

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](#)



On the Greek Idiom in Isocrates *Panegyricus*, 140

A. C. Pearson

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 02 / March 1906, pp 99 - 100

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993764, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993764

How to cite this article:

A. C. Pearson (1906). On the Greek Idiom in Isocrates *Panegyricus*, 140. The Classical Review, 20, pp 99-100 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993764

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Doloneia contains the following lines about Odysseus' helmet :

τήν ῥά ποτ' ἐξ Ἑλεῶνος Ἀμύντορος Ὀρμενίδαο
ἐξέλετ' Αὐτόλυκος πυκινὸν δόμον ἀντιτορήσας,
Σκάνδειαν δ' ἄρα δῶκε Κυθηρίῳ Ἀμφιδάμαντι·
'Αμφιδάμας δὲ Μόλῳ δῶκε ξεινήιον εἶναι,
αὐτὰρ ὁ Μηριόνη δῶκεν ᾧ παιδί φορῆναι.
δὴ τότε Ὀδυσσεύς πύκασεν κάρη ἀμφιτεθεῖσα.

Neither the author nor his audience can have missed the reference. What were the latter to think of the adaptation? Agamemnon's sceptre had passed through the hands of three gods before it reached their favourite Pelops in whose family it descended as a sacred heirloom. Where did the helmet come from? Autolycus broke into Amyntor's house and stole it: he transferred the stolen goods to Amphidamas in Scandeaia: Amphidamas got rid of the incriminating property by making a present of it to Molos: in the second generation it could safely be transferred to Molos' son, who lends it to Odysseus when on his way to purloin horses in the dead of night. Would any audience that knew its Homer have considered this a happy literary reminiscence? I once heard a divine, well known in Ulster, preach from the text 'He spake as one that had authority, and not as the scribes.' During the sermon

he introduced the quotation 'And still he talked, and still the wonder grew' which he proudly regarded as a satisfactory equivalent for the words of his text. I could not persuade a theological professor afterwards that there was anything amiss.

Just one more point. Mr. Lang says that 'the laugh of Odysseus is both in character and in keeping.' It is both undoubtedly; but I think it is something more. Mr. Lang in a happy sentence says 'Humour is certainly not the strong point of the Epics: the jests are pointed with spears or driven in with the staff of Odysseus.' But Homer has another way of pointing his humorous passages. In B 270 when Thersites is made to look ridiculous we read οἱ δὲ καὶ ἀχνύμενοί περ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἡδὺ γέλασαν. After the narrative in θ of what Hephaistos calls the ἔργ' ἀγέλαστα of Ares and Aphrodite the poet adds ἄσβεστος δ' ἄρ' ἐνὼρτο γέλως μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν. These are two specimens of what seems to have been an epic convention to indicate the point of view which the poet expected the hearers to adopt. It reminds one somewhat of the naïve Roman *plaudite*. I take Odysseus' guffaw to be similar in intention, like Sterne's asterisks, 'lamps hung up in dark places.'

R. M. HENRY.

BELFAST, Feb. 3, 1906.

ON THE GREEK IDIOM IN ISOCRATES *PANEGYRICUS*, 140.

PROF. PLATT has called attention to this passage in the February number of this Review, and proposes to substitute *γεγονός* for *γένονεν* on the ground that the words *ἐξ ὧν μεθ' ἐκατέρων γέγονεν* are ungrammatical. The purpose of these remarks is to maintain the soundness of the text, and to submit that *ἐξ ὧν μεθ' ἐκατέρων γέγονεν*, although seeming to defy grammatical analysis, is nevertheless perfectly good Greek for 'from his alliances with either party.'

The construction finds its ultimate motive in what Shilleto (on Dem. *de F. L.* § 263) has admirably characterised as the Greek fondness for '*throwing the substantive into the verb*.' Within the limits of the relative clause this gave rise to an extension in the range of the so-called cognate accusative,—whether remaining unaltered or passing into other cases by attraction. Consider in this light such examples as the following:—Herod. 3. 81 τὰ μὲν Ὀράνης εἶπε τυραννίδα ποιῶν,

λελέχθω κάμοι ταῦτα, τὰ δ' ἐς τὸ πλῆθος ἀνωγε φέρειν τὸ κράτος, γνώμης τῆς ἀρίστης ἡμάρτηκε. Dem. or. 16 § 13 χάριν ἔχειν ὧν ἐσώθησαν ὑφ' ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς ἐσχάτους ἐλθόντες κινδύνους. Dem. or. 21 § 196 φθόνον ἐξ ὧν ζῆς καὶ ἐφ' οἷς ἐξαπατᾶς ἔλεον (cf. § 134 ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ὧν ζῆς). Dem. or. 45 § 68 ἀπέπλασται καὶ βαδίζει οὗτος παρὰ τοὺς τοίχους ἐσκυθροπακός. It will be admitted that the normal demonstrative type is οὕτω (not ταῦτα) ζῆν, βαδίζειν, σωθῆναι, etc., and it follows that the abnormality of ταῦτα γίνεσθαι in the sense of οὕτω γίνεσθαι is not conclusive against the employment of ἐξ ὧν (μεθ' ἐκατέρων γέγονεν) in the sense of 'from the manner in which' or even 'from the fact that.' For the combination of the attracted relative with prepositions led to the gradual growth of quasi-conjunctions after the pattern of ἐξ οὗ, καθά, δῶτι, etc. The instances now to be quoted are on the same footing as the passage from the *Panegyricus*. Isocr. or. 10 § 47

χρῆ . . . δοκιμάζειν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς τῶν ἀποτυχουσῶν, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὧν ἀπασαι βουλευσάμεναι προέβαινον 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' ἀνθλωκέναι 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