

THE  
CLASSICAL MUSEUM,



A JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, AND OF  
ANCIENT HISTORY AND  
LITERATURE.

---

VOLUME THE THIRD.

---

LONDON :  
TAYLOR AND WALTON, UPPER GOWER STREET.

---

M.DCCC.XLVI.

In either case I conceive that these translations suggest the idea, howbeit with an obscure sense, that "quæ sunt super terram" refers to "membra," and that the words which follow are in apposition.

In Pole's *Synopsis* the passage is explained as follows: "*Membra vestra* (i.e. vitiosos vestros affectus) quos membra vocat respectu *veteris hominis* qui corpus vocatur. (*Rom.* vi. 6, and *Sup.* ii. 11.) Ne intelligantur corporis humani membra addidit τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ubi subintelligi debet ex præcedentibus τὰ φρονούντα.

Now v. 2 is τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Whence I infer, that τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is truly explained by the words which follow it, *πορνείαν. κ. τ. λ.* Again, τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν occurs *Rom.* vi. 13, in reference to *θνήσκον σῶμα*, and are there described as either capable of being *ἄπλα ἀδικίας* or *ἄπλα δικαιοσύνης*; so that if we take *νεκρώσατε* to govern two accusatives, which, indeed, seems the regular construction in this place, the sense is without ambiguity, and the proper meaning of each part of the sentence is preserved. Thus, "Mortify therefore your members (with regard to) base affections," viz. fornication, &c.

G. and C. C.

#### REMARKS ON THE ORIGIN OF TENSES.

In speculating on etymology, a difficulty is frequently encountered when we endeavour to mount up to the origin of certain elements. Those who allege that *amavi* is derived from *ama* and *fui*, or *τύψομαι* from *τυψ* and *ἔσομαι*, are exposed to the objection that the words *fui* and *ἔσομαι* need themselves to be accounted for. At least, a vague feeling of dissatisfaction is on this ground often felt. At present it is proposed to adduce a few facts from a modern language, which seem to relieve the general difficulty, without entering into any special discussion about *fui*, the alleged earlier form of *fui*.

That which is called the *past* tense in Arabic by no means specifically expresses *historical* time. *Katab* (for instance) means rather "he has written," than "he wrote;" and, in some connections, would even have a present meaning. Yet the verb *Kān*, which, judged of by the form, is in the very same tense, always has the historical notion, meaning, "he was," not "he has been," or "he is." In consequence, in order to give to another verb historical time, they prefix *Kān* to the present; as, *Yarāh*, he goes; *Kān yarāh* (=fuit it), he went: and to form the pluperfect, *Rah*, he has gone, *Kān rāh* (=fuit ivit), he had gone. This is exactly analogous in principle to saying, *Ama fui*, I loved; for *Kān* and *fui* are alike destitute of any thing in form which should fix them to historical time.

But, again, there is a second verb, *Sâr* or *Ssâr*, which primitively meant "factus est," but practically passes off into the sense of "est." Thus, in the very same tense, viewed grammatically, the two verbs, *Sâr* and *Kân*, express two different times, Present and Past; and may be without violence compared to Est and Fuit, if we are disposed to admit that the form of Fuit is that of the Present Tense.

In the Arabic of Bagdad, the verb *Kân* largely enters the composition of other verbs as an auxiliary, so as to throw some light on the composition of Amav-ero, Amav-erim, Fu-ero, Fu-erim. For its tense, *Yakân*, which is called the Aorist or Present, and in other verbs denotes either present or future time, in this verb is specifically future, "erit;" hence it serves to fix a future idea definitely on other verbs. Thus: *Yarûhh*, he goes, or will go; *Yakân yarûhh*, he will (hereafter) go; *Kân yakân yarûhh*, he was to have gone (literally, "Fuit erit it"); *Yakân râhh*, he will have gone (literally, "Erit ivit").

The special futurity inherent in *Yakân* may perhaps be compared to *ἔσομαι* and *Ero*, each of which is present in form, but future in sense. The crude form being *ἐς* and *er*, it will hardly be alleged that either *-ομαι* or *-ο* had any force essentially determining the sense to future time. It is true that in *ἔδομαι*, *φάγομαι*, *πίομαι*, the termination *-ομαι* may be thought to denote futurity; but the more legitimate conclusion seems to be, that there was a time when it was not yet settled what *ομαι* should mean. It tried to be future, and succeeded in a few verbs. It tried to be passive and middle, and sometimes was neither, but "deponent."

That forms were invented first, and their final sense affixed to them only afterwards, seems to be proved in various instances. Thus the reduplication, if we judge of it by Hebrew analogies, originally expressed something *frequentative* or *energetic* in the verb. If this cannot be proved in Greek, it is at least highly probable that *κέκλυθι*, *τέτλαθι*, *κέκλωμαι*, *μίμνω*, originally had a more emphatic sense than *κλυθι*, *τλήθι*, *κλωμαι*, *μίνω*. Be this as it may, we know that in the aorists *κέκαμον* *κέκαδον* the reduplication had as legitimate a place once, as afterwards in the Paulo Post Futurum and in the Perfects; and it cannot be denied, that the final tendency has been that which we see in the Latin language, to associate the reduplication with the idea of Past Time, with which it evidently had once nothing to do. This may well reconcile us to the belief that *-ομαι* in *ἔσομαι*, *ἔδομαι*, and *-ομαι* in *τύπτομαι*, are the same termination, though, by accident, differently understood.

It may be of interest to know the different method used at Aleppo to express certain tenses. The future is there formed by the substantive *Bed* (which, whatever it once meant, now means Want or Will)

with the possessive pronouns of different persons,—prefixed to the aorist. Thus we get :

Beddi arùhh — my will I go = ibo  
 Beddak tarùhh — thy will thou go = ibis  
 Beddo yarùhh — his will he go = ibit, &c.

Then, by prefixing *Kàn*, he was, but varied in all the persons, they produce a Future Past.

Kunt beddi arùhh — fui iturus  
 Kunt beddak tarùhh — fuisti iturus  
 Kàn beddo yarùhh — fuit iturus, &c.

Complications so cumbrous lose, by frequent repetition, the absurdity which on first hearing they seem to have ; and, by force of analogy, remove all *à priori* difficulty out of the way of saying *Ama fui ero*, and afterwards corrupting the combination into *Amavero*. On the question, whether Fui does actually enter into Amavi, no opinion is here expressed.

The forms *Ero* and *τίψω* suggest that *ἔσω*, as well as *ἔσομαι*, once conveyed a future idea in Greek : and this leads to a new question, whether the distinction of *εἶμι* and *ἔσομαι*, of *Sum* and *Ero*, was originally one of *tense*. *Ero*, from the crude form *er* (= *ἐς*), is evidently formed like *Rego* ; *εἶμι* and *Sum* are formed after verbs in *-μι*. The most natural inference is, that a double formation first arose dialectally, without any aim ; and that in this one verb a distinction of time was accidentally annexed, just at *οἶχομαι* is Past, and *ἔρχομαι* Present or Future.

There is much reason to believe that no simple tense originally carried an idea of time with it at all. *Rego* might have been future, as *Ero* ; and *Regam* past, as *Eram* ; only the wear and tear of the language settled the meaning.

In many languages it is observed that the verb To Be is made up of two or more roots. In such cases it may be predicted, that the different *times* which they indicate have nothing to do with the forms or inflexions. The phenomena which have been above adduced from the Arabic language, as parallel to the Greek and Latin, are, it is believed, by no means peculiar to these tongues ; but it may be sufficient at present to have indicated a principle without attempting an ambitious induction, which must, after all, remain very incomplete.

F. W. N.