

On Hendiadys in Greek

Author(s): David Sansone

Source: *Glotta*, 62. Bd., 1./2. H. (1984), pp. 16-25

Published by: [Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht \(GmbH & Co. KG\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40266646>

Accessed: 11/04/2014 05:25

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (GmbH & Co. KG) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Glotta*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

- R. Neuberger-Donath (1982), „Der Gebrauch von $\delta\tau\iota$ und $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ in Subjekt- und Objekt-Sätzen“, *RhM*, 125, 1982, 252–274.
- A. Ruiz de Elvira (1970), „Varia mythographa“, *Emerita*, 38, 1970, 291–310.
- E. Schwyzler-A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik*, I–II, München, 1939–1950.

The purpose of this paper is to ascertain the meaningful oppositions between the formal devices as used to construct substantives clauses in Ancient Greek. A functional approach is regarded as the apposite method; thus the evidence adduced is based on a) the place of the infinitive in the verbal paradigm; b) the alternation between infinitive and $\delta\tau\iota$ -/ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ - clauses after the same verb; c) the ground why some classes of substantive clauses are not attested along with some verbs. On the basis of the above criteria, it is suggested that the infinitive is the modal neutral form for the expression of substantive clauses; accordingly, infinitives are not provided with the meanings carried by modal inflection.

On Hendiadys in Greek

By DAVID SANSONE, Urbana

If one wishes to consult the standard discussion of the figure hendiadys in Greek, one is surprised to learn that such does not exist. While hendiadys in Latin has received extensive treatment,¹⁾ the figure is ignored in the Greek grammars of Kühner-Gerth, Schwyzler and Gildersleeve.²⁾ I cannot account for this omission in

¹⁾ Kühner-Stegmann, *Gramm. d. lat. Sprache: Satzlehre* II, ³1955, 26–7 and 578; Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lat. Gramm.* II, 1965, 782–3 with full bibliography.

²⁾ I have confirmed the fact that hendiadys is not treated in these grammars by checking all the instances of hendiadys that I have identified below in W.M. Calder III, *Index Locorum zu Kühner-Gerth*, Darmstadt 1965; E. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.* IV: *Stellenregister*, Munich 1971; P. Stork, *Index of Passages Cited*, in: B.L. Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek*, ²Groningen 1980. I have also checked K.H. Lee, *Index of Passages Cited in W. Breitenbach, Untersuchungen z. Sprache d. eurip. Lyrik*, Amsterdam 1979, and A. Kessels, *Stellenregister zu E. Bruhn, Anhang zu Sophokles*, Utrecht 1977. Hendiadys in Greek is recognized by H.W. Smyth, *A Greek Grammar*, New York 1920, § 3025 and J.D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style*, Oxford 1952, 35–6 and 62–3, but these discussions are very limited, and the fullest treatment is still that of Lobeck, in his note on *Soph. Aj.* 145. Grammars of

the two former, but Gildersleeve elsewhere gives an indication of why he neglects to include a section on hendiadys in his *Syntax of Classical Greek*. In his note on Pindar, *Pyth.* 4.18 he states, "The figure *ἐν διὰ δύοιν*, much abused in Latin, can hardly be proved for Greek".³) It is my intention to show that hendiadys does exist in classical Greek and to provide some stimulus to the further study of this phenomenon, to which a dissertation could well be devoted.

It should first be noted, however, that even the existence of hendiadys in Latin has been doubted. In an article⁴) that contains some useful observations on individual passages in Virgil, E. A. Hahn comes to the conclusion "that, whenever Vergil chooses to write as though he had two ideas, he really did have two, and that, accordingly, the term hendiadys is a misnomer, and the phenomenon which it is supposed to describe is non-existent." The first part of this statement may well be correct, but the last is a *non sequitur*. For demonstrating that a phenomenon has been assigned a name that does not accurately represent its essence scarcely constitutes proof that the phenomenon does not exist. One could easily thus prove the non-existence of English horns and hippopotamuses. Indeed it is for this reason appropriate to retain the improper form, sanctioned by nearly half a millenium of use, "hendiadys," rather than insist on the pedantically correct "hendiadyoin." For the form of the word is itself a reminder of the word's history. The form "hendiadys" has its origin in misspellings in the MSS of Servius. There is an entry "*endiadis*" in the *Vocabularium* of Papias,⁵)

New Testament Greek, unlike those of classical Greek, are quite willing to recognize the existence of hendiadys (Blass-Debrunner, *Gramm. d. neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, ¹⁴Göttingen 1976, § 442. 9b; Moulton-Turner, *A Grammar of NT Greek III*, Edinburgh 1963, 335-6), but there seems to be disagreement among NT scholars as to whether the figure enters the language of the NT from classical Greek (e.g. Lagercrantz, *ZNW* 31 [1932] 87) or is of Semitic origin (e.g. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, Rome 1963, §§ 453 and 460).

³) B.L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, New York 1885, 283. Cf. also his notes on *Ol.* 14. 17 and *Pyth.* 4. 94. Examples of hendiadys in Latin are given in Gildersleeve-Lodge, *Latin Grammar*, ²London 1895, § 698. It never occurs to T. Düring, who has a full discussion of hendiadys in Virgil (*De Vergilii sermone epico capita selecta*, Diss. Göttingen 1905, 2-19, esp. 6-7), to consider the possibility that Virgil might have adopted the figure from the Greeks.

⁴) Hendiadys: Is There Such a Thing?, *CW* 15 (1922) 193-7.

⁵) This work was published in Milan in 1476 and in Venice in 1485, 1491 and 1496. I have consulted only the edition of 1491.

which entry seems to derive from Servius' notes on Aen. 1.61 and 3.223. And we find the form "*endyadis*" in the edition of Servius' commentary on Virgil printed in 1520.⁶) In fact, with one exception, all the ancient references to the word and concept are to be found in Servius.⁷) Thus, despite its Greek name, there is no evidence that Greek grammarians or commentators recognized the figure.⁸) But that does not, of course, mean that the phenomenon is absent from Greek authors.

We must, then, *faute de mieux*, begin our investigation with Servius. What the expressions identified by Servius as hendiadys have in common is that each consists of two nouns in the same case, and each can be paraphrased (in many instances the commentator does himself so paraphrase) by substituting for one of the nouns either a genitive depending on the other noun or a corresponding adjective in agreement with the other noun. Now, if we are satisfied with collecting examples from classical Greek authors that conform to this pattern, we can easily prove that hendiadys exists in Greek. I have collected some sixty examples, and I am quite certain that an equal number have escaped my notice. But in order to understand a rhetorical or poetic figure it is not sufficient merely to translate the figurative expression into "ordinary speech". We must try to discern what it is that differentiates the figurative from the non-figurative and why (apart from the poet's and orator's natural aversion from "ordinary speech") an author has preferred the former. Typical of Servius' procedure is his note on Georg. 2.192 (*pateris libamus et auro*): "*pateris aureis. Ἐν διὰ δύοῖν, ut molemque et montes.*" Servius does not bother to consider whether the relationship between *pateris* and *auro* is indeed the same as that between *molem* and *montes*.⁹) In fact, the difference between these two kinds of

⁶) See, e.g., the notes on Aen. 1.61 and 7.15. The Oxford English Dictionary quotes the form "hendiadis" in English already in 1586.

⁷) See J.F. Mountford and J.T. Schultz, *Index rerum et nominum in scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati tractatorum*, Ithaca 1930, s.v., where 21 references are listed. We can add Aen. 2.116, which is paraphrased in the note on 8.52. The only other reference to hendiadys in antiquity is Porphyrio ad Hor. Carm. 2.15.18–20.

⁸) The fact that the scholia on the passages referred to below from Homer, Pindar, Aeschylus, Aristophanes and Euripides have no significant comments in this regard provides an interesting *argumentum ex silentio*.

⁹) The latter is a reference to Aen. 1.61, where Servius had given his definition of hendiadys: "cum una res in duas dividatur, metri causa interposita coniunctione."

hendiadys is of importance when we consider the figure in Greek. For, while examples of the type *molem et montes* are frequent, we (or at least I) do not find instances of the type *pateris et auro* in Greek authors. This is particularly interesting, as *pateris et auro* is often taken as the definitive example of hendiadys.¹⁰) This type, which Servius identifies also at Aen. 1.648, 2.627, 3.467, 5.259, 7.142 and 9.707, consists of two nouns, one of which corresponds to an adjective denoting *material* in agreement with the other noun. Passages like Eur. Ion 1194–5 *δρόσον . . . Βυβλίνον τε πώματος* and Phoen. 1677 *σίδηρος δρκιόν τέ μοι ξίφος*, which look similar, are really instances of epexegetis.¹¹) Another passage which looks like a parallel to *pateris et auro* is particularly instructive: Soph. O.T. 470 *πυρὶ καὶ στεροπαῖς*. Here Jebb, in harmony with Servius' *pateris aureis*, translates, "with fiery lightnings." And, if we compare the biblical "fire and brimstone," which can only stand for "fiery brimstone," we are bound to accept Jebb's paraphrase.¹²) But there is an alternative view, namely that of O. Longo ("= *κεραυνῶ πυρὶ*") and M. L. Earle: "*πυρὶ καὶ στεροπαῖς* is an hendiadys, *στεροπαῖς* defining the nature of *πυρὶ*." How do we decide which is the correct interpretation? Well, we cannot. Sophocles was perfectly capable of subordinating one element to the other, but he chose not to. It is precisely the nature of the figure hendiadys in Greek that it coordinates two elements, *either of which* could be logically and grammatically subordinated to the other. Sophocles' phrase manages to express simultaneously the notions *κεραυνῶ πυρὶ* (cf. Eur. Tro. 80) and *πυρὶ καὶ ἀστεροπαῖ* (cf. Ar. Aves 1746).

Let us look at some further examples. In their notes on Soph. Trach. 764 (*κόσμων τε χαλκῶν καὶ στολῇ*) both Jebb and Blaydes indi-

¹⁰) See, for example, C.F.W. Müller, Über das sogenannte hen dia dyoin im Lateinischen, Philologus 7 (1852) 297–318, esp. 299–300. (Even Webster's New International Dictionary gives as its example of hendiadys, "we drink from *cups and gold*, for *golden cups*." Likewise the new Brockhaus-Wahrig: "aus Bechern und Gold trinken wir.") Müller, like many others, seems to regard the expression *ἐν διὰ δυοῖν* as possessing a kind of sacred inviolability. For him the term is properly applied only in reference to "ein sachlich als ungeteilt zur Erscheinung kommendes Objekt." Miss Hahn (above, note 4) is equally literal in her understanding of the expression.

¹¹) See Lobeck ad Soph. Aj. 145. Similarly to be taken as epexegetis is Eur. Suppl. 980–1 *θαλάμας . . . τύμβον θ' ἱερὸν*, which Collard, however, considers hendiadys. For this use of *τε* in epexegetis see examples at Hermes 67 (1932) 328 n. 3.

¹²) Similarly Campbell, "with fiery bolts."

cate that the phrase = *κοσμίᾳ στολῇ*, and the latter quotes 1 Tim. 2.9 *ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ*. But the paraphrase in Schneidewin-Nauck, *κόσμῳ τῆς στολῆς*, is equally appropriate. Blaydes paraphrases Ar. Plut. 334 *τῇ βαδίσσει καὶ τῷ τάχει* as follows: *τῷ τάχει τῆς βαδίσσεως*. But *τῇ ταχείᾳ βαδίσσει* makes equally good sense in the context. Does A. Eum. 247 *πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σταλαγμόν* mean “the dripping of the blood” or “the dripping blood”? Is Dem. 19.314 *καὶ κλύδωνα καὶ μανίαν* best paraphrased *κλύδωνα μανίας* (cf. Eur. I. T. 307, A. Choe. 183) or *μανίαν κυμαίνοντα*? Are we to take Eur. I. A. 354 *ὄμμα σύγχυσίν τ’* as equivalent to *σύγχυσιν ὀμμάτων* (cf. 1128, A. P. 5.130.2 = 2489 Gow-Page) or *ὄμμα συγκεχυμένον*? There are three passages of a similar character that Denniston (above, note 2) 35–6 quotes, among others, to illustrate a tendency to use co-ordination rather than to qualify abstract substantives: Dem. 21.137 *τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὴν ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὴν ὑπερφηανίαν*, Thuc. 6.87.3 *τῆς ἡμετέρας πολυπραγμοσύνης καὶ τρόπου*, Pl. Symp. 219d *τὴν τοῦτου φύσιν τε καὶ σωφροσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν*.¹³) Denniston translates the first “unbridled character” and, given the context in which he quotes it, presumably considers the last to represent *τὴν σώφρονα καὶ ἀνδρείαν φύσιν*. But with equal justification Lamb translates the latter “the sobriety and integrity of his nature,” and “the insolence and arrogance of his character” would be an appropriate rendering of the former. Denniston also quotes Dem. 50.35 *τὴν σὴν μανίαν καὶ πολυτέλειαν* and Pl. Symp. 213d *τὴν τοῦτου μανίαν τε καὶ φιλεραστίαν*.¹⁴) Either “extravagant folly” or Denniston’s “insane extravagance” will do for the former; “his mad passion” or Lamb’s “his amorous frenzy” for the latter.

The inadequacy of all such paraphrases and translations was first intimated in a brief but important note by Gottfried Hermann. Hermann considers Eur. I. A. 53–4 *δεινὰ δ’ ἀπειλαὶ καὶ . . . φόνος ξυνίσταθ’* an example of hendiadys, but rejects the view that it is equivalent to *ἀπειλαὶ φόνον*: “Est hoc exemplum in iis, ex quibus illi, qui ista figura abuti amant, cognoscere poterunt, quid sit quod recte *ἐν διὰ δυοῖν* appellatur. Habet enim locum in iis, quae et coniuncta et disiuncta cogitari possunt, non in illis, quae disiuncta

¹³) Cf. also Eur. El. 390 *ἐν τῇ φύσει . . . κὰν εὐνυχία*, Cic. Cluent. 111 *mores eius et arrogantiam*, Rose. Am. 9 *natura pudorque meus*, Quinct. 91 *vestrae naturae bonitatie*.

¹⁴) Cf. Pl. Legg. 782e *οἷστρον . . . καὶ ἀνηκουστίας*, Cic. Cluent. 15 *cupiditate ac furore*, Verr. II 1.91 *morbo et cupiditate*, 2.35 *cupiditates et insanias*, 5.85 *amorem furoremque*.

absurda sunt.” This last comment is mis-quoted in an interesting way by C. F. W. Müller¹⁵) as “quae coniuncta absurda sunt.” What Hermann means is that I.A. 53–4 is a legitimate example of hendiadys because both ἀπειλαὶ ξυνίσταντο and φόνος ξυνίστατο make sense here. This is Housman’s point when he observes,¹⁶) “*mors et Caesar* will never be Latin for *mors Caesaris*. Propertius III 4.9 can write *Crassos clademque piate* because *cladem piate* and *Crassos piate* . . . make sense when separated.” What Hermann and Housman miss, however, is what we may term the “reciprocal” quality of true hendiadys. Thus, Propertius uses the figure in order to avoid subordinating either term to the other. He wishes to say neither *piate Crassos mortuos* nor *piate Crassorum cladem*, but both together. Likewise, Euripides’ phrase conveys simultaneously both “threats of death” and “threatened death.”¹⁷) It is this reciprocal quality that I find, with only a very few exceptions, to be characteristic of hendiadys in Greek. Further examples will be found below in an Appendix. Here it will be appropriate to consider the exceptions and apparent exceptions.

Of the genuine exceptions three obviously belong together: Eur. I.T. 159–60 τάσδε χοᾶς . . . κρατῆρά τε, 168–9 ἔνδος μοι πάγχρυσον τεῦχος καὶ λουβὰν Αἶδα, Ar. Eq. 906 κυλίχνιόν γέ σοι καὶ φάρμακον δίδωμι.¹⁸) I see no reason to deny these the title of hendiadys, but clearly van Leeuwen’s paraphrase of the latter, κυλίχνιον φαρμάκον, is the only one possible. Unless we take refuge again in “epexege-sis”¹⁹) we must, it seems, recognize these as exceptions. At the same time, the fact that the three passages are so similar leads one to believe that some one explanation may yet be discovered to account for them. Aristophanes, who seems particularly fond of hendi-

¹⁵) Above (note 10) 300.

¹⁶) CR 13 (1899) 433.

¹⁷) Similar is Hom. Il. 24.152 μηδέ τί οἱ θάνατος μελέτω φρεσὶ μηδέ τι τάρβος: “fear of death” or “dread death.” It is unclear whether F. Dornseiff (Pindars Stil, Berlin 1921, 26) is fully aware of the implications of his excellent explanation of Pind. Isth. 8.1 Κλεάνδρῳ . . . ἀλικία τε “als sehr gewähltes Ausbiegen statt Κλεάνδρου ἀλικία = dem jungen Kleandros.”

¹⁸) Lobeck (on Soph. Aj. 145) quotes Alexis 142.3 Kock incorrectly and so includes it as an example of hendiadys. The text can be found rightly punctuated and interpreted in Edmonds’ edition.

¹⁹) The word-order of the two passages from Euripides would seem to indicate that “epexege-sis” is inappropriate either for one or for the other, but cf. Aesch. Pers. 112–14, quoted by Fraenkel on Ag. 214f.

dys,²⁰) provides us with another exception: Eq. 1310 *εἴπερ ἐκ πεύκης γε κἀγὼ καὶ ξύλων ἐπηγνόμεν*. Here, however, we may feel more comfortable with “*exegesis*” or with the explanation of *καὶ* linking “*appositionally related ideas*.”²¹) In addition, there are a few expressions that have been labeled “*hendiadys*” by commentators but which, for one reason or another, ought to be excluded.²²) Denniston (above, note 2) 62, for instance, quotes Dem. 18.297 *συστάσεως καὶ κακίας, μᾶλλον δ’ . . . προδοσίας* and translates, “*conspiracy of cowardice, or rather of treachery*.” But this is a fanciful explanation; what we are dealing with here is a three-term *dinosiis*,²³) as at 20.166 *ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν λεγόντων κραυγῆς καὶ βίας καὶ ὀναισχυντίας*. Soph. El. 36 *ἄσκενον . . . ἀσπίδων τε καὶ στρατοῦ* is regularly considered an example of *hendiadys*.²⁴) But it is not necessary to take it thus. Apollo is telling Orestes two separate things: that he should dispense with an army (i.e. to act alone) and that he should dispense with defensive armor (i.e. to act by stealth).

All of the examples of *hendiadys* given by Servius consist of pairs of nouns, but commentators have occasionally sought to broaden the concept and apply it to other classes of words. Eng-

²⁰) This may be caused by the attachment of Aristophanes (and of Old Comedy in general) to what E.S. Spyropoulos labels “*accumulation verbale*”: *L’Accumulation verbale chez Aristophane*, Thessaloniki 1974. We may, therefore, be dealing with a phenomenon that has “*popular*” roots but, outside of Aristophanes, the examples I find are predominately from “*elevated*” authors.

²¹) J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2Oxford 1954, 291. Here also belong (perhaps) Ar. Eq. 811 *πρὸς Ἀθηναίους καὶ τὸν δῆμον* and (with *τε*) Eur. I.A. 1284–5 *Φρυγῶν νότος Ἰθάς τ’ ὄρεα*, although Blaydes considers the former, and England the latter, *hendiadys*. Cf. also Aesch. Eum. 685–6 *Ἀμαζόνων ἔδραν σκηπός θ’*, Pl. Legg. 660e *παιδεία καὶ μουσικῇ* (compare 654a, where the two are identified).

²²) R.G. Ussher, in his commentary (Rome 1978) on Eur. Cycl. 48, strangely applies the term to the phrase *βλαχαὶ τεκέων*, “*your bleating lambs*.” The term also ought not to be used to refer to the joining of synonyms or near-synonyms by “*and*” (as is done by, e.g. C.J. Ruijgh, *Autour de “τε épique”*, Amsterdam 1971, 180, ignoring the warnings of E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* I, Leipzig 1909, 167 n. 1 and Kühner-Stegmann [above, note 1] 578), which is a form of *pleonasm*, whereas in fact *hendiadys*, despite its name, is a form of *compression*.

²³) For the term, see Quint. 6.2.24.

²⁴) Thus the commentaries of Jebb, Bayfield, Schneidewin-Nauck, Kamerbeek and Campbell. El. 36 is one of only three examples of *hendiadys* given by Smyth (above, note 2). The expression is imitated by Cicero, *Caecin.* 93 *sine armis ac multitudine*.

land, for example, in his note on Pl. Legg. 875a5 as well as Adam on Rep. 429e and 558a use the word ‘hendiadys’ to refer to pairs of adjectives. Denniston (above, note 2) 63 does the same, and adds pairs of adverbs. These three scholars confine themselves to identifying the phrase in question as an example of hendiadys and, in the case of Denniston, to providing an English translation. If they had attempted, however, to give a paraphrase in Greek, they would have recognized that they were not in this case dealing with a grammatical “figure.”²⁵) For adverbs are not normally used in Greek to modify adjectives or other adverbs.²⁶) Thus, γελοίως ἐκπλντα and ἐπαχθῶς πολὺς (to say nothing of παραδόξως φιλανθρώπως) are not even Greek. When we consider pairs of verbs, however, we find that we can discern the same “reciprocal” relationship that we identified above as characteristic of nominal hendiadys. For example, van Leeuwen comments on Ar. Lys. 556 (ἀγοράζοντας καὶ μαινομένους), “Participia ἐν διὰ δυοῖν efficiunt, proprie enim alterum ab altero erat suspendendum; μαινονται ξὺν δπλοις ἀγοράζοντες.” Interestingly, when the same scholar refers to this expression in his note on Thesm. 795 (also identified as hendiadys), he paraphrases “ἀγοράζοντες διὰ τὴν μανίαν.” Similarly, the sixteen examples of verbal hendiadys that Denniston (above, note 2) 63 quotes can all be paraphrased in such a way that *either* verb can be made to depend on the other. For instance, Dem. 8.64 ἔχει καὶ ὁμολογεῖ (“avowedly possesses,” Denniston) represents both ἔχειν ὁμολογεῖ and ὁμολογῶν ἔχει; 9.61 ἐσίγα καὶ κατεπέπληκτο (“was cowed into silence”) both καταπεπληγμένος ἐσίγα and κατεπέπληκτο ὥστε σιγᾶν; Aeschin. 1.193 δεῦρο ἀναβῆ καὶ ἀναισχυντῇ (“has the effrontery to come forward”) both ἀναισχυντῇ ἀναβαίνων and ἀναισχυντῶν ἀναβῆ. The same is true of Pl. Rep. 351c τόδε μοι χάρισαι καὶ λέγε (= χαριζόμενος λέγε and

²⁵) All three were enviably sensitive to Greek idiom, as a result of their education in a British system that emphasized prose composition. Denys Page, in his biography of Denniston for the DNB, says of the latter that he “has probably never been surpassed in the art of rendering English prose into classical Greek.” His English translations (Aeschin. 2.40 παραδόξως καὶ φιλανθρώπως “in a surprisingly friendly way,” 2.41 πολὺς ἢ τοῖς ἐπαίνοις καὶ ἐπαχθῆς “fulsomely lavish in his compliments,” Dem. 59.107 οὕτως αἰσχρῶς καὶ ὀλιγώρως “with such disgraceful unconcern”) are exactly right, but Greek has no other way of expressing “in a surprisingly friendly way,” etc.

²⁶) G. Kaibel, *Philodemi Gadarensis epigrammata*, Greifswald 1885, xv. There are exceptions, of course, like οὕτως, μάλα, κάρτα, etc. and, among adverbs in -ως formed from adjectives, e.g., ἀληθῶς.

χάρισαι λέγων), cited by Wackernagel²⁷⁾, who refers to parallel examples of verbal hendiadys in German, Latin, English and Scandinavian languages.²⁸⁾ Wackernagel regards this construction as colloquial, but it may be useful to distinguish between “*sei so gut und komme*,” “*ibo et cognoscam*,” and “come and get it” on the one hand, and the more developed examples of verbal hendiadys cited by Denniston from “elevated” Greek authors on the other. The former are, indeed, colloquial, and are characteristic of a tendency to prefer parataxis to hypotaxis in “popular” speech.²⁹⁾ But the latter, like our examples of nominal hendiadys, arise out of a more sophisticated stylistic impulse, and they attempt to convey simultaneously the immediacy of co-ordination and the logical precision of subordination.

Appendix: Some Further Examples of Hendiadys

Hom. Il. 1.492 (also 6.328, 14.37, 96, 16.63) ἀντήν τε πτόλεμόν τε; cf. 5.732 ξριδος καὶ ἀντῆς, 12.35 μάχη ἐνοπή τε, 4.15 (also 82) πόλεμόν τε κακὸν καὶ φύλοπιν αἰνήν, Ar. Pax 991 μάχας καὶ κορκορυγὰς = “the din of battle” and “the noisy battle”

Od. 11.202–3 σὸς τε πόθος σά τε μήδεα . . . σή τ’ ἀγανοφροσύνη = πόθος σῶν μηχανῶν and σὰ ποθεινὰ μήδεα

Pind. Nem. 7.73 αἰχένα καὶ σθένος (see Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, Berlin 1921, 26–7) = σθένος αἰχένος and αἰχένα σθένοντα

Aesch. Eum. 694 κακαῖς ἐπιρροαῖσι βορβόρῳ θ’ = ἐπιρροαῖσι βορβόρον and βορβόρῳ ἐπιρρέοντι

Eum. 840 (= 873) μένος <θ’> ἅπαντά τε κότον = μένος κότον (cf. 832, Choe. 183–4) and κότον μαινόμενον

P. V. 525 δεσμούςς ἀεικεῖς καὶ δῦας ἐκφυγγάνω = δεσμῶν δῦας and δεσμούςς δνηπάθους (cf. 513, h. Hom. Merc. 486)

Soph. Aj. 145 βοτὰ καὶ λείαν = βοτὰ δορλίηπτα (Jebb) and βοτείαν λείαν

²⁷⁾ Vorlesungen über Syntax I, Basel 1920, 62–3. But he is wrong to prefer the reading *πειρασόμεθα* at Phlb. 13c, for the idea of “attempting” is irrelevant to the context.

²⁸⁾ With bibliography. Verbal hendiadys is also a conspicuous feature of Hebrew and Aramaic: Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*, ²⁸Leipzig 1909, § 120.2a.

²⁹⁾ S. Trenkner, *Le style καὶ dans le récit attique oral*, Brussels 1948.

Phil. 1450 *καιρός και πλοῦς* = *καίριος πλοῦς* (Blaydes) and *καιρός ὁδοῦ*;³⁰) cf. Dem. 59.3 *καιροῦ τοιούτου και πολέμου*

fr. 210.70 Radt *ἀμφὶ πλευραῖς και σφαγαῖσι* = “his wounded side” (Pearson) and “the wound in his side”

Thuc. 6.28.1 *μετὰ παιδιᾶς και οἴνου*

Eur. Hel. 1108 *μουσεῖα και θάκους*; cf. P. V. 909–10 *ἐκ τυραννίδος θρόνων τ’*

Ion 1216 *τόλμας Κρεούσης πάματός τε μηχανάς*; cf. Xen. Hell. 7.2.8 *ἐπ’ αὐτῶν τῇ τόλμῃ τε και μάχῃ* = “by the courage of their fighting” (Denniston) and “by their courageous fighting”

I. T. 1331–2 *φλόγα . . . και καθαυμὸν*

Med. 218 *δύσκειαν ἐκτῆσαντο και ῥαθυμίαν*; cf. Ion 600 *γέλωτ’ . . . μωρίαν τε λήφομαι*, Tro. 1035 *ψόγον τὸ θῆλόν τ’*, Dem. 19.220 *τὴν ἄρὰν και τὴν ἐπιорκίαν*, 22.31 *ὄνειδῶν και κακῶν*

Phoen. 365 *σπονδαί τε και σὴ πίστις*³¹)

Hel. 226 *ἐν ἀλὶ κύμασί τε*; cf. Theocr. 7.57 *τὰ κύματα τάν τε θάλασσαν*, 11.49 *θάλασσαν . . . και* (Ahrens: ἢ codd.) *κύμαθ’*

Ar. Nub. 13 *ὑπὸ τῆς δαπάνης και τῆς φάτνης και τῶν χρεῶν*

Eq. 803 *ὑπὸ τοῦ πολέμου και τῆς δμίχλης* (cf. Hom. Il. 17.243)

Aves 1182 *ῥύμη τε και περοῖσι και ῥοιζήμασιν* (cf. Pax 86, Soph. Ant. 1004); cf. Nub. 382 *περὶ τοῦ πατάγου και τῆς βροντῆς*, 407 *ὑπὸ τοῦ ῥοίβδου και τῆς ῥύμης*³²)

Pl. Legg. 646c *γυμνάσια και πόνοιν*

647d *ἡδοναῖς και ἐπιθυμίαις*³³)

649d *βασάνον και παιδιᾶς*

676a *χρόνον μήκους τε και ἀπειρίας*

798c *σπουδὴν και βλάβην*

Dem. 2.20 *τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης και κακοδαιμονίας*

19.77 *εἰς χρόνους και πόλεμον και τριβὴν*; cf. 123 *χρόνῳ και πολιορκίᾳ*

19.198 *ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ και τοῦ πράγματος*

³⁰) The hendiadys here perhaps eases the difficulty of γὰρ in sixth position in its sentence.

³¹) That the poet thinks of this expression as representing a single concept is clear from ἐν 364 and ἡ 365.

³²) Cf. V. Aen. 12.869 *stridorem agnovit et alas*.

³³) This phrase is a favorite of Plato’s, especially in the Laws. Elsewhere, however, the “reciprocal” force is missing, and I am reluctant to regard the following as hendiadys: Legg. 643c, 714a, 782e, 802c, 864b, 886a, Rep. 328d, Symp. 196c (*bis*).