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](#)

On Some Uses of the Aorist Participle

Frank Carter and Milton W. Humphreys

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 1-2 / February 1891, pp 3 - 7

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993004, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993004

How to cite this article:

Frank Carter and Milton W. Humphreys (1891). On Some Uses of the Aorist Participle. The Classical Review, 5, pp 3-7 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993004

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

or a nip of brandy (G. Radde, *Die Chews-uren und ihr Land*, p. 111 sq.).

In conclusion it is hardly necessary to say that even if, as I have tried to show, in ancient as in modern Greece swallows may have been allowed to build their nests on the rafters inside the house, it would be absurd to suppose that they did not sometimes build them under the eaves. If any proof that they did so were needed, we

might quote the lines in the Anthology (*Anthol. Palat.* x. 16, 5 sq.),

καὶ φιλόπαις ὑπὸ γείσα δόμους τεύεσσα
χελιδὼν
ἐκγόνα πηλοχύτους ξεινοδοκεῖ θαλάμοις.

'The swallow builds her nest under the eaves' &c.

J. G. FRAZER.

ON SOME USES OF THE AORIST PARTICIPLE.

IN Thuc iv. 81 we have: αὐτὸν δὲ Βρασιδαν βουλόμενον μάλιστα Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἀπέστειλαν, προῦθυμήθησαν δὲ καὶ οἱ Χαλκιδῆς, ἄνδρα ἔν τε τῇ Σπάρτῃ δοκοῦντα δραστήριον εἶναι ἐς τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐξῆλθε πλείστον ἄξιον Λακεδαιμονίοις γενόμενον. τό τε γὰρ παρατύκτα ἐαυτὸν παρασχὼν δίκαιον καὶ μέτριον ἐς τὰς πόλεις ἀπέστειρε τὰ πολλά κ.τ.λ.

Dr. Rutherford's treatment of the passage is hardly satisfactory. Considering γενόμενον = ὅς ὕστερον ἐγένετο a solecism, he treats the words from ἄνδρα to γενόμενον as an 'adscript' and omits them from the text. He does not seem to have observed that γὰρ in the next sentence is then quite meaningless. The moderation of Brasidas and his consequent success, referring, as the words ἐς τὰς πόλεις shew, to his conduct in Chalcidicé, cannot obviously be the reason either why the Lacedaemonians sent him thither *on the first occasion*, or why the Chalcidians wished him to come. The supposed adscript must therefore have formed part of the original text, unless changes even more considerable are to be made. The word γὰρ also forbids us to take ἐξῆλθε of his original start from Peloponnese, and πλείστον...γενόμενον of his rescue of Megara, as would otherwise be possible. Therefore γενόμενον cannot refer to time past to the verbs ἀπέστειλαν, προῦθυμήθησαν. It is simply one of the few instances of the rule that a purely attributive participle (i.e. a simple epithet, as distinct from one qualifying adverbially another verb) can be used without time-reference to the principal verb. Professor Goodwin (*Moods and Tenses* § 152) says 'An attributive aorist participle occasionally refers to time *absolutely* past, without regard to the time of the verb': he quotes (a) Her. vii. 62, (b) vii. 106, both quoted (with (c) vii. 164) by Professor Campbell in the *Classical Review* for November, but gives no Attic examples. As examples of the corresponding use of the present he

gives (*M. and T.* 141) τὴν νῦν Βοιωτίαν καλουμένην ὤκησαν Thuc. i. 12, and Dem. ix. 15 where also νῦν is closely joined with the participle. It will I think be found that the usage is limited to the cases where the participle is *unmistakeably* attributive, i.e. where either we have the article as in (a), (c) or it stands with ἄνθρωπος or similar word in apposition as in (b). Its attributive character is further emphasized, as a rule, by the addition, as in (a), of a *contradicting* adverb, i.e. one shewing that the participle cannot have regard to the main verb. Thus in Thuc. iv. 18 we have ὁ νῦν ὑμῖν καλῶς ἔχει πρὸς ἡμᾶς πρᾶξαι, καὶ μήποτε ὕστερον, ἣν ἄρα μὴ πιθόμενοι σφαλῆτε, ἃ πολλὰ ἐνδέχεται, νομισθῆναι τύχῃ καὶ τὰ νῦν προχωρήσαντα κρατῆσαι, where προχωρήσαντα cannot possibly be past to κρατῆσαι. Similarly Dem. xviii. (*De Cor.*) 171 (285) (ἐβιάζον ἂν) οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα τὰς μεγάλαις ἐπιδόσεσι ἐπιδόντες. Another example where the participle is substantival is found in Dem. xxi. (c. *Midiam*) 103 (547) τὸν τούτο ποιήσαντ' ἐμισθώσατο, where edd. read ποιήσοντ' against authority of Σ. Similarly in Andoc. *Myst.* 19. ὁ ἀπογράφας αὐτὸν Ἀνδὸς ἦν. Thus also are to be explained the instances in *M. and T.* 41, which Professor Goodwin explains as an exceptional use of the imperfect: but there is no analogy for this, since the 'philosophic imperfect' always conveys the notion of *turns out to be*, *was proved to be*, or the like. An even more striking instance is Dem. xxi. (c. *Midiam*) 178 (572) ἦν δ' οὗτος ὁ τοῦ βελτίστου πατρὸς Χαρικλείδου, τοῦ ἄρχαντος. Chariclides, as the previous sentence shews, was archon at the time of the assault mentioned, and τοῦ ἄρχαντος must therefore mean 'who was archon.' Possibly the fact that the present ἄρχων is used as a substantive may have influenced Dem. in his choice of tense. Buttmann quotes Xen. *Memor.* ii. 6. 25 καὶ ἄρχας ἀγαθὸν τι ποιεῖν τὴν πατρίδα πειράται,

where however the participle is 'instrumental' and therefore not parallel. A striking instance of a *future* participle used without reference to the time of the main verb, where it is not even attributive, is Eur. *Hec.* 517 εἰπὲ καίπερ οὐ λέξων φίλα, where however εἰπὲ may be considered as having necessarily a present reference, owing to imperatival notion. The passage in Thuc. iv. 81 substitutes ἀνὴρ with participle for the article with participle as in *ll. c.*: and this substitution is almost regular with proper names, when reference is made to general qualities, and not particular acts.

All such instances must be carefully distinguished from the 'timeless' uses of the aor. part., which may be tabulated as follows:—

(1) The *instrumental* aor. part. Mr. Monro (*H. G.* 77) defines it as expressing 'exact coincidence with the action of the principal verb.' Such coincidence cannot however be one merely of time, but the participle defines the manner, instrument or essential circumstances of the action, corresponding to the uses of the instrumental case. In Homer examples are extremely common: almost every book will furnish several—e.g. Π. 856 παμένη βεβήκει, in its flight, B. 269 ἀρχεῖον ἰδὼν, Δ. 508 κέκλετ' ἄνσας. In Δ. 112 καὶ τὸ μὲν εὖ κατέθηκε τανυσσάμενος ποτὶ γαίῃ | ἀγκλίνας we have a temporal participle τανυσσάμενος qualifying κατέθηκε, yet itself qualified by the instrumental ἀγκλίνας. But they are far from uncommon in Attic, both verse and prose—e.g. (i.) Soph. *Ant.* 171 ὄλοντο παίσαντές τε καὶ | πληγέντες (a probable but not absolutely certain instance): (ii.) Eur. *Med.* 1030 ἄλλως δ' ἐμόχθουν καὶ κατεξάνθην πόνοις | στερρὰς ἐνεγκούσ' ἐν τόκοις ἀλγηδόνας: (iii.) Ar. *Kan.* 484 δείσασα γὰρ καθείρπυσεν: (iv.) Thuc. i. 78 ἀντελπίσαντες ἄλλα ἐπλήρωσαν τὴν χρεῖαν: (v.) iv. 92. 7 ὃν χρὴ μνησθέντας...πιστεύσαντας δὲ...ὁμώσε χωρήσαι, i.e. in the confident belief: (vi.) iii. 22. 5 ἡ πεσοῦσα (by its fall) ψόφον ἐποίησε: (vii.) Dem. xx. (c. *Leptinem*) 70 (478) ἡγούντο γὰρ οὐ μικρὰν τυραννίδα καὶ τοῦτον τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀρχὴν καταλύσαντα πεπauκέναι: (viii.) xix. (*de F.L.*) 50 (356) τοῦτοις παραδοῦναι γέγραφε τὸ ἱερὸν γράψας τοῖς Ἀμφικτύουσιν παραδοῦναι: (ix.) xviii. (*de Cor.*) 58 (244) τὸ δὲ μὴ προσγράψαντα...κελεύσαι. Plato has γελάσας ἔφη, μειδιάσας ἔφη frequently ('said with a laugh, a smile,' as distinct from μειδιῶν ἔφη = said while smiling): (x.) *Phaedo* 117 Α οὐδὲν γὰρ οἶμαι κερδαίνειν ὀλίγον ὑπερον πίων: (xi.) Eur. *Or.* 104 δὸς λύσασα, and similarly in *ll.* 655, 925: (xii.) Thuc. i. 71 βοηθήσατε κατὰ τάχος ἐσβαλόντες.

Other exx. are given by Professor Goodwin (*M. and T.* 150), Madvig § 183 rem. 2. Instances iv. v. ix. x. xi. seem to shew that the restriction of the usage to the 'action of a verb of *past* time' is incorrect: ἐπλήρωσαν in iv. is clearly gnomic. On the other hand vii. viii. x. shew that no aorist attraction is necessarily at work. Usually the main verb is, if not past, an aorist, but x. shews that this is not always the case. Even if in this passage we adopt the *v. l.* κερδαίνειν, and thus (treating ἔφη as aorist) bring all these instances into conformity with Dr. Wheeler's rule with regard to τυγχάνω, φθάνω, λανθάνω, that 'the aorist participle, when combined with the present or imperfect, cannot coincide with the verb in time' (*M. and T.* 146), we cannot thus deal with Pl. *Rep.* 367 B ὡς δύναμαι μάλιστα κατατείνας λέγω.

The usage of the quasi-auxiliaries φθάνω, τυγχάνω, λανθάνω, where either verb may be in aor. part. (but only usually where the other is also aor.); of the aor. part. with οἴχομαι; and of ἀνύσας, are merely special cases of the general rule.

Many participles which appear at first sight to be instrumental, or which appear even to be exceptional uses of the aorist in a vague present sense, turn out on examination to be (certainly or possibly) instances of the 'culminating' sense of the aorist (*Hom. Gr.* 75, 78), e.g. B. 772 κεῖτ' ἀπομνησias. This may be the case with the Platonic κατατείνας quoted above, but probably not.

Two passages have been (I think) mistaken by eminent scholars, through neglect of this usage. In Solon's *Elegy*, *apud* Dem. xix. (*F. L.*) 255 (423), we have τῷ δὲ χρόνῳ πάντως ἦλθ' ἀποτισαμένη. ἦλθ' is here gnomic and Shilleto 'threw it out as a query,' that ἦλθ' ἀποτισαμένη = ἦλθε καὶ ἀπετίσατο. The participle is of course instrumental and the sense 'comes in vengeance' gives just what is required. The other instance is more difficult. In Soph. *O.C.* 716 ἃ δ' εὐήρετος ἔκπαγλ' ἄλῃ χερσὶ παρὰ πτομένα πλάτα | θρώσκει Professor Jebb says of παραπτομένα, 'if from παραπέτομαι it could be only aorist, which the sense excludes.' He therefore takes it from παράπτω closely with χερσὶ and translates 'apt to men's hands.' But the *present* is singularly out of place: an oar does not, or should not, move *while being* grasped by the hand: nor is there any special point in the tense, if we take παραπτομένα as imperfect: what is required is aorist or (better) perfect. On the other hand παραπτομένα from παραπέτομαι is absolutely right if taken as instrumental with θρώσκει: 'leaps in its flight past' describes exactly what an

oar does, from the point of view of those on board.

(2) The aorist participle is used substantivally with the article without any past sense, giving the idea of the agent, as the aor. inf. gives the idea of the action, in its simplest form. Thus in Thuc. i. 69 we have οὐ γὰρ ὁ δουλωσάμενος, ἀλλ' ὁ δυνάμενος μὲν παῦσαι περιορῶν δὲ, ἀληθέστερον αὐτὸ δρᾶν: and in Aesch. *P. V.* 213 δόλω δὲ τοὺς ὑπερσχύοντας κρατεῖν. In the former passage the aphoristic character of the sentence forbids us to interpret ὁ δουλωσάμενος = he who has enslaved us. In the second such an interpretation, though possible, is not likely: τοὺς ὑπερσχύοντας = the victors. Perhaps ἡ τεκοῦσα etc. really belong to this class, though the meaning of the word makes the temporal sense necessarily possible in all cases. Possibly also Aesch. *Ag.* 324 τῶν ἀλόντων καὶ κρατησάντων.

The instances quoted above as illustrative of Thuc. iv. 81 may most of them be classed under this head: and such ambiguity is necessary in nearly all instances where the main verb is not gnomic or future; in all other cases 'the murderer' is necessarily also 'he who has killed.' This ambiguity is only absent (a) where ἀνὴρ is used, (b) in such cases as Dem. xxi. 178, where the present participle is in common use as a substantive. But it seems best to treat the participle as *past* in all cases where this is possible, though in cases like Andoc. *Myst.* 19 (where no qualifying object or adverb is present) the 'substantival' view is almost equally probable.

(3) After περιορᾶν and similar verbs the participle may stand in the aorist without reference to past time, corresponding to the prolative use of the aor. inf. To the exx. given in *M. and T.* 148, 885 may be added Andoc. *Myst.* 53 ἐκείνους ἀποθανόντας ἀδίκως περιδεῖν, 58 περιδεῖν ἀπολόμενον καὶ τὸν κηδεστήν.

(4) Professor Goodwin includes ὁρᾶν under the same rule. But the cases are not quite parallel, since περιορᾶν has an acquired prolative force, corresponding in sense to εἶναι, which is normally quite absent in the simple verb. No convincing example is quoted to shew this 'timeless' force where the sense of 'allow' is absent. In Z. 284 κείνον ἴδοιμι κατελθόντα may equally well mean 'see that he has gone down' and similarly in Plat. *Rep.* 553 A. This ambiguity is almost, if not quite, inevitable, the meaning of the aor. part., on Professor Goodwin's view, being only suitable where it is open to us to consider it a past tense. On

general grounds there seems no reason for separating ὁρᾶν with aor. from ἐπίσταμαι with aor.: in Soph. *Ant.* 476, 477 we have them in successive lines, and if one aor. is temporal the other must also be so. Nor is any use of inf. possible prolatively after ὁρᾶν (except = allow) on analogy of which the tense could be explained. The distinction (easiest to see in English in the present) between *seeing a thing while it happens* and *seeing that a thing happens* is rather a nice one and I can hardly believe that the Greeks had two sets of usages to correspond, though the double constructions of ἀκούω, πυνθάνομαι, αἰσθάνομαι (*M. and T.* 886) support this view. These verbs, however, are not on the same footing. Though, as stated above, one cannot see that a thing is happening without seeing it while it happens, the same is not true of hearing or perceiving in a more general sense. Nor is the distinction in the aorist really easier, though in one sense it is a past tense, and in the other not; though *I saw him die* is not equivalent to *I saw that he had died*, yet the latter can be said whenever the former is possible. The non-temporal character of the aor. after ἀκούω is placed beyond question by examples like Soph. *O.C.* 1645, τοσαῦτα φωνήσαντος εἰσηκούσαμεν. But *certain* instances are hardly possible where the gen. denotes *thing heard about* not *person heard from*. Thus οἶμαί σε οὐκ ἂν φάναι γενομένου ποτὲ ἐν σαντῷ τοῦ τοιούτου αἰσθέσθαι, Plat. *Rep.* 440 B, may mean 'never perceived such a thing as *having happened* in yourself,' though the other is perhaps the more natural interpretation. In fact no examples that I have seen prove this non-temporal usage for Attic prose at all, though there is no reason whatever for questioning it in Homer and the Tragedians. Indeed in Homer it is probable that the aor. after ὁρᾶν is normally non-temporal. In Homer the aor. inf. is similarly used after φημί, not as a past tense, e.g. B. 171, φημί τελετηθῆναι ἅπαντα = *I state the accomplishment of all*, where the accomplishment is, as a matter of fact, *future*. If no instances of the non-temporal aor. are found in Prose, those in Tragedy should be regarded as 'Homericisms' or (less probably) survivals of pre-Attic syntax.

(5) In Homer we get a few instances of the aor. part. used quite 'timelessly' in an attributive sense, chiefly in fixed phrases: e.g. περιπλομένον ἐναντοῦ as in λ 248, οἱ μὲν δυσσομένον Ὑπερίονος α 24, and with prepositions as ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα, ἅμα δ' ἡλίῳ καταδύντι. Professor Goodwin (*M. and T.* 149, 829 b.) would extend this usage to

Attic: 'the aor. part. loses its reference to past time also in the peculiar construction in which the participle with its noun has the force of the infinitive with its subject.' Classen in his excursus on Thuc. iv. 63. 2 raises the question why it is that Greek constructions of the *post urbem conditam* type are so rare. I believe the answer to be this: *in Attic Greek, both in verse and prose, such constructions are only possible where the noun could stand alone with the preposition with the same, or virtually the same, meaning*; where, in fact, the participle only defines a phrase possible independently. It is obvious that this necessarily applies to all cases of ἐπὶ used of sequence with words denoting *time* or *events*. The same is true of μετὰ with nouns which imply something happening, and pronouns referring to them: μετὰ λόγον ῥηθέντα Plat. Symp. 198 B is possible, because μετὰ λόγον is possible in the same sense. Similarly μετὰ τὰντα λωφήσαντα in Thuc. ii. 49. 4 = after this, when it had abated. It is also obvious where ἐνὶ with gen. means 'in the time of' and a proper name with part. follows. Such instances as Dem. xviii. (*de Cor.*) 32 διὰ τούτους οὐχὶ πεισθέντας and 57 ἀπὸ τούτων ἐξεταζομένους also come under the rule. In Thuc. iii. 1, ἅμα τῷ σίτῳ ἀκυάζοντι, σίτῳ is treated as itself implying a date: cf. τραγῳδοῖς καινοῖς. An apparent exception, at first glance, is Thuc. vi. 33 μετὰ Συρακούσας οἰκισθείσας. But the sentence is Θουκλῆς δὲ καὶ οἱ Χαλκιδῆς ἐκ Νάξου ὀρμηθέντες ἔτει πέμπτῳ μετὰ Συρακούσας οἰκισθείσας, Λεοντίνους ...οἰκίζουσι. A Greek could say μετὰ Συρακούσας Λεοντίνους οἰκίζουσι or even ἔτει πέμπτῳ μετὰ Συρακούσας Λεοντίνους οἰκίζουσι (five years after Syracuse they founded Leontini), but could not have said μετὰ Συρακούσας ἀπέθανον and therefore not μετὰ Συρακούσας οἰκισθείσας ἀπέθανον. Similarly μετὰ Κύρον ἀποθανόντα αὐτὸς ἀπέθανε is possible, but ἀπέπλευσε would not be. The principle of the *Accusativus de quo* makes the same rule applicable to cases of acc. with part. and instances of the nom. as subject present no difficulty. In Thuc. iv. 47. 2 we have ξυνελάβοντο δὲ τοῦ τοιούτου οὐχ ἥκιστα...οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων κατάδηλοι ὄντες..., much as we might say 'The Athenian generals, by their evident reluctance..., aided the plot,' without implying that they had any actual share in it. Similarly in Thuc. iii. 20. 1, τῷ σίτῳ ἐπιλιπόντι ἐπιέζοντο. If this rule can be maintained, it follows that the participle in such phrases is in Attic necessarily temporal, the resemblance of μετὰ Συρακούσας οἰκισθείσας to μετὰ τὸ Συρ. οἰκισθῆναι being chiefly one of meaning. This rule will also

account for the comparative rarity of the construction. That the Attic limitation does not apply to Homer, the above instances shew: and Hdt. i. 34 μετὰ δὲ Σόλωνα οἰχόμενον ἔλαβε νέμεσις μεγάλη Κροῖσον can only be reconciled with it by treating Σόλωνα as equivalent to a date (after Solon's time, when he had gone), a somewhat violent expedient. But in Attic I have seen no exceptions.

The above are the regular timeless usages of the aorist. I know of no Attic instance which cannot be brought within the above limitations except συνελόντι εἰπεῖν, and συνελόντι. This may be a survival of an earlier more extensive usage; or it is just possible to take it temporally 'having summed up': or again it may be modelled on the regular instrumental συνελὼν λέγω. An Homeric instance of a somewhat isolated kind is K. 246 τούτου στομηνόιο, where however the genitive absol. expresses the essential condition of what follows. But I know of no other 'timeless' gen. absol., however strongly causal. It is erroneous to suppose that the aor. implies any idea of *suddenness* in any of these usages: the instrumental aor. is sometimes so interpreted. Thus ἔπεσε μακῶν in κ 163 means simply 'fell with a cry' not 'with a sudden cry' or 'with a single cry.' γελάσας ἔφη has been translated 'burst out laughing and said,' but we cannot on this principle translate μειδιάσας ἔφη. The aor. simply avoids stating continuity or contemporaneousness and so is restricted to the instrumental sense. These usages are doubtless a survival of the earlier participle corresponding to the original aorist-present:

originally $\left. \begin{matrix} \beta αῖνω \\ \xi βαινον \end{matrix} \right\} : \beta αίνων : \left. \begin{matrix} *βήμι \\ \xi βην \end{matrix} \right\} : βάς.$

φημι, φάσκω still has both presents and φάσ is usually treated as an aor. part. As the aorist-present dropped out of use or when remaining in use was assimilated in meaning to the commoner continuous-present (as some philologists hold to be the case with short-vowel presents like ἄγω), the aorist part. was more and more regarded as the part. of the past tense and the original *timeless* sense only remained in certain stereotyped usages. This is the only possible solution of (1) the far wider Homeric use, (2) the apparently capricious uses which we find in Attic. And the principle of non-ambiguity, so important with regard to aor. inf. (being, in fact, the probable criterion in the cases dealt with by W. T. Lendrum in the *Class. Rev.* for March last), was operative here also in fixing the limits of the use.

FRANK CARTER.

IN the note of Prof. Campbell (*Classical Review* iv. 9, p. 425) on *γενόμενον* = *ὅς ὕστερον τούτων ἐγένετο* (Thuc. iv. 81), additional examples are cited from Herodotus only, and this use of the aorist participle is spoken of in terms which imply that there might be doubt concerning the genuineness of the examples; and Dr. Rutherford's note, referred to by Prof. Campbell, clearly implies that he even considers the example in Thuc. iv. 81 entirely anomalous. In Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses* 152 the idiom is explicitly stated, but here too the only examples cited are two of the three from Herodotus mentioned by Prof. Campbell. In view of all this it may be worth while to call attention to the fact that the aorist participle is freely so employed in Attic prose, whenever occasion calls for it. Cf. Thuc. i. 3. 4 οἱ δ' οὖν ὡς ἕκαστοι ἔλλατ-

ν ες κατὰ πόλεις τε ὅσοι ἀλλήλων ξυνίεσαν καὶ ξύμπαντες ὕστερον κληθέντες οὐδὲν πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν...ἀθροοὶ ἐπραξαν. Id. ii. 49. 2 λύξ τε τοῖς πλείοσιν ἐνέπιπτε κενή, σπασμὸν ἐνδιδούσα ἰσχυρόν, τοῖς μὲν μετὰ ταῦτα λωφήσαντα, τοῖς δὲ καὶ πολὺ ὕστερον. Lys. xxx. 12 Σάτυρος καὶ Χρέμων, οἱ τῶν τριάκοντα γενόμενοι, οὐχ ὑπὲρ ἑμῶν ὀργιζόμενοι Κλεοφώντος κατηγοροῦν, κ.τ.έ. On this last Frohberger remarks: 'Der Zusatz von ὕστερον oder μετὰ ταῦτα scheint entbehrlich; die hervorragende und allbekannte Eigenschaft des Chremon als Mitglieds des Dreisigercollegiums wird vom Standpunkt der Gegenwart aus zur Charakterisierung des Mannes hervorgehoben.' Other examples of the aorist and of the analogously used present (chiefly with *vñ*) might be cited.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

University of Virginia.

CATULLIANA.

IX. 1.

Veranni, omnibus e meis amicis
Antistans mihi milibus trecentis,
Venistine domum ad tuos Penates
Fratresque unanimos anumque matrem?

Anumque Faernus, vulgo. But the MSS. *uno animo sanamque* or *suamque*. I think *anumque* is rude: *anus* in Latin was as uncomplimentary as 'old woman' in English; there is no *aurea*, or *pia*, or *dulcis* here to soften it down. At any rate a complimentary epithet balancing *unanimos* is more natural, and *bonamque* is in my opinion what Catullus wrote. *Bona* is the stock epithet of *mater* in Catullus. *b* is more than once corrupted into *u* in the MSS. of Catullus: *o* into *a*: hence, *s* preceding, *suonamque* changed to either *sanamque* or *suamque*.

X. 27.

'Mane me,' inquit puellae,
Istud quod modo dixeram, me habere,
Fugit me ratio: meus sodalis
Cinna est Gaius: is sibi paravit.'

It seems strange that this passage has not been used as an argument that Catullus's praenomen was *Gaius*. If it was, the joke of this passage is that Catullus excuses his

slip of memory by the fact that his friend Cinna had the same praenomen as himself. 'It's not Gaius *Catullus* I meant: it's Gaius *Cinna*.' Else why the emphatic position of *Cinna*? Why is the praenomen separated from it? Why given at all?

LIX.

Bononiensis Rufa rufum fellat
Uxor Meneni, saepe quam in sepulcretis
Vidistis ipso rapere de rogo cenam,
Cum devolutum ex igne prosequens panem
Ab semiraso tunderetur ustore.

Rufulum or *rufulum* is generally read for *rufum*, and *Bononiensis* is taken as nominative. It is in my judgment certainly accusative (cf. 58, 5). We should therefore read *rufuli*, which is nearer *rufum* than *rufulum* is. *l* is often undistinguishable from *i*, and from one of the strokes of an *m*, *n*, or *u*.

LXVIII. 101.

Ad quam tum properans fertur *simul* undique pubes
Graeca penetrales deseruisse focos,
Ne Paris abducta gavisus libera moecha
Otia pacato degeret in thalamo.

Simul is not in the MSS. It is difficult to see how it could have dropped out, and it