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](#)

The Latin Aorist Subjunctive

E. A. Sonnenschein

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 09 / November 1890, pp 398 - 399

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191243, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191243

How to cite this article:

E. A. Sonnenschein (1890). The Latin Aorist Subjunctive. The Classical Review, 4, pp 398-399 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191243

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Lastly, as regards the *present use* of oil which Professor Tarbell adduces, oil is, if I am not mistaken, used exactly like water, for *hardening* heated steel by a sudden cooling, whereas slow cooling would soften it. This may suggest that Pliny's distinction of the uses is not entirely correct, and that oil was reserved for the small articles merely because it was less plentiful than water: if so, it was regarded as a rather

more expensive improvement, and was very likely (as has been argued above) introduced long after the time of Sophocles. The whole question is made more difficult by the absence of any distinction in Latin and Greek terminology between iron and steel; but it is a difficulty which often arises in our own language at the present day.

G. E. MARINDIN.

THE LATIN AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE.

MR. KIRKPATRICK'S paper in the last number of the *Classical Review* suggests one or two remarks.

(1) Whether in a sentence like *novi quidnam causae fuerit* the subjunctive is a primary or a secondary tense is a delicate point, as to which it is very difficult to pronounce definitely. A good deal may be said for Mr. Kirkpatrick's view that it is secondary; if the sentence proceeds, the subjunctive subordinate to *fuerit* must be secondary, e.g. *nescio quidnam causae fuerit cur nullas ad me litteras daret*: on the other hand how is it that usage seems to have excluded *nescio quidnam causae esset*? Mr. Kirkpatrick asks whether this would not be Latin in the sense 'I do not know what he was doing.' If he thinks so, I wish he would quote some instances from classical authors. Professor Hale in his 'Sequence of Tenses' quotes only St. Augustine. If Mr. Kirkpatrick is right in recognising an aorist subjunctive, the ordinary rule of sequence ought to be amended; in my remarks (*C. R.* III. p. 9), to which Mr. Kirkpatrick refers, I specially guarded myself from saying more than that there is *some* rule of sequence, a primary tense requiring the subordinate subjunctive to be either present or a form in *-erim, -eris, -erit*. If *nescio quidnam esset* is Latin the whole doctrine of sequence is doomed.

(2) Mr. Kirkpatrick says 'sequence can no more apply to dependent questions than to dependent statements; both are practically quoted sentences.' If so, how does he explain *Georg.* iv. 118-120 and similar instances: *forsitan et pingues hortos quae cura colendi ornaret canerem...quoque modo potis gauderent intuba rivi*? The tense in dependent questions is certainly sometimes independent of the point of view of the principal clause (e.g. *Hic quantum in bello fortuna possit cognosci potuit*): but would it be possible to write *nesciebat quot bis bina sint* (for

essent)? In English we might say either 'He did not know how much twice two *is*' or '*was*.'

(3) May I venture to suggest an amended form of the Rule of Sequence, which it seems to me would obviate some difficulties? Firstly draw a sharp line of demarcation between cases in which the tense of the subordinate clause is adjusted to the point of view of the principal clause (e.g. Final Clauses) and cases in which the tense of the subordinate clause is not so adjusted (e.g. Consecutive Clauses); in the latter cases there is no 'sequence' at all. Then give the rule for sequence in adjusted clauses as follows:—'*Avoid* the Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive in dependence on a Present, Future or Future Perfect: *avoid* the Present and Perfect Subjunctive in dependence on an Imperfect, Perfect, Past (= Aorist) or Pluperfect.' This I have introduced into the last edition of my Grammar (§ 522). The advantage of the negative form of statement is that it leads the pupil to ask in the first place what is the natural tense to use, instead of proceeding mechanically, and recognises the point on which Prof. Hale laid stress—that the tenses of the subjunctive are not timeless, but have their own significance: after this line of thought has been followed, the pupil is told to *eliminate* certain tenses as not in accordance with usage, however logically correct they may seem. My rule takes account of the classical usage in regard to such sentences as *dixi ut scires* 'I have spoken that you *may* know'; *hodie expertus sum quam caduca felicitas esset* 'how transitory luck *is*.' The pupil must however be told that when the Perfect is precisely equivalent to a Present (*i.e.* where emphasis is laid on the *present state*) primary sequence takes place, e.g. *novisti* (*meministi, oblitus es*) *quid initio dixerim* (§ 519, 520). If Mr. Kirkpatrick is right in recognizing an Aorist

Subjunctive, the second half of the rule would have to be further amended so as to explicitly include that tense: but as it

stands the first half does not exclude the 'Aorist Subj.' in dependence on a primary tense.

E. A. SONNENSCHIN.

MR. GLADSTONE'S APPENDIX.

MR. GLADSTONE concludes his new book on Homer with an 'Essay on the points of contact between the Assyrian tablets and the Homeric text.' The title of the essay is somewhat misleading. By 'Assyrian tablets' he means Mesopotamian records of all sorts: not necessarily Assyrian, or on tablets. By 'Homeric text' he means the contents of the Homeric poems. And he does not suggest any points of contact between the two. The Greeks borrowed many notions from the Phoenicians, and the Phoenicians had many notions in common with the peoples of Mesopotamia: so the same notions sometimes appear in the Mesopotamian records and in the Homeric poems. The records and the poems are both in contact with Phoenician literature, but not in contact with each other.

Mr. Gladstone's arguments throughout this essay seem fanciful and inconclusive, and sometimes quite untenable. His first argument is this:—

'The great encircling river Okeanos is the parent of the gods themselves (*Il.* xiv. 201, 302) and of their entire number (*ibid.* 245); or, in other words, water is the origin of all things . . . and, alike from the evidence of the monument and from the records of later times, we learn how the conception of a water origin of things prevailed in the Babylonian system.'

'The statement in the *Iliad*, that the Ocean brought forth the gods, cannot possibly imply the Babylonian theory, that water is the origin of all things: for, according to that theory, the gods stood outside the universe of things which had its origin in water. And this 'water' is not terrestrial water, but a protoplasmic fluid. The following lines, quoted by Mr. Gladstone from a translation in the *Expositor*, misrepresent the original.

'The august ocean was their generator: the surging deep was she that bare them all.'

The terms here rendered as the 'ocean' and the 'deep' in the ordinary sense, really represent the 'waters' and the 'void' in the sense intended in the first verses of Genesis: cf. Delitzsch, *Chaldäische Genesis*, pp. 294 ff. The birth here described is the birth of the universe, not of the gods.

Mr. Gladstone then dwells on the correspondence between the Greek sea-god Poseidon and the Babylonian sea-god Ea, whom he assigns to Eridu on the Persian Gulf.

'One of the most characteristic notes of the Homeric Poseidon is his complexion, as the dark or black Poseidon. This is not only indicated by epithet: the word *Kuanochaites* or dark-haired (*Il.* xx. 144) stands substantively to describe him, without any other name or epithet. With this we have to compare the Hymn which treats Ea as the creator of the black race, meaning the old non-Semitic population belonging to Eridu.'

The 'black-headed' race (not the 'black' race) does not mean any particular population. It means the whole of mankind; fair-haired races being unknown. This meaning is clearly established by the passages collected and discussed by Delitzsch, *l.c.*, pp. 301 ff., and Pognon, *L'Inscription de Bavian*, pp. 27, 28. The word *Kuanochaites* does not imply that Poseidon was dark or black in his complexion; nor can it well signify 'dark-haired' when applied to him, for the allusion is obviously to the deep blue of the Mediterranean.

'We have yet another connecting link between Ea, the offspring of the Persian Gulf, and Poseidon. Evidently, in Homer's eyes, the Persian Gulf was part of the Ocean-stream, coiled around the world. For in *Il.* i. 423 he places his Aithiopes upon the Ocean verge. True, they are visited, in that passage, not by Poseidon only but by the whole body of the gods. But the visit paid to these same Aithiopes in *Od.* i. 22-25, was paid by Poseidon alone . . . The Eremboi [in *Od.* iv. 84] are doubtless the Arabs, and it thus seems that these Aithiopes can hardly be other than their neighbours the Babylonian Assyrians. Through their medium then, and through the location assigned to them on the River Ocean, we seem to have Poseidon placed once more in apparent derivation from the Babylonian Ea, who came from Eridu on the Persian Gulf.'

If the Eremboi are the Arabs, these Aithiopes are presumably their neighbours in Ethiopia: and that country touches the Ocean-stream in the Red Sea. Although Babylonians and Assyrians are known to history, 'Babylonian Assyrians' are unknown.

Then Mr. Gladstone proceeds to the correspondence between the Greek love-