To vice industrious, but to nobler deeds Timorous and slothful. Yet he pleased the ear [PL 2. 108–17];

that Milton had Drances in mind and wished his fit audience to think of him seems evident. We may further note Belial's "'Wherefore cease we then?' / Say they who counsel war" (ibid. 2. 159–60), which reflects Turnus' taunting question to Drances, quid cessas? (Aen. 11. 389)—Moloch, whose speech in favor of war preceded that of Belial, had not asked this question. Again, Belial's "Shall we, then, live thus vile" (ibid. 2. 194) reflects, more remotely it is true, Drances' nos animae viles (Aen. 11. 372). Whether Milton's readers could

5. The writer is obliged to Professor Lynette Thompson of Florida State University for pertinent observations regarding

be expected to recognize an allusion to Vida's *Christias* is a nice question, but it is perhaps not unduly fanciful to suppose that as Milton here evoked Virgil's Drances he thought of Vida's Drancean Annas, and incorporated the description of Christ (itself recalling Drances) that Vida attributes to Annas: "hic auctor fandi multos sermone fefellit; / et facie (ne cede dolis) mentitur honesta / virtutem; scelerum tegit alto in pectore amorem" (*Chr.* 5. 110–12) in lines 110–12 of his characterization of the fallen angel.⁵

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

University of Chicago

Vida and Milton.

THE VERBAL GROUP πυκτεύω πυκταλίζω πυκταλεύω

In Gk. $\pi v \xi$ $\pi v \gamma \mu \eta$ $\pi v \gamma \mu \alpha \hat{i} o s$, Lat. pugil pugnus, etc., lies a root pug-, which with an assimilated root-final appears again in $\pi \dot{v} \kappa \tau \eta s$ $\pi v \kappa \tau \iota \kappa \dot{o} s$ $\pi v \kappa \tau \dot{o} \dot{v} \dot{v} \eta$ $\pi v \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} \dot{v} \dot{v}$ $\pi \dot{v} \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} \dot{v} \dot{v}$ $\pi v \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} \dot{v} \dot{v}$. Beside the denominative $\pi v \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} \dot{v} \dot{\omega}$ are found two other semantically undifferentiated verbs $\pi v \kappa \tau \alpha \dot{\lambda} \dot{\epsilon} \dot{v} \dot{\omega}$, which show a - λ - extension and whose formation is less clear.

The verbal suffix $-\epsilon \psi \omega$ witnesses two kinds of development, formational and functional. Originally belonging largely to denominatives based on masculine nouns in $-\epsilon \psi_S$ and, in relation to the noun, carrying the meaning 'be what the noun denotes' or 'perform an action proper to what the noun denotes' (e.g., $\beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega =$ 'I am $\beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \dot{\nu} s$, reign,' $i \epsilon \rho \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega =$ 'I am $i \in \rho \in \psi_S$, sacrifice'), it was extended, through functional associations, to nouns of various stems (πτωχεύω:πτωχός, μνηστεύω:μνηστήρ, etc.). Parallel with this analogical extension ran the development of new functions beside the original one; one finds, for example, the signification 'be engaged in or perform what the noun denotes' $(\dot{\alpha}\epsilon\theta\lambda\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega = 'I \text{ am engaged})$ in $\alpha \epsilon \theta \lambda_{os}$) or 'employ what the noun denotes' $(\tau \circ \xi \in \psi \omega) = \mathrm{Imploy} \tau \circ \xi \alpha'$, a new reference,

1. Cf. E. Fraenkel, Griech. Denom. (Göttingen, 1906), p. 182; M. Leumann, Hom. Wörter (Basle, 1950), p. 113.

that is, to an action or an object beside the old one to a person in his official or professional capacity. Within the first kind of development falls $\pi \nu \kappa \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$ 'box, strike with the fist' based on $\pi \dot{\nu} \kappa \tau \eta s$; cf. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$ (: $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \eta s$), $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \sigma \pi \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$ (: $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\sigma} \tau \tau \eta s$).

However, for $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda l\zeta\omega$ and $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon \nu\omega$ no nominal bases are attested. In the circumstances that the suffix $-\zeta\omega$, like $-\epsilon \nu\omega$, became very productive and $-\zeta\omega$ formations are found, by analogical extension, derived from nouns other than guttural and dental stems, a single nominal basis would have done for both $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda l\zeta\omega$ and $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\nu\omega$: cf., e.g., $\lambda\lambda\eta\theta l\zeta\omega\mu\omega$ $\lambda\eta\eta\theta\epsilon\nu\omega$ (: $\lambda\eta\eta\theta\gamma$), $\lambda\nu\eta\theta$), $\lambda\nu\eta\theta$ (: $\lambda\eta\eta\theta$), $\lambda\nu\eta\theta$), $\lambda\nu\eta\theta$ (: $\lambda\nu\eta\theta$), $\lambda\nu\eta\theta$), $\lambda\nu\eta\theta$ (: $\lambda\nu\eta\theta$), $\lambda\nu\eta\theta$ 0, $\lambda\nu\eta$

In the absence of a nominal basis, then, one is compelled to look outside the $\pi\nu\kappa\tau$ - group for the source of derivation of $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda\iota\zeta\omega$ and $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega$. As it is, none of the other three $-\alpha\lambda\iota\zeta\omega$ /- $-\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega$ sets just quoted provides a clue; nor do, it seems, schematically or functionally,

2. See, e.g., E. Schwyzer, Mél. H. Pedersen (Aarhus, 1937), pp. 63 ff.

any of the few remaining $-\alpha\lambda\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega$ forms that are attested (καλεύω παλεύω πατταλεύω σαλεύω σκαλεύω, etc.). A way out is perhaps only to be found in one of the very few $-\alpha\lambda\dot{l}\zeta\omega$ verbs known (στροφαλ $\dot{l}\zeta\omega$ τροχαλ $\dot{l}\zeta\omega$ δνοπαλ $\dot{l}\zeta\omega$, etc.). This is the Homeric deverbative προκαλ $\dot{l}\zeta\omega$, found beside a rival form προκαλέομαι, after which $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega$ (since Corinn. 6th cent. B.C.) may have been transformed to $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda\dot{l}\zeta\omega$ (Anacr. 6th cent. B. C.). Both $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda\dot{l}\zeta\omega$ and $\pi\rho\kappa\alpha\lambda\dot{l}\zeta\omega$ belong to the same functional field: cf. $\chi\epsilon\rho\sigma\dot{l}$ δ $\dot{\epsilon}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\tau\iota$ $\lambda\dot{l}\eta\nu$ $\pi\rho\kappa\alpha\lambda\dot{l}\zeta\omega$. . . (Hom. Od. 18. 20), 'Do not challenge me too much to a combat with the

fists . . . 'Transformations of this kind due to the influence of words in the same functional/semantic field are further evidenced by, e.g., $\delta \dot{\nu} \sigma \gamma \omega$ and $\delta \dot{\nu} \pi \tau \omega$ (beside $\delta \dot{\nu} \omega$) after $\mu \dot{\nu} \sigma \gamma \omega^3$ and $\kappa \dot{\nu} \pi \tau \omega^4$ respectively, $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \kappa \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ (beside $\ddot{\epsilon} \lambda \kappa \omega$) after $\dot{\rho} \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, ' $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} - (\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha - \tau \rho \sigma \pi \alpha \lambda) \dot{\zeta} \omega \omega$ (beside $\dot{\epsilon} \nu - (\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha - \tau \rho \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega \mu \alpha)$) after $\sigma \tau \rho \sigma \dot{\alpha} \lambda) \dot{\zeta} \omega$.

On chronological consideration, $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha$ - $\lambda\epsilon\nu\omega$ —attested in Sophron in the fifth century B.C.—may be explained as the result of contamination: $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\epsilon\nu\omega$ x $\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda\iota\zeta\omega$ (cf., e.g., $\gamma\iota\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$ <* $\gamma\iota\gamma\nu\omega\mu$ x * $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$ ⁷).

OBAFEMI KUJORE

University of Ibadan

- 6. Cf. Risch, op. cit., p. 259; P. Chantraine, Gramm. hom. (Paris, 1942), I, 340. It is difficult to believe (as would Schwyzer, Griech. Gramm., I, 32; cf. 735) that Mod. Gk. ἐντροπαλός, as a survival that knows no previous attestation, is the basis of Hom. ἐντροπαλίζομαι.
 - 7. Cf. Leumann, Lat. Gramm., I, 314.

A SIGNIFICANT ELISION (CAT. 63. 37)

A significant pictorial elision has escaped the attention of Catullan scholarship. It appears in only one of the numerous commentaries to Catullus and there only incidentally, is ignored in the many articles on the poem itself, and fails to appear even in M. Owen Lee's intriguing paper, "Illustrative Elisions in Catullus" (*TAPA*, XCIII [1962], 144–53). Nor is there discussion of elision in articles on galliambics, the meter of the poem.³

The elision occurs in line 37 of Catullus' Attis poem. After castrating himself, Attis

wanders over the slopes of Ida with his band of fellow worshipers until, exhausted by his revels and pain, he is overtaken by sleep:

piger his labante languore oculos sopor operit; abit in quiete molli rabidus furor animi

[63. 37-38].4

The elision between *languore* and *oculos* is all the more noticeable because of its place in the line: it bridges the strong central diaeresis which is not bridged in the other ninety-two lines of the poem⁵ nor in the half-dozen lines

Kallimachos und Catullus," Hermes, XIV (1879), 194–201, and Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos, (Repr. Berlin, 1962), II, 291–95; R. Tyrrell, "Grant Allen on the Attis of Catullus," CR, VII (1893), 44–45; E. S. Thompson "The Galliambic Metre," CR, VII (1893), 145–46 and 354–55; G. Dunn, "The Galliambic Metre," CR, VII (1893), 146–48; W. R. Hardie, "The Galliambic Metre," CR, VII (1893), 280–81; T. Goodell, "Word Accent in Catullus' Galliambics," TAPA, XXXIV (1903), 27–32; J. W. Loomis, "Studies in Catullan Verse: An Analysis of Word Types and Patterns in the Polymetra" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1968); R. C. Ross, "Catullus 63 and the Galliambic Meter," CJ, LXIV (1969), 145–52.

- 4. R. A. B. Mynors' text (Oxford, 1958) is used here. There is no essential debate over the text of this line, the only emendation being Ellis' *languore* for the *langore* of the codices.
- 5. This fact is noted by V. Bongi, Catullus Attis (c. 63); Studio introduttivo, testo critico e commento (Florence, 1944), ad loc., who is the only commentator I have found to even mention the elision.

^{3.} See J. Wackernagel, KZ, XXXIII (1895), 39 (Kl. Schr., I, 718).

^{4.} See H. Frisk, Griech. etym. Wörterbuch, I, 425.

^{5.} Cf. E. Risch, Wortbild. der hom. Sprache (Berlin and Leipzig, 1937), p. 257; Schwyzer, Mél. H. Pedersen, p. 70; Griech. Gramm., I, 706.

^{1.} Those commentators consulted were: W. Kroll³ (Stuttgart, 1959), C. J. Fordyce (Oxford, 1961), E. T. Merrill (Cambridge, Mass., 1893), A. Baehrens (Leipzig, 1885), G. Friedrich (Leipzig and Berlin, 1908), R. Ellis² (Oxford, 1889), M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis (Turin, 1953). None of these mentions the elision, but see below, n. 5. I was not able to obtain many of the recent German and Italian commentaries listed in J. Kroumann's bibliography in Kroll's commentary.

^{2.} Of especial interest are: A.-M. Guillemin, "Le Poème 63 de Catulle," REL, XXVII (1949), 149-57; J. P. Elder, "Catullus' Attis," AJP, LXVIII (1947), 394-403, and "The Art of Catullus' Attis," TAPA, LXXI (1940), xxxiii-xxxiv; P. W. Harkins, "Autoallegory in Catullus 63 and 64," TAPA, XC (1959), 102-16; G. Allen, The "Attis" of Caius Valerius Catullus, Bibliotèque de Carabas, VI (London, 1892); O. Weinreich, "Catulls Attisgedicht," Mélanges Franz Cumont, Ann. Phil. Hist., IV (1936), 463-500. I regret not seeing T. Oksala, "Catulls Attis-Ballade," Arctos, N.S. III (1962), 199-213.

^{3.} U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Die Galliamben des