

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

F. A. K.

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 08 / October 1890, pp 342 - 346

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190912, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190912

How to cite this article:

F. A. K. (1890). The Latin Aorist Subjunctive. The Classical Review, 4, pp 342-346
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190912

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Vitr. II. 1 6 '*tritiores manus* ad aedificandum perficere.'

Ovid is fond of repeating his own phrases, and at *trist.* V. 7 17 *sq.* he has a couplet which stands in the editions thus :

uox fera, trux uultus, uerissima Martis
imago :

non coma, non ulla barba resecta manu.

He is describing his neighbours at Tomi. Now if one considers it attentively I think the expression 'non ulla resecta manu' will appear a trifle absurd : 'mortua non ulla lumina clausa manu' is a phrase I can understand ; but to say of a living man that his beard is trimmed 'non ulla manu' will imply, or so it seems to me, that he has lost the use of his own hands and depends on those of others. Therefore it may deserve remark that the ductus litterarum of 'ulla' and of 'trita' are practically the same. I anticipate the objection that any such adjective as 'trita' impairs the sense, inasmuch as the Tomitae of course did not trim their beards at all, neatly or otherwise ; and this is very true if we bring to the reading of the lines our modern habits of thought. But the ancients were not alive to this result of adding epithets in negative sentences : to take an example from the father of them all, when Homer says at δ 566 that in the Elysian

fields there is οὐ νιφετὸς οὐτ' ἄρ' χεῖμὼν πολὺς οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρος, he does not mean us to infer that there is χεῖμὼν μὲν ἀλλ' οὐ πολὺς : he means that there are no storms whatever, great or small ; only he cannot refrain from ornamenting χεῖμὼν with an adjective.

But I do not like to dismiss the distich without a word on the hexameter. It always struck me as strange that an unkempt savage should be called by a Roman poet the very image of Mars, a truculent deity to be sure, but a deity still and father of the founder of Rome, and I thought of a noun which seemed much better suited to the case ; but Riese's apparatus criticus made it appear that the best MS. had 'necis,' which afforded me no support but rather the contrary. Now, however, I learn from Mr. Owen's edition that the MS. which has 'necis' is a poor one, that 'Martis' has no authority but the second hand of another, and that with these exceptions all MSS. good and bad concur in reading 'mortis' and so confirm my conjecture 'trux uultus, uerissima m e n t i s imago : ' see Cic. *de or.* III. 59 221 'imago animi uultus est' and Ovid *ex Pont.* III. 4, 27, 'regum uultus, certissima pignora mentis.' At *met.* VI. 629 all MSS. give 'mortem' for 'mentem.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE LATIN AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE.

A SCHOOLBOY or undergraduate, having to translate into Latin *The shock was so fierce that they fell from their horses*, dares not write as Livy wrote :—*Adeo infestis animis concurrerunt ut ex equis lapsi sint*, Liv. 2, 6, 9. He has been taught that Latin has no aorist subjunctive, that *fuero* can only be used as a perfect, and that *essem* has to do duty for aorist as well as imperfect.

This is taught especially with regard to result-clauses¹ : the elementary school-books

forbid *ut fuero* : Roby and Kennedy recognise the use, but seem to treat it as something exceptional, and requiring explanation. This paper is an attempt to show that *fuero* constantly occurs as an aorist (a use quite distinct from its perfect use) :—

- (1) In Dependent Questions.
- (2) In Consecutive Sentences.
- (3) In Oratio Obliqua, Relative Sentences and Miscellaneous Constructions.

1. Dependent Questions. 'I know why he came' can only be translated *scio cur venerit* : this subjunctive is of course as much an aorist² as the infinitive in the

¹ Thus Prof. Sale (*C.R.* v. 3, p. 7) states that the past tense in Latin is regularly followed by the imperfect subjunctive of result. Prof. Hale (*American Journal of Philology* v. 8, p. 50) says, 'The aorist always had the power of catching sharply the attention.' Surely that is the fault of the rule we have learnt ; after reading Livy, who normally writes the aorist, the use ceases to catch the attention in Nepos and Tacitus. Prof. Hale says that the aorist first

began to be used in Cicero's time. This statement, though probable enough, cannot be made with authority in the absence of pre-Ciceronian prose.

² Mr. Sonnenschein remarks (*C.R.* vol. 3, p. 9) that 'we find regularly *novi quid causae fuerit* (not *esset*'), and seems to imply that *fuerit* is a primary

corresponding dependent statement—*scio eum venisse*. One instance will suffice to show the freedom of the use:—

Hannibalem elusum ut ubi dux, ubi exercitus esset, cum quo castra collata habuerit, ignoraret, Liv. 27, 47. *Esset* and *habuerit* are co-ordinate, just as *erat* and *habuit* might be.

2. Consecutive Sentences.¹

I have noted in Cicero (excluding cases which seemed doubtful) nine instances of *ut fuerit* as an aorist, in his imitator Pliny the younger four instances, in Caesar five, in Hirtius four, in Vell. Paternulus one, in Nepos forty-one, in Livy a hundred and six, in Sallust none, in Galba one, (Cic. *Fam.* 10, 30—an instructive instance, coming, so to speak, from outside literature). I have not counted the many instances in Tacitus. This list does not include results expressed by *qui fuerit*, as in Liv. 34, 1, 1; Caes. *B.C.* 1, 21.

Here are a few examples:—

(Dionysius) Eo facto sic doluit, nihil ut tulerit gravius in vita, Cic. *Tusc.* 5, 60.

(2) Pestilentiae tanta vis erat ut tantum aegrorum consules renuntiaverint, ut is numerus effici non potuerit, Liv. 4, 40, 19—a strong instance, since usually, where *ut fuerit* is followed by another result-clause, Livy writes the imperfect in the second case.

(3) Milites nostri tantum abfuerunt ut perturbarentur, ut magnas accessiones fecerint, Hirt. *B. Al.* 15—a sensible variation on the clumsy double imperfect which is taught so decidedly after *tantum aberat*: cf. Liv. 39, 28.

Roby (§ 1507) states that *fuerim* corresponds to *fui* both perfect and aorist. Yet in § 1524 he gives the imperfect as the normal use, adding the aorist in a bracket

tense, connected with the primary *novi*. The aorist is probably preferred as being clearer than the imperfect, but would not *nescio quid faceret*? be Latin—I know not what he was doing? The sequence of tenses can no more apply to dependent questions than to dependent statements; both are practically quoted sentences.

¹ Here are some references:—

Cic. *Phil.* 1, 8; 1, 36; 10, 14; *Tusc.* 1, 100.

Caes. *B.G.* 1, 11; 3, 15; 5, 15; 5, 54; 7, 17.

Liv. *Bk.* 22:—5, 8; 32, 3; 37, 2; 40, 9; 42, 2; 45, 4; 56, 4; 61, 9.

Vell. *Pat.* 1, 9, 1.

Nepos *Att.* 1, 4; 2, 4; 5, 1; 6, 4; 7, 3; 9, 4; 10, 3; 12, 2.

Tac. *Ann.* 1, 80; 2, 30; 2, 55; 2, 81.

It is useless to reckon the instances of the imperfect; it will naturally occur much more often, having to express (1) limited statement of the *expected* result; (2) continuous, repeated or unfinished action. Even so, Nepos has *ut esset* forty-two times, *ut fuerit* forty-one times.

as sometimes used,² 'the action being regarded as a distinct historical fact, not as a continuous state or as contemporary with the action of the principal verb.'

Kennedy (§ 169, 3) marks *fuerit* as exceptional 'instead of the imperfect,' and elsewhere he closely connects this use with that of the perfect proper (§ 196). He quotes Liv. 26, 29, which 'unites both constructions and illustrates their principle':—*Sicilia et classis Marcello evenit. Quae sors velut iterum captis Syracusis, ita examinauit Siculos, ut comploratio eorum flebilesque voces et extemplo oculos hominum converterent*,³ et postmodo sermones praebuerint.

Kennedy seems to imply that the lapse of time between the two results accounts for the change of tense; which notion agrees with Roby's non-contemporary explanation. But cf. Liv. 22, 61: *Adeo omnibus notis ignominiisque confectos esse ut quidam eorum mortem sibi extemplo consciverint, ceteri non foro solum omni deinde vita sed prope luce ac publico caruerint*. The non-contemporary theory would require *conscirent*.

This non-contemporary explanation seems intended to countenance an idea that *fuerit* must be picked out of its context in a manner and seized upon as conveying a fact, whereas the imperfect is more closely connected with the principal verb⁴ (Moberly on Caes. *B.G.* 3, 15). But what closer connexion can there be than that of result, whether *esset* or *fuerit* be found? Surely one need only say that this is the aorist. No one will deny that the aorist conveys a fact more distinctly, and with less regard to time, than the imperfect: it is here, as elsewhere, the tense of historical fact. But what really requires explanation is why the Latins so often, especially in Cicero's time, wrote *ut esset* where the aorist *fuerit* would seem more natural, viz. where a distinct fact is conveyed without either logical limitation or continued action.

² Roby's example *factum est ut* . . is unfortunate, since the imperfect is of course used after such phrases (except in Nep. *Mill.* 5, 1—*factum est ut voluerit*).

³ Madvig reads *converterint*, which would dispose of the distinction drawn.

⁴ Mr. J. R. King (on Cic. *Phil.* 1, 8) falls back on the 'more vivid' explanation. Elsewhere (*ibid.* 1, 36) he boldly translates the aorist as a perfect.

This exaggerated idea of distinctness leads to diversity. Mr. Moberly directly contradicts Roby's explanation of indefinite time and non-contemporary result. He says, 'The perfect lays more stress on the fact as occurring at a given time' (n. on *B.G.* 3, 15) and again, 'Caesar prefers the perfect when the consequence is instantaneous' (n. on *B.C.* 2, 44).

In the following passages the imperfect and aorist (or aorist and imperfect) follow the same consecutive *ut*, just as the tense varies in co-ordinate indicative sentences:—

Cic. *Phil.* 1, 36; Caes. *B.G.* 7, 17; Vell. Pat. 1, 9, 1; Tac. *Ann.* 15, 16; Liv. 5, 45, 5; 8, 36, 7; 22, 40, 9; 25, 6, 12; 27, 34, 4; 24, 40, 12; 34, 18, 2.

But perhaps the strongest evidence is the construction used when a result-clause contains a conditional sentence:—*ut facturus fuerit* (Roby § 1521: Kennedy § 196). It would be needless to mention this, but that school-boys are taught to write *ut facturus fuisset*.¹ Take the common form of sentence:—*They marched so fast that if they had followed the enemy straight, they would have overtaken him*. Now the Latin subjunctive is also the potential² mood: but this mood was already occupied by the result-clause. Hence some periphrasis was necessary to add potential force. The periphrasis used was *-turus fuerit*: the whole potential force lies in the participle—in a position to overtake: the auxiliary verb has only to express tense, they *were*. Thus the tense remains the same as in a result-clause: now both *essent* and *fuerint* are used in a result-clause, but since the apodosis of a conditional sentence must be a decided statement, the aorist is here more appropriate, and Livy writes:—*Adeo citato agmine ducti sunt ut, si via recta vestigia sequentes issent, haud dubie assecuturi fuerint*:—*They marched so fast that they were in a position to overtake the enemy if they had followed him straight*. Here *fuerint* is simply an aorist. *Assecuturi* (καταλαβόντες ἄν) bears the whole weight of the protasis, as the italics indicate.

Here is a similar principal sentence:—*Deditos* (= si dediti essemus) *cruciatibus affecturi fuerunt*, Liv. 21, 44. Make this sentence follow a consecutive *ut*, and you simply change *fuerunt* into *fuerint*. Cf. *ibid.* 34, 4:—*Habiturae* (ἐχονσαι ἄν), si liceret. The very common *ut potuerit* is precisely similarly. *Pot-* contains the potential force: *-uerit* is simply an aorist:—

Ventum quidem erat eo ut si hostem similem antiquis Macedonum regibus habuisset, magna clades accipi potuerit, Liv. 44, 4. Things had gone so far, that a great defeat

was possible to be received if the enemy had been an Alexander.

3. Oratio Obliqua, Relative Sentences with adverbial force, and Miscellaneous Constructions.

a. *Ferunt* Evandrum qui multis ante tempestatibus tenuerit loca, solenne instituisse, Liv. 1, 5: cf. Cic. *Off.* 2, 60; *Phil.* 12, 11. This is very common in Livy, when a short statement is, so to speak, accidentally subjoined to such phrases as *fama est*, *memorant*: the *fruit* of direct speech simply becomes *fuerit*. I believe however that in the report of a set speech Livy intends *fuerit* to preserve the tense (perfect or future) used by the speaker, with something like the force of the Greek indicative in Oratio Obliqua. But in Tacitus the use is more free (*Hist.* 4, 25; 5, 16; 5, 24).

(b) Similarly, where a relative sentence is thrown into the subjunctive to give some adverbial force, *fruit* becomes *fuerit*:—

Praeclare id quidem (Socrates), *qui et amico persuaserit et se ostenderit de hoc genere toto nihil laborare*, Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 103. Cf. Cic. *Off.* 3, 79; Liv. 39, 40, 12.

(c) Miscellaneous instances, such as one might expect, since the subjunctive has such multifarious uses:—

Potest fieri ut iratus dixerit, Cic. *De Or.* 2, 285; *Id periculum erat ne majestatem nominis Alexandri sustinere non potuerit populus Romanus*, Liv. 9, 18.

Cf. Cic. *Chu.* 91 (cum debuerint); *Phil.* 1, 14 (non quo potuerit).

Numerous instances might be quoted after *perinde ac, quasi*.

Fuerim then is an aorist as well as a perfect. This being so, why is it not used as freely as the aorist *fui*? Why particularly is the imperfect so often written, especially by Cicero, in a resulting fact-clause where an aorist would seem more natural?

Prof. Hale gives incidentally a sketch of the origin of this construction in the *American Journal of Philology* (vol. 8, p. 49). The following is a summary of it:—

Fleat is a 'limited independent statement'—*he may be expected to weep*. Put this into a result-clause, and you get:—*tam miser est ut fleat, he is wretched enough to weep*. This 'limited statement' was the source of all result-clauses, and when the Latins wanted to say—*he is so wretched that he actually weeps*, they did not write *ut fleat*, but borrowed the subjunctive of limited statement. Now the tense of 'limited independent statement' in past time is *fleret*—*he might have been expected to weep*. This form also was put into a result-clause without change:—

¹ This clumsy construction occurs in Livy three times in independent questions, never, I think, in Tacitus: one may perhaps compare the vulgar English redundancy—I should have liked to have seen him.

² I have ventured to write *potential* to describe the force of the apodosis (= Roby's *hypothetical*) without observing the illogical restriction of the word to cases where there is no protasis.

tam miser erat ut fleret—he was wretched enough to weep. When the Latins wanted to state a past fact in a result-clause, they did not write *ut flebat* or *ut flevit*, but kept the mood (subjunctive) of limited statement, and the tense also (imperfect).

In addition to this scientific account of the logical origin of the use, we may apply the scholastic method of explanation, to show by illustration and analogy that the use was agreeable to the character of the language.

School-boys ignorant of grammar have a universal rule for writing Latin prose:—‘when in doubt, write the imperfect subjunctive.’ This rule is no doubt based on general observation: the Latins have a curious predilection for that tense. We find *esset* very often (especially in Cicero) where *sit* would seem more natural:—

(1) In final sentences subjoined to a perfect—Cicero’s usual practice (Kennedy § 196)—to be logically explained by an ellipse.

(2) In consecutive sentences:—Nos ita a majoribus instituti sumus ut omnia consilia ad virtutem referremus Cic. *Phil.* x. 20 (cf. Prof. Sale in *C. R.* v. 3 p. 7). The imperfect seems to have here something of a modal rather than a temporal force: it is more ‘limited’ in nature than the present.

(3) In dependent questions:—nimum diu teximus quid sentiremus, Cic. *Phil.* 3, 36.

(4) In decrees or votes:—Senatus consultum his verbis perscribendum censeo...ei statuam auratam in rostris aut quo alio loco in foro vellet ex hujus ordinis sententia statui placere, Cic. *Phil.* 5, 41. Cf. *Ibid.* 9, 17; Plin. *Epp.* 8, 6, 13.

Similarly we often find in Tacitus *esset* after *donec* where one would rather expect *fuit*, that is to say, where the clause certainly contains a past fact (*Ann.* 11, 22; *Hist.* 3, 78). This is exactly analogous to *ut esset*: the construction has not shaken off the logical refinement which hangs about its origin:—

He waited until the thing should
did } happen.

This preference for *esset* over *sit* and *fuit* prepares us for the use of the imperfect in result-clauses. Further reasons for that use may be added:—

(1) *Fuerim* is also a perfect: in the passive especially the use of *ut factus sit* as an aorist is very harsh. *Fuerim* is also constantly used in *Oratio Obliqua* for *fuissem*, in order to give more nearly the speaker’s words. The more frequent the use of the tense as an aorist, the less forcible this use in reported speech.

(2) *Fuerim* is practically identical in form with the future perfect indicative, and very nearly touches that tense in some uses (*Tac. Hist.* 2, 47).

Yet in spite of these draw-backs, *fuerim* is used as an aorist:

(1) in dependent questions—everywhere;
(2) in result-clauses, by Cicero and Caesar sparingly; by Livy, Nepos and Tacitus very frequently.

The teaching of grammar in schools ought to be simplified in every possible way; and this point seemed to me to require a full statement, since most school-masters do not teach even the limited use of the aorist admitted in the grammars. Living out of reach of a library, I have been unable to follow up the matter through the grammarians; but the Latin authors must be our real teachers.

Consecutive fact-clauses of course only occur in narrative: the doctrine of them would therefore naturally be based on the historians: yet the examples given in the grammars show that the doctrine of this, as of most other constructions, is based chiefly on Cicero. It may be doubted generally whether Cicero’s elaborate style will teach us the ordinary usages of the language better than Livy’s simpler prose: but at any rate in a construction exclusively belonging to narrative, let us follow Livy and allow the normal use of *ut fuerit* as an aorist.

FREDERICK A. KIRKPATRICK.

POSTSCRIPT.—I have suppressed much illustration to save space; but I cannot help pointing out some passages which indicate that the Latins felt the inconvenience of the subjunctive in consecutive fact-clauses. The aorist indicative twice occurs, where the verb is separated from the introductory *ut* by intervening clauses (Cic. *Off.* 3, 10, *ut...factus est*; Liv. 27, 49, *ut...inquit*). So also Prof. Hale quotes two instances of a hypothetical sentence remaining unchanged, one in a dependent question, the other in a result-clause (Liv. 2, 33, 9; Cic. *Brut.* 126). Whether this is intentional, as he thinks, or due to a convenient negligence, as seems more likely, still there is an exact analogy to the indicative.

Dependent questions very much resemble result-clauses. Both take the indicative in Greek and English, the subjunctive in Latin: hence the periphrasis required in both for a hypothetical sentence. Now Plautus and Terence freely use the indicative as well as the subjunctive in dependent questions; the less direct form has survived. This

fact, considered in connexion with the passages just indicated, suggests a question. If we possessed more pre-Ciceronian prose, might we not sometimes find the indicative in consecutive fact-clauses? I have searched

the collected pre-Ciceronian fragments in vain: perhaps some one who has more opportunities may pursue the investigation further.

F. A. K.

ON THE QUOTATIONS FROM OLD LATIN POETS IN THE ESCURIAL MS. OF NONIUS MARCELLUS (M III. 14).

THERE is a tenth century MS. of Nonius Marcellus, *Compendiosa Doctrina*, in the Library at the Escorial Palace and Monastery, near Madrid. It is not mentioned by Haenel in his account of the Library (1830), and was first brought into notice by Loewe, who visited the Escorial and other libraries in Spain some years ago in his search for writings of the Latin Fathers. Lucian Mueller in his recent edition of Nonius describes it (Vol. II. p. 305), from information received from Loewe's notes, as an eleventh century MS., containing Books I.—III. only, and belonging to the same family of Nonius MSS. as the Guelferbytanus (at Wolfenbüttel).

In the Easter Vacation of this year I made a collation of the manuscript for Mr. Onions' posthumous edition of Nonius I.—III., an edition which Professor Nettleship has kindly undertaken to see through the press, and to complete by the addition of Books IV.—XX. A full account of the MS. will be given by Professor Nettleship in that edition, so I shall content myself here with a very brief description.

The volume marked M. III. 14 in the Escorial Library comes from the Ecclesia S. Petri at Ghent and consists of two manuscripts, both of them written in tenth century Caroline minuscules, on pages of the same size, and with two columns to each page. There is nothing to induce us to doubt that the two manuscripts were bound together soon after they had been written. The first contains Nonius I.—III.; the second, which has no title, Nonius IV.—XX. To make sure of the age of the writing, I had photographs taken of three pages, one from the first part, the other two from the second, and submitted them to M. Delisle, who gave his opinion without hesitation that all three belonged to the tenth century. The text of Book I. and the first part of Book II. to the point where the marginal headings cease (cf. Mueller II. p. 306) agrees

with that of the Paris MS. (7667); from there to the end of Book III. with the Florence Nonius (plut. 48.1). Book IV. shows a text like that of the Leyden copy (Voss. Lat. Fol. n. 73), and Books V.—XX. follow closely the readings of the uncorrected text of the Harleian Nonius. These books, IV.—XX., have been corrected throughout from a manuscript of another family, just as the Harleian MS. has been treated, so that E² generally agrees with H², and they contain on the margins a large number of the headings or paragraph summaries which are found in the Harleianus.

My object however in writing this paper is not to describe the Escorial MS., but to call the attention of the readers of the *Classical Review* to a curious feature of the MS. which may or may not be of significance. Books V.—XX. (of course omitting Book XVI. which does not survive in any Nonius MS.) are written in the same hand, a very neat and careful hand of the tenth century. In the Saturnian line quoted from Livius Andronicus at the beginning of Book XI. (p. 509 M.), in Mueller's edition vol. II. p. 155:

tuque mihi narrato omnia disertim

I noticed that a small interval giving room for about three letters was left between *narrato* and *omnia*, at the very place where the metrical division of the line falls, and soon afterwards (p. 510 M.), in the quotation from Varro, *Octogesis* (I quote from Mueller's edition),

postquam avida libido rapere ac caedere
coept
seque opificio non probiter clepere

I observed the same interval left between *coept* and *seque*.

The next instance was on the second line of the Afranius couplet on p. 514 M. *s.v.* Humanitus: