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](#)

Attraction through Apposition in *Iliad* X 325, *Odyssey* α 51, and *Aeschylus Sept. 3*

T. D. Seymour

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 01 / February 2009, pp 28 - 29

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00029395, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00029395

How to cite this article:

T. D. Seymour (2009). Attraction through Apposition in *Iliad* X 325, *Odyssey* α 51, and *Aeschylus Sept. 3*. The Classical Review, 15, pp 28-29 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00029395

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

For *εἰκῇ* as opposed to *τάξις* and *κόσμος*, we may compare Plato's *Gorgias* 503 Ef. The latest exegetical edition before me says on the passage in question, 'τοῖς ὀνόμασι duplicates and explains *εἰκῇ*,' while another recent commentator says 'κεκοσμημένους means adorned with tropes or rhetorical figures.' Neither of these statements is true. Socrates is made by Plato to call attention to his lack of premeditation both in the order of his arguments (*εἰκῇ*) and as to the language used (*λεγόμενα τοῖς ἐπιτυχούσιν ὀνόμασιν, spoken in the words which occur to me*).

Apology 20 B νῦν δ' ἐπειδὴ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐστόν, τίνα αὐτοῖν ἐν νῷ ἔχεις ἐπιστάτην λαβεῖν; τίς τῆς τοιαύτης ἀρετῆς, τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης τε καὶ πολιτικῆς, ἐπιστήμων ἐστίν;

Socrates is repeating his conversation with Callias. If the latter's two sons had been colts or calves, a farmer could have been found to give them the true

excellence of an ox or a horse. Now since they are boys, is there anyone who can give them the true excellence of a man and a citizen? The familiarity of *politics* has weakened the feeling of most commentators and translators for the adjective *πολιτικός* as the equivalent of the genitive of *πολίτης*. Thus *πολιτικός* σύλλογος, *Gorgias* 452 E, is simply equivalent to τῶν πολιτῶν σύλλογος, and *Phaedo* 82 A, οἱ τὴν δημοτικὴν καὶ πολιτικὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιτετηδευκότες is 'those who have practised the virtues of a common man and a citizen.' Elsewhere, of course, *πολιτικός* means *statesmanlike, political*, but also of the city, as the equivalent of *τῆς πόλεως*, as *Republic* 521 B, 489 c. Jowett's translation may be quoted, as showing the ordinary interpretation of the passage before us: 'Is there anyone who understands human and political virtue?' To the ordinary reader, this translation does not make clear the force of *πολιτική*.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

ATTRACTION THROUGH APPPOSITION IN *ILIAD* X 325, *ODYSSEY* α 51, AND *AESCHYLUS SEPT.* 3.

THAT an appositive word is often influenced by the construction of a relative clause which intervenes between it and the noun with which it is in apposition, has long been recognized, and is a familiar truth. *E.g.* in α 22

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Αἰθίοπας μετεκίαθε τηλόθ' ἔοντας,
Αἰθίοπας, τοὶ διχθὰ δεδαΐαται, ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν,

ἔσχατοι has been attracted from the accusative by the nearer τοί. In α 68

ἀλλὰ Ποσειδάων γαίηοχος ἀσκελὲς αἰεὶ
Κύκλωπος κεχόλωται, δν ὀφθαλμὸν ἀλάωσεν,
ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον κ.τ.λ.,

Πολύφημον has been attracted from the genitive. Cf. also Γ 121

Ἴρις δ' αὖθ' Ἑλένη λευκώλενος ἄγγελος ἦλθεν
εἰδομένη γαλῶν Ἀττηνοριδαο δάμαρτι,
τὴν Ἀττηνοριδὴς εἶχε κρείων Ἑλικῶν,
Λαοδίκην, Πριάμοιο θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀρίστην,

where Λαοδίκην is attracted from the dative. The idiom is common also in prose. Cf. Plato's *Apology*, 41 A, εἰ γὰρ τις...εὐρήσκει τοὺς ἀληθῶς δικάστας, οἳ περ καὶ λέγονται ἐκεῖ

δικάζειν, Μίνως τε καὶ Ῥαδάμανθους κ.τ.λ., and *Republic* 402 C οὕτως οἷδ' ἐμοσικοὶ πρότερον ἐσόμεθα, οὔτε αὐτοὶ οὔτε οὓς φάμεν ἡμῖν παιδεύεον εἶναι τοὺς φύλακας, where οἱ φύλακες is expected.

I should like to explain by this attraction to the construction of an intervening clause, three passages which have caused much difficulty to commentators:

X 322 τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἄλλο τόσον μὲν ἔχε χροῶ
χάλκεα τεύχεα,
καλά, τὰ Πατρόκλοιο βίην ἐνάριξε
κατακτάς,
φαίνεται δ' ἢ κληίδες ἀπ' ὤμων αἰχέν'
ἔχουσιν,
325 λαυκανίην, ἵνα τε ψυχῆς ὤκιστος ὄλεθρος.

Editors generally supply *χρῶς* as subject of φαίνεται, and Hentze says that he has no satisfactory explanation for the accusative of 325. May we not say that the poet had λαυκανίην in mind from the first, but that the noun was attracted to the construction of the relative clause?

α 48 ἀλλὰ μοι ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆι δαΐφρονι δαίεται ἥτορ,

δυσμόρφῳ, ὃς δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἀπο πῆματα
 πᾶσχει
 50 νάσω ἐν ἀμφιρύντῃ, ὅθι τ' ὀμφαλός ἐστι
 • θαλάσσης,
 νῆσος δεινδρήσσσα, θεὰ δ' ἐν δώματα ναίει.

Most exegetical editions put a period at the close of 50, and speak of the 'asyndeton of vivid description'; but the critical editions of Bekker and of Ludwig have a comma there, and Hayman rightly says that νῆσος is 'epanalepsis, see on 23, with case varied by attraction of ὀμφαλός preceding.'

The third passage to which I would apply this explanation is at the opening of Aeschylus's *Seven against Thebes*.

Κάδμον πολῖται, χρὴ λέγειν τὰ καίρια.
 ὅστις φυλάσσει πρᾶγος ἐν πρύμνῃ πόλεως,
 οἶακα νωμῶν, βλέφαρα μὴ κοιμῶν ὑπνῳ.

Paley says of the last clause quoted: 'μὴ κοιμῶν is to be closely taken with νωμῶν, for which reason it seems better to omit the comma usually placed after the latter word, "managing the helm without closing his eyes." The μὴ depends on the indefinite ὅστις.' Verrall places a period at the close of the first verse, saying that to the connexion of the three verses 'there are two fatal objections: (1) the case of κοιμῶν... and (2) the want of connexion between χρὴ λέγειν τὰ καίρια and the following figure; λέγειν τὰ καίρια is the business of everyone, not of a statesman in particular, still less of a sleepless pilot.' Wecklein-Zomarides say: ἐπειδὴ δὲ οἶακα νωμῶν ἐπεξηγείται οὐ μόνον τὴν εἰκόνα ἐν πρύμνῃ, ἀλλ' ἐμφαίνει καὶ τὸ καθήκον τοῦ ἀρχοντος... διὰ ταῦτα προσκολλᾶται ἐν παραθέσει ὁμοιοπαύτως ἡ ῥῆσις βλ ἑ φ α ρ α μὴ κοιμῶν ὑπνῳ· ἄλλως ὀφειλέ τις νὰ εἰκάσῃ, ὥσπερ ἤθελεν ὁ Heimsoeth, κοιμῶν θ' ἐν τῇδε τῇ συναρτήσει τῶν λέξεων, 'χρὴ λέγειν τὰ καίρια ἐκείνον, ὅστις—πόλεως οἶακα νωμῶν, βλέφαρα μὴ κοιμῶν θ' ὑπνῳ.' ἀμφοτέρων δὲ τῶν μετοχῶν

οὐσῶν τροπικῶν ἀναφέρεται ἡ μὲν νωμῶν εἰς τὸ ἐν πρύμνῃ, ἡ δὲ κοιμῶν εἰς τὸ φυλάσσει: ὅστις ἐν πρύμνῃ πόλεως φυλάσσει τὰ πράγματα αὐτῆς ὡς οἰακοστρόφος ἄγρυπνος. Heimsoeth's emendation is the less likely because Eustathius had κοιμῶν before him, and it is unnecessary, since the participle is naturally attracted to the construction of the relative clause, even though it is most closely connected in thought with the subject of λέγειν τὰ καίρια. The thought of Eteocles is, then: 'I am here *before the break of day*, and must devise the wisest plans, since I bear the responsibility for the safety of the ship of state.' The scholiast's comparison of B 24:

οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εἶδεν βουλευφόρον ἄνδρα,

is entirely in point, and Verrall's remark, 'The hour (it appears to be scarcely yet light, vv. 29, 66) lends significance to the figure,' is correct, but not sufficiently emphatic. This opening sentence of the play informed the audience of the time of the action, as distinctly as the opening of the *Clouds*—ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τὸ χρῆμα τῶν νυκτῶν ὅσον! The ἄγγελος κατὰσκοπος of the Thebans visited the Argive camp at night, and returned before day-break; by day he could not have mingled with the Argives without recognition. In 66 he promises to have an ἡμεροσκόπον ὀφθαλμόν for the day, i.e. to watch by day the movements of the enemy from a distance, as he had served as a spy by night.

The reader will remember that Euripides in his *Phoenician Women* (97) caused the Paedagogus to explain to Antigone his knowledge of the Argive army—he had been to their camp with a message to Eteocles; but the messenger of the *Seven against Thebes* had enjoyed no such opportunity.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

ON THE WORD ἀφειδεῖν.

A critic in the current number of *Hermathena* raises an interesting point on the text of Apollonius Rhodius. In ii. 98 the MSS. reading is

οὐδ' ἄρα Βέβρυκες ἄνδρες ἀφείδισαν βασιλῆος.

Choeroboscus however (Bekk. *Anecd.* p. 1353) quotes the line with ἀκήδισαν, which

has been adopted by Merkel and is considered as certain by Bonitz and Prof. Jebb. On the other hand Jacobs (on *Anth. Pal.* v. 279) and Meineke (*Anal. Alex. ad Euphor.* civ.) defend the text. In my recent edition of the text I have after consideration seen no sufficient reason for deserting the MSS. The objection to the text is of course