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](#)

δηθεν

F. W. Thomas

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 10 / December 1894, pp 441 - 443

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00189097, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00189097

How to cite this article:

F. W. Thomas (1894). δηθεν. The Classical Review, 8, pp 441-443 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00189097

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the Achaeans assigned to the sons of Theseus as part of the spoils of war on the capture of Troy. This is a delightfully artistic touch of the poet and a delicate reminder of the time of the action, if we suppose that Troy had been taken only a few days before; but entirely unmeaning and unreasonable if we suppose the sack of Troy to have preceded by eight or ten years. In the latter case, the question at once arises, why Athena had delayed so long the occupation of the land, and why she should be thus employed at this particular moment. In my opinion, by the words of Athena the poet tells us distinctly that the action of the *Eumenides* followed immediately the close of the Trojan war, and hence immediately after the action of the *Agamemnon*.

One further indication of time is found in the dialogue of the scene to which I have just referred. On Athena's arrival and in response to her questions, Orestes not merely tells her who he is but narrates in detail the death of his father. But if Agamemnon had been dead for eight or ten years, surely Athena would have heard of it! The Greek tragic poets, to be sure, often represent their characters as ignorant of what they must have known. For instance we should say that it was hardly complimentary to Theseus or his city for Sophocles to make Oedipus inquire (*O.C.* 68) who was king of Athens! But such statements are for the sake of the audience, while in the Oresteian trilogy no reminder of the death of the king was needed for the sake of the spectators. But if we understand that the poet wished to represent Athena as still in ignorance of the fate of Agamemnon all difficulty vanishes, and

the speech of Orestes is just what is desired.

According to my view, then, the Aeschylean Orestes was sent from home by his mother several years before his father's murder. He lived as an exile in Phocis. On learning of Agamemnon's death, he turned at once to Apollo (περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις πάτριος ἐξηγητής) for instructions as to his duty, and was directed to compass the death of his mother by guile and then to seek purification at the Pythian shrine. (ὁ μάντις ἐξηγεῖτο μητροκτονεῖν.) He returns at once to his home and slays Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra. Without delay the Furies, invoked by his mother, appear before his eyes, and he flees to Delphi. There he is purified by Apollo and is directed to hasten to Athens where he might hope for legal acquittal. Just as the warning of the chorus at the close of the *Agamemnon* is fulfilled in the *Choëphori*, so the last words of the *Choëphori* prepare for the first scene of the *Eumenides*, and the last words of this first scene lay the foundation for the action which follows. The connexion, from first to last of the trilogy, could hardly be closer. Of course the different plays of a trilogy might be separated by generations, as was the case in the Theban Trilogy—*Laius*, *Oedipus*, *Seven against Thebes*, each of a different generation,—not to speak of the time supposed to have elapsed between the action of the *Prometheus Bound* and that of the *Prometheus Loosed*. But certainly the action of the Oresteia loses nothing, while it gains in energy and distinctness, if we think of it as condensed into a few days.

THOMAS DALE SEYMOUR.

Yale College.

δῆθεν.

THERE is a use of δῆθεν in Apollonius Rhodius to which attention has not been hitherto drawn. The particle is employed where in Homer we should have had simply δῆ. Instances are:

εἰ δὲ καὶ οὐνομα δῆθεν ἐπιθύεις δεδαῖσθαι,
τῷδε Κυτίσωρος πέλει οὐνομα, τῷδὲ τε Φρόντις,
τῷ δὲ Μέλας. B 1157-9.

νῦν δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ δῆθεν ὁμοίης ἔμμορες ἄτης.

Δ 62.

ὠλόμεθ' αἰνότατον δῆθεν μόνον, οὐδ' ἐπάλυξίς
ἔστ' ἄτης. Ib. 1261.

τὴν δ' ὅγε δῆθεν ὑποβλήδην προσέειπεν.

Γ 1119.

The other passages are A 998, B 384, Γ 354, Δ 1291. In none of them is the special force of δῆθεν present, and we have simply an equivalent of δῆ. As δῆθεν does not occur in early Greek at all, the fact may serve to gauge Apollonius' familiarity with the minuter details of Epic usage. δῆθεν is similarly employed in the *Anacreontea* (i. 14-18, with καὶ δῆθεν for καὶ δῆ): ἐγὼ δ' ὁ μωρὸς ἄρας ἐδησάμην μετώπῳ· καὶ δῆθεν ἄχρι καὶ νῦν ἔρωτος οὐ πέπαυμαι. It is probably in view of such cases that Hesychius gives ἐντεῦθεν as one of the senses of δῆθεν: L. and S. quote the passage from the *Anacreontea* under this head.

The general employment of the particle is not free from difficulty. In the first place, it is extremely rare. It occurs in Aeschylus twice (*Prom.* 202 and 998), in Sophocles once (*Tr.* 381), in Euripides six times, in Thucydides six times, in Xenophon once, Herodotus nine times, Plato once, Hippocrates twice, never apparently in Aristophanes or the Orators. The only later writers beside Apollonius who appear to use it are Aratus (once), Plutarch (three times), Pausanias (once), Dio Cassius (*passim*), Herodian (eight times), Lucian and Heliodorus. I will now suggest an explanation of the usage, which differs from that generally current.

δῆθεν is employed (1) at the beginning of sentences (second) in order to distinguish profession or hypothesis from fact, (2) with single words or phrases—which it always follows—(a) as with sentences, (b) simply to draw attention to an explanation. We may represent the first usage by inverted commas,¹ the second by a *sic* or note of exclamation. But just as in English we constantly quote words or phrases, or professions in general, with an indignant, sarcastic, or ironical intention, so *δῆθεν* constantly occurs in indignant, sarcastic, or ironical sentences. To describe the particle however as always ironical is an abuse of language, from which few grammarians are free. The most generally apt translation would be 'you know' or 'you understand.'

To illustrate: for *δῆθεν* with the sentence we may quote

λόγος γε μὴν ἐντρέχει ἄλλος
ἀνθρώποις, ὥς δῆθεν ἐπιχθονίη πάρος ἦεν κ.τ.λ.
Aratus *Phaen.* 100-1.

τόν τε ἄρτον, ᾧ δῆθεν ἐμέμκτο τὸ φάρμακον
κ.τ.λ. Plut. *De Soll. An.* 973 E.

ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπεπεμψάμην μέγα φρονῶν, ὅτι δῆθεν
τῆς βασιλείως θυγατρὸς τὸν ἐμὸν υἱὸν ὀψοίμην
γαμέτην.—Xen. *Cyrop.* iv. 6, 3.

κάγω σκυθρωποὺς ὀμμάτων ἔξω κόρας,
ὥς δῆθεν οὐκ εἰδυῖα τάχειργασμένα.

Eur. *Or.* 1319-20.

In all the cases *δῆθεν* has the force of quotation marks; but the sentence gives to it in the second and fourth the sense of mere profession, in the third the same with a tinge of sarcasm added. If we translate the sentences, our 'you know' will be similarly affected.

¹ This method of putting the matter was suggested to me by Dr. Postgate.

Employed with words or phrases the particle merely calls attention in

οἱ δ' ἱητροὶ σοφίζόμενοι δῆθεν ἔστιν οἱ ἀμαρ-
τάνουσιν.—Hippoc. (Kühn) iii. p. 153. Cf.
iii. p. 64.

ὁ μὲν γυναῖκα ἐποίησεν ἔχουσαν λύραν,
Σπάρτην δῆθεν, Πολύκλειτος δέ κ.τ.λ.—Pausa-
nias iii. 18, 5.

καινὸν δὲ τοῦνομ' ἀνὰ χρόνον πεπλασμένον
Ἴων, ἰόντι δῆθεν ὅτι συνήντητο.

Eur. *Ion* 831-2.

Cp. *ibid.* 656 and *Herc. Fur.* 949.

Here we have simply 'you understand.' Indignation or contempt is added in

ἐκερτόμησας δῆθεν ὡς παῖδ' ὄντ' ἐμέ.

Aesch. *Prom.* 986.

'This surely is mockery, as if I were a child.'

οἱ μὲν θέλοντες ἐκβαλεῖν ἔδρας Κρόνον
ὥς Ζεὺς ἀνάσσοι δῆθεν, οἱ δὲ τοῦμπαλιν κ.τ.λ.
ibid. 202.

'Zeus forsooth.'

ἤλλαξε δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐνιαυσίων μηνῶν τὰ ὀνόματα,
ὅσα μὲν ἀρχαῖα καταλύσας, πάντας δὲ ταῖς
ἐαυτοῦ παρηγορίαις ὀνομάσας, ὧν αἱ πλείους εἰς
Ἡρακλέα δῆθεν, ὥς ἀνδρειότατον, ἀνεφέροντο.—
Herodian i. 14, 17.

'Heracles, if you please.'

Something between indignation and amazement is expressed in

καί σφι βουλευομένοισι δεινόν τι ἐσέδυνε, εἰ
δὴ διαγιγνώσκοιεν σφίσι τε βοηθεῖν οἱ παῖδες
πρὸς τῶν κουριδιέων γυναικῶν τοὺς παῖδας καὶ
τούτων αὐτίκα ἄρχειν περφόατο, τί δὴ ἀνδρω-
θέντες δῆθεν ποιήσουσι.—Herod. vi. 138.

Lastly, there is irony in

οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπὶ κωλύμῃ, ἀλλὰ γνώμης παραινέσει
δῆθεν τῷ κοινῷ ἐπρεσβεύσαντο.—Thuc. i. 92.
Cf. 127.

τοὺς Πέρσας εἶρξε ὥς κατασκόπους δῆθεν
έόντας.—Herod. iii. 136. Cf. i. 73, vi. 1,
viii. 5, etc.

πολλὰ δὲ τὰν
βασιλῖδ' ἐστὶαν κακῶς
ἔβαζε δῆθεν ἐχθρὸς ὢν στρατηλάταις.

Eur. *Rh.* 717-9.

'Reviled, truly.'

τέλος δὲ πεπεισμένους δῆθεν ὥς Ἀπόλλωνος
νῖφ δεῖξαι τὰ γράμματα.—Plut. *Lys.* 448 C.
Cf. *Pyrrh.* 395 D.

τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ἀπελθεῖν δῆθεν ὅποι βούλονται
δοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ ἐκείνων ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐφόνευσεν.—

Dio Cass. (Sturz) § 24 and *passim*. Cf. Herodian ii. 15, 6, vii. 11, 7 and 16, etc.

I now come to a question which has evoked some discussion. Hoogeveen not having seen that in Eur. *Or.* 1112

εἰσμεν ἐς οἴκους δῆθεν ὥς θανούμενοι

δῆθεν is misplaced and in sense follows ὥς, Hartung, using what our grammarians would, I suppose, term irony, says that this does not surprise him in Hoogeveen. Hartung's view has been followed by most editors in this and other passages. Jebb, discussing the matter on Soph. *Trach.* 381, declares that 'there are certainly instances where the special point of the irony conveyed by δῆθεν lies in the words which follow it' (quoting Aesch. *Prom.* 986, Thuc. i. 127, iv. 99)... 'but that is no reason why δῆθεν should not refer to the whole sentence.' The passage from Soph. *Tr.* 381 however—

τῆς ἐκείνος οὐδαμὰ
βλάστας ἐφώνει δῆθεν οὐδὲν ἰστορῶν—

he translates at variance with his note 'she of whose parentage Lysias could say nothing, because, forsooth, he had asked no questions.' Now very strong reasons would be needed to convince us that δῆθεν violates the canon that no word can begin a sentence-group which cannot begin a sentence; and again, to make it probable in the face of a comparatively large number of cases that δῆθεν does not go with the previous word. As soon as we see that the particle is not necessarily ironical every difficulty vanishes. If the ἐφώνει is sound—which has been doubted with some show of reason—δῆθεν goes with βλάστας to convey a sneer 'her origin forsooth': βλάστας is too general a word to use of a princess. ἐφώνει, as an unemphatic word, may come between βλάστας and δῆθεν, just as ἀνάσσοι intervenes in Aesch. *Prom.* 202 *supra* (though here possibly the particle goes with ἀνάσσοι, contrasting Zeus' kingship with Kronos' paternal rule) and αὐτό in Herodian vii. 7, 16 ὡς πολιορκήσοντες αὐτὸ δῆθεν. That a participial or ὡς clause should be added to explain or continue the sneer, irony, etc., in *Trach.* 381 and several of the passages quoted above is no more surprising than if to 'This surely is mockery,' which is sufficient to express indignation in itself, we should add 'as if I were a child' (*Prom.* 986). In Thuc. i. 127 τοῦτο δὲ τὸ ἄγος οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐκέλευον

ἐλαύνειν δῆθεν τοῖς θεοῖς πρῶτον τιμωροῦντες I propose to take δῆθεν not with the following words, but with the phrase ἄγος ἐλαύνειν, which is ironical like γνώμης παραινέσει c. 92. We have irony again in iii. 68 διότι τὸν τε ἄλλον χρόνον ἤξιον δῆθεν αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὰς παλαιὰς Πανσανίου μετὰ τὸν Μῆδον σπονδὰς ἡσυχάζειν, where δῆθεν goes with ἤξιον 'requested forsooth'; unless indeed it is a mere mark of quotation. In one passage, which Stephanus and Hoogeveen quote from Heliodorus (*Aethiop.* i. c. 14 θρήνων οὐκ ἐπαύετο δῆθεν μὲν τοῦ ἐπὶ σοι, τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς τοῦ ἐφ' αὐτῇ), the particle certainly attaches to the following words in the sense of 'professedly.' The passage, which no doubt was not without influence on the current view, seems to show that by the time of Heliodorus δῆθεν, which originally only *implied* pretence, had come to *denote* it: having recovered the force of a full word it had recovered the right to head its clause. But this does not justify us in finding the same usage in the tragedians. The passage from Eur. *Or.* 1112 we may translate 'We will indeed enter the house (as if about to die),' the δῆθεν being spoken with bitter sarcasm in the thought of the deed to be done there. The misplacement of the particle (εἰσμεν ἐς οἴκους δῆθεν for εἰσμεν δῆθεν κ.τ.λ.) may be due to the fact that the phrase acts as a single word: does not go with one word more than the other, and so, as in γνώμης παραινέσει δῆθεν, follows the whole.

The derivation of δῆθεν from δῆ + a form of the Homeric θῆν 'surely' seems to have been first given by Hartung. Although *θεν* does not occur separately, yet the parallelism of δέ and δῆ etc. lends support to the derivation. Hartung ascribes the sense of ἐντεῦθεν *ap.* Hesychius to a false etymology equating the -θεν to that of σέθεν. We have shown that there was a late classical employment of δῆθεν in place of δῆ; and, as δῆ often has practically the force of ἐντεῦθεν, the rendering may have arisen in this way. Of θῆν with δῆ in Homer we have one occurrence, viz. γ 352-3:

οὐ θην δῆ τοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς Ὀδυσσῆος φίλος
νῖος

νῆος ἐπ' ἱκρίοφιν καταλέγεται κ.τ.λ.

The proper force of the compound would therefore be 'now surely' or 'nothing less than this surely,' δῆ denoting that a limit or result has been reached (Monro, *Hom. Gr.* 2 § 350).

F. W. THOMAS.