Consider H.J. Rose’s critique of the Stoic philosopher (and man of letters) Seneca, who preached virtue while maintaining his position (as well as his considerable wealth) at the court of the monstrous emperor Nero (who was guilty, among other things, of killing his own mother):

That, being the most popular author of the day and master of an eloquence calculated to make the worst case appear passable, he should frame an elaborate justification of a matricide, may be passed over as one of the hard necessities of his position; but when the man who has done and is doing all this takes the tone of a rigid moralist and a seeker after uncompromising virtue, preaching, from his palace, simplicity and the plainest living with almost the unction of a St. Francis praising Holy Poverty, refusing all knowledge that does not tend to edification, and proclaiming, in verse worthy of a better man than Nero's hack, that the true king is he who fears nothing and desires nothing, the gorge of the reader rises and he turns for relief to some one who either made his life fit his doctrine or, if he behaved unworthily of the best that was in him, at least laid no claim to be a spiritual guide.

* A Handbook of Latin Literature (London: Methuen, 1936
  — cited in Richard A. Lanham’s Analysing Prose

General note on vocabulary (important!) — you will be expected to develop an active knowledge of the items introduced in the Learning Vocabularies for each unit, as well as any vocabulary items that are employed as paradigms in the Grammar. The Running Vocabularies are intended solely to help you work through the readings in each unit: while you should know the readings well, and be able to recognize general vocabulary in the context of a specific reading (if, for example, I were to give you a passage to translate based on one of the assigned readings), you will not be examined specifically on vocabulary that appears only in the Running Vocabularies.

General note on verbs (important!) — the typical Latin verb has four principal parts (fundamental forms from which various other forms of the verb are built) that must eventually be mastered. These are:

- the present active indicative
- the present active infinitive
- the perfect active indicative
- the perfect passive participle or the supine

Thus, when you look a verb up in a typical dictionary you will find something like the following:

*amō, amāre, amāūi, amātus*
or

amō (1) amāuī, amātus

We will begin with the first of these forms and will add the others later, but fairly early on you will find our book beginning to list the other elements of the verb without telling you what they are (e.g., dūcō 3 dūx- duct- in 1D). You should ignore this additional information until the forms have been properly introduced: there is no point in worrying about these forms until we begin to use them. (The complete list of forms will be listed in my flashcards, however, since the assumption is that you will be using these flashcards throughout the year, as the various forms are introduced.)

p. xiv: ph was actually pronounced like the “ph” of “top-hat”

p. 4: Reading (c) — enim is an explanatory word meaning “for,” “because”

p. 7: in the Learning Vocabulary — Verbs: habeō can also mean “I consider” (as in “we hold these truths to be self-evident”)

p. 17: in the paragraph for translation — ueniumt in line 1 = “they are coming” (3rd pl. pres. ind. act.); seruā at the very end of the passage = “keep safe!” (2nd sing. pres. imperative act. of seruō)

p. 19: in the Learning Vocabulary — Nouns, add exitium, ingenium, periculum, and somnium; under “Adjectives” note that multus in the singular can also mean “many a …”; nūllus is not a regular 1st-2nd declension adjective — it has a peculiar gen. and dat. sg. [Section 62]

p. 25: on deus (section 16) see Classical Philology 92.2 (1997) 138ff.; in section 17A, note that it is the vocative masculine s. of meus that is mī (but meus is also occasionally used for the vocative) [also in vocabulary on p. 36, and on p. 38 — section 20]

p. 30: Exercise sentences (a) and (e) — for the vocative, “my son,” see Grammar Section 20

p. 30: Exercise sentence (d) — for “you” (nominative singular of the personal pronoun), see Grammar Section 22

p. 36: in the Learning Vocabulary — Others: add the preposition ā, ab (“[away] from”)

p. 37: in section 18, note should be taken of the present imperatives for the verb sum: es / este

p. 38: in Exercise 2 — “go back! (pl.)” is ambiguous: you can use either abeo or redeo

p. 40: in Exercise 2C, patrēs = “fathers” (masc. nom. pl.) [see Learning Vocabulary for 1D]
p. 40: in section 23, add sub + abl. (1B)

p. 45: in the Running Vocabulary, note that nomen is 3n.

p. 46: in the Learning Vocabulary — Nouns, note that dīues, when used as an adjective, means “rich”; when used as noun it = “a rich person” (cf., e.g., Engl. “The rich like their pleasures.”)

p. 46: in the Learning Vocabulary — Nouns, add the word māter, mātris (3f.) — a curiously sexist omission from our learning vocabulary, that says something about the focus of the texts that are being employed for our readings!

p. 47: in section 24 — pay particular attention to note 4. The normal 2nd person sg. pres. act. imperative employs an –e. As so often, the book presents an irregular form as a model.

p. 50: the chart in section 29 is confusing and misleading — see Resource Sheets

p. 57: in the Running Vocabulary — the definition of subitus –a –um should read “sudden”

p. 58: in the Learning Vocabulary — New forms: verbs, add capiō

p. 58: in the Learning Vocabulary — New forms: verbs: ferō is not simply a third conjugation verb; it is irregular. See Grammar, section 35. (Ferō probably began as a third conjugation verb, but the loss of the thematic vowel in many of its forms makes it essentially athematic.)

p. 61: in Exercise 2 (with pulchrum) — opus is a 3rd decl. neut. noun like onus [2B]

p. 62: in section 40, note that the word negotium (2n.) means “business,” “work,” “occupation” but also “trouble” or “matter”; quid negoti est? can therefore be translated as either, “what’s the problem?” or “what’s the matter?” or simply “what’s up?” depending on the context.

p. 62: in Exercise 2.c, the form uōs (“you” — acc. pl.) is not introduced until section 43 [corrected to iē in revised edition]

p. 68: in the Learning Vocabulary — Nouns, under nihil, add nihilum (2n.), which does decline and gives, e.g., nihilī (“of no worth”)

p. 68: in the Learning Vocabulary — Verbs: auferō is not simply a third conjugation verb; it is a compound of ferō and conjugates like it

p. 69: in section 43 — it is a good idea to have a quick look at the plural forms of the 1st- and 2nd-person possessive adjectives (introduced in section 53 [Unit 2A]). Note how similar these forms can be to some forms of the personal pronoun.
p. 78: under nouns, the second entry in the second column should read “iuuen-is is”

p. 83: English-Latin (a) — read uirītē; for the expression “extremely beautiful,” see line 410 of the reading

p. 86: the Running Vocabulary should note that facile (the neuter acc. sg. of facilis) can be used as an adverb meaning “easily,” “with ease”

p. 87: in the Learning Vocabulary — New forms: adjectives, add ācer

p. 89: in Exercise 2, salūtat (“he/she/it greets”) has not yet been introduced

p. 92: in section 54, the presentation of the m./f. accusative of trēs/trīa is potentially confusing. Trēs/trīa is a regular third declension adjective: prior to the age of Christ (give or take), the m./f. acc. is regularly trēs; in later times the form trēs is employed.

p. 93: Exercise 2 — sōlt is from the noun (sōl, sōlis — sun)

p. 105: in section 60, the quantities in the gen. and dat. sg. of rēs are incorrect: these forms should be reī. (See the Resource Sheets for 2B on the fifth declension.)

p. 106: other adjectives similar to those in section 62 include alius, neuter, solus, totus, ullus, unus, uter

p. 113: Learning Vocabulary — New Forms and Grammar Section 63: in the masc. nom. sg., both hīc and hīc are found; the neut. nom./acc. sg. form is hōc

p. 115: in the Optional revision, 1 — we have not had salūtō (“to greet” — 1st conjugation)

p. 116: in Exercise 3b, read uidētur.

p. 117: in the third sentence (line 2) of the translation passage, read Nīcobūlō for Chrysalō

p. 121: in the Learning Vocabulary — Nouns, forum is 2n. [corrected in revised edition]

p. 126: add possum to the list of irregular verbs: pfct. – potuī

p. 127: in Exercise 1.c — the expression magnō post tempore involves a use of the ablative that we have not yet seen (the so-called ablative of degree of difference: see grammar section 100B.5). Literally, the expression means, “afterward by a long time.” This is not an example of the ablative of time.

p. 128: in the Reading Exercise — the expression longō post tempore involves a use of the ablative that we have not yet seen (the so-called ablative of degree of difference: see grammar section 100B.5). Literally, the expression means, “afterward by a long time.” This is not an example of the ablative of time.
p. 128: in Exercise 1.f you need the future of prōgredior (“to advance”), a deponent verb — this is not introduced until section 68; use prōgredientur

p. 133: in the Running Vocabulary for 2E — add a new meaning for the noun consilium (introduced in 1E): “deliberation, consultation, a considering together”

p. 134: in the Learning Vocabulary for 2E — Adjectives, similis can take either a dative or a genitive

p. 134: in the Learning Vocabulary for 2E — Adjectives, the entry for ambō should read ambō, ambae, ambō

p. 134: in the Learning Vocabulary for 2E — Verbs, audeo should be printed with an asterix: its perfect is irregular

p. 136: in Exercise 5, morābor (“I shall linger/delay”) is not in the Learning Vocabulary

p. 136: in Exercise 1.e amplexar is a hybrid form — it should be amplexābor (from amplexor [1]) or amplectar (from amplerctor [3])

pp. 147-48: the comparative forms are: melior, melius; peior, peius; plās (an adverb, actually, like satis and nimis); maior, maius; minor, minus

p. 150: the line numbers given in the margin of the reading passage make no sense [corrected in revised edition]; in line 9 of the passage, read fēcit; ualū (“very much, strongly”) in line 13 is not introduced until 6B

p. 151: in the English-Latin exercise 1.e, the phrase “than me” is potentially ambiguous, if you consider the scenario being presented here. The most logical way to take this is, “My brother is more like my father than I (am).”

p. 160: in Exercise 2, male (“badly, ill”) has not been introduced. It has a short final –e, according to the same principle as bene

p. 160: in Exercise 3, cōpiōsē (“richly, copiously”) is not in the vocabulary

p. 163: in Reading 1.d, read uirō rather than uirī

p. 172: Exercise 2 — the verb moror (1) appeared in 2E but is not part of the Learning Vocabulary

p. 172: Exercise 3 — the verb ponō (3) — “to place” — has not yet been introduced

p. 173: in Exercise 1.f, the ablatives are best explained as ablatives of respect (not introduced until section 147)
p. 175: in Exercise 3, *uirı̄tūte* should have a short -e. [corrected in revised edition] (You should also be aware that a number of these ablatives are not in fact ablatives of instrument or means, as the exercise would have you think.)

p. 175: the line numbers in the Reading Exercise are off by 1; in line four, delete the second *servūtō* [corrected in revised edition]; in line 12, read *dēcēpīt* [corrected in revised edition]

p. 180: the Running Vocabulary should note that throughout this reading the indefinite pronoun *aliquis/aliquid* (“someone”/“something”: see grammar section 102) appears as *quis/quid* (as routinely happens after *sī, num, nisē, and nē*). Instead, the vocabulary merely gives a particular gloss for, e.g., “*sī quid*” and “*sī quis*,” which can easily be missed and is in any case confusing.

p. 180: in the Running Vocabulary for 3D, *obstō* is 1, not 3  [corrected in revised edition]

p. 181: the Learning Vocabulary does not provide the principal parts for *pāreō* (*pārūt / pāritum* — regular) and *teneō* (*tenūt, tentus*). *Obsto* does have a fourth principal part (*obstātum*) but it is rarely found.

p. 186: in line 3 of the passage, read *pugnīs* for *pugnōs*

p. 193: in the Running Vocabulary for 4AIV, add: *creāre* — to create (as t.t. — elect); *extrā* (+ acc.) — beyond, outside of, without ; *fās* — divine will or law (often predicated of something to indicate that it is permitted in accordance with divine law); *sollicitāre* — to disturb, agitate, rouse, disquiet, instigate, tamper with; *sortīō / sortiōr* — to draw lots; *tunc* (adv.) — then, at that time

p. 193: in the Learning Vocabulary for 4AIV, the verb *coniciō* should be listed as 3/4

p. 198: in the paradigm for *quīdam, quaedam, quoddam*, the fem. and neut. nom. pl. should read *quaedam* (no macron).

p. 203: in Exercise 1d, the placement of *Agrigentīnīs* creates a certain ambiguity — it would be better positioned before *nūntiāuisse*.

p. 203: in Exercise 1f, note the slippage involved between the expected force of the comparative adjective *peiōra* (referring to *sclera*) and the actual point of the comparison, which lies in a contrast between the two agents (*nēminem vs. istum*).

p. 212: in the Learning Vocabulary, *effugiō* is 3/4; *intellegō* does not have a long -e- in the present tense.


p. 225: under Verbs, the word *cōnstitūtus* should be indented (it continues the entry from the previous column)
p. 232: in Exercise 2g, read *cuperere*.

p. 250: in Exercise 2 (last line), *amplexus est* comes from *amplector* (3).

p. 292: in section 139, n. 3: while the imperfect subjunctive can be used in conditions to indicate an unreal situation in the past, this is relatively rare and exceptional (as in reading 4Gii). Past unreal conditions usually employ the pluperfect subjunctive: see section 173.

p. 308: in section 146, the text should note that it is only the present (progressive) infinitive that is used in this construction. (As a result, it usually has the force of an imperfect indicative.) The infinitive is also usually active rather than passive.

p. 310: under “*ut* + indicative,” there should be three entries (cf. N.B. near the bottom of the page):
   
   (a) ‘how’
   (b) ‘as’
   (c) ‘when’

pp. 310-11: the following references should be included with the lists of constructions to be reviewed:

*ut* + indicative
   
   (a) exlamatory adverb (1C)
   (b) comparative adverb (1D)
   (c) temporal conjunction (= *ubi*) (1D: cf. T(a))

*ut* + subjunctive
   
   (a) indirect command/jussive noun clause (134) [in main clause: look for verb of commanding, urging, persuading, pleading, etc.]
   (b) result/consecutive clause (144) [in main clause: look for word such as *tantus*, *tam*, *adeo*. Also introduced by various expressions such as *accidit*, *perficio* (latter in past tense only) — cf. 135; 144 n. 3.]
   (c) purpose/final clause (145) [This is the one type of subordinate clause involving the subjunctive that routinely is *not* signalled in the main clause. Note that purpose clauses are also unique in that they routinely
can begin a sentence. In the present and future tenses, *perficio* introduces a purpose clause (135).]

(d) *accidit / perficio* (see above and cf. 135; 144 n. 3)

*qui* + indicative
- see Q1; cf. 106, 107, 126, 137

*qui* + subjunctive
- see Q2 [in practice, a subordinate clause introduced by *qui* and employing the subjunctive will often have a force similar to that of clauses introduced by *cum*, *ut*, or *quamvis*]
  (a) purpose (particularly following verbs that imply motion) (145 n. 3)
  (b) consecutive / generic (the relative clause of characteristic) (140.1)
  (c) causal (often signalled by *quippe*) (140.2)
  (d) as part of reported utterance in indirect discourse (= subordinate clause in indirect discourse) (142)
  (e) concessive (cf. 141.2; often flagged by *tamen* or the like in the main clause)

p. 335: note ad l. 117 — *quā proficiscerentur* is usually explained, as it is here, as a relative clause of purpose, but this is imprecise. Whether one takes the abl. abs. *cōnstitūtā nocte* in a temporal sense (“once the night had been determined”) or, much less likely, as an abl. of time when (“on the night that had been determined”), the relative clause has the force of an indirect command/jussive noun clause (“on which [abl. of time] the Allobroges were to set out”), introduced by *cōnstitūtā*. This is a good example of the flexibility of the so-called relative clause of characteristic: *qui* + subj. can introduce virtually any type of subordinate clause with a subjunctive, in effect replacing *cum*, *ut*, or *nē*.

p. 338: in section 152 and nn. 1 and 2 — treating the deliberative subjunctive as merely an interrogative form of the jussive subjunctive is unfortunate, in that the deliberative subjunctive regularly takes the negative *nōn* (as opposed to the jussive, which takes *nē*). The book confuses this by introducing the deliberative subjunctive in n. 1, in the midst of the discussion of the jussive, only then to return to constructions involving the jussive in n. 2.

p. 339: Exercise 2i — in the first line, *pugnāns* has the force of conditional clause: “if she fights [Latin would employ a fut. ind. here], a woman will be defeated.” In the same manner, *qui uetet* is employed, not to introduce a purpose clause (n. in text), but as the equivalent of the apodosis of a future-less-vivid condition (“he held a sword in his hand which *would prevent* [her, should she start to scream]”). The pres. *uētē* is determined by the vivid pres. deliberative subj. *clāmet*, which introduces the second half of the line and puts us in primary sequence.

p. 340: section 153.1 — the use of *nōn* in the final example (from Cicero) is exceptional. *Utinam* was likely understood to have an interrogative force originally; in any case an
impossible wish is similar to the deliberative subjunctive (152 n. 1) in that one wishes that something were not in fact happening or had not in fact happened.

p. 340: section 153.2 — the negative with the potential subjunctive is nōn

p. 341: Exercise a — note the paratactic construction, which juxtaposes the potential subj. (uellem — “I would have wished”) to the impossible wish involving past time (inuitāssēs — “if only you had invited me”) to yield, “I would have wished that you had invited me.” (Cf. the example in the middle of p. 340: velim adsīs.)

p. 356: Learning Vocabulary: Verbs — add metuō (3) metuī

p. 365: Exercise 1d — an idiomatic translation of this sentence entails the use of quīn (174.2)

p. 374: section 165.3 — what is wrong with the translation of the passage from Ovid cited in the NB? (Hint: notice the quantities in the verb uenī.)

p. 388: section 174.1 — nē can also be used (in place of quōminus) to introduce this construction

p. 395: Running Vocabulary for 5Gii — incurrō is 3rd conjugation

p. 401: in the paradigm presented in section 177, the dat. sg. of uterque (all genders) is utrīque

TOTAL LEARNING VOCABULARY (pp. 557ff.):

atrax: add the definition “terrible”

corōna –ae (1f.) — garland [omitted from the vocabulary: 1A]

inuītō (1) — to invite [omitted from the vocabulary: 4Biii]

placet: placeō is also used with a personal subject (“I please, win approval”)

pōculum, -t (2n.) — cup [omitted from the vocabulary: 4cii]

teneō is 2 not 3

Corrigenda/Addenda for Reading Latin: Text, Units 1-3

p. 14, line 298: the possessive adjective uester, uestra, uestrum (“your [pl.]”) is not introduced until unit 2A; uestrum = “your” (nom. neut. sg.) and modifies opus
p. 17, line 361: read omnīs

p. 27, line 10: the authors retain the reference in the original text to Nicobulus being “clever” (doctum), but then immediately contradict this by inserting the ablatives of description (lines 11-12) that portray him as being a fool (their own innovation). The best way to deal with this is to take doctum as “now that he is in the know,” “now that he has been instructed/informed (of our scheme),” which could in fact be what Plautus intends (since his Nicobulus is indeed portrayed as foolish in the course of the play).

p. 27, line 20: given the scenario that informs this scene, the notion of Chrysalus possibly returning money to Nicobulus makes no sense — the authors would appear to have nodded here

p. 38, line 311: the expression multō tempore post involves a use of the ablative that we have not yet seen (the so-called ablative of degree of difference: see grammar section 100B.5). Literally, the expression means, “afterward by a long time” (i.e., “long afterward”). This is not an example of the ablative of time.

p. 50, line 60: place a comma after uōs

Corrigenda/Addenda for Reading Latin: Text, Units 4-5

p. 84: Sertorius: an adherent of Cinna, Sertorius was a brilliant general and popular leader. Upon Sulla’s return from the East in 83, he withdrew to Spain and, later, Africa. Eventually, he attracted a sufficient following among the discontented peoples of Spain to establish his own government there and defy a number of attempts on the part of the Romans to oust him. Working in a loose alliance with other rebellious forces of the time — most notably, pirates in the eastern Mediterranean, the Romans’ old foe Mithridates, and the leaders of a massive slave revolt in southern Italy — he posed a serious challenge to Rome’s interests before being assassinated in 73 or 72.

p. 86: the use of imperfect subjunctives here, dealing with an unreal situation in the past, is exceptional: cognōsceret (330), remitterēs (330), ignōrāret (331), uidērētur (331), cōnstituerēs (331), tollerēs (333). Normally, one would expect the pluperfect subjunctive to be used in setting out a past unreal condition (section 173), but the context here is somewhat more involved, since it deals prospectively with a hypothetical situation in the past in which Verres would have considered the possible choices that would have confronted him, at some future time, had he decided to seek the testimony of Lucius Raecius. [Note 3 in section 139 is somewhat misleading.]

p. 98, line 10: delete the comma after ut at the end of this line.

p. 100, line 41: read repulsam attulit, with diēs as subject of both uēnit and attulit. (With tulit alone, the meaning would be, “and he [Catiline] endured a defeat,” which
involves an awkward change of subject: cf. Cic. Pro Sestio 114 and 8th Philippic 27; Livy epit. 105 and 108.)

p. 103, line 73: nōn factūrē essent presents an example of the ad hoc fut. subjunctive. The Latin here (which reflects that employed in the original text of Sallust) mixes two constructions: 1) a relative clause of characteristic (consecutive rel. clause) employed to introduce a clause of result (note the use of tam): “there was nothing so difficult that they would not do it” (where we expect the impf. subj. in secondary sequence); and 2) a subordinate clause in indirect discourse: “there was nothing, they said, that they would not do” (where the “fut. subjunctive” with essent represents an original fut. indicative being reported in secondary sequence)

p. 109, lines 168ff.: there is an ambiguity in the tense of attribuit in 168 and 169 (perfect or vivid present?) that is not resolved until the next sentence, which offers arcessit, concitat, vocat (all vivid presents). This type of ambiguity can arise in actual Latin, but it is potentially confusing, since the default assumption would be that attribuit is perfect. The potential confusion is not present in the original text.