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beyond the scope of the present inquiry. It will however not be amiss to point out how some of the more prominent idioms connected with the present and aorist indicative flow from the fundamental idea of action going on and concluded.

First, as regards the present forms:
1. Action ‘evolving itself’ naturally covers habitual action, the latter implying something that is still going on, not ended. Thus we get the present and imperfect of habitual action.

2. Whatever is vividly pictured as enacting itself before our eyes comes under ‘action evolving itself’—hence the historic present.

3. Vividness likewise accounts for the prophetic present so common in Aristeophanes. In this, as in the previous case, the grammatical present is the more suitable as having no distinctive mark of time.

4. Such expressions as πειμαφαν ἀγγελλόνυς (instead of ἀγγελλόνυς) may be justified on similar grounds. Literally ‘they sent persons announcing’; the time, which is colourless in the participle, being left to be gathered from the context. Again πάρον ἦμα ‘being present (in past time) I shall tell.’ The time of πάρον is per se present, past, or future, and has to be inferred from the context.

5. What grammarians term conative action is usually nothing more than a disposition to activity. Now the nearest approach to this idea lies in the stem which marks action in process of development. Hence the Praesens de Conatu and Imperf. de Conatu, e.g. Io. xiii. 7 στὶ μου νίπτεις τοῖς πόδας and τῆκενν of Demosth. ‘he was for giving.’

6. If we take the verb νικῶ it strictly represents no more than ‘I a-conquering,’ which truth may endure after actual victory, so that νικῶ may stand for ‘I am conqueror.’

Secondly, as regards the aorist:
1. It is obvious that ‘concluded action’ is well predicated of a stem which with its augment and personal endings serves to express:
   (a) Absolute past isolated events, (b) in narrative successive events, (c) relative priority of one occurrence with respect to another.

2. The inceptive aorist marks entrance into a state or entrance into action: in either case we have something concluded i.e. the end of the beginning.

3. The dramatic or conversational aorist (Aoristus Tragicus) seems to spring from Greek impatience and haste to mark something as done, e.g. approval given εἰπήσας, loathing felt ἄκπισις. There being no affix or suffix wherewith to graft an aorist stem (concluded action) on present time, the only resource left is to employ the aorist stem in its only available shape, i.e. with augment.

J. DONOVAN.

1 I think it is safe to say there exists no Aoristus de Conatu in Greek. Such examples as Ion 1291 ἐκτεινά σ’ ὄντα πολέμιον...1286 καὶ ἐκτεινὲς σὺ φαρμύκτων do not refer to attempted murder but rather by a sort of figurative diction to murder accomplished as far as intention and means taken could effect it.

(To be continued.)

ON SOME PASSAGES OF JUVENAL.

VII. 175—177.

tempta.
Chrysogonus quanti doceat uel Polio quanti lautorum pueros, artem scindens Theodori.

So all MSS., but scindens was altered by Jahn to scindes, and he is followed by Mayor, Weidner, Bücheler. The sentence then runs easily ‘Ascertain the sums made by a successful music-master, and you will tear up your Art of Rhetoric.’ But I think the participle scindens should be restored, as capable both of translation and parallel. It means ‘Tearing up your Art of Rhetoric, go and ascertain the sums a successful music-master makes.’ It can be supported by Propertius 3, 17, 37 ante fores templi crater antisitiss coæ | libatum fundens in tua sacra merum; and 3, 19, 21 teque, o Minae uenundata, Scylla, figura, | tandem purpurea regna paterna coma.

VIII. 27.
salue Gaetulice, seu tu Silanus, quocumque alio de sanguine, rarui ciuis et egregius patriae contingis ouanti.

The asyndeton is harsh; uel quocumque
might have been expected. As quocumque occurs infra line 60, the scribe’s eye may have wandered thither, and the word have been introduced from that line. Read quo-
que allo de sanguine.

VIII. 108—110.
nunc socis iuga pauc a boum, grex paruus equaram,
et pater armenti capto eripiuntur,  
quoue might have been expected. As quocumque occurs infra line 60, the scribe’s eye may 
quo-
been introduced from that line. Read 
have wandered thither, and the word have 

VIII. 237—244.
hic nouus Arpinas, ignobilis et modo Romae municipalis eques, galeatum ponit ubique praesidium attonitis et in omni monte laborat.
tantum igitur muros intra toga contulit illi nominis ac tituli, quantum † in Leucade,  
Thessal iae campis Octauius abstulit udo caedibus adsiduis gladio, sed Roma parentem Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit.

Here there are two points to notice, first the reading monte, second the obliterated reading in. The reading monte is apparently due to the first hand of P, and a Paris MS. 1585, cited by Ruperti: it is recognized in the scho-
lium. On the other hand gentle appears in po. Here is a startling difference in sense: was Cicero busy on all the seven hills of Rome with his precautions against Catiline, or in every tribe of Italy, where he stationed forces to crush the rebellion? Or rather may a third view be suggested, that Juvenal is writing with characteristic rhetorical exaggeration of the well-planned arrest upon the Mulvian bridge, upon which he seizes as the central fact in the downfall of the conspiracy? I think so, and propose to restore an ancient reading in omni ponte. Two considerations favour the change. (1) The adjacent (l. 245) Volscorum in monte soletab may well be the cause of monte, another example of the error noticed on viii. 27. I suppose no one would seriously defend in omni gente, evidently an attempt to emend monte, which was not understood. If emendation is required Weidner’s inermi monte is neater. (2) The note of the scho-
liast shows ponte to be an ancient reading: et in omni monte l. quia in montibus condita est Roma. legitur et ponte l. propter Mul-
uium ubi Catilinae coniurati et Allobroges deprehensi sunt.

I proceed to consider the unmétrical quantum in Leucade, which Bücheler rightly calls corrupt. Various remedies have been devised (1) quantum non Leucade po (2) quantum uix Leucade Hermann, followed by Mayor (3) quantum undo Leucade Weidner. The reading non appears to be wrong because, as Kiaer shows, the negative cannot be understood from the first into the second clause, and the words must be translated ‘Cicero the man of peace won as much glory as Augustus did not win at Actium but did win at Philippi’; which is absurd. If the negative could be understood in the second clause, it is still inap-
propriate; for the meaning is that Cicero the man of peace won as much glory as Augustus the man of war won, not as Augustus did not win; indeed an imperial writer could hardly have spoken so slight-
ingly of Augustus. The same objection, though to a less extent, applies to the reading uix; it disparages Augustus: for Weidner’s undo Leucade, lumbering in rhythm and lame in syntax, there is little to be said.

I propose to read u in: this slight change makes all simple. ‘Cicero won as much glory, the man of peace (toga) in Rome (muros intra), as Augustus won in war (u) at Actium (Leucade), and by constant slaughter with the sword (udo caedibus adsiduis gladio) in Thessaly’ (Thessal iae campis). The double antithesis is very skilful: intr a muros is opposed to (a) Leu-
cade (b) Thessal iae campis; toga to (a) u (b) udo caedibus adsiduis gladio. For u used of warlike violence cp. Verg. Aen. 9. 399 qua u uesta, quibus audax armis eripere? 12. 260 me duce ferrum | corripite, o miseri, quos improbus advena bello | territat, inualidas ut aues, et litora uestra u poputat.

X. 90—94.
uisne salutari sicut Seianus, habere 
tantundem, atque illi summas donare 
curules, illum exercitibus praeponer e, tutor haberi 
principis augusta Caprearum in rupe se-
dentis 
cum grge Chaldaeo?

Here habere at the end of the line so near to haberi is suspicious: again I fancy the scribe’s eye has wandered, as in viii. 27. Read amari tantundem: cp. Hor. Sat. 1. 3. 71 amari si uolat. The great popularity of Seianus before his fall is remarked upon by Velleius ii. 127 and 128. The reading
augusta, ‘royal,’ is adopted by Bücheler from P; but who that has sat on ‘Capri’s narrow cliff’ can doubt that augusta pu> is right?

XI. 117—119.
illa domi natas nostraque ox arbore mensas tempora uiderunt; hoc lignum stabat ad usus, annosam si forte nucem deiecerat Eurus.

Bücheler, in his third edition, has introduced hoc from P for hos co: then hoc lignum I suppose means ‘the logs of this sort of tree.’ But this leaves usus indeterminate, so that the old reading hos seems necessary: ‘its logs were stored for this use,’ viz. to make tables.

XII. 48—51.
esed quis nunc alius, qua mundi parte quis audet argento præferre caput rebusque salutem? non propter uitam faciunt patrimonia quidam sed uitio caeci propter patrimonia uiuunt.

Bentley on Horace A.P. 337 proposed to expunge the last two lines here printed, lines 50—51. As those lines seem to be genuine, I think it worth while to answer his strictures in detail.

(1) He objects to the employment of the word quidam ‘some,’ as in 47—48 Juvenal says ‘All prefer money to life,’ while in 50—51 ‘Some prefer money to life.’ What is the sense of saying ‘some’ after he has said ‘all’? If we were criticizing a logical writer, this might be a difficulty. But poets are not logicians, least of all Juvenal, whose thought often tends to be disconnected. After having made a general assertion, the poet proceeds to support it by certain (quidam) special cases within his own knowledge. The meaning of quidam seems to be ‘I know certain persons who do not make fortunes to live, but blind through infatuation live only to make fortunes.’

(2) He criticizes the expression facere patrimoniam as a ‘scabies locutionis.’ But in silver writers patrimonium often means property generally, not necessarily inherited property, e.g. vii. 113 centum patrimoniam causidicorum, where patrimonial is equivalent to res. If Horace (Ep. 1. 1. 65) can say suadet qui rem facias, why should not Juvenal say patrimonia facere?

(3) He characterizes utio caeci as ‘alienum et pannosum.’ Few will feel any difficulty about the proposition that men are blinded by the love of money. The use of uitium is illustrated by xiv. 175 where humanae mentis uitium is defined as saeua cupidio immodici census, i.e. avarice.

(4) He complains that the lines interrupt the context. But illogical amplification is characteristic of Juvenal, who like all moralists loves to enforce his moral truths by repetition in and out of season. There is a similar irrelevant amplification in xiv. 241—243, where he says that the modern love of riches is as keen as was the love of ancient heroes for their fatherland. The mention of Meneceus, who killed himself to save his city Thebes, si Graecia uera, leads to a description of the Σαρποί, born from serpents’ teeth. These have nothing to do with the point, and I wonder that no critic for that reason has proposed to omit lines 241—243.

XIII. 208.
has patitur poenas peccadii sola voluntas.

‘Such punishments attend on the mere wish to sin.’ The reading sola (ω) is accepted by Bücheler and most editors. P has saeua. I am inclined to think that saeua should be retained, taking peccadii saeua voluntas as ‘the relentless will to sin’; as in xiv. 175 saeua cupidio immodici census means ‘the relentless craving for unbounded wealth.’ Or, if we are to alter saeua, I should prefer something nearer to it than sola. Weidner’s laeu is ingenious: cp. xiv. 228 laeuo monitu pueros producit auaros. Possibly however saeua is the poet’s word.

XIV. 140—145.
ergo paratur altera uilla tibi; cum rus non sufficit unum, et proferre libet fines maiorque uidetur et melior uicina seges, mercar is et hanc et arbusta et densa montem qui canet oliua.

So the lines should be punctuated, not with a comma at tibi (141), as Mayor and Bücheler, nor a colon at seges (143), as Mayor. The awkwardness of the ordinary stopping has led editors to misunderstand, and Weidner to alter, the text gratuitously. Translate: ‘This is why you buy another country-house; when one estate does not content you, and you would gladly extend your boundaries, thinking a neighbour’s acres broader and better, you buy them as well and the shrubberies and hill gray with clustering olives.’
The text, so printed by Bücheler after Po, is hard, as there is no construction for the infinitive conduplicari; nor is conduplicare, the reading of a few MSS adopted by Mayor, any improvement. In either case the sentence is harsh, as some verb of teaching must be supplied to govern the infinitive; thus Bücheler Rhein. Mus. 43 p. 295 understands instituit from praecepit. Weidner ingeniously reads conduplicandi dat libertatem totas effundit habenas, beginning the apodosis at totas ‘he who allows them free scope in doubling by fraud their inherited property, gives the reins wildly to the chariot.’ A simpler remedy would be to transpose 229, 228; then conduplicari would depend on praecepit.

nam quisquis magni census praecepit amorem, et laeuo monitu pueros producit anaros, et qui per fraudes patrimonia conduplicari, dat libertatem et totas effundit habenas curriculo, quem si reuoces, subsistere nescit et te contempto rapitur metisque relictis.

Dr. Jebb in his note on Antig. 411 καθήμεθ’ ἄκρων ἐκ πάγων explains the use of ἐκ or ἀπό with a verb denoting position as follows. After quoting H. 14, 153 Ἡμὴ δ’ εἰσίατε κρυφθαλίοις ὑπερθαλίοις στὰς ἐκ Οἰλίμπου ἄκτω δῶν, and three other instances (Eur. Ph. 1000, 1224, Troy. 522), he says, ‘In all these passages, a picture is presented, and we have to glance from a remoter to a nearer object. The mental eye is required to measure the space between Hera on the peak of Olympus, and Poseidon on the plain of Troy; between Megareus on the walls of Thebes, and the cavern into which his corpse is to fall. And, in each case, ἐκ or ἀπό denotes the quarter in which the remoter object is to be looked for. This, which might be called the “surveying” use, is distinct from that in which the prep. has a pregnant force, as being directly suggestive of motion (οἱ ἐκ Συκελλίας ἔχοντες); but it springs from the same mental tendency,—viz. to take a rapid glance over the dividing interval. Cp. ἐπηασθαι πρός τυνος (“on his side”). So here: in the foreground of the picture is the corpse, which they have just laid bare. Now look to the hillocks behind it: in that quarter you will see the guards at their post.’

Similarly on Philoc. 1076-7 εἰς ὄρον τὰ τ’ ἐκ νεός στέλλει ναῦται he says, ‘The only difference between τὰ ἐκ νεός here and τὰ ἐν νηπί is that the former suggests the notion of the quarter—at some distance from the speaker—where the preparations are to be made. Cp. Plat. Lach. 184 A. ἦ δὲ γέλοιο καὶ κρότος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκ τῆς διλλάδος:—“the people off there in the merchant-ship.” Thuc. 6, 32, συνειπέκειτο ἐκ καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ὄμμος ὀ ἐκ τῆς γῆς (where ἐκ carries the mental eye from the scene on board the ships to the scene ashore).’

May it not be objected that this theory, instead of explaining the prepositions in connection with the words they belong to, attaches them to a verbal notion not expressed in the sentence? Whatever ἐκ means in the words καθήμεθ’ ἐκ πάγων, it ought to mean something or other that develops and enriches the idea of ‘sitting down on the hill’ internally to that idea: but the theory makes ἐκ external to that idea, diverting its force to aid an imaginary verbal notion of ‘surveying.’ So in ὀ