

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 Agent in the Attic Orators

E. C. Marchant

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 06 / June 1889, pp 250 - 251

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195125, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195125

How to cite this article:

E. C. Marchant (1889). The Agent in the Attic Orators. The Classical Review, 3, pp 250-251
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195125

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

family and particularly of your rightful master.' The form of the period forbids us to cut it into two pieces without any connexion of meaning. The condition ἡμῶν ἀπόντων τοῦ τε κυρίου explains the preceding question, *τίνι δίκῃ*, by *what right?* Unless ἵπαρνος denotes this condition and expresses it in another form, it has, as placed in this period, no relevance at all. It is also, I submit, plain enough that ἵπαρνος does describe the condition, and in what manner. As used here, it is derived primarily from the stem not of ἄρνα but of ἀρνείσθαι (cf. ἄπαρνος—ἀπαρνοῦμαι), and signifies 'a protester to the jurisdiction, one who puts in a rejection of a tribunal, as a bar to its proceeding': for the force of the compounded preposition compare ἵπ-ωμοσία.

This much seems to me obvious: but there remains the question whether the other possible meaning of ἵπαρνος is here to be neglected. I think not. Neither in the general tone of the *Andromache*, nor in the character of the old Peleus, is there anything

to make us hesitate in attributing to him a jest. The use of ἵπαρνος here is a jest. The substance of his question is contained in the words—

εἰπὲ τίνι δίκῃ χέρας
βρόχουσιν ἐκδήσαντες οἷδ' ἄγουσί σε
ἡμῶν ἀπόντων τοῦ τε κυρίου σέθεν;

'Upon what claim do they thus take possession of your person in the absence of your owner?' This question naturally suggests to him the word ἵπαρνος in its legal sense; and, his eye falling at the moment upon the boy Molossus (who by the way is no 'suckling' and only so styled here for the sake of the jest), he remarks parenthetically that with her *lamb* at her side *Andromache* looks as if she were actually putting in her *protest* against the usurpation of her tormentors. The best punctuation to express the point would be to mark καὶ παῖδ', ἵπαρνος γάρ τις ὡς ἀπόλλυσται as a parenthesis, and place the note of interrogation after σέθεν.

A. W. VERRALL.

THE AGENT IN THE ATTIC ORATORS.

I.

ANTIPHON AND ANDOCIDES.

SINCE Shilleto wrote 'in tironum gratiam' that 'the more usual construction after passive perfects is the dative,' nothing has been done, so far as I am aware, towards examining the various ways in which the agent is expressed in Greek and reducing the results to order. My main purpose is to discover the statistics for ὑπό and the dative respectively after the perfect of passive and intransitive verbs in the Orators: at the same time, it seems worth while to set down the facts, as far as they call for notice, with regard to other constructions of the agent. At present, I confine myself *entirely* to the two earliest orators, neither affirming nor denying that the conclusions drawn hold in the case of any other author.

1. ὑπό with things after passive and intrans. verbs. This construction is remarkably frequent in Antiphon, occurring twenty-seven times; it is found once in Andocides. The thing which takes the place of a personal agent is always *external* to the person affected; thus such expressions as ὑπὸ δέους ἀναγκάζεσθαι do not occur.

Hence Ant. *Tet.* A. a, 8 has διαφθαρῆναι ὑπὸ τῆς γραφῆς, and ἰδ. Γ. γ, 5, δ. ὑπ' ἀθεραπείας, but in Γ. β, 6 he writes τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀβουλίᾳ διέφθαρται, and in 5 § 5, ἀπειρία μᾶλλον ἢ ἀδικία ἡμαρτήσθαι, ἀληθείᾳ μᾶλλον ἢ δεινότητι εἰρησθαι. In ten cases, the thing in the gen. with ὑπὸ is coupled or contrasted with a *personal* agent; so that, as contrasted with the instrumental dat., the gen. with ὑπὸ represents the thing as *directly* bringing about the result described in the verb. Thus in Ant. 5 § 35, τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς ἐψευσμένοις ὑπ' ἐκείνου . . . ἐγὼ ἀπόλλυμαι, whereas grammar would allow ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων τῶν ἐψευσμένων ἐκείνῳ instead of this (below, 2, b), the effect would be marred by this change, the speaker's object being to represent the slave and those who put the slave to death, and not the lies told by the slave, as directly responsible for the danger in which he was himself placed. The verbs used with this construction are verbs of (a) *perishing* (ἀπολέσθαι, διαφθαρῆναι, ἀποθανεῖν), (b) *condemning*, *acquitting* (ἐξελέγχεσθαι, κατακρίνεσθαι, καταλαμβάνεσθαι, ἀπολύεσθαι), (c) of *inducing*, *forcing* (πείθεσθαι, ἀναγκάζεσθαι, βιάζεσθαι), (d) *πονεῖν*.

2. The agent with the perfect passive or perfect of an intransitive verb. (a) If the

subject acted upon is a *person*, *ὑπό* and the *gen.* is always used, *never* the dative. There are seven instances in Antiphon, including 5 § 39, *τεθνέωτα ὑπ' ἐμοῦ*, and frag. x. *πέπονθα ὑπὸ τούτου*. The others are *Tet. A.* α, 6; B. γ, 12, and δ, 4; 6 § 34, frag. xxi. Andocides gives four examples, including *de Pac.* § 23, *πεπονθότες ὑφ' ἡμῶν*. The others are *de Myst.* §§ 25, 101, 113. (b) Next come the cases in which the subject acted upon is *impersonal*. In these, Antiphon uses the dative in twelve cases, *viz.* with *πέπρακται* (twice), *πεπραγμένος* (twice), *ἡμάρτηται* or *ἐξ-* (thrice), *μεμηχάνηται*; *εἴρηται*, *ἐπιδέδεικται*, *δεδιήγηται*, *βεβοήθηται*. This construction appears in Andocides fourteen times, with *πέπρακται*, *πεπραγμένος* (thrice), *πεποιήται*, *πεποιημένος*, *ἡμάρτηται* (four times), *ἡσέβηται*; *ἀποδεδεικται*, *ἀπολελόγηται*, *μεμήνυται*. The other details which require remark are the following: firstly, these verbs all show clearly the ethic force underlying the 'dative of the agent'; and secondly, the verbs used all belong to one or other of two groups, *viz.* to *πράττω*, and words of similar meaning, or to *λέγω*, and words of similar meaning; for with *βεβοήθηται* we must supply *τῷ λόγῳ* (*Ant.* 1 § 31). In *Andoc. de Pace*, § 12, *ἡμῖν... γέγραπται*, the dat. appears to be purely ethic. The dat. then is found in twenty-six places, and in all the verbs are akin to *πράττω* or *λέγω*.

There remain three passages in which *ὑπό* and the *gen.* is used, the subject being impersonal. *Ant. Tet. A.* δ, 10 has *τὰ ἔχρη τοῦ φόνου οὐκ εἰς ἐμὲ φέροντα ἀλλ' εἰς τοὺς ἀπολυομένους ἀποδεδεικται ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, and in 5 § 35, *τοῖς δὲ λόγοις τοῖς ἐφευσμένοις ὑπ' ἐκείνου ὡς ἀλήθεσιν οὖσιν ἐγὼ ἀπόλλυμαι*, while in *And. de Myst.* § 56 we find *οὔτε μετὰ κακίας οὔτε μετ' ἀνανδρίας οὐδεμιᾶς τῶν γεγενημένων πέπρακται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ οὐδέν*. Are we to suppose that *ἀποδεδεικται αὐτοῖς* is the same as *ἀποδεδεικται ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, and that Andocides had no reason but usage for writing *ἀποδεδεικταί μοι ὡς οὔτε ἡσέβηκα κ.τ.λ.* (*de Myst.* § 29), rather than *ὑπ' ἐμοῦ*? Again, is *πέπρακται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ* convertible with *π. ἐμοί*? I think not. In *Ant. Tet. l.c.*, there seems to be particular emphasis on *ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, as a careful reading of the whole section seems to show. 'Everything else,' says the speaker, 'proofs and probability alike, are in my favour. *They*, my opponents, have shown,' &c. Similarly Andocides (*l.c.*) is laying the utmost stress on himself and his own innocence. The logic, as so often, is defective, and the sentence is without balance, but there is an implied reflection upon his opponents' character. 'I have to give account of my acts in the presence of

those who were guilty. *My* object is to prove that *I* am innocent, that it is not *I* who have acted meanly.' Lastly, in *Ant.* 5 § 35, there is a rather strained contrast between *ὑπ' ἐκείνου* and *ἐγὼ*, between the lies of the former, and the consequence of them to the latter. The result of the construction is to make *ὑπ' ἐκείνου*, though not grammatically, yet logically, agent to *ἀπόλλυμαι* as well as *ἐφευσμένοις*. If this interpretation of these three passages is right, *ὑπό* and *gen.* is used even with the perf. pass. of *πράττω* and *λέγω*, when a special effect is to be gained by throwing strong emphasis on the agent. Supposing this to be so, we can then see, perhaps, why Aristophanes (*Eg.* 57) writes *τὴν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ μεμαγμένην* and not *τὴν ἐμοί μ.* Great emphasis is thus laid on *ἐμοῦ*, and Demosthenes' resentment at Cleon's interference is expressed in the most vigorous language possible.

3. Antiphon *Tet. A.* δ, 1 has *τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τῶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ πραχθέντων*, where Maetzner takes *ἐκ* as for *ὑπό*, as in Ionic usage. But on comparing *Tet. B.* β, 2 and 10, *ἡ ἀλήθεια τῶν πραχθέντων*, this explanation seems open to question. Then again *Ant.* 5 § 2 says *δεῖ με σωθῆναι μετὰ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰπόντα τὰ γενόμενα*, very similar to which is *And. de Myst.* § 55.¹ The expression *τὰ ἐξ ἐμοῦ πραχθέντα* in Antiphon appears to hold a middle position between *ἡ ἀλήθεια τῶν πραχθέντων* (or *γενομένων*)—'the true nature of the facts'—and *ἡ ἀ. τῶν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ π.*: there is not the dynamic force in *ἐξ ἐμοῦ* that there is in *ὑπ' ἐμοῦ*, and *ἐξ ἐμοῦ* is not felt as the agent, but expresses the person concerned in the deeds. It may be some support to this that the defendant has to prove a negative, *i. e.* that he had taken no part at all in the murder. Thus the meaning will be no more than 'the true nature of the facts in which I am concerned,' or 'the true nature of my position.' *Ant. Tet. B.* β, 6 and γ, 10, *φόνος ἐξ ἀμφοῖν γενέσθαι*, where 'both are concerned' in the death of the one, but neither is concerned in at most more than *φόνος ἀκούσιος*, and where *ἐξ ἀμφοῖν* has not the dynamic force of *ὑπ' ἀμφοῖν*, confirms, I think, this view of the passage.

E. C. MARCHANT.

¹ Has attention been drawn to the numerous verbal similarities between *Ant. de caede Her.* and *And. de Myst.*? The external probability that the oligarch Andocides (for such I take him to have been all his life at heart) should admire the oligarch Antiphon, and, being himself in matters oratorical a layman, should use his speeches amongst other materials in preparing his own defence, is fairly supported by internal evidence; for, though there is no similarity in style between the two, there is in phraseology.