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 Remote Deliberative

J. D.

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 10 / December 1892, pp 435 - 437

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186871, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186871

How to cite this article:

J. D. (1892). The Remote Deliberative. The Classical Review, 6, pp 435-437 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186871

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

begins the transformation of *quo* > *cu* seen so plainly in the conjunction *quom* > *cum*, and hand in hand with this development of the conjunction goes the change of the preposition *quom* to *cum*. The first example of the conjunction *cum* occurs in 709 u.c., of the preposition in 705. For a while the two forms *quom* and *cum* exist side by side, then *quom* disappears altogether or is only retained through an archaizing tendency. From all this it appears very plain that we have in the preposition a real change of sound from *com* to *quom*, caused by identifying the preposition with the conjunction. Analogies for this identification were at hand in several pairs, as *ergo*, *sed*, *ad* (*at*). It was a kind of folks-etymology by which the two words were brought more closely together. That such an occurrence was quite possible we may easily convince ourselves by observing the effect of folks-etymology in living languages. Even in the Latin we may find a number of other examples that illustrate the principle (see in general Keller, *Lat. Volksetymologie und Verwandtes*, 1891). Thus *calx*, *chalk* = *χάλιξ* should have the form **chalx*, but joins itself to an already existing *calx*, *heel* (p. 67); *sarcophagus* becomes in vulgar idiom *sacrophagus* through the influence of *sacer* (p. 128); *sepulchrum* takes its *h* from *pulcher* (p. 128); *cloaca* gets the vulgar form *coacla* through supposed connexion with *coagula* (p. 131, Schuchardt, *Vulgärlatein* III. 312); *atqui* and *alioqui* are treated to a final *n* because the last syllable is identified with *quin* (p. 144). A striking instance of the same change of *c* > *qu* may be seen in the attempt made by scholars in the first century of our era to change *cottidie* to *quotidie*, not only in orthography but also in pronunciation, because of a supposed etymology *quot diebus* or *quoto die*; cf. Quintil. 1, 7, 6.; Vel. Long. 79, 16.

With regard to *cum* it must be borne in mind that the change discussed only affected the independent preposition. When appended to pronouns the form *-com* changed to *-cum* at the same time that other unaccented syllables in *o* were similarly affected (cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss* I. § 81). For that reason the earliest example found, *secum* from 631—2 u.c., shows already the form *-cum*. In composition we have *com-*, not because, as Bersu says (p. 42), 'inlantes *o* nicht betrübt war,' which is not true, but because the unaccented prefixes follow the analogy of the accented. Forms like *confugit*, *conficit*, *confluit* are perfectly regular, and from these unaccented *o* keeps its place in *confugio*, *confacio*, *confluere*, etc.

The forms of the independent preposition with *o* cited by Georges and Neue are all vulgar and late. They are not a survival of original *com* but a change from *cum* to *com*, as we see in Italian and Spanish *com* (cf. Schuchardt, II. 166). These inscriptions with *com*, *con*, *co* are provincial, being largely from Dalmatia, Pannonia, and the regions round about Trieste and Milan, with one or two from the vicinity of Naples.

In conclusion one word as to *quom* in our Manuscripts. If this form of the preposition was the common and established one, as the inscriptions indicate, we should expect to find traces of it in some of the Manuscripts of works whose authors must have used it. And such is indeed the case. Though the evidence for the preposition *quom* is not as great as that for the conjunction, yet it is still considerable. The new edition of Neue attests *quom* (prep.) in 18 passages from Plautus and in six from Cicero, and it can hardly be doubted that a careful search would reveal many others.

J. H. KIRKLAND.

Vanderbilt University.

THE REMOTE DELIBERATIVE.

MR. SIDGWICK bases his argument for the introduction of that grammatical novelty the Remote Deliberative Optative on 'the fact that all the passages where commentators have regretted the want of *āv* in Attic Greek have one common character; they are all *interrogative* either direct or indirect' (Aesch. Ag. App. I.). Should it turn out therefore on examination that many of the

examples cited as remote deliberatives are not interrogative in any sense of the word, Mr. Sidgwick's induction must be pronounced as incomplete as that of Paley, who somewhat hastily ascribed to all a *negative* character. Now it seems to me that, with a single exception, the examples brought forward by Mr. Sidgwick as indirectly interrogative are in no sense interrogative, but are merely

relative clauses with the antecedent omitted. The exception alluded to is οὐκ ἔχω πῶς ἀμφισβητοῖν. Οὐκ ἔχω, if not practically identical with οὐκ οἶδα, or only slightly shaded off from it, is at least analogous, and may therefore be regularly followed by an indirectly interrogative clause. As much cannot be said of any of the other examples cited, without doing violence to their analysis and without disregarding the cogency of parallel expressions. If we analyse these sentences we find they consist of a principal clause ἔστιν or οὐκ ἔστιν, with a subordinate relative clause introduced by ὅς, ὅστις or ὅπως. Thus οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτῳ νείμαιμι = οὐ (τις) ἔστιν ὅτῳ κ.τ.λ., οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως... is equivalent to οὐκ ἔστι μηχανὴ ὅπως (= ὁποῖα). Sometimes the antecedent appears and instead of the equivocal ὅστις we find ὅς which is almost exclusively *relative*, e.g. καὶ τίς ποτ' ἔστιν ὃν γ' ἐγὼ ψέξαμι τι; *who* is there *whom*...?

On the other hand in translating into Latin or English we must deal with them as *simple* sentences, treating ἔστιν ὅπως etc. as mere periphrases for adverbs or pronouns. Thus οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως = οὐδαμῶς; οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις = οὐδεῖς. In this way we find ourselves among a large and well-known class of periphrastic expressions, which are all ultimately reducible to relative clauses. Such are εἰσὶν οἱ (ἔστιν οἱ) = some (there are *those who*); ἔστιν ὅπου = somewhere (there is a place where); ἔστιν ὅτε = sometimes (there are times when), ἔστιν ἥ = somehow, οὐδεῖς ὅστις οὐ = everybody; οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως οὐ = most assuredly; οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως = by no means.

Of the foregoing, those with which we are now concerned are chiefly followed by the indicative, future or present. It may seem superfluous to cite examples, yet I may perhaps be pardoned for quoting a few.

οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως πόλιν | κείνην ἐρεΐψεις.
Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1372.

Never canst thou overthrow that city (Jebb).

ταύτην ποτ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὥς ἐτι ζῶσαν γαμεῖς.
Soph. *Ant.* 750.

οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως καταπαύσει.

Eur. *Med.* 171.

οὐ γάρ τις ἔστιν ὅς παροῖθ' αἰρήσεται.

Eur. *Heracleid.* 57.

ἔσθ' ὅπου τὸ δεινὸν εὖ.....

δεῖ μὲνεν καθήμενον.

Aesch. *Eum.* 517—19 (Sidgwick).

Somewhere should fear abide enthroned (Sidgwick).

οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐ Χαλκιδέας ἀφίστατον.

Arist. *Eq.* 238.

But though the indicative is more fre-

quent, the potential optative is also used, as might be expected. The difference between οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξεις and οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λεξείας ἄν lies in this—that whilst the former denies the *fact* (i.e. the means of its attainment), the latter denies even its *possibility*. Thus they both constitute strong denials. In like manner ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξεις; = will you say? i.e. is there any chance of your saying? ἔσθ' ὅπως λεξείας ἄν; = would you say?

The following are instances of optative with ἄν:—

ἔσθ' ὅτῳ ἄν ἄλλω ἰδοίς ἢ ὀφθαλμοῖς;

Plato *Rep.* 352 E.

οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅτου | ὀργὴν ἔχοις ἄν.

Soph. *Phil.* 1309.

Thou hast no cause of anger (Jebb).¹

οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅτου θίγοι μ' ἄν ἐνδικώτερον.

Eur. *El.* 224.

If we place side by side with these examples the passages without ἄν quoted by Mr. Sidgwick, we shall be at a loss to discover any difference—at least perceptible in translation. Οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξαμι ἄν would, in the light of the foregoing, be of identical force with that of the similar passage in the *Agamemnon*. The conclusion naturally suggests itself that, in those so-called remote deliberatives, the particle ἄν is omitted, just as it is not unfrequently in Epic and other non-Attic writings.²

To say nothing of Homer, instances of this omission are met with in Pindar and Theocritus:—

Αἰσῶνος γὰρ παῖς ἐπιχώριος οὐ ξεινίαν ἰκοίμεν
γαῖαν ἄλλων.

Pind. *Pyth.* iv. 118.

ναυσὶ δ' οὔτε πρὸς ἰὼν τάχ' ἐϋροῖς ἐς Ὑπερ-
βορέων ἀγῶνα θαυματὰν ὁδόν. (Sic. codd.)

Pind. *Pyth.* x. 30.

Θεός ἐῖη ἀπήμων κέαρ.

Pind. *Pyth.* x. 21.

οὐ μιν διώξω κεινὸς ἐῖην.

Pind. *Ol.* iii. 45.

οὕτως ἐπὶ ματέρα νεβρὸς ἄλοιοιο.

Theocr. viii. 89.

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Πτολεμαῖον, ἐπιστάμενος καλὰ εἰπεῖν,
ὑμνήσαιμι.

Theocr. xvii. 7.

¹ Cf. also the potential indicative
οὐκ ἔστιν ἥτις τοῦτ' ἄν Ἑλληνὶς γυνή | ἔτη ποθ'.

Med. 1339—40.

² A well-known feature of Epic Grammar is the omission of ἄν in indefinite clauses, temporal and relative e.g. with ἐπεὶ, ἐπειδὴ, μέχρι οὗ, πρὶν, δεῖ, ὅστις, etc., followed by a subjunctive: also in conditional clauses (εἰ σοὶ στερηθῶ). This usage has found its way into Attic drama and is even met with in Thucydides. Might not the poets have dealt similarly with the potential optative for metrical convenience or sententious brevity?

ἐν ἑκοσι πᾶσι μᾶθ' οἱ σιν.

Theoc. (?)

τάχα δ' ὕστερος οὐδ' ἄλλα δοίης.

Theoc. xxvii. 61.

καὶ τί φίλος ῥέξαίμιν; γάμοι πλῆθουσιν ἀνίας.

Theoc. *ib.* 25.

Cf. also Aesch. *Eum.* 265 (Sidgwick).

ἀπὸ δὲ σοῦ

φερόμαν βοσκὰν πώματος δυσπότου.¹

The omission takes place for terseness even in prose when the reader is expected to pick up the *ἄν* from a previous sentence: cf. Plat. *loc. cit.* *ἔσθ' ὅτω ἄν ἄλλω ἰδοῖς ἢ ὀφθαλμοῖς; Οὐ δῆτα. Τί δὲ ἀκούσεις ἄλλω ἢ ὤσιν;*

Mr. Sidgwick admits that the clauses he terms indirectly interrogative are not strictly such, but only by analogy. The analogy however is far to seek. An oblique question is essentially a question repeated in word or thought; it is therefore necessarily dependent on some verb or verbal substantive implying perception of mind or sense or the outward expression of such perception (*verba sentiendi et declarandi*). In these indirect deliberatives no such introductory statement occurs; neither can it be understood.

In the sentence *οὐκ ἔχω ὅ τι εἶπω*, which is quoted as analogous, this connecting link appears: *οὐκ ἔχω* (I am at a loss to know—to find) implies at least something like mental effort, whereas the introductory clause *οὐκ ἔστιν*, in the passages under discussion, denotes exclusively existence or actuality. The *ἔστιν* here is not copulative, as is seen from the analysis and as may be further shown if we endeavour to supply some word akin to a 'verbum sentiendi' or 'declarandi.' For instance *οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξαιμι* cannot be rendered 'there is no question how I am to speak,' nor 'there is no thinking how I could speak,' nor 'there is no saying etc.': none of these versions will give the required meaning. It is not the *question* 'how I am to say,' nor the *discovery* of *means* 'to say' that is denied; it is simply the future contingency of 'saying.' To have a genuine ring about them our examples should be of the following type *minus ἄν*:—

¹ This can scarcely be regarded as a wish, seeing that the blood-sucking punishment was already declared to be the special prerogative of the Furies and a thing positively to be accomplished. People do not wish for what is already their own.

οὐκ ἔχω πῶς ἄν | στέρξαιμι κακὸν λείσσω

Soph. *Trach.* 992.

οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως εἵπομι' ἄν.

Eur. *Hipp.* 981.

But for the inopportune presence of *ἄν* these would be admirable examples of the remote deliberative.

As regards the almost unique prose instance *οὐκ ἔχω πῶς ἀμφισβητοῖην*, most editors would unhesitatingly follow Professor Jebb in restoring *ἄν*, on the principle that the oversight of a copyist is a more plausible explanation of a manifest anomaly than the imputation of inconsistent grammar to Plato.

II. There remain the instances of the simple interrogative without *ἄν* such as *ποῖ τις φύγοι*; Of these I will say nothing, as they have, with two exceptions, been rejected by so great an authority as Professor Jebb. This eminent scholar follows in the wake of former critics in altering to the subjunctive or inserting *ἄν*. In the two following lines he pronounces the optative alone to be sound:—

τέαν Ζεῦ δύνασιν τίς ἀνδρῶν ὑπερβασία κατὰ σχοι;

Ant. 665.

ἀλλ' ὑπέρολμον ἀνδρὸς φρόνημα τίς λέγοι;

Aesch. *Cho.* 595.

Both these may be classed as cases of omission of *ἄν*, on the grounds previously set forth.

When I say that *ἄν* is omitted all I wish to imply is—that in the Greek of Pericles or Demosthenes the vast majority of sentences similar to those where it is missing would have it. I do not wish to assert that the optative alone was not used originally in clauses, affirmative, negative and interrogative, to express a statement put forward as a pure conception. The insertion of *ἄν* may have been an accretion to distinguish positive statement from the expression of a wish.

In conclusion it seems to me most undesirable to incorporate the remote deliberative into our grammars side by side with the optative of wish or mild command. The scholastic adage '*entia non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate*' is nowhere more applicable than in grammatical criticism. We must generalize from the broad facts of language and not base our theories on a few isolated anomalies.

J. D.