

## Pankoinon as a Rhetorical Figure in Greek Tragedy

By HENRY W. JOHNSTONE, JR., Pennsylvania State University

*ποῖον τοῦτο πάγκοινων λέγεις;*  
S. Ant. 1049

In this paper I will be concerned with a rhetorical figure easy to exemplify in many languages. “What must be must be”, “Was getan ist, ist getan”, “Lo que pasó, pasó”, and the Arabic saying “El mektubu mektub” (“What is written is written”) are examples.

Wecklein<sup>1)</sup> and Denniston<sup>2)</sup> list occurrences of this rhetorical figure in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides; many other editors as well have commented on certain of these occurrences. This paper will be a study of the items listed by Wecklein and Denniston. I think it is likely that their lists together exhaust all occurrences of the rhetorical figure in question in extant Greek tragedy. I will try to show that they also include a number of items which are not in fact occurrences of it. In addition, I shall have occasion to comment on some items mentioned by other editors which are also not in fact occurrences of the idiom in question.

For the purposes of my discussion, it is important to be able to identify occurrences of the rhetorical figure in question on the basis of more than just an intuitive grasp. A formal criterion of identification is desirable. In order to state such a criterion, I will introduce the concept of a *self-identity*. I define a self-identity as an instance of The Law of Identity, according to which  $X = X$ . Among relevant instances of this law are “What must be = what must be”, “Was getan ist = was getan ist”, “Lo que pasó = lo que pasó”, as well as examples more directly relevant to certain Greek tragedies, such as “What we are = what we are”, “What you have announced = what you have announced”, “The way I fear him = the way I fear him”, and “Where they are = where they are”. Considered from the standpoint of formal logic, self-identities are logically true, which is to say that they are true in all possible worlds and convey no information about the actual world.

---

<sup>1)</sup> N. Wecklein, *Euripides Medea, Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Bd. 1 (Leipzig 1891) ad 889.

<sup>2)</sup> J. D. Denniston (ed.), *Euripides Electra* (Oxford 1939), ad 1141.

The rhetorical figure in question is the use of a sentence formalizable as a self-identity which nonetheless works informally in certain contexts, but not in the absence of any context, to produce certain rhetorical effects. Examples are “We are what we are” said by Medea of the female sex, “You have announced what you have announced” said by Medea to a messenger whose announcement has disappointed her, “I fear him as I fear him” said by Euripides’ Electra to Clytemnestra about Aegisthus, whom Electra knows to be dead, and “They are where they are” said by Ismene in reply to the blind Oedipus’ inquiry “Where are your brothers?”

Locutions like this are dismissive<sup>3</sup>). They discourage further discussion of some point. This effect depends upon a semantic dissociation which prevents the locution from being perceived as simply a self-identity. Thus “We are what we are” tends to be taken as “What we are by nature is what we are by necessity”. This statement is no longer logically true, and its truth might in fact be challenged. But its effect is like that of a shoulder-shrug; it precludes further talk about the capacities of women. A proposition perceived as a self-identity could not serve as a shoulder-shrug; only one taken as non-analytic could have this function.

Let us consider what we should call the rhetorical figure under consideration. None of the lists of rhetorical figures with which I am acquainted—even the longest ones I know—have given this figure a name that has caught on. It is not named at all in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, or in Lausberg’s *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik*<sup>4</sup>), to mention a recent long list; and no name for it seems to have been used by any 19th- or 20th-Century editor of the Greek tragedies, although a number of them have singled out occurrences of it for special comment, and Wecklein and Denniston have, as I indicated, listed occurrences of it<sup>5</sup>). I have taken the liberty of

---

<sup>3</sup>) I owe this term to Professor Richard Hamilton of Bryn Mawr College, to whom I am indebted for much help with this paper. I also wish to thank Professors Archibald Allen and Walter Donlan and Mr. Joseph Cotter, all of The Pennsylvania State University.

<sup>4</sup>) Heinrich Lausberg, *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich 1949).

<sup>5</sup>) See above, notes 1, 2. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (Ch. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *La nouvelle rhétorique: Traité de l’argumentation*, 2 vols [Paris 1958] I 288–293) treat the idiom as a rhetorical figure, but give it no specific name. They mention (not necessarily with approval) names for the idiom used by Vico and Baron. Vico apparently called it “ploce” and Baron “Syllepse oratoire”. Of course *πλοκή* and *σύλληψις* are terms often occurring in the traditional lists of rhetorical figures, in a variety of uses;

giving it the name “Pankoinon”, a word which in at least one context (namely, my epigraph) means “Truism”. Let us bear in mind that to call an expression a self-identity is to characterize it logically, while to call it a pankoinon is to characterize it rhetorically.

I want now to distinguish the pankoinon from another sort of locution which it superficially resembles but which I would be reluctant to call a figure, since it gives rise to no identifiable range of rhetorical effects. The pankoinon “They are where they are” is formalizable as “Where they are = where they are” and is dismissive (Ismene is refusing to discuss the whereabouts of her brothers). But now consider “They are where they are because . . .”. The dots may be filled in in various ways; “because you led them there”, “because they were maddened by the Furies”, and “because they were shipwrecked” are examples. The clause “They are where they are” in all such cases cannot possibly be formalized as “Where they are = where they are”. For it would not make sense to say “Where they are = where they are because you led them there”. The speaker who says “They are where they are because . . .”, if he is not just being silly, is not trying to give a reason for a self-identity — to assert, for example, that the identity of “Where they are” with itself arises from your having led them to where they are. Self-identities simply do not have reasons of this sort; this is part of what is meant by saying that they are logically true and true for all possible worlds. What “They are where they are because you led them there” does mean is “Their whereabouts is the result of your leading them there”. No self-identity is any part of the meaning of this proposition. Nor is the proposition dismissive. If it is addressed to Odysseus, for example, Odysseus can properly continue the discussion, perhaps denying that the whereabouts of the people in question is his fault.

Now consider “. . . because they are where they are”. The dots might be filled in by “They will never see the light of the sun again” or “They can bring us help”. Once again the resulting expression is not a pankoinon. The self-identity “Where they are = where they are” plays no role in the expression, which can be paraphrased, for example, as “Because of their whereabouts, they will never see the light of the sun again”. This proposition once again is not dismissive in the way pankoina are.

---

they do not seem especially serviceable for naming the figure in question. In any event, neither Vico’s name nor Baron’s has caught on; the figure is still without a name.

To generalize, when a pankoinon is made to serve either as a dependent clause or as an independent clause having another clause dependent<sup>6)</sup> on it, it loses its status as a pankoinon. There is, however, an exception to this generalization. When two clauses, one independent and the other dependent, are both pankoina when considered by themselves, it is possible for one of them to retain its status as a pankoinon in the compound sentence. Thus Perelman gives the example

Quand je vois tout ce que je vois, je pense ce que je pense<sup>7)</sup>.

Clearly even without the "tout" the "Quand-" clause would not be a pankoinon; but the independent clause retains its status as one.

I want to call expressions like "They are where they are because . . ." and ". . . because they are where they are" "Pseudo-pankoina". While they share none of the logical or rhetorical properties of genuine pankoina, they can be confused with them. This possibility is established by the fact that, as I shall show, Wecklein, Denniston, and many other editors actually do on occasion fall into this confusion.

I shall now proceed to exhibit and comment upon each of the examples presented by Wecklein and Denniston. Since the examples from Euripides can be dealt with somewhat more straightforwardly than those from Aeschylus and Sophocles, I shall begin with them<sup>8)</sup>.

---

<sup>6)</sup> As will appear from what follows, I am using the phrase "dependent clause" quite loosely. A circumstantial participle modifying the subject or object of a clause might suffice to create the relevant condition of dependency. So might an adverb or adverbial phrase. Dependency is a logical, not a grammatical category.

<sup>7)</sup> Cited by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (above, n. 5) I 293, from M. Jouhandeau, *Ana de Madame Apremont* 61.

<sup>8)</sup> I will number my Euripides items E1 through E16, my Sophocles items S1 through S5, and my Aeschylus items A1 through A3, following the order in which the lines are given in the O. C. T. edition of each author. The only numbered item not to be found in an O.C.T. edition is S5, a fragment from Sophocles; this I have quoted from Pearson. In some cases I will quote lines preceding or succeeding those referred to by Denniston or Wecklein, in order to provide a context when needed.

I shall cite the play and line number or numbers of each item. (When there has been a disagreement about numbering, I shall take the O. C. T. numbering as decisive.) I shall indicate by "W," "D", or "W&D" the list or lists on which the item appears. Then I shall reproduce the line or lines in Greek, giving the name of the speaker or speakers and citing anything from the *Apparatus Criticus* affecting the expression which I am examining to see whether it is a pankoinon. I will translate the Greek, and comment upon

E 1 E. *Med.* 889–90 W

*Μήδεια*: ἀλλ' ἐσμὲν οἷόν ἐσμεν, οὐκ ἐρῶ κακόν, γυναῖκες·

“But we woman are as we are, I will not say a bad thing.”

This is, as I have already stated, clearly a *pankoinon*. Its context is Medea’s prevarication that she now accepts Jason’s second marriage; she excuses her earlier uncooperative attitude on the ground that she is a woman. Perhaps in some broad sense of the term, E 1 is euphemistic. Schiassi says of it “Frequente questo eufemismo che è una forma di aposiopesi mirante ad evitare l’esplicita indicazione di qualcosa di spiacevole”. A dismissive statement does avoid going into details. Schiassi goes on to list E 2, E 4, E 5, E 6, and E 7 as comparable<sup>9</sup>).

In his note to E 1, Headlam says that E. *Hec.* 873, *πάσχοντος οἷα πείσεται* (“When he suffers such things as he suffers”), is similar<sup>10</sup>). But genitive absolutes like this cannot be construed as *pankoina*, since they are dependent. Hence whatever similarity there may be between these two locutions is irrelevant.

E 2 E. *Med.* 1011 W&D

*Μήδεια*: ἤγγειλας οἶ' ἤγγειλας· οὐ σὲ μέμφομαι.

“You have announced what you have announced; I do not blame you.”

The context of this *pankoinon* is the Tutor’s question “Am I in ignorance telling you of some disaster, and not the good news I thought?” (Warner translation<sup>11</sup>). Medea’s self-identical reply yields, by dissociation, something like “You have announced what it was appropriate for you to announce”. She is forestalling further discussion of the announcement.

E 3 E. *Hec.* 1000 D

*Ἐκάβη*: ἔστ', ὦ φιληθεῖς ὡς σὺ νῦν ἐμοὶ φιλή . . .

“So be it, o you who are loved as you are now loved by me . . .”

A *pankoinon* can always be formalized as a self-identity. The main verb of a self-identity is “=”. Hence a phrase without a verb—or at least without a main verb—can not be formalized as a

---

the item to the extent I deem necessary. Some items do not seem to me to call for much comment, but others require consideration of context and rhetorical function, and in some cases several interpretations are possible.

<sup>9</sup> Giuseppe Schiassi, *Euripide Medea* (Bologna 1967) 193.

<sup>10</sup> C. E. S. Headlam, *The Medea of Euripides* (Cambridge 1897) 89.

<sup>11</sup> David Grene and Richmond Lattimore (edd.), *The Complete Greek Tragedies*, Euripides I–V (Chicago 1955) I, 93.

self-identity. But E 3, a noun phrase in the vocative case, lacks a main verb. Hence it cannot be a pankoinon. I think E 3 is simply a case of polyptosis. As we shall see, there are also other examples of non-pankoinal polyptosis in the lists. It is not difficult to confuse the two figures.

E 4 E. *Tro.* 630–1 W&D

*Ἀνδρομάχη: ὄλωλεν ὡς ὄλωλεν· ἀλλ' ὁμῶς ἐμοῦ  
ζώσης γ' ὄλωλεν εὐτυχεστέρω πότμῳ.*

“She perished as she perished. But nevertheless she perished by a happier fate than [the fate of] me who am alive.”

Of the pankoinon *ὄλωλεν ὡς ὄλωλεν*, Lee says “expressions of this sort are frequently used when the speaker wishes to avoid the discussion of unpleasant details”<sup>12</sup>). In this case, of course, most of the unpleasant details have already been discussed by Andromache in 622–3:

*τέθνηκέ σοι παῖς πρὸς τάφῳ Πολυξένη  
σφαγεῖσ' Ἀχιλλέως, δῶρον ἀψύχῳ νεκρῷ.*

“Your daughter Polyxena died slaughtered on the tomb of Achilles, a gift to a soulless corpse.”

The real point of this pankoinon, I think, is to discourage any *further* discussion of the matter.

E 5 E. *El.* 84–5 W&D

*Ὀρέστης: μόνος δ' Ὀρέστην τόνδ' ἐθαύμαζες φίλων,  
πράσσονθ' ἂ πράσσω δειν' ὑπ' Αἰγίσθου παθῶν*

“And you are the only friend to have respected this Orestes,  
As I fare what things I fare because I suffer terrible things at the hands of Aegisthus.”

My translation stretches *πράσσονθ'* slightly in order to bring out the self-identity which Wecklein and Denniston apparently thought they saw here, by virtue of which, presumably, they put E 5 on their lists. But even with *πράσσονθ'* translated this way, E 5 can be interpreted only as a pseudopankoinon, since *παθῶν* is circumstantial. Thus “I fare what things I fare” cannot be formalized as a self-identity, since a cause is dependent upon it. A paraphrase of the whole line would be “As I fare as I do because I suffer terrible things at the hands of Aegisthus”.

<sup>12</sup>) K. H. Lee, *Euripides Troades* (London 1976) 185.

E 6 E. *El.* 288–9 W&D

Ὀρέστης: ὁ κατθανὼν δὲ σὸς πατὴρ τύμβου κυρεῖ;

Ἡλέκτρα: ἔκυρσεν ὡς ἔκυρσεν, ἐκβληθεὶς δόμων.

Orestes: “And has the decedent your father obtained a tomb?”

Electra: “He has obtained what he has obtained having been thrown out of the house.”

The comma in 289 shows clearly enough that Murray, the editor of the O.C.T. version, has taken *ἐκβληθεὶς* as non-circumstantial. In this case one is strongly inclined to see the line in question as containing a pankoinon.

The pankoinon “He has obtained what he has obtained” produces, by dissociation, “He has obtained [the tomb] he might have been expected to obtain”. The context is clearly that of a question. We are, I think, surest about the meaning of a pankoinon if it is uttered in answer to a question.

E 7 E. *El.* 1121–2 W&D

Κλυταιμήστρα: ὄρας; ἀν’ αὖ σὺ ζωπυρεῖς νείκη νέα.

Ἡλέκτρα: σιγῶ· δέδοικα γάρ νιν ὡς δέδοικ’ ἐγώ.

Clytemnestra: “Do you see? You are rekindling new strifes.”

Electra: “I am silent. For I fear him as I fear him.”

I quote the line of Clytemnestra preceding that of Electra to show that Electra’s line is *not* an answer to a direct question. It would nonetheless be difficult to misunderstand what Electra says. *νιν* is, of course, Aegisthus; what Electra is saying about Aegisthus has as its context all that has been spoken from 1116 on. But the pankoinon has a broader context as well; namely Electra’s and the audience’s knowledge, and Clytemnestra’s ignorance, that Aegisthus is dead. The pankoinon helps to maintain the separation between the knowledge and the ignorance; for those in the know can take it in one way while Clytemnestra will take it in another.

E 8 E. *El.* 1141 D

Ἡλέκτρα: θύσεις γὰρ οἶα χρή σε δαίμοσιν θύη.

θύη Nauck; θύειν MSS

“For you will sacrifice what sacrifices you must to the gods.”

It is strange that this ordinary case of cognate accusative should have been the occasion for Denniston’s entire list of examples of the locution best exemplified by pankoinon. (With the manuscript reading, we have an ordinary case of polyptosis.)

E 9 E. *I.T.* 573–5 W&D

Ὁρέστης: ἐν δὲ λυπεῖται μόνον,  
ὅς οὐκ ἄφρων ὢν μάντεων πεισθεὶς λόγοις  
ἔλωλεν — ὡς ἔλωλε τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν.

“But he suffers one thing alone who, not being foolish, persuaded by the words of seers, has perished—as he has perished for the ones who know.”

As Platnauer points out, this is a difficult passage, with no clearly established interpretation<sup>13</sup>). Yet it is hard to see how on any interpretation it could contain a *pankoinon*. Murray’s dash decisively forestalls any temptation to associate the two occurrences of *ἔλωλε*, but even without it *ἔλωλεν ὡς ἔλωλε* is clearly modified by *τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν*: “He has perished the way he has perished for those who know”; the way he perished was for the benefit or to the disadvantage of those who know. (I assume that Platnauer is right in assuming that *εἰδόσιν* is an ethic dative<sup>14</sup>). Thus *ἔλωλεν ὡς ἔλωλε* is dependent. In short, I suspect that there is a pseudo-*pankoinon* here, but I see no trace of a genuine *pankoinon*.

E 10 E. *I.T.* 691–2 W

Ὁρέστης: τὸ μὲν γάρ εἰς ἔμ’ οὐ κακῶς ἔχει,  
πράσσονθ’ ἃ πράσσω πρὸς θεῶν, λῦσαι βίον.

“For so far as I am concerned it does not hold badly, as I fare what things I fare at the hands of the gods, to have undone my life.”

There are of course echoes here of E 5. But E 10 even more obviously contains no *pankoinon*. What prevents it from containing one is *πρὸς θεῶν*. In order to read E 10 as containing a *pankoinon*, we should have to suppose that Orestes meant “What things I fare at the hands of the gods = what things I fare at the hands of the gods”. Clearly, however, what he did mean is “as I fare everything at the hands of the gods”. So E 10 is a pseudo-*pankoinon*.

E 11 E. *Or.* 79 W&D (Erroneously cited as “89” by W.)

Ὁρέστης: ἔπλευσ’ ὅπως ἔπλευσα θεομανεῖ πότμῳ.

“I sailed as I sailed by a god-maddened fate.”

I see here only a pseudo-*pankoinon*. For the clause *ἔπλευσ’ ὅπως ἔπλευσα* is, in a broad but quite relevant sense, dependent upon the adverbial phrase *θεομανεῖ πότμῳ*.

<sup>13</sup>) M. Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia in Tauris* (Oxford 1938) 104.

<sup>14</sup>) See above, n. 13.

E 12 E. *Or.* 660–1 W

*Ὀρέστης: δεῖ γὰρ σ' ἐμοῦ πράσσοντος ὡς πράσσω τὰ νῦν  
πλέον φέρεσθαι, καὶ μὲ συγγνώμην ἔχειν.*

“For it is necessary, since I fare as I fare, that you have the advantage, and that I have forgiveness.”

This is the third time we find the form *πράσσω* used in combination with a participle of the verb *πράσσω* by Orestes. The genitive absolute construction in which the participle occurs, however, blocks any attempt to read E 12 as containing a *pankoinon*; “I fare as I fare” is ineluctably dependent. As a *pseudopankoinon*, E 12 can be paraphrased as Méridier translates it:

“Car il est juste, *dans l'état où je suis aujourd'hui*, que tu aies sur moi l'avantage et je t'en excuse.”<sup>15)</sup>

E 13 E. *Ba.* 955 D

*Διώνυσα: κρύψη σὺ κρύψιν ἦν σε κρυφθῆναι χρεών,*

“Hide in a hiding-place which it is necessary for you to hide in.”

This is clearly no more than a combination of cognate accusative and polyptosis.

E 14 E. *I.A.* 649 W&D

*Ἀγαμέμνων: ἰδοῦ, γέγηθά σ' ὡς γέγηθ' ὄρων, τέκνον.*

“Look, seeing you I delight in you as I delight in you, child.”

I do not regard “I delight in you as I delight in you” as dependent, for I do not think Agamemnon is saying that the way he delights in Iphigenia is dependent upon his seeing her. Hence I regard *γέγηθά σ' ὡς γέγηθ'* as a *pankoinon*. Ammendola says that this locution is a “modo di dire, non insolito nei tragici, che esprime reticenza”<sup>16)</sup>. This remark seems justified. Certainly Agamemnon does not want Iphigenia to pursue the discussion. His remark is dismissive.

E 15 E. *I.A.* 720–1 D

*Κλυταιμῆστρα: κάπειτα δαίσεις τοὺς γάμους ἐς ὕστερον;*

*Ἀγαμέμνων: θύσας γε θύμαθ' ἃ ἐμὲ χρὴ θῆσαι θεοῖς.*

Clytemnestra: “And then you will give a feast for the marriage later?”

Agamemnon: “Having sacrificed the sacrifices which it is necessary for me to sacrifice to the gods.”

<sup>15)</sup> Fernand Chapouthier (ed.), *Euripide*, Vol. VI, *Oreste*, translated by Louis Méridier (Paris 1959) 58. (Emphasis mine.)

<sup>16)</sup> Giuseppe Ammendola, *Euripide Ifigenia in Aulide* (Turin 1967) 59.

E 15 is polyptosis involving a cognate accusative; it is neither pankoinon nor pseudopankoinon.

E 16 E. *I.A.* 1182 W&D

*Κλυταιμῆστρα: δεξόμεθα δέξιν ἢν σε δέξασθαι χρεών.*

“We will welcome a welcome which it is necessary to welcome you.”

Exactly the observations I have made concerning E 15 would apply to E 16 as well. Ammendola agrees with me that E 13, E 15, and E 16 are all similar<sup>17</sup>).

S 1 S. *O.T.* 1375–6 W&D

*Οἰδίπους: ἀλλ’ ἢ τέκνων δῆτ’ ὄψις ἦν ἐφίμερος,  
βλαστοῦσ’ ὅπως ἔβλαστε, προσλεύσσειν ἐμοί;  
βλαστόνθ’ Hartung; βλαστοῦσ’ MSS.*

“But would the sight of children, arising as it arose [‘arising as they arose’ on Hartung’s conjecture] have been delightful for me to look at?”

S 1 is a pseudopankoinon. It can be paraphrased “But would the sight of children, under the conditions under which (it) (they) arose, have been delightful for me to look at?” If Oedipus, asked how his children had arisen, had replied simply *ἔβλασταν ὅπως ἔβλαστε*, we would indeed have a pankoinon, one with a special dismissive effect.

S 2 S. *Tr.* 1233–4 W&D

*Ὑλλος: τίς γάρ ποθ’, ἢ μοι μητρὶ μὲν θανεῖν μόνη  
μεταίτιος, σοὶ δ’ αἰθῆς ὡς ἔχεις ἔχειν,*

“For who ever [could do what you ask], since she alone shares responsibility for my mother’s death and moreover for your being in the condition in which you are . . .?”

Jebb compares S 2 with S 3 and with a locution from Greek Prose—Dem. *Orat.* 3. 8, *ἐχόντων ὡς ἔχουσι Θηβαίων*<sup>18</sup>). Since this latter is obviously a genitive absolute construction, it functions as a dependent clause and hence as a pseudopankoinon. Nor can S 2 itself be read in any other way than as a pseudopankoinon. We shall see that on one interpretation, S 3 is similar.

S 3 S. *O.C.* 273 W&D

*Οἰδίπους: νῦν δ’ οὐδὲν εἰδὼς ἐκόμην ἴν’ ἐκόμην,*

“As it was, knowing nothing, I arrived where I arrived.”

<sup>17</sup>) See above, n. 16, 110.

<sup>18</sup>) Gilbert A. Davies, *The Trachiniae of Sophocles with a Commentary Abridged from the Larger Edition of Sir Richard C. Jebb* (Cambridge 1955) 184.

This can be taken in two ways. If *εἰδῶς* is circumstantial, as it very likely is, then it means “Because I knew nothing, I arrived where I did”. In other words “My ignorance accounted for my whereabouts”. On this interpretation, S 3 is a pseudopankoinon. Possibly, however, we might take *ῥῆν δ’ οὐδὲν εἰδῶς* as independent from what follows. (Perhaps we could suggest this interpretation by putting a comma after *εἰδῶς*.) We could then read “I knew nothing and I arrived where I arrived”. We would then be entitled to formalize the second conjunct as “Where I arrived = where I arrived”. We would in that case have a pankoinon dismissing further attempts to discuss the matter. Rademacher writes “*ἰκόμην ἔν’ ἰκόμην* umschreibt, was Öd. nicht gerne ausspricht”<sup>19</sup>).

In his note to S 3, Jebb refers to O. C. 974 as similar to S 3<sup>20</sup>). This latter item, not on the lists of Wecklein and Denniston, is

*εἰ δ’ αἶ φανεῖς δόστηνος, ὡς ἐγὼ φάνην, . . .*

(“If again being born wretched, as I was born, . . .”) This indeed may look at first glance like a pankoinon, but fails to qualify, since it is the protasis of a conditional. This protasis behaves like the “Quand-” clause of “Quand je vois tout ce que je vois, je pense ce que je pense”, a sentence on which I commented above (p. 52). That is to say, the protasis cannot be a pankoinon. In this case it is taken up into the pseudopankoinon which is the conditional as a whole. (The apodosis is Line 977, *πῶς ἂν τό γ’ ἄκον προᾶγμ’ ἂν εἰκότως ψέγοις*;) England agrees that O. C. 974 is “not parallel” to some expressions that I have identified as pankoina<sup>21</sup>).

S 4 S. O.C. 335–6 W&D

*Οἰδίπους*: οἱ δ’ ἀνδρόμαίμοι ποῦ νεανῖαι πονεῖν;

*Ἰσμήνη*: εἶσ’ οὐτέρῳ εἰσι· δεινὰ τὰν κείνοις τανῶν.

Oedipus: “And what is become of the young men your brothers with regard to this service?”

Ismene: “They are where they are. Things are terrible for them now.”

This is clearly a pankoinon. Notice that it is uttered in response to a question, and is an attempt to dismiss the question. Ismene does not want Oedipus to know that her brothers are fighting over

<sup>19</sup>) F. W. Schneidwin and A. Nauck, *Sophokles erklärt*, Vol. 3, *Oidipus auf Kolonos*, ed. L. Rademacher (Berlin 1909) 52.

<sup>20</sup>) E. S. Schuckburgh, *The Oedipus Coloneus of Sophocles, with a Commentary. Abridged from the Larger Edition of Sir Richard C. Jebb*. (Cambridge 1955) 101.

<sup>21</sup>) E. B. England, *The Iphigenia at Aulis of Euripides* (London 1891) 67.

the throne of Thebes, so she says, in effect, “Never mind where they are”. Several other *pankoina* that I have considered arise in the context of a question. A *pankoinon* must have *some* context; otherwise it is just an inanity. One couldn’t simply walk in and announce *εἶς’ οὐδέρ’ εἶσι*, even if it were clear what the subject of the verb is.

S 5 S. Fr. Nauck 561 (= Pearson 618) D

*ἔγημεν ὡς ἔγημεν ἀφθόγγους γάμους*

“He married as he married voiceless marriages.”

I think this can be read only as a *pankoinon*. The underlying self-identity would be “The way he married voiceless marriages = the way he married voiceless marriages”. There seems to be no reason to doubt Pearson’s statement that “*ἔγημεν ὡς ἔγημεν* is a euphemism designed to avoid speaking of the marriage as fraught with evil consequences”<sup>22</sup>).

A 1 A. Ag. 973–4 D

*Κλυταιμῆστρα: Ζεῦ Ζεῦ τέλειε, τὰς ἐμὰς εὐχὰς τέλει·*

*μέλοι δέ τοι σοὶ τῶνπερ ἂν μέλλης τελεῖν.*

*μέλοι MS. Tri.; μέλη MS. F.; μέλει Maas.*

“Zeus, Zeus, accomplisher, accomplish my prayers; and may you take thought for these things you intend to accomplish.”

This is certainly not a *pankoinon*. It is simply a case of polyp-tosis. Fraenkel calls it “enigmatic”, which it may well be<sup>23</sup>). Not all enigmatic statements are *pankoina*.

A 2 A. Ag. 1286–7 W&D

*Κασσάνδρα: ἐπεὶ τὸ πρῶτον εἶδον Ἰλίου πόλιν*

*πράξασαν ὡς ἔπραξεν . . .*

“Since I first saw the city of Ilion faring as it fared . . .”

This is one more of a number of pseudopankoina involving a participle and a finite form of *πράσσω*. It can be paraphrased: “Since I first saw the city of Ilion in the condition in which it was”. I do not see any way of construing the example as containing a genuine *pankoinon*.

<sup>22</sup>) A. C. Pearson (ed.), *The Fragments of Sophocles*, Vol. 1 (Amsterdam 1963) 255.

<sup>23</sup>) Eduard Fraenkel (ed.), *Aeschylus Agamemnon*, 3 vols (Oxford 1950) Vol. 2, 441.

A 3 A. *Ch.* 780 D

*Χορός: μέλει θεοῖσιν ὥνπερ ἂν μέλη πέρι.*

“For the gods there is a care of those things concerning which there may be a care.”

This is the last and most difficult example. In order for Deniston to be right to include it in his list, the use of the subjunctive in *μέλη* must have a purely syntactical function; if *μέλη* differs semantically from *μέλει*, then we are not entitled to formalize A 3, as, say, “What is a care for the gods = what is a care for the gods”, and there is no *pankoinon*, only a case of polyptosis.

If there is a *pankoinon*, the semantical dissociation it produces probably results in something like “The gods’ concerns are what concern only the gods”; in other words the gods’ concerns (unlike other possible concerns) are exclusive to the gods. The line functions to express a resigned ignorance of divine purposes; it dismisses further discussion of them. If it is a genuine *pankoinon*, it is the only one in either list spoken by the chorus.

I conclude by noting that at least two proposals have been made to emend lines so that they become *pseudopankoina*. These are mentioned by Fraenkel in his note to A. *Ag.* 1171<sup>24</sup>). This line, in Fraenkel’s edition, reads

*Κασσάνδρα: τὸ μὴ <οὐ> πόλιν μὲν ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχει παθεῖν*

“That the city not suffer even as it [now] has it.”

Fraenkel gives us to understand that Wecklein felt that *παθεῖν* should be emended to *ἔχειν*. The meaning, shifted only slightly if at all, would be “That the city not have it even as it [now] has it”. This *pseudopankoinon*, incidentally, constitutes a very powerful argument for distinguishing *pseudopankoina* from contexts in which *pankoina* occur. For if “It has it just as it has it” is formalizable as a self-identity, then the denial of it achieved by *μὴ <οὐ>* must have the form of a logical falsehood. But clearly Cassandra is not envisaging a situation in which how the city has it ≠ how the city has it.

Fraenkel also refers<sup>25</sup>) to Headlam’s proposal to emend A. *Eum.* 611, which reads,

*Ὁρέστης: δρᾶσαι γάρ, ὥσπερ ἔστιν, οὐκ ἀρνούμεθα*

“For we will not deny that we have done just as it is”,

<sup>24</sup>) Fraenkel (above, n. 23) 3, 534.

<sup>25</sup>) See above, n. 24.

by substituting *ἔδρασα* for *ἔστιν* or *εἶναι* for *δραῖσαι*. In either case, of course, a pseudopankoinon would result.

In the course of his discussion, Fraenkel mentions one further pseudopankoinon from Greek tragedy; namely, *E. Hel.* 718:

*Ἄγγελος: σπεύδων δ' ὄτ' ἔσπευδ' οὐδὲν εἶχε*

“Striving when he strove he got nothing.”

Perhaps there are still other pseudopankoina not on the lists of Wecklein and Denniston.

### *Addendum*

*A. Ag.* 67–68 and *A. Eum* 679 have come to my attention since this article went to press. My arguments, however, remain unaffected.

### **Ἑκατικά**

by D. R. JORDAN, Athens

The words *έρπετοφάγος* and *καρδιοδαίτης*, which appear in LSJ Suppl., on the basis of the published text of an inscribed lead tablet, as epithets of Hecate, should now be deleted. Fresh reading has yielded a new epithet of Hecate, of unclear meaning, and a new verb.

G. W. Elderkin, *Hesperia* 6, 1937, 389–395, has published an inscribed lead tablet from the Athenian Agora, inv. IL 493, probably of the first century after Christ, that curses thieves. He reads and translates one of its passages as

4                   καταγράφω κὲ κατα-  
5 τίθεμε Πλούτωνι κὲ Μοίρες κὲ Περσεφόνη  
6 κὲ Ἐρεινώσι κὲ παντὶ κακῷ, κατατίθεμε κὲ Ἑκά[τη]  
7 ἐ[ρπ]ετοφάγω

4 I inscribe and consign  
5 to Pluto and Fates and Persephone  
6 and to Furies and every evil one, I consign also to Hecate  
7 eater of animals.

The only justification that he offers for his reading of the last word is that ‘the epitheton *έρπετοφάγω* seems to be the only possible restoration’. On the basis of Elderkin’s reading, the word, elsewhere unknown, has found its way into LSJ Suppl., with his