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](#)

Greek Causal Clauses *Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles*. Von Martin P. Nilsson. I. die Poesie. Würzburg: A. Stuber, 1907. 8vo. Pp. 145. M. 5.50.

H. Richards

The Classical Review / Volume 22 / Issue 03 / May 1908, pp 90 - 90

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00001256, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00001256

How to cite this article:

H. Richards (1908). The Classical Review, 22, pp 90-90 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00001256

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

GREEK CAUSAL CLAUSES.

Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles. Von MARTIN P. NILSSON. 1. die Poesie. Würzburg: A. Stuber, 1907. 8vo. Pp. 145. M. 5.50.

'How did you like it?' 'Well, since you ask me, I did not like it at all.' Is there or is there not an ellipse in this answer? The author of the study before us (a new part of Schanz's historical series) is much pre-occupied with this question. He works very hard the not quite clear and satisfactory distinction between *logical* and *psychological*, and is bent on showing that all sorts of uses in which *ἐπεὶ* (and other causal conjunctions, but chiefly *ἐπεὶ*) appears are the latter and not the former: that is, that logic would view them as implying ellipses of various kinds, but that psychologically the different clauses are duly connected and nothing more needed. He has thus persuaded himself that not only had *ἐπεὶ* no subordinating force originally, but that even in later classical practice it was also frequently without it. Hence a division of clauses with *ἐπεὶ* into three, (1) independent, (2) loosely connected, (3) closely attached, and in the first and second he insists that no ellipse is to be found. Indeed he actually suggests that in Ar. *Wasps* 73 *ἐπεὶ τοιάδε* (imperative) the *ἐπεὶ* = *ἐπειτα*. It is not clear to me that, even 'psychologically' speaking, we ought not to recognise an ellipse. If it be said that the minds of speaker and hearer, writer and reader, are not conscious of the omission of a connecting link in such words as I started with above, that no doubt depends on how far we are accustomed to reflect upon language; and most people are not, or very little. But, if I ask anyone what he means by 'since you ask me,' etc., he will at once supply the missing link. Also there seems to me no denying that the word *since* conveys the idea of such a relation between things as in the abbreviated sentence does not really exist. Take that sentence as complete, and it is mere nonsense. My having disliked the thing is not due to your now asking me about it.

Grammatically, however, the question does not appear important and I am not sure that there was any real occasion to raise it or at

any rate to do more than refer to it. A good many hardly necessary distinctions and refinements might have been thus spared.

Mr. Nilsson has brought together a large amount of material as to the use of *ἐπεὶ* and *ἐπειδὴ*, *ὅτε*, *ὅτι*, *ὥς*, etc. in the poets, and here and there a point emerges of some small interest as to usage in general or the usage of some particular writer, though the total result is not considerable. Now and then he misses rather curiously an obvious point. He draws attention for instance to the fact that in Homer *ἐπεὶ* does not begin sentences, but that we get combinations like *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ*. It has apparently not struck him that *ἐπεὶ* is metrically unsuited to begin a hexameter verse. So elsewhere he says naively that Aeschylus is not, like Homer, shy of starting with *ἐπεὶ*, and he does not see that this is because *ἐπεὶ* comes quite conveniently at the beginning of an iambic line. Again he seems inclined actually to hunt about for something to explain why *ἐπειδὴ* is not placed in that position by the tragedians. Nor does he realise that *ἐπεὶ* *when, after*, is mainly poetical and *ἐπειδὴ* much more prosaic: hence he rather wonders that Aristophanes does not use *ἐπεὶ*, nor the tragedians *ἐπειδὴ*, having apparently hardly noticed that the liberal use of *ἐπεὶ* (e.g. in narratives *ἐπεὶ* *λαπῶν*, etc.) is very characteristic indeed of tragedy. He makes the surprising statement that *ἄτε* occurs once in Aristophanes, i.e. in *Birds* 285. It occurs several other times, e.g. *Peace* 623, 634: *Frogs* 546, 671. He fails to see how much more noticeable is the curious use of *ὅταν* in *Ion* 744, referring to a single actual case, than the other examples he cites.

An extraordinary omission, of which I do not notice any explanation, is the failure to take any account whatever of fragments. Not only are the lyrical and elegiac poets wholly ignored, but in the examination of Aristophanes and the tragedians there is not, I think, a single reference to their fragments, nor to those of the other tragic and comic poets. In a work which purports to be historical and in a sense complete this is quite unpardonable.

H. RICHARDS.