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 Perfect Subjunctive, Optative and Imperative in Greek Again

J. E. Harry

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 02 / March 2006, pp 100 - 103

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993776, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993776

How to cite this article:

J. E. Harry (2006). The Perfect Subjunctive, Optative and Imperative in Greek Again. The Classical Review, 20, pp 100-103 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993776

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

χρῆ . . . δοκιμάζειν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς τῶν ἀποτυχουσῶν, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὧν ἀπασαι βουλευσάμεναι προέβαιον τὴν ἐκείνου διάνοιαν. Here Wolf noted that ἐξ ὧν stood for ἐκ τούτου ὅτι. Dem. or. 27 § 44 δῆλον τοῖνυν ἐστὶν . . . τὸ πλῆθος τῶν καταλειφθέντων . . . ἐξ ὧν τοσαῦτα χρήματα ἀλλήλοις φασὶ δοθῆναι ('from their admissions that such large sums were given to each other'). Dem. or. 28 § 23 ἐξ ὧν οὗτοι λαβεῖν ἔμολογούντες ἀθρόα τὰμὰ ταῦτ' ἀνηλωκέναι φασίν. And we can hardly refuse to equate ἐξ ὧν with ἐκ τούτου ὅτι in Plut. *Themist.* 29, 1 μηδὲν ἐλπίζοντα χρηστὸν ἐξ ὧν ἑώρα τοὺς ἐπὶ θύραις ἐγγύς . . . χαλεπῶς διακειμένους καὶ κακῶς λέγοντας. It is true that Holden writes:—ἐξ ὧν ἑώρα 'from what he saw, viz. that etc.', but this is to dislocate the period. A somewhat similar question arises in Thuc. 1. 43 ἡμεῖς δὲ περιπεπωκότες οἷς ἐν τῇ Λακεδαίμονι αὐτοὶ προείπομεν τοὺς σφετέρους ξυμμάχους αὐτόν τινα κολάζειν. Most editors, placing a comma after προείπομεν, treat αὐτοὺς (οἷς = τούτοις αὐτοὺς) as the direct object of προείπομεν, of which τοὺς . . . κολάζειν is expegetic. To this Stahl not without reason objects that the Corinthians could not have proclaimed at Sparta their present condition. Of course everybody agrees that the meaning is 'having fallen within the scope of the rule which we maintained' etc., but in order to extract this from the Greek it is necessary to admit that the clause τοὺς . . . κολάζειν is the direct object of προείπομεν and that οἷς conceals a loose cognate accusative. To this there is, I think, a precise parallel in Dem. or. 23 § 184 οὐ γὰρ ὧν ἀναγκαζόμενος φίλος εἶναι φησι, φενακίζων ὑμᾶς, χάριν ἐστὶ δίκαιον ὀφείλειν Κερσοβλέπτῃ, 'you must not feel gratitude to Cersobleptes for his pro-

fessions of friendship made under compulsion.' Not widely different from that of ἐξ ὧν is the use of ἀφ' ὧν in Thuc. 3. 64 καὶ νῦν ἀξιούτε, ἀφ' ὧν δι' ἐτέρους ἐγένεσθε ἀγαθοί, ἀπὸ τούτων ὠφελείσθαι. Now here we have the same verb (γίγνεσθαι) which has given trouble in Isocrates, and the relative attaches not to the verb itself but to the complex ἐγένεσθε ἀγαθοί as in Isocrates to the complex μετ' ἐκατέρων γέγονεν. The sense forbids us to restrict to ἀγαθοί alone the limiting force of the implied accusative, as if it followed the type of βοήν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος. Further it should be observed that ἀπὸ has no logical connexion with the relative clause, but belongs solely to the antecedent. Thus ἀπὸ τούτων is redundant after ἀφ' ὧν, and its appearance is due to rhetorical considerations. Indeed, the antecedent is generally omitted: for an exception see Theocr. epigr. 20 = Anth. Pal. vii. 663 ἔξει τὰν χάριν ἃ γυνὰ ἀντὶ τήνων, ὧν τὸν κῶρον ἔθρεψε. Thus we come to ἀνθ' ὧν, the force of which in these combinations is more generally recognised: see Jebb on Soph. *Ant.* 1068. Add Xen. *Anab.* 5. 5, 14 ἀνθ' ὧν ἐτίμησαν ἡμᾶς καὶ ξένια ἔδωκαν τῇ στρατιᾷ, ἀντετιμῶμεν αὐτούς. Lucian *dial. mort.* 22, 1 ἀπόδος ἀνθ' ὧν σε διεπορθμευσάμην.

In conclusion, I would emphasise the difficulty of determining exactly the significance which the Greek mind attached to this or that combination of verb and relative. But on a general survey we seem to approximate most closely to their meaning, if we adopt for an English rendering the abstract noun, which corresponds best to the sense of the Greek verb.

A. C. PEARSON.

THE PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE, OPTATIVE AND IMPERATIVE IN GREEK AGAIN.

THE December number of the *Classical Review* reached me to-day, and I hasten to thank Prof. Sonnenschein for his remarks on my article which was published in the October issue—πρότερον γὰρ οὐκ ἔχων πρόφασιν ἐφ' ἧς τοῦ βίου λόγον δοῖν, νυνὶ διὰ τούτου εἰληφα. First of all I desire to make restitution to Prof. Babbitt for not mentioning his grammar among the few which recognize in the paradigm the non-existence of the perfect imperative active; and then I wish to add one example of the perfect subjunctive to my list; Dem. 23. 122 ὑπειλήφωσι (a verb

already cited by me from Dinarchus)—εἰληφα being extremely frequent, εἰλήφωσι is brought within the range of possibility. This admission of an omission on my part may appear to be a justification of Prof. Sonnenschein's feeling that I may not have collected all the examples. Suffice it to say that I deemed one reading of the extant literature to be inadequate, that any induction made on such a basis must needs be hasty and (probably) erroneous. For this reason I re-read every author before I ventured to publish my results. Hence the examples

cited may be taken as fairly complete—for practical purposes exhaustive. And what do they show? Not that a 'list arranged in tabular form, would be useful,' as Prof. Sonnenschein thinks—the veriest tyro in chirography could write on his thumb-nail all the examples of either mood—but that the perfects optative and subjunctive (and imperative) active are rarer in Greek literature, proportionately, than *ὥς* final in Attic prose. Yet nobody nowadays would think of calling *ὥς πράττει* good Attic Greek.

Prof. Sonnenschein has certainly not understood me. My first impulse is to impute the cause to a failure on my part to make my meaning clear. Yet when I read on page 440: 'I do not feel certain that Prof. Harry's lists are complete; at any rate I can at once supply him with two examples which he has forgotten: *πεποιθοίη* in Aristophanes (*Acharn.* 940) etc.', I am not disposed to attribute carelessness to the writer rather than to the reader. Not only did I not forget *πεποιθοίη* (it stands out clear and plain on page 352 of my article), but I cited the example in a context which showed that it is not to be regarded as a perfect at all—a fact which Prof. Sonnenschein seems to have overlooked.¹

My reason for selecting the English (rather than a German or American) grammar for my first comment is patent: it was the latest. The difference between *ἐλθεῖν* with *βούλομαι* and *ἐλθεῖν* with *φημί* was never distinctly stated before 1847; and if any grammar to-day happens to contain the facts about the perfect subjunctive, the presumption is that it is the one just issued from the press.

Prof. Sonnenschein, in attempting to refute a charge I made against grammars in general with reference to the perfect *subjunctive* takes occasion to cite from his grammar a most elementary principle about the perfect *imperative*. I quote examples to sustain my charge, and I might have quoted many more to show that there had been no change in the tradition from country to country and from age to age—

¹ If the student is not trained to feel *πεποιθοίη* as a present, *ἦτοι* (Soph. *Al.* 186) as a perfect, *ἡλάκοι* (Hdt. 1. 83) as a passive, little wonder that he baulks, when he meets reduplicated forms of verbs that have no perfect at all. To form what we call the perfect is only one function of reduplication; and we must not lose sight of this fact (and others), when we are considering the few sporadic cases of the perfect forms of the subjunctive, optative, and imperative. So in *Moschus* 3 *μεμύκη* is merely intensive, onomatopoeic, which is to be carefully discriminated from the ordinary temporal use.

the grammars of Italy, France, Germany, England bear the same unvarying testimony: *λελύκω* *ich habe gelöst*, *Que j'ai fini de délier*, *λελύκοιμι* *möge gelöst haben*, etc.

But the climax is reached when my trans-Atlantic critic makes the startling statement that I deny 'that the Perfects Subj. and Opt. ever have Perfect meaning.' Turning to my article I find that what I have to say about such perfect forms as *ἐστίγκω* Prof. Sonnenschein makes me extend to all verbs in both the subjunctive and in the optative moods. In discussing the subject of the perfect optative (p. 352 f.) I state explicitly that it may represent the perfect indicative in oblique form. But the perfect has a beginning and an end, a past and a present. In some verbs the past is dwelt upon, in others the present (by reason of the character of the word). Generally only one sphere of action for any particular verb needs to be emphasized—present or past according to the nature of the given verb. But some demand that both spheres be recognized, e.g. *γίγνομαι*, which bifurcates into *γέγονα* (present) and *γενένημαι* (past)—*τὸ γεγονός πρᾶγμα* is not the same as *τὸ γεγεννημένον*. So with a number of the verbs which occur in the perfect optative: *πάσχω*, *λανθάνω*, *ἐμπίπτω*—it is the *end* of the action of the perfect that is important. I may even add the active of *ἐμπίπτω* (*εἰσβάλλω*), though this emphasis on the present sphere does not come out in the example cited from Thuc. 2. 48. 2. Nor do I deny that *ἐσβεβλήκειεν* here has a perfect meaning. It is the verb, not the example, of which I was speaking. For this reason I quote four examples in the same part of Thucydides' work, every one of which (*ἐσβεβληκότων*, *ἐσβεβληκυῖαν*, *ἐσβεβλήκεσαν*) shows that the perfect is for all practical purposes a present and the pluperfect an imperfect. What could be more natural than that a verb which is used so readily (from its meaning) in the pluperfect, should in oratio obliqua show at least one example in the extant literature of the *perfect* optative, that the indicative should glide into the optative in oblique form? No wonder 'cette langue fait, par son apparente indiscipline, le désespoir des grammairiens rigides'—*τοῦτο γὰρ ἀντιθίσω ἐκείνω*—my French Hellenist over against the *Lehrpläne* der Sonnenscheinischen Replik (daher die Länge dieser Duplik). And who are the 'grammairiens rigides,' if not those who pour both Latin syntax and Greek syntax into the same cast-iron mould; who, fresh from a debauch of Latin sequences, see the same mechanical uniformity in the sister tongue,

and look at syntactical phenomena in the more flexible Greek with a Roman squint? Parallelism of a certain kind I have no objection to—English and Greek as well as Latin and Greek, where they *are* parallel. But in spite of all the irrelevant discussion of ‘the highest educational authority in Germany’ in Prof. Sonnenschein’s last paragraph (I was discussing facts, not methods) I still ‘apprehend’ that the persistence of the perfect subjunctive, and other similar ghost forms, in our Greek grammars has been due to a feeling that Latin syntax and Greek syntax run on strictly parallel lines. (Latin grammar has had entirely too much to do even with English grammar for that matter.) Not only the perfect in Greek, but also the other tenses, the different moods, the participles, the subordinate clauses, looked at from a Roman point of view, frequently become distorted. To cite a single example (the first that comes to mind, and possibly not the best), we resort to the historical present, so familiar to the Latin reader, to explain the first verb in the first book of the first author usually read by the student. Mr. Gleason changes in his ‘Gate to the Anabasis’ (for obvious reasons) to *Δαρείω ἦσαν παῖδες δύο*. A distinguished American scholar, in an address before the New York Latin Club, a year or two ago, recognized the difficulty which inheres in the tense and thought we should be honest enough to say we do not really know. At the risk of inviting cis-Atlantic criticism I venture to think we do know. But I shall not enter into a discussion of that question here. Many Greek aorists have no equivalent in Latin. Imperfects in one of the languages do not always cover imperfects in the other. Medea says *ἔτικτον αὐτούς*, and the novice wonders why the aorist was not used.¹ But the manifold differences that subsist between the elastic Greek and the rigorous Roman idiom are conspicuous on almost every page of Plato and Demosthenes, of Sophocles and Thucydides, as compared with Livy and Cicero; and these divergencies² should be insisted on

¹ The Greek can even say *ἐδεξάμην*, *ἔτικτον*, *ἐκτρέφω*, and *τί με ἔτικτες*; (Nauck, *Trag. Dict. Index*, p. 636.)

² The perfect subjunctive was felt as a compound tense by the Romans. The ideal second person is confined to a few phrases in Greek. The pluperfects in the two languages differ widely. The tendency in Greek is to modal constructions in generic sentences. Insertion of the preposition between adjective and substantive is not permitted in Greek prose. The mobility of the Greek, as contrasted with the stiffness of the Latin tongue, is seen in the use of the aorist in connection with the imperfect. The nominative with the infinitive is a normal construction in Greek. But a multiplicity of illustrations is unnecessary.

even more strongly than the parallels—the latter can take care of themselves. Not only do the ancients often express the same ideas differently from the moderns—and also have different ideas to express (*ἄλλοι ἄλλων ἄλλως*)—but both ancients and moderns differently, respectively, from one another. A Frenchman says in English: ‘the clock, it is broken; it does not walk any more.’ And this difference of idiom is not confined to words and phrases, but extends to time relations as well. ‘I have been sick three days’ translates ‘*ich bin schon drei Tage krank*.’ One is present, the other perfect; yet one expression is used by the Anglo-Saxon and the other by the Teuton under precisely the same circumstances. The Greek does not hesitate to use a perfect form with a present meaning (otherwise how could he express ‘lest I stand’?), a present in a perfect sense, or even to employ a sliding scale between the two. The verb determines, rather than the tense. In like manner the choice between the present and aorist optatives is influenced by the signification of the word, e.g. *χαίρω* always in the present in certain constructions, *ἄλλυμι* always in the aorist. A German educated in his native land and teaching in an American university for twenty years does not, without an effort, bring himself to say ‘I have been sick three days’ (I am citing a concrete case), and simply because his German idiom refuses to be silenced. Similarly the Roman cast of the sentence is ever present to the mind of the young Hellenist. A modern Greek who had learned his English through French said to me: ‘I am not well for a day or two’; and the tyro in Germany, France, and America, has difficulty in turning *ich bin gewesen*, *j’ai été*, and *I have been* into Greek, or in translating *εἶναι* (= *fuisse*) into Latin.

In conclusion, I desire to call Prof. Sonnenschein’s attention to the fact that, when I quoted *ἡμαρτήκοι* from Pausanias, I made the explicit statement that I took no account (in my list of examples) of the writers of the later period. This was intended to include Athenaeus, even where he quoted from an earlier author whose works have not come down to us, except in a few scattered remnants. Nevertheless, I am grateful to Prof. Sonnenschein for adding *ἐθδοκοῖν* to my list, which will probably be swelled just a little by the results of my investigation in the later field of literature. In classical Greek there are whole ranges of verbs that never had a perfect; and in spite of the fact that these vacancies were filled

by the mechanical inventions of the later Greeks, in fifteen thousand Teubner pages of post-Demosthenean authors I have been able to find but one solitary spectre of a *subjunctive* perfect; the optatives may be

counted on the fingers of one hand; while active retroactive perfect imperatives—*εὐρών απαγγελέω*.

J. E. HARRY.

CINCINNATI, Jan. 8, 1906.

DE ANTIQUISSIMIS THEOCRITI MEMBRANIS.

BUCOLICOS Graecos cum nuper in Classicorum Oxoniensium collectione edidissem, huius ephemeridis hospitium impetravi, ut inter Britannos profiterer quae per oblivionem meam omissa esse gratissimo C. Wendelii v. d. admonitu comperi.

Rettulerat C. Wessely, chartarum Aegyptiacarum investigator spectatissimus, in Studiorum Vindobonensium volumine octavo p. 221–30 de codicis Theocritei membranacei laciniis quae in bibliotheca nationali Parisiorum numero 6678 notata sunt. Eiusdem codicis fragmentum Vindobonam devenit in thesaurum papyrorum Rainerianarum, quod idem Wessely edidit (Mitteilungen aus den Papyri Rainer anni 1887, p. 78). Qui codex saeculo quinto scriptus esse fertur ita ut triceni bini versus in pagina legerentur, sed dinumeratis versibus carminum ordo non potest investigari, cum et incertum sit, quomodo carminum principia distincta fuerint, nec desit exemplum versuum omissorum et postmodo additorum. Lacinae tam exiguae sunt ut paucae tantum litterae versuum horum supersint: Theocrit. 1. 14–19, 27–32, 46–52, 59–65, 4. 34–38, 5. 3–8, 50–56, 83–89, 13. 53–66 Baccharum, quod carmen vulgo dicitur Theocriti 26, in editione mea Appendicis est 4. vers. 10–20, Theocr. 15, 15–25, 48–59, 16. 6–31, 40–64, 22. 33–35, 65–68.

Scriba munere suo functus est neglegentissime; corrector multa emendavit addiditque saepe accentus spiritusque; nec tamen non neglexit turpia vitia, velut 16. 21 in versu a scriba postmodo inculcato *οισετε μηδεν* pro genuino *οἴσεται οὐδέν*, et intulit adeo falsa, velut 16. 61 *οἶα*, cum scriba verum dedisset quod etiam libri nostri tenent *οἶσα*. Vocales iam tunc modo ad vulgarem pronuntiationem, modo ad falsam Doridem erant ita deformatae, ut solent esse in codicibus Byzantinis. Qualia omnino spernenda esse usus docuit. Exemplum adfero 5. 50 *τιδε πατησης* (τῆδε vel τείδε πατησεῖς); 15. 48 *δαληται* (δαλείται), 54 *φενξει* (φενξή). Magis etiam corruptum 5. 85 *προθέρεῖσα* (προθορεύσα), ubi corrector tantum prius *ρ* delevit. Itaque vix ullius momenti quod Bacch. 13 *βακχω*

recte legitur, dudum contra codicum nostrorum *βάκχων* restitutum. Novis talis codicis lectionibus quam maxime diffidendum est, ac ne commemoratione quidem dignos habeo errores quales sunt 16. 24 *τινι δουναι αοιδωι* (αοιδῶν), 15. 25 *τυ ιδοισα*, quidquid praeterea olim ibi fuit; verum *και ιδοῖσα τυ* tenent codices nostri. Etiam minus ex incertissimis apicum reliquiis, quas Wessely 1. 46, 13. 65, 16. 30 dispicere sibi visus est, novas comminisci lectiones licet.

Nihil igitur ad ipsa poetae verba rectius scribenda proficimus; sed in adnotatione nonnulla locum sibi flagitant. 16. 16 *αυρεται* est, ubi *οἴσεται* recte et Ambrosianus K et stirps Φ praebent; *αὔρεται* deteriores tantum exhibent, quorum usum nullum esse in libro meo, Textgeschichte der Bukoliker, 56sq., demonstravi. Ibidem de 16. 42 et 44 dictum est, in quibus lectiones Φ, quamquam haud verae, in membranarum Parisinis comparent, et 44 quidem *θεῖος* (sive *ὁ θεῖος*) iam a Syriano lectum esse sciebamus. Denique 13. 61 versus spurius deest, ignoratus a scholiis et ab uno codice Ambrosiano.

Maxime memorabile quod carmen *Ἀῆναι* inscriptum post Hylam legitur, cum praeterea tantum in libris BCD servatum sit, i.e. in familia Π, idque longe a vere Theocriteis remotum. Colligendumne est, receptum id olim esse in Syllogam mere Theocriteam? Non dixerim. Demonstravi enim distinguendos esse carminum greges 1. 3–13, et 14. 2. 15–18 et ea carmina quae Φ et Π peculiariter habent, quae tamen mihi videbantur ad unam redire eandemque Bucolicorum appendicem. Itaque in codice quinti saeculi et lectiones stirpi Φ peculiare et carmen stirpi Π peculiare simul inveniri a rationibus meis minime abhorret. Gregum vero illorum ordinem perturbari novum quidem est, sed novum libri scholiis non instructi neglegenterque exarati vitium.

Commodo autem accidit, ut his ipsis diebus alterum ordinis carminum perturbati exemplum animadverterem in frustulo membranaceo quod inter papyros musei Berolinensis est 5017. Servatae sunt exiguae ver-