The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Juvenal, IV. 116

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 1-2 / February 1894, pp 16 - 17

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187165, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187165

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1894). Juvenal, IV. 116. The Classical Review, 8, pp 16-17 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187165

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ῖσαν produced ἴασι after the analogy of δέδιον to δέδιασι. From the relation of ῖσαν, ῖσαν to ἴασι and from no other source, as it seems to me, we have to trace the creation of the common Attic type τίθεαισι by the side of ἐτίθεσαν in the place of the Ionic τῑθείσι (τῑθέντι) or the Doric τῑθεντι. Whether the Ionic or Doric accent is the older, is a subject of dispute. It has become usual to affirm that the unbroken tradition as to the Ionic form is in error and that we should write τῑθείσι. But the external authority is overwhelmingly strong in favour of διδοῦσαν, ἰείσι, τῑθείσι and there are the numerous forms in ὕσι which could not be accented on the first without introducing an improbable confusion between the 3rd sing. and plural. Compare the accentuation of the corresponding participles, διδούς, ἰείς, τῑθείς, ζευγνύς. Whether or no the 3rd persons plural of the present and imperfect are, as is generally maintained, cases of the present participle, their identity in form is obvious. It only remains to account for the Doric τῑθεντι. The Doric dialect followed the same course with the 3rd pl. pres. of verbs in μι as it did with the same person of the thematic imperfect, i.e. it transferred the accent in the 3rd plural to the same vowel as was accented in the 1st and 2nd persons plural.

*H(ῥä), ῥσθα, ῥν (ῥεν) are formed on the same principle from the uncontracted subjunctive ῥω, the language in this instance making no distinction between the modal and radical σ. The hereditary form of the imperfect ῥα (ῥσν), ῥσ (ῥσσ), ῥσ (ῥστ) is known from the dialects. But though ῥα is common to the two series of persons, the instinct of the classical language regarded it as having the termination of the perfect and created from it ῥσαν as ῥσαν from ῥα. The epic ῥασι obviously bears the same relation to ῥσαν as ἴασι to ῖσαν, but, analogical as it is,

it never was strong enough to displace so common a word as the inherited εἰσι.

An attempt at a similar formation is found in the Herodotean ἐτίθεας created from ἐτίθεσαν, after the analogy of ῖσαν ῖας. The motive of the change from ἐτίθης apparently was that the termination in ης was felt to be connected with an intransitive meaning. The same motive accounts for the thematic ἐδίδουν, ἐδίδους, ἐδίδον, ἐτίθεις, ἐτίθει, the laws of contraction rendering the Herodotean expedient useless in the Attic dialect.

I have succeeded I hope in giving a consistent and rational account of the apparently anomalous forms which are the subject of this paper. If I have done so, it affords an almost convincing demonstration of the truth of the position that the Greek σ aorist is an indicative formed with the personal suffixes of the perfect from the σ subjunctive of an unthematic stem. For years I was, like other students of Greek Grammar, perplexed and baffled by the formation of ῥια, ῥεσθα, ῥει. The comparative philologists yielded no help. Their explanations (see Brugmann's *Greek Grammar*, p. 109) came to nothing more than a statement that the tradition of the language had gone seriously wrong. Even such great Atticists as Dawes and the Headmaster of Westminster conceived that ῥεσθα violated the dialectic law of contraction and denied its existence. But in the light of the theory I am striving to maintain it will be seen that all three persons are regularly formed in accordance with the usual procedure of the Greek language, and, if ῥεσθα had not been attested by manuscripts and grammatical tradition, it would be necessary to suppose its existence as a link in the chain of causes which transformed ῥδσθα into ῥδεσθα and introduced εἰ into the 2nd person of the pluperfect.

F. W. WALKER.

JUVENAL, IV. 116.

I TAKE leave to doubt Mr. S. G. Owen's interpretation of 'dirusque a ponte satelles,' Juv. iv. 116 (*Class. Rev.* vii. p. 401). He says 'it is simpler to understand by *pons* the celebrated causeway.....by which the Appia Via was carried across the foot of the valley below Aricia.' On general questions of Latinity I should not think of engaging with Mr. Owen, but *pons* or

'bridge' I take to imply in either language a passage from one point to another, generally carried on arches or otherwise open at the bottom, certainly detached at both sides. Now the 'causeway' which still remains below La Riccia and the Madonna di Galloro does not in the least correspond to this simile. The road is carried up the side of the steep hill from

the ancient Aricia to the modern Genzano, and where the ascent begins it is for some way buttressed up by a massive wall of stone, so high as to suggest a portion out of a Florentine palace. This no doubt was made necessary partly by the very steep natural slope, which the embankment modified, partly by the watery and half-submerged condition of the Vallericcia. The road however on its inner side is continuous with the hill, and presents no analogy to 'bridge,' 'causeway' or 'viaduct.' A better parallel is a railway embankment carried along a slope, like many that may be seen on Italian and Swiss mountain lines. Similar pieces of the Via Appia embanked with stone substructures may be seen on the descent from Genzano to the Pontine plain, between Genzano and Castel S. Gennaro, and at other places further along, *e.g.* between Fondi and Itri.

Again the carriage is not necessarily 'journeying from Puteoli to Rome.' The Via Appia after climbing from Bovillae to Castra Albana (Albano) descended into the Vallericcia, and up out of this to the modern Genzano. There were two slopes, and no doubt beggars on both. Aricia was the only town for miles along the road, and 'Aricinos axes' would suit either hill. And did beggars encamp upon bridges because they were narrow? I am not aware that they were narrower than roads. The ancient bridge was often a lofty arch, and offered the carriage a *clivus* which it slackened to climb.

T. W. ALLEN.

By the courtesy of the editor I have been allowed to see Mr. Allen's remarks in the proof. I feel very diffident at finding myself in conflict with such an adept as Mr. Allen on Italian topography; still, in justice to myself, I must say that when I was in Italy last April I made an excursion to Ariccia, with a special view to clearing up this passage in Juvenal; and what I wrote in my article is the result, based on notes taken at the time. It seemed to me that the causeway in question might very well be described as a bridge (*pons*). In support of the testimony of my own eyes I will only add the following quotation from Murray's *Handbook to Rome* (ed. 1888), p. 436; 'About ten minutes' walk from the village, descending into the valley to the S., is the magnificent causeway, 700 feet in length, and about 40 in width, by which the Via Appia was carried across the northern extremity of the Vallericcia: it is built of quadrilateral blocks of peperino, and is pierced by three arched apertures for the passage of water. In the deepest part of the valley its height is not less than 40 feet; a short distance from its S.E. extremity is the opening of what appears to be the emissarium of the lake of Nemi, from which flows an abundant and pellucid stream, which carries with it fertility into the subjacent plain of Vallericcia.' The italics are my own. I venture to think that there is here more than an 'analogy' to a 'bridge.' Further, as this causeway slopes from the ridge of the hill towards Ariccia, if the carriage were coming from Puteoli, it would be journeying down (*devexae*).

S. G. OWEN.

DORIC FUTURES IN ARISTOPHANES.

THE existence, outside the Doric dialect, of a future at once sigmatic and circumflexed is too well established to need proof. The use however of such a future in the best Attic is generally denied, and those instances that occur in Aristophanes are even by the author of the *New Phrynichus*, the one safe guide in all such matters, attributed to the exigencies of metre.

The futures in question are all of the middle voice, and come from roots containing a *υ* diphthong. They fall naturally into three readily distinguishable groups.

NO. LXVI. VOL. VIII.

1. φεύγω (φυγγάνω), φεύξομαι or φευξοῦμαι: πυνθάνομαι (πυνθομαι), πεύσομαι or πευσοῦμαι.

2. νέω, νεύσομαι or νενσοῦμαι: πλέω, πλεύσομαι or πλευσοῦμαι: πνέω, πνεύσομαι or πνευσοῦμαι: ῥέω, ῥεύσομαι or ῥενσοῦμαι (and θέω, θεύσομαι, no form θενσοῦμαι actually occurring in our texts, though Stephanus says that it 'citatur ex Thucydide,' while the form ἀποθνεύσομεθα is mentioned by a Grammarian in Bekker, 428, 3).

3. καίω, καύσω, or καύσομαι or κανσοῦμαι: κλαίω, κλαίῃσω, or κλαύσομαι or κλανσοῦμαι.

C