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## INTRODUCTION.

The subject here considered has naturally received limited attention in the Greek Grammars. Kühner ${ }^{1}$ refers to the more important uses of the poetic plural as follows: "Die Dichter gebrauchen den Plural oft um den Ausdruck zu amplifizieren (Pluralis Maiestaticus)," adding such words as $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a, \theta \rho o ́ v o l$,

Brugmann ${ }^{2}$ briefly mentions the matter, saying: "Der Plural, um das Komplizierte der Erscheinungsform einer Sache anzudeuten, findet sich besonders bei Ausdrücken für Massiges wie кр́́ $\alpha$, аїата. . . . ., für Geräte und Baulichkeiten, wie тóka, äp $\rho a \tau a$, סஸ́para. . . . ., für Örtlichkeiten wie ảkтaí, ク̉ióves. . . . ., für Körperteile wie $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{\omega} \pi \alpha \tau \alpha, \nu \hat{\omega ิ \tau a, ~} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\theta} \theta$. . . . ., für Veranstaltungen, wie $\gamma$ áभои, тафаí, тáфot. . . . Zwischen diesem Gebrauch des Plurals und dem des zugehörigen Singulars wurde ein Unterschied empfunden, der die Dichter, namentlich die Tragiker,
 zugen und sie auch da zu verwenden, wo man sich in der gewöhnlichen Umgangssprache des Singulars bediente (sog. Pluralis maiestaticus): z. B. $\mu$ úxaı $\rho a u$, $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a, \theta \rho o ́ v o . "$

Gildersleeve ${ }^{3}$ under the head of "Pluralis Maiestatis " classifies
 idea of fulness."

But Sasse' has chosen to employ the term in reference to the pronoun "nos" as found in imperial edicts, in the utterances of those in authority. So too the expression is employed by Gerber ${ }^{5}$, Volp ${ }^{6}$, Draeger ${ }^{7}$, Buttmann ${ }^{8}$ and others. There is certainly no uniformity in its use either in general works or commentaries. Apparently it does not occur in all Classical Latin literature, but was a late invention of some Jewish Bible com-

[^0]mentator ${ }^{1}$ who desired a special term for the Hebraic plurals elōhīm, adōnīm (God, Lord), the plural being so used by the Hebrews out of reverence for the Deity ${ }^{2}$, as was thought.

Ember", however, ignores the " Pluralis Maiestatis," choosing instead "Pluralis Intensivus" to designate a wide class of Hebraic plurals.

As will appear later, such an appellation can hardly express
 brace such uses as those referred to by the Pseudo-Longinus (below), together with the various ones so classified by grammarians and commentators.

In the interest of clearness, the term should be limited at least to ( 1 ) the first person plural pronoun as employed by dignitaries ; (2) plurals used in reference to a royal personage, ${ }^{4}$ as $e . g . \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ \tau \alpha \ell$, ки́pıot, кoípavoı; and (3) plurals of royal appurtenances, as $\theta$ póvot, $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a$. But inasmuch as there is a 'Pluralis Modestiae"' in both Greek and Latin which is applied to the plural pronoun when used for the sake of modesty, a similar restriction of the "Pluralis Maiestatis' ' is likewise desirable. In this way confusion is entirely avoided, and the term finds its most appropriate application.

As for the plural nouns referring to but one person, the term Allusive is a fitting general term, which will include what we shall here call the plural of Respect (e.g. $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi$ ótaı), of Relationship (e.g. oi тєкóvтєs, тє́кva, oi фídoı) and of Reserve (e.g. oi фoveîs, oi кãà $\gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s})$.

The plural of other nouns, whether concrete or abstract, often carries with it the idea of ${ }^{\circ} \gamma \kappa о$, fulness ; it has a poetic force and mission.

[^1]Aristotle is the first, so far as is known, to call at-




## 入ıлévas єis 'A ұaïкoús:

каì

## 

The latter passage should be eliminated at once from consideration. Hermann and Paley, whom Cope ${ }^{4}$ quotes approvingly, observe that Aristotle mistook Euripides' meaning: for the epithet $\pi$ odvévipot shows that the plural means the several layers of the tablets and only in case the poet had written סénro九 would he have taken the liberty Aristotle ascribed to him. Strikingly enough the plural of the same word is used referring to the same $\delta$ éd $\lambda$ os in the same tragedy, verse 787 :

In this plural there is ô $\gamma к о$; so also in the former phrase, where the plural affords a harbor with widening and picturesque prospect.

The Pseudo-Longinus, ${ }^{5}$ also, touches upon the rhetorical value of certain plurals as follows :



${ }^{1}$ Chapter III, §6.
${ }^{2}$ Eurip. Frag. Adesp. 83.
${ }^{3}$ I T. 727.
${ }^{4}$ Aristotle, Vol. III, p. 67, Cambridge, 1897.
${ }^{5}$ Hepl ífous, chapter XXIII.
${ }^{6}$ O T. 1403-1408.


In the same connection the rhetorician alludes to

and to a similar use of the plural in Plato. ${ }^{2}$
Now, merely to say that Greek Tragedy employs the plural for the sake of ö $\gamma к о$ seems entirely inadequate ; it would be unjust to Aristotle's meaning and to all the principles involved; for $\lambda \iota \mu$ éves is not a parallel case to (e.g.) кv́pıot, фóvol. Aristotle obviously did not have the following passage in mind :
iva $\tau \varepsilon$ סópata $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu$ оve סáïa


where if one harbor alone is meant oै óкos and $\sigma \tau \epsilon v o \pi$ ópot $\sigma \boldsymbol{v}$ would be contradictory. Here, as often in Euripides, the plural seems conventional ${ }^{4}$; and it may be said that metre alone often directs Enallage. ${ }^{5}$

As Aristotle, so the Psethdo-Longinus had in mind a particular class of words, such as $\gamma$ árou above mentioned; their passing comments, meant to be neither general nor universal, should not be pressed too far. The latter does not fail to see that the plural often serves a poetic, a dramatic purpose ; and that the reverse process may have the same object: "In each case the ornamental effect is the same; the unexpected change from singular to plural is a mark of emotion." ${ }^{6}$

So far as I am aware, antiquity presents no further literature on the subject ; neither has a part of the plural uses been

[^2]treated for all Tragedy nor have all the uses been treated for a part of Tragedy. ${ }^{1}$

Consequently it has seemed worth while to investigate with a fair degree of completeness the representative uses of the poetic plural. It abounds in Greek Tragedy and is in fact a marked characteristic there. Is it a creation of Tragedy? Or did it receive impulses from earlier sources?

Homer is not only a great fountain source of subject matter for Greek poetry, but traces of Homeric influence in forms and diction are more far-reaching than one might suspect. This influence is clearly shown in Chapter I, where so many uses of the plural for the singular seem to be nothing more than Homeric reminiscences. The same causes that produced analogous formations there, operated in Tragedy to effect plural uses of words which were foreign to Homer. And so it is the purpose of this dissertation to trace out in Homer, so far as they occur, the uses of the poetic plural as found in Tragedy, and to show the energetic progression of the plural tendency in the latter-from Aeschylus to Euripides.

This purpose affords an opportunity in the case of nouns referring to natural objects and of abstract nouns to investigate the pluralia tantum of Homer and other words whose plural occurs for the singular there, insofar as they appear in, or influence, the forms of Tragedy; to show the influence of analogy in the transition of kindred words fromsingular to plural ; to see where the plural presents a fuller concept ${ }^{2}$ or even a different one, and where the plural is expressive of poetic feeling ${ }^{3}$; to show that metrical convenience has exercised an important influence for the plural in Tragedy, as also in Homer ; and that in some cases the plural is hardly more than a mere convention-especially to Euripides.

[^3]As for the plural pronouns of the first person, the same uses occur in Homer as in Tragedy-rare in the former, but in the latter common and often serving a dramatic purpose.

The poetic plural alluding to one individual-Chapter III-is of rather frequent occurrence, but aside from a so-called "generalizing plural," common to the prose and verse of many languages, its use falls within lines pretty well defined. In not a few instances where the plural occurs, only one person can be thought of ; in such cases at least the Allusive Plural is apparently confined to Tragedy. As will be seen, it serves a purpose not only poetic but at times peculiarly dramatic.

The term Poetic Plural is here used not merely of plurals confined to poetry, -though such is usually the case, -for that would exclude much that occurs in the poetic diction of Plato or Isocrates. The word Oávaros stands in prose for the death of one or many, but Plato has the plural in the following passage ${ }^{1}$ :



Isocrates encroaches much on the field of poetry, especially in the use of abstract nouns in the plural for the sake of avoiding hiatus. ${ }^{3}$

Again, such a restriction would' preclude a $\quad$ ov̀s $\pi a i \hat{\delta}{ }^{\prime}$ s when it refers to but one child, for Lysias ${ }^{4}$ so uses it. Such plurals of singular meaning took their origin, no doubt, in legal phraseology, as will be seen in Chapter III. They, like the Plurals of Modesty and Majesty, are often utilized in Tragedy for a distinct purpose-they have a mission there. The Poetic Plural, ${ }^{5}$ then, will apply here to plurals for which one would

[^4]more naturally expect the singular in ordinary Attic prose, such as serve a poetic or dramatic purpose or both.

The special works pertaining to the subject should receive particular mention. For the study of the Homeric plural the thesis of Juhl ${ }^{1}$ is singularly incomplete for our purpose, touching as it does only a comparatively few words, as well as ignoring metre and other important considerations. His work has therefore been of little value ; and it has been necessary to resort to the Homeric text, through Gehring's Index and Ebeling's Lexicon, for the information desired.

Volp ${ }^{2}$, for Aeschylus and Sophocles, and Kummerer, ${ }^{3}$ for Sophocles and Euripides, provide excellent material for comparison. The former has been useful in the brief treatment of pronouns, and of nouns referring to persons. The latter includes only abstract nouns and those pertaining to natural objects. Neither deals with the rhetorical or dramatic value of the plural, nor does either take into account the question of metre. Again, their studies have no proper perspective in that Homeric usage does not appear in the background.

It would be entirely without the scope of this dissertation to take into consideration the admirable work of J. Schmidt ${ }^{4}$ on the Indo-European neuter. He regards the neuter plural (in $-a$ ) of the descendant languages as originally singular and feminine. ${ }^{5}$ But Greek Tragedy is dependent largely on Homer ; and we are concerned merely with what is found there. Even if Schmidt's thesis be accepted, the frequent occurrence of the

[^5]plural adjectives along with such Indo-European feminines shows that in Homer's time the singular notion was lost or faint. ${ }^{1}$ Brugmann ${ }^{2}$ speaks approvingly of Schmidt's theory.

It remains to mention the recent work of Witte, ${ }^{3}$ which did not reach my hand till the material had been gathered and independent conclusions reached as to the influence of metre ("Verszwang") upon the shifting of number in poetry. He treats in detail the operation of this influence in Homer (to which the work is chiefly devoted) and also offers valuable studies for Tragedy, to some of which reference is made at the proper place. ${ }^{4}$ His work, however, applies only to Chapter I of this dissertation.

[^6]
## CHAPTERI.

## PART ONE.

## NATURAL OBJECTS.

A.

## Extent and Mass Group, Indefinite.

Mention is here made of a large class of nouns whose plural gives a sense of indefiniteriess, vagueness-suggesting usually the parts that go to make up the whole.
I.

PLACE, QUARTER, REGION, SHORE, GROVE, THICKET.
(a) Place, region.

The most frequent Homeric words are ${ }^{\circ} \chi \chi a \iota$, $\mathfrak{\eta}$ óves (Attic
 in general of Homeric influence :

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \chi \theta$ au | 3 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | - | 1 |
| ク̉óves | 6 | 6 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| ákтаі́ | 14 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 5 | 15 | 25 |
| 入ıpéves | 25 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 5 |

(1). ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{x} \boldsymbol{\chi} \theta a \mathrm{c}^{1}$.



In the latter case the word probably appears in an original meaning-" hills," ${ }^{\prime 2}$ and therefore is not dualistic in origin.

[^7]
## 

The lone plural use in Sophocles ${ }^{3}$ is probably a true one. In view of the quotation from Aristotle'-- $\lambda \iota \mu$ '́vas $\epsilon$ is 'Aхаїкоv́s-note the appearance of the word in $\Psi 745$ : (For ingenious Phoenicians. wrought the cup, brought it over the sea),

of but one harbor. In such an isolated verse, the long form of the dative was obviously convenient for the poet, while at the same time the plural involves the poetic (ö $\gamma$ коs) notion. ${ }^{6}$

A large number of words poetically employed in the plural and to be explained as analogous to the above are found in Tragedy, though not in Homer. ${ }^{7}$

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
|  | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | I | 2 |
| aijuadoí | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | I | 1 |
|  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ко́入тоє | 14 | $\mathrm{I}^{8}$ | 4 | I | I | I | 0 | 6 |


 (6). aij ${ }^{1} a \lambda o i^{11}{ }^{11}$

[^8](7). ${ }_{\rho}^{\rho} \eta \gamma \mu \mathrm{ives}$. Note the lone use in Tragedy, I T. 253:

(8). ко́лтоь.

In Homer the plural is used of one bosom in I 570 ; but the plural in the sense of gulf, $\epsilon 5^{2}$, is a true one, as also in Pers. 539.
 the bay of Eleusis.

Euripides has only the plural. ${ }^{1}$
(9). $\mu v \chi^{o i^{2}}$ presents interesting poetic variations:




|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| (10) то́тоィ | - | - | 8 | 12 | 12 | II | 3 | 4 |
| (ii) $\chi^{\hat{\omega}}$ ¢ot ${ }^{4}$ | 33 | 0 | 4 | I | 15 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| (12) $\delta \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \delta a^{\text {b }}$ | 10 | - | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | - | - | 5 | 7 |
| (13) $\pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\prime} i^{6}$ | 115 | $1^{7}$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 19 |

(14). тáyoı. ${ }^{8}$

[^9]To be compared are such as the following :
 and

Naturally grouping with $\pi$ d́ $\gamma o \iota$ are the four following :

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 'Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| (15) ${ }^{\circ} \chi$ Oot ${ }^{4}$ | o | - | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 2 |
| (16) $\sigma \kappa 0 \pi \leftarrow i i^{5}$ | 13 | 4 | - | o | I | o | 2 | 4 |
| ( 17 ) $\kappa \rho \eta \mu \nu 0 c^{\text {² }}$ | 4 | 2 | - | - | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| (18) к入ítves ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 | - | 3 | 2 |

Other plural uses by analogy are the three :

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| (19) ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{pot}{ }^{8}$ | I | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | I | 9 | 18 |
| (20) of pla | - 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | I | 0 | 2 |
| (21) ópí $\sigma \mu a \tau \alpha$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |

(b). Grove, thicket.

Reference is here made to $\delta \rho v \mu i^{19}$ and $\lambda o ́ \chi \mu a t^{10}$. As for $\delta \rho v \mu o i^{\prime}$, only the neuter heteroclite form appears in Homer (the Odyssey),

[^10]being plural only, while $\lambda_{0} \neq$ uà occurs there once and in the singular. Clearly $\delta \rho v \mu \alpha$ is the starting point for the plurals of Tragedy.
2.

STREAM, WATER, BATH, FROST, DEW, BLOOD.
(a). Stream, water.

All in the table following occur in Homer except סappooai; as the figures show, the Homeric impulse toward the plural is strong.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
|  | 0 | 22 | 2 | 1 | - | 4 | - | 4 |
| (2) ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ (1)aí | 0 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 24 |
| (3) $\pi \eta \gamma \times i$ | 0 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 15 |
|  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (5) кข́йта | 78 | 30 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 17 |
| (6) i̋́ata | 101 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 25 | 9 |
| (7) Scappoaí | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

(b). Bath.

Homer leads the way with the plurale tantum $\lambda_{\text {outpá, which }}$ is followed in Tragedy by vintpa. With the latter compare the Homeric $\pi$ oסávint $\rho a$, which appears twice, ${ }^{1}$ plural only.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| $\lambda$ vorpá | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 18 |
| $\nu i \pi \tau \rho \alpha$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

[^11](c). ${ }^{1}$ Dew, frost, blood.
(I). סpórou-not Homeric, but analogous to the Homeric єєрбаи ("dewdrops").
(2). $\pi a ́ \gamma o$-not Homeric in this sense. ${ }^{2}$

Analogically aipara has a place here rather than in the Body Group. ${ }^{3}$

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plux. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| $\delta \rho о ́ \sigma о \iota^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4 |
| $\pi a ́ \gamma o \iota^{5}$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | - |
| aipara | 117 | - | 51 | 8 | 27 | 1 | 100 | 10 |

(3). aimaza.

Where the plural is employed, we should think, probably, of the streams or drops of blood, even where more than one individual is referred to.

Aeschylus:
(a). In the literal sense, singular 39, plural 5 times. Agam.
 sandra only. The plural has a similar meaning in Eum. 166 ch ., Cho. 66 ch . Of more than one person are Agam. 15 ro ch.,



[^12](b). Meaning murder, singular 7 ; plural 3 times, ${ }^{1}$ in each case of more than one person and being synonymous with фóvos.
(c). Meaning relationship only the singular appears-5 times.

Sophocles: The lone instance of the plural is found in Ant. 120 ch , á $\mu \epsilon \tau$ е́ $\rho \omega \nu$ аіца́т $\omega \nu$.

## Euripides :

(a). In the literal sense and of more than one the plural occurs 5 times. ${ }^{2}$ Of but one person are I A. 1485 ch. , aï $\mu a \sigma \iota$ ө́r $\mu a \sigma i \tau \epsilon$,
 respectively $\theta$ ávarot and $\phi$ óvot.
(b). Meaning gouts of blood-Alc. 496 ; and also I T. 73 :

(c). Relationship-Ion 693, ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ aí $a^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$, but of two persons, Xuthus and the alien mother.

Peile ${ }^{5}$ thinks "aipara in the plural, of itself generally denotes blood shed by violence." But might he not have said the same of the singular? In Tragedy, blood is commonly shed by violence, and furthermore the singular appears there almost in the ratio of ten to one! It seems nearer the truth to say the plural affords a fuller, more vivid, more poetic concept-as witnesses the fact that the plural occurs oftener in the choral passages.

> 3 DUST, SAND.

The poetic plural here, as in other languages, vividly comprehends the whole as made up of its parts.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Eturipides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| $\psi a ́ \mu a \theta o c^{6}$ | 4 | 16 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| кovíae ${ }^{7}$ | 17 | 50 | 0 | i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

[^13]In the plural, only the nominative and dative of the former and the dative of the latter are found. Thus Tragedy follows Homer precisely. With one exception, ${ }^{1}$ the plural appears only in choral passages.
4.

MEAL, DINNER.
In this class no poetic plural is found in Homer. ${ }^{2}$ The fact that Aj. 1294 ( $\delta \in i \pi n v o v$ ) and Or. 1008 ( $\delta \epsilon i \pi v a$ ) refer to the same banquet does not prove that the notion involved in each is exactly the same-for the former may have a collective idea and the latter a distributive. ${ }^{3}$

But admittedly the plural seems conventional with Euripides. He presents later analogous plurals, as the table shows. On the other hand $\delta$ ais resists the plural, even in Euripides.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| (1) $\delta \varepsilon i \pi v a^{4}$ | 37 | - | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | I | 9 |
| (2) Saîтєs ${ }^{5}$ | 80 | $4^{6}$ | 3 | $1^{5}$ | 4 | 0 | 30 | 2 |
| (3) ėovtá $\mu a \tau \alpha$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 |
| (4) Ooıvápara | 0 | - 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc 1$ | I |

[^14]5.

FLESH, MEAT.
As in Homer, so in Tragedy the plural prevails.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| (1) кре́a | 3 | 44 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| (2) ба́ркєร | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | I | 13 | 15 |

Trach. 1053-54 :

вє́ßршкє та́ркая
(i.e., the internal organs in this particular case).
6.

ARTICLES OF WEAR.
(a). Cloak, robe, girdle.

The starting point lies in eipara, ${ }^{1}$ which is for Homer practically plurale tantum ${ }^{2}$ : while $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda o \iota$, фáp $\epsilon, \chi \iota \tau \omega ิ \nu \epsilon s$ are always genuine plurals in Homer. It will be noted that Sophocles resists the general movement toward the plural.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| єi¢aтas | 2 | 78 | $\pm$ | $4^{4}$ | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| $\pi$ ¢́л $\lambda$ о | 9 | 7 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 84 |
| фа́pєа | 24 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | I | 3 | 13 |
| $\chi$ ชıผิves | 54 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

[^15](1) $\boldsymbol{\text { i }} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu \tau \alpha}$.

O T. 1268-69 :

## 


Both єiцár $\omega v$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho$ óvas are apparently singular in meaning. ${ }^{1}$
(2). $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda o \omega_{0}{ }^{2}$

In Homer the plural refers to several cloths, coverings or robes. The $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \lambda o s$ corresponds to the man's $\chi^{\lambda \alpha i v v a, ~ i \mu a ́ \tau \iota o v, ~ a n d ~ i s ~ n e v e r ~}$ used there of raiment in general.

This being the case, there is some warrant for assuming that when in Tragedy the plural is used of a given individual at a given time, it means simply the one outer robe. Favorable to this are the following verses from the Persae, where the reference is to the outer robe of Xerxes :



With these compare the singular of the same robe in verses io3o and io6o. In Eum. 352 and Supp. 457 the whole chorus may be referred to.

Soph. Frag. 406 :

Euripides has both the singular and plural for one and the same robe : the singular in Medea 786 ,
$\lambda \epsilon \pi \tau o ́ v$ тє $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda о \nu$ каì $\pi \lambda o ́ \kappa о \nu ~ \chi \rho v \sigma \eta ́ \lambda a \tau o v, ~$
and also in verses 949, 982 ; but the plural appears in verses 1065, II59, II88, I214 of the same play. Verse II59 is:

入aßov̂бa $\pi \in ́ \pi \lambda o v s ~ \pi o เ к i ́ \lambda o v s ~ ท ं \mu \pi i ́ \sigma \chi є \tau o . ~$
A similar contrast occurs in the Bacchae 935 (plural) and 938 (singular).

[^16]Here may be added a word which probably stands under the influence of $\pi$ ध́ $\pi \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\circ}$ :
(3). కิvar. ${ }^{1}$

To be compared are Aesch. Supp. 457,

and Bacch. 935 :

The latter refers to one girdle.
(4). фápea occurs in the sense of one garment in Hipp. I33, Eur. Supp. 286 . $^{2}$
(5). $\chi$ นтөิขєร.

I T. 288 presents one instance of the poetic plural:

$\pi \tau \epsilon \rho 0 i ̂$ е̇ $\rho$ є́ $\sigma \sigma \epsilon$.
(6). $\sigma \tau 0 \lambda \mu$ i $^{4}$

Compare Alc. 216,

and verse 923 of the same play,
$\lambda \epsilon v \kappa \omega ̂ \nu$ тє $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \lambda \omega \nu$ رélaves $\sigma \tau 0 \lambda \mu o i ́$.
(7). $\chi^{\lambda a v i o ́ a ~ i s ~ n o t ~ f o u n d ~ i n ~ H o m e r ~ a t ~ a l l, ~ b u t ~ i t ~ a p p e a r s ~ t w i c e ~}$ in Tragedy, where it is plural. ${ }^{5}$
(b). Veil.
(I). $\kappa \rho \eta \eta_{\delta} \epsilon \mu \nu a{ }^{6}$

For Homer compare є 346 (singular), $\zeta$ roo (true plural) and the four uses of the plural for the singular-a 334, $\pi 4^{16} 6, \sigma 210$, $\phi 65$. ${ }^{\text { }}$

Phoen. 1490 :


[^17](2). калv́m $\mu a \tau \alpha$-appears but once in Homer, $\Omega 93$, singular. In Tragedy ${ }^{1}$ it appears once in the singular, five times in the plural.
(c). Wreath, crown, head-band.

Homer presents as the regular form of $\sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \mu a$ the plural which occurs A 14, 373. The one use of the singular seems to be accounted for on purely metrical grounds. ${ }^{2}$ Analogous plurals are here listed with $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \mu \mu a \tau \alpha$ as follows:

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| бтє́ $\mu$ ата | 1 | 2 | - | - | o | - | o | 10 |
| $\boldsymbol{\tau \tau \epsilon ́ \phi \eta ~}$ | o | o | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| ттé¢avou | 1 | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | 26 | 13 |
| $\pi$ 入о́коє | - | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | o | 4 | 3 |
| ні́тpaı | 4 | 0 | 0 | o | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| ảvaíér $\mu$ al | 1 | 0 | o | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
|  | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | I | 1 |

(1). $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \mu \mu a \tau a^{3}$ occurs plural for singular in Eur. Supp. 470 :
$\lambda v ́ \sigma a v \tau a$ бє $\mu \nu \grave{~} \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \mu a ́ \tau \omega v$ iккท́pıa. Also in Ion 1310, Or. 12.
(2). $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \phi \eta$ just as also $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a$ is singular in meaning Agam. 1264-65 :

каì $\sigma \kappa \eta ิ \pi \tau \rho a$ каì $\mu \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon i ̂ a ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \delta \epsilon ́ \rho \eta ~ \sigma \tau є ́ \phi \eta ;$
Compare the singular in Cho. 1035 :


бтє́ф $\eta$ 入аßоv́бŋ кả $\pi \iota \theta v \mu \alpha ́ \mu a \tau \alpha$.

[^18]Euripides: ${ }^{1}$ Especially noteworthy is Phoen. 858,

where $\sigma \tau$ '́ $\phi \eta$ is identical with $\sigma \tau$ 'є́фavov in verse 856 . See also I A. ${ }^{1513}$.
(3). $\sigma \tau$ ย́фavo九. ${ }^{2}$

The poetical plural appears in Alc. 796 and 832 in the expression $\sigma \tau \epsilon ф$ ávous тvкаб $\theta \epsilon$ ís.
(4). $\pi \lambda$ о́коь. ${ }^{5}$

Compare the plural in Euripides E1. 778,

and the singular in Med. 786 as also 841 -
คооє́ $\omega \nu \pi \lambda$ ло́коข d̀ $\nu \theta$ '́ $\omega \nu$.
(5). $\mu i \tau \rho a t$.

Hec. 923-24 :


(6). ảvadé $\sigma \mu \mathrm{ar}$ in Med. 978 ch .,

is the same as $\sigma \tau$ éqavov in verse 984.
(7). а̉vaঠ́ŋ́ $\mu a \tau a$.

To be compared are the two following citations from Euripides :



## B.

## The Body Group.

Homer, as well as Tragedy, is rich in poetic plurals of this nature. Homer, however, does not go so far as Euripides, who

[^19]presents a case of ${ }^{\circ} \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ for the lone eye of the Cyclops, of $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mu}{ }^{\prime}$ for one shoulder, or of $\delta o ́ \mu o \iota$ for a cedar-chest!

Just as the plural was natural to Homer in ö $\mu \mu a \tau \alpha$ (plurale tantum, 14 times), $\dot{\delta} \phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu o i ́$ (generally plural there), $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \iota a i$ (plurale tantum, 19 times), $\mathfrak{\rho i v e s}$ (singular 4, plural II times), so the plural seems to involve a dual notion in other words as applied to parts of the body of a symmetrical nature.

On the other hand, the singular predominates in Homer for бтó $\mu$ (singular 25, plural 3 times), $\mu$ ét $\omega \pi$ (singular 11 , plural
 15, plural I time), $\sigma \tau$ є́ $\rho v a$ (singular 14, plural 4 times); as for $\nu \eta \delta u ́ s$, it is always singular in Homer and Tragedy.

But the plural form of $\sigma \tau \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta$ (singular 36 , plural 146) and $\nu \hat{\omega} \tau a$ (singular 9, plural 22) persisted strongly.

A review of the various words and their uses shows a reciprocal analogy at work, singular to plural and vice versa.

## I.

FACE, FOREHEAD, MOUTH, EYE, JAW, CHEEK, CHIN, THROAT, NECK.
(a). The face, forehead, mouth, eye.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| $\pi \rho о ́ \sigma \omega \pi \alpha$ | $\mathrm{I}^{1}$ | 9 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | Pas | sim |
| $\mu$ е́т $\omega \pi$ a | II | 1 | I | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| бто́ $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ та | 25 | 3 | 33 | 3 | 24 | 3 | 40 | 4 |
| орицата | 14 | 0 | 23 | 32 | 32 | 29 | 79 | 87 |
| ко́paı | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | I | 0 | 25 |

(I). $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi \alpha$.

The plural commonly means but one face both in Homer and Tragedy, except in Aeschylus-where every plural is genuine.

[^20]This applies also to the long form of Homer- $\pi \rho o \sigma \omega \boldsymbol{\pi} a \tau{ }^{1}$ (of one person H 212, $\sigma$ 192).
J. H. H. Schmidt ${ }^{2}$ thus interprets the plural of $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\omega} \pi \kappa \alpha$ : "Denn wärend die Stirn als Einheit erscheint" (why not Zweiheit in $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi \alpha$ as well as $\dot{v} \pi \omega ́ \pi \iota \alpha$ ?) "ist das untere' Gesicht bis zum Munde und Kinn hin-und nur dieses wird gemeint sein-durch die Nase in zwei gleiche Teile geteilt und jede Backe erscheint als ein selbständiger Teil des Gesichtes." ${ }^{3}$ Spitta's ${ }^{4}$ explanation of the force of the plural-"pulchritudinem mirum quantum auget" is rightly condemned by Juhl. ${ }^{5}$ Ovid's hostilia Ora (jaws) canum is dualistic.

As for Tragedy Kummerer ${ }^{6}$ (approved by Volp) rightly says, " Die Erklärung, der Plural bezeichne Mienen, Züge, der Singular aber Gesicht, scheint gezwungen, da in den meisten Fällen der Singular eben so gut mit Zügen, Mienen übergesetzt werden kann." ${ }^{7}$ The inner meaning ${ }^{8}$ of the word is shown to be dual by its composition-ö $\psi$.

Soph. Frag. 787, 6 (even of the moon's face):

Ion 187-189 :


$\pi \omega \nu$ кал入ı $\beta \lambda$ е́фароу фө́s.
Here $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \sigma \omega \pi \alpha$ is probably best taken as referring to the eastern façade only, whose architectural face, symmetrically divided, is boldly compared to the human face. ${ }^{9}$

[^21]（2）．$\mu^{\prime} \tau \omega \pi \alpha$ ．In Homer the plural occurs once－of one person



（3）．orópara．The plurals of Homer and Aeschylus are true ones ；but only one mouth is meant in Trach．937－8 ：
${ }_{\alpha}^{\mu} \mu \phi \dot{i} \nu \iota \nu \quad \gamma \quad \omega ́ \mu \epsilon v o s$

So too in Alc．402－3 ：
ка入оv̂mat ó

（4）．ӧ $\mu \mu a \tau \alpha$ ．Though plurale tantum in Homer，the singular is about as frequent in Tragedy as the plural ；the singular is often poetic．

Euripides reaches an extreme in applying the plural to the Cyclops＇eye－Cyc．459，470，5II．But the singular for the same appears in verse 600 and elsewhere．
（5）．Kópaı．Like ö́ $\mu \mu \tau \tau$ ，кópaє is of the Cyclops＇eye in Cyc． 463，611．
（b）．Jaw，cheek，chin，throat．

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur | Sing． | Plur． |
| $\gamma^{\prime}$＇́vecs ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | － | $3^{2}$ | o | 1 | 2 | 2 | 16 | 6 |
| үยөveia | 7 | － | 3 | o | 2 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| үєvéades | － | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | o | 9 | 3 |
| 入асноí | 5 | 0 | － | 0 | － | o | 5 | 6 |

（I）．子éves shows a marked movement towards the plural in Euripides．It affords an interesting comparison with $\sigma \tau o ́ \mu a \tau a$. The former，though plurale tantum in Homer，assumes the singu－

[^22]lar in Sophocles, and in Euripides is even used collectively ${ }^{1}$ like -то́яа.

On the other hand the singular of the latter prevails consistently, -but in Euripides even the plural is used of one eye. The analogical influence is reciprocally active. ${ }^{\text { }}$
(2). $\gamma^{\text {éveu. }}$. The only plural found is in Sophocles O T. 1277, of the bloody cheeks of Oedipus.
(3). yeveiades. ${ }^{3}$ The plural means cheeks Ion 1460-6I (Creuisa to Ion) :


(4). גauo'. The poetic plural does not appear before Euripides. Where the meaning is restricted to gullet, the plural does not occur. ${ }^{4}$ Plural for the singular are Or. 1472 ch., Phoen. 1092, Heracleidae $822,{ }^{5}$ Ion 1065. Probably the plural should convey a dualistic notion of the throat.
(c). Neck-av̉x́ves. ${ }^{6}$

The poetic plural appears only in Soph. Frag. 598, 4: ${ }^{\text {Tr }}$,


Euripides does not employ the poetic plural, but in Rhes. 303 reaches an opposite extreme in the collective singular :

2.

LUNG, SIDE, BOSOM, SHOULDER, BREAST, BACK, DIAPHRAGM, MIDRIFF, HEART, GALL.

The principal Homeric words obtaining here are $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ and $\phi \rho$ éves. The former is found but twice in Tragedy, ${ }^{7}$ and nowhere

[^23] the latter being very common.

|  | Homer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. |
| фрéves | 51 | 290 |
| $\sigma \tau \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta^{1}$ | 36 | 146 |

(a). Breast, lung, side, bosom, shoulder.
( 1 ). $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho v a .^{2}$ Already in Homer ${ }^{3} \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho v a$ had been used three times of one person- $\mathbf{~ 1 9 4 , ~ N ~ 2 8 2 , ~ 2 9 0 . ~ T h e ~ f o l l o w i n g ~ s u g g e s t ~}$


 $\pi \eta \delta \hat{\omega} \nu$ ä $\theta$ vpo七.
Aeschylus has the plural of one person three times, two of which


To the above are here added certain words, together with analogous plurals, which not only pertain to one person, but in some cases undergo a still further restriction in meaning :
(1). $\pi \lambda \epsilon \cup \rho a i$.

Compare Trach. 930-31,


with Ant. 1236,


[^24]In the latter, the metre permits the singular equally well, and yet probably only one side is meant. ${ }^{1}$

Cho. 639-40:


Trach. 567-68:
ès $\delta$ §è $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ úrovas

In each case the plural is apparently singular in meaning, just as is sometimes the case in English also. The sword or arrow is hardly thought of as penetrating both lungs. For the singular compare Trach. 1054. ${ }^{2}$
(3). ко́лтоt (See pages ro-it).
(4). $\mu а \sigma т о i^{3}$ ( $\mu$ a̧̧í).

Soph. E1. 776-77 :

ảто乌̆єvoviтo-
the dual notion of the word stands out prominently.
Trach. 924-25 :

> シ х х
$\pi \rho о$ йкєто $\mu а \sigma \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \epsilon \rho о \nu$ 's.
The plural strictly interpreted, would seem to mean merely the left breast, since it was the Greek custom to clasp the brooch at the left shoulder.*

(5). | $\mu$ | o is rather loosely used in a choral passage of Orestes, |
| :---: | :---: | verses 1471-73:





[^25]With this compare the singular in IT．1381：

（b）．Back．
（I）．$\nu \oplus ิ \tau \alpha$ ．
In Homer the singular appears 9 times；while the plural is found 22 times，usually referring to but one person ${ }^{1}$ or else em－ ployed in a transferred meaning．${ }^{2}$ The plural prevails in about the same ratio in Tragedy．${ }^{3}$

Prom．429－30 ch．：
$\gamma$ âs oủpávtóv $\tau \epsilon \pi$ ádov

The plural is probably dualistic and almost equals ${ }_{\omega}^{\omega} \mu \operatorname{cs}^{4}$（the shoulder of Atlas）．

Sophocles apparently has the same idea in the two uses follow－ ing－Trach．1047，

and also in verses $1089-90^{6}$ ：


Euripides has two uses of the poetic plural similar to those above，which are particularly worthy of note－Hec．1264，

and I T．1141－42，

$\lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \xi a \iota \mu \iota$ Өoá乌ovaa ${ }^{6}$ ．

[^26]In the transferred sense the word seems to be a favorite one of Euripides. He speaks of the backs of the sea, of the sky, of the earth, of the chariot, of the rock, the plural clearly involving the ö $\gamma \kappa$ os notion, quantity ${ }^{1}$ or extent. The poetic value of the plural is at once apparent in such passages as Hipp. 128 ch .,


(c). Diaphragm, midriff, heart, gall.
(i) фpéves is plural in its earliest use, meaning midriff, parts about the heart; then heart, breast, mind; manifestations of mind-and is synonymous with $\sigma \tau \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta$ when the latter has a figurative meaning.

Juhl ${ }^{4}$ following Ameis holds that for Homer the singular has only a psychic, and never a literal meaning. As for Tragedy, however, the plural is employed in the meaning of animus, mens ${ }^{5}$, while in at least one instance the plural means praecordia ${ }^{6}$ Aeschylus Prom. 881 :

where $\phi \rho$ éva clearly equals $\delta$ áф $\rho a \gamma \mu a$, metrical convenience probably being responsible for the singular. As in Homer, so in Tragedy, the plural prevails. ${ }^{\text { }}$

Aeschylus:
The plural equals карঠia in the Prom. 361 and Eum. 159.
Sophocles:
The plural is of one heart in Trach. 931. Euripides presents no departure from the uses found in Aeschylus and Sophocles.

[^27]As the following verses show, there is no clear distinction in number:
Prom. $7^{81}$,

Soph. Frag. 540,

(2). $\pi \rho a \pi i \delta \delta s^{1}$ is to be closely identified with $\phi \rho^{\prime} v \epsilon$. Its singular appears only twice, and in Euripides ${ }^{2}$; these two instances are to be charged to the influence of $\phi \rho \eta^{v}$ probably.
(3). रoגai is found but once in the plural-Ant. 1009-10:

каì $\mu$ ета́рбто七

Kummerer ${ }^{3}$ with some reserve explains the plural by Stücke der Galle which seems right. The gall-bladder burst and the particles were scattered into the air.
3.

HAIR AND BEARD.
A review of words in this class shows for Tragedy a decided tendency toward the singular, but it seems well to include them for the purpose of comparison. The collective notion is especially persistent in Aeschylus and Sophocles.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing, | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| $\gamma \in v \in i ́ a \delta e s$ | 0 | I | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 3 |
| єөєıраи | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | 1 |
| $\tau \rho i ́ \chi{ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 14 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | I |
| $\chi$ хîтaı | 3 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 3 |
| ко́цац | 10 | 3 | I | 0 | 6 | 2 | 29 | 15 |

[^28](1). yeveiades. (For the plural meaning cheeks in Tragedy, see page 25 ).
(2). Ëtcupal.

The plural carries a sense of vagueness in Cho. 175-moiaus è $\theta$ eípaus.

Hel. 632 :

```
        \gammá́\gamma\eta0a, кратì \delta` ỏ\rho0iovs é0ci\rhoas
```


(3). tрíxes.

In OC. the plural is used exactly as $\theta$ etpat in Hel. 632 (above).
(4). xaîтat.

The plural appears only in choral verses-Phoen. 308, Alc. 908, Med. 841.
(5). ко́цая.

See Aj. 1174, 1209 and Or. 1469.
C.

## The Instrument Group.

## 1.

## ARMS.

The starting point for our purpose lies in the Homeric pluralia
 lar appears there but twice. ${ }^{1}$

Aeschylus and Sophocles have only the plural of $\bar{\circ} \pi \lambda o v$, while Euripides employs the singular ${ }^{2}$ but three times as against a frequent use of the plural.
(a). Bow, sword, arrow.

[^29]|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur． |
| тó¢́a | 72 | 41 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 24 | 3 | 36 |
| $\beta \epsilon$ ¢́ $\lambda \eta$ | 46 | 43 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 13 | II | 8 |
| $\xi i \phi \eta$ | 54 | II | 7 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 43 | 12 |
| фа́бүava | 22 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | 3 |

（1）．róga in Homer not infrequently has a plural significance， meaning the whole bow equipment－－$\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \nu \tau \eta े \nu ~ \tau o \xi ̌ \iota ŋ \grave{\nu} \nu ~ \sigma \kappa \epsilon u ́ \eta \nu \nu^{1}$－ as for example in $\Phi 490-2$ ：．．．$\delta \epsilon \xi \iota \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \delta^{\prime}{ }_{a} \rho^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}{ }^{\omega} \mu \omega \nu$ aivvro－


The plural also expresses the abstract idea of archery，as in B 178 ：


But the plural is also found there in the sense of one bow． For example，in Book XXI of the Odyssey the one bow is referred to 40 times by the singular and 9 times by the plural．

In Tragedy the plural is relatively far more common，the meaning at times being restricted even to the arrow．

Agam．510，Apollo＇s bow ；Cho．694，Curse＇s bow；Eum． 627－8，тógoss is equivalent to $\beta$ é $\overline{\epsilon \epsilon}$ ：oṽ $\tau \iota$ Oovpioıs

тógots éкそßó入o七兀เข．
Sophocles：Of the bow－equipment are Phil．68，654，763， 942，1440；of the bow alone is Phil． 7 10－11 ：

$\pi \tau \alpha v o i ̂ s ~ l o i ̂ s ~ a ̉ v v ́ \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon ~ \gamma a \sigma \tau \rho i ̀ ~ ф о р ß a ́ v ~$
The arrows alone are meant in Phil．652，as Ellendt ${ }^{3}$ points： out，but the meaning is not so restricted in verse 654 ：

[^30]


Euripides affords the same uses as Sophocles and Aeschylus. Of one bow, Med. 632-4 :



In Ion 524 тóga clearly means only the arrows, or perhaps one arrow :

(2). $\beta$ éd $\eta$.

Cho. 160-1 :
èv хєроі̂v па入ívтov’
 the meaning of $\tau \dot{o} \xi a$ and mean one bow as indicated by the bowepithet ${ }^{2}$ ma入ívтova.

Sophocles:
In the Philoctetes there is, apparently, a loose interchange of $\beta_{\epsilon ́ \lambda \eta} \eta$ and tóga, each meaning bow, arrow, or both,-verse 140 ,

 $\phi \epsilon \hat{v}$. $\tau^{\prime} \mu^{\prime} a ̈ v \delta \delta a \quad \pi о \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu c o v$

Euripides strangely has no poetic plurals in this case ; all there are true ones.
(3). $\xi i \phi \eta$.

Aeschylus :
One would rather expect the singular in Cho. i63 ch.:

Sophocles:
In Ant. 820 the plural calls attention to the sword as such. As the singular in $\mathrm{Aj} .30^{4}$ shows, the plural in verse 231 is of

[^31]the hero's one sword, but suggests probably the number of objects slaughtered, the sword-thrusts :

бvүкатакта̀s

Euripides has a use similar to that of Aj .23 I (above) in Or. 1398-9 :
 $\sigma \iota \delta \alpha \rho \in ́ o \iota \sigma \iota \nu$ "Aı $\delta \alpha$.
Hades is hardly pictured as holding many swords in hand, but rather as meting out death in many forms, by many thrusts. ${ }^{1}$ One would surely expect the singular ${ }^{2}$ in And. 821-22:


(4). фá ${ }^{2} \alpha a v a$.

As Or. Io35-36 (where the singular is found) clearly shows, the plural of verse 953 is singular in meaning :


The general movement toward the plural enlists as poetic plurals the two following, if Volp be accepted for the latter :
(5). ioi. ${ }^{4}$

Trach. 573-74:

${ }^{\wedge}{ }^{\circ} \mu \in \lambda a \gamma \chi^{o ́ \lambda o v s}$


That only one arrow is meant, is seen in verse $567-\bar{\eta} \kappa \kappa v$ коцйтทv ióv. Jebb ${ }^{5}$ thinks the plural suggests the double barb of the arrow.
(6). ả $\gamma \kappa$ v́л̆aน.

OT. 204:
$\chi \rho v \sigma o \sigma \tau \rho o ́ \phi \omega \nu ~ \dot{a} \pi \pi^{3}$ ả $\gamma \kappa v \lambda \hat{a} v$ ßé $\lambda \epsilon a$,

[^32]and Or. 1476 both refer to but one bow. Volp ${ }^{1}$ considers the plural analogous to тóg $\alpha$. But IT. 1408 may show that $\mathfrak{a} \gamma \kappa v ́ \lambda \eta$ is the bow-string (nervus), and that the plural is of the loops at the end. In this case we have to do with a figure of speech, not a poetic plural.
(b). Shield, sheath.
(I). à ácrí̂es.

Sophocles is the first to use the poetic plural, if the following be admitted :


Similarly El. 36 :

In the former the notion of $\dot{a} \sigma \pi i \delta \omega v$ may be, as it probably is in the latter, equal to orparov ; in the latter each comprehends the same idea. ${ }^{3}$
(2). колєоí.

IA. ${ }^{1566-7}$ :
 where one sheath is meant. Compare Hec. 543-4 :

2.

## DOMESTIC ARTICLES.

(a). Axe, brooch, goad, sickle.
( I$)$. yéves is plurale tantum in Homer, having there a dual force in a different meaning-jazes. ${ }^{5}$ The same dual notion is probably transferred to its secondary meaning-axe-as is suggested in Eur. Frag. 530, 6 :


[^33]So too the word means axe in Soph. E1. 196-197 ch. :
öтє oi $\pi a \gamma \chi{ }^{\text {á }}{ }^{\prime} \kappa \omega \nu$ ảvтaia
$\gamma^{\epsilon} v^{\prime} \omega \nu^{1}{ }^{1}{ }^{\infty} \rho \mu a ́ \theta \eta{ }^{2} \pi \lambda a \gamma a ́$.
(2). $\pi \epsilon$ рóvą.

Sophocles OT. 1268-69:
á $\pi о \sigma \pi a ́ \sigma a s ~ \gamma \grave{a ̀ \rho ~ є i \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \chi р v \sigma \eta \lambda a ́ \tau o v s ~}$ $\pi \epsilon \rho o ́ v a s ~ \dot{a} \pi$ ’ $\alpha$ v̉tท̂s.
Phoen. 804-5:


Here may be added, too, Euripides Bacchae 98. These plurals may be singular in force ${ }^{2}$; and Trach. 924-25 would so suggest :

$\pi \rho \circ$ и́кєเто $\mu \alpha \sigma \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ 's.
(3). тó $\rho \pi a \iota .{ }^{8}$

The same applies here as to $\pi \epsilon$ póvac.
Phoen. 62:
Oedipus- $\chi \rho v \sigma \eta \lambda a ́ \tau o \iota s ~ \pi o ́ \rho \pi \alpha \iota \sigma \iota v ~ a i \mu a ́ \xi ́ a s ~ к o ́ \rho a s . ~$
(4). кє́vтра.

As $\pi \epsilon \rho$ óval, so кévтpa in O'T. 1318:

So, too, but one goad is meant, in Phoen. 177-178 :


The plural suggests the blows upon the horses in turn.
(5). ä $\rho \pi \alpha .^{5}{ }^{5}$

Ion 191-192 (of one sickle):
Aєрvaiov v̌ípav évaípєı


[^34](b). Rule, anvil', ladder, mirror.
(I). Kavóves. ${ }^{1}$

Tro. 814:
каvóver סè тvкíquata, that is-the rule of Phoebus. Compare verse 6.
(2). äкцо́ves. ${ }^{2}$

Eur. El. $4+3$ ch. :

(3). кліракея. ${ }^{3}$

Where the poetic plural occurs, it should probably convey a notion of the rounds of the ladder, its structure. The fact that this poetic plural occurs nowhere in Homer, or Tragedy, except in Euripides, and the further fact that metre cannot in general account for the plurals there, indicate a natural preference for the plural on the part of Euripides.
 appears Eur. Phoen. 1173 ; but кл七ца́к $\omega \nu$-of one ladder-appears in verse 489 of the latter play, as also in IT. 97 and Bacch. $1213 .{ }^{4}$
(4). ${ }^{\text {vivont }} \boldsymbol{\tau} \rho a{ }^{5}$

Hec. 925-6 ch. :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \chi \rho v \sigma \epsilon ́ \omega \nu \text { ย̇vóлт }{ }^{\chi \omega \nu}
\end{aligned}
$$

## 3.

INSIGNIA OF AUTHORITY.
(I). $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a$.

After Homer there is a marked shift towards the plural. ${ }^{7}$ The

[^35]explanation seems to lie in the extensive meaning of the word when used symbolically.

Already in Homer the plural was used of but one sceptre$\Sigma$ 503-505:
oi $\delta \grave{\text { ¢ }} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ €́povtes


where Leaf ${ }^{1}$ notes as follows: "The plural $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a$ seems to be used loosely to imply that they all had the staff in turn. The herald's staff is handed to the speaker to give him 'possession of the house', so that of course only one can be in use at the time." ${ }^{\prime 2}$ Such a use of the plural, of course, cannot be paralleled in Tragedy, but where it appears there-plural for singular-the royal personage is to be conceived of as the possessor of all official powers and prerogatives, to be dispensed as he may desire. ${ }^{3}$ It may be said in general for Tragedy that the poetic plural is based not merely on the idea of a literal sceptre but it embraces the much fuller concept just suggested; while on the other hand, the mere sceptre is designated by the singular.

To support this general statemeut, note the following :
Eum. 625-26:


Prom. 761 :
$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \tau u ́ \rho a v v a ~ \sigma \kappa \eta ̂ \pi \tau \rho a ~ \sigma u \lambda \eta \theta \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \tau a l . ~$
Soph. El. 650-51 :


OC. 425-26 :
 $\mu$ еі́veєеv.

[^36]OC. 448-49:

каі бкฑิттра краі́vєєv каі̀ тขрауvєv́єєv $\chi$ Өоvós.
For Euripides may be cited the following verses where the plural has the same force as those above : El. II, Herc. Fur. 213, ${ }^{1}$ 1167, IA. I194, IT. 187, Or. 437, 1058, Phoen. 52, 73, 80, 514, 591, 601, 1253, Ion 660.

But the singular means more than the mere sceptre in Phil. 139-140: ${ }^{2}$

$\Delta i o ̀ s ~ \sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho o v a ̉ v a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha u$.
Once even in Aeschylus the plural is literal but singular in meaning-the Agam. $1265^{3}$ :

Again, in three cases Euripides has the plural for the singular in a literal sense-And. 1222-23:


E1. $321-2$ :


Herc. Fur. 1103-04 :


(2). Bákrрa ${ }^{4}$ is used for one wand in Euripides, probably on the analogy of similar literal uses of $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a$ there.

Ion 216-7:
Bpómeos . . . ällav . . . Báktpots . . . èvaípet.
Phoen. 1719 :


[^37]4.

## VEHICLES AND PARTS THEREOF.

Kummerer ${ }^{1}$ in treating the problem of ${ }^{\circ} \rho \mu a$ (as also other neulters in $-\mu \alpha$ ) for Tragedy, considers the plural usages analogous to the substantive neuter plural of the participle: that is ${ }_{\alpha}^{\circ} \rho \mu a \tau \alpha$ equals $\eta_{\rho} \mu о \sigma \mu \epsilon \epsilon^{v} \alpha$ (things fitted together). ${ }^{2}$ The root of the, word is ar, as Kummerer, Volp ${ }^{3}$ and Juhl ${ }^{4}$ assert, yet no satisfactory explanation is presented for the use of the plural in Tragedy. Juhl is silent for Homer and so are Kummerer and Volp for Tragedy. For our purpose recourse must be had to Homer. There as well as in Tragedy both plural and singular are used of one chariot, ${ }^{5}$ but the plural is more frequent than the singular. In the Odyssey the singular does not appear at all.

The plurals of Homer clearly show traces of metrical convenience and this it is that serves largely to sustain the plural in Tragedy. The transition in Homer was particularly easy in view of the Homeric plurale tantum ö $\chi$ ª, which occurs there 37 times $^{6}$; it does not, however, appear in Tragedy, but is represented there by the masculine oboo. ${ }^{7}$

A comparison of the uses in Homer and Tragedy easily accounts for the rather free play toward the plural in the latter.

It is a question whether the plural should convey the notion of a vehicle as made up of its parts, the things fitted togcther; the
 the plural ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \rho \mu a \tau \alpha$ may have corresponded earlier to our colloquial rig-either $i \pi \pi \pi o$ or ${ }^{\circ} \rho \mu a \tau a$ being at times mutually inclusive.

[^38]（a）Chariot．

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur． |
| äp ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ata | 21 | 46 | 5 | 5 | o | $2^{1}$ | 15 | 29 |
| óxŋ́mata | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | II | 6 |
| 8íфрои | 82 | $7{ }^{1}$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| ${ }^{\text {ox }}$ о¢ | － | $1^{1}$ | 4 | $\mathrm{I}^{1}$ | 2 | 2 | 8 | 17 |
| тatival | o | － | － | － | 0 | － | o | 1 |

（1）．äp $\boldsymbol{a}$ ．
Pers．190－191 ：

where the plural is for the singular as also in Choephori 795，with which compare verse 660 ．

Herc．Fur．880－882 ：
及є́ßакеv èv סí申poutıv à mo入v́atovos

кévт $\rho$ ov．
 is of merely one chariot，of course．Compare Hipp．III，II66， 1183 with verse 1195 where the singular is used of the same chariot．
（2）．ỏхŋ́paта
Aeschylus ${ }^{3}$ Pers．607－8（of one chariot）：


Soph．E1． 740 ：
кápa $\pi \rho \circ \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega v$ i $\pi \pi \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu$ ỏ $\chi \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega v$,
where the plural is best taken in the sense of rig，both vehicle and horses．${ }^{4}$ A corresponding use of the singular appears in

[^39]A1c. 66-67:


Euripides ${ }^{1}$ IA. 6ro-1 (of one chariot ${ }^{2}$ ): ä $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ó $\chi \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$

(3). סí申pot. ${ }^{3}$

The plural first appears in Sophocles of one chariot-E1. 49-50=


Similiarly verses 510-512;
$\pi a \gamma \chi \rho \tilde{\sigma} \omega v$ е̇к $\delta i \not \subset \rho \omega v$
סvatávors aikías

and also verse $742^{4}$ :

Hel. 724-5 :


(4). ${ }^{\text {oै }} \boldsymbol{\chi}^{\circ \circ}$

Of one chariot: Soph. ${ }^{6}$ Frag. 6ri,
 and Soph. E1. 727 :

Euripides ${ }^{7}$ does not fail to press ${ }^{\circ} \chi^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ into varied service.

[^40]In IA. $r^{46-7}$ the word virtually means the wheels by reason of the adjective :



But merely the chariot is meant in verse 599 :

So too in verse $6 \mathrm{I}_{3}$, but the singular appears in verse 623 :

Other poetic plurals are Hipp. 1225,' Tro. 569, El. 966, I135, Hel. IO40, and Bacch. 1333-4 :


(5). oativat occurs only in Euripides. The lone instance there is plural and of but one chariot $/ \mathrm{Hel}$. 1310 Io-

乌evigaca $\theta \epsilon \grave{a}$ नatívas. ${ }^{3}$
(b). Rim, axle.
(I). ävrvyes ${ }^{4}$ is used of the rim of one chariot in Homer. The dual nature of the rim justifies the plural :


The plural in Tragedy meaning the chariot may be considered a figure of speech, the number being analogical to ápmara; or else the plural may be merely a Homeric reminiscence.

Aj. 1030:

Soph. El. 746 :


[^41]Eur. Rhes. 567-68:


Compare Phoen. II 93 where the plural is of more than one chariot, and Rhes. 236 , Hipp. I23I where the singular is used of one chariot.
(2) ${ }^{2} \xi{ }^{\xi}$ oves. ${ }^{1}$

Hipp. 1234-35 (of one axle) :


5.

WOVEN AND LINKED ARTICLES-CHAIN, NOOSE, NET.
Enallage of number is particularly free here. Where the plural occurs of one instrument, it probably conveys a fuller conceptthe constituent parts of the whole.
(a). Chain.

Homer presents $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ$ together with its heteroclite form סє́б $\quad$ aта. ${ }^{2}$ Of all the uses of the two words there, however, I find the plural for the singular but once; the latter so appears in $\mathbf{X} 468{ }^{\text {s }}$
( 1 ). $\delta \in \sigma \mu$ oi. ${ }^{4}$
To be compared are Prom. 96-97 :


and verses $524-25$ :


In the latter case días would encourage the plural.

[^42]In the two passages following, the bond made by the reins is meant-Hipp. 1236-7 :

 and verses 1244-46:


$\pi i \pi \tau \epsilon$.
(2). $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha^{\prime}$ (Homer, $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu a \tau \alpha$ ).

Prom. $5^{13}$ :

(3). $\delta є \sigma \mu \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a$ is in Tragedy twice-a plurale tantum-Pers. 745 and Soph. Frag. 26.
(b). Noose, net.

Of all the words under this head only three appear in Homer, and not one of the three has the plural for the singular there. The figures show for Sophocles and Euripides a strong shift toward the plural. The three in Homer are :

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| $\beta$ ро́хо | 1 | $1^{2}$ | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 21 |
| ¢ркө ${ }^{8}$ | 28 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Síktva | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | I | 0 | 3 |

NOOSE.
(1). Bpóхoc.

Or. 1035-6 (of one noose as $\beta_{\text {óóxov in }}$ in verse 953 shows) :

$$
\delta \in i ̂ ~ \delta ौ \hat{\eta} \beta \rho o ́ \chi o v s
$$



[^43]Similar instances are And. 843,
тí $\mu \epsilon \beta \rho o ́ \chi \omega \nu$ єï $\rho \gamma \epsilon \iota$,
Hipp. 779, ${ }^{1}$

The three following are non-Homeric:
( I$)$. à $\rho \tau$ ával. ${ }^{2}$
Iocaste's suicide is referred to in each of the following passages from Sophocles-Ant. 54 :
$\pi \lambda \epsilon \kappa т a i ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$ ảpтávaloı $\lambda \omega \beta a ̂ \tau a \iota ~ \beta i ́ o v$,
OT. 1266 :
крє $\mu a \sigma \tau \eta ̀ \nu$ ג̇ $\rho \tau \alpha ́ v \eta \nu$.
(3). $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \hat{\omega} \rho a \iota($ aî̀ $\rho a t)$.

OT. $1264^{8}$ :
$\pi \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \omega ́ \rho \alpha и я ~ \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu$ év $\eta \nu$.
(4). ả ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \boldsymbol{\chi}_{\text {óval. }}{ }^{*}$

Hel. 200-1 :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { } \theta \text { ávatov }{ }^{\text {Ė } \lambda \alpha \beta \in v . ~}{ }^{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hipp. 777 :

NET.
The working of analogy is apparent in such expressions as Herc. Fur. 729-30;

$\xi \iota \phi \eta \phi$ ópoto (literally : entangled in the sword-bearing meshes of the nets, i. e. shall suffer the peril of the sword.) For a contrast of $\epsilon \rho \kappa \eta$ and $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu$ oi, see Soph. El. 837 ; for that of $\bar{\epsilon} \rho \kappa \eta$ and $\beta$ ро́хоь, compare Eur. El. 155.
(1). É $\rho \kappa \eta$.

[^44]Agam. 1611:

Aj. 59-60 :


Soph. El. 837-38:


Eur. El. 154-5 :

еркєбш.
Bacch. 957-8:


(2). व̈ркขєя. ${ }^{2}$

Eum. 147:

Pers. 97-98:
фèóфршv $\gamma$ à $\rho$ тарабаíve
ßротòv cis ápкvas "Aтa. ${ }^{3}$
Euripides Bacch. $45^{1-2}$ :


Same play, verses 868-870:

ท̊víк' àv фоßєрàv фv́r刀



Med. 1278 :

(3). Siктva. ${ }^{\text {b }}$

[^45]Soph. Frag. 846, 3 :

Phoen. 263-4 :


(4). áyрєú $\mu a \tau a .{ }^{2}$

Compare Aeschylus Agamemnon $1048^{3}$ and Choephori 998.
6.

LETTER, WRITING-TABLET.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| $\gamma \rho \underline{\mu} \mu \mu а \tau \alpha$ | o | - | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 13 |
| үрафаí | 0 | o | 2 | 1 | 1 | o | 6 | 6 |
| í $\pi$ เбтo入ai ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | o | o | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | II |

The notion involved in रрá $\mu a \tau a$, रpaфai finds a parallel in such an expression as $\tau \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a \mu \mu \epsilon \in \sigma a .{ }^{5}$ Referring to the same letter in the Iphigenia among the Tauri are the following:



A similar free Enallage of number obtains for ó $\rho к о \varsigma^{6}$ in Tragedy.
(4). ס́́ $\lambda \tau o t$ resists the plural, but in certain instances yields. ${ }^{7}$ The two cases in Aeschylus and Sophocles are used in a metaphorical sense, but Euripides has the poetic plural in a literal sense.

[^46]Prom. 781 :

Soph. Frag. 540:

IT. 789 :

IT. 115 -6 :
$\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \omega ~ \sigma o 九 ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$

D.

## The House Group.

1. 

THE HOUSE.
Kummerer ${ }^{2}$ concludes that $\delta \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a$, סó $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ are to be explained as being " analog dem substantivirten Neutrum plural einer Adjectivs oder Particips" ; or else they should be placed among the "quasi pluralia tantum." He continues: "So bezeichnet $\delta \omega ̂ \mu a$, סó $\mu$ os der Ableitung nach (von $\delta \in ́ \mu \omega$ ) zunächst das Gebaute ;
 der Dichter den Plural סஸ́ $\mu a \tau a$, סómo gebrauchen, ohne dass die Beziehung auf die Theile des Hauses bemerkbar wäre." s

The explanation is at once ingenious and plausible, but it seems incorrect for two reasons: (1) The expression tà بंко$\delta_{0 \mu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ v a ~ f o r ~ h o u s e ~ i s ~ n o t ~ t o ~ b e ~ f o u n d ~ i n ~ G r e e k ~ L i t e r a t u r e ~ ; ~ i f ~}^{\text {* }}$ ס由́maza is analogous thereto, we should expect to find it actually existent. (2) The evidence at hand points to an original singular for house, and to the fact that the plural could easily have represented a combination of simple structures into a complex one.

As J. Schmidt ${ }^{\text {j }}$ points out, the earliest Homeric form was

[^47]$\delta \hat{\omega}$, which was originally singular. ${ }^{1}$ I venture to suggest that the early singular points to the time of the primitive hut of one chamber. ${ }^{2}$ When first used the plural did not mean things built, but rather a plurality of chambers. When the singular was used the notion was one of unity, and when the plural occurred, the notion was one of unity in the light of its parts-chambers.

Juhl for Homer, and Spitta for Vergil attempt to explain the plural as meaning " magnum vel magnificum vel amplum aedificium, quod dicimus Palast." But such a distinction cannot hold for the word as late as Homer, and certainly not for Tragedy or Vergil. The plural hardly does more than afford a distributive as against a collective notion, for both numbers are often applied to the same structure, as e. $g$. the palace of Odysseus. ${ }^{8}$

The cedar-chest of Alcestis" was far from being a "Palast"! To Euripides the plural there is a mere convention.

An example of $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu a^{5}$ in the sense of one chamber appears in Z313-317:

[^48]




Here a distinction is forced between the plural and singular, $\delta \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a$ being the whole house, $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu a$ the male apartments, $\theta$ áda $\mu \boldsymbol{v}$ the woman's apartments, and av̉ $\lambda \eta{ }^{v} v$ the court.

These studies show for Homer in general, however, that in speaking of the whole house, he is free to use either number of $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu a$, $\delta o ́ \mu о s$, the numerical difference in either case being small. The conclusion will appear inevitable that metre often dictated number, the avoidance of hiatus alone being responsible in not a few instances.

The original difference in meaning between $\delta \omega \hat{\mu} \mu$, סó $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ s and the word oikos is distinct. ${ }^{2}$ The former are traceable to the root dem, while fook is identified with vis ${ }^{3}$ of Zend-Avesta (eine Gemeinschaft von 15 Männern und Frauen), with Latin vicus and Gothic veihs. The fine distinctions of earlier times largely disappear, however, and the roots dem and woik have produced interchangeable words. ${ }^{\text {. }}$

Like $\delta \hat{\omega}$, oikos persists in the singular in Homer. The poetic plural occurs once in the Odyssey ${ }^{5}$ and in Tragedy the plural predominates. Analogy and metrical convenience serve to make a large number of words follow $\delta o ́ \mu o u$ and $\delta \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \tau a{ }^{6}$

[^49]|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| бо́нои | 89 | 67 | 16 | II3 | 4 | 72 | 49 | 524 |
| ঠө́иата | III | 137 | 12 | 45 | 5 | 15 | 60 | 149 |
| -¢коь | 170 | 5 | 14 | 22 | 27 | 32 | 74 | 192 |

( 1 ) סó $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{o}$.
Aeschylus: There is no sure example of סónos here in the sense of one chamber, unless such a conception be felt in the figurative use of the word in Eum. 515 :
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \grave{\eta} \pi i ́ \tau v \epsilon \iota$ סó $\mu$ оs סiкая, where the word means temple; in this meaning of the word, the plural occurs 10 to 2 in favor of the plural.

The plural means house in (e.g.) Agam. 1309, Sept. 232, Cho. 22, 745 ; means temple in (e. g.) Agam. 964, Eum. 35, 60, 185, 699 ; means family in (e.g.) Sept. 740, 879. In Agam. 851-52 the plural might be taken to refer to Agamemnon's private apartments:


Sophocles: For the literal sense the plural is always used ${ }^{1}$ except in OC. 1564 :

Twice the singular means family, domestic conditions-Ant. 584 :
ois ầv $\sigma \epsilon \tau \sigma \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta} \theta_{\epsilon} 0 \theta \epsilon v$ סóuos,
and OC. 370 :


[^50]The plural has the same meaning at least 9 times. ${ }^{1}$
The plural often means native land, ancestral home. ${ }^{2}$ So also the singular, as in Phil. 459-60 :


Sophocles has $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu a$ one time for temple, ${ }^{3}$ but never סó $\mu$ os or oikos.
An interesting combination of סó $о$ os and oikos appears in Trach. 688-690 :

 $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \underset{\sim}{\alpha}$.
кат' о'ког is a stereotyped phrase ${ }^{4}$ meaning within the house as against outside the gates; and if so taken here, סó $\mu o$ s must be regarded as referring to the woman's apartments (yvvauкшĩгs). ${ }^{5}$ Such a restricted meaning the plural has in the Odyssey. ${ }^{6}$ Euripides: Both numbers appear in the different meanings. Of one literal house compare Or. 179,

with Hec. 59,

Of one house (family), compare IA. 1030 :

and verse 930 :


[^51]Of one temple compare Ion 1275 ：

and verse 249 ：

To draw any line of distinction in meaning in Euripides is clearly out of the question．To him at least the plural is a con－ vention ${ }^{1}$ as such following instances show－Cyc． 129 （of the Cyclops＇cave ${ }^{2}$ ）：

So too verses 369－371 ：
$\nu \eta \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} s$, \％$\tau \lambda \hat{a} \mu \circ \nu$ ö $\sigma \tau \tau s$


The plural is of a chest in Alc．160－161 ：


Euripides probably had in mind a similar usage in Hesiod， where סóno七七七 is Pandora＇s jar．${ }^{4}$
（2）$\delta \omega ́ \mu a \tau \alpha$ ．
In Aeschylus the plural is commonly of singular significance．${ }^{5}$ There is no certain case of $\delta \omega \mu \alpha$ for one room．${ }^{6}$

[^52]Both numbers appear in the meaning of household, family, as in Agam. 1468 :
 Frag. 156, 2 :

For temple the singular appears once (Eum. 242) and the plural twice (Eum. 178, Supp. 291).

Sophocles: Here too the plural regularly refers to one structure. ${ }^{1}$

In the sense of family, OT. 1226:

In verse 71 of the same play the plural is applied to the temple of Phoebus, while in verse 29 the singular is collective in the sense of Thebes- $\delta \omega \hat{\mu} \mu \mathrm{K} a \delta \mu \varepsilon \hat{\nu}$ v.

In El. iro the singular is used of the home of Hades. ${ }^{2}$
Euripides:
The same observations in general apply to Euripides as those concerning Aeschylus and Sophocles. The notion of house as a collection of rooms stands out clearly enough, apparently, in Herc. Fur. 955 :



So also Alc. 546 :

छยvติvas olkas.
Like $\delta o ́ \mu o t, \delta \omega ́ \mu a \tau a$ is used of the Cyclops' cave in Cyc. $370{ }^{3}$
(3) olко七.

[^53]Aeschylus ${ }^{1}$ : оіко is largely confined to the Oresteia. The singular shares freely with the two meanings of house (literal), and family (as e.g. in the expression "House of the Hohenzolern '") ; the plural too is used in both senses. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

Agam. 96I has been a source of trouble to some commentators ${ }^{3}$ :

oikos in the meaning of a storage-room, if so taken, is easily transferred to the store-supply itself. In Eum. 459 the singular appears in the meaning of native-land.

Sophocles has both numbers in the sense of family ${ }^{4}$ as well as that of house ${ }^{5}$; also in the sense of native-land. ${ }^{6}$ Neither here nor in Aeschylus does it ever have the meaning of temple.
The phrase кат оікоv appears nine times with the force of intus, ${ }^{7}$ and twice with the meaning of domi, in patria. ${ }^{8}$

Sophocles does not assume to use the plural of a cave as does Euripides. The metre would not oppose oikovs in Phil. 159. Euripides alone applies the word to a temple-Ion 458, Пú日ıov oikov. He has it also as an equivalent of ävт


(4) $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda a \theta \rho \alpha{ }^{9}$ first meant cross-beam, then roof. Already in Homer it had the wider sense of dwelling. ${ }^{\circ}$

[^54]Aeschylus:
Here it is always of a literal dwelling and in the plural, except Agam. 1434 where the sense is figurative ;

Even the plural is apparently restricted in its meaning, sometimes, to that of hall, apartments, as e.g. in Agam. 851,


Sophocles:
Both numbers appear in the sense of cave.
Compare Phil. 1453 :

and verses $146-147$ :



## Euripides:

The word appears twice of the Cyclops' cave. ${ }^{2}$
(5) $\sigma \tau$ éyac. ${ }^{3}$

Aeschylus ${ }^{\text {: }}$
The plural is usually synonymous with $\delta \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a$, which it follows by analogy. The plurals in Eum. 56, and Prom. 709-gypsy wagon-homes-are true ones.

The singular occurs of one chamber in Frag. 124, 2-iv à $\nu \delta \rho \in \dot{q} \boldsymbol{q} \sigma \tau \in ́ \gamma \eta$.

Sophocles:
The stereotyped phrase кa亢à $\sigma \tau$ '́夭 $\gamma$ as is common ${ }^{5}$ (compare кат' оікоv).

[^55]The singular clearly means one room in OT. '1262 :
ёк $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \nu \theta \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$

The singular ${ }^{1}$ is twice used of Philoctetes' cave and the plural once (Phil. 286, 1262 respectively).

## Euripides :

Both plural and singular are used of the Cyclops' cave. ${ }^{2}$
Fiven in the plural the word seems to mean one chamber, Med. 1142-3 ${ }^{3}$ :


(6) ठ̈poфо七 ${ }^{4}$ naturally follows $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \gamma a s$ in plural uses.

Aeschylus Supp. 647-8 :


Compare the two following from Euripides-Ion II43: $\pi \rho \omega \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\tau}$
 and verses 89-90 :

Фоíßov пє́тєтаи.
(7) Пє́руана ${ }^{5}$ (arces).

Aeschylus Prom. 955-56:

vaíє七ข ả $\pi \epsilon \nu \theta \hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \gamma \alpha \mu(a) .{ }^{6}$
Phil. 346-47 :



[^56]In Euripides also the plural is not infrequently used of one citadel, ${ }^{1}$ and there as elsewhere is probably poetic.

## THE TEMPLE.

2. 

Analogous to the above are the frequent poetic uses of the plural for temple. As has already been seen the words above are often used for a temple in both numbers. ${ }^{2}$ The plural usage is naturally extended to words whose regular meaning is temple. In Homer, however, no such influence was effective.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| áváктора <br> (Lit. king's dwelling) vaoí (vךoí) | $12$ | $I^{4}$ | $0$ $0$ | 0 0 | 18 2 | 0 4 | $2^{3}$ Pas | $\begin{array}{r} 13^{3} \\ \operatorname{sim}^{6} \end{array}$ |

The adjectival substantives $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \eta \dot{p} \quad$ and $\mu a v \tau \epsilon i \alpha$ which occur in the sense of temple, shrine are for convenience listed here.
(3) $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \eta \rho^{\prime} \mu$ is non-Homeric, and outside of Euripides (i.e. in Aeschylus and Sophocles ${ }^{7}$ ) is found only in the plural.

Aeschylus Eium. 194-195: ov̉ Хрŋбттрiots


[^57]Ion 299 :

With this compare Med. 667 :

(4) $\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{\alpha} \alpha$ means ( 1 ) oracular response, (2) seat of an oracle : in the former sense is the lone Homeric use ( $\mu$ 272) which is plural.

Aeschylus ${ }^{2}$ Prom. 831 (of one shrine) :
$\mu a v \tau \epsilon i ̄ a ~ \theta a ̂ k o ́ s ~ \tau ' \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau i ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon \sigma \pi \rho \omega т о v ̂ ~ \Delta ı o ́ s . ~$
Ion 42 :
 with which compare verse 66:

3.

TENT, CHAMBER, CAVE, LAIR.
The leading words in this group are three : $\kappa \lambda \iota \sigma i a l$, $\theta a ́ \lambda \lambda \mu o \iota$, äv $\nu \underset{\sim}{\text { a }}{ }^{3}$ The plural of the first often occurs for the singular in Homer. * This is true once of $\theta$ áda $\mu \circ \iota$, butả้ arpa is a singular only in Homer. As will be seen there is a strong movement toward the plural in Tragedy-in the case of these as well as numerous others subjected to analogical influence.
(a) Tent.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
|  | 66 | 54 | 1 | 0 | I | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| бкпүаі́ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| бкәขшрата | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathrm{I}^{5}$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 3 |

${ }^{1}$ Other singulars: Ion 512, 1336.
${ }^{2}$ Sing. I (Eum, 4-oracular seat), plur. 2 ; but in Sophocles sing. 2 in sense of oracular seat-El. 33, OT. 243.
${ }^{2}$ See Ebeling Lex. Hom., p. 824.
${ }^{4}$ The Homeric figures for the three words mentioned are as follows: $\kappa \lambda \iota \sigma$ ial-Sing. 66, plur. 54. $\theta$ á $\lambda a \mu 0$-Sing. 64, plur. 7, àv $\rho \alpha$-Sing. 12, plur. 0.

[^58](1) $\kappa \lambda \_\sigma i a u$.

Aj. 191-192 ${ }^{3}$ :


Euripides has no poetic plural of клeocial in this sense, but in another sense it occurs. ${ }^{2}$
(2) $\sigma к \eta \nu а i^{3}{ }^{3}$

In all the five uses here-both singular and plural, the tent of Ajax is referred to.

As for Euripides, compare the singular of Hec. 53, Rhes. 45, with the plural of Tro. 139,176 : in every case the reference is to Agamemnon's tent."
(3) $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \omega ́ \mu a \tau \alpha$.

The plurals of Cyc. 324 and Ion II 33 are singular in meaning.
(b) Chamber, apartment.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| Oálаро | 64 | 7 | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | 4 | $\mathrm{I}^{6}$ | 7 | 31 |
|  | 0 | o | o | 2 | - | 3 | - | 2 |
| aủdaí | 45 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | - | 3 | 4 | 13 | $5^{5}$ |
| àvo̊pŵves | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | o | - | - | - |
| $\pi \alpha \rho \theta \epsilon \nu \omega ิ \nu \epsilon ¢$ | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| క̇evติves | o | 0 | o | o | 0 | o | - | 2 |
| ขvцфєิа | o | o | 0 | - | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| єiрктаі' | - | - | $\bigcirc$ | - | - | o | - | 2 |

${ }^{1}$ Cf. the sing. ib. 1407 .
${ }^{2}$ E.g. Alc. 993-94, where the original force appears (kג(nw) :


${ }^{3} \mathrm{Cf}$. Eur. IA. I, where $\delta \delta \mu \omega \nu$ equals $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \hat{\eta} s$.
${ }^{4}$ Similarly the plurals of Ion 982, 1129.
${ }^{6}$ True plural.
(I) $\theta$ á $\lambda a \mu o \iota .{ }^{1}$

In Aeschylus the plurals are probably true ones ${ }^{2}$; so also in Sophocles. ${ }^{3}$

In Euripides the plural is more often poetic then not ${ }^{4}$, being used in particular of a bridal chamber. The same bridal bower is referred to by the singular and the plural-





Only the plural appears in Tragedy.
In Aeschylus the word always equals $\theta$ ádauot.
Soph. E1. 1391-3 deserves mention :



where $\ell \in \dot{\delta} \dot{\lambda} \lambda c a$ is best taken, probably, as meaning an inner apartment and not as synonymous with $\sigma \tau$ é $\gamma$ as.

Euripides has the word only in the meaning of a quarter-deck. ${ }^{\top}$
(3) av̉גai. ${ }^{8}$

[^59]Sophocles：
As for Phil．153，the chorus are not yet aware of Philoctetes＇ cave－dwelling and the plural may not be called singular in meaning．The plural has an indefinite force in Ant． 785 ：
̇̇v $\boldsymbol{\tau}$＇ảypovóross av̉̉aîs（＂in pastoral wilds＂）．Elsewhere the plural is of one chamber－

Trach．901－02 ：

бтópvrvтa（the single aủ入ŋ́）．
Ant．944－46 ：



The poetic plural does not occur in Euripides．
（4）$\dot{2} \nu \delta \rho \omega \hat{\nu \epsilon}$ ．
Agam．242－244 ch．：
ध̇лєє̀ то入入áкıร

${ }_{\epsilon} \mu \varepsilon \lambda \psi \in \boldsymbol{v}$（the dining room）．
Cho． 712 ：

（5）$\pi \alpha \rho \theta \epsilon \nu \omega ิ \nu \epsilon$ ．
Prom．645－46 of Io＇s room）：


Phoen．193－4：

$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \theta \epsilon \nu \omega ิ \sigma \iota ~ \mu i ́ \mu \nu \epsilon ~ \sigma o i ̂ s ~(A n t i g o n e ' s ~ r o o m) . ~$.
Similarly IA．1174－5 ：
 кєvoùs $\delta$ ถ̇ $\pi a \rho \theta \epsilon v \omega ิ v a s ~(I p h i g e n i a ' s ~ r o o m) . ~$.

[^60]Orestes speaks to Iphigenia of the spear hid in her room in Iphigenia among the Tauri 826 :

(6) ${ }^{\text {E }} \in \nu \omega ิ \nu \epsilon \varsigma .{ }^{1}$

The plural most likely refers to but one chamber ${ }^{2}$ in Alc. 543 :

and verses $546-7$ :

छєยติvas ő̧as.
(7) ขv $\mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \hat{a}{ }^{3}$ has the meaning of bridal-chamber in Trach. 920, while the singular means the same in Ant. 891, 1205.
(8) єipктаi. ${ }^{4}$

The two plurals occurring in Tragedy are poetic-Bacch. 497 :

and verse 549 of the same play :

(c) Cave, lair.

Influence in favor of the plural did not affect the words of the following table till after Homer.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| ${ }^{*} \nu \tau \tau \rho \alpha$ | 12 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | II | 27 |
| $\alpha v$ Vıa | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| өa入ápaı | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| бךкоís | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 |

${ }^{1}$ Cf. Paley on Alc. 546, p. 272.
${ }^{2}$ So Kummerer, op. cit., p. 9 : he, following Vitruvius, mentions $\xi \in \nu \omega \hat{\omega}$ es as comprehending "triclinia et cubicula commoda."
${ }^{3}$ See $\nu v \mu \phi \in i ̂ a ~ u n d e r ~ " A b s t r a c t s . " ~$
${ }^{4}$ Meaning prison. Cf. छрк $\eta$ p. 88, to which the plural may be analogous.
${ }^{5}$ The meaning and use of $\sigma \eta \kappa b s$ in Attic Prose (cf. Speech of Lysias $\Pi$ epi $\tau \circ \hat{v} \sigma \eta \kappa o \hat{v}$ ) indicates that the plural here is on the analogy of $\alpha \nu \tau \rho \alpha, \theta a \lambda \alpha \mu a \iota$ and the like. In Homer it means pen, fold.
(1) ävтpa.

In Aeschylus there appears to be no sure case of the plural for the singular, for example-

Prom. 133-1 34 :

Verse 453 : ă้vт $\rho \omega \nu$ є่v $\mu v \chi$ रis ${ }^{1}$ àv $\eta \lambda$ ióos.

## Sophocles ${ }^{2}$ :

The notion is singular in two instancesPhil. 1263 :

OC. 1569-71 :


入óyos aî̀̀ éx $\chi$ ce.
Euripides *:
Here the plural regularly applies to but one cave. The cave of the Cyclops is designated by the singular 3 times, by the plural 14 times; while the cave in Ion is mentioned in the singular 6 times, plural 3 times. Such a discrepancy in ratio for the two plays affords room for conjecture as to whether the nature of the two caves mentioned, or the difference in the date of the composition of the Ion and Cyclops, could have had any bearing on the result.
(2) aṽ $\lambda c a .^{\text {b }}$

[^61]Sophocles has aṽ $\lambda c a$ only in Philoctetes where in each case it refers to Philoctetes' cave ${ }^{1}$ -

Verses in 149-50:

$\pi \epsilon \lambda a ̂ \tau \epsilon .{ }^{2}$
In Euripides both numbers occur of the Cyclops, as the following in the Cyclops show-

Verses 345-46:


and verse 593 :

(3) $\theta a \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu a u .{ }^{\text { }}$

Euripides has the plural for the cave of Trophonius-Ion 392-394 :


$\lambda \iota \pi o ́ v \tau \alpha$ $\theta a \lambda a ́ \mu a s ~ к т є$.
Phoen. 931-2 (the dragon's den) :


Eur. Supp. 980 (of a grave) :

Kaтavéшs.
(4) бךкоі: ${ }^{\text {b }}$

In Euripides both the singular (Phoen. roo9, of a dragon's lair) and the plural occur in the sense of $\theta a \lambda a \dot{\mu} a$.

[^62]Ion 300 (of the cave of Trophonius):

When the meaning is that of a sacred enclosure, even when referring to a city, city-walls, the singular is used. ${ }^{1}$ Kummerer's suggestion, therefore, that the one plural here is on the analogy

4.

THRONE, SEAT.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| $\theta$ póvot | 34 | 19 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 17 | 6 | 15 |
| $\theta$ аิкоя ${ }^{3}$ | 4 | $2^{2}$ | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| $\epsilon$ ¢раи | 5 | $7{ }^{3}$ | 6 | 9 | 15 | 4 | 26 | 21 |
| ¢¢pava | o | o | - | 3 | - | 4 | 1 | 1 |

(i) $\theta$ póvoc. ${ }^{4}$

In Homer the sense is always literal and the plural is nowhere to be found for the singular. ${ }^{\text {b }}$

As for Tragedy, the earlier uses of the plural in an apparently singular meaning involve, I believe, a concept which is really plural, just as in the case of $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a .{ }^{6}$ The following studies seem to prove this a general principle. If Euripides uses the plural of one ordinary seat, it may be said that this is not the only instance where with him convention has superseded precedent or logic.

[^63]${ }^{6}$ See pp. 37-39.

Aeschylus:
In the singular here the word has its literal sense except in Agam. 982 where the meaning is figurative ${ }^{1}$ :

as also Sept. 409-10:

тинิәта.
In Supp. 208 the Coryphaeus is speaking for the whole chorus :

The following citations serve to show that the plural is not merely the throne but has a much fuller concept,-it connotes the prerogatives, rights, privileges of the royal office; the abstract notion in fact is paramount.
Prom. 767 :

also verses 909-10 :
ös aủròv éк тvpavvíoos

and verse 912 :

Pers. 774-5:


Cho. 572 :

also verse 975 :
 temnestra ${ }^{3}$ ).

Eum. 18 :


[^64]Verse 29:

Verses 46-47:


Verse 511:

Verse 616:

Especially noteworthy is Supp. 374-75 :

$\pi a ̂ v$ ย̇ $\pi \iota$ ıраíveıs.

## Sophocles ${ }^{3}$ :

The above observation applies in general to Sophocles also.
Ant. 165-6 :
тov̂ro $\mu e ̀ v ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \Lambda a ̂ ́ o v ~$


## Verse 173:


OC. 237 :

Verses 1267-68:



## Verses 1293-4 :



Trach. 362-63:


${ }^{1}$ Cf. And. 699 :

and also ib. Or. 897.
${ }^{2}$ Note that ${ }^{\delta} \nu \theta \rho b$ vors comprises half the uses in Aeschylus.
${ }^{3}$ The only singular is OT. 16 r , where the word is best taken as meaning the chair of Artemis' statue:



OC. 367-68 :


Verse 375 :

Verse 1380-81;

кратоขิбเข-
where the word seems to pass entirely into the abstract, in contrast with $\theta$ áкпиа ${ }^{1}$-the seat.

O'T. 399-400 :

## ठоки̂v $\theta$ рóvots


where the meaning must be more than literal. Tiresias thinks to have a controlling hand in the new administration, is the idea. $\theta$ póvot occurs here three times in close connection with $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a$.
OC. 425-6 :

$\mu$ е́veєєv,
Verses 448-49:


Verse 1354:

In two instances, however, the literal idea is strong where the plural is found (but see remarks under head of Metre) -

E1. 267-269:



Soph. Frag. 144 :



[^65]There is a sense of vagueness in the plural when applied to the throne of Zeus，such as is noted in similar uses of ${ }^{\epsilon} \delta \rho a \iota$ and $\epsilon^{\varepsilon} \delta \rho a v a a^{1}$－

Ant．1040－41 ：


that is，the sky－throne of Zeus，symbolical of his manifold powers （ $\kappa \rho a ́ \tau \eta)$ ，which comprehend all those of lesser potentates． Similarly those of an Agamemnon or an Oedipus embrace the chief command over various subordinate rulers．

Euripides ${ }^{2}$ ：
Similar to the common uses of Aeschylus and Sophocles are those of the Phoen．74－75：


and Herc．Fur．166－67：
ởß ү⿳亠口冋阝 катактаข̀̀v

The abstract notion is not absent even in Ion 1571－73：

iסpuqov，
and verse 1618：

Euripides has the singular twice ${ }^{3}$ for the oracular throne of Apollo at Delphi，but the meaning is literal．

Only in Cyc． 579 is the singular used of the throne of Zeus ：
тov̂ $\Delta$ cós тє тòv $\theta$ póvov ${ }^{4} / \lambda \epsilon$ v́r $\sigma \omega$ ．
In the four citations following，divine－thrones are referred to by the plural，and in each case the notion is concrete－

[^66]IT．1270－1 ：


Tro．835－37 ：
ov̉ $\delta$ §̀ $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi \alpha ~ v \epsilon \alpha-$

ка入入ıүа́ла⿱㇒ т тє́фєıร．
Hel．241－43：
à ©è Xpvoćoss $\theta$ póvots


Herc．Fur． 1127 ：

In Rhes． 269 the plural may have merely the literal idea ：

Euripides reaches the extreme in using the plural for one literal
seat－
Med．1163－4：

Med．ir69－70 ：


Med．I190：

Alc．945－6 ：


where $\theta_{\text {póvovs }}$ is as $\epsilon \boldsymbol{v} v a ́ s$ probably singular in sense．
Or．1408－9 ：


үvvaukós．
（2）Өâкоь．

[^67]Agam. 518-9:


where the meaning is probably singular. ${ }^{1}$
The plural in OC. 9-10 may be corrupt :

ทै $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \beta \epsilon \beta \eta ́ \lambda o \iota s ~ \hat{\eta} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̈ ̉ \lambda \sigma \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu ~ \theta \epsilon \omega ิ \nu . ~$
The manuscript reading is hard to sustain. ${ }^{2}$ Euripides has the plural in singular meaning, Phoen. 839-40 :
oi $\omega \nu \imath \sigma \mu \tau^{\prime}$ ó $\rho v i ́ \theta \omega \nu \mu a \theta \grave{\omega}$

with which compare Ant. 999-1000, where the same Tiresias is speaking :

¿乡 $\omega \nu^{8}$
(3) É $\delta \rho \alpha{ }^{4}$

Prom. 389 :

The poetic plural here parallels certain uses of $\theta$ póvou. ${ }^{5}$
Sophocles:
In verse 2 of the Oedipus Tyrannus the plural is probably influenced by the number of persons alluded to:


[^68]
## Euripides:

To be compared are one use of the singular and three of the plural, the same object being referred to in each case-

Hel. 315 :

Hel. 797 :

Similar to the latter are the plurals of verses 528 and 1178 .
Compare also Herc. Fur. 1214 :

with Herac. 55 :

(4) $\epsilon$ ढipava (poetical form of $\left.{ }^{\circ} \delta \rho \alpha \iota\right)$.

Aeschylus ${ }^{2}$ Supp. 100-102 :



Sophocles ${ }^{4}$ Aj. 194 (of one seat apparently) :

5.

GATE, DOOR.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| «v́dą | - | 63 | - | 39 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 82 |
| $\theta$ Ópout | 9 | 62 | 1 | - | o | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| $\theta v$ v́pet $\rho a$ | - | 4 | - | o | - | - | 1 | 5 |
| $\pi \rho 0 ́ \theta v \rho a$ | 14 | 9 | o | 0 | o | $0^{5}$ | o | 2 |

${ }^{1}$ Cf. also Bacch. 410 with ib. 952.
${ }^{2}$ In Pers. 4 the plural means the palace or treasury of Xerxes (see Hesiod V 49).

${ }^{4}$ In OC. 176 and 233 the plural has the vague sense of herabouts, quarters, while the particular idea is indicated ib. 192 f . In Tro. 538 the word refers to the temple of Pallas.
${ }^{5}$ Unless Wolf's conjecture $\pi \rho \circ \theta \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \boldsymbol{y}$ be accepted for El. 109.

These words commonly refer to but one entrance. Starting with Homer- $\pi$ úlau and $\theta$ v́pat have a dualistic force as the modifying adjectives show in the two passages following, M 453-456 :




and $\rho 267-8$ :

It is hardly safe to claim the plural in Tragedy as a poetic plural, if we except such a clear case of license (or perhaps convention) as that of the opening to the Cyclops' cave, which in fact was closed by one large door, or rather stone! In our field I find no trace of the singular $\pi \dot{\lambda} \lambda \eta$ prior to Sophocles. As for oúpal, it also persists strongly in the plural both in Homer and Tragedy, while in both $\theta \dot{v} \rho \in \tau \rho a$ is a plurale tantum. ${ }^{1}$

Accordingly the later formations $\pi v \lambda \omega ́ \mu a \tau \alpha, \pi \rho o ́ \pi v \lambda \alpha, \pi \rho o v \omega ́ \pi \kappa \alpha$, $\pi \rho o ́ \theta v \rho a$, ávrítvpa, develop as pluralia tantum in Homer. ${ }^{2}$
(i) $\pi$ údat. ${ }^{3}$

Cyc. 667-8 (of the door to the cave) :

$$
\dot{\epsilon ̇ v} \pi{ }^{\prime}
$$


(2) Dípat.

[^69]Compare the singular of Cyc. 502,

with the plural in verse 635,


(3) $\theta$ v́pet $\rho a-B a c c h .448$, Herc. Fur. 999, Or. 1473.
(4) $\pi \rho o ́ \theta v \rho \alpha^{2}$-Cho. 966 ; Alc. ıor, Tro. 194.
(5) $\pi v \lambda \omega \mu \mu \tau \alpha-$ Sept. 408, 799 ; Phoen. $113^{3}$, Hipp. 808, Hel. 789, Ion 79.
(6) $\pi$ ро́тv $\lambda \alpha^{4}$-Soph. El. 1375, Herc. Fur. 523.
 Homeric precedent.

One other word may be added, which follows Ov́pat, av́lat in meaning and number 3 times.
(8) єौनoסo. ${ }^{6}$

Of the entrance to Phoebus' temple is Ion 34 :

-
6.

BED, COUCH.
By resorting to Homer it is found that the starting point lies in $\delta \epsilon ́ \mu \nu \imath a$, which is there a plurale tantum. $\lambda \epsilon \in \chi \eta$ is found more often in the plural than the singular. $\lambda$ éкт $\rho \boldsymbol{a}$ which is rare there appears four times with singular meaning but only in the convenient metrical form $\lambda_{\epsilon \text { éк }} \rho o \iota \sigma \iota(v)$. The vacillation of $\lambda^{\prime} \chi \eta$ is clearly the result of metre. ${ }^{7}$

[^70]${ }^{7} C f$. Witte, op. cit., p. 28.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur． | Sing． | Plur． |
| Sérvıa | 0 | 13 | 0 | － | 0 | 2 | 2 | 15 |
| 入é ${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | 2 I | 27 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 67 | 39 |
| 入éктра | 6 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 84 |
| củvaí | 62 | $14^{1}$ | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 30 | 29 |
| коіт $u^{2}$ | 1 | 0 | $3(2)$ | 2 | 5 | 2 | II | 10 |
| к入ıテía | 66 | 54 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | I | 3 |
| ¢บื้атท́pıa | 0 | 0 | 1 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| ¢บื้ท́para | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

A study of the uses of סє́яvia and $\lambda \epsilon \in \tau \rho a$ in Tragedy shows that the plural there is a convention，and that the singular can usually be explained on metrical grounds．${ }^{3}$
（i）$\delta \in ́ \mu \nu a$ ．
The two plurals in Sophocles－Trach．901，915－are of one couch．So usually those in Euripides．＂
（2）$\lambda^{\prime} \notin \eta$ ．
Of Zeus＇couch is Prom． 895 ；and so of one couch are O T． 821 ， 1243，Trach． 920 as also various uses in Euripides．${ }^{5}$

Noteworthy is $\lambda$ éxea in El．479－481 ch．：
тоผิขס̆ ävaкта סорเто́vшv

бà $\lambda$ é $\epsilon a, ~ к а к o ́ ф \rho ш \nu ~ к о ́ \rho а, ~$
where $\lambda^{\prime} \chi \in a$ is equivalent to $\gamma u v \eta^{\prime}{ }^{6}$
（3）$\lambda$ е́ктра．

[^71]Of one bed are, for example, Pers. 704, OC. 527, Ant. 862, Phil. 699, OT. 260 ; and so very often in Euripides.
(4) єv̉vaí.

Agam. 1192-93 :


Cho. 318 :

Sophocles does not have the plural in the mere literal sense of cubile, ${ }^{2}$ but Euripides has the plural of one bed several times. ${ }^{3}$
(5) коїта.

Of one couch are Trach. 921-22 ${ }^{4}$ :
ต́s " $\mu$ ’ ойтотє

and Soph. El. 194, èv коі́таєs $\pi a \tau \rho \underset{\alpha}{\text { ats. }}$
(6) клıбiau (See pages 60-6I).

Trach. 918 :

(8) єv̉vๆ́ $\mu a \tau \alpha$.

Occurs in Tragedy only in Ion 304 :


$$
7
$$

altar, Foundation, capital.
There is no indication of the plural for one altar in Homer. In $\omega_{441^{6}}$ the plural is of the chariot platform, the stepsd $\nu \dot{\alpha} \beta a \theta \rho a$-of the palace. Where the plural is used of one altar in Tragedy, it probably suggests the nature of the structure. ${ }^{7}$

[^72]Homer provides no precedent for the poetic plurals ér $\chi$ ápal,
 $\beta \omega \mu$ о́.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| $\beta \omega \mu$ ó | 15 | $5^{1}$ | 16 | $12^{8}$ | 3 | 8 | 48 | 26 |
|  | 7 | $1^{1}$ | 2 | $1^{3}$ | 2 | 1 | 10 | 7 |
| крךтiठ¢¢ | - | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 4 | 5 |
| èлíкрауа | 0 | o | - | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - | 1 | 1 |

(1) $\beta \omega \mu o i$.

Soph. ${ }^{2}$ Ant. 1016 :

Ant. Io05-06 could hardly refer to more than one altar :


OC. 897-8 seems to mean merely the one altar of Poseidon, ${ }^{4}$ inasmuch as no other god is mentioned :


It is more natural to assume but one altar in Trach. 904-05:


Eur. El. 803-04 (of one altar) :


(2) $\boldsymbol{e} \sigma \chi$ व́pau.

[^73]Eur. Supp. 290 :

And. 1102:

Phoen. 284 :

(3) $\kappa \rho \eta \pi i \delta \epsilon \epsilon$.

IT.996-97 (of the stone pedestal bereft of image) :
ทัvíк' ầv кєขàs
$\kappa \rho \eta \pi i \delta a s$ єṽp $\eta$ 入aívas ảyá $\lambda \mu a \tau o s$.
Ion 38-39 :
ท้̈сүка каì тòv $\pi а i ̂ \delta a ~ к \rho \eta \pi i \delta \omega \nu \nu^{4}$ ё $\pi \iota$ тi${ }^{\prime} \eta \eta \mu$ ขaov̂ то̂ิठє.
Also verse 510:

(4) ітікраиа.

IT. 50-52 (of the capital of the pillar):


̧̇av0às каӨєîval.

## 8. <br> TOMB, ${ }^{7}$ CASKET.

Words of this class are appended here not as logically having place, perhaps, but for convenience of classification.
(I) Táфoc. ${ }^{8}$
${ }^{1}$ Cf. ${ }^{\text {é } \sigma \chi \alpha ́ \rho a \nu, ~ i b . ~} 1200$.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. ${ }^{1} \sigma \chi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \nu, \mathrm{ib} .1138$.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. $̇ \sigma \chi$ ápav, Herac. 121.

${ }^{5}$ Cf. àvaкт $\delta \rho \omega \nu$ крךпî̀os, And. IIIIf.
${ }^{6}$ Cf. the other use of the word (singular), Hipp. 201.
${ }^{7}$ rór $\beta$ ßos is of frequent occurrence both in Homer and Tragedy but it entirely resists the poetic plural.
${ }^{8}$ Occurs Homer sing. 9 (sepultura) ; Aesch. sing. 16, plur. 2. (Sept. 914true plural, and Eum. 767 ) ; Soph. sing. 33, plur. 5 (all poetic plurals). Euripides has both numbers often, but the plural never occurs in sense of tomb.

Volp says: "Nam cum $\tau$ áфos sepulturam significet, de sepulcro legitur тáфoo." "This is misleading, for the singular is frequently used in the meaning of tomb, while the plural is rare in any sense.

Campbell concludes that "The use of the plural may perhaps point to the various ceremonials of burial, or to the number of tombs in the place where Polybus was gathered to his forefathers." That the latter notion is present is suggested by certain passages in Herodotus ${ }^{2}$; that the former can hardly be, may be seen in OT. $94^{2}$ and other places where the deceased is represented as already év $^{v}$ тáфoıs; that all five uses of the plural in Sophocles are poetic, and can be explained on metrical grounds is shown on another page-in the section on Metre.

Eum. 767 :

Here $\eta \dot{\eta} \epsilon \mathrm{i} \mathrm{s}$ might be regarded as including both Orestes and his contemporaries. The very fact that tádos occurs in the plural without any constraint of metre assures this-for elsewhere in Tragedy the plural has an explanation on that ground. And yet if $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \bar{i} s$ is a Pluralis Maiestatis, ${ }^{3}$ đáфos may be plural by attraction.

OT. $942^{4}$ :

(2) тафai. ${ }^{5}$

Of one person are Aj . ro89-90 :


Same drama, verses irog-io :


[^74]Hel．1063－4 ：

In the citations from Herodotus（page 81，note 2）the plural certainly means one tomb and equals ráфoıs．Jebb，however， thinks the word＂has its ordinary sense＇rites of sepulture＇＂ in Ajax 1090．The meaning of grave seems surely more natural in the three instances above，and furthermore only the plural is found where such a meaning seems apparent．
（3）кє́́向o七 ${ }^{2}$ is used poetically of a cedar－casket in Alc．365－6：

бò̀ тоv́のסє $\theta$ єîvau．
The plural carries with it a sense of vagueness just as $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta o ́ \lambda \omega \nu$ in Tro．II4r，where кé $\delta \rho o v$ appears in sense of casket ：


[^75]
## CHAPTER I.

PART TWO.

## Abstract Nouns.

I.

## MURDER, DEATH.

Of the words following only six occur in Homer : фovai, ${ }^{1}$ фóvou,
 Oávarot are found in the plural there. фóvot is a plurale tantum both there and elsewhere. The lone plural of Aávarou has a particular meaning, ${ }^{3}$ while that of фóvo ${ }^{4}$ too is probably a true plural.

The primary impulse arising in Homer-in фovai, apparentlyeffects marked traces in Tragedy, where the poetic usage is seen not only in Homeric words but also in later formations as the tables under this head show.
(a) Murder.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| \$ovaí | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| фо́vor | 45 | 1 | 31 | 1 | 29 | 6 | 165 | 6 |
|  | o | o | 1(2) | 5(6) | 1 | 5 | 19 | 27 |
| $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma \sim i^{\prime}$ | 3 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| бфáyua | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | - | I | го | 20 |
| $\pi \lambda \eta \chi^{\prime} \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha} \alpha$ | - | - | 0 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 2 |
| тфаугатноí | - | 0 | 0 | - | o | - | 0 | 1 |
| Suaф才ораí | o | o | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| тротфа́yната | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 3(4) |

[^76](i) фovai. ${ }^{1}$

The force is singular in Agam. 447 :

Similarly the reference is to but one person in Ant. 696, 1314 ; Eur. E1. 1207. ${ }^{2}$
(2) фóvor.

In Eum. $843-845$ the plural is a true one, since the tribunal is permanent :

фóvшv סккaotàs ípкiovs ${ }^{8}$ aipov $\mu$ év


Sophocles:
Means murder or blood in the singular, but murder in the plural.
OC. 962-4 (Oedipus to Creon):

тov̂ $\sigma o v ̂ ~ \delta \iota \eta ̂ \kappa a s ~ \sigma \tau o ́ \mu a \tau o s, ~ a ̆ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \gamma ̀ ̀ ~ \tau a ́ \lambda a s ~$
グ้є $є к о \nu$ äкк $\omega \nu$.
The context shows that фóvovs refers merely to one murderthat of Laius by Oedipus ; otherwise it might include the attendants. The three plurals of the passage are highly rhetorical and seem to magnify the enormity of Creon's charge.

Same play, verses 989-90 :
ovis aièv ${ }^{4}$ é $\mu \phi$ épets $\sigma$ v́ $\mu$ ot

Similarly in Soph. El. 779 Agamemnon is referred to in the expression фóvovs $\pi a \tau \rho \not ̣ o v s . ~$

[^77]Soph. El. $11-13$ :

 ク̈vєүка (i.e. Agamemnon).
Trach. 557-58:


Ion 1026 (of Ion alone) :
av̉rov̂ vvv av̉ròv ктєiv่, iv’ ảpvíret фóvovs.
As for Sophocles two uses of the plural from his latest ${ }^{3}$ play would easily allow a substitution of the singular-so far as metre is concerned; but in them the plural seems to avoid specific reference,-the notion of murder is generalized.

In the passage above quoted from Euripides-it is the only poetic plural there-the meaning is approximately: Kill him here, and then thou canst deny guilt of murdering anybody.
(3). बфаяaí.

Agam. 1599 :
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi i \pi \tau \epsilon \ell \dot{\delta} \pi \dot{o}$ odayàs ${ }^{3}{ }^{\epsilon} \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$, where more than one are thought of.

[^78]Same play, verse 1057 :

and verse 1096 :
 and $\beta \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \eta$, respectively, suggests itself.

In 187 the statement is general :

Prom. 863 :

where $\sigma \phi$ ayaio is a bold enallage for aimaбt (which is often similarly used in the plural) and is simply proleptic. There is not sufficient warrant for the meaning usually given-throat. ${ }^{1}$ As often the word means gash, wound, in this particular case having especial reference to the blood.

Eum. 450-1 :


The plural is of one animal and clearly equals aipara ${ }^{2}$ in force.
Sophocles has the one singular with the five plurals-
Ajax 915-918:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { кали́ч } \omega \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

(i.e. the wound).
or as suggesting bits of flesh (cf. Neue's Formenlehre on Carnes). Aeschylean usage favors the plural as suggesting the former idea; and a kindred use to the latter meaning is found in Aesch. Prom. 863. See
 read ai $\mu$ a oo $\phi a \gamma \dot{\eta} s$ : $\sigma \phi a \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ is a gash or wound and aï $\mu$ atos $\sigma \phi a \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ is simply a bold enallage for ai $\mu a \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial} \tau \hat{\eta} s \sigma \phi a \gamma \hat{\eta}$, as Bloomfield notes.
${ }^{1}$ The array of authority for this meaning includes Bloomfield, Ruhnken, Paley, Sidgwick, Kummerer, Dindorf (Lex. Aesch.), Steph. Thes., Liddell and Scott. The following passages are summoned for support: кoıv̀े $\delta \dot{\xi}$
 $\tau \hat{\eta} s \sigma \phi a \gamma \eta{ }^{\prime} s($ Polyaen. VIII, 48). But other uses of the word in Tragedy as well as the nature of the participle $\beta \dot{\alpha} \psi a \sigma a$ make a strong presumption for the view here taken. Cf. Wecklein's note, " $\sigma \phi a \gamma a i$ кєît $\alpha \iota \pi \epsilon \rho i \tau o \hat{v} \alpha \imath \mu \alpha \tau$ os $\tau$ ồ $\phi o v e v \theta \in v t o s "$ ( Vol. II. p. 206) and alsp that of J. E. Harry, " $\epsilon v \phi b \nu \varphi$, not in iugulo " (p. 279). See Eur. Or. 29r for a similar use of $\sigma \phi \alpha \gamma \alpha i$ (quoted p. 87).
${ }^{2}$ See on $\alpha i \mu \alpha \tau \alpha, \mathrm{pp} .14-15$.

E1. 37 :

(of both Aegisthus and Clytemnestra).
Electra 568 :

$$
\text { ov́ катà } \sigma \phi \text { ayàs }
$$


(alluding to one fawn).
Trach. 571-573;



( $\sigma \phi x \gamma^{\omega} \nu$ being the wound inflicted by the one arrow ${ }^{1}$ ); similarly $\sigma \phi a \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$ verse 717 , but in verse 756 the plural is of several victims:


## Euripides ${ }^{2}$ :

Instances of the plural referring to one person are Rhes. 605-6:

$$
\tau \text { às } \delta^{\prime \prime} \text { Ектороs }
$$

єv̉vàs êarov каi каратópovs $\sigma$ фayás (murder, or death-blows ${ }^{3}$ ),
El. $1227^{-8}$ :

каì каӨáp $\quad$ обоv бфаүás (wound, gash),
Or. 291-2 :

шَal گ́íqos.
(4) $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma a i$.

Just as $\sigma \phi$ a $a i, \pi \lambda \eta \gamma a i$ assumes the force of wound, the plural being poetic, as for example in Eum. $103^{3}$ :

[^79]
and Ion 282 :

(5) $\sigma \phi a ́ \gamma \iota a$.

The poetic plural appears only in Euripides. In Hecuba the singular occurs three times ${ }^{2}$ of the victim (Polyxena), but the plural alludes to merely the one victim in verses $133-135$ :

$\mu \eta ̀$ тòv äpıotov $\Delta a v a \omega ̂ \nu \pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu$

Or. 658 (of Iphigenia) :

Or. 1284-5 (of Helen) :

$\sigma \phi a ́ \gamma u a$ фovivoбєıv ;
In certain cases, as for example Orestes 815 and Eiur. El. 1294, the plural equals $\sigma \phi a \gamma a i$, , фóvo or $\theta$ ávarou. In other instances the plural refers to more than one or merely generalizes.
(6) $\pi \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu a \tau \alpha$.

In Ant. 1283 there is probably but one wound in mind ${ }^{3}$ :


(7) $\sigma \phi а \gamma^{\prime} \alpha \mu \mu$ í.

Eur. El. 200 (of the murder of Agamemnon) : ov̉ $\pi a \lambda a \iota \omega ̂ \nu \pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \sigma ф а \gamma ı a \sigma \mu o i ́ . ~$
(8) סuaфӨopaí.

OT. 572-3:

 фövovs).

Sophocles OC. 551-2 :
 тàs aipainpàs o̊ $\mu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu \quad \delta u \neq \theta$ ooás (being here under the influence of $\dot{o}^{\mu} \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ ). A parallel to this is to be seen in Euripides ${ }^{4}$ :

[^80]Phoen. 870:


(9) $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi \dot{\gamma} \gamma \mu а \tau \alpha$.

Compare the two following citations from Euripides, ${ }^{1}$ both plural and singular being used of the same victim-

Hec, 41-42:


Hec. 265 :

So too the plural is of one victim in Tro. 628 and Eur. El. 1174.

In Alc. 844-45 the plural is used of the blood of one victim :


But the singular is collective and means two victims in IT. 458, and also in verses 241-244:

$\pi \lambda a ́ \tau \eta$ фvүóvтes $\delta i \pi \pi \tau v \chi$ ot veavía


(b) Death.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| Oávato | 136 | 1 | 20 | 5 | 18 | 4 | 92 | 6 |
| Oípata | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 10 | го |
| Mópot | 14 | 0 | 45 | 1 | 20 | 2 | 22 | - |
| $\phi \theta o \rho a i ́$ | - | - | $1^{\prime}$ | 1 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 |
| Svarai | o | o | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| катабкафаí | 0 | o | $\bigcirc$ | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

[^81]（I）$\theta$ ávatol．
Aeschylus ${ }^{1}$ Agam．1337－39 ch．：

каì тоîб८ $\theta a \nu o v \sigma_{\iota}$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$
тоเvàs $\theta a v a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ è $\pi \iota \kappa \rho a i ́ v \epsilon \iota$.
Cho．50－53 ch．：
ì̀ катабкафаì ঠó $\mu \omega \nu$
ảvク́入ıo七 $\beta \rho о т о \sigma \tau v \gamma \epsilon i ̂ s$
סуóфоt ка入v́ntтvaı סómovs
$\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi о \tau \omega ิ \nu$ Өaváтoıбı．
The piling up of the plurals in these choral passages promotes dignity and elevation of style．Oavát $\omega v$ ，$\theta a v a ́ \tau o \sigma \tau{ }^{2}{ }^{2}$ and $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \tau \omega ิ \nu$ all refer to Agamemnon，while $\boldsymbol{\tau o i ̂ s} \theta a v o v ̂ \sigma \iota$ alludes to Iphigenia．

Sophocles：
The death of many is meant in OC．1200，but E1．203－06 can mean only that of Agamemnon ：
${ }_{\omega}{ }^{3} \nu \dot{v} \xi$ ，${ }^{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \delta \in \epsilon i \pi \nu \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \nu$



Trach．1275－76（of Deianira＇s death）：


OT．49I－3 ：



Euripides ${ }^{4}$ has the plural for the singular in only two places－ El．482－5 ：

[^82]тоเүáp $\sigma$ ย́ $\pi$ от’ ov̉pavíßau



and Frag. 964, 4 :


The following facts appear : (i) The poetic plural is usually in choral passages-the place where one sees the tendency toward elevation in style, toward generalizing, and avoiding the specific $^{3}$; (2) The plural for the singular is an extension, no doubt, of the plural use where more than one person is referred to ; (3) Another influence at work is that of analogy ${ }^{4}$; (4) The metre is in some instances particularly favorable to the plural.

Seidler ${ }^{3}$ observes that the plural is used especially of a violent death. Peile has expressed the same view for aipara. ${ }^{6}$ But it is extremely doubtful whether in any of the words of this nature the notion of violence is a common result of plurality ${ }^{\text {. }}$ Then, too, the singular prevails in Tragedy in the ratio of eight to one ${ }^{8}$, and whatever the number a death in Tragedy is usually violent!

In Soph. El. 206, 日avátovs may have the force of death-blows, closely approaching $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma a i$, , $\boldsymbol{\phi} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ás as $e . g$. in каратó $\mu$ ovs $\sigma \phi a$ ás $^{9}$. Kaibel ${ }^{10}$ considers $\theta a v a ́ t o v s ~ a ~ p l u r a l ~ b y ~ a t t r a c t i o n ~ o f ~ a ̈ \chi ~ © ~ \# ~ ; ~ h i s ~ o b-~$

[^83]jection to the meaning of death-blows, however, is groundless as B 264, $\delta 244$ show ${ }^{1}$.
(2) ípara.

Agam. 1117-18 has the singular :


to which may be compared the plural of verse 1310 (not necessarily of one, however) :

In Sophocles the word is plurale tantum ${ }^{2}$, while the singular and plural occur with about equal frequency in Euripides.

Just as $\theta$ v́ratos means Qávarov in Agamemnon in 18 (above), so also the plural is (like $\theta$ ávator) used of one person in Soph. El. 573 :
 and in IA. 1484-6 :



In each case the plural is of Iphigenia only. Elsewhere the plural can refer to more than one object.
(3) $\mu$ ópot.

On the analogy of $\theta$ ávarot, $\mu$ ópol appears once in Tragedy of one death-Sophocles Ant. 1312-13 :


 (of Haemon) and є̇кє́v๗y $\mu$ о́р $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ (of Megareus).

If it be said that the fact of having two persons in mind explains the plural, yet none the less the singular would be expected in prose. Note that ка̉кєivov would produce hiatus.

[^84](4) $\phi \theta o \rho a i$.

Agam. 406 :
 .with which compare the plural in verse 814 :

where the adjective $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho o \theta v \hat{\eta} \tau a s$ is distributive and projects its plural notion into the noun.

Compare Eur. Frag. 813, 2 :

ยั้ยเซเข.
(5) $\delta v \sigma \mu a i$ is commonly found in the plural both in prose and poetry. By a striking transfer of meaning it once equals $\theta$ ávarot Aesch. Frag. 69 :

(6) катабкафаi. ${ }^{2}$.

Sept. 46 :
 deeds of destruction). In Cho. 50 the plural is highly poetic ${ }^{3}$ : ì̀ катабкафаі̀ ঠо́дшу.
Euripides:
Compare Hel. 196,
'İíov катағкафáv
with such uses of the plural as appear in the Phoen. I196,
жи́рүш̀ катабкафа́s
and in IA. 92, 1379,
катабкафаі̀ Фриуஸิข.
The force of attraction is obvious.
2.

## POWER, DOMINION, AUTHORITY.

A comparison of á $\rho \chi a i ́, \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta, ~ \theta \rho o ́ v o t ~ a n d ~ \sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a$ shows a frequent coincidence in meaning. The plural of $\theta \rho o v_{0}$ and $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho \alpha$

[^85]is the regular form in Tragedy when their meaning is extended to include that of ápхau, кра́т ${ }^{1}$.
(1) $\dot{d} \rho \chi^{\alpha i}$ is included here only in so far as it has the meaning above-mentioned-regal powers, and the figures given are so limited. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

Aeschylus ${ }^{3}$ Cho. 864-5 :
å $\rho \chi$ а́s $\tau є \pi$ тодıббоvó $\mu$ ovs

the plural being distributive of the functions of the kingly office (or possibly suggesting the reign of the former usurpers).

There are also certain uses of this word which have a concrete force as in Agam. 123-125:
$\kappa \kappa \delta v o ̀ s ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \sigma \tau \rho a \tau o ́ \mu a v \tau \iota s ~ i ̊ ~ i ̀ ̀ \nu ~ \delta v ́ o ~ \lambda \eta ́ \mu a \sigma t v ~ i ̈ \sigma o v s ~$


Sophocles ${ }^{5}$ Ant. 177 :

Same play verse 744 :
 my royal prerogatives.

Verses 796-7:

$\theta$ ध́ $\sigma \mu \omega \nu$,
with which compare OC. 1267:

and same play 1382 :


[^86]OT. 259 :

where ä $\rho \chi$ as equals крáт ${ }^{\text {a }}$.
Euripides ${ }^{1}$ And. 699-700:


 as the latter often approaches the abstract notion of $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi a i$.
(2) крár $\eta$ is always singular in Homer (30 times), but the plural is frequent in Tragedy, The uses in Tragedy are defined by Kummerer ${ }^{3}$ as follows :
(a) Kräftige gewaltsame Handlungen.
(b) Vorrang, Oberhand, Sieg.
(c) Herrschaft, Regierung.

He should have added a fourth class where the meaning is concrete (just as sometimes $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi^{a i}$ )-i.e. the word is used of the person who exercises authority. In this sense, however, the word appears only in Aeschylus and is singular in each case ${ }^{4}$.

The third class marks the uses to be noted here ${ }^{5}$. In this sense Aeschylus has the plural ${ }^{6}$ in Pers. 785 :

where the plural subject suggests attraction.
In Sophocles the word in this meaning is practically plurale tantum, ${ }^{\top}$ though the singular does appearin such an expression as $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ кра́тоs ${ }^{8}{ }^{\text {' }}$ 人 $\gamma$ v́yov (Phil. 142), apparently metri gratia.

[^87]In Euripides the singular becomes the more common number for the meaning in question. Such is the case in Bacch. 213:

The plural is found four times in Euripides, one instance of which has a place here-Hipp. 5 :

(3) $\theta$ рóvot-See pages 67-72.
(4) $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a$-See pages $3.7-39$.

$$
3 .
$$

MARRIAGE, WEDLOCK.
The pluralizing of words of this meaning most likely has its origin in the early and persistent plural of words meaning bed and the like. ${ }^{2}$ The two classes of words often approach in meaning, and in fact have a point of coincidence in the sense of marital relations, repeated intercourse. ${ }^{3}$

It is not meant, to be sure, that $\gamma \dot{\mu} \mu o$, for example, always carries such a meaning, but merely to point out the psychological process of the transition.

A comparison of the uses of $\delta \in ́ \mu \nu \imath a, ~ \epsilon \in ̉ v a i ~ a n d ~ \gamma a ́ \mu o ~ s h o w s ~ a ~ c o n-~$ fusion of terms and a consequent extension of pluralization, under the influence of $\delta \epsilon \in \nu \nu a$ and other plurals for couch.

Compare Hesiod Theog. 1293-4:


with Soph. Trach. 109:

In the former case $\gamma$ ámov is $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho a$, equals єv̉vaí (Liebesakte ) ${ }^{4}$, but as yet resists the plural ; while in the latter citation Tragedy has є่vaís as a mere equivalent of $\lambda \dot{\kappa} \kappa \tau \rho \Psi$.

[^88]Hesiod avoided $\gamma$ ámovs, but not so the dramatists as may be seen in such passages as Prom. 765 ,

тิ̂v $\sigma \omega ิ \nu ~ \gamma a ́ \mu \omega \nu ~ \mu \nu \eta \sigma т ท ̂ p o s ~$
and OC. 945-6,
үá $\mu \mathrm{o}$. . . . . . . . ảvóvtot,
both of which-among others-apparently contain the notion above-mentioned.

Homer has the plural but once. ${ }^{1}$ The meaning there however is the indefinite one of marriage-scene, ${ }^{2}$ or probably marriagefeast.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| үа́лов | 34 | 1 | 16 | 10 | 6 | 18 | 43 | 149 |
| vшифеїa | - | o | 0 | o | 2 | 3 | o | $\mathrm{o}^{3}$ |
| vvцфєv́mата | o | o | - | o | - | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| ข่¢е́vato | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 15 |
| $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \subset$ ¢́цата | o | o | $\bigcirc$ | o | 0 | - | 0 | 2 |


In Aeschylus ${ }^{4}$ the plural pertains to but one marriage-six times.

In Sophocles ${ }^{5}$ the plural commonly refers to but one marriage. The plural has a concrete force ${ }^{6}$ and serves a dramatic purpose in Trach. 1139:

( रápous being Iole, whose name Hyllus contemptuously avoids). Uses similar to this are found in Euripides, e.g. Hipp. 1026 :

[^89]
and Med. 18 :

In either case the purposeful avoidance of the name is obvious.
Of the very frequent occurrence of the plural for the singular in the common meaning only two are cited from EuripidesPhoen. 424:

IA. 720 :

(2) $\nu \nu \mu \phi \epsilon i ̂ \alpha$.

Sophocles ${ }^{1}$ Trach. 7-8:
$\nu \nu \mu \phi \in i \omega v$ (marriage as such) ӧ́кvov

Same play verse 920:

But Ant. 568 (of the fiancée ${ }^{2}$ ) :


ОТ. 980 :

Tro. 419-20:
є̇тоv $\delta \in ́ \mu \circ$
$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ v a v ̂ s, ~ к а \lambda o ̀ v \nu i ́ \mu \phi є v \mu \alpha ~\left(\right.$ bride $\left.^{2}\right) ~ \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \lambda a ́ \tau \eta$
with which compare the plural in Euripides Andromache 192-193:

$\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi \omega \theta \hat{\omega}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \nu \eta \sigma \dot{i} \omega v \nu \nu \mu \phi \varepsilon v \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu(h u s b a n d)$.
The regular use of the plural of such words when the meaning is concrete suggests metrical influence in case of the lone use of the singular.
(4) í $\mu$ évaıo means wedding-song in Homer,* Aeschylus, ${ }^{5}$ and

[^90]Sophocles, ${ }^{1}$ but it becomes indentified with yámo in Euripides, both in the singular ${ }^{2}$ and the plural. ${ }^{*}$
(5) $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \alpha$ is found only in the plural-Hel. I514, and Phoen. 570.

## 4.

## OTHER ABSTRACTS.

The more important poetic uses of Abstracts have already been mentioned. It would be unprofitable, no doubt, to give a detailed account of certain other Abstracts whose plurals are common in poetry. Many of them are not infrequent in prose and especially in Isocrates, in whose writings "the plural is so marked a mannerism and is so often suggested by the avoidance of hiatus that it is not necessary to insist on sharp distinctions in that author ${ }^{4}$." ${ }^{5}$

In Tragedy, too, hiatus and other metrical considerations are in many instances to be considered determining factors. This does not preclude the fact that the plural of itself often has a rhetorical, poetic value.

The plural often assumes a concrete force and denotes repeated acts of a given kind ${ }^{6}$, or successive manifestations of the same sensation ${ }^{7}$. The suggestion of Kummerer ${ }^{8}$ that the plural inintensifies the meaning is probably true in some instances.

As a matter of convenience three groups are added here, which of course bear no necessary relation, one to the others.
(a) Emotion, passion, affliction.
${ }^{1}$ Sing. OT. 422, plur. Ant. 813 (indefinite plural).
${ }^{3}$ As e.g. IA. 430, 624.
${ }^{3}$ As e.g. IA. 1079, Hipp. 552, 554.
${ }^{4}$ Gildersleeve, op. cit., § 42.
${ }^{5}$ Cf. English Prayer Book: "Forgive us all our sins, negligences and ignorances," and note analogy to "sins". With a similar concrete force is крд́т $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ (" powerful deeds "), Eur. Phoen. 1760.
${ }^{6}$ Cf. note 5 .
${ }^{7}$ E.g. Prom. 879 (quoted p. roo, s. v. $\mu a \nu(a l)$.
${ }^{8}$ Op. cit., II, p. 12.

|  | Homer |  | Aeschylus |  | Sophocles |  | Euripides |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
| ópraí | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 27 | 4 | 27 | 16 |
| mavial | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | I | - 6 | 10 |
| vórou | 0 | 0 | 21 | 6 | 45 | 9 | 40 | 10 |
| $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ óOot | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 25 | 2 |
| Ovjoí | $759{ }^{1}$ | 0 | 17(18) | I(o) | 28 | 0 | 32 | 0 |

From a comparison of the figures it will be seen that Homer is not responsible for these plurals of Tragedy : it is an innovation of the later poets.
(I) ópyaí.

Prom. 3 15:

where the plural suggests the outbursts of wrath.
Compare the four plurals of Sophocles. ${ }^{2}$ Med. II49-51 :
$\pi$ óбıs $\delta$ ¢̀ $\sigma$ о̀s

$\lambda \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu \tau a ́ \delta(\epsilon)$.
(2) $\mu a v i a u$.

Prom. 878-79:

بaviat (fits of madness) $\theta$ ád $\pi$ ovar.
Similarly in verse 1057:
$\tau i ́ \chi a \lambda \hat{q} \mu a \nu \iota \omega \bar{v}$;
Ant. 960-6I ${ }^{3}$;
кєîvos èmé $\gamma v \omega$ pavíuls


[^91]In Euripides also the plural regularly means successive attacks of rage, unless we except IT. 283-4, where one paroxysm is is meant :

$\mu a v i ́ a s{ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ álaívшr, каi $\beta$ oậ кuvaүòs $\dot{\text { wis, }}$
with which compare verses $980-91^{2}$ :


(3) vóтo.

Aesch. 586-87 :
Tís үàp âv катє́̇̃avgev ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{H}$ -
pas vóvovs ėmıßoúdovs.
The vórovs means the two afflictions sent upon Io-that of the heifer-form and the gadfly.

In Sophocles the two verses following are noteworthy-OT. 960 and 962 :


There is apparently no call for a sharp distinction nor indeed is there any such distinction. Note that (1) each verse is isolated ; (2) vór $\omega v$ could take the place of vóvov, while on the other hand vóve could not be employed in the latter unless the verse should be entirely reconstructed; (3) both verses are spoken by the same person, in close succession.

A similar freedom of Enallage is observable where the plural equals mavial (throes of frenzy), as in Soph. Aj. 59-60:
 and same play 66 :

For Euripides may be noted Or. 280-81 :



[^92]As being used once in the sense of ojpyai we may include here the concrete noun $\gamma \lambda \bar{\omega} \sigma \sigma a \iota$.
(4) $\gamma \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \sigma \alpha \iota$.

To кєрторіоь ópyais of Sophocles Antigone 956, compare the similar expression of verses 960-61 :

кยîvoş è $\pi$ ย́ $\gamma \nu \omega$ pavíaยs

In each case the meaning is vituperative thrusts: the $\gamma \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma a s$ is an interpretation of the concreteness in such plurals as obpaí. It is bold and poetic indeed to say-hurl tongues of wrath ${ }^{1}$ !
(5) $\theta v \mu o i ́$.

It seems strange that the plural is read but once in all Tragedy ; even here the authority is variant-Aj. 717-8 :

Aüas $\mu \in \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon \gamma \nu \omega ́ \sigma \theta \eta$

Indications favor $\theta v \mu \hat{\omega} \nu^{2}$. The plural is found in Attic prose. ${ }^{3}$
(b) Distributives ${ }^{4}$.

Such plural uses generally stand under the influence of other plurals in the sentence. ${ }^{5}$ For example note the two following from Sophocles-OC. $55^{2}$ :
$\tau$ às aí $\alpha \tau \eta \rho a ̀ s ~ o ̉ \mu \mu a ́ \tau \omega v ~ \delta ı a \phi \theta o \rho a ́ s ~$
and Phil. 304 :
oi $\pi \lambda o ̂ ̂ ~ \tau o ̂ ̃ \sigma \iota ~ \sigma \omega ́ ф \rho o \sigma \iota \nu ~ \beta \rho o \tau \omega ิ \nu . ~$
But similar uses occur in prose. ${ }^{6}$
${ }^{1}$ This is merely a poetic extension of such a use as that of Aj. 198-99:
 $\gamma \lambda \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \iota s \beta a \rho v \dot{\alpha} \lambda \gamma \eta \tau \alpha$,
where there is more than one person : While all men mock with taunts most grievous. Cf. какोे $\gamma \lambda \omega \bar{\sigma} \sigma \alpha$, slander (Pindar 4, 505), and Soph. El. 596$\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma a \nu$ lévat $\gamma \lambda \omega ิ \sigma \sigma a \nu$, let the tongue loose.
${ }^{2} \theta v \mu \omega \bar{\nu}, \Gamma$ and Triclinius; others, $\theta v \mu \delta \nu$ or $\theta v \mu \delta \nu \tau(\epsilon)$; Hermann and Jebb $\theta v \mu 0 \hat{\tau} \tau(\epsilon)$.

${ }^{4}$ Cf. Kühner, op. cit., Vol. I, \& 348 and Gildersleeve op. cit., § 42.
${ }^{B}$ Cf. Plautus Mil. Glo. 942 f :
Ubi facta erit conlatio malitiarum
Haud vereor ne nos subdola perfidia pervincamur.
${ }^{6}$ Cf. Antiphon I, 28.
(c) Of Theft.

Euripides provides some bold uses of certain abstracts meaning theft, following a similar use in Aeschylus of but one word-
(I) клотai. ${ }^{1}$

Aesch. Agam. 399-402 ch. :


Or. 1497-8 ch. :

where клотаis may stand under the influence of té $\chi$ varovv, ${ }^{3}$ the plural suggesting the devices employed in a given theft.

It is to be noted that the plural-of the theft of one personoriginated in a choral passage, where as has been seen already innovations more often make their initial appearance.

A strange extension of plural usage is that of Hel. 1765:

where $\kappa \lambda$ ло̀às $\sigma$ ás is : Thee who wast stolen.
(2) $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi a \gamma a i ́$.

In Aeschylus the plural occurs twice ${ }^{4}$ and the subject of the action is plural in each case. In Euripides all but two instances of the plural have reference to more than one act of plundering ; the two refer to the rape of Helen. ${ }^{5}$
${ }^{\circ}$ Cyc. 280-81 :



Hel. 1320-22 :

щабтєv́ováa пóvovs
Ouyatpòs àpтayàs סo入íovs.

[^93]
## CHAPTERI.

## PART THREE.

Thus far, attention has been paid to the force of the plural when used for the singular, and the different poetic purposes the same serves, only occasional references however being made to the question of metre. Metre should certainly not be neglected in the study of the subject as has been the case in the dissertations of Juhl, Kummerer and Volp ; for metrical influence is to be seen both in Homer and Tragedv. If the poet of Tragedy employed the plural purposely in every case to give a sense of vagueness, fullness, complexity, or for some other rhetorical or dramatic purpose, the causes of Enallage would be purely psychological. But if in many instances a free change of number suggests caprice ; if in a given verse which is grammatically isolated there is a plural where the singular would hardly be possible from a metrical standpoint ; if certain plural uses seem practically a convention-as in Euripides especially ; if the difference in meaning between the singular and plural is indistinguishable, there is good reason for recognizing metre as a very important factor in the heavy shift toward the plural, and so to (1) Homeric usage, (2) analogy, and (3) the frequent poetic value of the plural, is added another contributing cause(4) metrical convenience.

## Metre.

The metrical causes contributing most largely to plural usage are : (1) Avoidance of hiatus ; (2) The fact that irrational syllables are allowable only in the odd feet of the iambic trimeter and in the even feet of the trochaic tetrameter catalectic ${ }^{1}$; (3) The elective forms of the dative plural. ${ }^{2}$

[^94]The Poetic Plural of Greek Tragedy．
105

For the trimeter especially two things are noticeable：（i） Metrical convenience gives an impetus toward the plural to second declension nouns of pyrrhic sequence，as e．g．סó ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{1}$ ，$\gamma$ á $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ os， ổos，фóvos，máyos，tádos．（2）Neuter nouns in $-\mu \alpha$ are found largely in the plural．

$$
\alpha i \gamma c a \lambda i^{\prime}{ }^{2}
$$

Compare the long dative form of IA．210－211 ：


with I＇T． 425 ：
$\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ ä $\lambda \iota o v a i \gamma c a \lambda o ́ v . ~$

$$
\text { аірата. }{ }^{3}
$$

E1．1172－73：


Alc． 496 ：
фátvas ỉdoıs âv aïца⿱⺌兀v тєфvp $\mu$ évas．
In the former，note the long form of the modifying adjective ； in the latter，the ending－$\sigma t v$ which makes a long syllable．

## àvaסŋ́paтa．

Metre determines the number in the only instances of this word，which are found in Hipp． 83 ：

and Eur．El． 882 ：


## áváктора．${ }^{4}$

[^95]Of the same temple are And. 42-3:


and verses $117-19$ :

каì äváктора $\theta$ á்-
סapòv ov̉dè 入eímeıs.

That Tragedy upon the whole has a preference for the plural has proof: (I) The singular may be metrically convenient in (e.g:) Phil. 27, an isolated verse :

as also in Eum. 193 and Aesch. Frag. 261: (2) No metrica reason can be assigned for the plural of Aj .1263 :

(3) In Euripides' Cyclops where the singular occurs three times and the plural fourteen times of the same cave, the singular in each case may be accounted for, but not so with the plural ; it is actually preferred e.g. in verse 100 :
 and in verse 288 :

As for verses 87 and 426, the singular is purely metrical, while clearness of expression is apparently responsible for ${ }^{\mu} \nu \tau \rho o v$ :

In Ion 958, however, the singular appears where the plural is equally admissible :

àvti $\theta v \rho a$.
Compare the lone uses of Homer and Tragedy $-\pi$ 159:

Sophocles Electra 1433 :


[^96]
## 

Homer leads the way in yielding to the convenience of metre－



In Pers．190－19I is found an instance of the long dative form ：

そєข์ $\frac{1}{v o \sigma เ ข ~ a v ̉ \tau \omega ́ . ~}$
The plural secures a long syllable in Hipp．ir66：

but the singular appears in verse II95 of the same chariot ：

Particularly convenient seems the plural in Hel．in $80-1$ ：
$\lambda v ́ \epsilon \theta^{\prime}$ iтл兀кàs
фа́тvas ӧтабои́，кд̉ккоціًє $\theta^{\circ}$ äриата
$\tilde{\alpha}_{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha$,
The poetic plural appears once－in Ion 191－92 ：
＾єpvaîov v̌סpav èvaípє七

where the dative singular both of adjective and noun would be difficult of use．

$$
\text { d́prával }{ }^{2} \text {. }
$$

The poetic plural occurs only in Sophocles Ant． 54 ：

（where the long dative form is doubly convenient）．
Compare the singular in OT． 1266 ：


$$
\alpha \cup \dot{v} \lambda \alpha i^{\prime 3} .
$$

The poetic plural appears only in Sophocles Ant． 945 ：
d̉d入áǵal סéras èv $\chi^{a \lambda \kappa o \delta e ́ r o t s ~ a v ̉ \lambda a i ̂ s . ~}$
and Trach．901 ：


[^97]Note how the plural of the noun or its modifier avoids hiatus.

$$
a v ̃ \lambda c a^{1} \text {. }
$$

Phil. $954^{2}$ :

Pertaining to the cave are the following-Cycl. 345 :

and same play, verse 593 :

The occasion of the plural seems obvious.

$$
\alpha \boldsymbol{v} \chi \in ́ v \in \varsigma^{3} .
$$

Only one instance of the poetic plural can be cited-Soph. Frag. 598, 4 :

$$
\hat{\eta} \tau \iota \varsigma[\pi \hat{\omega} \lambda o s]
$$


In striking comparison with this is the singular collective of Rhes. 303-4 :


$\beta a ́ \kappa \tau \rho a$.
The poetic plural is in Euripides only. Phoen. 1719 ch.:

Ion 216-218 ch.:


ėvaípaı Гâs тéкvшข o̊ ßакхєv́s.
In the latter, note the value of the long dative plural forms; and note too that both plurals are in choral passages.

> ßро́Хоє.

Poetic plural in Euripides only.
And. 843:
$\tau i \not \mu \epsilon \beta \rho o ́ \chi \omega \nu$ єì $\rho \gamma \epsilon!s$;

[^98]Hipp. 779 :

In the latter, hiatus is twice avoided by the plural.

$$
\gamma{ }^{\alpha} \mu \iota^{1} .
$$

The figures for all Tragedy are-singular 65, plural 177 , the plural predominating almost three to one. To this result the elective forms of the dative were strong contributors. The dative singular is found but once in Tragedy-Hel. 1097-being regularly displaced by $\gamma$ á $\mu \iota s, \gamma$ д́ $\mu o \iota \sigma \iota(v)$.

For the free play of numbers in the other cases compare Prom. 648-49:

тขхєì $\mu є \gamma і \sigma \tau \sigma v$,
with verses 739-40:

$\mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \eta ิ \rho o s$.
The accusative plural serves verse-convenience in (e.g.) Ant. 575 :

and IA. 720 :


## үє́ves.

Compare Soph. El. 195-96 ch.:


with Soph. Phil. 1205 :
ท̂ $\gamma^{\prime} v \nu v$, ทै $\beta \in \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega v \tau \epsilon, \pi \rho о \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi а \tau \epsilon$.
סaîtes².

Compare Ion 807:

and verses $1130-31^{3}$ (of the same meal) :



[^99]סєî̃va ${ }^{1}$.
Soph. E1. 203-04 ch.:
 ${ }_{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \pi \alpha \gamma \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \chi \chi \theta \eta$.
Ion 1124:

Euripides apparently prefers the plural, for the lone singular there could be accounted for metrically-Phoen. 728 :

סédtol.
Prom. 781 :

Soph. Frag. 540 :

IT. 787 :

with which compare $\delta \in ́ \lambda \tau o v$ in verse 727.
$\delta \in ́ \mu \nu a^{2}$.
The precedent of Homer has persistent weight in Tragedy. The two uses of the singular are Alc. 183-4:

 and Or. 229-30 :


where the modifier ávapóv avoids hiatus. It is clear that the poet avoided the singular.

$$
\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \sigma^{\prime}{ }^{4} .
$$

The plural referring to one instrument is probably found only in Tragedy.

[^100]For the play on number compare Prom. 96-97:
то九óvơ ò véos tayòs $\mu$ акáp $\omega \nu$




$$
\delta i \phi \rho \iota^{2} .
$$

Compare Soph. El. 749-50:


with Frag. 873, 2 :

But metre alone cannot always explain the plural here or in Euripides, as shows Soph. E1. 742 :


$$
\text { סóloc }{ }^{3} \text {. }
$$

In Homer the genitive, dative and accusative plural are found, while in Tragedy only the convenient dative forms סódoıs, סódourı( $v$ ) appear-except in three Aeschylean verses, 846, 880, and Eur.
 ov̉ (Cho. 888, OT. 960 and Phil. 91 respectively).

$$
\text { סó } \mu \iota^{4} \text {. . }
$$

The figures for Tragedy are : singular 69, plural 709, or about ten to one in favor of the plural. The plural surely must respond better to poetic feeling in case of this word-as well as numerous others, -for the use of the plural is extended beyond any bounds of metrical convenience ; the plural even becomes the preferred form where metre suffers either number with equal readiness. The plural has become conventionalized in Tragedy ${ }^{5}$, though for Homer such is not the case.

[^101]Strangely enough the genitive singular does not appear in all Tragedy, the dative singular occurs certainly but twice ${ }^{1}$, the accusative singular is not so common as the accusative plural and the nominative plural is comparatively rare. The decided preference of $\delta o ́ \mu \omega \nu$ and the three dative plural forms must have extended its influence throughout the declension, except the nominative plural where the ending is vocalic. Metre must be considered a factor in the general result.
$\delta \rho o ́ \sigma o \iota$.
Compare Hel. 1384 :

with Hipp. 78 :

Note the adjective form in the latter verse.
Spvцо́. "
Compare the singular of Rhes. 289 with the plural of Bacch. 1229:


$$
\delta \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a^{2} .
$$

For all Tragedy the singular occurs 77 times, the plural 222 times. The ratio of the plural of סónos to the singular is 7 to $I$, while the ratio for $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu a$ is 3 to I . The disparity may be accounted for in some measure by the fact that the plural forms of the former were convenient for the trimeter, upon the whole, while the nominative and accusative plural forms of $\delta \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \tau \alpha$ is singularly inconvenient for that metre ; in fact it seems to occur only as the final word of a verse ${ }^{3}$ or before a vowel ${ }^{4}$. The dative singular does not occur at all in Tragedy and the genitive singular is extremely rare. Hence the singular appears nearly invariably in the form $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu a$ (or $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu^{3}$ ). The plural proves clearly to be the preferred form.

[^102]$$
\text { éwpal }{ }^{1} \text {. }
$$

Appears only in OT. 1264 :
$\pi \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \omega ́ \rho o u s ~ \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta v$. [u-].
Note the double avoidance of hiatus and compare á $\rho \tau a ́ v \eta \nu$ of verse 1266 .

そฺ๐va.
The only poetic plural is that of Bacch. 935 :
 with which compare the singular in Hec. 762 :

Өаิкоя.
Compare Ant. 999-1000 ${ }^{2}$ :

i̋ $\zeta \boldsymbol{\omega}$
with Phoen. 840:

Note too the accusative plural in IA. 618:

and Herc. Fur. 1097 :


$$
\theta a ́ \lambda \alpha \mu o c^{8} .
$$

The lone instance of the poetic plural in Homer is doubtless due to hiatus- $\psi 41$ :

In Tragedy the poetic plural does not appear ${ }^{4}$, except in Euripides where it is found several times. The uses in Euripides show that he commonly prefers the plural, but not so in Alc. 175,

and verse $187^{\circ}$ (if the ms. reading be retained- $\theta$ á $\lambda \alpha \mu o v$ ).

$$
\text { Өávatoc. }{ }^{6}
$$

For examples note Agam. 1342 :

[^103]
and Cho. 53 :
$\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} v$ 日aváтoıб८.
It is significant that the poetic plural is usually found in choral passages ${ }^{1}$.
$$
\theta \text { рóvol }^{2} \text {. }
$$

The poetic plural is found only in Tragedy-not in Homer.
In Aeschylus the relative frequency of the dative plural suggests that the plural crept in through that case and number. The convenience of this case is obvious in such expressions as

 $\delta^{\circ} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{e} v} \theta$ póvoos (Aesch. Supp. 374).

Where the literal force of the word seems predominant in Sophocles in the plural of the word, metre may be called to ac-count-El. 267-68 :

 twice observed, and roîs appears in the long form.

Frag. 144 presents the long form in $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta$ póvoots ${ }^{3}$.
кє́ठ́ог.
The only instance of the poetic plural is in Alc. 365-6 :



> кévтра.

Soph. Frag. 622, 4 :

Хє $\rho \sigma i ̀$ кє́vт $\rho a$ кךঠєv́єє $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota v$.

## $\kappa \lambda о \pi \alpha i ́$.

Compare $\kappa \lambda о \pi a i ̂ \sigma \iota$ of Agam. $402^{4}$ with $\kappa \lambda о \pi \hat{\eta} s$, same play, verse 534.

[^104]$$
\text { коіттац }{ }^{1} \text {. }
$$

Compare Trach. 921-22 :


with Soph. El. 272 :


> кодєоі́.

Poetic plural only in IA. 1566-7:

ко入є $\omega$ ข ยै $\sigma \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$ ктย̇.
with which compare Hec. 543-4 :



$$
\kappa \rho \eta \pi i \delta \epsilon \varsigma^{2} .
$$

IT. 990-1 :

## ทีvíк' à̀v кevàs


Ion 38 :

In the above, hiatus is avoided or a long syllable effected by the plural. So also a long syllable is effected in the seventh foot of Ion 5 10:
 with And. IIII-2 :


Euripides has the poetic plural four times, the genitive being the case so used each time-

Herac. 821-22 :
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{a} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$

Ion 1064-65 :

ท̂ | $\eta \kappa \tau o ̀ v ~ \xi i ́ \phi o s ~$ |
| :--- |
| $\eta$ |



[^105]
## $\lambda \in ́ \kappa \tau \rho a^{1}$.

In all Tragedy the singular appears 12 times, the plural 93 times, $\lambda$ е́кт $\rho o \nu$ being the only form of the singular used. Aeschylus does not have the singular at all. Sophocles avoids the singular, using it only where it prevents a hiatus, and the same is usually true for Euripides. The plural therefore seems to be the conventional form for Tragedy: certainly metre can afford no thoroughgoing explanation.

$$
\lambda \epsilon ́ \chi \eta^{2} .
$$

For all Tragedy the figures are : singular 80, plural 47-while the Homeric figures are: singular 22, plural 27. The drift in Tragedy is clearly toward the singular, if the ratio be compared with that of Homer.

For Aeschylus and Sophocles we have the singular 13, the
 three times ; $\lambda e ́ \chi \epsilon \iota$ and $\lambda \epsilon ́ \chi o v s$ occur once each ; $\lambda \epsilon \chi \epsilon \epsilon \omega v$ appears 3 times, in choral parts.

Chiefly responsible for the disparity of the ratios of Homer and Tragedy is the frequent use of the dative plural in the former, 18 times out of a total of 27 plurals. Tragedy avoids the dative plural of the word altogether, and also shuns the dative singular, a rare form. The explanation is not difficult: the dative plural of this particular word presents a variety of convenient forms ${ }^{3}$ for hexameter verse, but not so for the trimeter. Tragedy either uses the singular, or selects some other word.

## $\lambda \iota \mu \epsilon ́ v \in s{ }^{4}$.

The poetic plural seems limited to Euripides ${ }^{5}$. With one exception the poetic plurals are found in other metres than the trimeter ${ }^{6}$, and in this one instance the plural avoids hiatus-

[^106]And. 749:


$$
\lambda_{o ́ \chi}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{1} \text {. }
$$

Tragedy has each number one time-Bacch. 730 :

Bacch. 957 :

даvíau.
Compare IT. $82-83^{2}$ :


with verse $283-84$ of the same play ${ }^{3}$ :

pavías ả̉aívev, кaì $\beta$ oậ кvvaүòs $\cos ^{4}$.
$\mu$ é $\lambda a \theta \rho a^{5}$.
Homer has the singular 7 times and the plural not at all, while in Tragedy the singular is used 18 times and the plural 9r times, or I to 5 in favor of the plural. With this word the work of analogy is almost complete. The singular is even avoided in Tragedy, as'e. g. the lone singular of Agam. 1434 shows :
oṽ $\mu$ ot фóßov $\mu$ é $\lambda a \theta \rho o v ~ e ̀ \lambda \pi i s ~ \grave{\epsilon} \mu \pi a \tau \epsilon ̂$,
where the singular serves convenience. Again, compare Phil. 146-7:

where the singular may be substituted-with verse 1453 of the same play:

where metre will not suffer the plural noun and adjective.
$\mu$ ย́ $\tau \omega \pi \alpha^{7}$.

[^107]There is one poetic plural in Tragedy-Hel. 1567-8 :


мі́траи.

Note the long dative forms in Eur. El. 162-3 :


and Hec. 923-4 :


In each case the passages are choral ${ }^{1}$.

$$
\mu \dot{\rho} \rho \boldsymbol{c}^{2} \text {. }
$$

Sophocles Ant. $13{ }^{12} 2-13^{3}$ :


${ }^{\text {оохо́. }}$
For free and easy enallage in $\mu \nu$ रós and ävvpov, compare Prom. 113-4:

$\mu \nu \chi o ́ v$,
Cyc. 480.


$$
\text { vaoi }{ }^{4} \text {. }
$$

The poetic plural does not appear till Euripides, but with him it is common, e. g. 8 times in the IT. and io times in the Ion, the singular occurring but once in both plays.

Compare Ion 38-39:
тòv $\pi \alpha i ̂ \delta a ~ \kappa \rho \eta \pi i ̂ \partial \omega \nu$ èmı

with verse 314 of the same play:

Also note verse 1384 of the same play:


[^108]ขórot.
Compare Aj. 59-60:

ब̈ँpvvov (noting the form of the adjective), with verse 66:

But especially-see page ror on the uses in OT. 960-962.
vóvтo.
The plural first arose no doubt as a distributive referring to various individuals ${ }^{2}$.

Aj. 900 :

But the plural occurs only 3 times in Tragedy ${ }^{3}$.
Soph. El. 194 :


Note metrical adaptation in Ant. 1205:

and Trach. 920 :


$$
\nu \omega ิ \tau \alpha^{5} .
$$

Only four illustrative examples are cited-Prom. 429-30:
үâs oủpávıóv тє пó入ov

Trach. 1047:

Hec. 1264 :

Tro. 572:


[^109]```
оікои }\mp@subsup{}{}{1
```

For Tragedy-singular II5, plural 244 times ${ }^{2}$. The forms of the genitive and dative singular, and the forms of the plural (save the lengthened forms of the dative) are not so suitable for the trimeter, since they are spondaic : either syllable is barred from being the first syllable of an odd foot. Other things being equal one would expect the nominative and accusative singular to appear far more than the corresponding forms of the plural. True it is for the nominative (singular 16, plural 1 ), but for the accusative, not so (singular 83, plural 101).

It is altogether probable that the dramatists actually preferred the plural of oikos-just as they preferred the plural of dómos and $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu a$-for the plural of oiкos is less suitable to the trimeter in at least the two cases of the singular just mentioned.
${ }^{\circ} \mu \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$.
In the Cyclops of Euripides both numbers are freely used for the Cyclops eye, e.g. the singular ${ }^{3}$ in verses 600,627 , the plural ${ }^{4}$ in verses $459,470,511$.


But in verses $627-8$ where either number is equally admissible the singular appears :
öp $\rho о$ (harbor).
The poetic plural is found merely in two choral passages of Euripides. ${ }^{5}$

IA. $1496-7$ :

बтеvoто́роитเข ö $\rho \mu$ оเs ${ }^{6}$.

[^110]$$
\text { ö̉Xot }^{1} .
$$

In our field the first poetic plural appears in Sophocles, where in each case the plural suggests metrical convenience.

Soph. Frag. 611 :
 of the noun and the adjective form).

Soph. El. 727 :

The free play of metre on number may be seen in IT. 613:

where the fifth foot obviously needs the plural, but compare verse 623:

Electra 965 seems to indicate on Euripides' part a prejudice in favor of the plural, when one considers that with him the plural prevails two to one :

If the above suggestion is not true, we should surely expect ${ }^{\sigma}{ }^{\circ} \boldsymbol{X} \boldsymbol{q}$ here.
đáyou (hill).

Cf. Or. 1650-2.

## 

пáชoutเv èv 'А

with OC. 947-8 :
тolovitov av̉roís "A peos єv๊ßovdov máyov


$$
\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda o t .
$$

There is a marked shift to the plural in Aeschylus and Euripides, independent of mere metrical considerations. For figures and citations see pages 17-18.

$$
\pi о ́ \rho \pi \alpha{ }^{2}
$$

Referring to the suicide of Oedipus, Euripides has the plural in Phoen. 62 :

[^111]
$\pi \rho о ́ \sigma \omega \pi \alpha$.
Compare for example Soph. El. 1276-7:
$\mu \eta \mu^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \eta$ s

and Or. 958 :


IT. 253 :

The verse is isolated, the singular impossible without an entire reconstruction.
$$
\boldsymbol{\sigma} \kappa \eta \vee a i^{1} .
$$

The poetic plural occurs in Sophocles and Euripides. A comparison of the singular uses in Aj . 218, 796, with the plural uses in verses $3,754,985$, makes the explanation of the plural lie in metrical convenience.

Aj. 3 :

 756. Another long form of the dative appears in verse 985$\pi а р a ̀ ~ \sigma \kappa \eta v a i ̈ \sigma \iota$, and so also in Ion 982 (and elsewhere):
ífpaî̃uv ẻv $\sigma \kappa \eta v a i ̂ \sigma u v$, ov $\theta$ ouvą̂ фídovs.

$$
\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a^{2} .
$$

Of the four passages cited from Aeschylus and Euripides on page 39, where the plural is for the singular in a purely literal sense, the plural forms suggest a convenience of metre. As for various other plurals where that number secures a broader meaning and expresses more fully the poetic feeling, it may be said that metre promotes the movement in Enallage none the less.

The four poetic uses in the literal sense are-Agam. 1265 :


[^112]And. 1223-4:


Eur. E1. $32 \mathrm{I}-2$ :

(with which compare the alternative-

Herc. Fur. $\mathrm{IIO}_{3}-\mathrm{O} 4$ :


For other citations pertaining to the fuller meaning of the word, and convenient uses of the plural see pages 38-39.

бтє́ $\mu \mu а т а$.
Compare Tragedy's Homeric precedent :



Accordingly Tragedy has the plural only-ro times ${ }^{1}$.

$$
\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho v \alpha^{2} .
$$

For all Tragedy, singular 6, plural 4 I times. It is a significant fact that five of these singulars are accusative, and in each case avoid a hiatus ${ }^{3}$, while the remaining singular is found in a choral passage ${ }^{4}$-just where under the circumstances one would expect to find $\mathrm{it}^{5}$. The singular therefore is shunned, the plural is the preferred form-it is conventional.

$$
\boldsymbol{\sigma \tau \epsilon ́} \not \eta^{6} .
$$

Compare Agam. 1264-65:



[^113]with Cho. 1035:

In the former case metre would suffer the singular of neither $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a$ nor $\sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\phi} \eta$ (note the adjective $\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i a)$.
$\sigma \tau о ́ \mu a ̀ a^{1}$.
The poetic plural appears in Sophocles and Euripides.
Trach. 938 :

A1c. 402-3:
калоขิцас ó
бòs $\pi \sigma \tau i ̀ ~ \sigma o i ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \pi i ́ \tau \nu \omega \nu ~ \sigma \tau o ́ \mu a \sigma \iota v ~ v \epsilon o \sigma \sigma o ́ s . ~$
Both are choral passages.
$$
\text { т́́фоь }{ }^{2} \text {. }
$$

Soph. El. 443 :

OT. 942 :

OC. 4 II:
 and similarly in verse 1410.

In OT. 987 even, the second syllable of the fourth foot is long in $\boldsymbol{o}$, but $\boldsymbol{o}$ would require considerable change in the construction of the verse :


$$
\tau \dot{\tau} \dot{\xi} \alpha^{3} .
$$

For all Tragedy: singular 14, plural 66 times. In Sophocles the ratio is 5 to 1 , and in Euripides 12 to 1 in favor of the plural. Of the four singulars in Sophocles ${ }^{4}$, three have the form rógov and are used metri gratia; the lone use of the genitive singular ${ }^{5}$

[^114]there however apparently has no explanation. In Euripides the singular appears three times ${ }^{1}$ in the form $\tau$ ógov, and serves metrical convenience in each case. It seems clear, then, that the plural was the preferred form for Tragedy: a marked advance beyond the ratio set by Homeric usage.
$$
\text { v̋ } \delta a \tau a^{2} .
$$

IT. 1192:

where the plural avoids hiatus ${ }^{3}$ and at the same time secures the poetic effect of the plural use in English.

ข๋ュย́valo ${ }^{4}$.
Compare IA. 624 :

with verse 693 of the same play :


$$
\text { фáo }{ }^{\prime}{ }^{2}{ }^{5} \text {. }
$$

Poetic plural only in Euripides.
Of the same weapon are Or. 953 :

and verses $1035-6$ :

$$
\delta_{\text {®ế }} \delta^{\circ} \hat{\eta} \beta \rho o ́ \chi o v s
$$


The singular in the former would be impossible without a reconstruction of the line.

$$
\text { фóvoc }{ }^{6} \text {. }
$$

Note especially the two passages from Sophocles :



[^115]126 The Poetic Plural of Greek Tragedy. ゅuо.
Compare the plural of Or. $1471-73 \mathrm{ch} .:$




Note in the first citation : (1) The passage is choral, (2) ${ }^{\omega} \mu \mathrm{Hos}$ avoids hiatus, (3) dं $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota v$ is a long dative form.

# CHAPTER II. 

> The Pronoun.
${ }^{1}$ PLURALES SOCIETATIS, MODESTIAE, MAIESTATIS.

## A. Homer.

As an introduction to the uses of the first person plural pronoun for the singular in Tragedy, it is well to consider the extent and force of such uses in Homer. I have noted twelve instances ${ }^{2}$. Among them. three uses of the first person plural pronoun for the singular may be recognized, which apparently represent the logical development of the plural as meaning one person out of the true plural. The steps are : (1) Pluralis Societatis, (2) Pluralis Modestiae, (3) Pluralis Maiestatis. We may suppose that at first the $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \mathrm{i}$ s associates in thought others with the ' $\begin{array}{r} \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma}\end{array}$-the speaker, and that the plural is really кarà ofvegov; the speaker then with purpose sinks his identity in the class to which he belongs ${ }^{3}$, and the notion of modesty, humility results; as in Latin ${ }^{\text {', }}$, so in Greek the Pluralis Maiestatis is an outgrowth of

[^116]the Pluralis Modestiae, for the latter becomes an instrument of superior personages, - " pride apes humility," exultant humility becomes self-assertive and proud; and now the plural pronoun carries with it the notion of dignity as surely as it oftentimes denotes modesty.
I.

## PLURALIS SOCIETATIS.

It is not difficult to associate some other person or persons with the speaker in the following :

Begin at any point whatever, Ogoddess, and relate to us also. To ทं $\mu i v$ compare $\mu \circ$ ( $\epsilon v \varepsilon \epsilon \pi \epsilon$ ) in verse 1 .

「 439-40 (Paris to Helen) :
vv̂v $\mu$ èv $\gamma$ à $\mathrm{Mevé} \mathrm{\lambda aos} \mathrm{évíк} \mathrm{\eta} \mathrm{\sigma ev} \mathrm{\sigma òv} \mathrm{'A} \mathrm{\theta} \mathrm{\eta ́v} \mathrm{\eta}$

Now hath Menelaos prevailed by Athena's help, but I'll get him
yet! For there are gods on our side too.
к 97-99 (Odysseus) :



p. 203). At the beginning of the fifth century A. D. the Pluralis Maiestatis occurs relieved of any idea of association, being the mark of dignified utterances of the crown, pope, or bishop ( $C f$. Sasse's Reviewer, Archiv, vol. 6, pp. 284 f., 1889). At the end of the fifth century even vos and vester became quite common, " quand on s'adressait à un supérieur, comme un pape à un empereur, un évêqne à un pape ou un empereur, un citoyen quelconque à tout représentant de l'autorité civile religieuse "' (Chatelain, E., " Le pluriel de respect en latin," Revue de Philologie, vol.' IV, p. 129, 1880).

For the classical period Draeger (op. cit., vol. I, p. 25) and others recognize only the Pluralis Modestiae, which is very common. But Dr. Conway has recently argued for nos as a plural of "Dignity" or "Superiority" in Cicero's Letters : "Nos had come to be used by a speaker of himself alone when he thought not of the ego he was to his own consciousness, but of the person visible or admirable to his neighbors" (Cambridge Philological Transactions, 1899 ; see also Purser's Review of the same in the Classical Review, 1900).
${ }^{1}$ This verse is quoted by Plutarch who mentions $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{i} \nu$ as used $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \boldsymbol{i} \tau о \hat{u} \epsilon \mu o i$,


I ascended a rocky cliff and stood where there was no sign of man or beast, but we saw only smoke issuing from the earth.
$\lambda 56 \mathrm{r}-2$ (Odysseus to Ajax) :


Now come hither, oh King, to hear what we have to say; bridle thy rage, etc.
v 356-8 (Odysseus to Nymphs) :


I never expected to see you, but zue shall continue to make gifts, etc.
$\pi$ 44-45 (Telemachus to Odysseus) :


Sit down stranger; we shall find a seat somewhere else in our stall: here's a man to arrange it.
X463-4 (Telemachus):


(I would hang these women and not give ait honorable death to them ) who heaped disgrace upon my head and our mother, and slept with the suitors.

If we are to think of others associated with the speaker in the above citations, $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu\left(\Gamma_{440}\right)$ may include the Trojans; $\dot{\rho} \rho \omega \hat{\mu} \mu \nu$

 ( $\pi 44,45$ ) involve Eumaeus ${ }^{2}$; $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \eta$ ( $\mathbf{x} 464$ ) suggests her as mother of the home.

The idea of humility ${ }^{3}$ stands out clearly in $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{i} v\left(\Gamma_{440}\right)$ : Paris says, "I shall conquer him ;" but then, " there are gods with us too," when he speaks of himself in connection with the gods.

[^117]The same is true of $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o v(\lambda 562)$ : Odysseus employs the singular through his narrative, but in addressing Ajax he has modestly distributed the responsibility.

The quick change from $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\eta}$ to $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \rho \eta$ in $\chi 463-464$ is significant: the latter apparently denotes dignity, for Telemachus is now commander issuing orders, ". . . . who heaped disgrace upon my head and upon the mother of a man like me."

## 2.

## PLURALIS MODESTIAE.

In the following case, the plural is of Odysseus alone- $\tau 344^{-6}$ :



Before the recognition Odysseus prays his wife that no luxuries be prepared for him ; he protests against the servants of the palace touching "our foot," unless there be some "old soul" to do it ; such a one he would not deny the service of washing " my
 fine touch of modesty (pretended of course) - just such as helps him to accomplish his designs.

## 3.

## PLURALIS MAIESTATIS.

It would be difficult to find any one associated with the speaker in the four instances following.
N 257-8 (Meriones to Idomeneus) :


For we have broken to pieces the spear I had before, striking the shield of Deiphobus.

Gildersleeve cites this passage, taking it apparently as a Plural of Modesty ${ }^{1}$, but Volp ${ }^{2}$, Draeger ${ }^{3}$, Gerber ${ }^{4}$, Leaf ${ }^{5}$ see in it a Pluralis Maiestatis and I think rightly.

[^118]O223-4 (Zeus to Phoebus concerning Poseidon):

ท̀ $\epsilon$ є́тєрои-
He has gone into the divine sea, avoiding our wrath. The context shows that Zeus means only himself. It is a clear-cut case of Dignity, as also that of
Ф60-61 (Achilles) :

үєv́vєтаи-
Surely he shall taste of the point of our spear.
Similarly $\pi$ 437-442 (Eurymachus) :


$\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \varphi-$
There is, nor will be, a man to do violence to thy son Telemachus, while I am alive and see the light. That is my word and verily it shall be fulfilled; his black blood shall stream forthwith about our spear.

Monro' is particularly insistent that the plural as a "variety for the singular is not Homeric" and "The plural is used to seem to associate others with the speaker." With him the plural is always one of Association and never Modesty or Dignity. But in such instances as 0224 and $\Phi 60$ the plural can hardly mean more than one. It may serve to call attention to the condition or rank of the speaker, whether the same be humble or exalted.

In certain of the passages cited above the plural appears in close connection with the singular-the change seems abrupt :



The provocation for the plural in the last two at least seems hard to find and there is warrant for suspicion that metre encouraged the Enallage, just as we may be sure it does at times in Tragedy. Compare such variations as accur in $\pi$ oooos . . . . .


[^119]
## B.

## Tragedy.'

I. AESCHYLUS.

The three plurals in question are rare in Aeschylus. Even the Pluralis Societatis, where $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$ s is $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$ in particular, is not common.

## (a) PLURALIS SOCIETATIS.

In Agam. 844-852, ßovגєvбо́ $\mu \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha$. . . . . $\pi \epsilon \rho а \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha$
$\delta \epsilon \xi \in \omega$ оонаи, Agamemnon seems to include the chorus in affairs of state (note the participles $\theta_{\epsilon ́ v \tau \epsilon \varsigma, ~ к e ́ a v \tau \epsilon s), ~ b u t ~ i n ~ s p e a k i n g ~ o f ~ h i s ~}^{\text {en }}$ personal act he employs the singular.

The following are colorless of any notion of majesty or modesty, except perhaps Agam. Io58.

Agam. 1279 (Cassandra to Chorus) ;

(i.e. including Agamemnon as the context shows).

Cho. 201-03:


бтро乃ои́ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\alpha)$ -
We call upon the gods, though they know etc.,-(a generalized statement).

The following is colloquial and natural-Cho. 176 (Electra to Chorus) :

This lock of hair is very similar to ours, i.e., that of our family, but one would have expected av่̉ $\hat{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{c}^{2}{ }^{2}$.

In Agam. 1058 Clytemnestra generalizes with fine dramatic effect in $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \iota$ :

[^120]
I had never hoped to have the pleasure. Clytemnestra associates others with herself purposely and then too there may be in the plural a sarcastic tinge of affected modesty.

To draw the line is sometimes difficult but the pronouns in the citations under the two heads following appear to involve but one person.
(b) PLURALIS MODESTIAE.

Cho. 428 :

Cho. 437-38 (Orestes) :


(She shall atone . . . .), so far as depends upon my hands; and then may I etc.

Eum. $45^{\text {I-5 }}$-53 (Orestes to Athena) :


Long since have I purged myself at other homes etc.-
(c) PLURALIS MAIESTATIS.

Cho. 672-73 (Clytemnestra to Orestes) :


and similarly in verses 716-17:

коเขш́боцєข-
$I$ shall confer with the authorities (i.e. Aegisthus ${ }^{2}$ ).

[^121]Eumenides 767-68 (Orestes to Athena) :

тоîs тảщà тарßaivovøt ท̂vิv ธ́ркш́цата.
For $I$, then in the grave, will punish them that break the oath $I$ now make.

The $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \varepsilon i \hat{i}_{s}$ may be Orestes only, asserting his supernatural power as a spirit in contrast with his human strength (note $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \alpha^{\prime}$ )



## 2. SOPHOCLES.

Sophocles uses these plurals much more freely than Aeschylus. Merely representative examples are cited from Sophocles (and Euripides), as completeness is not justifiable in the present limits.
(a) Pluralis societatis.

Phil. 91-92 (Neoptolemus) :


For he will not overcome us, so many as we are, when he has use of but one foot.

Similar instances are frequent. Volp ${ }^{4}$ points out rightly that messengers especially employ the plural in Sophocles ; and thinks this plural may have been common in daily Attic speech without any particular notion of modesty or majesty. But the latter statement of his is but a mere surmise and is without evidence. In Aeschylus the messenger never speaks of himself alone in the plural, though such is quite common in Euripides as well as Sophocles.

[^122](b) PLURALIS MODESTIAE.

Trach. 630-32 (Deianira) :
ס́́fouka үàp


$I$ fear it would be anticipating, to mention my own longing before learning whether I am longed for there.

Deianira clearly hides her identity in the plural, and its force is obviously in the direction of modesty ; the abrupt change after $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\delta} \circ \kappa \alpha$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{v}$ seems only to emphasize this point.

Electra 399 :
 where Electra speaking of herself uses the masculine plural ${ }^{1}$.

Aj. r400-or (Odysseus) :


That was my desire, but if thou dost not care for us to assist in this, it suits me, I'm off!

The $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ here is an echo of a similar use of the same word two verses above where Teucer speaks-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ajax 1398-99: नì סè }
\end{aligned}
$$

Do thou rest assured that thou hast been a true friend to $u s$.
In OT. 1419 the spirit of Oedipus is broken when he says :

OC. 347 (Oedipus to Ismene) :

Aj. 666-67 (Ajax) :



[^123]and similarly in verse 823 :

Aj. 737-9 (Messenger) : iov̀ iov́


El. 772 (Paedagogus):

(c) PLURALIS MAIESTATIS. ${ }^{1}$

Ant. 634 (Creon to Haemon) :

Or are we still thy friends, however we may act? That is-am I still thy father, however I may act?

Aj. 774-75 (Ajax boastingly) :


Queen Athene, take thy stand with the rest of the Greeks; where I am etc.

Aj. 1139 (Teucer to Menelaus) :

Aj. 126I ${ }^{3}$ (Agamemnon to Teucer):

(Wilt thou bring some freeborn man) to plead thy case for thee before me?

The $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ directs attention to Agamemnon's exalted position, while the singular very naturally appears in verses 1262 ( $\mu$ átoon' ${ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\prime}$ ), and 1263 :


[^124]Similarly the plural in Aj . 1320-21 (Agamemnon) :


Ant. 726-27 (Creon to Haemon) :


Is a man of my age actually to take lessons from a youth?
Similarly OT. 435-36 ('Tiresias to Oedipus) :



## 3. EURIPIDES.

It will suffice to mention some of the more striking uses of the Pluralis Modestiae and Pluralis Maiestatis.
(a) Pluralis modestiae.

IA. $1215^{1}$ (Iphigenia in supplicating her father):

IT. 368 (Iphigenia quoting former words to father):

IT. ${ }^{3} 605$ (Orestes of himself alone):

In El. 555 there is a striking use of the plural, in which one may discern a touch of art (Electra speaks to Orestes whom she has not yet recognized) :
 (i. e. our father).
(b) Pluralis maiestatis.

IT. 1172 (King Thoas) :

IT. 1432-3 (King Thoas) :
 тоьгбо́мєб $\theta$.

[^125]IT'. 1444 (Athena) :

Hec. $75^{8}$ (Agamemnon to Hecuba) :

4. ENALLAGE OF NUMBER-IN GENERAL.
(a) THE CHORUS.

It seems impossible to trace out any rule or plan governing Enallage in the Choral parts. In fact a mere caprice of thought, or the convenience of metre, seems to be the true explanation in a large number of instances. It is natural for the Coryphaeus to employ either number, for being the spokesman either number used by him would in general include the whole chorus. Compare for example Aeschylus Choephori 931 ( $\sigma \tau \in \in v \omega$ ) with verse 933 (aipov́ $\mu \epsilon$ a), where the Coryphaeus uses the iambic trimeter.

In Sophocles Ajax ${ }^{1} 36-165$ the singular appears three times
 too the Coryphaeus is acting.

The Coryphaeus surely obligates the whole chorus in Euripides Hipp. 713-14:




 ${ }^{\circledR} \eta \sigma \epsilon \hat{v}$, $\pi \alpha ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \mu \iota ~ \sigma \hat{\nu} \nu ~ к а к \omega ิ \nu ~ \pi \epsilon \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \rho \iota \alpha$,
and Soph. E1. 1230-31 :


When the chorus is addressed the same freedom of change is noted, as in Agam. II84 where Clytemnestra says $\mu$ артvрєirє, but in verse i196, éкцартv́p $\eta \sigma o v$; the singular shows a direction of at-

[^126] . . . . . . גaßov̂ca, and Ion 750-1, $\mu \eta$ vírete . . . . . . $\beta a \lambda e i ́ s . ~$

So also both numbers often appear close together in a choral part as, for example, in Aesch. Supp. 777-79:

тí $\pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a ;$ тоî фúyшرє匕 'A $\pi i ́ a s$

$\mu$ éлlas уєvoípav катуós (and in verse 782-ópoípav),
and IT. 1494-96 :

It is useless therefore to try to locate definitely Plurals of Modesty or Majesty in such passages as those above cited.
(b) THE TRIMETER.

In the course of one actor's remarks the plural and singular often appear in close connection. The change is often кatà oviveorv, and the construction loose, but not unnatural. Such is the case in Eum. $141-42^{1}$ :


It would seem difficult to ascribe any reason other than caprice, or convenience of metre, for such changes-in close proximityas in (e.g.) Phil. 1393-4:


Herc. Fur. 858 :

Ion 391 :

Even though in each citation the verbs refer to the same individual, nevertheless if a touch of modesty should be assumed in the plurals the abrupt changes would have a real dramatic value.

An interesting passage in this connection is IT. 342-368:


 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \sigma e ́ \theta e v . ~$

[^127]Other instances similar to the above are in Ion 1250-1 :

and IA. 1025-6 (Clytemnestra) :

Agaın, note Ant. 734 (Creon) :

Shall the city prescribe to me-the King-what orders I should geve?

The $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{i} v$ is not a mere arbitrary change here: it suggests Creon's office.

But compare the three following passages from Euripides, where any distinction is hard to see-

IA. 516 (Agamemnon to Menelaus):

I might send her back to Argos unnoticed, but there's something else in which we will not escape detection.

IT. 994-5 (Iphigenia to Orestes):
 бต́бацц $\delta$ ö̉коvs.

Compare IT. 790 (Pylades) :

where Pylades may be conceived of as expressing his proud glee over the situation with $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \boldsymbol{\mu} \epsilon \nu$, which is the I will ratify of a ruler.

## CHAPTER III.

## NOUNS REFERRING TO PERSONS.

## A. Homer and Pindar.

In Homer the material is scanty, and indeed what is found is related to but few of the uses in Tragedy.

(Helen) from a distant land, daughter-in-law of warlike men.
The generalization makes Helen the daughter-in-law of the Greeks as a nation. There is added force in that the verse is spondaic. To this example may be added $\Lambda$ I28, where the plural pronoun is used for the sake of indefiniteness :

For the smooth reins had slipped out of their hands. The pronoun refers to but one person ${ }^{1}$. Homer conceals the unimportant detail as to who was driving by the convenient plural.

In each of the two passages following the plural alludes to but one individual-


Lie thus; it is hard for thee to contend with an offspring of Cronion, though thou art sprung from a river-god.


Leto I shall not fight with thee at all; it is a grievous thing to exchange blows with a wife of Zeus.

The plural envelops the person in a class, thus bringing out in clear relief the notion of relationship at the expense of individuality. As will be seen later such uses are of frequent occurrence in Tragedy.

In Pindar are found a few instances of the plural when the allusion is to but one individual ${ }^{2}$ : Fragmentum 75, 12, $\pi a \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega v$ (Zeus); Fragmentum 13, ruvaккิ̂v (Semele) ; Olympian VII, Іо,

[^128] Isthmian V, $43^{1}$, tives (Achilles); Pythian IX, IO5, $\pi$ поуóvov (Alexidamus).

> B. Tragedy.

Here it is that the plural-not only that of Chapters I and II -but the so-called Indefinite, Generalizing, Allusive ${ }^{2}$ Plural reaches its widest variety and greatest frequency. In fact the plural now in question has a place in the very definition of the language of Greek Tragedy : for Greek Tragedy was naturally the soil most conducive to its highest and most useful development. This statement is especially true as regards the plural, when Allusive ${ }^{2}$.

An allusion may be made to a single person in a gnomic generalized statement ; the plural merely places the individual in a class and thus minuteness is avoided. Even proper names are pluralized, thus forming a class ${ }^{3}$.

Examples of the gnomic statements referred to are the fol-lowing-

Cho. 920 (Clytemnestra):

A woman (i. e. I myself) misses her husband awfully, child.
Agam. 1668 (Aegisthus):

$I$ know that exiles (i. e. Orestes) feed on hopes.
Agam. $94^{1}$ (Clytemnestra):

It is becoming for a victor (i.e. thee Agamemnon) to suffer defeat too.

[^129]In each case ' the plural directs attention to the class and away from the individual, though as often the one person alluded to is perfectly clear. This, however, is common in both prose and poetry of various languages ${ }^{2}$.

But other uses are not uncommon in Tragedy. One parent may be referred to in the plural, or one child may be so designated ; the plural may serve the purpose of caution or reserve ; it becomes the means of respectful reference to one in authority ; it may avoid a specific charge against a murderer; it may refer to a deceased person in a general and thus reverent way. The vagueness of oracular, and the generality of legal, phraseology appear in Tragedy-to serve dramatic purpose, to heighten suspense, to retard the action of the plot.

## I. THE ALLUSIVE PLURAL OF RESPECT ${ }^{8}$.

Before coming to nouns pertaining to persons, it may be noted that the plural is sometimes used in an allusion to one god.

Prom. 659-60 ${ }^{\text {: }}$

$$
\tau i \chi \rho \eta \grave{\eta}
$$

## 

where daipootv ${ }^{5}$ alludes to Zeus particularly, if not only; for to him alone is there any occasion $\pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon v$ фída.

## ${ }^{1}$ So also Prom. 225.

${ }^{2}$ To be distinguished is such a use of the plural as e. g. that of Cho. 336-37:
 $\phi u \gamma a ́ \delta a s$ (i. e. Orestes) $\theta^{*} \dot{\delta} \mu \mathrm{l} \omega \mathrm{\omega}$,
where the plural emphasizes the state of each, etc., but can refer in each case to merely the one individual. Cf. the Scholiast: "iкєт $\eta \nu \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon$,
${ }^{3}$ The three divisions here made of the Allusive Plural-Respect, Relationship, Reserve-are of course somewhat arbitrary ; the distinction cannot be sharp e.g. between oi кolpavoc (Respect) and ol кard $\gamma \hat{\eta} s$ (Reserve), for both ideas are present.

 for respect on the part of the chorus; norfor caution, as the following verse
 torical step towards the direct charge just quoted.
${ }^{5}$ The scholiast merely : "qoîs $\delta$ al $\mu \sigma \sigma \iota \nu=\tau 0$ ôs $\theta \epsilon o i ̂ s . " ~ C f . ~ V e r g i l ' s ~ A e n e i d ~ I, ~$ 4, Vi superum (i.e. Juno), and ib. VI, 322, Anchisa generata, deum (i.e. Venus) certissima proles.

In Ion 132 ( $\theta$ coiotv) Phoebus is meant as also in verse 183 (тои́s $\beta$ óqкоутац).

Eum. 435 deserves special mention here (Chorus to Athene) :

Wecklein's ingenious emendation- $\mathfrak{e} \pi a ́ \xi \iota a-i s ~ u n n e c e s s a r y, ~ a n d ~$ disregards the correct observation of the scholiast: á $\xi i \not \omega v$ ovzav үоvé $\omega \nu$.

Paley ${ }^{2}$ is doubtless right in his supposition that the error of
 Just twenty lines before, Athene is addressed by the Furies as $\Delta$ iò кóp $\eta$. They seem to be bearing especially in mind her relation to him. So too in Sept. 127 she is addressed as $\Delta$ ooyevès кра́тоs. Compare especially Ion 735, where Athene is referred to by the same words as here and where the plural has a similar reference to Zeus :

The House of Atreus, including the whole line, is 'A $\tau \rho \epsilon \hat{\varepsilon} \delta \alpha$, . But in Tragedy the plural is often employed with particular allusion to one person as, for example, in Agam. 3, 3ro. In Soph. El. $1068^{\text {'A ATpeídaus means Agamemnon and him only. Similarly }}$ only Laius is meant in Sophocles OT'. 495-6 :
$\Lambda \alpha \beta \delta a \kappa \iota \delta \alpha \iota s$
è $\pi$ íкovpos ả $\delta \grave{j} \lambda \omega v$ өavát $\omega v$.
Just so, other nouns appear in the plural referring to one person in authority. It may be that $\delta \in \sigma \pi$ óraı sometimes includes both king and queen ${ }^{3}$ as perhaps in Agam. 1042-43 where Clytemnestra says to Cassandra :


At any rate should such a hard lot oppress one, great is the advantage of having a master of established opulence. But even here it is unnecessary to look for plurality ; the plural is best taken

[^130]as alluding merely to Agamemnon-as being a (pretendedly) respectful reference to him.

The following may be classified as Allusive Plurals of Respect :

| - | Aeschylus | Sophocles | Euripides |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| oi ঠєбпо́тац oí ки́ptot ${ }^{2}$ | Agam. 32, 1043 : Cho. 53, 82(? $)^{1}$ Cho. 658, 689 | Ajax 734 | Alc. 138 ; Hec. 557, 1237; Ion 233, 304, 312,75I, 755 ; Med. 61, 823. |
| oi кoípavos | Agam. 549. |  | Alc. 216 |
|  | Supp. 184 |  |  |
| oí кратоขิvтes | Cho. 716 | OT. 530 | IT. 1301. Frag. 604 |
| oí тv́pavwo |  | Ant. 60; OT. 1096 | Hel. 552 ; Ion 236 ; <br> IA. 470 |
| oi Ėv $\tau$ éde | Supp. 514 <br> (Gnomic) | Ant. 67 |  |
| oi åvaктes |  | OC. 295 |  |
|  |  | OC. 884 |  |
| oi tayoí |  | Ant. 1057 |  |
|  |  | OC. 1087 |  |
|  |  | OT. 1667 |  |
| oi $\beta$ acileîs |  |  | Alc. 132; Herac. 294; IT. 109 |
| oi äpXovtes |  |  | Ion 1070 |

The uses known in Tragedy are doubtless an outgrowth of a very familiar law, which Euripides refers to in Frag. 337, 2 :

The same idea is contained in the maxim of Eur. Frag. 604: $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ к e ́ v \tau \rho a ~ \mu \eta े ~ \lambda a ́ к т \iota \zeta ̧ e ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ к \rho a \tau o v ̂ \sigma i ́ ~ \sigma o v . ~$

[^131]Each of the plurals above listed alludes to some particular individual, and in a number of instances the plural cannot even suggest more than one person. A survey of all the examples leads to three observations : (I) The plural is used merely to refer to some authority not definitely known or to avoid personating some authority in question.

IA. 304 (Menelaus to Slave) :

Away! Thou art too loyal to thy master (Agamemnon only).
Aesch. Supp. 184 (Danaus) :

Perhaps the ruler of this land (whoever he is) is coming to spy us out.

Similarly Hel. 551-2 (Helen) :

Sov̂val tupávvots i̊v モ̇фєúyoucv 耳ápovs-
He wants to take me and give me to his master whose marriage I am avoiding.

Ion 1070 (Chorus) :

```
ä\rho\chiovтas å\lambdalo\deltaa\piov́s-
```

A foreign ruler, that is Ion; a similar idea is expressed by the contemptuous avoidance of the name in verse 1058:

(2) The plural calls attention to the office rather than the individual, at the same time exalting the office, as in Ion 750-5I where Creusa refers to herself in addressing the chorus :


For if you will give me good news, you will favor a mistress who will prove true.

Similarly Medea refers to herself as $\boldsymbol{\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ \sigma a \iota s ~ i n ~ M e d . ~} 823$ (addressing the Chorus).

Ant. 59-60 :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { єi vópov ßía }
\end{aligned}
$$

${ }^{1} C f$. verse 25 I where Pelasgus calls himself $\alpha \rho \chi \eta \gamma \xi \tau \eta s$.

If we，despite the law，stand against the decree or might of $a^{1}$ king（alluding to Creon ${ }^{2}$ ）．

Ant． 67 （Ismene）：

$I$ shall obey the powers that be（Creon）．
Ant． 1057 （Creon to Tiresias）；

Dost thou know that what thou sayest is of thy king？
（3）The plural is most commonly used as a means of respect－ ful reference to one in authority ；here too the office of the supe－ rior is magnified，and caution or reserve on the part of the speaker implied．
§єбто́тан．
Agam． 32 （the Ginard）：
$\tau \grave{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi о \tau \omega ̂ \nu$（Agamemnon）үàp єv̉ $\pi \epsilon \sigma o ́ v \tau a$ Oŋ́бораи．
So too Agamemnon is meant in Cho． $52-53^{3}$ ：
§vóфot ка入úntovaı סópovs
סєбтотต̂v Өavátoưเv．
Hec． 557 （Talthybius）：

where Agamemnon alone is meant．In verse 1237 of the same play Hecuba says to Agamemnon ：

But since thou art a king，I do not rail at thee．
Eur．Tro．663－64（Andromache）：
тóvס́（Hector） $\boldsymbol{\delta} a \boldsymbol{v}$

Pyrrhus alone being meant．
Ion 755 （Nurse）：

So Admetus is alluded to by סєбтóraヶซィ in Alc．138，and Aga－ memnon by $\delta \in \sigma \pi \sigma \tau \omega \nu$ in IA． 312 ，but both statements are gnomic．

[^132]Med. 61-62 (Nurse) :

Oh, the foolish one (Medea), if I may thus speak of my (a) mistress ${ }^{1}$.

Similarly Creusa is mentioned by the chorus in Ion 233.
It is noteworthy that the speaker in each of these citations is either a slave ${ }^{2}$ or the chorus.

```
\kappav́\rho\iotaor.
```

Cho. 688-90 (Orestes to Clytemnestra) :
єỉ $\begin{gathered}\text { ®̀ } \\ \tau \cup \gamma \chi a ́ v \omega ~\end{gathered}$


Whether perchance I am addressing the authority of the house or a relative of his, I do not know, but it is proper for the parent to learn of it.

The humble attitude of Orestes goes far to disguise him.
In verse 658 of the same play, the plural does not involve both Aegisthus and Clytemnestra: from the standpoint of the pretended friend it means simply the chief person of the palace, whoever that might be :

Aj. 733-4 (Messenger) :


oi кратоиิขтєs.
Cho. 716-7 (Clytemnestra to Orestes) :

коьш́бонєv (that is, Aegisthus ${ }^{3}$ alone.)
OT. 530 (Chorus to Creon) :

[^133]
IT'. 1301 (Chorus to Messenger) :


## oi коípavo.

Agam. 549 (Clytemnestra to the Chorus) :

What? Afraid of somebody because the King is away? There would seem to be no point in making кoь $\alpha^{2} \nu \omega$ include Menelaus. It is much more forceful to make it the herald's respectful substitute for 'A $\mathbf{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\mu} \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \nu$ vovos, as Aeschylean usage warrants.

Med. 875 (Medea) :

oi túpavvo.
OT. 1096 (Chorus) :

(Thou, O Cithaeron art praised in our choral song) since thou art a joy to my ruler (that is Oedipus).

Similarly the chorus uses $\tau v \rho a v_{v \omega v}$ in IA. 470 ; and the chorus mentions Creousa as т $\omega \hat{\nu} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\omega} v \tau v \rho a ́ v v \omega v$ in Ion 236.

$$
\text { oi ävakтes }{ }^{\text {² }} \text {. }
$$

OC. 294-5 (Chorus) :



$$
\text { oi } \pi \rho \dot{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\sigma} \text {. }
$$

OC. 884 (the King is about to enter and the chorus speaks) :

where the King alone is meant by $\pi \rho o \mu_{0}$ apparently.
oi $\delta a \mu o \hat{\chi} \chi o$.
OC. 1087 (Chorus) :


[^134]where $\delta a \mu o v x^{\prime} o u s$ is best taken as meaning Theseus, just as he alone seems to be meant in the same play, verse 1667 (Chorus) :

oi ßaбı入єís.
Alc. 131-2 (Chorus) :
$\pi a ́ v \tau \alpha$ үà $\frac{\eta}{\eta} \delta \eta$ тєтé̀ $\epsilon \sigma \tau a \iota ~ \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \iota$
(that is, Admetus ${ }^{1}$ alone).
Similarly the chorus refers to Eurystheus in Herac. 294.
2. THE ALLUSIVE PLURAL OF RELATIONSHIP.
(a) PARENT.

|  | Aeschylus | Sophocles | Euripides |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| oi teкóvtes | Pers. 245, <br> Cho. 329, 68I |  | I A. 689 |
| oi тєко́ $\boldsymbol{\text { ¢ }}$ ¢ои | Cho. 419 |  |  |
| oi токеยิร | Cho. 384, Eum. 152 | E1. 187. | Hec. 403 |
| oi $\pi \alpha \tau$ ¢́ $\rho \in \varsigma$ | Cho. 865 |  |  |
| oi yoveis |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { El. 146, 24I, } \\ & \text { OT. } 436,1495 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| oi фитev́ravtes |  | ОТ. 1007, 1012, OC. 1377 |  |
| oi фv́araves |  |  | Ion. 561 |

The plural when referring to one individual calls attention to the relationship rather than the individual. In Eum. 152 the plural is apparently an echo of legal phraseology :

O son of Zeus (Apollo) . . . thou hast overthrown aged deities in thy respect for the suppliant (Orestes), a man who is godless and токєิेбьv тєкоóv; that is, Clytemnestra alone. Orestes is guilty of " mistreatment of parents. ${ }^{\text {" " }}$

Similarly in Sophocles Electra 24I-242 Electra says in effect : May I not dishonor my father ( $\gamma$ ové $\omega v$ ).

[^135]In OT. II76 the language savors both of the legal and the oracular :

ктєvêv viv тoùs тєкóvтas j̄ $\lambda$ óyos,
but reкóyтas means only the father.
The statement in Cho. 329-3I is gnomic ${ }^{1}$, though Agamemnon alone is alluded to :

татє́рау тє каі̀ тєко́vтшу
үóos êvodıos щatevít

True grief for a father and parent is a world-wide searcher of vengeance.

In the generalization the challenge to Orestes and Electra becomes milder.

In Cho. 418-19, however, only Clytemnestra can be thought of :


What might we say rightly? Oh what wrongs have we suffered at the hands of -yes, her that gave us birth?

Similarly токеṽ $\sigma$ in verse 384 is best taken as referring simply to Clytemnestra :

But still, for a mother vengeance is on the way.
Same play, verse 865 (Chorus) :

that is, Agamemnon, but of course $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \in \omega \nu$ might have the idea of the accumulated wealth of the house.

Ion 560 (Ion) :

Am I really embracing him that begot me (that is, Xuthus)? So too Xuthus alone is meant in verse 1561, (фv́vaбı).

OT. 1007 (Oedipus) :


[^136]The messenger has just announced the death of Polybus.
Soph. El. 185-86 (Electra) :


äтเร ăvยv токє́ $\omega v$ катата́коцаи,
alluding especially to her father Agamemnon ${ }^{1}$. Meineke, followed by Nauck and Jebb, emends the manuscript reading to $\tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \in \omega{ }^{2}$. Jebb states three reasons for accepting the change: (i) "She is saying that the best days of her life have gone by without giving her anything to hope for. It would be inappropriate to justify this (as the causal ${ }^{\circ} \tau \iota s$ does) by saying that she is pining away 'without parents', or a husband's care, while the mention of children is perfectly in place." (2) "The very order of words, тєкє́ $\omega v$. . . . ávи́p, is confirmed by vs. 164 f ., äँтєкvos . . . ávú $\mu \phi \in v \tau o s . " ~(3) ~ " I f ~ \tau о к є ́ \omega v ~ b e ~ r i g h t ~ i t ~ m e a n s ~ t h a t, ~ w h i l e ~$ Agamemnon is dead, the living Clytemnestra is a $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$ ( 1154 ) : but this is forced."

But it seems to be unnecessary to deviate from the mss.: (i) Electra says her life is without hope ; she not only has in mind her deceased father but the fact that he is not present to guarantee her a happy wedding, such as would befit a princess. This point of view satisfies the requirement of those who desire to read $\tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \omega v$. (2) The unvarying authority of the manuscripts for $\tau \boldsymbol{\kappa} \epsilon \omega \nu$ would at least demand a much stronger case than has yet been made out for $\tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$.
(b) Child.

|  | Aeschylus | Sophocles | Euripides |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| т ${ }^{\text {à }}$ тéкva | Persae 218 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OC. 946, } \\ & \text { I250 ( téкv }) \end{aligned}$ | IA. $396,403,490$, 736, 1015, 1104, 1169, - 1209 ; Нес. 750 |
| oi $\pi \times i \delta \varsigma^{3}$ |  | OC. 970 | IA. 399, 690 . |

[^137]As in the case of the plural for one parent, so too the plural for one child apparently reflects the wording of the Athenian law. In the First Speech of Lysias ${ }^{1}$ Euphiletus says: ©́кeiv $\eta v \tau \epsilon$
 Euphiletus had only one child, which he calls $\pi a i \delta i o v^{2}$ here and there in the speech. The plural directs attention to the child as such : the law which prohibits placing a stigma of shame upon a child is broken.

The same idea stands out clearly in the Tenth Speech ${ }^{3}$, where the speaker refers to himself alone : $\tau \epsilon \theta v a ́ v a l ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ v ~ v i \pi o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} v ~ € ं \chi \theta \rho \hat{\nu}$,

[What would be more dreadful to my father than] to die at the hand of an enemy, but to suffer the repute of being murdered by a child of his.

OC. 969-70 preserves, apparently, the plural of an oracle :


So tell me, if according to the oracle some divine fate was coming to my father, to die at the hand of a son. .

In verse 946 there, ávóб七o тéкvov savors of a law against incest (Oedipus alone is meant) ; and so a law on the murder of offspring in IA. 490 :

that is, Iphigenia.
One more of the many instances in Euripides will suffice, namely,

IA. 396-9, where both тє́кva and $\pi a i ̂ \delta \epsilon$ are of Iphigenia alone:




One case in Aeschylus deserves special mention, Pers. 216-9

[^138]（Chorus to Atossa）：
каì $\pi$ ó入є七 фídoıs $\tau \epsilon \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota$ ．

Very strangely some of the editors－even Weil and Wecklein ${ }^{1}$ －read тéкvę，but the mss．have the plural．The scholiast cor－ rectly interprets by＂$\tau \underset{\varphi}{\hat{\omega}} \exists_{\epsilon} \rho \xi_{\eta} \eta_{"}$ ；following which Wecklein
 225 ＂（222）＂каi 230＂（227）．Wecklein might also have added verses 177 and 189 where Atossa speaks of Xerxes as $\pi$ ais $\notin \mu$ ós． Within the compass of 45 verses（ $177-222$ ）Xerxes is referred to by the singular 5 times and by the plural only once． And yet to emend to the singular is without justifica－ tion：（i）All are agreed that only Xerxes is meant．（2）If the scholiast＇s text read réкvゅ in verse 218 ，it would have been strange indeed for him to explain it as referring to Xerxes at this point and make no such enlightening refer－ ence to the earlier $\pi \alpha$ îs（verse 177）or тéкvę（verse 222）．The fact that the scholion appears is evidence that there was a plural in the text，which amid several uses of the singular－all mean－ ing one and the same person－might to the casual reader need interpretation．（3）Why is the plural used here？The chorus， Atossa＇s well－meaning counsellors，suggest prayer to her．The prayer they prescribe savors of a set form or ritual something like this ：

Whosoever hath an ominous vision or hath aught to fear should approach the gods with supplications，praying that calamity may be averted and that heavenly blessings may fall upon himself，his chil－ dren and all his friends．

Thus тékvots echoes the formula．（4）The chorus prescribes a further religious observance in verses 219－20：

भn̂ $\tau \epsilon$ каì фөıгоîs $\chi^{\text {éar } \theta a \iota-~}$

[^139]Pour out libations to earth and dead, that is Darius ${ }^{1}$ who had just appeared to the queen in a horrifying vision. To be consistent, why not emend to $\phi \theta \iota \tau \underset{\hat{\varphi}}{ }$ here as well as to $\tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu \omega$ above ${ }^{2}$ ?

## 3. MEMBER OF FAMILY IN GENERAL.

(a) The pronoun of the third person as well as the noun is used in the plural to refer to one individual. This usually applies to some member of the family.
 where the relative clause is a stereotyped expression, $\Phi v$ meaning only Diogeiton. Cicero ${ }^{3}$ has the same thing.

In Tragedy the notion of the existing relationship becomes stressed when the name of the individual is lost in the plurality. Thus the plural obviously serves a dramatic purpose in some instances, as for example in O'T. 1184-5 (Oedipus) :

 and same play 1273-4 (Oedipus) :


and OC. 547 (Oedipus) :

Compare also OT $136 \mathrm{I}-\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\phi}^{\prime} \dot{\omega} v^{4}$ (Laius) and also verse $1360-$ avooíw (Iocaste). The plural in every case both avoids the specific and softens the statement.

In Cho. 215 the plural pronoun has a sense of vagneness about it which aids to stay the recognition :

In IA. 864 the Presbytes begins to break the news to Clytemnestra of Iphigenia's impending doom. He says : $\sigma \omega ́ \sigma \alpha \theta^{\prime}$ oűs ধ̇ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$

[^140]$\theta \dot{\theta} \lambda \omega$, but not until verse 873 is the formula displaced by the explicit statement :

(b) Both the neuter and masculine plural of pinos are found often when but one person is alluded to. oi фídoc and oi фídtarot.
The force of these plurals is essentially the same as (e.g.) үoveís and тéкva; they call attention particularly to the relationship, kinship.

Cho. 234 (Orestes) :

For I know that she who is bound to us by the closest ties is our bitter enemy.

Same play, verses 83 I-34 (the Chorus concerning Orestes)Пєроє́шs $\tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \phi \rho \epsilon \sigma і \nu$
 roîs $\theta^{\circ}$ vinò $\chi^{\theta o v o ̀ s ~ \phi i ́ \lambda o u s ~(A g a m e m n o u ~ a l o n e) ~}$

Taking in thy soul the courage of Perseus, accomplishing (vengence) for thy deceased father and thy living sister.

OT. 366-7 (Tiresias to Oedipus) :


I say that thou hast been consorting unconsciously with thy nearest relative (Iocaste).

In Soph. El. 346 and 395 the plural of Фídos is of Agamemnon ; and in verse $65^{2}$ Clytemnestra means only Aegisthus (фídotrı). Compare also фídol, Antigone 634.

Ant. 437-39 (Guard)


ả̉ $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu o ́ v$.
The scholiast explains $\phi$ ídovs thus: $\phi \eta \sigma i$, $\delta$ ià $\tau \grave{̀}$ eival $\tau \grave{v} v$


[^141]on the ground that the guard is "a doûdos of the family," as the scholiast too doubtless thought. So far as I have been able to discover, such a notion in the plural of фídos is unparalleled in Tragedy. The statement here is gnomic in force ${ }^{1}$ anyway, though of course Antigone is the one alluded to. Humphreys ${ }^{2}$ has already mentioned the lack of necessity for the scholiasts' interpretation.

```
IA. 744-45 :
    \sigmaoфí\zetaо\mual \deltaè кả\piì \tauoî\sigma\iota ф\ell\lambda\tauá\tauo\iotas(Iphigenia)
    \taué\chivas \piорi\zeta%.
```

    Same play verses 839-40 (Clytemnestra) :
    
$\kappa \alpha \iota v o ̀ ̀ s ~ o ́ \rho \omega ิ \sigma \iota ~ к а і ̀ ~ \gamma a ́ \mu о v ~ \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \mu$ évovs.
Other places for reference ${ }^{4}$ are IA. 334, 404, 408, 1022, 124 I,

Here may be included OC. 146-8 :

ӧ $\mu \mu а \sigma \iota \nu$ єіртоข
к $\dot{\pi} \pi \grave{\imath} \sigma \mu \iota \kappa \rho \circ i ̂ s ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma a s ~ \omega ̄ \rho \mu о v v-~$
I would otherwise not bc walking by the eyes of another and, large
man that I am, be resting upon the weak (i.e. Antigone ${ }^{5}$ ).

## ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Pers. 702.

${ }^{2}$ Note in his Antigone ad loc., p. Ior.
${ }^{3} \phi$ inous kalvous may be a delicate way of saying new member of family.
${ }^{4}$ Just as ol $\phi \AA$ iot, so ol ex $\chi$ 日pol appears in Tragedy a few times referring to but one as in (e.g.) Aeschylus Cho. 615 f.:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \dot{\alpha} \tau^{\prime} \ell \chi \theta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\nu} \pi a l \\
& \phi \hat{\omega} \tau^{\prime} \dot{\alpha \pi} \boldsymbol{\omega} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu \phi(\lambda 0 \nu-
\end{aligned}
$$

She (Scylla) induced by an enemy (Minos) ruined her dear father.
Similarly Agamemnon is alluded to by Clytemnestra in Agam. 1374, Aegis-


 ing interpretation also appears in the Scholia and is correct: roû̃o $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \phi \eta \sigma \iota$
 Campbell (note ad loc.) thinks the latter interpretation "attributes a doubtful use both to the dative and to the plural." But that the dative is not a doubtful use shows the exact parallel $\notin \pi l \quad \delta v \sigma l$ ßounaîs $̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ árкúpais $\dot{\delta} \mu 0 \hat{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \nu . . . . \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \delta \lambda \iota \nu$ (Plutarch Solon 19) ; that the masculine or neuter plural is not infrequent in Tragedy when applied to a female has already appeared in these pages ; that this meaning of $\sigma \mu i \kappa \rho o i s$ is more apropos here is obvious.

Just as фídos and фídtatos refer to one woman in the plural, so also $\sigma \mu$ ккроі. $\sigma \mu$ ккроîs may, however, be neuter as the uses of фídтara (following) show, but in either case the meaning is the same.
2) $\tau \grave{\alpha} \phi i ́ \lambda \tau \alpha \tau \alpha$.

Even in prose the substantival plural neuter adjective is used of persons, but so far as I have seen the meaning there is plural as in $(e . g)$. Xenophon's Cyropedia, IV, $3,2^{1}$ :

The soldiers said they could fight better if they had rà фìлтaтa along with them.

The bearing of plurality on the meaning is the same as that of oi фídoo.

Pers. 85 I (Atossa) :

Phil. 434 (Philoctetes) :
Пáтрок入os, ŏs бov̂ $\pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \eta \ni v ~ \tau a ̀ ~ ф i ́ \lambda \tau a \tau a . ~$
Soph. El. 1208 (Electra to Orestes) :

(i. e. the urn containing the supposed ashes of Orestes).

Ion 52 I (Xuthns to Ion) :

IA. 458 (Agamemnon) :
(Clytemnestra has come) $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ фíגлала (Iphigenia only) $\delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma v \sigma(a)$.

## 4. THE ALLUSIVE PLURAL OF RESERVE.

Two classes of words come into observation here : those concerning criminals and the dead. In each case the plural avoids the specific, whether it be from caution, regard, or some other dramatic purpose.

> (a) THE CRIMINAL.

As the Tenth Speech of Lysias shows, to accuse an innocent person of crime was an indictable offense. The speaker there whom Theomnestus had accused of murder repeatedly accuses his slanderer of throwing away his shield; but he carefully

[^142]avoids a specific charge by using the plural（ $\tau$ ô̂s á $\pi$ oßá $\lambda \lambda o v \sigma \iota^{1}$ ） and other means to keep himself without the pale of the law．

The uses of the plural in Tragedy point back to the phaseology of the law for their origin ${ }^{3}$ ．

Agam．1323－25（Cassandra）：



$I$ beseech the sunfor my avengers to repay thy hateful murderers．
In Cho． 41 roîs ктavov̂бı is primarily（at least）of Clytemnestra who struck the blow＊，while roùs $\gamma$ âs vép $\theta \in \nu$（verse 40）is of Agamemnon alone．

Sophocles Antigone 1263－64（Creon）：
® кта⿱亠䒑⿱亠乂寸таs тє каі
Oavóvтаs $\beta \lambda$ е́тогтєs $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi v \lambda i ́ o v s-~$
Oye，seeing slayer（Creon himself）and the slain（Haemon）．
OT．105－6 ：
тov́rov $\theta a v o ́ v \tau o s ~ v ิ ิ v ~ ย ่ \pi เ \sigma \tau e ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon t ~ \sigma a \phi \omega ิ \varsigma ~$
тoùs av̉тoévтas Хєเрì тıцшрєîv тเvas－
Now that he（Laius）is dead，（Phoebus）bids us plainly to mete out vengeance to the murderer，whoever it may be．

So Oedipus in repeating the oracle says тov̀s ктavóvтas（verse 308）．

And． 403 （Andromache）：
фоvєข̂бยv＂Eктороs vvرфєи́opat，
Neoptolemus the son of the actual murderer being meant．The individual meant is not the material point：she is to be in a house stained with blood．She expresses the same sentiment in


IA． 1189 （Clytemnestra to Agamemnon，bitterly）：

[^143]

Indeed I should regard the gods devoid of reason, if I shall feel kindly toward a murderer (i. e. Agamemnon himself).

The following instances show the plural's dramatic value: the oracular vagueness of the plural intensifies the irony ${ }^{1}$ of the situation.

OT. ro6-07 (Creon to Oedipus) :


But compare verses $308-9$ of the same play when Oedipus says :
(Phoebus responded that the only way our deliverance could come was)-


More terrible irony ${ }^{2}$ can scarcely be imagined than this, or that of verses 122-23 where Creon says to Oedipus :


with which compare verses 124-5:


To the audience, $\lambda \eta \eta \sigma$ ás is Oedipus alone ; to him it is more than one person as verses $842-4$ show. The singular (verse 124) " may only be an idiomatic way of speaking, but may also be a stroke of art in representing Oedipus as wholly careless about number of persons ${ }^{3}$."

The plural thus assists in retarding the action of the plot to verses $84^{2-44}$ when Oedipus says to Iocaste :




[^144]What was to Oedipus an immaterial point earlier in the play is now paramount.
Ant. 1172-5:

Mess. retvẫıv (Haemon) oi dè (Creon) そ̧̂vvres aïtoo Oaveiv.


The plural protracts the suspense-an art in which Sophocles is peculiarly gifted ${ }^{\text {'. }}$
(b) THE DEAD.

The plural calls attention to the state of death and in general is euphemistic.
 403) all allude to Agamemnon ; the same is true of oi $\gamma$ âs ímaì ке́fevor and oi $\theta a v o ́ v e \epsilon s$ in Soph. El. 1419-142 I.

Cho. $376-77^{2}$ (Chorus) :

We now have a helper (Agamemnon) beneath the earth.
Pers. 229 :

Similarly $\phi \theta$ íross in verse 218 .
Soph. El. 832-3 (Electra to Chorus) :


If you afford me any hope for them (Orestes) that are surely departed, you will crush me still deeper into sorrow.

- Here both verb and plurality serve euphemism. .

In Ant. 1263-4 (quoted page 159) Aavóvras is of Haemon as ктavóvtas is of Creon.

Cho. 886 (Nurse to Clytemnestra) :


[^145]


The verse is at once ambiguous and paradoxical. Tension of interest is sustained and the climax is postponed.

Eum. 599 (Furies to Orestes) :

When Orestes says, I have faith; help will come from my father -from the tomb, the reply comes, yes, have faith in the dead, now that thou hast slain thy mother.

The plural which may be either plural or singular in meaning is particularly cutting : the Chorus means to suggest to Orestes the idea of procuring his mother's assistance!

Cho. 803-04 (Chorus) :
$\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \pi a ́ \lambda \alpha \iota \pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ v \omega \nu$

Hermann deletes $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v \omega \nu$. Other editors (as a rule) read it and interpret as netuter. Schütz ${ }^{2}$ alone regards it as masculine: "Virorum olim occisorum sanguinem nova vindicta expiate." Blaydes reads $\delta \iota a \pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma^{\mu} \epsilon^{v} \omega \nu$. Schütz may be right, and, if so, the plural is a euphemistic allusion to Agamemnon. Compare Cho. $1^{32-1} 33$ where Electra says :


 editors disregard the evidence and emend to $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \mu$ évol, following Casaubon. It is not unlikely that the scholiast is right, and that in the two passages cited the word has the force of done for as is often the case with the compound $\delta a \pi \pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \epsilon^{\prime}{ }^{2}{ }^{3}{ }^{3}$.

In either case the meaning would be more forceful, and in the first passage cited aipa would be more appropriate (blood of him that is done for).

[^146]Sept. 419-21 :

фópovs $\mu$ ópovs vimè $\rho$ фí $\lambda \omega v$

Of a man slain for a friend, that is Melanippus alone. This passage has caused commentators no little worry, but the mss. reading should stand: and ỏ $\lambda_{o \mu} \hat{\varepsilon}_{\nu} \omega \nu$ is the best taken apart from $\phi i \lambda \omega \nu$. The article is often thus omitted in Aeschylus as (e.g.) $\pi а \rho a \beta a ̂ \iota v$, Agam. 59, and $\pi \iota \pi \lambda a ́ v \tau \omega v$, Cho. $361^{1}$.

## 5. NEUTER AND ABSTRACT PLURALS.

Such plurals are not infrequently used in Tragedy, referring to one person (or thing) and seem to carry poetic feeling.
(a) Neuters in $-\mu a$ and Adjectival Substantives.

Or. 1053:

Hipp. 116-17 :


Hec. 265 :

Hipp. II :

Alc. 1028-9 :

$\lambda a \beta \omega ้$.
Med. $134^{8}$ :

For I shall never rejoice o'er my new-found bride ${ }^{3}$.
Tro. 252 :


[^147] the neuter plural see d́pıcteía (Bacch. 1239), áкpotivıa (Phoen. 203), $\sigma v \gamma к о \mu \dot{\eta} \mu а \tau \alpha$ (And. 1273).
(b) ABSTRACTS.

Trach. 1 138-39 (Hyllus) :


when she saw the bride (Iole) within.
Hyllus thus refers to Iole whose name he avoids with contempt.

Soph. E1. 1232-1233 (Electra) :
ì̀ үovai
रovaì $\sigma \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega v$ é $\mu \circ \grave{\imath} \phi \iota \lambda \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu-$
O thou offspring, offspring of the dearest life to me. yovai alludes merely to Orestes and $\sigma \omega \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ to Agamemnon. As Jebb notes, $\sigma \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ for $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s$ is " seemingly unique," but the influence of $\phi \iota \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\tau} \omega \nu$ which is so common for the singular easily accounts for enallage in $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$. To make rovaí include Orestes is to me an untenable position, for it not only weakens the force of the sentiment, but also renders the interpretation of $\sigma \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega v$ extremely awkward.

[^148]
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Mavíal，100，102， 117
цаขтєîa， 60
набтoí， 27
$\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \alpha \theta \rho a, 56,{ }^{11} 7$
$\mu$ є́ $\tau \omega \pi \alpha, 22,24,117$
$\mu i \tau \rho a t, 20,21,118$
циทбтєข́भата，97， 99
но́pot，89，92， 118

vaoí，59， 118
$\nu i ́ \pi \tau \rho \alpha, 13$
vó́rot，100，101，II9
vóvтоt， 119
ขขдфєї，61，64，97，98，119
ขvифєข́цата，97， 98
ขติта，28，29， 119
گє $\boldsymbol{\omega} \omega \mathrm{\nu} \epsilon \varsigma, 61,64$
$\xi i \phi \eta, 32,33$
oiкоь， $51,52,53,55,56,120$
ӧ $\mu \mu а \tau а, 22,24,120$
ópraí， 100
öpla， 12
ópíт $\mu$ ата， 12
ӧ $\rho \mu$ оt， 10,120
öpot， 12
ӧрофоь， 58
ỏ $\chi$ ท́ $\mu a \tau \alpha, 41$
${ }^{\text {oै } \chi \theta a \iota, ~} 8$
${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{X} X$ Oot， 12
ै $\chi$ or，40，41，42， 121
тáyoı，II，14， 12 I
$\pi \alpha i ̂ \delta e s, ~ I 52$
$\pi \alpha \rho \theta \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ，61， 63
$\pi a \tau$ е́ $\rho \in \varsigma, 150$
$\pi \epsilon \delta i a$, II
тย่т $\lambda$ оt， $17,18,121$
тє́рүаца，58， 59
тєро́vaи， 36
$\pi \eta \gamma a i, 13$
$\pi \lambda є$ и́ $о \nu є \varsigma, 27$
$\pi \lambda$ еvpaí， 26
$\pi \lambda \eta \gamma a i, 83,87,88$
$\pi \lambda \eta \gamma^{\gamma} \mu a \tau \alpha, 83,88$
$\pi$ ло́коь，20， 21
$\pi$ п́́Ol， 100
то́ $\rho \pi \alpha \iota, 36,121$
$\pi \rho a \pi$ étes， 30
$\pi \rho o ́ \theta v \rho a, 74,76$
тротфа́үмата，83， 89
$\pi$ ро́т $\omega \pi \alpha, 22,23,122$
$\pi \rho о ́ \mu о \iota, 145,149$
（oi）тротє́мұа⿱亠теs， 145
$\pi \rho о ́ \pi v \lambda а, 76$
трохоаі， 13
тúגà，74， 75
тид $\boldsymbol{\mu} а т а, 76$
рє́є $\theta \rho a,{ }_{1} 3$
คำ $\neq \mu \mathrm{ives}, \mathrm{IO}, \mathrm{II}, 122$
pooú， 13
ба́ркєє， 17
батival，41， 43
бךкоí，64，66，67
бкทvai，60，61， 122
бкпиш́цата，60，6I
бкฑ̂тт $\rho a, 37,38,39,93,96,122$
бкотеаí， 12
ттє́үаи，57， 58
бтє́ $\mu$ мата，20， 123
ттє́คva，26， 123

बré申avol，20， 21
बтє́ф $\eta, 20,123$
$\sigma \tau \eta \eta_{\eta} \eta, 25,26,29$
$\sigma \tau \sigma \lambda \mu \circ i ́, 19$
бто́ната，22，24， 124
бфагаí，83，85，86， 87
бфа́үка，83， 88
бфаүцаб $\mu$ о́，83，8у
таүó， 145
тафаi，81， 82
тáфoı，80，81， 124
тє́киа， 152
（oi）тєкó $\boldsymbol{\mu \varepsilon v o t , 1} 150$
（oi）тeкóvтєs， 150
（ơ êv）тé éce， 145
токєîs， 150
тóga，32， 124
то́тоя， 11
т $\boldsymbol{\text { íX }}$ еs， 30,31
тúpavvot， 145
víata，13， 125
ข์ィย́vatot，97，98， 125
фа́рєа，17，19
фа́сүаиа，32，33， 125
$\phi$ Oopaí，89， 93
（oi）фídol， 155
（ $\tau \grave{\alpha}) \phi \grave{\lambda} \tau a \tau \alpha, 157$
（oi）фí入татоь， 155
фovaí， 83,84
фóvol，83，84，85， 125
фoveîs， 158,159
фре́ves，25，26， 29
（oi）фи́баитєs， 150
$\chi^{\text {aítal，} 30,31}$
$\chi$ хเศิขєร， 17,19
$\chi^{\text {גаvíóa，}} 19$
$\chi^{\text {алаí，}} 30$
хрŋбтйриа，59，60

廿́́цаӨoı， 15
む $\mu \mathrm{o}$ ， $27, \mathrm{I} 26$
N




[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Griechische Grammatik, Vol. I, p. 17 f. (1898).
    ${ }^{2}$ Griechische Grammatik ${ }^{3}$, Müller's Handbuch, II, I, p. 369 f.
    ${ }^{3}$ Greek Syntax, p. 26, 852.
    ${ }^{4}$ De numero plurali qui vocatur maiestatis (1889).
    ${ }^{5}$ Die Sprache als Kunst, Vol. I, p. 502 (1885).
    ${ }^{6}$ De usu numeri pluralis Aeschyleo et Sophocleo (1888).
    ${ }^{7}$ Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache, Vol. I, p. 26 (i878).
    ${ }^{8}$ Grammar of the New Testament Greek (Trans.) p. 131 (1880).

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ So Reuchlin, quoted by Maas, Archiv, Vol. 12, p. 481.
    ${ }^{2}$ But cf. Tobler, Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie, Vol. 14, p. 416, where the plural forms are explained as not originally concrete: "Elōim, Gottheit ('himmlische Mächte') im Gegenteil zu dem spätern streng monotheistischen Jahveh, Jehova"; also: "Adōnim, Inbegriff der Herrschaftsrechte, als verkörpert in einer Person gedacht wie Ital. podestá (potestas)."
    ${ }^{3}$ The Pluralis Intensivus in Hebrew, Johns Hopkins Dissertations, 1905.
    ${ }^{4}$ Though the term was invented for just such a class of words, yet as a rule they are not even included under that head.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Soph. Frag. Adesp. 289.
    ${ }^{2}$ Menexenus 245 D.
    ${ }^{8}$ I. T. 1495-1497.
    ${ }^{4}$ Note e. g. Alc. 165:
    
    ${ }^{5}$ See Part Three of Chapter I.
    ${ }^{6}$ Mepi ï千ous, Chapter XXIV :
    
    

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ The separate works on different phases of the subject and for certain portions of Tragedy are mentioned later.
    ${ }^{2}$ As mentioned by Aristotle (see p. 3).
    ${ }^{3}$ As suggests Pseudo-Longinus (see p. 3 f.).

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Republic $\S 492$, D. Cf. also Antiphon 1, 28.
    ${ }^{2}$ The plural stands under the influence of $\dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu i a \iota s$ and $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \sigma \iota$; and a number of persons are involved.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Gildersleeve, op. cit., p. 21.
    ${ }^{4}$ Or. I, §4.
    ${ }^{5}$ It was intended to treat also the Poetic Singular, which would be an interesting task, but it must be postponed owing to the limits imposed. I re-
    

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ De numeri pluralis usu Homerico, Halle, 1879.
    ${ }^{2}$ De usu numeri pluralis Aeschyleo et Sophocleo, Marburg, 1888.
    ${ }^{3}$ Über den Gebrauch des Plurals für den Singular bei Sophokles und Euripides, Programm XIX-XX, Klagenfurt, 1869-70.
    ${ }^{4}$ Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra, Weimar, 1889.
    ${ }^{5}$ Striking reminiscences of this he finds in Homer and elsewhere-e.g.
     $\mathbb{\$} \phi \theta \iota \tau o \nu$ alel ; and Vergil's Aeneid VIII, 729, per clipeum Vulcani, dona parentis. This theory explains the neuter plural subject of the singular verbin Greek; ultimately various plurals of Homer are traced to feminine singular nouns, as those of symmetrical parts of the body, e. g. $\pi \rho \delta \sigma \omega \pi \alpha$.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Indicative of this, too, is the appearance of singular forms side by side with the $-a$ form of the plural. Cf. $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \pi \sigma \nu, \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \pi \alpha$; but note that a form $\pi \rho о \sigma$ ஸ́mara also appears (see p. 23).
    ${ }^{2}$ Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprache, Vol. II, p. 682, Strassburg, 1892.
    ${ }^{3}$ Singular und Plural-Forschungen über Form und Geschichte der griechischen Poesie, Teubner, Leipsic, $190 \%$
    ${ }^{4}$ The citations in this work are numbered according to the following editions : Homer and Sophocles-Dindorf; Aeschylus-Weil ; EuripidesNauck; Tragicae Dictionis Index-Nauck. The readings adopted however are independent of any single edition. Unless some specific note to the contrary is given, the ms. authority is followed where the reading pertaining to the subject in hand is disputed.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Prom. 810, Sept. 392 ; Ant. 1132 (ch), Phil. 726 (ch) ; Hel. 491.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Ellendt, Lexicon Sophocleum, Berlin, 1872.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Agam. 1159 ; Or. 994 (ch), Tro. 826 (ch).
     rocky, projecting parts.
    ${ }^{3}$ Phil. 936.
    ${ }^{4}$ See Introduction, p. 3 ; also chapter on metre.
    ${ }^{5}$ Cf. also ò 846, v 96.
    ${ }^{6}$ Cf. definition of plural-"inlets," "bays"-in Autenrieth's Homeric Dictionary (trans. Keep), 1904.
    ${ }^{7}$ Excepting $\pi \varepsilon \delta i \alpha$ and $\kappa \delta \lambda \pi o \iota$ mentioned in table.
    ${ }^{8}$ I. e. once only in this sense-meaning gulfs in general.
    ${ }^{9}$ I A. 1497 (ch).
    ${ }^{10} \mathrm{Hec} .450$.
    ${ }^{\text {Ir }}$ Sing.-I T. 425 ; plur.-I A. 2 IO (ch).

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ I T. i29I f. : . . . . . . . ofemov ßpettas
    
    
    Other instances are Rhes. 354 (ch), Hel. 1146 (ch), Ion 889 (ch). Frag1132, 34.
    ${ }^{2}$ Singular and plural respectively as follows:
    Homer 19-1. Aeschylus 8-2, Sophocles 0-4, Euripides 5-24.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Cf}$. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \mu \nu \chi \hat{\varphi}$ тov̂ $\lambda c \mu \hat{\ell}$ vos, Thuc. VII, 52.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. Herod. IX, 25.
    ${ }^{5}$ For $\gamma \dot{d} \pi \in \delta a$ see Lexicons.
    ${ }^{6}$ But $\pi \hat{\epsilon} \delta o \nu$ is invariably singular ; Homer 2, Aeschylus 24, Sophocles 16, Euripides 35.
    ${ }^{7}$ A true plural-all the plains.
    ${ }^{8}$ Singular and plural respectively : Homer 0-2 ("Cliffs," e 405, 411), Aeschylus 8-I (Frag. 304, 10), Sophocles 3-5, (Ant. 4II, Trach. 634 ch. Frags. 86, 353, 248-3), Euripides 5-2 (Or. 1651, I T. 1470).

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. also Or. 1651, $\pi$ á $\gamma \circ \iota \sigma \iota y$ èv 'Apelotбıv.
    ${ }^{2}$ I T. 1470 f .
    ${ }^{3}$ OC. 947.
    ${ }^{4} C f$. Homeric $\delta \chi \theta \eta$. Plural : Agam. x16r ; Phil. 729 ; Tro. 8or, I T. 1375.
    ${ }^{5}$ Plural : Eur. El. 447, Hel. 769, 1324, Phoen. 233.
    ${ }^{6}$ Plural : Aj. 721, Soph. Frag. 505 ; Hipp. 124, Phoen. I315.
    ${ }^{7}$ Plural : II 390; Cyc. 27, Alc. 578.
    ${ }^{8}$ Homeric form ôpos, meaning landmark in the singular ( $\Phi 405$ ), and boundary in the plural (M421).
    ${ }^{9}$ Aeschylus has the word once in the plural along with $\pi$ ároc (Frag. 304,
     Euripides twice singular, once plural (Bacch. 1229).
    ${ }^{10}$ Singular occurs Bacch. 730 ; plural ib. 957.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1} \tau 343,504$.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ One would expect to list $\boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\nu} \phi \dot{\alpha}$ here, occurring as it does four times plural
    
     lar only-in Homer and Tragedy. It is entirely probable that the invariable use of $\nu \iota \dot{\text { a }}$ in the singular in Tragedy is due to the persistent $\chi$ ( $\omega \nu$ which is always singular both in Homer and Tragedy.
    ${ }^{2}$ See $\pi$ árot (cliffs), p. il f.
    ${ }^{3}$ See p. 21.
    ${ }^{4}$ Plural: Agam. 336, 56r ; Aj. 1208; Hipp. 78, I A. 182, Ion 96, 117.
    ${ }^{5}$ Plural : Agam. 335 ; Ant. 356.
    ${ }^{6}$ Ares riots in the fresh-spilt blood of kindred, one after another.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ Supp. 265, Cho. 284, 932.
    ${ }^{2}$ Or. 1548 ch., Phoen. 1052 ch., 1292 ch., Herc. Fur. 894 ch., El. 1172
    
    
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. Horace Car. II, 1, 5 -arma uncta cruoribus.
    ${ }^{5}$ Note, Vol. I, p. 28.
    ${ }^{6}$ The plurals of Tragedy are in Hipp. 234, 1126.
    ${ }^{7}$ The three plurals of Tragedy are in Agam. 64 ; And. 112 ; Eur. Supp. 821.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ Eur. Supp. 821 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Strangely both $\delta \epsilon i \pi \nu \nu \nu$ and $\delta a i t s$ resisted the plural in Homer (the plurals. of the latter there being true ones) : i.e. the influence of ovetara (sing. 4, plur. 17) is ineffective.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Kummerer, 1. c., p. 22.
    ${ }^{4}$ Plurals : Elum. 108, Aesch. Frag. 183, 3 (true plurals) ; O T. 79, Trach. 268, Soph. El. 203 (each of one banquet) ; Eur. Hec. 915, Ion 655, 712, 1032, 1124, Or. 1008, Alc. 749, Cyc. 31, Med. 343.
    ${ }^{5}$ Plural for singular, Ion II3I.
    ${ }^{6}$ True plurals.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1} C f$. vestes, common in Latin poetry.
    ${ }^{2}$ Singular merely $\Sigma 538, \xi 501$.
    ${ }^{3}$ Plurals : Cho. 81, Agam. 921, 960, 963 ; OR. 1268; I A. 73, Hel. 1574 , Hec. 342.
    ${ }^{\text {© }}$ True plurals.

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Soph. Frag. 924, $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda o \nu . . . . \pi \epsilon \rho o \nu i s$, and Med. 786. Also of. $\pi \epsilon \rho \delta \nu a$, p. 36, and note.
    ${ }^{2}$ Plurals : Sept. 101, Agam. 232, 1126, 1580, Cho. 30, 1000, Eum. 352, Supp. 235, 432, 457, Pers. 125, 182, 199, 468, Frag. 297 ; Soph. Frag. 406 ; Eur. (see the few cited.)
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Ellendt, op. cit., p. 621.

[^17]:    ${ }^{1}$ Homer, singular 6; Aesch. singular 2, plural 1; Eur. singular 2, plural 1.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. also Or. 840, 1436, I T. 1149, Hipp. 126, Eur. El. 543.
    ${ }^{5}$ Hermann, Hartung, Markland, Musgrave, Kirchhoff, Rauchenstein propose unnecessary emendations.
    ${ }^{4}$ Non-Homeric ; Cho. 29, Supp. 715, (true plurals) ; Euripides-singular, Alc. 216, And. 148, and plural, Alc. 819, 923, Herc. Fur. 526, Tro. 258.
    ${ }^{5}$ A very rare word, but I find the ${ }^{-}$singular in Herodotus I, 195.
    ${ }^{6}$ Homer singular 7, plural 7 ; Euripides plural 2 times.
    ${ }^{7}$ Homer has the plural twice in a metaphorical sense, ( $\Pi$ Ioo, $\nu 388$ ), and is followed by Euripides in Tro. 508 ; but in the same sense Hesiod has the singular (Sc. ro5).

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ Singular Soph. El. 1468. Plural Agam. 1178 (one veil) Cho. 494 (one net) ; Aj. 245, Trach. 1078 ; I T. 372.
    ${ }^{2}$ See this word in Part Three of this chapter.
    ${ }^{3}$ Plurals: Eur. Supp. 36, 470, Ion 224, 522, 1310, 1338, 1389, Or. 12, And. 894, Bacch. 350.

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ Singular, Med. 949, but the verse is generally suspected (see Stephanus' Lexicon and editors), $\pi \lambda 6 \kappa 0 y$ being read instead on the ground that an exact repetition of verse 786 is meant. Statistics support the emendation. Plurals are in Phœen. 858, Supp. 359, I A. 1477, 1512, Tro. 258, 451, 1247, Herac. 7r, Ion 104.
    ${ }^{2} C f$. Demosthenes' veiled reference to a crown in $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \beta \epsilon \beta o v \lambda \epsilon v \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$ (De Corona 8 53) ; also Aeschines vs. Ctes. § 249.
    ${ }^{8}$ Means lock of hair in Cho. 197, Aj. 1179. Euripides singular-Med. 786, 842, 1186, El. 527 ; plural Ion 1266, Herc. Fur. 233, E1. 778.
    

[^20]:    ${ }^{1}$ Since the metre favors the singular in $\Sigma 24$ (note the agreeing adjective) the singular is probably thus to be accounted for.

[^21]:    ${ }^{1}$ J. Schmidt (1. c., p. $40+$ f.) thinks $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \pi \alpha$ is the Acc. sing. of the $-n$ stem. This long form seems surely to be a formation on the analogy of $\delta \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$. See note 5, p. 7, and note 1, p. 8.
    ${ }^{2}$ Synonymik der Griechischen Sprache, Vol. IV, Leipsic, 1886.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Gildersleeve op. cit., p. 24.
    ${ }^{4}$ Quaestiones Vergilianae, 1867.
    ${ }^{5}$ Op. cit., p. 9: "In plurali solo pulchritudinis notio non inest."
    ${ }^{6}$ Op. cit., p. 4 .
    ${ }^{7}$ Cf. for example Ant. 1241 and Soph. E1. 1297.
    ${ }^{8}$ Cf. Pollux II, 53, where $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi a$ is defined as the bones next to the nose. under the eyes; to this the Scholiast added— $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \circ \psi \iota \nu \cdot \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \rho \rho \nu_{s} \tau \delta$. $8 \lambda 0 \nu$.
    ${ }^{9}$ Variously construed is $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \pi a$ here : as meaning images of Apollo and Diana (Heath), the sun and moon-symbols of Apollo and Diana (Paley), statues (Hermann), the eastern and western façades, etc.

[^22]:    ${ }^{1} C f . \gamma a \mu \phi \eta \lambda \alpha i s-n o t ~ o n l y$ plurale tantum but also restricted to dative only－Homer 3，Prom．353，Eur．Ion 159， 1495.
    ${ }^{2}$ For example $\Lambda 416$.

[^23]:    ${ }^{1}$ Phoen. 63, $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu \omega v$ र่̇עus $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$; $C f$. ib. 32, plural of one persou.
     $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$.
    ${ }^{3}$ The plural in Homer means beard. See' p. 30.
    
    ${ }^{5}$ For $\lambda a \iota \mu \hat{\nu} \beta$ ßote $\epsilon \omega \nu$, see Allusive Plural, Chap. III.
    ${ }^{6}$ Homer singular 31, plural I ; Aeschylus singular 2, plural I; Sophocles singular 2, plural 1 ; Euripides singular 7, plural 4.
    ${ }^{7}$ Sept. 865, and 663 :
    iкveîtal $\lambda$ र́子os $\sigma \tau \eta \theta \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$, but the Coryphaeus includes the chorus.

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Witte: "Wenn $\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \theta$ os von dem Körperteil als solchem gesagt ist stehe im allgemeinen der Singular; plurale tantum dagegen sei das Wort, wenn es 'animus' bedeute. Ganz natürlich: in allen diesen Fällen ist $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \theta \in \sigma \sigma \iota(\nu)$ ja Analogiebildung nach $\phi \rho \in \sigma \ell(\nu)$ "-In Glotta, p. I37, 1908, "Zur Homerischen Sprache."
    ${ }^{2}$ Uses in Tragedy : Aesch. plural 5-Prom. 65, Pers. 1054, Agam. 76, Cho. 746. Fr. 362 ; Soph. sing. 2, plur. 8 -literal sense, Phil. 792, OC. 1609, E1. 90 , Trach. 568, IO90, Aj .633 ; figurative sense OC. 482, Ant. 639, while the singulars are in Trach. 482, Fr. 196 ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \tau \epsilon \rho \nu 0 \nu$ collective), both being figurative uses; Eur. commonly plural.
    ${ }^{3}$ Used there sing. 14, plur. 5 times.
    
    ${ }^{5}$ Cf. Gothic Brusts, but German Brust. Even Xenophon has the plural of one person in Cyr. I, 2I3, maiซas els rd $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho v a . ~ . ~ \pi a i ̂ \delta a$.

[^25]:     used the feminine noun only in the singular and that only the heteroclite neuter plurale tantum appears in the plural there (note to Herac. 824) ; so also Porson (note to Hec. 820, Or. 217).
    ${ }^{2}$ Homer once in singular $-\Delta 528$; plural always in Tragedy, but in Trach. IO54 mss. L' ${ }^{1} \mathbf{r}$ favor singular.
    ${ }^{3}$ Occurs Homer singular 17, Aeschylus singular 3, Sophocles plural 2, Euripides more often the singular.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. Jebb's note, s. v., p. 136 .

[^26]:    ${ }^{1}$ For a collection of such uses，see Bekker，Homerische Blätter，Vol．I， p． 163.
    
    
    ${ }^{3}$ Aeschylus sing．I，plur．I ；Sophocles sing．2，plur． 7 ：Euripides sing． 8，plur． 21.
    ${ }^{4} C f . \xi 225-\nu \omega ิ \tau \alpha$ кає єủpéas Øんous．
    ${ }^{5} C f$ ．also Aj ．IIO，$\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \iota \gamma \iota \pi \rho \hat{\tau} \tau \circ \nu \nu \omega ̂ \tau a$ фoเvเ久 $\theta \epsilon$ ls $\theta$ ápp．
     imitates，Aeneid II，474－Lubrica convolvit sublato pectore terga．Juhl （p．12）and Spitta（p．2I）rightly see in the plural a vivid picture of the coils．

[^27]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Juhl, p. 12, and Spitta p. 5.
    ${ }^{2}$ Strictly speaking, such plurals are genuine-each wave being a $\nu \hat{\omega}$ Tov.
    ${ }^{3}$ Here as in El. 731 ch., and Frag. 114, 3, the plural assumes the indefinite force of тбтоь, $\chi \hat{\omega}$ роь.
    ${ }^{1}$ L. c., p. 17.
    ${ }^{5}$ See Dindorf, Lexicon Aeschyleum, p. 383, and Volp, 1. c., p. 50.
    ${ }^{6}$ Not so recognized by Dindorf and Volp.
    ${ }^{7}$ Occurs Aesch. sing. 52, plur. 62 ; Soph. sing. 29, plur. 37. Euripides has both numbers passim, the plural being the more frequent.

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ Uses: Homer plural 11; Aeschylus plural 3; Euripides singular 2, plural 3.
    ${ }^{2}$ Bacch. 427, 999.
    ${ }^{3}$ Op. cit., p. 7.

[^29]:    ${ }^{1} \phi 390, \xi 346$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Herc. Fur. 161, 570, 942.

[^30]:    Cf．Juhl，p． 34.
    
     sagittae＂．Cf．also Phil．I303．

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Or. 268, Supp. 886, Herc. Fur. 366, 1090, 1098.
    ${ }^{2}$ See $\theta$ 266, Herodotus VII, 69, Trach. 51 II.
    ${ }^{8}$ Apollo ( $\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ ) provided Heracles with bow and arrows.
    

[^32]:    ${ }^{1} C f$. E1. 164.
    ${ }^{2}$ Volp in referring to Aj . 23 I says wrongly: "Quem pluralem neque antea neque postea quisquam de singulari ense usurpare ausus est."
    ${ }^{3} \delta \epsilon \iota \delta^{\prime} \eta \beta \rho b \chi$ ous (see under $\beta \rho \delta \chi 0 \iota$ )
    
    ${ }^{4}$ Homer sing. 25, plural 12 ; Aesch. sing. 5, plural 1 ; Soph. sing. 4, plural 3 ; Eur. I, plur. 1.
    ${ }^{5}$ Note, s. v., p. 90.

[^33]:    ${ }^{1}$ So does Witte, op. cit., p. $3^{1}$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Kummerer: "So kann man nur an den einen Schild denken; Sophokles will durch $\dot{d} \chi$. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi$. die personificirte Peste von Kriegsgotte unterscheiden."
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Kaibel, Sophokles Electra, note s. v.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta 0 \lambda d \dot{s}$, ib. Phoen. 276.
    
    ${ }^{5}$ See p. 24.

[^34]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. singular ib. Phil. 1205.
    ${ }^{2}$ So Kummerer, but Jebb: "One fastened Iocasta's $i \mu d ́ \tau \iota o \nu$ on her left shoulder, and another her Doric Xıc $\omega \nu$ on the right" (note s. v., OT. 1269.)
    ${ }^{3}$ Plural only in Homer and Tragedy ; not found in Aeschylus or Sophocles.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. also Eur. Frag. 622, 4 and ib. Hipp. 194.
    ${ }^{5}$ Uses : Homer sing. I (kite) ; Soph. sing. I, Frag. 391 (where it equals $\delta \rho \in \pi a \nu o \nu)$; Eur. plur. I, where it is equivalent to $\delta \rho \in \pi a v o \nu$.

[^35]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Homer sing. I, plur. 2 (true plurals) ; Soph. sing. I; Eur. sing. 4, plur. 4.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs Homer sing. 3, plur. I (true plural) ; Aesch. plur. I (true plural); Soph. sing. 1 ; Eur. plur, 1.
    ${ }^{3}$ Occurs Homer sing. 4 ; Aesch. sing. I; Soph. plur. I; Eur. sing. 4, plur. 8.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. also Phoen. 100, 104, 1179, 1182.
    ${ }^{5}$ Found only in Euripides-plurale tantum. Cf. кd́тоттро⿱ which appears in Tragedy in the singular only.
    ${ }^{6}$ Cf. Eur. Or. 1112, Tro. 1107.
    ${ }^{7}$ The uses of the word are: Homer sing. 34, plur. 2; Aeschylus sing. 2, plur. 4 ; Sophocles sing. 4, plur. 5 ; Euripides sing. 7, plur. 19.

[^36]:    ${ }^{1}$ Iliad-Vol. I, p. 306.
    ${ }^{2} \Psi 567$ and A 234 .
    ${ }^{3}$ As Pers. 298 suggests, officers as well as the king held a sceptre. There were royal eunuchs who were called $\sigma \kappa \eta \pi \tau 0 \hat{\chi} \chi \circ$ (Xenophon Cyropedia VII, 3, 16). In a sense the king possesses sceptres just as he possesses powers (крd́тท.)
    ${ }^{4}$ The dual in OC. 848, IIO9 refers of course to Antigone and Ismene.

[^37]:    ${ }^{1}$ Herc. Fur. 254 has a true plural.
    ${ }^{2}$ So Ellendt Lex. p. 686 : " Medium propriae et tralatae huiusce significationis locum obtinet.
    ${ }^{3}$ For such passages as this and the following see chapter on metre, s. v. It is easy to see the convenience of the plural.
    ${ }^{4}$ Non-Homeric ; Aesch. sing. I, plur. I (true plur.) ; Eur. sing. 4, plur. 4.

[^38]:    ${ }^{1}$ Op. cit., II, p. I4.
    ${ }^{2}$ Volp combats their view on p. 42 , but apparently accepts it on p. 54 .
    ${ }^{3}$ Op. cit., p. 54.
    ${ }^{4}$ Op. cit., p. 36.
     and elsewhere,
    ${ }^{6}$ Witte ingeniously notes how inconvenient the tribrach $\delta \chi \in a$ was for heroic verse, and regards the persistent plural a proof of the original plurality of the word.
    ${ }^{7}$ This word occurs but once in Homer-є 404 -where it means harbors.

[^39]:    ＇True plurals．
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf．$\delta$ iфpov ib．194．
    ${ }^{3}$ Prom．468．The other uses in Aeschylus are Supp． 183 and Prom． 468.
    ${ }^{4} \mathrm{Cf}$ ．Ellendt，p．589，and Jebb＇s note．

[^40]:    ${ }^{1}$ Plurals-IA. 6io, 616, Rhes. 392, Phoen. 44, Supp. 662, Frag. 779, 6. Some of the singulars are Hipp. 1233, Tro. 884, Med. 1321, Rhes. 621, Alc. 67.
    ${ }^{2}$ Similarly ib. 616 and Phoen. 44.
    ${ }^{3}$ Literally the chariot-board, where the $\dot{\eta} \nu$ loxos and the mapaıßár $\bar{s}$ stood. Note the word's etymology ( $\delta \dot{v} 0+\phi \hat{\rho} \rho \omega$ ).
    ${ }^{4}$ See also ib. $710,723,750$.
    ${ }^{5}$ See also ib. 1040, Phoen. 2, IT. 214.
    ${ }^{6}$ In OT. 808 Doederlein (followed by Hartung, Dindorf, Nauck) reads bxous, while Jebb, Ebeling and others follow the text which is very difficult to construe.
    ${ }^{7}$ Occurs sing. Med. I123, Hipp. 1166, 1212, 1229, IA. 623, Tro. 856, E1. 999, Rhes. 190; plur. Phoen. 1190, And. 1019. Tro. 569, 626, Hipp. 1225, IT. 370, Hach. 191, Hel. 1040, El. 969, II35, IA. 146, 599, 613, Rhes. 416, Supp. 316 (Pierson, Dindorf and Hermann read 入ó $\chi o u s$ ) 674,676 , Bacch. p. 33

[^41]:     (ib. 1229).
    ${ }^{1}$ The ms. reading $\delta \chi \omega \nu$ seems impossible. As against the prevalent reading ${ }^{6}$ Xov (Dind., Weck., Paley), the plural is preferable. So Witte, p. 200.
    ${ }^{3}$ A true plural appears in H. Hom. Ven. I3 ; but of. Anacreon 20, 12ėтıßaivet नatıvécv.
    ${ }^{4}$ Homer sing. 9, plur. 4 ; Soph. plur. 2 ; Eur. sing. 7, plus. 3.

[^42]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Homer sing. 5, plur. I (true plur.) ; Aesch. one true plural ; Soph. sing. I (El. 745) ; Eur. plur. 2.
    ${ }^{2}$ For convenience the two are classified separately.
    ${ }^{3}$ So Autenrieth, Homeric Dictionary.
    ${ }^{4}$ Occurs Homer sing. 20, plur. II (probably true plural in each case, but note $\Sigma 379, \kappa \delta \pi \tau \epsilon \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu$ oús, i. e., rivets, as Leaf takes it) ; Aesch. sing. 4, plur. 9 (Prom. 6, $113,155,176,509,525,770,1006$, Frag. 235, 2) ; Soph. sing. 1, plur. 3 (Aj. 62, 72, Frag. 60) ; Eiur. sing. 3, plur. 18.
    ${ }^{5}$ Cf. $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha$, ib. 513 .

[^43]:    ${ }^{1}$ Plurale tantum both in Homer and Tragedy: Homer 3, Aeschylus 3 , Euripides 14.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs in $\chi 472$, where the plural is really a true one ; $c f . \beta \rho b \chi 0$ there with $\tilde{E}_{\rho \kappa \epsilon \epsilon, ~ v . ~}^{269}$. The nooses about the several necks are the meshes of a net, as it were.
    ${ }^{3}$ Only once used in this sense in Homer and there it is singular.

[^44]:    ${ }^{1}$ So also Tro. IOI2 and elsewhere.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs Aeschylus plur. 3 (true plurals) ; Sophocles sing. I, plural i.
    ${ }^{3}$ Only here in Tragedy.
    ${ }^{4}$ Occurs Aeschylus sing. I (Eum. 346) ; Sophocles sing. I (OT. 1374); Euripides sing. 5, plur. 6.
    ${ }^{5}$ See ib. verse 136 .
    ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Cf}$. ib. verse $779-{ }^{6} \nu$ ppóxous.

[^45]:    Eur. plur. 3 (Or. 1315, Phoen. 263, Bacch. 1206).
    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. use of singular ib. Med. 986, and Herac. 441 :
    
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs Aesch. sing. 2, plur. 2 (I) ; Eur. sing. 2, plur. 6.
    ${ }^{3}$ Hermann thus restores the reading from the corrupt apкborata.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. further Bacch. 231, El. 965, IT. 77.
    ${ }^{5}$ Uses-Homer sing. 1 ( $\chi 386$ ) ; Aesch. sing. 7 ; Soph. sing. 1, plur. 1 ;

[^46]:    
    ${ }^{2}$ Aesch. sing. 2, plur. 2; Eur. sing. I (Frag. 754), plur. 2.
    ${ }^{8}$ The plural in Eur. Bacch. 1241 has another meaning-prey.
    ${ }^{4}$ In Aeschylus and Sophocles always equals mandata.
    ${ }^{5}$ I. T. 760, 763.
     $\delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho \kappa о \nu \quad \kappa а \tau \omega \mu \mu \sigma{ }^{\prime} \quad \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$. While the plural suggests metrical convenience, it apparently conveys the notion of the stipulations in the oath.
    ${ }^{7}$ Uses-Aesch. plur. I ; Soph. sing. 3, plur. I ; Eur. sing. 26, plur. 4 (IA. 116, 798, IT. 787, Frag. 369, 6).

[^47]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. ib. $760:$ év $\delta$ ย̂גтov $\pi \tau v \chi a i ̂ s . ~$
    ${ }^{2}$ Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 14.
     ésevyúva).
    ${ }^{4} C f$. Volp, p. 42.
    ${ }^{5}$ Op. cit., pp. 221-223.

[^48]:    ${ }^{1}$ The word is always found in the sixth foot, and in 22 of 23 places has a
     modified by an adjective-'s $\pi a \tau \epsilon \in \rho o s ~ \delta \hat{\omega}$. In Hesiod's Theogony 933 ( $\chi \rho v \dot{\sigma} \epsilon a$ $\delta \hat{\omega}$ ) the plural adjective does not oppose the view taken, for it cannot be considered the reminiscence of an earlier usage. Our word is there thrown out of its formal position anyway ( $i$. $e$. the sixth foot). This solitary use of $\delta \hat{\omega}$ as plural may be explained as that of an obsolete singular noun following by analogy the Homeric $\delta \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau$.
    ${ }^{2}$ In reference to the oriental "joint undivided family", see Sterrett's Iliad, p. 222, where he says: "When a young man marries, he needs but one chamber (cone) ; as his family increases other cone-chambers are built by the side of this original cone-chamber. As each child marries, other conechambers are built . . . . until finally the establishment of a patriarch consists of a great collection of isolated, but juxtaposed and intercommunicating chambers, each with its own cone roof with a hole at the apex for the exit of the smoke."
    ${ }^{s}$ This palace is designated by $\delta \delta \mu o s, \delta \delta \mu o \iota$, $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu a, \delta \omega \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a$. oikos, $\mu \epsilon \gamma \gamma a \rho o v$, and $\mu^{\epsilon} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \alpha \rho!$
    
    ${ }^{5} \mathrm{Cf}$. Lat. aedes which occurs regularly in the plural in the sense of dwelling, but the singular is used for temple (Neue, Formenlehre der Lateinischen Sprache, Vol. I, p. 675, Leipsic, 1902). The singular appears of one room in a dwelling also,-e. g. Plautus Asinaria 220, Aedis nobis areast. Cf. also the very elastic use of $\mu$ é yapo which occurs often in Homer, but never in Tragedy.

[^49]:    ${ }^{1} C f$. also $\chi 494, \psi 146$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. J. H. H. Schmidt, op. cit., 508.
    ${ }^{3}$ So Justi, quoted by Schmidt.
    ${ }^{4}$ But cf. Eur. Med. 1136-1143, where olkot (the household) is contrasted with $\delta 6 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ( the house). Note too $\sigma$ t'rau (women's apartments).
    ${ }^{5}$ See Juhl, op. cit., p. 25. Grashof, LaRoche, Nauck would emend this one instance of the poetic plural- $\omega 417$. The mss. consistently read olk $\omega \nu$.
    ${ }^{6}$ It is important to note here the Homeric $\mu$ trapoy which does not occur in Tragedy, but in Homer is found sing. 98, plur. 204. It must have given impetus to the plural tendency of $\delta \delta \mu o s$ and $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu a$. The $\mu \hat{\gamma} \gamma a \rho o v$ is properly (x) the big ( $\mu \dot{\gamma} \gamma a$ ) room of the Homeric house, i.e. the men's dining hall ( 8300 ) ; it means also (2) the women's apartments ( $\tau 16$ ) ; (3) the housekeeper's apartments up-stairs (úтєрळ́九ov $\beta$ 94) ; (4) a sleeping apartment

[^50]:    ( $\lambda 374$ ) ; (5) the whole house was first mentioned by the plural in A 396, and commonly so thereafter. But in $\sigma 24$ even the singular applies to the house, and in $\beta 94$ the plural means one chamber- $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma a \mu \notin \nu \eta$ $\mu \hat{\prime} \gamma a \nu$ l $\sigma \tau \partial \nu$
    
    As Juhl notes (p. 26), Athenaeus is wrong in referring the plural only to the homes of heroes (Vol. V, p. 193, C).
    ${ }^{1}$ E.g. OT. 861, 1006; OC. 643 ; El. 1493 ; Ant. 392.
    ${ }^{2}$ In Homer the accusative singular is used of the home of Hades II times.

[^51]:    ${ }^{1}$ E.g. El. 1070, OT. 934. El. I359.
    ${ }^{2}$ E.g. OC. 784, 1408, E1. 63.
    ${ }^{3}$ OT. 71 .
    ${ }^{4}$ See p. 56.
    ${ }^{5}$ Kummerer (p. 8) following Schneidewin interprets $\delta \delta \mu o t s$ by "von einem einzelnen Gemache." Volp (p. 44) considers $\kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}$ olкov equal to "in conclavi," and $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta b \mu o{ }^{\prime}$ equal to "domi." olikos is used in Homer at least twice of one chamber- $\tau 18$ (i.e. the atrium), and probably a $356, \tau 514$. In this regard Volp's view is not objectionable. Cf. Bekker's Charikles in the house-description-" die Zimmer, oikoo oder oikฑ $\mu a \tau a "$-Vol. II, p. 136.
     quoted) and the restricted meaning referred to in Euripides (following).

[^52]:    ${ }^{1}$ The conclusion is based also upon the statistics above and the free use of the plural even when the singular would easily serve metre．
    ${ }^{2}$ See also under $\delta \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a$.
    ${ }^{3}$ Previous to this play，${ }^{2} \nu \tau \rho a$ had been often used of one cave on the analogy of $\delta \delta \mu \circ \iota, \delta \omega \mu a \tau \alpha$ ．Now in turn $\delta \delta \mu o \iota, \delta \omega \dot{\mu} \alpha \tau \alpha$ and $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \gamma a$ are all ap－ plied to the Cyclops＇cave．Volp（p．44）thinks $\delta 6 \mu 0$ is here used＂per iocum，＂but this would hardly be justifiable in verse 371 ．
    
    
    ${ }^{5}$ The mss．reading of Eum． 827 f ．is ：
    $\kappa a l \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \delta \alpha{ }^{\circ}$ ot̀ $\delta \alpha \delta \omega \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \mu \delta \nu \eta \theta \varepsilon \omega ิ \nu$ ，
    
    ${ }^{6}$ Casaubon（followed by Hermann，Wecklein，Sidgwick and others）： emends to $\delta \dot{\omega} \mu a r o s$ ．Triclinius（followed by Schütz and Butler）change merely the relative，reading $\epsilon \nu$ ots．Hermann says：＂Nimirum non in pluribus，sed in uno conclavi fulmen conclusum fuisse credibile est（Vol． II，p．633）．Wecklein objecting to $\overline{\text { I }} \nu$ ots says：＂Minder wahrscheinlich und passend hat Triclinios nachher $\epsilon \nu$ ots geschrieben．Denn der Begriff

[^53]:    'Gemach' ist besser als der Begriff 'Haus'." The Homeric use of $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu a$ (chamber) may justify the singular relative here, the construction being $\kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma u ́ v \in \sigma \iota \nu$. The remarks of Hermann and Wecklein only re-enforce belief in such a probability.
    ${ }^{1}$ E.g. OT. 531, 925, 95 I, 1395.
    ${ }^{2} C f .025 \mathrm{I}-\delta \hat{\omega} \mu$ ' $\mathrm{A} \delta \delta \alpha_{0}$ : in this connection the plural does not appear in Homer, but often both $\delta 6 \mu$ os and $\delta \delta \mu o s$.
    ${ }^{3}$ See under $\delta 6 \mu$ o above.

[^54]:    ${ }^{1}$ For otxo meaning one chamber in Homer, see under $\delta \delta \mu o$.
    ${ }^{2}$ The singular occurs-Agam. 18, 37, 136, 732, 867, 96r, 1532; Cho. 579 ; Eum. 459, 751, 895 ; Prom. 387, Sept. 190, Frag. 192 ; plural-Agam. 35, 156, 237. $344,427,761,1481$, 1524, 1554, Cho. 76, 719, 765, 862, 934, Eum. 239, 417,452 , 1044, Pers. 230, 524, 833, 862.
    ${ }^{3}$ Porson, Dindorf, Bloomfield and others emend to otkoss, but Hermann, Verrall, Sidgwick retain mss. reading.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. Frag. 856 (sing.) with Ant. 594 (plur.).
    ${ }^{5}$ Cf. Trach. 1066, OT. I491 (sing.) with El. 1309, O T. II2 (plur.).
    ${ }^{6}$ Sing. 7, plur. 12. The usual phrases are $\begin{gathered}\text { 's oikov (Phil. 240), ès otkous (ib. }\end{gathered}$
    
    ${ }^{7}$ E1. 929, 1147, 1473 ; OC. 343 ; Trach. 531, 689, 934.
    ${ }^{8}$ Aj. IO2I, Phil. 469.
    ${ }^{9}$ Uses : Homer sing. 7 ; Aesch. sing. 1, plur. 11 (Agam 116, 518, 770, 85 I, 957, 1333, 1575, Cho. 343, 789, 1069, Frag. 386) : Soph. sing. I, plur. 4 (Phil. 147, 1428, Ant. II7, El. 1268) : Eur. sing. 16, plur. 76.
    ${ }^{10} \mathrm{I} 640$ : $a \ell \delta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \delta \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda a \theta \rho o \nu$. But Witte cites a case of the plural, Pindar Pyth. V, 40 (op. cit., p. 25 ).

[^55]:    ${ }^{1}$ Weil needlessly emends to plural. Wecklein brackets $1435-1438$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cyc. 49I, 5II. Where the plural is used for a cave, it is always genitive. The genitive singular of the word is avoided both in Homer and Tragedy, occurring but once in the latter-Euripides.
    ${ }^{3}$ The neuter noun $\sigma$ téros (tectum) is non-Homeric, but occurs in Tragedy, Aesch. 2, Soph. 3, Eur. 8. Strangely it invariably resists analogical influence in favor of the plural and remains singular.
    ${ }^{4}$ Occurs here sing. 6, plur. 4 ; Soph. sing. 21 , plur. 10 ; in Eur. common in both numbers, being plural for singular 36 times (see Kummerer, p. 8).
    ${ }^{5}$ OT. 637, OC. 339, El. 282, 1308, Phil. 1262.

[^56]:    ${ }^{1}$ The singular means grave Ant. 888, and dungeon E1. 282.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Cyc. 9I (sing.) and ib. 29 (plur.), So too the plural in I'T. 263.
    ${ }^{3}$ So also Med. I164, but $c f$. ib. II8o for the singular.
    ${ }^{4}$ Occurs in Homer only $\Omega 45$ I, where it is a collective singular of reeds for thatching ; Aescb. plur. I; Soph. sing. I ; Eur. sing. 1, plur. I.
    ${ }^{5}$ Homer sing. 3 (masc. forms) ; Aesch. plur. 1; Soph. plur. 4 ; Eur. only
    
    ${ }^{6}$ According to Servius (note, Vergil Aeneid II 556) we would have here a true plural: "propter Pergama quae altissima fuerunt, ex quibus omnia alta aedificia pergama vocantur sicut Aeschylus dicit". ( $C f$. Ebeling Lex. Soph. ).

[^57]:    ${ }^{1}$ As And. 292, Hel, 384, IA. 589, 762, 1576, Tro. 598, 851 , 1295, ${ }^{1325}$, Or. 1388, Phoen. 1098.
    ${ }^{2}$ Aeschylus (e.g.) does not have d̀d́ктopa or vaol at all, but generally employs $\delta 6 \mu \%$ or $\delta \delta \mu 0 t$ instead.
    
    
    exфaveis d̀áкcopov. But Wecklein is apparently right in reading dขакт $\delta \rho \omega \nu$.
    ${ }^{4}$ Sing. And. 43, Tro. 330 ; plur. And. 117, 380, 1111 , 1157 , Ion 55, 1224, IT. $4 \mathrm{I}, 66,635$, Rhes. 5 16, Supp. 88 , Tro. ${ }_{15}, 85$.
    ${ }^{3}$ True plurals.
    ${ }^{6}$ Some instances of the plural of one temple are IT. 34, 88, 129, 138,406 , $460,1215,1227$, Supp. 2, Ion 97 , III, $115,178,314,498,555,683,1366,1384$, El. 7.
    ${ }^{7}$ Aesch. 4 (Sept. 230, 450-of victims; Eum. 194, Sept. 748-of a temple) ; Soph. 3 (Aj. 220-of victims; OC. 604, 1331-of a temple) ; Eur. sing. 5, plur. II (as in Ion 38, 299, 409. IT. 1261, And. Ifir).

[^58]:    ${ }^{5}$ The form here is $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta \mu a \tau a$.

[^59]:    ${ }^{1}$ Poetic plural $\psi 4 \mathrm{I}-42$ :
     equivalent to $\delta \omega \dot{\omega} \mu \tau a$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Eum. 1004, Pers, 624.
    ${ }^{3}$ In Ant. $804 \theta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \mu o \nu$ equals $\tau u ́ \mu \beta o \nu$.
    ${ }^{4}$ E.g. And. 104, 109, 112, IT. 209 Hipp. 182, Tro. 854, Bacch. 95, 1370, Hel. 1354, Hec. 919, Med. 14I, Phoen. 1541.
    ${ }^{5}$ Paley and others retain $\theta \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \mu o \nu$. but Euripidean usage strengthens the view of Nauck and others who read $\theta a \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \omega \nu$.
    ${ }^{6}$ Occurs Sept. 455, Cho. 71 ; Soph, El. 1398, Aj. 1277, Soph. Frag. 141 (the last two being true plurals) ; Cyc. 238, Hel. 1571.
     the stern of the vessel. See Jebb's discussion of this point in note to Soph. Aj., p. 237. Stephanus' Thesaurus quotes Pollux thus on é $\delta \dot{\omega} \lambda \iota \nu$ : " $\pi \rho \omega \rho \alpha-$
     غ̇ठ்лıa at the stern.
    ${ }^{8}$ In Aesch. but once and singular-Diòs aủ̉hiv (Prom. 122; just as in
    

[^60]:    ${ }^{1}$ Described by Horace（Car．III，6）as turris aenea．＂Pherecydes（ap． Schol．A poll．Rhod．4，IOgI）refers to it as a brazen chamber（ $\theta \& \lambda^{\prime} \mu_{\mu} \mu$ $\chi \alpha \lambda_{\kappa o v ̂}^{v}$ ）made underground in the court－yard（ $\alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \hat{\gamma}$ ）of his house＂（Jebb， notes．v．，p．170）．

[^61]:    ${ }^{1}$ But note the Enallage of number in $\mu \nu \chi$ bs. See also ib. 30r, 352. The plural may suggest the various recesses.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs sing. Phil. 27 ; plur. Aj. 413, Phil. 1263, Ant. 883 , OT. 477 , OC.
     Bergki emendatio."
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Vergil's Aeneid VI, 417-418.:
    Cerberus haec ingens latratu regna trifauci
    Personat adverso recubans immanis in antro.
    ${ }^{4}$ Sing: Cyc. 87, 426, 480, Ion 17, 892, 937, 949, 958, 1494, Hel. 424, 607 ; Plur. : And. 1224, Bacch. 123, Cyc. 22, 35, 47, 82, 100, 118, 191, 206, 224, 252, 255, 288, 375,516 , Hel. 475, 486, 573, Ion 288, 502, 1400, IA. 1082, I'T. 107, Phoen. 239, Rhes. 970, Frag. 42 r.
    ${ }^{5}$ The singular appears Hom. Hym. Merc. 103-" cottage."

[^62]:    ${ }^{1}$ Sing. ib. 19, 954, 1087 ;' plur. ib. 1149.
    ${ }^{2}$ Jebb emends the mss. to read thus:
    
    $\pi \eta \delta a ̀ \tau \epsilon$, in which case $a \dot{v} \lambda t \omega \nu$ of course is lairs of beasts, a true plural. While $\pi \epsilon \lambda \hat{a} \tau \epsilon$ is strange here, it is not impossible; and if the mss. be followed, aủ入 $\omega \omega \nu$ is best taken as above suggested.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Cf}$. the common phrase kaz' olkov.
    ${ }^{4}$ Homer $\epsilon 432$ өa入áa $\eta$.
    ${ }^{5}$ The singular in Phil. 1328-"shrine."

[^63]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Supp. 30, Bacch. II, Rhes. 59t, Phoen. 175 I.
    ${ }^{2}$ Homer- $\theta \hat{\omega}$ коs, $\theta$ obwos.
    ${ }^{3}$ True plurals.
    ${ }^{4}$ In origin, of literal sense : $V$ dhra-support; hence $\theta \rho b \nu_{o s-s e a t, ~ c h a i r ~ ; ~}^{\text {- }}$ then "sella excelsior et honoratior."
    ${ }^{5}$ E.g. Z 238 (notice $\delta \omega \hat{\omega} \alpha$ ) :
    

[^64]:    ${ }^{1}$ This force of the word is to be distinguished from that where the plural is used.
    
    ${ }^{3}$ The idea here is particularly that of authority usurped rather than one of "sitting in the seats" as it is usually translated: $\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$ would seem more natural, if such were the thought.

[^65]:    ${ }^{1}$ However, $\theta$ áкŋиа may mean supplication here.

[^66]:    
    
    ${ }^{2}$ Sing．El．315，I T．1254，1282，Herac．754，Cyc．574，Frag．640， 2 ；plur．： Alc． 946 ，Hel． 241 ，Herc．Fur． 167 ， 1127 ，Ion ${ }_{1572}$ ， 1618 ．I A．I174，I T． 1271 ， Med．1163，1170，1190，Or．1408，Phoen．75，Rhes．269，Tro． 836.
    ${ }^{3}$ I T．1254， 1282.
    ${ }^{4}$ Perhaps the Cyclops in his drunken ecstasy saw a throne－to him ever so real and literal ！

[^67]:    ${ }^{1}$ Badham＇s emendation to $\delta \rho \epsilon \xi \epsilon \nu$ eis $\Delta i o \nu \quad \theta \rho b \nu o \nu$（followed by Weil）is gratuitous．

[^68]:    ${ }^{1}$ So Sidgwick: "The marble throne of the king at the door of the palace "' (note 8. v., p. 33).
    ${ }^{2}$ Seidler (followed by the editors generally) reads $\theta \alpha<\kappa \eta \sigma \iota \nu$. For a full discussion see Jebb.
    ${ }^{8}$ See also Bacch. 347, Phoen. 840.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. the Homeric $\varepsilon$ ย $\delta \eta$-sing. I3, plur. 2 (A 534, 581). The plural there means the council-chamber of the gods with its seats. The singular is used both for seat and abode-as E 360 dं $\theta a \nu \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ èos. One would expect the
     sumes the specialized force of "god-images " (see Jebb's note, Soph. OT., p. 166).
     uses $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \delta \rho a \iota$ in an indefinite sense similar to that of $\tau \delta \pi \sigma \iota$ and $\chi \hat{\omega} \rho o t$ as $e . g$. in
     1414, O C. 45.
    ${ }^{5}$ See page 71 and footnote 1 .

[^69]:    ${ }^{1}$ On both words $c f$. Witte (p. 21). He points out that the Skt. dvār is 1most plurale tantum in the RV and AV, and that dür is plurale tantum. His conclusion that the singular $\pi \dot{v} \lambda \eta$ is a development of poetic license and not a pure Attic form has considerable weight. He claims rightly that the Homeric $\theta \dot{v} \rho a j e$ and the Attic $\theta \dot{v} \rho a \sigma \iota$ point to the plural as the original number (Cf. also Skutsch, Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik, XV, 1906, pp. 45 ff.). He would find poetic excuse for the singulars in Ant. 1186, Aj. 11, Eur. Frag. 781, 45. But of. Aristarchus on I 473 :
     mericis, ${ }^{2}$ p. 125 f.).
    
    ${ }^{3}$ Porson attempts to read the lone singular out of Euripides (note to Or. 1080), but Ellendt rightly upholds it (Lex. Soph., p. 683).

[^70]:    ${ }^{1}$ The same plural for singular (of the cave) appears $6243,304$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. $\gamma 493$ (sing.) with $\delta 20$ (plur.).
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Cf}$. $\pi$ ồal, ib. 1104, $1110,1123$.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. $\pi \rho \frac{\pi}{4}$ ѝaıa, Herod. II, 63 .
    ${ }^{5}$ Homer once, singular, $\times 90$, place of entrance.
    ${ }^{6}$ Similarly ib. 104, 1163 . For different meaning, of. Eum. 30 and And. $930^{-}$
    

[^71]:    ${ }^{1}$ In this sense the plural occurs but three times．
    ${ }^{2}$ Homer has the form кoîros in the singular ten times．
    ＂See on these words under head of＂Metre．＂Also cf．Witte，op．cit．， pp． 208 f．and pp． 221 f ．
    ${ }^{4}$ E．g．Alc．186，1062，Cyc．999，Hipp．180，Or．35，44， 88.
    ${ }^{5}$ E．g．Alc．175，M̌ed．180，Or． 313.
    ${ }^{6}$ Cf．similar use of $\nu \nu \mu \phi$ eia Ant． 568 and of $\gamma$ dдоє ib．Trach． 1139, Med． 18.

[^72]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Soph. E1. 436 : cls єv̇v̀̀̀ $\pi a \tau \rho o ́ s$.
    ${ }^{2} C f$. Ellendt, Lex. Soph.
    ${ }^{3}$ Eg. Rhes. 1, 88, 581, 606, 63I, 660 (the bed of Hector).
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. Alc. 249.
    ${ }^{5}$ Cf. the lone instance of the word in Euripides-Or. 590:
    
    
    ${ }^{7} \beta \omega \mu \hat{\sigma} s=\beta a \sigma \iota s$ (step). When the $\epsilon \sigma \chi d \rho a$ was away there were several steps in the ascent (Volp, op. cit., p. 52).

[^73]:    ${ }^{1}$ True plurals.
    ${ }^{2}$ Sing. OC. 888, 1158 , Frag. 34 r ; plur.. Ant. Ioo6, Ior6, OT. 16, OC. .898 , Trach. $238,754,904,993$. -
    ${ }^{3}$ But this is not surely of one altar ( see Volp, however, op. cit., p. 53.)
    ${ }^{4}$ Mentioned in the singular ib. II58.
    ${ }^{3}$ So also IT. 405. Cf. the singular in El. 792, IT. 72, 705.

[^74]:    ${ }^{1}$ op. cit., p. 58.
    ${ }^{2}$ IV, 127 : $\pi a \tau \rho \omega ́ \iota \iota \tau \alpha ́ \phi o \iota$; and II, 169: èv $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma t \pi a \tau \rho \omega t \eta \sigma \iota \tau a \phi \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota$.
    ${ }^{3}$ So taken, the pronoun emphasizes his supernatural power beyond the grave, whence he is to cooperate with Pallas in inflicting calamity. See s.v., chapter II.
    ${ }^{4}$ For other citations see $s$. v. in section on Metre.
    ${ }^{5}$ Occurs Aesch. sing. I (Sept. 818) ; Soph. sing. 3. plur. 2 (Ajax rogo, 1109) ; Eur. plur. 2 (Supp. 376, Hel. 1063).

[^75]:    ${ }^{1}$ Forthis，at least，the notion of place where many are buried is not present．
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs Eur．sing．3，plur．I．

[^76]:    ${ }^{1}$ Limited to the dative plural with prepositions $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \ell$ and $\epsilon \nu$.
    ${ }^{2}$ For the uses of alpara in this sense, see pages 14-15.
     deaths).
    ${ }^{4} \lambda 612$.

[^77]:    ${ }^{1}$ As to K 733 where the slaughter of a heifer is mentioned the Scholiast
    
    ${ }^{2}$ The other uses in Tragedy are Ant. 1003. Hel. I54.
    ${ }^{3}$ д́ккiovs aipov $\mu \notin \nu \eta$-Casaubon.
    4Volp's idea that $\phi \delta$ voc may have been used by reason of the influence of aí̇ $\nu$ seems fanciful : al $\bar{\nu}$ nowhere else appears as a plural companion of фо́vos !

[^78]:     of Electra II. Jebb in his note to the former accepts the change : " $\phi \circ \boldsymbol{} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$, Bergk's correction of $\phi$ óvov seems right " on the ground that "here we expect a word which will directly suggest the wounds." Against any changes the following reasons seem conclusive : (1) The mss. authority ; (2) There is no precedent for the genitive of ooval-it occurs in the dative only and in a prepositional phrase always; (3) фóvwv does suggest a wound, often
    
     ora入aүmoùs aïnatos in Eur. Ion $1003 ;$ cf. also the adjectives фóvoos, фolvos (bloody); (4) The scholiast has фóvov in the lemma ; (5) The uses of oóvoc in Tragedy show that emendation is unnecessary.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Christ, Griechische Litteraturgeschichte, Müller's Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Vol. VII, p. 173.
    ${ }^{3}$ The reading of the codd.- $\sigma \phi a \gamma \hat{\eta} s-c a n ~ h a r d l y ~ s t a n d . ~ V o s s, ~ W i l a m o w i t z, ~$ and Witte write $\sigma \phi a \gamma d s$, others $\sigma \phi a \gamma \eta_{v}$. The former is far more probable, whether the plural should be considered as suggesting the two children

[^79]:    ${ }^{1}$ See on lol, p. 70.
    ${ }^{2}$ Aside from the three cases cited, the plural refers 17 times to the murder of one person : And. 399, El. 1069, 1243, Hec. 522, Hel. 778, 848, IA. 906, 1318, 1548, Ion 1250, Or. 39, Phoen. 945, Rhes. 606, 636, Tro. 1315, Fr. 781 69, 70. Other cases of the plural are Phoen. I431, Supp. 765 Tro. 562, Hel. 142, 301, Ion 377, 616.
    ${ }^{\text { }}$ Cf. Od̀vatoı, pp. 90 f .
    ${ }^{4}$ Used as in Prom. 863 (quoted p. 86).
    

[^80]:    ${ }^{1} C f$. the sing. of Aj. 919 : $\alpha \pi{ }^{\prime}$ olxelas $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma \dot{\eta} s$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Vs. 109, 119,305 . Witte would justify the singulars here and elsewhere as being metri gratia.
    ${ }^{3}$ So Kummerer, op. cit.
    ${ }^{4}$ In Hipp. 682 the variant reading $\delta \iota a \phi \theta 0 \rho \in \hat{v}$ is preferable.

[^81]:    ${ }^{1}$ In El. 1174 the mss. have $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi \theta \epsilon \gamma \mu \alpha{ }^{2} \omega \nu$, but Musgrave and Nauck do well to read $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi a \gamma \mu d \tau \omega \nu$.

[^82]:    ${ }^{1}$ In three instances more than one person is referred to．For a similar usage in Plato，see page 6．See Sept．877，894，Agam． 1573.
    ${ }^{2}$ So Volp，and Jebb（note to Soph．E1．citing Cho．53），but Witte wrongly：＂Der Plural anstatt des Singulars ist zuerst bei Sophokles El． 204 belegt＂（p．254）．
    
    ${ }^{4}$ The plural occurs Or．164I，Med．197，Alc．886́，Herc．Fur．629，El．484， Frag．964， 4.

[^83]:    ${ }^{1}$ I.e. Clytemnestra alone.
    ${ }^{2}$ Probably influenced by фurás.
    ${ }^{3}$ E.g. in OT. 493 (quoted p. 90) dं $\delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ intensifies a vagueness already residing in the plural $\theta a v a \tau \omega v$.
    *Volp (p. 72) thinks the plural is analogical to $\delta v \sigma \mu a l$, citing Aesch.
     of $\delta v \sigma \mu a l$ can hardly be so connected with $\theta \dot{a} \nu a \tau o r$. It is best to associate
    
    ${ }^{5}$ In note to Eur. E1. 483 (cited by Ellendt).
    ${ }^{6}$ See discussion (pp. 14-15) on this point.
    ${ }^{7} \mathrm{Cf}$. Kummerer (op. cit., p. 2I).
    ${ }^{8}$ Note $e . g$. the singular-of a violent death-in OC. 1425.
    ${ }^{9}$ Rhes. 606.
    ${ }^{10}$ Sophokles Elektra, p. 103.

[^84]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~B} 264$ : $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \dot{\omega}$ s $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon \kappa \hat{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \iota \nu \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota \nu$-but Kaibel says, "Todesschläge. nicht aikeis heissen könnten.
    ${ }^{2}$ Phil. 8, OT. 239, OC. 899, Trach. 287, 995, El. 573; 634, Ant. 1007.
    ${ }^{3}$ See al $\mu a \tau \alpha$, p. 15.

[^85]:    ${ }^{1}$ See p. 91, footnote 5 .
    ${ }^{2}$ The literal meaning is found in Sept. Io08, 1037 ; and Ant. 900 (where $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \phi \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ is to be read).
    ${ }^{3}$ See p. 90 on this passage.

[^86]:    ${ }^{1}$ See pp. 37-39 and pp. 67-72.
    ${ }^{2}$ Homer has only the singular (ri times) aud in the earlier meaning.
    ${ }^{3}$ Occurs sing. 9-Prom 166, 231, 757 ; Sept. 196, Cho. 960, Supp. 485, 595 (Schütz ả $\rho \chi$ âs), 700, Frag. 23; plur. 2-Cho. 864, Agam. 124.
    ${ }^{4} C f$. Sidgwick in note s. v. The plural has the concrete sense of rulers in Eur. And. 1097 :
    
    
    ${ }^{5}$ Occurs sing. 8- OT. 49, 383, 593, 737, 905, OC. 374, 451, Aj. 1104; plur. 4.
    

[^87]:    ${ }^{\text {i S Sing. 5, plur. }}$ - And. 699, 1097, Hel. 1580, Ion IIII, IA. 343, Or. 897, Phoen. 97., 1586.
    ${ }^{2}$ Aesch. Cho. 975.
    ${ }^{8}$ II, p. 9.
    ${ }^{4}$ Four times : Agam. 109, 619, Supp. 526, Sept. 127.
    ${ }^{5}$ See $\theta \rho 6 \nu 0 \iota(\mathrm{pp} .67-72$ ) and $\sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho \alpha$ (pp. 37-39) for citations including кра́т $\eta$.
    ${ }^{6}$ But the singular 6 times, Prom. 948, Agam. 104, 258, 1470, Cho. 480, Supp. 425.
    ${ }^{7}$ Kummerer considers it plurale tantum in Sophocles for the "Herrschaft" meaning.
    ${ }^{8}$ Cf. the singular in Ant. 873, OC. 375. The plurals occur OT. 201, 237, 586, 758, Ant. 60, 166, 173.

[^88]:    ${ }^{\prime}$ Similarly ib. Cyc. 119, Herc. Fur. 464, 543, Hel. 68, Tro. 949.
    ${ }^{2}$ See pages 76-78.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Kummerer, p. 18 and Volp, p. 68 ; also Witte who takes the same view (p. 29).
    ${ }^{4}$ Witte mentions $\epsilon \dot{v} v \dot{\eta}$ as meaning bed in Homer and then Liebesakt ( $\epsilon 126$ ) ; then $\epsilon \dot{v j} \dot{\eta}$ gradually assumes the plural ; rámos of similar meaning would then follow $\varepsilon$ evin to the plural in Tragedy.

[^89]:    
    ${ }^{3}$ So Leaf inlerprets $\gamma \dot{a} \mu 0$, quoting Monro.
    ${ }^{3}$ Not found as a substantive in Euripides.
    ${ }^{4}$ Prom. 559, 739, 947, Sept. 779, Agam. 1156 , Supp. 331.
    ${ }^{5}$ Plurals : OC. 526, 751, 945, 962, 978. 989, OT. 825, 1403, 1492, E1. 494, 971, Trach. 504, 546, 843, II39, Ant. 575, 870, Frag. 56i.
     (And. 193), vицфєvтทpıa (Tro. 252).

[^90]:    'The singular in Sophocles is always a thalamus nuptialis.
    ${ }^{2}$ See footnote 6, p. 97.
    ${ }^{8}$ For similar uses in Euripides, see Phoen. 1204, And. 20, 988, 1232, IA. 832, IT. 365, El. 361.
    'The only example is $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} 493$.
    ${ }^{\circ}$ Agam. $70 \%$.

[^91]:    ${ }^{1}$ The mere figures would be misleading. In Homer the meaning is restricted to seat of the life-principle, seat of anger; but in Attic the plural denotes the outward manifestations.
    ${ }^{2}$ Ajax 640, Ant. 354 (áropa $\sigma$-M ; ор $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \sigma$-L), 956, 1199.
    ${ }^{8}$ Cf. ib. 959 where the singular seems to be in contrast as meaning state of madness.

[^92]:    ${ }^{1}$ But avoidance of hiatus is suggested by the plural.
    ${ }^{2}$ Also ib. 83 f.
    ${ }^{3}$ Note the metrical form of the dative plural adjective, whose last syllable is long; and compare singular dative form.

[^93]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Aesch. sing. I (Agam. 534), plur. 1 ; Soph. sing. 2 ; Eur. sing. I, plur. 5.
    
    
    ${ }^{3}$ Or $\delta 6 \lambda$ ot as in Eur. Herc. Fur. 100.
    ${ }^{4}$ Sept. 35I, Supp. 5 Io.
    ${ }^{5}$ Here may be added, too, ¿ขартaүás, Hel. 49 ff.
    
    
    

[^94]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Schmidt, Rhythmic and Metric, p. 84.
    

[^95]:    ${ }^{1} C f$ ．the ratio of singular to plural in the following ：$\delta \delta \mu 0 s-69: 709$ ，oikos 115：244，$\delta \omega \hat{\mu \alpha} 77$ ： 222.
    ${ }^{2}$ The two instances cited are the only ones in Tragedy ；Homer has only the singular－ 4 times．
    ${ }^{3}$ Occurs Homer 117－0；Aeschylus 51－8；Sophocles 27－1；Euripides 100－10．
    ${ }^{4}$ Found only in Euripides and Sophocles，and also Adesp．262：חuөE ${ }^{2}$ d．vaкто́ршv．

[^96]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Homer 12-0, Aeschylus 2-4, Sophocles 1-5, Euripides II-27.
    ${ }^{2} C f$. the alternative $\kappa \alpha \kappa \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa$ ' ${ }^{2} \nu \tau \rho \omega \nu \mu v \chi \hat{\omega} \nu$.

[^97]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Homer 21－46，Aeschylus 5－5，Sophocles 1－2（but there is no plural for singular here），Euripides 15－29．
    ${ }^{2}$ See éẃpas，p． 113.
    ${ }^{3}$ Occurs Homer 45－0，Aeschylus 1－0，Sophocles 3－4，Euripides 13－1．

[^98]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Sophocles 3-1, Euripides 1-2.
    ${ }^{2}$ See p. 66 and foot-note 2.
    ${ }^{3}$ Occurs Homer 36-1, Aeschylus 2-1, Sophocles 2-1, Euripides 7-4.

[^99]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Homer 34-1, Aeschylus 16-10, Sophocles 6-18, Euripides 43-149.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs Homer 80-4, Aeschylus $3^{-1}$ (true plural), Sophocles 4-0, Euripides 30-2.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. also Medea 201.

[^100]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Homer 37-0, Aeschylus 5-2, Sophocles 1-3, Euripides 1-9.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs Homer 0-13, Aeschylus 0-0, Sophocles 0-2, Euripides 2-15.
    ${ }^{3} \pi d \nu \tau a$ is an impossible reading for the line and hence the singularбе́циноу.
    ${ }^{4}$ Occurs Homer 20-11, Aeschylus 4-9, Sophocles 1-3, Euripides 3-18.

[^101]:    ${ }^{1}$ Similarly $c f$. Eur. Hipp. 1237 with ib. 1244.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs Homer 82-7, Aeschylus 1-0, Sophocles 1-6, Euripides 4-5.
    ${ }^{3}$ Occurs Homer 32-10, Aeschylus 9-3, Sophocles 12-7, Euripides 23-5.
    ${ }^{4}$ Occurs Homer 89-67, Aeschylus I 16-1 13, Sophocles 4-72, Euripides 49-524.
    ${ }^{5}$ Witte says: " $\delta \delta \mu 0 s-\delta \delta \mu o t$ ist für die Tragiker a priori pluralisch gewesen " and "der Singular muss in den Chorpartien entstanden sein" (p.51). The following figures seem to give weight to that belief :

    Aeschylus, singular, Choral parts, 12 times, Trimeter 4 times; Sophocles, singular, Choral parts, 2 times, Trimeter I time ; Euripides, singular, Choral parts, 21 times, Trimeter 27 times.

[^102]:    ${ }^{1}$ Eum. 964, and Eur. Frag. 1132 , 8. In Eum. $103^{2}{ }^{2} \nu \delta b \mu \omega t(M)$ is corrupt.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs Homer III-I37, Aeschylus 12-45, Sophocles 5-15, Euripides 60162.
    ${ }^{3}$ Eg. Or. ${ }^{1} 312$.
    ${ }^{1}$ Eg. Phoen. 1707 ( $\left.\delta \dot{\omega} \mu a \theta^{\prime}\right)$.

[^103]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. ${ }^{2} \rho \tau$ dıaı, p. 107.
    ${ }^{2}$ Also Eur. Hel. 895.
    ${ }^{3}$ Occurs Homer 64-7, Aeschylus 0-2, Sophocles 4-1, Euripides 7-31.
    ${ }^{4}$ See p. 62.
    ${ }^{5}$ For citations and readings see p. 62 and footnote.
    ${ }^{6}$ Occurs Homer 136-1, Aeschylus 20-5, Sophocles 18-4, Euripides 96-6.

[^104]:    ${ }^{1}$ For full citations, see pp. 89-92.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs Homer 34-19, Aeschylus 6-14, Sophocles 1-17, Euripides 6-15.
    ${ }^{3}$ For full citations, remarks on the plural in its broader sense, and the extreme literal uses in Euripides, see pp. 67-72.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cited p. 103.

[^105]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Homer 1-O, Aeschylus 3-2, Sophocles 5-2, Euripides 11-10.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs only in Aeschylus 1-0, Sophocles I-O, Euripides 4-5.
    ${ }^{3}$ Occurs Homer 5-0, Euripides 5-6.

[^106]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Homer 6-4, Aeschylus 0-5, Sophocles 3-4, Euripides 9-84.
    ${ }^{2}$ Occurs Homer 22-27, Aeschylus 3-2, Sophocles io-6, Euripides 67-39.
    ${ }^{3} \lambda \epsilon \chi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota(\nu), \lambda \epsilon \chi \chi^{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \iota(\nu)$, $\lambda \epsilon \chi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \sigma^{\prime}$ etc.
    ${ }^{4}$ Occurs Homer 25-9, Tragedy $17-6$.
    ${ }^{5}$ But see on Phil. 936, p. 10.
    ${ }^{6}$ Trimeter sing. 6, plur. 1, other metres sing. 3, plur. 4. Of course Adesp. 83 - $\lambda c \mu \notin \nu a s \in l s$ 'A $\chi$ aïкoús-is not taken into account in figures or remarks here ) see on Aristotle p. 3).

[^107]:    ${ }^{1}$ Homer has the singular one time-T 439.
    ${ }^{2}$ See also verse 307.
    ${ }^{3}$ See page 100 and note.

    * Also $c f$. verse 981.
    ${ }^{5}$ Homer 7-0, Aeschylus 1-11, Sophocles 1-4, Euripides 16-76.
    ${ }^{6}$ Other cases Eur. IA. 612, 1160, IT. 367, 1216, Or. 378.
    ${ }^{7}$ Homer II-1, Aeschylus 1-1, Sophocles 1-2, Euripides I-2.

[^108]:    ${ }^{1} C f$. the singular in Bacch. 929 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Homer 14-0, Aeschylus 45-1, Sophocles 20-2, Euripides 23-0.
    ${ }^{2}$ See page 92.
    ${ }^{4}$ See page 59, and notes 5 and 6.

[^109]:    
    2 "The plural was familiar in relation to the return from Troy; thus the poem ascribed to Agias (c. 750 B. C.) was entitled N6otot " ( Jebb, note, Soph. El. 194).
    ${ }^{3}$ Occurs Homer 67-0, Aeschylus 4-1, Sophocles 4-2, Euripides 30-0.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. also Trach. 7, Ant. 568.
    ${ }^{5}$ Homer 9-22, Aeschylus 1-1, Sophocles 2-7, Euripides 8-21.

[^110]:    ${ }^{1}$ Homer 170-5, Aeschylus 14-22, Sophocles 27-32, Euripides 74-190.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. figures for $\delta \delta \mu \circ s$ (p. III) and $\delta \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ (p. II2).
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. $\delta \phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu 0 \nu, i b .636$.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. кбраs, ib. 6ır.
    ${ }^{5}$ IA. 1321 IA. 1497.
    ${ }^{6}$ Cf. $\Delta \omega \rho(\delta о$. $\quad \rho \mu о \nu$, Нес. 450.

[^111]:    ${ }^{1}$ Occurs Homer 0-1. Aeschylus 4-1, Sophocles 2-2, Euripides S-17.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. $\pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\nu} \nu a \iota$ OT. 1269 ; Phoen. So5; Bacch. 98 ; and $\pi \epsilon \rho o \nu i s$, Trach. 925.

[^112]:    ${ }^{1}$ Homer 0-0, Aeschylus 0-2, Sophocles 2-3, Euripides 4-10.
    ${ }^{2}$ Homer 34-2, Aeschylus 2-4, Sophocles 4-5, Euripides 7-19.

[^113]:    ${ }^{1}$ All in Euripides, e.g. Supp. 470 and Or. 12.
    ${ }^{2}$ Homer 14-5, Aeschylus 0-5, Sophocles 2-8, Euripides 4-28.
    ${ }^{8}$ Trach. 482, Soph. Frag. 196 ; Herc. F'ur. 893, 1004, Herc. 563.
    ${ }^{4}$ Eur. Supp. 979.
    ${ }^{5}$ Witte, (op. cit., p. 213 ) citing $\pi \rho o s ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \nu o t s ~ o f ~ I T T . ~ 233, ~ t h i n k s ~ t h e ~ p l u r a l ~$ imperative here, but the fact that this usage is in Euripides, and is in a choral passage, is sufficient to offset any objection.
    ${ }^{6}$ Homer 0-0, Aeschylus 2-3, Sophocles 0-1, Euripides 1-9.

[^114]:    ${ }^{1}$ Homer 25-3, Aeschylus 33-3, Sophocles 24-3, Euripides 40-4.
    ${ }^{2}$ Homer 9-0, Aeschylus 16-2, Sophocles 33-5, Euripides passimin both numbers. See page 81 .
    ${ }^{3}$ Homer 72-41, Aeschylus 6-6, Sophocles 4-24, Euripides 3-36.
    ${ }^{4}$ Phil. 288, 1128 , Trach. 266, Soph. Frag. 875.
    ${ }^{5}$ Trach. 266.

[^115]:    ${ }^{1}$ Bacch. 1066, Supp. 745, Frag. 785, 2.
    ${ }^{3}$ Homer 100-1, Aeschylus 8-0, Sophocles 5-2, Euripides 25-9.
    ${ }^{3} C f$. the lone use of the plural in Homer, the Odyssey-v $109: \varepsilon \nu \delta^{\prime} \dot{v} \delta a \tau$, alevdovta, where the cause of the plural was metre no doubt.
    ${ }^{4}$ In Euripides usually synonymous with ráuor ; sing. 13, plur. 15 there.
    ${ }^{5}$ Homer 22-3, Aeschylus 1-0, Sophocles 4-0, Euripides 2-3.
    ${ }^{6}$ Homer 45-1, Aeschylus 31-1, Sophocles 29-6, Euripides $165-6$.

[^116]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Introduction, pp. 1-2, for the disagreement of scholars in the use of terms.
    ${ }^{2}$ Iliad- $\Gamma$ 440, N 258, 0 224, Ф 60; Odyssey-a $10, \kappa 99, \lambda 562, \nu 358, \pi 45$, $\pi 442, \tau 345, \chi 464$.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Gildersleeve, op. cit., p. 27.

    - For the development of the Pluralis Maiestatis, see Sasse (op. cit.). He thinks that it was introduced by Gordianus III (238-244 A. D.), appearing side by side with the singular. In Constantine I the plural is distinctly more common ; but as Mommsen shows (Hermes, vol. 17, pp. 530-533), the plural there is really our Pluralis Societatis. Littré had the right idea when he said (s. v. "nous") : "Usage, qui, je crois, prit naissance chez les empereurs romains, lorsqu'ils faisaient semblant de prendre conseil du sénat, et d'exprimer dans leurs édits une volonté collective." Donatus had already called attention to the plural in question as follows: "Tractum est autem a maiestatibus vel potestatibus, quibus familiaris mos est semper in edictis suis pluraliter loqui-' Decrevit nostra maiestas' " (Keil, Supp. Vol.,

[^117]:    ${ }^{1}$ Weck sees in $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \omega$ " Selbstgefühl" (ad loc. Homer's Odyssee, Gotha, 1886-88).
    ${ }^{2}$ So Monro: "Telemachus takes care to associate the others, especially Eumaeus, in the reception of the stranger and the ownership of the homestead " (Note ad loc., Homer's Odyssey, Bks. XIII-XXIV, Oxford, 190I).
    ${ }^{3}$ So taken and cited by Gildersleeve, op. cit., p. 27.

[^118]:    ${ }^{2}$ Op. cit., p. 27 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Op. cit., p. 19.
    ${ }^{5}$ Op. cit., p. 26.
    ${ }^{4}$ Op. cit., p. 502.
    ${ }^{5}$ Leaf, Index (under "Plural"), Vol. II, p. 661.

[^119]:    ${ }^{1}$ See notes on $\pi 44 \mathrm{f}$. and $\pi 442$.

[^120]:    ${ }^{1}$ The plural pronoun for the singular is frequent in Isocrates, e. $g . \mathrm{V}$, 105
     тapaıveî ктє่. Similarly the plural is used in Xenophon Cyr. I, I, and elsewhere in prose. But Tragedy is the field of its flourishing.
    ${ }^{2}$ (a) If a true plural, a distinctness in the hair of the members of the family must be assumed, as contrasted with that of others ; (b) Cf. $\epsilon \mu 0 \hat{v}$, ib. 172 ; (c) Metre is probably effective here, for the line is isolated and the long dative form aúroīt is particularly convenient.

[^121]:    ${ }^{1}$ Blass shows that $\dot{\alpha} \mu o ́ s$ is $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho o s$, though "von einer redenden Person gebraucht" (Choephoren, p. 128, Halle, 1906). Cf. Kühner I ${ }^{3}$, p. 602 and Dindorf s. v.; also Gildersleeve, note to Pindar P. IV, 27, and ib. III, 4I, where the same plural for singular occurs ; the plural in these instances of Pindar may, however, have the idea of Dignity. It might be urged of course that $\dot{\alpha} \mu \delta \delta \nu$ in our passage refers to the whole chorus and that kápa is used collectively.
    ${ }^{2}$ Note the dramatic power in the studied obscurity of Clytemnestra's words. Orestes is no less wise than she in rois кuplotot, verse 689.

[^122]:    ${ }^{1}$ See under $\tau \dot{d} \phi o \iota, p .81$.
    
    ${ }^{3}$ Volp makes $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ here a Pluralis Maiestatis, but it clearly includes the chorus of seamen.
    ${ }^{4}$ Op. cit., p. 22.

[^123]:    ${ }^{1}$ Similarly Antigone in Ant. 926, Alcestis in Alc. 383, Medea in Med. 314 f., and Deianira, Trach. 491 f. Volp thinks Electra includes Orestes in the above verse, showing that the masculine cannot include Chrysothemis or the chorus (the feminine participle would be used). It is, however, simply a Pluralis Modestiae. Whenever a woman refers to herself by the plural, the masculine is always used in Tragedy, for the masculine is generic cf. (Gildersleeve, op. cit., p. 27).

[^124]:    ${ }^{1}$ Volp thinks the Pluralis Maiestatis is found in the second person plural pronoun of OT. 989 (Messenger to Oedipus) :
    
    and in same play verse 991 ( $\dot{\mu} \mu i \nu$ ). But such an idea in the second person plural can hardly be paralleled elsewhere in Tragedy ; the change of number in connection with the vocative, however, is found e.g. in Homer ( $\mu 82$ ), Phil. 369, OC. HO4. Admittedly the context does make it difficult to include Iocaste with Oedipus in the plurals of OT. $989,991$.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Chap. III, 3, b, for $\phi$ ( $\lambda o t$ in' singular meaning.
    ${ }^{3}$ The plural pronoun as used by Agamemnon elsewhere in this play includes Menelaus, but it is best taken as singular in meaning in this verse and verse 1320.

[^125]:    ${ }^{1}$ In IT. 62 she uses the same words to Orestes.
    ${ }^{1}$ Similarly Pylades refers to himself ib. 674. See also ib. 690 (Orestes),
    
    ${ }^{3}$ See footnote, r, p. 133.

[^126]:    ${ }^{1}$ The abrupt change to $\mu 0$ forcefully indicates the individual act not only of the Coryphaeus but each member of the chorus. We may suppose that each one wept, following the leader: just as it may be assumed that the chorus followed him by some act or gesture whenever they could thus second his sentiment.

[^127]:    

[^128]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Monro and Leaf, note ad loc.
    ${ }^{2}$ Edition-Bergk, Poetae Lyrici Graeci, Leipsic, 1878.

[^129]:    
    ${ }^{2}$ See Introduction, p. 2.
    ${ }^{3}$ Similar to the citation from the pseudo-Longinus (see p. 4) are Agam. 1439 (Clytemnestra) :
     Rhes. 866 :
    
    Cf. Plautus, Curculio 546:
    Quos Summanos somnias? What Summanuses are you talking about?

[^130]:    
    ${ }^{2}$ Note, ad loc.
    ${ }^{3}$ The Greeks of today speak of the King and Queen as oi $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda$ îs. $C f$. Plautus, Amphitruo 960 for a use of eri referring to husband and wife.

[^131]:    ${ }^{1}$ The ms. reading is $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \delta \tau \alpha \nu$, but we should read $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$, most probably.
    
    
    ${ }^{8}$ Cf. Paul's "powers that be," Romans 13, 1.

[^132]:    ${ }^{1}$ Note that very frequently the plural of a noun referring to persons finds its best translation in the English indefinite article．
    ${ }^{2}$ So olōe in verse 927 is Creon．
    ${ }^{2}$ On this passage see p． 90.

[^133]:    ${ }^{1}$ But $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o l v a$ is found nowhere in Tragedy in the plural. When a woman is spoken of in the plural the masculine is always used.
    ${ }^{2}$ As for Andromache (who speaks in Tro. 664, cited p. 147), Tro. 660
    
    ${ }^{3}$ oi кратоv̂vt $\epsilon$, meaning Aegisthus and being in the mouth of Clytemnestra, has a ring of insincerity about it for us! It is much for her to acknowledge.

[^134]:    1 " These nobles of Thebes have no eyes for indiscretion in their sovereign master" (Jebb ad loc.). Cf. vs. 1223 f .
    
    ${ }^{3}$ In Aesch. Supp. 514 the statement is gnomic; the King Pelasgus thus "gracefully" (See Tucker, note ad loc.) alludes to himself. It is not necessary to amend the ms. dvékт $\omega v$ to $\gamma u v a u \kappa \hat{y} v$ as do many scholars.

[^135]:    ${ }^{1}$ The scholiast takes pains to note that only Admetus is meant : 'A $\delta \mu \hat{\eta} r \boldsymbol{\gamma} \psi$.
    ${ }^{2} C f$. Andocides (Myst. §74) on the crimes subject to $d \tau \iota \mu l a$, of which one
     трє́фєєע тovs rovéas, and similarly Plutarch (Sol. \% 22).

[^136]:    ${ }^{1}$ So IA. 689 f : It grieves a father ( $\tau$ ov̀s $\tau \epsilon \kappa \delta \nu \tau \alpha \mathrm{s}$ ) to give up a child. Нес. 403 is similar.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. ib. 68I f. :
    
    The plural may be father, mother, or both. To all that know in this case (and that includes the pretending Orestes), it means Clytemnestra alone. Cf. the generalizing masculine singular, ib. 690 .

[^137]:    ${ }^{1}$ At another place she speaks of her mother as being $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$ (verse 1154).
    ${ }^{3}$ Ellendt (Lex. Soph.) and Kaibel (Elektra, Leipsic, 1896) retain ток ${ }^{\text {E }} \omega \mathrm{\nu}$.
    ${ }^{3}$ For the use of Liberi of one child, see Schmalz, Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen, 1881, p. 121 .

[^138]:    184. 

    ${ }^{2}$ E.g. 86.
    ${ }^{3}$ § 28 .

[^139]:    ${ }^{1}$ Wečklein formerly read $\tau \epsilon \in \nu o \Delta s$ ，but in his latest edition reads réкvч．
    ${ }^{2}$ See note，p．266；ed．189I．

[^140]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{Cf}$. vs. 619 ff . where amid the libation ceremonies Darius is summoned from below, being addressed as $\delta a / \mu \omega \nu$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Since writing the above, I have noted that scholion B on $\phi \theta$ oroîs (v. 523) is " $\tau \hat{\varphi} \Delta a \rho \in i \varphi \bar{\gamma} \delta \eta \lambda o \nu \dot{\sigma} \tau$, ," but there no one has thought to emend the text!
    ${ }^{3}$ Fam. V, I : Video me disertum a quibus minime conveniebat.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. Jebb's note ad loc.

[^141]:    ${ }^{1} C f$. Eum. Ioo where $\phi i \lambda \tau \dot{d} \tau \omega \nu$ is probably of Orestes alone (Wecklein"gemein von dem Sohne").

[^142]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. also Lysias XIII, 46 and Demosthenes XVIII, 215 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Schol. " $\tau$ oùs $\phi i \lambda \tau \alpha \dot{\tau}$ ous."

[^143]:    1830. 

     Arist．§51 and Antiphon Tetr．A．$\gamma$. \＆ 8 （ol ктeivavres）．
    ${ }^{3}$ That Cassandra has Orestes in mind is shown by verses $\mathrm{I} 280-\mathrm{I}$ ：能 $\epsilon \mathrm{\gamma}$ 亩 $\rho$
    
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf．Agam． 1633 ff．（Chorus to Aegisthus）：
    Thou didst plan，but didst not execute the deed．

[^144]:    ${ }^{1}$ On Tragic Irony in Sophocles see Thirlwall, Philological Museum, Vol. II, and Haigh, The Tragic Drama of the Greeks, pp, 174 ff.
    ${ }^{2}$ Other instances where the allusive plural serves the purpose of tragic
     unveiled thought would precipitate the action of the plot.
    ${ }^{3}$ Camp, quoted by White (note ad loc.).

[^145]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Soph. El. 666-673.
    ${ }^{2}$ On tols $\theta$ avov̂бı (Iphigenia) see p. 90.
    ${ }^{8}$ Wecklein's emendation to $\phi i \lambda \alpha$ is not convincing.
    ${ }^{4}$ Schol. : गुरovv $\tau \hat{\varphi} \Delta \alpha \rho \epsilon i \varphi$.

[^146]:    ${ }^{1}$ But as Verrall notes, the verb kalveı means " is about killing." Clytemnestra does not know Aegisthus is dead till verse 892 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Vol. III, p. In5, Halle, 1808.
    ${ }^{3}$ E.g. Cho. 880 :
    
    

[^147]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{Cf}$. especially the notes of Bloomfield, Hermann, Wecklein, Sidgwick and Verrall.
     cani dona.
    ${ }^{3}$ Similarly Hel. 1634, IA. 382.

[^148]:    ${ }^{1} C f$. IA. $27 \mathrm{I}, \beta \alpha \rho \beta \alpha \rho \omega \nu \nu \alpha{ }^{2} \rho \iota \nu \gamma \alpha \mu \omega \nu$.

