

ANDOCIDES 1. 8 AND THUCYDIDES 4. 63. 1¹

And. 1. 8. ὁ δέ με ποιεῖ μάλιστ' ἀπορεῖν, ἐγὼ ὑμῖν ἐρῶ, ὅτι οὐ πάντες ἴσως ἐπὶ πασι τοῖς κατηγορουμένοις ὁμοίως ὀργίζεσθε, ἀλλ' ἕκαστός τι ὑμῶν ἔχει πρὸς ὁ βούλοιτο ἄν με πρῶτον ἀπολογεῖσθαι.

ἕκαστός τι ABL: τις cett.

If we reject *τις*, which appears only in derivative manuscripts, then the sentence is notable in the following ways. First, the position of *τι*—not that it separates *ἕκαστος* from *ὑμῶν*, but because (a) we expect it, if present at all, to appear as *πρὸς ὃ τι . . .* and (b) *ἕκαστός τι* in itself is a conspicuously discordant juxtaposition—hence presumably the corruption to *ἕκαστός τις*. Second, the sense: the sentence must surely mean not that each juryman has a criterion, but that each has a different criterion, that he would like to see satisfied.²

There is little help in this matter elsewhere in Andocides. Like the other orators he uses *ἕκαστος* generally more nearly as a synonym of *πᾶς τις* and this passage is the only instance where it is associated with an indefinite. The expression brings to mind, however, a related problem in Thucydides.

Thuc. 4. 63. 1 καὶ νῦν τοῦ ἀφανοῦς τε τούτου διὰ τὸ ἀτέκμαρτον δέος καὶ διὰ τὸ ἤδη παρόντας Ἀθηναίους, κατ' ἀμφοτέρα ἐκπλαγέντες, καὶ τὸ ἐλλιπὲς τῆς γνώμης ὧν ἕκαστός τι ᾤήθημεν πράξειν ταῖς κωλύμασι ταύταις ἱκανῶς νομίσαντες εἰρχθῆναι, τοὺς . . . πολεμίους . . . ἀποπέμπωμεν.

τι codd.: *τις* G.

Hermocrates advises the Siceliot to sack Athenian 'allies' on the ground that their presence aggravates the evils that it is intended to cure; *κωλύμασι* refers to the two circumstances mentioned in the first participial clause, the point seemingly being that the uncertainty of the future and the presence of the Athenians themselves sufficiently account for failure to achieve war aims. That first participial clause has its own difficulties; ours begin with *καὶ τὸ ἐλλιπὲς . . .*

(1) *τὸ ἐλλιπὲς* may be subject of *εἰρχθῆναι*, internal accusative after that verb or absolute accusative of reference; in the latter two cases the subject of the infinitive would be 'we'. The established interpretation at least since Steup has been that the subject of the infinitive is 'we' and *τὸ ἐλλιπὲς* is absolute accusative of reference. There seems no good reason to overturn these judgements. We begin then from approximate agreement with Gomme's 'To account for that failure . . . we must realize that we have been well hemmed in . . .'. But other matters are less settled.

(2) In *ὧν ἕκαστός τι/τις* the reading *τις* again looks like a facile conjecture designed to remove the discordance. If *τι* is accepted, *ὧν ἕκαστός τι* is difficult:

¹ My thanks for encouragement and advice to Professor D. M. MacDowell and Mr. A. F. Garvie.

² To avoid the difficulty by translating 'Not all . . . equally . . . but *each* of you has *something* he would like me to reply to *first*' inevitably requires *τι* to be emphatic. Em-

phatic *τις* seems to be rare; but also this instance is too similar to other cases of undoubtedly unemphatic *τις* to be anything but unemphatic itself: cf. Dem. 21. 59 ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτον τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐν ἑκάστῳ τις ἂν ὑμῶν ἴδοι . . .

either (a) $\acute{\omega}\nu = \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}$, and $\tau\iota$, which can hardly be adverbial, is incompatible, or (b) $\acute{\omega}\nu = \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omega\nu \acute{\omega}\nu$. This latter removes the grammatical difficulty but seems an inexplicably gratuitous elaboration from the point of view of sense. The established reading is $\tau\iota$ but Gomme inclines towards $\tau\iota\varsigma$. It is possible here to pass on uncommitted.

(3) The whole relative clause $\acute{\omega}\nu \dots \pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota\nu$ may depend either on $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma$ or on $\epsilon\iota\rho\chi\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$. Steup favours the latter; Gomme's translation implies the former. Steup's version presents no particular difficulties, but if, with Gomme, the relative clause is subordinate to the words which precede it, we are plunged into the problems of (4) below.

(4) First, $\acute{\omega}\nu$ may depend (a) upon $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, either (–o) objectively, 'falling short of (failure to attain to) what we expected to achieve', or (–s) subjectively, 'the failure of what we expected to achieve'; or (b) upon $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma$, 'judgement of what we expected . . .'. Second, $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma$ may be (i) subjective genitive after $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, 'our judgement's failure/shortfall', or (ii) objective, 'falling short of (failure to attain to) our expectation' (so in fact Steup). Of the resulting permutations, a–s i, i.e. both $\acute{\omega}\nu$ and $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma$ subjectively dependent on $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, yields no sense; for a–o ii, both $\acute{\omega}\nu$ and $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma$ objectively dependent on $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, see below. Meanwhile, the following may be eliminated: (a–o i) 'our judgement's falling short of what we expected to achieve'; (a–s ii) 'the failure of what we expected to achieve to live up to our expectations'; (b i) 'the failure of our judgement of what we expected to achieve'; (b ii) 'the failure to attain to our expectation of what we expected to achieve'. All of these are either tautologous or otherwise defective in sense. The least unattractive is b i, which seems to correspond to Gomme's 'that failure in our judgement of all that each of us expected to do in the war', but even this is open to objection: expectations are not normally subject to judgement but result from judgement of situations.

So far, then, it would appear that unless some more attractive alternative can be found, acceptance of Steup's version in (3) above is indicated. The sentence would thus mean 'And to account for the failure to live up to expectations, we must realize that the aforementioned obstacles have proved a sufficient barrier to hinder us from what we expected to achieve.'

The phrasing, however, is much less inelegant if the apodotic parts of the two participial clauses are approximately in proportion, as is not achieved by Steup; it is awkward style, if, following on the long protasis $\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \dots \text{\textit{\AA}}\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, the short apodosis $\kappa\alpha\tau' \acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\lambda\alpha\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ has as its corresponsion so long an expression as $\acute{\omega}\nu \dots \acute{\omega}\eta\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu \pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota\nu \dots \nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \epsilon\iota\rho\chi\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ preceded by a short protasis $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma$. The proportions of the first participial clause raise an expectation in the mind of the reader, and if style is to assist comprehension it is preferable that that expectation should be fulfilled by the proportions of the second such clause. Steup's version also leaves problem (2) untouched, and it seems better if possible to find a solution covering that too. Neither of these points is a major objection, but clearly there is room for a more attractive alternative. The problem, then, is to find both a solution to problem (2) and a way of taking the relative clause with the protasis without falling into the difficulties of (4).

The natural interpretation of $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma$, especially in view of 4. 55. 2 $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\iota\pi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \eta\nu \tau\eta\varsigma \delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, to which the commentators refer, is 'failure to live up to expectations': so Steup, contradicted by Gomme. That passage continues $\delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma \tau\iota \pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota\nu$, while in 63. 1 the proximity of $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma$ to $\acute{\omega}\eta\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu \pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota\nu$,

and the difficulty in avoiding tautology when we try to make the relative clause subordinate to the preceding words, might warn us that they have identical reference, that the relative clause indicates the reference of the judgement, the sense being 'the failure to come up to expectations, namely to what we expected to achieve . . .'. This is the natural way to take the sentence at first glance, and only the problem of accounting for the grammar gives us pause, leading to the strange versions of (4). The protasis *καὶ τὸ ἐλλιπὲς τῆς γνώμης* would as Greek be sufficiently obscure in its reference to require some expansion; it is a further, minor, objection to Steup's solution to problem (3) that the expansion is there found to be part of the apodosis.

The desired result could be obtained by adopting permutation a-o ii (see (4) above) and treating *ὧν* . . . as in apposition to *γνώμης*, but that would be a strange use of a relative pronoun and would leave problem (2) untouched. There is, however, a type of relative clause, idiomatically associated with *ἕκαστος*, which is used in a vague, appositional, way, to expand a preceding phrase, viz. a *ὥς* clause: LSJ *ὥς* F 3, *ἕκαστος* III 3. Then *τι* is an ordinary object of *πράξεω*, as in 55. 2. For the discordance *ἕκαστός τι* cf. 4. 34. 1 . . . *ἔβαλλον . . . λίθοις τε καὶ τοξεύμασι καὶ ἀκοντίοις, ὥς ἕκαστός τι πρόχειρον εἶχεν*, where the point is variety of weapons, 'just as each could find anything to hand', 'whatever each found to hand'. The proposal then is to read *ὥς ἕκαστός τι ᾧ ἤθημεν πράξεω*, 'And to account for events falling short of our expectation, of those aims which we severally expected to achieve . . .'. The point of the expansion lies in the variety of aims (since the conference was attended by members of opposite sides in the war), which is not represented in *καὶ τὸ ἐλλιπὲς τῆς γνώμης*, nor made clear in Gomme's version, given in (4) above.¹

It may be difficult to find any cause for such a corruption other than simple misreading. The following evidence gives support of another kind. These lists of Thucydidean usage are intended to be exhaustive but for the omission of the passage in question.

ἕκαστος with *τις* in agreement, whatever the word-order:

3. 45. 4 *ὥς ἐκάστη τις κατέχεται* . . . 4. 4. 2 *ὥς ἕκαστόν τι ξυμβαίνει* 6. 31. 4 *ὃ τις ἕκαστος προσετάρχη* 7. 75. 5 *ὃ τι τις ἐδύνατο ἕκαστος χρήσιμον*.

Both cases of *ἕκαστός τις* have *ὥς* preceding; when the opening is other than *ὥς* the word-order is different.

While there is little grammatical² difficulty in the singular *ἕκαστος* in predicative agreement with the individuals who make up the subject of the plural verb, *τις* may be less free of objection on that score. Whatever *ἕκαστος* is, *τις* seems likely to be the subject of the verb, which may be thought difficult when that is in the first person plural.

However that may be, it becomes clear that *ἕκαστός τις*, unlike *πᾶς τις*, is not an idiom in its own right.

¹ In fact *ὥς* appears as a manuscript reading in *H* (*γρ. ὧν*) as reported by the Budé apparatus of de Romilly. I would not doubt the judgement of Kleinlogel (*Die Geschichte des Thukydidestextes im Mittelalter*, 14 ff.) that peculiarities in this part of *H* result from errors in direct copying from *B*. In this case the error would seem to be in favour of the truth. Note that *ὥς* does much more than

facilitate the construction of *τι*.

² Cf. 2. 87. 8 *θαρσύνετε οὖν . . . τὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἕκαστος ἔπεσθε*. This does not, however, seem to occur with *ὥς*, and from the point of view of sense one would expect the war aims to be those not of individuals but of delegations or of cities; the best sense would be got from *ὥς ἕκαστοί τι* . . .

ἕκαστος directly followed by any indefinite, whether or not in agreement :

1. 93. 2 καὶ οὐ ξυνειργασμένων ἔστιν ἤ, ἀλλ' ὥς ἕκαστόν ποτε προσέφερον·
2. 17. 3 καὶ ὥς ἕκαστός που ἐδύνατο, 37. 1 κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίωσιν, ὥς ἕκαστος ἔν
τῳ εὐδοκμεῖ . . . (3. 45. 4, 4. 4. 2, 34. 1—see above) 4. 58 . . . διαφερομένων
καὶ ἀξιούντων, ὥς ἕκαστοί τι ἐλασσοῦσθαι ἐνόμιζον, 96. 7 οἱ μὲν . . . ὥρμησαν,
οἱ δὲ . . . οἱ δὲ ὥς ἕκαστοί τινα εἶχον ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας· 6. 2. 1 ἀρκείτω δὲ
ὥς ποιηταῖς τε εἶρηται καὶ ὥς ἕκαστός πῃ γινώσκει περὶ αὐτῶν, 69. 1 ὥς
δὲ ἕκαστός πῃ . . . προσμείξειε . . . , 76. 3 τοὺς μὲν λιποστρατίαν, τοὺς δὲ . . .
στρατεύειν, τοῖς δὲ ὥς ἕκαστοῖς τινα εἶχον αἰτίαν εὐπρεπῇ ἐπενεγκόντες κατε-
στρέψαντο, 77. 2 ὥστε τοὺς μὲν . . . διστάναι, τοὺς δὲ . . . ἐκπολεμοῦν, τοῖς δὲ ὥς
ἕκαστοῖς τι προσηγνὲς λέγοντες δύνανται κακουργεῖν· 7. 74. 2 τὰς δ' ἄλλας . . .
ὥς ἕκαστην ποι ἐκπεπτωκυῖαν . . . ἐκόμιζον . . .

LSJ ὥς F 3 appears to be misleading in suggesting that this idiom is rarely with verb and quoting only Herodotus for such usage. With the exception of 7. 74. 2, in the above instances, which include only those where an indefinite follows directly,¹ the idiom is the opening of a full relative clause.

As parallel for the proposed reading notice particularly 2. 37. 1, where also the idiom expands a preceding loosely related expression. But the list does not merely supply parallels, for the word ὥς is not part of its initial definition. Rather the conclusion is that in Thucydides ἕκαστος is not followed directly by any indefinite, whether or not in agreement, except as part of the idiom ὥς ἕκαστος, the resulting sequence of words being not infrequent, and 4. 63. 1 the only exception. Should it, in view of the other difficulties, remain an exception?

It is difficult to resist relating the above evidence to And. 1. 8 and there considering ἀλλ' <ὥς> ἕκαστός τι ὑμῶν ἔχει . . . For the use with ἀλλά cf. Thuc. 1. 93. 2 above and also 7. 57. 1 . . . οὐ κατὰ δίκην . . . ἀλλ' ὥς ἕκαστοῖς τῆς ξυντυχίας . . . ἔσχευ. The position of τι is now explained : it is part of the formula. The sense is improved, ὥς being the counterpart of ὁμοίως, 'not uniformly, but in accordance with your several criteria'. The omission could have been due to the inadvertence of a copyist who, unaware of the idiom, took ὥς as an otiose repetition of ὅτι—its accidental omission then causing no apparent change in meaning would be both easy in itself and difficult to detect. It is clear from numerous instances above that (ἀλλ') ὥς ἕκαστος is frequently associated with the use of ἔχειν in various senses; whereas in Thucydides and the orators sentences opening with ἀλλ' ἕκαστος are rare and unlike And 1. 8.² This would indeed be the only instance of ὥς ἕκαστος in Andocides, but in any case ἕκαστός τι is similarly unique. A particularly close parallel is [Dem.] 25. 1 ὅτι οὔτε παρὰ τοὺς ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ λόγους . . . οὔτε τοὺς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ . . . τὰ τουτοῦ τοῦ ἀγωνός ἐστιν δίκαι' ἰσχυρά, ἀλλ' ὥς ἂν ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ἔχη πρὸς τὸ δυσχεραίνειν ἢ προσείσθαι πονηρίαν. This last, also in a proem and addressed to a jury, suggests a rhetorical commonplace used for flattery.

On the other hand these parallels do have to be drawn from widely separated

¹ There are also the following instances without directly following indefinite : relative clause, 2. 48. 3, 51. 1 ; 3. 81. 3, 82. 2, 90. 1 ; 4. 25. 2, 93. 4 ; 5. 26. 1 ; 6. 44. 2, 57. 1, 85. 2 (supply copula), 97. 3 ; 7. 13. 2, 57. 1 ; adverbial phrase, 1. 15. 2, 48. 4, 67. 4, 89. 2, 107. 5, 113. 1 ; 3. 107. 4 ; 4. 32. 2 ; 5. 4. 3,

57. 2 ; 6. 17. 4 ; 7. 65. 2. Intermediate between the classes of relative clause and adverbial phrase are 1. 98. 4 and 8. 104. 3 (cf. 1. 107. 5, 113. 1).

² They are : Isocr. 3. 19, 9. 23 ; Aeschin. 3. 7 ; Dem. 19. 92, 29. 30 ; Din. 2. 19 ; the last is the least unlike.

sources. Generally in the orators *ὥς ἕκαστος* is not particularly common.¹ More seriously, the improvement in the sense yielded by *ὥς* is offset by the impression it would produce that the intensity of passion aroused by different charges depends on the juror's idea of the proper presentation of the defence, and not the reverse. This in fact serves to illuminate something which, with or without *ὥς*, is a peculiarity of this sentence. It would have been more natural to say either, 'You do not all have the same priorities for the defence but have differing degrees of passion about different charges' or, 'Because you have different degrees of passion . . . you do not all have the same priorities'. The form of expression with ' . . . not . . . but . . . ' is best suited to an order of presentation of ideas the reverse of that which Andocides has given us. This awkwardness, partly offset by the elegance of *οὐ πάντες ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ὁμοίως*, may perhaps suggest that Andocides was influenced by *ὥς ἕκαστος* phraseology, but to avoid an undesirable implication, himself omitted the *ὥς*.

University of Glasgow

M. H. B. MARSHALL

¹ It does occur at Isocr. 8. 132, 15. 140, Dem. 22. 26, 54. 2, 59. 94 (cf. Hdt. 8. 107. 1, Thuc. 2. 90. 4, 6. 97. 3), 114. 60. 23 (cf. *Proem* 18); none of these has an indefinite. The use of *ἕκαστος* with the implication of variety among individuals ('differential-distributive') seems to be associated with a small number of characteristic phraseologies different from those in sentences where uniformity is implied ('miscellaneous'). The former category includes: (a) expressions of the *sibi quisque* type, including *ὥς ἕκαστος* as an adverbial phrase (LSJ *ὥς* H 5); (b) the idiom as the opening of a relative clause; (c) *ἕκαστος* in some other relative clauses and articular participial clauses. Selected examples of (a) and (c): Thuc. 1. 15 *πάντες δὲ ἦσαν . . . πρὸς ὁμόρους τοὺς σφετέρους ἐκάστοις* Gorg. *Hel.* 15 *ἣν ἕκαστον ἔτυχεν* Isocr. 6. 102 *ὁποῖοί τινες ἕκαστοι τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες*, 14. 48 *ὅπως ἕκαστοι δύνανται*, 7. 24 *ἐκ τῶν ἐκάστοις ὑπαρχόντων*. In all these there is an implication of variety.

Examples of 'miscellaneous': Thuc. 1. 141. 7 *καὶ ἕκαστος . . . οἶεται βλάβειν* Aeschin. 3. 243 *καὶ ἄλλοις, ὧν ἐκάστῳ πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ ἔργα πέπρακται* Dem. 4. 7 *καὶ ἕκαστος ὕμῶν . . . ἔτοιμος πράττειν ὑπάρξει*. In the (b) and (c) varieties of the 'differential-distributive' type the verb is frequently *τυγχάνω*, *συμβαίνω*, *ἔχω*, *δύναμαι*. In the 'miscellaneous' use it is often difficult to see any important distinction in sense from *πᾶς τις*. In most of the orators it is the 'miscellaneous' use that is mainly in evidence, and when the other type occurs it is usually in form (c). Thucydides seems to have an above average preference for the *ὥς* form, and there it may be that expressions like *ὥς ἕκαστός τι*, *ὥς ἕκαστός πη* take the place of what in others would be *ὅ τι*, *ὅπῃ ἕκαστος* (similarly A. G. Laird, *A.J.P.* 27 [1906], 33 ff., on the form without indefinite). In the orators *ἕκαστος ὕμῶν* is regular in the 'miscellaneous' use but rare in the other.