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. II.

E. C. Marchant

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 10 / December 1889, pp 436 - 439

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196143, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196143

How to cite this article:

E. C. Marchant (1889). The Agent in the Attic Orators. II.. The Classical Review, 3, pp 436-439 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196143

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

was made for an increase on 3 obols (a head), to the extent of 5 minae (per ship). For to 5 ships he offered per month 3 talents minus 5 minae, *i.e.* he gave per ship 3 obols $\times$ 200 (the crew) $\times$ 30 (the days) + 5 minae = 21,000 obols. 'Not,' says Thucydides, 'that this was the *basis* of his calculation: his basis was 2 talents 55 minae (= 105,000 obols) per 5 ships.' According to this arrangement each man gets about $3\frac{1}{2}$ obols instead of 3, and the arrangement is all the more likely, since the payment to each 5 ships could be made in the very manageable sum (to a Persian) of exactly 875 Daric staters.

C. 66.—καὶ ἐξευρεῖν αὐτὸ (αὐτοὶ *al.*) ἀδύνατοι ὄντες διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀλλήλων ἀγνωσίαν οὐκ εἶχον αὐτὸ (αὐτοὶ *al.*) ἐξευρεῖν.

A flagrant tautology, which editors endeavour to remove by omitting the last two words and expressing suspicions of ἀδύνατοι ὄντες. I need not repeat here the discussions of Poppe, Jowett, &c. I will only suggest that every difficulty is cleared by a change of the latter ἐξευρεῖν to ἐξαίρειν: 'and, being unable *on their side* (αὐτοὶ) to discover (the truth) because of the greatness of the city and their not knowing each other, they could not *put it down* (*viz.* the work of the conspirators).' For ἐξαίρειν cf. c. 46, *Xen. Hell.*, II. 2, 19, &c.

AESCH. S.C.T.

In Dr. Verrall's remarks upon my notes on Aesch. S.C.T. (*Class. Review* for March), there occur three matters to which I would give some answer.

v. 271.—ἐπτατειχεῖς ἐξόδοις. The λευκοπήχαι χειρῶν ἀκμαί of Eur. *Bacch.* 1206, is no

parallel. λευκοπήχαι χειρῶν are χεῖρες 'attached to' or 'belonging to' white arms. But ἐπτατειχεῖς ἐξόδοι are not 'outlets belonging to seven walls.'

v. 549.—Is the ᾱ of ἀγρεύσαιμι satisfactory? See P.V. 384 (ἀγρίαὺς γνάθους), P.V. 24 (ἀποκρίψει), S.C.T. 70 (πᾶτρός), 1052 (κάποτ' ἐρέπομαι), Ag. 1444 (ισοτρίβης), *Suppl.* 632 (ἐπέκραναν).

v. 247.—ταχθήσομαι, 'I will accept orders.' Cf. *Suppl.* 504, τούτῳ μὲν εἶπας, καὶ τεταγμένος κίει ('obediently'). The surroundings in the present case are military. The use is but a slight extension (if any) of, *e.g.* ἐτάχθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν τετρακοσίων περιπλεῖν Εὐβοίαν = ἐκελεύσθησαν practically.

I should like to add one or two more brief notes on the play.

v. 1013.—τυμβοχόα χειρώματα. May not χειρώματα mean 'slaves'? Cf. v. 326 κεχειρωμένους ἀγεσθαι, Plat. *Legg.* 919a αἰχμαλωτοὺς κεχειρωμένους, and the partially appropriate Ag. 1326 δούλης θανούσης, εἰχεροῦς χειρώματος.

v. 1026.—

τούτῳ δὲ σάρκας οὐδὲ κοιλογάστορες
λύκοι σπᾶσσονται.

For ΤΟΥΤΩ read ΤΟΡΓΩΙ (τόργοι, 'vultures'), cf. Lyc. 'Ἀλεξ. 1080, τόργοισιν αἰώρημα φοινοῖς. For the single negative, cf. Ag. 532 and Pind. *Ol.* XI. (X.), 18, φνυγόεινον στρατὸν μηδ' ἀπειράτον καλῶν.

v. 1028.—

τάφον γὰρ αὐτῷ (*sic.* M) καὶ κατασκαφᾶς ἐγώ,
γυνή περ οὔσα, τῷδε μηχανήσομαι
κόλπῳ φέρουσα βυσσίνου πεπλώματος,
καυτὴ καλύψω.

Dr. Verrall reads αὐτῷ, previous editors αὐτῇ. I should prefer αὐτοῦ, 'here and now.'

T. G. TUCKER.

THE AGENT IN THE ATTIC ORATORS.

II.

In the following passages ἐκ is explained as synonymous with ὑπό: Antiphon, *Tet. A.* δ, 1 τὰ ἐξ ἐμοῦ πραχθέντα, by Maetzner and Lutz; Isocrates 16 § 27 κατέστησαν ἐκείνην τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἐξ ἧς ἐπαιδεύθησαν οἱ πολῖται, by Lutz and Max Koch, the two latest writers on the prepositions in the Orators; Isaeus 6 § 57 ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐλέγχονται, by Schoemann; Lysurgus § 62 συνοικισθῆναι ἐκ τῶν τυχόντων ἀνθρώπων, by Maetzner; and

Dinarchus 1 § 44 οἱ φεύγοντες ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου, by Lutz. Kuehner refers with approval to the notes of Maetzner and Schoemann. In the June number of the *Classical Review*, I suggested a different explanation of *Ant. l.c.*, and I wish now to add that, if it be true that ἐκ stands for ὑπό in this passage of Antiphon, the earliest of the ten Orators is the only one who has this Ionic use of ἐκ with persons. The other passages can be easily disposed of. Isocrates, who is a careful writer with a nice perception of

minute distinctions between words, does, it is true, occasionally sacrifice grammatical precision to rhetorical effect, purity of idiom to melody in composition. Thus in 12 § 68 οὐκ ἐκ τούτων ἔφερων ἐξ ὧν αὐτοὶ διέσωσαν, ἀλλ' ἀφ' ὧν δι' ἡμᾶς εἶχον, no one will deny that ἐκ and ἀπό are synonymous. Again, in 9 § 81 γεγονὼς τὸ μὲν παλαιὸν ἀπὸ Διός, τὸ δ' ὑπογινώσκειν ἐξ ἀνδρὸς τοιούτου, as the descent is direct from Zeus, ἀπό ought to be ἐκ, and ἐκ is actually a *varia lectio*, which Max Koch seems to prefer: but who will doubt that Blass is right in reading ἀπό? In 16 § 27 however I see no reason why Isocrates should have substituted ἐξ ἧς for ὑφ' ἧς. The prepositions ἀπό, ἐκ and ὑπό are all found in the Orators with certain verbs; e.g. with γίγνεσθαι and ὠφελείσθαι, and in these cases ἐκ may be said to be a mean between ἀπό and ὑπό, the distinction between the three being clear in such phrases as ὠφελείσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν χρημάτων, ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ὑπὸ τῶν δούλων. Isocrates in 15 § 161 has τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἀφ' ὧν ἡμᾶς ἐπαίδευσεν, and in 7 § 82 ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκείνης εὐταξίας ἐπαυδέθησαν οἱ πολῖται. Comparing the last passage with 16 § 27, we see that ἐκ τῆς δημοκρατίας in the latter means 'by the institutions of the democracy,' not 'by the democracy' directly, and might be explained as ὑπὸ τῆς εὐταξίας τῆς ἐκ τῆς δημοκρατίας γεγενημένης. Isaeus 6 § 57 is disposed of by Bekker's certain correction of ἐξ ἡμῶν to ὑφ' ἡμῶν. Lycurgus § 62 is rightly explained by Lutz as a case of ἐκ used of the constituent elements of a whole. A comparison of Andocides 1 § 77 and Plut. *Sol.* xix. with Dinarchus 1 § 44 shows that ἐκ in the last-mentioned passage has nothing to do with ὑπό, and that οἱ φεύγοντες ἐξ 'Αρείου πάγου should be rendered, not 'a senatu Areopagitico in exilium acti,' but 'secundum senatus iudicium exsultantes.'

I return now to the agent with the perfect passive. Throughout the following statements I deal only with the cases in which the agent is *personal*, reserving ὑπό with things for separate treatment. I follow the conclusions of Blass with respect to the genuineness of the speeches attributed to Demosthenes: the eighth and ninth speeches of Lysias are omitted as spurious, but the first of Isocrates is included. I have spared no pains to make the numbers given correct: even if any passage has still escaped my notice, I am confident that the statistics are for all practical purposes complete.

From Antiphon to Dinarchus the perfect passive of πράττω is used with the agent in the dative one hundred and sixty-four times, but only in the following forms: the neuter

plural genitive of the participle occurs seventy-five times; the nom. or accus. neut. plur. forty-two¹ times; πέπρακται twenty-seven times; πεπράχθαι eight times (all in Demosthenes); πεπραγμένοις (neuter) six times (Lys. 14 § 17, Isocr. 6 § 90, Dem. 2 § 10, 41 § 24, 45 § 71, Dinarch. 1 § 95), never with the agent in dat. plur.; πεπραγμένον twice (Lys. 4 § 19, Dem. 18 § 178); ἐπέπρακτο twice (Dem. 18 § 95, 19 § 75); πεπραγμένον once (Ant. 5 § 43). The agent is far more often a pronoun than a noun, and in the large number of instances in which ἐκείνος or αὐτός is used with the participle, ἐκείνος is placed before the participle, as τῶν ἐκείνων πεπραγμένων, while αὐτός is placed after it. The only exceptions are Isocr. 15 § 96, 17 § 15, Hyperides 4, II, 6 τῶν πρότερον αὐτῇ πεπραγμένων, where πρότερον causes the inversion, Dem. 15 § 35, Dem. 21 § 169 τοιαῦτ' ἦν αὐτῷ τὰ πεπραγμένα, where αὐτῷ belongs as much to ἦν as to πεπραγμένα, Dem. 23 § 6 ἃ οἶδα πεπραγμέν' ἐκείνῳ, and Dinarch. 2 § 11 ἐκ τῶν νῦν αὐτῷ πεπραγμένων. There are but four instances of the perf. pass. of ποιεῖν with an agent of any sort (for which see also [Lys.] 6 §§ 33, 50), viz.: Andoc. 1 §§ 71, 106, Dem. 18 § 246 ἐμοὶ πεποιήται, τὰ πεποιημένα ὑμῖν, and Dem. 19 § 247 ὁ Κρέων Αἰσχίνης οἷα λέγων πεποιήται τῷ ποιητῇ. The last passage is remarkable as being one of the two cases in the Orators in which the agent with a perf. pass. is put in the dative when the subject is a person. It is evident that Demosthenes purposely used the dat. in scorn: 'our Creon' Aeschines is not a person at all, but a mere puppet of the poet's fancy, made to speak whatever words he chose to breathe into him. Compare what Weil notes on the passage. The other case is Dem. 57 § 10 οἱ τοῦτ' παρεσκευασμένοι, where again the dat. is used with disparagement, and with a very close relation to the true dat. of interest (cf. [Lys.] 15 § 5). These two cases are similar to the Homeric use of ἐδάμην with a dat., for which see Monro, *Hom. Gram.* § 143, 5, Delbrück *Forschungen* IV. p. 76. I believe that the former is right in considering the dat. originally a dat. of interest and not an instrumental dat. in this use, and e.g. in Πηλείωνι δαμείς the dat. is used just because Hector becomes Achilles' chattel by the latter's victory. The only other passages in which παρεσκευασμένος appears in the Orators with an agent are Lys. 1 § 24 τῆς θύρας ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνθρώπου παρεσκευασμένης, id. 13 § 76 εἰ μὴ τι σοι ἦν παρεσκευασμένον.

¹ διαπεπραγμένα, Dem. 57 § 66 is here included.

Besides *πράττω* and *ποιῶ*, the following verbs are used with the agent in dative. Antiphon has *ἡμάρτηται* or *ἐξ-* thrice, and each of the following once: *μεμηχανήται*, *εἴρηται*, *ἐπιδέδεικται*, *δεδιήρηται*, *βεβοήθηται*, *κατείργασται*, *εἵργασται*, *ὑπῆρκεται*.¹ Andocides gives *ἡμάρτηται* four times, and *ἡσέβηται*, *ἀποδέδεικται*, *ἀπολελόγηται*, *μεμῆνυται* each once. From Lysias we obtain *εἴρηται* four times, *εἵργασται* thrice, *ἡμάρτηται* twice, and *δεδαπνήται*, *ἐψήφισται*, *βεβίωται*, *πεπολίτευται*, *συνελήπται*, *παρεσκεύασται* once. Isocrates uses *εἴρηται* five times, *προεἴρηται* twice, *ἡμάρτηται* and *ἡῦρηται* twice, *γέγραπται*, *ἀποδέδεικται*, *πεπολίτευται*, *πεπλημύελλται* once. The instances in Isaeus are confined to *μεμαρτύρηται* twice and *εἴρηται* once. Lycurgus has but one case—*κατείργασται*, while Hyperides has none at all. In Demosthenes *βεβίωται* appears nine times, *πεπολίτευται* five, *πεπρέσβευται* four times, *εἴρηται* thrice, *ἀποδέδεικται*, *διώκηται*, *εἵργασται*, *ἡμάρτηται*, *μεμαρτύρηται* each twice, and each of the following once: *δεδήλωται*, *νενεανιένται*, *προσεξείργασται*, *λελειτούργηται*, *προδιώκηται*, *ἡτοίμασται*, *ἡῦρηται*, *πεπόννηται*, *ἐκτένισται*, *διαλέλυται*, *πεπλήρωται*, *ἐψήφισται*, *συμβέβληται*. Aeschines supplies *εἴρηται* and *προεἴρηται*, each twice, *ἡσέβηται*, *ὑπῆρκεται*, *ἡμέληται*, *σεσωφρόνηται* once. Lastly Dinarchus has *πεπολίτευται* three times. If from this total of one hundred and six we exclude words of kindred meaning to *λέγω* and *πράττω*, and a few impersonal passives from intrans. verbs, there are barely a dozen verbs used with the agent in the dative. Moreover, in all these passages the participle occurs in the dative only in Dem. 21 § 18 *ἐφ' ἅπασι τοῖς ἐαντῷ νενεανιευμένοις*, and Dinarch. 1 §§ 70, 95, and in those places because the impersonal perf. pass. from intransitive verbs never has *ὑπό*.

Reckoning up all the cases of the dative agent, we find the number is two hundred and seventy-two. In all but two the subject is impersonal. If however the subject is a person, city, or country, the personal agent is always expressed by *ὑπό*. There are one hundred and two such cases in the Orators. One apparent violation of this rule, besides the two already dealt with, requires remark. In Dem. 27 § 63 *τῷ δὲ καὶ προσοφείλων ἐγγράμμαι*, the agent is constructed to suit the participle, not the verb, as in the well-known cases of a common *object* to a participle and verb of different constructions. The same rule applies to the perf. of intransitive verbs—*ὑπό* is required. Only the following verbs occur: *πέπονθα* thirty-six times and in every

¹ In enumerating these on p. 251 I carelessly omitted the last three.

Orator but Hyperides; *τέθνηκα* five times (Ant. 5 § 39, Lys. 10 § 28, 13 §§ 38, 84, 94), *γεγέννημαι* six times only in the phrase *ἀνάστατοι γεγέννηται* (Lys. 33 § 3, Isocr. 7 § 6, 8 §§ 4, 69, 70, 14 § 1); *ἐάλωκα* twice (Lys. 10 § 25, Dinarch. 1 § 85); *ἀπόλωλα* once (Lys. 28 § 17); *περιπέτωκα* twice (Dem. 21 §§ 96, 100); *ἐκπέτωκα* once (Lys. 13 § 77); *πεπλούτηκα* once (Dem. 21 § 189). Moreover, even if the subject of an intransitive verb is a thing, the personal agent must have *ὑπό*; for the dat. in such a case might often be mistaken for the dat. of interest. A good instance is Aeschines 2 § 172 *τῶν τευχῶν ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων πεπωκότων*. Dinarchus has five instances of this construction, all with *γεγέννηται*; contrast 1 §§ 22, 38, 57 and 3 §§ 14, 15 with 3 § 18 *τὴν γεγενημένην αὐτῷ πρὸς ὑμᾶς πίστιν*, and compare the last passage with Hyperides 2, xiii, 10 *ἐγκλημά μοι πρὸς οὐδένα γέγονεν*. This carries us on to Dem. 36 § 25 *ἂ τῷδ' ἔγγον' ἀμφοτέρω, which I think must mean 'the plaintiff is in both these positions,' not 'both of these have been given by this man,' as Kennedy translates.*

The following list gives the number of instances in which the several Orators construct the personal agent with *ὑπό*, the subject being impersonal: Antiphon two, Andocides one, Lysias eight, Isocrates thirty-one, Isaeus six, Lycurgus two, Hyperides one, Demosthenes sixteen, Aeschines nine, Dinarchus seven. The last Orator's list is *τῶν . . πεπραγμένων* (1 §§ 16, 23, 2 § 4), *εἰρημένων* (1 § 1), *γεγραμμένων* (1 § 70), *κεκριμένων* (1 § 84), and *τίς κόσμος ἀνίηκεται*; (1 § 91). He has the agent in the dative only four times, and it will be seen that he is the only Orator who does not conform to the rules for the construction of the agent when the subject is impersonal. It is therefore necessary to omit him from the totals. For the other nine Orators we get seventy-six cases of *ὑπό* against two hundred and sixty-eight of the dative. In all the cases of *πράττω* with dat. the subject is neuter, except Dem. *pro.* 9 *πολλῶν πράξεων πᾶσι πεπραγμένων*. Still, excluding Dinarchus, I find that among the hundred and four cases of other verbs with dat. the subject is masculine thrice, in Dem. 19 §§ 199 and 200 *βεβίωται βίος*, and Aeschines 3 § 217, *τοὺς εἰρημένους ἐν ὑμῶν λόγους ἐμαντῷ*: it is feminine thrice, in Isocr. 8 § 39 *θεραπείαι τοῖς ἰατροῖς ἡῦρηται*, Isaeus 3 § 17 *τῶν τούτοις μεμαρτυρημένων μαρτυριῶν*, and Aeschines 2 § 109 *τὰς εὐεργεσίας τὰς ὑπηρεμένους εἰς Φίλιππον αὐτῷ*. In Dem. 51 § 5 *ἐπεπλήρωτό μοι*, where it is possible to supply *ἡ ναῦς*, the verb appears to be impersonal,

notwithstanding Thuc. i. 29. There is also a doubtful passage in Dem. *ep.* 3 § 28 τῶν δὲ (χαρίτων) τοῖς θεοῖς ἀποδεδεγμένων (? ἀποδεδειγμένων or ἐν τοῖς θ.). The only certain cases of a masculine or feminine noun as subject are therefore βίος βεβίωται, μαρτυρία μεμαρτύρηται, λόγος εἴρηται, εὐεργεσία ὑπήρκει, θεραπεία ἤρρηται. But among the seventy-six cases of ὑπό, the subject is a masculine noun a dozen times, feminine twenty¹ times. Therefore ὑπό is universal in the Orators with masc. and fem. subjects, even if impersonal, except in a few cases where a cognate accusative becomes subject to a perf. pass. As regards the dative plural of the participle, πεπραγμένους has the agent in the dat. five times against seven cases of ὑπό, but with the other verbs there is only Dem. 21 § 18 (see above) to place against thirteen cases of ὑπό when the dat. plur. of the partic. is used (Ant. 5 § 35, Lys. 12 § 77; Isocr. 1 § 51, 4 § 31, 5 § 12, 6 § 60, 10 § 9, 12 §§ 237, 263, 15 § 16, *ep.* 2 § 12; Dem. 37 § 20; Aesch. 3 § 126). When we omit all cases of the dat. plur. of the partic. and of masc. and fem. nouns, there remain only the following instances of impersonal subjects with ὑπό of the personal agent: Ant. *Tet.* A. 8, 10, And. 1 § 56, Lys. 3 §§ 15, 37, 12 § 77, *frag.* 78, Isocr. 4 § 45, 5 § 94, 12 § 16, 15 § 74, *ep.* 6 § 7, 12 § 74, 15 §§ 10, 110, Isaeus 3 §§ 13, 16, 4 § 9, 6 § 41, Lycurg. § 54, Dem. 19 §§ 117, 162, 36 § 7, 41 § 23, 45 §§ 13, 39, Aesch. 1 § 85, 3 §§ 98, 119, 229. From these the following must be deducted: Lys. 3 §§ 15, 37, Isaeus 3 § 16, Dem. 36 § 7 μεμαρτύρηται ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τούτων, Isaeus 4 § 9 τὰ χρήματα Ἀθηναῖοι ὑπὸ Νικοστράτου καθιερωσθαι, αὐτῷ δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δεδοσθαι, Aesch. 1 § 85 μαρτυρίαν μεμαρτυρήσθαι ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου, Lys. *frag.* 78 and Dem. 19 § 162, where ὑπό is clearly necessary to prevent confusion with the dat. of interest. There remain twenty passages, two of which, Ant. *l. c.* and And. *l. c.*, I have already dealt with (p. 251). As regards Demosthenes, we found that in two cases he uses the dat. when the subject is a person, in order to disparage that person by representing him as a kind of *possession* of the agent. With these exceptions we must

contrast 41 § 23 δεινὸν εἰ πρὸς τὰ συγκεχωρημέν' ὑπ' αὐτῶν τούτων ἐξέσται νῦν ἀντιλέγειν, 45 § 13 ἢ' εἰ μὲν ἀλλ' ἅπτα τῶν ὑπὸ τούτων μεμαρτυρημένων ἦν τὰκεῖ γεγραμμένα, τεκμηρίω τούτω ὡς κατασκευάζουσιν ἐχρώμενην, and 45 § 39 ἀφαιρῶν τὰ ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις ὑπὸ τούτου γεγραμμένα, where the rhetorical purpose of ὑπό and the gen. is clear: the speaker is very emphatic; no doubt he raises his voice to a high pitch, and puts forth all his strength to deal a crushing blow at his adversary. So too with 19 § 117. There is a direct responsibility implied in ὑπό which is wanting to the dative of the agent, and which makes ὑπό more suited to impassioned utterance. The same purpose is at work in Lys. 12 § 77 πάντα τὰ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ εἰρημένα ἀπολογούμενος ἔλεγεν, in Isaeus 3 § 13 ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων οἰκείων καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν γειτόνων μεμαρτύρηται πρὸς ὑμᾶς (where the earnestness of the speaker is further marked by the emphatic πρὸς ὑμᾶς instead of the usual ὑμῖν),¹ in Isaeus 6 § 41 and in Aesch. 3 § 119 ὁρᾷ' ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀμφικτύονες ἐξευργασμένον τοῦτο τὸ πεδίον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀμφισσέων καὶ κεραμεῖα ἐνφοδομημένα κ.τ.λ., a passage mouthed by the retired actor as though he were once again playing Creon. In a slightly different category are Lycurg. § 54 and Aeschines 3 §§ 98, 229, the first of which is an instance of genuine σεμνολογία, while the other two illustrate that προπέτεια which is characteristic of the style of Aeschines. Lastly Isocrates, referring to the advantages of Athens, says (4 § 45) καὶ τοῦθ' ὑπ' αὐτῆς περιελήφθαι, *et hoc ab ipsa comprehensum esse*, in 15 § 110 μηδ' ὑφ' ἐνὸς ἐωρᾶσθαι ναυτικόν, and in all the other passages he is speaking of his own works, which he never once refers to as τὰ ἐμοῦ εἰρημένα or γεγραμμένα, but always as τὰ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ εἰ. or γ.; clearly the more emphatic form of speech was gratifying to the no small pride Isocrates took in all that he wrote. I think therefore that in all these twenty-one cases ὑπό is a rhetorical device, employed to heighten the effect, and quite in accordance with the genius of the language, which so constantly expresses in the form of speech gradations of feeling which we are forced to leave to type or gesture.

E. C. MARCHANT.

¹ The preference for ὑπό with fem. nouns is well seen in Isaeus, *frag.* II. διαθηκῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐσκευοποιημένων.

¹ Also by the repetition of ὑπό before γειτόνων.