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 'Extended Deliberative' in Greek

Wm. Gardner Hale

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 1-2 / February 1894, pp 27 - 28

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187219, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187219

How to cite this article:

Wm. Gardner Hale (1894). The 'Extended Deliberative' in Greek. The Classical Review, 8, pp 27-28 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187219

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

helix Cic. Univ. 9, 27, means 'a spiral,' not 'a kind of ivy,' as L. and S.

hieran fecimus Sen. *Ep.* 83, 4. The context strongly favours the meaning 'we ran a dead heat.' Was the wreath in such cases dedicated to the god?

impuns = *impudens* Lucil. *fr.* 46 Baehr.

instabilis = 'that cannot be stood upon,' Ox. *Met.* 1, 16.

iubar in its original sense = 'the morning star,' Paul. ex Fest. p. 104 Müll.; and in Enn. *frag.* 314 Baehr. 'interea fugit albus iubar Hyperionis cursum,' where Baehrens most unhappily alters 'fugit' into 'facit.' So prob. in Verg. *Aen.* 1, 130. Festus says it also = 'the evening star': this sense is found in Licinius Calvus *ap.* Prisc. 1, 170.

libella. heres ex l. = 'heir to $\frac{1}{10}$,' not = ex asse (L. and S.). The mistake is repeated s.v. *teruncius*.

1 *liceo*. Erase section II.: in these passages *liceo* has its true sense = 'to fetch a price.'

malō. 'malet' occurs Sen. *Ep.* 28: this has escaped Neue.

maneo = 'await,' with dat.: Verg. *Culex* 38, which Baehrens emends without reason: and cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9, 301.

mapalia 'II. B. useless things, follies.' In the passage quoted from Sen., if the reading be sound, the word = 'low haunts.'

memini. Part. *meminens* Laevius *fr. ap.* Prisc. 1, 560.

ne. ut ne is denied to Tac.; it occurs H. 4, 58. Add ne = *nedum* e.g. Sall. *Cat.* 11, 8.

neo 3 Plur. *neunt* Tib. 3, 3, 36.

ocris. Add Lucil. *ap.* Gell. 16, 9, 3, (79 Baehr.).

pistillus. Add Verg. *Mor.* 111.

plagium in Grat. *Cyn.* 24, *casses plagique exordiar astus*, seems to mean 'catching animals with a plāga.'

plectricanus Chalcidius ex Alexandro Milesio Baehr. *Fragm.* p. 409.

prorogo = 'advance money.' So prob. in Quint. 10, 7, 10.

regemo. Add 'II. "to groan repeatedly" Verg. *Culex* 386.'

reses ['nom. sing. does not occur' L. and S.]. The nom. occurs Lucil. *fr.* 827 Baehr.

salebrosus. Add to reff. from Apuleius, Verg. *Mor.* 110.

scio. Add to perfect forms, *sciero Priap.* 68, 36; *scieris* Sen. *Ep.* 110, 13; *scierit* Petr. 3.

scultimido Lucil. *Fr.* 887 Baehr.

tessera = 'a backgammon-board,' Mart. 14, 17.

tōtus. Add Lucr. 6, 652 to reff. from Col. and Manil.

undivagus. Add Sil. 14, 372 to reff. from late authors.

vapor = 'smell,' v. *ferinus* Grat. *Cyn.* 223. W. R. INGE.

THE 'EXTENDED DELIBERATIVE' IN GREEK.

THE debate in the *Classical Review* upon the question of the existence of 'Extended' and 'Remote Deliberatives' in Greek (in two groups of examples illustrated by Soph. *Ai.* 514 ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκέρ' ἔστιν εἰς ὃ τι βλέπω | πλὴν σοῦ and Aesch. *Cho.* 172 οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις πλὴν ἐνὸς κείραιρό νιν) has not resulted, as it seems to me, in any clear settlement of the case for either the subjunctive or the optative idiom under examination. The nature of the latter is perhaps difficult to establish beyond a doubt. As regards the subjunctive, the case is different. At a meeting of the American Philological Association in July 1892, I gave, during an informal discussion at the close of the reading of Mr. Earle's 'Notes on the Subjunctive of Purpose in Relative Clauses in Greek' (published in abstract in the 'Proceedings' of the year), what seems to

me a sure disproof of the theory that the subjunctive idiom under dispute is descended from a clause of purpose. Our discussions are not reported, and my argument consequently was not put into print. At the meeting of the same Association in the summer just passed, I presented a formal paper, which will appear in the 'Transactions' for the year 1893, and will contain an attempt to solve the question for both modes. In view, however, of the fact that the debate still goes on (see *Classical Review* for October), I venture to contribute at once that part of the evidence upon the origin of the subjunctive idiom which seems to me to be unanswerable.

Two origins have been proposed, one in the deliberative subjunctive, the other in the final clause. Against the latter stands the overwhelming objection that no such

relative clause of purpose as has to be assumed (namely a relative clause with the bare subjunctive, as in the idiom in question) was ever, in literary times, in vogue in Greek. In the Homeric poems, to be sure, the subjunctive with the relative pronoun is freely used to express purpose, *but*, with the exception of Γ 287 (and the duplicate 459),¹ the mode is accompanied by *ἄν* or *κε*. On the other hand, the deliberative question

¹ Monro (*Homeric Grammar*, p. 257) follows Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* i. p. 130, in classing σ 334 under the same head. My own view with regard to this example agrees with that of Professor Goodwin, viz. that it is not final. But both examples, and even others, might be admitted without affecting the substantial weight of the argument.

in the subjunctive, to which the rival theory refers the idiom, is regularly unaccompanied by either of these particles.

Mr. Earle's example, Hes. *Op.* 57 δώσω κακὸν ᾧ κεν ἅπαντες τέρπωνται (the one instance thus far cited² that has *ἄν* or *κε*), is of an entirely different nature from the other examples, not only in its outward form but in the character of the introductory phrase. By both of these points it should have given warning.

WM. GARDNER HALE.

University of Chicago.

² In my full paper, I shall discuss Σ 192, [ἄλλου δ' οὐ τευ οἶδα, τεῦ ἂν κλυτὰ τεύχεα δύω] not yet cited by any one.

THE 'REMOTE DELIBERATIVE' AND THE 'PROSPECTIVE SUBJUNCTIVE AND OPTATIVE.'

IN my paper on the Prospective Subjunctive (*Class. Rev.* Feb. 1893) I quoted Soph. Trach. 903

κρύψας' ἐαυτὴν ἔνθα μή τις εἰσῖδοι

as parallel in past time to Soph. Aj. 658 f.

κρύψω τοδ' ἔγχος... ἔνθα μή τις ὄψεται.

These passages are twice alluded to in the last number of the *Class. Rev.* (pp. 343 f. and 353 f.). Mr. A. C. Pearson thinks that I have accidentally fallen into the error of regarding the Opt. as the normal way of expressing past purpose in a Relative Clause; and Mr. A. Sidgwick says 'the historic sequence of a Future cannot be an Aorist.' J. D. on the other hand treats the above two passages as parallel; and I still think that they correspond to one another, the one in present, the other in past time. But I never said that the Optative is *final* (that is just what I meant to *deny*), nor that the former passage is the *historic form* of the latter. (O.T. 796 ἐφευγον ἔνθα μήπορ' ὀψόμεν corresponds more in form, though here there is a case of virtual or. obl., as Mr. Pearson says.)

My view was that the Opt. mood in Trach. 903 marks the action as *prospective in the past*; and my object in writing the present note is to add a new suggestion to those that have already been made as to the 'affinities' of such constructions as τίν' ἔχων φήμεν ἀγαθὴν ἦκεις, ἐφ' ὅτῳ κινσῶμεν ἀγυῖās Aristoph. Knights 1320, an instance to

which Mr. H. Richards calls my attention, and ὁρῶντα... ἄνδρα οὐδέν' ἔντοπον, οὐχ ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν, οὐδ' ὅστις νόσον κάμνοντι συλλάβοιτο, Soph. Phil. 276 f., cf. 695 οὐκ ἔχων... τιν' ἐγχώρων κακογείτονα, παρ' ᾧ στόνον... ἀποκλαύσειεν. Is not the 'affinity' of these Subjunctives and Optatives to be found (partly at any rate) in those clauses, chiefly temporal, in which the Subj. (sometimes without *ἄν*) marks an action as *in prospect* in the present, and the Optat. (always, or nearly always, without *ἄν*) marks it as *in prospect* in the past? e.g. μὴ στέναζε πρὶν μάθης 'till thou learn,' Phil. 917 (Goodwin § 648), ἕως τὸ χαίρειν καὶ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι μάθης Aj. 555 (Goodw. § 620); so with ἐς ὃ or ἐς ᾧ in Herodotus and μέχρι or μέχρι οὐ even in Thucydides: περιεμένονεν ἕως ἀνοιχθείη τὸ δεσμοτήριον 'donec apertus esset carcer,' Plato, Phaedo 59 D, ἡσύχαζε... ἕως δέου βοηθεῖν Thuc. iii. 102, etc. (Goodw. § 614). I am assuming (against Goodwin) that the latter clauses do not express *purpose*, and in my article on the 'Prospective Subjunctive' I gave reasons for that view.¹ To my mind 'I am waiting till he come' (ordinarily μένω ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ) and 'I was waiting till he should come' (ἔμενον ἕως ἔλθοι) are not equivalent to 'I am (was) waiting in order that he may (might) come'; the Subj. and Opt. seem to me to express simple futurity. Now is not ἔνθα μή τις

¹ I would add a pretty example from Ovid. Fast. iv. 387

Ante tamen quam summa dies spectacula sistat
Ensifer Orion aequora mersus erit.