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 Ὄτι-/ὥς- 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, Schwyzzer and Gildersleeve.² I cannot account for this omission in __________


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. Schwyzzer, Gr. Gramm. IV: Stellenregister, Munich 1971; P. Stork, Index of Passages Cited, in: B.L. Gildersleeve, Syntax of Classical Greek, Groningen 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. Keesels, 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 82–3, but these discussions are very limited, and the fullest treatment is still that of Lobeck, in his note on Soph. Aj. 143. Grammars of
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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 δύο φωνῶν, 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. Lagererantz, ZNW 31 [1932] 87) or is of Semitic origin (e.g. Zerwick, Biblical Greek, Rome 1963, §§ 453 and 460).

3) B.L. Gildersleeve, Pinder: 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, *London 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.


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. 4) 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. év õiav õov, ul 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

4) See, e.g., the notes on Aen. 1.61 and 7.15. The Oxford English Dictionary quotes the form "hendiadis" in English already in 1886.

7) See J.F. Mountford and J.T. Schultz, Index rerum et nominum in scholiis Servii et Aselli Donati tractatorum, Ithaca 1930, a.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.

9) 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 has given his definition of hendiadys: "*cum una res in duas dividatur, metri causa interposita cominuenta.*"
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 δόσον ... Ὠμβλίνον τε πώματος and Phoen. 1677 σίδηρος ὄρυκόν τε μοι ξίφος, which look similar, are really instances of epexegesis.11) Another passage which looks like a parallel to *pateris et auro* is particularly instructive: Soph. O. T. 470 πυρὶ καὶ στερωπὰς. 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 ("= κεραυνὸς πυρὶ") and M. L. Earle: "πυρὶ καὶ στερωπὰς is an hendiadys, στερωπὰς 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 *κεραυνὸς πυρὶ* (cf. Eur. Tro. 80) and *πυρὸδει ἀστεροφη* (cf. Ar. Aves 1746).

Let us look at some further examples. In their notes on Soph. Trach. 764 (κόσμῳ τε χαίδων 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 *et dyia doin* 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 epexegesis is Eur. Suppl. 980–1 θαλάς ... τεῦμβον τε ἵππον, which Collard, however, considers hendiadys. For this use of *τε* in epexegesis 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 βαδίσει καὶ τῷ τάχει as follows: τῷ τάχει τῆς βαδίσεως. But τῇ ταχεῖα βαδίσει makes equally good sense in the context. Does A. Eum. 247 πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σταλαγμῶν mean “the dripping of the blood” or “the dripping blood”? Is Dem. 19.314 καὶ κλόνων καὶ μανίαν best paraphrased κλόνων μανίας (cf. Eur. I. T. 307, A. Choe. 183) or μανίαν κυμαίνοντα? Are we to take Eur. I. A. 354 Ὑμα σύγχυσιν τ’ as equivalent to σύγχυσιν ὑμάματον (cf. 1128, A. P. 5.130.2 = 2489 Gow-Page) or ὑμα συγκυκμενὸν? 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 τῶν τρόπων καὶ τῆς ἀσέλγειας καὶ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας, Thuc. 6.87.3 τῆς ἠμετέρας πολυπρεγμοσινης καὶ τρόπων, Pl. Symp. 219d τὴν τοῦτον φόνον τε καὶ συφροσύνην καὶ ἄνδρεαν. 13) Denniston translates the first “unbridled character” and, given the context in which he quotes it, presumably considers the last to represent τὴν σύφροσυνα καὶ ἀνδρεάς φόνων. 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 τὴν μανίαν καὶ πολυτέλειαν and Pl. Symp. 213d τὴν τοῦτον μανίαν τε καὶ φιλεραιτίαν. 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. 63–4 δεινα δ’ ἄσελα καὶ . . . φόνος ξυνίστανθ’ an example of hendiadys, but rejects the view that it is equivalent to ἄσελα φόνον: “Est hoc exemplum in iis, ex quibus illi, qui ista figura abuti amant, cogno scre poterunt, quid sit quod recte ἐν διὰ δυνών appellatur. Habet enim locum in iis, quae et conuncta et disuncta cogitari possunt, non in illis, quae disuncta

13) Cf. also Eur. El. 390 ἐν τῇ φόνοι . . . καὶ σύφροσις, Cic. Cluent. 111 mortes eius et arrogantis, Rosc. Am. 9 natura rudorque meus, Quinct. 91 vestrae naturae bontatique.

14) Cf. Pl. Legg. 782e αὕρετον . . . καὶ ἀγκρυστάς, Cic. Cluent. 15 cupiditate ae fururo, Vorr. Π 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. Müller as “quae coniuncta absurda sunt.” What Hermann means is that I.A. 53–4 is a legitimate example of hendiadys because both ἀπειλῇ ἔνιστατο and φύος ἔνιστατο make sense here. This is Housman’s point when he observes, “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.” 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 τάσσε χοᾶς . . . ἡφατηρά τε, 168–9 ἐνδος μου πάγχωνον τέχος καὶ λοιβάν Άιδα, Ar. Eq. 906 καλίγνων γε σοι καὶ φάραμοιν δόλῳμ. I see no reason to deny these the title of hendiadys, but clearly van Leeuwen’s paraphrase of the latter, καλίγνων φαμίλαν, is the only one possible. Unless we take refuge again in “epexege-sis” 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 hendia-

15) Above (note 10) 300.
16) OR 13 (1890) 433.
17) Similar is Hom. II. 24.152 μηδὲ τί οἱ θάνατος μελέτω φρεσμι μηδὲ τί τάραδος: “fear of death” or “dread death.” It is unclear whether F. Dornseiff (Fauls Stil, Berlin 1921, 26) is fully aware of the implications of his excellent explanation of Pind. Isth. 8.1 Κλεάνδρο . . . ἀληθα τε “als sehr gewähltes Ausbriogen statt Κλεάνδρον ἀληθα = dem jungen Klea

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 “epexegeesis” is inappropriate either for one or for the other, but cf. Aesch. Pers. 112–14, quoted by Fraenkel on Ag. 214f.
provides us with another exception: Eq. 1310 εἰσερ ἐκ πείνης ἑκ θάμω καὶ ξύλων ἐπηγυμν. Here, however, we may feel more comfortable with “epexegesis” or with the explanation of καὶ linking “appositionally related ideas.” 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. Denniston (above, note 2) 62, for instance, quotes Dem. 18.297 συστάσεως καὶ κατασ., μᾶλλον δ’, . . . παραδούς 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 δίνοσις, as at 20.166 ὅπω τῆς τῶν λεγόντων κρανῆς καὶ βλας καὶ ὀνασκυνῆς. Soph. El. 36 ἄσμενων . . . ἀπάνων τε καὶ στρατοῦ is regularly considered an example of hendiadys. 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 hendiydys 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, Oxford 1954, 291. Here also belong (perhaps) Ar. Eq. 811 πρὸς Ἀδριάνον καὶ τῶν ὧν δήμον and (with τε) Eur. I.A. 1284–5 Φυγὼν νότος Ἰδαῖς καὶ ὀρεα, although Blaydes considers the former, and England the latter, hendiadys. Cf. also Aesch. Eum. 685–6 Ἀμαξίων ἔθαν σκηνας θ’, Pl. Legg. 660e παιδεία καὶ μονοψυκός (conpare 654a, where the two are identified).

22) R.G. Unsworth, in his commentary (Rome 1978) on Eur. Cycl. 48, strangely applies the term to the phrase βλαχαῖ 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 do “τε épique,” Amsterdam 1971, 180, ignoring the warnings of E. Norden, Die antike Kunstprosa I, Leipzig 1909, 167 n. 1 and Kühner-Stagmann [above, note 1] 578), which is a form of pleonasms, 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, Schmidsenin - Nauck, Kueverbeek and Campbell. El. 36 is one of only three examples of hendiydys given by Smyth (above, note 2). The expression is imitated by Cicero, Caecein. 93 sine armis ac multitudine.
land, for example, in his note on Pl. Legg. 875a.5 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.” 24) For adverbs are not normally used in Greek to modify adjectives or other adverbs.24) Thus, γελώντως ἐκλύναται καὶ ἐπαρθῶς πολὺς (to say nothing of παραθύρως φιλανθρόπως) 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 μανωμόντας), “Participia έν δiα ιυπόν εficient, propriie enim alterum ab altero erat suspendendum; μανωμόταi έν τόις ἀγοράζοντας.” Interestingly, when the same scholar refers to this expression in his note on Thesm. 795 (also identified as hendiadys), he paraphrases “ἀγοράζοντες διά τήν 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 έχει καὶ ὁμολογεὶ (“avowedly possesses,” Denniston) represents both έχειν ὁμολογεῖ and ὁμολογείν έχει; 9.61 έστικα καὶ κατεπέληκτο (“was cowed into silence”) both κατεπέληκτος ἢστικα καὶ κατεπέληκτο ὧστε σιγῶν; Aeschin. 1.193 δόξο τόποι ἀναβή καὶ ἀνασχυτή (“has the effrontery to come forward”) both ἀνασχυτήν ἀναβάντων καὶ ἀνασχυτήν ἀναβή. The same is true of Pl. Rep. 351c τόδε μοι χάμεσαι καὶ λέγε (= χαράζομενος λέγε and

24) 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 surpased in the art of rendering English prose into classical Greek.” His English translations (Aeschin. 2.40 παραθύρως καὶ φιλανθρόπως “in a surprisingly friendly way,” 2.41 πολύς ἤ τοίς ἐπαρθὼς καὶ ἐπαρθής “falsely lavish in his compliments,” Dem. 59.107 οὕτως ἀλαχάς καὶ ἀλληλός “with such disgraceful unconcern”) are exactly right, but Greek has no other way of expressing “in a surprisingly friendly way,” etc.

25) G. Kaibel, Philodemi Gadarensis epigrammata, Greifswald 1885, xv. There are exceptions, of course, like οὕτως, μιλῶ, μάγια, etc. and, among adverbs in -ός formed from adjectives, e.g., ἀληθῶς.
χάμαι λέγον), cited by Wackernagel\textsuperscript{27}), who refers to parallel examples of verbal hendiadys in German, Latin, English and Scandinavian languages.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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. II. 1.492 (also 6.328, 14.37, 96, 16.63) αὐτήν τε πτόλεμόν τε; cf. 5.732 ἑρωδο καὶ ἄντις, 12.35 μάχη ἔνοπλη τε, 4.15 (also 82) πάλιν τε κακόν καὶ φύλοιν αὐλήν, Ar. Pax 991 μάχας καὶ κορκοφυγὰς = “the din of battle” and “the noisy battle”

Od. 11.202–3 σὸς τε πόθος σὰ τε μὴδεα . . . σῇ τε ἀγανορφοσύνη = πόθος σῶν μηχανῶν καὶ σὰ ποθεῖνα μὴδεα

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

Aesch. Eum. 694 κακαίς ἐπιμυραίοις βοβρῷφοι θῦ = ἐπιμυραίοι βοβρῷφοι ἐπιμυράντω

Eum. 840 (= 873) μένος (θῦ) ἄπαντα τε κόστον = μένος κόστον (cf. 832, Choe. 183–4) and κόστον μαινόμενον

P. V. 525 δεσμώς ἀπεικονισμένος καὶ δύσα ἐκφραγμάνω = δεσμῶν δύας καὶ δεσμώς ὀνταθάνους (cf. 513, H. Hom. Merc. 480)

Soph. Aj. 145 βοτά καὶ λελαν = βοτὰ δογλήττα (Jebb) et βοταλαν λελαν

\textsuperscript{26) Vorlesungen über Syntax I, Basel 1920, 62–3. But he is wrong to prefer the reading πειρασμένα at Philh. 13c. for the idea of “attempting” is irrelevant to the context.}

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

\textsuperscript{29) S. Trenkner, Le style καὶ dans le récit attique oral, Brussels 1948.
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Phil. 1450 καιρὸς καὶ πλοῖος = καίριος πλοῖος (Blaydes) and καιρὸς ὁδός; cf. Dem. 59.3 καιροῦ τουστοῦ καὶ πολέμου
fr. 210.70 Rsdt ἄμφι πλευράς καὶ σφαγαίας = “his wounded side” (Pearson) and “the wound in his side”
Thuc. 6.28.1 μετὰ παιδᾶς καὶ οἰνοῦ
Eur. Hel. 1108 μονοείδια καὶ θάκοντα; cf. P. V. 909–10 ἐκ τυφανόδος θρόνων τ’
Ion 1216 τόλμας Κρεούσης πάματος τε μηχανᾶς; cf. Xeu. Hell. 7.2.8 ὑπ’ αὐτῶν τῇ τόλμῃ τε καὶ μάχῃ = “by the courage of their fighting” (Denniston) and “by their courageous fighting”
I. T. 1331–2 φλόγα . . . καὶ καθαρόν
Med. 218 δύσκλειαν ἐκτίσθαι τε καὶ ἐφεύμη; cf. Ion 600 γέλων . . . μοιρὰν τε λήψαι τε, Tro. 1035 ψέγον τὸ θῆλο τ’, Dem. 19.220 τὴν ἄραι καὶ τὴν ἐπορκίαν, 22.31 ἀνειδῶν καὶ κακῶν
Phoen. 365 ὑπονοαί τε καὶ σῇ πίστις
Hel. 226 ἐν ἀλλ’ κόμασι τε; cf. Theocr. 7.57 τὰ κόματα τὰν τε θάλασ-
σαιν, 11.49 χάλασαι . . . καὶ (Ahrens: ἦ codd.) κύμαθ’
Ar. Nub. 13 ὑπὸ τῆς δαπάνης καὶ τῆς φάτνης καὶ τῶν χρεῶν
Eq. 803 ὑπὸ τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τῆς δρικῆς (cf. Hom. II. 17.243)
Aves 1182 ὤμη τε καὶ απερίσκοι καὶ ὑπογίμαιαν (cf. Pax 86, Soph.
Ant. 1004); cf. Nub. 382 περὶ τοῦ πατάγου καὶ τῆς βροντῆς, 407 ὑπὸ τοῦ φοίβου καὶ τῆς ἔνθης
Pl. Legg. 646c γυμνᾶσα καὶ πόνονς
647d ᾱδοναῖς καὶ ἐπιθυμιαῖς
649d βασάνοι καὶ παιδᾶς
676a χρόνον μῆκος τε καὶ ἀπειρίας
798c ὑπονόην καὶ βλάβην
Dem. 2.20 τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης καὶ κακοδαμονίας
19.77 εἰς χρόνους καὶ πόλεμου καὶ τριβήν; cf. 123 χρόνων καὶ πολυορκίᾳ
19.198 ὑπὸ τοῦ κακών καὶ τοῦ πράγματος

30) The hendiadys here perhaps eases the difficulty of γῳρ in sixth position in its sentence.
31) That the poet thinks of this expression as representing a single concept is clear from ὑπὸ τῶν 364 and ἦ 365.
32) Cf. V. Δον. 12.80 ἐκτίθεμεν αὐγονεῖτο αἰθαί.
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. 943c, 714a, 782e, 802c, 864b, 886a, Rep. 328d, Symp. 196c (bis).