pr

sp

 $\mathbf{Th}$ 

wi

an

im

th

Æ

be

no

co

ou

ac

di

de

re

ur

in

th

u

tl

p

ľ

ι

Ai $\sigma_X i \lambda \epsilon$ ; the latter answers, 'E $\beta o \nu \lambda \delta \mu \eta \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \delta \kappa \epsilon \rho \nu \xi \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \theta a \delta \epsilon$ . The wish is certainly entertained here, for the question is asked, "What do you wish to do?" Now if Æschylus only says, "I could wish," implying that he does not entertain the wish now, he evades the question; but that is clearly not the force of the answer; it means, I 'do actually wish not to contend here, but I cannot have my way, or I do not know that I can have my way.'

Æschines, in his oration against Ctesiphon, also makes use of the idiom under consideration. In Sec. 2, Oxford ed. after briefly referring to the preparations which the party of Demosthenes had made to gain their desired object, he declares that his appeal is to the gods, the laws, and the people, as he supposes that no means which could be used, would more avail with the people, than the laws and the principles of justice ; he then proceeds, "I could wish  $(\epsilon\beta\sigma\nu\lambda\delta\mu\eta\nu)$  therefore, that the council of five hundred, and the ecclesiae, were rightly directed by those placed over them; and that the laws enacted by Solon concerning the orderly behaviour of public speakers, should have full force," &c. That he actually entertains this wish, there can be no doubt; it is just because he really desires such things that he undertakes to speak, but just as Agrippa, after stating his wish, politely deferred to Festus, so here Æschines states what he really wants, and then leaves it with the people. Where then is the impossible condition ? In the close of the same oration, after a ridiculous flight, he says, "and now if I have spoken nobly and worthily against this violation of law, I have spoken as I could wish  $(\partial \beta ov \lambda \delta \mu \eta v)$ ; but if indifferently, as we were able." It is unnecessary to add that the wish expressed is entertained.

We have examined another passage in Lucian's Dialogues of the Dead, proving the same thing, but we need not quote any more; for the rest we can take Winer's word. He says, " $E\beta ov\lambda \delta\mu\eta$ , &c., vellem, without  $a\nu$  is to be explained somewhat differently, as Acts xxv. 22. 'I too should have liked,' &c. Aristoph. Ran., 866. Æs. Ctes. 274b. Arrian Epict. 1, 19, 18. Lu. Dial. Mort. 20, 4. abdic. Char. 6, etc. Here is expressed, not a wish previously excited by another circumstance, volebam, but a wish still felt by the speaker. This however is not directly stated by him, volo, as the gratifying of it does not depend purely on his will." Dr. Alexander is of the same opinion, as the following quotation will show. "The nice distinction in Greek usage as explained by these authorities," (the most exact philologists of modern times) "is that the