AELIAN AND ATTICISM. CRITICAL NOTES ON THE TEXT OF *DE NATURA ANIMALIUM*

The need for a new edition of Aelian's *De natura animalium* (*NA*), relying on a fresh study of the manuscripts and providing an adequate critical apparatus, has long since been felt, as Scholfield himself pointed out in the preface of his Loeb edition.[1] This is the task in which a research team has been engaged from 2000 at the University of Oviedo (Spain), and this paper results from the first stage of that project, namely the collation of all the best and oldest manuscripts.[2]

Inaccuracy of a critical edition may result in various shortcomings, one of these being the unreliability of linguistic studies resting on it. This is, in part, the case of Hercher's Teubner edition of *NA*[3]—still considered the canonical one—and the major study on the language of Aelian which is based on it, the third volume of Schmid's monumental work on Atticism.[4] After a systematic revision of Schmid's remarks on Aelian's morphology,[5] we have found several inaccuracies and errors, which make a good case for the above-mentioned unreliability.

According to the *stemma* elaborated by De Stefani,[6] the agreement of the manuscripts *VLP*, or even that of *V* with only one of the other two, leads us to the text of the lost archetype, so these three codices will suffice for our present purpose. We are, of course, well aware that an archetype is far from being the author's 'original', and that it always contains errors. In our particular instance, it is very likely that the archetype presented alterations of Aelian's language, since the scribes' tendency to replace dialectal variants that were unfamiliar to them with κοινή forms is well known. However, Hercher's emendations in this sense sometimes go too far, as we will see. At the same time, it must be taken into account that Aelian's Atticism

---

[1] A. F. Scholfield, *Aelian. On Animals* 1 (Cambridge, MA and London, 1958), vii viii.

[2] This team is directed by Dr M. García Valdés. The various manuscripts have been collated by Dr M. García Valdés (*L*, Laur. 86.7, 12th 13th centuries), M. González Suárez (*H*, Vatic. Palat. gr. 260, 14th century), Dr L. A. Llera Fueyo (*P*, Parisiens. gr. 1757, 14th century), Dr V. Muñoz Llamosas (*A*, Monac. August. 564, 14th 15th centuries), and myself (*V*, Parisiens. suppl. 352, 13th century). I should like to thank all of them for their invaluable help in the elaboration of this paper.

[3] R. Hercher, *Claudii Aeliani, De natura animalium libri XVII* (Leipzig, 1864), which is a revision of the author's previous text in the Didot series (Paris, 1858). However, its critical apparatus is inferior, and those interested in an explanation of the editor's choices or emendations must turn to the Didot edition. Previous editions are those by G. Gesner (Zurich, 1556, and Geneva, 1611, the former being the *editio princeps* and the latter including a Latin translation by P. Gillius); A. Gronovius (London, 1744); J. E. G. Schneider (Leipzig, 1784); and C. F. W. Jacobs (Jena, 1832). Hercher made use of Jacob's *stemma codicum*, which was faulty in several aspects, as we now know.

[4] W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern, von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus* 3 (Stuttgart, 1893, repr. Hildesheim, 1964). Schmid's references are always to the page and line of Hercher's Teubner edition, and the forms he quotes are those printed in the text, without any allusion to its critical apparatus.

[5] Schmid (n. 4), 13 45.

[6] E. L. De Stefani, 'I manoscripti della *Historia Animalium* de Eliano', *SIFC* 10 (1902), 175 222. At the present state of our research we can say that De Stefani's *stemma* is right, at least as far as manuscripts *VLPAH* are concerned. I refer to his excellent paper for everything related to the manuscripts of Aelian and their relations.

was not purist.[7] And, anyway, there is no guarantee at all that Hercher's emendations and conjectures reproduce Aelian's language more accurately than the archetype reconstructed from the manuscripts *VLP*. Therefore, the only way to avoid working with ill-founded material when describing the language of *NA* is to respect the manuscript transmission, unless there are good reasons to proceed otherwise.

In my revision, I will expound the data in the same order as they appear in Schmid's work. It goes without saying that I will only refer to sections where inaccuracies have been found, after the revision of the whole chapter on morphology.

(1) ἐς/εἰς ἔσω/εἴσω (Schmid, p. 18)

Schmid states that, as a rule, Aelian only employs the forms ἐς and ἔσω for the preposition and the adverb, and that only two examples of εἰς[8] and three of εἴσω[9] can be found in his works. But this assertion is not corroborated by the manuscripts of *NA*:[10] a sampling of ἐς/εἰς[11] in Books 1, 5 and 10 gives the following results. The word, either as a preposition or in compounds, appears 207 times in those three books. We have to lay aside two cases of εἰς in a quotation of Euripides (125.1–2), and eleven more where *LP* diverge from *V*, so we cannot be sure which was the archetype's text.[12] With regard to the other 194 examples, the archetype has 157 instances of εἰς (60 in Book 1,[13] 53 in Book 5,[14] and 44 in Book 10[15]), and

---

[7] Cf. Schmid (n. 4), 13: 'Älian ist der Erste unter den hier zu behandelnden Sophisten, bei welchem sich nichtattische Elemente stärker hervordrängen. Die Zulassung derselben ist von der strengen Richtung sowohl der Grammatik ... als der Rhetorik verpönt, und Aristides hat sich wirklich von ihnen ganz rein gehalten.'

[8] *NA* 333.4 and 432.32 (εἰσδύεται).

[9] *NA* 77.10, 333.15 and 404.31.

[10] We have to say that in his *Index mutationum*, on the occasion of the first occurrence of each word, Hercher indicates that he is always going to write ἐς and ἔσω ('*quod semel moneo*', he says); so in fact the few examples of εἰς and εἴσω found by Schmid are nothing but misprints (from the viewpoint of Hercher's edition). From now on, unless otherwise stated, quotations are from *NA*.

[11] Attic tragedians employed one form or another profiting from its different metrical value. Εἰς is usual in Attic prose (except Thucydides) and comedy. Early Attic inscriptions have ἐς, but this must be probably understood as εἰς, which is the form they have after the adoption of the Ionian alphabet. Εἰς is also the normal form in κοινή.

[12] Book 1: 6.21 εἰς *V*: ἐς *L* (*P* vac.); 10.2 εἰς *V*: ἐς *LP*; 16.28 ἐς *V*: εἰς *LP*; 28.10 ἐς *V*: εἰς *LP*. Book 5: 110.30 ἐς *V*: εἰς *LP*; 133.10 εἰς *V*: ἐς *LP*; 135.8 εἰς *V*: ἐς *LP*; 137.22 ἐς *V*: εἰς *LP*. Book 10: 256.7 ἐς *V*: εἰς *LP*; 260.10 εἰς *V*: ἐς *LP*, and 266.22 εἰς *V*: ἐς *LP*.

[13] In 4.10; 4.13; 4.16; 5.15; 6.3; 6.9; 7.20; 8.15; 10.26; 11.2; 11.3; 11.28; 12.19 (εἰσεδέξατο); 12.24; 12.25; 12.25 (εἰσέδυ); 13.4 (εἰσδύντες); 14.18; 14.28; 15.7; 16.10; 16.11; 16.13; 19.6 (εἰσδοῦσα); 19.14; 19.20; 21.4; 21.22; 21.23; 21.24; 22.2; 22.29; 23.2; 23.17; 24.15; 24.21 (*VP*); 24.28; 24.32 (εἴσδυσιν); 25.12; 25.13; 25.16; 26.12; 26.13; 26.18; 26.19 (also Hercher as a misprint); 26.21; 26.25; 26.28; 27.27; 28.3; 28.9; 28.22; 28.23; 28.24 (εἰσεπήδησαν); 30.10 (εἰσπίπτουσιν); 30.18; 30.24; 31.19 *LP* (*V* vac.); 31.30 *LP* (*V* vac.); 31.31.

[14] In 108.6; 108.10; 108.17; 108.29 (εἰσκομισθεῖσαν); 109.12 (εἰσάγοι *V*: εἰσαγάγοι *LP*); 109.15; 109.17; 109.19; 109.27 (twice); 110.15; 110.17; 110.23; 110.31; 111.7; 111.8; 111.13; 111.18; 111.22; 112.6; 112.11; 112.14; 112.24; 113.2; 113.7; 113.23; 114.12; 114.15; 115.23; 116.5; 116.16 (*om.* Hercher); 117.2; 119.14; 119.27; 120.1; 120.14 (*LP*, *V* vac.); 121.7 (*VP*); 121.12; 122.4; 123.10 (twice); 124.29; 126.1; 126.2; 126.22; 127.13; 129.16; 132.1 (*om.* Hercher); 132.21; 132.22; 133.7; 134.29 *LP* (*om. V*); 134.30 31 (εἰσέρπουσι); 135.5 and 135.18.

[15] In 245.29; 245.31 (*VL*, *P dub.*); 246.2; 246.4 (*VL*); 246.18; 249.11; 249.17; 250.4; 250.14 (εἰσπηδήσασα *V*: εἰσπηδήσασαι *LP*); 250.18; 250.28 (εἰσάγονται); 250.28; 250.31; 251.16; 251.23; 251.29; 251.31; 253.30; 254.15; 255.7; 255.19; 255.21; 255.29; 255.31 (*P dub.*);

only 37[16] of ἐς (11 in Book 1, 10 in Book 5, and 16 in Book 10). As I have said, these figures are just a sampling, but they give quite a clear idea of what happens in the whole work, where both forms coexist, but εἰς is clearly more frequent. Therefore, the manuscripts provide a picture that is very different from the one Schmid gives for Aelian, and significantly more similar to the one we find in Aristides and Phrynichus, who always have εἰς, except in quotations; as for Lucian, there are 982 cases of εἰς and 857 of ἐς.[17]

The same is true for the adverb ἔσω/εἴσω, which appears eight times in the whole work. In six of them *VLP* unanimously testify εἴσω, and have ἔσω only twice.[18]

(2) ὀστέον/ὀστοῦν (Schmid, p. 19)

Schmid found in Aelian only one case of the uncontracted form (predominating in κοινή) ὀστέου (*NA* 94.28) instead of the Attic ὀστοῦ (the one always used by Aristides,[19] except in quotations, and nearly always by Lucian;[20] no examples are found in Phrynichus), in contrast to five examples of Attic (contracted) forms. In fact, the word appears seventeen times in *NA*, and the vast majority of the contracted forms are the result of Hercher's emendations. In fact, according to *VLP* the archetype had six cases of ὀστέον, three of ὀστέου, three of ὀστέων, one of ὀστέα, one of ὀστέοις, and only three instances of an Attic form, ὀστᾶ.[21] It is, therefore, clear that the ratio of uncontracted forms of this word in *NA* is much higher than that of Attic forms (14:3).

(3) Ending −ᾱ/-ῆ in s-stem adjectives (Schmid, p. 21)[22]

Schmid says that in the s-stem adjectives the accusative singulat masculine and feminine, and the nominative/accusative plural neuter is nearly always −ᾱ, except for

256.1; 256.17; 256.19; 258.14; 259.24; 260.9; 260.31 (*om. P*); 261.14; 261.31; 262.6; 263.24; 264.28; 264.30; 265.16; 265.22; 265.23 (εἰσδύντες); 266.1; 266.10; 266.29, and 268.27.

[16] Book 1: 5.4; 5.32; 6.12; 6.26; 8.29; 11.26 (*VL*); 12.32; 19.6; 19.12; 22.31; 23.22. Book 5: 112.6 (there is an εἰς in the same line); 113.5; 115.11; 116.27; 118.5; 118.15; 118.27; 124.8; 127.8; 127.14. Book 10: 243.5; 243.19; 243.22; 243.30 (πρός Hercher); 244.9; 248.20; 252.21; 253.3; 255.20; 256.12 (*VL*); 256.30; 259.22; 263. 9; 263. 11; 264.7 and 267.11.

[17] Data regarding these authors have been gathered with the help of the TLG, and contrasted with the critical apparatus of F. W. Lenz and C. A. Behr, *P. Aelii Aristidis Opera quae exstant omnia*, 1.1 1.4 (Leiden, 1976 1980); B. Keil, *Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei Quae supersunt omnia* 1 2 (Berlin, 1898, repr. Hildesheim, 2000); J. de Borries, *Phrynichi sophistae praeparatio sophistica* (Leipzig, 1911); E. Fischer, *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos* (Berlin, 1974); M. D. McLeod, *Luciani Opera* 1 4 (Oxford, 1972 87), but the checking of the apparatus has not been exhaustive where the incidence of the words studied surpassed a certain limit, as in the case of ἐς/εἰς, and of the sigmatic aorist optative endings (§8 below), for which the editors' choice was relied on. Spurious works and quotations from other authors have not been taken into account. I quote Aristides' *Orationes* by Jebb's volume and page.

[18] Εἴσω appears in 5.15, 8.32, 15.11, 125.27, 224.22, and 272.1; ἔσω in 72.27 and 240.10.

[19] Where we find one case of ὀστοῦ (*Or.* 1.280 J.) and three of ὀστᾶ (*Or.* 1.312, 1.313, and 2.241 J.).

[20] In this author seventeen examples of ὀστᾶ (in 13.36, 14.46 [twice], 23.3, 25.8, 31.14, 34.31, 36.17, 36.26 [twice], 38.15, 61.22, 71.7, 77.5.1 [twice], 77.30.2, 79.5.1) against one of ὀστέα (in 13.31; there is another more in a quotation), tree of ὀστοῦν (in 23.7 and 28.36, twice), and only one of ὀστέων (ὀστῶν β), in 38.15, may be found.

[21] We find ὀστέον in 249.7, 252.1 (*VP*), 288.7, 301.24, 303.8, and 329.15; ὀστέου in 183.21 (*VL*; *P* has ὀστρέου, clearly an error); 302.30 and 302.32; ὀστέων in 94.28, 207.5, and 295.13; ὀστέα in 302.22; ὀστέοις in 310.3; and ὀστᾶ in 94.29, 410.19, and 425.1.

[22] With regard to s stem nouns, we can add that it is true, as Schmid says, that the genitive plural of ἄνθος is always ἀνθέων (8.23, 22.5, and 322.26), but in the case of χεῖλος, *VLP* testify once χειλέων (110.22), and another time χειλῶν (172.13).

συμφυῆ (401.27 and 405.5, accusative singular, and 405.16, nominative/accusative plural neuter). However, when we turn to the manuscripts, we find four other examples with -ῇ (a normal κοινή ending[23]): ἀδεῇ (272.11, accusative singular— but ἀδεᾶ, 324.14, also accusative singular), ὁμοφυῆ (132.30 VP: ὁμοφυᾶ L; nominative/accusative plural neuter), συμφυῆ (134.13 accusative singular), and ὑγιῇ (290.14 —but ὑγιᾶ, 104.21, also accusative singular). In Attic,[24] the result of the contraction depends partly on the preceding sound (so we find -α after ι or ε, like in ἐνδεᾶ, and -η in the rest of the cases, like in ψευδῆ or πλήρη), but in some words analogy operates (so the —α in ὑπερφυᾶ, and so on, is explained); in others, finally, there is also some hesitation (so, for instance, εὐφυᾶ and εὐφυῆ[25]). Therefore, Hercher may be right in correcting ἀδεῇ and ὑγιῇ,[26] whereas ὁμοφυῆ and συμφυῆ are acceptable Attic forms.

(4) πήχεων/πηχῶν (Schmid, p. 25)

Schmid points out that in Aelian the genitive plural of πῆχυς is πήχεων, which is the Attic form sanctioned by Phrynichus (*Eclogae* 217), and the only one that appears in Hercher's edition of *NA*. However, *VLP* have only one case of πήχεων (257.25), and unanimously testify the (late) contracted form πηχῶν in the other twenty-one occurrences of the word.[27] In Lucian there is one example of πηχῶν (24.6), and three of πήχεων (14.11, 14.37, and 73.5); in Aristides this form is not found.

(5) κνέφει/κνέφᾳ (Schmid, p. 27)

Schmid includes as the only example of the dative singular of κνέφας in *NA* the form κνέφει (129.24). Nevertheless, what the manuscripts testify is κνέφᾳ (so *VP*, κνέφαι L), a form we read at Xen. *HG* 7.1.15 and *Cyr.* 4.2.15, and which is considered the Attic one. It is true that the *Suda* (κ 1861 s.v.) attributes the dative κνέφει to Aelian (fr. 153), but as a form from κνέφος (ἀπὸ τῆς κνέφος εὐθείας), a synonym of κνέφας. Hercher's edition also has κνέφει in Aelian's fr. 342, but what we read this time in the *Suda* (χ 208, s.v. χερνῆτις), which is also the source of the text, is τῷ κνέφᾳ, κνέφει being an emendation by a *manus recentior* in MS F, according to Adler's critical apparatus.[28] Apart from that, the dative κνέφει (or κνέφεϊ) is only found in *AP* 7.633 (Crinagoras, first century B.C.).

---

[23] Cf. E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* 1.2 (Berlin, 1938, repr. 1970), 56; and F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, rev., trans. and ed. by R. W. Funk (Chicago and London, 1961), §48.

[24] Cf. M. Lejeune, *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien* (Paris, 1972), 262; P. Chantraine, *Morphologie historique du grec* (Paris, 1961²), §67.

[25] So Lucian always writes εὐφυᾶ (42.5, 45.74, and 59.35), but both ὑπερφυᾶ (9.1, 21.11, and 21.40) and ὑπερφυῆ (46.6) are found in his works. There are no examples of these forms in Aristides and Phrynichus.

[26] Ἀδεᾶ appears four times in Aristides (*Or.* 1.54, 1.144 [ἀδεῶς Monac. 432], 1.414, and 1.421 J.), and ὑγιᾶ, once (*Or.*, 2.95 J.); no examples are found in Phrynichus and Lucian.

[27] In 110.4, 244.3, 322.28, 344.21, 382.3, 392.32, 393.1, 393.16, 396.16, 409.18, 409.23, 409.25, 412.2, 412.10, 412.23, 413.30, 413.31, 414.9, 414.13, 430.9, and 430.14.

[28] A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* 4 (Stuttgart, 1971).

(6) τετταρεσκαίδεκα/τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα (Schmid, p. 29)

Schmid draws our attention to an isolated form of the hybrid τετταρεσκαίδεκα (414.27), in contrast with the Ionic form τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα (98.22). The fact is that the responsibility for this hybrid very likely falls on the copyist of *L*, because both *V* and *P* have ιδ' instead of the number written in full, which makes us think that this was also the reading of the archetype.

(7) πιότερος (Schmid, p. 29)

Schmid records in *NA* one instance of the comparative πιότερος, from πίων (πιότεραι, 344.12). However, what we actually read in *VLP* is the superlative πιόταται, so it can not be stated that Aelian actually employed the form πιότεραι. Difficult as the passage is, a superlative is more likely to be a hypercorrection of the author than the emendation of a copyist.

(8) Sigmatic aorist optative (Schmid, pp. 31–2)

Schmid says that the Atticists did not have a sure morphological pattern of this verbal tense, and that they made use of two kinds of endings,[29] the so-called 'Aeolic' (second-person singular -ειας, third-person singular -ειε, third-person plural -ειαν), and the 'non-Aeolic' ones (second-person singular -αις, third-person singular -αι, third-person plural -αιεν). Nevertheless, Aelian constitutes, according to Schmid, a special case, using only the Aeolic forms, except for an isolated example of a third-person plural -αιεν. This is true according to Hercher's edition, but *VLP* show a rather different situation. In fact, of the second-person singular, there are twenty-one examples that in Hercher's edition have the ending -ειας; instead, *VLP* present unanimously -αις in seventeen of them,[30] and have -ειας only once (προσπτύσειας, 46.25).[31] In the third-person singular, there are thirty-six examples ending in -ειε in Hercher's edition; of these, eleven actually have -αι in *VLP*,[32] and we can ascribe to the archetype one more, due to the agreement of *VL*.[33] The three manuscripts are also unanimous in testifying seven forms in -ειε.[34]

---

[29] Probably due to the fact that the use of one or another group of endings in Attic prose was rather fluctuating (for instance, according to Schmid [n. 4], 31, Isocrates, Plato, and Xenophon employed both kinds of endings, whereas orators like Andocides, Antiphon, Lycurgus, or Dinarchus only made use of the so called 'Aeolic' forms). Nevertheless, Phrynichus says (*PS. Fr.* 348): ποιήσειας καὶ γράψειας καὶ ποιήσειαν καὶ γράψειαν. Ἀττικοὶ μᾶλλον. The 'non Aeolic' forms are preferred in κοινή, cf. Mayser (n. 23), 87 8, and Blass and Debrunner (n. 23), §85.

[30] Ὑπορρίψαις (20.31), ἐμπάσαις (48.20), ἐμπήξαις (50.21), ἀμύξαις (50.23), ἀκούσαις (74.26, 75.10), κομίσαις (75.10), εἰκάσαις (101.31), ῥίψαις (149.7), ἀποσπάσαις (164.13), προσλιπαρήσαις (170.10), ἀκούσαις (197.29), κομίσαις (214.31), διατρήσαις (-τρι- *P*, 224.15), καταπάσαις (228.8), ἀκούσαις (319.12), and ἀποκρίναις (383.17).

[31] The other three cases can not be taken into account due to the textual problems they present: 162.28 ἀκούσεις *V*: ἀκούσαις *LP*, ἀκούσειας Hercher; 216.9 νύξεις *VL*: νύξῃς *P*: νύξειας Hercher; 225.14 θελήσεις *V*: θελήσαις *LP*: θελήσειας Hercher.

[32] Ἐπιρράναι *VLP* (-ρρᾶ- *V*, 22.17), ἀποδημῆσαι (51.6), ὁμιλῆσαι (-λῆ- *VL*) (79.28), ἐπιβουλεύσαι (85.30), ᾆσαι (92.27), μισῆσαι (-σῆ- *V*) (117.11), ἐμπλῆσαι (-πλῆ- *VP*) (144.2), εἴξαι (εἶ- *VP*) (224.16), εἰσρεύσαι (-ρεῦ- *VP*) (224.21), ἐπιθυμιάσαι (247.6), ἀνοίξαι (248.1).

[33] Θυμιάσαι *VL*: θυμιάσει *P* (24.24).

[34] Προσπελάσειε (21.3), ἐγχρίσειεν (87.4), καλέσειεν (125.32), ἰχνεύσειε (202.11), βλάψειεν (216.21), θελήσειε (212.9), and ψαύσειεν (402.24, quotation of Simonides). The other 17 examples can not be taken into account due to different textual problems: 13.20 νοήσει *V*:

Finally, of the two examples of a third-person plural which appear in Hercher's edition, *VLP* testify for one the ending -αιεν (δόξαιεν 307.24), and the other presents textual problems (δράσαιεν *V*, Hercher: δράσαι *LP*). In conclusion, the manuscripts show that Aelian, just as other Atticists, employed both the non-Aeolic and the Aeolic endings in the sigmatic aorist optative.

(9) Unaugmented pluperfect (Schmid, p. 34)

Schmid says that in Aelian the pluperfect usually retains the augment (which is often lacking in κοινή, though rarely in Attic),[35] and only in the *Varia Historia* does he find forms lacking it, as this also happens sporadically in Philo and Herodian.[36] But the manuscripts of *NA* do sometimes testify unaugmented pluperfects, all of which have been emended by Hercher. In fact, of the four examples adduced by Schmid to exemplify the augmented pluperfect in this work, two actually appear unaugmented in *VLP*, where we read πεπλήρωτο (225.18) and πέφρακτο (309.12).[37]

(10) ἐούρησα/οὔρησα (Schmid, p. 35)

According to Schmid, an unaugmented form (in fact a contracted one[38]) of the verb οὐρέω, οὔρησε (169.16), exists side by side with another with a syllabic augment (this is uncontracted, as in Attic) in the compound ἐνεούρησε (86.30). But this is just the result of an emendation, for *VLP* have the non-Attic form ἐνούρησε. No examples are found in Aristides, Phrynichus, or Lucian.

(11) παραδεικνύασι/παραδεινῦσι (Schmid, p. 37)

Among the forms of the verbs in -μι, Schmidt records an isolated example of an Attic third-person plural of a present indicative ending in -ασι, παραδεικνύασι (form sanctioned by Phrynichus against the thematic one δεικνύουσι, *PS* 10.22–3), but this is once more the result of an emendation, the reading of *VLP* being unanimously παραδεικνῦσι. No examples of the ending -νύασι nor or -νῦσι are found in Aristides and Lucian.

νοήσειε LP, Hercher; 24.31 ἐπιφράξει *V*: ἐπιφράξειε *LP*, Hercher; 67.12 ψαύσει *V*: ψαύσοι *LP*: ψαύσειεν Hercher; 67.13 ἐπιμείνῃ *VP*: ἐπιμείνει *L*: ἐπιμείνειε Hercher; 104.28 συντρίψει *V*: συντρίψαι *LP*: συντρίψειεν Hercher; 185.6 τιμωρήσας *V*: τιμωρῆσαι *LP* (-ρῆ- *L*): τιμωρήσειεν Hercher; 228.6 ἐάσει *V*: ἐάσαι *LP*: ἐάσειεν Hercher; 229.20 ἀνασπάσει *VL*: ἀνασπάσῃ *P*: ἀνασπάσειεν Hercher; 259.29 ὁμιλήσῃ *VLP*: ὁμιλήσειεν Hercher; 280.19 ἀποκείρει *VLP*: ἀποκείρειε Hercher; 280.32 οἰκτείρῃον *V*: οἰκτείρῃ *dub. L*: οἰκτείρει *P*: οἰκτείρειε Hercher (quotation of Sophocles); 301.3 ὑπομείνῃ *V*: ὑπομεῖναι *LP*: ὑπομείνειε Hercher; 346.30 ἀποκτείνῃ *VL*: ἀποκτείνει *P*: ἀποκτείνειε Hercher; 351.31 κατατήξει *VLP*: κατατήξειεν Hercher; 352.11 ἐκνικήσει *VP*: ἐκνικήσεται *L*: ἐκνικήσειεν Hercher; 402.25 ὄναρι* *V*: ὄναρ εἶεν *L* (δ *supra* ἰε scr.) *P*: ἄρειεν Hercher (quotation of Simonides); 429.23 θελήσοι *V*: μελήσῃ *P* (*L* vac.): θελήσειεν Hercher.

[35] Cf. Chantraine (n. 24), §358, Mayser (n. 23), 98, and Blass and Debrunner (n. 23), §66.

[36] So in Philo we found ὑπολέλειπτο (*De opificio mundi* 64), and in Herodian γεγένητο (1.7.4), κεκόρεστο (1.13.5), or πεπλήρωτο (1.15.2).

[37] The other two cases can not be taken into account, due to different textual problems. One of them, ὑπεκέκρυπτο (186.31), is the result of an emendation, for *VLP* have unanimously the imperfect ὑπεκρύπτετο, and the other one, ἐπεφρίκεσαν (410.4), is thus written in *V*, but *LP* have ἐπιπεφρίκασιν.

[38] Cf. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* 1 (München, 1953), 654.

(12) ἀμφιέννυμι/ἀμφιάζω (Schmid, p. 39)

Schmid says that in Aelian 'ἀμφιέννυμι ... hält das ε fest in μεταμφιεσάμενος', that is to say, that Aelian uses the verb ἀμφιέννυμι, and not the late thematic form ἀμφιάζω.[39] This is true for the simple form ἠμφιεσμένοι (102.17),[40] but as for the two occurrences of the compound with μετα- (42.14 and 305.28), which in Hercher's edition appear as μεταμφιεσάμενος, the reading of *VLP* is actually μεταμφιασάμενος, from μεταμφιάζω.[41]

(13) κάω/καίω, κλάω/κλαίω (Schmid, p. 41)

Regarding Schmid's remark about the exclusiveness of the use of the Attic verb κάω in *NA*,[42] the manuscripts *VLP* unanimously testify forms resulting from καίω in the thirteen occurrences of the verb,[43] all of which have been emended by Hercher. In Aristides' MSS only one form from καίω is found (*Or*. 2.246 J., ἐκαίετο codd.: ἐκάετο Dindorf, Lenz-Behr), against five from κάω (*Or*. 1.78, 2.342, 349 [twice] and 357 J.), whereas Phrynichus, quotations excepted, only shows forms from καίω (*PS*. 15.13, 71.5 and *PS. Fr.* *18); in Lucian we have found twenty-one examples from καίω (we discard two more which are conjectures of the editors), and four from κάω (two of them with critical variants).[44]

Likewise, the only time that the verb κλάω occurs in the *NA*, *VLP* have κλαίοντες (250.27), κλάοντες being the form that Schmid takes from Hercher.[45] In Aristides we have found only one occurrence of the verb, corresponding to κλάω (*Or*. 2.286 J.), and in Lucian there are six examples from κλάω (most of them with critical variants), and two of κλαίω.[46] No examples are found in Phrynichus.

[39] For the history of this verb, see P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (París, 1968), s.v. ἀμφιάζω.

[40] Also in Lucian, 8.11.

[41] Also in the anonymous work attributed to Aristides Ἀπελλᾶ γενεθλιακός (*Or*. 1.72 J.) a form from a compound of ἀμφιάζω is found, ἐπαμφιασαμένη.

[42] In Attic from the fifth century B.C. the diphthong /ai/tended to /a:/when, after the fall of a [w], it was in hiatus before a non-back vowel (so in κάεις, κλάεις, and so on). But the tendency towards the standardization of the paradigm yielded forms like κάω, κλάω, and so on, as well as others like κλαίειν (more seldom). Cf. Lejeune (n. 24), 247. In κοινή κάειν κλάειν do not appear, cf. Blass and Debrunner (n. 23), §30.

[43] Καιομένου (52.18), καίονται (106.21), καίει (111.26; 151.32), καιομένου (152.31), καίοντες (156.15, κάουσιν Hercher), καιομένῳ (194.6; 194.7), ἔκαιον (203.10), καιομένη (203.12), καιόμενον (225.13), καιομένου (334.19), and ἔκαιε (334.30).

[44] The forms from καίω are in 13.34, 14.1, 14.27, 14.29, 15.5, 23.19, 26.22, 30.5, 33.46, 38.9, 40.8 (καιόμενοι: καόμενοι β), 42.39, 44.49, 48.29, 55.22, 55.25, 55.31, 56.1, 56.7 (twice), and 62.5. Those from κάω in 13.40 (ἐκάετο: ἐκαίετο β), 40.18, 55.25, and 78.4.2 (κάειν ΒΩ^b: καίειν γL).

[45] The Greek name of the eagle offers another example of the same phonetic issue. Hercher always writes it in his text as ἀετός, and so on, which is the classic Attic form, and the one prevailing in κοινή, Cf. Blass and Debrunner (n. 23), §30, but in this case we read αἰετός, and so on (the epic, Ionic, and ancient Attic form) twenty-nine times in the manuscripts (20.18, 23.32, 47.20, 51.20, 51.24, 51.28, 52.14, 52.17, 52.20, 53.4, 53.5, 53.15, 54.12, 55.24, 57.9, 64.6, 122.32, 123.21, 125.16, 134.1, 152.24, 152.27, 160.9, 218.7, 303.14 [*VL*], 304.3, 382.6, 382.11 and 429.28), and ἀετός, and so on, another 21 (24.8, 90.11, 122.30 [*VP*], 124.11, 132.9, 152.20 [*VL*], 178.22, 178.26, 178.28, 182.8, 218.10, 218.25, 221.16, 290.2, 303.26, 317.25, 325.8, 366.5, 381.1, 428.32, and 429.8). The words ἀετίτης (20.19) and ἀετῶδες (91.4) do not present the ι in *VLP* either.

[46] Forms from κλάω are found in 16.12, 27.13, 27.14 (κλάεις: κλαίεις γ), 40.24 (κλάειν γ: καλεῖν β), 77.2.2 (ἔκλαον: ἔκλαιον γ), and 77.7.1 (κλάεις ΒΝ: κλαίεις γΦ). Forms form κλαίω, in 33.13 and 50,24.

(14) λοῦμαι/λούομαι (Schmid, p. 42)

Schmid says that Aelian uses both contracted and uncontracted forms of the verb λούω, the latter being the only ones to be found in Lucian,[47] but rejected by Phrynichus, *Eclogae* 159 and 159 q (even though in his *PS.* we read λουομένους at 76.19 and ἐλούοντο at 103.14). Aristides seems to use mainly contracted forms of this verb.[48] Still, the archetype shows three instances of uncontracted forms, λούεται (76.30), ἀπολούονται (*LP*: ἀπελούοντον *V*, 144.25), and λουόμενον (130.2), and only on one occasion do *LP* have a contracted form, λοῦται (322.18), but *V* has λούεται, which is the preferable reading, in view of the other three examples. So, it seems that Aelian, as Lucian, used only uncontracted forms of this verb.

(15) ἑόρακα/ἑώρακα (Schmid, p. 42)

In relation to the verb ὁράω Schmid points out that, unlike Lucian, who always writes ἑώρακα[49] (the form usually preferred in κοινή),[50] in *NA* Aelian uses the form ἑορακέναι, with -o-, which occurs in early Attic writers. Nevertheless, if we leave aside Hercher's edition, and turn to the manuscripts, we find that *VLP* unanimously have ἑωρακέναι in the three occurrences of this perfect in the work (in 89.2, 412.2 and 418.11), the same as Lucian, therefore. In Aristides' manuscripts, ten of the 11 examples of this perfect are written with -ω- (all of them emended by Dindorf), and in one more the tradition is divided.[51] No cases are found in Phrynichus.

A systematic revision of Schmid's chapter on Aelian's morphology has shown that the classical work on Atticism, as far as *NA* is concerned, is partially based on ill-grounded data. This invites both reconsideration of other chapters of Schmid's book, and encouragement for a new edition of Aelian's work. Meanwhile, this paper aims to act as an up-to-date revision of the *Formenlehre* chapter in the reference work on the language of Aelian.

University of Oviedo   LUCÍA RODRÍGUEZ-NORIEGA GUILLÉN
                                              lnoriega@uniovi.es

[47] In 8.13, 9.42, 13.34, 31.23, 34.19, 38.7, 61.17, and 78.13.1.
[48] Cf. *Or.* 1.38, 1.252 (λούεσθαι: λοῦ/σθαι U *p. corr.*), 1.256, 1.274 (λουμένῳ O: λελουμένῳ A²), 1.281 (λουμένῳ: λουομένω [*sic*] SDT), 1.293 (λούμενον S²T²: λουμένον O: λελουμένον A²), 1.301 (four times; in three of them MS A² has forms from λούομαι), 1.307 (ἐλούμην: ἐλουόμην A²), 1.357, and 1.359 J. On the other hand, two forms from λούομαι are found in the manuscripts: *Or.* 1.278 J. λούεσθαι: λοῦσθαι Dindorf, and 1.358 λούεσθαι O: λοῦσθαι Dindorf.
[49] In 8.8, 10.3, 10.25, 13.34, 14.34, 17.11, 22.15, 22.17, 24.14, 24.19, 31.27, 34.18, 34.24, 34.31, 36.19, 37.18, 37.23, 38.16, 43.4, 43.14, 53.22, 55.40, 56.1, 57.19, 59.10, 59.29 (twice), 59.37, 68.7, 70.2, 70.18, 70.27, 70.39, 70.45, 70.55 (twice), 77.6.1, 77.6.5 (twice), 77.22.1, 78.4.2, 79.11.1, 80.2.1, 80.4.1, 80.5.3, 80.9.1, 80.10.1.
[50] Cf. Mayser (n. 23), 103; Blass and Debrünner (n. 23), §68.
[51] The forms with -ω- appear in *Or.* 1.8, 1.20, 1.138, 1.139, 1.275, 1.337, 1.478 (twice), 1. 537, and 2.286 J. The doubtful example, in *Or.* 1.176 J. (ἑορακότων A: ἑωρακότων OPh).