

ia



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

Clarendon Press Series

HOMERIC GRAMMAR

D. B. MONRO

London
HENRY FROWDE



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.

Clarendon Press Series

UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO

49291

A GRAMMAR

OF THE

HOMERIC DIALECT

BY

D. B. MONRO, M.A.

PROVOST OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED

L'objet de cette science est de rechercher dans l'esprit de l'homme
la cause de la transformation des idiomes

M. BRÉAL

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1891

[*All rights reserved*]

Oxford

PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

BY HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY

OF THE REV.

JAMES RIDDELL

LATE FELLOW AND TUTOR OF BALLIOL

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

It may be said, without fear of giving offence, that a new Grammar of the Homeric dialect is sorely wanted. The admirable *Griechische Formenlehre* of the late H. L. Ahrens is now just thirty years old, and is confined, as its title indicates, to the inflexions. Not only has the course of discovery been going on since Ahrens wrote (and with hardly less rapidity than in the first years of the new science), but the historical method has been carried into the field of syntax. And apart from 'comparative philology,' the researches of Bekker, Cobet, La Roche, and many other students have brought together a wealth of material that only needs careful analysis and arrangement to make it accessible to the general body of learners.

The plan of this book has sufficient novelty to call for some explanation. I have not attempted to write a Comparative Grammar, or even a Grammar that would deserve the epithet 'historical:' but I have kept in view two principles of arrangement which belong to the historical or genetic method. These are, that grammar should proceed from the simple to the complex types of the Sentence, and that the form and the meaning should as far as possible be treated together. Now the simplest possible Sentence—apart from mere exclamations—consists of a *Verb*, or word containing in itself the two elements of all rational utterance, a Subject and a Predicate. We begin, therefore, by analysing the Verb, and classifying (1) the Endings, which express the Person and Number of the Subject (§§ 1-7), and serve also to distinguish the 'Middle' or Reflexive use (§ 8), and (2) the modifications of the Stem which yield the several Tenses and Moods. These modifications, we at once perceive, are more numerous than the meanings which they serve to express, and we have therefore to

choose between classifying according to *formation*—i. e. according to the process by which each Tense-Stem and Mood-Stem is derived from the simple Verb-Stem or Root,—and the ordinary classification according to meaning (Present, Future, Perfect, Aorist, &c.). The former course seemed preferable because it answers to the historical order. The problem is to find how pre-existing forms—common to Greek and Sanscrit, and therefore part of an original ‘Indo-European’ grammar—were adapted to the specifically Greek system of Tense-meanings. I have therefore taken the different formations in turn, beginning with the simplest (§§ 9–20, 22–27, 29–69, 79–83), and introducing an account of the meaning of each as soon as possible (§§ 21, 28, 70–78). This part of the subject naturally includes the accentuation of the different forms of the Verb (§§ 87–89).

The next great division of the subject is concerned with the first enlargement of the Sentence. A word may be added which taken by itself says nothing—contains no Subject and Predicate—but which combines with and qualifies the primitive one-word Sentence. The elements which may gather in this way round the basis or nucleus formed by the Verb are ultimately of two kinds, Nouns and Pronouns; and the relations in which they may stand to the Verb are also twofold. A Noun or Pronoun may stand as a Subject—limiting or explaining the Subject already contained in the Person-Ending—or may qualify the Predicate given by the Stem of the Verb. These relations are shown by the Ending, which again may be either a Case-Ending or an adverbial Ending. We begin accordingly by an account of the *Declensions*, supplemented by a list of the chief groups of *Adverbs* (Chapter V).

When we pass from the Endings to the Stems of Nouns and Pronouns, we find that they are essentially different. A ‘Nominal Stem’ consists in general of two parts, (1) a *predicative* part, usually identical with a Verb-Stem, and (2) a Suffix. Each of these two elements, again, may be complex. The addition of a further Suffix yields a fresh Stem, with a corresponding derivative meaning; and thus we have the distinction between *Primitive* or Verbal and *Secondary* or Denominative Nouns. The Suffixes employed in these two

classes are generally distinct, and deserve a more careful enumeration than is usually given in elementary grammars. The predicative part, again, may be enlarged by a second Nominal Stem, prefixed to the other, and qualifying it nearly as a Case-form or Adverb qualifies the Verb. The Compounds thus formed are of especial interest for the poetical dialect of Homer. The analysis which I have given of the chief forms which they present must be taken to be provisional only, as the subject is still full of doubt. With respect to the meaning I have attempted no complete classification. It is always unsafe to insist on distinctions which may be clear to us, but only because we mark them by distinct forms of expression.

The chapter on the formation of Nouns should perhaps have been followed by one on the formation of Pronouns. The material for such a chapter, however, lies for the most part beyond the scope of a grammar. It is represented in this book by a section on Heteroclitite Pronouns (§ 108), which notices some traces of composite Pronominal Stems, and in some degree by another on the Numerals (§ 130).

When we come to examine the syntactical use of the Cases, we find ourselves sometimes dealing with sentences which contain at least two members besides the Verb. Along with the constructions which may be called 'adverbial' (using the term *Adverb* in a wide sense, to include all words directly construed with the Verb), we have the constructions in which the governing word is a Noun or Preposition. And in these again we must distinguish between the government of a Case *apparently* by a Noun or Preposition, really by the combined result of the Noun or Preposition and the Verb, and the true government by a Noun alone, of which the dependent Genitive and the Adjective are the main types. These distinctions, however, though of great importance in reference to the development of the use of Cases, cannot well be followed exclusively in the order of treatment. I have therefore taken the Cases in succession, and along with them the chief points which have to be noticed regarding the 'concord' of Gender (§§ 166-168) and Number (§§ 169-173).

In the Infinitive and Participle (Chapter X) we have the first step from the simple to the complex Sentence. The pre-

dicative element in the Verbal Noun is treated syntactically like the same element in a true or 'finite' Verb; that is to say, it takes 'adverbial' constructions. Thus while retaining the character of a Noun it becomes the nucleus of a new imperfect Sentence, without a grammatical Subject properly so called (though the Infinitive in Greek acquired a quasi-Subject in the use of the Accusative before it), and standing to the main Sentence as an adverb or adjective.

While the Infinitival and Participial Clauses may thus be described as Nouns which have expanded into dependent Sentences, the true Subordinate Clause shows the opposite process. In many instances, especially in Homeric syntax, we can trace the steps by which originally independent Sentences have come to stand in an adverbial or adjectival relation. The change is generally brought about, as we shall see, by means of Pronouns, or Adverbs formed from Pronominal stems. Hence it is convenient that the account of the uses of the Pronouns (Chapter XI) should hold the place of an introduction to the part in which we have to do with the relations of Clauses to each other.

The next chapter, however, does not treat directly of subordinate Clauses, but of the uses of the Moods in them. It seemed best to bring these uses into immediate connexion with the uses which are found in simple Sentences. In this way the original character of Subordinate Clauses comes into a clearer light. If anything remains to be said of them, it finds its place in the account of the Particles (Chapter XIII); in which also we examine the relations of independent Sentences, so far at least as these are expressed by grammatical forms.

The last chapter contains a discussion of the Metre of Homer (Chapter XIV), and of some points of 'phonology' which (for us at least) are ultimately metrical questions. Chief among these is the famous question of the Digamma. I have endeavoured to state the main issues which have been raised on this subject as fully as possible: but without much hope of bringing them to a satisfactory decision.

A book of this kind is necessarily to a great extent a compilation, and from sources so numerous that it is scarcely possible to make a sufficient acknowledgment of indebted-

ness. The earlier chapters are mainly founded on the great work of G. Curtius on the Greek Verb. More recent writers have cleared up some difficulties, especially in the phonology. I have learned very much from M. de Saussure's *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles*, and from several articles by K. Brugmann and Joh. Schmidt, especially the last. I would mention also, as valuable on single points, the papers of J. Paech (Vratisl. 1861) and H. Stier (*Curt. Stud.* II) on the Subjunctive, B. Mangold on the 'diectasis' of Verbs in $-á\omega$ (*Curt. Stud.* VI), F. D. Allen on the same subject (*Trans. of the American Phil. Assoc.* 1873), Leskien on $\sigma\sigma$ in the Fut. and Aor. (*Curt. Stud.* II), and K. Koch on the Augment (Brunsvici 1868). On the subject of Nominal Composition I may name a paper by W. Clemm in *Curt. Stud.* VII, which gives references to the earlier literature of the subject, and one by F. Stolz (Klagenfurt 1874). On the forms of the Personal Pronouns there is a valuable dissertation by P. Cauer (*Curt. Stud.* VII): on the Numerals by Joh. Baunack (*K. Z.* XXV): on the Comparative and Superlative by Fr. Wehrich (*De Gradibus, &c.* Gissae 1869). Going on to the syntax of the Cases, I would place first the dissertation of B. Delbrück, *Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis, &c.* (Berlin 1867), and next the excellent work of Hübschmann, *Zur Casuslehre* (München 1875). On the Accusative I have obtained the greatest help from La Roche, *Der Accusativ im Homer* (Wien 1861): on the Dual from Bieber, *De Duali Numero* (Jena 1864). On the Prepositions I have used the papers of C. A. J. Hoffmann (Lüneburg 1857-60, Clausthal 1858-59), T. Mommsen (see § 221), Giseke, *Die allmälliche Entstehung der Gesänge der Ilias* (Göttingen 1853), La Roche, especially on $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}$ (Wien 1861) and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ (in the *Z. f. öst. Gymn.*), Rau on $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ (*Curt. Stud.* III), and the articles in Ebeling's *Lexicon*. On this part of syntax the fourth volume of Delbrück's *Forschungen* is especially instructive. Of the literature on the Infinitive I would mention J. Jolly's *Geschichte des Infinitivs im Indogermanischen* (München 1873), also a paper by Albrecht (*Curt. Stud.* IV), and a note in Max Müller's *Chips from a German Workshop* (IV. p. 49 ff.). The use of the Participle has been admirably treated by Classen, in his *Beobachtungen über den homerischen Sprachgebrauch*

(Frankfurt 1867). A paper by Jolly in the collection of *Sprachwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen* (Leipzig 1874) is also suggestive. On the subject of the Pronouns the chief source is a dissertation by E. Windisch in *Curt. Stud.* II. On the Article almost everything will be found in H. Foerstemann's *Bemerkungen über den Gebrauch des Artikels bei Homer* (Magdeburg 1861). The controversy on the Reflexive Pronoun is referred to in § 255. On the Homeric uses of the Moods, besides Delbrück's great work, I would mention Jolly's monograph entitled *Ein Kapitel vergleichender Syntax* (München 1872), and L. Lange's elaborate papers on *ει* (Leipzig 1872-73). It is to be regretted that they have not yet been carried to the point of forming a complete book on the Homeric use of *ει*. For the general theory of the subject Prof. Goodwin's *Greek Moods and Tenses* is of the very highest value. Regarding the cognate question of the uses of *ἄν* and *κεν* the main principles have been laid down by Delbrück. It is worth while to mention that they were clearly stated as long ago as 1832, in a paper in the *Philological Museum* (Vol. I. p. 96), written in opposition to the then reigning method of Hermann. For the other Particles little has been done by Homeric students since Nägelsbach and Hartung. I have cited three valuable papers; on *τε* by Wentzel, on *ἦ* (*ἦε*) by Praetorius, and on *μή* by A. R. Vierke. I would add here a paper on the syntax of Causal Sentences in Homer, by E. Pfudel (Liegnitz 1871). On all syntactical matters use has been made of the abundant stores of Kühner's *Ausführliche Grammatik*. And it is impossible to say too much of the guidance and inspiration (as I may almost call it) which I have derived from the *Digest of Platonic Idioms* left behind by the lamented friend to whose memory I have ventured to dedicate this book.

On the collateral subjects of Metre I have profited most by Hartel's *Homerische Studien*, La Roche, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig 1869), Knös, *De digammo Homericò* (Upsaliae 1872-79), and Tudeer, *De dialectorum Graecarum digammo* (Helsingforsiae 1879).

OXFORD, July 18, 1882.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE rapid progress of linguistic science during the nine years that have passed since this Grammar was first published has necessitated considerable alteration and enlargement in a new edition. Much has been discovered in the interval; much that was then new and speculative has been accepted on all sides; and much has been done in sifting and combining the results attained. The *Morphologischen Untersuchungen* of Osthoff and Brugmann have been followed by Brugmann's admirable summary of Greek grammar (in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*), and his comprehensive *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Of three portions of this work that have already appeared (Strassburg 1886-90-91), the last (treating chiefly of the Declensions) came too late to be of service to the present book. The part which deals with the Verb has not yet been published: and the volume on Comparative Syntax, promised by Delbrück—the first complete work on this part of the subject—is also still to come. It will doubtless be a worthy sequel to the *Altindische Syntax*, which now forms the fifth volume of his *Syntaktische Forschungen*. Among other books which have appeared since the publication of this Grammar, or which were not sufficiently made use of for the first edition, I would mention Joh. Schmidt's *Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra* (Weimar 1889), G. Meyer's *Griechische Grammatik* (second edition, Leipzig 1886), the new edition of Mr. Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses* (London 1889), the treatises in Schanz's series of *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*, Aug. Fick's two books (see Appendix F), articles by Wackernagel, Fröhde and others in *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* and *Bezzenger's Beiträge*, the long series of papers by Aug.

Nauck collected in the *Mélanges gréco-romains* (St. Petersburg 1855-88)—a book not often seen in this country,—and the dissertations of J. van Leeuwen in the *Mnemosyne*. The two writers last mentioned are chiefly concerned with the restoration of the Homeric text to its original or pre-historic form. Their method, which is philological rather than linguistic, may lead to some further results when the numerous MSS. of the Iliad have been examined and have furnished us with an adequate *apparatus criticus*.

Although very much has been re-written, the numbering of the sections has been retained, with a few exceptions; so that the references made to the first edition will generally still hold good. The new sections are distinguished by an asterisk.

I will not attempt to enumerate the points on which new matter has been added, or former views recalled or modified. The increase in the size of the book is largely due to the fuller treatment of the morphology. Additions bearing on questions of syntax will be found in §§ 238, 248, 267, 270*, 362, 365. On the whole I have become more sceptical about the theories which seek to explain the forms of the Subordinate Clause from parataxis, or the mere juxta-position of independent clauses. In general it may be admitted that the complex arose in the first instance by the amalgamation of simpler elements: but we must beware of leaving out of sight the effect of 'contamination' in extending syntactical types once created. The neglect of this consideration is in reality another and more insidious form of the error from which recent writers on morphology have delivered us, viz. that of explaining grammatical forms as the result of direct amalgamation of a stem with a suffix or ending, without duly allowing for the working of analogy.

OXFORD, *March* 21, 1891.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.



CHAPTER I. The Person-Endings.

	PAGE
§ 1. Sentences—Subject and Predicate	I
2. Stem and Endings	I
3. The Person-Endings	I
4. Thematic Vowel—Non-Thematic forms	2
5. Table of Person-Endings	2
6. Influence of the Ending on the Stem	6
7. The forms of the 3 Plural	8
8. Meaning of the Middle	9

CHAPTER II. The Tenses.

9. Verb-Stem—Tense-Stem	10
10. Formation of Tense-Stems	11
11. The Simple Non-Thematic Present	12
12. Variation of the Stem—Examples	12
13. The Simple Non-Thematic Aorist	14
14. Metathesis	15
15. Aorists in -ᾶ and -κᾶ	16
16. The Non-Thematic Reduplicated Present	17
17. The Presents with -νῆ (-ῥᾶ) and -νυ	18
18. Thematic forms	18
19. Non-Thematic Contracted Verbs—Presents	20
20. " " " Aorists	22
21. Meaning of Non-Thematic Tenses	22
22. The Perfect	22
23. Reduplication	26
24. The forms of the 3 Plural	27
25. Long and Short Stems	28
26. The Perfect Participle	28
27. Thematic forms	30
28. Meaning of the Perfect	31
29. The Simple Thematic Present	32
30. With Short Stem	33
31. The Thematic Aorist	34
32. Remarks	36
33. Doubtful forms	37
34. Thematic Aorists in Homer	38

	PAGE
35. The Reduplicated Thematic Present	39
36. The Reduplicated Aorist (Thematic)	39
37. Aorists in - $\bar{\alpha}$	40
38. Tense-Stems formed by a Suffix	40
39. The Aorist in - $\sigma\bar{\alpha}$	40
40. Aorists with Suffix - σ -	42
41. The Aorist in - $\sigma\epsilon$, - $\sigma\omicron$ (Thematic)	43
42. Passive Aorists—the Aor. in - $\eta\nu$	44
43. " " " $\theta\eta\nu$	44
44. Meaning of the Passive Aorists	44
45. Suffixes of the Present-Stem	45
46. T-Class (- $\tau\epsilon$, - $\tau\omicron$)	46
47. Nasal Class (- $\nu\epsilon$, - $\nu\omicron$, &c.)	46
48. Iterative Class (- $\sigma\kappa\epsilon$, - $\sigma\kappa\omicron$)	47
49. Iterative Tenses	47
50. I-Class (- $\iota\epsilon$, - $\iota\omicron$)	48
51. Verbs in - $\iota\omega$, &c.	48
52. Epenthesis	49
53. Assimilation of ι	49
54. Compensatory lengthening	50
55. Verbs in - $\alpha\omega$, - $\epsilon\omega$, - $\omicron\omega$ —Assimilation	50
56. Contraction	54
57. Synizesis	55
58. Meaning of Verbs of the I-Class	56
59. Desideratives	56
60. Frequentatives	56
61. Intensives	56
62. Collateral forms of the Present in Homer	56
63. The Future in - $\sigma\omega$	57
64. The Future in - $\sigma\epsilon\omega$	58
65. Futures from Perfect and Aorist Stems	59
66. Future Middle	59
67. The Augment (Historical Tenses)	60
68. The Pluperfect	61
69. Loss of Augment	62
70. Meaning of the Present and Aorist Stems	62
71. Present-Stem—Relative progress	63
72. Essentially progressive action	64
73. Past process (the Imperfect)	64
74. Descriptive Imperfect	64
75. Aorist-Stem	65
76. Aorist of the immediate past	65
77. Aorist Participle (coincidence)	66
78. Aorist of present time :	66
Aor. in Similes—gnomic Aor.	67

CHAPTER III. The Moods.

	PAGE
79. The Moods—Infinitive and Participle	67
80. The Subjunctive—Non-Thematic Tense-Stems	68
81. Contraction	69
82. Thematic Tense-Stems	70
83. The Optative	72
84. The Verbal Nouns	73
85. The Infinitive	74
86. The Participle	75

CHAPTER IV. Accentuation of the Verb.

87. General rule of accentuation of Verbs	75
88. Accent in Composition	76
89. The Infinitive and Participle	77

CHAPTER V. Nouns and Pronouns.

90. Nominal and Pronominal Stems	78
91. Declensions	78
92. The Vocative	79
93. The Case-Endings	79
94. Stems in -ι, -υ and -σ	80
95. Stems in -ᾱ	81
96. Cases—The Nominative Singular	81
97. The Accusative Singular	82
98. The Genitive Singular	83
99. The Dative Singular	83
99*. Plural	84
100. The Accusative Plural	84
101. The Genitive Plural	85
102. The Dative Plural	85
103. The Dual	86
104. The Instrumental in -φι(υ)	86
105. Contraction, Synizesis, Hyphaeresis	87
106. Variation of the Stem	88
107. Heteroclitite Nouns	90
108. Heteroclitite Pronouns	92
109. Adverbial Endings	93
110. Case-forms as Adverbs	94
111. Accentuation of Nouns	97
112. The Vocative	98

CHAPTER VI. Formation of Nouns.

113. Nominal Stems—Primary and Secondary	99
114. Primary Suffixes	100
114*. Variation of Suffixes	104
115. Accentuation	107
116. Gender	108

	PAGE
117. Secondary Suffixes	110
118. Compound Suffixes	111
118*. Suffixes of different periods	111
119. Gender	112
120. Denominative Verbs	113
121. Comparison of Adjectives	114
122. Meaning of Comparatives and Superlatives	116
123. Composition	116
124. Form of the Prefixed Stem	117
125. Form of the Second Stem	120
126. Meaning of Compounds	122
127. Stems compounded with Prepositions	123
128. Accentuation of Compounds	124
129. Proper Names	124
130. Numerals	125

CHAPTER VII. Use of the Cases.

131. Relation of Nouns and Pronouns to the Verb	127
132. The Accusative—Internal and External Object	128
133. Neuter Pronouns	129
134. Neuter Adjectives	129
135. Cognate Accusatives	129
136. Other Adverbial Accusatives	130
137. Accusative of the part affected	131
138. „ of Time and Space	132
139. „ with Nouns	132
140. „ of the External Object	133
141. Double Accusatives	134
142. The Dative	135
143. The 'true' Dative	135
144. The Instrumental Dative	137
145. The Locative Dative	139
146. The Genitive	140
147. The Genitive with Nouns	141
148. „ „ in the Predicate	142
149. „ „ of Place	143
150. „ „ of Time	143
151. The quasi-Partitive Genitive	144
152. The Ablative Genitive	147
153. The Genitive of Price	148
154. The Case-Ending $-\phi\iota(v)$	148
155. Instrumental	149
156. Ablative	149
157. Locative	150
158. Dative and Genitive	150
159. Forms in $-\theta\epsilon v$ and $-\omega s$ —The Ending $-\theta\epsilon v$	151
160. The Ending $-\omega s$	152

	PAGE
161. The Nominative—Impersonal Verbs	152
162. Nominative in the Predicate	153
163. Interjectional Nominative	155
164. The Vocative	155
165. Substantive and Adjective	156
166. Gender of Adjectives	157
167. „ Pronouns	158
168. Implied Predication	158

CHAPTER VIII. Use of the Numbers.

169. Collective Nouns	158
170. Distributive use of the Singular	159
171. Plural of Things	160
172. Neuter Plural with Singular Verb	160
173. The Dual	161

CHAPTER IX. The Prepositions.

174. Definition	163
175. Adverbial use of Prepositions	163
176. Tmesis	163
177. Ellipse of the Verb	164
178. Use with Oblique Cases	165
179. Use with the Genitive	166
180. Accentuation—'Anastrophe' of Prepositions	166
180*. Apocope	169
181. ἀμφί	170
182. ἀμφί with the Dative	171
183. „ „ Accusative	171
184. „ „ Genitive	172
185. περί	172
186. περί with the Dative	173
187. „ „ Accusative	174
188. „ „ Genitive	174
189. παρά	175
190. παρά with the Dative	175
191. „ „ Accusative	176
192. „ „ Genitive	176
193. μετά	177
194. μετά with the Dative	177
195. „ „ Accusative	178
196. „ „ Genitive	178
197. ἐπί	179
198. ἐπί with the Dative	179
199. „ „ Accusative	180
200. „ „ Genitive	181

	PAGE
201. <i>ὑπό</i>	181
202. <i>ὑπό</i> with the Dative	182
203. " " Accusative	182
204. " " Genitive	183
205. <i>πρὸς</i> (<i>πρός</i>), <i>πρὶ</i>	184
206. <i>πρὸς</i> with the Dative	184
207. " " Accusative	184
208. " " Genitive	184
209. <i>ἀνά</i> —with the Dat.—with the Gen.	185
210. <i>ἀνά</i> with the Accusative	185
211. <i>κατά</i>	186
212. <i>κατά</i> with the Accusative	186
213. " " Genitive	187
214. <i>διά</i>	187
215. <i>διά</i> with the Accusative	187
216. " " Genitive	188
217. <i>ὑπέρ</i>	188
218. <i>ὑπέρ</i> with the Accusative	188
219. " " Genitive	188
220. <i>ἐνί</i> (<i>ἐν</i>)	189
221. <i>σύν</i> , <i>ξύν</i>	189
222. <i>εἰς</i>	190
223. <i>ἐξ</i>	190
224. <i>ἀπό</i>	191
225. <i>πρό</i>	191
226. <i>ἀντί</i>	192
227. Double Prepositions	192
228. Improper Prepositions	193
229. Homeric and Attic uses	194

CHAPTER X. The Verbal Nouns.

230. Nature of the Verbal Nouns	195
231. The Infinitive—original meaning	196
232. Infinitive with Nouns	198
233. " with Impersonal Verbs	198
234. " as the Subject	199
235. " with Relatives	201
236. " with <i>πρὶν</i> and <i>πάρῃς</i>	201
237. Accusative with the Infinitive	201
238. Tenses of the Infinitive	203
239. Dative with the Infinitive	204
240. Predicative Nouns—Attraction	204
241. Infinitive used as an Imperative	206
242. Origin and History of the Infinitive	207

	PAGE
243. The Participle—uses	209
244. Tenses of the Participle	211
245. Implied Predication	212
246. The Genitive Absolute	212
246*. The Verbal Adjectives	214

CHAPTER XI. Use of Pronouns.

247. Subordinate Clauses—Deictic and Anaphoric Pronouns	215
248. Interrogative Pronouns	215
249. ὅδε, τοσόσδε, τοιόσδε, ᾧδε, ἐνθάδε	216
250. κείνος	217
251. οὗτος	217
252. αὐτός, αὐτως	218
253. The Reflexive Pronoun	219
254. The Possessive ἐός, ὅς	220
255. ἐός, ὅς as a general Reflexive	221
256. The Article	224
257. The Substantival Article	224
258. The Attributive „	226
259. With connecting Particles	227
260. With Adjectives	228
261. The defining Article	229
262. The Article as a Relative	231
263. The Article with τε	232
264. Homeric and Attic use of the Article	232
265. ὅς ἢ ὅ	234
266. ὅς τε, ὅς τις	235
267. Correlative Clauses	236
268. οὐνεκα	240
269. ὅ, ὅτι, ὅ τε	241
270. ὅ, ὅτι, ὅ τε as Conjunctions	244
270*. Indirect Discourse	245
271. Form of the Relative Clause	245
272. Double Relative Clauses	247

CHAPTER XII. Use of the Moods.

273. Classification of Sentences	248
274. The Subjunctive in Principal Clauses	251
275. Affirmative	251
276. Negative	253
277. Interrogative	253
278. Prohibitive	254
279. Homeric and Attic uses	255
280. The Subjunctive in Subordinate Clauses—Clauses with ἤέ—ἤε	255
281. Clauses with μή	256
282. Relative Clauses—Final	257
283. „ „ Conditional	258

	PAGE
284. Relational Adverbs	260
285. <i>ὡς, ὅπως</i>	260
286. <i>ἵνα</i>	261
287. <i>ὄφρα</i>	262
288. <i>ἕως, εἰς ὃ</i>	262
289. <i>ὅτε, ὁπότε</i>	263
290. <i>εὖτε, ἥμος</i>	265
291. Clauses with <i>εἰ</i> , &c.	265
292. Conditional Protasis	265
293. Final Clauses with <i>εἰ</i>	267
294. Object Clauses with <i>εἰ</i>	267
295. The Subjunctive with <i>ὡς εἰ</i>	268
296. <i>ἐπεὶ</i> with the Subj.	268
297. <i>πρὶν</i> „ „	269
298. The Subjunctive after Secondary Tenses	270
299. The Optative in Simple Sentences	271
300. With <i>κεν</i> or <i>ἄν</i>	273
301. The Optative in Subordinate Clauses	275
302. Clauses with <i>ἤέ—ἤε</i>	275
303. Clauses with <i>μή</i>	276
304. Relative Clauses—Final and Object	276
305. „ „ Conditional	278
306. Relational Adverbs— <i>ὡς, ὅπως, ἵνα</i>	279
307. <i>ἕως, ὄφρα</i>	281
308. <i>ὅτε, ὁπότε</i>	282
309. <i>ἐπεὶ</i>	283
310. <i>πρὶν</i>	283
311. <i>εἰ</i> —Conditional Protasis	284
312. <i>εἰ</i> —Optative of Wish	285
313. <i>εἰ κεν</i> —Conditional Protasis	285
314. <i>εἰ</i> —Final and Object Clauses	286
315. History of the Subjunctive and Optative—	
Uses in Independent Clauses	287
316. „ „ Subordinate Clauses	287
317. Original meaning	289
318. Conditional Protasis with <i>εἰ</i>	290
319. Final Clauses with <i>εἰ</i>	291
320. <i>εἰ δ' ἄγε</i>	291
321. Conclusion	292
322. Homeric and Attic Uses	293
323. The Indicative—Modal Uses	293
324. Conditional Apodosis	294
324*. Ellipse of the Apodosis	295
325. Past Tense by Assimilation	296
326. Future Indicative	296
327. The Imperative	298
328. Prohibition	299

CHAPTER XIII. The Particles.

	PAGE
329. Classification of the Particles	299
330. καί	300
331. τε	301
332. τε in <i>general</i> statement	301
333. δέ	304
334. δέ of the Apodosis	305
335. Enclitic δέ	307
336-7. ἀλλά, αὐτόρ, ἀτόρ, αὖ, αὖτε, ἔμπης	308
338. ἦ	308
339. τίη, ἐπειή	309
340. ἦέ, ἦ	310
341. Dependent Interrogative	311
342-5. μάν, μήν, μέν	312
346. τοι	315
347-8. ἄρα, γάρ	316
349-352. οὖν, δή, νν, θην	319
353. περ	320
354. γε	321
355. οὐ, μή—distinction of usage	322
356. οὐδέ, μηδέ, οὐδέίς	323
357. Double negatives	323
358. Uses of μή—Indicative	324
359. οὐ and μή in Conditional Clauses	325
360. οὐ with the Infinitive and Participle	326
361. μή " " " "	326
362. κεν and ἄν	327
363. Summary of uses—difference of ἄν and κεν	331
364. Original meaning of ἄν and κεν	334
365. Order of Particles and Enclitic Pronouns	335

CHAPTER XIV. Metre and Quantity.

366. The Hexameter	338
367. Diaeresis and Caesura	338
368. Spondaic verses	340
369. Quantity of Syllables	341
370. Position	342
371. Lengthening before ρ, λ, μ, ν, σ, δ	344
372. Origin of the lengthening	345
373. Final -ι of the Dat. Sing.	346
374. Final -α of the Neut. Plur.	347
375. Short Syllables ending in a Consonant	347
376. Elision, &c.	349
377. Crasis	350
378. Synizesis	351
378*. Contraction	351

	PAGE
379. Hiatus	355
380. Long vowels before Hiatus	355
381. Shortening of diphthongs before Hiatus	356
382. Hiatus after short syllables	357
383. Doubtful Syllables	357
384. Doubtful vowels	358
385. Doubling of consonants	360
386. Metrical licence	360
387. Vocatives	360
388. The Digamma	361
389. Nature of the evidence from metre	361
390. Words with initial <i>f</i>	363
391. Words with initial <i>σf</i> (<i>ʹf</i>)	370
392. <i>f</i> inferred from metre only	371
393. Loss of <i>f</i> , esp. before <i>o</i> , <i>ω</i>	372
394-5. Initial <i>δf</i> , <i>fβ</i> , &c.	374
396. <i>f</i> not initial	375
397. Loss of initial <i>σ</i> and <i>ξ</i>	376
398. Traces of <i>f</i> —Summary	376
399. Theories of the Digamma	376
400. Hypothesis of alternative forms	377
401. Explanation from fixed phrases, &c.	377
402. Hiatus, &c., as a survival	378
403. Explanation from the nature of the <i>f</i>	379
404-5. <i>f</i> in other Greek dialects—in Ionic	379
APPENDIX C. On <i>η</i> and <i>ε</i> in Homer	384
F. Fick's theory of the Homeric dialect	386
Other Notes and Corrections	396
INDEX I.—Homeric Forms	403
II.—Subjects	424
III.—Chief passages referred to	431

ERRATA.

Page 70, line 6, for <i>γνάς</i> read <i>γνῶς</i>
" 83, " 23, for <i>κρηέντος</i> read <i>κρυέντος</i>
" 93, " 30, for <i>θήρηθι</i> read <i>θύρηθι</i>
" 149, " 38, before 18. 305 insert II.
" 185, " 1, for II. read Od.
" 223, " 32, for <i>οἶος</i> read <i>οἶος</i>
" 245, " 36, for three read two, and dele 16. 131.,
" 259, " 12, for governing read governing
" 309, " 12, for 22. 280 read 16. 61
" 329, " 10, for <i>φίλην</i> read <i>φίλον</i>

HOMERIC GRAMMAR.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.—THE PERSON-ENDINGS.

1.] ALL language of which grammar takes cognisance consists of SENTENCES. The simplest complete Sentence expresses the combination of a SUBJECT—that about which we speak (or think); and a PREDICATE—that which we say (or think) about the Subject. On the sentences which are (apparently or really) without a Subject, see §§ 161, 163.

2.] In Greek (and generally in languages whose structure resembles that of Greek) every Verb is a complete Sentence, consisting of two parts, the *Stem*, which expresses the Predicate, and the *Ending*, which expresses the Subject. Thus $\xi\sigma\text{-}\tau\iota$ *he* (or *it*) *is*, $\phi\alpha\text{-}\theta\iota$ *say thou*, $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$ *we came*, are Sentences; the several Predicates are expressed by the Stems $\xi\sigma\text{-}$, $\phi\alpha\text{-}$, $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\text{-}$, and the Subjects by the Endings $\text{-}\tau\iota$, $\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$. As the Endings of a Verb may always be translated by Personal Pronouns they are called the *Person-Endings*.

It may happen that the ending has been lost by phonetic corruption, as in $\xi\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon$ (for $\xi\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\text{-}\tau$) *he took*. This however does not form a real exception, because in Greek such words are used exactly as if the lost ending were still sounded. In English it is different: *took* can only be used to express a Predicate. The original Subject is lost to the mind as well as to the ear.

It should be noticed that the term 'Verb' is used in Grammars with a double meaning, sometimes of a single form—as when we say that $\epsilon\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omicron\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$ is 'a Verb'—sometimes collectively, as when we say that $\epsilon\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omicron\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$ is a 'part' of 'the Verb $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omega$.' Here 'a Verb' means a group of forms, derived from a common root.

3.] There are three main sets of Person-Endings:—

1. Those used in the Tenses called 'Principal' (the Present, Perfect, and Future Indicative), and in the Subjunctive; these are called the *Primary Endings*.

2. Those used in the 'Historical Tenses' (the Imperfect, Aorist, and Pluperfect), and in the Optative; these are called the *Secondary Endings*.

3. The Endings of the Imperative.

4.] The further modifications which the Endings undergo depend chiefly upon the final letter of the Stem.

In certain forms the Ending is preceded by **Ο** or **Ε**: that is to say, **Ο** before the nasals **μ**, **ν**, and **Ε** before other letters; e.g. *τύπτΟ-μεν*, *τύπτΕ-τε*, *τύπτΟ-ντι* (older and Dor. form of *τύπτουσι*). We shall call this the *Thematic Vowel*,* and the Stems which contain it *Thematic Stems*. The term will naturally include the corresponding Subjunctives, in which the final letter of the Stem varies in the same way between **η** and **ω**, as *τύπτω-μεν*, *τύπτῃ-τε*, &c. and the 1 Sing. in **-ω**. These long vowels doubtless represent a primitive contraction of the Thematic vowel with some other element: but the exact process can hardly be determined.

The forms which do not contain this variable **ε** or **ο** are called *Non-Thematic*. Among these, again, we have to distinguish a group of Tenses with Stems ending in **-ᾶ**, viz. the Perfect, the First Aorist, and some forms peculiar to the Ionic Dialect, as the Plpf. (e.g. *ἤδεα I knew*), the Impf. *ἦα I was*, *ἦια I went*.† In these Stems the **-ᾶ** changes in the 3 Sing. to **-ε(ν)**.†

The distinction between Thematic and Non-Thematic applies in strictness only to *forms*, but may generally be extended to Tenses and Moods. Thus the Pres. and Impf. of *τύπτω* are Thematic, the same Tenses of *φημί* are Non-Thematic. In every Verb the Future is Thematic, the Optative is Non-Thematic, &c. But the distinction does not apply to 'Verbs' (in the collective sense of the term), because almost every Verb is made up of forms of both kinds.

5.] In the following Table of the Person-Endings found in Homer the Endings distinguished by larger type are those of the Non-Thematic Tenses. The Endings in smaller type are, first, those of the forms with **-ᾶ**, and, under them again, those of the Thematic forms. In the Dual and Plural (except the 3 Plur.) the Endings are the same throughout.

* This vowel has also been termed the 'Connecting' or 'Auxiliary' Vowel—names given on the supposition that it is originally euphonic, inserted in order to allow the Stem and the Ending to be distinctly heard in pronunciation. The name 'Thematic' implies a different theory, viz. that it serves to form a 'Theme' from a simpler element or 'Root,' as *λεγ-ε* from the Root *λεγ-*; see Curt. *Chron.* p. 40. On this theory the Stem *λεγ-ε*, *λεγ-ο* is originally the same as the Theme or Stem of the Noun *λόγος*. See the remarks of Brugmann, *Grundriss*, ii. § 8, n. 1.

In the former edition the **-ω** of the 1 Sing. was explained as **-ο-μ** (Sanscr. *-ā-mi*). It is now generally thought that **-ω** and **-μ** are originally distinct, and represent respectively the Thematic and Non-Thematic Endings of the primitive Indo-European Verb. If so, the Sanscrit *-āmi* has extended from the Non-Thematic to the Thematic conjugation; and similarly the **-ομαι** of Greek *φέρομαι* (Sanscr. *bhāre*). See Meyer, *G. G.* p. 404.

† The **ᾶ** of these Stems is of course quite different from the final vowel of the Stem in such forms as *φα-μέν*, *ἴστα-μαι*, *τέτλα-θι*, where it is part of the Verb-Stem or 'Root.'

Remarks on the Table of Person-Endings.

1 Sing. On the Subj. in *-ω-μι* see § 82, and on the Optatives which take *-μι* in the 1 Sing. see § 83.

2 Sing. The original *-σι* remains only in *ἔσ-σί* *thou art*.

The form *εἶς* (or enclitic *εἶς*) is read in nine places, but there is only one (Od. 17. 388) in which the metre does not allow *ἔσσ'* to be read instead. Probably, therefore, *ἔσσί* is the genuine Homeric form. The Attic *εἶ* is not found in Homer.

The Ending *-σθα* occurs in the Pf. *οἶσθα* *thou knowest* (*οἶδας* in Od. 1. 337, is a very doubtful reading), Plpf. *ἤδησθα* (Od. 19. 93), the Impf. *ἦσθα* and *ἔησθα* *thou wast*, *ἔφησθα* *thou saidst*, and the Pres. *εἶσθα* *thou wilt go*, *τίθησθα* (Od. 9. 404., 24. 476), *διδόσθα* (Il. 19. 270), perhaps *φήσθα* (Od. 14. 149): also in some Subjunctives, *ἐθέλησθα*, *εἴπησθα*, *βουλεύησθα* (Il. 9. 99), *ἦρησθα* (Il. 10. 67); and in the Optatives *βάλουσθα* (Il. 15. 571), *κλαίουσθα* (Il. 24. 619), and *προφύγοισθα* (Od. 22. 325).

The history of this *-σθα* can still be traced. Originally *-θα* (Sanser. *-tha*) was the Ending of the 2 Sing. Pf. Ind.: hence *οἶσθα* for *οἶδ-θα* (Sanser. *vettha* for *ved-tha*), and *ἦσ-θα* (Sanser. *āsitha*) properly Pf. from the root *ἔσ-*. Having in these cases appeared accidentally as an ending *-σθα*, it was transferred in this form to other Tenses and Moods.*

The forms *ἦσθας*, *οἶσθας* which appear in some MSS are due to the common 2 Sing. in *-ās*. Aristarchus rejected them in Homer.

In the Middle the *σ* of *-σαι*, *-σο* when it follows a vowel is generally lost: so always in the Secondary Tenses, as *ἐμάρνα-ο*, *δαίνυ-ο*, *ἔσσυ-ο*, *ἐείσα-ο*, contracted *ἐκρέμω* (Il. 15. 18), *ἐπεφράσω* (Il. 21. 410), *ἐκτήσω* (Od. 24. 193)—for which, however, the metre allows us to write *ἐκρέμα'*, &c.—and the Opt. *-οι-ο*. In the Pres. and Pf. Indic. and the Imper. the usage is not uniform: *δύνα-σαι* (Il. 1. 393), *ὄνο-σαι* (Od. 17. 378), *παρ-ίστα-σαι* (Il. 10. 279., Od. 17. 450), *ὑπο-δάμνα-σαι* (Od. 16. 95), *δαίνυ-σαι* (Od. 21. 290), *μέμνη-σαι* (Il. 23. 648), Imper. *ἴστα-σο* (seven times), *ὄνη-σο* (Od. 19. 68), *κέι-σο* (Il. 21. 122): but *μέμνη-αι* (Il. 21. 442), *μέμνη* (Il. 15. 18, where we may read *μέμνη'*), *βέβληαι* (three places in the Iliad), *δίζη-αι* (Od. 11. 100), Imper. *θέ-ο* (Od. 10. 333), *φά-ο* (Od. 18. 171), *μάρνα-ο* (Il. 15. 475), *παρ-ίστα-ο* (Il. 10. 291, according to Aristarchus, *παρ-ίστα-σο* MSS.).

The loss of *σ* was in accordance with Greek phonetic law, and originally universal; but new forms in *-σαι*, *-σο* were produced on the analogy of forms such as *λέξο* (for *λεχ-σο*), *ἦσο* (for *ἦσ-σο*), *πέπυσσαι* (for *πεπυθ-σαι*), *τέτυξο*, &c., in which the *σ* is preserved by the preceding consonant.

Verbs in *-εω*, which would properly form *-εεαι*, *-εεο*, sometimes

* On this point recent writers have gone back to the explanation given by Bopp, *Vergl. Gr.* II. pp. 292, 498.

suffer *Hyphaeresis* (cp. § 105, 4), and drop one ϵ ; as $\mu\theta\epsilon\alpha\iota$ (Od. 2. 202), $\alpha\pi\omicron\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\omicron$, $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\omicron$. But we find also $\mu\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\iota\alpha\iota$ (Od. 8. 180), $\nu\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\iota\alpha\iota$ (Od. 11. 114., 12. 141)—where it is possible to substitute the uncontracted $\mu\theta\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\alpha\iota$, $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\alpha\iota$ —and $\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\omicron$ (Il. 24. 503).

In the Imper. the Ending $-\theta\iota$ is common in Non-Thematic Tenses: $\acute{\iota}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\kappa\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\upsilon\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\xi\sigma\tau\alpha\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\delta\rho\upsilon\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\text{-}\theta\iota$ (Il. 18. 198), $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\text{-}\theta\iota$ (Od. 3. 380), $\epsilon\mu\pi\acute{\iota}\pi\lambda\eta\text{-}\theta\iota$ (Il. 23. 311). We find $-\varsigma$ in $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\varsigma$, $\delta\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$, $\pi\rho\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$ ($\pi\rho\omicron\text{-}\acute{\iota}\eta\mu\iota$), and the thematic $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\iota}\text{-}\sigma\pi\epsilon\text{-}\varsigma$ *Th. p. 73.*
tell (cp. Attic $\sigma\chi\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\varsigma$).

In the forms $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta$ (Il. 21. 313), $\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\upsilon$ (Il. 9. 70), $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\kappa\upsilon$ (Hes. Th. 526), the long final vowel probably comes by analogy from the Pres. and Impf. Singular forms (by the 'proportion' Impf. $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\text{-}\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$; Imper. $\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon$:: $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$, $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta$: $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta$). For the forms $\kappa\alpha\theta\text{-}\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha$, $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\iota$, $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon$, &c., see § 18.

3 Sing. The original $-\tau\iota$ remains only in $\xi\sigma\text{-}\tau\iota(\upsilon)$, in which the phonetic change of $-\tau\iota$ to $-\sigma\iota$ is prevented by the preceding σ .

On the Subjunctives in $-\eta\text{-}\sigma\iota$ see § 82.

3 Plur. The Ending $-\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ (for $-\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota$) is found in $\xi\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ (for $^*\xi\sigma\text{-}\alpha\sigma\iota$) *they are* and $\acute{\iota}\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ *they go*. *Th. p. 65*

Stems in α , ϵ , \omicron , υ form $-\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$, $-\epsilon\sigma\iota$, $-\omicron\sigma\iota$, $-\upsilon\sigma\iota$ (for $-\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota$, &c.), as $\phi\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}$, $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$, $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota$, $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$, $\zeta\epsilon\gamma\upsilon\gamma\upsilon\sigma\iota$ (not $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\alpha\sigma\iota$, &c., as in Attic). On the accent of these forms, see § 87, 2.

The Perfect Act. has $-\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ and $-\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$. The latter occurs only twice in Homer, $\pi\epsilon\phi\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ (Od. 7. 114), $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\chi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\omega$ (Od. 11. 304); for other examples in Ionic see Curt. *Verb.* ii. 166. In these forms the $\acute{\alpha}$ belongs to the Ending, since $-\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ is for $-\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota$, which corresponds to the $-\nu\tau\iota$ of the Doric $\phi\alpha\text{-}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$, $\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\text{-}\nu\tau\iota$ (as $-\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota$ in the Mid. to $-\nu\tau\alpha\iota$). The forms with $-\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ belong to two essentially distinct groups; see § 7.

The secondary $-\acute{\alpha}\omega$ (for $-\alpha\upsilon\tau$) is found in all Aorists which form the 1 Sing. in $-\acute{\alpha}$. It may also be traced in the Impf. of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\iota}$, in the form $\acute{\eta}\nu$ (Hes. Th. 321, 825), for $\acute{\eta}\alpha\upsilon$ (Sanscr. *ásan*). *^-\acute{\alpha}\omega*

Non-Thematic $-\nu$ occurs in the forms $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\nu$, $\phi\theta\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\upsilon\text{-}\nu$ (Il. 11. 263), $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\upsilon\text{-}\nu$ (Od. 10. 397), $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\nu$, Impf. $\acute{\iota}\epsilon\text{-}\nu$ (in $\xi\upsilon\text{-}\nu\text{-}\acute{\iota}\epsilon\upsilon$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\text{-}\acute{\iota}\epsilon\upsilon$), $\pi\rho\acute{o}\text{-}\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\text{-}\nu$ (read by Aristarchus in Od. 1. 112), $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\text{-}\nu$ (H. Cer. 327), and many Passive Aorists, as $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\alpha\text{-}\beta\epsilon\text{-}\nu$, $\delta\acute{\iota}\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\tau\mu\alpha\gamma\epsilon\text{-}\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\text{-}\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\text{-}\nu$, $\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\text{-}\nu$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\text{-}\nu$, $\acute{\eta}\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\epsilon\text{-}\nu$, $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\eta\theta\epsilon\text{-}\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\text{-}\nu$. On the form $\mu\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\eta\upsilon$ (Il. 4. 146) see § 40. In these tenses $-\nu$ is commoner in Homer than $-\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu$. But $-\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is the only Ending found in the two Imperfects $\acute{\eta}\text{-}\sigma\alpha\upsilon$ and $\acute{\eta}\acute{\iota}\text{-}\sigma\alpha\upsilon$, $\acute{\iota}\text{-}\sigma\alpha\upsilon$, and in the Pluperfect: see § 68. *^-\acute{\alpha}\omega*

In the Middle, the forms $-\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota$, $-\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron$ are regular after consonants and the vowel ι (including the diphthongs $\epsilon\iota$, η , $\omicron\iota$, &c.); the forms $-\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, $-\nu\tau\omicron$ after $\acute{\alpha}$, ϵ , \omicron . After υ , η both forms are found: e.g. $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\upsilon\text{-}\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\upsilon\text{-}\alpha\tau\omicron$, but $\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\text{-}\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\kappa}\acute{\epsilon}\chi\upsilon\text{-}\nu\tau\alpha\iota$; $\beta\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\eta}\text{-}\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ (Il. 11. 656), but $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\eta\upsilon\eta\text{-}\nu\tau\omicron$, $\xi\upsilon\mu\beta\lambda\eta\text{-}\nu\tau\omicron$; even $\acute{\eta}\nu\tau\omicron$ (Il. 3. 153) as well as $\acute{\eta}\text{-}\alpha\tau\omicron$ (for $^*\acute{\eta}\sigma\text{-}\alpha\tau\omicron$). *A344/and: μακ*

The Imper. Endings *-τωσαν*, *-σθωσαν* are post-Homeric.

1 Dual. *-μεθον* occurs only once, in *περιδώμεθον*, Il. 23. 485. Elmsley (on Ar. Ach. 733) maintained that this form was a fiction of the grammarians. It is defended by G. Curtius (*Verb. I.* 97 f.), and there seems no valid reason for rejecting it.

2 and 3 Dual. In the Historical Tenses, according to the ancient grammarians, the regular Endings are—

2 Dual Act. *-τον*, Mid. *-σθον*.

3 „ „ *-την*, „ *-σθην*.

This scheme, however, is open to some doubt; for—

(1) Homer has three instances of the 3 Dual Impf. in *-τον*, where the metre does not admit of *-την*, viz. *διώκε-τον* (Il. 10. 363), *ἐτεύχε-τον* (Il. 13. 346), *λαφύσσετον* (Il. 18. 583). Three others in *-σθον* occur as various readings, where the metre admits of either *-σθον* or *-σθην*, viz. *ἀφίκε-σθον*, read by some ancient critics (probably Zenodotus) in Il. 13. 613; *θωρήσσε-σθον*, the reading of A. (the Cod. Venetus) and Eust. in Il. 16. 218; *πέτε-σθον*, a marginal variant of A. in Il. 23. 506.

(2) Three forms of the 2 Dual in *-την* were read in the text of Zenodotus, viz. *καμέ-την* (Il. 8. 448), *λαβέ-την* (Il. 10. 545), *ἠθέλε-την* (Il. 11. 782). Aristarchus read *κάμε-τον*, *λάβε-τον*, *ἠθέλε-τον*. The metre gives no help to a decision.

(3) In Attic the examples of the 2 Dual in *-την*, *-σθην* are so common that Elmsley (on Ar. Ach. 733) held these to be the only correct forms, thus making the Dual of Historical Tenses uniformly end in *-ην*, as the Dual of the Principal Tenses ends in *-ον*. Cobet maintains the same view (*Misc. Crit. pp.* 279 ff.). But the account of the Greek grammarians is strikingly borne out by the forms of the Sanscrit Dual. In Sanscrit we find that in the Historical Tenses the 2 Dual ends in *-tam*, 3 Dual in *-tām*, answering perfectly to the Greek *-τον*, *-την*. This therefore is to be regarded as the original rule. The exceptions which have been quoted are evidently due to the tendency towards uniformity: and it is to be noticed that this tendency seems to have acted in Homer in the direction of making all Duals end in *-τον*, *-σθον*, whereas in Attic the tendency was to extend the Endings *-την*, *-σθην* to the Second Person.

The Imper. Ending *-των* is found in *ἔστων* (Il. 1. 338) and *κομείτων* (Il. 8. 109). As to *ἔστων* in Od. 1. 273, where it is usually taken as a Plural, see § 173.

Variation of the Stem.

6.] In Thematic Stems it is plain that the Ending influences only the final ε(ο), leaving the rest of the Stem unaffected. Non-Thematic forms, on the other hand, are liable to variations in *quantity* which affect the main vowel of the Stem. These variations are governed by the general rule that *when there are two forms of a Stem the longer is found with the Endings of the*

Sing. Indic. Act., the shorter with all other Endings, viz. those of the Dual and Plural, the Imperative, and the Middle. Thus:—

(1) *ǎ, ε, ο interchange with the corresponding long vowels ā (in Ionic η), η, ω; as φη-μί, ἔ-φη-ν, but 1 Plur. φᾶ-μέν, Imper. φᾶ-θεί, Mid. ἔ-φα-το; τίθη-μι, Mid. τίθε-μαι; δίδω-μι, Mid. δίδο-μαι.*

(2) *ι with ει and οι: as εἶ-μι, 1 Plur. ἴ-μεν, Imper. ἴ-θι; οἶδα, 1 Plur. ἴδ-μεν.*

(3) *ῡ with ευ and ū: as ἔ-χευα, Mid. χύ-το (§ 15); δείκνυ-μι, 1 Plur. δείκνυ-μεν. Sometimes with ου, as εἰλήλουθα, stem ἔλυθ-.*

Note however that all vowels are liable to be shortened before the combination ντ, as in the 3 Plur. ἔσταν (but ἔστη-μεν), &c., and the Participle, σταντ-ος, γνόντ-ος. Also before ι of the Optative, σταίνην, γνοίην.

The same law governs the interchange of—

(4) *ǎ with εν and ον: as γέγονα (γένος), 1 Plur. γέγα-μεν; πέποιθα (πένθ-ος), Part. Fem. πεπᾶθ-υῖα.**

(5) *ǎρ with ερ and ορ: as ἔφθορα, Mid. ἔφθαρ-ται (Pres. φθείρω for φθερ-ω); and, with Metathesis (ρα for αρ, &c.), τέτροφε, Mid. τέθραπ-ται (τρέφ-ω).**

The combinations ᾶρ(ρᾶ) and ᾶλ(λᾶ) represent the primitive 'liquid vowels,' *γ* and *λ*. They appear in place of the consonantal ρ and λ when these are phonetically impossible: e. g. ἔφθαρται is for ἔ-φθρ-ται,—the ερ of the root φθερ- passing into αρ where Sanser. ar would pass into γ.

Similarly, ᾶ represents the 'nasal vowels' *ḡ* and *ḡ̃*: thus πᾶθ- is for πνθ-. Before another vowel εμ, εν sometimes pass into ᾶμ, ᾶν, as in ἔκτανον for ἔ-κτν-ον (root κτεν-), in the same way that u and i before a vowel may appear as uv, iy.

Sometimes the longer Stem contains an additional consonant, viz. in the Perfects and Aorists in -κα, as ἔστηκα, 1 Plur. ἔστᾶ-μεν; ἔθηκα, 1 Plur. ἔθε-μεν.

These are the principal variations which can be exemplified within the limits of a single Tense. When we compare one Tense with another, we observe further the interchange of—

(6) *Stems with the vowel ε or ο and Stems in which the vowel is lost; as ἔχ-ω (for *σέχ-ω), ἔ-σχ-ον; πέτ-εσθαι, Aor. πτ-έσθαι (cp. ποτ-άομαι).*

This definition will cover the reduction of ερ, ελ, εμ, εν to ρ, λ, μ, ν (instead of ᾶρ, ᾶλ, ᾶ); as in ἔργε-το (έγερ- in έγείρω), ἔ-πλ-ετο (πέλ-ω), ἔ-τε-τμ-ον (τέμ-

* Similarly, ᾶλ(λᾶ) with ελ and ολ: but it is difficult to find examples in Greek. The form πῖ-πλά-μεν perhaps answers to an original Sing. *πί-πελ-μυ (cp. Sanser. *piparmi*, Pl. *pipi-mas*, Brugmann, *M. U. I.* p. 44), and the form τέ-τλά-μεν to *τέ-τολ-α (Lat. *tetuli*).

νω), ἔ-πε-φν-ον (φεν-, cp. φόν-ος). Thus we have an apparent interchange of two short Stems, as φν- in ἔπε-φν-ον with φᾶ- in πέ-φᾶ-ται, &c.

When loss of ε would make the word unpronounceable, it is sometimes retained in the short form, as in ἔ-τεκ-ον, τεκ-εῖν (Stems τεκ-, τoκ-).

Again, there are in general two longer forms of each Stem, one marked by the predominance of the sounds ε, η, the other by that of ο, ω. The chief interchanges which are due to this cause are—

(7) ε and ο, including the combinations ει, ευ, ερ, ελ, εμ, εν and οι, ου, ορ, ολ, ομ, ον. It is needless to give further examples.

(8) ᾶ (Ionic η) and ω: ἔ-πτη *flew*, πτήσσω *cower*, and πέ-πτω-κα; cp. φη-μι and φω-νή, ὀδ-ηγός and ἄγ-ωγ-ή.

(9) η and ω: ῥήγ-νυμι and ἔρ-ρωγα; cp. ἄρῃγω and ἄρωγ-ός, ἦθος and εἴωθα.

(10) In a certain number of Stems the only variation is between ω and ο: δι-δω-μι (δο-), ὄδ-ωδα, ὄλ-ωλα.

The Endings which are found with the long Stem have been called the *Light*, the others the *Heavy* Endings.

The short form of the Stem is usually called the *Weak* Stem. Of the longer forms that which contains the vowel ο (οι, ου, ον, ορ, ολ) may be distinguished as the *O-form*: the other will be simply called the *Strong* form.

The different variations may be represented in a tabular form:—

Strong	ᾶ(η)	η	ω	ει	ευ	ερ(ρε)	ελ	εμ	εν	ε
O-form	ω	ω	ω	οι	ου	ορ(ρο)	ολ	ομ	ον	ο
Weak	ᾶ	ε	ο	ι	υ	ρ	λ	μ	ν	νιῖ
						ᾶρ(ρᾶ)	ᾶλ			

7.] The 3 Plur. offers some exceptions to the general rule:—

(1) The Ending -ᾶσι (for -ᾶτι, -NTI) is used with the long Stem of the Pf., as λελόγγ-ᾶσι, πεφύκ-ᾶσι. Cp. Mid. τετεύχ-ᾶται, ἐ-τετεύχ-ᾶτο (§ 22, 5).

(2) The long Stem is also found in a few forms of the Pf. with the Ending -ᾶσι, as πεποιθᾶσι, ἐστήκᾶσι (§ 24), and of the Aor. in -α, as ἔχεναν, ἔθηκαν, ἔδωκαν (§ 15).

(3) The Endings -(σ)ᾶσι, -σαν (for -ΣΑΝΤΙ, -ΣΑΝΤ) are found with the weak Stem. The leading examples are:—

With Simple Stems: ἔ-σαν, ἔ-φα-σαν, ἔ-θε-σαν, ἔ-δο-σαν, &c.

Presents: τιθέ-ασι, διδό-ασι (Att.); ἔ-τίθει-σαν, ἔ-δίδο-σαν, &c.

Perfects: ἴσασι (ιδ-σασι), ἴσαν; εἴξασι (Att. 3 Plur. of ἔοικα).

βεβά-ασι, γεγά-ᾶσι, μεμά-ᾶσι; Plpf. βέβα-σαν, μέμα-σαν.

ἔστᾶσι (for ἔστά-ασι), τεθνᾶσι; ἔστα-σαν, τέθνα-σαν.

πεφύ-ασι, δεδί-ασι; δεἰδι-σαν.

The hiatus shows that -ᾶσι is for -σᾶσι, the Primary Ending

answering to -σάν. The corresponding Mid. -σάται is found in Doric (γεγράφαι, *Tab. Heracl.* i. 121, in *C. I.* 5774).

The contraction in ἐστάσι, τεθνάσι is evidently due to the impossibility of ἐστά-ασι, τεθνά-ασι in the hexameter. Brugmann regards them as wrongly accented, and would write ἔστασι, τέθνασι, *i. e.* ἔστα-ντι, τέθνα-ντι (*Curt. Stud.* ix. 296). This is open to the objection (1) that it separates them from βεβά-ασι, γεγά-ασι, μεμά-ασι; and (2) that in all other Stems which form a Pf. or Aor. in -κα the Endings -ντι and -ν are confined in Homer to the forms with -κ: thus we find—

πεφύκ-ασι	and	πεφύ-ασι,	but not	πέφουσι
ἐστήκασι, &c.	„	βεβά-ασι,	„	βέβασι
(οἶδασι Hdt.)	„	ἴσασι	„	ἴδ-ασι
ἔθηκα-ν	„	ἔθε-σαν	„	ἔθε-ν
ἔδωκα-ν	„	ἔδο-σαν	„	ἔδο-ν (Hesiod).

The weak form with -ντι, -ν is therefore confined to Verb-Stems ending in a vowel, as in φασί, τιθείσι (for φαντί, τίθε-ντι). And in these the short vowel is due to the (original) following -NT, as in ἔ-σταν, ἤγερθεν, ἀλό-ντες, &c.

For a plausible hypothesis as to the origin of the Ending -σαν see § 40. Regarding -(σ)ᾶσι (*i. e.* the Ending -ᾶσι preceded by hiatus) no satisfactory view has been put forward.

Meaning of the Middle.

8.] The original force of the Middle Person-Endings is ‘ reflexive; ’ that is to say, they denote that the action of the Verb is directed towards the agent.

Greek has no Passive Endings distinct from those of the Active and Middle: it is desirable therefore to speak, not of Passive forms, but of the Passive meaning or use of a form.

The chief uses of the Middle are —

(1) The use to signify that the agent is also the *indirect object* of the action—that the action is done by some one *for* or *toward* himself, or in his own interest: ἐννυ-μαι *I put* (clothes, &c.) *on myself*; δέχο-μαι *I take to myself*; ἄρ δὲξ' ἐρυσσάμενος *having drawn him his sharp sword*; ἤρειτο τόξον *took his bow with him*; φερέσθω *let him bear away (as his prize)*.

(2) The use in which the agent is the direct object of the action, as λούο-μαι *I wash myself*. This is comparatively rare.

(3) The Intransitive use, in which the reflexive sense is faint, as φαίνε-ται *appears* (but φαίνει ἑαυτόν *he shows himself*). So, generally, when the action centres in the agent; as in Verbs of *bodily action* (ἐρχομαι, πέτομαι, ἄλλομαι, οἴχομαι, &c.), and in such uses as λαβέσθαι *to gain a hold* (not *to take a thing*), δεδραγμένους *clutching*; ἐχέυατο *threw her arms*; also in Verbs of *feeling* and *thinking* (αἰσθάνομαι, αἰδέομαι, βούλομαι, οἶομαι, μέμνημαι, ἐπίσταμαι, μέλομαι, μέμφομαι, &c.). So in French, ‘ je m’aperçois ’ *I perceive*, ‘ je me doute ’ *I suspect*, ‘ il se peut ’ *it may be*.

(4) The Reciprocal use; ἀμειβόμενος *taking his turn*; λέγεσθαι *to tell over* (in talk); ἀρέσκεσθαι *to make friends with*; ἑνσσομένων (Il. 14. 26) *as they pierced each other*; ἐρείδουσθον (Il. 23. 735) *push each other, strive*. Hence the Middle form of μάχομαι, Fr. *se battre* and its equivalents, ἀγωνίζομαι, ἀμιλλάομαι, δικάζομαι.

(5) The Passive use, as ἔχε-ται *is possessed*, ἐβλη-το *was struck*, δέδε-το *was bound*, ἐκ-πέπο-ται *is drunk up*. This is not a very common use of the Middle. It may be illustrated from the similar use of some Reflexive Verbs in French, as 'je me trouve' *I am found*, 'il se mange' *it is eaten*.

The Middle is rather more common in Homer than in later Greek. For example, in the class of Verbs of *feeling* and *thinking* we may add the Homeric ἔραμαι, γάννυμαι, ἔλδομαι, ἔλπομαι, ὄθομαι, ὄνομαι, στένομαι, κεχάροντο, ὀδύσασθαι. And the use is extended to Verbs of *seeing* and *hearing*, as ὀρῶ-μαι (Aor. ἰδέ-σθαι), ἀκού-μαι (used as well as ὀρῶ, ἰδεῖν, ἀκούω), δέρκομαι, ὄσσομαι, σκέπτομαι, φράζομαι; cp. the Attic σκοποῦ-μαι *I consider*.

Conversely, Homer has the Act. ὄτω *I think, expect*, as well as the Mid. ὄτο-μαι *I harbour the thought, suspect* (cp. the distinction in French between *je doute* and *je me doute*).

Sometimes (esp. in Homer) the Middle appears to be used because the Verb implies acting *arbitrarily, as a superior, &c.*; e.g. βιάζομαι *I use force towards*, σίνομαι, δηλέομαι, &c. *I do mischief for pleasure*; ἐφίλατο *made a favourite of*; δίε-νται *run in a race*, δίεσθαι *to chase* (but δίων *I fled*); δειδίσσεσθαι *to terrify*; κέκλετο *shouted in command*.*

A use intermediate between the Reflexive and the Passive (pointed out by Riddell, *Dig.* § 88) may be exemplified in ἀπήχθετο *got himself hated, incurred hatred*, κτείνονται (Il. 13. 110) *let themselves be slain*, λείπεσθε (Il. 23. 409) *get left behind*: cp. Il. 13. 525., 15. 645, Od. 3. 284.

On the Futures only used in the Mid., see § 66.

CHAPTER II.

THE TENSES.

¶.] **Verb-Stem and Tense-Stem.** A comparison of the different forms of a Greek VERB usually enables us to see that some one syllable or group of syllables is present in them all: as **τυπ-** in the forms of **τύπτω**, or **βουλευ-** in those of **βουλεύω**.

* Cp. Icelandic 'heita' *I promise*, 'heita?' *I threaten*.

This we shall call the *Verb-Stem*. A Verb-Stem not derived from more primitive elements is called a *Root*.

Again, the different forms belonging to any one TENSE are based upon a common part, which we shall call the *Tense-Stem*. This part may be the same as the Verb-Stem; or it may contain an additional element, as δι- in δι-δο-μεν, δι-δο-λη-ν, &c.; -τε, -το in τύπ-τε-τε, τύπ-το-μεν, ξ-τυπ-το-ν, τύπ-το-ι-μι, &c.

The Subjunctive and Optative, again, are distinguished by a Suffix to the Tense-Stem: e.g. δο-λη-ν, διδο-λη-ν, τύπτο-ι-μι, στήσα-ι-μι. The new Stems so formed may be called *Mood-Stems*.

Finally, the Stems used in the 'Historical' Tenses—the Impf., Aor., and Plpf.—are formed from the Tense-Stem by prefixing the *Augment*.

The Stems of the augmented forms are therefore parallel to the Mood-Stems, the only difference being that they are formed by a prefix, while the Mood-Stems are formed by a suffix. They may be described as Time-Moods of the several Tenses,—combining the notion of Past Time, which is expressed by the Augment, with the meaning contained in the Tense-Stem.

Each Tense-Stem furnishes an *Infinitive* and a *Participle*.

Thus we have (supplying one or two links by analogy) from the three Tense-Stems βαλλε (or -ο), βαλε (or -ο), βεβληκα.

	PRES.	AOR.	PERF.
Principal Tense	βάλλε-τε	wanting	βεβλήκα-τε.
Historical	ἐ-βάλλε-τε	ἐ-βάλε-τε	ἐ-βεβλήκα-α.
Subjunctive	βάλλη-τε	βάλη-τε	βεβλήκη-τε.
Optative	βάλλο-ι-τε	βάλο-ι-τε	βεβλήκο-ι-τε.
Imperative	βάλλε-τε	βάλε-τε	βεβλήκα-τε.
Infinitive	βαλλέ-μεναι	βαλέ-ειν	βεβληκ-έναι.
Participle	βάλλο-ντος	βαλό-ντος	βεβληκ-ότος.

It is evident that there might have been a Future 'Time-Mood' as well as a Past for each Tense-Stem. In English indeed we can distinguish progressive action in the future as well as in the present and past: *I shall be writing* as well as *I am writing* and *I was writing*. See Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses*, § 65; Driver's *Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, § 4. Modern Greek has two such Futures, θὰ γράφω *I will be writing* and θὰ γράψω *I will write*, related to each other as ξγραφον and ξγραψα.

10.] **Formation of Tense-Stems.** Leaving out of sight the meanings of the several Tenses, and looking to the mode of their formation, we may distinguish the following groups:—

(1) With the Verb-Stem serving as Tense-Stem—

The Simple Non-Thematic Present, as φη-μί.

The Simple Non-Thematic Aorist, as ἔ-βην.

The Aorist in -ᾶ, as ἔ-χευ-α.

- (2) With Tense-Stem enlarged from Verb-Stem—
 The Non-Thematic Reduplicated Present, as *τί-θη-μι*.
 The Present in *-νη-μι* and *-νῦ-μι*, as *σκίδ-νη-μι*, *δείκ-νῦ-μι*.
 The Perfect.
- (3) With the Thematic Vowel—
 The ordinary Thematic Present, as *λέγω*.
 The Present with short Stem, as *ἄγω*.
 The Simple Thematic Aorist, as *ἔ-λαῖβ-ο-ν*.
- (4) With Reduplication (Thematic)—
 The Thematic Reduplicated Present, as *γί-γν-ο-μαι*.
 The Thematic Reduplicated Aorist, as *ῆγ-ἄγ-ο-ν*.
- (5) With other Suffixes (Non-Thematic)—
 The Aorist in *-σᾶ*, and in *-σε*, *-σο*.
 The Aorist in *-η-ν* (Aor. II Pass.).
 The Aorist in *-θη-ν* (Aor. I Pass.).
- (6) With other Suffixes (Thematic)—
 The Present in *-τω* (T-Class of Curtius).
 The Present in *-νω* (Nasal Class).
 The Present in *-σκω*, and the Iterative forms.
 The Present in *-ιω* (I-Class).
 The Future in *-σω*, *-(σ)ω*.

The Non-Thematic Present and Aorist.

11.] **The Simple Non-Thematic Present.** The chief Presents in which the Tense-Stem is the same as the Verb-Stem are—

εἰ-μί (for *ἔσ-μί*) *I am*, *εἶ-μι* *I go*, *φη-μί* *I say*, *ἦ* *he said*, *κεῖ-ται* *lies*, *ἦσ-ται* *sits* (3 Plur. *εἶ-αται*, properly *ἦ-αται*, for **ἦσ-αται*), *ἐπί-στα-μαι* *I know*, *ἄγα-μαι* *I wonder*, *ἔρα-μαι* *I love*, *δύνα-μαι* *I am able*, *ἐ-κρέμω* (for *ἐ-κρέμα-ο*) *didst hang*, *δέα-το* *seemed*, *δίε-νται* *race* (*ἐν-δίε-σαν* *tried to scare*), *ὄνο-σαι* *dost blame* (*ὄνα-το* II. 17. 25), *ἄη-τον* *blow*, *κιχή-την* *caught*, *ἔρῦ-το* *protected*, *στεῦ-ται* *is ready*, *threatens*, *ἔδ-μεναι* *to eat*: also *ἔετο* *desired* (*ἔμενος* *eager*), if it is to be separated from *ἦμι* and referred to *φίεμαι*, Sanser. *vī* (see § 397). For *ἔληθι* see § 16.

On the Non-Thematic forms of Contracted Verbs (such as *φορή-μενος*), see § 19.

12.] **Variation of the Stem** according to the 'weight' of the ending is carried out consistently in *φη-μί* and *εἶ-μι*. Thus—

Pres. *φη-μί*, *φή-s*, *φή-σί*, Plur. *φᾶ-μέν*, *φᾶ-τέ*, *φασί*.

Impf. *ἔ-φη-ν*, *ἔ-φη-s* and *ἔ-φη-σθα*, *ἔ-φη*, 1 Plur. *φᾶ-μεν* (for *ἔ-φᾶμεν*), 3 Plur. *ἔ-φᾶ-σαν* and *ἔφαν*, Part. *φάς*.

Mid. 2 Plur. *φά-σθε*, Impf. *ἐ-φά-μην*, *ἔ-φᾶ-το*, Imper. *φά-ο*,
φά-σθω, Inf. *φά-σθαι*, Part. *φά-μενος*.

And similarly—

Pres. *εἶ-μι*, *εἶ-σθα*, *εἶ-σι*, 3 Du. *ἴ-τον*, Plur. *ἴ-μεν*, *ἴ-τε*, *ἴασι*.

Impf. 3 Du. *ἴ-την*, 3 Plur. *ἴσαν*, Imper. *ἴ-θι*, *ἴ-τω*, *ἴ-τε*, Inf.
ἴ-μεναι (once *ἴ*), and *λέναι*.

The 1 Sing. *ἦἰα* does not represent the original form of the Impf., which would be *ἦα* (for *ἦἰα*, Sanser. *áyam*). Hence *ἦἰα* with the 3 Sing. *ἦει* and 3 Plur. *ἦἰσαν*, *ἦσαν* must be formed like *ἦδεα* and other Pluperfects in *-εα* (§ 68, 2); the *ε* of the original *ἦεα*, *ἦεσαν* being changed to *ι* under the influence of *ἴ-μεν*, &c. (Wackernagel, *K. Z.* xxv. 266). For *-σαν* see § 40.

The forms *ἦἰον* (1 Sing. and 3 Plur.), *ἴεν*, Part. *ἰών*, are evidently produced by confusion with the Thematic conjugation (§ 30, cp. also § 18).

The Verb *εἰμί* *I am* is inflected as follows:—

	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Dual.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Pres.	1. <i>εἰμί</i>	—	<i>εἰμέν</i> (for <i>ἔσ-μέν</i>)
	2. <i>ἔσ-σί</i> , <i>εἷς</i> (§ 5)	<i>ἔσ-τόν</i>	<i>ἔσ-τέ</i>
	3. <i>ἔσ-τι(ν)</i>	<i>ἔσ-τόν</i>	<i>εἰσί</i> (Dor. <i>ἐντί</i>), <i>ἔ-ασι</i> .
Impf.	1. <i>ἦα</i> , <i>ἔα</i> (Th. <i>ἔον</i>)	—	<i>ἦμεν</i>
	2. <i>ἦσθα</i> , <i>ἔησθα</i>	—	<i>ἦτε</i>
	3. <i>ἦεν</i> , <i>ἦν</i> , <i>ἔην</i> , <i>ἦην</i> (Dor. <i>ἦς</i>)	<i>ἦσ-την</i>	<i>ἦσαν</i> , <i>ἔσαν</i> , <i>ἦν</i> (Hes.).

Imper. *ἔσ-τω*, *ἔσ-τε*, *ἔσ-των*; Inf. *ἔμμεναι*, *ἔμεναι*, *ἔμεν*, *εἶναι*; Imper. Mid. *ἔσ-σο* (Od. i. 302).

The root *ἔσ-* is not reduced before Heavy Endings, as in the corresponding Sanser. forms (Dual *s-vas*, *s-thas*, *s-tas*, Plur. *s-mas*, *-tha*, *s-anti*, Opt. *syám*), and the Lat. *sumus*, *sunt*, *sím*. The loss of *σ* in *εἰμί*, *εἰμέν*, *ἦμεν* (for *ἔσ-μί*, &c.) is according to Greek phonetic law: the Attic *ἔσ-μέν* is a new formation, due to the analogy of *ἔσ-τι*, *ἔσ-τέ*, &c. On the other hand *ἦτε* (Il. 16. 557) follows *ἦμεν*; the older *ἦσ-τε* survives in Attic. The *σ* of *ἦσαν* belongs to the ending *-σαν* (§ 40), not to the root.

In the Impf. it is probable that we have an admixture of forms from the original Perfect: thus *ἦσ-θα* (Sanser. *ásitha*) is Pf., *ἦα*, for **ἦσα*, is both Pf. (Sanser. *ása*) and Impf. (Sanser. *ásam*), *ἦεν* may be Pf. (Sanser. *ása*) or thematic Impf. (answering to the Homeric 1 Sing. *ἔον*); the original 3 Sing. Impf. survives in the Dor. *ἦς* (Vedic *ás*). Again, the 2 Sing. *ἔησθα* and 3 Sing. *ἔην*, *ἦην* seem to require a stem (*ἔ*)*ση-*, found also in Lat. *e-rām* (Brugmann, *M. U.* i. p. 35). The *-ν* of the 3 Sing. is unexplained: it does not appear to be the *ν* *ἐφελκυστικόν*, for we find no form **ἦε* alongside of *ἦεν*.

Note that the 1 Sing. *ἦν* is not found in Homer.

The Homeric forms of *εἰμί* were discussed some years ago by L. Meyer (*K. Z.* ix. pp. 385, 423). He maintained that the Homeric 3 Sing. Impf. was *ἦεν* or (without augment) *ἔεν*: the forms *ἦν*, *ἔην* and *ἦην* being due to

corruption or misreading. The facts certainly give much countenance to this view, which has been adopted by Curtius (*Stud.* i. 2, 292) and Nauck. It can hardly be accidental that out of 54 places in which $\eta\nu$ occurs in the *thesis* or second half of the foot, there are 50 in which it is followed by a vowel, as—

Il. 2. 77 Νέστωρ ὅς ῥα Πύλοιο ἀναξ ἦν ἡμαθύντος.

Od. 17. 208 ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' αἰγείρων ὕδατοσφρέων ἦν ἄλσος.

Moreover, out of 72 instances of $\epsilon\eta\nu$ there are 63 in which it is followed by a consonant (including *F*). On the other hand, in 26 places $\eta\nu$ occurs in the first half of the foot, and in 2 places it ends the line (in the phrase οὐδ' ἄρα πως ἦν); and it is not easy to correct many of these so as to admit $\eta\epsilon\nu$ or $\xi\epsilon\nu$. Again, $\eta\nu$ and $\epsilon\eta\nu$ have some support in the 2 Sing. forms $\eta\sigma\theta\alpha$, $\epsilon\eta\sigma\theta\alpha$. (For $\epsilon\eta\sigma\theta\alpha$ Curtius proposed $\xi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$, but there is no good reason for this.) And $\epsilon\eta\nu$ is found on an Ionic inscription of the 5th century (Röhl, no. 382). On the whole it seems that the argument for $\xi\epsilon\nu$ is stronger than the argument against $\eta\nu$ and $\epsilon\eta\nu$. Perhaps we must recognise two Stems, giving four forms: a Stem $\epsilon\sigma-$, whence $\eta\epsilon\nu$, without augment $\xi\epsilon\nu$, and a Stem $(\epsilon)\sigma\eta-$ (Lat. *e-rām*), whence $\epsilon\eta\nu$, without augment $\eta\eta\nu$. The rare $\eta\eta\nu$ occurs followed by a vowel (so that we cannot read $\eta\epsilon\nu$) in 3 places only, viz. Od. 19. 283 (al. $\epsilon\eta\nu$, $\eta\epsilon\nu$), 23. 316., 24. 343. It may be due to mere 'contamination' of $\eta\epsilon\nu$ and $\epsilon\eta\nu$. But no theory can be accepted as satisfactory that does not account for the fixed *-v* of all these forms.

The α of $\epsilon\alpha$ is treated as long in 3 places, Il. 4. 321., 5. 887., Od. 14. 352. In Od. 14. 222 τοῖος ϵ' ἐν πολέμῳ it is elided; but perhaps the $\epsilon\nu$ may be omitted.

The vowel remains long before Heavy Endings in the Stems—

ἀη-, 3 Du. ἀη-τον, Inf. ἀή-μεναι, Mid. ἀη-το, Part. ἀή-μενος,

κιχη-, 3 Du. Impf. κιχή-την, 1 Plur. ἐ-κίχη-μεν, Inf. κιχή-μεναι, Part. κιχή-μενος,

except that it is shortened before *-ντ* and *-ι* (§ 6), as in the Part. *ἀέντες blowing*, 3 Plur. *ἀεῖσι* (for *ἄε-ντι*, in Hes. Th. 875), and the Opt. *κιχε-ίη may find*. The vowel is also long in *ἔρῦ-το protected*, Inf. *ῥῦ-σθαι*; and in all forms of *κεῖμαι, ἦμαι, στεύμαι. ἦεπνῦμενος*

A similar Non-thematic inflexion, in which the final vowel of the Stem is long except before *-ντ* and *-ι*, appears in the Æolic conjugation of verbs in *-μι*, as *γέλαι-μι I laugh, αἶνον-μι I praise* (Hes. Op. 681), *φίλη-μι I love* (1 Plur. *φίλη-μεν*, 3 Plur. *φίλεισι*, Part. *φιλῆ-μενος*), *σάω-μι I save*. See § 19.

13.] **The Simple Non-Thematic Aorist.** This term includes the 'Second Aorists,' such as ξ -βη-ν ξ -στη-ν &c., and also those so-called First Aorists in which the *-α* of the 1 Sing. Active is added directly to the Verb-stem, as in ξ -χε-α.

Variation of quantity is rare in the Active, but the Stem is usually shortened in the Middle. The chief forms are:— ξ -βη-ν *I went*, 3 Du. $\beta\acute{\alpha}$ -την (but also ξ -βήτην), 3 Plur. υ πέρ-βᾶ-σαν, Imper. $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ -βηθι, Inf. $\beta\acute{\eta}$ -μεναι: ξ -στη-ν *I stood*, Du. $\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}$ -την, Plur. ξ -στη-μεν, ξ -στη-τε, ξ -στη-σαν, Imper. $\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}$ -θι, $\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}$ -τε, Inf. $\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}$ -μεναι; ξ -φθη *came before*, Part. $\phi\theta\acute{\alpha}$ -μενος: $\xi\zeta$ -έ-πτη *flew out*

(Hes. Op. 98), 3 Du. κατα-πτῆ-την ⁰¹³⁶ covered, Mid. ἔ-πτα-το flew: ἔ-σβη was quenched; ἔ-τλη-ν I endured, Plur. ἔ-τλη-μεν, ἔ-τλη-τε, Imper. τλή-τω, τλή-τε; ἔ-γνω-ν I knew, 3 Du. γνώ-την, 3 Plur. ἔ-γνω-σαν; ἐπ-έ-πλω-ς ¹⁶ didst sail over, Part. ἐπι-πλώς; βιώ-τω let him live, Inf. βιώ-ναι; ἀλῶ-ναι to be taken, Part. ἀλούς: ἔ-φθι-το perished; κτί-μενος built; ἔ-δῦ sank under, 3 Du. ἐ-δύ-την, 2 Plur. ἔ-δῦ-τε, Imper. δῦ-θι, Inf. δῦ-μεναι; ἔ-φῦ grew, 3 Plur. ἔ-φῦ-σαν (H. Ven. 265): λύ-το was loosed (once λῦ-το, Il. 24. 1). κλυ-θι hear, Plur. κλυ-τε (Part. κλυ-μενος as a Proper Name in Homer). On the forms ἔσσυ-το, ἔ-χῦ-το see § 15.

The vowel is invariably long in ξυμ-βλή-την the two encountered, Mid. βλή-το was struck; πλή-το was filled; πλή-το came near; ἀπ-όνη-το profited, Imper. ὄνη-σο, Part. ὀνή-μενος; ἄμ-πῦ-το recovered breath; ἔ-στρω-το was strewed: see § 14.

On the other hand the vowel is short throughout in κατ-έ-κτᾶ-ν (Il. 4. 319, where some ancient critics read κατέκτᾶ), 3 Sing. ἔ-κτᾶ (the quantity is proved by Od. 11. 410 ἔκτα σὺν οὐλομένη κ. τ. λ.), 1 Plur. ἔ-κτᾶ-μεν, Part. κατα-κτάς, Mid. ἔ-κτᾶ-το, Inf. κτά-σθαι, Part. κτά-μενος. The longer form of the root is κτεν- (Pres. κτείνω for κτεν-ιω). A similarly irregular 3 Sing. in -ᾶ is found in οὔτα he wounded, Inf. οὔτᾶ-μεναι, Part. Mid. οὔτᾶ-μενος: perhaps also in ἀπ-ηύρα-ς, ἀπ-ηύρα. For, comparing the Part. ἀπο-ύρας, Mid. ἀπο-υρά-μενος (Hes. Sc. 173), we may conjecture that the Indic. should be written ἀπ-εῦρα-ς, ἀπ-εῦρα (or ἀπ-έ-φρᾶ-ς, ἀπ-έ-φρᾶ), where φρᾶ- is the weak form of a root φερ- (Meyer, G. G. § 524). We have -ᾶ for -εν also in ἀπ-έ-φα-το died (Hesych.), from the root φεν- (Pf. πέφᾶ-ται).

On the Non-Thematic Aorists with Stems ending in a consonant, such as ἄλτο, ἔ-παλτο, ὦρτο, δέκτο, λέκτο, μίκτο, &c., with the Inf. πέρθαι and the Participles ἄρμενος, ἴκμενος, ἄσμενος, see § 40.

14.] **Metathesis.** This term has been employed to explain a number of forms in which a short vowel is lost before a liquid, and the corresponding long vowel follows the two consonants thus brought together: as ξυμ-βλή-την met, Mid. βλή-το was struck (βᾶλ-, βέλ-ος), ἔ-τλη endured (τάλα-ς), πλή-το drew near (πέλα-ς), πλή-το was filled (Sanscr. par-), ἔ-στρω-το was scattered (στορε-), κλη-τός called (καλ-έω, κέλ-ομαι), κασί-γνη-τος kinsman (γεν-), μέμνη-μαι (μεν-), δμη-τός tamed (δᾶμᾶ-), &c. But this long vowel—*ā*, *η*, or *ω*—is clearly of the same nature as the *η* of σχή-σω (σεχ-), ἐνι-σπή-σω (σεπ-), πε-πτη-ώς (πετ-, πῖ-πτ-ω), ἄημι (root *av* in *aūra*), or the *ω* of πέ-πτω-κα (πετ-), ἔ-γνω-ν (root *gan*), ζω-ός (root *gi*, hence Greek ζη- and ζω-, for γη-η, γη-ω). In these and many similar cases 'metathesis' is out of the question. Moreover we find several Stems of the same character with the long vowel *ū*,

as ῥῶ-σθαι to shield (*Fρῶ-*), ῥῶ-τός drawn (*Fερῶ-, Fρῶ-*), τρῶ-ω (cp. τρ-η-, root *tar*). Hence it is probable that the long vowel is of the nature of a suffix, by which a new verbal stem is formed from the primitive stem or 'root.' This vowel usually does not vary with the Person-endings, but is long in all forms of the Tense. It cannot be an accident, however, that the same Stems appear also as disyllables with a *short* final vowel: τᾶλ-ᾶ, πελ-ᾶ, στωρ-ε, καλ-ε (in καλέ-σαι), γεν-ε (in γένε-σις), δᾶμ-ᾶ, πετ-ᾶ, *Fερ-ῶ* in ἐρύ-σαι, and many others. What then is the relation between these forms and the monosyllabic τλ-η, πλ-η, στρ-ω, κλ-η, γν-η, δμ-η, πτ-η? Apparently the difference is ultimately one of accent. The same disyllable would become τάλ-α or τλ-ή as the stress fell upon the first or the second syllable*.

15.] **Aorists in -ᾶ and -κᾶ.** These consist of (1) four Aorists from stems ending in -υ, (2) three Aorists in -κᾶ, and (3) the isolated forms ἦνεια and εἶπα.

The four Aorists ἔσσευ-α (weak stem σῦ-) *I urged*, ἔ-χευ-α or ἔ-χε-α *I poured*, ἔ-κη-α (weak stem κᾶυ-) *I burned*, ἠλεύ-ατο avoided (Opt. ἀλέ-αιτο, Inf. ἀλέ-ασθαι) form the 1 Sing. with -ᾶ instead of -υ. Thus ἔ-χευ-α is formed like ἔ-φη-υ, except that, after the diphthong *ευ* the final -*m* of the ending passed into -ᾶ, as in the Impf. ἦα (for ἦσ-α). So too in the Accusative of Nouns we have -υ after a single vowel (λόγο-υ, πόλι-υ, ἰχθύ-υ), but -ᾶ after ηυ, ευ or a consonant: νῆ-α (for νῆυ-α or νῆF-α), πόδ-α, as in Latin *nāv-em, ped-em*. The forms without υ, as ἔχεα, ἔκηα, are obtained by υ passing into the semi-vowel (ἔχε-α for ἔχεFα).

The original inflexion then was ἔ-χευ-α (ἔ-χεF-α), ἔ-χευ-ς, ἔ-χευ(-τ), Plur. ἔ-χῦ-μεν, ἔ-χυ-τε (cp. ἔ-κτᾶ-μεν, § 13), ἔ-χευ-αν, Mid. ἔ-χῦ-το (like ἔ-φᾶ-το, ἔ-κτᾶ-το), &c. Thus ἔχυτο and ἔσσυτο are primitive forms, standing to ἔχεα, ἔσσευα as ἔ-φᾶ-το to ἔ-φη-υ.

How then are we to account for such forms as ἔ-χεύα-μεν, ἔ-χεύα-το, σεύά-μενος, ἠλεύα-το? They are obtained from the 1 Sing. and 3 Plur. by treating the stem *plus* the -ᾶ as a new stem or base, to which the Person-endings are then attached. Thus ἔ-χευα-ς, ἔ-χεύα-μεν, ἔ-χεύα-το are duplicate forms, related to ἔ-χευ-ς, ἔ-χῦ-μεν, ἔ-χυ-το as the later οἶδα-ς, οἶδᾶ-μεν to οἶσθα,

* Joh. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxiii. 277; Brugmann, *M. U.* i. 1-63; Fröhde, *B. B.* ix. 119. The whole subject, as Brugmann has recently warned us (*Grundriss*, ii. § 8, n. 1), is full of uncertainty, and it is possible that forms such as *pelē-* represent the 'root' or primitive word, from which not only *plē-* (πλη-, Lat. *plē-nus*) and *pele-*, but also *pel-* (Sanser. *pi-par-ti*) and *pl-* (πί-πλᾶ-μεν), are derived. We are dealing here, not with the derivation of Greek, &c. from Indo-European,—where the comparison of other languages, such as Sanserit, may give us help,—but with the formation of Indo-European itself, to which the comparative method is *ex hypothesi* inapplicable.

ἴδ-μεν. The 3 Sing. in -ε(ν), follows the analogy of the Thematic conjugation (ἔχενε like ἔλεγε).

The three Aorists in -κα, ἔ-θηκα *I put*, ἔ-ηκα *I sent forth*, ἔ-δωκα *I gave*, are inflected as follows:—

1 Sing. ἔ-θηκα		1 Plur. ἔ-θε-μεν
2 „ ἔ-θηκα-ς	2 Du. ἔ-θε-του	2 „ ἔ-θε-τε
3 „ ἔ-θηκε(ν)	3 „ ἔ-θέ-την	3 „ { ἔ-θε-σαν ἔ-θηκα-ν.

Imper. θέ-ς, θέ-τω, Plur. θέ-τε, θέ-ντων.

Inf. θέ-μεναι, θέ-μεν, θεῖναι, Part. θεῖς, θέ-ντος, &c.

Mid. ἔ-θέ-μην &c. with θε- as stem throughout.

Thus *θηκα-*, *ἦκα-*, *δωκα-* alternate with *θε-*, *έ-*, *δο-* as long and short Stems respectively. The only forms in Homer which do not conform to this scheme are the 1 Plur. ἐν-ἦκα-μεν (Od. 12. 401), and the 3 Sing. Mid. θήκα-το (Il. 10. 31, 14. 187, also Hes. Th. 175). The primitive 3 Plur. ἔ-δο-ν occurs in Hes. Th. 30, and in Doric: ἔ-θε-ν only on inscriptions (*C. I.* 29).

The Homeric forms with the stem *έ-* do not take the augment: in Attic we have (e. g.) εἶ-μεν εἶ-τε (for ἐ-έ-μεν ἐ-έ-τε).

In respect of the -ᾶ of the Stem the 2 Sing. ἔ-θηκα-ς is formed like ἔ-χενα-ς, and the occasional examples of the type ἐ-θήκα-μεν, ἐ-θήκα-το are parallel to ἐ-χεύα-μεν, ἐ-χεύα-το. That is to say, the -ᾶ comes from ἔ-θηκα, ἔ-θηκα-ν. The relation of ἐ-θήκα-μεν, ἐ-θήκα-το to ἔ-θε-μεν, ἔ-θε-το, is complicated by the use of a new Verb-Stem (*θηκ-* instead of *θη-*). Thus it is the same as the relation of ἐστήκα-μεν to ἔστᾶ-μεν (§ 22).

The Aorist ἦνεια (without augment ἔνεια) shows no variation of stem; 1 Plur. ἐνείκα-μεν, 3 Plur. ἦνεια-ν and ἔνεια-ν, Imper. ἐνείκα-τε, Mid. 3 Plur. ἠνείκα-ντο.

On the Aorist εἶπα see § 37.

16.] **The Non-Thematic Reduplicated Present.** These Presents are formed by Reduplication, usually of the initial consonant with *ι*; τίθη-σι *puts*, δίδω-μι *I give*, ἵη-σι (for σίση-σι?) *sends*, ἰσῆσι (σι-σῆ-) *they set*, πιμπλάσι *they fill* (the *μ* is euphonic: it is dropped after *μ* in ἐμ-πίπλη-θι), δίδη *bound*, βιβᾶ-ς *striding*; with Attic Reduplication, δνίνη-σι (for δν-ονη-) *benefits*: perhaps also ἵλη-θι *be appeased* (ἵλα-μαι *I propitiate*, Hom. H. xxi. 5: Stem ἵλα for σι-σῆ, Meyer, *G. G.* p. 437).

In these Present Stems the quantity of the vowel in the Stem regularly varies under the rules laid down in § 6 (1).

The vowel is long in ἐμ-πίπλη-θι (Il. 21. 311), ἵλη-θι, δίδω-θι (Od. 3. 380)*, and the Inf. τιθή-μεναι (Il. 23. 83, 247) and Part.

* The variation is perhaps less regular in the Imper.; cp. κλύ-θι. In Sanser. the 3 Sing. Imper. has the strong Stem.

τιθή-μενος (Il. 10. 34). Also in δίζη-μαι *I seek* (for *δι-διη-), the Homeric Verb answering to Attic ζη-τέω.

ΐημι is now generally connected with Lat. *sero* (for *si-so*, cp. ἴστημι *sisto*). Earlier scholars (as Bopp) derived it from the root *yā* (Lat. *ja-c-io*). Possibly it represents both σί-σημι (*sā-*) and ἰ-ημι (*yā-*). In meaning it is much nearer to *jacio* than to *sero*.

17.] Present Stems in -νῆ (-νᾶ) and -νυ. The Tense-Stems of this class—which may be called the Non-Thematic Nasal class—form the Present-Stem from the Verb-Stem by the Suffixes -νῆ, -νῦ (which with Heavy Endings regularly become -νᾶ, -νῦ).

The Presents with -νῆ (-νᾶ) are nearly all peculiar to Homer, δάμ-νῆ-μι *I subdue*, κίρ-νῆ *mixed*, πέρ-να-ς *selling*, σκιδ-να-ται *is scattered*, πιλ-να-ται *comes near*, μάρ-να-ται *fights*. Note τ for ε in κίρ-, σκιδ-, πιλ-; cp. the later Verbs πίτ-νω, κτίν-νυμι.

A few Presents with -νυ are common to all periods of Greek, δείκ-νυ-μι *I show*, ὄμ-νυ-μι *I swear*, ζεύγ-νυ-μι *I join*, ὄλλυμι (for ὄλ-νυ-μι) *I destroy*; but they are mainly Homeric or poetical; ὄρ-νῦ-θι *arouse*, δαί-νῦ *feasted*, ἄγ-νυ-τον *break*, στορ-νῦσα *spreading*, ἀπ-ομόργ-νῦ *wiped away*, ἐέργ-νῦ *shut in*, ῥηγ-νῦσι *they break*, γά-νυ-ται *is gladdened*, τά-νυ-ται *is stretched*, ἦ-νυ-το *was finished*, κί-νυ-ντο *were moved*, τί-νυ-νται *punish*, αἰ-νυ-ται *takes*, ἐ-καί-νυ-το *surpassed*, ἀρ-νῦ-σθην *won*, ἄχ-νυ-μαι *I am vexed*, ὠέγ-νυ-ντο *were opened*, ἐννυτο (for ἐσ-νυ-το) *put on*, ζώννυ-το (for ζωσ-νυ-) *girded himself*, ὄρεγ-νῦ-ς *stretching out*, σβεννυ-μενῶν (Hes. Op. 590).

In the Verbs in -νῆμι the Verb-Stem is nearly always disyllabic: cp. δαμά-σαι (παν-δαμά-τωρ, &c.), κερά-σαι, πετά-σαι, περά-σαι, σκεδά-σαι, πέλα-ς. So in some Verbs in -νῦμι; cp. ὄμό-σαι, ὄλί-σαι, στορέ-σαι. Thus we may regard δαμ-α and δαμ-νῆ, ὄμ-ο and ὄμ-νῦ, &c., as twin forms obtained by the addition of a different suffix to the same original root δαμ-, ὄμ-, &c. (§ 14). It is to be observed also that Presents in -νῆμι are often found along with forms in -αζω and -αω: δάμ-νῆμι, Attic δαμ-άζω; κίρ-νῆμι, κερ-άω; πέρ-νῆμι, περ-άω; σκιδ-νῆμι, σκεδ-άω; πιλ-νῆμι, πελ-άζω. Cp. κάμ-νω, κάμα-τος (§ 47).

The Verb-Stem, it will be seen, has most commonly its weak form (note especially τᾶ-νυ-ται, Pf. τέ-τᾶ-ται), sometimes the strong form, as in δείκ-νυ-μι, ζεύγ-νυ-μι, ῥήγ-νυ-μι.

The forms in -αννυμι and -εννυμι are post-Homeric.

18.] Thematic forms. Some forms of Non-Thematic Tenses follow the conjugation of the corresponding Contracted Verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω (§ 56); especially in the Impf. Indic. and the Imperative. Thus we find:—

ἐδάμνα (as if from *δαμνάω), ἐκίρνα (Od. 7. 182, &c.), πίτνα: Imper. καθ-ίστα (Il. 9. 202).

ἐτίθει, ἴει (ἀφ-ίει, προ-ίει, &c.), ἄει (v. l. ἄη) *blew*, κίχεις: Imper. τίθει, ἴει (ξυν-ίει).

ἐδίδους, ἐδίδου : Imper. δίδου (Od. 3. 58).

Examples occur also in the Pres. Indic.; δαμνᾶ (3 Sing. Act.) in Od. 11. 221 (with v. l. δάμνατ'); δαμνᾶ (2 Sing. Mid.) in Il. 14. 199 (with v. l. δάμνα, for δάμνα-αι); ἀν-ιεῖς (Il. 5. 880), μεθ-ιεῖς (Il. 6. 523, Od. 4. 372), μεθ-ιεῖ (Il. 10. 121), τιθεῖ (Il. 13. 732), παρ-τιθεῖ (Od. 1. 192), for which the MSS. usually have ἀνίεῖς, &c. : διδοῖς (Il. 9. 164), διδοῖ (Il. 9. 519, Od. 4. 237). So for προῖεῖ in Il. 2. 752 we should read προιεῖ.

Add the Part. βιβῶντα (Il. 3. 22, cp. 13. 807., 16. 609), Fem. βιβῶσα (Od. 11. 539); for which Bekk. writes βιβάντα, βιβᾶσα.

Editors differ in their manner of dealing with these forms. Bekker in his second edition (1858) restored the 2 Sing. Pres. τίθης, ἴης, δίδως, and Impf. ἐτίθη, ἴη, ἐδίδω, but left the 3 Sing. τιθεῖ, διδοῖ and Imper. τίθει, ἴει, δίδου. Nauck proposes to restore καθίστη (Imper.) and the Impf. ἐδάμνη, πίτηη, ἐκίρηη. In the case of τίθημι, ἴημι, δίδωμι the weight of authority seems to be for the spelling which follows the Thematic conjugation, viz. -εῖς, -οῖς in the 2 Sing. Pres., and -εις, -ει, -ους, -ου in the Impf. (Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* p. 281, is extremely positive on this side). But Verbs which have η in the Dual and Plural (ἀη-τον, κίχη-την) should follow the analogy of the Passive Aorists: hence ἄη, κίχης. And we may leave undisturbed the form δίδη he bound (Il. 11. 105), for which no one has proposed to read δίδει.

The 1 Sing. προ-τεῖν (Od. 9. 88., 10. 100., 12. 9) stands alone, and is doubtless a mere error for προτήν (Bekker, ed. 1858). *Keiberg unter vor analogi med den Thematike 2 og 3 person*

Porson (in his note on Eur. Or. 141) condemns ξυνιέῖς, τιθεῖς, &c. on the ground that if τιθεῖς were right we ought also to have τιθῶ, τιθεῖ, τιθοῦμεν, τιθεῖτε. It is possible, however, that a form like τιθεῖς may have crept in through the analogy of the Verbs in -εω, although no 'Verb' τιθέω was in use. It is characteristic of the working of analogy to be partial and gradual. In Homer we find the corresponding 3 Sing. Pres. δαμνᾶ, τιθεῖ, μεθιεῖ, διδοῖ—forms which are guaranteed by the metre. The forms so guaranteed are indeed few, and perhaps were not found in the oldest text of the poems; but they are supported by similar forms in Herodotus and other Ionic writers*.

Similarly, in the Presents formed with -νυ there is evidence of a tendency to introduce the Thematic -ννε(ο). The instances are:—*εφννε 9¹⁰⁰* ὄρ-νν-ον (Il. 12. 142), ὤμννε (Il. 14. 278), ξεύγννον (Il. 19. 393), ὄμνν-έτω (Il. 19. 175), τανύ-ουσι, τανύ-οντο (four times), *Od 14. 228, 15. 42*
ἡ'-ο-μεν
ἡ'ε (ἡῖε)

* In considering this and similar questions it should be remembered (1) that we do not know when the Homeric poems were first written down; (2) that we do not know of any systematic attention having been paid to spelling, accentuation, &c. before the time of the Alexandrian grammarians; (3) that the tendency of oral recitation must have been to substitute later for earlier forms, unless the metre stood in the way; (4) that this modernising process went on in different parts of Greece, and therefore need not represent the exclusive influence of any one dialect; (5) that the older Ionic alphabet confused ε, ει, η and ο, ου, ω.

τανύ-ειν (Π. 17. 391), ἀνώ (Π. 4. 56, but may be Fut.). As to δαινύ-η (2 Sing. Subj. Mid.) see § 80.

Also, the Verb ῥύομαι *protect, save*, is for the most part Non-Thematic (ἔρῦ-σο, ἔρῦ-το, 3 Plur. ῥύ-ατο, Inf. ῥῦ-σθαι), but partly Thematic (ῥύε-ται, ῥύε-το, ῥύο-νται, &c.), see § 11. And the Aor. ἔ-κλυ-ον is Thematic, except the Imper. κλυ-θι, κλυ-τε.

It should be observed that in all the foregoing cases the Thematic form is obtained by combining thematic endings with the final vowel of the Stem. In other cases the original final vowel is lost, as κίχε(ν) for ἐ-κίχη, δίζω for δίζη-μαι, and the like.

19.] **Non-Thematic Contracted Verbs.** The following Homeric forms are usually regarded as instances of 'irregular Contraction' of Verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω:—

(-αω): συναυτή-την *met*, συλή-την *spoiled*, προσαυδή-την *spoke to*, φοιτή-την *went about*, κνή *scraped*, ὀρή-μεναι *to pray*, γοή-μεναι *to bewail*, πεινή-μεναι *to hunger*, θῆ-σθαι *to milk*. ὄρεαι?

θ. 1. 78 (εω): ἀπειλή-την *threatened*, ὀμαρτή-την *met*, καλή-μεναι *to call*, πευθή-μεναι *to mourn*, ποθή-μεναι *to regret*, φιλή-μεναι *to love*, φορή-μεναι, φορή-ναι *to carry*, ἀλιτή-μενος *sinning*, τερσή-μεναι *to get dry* (§ 42).

(-οω): σάω 3 Sing. Impf. and also 2 Sing. Imper of σαώω *I keep safe*.

These forms cannot be explained by the ordinary contraction with the Thematic ε or ο: e. g. φοιτή-την cannot come from *φοιταέτην, φορή-ναι from *φορέε-ναι, ἀλιτή-μενος from *ἀλιτέο-μενος, σάω from σάοε, &c. On the other hand, as Curtius has shown (*Stud.* iii. 377-401, *Verb.* i. 352 ff.), they agree exactly with those Non-Thematic forms in which *the vowel before the Ending is long except before -ντ and -ι*, such as the Pres. κιχή-μεναι, ἀή-μεναι (§ 12), the Aor. στή-μεναι, τλή-ναι, γνώ-μεναι, &c. and (as we may add by anticipation) the Passive Aorists in -ην and -θην.

Moreover, the same type of inflexion appears in the peculiar 'Verbs in -μι' of the Æolic dialect, as φίλη-μι, 1 Plur. φίλη-μεν, 3 Plur. φίλεισι (for φίλε-ντι), Part. φιλή-μενος; and also in the Latin Verbs in -āre and -ēre, except in the 1 Sing.; e. g. amā-mini is parallel to ἀρή-μεναι, docemini to φορή-μεναι, docemus, doce-nt to φίλη-μεν, φίλεισι.

Further traces of this formation may be seen in those Attic verbs in -αω and -οω which take η and ω instead of ā and ου respectively (as ζάω, ζῆς, ζῆ, &c., ριγῶ, Inf. ριγῶν), and in the Opt. in -ωην, -οιην (for which however in the case of verbs in -εω we expect -ειην, as in κειλήην and Æolic φιλείην).

These facts seem to show that the formation now in question is of high antiquity, and Curtius even maintained that it was older than the ordinary conjugation of the verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω.

In these verbs, as he pointed out, there is evidence to show that the vowel before the thematic ending was originally long (e.g. in Homeric *διψάων, πεινάων, ὑπνώοντες*, Æolic *ποθήω, ἀδικήει*, &c.). The forms in *-ᾱω, -ηω, -ωω*, again, may represent an older (and Æolic) *-āmi, -ηmi, -ωmi*, just as *δεικνύω* is for older *δείκνυμι*: and these again may be explained by contraction from *-āημι, -ηημι, -ωημι*, the Greek representatives of the Sanscrit *-agāmi*. The Latin *amo, doceo*, Pl. *amāmus, docēmus*, would fall into this scheme, if we suppose that they belong to the stage at which the thematic endings had not extended beyond the 1 Sing.

Against this theory it is urged by Brugmann (*M. U.* i. 86) that the thematic conjugation of these verbs is found also in Sanscrit, Zend, Slavo-Lithuanian and Germanic—all which members of the Indo-European family, if Curtius is right, must have recast their derivative verbs on the same thematic model. It is more probable therefore that these verbs were originally thematic, and according to the final vowel of the base appeared as verbs in *-αω* (as *νικάω*), *-εω* (as *ποθέω*), or *-ωω* (as *δηϊόω*). On this assumption, again, the Homeric forms now in question may be variously explained. Where we find *η* for *εε* or *αε*, as in *φιλήμεναι, γοήμεναι* (instead of the *ει, ᾱ* required by the ordinary rules), we may suppose, with Wackernagel (*K. Z.* xxvii. 84), that the contraction belongs to an earlier (pre-Hellenic) period. The existence of such a period is proved (e.g.) by the temporal augment, as in *ῆ(σ)α* for an original *ἔ-εσα*. Then the participles *ἀλιτήμενος, φιλήμενος* and the like may be explained by supposing a form in *-μενος*, cp. Lat. *leg-imini, docēmini*, so that *φιλήμενος* would be a primitive contraction from *φιλε-έμενος* (*φιλε-με-μενος*). The solution however is confessedly incomplete. It does not (directly at least) explain Æolic *φίλημεν, φίλεισι*, Lat. *amāmus, docēmus, amant, docent*. It only explains the long vowel of *φιλή-σω, ἐφίλη-σα, φιλητός*, &c., if we also suppose that the *-με* of the Present was carried through all the tenses. And it does not give any satisfactory account of the common contracted forms, *νικᾶτε, φιλεῖτε, δηλοῦτε*, &c., since these must have come from *νικάετε, φιλέετε, δηλόετε*, &c. at a period in which the ordinary Greek rules of contraction were in force.

A wholly different explanation is proposed by Brugmann himself (*l. c.*). He shows, as we have seen (§ 14), that there is a large class of non-thematic forms with stems ending in a long vowel—*ā, η, ω*—which is of the nature of a suffix. Such are *ἔ-βλ-η-ν* (*βᾶλ-, βλ-η*), *ἔ-πτη-ν* (*πετ-, πτ-η*), *ἔ-γνω-ν* (*γεν-, γν-ω*), and many others, which have their representatives in all languages of the Indo-European family. By an extension of this type has been formed the specifically Greek class of the Passive aorists in *-ην*, as *ἔ-φαναη-ν, ἔ-τύπη-ν* and one or two in *-ων*, as *ἔ-άλω-ν*.

Similarly, again, the analogy of the 'verbs in -μι,' and especially of those tenses which do not vary the quantity of the stem (as κίχρημι, ἄρημι, πλῆ-το, ἔγνω) has affected the derivative verbs, and has thus produced the non-thematic forms in question—φιλήμεναι like ἀήμεναι, ἀλιτήμενος like κιχήμενος, and so on. The forms τιθή-μεναι (Il. 23. 83, 247), τιθή-μενον (Il. 10. 34) are probably due to the influence of the same group of Verbs. A similar process explains the Æolic conjugation of verbs in -μι (γέλαιμι, φίλημι, δοκίμωμι), the difference being that in Æolic it was carried much further. In Homer we have nothing answering to the 1 Sing. φίλημι, the 1 Plur. φίλημεν, the 3 Plur. φίλεισι, or the corresponding Imperfect forms.

We cannot be sure, however, that all the examples of this type which appeared in the original text of Homer have been preserved. Wackernagel has observed that nearly all the words now in question are forms which would be unfamiliar in the Greece of classical times. The list is made up chiefly of duals (προσαυδήτην, φοιτήτην, &c.) and Infinitives in -μεναι. It is not improbable (e.g.) that the familiar form προσήδα has supplanted an original Non-Thematic προσήδη. On the other hand in Il. 11. 638 ἐπὶ δ' αἴγειον κνή τυρόν the metre points rather to the uncontracted κνάε.

20.] Aorists. Of the Aorist Stems noticed in § 13, several are probably derived from Nouns, and do not differ in formation from the Presents discussed in the preceding section: e.g. ἐ-γήρα (γῆρα-s), βιώ-τω (βίο-s), ἐπ-έπλω-s (πλόο-s), ἀλώ-ναι, perhaps ἀπ-όνη-το. Regarding the Passive Aorists, see §§ 42-44.

21.] Meaning of the Non-Thematic Pres. and Aor. The Presents formed by Reduplication, and by the Suffixes -νη and -νυ, are nearly always Transitive or 'Causative' in meaning, as ἴστη-μι, σκιδ-νη-μι, ὄρ-νυ-μι: whereas the simpler Verbs, whether Present or Aorist, are usually Intransitive, as ἔστη-ν, ἔσβη.

Regarding the Tense-meaning, it is enough to point out here that the difference of the Present and Aorist is not given by the form of the Tense: thus the Impf. ἔ-φη-ν is the same in formation as the Aor. ἔ-βη-ν, ἔ-στη-ν.

The Perfect.

22.] The Perfect-Stem is formed by Reduplication, and is liable to vary with the Person-Endings (§ 6). This variation is the rule in the Homeric Perfect. In Attic it survives in a few forms only; it is regular in οἶδα and ἔσθηκα.

The weak form of the Stem is the same (except for the Reduplication) as in the Tenses already discussed. The long Stem is often different, showing a predilection for the O-form.

The variation appears in the interchange of—

(1) η (ā) and ᾱ: as τεθήλ-ει *bloomed*, Part. Fem. τεθάλ-υῖα; ἄρηρε *is fitting*, ἀρᾶρ-υῖα; λεληκ-ώς, λελᾶκ-υῖα *yelling*, μεμηκ-ώς, μεμᾶκ-υῖα *bleating*; λέλασται (λελαθ-ται, λήθ-ω) *has forgotten*, ἀκαχ-μένος *sharpened*, πέφαν-ται *has appeared*; σέσηπε *is rotten* (σαπρός), τέθηκα (τήκ-ω), τέθηπα (Aor. Part. ταφ-ών), πέπηγε (πάγ-η), κεχην-ότα, κεκληγ-ώς, πεπληγ-ώς, τετρήχ-ει (τᾶρᾶχ-); πεπᾶσ-μην *I had eaten* (πατ-έομαι), κεκασμένος (κάδ-) *excelling*, ἐρράδ-αται *are sprinkled*, δέδασ-ται *is divided* (but 3 Plur. δεδαί-αται, from δαι-, § 51, 2). In the last four cases the strong form does not actually occur.

δέδηε *is on fire* is for *δέδηε (δεδηF-ε): the weak Stem is δαυ- (δαίω for δαF-ιω, cp. καίω, ἔκηα). Similarly γέγηθε *rejoices* is for *γέγηθε (Lat. *gaud-eo*).

ᾱ for η occurs in ἔαγε *is broken* (Hes. Op. 534: ἔαγη as Subj. is only Bekker's conj. in Il. II. 558, see § 67): also in ἔαδ-ότα *pleasing*, as to which see § 26, 2.

ω and ᾱ: this interchange cannot be exemplified from Homer: cp. Attic ἔρωγα (ῥᾶγ-, Mid. συν-έρρηκ-ται). ω is also found in ἄνωγα *I bid*, γέγωνε *calls aloud*, but the corresponding weak Stems are unknown.

(2) ω and ε: εἴωθε *is accustomed* (cp. ἔθων, ἦθος, root σφηθ-): ἐπ-ώχ-ατο *were shut to* (of gates), from ἐπ-έχω: συν-οχωκ-ότε (better perhaps συν-οκωχότε, see Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* p. 303) *leaning together*, from συν-έχω (cp. ὀκωχή *a stay or buttress*, ἀν-οκωχή = ἀνοχή *staying, cessation*).

η and ε: in μέμηλε *is a care*, ἐδ-ηδ-ώς *having eaten*.

(3) ω and ο: in δέδο-ται (δω-), ἐκ-πέπο-ται *is drunk up*, ὄλωε *is lost*, ὄρωρε *is aroused*, ὄπωπα *I have seen*, ὀδώδ-ει *smelt*: perhaps also ὀρώρει *watched* (Il. 23. 112 ἐπὶ δ' ἀνὴρ ἐσθλὸς ὀρώρει = *was the ἐπί-ουρος*), cp. § 30.

προ-βέβουλα (Il. 1. 113) seems to follow the Pres. βούλομαι: we expect *βέβωλα (βολ-, § 30).

(4) ου and ι: οἶδα, 1 Plur. ἴδ-μεν; πέποιθα, 1 Plur. Plpf. ἐπέπιθ-μεν; εἰκα, Dual εἰκ-τον, Part. Fem. εἰκ-υῖα; λέλοιπα, Aor. ἔ-λιπ-ον; δειδω *I fear*, for δέδφοια (by loss of ι and contraction), 1 Plur. δειδι-μεν (for δέδφι-μεν).

This account of the isolated 1 Sing. δειδω was given by G. Mahlow (*K. Z.* xxiv. 295), and has been adopted by most scholars. The original Homeric form was probably δείδοα (or δέδφοα), which can be restored in all the passages where the word occurs. Others (as Cobet) would substitute δείδια, a form which is found in several places, sometimes as an ancient v. l. for δειδω. But it is difficult on his view to account for the change from δείδια. Rather, an original δείδοα (or δέδφοα) was altered in two ways, (1) by contraction, which gave it the appearance of a Present in -ω, and (2) by change of ο to ι under the influence of δειδι-μεν, &c.

(5) *ευ* and *υ*: *πεφευγ-ώς* *having escaped*, Mid. *πεφυγ-μένος*; *τετεύχ-αται* *are made*, 3 Sing. *τέτυκ-ται*; *κέκευθε* *hides* (Aor. *κῦθε*); *ἔξευγ-μένοι* *joined* (*ζυγ-όν*). Other weak Stems: *κέχυ-ται*, *ἔσσυ-ται* (§ 15), *πέπυσ-μαι* (*πῦθ-*), *κέκλυ-θι* *listen*.

ου interchanging with *υ* is much less common: *εἰλήλουθα* *I am come* (*ἐλῦθ-*), perhaps *δεδουπ-ότος* (cp. *κτύπ-ος*).

υ appears in *μέμυκε* (Aor. *μῦκε*), *βέβρυχεν* *roars*, as in the Pres. *μυκάομαι*, *βρύχω*.

(6) *ορ* (*ρο*), *ολ* and *ᾶρ* (*ρᾶ*), *ἄλ* (for *γ*, *λ*, § 6, 5): *δι-έφθορας* *art destroyed* (*φθᾶρ-*); *ἔμμορε* *has a share*, Mid. *εἴμαρ-το* *was apportioned*; *τέτροφε* *is thickened* (*τράφ-*); *ἐπι-δέδρομε* *runs over*; *δέδορκε* *sees*; *ἔοργας* *has done*; *ἔολπα* *I hope*. Weak forms: *πεπαρ-μένος* *pierced*, *τέτραπ-το* (*τρέπ-ω*), *ἐ-τέγαλ-το* (*τέλλω*).

But *ερ*, *ελ* in *ἔερ-μένος* *strung* (Lat. *sero*), *ἔρχ-αται* *are packed in*, Part. *ἔεργ-μένοι* (*ἔεργ-ω*), and *ἔελ-μένος* *cooped in*: cp. § 31, 6.

ρῖ appears in *βέβριθε* *is heavy*, *ἔρριγα* *I dread*, *πεφρικ-υῖαι* *bristling*, *τετριγ-υῖαι* *chirping*, with no corresponding weak Stem. In these words *ρῖ* seems to come from original *ερ*, *ρ*, or *γ*; cp. § 29, 4.

(7) *ον* and *ᾶ* (for *γ*): *γέγονε* *is born*, 1 Plur. *γέγα-μεν*; *πέπονθα* *I suffer*, 2 Plur. *πέπασθε* (for *πεπαθ-τε*), Part. *πεπαῖθ-υῖα*; *μέμονας* *art eager*, 2 Plur. *μέμα-τε*; *λελόγγ-ᾶσι* *have as portion* (Aor. *ἐλάχ-ον*); *πέφα-ται* *is slain* (*φόν-ος*), *τέτα-ται* *is stretched* (*τόν-ος*), *δεδα-ώς* (§ 31, 5). But we find *αν* in *κεχανῶ-ώς* *containing* (Aor. *ἐχᾶδε*).

(8) *ο* and *ε*: as in *τέτοκα* (Hes. Op. 591, cp. Aor. *ἔ-τεκ-ον*); *δέδεγ-μαι* *I await* (cp. *προ-δοκ-αί ambush*); *ἔσ-σαι* *art clothed*; *ἀνήνοθεν* *mounted up* (of a stream of blood, Il. 11. 266), *ἐπ-ενήνοθε* *is upon*; *ἀγηγέρ-ατο* *were assembled* (cp. *ἀγορ-ή*): *κεκοπ-ώς* *striking*. Properly the form with *ο* should interchange with a form without a vowel (*τοκ-* with *τκ-*, &c.), but when this is impossible *ε* remains in the weak Stem: see § 6, 6.

ἀνήνοθε answers in meaning to the Attic *ἀνθέω*, *to be on the surface, come forth upon*: the Pres. would be *ἀνέθ-ω* (related to *ἀνθ-ος* as *ἀλέγ-ω* to *ἀλγ-ος*). So *ἐν-ήνοθε* supposes *ἐνέθ-ω*, weak form *ἐνθ-*.

(9) Stems which take the suffix *κ**.

* A word may be said here on the origin of the Perfects in *-κᾶ*. They may be regarded as formed in the ordinary way from Stems in which a Root has been lengthened by a suffixed *κ*, as in *ὀλέκ-κ-ω*, *ἐρύκ-κ-ω* (§ 45), *πτήσω* (for *πτηκ-ιω*, cp. *ἔ-πτακ-ον*), *δειδίσομαι* (for *δει-δφικ-ιο-μαι*). Thus *ὀλώλεκα* is the regular Pf. of *ὀλέκω*, and *πέπτωκα*, *δείδωκα*, answer to the weak stems *πᾶκ-*, *δφί-κ-*. So *βέβηκα*, *ἔστηκα* answer to (possible) Presents **βήκ-ω* (cp. *βάκ-τρον*), **στήκ-ω*. It is not necessary to suppose an actual Stem in *κ* in each case; a few instances would serve to create the type. The reason for the use of the longer Stems *βηκ-*, *στηκ-*, &c., was probably that the forms given by the original Stems were too unlike other Perfects. The characteristic *-ᾶ* would be lost by contraction with the preceding vowels.

When the Stem ends in a vowel, certain forms of the Pf. Act. take κ , thus filling the hiatus which would otherwise be made between the Stem and the Ending: as in $\xi\sigma\tau\eta\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\alpha\varsigma$, $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\iota\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\alpha$, $\tau\epsilon\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\acute{\eta}\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\alpha\varsigma\iota$. The Perfects of this type—including those of which no forms with κ are actually found—may be divided again into—

(a) Perfects with variable root-vowel: $\xi\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\alpha$ *I stand*, 1 Plur. $\xi\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$; $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha$ *I fear*, 1 Plur. $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$; $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\upsilon\kappa\epsilon$, 3 Plur. $\pi\epsilon\phi\acute{\upsilon}\text{-}\alpha\varsigma\iota$: $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\kappa\alpha$, Inf. $\beta\epsilon\beta\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$; $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\eta\kappa\alpha$, Imper. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\theta\iota$; $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha$, Imper. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\theta\iota$. Add also $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\upsilon\text{-}\kappa\epsilon$ *is closed* (of a wound), $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\upsilon\text{-}\kappa\epsilon$ *is sunk in*, though the short form is not found.

(b) Perfects with invariable long vowel, especially η and ω (discussed in § 14): $\beta\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\eta}\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\epsilon\iota$ *struck*, Mid. $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\text{-}\tau\alpha\iota$ (cp. $\xi\upsilon\mu\text{-}\beta\lambda\acute{\eta}\text{-}\tau\eta\nu$, $\beta\lambda\acute{\eta}\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$); $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\mu\eta\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\alpha\varsigma$ *art weary*; $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ *brought near*, $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\text{-}\tau\alpha\iota$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\upsilon\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\mu\eta\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$; $\beta\epsilon\beta\rho\omega\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ *having eaten* (Fut. Mid. $\beta\epsilon\beta\rho\acute{\omega}\text{-}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$), $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\beta\lambda\omega\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\epsilon$ *is gone*, $\pi\epsilon\pi\rho\omega\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ *fated*.

Similarly, from disyllabic Stems, $\delta\epsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\eta\text{-}\kappa\epsilon$ (Aor. $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\delta\acute{\alpha}\eta\text{-}\nu$) *has learned* (Od. 8. 134), $\tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\text{-}\kappa\epsilon$ (Od. 10. 88), and the Participles $\kappa\epsilon\chi\alpha\rho\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\text{-}\nu$), $\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\rho\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\alpha\phi\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$.

To this class belong the Perfects of derivative Verbs in $\text{-}\acute{\omega}$, $\text{-}\epsilon\omega$, $\text{-}\omicron\omega$, $\text{-}\upsilon\omega$, as $\beta\epsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\eta\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\epsilon\nu$ (Il. 10. 145, 172., 16. 22), $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\text{-}\epsilon\mu\eta\eta\mu\text{-}\kappa\epsilon$ (Il. 22. 491), $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\pi\upsilon\eta\text{-}\kappa\epsilon\iota$ (Od. 17. 359), $\tau\epsilon\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\acute{\eta}\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\alpha\varsigma\iota$ (Il. 9. 420, 687): $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\omicron\tau\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\omicron\rho\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\text{-}\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$.

$\pi\alpha\rho\text{-}\acute{\omega}\chi\eta\text{-}\kappa\epsilon\nu$ (Il. 10. 252, with v. l. $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}\chi\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$) is formed as if from $\text{*}\pi\alpha\rho\text{-}\omicron\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, for $\pi\alpha\rho\text{-}\omicron\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$.

$\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\text{-}\kappa\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (Od. 12. 281, and four times in Il. 10) means *displeased, disgusted*, *etc.* 26.4 and should probably be written $\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\kappa\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, from $\acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (for $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\sigma\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\delta\text{-}\epsilon\omega$).

The Subj. $\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\eta}\kappa\eta\sigma\iota$ (Od. 21. 36), Opt. $\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\iota$ (H. Apoll. 165) point to a Pf. $\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha$ or Pres. $\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\eta}\text{-}\kappa\omega$.

(10) A Perfect in $\text{-}\theta\alpha$ may be recognised in $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\eta\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\text{-}\theta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ *keep awake* (Il. 10. 419): perhaps in the Opt. $\beta\epsilon\beta\rho\acute{\omega}\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$ (Il. 4. 35).

In general the Perfects of derivative Verbs are formed with an

It is a confirmation of this view that the Stem with $\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ is in the same form as the Present Stems with a suffixed κ , γ , θ (§ 45), or $\sigma\kappa$ (§ 48).

A similar theory may be formed of the Perfects in $\text{-}\theta\alpha$, of which the germs have been mentioned above. $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\rho\omega\text{-}\theta\alpha$ is related to a Part. $\beta\epsilon\beta\rho\omega\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ (§ 26, 4) as $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\eta\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ to $\tau\epsilon\theta\upsilon\eta\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, and to a Mid. $\text{*}\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\rho\omega\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$ (cp. $\beta\epsilon\beta\rho\acute{\omega}\text{-}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$) as $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ to $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$. If in a few more cases, such as $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\rho\tau\text{-}\theta\alpha$ ($\beta\rho\tau\text{-}$), $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\omega\theta\alpha$ (*suē-tus*), $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\eta\text{-}\theta\alpha$ ($\gamma\alpha\text{-}\acute{\iota}\omega$), we had had short forms of the Stem without θ , the suffix $\text{-}\theta\alpha$ would have been felt to characterise the Pf. Act.; that is to say, the type of the 'Pf. in $\text{-}\theta\alpha$ ' would have been created, and might have spread as the Pf. in $\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ has done.

The Aorists in $\text{-}\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ are to be accounted for in the same way. The κ may be traced in the Pres. $\delta\acute{\alpha}\omega\kappa\omega$ (on the inscription of Idalion, see Curt. Stud. vii. 243) and in the Noun $\theta\acute{\eta}\kappa\text{-}\eta$, which points to a Verb-Stem $\theta\eta\text{-}\kappa\text{-}$.

invariable Stem : as κεκορυθ-μένος, πεπόλισ-το, δδῶδυσ-ται, κεκοιν-μένος. But no such Perfects are used in the Active.

23.] The Reduplication takes the following forms :—

(1) An initial consonant is repeated with ε. This is the general rule : we need only notice the Perfects in which an original consonant has been lost, viz. :—

A labial semi-vowel (F) in ἐ-ελ-μένος *cooped in* (for Fε-Fελ-μένος), εἰρύαται (Fερυ-) *are drawn up*, εἶλυ-το (Fελυ-, *volvo*), ἐ-οργα (Fέργ-ον), ἐ-ολπα, ζοικα, Mid. ἦικ-το (unless this comes from εἶσκω).

A sibilant (σ) in ἐ-στηκα (for *σέ-στηκα), ἐ-ερ-μένος *strung together* (Lat. *sero*). But the σ is retained in σέσηπε.

(2) Stems beginning with two consonants (except when the second is ρ λ μ or ν), or with ζ, usually prefix ε only : as δι-έ-φθορας, ἐ-φθίατο, ἐ-κτῆσθαι (but κέκτημαι, Hes. Op. 437), ἐ-ζευγμέναι. But we find πε-πτηώς, πέ-πτανται. And in ἔστηκα the rough breathing represents original σ-.

The group σF has been lost in ἐ-ᾰδῶς (either σε-σFᾰδῶς or ἐ-σFᾰδῶς) *pleasing*, and εἴωθα, ἔωθα (Lat. *suē-sco*).

The group δF has the effect of lengthening the vowel of the reduplication in δεῖδοικα, δεῖδι-μεν, &c., which represent original δέ-δFοι-κα, δέ-δFι-μεν, &c.

Initial ρ, which generally stands for Fρ (sometimes σρ), gives ἔρρ-, as in ἔρρηκται (Fρηγ-), ἐρρίζωται. Sometimes εἶρ-, as εἶρηται (Fρη-, cp. *ver-bum*), and εἰρύαται (ρύομαι, Fρῦ- *protect*). One Stem reduplicates ρ, viz. ῥε-ρῦπωμένα, from ῥῦπῶ.

Similarly we have ἔμμορε, Mid. εἶμαρ-ται (σμαρ-), and ἔσσοῦται (σεύω, root κτεν- : also εἰληφα (post. Hom., cp. ἔλλαβον, § 67.)

We must distinguish between (1) phonetic loss, as of σ or F, and (2) *substitution* of initial ἐ- for the reduplication. The latter may be seen (*e.g.*) in ἐ-κτῆσθαι, which cannot be derived by phonetic decay from κε-κτῆσθαι. The distinction will serve to explain the difference between εἶμαρται, which is the proper representative of an original σέ-σμαρ-ται, and ἔμμορε, which follows the general tendency to double an initial μ, ν, λ or ρ after the augment.

(3) Attic Reduplication ; as ὄπ-ωπα *I have seen*, ἐλ-ήλα-το *was driven*, ἐγρ-ήγορα *I am awake*.

The syllable which follows the Attic Reduplication may vary in quantity, as ἄρηρε, Fem. Part. ἀρᾶρῦα ; ἐρήριπε, Mid. ἐρέριπτο. Usually it is long, as ἐλήλαται, ἀρηρομένος, ἀχηχεμένος, δδῶδυσται, ^{ε 423} ἠρήρειστο, ἐρήρισται (Hes. fr. 219), 3 Plur. ἀγηγέρατο, ἐρηρέδαται, ^{κ 202} ὀρωρέχεται. But it is short in ἀκάχημαι, ἀλάλημαι, (ἡμμηγον).

(4) Temporal Augment (see § 67): e. g. ἐφ-ῆπ-ται (ἄπτω), κατ-ήκισ-ται (αἰκίζω), ἤσκη-ται (ἀσκέω), ἤσχυμμένος.

(5) In a few cases there is no Reduplication:—

οἶδα, for *Foída*, Sanscr. *veda*.

ἐρχ-αται are shut in (Φεργ-), Plpf. ἐρχ-ατο and (with augment) ἐέρχατο. *Christ p. 111: ἐέρχεται*

εἶμαι *I am clothed with* (Φεσ-), ἔσ-σαι, Plpf. ἔσ-σο, ἔσ-το and (with augment) ἔ-εσ-το, Du. ἔσ-θην, 3 Plur. εἶατο, Part. εἰμένος. Reduplication is not to be found in the *ει* of εἶμαι, εἰμένος, since these are for *Fέσ-μαι*, *Fεσ-μένος* (as εἶμα for *Fέσμα*). The 3 Sing. Pf. occurs once in Homer, in *Od.* 11. 191, where the best MSS. have ἦσται, others εἶσται and εἶται. The true form is probably ἔσται, preserved in an oracle in *Hdt.* 1. 47 (cp. ἔσσαι).

ἀμφιαχῦα (*Il.* 2. 316) *crying around* can hardly be divided ἀμφ-ιαχῦα, since the Stem *läch-* has initial *F* (§ 390). But a Stem *Fηχ-* (*Fηχή cry*), weak form *Fäch-*, without Reduplication would give the Fem. Part. *Fächῦα*, whence ἀμφι-αχῦα.

These examples make it doubtful whether initial *F* was originally reduplicated in the Pf. stem. In Sanscr. the roots which begin with *va* (answering to Gr. *Fε-*) take *u-*, as *uáca* (*vac-*, Gr. *Fεπ-*). Thus the *Fε-* of *FέΦοικα*, *FεFελμένος*, &c. may be later, due to the analogy of other Perfects.

δέχ-αται *await* (*Il.* 12. 147), Plpf. ἐ-δέγγην (*Od.* 9. 513., 12. 230), Part. δέγγμενος (*Il.* 2. 794., 9. 191., 18. 524., *Od.* 20. 385),^{23. 31} with the same Pf. meaning that we have in *δέδεγμα* (*await*, not *receive*, § 28): while in other places ἐ-δεκτο, &c. are no less clearly Aorists. It seems that we must recognise a Pf. form *δέγμα (*Buttm. G. G.* ii. 149., *Curt. Verb.* ii. 144), probably older than *δέδεγμα*.

(6) The Reduplication in *δει-δέχ-αται* *they welcome*, seems to be that of the 'Intensive' forms, as in *δει-δίσκομαι*: see § 61. The form belongs to *δείκ-νυμι*, not *δέχ-ομαι* (see *Veitch*).

24.] In the 3 Plur.—*A 573.*

1. The long Stem with *-ᾱσι* (*-a-NTI*) is comparatively rare:—

πεποιθᾱσι (*Il.* 4. 325), ἐστήκᾱσι (*Il.* 4. 434, v. l. ἐστήκωσι), κατατεθνήκᾱσι (*Il.* 15. 664), τεθαρσήκᾱσι (*Il.* 9. 420, 682), ἐγγρηγόρθᾱσι (*Il.* 10. 419).

These forms evidently result from *generalising the Stem in -a*. So we have *οἶδα-s* (*Od.* 1. 337), *οἶδᾱ-μεν*, *οἶδᾱσι* in *Herodotus* (and in *Attic*, see *Veitch s. v.*).

2. The final consonant of the Stem, if a labial or guttural, is aspirated before the *-αται*, *-ατο* of the *Mid.*; as *ἐπι-τετράφ-αται* *B 25, 62* are entrusted, *τετράφ-ατο* were turned, *ἐρχ-αται* (*Φεργ-*) are shut in, *ὀρωρέχ-αται* (*ὀρέγ-ω*) are stretched out, *δειδέχ-αται* (*δείκ-νυμι*)

welcome, κεκρύφ-αται (Hes. Op. 386). The aspirated forms of the Act., such as εἴληφα, κέκοφα, are entirely unknown to Homer.

It has been pointed out by Joh. Schmidt (*K. Z.* xxviii, 309) that the aspiration in these cases is due to the analogy of the forms in which a similar aspiration is caused by the ending: τετράφ-αται because of the 2 Plur. τέτραφ-θε, Inf. τετράφ-θαι. This explains why a final dental is not affected: for δ before θ passes into σ.

3. An anomalous ε for ι appears in δει-δέχ-αται (δείκ-νυμι, see § 23, 6), ἐρ-ηρέδ-αται (ἐρείδω, cp. ἠρισ-μένος Hesych.), and ἀκηχέδ-αται (ἀκαχίζω).

4. A final δ of the Stem sometimes appears only in the 3 Plur.: as ἀκηχέδ-αται, ἐρράδ-αται (ραίνω, 1 Aor. ράσσατε), ἐλληλάδ-ατο. But the last of these forms is doubtful; it occurs only in Od. 7. 86 χάλκεοι μὲν γὰρ τοῖχοι ἐλληλάδατ', where some good MSS. have ἐρηρέδατ'.

25.] **Interchange of Stems.** The original variation between the Strong and the Weak form is disturbed by various causes.

1. The O-form of the Stem is found instead of the weak form in εἰλήλουθ-μεν *we are come* (for εἰλήλυθ-μεν), ἄωρτο *was hung aloft* (cp. ἄερ-θεν), ἐγρήγορθε *keep awake*, with the Inf. ἐγρήγορθαι (Il. 10. 67, cp. ἐγρηγορτί 10. 182); ἄνωγμεν (H. Apoll. 528); cp. ἔοιγμεν (in Tragedy), δέδοιγμεν (Et. M.).

2. The strong Stem of the Pres. takes the place of the weak Stem in συν-έρρηκται (Attic ἔρρωγα), λέλειπ-ται, ἐξευγ-μέναι, ἠρήρειστο (ἐρείδω); also in ἐερ-μένος, ἐελ-μένος, ἔρχ-αται (§ 22, 6). So κεχανδ-ός (for κεχᾶδ-φός, χανδάνω).

ἔστητε, commonly read in Il. 4. 243, 246, is an error for ἔστητε: see § 76.

3. The influence of the Present may further be traced in the Perfects which take ι for ει (§ 22, 4), and υ, ευ for ου (§ 22, 5). So ἐδηδ-ός (but ἐδωδή), προ-βέβουλα (βούλομαι).

In all these cases it is worth noticing that the change does not affect the metrical form of the word: e.g. we may read εἰλήλυθμεν, ἔρρακται, ἐζυγμέναι, ἠρήριστο, &c. and some of these may be the true Homeric forms.

The weak Stem appears to take the place of the O-form in δεῖδια (as to which see § 22, 4), and in ἀνα-βέβροϋχεν (Il. 17. 54) *gushes up*. For the latter Zenodotus read ἀναβέβροχεν—doubtless rightly, since this is the correct Pf. of ἀνα-βρέχω.

In Attic Reduplication the second vowel of a disyllabic Stem may be short, as in ἐλήλυθα (less common in Homer than εἰλήλουθα), and κατερήριπε (Il. 14. 55).

26.] **The Perfect Participle** was formed originally from the

weak Stem, but there are exceptions in Homer, due partly to the *F* of the Masc. and Neut. Suffix (-*F*ώς, -*υ*ία, -*F*ός), partly to the general tendency to adopt the form of the Sing. Indic. as the Stem. Thus the Homeric Pf. Part. is intermediate between the primitive formation with the weak Stem (as in Sanscrit), and the nearly uniform long Stem of Attic. In particular—

1. When the Ending -ώς (-ότος) follows a vowel, one or both of the concurrent vowels may be long: μεμᾶ-ότε, μεμᾶ-ῶτε (both for μεμᾶ-*F*ότε). So γεγᾶ-ῶτας; βεβᾶ-ῶτα; πεφῦ-ῶτε; κεκμη-ότας and κεκμη-ῶτα; τεθυη-ότος, τεθυη-ῶτα, also τεθυεῶτι; πεπτη-ότα and πεπτη-ῶτες (πτήσσω): πεπτεῶτα (πίπτω). Both vowels are short in ἐστᾶ-ότος. § 515

ω also appears in τετρῖγ-ῶτας (Il. 2. 314), κεκληγ-ῶτας (Il. 16. 430). For the latter there is a v. l. κεκλήγοντας (see § 27); and so perhaps we may read τετρίγοντας. *Causes p. 38*

2. When -ώς (-ότος) follows a consonant, the Stem generally takes the long form, as in the Sing. Ind. Act.: ἄρηρ-ώς, μεμηκ-ώς, λεληκ-ώς, εἰοικ-ώς, πεποιθ-ώς, ἐοργ-ώς: except εἰδ-ώς (οἶδα), εἰκ-ώς or εἰκ-ώς (Il. 21. 254), εἶδ-ότα (ἄνδάν, root σῆδ-).

As these exceptions show, the strong form is not original: thus εἶδώς is for *F*ιδ-*F*ώς, εἶδότα for ἐσῆιδ-*F*ότα. So we have μεμᾶώς (perhaps μεμᾶώς), not μεμονώς. When *F* was lost the original quantity of the syllable was preserved by lengthening the vowel: and in determining the new long vowel the analogy of the Sing. Ind. naturally had much influence.

3. A long vowel appears in the Feminine εἶδ-*υ*ία (Il. 17. 4, elsewhere ἰδ*υ*ία, Schol. Il. 20. 12), εἰοικ-*υ*ία (Il. 18. 418, elsewhere εἰκ-*υ*ία)*, τεθυη-*υ*ία, πεπληγ-*υ*ία, τετρηχ-*υ*ία (as Plpf. τετρήχ-*ει*), βεβῆρθ-*υ*ία, τετρῖγ-*υ*ία, πεφῆρικ-*υ*ία, κεκληγ-*υ*ία (Hes. Op. 449). Later forms, ἄρηρ-*υ*ία (Hes. Th. 608), τεθηλ-*υ*ία (Hom. H. xlviii. 4).

The form βεβῶσα (Od. 20. 14) is an anomaly, apparently formed from the Masc. βεβώς on the analogy of Participles in -ούς, -ούσα and -είς, -είσα.

4. The κ of the Indic. Act. (§ 22, 9) appears in τετυχη-κ-ώς (Il. 17. 748), δεδαη-κ-ότες (Od. 2. 61), ἄδη-κ-ότες (Il. 10. 98, 312, 399, 471., Od. 12. 281), and βεβρω-κ-ώς (Il. 22. 94., Od. 22. 403). These instances are hardly sufficient to prove that the form is Homeric, since we might read τετυχηώς, δεδαηότες, &c. (like κεχαρηώς, κεκοτηώς, &c.) A form βεβρωώς is supported by Attic βεβρωότες (Soph. Ant. 1022). τεθυη-κ-ώς (for

* The form εἰοικ*υ*ία is found in—

καλή Κασσιέπεια θεοῖς δέμας εἰοικ*υ*ία

quoted by Athenaeus xiv. p. 632 as an instance of a line defective in quantity. It does not occur in the text of Homer, but seems to be a variant for Il. 8. 305—

καλή Καστιάνειρα δέμας εἰοικ*υ*ία θεῖσιν.

the Homeric *τεθνη-ώς*) is not earlier than Theognis. Similarly *γεγον-ώς* for *γεγαώς* first appears in H. Merc. 17.

5. The form *πεφυζ-ότες flying* (only in Il. 20 and 21), seems to be formed from the noun *φύζα*, without the intervention of any Tense-Stem. This account will apply also to—

κεκοπ-ώς (Il. 13. 60), from *κόπος striking*.

δεδουπ-ότος (Il. 23. 679) *having fallen with a thud*. (The regular form would be *δεδουπη-ώς*, or rather perhaps *ἐγδουπη-ώς*, cp. *ἐ-γδούπη-σαν*.)

ἀρη-μένος, in which the α of *ἀρη* is retained, against analogy.

It is in favour of this view that many Denominative Verbs form the Pf. Part. without the corresponding Indicative, as *κεκοτη-ώς* and the others given above (§ 22, 9). That is to say, the Participle is treated as a derivative *Adjective*, which may be formed independently of the corresponding verb.

27.] **Thematic Perfects.** By this term we understand the forms which arise when a Perfect is inflected like a Present in -ω. This change took place universally in Syracusan Doric, occasionally in other dialects. The chief Homeric instances are as follows:—

ἄνωγα: 3 Sing. *ἀνώγει*, which has a Present sense in several places (though more commonly it is a Plpf.), Dual *ἀνώγε-τον*; also *ἦνωγον*, *ἄνωγον*, *ἄνωγε*, Opt. *ἀνώγοιμι*, Imper. *ἄνωγέ-τω*, *ἀνώγε-τε*. Such a form as *ἦνωγον* may be regarded either as a thematic Plpf. of *ἄνωγα*, or as Impf. of a new thematic Pres. *ἄνώγω*. This remark applies also to the next three cases.

γέγωνα: *ἐγέγωνε*, Inf. *γεγωνέ-μεν* (also *γεγώνειν* or *γεγωνεῖν*, Il. 12. 337).

πεπληγώς (only in the Part.): *ἐπέπληγον* and *πέπληγον*, Inf. *πεπληγέ-μεν*, Mid. *πεπλήγε-το*. Similarly—

μεμηκώς (Part.): *ἐμέμηκον*.

κεκληγώς: Plur. *κεκλήγοντες* (Il. 12. 125., 16. 430., 17. 756, 759), perhaps *τετρίγοντες* (§ 26, 1), and *κεκόπων* (v. l. for *κεκοπώς*, Il. 13. 60., Od. 18. 335).

μέμνημαι: the Opt. *μεμνέωτο* (Il. 23. 361) is apparently obtained by transference of quantity from a thematic *μεμνή-οιτο*; but we may read *μέμνητο*, 3 Sing. of the regular Opt. *μεμνή-μην* (Il. 24. 745). For this, again, some MSS. have *μεμνοίμην*, as if from **μέμνο-μαι*. The 2 Sing. Ind. *μέμνη* (Il. 15. 18) also points to *μέμνομαι*, but we may read *μέμνη* (i. e. *μέμνηται*).

μέμβλε-ται (Il. 19. 343) and *μέμβλε-το* (*μέλ-ω*) may be variously explained. Perhaps *μεμελ-*, the short Stem answering to *μέμνηε*, became by metathesis *μεμλε-*, *μεμβλε-*: cp. *ἡμβροτον* for *ἡμαρτον*.

δῶρε-ται (Od. 19. 377, 524, Subj. *δῶρη-ται* Il. 13. 271).

εἶδηδε-ται (v. l. in Od. 22. 56, see § 25, 3). We may add the

Pluperfects δεῖδιε *fear'd*, ἀνήνοθεν (Il. 11. 266), ἐπ-ενήνοθεν (Il. 2. 219., 10. 134): perhaps also the Optatives in -οιμι, -οις, &c. viz. βεβρώθ-οις (Il. 4. 35), βεβλήκοι (Il. 8. 270), πεφεύγοι (Il. 21. 609), ἰλήκοι (H. Apoll. 165); see § 83.

28.] **Meaning of the Perfect.** The Perfect denotes a lasting condition or attitude (ἔξις). If we compare the meaning of any Perfect with that of the corresponding Aorist or Present, we shall usually find that the Perfect denotes a permanent *state*, the Aor. or Pres. an *action* which brings about or constitutes that state. Thus, δαίω *I kindle*, δέδηκε *blazes*, or (better) *is ablaze*; κύθε *hid*, κέκευθε *has in hiding*; ὄρ-νυ-ται *bestirs himself*, ὄρωρε *is astir*; ὤλε-το *was lost*, ὄλωλε *is undone*; ἤραρε *made to fit*, ἤραρε *fits* (Intrans.); ταραύσω *I disturb*, τετρήχει *was in disorder*; μείρο-μαι *I divide*, ἔμμορε *has for his share*; ῥύομαι *I save, shelter*, εἰρύ-αται *keep safe*; τεύχω *I make*, τέ-τυκ-ται *is by making* (not *has been made*); ἔφυ *grew*, πέφυκε *is by growth*.

Thus the so-called *Perfecta praesentia*, βέβηκα, ἔστηκα, γέγηθα, μέμνημαι, πέποιθα, οἶδα, ἔοικα, κέκτημαι, &c., are merely the commonest instances of the rule.

Note the large number of Homeric Perfects denoting attitude, temper, &c. Besides those already mentioned we have—παρ-μέμβλωκε *is posted beside*, δέδορκε *is gazing*, ἔρριγε *shudders*, τέθηκα *I am wasting*, μέμυκε *is closed* (of wounds), δεδάκρυσαι *art in tears*, δέδεξε *be in waiting*, ὄρωρέχατο *were on the stretch*, πεποτή-αται *are on the wing*, κέκμηκα *I am weary*, προβέβουλα *I prefer*, δειδία *I fear*, ἔλοπα *I hope*, τέθηπα *I am in amazement*, τέτληκα-ς *thou hast heart*, ἔπνυται *has his senses*, δειδέχ-αί¹² *welcome* (in the attitude of holding out the hand, while δεικνύ-μενος denotes the *action*), together with many Participles—κεχηνώς *agape*, κεκαφηώς *ranting*, πεπτηώς *cowering*, συν-οχωκότε *bent together*, κεκοτηώς *in wrath*, τετιηώς *vexed*, ἀδηκώς *disgusted*, μεμηλώς *in thought*, πεφυλαγμένος *on the watch*, δεδραγμένος *clutching*, λεληγμένος *eager*, κεχολωμένος *enraged*, &c. So in later Greek; ἐξην-θηκός (Thuc. 2. 49) *in eruption*, ἐσπουδασμένος *in haste*.

Verbs expressing sustained sounds, esp. cries of animals, are usually in the Perfect: γέγωνε *shouts*, βέβρυχε *roars*, κεκληγώς, λεληκώς, μεμηκώς, μεμυκώς, τετριγώς, ἀμφιαχυία. So in Attic, βοῶν καὶ κεκραγώς (Dem.).

With Verbs of *striking* the Perfect seems to express continuance, and so completeness: κεκοπώς, πεπληγώς, βεβολή-ατο *was tossed about*, βεβλήκει *made his hit*, ἠρήρειστο *was driven home*. (Cp. Ar. Av. 1350 ὃς ἂν πεπλήγη τὸν πατέρα νεοττὸς ὦν.)

Note the number of Imperatives of the Perfect in Homer: τέτλαθι, μέματε, δέδεξε, τέθναθι, δεῖδιθι, κέκλυθι, ἄνωχθι; Mid. τετύχθω *let it be ordered*, τετράφθω *let him keep himself turned*.

(In later Greek this use seems to be confined to the Middle: *μη πεφόβησθε do not be in alarm, πέπασσο keep silence.*)

The number of Homeric Perfects which can be rendered by *have* is comparatively small. The chief instances in the Active are, *ἔοργα-s thou hast done, ὄπωπα I have seen, λέλοιπε has left, πέπασθε ye have suffered, ἐδηδ-ώς, βεβρωκ-ώς having eaten*; they are somewhat commoner in the Middle. Yet in the use of these Perfects (and probably in the Perfect of every period of Greek) we always find some *continuing result* implied. There is nothing in Greek like the Latin idiom *fuit Ilium (= Ilium is no longer), vixi (= I have done with living), &c.*

The Intransitive meaning prevails in the Perfect, so that the Act. is hardly distinguishable from the Mid.: *cp. τέτευχε and τέτυκται, πεφευγώς and πεφυγμένος, γέγονα and γεγένη-μαι.* Compare also the Pf. Act. with the Pres. Mid. in such instances as *ὄλωλα* and *ὄλλυμαι, πέποιθα* and *πείθομαι, βέβουλα* and *βούλομαι, ἔολπα* and *ἔλπομαι.* The forms *τέτροφα, ἔφθορα* are Intrans. in Homer, but Trans. in Attic: and an Intrans. or almost Passive meaning is conspicuous in the Homeric group of Participles *κεκοτηώς enraged, τετηγώς (= τετηγ-μένος) vexed, κεκορηγώς (= κεκορη-μένος) satiated, βεβαρηγώς heavy, κεχαρηγώς rejoicing, κεκαφηγώς* ε 468

ranting (§ 22, 9, b).

Thematic Tenses.

29.] **The simple Thematic Present.** The Stems which fall under this description generally contain the same vowels (or diphthongs) as the strong Stem of the Non-Thematic Present (§§ 6, 12). They may be classed according to the stem-vowel, as follows:—

(1) *η*, Ionic for *ā*: *λήθ-ε-το forgot, τήκομαι I waste away, θήγει sharpens, σήπεται is rotted, κήδει vexes.*

η: *ἀρήγει helps, λήγει ceases, μήδεται devises.* The *η* of these Stems is 'pan-Hellenic,' *i. e.* answers to *η*, not *ā*, in other dialects.

(2) *ει*: *εἶδ-ε-ται seems, εἶκε yield, λείβειν to pour, λείπει leaves, πείθω I persuade, στείβων trod, στείχειν to march, πείκετε comb, εἶβει drops, φείδω spare, αἶναι sing, ἀλείφει anointed, ἀμείβε exchanged, ἔρεικόμενος torn, ἔρειδε stayed, ἔρειπε knocked down, νειφέμεν to snow (so to be read instead of νιφέμεν in Il. 12. 280). For ἴκω I come the Doric form is εἶκω.*

(3) *ευ*: *φεύγ-ω I fly, πεύθομαι I learn (by hearing), ἐρεύγεται belches, ἐρεύθων reddening, σπεύδειν to hasten, ψεύδονται play false, εὐόμενοι being singed, ἐσσεύοντο were urged on, νεῖον nodded, δεύομαι I need; also, with loss of *υ* before the Thematic vowel, ἔν-νεον swam (νεφ-ον), θέει runs, πλέων sailing, πνέει breathes, ρέει flows, χέει pours, κλέομαι I am famed.*

The forms with $\epsilon\iota$ for ϵ , as $\theta\epsilon\iota\text{-}\epsilon\iota\omega$, $\pi\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\omega$, $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\iota\omega$, $\epsilon\gamma\text{-}\chi\epsilon\iota\eta$, (for $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\epsilon\iota\omega$, &c.) should probably be written with $\epsilon\upsilon$, $\theta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\text{-}\epsilon\iota\omega$, $\pi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\text{-}\epsilon\iota\omega$, &c. See Appendix C.

(4) $\epsilon\rho$ ($\rho\epsilon$): $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\kappa\text{-}\omicron\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$ *I behold*, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\pi\epsilon\iota\omega$ *to rejoice*, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron$ *was sacked*, $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota$ *confines*, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ *is dried*, $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\pi\epsilon\iota$ *creeps*, $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ *urge*, $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\omega$ *sweeping*, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\omega$ *flayed*, $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ *to be warmed*, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon$ *sank downwards*, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon$ *shone*, $\tau\acute{\rho}\epsilon\pi\epsilon$ *turned*, $\tau\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\iota$ *nurtures*, $\sigma\tau\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\iota$ *twists*.

$\epsilon\lambda$: $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\text{-}\omicron\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$ *I hope*, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ *to play*, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\kappa\epsilon\iota$ *draws*, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\lambda\gamma\epsilon$ *milked*, $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ *I command*, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota$ *turns*, $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ *I am willing*.

$\rho\acute{\iota}$ from $\epsilon\rho$ appears in $\tau\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\beta\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota$ *to rub* (Lat. *ter-o*), $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\text{-}\omicron\omega$ *anointed* (Sanscr. *gharsh-ati*), $\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\omega$ *were heavy*.

$\gamma\rho$ ($\rho\acute{\iota}$, $\rho\acute{\iota}$) for γ appears in certain combinations: $\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\text{-}\nu\eta\mu\iota$ (§ 17), $\kappa\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\omega$, $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (*cerno, certus*), $\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha$ for $\text{F}\rho\delta\text{-}\zeta\alpha$, $\delta\rho\acute{\iota}\text{-}\omicron\omega$ for $\delta\rho\text{f-}\omicron\omega$ ($\delta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\text{-}\varsigma$): $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ (Lat. *cervus*), $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\theta\eta$ for $\kappa\rho\sigma\text{-}\theta\eta$, *hordeum*, O. Germ. *gersta* (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 35: Thurneysen, *K. Z.* xxx. 352).

(5) $\epsilon\nu$: $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\text{-}\epsilon\text{-}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ *to labour*, $\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$ *groans*, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ *I wait*, $\phi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\omicron$ *call out*, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\epsilon\iota$ *reproves*, $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\omega\omega$ *making libation*.

$\epsilon\mu$: $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\omega$ *I send*, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\phi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ *I blame*, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\iota$ (Il. 13. 707) *cuts*, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\omega$ *built*, $\beta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\iota$ *roars*, $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\iota$ *apportions*, $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\tau\rho\epsilon\mu\epsilon$ *trembled*.

(6) ϵ : $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\text{-}\epsilon$ *told*, $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\text{-}\omega$ *I have*, $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota$ *eats*, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ *follows*, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ *flies*, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ *I receive*, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\upsilon\text{-}\epsilon\pi\epsilon$ *say*, $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\epsilon$ *set as a covering*; with loss of σ , $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ ($\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota$, for $\tau\rho\epsilon\sigma\text{-}\epsilon\iota$, cp. $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\tau\rho\epsilon\sigma\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$) *trembles*, $\zeta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ ($\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota$) *boils*, $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (cp. $\nu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$) *I return*.

The Thematic forms of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\iota}$, viz. $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\omega$, Opt. $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota$, Part. $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\omega$, belong to this head, since $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\text{-}$ is the *strong stem*. So too $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (for $\kappa\epsilon\iota\text{-}\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$), 3 Plur. of $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$.

ω (instead of η) appears in $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\gamma\text{-}\epsilon\iota\omega$ *to gnaw* ($\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\text{-}$), $\delta\iota\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\iota\omega$ *to chase*. Both forms appear to be derivative (with suffixed γ , κ , § 45): $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\text{-}\gamma\omega$ may be connected with $\tau\omicron\rho\text{-}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega$ (§ 31, 4). $\delta\iota\acute{\omega}\text{-}\kappa\omega$ is related to $\delta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$ (§ 11): it has been supposed to be a Thematic Perfect, with loss of reduplication (i.e. from $*\delta\epsilon\text{-}\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\text{-}\kappa\alpha$).

$\bar{\upsilon}$ appears in $\tau\rho\acute{\upsilon}\chi\text{-}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ *waste away*, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\text{-}\psi\acute{\upsilon}\chi\text{-}\epsilon\iota\omega$ *to cool*, $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\text{-}\epsilon\iota$ *restrains*. These also are derivative (§ 45).

\omicron appears in $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\epsilon$ *washed* (Od. 10. 361, H. Apoll. 120), Inf. $\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (Od. 6. 216). $\lambda\omicron\text{-}$ is for $\lambda\omicron\text{f-}$, cp. Lat. *lav-ere*. A Pres. $*\lambda\omicron\upsilon\omega$ is inferred from the form $\lambda\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (Il. 6. 508 = 15. 265), for which we may read $\lambda\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (from the derivative Pres. $\lambda\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\omega$).

30.] **Thematic Present with weak Stem.** Of this formation there are a few instances: $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\text{-}\omega$ *I drive, bring* (Aor. $\acute{\eta}\gamma\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\omega$), $\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ *I am vexed* (Aor. $\acute{\eta}\kappa\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\chi\epsilon$), $\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ *fight*, $\beta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ *fails, breaks down*, $\beta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ *wishes*, $\delta\rho\omega\tau\alpha\iota$ *watch*, $\acute{\omicron}\theta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ *I care*, $\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ *do not hear*, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\text{-}\delta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\phi\omicron\iota$ (Opt.) *tear off*, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon\iota$ *leads*, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\chi\epsilon$ *choked*; also the Thematic forms of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\iota}$, viz. Impf. $\acute{\eta}\text{-}\acute{\iota}\omicron\omega$, Opt. $\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota$, Part. $\acute{\iota}\acute{\omega}\omega$.

Note that *γράφω* is not found in Homer except in the Aor. *ἔγραψα*.

The forms *βόλεται* (Il. 11. 319), *ἔβολοντο* (Od. 1. 234), *βόλεσθε* (Od. 16. 387) were restored by Wolf: see Buttmann's Lexil. s. v.

The form *βλάβεται* (Il. 19. 82, 166, Od. 13. 34) occurs in gnomic passages only, where an Aorist would be equally in place (§ 78, 2).

ὄρονται (Od. 14. 104), *ὄροντο* (Od. 3. 471) occur in the phrase *ἐπὶ δ' ἀνέρες ἐσθλοὶ ὄρονται*, where *ἐπὶ ὄρονται* seems to be = 'act as ἐπίουροι,' 'are in charge.'

ἄτω only occurs as a Pres. in the phrase *οὐκ αἴεις*; = *have you not heard?* Elsewhere *ἄων* is used as an Aorist (Schulze, K. Z. xxix. 249).

A Pres. *δρύφω* cannot be inferred with certainty from the Opt. *ἀποδρύφοι* (Il. 23. 187., 24. 21), which may be an Aorist.

The forms *ἄρχω*, *ἄρχω* are difficult because original *ἄρχ-*, *ἄρχ-* would shorten the vowel (before a semi-vowel and mute), and consequently the Stem would be indistinguishable from original *ἄρχ-*, *ἄρχ-*. That in *ἄρχω* the Stem is *weak* may be inferred from the Nouns *ἄρχ-ός*, *ἄρχ-ή* (§ 109): the O-form may be found in *ὄρχαμος*, the strong form possibly in *ἔρχ-ομαι*. Again *ἄρχω* may be identified with Sanscr. *āh-ati* (for *īgh-ati*): the strong form being *ἔρχ-* in *ἔρχ-ελευ* (De Saussure, *Mém.* p. 276 ff.).

31.] **The Thematic Aorist.** The Verb-Stem is in the weak form: we may distinguish the following groups:—

(1) With *ā* as Stem vowel (the strong Stem with *ā* or *η*): *λάθε* *was unseen by*, *λάκε* *crackled*, *ἔλ-λαβε* *took*, *εὐαδε* (for *ἔ-σFāδε*) *pleased*, *μακῶν* *bellowing*, *φάγον* *ate*, *δι-έ-τμαγον* (*τμήγω*) *parted*, *ἀν-έ-κραγον* *cried aloud* (Attic Pf. *κέκράγα*), *ἄρετο* *gained*, *ἄληται* (Subj.) *shall leap*, *ἔ-χραε* ⁸³⁷⁺⁸⁵⁰ *assailed* (*χραῦ-*), *δάηται* (Subj.) *shall be burned* (*δαῦ-*), *φάε* *shone* (*φᾶ-*, cp. *πιφαύσκω*), *λάε* *seized, pinned* (*λαῦ-*, cp. *ἀπο-λαύω*), *ἄλθετο* *was healed*, *ἦλφον* (Opt. *ἄλφοι*) *earned*, *ἦντετο* *met* (Part. *ἀντ-όμενος*).

The forms *φάε* (Od. 14. 502) and *λάε*, Part. *λάων* (Od. 19. 229, 230) are placed here provisionally. Each occurs once, in a context which does not decide between Aor. and Impf.

The existence of an Aor. *ἔ-φαχ-ον* has been made probable by W. Schulze (K. Z. xxix. 230). He shows that the form *ἴαχον*, generally taken as the Impf. of *ἴαχω* (§ 35), is an Aor. in meaning, and constantly occurs after elision (*μέγ' ἴαχον*, *ἐπὶ δ' ἴαχον*, *ἐπ-ἴαχον*). Consequently we can always read *Φάχον* (*μέγα Φάχον*, *ἐπὶ δὲ Φάχον*, *ἐπ-ἴαχον*), or with augment *εὐαχον* (cp. *εὐαδε* for *ἔ-φαδε*). In Il. 20. 62 *καὶ ἴαχε* would be read *καὶ εὐαχε*. The alternative is to suppose that *ἔ-φἴαχον* became *εἴαχον* by loss of *F* and contraction (Wackernagel, K. Z. xxv. 279): but contraction in such a case is very rare in Homer, and the Aor. meaning of *ἴαχον* has to be accounted for. On the other hand if we accept Schulze's view we have still to admit a Pres. (or Aor.?) Participle *ἴαχον* (*FιΦάχων*).

(2) With *ε* (strong *η*): *ἔθων* *doing as he is wont* (cp. *ἦθ-ος* for *σFηθ-ος*), perhaps *μέδ-οντο* *bethought them* (*μήδ-ομαι*).

The forms μέδοντο, &c. are generally referred to a Verb μέδο-μαι: but no such Present is found, and the other Moods—Subj. Opt. Imper. and Inf.—always admit the Aor. meaning. As to ἔθων see § 243, 1. If an Aor. it should be accented ἔθων.

(3) With ι (strong ει): ἔ-στίχ-ον (στείχω) *marched*, ἔ-πίθοντο *obeyed*, ἰκέσθαι *to come to*, λιπέσθαι *to entreat*, ἤριπε (ἐρείπω) *fell down*, ἤρικε (ἐρείκω) *was torn*, ἤλιτεν *offended* (Mid. ἀλιτέσθαι), ἄϊον *heard*, δίε *feared* (δφι-), δίον *ran*, ἔ-κιον *moved*, ἔ-πιον *drank*, ὄλισθε *slipped*, κρίκε *cracked*.

With αι, αἰθόμενον *burning*, αἰδέτο *felt shame* (§ 32, 2); ἔχραισμε *availed* (§ 32, 3). $\Xi\alpha$

διόν I ran (Il. 22. 251) is not to be connected with διέ *feared*, but with $\Sigma 58\gamma$ ἐν-διε-σαν, διε-νται *chase*, of which we have the Thematic Subj. δίωμαι, Opt. $\rho 317$ δίουτο, Inf. δίσσθαι. That they are Aorists appears (e.g.) from Il. 16. 246 ἐπεὶ κέ δίηται *when he shall have chased*.

ἔκιον is probably an Aor., since *κίω does not occur. The accentuation of the Part. κίων is in favour of this, but not decisively (cp. ἴων, ἰών).

(4) With υ (strong ευ): κύθε *hid*, φύγον *fled*, τύχε *hit upon*, τυθόμην I *heard tell*, ἔστνυγον *felt disgust*, ἔκτυπε *sounded*, ἤρυγε *bel-lowed*, ἤλυθον I *came*, ἔκλυον *heard*, ἄμ-πνευε *recovered breath*.

With αυ, αὔε *shouted*, αὔη (Subj.) *kindle*, ἐπ-αυρεῖν *to gain from*, *enjoy*. With ευ, εὔρε *found*.

ἔκλυον is clearly an Aor. in Homer. The Pres. κλύω, which occurs in Hesiod (Op. 726 οὐ γὰρ τοί γε κλύουσιν) and in Attic poets, is perhaps only a mistaken imitation of the Homeric style.

(5) With ᾠρ, ρᾶ, ρ (strong ερ, ρε): ἐ-πράθ-ο-μεν (πέρθ-ω) *we sacked*, κατ-ἔδραβον *went to sleep*, ἐ-δρακον (δέρκομαι) *looked*, ἔδραμον (δρόμος) *ran*, ἔ-τραπον *turned*, ἔτραφε (τρέφω) *was nurtured*, ταρπώ-μεθα (τέρπω) *let us take our pleasure*, ἔβραχε *rattled*, ἄμαρτε (also ἤμβροτε) *missed*, ἔπταρε *sneezed*, ἔγρ-ετο (ἔγερ-) *was roused*, ἀγρ-όμενοι (ἀγερ-) *assembled* (§ 33).

With ἄλ, λ (strong ελ): ἔ-βαλ-ον (βέλ-ος), ἔ-πλ-εν, ἔπλετο *turned, came to be* (§ 33).

With ορ, ολ: ἐ-πορ-ον *furnished*, ἔθορε *leaped*, ἔπορε *pierced*, ὤρετο *was stirred up*, ἔκ-μολ-ε *came out*, ὀλέσθαι *to perish*.

The ε of the strong Stem appears in εἶλον, ἔλ-ον *took*, ἐρ-έσθαι *to ask* (cp. § 22, 6).

It will be seen that ᾠρ, ρᾶ, ἄλ are generally placed between consonants, where ρ, λ would be unpronounceable. The only exceptions are, ἔπταρον and ἔβαλον. On the other hand ορ, ολ only appear before a vowel.

(6) With ᾱ (strong εν, εμ): ἔ-παθ-ον (πένθ-ος) *suffered*, μάθ-ον *learned*, ἔλαχον *obtained as share*, ἔχαδε (Fut. χείσομαι) *contained*, δακέειν *to bite*, δάηται *shall learn* (δᾶσ-, strong form *δενσ-, cp. δέδαεν, § 36, 5).

ἄν, ἄμ (before a vowel): ἔ-κταν-ον *killed*, ἔθανε *died*, ἔ-καμ-ον *wearied*, τάμεε *cut* (cp. ἔ-δάμ-η, § 42).

εν appears in γεν-έσθαι *to become*.

(7) With loss of ε: ἔ-σχ-ον *held* (ἔχ-ω for σέχ-ω), ἔσπετο *followed*, Inf. ἐπι-σπέσθαι (ἔπομαι for σεπ-ομαι), ἐπι-πτέσθαι (πετ-) *to fly over*, ἔζετο *sat* (for ἔ-σδ-ετο, Ahrens, *Gr. F.* § 95).

The ε is retained in ἔ-τεκ-ον *brought forth*, ἀπ-εχθ-έσθαι *to incur hatred*, ἔσχεθον *held* (?). In these cases loss of ε is phonetically impossible.

ἀπ-ήχθε-το is an Aor. in Homer (the Pres. being ἀπ-εχθάνο-μαι), although a Present ἔχθο-μαι is found in Attic. The simple ἤχθετο (Od. 14. 366, ἔχθεσθαι Od. 4. 756, ἐχθόμενος Od. 4. 502) is called Impf. by Veitch; but the meaning in the three places seems to be the same as in ἀπ-ήχθετο—not *was hateful*, but *came to be hated*.

The only ground for taking ἔσχεθον to be an Aor. is the Inf. σχεθέειν (Il. 23. 466, Od. 5. 320). Possibly this may be a Pres. Inf. in -εεν (§ 85, 2), preserved owing to the impossibility of σχίθειν in the hexameter.

32.] The foregoing list calls for some further remarks.

1. Comparing the Second Aorists of later Greek, we are struck by the number of instances in Homer in which the Thematic ε or ο follows another vowel.

In ἔχραε, φάε, λάε, δάηται (for ἔ-χραῖF-ε, φάF-ε, λάF-ε, δάF-ηται) the hiatus is due to the loss of F. So in λύε (for λófε). Similarly σ is lost in δάηται (δαῖσ-) *shall learn*.

In several cases the Thematic inflexion is found intermingled with Non-thematic forms. Thus we have ἔκλυον, Imper. κλύθι; ἄμ-πνυε, Mid. ἄμ-πνῦ-το; ἔπιον, Imper. πίθι (Ar. Vesp. 1489); δίον *I ran*, ἐν-δίε-σαν *chased* (δίη-μι). The presumption is that the Non-thematic forms are older, the others being derived from them as ἔον *I was* and ἦιον *I went* from corresponding parts of εἶμί, εἶμι (cp. § 18). Similarly we may account for ἔκιον (κι- in Pres. κί-ννυμαι), and perhaps δέε *feared*, ἄιον *heard*.

2. Another characteristic group is formed by the Aorist Stems in which we find initial α either entering into a diphthong (αἰ-, αὐ-) or followed by a double consonant: viz. αἰθ-, αἰδ-, αὐ- (in αὐέ), αὐ- (in αὐῆ *kindle*), αὐρ-, ἀλθ-, ἀλφ-, ἀντ-. Some of these which are usually counted as Present Stems require separate notice:—

αἰθ- occurs in Homer only in the Part. αἰθόμενος *burning*: as to the adjectival use of Participles see § 244. The Stem is found in the Sanser. *idh-ati burns*.

αἰδ- occurs in the Indic. αἰδετο, Imper. αἰδεο, Part. αἰδόμενος; the corresponding Pres. is always αἰδέομαι.

αὐε *shouted* may always be an Aor. (Il. 11. 461., 13. 477., 20.

48, 51). We may identify this *αι-* with *u* in Sanser. *u-noti calls*. The *αι-* is a distinct syllable in the Aor. *αῑν-σε*, cp. *αῑντή*.

αῑνη (Od. 5. 490, v. l. *αῑνοι*) makes good sense as an Aor., expressing the *act* of kindling. The Stem is weak (*αῑνσ-* = Sanser. *ush-* in *ush-ás*, Æol. *αῑως*); the strong form appears in *ε̄ν-ω*, Lat. *uro*.

ε̄π-αυρε̄ιν exhibits the Thematic form answering to *αῑπ-η̄ρα*, *αῑπο-υράς* (§ 13). *Κιαναι αῑναι η̄ναι?*

αῑλθ-ετο, found only in Il. 5. 417, is clearly an Aor.

αῑλφ- occurs in *η̄λφον*, Opt. *αῑλφοι*, with Aor. meaning.

αῑντ- in *η̄ντετο*, *συν-αῑντέσθην*, Inf. *αῑντεσθαι*, Part. *αῑντόμενος*, always with clear Aor. meaning. Accordingly *αῑντεσθαι* in Il. 15. 698 (the only place where it occurs) was accented by Tyrannio *αῑντέσθαι*.

The *αῑ-* of *αῑθ-*, *αῑνσ-*, &c. is discussed by De Saussure along with that of *αῑρχ-*, *αῑγχ-* in a passage quoted above (§ 30 note). He regards it as 'prothetic,' so that the Stems in which it appears are generally in the *weak* form. The *υ-* of *αῑν-* may answer to either *fe* or *eu* in the strong form; thus *αῑνδ-η̄*: *αῑφειδ-ω* = *αῑξω*: *αῑφείξ-ω* (Sanser. *vaksh-*) = *αῑνχ-η̄*: *ε̄νχ-ομαι*, perhaps *ε̄π-αυρε̄ιν*: *ε̄νρ-ε̄ιν*. A similar *αῑ-* appears in *αῑ-μειβω*, *αῑ-μέλω*, *αῑέρω*; perhaps in *αῑ-λιτέσθαι*, *αῑ-μαρτε̄ιν* (but in these it may be originally significant, *infra*, 3).

In *αῑλθ-*, *αῑλφ-*, *αῑντ-* the form is weak (perhaps *αῑλθ-* is to a strong *αῑλθ-* as *αῑλγ-ος*: *αῑλέγ-ω* or *αῑλκ-η̄*: *αῑλεκ-* in *αῑλέξω*), or else the strong and weak forms coincided (as in *αῑρχ-*, *αῑγχ-*, § 30).

It appears then that in the Tenses with which we are dealing the strong Stem has generally disappeared, and the Present has been derived afresh from the weak Stem, by means of one of the various Suffixes. Thus we have *αῑδ-*, Pres. *αῑδ-έομαι*; *αῑνε*, Pres. *αῑντέω*; *αῑνρ-*, Pres. *ε̄π-αυρ-ίσκω*; *αῑντ-*, Pres. *αῑντιάω*, *αῑντιάζω*. The process has been the same in *αῑλιτ-έσθαι* and Pres. *αῑλιτ-αίνω*, *αῑμαρτ-ε̄ιν* and *αῑμαρτ-άνω*, *ε̄νρ-ε̄ιν* and *ε̄νρ-ίσκω*, *ε̄χθέσθαι* and *αῑπ-εχθ-άνομαι*, *ο̄λισθε* and *ο̄λισθ-άνω*, also in Attic *αῑισθ-έσθαι* and *αῑισθ-άνομαι*. The last is interesting as the only post-Homeric Second Aorist which is used in good Attic prose.

3. A few Thematic Aorists seem to be formed from the Stems of Nouns of the O-declension. Thus *ε̄χραισμε* *availed* is generally derived from *χρήσιμος* *useful* (Curt. *Verb.* ii. 13). So, according to Curtius, *θέρμε-τε* *warm ye*, *θέρμε-το* *grew warm*, from *θερμός*; *ο̄πλε-σθαι* (Il. 19. 172., 23. 159) *to get ready*, from *ο̄πλον* (*ο̄πλέ-ω*); *γόνον* (Il. 6. 500) *bewailed*, from *γόςος* (*γο-άω*); *αῑμαρτ-ε̄ιν* *to miss*, from *αῑμαρτ-το-* *without part in*.

Some at least of these instances may be otherwise explained. For *ο̄πλεσθαι* we may read *ο̄πλείσθαι* (the uncontracted *ο̄πλέεσθαι* is impossible in the hexameter). *γόνον* in Il. 6. 500 *αῑ μὲν ἔτι ζῶν γόνον* "Εκτορα κ. τ. λ. makes better sense as an Impf.: Fick reads *γόνω*, 3 Plur. of an 'Æolic' *γόνημ*. Possibly *γόνον* is for *γόεον* by hyphaeresis (§ 105, 4).

33.] In several cases it is difficult to say whether loss of *ε* is characteristic of an Aor. Stem, or is merely phonetic, due to

'syncope.' Thus we have ἀγέροντο, Part. ἀγρόμενοι: ὄφελον *ought* and the Attic ὄφλον *owed*: πέλω and the syncopated forms ἐπλεν, ἐπλετο, Part. ἐπιπλόμενος, &c. (not ἐπελεν, ἐπέλετο, &c. in Homer).

ἀγέροντο *were assembled*, Inf. ἀγέρεσθαι (so accented in MSS.) imply a Pres. ἀγέρω; but the Part. ἀγρ-όμενοι seems to be an Aor. The ε is only lost in the Part., whereas in the undoubted Aor. ἔγρ-ετο the form ἔγρ- never occurs (Opt. ἔγροιο. Inf. ἔγρεσθαι). In Il. 7. 434., 24. 789 ἀμφὶ πυρῆν . . . ἔγρετο λαός Cobet *Misc. Crit.* p. 415) proposed to read ἤγρετο, from ἀγερ-. The emendation gives a good sense, but is not absolutely necessary.

ὄφελον *ought* (= *would that*) bears a different sense from the Aor. ὄφλον, but is indistinguishable from the Impf. ὄφελλον (Od. 8. 312 τῷ μὴ γείνασθαι ὄφελλον, so Il. 7. 390., 24. 764, Od. 14. 68., 18. 401). Hence ὄφελον is probably an older form of the Imperfect which has survived in this particular use.

ἐπλεν, ἐπλε-το, &c. must be Aorists, since —

(1) ἐπλετο occurs in the 'gnomic' use, e.g.—

Il. 2. 480 ἦντε βοῦς ἀγέληφι μέγ' ἔξοχος ἐπλετο πάντων

and so in Il. 24. 94, Od. 7. 217. This use is not found with the Impf.

(2) ἐπλετο with the meaning of a Present can only be explained as an Aor. = the English Pf., *has turned out, has come to be, (and so is)*: see § 78, and cp. Il. 12. 271 νῦν ἐπλετο ἔργον ἀπάντων *now it has become*: with another Aor. similarly used, Il. 15. 227 πολὺ κέρδιον ἐπλετο, ὅτι ὑπόειξεν *it is better that he has yielded*: also Il. 6. 434., 7. 31., 8. 552., 14. 337., 19. 57, Od. 20. 304, &c.

The Part. occurs in ἐπι-πλόμενον ἔτος (Od.) and περι-πλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν, with much the same force as the Pres. Part. in the equivalent phrase περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν. But, as we shall see, an Aor. Part. may have the meaning of an *adjective* (§ 244): cp. *rotunda dies*.

34.] Comparison of the Thematic 'Strong' Aorists found in Homer with those of other periods of Greek brings out strikingly the relation between the Homeric and the later dialect.

It may be assumed that the Strong Aorists, like the Strong Preterites in English, were a diminishing class, never added to (except by learned imitators of the Epic style), and gradually superseded by the more convenient forms in -σα. Hence the comparative frequency of these Aorists in an author indicates either an early date or (at least) the use of an archaic style.

Curtius enumerates altogether 117 Strong Aorists, of which 84 are found in Homer. Of these 84, again, about 30 occur also in prose, while as many more are used in the later poetical style (ἔλακον, ἔκιον, ἔκλυον, μολεῖν, πορεῖν, &c.). Of the non-Homeric examples only one, viz. αἰσθῆσθαι, belongs to the language of prose; about 15 are found in good early poetry (e.g. δικεῖν, θιγεῖν, κανεῖν, βλαστεῖν, in Attic dramatists); most of the others are evidently figments of learned poets, imitated from actual Homeric forms, e.g. ἔδαεν (from Homeric δέδαεν), ἔμμορον (from μόρος and the Homeric Pf. ἔμμορε), ἔδουπε.

These facts seem to show both the high antiquity of the Homeric language and the position which it held as the chief though not the only source of the poetical vocabulary of historical times.

35.] **The Reduplicated Thematic Present.** This formation appears in a few instances only :—

μί-μν-ετε *await* (μέν-ω).

πίπτε *fell* (πετ-).

ἴσχει *holds*, for *σι-σχ-ει, from *σεχ-.

ἴζει *sits*, for *σι-σδ-ει, from σεδ-.

γίγνεται *becomes* (γεν-).

τίκτω, for τι-τκ-ω, from τεκ-.

νίσσομαι *I go, pass*, for νι-νσ-ομαι, or νι-νσ-μο-μαι, from νεσ- : related to νέομαι (§ 29, 6) as ἴσχω to ἔχω.

δίξει *sought* (Thematic form answering to δίξημαι, § 16).

λαύ-εις *sleepest* (Aor. ἄεσα, for ἀφε-σα, *I slept*, cp. αὔξω and ἀέξω).

In this group of Verbs the Root is in the weak form; the vowel of the reduplication is always *ι*.

ιάχω (for Fi-Fáchω) is generally placed in this class. The Pres. Indic. does not occur, and the past Tense ἴαχον is an Aor. in Il. 5. 860., 14. 148., 18. 219 ὅτε τ' ἴαχε σάλπιγγι (§ 79), and may always be so in Homer. As to its original form see § 31, 1, *note*. Thus the evidence for ἴάχω is reduced to the Part. ἴάχων, and that is not used in a way that is decisive between the Pres. and the Aor.

36.] **The Reduplicated Aorist.** These Tenses are formed with the weak Stem, and either (1) reduplication of an initial consonant with *ε*, or (2) Attic Reduplication. The following are the chief examples :—

(1) *ἄ* : ἐκ-λέλαθ-ον *made to forget*, λελαβέσθαι *to seize*, κεκάδων *severing*, κεκάδοντο *yielded*, κεχάροντο *rejoiced*, ἄμ-πεπαλῶν *brandishing on high*, τεταγῶν *grasping*, ἦγ-αγ-ον *led*, ἐξ-ήπαφε *deceived*, ἦραρε *fitted*, ἦκαχε *vexed*.

(2) *ι* : πεπίθ-οιμεν *may persuade*, πεφιδέσθαι *to spare*.

(3) *υ* : τετύκ-οντο *made for themselves*, πεπούθοιτο *may hear by report*, κεκύθωσι *shall hide*.

(4) *ᾱρ* (ρᾱ), ᾱλ, λ : τετάρπ-ετο *was pleased*, πέφραδε *showed forth*, ᾱλ-αλκε *warded off*, ἐ-κέ-κλ-ετο *shouted* (κελ-).

(5) *ᾱ, ν* (for εν) : λελάχ-ητε (Subj.) *make to share*, δέδαεν *taught* (cp. § 31, 5); ἔ-πε-φν-ε *slew* (cp. πέ-φᾶ-ται *is slain*).

(6) Loss of *ε* : ἔ-τε-τμε *found, caught* (τεμ-?); ἔειπον *said* (perhaps for ἐ-φε-φεπ-ον)*; also ἔσπετο *followed*, if it is taken to be for σέσπε-το.

* The difficulty in the way of this explanation is that in the old Attic inscriptions which distinguish the original diphthong *ει* (written EI) from the sound arising from contraction or 'compensatory' lengthening (written E), the word *εἶπε* is always written with EI (Cauer in *Curt. Stud.* viii. 257). In Sanscr. the corresponding form is *avocam*, for *a-va-vac-am* (*vā* becoming *uo*). Answering to this we expect in Greek *ἔειπον* (Vogrinz, *Gr. d. hom. Dial.* p. 123).

The forms which point to *σε-σπε-το, viz. ἔσπωνται (Od. 12. 349), ἐσποίμην (Od. 19. 579., 21. 77), ἐσπέσθω (Il. 12. 350, 363), ἐσπόμενος (Il. 10. 246., 12. 395., 13. 570), can be easily altered (e.g. by writing ἅμα σποίμην for ἅμ' ἐσποίμην). We always have ἐπι-σπέσθαι, ἐπι-σπόμενος, μετασπόμενος (never ἐφ-εσπόμενος, &c.); i.e. ἐσπ- only creeps in when a preceding final vowel can be elided without further change.

(7) A peculiar Reduplication is found in ἡρόκακε (Pres. ἐρόκ-ω) *checked*, and ἡρίπαπε (ἐνιπή) *rebuked*.

These Aorists are exclusively Homeric, except ἦγαγον and ἔειπον (Attic εἶπον). They are mostly Transitive or Causative in meaning; compare ἔ-λαχο-ν *I got for my share*, with λέλαχο-ν *I made to share*; ἄρηρε *is fitting*, with ἦραρε *made to fit*, &c. ^{δγ π 214, δ 177}

The Inf. δεδάα-σθαι (Od. 16. 316) is not to be connected with the Perf. Part. δεδα-ώς, but is for δεδαέσθαι, Inf. Mid. of the Reduplicated Aorist ἐδάεν *taught*. Thus the sense is *to have oneself taught*.

37.] **Aorists in -ᾶ.** Besides the usual forms of ἔ-ειπο-ν (εἶπο-ν) we find a 2 Sing. εἶπα-ς (Il. 1. 106, 108), or ἔ-ειπα-ς (Il. 24. 379), 2 Plur. εἶπα-τε (Od. 3. 427). Answering to the Attic ἡνεγκον Homer has ἦνειακα, Opt ἐνείκα-ι, &c.: but Inf. ἐνεικέ-μεν (Il. 19. 194). In these two cases the form in -ον is probably older.

Tenses with Suffix (Non-Thematic).

38.] The Tense-Stems which remain to be discussed are formed (like the Presents in -νημι and -ννμι) by means of a characteristic Suffix. Of these Tense-Stems three are Non-Thematic, viz. those of the Aorists formed by the Suffixes -σᾶ, -η, and -θη.

It is important to notice the difference between these formations and the Perfect and Aorist Stems which take -κα. The Suffix -κα in such cases is not characteristic of the Tense-Stem. It is only found as a rule with certain Person-Endings.

39.] **The Aorist in -σᾶ** (called 'Sigmatic' and 'Weak*' Aor.). The Suffix -σᾶ is joined to the Verb-Stem (usually in its strong form), as ἔρρηξε (ῥηγ-), ἠλειψα-ν (ἀλειφ-), ἔπνευ-σα-ν (πνευ-), ἔδεισε (for ἔ-δφει-σε) *feared*, ἔ-βη-σᾶ-ν, ἔ-φῦ-σᾶ.

The following are the chief varieties:—

1. Verb-Stems ending in a Dental or σ, preceded by a short vowel, form -σσᾶ or -σᾶ: thus we have ἦρεσσα and ἦρεσα (for ἦ-ρετ-σα, from ἐρετ-); ἔσ-σατο, ἔσασθαι (φεσ-); σβέσ-σαι, τρέσ-

* The term 'Weak' implies formation by means of a Suffix. It was suggested by the analogy between the two Aorists and the Strong and Weak Preterites of the Teutonic languages.

before δ is lost in ξ -σπεισα (for ξ -σπενδ-σα): cp. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ for $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta$ -σομαι, &c. The form $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\alpha\iota$ (Il. 23. 337) is later.

The Verb-Stem $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda$ - makes an Aor. Opt. $\delta\phi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon$: see § 53.

40.] **Primitive Aorists with Suffix -σ-.** Originally the Sigmatic Aorist was inflected like the Aorist in $\acute{\alpha}$ already described (§ 15): that is to say, the a appeared in the 1 Sing. (perhaps also 3 Plur. $\acute{\alpha}\nu$) and the Stem was liable to variation between a strong and a weak form. Thus from a Stem $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\kappa$ -, $\tau\ddot{\upsilon}\kappa$ -, with the regular phonetic changes, we should have had—

Active, 1 Sing. $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\zeta\alpha$.

2 $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\zeta$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\kappa$ -σ-σ).

3 $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\zeta$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\kappa$ -σ-τ).

1 Plur. $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu$ (or $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu$).

2 $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon$ (or $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon$).

3 $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\zeta\alpha\nu$.

Middle, 1 Sing. $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\mu\eta\nu$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ- $\mu\eta\nu$).

2 $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\zeta\omicron$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ-σο), Imper. $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\omicron$.

3 $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\kappa\tau\omicron$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ-το).

3 Du. $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\theta\eta\nu$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ-σθην).

Inf. $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\theta\alpha\iota$ (for $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ-σθαι or $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ-θαι).

Part. $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (for $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ- $\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$).

Several forms belonging to this scheme have survived in Homer:

$\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\zeta\alpha$, Mid. $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\mu\eta\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron$, Imper. $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\omicron$, Inf. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ - $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\alpha\iota$, Part. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ - $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

($\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\zeta\acute{\alpha}$ - $\mu\eta\nu$), $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\omicron$, Imper. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\omicron$, Inf. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\alpha\iota$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\zeta\alpha$, Mid. $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\kappa\tau\omicron$ and $\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\omicron$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\zeta\alpha$, Mid. $\kappa\alpha\tau$ - $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\kappa\tau\omicron$ (Il. 11. 378).

$\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\sigma\alpha$, Mid. Inf. $\acute{\pi}\acute{\epsilon}\rho\theta\alpha\iota$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\lambda\alpha$, Mid. $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\lambda\tau\omicron$, $\acute{\pi}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\omicron$.

($\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha$ - $\tau\omicron$), $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\sigma\omicron$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\omicron$ (better $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\sigma\omicron$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\omicron$), Part. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi$ - $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

$\acute{\omega}\rho\sigma\alpha$, Mid. $\acute{\omega}\rho\tau\omicron$, Imper. $\acute{\omicron}\rho\sigma\omicron$, Inf. $\acute{\omicron}\rho\theta\alpha\iota$, Part. $\acute{\omicron}\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

$\acute{\eta}\rho\sigma\alpha$, Part. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

($\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha$ - $\tau\omicron$), Part. $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

($\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\acute{\alpha}$ - $\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$), $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\kappa\tau\omicron$ (read $\text{F}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\zeta\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\text{F}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\kappa\tau\omicron$, § 53).

$\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron$ seized ($\gamma\epsilon\mu$ -).

$\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\eta\nu\alpha$, 3 Du. $\mu\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\eta\nu$ (cp. $\acute{\pi}\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\nu\theta\epsilon$ for $\acute{\pi}\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu$ -σθε).

$\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\omicron$ (Hes. Th. 481), Part. $\acute{\iota}\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ coming.

Add $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\kappa\tau\omicron$ (Thebais, fr. 3), $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron$ (Alcm. fr. 141).

The 'regular' forms, such as $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\alpha\tau\omicron$, $\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron$, $\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$, are to be explained like $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$ - $\tau\omicron$, &c. (§ 15). On this view $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\alpha\tau\omicron$ and $\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron$ are related to $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\omicron$ and $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\omicron$ precisely as $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\tau\omicron$ to $\chi\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron$, and similarly $\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha$ - $\tau\omicron$ to $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ as $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\tau\omicron$ to $\chi\acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

The form $\mu\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\eta\nu$ (Il. 4. 146) is now generally taken as 3 Plur., for $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\theta\epsilon\nu$, or $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$. The 3 Plur. in $-\eta\nu$ is found occa-

sionally on inscriptions in other dialects (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 468); but that is very slight ground for admitting it in Homer. In any case it is later than -εν, and due to the analogy of the other Person-Endings*.

The Homeric forms of the Subj. also pre-suppose a Stem without final α: e. g. the Subj. βήσ-ο-μεν points to an Indic. *ξ-βησ-μεν (§ 80). The existence of such Indicatives in an earlier period of the language is proved by the Sanscrit Aorists with *S*, many of which join the Person-Endings directly to the Stem, without an 'auxiliary' *a* (except in the 1 Sing. and 3 Plur.); e. g. the Root *ji* gives *ajaiś-am*, 3 Sing. *ajaiś* (for *a-jai-s-t*), 1 Plur. *ajaiś-ma*, &c.

Upon this stage of inflexion Joh. Schmidt has based a very probable explanation of the 3 Plur. Ending -σαν (*K. Z.* xxvii. p. 323). It is evident that owing to the loss of σ the Tense-Stem of such forms as *ἔτευγμεν*, *ἔτευκτε*, *ἔτευκτο* appears as *τευκ-* or *τυκ-*, instead of *τευξ-*, *τυξ-*. Consequently the form *ἔτευξαν* would be felt as *ἔτευκ-σαν*; that is to say, -σαν would become in fact the 3 Plur. Ending. Such an Ending would then be easily transferred to other Tenses,—*ἔδο-σαν*, *ἔστα-σαν*, &c. The usual theory is that -σαν in these forms comes from the regular Aor. in -σα. But this does not explain why it is confined to the 3 Plur.—why we have (e. g.) *ἔδο-σαν* but not *ἔδο-σαμεν*.

41.] Aorist in -σε(ο). Several Stems form a Weak Aorist as a thematic tense, with ε or ο instead of ᾶ: viz. *ἴξο-ν*, *ἔ-βήσε-το*, *ἔ-δύσε-το* (*δυσό-μενος* Od. 1. 24); Imper. *πελάσσε-τον* (Il. 10. 442), *ἄξε-τε*, *οἴσε-τε*, *λέξε-ο*, *ῥρσε-ο*; Inf. *ἄξε-μεναι* (Il. 23. 50, 111), *οἰσέμεναι* (Il. 3. 120): perhaps also *ἔ-πεσο-ν* (*πετ-*).

The forms *ἔβησετο*, *ἔδύσετο* were preferred by Aristarchus to those in -σᾶτο: see Schol. A on Il. 2. 579., 3. 262., 10. 513. They were regarded by ancient grammarians as Imperfects (Schol. A on Il. 1. 496); and this view is supported by one or two passages, esp. Od. 10. 107, where *ἡ μὲν ἄρ' ἐς κρήνην κατεβήσετο* must mean *she was going down to the spring* (when the messengers met her). So in the Part., Od. 1. 24 *οἱ μὲν δυσομένον Ὑπερίονος οἱ δ' ἀνιόντος*, and Il. 5. 46 *νύξ' Ἰππων ἐπιβησόμενον* *pierced as he was mounting his chariot*, cp. 23. 379.

The forms *ἴξο-ν*, *ἄξε-μεναι*, &c. answer closely to the Sanscr. Preterite in -*sa-m*, as *á-diksha-m*. *ἔπεσον* is difficult to explain as *ἔ-πετ-σον*, both (1) because it can hardly be accidental that we never have *ἔπεσσον*, and (2) because it has to be separated from the Doric *ἔπετον*. Possibly there was a primitive non-Thematic **ἔ-πετα*, *ἔ-πες*, *ἔπες* (for *ἔ-πετ-ς*, *ἔ-πετ-τ*), Du. *ἔπεστον*, &c., 3 Plur. *ἔ-πετ-αν*, from which both *ἔπετ-ον* and *ἔπεσ-ον* might be derived in much the same way as *ἔκταν-ον* from the primitive *ἔ-κτενα*, Plur. *ἔ-κτᾶ-μεν* (§ 13).

* One of the reviewers of the former edition (Cauer in the *Jahresb. d. philol. Vereins*) objects that the Dual does not suit the context ('hier gar nicht in den Zusammenhang passt'). The subject is *μηροί*, which is Dual in sense; and the Dual might well be restored throughout the sentence (*τοίω τοι, Μινέλαε, μιάνην αἵματι μηρῶ εὐφύεε, κνήμαί τε κ.τ.λ.*). The explanation of a Dual is due to Buttmann (*Ausf. Spr.* ii. 244, ed. 2).

42.] **The Aorist in -η-ν.** The Stem of this Tense is formed by suffixing η to the weak form of the Verb-Stem. This η becomes ε in the 3 Plur. (-εν for original -εντ), the Opt. and the Part. (*i. e.* before ι and ντ). The Person-Endings are those of the Active, but the meaning is either Intransitive or Passive: e. g. ἐ-χάρ-η rejoiced, ἐ-δάη was taught, ἐ-φάν-η appeared, τράφ-η was nurtured, ἐ-άλ-η shrunk (Stem Fελ-), δι-έ-τμαγ-ε-ν parted asunder, ἐ-πάγ-η, ἐ-δάμ-η, ἐ-άγ-η, ἔ-βλαβ-ε-ν, ἐ-μίγ-η, τάρπ-η-μεν and (with Metathesis) τραπ-ή-ομεν (τέρπ-ω), &c.

The Stem is long in ἐ-πλήγ-η (cp. ἐ-πέπληγ-ον, πληγ-ή), and once in ἐάγῃ (ā in Il. II. 559)*. The Inf. *τερσῆ-μεναι* (*τερσῆναι*), which occurs in Il. 16. 519, Od. 6. 98, need not be an Aorist: see the similar forms in § 19. The Part. *ἀνα-βροχέν* (Od. II. 586) is not connected with *ἀνα-βέβροχεν* (§ 25); see Buttmann, *Lexil.*

There is evidently a close relation between these 'Passive' Aorists and the forms discussed in § 14 (such as ἐ-βλη-ν, ἔ-πτη-ν, ἔ-τλη, ἔ-σβη), and we can hardly doubt that they are nothing more than an extension by analogy of that older type (see Brugmann, *M. U.* i. 71). The chief difference is that (as in the Thematic Aorist) the Stem is usually disyllabic, retaining the short vowel of the root: thus we have ἐ-δάμη, but δμη- in δέ-δμη-ται, &c.

The Aorists with Stems in ā and ω (§ 19) are parallel to the Aorists in -η. Thus γηῶ-ναι, βιῶ-ναι, ἀλῶ-ναι only differ in the quality of the vowel from δαῖ-ναι, ἀλῆ-ναι: and there might have been numerous Aorists in -āν and -ων along with those in -ην, just as there are derivative Verbs in -αω, -οω as well as in -εω.

43.] **The Aorist in -θη-ν.** The Stem of this Tense is formed by the Suffix -θη. The Person-Endings are the same as those of the Aorist in -η, and the meaning is Reflexive or Passive.

In later Greek the Verb-Stem is mostly in the strong form, as ἐ-δήχ-θη-ν, ἐ-λείψ-θη-ν, ἐ-ζεύχ-θη-ν; but this does not seem to have been the original rule: e. g. Homer has ἐ-τύχ-θη was made, Attic ἐ-τεύχ-θη. So we find the weak Stem in κατ-έ-κτᾶ-θεν (κτεν-), τᾶ-θη (τεν-), τάρφ-θη (τέρπ-ω), τραφ-θῆ-ναι (τρέπω), ἐ-στᾶ-θη (Od. 17. 463), λῦ-θη, ἔξ-ε-σύ-θη, ἔ-φθῖ-θεν.

The Stems of κλίνω and κρίνω vary in regard to the ν: we have ἐ-κλίν-θη and ἐ-κλίθ-θη, κριν-θῆ-ντες and δι-έ-κρίθ-ε-ν.

44.] **Meaning of the Passive Aorists.** The Aorist in -η appears to have originally had an Intransitive sense, of which the Passive sense was a growth or adaptation. This transition is

* In the former edition Bekker's reading ἐάγῃ (Pf. Subj) was given as the probable correction for this passage. But the sense required is rather that of the Aor.—*were* (*i. e.* had been) broken—than the Pf.—*are in a broken state.* Cp. Hes. Op. 534 οὐ τ' ἐπὶ νῶτα ἕαγε whose back is broken down, *i. e.* bowed. As to the ā of ἐάγῃ see § 67, 3.

seen (e.g.) in ἐχάρη *rejoiced*, ἐδάν *learned*, ῥύη *flowed*, ἐφάνη *appeared*. In these instances the Passive grows out of the Intransitive meaning (as in the Middle forms it grows out of the Reflexive meaning). Similar transitions of meaning may be found in the Perfect (§ 28, *fin.*), the Aorist (ἔσβη *was quenched*), and even in the Present, as ἐκπίπτειν *to be driven out*, κείται *is laid down* (as Pf. Mid. of τίθημι), and πάσχω itself.

The Aorist in -θη-ν is often indistinguishable in meaning from the Aor. Middle. There appears to be ground for distinguishing it from the Aor. in -ην as originally reflexive rather than intransitive (Wackernagel, *K. Z.* xxx. 305.) In many cases Middle forms are used in Homer interchangeably with those in -θη-ν: thus we find ἀάσατο and ἀάσθη, αἰδετο ἠδέσατο and αἰδέσθητε, ἀίξασθαι and ἀίχθηναι, δυνήσατο and δυνάσθη, κορέσσατο and κορέσθη, μνήσασθαι and μνησθηναι, ἀπ-ενάσατο and νάσθη, ἐφρασάμην and ἐφράσθης, οἴσατο and ὄισθη, ἐχολώσατο and ἐχολώθη, ἐρείσατο and ἐρείσθη, ὠρμήσατο and ὠρμήθη, &c.; also ἔφθιτο and ἔφθιθεν, ἄμπνυτο and ἄμπνύθη, λύτο and λύθη, ἔκτατο and ἔκταθεν, λέκτο and ἐλέχθη, μῖκτο and ἐμίχθη.

This observation has recently suggested a very probable account of the origin of the Aor. in -θη-ν. The 2 Sing. Mid. Ending in Sanscr. is -thās, to which would correspond Greek -θης. Hence the original inflexion was (e.g.) ἐ-λύ-μην, ἐ-λύ-θης, ἔ-λυ-το, &c. Then ἐλύθης was regarded as ἐ-λύθη-ς, that is to say, λυθη- was taken as the Tense-Stem, and the inflexion was completed on the model of the already formed Aorists in -ην (Wackernagel, *l. c.*).

The Aorists in -ην and -θη-ν are formations peculiar to Greek, and were doubtless developed along with the separation of Present and Aorist forms which had hardly been completed in the time of Homer (Curtius, *Verb.* ii. 1 ff.). It is worth notice that the three Aorists that have a distinctive Suffix agree in avoiding the Thematic Endings, while the Impf. tends to adopt them, as in ἐτίθει, ἐδίδου, ὤμνυε, &c. The reason doubtless was that the Thematic inflexion already prevailed in the Present. Thus a distinction of form was gained which was especially needed for the Aorists in -ην. Forms like ἐφίλει (which at first, as we see from φιλή-μεναι, subsisted side by side with ἐφίλη) were adopted as Imperfects, while ἐμίγη &c. were retained as Aorists.

Thematic Present (with Suffix).

45.] In the forms to which we now proceed the Verb-Stem receives a suffix which serves to distinguish the Present Stem; as τύπ-τω, κάμ-νω, βιά-σκω, κτείνω (for κτεν-ιω).

These suffixes may be compared with other elements used in the same way, but not always confined to the Present; as κ in ὀλέ-κω *I destroy*, ἐρύ-κω *I restrain*, διώ-κω *I chase*, γ in τμή-γω *I cut*, χ in νη-χέ-μεναι *to swim*, τρύ-χουσι *they waste*, σμή-χειν *to smear*, σ in αὔξω (*aug-co*), θ in σχέ-θε *held*, ἔσθειν (*ἐδ-θειν*) *to eat*,

βῤῥῖ-θο-ν were heavy, *πλῆ-θεν* was full, *ἔρε-θε* provoke, *φλεγέ-θει* blazes, *μινύ-θει* diminishes, *φθινύ-θει* wastes, *ἔργα-θεν* kept off, *θαλέ-θο-ντες* blooming, *μετ-ε-κία-θον* moved after, *ἠερέ-θο-νται* flutter, *ἠγερέ-θο-ντο* were assembled (*ἀγερ-*, in *ἀγειρώ*), &c. These elements were called by Curtius Root-Determinatives (*Chron.* p. 22 ff.)—the name implying that they are of the nature of suffixes modifying or ‘determining’ the meaning of a simple Root. But their origin and primitive significance are quite unknown (Brugmann, *Grundriss*, ii. § 8, n. 2).

46.] **The T-Class.** The suffix *-τε* (ο) is usually found with a Verb-Stem ending in a labial mute (*π, β, φ*), as *ἐνιπ-τε* rebuke (*ἐνῖπ-ή*), *χαλέπ-τει* annoys, *ἀστράπ-τει* lightens, *σκέπ-τεο* look out, *κλέπ-τε*, *κόπ-τε*, *τύπ-τε*, *ἔ-μαρπ-τε*; *ἄπτω* (*ἄφ-*) fasten, *κρύπτω* (*κρύφ-α*) hiding, *θάπτε* (*θαφ-*) bury, *ράπτειω* to sew, string together; *βλάπτει* (*βλαῖβ-*) harms.

The Stem is in the weak form; the corresponding long forms are generally wanting.

This suffix is combined with Reduplication in *ἰ-άπ-τω* (for *ἰ-ιάπ-τω*, cp. Lat. *jac-io*) I hurl, which occurs in Od. 2. 376 *κατὰ χροῖα καλὸν ἰάπτῃ* shall maltreat (lit. knock about) her fair flesh*.

πτ may be for *π-τ*, and, if so, these Verbs would belong to the I-Class (§ 50). In some cases, however, the *π* represents an original guttural. Thus we find *ἐνίσσω* (*ἐνικ-ιω*), as well as *ἐνίπτω* (*ἐνιπ-ή*); *πέσσω*, later *πέπτω* (*πέπ-ων*); *νίζω*, later *νίπτω* (*ἀπονίπτεσθαι* in Od. 18. 179 is doubtful). Here *ἐνίσσω*, *πέσσω*, *νίζω* are formed by the suffix *-κε*(ο), and consequently *ἐνίπτω*, *πέπτω*, *νίπτω* must be otherwise explained. So in *σκέπτομαι*, since *σκεπ-* is for *σπεκ-* (Lat. *spec-io*), the form with *πτ* must be at least later than the metathesis. Hence if we adhere to the supposition that *-πτ-* is for *-πκ-* we must explain these four forms as due to the analogy of other Verbs in *-πτε*(ο) already in existence.

47.] **The Nasal Class.** The suffix is *-νε* (ο) after a vowel or *μ*: *φθά-νει* comes first, *τί-νων* paying (a penalty), *δύ-νε* sank in, *θύ-νον* bustled, *κάμ-νε* grew weary, *τάμ-νε* cut; *-ἄνε*(ο) after a mute, *ἤμαρτ-ανε* missed, *ἤλδ-ανε* made fat, *ληθ-άνει* makes to forget, *οἰδ-άνει* swells, *κυδ-άνει* glorifies, *ἐ-κεύθ-ανον* hid, *ἀπ-εχθ-άνειαι* becomes hateful: often with the weak Stem and *ν* inserted, *ἄνδ-άνει* pleases (*ἄδ-*), *λανθ-ανόμεν*, *ἐ-χάνδ-ανον*, *ἐ-λάγχ-ανον*, *τύγχ-ανε*, *πνυθ-άνομαι*.

The suffix *-ανε*(ο) is combined with Reduplication (as in § 35)

* With *ἰ-άπ-τω* may be connected *ἰ-άφ-θη*, which occurs in the phrase *ἐπὶ δ' ἀσπίς ἐάφθη καὶ κόρυς* (Il. 13. 543., 14. 419), of a warrior's shield, which falls with or after him. For the aspirate (*ἰάφθη* for *ἰ-ιάφθη*) compare *ἤκα*, *ἔστο*, &c. This explanation was given by Ebel, in *K. Z.* iv. 167. The scholar to whom I owe this reference, F. Froehde, derives it from Sanscr. *varāmi*, ‘I throw, strew about:’ so *ἀπποεῖς* = ‘one whose words are thrown about at random’ (*Bezz. Beitr.* iii. 24). See Curtius, *Verb.* ii. 364 (2 ed.).

in *πιμ-πλ-άνεται* (Il. 9. 679), *ισχάνω* (for *σι-σχ-άνω), *ιζάνω* (for *σι-σδ-άνω).

The class of Verbs in *-νω* is derived from the Non-thematic Verbs in *-νυ-*. Sometimes, as has been noticed (§ 18), *-νυ* takes the Thematic *ε* or *ο* after it, as in *ὀμ-νύω* for *ὀμνῦ-μι*; but in other cases, especially when *-νυ* follows a vowel, *υ* becomes *φ* and is lost. Thus *ἀ-νυ-* gives *ἀνύω* *I accomplish*, and also *ἀνεται* (*ᾶ*) *draws to a close*: so *τίνν-ται* *punishes* and *τίνω*, *φθίνν-* (in *φθίνῦ-θω*) and *φθίνω*. The vowel of *ᾶνω*, *φθάνω*, *τίνω*, *φθίνω* is long in Homer, short in Attic (cp. Homeric *ξέω-ος* for *ξέν-φος*, Attic *ξέν-ος*); whereas in *κλίνω*, *κρίνω* (for *κλι-νω*, *κρι-νω*) it is always long. Note also that *-νε(ο)* for *-νφε(ο)* is confined to the Present, while the *ν* of *κλίνω*, &c. appears in other Tenses (Solmsen, *K. Z.* xxix. 78).

ἐλαύνω has been explained as **ἐλα-νυ-ω*, but there is no parallel for epenthesis of *υ*.

The *ᾶ* of *ικάνω*, *κιχάνω* points to *-αν-φω*, but the forms have not been satisfactorily explained.

48.] Stems formed by *-σκε(ο)*, the Iterative class of Curtius.

(1) Without Reduplication, as *βά-σκε go*, *βό-σκει feeds*, *φά-σκε said*, *ιλά-σκο-νται propitiate*, *ἠλάσκουσι flit about*, *θνή-σκο-ν died*, *θρή-σκουσι leap*, *προ-βλω-σκέ-μεν to go before* (*βλω-* for *μλω-*).

(2) With Reduplication, *μι-μνή-σκε-ται is reminded*, *κί-κλη-σκεν called*, *γι-γνώ-σκω I know*, *πί-φau-σκε showed*.

Stems ending in a consonant sometimes insert *ι*, as *ἀπ-αφ-ί-σκει deceives*, *ἄρ-ἄρ-ι-σκε fitted*, *εὐρ-ίσκω I find* (Od. 19. 158), *ἐπ-αυρ-ίσκονται get benefit from* (Il. 13. 733). A final consonant is lost before *σκ* in *δι-δασκέ-μεν* (for *δι-δαχ-σκε-*), *ἴσκω* and *εἴσκω* (cp. *ἴκ-ελος*), *τι-τύσκε-το* (*τύκ-ορ τυχ-*), *δει-δίσκετο welcomed* (*δίκ-*); probably also in *μίσγω-ν* (for *μιγ-σκο-ν*) and *πάσχω* (for *παθ-σκω*).

49.] Iterative Tenses. The suffix *-σκε(ο)* is also used to form a number of Past Tenses with Iterative meaning, as *ἔσκε* (for *ἔσ-σκε*) *used to be*, *ἔχε-σκε used to hold*, *καλέ-εσκε*, *πελέ-σκε-ο* (Il. 22. 433), *νικά-σκο-μεν* (Od. 11. 512), *τρωπά-σκετο* (Il. 11. 568), *ρίπτα-σκέ*, *οἴχνε-σκε*, *πωλέ-σκε-το*, *ᾤθε-σκε*, &c.; and from Aorist Stems, as *στά-σκε*, *δό-σκο-ν*, *εἶπε-σκε*, *φάνε-σκε*, *ἐρητύ-σα-σκε*, *δα-σά-σκε-το*, *ᾤσά-σκε*, &c. These formations differ from the Present Stems described above (1) in carrying distinctly the notion of *repeated action* and (2) in being confined to the Past Indicative. They are peculiar to the Ionic dialect, and the forms derived from Aorists in *-σα* are only found in Homer.

ἔ-φασκο-ν has sometimes a distinctly Iterative meaning in Homer, as Od. 8. 565 *Ναυσιθόου, δὲ ἔφασκε Ποσειδάων' ἀγάσασθαι*, and the Pres. *φάσσω* does

Od. 11. 306 *εἰδὼς δὲ τὸν ἑσθλὸν ἄνδρα*, *ἔρασαν ἑσθλὸν ἄνδρα* Od. 5. 135, 11. 275, 7. 256, 14. 320, 24. 269

(3) -ειω : πενθείε-τον (probably for πενθεσ-ιε-τον) *mourn*, μαχειό-μενος *fighting*, οἰνοβαρείων *drunken*, τέλειο-ν *brought to pass*, κείων *splitting*, ἀκειό-μενοι *being healed*, νεικείη-σι *shall quarrel*, ὀκνεῖω *I shrink*, ὕμνειω (Hes.).

When the diphthongs αι, ει come before a vowel there is a tendency to drop the ι; as ἀγα-ίο-μαι, 2 Plur. ἀγά-σθε (for ἀγά-ε-σθε, § 55); κερα-ίω, 2 Plur. κερά-σθε; τέλειο-ν, also τέλειο-ν; ναῖον *swam*, also νά-ει, νά-ουσι; perhaps also δάηται *shall be destroyed* (root δαι-; see Schulze, *K. Z.* xxix. p. 258). Where this tendency does not show itself, as in παῖω, πταῖω, σείω, it will usually be found that the diphthong belongs to the whole Verb, not merely to the Present Stem.

So perhaps ἐράσθε *ye loved*, ἰλάονται *appease*, ἔλων *drove* (Part. ἐλάων), ἔκλων *broke*: unless these forms are obtained by simple change from the Non-Thematic ἐρα-μαι, &c. (§ 18).

For the Presents in -ειω from -εγω (θείω, πλείω, &c.), see § 29, 3.

(4) -υιω : ὄπιε *had to wife* (for ὄπισ-ιω).

Most of the Presents in -υω are of this Class (original -υιω), as φύω (Aeolic φυῖω), θύω (ἔθυιεν Hesych.), λύω, δύω, ἰθύω, ἠπύω, δίζύω. The vowel is doubtful, but only because it comes before another vowel (as was noticed in the case of Verbs in -ιω).

ἰθύω generally has υ̅; but υ̅ in ἐπι-θύουσι (Π. 18. 175), which ought to be so divided, not ἐπι-θύουσι. It is a Denominative from ἰθύς (υ̅) *aim*.

The Verbs in -ευω, -ουω are probably also of the I-Class (for -ευιω, -ουιω). For, as Curtius points out (*Verb.* i. 360), they are chiefly Denominatives, and it is contrary to analogy to form a Verb by suffixing the Thematic ε (ο) to a Noun-Stem.

b. Epenthesis of ι.

52.] It will suffice to give a few examples:—

-νω : μαίνο-μαι, φαίνω, βαίνω (βαμ-ιω), and with reduplication, τι-ταίνω, παμφαίνω.

-ρω : αἶρω, σκαίρω, ἀσπαίρω, μαρμαίρω, καρκαίρω, χαίρω.

αἶρω (for ἀρ-ιω) is distinct from αείρω, which by contraction would become ᾄρω: cp. αείδω, ᾄδω (Brugmann, *K. Z.* xxvii. 196).

This Class includes also the numerous Denominatives in -αινω, -αιρω: see § 120. The Stem is in the weak form.

c. Assimilation of ι.

53.] Examples: -λλω : ἄλλο-μαι, βάλλω, πάλλω, στέλλω, τέλλω; from Nouns, ἀγγέλλω, ναυτίλλομαι; with Reduplication ἰάλλω, ἀπιτάλλω *I rear, tend*, cp. ἀτάλλω *I cherish*.

Epenthesis (instead of Assimilation) is found in ὀφείλω *I owe*.

-σσω : ὄσσο-μαι (ὄκ-), πέσσω (πεκ-), ἐλίσσω (ἐλικ-), πτύσσω (πτύχ-), λίσσο-μαι (λίτ-), κορύσσω (κορυθ-), πτώσσω (πτωκ-).

-ζω : for -διω in κλύζω, φράζω, χάζο-μαι ; for -γιω in ἄζο-μαι, ῥέζω, τρίζω ; with reduplication, μιμνάζω *I loiter*, βιβάζω *I cause to go*, ἐλελίζω *I make to quiver* (Il. I. 530)*.

d. Compensatory lengthening.

- 54.] Examples : -εινω (for -εν-ιω), in τείνω, κτείνω, θείνω.
 -ειρω (for -ερ-ιω), in εἶρω, κείρω, μείρομαι, πείρω, σπείρω, τείρω, φθειρω, ἀγείρω, ἀείρω, ἐγείρω, ἐθείρω.
 -ῖνω (for -ιν-ιω), in κλίνω, κρῖνω, ὀρίνω.
 -ῦνω (for -υν-ιω), in πλύνω, ἐντύνω.
 -ῦρω (for -υρ-ιω), in κύρω, μύρομαι, φύρω, ὀδύρομαι.

e. Verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω.

55.] **Assimilation.** This term is applied to certain forms of the Verbs in -αω, in which, instead of contraction, we find *assimilation* of one of two concurrent vowels to the other, as ὀρώω for ὀράω, ὀράας for ὀράεις.

The chief varieties are as follows :—

(a) Forms with simple Assimilation, the vowel being long—

μνᾶό-μενοι	gives	μνῶό-μενοι
ἦβάο-ντες	„	ἦβῶο-ντες
μενοινάω	„	μενοινώω
ἦγά-εσθε	„	ἦγάασθε <i>ε. 122</i>
μνά-εσθε	„	μνάασθε
μνάη	„	μνάα (2 Sing. Mid.).

(b) With shortening of the first vowel—

ὀράω	gives	ὀρώω
ἐάη-s	„	ἐάα-s
αἰτιάε-σθαι	„	αἰτιάα-σθαι.

Cp. δεδάα-σθαι from δεδαέ-σθαι (§ 35) and ἀγάα-σθε from ἀγάε-σθε ; Fut. ἐλώω, κρεμῶω from ἐλάω, κρεμάω.

(c) With lengthened second vowel—

ὀράο-ντες	gives	ὀρώω-ντες
ὀράοι-τε	„	ὀρώω-τε
ὀράει-s	„	ὀράα-s.

This is the commonest form of Assimilation : cp. δηῖόω-ντο, *βαιρα 77* δηῖόω-εν from δηῖόω, ἀρόωσι (Od. 9. 108) from ἀρόω, κατ-ηπιόωντο (Il. 5. 417), ἐστρατόωντο (Il. 4. 378), ῥυπόωντα (Od.).

* Cobet (*Misc. Crit.*), following Bentley, has sought to show that the forms of ἐλελίζω belong in reality to ἐλίσσω (*φελίσσω*). He is doubtless right in substituting *φελιχθέντες* for ἐλελιχθέντες *wheeling about* : but it seems necessary to retain ἐλελίζω where the meaning is *to set trembling* (with intensive reduplication, like ἀκαχίζω, ὀλολύζω, &c.).

(d) With lengthened second vowel (the first being also long), in very few forms—

δράουσι	gives	δρώουσι
μαμάουσι	„	μαμώουσι ^{μ 95}
ἡβάουσα	„	ἡβώουσα
μενουάει	„	μενουάα.

Other isolated examples are: *μενουήησι* (Il. 15. 82); *ἀλόω* (Od. 5. 377), 2 Sing. Imper. of *ἀλάομαι* (for *ἀλάεο ἀλάου*); *κεκράανται*, *κρηήναι*, *κρααίνω*; *φαάνθη*^{μ 44} (for *φαέν-θη*); *σώουσι* (Subj.), *σώως*, *σώφ* (Opt., cp. § 83), *σώοντες* (*σαώω*). Similar phenomena may be seen in *φώως* for *φάως* (or *φᾶως*), *σός* for *σαός*, *φαάντατος* for *φαέντατος*, *νηπιάας* for *νηπιέας*, *πρώουες* (Il.) for *πρήουες*, *ἀστυβοώτης* for *ἀστυβοήτης*: also in a form *Αινείωο* (for *Αινείαο*) read by Zenodotus in Il. 5. 263, 323. *Ἰσώουσι* (μ 318) (μ 267).

1. These forms were regarded by the older grammarians as the result of a process called ‘distracted,’ (the exact reverse of contraction), by which a long vowel, *ā* or *ω*, could be separated into two distinct vowels (*āā*, *ωω*, &c.). The first attempt to account for them in a more rational way was made by L. Meyer (*K. Z.* x. 45 ff.). According to him they represent an intermediate stage in the process of contraction. The order, he argued, is *δράω*—*δρώω*—*δρῶω*: i.e. in *δρώω* the *α* has been assimilated to the following *ω*, but is not yet uttered in one breath with it. In the forms *δρόωντες*, *δρόουσι*, &c. he pointed out that the long vowel is never wanted for the metre, and accordingly he wished to read *δρόοντες*, *δρόουσι*, &c. To this last proposal exception was taken by G. Curtius (*Erläuterungen*, p. 96), who made the counter-supposition that, as the *α* of these Verbs was originally long, the successive steps might be *δράοντες*, *δρώοντες* and (by metathesis of quantity) *δρόωντες*. The stage *-ωο-* is exemplified in *μνωόμενος*.

2. The main objection to this theory lies in the circumstance that the forms *δρόω*, *δράας* and the like are exclusively ‘Epic,’ that is to say, they are confined to Homer, Hesiod, and their direct imitators. If they had been created by any natural development of Greek sounds, we should expect to find them in other dialects. But neither in Ionic nor elsewhere is there any trace of their existence in living speech. It must be admitted, too, that neither Meyer nor Curtius has given a satisfactory account of the long vowel in *δρόουσι*, *δρόωντο*, *δρόωντες*, &c. A form *δρόοντες*, as Curtius pointed out, would give *δρῶντες*, not *δρῶντες*. And if there has been metathesis of quantity, why do we never find *δρόωμεν* for *δράομεν*, or *δράατε* for *δράετε*?

3. An entirely different theory was put forward by J. Wack-

ernagel (*Bezz. Beitr.* iv. 259). The true Homeric forms, in his view, are the original uncontracted $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, &c. and these have passed into the $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\alpha\varsigma$, &c. of our Homer by a process of textual corruption consisting of two stages: (1) contraction, according to the ordinary rules of Attic, into $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omega}$, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, &c.—which would obviously give forms of different metrical value from the original words,—and then (2) restoration of the metre by a kind of ‘distracted’ (in the old sense of the term), *i.e.* the insertion of a short vowel before the new contracted $-\acute{\omega}$, $-\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, &c. Thus $\omicron\upsilon\chi$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ first became $\omicron\upsilon\chi$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, and then *metri gratia* $\omicron\upsilon\chi$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\alpha\varsigma$ *.

4. Paradoxical as this may seem, there can be little doubt that it is substantially right. The forms in question, as Wackernagel justly argues, are not a genuine growth of language. They are the result of literary tradition, that is to say, of the modernising process which the language of Homer must have undergone in the long period which elapsed before the poems were cared for by scholars. The nature of this process is excellently described and illustrated in his dissertation. In many cases, too, he shows that when the later form of a word ceased to fit the metre, some further change was made by which the metrical defect was cured, or at least disguised. Corruption of this latter kind may often be traced in the various readings of MSS.

But must we suppose that $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$, &c. went through the two changes which Wackernagel postulates?

5. The case is unique, not only from the large number of forms involved, and the singularly thorough and systematic way in which they have been introduced into the text, but also from the circumstance which he has himself so well pointed out, *viz.* their unreal conventional stamp. They are hardly more ‘modern’—in the sense of being familiar through contemporary speech—than the forms which they have displaced. Wackernagel has shown how $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ and $\acute{\tau}\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ supplanted the original $\acute{\eta}\omega\varsigma$ and $\acute{\tau}\acute{\eta}\omega\varsigma$, even where the result was absolute ruin to the verse; as in *Od.* 19. 367, where nearly all the MSS. have $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ $\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\iota\omicron$. Similarly the loss of the old Gen. in $-\omicron\omicron$ (§ 98) has produced the forms $\acute{\alpha}\iota\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\upsilon$, $\acute{\iota}\phi\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\upsilon$, $\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$, &c. scanned — — — . These examples, however, prove too much; for if such unmetrical forms could remain in the text without further change, why do we never find the slightest trace of an unmetrical $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omega}$?

6. It is a further objection to this part of Wackernagel’s theory that in several words the original $-\alpha\omega$, $-\alpha\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $-\alpha\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$, &c.

* This theory was criticised by Curtius in the *Leipziger Studien*, iii. pp. 192 ff.

have been retained. The instances are, *ναιετάω*, -άει (Hes. Th. 775), -άουσι, -άων, -άοντα, ἰλάει, -άουσι, ἀοιδιάει, -άουσα, ὁμοστιχάει, γοάοιμεν, -άοιεν, κραδάων, ἐλάων, ἰλάονται, τηλεθάοντας; with \bar{a} , ἀναμαιμάει, πεινάων, -άοντα, διψάων. (The forms which have lost a *F*, as λάε, φάε, ἔχραον, do not concern us now.) A third variety is exhibited by the form *ναιετάωσαν* (-σης, -ση, -σας), which occurs in MSS., usually as a variant along with -άουσαν and -όωσαν. These facts are enough to show that the causes which produced the Homeric -ω, -ας, &c. were not of universal efficacy.

7. Is there, then, any way from ὀράω, ὀράεις to ὀρόω, ὀράας except through the contracted ὀρῶ, ὀρᾶς? We have to deal with a time when ὀρῶ, ὀρᾶς were the forms of ordinary speech, while ὀράω, ὀράεις were only known from the recitation of epic poetry. Under such conditions it is surely possible that the poetical forms were *partially assimilated* to the colloquial forms—that ὀράω, ὀράεις were changed into ὀρόω, ὀράας *by the influence of* the familiar ὀρῶ, ὀρᾶς. Similarly ἐήνδανε for ἐάνδανε was doubtless due to the presence of the later ἦνδανε, not to any process of contraction and distraction. The principle is constantly exemplified in language; cp. the change of φρασί, the original Dat. Plur. of φρήν, into φρεσί through the association of the other Case-forms.

8. With this modification of Wackernagel's view it is easier to account for the occasional retention of the original -αω, -αεις, &c. If ὀρόω, ὀράας are due to the presence of ὀρῶ, ὀρᾶς in everyday language, we may expect to find a different treatment of words which went out of use in post-Homeric times. Thus *ναιετάω* does not pass into *ναιετάω* because there was no *ναιετώ* alongside of it in common use. Similarly ἐλώω, ἐλάων are accounted for by the Attic ἐλῶ, ἐλᾶν; but the Homeric Pres. Part. ἐλάων is unaffected. Two instances call for a different explanation, viz. *πεινάω* and *διψάω*, since they are not rare or poetical words. But these are exceptions which prove the rule. As is shown by the Attic contraction (*πεινής*, &c.), they are not really Verbs in -αω. Whatever may be the origin of the \bar{a} in the Homeric *πεινάων*, *διψάων*, &c., they do not belong to the group with which we are now concerned.

9. An example of the process supposed by Wackernagel may be found in the Homeric *τροπάω*, *τροχάω*, *στρωφάω*, *πωτάομαι* (as to which see Nāuck, *Mél. gr.-rom.* iv. 886). The forms which occur are always contracted, but in every instance except one (Il. 13. 557 *στρωφᾶτ'*) the uncontracted form can be restored *if at the same time the root-vowel is shortened*. Thus in Il. 15. 666 *μηδὲ τροπᾶσθε φόβονδε* we may read *μηδὲ τροπέασθε φόβονδε*. The verb *πωτάομαι* only occurs once (Il. 12.

287 λίθοι ποτῶντο θαμειά), while the form ποτάομαι is well attested. In the other cases the restoration is supported by etymology (τροπάω from τροπή, &c.), and by the considerable traces of τροπάω, τροχάω, στροφάω in our manuscripts (see Leaf on II. 15. 666). The process must have been that (*e.g.*) original τροπάεσθε became τροπᾶσθε (which is also found in MSS.), and then τρωπᾶσθε.

10. In the Impf. Aet. assimilation is unknown, mainly because the metre generally allows contraction. We find however (1) several uncontracted forms, viz. οὔταε (Od. 22. 356), πέραον (II. 16. 367), ὕλαον (Od. 16. 5), κατεσκίαον (Od. 12. 436): ἔχράετε, ἔχραον (for ἔχράφετε ἔχραφον) do not belong to this head. Also (2) some verbs show the New Ionic -εο- for -αο-, viz. ὀμόκλεον, ὀμοκλέομεν, ποτέονται, μενοίνεον, ἦντεον, τρόπεον.

For φᾶος we find the two forms φῶος and φῶως (II. 16. 188 ἐξάγαγεν φῶωσδε), but never φῶος or φῶος*. The exclusion of φῶος is remarkable, since it is related to φᾶος as μυῶόμενος to μυᾶόμενος. The reason doubtless is that φᾶος came under the influence of φῶος (cp. ὀράος and ὀρ-ᾶς). On the other hand σῶος became σῶος owing to the later σῶος. The change of πρηῶνες to πρῶνες is similarly due to πρῶνες. In the case of ἀστυβοῶτης (for -βοήτης) there is no evidence of a form -βῶτης, but such a form would be according to the rules of Ionic contraction (βῶσας for βοήσας, &c.).

56.] **Contraction.** The extent to which contracted forms of verbs were admitted in the original text of Homer is a matter of much dispute. In this place we are properly concerned only with verbs of the I-Class (-αω, -εω, -οω, for -α-ιω, -ε-ιω, -ο-ιω), not with those in which a different spirant has been lost (as τρέω for τρέσ-ω, πλέω for πλέφ-ω).

1. In the verbs in -αω contraction is frequent. If the resolved form were written wherever the metre admits it, we should still find that in about half the whole number of cases the contraction must remain. It is worth notice too that contracted forms are often used in phrases of a fixed type, as ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (or προσηύδων)—τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶμαι—ὀρᾶ (ὀρᾶν) φᾶος ἠελίου—ἀνείρρει ἠδὲ μεταλλᾶς—ἐξάνδα, μὴ κεῖθε, and the like †. It has indeed been noticed that there is an apparent preference for the resolved -αον of the 1 Sing. and 3 Plur. Impf. ; but this must be accidental. We must conclude then that contracted and uncontracted forms of verbs in -αω were used in the language of Homeric times with equal freedom : or at least—if this be thought improbable—that they subsisted together as alternative forms in the poetical dialect.

* φῶος may represent an ancient Plur. φᾶως (Joh. Schmidt, *Pluralb.* p. 142).

† Mangold, *Curt. Stud.* vi. 194.

‡ Menrad, pp. 122-124.

2. Verbs in $-\epsilon\omega$ rarely contract $-\epsilon\omicron$ or $-\epsilon\omega$, except in the Participle ($-\epsilon\upsilon\muενος$ for $-\epsilon\omicron\muενος$). This rule is confirmed from New Ionic inscriptions (Erman, *Curt. Stud.* v. 292), as well as the MSS. of Herodotus. For $\epsilon\upsilon$ in $\piοιεύμην$ (Il. 9. 495), $\thetaηεύντο$ (Il. 7. 444), $\delta\chiλεύνται$ (Il. 21. 261), $\xiγεγώνευν$ (Od. 9. 47, &c.) and a few similar forms we should write $-\epsilon\omicron$ (see § 57).

The contraction of $-\epsilon\epsilon$, $-\epsilon\epsilon\iota$ is established by the large number of instances* in which it is required by the metre. Moreover it is not merely a *license*, necessary for the sake of admitting certain forms into the hexameter (such as $\tauαρβείς$, $\upsilonεικύν$, $\tauελείται$, $\etaγείσθαι$, $\sigmaμαραγεί$, $\acute{\epsilon}φίλει$, $\omicron\iotaνοχόει$). Among the instances of contraction in the last foot we find 29 of $-\epsilon\iota$ for $-\epsilon\epsilon$ (as $\chiόλος δέ μιν \acute{\alpha}γριος \etaρει$), and 16 of $-\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ for $-\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota$ (as $\kappaαί με γλυκὺς \etaμερος αἰρεῖ$); also the forms $\phiιλεῖ$ (Il. 2. 197 $\tauιμῆ δ' \acute{\epsilon}κ Διός \acute{\epsilon}στι$, $\phiιλεῖ δέ \acute{\epsilon} μητέρα Ζεύς$, also Il. 7. 280., 10. 245, 552., 16. 94, Od. 15. 74), $\deltaοκεί$ (Od. 2. 33, and six times in the phrase $\acute{\omega}ς μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι \acute{\alpha}ριστα$), $\tauελεῖ$ (Il. 4. 161), $\kappaαλεῖ$ (Il. 3. 390, Od. 17. 382), $\phiοβεῖ$ (Il. 17. 177). On the other hand the uncontracted form has the support of the metre in about a hundred places, and against the instances now quoted of $\phiιλεῖ$, &c. we have to set about thirty of the corresponding uncontracted $\phiιλέει$, $\deltaοκέει$, $-\epsilon\iota$, $\tauελέει$, $\kappaαλέει$, $\phiοβέειν$. The uncontracted form therefore seems to have a slight preference, when the metre allows either.

In the MSS. of Homer contraction is generally introduced as far as possible, according to the tendencies of Attic: but the open forms occasionally survive, chiefly in the fourth foot (in such forms as $\piροσεφάνεε \thetaεῖος \deltaνειρος$ — $\kappaαί \etaττε σῆμα ιδέσθαι$ — $\kappaατὰ δ' \etaρεε Πηλείωνα$). And the metre clearly points to the open form in several other places: as—

Il. 11. 55 $\frac{1}{2}$ (= 17. 663) $\tauὰς τε τρέει \acute{\epsilon}σσύμενός περ$.

21. 362 $\acute{\omega}ς δὲ λέβης ζέει \acute{\epsilon}νδον κτλ$.

16. 201 $\acute{\alpha}πειλέετε Τρώεσσιν$.

Od. 10. 548 $\acute{\alpha}ωτέετε γλυκὺν ὑπνον$.

3. Verbs in $-\omicron\omega$ generally contract; $\chiολοῦμαι$, $\kappaορυφοῦται$, $\gammaονονοῦμαι$. For the 'assimilated' forms $\deltaηῖδόντο$, $\kappaατηπιόωντο$, $\acute{\epsilon}στρατόωντα$, $\acute{\rho}υπτόωντα$ (§ 55) we ought, on the analogy of the Verbs in $-\alpha\omega$, to substitute $\deltaηῖδοντο$, &c.

57.] **Synizesis.** The vowel ϵ sometimes coalesces with a following \omicron or ω , so as to form one syllable for the purpose of the metre; e. g. $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\lambda\pi\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, $\eta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon$, $\eta\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (at the end of a verse), $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\sigma\iota$, $\chi\rho\epsilon\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$. Whether the pronunciation of these words differed from that of the contracted forms is a question which perhaps there are no means of determining.

* About 160 according to the list in Menrad, pp. 132-142.

Meaning of Verbs of the I-Class.

58.] Verbs in -εω are mainly Intransitive, whether formed from Adjectives, as ἀπιστέω *I am unbelieving*, or abstract Nouns, as μοχθέω *I labour*. But there is also a group of Causatives in -εω, as φοβέω *I put to flight*, ὀχέω, φορέω. Therpu cl. p. 11

Verbs in -οω are chiefly formed from Adjectives in -ος, and are Causative, as χηρόω *I make desolate*. Exceptions are, ὑπνώ-οντες *sleeping*, ριγώω *I shudder*, βιώω *I live*.

59.] **Desideratives.** One instance in -σειω is found in Homer, ὀψείοντες (Il. 14. 37) *going to see*. A suffix -ι(ο) may be found in κακκείοντες *going to bed* (κατά-κει-μαι), πι-όμενα *going to drink*, δραίνεις (Il. 10. 96) *thou art for doing*.

60.] **Frequentatives**, expressing *habitual action*, in -ταω, -ταζω, -τεω : as εὐχετάο-μαι, ναιετάω, οἰνοπο-τάζω, ζη-τέω (δί-ζη-μαι), λαμπετόωντι, ἔλκυστάζων. ἐξ ἐκείνων

In -ιαω, κελυτιόων *shouting* (as if from an abstract Noun κελυτία), κυδιόων *glorifying*.

In -νωω, as ἐρκανόωσι *keep restraining*, ἰσχανόωσι.

In -θαω, as τηλεθόωσα *blooming* (θαλ-έθω).

61.] **Intensives**, expressing actions *intensified by repetition*. These are generally reduplicated Verbs of the I-Class, the reduplication containing either a diphthong or a second consonant, as δει-δίσεισθαι *to terrify*, δαι-δάλλων *working curiously*, ἐκ-παι-φάσσειν *to rush in front*, παμ-φαίνων *gleaming*, βαμ-βαίνων *staggering*, μαρμαίροντες *glittering*, κάρ-καιρε *chattered*, πόρ-φυρε *was troubled* (lit. of water), πα-φλάζοντα *splashing*, πα-πταίνων *peeping round*, μαι-μάει 75 *rages*, δενδίλλων (for δελδ-?) *winking*.

62.] **Collateral forms of the Present.** It is characteristic of the Homeric language that Present Stems formed in different ways from the same Verb-Stem often subsist together in actual use, as alternative forms expressing the same (or nearly the same) meaning. Thus we have λήθ-ω, ληθ-άνω, λανθάνω ; πεύθο-μαι, πυνθάνο-μαι ; βιά-σκω, βαίνω, βιβιά-s, βιβιά-ζω, βιβιάσθων ; ἴκω, ἱκάνω, ἰκ-νέ-ο-μαι ; ἔχω, ἰσχω, ἰσχάνω, ἰσχανάω ; ἐρύ-κο-μαι, ἐρυκ-άνω, ἐρυκ-ανό-ωσι ; ἀλεύ-ομαι, ἀλύσκω, ἀλυσκάνω, ἀλυσκάζω ; τά-νυ-μαι, τα-νύω, τείνω, τιταίνω ; τεύχω, τυγχάνω, τι-τύ-σκο-μαι ; μένω, μί-μνω, μι-μνά-ζω. Ὀμ δὲ μὴ παρ -αζω στ μ. 397.

It may be conjectured that these different forms originally expressed corresponding shades of meaning. In some cases a more specific meaning may still be traced ; e.g. φάσκω *I allege* (i.e. *keep saying*, or perhaps *try to say*) has something of the Iterative force (cp. ρίπτασκε *he kept stinging about*) which in

θνήσκω, διδάσκω, &c. has been softened or generalised into the ordinary meaning of the Present. Similarly the reduplication in βίβας *striding*, μμνάξω *I stay waiting*, τιταίνω *I stretch* is to be compared with that of the Intensive Verbs. The Perfect, too, may be regarded as a refined and generalised kind of Intensive; cp. the forms λέληκα, κέκράγα, μέμυκα, &c. with καρκαίρω, ὀλολύξω, παφλάξω, &c.

Future in -σω.

63.] The Stem of the Future is formed by suffixing -σε(ο) to the Verb-Stem (in the strong form); as φή-σει, δώ-σω, δείξω (δεικ-), ἔκ-πέρω (περθ-), πείσομαι (πενθ-), χεῖσεται (χενδ-), δέξομαι (δεχ-), εἴ-σομαι (εἰ-μι).

The Stem εἶσ- gives εἶσ-σομαι and εἶσομαι (3 Sing. εἶσε-ται and εἶσ-ται); so ἔσ-σω (Fεσ-). The Futures φράσσο-μαι (or φράσο-μαι), μάσσε-ται, ἀπο-δάσσο-μαι (δάσο-νται), χάσσο-νται are formed like the corresponding Aorists in -σα; see § 39.

Other Verbs which have an Aorist in -σαῖ (-σαῖ)—the Verb-stem ending in a *short vowel* (§ 39, 2)—usually form the Future without σ. Thus we find:—

Aor. τελέσαι	Fut. τελέ-ω, ^{τελέσσω} ₅₅₉
καλέσαι	καλέ-ουσα (Π. 3. 383).
ὀλέσαι	ὀλεῖται, ὀλέ-εσθε (also ὀλέσσεις, ὀλέσει) ₈₄₉
μαχέσασθαι	μαχέ-ονται, μαχεῖται.
κορέσασθαι	κορέ-εις.
κρεμάσαντες	κρεμόω (for κρεμά-ω).
ἐπέρασσε	περάαν (for περά-ειν).
ἐδάμασσα	δαμόω, δαμῶ (for δαμά-ω, δαμά-ει).
ἤλασσα	ἐλόω, Inf. ἐλάαν (for ἐλά-ω, ἐλά-ειν).
ὤμοσα	ὀμοῦμαι (for ὀμό-ομαι: 3 Sing. ὀμείται, on the analogy of ὀλεῖται, μαχεῖται).
ἐτάνυσε	τανύω. _{97, 174}
ἀνύσας	ἀνύω.
ἔρυσσα	ἐρύω, ἐρύ-εσθαι.
ἔρρύσατο	ῥύεσθαι (Π. 20. 195).
ἀντιάσας	ἀντιώω (also ἀντιάσεις, Od. 22. 28).
ἐκόμισσα	κομιώ.
ἀεικίσασθαι	ἀεικιῶ.
κτερίσαιεν	κτεριοῦσι.
	ἀγλαῖεσθαι.

It is not easy to determine (even approximately) the number of Future Stems formed like the Aorist in -σαῖ. In several instances the reading is uncertain: e. g. between ἐρύσσεισθαι and ἐρύσσασθαι (Π. 21. 176, Od. 21. 125), ἀγάσεισθαι and ἀγάσσασθαι (Od. 4. 181), ἀνύσεισθαι and ἀνύσσασθαι (Od. 16. 373), παρελάσειεις, παρελάσαιεις and παρελάσαι (Π. 23. 427), ἀπουρίσσουνσι and ἀπουρήσουνσι (Π. 22. 489). Several forms may be either

Fut. or Aor. Subj.: γοννάσομαι (Il. 1. 427), ὀπάσομεν (Il. 24. 153), ἐνύσω (Od. 4. 408), λήϊσομαι (Od. 23. 357), ἐρύσσεται (Il. 10. 44), ὀλέσω (Od. 13. 399), ἀρεσσόμεθα. There remain: ἀρκέσει (Il. 21. 131—in Od. 16. 261 we should read ἀρκέση), αἰδέσεται (Il. 22. 124., 24. 208), ὀνόσσεται (Il. 9. 55), γανύσσεται (Il. 14. 504), ὀλέσσεις (Il. 12. 250), ὀλέσσει (Od. 2. 49), and a few forms of derivative Verbs in -αζω, -ιζω, viz. αἰχμάσσουσι (Il. 4. 324), θανμάσσεται (Il. 18. 467), ἐφοπλίσσουσι (Od. 6. 69), ἀντιάσεις (Od. 22. 28). On the whole it would appear that the Futures with σσ (or σ representing original σσ) are confined to the stems which ended in σ or a dental. In a very few instances they are due to analogy, like the corresponding Aorists in -σαῖ. Distinct Stems are used in ἀρπάζω, Aor. ἤρπασεν and ἀρπάξαι, Fut. ἀρπάξω; ἀφύσσω, Aor. ἀφυσσάμενος, Fut. ἀφύξειν.

From μάχο-μαι, besides Aor. μαχέσασθαι, Fut. μαχέονται, the MSS. give an Aor. μαχέσατο, Fut. μαχήσομαι. The ancient critics were divided as to these forms: Aristarchus wrote μαχίσατο, μαχήσομαι, others μαχέσατο, μαχέσομαι. The form μαχέσσα-το is supported by μαχέσασθαι; on the other hand μαχήσομαι is supported by μαχητής, μαχήμων, &c. Considering the number of cases in which the language has avoided forming the First Aorist and the Future in the same way, the probability would seem to be that the MSS. are right.

For γυναῖκα γαμέσεται αὐτός, which the MSS. give in Il. 9. 394, Aristarchus read γυναῖκά γε μάσσεται αὐτός: doubtless rightly, the trochaic caesura in the fourth foot being unknown in Homer (§ 367, 2: Veitch, p. 130). The usual Fut. is γαμέω.

Verb-Stems ending in a *liquid* (ρ, λ, μ, ν) insert ε and drop the σ, as μεν-έ-ω, ἀγγελ-έ-ων, κερ-έειν, κραν-έεσθαι, ὀτρύν-έ-ω, κτεν-έ-ω*, and (with contraction) ἐκ-φανεί (Il. 19. 104), κατα-κτενεῖ (Il. 23. 412). But some Stems in ρ form -ρω, as δια-φθέρ-σει, ὄρ-σουσα (Il. 21. 335), θερ-σόμενος (Od. 19. 507).

Similarly μάχομαι forms μαχέονται (Il. 2. 366), and with contraction μαχεῖται (Il. 20. 26).

The derivative Verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω, -υω form -ησω, -ωσω, -ῦσω, the vowel being invariably long.

Exceptional: διδώ-σομεν (Od. 13. 358), διδώσειν (Od. 24. 314).

On the anomalous Futures ἔδομαι, πίομαι, δῆω, κείω, βείομαι, see §§ 59, 80.

64.] **The Future in -σεω.** The Suffix -σεε(ο) is found in ἐσ-σεῖται (Il. 2. 393., 13. 317, Od. 19. 302), and πεσέονται (Il. 11. 824) which is perhaps for *πετ-σεο-νται (but see § 41). Also,

* The forms κατα-κτανέουσι (Il. 6. 409) and κατακτανέσθε (Il. 14. 481) are probably corrupt (Cobet, *V. L.* p. 195). κτανέοντα (Il. 18. 309) involves a use of the Fut. Part. which is hardly to be defended: see § 86.

the accent of the Futures κομι-ῶ, ἀεικι-ῶ, κτερι-οῦσι, ἀγλαῖ-εῖσθαι points to contamination of the forms in -σω and in -εω.

According to some ancient grammarians the Fut. of ἀνώ, ἐρώ, &c. should be written ἀνωῶ, ἐρωῶ, &c. ; see Schol. Il. II. 454., 20. 452. This form in -ῶω is found in Attic (πλευσοῦμαι, &c. : see however Rutherford's *New Phrynichus*, pp. 91-95) ; it answers to the Doric Fut. in -σω.

65.] Futures from Perfect and Aorist Stems. A Future Perfect meaning appears in μεμνή-σομαι *I shall remember*, κεκλή-σῃ *thou wilt bear the name*, εἰρή-σεται *will be said*, κεχολώ-σεται *he will be in wrath*, δεδέξομαι *I will await*, πεφή-σεται *will appear* (Il. 17. 155), πεφή-σσαι *thou wilt be slain*, τετεύξεται *will be made*, λελείψεται *will remain behind*, βεβρώσεται *will be devoured*. In these cases the Fut. answers to a Perfect in actual use.

For πεφήσσαι J. Wackernagel (*K. Z.* xxvii. 279) would read πεφέσσαι (for πε-φεν-σαι, related to πεῖ-ται as τετεύξεται to τέτυκται). But the stem πεφεν- does not occur in the inflexion of the Verb, and there is no analogy to suggest it. More probably πεφήσσαι is formed from πέφαται on the analogy of ἐῖπα-το and φή-σω, δύνα-μαι and δυνή-σομαι, &c.

Active Futures of the kind occur in Il. 15. 98 οὐδέ τί φημι πᾶσιν ὁμῶς θυμὸν κεχαρη-σέμεν *I do not suppose I shall gladden the heart of all alike* (cp. Od. 23. 266 οὐ μὲν τοι θυμὸς κεχαρή-σεται *will not be gladdened*) : Il. 22. 223 πεπιθή-σω *I will persuade* : Od. 21. 153, 170 κεκαδή-σει *will deprive*. These forms may be either connected with the Perfect (κεχαρη-ότα *rejoicing*), or with the Reduplicated Aorist (κεχάρο-ντο *were gladdened*, πεπιθεῖν *to persuade*). The latter view is supported by two other Futures of the kind ; κεκαδη-σόμεθα *we will give way*, answering to the Aor. κεκαδῶν, Mid. κεκάδο-ντο ; and πεφιδή-σεται *will spare*, answering to πεφιδέ-σθαι *to spare*. It will be seen that the Active forms of this kind have a distinctly *causative* meaning, whereas (*e.g.*) χαιρήσω and πιθήσω are intransitive.

Futures from the Passive Aorists. Of this formation two examples at most can be found in Homer : μιγή-σε-σθαι (Il. 10. 365), and δαή-σε-αι (Od. 3. 187., 19. 325). It has been already noticed (§ 9) that there is nothing in the Greek Future answering to the distinction between the Aorist and the Imperfect, though *à priori* such a distinction is quite conceivable.

It is worth noticing that in the Doric dialect this group of Futures takes the Active endings : as φανήσω.

66.] The Fut. is sometimes found with Mid. Endings while the corresponding Pres. is Act. The examples in Homer are :—εἰμί, ἔσομαι ; θέω, θεύσομαι ; κλαίω, κλαύσομαι ; φεύγω, φεύξομαι ; αἰίδω, αἰείσομαι ; κατα-ρεύω, κατα-ρεύσομαι ; θαυμάζω, θαυμάσεται.

With these are usually reckoned the Verbs in which the Pres. is of a different formation, as ὁμοῦμαι (ὄμ-νυμι), πεσέονται (πίπτω), τέξεσθαι (τίκτω), φθήσονται (φθάνω), βήσομαι (βαίνω), καμῖται (κάμνω), τεύξεσθαι (τυγχάνω), ἀμαρτήσεσθαι (ἀμαρτάνω), θανέεσθαι (θνήσκω), πείσομαι (πάσχω): also the Futures to which no Pres. corresponds, as εἶσομαι (οἶδα), δείσομαι (δεῖδια), ὄσσομαι (ὄπ-).

It may help to explain these cases if we consider that the Fut. Act. is apt to have a *Transitive* sense, as in στήσω, βήτω, φύσω. Hence there was a tendency to have recourse to the Middle whenever a distinctly intransitive sense was wanted.

Historical Tenses—the Augment.

67.] The Augment takes two forms, the *Syllabic* and the *Temporal*.

The Syllabic Augment is the prefix ἐ-, and is used for Stems beginning with a consonant. The Temporal Augment is a simple lengthening of the initial vowel of a Stem, the vowels *ā* and *ε* becoming *η*; as ἤγο-ν (ἄγο-), ἤλα-σα-ν (ἐλα-), ἔκε-το (ἔκε-), ὤρ-το (ὄρ-), ἠλήλα-το (Pf. ἐλήλα-ται), ἦνεον (αινέω), ὤχετο (οἴχομαι). So the Impf. ἦα *I went* (Sanser. *āyam*), from the stem εἰ (εἰ-μι): as to the form ἦια see § 12.

Many seeming exceptions are due to the loss of the original initial consonants, *F*, *σ*, *ι*. The loss of one of these consonants may generally be presumed whenever we find the Syllabic instead of the Temporal Augment. Thus—

F has been lost in ἐ-άγη and ἐ-αξε (ἄγνυμι), ἐ-άλη (*Fελ-*), ἐ-ειπε, ἐ-έσ-σα-το (ἔννυμι), εἶδον (for ἐ-ἴδο-ν), ἐ-ώθεο-ν; so perhaps, with contraction of *εε* to *ει*, εἶρυ-σα (*Fερν-*), and εἶλο-ν.

For εἶδον there is an *Æolic* form εὔιδον (ἐ-φιδον, cp. εὔαδε), which should perhaps be restored in some at least of the numerous places where the present text of Homer has εἶσινε (Nauck, *Mél. gr.-rom.* ii. 407).

σ in ἐ-έσσα-το (for ἐ-έσσα-, from *σεδ-*), and, with contraction, εἶπε-το (*σεπ-*), εἶσα-ν (*σεδ-*), εἶχο-ν (*σεχ-*), εἶρο-ν (*σερπ-*). In these cases the *σ* passed into the rough breathing, which was then thrown back on the Augment: but εἶχον has the smooth breathing owing to the following *χ*. Also εἶα (*έάω* for *σεFάω*).

ι (or *γ*) perhaps in ἐγκα (for ἐ-ἰγκα) and, with contraction, εἶμεν (ἐ-έ-μεν), and παρ-εἶθη (-*ε-εθη*). But see § 16.

Several Homeric forms have been supposed to point to a Syllabic Augment ἦ- (instead of ἐ-). One of these—ἦια *I went*—has been already explained (§ 12). As to the others we have to note as follows:

(1) ἦειπεν (Il. 10. 499) is not from εἶρω *to join together* (Lat. *sero*), but from ἀείρω: for, as Cobet has shown (*Misc. Crit.* p. 326), ἀείρω is a technical word in the sense required (cp. Il. 15. 680 συναείρεται ἵππους, also the words ξυνωρίς, for ξυν-αορ-ίς, and παρ-ήροπος).

(2) In several words (as usually written) the initial vowel of the Stem is lengthened after $\acute{\epsilon}$ - f -: $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\nu\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - f $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$), $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\varphi\omega\nu\chi\acute{o}\epsilon\omega$ ($\varphi\omega\nu\chi\acute{o}\epsilon\omega$), $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\varphi\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\omega\acute{\xi}\epsilon$ ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$ - $\varphi\acute{o}\iota\gamma\omega$), also $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta$ ($\varphi\acute{\alpha}\gamma$ - $\nu\mu\iota$), with $\bar{\alpha}$ in one place (Il. II. 559), and the Plpf. forms $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\lambda\pi\epsilon\iota$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\omega\lambda\pi\alpha$, $\varphi\epsilon\lambda\pi$ -), $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\omega\rho\gamma\alpha$, $\varphi\epsilon\rho\gamma$ -), $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\iota$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\omega\kappa\alpha$, $\varphi\iota\kappa$ -). In some of these there may be merely confusion with the later use of the Temporal Augment: e. g. $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\nu\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$ is doubtless due to the Attic $\eta\nu\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$, a form which arose after the loss of f . Hence recent editors write $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$, $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu\chi\acute{o}\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\iota\gamma\omega\nu$, also $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\lambda\pi\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\iota$. *Handb. Gr. u. Z. II. 3.*

(3) A different explanation is required for $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta$ ($\bar{\alpha}$), supported as it is by Attic $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\rho\omega\nu$ ($\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$) and $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu$ ($\bar{\alpha}$ in $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu\alpha\iota$, &c.)*. These point to an Augment η -, the combinations $\eta\varphi\omega$, $\eta\varphi\bar{\alpha}$ passing into $\epsilon\omega$, $\epsilon\bar{\alpha}$ (as in $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$, $-\epsilon\bar{\alpha}$ for $-\eta\varphi\omega\varsigma$, $-\eta\varphi\alpha$). Such an Augment is also found in $\eta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$, $\eta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\delta\epsilon\iota$ (Plpf. of $\acute{o}\iota\delta\alpha$), and $\eta\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\epsilon$. There is much probability in the suggestion of G. Meyer (*G. G. p. 423*) that this η - is a Temporal Augment obtained from the prothetic $\acute{\epsilon}$ - so often found before f : e. g. in $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\varsigma$ ($\varphi\epsilon\iota\delta$ -). Thus $\eta\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\epsilon$ would be the augmented form of $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\kappa\omega$, not of $\iota\sigma\kappa\omega$.

(4) The forms $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\varphi\omega\gamma\epsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\acute{\xi}\epsilon$ are peculiarly difficult on account of the Homeric Pres. $\acute{o}\tau\gamma$ - $\nu\mu\iota$, Aor. $\acute{\omega}\tau\acute{\alpha}$, and Lesbian $\acute{o}\acute{\epsilon}\iota\gamma\omega$ (Pres. Inf. $\acute{o}\acute{\epsilon}\iota\gamma\eta\nu$, Coll. 214, 43). We might read $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - $\acute{o}\acute{\epsilon}\iota\gamma\epsilon$, &c., but the ordinary forms $\acute{o}\iota\gamma\omega$ (Hes. Op. 817), $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - $\acute{o}\iota\gamma\omega$, &c. would still be unexplained.

Initial ρ is nearly always doubled, initial λ , μ , ν , σ very often.

This may often be explained as the assimilation of an original initial f or σ : thus $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\eta\acute{\xi}\alpha$ is for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\varphi\rho\eta\acute{\xi}\alpha$, and so $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon$ ($\varphi\epsilon\rho\gamma$ -) and $\varphi\rho\epsilon\gamma$ -), $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon$ ($\varphi\rho\acute{\iota}\gamma$ -). Again $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\epsilon\epsilon\nu$ is for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\sigma\rho\epsilon\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\epsilon\omega\nu$ for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\sigma\nu\epsilon\omega\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon$ perhaps for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\sigma\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon$ (Joh. Schmidt, *Pluralb.* p. 434). So $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$ (which Ar. wrote $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$) is for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\delta\varphi\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$: and $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu\alpha$ probably for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\kappa\iota\epsilon\nu\alpha$ (Sanser. root $\kappa\gamma\upsilon$). So too in $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\gamma\delta\acute{o}\upsilon\pi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ the γ reappears which is lost in the unaugmented $\delta\acute{o}\upsilon\pi\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$.

There are instances, however, to which this explanation does not apply, as $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon$. These are probably due to the influence of forms such as those already mentioned upon the traditional poetic dialect (Curtius, *Stud.* iv. 479 ff.; for a different view see Hartel's *Homerische Studien*). Cp. § 371.

68.] The Pluperfect. The Perfect Stem forms the corresponding Historical or Past Tense—the Pluperfect—in two ways:—

1. Simply, with the Augment (often omitted) and the Secondary Person-Endings. All Middle forms of the Tense are of this kind, as $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\kappa$ - $\tau\omicron$, $\acute{\epsilon}\varphi$ - $\eta\pi\tau\omicron$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ - $\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, $\eta\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha$ - $\tau\omicron$. In the Active the examples are comparatively few, viz. $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\epsilon$ (Il. 18. 34), $\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\nu\theta\epsilon\nu$ (Il. II. 266), and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi$ - $\epsilon\nu\eta\nu\theta\epsilon$ (Il. 2. 219); Plur. $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta$ - $\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\delta\iota$ - $\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\delta\iota$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ - $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\alpha$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$; Dual $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\kappa$ - $\tau\eta\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ - $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}$ - $\tau\eta\nu$.

* $\eta\lambda\omega$ was taken (Od. 22. 230 $\sigma\tilde{\eta}$ δ' $\eta\lambda\omega$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta\tilde{\eta}$ $\kappa\tau\lambda.$) should perhaps be written $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega$. The Stem $\varphi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega$ - appears in the Moods ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\omega}\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\omega}\eta\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$), except in the form $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{o}\nu\tau\epsilon$ (Il. 5. 487), where the metre requires $\bar{\alpha}$.

With these may be placed the Thematic forms ἐ-γέγωνε (Il. 14. 469), ἄνωγο-ν, ἄνωγε, ἐ-πέπληγο-ν, πεπλήγε-το, ἐμέμηκον, in Hesiod ἐπέφικον: see § 27.

2. By Composition, with the Augment and the Suffix -εα (probably for -εσα), joined to the longer form of the Stem: e. g. ἐ-τεθήπ-εα, πεποιθέα, ἠνώγ-εα. The 3 Sing. usually has -εε(ν) contracted -ει(ν), as ἐ-πεποιθείει, ἠνώγειν, δεδήει, ἠρήρει, βεβήκει. The Plur. occurs only once in Homer, in ζοίκ-εσαν (Il. 13. 102): the Dual never.

To this group belongs ἦδεα I knew, 2 Sing. ἠέιδης (for ἐ-Feίδεας), also ἦδησθα, 3 Sing. ἠείδει, ἦδει (or, as Aristarchus read, ἠέιδη, ἦδη). As to the augment ἦ- see § 67. In respect of form ἦδεα is a Sigmatic Aorist, standing for ἐ-Feίδεσα, Sanscr. *ávedisham*, and is only a Pluperfect because it is used as the past tense answering to οἶδα (*M. U.* iii. p. 16).

69.] **Loss of Augment.** The Augment is so often dropped in Homer that the augmented and the unaugmented forms are almost equally numerous. It has been observed however* that the forms without the Augment are comparatively rare in the speeches, the proportion of augmented to unaugmented forms (excluding speeches which mainly consist of narrative matter) being about 10 to 3, whereas in narrative it is about 5 to 7. It would appear therefore that the Augment is chiefly omitted where the context shows that past time is meant; and this is confirmed by the remarkable fact that the Iteratives, which are only used as Historical Tenses, do not take the Augment.

The only clear instance of an Iterative form with the Augm. is ἐ-μισγέσ-κοντο (Od. 20. 7). On the forms ἐ-φασκο-ν, ἐ-φασκε see § 49. *παρεπέδμετο* (3521), *εἰδόμενοι*

Meaning of the Present and Aorist Stems.

70.] **The forms which contain the Present Stem** (the Present and Imperfect Indic., with the Moods of the Present) denote *progressive* action (incipient, continued, repeated, &c.), as opposed to a *single* fact or event.

It is easy to understand why a language which distinguished these two kinds of action should have no Aorist for present time (*βῆμι, *λάβω, &c.). The present is not a space of time, but a point; what is present therefore is not (generally speaking) a whole action or event, but the fact that it is in course of happening. So in English we usually say, not *I write now*, but *I am writing now*. The mere effort of regarding an action as in present time almost obliges us to give it a progressive character.

The forms εἶμι, εἶμι, φημί, ἄγω, γράφω, &c., in which the Stem has the form generally found only in Aorists (§ 11, § 30), may be regarded as surviving

* Konrad Koch, *De Augmento apud Homerum omisso*, Brunswick, 1868.

instances of the 'Present Aorist,' *i.e.* of a Present not conveying the notion of progress. We may compare the English use of *I am*, *I go* (now archaic in the sense of *I am going*), *I say* (*says he*), &c. In these cases the use of a distinctly progressive form has not been felt to be necessary.

A past action may usually be regarded, if we choose, as a single fact, irrespective of its duration (*ἔβασίλευσεν ἔτη τριάκοντα he reigned*, not *he continued reigning*). But an action which is thought of as contemporary with some other event is almost necessarily regarded as progressive. Accordingly, answering to the Present *I am writing* (*now*), we have the Past Tense *I was writing* (*when he came*).

It follows from what has been said that a Pres. or Impf. may be used either (1) because the action intended is essentially progressive, or (2) because the time is fixed by reference (α) to the moment of speaking, or (β) to a point of time in the past. *E.g.* *δίδωμι* may mean either *I seek to give*, *I offer*, or *I am giving*; *ἔδιδον* either *he offered* or *he was giving*. In the second of these uses the notion of progress is only *relative*, arising from the relation of time under which the action is thought of*.

71.] From the relative notion of progress or continuance is derived the general rule that the Impf. is used of a *subordinate* action or circumstance: Il. 8. 87 ὄφρ' ὁ γέρων ἀπέταμνε τόφρ' Ἐκτορος ὠκέες ἵπποι ἦλθον *while he was cutting the chariot came*.

Some varieties of this use may be noticed:—

(1) The Impf. shows that a Verb stands in a special connexion with the Verb of another clause; Il. 1. 3–5 ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν ἠρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τευχε κύνεσσιν *sent down the souls of heroes to Hades, while it made themselves a prey to dogs*.

Od. 8. 532 ἔνθ' ἄλλους μὲν πάντας ἐλάνθανε δάκρυα λείβων, Ἀλκίνοος δὲ μιν οἶος ἐπεφράσατ' ἠδ' ἐνόησε *while he was unobserved by the others, Alcinous observed him*.

So Il. 7. 303 ὧς ἄρα φωνήσας δῶκε ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον, Αἴας δὲ ζωστήρα δίδου (*gave in exchange*).

Od. 8. 63 τὸν περὶ Μοῦσ' ἐφίλησε, δίδου δ' ἀγαθὸν τε κακόν τε, ὀφθαλμῶν μὲν ἄμερσε, δίδου δ' ἠδέϊαν αἰοιδήν.

(2) In *oratio obliqua*, as Il. 22. 439 ἠγγειλ' ὅττι ρά οἱ πόσις ἔκτοθι μίμνε πύλαων.

(3) The action or point of time to which the Verb in the Impf. is subordinate may be merely implied:—

Il. 4. 155 θάνατόν νύ τοι ὄρκι' ἔταμνον *it was death then to you that I made (in making the treaty)*.

So in the common use with ἄρα: *as σὺ δ' οὐκ ἄρα τοῖος ἔησθα you were not as I thought (=you are not, it now seems)*.

* Aken, *Hauptdata*, p. 9.

72.] Essentially progressive action (incomplete or continuous) is exemplified—

(1) In the Verbs which form the Aor. from a different Verb-Stem: ὁράω *I watch* (Lat. *tueor*, whereas εἶδον means *I descried*); λέγω *I relate, set forth* (but εἶπον *I said*); φέρω *I carry* (but ἤνεγκον *I brought*); so τρέχω, ἔρχομαι (expressing different kinds of motion).

(2) In other Verbs of motion, esp. βαίνω and ἵστημι, as Il. 21. 313 ἵστη δὲ μέγα κῦμα *raise up a great wave*, and often in the Mid., as Il. 2. 473 ἐν πεδίῳ ἵσταντο *were drawn up in the plain*, παρίσταντο *came and stood beside*, &c.

Note 1. We should read ἵστασαν (not ἔστασαν as a First Aor.) in—
Il. 2. 525 στίχας ἵστασαν (Bekk., La R., from the best MS.).

12. 56 τοὺς ἵστασαν υἴες Ἀχαιῶν *which the Greeks had planted*; see § 73.

Od. 3. 180 τέτρατον ἡμᾶρ ἔην ὅτ' ἐν Ἀργεῖ νῆας εἶσας

Τυδείδew ἔταροι . . . ἵστασαν (see Ameis a. l.).

8. 435 αἱ δὲ λοετροχόον τρίποδ' ἵστασαν

18. 307 αὐτίκα λαμπτήρας τρεῖς ἵστασαν

Bekk., La Roche.

2. The Verb ἄγω is often so used: Il. 1. 367 τὴν δὲ διεπράθομέν τε καὶ ἤγομεν ἐνθάδε πάντα; Il. 7. 363 κτήματα δ' ὅσσο' ἀγόμην *the treasures which I brought* (= *have brought*); Il. 9. 664 τὴν Λεσβόθεν ἤγε *whom he had brought*. In this Verb, however, the Aorist meaning appears distinctly in the Participle; Il. 6. 87 ἡ δὲ ξυνάγουσα γεραίᾶς *assembling* (= *having assembled*); Il. 1. 311 εἶσεν ἄγων *brought and seated* (cp. 3. 48., 4. 392., 11. 827., 22. 350). Perhaps these uses should be connected with the Aoristic form of the Stem (§ 70).

(3) In Verbs expressing the *beginning* of a motion, as ὠρνωτο *bestirred himself* (but ὠρτο *arose*); ἀφίει, προίει, ἔπεμπε; μύθων ἤρχε *began speech*.

This usage extends to all words which imply a continuous result; κελεύει, ἐκέλευε, ἐπέτελλε, ἤττεε; οὐκ ἐᾷ *will not allow*; λείπει (to leave = to keep at home).

(4) ἀκούω and πεύθομαι sometimes mean *to know by hearing*; as Il. 11. 497 οὐδέ πω Ἔκτωρ πεύθετο *Hector was not yet aware*: 14. 125 τὰ δὲ μέλλετ' ἀκούμεν *ye are like to have heard it*; Od. 3. 87, 187, 193. So in Attic μανθάνω *I understand*, αἰσθάνομαι *I am aware*, πυνθάνομαι *I learn* (Goodwin, § 28).

73.] A process thought of in relation to the present time, or to a point in the past, is expressed by the Impf. (=Engl. *I have been doing, I had been doing*): e. g.—

Il. 6. 282 μέγα γάρ μιν Ὀλύμπιος ἔτρεφε πῆμα *has reared him up to be a mischief* (a process). Cp. Il. 1. 414 τί νύ σ' ἔτρεφον; *why have I reared thee?* 9. 524 ἐπευθόμεθα *we have been accustomed to hear*. So the Participle, Il. 3. 44 φάντες *who have been saying*.

74.] The 'historical Present' is not found in Homer, but

somewhat the same effect is often given by the use which may be called the *descriptive Imperfect*. *E. g.*—

Π. 2. 150 νῆας ἔπ' ἐσσεύοντο, ποδῶν δ' ὑπένερχε κούρη
ἴστατ' ἀειρομένη, τοὶ δ' ἀλλήλοισι κέλευον
ἀπτεσθαι νηῶν ἢδ' ἐλκόμεν εἰς ἅλα δῖαν,
οὔρους τ' ἐξεκάθαιρον κ.τ.λ.

The Impf. appears sometimes to be used in a description along with Aorists for the sake of connexion and variety (*i. e.* in order to avoid a series of detached assertions): *e. g.* in Π. 1. 437-439., 2. 43-45., 4. 112-119, Od. 4. 577-580.

75.] **The Aorist** gives the meaning of a Verb without the accessory notion of progress or continuance. It does not *describe*, or transport us to a time in the past when the action was present (as the Impf. does), but makes us think of it as *now past*. Hence it asserts a *single* occurrence,—an action, or series of actions, regarded as an undivided whole,—or *completion*, a *culminating point*, in which the action is summed up. Thus μογέω *I am toiling*, ἐμόγησα (Π. 1. 162) *I have toiled*; νοέω *I think of*, ἐνόησε *perceived, understood*; θαρσέω *I feel confident*, θαρσήσας *taking courage*, and so δείσας, ἀλγήσας, μίσησε, νεμέσησε, &c., of the access of a feeling; δηρωθήτην (Π. 16. 756) *joined in strife*; παπτήσας *casting a glance*; φωνήσας *either raising his voice or having spoken*: ἐπ' ἡματι δακρύσαντες (Π. 19. 229) *performing the due weeping for the day*.

76.] **The Aorist** is often used in Homer of the immediate past—that which in an especial sense is thought of as *now past*:—

Π. 2. 114 νῦν δὲ κακὴν ἀπάτην βουλευσατο, καὶ με κελεύει
δυσκλέα Ἄργος ἰκέσθαι.

Od. 1. 182 νῦν δ' ὧδε ξὺν νηὶ κατήλυθον (cp. 23. 27).

Π. 20. 16 τίπτ' αὐτ', ἀργικέραυτε, θεοὺς ἀγορήνδε κάλεισσας;

Sometimes the Aor. seems to give the question a tone of impatience: Π. 2. 323 τίπτ' ἄνεω ἐγένεσθε; 4. 243 τίφθ' οὔτως ἔστητε τεθηπότες; (vulg. ἔστητε, an impossible form), cp. 20. 178 τί νῦ τόσσον ὀμίλου πολλὸν ἐπελθὼν ἔστης; 21. 562., 22. 122., Od. 4. 810., 10. 64. Cp. the Attic use of τί οὐ, as Soph. O. T. 1002 τί δῆτ' ἐγὼ οὐχὶ . . . ἐξελυσάμην; (Goodwin, § 62).

When the Aor. is used of an action which is subordinate to another in the past, it implies completion before the main action: Π. 2. 642 οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' αὐτὸς ἔην, θάνα δὲ ξανθοῦς Μελέαγρος *he was no longer living, and yellow-haired Meleager had died*.

A similar use of the Aor. is regular in the Subj., as Π. 1. 168 ἐπεὶ κε κάμω *when I have grown weary*: and in the Participle, as ὧς εἰπὼν *having thus spoken*. The Aor. in these uses expresses, not past time as such (with reference to the moment of speak-

ing), but *completion* with reference to (*i. e.* usually before) the time of the principal Verb.

77.] The Participle of the Aor. is sometimes used to express *exact coincidence* with the action of the principal Verb: as βῆ δὲ αἰξασα *went with a spring*, ψευσαμένη προσήυδα *spoke a lie*, ἄλτο λαθῶν *leaped unseen*. Here a Pres. Part. would imply that there was a *distinct* subordinate action: the Aor. expresses something that *coincides* with, or is *part of*, the main action.

This is especially found with Verbs expressing the manner (tone, gesture, &c.) with which a thing is said or done: Il. 6. 54 ὁμοκλήσας ἔπος ἦδα *shouted the words*; Il. 8. 219 ποιπνύσαντι θοῶς δτρῦναι Ἀχαιοὺς *to make hot haste in stirring up the Greeks*; Il. 13. 597 χεῖρα παρακρεμάσας: Il. 10. 139., 16. 474., 17. 334., 20. 161, Od. 2. 422., 17. 330 (cp. φεύγειν παρασεύσαντι Arist. Eth. Nic. 4. 3. 15).

78.] The Aor. sometimes appears to be used of present time.

(1) As in—

Il. 14. 95 νῦν δέ σευ ὠνοσάμην πάγχυ φρένας οἶον ἔειπες.

The Aor. here expresses a *culminating point*, reached in the immediate past, or rather at the moment of speaking: *I have been brought to the point of blaming, i. e. I blame*.

Il. 20. 306 ἦδη . . ἤχθηρε *has now come to hate*.

Il. 3. 415 τῶς δέ σ' ἀπεχθήρω ὡς νῦν ἔκπαγλ' ἐφίλησα *come to hate you as I now love you* (lit. *have got to love*; cp. Od. 8. 481).

So ἔπλετο *has come to be, is* (§ 32); Attic ἦσθην, ἐπήνεσα, &c. In these cases the Aor. is used because the stress is on the nature of the action as something completed, though the completion is in present time*.

By a slight boldness of expression the Aor. may even be used of an event completed in future time:—

Il. 9. 412 εἰ μὲν κ' αὔθι μένων Τρώων πόλιω ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
ὦλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται.

= *my return will have been lost, i. e. will be ipso facto lost*. The

* So Eur. Med. 791 φῶξα, I. A. 510 ἀπέπτυσσα: where, as Aken observes, 'die Handlung geschieht erst mit dem Aussprechen' (*Grundz.* § 18). These Aorists are sometimes explained of the past time at which the action began. As a reviewer of the former edition put it, 'Greek speakers, in describing feelings excited by the previous remarks of other speakers, frequently refer those feelings to the time when they were felt, and not to the present time of the description' (*Saturday Rev.*, Feb. 17, 1883). That is to say, ἐπήνεσα means *I praised (when I heard)*. But this kind of subordination to a past event is precisely what is expressed by the Impf., not the Aor. The reviewer goes on to explain ἔπλετο in Il. 19. 57 by the presence of the particle ἄρ (ἦ ἄρ τι τόδ' ἔπλετο *this was as we can now see*), 'as in the common ἦν ἄρα'. This would only be possible if ἔπλετο were an Impf.; see § 33.

speaker puts himself at the (future) point of time given by the context, and uses the Tense which then becomes appropriate.

(2) Again—

When an assertion is made irrespective of time, the Pres. or Aor. is used—the Pres. for continuous and the Aor. for single or momentary action. Hence the use—

In similes, as Π. 3. 23 ὥστε λέων ἐχάρη *as a lion is gladdened* (but in v. 25 κατεσθίει *goes on devouring*): Π. 4. 75 οἶον δ' ἀστέρα ἦκε . . τοῦ δέ τε πολλοὶ ἀπὸ σπινθῆρες ἔενται.

The only examples of the Impf. in a simile are Π. 15. 274., 21. 495, in the phrase οὐδ' ἄρα . . αἴσιμον ἦεν, where it is virtually a Present.

Also in 'gnomic' passages, reflexions, general sayings, &c.:

Π. 1. 218 ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπέιθηται μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ.

9. 320 κάτθαν' ὁμῶς ὃ τ' ἄεργος ἀνὴρ, ὃ τε πολλὰ ἐοργῶς.

These uses of the Aor. are very common in Homer.

The Impf. may possibly be found in a gnomic passage, Π. 13. 730-732—

ἄλλω μὴν γὰρ ἔδωκε θεὸς πολεμῆια ἔργα

ἄλλω δ' ἐν στήθεσσι τιθεὶ νόον εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς,

where the MS. reading τίθει may be defended as an Impf. marking subordination to the Aor. ἔδωκε: cp. the examples in § 71. 2.

Much light has been thrown upon the history of the Aorist by the comparison of the use in Sanscrit (Delbrück, *S. F.* ii, and *A. S.* p. 280). If the result has not been to determine the original force of the Aorist, it has at least shown that the question cannot be settled from the material furnished by Greek alone. The use which predominates in Greek, the historical use to assert the happening of a single event in the past, is almost unknown to the earliest Sanscrit. In the Veda the Aor. is employed, as often in Homer (§ 74), of what has happened in the *immediate* past. In the early Sanscrit prose (the Brāhmaṇas) the Aor. is used of what has happened to the speaker himself. It is worth noticing that these uses, in which the Aor. answers approximately to the English Pf. with *have*, are found in later Greek in the case of the verbs whose Pf. retains its original meaning. As Mr. Gildersleeve puts it, 'when the Perfect is used as a Present, the Aorist is used as a Perfect. So ἐκτησάμην *I have gained possession of*, κέκτημαι *I possess*' (*Am. Journ. of Phil.* iv. 429). Hence, if the Greek Perfect is originally a kind of present, there is a presumption that the Aor. was originally akin in meaning to our Perfect. On this view the ordinary historical Aor. is a derivative use.

CHAPTER III.

THE MOODS.

79.] The Moods of the Verb (properly so called) are the *Subjunctive*, the *Optative*, and the *Imperative*. It is convenient however to rank the two Verbal Nouns, the *Infinitive* and the

Participle, along with them. The meanings of the Moods and Verbal Nouns cannot well be discussed until we come to the chapters dealing with Complex Sentences.

The Subjunctive.

80.] **Non-Thematic Tense-Stems** usually form the Subj. by taking the Thematic Vowel, with the Primary Endings; except that when the Thematic Vowel enters into a diphthong, or is followed by two consonants, it becomes η or ω instead of ε or ο. Thus the scheme is—

Sing.		Dual.		Plur.	
<i>Act.</i>	<i>Mid.</i>	<i>Act.</i>	<i>Mid.</i>	<i>Act.</i>	<i>Mid.</i>
-ω	-ομαι			-ιμεν	-όμεθα, -όμεσθα
-ης	-εαι	-ετον	-ησθον	-ετε	-ησθε
-η (-ησι?)	-εται	-ετον	-ησθον	-ωσι(v)	-ωνται.

The long η or ω, it will be seen, comes in place of ε or ο wherever it can do so without disturbing the metre. Examples:—

Strong Aorists: ξ -φθη, Subj. φθή-η:

ξ -βη, Subj. βή-ω (or βείω), υ περ-βή-η, βή-ομεν (or βεί-ομεν):

ξ -στη, Subj. στή-ης, στή-η, στή-ετον, στή-ομεν, στή-ωσι:

ξ -γνω, Subj. γνώ-ω, γνώ-ομεν, γνώ-ωσι:

ξ -δν, Subj. δύω, δύ-ης, δύη:

ξ -βλη-το, Subj. βλή-εται:

ξ -φθι-το, Subj. φθί-εται, φθι-όμεσθα:

α λ-το, Subj. α λ-εται:

Stem θη-, Subj. θεί-ω (or θή-ω), θή-ης, θεί-ομεν (or θή-ομεν), α πο-θεί-ομαι:

Stem ἦ-, Subj. ἔφ-εί-ω, ἀν-ή-η:

Stem δω-, Subj. δώ-η and δώ-ησι, δώ-ομεν, δώ-ωσι.

Presents: εἰμί, Subj. ξ -ω (for ξ σ-ω), ξ -ης, ξ -η and ξ -ησι, ξ -ωσι:

εἶ-μι, Subj. ἶ-ω, ἶ-ησθα, ἶ-ησι, ἶ-ομεν (ἶ):

φη-μί, Subj. φή-η:

κιχῆ-ναι, Subj. κιχεί-ω, κιχεί-ομεν (or κιχή-ω, κιχή-ομεν):
so ἐρεί-ομεν as if from * ξ ρη-μι.

Passive Aorists: ξ -δάμη, Subj. δαμεί-ω, δαμή-ης, δαμή-ετε:

so δαεί-ω, α λώ-ω, α λώ-η, σαπή-η, φανή-η, τραπέι-ομεν.

For δαινύη, 2 Sing. Subj. Mid. (Od. 8. 243., 19. 328), we may read δαινύε', *i. e.* δαινύ-ε-αι.

Perfects: πέποιθα, Subj. πεποιθ-ης, πεποιθ-ομεν: ξ ρριγε, Subj.

ξ ρρίγ-ησι: βέβηκε, Subj. προ-βεβήκ-η: so ξ στήκ-η, ἀρήρ-η, μεμῆλ-η, δ λώλ-η, δ ρώρ-η, βεβρύχ-η: also ἰλήκησι (Od. 21. 365.)—unless we assume a Pres. ἰλήκω (§ 45).

Pf. Mid. προσ-αρήρεται (Hes. Op. 431).

οἶδα, Subj. εἰδέω, εἰδῆς, εἰδῆ, εἶδομεν, εἶδετε, εἰδώσι.

For εἶδew, &c., Tyrannio wrote εἶδw, εἶδης, εἶδη, εἶδωσι (Schol. Od. i. 174), uniform with εἶδομεν, εἶδετε. Both forms may be accounted for: εἶδew is Subj. of ἐ-φείδεα (§ 68); εἶδw with the Plur. εἶδο-μεν, εἶδ-ε-τε, is Subj. of a Non-Thematic *φείδ-μι, Sanser. *ved-mi* (M. U. iii. 18). The form ἰδέw, read by most MSS. in Il. 14. 235, is a mere error for εἶδέw. γ 13b

Aorists in -σά: ἐ-βήσα-μεν, Subj. βήσ-ομεν: ἤγειρα, Subj. ἀγείρ-ομεν: ἔ-τισα, Subj. τίσ-ετε, τίσ-ωσι: ἠμείψα-το, Subj. ἀμείψ-εται: ἠλεύα-το, Subj. ἀλεύ-εται: and many more. These Subjunctives properly belong to the older inflexion of the Sigmatic Aorist without -α (§ 40).

To these should be added some forms used as Futures:—

ἔδ-ο-μαι, ἔδονται *shall eat* (cp. Sanser. *ad-mi*, Lat. *est* for *ed-t*).

δῆ-εις, δῆ-ομεν, δῆ-ετε *shall find*, with the strong Stem answering to δᾶ(σ)- in δέδαεν, &c.

βεί-ο-μαι *shall live*, from the stem βίφ-; also in the form βείομαι. Evidently βείομαι: βιώναι:: δῆw: δαῖναι.

It will be found that the Homeric uses of these words are all such as can be referred to the Subj. On πίομαι and κείw see § 59. The form δῆεις may be a trace of an older inflexion, -w, -εις, -ει, answering to -ομεν, -ετε.

It will be seen that the strong form of the Stem is found in the Subjunctive, as φῆ-η, δῶ-ομεν, ἐστήκ-η. Apparent exceptions are, (1) the Subj. of εἶμι—in which the ι of ἴομεν (for εἶ-ομεν) is ^{B440} unexplained, while the forms ἴ-ω, ἴ-ησι may be Thematic, (as are Opt. ἴοι, Part. ἴών); and (2) the forms ἀφ-έ-η (Aor. of ἀφ-ίη-μι), ^{Π570} μιγέ-ωσι, φθέ-ωσι, στέ-ωμεν, κτέ-ωμεν, φθέ-ωμεν, θέ-ωμεν, ἔ-ωμεν. These forms are the result of transference of quantity, στε-ω- for στή-ο-, &c., and it is important to notice that the last six are always scanned as disyllables, thus forming the transition to the contracted φθῶσι, στῶμεν, &c.

Anomalous lengthening is found in μετ-έw (Il. 23. 47) for μετ-έw.

On the ει for η in βεί-ω, θεί-ω, δαμεί-ω, &c. see Append. C.

81.] Subjunctives with lengthened Stem-vowel. The formation of the Subj. by means of the Thematic vowel must have been confined originally to Stems ending in a consonant, or in one of the vowels *i, u*. The hiatus in such forms as φῆ-η, στή-ομεν, γνώ-ομεν is enough to prove that they are not primitive. In Vedic Sanscrit, accordingly, while *as-a-ti*, *han-a-ti* are Subj. of *as-ti*, *han-ti*, we find *sthā-ti*, *dā-ti* as the Subj. answering to the Aorists *á-sthā-t*, *á-dā-t*. These would become in Homer στή-σι, δῶ-σι or (with the usual ι of the 3 Sing.) στή-σι, δῶ-σι. Similarly we may infer an original Plural στήμεν, στήτε, στήντι (στήσι); δῶμεν, δῶτε, δῶντι (δῶσι); and so on. The principle of the formation is that the Stem ends in a simple long vowel—not one that has arisen from specifically Greek contraction.

Traces of this type of Subj. are found in the Greek dialects: *δύνῃ-μαι* (for *δύνωμαι*), *καθ-ίστῃ-ται*, *προ-τίθηντι*, &c. (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 502). In Homer it may be recognised in the 3 Sing. forms *φῆσι* (Od. i. 168), *φθῆσι* (Il. 23. 805), *ῆσι* (Il. 15. 359), *μεθ-ίησι* (Il. 13. 234), *δῶσι*; perhaps in *δῶ*, *δῶς*, *δῶμεν*, *δῶσι*, *περι-δῶμεθον*, *ἐπι-δῶμεθα*; *γνώς*, *γνώμεν*, *γνώσι*; *ἐπι-βῆτον*, *πειρηθῆτον*, &c.—which are usually regarded as contracted from the regular Homeric *δῶω*, *δῶης*, *δῶομεν*, &c.—and in *δύνη-ται*, *ἐπί-στηται* (§ 87, 3).

How then did the Homeric forms of the type of *φή-η*, *στή-ομεν*, *γνώ-ομεν* arise? Doubtless by a new application of the process already familiar in *ἴο-μεν* (*εἶ-μι*), *φθί-ε-ται*, *χεύ-ε-ται*, *πεποιθ-ο-μεν*, &c. We may compare the extension of the Endings *-ᾶται*, *-ᾶτο* to the Pf. *βεβλή-αται*, in imitation of *κεκλί-αται*, *εἰρύ-αται* (§ 5).

Contraction appears in the 3 Sing. *φῆ* (Od. 19. 122), *στῆ* (Od. 18. 334), *βῆ* (Od. 2. 358), *φανῆ* (Il. 9. 707), *γνώ* (Il. i. 411., 16. 273)—unless we suppose that these are obtained by dropping the *-σι* of *φῆ-σι*, &c. on the analogy of the Thematic *-η*. Also in the 1 Plur. *μεθ-ῶμεν* (Il. 10. 449), *συν-ῶμεθα* (Il. 13. 381), *δαῶμεν* (Il. 2. 299), *μεμν-ῶμεθα* (Od. 14. 168; and the 3 Plur. *ῶσι* (Il. 14. 274, Od. 24. 491), *βῶσι* (Od. 14. 86); but it is probably more correct to write these words with *εω* (like *φθέωσι*, *ἔωμεν*, &c.), except when a vowel precedes (as in *δαῶμεν*).

The two forms of the Subj. present a certain analogy to the two kinds of derivative Verbs—the Attic *-αω*, *-εω*, *-οω*, and the Æolic *-ᾶμι*, *-ημι*, *-ωμι*. Thus *δύνῃ-μαι*, *τίθη-ντι* are related to *δύνω-μαι*, *τιθέωσι* nearly as *φίλημεν*, *φιλείσι* to *φιλέομεν*, *φιλέουσι*.

κεῖται occurs as a Subj. in Il. 19. 32., 24. 554, Od. 2. 102., 19. 147. It has been explained as contracted from *κεῖ-εται*, the regular form answering to the Non-Thematic *κεῖ-ται* (*Curt. Stud.* vii. 100). The best MS. (Ven. A of the Iliad) gives *κῆται*. The true reading is probably *κέεται* (related to *κείεται* as *τελέω* to *τελείω*).

ζώννυνται, construed with *ὅτε κεν* (Od. 24. 89) is regarded by Curtius as a Subj. (*Verb.* ii. 67). But the example is uncertain; the clause refers to past time, so that *ὅτε κεν* with the Subj. is quite irregular (§ 298).

σῶφ and *σῶφς* or *σοφς* (Il. 9. 424, 681) are probably Optatives; see § 83.

82.] Thematic Tense-Stems form the Subj. by changing *ε* into *η* and *ο* into *ω*.

The Subjunctive of the Thematic Aor. and Pres. frequently employs the Person-Endings *-μι* and *-σι*: e.g. *ἐθέλ-ωμι*, *ἐθέλ-ησι*; *εἶπωμι*, *εἶπησι*; *ἀγάγωμι*, *ἀγάγησι*; *τύχωμι*, *τύχησι*; *ἴδωμι*, *κτείνωμι*; *ἄγησι*, *ἀεῖδησι*, *ἄρχησι*, *ἀλάλησι*, *βάλησι*, *ἔλησι*, *κάμησι*, &c. (Bekker, *H. B.* i. 218). These Endings are also found (but rarely) with Non-Thematic Stems: Pres. *ἔ-ησι*, *ἔ-ησι* (which however may be Thematic), Aor. *δῶ-ησι* (Il. i. 324), Pf. *ἐρρίγ-ησι*

(II. 3. 353). The 2 Sing. sometimes takes *-σθά*; *ἔθελ-ησθα*, *εἴπ-ησθα*, *πίησθα*, &c.

The Subj. in *-ομι* had almost disappeared at one time from the text of Homer, having been generally corrupted into *-οιμι*, sometimes *-ομαι*. It was restored by Wolf, chiefly on the authority of the ancient grammarians. Some of the best MSS. (especially Ven. A) have occasionally preserved it.

It is interesting to observe the agreement in form between the Thematic Indic. and the Non-Thematic Subj.; e.g. Indic. *ἄγω* and Subj. *γνώ-ω*, in contrast to Subj. *ἔθελω-μι*: just as *ἄγο-μεν* and *γνώ-ομεν* agree in contrast to *ἄγω-μεν*.

A few forms of the Aorist in *-σᾶ* follow the analogy of the Thematic Stems, as *ῥοσ-ομεν* (II. 7. 38), *ῥοσ-ητε* (II. 23. 210), *δηλήσ-ηται* (II. 3. 107), *μνησώμεθα* (II. 15. 477, &c.), *παύσωμεν* (II. 7. 29), *παυσώμεσθα* (II. 7. 290., 21. 467), *πέμψομεν* (Od. 20. 383), *ἐνιπλήξωμεν* (II. 12. 72), *φθίσωμεν* (Od. 16. 369), *περάσῃτε* (Od. 15. 453), *ἀντιάσῃτον* (II. 12. 356), *τρώσῃτε* (Od. 16. 293., 19. 12), *δείσῃτε* (II. 24. 779), *βουλεύσωμεν* (Od. 16. 234).

In most of these instances the original reading is probably either a Pres. Subj. or an Opt. Thus in II. 21. 467 the best MSS. have *παυώμεσθα*, and in Od. 20. 383 there is good authority for *πέμψομεν* (in II. 15. 72 the MSS. are divided between *παύω* and *παύσω*). Similarly we may read *παύομεν* and *ἐνιπλήσσομεν*. Again *φθίσομεν* follows a Past Tense (§ 298), *περάσῃτε* an Opt. (§ 308, 1, b): read *φθίσαιμεν*, *περάσαιτε*. For *ἀντιάσῃτον* we may have either the Opt. *ἀντιάσαιτον* or a Pres. Subj. *ἀντιάῃτον*. For *τρώσῃτε* we should perhaps read *τρώῃτε* (cp. the Pres. Ind. *τρώει*), and for *βουλεύσωμεν* *βουλεύομεν*.

There are no clear instances of Thematic Stems forming the Subjunctive with a short vowel (*ε* or *ο*). *Od. 13. 204 216 (15-25?)*

The forms *μίσσῃται*, *κατίσῃται* (II. 2. 232, 233), for *μίσσῃται*, *κατίσῃται*, are like *βέβῃται* (II. 11. 380) in which the *η* forms a short syllable.

In II. 14. 484 *τῷ καί κε τις εὔχεται ἀνήρ κτλ.* Hermann's conjecture *καί τέ τις* is found in two of La Roche's MSS., and in any case the *κε* is unsuitable to the sense. The true reading is probably *καί τις τ'* (§ 332).

In Od. 4. 672 *ὡς ἂν ἐπισμυγερῶς ναυτίλλεται* write *ναυτίλλεται*, the Aor. Subj.

Three places remain to be mentioned:

II. 1. 66 *αἶ κέν πως ἀρνῶν κνίσης αἰγῶν τε τελείων
βούλεται ἀντιάσας ἡμῖν ἀπὸ λοιγὸν ἀμύνειν.*

Curtius adopts the suggestion of Stier, *βούλητ' ἀντιάσας* (*Curt. Stud.* ii. 138).

II. 10. 360 *ὡς δ' ὅτε καρχαρόδοντε δῶα κύνε, εἰδότε θήρησ,
ἢ κεμάδ' ἢ λαγῶν ἐπέιγετον ἐμμενὲς αἰεὶ
χῶρον ἀν' ὑλήενθ', ὁ δέ τε προθήρησι μεμηκῶσ.*

Here *ἐπέιγετον* is difficult because the Subj. *προθήρησι* is used in the next clause. Possibly the author of book 10 used the archaic form in *-ησι* as an Indicative.

II. 12. 42 *ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἔν τε κύνεσσι καὶ ἀνδράσι θηρευτῆσι
κάπριος ἢ λέων στρέφεται.*

The use of *ὅτ' ἂν* in a simile is doubtful in Homer (see § 289). Should we read *ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἔναντα*? Cp. II. 20. 67.

The Optative.

83.] The Optative Stem is formed from the Tense Stem by the Suffix *ιη* or *ι*, as *διδο-ιη-ν*, *τύχο-ι-το*.

1. Non-Thematic Tenses (except the Aorist in *-σα*) take *ιη* before Light Endings, *ι* before Heavy Endings; as *εἶη-ν* (for *εἶσ-ιη-ν*), *θε-ιη-ν*, *δο-ιη*, *κιχε-ιη*, *τεθνα-ιη-ς*, *δαμε-ιη*; but Plur. *φα-ι-μεν*, *δια-κοσμηθε-ι-μεν*, *ἐπι-θε-ι-τε*.

The 3 Plur. ends in *-ιεν*, as *ε-ιεν*, *δαμε-ιεν*, *δο-ιεν*: once *-ιησαν*, viz. *στα-ιησαν* (Il. 17. 733).

The *ι* is lost in *δύη* (Od. 9. 377., 18. 348., 20. 286, for *δυ-ιη*), *ἐκ-δύμεν*, *λελῦτο* (Od. 18. 238 La Roche), *δαινῦτο* (Il. 24. 665), *δαινύ-ατο* (Od. 18. 248), *φθίτο*, *ἀπο-φθίμην* (for *φθι-ι-το*, *ἀπο-φθι-ι-μην*).^{MS. 1330}

2. In Thematic Tenses the scheme of Endings is:—

	Sing.		Dual.		Plur.
1. <i>-οιμι</i>	Mid. <i>-οίμην</i>	. . .	Mid. . . .	<i>-οιμεν</i>	Mid. <i>-οίμεθα</i>
2. <i>-οις</i>	<i>-οιο</i>	<i>-οιτον</i>	<i>-οισθον</i>	<i>-οιτε</i>	<i>-οισθε</i>
3. <i>-οι</i>	<i>-οιτο</i>	<i>-οίτην</i>	<i>-οίστην</i>	<i>-οιεν</i>	<i>-οιάτο</i> .

3. The Aorist in *-σα* forms the Optative in two ways—

(1) In *-σειᾶ* the (so-called) Æolie Optative.

(2) In *-σαι-μι* with Endings as in the Thematic Tenses, putting *α* for *ο* throughout.

The scheme of the Homeric forms is:—

1	Sing. <i>-αιμι</i>	Plur. <i>-αιμεν</i>
2	„ <i>-ειᾶς</i> , rarely <i>-αις</i>	„ <i>-αιτε</i>
3	„ <i>-ειε(ν)</i> , sometimes <i>-αι</i>	„ <i>-εἰᾶν</i> (<i>-αιεν</i> Il. 24. 38).

The Mid. Endings are of the second kind, *-αίμην*, *-αιο*, *-αιτο*, &c.

The Perfect forms the Opt. from the weak Stem, as *τετλα-ιη*, *τεθνα-ιη-ς*, *έστα-ιη*. The Opt. of *οἶδα* is formed (like the Plpf., see § 68, 2) from an Aor. *ἐ-φείδε-σα* (*εἶδειη-ν* for *φείδεσ-ιη-ν*).

The instances of the Pf. Opt. with Thematic *-οι-μι*, *-οι-ς*, &c. are doubtful. *βεβλήκοι* is the reading of Aristarchus in Il. 8. 270, where the best MSS. have *βεβλήκει*. In Il. 21. 609 *γνώμεναι ὅς τε πεφεύγοι ὅς τ' ἔθαν' κτλ.*, the reading *πεφεύγει* is given by one good MS. (D.), and evidently agrees better with *ἔθανε*. *βεβρώθοις* (Il. 4. 35) points to a form *βέβρωθα*, of which however there is no other evidence. *ιλήκοι* (H. Apoll. 165) may be Pf. or Pres.

Irregular forms:—

Thematic *ἔοι-ς*, *ἔοι* (Il. 9. 142, 284), *ἴοι* (Il. 14. 21), *δίοι-το* (Od. 17. 317). Homer has also *ιε-ιη* (Il. 19. 209), to be compared with *εἶδειη*, *δεδειείη*.

The so-called 'Æolic' Opt. of Contracted Verbs (-ωη-ν, -οιη-ν) appears in φιλοίη (Od. 4. 692) and φοροίη (Od. 9. 320).

In Il. 14. 241 most authorities give ἐπισχοίης as an Opt. (τῶ κεν ἐπισχοίης λιπαροῖς πύδας εἰλαπινάζων. Three of the chief MSS. (A. B. C.) have ἐπίσχοιες, and this was quoted by Herodian, apparently as the only reading known to him (see Ludwich, *A. H. T.* i. 374). The Syr. palimpsest has ἐπίσχοιας. All three forms are anomalous; ἐπισχοίης finds a parallel in ἀγαγοίην (Sappho) and one or two other forms, but can hardly be Homeric.

The forms σόφς (Il. 9. 681), σόφ (Il. 9. 424) are so written by modern editors. Most MSS. have σόης, σόη. In the former place we learn that Ar. doubted between σαῶς and σοῶς (or σόφς, for the accent here is conjectural). The ancient grammarians apparently took both forms as Opt. (which suits the sense, § 304, a). Some wrote σαῶς, σαῶ (or σοῶς, σοῶ), deriving them directly from σαώω: others σόφς, σόφ, from σώω or sóω. It is not difficult to restore the uncontracted σαόους, σαόοι, or, if the Subj. is preferred, σαόης, σαόη (so Nauck).

For the 3 Plur. in -οιε-ν Bekker finds one instance of -οι-ν, viz. in Od. 20. 382, where the common text has—

τοὺς ξείνους ἐν νηϊ πολυκλήϊδι βαλόντες
ἐς Σικέλου πέμψωμεν ὅθεν κέ τοι ἄξιον ἄλφοι,

for which he would read ἄλφοιν. The 1 Sing. in -οι-ν (instead of the anomalous -οι-μι) was not unknown in Attic (Bekker, *H. B.* p. 111 ff) *.

παρα-φθα-ίη-σι (Il. 10. 346), with Primary instead of Secondary Ending, is perhaps a pseudo-archaic form, made on the analogy of the Subjunctives in -ησι.

The Verbal Nouns.

84.] **Infinitives and Participles** are not properly speaking Verbs—since they do not contain a Subject and Predicate—but Nouns: the Infinitive is a kind of Substantive and the Participle an Adjective. In certain respects however they belong to the scheme of the Verb:—

1. They answer in form and meaning to the Tense Stems; each Tense Stem has in general an Infinitive and a Participle formed from it.

2. They are distinguished as Active and Middle (or Passive) in sense.

3. They are construed with the same oblique cases of Nouns, and the same Adverbs and Adverbial phrases, as the corresponding Verbs.

* It must not be supposed, however, that the 1 Sing. and the 3 Plur. in -οι-ν are primitive forms. The termination -οι-ν was originally impossible in Greek (as -em and -om are in Sanscrit); we should expect -οιᾶ, -οιᾶν (Sanser. *-eyam, -eyas*). Hence -οι-μι probably made its way into Greek in place of *-οιᾶ, as -σαι-μι in the Aor. in place of -σαιᾶ (see Brugmann, in *Curt. Stud.* ix. 113). The 3 Plur. form ἀποτινοῖαν is found in the Eleian dialect.

85.] The Infinitive Active is formed—

(1) In Non-Thematic Tenses (except the Aor. in -σαῖ) by the Suffixes -μεναι, -μεν, -εναι, -ναι.

Of these -μεναι is the most usual, as θέ-μεναι, γινώ-μεναι, μιγή-μεναι, ἰδ-μεναι, τεθνά-μεναι, ζευγ-νύ-μεναι: -μεν occurs after short vowels, as ἵ-μεν, δό-μεν, τεθνά-μεν, ὄρ-νύ-μεν; also in ἔμμεν (five times, but always where we may write ἔμμεν'), ἰδ-μεν (Il. 11. 719), and ζευγ-νύ-μεν (Il. 16. 145), in which the long υ is irregular.

The full Suffix -έναι only occurs in ἰ-έναι; but there are many other Infinitives in -ναι, all of them containing a long vowel or diphthong in which an ε may be supposed to have been absorbed; as δοῦναι (for δο-έναι, see Max Müller, *Chips*, iv. 56), θείναι, στήναι, βῆναι, δύναι, γινῶναι, ἀλῶναι, βιῶναι, ἀήναι, φορῆ-ναι, διδοῦναι (Il. 24. 425). The original form of the Suffix seems to have been -Fεναι. *ἰδεναι κεῖναι. ἰδεναι*

From εἰμί (ἴσ-) are formed ἔμμεναι, ἔμμεν, ἔμμεν, and εἶναι. Of these ἔμμεναι, ἔμμεν are irregular; they follow the analogy of θέμεναι, &c. Cp. the 1 Plur. ἐμέν (Soph. El. 21). From εἶ-μι are formed ἴ-μεναι, ἴ-μεν, and ἰ-έναι. In one place (Il. 20. 365) ἴμεναι is scanned with τ—perhaps in imitation of ἔμμεναι (Solmsen, *K. Z.* xxix. 72).

The common Attic Present Infinitives ἰστά-ναι, τιθέ-ναι, διδῶ-ναι, δεικ-νύ-ναι, &c., as well as the Perfect Infinitives in -έναι, are entirely unknown in Homer.

(2) In Thematic Tenses by -έ-μεναι, -έ-μεν, -ειν; as εἰπ-έ-μεναι, εἰπ-έ-μεν, βάλλ-ειν.

The Ending -ε-ειν only occurs in the Thematic Aor., and is anomalous; compare βαλ-έ-ειν (Stem βαλε-) and βάλλ-ειν (Stem βαλλε-). The original ending was doubtless -έεν: thus—

Stem βαλε-, Inf. βαλέ-ειν, contr. βαλεῖν.
βαλλε-, ,, βάλλε-ειν, ,, βάλλειν.

In the Aor. the metre usually allows us to restore -έεν (see Renner, *Curt. Stud.* i. 2. p. 33).

It is possible that the forms βαλέ-ειν, &c., are genuine, since -εειν might pass into -εειν from the analogy of the Pres. Inf. in -ειν, just as in the Rhodian dialect -ίμεν became -ίμειν. Leo Meyer (*Vergl. Gr.* ii. 284) proposed to read βαλέ-μεν, &c. But, as Renner points out (*l. c.*), the change from -εειν to -εειν is very much slighter, indeed is a mere matter of spelling. Original βαλέμεν, &c. would probably have been retained.

(3) The Aor. in -σαῖ forms -σαι, as στή-σαι.

(4) The Inf. Middle is formed by -σθαι: βλή-σθαι, πεφά-σθαι, ἵστα-σθαι, ἰδέ-σθαι, βάλλε-σθαι, στή-σα-σθαι.

The Infinitive is originally a Case-form of an abstract Noun (*nomen actionis*). Thus -μεναι consists of the Nominal Suffix -μεν (§ 114) with the Dative ending -αι: ἰδ-μεν-αι 'for knowing'

(Sanscr. *vid-mán-e*). Similarly *δοῦναι* is *δο-φεν-αι* (*dā-ván-e*) 'for giving.' Probably the Infinitives in *-σαι* and *-σθαι* also are Datives (Max Müller, *l.c.*). Infinitives in *-μεν* and *-εν* appear to be Locatives formed without Case-ending (§ 99). If so, the Infinitives in *-μεν* and *-εν* (*-ειν*) originally differed in meaning from those in *-μεναι*, *-εναι*, &c. In Greek, however, the sense of the Inf. as a Case-form is lost, so that the different forms are all construed in exactly the same way.

86.] **The Participle.** The Aorist, the Present, and the Future Tense Stems form the Active Participle by the Suffix *-ντ*: thus we have, Non-Thematic *στα-ντ*-, *τιθε-ντ*-; Thematic *βαλο-ντ*-, *στη-σο-ντ*-, &c.

The vowel before *ντ* is always short, as *γνο-ντ*-, *μιγε-ντ*-.

The Perfect Stem takes *-οτ* or *-οσ* (originally *-φοτ*-, *-φοσ*), Fem. *-υιά* (for *-υσ-ιά*, the *-ῦσ* originally a weak form for *-φοσ*). The Middle Participle is formed by *-μενος*, which in the Perfect is accented *-μένος*.

For the Verbal Adjectives in *-τος*-, see § 114. The Verbal in *-τέος* is post-Homeric.

CHAPTER IV.

ACCENTUATION OF THE VERB.

87.] The general rule is that the accent is thrown back as far as possible; and the chief departures from this rule are found in the Infinitives and Participles, which are in reality Nouns. In the forms of the Verb properly so called the following exceptions have to be noted:—

I. *εἰμί* and *φημί*. The 2 Sing. Imper. *φα-θί* is oxytone.

The disyllabic forms of the Pres. Indicative, *εἰμί*, *έσσί*, *φημί*, *φησί*, &c., are enclitic, and, when they do not lose the accent altogether, are oxytone; but *έσσι* is accented in the ordinary way when it occurs at the beginning of a sentence, or after certain words (*οὐκ*, *καί*, *ὤς*).

Such was the commonly accepted account; but the ancient grammarians were not agreed as to the enclitic character of the Dual and Plural forms (on *έστόν* see Charax 1151; on *φαμέν*, *φατέ*, *φασί*, *ibid.*; on *έσμέν*, *έστέ*, *είσί*, Eust. 1457, 48). Again, one grammarian denies that *φημί* was ever enclitic (Charax 1152); another holds that it should be written *φήμι*, at least in such instances as *φήμι γάρ οὖν κατανεῦσαι*, *κτλ.* (Tyrannio ap. Eust. 1613, 18). In all likelihood the original forms were, Sing. *έσσι*, *φήμι*, Plur. *έσμέν*, *φαμέν*, and we may suppose that *φημί* and *έσσί* are not properly oxytone, but are unaccented forms made oxytone as enclitics (*ἄξύνθη διὰ τὴν ἐποῦσαν αὐτοῖς*

ἔγκλιαν Apoll. Synt.). The Sanscrit Verbs of the same kind follow the rule of accenting the Stem in the Sing., the Ending in the Dual and Plur.; and this must be connected with the difference of quantity between strong and weak Stems (§ 6). See Benfey, *Vedica und Linguistica*, pp. 90 ff.

The 2 Sing. εἰς is enclitic, though the corresponding Attic form εἶ is not; but see § 5. As to φῆς there is a contradiction; it is not enclitic according to Arc. 142, 8, but enclitic according to Schol. A. Il. 17. 147—both notices being supposed to rest on the authority of Herodian (ed. Lentz, i. 553, 4 and ii. 105, 5).

2. The 3 Plur. ἰσῶσι, τιθέωσι, διδοῦσι, δεικνῶσι, are properispomena (Herodian, i. 459, ed. Lentz).

This can hardly have been the original accentuation, since they are not contracted forms, but represent ἰσῶ-ντι, &c. Probably it comes from the Attic ἰσῶσι (contracted from ἰσῶ-ασι, cp. τιθέ-ασι, &c.). The Doric forms are written τιθέντι, &c. by Eustath. Od. 1557, 45; but we do not know that this represents the usage of any living dialect.

3. Subjunctives such as φανῆ, δαῶμεν are circumflexed, as being contracted forms (for φανήη, δαήομεν). On εἰδέω, εἰδῆς, εἰδῆ, εἰδέωσι see § 80.

Optatives in which -η- becomes -ι- before Heavy Endings are accented on the ι throughout, as διακρῖνωθεῖτε, δαμέειν.

But Middle forms to which there is no corresponding Active follow the general rule: δύνωμαι, δύνηαι (so Herodian, but Tyrannio wrote δυνῶμαι, δυνῆαι, Schol. Il. 6. 229), κέρωνται (Il. 4. 260), ἐπίσθηται (§ 280); ἐπίσθαιτο, ὄναιο, ὄνοιτο.

4. The Imperatives εἰπέ, ἔλθέ, are oxytone (and so in Attic εὔρε, ἰδέ, λαβέ). Similarly Tyrannio wrote πιθέσθε, λαβέσθε (Schol. V. Il. 18. 266); cp. the Attic βαλοῦ, &c.

The rule in Sanscrit is that the Verb loses the accent, except in subordinate clauses, or when it begins the sentence. Hence the verbs εἰμί and φημί in fact retain the original accentuation, which was doubtless that of the Indo-European language. The Imperatives εἰπέ, ἔλθέ, &c., are evidently words that would often be used to begin a sentence.

The ordinary accent of a Greek verb, the so-called 'recessive' accent, represents the original enclitic condition. The Opt. φαίην, for example, is originally oxytone. On the Sanscrit rules it loses its accent, and we should have (e. g.) ἔγῶ-φαιην. But owing to the Greek rhythmical law this is impossible. Accordingly the accent goes back as far as the Greek rules will allow, and we have ἐγῶ-φαιην.

5. The final -αι of the Endings -μαι, -σαι, -ται, -νται, and of the Inf. is treated as short. These are all cases in which -αι represents the original final sound of the word. But the -αι of the Opt., which is for original -αιτ, counts as long.

88.] **Accent in Composition.** Unaugmented forms of Compound Verbs are accented as though the Verb were an enclitic

following the Preposition: hence *σύν-εχον, πρό-ες, παρά-θες, περί-κειται, ἀπό-σχωνται*. If the final syllable of the Preposition is lost by elision or apocope the accent falls on the first syllable; hence *ὑφ-ελκε, κάτ-θανε*.

But the accent falls if possible upon the Augment: hence *προσ-έβᾶν, ἐπ-έσχον, ἐπ-ῆλθε*. In other words, the Augment is treated in accentuation as a Preposition.

The form *ἔσται* keeps the accent (*παρ-έσται, &c.*); perhaps because it is formed by syncope from *ἔσεται*.

The Subj. *ξυμ-βληται* (Od. 7. 204) ought to be properisponenon, if it is a contracted form; cp. *βλήεται* (Od. 17. 472). The grammarians however wrote *ἀπό-θωμαι* (in spite of *ἀπο-θείομαι*, Il. 18. 409) and *διά-θωμαι* (Herodian, i. 469, 7, ed. Lentz). We have to recognise in such cases the encroachment of the common Thematic type, though we may doubt whether the change reaches back to the earliest form of the text of Homer.

According to Herodian, the 2 Sing. Imperative *ἐνί-σπες* is paroxytone, but the other Imperative form *ἔνι-σπε*, and the Indic. forms *ἐνι-σπε-ς, ἔνισπε*, are proparoxytone; see Schol. on Il. 24. 388. That is to say, the Imper. *ἐνί-σπε-ς* is regular, the others are accented as if compounds of *ἴσπω*.

The Imperative *ἐπισχε* in Hes. Scut. 446 may be divided *ἐπι-ισχε* or *ἐπι-σχε*, and in the latter case we may write *ἐπίσχε* (with the MSS.), or *ἔπισχε*, like the *ἔνισπε* of Herodian.

The MSS. vary between (Imper.) *ἐνίσπες* and *ἔνισπε*: in the two places of the Iliad (Il. 186., 14. 470) the Venetus has *ἐνίσπες*: on the other hand in the only Homeric passage in which the metre gives any help (Od. 4. 642) it is decisive for *ἔνισπε*. The accent in the MSS. nearly always follows Herodian's rule.

89.] The Infinitive and Participle. Infinitives in *-ειν* and *-μεναι* follow the general rule: those in *-μεν* have the same accent as the corresponding forms in *-μεναι*, as *φευγέ-μεν*. On the Aor. Inf. in *-εῖν*, see § 85, 2.

The forms in *-ναι, -σαι* accent the penultimate, as *ίεναι, ἀλῶναι, ἐρύσαι*. The Middle forms of the Thematic Aorist and Perfect are also paroxytone, as *πιθέσθαι, λελαθέσθαι, κεκλήσθαι, τετύχθαι*. The ancient grammarians doubted between *ἀκάησθαι, ἀλάησθαι* and *ἀκάησθαι, ἀλαλήσθαι*. The former were adopted in the common texts, and were explained as Æolic forms of the Pres. Infinitive (Herodian, ii. 111, 21, ed. Lentz).

It may be conjectured that the forms in *-μεναι* and *-μεν* were originally accented on the suffix, like Sanscr. *vidmāne, dāvāne*. If so, this is one of the cases in which the accent of an archaic form in Homer has been lost.

Active Participles, except the Thematic Present and Future, accent the Suffix, as *διδούς, στρεφθείς, μεμαώς, λαβών, τεταγών*. So the Presents *έών, ίών*.

The Part. of the Pf. Middle is paroxytone. But ἀκαχήμενος follows ἀκάχησθαι.

In Composition the Infinitive and Participle retain the accent of the simple word; in other words, they do not become enclitic. Hence we have Impf. σὺν-εχον, but Neut. Part. συν-έχον.

CHAPTER V.

NOUNS AND PRONOUNS.

90.] The words to which we now proceed are incapable of forming Sentences except in combination with a Verb.

The relation of such words to the Verb is shown in general either by a *Case-Ending*—as in the words which are said to be ‘declined,’—or by an *Adverbial Ending* (such as -ως, -θεν, &c.). The Ending in either case is suffixed to a *Stem* or *Theme*. Thus, λογο- is the Stem of the Case-forms, Nom. λόγο-ς, Acc. λόγο-ν, Gen. λόγο-ιο, &c.: αὐτο- is the Stem of the Case-forms αὐτό-ς, αὐτό-ν, αὐτο-ῖο, and also of the Adverbs αὐτό-θεν, αὐτό-θι, αὐτως, &c.

The Stems now in question belong to two great classes, those of *Nouns* and of *Pronouns*, called *Nominal* and *Pronominal* Stems respectively. The term ‘Noun’ includes Substantives and Adjectives. The other ‘parts of speech’—Adverbs, Prepositions, Conjunctions—may ultimately be resolved into Case-forms or Adverbial forms either of Nouns or Pronouns.

The distinction between Nouns and Pronouns brings before us in a new form the fundamental antithesis involved in the division of a Verb into a Stem which ‘predicates,’ and a Person-Ending which marks the Subject. A Noun either denotes a single object or group of objects (*i. e.* when it is a ‘proper name’), or denotes objects through their permanent attributes, as belonging to a class; whereas a Pronoun denotes an object by its local position, or momentary relation to something else, as ‘this’ or ‘that,’ ‘here’ or ‘there,’ ‘same’ or ‘other.’ This contrast is shortly expressed by saying that Nominal Stems are *Predicative*, and Pronominal Stems *Demonstrative*; the former name or describe, the latter only ‘point out’ what is intended. Accordingly, Nominal Stems are in general either identical with, or formed from, the Stems of Verbs: Pronouns are found to contain the same elements as those which furnish the Person-Endings of Verbs. The simplest forms obtained by analysis are thus of two kinds. They were first clearly distinguished by Bopp, and called by him *Verbal* and *Pronominal Roots* respectively (*Vergl.-Gr.* § 105).

The Cases.

91.] **Declensions.** The main distinction is that between the *Consonantal Declension* (including that of Stems in -ι and -υ),

which forms the Genitive in *-ος*, and the *Vowel Declensions*, of which three may be distinguished:—

- (1) Stems in *-ο* (chiefly Masc. and Neut.): Gen. *-οιο*.
 (2) „ *-ᾱ, -η* (chiefly Fem.): Gen. *-ας, -ης*.
 (3) „ *-ε* (Personal Pronouns): Gen. *-ειο*.

92.] Vocative. A Noun used in addressing a person by his name or title has properly no Case-Ending. Accordingly the Vocative Case consists in general of the simple Stem; e. g. *Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, Αἴαν* (for *Αἴαντ-*), *διόγενες, ᾧ ἄνα* (for *ἀνακτ-*).

In *Il.* 1. 86 *Κάλχαν* (Voc. of *Κάλχας*) was read by Aristarchus, *Κάλχα* by Zenodotus. On the other hand in *Il.* 12. 231 *Ar.* read *Πουλυδάμα*, but Zen. *Πουλυδάμαν*. The form *Λαοδάμα* in *Od.* 8. 141 probably has the authority of Aristarchus.

Stems in *-ο* form the Voc. in *-ε*, as *φίλε έκυρέ*. Some Stems in *-ᾱ(η)* shorten the final vowel, as *νύμφᾱ*, Voc. of *νύμφη*, and the Masc. *συβᾱτᾱ, ἡπεροπευτᾱ, τοξότᾱ, κυνᾱπά*, &c. But the long vowel of the Stem is used in the Voc. *Ἐρμῆα, Ἄτρεΐδη, ὑφαγόρη, αἰναρέτη* (*Il.* 16. 31). Feminines in *-ω* or *-ω* form the Voc. in *-οι*, as *Λητοῖ* (*Il.* 21. 498). Evidently *-ω* : *-οι* :: *η* : *ᾶ*.

The words of address, *πάππα, ἄττα, τέττα, μαῖα*, may be ranked as Vocatives. So *ἡθεῖε*, as to which see the note on § 96.

93.] Case-Endings. These are given in the following Table. The Endings of the Consonantal Declension are in larger type: the two Vowel Declensions of Nouns are numbered (1), (2), and the Pronominal Declension (3).

	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Dual.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Nom.	-ς	-ε	-ες , Neut. -ᾶ
	(1) <i>-ο-s</i> , Neut. <i>-ο-ν</i>	<i>-ω</i>	<i>-οι</i>
	(2) <i>-ᾱ(η)</i> , <i>-ῃᾶ</i> ; <i>-η-s</i>	<i>-ᾱ</i>	<i>-αι</i>
Acc.	-ν, -ᾶ	-ε	-ᾶς , Neut. -ᾶ
		(1) <i>-ω</i>	<i>-ους</i> (for <i>-ο-νς</i>)
		(2) <i>-ᾱ</i>	<i>-ᾶς</i> (<i>-α-νς</i>)
Gen.	-ος	-οῖῖν	-ων
	(1) <i>-οιο, -οο, -ον</i>	<i>-οῖῖν</i>	<i>-ων</i>
	(2) <i>-ης; -ᾶο, -εω</i>		<i>-ᾶων, -εων</i>
	(3) <i>-ειο, -εο, -εν</i>	<i>-ῖ(ν)</i>	<i>-ειων, -εων</i>
Dat.	-ι	-οῖῖν	-σι(ν), -εσσι(ν)
	(1) <i>-φ</i> (Loc. <i>-οι</i>)	<i>-οῖῖν</i>	<i>-οισι(ν), -οις</i>
	(2) <i>-η</i> (Loc. <i>-αι</i> ?)	—	<i>-ησι(ν), -ης</i>
	(3) <i>-οι</i>	<i>-ῖ(ν)</i>	<i>-ῖν, -ῖ(ν)</i>
Instrum.	-φι(ν)		-φι(ν)

94.] Stems ending in ι , υ , and σ are liable to lose the final letter before the Case-Endings which begin with a vowel.

1. Stems in $-\eta\upsilon$, $-\epsilon\upsilon$: e. g.—

$\nu\eta\upsilon$ -s, Gen. $\nu\eta$ -ός (for $\nu\eta\upsilon$ -ός), rarely $\nu\epsilon$ -ός. The ϵ arises by shortening from η ; so $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\varsigma$, $\nu\epsilon\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$, $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ —all less common than the corresponding forms with η -, $\nu\acute{\eta}\epsilon\varsigma$, $\nu\eta\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\nu\acute{\eta}\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$, $\nu\acute{\eta}\alpha\varsigma$.

The forms $\nu\eta\upsilon$ -s, $\nu\eta\upsilon$ -σί are irregular, since original $\tilde{a}u$ before a consonant would appear in Greek as $\tilde{a}u$ (ep. Zeús for original dyáus). Hence the true Greek form is preserved in the Instrum. $\nu\tilde{a}\tilde{u}$ -φιν (§ 104) and the Compounds $\nu\alpha\sigma\iota$ -κλυτός, $\text{Ná}\nu\sigma\iota$ -κάα, &c. The η of $\nu\eta\upsilon$ -s and $\nu\eta\upsilon$ -σί is taken by analogy from the other Cases.

$\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$ -s, Gen. $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}$ -ος (but Dat. Plur. $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\tilde{u}$ -σι).

$\text{P}\eta\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$ -s, Gen. $\text{P}\eta\lambda\acute{\eta}$ -ος and $\text{P}\eta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}$ -ος. In oblique Cases of Stems in $-\epsilon\upsilon$ the ϵ seems to be nearly confined to proper names; ep. $\text{T}\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ $\text{T}\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}$ $\text{T}\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$, $\text{A}\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ $\text{A}\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}$, $\text{O}\theta\eta\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$, $\text{N}\eta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$, &c.

On $\text{Z}\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$, $\beta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ see § 106, 2.

2. Stems in $-\iota$ and $-\upsilon$ form the same Cases in two ways:—

(1) Retaining the Stem-vowel, as $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota$ -s $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota$ -ος, $\text{P}\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota$ -s $\text{P}\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota$ -ος, $\acute{\iota}\lambda\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\iota}\lambda\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\iota}\chi\theta\acute{\upsilon}$ -s $\acute{\iota}\chi\theta\acute{\upsilon}$ -ες, $\sigma\tilde{\upsilon}$ -s $\sigma\tilde{\upsilon}$ -ός, $\sigma\tilde{\upsilon}$ -ί, $\sigma\tilde{\upsilon}$ -ες.

It is probable that this form of declension was originally confined to monosyllables.

(2) Inserting ϵ and dropping ι or υ : as $\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\sigma\iota$ -s, Dat. $\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\sigma\epsilon$ -ῖ, $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\upsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ -ος, $\text{p}\acute{\eta}\chi\upsilon$ -s $\text{p}\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon$ -ος, $\text{p}\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}$ -s $\text{p}\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}$ -ος. Here the Stem of the oblique Cases ends in $-\epsilon\iota$, $-\epsilon\upsilon$: hence Gen. $-\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ for $-\epsilon\iota$ -ος, $-\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}$ -ος, &c.

$\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ forms several of its Cases in three ways :

(1) Gen. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota$ -ος, Dat. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\acute{\iota}$ (for $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota$ -ι, § 99), Plur. Nom. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota$ -ες, Gen. $\text{p}\omicron\lambda\acute{\iota}$ -ων, Dat. $\text{p}\omicron\lambda\acute{\iota}$ -εσσι, Acc. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota$ -ας and $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (§ 100).

(2) Gen. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (so Bekk. reads in Il. 2. 811., 21. 567, with the scanning \cup -; ep. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ in Theognis), Dat. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\iota$, $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}$ (Il. 17. 152, perhaps should be $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota$, ep. the Cyprian form $\text{p}\omicron\lambda\iota\gamma\iota$).

(3) Gen. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\eta$ -ος, Dat. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\eta$ -ῖ, Plur. Nom. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\eta$ -ες, Acc. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\eta$ -ας.

The stem $\text{p}\omicron\lambda\eta$ - which furnishes the last of these three forms of inflexion has been traced by Joh. Schmidt (*K. Z.* xxvii. p. 287) to a primitive Locative in $-\eta$ (ep. Sanscr. *agni*, Loc. *agnā*), to which the ordinary Loc. $-\tilde{\iota}$ was suffixed. From this new Loc. $\text{p}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\eta$ -ῖ the other Cases were then formed by analogy.

The Nouns in $-\tilde{a}$ (from $-\tilde{\iota}\tilde{a}$) answer to the original Stems in $-\tilde{\iota}$, as $\acute{\iota}\delta\upsilon\tilde{\iota}\alpha$, for $\acute{\iota}\delta\upsilon\sigma$ -ια, Sanscr. *vidush*-ῖ.

$\acute{\eta}\tilde{\iota}$ -s or $\acute{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ -s *good* makes Gen. $\acute{\epsilon}\tilde{\eta}$ -ος, perhaps by transference of quantity for $\acute{\eta}\acute{\epsilon}$ -ος. Other Adjectives in $-\tilde{\upsilon}\varsigma$ form $-\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$, $-\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}$, &c.

3. Stems in $-\epsilon\omicron$, $-\alpha\omicron$, $-\omicron\omicron$ drop the σ , as $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon$ -ος, $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$ -ος, $\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omicron}$ -ος.

95.] Original \bar{a} as the final vowel of the Stem becomes η ; except (1) after ϵ , $\epsilon\iota$, \bar{a} , as in $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$, and the proper names 'Ερμείας, Αἰνείας, Ἀνγείας, Ναυσικάα, 'Ρεία (Ar. on Il. 14. 203), Φειά (Il. 7. 135, Od. 15. 297), and (2) in the Gen. in $-\bar{a}\omega$ and $-\bar{a}\omega\eta$.

Other exceptions to the scheme given above will be best treated under the separate Cases.

96.] **Nominative Singular.** The final $-s$ is retained after vowels and mutes, but lost with Stems ending in ρ , as $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, $\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\tau\omega\rho$.

Stems ending in ν either (1) take final $-s$ (with loss of ν), as $\epsilon\acute{\iota}s$ (for $\epsilon\nu-s$), $\theta\acute{\iota}s$ Acc. $\theta\acute{\iota}\nu-a$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ Gen. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\nu-ος$, or (2) do not take $-s$, but lengthen a preceding vowel, as $\chi\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$ Gen. $\chi\theta\omega\nu-ός$, $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\nu$ Gen. $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu-ος$. So with Stems in $-\nu\tau$: $\delta\acute{o}\nu\varsigma$ Gen. $\delta\acute{o}\nu\tau-ος$, but $\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$. Originally it seems that all monosyllables took $-s$ and all others $-\nu$ (J. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxvii. 392). If so, $\chi\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\phi\rho\acute{\eta}\nu$, &c. are forms due to the $-\nu$ of the oblique Cases: and on the other hand $\delta\iota\delta\acute{o}\nu\varsigma$, $\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, &c. have followed the analogy of corresponding monosyllabic words, $\delta\acute{o}\nu\varsigma$, $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, &c.

Thomson p. 37
Thomson p. 43

There is a remarkable group of Masc. Stems in $-\bar{a}(\eta)$, with Nom. Sing. in $-\bar{a}$, viz.—

Titles of gods: $\nu\epsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\eta\gamma\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha$, $\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\eta\gamma\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha$, $\mu\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\alpha$, $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\pi\alpha$ (Zeus); $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\tau\alpha$ ('Ερμείας $\acute{\alpha}$.); $\kappa\upsilon\alpha\nu\omicron\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha$ (Ποσειδάων).

Titles of heroes: $\iota\pi\acute{\nu}\omicron\tau\alpha$, $\iota\pi\pi\eta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$, $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}$; $\eta\acute{\nu}\tau\alpha$ ($\kappa\acute{\eta}\rho\upsilon\zeta$).

One proper name, $\Theta\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha$ (Il. 2. 107).

Except $\Theta\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha$ these words are only found as adjectives: thus we have $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\Lambda\upsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$, $\kappa\upsilon\alpha\nu\omicron\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha$ Ποσειδάων , but $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\kappa\upsilon\alpha\nu\omicron\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma$ when the same words are substantives.

The accent generally follows the forms in $-\eta-s$ where such forms exist; thus $\iota\pi\acute{\nu}\omicron\tau\alpha$, $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}$, like $\iota\pi\acute{\nu}\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$, $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$. But it is thrown back in $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\pi\alpha$, $\mu\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\tau\alpha$,—ancient epithets only known from the traditional Homeric use.

These are in reality Vocatives which have been turned into Nominatives. That is to say, they belonged originally to certain established forms of address— $\mu\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\alpha$ $\text{Ze}\acute{\upsilon}$, $\kappa\upsilon\alpha\nu\omicron\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha$ Ποσειδάων , $\iota\pi\acute{\nu}\omicron\tau\alpha$ $\text{Πη}\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}$, &c.—and were not inflected when the names to which they were attached came to be used in the Nom. In this way the *rhythm*, which doubtless had a traditional sacredness, remained unaltered, and the whole phrase retained something of its vocative character. The feeling which might lead to this is that expressed by Eumæus in Od. 14. 145 ff.—

τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν, ᾧ ξεῖνε, καὶ οὐ παρόντ' ὀνομάζειν
αἰδέομαι· περὶ γάρ μ' ἐφίλει καὶ κήδετο θυμῷ·
ἀλλὰ μιν ἠθεῖον καλέω καὶ νόσφιν ἔδοντα.

I call him by the title $\eta\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ even in his absence,—the word $\eta\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ being only used as a form of address. Cp. also § 111 (2). The Nominatives in $-\bar{a}$ are evidently part of the archaic and conventional style of Epic poetry. They are commoner in the Iliad than in the Odyssey in the proportion of 3 to 1. The ancient grammarians regarded them as Æolic, but without sufficient reason.

The form *εὐρύσπα* also appears as an Acc., and has accordingly been explained from a Nom. *εὐρύ-οψ*. It is improbable however that it is a different word from the Nom. Voc. *εὐρύσπα*. Probably the fact that it had the appearance of an Acc. of one of the numerous Compounds in *-οψ* led to an extension of use*.

97.] **Accusative Sing.** The Ending *-ᾶ* is found after consonants and the diphthongs *ηυ*, *ευ*; as *νηῦ-ς νῆα* (for *νηνα*, *νηφα*), *βασιλεύ-ς βασιλῆα*, *Τυδεύ-ς Τυδέα* †. Otherwise the Acc. takes *-ν*; e. g. *πόλι-ν*, *ἰχθύ-ν*, *βοῦ-ν*.

But *εὐρύ-ς* makes *εὐρέα* in the phrases *εὐρέα πόντου*, *εὐρέα κόλπων*: the common form being *εὐρύ-ν*.

The original Ending is *-m*, which becomes *-ν* after a vowel and *-ᾶ* (for *ῃ*) after a consonant. The preference for *ᾶ* after *ηυ*, *ευ* is due to the semi-consonantal nature of the *υ* in these combinations. We may compare the Aorists *ἔκηα* (for *ἔκη-α*), *ἔχεα* (also *ἔχεα*), &c., and on the other hand *ἔδου-ν*, *ἔφου-ν*.

Several Stems form the Acc. in *-ν* and also in *-ιδα*: *ἔριδα* and *ἔριυ* (Od.), *φυλόπιδα* (Od. II. 313) and *φύλοπιυ*, *γλαυκώπιδα* (II. 8. 373) and *γλαυκώπιυ* (Od. I. 156), *ἀνάλκιδα* and *ἀναλκιυ* (Od. 3. 375), *ὄπιδα* and *ὄπιυ*, *Κύπριδα* and *Κύπριυ*; *θοῦριυ*, *Ἴριυ*, *αὔλιυ*, *Θέτιυ*. Cp. also *χάρι-ν* (for *χάριτ-α*), and *κόρυ-ν* (for *κόρυθ-α*), found in the line II. 13. 131 (= 16. 215),—

ἀσπίς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυυ, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνήρ.

In Attic there are many more such forms; *ὄριυ*, &c.

Note that no oxytones form the Acc. in *-ν*.

The Accusatives *ζαῖν* (Od. 12. 313), *Ἄρην*, *Μέγην* are probably formed directly from the Nom. *ζαῖς*, *Ἄρης*, *Μέγης*, on the analogy of Masc. Nouns in *-ης*. On the other hand *Ζῆν* (*Ζεύς*), *βῶν* (*βοῦς*), are very ancient forms, answering to the Sanser. *dyám*, *gám* (Joh. Schmidt in *K. Z.* xxv. 17): see § 106, 2.

A final *δ* is lost in the Neut. Pronouns *ὄ*, *τό*, *τοῦτο*, *ἐκείνο*, *ἄλλο* (Lat. *id*, *is-tud*, *illud*, *aliud*), and in *τί* (Lat. *quid*): perhaps also in the Personal Pronouns, Acc. Sing. *ἐμέ* (*με*), *σέ*, *ἐ*, Dual *νώ*, *σφώ*, *σφῶε*, Plur. *ἄμμε*, *ὑμμε*, *σφέ* (*Curt. Stud.* vi. 417 ff.; Max Müller, *Chips*, iv. 44).

* It will be shown hereafter (§ 116, 2) that the Masc. Nouns in *-της* are probably derived from Feminines in *-τη*, of abstract or collective meaning. Hence it is possible that the Homeric Nominatives in *-τᾶ* come directly from these Feminines: so that (e. g.) *μητιέτα* meant literally Counsel rather than Counsellor. The abstract word may have been used as a title, like *βίη Πριάμοιο* and the like. According to Joh. Schmidt (*Pluralb.* p. 400) *εὐρύσπα* is originally a Neuter: see § 107, 2.

† The forms *Τυδῆ* (II. 4. 388) and *Μημιστῆ* (II. 15. 339) are probably false: see Nauck, *Mel. gr.-rom.* iii. 222.

98.] **Genitive Singular.** The Stems in *-o* form the Gen. in *-οιο*, *-οο*, *-ου*. Of these forms only *-οιο* and *-ου* are read in the existing text of Homer; but there are sufficient traces of *-οο*, and indeed several places where it is called for by the metre. Thus we must read— *Nauck proef. Stud. p. 135* *Herist proef. p. 135*

- Π. 2. 518 *υἱέες Ἰφίτοο μεγαθύμου.*
 15. 66 (= 21. 104) *Ἰλίοο προπάροιθεν.*
 22. 313 *ἀγρίοο, πρόσθεν δὲ κτλ.*
 Od. 10. 36 *δῶρα παρ' Αἰόλοο μεγαλήτορος.*
 60 *βῆν εἰς Αἰόλοο κλυτὰ δῶματα.*
 Π. 9. 440, &c. *ὁμοίτοο προλέμοιο* (for *ὁμοίτου πολέμοιο*).
 2. 325 *ὄο κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται* } (for *οὔ*).
 Od. 1. 70 *ὄο κράτος ἔσκε μέγιστον* }
 Π. 2. 731 *Ἀσκληπίοο δύο παῖδε.*
 15. 554 *ἀνεψίοο κταμένοιο.*
 5. 21 *ἀδελφεόο κταμένοιο*: so in—
 6. 61 (= 7. 120., 13. 788) *ἀδελφεόο φρένας ἦρωσ.*
 Od. 14. 239 *χαλεπὴ δ' ἔχε δήμοο φῆμυς.*

Also in the two lines— *Γαι. 78*

Π. 6. 344 *εἶνεκ' ἐμείοο κυνὸς κακομηχάνου ὀκρυόεσσης,*
 9. 723 *ὄο πολέμου ἔραται ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυόεντος,*
 since *ὀκρυόεις* does not occur elsewhere, but *κρυόεσσα* (Π. 5. 740),
κρηόεντος (Π. 9. 2), *κρυερός* &c., we should probably read—

. . . *κακομηχάνου κρυόεσσης.*
 . . . *ἐπιδημίου κρυόεντος.*

A trace of *-οο* may also be found in the fact that Nouns in *-αος* sometimes form the Gen. in *-εωο*, which is for *-αοο*; e.g. *Πετέ-ωο, Πηνελέ-ωο.* *Ξ. 491 B 552*

Masc. Stems in *-ᾱ(η)* form the Gen. in *-ᾱο* (original *-ᾱιο*), less commonly *-εω* (by transference of quantity). This *-εω* is often scanned as one syllable; after another vowel it is written *-ω*, as *Βορέ-ω* (for *Βορέ-εω*), *Ἑρμεί-ω, Αἰνεί-ω, ἔϋμμελλ-ω.* (So in Ionic, *Curt. Stud.* v. 294., viii. 172.)

The Pronominal Stems in *-ε*, viz. *ἐμε* (*με*), *σε* (for *τε*), and *ἐ* or *έε*, form the Gen. in *-ειο*, *-εο* and (by contraction) *-εῦ*. Thus we find *ἐμείοο, ἐμέο* (Π. 10. 124), *ἐμεῦ*; *σεῖο, σέο, σεῦ*; *εἶο, εἶο, εἶ*. For *σεῖο* there is also a longer form *τεοῖο* (Π. 8. 37=468), and for *εἶο* in one place (Π. 19. 384) Zenodotus read *εἶοῦ*.

99.] **Dative Singular.** In Homer the *ι* of the Dat. is sometimes long (as in Latin), chiefly in forms which otherwise could not be easily brought into the verse; in the *Iliad*, *Ἀχιλλῆϊ, ὑπερμένει, κράτει, σάκει, πτόλει, σθένει, ἔριδι*; in the *Odyssey*, *Ὀδυσσῆϊ, ἔτει, δέπαι, ὕδατι.* But we find also *Ζητὶ μενεαίνομεν* (Π. 15. 104), *πὰρ νητὶ τέ μένειν* (Od.) See § 373.

The Dat. of Neuters in *-as* was commonly written *-α*; but the long *α* is anomalous, and *-αι* is now read by La Roche from good MSS. (in *σέλαι, κέραι*). The forms in *-α* appear to have become established in later Greek (Hdn. II, 316, 10, ed. Lentz).

Stems in *-ι*, Gen. *-ι-ος*, form the Dat. in *-ι*, as *κόνι, μήτι, μάστι, κρήστι, Θέτι, νεμέσσι* (with v. l. *νεμέσσει* Il. 6. 335). So Bekker restored the forms *πόλι* (Il. 5. 686, &c.), *ἀγύρι* (Il. 16. 661), *ῥψι, ῥβρι, δυνάμι, πόσι*, for which the common texts give forms in *-ει*.

Stems in *-υ*, Gen. *-υ-ος*, form the Dat. in *-υι* (a diphthong which in later Greek can only occur before a vowel), *πληθυῖ* (Il. 22. 458), *νέκυι, ὄρχηστυῖ, οἰζυῖ, ἰξυῖ, θρήνυι*. But *δρῦ-s, σῦ-s* form the disyllables *δρῦ-ι̇, σῦ-ι̇*.

It is possible, however, that the Datives in *-ι* are Instrumental forms, and similarly that the Datives in *-υι* have taken the place of Instrumentals in *-ῦ*. For the Vedic and Zend Instrum. in *-ι, -ῦ* see Osthoff, *M. U.* ii. 139.

Sanscrit Nouns in *-an* and *-as* sometimes form the Locative from the Stem without any Case-ending (Whitney, 425, c). Traces of this are to be found in Greek in the form *αἰέν* (cp. *αἰεί*), and the Inf. in *-μεν* and *-εν* (§ 85).

Stems in *-ο* sometimes form a Locative in *-οι*, as well as the true Dat. in *-ω*, e. g. *οἴκο-ι*. So *χαμα-ί* and perhaps *πάλα-ι*. Cp. the adverbial ending *-ει* (§ 110).

Pronominal Stems in *-ε* form *-οι*; *ἐμοί* (enclitic *μοι*), *σοί* (encl. *τοι*), *ἐοῖ* and *οἶ*. For *σοί* there is another form *τεῖν* (Il. 11. 201): so in Doric we find *ἐμίν* and *ἔιν, ἔν*.

99*.] **Plural.** Several Stems in *-ο* which are Masc. (or Fem.) in the Sing. form a Neut. Plur.: *κέλευθος*, Plur. *κέλευθοι* and more commonly *κέλευθα*; *μηρός*, Plur. *μηροί* and *μῆρα*; *κύκλος*, Plur. *κύκλοι* and *κύκλα*; *ἰός*, Plur. *ἰοί* and *ιά*: *Τάρταρος*, Plur. *Τάρταρα* (Hes.). There is probably a slight change of meaning, the Neuter expressing vague mass or quantity rather than plurality: cp. *δρυμά thicket*, and post-Homeric *δεσμά, θεσμά, σῖτα*, Lat. *loca, joca*. Thus *κέλευθα* means a *group of paths*, and could not be used (e. g.) in such a passage as Il. 10. 66 *πολλὰι γὰρ ἀνὰ στρατόν εἰσι κέλευθοι*. So *κύκλα* of a set of wheels, *Τάρταρα* of one place so called, &c.

100.] **Accusative Plural.** Stems in *-ι* and *-υ* which admit an Acc. Sing. in *-ν* often form the Plur. in *-ις, -υς* (for *-νς, -νς*): thus *οἶς* (Il. 11. 245), *ἀκοίτις* (Od. 10. 7), *βοῦς ἦνις* (Il. 6. 94). So we should read *πόλις* (with Bekker) for *πόλεις*. Again we have *δρῦς, γένυς, κλιτῦς, γραπτῦς, σῦς* and *σύ-ας, ἰχθῦς* and *ἰχθύ-ας* (Od. 22. 384), *ὄφρῦς* (Il. 16. 740) and *ὄφρῦ-ας* (Od. 9. 389), *νέκυς* (Od. 24. 417) and *νέκυ-ας, βοῦς* and *βό-ας*. *ἴστυς, ἴστυ-ας* (Od. 11. 113)

Stems in *-υ*, Gen. *-εος*, have only *-εας* in Homer: except *πολῦς*, read by Zenodotus in *Il.* 2. 4, perhaps in other places (*Il.* 1. 559., 13. 734., 15. 66., 20. 313., 21. 59, 131, *Od.* 3. 262., 4. 170), where the MSS. have *πολέας* or *πολεῖς*.

The MS. of Schol. A in *Il.* 2. 4 gives *πολεῖς* as read by Zen., but the context shows that the true reading of the scholium is *πολῦς*. But there is no trace of this form in any of the other places.

The Personal Pronouns have *ἡμέας* (once *ἦμας*), *ὕμέας*, *σφέας* (once *σφᾶς* encl., *Il.* 5. 567), as well as *ἄμμε*, *ὕμμε*, *σφέ*. The forms in *-ᾶς* are later, the result of adding the common ending of the Acc. Plur.: see on the Acc. Sing.

101.] Genitive Plural. Stems in *-ᾶ(η)* and *-ᾷ* form the Gen. Plur. in *-ᾶων*, less commonly *-εων*. The *-εων* is generally scanned *-ἔων*, and after a vowel is written *-ῶν*, as *κλισι-ῶν*, *παρει-ῶν*, *τρυφαλει-ῶν*, *Σκαι-ῶν* (cp. the Gen. Sing. in *-ᾶο*, *-εω*).

The Pronominal Stems *ἡμε-*, *ὕμε-*, *σφε-* form *ἡμείων* and *ἡμέων*, *ὕμειων* and *ὕμέων*, *σφείων* *σφέων* (encl.) and *σφῶν*.

These forms are plausibly explained by supposing that originally the Gen. was in *-ειο*, as in the Singular. Then **ἄμμεῖο*, **ὕμμεῖο*, were assimilated to the Gen. Plur. in *-ων*; and *σφείων* followed the same analogy later (Brugmann, *K. Z.* xxvii. 397).

102.] Dative Plural. The two Endings of the Dat. Plur. are *-σι(ν)* and *-εσσι(ν)*. Many Nouns in Homer form the Case in both ways, e. g. *βου-σί* and *βό-εσσι* (for *βού-εσσι*), *χερ-σί* and *χείρ-εσσι*, *ποσσί* or *ποσί* (for *ποδ-σί*) and *πόδ-εσσι*, *ἀνδρά-σι* and *ἀνδρ-εσσι*, *μνηστῆρ-σι* and *μνηστῆρ-εσσι*. The accent is often different, the forms in *-εσσι* being always proparoxytone. The ending *-σι(ν)* originally belongs to the Locative Plur. (Sanscr. *-su*).

A final dental or *-σ* with *-σι* forms *-σσι*, and this *σσ* may be reduced to *σ*, as in *ποσσί* and *ποσί*, *ἔπεσ-σι* and *ἔπεσι*, *δέπασ-σι* and *δέπασι*. But *-εσι* for the ending *-εσσι* is very rare: *χείρ-εσι*, *ἴν-εσι*, *αἶγ-εσι*, *οἶ-εσι*, *ἀνάκτ-εσι* occur once each.

An ending *-σσι* (instead of *-σι*) occurs in a few stems in *-υ* (Gen. *-υος*): *γένυ-σσι* (*Il.* 11. 416), *νέκυ-σσι* (*Od.*), *πίτυ-σσι* (*Od.*). This is an extension of the type *ἔπεσ-σι*, &c.: cp. *ἴρισσι* (*Il.* 13. 27) for *ἴριδ-σι*. Or possibly, as Brugmann suggests (*G. G.* p. 62), these are forms in *-ῦσι*, *-ῖσι*, the vowel retaining its original quantity (cp. § 116, 3 and 4).

Final *ι* or *υ* of the Stem becomes *ε* in *ἐπάλξε-σι*, *πολέ-σι* (*πολύ-ς*), from the analogy of the forms of the other Cases, as *ἐπάλξε-ος*, *πολέ-ος*. Similarly on the analogy of forms with *-εσσι* (as in *ἔπεσσι*) we have the rare forms *πολ-έσσι* (*πολύ-ς*), *πελέκ-εσσι* (*πέλεκ-υς*).

The Ending *-εσσι(ν)* is itself the result of a similar analogy. In *ἔπεσσι*, *βέλεσσι*, &c. the *-εσσι* was felt as characteristic of the

Case, and then combined with other Stems; hence *κύν-εσσι*, *σύ-εσσι*, &c. Thus forms like *ἐπέ-εσσι* (for *ἐπεσ-εσσι*) really contain the Suffix *εσ* twice over. (Bopp, *Vergl. Gr.* § 292 of the first edition; Meyer, *G. G.* p. 355.)

Stems in *-ο* and *-ᾱ* (*η*) form the Dat. Plur. in *-οισι(ν)* and *-ησι(ν)* respectively, also in *-οις* and *-αις* or *-ης*. The latter forms are common in the existing text of Homer, but (as was pointed out by Gerland, *K. Z.* ix. 36, and again by Nauck, *Mél. gr.-rom.* iii. 244) in the great majority of instances the loss of *ι* may be regarded as due to elision: *e.g.* for *σοῖς ἐτάροισι* we may write *σοῖς' ἐτάροισι*. The Fem. *-αις* appears only in the forms *θεαῖς* (Od. 5. 119), *ἄκταις* (Il. 12. 284), and *πάσαις* (Od. 22. 471). Hence it is a question whether the forms in *-οις*, *-αις* are Homeric.

The Endings *-οισι*, *-ησι* are those of the Locative (Sanser. *-ēshu*, *-āsu*). Originally *-ησι* was without *ι* (as in the adverbial *Ἀθήνησι*, *θύρᾱσι*). The Endings *-οις*, *-αις* are probably not to be derived from *-οισι*, *-ησι*, but from the original Instrumental of Stems in *-ο*. This was in Sanser. *-āis*, in Greek **-ωις*, becoming *-οις*: and from this again by an easy analogy the corresponding Fem. *-αις* was formed.

The Pronouns of the First and Second Person use two forms, viz. (1) *-ἔν* in *ἡμῖν* (encl. *ἡμιν*) and *ὑμῖν* (encl. *ὑμιν*), and (2) *-ἔ(ν)* in *ἄμμι(ν)*, *ὑμμι(ν)*, also *ἡμῖν*, *ὑμῖν*. This is evidently the same Suffix as in *ἐμίν*, *τείν*, *εἶν*, and the form *-ἔν* is presumably the older (for which *-ἔν* was perhaps adopted from the analogy of the Dat. in *-σί(ν)*).

The 3 Plur. *σφι(ν)* is originally in all probability the Instrum. Plur. of the Stem *σφε-* (for *σφ-φω*): ep. Lat. *sibi*, for *s-bi*. If so, the other Case-forms *σφέ*, *σφείων*, *σφί-σι* as well as the corresponding Duals *σφῶ*, &c. are the result of analogy.

103.] **Dual.** The Nom. Acc. in *-ᾱ*, from Stems in *ᾱ*, *η* is only found as a Mase.: *Ἀτρεΐδᾱ*, *κορυστά* (Il. 18. 163), *ὠκυπέτᾱ* (Il. 8. 42): but Fem. *προφανέντε*, *πληγέντε* (of two goddesses, Il. 8. 378, 455).

The Genitive and Dative Ending in all Nouns is *-οῖν*, as *ποδ-οῖν*, *ἱππ-οῖν*. The contracted form *-οιν* and the Fem. *-αιν* do not occur. The Personal Pronouns have:—

1. Nom. Acc. *νῶϊ*, *νῶ* (*νῶϊν* Il. 16. 99, *σφῶϊν* Od. 23. 52?); Gen. Dat. *νῶϊν*.

2. Nom. Acc. *σφῶϊ*, *σφῶ*; Gen. Dat. *σφῶϊν* (*σφῶν* Od. 4. 62).

3. Acc. *σφῶέ* (encl.); Dat. *σφῶϊν* (encl.).

104.] **Instrumental.** The Homeric poems have preserved many instances of an Ending *-φι(ν)*; *e.g.* *ῥεσ-φιν*, *στήθεσ-φι*,

ναῦ-φιν, ζυγό-φι, βίη-φι, κοτυληδον-ό-φιν (Od.): probably also the Pronoun σ-φι(ν), Lat. *si-bi*. These are relics of an original *Instrumental Case*. *confamulavit Id. 5. 57 ἐπ' ἑβχαρόφιν*

105.] **Contraction, &c.** The loss of ι, υ and σ between vowels (§ 94) does not generally lead to contraction in the Homeric dialect: note that—

1. The Dat. Sing. of Stems in -εσ and -υ (Gen. -εος) often forms ει (for -ε-ι), but nearly always before a vowel, so that the ει is scanned as a short syllable (§ 380); e.g. *τείχει ὑπο Τρώων, ἦ ἔπει ἦ ἔργω*, &c. No such rule will be found to hold for the Dat. Sing. of Stems in -ι, as *πόλει, ἀγύρει* &c.—either because -ει from -ε-ι became monosyllabic earlier than -ει from -εσ-ι or -εφ-ι; or because, as has been suggested (§ 99), the true form of the Dat. is *πόλι, ἀγύρι*, &c.

Exceptions, real or apparent, to this rule are—

Il. 6. 126 *σῶ θάρσει* (read *θάρσει σῶ*, cp. Il. 7. 153 *θάρσει ῶ*).

17. 647 *ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλεσσον* (read *ἐν φάει*).

23. 515 *οὗ τι τάχει γε* (read *οὗ τάχεϊ γε*).

23. 639 *πλήθει* (read *πληθι*).

Also *οὔδει*, Dat. of *οὔδας* (Il. 5. 734., 8. 385., 14. 467., 17. 92., 23. 719., 24. 527), for which read *οὔδαι* or *οὔδα* (§ 99).

2. The combinations -εα, -εο, -εω are often scanned as one syllable by 'Synizesis,' as *θεοί* (Il. 1. 18), *σάκεα* (Il. 4. 113), *τεύχεα* (Il. 7. 207, &c.); so with the Pronouns *ἡμέας, ὑμέας, σφέας*.

In Il. 1. 18 *ὑμῖν μὲν θεοὶ δοῖεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες* the word *θεοί* is not certain, since *Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες* the *lords of Olympus* is used as a Substantive, and *θεοί* is therefore unnecessary (Fick, *Iliad* p. 75).

3. The Gen. Sing. has -ευσ for -ε-ος in a few words; *Ἐρέβευς*, ¹³⁷ *θάρσευς, θέρευς, θάμβευς*—chiefly *ἄπαξ εἰρημένα*. It is probably better to write -εος and admit Synizesis.

On -εϋ in *ἐμεϋ, σεϋ, εϋ, τεϋ* see § 378*.

4. Nouns with Stems in -εεσ (as *κλέος, δέος*) and some Nouns in -ᾶς are liable to 'Hyphaeresis,' or dropping a vowel before another vowel: as *κλέα* (for *κλέε-α*), and so *δυσκλέα, ἀκλέα, ἀκλέ-ες*; *νηλής, νηλέϊ, νηλέα* (Neut. Sing. *νηλέες*); *θεουδής, θεουδέα* (for *θεο-δής god-fearing*), *ὑπερδέα* (Il. 17. 330); *γέρα, δέπα, κέρα, κρέα, σφέλα* (for *γέρα-α, &c.*), *χρέα debts* (Hes. Op. 647). Cp. *δαί* (for *δαϊ-ι*), Dat. of *δαί-s*; also *ἀποαίρεο* for *ἀποαιρέ-εο* (§ 5).

The forms *κλέα* (*ἀκλέα, δυσκλέα*), *δέπα, κέρα, σφέλα* are only found before hiatus; e.g. *κλέα* only occurs in the phrase *κλέα ἀνδρῶν*: so that we must either suppose -ᾶ to be shortened by the hiatus, or (better) read *κλέε' ἀνδρῶν*, &c. But *γέρα* occurs before a consonant (Il. 2. 237 *γέρα πεσσέμεν*, and so

9. 334, Od. 4. 66). κρέα occurs in the phrase κρέα ἔδμεναι, and in one or two other places before a vowel; but more frequently it is followed by a consonant, and is to be scanned κρεᾶ or κρεᾷ (necessarily so in Od. 9. 347, where it ends the line). Possibly the *ā* is shortened by the analogy of the ordinary Neut. Plur. forms in *-ā* (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 348). Or, as is now maintained by Joh. Schmidt (*Pluralb.* p. 321 ff.), κρέα, γέρα, &c. are stems in *-ā*, originally distinct from the corresponding stems in *-āo*, and are therefore properly Singular, but capable of being used in a collective sense. On this view κρεᾶ meant *flesh*, κρέαα *pieces of flesh*: cp. μῆρα and μηροί (§ 99*). Schmidt does not admit hyphaeresis in most of these words, holding that it only occurred when three vowels came together in the oldest Greek: so that (e.g.) we may have δέα for δφέα (δφέα-a), but not κλέα for κλέφα.

5. There are also several contracted forms from Stems in *-εεσ* which offer some difficulty: ἀκληεῖς (Il. 12. 316), ἀκλειῶς (Od. 1. 241, 14. 371), ἐυκλειῶς (Il. 22. 110), ἐυκλείας (Il. 10. 281, Od. 21. 331; al. ἐυκλήας), ἀγακλήος (ἀγακλείος Hesych.), Πατροκλήος, Πατροκλήα, Ἡρακλήος, Ἡρακλήα, Ἡρακλήϊ, Βαθυκλήα, Διοκλήος, Διοκλήα; ζαχρηεῖς, ζαχρειῶν (also ζαχρηῶν Hesych.); ἐϋρρείος; δείους (Il. 10. 376., 15. 4); σπέιους, σπήϊ, σπέεσσι and σπήεσσι. 6πεῖος εἰ 94.

But the η or ει always occurs where it can be resolved into εε, as Πατροκλέε-ος, ἐϋρρέε-ος, ἀκλέε-ως, &c.; moreover the long final syllable so lost (e.g. in writing ἀκλέε-ες, δέε-ος, σπέε-ος) is never necessary to the metre. Hence we can hardly doubt that these are the true Homeric forms. So κρειῶν (Gen. Plur. of κρέας) should be κρεά-ων (as in H. Merc. 130), or perhaps κρέεων (see § 107, 3); and ζαχρηεῖς, ζαχρειῶν should be ζαχραέες, ζαχραέων. For σπέεσσι we can read σπέεσι. ε 55.

The Voc. of Πατροκλέης should be written in the uncontracted form Πατρόκλεες in the phrase Πατρόκλεες ἱππεῦ (which ends the line in Il. 16. 20, 744, 812, 843), and also whenever it comes before the Bucolic Diaeresis (§ 368). When it stands at the beginning of the line (Il. 16. 693, 859) we should perhaps read Πάτροκλος: see § 164.

6. The Case-forms of Nouns in *-ως* and *-ω* (Gen. *-οος*) ought generally to be written without contraction; thus ἦώς, Dat. ἦοί, Acc. ἦοά (see § 368); αἰδώς, Dat. αἰδοί, Acc. αἰδόα: ἰδρός, Acc. ἰδρόα (Il. 10. 574). But the Genitive in *-οῦς* (ἦοῦς, Λητοῦς, &c.) is required by the metre in several places. Naturally the contraction of *οο* was earlier than that of two *unlike* sounds, as *οι*, *οα*. See L. Meyer, *Decl.* 23.

106.] **Variation of the Stem.** The phonetic influence of the Ending on the form of the Stem, which plays so large a part in the inflexion of Non-Thematic Tenses, was originally no less important in the Nouns. In Sanscrit a Nominal Stem of the consonantal Declension appears in general in at least two forms,

a 'strong' and a 'weak' form; the strong form being used in the Nom. and Acc. Sing. and Dual and the Nom. Plur., the weak form in other Cases. The weak form, again, may have two degrees, which are then called the 'weak' or 'middle' and the 'weakest' form. A few traces of these variations remain in the Greek Declension:—

1. In the words of relationship, *πατήρ*, *μήτηρ*, &c. and in *άνήρ*. Thus we find Nom. *πατήρ*, Acc. *πατέρ-α*, but Gen. *πατρ-ός* (*πατέρ-ος* only Od. 11. 500), Dat. *πατρ-ί* (sixty times in Homer, *πατέρ-ι* thrice); *μήτηρ*, Acc. *μητέρα* (only), Gen. and Dat. *μητρ-ός*, *μητρ-ί*, less commonly *μητέρ-ος*, *μητέρ-ι*. *άνήρ* uses *άνερ-* and *άνδρ-* (for *άνρ-*) almost promiscuously; the latter is also seen in the Dat. Pl. *άνδρᾶ-σι* (for *άνδρ-σι*). The Gen. Plur. *δαέρων* (Il. 24. 769) is scanned as a spondee: it should probably be written *δαιφρ-ών*, the stem *δαιφρ-* standing to *δαήρ* (for *δαφήρ*) as *άνδρ-* to *άνήρ* (Ebel, *K. Z.* i. 293).

2. *Ζεύς*, for *διγύς* (Sanscr. *dyáus*) forms the Gen. and Dat. from the Stem *διφ-*. The original Acc. is *Ζήν*, Sanscr. *dyám* (with loss of *u*): *Δία* follows the analogy of *Διός*, *Διί*. Similarly *βοῦς*, for **βωῦς* (Sanscr. *gáus*), Gen. *βοφ-ός*, Acc. in Hom. *βῶν* (Sanscr. *gám*).

κύων, Voc. *κύν*, forms the other Cases from the Stem *κύν-*. Cp. Sanscr. *çvan*, Acc. *çván-am*, Gen. *çun-as*, &c. The Acc. *κύν-α* (like *Δία*) follows the analogy of the Gen. and Dat.

Similarly, **φρήν* a *lamb* (surviving in *πολύ-ρρην-ες*) forms Gen. *άρν-ός* (for *φρν-ός*), &c.

3. Adjectives in *-εις*, Gen. *-εντος* (Stem *-φεντ-*), form the Dat. Plur. in *-εσσι*, *-εσι*. To explain this we must first suppose the weak Stem in *Fät-* (with *ä* for *εν*, cp. § 31, 5 and § 37), which would give a Dat. Plur. in *-ασσι*, *-ᾶσι*; this form then was assimilated to the other Cases by change of *ä* to *ε*. A form in *-ασι* has survived in *φρασί** for *φρεσί* (*φρᾶ*: *φρεν* = *Fät*: *Fεντ*). In the same way *δαίμοσι*, *ποιμέσι*, &c. are not for *δαίμων-σι*, *ποιμέν-σι*, but for **δαίμᾶ-σι*, **ποιμᾶ-σι*. The Adverb *ἀγκάς* has been explained γ252 ἀγμ as *ἀγκάσ(ι)*, the true Dat. Plur. of *ἀγκών*.

4. The primitive variation sometimes gives rise to parallel forms of a word: e.g. *πτῶξ* and *πτᾶξ* a *hare* (*πτήσσω*), which originate in the declension *πτῶξ*, Acc. *πτῶκ-α*, Gen. *πτακ-ός*. So from *πούς* and Lat. *pēs*, *ped-is* we may infer original *πούς* (or rather *πός*), Acc. *πόδα* or *πῶδα*, Gen. *πεδ-ός*: and so in other cases †.

* Found in Pindar, also in an Old Attic inscription given by Joh. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxv. p. 38.

† Much, however, remains uncertain in the attempts that have been made to reconstruct the primitive declension of these and similar words. The Sanscrit forms would furnish a fairly complete key, but for two defects: (1)

107.] **Heteroclitite Nouns.** This term is applicable to Nouns that employ distinct Stems. The chief variations are—

1. Between the vowel Declension (Stems in *-o* and *-ā, -η*) and the corresponding consonantal forms:—

δίπτυχο-*s*; Acc. δίπτυχ-*a*.

ἐρίηρο-*s*; Plur. ἐρίηρ-*ες, ἐρίηρ-ας.*

(ἀνδράποδο-*ν* post-Hom.); Dat. Plur. ἀνδραπόδ-*εσσι.*

ἀλκή; Dat. ἀλκ-*ί.*

ὑσμίνη; Dat. ὑσμῖν-*ι.*

ἰωκή; Acc. ἰῶκ-*a.*

Ἄϊδη-*s*, Gen. Ἄϊδα-*ο*; also Ἄϊδ-*ος*, Dat. Ἄϊδ-*ι.*

φυλάκου*s* (or φυλακού*s*, as Aristarehus accented the word); also φύλακ-*ας*, Dat. Plur. φυλάκ-*εσσι.*

ὄσσε, Dat. Plur. ὄσσοισι (Hes. Sc. 426).

πολλός-*s* and πολύ-*s* are both declined throughout: so δάκρυ-*ο* and δάκρυ.

2. With forms in *-τ* or *-ᾶτ*:—

γόνυ, Gen. γονός (for γονφ-ός), Plur. γούν-*a*, γούν-*ων, γούν-εσσι*; also γούνατ-*ος, &c.*

δору, Gen. δουρός (for δορφ-ος), &c.; δούρατ-*ος, &c.*

ὄνειρο-*s*; Plur. ονειρατ-*a.*

πρόσωπο-*ν*; Plur. προσώπατ-*a*, Dat. προσώपाσι. Hence the form ὦπα (εἰς ὦπα ιδέσθαι, κατ' ἐν-ὦπα ιδών) may be a Neut. Sing.: cp. Æolic ὄππατα *eyes**.

ὄς; Gen. οὔατ-*ος*, Dat. Plur. οὔασι and ὠσί.

ἦμαρ (cp. ἡμέρ-*a*); ἦματ-*ος, &c.* (cp. ἡμάτ-*ιος*). So πείραρ (πείρατ-*a*), ἦπαρ, οὔθαρ, εἶδαρ, ὄνειαρ, φρέϊαρ, κτέαρ, ἄλειφαρ, στέαρ.

ὔδαρ, ὔδατ-*ος.* See § 114*, 8, *d*.

χάρι*s*, Acc. χάρι-*ν* (cp. χαρί-*εις*); Plur. χάριτ-*ες, &c.*

μέλι (μείλι-*νος, μελι-ηδέα*); μέλιτ-*ος, &c.*

χρός, χρο-ός. χρο-ί, χρο-*a*; also χρωτ-ός (Il. 10. 575) and χρωτ-*a* (Od. 18. 172, 179).

We should add the whole class of Nouns in *-μα*, Gen. *-ματ-ος*: since the *-ᾶ* of the Nom. Acc. is not for *-ᾶτ*, but answers to the Latin *-men*, Gen. *-mīn-is*. Thomasp³⁹

3. Between *-ασ-* and *-εσ-*:—

τέρας, τέρα*a*, τερά-*ων, τερά-εσσι*; but τείρε*a* (in the sense of 'stars,' Il. 18. 485).

the Sanser. *a* may represent either *ε* or *ο*, so that (e. g.) *padās* may be *ποδός* or *πεδός*, and similarly *ā* may be *η* or *ω*: and (2) Sanser. *ā* often answers to Greek *ο*, so that (e. g.) *pādām* may point to either *πόδα* or *πῶδα*. See Joh. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxv. 23 ff., Brugmann, *Grundr.* i. § 311, p. 251.

* The old explanation of *ὄππα* from *ὄπ-μα*, by 'progressive assimilation,' seems to be groundless.

οὔδας, οὔδε-ος, &c. : so κῶδας, κῶε-α, κτέρας, κτέρε-α (and New Ionic γέρεα, &c. ; Attic βρέτους, κνέφους).

This variation doubtless arose from the Ionic change of *ᾰο*, *ᾰω* into *εο*, *εω*. Thus the *ε* first appeared in the Gen., giving (*e. g.*) *τέρας*, *τέρεος*, *τέραι*, Plur. *τέραα*, *τερέων*, *τέρασι* or *τερά-εσσι*. Then *ε* was extended to other Cases, and on the other hand *α* was sometimes restored, as in *τεράων*, *κρεάων*. See § 106, 4, and Joh. Schmidt, *Pluralb.* p. 325.

4. Comparatives in *-ων* (Gen. *-ου-ος*) sometimes form Cases as if by contraction with a Stem in *-οο*; *ἄμεινω* (for *ἄμεινοο-α*, *ἄμεινο-α*), *πλείους* (for *πλείοο-ες*), *ἄρείους* (§ 114* 7; § 121).

5. Other variations are—

ἡνίοχο-ς; Acc. *ἡνιοχῆ-α*, Nom. Plur. *ἡνιοχῆ-ες*.

Αἰθίοπ-ες, &c., but Acc. *Αἰθιοπῆ-ας*.

Ἀντιφάτη-ς, Acc. *Ἀντιφατῆ-α*.

Ἄρης, Voc. *Ἄρες*; Gen. *Ἄρη-ος* and *Ἄρε-ος*, &c.; Acc.

Ἄρηα and once *Ἄρη-ν* (Il. 5. 909).

ζαῆς, Acc. *ζαῆ-ν* (Od. 12. 313): see § 97.

λᾶα-ς, Acc. *λᾶα-ν*; Gen. *λᾶ-ος*, Dat. *λᾶ-ϊ*, Dual *λᾶε*, Plur.

λᾶ-ες, *λᾶ-ων*, *λᾶ-εσσι*. The latter forms are doubtless by hyphaeresis (§ 105, 4) for *λᾶα-ος*, &c.

γρηῦς, Dat. *γρηῖ*, as if from a monosyllabic *γρηῦς*.

μέγα (for *μεγῆ*, cp. *magn-us*), Masc. *μέγα-ς*, *μέγα-ν*; the other Cases from the derivative stem *μεγα-λο-*.

Three apparently distinct Stems are used in *νίος son*, viz.— *νίος*, *νίος*,

(1) *νιό-ς*, Voc. *νιέ*; the forms *νιοῦ*, *νιῶ*, *νιοῖσι* are very rare in Homer.

(2) (*νίν-*), Acc. *νιέ-α*, Gen. *νιέ-ος*, Dat. *νιέ-ϊ*, Plur. *νιέ-ες*, *νιέ-ας*: and from these by hyphaeresis—

(3) Acc. *νι-α*, Gen. *νι-ος*, Dat. *νι-ι*, Dual *νι-ε*, Plur. *νι-ες*, *νι-ας*, *νιά-σι*; cp. *γρηῦς*, *λᾶας*.

The form *νιάσι* (instead of *νιύ-σι*) follows the type *πατράσι*, &c.

The Neut. *κάρη head* forms—

(1) Gen. *καρήατ-ος*, *κάρητ-ος*, Dat. *καρήατ-ι*, *κάρητ-ι*.

(2) Gen. *κράατ-ος*, Dat. *κράατ-ι*, Plur. *κράατ-α(ᾶα)*.

(3) Acc. Sing. *κᾶτ-α* (Od. 8. 92), Gen. *κᾶτ-ός*, Dat. *κᾶτ-ί*, Plur. Gen. *κᾶτ-ων*, Dat. *κᾶσί*. The Dat. Sing. form *κᾶτεσφι* (Il. 10. 156) is quite anomalous*.

* We might add the stem *κρη-*, in *κατὰ κρηῖθεν* down from the head, cp. *κρη-δεμνον*, *κρη-νη*. The relations of these forms have hardly yet been satisfactorily cleared up: see especially Joh. Schmidt, *Pluralb.* p. 363 ff. It is highly probable that *κέρας* is originally the same word, so that the original declension, answering to Sanscr: *cīras*, *cīrshnās*, &c., was *κέρας*, Gen. *κᾶ(σ)νός* and *κᾶ(σ)-ατος* (like *γόνυ*, Gen. *γόνυ-ός* and *γόνυ-ατος*, &c.). The form *κάρη* must

The declension of ἔρως, γέλως and ἰδρῶς in Homer is open to some doubt ; it is clear however that the Stems in -τ are post-Homeric.

Nom. ἔρος occurs in Il. 14. 315, Acc. ἔρον in the phrase ἐξ ἔρον ἐντρο *put away desire*, Dat. ἔρω in Od. 18. 212 ; Nom. ἔρως is read in Il. 3. 442., 14. 294, but the metre allows ἔρος in both places. ἔρωτ-α occurs first in H. Merc. 449.

Nom. γέλως occurs in Il. 1. 599, Od. 8. 326, 343, 344 : in the two last passages (in the Song of Demodocus) the metre is rather against γέλος. The Dat. γέλω occurs in Od. 18. 100 (most MSS. γέλω) ; the Acc. γέλον or γέλω in Od. 18. 350., 20. 346 (MSS. γέλων, γέλον, and γέλω). Thus the word may be either γέλο-ς (Gen. -ου) or γέλως, Acc. γέλω (for γέλω-α or γέλο-α) : cp. αἰδῶ for αἰδέα. The Stem γελοσ- appears in γελοῖος, cp. αἰδοῖος, ἡοῖος. ^{λέ, λρ, λ}

From ἰδρῶς we have Acc. ἰδρῶ ; but this must be read ἰδρᾶ in one place (Il. 10. 574 ἰδρῶ πολλόν at the end of the line), and always may be so read. The Dat. is ἰδρῆ (Il. 17. 385, 745), possibly to be written ἰδροῖ. Hence ἰδρῶς is probably like χράς.

Two other Case-forms of this type are ἰχῶ (Il. 5. 416), Acc. of ἰχώρ, and κκεῖῶ (Il.) or κκεῖῶ (Od.), Acc. of κκεῖών. Cp. also αἰῶ (Aesch. fr. 413), Acc. of αἰών.

The history of all these instances is very similar. The original Stem ended with a spirant (commonly σ), the loss of which in the oblique Cases caused hiatus (-οος, -οῖ, -οα, &c.) : then these forms were replaced by adopting Stems in -τ and -ν. Cp. § 114*, 6-8.

108.] **Heteroclite Pronouns.** The following points remain to be noticed :—

1. The stems ἐμε (με) and ἐε, ἐ do not form a Nom. Sing.

It is evident that the original Nom. coalesced at a very early period with the Stem of the Verb, becoming the ending -μ ; just as the French *je* has ceased to be used except in a fixed place before the Verb, so that it is hardly a separate word.

In the Plural also the Nom. was not originally formed from the same Stems as the oblique Cases. Both ἄμμε-ς, ὕμμε-ς and ἡμέ-ες, ὑμέ-ες are comparatively late, and due to the analogy of the Nominal declension (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 388).

2. The Interrogative and Indefinite τίς is declined from three Stems, viz.

(1) τῖ-, giving Neut. τί (for τῖδ), also the Plur. Neut. traceable in ἄσσα (for ἄ τῖα). The Indef. ἄσσα occurs in Od. 19. 218 ὀπποῖ ἄσσα, where it would be better to write ὀπποῖά 'σσα (for τῖα).

(2) τε-, giving Gen. τέο, τεῦ (cp. ἐμέο, &c.), Dat. τέω, τῷ (Il. 16. 227, H. Apoll. 170).

Gen. τέων (ἔω), Dat. in ὀ-τέοισι (ἔοι), Il. 15. 491.

(3) τιν-, giving Acc. τίν-α, Dat. (very rarely) τίν-ι, Plur. Nom. τίνες (only in the Od.).

have been originally a derivative, introduced to mean *head* when κέρας had come to be limited to the sense of *horn*. From it again κερῆ-ατος, &c. were obtained by analogy.

In the Compound $\delta\sigma\text{-}\tau\iota\varsigma$ the first part is sometimes declined as $\delta\varsigma$, η , δ , sometimes undeclined, giving $\delta\text{-}\tau\iota\varsigma$, $\delta\text{-}\tau\epsilon\nu$, &c. The Neut. Plur. is once $\delta\text{-}\tau\iota\nu\text{-}\alpha$ (Il. 22. 450), usually $\delta\sigma\sigma\alpha$. *Thomson p. 61*

In the forms with $\tau\tau$, $\pi\pi$ (as $\delta\tau\tau\iota$, $\delta\pi\pi\omega\varsigma$) we have to recognise the original Neuter $\delta\delta$ (Sanser. *yad*). Thus $\delta\delta\ \tau\iota$ becomes $\delta\tau\ \tau\iota$ (not $\delta\sigma\tau\iota$, since $\tau\iota$ is a distinct word, not a Suffix). In $\delta\tau\tau\epsilon\omicron$, which occurs in the Odyssey (I. 124., 17. 121., 22. 377), $\delta\delta\text{-}$ is indeclinable (cp. $\delta\text{-}\tau\iota\varsigma$), and so in $\delta\pi\pi\omega\varsigma$, $\delta\pi\pi\omicron\sigma\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\pi\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$, &c. For the assimilation we may compare $\kappa\alpha\delta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\alpha\pi\ \pi\epsilon\delta\iota\omicron\nu$, &c. (for $\kappa\alpha\tau\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\ \pi\epsilon\delta\iota\omicron\nu$).

3. The Article is declined from two Stems:—

$\delta\text{-}$, Fem. $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}$, which gives δ , η , $\omicron\iota$, $\alpha\iota$: perhaps also $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ *thus*, if it is distinct from the Relativial $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ *as*.

$\tau\omicron\text{-}$, Fem. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\text{-}$, which gives the other Cases, and second forms of the Nom. Plur. $\tau\omicron\iota$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota$: also the Adverb $\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ *thus*.

The Compound $\delta\text{-}\delta\epsilon$ uses the Stem $\delta\text{-}$ for the forms $\delta\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, $\eta\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, $\omicron\iota\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, $\alpha\iota\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, and the Adverb $\delta\delta\epsilon$. The second part is sometimes declined in the Dat. Plur., $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\text{-}\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\omega$ or $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\text{-}\delta\epsilon\sigma\iota\omega$ (Il. 10. 462 and Od.). The $\text{-}\delta\epsilon$ is enclitic: hence the accent, $\eta\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, not $\eta\delta\epsilon$. Strictly, therefore, it should be written $\delta\ \delta\epsilon$, $\eta\ \delta\epsilon$, &c.

The forms $\xi\mu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$, $\sigma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$, &c. are post-Homeric. The earliest instance of a Compound of this kind is the word $\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\eta$, in Hes. Th. 216.

Adverbial Suffixes.

109.] The Suffixes employed in Homer to form Adverbs are as follows:—

$\text{-}\theta\iota$ expresses the *place where*: the chief instances are—from Pronouns and Prepositions, $\tau\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\delta\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\alpha\upsilon\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\text{-}\theta\iota$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\text{-}\theta\iota$ only Od. 17. 10), $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\pi\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\upsilon\psi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\text{-}\theta\iota$; from Nouns, $\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\theta\acute{\eta}\rho\eta\text{-}\theta\iota$ (Od. 14. 352), $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\eta\acute{\omega}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\kappa\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$; $\text{'}\text{I}\lambda\iota\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\text{K}\omicron\rho\iota\nu\theta\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\text{'}\text{A}\beta\upsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$. Note that $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ is not found in Homer.

$\text{-}\theta\alpha$ *place*; $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\text{-}\theta\alpha$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\upsilon\text{-}\theta\alpha$, $\upsilon\pi\alpha\iota\text{-}\theta\alpha$ (cp. also $\delta\eta\theta\acute{\alpha}$, $\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\nu\theta\alpha$).

$\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$ *place*, from Prepositions; $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\sigma\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$, $\delta\pi\iota\sigma\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$ and $\delta\pi\iota\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$, $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\iota\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\rho\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$.

$\text{-}\theta\epsilon\upsilon$ *place whence*, used with nearly the same Stems as $\text{-}\theta\iota$; $\delta\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\upsilon\psi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\omicron\text{-}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$. From Nouns, $\eta\acute{\omega}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\Delta\iota\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$ (Il.), $\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\iota\pi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, &c. *Thomson p. 59*

This Suffix is often used with the Prepositions $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ and $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}$, as $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \Delta\iota\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, &c. With the Stems $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon$, $\sigma\epsilon$, $\acute{\epsilon}$, it forms a Genitive; as Il. 1. 280 $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\nu\ \delta\text{'}\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$. The form $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\nu$ is only found in the Iliad.

$\text{-}\theta\omicron\iota$, only in $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\nu\text{-}\theta\omicron\iota$ *there* (Od.).

-τος *place*; ἐν-τός, ἐκ-τός. Originally, perhaps, it expressed the *place whence*, as Lat. *caeli-tus, divini-tus*.

-τις, in αὖ-τις *back, again* (Attie αὖ-θις).

-σε *place whither*; πό-σε, ὀππό-σε, κεῖ-σε, ἑτέρω-σε, ἀμφοτέρω-σε, ὁμό-σε. From Nouns, πάντο-σε, κυκλό-σε.

-φι(ν), -φίς, in ῥόσ-φι(ν) *apart*, λικρι-φίς *sideways* (Il. 14. 463). This may be the Instrumental Ending -φι(ν).

-φα, in μέσ-φα *until*, lit. *meanwhile* (Il. 8. 508).

-χι, in ἧ-χι *where* (lit. *which way*, Lat. *quā*).

-χα, with Numerals; δὶ-χα *two ways*, τρί-χα, πέντα-χα, ἑπτα-χα.

-χθα, in the same sense, τρι-χθα, τετρα-χθα.

-κίς, -κι; with Numerals, in δεκά-κίς, τετρά-κίς, εἰνά-κίς, εἰκοσά-κίς; and with similar meaning πολλάκις and πολλάκι, ὀσσάκι, τοσσάκι.

The original Suffix is -κίς or -κι (not -ᾱκίς), but in consequence of its having been used at first with Stems ending in -ᾱ (τετραᾱ-, ἑπταᾱ-, δεκαᾱ-, εἰναᾱ-), the combination -α-κίς came to be felt as the Suffix, and was extended to other words by analogy. A similar explanation applies to the ᾱ of πέντα-χα.

-κας expresses *manner*; ἀνδρα-κας = Lat. *viritim*.

-δε *place whither*, suffixed to the Accusative; οἰκόν-δε, πόλε-μόνδε, ἄλαδε. This Suffix is peculiar in being an enclitic; in strictness we should write οἰκόν δε, πόλεμόν δε, &c.

-δις expresses *direction* or *manner*; χαμά-δις, ἄμυ-δις, ἄλλυ-δις, ἐπαμοιβα-δίς (Od. 5. 481).

110.] **Case-forms as Adverbs.** The Suffixes which follow have been explained, with more or less probability, as Case-Endings.

-α *manner*; ἄρ-α (lit. *fittingly*), ἄμ-α, μάλ-α, θάμ-α, τάχ-α, σάφ-α, κάρτ-α, ῥέϊ-α or ῥέ-α, ὤκ-α, ἦκ-α, αἰψ-α, λίγ-α, σίγ-α, ῥίμφ-α, πύκ-α, λίπ-α; in Attie κρούφ-α, ἠρέμ-α.

The Adverbs in -ᾱ belong to an early stage of Greek, most of them being confined to Homer. They have generally been taken to be primitive Instrumental forms (so Brugmann, *M. U.* ii. 158, *G. G.* § 83). It is a question, however, whether the original Instr. ending was -ᾱ or -ε: see Joh. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxvii. 292. Those which answer to adjectives in -ύ-s, viz. τάχα, ἄκα, λίγα, κάρτα, θάμα, are explained by Joh. Schmidt as older Neut. Plur. forms (ταχφ-α, &c.), cp. αἰπά Neut. Plur. of αἰπύ-s, and πρέσβᾱ (for πρεσβφ-ᾱ?) Fem. of πρέσβυ-s. This will not apply to ἄρα, μάλα (since ἀρ-φα, μαλ-φα would give ἀρα, μάλα). Some may be stems in -η, like μέγα: cp. λίγα and λιγαίνω (-ηῖω), λίπα and λιπαίνω, πύκα and πυκνός, also the stems κρεα-, γερα- (§ 105, 4).

-η or -η *way, direction*; ἧ, τῆ, πῆ, ὄπη (or πῆ, ὄπη), πάντ-η, λάθρη. These forms represent the Instrumental of the *way by which* (Lat. *quā*, &c.).

It is a question whether they should be written with *iota subscr.* or not. The ancient grammarians prescribed *iota* (Apoll. *de Adv.* 625, 1), and this is

confirmed by the forms $\tilde{\alpha}$, $\delta\tilde{\alpha}$, $\alpha\lambda\tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tau\tilde{\alpha}$ on Doric inscriptions (Ahrens, ii. 369). In Homer however the final vowel of $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tau\tilde{\eta}$ (or $-\tilde{\eta}$) is frequently shortened before another vowel, which is rarely done in the case of final $-\tilde{\eta}$ (§ 380). It is not unlikely therefore that the original Instrum. Fem. $-\tilde{\eta}$ took *iota subscr.* from the analogy of the Dat. Fem. in $-\tilde{\eta}$. There were also Doric adverbs of *place* in $-\tilde{\eta}$ or $\tilde{\eta}$ ($\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\eta}$ ποκα, $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\eta}$, see Ahrens, ii. 362, Brugmann, M. V. ii. 244), in which $\tilde{\eta}$ is of course pan-Hellenic; but Ionic $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\eta}$, &c. are connected by the meaning with the Doric forms in $-\tilde{\alpha}$. Cp. also $\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\theta}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\eta}$ ($-\tilde{\eta}$) with Attic $\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\theta}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\alpha}$ (or $-\tilde{\alpha}$). The form $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tau\tilde{\eta}$ is an extension of the ending $-\tilde{\eta}$ to the consonantal declension (as with the adverbs in $-\omega\tilde{s}$).

$-\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$, $-\tilde{\iota}$ *time, manner*; $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tau\tilde{o}\nu\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{-}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ (or $-\tilde{\iota}$) *that very night*, II. 8. 197; $\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{-}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{o}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{-}\tilde{\iota}$ *in three rows*, $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{-}\tilde{\iota}$ ($\tilde{\iota}$) *bloodlessly*, $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{o}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{-}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tilde{o}\nu\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{o}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$: with $\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$ *with the will*, $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{-}\tilde{\iota}$ *without the will*, $\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{-}\tilde{\iota}$ *limb by limb*, $\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$ *in mighty fashion*.

Short $-\tilde{\iota}$ is certain in $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$, and is not excluded by the metre in $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{o}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$. Where the syllable is long the MSS. are usually divided between $-\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ and $-\tilde{\iota}$. The evidence of inscriptions is strongly in favour of $-\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ (H. W. Smyth, *The reduction of $\epsilon\iota$ to ι in Homer*, p. 10): but $-\tilde{\iota}$ can hardly be due to mere itacism, and we have further to explain the forms in $-\tilde{\iota}$. The generally accepted view is that $-\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ is the original Locative ending of the σ -declension, which is preserved in the Doric adverbs $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\tau}\tilde{o}\nu\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$, $\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$, &c., also in $\tilde{o}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ (Menander fr. 456). On this view short $\tilde{\iota}$ must be the corresponding ending of the consonantal declension, and the analogy of forms of that declension must have been extended so as to create a new adverbial ending $-\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$ (cp. $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$ in Soph.). The $-\tilde{\iota}$ of $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}$, &c., if not a mere error, may be due to contamination between $-\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ and $-\tilde{\iota}$.

$\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ has been taken to be a Loc. from the stem $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\sigma}$ - (of which the Doric $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\sigma}$ is the Acc.). Mr. H. W. Smyth (*l. c.*) justly objects to this that the Homeric form would be $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$: and this form, we may add, would become $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$, not $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$. Hence he derives it from the stem $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\phi}\tilde{o}$ -, Lat. *aervo-m*.

A different account of the Adverbs in $-\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ and $-\tilde{\iota}$ is given by Mahlow (*Die langen Vocale*, p. 121). Noticing that they are mainly compounds, especially with $\tilde{\alpha}$ *priv.*, he compares the numerous Latin adjectives such as *ex-animi-s*, *in-ermi-s*, *im-belli-s*, and shows that change to an I-stem is found in similar words in other European languages. This I-stem in the Acc. Neut. gives the adverbs in $-\tilde{\iota}$, in the Loc. those in $-\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ or $-\tilde{\iota}$. On this view the doubt between $-\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}$ and $-\tilde{\iota}$ is the same that we meet with in the Dat. of Nouns in $-\tilde{\iota}\tilde{s}$ (§ 98).

$-\omega\tilde{s}$ *manner*; a Suffix of which there are comparatively few examples in Homer: the commonest are from Stems in $-\sigma$, viz. $\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$ (also $\tilde{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$), $\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\acute{\alpha}}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$ (rare); from other Stems, $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\phi}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$.

$-\omega$, chiefly from Prepositions; $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\xi}\tilde{\xi}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{o}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\pi}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{o}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$ (*further on*), $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\acute{\alpha}}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$ (*farther, farthest*), $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{o}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\rho}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$ *nearer*.

Two others are Adverbs of *manner*, $\tilde{\omega}\tilde{-}\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\epsilon}$, $\tilde{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{-}\tilde{\omega}$ (for which $\tilde{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$ is only written when a vowel follows in the same sentence).

The ending *-ως* has long been considered to be the Greek form of the original Ablative *-ōt* (Lat. *-ōd*) of *o*-stems. In Greek, however, a final *-d* would disappear (as in *ἄλλο*, Lat. *aliu-d*, &c.) and consequently the theory applies only to the forms without *-s*, viz. *ᾧδε* and *οὔτω*. The difficulty was met by Curtius (*Curt. Stud.* x. 219) with the suggestion that *-τ* would pass into *-s* before a dental or *σ*: e. g. *οὔτως σοί, οὔτως τίθῃμι* for *οὔτωτ σοί, οὔτωτ τίθῃμι*. When two forms *οὔτω* and *οὔτως* had thus come into existence as 'sentence-doubles' (like *οὐ* and *οὐκ*, *ἐξ* and *ἐκ*), it would be natural to use *οὔτως* when it served to prevent hiatus, and the more regular *οὔτω* in other cases. This explanation was rejected by later scholars (as Brugmann and G. Meyer), and is certainly not quite satisfactory. If Curtius is right we should expect *ᾧτ δέ* to become *ᾧσδε* rather than *ᾧδε*. His view is however defended by Joh. Schmidt (*Pluralb.* p. 352).

The ending *-ω* in *ἄν-ω*, &c. may be either the Ablative *-ōt*, or (more probably) an Instrumental ending *-ō* (Mahlow, *Die langen Vocale*, p. 86). In Latin, as Mahlow shows, it is probable that the Instrumental is represented by the adverbs in *-ō*, as *modo, cito*, the Abl. by archaic *-ōd*, later *-ō*. If *-ως* and *-ω* were alternative Ablative endings—sentence-doubles—it seems possible that the adoption of *-ως* rather than *-ω* in the Adverbs of *manner* was partly determined by the circumstance that *-ω* was already familiar in the Instrumental use.

The extension of *-ως, -ω* to the consonantal declension presents no difficulty. It may be observed, perhaps, that the proper Ablat. of that declension was unsuited for adverbial use, because it was the same in form as the Genitive: e. g. *ταχέος* was already = *of a swift*, and accordingly a new word *ταχέως swiftly* was coined on the model of *φίλωσ, &c.**

-ου place; πού, ὀμοῦ, ἀρχοῦ, τηλοῦ, ὑψοῦ, αὐτοῦ,—all periphrases. They are the same in meaning as the corresponding Adverbs in *-όθι*.

-δον, -δην, -δα, forming Adverbs of *manner*, are evidently Accusatives from Stems in *-δο-, -δη-* (§ 114); e. g. *σχε-δόν nearly*, lit. *holding-wise*, *ἀποστα-δόν aloof*, *ἐμβα-δόν on foot*, *ἄμφα-δόν openly*, *λα-δόν in crowds*; so *βοτρυ-δόν*, *πυργη-δόν*, *ῥυδόν*, *συναχα-δόν, &c.*; *βά-δην steppingly*, *τμή-δην*, *κρύβ-δην*, *κλή-δην*, *ἐπιγράβ-δην, &c.* (all from Verbs), also a peculiar group in *-ά-δην*, as *ἐπιστροφά-δην wheeling about*, *προτροπά-δην headlong*, *ἐπιροχά-δην*, *μεταδρομά-δην*, *ἀμβολά-δην*; *μίγ-δα*, *κρύβ-δα*, *ἀποσταδά*, *ἄμφα-δά*, *ἀναφαν-δά*, *αὐτοσχε-δά*. It is evident that these are much more numerous than the Noun-Stems in *-δο, -δη* can ever have been. In such cases we have to explain, not the derivation of the individual forms, but the origin of the type.

Other Adverbs obtained from Accusatives are: *ἄκην in silence*,

* As adverbs of the Gen. Abl. form (*ταχέος, &c.*) must have existed at one time alongside of those in *-ωτ* from *o*-stems, the conjecture may be hazarded that this adverbial *-ως* was one of the influences which determined the choice of *-ως* rather than *-ω* for original *-ōt*. If so, such a form as *παντ-ως* is a sort of contamination of the Gen. Abl. *παντ-ός* and the forms in *-ω(s)*.

ἄντην (ἀντίον, ἐναντίον, &c.) *opposite*, πάλιν *backwards*, δηρόν *long*, σχεδίην *hand to hand*, ἀμφαδίην *openly*, ἀπριάτην *without purchase*; perhaps also ἄγχι *near*, ὑψι *aloft*, ἱφι *mightily*. The form ἱφι is generally taken as the Instrum. of ἱ-*s* *force* (§ 104): but this does not explain how it comes to be used as a Stem in the Adj. ἱφι-*a* (μῆλα), as well as in Compounds, Ἱφι-ἀνασσα, &c. (Bekker, *H. B.* i. 160). cf. *Διγ Τελευ-ι-ηηψ*

Many Adverbs are formed with a final -*s*, which is liable to be lost before a word beginning with a consonant, as οὔτω(*s*) and the Adverbs in -*κι*(*s*) already mentioned; other Homeric instances are, ἄχρι(*s*) and μέχρι(*s*) *until*, ἰθύ(*s*) *straight towards*, μεσσηγύ(*s*) *between*, ἀτρέμα(*s*) *quietly*: also the Prep. ἀμφί, Adv. ἀμφίς, and Homeric ἀντικρύ, later ἀντικρύς. Similar Adverbs in which -*s* is not lost are, ἄλι-*s*, μόγι-*s*, χωρί-*s*; ἀγκάς, ἐκά-*s*, πέλα-*s*, ἐντυπάς (Il. 24. 163); ἐγγύ-*s*; χθέ-*s*; and those in -*δι-*s**, as ἄλλυδις, ἀμοιβηδῖς. Note also the group formed by -*s* subjoined to a monosyllabic Verbal Stem; πύξ *with the fist*, ἐπί-μιξ *in confusion*, ἄ-παξ *once*, μάψ *idly*, ὀ-δάξ *with the teeth* (δάκ-*νω*). The nature of this -*s* is obscure. Brugmann (*K. Z.* xxiv. 74) connects it with the -*s* of the Prepositions ἐξ, ἄψ, ἀμφί-*s*, holding that it is Ablatival. Joh. Schmidt (*Pluralb.* 357) supposes a group of Neuter stems, like the nouns in -*ας*, -*ες*, &c.

Accentuation of Case-forms.

111.] For the purpose of accentuation Nouns may be divided into those in which the accent remains on the Stem (and as far as possible on the same syllable of the Stem), and those in which it passes in the Gen. and Dat. to the Case-Ending.

Nouns of the Vowel-Declensions generally belong to the first of these groups. The last syllable if accented has the acute in the Nom. and Acc., the circumflex in the Gen. and Dat., and in the Adverbs in -*ου* and -*ως*: *e.g.* καλός, καλοῦ, καλῶ &c., Adv. καλῶς; but Acc. Plur. καλοῦς. On the Nouns in -*ᾶ*, see § 96.

One or two Feminines with Nom. Sing. in -*ᾶ* accent the Ending in those Cases in which the last syllable is long, as μία, Gen. μῆς; ἴα, Dat. ἰῆ; ταρφύς *thick*, Fem. ταρφεῖα, but Plur. ταρφειαί, Acc. ταρφειάς; ἄγυια *street*, Gen. ἀγυιῆς, Plur. ἀγυιαί, ἀγυιάς. So θαμειαί and θαμειάς answer to a Nom. Sing. θαμεία, Masc. *θαμύς (cp. θαμέ-*ες*, θαμέας); and καυστειρῆς (Il. 4. 342, &c.) is Gen. of κάυστειρα.

αὔτως *in the very way* (from αὐτός), is made barytone by the authorities. The word is only Homeric, and the original accentuation αὐτῶς had evidently been lost, perhaps by a confusion with οὔτως.

The oxytone Adverbs in -*αι* and -*ι*, as αὔτουνχεῖ, ἀσπουδί, μελειστί, may date from a time when the Loc. of the *ο*-declension was regularly oxytone—the accent determining the appearance of *ε* for *ο*.

The second group consists of—

(1) Nouns with monosyllabic Stem, as *πούς, ποδ-ός, ποδ-ί, ποδ-οῦν, ποδ-ῶν, ποσσί; κύων, κυν-ός, κυν-ί, κυν-ῶν, κυσί; θήρ, θηρ-ός, θηρ-ί, θηρ-ῶν, θηρ-σί.*

(2) The words *πατήρ, μήτηρ, θυγάτηρ, ἀνήρ, γαστήρ; Gen. πατρ-ός, μητρ-ός, θυγατρ-ός, ἀνδρ-ός, γαστρ-ός &c.*

The accent of *μήτηρ* and *θυγάτηρ* is anomalous: cp. the Accusatives *μητέρ-α, θυγατέρ-α*. Probably the Nom. Sing. was originally oxytone. The change of accentuation may be explained by supposing that the Nom. was influenced by the accent of the Vocative—that in fact the Voc. *pro tanto* took the place of the Nom. (cp. § 96). It is evident that the Voc. of these words would be especially familiar to the ear.

The Dat. ending *-εσσι* never takes the accent; hence *πόδ-εσσι, νή-εσσι, ἄνδρ-εσσι, κύν-εσσι, &c.* The reason doubtless is that these are forms that have followed the analogy of the Stems in *-εσ*, as *ἔπεσ-σι, βέλεσ-σι, &c.*

The Genitives *παίδ-ων, δᾶδ-ων, Τρώ-ων, δμώ-ων, θώ-ων*, are barytone; perhaps because the Stems are originally disyllabic.

It appears that in an earlier stage of the language the shifting of the accent to the Case-Ending was always accompanied by 'weakening' of the Stem (§ 106). The few instances of the type of *κύων*, Gen. *κυν-ός*, and *πατήρ*, Gen. *πατρ-ός*, are to be regarded as surviving examples of the older declension.

112.] The Vocative in the Consonantal Declension sometimes retracts the accent, as *πατήρ*, Voc. *πάτερ*; *δαήρ*, Voc. *δᾶερ*; *διόγενής*, Voc. *διόγενες*.

Proper Names with a long vowel in the penultimate are often properispomena, as *Σαρπηδών*, Voc. *Σαρπήδον*; *Ἀντήνωρ*, Voc. *Ἀντήνορ*; *Μαχάων*, Voc. *Μαχᾶον*. Otherwise they are mostly proparoxytone, as *Ἀγάμεμνον, Ἀπολλον*.

Oxytones in *-εύς* form the Voc. in *-εῦ*, as *Ζεῦ, Ὀδυσσεῦ*. This may be regarded as a retraction of the accent, since the circumflex stands for a double accent, viz. an acute followed by a grave in the same syllable (*Ζεῦ = Ζέϛ*).

Originally the Vocative, unless it stood at the beginning of a sentence, was enclitic. Hence the barytone accent is to be explained as in the case of the Verb (§ 87), viz. as the result of an original loss of accent.

CHAPTER VI.

FORMATION OF NOUNS.

113.] **Nominal Stems.** Some Nouns are formed with Stems identical with Verb-Stems; πτύχ-ες *folds* (πτύσσω for πτυχ-ιω), στίχ-ες *ranks* (στείχω, ἔ-στίχ-ον), φλόξ *flame* (φλέγω), πτώκ-α *cowering* (πτήσσω, ἔ-πτακ-ον), δῶ *house*, for δωμ, cp. δᾶ- (*dᾶ*) in δά-πεδον (lit. *house-floor*), ῥῶπ-ας *twigs* (ῥέπ-ω), ῥῶγ-ας *clefts, openings* (ῥήγ-νυμι), θῶς *jackal* (θέω), ὄπ-α *voice* (Ἔεπ-), φρίξ, θρίξ, Στύξ. In these Nouns the Stem is usually either in the weak form or in the O-form (§ 38).

Originally the Stem was long (and accented) in the Nom. and Acc., weak (with the accent on the Case-Ending) in the Gen. and Dat. Instances of this variation have been given in § 106; cp. § 114*.

Commonly however a Nominal Stem is formed from a Verb-Stem by means of one or more Suffixes, which we may call *Nominal Suffixes*. These are of two kinds:—

1. *Primary*, by which Nouns are formed from Verb-Stems; as -ο in ἀγ-ός *leader*, -τι in φά-τι-ς *saying*. Nouns so formed are called *Primitive* (sometimes *Verbal*: but this term is better known in a more restricted sense, § 84).

2. *Secondary*, by which Nouns are formed from other Nouns; as -ιο in δικά-ιο-ς *just*, -ευ in ἵππ-εύ-ς *horseman*. These Nouns are called *Denominative*.

The Suffixes which mark the Feminine Gender might be classified as Secondary; thus the Stem καλη- might be said to be formed by a fresh suffix from καλο-, the Stem δμητειαῖ- (for δμη-τερ-ιαῖ) from δμη-τερ-, &c. But it is more convenient to treat the Feminine Endings as mere *inflections*, along with the corresponding Masc. forms.

In the same way we might treat Suffixes like -τρο (in ἰη-τρό-ς *healer*, ἄρο-τρο-ν *plough*) as compounded of -τηρ or -τερ (ἰη-τήρ *healer*, ἄρο-τήρ *ploughman*), and a secondary -ο. Practically, however, -τρο is a single Primary Suffix: and this applies also to -μνο (in βέλε-μνο-ν *dart*), which might be resolved into μο + εν + ο, and to many similar cases.

Primitive Nouns.

114.] **Primary Suffixes.** The form of the Verb-Stem in Primitive Nouns is liable to the same variations as in the Tenses (§ 38). It will be seen that these variations are connected with the accent; but this part of the subject will be best treated separately (§ 115).

The chief Primary Suffixes are as follows:—

-o, Fem. - \bar{a} , - η ; the Verb-Stem taking three forms—

(1) The weak form; as ἀγ-ός leader, ζυγ-ό-ν yoke, φυγ-ή flight: with reduplication, ἰαχῆ (Fi-Faχ-ή) cry, ἵ-στο-ς (στα-) web.

(2) The O-form; as τόκ-ο-ς (τεκ-) offspring, ἀρωγ-ός-s (ἀρήγ-ω) helper, σπονδ-ή (σπένδ-ω) libation, ποτ-ή flight, ῥοή flow.

(3) Attic reduplication; as ἀγ-ωγ-ή leading, ἀκωκή point, ἐδωδή eating, ὀπωπή sight, ὀδωδή smell. The radical vowel appears as ω.

-ι: as τρόφ-ι (τρέφ-ω) thick, τρόπ-ι-s keel of a ship, φρόν-ι-s understanding (with the Verb-Stem in the O-form).

-ια: seldom with Stems of clearly Verbal meaning, as in φύζα (φυγ-ια) flight, σχίζα (σχιδ-ια) chip; more often with roots used as Nouns, as δῖα (διφ-ια), πέζα (πεδ-), μνῖα (μυσ-), πίσσα (πίκ-); and as a Fem. suffix in Adjectives (*infra*).

The Greek -ια takes the place of -ι, the original declension of which is lost in Greek: see Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 109, p. 313; Joh. Schmidt, *Pluralb.* p. 42.

-υ: with two forms of declension—

(1) Gen. -ε-ος, with the weak Stem; chiefly in Masc. and Neut. Adjectives, as ταχ-ύ-ς swift, παρφ-ύ-ς (τρέφ-ω) thick; βαθ-ύ-ς, λιγ-ύ-ς, γλυκ-ύ-ς, βαρύς, βραδύς, κρατύς, παχύς, εὐρύς (for ἐ-φρυ-, root φερ-). But ἡδύ-ς has the strong Stem: and ὠκύ-ς the O-form.

Fem. -ειᾶ (for -εφ-ια), -εᾶ, as ἡδεῖα, ὠκέα.

(2) Gen. -υ-ος; in Substantives (chiefly Fem.), as πληθ-ύ-ς multitude, ἰθ-ύ-ς path, aim, ἰλύς mud, νέκ-υ-ς (Masc.) corpse, γενύ-ς chin, γῆρυ-ς voice, cry.

As to the declension of Nouns in -ις, Gen. -ιος, and -υς, Gen. -υος, see § 94.

-εσ, with the strong form of the Stem, as τεῖχ-ος wall, τεύχ-ε-α arms, ἔπ-ος word, πένθ-ος suffering, βένθ-ος depth (cp. βαθ-ύ-ς), θέρ-ος warmth, summer, ἡδ-ος pleasure.

Fem. -ειᾶ (for -εσ-ια), as ἡριγένεια.

The O-form of the Stem is found in ὄχ-ος chariot (cp. the Pf. ὄκωχα, § 26, 5); the weak form in θάλ-ος blossom (but cp. νεο-θηλ-ής), κάρτος (also κράτος), θάρσος (cp. Θερασ-ίτης, Ἀλι-θέρσ-ης), ἄχ-ος grief. The forms πάθ-ος, βᾶθ-ος are not Homeric.

Note however that in Homer the Substantive is *θάρασος* (for which *θράσος* occurs only once, Il. 14. 416), the Adj. always *θρασύς*; so that a distinction of quantity is kept up in place of the original distinction between **θέρασος* and *θρασύς*. On *θέρασος* as the original Greek form see Osthoff, *M. U.* ii. 49.

ī and ū appear in these Stems as in the Present tense (§ 29):
e. g. *ρίγ-ος colid*, *ψῦχ-ος warmth*, *κῦδ-ος glory*.

-ωσ, -οσ; in *ἦώς* (Sanscr. *ush-ás*) *dawn*, *αἰδώς shame*, and in the older declension of *γέλωσ*, *ἰδρωσ*, *αἰών*, *ἰχώρ* (§ 107 *ad fin.*). The Stem is probably in the weak form; see § 30.

-ασ; as *δέμ-ας 'builld.'* The Stem is in the strong form; indeed the Stem-vowel is always ε, except in *γῆρας old age*, *κῶας fleece*, and *οὔδας floor*; cp. *γέρας*, *δέπας*, *κέρας*, *κνέφας*, *κρέας*, *κτέρας*, *πέρας*, *σέβας*, *σέλας*, *σκέπας*, *σφέλας*, *τέρας*: also **ἔρας* (*ἐραυνός* for *ἐρασ-νός*) and **γέλας* (*ἐ-γέλασ-σα*).

-εν, -ᾶν, -ον, -ων: e. g. *τέρ-ην*, Gen. *-εν-ος* (*τείρω*) *soft*, *ἄρσ-ην male*, *αὐχ-ήν neck*; *πέπ-ον* (Voc.) *tender one*, *ἀρηγ-όν-ες defenders*, *τέκτων*, *περι-κτίονες*; *ἀγκ-ών*, Gen. *-ών-ος* *elbow*, *ἀγών*, *αἶθων*.

Fem. -αινα (-αν-ια), in *λέαινα*: imitated by way of sarcasm in *θέ-αινα* (Il. 8. 5).

-ντ, -οντ, in Participles, and in a few Substantives, as *δράκ-ων a serpent*, lit. the 'staring' animal (*δέρκ-ομαι*), *τέν-ων*, *γέρων*.

-ᾶτ, in oblique Cases of Neuter Nouns as (*ὔδωρ*), *ὔδατ-ος*, &c. The ᾶ of this Suffix represents the weak form of a nasal syllable; see § 38, and § 114*, 8, c.

-αντ, notably in Compounds, as *ἀκάμας*, *ἀδάμας*, *πολύτλας*.

-ᾶν, in *τάλας*, *μέλας*: perhaps originally Stems in -αντ, which have followed the analogy of -εν, -ον (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 304).

-ερ, -ωρ, -ᾶρ; as *ἀήρ* (*ἄφ-ήρ*) *air*, *αἶθ-ήρ* (*αἶθ-ω*) *bright sky*, *δα-ήρ* *husband's brother (levir)*; *ἔλ-ωρ booty*, *ὔδ-ωρ water*; *μάκ-αρ great* (Il. 11. 68), *ἔαρ spring*.

-ορ in the Homeric *ἄορ sword*, *ἦτορ breast* is perhaps only the Æolic form of -αρ (-ρ). As to the Nom. and Acc. Neut. forms in -ωρ see § 114*, 8, d.

-ιο, -ιο is very rare in Greek as a Primary Suffix: Brugmann gives *ἐρεπί-ια ruins* and (post-Hom.) *ἄγ-ιος*, *στύγ-ιος*, *σφάγ-ιον*, *πάγ-ιος*. We may add *ταμ-ίη dispenser*, *πεν-ίη poverty*: also *δίος* (*διφ-ιο-ς*) *bright*, *πεζός* (*πεδ-*) *on foot*, *κραδ-ίη* (*κῆρ* for *κῆρ-δ*) *heart*, in which the Stem is a Root-Noun.

The word *ἀ-οσση-τήρ helper* pre-supposes a Stem *δσσο-* for *σοκ-ιο-*, answering to Latin *soc-iv-s* (*seq.*, Gr. *έπ-*).

In *ἄλλος* (*al-ius*), *μέσσος* (*medius*), *δειός* the Suffix appears to give the force of a Comparative: see Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 63, p. 125.

-ιος, -ισος, -ισ: the Comparative Suffix, as πλέω (πλε-ισοσ-α) πλείστος (πλε-ισ-τος): see § 114*, 7.

-FO: κεινός (κεν-Φός) *empty*, οὔλος (όλ-Φος) *whole*, λαι-ός *laerius*, ὀρθός *ard-uus*.

-Fεν, -Fον, -Fων, -Fν: πίων *fat*, αἰών *age, life* (Loc. αἰέν, see § 99), ἀ-πέιρων (ἀ-περ-Fων, cp. πειραίνω for περ-Fν-ιω): -Fεν appears in the Inf. in -εν-αι, as εἰδέναι for Fιδ-Fέν-αι (§ 84).

-Fωσ, -Fοτ, Fem. -υῖα; in the Pf. Part., and in the Nouns ὄργ-υια *fathom*, ἄρπ-υια *storm-wind*, ἄγ-υια *street*.

-Fᾶρ; as πῖαρ (for πῖ-Fαρ) *fatness*, ὄνειαρ (ὄνη-Fαρ?) *help*, εἶδαρ (εἶδ-Fαρ) *food*, εἶλαρ *shelter*, &c.; -Fερ in πείρα, Fem. of πίων *fat*. The ancient grammarians noticed that the Stem before -ᾶρ is long (Herodian ii. 769 ed. Lentz).

-ΜΟ; with the O-form, as πόν-μο-σ (πετ-) *fall*, κορ-μό-σ (κείρω) *a trunk*, ὄλ-μο-σ (Fελ-) *a rolling stone*, ῥωχ-μός (ῥηγ-) *gully*.

-μι; in φῆ-μι-σ *report*, δύνα-μι-σ *power*.

-μῖν in ῥηγ-μῖν *beach on which the waves break*, Dat. ὑσμῖν-ι *fight*: also Nom. ὑσμίνη.

-μεν, -μον, -μων; πῦθ-μῆν (Gen. -μέν-ος) *base*, αὐτ-μῆν *breath*, λιμῆν *haven*, ποιμῆν *shepherd*, δεῖ-μων (-μων-ος) *fearing*, μνή-μων *mindful*, ῆ-μων *shooter*, τέρ-μων *end*, θη-μῶν-α (Acc.) *a heap*. Also the Infinitives in -μεν-αι (Dat.) and -μεν (Loc.): see § 84.

-μαῖτ; as δεῖ-μα, Gen. -ματ-ος, *fear*, ὄνομα *name*, &c.

Of these Suffixes -μον and -μαῖτ go with the strong form of the Stem, -μεν with the weak form.

With -ο, -η are formed -μενο (in Participles), and -μνο, -μνη, as βέλε-μνο-ν *a dart*, λί-μνη *a marsh*; -μνᾶ (-μν-ιᾶ), in μέρι-μνα *care*.

-μαρ, -μωρ; as τέκ-μαρ and τέκ-μωρ *a device*; -μερο, in ἴ-μερο-σ *desire*.

-ΝΟ, -ᾶνο; as δεῖ-νό-σ *fearful*, πτη-νό-σ *flying*, τέχ-νη *art*, ποι-νή *atonement*; ὄχ-ανο-ν *handle*, δρεπάνη *sickle*, τρύπ-ανον *auger*, στέφ-ανος.

-νεσ; τέμε-νεσ *enclosure*, ἴχ-νεσ *imprint*, γλῆ-νεσ *jewel*.

-νυ; θρῆ-νυ-σ *a foot-stool*.

-ΡΟ, -ΛΟ; generally with the weak Stem; πικ-ρό-σ *bitter*, ἄκ-ρο-σ *point*, ἔδ-ρη *seat*: also with an auxiliary ᾶ, σθεν-αρό-σ *strong*, ἀπαλός *tender*, στιβαρός, λιπαρός.

-ρι; in ἴδ-ρι-σ *knowing*, ἄκ-ρι-σ *mountain-top*.

-ρυ, -λυ: δάκ-ρυ *tear*, θῆ-λυ-σ *female* (θῆ-σθαι).

-Τ: θῆς θη-τ-ός, νύξ νυκ-τ-ός; but chiefly in Compounds, as προ-βλής, ἀ-γνώς.

-ετ, -ητ: Acc. ἀργ-έτ-α *white* (Il. 21. 127), also ἀργήτα (Il. 8. 133), Dat. ἀργέτι and ἀργήτι (Il. 11. 818), κέλ-ης, λέβ-ης.

-το; found with Stems—

(1) In the O-form, as κοί-το-s, κοί-τη (κεῖ-μαι) *lair*, φόρ-το-ν *burden*, νόσ-το-s *going, return* (νέομαι for νεσ-ο-μαι), οἶ-τος (εἶ-μι) *course, fortune*, βροντή (βρέμ-ω) *thunder*.

(2) In the weak form, as στα-τό-s *stalled*, δρα-τό-s *flayed*; ἀκ-τή *beach*; δέκ-τη-s *beggar*, παραι-βά-τη-s.

For the use of -το to form Superlatives and Ordinal Numerals see §§ 121 and 130.

-τι, -σι; generally with the weak Stem, as φά-τι-s *saying*, πίσ-τι-s (for πιθ-τις) *trust*, τί-σι-s *vengeance*, δόσις, βόσις, βρώσις, γένεσις, νέμεσις, ἄνυσις, ἄροσις.

-σιη, as κλισίη *a tent*, ὑπο-σχε-σίη *promise*.

-τινη in δω-τίνη (from δῶ-τις) *gift*.

-τῦ; βρω-τύ-s *food*, κλι-τύ-s *a slope*, μησ-τύ-s *wooing*, δαι-τύ-s *feasting*, ἐδη-τύ-s *eating*. This Suffix is especially common in Homer: ἀγορητύς, ἀλαωτύς, βοητύς, γραπτύς, ἐλεητύς, καθαριστύς, ἀκουτιστύς, ὀριστύς, ὄρηστύς, ὄτρυντύς, ῥυστακτύς, τανυστύς.

-τερ, in πατήρ, μήτηρ, θυγάτηρ, εἰνά-τερ-ες, γαστήρ, ἀστήρ.

-τηρ, -τορ, -τωρ; as δο-τήρ-α and δῶ-τορ-α (Acc.) *giver*, βοτήρ-ες and βώτορες *herdsmen*, ἴστωρ *witness*, ἀφ-ήτωρ *shooter*, ἐπ-ακτήρ *'driver,' huntsman*, δι-οπτήρ *spy*, ληϊστήρ *spoiler*, κοσμήτωρ *arrayer*, μῆσ-τωρ-α (μῆδ-ομαι) *adviser*: also of *things*, with a touch of personification, κρητήρ, ζωστήρ, λαμπτήρ. Fem. -τειρα (-τερ-ῆ), as δμή-τειρα *subduer*.

-τρο, as ἰη-τροός *healer*, ἄρο-τρο-ν *plough*, σκῆπ-τρον, λέκτρον.

-δ, -ῖδ, -ᾶδ; as Acc. ἐλπ-ῖδ-α *hope*; λευκ-ᾶδ-α *white*.

-δο, -δη; κέλα-δο-s *noise* (κέλ-ομαι), κομί-δη *tending*, κλά-δος *branch*, ὄμαδος, χρομάδος, ῥάβδος.

This Suffix is chiefly seen in the Adverbs in -δον, -δην, as σχε-δό-ν *near*, βά-δη-ν *at a walk*, &c.: see § 110, and cp. the secondary forms στά-δ-ιος, &c. (§ 118).

The Suffixes -θ-ρο, -θ-λο, -θ-μο are produced by combining the Verbal suffix or Root-determinant -θ (§ 45) with -ρο, -λο, -μο: thus ὄλε-θ-ρος, γενέ-θ-λη, στα-θ-μός presuppose the Verbs *ὄλέ-θω, *γενέ-θω, *στά-θω (cp. εὔ-σταθ-ής, also στή-θος) formed like πλή-θω, φλεγέ-θω, μινύ-θω, &c. Practically, however, they are single Primary Suffixes: -θμο is especially common in Homer, cp. ἄρ-θμός, ἄρι-θμός, κληθ-θμός, ἔλκη-θμός, ὄρηθ-θμός, κνυζη-θμός: λύ-θρον, ῥέε-θρα, μέλπη-θρα, μέλα-θρον, βέρε-θρον. Cp. also -θμα in ἰ-θμα-τα *going*. Πίτολιέθρον

Similarly from Verb-Stems with the suffix $-\tau$ we have $\lambda\alpha\tilde{\iota}-\tau-\mu\alpha$ *gulf* (cp. $\lambda\alpha\iota-\mu\acute{o}s$ *throat*), $\acute{\alpha}\ddot{\upsilon}-\tau-\mu\acute{\eta}$ *breath*, also $\acute{\alpha}\ddot{\upsilon}-\tau-\mu\acute{\eta}\nu$ (root $av-$), $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon-\tau-\mu\acute{o}s$ *oar*, $\acute{\epsilon}\phi-\epsilon-\tau-\mu\eta$ *injunction*.

114*. Variation of Suffixes.

1. Primary Suffixes were originally liable to variation of the kind already noticed (§ 106). From the Sanscrit declension, in which the variation is preserved with singular fidelity, it appears that a Suffix in general has three different forms or degrees of quantity, called by Sanscrit grammarians the *strong*, the *middle*, and the *weakest* form. Just as in the declension of *dyāus*, Gr. *Ζεύς*, we find (1) $dyāu-$ in the Nom., (2) $dyāu-$ in the Loc. $dyāv-i$ (Lat. *Jōvi* for *dīēv-i*), and (3) $dīv-$ or $diu-$ in other Cases, so in $dā-tā$ 'giver' we have (1) $-tār-$ in the Acc. $dā-tār-am$, (2) $-tar-$ in the Loc. $dā-tār-i$, and (3) $-tr-$ in the Dat. $dā-tr-é$, Instrum. $dā-tr-á$.

Similarly we have the series $-\bar{a}r$, $-\check{a}r$, $-r$; $-mān$, $-mǎn$, $-mn$; $-vān$, $-vǎn$, $-vn$; $-ān$, $-ǎn$, $-n$, &c.: the rule being that the first or strong form contains a long vowel, which in the second is short, and in the third disappears altogether.

In the combinations $-va$, $-ia$ the a is lost and the semivowel becomes a vowel, thus giving $-u$, $-i$.

2. In Greek we find the same Suffixes as in Sanscrit, with the further distinction that the vowel may be η or ω , ϵ or \omicron . Thus we may have $-\tau\omega\rho$, $-\tau\omicron\rho$, $-\tau\eta\rho$, $-\tau\epsilon\rho$, $-\tau\rho$; $-\mu\omega\nu$, $-\mu\omicron\nu$, $-\mu\eta\nu$, $-\mu\epsilon\nu$, $-\mu\nu$ ($-\mu\check{\alpha}$, $-\mu\check{\alpha}\nu$); $-\omega\sigma$, $-\omicron\sigma$, $-\epsilon\sigma$; $-f\omega\sigma$, $-f\omicron\sigma$, $-f\epsilon\sigma$, $-\upsilon\sigma$; $-\iota\omega\sigma$, $-\iota\omicron\sigma$, $-\iota\epsilon\sigma$, $-\iota\sigma$; and so in other cases. Sometimes both sets of forms occur with the same root; as $\delta\acute{\omega}-\tau\omega\rho$, $\delta\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\rho-\omicron\sigma$ and $\delta\omicron-\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, $\delta\omicron\tau\acute{\eta}\rho-\omicron\sigma$.

The interchange of \omicron and ϵ in the Suffix $-\omicron$ (as $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron-s$, Voc. $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon$) belongs to this head.

The three forms of a Suffix are hardly ever to be seen in the Greek declension; one of them being usually taken as the Stem of all the oblique Cases. Thus the strong form is generalised in $\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma-\tau\omega\rho$, $-\tau\omega\rho-\omicron\sigma$, the second in $\delta\acute{\omega}-\tau\omega\rho$, $-\tau\omicron\rho-\omicron\sigma$, to the exclusion of the original $*\mu\eta\sigma\tau\rho-\acute{\omicron}\sigma$, $*\delta\omega\tau\rho-\acute{\omicron}\sigma$, &c. The 'weakest' form, however, often appears in derivatives; e.g. $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\nu$, $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu-\omicron\sigma$, $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\nu-\eta$: $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\mu\omega\nu$, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\mu\omicron\nu-\omicron\sigma$, $\delta\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\omega$ (for $-\mu\check{\alpha}\nu-\iota\omega$, $-\mu\nu-\iota\omega$): $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\omega\nu$, Fem. $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\nu-\eta$, also $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$ (for $-\pi\nu-\lambda\alpha$): $\lambda\eta-\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, $\lambda\alpha\tau\rho-\acute{\omicron}\sigma$: $\upsilon\delta\omega\rho$, $\upsilon\delta\rho-\omicron\sigma$: $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa-\mu\omega\rho$, $\tau\epsilon\kappa\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ (for $\tau\epsilon\kappa\mu\check{\alpha}\rho-\iota\omicron-\mu\alpha\iota$), &c. Cp. Lat. $car-\acute{\omicron}(n)$, Gen. $car-n-is$.

3. The relation of the forms $-\omega\nu$ ($-\mu\omega\nu$, $-f\omega\nu$), $-\omega\rho$ ($-\tau\omega\rho$), &c. to $-\eta\nu$, $-\mu\eta\nu$, $-f\eta\nu$, $-\eta\rho$, $-\tau\eta\rho$, &c. has been the subject of much controversy. It is generally agreed that the difference is not original, but arises in each case by differentiation from a single

form. Probably it is due to shifting of accent, the Suffixes with η being generally accented, while those with ω are found in barytone words. Thus we have the pairs δοτήρ and δῶτωρ, ῥητήρ and ῥήτωρ, βοτῆρες and βώτορες, πατήρ but φράτωρ, also Lat. sor-ōr (Sanscr. *svāsā*). In composition, too, the loss of accent is regularly accompanied by the change from η, ϵ to ω, o : πατήρ, μητρο-πάτωρ; δητήρ, παν-δαμάτωρ; άνήρ, εὐ-ήνωρ; φρήν, ἄφρων, &c. Many exceptions, however, remain unexplained.

4. The Nouns of Relationship (the group πατήρ &c.) with one or two similarly inflected words (ἄστήρ, γαστήρ) are distinguished from the Nouns of the Agent in -τηρ (-τωρ) by the use of the shorter form -τερ in the Accusative: πατέρ-α, Sanscr. *pitár-am*, but δοτήρ-α, Sanscr. *dātár-am*. Similarly among Stems in -ν ἄρσην, ἄρσεν-α answer to Sanscr. *vśh-a*, *vśhan-am* (instead of *-ān-am*). This peculiarity has been explained as the result of an original difference of quantity. That is to say, the form *pitár* (Gr. πατερ-) has been taken to be the *strong* Stem, because it is the Stem of the Acc. If so, the η of the Nom. has to be explained as due to the analogy of the -ηρ of δοτήρ, &c. But this view cannot well be reconciled with the fact that the Stem *pitár-* occurs not only in the Acc. *pitáram* but also in the Loc. *pitár-i*. The Loc. is a Case which regularly takes the *middle* Stem; cp. *dātár-am*, Loc. *dātár-i*, *ἄσμαν-αμ*, Loc. *ἄσμαν-ι*. Hence we must recognise a group of Stems in -r and -n forming the Acc. with the middle form. Thus the original declension would be (e. g.), Strong form, Nom. πα-τήρ,—Middle form, Acc. πα-τέρ-α, Loc. πα-τέρ-ι, Voc. πά-τερ,—Weakest form, Gen. πα-τρ-ός. The cause of this difference in the treatment of the Accusative has still to be found*.

5. The Stems in -ant, -mant, -vant, (Gr. -οντ, &c.) interchange with shorter forms in -at, -mat, -vat, Gr. -ᾶτ, -μᾶτ, -φᾶτ. In Greek the Suffix -οντ is used to form the Part. Pres., as φέρουτ-α. The chief trace of -ᾶτ is the Doric ἔασσα (ἔσ-ᾶτ-ια) for ἔουσα. The forms -μᾶτ, -φᾶτ are found in the Neuters, such as δεί-ματ-ος, πέιρατος, (περ-φᾶτ-ος), &c. So in Latin *nōmen*, *nōminis*, for *nō-mn-is* (Sanscr. *nā-mn-as*).

On the other hand some Stems in -ν take -ντ in the oblique Cases: λέων, λέοντ-ος, but Fem. λέαινα (for λε-φν-ια, cp. Lat. *leō*, *leōn-is*): θεράπων, -οντος, but θεράπ-ν-η: πρόφρων, Fem. πρόφρασσα for προφρα-τιᾶ. Cp. § 107, 2. Ποιμνῆ

6. The Suffix of the Pf. Part. Act. presents anomalies, both in Sanscrit and Greek, which are not yet satisfactorily explained. The Sanscr. -vāms, -vas, -us and Greek -φωσ, -φοτ, -ῦσ (in -υια for

Neuters in -ᾶρ, -ωρ, Gen. -ᾶτ-ος, as *πεῖραρ*, -ᾶτος (for *περ-ῆᾶρ*, -*ῆν-τ-ος*): also in Neuters in -μᾶ, Gen. -μᾶτ-ος (for -*μν-τ-ος*).

(d) It is probable that the Neuters in -ωρ—viz. *ῥδωρ*, *ἔλωρ*, *πέλωρ*, *ἔἔλδωρ*, *τέκμωρ*, *νύκτωρ* (Acc. used adverbially)—were originally Collective or Abstract nouns (Joh. Schmidt, *Pluralb.* p. 193). On this view *ῥδωρ waters* (Germ. *gewässer*) is properly a different word from the stem **ῥδα* or **ῥδαρ* which we infer from the oblique Cases: *τέκμωρ* is originally a Collective or Abstract from *τέκμαρ*: and similarly *ἔλωρ*, *ἔἔλδωρ*, *πέλωρ*, *νύκτωρ* (cp. *νυκτερ-ίς*), which only occur in the Nom. Acc., are nouns formed like *χειμών* (*χειίμα*), *αἰδώς* (*αἰδεσ-* in *αἰδέομαι*, *ἀν-αιδής*), *γέλωσ* (*γελασ-* in *γελάω*), &c. When *ῥδωρ*, &c. were brought into use as Nominatives answering to Neuter oblique Cases, they naturally followed these in respect of gender. Cp. § 110 (*ad fin.*).

115.] Accentuation. The accent is often connected with the form of the Suffix, and sometimes varies with the meaning. But the rules that can be given on this subject are only partial.

1. Stems in -ο are generally oxytone when they denote an agent, barytone when they denote the thing done; e. g. *φορός*-s *bearer*, but *φόρο-ς* *that which is brought*; *ἄγός*-s *leader*, *ἀρωγός*-s *helper*, *σκοπός*-s *watcher*, *τροφός*-s *nurse*, *τόκο-ς* *offspring*. But *νομός*-s *pasture*, *λοιγός*-s *pestilence* (perhaps thought of as an agent, 'destroyer').

2. Stems in -η are generally oxytone, but there are many exceptions (as *δίκ-η*, *μάχ-η*).

3. Most stems in -ιδ, and all in -ᾶδ, are oxytone. But those which admit an Acc. in -ω are all barytone.

4. Adjectives in -υ-ς are oxytone; except *θῆλ-υ-ς* and the isolated Fem. *θάλεια*. Substantives in -υ-ς are mostly oxytone; but see § 116, 4.

5. Neuters with Stems in -εο (Nom. Acc. -ος) are barytone, but Adjectives in -ης, and Fem. Nouns in -ως, Gen. -οος, are oxytone. *ἡ τροχίτης* *composita* *παρ-ης* *accentu* *τίλλω* *·χαλιήρης* *·φοῖσαν* *νιότ* *·φοῖστε* *λεδ* *εν* *δ*

6. Nouns in -ηρ and -ην are oxytone, except *μήτηρ*, *θυγάτηρ* (but see § 111, 2), *ἄρσην*, *τέρην*.

Nouns in -ωρ and -ων are mostly barytone, but there are many exceptions, esp. the Abstract Nouns in -δων, the Substantives in -μων, as *δαιτυμών*, *ἡγεμών*, *κηδεμών*, and most Nouns in -ων, Gen. -ωνος, as *ἄγων*, *ἀγκών*, *χειμών*, *τελαμών*.

7. Stems in -το with the O-form are barytone, with the weak form oxytone; e. g. *κοῖ-το-ς*, *νόσ-το-ς*, but *στα-τός*, &c.

8. Stems in -τη are mostly oxytone. Accordingly the Prim-

itive Masculines in *-τη-s*, which are Nouns of the Agent, can generally be distinguished from the Denominatives in *-της* (§ 117): *e. g.* ἀγορητής *a speaker*, but ναύτης *a ship-man*.

9. Abstract Nouns in *-τι, -σι* are barytone; in *-τῦ* oxytone.

It will be seen that, roughly speaking, when the Verbal Stem is in the weak form, the Suffix is accented, and *vice versa*: also that words with an active meaning (applicable to a personal agent) are oxytone, those with a passive meaning (expressing the *thing done*) are barytone.

116.] **Gender.** The Gender of Nouns is determined in most cases by the Suffix. The following rules do not apply to Compounds, as to which see § 125.

1. Stems in *-ο* are Masc. or Neut., with some exceptions, as δόδος, ἀταρπός, κέλευθος, νῆσος, φηγός, ἄμπελος, νόσος, ταφρός, ψῆφος, σποδός, ψάμαθος, ῥάβδος, δοκός, ῥινός, πρό-χοος. In these the change of gender seems to be due to the meaning.

κλυτός is used as a Fem. in Il. 2. 742 κλυτὸς Ἴπποδάμεια. In Od. 4. 406 πικρὸν ἀποπνεύουσαι . . ὀδμήν it is best to take πικρὸν as an adverb, not with ὀδμήν: ep. Il. 6. 182.

Πύλος has the two epithets ἡμαθόεις and ἡγαθέη, and is probably therefore of both Genders.

2. Stems in *-η* (for *-ā*) are mainly Fem.; but—

Stems in *-τη* denoting an agent are Masc., as δέκ-τη-s *a beggar*, αἰχμη-τή-s *a warrior*. Also, πόρκη-s *the ring of a spear*, ἔτη-s *comrade*, ταμίη-s *dispenser*, νεηνίη-s *a youth*, perhaps ἀγγελίη-s *a messenger*; also the proper names Βορέα-s, Ἑρμεία-s, Αἰνεία-s, Αὐγεία-s, Τειρεσία-s, Ἀγχίση-s, Ἀΐδη-s.

The Masc. Nouns in *-ās, -ης* are probably formed originally from Feminine abstract or collective Nouns in *-ā, -η*. The first step is the use of the word as a concrete: ep. Od. 22. 209 *ὁμηλικὴ δέ μοι ἔσσι* *thou art one of the same age (ὁμηλιξ) with me*; Il. 12. 213 *δῆμον ἕοντα* *being one of the common people*. So in Latin *magistratus, potestas* (Juv. 10. 100), *optio*: English *a relation* (= a relative). The next step is the change to the Masc., which leads to the use of the Endings *-ης, Gen. -ας* on the analogy of the Masc. *-ος, Gen. -οιο*. We may compare Fr. *un trompette bearer of a trumpet*, Italian *il podestà the magistrate*, where the change of meaning is marked by the gender only. So ἔτη-s is probably from a word σφέ-τη *kindred*, νεηνίη-s from a Fem. νεηνίη *youth*, ἀγγελίη-s (if the word exists, see Buttmann, *Lexil.* s. v.) from ἀγγελίη. The Masc. ταμίη-s may be formed from the concrete Fem. ταμίη, the office of household manager being generally filled by a woman (γύνη ταμίη Od.). And so the Nouns in *-τ s* owe their origin to the older abstract or collective Nouns in *-τη*, as ἀκ-τή, βροντή, ἀρε-τή, γενε-τή, πινυ-τή, &c. See Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. pp. 7-13.

3. Stems in *-iǎ*, *-iǐ*, *-ǎǐ* are Fem.; also most Stems in *-i*. But *μάν-τι-ς* is Masc., and some Adjectives—*ἴδ-ρι-ς*, *τρόφ-ι-ς*, *ἔννι-ς*—are of all genders.

Masc. Nouns in *-ο* sometimes form a Fem. in *-ι*, *-ιδ*, *-ǎǐ*: as *θοῦρο-ς*, Fem. *θοῦρι-ς* (Acc. *θοῦρι-ν*, Gen. *θοῦριδ-ος*); *φόρ-το-ς* *burden*, *φόρ-τι-ς* (Gen. *φόρτιδ-ος*) *a ship of burden*; *τόκ-ος*, Fem. *τοκάδ-ες*; *λευκό-ς*, Fem. *λευκάδ-α* (*πέτρην*).

Originally (as in Sanscrit) the chief Feminine Suffix was *-ι*. The metre shows that the long *ι* should be restored in *ἦνι-ς* (*βοῦν ἦνιν εὐρυμέτωπον* Il. 10. 292, Od. 3. 382), *βλοσυρῶπις* (Il. 11. 36), and *βοῶπις* (Il. 18. 357, where Ven. A has *βοῶπι πόντια* "Ἥρη"). The *ι* appears also in *ἀψιδ-ος*, *κνημίδ-ας*, *ἐπιποκαμίδ-ες*. Thomson p. 25

4. Adjectives in *-ῦ* generally form the Fem. in *-ειῶ* or *-εῶ* (for *-εφ-ιῶ*), as *ἡδεῖα*, *ὠκέα*. But *θῆλυ-ς* as a Fem. is commoner than *θήλεια*; and we also find *ἡδὺς αὐτμή* (Od. 12. 369), *πουλὺν ἐφ' ὑγρήν* (Il. 10. 27). 211664 f. 11
21555 ζ 122

On the other hand most Substantives in *-υ-ς* are Fem. (and oxytone), and this *υ* is frequently long, as in *ἰθύ-ς aim* (whereas the Adj. *ἰθύ-ς straight* has *υ*), *πληθύ-ς multitude*, *ἰλύ-ς mud*, *Ἐρινύ-ς*, and the Abstract Nouns in *-τύ-ς*, as *βρω-τύ-ς*, *ὄρχηστ-τύ-ς*, *κλι-τύ-ς*. But there are a few Masc. Substantives in *-υ-ς*, viz. *θρήνυ-ς*, *στάχυ-ς*, *βότρυ-ς*, *νέκυ-ς*, *ἰχθύ-ς*.

5. The Suffix *-εο* is almost confined in Homer to Neut. Substantives of abstract meaning: the only clear example of an Adjective is *ὑγής* (Il. 8. 524). For *ἐλεγχέ-ες* (Il. 4. 242., 24. 239) we should probably read *ἐλέγχεα*. In Il. 4. 235 (*οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι πατήρ Ζεὺς ἔσσειτ' ἀρωγός*) we may equally well read *ψευδέσσι* (*Zeus will not help falsehood*). The Gen. *φραδέ-ος* (Il. 24. 354) may come from *φραδής* or *φραδύς*.

It seems very probable that these words are to be accounted for in much the same way as the Masculines in *-της*, viz. as abstract turned into concrete Nouns by a simple change of gender. The transition to a concrete meaning may be observed in *ψεῦδος* in such uses as Il. 9. 115 *οὐ γὰρ ψεῦδος ἐμὰς ἀτὰς κατέλεξας not falsely* (lit. *not falsehood*) *hast thou related my folly*. So *ἐλέγχεα reproaches!*

6. Suffixes which are used to express an abstract or a collective meaning are generally Feminine; e. g. *κακό-ς coward*, *κάκη cowardice*; *ὀσίη piety*; *φύζα*, *φυγ-ή flight*; *βουλή counsel*, also *the body of counsellors, a council*; *φρόν-ι-ς understanding*; *νιφ-άς* (*-άδ-ος*) *a snow-storm*; *πληθ-ύ-ς multitude* (collective and abstract); and the Nouns in *-τις* (*-σις*), *-τυς*, *-ως*, *-δων*.

It is probable that all the Collective Nouns in *-ων*, *-ως*, *-ωρ* (§ 114, 8, *d*) were originally Feminine. The change of gender may be traced in *αἰών* (Fem. in Homer), and *ἰδρώς* (Fem. in Æolic). In the case of *ἔρω*, *γέλως* it may be connected with the confusion between *-ωσ*-stems and *-ο*-stems (§ 107 *ad fin.*). It is to be noted that no nouns in *-μων* form the Fem. with *-ια*.

Denominative Nouns.

117.] **Secondary Suffixes.** The following are the chief Secondary or 'Denominative' Suffixes. (Note that *-ο* and *-η* of the Primitive Stem disappear before Secondary Suffixes beginning with a vowel*.)

-ΙΟ, -ΙΗ; as *δίκα-ιο-s* *just*; *ἄρμον-ιη* a *joining*, *ἄρθμ-ιο-s* *friendly*, *αἰδοῖο-s* (for *αἰδοσ-ιο-s*) *reverenced*, *γελοῖο-s* (probably to be written *γελώϊο-s*) *laughable*, *ῶρ-ιο-s* *in season*, *σοφ-ιη* *skill*, *σκοπ-ιή* *watch*, *ἀναγκα-ιη* *necessity*.

-ΕΙΟ, -ΕΟ (chiefly used to denote *material*, especially the *animal* which furnishes the material of a thing); e. g. *ἵππ-ειο-s*, *ταύρ-ειο-s*, *αἶγ-ειο-s*, *βό-ειο-s* and *βό-εο-s*, *κυν-έη*, *χάλκ-ειο-s* and *χάλκ-εο-s*, *κύν-εο-s*, *δουράτ-εο-s*, *φλόγ-εο-s*, *ἡγάθ-εο-s* (from *ἄγαθό-s*), *δαιδάλ-εο-s*, &c. These must be distinguished from the Adjectives in which *ειο* stands for *εσ-ιο*, as *τέλειο-s* (for *τελεσ-ιο-s*), *ὀνειδειο-s*, *Ἀργεῖο-s*.

-ΕΥ; *ἵππ-εύ-s* *horseman*, *ἀριστ-εύ-s* *one who does best*, *χαλκ-εύ-s*, *ἱερ-εύ-s*, *νομ-εύ-s*, *Σμινθ-εύ-s*, &c.—all from Nouns in *-ο*.

-ΙΔΗ, -ΙΑΔΗ; in patronymics, as *Ἄτρε-ίδη-s*, *Πηλη-ιάδη-s*, *Ἄσκληπι-άδη-s*. Cp. the compound *-ιδ-ιος* (§ 118).

-ΡΟ, -ΕΡΟ; as *λιγυ-ρό-s* *shrill*, *δυοφ-ερός* *dark*; *μέγα-ρο-v*.

-ΪΜΟ; *αἰοῖδ-ιμο-s* *matter of song*, *μόρ-ιμο-s* *fated*, &c.

-ΥΟ, -ΙΥΟ; as *φαινώ-s* (*φαισ-*) *shining*, *ἔρεβεννώ-s* (*ἔρεβεσ-*) *dark*, *ἐρανώ-s* *lovely*; *φῆγ-ινο-s* *oaken*, *εἰαρ-ιώ-s* *of spring*, &c.

-ΙΥΟ; *ὀπωρ-ῖνώ-s* *of autumn*, *ἀγχιστ-ῖνος*.

-ΗΥΟ; *πετε-ηνώ-s* *flying* (*πετ-εσ-*).

-ΣΥΝΟ, -ΣΥΝΗ; *γηθό-συνο-s* *joyful*; *ἵππο-σύνη* *horsemanship*, &c.

-ΕΥΤ (for *-Φευτ*), Fem. *-εσσα*; *ύλή-εντ-α*, Fem. *ύλή-εσσα* *wooded*, *διμή-εντ-α* *full of eddies*, *λειριό-εντ-α* *like the lily*, &c, *δυσίεντ-α*

-ΙΚΟ; only found in *ὀρφαν-ικό-s* *orphan*, *παρθεν-ική* *virgin*, and a few Adjectives from proper names, as *Τρω-ικό-s*, *Ἀχαι-ικό-s*, *Πελασγ-ικό-s*. In these words it is evident that there is no approach to the later meaning of the Suffix.

* This is probably not the result of an 'elision,' but analogous to the weakening of a Suffix (cp. § 114, 1). Thus the Stem of *σοφό-s*, Voc. *σοφέ*, is related to the form *σοφ-* (in *σοφ-ιη*) as *πάτερ* to *πατρ-* in *πατρός*, *πάτριος* (Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 59, p. 102).

-τη; ναύ-τη-s, ἰππό-τα, τοξό-τα (Voc.), ἀγρό-ται, αἰχμη-τή-s, κορνή-τη-s, ὑπνῆ-τη-s, πολίη-τη-s and πολλ-τη-s, ὀδί-τη-s. Some of these are perhaps Primitive: e. g. αἰχμη-τή-s may come from an obsolete *αἰχμάω to wield the spear: see § 120.

-τητ; φιλό-τητ-a love, δηϊο-τήτ-a battle.

-ιγγ; φόρμιγξ a lyre, σύριγξ a reed-pipe, σάλπιγξ a trumpet, λάιγγ-ες pebbles, στροφάλιγξ eddy, ῥαθάμιγγ-ες drops.

The ι of -ιδη, -ιμο, -ινο, -ικο was probably not part of the original Suffix, but was the final vowel of the Stem. We may either suppose (e. g.) that μόρ-ι-μος was formed directly from a Stem μορ-ι (cp. μοῖρα for μορ-ιᾶ), or that it followed the analogy of ἄλκι-μος, φύξι-μος, &c. Cp. the account given in § 109 of the α of -ακίς. It is remarkable that ο, which is regular as a 'connecting vowel' of Compounds, is extremely rare before Suffixes (except -τη, -τητ, -συνο).

Note that the $\epsilon\iota$ of the Patronymics Ἄτρε-ῖδης, Πηλε-ῖδης, &c. does not become a diphthong in Homer.

Of the use of Secondary Suffixes to form *Diminutives* there is no trace in Homer. It may be noted here as another difference between Homeric and later Greek that the Verbals in -τέος are entirely post-Homeric.

118.] **Compound Suffixes.** There are some remarkable instances in Homer of a Secondary amalgamating with a Primary Suffix. E. g.—

-ἄλ-εο; ἄζ-αλέο-s dry, ἀργ-αλέο-s (for ἀλγ-αλέο-s) *rainful*, θαρσ-αλέο-s, καρφ-αλέο-s, κερδ-αλέο-s, λευγ-αλέο-s, μυδ-αλέο-s, ῥωγ-αλέο-s, σμερδ-αλέο-s. It is used as a Secondary Suffix in λεπτ-αλέο-s *thin*, ὀπτ-αλέο-s *roast*.

-ἄλ-ιμο; κῦδ-άλιμο-s *glorious*, καρπ-άλιμο-s *swift*, πευκ-άλιμο-s *shrewd*.

-εινο (for -εσ-ινο or -εσ-νο); φα-εινό-s *shining*, αἰπ-εινό-s *lofty*, ἀλεγ-εινό-s *rainful*; Secondary in ἔρατ-εινό-s, κελαδ-εινό-s, ποθ-εινό-s. This Suffix takes the form -εννο in ἀργ-εννό-s *shining* and ἐρεβ-εννό-s *murky*.

-δ-ιο, -ιδ-ιο, -αδ-ιο: στά-διο-s, ἀμφά-διος, σχε-δίη (σχε-δό-ν), παν-συ-δίη; also as a Secondary Suffix in κουρῖδιος, μαψ-ιδίως, ῥή-ῖδιος, ἐπινεφρ-ῖδιον: κρυπτ-άδιος, διχθ-άδιος, μινυθ-άδιος.

-δ-ον, in τηκε-δόν-ι (Dat.) *wasting*, ἀηδών *nightingale*: -δωνη in μελε-δῶναι *cares*.

-δ-ᾶνο, in ῥιγε-δανός *horrible*, ἠπεδανός, πευκεδανός, οὔτιδανός.

118*.] **Suffixes of different Periods.** In the great variety of Suffixes discovered by the analysis of the Greek Noun it is important to distinguish those which are 'living' in the period of

the language with which we are concerned, and those which only survive in words handed from an earlier period. Thus in Homer the oldest and simplest Suffixes, as *-ο*, *-ι*, *-υ*, *-εσ*, *-ασ*, *-εν*, *-ερ*, *-φο*, evidently belong to the latter class. They are no longer capable of being used to form new words, because they are no longer separable in meaning from the Stems to which they are attached. On the other hand the Nouns in *-μο-ς*, *-μων*, *-μα*, *-τηρ*, *-τρο-ν*, *-σι-ς*, *-τυ-ς*, and the Denominatives in *-ιο-ς*, *-ερο-ς*, *-ινο-ς*, *-τη-ς*, &c. are felt as derivatives, and consequently their number can be indefinitely increased by new coinage. Again the use of a Suffix may be restricted to some purpose which represents only part of its original usage. Thus *-τη* ceased, as we have seen, to form abstract Nouns, but was largely used to form Masculine Nouns of the Agent. So too the Suffix *-δο*, *-δη* survived in two isolated uses, (1) in Adverbs in *-δο-ν*, *-δη-ν* and (2) in Patronymies. Compare in Latin the older use of *-tus* in the adjectives *cautus*, *certus*, &c. with the living use in *amā-tus*, &c. Sometimes too a Suffix dies out in its original form, but enters into some combination which remains in vigour. Thus *-νο* survives in the form *-ινο*, and in *-εινο* (*-εσ-νο*).

The distinction of Primary and Secondary Suffixes is evidently one which grew up by degrees, as the several forms came to be limited to different uses. In this limitation and assignment of functions it is probable that the original meaning of the Suffix seldom had any direct influence*. The difference between the Suffixes of the two great classes is mainly one of *period*. The elements which go to form them are ultimately much the same, but the Primary Suffixes represent on the whole earlier *strata* of formation.

119.] **Gender.** The rules previously given (§ 116) apply to Denominative Nouns; the exceptions are few. Note II. 18. 222 ὄπα χάλκεον (*χαλκήν* Zenod.), 19. 88 ἄγριον ἄτην (the passage is probably corrupt, since it appears that the Homeric form of ἄτη is the uncontracted ἀάτη, ἀφάτη), 20. 299 (= Od. 5. 410) ἀλὸς πολιοῖο, Od. 3. 82 πρῆξις . . δῆμιος, 4. 442 ὀλοώτατος ὀδμή, 23. 233 ἀσπάσιος γῆ (al. ἀσπασίως).

The origin of the Masc. patronymies in *-δη-ς* may be explained in the same way as the Nouns of the Agent in *-τη-ς* (§ 116, 2). We may suppose them to be derived from a group of Collective Nouns in *-δη*: e. g. Ἄτρεϊδη meaning the *family of Atreus*, Ἄτρεϊδῆ-ς would mean one of the Ἄτρεϊδῆ †.

* On this point see Brugmann (*Grundr.* ii. § 57, p. 99). It will be seen that he gives no countenance to the view (which has been put forward in Germany and elsewhere) that the Suffixes were originally without meaning.

† It may be conjectured that the epithets in *-ιον*, such as *Κρονίαν*, Ἰπερίαν,

120.] **Denominative Verbs.** Some apparent anomalies in the Denominative Verbs may be explained by the loss of an intermediate step of formation. Thus, there are many Verbs in *-ευω* not formed from Nouns in *-ευ-ς*, as *βουλεύω* (*βουλ-ή*), *ἀγορεύω* (*ἀγορή*), *θηρεύω* (*θήρ*); so that, instead of the three stages—

νομός-ς, Denom. Noun *νομ-εύ-ς*, Denom. Verb *νομ-εύ-ω*

ἄριστο-ς, „ „ *ἄριστ-εύ-ς* „ „ *ἄριστ-εύ-ω*

the language goes directly from any Noun to a Verb in *-ευω*.

Again, the Verbs in *-ιαω* (§ 60) presuppose Nouns in *-ιη*, which are seldom found in use: *δηριάομαι* (cp. *δηρι-ς* from which an intermediate *δηρί-η* might be formed), *μητιάω* (cp. *μητι-ς*), *κνυδίων*, *ἀοιδιάουσα*, *ἐδριώνωτο*, *μειδίων*, *θαλπιδίων*, *φυσιδιώντες*, *φαληριώνωτα*, *ἐψιδάσθαι* (Od. 21. 429), *δειελήσας*.

Similarly, a Primitive Noun may appear to be Denominative because the Verb from which it is formed is wanting. *E.g.* if in the series—

ἀνί-η vexation, *ἀνι-άω*, *ἀνι-η-ρό-ς*

διζύ-ς grief, *διζύ-ω*, *διζυ-ρό-ς*

the Verb were passed over, we should appear to have a Denominative Noun in *-ρο-ς*. Again, if the Primitive Noun in *-η* and the Verb in *-αω* were both wanting, we should practically have the Compound Suffix *-η-ρο*: and this accordingly is the case (*e.g.*) in *αἰψ-ηρό-ς* (*αἰψα*) *swift*, *θυ-ηλή* (*θύ-ω*), *ύψ-ηλό-ς* (*ὑψι*), *φύξ-ηλι-ς*.

In this way are formed the peculiar Homeric *-ωρη*, *-ωλη*, which are used virtually as Primary Suffixes (forming abstract Nouns); *ἐλπ-ωρή hope*, *θαλπ-ωρή comfort*, *ἀλεωρή* (*ἀλεφ*) *escape*, *τερπ-ωλή delight*, *φειδ-ωλή sparing*, *πασσ-ωλή ceasing*. Note that the difference between *-ωρη* and *-ωλη* is euphonic; *-ωρη* is found only when there is a preceding *λ* in the Stem.

The Verb-Stem in Denominative Verbs is not always the same as that of the Noun from which it is formed: in particular—

1. Verbs in *-εω*, *-ωω* lengthen the final *-ο* of the Noun-Stem to *-η* and *-ω*; as *φόβο-ς*, *ἐ-φόβη-σα*; *χόλο-ς*, *ἐ-χόλω-σα*.

The ground of this peculiarity must be sought in the fact that the Denominative Verbs were originally confined (like the Tenth Class of Sanscrit) to the Present Tense and its Moods. Consequently the other Tenses, the Fut., the Aor., and the Pf., were formed not directly from the Noun, but from the Stem as it appeared in the Present Tense. Hence such forms as

Οὐρανίανες, are derived from Collectives in *-ων* (§ 116, 6). Thus from *οὐρανίαν* (Sing. Fem.) *the heavenly powers* we might have *οὐρανίανες heavenly ones*, and finally *οὐρανίαν* as a Sing. Masc. Cp. *φυγάς* originally 'a body of exiles,' then *φυγάδες* 'exiles,' then *φυγάς* 'an exile.' So in French, first *la gent* 'people,' then *les gens*, finally *un gens-d'armes*.

φοβή-σω, ἐ-φόβη-σα, πε-φόβη-μαι go back to a period when the Pres. was either φόβη-μι or φοβή-ω.

2. Verbs in -ζω form Tenses and derivative Nouns as if from a Verb-Stem in -δ; as ὕβρι-ς, ὑβρί-ζω, ὑβριστής (as if ὑβριδ-τη-ς, although there is no δ in the declension of ὕβρι-ς).

3. Verbs in -ιω from Nominal Stems in -ρο, -λο, -νο often suppress the final -ο, as καθαρό-ς, καθαίρω (for καθαρ-ιω); ποικίλο-ς, ποικίλλω (for ποικιλ-ιω), ποικίλ-ματα. So perhaps ἀπινύσσω from ἀπίνυτο-ς, and even ἐρέσσω from ἐρέτ-η-ς. We may compare the loss of -ο, -η before a Suffix such as -ιο: see § 117 (*foot-note*).

Comparatives and Superlatives.

121.] The Suffixes which express comparison—either between two sets of objects (Comparative) or between one and several others (Superlative)—are partly Primary, partly Secondary. Hence it is convenient to treat them apart from the Suffixes of which an account has been already given.

The Comparative Suffix -ιον is Primary: the Positive (where there is one) being a parallel formation from the same (Verbal) Root. The Homeric Comparatives of this class are:—

γλυκ-ίων (γλυκ-ύ-ς), αἰσχ-ιον (αἰσχ-ρό-ς), πάσων (for παχ-ίων, παχ-ύ-ς), βράσων (βραχ-ύ-ς), θάσων (ταχ-ύ-ς), κρείσων (for κρετ-ίων, κρατ-ύ-ς), κακ-ίων, ὑπολίζον-ες better written ὑπολείζονες, ὀλίγ-ο-ς), μείζων (μέγ-α-ς), μᾶλλον (μάλ-α), ἄσπον (ἄγχι-), ἐλάσων (ἐλαχ-ύς), ἥσων (ἦκα), χείρων and χερε-ίων, ἄρε-ίων (ἄρε-τή), κέρδ-ιον (κέρδ-ος), ρίγ-ιον (ρίγ-ος), κάλλ-ιον (κάλλ-ος), ἄλγ-ιον (ἄλγ-ος), πλε-ίων, μείων, φιλ-ίων, ἀμείνων, βέλτ-ιον, λώ-ιον, βραδίων (Hes.).

The Stem is properly in the strong form, as in κρείσων (but κρατ-ύς, κάρτ-ιστος); but it is assimilated to the Positive in πάσων, βράσων, γλυκίων. In θάσων, ἐλάσων the \bar{a} points to forms *θαγχ-ίων, *ἐλαγχ-ίων, in which the nasal of the original *θεγχ-ίων, *ἐλεγχ-ίων was retained, but the ϵ changed into \bar{a} .

The Superlative -ιστο is used in the same way; we have:—

ἦδ-ιστο-ς (ἦδ-ύ-ς), ὤκ-ιστο-ς (ὤκ-ύ-ς), βάρδ-ιστο-ς (βραδ-ύ-ς), κῦδ-ιστο-ς (κῦδ-ος), κῆδ-ιστο-ς (κῆδ-ος), ἔχθ-ιστο-ς (ἐχθ-ρό-ς), ἐλέγχ-ιστο-ς (ἐλεγχ-ος), οἶκτ-ιστο-ς (οἶκτ-ο-ς), μῆκ-ιστα (μῆκ-ος), βάθ-ιστο-ς (βαθ-ύ-ς), ῥῆ-ῖστο-ς (ῥεῖα, for ῥῆι-α), φέρ-ιστο-ς (φέρ-ω); also, answering to Comparatives given above, αἰσχ-ιστο-ς, πάχ-ιστο-ς, τάχ-ιστα, κάρτ-ιστο-ς, κάκ-ιστο-ς, μέγ-ιστο-ς, μάλ-ιστα, ἄγχ-ιστα, ἦκ-ιστο-ς, ἄρ-ιστο-ς, κέρδ-ιστο-ς, ρίγ-ιστα, κάλλ-ιστο-ς, ἄλγ-ιστο-ς, πλε-ῖστο-ς: finally the anomalous πρώτ-ιστο-ς.

The Suffix -ιον has taken the place of -ισσ (§ 107, $\frac{f}{g}$); the 'weakest' form may be traced in -ισ-τος. The middle form -ιερ

perhaps appears in the two Comparatives *πλέες more* (Π. II. 395, Acc. *πλέας* Π. 2. 129) and *χέρεια worse* (Acc. Sing. and Neut. Plur., also Dat. Sing. *χέρηϊ*, Nom. Plur. *χέρηες*). Original *πλέεες* (for *πλε-ιες-ες*) became *πλέες* by Hyphaeresis (§ 105, 4): and so *χέρεια* is for *χερε-ιες-α* *. The weakest form of *-ιον* would be *-ιν*, which may be found in *πρίν* (cp. Lat. *pris-cus*), and the Attic *πλε-ίν*. Evidently *πλεος* : *πλειος* : *πλε-ίν* = *prios* : *pris-* : *prīn*.

Traces of a Comparative Suffix *-ερο* appear in *ἔν-εροι those beneath* (Lat. *inf-eru-s, sup-eru-s*).

The Suffix *-το* or *-ἄτο* is found in the Ordinals *τρί-το-s, &c.*, and with the Superlative meaning in *ὑπ-ατο-s, νέ-ατο-s, πύμ-ατο-s. μέσσ-ατος, ἔσχ-ατο-s*, and *πρώτος* (for *πρό-ατο-s*); also combined with Ordinal Suffixes in the Homeric *τρί-τ-ατο-s, ἐβδόμ-ατο-s, ὀγδό-ατο-s*. The form *-ἄτο* is probably due to the analogy of the Ordinals *τέτρα-το-s, ἕνα-το-s, δέκα-το-s*, in which the *ἄ* is part of the Stem †.

A Suffix *-μο* may be recognised in *πρό-μο-s foremost man* (Lat. *infi-mu-s, sum-mu-s, pri-mu-s, ulti-mu-s, mini-mus*).

The common Suffixes *-τερο, -ἄτο* appear with a Verb-Stem in *φέρ-τερο-s, φέρ-τατο-s* (cp. *φέρ-ιστο-s*), *βέλ-τερο-s* (*βόλ-ομαι*), *φίλ-τερο-s, φίλ-τατο-s* (cp. *ἐ-φίλα-το loved*), *δεύ-τερο-s, δεύ-τατο-s* (*δεύ-ω to fail, to come short of* †). So *φαάν-τατος*, for *φαέν-τατος* (*φαείνω*). Otherwise they are used with Nominal Stems: as *πρεσβύ-τερο-s, βασιλεύ-τερο-s, μελάν-τερο-s, κύν-τατο-ν, μακάρ-τατο-s, ἀχαρίστερος* (*ἄ-χαριτ-τερος*): and Pronouns, as *ἡμέ-τερος, ὑμέ-τερος, πό-τερος, ἀμφό-τερος, ἐκά-τερος, ἕτερος* (for *ἄ-τερος, ἄ-οιη*, with assimilation to *έν-*). Final *ο* of the Stem becomes *ω* when a long syllable is needed to give dactylic rhythm; as *κακώ-τερο-s, κακοξενιώ-τερο-s* §. In *ἀνιηρέσ-τερος* (Od. 2. 190) the Stem follows the analogy of *θυμ-ῆρες, &c.* In *χαρίεσ-τερος* (for *χαριFāt-τερος*) there is the same assimilation as in the Dat. Pl. *χαρίεσσι* (§ 106, 3). In *μυχόλ-τατο-s innermost* the Stem appears to be a Locative case-form; cp. *παρόλ-τεροι more forward*, and

* So G. Mahlow and J. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxvi. 381. A different analysis is given by Collitz in *Bezz. Beitr.* ix. 66 and Brugmann (*Grundr.* ii. § 135, p. 402), who explain *πλέες* as *plē-is-es, i. e.* from the weakest form of the Stem. This view does not apply so well to *χέρει-α*, since it leaves unexplained the divergence between it and the Superl. *χείρισ-τος*. It may be noticed as an argument for the supposition of Hyphaeresis that we do not find the Gen. *πλέος, χέρειος*, just as we do not find Hyphaeresis in the Gen. of Nouns in *-εος, -ης* (§ 105, 4). Cp. however, the absence of trace of a Gen. *ἀμείνο-ος* (§ 114, 7, foot-note).

† Ascoli in *Curt. Stud.* ix. p. 339 ff.

‡ This very probable etymology is given by Brugmann, *K. Z.* xxv. p. 298.

§ According to Brugmann the *ω* of *σοφώτερος, &c.* is not a metrical lengthening, but comes from the adverbs * *σοφῶ*, &c. (related to *σοφῶς* as *οὔτω* to *οὔτως*, § 110), like the later *κατώ-τερος* from *κάτω*, &c.

later forms like *κατώ-τερο-ς*, *άνώ-τατο-ς*, &c.; so probably in *παλαιότερος* and *ύπέρ-τερος*. On the analogy of *ύπέρ-τερος* we can explain *ένέρ-τερος* (cp. *ύπερ-θε*: *ένερ-θε*, &c.). The form *γεραιότερος*, again, may be suggested by *παλαιότερος*, through the relation *γεραιός*: *παλαιός* and the likeness of meaning (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 372). The words *δεξι-τερός*, *αριστερός* are formed like Comparatives, but are distinguished by their accent.

The Suffix *-τερο* is combined with the Suffix *-ιον* in *άσσοτέρω* (Adv.) *nearer*, *έπ-ασσύτεροι* *drawing on*, *χειρό-τερο-ς* and *χειριό-τερο-ς* *worse*.

-τερο, *-τάτο* are combinations of *-το* (in *τρί-το-ς*, &c.) with the Suffixes *-ερο* and *-άτο* respectively. The tendency to accumulate Suffixes of comparison is seen in *έν-έρ-τερος* (*-τατος*), *ύπ-έρ-τερος* (*-τατος*), *άσσο-τέρω*, *χειρό-τερος* and *χειριό-τερος*; *τρί-τατος*, *έβδό-ματος*, *πρώτ-ιστος*; Lat. *-issimu-s* (for *-is-ti-mu-s*), *mag-is-ter*, *min-is-ter*.

122.] Comparative and Superlative Meaning. The Stem is often that of a Substantive, as *κύν-τερο-ς* *more like a dog*, *βασιλεύτατο-ς* *most kingly*; so that the Adjectival character is given by the Suffix.

The meaning is often, not that an object has more of a quality than some other object or set of objects, but that it has the quality *in contradistinction to objects which are without it*. Thus in *πρό-τερο-ς* the meaning is not *more forward*, but *forward*, opposed to *ύσ-τερο-ς* *behind*. So *ύπέρ-τερο-ς* and *ένέρ-τερο-ς*, *δεξι-τερός*, and *αρισ-τερός*, *δευ-τερο-ς*, &c. The same thing appears in the Pronouns *ήμέ-τερο-ς*, *ύμέ-τερο-ς*, *έ-τερο-ς*, *πό-τερο-ς*, *έκά-τερο-ς*, *άμφό-τερο-ς*, &c.; *ήμέ-τερο-ς* is not *more belonging to us*, but *belonging to us* (not you). So in the Homeric Comparatives:—

άγρό-τερο-ς of the country (opp. to the town).

όρέσ-τερο-ς of the mountains (opp. to the valley).

θεώ-τεραι, opp. to *καταιβαται άνθρώποισιν* (Od. 13. 111).

θηλύ-τεραι female (opp. to male).

κουρό-τεροι
όπλό-τεροι } the class of youths.

Cp. Il. 19. 63 *Τρωσι τὸ κέρδιον* that is a gain to the Trojans (rather than to us). Hence the Comparative is sometimes used as a softened way of expressing the notion of the Positive: as Il. 19. 56 *ἀρειον* 'good rather than ill'; Il. 1. 32 *σαώτερος* safe (as we speak of being 'on the safe side'): so *θάσσον* with an Imper. Hence too the idiomatic use of the double Comparative, Od. 1. 164 *έλαφρότεροι πόδας εἶναι ἢ άφνειότεροι* to be light of foot rather than wealthy.

Composition.

123.] It is a general law of Greek and the kindred languages

that while a Verb cannot be compounded with any prefix except a Preposition, a Nominal Stem may be compounded with any other Nominal Stem, the first or prefixed Stem serving to limit or qualify the notion expressed by the other.

The Homeric language contains very many Compounds formed by the simple placing together of two Nominal Stems: as *πολιπορθο-s* *sacker of cities*, *ροδο-δάκτυλο-s* *rose-fingered*, *τελεσ-φόρο-s* *bringing to an end*, *βουλη-φόρο-s* *bringing counsel*, *ὑψ-αγόρη-s* *talking loftily*, *πρωθ-ήβη-s* (for *πρωτο-ήβη-s*) *in the prime of youth*, &c.

124.] **Form of the Prefixed Stem.** The instances which call for notice fall under the following heads:—

a. Stems in -ο, -η:—

The great number of Nominal Stems in -ο created a tendency (which was aided by the convenience of pronunciation) to put -ο in place of other Suffixes. Thus we have—

-ο for -η, as *ἵλο-τόμο-s* *wood-cutter*, &c.* *σηϊόεντα*

-ο for -εσ, in *εἰρο-κόμο-s* *wool-dresser*, *μενο-εικής* *pleasing to the spirit*; and for -ᾶσ, as *γηρο-κόμο-s* *tending old age*.

-μο for -μον, as *ἀκμό-θετο-ν* *anvil-block*; and for -μᾶ, as *αἰμο-φόρυκτο-s* *dabbled with blood*, *Κυμο-δόκη*, &c.

-ρο for -ρᾶ, in *πατρο-κασίγνητος*, *μητρο-πάτωρ*, *ἀνδρο-φόνος*, and the like. In *ἀνδρά-ποδον* the short Stem (as in *ἀνδρά-σι*) is retained, but probably this form is due to the analogy of *τετράποδον*: slaves and cattle being thought of together as the two main kinds of property in early times (Brugm.).

-ο inserted after a consonant; *παιδ-ο-φόνος* *child-slayer*, *ἀρ-ματ-ο-πηγός* *chariot-builder*, *ἕδατ-ο-τρεφής* *water-fed*, *ἐλε-ύθρεπ-το-s* (*ἐλεσ-ο-*) *grown in a marsh*, *ἤερ-ο-φοίτι-s* *flying in air*, *δοуро-δόκη* (*δορφ-ο-*) *spear-holder*, *κεραο-ξόο-s* (*κερασ-*) *worker in horn*. Sometimes the -ο is a real Suffix; e.g. in *δι-ο-γενής* (*διφ-ιο*) *Zeus-sprung* (= *δῖον γένος ἔχων*).

Stems in -η instead of -ο appear in *θαλαμη-πόλο-s* *attendant of a chamber*, *πυρη-φόρο-s* *bearing wheat*, *ελαφη-βόλο-s*, *έκατη-βόλο-s*, *κραναή-πεδο-s*, *ὑπερή-φανο-s*. We may suppose that there was a collateral Stem in -η (e.g. *θαλάμη* is found, but in a different sense from *θάλαμο-s* Od. 5. 432), or that the Compound follows the analogy of *βουλη-φόρο-s*, &c.

Fem. -ᾶ becomes either -ο, as *ἀελλό-πος* *storm-foot*; or -η, as *γαιή-οχο-s* *earth-holder*, *μοιρη-γενής* *born by fate*.

* It is possible however that Feminine Nouns in -η were regarded as formed from Stems in -ο, the long vowel being of the nature of a Case-ending (§ 113). This is especially applicable to Adjectives: e.g. *ἀκρό-πολις* comes directly from Masc. *ἀκρο-s* (Brugm.).

The result of these changes is to make *o* the 'connecting vowel' in the great majority of Compounds. In later Greek this form prevails almost exclusively.

b. Stems in *-ι* :—

The Compounds which contain these stems are mostly of an archaic stamp : ἀργί-ποδ-ες *with swift (or white) feet*, ἀργι-όδοντ-ες *white-toothed*, ἀργι-κέραυνο-ς *with bright lightning*, τερπι-κέραυνο-ς *hurting thunderbolts* (τέρπω = τρέπω, Lat. *torqueo*), εἰλί-ποδ-ες *trailing (?) the feet (of oxen)*, ἄλι-πλοο-ς *washed by the sea*, also ἄλι-αῆς, ἄλι-πόρφυρος, Ἄλι-αρτος, Ἄλι-ζωνοί, Ἄλι-θέρησις (cp. ἄλι-εὐς *fisherman*), ἀλι-βοτο-ς *fed on by goats*, ἀλι-λιψ *deserted by goats*, χαλί-φρων *of light mind*, δαί-φρων *warlike (or prudent)*, ἀλεξί-κακο-ς *defender against ill*, λαθι-κηδής *forgetting care*, πυκι-μηδής *with shrewd counsel*, καλλι-γύναικ-α *with beautiful women* (cp. κάλλι-μος), κυδι-άνειρα *glorifying men* (cp. κυδι-όων); with the Proper Names, Αἰθί-οπ-ες, Πειρί-θοο-ς, Ἀλκί-νοο-ς, Ἀλκι-μέδων (cp. ἄν-αλκι-ς), and the words beginning with ἀρι- and ἐρι-.

The meaning of several of these words is very uncertain, owing to the merely ornamental and conventional way in which they are used in Homeric poetry. It seems to follow that they are survivals from an earlier period, one in which the number of Stems in *-ι* was probably greater than in Homeric times.

Loss of *o* may be recognised in ἀρτί-πος (= ἄρτιος τοὺς πόδας), ζεί-δωρος *grain giving* (ζεῖά), κραται-γύαλος *of strong pieces*, Δηί-φοβος, perhaps also μαι-φόνος, Ἄλθαι-μένης, ταλαί-πωρος : cp. γεραί-τερος from γεραῖο-ς.

c. Stems in *-σι* :—

This group is mainly Homeric : ἐρυσί-πολι (Voc.) *deliverer of the city* (with v. l. ῥῦσί-πολι Il. 6. 305), ἀερί-ποδ-ες *lifting the feet* (i. e. with high action), πλήξ-ιππο-ς *smiter of horses*, λυσι-μελής *loosening the limbs (of sleep)*, τανυσί-πτερο-ς, ταλασί-φρων, ἀεσί-φρων, ταμεσί-χρως, φαεσί-μβροτο-ς, φνυσί-ζοος, φθισί-μβροτο-ς, τερψί-μβροτο-ς, Τερψι-χόρη (Hes.), ἐνοσί-χθων (ἐνοσί-γαιος, εἰνοσίφυλλος, &c.), πηγασί-μαλλο-ς, ὤλεσί-καρπο-ς, ἄλφεισί-βοιος, ἔλκεσί-πεπλο-ς, φθισ-ήνωρ, πλησ-ίστιο-ς, ἐρυσ-άρματ-ες, ῥήξ-ήνωρ, γαμφ-ῶνξ; and Proper Names, Πρωτεσί-λαο-ς, Ἀρσί-νοο-ς, Δεισ-ήνωρ, Λύσ-ανδρος, Πεισ-ήνωρ, Πεισί-στρατο-ς, Ὀρσί-λοχο-ς, Ἀναβησί-νεως, Ἠσί-οδος (Hes.), &c.

There are a few Stems in *-τι*; βωτι-άνειρα *feeding men*, Καστι-άνειρα (cp. κε-κασ-μένος).

We may add the Hesiodic φερέσ-βιος *life-bearing*, and φερεσ-σακής *shield-bearing* with φερεσ- apparently for φερεσι-.

These Stems were originally the same as those of the abstract Nouns in *-τι-ς*, *-σι-ς*: cp. Τέρψι-χόρη, τερψί-μβροτος, &c. with

τέρψι-*s*, πλήξ-ιππος with πλήξι-*s*. But in many cases new Stems have been formed under the influence of the sigmatic Aorist, with a difference of quantity, as in φῦσι-ζοο-*s* *life-giving* (φύσι-*s*), λῦσι-μελής, φθίσι-μβροτο-*s*. Compare also ταμεί-χρως with τμήσι-*s*, Πεισί-στρατο-*s* with πίστι-*s*, &c.

The group of Compounds is also to be noticed for the distinctly *Verbal* or *participial* meaning given by the first part of the word; cp. the next group, and § 126.

d. Stems in -ε:—

These are nearly all Verbal, both in form and meaning: ἔλκε-χίτων-ε*s* *trailing the chiton*, μενε-δήϊο-*s* *withstanding foemen* (so μενε-χάρμη-*s*, μενε-πτόλεμο-*s*, Μενέ-λαο-*s*, Μενε-σθεύς, &c.): ἐχέ-θυμο-*s* *restraining passion*, ἐχέ-φρων *possessing judgment*, ἔχε-πευκές *carrying sharpness*, Ἐχέ-πωλο-*s*, Ἐχέ-νηος, Ἐχε-κλῆς; ἀγε-λείη *driving spoil*, ἀρχέ-κακο-*s* *beginning mischief*, ἀγché-μαχο-*s* *fighting close*, λεχε-ποίη *with beds of grass*: Ἀρχέ-λοχο-*s*, Φέρε-κλος, Μελέ-αγρο-*s*; φερέ-οικος *carrying his house* (of the snail in Hes.), ἐγρε-κῦδομος *stirring tumult*: also (if ε is elided) ψευδ-ἀγγελο-*s* *bringing false news*, αἰθ-οψ *fiery*, μισγ-ἀγκεια *the meeting-place of glens*, ἀλεξάνεμος *keeping off wind*, Ἀλέξ-αἰδρος.

Stems in -σε; ἀκερσε-κόμη-*s* *with unshorn hair*, Περσε-φόνεια.

With the Stems in -ε may evidently be placed ταλα-, in ταλά-φρων *with enduring mind*, ταλα-εργό-*s* *enduring in work*, ταλαῦριος (for ταλα-φρω-*s*) *bearing a shield of hide*, ταλα-πενθής *bearing sorrow*, ταλα-πέριος *bearing trial*; and τλη- in Τλη-πόλεμος &c.: also ταυ-, in ταυ-γλωσσο*s* *with outstretched tongue, long-tongued*, ταυ-φυλλος *long-leaved*, ταυ-γλώχινες *long-notched* (arrows), and ἐρυ- in Ἐρύ-λαος, *defender of the host*.

e. Stems in -ν:—

ἄ for η appears in ὀνομά-κλυτος *of famous name*, κυνά-μνια for κυνα-μνια on the analogy of κύν-α.

f. Case-forms:—

Nom. Acc. in Numerals, as ἔν-δεκα, δυνά-δεκα.

The Dative is probably to be recognised in ἀρητ-φατο-*s* *slain in war* (and so Ἀρητ-θοο-*s*, Ἀρητ-λυκο-*s*), πυρι-ηκής *sharpened by fire* (πυρί-καυστο-*s*, Πυρι-φλεγέθων), διῦ-πετής *falling in the sky*; the Dat. Plur. in κηρесси-φόρητο-*s* *brought by the fates*, ὄρεσι-τροφο-*s* *nursed in mountains*, ἐγχεσι-μωρο-*s* *great with spears*, ἐντεσι-εργό-*s* *working in harness*, τειχεσι-πλήτα (Voc.) *drawing near to (assailing) walls*, Νασι-κάα, Μηδεσι-κάστη, Πασι-θέη, Χερσι-δάμας; a Locative form in χαμαι-εύνης *sleeping on the ground*, ὄδοι-πόρο-*s* *a wayfarer*, χοροί-τυπία *figuring in the dance*, Πυλο-γενής *born at Pylos*, παλαι-φατο-*s* *of ancient fame*, and perhaps (to express manner) in ἰθαι-γενής *duly born*, ὀλοοί-τροχο-*s* *rolling*. Cp. ἐμ-πυρι-βήτης *made to stand over the fire*, i. e. a kettle.

This use of the Dative may have been suggested by the Stems in *-ϊ* and *-στ*. Compounds such as *ἐλκεσί-πεπλος*, *ὤλεσί-καρπος*, *ἀλφεσί-βοιος*, containing forms which sounded like the Dat. Plur. of Stems in *-εσ*, may have served as types for the group *ἐγγεσί-μυρος*, *τειχεσι-πλήτης*, *ὑρεσί-τροφος*, &c. in which the Dat. Plur. takes the place of the Stem. Cp. *Πρωτεσί-λαος*.

Conversely, *φερέσ-βιο-s* *life-bearing*, and *φερεσ-σακῆς* (Hes.) ought to be **φερεσί-βιο-s*, but have followed the type of *ὑρέσ-βιο-s*, *τελεσ-φόρο-s*, &c.

The forms *διῖ-φιλο-s*, *ἀρηῖ-φιλο-s*, *ἀρηῖ-κτάμενο-s*, *δαῖ-κτάμενο-s*, *δουρι-κλυτό-s*, *δουρι-κλειτό-s*, *ναυσι-κλυτό-s*, should probably be written as separate words, *Διῖ φίλος*, *Ἀρηῖ κτάμενος*, &c. As to *-κτάμενος* see § 125, 6 : as to *-κλυτός*, *-κλειτός*, cp. § 128.

The Genitive is very rare: *οὐδενόσ-ωρο-s* *not worth caring for*, *Ἑλλάσ-ποιτος*.

The Accusative may be recognised in *δικασ-πόλο-s* *busied about suits* (*δίκαι*), *ἀταλά-φρων* *with childish thought* (= *ἀταλὰ φρονέων*, which is also used in Homer), *ἀκαλα-ρρείτης* *gently flowing*, *Ἀλκάθοος* (cp. Dat. *ἀλκ-ί*), *ποδά-ριπτρον*, also *πᾶν-* (*altogether*) in *πάμπαν*, *παν-αίολος*, *παν-άποτμος*, *πάμπρωτος*, &c.

An ending *-η* (for *-ā*) may be seen in *νεή-φατος* *new-slain*, *ὀλιγη-πελέων*. This is perhaps an Instrum., as *πάντη* (§ 110).

125.] **Form of the second Stem.** 1. The use of a Root-Noun, *i. e.* a Verbal Stem without a distinct Nominal Suffix (§ 113), is more common in Composition than in simple Nouns: as, *δί-ζυγ-ες* *yoked in a pair*, *δί-πλακ-α* *two-fold*, *χέρ-νιβ-α* *hand-washing*, *οἶν-οπ-α* *wine-like*, *νήϊδα* (*νή-φιδ-α*) *ignorant*, *αἰγί-λιπ-ος* (Gen.) *left by goats*, *πολυ-αῖξ* *much starting*, *βου-πλήξ* *an ox-whip*. The Stem, it will be seen, is in the Weak form.

2. Nouns in *-ώς* (Gen. *-ο-ος*) and in *-ος* (Gen. *-ε-ος*) form the Compound in *-ης*, Neut. *-εσ*, as *ἀν-αιδῆς* *without shame* (*αἰδώς*), *θυμ-αλγῆς* *grieving the spirit* (*ἄλγος*).

The Stem in these Compounds is often weak, though in the simple Neuters in *-ος* it is strong (§ 114): *e. g.* *αἶνο-παθῆς* (as well as *ταλα-πενθῆς*, *νη-πενθῆς*, from *πέιθος*), *ἀγχι-βαθῆς* (*βένθος*, *πολυ-βενθῆς*), *οἶνο-βαρῆς*, *πρωτο-παγῆς*, *ἀ-σινῆς*, *θυμο-δακῆς*, *ἀρι-φραδῆς*, *ἔτερ-αλκῆς*, *τηλε-φανῆς*, &c. So we find *αἰκῶς* (Il. 22. 336) as Adv. to *αἰκῆς*, and *ἄλλο-ἰδέα* (Od. 13. 194) alongside of *θεο-ειδῆς*, *μυλο-ειδῆς*, &c.

This weakening of the Stem, accompanied by shifting of the accent to the suffix, apparently represents the original rule—words like *ταλα-πενθῆς* being formed afresh from the Simple Noun. Conversely, the analogy of the Compounds has given rise to the forms *πάθος*, *βάθος*, *βάρος*, &c. and also to the simple Adjectives such as *ψενδῆς*, *σαφῆς*.

3. Stems in *ην* (*εν-*) usually take *ων* (*ον-*) in Composition: as *φρήν* (Gen. *φρευ-ός*) forms *πρό-φρων*, Gen. *πρό-φρον-ος*: and

Neuters in $-\mu\alpha$ form Compounds in $-\mu\omega\upsilon$, Gen. $-\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, as $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\epsilon\varsigma$ ($\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha$) *bloodless*. Cp. $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega\upsilon$ *boundless* ($\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\rho$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$). So too $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, $\mu\acute{\eta}\tau\eta\rho$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\eta}\rho$, &c. form $-\omega\rho$ (Gen. $-\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$), as $\mu\eta\tau\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho$, $\epsilon\upsilon\text{-}\acute{\eta}\nu\omega\rho$.

4. Some Stems take a final $-\tau$, as $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\beta\lambda\acute{\eta}\text{-}\tau\text{-}\alpha$ (Acc. Sing.) *un-thrown*, $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\kappa\mu\acute{\eta}\text{-}\tau\text{-}\epsilon\varsigma$ *unwearied*; so $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\text{-}\beta\lambda\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\delta\mu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\gamma\upsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma$.

5. In Adjectives the Suffix is often replaced by one ending in $-\omicron$; as $\delta\text{-}\pi\alpha\tau\rho\text{-}\varsigma$ of *one father*, $\beta\alpha\rho\beta\alpha\rho\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\phi\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ with *strange voice* (from $\phi\acute{\omega}\nu\eta$), $\chi\rho\upsilon\varsigma\text{-}\eta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\text{-}\varsigma$ with *golden distaff* ($\eta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$), $\delta\upsilon\varsigma\text{-}\acute{\omega}\nu\upsilon\mu\omicron\text{-}\varsigma$ of *evil name* ($\delta\omicron\upsilon\omicron\mu\alpha$), $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\omicron\text{-}\varsigma$ without *seed* ($\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$), &c. In other cases the Suffix is retained, and thus we find in Compounds (contrary to the general rules of Noun-formation)—

Masc. Stems in $-\eta$, as $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\omicron\text{-}\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\text{-}\varsigma$,
and $-\iota\delta$, as $\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\iota\delta\text{-}\epsilon\varsigma$.

Masc. and Fem. Stems in $-\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, as $\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\text{-}\eta\delta\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ *honey-sweet*, $\eta\rho\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\alpha$ (for $-\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\text{-}\mu\acute{\alpha}$) *early born*.

Fem. Stems in $-\omicron$, as $\chi\rho\upsilon\varsigma\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\rho\omicron\upsilon\omicron\text{-}\varsigma$ (Ἡρῆ), $\rho\omicron\delta\omicron\text{-}\delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\upsilon\lambda\omicron\text{-}\varsigma$ (Ἡὼς), and many other adjectives 'of two terminations.'

A Masc. Stem in $-\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau$, viz. $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\upsilon\varsigma\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha\tau\text{-}\epsilon\varsigma$ (Ἴπποι).

6. The use of a Participle in the second part is rare: it is found in some Proper Names, as $\text{Οὐκ-}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\upsilon$, $\text{Πυρι-}\phi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\theta\omega\upsilon$, $\text{Θεο-}\kappa\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$: also where it is a mere Adjective without any Tense-meaning, as $\mu\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\text{-}\tau\lambda\alpha\varsigma$, cp. $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\varsigma$. In other cases we can write the words separately, as $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\upsilon$ $\pi\lambda\alpha\gamma\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$, $\delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\upsilon$ $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\alpha$, $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta$ $\kappa\omicron\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\nu\alpha\iota\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega\upsilon$, $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\upsilon}$ $\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon$, $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\kappa\acute{\tau}\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\upsilon$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, Ἀρηῖ $\kappa\acute{\tau}\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa\acute{\tau}\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, &c.

7. Abstract Primitive Nouns are not used in the second part: thus we do not find $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\text{-}\beta\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}$, but $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\text{-}\beta\omicron\lambda\acute{\iota}\eta$ (through a concrete $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\text{-}\beta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\text{-}\varsigma$): and so $\beta\omicron\text{-}\eta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\eta$ (not $\beta\omicron\text{-}\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\sigma\iota\text{-}\varsigma$), $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\omicron\kappa\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\text{-}\eta$, $\epsilon\upsilon\text{-}\delta\iota\kappa\text{-}\acute{\iota}\eta$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\text{-}\tau\rho\omicron\chi\iota\acute{\eta}$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\omicron\text{-}\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\iota\acute{\eta}$. Except after Prepositions; as $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\acute{\iota}\text{-}\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\text{-}\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\text{-}\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\text{-}\varsigma$, $\pi\rho\omicron\text{-}\chi\omicron\eta$, $\pi\rho\omicron\text{-}\delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\eta}$.

Note however $\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma\iota\varsigma$ (for $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\text{-}\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma\iota\text{-}\varsigma$), $\beta\omicron\upsilon\text{-}\lambda\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\varsigma$ *the time of unyoking*, $\beta\omicron\upsilon\text{-}\beta\rho\omega\sigma\tau\iota\text{-}\varsigma$.

8. When the latter part of a Compound is derived from a disyllabic Verbal Stem beginning with a vowel, its initial vowel is often lengthened: as—

$\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\text{-}$ *drive*, $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\text{-}\eta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$, $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\text{-}\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\beta\omicron\text{-}\eta\lambda\alpha\text{-}\sigma\acute{\iota}\eta$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\text{-}$ *love*, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\text{-}\acute{\eta}\rho\alpha\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\mu\omicron\lambda\upsilon\text{-}\acute{\eta}\rho\alpha\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

$\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\lambda\gamma\text{-}$ *milk*, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\text{-}\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\lambda\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\text{Ἴππ-}\eta\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}$.

$\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\omega$ *plough*, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\text{-}\acute{\eta}\rho\omicron\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

$\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\text{-}\omega$ *care*, $\delta\upsilon\varsigma\text{-}\eta\lambda\epsilon\gamma\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ (Gen.), $\acute{\alpha}\pi\text{-}\eta\lambda\epsilon\gamma\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\text{-}\omega$ *cover*, $\kappa\alpha\tau\text{-}\eta\rho\epsilon\phi\text{-}\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\text{-}\eta\rho\epsilon\phi\text{-}\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\text{-}\omega\rho\acute{\omicron}\phi\text{-}\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

$\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\beta\text{-}\omega$ *change*, $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\text{-}\eta\mu\omicron\iota\beta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\text{-}$ *row*, $\phi\iota\lambda\text{-}\acute{\eta}\rho\epsilon\tau\text{-}\mu\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\omicron\lambda\iota\chi\text{-}\acute{\eta}\rho\epsilon\tau\mu\omicron\varsigma$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\kappa\text{-}$ *carry*, $\delta\iota\text{-}\eta\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\text{-}\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\mu\omicron\delta\text{-}\eta\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\text{-}\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\delta\omicron\upsilon\rho\text{-}\eta\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\text{-}\acute{\eta}\varsigma$.

ἔλυ(θ)- *come*, νε-ήλυδ-ες.

ἀγερ- *assemble*, ὄμ-ηγερ-έες, θυμ-ηγερ-έων (= θυμὸν ἀγείρων).

ἐριδ- *strive*, ἀμφ-ήριστος *striven about*.

So ποδ-ήνεμος, εὐ-ώνυμος (πολυ-ώνυμος, &c.), εὐ-ήνωρ (ἀνερ-), εὐ-ηφεινής (from ἄφενος *wealth*), γαμφ-ώνυξ, πεμπ-ώβολον, ἀν-ήκεστος, ἀν-ώιστος, ἐρι-ούνης (ὄνα- *help*), ὑπ-ώρεια (ὄρος), δι-ηκόσιοι and τρι-ηκόσιοι (ἐκατόν), χαλκ-ήρης (ζῆρ-μῶ).

Similar lengthening is found, but less frequently, in the first part of the Compound; ὠλεσί-καρπος, ἡλιτό-μηνος, Ὀρεί-θνια.

Also in other derivatives, as ἠνεμό-εις, ἠγορ-έη, τηλεθόωσα (θαλέθω), ἠγερέθονται (ἀγερ-). *Od. 6. 63, 23. 1*

126.] **Meaning of Compounds.** The general rule is that the prefixed Stem limits or qualifies the meaning of the other: as ὦμο-γέρων *hale old man*, δημο-γέρων *elder of the people*, τρι-γέρων (Aesch.) *thrice aged*; ἰππό-δαμο-ς *tamer of horses*, ἰππό-βοτο-ς *pastured by horses*, ἰππό-κομος *with plume of horse-hair*, ἰππο-κέλευθος *making way with horses*; βαθυ-δινήεις *deep-eddying*.

The prefixed Stem may evidently express very different relations—that of an Adjective, as ὦμο-γέρων, βαθυ-δίνης, or a Genitive, as δημο-γέρων, ἰππό-κομος, or an Object, as ἰππό-δαμος, or an Adverb of manner or place or instrument, as ὄμ-ηγερέες, ἠερο-φοίτις, &c.—and various attempts have been made to classify Compounds according to these relations. Such attempts are usually unsatisfactory unless the differences of meaning upon which they are based are accompanied by differences of grammatical form.

In respect of form an important distinction is made by the fact that in the second part of many Compounds a Substantive acquires the meaning of an Adjective without the use of a new Suffix; e. g. ῥοδο-δάκτυλο-ς, literally *rose-finger*, means not a *rosy finger*, but *having rosy fingers*; so ἰππό-κομος *with a horse-plume*, ἰππιο-χαίτη-ς *with horse's mane (as a plume)*, βαθυ-δίνη-ς (= βαθυ-δινή-εις), &c. Such Compounds are called by Curtius *Attributive*. The formation is analogous to the turning of abstract into concrete Nouns by a mere change of Gender (instead of a Suffix), § 116. Thus διο-γενής (= δῖον γένος ἔχων) is to δῖον γένος as ψευδής *false* to ψεῦδος *falsehood*.

Among the meanings which may be conveyed by a Stem in a Compound, note the poetical use to express *comparison*: as ἀελλό-πος *storm-foot*, i. e. *with feet (swift) as the storm*, μελί-γηρυ-ς *honey-voiced*, ῥοδο-δάκτυλο-ς, κυν-ῶπι-ς, &c. So too ποδ-ήνεμο-ς *like the wind in feet*, θυμο-λέων *like a lion in spirit*.

The order of the two Stems may be almost indifferent; i. e. it may be indifferent which of the two notions is treated as qualifying the other; e. g. ποδ-ώκης *swift of foot* (= ὠκὺς τοὺς πόδας)

is the same in practical effect as ὠκύ-πους *swift-foot, with swift feet* (ὠκεῖς πόδας ἔχων).

In the Compounds called by Curtius *Objective*, i. e. where the relation between the two parts is that of governing and governed word, the general rule requires that the governed word should come first, as in ἵππό-δαμο-ς *horse-taming*. This order appears to be reversed in certain cases in which the first Stem has the force of a Verb. The Stems so used are—

1. Stems in -ε (§ 124, d), as ἔλκε-χίτωνες, ἐχέ-φρων, &c.

2. Stems in -σι (§ 124, c), as ἔλκε-σί-πεπλος, φθι-σ-ήνωρ, &c.

3. Some of the Stems in -ι, as εἰλί-ποδες, κυδι-άνειρα, ἄμαρτι-νοος (Hes.), λαθι-κηδής, λαθί-φρων, τερπι-κέρανος (§ 124, b); and in -ο, as φιλο-πόλεμος *loving war*, φιλο-κέρτομος, φιλο-κτέανος, φυγο-πόλεμος *flying from war*, ἄμαρτο-επής *blundering in speech*, ἠλιτό-μηνος *astray as to the month*: also the Compounds of ταλα-, τλη-, as ταλα-πενθής *enduring sorrow*, Τλη-πόλεμος, &c., and τανυ-, as τανύ-πτερος (Hes.), which is = the Homeric τανυσί-πτερος.

In most of these cases the inversion is only apparent. For instance, ἔλκεσί-πεπλος means *trailing* the robe as distinguished from other ways of wearing it; the notion of trailing is therefore the limiting one. So τανυσί-πτερος means *long-winged*; μενε-πόλεμος, φυγο-πόλεμος, Τλη-πόλεμος, Νεο-πόλεμος describe varieties of the genus 'warrior.'

Nevertheless we must recognise a considerable number of Compounds in which the Prefixed Stem is Verbal in form as well as in meaning. A similar group has been formed in English (e. g. *catch-penny, make-shift, do-nothing*, &c.), and in the Romance languages (French *vau-rien, croque-mitaine*, Italian *fa-tutto*, &c.). These groups are of relatively late formation, and confined for the most part to colloquial language. The corresponding Greek forms represent a new departure of the same kind.

The process by which the second part of a Compound passes into a *Suffix* cannot often be traced in Greek. An example may be found in -απο-ς (ποδ-απός, ἡμεδ-απός, ἄλλοδ-απός), = Sanser. *-ānc*, Lat. *-inquu-s* (*long-inquus, prop-inquus*). In the adjectives in -οψ, as οἶνοψ, αἶθοψ, ἦνοψ, νῶροψ, μέροψ, the original sense of the Stem -οπ is evidently very faint. In the proper names Αἰθίοπες, Δόλοπες, Ἑλλοπες, Πέλοψ, &c. it becomes a mere Suffix.

127.] **Stems compounded with Prepositions.** These are of two readily distinguishable kinds:—

1. The Preposition qualifies; as ἐπι-μάρτυρος *witness to (something)*, περι-κτίον-ες *dwellers around*, ἀμφί-φαλο-ς *with crest on both sides*, πρό-φρων *with forward mind*. Forms of this kind are

sometimes obtained directly from Compound Verbs: *e.g.* ξξοχος from ξξ-έχω, not from ξξ and ὄχος.

2. The Preposition governs, *i.e.* the Compound is equivalent to a Preposition governing a Noun; ἐν-νύχιο-ς *in the night*, κατα-χθόνιο-ς *under-ground*, ἀπο-θύμιο-ς *displeasing* (lit. *away from the mind*), &c.; also (but less commonly) without a Secondary Suffix, as ἐγ-κέφαλο-ς *brain* (lit. *within the head*), ἐπ-ἄρουρο-ς *attached to the soil*.

The placing of the Preposition before the *governed* Stem is a departure from the general rule stated above. It may be held, however, that the Preposition serves (in some of these Compounds at least) as the limiting or qualifying member of the word. Compare νύχιο-ς *by night*, ἐν-νύχιο-ς *within the night*: it is evident that the ἐν limits the sense of νύχιος in essentially the same way as παν- in παν-νύχιο-ς *all the night*. So κατα-χθόνιο-ς is nearly equivalent to χθόνιο-ς; the Preposition merely makes it clear in what sense the Suffix -ιο is to be understood—‘belonging to the earth’ by being *under* it.

128.] **Accentuation.** The Accent generally falls on the last syllable of the prefixed Stem, or if that is impossible, then as far back as possible; χρυσό-θρονος, ἀελλό-πος, ἐπ-ήρατο-ς (ἐρατό-ς), αἰν-αρέτη-ς (ἀρετή), &c. The chief exceptions are the following:—

1. When the second Stem ends in -ο and has the force of an Active Participle, it is oxytone, or, if the penult is short, paroxytone; as ὑ-φορβό-ς, δημο-εργό-ς, τοξο-φόρο-ς. Except Compounds with Prepositions, as ἐπί-κλοπο-ς, πρό-μαχο-ς, ὑπό-τροπο-ς; also those in -οχο-ς, and one or two more, πτολί-πορθο-ς, ἀγχι-μολο-ν, ἱππό-δαμος.

2. Adjectives in -ης (Stems in -εσ), Nouns in -ευ-ς, Nouns of the agent in -τηρ and -τη-ς, and Abstract Nouns in -η and -η retain their accent; οἰνο-βαρής, ἡνι-οχεύ-ς, μηλο-βοτήρ-ας, ἱππο-κορυστή-ς, ἐπ-ιωγή, ἄρμα-τροχή, ἀλασκοπή.

But a few Adjectives in -ης are barytone, as ὑψι-πέτης, ποδ-ώκης, χαλκ-ήρης, ταυ-ήκης; also the Fem. forms ἡρι-γένεια, λιῖ-βότεира, δυσ-αριστο-τόκεια, μισγ-άγκεια.

3. When the second Stem is a long monosyllable, it is accented: βου-πλήξ, ἀπο-ρρώξ, παρα-βλῶπ-ες, παρα-πλήγ-ας, ἀ-βλής, &c. (§ 125, 2). Hence the Fem. forms βο-ῶπι-ς, γλαυκ-ῶπι-ς, &c. (as if from βο-ῶψ, γλαυκ-ῶψ, &c.).

129.] **Proper Names** in Greek are generally Compounds; the exceptions are chiefly names of gods, as Ζεὺς, Ἥρη, Ἀθήνη, &c., and of certain heroes, as Πάρις, Πρίαμος, Αἴας, Τεύκρος, &c.

Note that the gods whose names are Compound, as Διό-υσος, Δη-μήτηρ, Περσε-φόνεια, are less prominent in Homer.

The second part of a Proper Name is liable to a peculiar shortening; Πάτρο-κλο-ς, Φέρε-κλος, for Πατρο-κλής, Φερε-κλής, Σθένε-λος for Σθενέ-λαο-ς, Αίγι-σθος for Αίγι-σθένης, Μενεσθεύς for Μενε-σθένης; cp. Εύρυμίδης (Od. 9. 509), patronymic of Εύρυμέδων. In these names the shorter form has (or had originally) the character of a 'nick-name,' or pet name.

In general, however, the 'pet' name is formed by dropping one of the two Stems altogether: the other Stem taking a Suffix in its place*. Thus we have in Homer the names—

in -το-ς, as Ἐκα-τος (for ἐκατη-βόλος), Εύρυ-τος (Εύρυ-βάτης, Εύρύ-αλος, &c.), Ἴφι-τος, Ἐχε-τος, Λήϊ-τος.

in -τωρ, as Ἄκ-τωρ (for Ἀγέ-λαος or some other name beginning Ἀγε-), Ἐκ-τωρ (Ἐχε-), Μέν-τωρ (Μενε-), Καλή-τωρ, Ἀμύν-τωρ, &c.

in -τη-ς, as Θερσί-της (cp. Θερσί-λογος, &c.), Πολί-της, Ὀρέσ-της, Θυέσ-της, Μέν-της (cp. Μέν-τωρ).

in -ων, as Δόλ-ων, Ἀγάθ-ων (cp. Λάκων = Λακεδαιμόνιος).

in -εϋ-ς, as Περσ-εϋς (from Περσε-φόνος), Οἰν-εϋς (cp. Οἰνό-μαος, &c.), Πρωτ-εϋς, Λεοντ-εϋς, &c.

in -ιο-ς; Δολ-ίος (Δόλ-οψ, &c.) Ὀδ-ίος, Τυχ-ίος, Φήμ-ιος, Καλήσ-ιος, and many more.

in -ια-ς, -εια-ς; Πελ-ίης, Τειρεσ-ίας; Ἐρμείας, Αἰνείας, Αὐγείας.

In these names the Suffix is not used with its proper force, but merely in imitation of the corresponding groups of Common Nouns. This is evident from the fact that so many of these words are inexplicable as Simple Nouns. Note especially the names in -το-ς and -ων from Adjectives, as Εύρυ-το-ς, Ἴφι-το-ς, Ἀγάθ-ων; and those in -εϋ-ς from Nouns of the consonantal declension (§ 118), as Λεοντ-εϋ-ς, Αἰγ-εϋ-ς, and even from Verbs, as Περσ-εϋ-ς*.

The first part of the Compound has probably been dropped in Κλυμένη (cp. Περι-κλύμενος), Θόων (cp. Ἴππο-θόων), &c.

130.] Numerals. Although the Numerals are not properly to be counted as 'Nouns,' it will be convenient to notice here the chief peculiarities of formation which they exhibit.

1. There are two Fem. forms for εἶς, viz. μία and ἴα; also a Neut. Dat. ἰῶ (Il. 6. 422). The Stem ἄ- (for ση-) in ἄ-παξ, ἄ-πλοος, &c. is to be regarded as a weak form of the Stem ἐν- (sam). The weak form sm- is to be traced in μία, for σμ-ιᾶ.

2. The forms δύο and δύω are equally common in Homer.

* Aug. Fick, *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt*, Göttingen, 1874.

For the number 12 we find the three forms *δωδέκα*, *δῶδέκα*, and *δυοκαίδεκα*; also the Ordinals *δυωδέκατος* and (rarely) *δωδέκατος*.

3. Besides *τέσσαρ-ες* there is a form *πίσυρ-ες*, applied to horses in *Il.* 15. 680 and 23. 171, to other objects in *Il.* 24. 233 and three times in the *Odyssey* (5. 70., 16. 249., 22. 111).

The Stem *τετρᾶ-* appears in the *Dat.* *τέτρα-σι*, also in the Ordinal (*τέτρα-τος* and *τέταρ-τος*), and most derivatives, as *τετρά-κισ*, *τετρα-χθά*, *τετρά-φαλος* *four-crested*, &c. (but cp. *τεσσαρά-βοιός* *worth four oxen*): also with loss of the first syllable in *τρά-πεζα*.

The variation in the Stem of this Numeral has been fully discussed by Joh. Schmidt *K. Z.* xxv. p. 47 ff.). He shows that the Stem had three forms (§ 114*). The strong form is seen in Sanser. *catvāras*, which would lead us to expect Greek **τετῶρες* (hence perhaps Dor. *τέτορες*); the weakest in the Sanser. Ordinal *turīya*, for *kturīya*, in which the shortening affects both syllables, and the first is consequently lost. This weakest Stem appears in *τρυ-φάλεια* *a four-ridged helmet*, and is not derived from the form *τετρᾶ-*. It probably fell into disuse owing to its unlikeness to *τέσσαρες*; accordingly it has only survived in words in which the meaning 'four' had ceased to be felt.

The form *πίσυρες* may be akin to Lesbian *πέσσυρες* or *πέσυρες*, but there is no decisive ground for regarding it as *Æolie*.

4. *ὀκτώ*, like *δύω*, is a Dual in form. The primitive ending *-ωυ* (Sanser. *ashṭāu*) may be traced in *ὄγδοος* (*ὄγδωF-ος*, *ὄγδωος*, Lat. *octāvus*).

5. Under *ἐννέα* note the varieties *ἐνα-τος* and *εἶνα-τος* *ninth*, probably for *ἐνφα-τος*; so *εἰνά-κισ*, *εἰνά-νυχες*, *εἰνά-ετες*; also *ἐνν-ἡμαρ* (for *ἐννέ-ημαρ*), *ἐννέ-ωρος* *of nine seasons*, *ἐννήκοντα* (for *ἐννε-ήκοντα*, cp. *τρι-ήκοντα*, &c.) and *ἐνενηκοντα*—the last a form difficult to explain.

The numbers above ten are generally denoted by Compounds of the kind called *Copulative* (Sanser. *dvandva*): *δύω-δεκα* *two and ten*.

The analogy of the Numerals ending in *-ᾶ* (*ἐπτά*, *δέκα*, with the Stems *τετρᾶ-*, *εἰνᾶ-*) has led to the use of *ᾶ* as a connecting vowel in Numerals generally; hence *πεντά-ετες* and *ἑξά-ετες* (*Od.* 3. 115), *ὀκτά-κνημος*, *τεσσαρά-βοιός*, *ἑικοσά-βοιός*. But inversely *ο* is found for *ᾶ* in *πεντηκοντό-γυος* (*Il.* 9. 579); cp. § 124, a.

CHAPTER VII.

USE OF THE CASES.

Introductory.

131.] The Case-Endings and Adverbial Endings serve (as has been said in § 90) to show the relation in which the words to which they are suffixed (Nouns, Pronouns, Adverbs, &c.) stand to the Verb of the Sentence.

This relation may be of three kinds :—

1. The Noun or Pronoun may express the Subject of the Verb : or rather (since a Subject is already given by the Person-Ending) it may *qualify* or *define* the Subject so given. *E. g.* in the sentence βασιλεὺς δίδω-σι *the-king he-gives* βασιλεύς explains the Subject given by the Ending -σι.

2. The Noun &c. may qualify the Predicate given by the Stem of the Verb. *E. g.* in ταῦτα δίδω-σι, ἐμοὶ δίδω-σι, καλῶς δίδω-σι, ἀπο-δίδω-σι the Noun (Pronoun, Adverb, Preposition) qualifies the meaning expressed in the Stem δίδω-.

Constructions of these two kinds are found in Sentences which involve the addition of one word only to the Verb. Those of the second kind might be called 'Adverbial'—using the term in the widest sense, for a word construed with a Verb-Stem.

Note that a Nominative may be used 'adverbially': *e. g.* βασιλεύς ἐσ-τι may mean *he-is king* (as well as *the king he-is*). See § 162.

3. The Noun &c. may be connected with, and serve to qualify, another Noun or Adverbial word. *E. g.* in the sentences βασιλέως υἱὸς δίδωσι, Κύρου βασιλέως περιγίγνεται, the word βασιλέως is not connected with the Verb, but with a Noun.

If the former constructions are 'Adverbial,' these might be called 'Adnominal' or 'Adjectival.' The Sentences in which they are found must contain at least *two* words besides the Verb; they are therefore of a higher order of structure than the two former kinds.

From these relations, again, more complex forms of structure are derived in several ways, which it will be enough to indicate in the briefest manner.

A Verb compounded with a Preposition becomes for the purposes of construction a new Verb, with a syntax of its own.

Similarly, the phrase formed by a Verb and a Noun (Case-form or Adverb) may be equivalent in the construction to a single Verb, and may take a further Adverb, or govern Cases of Nouns accordingly. *E. g.* in κακὰ ῥέζει τινά *he does evil to some*

one the Acc. *τινά* is governed by the phrase *κατὰ ῥέξει*: in *τίεν ἴσα τέκεσσι* *honoured like his children* the Dat. *τέκεσσι* is governed by *τίεν ἴσα*.

Again, the new Case-form or Adverb so 'governed' by a Verb and Noun may belong in sense to the Noun. Thus in the sentence *μέγ' ἔξοχος ἔπλετο* *he is greatly eminent*, since *ἔξοχος* expresses the meaning which *μέγα* is intended to qualify, we may consider that practically *μέγα* is construed with *ἔξοχος* alone. Evidently a qualification of this kind will generally apply only to an Adjective* (just as the degrees of comparison are essentially adjectival). In this way it comes about that an Adverb may in general be used to qualify an Adjective; and that very many Adjectives and Adverbs 'govern' the same Cases as the Verbs which correspond to them in meaning. *E.g.* in *σὺ εἶκελος ἀλκῆν* the Adj. *εἶκελος* takes the construction of a Verb meaning *to be like*.

In a strictly scientific treatment of the Cases the various constructions with the Verb should come before the constructions with Nouns and Prepositions. Such a treatment, however, would have the inconvenience of frequently separating uses of the same Case which are intimately connected. *E.g.* the construction *ἀλγεί τὴν κεφαλὴν* (2) cannot well be separated from the extension of the same construction in *μέγας ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα* (3). The Nominative, too, is used not only as the Subject, but also as the Predicate, or part of it. It will be best therefore to take the several Cases in succession, and to begin with the 'oblique' Cases.

The Accusative.

132.] **Internal and External Object.** The uses of the Accusative have been divided into those in which the Acc. repeats, with more or less modification, the meaning given by the Verb, and those in which the action of the Verb is limited or directed by an 'Object' wholly distinct from it. *E.g.* in the sentence *ἔλκος ὃ με οὔτασε*, lit. *the wound which he wounded me*, *ὃ* (*ἔλκος*) qualifies *οὔτασε* by a word which expresses to some extent the same *thing* as the Verb *οὔτασε*: whereas *με* qualifies it in a different way. As the latter kind of Acc. had been known as the Acc. of the EXTERNAL OBJECT, so the former has more recently been termed the Acc. of the INTERNAL OBJECT. We shall take first the different uses which fall under the description of the 'Acc. of the Internal Object.'

The foundation of this division (as Delbrück observes, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 29) is the circumstance that all Accusatives which

* In later Greek Adverbs are constantly used to qualify substantives: as *ὃ δὲ βασιλεύς, ὃ πρὶν χρόνος*, &c. But this use only becomes possible when we have the Article to show how the Adverb is to be understood.

do not express the external Object of an action may be explained in nearly the same way. The real difficulty arises when we try to find a principle which will explain these different Accusatives and at the same time exclude the relations expressed by other Cases or Adverbial forms. No such principle can be laid down. The fact seems to be that the Accusative originally had a very wide 'Adverbial' use, which was encroached upon by the more specific uses of other Cases. The different constructions included under the 'Internal Object' have all the appearance of fragments of an earlier more elastic usage.

133.] **Neuter Pronouns** may be used in the Accusative 'adverbially,' *i. e.* to define the action of the Verb: as Π. 1. 289 ἄ τω' οὐ πείσεσθαι ὅτω *in which I think that some one will not obey*; Π. 14. 249 ἄλλο ἐπίνυσσεν *gave another lesson*; Od. 23. 24 τοῦτο ὀνήσει *will do this benefit*; Od. 10. 75 τόδ' ἰκάνευς *comest as thou dost*; Π. 5. 827 μήτε σύ γ' Ἄρηα τό γε δειδίθι *fear not Ares as to this*; τόδε χῶεο *be angry at this*; τάδε μαίνεται *does these mad things (=is mad with these acts).*

This use includes the Adverbial τί *why?* (*e. g.* τί ἦλθες *in regard to what have you come?* = what means your coming?): τό *therefore* (§ 262, 3), ὅ, ὅτι *because, that* (§ 269): τὶ *in any way*, οὐδέν *not at all*, ἀμφοτέρων *for both reasons* (Π. 7. 418), δοιᾶ *in two ways* (Od. 2. 46), πάντα *altogether*, &c.; also the combination of Pronoun and Adverb in τὸ πρίν, τὸ πάρος, &c. *the time before* (see § 260, b).

134.] **Neuter Adjectives** are often used in this way; as εὐρὴν ῥέει *flows in a broad stream*, ὀξέα κεκληγῶς *uttering shrill cries*; so πρῶτον, πρῶτα *in the first place*, πολὺ, πολλόν, πολλά *much*, μέγα *greatly*, ὀλίγον, τυτθόν *little*, ἴσον, ἴσα *equally*; ὅσον, τόσον, τοῖον; ἀντίον, ἐναντίον; ὕστερον, ὕστατα, μᾶλλον, μάλιστα, ἄσσον, ἀγχιστα; εὖ (Neut. of ἡῦς or ἐῦς), ἡδύ, δεινόν, δεινά, αἰνά, καλόν, καλά, πυκνά, μακρά, ἀδινά, βαρύ, βαρέα, ὀξύ, ταρφέα, ὑπέρμωρα, ἐνδέξια, ὄχα, ἕξοχα; and many more.

In general there is no difference perceptible between the Neut. Sing. and Neut. Plur. But compare τυτθόν *for a little space*, and τυτθὰ κεῖσθαι *split into little pieces* (Od. 12. 388).

Note the combination of Pronoun and Adjective in τὸ πρῶτον, τὰ πρῶτα, τὸ τρίτον, τὸ τέταρτον: also in τὰ ἄλλα *in other respects*.

This construction is very common in Homer, and may almost be said to be the usual Homeric mode of forming an Adverb. It has been already observed that Adverbs in -ως are comparatively rare in Homer (§ 110).

135.] **Cognate Accusative.** This term denotes that the Verb

is construed with a Substantive in the Acc. of 'cognate' form, or at least of equivalent meaning.

A Cognate Acc. is generally used to introduce the Adjective or Pronoun which really qualifies or defines the predication contained in the Verb: *e.g.* ἀπρηκτον πόλεμον πολεμίζειν *to wage a war without result* (cp. the adverbial use of a Neut. Adj. in ἄλληκτον πολεμίζειν *to war without ceasing*); ὅς κεν ἀρίστην βουλήν βουλεύσῃ *who shall give the best counsel* (= ἄριστα βουλευέσῃ); ἐφίλει παντοίην φιλότητα *treated with all manner of love*; ἰέναι τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν *to go the same way*. So ἐπί-κλησιν καλέουσι *call by way of surname*: and with a Noun in the Plural, βουλὰς βουλεύειν *to give counsel* (from time to time); δάσαντο μοίρας *divided into the several shares*; αἰχμὰς αἰχμάσσουσι νεώτεροι (with repetition for the sake of emphasis), &c.

With a Pronoun referring to a cognate Noun; λώβης . . ἦν ἐμὲ λωβήσασθε, ἔλκος ὃ με βροτῶς οὐτασει, ὑπόσχεσις ἦν περ ὑπέστην, &c.

136.] **Other Adverbial Accusatives.** The following uses may be placed here as more or less analogous to the Cognate Accusative:

(1) Substantives expressing a particular *sphere* or *kind* of the action denoted by the Verb: as—

Il. 6. 292 ἤγαγε Σιδουήθεν . . τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν Ἑλένην περ ἀνήγαγε *the voyage on which he brought back Helen*: (cp. Od. 6. 164 ἦλθον γὰρ καὶ κείσε . . τὴν ὁδὸν ἣ δὴ κτλ.); so ὁδὸν οἴχεσθαι, ὁδὸν ἠγήσασθαι *to lead on the way*; and again ἐξεσίην ἐλθεῖν *to go on an expedition* (and in Od. 21. 20 ἐξεσίην πολλὴν ὁδὸν ἦλθεν *went a long way on an expedition*), ἀγγελίην ἐλθόντα *going on a message*; βουλὰς ἐξάρχων ἀγαθὰς *taking the lead in good counsels*; Od. 8. 23 ἀέθλους . . τοὺς . . ἐπειρήσαντ' Ὀδυσῆος; Od. 19. 393 οὐλὴν τὴν ποτὲ μιν σὺς ἤλασε. So δαινύντα γάμον *holding a wedding-feast*, δαίνν τάφον *gave a funeral feast* (whereas the cognate δαίτην δαινυμένους means *holding an ordinary feast*); ξυνάγωμεν Ἄρηα *let us join battle*, ἔριδα ῥήγνυντο *barēian broke in grievous strife*.

So probably we should explain Il. 1. 31 ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιώσασαν, like Il. 15. 33 φιλότης τε καὶ εὐνὴ ἦν ἐμίγης (cp. Pind. N. 1. 67 ὅταν θεοὶ . . γιγάντεσσι μάχαν ἀντιάζωσι). Also Od. 6. 259 ὄφρ' ἂν μὲν κ' ἀγροὺς ἴομεν καὶ ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων *so long as our way is through fields and tillage of men*,—ἀγροὺς = ὁδὸν ἐν ἀγροῖς.

Note that this construction is chiefly applied to the *familiar* spheres of action—battle, council, feasting, &c.

(2) Abstract Nouns expressing an *attribute* of the action.

Il. 9. 115 οὐ τι ψεῦδος ἐμὰς ἀτας κατέλεξας *with no falsehood*

hast thou recounted my folly : Od. 7. 297 ταῦτά τοι . . ἀληθείην κατέλεξα.

So *δέμας* (in phrases like *δέμας πυρός like fire*), and the Adverbs *ἄκην, ἄδην, λίην*, with many others (see § 110), are originally the Accusatives of Abstract Nouns.

Add the poetical expressions such as *πῦρ ὀφθαλμοῖσι δεδορκῶς with look of fire, μένεα πνέοντες breathing martial fury*.

The phrase *πῦρ δεδορκῶς* is a boldness of language (compared *e.g.* with *δεινὸν δερκόμενοι*) analogous to that which we observed in Compounds such as *ἀελλόπος with storm-(like) feet*, as compared with *ἄκνυ-ποδες, &c.*; see § 126.

(3) The words *ἔργον, ἔπος, μῦθος*, with Pronouns, are used nearly as the Neuter of the same Pronouns : as—

Il. 1. 294 *πάν ἔργον ὑπέξομαι I shall yield in every matter* (*πάν ἔργον = πάντα*) : 5. 757 *οὐ νεμεσίζη Ἄρει τάδε καρτερὰ ἔργα* (constr. like *τόδε χάεο*); cp. 9. 374.

Od. 3. 243 *ἔπος ἄλλο μεταλλῆσαι to ask another question*.

Il. 5. 715 *ἦ ῥ' ἄλιον τὸν μῦθον ὑπέστημεν our promise was idle*.

(4) Words expressing the *sum* or *result* of an action are put in the Acc.; as Il. 4. 207 *ἔβαλεν . . τῷ μὲν κλέος ἄμμι δὲ πένθος*; 24. 735 *ρίψει χειρὸς ἐλῶν ἀπὸ πύργου λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον* : Od. 6. 184. So *ποινήν in compensation, πρόφασιν on the pretence, ἐπίκλησιν nominally, χάριν as a favour* (only in Il. 15. 744).

The use of Substantives to qualify a Verb evidently bears the same relation to the use of Neut. Adjectives as Nouns in Apposition bear to ordinary Adjectives qualifying Nouns.

Note. Many of these constructions have been treated as varieties or extensions of the 'Cognate Accusative.' *E.g.* from *ὄδον ἐλθεῖν* have been explained, on the one hand, *ὄδον ἠγήσασθαι, ὄδον ἀνήγαγε, &c.*, on the other, *ἀγγελίην ἐλθεῖν, &c.*; so *δαίνυντο γάμον, δαῖν τάφον*, have been regarded as modelled on *δαίτην δαίνυσθαι*; *μῦθον ὑπέστημεν* as justified because a promise is a *μῦθος, ψεῦδος κατέλεξας* because *ψεῦδος = a false tale*, and so on. It must not be supposed, however, that these analogies explain any of the uses in question, or that the 'Cognate' Acc. is prior to the others, either in simplicity or in the order of development. If we compare the Cognate Acc. with the use of Neuter Adjectives and Pronouns, we see that (*e.g.*) *ἀριστα βουλεύειν* is simpler, and doubtless earlier in type, than *ἀρίστην βουλήν βουλεύειν, ἃ περ ὑπέστην* than *ὑπόσχεσιν ἦν περ ὑπέστην, τὰ ὑπέστημεν* than *τὸν μῦθον ὑπέστημεν*. Again, *δαίνυσθαι γάμον* is probably an earlier phrase than the tautologous *δαίνυσθαι δαίτην, τὸν μῦθον ὑποστήναι* than *ὑπόσχεσιν ὑποστήναι, &c.* The repetition in the Noun of the Stem already given in the Verb is a feature of complexity which itself needs explaining. The Cognate Acc., in short, is only a special form of the use of the Acc. as a defining or qualifying word. Grammarians have explained other constructions by its help because it is familiar; but in so doing they have fallen into the error of deriving the simple from the complex.

137.] Accusatives of the 'part affected.' Many verbs that are Intransitive or Reflexive in sense take an Acc. restricting

the force of the Verb to a *part* or *attribute* of the subject: as κάμνει χεῖρα *his hand is weary*, πυρὶ χεῖρας ἔοικε *his hands are as fire*, βλήτο κνήμην *was wounded in the shin*, ἀλλάων περιέμι νόον *I am beyond others in understanding*; φρένα τέρπετ' ἀκούων *was pleased at heart listening*; οὐ λήγε μένος *ceased not in his fury*; γένος δ' ἦν ἐκ ποταμοῖο *in descent he was from the river*, γενεῖν ἐφκει (Il. 14. 474) *was like in descent*, i. e. bore 'a family likeness'; ἀθανάτησι δέμας καὶ εἶδος ἐρίζειν *to rival the immortals in form and feature*. See § 141.

These uses differ from other Accusatives of the *sphere* of an action in the distinctly *concrete* nature of the words employed. The Acc. does not express the notion of the Verb, or an attribute of it, but merely denotes a *thing* by reference to which it is limited or characterised. Thus in κάμνει χεῖρα the Aec. limits the action κάμνει—'feels hand-weariness.' The relation is local or instrumental, though not so expressed. The meaning 'in or with the hand' is conveyed, because it is the only one possible—the only way in which the notion *hand* can qualify the notion *weariness*.

The 'Aec. of the part affected,' or 'Aec. of reference,' is characteristic of Greek: hence it is called *Accusativus Graecus* by the Latin grammarians. It is unknown, or nearly so, in Sanscrit. We cannot infer, however, that it originated with the Greeks, especially as it is found in Zend (Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. 33): but it may have been extended in Greek. The alternative Case is generally the Instrumental: cp. Il. 3. 194 εὐρύτερος ὄμοισιν ἰδὲ στέρνοισιν ἰδέσθαι, but 2. 478 ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν ἱκελος Διὶ. Or the sense may be further defined by a Preposition: πρὸς στήθος, κατὰ φρένα, &c.

138.] **Accusative of Time and Space.** The word expressing *duration* of time is put in the Acc., as ἕνα μῆνα μένων *waiting a month*, χεῖμα εὔδει *sleeps through the winter*, τρὶς ἀνάσθαι γένε' ἀνδρῶν *to reign for three generations of men*.

The Accusative of Space expresses the *extent* of an action, as Il. 23. 529 λείπετο δουρὸς ἔρωήν *was a spear's throw behind*.

These Accusatives are to be compared with the Neuter Adjectives of quantity, as πολὺ, ὀλίγον, τυτθόν, τόσον, &c.

139.] **Accusative with Nouns.** The chief uses are:—

(1) Neut. Adjectives, as μέγ' ἔξοχος *greatly surpassing*.

(2) Cognate Accusative, as Il. 15. 641 ἀμείνων παντοίας ἀρετᾶς *better in every kind of excellence*. This is rare in Homer.

(3) Acc. of the 'part affected'; ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν ἱκελος *like in eyes and head*, (cp. χεῖρας ἔοικε), βοὴν ἀγαθός *good in shouting*,

γένος κακὸς καὶ ἀναλκίς *a coward by right of descent*. With a Substantive: χεῖράς τ' αἰχμητῆν ἔμειναι.

140.] **Accusative of the External Object.** Under this head it is unnecessary to do more than notice one or two points:—

(1) The ceremonial words ἀπάρχω, κατάρχομαι, &c. are construed according to the acquired meaning: as τρίχας ἀπάρχειν *to cut off hair as a preliminary*, cp. Od. 3. 445 (with the note in Riddell and Merry's edition). So Il. 24. 710 τὸν . . τιλλέσθην *mourned him by tearing their hair*: and ὄρκια τέμνειν *to make a treaty (by slaying a victim)*.

(2) The Verbs εἶπον, ἀνθάω, &c. may take an Acc. of the person spoken to: Il. 5. 170 ἔπος τέ μιν ἀντίον ἠῶδα: Il. 13. 725 Πουλυδάμας θρασὺν Ἔκτορα εἶπε. Cp. Il. 9. 59., 17. 651, Od. 4. 155. But this construction is rare with the simple Verbs: it is found *passim* with Compounds (προσηῦδα, προσέειπε, &c.).

(3) An Acc. may be used of the person *about* whom something is told, known, thought, &c.—

(a) If a person or a thing is treated as the *thing said, known, &c.* (not merely spoken or known *about*): as Il. 1. 90 οὐδ' ἦν Ἀγαμέμνονα εἶπης *not even if you say Agamemnon* (cp. οὐνομα εἰπεῖν); 3. 192 εἶπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε *tell me this man too*. So with οἶδα when it means only to know *what a thing is*: as Il. 6. 150 ὄφρ' ἐν εἰδήσῃ ἡμετέρεην γενεήν, πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἴσασιν: and with μέμνημαι, as Il. 9. 527 μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον; Il. 23. 361 ὡς μεμνέετο δρόμους *that he might remember the courses (i. e. remember how many there were)*; Il. 6. 222 Τυδέα δ' οὐ μέμνημαι (of remembering his existence). The Acc. implies that the person is the whole fact remembered. But with a Gen. μέμνημαι means *I remember something about, I bethink myself of* (§ 151, d).

(b) If the real Object of the Verb is a *fact* expressed by a limiting word or clause: as Il. 2. 81 ψεῦδος κεν φαῖμεν *we should call it false*; Il. 6. 50 αἶ κεν ἐμὲ ζῶν πεπύθοιτο *if he heard of me alive (of my being alive)*; Il. 5. 702 ἐπύθοντο μετὰ Τρώεσσω Ἄρηα *heard of Ares among the Trojans*. Especially with a Participle, as Od. 17. 549 εἶ κ' αὐτὸν γνώω νημερτέα πάντ' ἐνέποντα *if I find him telling (that he is telling) nothing but truth* (§ 245, 2). And with a subordinate clause, as Il. 2. 409 ἦδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀδελφεὸν ὡς ἐπονείτο; Il. 8. 535 αὔριον ἦν ἀρετὴν διαίσειται εἶ κ' ἐμὸν ἔγχος μείλη ἐπερχόμενον *he will know about his valour, whether he will withstand my spear (i. e. whether his valour is such that &c.)*; cp. 13. 275., 18. 601., 20. 311.

(4) The Acc. of the object to which motion is directed (*terminus ad quem*) is common with ἰκνέομαι, ἴκω, ἰκάνω (which always

imply *reaching* a point), but is comparatively rare with other simple Verbs, such as εἶμι, ἔρχομαι, νέομαι, ἄγω, ἡγέομαι. The words so used with these Verbs are mostly Nouns denoting *house* (δῶ, Il. 7. 363, &c.; δόμον, Od. 7. 22, Il. 22. 482; οἶκον, Od. 14. 167), *city* (Od. 6. 114., 15. 82), *native land* (Il. 7. 335., 15. 706): cp. also Il. 1. 322 ἔρχεσθον κλισίην; 6. 87 ξυνάγουσα γεραιὰς νηόν; 21. 40 Ἀημνον ἐπέρασσεν; Od. 4. 478 Αἰγύπτιοι ὕδωρ ἔλθης.

Compound Verbs—esp. with the Prepositions εἰς, ἐπί, πρὸς, ὑπό, παρά—usually take an Acc. of this kind.

There is no reason to infer from these and similar instances that the Accusative is originally the Case of the *terminus ad quem*. It is natural that a Verb of motion should be defined or qualified by a Noun expressing *place*, and that such a Noun should generally denote the place *to which* the motion is directed. But this is not necessary. The Acc. is used with Verbs denoting *motion from*, as φεύγω, νοσφίζομαι, ὑποείκω (Il. 15. 228); and even with other Verbs of motion it may express the *terminus a quo* if the context suggests it, as ἀνεδύσето κῦμα rose from the wave, ὑπερώϊα κατέβαινε came down from the upper chambers.

The uses with Prepositions are treated of in the sections dealing with the several Prepositions (181–218).

141.] **Double Accusatives.** It is needless to enumerate the different circumstances in which a Verb may be construed with two Accusatives. Many examples will be found among the passages already quoted; and it will be seen that the combination of an Acc. of the External Object with one of the various ‘Accusatives of the Internal Object’ is especially frequent. Thus with Verbs of *saying* the Acc. of the *thing* said may be combined with an Acc. of the *person* spoken to: as Il. 5. 170 ἔπος τέ μιν ἀντίον ἠῦδα (so 9. 58., 16. 207, Od. 23. 91). Again, with Verbs of *taking away* there may be an Acc. of the *thing* taken and the *person* from whom it is taken: as Il. 8. 108 οὓς ποτ’ ἀπ’ Αἰνείαν ἐλόμην, Il. 6. 70 ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τὰ ἔκηλοι νεκροὺς ἀμ πεδίων συλήσετε (cp. 16. 58., 17. 187). So with Verbs of *cleansing*; Il. 16. 667 κελαινεφές αἶμα κάθηρον ἐλθὼν ἐκ βελέων Σαρπηδόνα (cp. 18. 345); also Od. 6. 224 χρῶα νίζεται δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἄλμην, and (with three Accusatives) Il. 21. 122 οἱ σ’ ὠτειλὴν αἶμ’ ἀπολιχμήσονται. In such cases the Verb almost seems to be used in different senses—*cleanse* Sarpedon, *cleanse away* the blood, &c.

In some cases the two Accusatives are not to be explained independently, but one is construed with the phrase formed by the Verb in combination with the other. Thus we cannot say ῥέξειν τινὰ *to do to a person*, but we may have κακὸν ῥέξειν τινὰ *to do evil to a person or thing*: e. g.—

Il. 9. 540 ὃς κακὰ πόλλ’ ἔρδεσκεν ἔθων Οἰνῆος ἄλωήν.
647 ὡς μ’ ἀσύφηλον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξευ.

The notion 'doing' given by *ρέζω* is so vague that an Acc. of the person would be ambiguous: but the more definite notions of doing evil, &c. become susceptible of the construction. So with *εἰπεῖν*, as Od. I. 302 *ἵνα τίς σε ἐὺ εἴπῃ* may speak well of thee: cp. II. 6. 479.

A similar account is to be given of the 'Accusative of the Whole and Part,' which is very common in Homer; e.g. τὸν βάλε κνήμην *him he smote on the shin*, σὲ φύγεν ἔρκος ὀδόντων *has escaped you over the fence of teeth*. The second Acc. has been sometimes explained as parallel in construction to the first, the part being added 'epexegetically' or in 'Apposition' to the whole. But it is impossible to separate τὸν βάλε κνήμην from βλήτο κνήμην: in both the Acc. of the part is a *limiting* Accusative. The difference between this and a double Acc. arising from Apposition appears if we consider that

Τρῶας δὲ τρόμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἕκαστον

is equivalent to Τρῶες ἔτρεμον τὰ γυῖα ἕκαστος, where ἕκαστος is (as before) epexegetic of Τρῶες, but γυῖα is an Acc. qualifying the Verb.

The Dative.

142.] Comparison of the Case-system of Greek with that of Sanscrit shows that the Greek Dative does the work of three Sanscrit Cases, the Dative, the Instrumental, and the Locative. There is also reason to think that distinct forms for these three Cases survived down to a comparatively late period in Greek itself. This is made probable (1) by the traces in Homeric Greek of Instrumental and Locative Case-forms, and (2) by the readiness with which the *uses* of the Greek Dative (especially in Homer) can be re-apportioned between the three Cases—the original or true Dative, and the two others.

143.] **The true Dative** expresses the person *to* or *for* whom something is done, or who is regarded as chiefly affected or interested: e.g.—

II. I. 283 Ἀχιλλῆϊ μεθέμεν χόλον *to put away his anger for (in favour of) Achilles*; cp. Od. II. 553.

Od. I. 9 τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο *took away for (i. e. from) them*.

II. 21. 360 τί μοι ἔριδος καὶ ἀρωγῆς; *what is there for me (that concerns me) in strife and help?*

Od. 7. 303 μή μοι τοῦνεκ' ἀμύμονα νείκεε κούρην *chide not for me on that account the blameless maiden*; cp. II. 14. 501.

Od. 9. 42 ὥς μή τίς μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κλοι ἴσῃς *that for me no one should go away wronged (i. e. that I might see that no one &c.)*.

II. I. 250 τῷ δύο γενεαὶ ἐφθίατο *he had seen two generations pass*.

Il. 12. 374 ἐπειγομένοισι δ' ἴκοντο *they came for them when hard pressed, i. e. their coming was (what such a thing is) to hard pressed men.* So Il. 14. 108 ἐμοὶ δέ κεν ἀσμένῳ εἶη *it would be for me when welcoming it, i. e. would be what I welcome: Od. 21. 115 οὗ κέ μοι ἀχρυνμένῳ κτλ.*

The Dat. with Verbs of *giving, showing, telling (a fact), praying, helping, pleasing, favouring, being angry, &c.*, and the corresponding Adjectives (φίλος, ἐχθρός, &c.), is evidently of this kind.

The so-called *Dativus commodi*, 'Ethical Dative,' &c. need not be separated from the general usage. Note however that—

1. The Dative of the Personal Pronouns is very often used where we should have a Possessive agreeing with a Noun in the Clause; as Il. 1. 104 ὅσσε δέ οἱ πυρὶ εἴκητην *his eyes were like fire; Od. 2. 50 μητέρι μοι μνηστήρες ἐπέχραον the suitors have assailed my mother; so Il. 1. 55, 150, 188, 200, &c.*

2. δέχομαι with the Dat. means *to take as a favour: Il. 15. 87 Θέμιστι δέκτο δέπας accepted the cup from Themis (as a compliment); or to take as an attendant does, Il. 2. 186., 13. 710., 17. 207, Od. 15. 282.* For the Gen. see § 152.

3. ἀκούω with the Dat. means *to hear favourably; Il. 16. 515 ἀκούειν ἀνέρι κηδομένῳ; and so κλῦθί μοι in prayers (Il. 5. 115, Od. 2. 262).* See § 151, d.

4. The Dat. with Verbs meaning *to give commands (κελεύω, σημαίνω, &c.)*, and *to lead the way (ἄρχω, ἡγέομαι, ἡγεμονεύω)* is apparently the true Dat. But this does not apply to Verbs meaning *to have power, to be king (as κρατέω, ἀνάσσω): e.g. ἀναστέμεν Ἀργείοισι probably means to be king among the Argives (Loc.).* See § 145 (7, a).

5. The 'Dat. of the Agent' with Passive Verbs seems to be a special application of the true Dat.; cp. Il. 13. 168 ὃ οἱ κλισίῃφι λέλειπτο *which for him was (= which he had) left in the tent, ἔχεθ' Ἕκτορι was had as wife by Hector.* So Τρωσὶν δαμναμένους, Πηλείωι δαμείς, &c. because the victory is *gained* by the victor; and so in Attic, ἠθροίσθη Κύρῳ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν 'Cyrus got his Greek force collected.' The restriction to Past Tenses is intelligible, because the *past fact* is thought of as a kind of *possession* or *advantage* (cp. the English auxiliary *have* of past events). This view is strongly supported by the Latin Dat. of the Agent, which is not common except with Verbals and Past Participles (Roby, § 1146). Evidently *nobis facienda* = 'things for us to do,' *nobis facta* = 'things we have got done.'

The true Dat. of Nouns denoting *things* is rare in Greek (perhaps only used when the thing is regarded as an agent, or stands for a person, as Πριάμοιο βίη for Πριάμος).

In this respect Latin offers a marked contrast; cp. the various uses, especially of abstract Substantives, explained by Mr. Roby under the headings 'indirect object' (1143, n. 11), 'work contemplated' (1156), 'predicative dative' (1158 ff.). The source of the difference evidently is that the Dat. is not liable, as in Greek, to be confounded with the Loc. and Instrum. It will be seen however that the Greek Infinitive is in fact the Dat. of an abstract Substantive.

144.] **The Instrumental Dative.** The so-called Instrumental Case appears to have been employed to express whatever accompanies or shares in an action:—not only the instrument or cause, but any attendant object or circumstance. Hence it covers the ground of the Datives of 'circumstance,' 'manner,' &c.

The Dat. of *circumstance* &c. is common with abstract or semi-abstract words: as ἡχῆ *with noise* (κλαγγῆ, ἀλαλητῶ, ἐνοπή, &c.); σιγῆ, σιωπῆ; αἰδοῖ *with reverence* (Od. 8. 172); ἀνάγκη, βίη, σπουδῆ; κακῆ αἴση *with evil fortune*; φυγῆ (ἵκοντο) *in flight*; κερδοσύνη *in his cunning*; γενεῆ *by descent*.

In Homer it often expresses the *reason* or *occasion* (for which *Madv. 41* διά with the Acc. is regular in later Greek): Od. 3. 363 φιλότητι ἔπονται *accompany out of friendship (propter amorem)*; Od. 9. 19 ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν ἀνθρώποισι μέλω *who am regarded by men for my craft* (cp. 13. 299); Il. 16. 628 ὀνειδείους ἐπέεσσι χωρήσουσι *will give way for reviling words*; Od. 14. 206 τίετο . . ὄλβῳ τε πλούτῳ τε καὶ υἰάσι; Od. 17. 423 οἷσιν τ' εὖ ζῶουσι καὶ ἀφρευτοὶ καλέονται *things because of which men live well and are called opulent*. So of an almost personal agent, Od. 14. 299 ἣ δ' ἔθεεν Βορρῆ ἀνέμῳ *the ship coursed on with (driven by) the North wind*.

The 'comitative' or 'sociative' sense is chiefly found in the *Madv. 42* Plural, which denotes *attendants, surroundings, adjuncts, &c.*; Il. 18. 506 τοῖσιν ἔπειτ' ἦισσον *with these (the sceptres) they started up*; Od. 4. 8 ἵπποισι καὶ ἄρμασι πέμπε *sent with horses and chariots* (cp. 4. 533); Od. 11. 161 νηὶ τε καὶ ἐτάροισι *with a ship and comrades*; Il. 12. 28 κύμασι πέμπε *let go with the waves*; Il. 2. 818 μεμαότες ἐγχείρῃσι *ardent with their spears*; Il. 6. 243 ξεστῆς αἰθούσῃσι τετυγμένον *built with smooth porticoes* (cp. Od. 9. 185, &c.); Il. 2. 148 ἐπὶ τ' ἡμῦει ἀσταχύεσσι *bends forward with the ears* (of a field of corn): Il. 6. 513 τεύχεσι παμφαίνων *glittering with his armour*; similarly Il. 100 στήθεσι παμφαίνοντας *shining with (naked) breasts*. For the corresponding Sing. cp. Od. 10. 140 νηὶ κατηγούμεσθα; Od. 9. 68 ἐπ' ὤρσ' ἄνεμον Βορρῆν λαίλαπι θεσπεσίῃ; Od. 12. 241 ὑπένερθε δὲ γαῖα φάνεσκε ψάμμῳ κυανῆ *the ground showed beneath with its dark sand*; Il. 15. 282 ἐπιστάμενος ἄκουτι.

This Dative is idiomatically used with αὐτός: as Il. 8. 24 αὐτῇ κεν γαίῃ ἐρύσαιμ' αὐτῇ δὲ θαλάσῃ *with the earth and sea as well*

(without their losing hold): Od. 14. 77 *θέρμ' αὐτοῖς ὀβελοῖσι hot with the spits as they were**.

The Dative with Verbs meaning *to be with, to follow, to join, to agree with, to be like, &c.*, and again with the Prepositions *σύν* and *ἅμα*, and the various Pronouns and Adjectives meaning *the same, equal, like, &c.*, is generally Instrumental.

The Dat. with Verbs meaning *to fight, strive, &c.* may be the Instrumental or (more probably) the true Dat. Words meaning to trust &c. probably take an Instrumental Dat. of the ground of trust, a true Dat. of the person trusted or obeyed: cp. the Lat. construction of *confidere* with a Dat. or Abl.

With Verbs meaning *to be pleased* the Dat. is doubtless Instrumental: as Il. 21. 45 *ἑτέρπετο οἴσι φίλοισι hab. pleasure with his friends* (so Od. 14. 245). This is still more clear in Il. 5. 682 *χάρη δ' ἄρα οἱ προσιόντι* and Il. 23. 556 *χαίρων Ἀντιλόχῳ ὅτι κτλ. 'rejoiced at the fact (of his coming, &c.).'*

The Instrum. is used in Sanscrit of the space *over which* action extends. The nearest approach to this in Greek is the Dat. of the *way by which*: cp. the Adverbs *ἦ, τῆ, τῆδε, πῆ, ὅπη, πάντη*. But see § 158, *note*.

The Dat. is probably Instrumental (not Locative) in Od. 1. 197 *κατερύκεται εὐρέϊ πόντῳ (by, not on, the sea)*. Also with *δέχομαι, &c.*, as Il. 6. 136 *ὑπέδέξατο κόλπῳ*, Od. 16. 70 *ὑποδέξομαι οἴκῳ*. In later Greek *δέχομαι* is construed with *οἴκῳ, πόλει, &c.* without a Preposition.

Note the occasional use of the Instrumental Dat. with Verbs of *buying*, as Il. 7. 475 *οἰνίζοντο ἄλλοι μὲν χαλκῷ κτλ.*, Od. 15. 483 *πρίατο κτεάτεσσιν εἰοῖσιν* (cp. Il. 4. 161 *σύν τε μεγάλῳ ἀπέτισαν*): with Verbs of *abounding*, Il. 17. 56 *βρῦει ἄνθει λευκῷ* (§ 151, e):

* Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 58) notices the difficulty of finding a special explanation of the 'sociative' use of the Dat. in combination with *αὐτός*. It may help towards such an explanation to observe that the use of a Case-form in a particular sense not unfrequently depends upon the presence of a qualifying word in agreement with it. *E. g.*—

ἐμοὶ βουλομένῳ ἐστὶ ἰσὶ it is for me what I desire.

τοῖχου τοῦ ἑτέρου by the wall on the other side.

μέσσω δουρὸς ἑλάν taking the spear by the middle.

εἰ τεθνεώτος ἀκούσαι if he were to hear of his being dead.

ἤχθητο Τρωσὶν δαμναμένους he was vexed at their being subdued by Trojans.

In each of these instances the qualifying word indicates the sense in which the Case is used, and so makes the use possible. The 'ethical Dat.' is suggested by *βουλομένῳ*, the Gen. of *place* by *ἑτέρου*, the Gen. of *part* by *μέσσω*, the *fact about the person* by *τεθνεώτος*, the *cause of feeling* by *δαμναμένους*. Now, in such a phrase as *αὐτοῖς ὀβελοῖσι spits and all*, the force of *αὐτός* is 'without change,' 'as before,' and so the phrase means *with the meat sticking to the spits as before* (cp. *αὐτως, αὐτοῦ, αὐθι*). Thus the sociative sense is emphasised by the addition of *αὐτοῖς*. Without such an addition there would generally be nothing to decide between the different possible meanings of the Dative, and consequently a Preposition (*σύν* or *ἅμα*) would be needed.

also with a Verb of 'cognate' meaning, as *θάνον οϊκτίστῳ θανάτῳ* (Od. 11. 412), *ρέον ὕδατι* (Od. 5. 70).

145.] **The Locatival Dative.** The Dative without a Preposition denoting the *place* of an action is much commoner in Homer than in later Greek, though already restricted to a comparatively narrow range. It is used—

(1) Of towns and countries: *Ἰλίῳ εἰσί* are in *Ilios*, *Φρυγίῃ ναίεσκε* dwell in *Phrygia*: so *Οὐλύμπῳ*, *Λακεδαίμονι*, *Δήλῳ*, *Σχερίῃ*, *Κυθήροισι*, *Θήβῃ*, *Κρήτῃ*, *Ἄργεϊ*, *Ἑλλάδι*, &c. So too *Ἄϊδι*.

(2) Of the great divisions of the world, the chief spheres of action, &c., as *αἰθέρι*, *οὐρανῷ*, *οὐρεσι*, *ἀγρῷ* *afield*, *δόμῳ* *in the house*, *νομῷ* *at pasture*, *πόντῳ* *out at sea*, *αἰγιαλῷ* *on the shore*, *χέρσῳ* *on dry land* (Il. 4. 424-5), *οὔδει* *on the ground*, *πεδίῳ*, *χθονί*; *χορῷ* *at the dance*, *μάχῃ*, *βουλῇ*, *ἀγορῇ*, *τραπέζῃ* *at table* (Od. 21. 35), *σέλαι πυρός* *in the fire light*.

But the Dat. in *ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι* (Il. 1. 8), *ὕσμῃνι μάχεσθαι* (Il. 2. 863), &c. is one of *manner* (Instr.), rather than of place.

(3) Of the *parts* of a thing, especially of the body; *ᾧμῳ* and *ᾧμοισι*, *κεφαλῇ*, *χρoτί*; *καρδίῃ*, *φρεσί*, *θυμῷ*; *ἀκροτάτῃ κορυφῇ*, *ἔσχατῇ πολέμοιο*, *μύχῳ Ἄργεος* (*θαλάμοιο*, &c.), *μέσῳ ἔρκει*, *πρώτῃσι πύλῃσι*, *γουνῷ ἀλωῆς*, *βένθεσι λίμνης*, *τάρφεσι* *ἕλης*, &c.

The Dat. of the part *with* which a person does something may be Instrumental; as *χερσὶ μαχήσομαι*, *κεφαλῇ κατανεύσομαι*, *ἐκὼν ἀέκοντί γε θυμῷ*. But the Locative mode of expression is the prevailing one; cp. *ἐν χεῖρεσσι λάβ' ἦνια*, *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι*, *ἐγνώ ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσί*, *ἐν θυμῷ μεμαῶτες*, &c. Hence the common use of *χειρί*, *χερσὶ*, &c. with *ἔχω*, *αἰρέω*, *λαμβάνω*, and the use of *θυμῷ*, *φρεσί*, &c. with Verbs of *knowing*, *thinking*, *feeling*; are doubtless Locatival.

(4) With some Verbs that imply locality, *ναίω*, *τίθημι*, *κείμει*, *ἤμαι* (Od. 20. 22 *πυχι Οὐλύμποιο ἤμενος*); esp. *κλίνω*, as Il. 11. 371 *στήλῃ κεκλιμένος*, and (in the derived sense) Il. 5. 709 *λίμνῃ κεκλιμένος*.

(5) Of *time*: *ἡματι τῷ ὅτε* κτλ. *on the day when* &c., *θέρεϊ* *in summer*, *ᾠρῃ χειμερινῇ* *in the season of winter*, &c.

(6) After a Verb of motion (where we expect *εἰς* or *πρός* with the Acc.): as Il. 5. 82 *πεδίῳ πέσε* *fell on the plain*; Il. 7. 187 *οὐδ. 5. 374* *κυνῆ βάλε* *threw into the helmet*; Il. 3. 10 *εὐτ' ὄρεος κορυφῇσι Νότος κατέχευεν ὀμίχλην* *has spread a mist over the tops of the mountains*; *προκαλέσσατο χάρμῃ* *called out (to meet) in combat*. This idiom helps to show that the use of the Accusative for the *terminus ad quem* of motion does not represent the original force of that Case.

The Dat. after the Prepositions ἐν, ἐπί, παρά, μετά, ὑπό, ἀνά, περί, ἀμφί, and the Verbs compounded with them, is generally Locatival. It is used (like the simple Dat.) after Verbs of motion: see §§ 194, 198, 202, 206.

The sense may admit or require a true Dat.: ep. Il. 1. 174 πᾶρ' ἐμοί γε καὶ ἄλλοι *others are at hand with me* (Loc.), or *I have others at my command* (true Dat.). So Il. 7. 73 ὑμῖν ἐν γὰρ ἔασι may mean *there are among you* (Loc.), or *you have* (true Dat.) *among you*. Cp. Lat. *inesse alicui* or *in aliquo*.

(7) The Locatival Dat. of *persons* is chiefly found in the Plural:—

(a) with κρατέω, ἀνάσσω, βασιλεύω: Il. 2. 669 θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀνάσσει *is king among gods and men*; Od. 1. 71 οὖν κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον πᾶσιν Κυκλώπεσσι; Il. 13. 217 ὃς πάσῃ Πλευρῶνι καὶ αἰπεινῇ Καλυδῶνι Αἰτωλοῖσιν ἄνασσε. Cp. the equivalent constructions with Prepositions, as Il. 1. 252 μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσε, Od. 7. 62 ὃς ἐν Φαίηξιν ἄνασσε, and the compound ἐμβασιλεύω. This group of uses is almost confined to Homer.

(b) in phrases introducing a speech, as τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη, τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἦρχε, and the like; ep. Il. 19. 175 ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἀναστάς, 9. 528 ἐν δ' ὑμῖν ἐρέω, Od. 10. 188 μετὰ πᾶσιν ἔειπον, 16. 378 ἐρέει δ' ἐν πᾶσιν ἀναστάς.

(c) meaning 'in the sight of,' 'in the opinion of,' &c. as Il. 2. 285 πᾶσιν ἐλέγχιστον θέμεναι μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσι: 11. 58 ὃς Τρωσὶ θεὸς ὡς τίετο δῆμῳ. Cp. Il. 23. 703 ἐνὶ σφίσι τῶν. So in Sanscrit the Loc. is used of the person *with* or *before* whom conduct is judged: 'may we be guiltless before Varuṇa' (Delbrück, *A. S.* p. 118).

(d) occasionally with Adjectives implying eminence &c., as Il. 6. 477 ἀριπρεπέα Τρώεσσι *distinguished among the Trojans*, Od. 15. 227 Πυλίοισι μέγ' ἕξοχα δώματα ναίων.

The Genitive.

146.] The Greek Genitive, as appears at once by comparison with Latin or Sanscrit, stands for the original or 'true' Genitive, and also for the Ablative. The uses of the Gen. may therefore be divided (theoretically at least) between these two Cases. The distinction however is more difficult than in the case of the Dative; partly, perhaps, because the Case-forms of the Ablative were earlier lost than those of the Locative and Instrumental, but also from the peculiar syntactical character of the Genitive.

The Ablative (like the cases already treated of) belongs originally to the second group of constructions distinguished in § 131, *i. e.* it is construed with

the predicate given by a *Verb*. The Genitive is originally of the third group ; and properly qualifies a *Noun*. Hence the Ablative and Genitive uses are generally distinguished partly in meaning, partly in grammatical structure. But they are not always distinguished by the structure, since (1) the Ablative (like the Acc. and Dat.) may be construed with an Adjective, and (2) the true Gen. may be predicative (like an Adj.), and thus apparently construed with a Verb. To give a single example : *θεῶν γόνος ἐστὶ* might be (theoretically) = *he is offspring from-gods* (Abl.), and on the other hand *θεῶν γέγονε* may be = *he is offspring of-gods* (Gen., see § 148).

147.] **The Genitive with Nouns.** The manner in which a Genitive serves to define or qualify the 'governing' Noun may be very various. *E.g.* *Τρώων χόλος* may mean *anger of* (i. e. *felt by*) *the Trojans*, or (as in *Il. 6. 335*) *anger at the Trojans*, or *anger on account of the Trojans* (as in *Il. 15. 138* *χόλον υἱὸς ἔηος* means *anger about the death of his son*). Compare also—

ἔρκος πολέμοιο a bulwark in (or against) war.

ἔρκος ὀδόντων the fence (made) of teeth.

τέρας μερόπων ἀνθρώπων a sign to men.

λάθρη Λαομέδοντος with secrecy from Laomedon.

βίη ἀέκοντος with force used to one unwilling.

κύματα παντοίων ἀνέμων the waves raised by all winds.

ὄμφαλοι κασσιτεροῦ bosses made of tin.

Ἴλιον πτολίεθρον the town of Ilios.

Ἵϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας swift Ajax son of Oileus.

δαιμόνιε ξείνων unaccountable stranger !

νομὸς ὕλης pasture ground in the wood.

νόστος γαίης Φαιήκων return to the land of the Phaeacians.

ὑπόψιος ἄλλων suspected by others.

ἐπίστροφος ἀνθρώπων going about among men.

ἀφνειὸς βιότιο rich in substance.

ἴθυς Διομήδεος straight for Diomedes.

The different uses of the Genitive often answer to the different meanings given by the Suffixes which serve to form Adjectives from Nouns (§ 117). Compare, for instance, *Il. 2. 54* *Νέστορέη παρὰ νηὶ Πυλογενέος βασιλῆος* by the ship of Nestor the Pylian king ; *Il. 6. 180* *θεῖον γένος οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων* the offspring of gods, not of men ; *τόξον αἰγός* (*Il. 4. 105*) a bow of goat's horn, but *ἄσκος αἰγείου* a bag of goatskin ; *Ἵϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας* and *Αἴας Ἵϊλιάδης* ; *Τελαμώνιος υἱὸς* the son of Telamon ; and so in the Pronouns, *ἐμέοιο ποθῆ* (*Il. 6. 362*), but *σῆ ποθῆ* (*Il. 19. 321*).

These uses have been classified as Objective and Subjective, Possessive, Partitive, Material, &c. In many cases however the variety of relations expressed by the Gen. eludes this kind of analysis. Such classifications, moreover, are apt to lead us into the fallacy of thinking that relations which are distinct to us, because expressed by different language, were distinctly conceived by those who expressed them all in the same way ;—the fallacy, in

short, of supposing the distinctions of thought to be prior to the language which embodies them.

The relation of the Genitive to the governing Noun is in many ways analogous to the relation of the Accusative to the Verb, and also to that which subsists between the first part of a Compound Noun and the second. In each of these cases the relation is that of a defining or qualifying word to the notion defined or qualified, and it is one which may be of various kinds, as may be suggested by particular combinations of meaning.

Notice, as especially frequent in Homer—

(1) the use of a Gen. after Nouns meaning *grief, anger, &c.*, to express the *object or cause of the feeling*: as ἄχος ἠνιόχοιο *grief for the chariot-driver* (Il. 8. 124, 316, &c.), ἄχος σέθεν (Il. 4. 169); ὀδύνη Ἡρακλήος (Il. 15. 25); πένθος παιδὸς ἀποφθιμένοιο (Il. 18. 88); κήδε' ἔμων ἑτάρων (Il. 22. 272, Od. 11. 382); and so in the much-disputed phrase Ἐλένης ὀρμήματά τε στοναχάς τε (Il. 2. 356, 590), which can only mean *efforts and groans about Helen*.

(2) the 'partitive' use after τίς (Interrog.) and τις (Indef.), often with several words interposed: as Il. 1. 8 τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν κτλ.; Il. 1. 88 οὗ τις ἐμεῦ ζῶντος . . . χεῖρας ἐποίησε συμπάντων Δαναῶν *no one shall . . . of all the Greeks*.

The partitive Gen. is also seen in the Homeric phrases δια θεῶν *bright one among goddesses*, δια γυναικῶν, δαιμόνιε ξείνων, πάντων ἀριδείκετον ἀνδρῶν (Il. 14. 320): where the governing word implies some kind of distinction or eminence. So when there is a contrast, as—

Il. 11. 761 πάντες δ' εὐχετόωντο θεῶν Διὶ Νέστορι τ' ἀνδρῶν.

148.] **Genitive in the Predicate.** Among the various uses of the Gen. in construction with a Verb the first to be noticed are those in which the Case evidently retains its attributive or adjectival character. This use is rare in Homer: examples are,—αἵματός εἰς ἀγαθοῖο *thou art of good blood*, ἐποίησεν σάκος αἰόλον ἑπταβόειον ταύρων ζατρεφέων *made a shield seven hides thick, of (hides of) goodly bulls*. In classifying the Greek uses of the Gen. the chief object is to separate constructions of this kind (in which the Case is ultimately the adjectival or 'true' Gen.) from those in which it represents an Ablative, and therefore is essentially akin to the Adverbs.

* Prof. Max Müller (*Lectures*, I, p. 103) shows how the Genitive Ending -οιο (for -ο-οιο) may be explained as a Suffix of the same kind as those which form Adjectives from Nouns. If his hypothesis is admitted, the Genitive is simply 'an Adjective without Gender,' in respect of *form* as well as *use*. And even if the identification on which he chiefly relies (of the Case-ending -σγα and Suffix -τυα with the Pronoun *syas, syá, tyad*) should be thought open to question, there can be little doubt that the Case is originally 'adnominal' or adjectival in character.

This use of the Gen. is singularly common in Latin : see Roby, § 1282. The reason for this difference between Greek and Latin evidently is that in Latin the Gen. is not confounded with the Abl. The same explanation has been given of the free use which Latin makes of the predicative Dative (§ 143, note).

149.] Genitive of Place. A Gen. expresses a vague local relation (*within, in the sphere of, &c.*), in the following uses :—

(1) After a negative—

Il. 17. 372 νέφος δ' οὐ φαίνεται πάσης γαίης οὐτ' ὄρέων.

Od. 3. 251 ἢ οὐκ Ἄργεος ἦεν Ἀχαιϊκοῦ. Cp. 14. 98., 21. 109.

(2) When two *sides* or *alternative* places are contrasted—

Il. 9. 219 αὐτὸς δ' ἀντίον ἴζεν Ὀδυσσεύς θείου

τοίχου τοῦ ἑτέρου. Cp. 24. 598.

Od. 1. 23 Αἰθίοπας, τοὶ διχθὰ δεδαίαται, ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν,
οἱ μὲν δυσομένου Ὑπερίονος, οἱ δ' ἀνιώντος,

and so perhaps Od. 12. 27 ἢ ἀλὸς ἢ ἐπὶ γῆς, and Od. 4. 678 αὐλῆς ἐκτὸς ἑῶν *in the court outside* (cp. 9. 239).

(3) With Verbs of motion, to express the space *within* which the motion takes place, as Il. 2. 785 διέπρησον πεδίοιο *made their way over the plain* : so ἰὼν πολέος πεδίοιο, ἴππω ἀτυζομένω πεδίοιο, πεδίοιο διώκειν, κούιοντες πεδίοιο, &c. ; 10. 353 ἐλκόμεναι νεοῖο βαθείης πηκτὸν ἄροτρον : 24. 264 ἵνα πρήσσωμεν ὁδοῖο, cp. *Od. 1-30*⁹ Od. 2. 404., 3. 476. This use of the Gen. is almost confined to set phrases ; accordingly it is only found with the Gen. in -οιο (the archaic form).

The difference of meaning between this Genitive and the Accusative of Space (§ 138) seems to be that the Acc. measures the action of the Verb, whereas the Gen. only gives a local relation in which the action stands. When an Acc. of quantity and a Gen. are both used, the Acc. often seems to govern the Gen. ; e.g. ὀμίλου πολλὸν ἐπελθὼν *advancing far in the throng, παρεξελθεῖν πεδίοιο, τυτθόν, to go a short space of plain beyond.* So with Adverbs : ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθ' ἴθυσσε μάχη πεδίοιο : ἄδην ἐλάσαι πολέμοιο ; and with a negative : οὐκ Ἄργεος ἦεν = *he was nowhere in Argos.* Thus the Gen. has a partitive character.

150.] Genitive of Time. This Gen. expresses a period of time to which the action belongs, without implying anything as to its duration ; e.g.—

Od. 14. 161 τοῦδ' αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος ἐλεύσεται *he will come (some-time in) this very year.* So Il. 5. 523 νημελῆς *in calm weather* ; 8. 470 ἠοῦς *in the morning* ; 11. 691 τῶν προτέρων ἐτέων *in former years* ; 22. 27 ὀπώρας εἶσι *goes in autumn.*

It appears from the corresponding construction in Sanser. and

Zend that this is the true Genitive (Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 45).

For the 'Gen. Absolute'—which is akin to the Gen. of *time*—see § 246.

151.] **The quasi-partitive Genitive.** Under this term we may include a number of constructions in which the Gen. is used (in preference to some other Case) because the action of the Verb does not affect the person or thing in a sufficiently direct and unqualified way: *e.g.* in *λωτοῖο φαγών* *eating of the lotus* (not *eating up the lotus*); *πτέρυγος λάβε* *took by the wing* (not *took the wing*); *λούεσθαι ποταμοῖο* *to bathe in a river* (but *λούειν ὕδατι* *to bathe with water*).*

The chief uses to which this view may be applied are:—

(a) With Verbs that imply *fastening to, holding by, &c.*: II. 1. 197 *ξανθῆς δὲ κόμης ἔλε Πηλεΐωνα* *took Achilles by the hair*.

So *χειρὸς ἑλών* *taking by the hand* (but *δεξιτερὴν ἔλε χεῖρα* *took the right hand*), *ποδὸς ἔλκε* *dragged by the foot*, *δῆσεν ποδός* *fastened by the foot*, *κόνιος δεδραγμένος* *clutching the dust*, *λισσέσκετο γούνων* *entreated by seizing the knees*, *ἐρείσατο γαλῆς* *propped himself against the earth* (*i. e.* his hand touching it), *μέσσου δουρὸς ἑλών* *taking his spear by the middle*; and with a metaphorical sense, *περίσχεο παιδός* *take charge of thy child*, *σέο ἔξεται* *will depend upon thee*.

* Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 39) aptly quotes from J. Grimm the saying that 'the Accusative shows the fullest, most decided mastering of an object by the notion contained in the Verb of the sentence. Less "objectifying" is contained in the Gen.; the active force is tried and brought into play by it, not exhausted.' The contrast, however, is to be traced not merely between the Gen. and the Acc., but generally between the Gen. and all the Cases which are used primarily with Verbs. Thus the Gen. of Space and Time may be compared with the Locative, the Gen. of Material with the Instrumental; and perhaps other Genitives with the Abl. (§ 151, *e*, note, § 153, note).

It is important to observe here (especially since we have adopted the term 'quasi-Partitive' for these uses) that the partitive relation is not the only one which may lie at the root of the construction. The Gen. expresses any relation, however indefinite, in which one Noun may stand to another.

1. The Gen. of Place noticed in § 149 (2) is not partitive; for *δυσομένου Ὑπερίονος* (*e.g.*) does not mean *within sunset*, but *on the side of, belonging to, sunset*. The Gen. is like the Latin 'novarum rerum esse' *to be on the side of change*; cp. Liv. 22. 50 *ad Cannas fugientem consulem vix septuaginta secuti sunt, alterius morientis prope totus exercitus fuit*.

2. The Gen. of Time is similar. Such a Gen. as *ἡὸς* *in the morning* is to be compared with the use of the Adj. in *ἐσπέριοι ἀφίκοντο* *they came in the evening*, lit. *belonging to the evening, as men of the evening*. It differs from the Dat. of Time negatively, in the want of a distinct Locative meaning.

3. The Gen. of the *person* with Verbs of *hearing, &c.* (§ 151, *d*) is clearly not partitive. The *thing* heard is not *part of*, but something *belonging to, the person*. But the Gen. of the *sound* heard may be partitive; and so is doubtless the Gen. of *material*, § 151, *e*.

As to the Gen. of *price*, see § 153. If a true Gen., it is not partitive.

The Gen. in this group of uses is probably akin to the Gen. of the *space within which* action takes place, § 149. Compare, for example, *ἐρείσατο γαίης* with *ἴξε τοίχου τοῦ ἐτέρου*,—passages given under the same head by Kühner (§ 418, 8, a). Or it may be Ablatival: cp. *πρῦμνηθεν λάβε*, § 159.

(b) With Verbs meaning *to touch, to hit* (an object aimed at), *to reach* (a person), *to put in or on* (a chariot, ship, wall, &c.), with the derivative meanings, *to attain to, get a place or share in*, &c.; as *ἀλλήλων ἐφίκοντο* got at each other; *τύχε γάρ ῥ' ἀμάθοιο βαθείης* he happened to fall in deep sand; so *νεκροῦς πυρκαϊῆς ἐπενήνεον* heaped the corpses on the funeral pile; so metaphorically, *κακῶν ἐπιβασκέμεν* to bring into mischief; *ἀντιάαν πολέμοιο* to join in war, *ἀντιῶν ἐκατόμβης* (but Il. I. 31 *ἔμὸν λέχος ἀντιῶσαν* because *λέχος* is the whole object, cp. § 136, 1).

(c) With Verbs meaning *to aim at, strive after, desire, care for, complain of, grieve for, be angry about*, &c.; as *Αἴαντος ἀκόντισε* threw a dart at Ajax, *οὗ παιδὸς ὀρέξατο* held out his arms for his child, *σκοπέλων ἐπιμαίεο* feel for the rocks (but *ἐπέμαίετο ἵππους* touched up the horses), *ἐπειγόμενος Ἄρηος* hasting to (eager for) battle, *τῶν οὐ τι μετατρέπη οὐδ' ἀλεγίζεις* these you do not regard or heed, *Κύκλωπος κεχόλωται* is enraged on behalf of the Cyclops; and many similar instances.

Kühner (§ 416, *Ann.* 9) quotes Il. 5. 582 *χερμαδίῳ ἀγκῶνα τυχῶν μέσον* as a use of *τυγχάνω* with the Acc. But it is possible to construe *ἀγκῶνα* with *βάλε* in the earlier part of the sentence.

(d) With Verbs meaning *to hear, perceive, know of, remember*, and the like; the Gen. expressing—

- (1) the person from whom sound comes;
- (2) the person about whom something is heard, known, &c.
- (3) the sound heard (but the Acc. is more usual).

The particular thing heard or known is often indicated by a Participle agreeing with the Genitive: *e.g.*—

Il. I. 257 *εἰ σφῶν τάδε πάντα πυθόλατο μαρναμένοιν* (=if they heard of all this fighting on your part).

Il. 4. 357 *ὡς γινῶ χωρόμενοιο* (=ὡς ἔγνων αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐχώετο).

Od. 2. 220 *εἰ δέ κε τεθυῶτος ἀκούσω*: so 4. 728, &c.

The Verb *οἶδα*, when it means *to know about, to be skilled in*, takes a Gen., as Il. II. 657 *οὐδέ τι οἶδε πένθεος* knows nothing of the sorrow. So Od. 2I. 506 *φόρμιγγος ἐπιστάμενος καὶ αἰοιδῆς*: Il. 16. 811 *διδασκόμενος πολέμοιο*.

So *μέμνημαι* takes a Gen. when it means *I bethink myself of, am affected by the memory* (Il. 2. 686, Od. 15. 23): see § 140, 4, a. Cp. Lat. *memini* with the Gen. or Acc., perhaps with a similar difference of meaning (Roby, § 1332).

(e) The Gen. of *material*, &c. The construction so termed is found with Verbs that imply the use of a material (especially one of indefinite quantity), a stock drawn upon, &c. *E. g.*—

Il. 1. 470 κούροι μὲν κρητῆρας ἐπεστέψαντο ποτοῖο *filled up the cups to the brim with liquor*; 9. 214 πάσσε δ' ἄλός *sprinkled with salt*. So πυρός in the phrases πῆσαι πυρός *to burn with fire*, B415
πυρὸς μειλισσέμεν *to propitiate (the dead) with fire*.

Il. 18. 574 χρυσοῖο τετεύχατο *were made of gold*.

Od. 3. 408 ἀποστίλβοντες ἀλείφατος *shining with fat*.

And with a distinctly *partitive* force:—

Od. 1. 140 χαριζομένη παρεόντων *favouring him (with good things) from her store*; 9. 102 λωτοῖο φαγών *eating of the lotus*; and so with γέωω *to give a taste of*.

Il. 5. 268 τῆς γενεῆς ἔκλεψε *stole (a strain) from the brood*.

9. 580 πέδιοιο ταμέσθαι *to cut off (a τέμενος) from the plain*.

14. 121 Ἀδρήστοιο δ' ἔγημε θυγατρῶν *married (one) from the daughters of Adrastus* (so Od. 9. 225., 12. 64., 15. 98).

The Gen. with Verbs meaning *to stint, grudge, spare* is probably of the same nature (*to stint being = to give little*).

The Genitives in λούεσθαι ποταμοῖο *to bathe in a river*, χεῖρας νιψάμενος πολίης ἄλός *washing his hands in the sea*, &c. are intermediate between this group and the Genitives of Space (§ 149).

A Gen. of the *person* may be used with Verbs meaning *to gain profit from*; *e. g.* Il. 1. 410 ἵνα πάντες ἐπαύρωνται βασιλῆος: 16. 31 τί σευ ἄλλος ὀνήσεται; Od. 11. 452 υἱὸς ἐμπλησθῆναι (υἱὸς = *the company of his son*): also with πειράομαι *to try* (Od. 8. 23); *cp.* the Gen. with γέωω.

Note also the elliptical expression, Il. 21. 360 τί μοι ἔριδος καὶ ἀρωγῆς *what (share) have I in combat and aid?*

Most of these Genitives are clearly 'partitive,' and all of them can be explained as 'true' Genitives. There is a similar use of the Gen. in Sanscrit with Verbs meaning *to enjoy*, &c. (Delbrück, *A. S.* § 109). Some however may be Ablatives. In particular, the Gen. of *material* with τεύχω, ποιέω, &c. is so regarded by Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 48) on the ground of the Sanscrit use. It may be that in certain cases the original usage allowed either Gen. or Abl., according to the shade of meaning to be expressed; just as with Verbs of *filling* Latin employs the Gen. or the Abl.

(f) With Verbs meaning *to rule, be master*; *viz.*—

ἀνάσσω, Gen. of the *place* or *thing*, as Il. 1. 38 Τενέδοιό τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις: Od. 24. 30 τιμῆς ἧς περ ἄνασσεσ: of the *people*, only Il. 10. 32, Od. 11. 2376. The Gen. of the *thing* and Dat. of the *people* combined, Il. 20. 180 Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξειν τιμῆς τῆς Πριάμου.

βασιλεύω: Od. 1. 401., 11. 285.

κρατέω: Il. 1. 79 Ἀργείων κρατεῖ *has power over the Argives*.

σημαίνω : Il. 14. 85 στρατοῦ ἄλλου σημαίνειν : so ἡγοῦμαι, &c.

θεμιστεύω : Od. 9. 114 θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος παίδων ἢδ' ἀλόχων.

It is probable, from the analogy of Sanscrit, that this is the true Gen.; but the original force of the Case is obscure.

152.] The Ablatival Genitive. The Ablative expressed the object (person, place, or thing) from which separation takes place, and is represented by the Gen. in various uses : as—

ἀνέδν πολίης ἀλός rose from the grey sea.

χάζοντο κελεύθου gave way from the path.

ἔσχοντο μάχης were stayed from the fight.

παιδὸς ἐέργει μύϊαν keeps off a fly from her child.

διώκετο οἴο δόμοιο was chased from his house.

κακότητος ἔλυσαν delivered from ill.

ἀτεμβόμενος ἴσης defrauded of a share.

παιδὸς ἐδέξατο received from her son.

πίθων ἠφύσσετο οἶνος wine was drawn from casks.

Ἄντιλόχοιο λείπετο was left behind Antilochus.

γόνυ γονυδὸς ἀμείβων exchanging knee past knee (= putting them in front by turns).

ἄρχομαι I begin from (a point), Il. 9. 97, Od. 21. 142.

ἄμαρτάνω I miss, lose, fail in.

Τρώας ἄμυνε νεῶν keep off the Trojans from the ships : so with ἀλαλκεῖν.

ἀκούω, πυνθάνομαι, ἔκλουν hear from : see § 151, d.

τεύχω, ποιέω I make of (material) : see § 151, e.

For the Gen. with Verbs of buying, selling, &c., see § 153.

Adjectives implying separation (want, freedom, &c.) may take an Ablatival Gen. by virtue of their equivalence to Verbs of similar meaning ; or they may be construed as Nouns, that is to say, with a true Gen. *E.g.* λείως πετράων might be *smooth* (i. e. *cleared*) from rocks, or *smooth as to rocks*. Cp. the similar Latin Adjectives which take either Abl. or Gen.

The Gen. with Adjectives of comparison represents the Ablative (cp. the Latin construction). It expresses the point from which the higher degree of a quality is separated : cp. the Gen. with Verbs of *excelling* and *falling behind*, and with Adjectives of similar meaning, as Od. 21. 254 βίης ἐπιδενέες εἰμὲν Ὀδυσσῆος we are wanting in strength behind (compared with) Ulysses.

In Sanscrit the Abl. is used with numerals to express the point from which we count. A trace of this may be seen in the elliptical form δωδεκάτῃ ὅτε κτλ. the twelfth day (from the day) when &c. (Il. 21. 81, cp. Od. 3. 180).

The Gen. with ἐξ, ἀπό, παρά, πρὸς, πρό, ὑπέρ, περί (beyond), ὑπό (from under), κατά (down from), and the Verbs compounded with them, is Ablatival ; with some of the 'improper Prepositions,' as

χωρίς, ἄνευ. τῆλε. ἄτερ. ῥόσφι, ἀμφίς, ἐκάς, ἐκτός. ἄψ. πάλιν, it may be either the Ablative or the true Genitive. When *motion from* is not implied, the Case is probably the true Gen.; see § 228.

It should be observed that the use of the Ablatival Gen. with simple Verbs is comparatively restricted in Homer. It is not used, as it is in Sanscrit, with simple Verbs of *going, coming, bringing* (e. g. we could not substitute the Gen. for the form in -θεν in such phrases as κλισίθηεν ἰοῦσα, ἀγρόθεν ἐρχομένη, οἴκοθεν ἦγε, Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων, &c.), but only with Verbs which imply *separation* or *distance from* a point, or which are compounded with Prepositions such as ἐξ, ἀπό, &c.

Later poets seem to be more free in this respect (probably because they treated the usage as an archaism, adopted as being poetical): e. g. Soph. O. T. 142 βάρων ἴστασθε, Ant. 418 χθονὸς αἰέρας, Phil. 630 νεὺς ἄγοντα, &c. Further extensions are,—the use for the place from which something is *seen*, as Soph. El. 78. 324, and for the *agent*, Eur. Or. 497, El. 123.

153.] Gen. of Price. Verbs meaning *to change places with* take an Ablatival Gen., as γόνυ γονὸς ἀμείβων (quoted in the last section): hence the constructions—

Il. 6. 235 τεύχε' ἀμειβε χρύσεια χαλκείων *exchanged armour, golden (passing in exchange) for bronze.*

Il. 1. 111 Χρυσήϊδος ἀγλά' ἄποινα .. δέξασθαι *to accept a splendid ransom for Chryseïs*; so Od. 11. 327 ἡ χρῦσον φίλον ἀνδρὸς ἐδέξατο *who took gold for (to betray) her husband.*

Il. 11. 106 ἔλυσεν ἀποίνων *released for a ransom.*

Hence we may explain the construction with Verbs meaning *to value at, set off against (a price)*; as Il. 23. 649 τιμῆς ἧς τέ μ' εἶοικε τετιμῆσθαι; so with the Adjectives ἀντάξιος, &c.

It is possible however that a word expressing value or price may be construed as a Gen. with a Noun. As we can say τεύχεα ἑκατόμβοια *armour worth a hundred oxen*, we might have τεύχεα ἑκατὸν βοῶν (as in Attic prose, e. g. δέκα μῶν χωρίον *a plot worth ten minae*); cp. the Latin *magni emere, magni facere, &c.*

Case-forms in -φι(ν).

154.] The Case-Ending -φι(ν) is found in a number of Homeric forms which appear to be construed indifferently as Datives or Genitives. It will be shown, however, that there is ground for believing these forms to have been used for the Dat. only in the instrumental and locatival senses (the latter being comparatively rare), and for the Gen. only in the ablatival sense. They formed, therefore, a 'mixed Case,' composed of the same elements as the Latin Ablative, viz. the original Instr. Abl. and Loc.

In respect of usage these forms are archaic: that is to say, they are confined for the most part to lines and phrases of a

fixed conventional type. In several instances the survival is evidently due to the influence of the metre: thus *δακρυόφι, στήθεσφι* take the place of *δακρύων, στήθέων*; *δοστέοφιν* and *ικριόφιν*, of *δοστέων, δοστέοισι*, and *ικρίων, ικριόισι*—forms impossible in a hexameter. So *δι' ὄρεσφι, κατ' ὄρεσφι, ὑπ' ὄχεσφι*, for *δι' ὄρέων, κατ' ὄρέων, ὑπ' ὄχέων*.

155.] Instrumental. The forms in -φι(ν) appear to have been forms of the Instrumental (Sing. and Plur.), and the majority of the Homeric examples may be referred to that Case: *ἐτέρηφι with the other hand* (Il. 16. 734, &c.), *δεξιτερῆφι* (Od. 19. 480); *βίηφι by force* (Il. 16. 826, Od. 1. 403, &c., and in the phrase *κρατερῆφι βίηφι*), also *in strength* (*βίηφι φέρτερος*, Od. 6. 6, &c.); *ἀναγκαλῆφι δαμέντας* (Il. 20. 143); *γενεῆφι νεώτατος* (Il. 14. 112, &c.): *δακρυόφι πλήσθεν were filled with tears* (Il. 17. 696, &c.).

In the 'comitative' use, *αὐτοῖσιν ὄχεσφιν chariot and all, ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεσφιν with horses and chariot* (Il. 12. 114, Od. 4. 533); with Prepositions, *ἄμ' ἠοῖ φαινομένηφιν, σὺν ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεσφιν* (often in the Iliad), also *παρ' ὄχεσφιν* (construed with Verbs of rest, Il. 5. 28, 794., 8. 565., 12. 91., 15. 3)—unless *ὄχεσφιν* is a Loc. (§ 157); with words expressing *agreement, likeness, &c.*, as *παλάμηφιν ἀρήρει fitted his hand, θεόφιν μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος* (Il. 7. 366, &c.).

With Verbs of *trusting*; Il. 4. 303 *ἵπποσύνη τε καὶ ἠνορέηφι πεποιθώς*; so *ἀγλαῖηφι* (Il. 6. 510), *βίηφι* (several times).

156.] Ablative. Forms used as Ablatival Genitives are—

Il. 2. 794 *ναῦφιν ἀφορμηθεῖεν start from the ships.*

13. 700 *ναῦφιν ἀμυνόμενοι defending the ships* (§ 152).

3. 368 *ἐκ δέ μοι ἔγχος ἠίχθη παλάμηφιν.*

10. 458 *ἀπὸ μὲν . . κυνέην κεφαλῆφιν ἔλοντο.*

Od. 5. 152 *δακρυόφιν τέρσοντο were dried from tears.*

8. 279 *καθύπερθε μελαθρόφιν ἐξεκέχυντο.*

With the Prepositions—

ἐξ: as *ἐξ εὐνῆφι, ἐκ θεόφιν, ἐκ πασσαλόφι, ἐκ ποντοφῖν, ἐκ στήθεσφιν, ἐξ Ἐρέβησφιν, &c.*

ἀπὸ: as *ἀπὸ νευρήφιν, αὐτόφιν, χαλκόφι, στήθεσφιν, ναῦφι, &c.*

παρὰ when it means *from*: Il. 12. 225 *παρὰ ναῦφιν ἔλευσόμει' αὐτὰ κέλευθα*, Od. 14. 498 *παρὰ ναῦφιν ἐποτρύνει νεέσθαι*. So—

18. 305 *παρὰ ναῦφιν ἀνέστη δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.*

8. 474 *πρὶν ὄρθαι παρὰ ναῦφι ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα.*

16. 281 *ἐλπόμενοι παρὰ ναῦφι ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα μνηστῆρῶν μὲν ἀπορρίψαι, φιλότητα δ' ἐλέσθαι.*

In these three places the notion of *leaving* the ships is implied, so *παρὰ ναῦφι* has the meaning of *παρὰ νεῶν*.

κατά *down from*: κατ' ὄρεσφι (Il. 4. 452., 11. 493).

ὑπό *from under*: ὑπ' ὄχεσφι (Il. 23. 7), ὑπὸ ζυγῶφι (Il. 24. 576).

With this use of -φι we may compare the use of the *Dative* with ἐξ and ἀπό, which is one of the peculiarities of the Arcadian and Cyprian dialects (Meister, ii. 119, 296). The parallel of the Latin Abl. has been noticed.

157.] **Locative.** This use is found in several clear instances, as well as others of an indecisive kind:—

Il. 19. 323 Φθίηφι *in Phthia*; Il. 13. 168 κλισίηφι λέλειπτο *was left in the tent*; θύρηφι *out of doors, foris* (Od. 9. 238., 22. 220); κεφαλῆφι ἔθηκε *put on the head* (Il. 10. 30., 257., 261; cp. 496, Od. 20. 94); Il. 11. 474 ὡς εἶ τε δαφουνοὶ θῆρες ὄρεσφι: 19. 376 τὸ δὲ καίεται ὑψοθ' ὄρεσφι: 22. 139 ἦντε κίρκος ὄρεσφι κτλ.; 22. 189 ὡς δ' ὅτε νεβρὸν ὄρεσφι κῶν κτλ.; Il. 2. 480 ἦντε βοῦς ἀγέληφι μέγ' ἕξοχος ἔπλετο πάντων: 16. 487 ἀγέληφι μετελλθῶν *coming into the herd*.

With the Prepositions:—ἐν, as Il. 24. 284 ἐν χειρὶ . . δεξιτερῆφι (= Od. 15. 148): πρὸς, in Od. 5. 432 πρὸς κοτυληδονόφι *(sticking) to the suckers*: ἀμφί, in Od. 16. 145 φθινύθει δ' ἀμφ' ὀστεόφι χρώς: ὑπό, in ὑπ' ὄχεσφι, ὑπὸ ζυγῶφι (Il. 19. 404, unless the meaning is *from under*).

With ἐπί *on, at*, in the combinations ἐπὶ ἰκριόφι, ἐπ' ἔσχαρόφι, ἐπὶ νευρήφι (all in the Od.) the Case may be Loc. or Gen.

παρ' αὐτόφι occurs four times in the Iliad (12. 302., 13. 42., 20. 140., 23. 640). In three of these places there is a v. l. παρ' αὐτόθι (or παραυτόθι), which generally gives a better sense, and which is required by the grammar in 13. 42 ἔλιποντο δὲ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν αἰρήσειν κτενείν τε παρ' αὐτόφι (= παρὰ νησί). So 19. 255 ἐπ' αὐτόφι ἦτο σιγῆ where αὐτόθι (Nauck) is probably right. It seems that the Endings -θι and -φι were confused, possibly at a very early period.

158.] **The true Dat. and Gen.** There is only one example of the true Dat., viz. Il. 2. 363 ὡς φρήτηρ φρήτηρφι ἀρήγη, φύλα δὲ φύλοις *that phratRIA may bear aid to phratRIA, and tribe to tribe*.

The instances of the true Gen. are—

(1) Il. 21. 295 κατὰ Ἰλιόφι κλυτὰ τείχεα λαὸν ἕέλσαι *to coop up the army within the famous walls of Ilios*.

(2) Il. 21. 367 τείρε δ' αὐτμῆ Ἡφαίστοιο βίηφι πολύφρονος *the breath of Hephaestus ('Hphaίστοιο βίη) wore him out*.

(3) Od. 12. 45 πολὺς δ' ἀμφ' ὀστεόφι θις ἀνδρῶν πυθομένων *there is around a great heap of bones, of men rotting*. But this may be an Instr. of material, = 'a heap (is made) of bones.'

(4) Il. 16. 762 κεφαλῆφι ἐπεὶ λάβεν οὐχὶ μεθίει (Gen., § 151, a); and Il. 350 οὐδ' ἀφάμαρτε τιτυσκόμενος κεφαλῆφι (but the Gen. might be construed with ἀφάμαρτε, as an Abl.).

(5) Certain uses with Prepositions; viz. ἐπί in Il. 13. 308 ἡ ἐπὶ δεξιόφω . . ἡ ἐπ' ἀριστερόφω *towards right or left*; πρόσθε in Il. 5. 107 πρόσθ' ἵπποϊν καὶ ὄχεσφω: διὰ *through*, in διὰ δὲ στήθεσφω ἔλασσευ (Il. 5. 41, &c.), also 10. 185 ἐρχηται δι' ὄρεσφι.

The first four of these references evidently do not prove much. The first would be a clear instance of the true Gen. if we could be sure of the text: but there is some probability in favour of Ἰλίοο (§ 98), proposed by Leo Meyer (*Decl.* p. 35). In Il. 21. 367 we may perhaps take βίηφι as an Instr.: *hot breath vexed him through (by reason of) the might of Hephaestus*.

Again, the use with ἐπί may be locatival, with πρόσθε ablatival (as with πρό). The uses with διὰ are more important, because they are not isolated, but form a distinct group. It is improbable that διὰ *through* should take an ablatival Gen. or a Locative. The Sanscrit Instr. is used of the space or time *over which* an action extends (Delbrück, *A. S.* § 88): and so the Abl. in Latin (Roby, §§ 1176, 1189). This use appears in Greek as the Dat. of the *way by which*, and perhaps in the phrases περιῶντι τῷ θέρει, &c. It may be thought possible that δι' ὄρεσφι and διὰ στήθεσφι are fragments of this use. If so, one or two other uses assigned above to the Loc. may be really Instr.; especially ὄρεσφι, Il. 11. 474., 22. 139, 189.

On the other hand, if the forms in -φι(ν) constitute a 'mixed Case' (Locative, Instrumental, and Ablative), there must have been a tendency to extend its sphere from the Loc. and Instr. to the Dat., and from the Abl. to the Gen. Thus the few instances of forms in -φι(ν) standing for the true Dat. and Gen. may be first steps towards an amalgamation of five Cases (such as we have in the Greek Dual). One or two are probably among the 'false archaisms' which doubtless exist in Homer, though not to the extent supposed by some commentators: see § 216.

Forms in -θεν and -ως.

159.] The Ending -θεν expresses the point *from which* motion takes place; hence it is common in construction with Verbs of motion, and after the Prepositions ἐξ and ἀπό. Cp. also—

Il. 3. 276 Ζεῦ πάτερ Ἰδηθεν μεδέων *ruling from Ida*.

8. 397 Ἰδηθεν ἐπεὶ ἶδε *when he saw, looking from Ida*.

15. 716 Ἐκτωρ δὲ πρύμνηθεν ἐπεὶ λάβε *when he had got hold from (i. e. in the direction from, beginning with) the stern*; so ἐτέρωθεν *on the other side, ἀμφοτέρωθεν on both sides*.

Of time; ἠῶθεν *from (beginning with) dawn*.

In a metaphorical sense; of an agent (regarded as the source of action), as Il. 15. 489 Διόθεν βλαφθέντα βέλεμνα: Od. 16. 447 οὐδέ τί μιν θάνατον τρομέεσθαι ἄνωγα ἕκ γε μνηστήρων θεόθεν δ' οὐκ ἔστ' ἀλέασθαι. Also, Il. 10. 68 πατρόθεν ἕκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων *naming from (on the side of) the father*. And in two phrases, Il. 7. 39, 226 οἴοθεν οἶος *quite alone*, and Il. 7. 97 αἰνόθεν αἰνώως *quite terribly*,—where the force of the Ending is indistinct.

It is to be observed that (except in the Personal Pronouns) this form is not found with Verbs meaning to deprive of, free

from, defend, surpass, or with the corresponding Adjectives and Adverbs. Hence it cannot be held to be equivalent to an Ablative (§ 152), and probably differed from the Abl. in expressing *motion from* rather than *separation*.

On the other hand, the Pronominal forms ἐμέθεν, σέθεν, ἔθεν are freely construed—

(1) as Ablatives: πρὸ ἔθεν, ὑπὲρ σέθεν, ἄνευ ἐμέθεν; and with a Comparative, Il. 1. 114 οὗ ἔθεν ἐστι χερείων, &c. Cp. also Il. 9. 419 μάλα γὰρ ἔθεν . . χεῖρα ἔην ὑπερέσχε.

(2) as true Genitives: Il. 4. 169 ἀλλά μοι αἰνὸν ἄχος σέθεν ἔσσειται *I shall have terrible grief for thee*; with Verbs of *hearing* (Il. 2. 26, &c.), *remembering* (Od. 4. 592), *caring* (Il. 1. 180 σέθεν δ' ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀλεγίζω), *reaching* or *touching* (ἀντιάζω, πειράζω, &c.): and with ἄσσον, πρόσθε, ἅντα, ἀντίον, ἔνεκα, ἔκητι.

160.] The Ending -ως is generally derived from the Ablative of Stems in -ο (§ 110), although -ὄτ would not regularly become -ως, and the transition of meaning is not a very easy one. The chief examples in common use in Homer are—

From Pronominal Stems: ὦς, τῶς, πῶς, ὄμῶς, αὐτῶς, ἄλλως.

From Stems in -ο: αἰνῶς, ἀσπασίως, ἐκπάγλως, ἐπισταμένως, θαρσαλέως, κακῶς, καρπαλίμως, κραιπνῶς, κρατερῶς, ὄτραλέως, πυκινῶς, ῥηϊδίως, στερεῶς, στυγερῶς, χαλεπῶς, μεγάλως, καλῶς, αἰσχυρῶς, φίλως.

From other Stems: πάντως, λιγέως, ἀτρεκέως, ἀσφαλέως, ἀφραδέως, περιφραδέως, διηνεκέως, ἐνδυκέως, νωλεμέως, προφρονέως, ἐπικρατέως, ταχέως.

It will be seen that comparatively few of these Adverbs come from the *short familiar* Adjectives. Thus καλῶς, αἰσχυρῶς, μεγάλως, ταχέως, φίλως are very rare in Homer; and there is no Adverb of the kind from δεινός, ἴσος, ὀρθός, βαρύς, ὠκύς, ὀξύς.

The Nominative.

161.] **Impersonal Verbs.** It is evident that in a language which distinguishes the Person and Number of the Verb by the Ending, it is not essential that there should be a distinct word as Nominative. ἐσ-τί (*e.g.*) stands for *he is, she is, it is*; the person or thing meant by the Ending may be left to be gathered from the context. In certain cases, however, the Subject meant by an Ending of the Third Person is too indefinite to be expressed by a particular Noun, such as the context could supply to the mind. For instance, in the sentence οὕτως ἐσ-τί *it is so*, the real Subject given by the Ending -τι (in English by the word *it*) is not a particular thing already mentioned or implied, but a vague

notion—‘the case,’ ‘the course of things,’ &c.* Verbs used with a vague unexpressed Subject of this kind are called IMPERSONAL.

The vague Subject may be a Plural, as Il. 16. 128 οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλονται *the case no longer allows of flight*, Od. 2. 203 ἴσα ἔσσεται *things will be even*.

A Neuter Pronoun used as the Subject sometimes gives a vague meaning, not far removed from that of an Impersonal Verb; e.g. Il. 1. 564 εἰ δ' οὕτω τοῦτ' ἐστὶ *if this is so* (cp. οὕτως ἐστὶ *it is so*); ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται *it is a good thing too*.

An Impersonal Verb is often followed by an Infinitive, or dependent Clause, which supplies the want of a Subject. See § 234, 2.

162.] **Nominative in the Predicate.** In certain cases the Predicate of a sentence may be limited or modified by a Nominative in agreement with the Subject. This is especially found—

1. With Adjectives of *time*; as ἐσπέριοι ἀφίκοντο *they came in the evening*, ἐννύχιος προμολῶν *coming forth by night*, εὐδον παννύχιοι *slept all night*, χθιζὸς ἔβη *went yesterday*.

Such Adjectives seem to answer most nearly to the Gen. of time *within* which, but may also express *duration*, as πανημέριος and παννύχιος.

2. In describing the *attitude, manner, position, &c.* in which an action is done: as παλίνορσος ἀπέστη *stood off with a start backwards*, ὑπτιος οὐδὲι ἐρείσθη *was dashed face upwards on the ground*; so πεζὸς εἰλήλουθα, λαβρὸς ἐπαιγίζων, πρόφρων τέτληκας (cp. προφρονέως), ἀμετροέπης ἐκολψά, &c.

3. The Pronouns ὄδε and κείνος are sometimes used instead of Adverbs of place: Il. 5. 604 καὶ νῦν οἱ πάρα κείνος Ἄρης *now too yonder is Ares at his side*; 10. 434 Θρηάικες οἷδ' ἀπάνευθε *here are the Thracians apart*; Od. 6. 276 τίς δ' ὄδε Ναυσικάα ἔπεται; So οὗτος in Il. 10. 82 τίς δ' οὗτος κτλ.

4. With Verbs meaning *to be, to become, to appear, to be made, called, thought, &c.*; as κάρτιστοι τράφεν *they were nurtured the mightiest, (i. e. to be the mightiest)*; εἰσωποὶ ἐγένοντο νεῶν *they came to be in front of the ships*: ἦδε ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή *this appeared the best counsel*.

In all such cases the Nominative which goes with the Verb not only qualifies the notion given by the Verb-Stem, but also becomes itself a Predicate (i. e. the assertion of an attribute). E.g. κάρτιστοι τράφεν implies that they were κάρτιστοι. A Noun so used is called a SECONDARY Predicate.

The use of εἰμί as the ‘logical copula’ is merely a special or ‘singular’ case

* See Riddell's *Digest*, §§ 95–100: Sigwart, *Impersonalien*.

of this type of sentence. The Verb has then little or no meaning of its own, but serves to mark the following Noun as a Predicate. The final stage of the development is reached when the Verb is omitted as being superfluous.

5. With Impersonal or half-Impersonal Verbs meaning *to be*, &c.; the Predicate being—

(a) a Neuter Adjective; as *μόρσιμόν ἐστι* *it is fated*; *νεμεσητόν δέ κεν εἶη* *it would be worthy of indignation*; *οὐ τοι ἀεικές ἴσθι* *it is not unmeet for thee*: with a Pronominal Subject, *ἐσθλὸν γὰρ τὸ τέτυκται* *it is a good thing*.

In the Plural, *οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλονται* *there is no more escaping*; cp. *λοίγια ἔργα τὰδ' ἔσσειται* *this will be a pestilent business*.

In one or two instances the Adverbial form in *-ως* is used in phrases of this kind: Il. 11. 762 *ὡς ἔον εἰ ποτ' ἔον γε* *such I was if I was*; Il. 9. 551 *Κουρήτεσσι κακῶς ἦν* *things went ill for the Curetes*; Il. 7. 424 *διαγῶναι χαλεπῶς ἦν* *it was hard to distinguish*; Il. 11. 838 *πῶς τ' ἄρ' ἔοι τάδε ἔργα*; Od. 11. 336 *πῶς ὑμῖν ἀνὴρ ὄδε φαίνεται εἶναι*. This may be regarded as older than the Neut. Nominative, since it indicates that the Verb is not a mere 'copula,' but has a meaning which the Adverb qualifies. Cp. Il. 6. 131 *δὴν ἦν* *lived long* (= *δηναιὸς ἦν*): also the Adverbial Neut. Plur., as Thuc. 1. 25. 4 *ὄντες . . ὅμοια*, 3. 14. 1 *ἴσα καὶ ἰκέται ἐσμέν*.

(b) an abstract Noun; as Il. 17. 556 *σοὶ μὲν δὴ Μενέλαε κατηφείη καὶ ὄνειδος ἔσσειται εἰ κτλ.* *to thee it will be a humbling and reproach if &c.*; *οὐ νέμεσις ἴσθι* *it is no wrong*; *οὐκ ἄρα τις χάρις ἦεν ἴσθι* *was no matter of thanks*; *εἰ δέ μοι αἴσα* *but if it is my fate*: with a Pronominal Subject, *λώβη τάδε γ' ἔσσειται* *this will be a shame*.

The use of an abstract Noun instead of an Adjective is a license or boldness of language of which we have already had examples; see § 116 and § 126.

It is worth while to notice the tendency to import the ideas of *obligation, necessity, &c.* into these phrases: e.g. *οὐ νέμεσις ἴσθι* *not (worthy of, a matter of) indignation*, *ὄνειδος ἔσσειται ἴσθι* *it will be (ground of) reproach*. So in Latin *vestra existimatio est* = *it is matter for your judgment*.

The Latin idiom called the Predicative Dative (Roby, Pt. II. pp. xxv-lvi) may be regarded as a less violent mode of expression than this Nom., since the Dat. is a case which is originally 'adverbial,' i. e. construed with the Predicate given by the Verb-Stem. In other words, *dedecori est* is a less bold and probably more primitive way of saying *it is disgraceful than* *dedecus est*; just as *κακῶς ἦν* is more primitive than *κακὸν ἦν*.

6. The ordinary use of the Participle belongs to this head: as *διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε* *parted after having quarrelled*. In this use the Participle qualifies the Verb-Stem, and at the same time makes a distinct assertion: see Chapter X.

163.] **Interjectional Nominative.** The Nom. is not unfrequently used in Homer without any regular construction, as a kind of exclamation: *e.g.*—

Il. 5. 405 σοὶ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἀνῆκε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη,
νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδε κτλ. *fool! he knows not &c.*

Similarly σχέτλιος *cruel!* δύσμορος *the unhappy one!* (Od. 20. 194); and so Il. 1. 231 δημοβόρος βασιλεύς! Cp. the interjectional use of αἰδώς *shame!* (Il. 5. 787., 13. 95., 16. 422).

A similar account may be given of one or two passages in which commentators generally suppose 'anacoluthon': viz.—

Il. 10. 436 τοῦ δὴ καλλίστους ἵππους ἴδον ἠδὲ μεγίστους
λευκότεροι χιόνος, θείειν δ' ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοίῳ

whiter than snow they are! &c.; and so in the equally abrupt—

Il. 10. 547 αἰνῶς ἀκτίνεσσιν εἰκότες ἠέλιῳ.

2. 353 ἀστράπτων ἐπιδέξι' ἐναίσιμα σήματα φαίνων (*he did so I tell you*) *by lightning on the right &c.*

Od. 1. 51 νῆσος δεινδρήεσσα, θεὰ δ' ἐνὶ δώματα ναίει *an island (it is) well wooded, and a goddess has her dwelling there!*

These forms of expression, when we seek to bring them under the general laws of the grammatical Sentence, resolve themselves into *Predicates with an unexpressed Subject*. On the logical Propositions of this kind see Sigwart (*Logik*, I. p. 55). The Predicate, he shows, is always expressed in a word (or words); but the Subject, when it is of the kind which would be expressed by a Pronoun (*it, this, &c.*) may be indicated by a gesture. The simplest examples of the type are the imperfect sentences used by children, such as *horse!* for *this is a horse*. When such sentences are introduced into literary language, they give it an abrupt and interjectional character, as in the examples quoted. We might add the phrases such as οὐ νέμεσις *it is no wrong* (§ 162), in which the want of a Verb makes the expression somewhat interjectional. Compare, for instance, οὐ νέμεσις with αἰδώς, Ἀργεῖοι *shame on you, Greeks!* also the so-called ellipse in commands, as ἀλλ' ἄνα *but up!*

The Vocative.

164.] Regarding the use of the Vocative in Homer the chief point to be noticed is the curious one (common to Greek and Sanscrit) that when two persons are addressed, connected by τε, the second name is put in the Nominative.* For instance—

Il. 3. 277 Ζεῦ πάτερ Ἴδηθεν μεδέων κῦδιστε μέγιστε,
Ἥλιος θ' ὄς κτλ.

Similarly, the Vocative is not followed by δέ or any similar Conjunction, but the Pronoun σύ is interposed; as Il. 1. 282 Ἀτρεΐδῃ σὺ δὲ παῦε κτλ. *but, son of Atreus, cease &c.*

* Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 28.

The Nominative is often used for the Voc., especially, it would seem, in order to avoid the repetition of the Voc.; e.g. Il. 4. 189 φίλος ᾧ Μενέλαε. On this point however it is not always possible to trust to the accuracy of the text. Cobet (*Misc. Crit.* p. 333) has good grounds in the metre for proposing to change a great many Vocatives into Nominatives: e.g.—

Il. 23. 493 Αἴαν' Ἰδομενεῦ τε (read Αἴας Ἰδομενεύς τε).

Il. 2. 8 οὔλε ὄνειρε (read οὔλος).

Od. 8. 408 χαίρε πάτερ ᾧ ξείνῃ (read πατήρ).

Il. 18. 385 τίπτε Θέτι ταυῦπεπλε ἰκάνεις (Θέτις Zenod.). η γυνὴ πεπλε

Adjectival Use of the Noun.

165.] **Substantive and Adjective.** This seems a convenient place for one or two remarks on the distinction expressed by these terms.

It will be seen from §§ 114 and 117 that there is no general difference in the mode of forming Substantives and Adjectives. Certain Suffixes, however, are chiefly or wholly employed in the formation of *abstract* and *collective* Nouns: as in the Feminine Nouns in -τις, -τυς, -δων, the Neuters in -μα(τ), the Denominatives in -της (Gen. -τητος).

In respect of meaning and use the distinction between the *concrete* Substantives and Adjectives is practical rather than logical. Certain Nouns are mainly used as qualifying words in agreement with other Nouns; these are classed as Adjectives. In such combinations as βοῦς ταῦρος, ἀνέρες ἀλφησταί, χαλκῆες ἄνδρες, βασιλεὺς Κῦρος, Ἀγαμέμνων Ἀτρεΐδης, where the qualifying word is one that is not generally used as an Adjective, we speak of the 'adjectival use' of a Substantive. Conversely, when an Adjective stands by itself to denote an individual or group of objects, the use is called 'substantival': e.g. κακός a *base fellow*, κακά evils, τυκτὸν κακόν a *made mischief*. This is a use which arises when the objects to which an Adjective applies are such as *naturally* form a distinct class. Thus the Suffixes which form Nouns in -της, -τηρ, -τωρ and -εως are practically confined to Substantives.

Abstract and Collective Nouns, it is evident, are essentially Substantives. Thus there is a clear distinction, both in form and meaning, between Abstract and Concrete Nouns; but not between Substantives and Adjectives.

The common definition of an Adjective as a word that expresses 'quality' ('Adjectives express the notion of QUALITY,' Jelf, ii. p. 7) is open to the objections (1) that an abstract Substantive may be said to express quality, and (2) that every concrete Noun of which the etymological meaning is clear

expresses quality in the same way as an Adjective. *E. g.* the definition does not enable us to distinguish *μαχητής* from *μαχήμων*.

It is evident that the use of a Nominative in the Predicate—as *βασιλεύς ἐστι* *he is king*—is strictly speaking an adjectival use.

The corresponding distinction in the Pronouns does not need much explanation. The Personal Pronouns are essentially Substantives (being incapable of serving as limiting or descriptive words); the Possessive Pronouns are essentially Adjectives. The others admit of both uses; *e. g.* *οὗτος* *this one*, and *ἀνὴρ οὗτος* (in Attic *ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτος*) *this man*.

166.] **Gender of Adjectives.** In a few cases the Gender of the Adjective is independent of the Substantive with which it is construed.

1. When a *person* is described by a word which properly denotes a *thing* (*viz.* a Neuter, as *τέκνον*, *τέκος*, &c., or an abstract Noun, *βίη* *Πριάμοιο*, &c.), the concord of Gender is not always observed. Thus we have *φίλε τέκνον* (but *φίλον τέκος*, *φίλη κεφαλή*); again—

Il. 11. 690 *ἐλθὼν γάρ ῥ' ἐκάκωσε βίη Ἑρακλεΐη* (= *Heracles*).

Od. 11. 90 *ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχῇ Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο
χρῦσεον σκήπτρον ἔχων*.

In such cases grammarians speak of a 'construction according to the meaning' (*κατὰ σύνεσιν*). The term is unobjectionable, provided that we remember that constructions according to the meaning are generally older than those in which meaning is overridden by idiom or grammatical analogy.

2. Where an Adjective refers to more than one Noun, it follows the most prominent: or (if this is at all doubtful) the Masc. is used of *persons*, the Neut. of *things*: *e. g.*—

Il. 2. 136 *αἱ δέ που ἡμέτερά τ' ἄλοχοι καὶ νήπια τέκνα
ἦατ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισι ποτιδέγμεναι*

because the wives are chiefly thought of: but—

Il. 18. 514 *τείχος μὲν ῥ' ἄλοχοί τε φίλαι καὶ νήπια τέκνα
ῥῦατ' ἐφεσταότες, μετὰ δ' ἀνέρες οὖς ἔχε γῆρας*

because the boys and old men are also in the speaker's mind.

Od. 13. 435 *ἀμφὶ δέ μιν ῥάκος ἄλλο κακὸν βάλεν ἠδὲ χιτῶνα,
ῥογαλέα ῥυπόωντα*.

The Neut. Plur. is especially used of sheep and cattle: Il. 11. 244 *πρῶθ' ἑκατὸν βοῦς δῶκεν, ἔπειτα δὲ χίλι' ὑπέστη, αἶγας ὁμοῦ καὶ οἷς*; Il. 11. 696 *ἐκ δ' ὁ γέρον ἀγέλην τε βοῶν καὶ πῶῦ μὲγ' οἰῶν εἴλετο, κρωάμενος τριηκόσι' ἠδὲ νομῆας* (*three hundred head*): *cp.* also Il. 5. 140, Od. 12. 332.

3. A Noun standing as Predicate may be Neuter, although the Subject is Masc. or Fem.: as *οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη*. This is a kind of substantival use.

167.] **Gender of Pronouns.** A substantival Pronoun denoting a *person* may retain its proper Gender although the antecedent is a Neuter, or an abstract word; as Il. 22. 87 φίλον θάλος, ὄν τέκον αὐτῆ.

Conversely a Neuter Pronoun may be used substantivally of a *thing* which has been denoted by a Masc. or Fem. word:

Il. 2. 873 ὃς καὶ χρῦσον ἔχων πόλεμόνδ' ἔεν ἠῦτε κούρη,
νῆπιος, οὐδέ τί οἱ τό γ' ἐπήρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον.

Cp. Il. 11. 238., 18. 460, Od. 12. 74 (with the note in Merry and Riddell's edition).

On the other hand, a Pronominal Subject sometimes follows the Gender of a Noun standing as Predicate, as αὐτῆ δίκη ἐστὶ *this is the manner*, ἣ θέμις ἐστὶ *which is right*. But the Neuter is preferred if a distinct object is meant by the Pronoun; as Od. 1. 226 οὐκ ἔρανος τάδε γ' ἐστὶ *what I see is not a club-feast*.

168.] **Implied Predication.** An Adjective (or Substantive in an adjectival use) construed with a Noun in an oblique Case may be so used as to convey a distinct predication; as οὐκέτ' ἐμοὶ φίλα ταῦτ' ἀγορεύεις = *this (that you now speak) is not pleasing to me*.

So after Verbs meaning *to make, cause to be, call, think, &c.*; λαοὺς δὲ λίθους ποίησε Κρονίων *Zeus made the people (to be) stones*.

This use is parallel to that of the Nominative in the Predicate (§ 162): cp. the forms of sentence λαοὶ ἐγένοντο λίθοι, λαοὺς ἐποίησε λίθους. In the latter the predicative Noun (λίθους) is construed with an oblique Case, instead of with the Subject. A Noun so used is called a TERTIARY PREDICATE: cp. § 162, 3.

CHAPTER VIII.

USE OF THE NUMBERS.

169.] **Collective Nouns.** The Subject of a Plural Verb may be expressed by means of a Collective Noun; as ὧς φάσαν ἡ πλῆθὺς *thus they said, the multitude* (cp. Il. 15. 305., 23. 157).

Conversely, a Participle construed with a Collective Noun and Singular Verb may be Plural: as Il. 18. 604 περιῖσταθ' ὄμιλος τερπόμενοι. Cp. Il. 16. 281 ἐκίνηθεν δὲ φάλαγγες ἐλπόμενοι, also Od. 11. 15.

In these instances, again, the construction is said to be 'according to the meaning' (§ 166). The principle is evidently that an abstract or collective word may be used in 'apposition' to a concrete word. It may be noticed however that the com-

binations such as ὄμιλος - τερπόμενοι are only found when there is some pause between the words; otherwise the Genitive would be used (construed as in Τρώων κατεδύσεθ' ὄμιλον, &c.).

170.] **Distributive use of the Singular.** The word ἕκαστος is often used in the Sing. with a Plural Verb, as ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος *they went home, each one*, δεδμημέσθα ἕκαστος *we are each one obedient*. Other words in a clause may follow ἕκαστος in respect of Number: as Il. 2. 775 ἵπποι δὲ παρ' ἄρμασιν οἷσιν ἕκαστος *the horses each beside his chariot*; Il. 9. 656 οἱ δὲ ἕκαστος ἑλὼν δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον σπείσαντες παρὰ νῆας ἴσαν πάλιν. Even the Verb is made Sing. in Il. 16. 264 οἱ δ' ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἔχοντες πρόσω πᾶς πέτεται καὶ ἀμύνει οἷσι τέκεσσι: but this is a slight boldness of expression.

On the same principle we may explain the Sing. in Od. 4. 300 αἱ δ' ἴσαν ἐκ μεγάροιο δάος μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσαι (= *each with a torch in her hands*); Il. 13. 783 τετυμμένω κατὰ χεῖρα (*each of the two wounded in the-hand*); Il. 3. 235 οὓς κεν ἐν γνοίην καί τ' οὔνομα μυθησαίμην. So in Il. 17. 260 τῶν δ' ἄλλων τίς κεν . . οὔνοματ' εἶποι we should doubtless read οὔνομα (Fείποι).

Similarly the Dual is used of a group of pairs:—

Il. 16. 370 πολλοὶ δ' ἐν τάφρῳ ἐρυσάρματες ὠκέες ἵπποι
ἄξαντ' ἐν πρώτῳ ῥύμῳ λίπον ἄρματ' ἀνάκτων
where the Dual ἄξαντε (like the Sing. ῥύμῳ) refers to *one* chariot. Probably, too, we should read ἄρμα ἀνάκτων (*i. e. Φανάκτων*). So Il. 23. 362 οἱ δ' ἄμα πάντες ἐφ' ἵπποισιν μάστιγας ἄειραν, Od. 20. 348 ὄσσε δ' ἄρα σφέων δακρυόφιν πίμπλαντο, also Il. 9. 503, Od. 19. 444.

The Dual is often used in this way in Aristophanes: cp. Av. 622 ἀνατείνοντες τῷ χεῖρε, and other instances given by Bieber (*De duali numero*, p. 44).

In Il. 5. 487 μή πως ὡς ἀψίσι λίνου ἀλόντε πανάγρου, the Dual ἀλόντε is explained by Schol. Β ὑμεῖς καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες. If so, it is a distributive use: 'see that ye be not taken, man and wife in one net.' But more probably it refers to Hector and Paris.

In speaking of the characteristics of a group or class it is common to pass from the Plural to the Singular, or *vice versa*; e. g. Od. 4. 691 ἦ τ' ἐστὶ δίκη θείων βασιλῆων, ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρησι βροτῶν κτλ. *it is the way of kings, (a king) will hate one &c.*; and in the same clause, Il. 10. 259 ῥύεται δὲ κάρη θαλερῶν αἰζήων (of a *kind* of helmet); Il. 2. 355 πρὶν τινα παρ Τρώων ἀλόχῳ κατακοιμηθῆναι *beside the wife of some Trojan*; Il. 19. 70 ἀλλά τιν' οἶω . . ὑπ' ἔγχεος ἡμετέροιο *before the spear of one of us*. The distributive τις is equivalent to a Plural.

Hence a peculiar *vague* use of the Plural, as Il. 3. 49 νυδὸν ἀνδρῶν αἰχητῶν *the bride of some warrior's son* (lit. *daughter-in-*

law of warriors, i.e. of this or that warrior); 4. 142 παρήϊον ἔμμεναι ἵππων (v. l. ἵππων); 21. 499 πληκτίζεσθ' ἀλόχοισι Διός (less directly personal than ἀλόχῳ).

171.] **Plural of Things.** The Plural form is not confined in Greek (or indeed in any language) to the expression of 'plurality' in the strict sense, *i.e.* to denote a group composed of distinct individuals, but is often used (esp. in Homer) of objects which it is more logical to think of in the Singular. Many words, too, are used both in the Sing. and the Plur., with little or no difference of meaning.

Notice especially the uses of the Plural in the case of—

(1) Objects consisting of parts: τόξον and τόξα *bow and arrows*: ὄχος and ὄχεια, ἄρμα and ἄρματα *a chariot*: δῶμα, μέγαρον *a hall or room*, δῶματα, μέγαρα *a house*: λέκτρον and λέκτρα *a bed*.

πύλαι *a gale* is only used in the Plur.; θύρη is used as well as θύραι, but only of the door of a room (θάλαμος).

(2) Natural objects of undefined extent: ψάμαθος and ψάμαθοι (as we say *sands*), ἄλες (once ἄλς) *salt*, κονίη and κονίαι *dust*, πυρός and πυροί *wheat*, βέεθρον and βέεθρα, κύμα (in a collective sense) and κύματα, δάκρυ and δάκρυα, κρέα (seldom κρέας) *meat*, σάρκες (once Sing.) *flesh*.

(3) Parts of the body: νῶτον (or νῶτος—the Nom. Sing. does not occur in Homer) and νῶτα, στήθος and (more commonly) στήθεα, πρόσωπον and πρόσωπα *the countenance*, φρήν and φρένες.

(4) Abstract words: λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων *forgetting horse-manship*, ποδωκείησι πεποιθώς *trusting to speed of foot*, ἀναλκείησι δαμέντες *overcome by want of prowess*, πολυιδρείησι νόοιο *through cunning of understanding*: so ἀτασθαλῆαι, ἀφραδίαι, ἀγνηορίαι, ἀεσιφροσύναι, τεκτοσύναι, μεθημοσύναι, &c.; note also προδοκαί *ambush*, προχοαί *moult of a river*, δῶρα *gift* (Il. 20. 268 χρῦσος γὰρ ἐρύκακε, δῶρα θεοῖο), κυνῶν μέλπηθρα *the sport of dogs*, φυκτά *escaping*, ἴσα *fairness* (§ 161).

The Plural in such cases is a kind of imperfect abstraction; the particular manifestations of a quality are thought of as units in a *group* or mass,—not yet as forming a single *thing*.

(5) Collective words: μῆλα *flocks*; so πρόβατα is only Plur. in Homer (cp. πρόβασις Od. 2. 75).

(6) Pronouns and Adjectives; see the examples of adverbial uses, §§ 133, 134; cp. also § 161.

172.] **Neuter Plural.** The construction of the Neut. Plur. with a Singular Verb is the commoner one in Homer, in the proportion of about three to one. When the Plural is used, it will

generally be found that the word is really Plural in meaning (*i. e.* that it calls up the notion of distinct units). Thus it is used with—

Nouns denoting agents; as *ἔθνεα* applied to the men of the Greek army (Il. 2. 91, 464), to birds (Il. 2. 459), to swine (Od. 14. 73); so with *φῶλ' ἀνθρώπων* (Od. 15. 409).

Distinctly plural parts of the body: *πετερά, χεῖλεα, οὐατα, μέλεα*: so *πέδιλα* (of the shoes of *Hermes*).

Numerals: *δέκα στόματα* (Il. 2. 489), *οὐατα τέσσαρα* (Il. 11. 634), *τέσσαρα δέρματα* (Od. 4. 437), *αἰπόλια ἔνδεκα πάντα* (Od. 14. 103); so with *πάντα* and *πολλά* (Il. 11. 574, 15. 714., 17. 760, Od. 4. 437, 794., 9. 222., 12. 411), and when the context shows that distinct things are meant: as Il. 5. 656 *τῶν μὲν δούρατα* (the spears of *two* warriors), 13. 135 *ἔγχεα . . ἀπὸ χειρῶν*.

A few instances occur in fixed phrases, which may represent an earlier syntax; *λύντο δὲ γυῖα* (but also *λύτο γούνατα*), *ἀμήχανα ἔργα γέγοντο*, &c. Note especially the lines ending with *πέλονται* (*τά τε περὰ νηυσὶ πέλονται, ὅτε τ' ἤματα μακρὰ πέλονται, φυκτὰ πέλονται*, &c.).

The exceptions to the use of the Sing. are fewest with Pronouns and Adjectives: doubtless on account of their want of a distinct Plural meaning (see the end of last section).

173.] **The Dual** is chiefly used (1) of two objects thought of as a distinct pair, and (2) when the Numeral *δύω* is used.

1. Thus we have the natural pairs *χεῖρε, πήχεε, τένοντε, ὦμω, μηρῶ, ὄσσε, ὀφθαλμῶ*, and (in the Gen. Dat.) *ποδοῖν, βλεφάροιν*: *σταθμῶ door-posts*; *ἵππω the horses of a chariot*, *βόε a yoke of oxen*, *ἄρνε a pair of lambs* (for sacrifice); *δοῦρε* (in Il. 13. 241., 16. 139 of the two spears usually carried, but *δύο δοῦρε* is more common); *ποταμῶ* (Il. 5. 773) of the two rivers of the Troad, and so *κρουνώ* (Il. 22. 147). So of the two warriors in a chariot (Il. 5. 244, 272, 568), two wrestlers (Il. 23. 707), two dancers (Od. 8. 378), the Sirens (Od. 12. 52, &c.); the *Ἀτρεΐδα* and *Αἴαντε*.

The Numeral is generally added in speaking of two wild animals (*θῆρε δύω, λέοντε δύω*, &c.): *κάπρω* (Il. 11. 324) and *λέοντε* (Il. 16. 756) are hardly exceptions, since the context shows that two are meant. Also *αἰετώ* (Od. 2. 146) of two eagles sent as an omen, and *γῦπε* (Od. 11. 578) of the vultures that devoured *Tityos*.

The Dual in Il. 8. 185–191 (where Hector calls to *four* horses by name) might be defended, because two is the regular number; but probably v. 185 is spurious. In Il. 23. 413, again,—*αἴ κ' ἀποκηδήσαντε φερώμεθα χεῖρον ἄεθλον*—the Dual is used because

it is the horses that are chiefly in the driver's mind, although he associates himself with them. In Il. 9. 182-195 the Dual refers to the two envoys, Phoenix being overlooked.

Again, when two agents have been mentioned together, or are represented as acting together in any way, the Dual may be used: as Il. 1. 531 τῷ γ' ὧς βουλεύσαντε (of Thetis and Achilles), 16. 823 (of a lion and boar fighting), Od. 3. 128., 13. 372., &c. Similarly, of the meeting of two rivers, Il. 4. 453 ἐς μισγάγκειαν συμβάλλετον ὄβριμον ὕδωρ (cp. 5. 774).

The Dual Pronouns νῶϊ and σφῶϊ are used with comparative regularity: see Il. 1. 257, 336, 574., 5. 34, 287, 718, &c. This usage may be a matter of traditional courtesy. Hence perhaps the scrupulous use where the First Person Dual is meant; Il. 4. 407 ἀγαγόνθ' ('Diomedes and I'); 8. 109 θεράποντε *our attendants*; 11. 313 τί παθόντε λελάσμεθα κτλ.; 12. 323 ᾧ πέπον εἰ . . φυγόντε; Od. 3. 128 ἕνα θυμὸν ἔχοντε ('Ulysses and I'). In Od. 2. 78 for ἀπαιτίζοντες ἕως should be read ἀπαιτίζονθ' ἧος, since Telemachus there is speaking of his mother and himself. So with the Second Person, Il. 1. 216 (Athene and Here), 322 (the heralds), 3. 279., 7. 279.

In Il. 3. 278 καὶ οἱ ὑπένερθε καμώντας ἀνθρώπους τίνισθον, ὅτις κ' ἐπιόρκον ὁμόσση the two gods indicated by the Dual are doubtless Hades and Persephone, as appears from Il. 9. 456 θεοὶ δ' ἐτέλειον ἐπάρας, Ζεὺς τε καταχθόνιος καὶ ἐπαινή Περσεφόνηα, and 9. 569, where Althaea beats upon the earth κικλήσκουσ' Αἶδην καὶ ἐπαινήν Περσεφόνηαν. And since these were the gods especially called upon as witnesses and avengers of wrong, it is probable that they are meant in Od. 1. 273 θεοὶ δ' ἐπιμάρτυροι ἔστων. The omission of the names may be a mark of reverence. If this view is correct, it removes the difficulty as to ἔστων (Meyer, *G. G.* § 577, 1).

2. Of the use with the Numeral the most significant examples are Od. 8. 35, 48 κούρω δὲ κρινθέντε δύω καὶ πεντήκοντα βήτην: where the Dual is used by a kind of attraction to the word δύω.

The Dual is never obligatory in Homer, since the Plural may always be used instead of it. Hence we often have a Dual Noun or Pronoun with a Plural Verb or Adjective, and *vice versa*.

The Neut. Dual (like the Neut. Plur.) may go with a Sing. Verb: thus we have ὄσσε with all three Numbers.

Certain of the ancient grammarians—Zenodotus among them—supposed that Homer sometimes used the Dual for the Plural. But Aristarchus showed that in all the passages on which this belief was founded the Dual either had its proper force, or was a false reading.

The use of the Dual in Attic is nearly the same as in Homer: in other dialects it appears to have become obsolete. This was one of the reasons that led some grammarians to maintain that Homer was an Athenian.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PREPOSITIONS.

Introductory.

174.] **Prepositions** are words expressing some local relation, and capable of being used as prefixes in forming Compound Verbs. The Prepositions are also used in construction with oblique Cases of Nouns and Pronouns.

The Adverbs that are construed with oblique Cases, but do not enter into composition with Verbs, are called *Improper Prepositions*.

The list of Homeric Prepositions is the same (with perhaps one exception, see § 226) as that of later classical Greek. In the use of Prepositions, however, there are some marked differences between the two periods (§ 229).

There are no 'Inseparable' Prepositions in Greek: see however § 221.

175.] **Adverbial use.** In post-Homeric Greek it is a rule (subject to a few exceptions only) that a Preposition must either (1) enter into Composition with a Verb or (2) be followed immediately by and 'govern' a Noun or Pronoun in an oblique Case. But in the Homeric language the limitation of the Prepositions to these two uses is still far from being established. A Preposition may not only be separated from the Case-form which it governs (a licence sometimes found in later writers), but may stand as a distinct word without governing any Case. In other words, it may be placed in the sentence with the freedom of an Adverb: *e.g.* ἀμφί may mean either *on both sides* (of an object expressed by an oblique Case) or simply *on both sides*; ἐν may mean *in* (taking a Dat.), or simply *inside*; and so of the others, *e.g.*—

γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χθών *all the earth smiled round about.*

ἵπαι δέ τε κόμπος ὀδόντων γίγνεται *beneath arose rattling of teeth.*

These uses, in which the Preposition is treated as an ordinary 'Adverb of place,' may be called in general the *adverbial uses*.

176.] **Tmesis.** The term **TMESIS** is sometimes applied generally to denote that a Preposition is 'separated' from the Verb

which it qualifies, thus including all 'adverbial' uses, but is more properly restricted to a particular group of these uses, viz. those in which the meaning is the same as the Preposition and Verb have in Composition: *e. g.*—

οὐ κατὰ βοῦς Ὑπερίονος Ἡελίου ἥσθιον *who ate up* (κατήσθιον)
the oxen of the sun.

οὓς ποτ' ἀπ' Αἰνείαν ἐλόμην *which I took from* (ἀφειλόμην) *Aeneas.*
ὑπὸ δ' ἔσχετο μισθόν *and promised* (ὑπέσχετο) *hire.*

μετὰ νῶτα βαλὼν *turning his back.*

χείρας ἀπὸ ξίφει τμήξας *cutting off his hands by a sword.*

This is the sense in which the word *τμήσις* was employed by the Greek grammarians, who looked at the peculiarities of Homer as deviations from the later established usage, and accordingly regarded the independent place of the Preposition as the result of a 'severance' of the Compound Verb. We may retain the term, provided that we understand it to mean no more than the fact that the two elements which formed a single word in later Greek were still separable in the language of Homer.

The distinction between *Tmesis* (in the strict sense) and other 'adverbial' uses cannot be drawn with any certainty. The clearest cases are those in which the compound Verb is necessary for the construction of other words in the sentence; *e. g.* in ἀπ' Αἰνείαν ἐλόμην or ὑπὸ δ' ἔσχετο μισθόν. On the other hand, the use is simply adverbial in—

περὶ φρένας ἱμερος αἰρεῖ *desire seizes his heart all round* (because the Compound *περαιρέω* means *to strip off, to take away from round a thing*).

ὧς τοὺς ἡγεμόνες διεκόσμεον . . μετὰ δὲ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων *and in the midst the king Agamemnon.*

ὧς Τρῶες πρὸ μὲν ἄλλοι ἀρηρότες, αὐτὰρ ἐπ' ἄλλοι *the Trojans, arrayed some in front, others behind.*

177.] **Ellipse of the Verb.** In certain cases, viz. when the Verb is understood, a Preposition may represent the whole Predicate of a clause:—

οἰωνοὶ δὲ περί πλέες ἢ γυναικες *about (him) are more &c.*

ἐνθ' ἐνι μὲν φιλότης *therein is love.*

οὐ τοι ἐπι δέος *there is no fear for thee.*

ἀλλ' ἀνα *but up!*

πάρα δ' ἀνήρ *the man is at hand.*

πάρ' ἔμοιγε καὶ ἄλλοι *others are at my command* (not *are beside me*, but = *πάρεισι* in its derived sense).

So when a Verb is to be repeated from a preceding clause; as *Il.* 24. 229–233 *ἔνθεν δώδεκα μὲν περικαλλέας ἔξελε πέπλους . . ἐκ δὲ δὴ αἰθωνας τρίποδας*: *Il.* 3. 267 *ὄρνυτο δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων, ἂν δ' Ὀδυσσεύς* (sc. *ὄρνυτο*).

178.] Use with oblique Cases. Prepositions are frequently used in Greek with the Accusative, the locatival and instrumental Dative, and the ablatival Genitive; much less commonly (if at all) with the true Genitive.

It may be shown (chiefly by comparison with Sanscrit) that the government of Cases by Prepositions belongs to a later stage of the language than the use of Prepositions with Verbs. In the first instance the Case was construed directly with the Verb, and the Preposition did no more than qualify the Verbal meaning. *E.g.* in such a sentence as εἰς Τροίην ἦλθε the Acc. Τροίην originally went with ἦλθε. If however the construction Τροίην ἦλθε ceased to be usual except with εἰς, the Preposition would be felt to be necessary for the Acc., *i. e.* would 'govern' it.

In Homer we find many instances of a transitional character, in which a Case-form which appears to be governed by a Preposition may equally well be construed directly with the Verb,—modified, it may be, in meaning by the Preposition.

Thus we have ἀμφί with the Dat. in the recurring form—

ἀμφί δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος,

but the Preposition is not necessary for the Case, as we see from its absence in τόξ' ὤμοισιν ἔχων, &c., and again from forms such as—

ἀμφί δὲ χαῖται | ὤμοις ἀτίσσονται,
περὶ μὲν ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον | ὤμοϊν βαλόμην

where the Preposition is best taken in the adverbial use. Cp. Il. 17. 523 ἐν δέ οἱ ἔγχος | νηδυίοισι μάλ' δὲν κραδαινόμενον λυε γυῖα, where ἐν is adverbial.

Again, we seem to have ἀμφί governing the Accusative in—

Il. 11. 482 ὡς ῥα τότ' ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆα . . Τρῶες ἔπον.

But ἀμφί must be taken with ἔπον, as in Il. 11. 776 σφῶϊ μὲν ἀμφί βοῶς ἔπετον κρέα. So in ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἦγαγε brought under the yoke the supposition of Tmesis is borne out by the form ὑπαγε ζυγὸν ὠκέας ἵππου. And in the line—

Il. 1. 53 ἐννήμαρ μὲν ἀνὰ στρατὸν ἔχχετο κῆλα θεοῖο

the rhythm is against taking ἀνὰ στρατόν together (§ 367, 1), and points therefore to ἀνέχχετο.

Again, the ablatival Genitive in—

ἦλθ' ἐξ ἀλός came out from the sea

may be explained like τείχεος ἐξελθεῖν, &c.; and in νηὸς ἀπὸ πρύμνης χαμάδις πέσει like νηὸς ἀποθρόψκων, and numerous similar constructions.

Thus the history of the usage of Prepositions confirms the general principle laid down in a previous chapter (§ 131), that the oblique Cases, with the exception of the true Genitive, are

primarily construed with Verbs, and that consequently the construction of these Cases with Nouns and (we may now add) Prepositions is always of a derivative kind.

179.] **Use with the Genitive.** Where the Genitive with a Preposition is not ablatival, it may usually be explained in two ways, between which it is not always easy to choose:—

(1) It may be derived from one of the uses with Verbs discussed in §§ 149–151. *E.g.* the Genitive in—

ὄς τ' εἶσω διὰ δουρός *which goes through the wood*

is probably the Genitive of the space *within which* motion takes place. For εἶσιω διὰ δουρός has the same relation to πεδίλιο διώκειν and πεδίλιο διαπρήσσειν, that ἦλθεν εἰς Τροίην has to Τροίην ἦλθεν and Τροίην εἰσῆλθεν.

(2) It may be of the same kind as the Genitive with a Noun: *e.g.* the construction with ἀντί may be the same as with the Adverbs ἄντα, ἀντίον, ἀντία, &c., and the Adjectives ἀντίος, ἐναντίος, &c., and this is evidently not akin to any of the constructions with Verbs, but falls under the general rule that a Noun or Pronoun qualifying a Noun is put in the Genitive (§ 147).

It is held by Curtius (*Elucidations*, c. 17) that the Genitive with ἀντί, πρό, διά, ὑπέρ, ὑπό, when they do not necessarily imply *motion from*, is of the same kind as the ordinary Genitive with Adjectives and Adverbs, *i.e.* the true Genitive. This view is supported by the Improper Prepositions, which nearly all govern the Genitive, whatever their meaning: *e.g.* ἐγγύς and ἐκάς, ἐντός and ἐκτός, ἄντα, μέχρι, ἔνεκα, &c. For in these cases the construction evidently does not depend upon the local relation involved, but is of the same kind as in δέμας πρὸς, χάριν Τρώων, &c.

On the other hand, it is pointed out by Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 134) that such a construction of the Genitive is unknown in Sanscrit, and this argument, which applies to πρό, ὑπό, ὑπέρ (Sanscr. *prá, úpa, upári*), is confirmed by the Latin construction of *pro, sub, super* with the Abl. He would allow the supposition however in the case of ἀντί (the Sanscrit *ánti* being an Adverb), and perhaps διά; regarding these words as having become Prepositions more recently than the others.

180.] **Accentuation.** The rules for the accentuation of Compound Verbs have been already given in § 88. They proceed on the general principle that (except in the augmented forms) the accent falls if possible on the Preposition; either on the last syllable (as ἀπό-δος), or, if that is elided, then on the first (as ὑπ-αγε).

In regard to the other uses, and in particular the use with

Cases, the general assumption made by the Greek grammarians is that all Prepositions are oxytone. They do not recognise the modern distinction according to which ἐν, εἰς, and ἐξ are unaccented. This distinction rests entirely on the practice of the manuscripts (Chandler, p. 254), and apparently arises from the accident of the smooth breathing and accent falling on the same letter (Wackernagel, *K. Z.* xxix. 137).

Disyllabic Prepositions, however, are liable in certain cases to become barytone. The exact determination of these cases was a matter of much difficulty with the ancients, and unfortunately we cannot now determine how far their *dicta* rest upon observation of usage, and how far upon analogy and other theoretical considerations. The chief points of the accepted doctrine are:—

(1) The disyllabic Prepositions, except ἀμφί, ἀντί, ἀνά, and διά (except also the dialectical forms καταί, ὑπαί, παραί, ἀπαί, ὑπείρ, προτί), are liable to ‘Anastrophe;’ that is to say, when placed *immediately after* the Verb or the Case-form to which they belong, they throw back the accent; as λούσῃ ἄπο (= ἀπολούσῃ), ἔχεν κάτα, ᾧ ἔπι, μάχῃ ἐνι, Ζεφύρου ὕπο, &c. Some held that the insertion of δέ before the Preposition did not prevent Anastrophe, and accordingly wrote ὦσε δ’ ἄπο, &c.

(2) Also, according to some, if the Prep. stands at the end of a verse, or before a full stop (Schol. A on Il. 5. 283).

(3) Also, when it is equivalent to a Compound Verb (§ 177); as ἐνι, ἐπι, πέρι, πάρα (for ἐν-εστι, &c.). So ἀνα (for ἀνάστηθι); although ἀνά according to most authorities was not liable to Anastrophe. Some wrote πάρα γὰρ θεοί εἰσι καὶ ἡμῖν (Il. 3. 440), on the ground that in πάρα-εισι the accent is on the syllable παρ-.

(4) Two Prepositions are barytone in the adverbial use,—
ἄπο when it is = ἀποθεν *at a distance*, and
πέρι when it is = περισσῶς *exceedingly*.

To which some added ὕπο (as τρομέει δ’ ὕπο γυῖα, &c.).

(5) Monosyllabic Prepositions when placed after the governed word take the acute accent (as an equivalent for Anastrophe); but only when they come at the end of the line. Some however accented Od. 3. 137—

καλεσσαμένω ἀγορήν ἐς πάντας Ἀχαιοῖς.

Most Prepositions, as appears from the Sanscrit accent, are originally barytone, and the so-called Anastrophe is really the retention of the accent in certain cases in which the Preposition is emphatic, or has a comparatively independent place in the sentence. Just as there is an orthotone ἔστι and an enclitic ἐστι (§ 87, 1), so there is an orthotone πέρι and a ‘proclitic’ περι, written περι before a governed Noun, but in reality unaccented.

This view will serve to explain one or two minor peculiarities of Greek usage. Thus (1) it is the rule that when the last syllable of a Preposition is elided before a Case-form, the accent is not thrown back. This is intelligible on the ground that the Preposition is in fact without accent; and the same account will apply to the same peculiarity in the case of *ἀλλά* and *τινά*. On the other hand, (2) in the case of elision before a Verb (as *ὑπαγε*) the accent is retracted, because the Preposition is then the accented word.* Again, (3) the general rule of the Æolie dialect, that all oxytones become barytone, does not extend to Prepositions, because they are not real oxytones.

The word *ἔτι* (Sanscr. *āti*) is a Preposition which happens to have survived (with the original accent) in the adverbial use only: cp. *πρός* = *besides*.

One or two suggestions may be added in reference to the Prepositions which are generally said to be incapable of Anastrophe:—

ἀνά was thought by some to be capable of Anastrophe, and this view is supported by the adverbial use *ἄνα ὑπ!*

ἀμφί is probably a real oxytone, like the Adverb *ἀμφίς*. The corresponding Sanscrit Preposition *abhi* is oxytone, contrary to the general rule.

The assertion that *ὑπαί*, *παραί*, *πρότι*, &c. are not liable to Anastrophe is difficult of interpretation. It may mean only that these words are not Attic, and by consequence that later usage furnished the grammarians with no examples.

If this is the true account of Anastrophe, it is probable that the Prepositions retained their accent in all quasi-adverbial uses, including Tmesis—not only when they followed the Verb or governed Noun. The doctrine of the grammarians is unintelligible unless it admits of this extension. For if we write *πάρ' ἐμοί γε καὶ ἄλλοι* because *πára* = *πáρεισι*, we must also write *πára γὰρ θεοί εἰσι*, where *πára* is equally emphatic. In Sanscrit too the Preposition when separated from its Verb is accented.

It is not so clear how far the later rules for Prepositions in Composition are to be applied to Homer. In Sanscrit there is an important difference between Principal and Subordinate Clauses. In a Principal Clause the Verb loses its accent, unless it begins the sentence (§ 87); the Preposition (which usually precedes the Verb, but is not always immediately before it) is accented. Thus we should have, on Sanscrit rules, such forms

* See Wackernagel, *K. Z.* xxiii. 457 ff. On this view, however, the original accent would be *ἀπο-δος*, *ἐνι-σπες*, *πára-σχος*, &c. It may perhaps be preserved in the Indic. *ἐνι-σπες* and Imper. *ἐνι-σπε* (see § 88, where a different explanation of these forms was suggested).

as *περί δειδία*, *περί πάντων οἶδε*, &c. But in Subordinate Clauses the accent is on the Verb, and the Preposition commonly forms one word with it, as in *περιδείδία*. If the Preposition is separated from the Verb, both are accented. In classical Greek two changes have taken place: (1) the Preposition and Verb are inseparable, and (2) the accent is placed almost uniformly according to the 'law of three syllables' (§ 88):—if it falls on the Preposition, as in *σύμ-φημι*, *κάτ-εχεν*, or on the Verb, as in *συμφήσει*, *κατ-έχει*, the reason is purely rhythmical. The first of these changes had not taken place in the time of Homer. As to the second we are practically without evidence. We do not even know when the law of three syllables obtained in Greek. It may be observed however that—

(1) When a word of three syllables could not be unaccented, the form *περί δειδία* became impossible; but it does not follow that *περί* lost its accent at the same time. An intermediate *περί δειδία* is quite admissible as a hypothesis.

(2) In many places in Homer it is uncertain whether a Preposition is part of a Compound or retains its character as a separate word. Thus we find—

Π. 4. 538 πολλοὶ δὲ περὶ κτείνοντο καὶ ἄλλοι (Wolf, from Ven. A.).

16. 497 ἐμεῦ περὶ μάρναο χαλκῶ (περὶ sic Ven. A.).

18. 191 στεῦτο γὰρ Ἥφαιστοιο πάρ' οἰσέμεν ἔντεα καλά (so Ar.).

I. 269 καὶ μὲν τοῖσιν ἐγὼ μέθ' ὄμιλλον (Ar.).

with the variants *περικτείνοντο*, *περιμάρναο*, *παρουσέμεν*, *μεθομίλων*. And the existing texts contain a good many Compounds which we might write *divisim* without loss to the sense; as Π. 18. 7 νηυσὶν ἐπικλονέονται, Od. 8. 14 πόντον ἐπιπλαγχθείς, Od. 16. 466 ἄστν καταβλώσκοντα, Π. 2. 150, 384., 3. 12., 4. 230., 5. 332, 763, 772., 6. 100, &c.

In reference to such forms we may fairly argue that the tendency of grammarians and copyists, unfamiliar with the free adverbial use of the Prepositions, would be always towards forming Compounds; hence that modern critics ought to lean rather to the side of writing the words separately, and giving the Prepositions the accent which belonged to them as Adverbs.

With regard to the accent of Prepositions in the ordinary use with Case-forms it is still more difficult to decide. A Sanscrit Preposition generally follows the Noun which it governs: hence it does not furnish us with grounds for any conclusion about the Greek accent.

180*.] **Apocope.** Most Prepositions appear in Homer under several different forms, due to loss of the final vowel combined (in most cases) with assimilation to a following consonant.

Thus we find—

παρά and πᾶρ :
 ἀνά, ἄν, ἄμ (βωμοῖσι, φόρον) :
 κατά, καδ̄ (δέ), κάβ-(βαλε), κάτ-(θανε), κὰρ (ρόον), καμ-(μονίη),
 κὰγ (γόνυ), κὰκ (κεφαλῆς), κάλ-(λιπε), κὰπ (πεδίον) :
 ὑπό, ὑβ-(βάλλειν) :
 προτί, πρὸς (for προτ-), cp. ποτί, πός :
 ὑπείρ (for ὑπέρι), ὑπέρ :
 ἐνί, εἰν (εἰνί), ἐν :
 ἀπό, ἀπ-(πέμψει).

This phenomenon appears to be connected with the loss of accent which the Preposition suffers when closely connected with a Verb or Case-form. That is to say, from the adverbial forms πᾶρα, πρότι, κατά, ἐνί, ἄνα (or ἀνά), &c. were formed in the first instance the unaccented παρ, προς, κατ or κα, ἐν, ἄν. Then the pairs πᾶρα and παρ, &c. were used promiscuously. Finally one form was adopted as normal.

ἀμφί.

181.] The Preposition ἀμφί means *on both sides*, or (if the notion of two sides is not prominent) *all round*. It is doubtless connected with ἄμφω *both*.

The adverbial use is common; e.g. with a Verb understood, Od. 6. 292 ἐν δὲ κρήνῃ νάει, ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμών *and around is a meadow*.

It is especially used in reference to the two sides of the body : Il. 5. 310 ἀμφὶ δὲ ὄσσε κελαινὴ νύξ ἐκάλυψε *black night covered his eyes on both sides (i.e. both eyes)*; Il. 10. 535 ἀμφὶ κτύπος οὔατα βάλλει : Il. 18. 414 σπόγγῳ δ' ἀμφὶ πρόσωπα καὶ ἄμφω χεῖρ' ἀπομόργνυ : Od. 2. 153 παρειᾶς ἀμφὶ τε δειράς : Od. 9. 389 πάντα δὲ οἱ βλέφαρ' ἀμφὶ καὶ ὀφρῦας κτλ.

So Il. 6. 117 ἀμφὶ δὲ μω σφυρὰ τύπτε καὶ αὐχένα δέρμα κελαιόν *the shield smote him on the ankles on both sides and on the neck*. Here ἀμφί is generally taken to mean *above and beneath*; wrongly, as the passages quoted above show.

This use of ἀμφί is extended to the *internal* organs, esp. the midriff (φρένες) regarded as the seat of feeling : as—

Il. 3. 442 οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ' ὦδε ἔρωσ φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψε.

6. 355 ἐπεὶ σὲ μάλιστα πόνος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκε.

16. 481 ἐνθ' ἄρα τε φρένες ἔρχεται ἀμφ' ἄιδινον κῆρ.

Od. 8. 541 μάλα πού μιν ἄχος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκεν.

So Hesiod, Theog. 554 χῶσατο δὲ φρένας ἀμφί : Hom. H. Apoll,

273, H. Ven. 243; Mimnerm. 1. 7 φρένας ἀμφὶ κακαὶ τείρουσι μέριμναι. Hence read—

Il. 1. 103 μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφὶ μέλαιναί πῖμπλαντ',
and similarly in Il. 17. 83, 499, 573.

182.] **The Dative with ἀμφί** is a natural extension of the ordinary locatival Dative—the Preposition being adverbial, and not always *needed* to govern the Case. Compare (*e.g.*)—

Il. 1. 45 τόξ' ὤμοισιν ἔχων (Loc. Dat., § 145, 3).

20. 150 ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ἄρρηκτον νεφέλην ὤμοισιν ἔσαντο.

11. 527 ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ἔχει σάκος *has a shield on both sides on his shoulders, i.e. across his shoulders.*

In a metaphorical sense ἀμφί is applied to the object *about* which two parties contend: as Il. 3. 70 ἀμφ' Ἑλένη καὶ κτήμασι πᾶσι μάχεσθαι: so of a negotiation, Il. 13. 382 συνώμεθα ἀμφὶ γάμφω *we shall agree about the marriage*; Il. 7. 408 ἀμφὶ δὲ νεκροῖσιν *as to the question of the dead*; Il. 16. 647 ἀμφὶ φόνῳ Πατρόκλου μερμηρίζων. Cp. the use with περί (§ 186). So too in Sanscrit the Loc. is used with Verbs of *fighting* to express the *object over which the fighting is*.

It is a further extension of this use when ἀμφί with the Dat. is construed with Verbs meaning *to speak, think, &c.*, as Od. 4. 151 ἀμφ' Ὀδυσσῆϊ μυθεόμην. This last variety (in which the notion of *two sides* disappears) is confined to the *Odyssey*: cp. 5. 287., 14. 338, 364.

A true Dative may follow ἀμφί, but cannot be said to be governed by it; *e.g.* in Il. 14. 420 ἀμφὶ δὲ οἱ βράχε τεύχεα *his arms rattled about him* the Dat. is 'ethical,' as in Il. 13. 439 ῥῆξεν δὲ οἱ ἀμφὶ χιτῶνα. So in Il. 4. 431 ἀμφὶ δὲ πᾶσι τεύχεα ποικίλ' ἔλαμπε, the Dat. is not locatival, but the true Dat. The two kinds of Dat. may be combined, as Il. 18. 205 ἀμφὶ δὲ οἱ κεφαλῇ νέφος ἔστεφε.

The construction of ἀμφί with the Dat. is not found in Attic prose. It survives in the poetical style, and in Herodotus.

183.] **The Accusative with ἀμφί** is used when the Verb expresses *motion*, as—

Il. 5. 314 ἀμφὶ δ' ἔδον φίλον υἷον ἐχέυατο πηχέε λευκῶ.

Also to express *extent*, diffusion over a space, &c. (ideas naturally conveyed by terms denoting motion):—

Od. 11. 419 ὧς ἀμφὶ κρητῆρα τραπέζας τε πληθούσας κείμεθα
as we lay (scattered) about &c.

Accordingly it is especially used in Homer—

(1) of dwellers *about* a place, as Il. 2. 499, 751, &c.

(2) of attendants or followers; as Il. 2. 445 οἱ δ' ἄμφ' Ἀτρείωνα . . θῦνον *they bustled about Agamemnon*.

The description *about (a person)* does not exclude the person who is the centre of the group; e.g. in Il. 4. 294 (Agamemnon found Nestor) οὓς ἐτάρους στέλλοντα . . ἀμφὶ μέγαν Πελάγοντα Ἀλάστορά τε Χρομίον τε, where Pelagon &c. are included under the word ἔταροι. This is an approach to the later idiom, οἱ ἀμφὶ Πλάτωνα = *Plato and his school*.

It should be observed that the motion expressed by the Verb when ἀμφί takes an Acc. is not motion to a *point*, but motion *over a space*. Hence this Acc. is not to be classed with Accusatives of the *terminus ad quem*, but with the Accusatives of Space (§ 138). This remark will be confirmed by similar uses of other Prepositions.

184.] **The Genitive with ἀμφί** is found in two instances,—

Il. 16. 825 μάχεσθον πίδακος ἀμφ' ὀλίγης *fight over a small spring of water*.

Od. 8. 267 ἀεῖδειν ἀμφ' Ἄρεος φιλότῆτος κτλ.

Another example may perhaps lurk in—

Il. 2. 384 εὖ δέ τις ἄρματος ἀμφὶς ἰδῶν κτλ.

if we read ἀμφὶ Φιδῶν (*having looked over, seen to his chariot*). With this meaning compare Il. 18. 254 ἀμφὶ μάλα φράζεσθε: and for the construction the Attic use of περιωρῶμαι with a Gen. = *to look round after, take thought about* (Thuc. 4. 124): also the Gen. with ἀμφιμάχεσθαι Il. 16. 496., 18. 20., 15. 391.

περί.

185.] **The Preposition περί** (or πέρι, § 180) has in Homer the two meanings *around* and *beyond*.

Both these meanings are common in the adverbial use; the second often yields the derivative meaning *beyond measure, exceedingly*, as—

Il. 16. 186 πέρι μὲν θείειν ταχύν *exceeding swift to run*.

18. 549 πέρι θαῦμα τέτυκτο *was an exceeding wonder*.

Od. 4. 722 πέρι γάρ μοι Ὀλύμπιος ἄλγε' ἔδωκε *for Zeus has given to me griefs beyond measure*.

The meaning *beyond* is found in Tmesis, Il. 12. 322 πόλεμον περὶ τόνδε φνυόντες *escaping this war*: Il. 19. 230 πολέμοιο περὶ στυγεροῖο λίπωνται *shall remain over from war*: and in Composition, περίεμι *I excel*, περιγίγνομαι *I get beyond, surpass*, περίοιδα *I know exceeding well* (Il. 13. 728 βουλῇ περιίδμεναι ἄλλων *to be knowing in counsel beyond others*; cp. Od. 3. 244., 17. 317). The Gen. in such constructions is ablatival (§ 152).

186.] The Dative with *περί* (as with *ἀμφί*) is Locative; as Il. 1. 303 ἐρώησει *περὶ* δουρὶ *will gush over* (lit. *round upon*) the spear; 2. 389 *περὶ* δ' ἐγγχεῖ χεῖρα *καμείται his hand will be weary with holding the spear*; 2. 416 χιτῶνα *περὶ* στήθεσσι *δαΐξαι to tear the chiton about (round on) the breast*. Also of an object of contention, *over*; as Il. 16. 568 *περὶ* παιδί . . πόνος εἶη *the toil (of battle) might be over his son*, cp. Il. 17. 4, 133, Od. 5. 310: and in a derivative sense, Od. 2. 245 *μαχίσασθαι περὶ* δαιτί *to fight about a feast*.

1. It is a question which meaning is to be given to *περί* in—

Il. 5. 566 *περὶ* γὰρ *διε* ποιμένι λαῶν (so 9. 433., 11. 556).

10. 240 *ἔδεισεν δὲ* *περὶ* ξανθῷ Μενελάω.

17. 242 ὄσσον ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ *πέρι* δείδια (or *περιδείδια*).

and in the Compound (Il. 11. 508 τῷ *βα* *περιδείσαν*, 15. 123 *περιδείσσα* θεοῖσι, 21. 328., 23. 822). Most commentators here take *περί* = *exceedingly* and the Dat. of the person as a *Dativus ethicus*: *περὶ* γὰρ *διε* ποιμένι *for he feared exceedingly for the shepherd*, &c. But it is difficult to find Homeric analogies for such a use of the Dative, and the meaning *over, on behalf of* is supported by later writers: H. Merc. 236 *χωόμενον περὶ* βουσί, H. Cer. 77 *ἀχρυνμένην περὶ* παιδί, Hdt. 3. 35 *περὶ* ἐθνωτῷ *δαιμαίνοντα*, Thuc. 1. 60 *δεδιώτες περὶ* κτλ.; also by the use of *ἀμφί* with the Dat. (§ 182) in nearly the same meaning.

2. Much difficulty has been felt about the use of *περί* in a group of phrases of which the following are the chief instances:—

Il. 4. 53 τὰς διαπέρσαι, ὄτ' ἂν τοι ἀπέχθωνται *περὶ* κῆρι (cp. 4. 46, &c.).

Od. 6. 158 *κείνος δ' αὖ* *περὶ* κῆρι *μακάρτατος* ἔξοχον ἄλλων.

Il. 21. 65 *περὶ* δ' ἤθελε θυμῷ (so 24. 236).

22. 70 ἄλύσσοντες *περὶ* θυμῷ.

Od. 14. 146 *περὶ* γάρ μ' ἐφίλει καὶ κήδετο θυμῷ, 15-245

Il. 16. 157 τοῖσιν τε *περὶ* φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή.

Od. 14. 433 *περὶ* γὰρ φρεσὶν αἴσιμα ἦδη.

In all these places the Dative may be construed as a Locative (although *κῆρι* without *περί* is only found in Il. 9. 117): the only question is whether the Preposition is to be taken in the literal local sense *round, all over*, or in the derivative sense *exceedingly*. In favour of the latter it may be said that the same combinations of Preposition and Verb are found without a Dat. such as *κῆρι* or *θυμῷ*, where accordingly *περί* must mean *exceedingly*; compare—

Il. 13. 430 τὴν *περὶ* κῆρι φίλησε πατῆρ }

Od. 8. 63 τὸν *περὶ* Μοῦσ' ἐφίλησε }

Od. 14. 433 *περὶ* γὰρ φρεσὶν αἴσιμα ἦδη }

2. 88 *περὶ* κέρδεα ὄδδε }

Il. 16. 157 τοῖσιν τε *περὶ* φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή }

Od. 12. 279 *πέρι* τοι μένος }

Od. 5. 36 *περὶ* κῆρι θεὸν ὡς τιμήσουσι }

Il. 8. 161 *περὶ* μὲν σε τίον Δαναοί. }

Again, in Il. 4. 46 τῶν μοι *περὶ* κῆρι τίεσκετο the meaning *beyond* is required by the Gen. τῶν; cp. 4. 257 *περὶ* μὲν σε τῶν Δαναῶν ταχυπόλων, 7. 289 *περὶ* δ' ἔγχει Ἀχαιῶν φέρτατος ἔσσι, 17. 22 *περὶ* σθένει βλεμεαίνει. So with the Acc. in Il. 13. 631 *περὶ* φρένας ἔμμεναι ἄλλων.

Od. 7. 67 ὡς κείνῃ *περὶ* κῆρι τῆτι γητὰ τῆ καὶ ἔστιν ἐν τεφίλκων πύιδων κτλ.
Amieis opfakker ἔστιν κτλ. τῆτι γητῆν γαλθιαν perfect first ἰρνασθερίτ. λου ἰρνασθερίτ.

On the other side, the representation of a feeling as something *surrounding* or *covering* the heart, midriff, &c. is common in Homer. Thus we have—

Il. 11. 89 *σίτου τε γλυκεροῦ περι φρένας ἴμερος αἰρεῖ.*

Od. 9. 362 *ἐπεὶ Κύκλωπα περι φρένας ἤλυθεν οἶνος.*

So of a sound, Il. 10. 139 *περὶ φρένας ἤλυθ' ἰωή* (cp. Od. 17. 261). And more frequently with ἀμφί; cp. Od. 19. 516 *πυκινὰ δέ μοι ἀμφ' ἀδινὸν κῆρ ὀξείαι μελεδῶνες ὀδυρομένην ἐρέθουσι*; and the other passages quoted at the end of § 181. Similarly *περὶ κῆρι*, *περὶ φρεσί*, may have been meant in the literal sense,—the feeling (fear, anger, &c.) being thought of as *filling* or *covering* the heart. On the whole, however, the evidence is against this view;—unless indeed we explain *περὶ κῆρι* as a traditional phrase, used without a distinct sense of its original meaning.

The occasional use of the Dat. with *περὶ* in Attic is probably due to familiarity with Homer.

187.] The Accusative with *περὶ* is used (as with ἀμφί) when *motion* or *extent in space* is expressed: as Il. 1. 448 *ἐκατόμβην ἔστησαν περὶ βωμόν* placed the hecatomb round the altar; 2. 750 *περὶ Δωδώνην οἴκι' ἔθειτο* made their dwellings round Dodona. Generally speaking the Accusative implies surrounding in a less exact or complete way than the Dative. It makes us think of the *space about* an object rather than of its actual circumference. Occasionally, of course, the circumference is the space over which motion takes place, or extent is measured: as Il. 12. 297 *ῥάψε ῥάβδοισι διηνεκέειν περὶ κύκλον* round in a circle; Il. 18. 274 *ἑστάμεναι περὶ τοῖχον* to stand along the wall all round it. η¹⁵

188.] The Genitive with *περὶ* is used in three distinct ways:—

1. With *περὶ* meaning *beyond* (in the figurative sense, = *excelling*) it expresses the object of comparison: Il. 1. 287 *περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι* to surpass all, Od. 1. 235 *ἄϊστον ἐποίησαν περὶ πάντων* have made him unseen more than all men, 4. 231 *ἐπιστάμενος περὶ πάντων*. This use is distinctively Homeric. The Gen. is ablative, as with Adjectives of comparison (§ 152).

2. With *περὶ* = *round, over* (in the local sense) the Gen. is very rare; the instances are—

Od. 5. 68 *ἦδ' αὐτοῦ τετάνυστο περὶ σπειλούς γλαφυροῦ ἡμερὶς ἠβώωσα.*

130 *τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἐσάωσα περὶ τρόπιος βεβαῶτα.*

The Gen. may be akin to the (partitive) Gen. of place (§ 149): the vine *e. g.* grew round in or over (but not covering) the cave.

3. With *περὶ* = *over* (the object of a contest), as Il. 16. 1 *ὡς οἱ μὲν περὶ νηὸς ἑυσσέλμοιο μάχοντο*, 12. 142 *ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ νηῶν* to defend the ships; sometimes also in the figurative sense, *about*, Il. 11. 700 *περὶ τρίποδος γὰρ ἔμελλον θεύσεσθαι*, Od. 9. 423 *ὡς τε*

περὶ ψυχῆς *as when life is at stake*; and of *doubt*, Il. 20. 17 ἦ τι περὶ Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν μερμηρίζεις. The use with Verbs of *anger* and *fear* is closely akin; Il. 9. 449 παλλακίδος πέρι χόσαστο; 17. 240 νέκνος πέρι δειδία (unless we read περιχόσαστο, περιδειδία).

The *weapons* of the contest are said to be fought *over* in Od. 8. 225 ἐρίζεσκον περὶ τόξων; so Il. 15. 284 ὀππότε κοῦροι ἐρίσσειαν περὶ μύθων. And this is also applied to the quarrel itself, Il. 16. 476 συνίτην ξιρίδος πέρι θυμοβόροιο (cp. 20. 253).

Under this head will come the Gen. in Il. 23. 485 τρίποδος περιδώμεθον *let us wager a tripod*, Od. 23. 78 ἐμέθεν περιδώσομαι αὐτῆς *I will stake myself*. Whatever may be the original meaning of περιδόσθαι, it is construed as if = *to join issue, contend* (Lat. *pignore certare*): cp. the Attic use περιδίδομαι τιμὴν περὶ (Gen. of the thing staked).

By a not unnatural extension, περὶ with the Gen. follows Verbs meaning *to speak, know, &c.*, but only in the *Odyssey*; viz. 1. 135 (= 3. 77) ἵνα μιν περὶ πατρὸς ἀποικομένοιο ἔροιτο; 15. 347 εἶπ' ἄγε μοι περὶ μητρὸς κτλ.; 17. 563 οἶδα γὰρ εὖ περὶ κείνου; also 1. 405., 7. 191., 16. 234., 17. 371., 19. 270. Note that the corresponding use of ἀμφί with the Dat. is similarly peculiar to the *Odyssey* (§ 182).

The origin of this group of constructions is not quite clear. It may be noted, however, that they answer for the most part to constructions of the Gen. without a Preposition; cp. ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ νηῶν and ἀμύνεσθαι νηῶν; and again εἶπε περὶ μητρὸς, οἶδα περὶ κείνου, &c. with the examples given in § 151, d.

παρά.

189.] The Preposition παρά (παραί, by Apocope πάρ) means *alongside*. It is common in the adverbial use (see § 177), and also in Tmesis and Composition. Note the derivative meanings—

- (1) *at hand*, hence *at command*; as Il. 9. 43 πάρ τοι δδός *the way is open to you*; Od. 9. 125 οὐ γὰρ Κυκλώπεςσι νέες πάρα.
- (2) *aside*; as Il. 11. 233 παραὶ δέ οἱ ἐτράπετ' ἔγχος *the spear was turned to his side* (instead of striking him).
- (3) hence figuratively, παρά μ' ἠπαφε *cozened me 'aside,' away from my aim*: and so παρπεπιθῶν *changing the mind by persuasion*, παρειπών *talking over, &c.*; also, with a different metaphor, *wrongly*.
- (4) *past*, with Verbs of motion, as ἔρχομαι, ἐλαύνω, &c.

190.] With the Dative παρά means *beside, in the company of, near*. It is applied in Homer to both persons and things (whereas in later Greek the Dat. with παρά is almost wholly

confined to persons); thus we have *παρὰ νηϊ*, *παρὰ νηυσί* (very frequently), *παρ' ἄρμασι*, *παρὰ βωμῶ*, *παρ ποσί*, *παρὰ σταθμῶ*, &c.

This Dat. is either locatival or instrumental: see § 144. It may be used after a Verb of motion (*e.g.* Il. 13. 617), see § 145, 4.

191.] The Accusative with *παρά* is commonly used—

(1) when *motion* ends *beside* or near a person or thing: as Il.

3. 406 ἦσο παρ' αὐτὸν ἰούσα *go and sit by him*; Il. 7. 190 τὸν μὲν παρ πόδ' ἐὼν χαμάδις βάλει.

Hence the use of the Acc. often *implies* motion: as Il. 11. 314 παρ' ἐμ' ἴστασο *place yourself beside me*; Od. 1. 333 στή ῥα παρὰ σταθμόν *came and stood beside the pillar*; Il. 6. 433 λαὸν δὲ στήσον παρ' ἐριεῶν. Similarly of the *place near which* a weapon has struck, as Il. 5. 146 κληῖδα παρ' ὤμων πλῆξε *struck the collar-bone by the shoulder*.

(2) of *motion* or *extent alongside* of a thing (esp. a coast, a river, a wall, &c.); Il. 1. 34 βῆ δ' ἀκέων παρὰ θίνα *went along the shore*; Od. 9. 46 πολλὰ δὲ μῆλα ἔσφαζον παρὰ θίνα *sacrificed many sheep along the shore*; Il. 2. 522 παρ ποταμὸν ἔβαιον *dwelt by the side of the river*; Il. 3. 272 παρ ξίφους κουλεὸν ἄωρτο *hung beside the sword-scabbard*. *πρὸ β' μὲν π' 153*

(3) of *motion past* a place; as Il. 11. 166, 167 οἱ δὲ παρ' Ἰλου σῆμα . . παρ' ἐριεῶν ἐσσεύοντο *they sped past the tomb of Ilius, past the fig-tree*; Il. 6. 42 παρὰ τρόχον ἐξεκλίσθη *rolled out past the wheel*; Il. 16. 312 οὗτα Θόαντα στέρνον γυμνωθέντα παρ' ἀσπίδα *passing the shield* (implied motion, οὗτα = *thrust at and struck*). The derivative meaning *beyond* (= *in excess of*) is only found in Homer in the phrases *παρ δύναμιν* (Il. 13. 787) and *παρὰ μοῦραν* (Od. 14. 509): but ἐπ. the Adj. *παραίσιος* *against fate*.

192.] With a Genitive *παρά* properly means *sideways from, aside from*. As with the Dative, it is used of *things* as well as *persons* (whereas in later Greek it is practically restricted to *persons*). On the other hand it is confined in Homer to the local sense; thus it is found with Verbs meaning to *go, bring, take, &c.* not (as afterwards) with *ἀκούω, μανθάνω, οἶδα*, or the like. An apparent exception is—

Il. 11. 794 εἰ δέ τινα φρεσὶν ἦσι θεοπροπίην ἀλεείναι,
καὶ τινα οἱ παρ Ζηνὸς ἐπέφραδε πότνια μήτηρ,

where however the notion of *bringing* a message is sufficiently prominent to explain the use. So Il. 11. 603 φθρυγξάμενος παρὰ νηός *sending his voice from the ship*; and Hes. Op. 769 αἶδε γὰρ ἡμέραι εἰσὶ Διὸς πάρα, i. e. *coming from Zeus*. The later use is to

be seen in Emped. 144 θεοῦ πάρα μῦθον ἀκούσας, Xenophanes 3. 1 ἀβροσύνας δὲ μαθόντες ἀνωφελέας παρὰ Λυδῶν.

The original meaning *sideways* or *at the side from* is visible in some of the uses with a Gen. denoting a *thing*: as Il. 4. 468 παρ' ἀσπίδος ἐξεφαάνθη *appeared beyond (outside the shelter of) the shield*: so probably Il. 4. 500 νιδὸν Πριάμοιο νόθον βάλει . . παρ' ἵππων ὠκειάων *struck him (aiming) past the chariot*. So too a sword is drawn παρὰ μηροῦ *sideways from the thigh*. The same meaning lies at the root of the frequent use of παρά in reference to the act of passing from one person to another (as in παραδίδωμι and παραδέχομαι), hence of gifts, messages, &c.

It is usual to regard παρά with the Gen. as meaning *from the side of, from beside, de chez*. But this is contrary to the nature of a prepositional phrase. The Case-ending and the Stem must form a single notion, which the Preposition then modifies; hence (e. g.) παρὰ μηροῦ means *beside from-the-thigh*, not *from beside-the-thigh*. This is especially clear where the Preposition is joined to a Verb; Od. 19. 187 παραπλάγξασα Μαλειῶν *driving-aside from-Maleae*: and in—

Il. 4. 97 τοῦ κεν δὴ πάμπρωτα παρ' ἀγλαὰ δῶρα φέροιο

the rhythm connects παρά with φέροιο rather than with τῷ—*thou wilt bring-aside (= trans-fer) from-him*. So with other Prepositions: ἀπὸ Τροίης *off from-Troy*, not *from off-Troy*: κατ' οὐρανοῦ *down from-heaven*, not *from under-heaven*. As to ὑπὸ with the Gen. = *from under*, see § 204.

μετά.

193.] **The Preposition μετά** in the adverbial use means *mid-way, in the middle*; e. g. with a Verb understood, Il. 2. 446 μετὰ δὲ κτλ. *and among them &c.* Hence *alternately*, as Od. 15. 460 χρύσειον ὄρμον ἔχων, μετὰ δ' ἠλέκτροισιν ἔερτο *strung with electrum between (the gold)*; so *in succession, afterwards*, as Od. 21. 231 πρῶτος ἐγώ, μετὰ δ' ὕμεις *I first and you in turn*; Od. 15. 400 μετὰ γάρ τε καὶ ἄλγσει τέρπεται ἀνὴρ = *a man has his turn of being pleased even in the course of his sufferings*.

The notion of *alternation* appears in Compounds with μετά, as μεταβάλλω, μεταστρέφω: in Tmesis, Od. 12. 312 μετὰ δ' ἄστρα βέβηκε *the stars have changed their place*. So μεταπανόμενοι (Il. 17. 373) means *with turns or intervals of rest*.

194.] **With the Dative μετά** means *between* or (less exactly) *among*. The meaning *between* is found in phrases such as μετὰ χερσίν, μετὰ ποσσίν, μετὰ φρεσίν (on the double character of the φρένες cp. § 181); also, of two *parties*, μετ' ἀμφοτέρωσι.

The use in reference to several objects (*among*) is mostly restricted to *persons*, since it conveys the idea of *association* of units forming a group, &c. (whereas ἐν is more *local*). Hence μετ' ἀστράσι (Il. 22. 28, 317) is said of a star *among other stars* (with a touch of personification): and in Il. 21. 122 κείσο μετ'

ἰχθύσι there is a sarcastic force—*lie there with the fish for company*. Cp. also the phrase Od. 5. 224 μετὰ καὶ τόδε τοῖσι γενέσθω *let this be as one among them*. The expression in Il. 15. 118 μεθ' αἵματι καὶ κονίησι is equivalent to a Collective Noun, = 'the crowd of wounded and fallen.' So Il. 21. 503 μετὰ στροφάλιγγι κονίης, a somewhat bolder phrase of the same kind, *T50, J156, 943, 1143*.

The Dat. with μετὰ is locatival (whereas with σύν and ἅμα it is comitative). This appears in the restriction to Plurals or Collectives, also in the use with Verbs of motion, as Il. 4. 16 φιλότητα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι βάλωμεν (§ 145, 6).

The construction of μετὰ with the Dative is in the main Homeric. It is occasionally imitated in later poetry.

195.] With the Accusative μετὰ has the two meanings *among* and *after*.

The meaning *among* is found after Verbs of motion with Plurals, and also with Collective Nouns, as μεθ' ὀμήγηριν, μεθ' ὄμιλον; so μετὰ δεῖπνον *to (join the company at) a feast*, μετὰ τ' ἦθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων = *to the pasture ground where other horses are*.

It occurs without a Verb of motion in Il. 2. 143 πᾶσι μετὰ πληθύν *to all among the multitude*; Il. 9. 54 μετὰ πάντας ὀμήλικας ἔπλεν ἄριστος (so Od. 16. 419). And with a Singular in Il. 18. 552 δράγματα μετ' ὄγμον πίπτου *the handfuls of corn fell in the middle of the furrow (between the ridges)*.

Of the other meaning we may distinguish the varieties—

(1) *after, following*; Il. 13. 513 ἐπαΐξαι μεθ' ἐὼν βέλος *following his weapon*, Od. 2. 406 μετ' ἔχρια βαΐνε θεοῖο.

(2) *after, in order to find* (with a Verb of motion), as μετ' ἐμ' ἦλθες *has come in search of me*, Od. 1. 184 ἐς Τεμέσην μετὰ χαλκόν.

(3) *in succession to, next to*; τὸν δὲ μετὰ κτλ. *and after him &c.*; Il. 8. 289 πρότωι τοι μετ' ἐμὲ πρεσβήϊον ἐν χειρὶ θήσω *to thee after myself*; of rank, Il. 7. 228 οἶοι . . μετέασι καὶ μετ' Ἀχιλλῆα *even (in the second rank) after Achilles*.

196.] With the Genitive μετὰ occurs in five places (with a Plural Noun), in the meaning *among* or *with*—

Il. 13. 700 μετὰ Βοιωτῶν ἐμάχοντο.

21. 458 οὐδὲ μεθ' ἡμέων πειρᾶ κτλ.

24. 400 τῶν μέτα παλλόμενος κλήρω λάχον.

Od. 10. 320 μετ' ἄλλων λέξο ἑταίρων.

16. 140 μετὰ δμῶων τ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ πῖνε κτλ.

Of these instances the first is in a passage probably inserted afterwards to glorify the Athenians; the second is in the θεῶν μάχη, and therefore doubtful; in the third we should perhaps

write μεταπαλλόμενος and construe of them casting lots in turn I was chosen. But the last two indicate that the use had crept into colloquial language as early as the Odyssey, taking the place of σύν or ἄμα with the Dative. See § 221.

ἐπί.

197.] The Preposition ἐπί means *over, upon*; sometimes *after* (as we speak of following *upon*); *with, at* (i. e. close *upon*); *in addition, besides*, esp. of an addition made to correspond *with* or *complete* something else; also, *attached to*, as an inseparable incident or *condition* of a person or thing; and conversely, *on the condition, in the circumstances, &c.*

Examples of these meanings in the adverbial use are—

Il. 1. 462 ἐπὶ δ' αἶθοπα οἶνον λείβε poured wine *over* (the meat).

13. 799 πρὸ μὲν τ' ἄλλ', ἀντὰρ ἐπ' ἄλλα *in front—behind*.

Od. 1. 273 θεοὶ δ' ἐπὶ μάρτυροι ἔστων the gods be witnesses thereto.

5. 443 ἐπὶ σκέπας ἦν ἀνέμοιο there was thereto (the place was furnished with) a shelter from the wind.

Il. 18. 529 κτεῖνον δ' ἐπὶ μηλοβοτῆρας killed the shepherds with the sheep.

1. 233 ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὀμοῦμαι I will swear in confirmation.

With a Verb understood, ἐπι=*is present, is in the case*, as Od. 2. 58 οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνὴρ there is no man (for the purpose); Il. 1. 515 οὐ τοι ἐπι δέος there is no fear with or for you (as part of your circumstances); Il. 21. 110 ἐπι τοι καὶ ἐμοὶ θάνατος death is my lot too (cp. 6. 357 οἶσιν ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόρον).

It is very much used in Composition. Note the meaning *over* in ἐπι-πλέω to sail over, also ἐπι-οίχομαι to go over, review, ἐπι-πυλέομαι, ἐπι-αλάομαι (Il. 17. 650 μάχη δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσα φαάνθη the fight was lighted up all over); besides, in ἐπι-δίδωμι, &c.; to (of bringing aid, joining, &c.) in ἐπι-αρήγω, ἐπι-αλέξω, ἐπι-απαρίσκω, ἐπι-αλλάσσω, &c.; for, in ἐπι-κλώθω to spin for (so as to attach to); hence of assent, ἐπι-νεύω, ἐπι-τλήναι, ἐπι-εἶκω (with a general affirmative meaning, on as opposed to off, for as opposed to against).

198.] With the Dative ἐπί has the same group of meanings; note especially—

(1) ἐπὶ νηυσὶ by the ships, ἐπ' ὄεσσι with the sheep (of a shepherd), ἐπὶ κτεάτεσσι with (in charge of) the possessions; Il. 4. 235 ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι will be a helper with (on the side of) falsehood (or false men, reading ψευδέσσι).

(2) Il. 4. 258 ἀλλοίῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ in (engaged upon) other work, so ἀτελεντήτῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ with a work unfinished: so Il. 4. 178 ἐπὶ πᾶσι in all cases dealt with.

(3) Od. 17. 454 οὐκ ἄρα σοί γ' ἐπὶ εἶδει καὶ φρένες ἦσαν *with form thou hast not understanding too*; Il. 13. 485 τῶδ' ἐπὶ θυμῷ *with this spirit (too)*; Hes. Theog. 153 ἰσχύς . . μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ εἶδει.

(4) Od. 11. 548 τοιῶδ' ἐπ' ἀέθλῳ *with such a prize* (when such a thing is prize); μισθῷ ἐπι ῥητῷ *for fixed hire* (given the hire, hence *in view* of it). *Is. 1. 24. 7.*

(5) ἐπ' ἡματι *for the day*, i. e. *as the day's work, in a single day.* *μ. 135, p. 284*

Note also that ἐπί meaning *upon* very often takes the Dat. *ε. 35, K. 48* after Verbs of motion, as κατέχευεν ἐπ' οὐδαι *poured on to the ground*: hence with the meaning *against*, as ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἰόντες, *μάρνασθαι ἐπ' ἀνδράσι, &c.* *1. 14, 2.*

199.] With the Accusative ἐπί implies (1) motion *directed to* a place, seldom (2) to a *person*; or (3) motion or (4) diffusion, extent, &c. *over* a space or (5) time.

1. After Verbs of motion the Acc. does not (like the Dat.) distinctly express that the motion *terminates on* the place: e. g. ἐπὶ χθόνα is merely *to* or *towards* the ground, but ἐπὶ χθονί implies *alighting on it*. Cp. Il. 18. 565 ἀταρπιτὸς ἦεν ἐπ' αὐτήν *there was a path leading to it*; Il. 2. 218 ἐπὶ στήθος συνοχωκότε *bent in over the chest*.

Hence the phrases expressing *attitude*, as ἐπὶ στόμα, ἐπὶ γούνα, &c. Two forms, ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ and ἐπ' ἀριστερά, are used even when motion is not expressed; as Il. 5. 355 εὗρεν ἔπειτα μάχης ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ θοῦρον Ἄρηα ἤμενον. Note however that ἐπ' ἀριστεροῖς and ἐπ' ἀριστερῶν are metrically impossible.

2. The use with *persons* in the meaning *towards, in quest of*, is rare, and almost confined to the Iliad: as 2. 18 βῆ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' Ἀτρεΐδην Ἀγαμέμνονα, τὸν δ' ἐκίχανεν: also 5. 590., 10. 18, 54, 85, 150., 11. 343, 805., 12. 342., 13. 91, 459., 14. 24., 16. 535., 21. 348, Od. 5. 149.

3. The meaning *over*, with Verbs of motion, is very common; ἐπὶ πόντον (ἰών, πλέων, φεύγων, &c.), ἐπὶ γαίαν, ἐπὶ χθόνα, ἐπὶ κύματα, &c. Also with Verbs of *looking*, as Il. 1. 350 ὁρώων ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον.

Hence such phrases as ἐπὶ στίχας, of troops &c. moving *in ranks*, i. e. *over* or *along* certain lines: as Il. 3. 113 ἵππους ἔρυσαν ἐπὶ στίχας: and so Od. 5. 245 ἐπὶ στάθμην ἴθυνε *straightened along* (hence *by*) *the rule*.

So with Plural Nouns, Il. 14. 381 οἰχόμενοι ἐπὶ πάντας *going over them all*, Od. 15. 492 πολλὰ βροτῶν ἐπὶ ἄστé' ἀλώμενος; and of a distribution, Od. 16. 385 δασσάμενοι κατὰ μοῖραν ἐφ' ἡμέας i. e. *equally*, so as to go *round*.

4. The instances in which *extent* (without *motion*) is implied are chiefly found in the *Odyssey* (2. 370, &c.). Examples from the *Iliad* are: 9. 506 φθάσει δέ τε πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν *she is beforehand all the world over* (so 23. 742): 10. 213 κλέος εἶη πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, 24. 202, 535. It will be seen that they are from books 9, 10, 23, 24.

Notice also the use with Neuters expressing *quantity*; as II. 5. 772 τόσσον ἐπι θρόσκουσι *to such a distance they bound*; also ἐπὶ πολλόν *a long way*, ἐπὶ ἴσα *to an equal extent*; and esp. the common phrase ὅσον τ' ἐπί, see II. 2. 616, &c.

5. Of *time*: II. 2. 299 μείνατ' ἐπὶ χρόνον *wait for* (lit. *over*) *a time*; Od. 7. 288 εὐδον παννύχιοι καὶ ἐπ' ἠῶ καὶ μέσον ἡμᾶρ *slept all night and on through morning and midday*.

200.] The Genitive with ἐπί is used in nearly the same sense as the Dative, but usually with less definitely local force; in particular—

(1) with words expressing the great divisions of space, esp. when a contrast is involved (land and sea, &c.); as ἐπὶ χέρσου, ἐπ' ἠπείρου, ἐπ' ἀγροῦ; Od. 12. 27 ἢ ἀλὸς ἢ ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλγήσετε (cp. II. 13. 565). This is evidently a Gen. of place, § 149. For the difference of Gen. and Dat. cp. II. 1. 485 ἐπ' ἠπείροιο ἔρυσσαν ὑψοῦ ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις.

(2) where the local relation is a familiar one; as ἐπὶ νηός, ἐπ' ἀπήνης, ἐφ' ἵππων, ἐπὶ θρόνου, ἐπ' οὐδοῦ, ἐπὶ πύργου, ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος, ἐπὶ μελῆς (ἐρεισθείς). Thus ἐπὶ νηυσί means *on or beside ships*, ἐπὶ νηῶν *on board ships*.

(3) with Verbs of motion, *υπο* (of the *terminus ad quem*), as II. 3. 293 κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ χθονός; so *bearing down on*, as II. 3. 6 πέτονται ἐπ' Ὀκεανοῖο ῥοάων: II. 5. 700 προτρέποντο μελαινάων ἐπὶ νηῶν: Od. 3. 171 νεοίμεθα νήσου ἐπι Ψυρίας *taking the course by the island Psyria*. So perhaps II. 7. 195 (εὐχέσθε) σιγῇ ἐφ' ὑμείων (*keeping the words*) *to yourselves*.

(4) of *time*; ἐπ' εἰρήνης (II. 2. 797, &c.); ἐπὶ προτέρων ἀνθρώπων (II. 5. 637, &c.). Cp. the Gen. of Time, § 150.

In later prose the Gen. is very common, and the uses become indistinguishable from those of the Dat.

ὑπό.

201.] The Preposition ὑπό (also ὑπαί) usually means *beneath*, as in II. 2. 95 ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα *the earth groaned beneath (their tread)*. The original sense, however, seems to have been *upwards*, as in the Superlative ὑπ-ατος *uppermost* (cp. ὑψη *aloft*, ὑπ-τιος *facing upwards*). On this view we can understand why

ὑπό is not applied (like κατά) to express *downward* motion. Hence, too, it is especially used of *supporting* a thing, as Il. 1. 486 ὑπὸ δ' ἔρματα μακρὰ τάνυσσαν: and on the same principle it expresses resistance to a motion (whereas κατά implies *yielding*, going *with the stream* &c.); as Il. 5. 505 ὑπὸ δ' ἔστρεφον ἠνιοχῆς *the drivers wheeled them up*, i. e. *to face* (the Trojans): and so ὑπ-αντιάσας *meeting face to face*, ὑπο-μένω *to stand against* (as we say, *up to*); and with the derived notion of *answering*, ὑπ-αείδω *I sing in correspondence*, ὑπο-κρίνομαι (= Att. ἀποκρίνομαι), ὑπο-βάλλω *I take up* (a speaker), ὑπ-ακούω *I hear in reply*, i. e. *show that I hear* (by answering or obeying).

So too the Compounds ὑφ-ορώ, ὑπ-όψιος, ὑπό-δρα, &c. do not express looking *down*, but looking *upwards from under*; even in Il. 3. 217 στάσκειν ὑπαὶ δὲ ἴδεσκε κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματα πῆξας it is the *face* that is bent downwards: cp. Il. 19. 17.

From the notion of being *immediately under* is derived that of being moved *by*, i. e. of *agency* or *cause*. The transition may be seen in ὑπο-εἰκω *I give way (before)*, ὑπο-τρέω &c.; so Il. 16. 333 ὑπεθερμάνθη *was warmed by (the blood)*.

202.] **With the Dative** ὑπό is very common in the simple local meaning, *under*. It is sometimes found with Verbs of motion, as Od. 4. 297 δέμνι' ὑπ' αἰθούσῃ θέμεναι; and even when motion *from* is intended, in Il. 18. 244 ἔλυσαν ὑφ' ἄρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους. In this case however we have to consider that ἄρμάτων is metrically impossible.

The derived sense *under the charge* or *power* is found in such uses as Il. 5. 231 ὑφ' ἠνιοχῶ (of horses), 6. 139 Ζεὺς γὰρ οἱ ὑπὸ σκῆπτρῳ ἐδάμασσε, 6. 171 θεῶν ὑπ' ἀμύμονι πομπῇ: also, with the notion of an effect produced (where the Gen. would therefore be rather more natural), ὑπὸ χερσὶ (δαμῆναι, θανείν, &c.), ὑπὸ δουρί (τυπείν, &c.); Il. 13. 667 νούσῳ ὑπ' ἀργαλέῃ φθίσθαι, Od. 4. 295 ὑπνώ ὑπο γλυκερῶ ταρπώμεθα: and often of *persons*, as Il. 5. 93 ὑπὸ Τυδείδῃ πυκινὰ κλονέοντο φάλαγγες, *Od. 11. 136*.

203.] **The Accusative** is used with ὑπό (1) of motion *to a point under*, as—

Il. 2. 216 ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε *came under (the walls of) Troy*.

17. 309 τὸν βάλ' ὑπὸ κληῖδα μέσσην (so often with Verbs of striking, &c.).

Also (2) of motion *passing under*, and hence of *extent under*: Od. 15. 349 εἴ που ἐτι ζώουσι ὑπ' αὐγὰς ἡελίοιο i. e. *anywhere that the sun shines* (cp. ὑπ' ἡῶ τ' ἡέλιθα τε—an equivalent phrase). *Od. 11. 978*

Il. 2. 603 οἱ δ' ἔχον Ἀρκαδίην ὑπὸ Κυλλήνης ὄρος.

3. 371 ἄγχε δέ μιν πολύκεστος ἰμὰς ἀπαλὴν ὑπὸ δειρήν (i. e. *passing under the throat*).

In one or two places it is applied to *time*: Il. 16. 202 πάνθ' ὑπὸ μνηϊθμόν *all the time that my anger lasted*; so perhaps Il. 22. 102 νύχθ' ὑπο τήνδ' ὀλοήν (but night is often regarded as a *space* of darkness).

204.] The Genitive with ὑπό is found in two or three distinct uses:—

- (1) with the force of *separation from*: as Il. 17. 235 νεκρὸν ὑπ' Αἴαντος ἐρύειν *from under Ajax*; Od. 9. 463 ὑπ' ἄρνεϊοῦ λυόμην: so Il. 19. 17 ὅσσε δεινὸν ὑπὸ βλεφάρων ὡς εἰ σέλας ἐξεφάανθεν.

In this use the Gen. is ablatival, cp. § 152. Originally ὑπό with an Abl. probably meant *upwards from*: see § 192.

- (2) of *place under*, with *contact* (especially of a surface); as—

Il. 8. 14 ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστι βέρεθρον, *Od. 11. 52.*

Od. 5. 346 τόδε κρήδεμνον ὑπὸ στέρνοιο τανύσαι.

Il. 1. 501 δεξιτερῇ δ' ἄρ' ὑπ' ἀνθρεῶνος ἐλοῦσα *taking hold of him under the chin.*

4. 106 ὑπὸ στέρνοιο τυχήσας.

16. 375 ὕψι δ' ἄελλα σκίδναθ' ὑπὸ νεφέων, i. e. *seeming to reach the clouds* (cp. 15. 625., 23. 874).

These uses of the Gen. are evidently parallel to some of those discussed in § 149 and § 151; compare (e.g.) ὑπὸ νεφέων with the Gen. of *space within* which (πεδίοιο διώκειν, &c.), and ὑπ' ἀνθρεῶνος ἐλοῦσα with κόμης ἔλε (§ 151 a) *took by the hair*. They are doubtless to be regarded (like the Gen. with ἐπί, § 200) as varieties or developments of the Genitive of Place. *ἕως γενεῖται ἕως*.

As with the Dative, the notion *under* passes into—

- (3) the metaphorical (or half metaphorical) meaning *under the influence of, by the power of*; as Il. 3. 61 ὅς τ' εἶσω διὰ δουρὸς ὑπ' ἀνέρος *under the man's hand*; Od. 19. 114 ἀρετῶσι δὲ λαοὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ *under his rule*; and many similar uses.

Cases may be noted in which the agency intended is *indirect* (where later writers would rather use διὰ with an Acc.):—

Il. 16. 590 ἦν ῥά τ' ἀνὴρ ἀφ' ἑῷ πειρώμενος ἢ ἐν ἀέθλω *β110*
ἢ καὶ ἐν πολέμῳ δῆτων ὑπο θυμοραϊστέων,
= *under the stress of an enemy* (so 18. 220);

Il. 23. 86 εὐτέ με . . ἤγαγεν ὑμέτερόνδ' ἀνδροκτασίης ὑπὸ λυγρῆς
by reason of a homicide (committed by me).

As a sound is said to be *over* or *about* (περί, ἀμφί) the person hearing, so he is *under* the sound: hence (e.g.) with a half metaphorical meaning Il. 15. 275 τῶν δέ θ' ὑπὸ ἰαχῆς ἐφάνη λῖς. So of other accompaniments, as Il. 18. 492 δαΐδων ὑπο λαμπομενάων *by the light of blazing torches.*

πρὸτί.

205.] **The Preposition** πρὸτί (πρός, ποτί) expresses attitude or direction *towards* an object. It is found in the adverbial use; Od. 5. 255 πρὸς δ' ἄρα πηδάλιον ποιήσατο *he made a rudder to be put to (the raft)*; hence commonly *in addition, besides*—a use which remained in later Greek.

It is a question whether πρὸτί and ποτί are originally the same word. The present text of Homer does not indicate any difference of usage.

206.] **With the Dative** πρὸτί means *resting on, against, beside* a thing: as Il. 4. 112 ποτὶ γαίῃ ἀγκλίνας *resting (the bow) against the ground*: Od. 5. 329 πρὸς ἀλλήλησιν ἔχονται *hold on to one another*. With Verbs of motion it implies that the motion *ends on or beside* the object; Od. 9. 459 θεινομένου πρὸς οὐδεῖ. Od. 11. 423.

The later meaning *besides, in addition*, is only found in Od. 10. 68 ἄσάν μ' ἔταροί τε κακοὶ πρὸς τοῖσιν τε ὕπνος.

207.] **With the Accusative** πρὸτί is very common, meaning *towards*: as πρὸς πόλιν *towards the city* (not necessarily reaching it), Il. 8. 364 κλαίσκε πρὸς οὐρανόν *cried out to heaven*; hence *to, on to* (mostly with Verbs of motion), as Od. 4. 42 ἔκλιων πρὸς ἐνώπια *leaned against the walls*: *against* (persons), as πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι *to fight with a man in opposition to a god*; also *addressing* (persons), with Verbs of speaking, &c.; in one place of *time*, Od. 17. 191 ποτὶ ἔσπερα *towards evening*.

Note that the literal local sense appears in all the Homeric uses of πρὸτί with the Aec.: the metaphorical uses, viz. *in respect of, for the purpose of, in proportion to, according to, &c.*, are later.

208.] **With the Genitive** πρὸτί expresses *direction* without the idea of motion *towards* or rest *on* the object: as Od. 13. 110 αἰ μὲν πρὸς βορέαο . . αἰ δ' αὖ πρὸς νότον *i. e. not at or facing the north and south, but more generally, in the direction fixed by north and south*; Il. 10. 428-430 πρὸς μὲν ἄλδος . . πρὸς Θύμβρης: Il. 22. 198 ποτὶ πτόλιος *in the direction of Troy*; Od. 8. 29 ἦε πρὸς ἠοίων ἢ ἔσπεριων ἀνθρώπων (= *from east or west*).

Among derived senses we may distinguish—

- (1) *at the hand of, from* (persons), as Il. 1. 160 τιμὴν ἀρνύμενοι πρὸς Τρώων, Il. 831 τὰ σε πρὸτί φασιν Ἀχιλλῆος δεδιδάχθαι.
- (2) *on the part of, by the will of*, as Il. 1. 239 οἱ τε θέμιστας πρὸς Διὸς εἰρύαται *who uphold judgments on behalf of Zeus*; Il. 6. 456 πρὸς ἄλλης ἰστον ὑφαίνουσι *at another's bidding*: and, perhaps in a metaphorical sense, Od. 6. 207 πρὸς γὰρ Διὸς εἰσω ἅπαντες ξείνοί τε πτωχοί τε.

(3) *before, by* (in oaths and entreaties); as Π. 13. 324 πρὸς πατρός γοννάζομαι *I entreat in the name of thy father*. The Preposition here implies that the god or person sworn by is made a party to the act; cp. Od. 11. 66 νῦν δέ σε τῶν ὄπιθεν γοννάζομαι οὐ παρεόντων, πρὸς τ' ἀλόχου καὶ πατρός κτλ. *on the part of the absent ones I entreat &c.*

It will be seen that προτί with a Gen. is seldom used in the strictly local sense except when there is a *contrast between two directions*. Hence the use approaches closely to that of the Gen. of Place given in § 149 (2); compare (*e.g.*) πρὸς βορέαιο—πρὸς νότου with Od. 1. 24 οἱ μὲν δυσομένον Ὑπερίονος οἱ δ' ἀνιόντος. The Case is accordingly 'quasi-partitive' (*i.e.* true) Genitive, and has no ablative character.

ἀνά.

209.] The Preposition ἀνά (ἄν) means *up, upwards, up through*. It is rarely used as a pure Adverb (the form ἄνω being preferred) except in the elliptical ἀνα *up!* But it has a derivative adverbial sense in Π. 18. 562 μέλανες δ' ἀνά βότρυες ἦσαν *there were dark grapes throughout*. Tmesis may be seen in Π. 2. 278 ἀνά δ' ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔστη, and in ἀνά δ' ἔσχετο (ἀνέσχετο), &c. In Tmesis and Composition it sometimes expresses *reverse action*, as ἀνα-λύω. So ἀνα-βάλλω *to put off*.

ἀνά is seldom used with the **Dative**; the meaning is *up on* (a height of some kind), as Π. 1. 15 χρυσεῖω ἀνά σκήπτρῳ *raised on a golden staff*; 15. 152 ἀνά Γαργάρῳ; so 8. 441., 14. 352., 18. 177., Od. 11. 128-23. 275., 24. 8. This use is occasionally found in Pindar (Ol. 8. 67, Pyth. 1. 10), and lyric parts of tragedy, but is not Attic.

With the **Genitive** ἀνά is only used in three places in the *Odyssey* (2. 416., 9. 177-15. 284), and only of going on board a ship (ἀνά νηὸς βαίνω). The meaning *up from* is only found in Composition: ἀνέδυσσεν πολίτην ἀλός, &c.

210.] With the **Accusative** ἀνά means *up along, up through*, of motion or extent: ἀνά ἄστυ, ἀμ πεδίον, ἀνά δώματα, ἀν' ὁδόν, ἀν' Ἑλλάδα, &c.; Π. 5. 74 ἀν' ὄδοντας ὑπὸ γλῶσσαν τάμε χαλκός *the spear cut its way up through the teeth and under the tongue*; so ἀνά στόμα, used literally (Π. 16. 349., 22. 452, &c.), and also of words uttered, Π. 2. 250 βασιλῆας ἀνά στόμ' ἔχων *having the kings passing through your mouth (i.e. talking freely of them)*; similarly ἀνά θυμόν of thoughts rising in the mind. Note also the application to *mixing*, as Od. 4. 41 πᾶρ δ' ἔβαλον ζείας, ἀνά δὲ κρήνην λευκὸν ἔμιξαν; cp. Od. 9. 209 (with the note in Merry and Riddell's edition). The Accusative is evidently one of Space (§ 138).

The use with collective Nouns, as *ἀν' ὄμιλου through the press, μάχην ἀνά, ἄμ φόνον ἄν νέκρας*, &c. seems to be peculiar to the Iliad.

The use in Il. 14. 80 *ἀνά νύκτα* may be explained either of *time* or of *space*: ep. *ὑπὸ νύκτα* (§ 203), *διὰ νύκτα* (§ 215).

The meaning *up on, up to* (of motion) may be traced in Il. 10. 466 *θῆκεν ἀνά μυρικήν*: Od. 22. 176 *κίον' ἀν' ὑψηλήν ἐρύσαι draw (the cord) up to a high pillar*; perhaps in the phrase *ἀνά θ' ἄρματα ποικίλ' ἔβαινον* (Od. 3. 492, &c.).

κατά.

211.] The Preposition *κατά* (by Apocope *κάδ*, &c.) means *down*, and is parallel in most uses to *ἀνά*. It is never purely adverbial (*κάτω* being used instead, ep. *ἄνω*), but is common in Tmesis, as Il. 1. 436 *κατὰ δὲ πρυμνήσι' ἔδησαν*, 19. 334 *κατὰ πάντων τεθνάμεν*, &c., and in Composition. Besides the primary sense (seen in *κατ-άγω I bring down, κατα-νεύω I nod downwards*, i. e. *in assent*, &c.) it often has the meaning *all over*, as *κατα-εινύω I clothe, καταχέω I pour over*; hence *completely*, as *κατὰ πάντα φαγεῖν to eat all up, κατα-κτείνω I kill outright*: also *in the place, as before*, as *καταλείπω I leave where it was*, &c.

κατά is not used with the Dative. If such a use ever existed it was superseded by *ὑπό* (just as *ἀνά* with the Dat. gave way to *ἐπί*). The possibility of the combination may be seen from the phrases *κατ' αὐτόθι, κατ' αὐθι*.

212.] With the Accusative *κατά* means *down along, down through*, as *κατὰ ῥέον down stream*; ep. Il. 16. 349 *ἀνά στόμα καὶ κατὰ ῥίνας* (of blood). But it is very often used (like *ἀνά*) of motion that is not upward or downward, except from some arbitrary point of view; as *καθ' ὁδόν along the way, κατὰ πόλιν through the city*, &c.: again, *κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν in mind and spirit*.

Other varieties of use are:—

- (1) with collective Nouns (chiefly in the Iliad), as *κατὰ στρατόν through the camp, πόλεμον κάτω, κατὰ κλόνον*, &c.
- (2) with Plurals (less common), as *κατ' αὐτούς going among them, κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἀλάλησθαι*.
- (3) of the character or general description of an action, as *κατὰ πρῆξιν (ἀλάλησθε) on a piece of business, ἦλθον κατὰ χρέος*, Od. 11. 477 *πλαζόμενοι κατὰ ληΐδα* (all in the Odyssey). *Madv. 70. 1. C. A 421 dog*
- (4) to express place; esp. of wounds, e. g. *κατ' ὤμον about (some-where on) the shoulder*. Cp. Il. 1. 484 *ἴκοντο κατὰ στρατόν arrived opposite (within the space adjoining) the camp*; Od. 5. 441 *ποταμοῖο κατὰ στόμα ἵξε νέων*.

- (5) to express *agreement* (from the notion of *falling in with*), in the phrases *κατὰ θυμόν, κατὰ κόσμον, κατὰ μοῖραν, κατ' αἴσαν*.
- (6) distributively: as *Il. 2. 99 ἐρήτυθεν δὲ καθ' ἕδρας* in *their several seats*; and so in *2. 362 κρῖν' ἀνδρας κατὰ φύλα κατὰ φρήτρας*.
- (7) *κατὰ σφέας (μάχεσθαι)* by *themselves* (to the extent constituted by themselves): so *Il. 1. 271 κατ' ἑμ' αὐτόν*.

These uses may generally be identified in principle with some of the Accusatives mentioned in §§ 136-138. Thus the Acc. in *ἦλθον κατὰ χρέος* is like *ἀγγελίην ἐλθεῖν*: in *κατὰ κόσμον* it is like the adverbial *δέμας, ἀκην, &c.*: *κρῖνε κατὰ φύλα = μοίρας δάσασθαι*; and *κατ' ἄμω* like the Acc. of the 'part affected.'

213.] With the Genitive *κατὰ* has two chief meanings:—

- (1) *down from*; as *κατ' οὐρανοῦ* down from heaven, *καθ' ἵππων ἄλτο* leaped from the chariot. This Genitive is clearly ablatival in origin.
- (2) *down on (in, over, &c.)*: as *Il. 3. 217 κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματα πήξας* fixing his eyes on the ground; *κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς* a mist was shed over his eyes; *κατὰ γαίης* down in the earth. *Od. 12. 93.*

Comparing the similar uses of *ἐπί* (§ 200), *ὑπό* (§ 204, 2), and *πρὸς* (§ 208), we can hardly doubt that the Gen. in this latter group is originally akin to the Genitives of Place (§ 149).

διὰ.

214.] The Preposition *διὰ* seems to mean properly *apart, in twain*. It is not used freely as an Adverb; but the original sense appears in the combinations *διαπρό, διαμπερές*, and in Tmesis and Composition, as *δια-στῆναι* to stand apart; *δια-τάμνω* I cut asunder; *διὰ κτήσιν* *δατέοντο* divided the possession. From the notion of going through it means *thoroughly*, as in *δια-πέρθω* I sack utterly.

In several Compounds, as *δια-τάμνω, δι-αιρέω, δια-δάπτω*, the notion of division is given by the Preposition to the Verb; *e.g.* *δια-τάμνω* I separate by cutting, &c.

215.] The Accusative with *διὰ* is often used to denote the space through which motion takes place: as—

Il. 1. 600 διὰ δώματα ποιπνύοντα bustling through the palace (so *διὰ σπέος, διὰ βήσσας, διὰ ῥωπήια, &c.*).

14. 91 *μῦθον ὃν οὐ κεν ἀνὴρ γε διὰ στόμα πάμπαν ἀγοίτο* (=with which a man would not sully his mouth: *cp. ἀνὰ στόμα, § 210*).

Od. 9. 400 ῥέκεον ἐν σπήεσσι δι' ἄκριας dwelt in caves about (scattered through) the headlands. *Od. 10. 150, 51*

So *Il.* 2. 40 διὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμύνας *lasting through hard fights*: and διὰ νύκτα (chiefly in the *Odyssey*, and books 10 and 24 of the *Iliad*).

This use is distinctively Homeric. Sometimes also διὰ with the Acc. is used in Homer to express *cause* or *agency*; as *Il.* 1. 73 ἦν διὰ μαρτοσύνην (Calchas led the army) *by virtue of his soothsaying*; *Od.* 8. 520 διὰ μεγάθυμον Ἀθήνην (to conquer) *by the help of Athens*; so *Il.* 10. 497., 15. 41, 71, *Od.* 8. 82., 11. 276, 282, 437., 13. 121., 19. 154, 523. These places do not show the later distinction between *by means of* and *by reason of*.

216.] The Genitive with διὰ implies passing *through* something in order to get *beyond* it; esp. getting through some *obstacle*: as—

Il. 4. 135 διὰ μὲν ἄρ ζωστήρος ἐλήλατο.

So of a gate, *Il.* 3. 263 διὰ Σκαιοῶν ἔχον ἵππους: and of lower and upper air, &c. δι' ἠέρος αἰθέρ' ἵκανε, δι' αἰθέρος οὐρανὸν ἴκε, πεδίονδε διὰ νεφέων. So again διὰ προμάχων, δι' ὀμίλου &c. of making way through the press.

The Acc. is used where we expect this Gen. in *Il.* 7. 247 ἐξ δὲ διὰ πύχας ἦλθε *went through six folds*: but this may be partly due to the metrical impossibility of πυχῶν. Conversely, in *Il.* 10. 185 ὅς τε καθ' ὕλην ἐρχεται δι' ὄρεσφι the Acc. would be right, and ὄρεσφι is perhaps a false archaism: but cp. § 158.

ὑπέρ.

217.] The Preposition ὑπέρ (or ὑπείρ) means *higher*, hence *over*, *beyond*. It is not found in the adverbial use, or in Tmesis, or with a Dative.

In Composition ὑπέρ expresses going *across* or *beyond*, hence *excess*, violation of limits, &c.

218.] With the Accusative ὑπέρ is used—

(1) of motion or extent *over* a space, as *Il.* 23. 227 ὑπείρ ἄλα κίδναται ἠώς. This use is not common; *Il.* 12. 289., 24. 13, *Od.* 3. 68^{1/2} 4. 172., 9. 254, 260.

(2) of motion *passing over* an object: as *Il.* 5. 16 ὑπὲρ ὄμων, ἀριστερόν ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή; *Od.* 7. 135 ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσεται.

(3) metaphorically, *in excess of*, *in violation of*: ὑπὲρ αἴσαν, ὑπὲρ μοῖραν, ὑπὲρ ὄρκια: also, somewhat differently, *Il.* 17. 327 ὑπὲρ θεόν *in spite of God*.

219.] With the Genitive ὑπέρ is used both of position and of motion *over* an object, esp. at some distance from it; as *στῆ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς*; *Il.* 15. 382 *νηὸς ὑπὲρ τοίχων* (of a wave com-

ing) *over the sides of a ship*: Π. 23. 327 ὄσον τ' ὄργυι' ὑπὲρ αἴης *a fathom's length above ground*.

Metaphorically it means *over* so as to protect, hence *in defence of, on behalf of*; as Π. 7. 449 τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο νεῶν ὑπερ; Π. 1. 444 ἑκατόμβην ῥέξαι ὑπὲρ Δαναῶν. So Π. 6. 524 ὄθ' ὑπὲρ σέθεν αἰσχέ' ἀκούω *when I listen to reproaches on your account* (of which I bear the brunt). But Hes. Op. 217 δίκη δ' ὑπὲρ ὕβριος ἴσχει *justice rises (prevails) over insolence*.

In respect of form ὑπέρ (for ὑπέρι, Sanscr. *upári*) is a Comparative of ὑπό; cp. the Superlative ὑπατος, and the Lat. *superus, summus*. Hence the Gen. is ablatival, like the Gen. with words of comparison; see § 152.

ἐνί.

220.] **The Preposition ἐνί** (also εἰνί, εἰν, ἐν) means *within, in*; it is used adverbially (as Π. 5. 740 ἐν δ' ἔρις, ἐν δ' ἀλκή &c.), in Tmesis (as ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί), and with a (locative) Dative.

Notice, as departures from the strict local sense, the uses—

(1) with Plurals denoting persons (= μετὰ among), as ἐν ὑμῖν (Π. 9. 121, 528., 10. 445), ἐν πᾶσι (Od. 2. 194., 16. 378), ἐν σφίσι (Π. 23. 703). *K127,180,207,314 (= E1)*

(2) with abstract words (rare in the Iliad); ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι (Π. 10. 245, 279), ἐν πάντεσσ' ἔργοισι (Π. 23. 671), ἐν ἄλγεσι (Π. 24. 568); θαλίη ἐνι (Π. 9. 143, 285), ἐν νηπιέη (Π. 9. 491); ἐν φιλότητι; ἐν μόρῃ *aright* (Π. 19. 186), αἴση ἐν ἀργαλέη (Π. 22. 61), ἐν Καρὸς αἴση (Π. 9. 378); ἐν δὲ λῆ τιμῇ (Π. 9. 319).

These two uses are nearly confined in the Iliad to books 9, 10, 23, 24. *Esfer benegelesen v. 21. 404 d. N. 62. 12. 2*

σύν.

221.] **The Preposition σύν** (or ξύν) means *in company with*. It is not used as a pure Adverb, but is found in Tmesis, as Π. 1. 579 σὺν δ' ἡμῖν δαῖτα παραῆξ and disturb (συνταράσσω) *our feast*. It is used with an Instrumental Dative (§ 144).

To express *equally with, or at the same time as*, Homer uses ἄμα with a Dat.; while σύν commonly means *attended by, with the help of, &c.* Hence σύν ἐντεσι *with armour on*, σύν νηυσί *in ships*, σύν ὄρκῳ *on oath*, σύν Ἀθήνῃ *aided by Athens*: so Π. 4. 161 σύν τε μεγάλῳ ἀπέτισαν *they pay with a great price*.

The use of σύν with the Dative has been recently shown by Tycho Mommsen to be confined, generally speaking, to poetry. The Attic prose writers (with the singular exception of Xenophon) use μετὰ with the Gen.; the practice of the poets varies, from Homer, who hardly ever uses μετὰ with the Gen., down to Euripides, who uses it about half as often as σύν. It is evident that in

post-Homeric times *μετά* with the Gen. became established in the ordinary colloquial language, while *σύν* with the dat. was retained as a piece of poetical style, but gradually gave way to living usage. See Tycho Mommsen's dissertation *Μετά, σύν und άμα bei den Epikern* (Frankfurt am Main, 1874).

εις.

222.] The Preposition *εις* (or *εις*) expresses motion *to* or *into*. It is not used adverbially (the Adverb being *εισω*), and seldom in Tmesis: Il. 8. 115 τὸ δ' *εις* ἀμφοτέρω Διομήδεος ἄρματα βήτην.

The motion is sometimes *implied*: as Il. 15. 275 ἐφάνη λῖς ἠϋγένειος *εις* ὁδόν: 16. 574 ἐς Πηλῆ ἰκέτευσε (*came as suppliant*).

Of *time*; ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα *to sun-set*; so ἐς τί *how long?* *εις* ὅ *until*: Od. 14. 384 ἐς θέρος ἢ ἐς ὀπώρην *as late as summer or autumn*.

Metaphorical uses: Il. 2. 379 εἰ δέ ποτ' ἐς γε μίαν βουλευόμεν *if we take counsel to one purpose*; Il. 9. 102 εἰπεῖν *εις* ἀγαθόν *to speak to good effect* (so Il. 789., 23. 305).

ἐξ.

223.] The Preposition *ἐξ* (or *ἐκ*) usually expresses motion *out* from an object. It is not used purely adverbially, but there are many examples of Tmesis: as ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο, ἐκ δέ οἱ ἠνίοχος πλήγη φρένας *his charioteer lost* (lit. *was struck out of*) *his wits*, ἐκ τε καὶ ὄψ' ἐτελεί (Il. 4. 161) *he brings it to pass* (ἐκτελεί) *late*.

With a Gen. (ablatival) *ἐξ* is used of motion *from* or *out of*. Sometimes the idea of motion is *implied*:—

Il. 13. 301 ἐκ Θρήκης Ἐφύρους μέτα θωρήσσεσθον *armed themselves to come from Thrace after the Ephyri*.

14. 129 ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτ' αὐτοὶ μὲν ἐχώμεθα δηϊοτήτος ἐκ βελέων *hold back from fighting (going) out of range*: cp. 16. 122, 678., 18. 152.

So of *direction*: Il. 14. 153 Ἥρη δ' εἰσεῖδε . . σταῶ' ἐξ Οὐλύμπιο *stood and looked from Olympus*; Od. 21. 420 (drew the bow) αὐτόθεν ἐκ δίφροιο καθήμενος *from the chair as he sat*; Il. 19. 375 ὄτ' ἂν ἐκ πόντοιο σέλας ναύτησι φανήη *when a meteor appears to sailors at sea* (seeing it from the sea): of *choosing* out of, Il. 15. 680 ἐκ πολλέων πῖσυρας συναίρεται ἵππους, and similarly; Il. 18. 431 ὅσσ' ἐμοὶ ἐκ πασέων Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἄλγε' ἔδωκε *to me* (*taken from, hence*) *more than all*.

ἐξ is also used of an *agent* as the *source* of action; as Il. 5. 384 τλήμεν . . ἐξ ἀνδρῶν *have endured at the hands of men*; cp. Il. 22. 280, Od. 7. 70., 9. 512: also Il. 24. 617 θεῶν ἐκ κήδεα πέσσει *endures heaven-sent troubles*, and Hes. Theog. 94 ἐκ γὰρ Μουσῶν καὶ ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος ἄνδρες ἀοιδοὶ ἔασι. The meaning *in*

consequence of (a thing) occurs in Il. 9. 566 ἐξ ἀρέων μητρὸς κεχολωμένος, and in the Odyssey (3. 135, 5. 468, &c.).

Of time: ἐκ τοῦτο from that time, ἐξ ἀρχῆς from the first (Od. 1. 188, &c.), ἐκ νεότητος (Il. 14. 86).

With an abstract word, Il. 10. 107 ἐκ χόλου ἀργαλέοιο μεταστρέψῃ φίλον ἦτορ. Note also: Il. 10. 68 πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων calling them by the father's name according to family; Il. 9. 343 (486) ἐκ θυμοῦ from the heart, heartily (but Il. 23. 595 ἐκ θυμοῦ πεσέειν to fall away from a person's favour).

ἀπό.

224.] The Preposition ἀπό means off, away, at a distance from. It is not used adverbially, but is common in Tmesis; as Il. 8. 108 οὓς ποτ' ἀπ' Αἰνείαν ἐλόμην which I took from Aeneas. In Composition it generally gives the Verb the notion of separating; e.g. ἀπο-κόπτω is not I hew at a distance, but I separate by hewing: so ἀπεκόσμεον cleared away (Od. 7. 232), and similarly ἀποδύω, ἀποβάλλω, ἀπολούω, ἀπορρήγνυμι, ἀποκαπύω (all used in Tmesis). Hence we must explain Il. 19. 254 ἀπὸ τρίχας ἀρξάμενος cutting hair as an ἀπαρχή, or first offering; cp. Od. 3. 446., 14. 422.

Sometimes ἀπό has the force of restoration or return, as in ἀποδίδωμι, ἀπο-νοστέω (cp. ἄψ backwards). So ἀπο-ειπεῖν means either to speak out or to forbid, refuse. In a few cases it has an intensive force, as in ἀπομηνίω, ἀπήχθετο, ἀποθανμάζω.

With the Genitive ἀπό generally expresses motion away from, not implying previous place within the object (whereas ἐξ means proceeding from). It is also used of position, as Il. 8. 16 ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης as far as heaven is from earth; Od. 1. 49 φίλων ἀπο πῆματα πάσχει suffers woes far from his friends; metaphorically, Il. 1. 562 ἀπὸ θυμοῦ μᾶλλον ἐμοὶ ἔσσει you will be the more out of favour with me; ἀπὸ δόξης away from expectation. ^{Λ. 547} This Gen. is clearly ablatival.

πρό.

225.] The Preposition πρό means forward, in front. It is seldom used as an Adverb; Il. 13. 799 πρό μὲν τ' ἄλλ', κτλ.; Il. 16. 188 ἐξάγαγε πρό φώσδε brought forth to the light: and of time, Il. 1. 70 πρό τ' ἐόντα the past. In one or two other instances we may recognise either the free adverbial use or Tmesis: Il. 1. 195 πρό γὰρ ἦκε, 1. 442 πρό μ' ἔπεμψε, Od. 1. 37 πρό οἱ εἶπομεν.

Traces of a use of πρό with the Locative may be seen in the phrases οὐρανόθι πρό in the face of heaven, Ἰλιόθι πρό in front of Troy, and (perhaps in the temporal sense) ἠώθι πρό before dawn. In these cases the meaning is to the front in, hence immediately before. *Alkms Rh. Μεν II 166: πρὸ. Christ πρό, p 112.* ①561, N3
Λ50, ε469

With a Genitive, on the other hand, πρό means *in front with respect to, in advance of*; hence, in a more or less metaphorical sense, *in defence of*, as Il. 8. 57 πρό τε παίδων καὶ πρό γυναικῶν. The Case is here the ablative Gen. (as with ὑπέρ and words of comparison).

But in Il. 4. 382 πρό ὁδοῦ ἐγένοντο the Gen. is partitive, *got forward on the way*; and so perhaps Il. 16. 667 πρό φόβοιο *forward in the flight*, i. e. *having betaken themselves to flight* (so Düntzer *a. l.*).

The temporal sense is rare in Homer; Od. 15. 524., 17. 476 πρό γάμοιο *before marriage*; Il. 10. 224 καὶ τε πρό ὁ τοῦ ἐνόησε *one thinks of a thing before another*.

ἀντί.

226.] The only certain Compound with ἀντί in Homer appears to be ἀντι-φέρεισθαι *to oppose* (Il. 1. 589., 5. 701., 22. 482, Od. 16. 238): for the Verbs ἀντιβολέω *meet* and ἀντιτορέω *pierce* may be derived from the Nouns ἀντί-βολος, ἀντί-τορος: also in Il. 8. 163 we may read γυναικὸς ἄρ' ἀντὶ τέτυξο, not ἀντετέτυξο (cp. Od. 8. 546 ἀντὶ κασιγνήτου ξεινός θ' ἰκέτης τε τέτυκται), and in Od. 22. 74 for ἀντίσχεσθε (*hold up against*) ἀν' ἴσχεσθε (i. e. ἅντα ἴσχεσθε, cp. Od. 1. 334 ἅντα παρειάων σχομένη λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα).

ἀντί also resembles the Improper Prepositions (esp. the Adverbs ἅντα, ἀντίον, &c.) in being used with the Gen., but not with the Dat. or Acc. It means *in place of*, hence *in the character of, equivalent to*: as Il. 21. 75 ἀντὶ τοῖ εἰμ' ἰκέταο.

Double Prepositions.

227.] It is characteristic of Homer to form a species of compound by combining two Prepositions. We have—

ἀμφὶ περί, like our *round about*: also περί τ' ἀμφὶ τε *round and about*: used adverbially, as Il. 22. 10 ὄχθαι δ' ἀμφὶ περί μεγάλ' ἴαχον; in Composition, ἀμφιπεριστρώφα (Il. 8. 348), &c.

παρῆξ *out besides, out along, out past*: adverbial in Od. 14. 168 ἄλλα παρῆξ μεμνώμεθα: with the Acc., παρῆξ ἄλα *alongside the sea*, παρῆξ τὴν νῆσον *past the island*; παρὲκ νόον *beyond (=contrary to) reason*: with the Gen., παρῆξ ὁδοῦ *aside from the way*.

ὑπέξ, with a Gen. *away from under*, as Il. 13. 89 φεύξεσθαι ὑπέκ κακοῦ.

διέξ, with a Gen. *right through*, as διέκ προθύρου, διέκ μεγάροιο.

ἀποπρό *quite away*, used adverbially and with a Gen.

διαπρό *right through*, adverbially and with a Gen.

περιπρό *round about*; Il. 11. 180 περιπρό γὰρ ἔγχρῃ θύε.

In all these instances the meaning and construction are mainly determined by the first of the two Prepositions (so that *e. g.* *παρέξ* is used nearly as *παρά*, *διέξ* and *διαπρό* as *διά*, &c.). The second does little more than add some emphasis.

The treble Preposition *ὑπεκπρό* is found in Composition: *ὑπεκπροθέω*, *ὑπεκπρορέω*, &c. The sense is represented by dividing the words *ὑπεκ-προθέω*, &c.

A curious variety is found in the Compound *προ-προκυλινδόμενος* *rolling forward before*, where a second *πρό* is added to give emphasis to the first.

Improper Prepositions.

228.] The term 'Improper Preposition' may be applied to any Adverb used to govern a Case. The following are some of the most important words of the kind:—

Used with a Genitive: *ἄγχι* *near, close to*, *ἐγγύθι*, *ἐγγύς* *near*, *ἄντα*, *ἀντίον*, &c. *facing*, *πρόσθε(ν)* *before*, *πάροιθε(ν)* *in front of*, *ὀπισθε(ν)* *behind*, *μεσσηγύς* *between*, *ἐντός*, *ἐντοσθε*, *ἐνδοθεν* *within*, *ἔξω* *out*, *ἐκτός*, *ἐκτοθι*, *ἐκτοσθε(ν)* *outside*, *ἐνερθε* *beneath*, *ἄνευ*, *ἀνευθε(ν)* *apart from, without*, *ἄτερ* *without*, *νόσφι* *away from*, *ἐκάς*, *ἐκάτερθε(ν)* *apart from*, *μέσφα* *until*, *πέραν* *beyond*, *πάλιν* *back from*, *ἀντικρύ* *straight to*, *ἰθὺς* *straight towards*, *τῆλε*, *τηλόθι* *far off*, *ὑπαιθα* *under*, *εἵνεκα* (*ἐνεκα*) *on account of*, *ἐκῆτι* *by the favour of*. The Gen. with some of these words may be ablatival (§ 152). In general, however, it appears to be used with little or no reference to the meaning of the governing Adverb, and merely in order to connect the two words. Hence these constructions are best brought under the general rule that a Noun governs the Genitive (§ 147).

With a Dative: *ἅμα* *together with*, *μίγδα* *in company with*, *ὁμῶς* *in like manner*.

ἀμφίς takes a Gen. in the meaning *aside from* (Il. 8. 444., 23. 393, Od. 14. 352). It is also found with the Acc. in the same sense as *ἀμφί*, in the phrase *θεοὶ Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἰόντες*, Il. 14. 274., 15. 225 (see also Il. 11. 634, 748, Od. 6. 266); and once with a Dat., viz. in Il. 5. 723 *σιδηρέω ἄξονι ἀμφίς*. Also as an Adv. = *around* in Il. 9. 464., 24. 488.

εἴσω generally takes an Accusative, as *Ἰλιον εἴσω* *to Ilium*: but a Gen. in Od. 8. 290 *ὁ δ' εἴσω δώματος ἦει* *went inside the house* ηβ5 (not merely *to the house*).

The word *ὥς* was supposed to govern an Accusative in one place in Homer, viz. Od. 17. 218 *ὥς αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει θεὸς ὥς τὸν ὁμοῖον*. But the true construction is (as Mr. Ridgeway has pointed out) *ὥς—ὥς* *as God brings like as he brings like, i. e. deals with a man as he dealt with his like* (see *Journal of Philology*, vol. xvii. p. 113).

Note the frequency of Compounds formed by one of these words following a Preposition: *ἐν-αντα*, *εἰς-αντα*, *ἀν-αντα*, *κάτ-αντα*, *πάρ-αντα*, *ἐν-αντίον*, *κατ-εν-*

αντίον : ἔμ-προσθεν, προ-πάροιθε, μετ-όπισθεν, ἀπ-άνευθεν, ἀπ-άτερθεν, ἀπό-νοσφι, ὑπ-ένερθε, κατ-αντικρύ. Cp. ἄν-διχα, δι-αμπέρες, κατ-αυτοῖσι, &c. These are not true Compounds (σύνθετα), but are formed by παράθεσις, or mere juxtaposition : *i. e.* they do not consist of two members, of which the first is wholly employed in limiting or qualifying the second, but of two adverbial words qualifying the same Verb. Thus they are essentially akin to the combinations formed by a Preposition and its Case : see § 178.

Homeric and Attic uses of Prepositions.

229.] The development of the language between the Homeric and the Attic period is especially shown in the uses of Prepositions. It may be convenient here to bring together some of the chief points.

1. Most of the Prepositions,—but esp. ἀμφί, περί, παρά, ἐπί, ὑπό, προτί, ἐνί—are used in Homer adverbially, *i. e.* as distinct words. Afterwards they become mere unaccented words or prefixes.

2. A variety of the same process shows itself in the disuse of Tmesis. Besides the Prepositions already mentioned, this applies to μετά, ἀνά, κατά, διά, ἔξ, ἀπό, εἰς.

In these processes of development we have seen that the loss of independent meaning is accompanied by a change (which is in all probability simply a *loss*) of accent.

3. The construction with the Dative (which is mostly locative) is the one in which the Preposition retains most nearly its own ‘adverbial’ meaning—so much so that it is often doubtful whether the Preposition can be said to ‘govern’ the Case at all. Accordingly we find that this construction is comparatively rare in Attic. It is virtually lost (except as a poetical survival) with ἀμφί, περί, μετά, ἀνά, and σύν.

4. On the other hand the Genitive is more frequent in Attic, and not confined (as it generally is in Homer) to uses in which it has either an ablatival or a quasi-partitive sense. Thus it is used with ἀμφί, περί, and μετά : also with διά of motion *through*. In such uses as these the Case ceases to have a distinct meaning : it merely serves (as with the Improper Prepositions) to show that the Noun is governed by the Preposition.

5. The development of meaning is chiefly seen in the extension from the literal sense of *place* to various derivative or metaphorical senses. Some of these senses are beginning to be used in the Homeric language : *e.g.* ἀμφί with the Dat. = *about, concerning* ; περί with the Gen. (probably also the Dat.) in the same meaning ; παρά with the Acc. = *in excess of, in violation of* ; μετά with the Acc. = *after* ; ἐπί with the Acc. = *towards* (a person) : διά with the Acc. = *owing to* : ἔξ = *in consequence of*. Others may safely be counted as post-Homeric ; note in particular—

περί with the Acc. = *about, nearly* (of time and number); also = *concerning, in relation to*:

παρά with the Dat. = *in the opinion of*; with the Acc. = *during the continuance of*; also *compared with*:

κατά with the Acc. = *answering to*; also *during the time of*: with the Gen. = *about, against*:

ἐπί with the Dat. = *in the power of*:

with many phrases in which the force of the Preposition is vague, such as δι' ὀργῆς, ἀνὰ κράτος, πρὸς βίαν, ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφανούς, &c.

6. There are slight but perceptible differences between the usage of the Iliad and that of the Odyssey (§§ 182, 188, 196, 199, 215). Some uses, again, are peculiar to one or two books of the Iliad, esp. 9, 10, 23, 24: see §§ 199 (4), 220, 223 (*fin.*).

CHAPTER X.

THE VERBAL NOUNS.

Introductory.

230.] The preceding chapters deal with the Simple Sentence: that is to say, the Sentence which consists of a single Verb, and the subordinate or qualifying words (Case-forms, Adverbs, Prepositions) construed with it (§ 131). We have now to consider how this type is enlarged by means of the Verbal Nouns.

The Infinitive and Participle, as has been explained (§ 84), are in fact Nouns: the Infinitive is an abstract Noun denoting the action of the Verb, the Participle a concrete Noun expressing that action as an attribute. They are termed 'Verbal' because they suggest or imply a predication, such as a finite Verb expresses (*e.g.* ἔρχεται ἄγων αὐτούς implies the assertion ἄγει αὐτούς), and because the words which depend upon or qualify them are construed with them as with Verbs (ἄγων αὐτούς, not ἄγων αὐτῶν *bringer of them*). Thus they have the character of subordinate Verbs, 'governed' by the finite Verb of the sentence, and serving at the same time as centres of dependent Clauses.

The distinction between Infinitives and other abstract Substantives, and again between Participles and other primitive Adjectives, was probably not always so clearly drawn as it is in Greek. The Infinitives of the oldest Sanscrit hardly form a distinct group of words; they are abstract Nouns of various formation, used in several different Cases, and would hardly have

been classed apart from other Case-forms if they had not been recognised as the precursors of the later more developed Infinitive. The Participles, too, are variously formed in Sanscrit, and moreover they are not the only Nouns with which the construction is 'adverbial' instead of being 'adnominal.'

The peculiarity of the Verbal Nouns in point of meaning may be said to consist in the *temporary* and *accidental* character of the actions or attributes which they express. Thus πράττειν and πράξει suggest a *particular doing*, momentary or progressive, at or during a time fixed by the context; whereas πράξις means *doing*, irrespective of time; πράκτωρ *one who does*, generally or permanently, a *doer*; and so in other cases. The distinction is especially important for Homer. In the later language there are uses of the Infinitive and Participle in which they lose the Verbal element, and have the character of ordinary Nouns; e. g. τὸ πράττειν is nearly equivalent to πράξις, οἱ πράττοντες to πράκτορες, &c.

The Infinitive.

231.] **Form and original meaning.** The Greek Infinitive is a Case-form—usually the Dative—of an abstract Verbal Noun (*nomen actionis*). As a Dative it expresses an action to which that of the governing Verb is *directed*, or *for which* it takes place,—viz. a purpose, effect, bearing, &c. of the main action. Thus δόμεν-αι *to give*, being the Dative of a Stem δο-μεν *giving*, means 'to or for giving,' hence *in order to give, so as to give*, &c. But owing to the loss of all other uses of the Dative in Greek (§ 143), and the consequent isolation of the Infinitive, its meaning has been somewhat extended. For the same reason the Infinitives derived from other Cases (§ 85) are no longer used with different meaning, but are retained merely as alternative forms.

The Dative meaning evidently accounts for the common constructions of the Infinitive with Verbs expressing *wish, command, power, expectation, beginning*, and the like: as ἐθέλω δόμεναι lit. *I am willing for giving*, δύναμαι ἰδεῖν *I have power for seeing*, &c. In Homer it may be said to be the usual meaning of the Infinitive. It is found in a great many simple phrases, such as ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι *urged together to fight (so that they fought)*, δὸς ἄγειν *give for leading away (to be led away)*, οἶδε νοῆσαι *knows (has sense) to perceive*, βῆ δ' ἰέναι *stepped to go (=took his way, cp. γούνατ' ἐνώμα φευγέμεναι)*; προέηκε πυθέσθαι, πέμπε νέεσθαι, ὦρτο πέτεσθαι, &c. Cp. also—

Il. 1. 22 ἐπυφῆμῃσαν Ἀχαιοί, αἰδεῖσθαι κτλ. *the Greeks uttered approving cries for (to the effect of) respecting, &c.*; so 2. 290 δδύρονται οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι.

2. 107 Ἀγαμέμνονι λείπε φορῆναι, πολλῆσιν νήσοισι καὶ Ἄργεϊ παντὶ ἀνάσσειν *left (the sceptre) to Agamemnon to bear, therewith to rule over many islands and Argos.*

Od. 4. 634 ἐμὲ δὲ χρεὼ γίνεται αὐτῆς Ἥλιδ' ἐς εὐρύχορον διαβή-
μεναι *I have need of it for crossing over to Elis.*

The notion of *purpose* often passes into that of adaptation, possibility, necessity, &c. ; *e. g.*—

Il. 6. 227 πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἐμοὶ Τρῶες . . κτείνειν *there are many Trojans for me to kill (whom I may kill)*; cp. 9. 688 εἰσὶ καὶ οἷδε τὰδ' ἐλπέμεν *these too are here to tell this*, II. 342 ἐγγὺς ἔσαν προφυγεῖν *were near for escaping, to escape with.*

13. 98 εἶδεται ἡμᾶρ ὑπὸ Τρώεσσι δαμῆναι *the day is come for being subdued (when we must be subdued) by the Trojans*; cp. Od. 2. 284.

Again, from the notion of direction or effect the Infinitive shades off into that of *reference*, sphere of action, &c. ; as Il. 5. 601 οἶον δὴ θαυμάζομεν Ἑκτορα δῖον αἰχμητῆν τ' ἔμεναι κτλ. *for being a warrior*; Od. 7. 148 θεοὶ ὄλβια δοῖεν ζῶμεναι *may the gods grant blessings for living, i. e. in life*; ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι *was best for (and so in) fighting*, εὐχεται εἶναι *boasts for (of) being.*

In the passages quoted the Infinitive is so far an *abstract Noun* that the action which it denotes is not predicated of an *agent*. The agent, if there is one in the speaker's mind, is not given by the form of the sentence; *e. g.* ἐγγὺς ἔσαν προφυγεῖν (*were near for escaping*) might mean *were near so as to escape* or (*as the context of Il. 11. 342 requires*) *were near so that he could escape*; δῦναι ἐπειγόμενος would usually mean *eager to set*, but in Od. 13. 30 it means *eager for (the sun's) setting*. Hence the apparently harsh change of subject in such a case as—

Od. 2. 226 καὶ οἱ ἰὼν ἐν νηυσὶν ἐπέτρεπεν οἶκον ἅπαντα
πεῖθεσθαί τε γέροντι καὶ ἔμπεδα πάντα φυλάσσειν *med. mind's bal*

to the intent that it should obey the old man and he should guard all surely (lit. for obeying—for guarding). And so in Il. 9. 230 ἐν δοιῇ δὲ σωσέμεν ἢ ἀπολέσθαι νῆας, where νῆας is first Object, then Subject. The harshness disappears when we understand that the abstract use is the prevailing one in Homer.

It may also be noticed here that—

(1) With Verbs of privative meaning, the Infinitive may be used as with the corresponding affirmative words: as ἔρριγ' ἀντιβολῆσαι *shudders as to (from) meeting*; Od. 9. 468 ἀνὰ δ' ὀφρύσι νεῦον ἐκάστω κλαίειν *I nodded backwards to each for weeping (=for-bidding him to weep)*, Il. 22. 474 εἶχον ἀπολέσθαι. But the proper use also appears, as in Il. 22. 5 αὐτοῦ μέναι ἐπέδησε *fettered so that he remained*. Here the context must determine the meaning.

(2) With φρονέω, οἶω, &c. the Infinitive may express the effect or conclusion: *I think to the effect—, hence I think fit*; as Il. 13. 263 οὐ γὰρ οἶω . . πολεμίζειν *I have no mind to do*. So

εἰπεῖν *to speak to the intent that, to bid*, as Od. 3. 427 εἶπατε δ' εἴσω δμῶησιν . . πένεσθαι. Other examples are given in § 238.

In this use, as was observed by Mr. Riddell (*Dig.* § 83), the 'dictative force'—the notion of thinking right, advising, &c.—comes through the Infinitive to the governing Verb, not vice versa. The same remark holds of the use with ἔστι *it is possible*, lit *it is* (a case) *for* (something to happen).

232.] **Infinitive with Nouns, &c.** It will be useful to bring together instances in which the Infinitive depends upon some qualifying word—Preposition, Adverb, Adjective, &c.—construed with the Verb:—

Il. 1. 258 οἱ περὶ μὲν βουλήν Δαναῶν περὶ δ' ἔστε μάχεσθαι *excel them in fighting*.

1. 589 ἀργαλέος γὰρ Ὀλύμπιος ἀντιφέρεσθαι *the Olympian is hard to set oneself against*; cp. 20. 131.

4. 510 ἐπεὶ οὐ σφι λίθος χρῶς οὐδὲ σίδηρος χαλκὸν ἀνασχέσθαι *since their flesh is not stone or iron for withstanding (so as to be able to withstand) bronze*.

8. 223 ἦ ῥ' ἐν μεσάτῳ ἔσκε γεγωνέμεν ἀμφοτέρωσε *for shouting (= so that one could shout) both ways*.

13. 775 ἐπεὶ τοι θυμὸς ἀναίτιον αἰτιάσθαι *since your mind is for blaming (is such that you must blame) the innocent*.

Od. 17. 20 οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ σταθμοῖσι μένειν ἔτι τηλικός εἰμί *I am not yet of the age to remain*.

17. 347 αἰδῶς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κεχρημένῳ ἀνδρὶ παρῆναι *shame is not good to be beside a needy man (is not a good 'backer' for)*.

21. 195 ποῖοί κ' εἶτ' Ὀδυσῆι ἀμννέμεν εἴ ποθεν ἔλθοι; = *how would you behave in regard to fighting for Ulysses?*

Od. 2. 60 ἡμεῖς δ' οὐ νύ τι τοῖοι ἀμννέμεν may be either *we are not like him, so as to defend*, or simply *we are not fit to defend*. The construction of the Inf. is the same in either case: the difference is whether τοῖοι means 'of the kind' with reference to οἶος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔσκε or to the Inf. ἀμννέμεν. The latter may be defended by Od. 17. 20 (quoted above).

This construction is extended to some Nouns even when they are not used as predicates; as θείειν ταχύς *swift to run*, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι *a wonder to behold* (cp. the use of the Accusative with Adjectives, § 131 *fin.*).

233.] **Impersonal Verbs.** The Infinitive is used with ἔστι *there is* (means, room, occasion, &c.), ἔοικε *it is fit*, πέπρωται *it is determined*, εἶμαρτο *it was fated*. For ἔστι cp.—

Il. 14. 313 κείσε μὲν ἔστι καὶ ὕστερον ὄρηθηναί.

Od. 15. 392 αἶδε δὲ νύκτες ἀθέσφατοι· ἔστι μὲν εὔδειν, ἔστι δὲ τερπομένοισι ἀκούειν *there is (enough) for sleeping and for listening*.

It is very common with a negative: οὐκ ἔστι, οὐ πως ἔστι, &c. meaning *there is no way, it may not be that, &c.*

The Impersonal use is also found in phrases of the two kinds noticed in § 162, 4; viz.—

(a) With a Neuter Adjective; as ἀργαλέον δέ μοι ἔστι θέσθαι κτλ. *it is difficult for me to make &c.*; μόριμον δέ οἱ ἔστ' ἀλέασθαι *it is fated for him to escape*; so with αἰσχροῦν, νεμεσσητόν, αἰσιμον, ἄρκιον, βέλτερον, and the like.

(b) With an abstract Noun: as—

Il. 14. 80 οὐ γάρ τις νέμεσις φυγέειν κακόν *there is no wrong in escaping ill.*

Od. 5. 345 ὅθι τοι μοῖρ' ἔστιν ἀλύξαι *where it is thy fate to &c.*

Il. 330 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥρη εὐδειν *there is a time for &c.*

So with αἴσα, μόρος, θέμις, χρεώ, ἀνάγκη, αἰδώς, δέος, ἐλπωρή, &c. followed by an Infinitive to express what the *fate, need, shame, &c.* brings about, or in what it consists.

These examples throw light on two much-debated passages:

Il. 2. 291 ἦ μὴν καὶ πόνος ἔστιν ἀνηθέντα νέεσθαι

verily there is toil for a man to return in vexation, i. e. 'I admit that the toil is enough to provoke any one to return.' Thus understood, the expression is a slightly bold use of the form of sentence that we have in ὥρη ἔστιν εὐδειν, μοῖρα ἔστιν ἀλύξαι, θυμός ἐστιν ἀνάϊτιον αἰτιάσθαι, &c. The other interpretation, 'it is toil to return vexed,' though apparently easier, is not really more Homeric; and it certainly does not fit the context so well.

Il. 7. 238 οἶδ' ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ, οἶδ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ νωμῆσαι βῶν
ἀζαλέην, τό μοι ἔστι ταλαύρινον πολεμίζειν

I know how to turn my shield of seasoned ox-hide to the right and to the left, wherefore I have that wherewith to war in stout-shielded fashion (= I have a good claim to the title of ταλαύρινος πολεμιστής, elsewhere an epithet of Ares). Here ἔστι is used as in ἔστιν εὐδειν, &c.

In Il. 13. 99-101 ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν δρῶμαι, Τρῶας ἐφ' ἡμετέρας ἰέναι νέας the Inf. follows θαῦμα, or rather the whole phrase θαῦμα τόδε δρῶμαι (= θαῦμά ἐστι): ὄρω does not take an Inf. (§ 245).

234.] **Infinitive as apparent Subject, &c.** In the Impersonal uses the Infinitive appears to stand as Subject to the Verb; ἀργαλέον ἔστι θέσθαι = *making is hard*; οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακὸν βασιλευμένον *to be a king is not a bad thing*. This construction however is not consistent with the original character of the Infinitive. It is plain that ἔστιν εὐδειν can never have meant 'sleeping is,' but 'there is (room &c.) for sleeping': and so ἀργαλέον ἔστι θέσθαι is originally, and in Homer, *it (the case, state of things, &c.) is hard in view of making*. It is only in later Greek that we have the form ἀργαλέον ἔστι τὸ θέσθαι, in which θέσθαι is an indeclinable Neuter Noun.

The process by which the Infinitive, from being a mere word

of *limitation*, comes to be in sense the Subject or Object of the principal Clause. can be traced in sentences of various forms:—

(1) With a personal Subject; *e.g.* in—

Π. 5. 750 τῆς ἐπιτέτραπται μέγας οὐρανοῦ Οὐλυμπός τε
ἡμῖν ἀνακλῖναι πυκινὸν νέφος ἠδ' ἐπιπέειναι

the meaning 'to them is entrusted the opening and shutting of the thick cloud of heaven,' is expressed by saying 'to them heaven is entrusted for opening and shutting the cloud.' So—

Π. 1. 107 αἰεὶ τοι τὰ κάκ' ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσὶ μαντεύεσθαι.

4. 345 ἔνθα φίλ' ὄπταλέα κρέα ἔδμεναι.

Meaning *you love to prophesy evils (to eat roast flesh, &c.)*.

(2) The Impersonal form (ἀργαλέον ἐστὶ) only differs from the other in the vagueness of the Subject, which makes it easier for the Infinitive to become the Subject in sense, while it is still grammatically a word limiting the vague unexpressed Subject.

The use of a Neuter Pronoun as Subject (*e.g.* τό γε καλὸν ἀκούμεν *the thing is good, to listen*) may be regarded as a link between the personal and impersonal forms of expression: cp. § 161 (*note*), also § 258.

(3) Similarly an Infinitive following the *Object* of a Verb may become the logical *Object*; as—

Π. 4. 247 ἦ μένετε Τρῶας σχεδὸν ἐλθέμεν; *do ye wait for the Trojans for their coming on? i.e. for the coming on of the Trojans.*

14. 342 Ἦρη, μήτε θεῶν τό γε δεῖδιθι μήτε τιw' ἀνδρῶν ὄψεσθαι *do not fear any one of gods or of men for their being about to see, i.e. that any one will see: cp. Od. 22. 39, 40.*

A further development of this use leads, as we shall see, to the 'Accusative with the Infinitive.'

(4) Again, the Infinitive sometimes takes the place of a vague *unexpressed Object*. Thus οἶδε νοῆσαι means *knows (enough) to perceive*: the full construction being such as we have in Π. 2. 213 ὅς ῥ' ἔπεα φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἄκοσμά τε πολλά τε ἦδει . . ἐριζέμεναι *who knew (had a store of) words wherewith to wrangle*. So too δίδωμι with an Infinitive is originally construed as Od. 8. 44 τῷ γάρ ῥα θεὸς πέρι δῶκεν ἀοιδῆν τέρπειw: Π. 11. 20 τόν ποτέ οἱ Κινύρης δῶκε ξεινήιον εἶναι; thence it comes to mean 'to give (such a state of things) that some event shall happen,' *i.e. to grant the happening*; as δὸς τίσασθαι *grant that I may punish*. In such a passage as Π. 3. 322 τὸν δὸς ἀποφθίμενον δῦναι κτλ. we may take τόν with δός or as an Acc. with the Inf. δῦναι.

A Neuter Pronoun, too, may serve as a vague *Object*, explained by an Infinitive; *e.g.* Π. 5. 665-6 τὸ μὲν οὐ τις ἐπεφράσατ' . . ἐξέρύσαι: cp. Od. 21. 278 καὶ τοῦτο ἔπος κατὰ μοῖραν ξείπε, νῦν μὲν παῖσαι τόξον κτλ.

(5) The Infinitive may also be equivalent in sense to the Genitive depending on a Noun; as—

Π. 7. 409 οὐ γὰρ τις φειδῶ νεκρῶν κατατεθνηώτων

γίγνεται ἐπεὶ κε θάνασσι πρὸς-μελισσόμενον ὄκα

i. e. there is no grudging about the appeasing of the dead. Hence is developed an idiomatic use of the Genitive parallel to that of the *Accusativus de quo*: see Shilleto on Thuc. I. 61, 1.

235.] **With Relatives.** It is remarkable that the use of the Infinitive with ὡς, ὡς τε, οἶος, ὅσος, &c. is rare in Homer. The familiar construction of ὡς τε only occurs twice: Π. 9. 42 ἐπέσονται ὡς τε νέεσθαι *is eager to return*, and Od. 17. 20 οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ σταθμοῖσι μένειν ἔτι τηλικός εἰμί, ὡς τ' ἐπιτειλαμένῳ . . πιθέσθαι. The other instances are: Od. 21. 173 τοῖον—οἶόν τε ἔμεναι *such a one as to be*; Od. 5. 484 ὅσσον τε . . ἔρυσθαι *so far as to shelter*; Od. 19. 160 ἀνὴρ οἶός τε μάλιστα οἶκον κήδεσθαι, 21. 117 οἶός τ' . . ἀνελέσθαι.

236.] **With πρὶν and πάρος.** This use is common in Homer: as Π. 1. 98 πρὶν γ' ἀπὸ πατρὶ φίλῳ δόμεναι *before they give back to her father*; II. 573 πάρος χροῖα λευκὸν ἐπαυρέν *before touching the white flesh*.

The tense is nearly always the Aorist: the exceptions are, Od. 19. 475 πρὶν ἀμφαφάασθαι (a verb which has no Aorist), and Π. 18. 245 πάρος δόρποιο μέδεσθαι. Perhaps however μέδεσθαι is an Aorist: see § 31, 2.

πρὶν with the Indicative first appears in H. Apoll. 357 πρὶν γέ οἱ ἰὼν ἐφήκεν. For the use with the Subj. see § 297.

The origin of this singularly isolated construction must evidently be sought in the period when the Infinitive was an abstract Noun; so that (*e. g.*) πρὶν δόμεναι meant *before the giving*. The difficulty is that a word like πρὶν would be construed with the Ablative, not the Dative: as in fact we find Ablatives used as Infinitives in Sanscrit with *purá* 'before' (Whitney, § 983). It may be conjectured that the Dative Infinitive in Greek was substituted in this construction for an Ablative. Such a substitution might take place when the character of the Infinitive as a Case-form had become obscured.

It is held by Sturm (*Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Constructionen mit πρὶν*, p. 15) that the Inf. has the force of *limitation*: *e. g.* πρὶν οὐράσαι 'before in respect to wounding,' before the time of wounding. But on this view the sense would rather be 'too soon to wound.' It is better to say, with Mr. Goodwin (§ 623), that πρὶν is 'quasi-prepositional': and if so the Infinitive had ceased to be felt as a Dative when the use arose.

The restriction to the Aor. Inf. may date from the time when Infinitives—or Case-forms on the way to become Infinitives (§ 242)—were chiefly formed from the same Stem as the Aorist. Cp. the Aor. Participles which are without Tense-meaning (§ 243, 1).

237.] **Accusative with the Infinitive.** Along with the use of the Infinitive as an abstract Noun, we find in Homer the

later use by which it is in sense the Verb of a dependent Clause, the Subject of the Clause being in the Accusative.

In the examples of the Acc. with the Infinitive we may distinguish the following varieties or stages of the idiom:—

1. The Acc. has a grammatical construction with the governing Verb: *e.g.*—

II. 1. 313 λαοὺς δ' Ἀτρείδης ἀπολυμαίνεσθαι ἄνωγε Ἀγαμέμνονι
ordered the people to purify themselves (=that they should purify).

5. 601 οἶον δὴ θαυμάζομεν Ἐκτορα δῖον αἰχμητὴν τ' ἔμεναι κτλ.
(for being a warrior, how he was a warrior).

This might be called the *natural* Acc. with the Infinitive.

2. The Acc. has not a sufficient construction with the Verb alone, but may be used if it is accompanied by an Infinitive of the *thing* or *fact*: *e.g.*—

βούλομ' ἐγὼ λαὸν σῶν ἔμμεναι *I wish the people to be safe* (the safety of the people).

οὐνεκ' ἄκουσε τείρεσθαι Τρῶας *because he heard of the Trojans being hard pressed.*

τῷ οὐ νεμεσίζομ' Ἀχαιοὺς ἀσχαλάαν *wherefore I do not think it a shame in the Greeks to chafe.*

In this construction the logical Object is the fact or *action* given by the Infinitive, to which the Acc. furnishes a Subject or *agent*, and thus turns it from an abstract Noun to a predication (so that *e.g.* τείρεσθαι Τρῶας is virtually = ὅτι ἐτείροντο Τρῶες). It is found with Verbs that usually take only a 'Cognate Acc.' (Neuter Pronoun, &c.), as φημί, εἶπον, ἀκούω, πυνθάνομαι. οἶδα, δῖω, φρονέω, ἐθέλω, βούλομαι, ἔλπομαι, νεμεσίζομαι, φθονέω, &c. Thus it is in principle a particular form of the *Accusativus de quo* (see § 140, 3, *b*, also § 234, 3).

3. The Acc. has no construction except as the Subject of the Infinitive. This Acc. is chiefly found in Homer—

(*a*) after Impersonal Verbs (§ 162, 4): as—

II. 18. 329 ἄμφω γὰρ πέπρωται ὁμοίην γαίαν ἐρεῦσαι
it is fated for both to die.

19. 182 οὐ μὲν γάρ τι νεμεσσητὸν βασιλῆα ἄνδρ' ἀπαρέσασθαι
it is no shame that a king should die.

(*b*) after πρὶν and πάρος; as πρὶν ἐλθεῖν νῆας Ἀχαιῶν *before the Greeks came*, πάρος τάδε ἔργα γενέσθαι *before these things came to pass.*

The other examples are from the *Odyssey*, viz.—

Od. 4. 210 ὡς νῦν Νέστορι δῶκε διαμπερὲς ἤματα πάντα
αὐτὸν μὲν λιπαρῶς γηρασκόμεν (10. 533., 14. 193).

This may be called the purely *idiomatic* Acc. with the Infinitive. It has evidently been formed on the analogy of the older varieties.

238.] Tenses of the Infinitive. So long as the Infinitive is merely a Verbal Noun, it does not express anything about the *time* of the action as past, present, or future. But when it is virtually a predication, the idea of time comes in; *e. g.*—

Il. 5. 659 ἀλλ' οἶόν τινα φασι βίην Ἑρακλεΐην
ἔμμεναι ('what they say he *was*'): *cp.* Od. 8. 181.

14. 454 οὐ μὰν αὐτ' ὄτω . . ἄλιον πηδῆσαι ἄκουτα,
ἀλλά τις Ἀργείων κόμισε χροῖ.

The Future Infinitive is used with φημί, δῶ, ἔλπομαι, ὑπισχνέομαι, ὄμνυμι and other Verbs implying *expectation* or *promise*; also with μέλλω when it means *to be about to*.

When the Inf. expresses, not simple expectation as to the future, but *fitness, obligation, necessity*, or the like (§ 231, 2), the Aorist or Present is used. Thus Il. 13. 262 οὐ γὰρ ὄτω πολεμίζειν means, not 'I do not think I shall fight,' but *I do not think fit, I have no mind, to fight*; so Il. 3. 98 φρονέω διακριθῆμεναι *my mind is* (=δοκεῖ μοι) *that they should be parted*: 9. 608 φρονέω τετιμῆσθαι *I claim to be honoured*: 22. 235 νοέω φρεσὶ τιμῆσασθαι *I see (understand) that I should honour thee* (=I purpose to honour thee): 24. 560 νοέω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς Ἑκτορά τοι λῦσαι: and so in a prophecy, Od. 2. 171 φημί τελετηθῆναι ἅπαντα *I say that all must be accomplished*: and—

Il. 13. 665 ὅς ῥ' εὖ εἰδὼς κῆρ' ὀλοὴν ἐπὶ νηὸς ἔβαινε,
πολλάκι γάρ οἱ ἔειπε γέρον ἀγαθὸς Πολύτιδος
νούσῃ ὑπ' ἀργαλήν φθίσθαι οἷς ἐν μεγάροισιν
that he must perish (according to his fate).

So with μοῖρα and θέσφατόν ἐστι: also with μέλλω when it means *to be likely*: Il. 11. 364 ᾧ μέλλεις εὐχεσθαι *to whom it is like that you pray*; Od. 9. 475 οὐκ ἄρ' ἐμελλες ἀνάλκιδος ἀνδρὸς ἐταίρους ἔδμεναι *he proves to be no helpless man whose comrades you ate*; Il. 21. 83 μέλλω που ἀπέχθεσθαι *it must be that I am become hateful*; Il. 18. 362 μέλλει βροτὸς τελέσσαι *a man is likely to accomplish (i. e. it may be expected of him)*. Ωγ

The instances in which a Pres. or Aor. Inf. appears to be used of future time may be variously accounted for. The Inf. ἰέναι has a future sense in Il. 17. 709 οὐδέ μιν οἶω νῦν ἰέναι κτλ.; so Il. 20. 365., Od. 15. 214. Again in Od. 9. 496 καὶ δὴ φάμεν αὐτόθ' ὀλέσθαι the Aor. is used for the sake of vividness—we thought 'we are lost': *cp.* Il. 9. 413 ὤλετο μὲν μοι νόστος (§ 78). Similarly Il. 3. 112 ἐλπόμενοι παύσασθαι may be *hoping that they had ceased* (by the fact of the proposed duel); *cp.* Il. 7. 199., 16.

281. So Od. 13. 173 ὅς ἔφασκε Ποσειδάων' ἀγάσασθαι *who said that Poseidon was moved to indignation* (= ὅτι ἠγάσαστο).

In several places the reading is uncertain, the Fut. being of the same metrical value as the Aor. or the Pres. (-εσθαι and -ασθαι, -ιζειν and -ιζειν, &c.). In such cases the evidence of the ancient grammarians and the MSS. is usually indecisive, and we are justified in writing the Fut. throughout, according to the general rule. Thus—

Il. 3. 28 φάτο γὰρ τίσεσθαι (so Ven. A.: most MSS. τίσασθαι). Hence we may read φάτο γὰρ τίσεσθαι in Od. 20. 121.

22. 118 (ἀλλ' ἀποδάσσεσθαι (so Aristarchus: most MSS. -ασθαι).

22. 120 μή τι κατακρύψην, ἀλλ' ἀνδιχα πάντα δάσεσθαι (MSS. -ασθαι).

23. 773 ἐμελλον ἐπαίξεσθαι (the best MSS. have -ασθαι).

20. 85 (ἰπίσχεο) ἐναντίβιον πτολεμίξειν (so A. D.: other MSS. πολεμίξειν).

16. 830 ἦ που ἔφησθα πόλιν κεραϊζέμεν (MSS. -ιζέμεν).

Od. 2. 373 ὄμοσον μὴ . . τάδε μυθήσεσθαι (so Ar.: MSS. -ασθαι).

Two exceptions remain: Od. 2. 280 ἐλπαρῆ τοι ἔπειτα τελευτήσαι τάδε ἔργα (τελευτήσῃ in one of Ludwich's MSS.): Il. 12. 407 ἐπεὶ οἱ θυμὸς ἐέλεπετο κῦδος ἀρέσθαι (some good authorities give ἐέλετο).*

The only example of an Inf. representing an Optative is—

Il. 9. 684 καὶ δ' ἂν τοῖς ἄλλοισιν ἔφη παραμυθήσασθαι which is the report of the speech (v. 417) καὶ δ' ἂν . . παραμυθησαίμην. But cp. Od. 3. 125 οὐδέ κε φαίης . . μυθήσασθαι *you would not think that . . would speak*.

239.] **Dative with the Infinitive.** An idiomatic use of the Dative arises when the Noun which stands as logical subject to an Inf. of *purpose* is put in the same Case with it, *i. e.* in the Dative. Thus the construction in—

αἰσχρὸν γὰρ τόδε γ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι

is idiomatic (as compared with σφῶν δὸς ἄγειν, &c.), because the meaning is, not 'is shameful for future men,' but 'is shameful for (with a view to) the hearing of future men.' The principle is evidently the same as has been pointed out in the case of the Nominative and the Accusative (§ 234). Because the *action* of the Infinitive stands in a Dative relation to the governing Verb, the *agent* or Subject of the action is put in the Dative.

This construction is found in the 'double Dative' of Latin (*e. g.* ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι would be in Latin *posteris auditui*), and of Sanscrit (Delbrück, *A. S.* p. 149). It is usually classified as 'Attraction'—the Dat. of the *person* being regarded as following the Dat. of the *thing* or action. In Greek it evidently goes back to the time when the Inf. was still felt as a Dative.

240.] **Predicative Nouns—'Attraction.'** Corresponding to the Nominative in the Predicate (§ 162), an Infinitival Clause

* See Madvig, *Bemerkungen über einige Punkte der griech. Wortfügungslehre*, p. 34: Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* p. 328.

may have a Predicative *Accusative*, in agreement with its (expressed or understood) Subject: as Π. 4. 341 σφῶν μὲν τ' ἐπέοικε μετὰ πρώτοισιν ἕοντας ἕσταμεν *it becomes you that you should stand among the foremost*; Π. 8. 192 τῆς νῦν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἔκει πᾶσαν χρυσεῖην ἔμεναι *whose fame reaches heaven that it is all gold*.

Or the words which enter in this way into an Infinitival Clause may follow the construction of the principal Clause, and thus be put in the Nom. or Dat.; as—

Π. 1. 76 καὶ μοι ὄμοσον, ἦ μὲν μοι πρόφρων . . ἀρήξειν
12. 337 οὐ πῶς οἱ ἔην βώσαντι γεγωνεῖν.

Here πρόφρων is said to be 'attracted' into the Nom. (agreeing with the subject of ὄμοσον), and βώσαντι into the Dat. (agreeing with οἱ).

The difference of meaning given by the two constructions is generally to be observed in Homer, at least in the case of the Dative. A Noun or Participle is put in the Acc. if it is closely connected with the Inf., so as to become an essential part of the predication: whereas a Dat. construed with the principal Clause expresses something prior to the Inf. (either a condition or a reason). Thus—

Π. 1. 541 αἰεὶ τοι φίλον ἔστιν ἐμεῦ ἀπὸ νόσφι ἕοντα
κρυπτάδια φρονέοντα δικαζέμεν,

means 'you like to decide apart from me,' *i. e.* 'you like, when you decide, to be apart from me': whereas with ἕοντι the sense would be 'when you are apart from me you like to decide.' So Π. 15. 57 εἴπησι Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι πανσάμενον πολέμοιο ἰκέσθαι 'shall bid Poseidon to cease from war and come'—not 'when he has ceased, to come.'

But with a Dat.—

Π. 6. 410 ἐμοὶ δέ κε κέρδιον εἴη σεῦ ἀφαρματούση χθόνα δῦμαι
it were better for me, if (or when) I lose thee, to die.

Π. 8. 218 εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκ' Ἀγαμέμνονι πότνια Ἥρη
αὐτῷ ποιπνύσαντι θοῶς ὀτρύναι Ἀχαιοῦς
'who had of himself made hot haste,' αὐτῷ as in the phrase μεμαῶτε καὶ αὐτῷ (13. 46., 15. 604).*

Π. 15. 496 οὐ οἱ ἀεικὲς ἀμνομένῳ περὶ πάτρης τεθνάμεν
to die when fighting for his country.

So Π. 5. 253., 13. 96., 20. 356., 21. 185., 22. 72.

There are some exceptions, however, if our texts are to be trusted; *i. e.* there are places where a word which belongs to the predication is put in the Dat. owing to a preceding Dat.: *e. g.*—

Π. 15. 117 εἰ πέρ μοι καὶ μοῖρα Διὸς πληγέντι κεραυνῷ
κεῖσθαι ὁμοῦ νεκύεσσι (cp. Od. 19. 139, 284).

* This is pointed out by Dingeldein, *De participio Homericō*, p. 8.

This seems to be always the case when there are two successive Participles, the first of which is properly in the Dat. : as—

Il. 12. 410 ἀργαλέον δέ μοι ἔστι καὶ ἰφθίμῳ περ ἔόντι
μοῦνιφ ῥηξάμενιφ θέσθαι παρὰ νησὶ κέλευθοι.

Here the meaning is, 'to break through and make' &c.,—and therefore ῥηξάμενον would be correct; but after ἔόντι the change from the Dat. to the Acc. would be very harsh. So Il. 13. 317–319, Od. 10. 494–5. In other places the text may be at fault. As attraction became the rule in later Greek, and the two Case-forms are generally of the same metrical form, it would be easy for a Dat. to take the place of an Acc. : e.g. in Il. 9. 398–400 ἔνθα δέ μοι . . ἐπέσσυτο θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ γήμαντι . . κτήμασι τέρπεσθαι, where for γήμαντι, the reading of Aristarchus, others gave γήμαντα, which conforms to the principle laid down.

When the Subject of the Infinitive is also Subject of the governing Verb the Nominative is generally used : as Il. 1. 76 (quoted above), I. 415., 4. 101–3., 8. 498, &c. An exception is—

Od. 9. 224 ἔνθ' ἐμὲ μὲν πρῶτισθ' ἔταροι λίσσουντ' ἐπέεσσι,
τυρῶν αἰνυμένους ἰέναι πάλιν

that they might take of the cheeses and so go back.

241.] **Infinitive as an Imperative.** This use is often found in Homer, but chiefly after an Imperative, so that the Infinitive serves to carry on the command already given :—

Il. 1. 322 ἔρχεσθον κλισίην Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο, *cf. d. 172.*
χειρὸς ἔλόντ' ἀγέμεν Βρισηΐδα.

2. 8–10 βάσκ' ἴθι . . ἀγορευέμεν ὡς ἐπιτέλλω.

3. 459 ἔκδοτε, καὶ τιμὴν ἀποτινέμεν.

Od. 4. 415 καὶ τότ' ἔπειθ' ὑμῖν μελέτω κάρτος τε βίη τε,
αὔθι δ' ἔχειν κτλ. (cp. v. 419, 422 ff.).

Or after a Future, to express what the person addressed is to do as *his* part in a set of acts :—

Il. 22. 259 νεκρὸν Ἀχαιοῖσιν δώσω πάλιν, ὡς δὲ σὺ ρέξεις.

Od. 4. 408 εὐνάσω ἔξείης· σὺ δ' εὖ κρίνασθαι ἑταίρους.

So after a clause which leads up to a command; Il. 11. 788 ἀλλ' εὖ οἱ φάσθαι (Achilles is the mightier) *but do you advise him well*: 17. 691., 20. 335. Cp. also, Il. 10. 65 αὔθι μένειν (answer to the question *am I to remain here?*): 5. 124 θαρσέων νῦν . . μάχεσθαι (in answer to a prayer) *without fear now you may fight*.

The use for the Third Person is rare : in a *command*, Il. 6. 86–92 εἰπέ δ' ἔπειτα μητέρι σῆ καὶ ἐμῆ· ἦ δὲ . . θεῖναι κτλ. ; 7. 79 σῶμα δὲ οἴκαδ' ἐμὸν δόμεναι πάλιν (let him take my arms) *but give back my body*; so 17. 155., 23. 247, Od. 11. 443 : in a *prayer*, with a Subject in the Accusative,—

II. 2. 412 Ζεῦ κῦδιστε, μέγιστε, κελαινεφές, αἰθέρι ναίων,
μὴ πρὶν ἐπ' ἠέλιον δῦναι κτλ. (cp. 3. 285., 7. 179).

Od. 17. 354 Ζεῦ ἄνα, Τηλέμαχόν μοι ἐν ἀνδράσιω ὄλβιον εἶνα.

An Infinitive of wish is used with the Subject in the Nom., once of the Second Person, and once of the First Person :—

Od. 7. 311 αἱ γὰρ Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἀπολλων
τοῖος ἐὼν οἶός ἐσσι, τὰ τε φρονέων ἃ τ' ἐγώ περ,
παῖδά τ' ἐμὴν ἐχέμεν καὶ ἕμὸς γαμβρὸς καλέεσθαι.

24. 376 αἱ γὰρ . . οἶος Νήρικον εἶλον . . τοῖος ἐὼν . . ἐφεστά-
μεναι καὶ ἀμύνειν.

The force of the Infinitive in all these uses seems to be that of an *indirect* Imperative. The command is given as something *following* on an expressed or implied state of things. Thus we may connect the idiom with the use of the Infinitive to imply *fitness, obligation, &c.* (§ 231); compare εἰσὶ καὶ οἶδε τὰδ' εἰπέμεν *these are here to say this* with καὶ δὲ σὺ εἰπέμεναι *it is your part to say*. There is a similar use of the Infinitive in Sanscrit, with ellipse of the verb *to be* (Delbrück, *A. S.* p. 15; Whitney, § 982, c, d).

It should be noticed, however, that other languages have developed a use of the Infinitive in commands, to which this explanation does not apply: as Germ. *schrift fahren!* In these cases we may recognise a general tendency towards the impersonal form. It is very probable that the ordinary 2 Sing. Imper. λέγε represents an original use of the Tense-stem without any Person-ending (Paul, *Principien*, p. 108).

242.] **Origin and history of the Infinitive.** That the Greek Infinitive was originally the Dative of an abstract Noun is proved by comparison with Sanscrit. 'In the Veda and Brāhmaṇa a number of verbal nouns, *nomina actionis*, in various of their cases, are used in constructions which assimilate them to the infinitive of other languages—although, were it not for these other later and more developed and pronounced infinitives, the constructions in question might pass as ordinary case-constructions of a somewhat peculiar kind' (Whitney, § 969). In the Veda these Infinitives, or Case-forms on the way to become Infinitives (*werdende Infinitive*, Delbr.), are mostly Datives, expressing *end* or *purpose*, and several of them are identical in formation with Greek Infinitives; as *dāvane* δοῦναι (*δοφεναι*), *vidmane* εἰδμεναι, *-dhyai* -σθαι,* *-ase* -σαι. In Greek, however, the Dative Ending *-ai* is not otherwise preserved, and the 'true Dative' construction is not applied to *things* (§ 143): conse-

* So Delbrück and others; but see Max Müller's *Chips*, Vol. IV. p. 58.

quently these forms stand quite apart from the Case-system, and have ceased to be felt as real Case-forms. Thus the Greek Infinitive is a *survival*, both in form and in construction, from a period when the Dative of purpose or consequence was one of the ordinary idioms of the language. In Latin, again, this Dative is common enough, and often answers in meaning to the Greek Infinitive; compare (*e.g.*) ὥρῃ ἐστὶν εὐθεῖν with *munitioni tempus relinquere* (Roby, § 1156), ἀμύνειν εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλοι with *auxilio esse*, &c. The retention of the construction in Latin is connected, on the one hand with the fact that the Latin Dative is a 'true Dative,' on the other hand with the comparatively small use that is made in Latin of the Infinitive of purpose. Similarly in classical Sanskrit the Dative of purpose &c. is extremely common, but the Dative Infinitives have gone entirely out of use (Whitney, § 287 and § 986)—a result of the 'struggle for existence' which precisely reverses the state of things in Greek.

The growth of the Dative of purpose into a distinct subordinate Clause was favoured by the habit of placing it at the end of the sentence, after the Verb, so that it had the appearance of an addition or afterthought. This was the rule in Vedic Sanskrit (see Delbrück, *A. S.* p. 25). It may be traced in Greek, not merely in collocations like ἐριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι, &c., but even in such forms as—

Il. 5. 639 ἄλλ' οἶόν τινα φασι βίην Ἡρακλεΐην
ἔμμεναι (*what they call him as to being*),

where the Inf. appears to be added epexegetically after a slight pause: ep. Il. 2. 249., 17. 27., 21. 463, 570, Od. 1. 233, 377., 6. 43., 17. 416.

The development of the Infinitival Clause which we find in Greek and Latin may be traced chiefly under two heads; (1) the construction of the 'Accusative with the Infinitive,' by which the predication of the Infinitive was provided with an expressed Subject (§ 237): and (2) the system of Tenses of the Infinitive, which was gradually completed by the creation of new forms,—esp. the Future Infinitive, peculiar to Greek,—and by the use of the Present Infinitive as equivalent in meaning to the Present and Imperfect Indicative. In the post-Homeric language the Infinitive came to be used as an equivalent, not only for the Indicative, but also for other Moods.

The use of the Infinitive as an indeclinable Noun is subsequent to Homer; it became possible with the later use of the Article. Some of the conditions, however, out of which it grew may be traced in Homeric language. The first of these was the complete separation of the Infinitive from the Case-system; so that it

ceased to be felt as a Case-form, and could be used in parallel construction to the Nom. or Acc.: as—

Π. 2. 453 τοῖσι δ' ἄφαρ πόλεμος γλυκίων γένετ' ἢ νέεσθαι.

7. 203 δὸς νίκην Αἴαντι καὶ ἀγλαὸν εὐχος ἀρέσθαι.

Again, an Infinitive following a Neuter Pronoun, and expressing the logical Subject or Object, easily came to be regarded as in 'Apposition' to the Pronoun: as—

Od. 1. 370 ἐπεὶ τό γε καλὸν ἀκουέμεν ἐστὶν αἰδοῦ.

11. 358 καί κε τὸ βουλοίμην, καί κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη,
πλειότερη σὺν χειρὶ φίλῃν ἐς πατρίδ' ἰκέσθαι.

The only instance which really comes near the later 'Articular Infinitive' is Od. 20. 52 ἀνίη καὶ τὸ φυλάσσειν (§ 259). The use of the Infinitive with an Article in the Gen. or Dat. is wholly post-Homeric.

The Participle.

243.] **Uses of the Participle.** Following out the view of the Participle as a Verbal Adjective, we may distinguish the following uses:—

1. The Participle is often used as an ordinary Adjective qualifying a Noun; as θεοὶ αἰὲν ἐόντες, βροτοὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες, πίθοι ποτὶ τοῖχον ἀρηρότες, σάκος τετυγμένον, and the like. In one or two cases it is Substantival: as τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων, ψυχὰ ἐῖδωλα καμόντων, 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες.

A few Participles have lost their Verbal character altogether: esp. οὐλόμενος *miserable*, οὐνήμενος *happy*, ἴκμενος *secundus*, ἄσμενος *glad*, ἐκὼν *willing*, ἔθων (better ἐθῶν, since it is an Aor. in form, § 31, 1) *according to wont*, περιπλόμενος (in the phrase περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν *the revolving years*); also the Substantival μέδοντες *rulers*, τένοντες *muscles*, ἀμείβοντες *rafters*, αἴθουσα *a portico*, δράκων *a serpent*, γέρων, μοῦσα. The word κρείων *ruler* retains a trace of the Verb in εὐρὺ κρείων *widely ruling*. Cp. also the compounds πολύ-τας, ἀ-κάμας, ἀ-δάμας, λυκά-βας.

2. Much more frequently, the Participle qualifies or forms part of the predication (§ 162): e.g. in such combinations as—

διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε *parted having quarrelled*
εὐφρονέων ἀγορήσατο *spoke with good thought*

the Participle has the same construction as the Adjective in παλιννοστος ἀπέστη, or πρόφρων τέτληκας (§ 162, 2). Thus it serves to express a predication which the speaker wishes to subordinate in some way to that of the governing Verb.

The Participle may express different relations: attendant *cir-*

cumstance or *manner* (as in the examples quoted); *cause*, as II. 11. 313 τί παθόντε λελάσμεθα θούριδος ἀλκῆς; *opposition*, as often with καί and περ, &c. (Goodwin, §§ 832-846).

3. Finally, a Participle construed in 'Apposition' to a Noun in an oblique Case may imply a predication (§ 168); as καπνὸν ἀποθρόσκοντα νοῆσαι *to descrie the smoke rising* (i. e. *when it rises, or that it rises, &c.*). Note that—

(a) A Participle of this kind often has the character of a distinct Clause, coming at the end of a sentence, and after a metrical pause: as—

II. 4. 420 δεινὸν δ' ἔβραχε χαλκὸς ἐπὶ στήθεσσι νᾶρατος
ὀρνυμένον (*as he roused himself*).

Od. 23. 205 ὡς φάτο, τῆς δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ
σήματ' ἀναγνώσῃς (*when she recognised the token*).

(b) Not unfrequently the word with which the Participle should be construed is understood: especially when it is a Partitive or quasi-Partitive Gen. (§§ 147, 151):—

II. 2. 153 αὐτὴ δ' οὐρανὸν ἰκεν οἴκαδε ἰεμένων *a cry rose to
heaven (of men) eager to return home*: so II. 12. 339., 13. 291, 498., 15. 689.

5. 162 πόρτιος ἠὲ βοὸς ξύλοχον κάτα βοσκομενάων *a heifer or
cow (of those) that are feeding in a thicket*.

5. 665 τὸ μὲν οὐ τις ἐπεφράσατ' οὐδ' ἐνόητε μηροῦ ἐξερύσαι
δόρυ μείλιον, ὄφρ' ἐπιβαίῃ, σπενδόντων *no one
... (of them) in their haste*: cp. 15. 450 τό οἱ
οὐ τις ἐρύκακεν ἰεμένων περ.

18. 246 ὀρθῶν δ' ἐσταότων ἀγορῇ γένετ' *an assembly was held
upstanding (of them standing up)*.

Od. 17. 489 Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐν μὲν κραδίῃ μέγα πένθος ἄεξε
βλημένου (*for his having been wounded*).

So with the Dative; II. 12. 374 ἐπειγομένοισι δ' ἴκοντο *came as a
relief (to them) when they were hard pressed*; Od. 5. 152 κατείβετο
δὲ γλυκὺς αἰὼν νόστον ὀδυρομένῳ.

(c) The Subject thus understood may be indefinite:—

II. 2. 291 πόνος ἐστὶν ἀνηθέντα νέεσθαι (see § 233).

6. 267 οὐδέ πη ἔστι κελαινεφεῖ Κρονίωνι
αἵματι καὶ λύθρῳ πεπαλαγμένον εὐχετάσθαι
for one who is bespattered . . . to pray.

13. 787 πᾶρ δύναμιν δ' οὐκ ἔστι καὶ ἐσύμενον πολεμίζειν.

So II. 2. 234., 14. 63, Od. 2. 311: cp. the phrase ὅσον τε γέγωνε
βοήσας *as far as a man makes himself heard by shouting*.

(d) The Participle is sometimes found in a different Case from

a preceding Pronoun with which it might have been construed. Thus we have—

- Il. 14. 25 λάκε δέ σφι περὶ χροῦ χαλκὸς ἀτείρης
 νυσομένων (construed with χροῦ instead of σφι).
 16. 531 ὄττι οἱ ὦκ' ἤκουσε μέγας θεὸς εὐξαμένοιο
 (with ἤκουσε instead of οἱ).
 Od. 9. 256 ὡς ἔφαθ', ἡμῖν δ' αὖτε κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ
 δεισάντων (so Il. 3. 301, Od. 6. 157., 9. 458).
 Il. 20. 413 τὸν βάλε . . . νῶτα παραΐσσοντος wounded him . . .
 in the back as he darted past.
 Od. 4. 646 ἦ σε βίη ἀέκοντος ἀπηύρα.
 Il. 10. 187 ὡς τῶν νήδυμος ἕπνος ἀπὸ βλεφάροϊν δλώλει
 νύκτα φυλασσομένοισι κακῆν : so Il. 14. 141-3.
 Od. 17. 555 μεταλλῆσαι τί ἐθυμὸς
 ἀμφὶ πόσει κέλεται καὶ κήδεά περ πεπαθυῖη. p. 232

We need not consider these as instances of 'Anacoluthon' or change of the construction. The Participle, as we saw, does not need a preceding Pronoun: it may therefore have a construction independent of such a Pronoun. And it is characteristic of Homer not to employ concord as a means of connecting distant words when other constructions are admissible.

244.] Tenses of the Participle. The distinction between the Present and Aorist Participle has already been touched upon in §§ 76-77, and the meaning of the Perfect Participle in § 28.

It may be remarked here, as a point of difference between the two kinds of Verbal Noun, that the Aorist Participle almost always represents an action as past at the time given by the Verb (e. g. ὡς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἕζετο having thus spoken he sat down), whereas the Aor. Inf. generally conveys no notion of time. This however is not from the Participle itself conveying any notion of past time. Indeed it is worth notice that the Participles which are without Tense-meaning are chiefly Aorists in form (§ 243, 1).

The Future Participle is used predicatively with Verbs of motion: ἦλθε λυσόμενος came to ransom, καλέουσ' ἔε went to call, ἦγ' ἐπικουρήσοντα, ἐπέδραμε τεύχεα συλήσων, &c. The exceptions to this rule are—

- (1) ἐσσόμενος future, in Il. 1. 70 τὰ τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα things future and past; 2. 119 καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι.
- (2) ἐπιβησόμενος, in Il. 5. 46 (16. 343) νύξ' ἔππων ἐπιβησόμενον, 23. 379 αἰεὶ γὰρ δῖφρον ἐπιβησομένοισιν ἔκτην. But see § 41.
- (3) Il. 18. 309 καί τε κτανέοντα κατέκτα, see § 63.
- (4) Od. 11. 608 αἰεὶ βαλέοντι εἰκῶς like one about to cast.

245.] **Implied Predication.** Where the Participle is predicative, we often find the Noun or Pronoun taking the place in the construction of the whole Participial Clause: as Il. 17. 1 οὐδ' ἔλαθ' Ἀτρείος υἱὸν Πάτροκλος Τρώεσσι δαμείς *that Patroclus had fallen*: Od. 5. 6 μέλε γάρ οἱ ἔων ἐν δώμασι νύμφης *it troubled her that he was &c.*: Il. 6. 191 γίγνωσκε θεοῦ γόνον ἦν ἐόντα *knew him for the offspring of a god*: Od. 10. 419 σοὶ μὲν νοστήσαντι ἐχάρημεν *we were gladdened by thy return*: Il. 13. 417 ἄχος γένετ' ἐξαρμένιοι *there was vexation at his boasting*: Il. 5. 682., 14. 504., 17. 538, 564., 18. 337, &c.

We have here the idiom already observed in the use of the Infinitive (§ 237) by which the weight of the meaning is shifted from the grammatical Subject, Object, &c. to a limiting or qualifying word. Note especially that—

1. The Aor. Participle may be used in this way to express a fact which *coincides* in time with the Verb of the sentence: as Il. 6. 284 εἰ κείνόν γε ἴδοιμι κατελθόντ' Ἀΐδος εἴσω. So especially when the *time* of the fact is the important point, as ἐς ἡλίον καταδύντα *till sun-set*: Il. 13. 38 μένοιεν νοστήσαντα ἀνακτα *should await the master's return*: 13. 545 Θόωνα μεταστρεφθέντα δοκεύσας.

2. With Verbs of *saying, hearing, knowing, &c.*, also of *rejoicing and grieving*, the Acc. with a Participle is used like the Acc. with the Inf. (both being evidently applications of the *Accusativus de quo*, § 140, 3, b): *e.g.*—

Il. 7. 129 τοὺς νῦν εἰ πτώσσοντας ὑφ' Ἐκτορι πάντας ἀκούσαι *if he were to hear of their shrinking.*

Od. 4. 732 εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ πυθόμην ταύτην ὁδὸν ὀρμαίνοντα.

23. 2 δεσποίνῃ ἐρέουσα φίλον πόσιν ἐνδὸν ἐόντα.

Il. 1. 124 οὐδέ τί που ἴδμεν ξινήια κείμενα πολλά.

Od. 7. 211 οὓς τινὰς ὑμεῖς ἴστε μάλιστ' ὀχέοντας οἷζύν.

Il. 8. 378 ἢ νῶϊ . . γηθήσει προφανείσα *will rejoice at our appearing.*

13. 353 ἤχθετο γάρ ῥα Τρωσὶν δαμναμένους *he was vexed at their being subdued by the Trojans.*

A further extension, analogous to the Acc. with the Inf. after Impersonal Verbs, may perhaps be seen in Od. 6. 193 ὦν ἐπέοιχ' ἰκέτην ταλαπείριον ἀντίδασα *which it is fit that a suppliant should meet with.*

246.] **Genitive Absolute.** This is a form of implied predication, in which the Noun or Pronoun has no regular construction with the governing Verb. The Participial Clause expresses

the *time* or *circumstances* in which the action of the Verb takes place :—

Il. 1. 88 οὐ τις ἐμεῦ ζῶντος κτλ. *no one, while I am living shall &c.*

2. 551 περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν *as years go round.*

5. 203 ἀνδρῶν εἰλομένων *where men are crowded* ; so ἀνδρῶν λικμώντων, ἀνδρῶν τρεσσάντων, πολλῶν ἐλκόντων, &c.

Od. 1. 390 καὶ κεν τοῦτ' ἐθέλομι Διὸς γε διδόντος ἀρέσθαι *that too I would be willing to obtain if Zeus gave it.*

The Subject is understood in Od. 4. 19 μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντος *when the singer began the music.*

The Aorist Participle is less common in Homer than the Present, especially in the Odyssey : the instances are, Il. 8. 164, 468., 9. 426., 10. 246, 356., 11. 509., 13. 409., 14. 522., 16. 306., 19. 62, 75., 21. 290, 437., 22. 47, 288, 383, Od. 14. 475., 24. 88, 535 (Classen, *Beob.* p. 180 ff.).

The 'Genitive Absolute' must have begun as an extension of one of the ordinary uses of the Gen. ; most probably of the Gen. of *Time* (§ 150). For, ἡελίου ἀνιόντος *within the time of the sun's rising* is a Gen. like ἡοῦς *in the morning*, νυκτός *by night*, &c., and answers, as a phrase denoting time, to ἄμ' ἡελίῳ καταδύντι *at sun-set*, ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα *up to sun-set*, &c. So we may compare τοῦδ' αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος ἐλεύσεται *he will come within this year* with ἡ σέθεν ἐνθάδ' ἐόντος ἐλεύσεται *he will come within your being here* ; and again περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν *in the years as they go round*, with τῶν προτέρων ἐτέων *in the former years*. The transition may be seen in ἔαρος νέον ἱσταμένοιο *in the spring when it is beginning*. Compare also the phrases ἐπειγομένων ἀνέμων, Βορέας πεσόντος, &c. with νηνεμῆς *in calm weather*, &c.

The circumstance that the Ablative is the 'Absolute' Case in Latin is far from proving that the Greek Gen. in this use is Ablatival. In Sanscrit the Case used in this way is the Locative, occasionally the Genitive : and the Latin Abl. Absolute may represent a Locative of *time at which*, or an Instrumental of *circumstance* (§ 144). The hypothesis that such Participial Clauses in Greek expressed *space of time within which* (rather than *point of time, or circumstance*) is borne out by the interesting fact, noticed above, that in Homer this construction is chiefly found with the Participle which implies *continuance*, viz. the Present : whereas in Latin the Abl. Abs. is commonest with the Perfect Participle.

An approach to a 'Dative Absolute' may be seen in such uses as—

Il. 8. 487 Τρωσιν μὲν β' ἀέκουσιν ἔδν φάος.

12. 374 ἐπειγομένοισι δ' ἴκοντο.

Od. 21. 115 οὐ κέ μοι ἀχρυσμένη τάδε δώματα πότνια μήτηρ λείποι (= *it would be no distress to me if &c.*)

which are extensions or free applications, by the help of the Participle, of the true Dat. (*Dativus ethicus*).

246.*] **The Verbal Adjectives.** The formations to which this term is applied resemble the Participles in some of their characteristics.

Several groups of Nouns are used as Participles or 'Gerundives' in the cognate languages, such as the Latin forms in *-tu-s*, the Sanser. in *-ta-s*, *-na-s*, *-ya-s*, *-tava-s*, &c. Of the corresponding Greek forms the Verbal in *-το-s* is the most important, and approaches most nearly to the character of a Participle.* It is used mainly in two senses:—

(1) To express the *state* corresponding to or brought about by the action of a Verb: *τυκ-τός made*, *κρυπτός secret*, *κλυ-τός heard about*, *φάμ-τός famed*, *στα-τός standing (in a stall)*, *πλη-τός enduring* (II. 24. 49), *ἀγαπη-τός object of love*, *ἔρπε-τόν creeping thing*, *φυ-τόν growth*, *πυ-τός wise*. So with *ἀ-* priv., *ἄ-κλαυτος unweeping*, *ἄ-παστος fasting*, *ἄ-πιστος not having news*, also of *whom there is no news*, *ἄ-πιστος faithless*, &c. The force of the Verb in these words is intransitive rather than passive, and they have no reference to *time* as past or present. Compare the Latin *aptus*, *cautus*, *certus*, *catus*, *falsus*, *scītus*, &c. We may note that there is a similar (but more complete) divergence of use between the Sanser. Participles in *-na-s* and the Greek Adjectives in *-νο-s*, as *στυγ-νός*.

(2) To express *possibility*, as *κτη-τός that can be acquired*, *ληϊστός that can be taken as plunder* (II. 9. 406), *ρήκτός vulnerable* (II. 13. 323), *ἀμ-βα-τός approachable*. This meaning is chiefly found in Compounds with *ἀ-* priv.: as *ἄ-λυ-τος that cannot be loosed*, *ἄρρηκτος*, *ἄ-φυκτος*, *ἄ-λαπτος*, *ἄ-κίχητος*, *ἄ-σβεστος*, *ἄ-τλητος*, *ἄ-φθι-τος*, &c.: and in other negative expressions, as *οὐκ ὀνόμαστος*, *οὐκέτ' ὀνοστά*, *οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτός*, *οὐ τι νεμεσητόν*. Hence, as Brugmann observes, it is probable that this use of the Verbal in *-τος* began in the use with the negative. δ 275
οὐκ ὀνόμαστος

It is evident that in respect of meaning the Verbals in *-τος* are closely akin to the Perfect Participle. Compare (e. g.) *τυκτός* and *τετυγμένος*, *στατός* and *ἑστηώς*, *πυτός* and *πεπνυμένος*. Hence the readiness with which in Latin they have taken the place of the Pf. Part. Passive. The extension by which they came to convey the notion of *past time* took place in the Perfect tense itself, in Latin and Sanserit.

The Verbals in *-τέο-s* (for *-τεF-λο-s*) are post-Homeric. The earliest instance seems to be *φα-τειό-s*, in Hesiod, Th. 310 *δεύτερον αὐτίς ἔτικτεν ἀμήχανον, οὐ τι φατειόν, Κέρβερον κτλ.*

* See the fine observations of Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 79, p. 207.

CHAPTER XI.

USES OF THE PRONOUNS.

Introductory.

247.] The preceding chapter has dealt with the two grammatical forms under which a Noun, by acquiring a verbal or predicative character, is developed into a kind of subordinate Clause. We have now to consider the Subordinate Clause properly so called: that is to say, the Clause which contains a true (finite) Verb, but stands to another Clause in the relation of a dependent word. *E.g.* in the Sentence *λεύσσετε γὰρ τό γε πάντες ὁ μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλη γε* see that my prize goes elsewhere, the Clause *ὁ μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλη* stands in the relation of *Object* to the Verb of the principal Clause.

As the grammatical structure of Subordinate Clauses is shown in general by means of Pronouns, or Conjunctions formed from Pronominal Stems, it will be proper to begin with an account of the meaning and use of the different words of this class.

The Greek Grammarians divided the Pronouns (*ἀντωνυμίαι*) into *δεικτικά* 'pointing,' and *ἀναφορικά* 'referring' or 'repeating.' These words have given us, through the Roman grammarians, the modern terms Demonstrative and Relative; but the meaning, as often happens in such cases, has undergone a considerable change. A *Deictic* Pronoun—it will be convenient to adopt the Greek words—is one that marks an object by its position in respect to the speaker: *I, thou, this* (here), *yonder*, &c.; an *Anaphoric* Pronoun is one that denotes an object already mentioned or otherwise known,—the term thus including many 'Demonstratives' (*that same man, the man*, &c.), as well as the 'Relative.' In all, therefore, we may distinguish three kinds of Pronouns:—

1. DEICTIC, in the original sense.
2. ANAPHORIC, *i. e.* referring to a Noun, but Demonstrative (in the modern sense).
3. RELATIVE, in the modern sense.

This however, it should be observed, is a classification of the *uses* of Pronouns, not of the words or Stems themselves: for the same Pronoun may be Deictic or Anaphoric, Demonstrative or Relative, according to the context. It is probable, indeed, that all Pronouns are originally Deictic, and become Anaphoric in the course of usage.

248.] **Interrogative Pronouns.** The Interrogatives used in Homer are *τίς* (§ 108), *πότερος*, *πόστος*, *ποιός*, *πῆ*, *πῶς*, *ποῦ*, *πόθι*,

πόθεν, πότε, πόσε. The form *πόσος* only occurs in the compound *ποσσημαρ* (Il. 24. 657).

The Pronoun *τίς* is used both as a Substantive and as an Adjective. The adjectival use is chiefly found in the *Odyssey* (e. g. I. 225 *τίς δαίς, τίς δὲ ὄμιλος ὅδ' ἔπλετο*; 13. 233 *τίς γῆ, τίς δῆμος, τίνες ἀνέρες ἐγγεγάασι*;) and in the 24th book of the *Iliad* (Il. 367, 387). The only clear instance in the rest of the *Iliad* is 5. 633 *τίς τοι ἀνάγκη*; for in Il. I. 362., 18. 73, 80 *τί* is probably adverbial.

Notice also as peculiar to the *Odyssey* the combination of *τίς* with *ὅδε*, as Od. 6. 276 *τίς δ' ὅδε Ναυσικάα ἐπεται*; 20. 351 *τί κακὸν τόδε πάσχετε*; The corresponding use with *οὗτος* is only found in Il. 10. 82 *τίς δ' οὗτος . . ἔρχεται*; cp. H. Merc. 261 *τίνα τοῦτον ἀπηνέα μῦθον ἔειπας*;

The use of the Interrogative in Dependent Questions is rare:—

Il. 5. 85 *Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ἂν γνοίης ποτέροισι μετείη.*

Od. 15. 423 *εἰρώτα δὴ ἔπειτα τίς εἶη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι.*

17. 368 *ἀλλήλους τ' εἶροντο τίς εἶη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι.*

17. 373 *αὐτὸν δ' οὐ σάφα οἶδα πόθεν γένος εὔχεται εἶναι.*

With these it is usual to reckon the anomalous—

Il. 18. 192 *ἄλλου δ' οὗ τευ οἶδα τεῦ ἂν κλυτὰ τεύχεα δύω.*

But in this case we have the further difficulty that the form of the Principal clause leads us to expect a Relative, not an Interrogative—the Indefinite *ἄλλου τευ* standing as Antecedent: cp. Od. 2. 42 (§ 282). Hence there is probably some corruption in the text.

The use of the Interrogative in a Dependent Question doubtless grew out of the habit of announcing that a question is going to be asked. A formula, such as *ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ καὶ ἀπρεκέως κατάλεξον, ἢ καὶ μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐπήτυμον ὄφρ' ἐὺ εἰδῶ*, though grammatically a distinct sentence, may be regarded as on the way to become a governing clause. It is a step to this when there is no Pronoun as object—not 'tell me this,' but simply 'tell me': as Od. 4. 642 *νημερτές μοι ἐνισπε, πότε ᾗχετο καὶ τίνες αὐτῶ κοῦροι ἔποντ' κτλ.*; 11. 144 *εἰπέ, ἄναξ, πῶς κτλ.*; 24. 474 *εἰπέ μοι εἰρομένη, τί νύ τοι νόος ἐνδοθι κεύθει*; It is to be observed that nearly all the passages of this kind are to be found in the *Odyssey* and in the 10th and 24th books of the *Iliad*. The only instance in the rest of the *Iliad* is 6. 377 *εἰ δ' ἄγε μοι, δμῶαί, νημερτέα μυθήσασθε πῆ ἔβη κτλ.*

ὅδε, κείνος, οὗτος.

249.] The Pronoun *ὅδε* is almost purely Deictic. It marks an object as near the speaker,—*this here, this on my side, &c.*; as *ναὶ μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον* by *this sceptre (in my hand)*; *Ἐκτορος ἦδε γυνή* *this*

is the wife of Hector; Od. 1. 76 ἡμεῖς οἶδε περιφραζώμεθα *let us here consider* (§ 162, 2): 1. 226 οὐκ ἔρανος τάδε γ' ἐστὶ *what I see here is not a club-feast*. It is especially applied to a person or thing to which the speaker turns for the first time, as—

Il. 3. 192 εἴπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε, φίλον τέκος, ὅς τις ὄδ' ἐστὶ.

Hence the use to denote what is *about to be* mentioned—the new as opposed to the known. This is an approach to an Anaphoric use, in so far as it expresses not *local* nearness, but the place of an object in the speaker's thought. So in—

Il. 7. 358 οἶσθα καὶ ἄλλον μῦθον ἀμείνονα τοῦδε νοῆσαι

the speech is the *present* one, opposed to a better one which should have been made.

The derivatives τοσόσδε, τοιόσδε, ὦδε, ἐνθάδε, are similarly Deictic: as Il. 6. 463 χήτεϊ τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρός *from want of a man such as I am now*.

250.] The Pronoun κείνος is sometimes used in the Deictic sense, pointing to an object as distant:—

Il. 3. 391 κείνος ὃ γ' ἐν θαλάμῳ *yonder he is in the chamber*.

5. 604 καὶ νῦν οἱ πάρα κείνος Ἄρης *there is Ares at his side*.

So of an absent object: as Od. 2. 351 κείνον οἰομένην τὸν κάμμορον *thinking of that (absent) one, the unhappy*.

Hence in an Anaphoric use, κείνος distinguishes what is *past* or *done with*, in contrast to a new object or state of things:—

Il. 2. 330 κείνος τὼς ἀγόρευε *he (on that former occasion), &c.*

3. 440 νῦν μὲν γὰρ Μενέλαος ἐνίκησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ,
κείνον δ' αὖτις ἐγώ.

Od. 1. 46 καὶ λίην κείνός γε εἰκότι κείται ὀλέθρῳ·
ἀλλὰ μοι ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆϊ κτλ.

Here κείνος marks the contrast with which the speaker turns to a new case. The literal sense of local distance is transferred to remoteness in *time*, or in the *order of thought*.

251.] The Pronoun οὗτος is not unfrequently Deictic in Homer, expressing an object that is present to the speaker, but not near him, or connected with him. Hence it is chiefly used (like *iste* in Latin) of what belongs to or concerns the person spoken to, or else in a hostile or contemptuous tone. Instances of the former use are:—

Il. 7. 110 ἀφραίνεις, Μενέλαε διοτρεφέες, οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ
ταύτης ἀφροσύνης.

10. 82 τίς δ' οὗτος κατὰ νῆας ἀνὰ στρατὸν ἔρχεται οἶος;

Od. 2. 40 οὐχ ἕκασ οὗτος ἀνὴρ *the man you want is not far off*.

6. 218 στήθ' οὕτω ἀποπρόθεν *(as you are)*.

Again, οὗτος is regularly used of one of the enemy; as—

- Il. 5. 257 τούτῳ δ' οὐ πάλιν αὖτις ἀποίσειτον ὠκέες Ἴπποιοι.
22. 38 μή μοι μίμνε, φίλον τέκος, ἀνέρα τούτου.

Similarly, with a tone of contempt,—

- Il. 5. 761 ἄφρονα τούτου ἀνέντες (ep. 831, 879).

Od. 1. 159 τούτοισιν μὲν ταῦτα μέλει (of the Suitors).

More commonly, however, οὗτος is Anaphoric, denoting an object already mentioned or known. In later Greek it is often employed where Homer (as we shall see) would use the Article.

αὐτός.

252.] The Pronoun αὐτός is purely Anaphoric: its proper use seems to be to emphasise an object as the one that has been mentioned or implied,—the *very* one, *that and no other*. It conveys no local sense, and is used of the speaker, or the person addressed, as well as of a third person. Specific uses are—

(1) To distinguish a person from his surroundings, adjuncts, company, &c. : as—

- Il. 3. 195 τεύχεα μὲν οἱ κείται ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ,
αὐτὸς δὲ κτλ.

9. 301 αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ δῶρα *he and his gifts*.

14. 47 πρὶν πυρὶ νῆας ἐνιπρήσαι, κτείνει δὲ καὶ αὐτούς.

17. 152 ὅς τοι πόλλ' ὄφελος γένετο πόλει τε καὶ αὐτῷ
to thy city and thyself.

So of the *body*, as the actual person, in contradistinction to the soul or life (ψυχή), Il. 1. 4, Od. 11. 602, &c.

Hence, too, αὐτός = *by himself* (without the usual adjuncts) :—

Il. 8. 99 Τυδείδης δ' αὐτὸς περ ἔων προμάχοισιν ἐμίχθη.

So Achilles in his complaint of Agamemnon, Il. 1. 356 ἔλων γὰρ ἔχει γέρας αὐτὸς ἀπούρας, i. e. *at his own will*, without the usual sanction: ep. 17. 254., 23. 591.

This meaning appears also in αὐτως = *merely*, as—

Od. 14. 151 ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐκ αὐτως μυθήσομαι ἀλλὰ σὺν ὄρκῳ.

Cp. Il. 1. 520 ἧ δὲ καὶ αὐτως . . νεικεῖ *as it is* (without such provocation) *she reproaches me*.

The Gen. αὐτοῦ, &c. is used to strengthen the Possessives: as Od. 2. 45 ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος: Il. 6. 490 τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα: Il. 10. 204 ᾧ αὐτοῦ θυμῷ (*suo ipsius animo*): Od. 16. 197 ᾧ αὐτοῦ γε νόφ.

Hence in Il. 9. 342 τὴν αὐτοῦ φιλέει—where the use of the Art. is not Homeric—we should probably read ἦν αὐτοῦ.

(2) To express *without change, the same as before*:—

Il. 12. 225 οὐ κόσμῳ παρὰ ναῦφιν ἑλενσόμεθ' αὐτὰ κέλευθα.

Od. 8. 107 ἦρχε δὲ τῷ αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἦν περ οἱ ἄλλοι κτλ.

Hence the use with a Dat., noticed in § 144; as Od. 8. 186 αὐτῷ φάρεϊ *with his cloak as it was* (without putting it off); and so αὐτόθι, αὐτοῦ *in the place, without moving*; and αὐτως *without doing more, hence without effect, idly*: as—

Il. 2. 342 αὐτως γάρ ῥ' ἐπέεσσ' ἐριδαίνομεν.

(3) The unemphatic use, as it may be called, in which it is an ordinary Anaphoric Pronoun of the Third Person (Eng. *he, she, it*). In this use the Pronoun cannot stand at the beginning of a Clause (the emphatic position), or in the Nominative—an unemphasised *Subject* being sufficiently expressed by the Person-Ending of the Verb. The use is derived from that of the emphatic αὐτός in the same way that in old-fashioned English 'the same' often denotes merely the person or thing just mentioned: and as in German *derselbe* and *der nämliche* are used without any emphasis on the idea of sameness.

(4) The Reflexive use of αὐτός is very rare: Od. 4. 247 ἄλλω δ' αὐτὸν φωτὶ κατακρύπτω ἦϊσκε, and perhaps Il. 20. 55 ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς ξριδα ῥήγγυντο βαρείαν (among them *there, in heaven itself*). On Il. 9. 342 τὴν αὐτοῦ φιλέει see above (1). In Il. 12. 204 κόψε γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔχοντα it is best to take αὐτόν in agreement with ἔχοντα (of the eagle). In Il. 19. 255 read αὐτόθι (§ 157).

The Reflexive Pronoun.

253.] The Pronoun εἶ (i. e. the Personal Pronoun declined from the Stems ἐε- or ἐ- and σφε-) is sometimes Reflexive (i. e. denotes the Subject of the Sentence or Clause), sometimes a simple Anaphoric Pronoun. In the latter use it is always unemphatic.

(1) The Reflexive sense is chiefly found either (a) after a Preposition, as ἀμφὶ ἑ παπτήνας *looking round him*, and so ἀπὸ εἶ, ἐπὶ οἷ, προτὶ οἷ, μετὰ σφίσι, κατὰ σφέας, &c.; or (b) when it is reinforced by αὐτός, as Il. 20. 171 ἐξ δ' αὐτὸν ἐποτρύνει μαχέσασθαι *stirs himself up to fight*. Other examples are few in number:—

Il. 2. 239 ὅς καὶ νῦν Ἀχιλῆα, εἶ μέγ' ἀμείνονα φῶτα κτλ.

5. 800 ἦ ὀλίγον οἱ παῖδα εἰκότα γείνατο Τυδεΐς.

So Il. 4. 400., 5. 56., 24. 134, Od. 11. 433., 19. 446, 481. We should add however such Infinitival Clauses as—

Il. 9. 305 ἐπεὶ οὗ τινά φησιν ὁμοῖον οἱ ξμεναι κτλ.

where the reference is to the Subject of the governing Verb: so

Il. 17. 407, Od. 7. 217, &c. Compare also the similar use in Subordinate Clauses, as—

Il. 11. 439 γρῶ δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ὃ οἱ οὗ τι τέλος κατακαίριον ἦλθεν.

The strictly Reflexive use is commoner in the Iliad than in the Odyssey. Excluding Infinitival and Subordinate Clauses, there are 43 examples in the Iliad, against 18 in the Odyssey. Note that the use is mainly preserved in fixed combinations (ἀπὸ ἔο, προτὶ οἱ, &c.).

(2) The Anaphoric (non-Reflexive) use is very much commoner. In this use—which is doubtless derived from the other by loss of the original emphasis—the Pronoun is enclitic: whereas in the Reflexive use it is orthotone.

Accentuation. According to the ancient grammarians this Pronoun is orthotone (1) when used in a reflexive sense, (2) when preceded by a Preposition, and (3) when followed by a Case-form of αὐτός in agreement with it. The first and second rules, as we have seen, practically coincide: and the third is not borne out by the usage of Homer. In such places as Od. 2. 33 εἶθε οἱ αὐτῷ Ζεὺς ἀγαθὸν τελέσειε, Il. 6. 91 καὶ οἱ πολλὸν φίλτατος αὐτῇ, Od. 8. 396 Εὐρύαλος δέ ἐ αὐτὸν (Ὀδυσσεύα) ἀρессάσθω,—add Il. 24. 292, Od. 4. 66, 667., 6. 277—the Pronoun is evidently unemphatic, and is accordingly allowed to be enclitic by good ancient authorities. This is amply confirmed by the instances of μιν αὐτόν (Il. 21. 245, 318, Od. 3. 19, 237, &c.), and the parallel use of αὐτός with the enclitic μοι, τοι, &c.

In one instance, viz.—

Od. 4. 244 αὐτόν μιν πληγῆσιν ἀεικελίησι δαμάσσας

it would seem that μιν has a reflexive sense. The reading, however, is not certain, some ancient authorities giving αὐτὸν μὲν or αὐτόν μὲν.

254.] The Possessive ἐός, ὅς is nearly always Reflexive. Occasionally it refers to a prominent word in the same Sentence which is not grammatically the Subject: as—

Il. 6. 500 αἱ μὲν ἔτι ζῶν γόον Ἔκτορα ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.

Od. 9. 369 Οὔτιν ἐγὼ πύματον ἔδομαι μετὰ οἷς ἐτάροισι.

Cp. Il. 16. 800., 22. 404, Od. 4. 643., 11. 282., 23. 153. And it is occasionally used in a Subordinate Clause to refer to the Subject, or a prominent word, of the Principal Clause:—

Od. 4. 618 πόρην δέ ἐ Φαίδιμος ἦρας
Σιδουῖων βασιλεύς, ὅθ' ἐὸς δόμος ἀμφεκάλυψε
κεῖσέ με νοστήσαντα (cp. 4. 741).

Il. 10. 256 Τυδείδῃ μὲν δῶκε μενεπτόλεμος Θρασυμήδης
φάσγανον ἄμφηκες, τὸ δ' ἐὸν παρά νῆϊ λέλειπτο.

16. 753 ἔβλητο πρὸς στῆθος, ἐή τέ μιν ὤλεσεν ἀλκή.

It will be seen that where ἐός does not refer to the grammatical Subject it is generally emphatic: e.g. in the line last quoted, ἐή ἀλκή *his own prowess*, not that of an enemy. This indicates the

original force of the Pronoun, which was to confine the reference emphatically to a person or thing just mentioned.

255.] Use of *έός, ος* as a general Reflexive Pronoun. It has been a matter of dispute with Homeric scholars, both ancient and modern, whether *έός* (*ος*) was confined to the Third Person Singular (*his own*) or could be used as a Reflexive of any Number and Person (*own* in general—*my own, thy own, their own, &c.*)* The question is principally one of textual criticism, and depends in the last resort on the comparative weight to be assigned to the authority of the two great Alexandrian grammarians, Zenodotus and Aristarchus. It is connected with another question, of less importance for Homer, viz. whether the forms *έο, οι, ε* are confined to the Singular, and those beginning with *σφ-* to the Plural.

(1) In regard to the latter of these questions there is no room for doubt. The only instance in dispute is Il. 2. 197, 198, where Zenodotus read—

θυμὸς δὲ μέγας ἐστὶ διοτρεφέων βασιλῆων
τιμὴ δ' ἐκ Διὸς ἐστι, φιλεῖ δὲ εἰ μητίετα Ζεὺς,

and so the first line is quoted by Aristotle (Rhet. 2. 2). Aristarchus read *διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος*. However, admitting Zenodotus to be right, *ε* need not be a Plural. The change from Plural to Singular is not unusual in passages of a gnomic character, e.g.—

Od. 4. 691 ἦ τ' ἐστὶ δίκη θείων βασιλῆων
ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρησι βροτῶν, ἄλλον κε φιλοίη.

(2) Again, the 'general' Reflexive use, if it exists in Homer, is confined to the Adjective *έός, ος*. The only contrary instance is Il. 10. 398 (Dolon tells Ulysses that he has been sent by Hector to find out)—

ἦ ἐ φυλάσσονται νῆες θοαὶ ὡς τὸ πάρος περ,
ἦ ἤδη χεῖρεσσιν ὑφ' ἡμετέρησι δαμέντες
φύξιν βουλευοῖτε μετὰ σφίσιν, οὐδ' ἐθέλοῖτε κτλ.

So the MSS., but Ar. read *βουλευοῦσι, ἐθέλουσι*, making Dolon repeat the exact words of Hector (Il. 309–311); and this reading, which gives *σφίσι* its usual sense, is clearly right. The Optative is not defensible (esp. after the Indic. *φυλάσσονται*), and was probably introduced by some one who thought that Dolon, speaking of the Greeks to Ulysses, must use the Second Person Plural. But the Third Person is more correct; for Ulysses is not one of

* The question was first scientifically discussed by Miklosich, in a paper read to the Vienna Academy (I, 1848, p. 119 ff.). He was followed on the same side by Brugmann (*Ein Problem der homerischen Textkritik und der vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft*, Leipzig, 1876).

the Greeks who can be supposed to be 'consulting among themselves.'

The form ξ is found as a Plural in Hom. II. Ven. 267. In later Epic poets the Substantival $\epsilon\iota\omicron$, &c. are used as Reflexives of any Person or Number: see Theocritus 27. 44, Apollonius Rhodius 1. 893., 2. 635, 1278., 3. 99 (Brugmann, *Probl.* p. 80). But the use is exclusively post-Homeric.

(3) The ease is different with the Adjective. We find forms of $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ($\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$) read by Zenodotus in a number of places in which our MSS. and editions—following the authority of Aristarchus—have substituted other words. Thus in—

Il. 3. 244 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\phi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron$, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ δ' $\eta\delta\eta$ $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\chi\epsilon\nu$ $\psi\nu\sigma\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha$,
 $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\Lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\nu\iota$ $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\theta\iota$, $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$ $\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta$

for $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta$ Zenodotus read $\acute{\epsilon}\eta$ (*their own*). So, again, in—

Il. 1. 393 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$, $\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\sigma\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\gamma\epsilon$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\chi\epsilon\omicron$ $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\omicron\varsigma$,
 and in similar passages (Il. 15. 138., 19. 342., 24. 550), it is known from the Scholia that Aristarchus read $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\omicron\varsigma$, Zenodotus $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\omicron$ (= *thine own*). Again, in—

Il. 11. 142 $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\delta\eta$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\delta\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ $\lambda\acute{\omega}\beta\eta\nu$
 Zenodotus read $\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\delta\varsigma$ (*your own father*). It is probable that he read $\omicron\upsilon$ in the similar places Il. 19. 322, Od. 16. 149, &c. $\mathcal{I}455$

Besides the instances of undoubtedly ancient difference of reading, there are several places where one or more MSS. offer forms of $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ in place of $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ and $\sigma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. Thus—

Il. 14. 221 $\acute{\omicron}$ $\tau\iota$ $\phi\rho\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}$ $\sigma\eta\eta\sigma\iota$ $\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\omega\varsigma$ ($\eta\eta\sigma\iota$ D).

19. 174 $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\phi\rho\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}$ $\sigma\eta\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ $\iota\alpha\nu\theta\eta\varsigma$ ($\eta\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ in several MSS.).

Similar variations (with $\phi\rho\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}$) are found in Od. 5. 206., 6. 180., 13. 362., 15. 111., 24. 357. Again—

Od. 1. 402 $\delta\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota$ $\sigma\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ($\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ ten MSS.).

Similarly in Od. 8. 242., 15. 89 ($\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\omicron\sigma\iota$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$): also—

Od. 7. 77 $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\sigma\eta\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$ $\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ ($\eta\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ in one MS.).

13. 61 $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\pi\epsilon\omicron$ $\tau\acute{\omega}\delta'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\lambda\acute{\iota}$ $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega$ ($\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\lambda\acute{\iota}$ one MS.).

Another instance of variation is detected by Brugmann in—

Il. 9. 414 $\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\delta'$ $\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega\mu\iota$ $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$ $\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$,

where the MSS. (except A) have $\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, pointing to $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\nu$ (*my own*).*

The existing text of the Odyssey contains three passages which Brugmann claims as instances of a general Reflexive sense, viz. Od. 4. 192 (as to which see Merry and Riddell's note),

* Brugmann carries his theory into other passages where he supposes Aristarchus to have corrected the text in order to get rid of the use of $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ for the First or Second Person: but the examples quoted above will suffice to give an idea of the strength of his argument.

Od. 13. 320 (where there is some reason to suspect an interpolation), and—

Od. 9. 28

οὐ τοι ἐγώ γε
ἦς γαίης δύναμαι γλυκερώτερον ἄλλο ἰδέσθαι.

But there is no reason to take ἦς otherwise than in v. 34 ὡς οὐδὲν γλύκιον ἦς πατρίδος οὐδὲ τοκήων γίγνεται *nothing is sweeter than a man's own country, &c.* The reference of the Pronoun is to a typical or imaginary person, as in Od. 1. 392 αἰψά τε οἱ δὴ ἀφ-
νειὸν πέλεται *a man's house (when he is a king) quickly grows rich.*

We have seen that post-Homeric poets use the substantival εἶο, &c. in the sense in question. The corresponding use of the adjective ἐός, ὅς is still more common, as Brugmann shows. It is found in Hesiod for the Third Person Plur. (Op. 58, Theog. 71), and in Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, and Quintus Smyrnaeus (*Probl.* pp. 28, 78–83).

(4) In attempting to arrive at a conclusion on this matter we must begin by understanding that the issue does not lie between supposing on the one hand that Aristarchus was entirely right, and on the other hand that he introduced a strange form like ἐῆος on his own authority, and merely to satisfy a theory. The latter is improbable, not only from the respect for manuscript authority which is expressly attributed to him, but also because the various readings are not all capable of being explained on this supposition. Thus, (1) the word ἐῆος is proved to exist by Od. 14. 505., 15. 450, and in the latter place ἐοῖο, though excluded by the sense, is found as a variant. Also (2) ἐῆος is found for ἐοῖο meaning *his own* in Il. 14. 9., 18. 71, 138. It cannot therefore be regarded as certain that ἐῆος was systematically introduced merely to get rid of ἐοῖο = *my own, thy own*. Again, (3) the use of the Article in τοῦ πατρός, τῆς μητρός, τοῦ παιδός, is not clearly un-Homeric (see § 258). And if in Il. 11. 763 οἶος τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπονήσεται Bentley was right in reading ἦς (cp. 17. 25), it follows that the Article might creep in for οὐ, ἦς, &c. apart from the intention of carrying out a grammatical theory.

On the other side it must be conceded that the generalised Reflexive use of ἐός, ὅς,—if not of the substantival εἶο, &c.—is of high antiquity, so that sporadic instances of it may have occurred in the genuine text of Homer. If so, the error of Aristarchus will consist in a somewhat undue purism.

Brugmann holds that the general Reflexive sense is the primary one, belonging to the Stem *sva* in the original Indo-European language, and surviving in the Homeric use of ἐός, ὅς. But even if the readings of Zenodotus which give this sense are right, it does not follow that they represent the oldest use of the Pronoun.

Brugmann has himself given excellent instances of the extension to the First and Second Person of a Reflexive Pronoun originally confined to the Third (*Probl.* pp. 119 ff.). In the present case it is significant that the generalised use of the substantival forms εἶ, &c. is clearly post-Homeric. If εἶς (εἶς) is sometimes used in Homer, as well as afterwards, of the First and Second Persons, it is natural to see in this the result of an extension of usage. The case is different with the use of the Stem *sva* for the Plural. That use, as we see from the Latin *se* and *suus*, was the original one. It is noteworthy that this undoubtedly primitive use is precisely the one of which there is least trace in Homer.

ὁ ἢ τό.

256.] **The Article** ὁ ἢ τό may be defined as a purely Anaphoric Pronoun, conveying some degree of emphasis. It differs from ὅδε οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος in the absence of Deictic meaning: for while it usually marks some contrast between objects, it does not distinguish them as *near* or *far*, *present* or *absent*, &c. On the other hand it is distinguished from the non-Reflexive use of αὐτός and εἶο by greater emphasis.

Three chief uses of ὁ ἢ τό may be distinguished:—

1. The use as an independent Pronoun; ὁ ἢ τό=*he she it*. This may be called the **SUBSTANTIVAL** use: it embraces the great majority of the instances in Homer.
2. The use as an 'Article' in the later sense of the term, *i. e.* with a Noun following. This may be called the **ATTRIBUTIVE** use.
3. The use as a Relative.

257.] **The Substantival Article.** This use of the Article is very much the commonest in Homer, and it is also the use from which the others may be easily derived.

The Substantival Article either (1) is simply 'resumptive,' recalling a person or thing already mentioned, as ὁ γάρ *for he*, τὸν ῥα *him I say*, αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ δῶρα *the man and his gifts*: or (2) marks a contrast, as ὁ δέ *but the other*.

The following points of usage are to be noticed:—

1. The most frequent—we may almost say the regular—place of the Article is at the beginning of a Clause, followed by μέν, δέ, γάρ, ἄρα, or preceded by αὐτάρ, ἀλλά, ἢ τοι, or an equivalent Participle. Hence the familiar combinations ὁ μέν, ὁ δέ, ὁ γάρ, καὶ γὰρ ὁ, αὐτὰρ ὁ, ἢ τοι ὁ, τὸν ῥα, ἀλλὰ τόν, &c. of which it is needless to give instances.

The later Substantival use with μέν and δέ is a surviving frag-

ment of this group of uses. A few others are found in Attic poets, as *ὁ γάρ* (Aesch. Sept. 17, Soph. El. 45, O. T. 1082).

The use to contrast *indefinite* persons or things (*ὁ μὲν—ὁ δὲ = one—another, οἱ μὲν—οἱ δὲ = some—others*) is not very common in Homer.

The use of the Article with an adversative Particle (*δέ, ἀντάρ, ἀλλά*) generally marks a change of Subject: *ὁ δέ* but *the other*, &c. But this is not always the case: *e.g.* Il. 4. 491 τοῦ μὲν ἄμαρθ', ὁ δὲ Λεύκων . . . βεβλήκει *him he missed, but smote Leucus* (so Il. 8. 119, 126, 302., II. 80, &c.); Il. 1. 496 Θέτις δ' οὐ λήθετ' ἐφευγμένων παιδὸς ἑοῦ, ἀλλ' ἢ γ' ἀνεδύσето κτλ.: *cp.* Il. 5. 321., 6. 168, Od. 1. 4, &c. The Article in all such cases evidently expresses a contrast: not however between two persons, but between two characters in which the same person is thought of.

This last use—in which the Article is pleonastic, according to Attic notions—occurs in Herodotus, as 5. 120 τὰ μὲν πρότερον οἱ Κἄρες ἐβουλεύοντο μετῆκαν, οἱ δὲ αὐτῖς πολεμεῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀρτέοντο. We may compare it with the pleonastic use of the Pronoun in—

Il. 11. 131 ζώγρει Ἀτρείος υἱέ, σὺ δ' ἄξια δέξαι ἄποινα,
where the effect of inserting *σύ* is to oppose the two acts denoted by *ζώγρει* and *δέξαι ἄποινα*.

2. The Article is frequent in Disjunctive sentences:—

Il. 12. 240 εἴ τ' ἐπὶ δεξι' ἴωσι πρὸς ἧῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε,
εἴ τ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ τοί γε κτλ. (*or else to left*).

Od. 2. 132 ζώει ὃ γ' ἢ τέθνηκεν.

Here also it serves to contrast the alternative things said about the same Subject.

3. The principle of contrast often leads to the placing of two Articles together: Il. 21. 602 ἦος ὁ τὸν πεδίοιο διώκετο, 10. 224 καὶ τε πρὸ ὁ τοῦ ἐνόησεν. So an Article and a Personal Pronoun, ἐν δὲ σὺ τοῖσι (Il. 13. 829, &c.); *cp.*—

Il. 8. 532 εἴσομαι εἴ κέ μ' ὁ Τυδεΐδης κρατερὸς Διομήδης
παρ νηῶν πρὸς τεῖχος ἀπώσεται, ἦ κεν ἐγὼ τόν.

Note that when the second of the two is in the Nom., it usually takes *γε*: hence τοῦ ὃ γε, τῆ ρ' οἱ γε, &c.

4. The Article often stands for the object to be defined by a following Relative Clause, *e.g.*—

Il. 9. 615 καλόν τοι σὺν ἐμοὶ τὸν κήδειν ὅς κ' ἐμὲ κήδη.

1. 272 τῶν οἱ νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσι &c.

The use is to be classed as Anaphoric; the intention of saying something about the object is equivalent to a previous mention. So in Latin the Anaphoric *is* is used to introduce *qui*.

The Neuter Article is similarly used to introduce Clauses beginning with *ὅτε*, *ὡς*, and the like:—

Il. 15. 207 ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται ὄτ' ἄγγελος αἴσιμα εἰδῆ.

Od. 9. 442 τὸ δὲ νήπιος οὐκ ἐνόησεν ὡς οἱ κτλ.

Il. 3. 308 Ζεὺς μὲν που τό γε οἶδε . . . ὀπποτέρῳ κτλ.

So Il. 14. 191., 20. 466., 23. 545. It may even introduce an independent sentence, as—

Od. 4. 655 ἀλλὰ τὸ θανάζω· ἴδον ἐνθάδε Μέντορα δῖον.

5. The uses in which the Article is least emphatic (*i. e.* does not begin the Clause, or express a contrast) appear to be—

(*a*) after Prepositions: esp. in the Dat. Plur. after *μετά*, *παρά*, *πρὸς*, *σύν*, *ἐν*, *ἅμα*: as Il. 1. 348 ἡ δ' ἀέκουσ' ἅμα τοῖσι γυνὴ κίεν. This is to be connected with the fact that the forms *εἶο*, *οἶ*, *σφίσι*, &c. are not used with Prepositions in the simple Anaphoric sense (§ 253), and thus the Art. is used instead of them.

(*b*) when the Neuter Article is used for a fact or set of facts; as Il. 4. 353 ὄψεται ἦν ἐθέλησθα καὶ αἶ κέν τοι τὰ μεμήλη. Here again the want of a corresponding form of *εἶο* makes itself felt. This use is chiefly found in the Nom. and Acc.; but also in *τοῦνεκα* *therefore*, *ἐκ τοῦτο* *from that time*, &c.

258.] **The Attributive Article.** The Attributive Article is found in Homer in a limited range of cases, and has evidently grown out of the use of the Substantival Article followed by a Noun in 'Apposition;' *e. g.* Il. 4. 20 ὡς ἔφαθ', αἶ δ' ἐπέμυξαν Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη *thus he spoke, but they murmured, Athene and Here*: Il. 1. 348 ἡ δ' ἀέκουσ' ἅμα τοῖσι γυνὴ κίεν. So with *μιν*, Il. 21. 249 ἵνα μιν παύσειε πόνοιο | δῖον Ἀχιλλῆα, *cp.* Od. 11. 570. In such cases the Pronoun is still substantival, the Noun being added by way of afterthought.

It is a step towards an Attributive use when the Article *needs* the addition of the Noun to explain it; *e. g.*—

Il. 4. 501 τόν ῥ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐτάριοι χολωσάμενος βάλε δουρὶ
κόρσην ἡ δ' ἐτέριοι διὰ κροτάφοιο πέρησεν
αἰχμὴ χαλκείη.

Here *ἡ δέ* would not be clear without *αἰχμὴ*. So in—

Il. 1. 408 αἶ κέν πως ἐθέλησιν ἐπὶ Τρώεσσιν ἀρῆξαι,
τοὺς δὲ κατὰ πρύμνας τε καὶ ἀμφ' ἄλα ἔλσαι Ἀχαιοῦς.

Od. 15. 54 τοῦ γάρ τε ξείνος μμνήσκειται ἥματα πάντα
ἀνδρὸς ξεινοδόκου.

So too with Proper Names,—when a *new* person is about to be mentioned the Art. *anticipates* the Noun: *e. g.*—

Il. 2. 402 αὐτὰρ ὁ βοῦν ἰέρευσεν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων.

And where the Neut. τό is followed by an exegetic Infinitive:—

Od. 1. 370 ἐπεὶ τό γε καλὸν ἀκούμενον ἐστὶν αἰδοῦ.

Il. 17. 406 ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ τὸ ἔλπετο πάμπαν,
ἐκπέρσειν πολλίεθρον ἄνευ ἔθειν.

In all these cases the combination of Article and Noun is not sufficiently close to constitute an Attributive use; but they serve to show how such a use is developed.

The Attributive uses in Homer may be classified as follows:—

1. Uses with *connecting Particles*, where some contrast is made in passing to the new sentence or clause.
2. Uses with certain *Adjectives* that imply contrast.
3. Uses to mark a person or thing as *definite*.

259.] Article of Contrast—with connecting Particles. The uses that fall under this head, though not very numerous, are characteristic of Homer. The following are the chief:—

(a) The Article with an adversative δέ, αὐτάρ, &c. is not unfrequently used to bring out the contrast in which the Noun stands to something already mentioned: *e.g.*—

Il. 2. 217 φοκὸς ἔην, χωλὸς δ' ἔτερον πόδα, τὼ δέ οἱ ὤμω κτλ.
but then his shoulders; so τὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε (Il. 13. 616), &c.

Il. 22. 405 ὡς τοῦ μὲν κεκόνιτο κάρη ἄπαν, ἡ δέ νυ μήτηρ κτλ.
but on the other hand his mother &c.

Il. 1. 382 ἦκε δ' ἐπ' Ἀργείοισι κακὸν βέλος, οἱ δέ νυ λαοὶ
θυήσκον ἐπασσύτεροι, τὰ δ' ἐπ' ἔρχετο κῆλα θεοῖο.

4. 399 τοῖος ἔην Τυδεὺς Αἰτώλιος· ἀλλὰ τὸν υἱὸν κτλ.

So we should explain the Article in Il. 1. 20 παῖδα δέ μοι λύσαιτε φίλην, τὰ δ' ἄποινα δέχεσθαι *release my daughter, and on the other side accept ransom*. The usage is common in the Iliad, but perceptibly rarer in the Odyssey.

(b) The use of the Art. with μέν—in contrast with something that follows—is rare: Il. 11. 267 αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ τὸ μὲν ἔλκος ἐτέρητο: cp. 8. 73., 9. 1., 13. 640., 19. 21., 20. 75, Od. 3. 270 (seemingly the only instance in the Odyssey). There is a similar use with the Art. following the Noun in Od. 1. 116 μνηστήρων τῶν μὲν σκέδασι κατὰ δώματα θεῆν, κτλ.

(c) The corresponding use with copulative and illative Particles, καί, τε, ἠδέ, καὶ γάρ, is much less common: cp.—

Il. 1. 339 πρὸς τε θεῶν μακάρων πρὸς τε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
καὶ πρὸς τοῦ βασιλῆος ἀπηγέος.

15. 36 ἴστω νῦν τόδε γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὑπερθεν,
καὶ τὸ κατειβόμενον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ (cp. 18. 486).

Od. 22. 103 δώσω δὲ συβώτῃ | καὶ τῷ βουκόλῳ ἄλλα.

Il. 14. 503 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ Προμάχοιο δάμαρ κτλ.

The Article singles out its Noun as the special object intended, or turns to it with fresh emphasis. So with an Infinitive, Od. 20. 52 ἀνίη καὶ τὸ φυλάσσειν, where we need not take τὸ φυλάσσειν closely together. So Hes. fr. 192 ἡδὺ δὲ καὶ τὸ πυθέσθαι κτλ. also Op. 314 τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι ἄμεινον.

These uses should be carefully distinguished from the later Definite Article. For instance, in Il. 1. 20 τὰ ἄποινα does not mean *this* or *the ransom*, in contradistinction to other ransoms. It means *the other, the ransom*, in contrast to the person ransomed. Again, the 4th book of the Iliad begins οἱ δὲ θεοί, which we naturally take to mean simply *but the gods*. But, taking in the last line of the 3rd book, we have—

ὡς ἔφατ' Ἀτρείδης, ἐπὶ δ' ἦνεον ἄλλοι Ἀχαιοί·
οἱ δὲ θεοὶ παρ Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ἡγοράωντο.

Clearly the Article marks the turning from the one scene to the other,—from the battlefield to Olympus. Thus the Attic οἱ (θεοί) distinguishes the gods from other beings: the Homeric οἱ (δὲ θεοί) marks, not this permanent distinction, but the contrast arising out of the particular context.

The difference appears also in the use with Proper Names. In Attic the Article shows that a particular known person is spoken of; in Homer it marks the turning of attention to a person—ushers in the name, as it were. In short, the Homeric Article *contrasts*, the Attic Article *defines*.

260.] **With Adjectives.** The Article is used before adjectival words that imply a contrast or distinction, especially between definite or well-known alternatives: in particular—

(a) ἄλλος and ἕτερος, *passim*: also αὐτός = *same*.

(b) Comparatives and Superlatives; οἱ πλέονες, οἱ ἄριστοι, &c. So in the adverbial expressions τὸ πρίν, τὸ πάρος, τὰ πρῶτα, and the like, in which the Neut. Article is used adverbially (τὸ πάρος = *then formerly*). It is quite different when a Masc. or Fem. Article is used with an Adverb, as οἱ ἐνερθε θεοί (Il. 14. 274), ἀνδρῶν τῶν τότε (Il. 9. 559), τὰ τ' ἐνδόθι καὶ τὰ θύρηφιν (Od. 22. 220),—a use which is extremely rare in Homer.

(c) Ordinal Numerals: as τῇ δεκάτῃ: so τὸ ἡμισυ. Also Cardinal Numerals, when a *division* is made; as Il. 5. 271 τοὺς μὲν τέσσαρας αὐτὸς ἔχων ἀτίταλλ' ἐπὶ φάτῃ, τὼ δὲ δὺ' Αἰνεΐα δῶκεν *four he kept, and the (other) two he gave to Aeneas*: Il. 11. 174 πάσας· τῇ δὲ τ' ἰῆ κτλ. (*the lion chases*) *all, but to one &c.*

(d) Possessives; τὸν ἐμὸν χόλον, τὰ σὰ κῆλα, &c.

(e) A few words expressing the standing contrasts of great and small, many and few, good and evil, &c., esp. when the contrast is brought out by the context:—

Il. 1. 106 μάντι κακῶν, οὗ πῶ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγνον εἶπας·
αἰεὶ τοι τὰ κάκ' ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσὶ μαντεύεσθαι.

3. 138 τῷ δέ κε νικήσαντι φίλη κεκλήση ἄκοιτις
(*the conqueror being one of two definite persons*).

So ἡ πληθὺς (Il. 2. 278., 15. 305) *the many* (in contrast to a single man, or to the few): τὸ χθιζόν (Il. 13. 745); τὸν δεξιὸν ἵππον (Il. 23. 336); Αἴας ὁ μέγας *the greater Ajax*: θεοὺς . . τοὺς ὑποταρταρίους (Il. 14. 279) *the gods of the lower world*: ἄνακτες οἱ νεοί (Od. 14. 61) *masters of the younger generation*: ἰχθύσι τοῖς ὀλίγοισι (Od. 12. 252) *the smaller kinds of fish*. So—

Il. 1. 70 ὃς ἤδη τὰ τ' ἐόντα τὰ τ' ἐσσόμενα πρὸ τ' ἐόντα.

The use to contrast *indefinite* individuals (*one—another*) is rare in Homer: Il. 23. 325 τὸν προὔχοντα δοκεύει *waits on the one in advance*: Il. 16. 53 ὅπποτε δὴ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἀνὴρ ἐθέλησιν ἀμέρσαι: Il. 9. 320 κάθθαν' ὁμῶς ὃ τ' ἄεργος ἀνὴρ ὃ τε πολλὰ ἐοργῶς: Od. 17. 218 ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει θεὸς ὡς τὸν ὁμοῖον.

(f) Patronymics and geographical epithets: *e.g.* Il. 11. 613 Μαχάονι πάντα ἔοικε τῷ Ἀσκληπιάδῃ (cp. 13. 698., 14. 460., 23. 295, 303, 525): Il. 2. 595 Θάμυριν τὸν Θρήϊκα: Il. 6. 201 πεδῖον τὸ Ἀλφειῶν, cp. 2. 681., 10. 11: and so perhaps Il. 21. 252 αἰετοῦ . . τοῦ θηρητῆρος *an eagle, the hunting kind*. This use is rare.

(g) In a very few places, a Genitive: Il. 20. 181 τιμῆς τῆς Πριάμον: Od. 24. 497 νείεις οἱ Δολιῖοι: Il. 9. 342., 10. 408., 23. 348, 376, Od. 3. 145.

261.] **The defining Article.** The few and somewhat isolated uses which fall under this description may be grouped as follows:

1. The use before a Relative is combined with 'Apposition' to a preceding Noun: as—

Il. 5. 319 οὐδ' υἱὸς Καπανῆος ἐλήθετο συνθεσιάνω
τάων ἅς ἐπέτελλε κτλ. (cp. 5. 331 θεάων τάων αἰ—).

This is the primitive order, the Article being 'resumptive'—*the injunctions, those namely which, &c.* So ἤματι τῷ ὅτε—, and commonly in the Iliad. The later order—that in which the Noun follows the Article—appears in a few places of the Iliad:—

5. 265 τῆς γὰρ τοι γενεῆς ἧς Τρωτὶ περ κτλ. (cp. v. 268),
also 6. 292., 8. 186., 19. 105. It is commoner in the Odyssey.

2. Occasionally the Article conveys a hostile or contemptuous tone: Il. 2. 275 τὸν λωβητῆρα: 13. 53 ὁ λυσσώδης: 21. 421 ἡ κυνάμνια: 22. 59 τὸν δύστηνον: Od. 2. 351 τὸν κάμμορον: 12. 113 τὴν ὀλοήν: 14. 235 τὴν γε στυγερὴν ὀδόν: 18. 26 ὁ μολοβρός: 18. 333 τὸν ἀλήτην: 19. 372 αἱ κύνες αἶδε. So in Il. 3. 55 ἦ τε κόμη τό τε εἶδος.

In Od. 18. 114 τοῦτον τὸν ἀναλτον does not mean (as it would in Attic) 'this ἀναλτος,' but 'this man—ἀναλτος that he is.' Cp.

Il. 13. 53 ἢ ῥ' ὅ γ' ὁ λυσσώδης κτλ., where ὁ λυσσώδης—the mad-man—is used as a single term, in Apposition to ὅ γε. This use—which is characteristic of Homer—may be regarded as a relic of the Deictic force of ὁ ἢ τό. It answers to the later use of οὔτος, Latin *iste*.

3. The use of the Article to show that the Noun denotes a known person or thing—the defining Article of later Greek—is rare in Homer. It is found in the Iliad—

(a) with γέρων, γεραιός, ἀναξ, ἥρωσ: where however the Pronoun is the important word, the Noun being subjoined as a kind of title: τοῖο ἀνακτος=‘of his lordship’ (cp. the German *allerhöchst derselbe*). Accordingly, when the name is added the Art. is generally not used; as γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεὺς (not ὁ γέρων).

(b) with ἔπος and μῦθος, in certain phrases, as ποῖον τὸν μῦθον εἶπες; In these cases the Noun is of vague meaning, adding little to the Article: cp. ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσε with ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε. So in the formula ὄμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὄρκον, perhaps with a touch of ceremonial verbiage.

In the Odyssey it occurs with several other Nouns: ὁ ξείνος (*passim*); ἡ νῆσος Od. 5. 55., 9. 146., 12. 201, 276, 403, &c.; τὰ μῆλα Od. 9. 464., 11. 4, 20: ὁ μόχλος Od. 9. 375, 378: τὸ τόξον Od. 21. 113, 305. The other examples in the Iliad are chiefly found in books x, xxiii, xxiv: see Il. 10. 97, 277, 321, 322, 330, 408, 497., 23. 75, 257, 465., 24. 388, 801, also 2. 80., 7. 412., 20. 147.

We may perhaps add a few uses with words of relationship:—

Il. 11. 142 οὖν μὲν δὴ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀεικέα τίσετε λῶβην.

But here the Art. is resumptive with emphasis: (if ye are sons of Antimachus) *ye shall now pay for his, your father's, outrage.*

Il. 19. 322 οὐδ' εἴ κεν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀποφθιμένοιοι πυθοίμην
not even if I heard of such a one as my father being dead: Od. 2. 134 ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς κακὰ πέισομαι for from my father (for one) I shall suffer (cp. Il. 15. 641 τοῦ γένετ' ἐκ πατρὸς κτλ.): Od. 16. 149, Il. 21. 412. See however § 255.

It has been a question whether the Article is ever equivalent to a Possessive Pronoun. If so it would be a kind of defining Article—defining a thing as belonging to a known person. In most of the instances, however, the reference to a person is given by a distinct Pronoun: Il. 19. 331 ὡς ἂν μοι τὸν παῖδα κτλ.: Od. 11. 492 ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τοῦ παιδὸς κτλ.: Od. 8. 195 καὶ κ' ἀλαός τοι . . τὸ σῆμα: Od. 18. 380 οὐδ' ἂν μοι τὴν γαστέρ' κτλ.: Od. 19. 535 ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τὸν οὐειρον κτλ.: Il. 1. 167 σοὶ τὸ γέρας πολὺ μείζον. Hence the Art. in these places has much the same

function as with a Possessive (μοι τὸν παῖδα=τὸν ἐμὸν παῖδα); it reinforces the Pronoun which conveys the idea of possession.

This account does not apply to τῆς εὐνῆς (Il. 9. 133, 275., 19. 176), and τῆς ἀρετῆς (Od. 2. 206). But here the Art. is probably substantival: τῆς εὐνῆς *her couch*, τῆς ἀρετῆς *her perfection*. In 23. 75 καὶ μοι δὸς τὴν χεῖρα the Art. is quite anomalous.

262.] The Article as a Relative. The Article at the beginning of a clause may often be translated either as a Demonstrative or as a Relative. It has the character of a Relative when the clause which it introduces is distinctly subordinate or parenthetical: as—

Il. 1. 36 Ἀπόλλωνι ἀνακτι, τὸν ἠΰκομος τέκε Λητώ
Apollo—son of the fair-haired Leto.

The use of δ ἢ τό as a Relative is less common in Homer than that of ὅς ἢ ὅ, and is restricted in general to clauses which refer to a *definite* antecedent. Thus in the line just quoted the clause τὸν ἠΰκομος τέκε Λητώ does not *define* Apollo, *i. e.* does not show who is meant by the name; it assumes that a definite person is meant, and adds something further about him.

From this principle it evidently follows that—

(1) The Art. when used as a Relative must *follow* the Noun or Pronoun to which it refers; whereas a Relative Clause often precedes. The only exceptions are—

Il. 1. 125 ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πολλῶν ἐξεπράθομεν, τὰ δέδοσται.

Od. 4. 349 (= 17. 140) ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μοι ἔειπε . . τῶν κτλ.

We may perhaps read ἀλλὰ θ' ἃ μὲν (§ 332).

(2) The Art. cannot stand as correlative to a Demonstrative (*i. e.* we must have τό—ὅ *that which*, not τό—τό). Hence in—

Il. 7. 452 τοῦ δ' ἐπιλήσονται, τὸ ἐγὼ καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων κτλ.
τοῦ—τό are not meant as correlatives: the sense is *and will forget the other—(a wall) which &c.* But some MSS. have ὃ τ' ἐγώ. So Od. 13. 263 (τῆς ληΐδος) τῆς εἴνεκ' ἐγὼ πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῷ *my share of the spoil—(spoil) for which I had suffered &c.* Exceptions are, Od. 14. 227 αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ τὰ φίλ' ἔσκε τά που θεὸς ἐν φρεσὶ θῆκεν, 19. 573 τοὺς πελέκεας τοὺς κτλ. (perhaps also Od. 9. 334).

(3) The Art. is not used in *epexegetic* clauses, as Il. 2. 338 νηπιᾶχοις, οἷς οὐ τι μέλει κτλ., Il. 5. 63 ἀρχεκάκους, αἱ πᾶσι κακὸν κτλ., Il. 15. 526 Λαμπετίδης, ὃν Λάμπος ἐγένετο.

Instances at variance with the general principle are to be found in Il. 5. 747 ἡρώων τοῖσιν τε κοτέσσεται (οἷσιν τε in some MSS.), Il. 9. 592 κῆδ' ὅσ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλει τῶν ἄστν ἁλώη, also Il. 17. 145., 18. 208, Od. 1. 17., 6. 153., 11. 545., 16. 257., 23.

355, &c. It is probable however that the text is sometimes at fault, the Art. having been substituted for οἷς, especially in order to avoid hiatus: *e.g.*—

Il. 17. 145 οἷος σὺν λαοῖσι τοῖ Ἰλίῳ (λαοῖς οἱ Φιλίῳ).

Od. 16. 263 ἐσθλώ τοι τούτω γ' ἐπαμύνορε τοὺς ἀγορεύεις, (where οὖς is not excluded by the hiatus, § 382).

As the Art. usually adds some new circumstance about a known antecedent, it sometimes has the effect of representing a fact as *unexpected*: as Il. 1. 392 τὴν μοι δόσαν νῆες Ἀχαιῶν (*Briséis*)—whom the Greeks gave me (=although the Greeks had given her to me): Od. 16. 19 μῶνον τηλύγετον, τῷ ἐπ' ἄλγεα πολλὰ μογήσῃ *his only son, after he has endured many sorrows about him* (cp. 19. 266., 23. 6): Il. 1. 160 πρὸς Τρώων, τῶν οὐ τι μετατρέπει *the Trojans—while you pray no heed to them*. So in—

Il. 1. 319 λῆγ' ἔριδος τὴν πρῶτον ἐπηπέλιθ' Ἀχιλῆϊ, the meaning is not *the same quarrel which he had declared*, but *his quarrel—now that he had declared it*. And so—

Od. 19. 393 οὐλήν, τὴν ποτέ μιν σὺς ἤλασε *a wound—one that once a boar gave him*. Similarly τῇ=*at a place where* (Il. 14. 404., 21. 554., 23. 775).

The Acc. Neut. τό used adverbially means *wherefore* (§ 133), as—

Il. 3. 176 ἀλλὰ τά γ' οὐκ ἐγένοντο· τὸ καὶ κλαίουσα τέτηκα.

So Il. 7. 239., 12. 9., 17. 404., 19. 213., 23. 547. There is one instance in the *Odyssey*, in the song of Demodocus (8. 332).

The Relational use does not extend to the Adverbs *τῶς, τότε, τείως* (τῆος), or to the derivative adjectives *τοῖος, τόσος, &c.*

263.] The Article with τε serves as a Relative. In accordance with the use of τε in Homer (§ 332) ὃ τε expresses a constant or *general* characteristic, but only of a *definite* Antecedent: as—

Il. 6. 112 Ἔκτορι Πριαμίδῃ, τὸν τε στυγέουσι καὶ ἄλλοι.

15. 621 κύματά τε τροφόμεντα, τὰ τε προσερεύεται αὐτήν.

Od. 18. 273 οὐλομένης ἐμέθεν, τῆς τε Ζεὺς ὄλβον ἀπήρα.

It is especially used in similes (where a *typical* case is described), as Il. 13. 390 πίτυς βλωθρῇ τὴν τ' οὔρεσι κτλ.: Il. 5. 783., 11. 554., 12. 146., 13. 571., 15. 581., 23. 712, &c.

264.] Homeric and Attic Article. After the account given in the preceding §§ of the Homeric uses of the Article it is hardly necessary to show in detail where they differ from the corresponding uses in Attic Greek. What we have chiefly to observe is that the difference is often greater in reality than it appears to be at first sight. Familiar as we are with the de-

fining Article of modern languages, and of Attic Greek, we naturally import it into Homer whenever it is not made impossible by the context. But even when a Homeric use falls under the general head of the 'defining Article' (§ 261), the effect is perceptibly different from that of the 'Definite Article' properly so called. In Homer the Article indicates, not that a person or thing is a known or definite one, but *that it is presented to us in an antithesis or contrast*. Objects so contrasted are usually definite, in the sense that they are already known or suggested by the context: and hence the readiness with which the later defining sense can be applied to passages in Homer. Thus *αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ἦρωσ* can usually be translated *but the hero (before mentioned)*, as though *ὁ* distinguished him from other heroes. But when we find that *αὐτὰρ ὁ* in Homer constantly means *but he*, or *but the other*, and that it may be followed by an exegetic Noun (as *αὐτὰρ ὁ βοῦν ἱέρευσεν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων*), we see that *ὁ* is more important than a mere Article, is in fact a Substantival Pronoun, to which *ἦρωσ* is added as a kind of epithet—*but he the hero*.

This point has been explained in connexion with the use of the Attributive Article, § 259, *a*. It may be further illustrated from instances in which the Article marks contrast, *but not definition*, and consequently cannot be translated by *the*. Such are:—

Il. 15. 66 πολέας δλέσαντ' αἰζηοὺς

τοὺς ἄλλους, μετὰ δ' υἷὸν ἐμὸν Σαρπηδόνα διόν

not *the others*, but *others as well, certain others*.

Il. 5. 672 ἢ προτέρω Διὸς υἷὸν ἐριγδούποιο διώκοι,

ἢ ὅ γε τῶν πλεόνων Λυκίων ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἔλοιτο

or *should take the lives of more Lycians instead*. Here οἱ πλείους does not mean 'the greater number,' but 'a greater number,' in contrast to the one person mentioned.

Il. 22. 162 ὡς δ' ὄτ' ἀεθλοφόροι περὶ τέρματα μώνυχες ἵπποι

ρίμφα μάλα τραχῶσι· τὸ δὲ μέγα κείται ἀεθλον

and *there a great prize lies ready*. So Od. 20. 242 *αὐτὰρ ὁ . . ὄρνις* but *a bird*. The same thing is shown by *μνηστήρων τῶν μὲν κτλ.* (§ 259, *b*). It is evident that τῶν is used, not because the suitors are definite persons, but because a contrast is made by μὲν.

The same remark applies to the use with Adjectives (§ 260), especially to the use by which they are turned into Substantives, as τὸ κρήνον, τὰ κακά. In Homer τὰ κακά is said because in the particular context κακά *evils* are opposed to *good*. In Attic τὰ κακά or τὸ κακόν implies that evils form a *class* of things, distinguished from all other things. This again is a difference,

which does not come out in translating Homer, and is therefore apt to be overlooked.

The use with Cardinal Numerals (§ 260, *c*) is to be similarly explained. It is not peculiar to Homer, but is regular in Attic also, where it may be regarded as a survival of the Homeric use of the Article.

The use of the Art. in Hesiod shows some advance. Thus the use to form a *class* is no longer confined to the case of a particular contrast given in the context: Op. 280 τὰ δίκαι' ἀγορεύσαι, Op. 353 τὸν φιλέοντα φιλεῖν καὶ τῷ προσιόντι προσεῖναι. The use with Adverbs is commoner, Op. 365 τὸ θύρηφιν, Op. 457 τῶν πρῶσθεν. The Prepositional phrase in Op. 364 τὸ ἐν οἴκῳ κατακέιμενον is quite post-Homeric. The same may be said of the 'articular' Inf. in Op. 314 τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι ἄμεινον (§ 259, 3). It will be found that the Art. occurs nearly twice as often in Hesiod as in Homer.

It is a further question, and one that cannot be fully discussed here, whether any uses of the Article found in our text of the Iliad and Odyssey are post-Homeric, and evidence of a later origin of the books or passages where they occur. It will be seen that in the case of the uses which have been noticed as rare or exceptional most of the examples come from books ix, x, xxiii, and xxiv. See especially the uses treated of in § 260, *f, g*, and § 261, 3. Others again seem to belong to the Odyssey; see § 261, 3, and cp. § 259, *a*. The use of the Article in the 10th book of the Iliad seems clearly later than in any other part of Homer: *e. g.*—

Il. 10. 97 δεῦρ' ἐς τοὺς φύλακας καταβήομεν.

277 χαῖρε δὲ τῷ ὄρνιθ' Ὀδυσσεύς.

322 ἦ μὲν τοὺς ἵππους τε καὶ ἄρματα κτλ. (so 330).

408 πῶς δ' αἰ τῶν ἄλλων Τρώων φυλακαὶ κτλ.

Also πεδίον τὸ Τρωϊκόν (v. 11), ὁ τλήμων Ὀδυσσεύς (v. 231, 498), τὴν νύκτα (v. 497). So in the Catalogue of the Ships we have Θάμυριν τὸν Θρηῖκα (Il. 2. 595), and τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος (2. 681).

ὄς ἢ ὄ.

265.] The Pronoun ὄς ἢ ὄ, and the Adverbs formed from the same Stem, esp. ὄς, ὄτε, ἕως, are occasionally used in a Demonstrative or quasi-Demonstrative sense; viz.—

(1) After καί, οὐδέ, μηδέ: as Il. 21. 198 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὄς δειδούκει *even he fears*: Il. 6. 59 μηδ' ὄς φύγοι *may not even he escape*: and often in the combinations καὶ ὄς *even so*, οὐδ' ὄς *not even so*. So οὐδ' ἔνθα *not even there* (Od. 1. 18).

(2) With μὲν and δέ, to express a contrast between indefinite objects: as—

Il. 11. 64 ὄς Ἐκτωρ ὄτε μὲν τε μετὰ πρότωισι φάνεσκεν,
ἄλλοτε δ' ἐν πυμάτοισι κτλ. (so 18. 599., 20. 49).

12. 141 οἱ δ' ἢ τοι ἦος μὲν κτλ. *up to a certain time*.

17. 178 ὄτε δ' αὐτὸς ἐποτρύνει *but sometimes &c.*

(3) In the Adverb ὄς *so*; especially as the second member of

the Correlation $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ — $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ *as—so*. A single $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ is often used where it may be either a Relative or a Demonstrative, as in the formula $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\phi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\omega}\nu$, &c. : cp. the Latin *quae quum dixisset*, &c. The other instances in which we have to translate $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ as a Demonstrative are rare : *e.g.* Il. 3. 339 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ δ' $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma$ *and in like manner*.

Among Demonstrative uses of $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ it is usual to count the use with $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, as $\delta\varsigma$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$. This however is an error, arising from the occasional use of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ where it cannot be translated *for* : see § 348, 3.

Some commentators find a Demonstrative $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ in—

Od. 4. 388 $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ γ' $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\omega\varsigma$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\iota\omicron$ $\lambda\omicron\chi\eta\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$,
 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\omicron\iota$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ $\acute{\omicron}\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\kappa\tau\lambda.$

Here however the clause $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\omicron\iota$ $\kappa\tau\lambda.$ is not the Apodosis, but a Relative Clause expressing *purpose*. The peculiarity of the passage is merely that the Apodosis is left to be understood : *if you can seize him, (do so), that he may tell you &c.* : cp. Od. 5. 17., 10. 539.

These idioms are usually regarded as the remains of an earlier use of $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ in the simple Anaphoric sense. The growth of a Relative out of a Demonstrative has been already exemplified in the Article (§ 262). But the Relational use of $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ is so ancient that any attempt to trace its growth from an earlier syntax must be of very uncertain value.

266.] $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\tau\epsilon$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\tau\iota\varsigma$. The simple $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ may be used in any kind of Relative Clause, although in certain cases (§ 262) the Article is preferred. Thus we have—

Il. 4. 196 $\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\omicron}\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ $\xi\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\nu$ (a particular fact).

1. 403 $\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\text{B}\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\omega\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ (a constant, characteristic fact).

In these two places the Art. might be put in place of $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$: but not in—

Il. 2. 205 $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\text{B}\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $\phi\acute{\iota}$ $\xi\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$ (a characteristic fact, defining).

1. 218 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\kappa\epsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ (definition of a class).

So $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ is used to convey a *reason* (which implies a *general* cause or tendency) : as Od. 1. 348 $\text{Z}\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ $\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ $\kappa\tau\lambda.$; cp. Il. 2. 275., 5. 650., 8. 34.

If the Relative is meant to refer to an indefinite number of individuals falling under a common description, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\tau\iota\varsigma$ is generally used, = *who being any one, whoever*.

If, again, the Relative Clause generalises by making us think, not so much of all possible *individuals* in a class, as of *different times and circumstances*,—in other words, if it lays stress on the *general and permanent element in facts*— $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\tau\epsilon$ is used : *e.g.*—

Il. 1. 279 $\sigma\kappa\eta\pi\tau\omicron\upsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma$ $\text{B}\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $\phi\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\text{Z}\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ $\xi\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$ *to whom as king, to whom in every such case.*

Il. 4. 361 τὰ γὰρ φρονέεις ἃ τ' ἐγὼ περ (*such things as* ὄςc.).

5. 545 Ἀλφειοῦ ὅς τ' εὐρὸν ῥέει (cp. 5. 876).

9. 117 ἀνὴρ ὃν τε Ζεὺς κῆρι φιλήσῃ.

Od. 7. 74 οἷσίν τ' εὖ φρονέσῃ *they to whom she is well inclined.*

Thus ὅς τε is constantly used in *comparisons*: as Il. 3. 61 (πέλεκυς) ὅς τ' εἰσιν διὰ δουρὸς ὑπ' ἀνέρος ὅς ῥά τε τέχνη νῆιον ἐκτάμνησι.

So ὡς τε, ὅθι τε, ὅθεν τε, ὅτε τε: ἔνθα τε, ἵνα τε: ὅσος τε, οἷός τε.

Od. 12. 22 δισθανέες, ὅτε τ' ἄλλοι ἄπαξ θνήσκουσ' ἀνθρωποι.

19. 179 Κνωσός, μεγάλη πόλις, ἔνθα τε Μίνως κτλ.

Thus Homer has *five* Relatives, viz. ὅς, ὅς τε, ὅς τις, ὅ, ὃ τε, each with a distinct use: Attic retains only ὅς and ὅς τις.*

267.] **Correlative Clauses.** 1. We have first to distinguish between the simple structure in which the Relative Clause only qualifies a Noun or Pronoun in the Principal Clause, as—

τῶν οἱ νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσι *of those who are now living.*

ἐν πεδίῳ ὅθι περ κτλ. *in the plain where* ὄςc.

and the *parallel* structure, in which the Relative is an Adverb of the same form as the Antecedent; as—

τὼς δέ σ' ἀπεχθῆρω ὡς νῦν ἐκπαγλ' ἐφίλησα.

τόφρα δ' ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι τίθει κράτος, ὄφρ' ἂν Ἀχαιοὶ κτλ.

τῇ ἴμεν ἢ κεν δὴ σύ, κελαινεφέες, ἡγεμονεύης.

Here the notion given by the adverbial ending—*manner, time, way, &c.*—is the point of comparison, and must be understood to qualify both clauses.

In both these kinds of compound sentence the Demonstrative Antecedent may often be omitted, but this is especially the case with the second, in which a Relational Adverb implies a *corresponding* Demonstrative. Thus ὡς ἐφίλησα implies τὼς—ὡς ἐφίλησα: ὄφρ' ἂν is equivalent to τόφρα—ὄφρ' ἂν, &c.

In this way, then, it came about that ὡς (lit. *in which manner*) means *in the manner in which*: and so ὄφρα *to the time up to which*, ἢ *by the way by which*, ὅθι *at the place where*, ὅτε *at the time when*, and so on.† The whole Relative Clause in fact serves as an Adverb (of *manner, time, way, &c.* as the ending may determine), construed with the Verb of the Principal Clause. Such clauses accordingly are called *adverbial*: while clauses which merely qualify a Noun or Pronoun are *adjectival*.

* It is worth notice that ὅς τις in Attic has some of the uses of ὅς τε: see Jowett, *Thucyd.* ii. p. 372, Stein, *Hdt.* 4. 8.

† In the corresponding sentences in English it is often the Relative that is wanting: thus τῇ ἴμεν ἢ κεν ἡγεμονεύης *to go by the way [by which] you lead.* This forms a characteristic difference between Greek and English Syntax.

3. The suppressed antecedent, again, may have no clear or grammatical construction :—

(a) This is especially found when the Relative Clause expresses a *reason*, as—

Od. 4. 611 αἵματος εἰς ἀγαθοῖο, φίλον τέκος, οἷ' ἀγορεύεις
lit. *you are of good blood (seeing the things) such as you speak, i.e. as I see by the manner of things that you speak.*

Il. 14. 95 νῦν δέ σευ ὠνοσάμην πάγχυ φρένας οἶον ξείπες
I blame your thought, because of the kind of thing you have said.

Od. 2. 239 νῦν δ' ἄλλω δήμῳ νεμεσίζομαι, οἶον ἅπαντες
ἦσθ' ἀνεφ' *at the way that ye all sit silent.*

Il. 17. 586 Ἐκτωρ, τίς κέ σ' ἔτ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν ταρβήσειεν,
οἶον δὴ Μενέλαον ὑπέτρεσας ;
who would fear you any more, seeing the way you shrank before Menelaus ?

Od. 15. 212 οἶος ἐκείνου θυμὸς ὑπέρβιος, οὗ σε μεθήσει.

Il. 16. 17 ἢε σύ γ' Ἀργείων ὀλοφύρεαι ὡς δλέκονται.

Od. 10. 326 θαυμά μ' ἔχει ὡς κτλ. *I wonder at the way that &c.*

This is the idiom generally described by saying that οἶος is put for ὅτι τοιοῦτος, ὡς for ὅτι οὕτως, and so on. So when ὅς introduces a reason (§ 266) we might say that it is for ὅτι οὗτος (e.g. Ζεὺς αἴτιος ὅς τε δίδωσι = ὅτι οὗτος δίδωσι). The peculiarity, however, of the clauses now in question is that the Relative can have no grammatical Antecedent, that is to say, that the Correlative which it implies as an Antecedent has no regular construction in the Principal Clause.

(b) This is also found after Verbs of *knowing*, &c.—the Relative Clause expressing the Object or *thing* known : as—

Il. 2. 409 ἦδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀδελφείον ὡς ἐπονεῖτο
he knew of his brother (as to the manner) in which he laboured.

24. 419 θηοῖό κεν . . οἶον ἐερσήεις κείται.

Od. 7. 327 εἰδήσεις . . ὄσσον ἄρισται νῆες ἐμαί.

This is evidently an extension of the form γνώση ὅς κακός (*supra*, 2 c), with the difference that the suppressed Correlative in the Principal Clause is without a regular construction.

(c) Sometimes the Relative Clause is used without any Principal Clause, as an exclamation : e.g.—

Il. 7. 455 ὦ πόποι, Ἐννοσίγαι' εὐρυσθενές, οἶον ξείπες.

Od. 1. 32 ὦ πόποι, οἶον δὴ νυ θεοὺς βροτοὶ αἰτιώωνται.

Il. 5. 601 ὦ φίλοι, οἶον δὴ θαυμάζομεν Ἐκτορα.

The ellipse gives an expression of surprise : (*to think*) *what a thing you have said !* (*to see*) *how men blame the gods !* (*to remember*)

how we wondered at Hector! The want of a construction has much the same effect as with the exclamatory use of the Nominative (§ 163). Similarly—

Od. 4. 240 πάντα μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
 ὄσσοι Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονός εἰσιω ἄεθλοι·
 ἀλλ' οἷον τὸδ' ἔρεξε κτλ.

I will not tell of all his feats: but (just to mention) what a feat this was that he did &c. So Od. 4. 269., II. 517; cp. also II. 5. 638 ἀλλ' οἷον τινὰ φασι κτλ. (*just to instance*) the kind of man that they tell &c.

If the explanation now given of these Relative Clauses is right, it is evidently incorrect to accent and punctuate as is done by editors (*e.g.*) in—

II. 6. 108 φὰν δέ τιν' ἀθανάτων ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος
 Τρωσὶν ἀλεξήσοντα κατελθέμεν' ὡς [οἱ ὦς] ἐλέλιχθεν

taking it as an Independent Clause—'so they wheeled.' The same editors do not hesitate to write in II. 16. 17 ὀλοφύρει, ὡς ὀλέκονται, where the construction is precisely the same.

It is sometimes maintained that in all such cases we have a survival of the primitive 'parataxis'—that (*e.g.*) ὀλοφύρει ὡς ὀλέκονται was originally ὀλοφύρει, ὡς ὀλέκονται *you lament, they so perish, hence you lament how they perish, or that they thus perish.* On the same view the exclamatory οἷον ἔειπες is not elliptical, but represents the original independent *what a thing you have said!* (See Mr. Leaf on II. 2. 320 θαυμάζομεν οἷον ἐτύχθη). This hypothesis, however, is not borne out by the facts of language. In the first place, it is strange that the traces of parataxis should be found with the Relatives ὡς, οἷος, ὅσος, &c. rather than with the corresponding Demonstrative forms. Again, if the Relative retained an original Demonstrative use, we should expect to find this, like other survivals, in some *isolated* group of uses: whereas the clauses now in question are very various in character. Again, the passages which favour the notion of parataxis are indistinguishable in structure from others to which it cannot be applied, such as most of the examples given under 2. Yet we cannot separate τὰ τ' ἐέλδεται ὅς κ' ἐπιδενῆς from φιλήσει οἷά κ' ἔχωμεν, or that again from ἠνοσάμην οἷον ἔειπες. In particular it will be found that the theory does not apply to clauses which are *conditional* so well as to those which give a *reason*. The exclamatory use—οἷον ἔειπες and the like—does not furnish a good argument, because the pronoun used in a simple exclamation would not be Demonstrative, but Interrogative (ποῖον ἔειπες, &c.). The most decisive consideration, however, is that the Relative use of ὅς and its derivatives is common to Greek and Sanscrit, and may be regarded therefore as Indo-European. Consequently there is a strong presumption against any hypothesis which explains the Homeric use of the Relative from a still earlier or pre-Indo-European stage of language.

4. Sometimes an Antecedent is not construed with the Governing Clause, but follows the Case of the Relative. This is allowed if the Antecedent is separated from its own clause, as—

II. 14. 75 νῆες ὅσαι πρῶται εἰρύαται ἄγχι θαλάσσης
 ἔλκωμεν (so II. 6. 396., IO. 416., 14. 371).

This 'Inverse Attraction' may be placed with the forms in which the Antecedent is wanting, because it can only arise when the original construction of the Antecedent (ἐλκωμεν νῆας ὄσαι—) has been forgotten.

5. Again, the Correlative structure is liable to an extension, the characteristic of which is that the Relational Adverb *has no proper construction in its own clause.*

This may be most clearly seen in the use of οὐνεκα (*i. e.* οὐ ἐνεκα) *for which reason* : *e. g.*—

II. I. 110 ὥς δὴ τοῦδ' ἐνεκά σφιν ἐκηβόλος ἄλγεα τεύχει,
οὐνεκ' ἐγὼ . . οὐκ ἔθελον κτλ.

Apollo causes sorrow for this reason, that I would not do. Here we cannot translate οὐνεκα *for which reason* : the reason does not precede, but is given by the Relative Clause. That is, the first ἐνεκα is rational ; the second is logically unmeaning. Hence the οὐνεκα can only be due to the correlation : as it is usually expressed, οὐνεκα is *attracted* to the antecedent τοῦνεκα. Then—since οὐνεκα comes to imply a correlative τοῦνεκα—the antecedent τοῦνεκα is omitted, and the relational οὐνεκα by itself comes to mean *for the reason that, because.*

The process may be traced more or less distinctly in all the Relational Adverbs. Thus ὥς (*in which manner*) comes to mean *in such manner that* : and so ὅφρα *for so long that, ἵνα* (*lit. where*) *to the end that.* Also, as will be shown presently, ὅ, ὅτι and ὅ τε are Adverbial Accusatives, meaning literally *in which respect, hence in respect that, because* : *ep. εἰπεῖν ὅ τι ἐχώσατο to say for what he was angered with χώσατο ὅτι he was angered for (the reason) that.* The qualifying force of the Adverb is transferred from its own clause to the Verb of the Governing Clause.

On the same principle ἐκ τοῦ ὅτε *from the time when* becomes ἐξ οὗ (*for ἐκ τοῦ οὗ*—) : and εἰς τὸ ὅτε becomes εἰς ὃ *to the time that.*

268.] οὐνεκα. This Conjunction (which may be treated as a single word) is used in two ways :—

(a) to assign a *cause* or *reason* :

(b) to connect the fact expressed in the Relative Clause with a Verb of *saying, knowing, &c.*

The second of these uses is evidently derived from the first by a kind of degeneration, or loss of meaning. The *fact* told or known is originally given as the *ground* of the saying or knowing. The transition may be seen in—

Od. 7. 299 ξείν', ἦ τοι μὲν τοῦτό γ' ἐναίσιμον οὐκ ἐνόησε
παῖς ἐμή, οὐνεκά σ' οὐ τι μετ' ἀμφιπόλοισι γυναῖξιν
ἦγεν ἐς ἡμέτερον

my daughter did not judge aright in this, because she did not &c., more simply, in this, that she did not &c. Again—

Od. 5. 215

οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς

πάντα μάλ', οὐνεκα σείο περίφρων Πηνελόπεια κτλ.

I know all, inasmuch as Penelope is &c.; i.e. I know that she is. This use is found with Verbs of saying in Od. 13. 309., 15. 42., 16. 330, 379. In the Iliad it occurs only once, viz. Il. 11. 21 πεύθετο . . μέγα κλέος, οὐνεκ' Ἀχαιοί κτλ.

Note that (except in Od. 13. 309., 16. 379) the Verb is followed by an Acc. of the *thing*; so that the Relative Clause does not directly take the place of the Object. Thus (*e.g.*) πεύθετο κλέος οὐνεκα is literally *heard a rumour the ground of which was that &c.*

A peculiar use to state a *consequence* which is made the *ground* of inference may be seen in Il. 9. 505 ἡ δ' Ἄτη σθεναρὴ τε καὶ ἀρτίπος, οὐνεκα πάσας πολλὸν ὑπεκπροθέει *Ate is strong and sound of foot, (as we know) because she &c.*

269.] ὃ, ὅτι, ὃ τε. The Acc. Neut. of the Relative, when used adverbially (§ 133), yields the three 'Conjunctions' ὃ, ὅτι, ὃ τε, which mean properly *in respect that*, hence usually (*a*) *because*, or (*b*) *that* (after a Verb of *saying, knowing, &c.*). The antecedent τό is generally wanting, but is found in a few instances: as Il. 19. 421 τὸ οἶδα καὶ αὐτός, ὃ τοι κτλ.: Il. 5. 406 οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδε . . ὅτι μάλ' οὐ δηναῖός κτλ.: Il. 1. 120 λεύσσετε τό γε πάντες, ὃ μοι κτλ.; also Il. 15. 217., 19. 57., 20. 466, and Od. 13. 314 (seemingly the only instance in the Odyssey). These places, however, serve to show the origin of the idiom. We have here the phenomenon already noticed in § 267, 5, viz. the Relative has no construction in its own Clause, but reflects the construction of the Demonstrative in the principal Clause. *E.g.* Il. 20. 283 *ταρβήσας ὃ οἱ ἄγχι πάγῃ βέλος* *dreading because the dart stuck near him* represents an older *ταρβήσας (τὸ) ὃ πάγῃ βέλος.* The adverbial Accusative with *ταρβήσας* would express the *nature or ground* of dread (as in τό γε δελθῆναι, τόδε χῶεο, &c.); hence the meaning *dreading in respect of* (or *because of*) *this, that the dart stuck.* Accordingly we find ὃ=*because* chiefly with Verbs of *feeling*, which regularly take a Neuter Pronoun of the *ground of feeling*.*

* The Clauses of this type are the subject of Dr. Peter Schmitt's monograph, *Ueber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen* (Würzburg, 1889). He rightly takes ὃ (ὅτι, &c.) to be an Acc. of the 'inner object' (§ 133), but he seems to have overlooked the real difficulty; which is that ὃ supplies an object to the Verb of the principal Clause, not to the Verb of its own Clause. Thus he says 'ὄρω δ νοσεῖς war ursprünglich: ich weiss, was du krankst; οἶδ' ὃ σε ἐπήνεσε ich weiss, was er dich gelobt hat' (p. 21). But the

(1) δ in respect that, because may be exemplified by—

Il. 16. 835 Τρωσὶ φιλοπτολέμοισι μεταπρέπω, ὃ σφιν ἀμύνω
ἡμαρ ἀναγκαῖον (*for that I keep off*).

Od. 1. 382 Τηλέμαχον θαύμαζον ὃ θαρσαλέως ἀγόρευε.

So Il. 9. 534 (χωσαμένη), Od. 19. 543., 21. 289 (οὐκ ἀγαπᾷς ὃ).

The use to state a consequence as a ground of inference (like that of οὐνεκα in Il. 9. 505, § 268) occurs in—

Od. 4. 206 τοίου γὰρ καὶ πατρός, ὃ καὶ πεπνυμένα βάζεις
for you are of a wise father, (as I know) because you speak wisely :
so Od. 18. 392, and probably also—

Il. 21. 150 τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν, ὃ μιν ἔτλης ἀντίος ἐλθεῖν ;
who are you that you dare &c.

The transition to the use of δ = *that* may be seen in—

Od. 2. 44 οὔτε τι δῆμιον ἄλλο πιφαύσκομαι οὐδ' ἀγορεύω
ἀλλ' ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος, ὃ μοι κακὸν ἔμπεσεν οἴκῳ
*what I tell is my own case (which consists in the fact) that evil has
fallen on my house.* It is common with οἶδα, γιγνώσκω (Il. 5. 433,
&c.), αἶτω (Il. 15. 248): and is found with Verbs of seeing, as Il. 1.
120 λεύσσετε γὰρ τό γε πάντες ὃ μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλη *ye see this,
that my prize goes elsewhere* (Il. 19. 144., 22. 445, Od. 17. 545).

(2) δ τι because is common after the Verbs of feeling. We need only stop to notice some instances (parallel to those of δ just quoted) in which δ τι is = *as I know because* :—

Il. 16. 33 νηλεές, οὐκ ἄρα σοὶ γε πατήρ ἦν ἱππότα Πηλεὺς,
οὐδὲ Θέτις μήτηρ, γλαυκὴ δέ σε τίκτε θάλασσα,
πέτραι τ' ἠλίβατοι, ὅτι τοι νόος ἐστὶν ἀπηνής
*meaning now I know that you are no child of Peleus &c., because
your mind is relentless.* So—

Il. 21. 410 νηπύτι, οὐδὲ νύ πώ περ ἐπεφράσω ὄσσον ἀρείων
εὐχόμε' ἐγὼν ἔμεναι, ὅτι μοι μένος ἀντιφερίζεις.

Od. 5. 339 κάμμορε, τίπτε τοι ὦδε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων
ὠδύσατ' ἐκπάγλως, ὅτι τοι κακὰ πολλὰ φυτεύει
why is Poseidon so enraged against you (as he seems to be) since he

two meanings, *I know in what respect you are sick* and *I know that you are sick* are quite distinct, and are given by essentially different constructions of the Relative. Let us take as example a Clause which follows a Verb of feeling: ἐχώσατο ὅτι οἱ βέλος ἔκφυγε χειρός. The construction with ἐχώσατο is the Acc. of the 'inner object' (as τότε χῶεο, τό γε δεῖδιθι, &c.). But ὅτι is in a different Clause from ἐχώσατο: the full construction would be ἐχώσατο (τὸ) ὅτι. Schmitt would say that ὅτι ἐκφυγε also is an Acc. of the 'inner object,'—that the sentence meant originally *was angered in respect of this in respect of which it flew out.* It is surely more probable that ἐχώσατο ὅτι was like ἐξ οὗ from the time that, εἰς ὃ to the time that, οὐνεκα for the reason that, &c. (§ 267, 5), so that ὅτι was an Acc. by Attraction, and had no real construction with its own Verb.

causes you many evils? So Π. 10. 142., 21. 488., 24. 240, Od. 14. 367., 22. 36.

The transition to the meaning *that* may be seen in—

Π. 2. 255 ἦσαι ὀνειδίζων ὅτι οἱ μάλα πολλὰ διδοῦσι
reproaching him in respect that, with the fact that, &c. 24. 538.
It is the regular meaning with Verbs of *knowing*: Π. 8. 175
γιγνώσκω δ' ὅτι μοι πρόφρων κατένευσε Κρονίων *I know that &c.*
Cp. Π. 1. 536 οὐδέ μιν Ἥρη ἠγνοίησεν ἰδοῦσ' ὅτι οἱ κτλ.: 24. 563
καὶ δέ σε γιγνώσκω . . ὅτι θεῶν τίς σ' ἦγε.

The use of ὅτι=*that* is commoner in the Iliad than in the Odyssey (where ὡς and οὐνεκα partly supply the place, see § 268).

(3) The form ὃ τε (so written by Bekker to distinguish it from ὅτε *when*) is found in Homer with the same varieties of meaning as ὃ and ὅτι. Thus we have ὃ τε = *because* in—

Π. 1. 244 χωόμενος ὃ τ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισας
angry because &c.; Π. 6. 126., 16. 509, Od. 8. 78. So—

Od. 5. 356 ὦ μοι ἐγώ, μή τίς μοι ὑφαίνησιν δόλον αὐτε
ἀθανάτων, ὃ τέ με σχεδὴς ἀποβῆναι ἀνώγει *snare* *snare* *snare*
i. e. there is a snare in this bidding me to get off the raft. So
probably Π. 1. 518 ἣ δὴ λοίγια ἔργ' ὃ τέ μ' κτλ. *it is a pestilent*
thing that you &c.; Π. 19. 57 ἣ ἄρ τι τόδ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἄρειον
ἔπλετο ὃ τε κτλ.: and the exclamatory use (§ 267, 3, c) in Π. 16.
433 ὦ μοι ἐγών, ὃ τε κτλ. *alas for me that &c.*

Again, ὃ τε is = *as I know because*, in— *Deumz brug hai holdt sig i dagly tale*

Π. 4. 31 δαιμονίη, τί νύ σε Πριάμος Πριάμοιο τε παῖδες
τόσσα κακὰ ῥέζουσιν, ὃ τ' ἀσπερχὲς μενεαίνεις
how do Priam and his sons do you such evil, (as they must do) since
you are furiously enraged?

Π. 15. 467 ὦ πόποι, ἣ δὴ πάγχυ μάχης ἐπὶ μῆδεα κείρει
δαίμων ἡμετέρης, ὃ τέ μοι βιδὸν ἔκβαλε χεῖρός
(as I judge from this) that he has thrown the bow from my hands.
So Od. 13. 129 ὃ τέ με βροτοὶ οὐ τι τίουσιν *for that mortals honour*
me not: Od. 14. 89 οἶδε δέ τοι ἴσασι . . ὃ τ' οὐκ ἐθέλουσι *they know*
something (as is plain) because they are not willing: Od. 21. 254
τοσσόνδε βίης ἐπιδενέες εἰμὲν . . ὃ τ' οὐ δυνάμεσθα *we are so want-*
ing in strength, as appears by the fact that we are not able.

With Verbs of *knowing*, again, ὃ τε has the meaning *that*—

Π. 1. 411 γνῶ δὲ καὶ Ἀτρείδης εὐρυκρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
ἦν ἄτην, ὃ τ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισεν
may know his folly, in that he failed to honour &c.

Od. 14. 365 ἐγὼ δ' εὖ οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς
νόστον ἐμεῖο ἀνακτος, ὃ τ' ἤχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσι
I know of the return of my lord, that (as it showed) he was hated

by all the gods. So Il. 8. 251 εἶδονθ' ὃ τ' ἄρ' κτλ. saw that &c.; and with γινώσκω, Il. 5. 231, &c.

The existence of a distinct ὃ τε with the meaning *because* or *that* depends upon its being shown that in places such as those now quoted the word cannot be either ὅτι *that* or ὅτε *when*. The latter explanation of the reading ὅτε (or ὅτ') is often admissible, e.g. in Il. 14. 71 ἦδεα μὲν γὰρ ὅτε—, οἶδα δὲ νῦν ὅτε—; cp. Il. 15. 207 ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται ὅτ' . . εἰδῆ, and instances in Attic, as Soph. O. T. 1133 κάτοιδεν ἦμος κτλ. *he knows well of the time when &c.*, Eur. Troad. 70 οἶδ' ἠνίκ' Αἴας εἶλκε. But the supposition of a distinct ὃ τε is supported by a sufficient number of examples in Homer,—e.g. Il. 5. 331 γινώσκων ὃ τ' ἀναγκίς ἔην θεός, —and generally by the complete correspondence of meaning thus obtained between ὃ, ὅτι, and ὃ τε. On the other hand it is extremely improbable that the ι of ὅτι was ever capable of elision. In this respect ὅτι *that* stands on the same footing as τί and ὅτι. Moreover, the adverbial use of these words, which gives them the character of Conjunctions, is only a slight extension of the ordinary Acc. of the Internal Object (§ 133). Hence if the Neut. of ὅς and ὅς τις is used in this way, it is difficult to see any reason why the Neut. of the equally familiar ὅς τε should be excluded. The ancient authorities and the MSS. vary in some places between ὅτε and ὅτι (as in Il. 14. 71, 72., 16. 35, Od. 13. 129), and on such a point we have no good external authority.

270.] ὃ, ὅτι, ὃ τε as Conjunctions. In a few instances it is impossible to explain these Relatives by supplying an Accusative τό in the principal Clause. Thus in—

Od. 20. 333 νῦν δ' ἦδη τόδε δῆλον, ὃ τ' οὐκέτι νόστιμός ἐστι
the Antecedent is a Pronoun in the Nom. Similarly in—

Il. 5. 349 ἦ οὐχ ἄλλίς ὅτι γυναικάς ἀνάκιδας ἠπεροπέυεις;
the principal Clause is Impersonal, and the Antecedent might be a Nom. (*is it not enough*) or Gen. (*is there not enough in this*), but hardly an Accusative. Again in—

Il. 8. 362 οὐδέ τι τῶν μέμνηται, ὃ οἱ μάλα πολλάκις κτλ.

17. 207 τῶν ποιήν, ὃ τοι κτλ. (*as amends for the fact that*)
the Relative Clause serves as a Genitive: cp. Od. 11. 540 γηθοσύνη ὃ οἱ κτλ., 12. 374 ἄγγελος ἦλθεν . . ὃ οἱ κτλ.

Add Il. 9. 493 τὸ φρονέων ὃ μοι κτλ., 23. 545 τὰ φρονέων ὅτι οἱ κτλ.: and also Od. 2. 116 τὰ φρονέουσ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ἃ οἱ κτλ., where the *v. l.* ὃ for ἃ has good MS. authority.

In these instances, then, the forms ὃ, &c. have ceased to be felt as Case-forms, and may properly be termed Conjunctions.

The Mood in all Clauses of this kind is the Indic.—not the Opt., as in some Attic uses (Goodwin, § 714).

It may be worth while pointing out the parallel between this extension of the Relative Clause and the development which has been observed in the use of the Infinitive (§ 234). In the first instance the Clause serves as epexegesis of an Acc. with a Verb of *saying, knowing, feeling, &c.* (§ 237, 2): *μη δειδῖθί τινα ὄψεσθαι* *fear not any one, for being likely to see*; *ταρβήσας* (τὸ) *ὃ ἄγχι πάγη βέλος* *fearing (this), that the spear stuck near him*. Then the Acc. is used without reference to the construction of the principal Verb and consequently the dependent Clause may stand to it as logical Subject: *οὐ τι νεμύσσητον βασιλῆα ἀπαρέσσαι* *for a king to make his peace is no shame*; *οὐχ ἅλις ὅτι ἠπεροπεύεις* *is (the fact) that you deceive not enough*;—where the Clause in both cases serves as a Nom. Finally the Clause is used as an indeclinable Noun of any Case: *τῶν μέμνηται ὃ κτλ.* *remembers this, that &c.*; to which corresponds the so-called ‘articular Infinitive,’ or Inf. with the Article as a Substantive.

The three forms *ὃ, ὃ τε, ὅτι* do not differ perceptibly in meaning. Hence the reduction in Attic to the single *ὅτι* is no real loss.

270*.] **Indirect Discourse.** Clauses introduced by *ὃ* (*ὃ τε, ὅτι*), *ὥς, οὐνεκα* after Verbs of *saying* and *knowing* are evidently of the nature of *oratio obliqua*, or indirect quotation of the words of another person.

The Homeric language has no forms of Syntax peculiar to Indirect Discourse (such as the use of the Opt. or Pres. Indic. after a Secondary Tense). Every assertion is made from the speaker’s own point of view: consequently what was present to the person quoted must be treated as now past. Accordingly the Present Tense of the *oratio directa* becomes the Impf., the Pf. becomes the Plpf. The Future is thrown into past time by the help of *μέλλω*, as in *οὐδὲ τὸ ἤδη ὃ οὐ πείσεσθαι ἔμελλεν* *he knew not that he would not be persuaded*. The only exception to this is *Od. 13. 340 ἦδ’ ὃ νοστήσεις* *I knew that you will* (i. e. *would*) *return*. For an instance of the Opt. with *ὥς* after a Verb of *saying* see § 306, 2: and cp. the Dependent Question, § 248.

The Clauses now in question are commoner after Verbs of *knowing, hearing, remembering, &c.* than after Verbs of *saying*. Of the former kind there are about 70 in Homer; of the latter, which may be counted as examples of true Indirect Discourse, there are 16. Of these, again, only three are in the *Iliad* (16. 131., 17. 654., 22. 439). This confirms the view that these Clauses are originally causal, the meaning *that* being derived from the meaning *because* (§ 268). If we confine ourselves to *ὃ* (*ὃ τε*) and *ὅτι* the proportion is still more striking, since out of more than 50 instances there are only four with a Verb of *saying**.

271.] **Form of the Relative Clause.** It is characteristic of the Relative Clause that the Verb *to be* is often omitted: as—

Il. 8. 524 *μῦθος δ’ ὃς μὲν νῦν ὑγιής, εἰρημένος ἔστω,*

* The figures are taken from Schmitt (*Ursprung des Substantivsatzes*), but include instances of *ὃ τε* which he refers to *ὅτε* when.

and so ὅσοι Ἀχαιοί, οἳ περ ἄριστοι, ἢ τις ἀρίστη, ὅς τ' αἴτιος ὅς τε καὶ οὐκί, &c. Hence we should write in Il. 11. 535., 20. 500 ἄντυγες αἱ περὶ δίφρον, in Il. 21. 353 ἰχθύες οἱ κατὰ δίνας. So with the Adverbs; as Od. 10. 176 ὄφρ' ἐν νηὶ θοῇ βρωσίς τε πόσις τε *so long as there is food and drink in the ship.*

1. This ellipse leads to a peculiar 'Attraction' into the Case of the Antecedent, found chiefly with ὅσος τε, as—

Od. 10. 113 τὴν δὲ γυναικα | εὔρον ὅσῃν τ' ὄρεος κορυφήν,
which is equivalent to τόσῃν ὅσῃ ἐστὶ κορυφή; and so ὅσον τε, Od. 9. 322, 325., 10. 167, 517., 11. 25; also οἶόν τε, Od. 19. 233. The only instance in the Iliad is somewhat different:—

Il. 1. 262 οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον . . οἶον Πειρίθοον κτλ.

The later Attraction of the Relative into the Case of the Antecedent is not found in Homer. Kühner gives as an example Il. 5. 265 τῆς γάρ τοι γενεῆς ἧς Τρωῖ περ εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς δῶκε. But there the Gen. is partitive: 'the brood *from* which Zeus gave' (§ 151 e). So Il. 23. 649 (§ 153).

2. Another effect of this omission may be found in the use of double Relational forms, especially ὡς ὅτε *as (it is) when*; which again may be used without any Verb following: *e.g.*—

Il. 13. 471 ἀλλ' ἔμεν' ὡς ὅτε τις σὺς οὖρῃσι ἀλκί πεποιθώς,
ὅς τε μένει κτλ.

So ὡς εἰ and ὡς εἴ τε *as (it would be) if*, as in Il. 5. 373 τίς νύ σε τοιάδ' ἔρξεε . . ὡς εἴ τι κακὸν ῥέζουσας.

A similar account is probably to be given of the peculiar double Relative—

Il. 8. 229 πῆ ἔβαν εὐχωλαί, ὅτε δὴ φάμεν εἶναι ἄριστοι,
ἅς ὀπότ' ἐν Λήμνῳ κενεαυχέες ἡγοράασθε
when once (whenever it was) you made boast in Lemnos.

3. The want of a finite Verb also leads to the construction of οἶος, ὡς, &c. with the Infinitive. This is only beginning in Homer: see § 235. It arises by a kind of mixture or 'contamination' of two simple constructions, viz.—

(1) the ordinary Inf. with the Demonstratives τοῖος, τηλικός, &c. (§ 232); as τοῖοι ἀμνόμεν *of the kind to defend* (Od. 2. 60), μένειν ἔτι τηλικός *of the age for remaining* (Od. 17. 20);

(2) the Correlative form, such as Il. 5. 483 τοῖον οἶόν κ' ἠὲ φέροισιν Ἀχαιοὶ ἢ κεν ἄγοισιν: Il. 7. 231 ἡμεῖς δ' εἰμεν τοῖοι οἱ ἄν σέθεν ἀντιάσαιμεν.

Thus (*e.g.*) Od. 21. 172 τοῖον . . οἶόν τε ῥυτῆρα βιοῦ τ' ἔμεναι καὶ διστῶν combines the forms τοῖον ἔμεναι *of the kind to be* and τοῖον οἶός τε (*ἐστὶ*) *of the kind that (is)*. In other words, the con-

struction of τοῖος is transferred to the Correlatives τοῖος—οἶος. Then τοῖος is omitted, and we get οἶος with the Inf. The same may be said of ὡς τε with the Inf., which is post-Homeric.

272.] **Double Relative Clauses.** When a Relative introduces two or more Clauses connected by καί or δέ, it need not be construed with any Clause after the first: *e. g.*—

Il. 1. 162 ᾧ ἔπι πόλλ' ἐμόγησα, δόσαν δέ μοι υἱες Ἀχαιῶν
for which I toiled, and which the sons of the Greeks gave me.

Od. 2. 114 τῷ δτεφ̄ τε πατήρ κέλεται καὶ ἀνδάνει αὐτῇ, ^{ρ54}
and who is pleasing to herself. The Relative is not repeated in any Clause of this form; but its place is often taken by another Pronoun (usually an enclitic, or an unemphatic αὐτός):—

Il. 1. 78 ἧ γὰρ ὄτομαι ἄνδρα χολωσέμεν, δς μέγα πάντων
Ἀργείων κρατεῖ καὶ οἱ πείθονται Ἀχαιοί.

Od. 9. 19 εἰμ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, δς πᾶσι δόλοισιν ^{ρ576}
ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καὶ μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἴκει.

This idiom, it should be observed, is not peculiar to Homer, but prevails in all periods of Greek (Kühner, II. p. 936).

On the same principle, when a succession of Clauses is introduced by a Relational Adverb, the first Verb may be in the Subj. or Opt., while the rest are in the Indic. This is especially noticeable in similes, as—

Il. 2. 147 ὡς δ' ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺν λήϊον ἐλθῶν,
λαβρὸς ἐπαιγίζων, ἐπὶ τ' ἡμῦν ἀσταχέουσι.

4. 483 ἧ ρά τ' ἐν εἰαμενῇ ἔλεος μέγαλοιο πεφύκη
λείη, ἀτάρ τέ οἱ ὄζοι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῃ πεφύασι.

Successive Relative Clauses not connected by a Conjunction are frequent in Homer. The Relative may be repeated for the sake of emphasis: Od. 2. 130 δόμων ἀέκουσαν ἀπῶσαι ἧ μ' ἔτεχ' ἧ μ' ἔθρεψε. Or the second Clause is epexegetic of the first: as—

Il. 5. 403 σχέτλιος, ὀβριμοεργός, δς οὐκ ὅθει' αἴσουλα ρέζων,
δς τόξοισιν ἔκηδε θεοῦς (so 6. 131., 17. 674, &c.).

Or it marks the return to the main thread of the narrative: as—

Od. 14. 288 δῆ τότε Φοῖνιξ ἦλθεν ἀνήρ, ἀπατήλια εἰδῶς,
τρῶκτης, δς δῆ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἑώργει,
ὅς μ' ἄγε παρπεπιθὼν κτλ. (cp. Il. 15. 461–3).

Where different Pronouns are used as Relatives in successive Clauses, the reason of the variety may often be traced. Thus in Il. 16. 157 οἱ δὲ λύκοι ὡς ὠμοφάγοι, τοῖσιν τε περὶ φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή, οἳ τ' ἔλαφον . . δάπτουσιν, the Art. τοῖσι gives a characteristic of all wolves, the Rel. οἳ passes to the wolves of the particular simile. In both the meaning is general, accordingly τε is used.

Again, we find ὅς τε introducing a general assertion, while ὅς

relates to a particular fact: as Π. 4. 442 ἢ τ' ὀλίγη μὲν πρῶτα κορύσσεται . . ἢ σφιν καὶ τότε κτλ.; 5. 545 Ἄλφειοῦ, ὅς τ' εὐρὸν ῥέει Πυλίων διὰ γαίης, ὅς τέκετ' Ὀρσίλοχον: and in the reverse order, Π. 18. 520 οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἔκανον ὅθι σφίσιν εἶκε λοχῆσαι ἐν ποταμῶ, ὅθι τ' ἀρδμὸς ἔην.

The difference between ὅς τις and ὅς τε appears in Od. 6. 286 καὶ δ' ἄλλη νεμεσῶ ἢ τις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι, ἢ τ' ἀέκητι φίλων πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς ἐόντων ἀνδράσι μίσηται. Here ἢ τις insists on the inclusion of all members of the class (*any one who—*), ἢ τε prepares us for the class characteristics (*one of the kind that—*).

CHAPTER XII.

USES OF THE MOODS.

Introductory.

273.] **Classification of Sentences.** Before entering upon an examination of the Homeric uses of the Moods, it will be convenient to give some account of the different kinds of Sentences and Clauses with which we shall have to deal.

A Simple Sentence—or the principal Clause in a Complex Sentence—may be purely *Affirmative*. Or, the affirmation may be turned (either by the use of a suitable Pronoun or Particle, or by the tone and manner in which it is uttered) into a question: *i. e.* the Sentence may be *Interrogative*. Or, a predication may be framed in order to be denied: in which case a Particle is added to make the Sentence *Negative*. Or, the Sentence may express *Wish, Purpose, or Command*; and any of these may again be combined with a Negative, so as to express some variety of *Prohibition*. Or, once more, the Sentence may be *Conditional, i. e.* may assert, deny, command, &c. subject to a hypothesis; and this hypothesis or condition may be expressed by a subordinate Clause, or by an Adverb or adverbial phrase (*then, in that case, or the like*): or the condition need not be expressed at all, but conveyed by the drift of the context.

A subordinate Clause may be so loosely connected with the principal Clause as to be virtually an independent sentence. We have seen that this is generally the case (for example) with Clauses introduced by the Article (§ 262). The Clauses which chiefly concern us now are—

1. Dependent Interrogative Clauses.

2. Prohibitive Clauses ($\mu\eta = lest$).
3. Relative Clauses proper (introduced by $\delta\varsigma$).
4. Clauses introduced by a Relational Adverb ($\acute{\omega}\varsigma, \acute{\omicron}\theta\iota, \acute{\omicron}\theta\epsilon\nu, \acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon, \acute{\xi}\omega\varsigma, \acute{\omicron}\phi\rho\alpha, \&c.$; also $\acute{\xi}\nu\theta\alpha, \acute{\iota}\nu\alpha, \text{ and } \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$).
5. Clauses introduced by $\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ *if*.

This classification is based upon the grammatical *form* of the Clause. If we look to the relation in point of *meaning* between the two Clauses of a Complex Sentence, we find that subordinate Clauses fall into a wholly different set of groups. Thus there are—

(1) Clauses expressing *cause* or *reason*: as—

Il. 2. 274 $\nu\tilde{\nu}\nu$ δὲ τόδε μέγ' ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν,
 ὃς τὸν λωβητῆρα ἐπεσβόλον ἔσχ' ἀγοράων.

And clauses like Il. 4. 157 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ σ' ἔβαλον Τρῶες *since the Trojans have thus shot at you*; 6. 166 οἶον ἄκουσε *at hearing such a thing* (§ 267, 3): as well as in the regular Causal use of $\acute{\omicron}, \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota, \acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$ (§ 269), and $\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha$.

(2) Clauses expressing the *Object* of Verbs of *saying, knowing, thinking, &c.* (*i. e.* the *fact* or *thing* said, &c.): as—

Il. 2. 365 γνώση ἔπειθ' ὃς θ' ἠγεμόνων κακός, ὃς τέ νυ λαῶν.

Od. 6. 141 ὁ δὲ μερμήριξεν Ὀδυσσεὺς | ἦ . . ἦ κτλ.

Il. 18. 125 γνοῖεν δ' ὡς δὴ δηρὸν ἐγὼ πολέμοιο πέπαυμαι.

601 πειρήσεται αἶ κε θέησιν (*tries if it will run*).

(3) Clauses expressing *condition* or *limitation*; which may be introduced—

By $\delta\varsigma$: as τῶν οἱ νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσι *of the mortals now living*: $\delta\varsigma$ κ' ἐπιδευῆς *he who is in want*: $\delta\varsigma$ κε θεοῖς ἐπιπειθήται *he who shall obey the gods*: $\acute{\omicron}$ τι οἱ εἶσατο *whatever seemed to him*.

By a Relational Adverb: of *manner*, as $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ἐπιτέλλω *as I bid*, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ἂν ἐγὼν εἶπω *as I shall speak*; of *time*, ἐπεὶ, ὅτε, &c., also $\acute{\xi}\omega\varsigma$ and $\acute{\omicron}\phi\rho\alpha$ when they mean *so long as*; of *place*, as $\acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\omicron}\theta\iota$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ $\pi\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ *where is the richest of the plain*.

By $\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ —the common form of Conditional protasis.

It will be convenient to term all these Clauses 'Conditional'—the word being taken in a wide sense, so as to include every Clause of the nature of a *definition* or *limitation*, as well as those in which actual *priority* in time is implied.

(4) Final Clauses, expressing *end* or *purpose*: introduced—

By $\delta\varsigma$; as Il. 4. 190 ἐπιθήσει φάρμαχ' ἃ κεν πάσῃσι *will apply drugs which shall stay*: Il. 14. 107 νῦν δ' εἶη ὃς . . ἐνίσποι *may there be one who may tell*.

By $\acute{\omega}\varsigma, \acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma, \acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ —the ordinary forms expressing purpose.

By $\xi\omega\varsigma$ (better written $\eta\omicron\varsigma$ in Homer*) and $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$, when they mean *till such time that*. To these we may add $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ δ' *until*, which (like $\omicron\nu\nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha$) is practically a single word.

By $\epsilon\iota$ or $\alpha\iota$: as Il. 1. 420 $\epsilon\iota\mu'$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$. . $\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\epsilon$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ *I go in the hope that he will listen*.

By $\mu\acute{\eta}$ *lest* (= $\iota\nu\alpha$ $\mu\acute{\eta}$).

It is important to observe that the several groups of Clauses now pointed out are generally indistinguishable in respect of grammatical form; so that Clauses of the same form (introduced by the same Pronoun or Particle, and with a Verb of the same Tense and Mood) often bear entirely different meanings. This will be shown in detail in the course of the present chapter; meanwhile a few instances may be noted as illustrations.

1. Final Clauses introduced by $\delta\varsigma$ are in the same form as the Conditional or limiting Clauses such as $\delta\varsigma$ $\kappa\epsilon$ $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$, $\delta\tau\tau\iota$ $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ $\epsilon\iota\pi\eta\varsigma$, &c.

2. The regular Final Clauses with $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ and $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ are in the same form as the limiting $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\grave{\alpha}\nu$ $\epsilon\gamma\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\epsilon\iota\pi\omega$ as *I shall speak*, $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ $\epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ as *he pleases*, &c.

3. Clauses with $\xi\omega\varsigma$ and $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$ may either be Conditional (when the Conjunction means *so long as*), or Final (when it means *until*).

4. The Final Clause with $\epsilon\iota$ is indistinguishable in form from the ordinary Conditional Protasis: compare $\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\epsilon$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ *to see if he will listen* with Il. 24. 592 $\mu\acute{\eta}$ $\mu\omicron\iota$ $\Pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\kappa\lambda\epsilon$ $\sigma\kappa\upsilon\delta\mu\alpha\iota\acute{\nu}\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\epsilon$ $\pi\acute{\upsilon}\theta\eta\alpha\iota$ *be not angry in case you hear*.

5. Clauses with $\mu\acute{\eta}$ may either be Final (when $\mu\acute{\eta}$ = $\iota\nu\alpha$ $\mu\acute{\eta}$), or Object-Clauses after a Verb of *fearing* ($\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$ $\mu\acute{\eta}$).

From these examples it is evident that in this as in so many parts of Greek grammar the most important differences of meaning are not expressed by corresponding distinctions of form. The Pronoun or Conjunction which connects the subordinate with the principal Clause generally leaves the real relation between the two Clauses to be gathered from the context.

These different kinds of Sentence are distinguished to some extent by means of Particles, of which it will be enough to say here that—

(1) Strong *Affirmation* is expressed by η , and the same Particle is employed in *Interrogation* (especially with ironical force).

(2) *Negation* is expressed by $\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}$ ($\omicron\upsilon\kappa$, $\omicron\upsilon$), *Prohibition* by $\mu\acute{\eta}$.

(3) The Particle $\epsilon\iota$, in its ordinary use, marks a *Conditional Protasis*, *i.e.* a Clause stating a condition or supposition.

(4) The Particles $\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$ and $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ mark a predication as being *Conditional*, or made in view of some *limitation* to particular conditions or circumstances.

* It is often convenient to use the Attic form $\xi\omega\varsigma$ as the name of the Particle, but this cannot be the true Homeric form. The metre shows that it must be a trochee; and the Doric $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ (Ahrens, *Dial. Dor.* p. 200) represents contraction of $\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$: cp. the Cretan $\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega\varsigma$ for $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ (Hesych.). Hence we should have in Homer either $\eta\omicron\varsigma$ (the older Ionic form, cp. $\nu\eta\omicron\varsigma$) or $\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$, which would properly be Doric or Æolic, like $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ &c. Of these $\eta\omicron\varsigma$ is evidently the more probable. *Nauck. Met. Gr. R. II. p. 411.*

The Subjunctive—in Principal Clauses.

274.] The Subjunctive in a Simple Sentence, or in the Principal Clause of a Complex Sentence, may be said in general to express either the *will* of the speaker or his sense of the *necessity* of a future event. Like the English *must* and *shall*, by which it may usually be rendered, it is intermediate in meaning between an Imperative and a Future. Sometimes (as in *ἵομεν let us go*, or in Prohibitions with *μή*) it is virtually Imperative; sometimes it is an emphatic or passionate Future. These varieties of use will be best understood if treated with reference to the different kinds of sentence—Affirmative, Interrogative, Negative, Prohibitive, &c.—in which they occur.

275.] In *Affirmative* sentences the force of the Subj. depends in great measure on the Person used.

(a) In the First Person the Subj. supplies the place of an Imperative, so far as such a thing is conceivable: that is, it expresses what the speaker *resolves* or *insists* upon doing; e. g.—

Il. 9. 121 ὑμῖν δ' ἐν πάντεσσι περικλυτὰ δῶρ' ὀνομήνω
(where the list of gifts immediately follows).

Od. 2. 222 σῆμά τέ οἱ χεύω καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερεῖξω
πολλὰ μάλ' ὅσσα ἔοικε, καὶ ἀνέρι μητέρα δώσω
(the Subj. expresses the decisive action to be taken by Telemachus, viz. to acknowledge his father's death: the Fut. δώσω expresses what would follow as a matter of course).

Il. 12. 383 δύσομαι εἰς Ἀΐδαο καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσι φαείνω
(said by way of a threat).

Hence after a Clause containing an Imperative the Subj. is used to show what the speaker will do *as his part* of what he desires to be done: as—

Il. 6. 340 ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐπίμεινον, ἀρήϊα τεύχεα δύω
do you wait, and I will put on my armour.

22. 416 σχέσθε, φίλοι, καὶ μ' οἶον ἔασατε κηδόμενοι περ
ἔξελεύοντα πόλῃος ἰκέσθ' ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν,
λίσσωμ' ἀνέρα τούτου κτλ.

450 δεῦτε, δύω μοι ἐπεσθον, ἴδωμ' ὅτιν' ἔργα τέτυκται.

So after the phrases ἀλλ' ἄγε, εἰ δ' ἄγε, as Od. 6. 126 ἀλλ' ἄγ' ἐγὼν αὐτὸς πειρήσομαι ἠδὲ ἴδωμαι: 9. 37 εἰ δ' ἄγε τοι καὶ νόστον ἐμὸν πολυκηδέ' ἐνλίπω. On the phrase εἰ δ' ἄγε see § 321.

To show that a purpose is *conditional* upon something else being done, the Subj. may be qualified by the Particle *κε(ν)*:

Il. 1. 137 εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώσωιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι
if they do not give her, I will (in that case) &c.

Il. 14. 235 πείθευ, ἐγὼ δὲ κέ τοι εἰδέω χάριν
obey, and I will feel thankfulness.

16. 129 δύσεο τεύχεα θᾶσσον, ἐγὼ δὲ κε λαὸν ἀγείρω.

Od. 17. 417 τῷ σε χρὴ δόμεναι καὶ λώϊον ἢ ἐπερ ἄλλοι
σίτου· ἐγὼ δὲ κέ σε κλείω κτλ.

So too Il. 1. 183 τὴν μὲν . . πέμψω, ἐγὼ δὲ κ' ἄγω Βρισηίδα I will send her (as required), and then I will take Briseis—the Subj. expressing the speaker's own threatened action, and *κεν* marking that it is the counterpart to what is imposed upon him. It will be found that *κεν* is used when the Clause with the Subj. is introduced by *δέ*, but not when it follows without a connecting Particle. *I. e.* it is when the two Clauses are set *against* one another by *δέ* that it becomes necessary to express also the *conditional* nature of the second Clause.

This use of *κεν* with the Subj. is not found except in Homer.

The First Person Plural is similarly used, as Od. 3. 17 ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἰθὺς κίε Νέστορος ἵπποδάμοιο· εἶδομεν κτλ. And so in the common Hortatory Subj., as φεύγωμεν *let us fly*.

(*b*) A Subj. of the Second and Third Person in an Affirmative sentence is usually an emphatic Future, sometimes approaching the force of an Imperative. The only example of a *pure* Subj. (*i. e.* without *κεν* or *ἄν*) in this use appears to be the phrase *καὶ ποτέ τις εἴησι* and *men shall say* (Il. 6. 459, 479., 7. 87).

With *ἄν* we find—

Il. 1. 205 ἦς ὑπεροπλήσι τάχ' ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀληται
(in effect a threat of what the speaker will do).

22. 505 νῦν δ' ἄν πολλὰ πάθησι φίλου ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἀμαρτῶν
but now he must suffer much &c.

With *κεν* the examples are rather more numerous:—

Od. 1. 396 τῶν κέν τις τόδ' ἔχρησι, ἐπεὶ θάνε διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς
let one of them have this (emphatic assent).

4. 80 ἀνδρῶν δ' ἢ κέν τίς μοι ἐρίσσειται ἢ ἐκαὶ οὐκί.

4. 391 καὶ δὲ κέ τοι εἴησι κτλ.

10. 507 ἦσθαι, τὴν δὲ κέ τοι πνοιὴ Βορέας φέρησι
sit still, and her the breath of Boreas shall bear along (solemn prophetic assurance).

Il. 9. 701 ἀλλ' ἢ τοι κείνον μὲν ἐάσομεν, ἢ κεν ἴησι
ἢ κε μένη (*let him go or let him stay*): cp. Od. 14. 183.

Note that where two alternatives are not expressed by the same Mood, the Subj. gives the alternative on which the stress is laid:

Il. 11. 431 σήμερον ἢ δοιοῖσιν ἐπέξεται . .
ἢ κεν ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπεῖς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσης.

Il. 18. 308 στήσομαι, ἢ κε φέρῃσι μέγα κράτος ἢ κε φεροίμην
*I shall stand firm, let him gain the victory (= though
 he shall gain) or I may gain it.*

Od. 4. 692 ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρῃσι βροτῶν, ἄλλον κε φιλοίῃ
a king will (is sure to) hate one, he may love another.

A curious combination of Opt. and Subj. is found in—

Il. 24. 654 αὐτίκ' ἂν ἐξείποι Ἀγαμέμνονι, ποιμένι λαῶν,
 καὶ κεν ἀνάβλησις λύσιος νεκροῦο γένηται

*he would straightway tell Agamemnon, and then there must be a
 delay in the ransoming of the dead.* The Subj. appears to express
 the certainty of the further consequence, as though the hypo-
 thetical case (αὐτίκ' ἂν ἐξείποι) had actually occurred.

276.] In *Negative* Clauses properly so called (*i. e.* distinguished
 from Prohibitions) the Subj. is an emphatic Future. We find—

(a) The pure Subj. (expressing a general denial):—

Il. 1. 262 οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον ἀνέρας οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι
I have not seen—I never shall see.

7. 197 οὐ γάρ τις με βίῃ γε ἐκὼν ἀέκοντα δίηται
no man shall chase me against my will.

15. 349 οὐδέ νυ τόν γε
 γνωτοί τε γνωταί τε πυρὸς λελάχωσι θανόντα.

Od. 16. 437 οὐκ ἔσθ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ οὐδ' ἔσσειται οὐδὲ γένηται
*there is not, there never will or can be, the man
 who, &c. (so 6. 201).*

24. 29 μοῖρ' ὀλοή, τὴν οὐ τις ἀλεύεται (cp. 14. 400).

(b) The Subj. with ἂν:—

Il. 3. 54 οὐκ ἂν τοι χραίσμη κίθαρις κτλ.
be sure that then your lyre will not avail you.

11. 386 εἰ μὲν δὴ ἀντίβιον σὺν τεύχεσι πειρηθείης,
 οὐκ ἂν τοι χραίσμησι βιῶς κτλ.

The reason for ἂν in these places is obvious: in the following
 instances it seems to be used because there is a *contrast*:—

Il. 2. 488 πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω
but the multitude I cannot declare or tell by name.

Od. 6. 221 ἄντην δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ γε λοέσομαι (ἄντην is emphatic:
 cp. Od. 4. 240., 11. 328, 517).

277.] In *Interrogative* sentences the Subj. generally expresses
necessity, submission to some command or power; as Il. 10. 62
 αἶθι μένω . . ἦε θέω κτλ. *am I to remain here, or am I to run &c.* ;
 Od. 15. 509 πῆ γὰρ ἐγὼ, φίλε τέκνον, ἴω ; τεῦ δῶμαθ' ἴκωμα κτλ.
where am I to go? to whose house &c. : Od. 5. 465 ὦ μοι ἐγὼ, τί

πάθω ; τί νύ μοι μήκιστα γένηται ; *what am I to suffer? what is to become of me?* And rhetorically, with an implied negation—

Il. 18. 188 πῶς τ' ἄρ' ἴω μετὰ μῶλον ; ἔχουσι δὲ τεύχε' ἐκεῖνοι
how can I go into the battle? They have my arms.

Il. 1. 150 πῶς τίς τοι πρόφρων ἔπεσιν πείθηται Ἀχαιῶν ;

One or two passages given by Delbrück under this head should perhaps be classed as Subordinate Clauses. A transitional instance may be seen in Od. 22. 166 σὺ δέ μοι νημερτὲς ἐνίσπες, ἧ μιν ἀποκτείνω . . ἧε σοὶ ἐνθάδ' ἄγω κτλ. *tell me, am I to kill him, or bring him here?* Here the Clause may be a distinct sentence ; but not so Il. 9. 618 ἅμα δ' ἠοὶ φαινομένηφιν φρασσόμεθ' ἧ κε νεώμεθ' κτλ., because this does not express an actual but an intended future deliberation. So in Od. 16. 73 μητρὶ δ' ἐμῇ δίχα θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμηρίζει ἧ αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐμοί τε μένη κτλ. the form of expression is changed from the First to the Third Person, as in *oratio obliqua* (§ 280).

278.] With the *Prohibitive* Particle μή the Subj. has the character of an Imperative. We may distinguish however—

(a) Direct forbidding, usually with the First Person Plural (answering to the Hortatory Subj.), and the Second Person Sing.; sometimes also with the Third Person, as—

Il. 4. 37 ἔρξω ὅπως ἐθέλεις· μὴ τοῦτό γε νεῖκος ὀπίσω
σοὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ μέγ' ἔρισμα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι γένηται
I do not want this to become a quarrel.

Od. 22. 213 Μέντορ, μὴ σ' ἐπέεσσι παραιπεπίθησιν Ὀδυσσεύς
see that Ulysses does not persuade you.

And with the First Person Sing., as Il. 1. 26 μὴ σε κιχέω *let me not catch you* ; Il. 21. 475 μὴ σευ ἀκούσω.

(b) Fear, warning, suggestion of danger, &c. ; e.g.—

Il. 2. 195 μὴ τι χολωσάμενος ῥέξῃ (*I fear he will &c.*).

5. 487 μὴ πως ὡς ἀψίσι λίνου ἀλόντε πανάγρου
ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένησθε
see that you do not become a prey &c.

22. 123 μὴ μιν ἐγὼ μὲν ἴκωμαι ἰών, ὃ δέ μ' οὐκ ἐλεήσει.

Od. 5. 356 ὦ μοι ἐγώ, μὴ τίς μοι ὑφαίνῃσιν δόλον αὔτε
ἀθανάτων (*I hope some god is not weaving &c.*).

18. 334 μὴ τίς τοι τάχα Ἴρου ἀμείνων ἄλλος ἀναστή
see that a better than Irus does not rise up.

The construction is the same in principle when a Clause of this kind follows a Verb of *fearing* ; and it is sometimes a question whether the Clause is subordinate or not. Thus the older editors (including Wolf) punctuated Il. 11. 470 δεῖδω, μὴ τι πάθῃσι—as though δεῖδω were parenthetical. It is

probable, however, that in such cases the Clause with μή has acquired a subordinate character, serving as Object to the Verb (*thing feared*); see § 281.

On the other hand, the Clauses now in question are often explained by supposing an ellipse of a Verb of *fearing*: μή βέξῃ for δεῖδω μή βέξῃ. This is open to the objection that it separates Clauses which are essentially similar. For μή βέξῃ *I will not have him do* (hence *I fear he may do*) is identical in form with μή βέξῃς *I will not have you do*. In this case, then, we have the simple Sentence μή βέξῃ, as well as the Compound δεῖδω μή βέξῃ, into which it entered.

Similar questions may arise regarding Final Clauses with μή. Thus in Il. i. 586-7 τέτλαθι, μήτερ ἐμή, . . . μή σε . . . ἴδωμαι we may translate *endure, mother; let me not see you &c.*, or (bringing the two Clauses more closely together) *endure, lest I see you &c.* So in Il. 8. 522, Od. 13. 208. No clear line can be drawn between independent and subordinate Clauses: for the complex Sentence has been formed gradually, by the agglutination of the simple Clauses.

The combination μή οὐ—prohibition of a negative—is extremely rare in Homer. In Il. 5. 233 μή τῶ μὲν δέλσαντε ματήσσετον οὐδ' ἐθέλητον, and Il. 16. 128 μή δὴ νῆας ἔλωσι καὶ οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλωνται, the Particles are in distinct Clauses. It occurs in a Final Clause, Il. 1. 28 μή νύ τοι οὐ χραίσμη κτλ., Il. 24. 569: and after δεῖδω in Il. 10. 39 δεῖδω μή οὐ τίς τοι κτλ.

The Subj. in this use does not take κεν or ἄν, the prohibition being always regarded as unconditional.

It is well known that the *Present* Subj. is not used as an Imperative of Prohibition (with μή). The rule is absolute in Homer for the Second Person. The Third Person is occasionally used when *fear* (not *command*) is expressed; the instances are,—Od. 5. 356 (quoted above); 15. 19 μή νύ τι . . . φέρηται; 16. 87 μή μιν κερτομέωσιν. The restriction does not apply to the First Person Plur., as Il. 13. 292 μηκέτι ταῦτα λεγώμεθα. We shall see that a corresponding rule forbids or restricts the use of μή with the Aorist Imperative (§ 327).

279.] **Homeric and Attic uses.** In Attic the use of the Subj. in independent Clauses is either Hortatory, or Deliberative, or Prohibitive. Thus the use with ἄν (§ 275, *a*), the use in *Affirmation* (§ 275, *b*), and the *Negative* uses (§ 276) do not survive.

The Subjunctive in Subordinate Clauses.

280.] **Clauses with ἤε—ἦε.** Doubt or deliberation between alternative courses of action is expressed by Clauses of the form ἤε (ἦ)—ἦε (ἦ) with the Subj., dependent on a Verb such as φράζομαι, μερμηρίζω, &c., or an equivalent phrase: *e. g.*—

Il. 4. 14. ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζώμεθ' ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα,
ἢ ῥ' αὖτις πόλεμόν τε κακὸν καὶ φύλοπιν ἀλὴν
ὄρσομεν, ἢ φιλότητα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι βάλωμεν.

Od. 19. 524 ὧς καὶ ἐμοὶ δίχα θυμὸς ὀρώρεται ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα,
ἦὲ μένω . . . ἢ ἦδη ἄμ' ἔπωμαι κτλ. (cp. 22. 167).

This form is also found (but rarely) expressing, not the speaker's own deliberation, but that of a third person:—

Od. 16. 73 μητρὶ δ' ἐμῇ δίχρα θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμηρίζει,
ἢ αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐμοί τε μένη καὶ δῶμα κομίζῃ, κτλ.

The speaker (Telemachus) here expresses himself from his mother's point of view, only putting the Third Person for the First.

So of doubt as to which of two possible results of the speaker's action will be realised:—

Il. 13. 327 εἶδομεν, ἢέ τφ εὖχος ὀρέξομεν, ἢέ τις ἡμῖν.

16. 243 εἴσεται ἢ ῥα καὶ οἶος ἐπίσθηται πολεμίζειν
ἡμέτερος θεράπων, ἢ οἱ κτλ.

where ἐπίσθηται (*is to know*, = *will prove to know*) is used nearly as the Latin Subj. in Indirect Questions.* An example after a *Past Tense* is found in Il. 16. 646 ff.; see § 298 *fin.*

281.] **Clauses with μή.** These are mainly of two kinds —

(1) Final Clauses: the Verb of the principal Clause being—

(a) an Imperative, or equivalent form: as—

Il. 3. 414 μή μ' ἔρεθε, σχετλίη, μή χωσαμένη σε μεθείω.

(b) a Present or Future in the First Person: as—

Od. 6. 273 τῶν ἀλεείνω φῆμιν ἀδευκέα, μή τις ὀπίσσω
σωμεύη.

In these places the governing Verb shows that the purpose expressed is the speaker's own. The only instance of a different kind is—

Il. 13. 648 ἄψ δ' ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ' ἀλεείνων,
πάντοσε παπταίνων, μή τις χρόα χαλκῶ ἐπαύρη.

Here (if the reading ἐπαύρη is right) the poet describes the fear as though it were present to himself (see however § 298 *fin.*).

The two groups of Clauses under discussion agree in using only the *pure* Subj. (not the Subj. with *κεν* or *ἄν*). In this respect they adhere to the form of the Simple Prohibitive Clause (§ 278).

(2) Clauses following a Verb that expresses the *fear* of the speaker, as *δεῖδω μή τι πάθῃσι* *I fear that he will suffer*. Here the Clause with *μή*, although of the same form as the independent Clauses given in § 278, is practically subordinate, and serves as *Object* to the Verb. The Verb, it is to be observed, is always in a Present Tense, and in the First Person: *i.e.* it is the speaker's *own present* fear that is expressed.

* It is impossible to agree with the scholars who explain ἐπίσθηται here as an Indicative; see G. Meyer, *G. G.* § 485.

Such a Clause may be Object to a Verb of *knowing*, &c., as—

Il. 10. 100 *δυσμενέες δ' ἄνδρες σχεδὸν ἦται, οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν
μή πως καὶ διὰ νύκτα μενοιρήσωσι μάχεσθαι.*

The fear expressed by *μή πως κτλ.* is subordinated (or on the way to be subordinated) to *ἴδμεν*: *we do not know* (said apprehensively) *whether they will not be eager &c.* So Od. 24. 491 *ἐξελθὼν τις ἴδοι μὴ δὴ σχεδὸν ὦσι κιόντες some one go out and look whether they are not near.* And in the Prohibitive use—

Il. 5. 411 *φραζέσθω μή τίς οἱ ἀμείνων σεῖο μάχηται,
μή δὴν κτλ. let him see to it that no one &c., lest &c.*

Od. 22. 367 *εἰπὲ δὲ πατρὶ μή με περισθενέων δηλήσεται.*

So with a Verb of *swearing*, Od. 12. 298 *ὀμόσσετε μή πού τις . . ἀποκτάνη swear that no one shall slay*: Od. 18. 55.

282.] Relative Clauses. These fall into the two groups of Final Clauses and Conditional or limiting Clauses.

The **Relative Clauses** called Final in the strict sense of the word are those which follow a Clause expressive of *will*; and the reference to the future is shown in most cases by *κεν*: *e. g.*—

Il. 9. 165 *ἀλλ' ἄγετε κλητοὺς ὀτρύνομεν, οἳ κε τάχιστα ὀδ. 12. 82.
ἔλθωσ' ἐς κλισίην.*

24. 119 *δῶρα δ' Ἀχιλλῆϊ φερέμεν τά κε θυμὸν ἰήνη.*

Od. 13. 399 *ἀμφὶ δὲ λαΐφος
ἔσσω, ὃ κε στυγέρισιν ἰδὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔχοντα.*

19. 403 *ὄνομ' εὔρεο ὅττι κε θῆαι.*

With ellipse of the antecedent, so that the Clause supplies an Object to the governing Verb—

Il. 7. 171 *κλήρω νῦν πεπάλασθε διαμπερὲς ὅς κε λάχησι.*

In other instances the notion of *End* is less distinctly conveyed, so that the Subj. need only have the emphatic Future meaning (§ 275, *b*): as—

Il. 21. 126 *μέλαιναν φρίχ' ὑπάτξει
ἰχθύς, ὅς κε φάγησι Λυκάονος ἀργέτα δημόν.*

Od. 10. 538 *ἔνθα τοι αὐτίκα μάντις ἐλεύσεται, ὄρχαμε λαῶν,
ὅς κέν τοι εἴπησι κτλ. (so 4. 389, 756., 11. 135).*

The prophetic tone prevails in these places: cp. Il. 8. 33 *ἀλλ' ἔμπης Δαναῶν ὀλοφυρόμεθ' αἰχμητῶν, οἳ κεν δὴ . . ὀλωνται*, where the Subj. is used as in an independent sentence.

The chief examples of a *pure* Subj. in a Final Clause are—

Il. 3. 286 *τιμὴν δ' Ἀργείοις ἀποτινέμεν ἦν τιν' εἰοικεν,
ἦ τε καὶ ἐσσομένοισι μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέληται.*

Od. 18. 334 *μή τίς τοι τάχα Ἴρος ἀμείνων ἄλλος ἀναστή,
ὅς τίς σ' . . δώματος ἐκπέμψησι.*

So Il. 18. 467 *παρέσσεται οἷά τις . . θανάσσεται* (unless this is Fut.): also the *Object Clause* Il. 5. 33 *μάρνασθ', ὅπποτέροισι πατήρ Ζεὺς κῶδος ὀρέξῃ* to fight (out the issue) to which of the two Zeus shall give victory (i. e. till one or other wins). The want of *κεν* or *ἄν* is owing to the *vagueness* of the future event contemplated, i. e. the wish to exclude reference to a particular occasion.

The Relative is sometimes used with the Subj. after a Negative principal Clause—where there is necessarily no *actual* purpose:—

Od. 6. 201 οὐκ ἔσθ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ . . ὅς κεν . . ἵκηται (v. l. ἵκοιτο).

Il. 23. 345 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς κέ σ' ἔλῃσι κτλ.

and without *κεν*, Il. 21. 103 *νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς τις θάνατον φύγῃ* (v. l. φύγοι). In these places the construction evidently follows that of *οὐ* and *οὐκ ἄν* with the Subj. in Simple sentences (*οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς φύγῃ* = *οὐ τις φύγῃ*). Otherwise we should have the Opt. (§ 304, b).

The Subj. is quite anomalous in—

Od. 2. 42 οὔτε τιν' ἀγγελίην στρατοῦ ἔκλυον ἐρχομένοιο,
ἦν χ' ὑμῖν σάφα εἶπω, ὅτε πρότερός γε πυθοίμην.

But here the speaker is repeating what has been said in the Third Person (30, 31), and with the regular Opt. (*εἶποι, πίθοιτο*). He evidently uses *εἶπω* because *εἶποιμι* does not fit the metre.

It is worth notice that the Relative of purpose with the Subj. is much commoner in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*. Of the group which *Delbrück* describes as Subjunctives of Will with *κεν*, eleven are from the *Odyssey*, two (Il. 9. 166., 24. 119) are from the *Iliad* (*Synt. Forsch.* I. pp. 130-132). In *Attic* the idiom survives in a few phrases, as *ἔχει ὅ τι εἶπη* (*Goodwin*, § 65, n. 3).

283.] Conditional Relative Clauses. The numerous Clauses which fall under this heading may be divided again into two classes distinguished by the presence or absence of *κεν* or *ἄν*.

(a) The *pure* Subj. is used when the speaker wishes to avoid reference to particular cases, especially to any *future* occasion or state of things. Hence the governing Verb is generally a Present or Perfect Indicative: examples are—

Il. 1. 554 τὰ φράζεαι, ἅσθ' ἐθέλησθα (*whatever you choose*).

Il. 81 βέλτερον ὅς φεύγων προφύγῃ κακὸν ἢ ἄλῳγ.

Od. 8. 546 ἀντὶ κασιγνήτου ξείνός θ' ἱκέτης τε τέτυκται
ἀνέρι ὅς τ' ὀλίγον περ ἐπιψαύῃ πραπίδεςσι.

In *Similes* this usage is extremely common; as—

Il. 5. 5 ἀστέρ' ὀπωρινῷ ἐναλίγκιον, ὅς τε μάλιστα
λαμπρὸν παμφαίνησι (3. 62., 5. 138., 10. 185, &c.).

Od. 13. 31 ὡς δ' ὄτ' ἀνὴρ δόρπιοιο λιλαίεται, ᾗ τε πανῆμαρ
νειὸν ἀν' ἔλκητον βόε οἴνοπε πηκτὸν ἄροτρον.

Where the principal Verb refers to the future, and *κεν* or *ἄν* is not used, the intention is to make the reference quite general and sweeping; *e.g.*—

Od. 20. 334 ἀλλ' ἄγε σῆ τάδε μητρὶ παρεζόμενος κατάλεξον
γῆμασθ' ὅς τις ἄριστος ἀνὴρ καὶ πλείστα πόρῃσι.

Forms of the 3 Sing. Plqpf. are sometimes given by the MSS. and older editions in Clauses of this kind: as *πεφύκει* (Il. 4. 483), *ἑστήκει* (Il. 17. 435), &c. These were corrected by Hermann (*Opusc.* ii. 44), reading *πεφύκη*, *ἑστήκη*, &c.: see La Roche on Il. 4. 483.

(*b*) The Subj. with *κεν* indicates *limitation* to particular circumstances in the future. Hence it is used (with few exceptions) when the governing Verb is a Future, or implies futurity (an Imperative, Subjunctive or Optative): as—

Il. 1. 139 ὁ δέ *κεν* κεχολώσεται ὃν *κεν* ἴκωμαι.

Od. 2. 25 κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν, Ἰθακήσιοι, ὅττι *κεν* εἶπω.

Il. 21. 103 νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς τις θάνατον φύγη, ὃν *κε* θεός γε κτλ.

Od. 1. 316 δῶρον δ' ὅττι *κέ* μοι δοῦναι φίλον ἦτορ ἀνώγη,
αὐτὶς ἀνερχομένῳ δόμεναι (cp. Od. 6. 28).

And after a Verbal in *-τος* expressive of necessity:—

Il. 1. 527 οὐδ' ἀτελεύτητον ὅ *τι* *κεν* κτλ.

3. 65 οὗ *τοι* ἀπόβλητ' ἔστί . . ὄσσα *κεν* κτλ.

The reference to a particular future occasion may be evident from the context: as:—

Od. 6. 158 κείνος δ' αὖ περὶ κῆρι μακάρτατος ἕξοχον ἄλλων,
ὅς *κε* σ' ἐέδνοισι βρίσας οἰκόνδ' ἀγάγηται.

In the following places this rule appears to be violated by *κέ(ν)* being used where the reference is *general*; Il. 1. 218., 3. 279., 6. 228, 229., 9. 313, 510, 615., 11. 409., 14. 416., 16. 621., 17. 99., 19. 167, 228, 260., 21. 24, 484., 23. 322., 24. 335, Od. 4. 196., 7. 33., 8. 32, 586., 10. 22, 74, 328., 14. 126., 15. 21, 55, 70, 345., 422., 19. 564., 20. 295., 21. 313, 345. There is strong reason, however, to believe that in most of these instances the appearance of the Particle is due to alteration of the original text. Of the three forms *κεν*, *κε*, *κ'*, the first is on the whole the most frequent in Homer. But out of the 35 places now in question the form *κεν* only occurs in six (not counting Il. 14. 416 *ὅς κεν ἴδηται*, where *κεν* is more than doubtful on account of the *F*); and these six are all in the Odyssey (8. 586., 15. 21, 55, 345., 20. 295., 21. 313). This can hardly be mere accident, and the obvious explanation is that in most of these places, at least in the Iliad, *ὅς κε* and *ὅς κ'* have been substituted for *ὅς τε* and *ὅς τ'*. Thus we should probably read (*e.g.*)—

Il. 1. 218 ὅς *τε* θεοῖς ἐπιπέιθηται, μάλα τ' ἐκλυον αὐτοῦ.

9. 508 ὅς *μέν* τ' αἰδέσεται κούρας Διὸς . .

510 ὅς *δέ* τ' ἀνήνηται καὶ *τε* κτλ. (cp. 23. 322).

(instead of the strange correlation *μέν τε—δέ κε*).

The real exceptions are most commonly passages in which a Singular is used after a Plural antecedent: as—

Od. 20. 294 οὐ γὰρ καλὸν ἀτέμβειν οὐδὲ δίκαιον
ξείνους Τηλεμάχου, ὅς κεν τάδε δώμαθ' ἴκηται.

With the change of Number we seem to pass from a general description to a particular instance. So in Od. 15. 345, 422, and perhaps in Il. 3. 279., 6. 228., 16. 621, Od. 7. 33: see § 362, 6.

(c) The use of ἄν in the Clauses of this kind is very rare. In the two places Il. 8. 10 and 19. 230 the reference to the future is plain. The remaining instance is Od. 21. 293 ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλους βλάπτει, ὅς ἄν κτλ., where there is the change from the Plural to the Singular just noticed.

284.] **The Relativ Adverbs.** The most important are: the Adverbs of *manner*, ὡς and ὅπως; ἵνα, originally an Adverb of *place* (= *where*); and the Adverbs of *time*, ὄφρα, ἕως (ἤος), εἰς ὅ, ὅτε and ὁπότε, εὐτε, ἦμος. It will be best to take these words separately.

285.] ὡς, ὅπως :

(1) Final Clauses with ὡς or ὅπως and the Subj. generally depend upon an Imperative, or some equivalent phrase, *i. e.* they express the aim or purpose of something which the speaker himself does, or wills to be done: as—

Il. 1. 32 ἀλλ' ἴθι μὴ μ' ἐρέθιζε, σαώτερος ὡς κε νέηαι.
7. 293 ἀγαθὸν καὶ νυκτὶ πιθέσθαι,
ὡς σύ τ' εὐφρήνης πάντας κτλ.

The only instance in which the purpose expressed is not *the speaker's own* is—

Od. 14. 181 τὸν δὲ μνηστῆρες ἀγαοὶ
οἴκαδ' ἰόντα λοχῶσιν, ὅπως ἀπὸ φῆλον ὄληται.

(2) With Verbs that by their own meaning imply aim or purpose a Clause of this kind becomes an *Object Clause*: thus—

Il. 4. 66 πειρᾶν δ' ὡς κε Τρῶες . . ἄρξωσι κτλ. (so Od. 2. 316).
9. 112 φραζώμεσθ' ὡς κέν μιν ἀρεσσάμενοι πεπίθωμεν.
Od. 1. 76 ἡμεῖς δ' οἶδε περιφραζώμεθα πάντες
νόστον, ὅπως ἔλθῃσι (*how he is to come*).
3. 19 λίσσεσθαι δέ μιν αὐτὸς ὅπως νημερτέα εἶπη
entreat him so that he shall speak (i. e. to speak).

Here the Clause expresses the *thing* to be tried, thought about, &c., rather than a consequence of such action.

The purpose is sometimes that of some other person, *e. g.*—

Od. 1. 205 φράσεται ὡς κε νέηται *he will devise how he is to return* (cp. 2. 368., 14. 329).

Il. 1. 558 τῇ σ' οἴω κατανεῦσαι ἐτήτυμον ὡς Ἀχιλλῆα
τιμῆσσι, ὀλέσῃσι δὲ κτλ. (*hast nodded to the effect &c.*).

Regarding *κεν* and *ἄν* observe that in Final and Object Clauses after *ὡς* the Subj. with *κεν* is the commonest, occurring 32 times, while the Subj. with *ἄν* and the pure Subj. occur each 8 times. After *ὅπως*, which has a more indefinite meaning (*in some such manner that*), the pure Subj. occurs 7 times, the Subj. with *κεν* twice (Od. 1. 296., 4. 545,—both Object clauses).

(3) In Conditional or limiting Clauses:—

(a) After a Present the Subj. is pure in the phrase *ὅπως ἐθέλησι* as he pleases (Od. 1. 349., 6. 189). In Il. 16. 83 *πείθεο δ' ὡς τοι ἐγὼ μύθου τέλος ἐν φρεσὶ θείω* the pure Subj. indicates that *θείω* is really an unconditional expression of *will*: 'listen to me—I will tell you': cp. the independent sentences such as Il. 6. 340 *ἐπίμεινον, ἀρήϊα τεύχεα δύω* (§ 275, a).

The use of *ὡς* and *ὡς τε* in *similes* belongs to this head: e. g.—

Il. 5. 161 *ὡς δὲ λέων ἐν βοῦσὶ θορῶν ἐξ αὐχένα ἄξει κτλ.*

11. 67 *οἱ δ' ὡς τ' ἀμητῆρες ἐναντίοι ἀλλήλοισιν ὄγμον ἐλαύνωσιν κτλ.*

In this use, as in the corresponding use of the Relative (§ 283), the Subj. is pure, the case supposed being not a particular one actually expected, but a typical or recurring one.

Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* I. p. 161) makes the curious observation that if the simile begins (as in the second instance quoted) with a Demonstrative denoting the subject of the comparison, then the Adverb used is always *ὡς τε*. This rule appears to be without exception.

(b) The Subj. with *ἄν* occurs in the formula *ὡς ἄν ἐγὼν εἶπω περθώμεθα*, which refers to a speech about to follow.

The use of *κεν* in—

Il. 20. 242 *Ζεὺς δ' ἀρετὴν ἀνδρεσσιν ὀφέλλει τε μινύθει τε ὅπως κεν ἐθέλησιν*

is perhaps due to the *contrast* between opposite cases: so with *ὅτε*, § 289, 2, b.

286.] *ἵνα* is used in Final Clauses only. With a Subj. it usually expresses the speaker's own purpose; even in—

Od. 2. 306 *ταῦτα δέ τοι μάλα πάντα τελευτήσουσιν Ἀχαιοί, νῆα καὶ ἐξαίτους ἐρέτας, ἵνα θᾶσσον ἴκηαι.*

the meaning is 'I undertake that the Achaeans will do this for you.' Exceptions (out of about 80 instances) are: Il. 1. 203 ἢ *ἵνα ὕβριν ἴδῃ* is it that you may see &c.: Il. 9. 99., 12. 435., 24. 43., Od. 8. 580., 10. 24., 13. 327.

An Object Clause with *ἵνα* is perhaps to be recognised in—

Od. 3. 327 *λίσσεσθαι δέ μιν αὐτὸς ἵνα νημερτὲς ἐνίσπη*

if the reading is right. The line may be an incorrect repetition of 3. 19.

The pure Subj. only is used with *ἵνα*, except in Od. 12. 156 *ἵνα εἰδότες ἢ κε θάνωμεν ἢ κεν ἀλευόμενοι θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγοιμεν*, where two alternatives are given by the correlative *ἢ κεν—ἢ κεν*: cp. § 275, *b*. But some MSS. have *ἢ ἐ θάνωμεν*.

As Mr. Gildersleeve points out (*Am. Jour. of Phil.* iv. 425) *ἵνα* is the only purely final Particle, *i. e.* the only one which does not limit the *purpose* by the notion of *time* (*ὄφρα, ἕως*) or *manner* (*ὡς, ὅπως*). Hence Clauses with *ἵνα* do not take *κεν* or *ἄν*, because the purpose as such is unconditional.

287.] *ὄφρα* is sometimes Final, sometimes Conditional.

(1) In Final Clauses *ὄφρα* either retains a distinctly *temporal* force—meaning *so long till, till the time when*,—or passes into the general meaning *to the end that*. Thus we have—

(*a*) *ὄφρα* = *until (as shall be)*, used with *κεν* or *ἄν*, as—

Il. 1. 509 *τόφρα δ' ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι τίθει κράτος, ὄφρ' ἄν Ἀχαιοὶ
υἶδὸν ἔμδὸν τίσωσιν, ὀφέλλωσιν τέ ἐ τιμῇ.*

22. 192 *ἀνιχνεύων θέει ἔμπεδον, ὄφρα κεν εὔρη.*

With this meaning the pure Subj. is found in Il. 1. 82 *ἔχει κότον ὄφρα τελέσῃ* *he keeps his anger until he accomplishes it*—a general reflexion: also in Il. 12. 281 (in a simile).

(*b*) *ὄφρα* = *to the end that*, used with the pure Subj., rarely with *κεν* or *ἄν*. The transition to this meaning may be seen in—

Il. 6. 258 *ἀλλὰ μέν', ὄφρα κέ τοι μελιηδέα οἶνον ἐνείκω
stay till I bring (=giving me time to bring).*

(2) Clauses with *ὄφρα* may be elassed as Conditional when it means *so long as*; *e. g.*—

Il. 4. 345 *ἔνθα φίλ' ὀπταλέα κρέα ἔδμεναι . . ὄφρ' ἐθέλητον.*

Od. 2. 123 *τόφρα γὰρ οἶν βίσιόν τε τεὸν καὶ κτήματ' ἔδονται,
ὄφρα κε κείνη τοῦτον ἔχη νόον.*

The use of *κεν* or *ἄν* in these Clauses is governed by the same rule as with *ὅς*, *viz.* it is used when the reference is to the future, and is not expressly meant to be general (as Il. 23. 47 *ὄφρα ζωῶσι μετείω*). As to the form *ὄφρ' ἄν μέν κεν*, see § 363, 4.

In Il. 6. 112 *ἀνέρες ἔστε, φίλοι, μνήσασθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς, ὄφρ' ἄν ἐγὼ βῆω* (cp. 8. 375., 17. 186, Od. 13. 412., 19. 17) the Clause seems to mean *until I go*, *i. e. long enough for me to go*. Delbrück however counts the uses of *ὄφρα* in Il. 6. 112, &c. as Conditional (*Synt. Forsch.* i. p. 170).

288.] *ἕως* (*ἤως*) and *εἰς* *ὅ*, used with the Subj., always take *κεν*. The meaning *until*, with implied purpose, is the usual one: as—

Π. 3. 290 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα μαχήσομαι εἵνεκα κούρης
αὔθι μένων, ἧός κε τέλος πολέμοιο κιχέω.

9. 48 νῶϊ δ' ἐγὼ Σθένελός τε μαχησόμεθ' εἰς ὃ κε τέκμων
'Ιλίου εὔρωμεν.

The Conditional meaning is only found in the recurring expression εἰς ὃ κ' αὐτῆ ἐν στήθεσσι μένη καί μοι φίλα γούνατ' ὀρώρη (Π. 9. 609., 10. 89) = *so long as I have life*.

289.] ὅτε, ὁπότε :

(1) Clauses with ὅτε and ὁπότε may be counted as Final in a few instances in which the governing Clause contains an expression of *time* :

(a) with the pure Subj.—

Π. 21. 111 ἔσσεται ἢ ἧὼς ἢ δειλίη ἢ μέσον ἡμαρ,
ὁππότε τις καὶ ἐμεῖο Ἄρει ἐκ θυμὸν ἔληται.

So Π. 19. 336 ἐμὴν ποτιδέγμενον αἰεὶ λυγρὴν ἀγγελίην, ὅτ' ἀποφθιμένοιο πύθηται *waiting for the message when he shall hear &c.*, i. e. 'waiting for the time when the news shall come that &c.' Here the clause with ὅτε becomes a kind of Object Clause.

(b) with *κεν* or *ἂν* :—

Π. 4. 164 ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὀλώλη κτλ. (6. 448).

The use of *ἂν* gives definiteness to the expectation, as though a particular time were contemplated. Cp. also Π. 6. 454 ὄσσον σεῦ (μέλει), ὅτε κέν τις . . δακρυόεσσαν ἄγηται *as I am concerned for you (in respect of the time) when &c.*, and 8. 373 ἔσται μὰν ὅτ' ἂν κτλ.

It is obvious that in these places the Clause is not strictly Final, since the Subj. expresses *emphatic prediction* (§ 275, b) rather than purpose. But they have the essential characteristic of Final Clauses, viz. that the time of the Clause is fixed by that of the governing Verb.

(2) Clauses with ὅτε or ὁπότε which define the time of the principal Clause may be regarded as Conditional. In regard to the use of *κεν* and *ἂν* they follow the rules which hold in the case of Conditional Relative Clauses (§ 283) : viz.—

(a) The pure Subj. indicates that the speaker is supposing a case which may occur *repeatedly*, or *at any time* : as—

Od. 7. 71 οἳ μὲν ῥα θεὸν ὡς εἰσορόωντες
δειδέχεται μύθοισιν, ὅτε στείχησ' ἀνὰ ἄστν
who look on him as a god, and salute him when he walks &c.

Π. 1. 163 οὐ μὲν σοί ποτε ἴσον ἔχω γέρας, ὁππὸτ' Ἀχαιοὶ
Τρώων ἐκπέρωσ' εὖ ναιόμενον προλιέθρον
whenever the Greeks sack a Trojan town. So in maxims, &c. :—

Π. 1. 80 κρείστων γὰρ βασιλεὺς ὅτε χῶσεται ἀνδρὶ χέρηϊ.

Π. 15. 207 ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται ὅτ' ἄγγελος αἴσιμα εἶδῃ.
 And in similes, as Π. 2. 395 ὅτε κινήσῃ Νότος ἐλθῶν. So with the
 regular ὡς ὅτε *as when*, ὡς ὁπότε *as in any case when*.

In a few instances ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν is found instead of ὡς δ' ὅτε : viz.—

- Π. 15. 170 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ἐκ νεφέων πτήται κτλ.
 19. 375 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ἐκ πόντοιο σέλας ναύτησι φανήη
 Od. 5. 394 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ἀσπασίος βίोटος παίδεσσι φανήη
 23. 233 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ἀσπασίος γῆ νηχομένοισι φανήη
 Π. 11. 269 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ὠδίνουσαν ἔχη βέλος οὐδ' ἄν γυναῖκα
 17. 520 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν οὐδὲν ἔχων πέλεκυν κτλ.

Also Π. 10. 5., 24. 480, Od. 22. 468. The resemblance that runs through these instances would seem to indicate some common source of the peculiar ἄν.

In the one or two places where the pure Subj. occurs after a Future there is an evident intention to speak quite generally : as Π. 21. 322 οὐδέ τί μιν χρεῶ ἔσται τυμβοχόης ὅτε μιν θάπτωσιν Ἀχαιοί : so Od. 16. 268., 23. 257. But κεν is used in the similar passage Π. 10. 130 οὐ τις νεμεσήσεται . . ὅτε κέν τιν' ἐποτρύνη.

(b) κεν or ἄν connects a supposition with a *particular* event or state of things : hence it is usually found after a Future, Subjunctive, or Imperative, as—

Π. 4. 53 τὰς διαπέρσαι ὅτ' ἄν τοι ἀπέχθωνται.

Od. 1. 40 ἐκ γὰρ Ὀρέσταιο τίσις ἔσσεται Ἀτρεΐδαο
 ὁππότε ἄν ἠβήσῃ τε καὶ ἧς ἰμέριται αἴης.

Π. 20. 130 δείσειτ' ἔπειθ', ὅτε κέν τις κτλ.

Od. 2. 357 ἐσπέριος γὰρ ἐγὼν αἰρήσομαι ὁππότε κεν δῆ κτλ.

So after μοῖρα (Od. 4. 475), followed by an Inf.

In other places it is not so clear why an event is treated as particular. Perhaps κεν or ἄν may be used with ὅτε, ὁπότε—

(1) When a *contrast* is made between supposed cases, as—

Π. 6. 224 τῷ νῦν σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ ξεῖνος φίλος Ἄργεϊ μέσσω
 εἰμί, σὺ δ' ἐν Λυκίῃ, ὅτε κεν τῶν δῆμον ἴκωμαι.

20. 166 πρῶτον μὲν . . ἀλλ' ὅτε κέν τις κτλ.

Od. 20. 83 ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν καὶ ἀνεκτὸν ἔχει κακόν, ὁππότε κέν τις
 κτλ.

Π. 11. 17 οὐθ' ὁππότε ἄν στείχησι . . οὐθ' ὅτ' ἄν ἀψ κτλ.

(Here we should read ὁπότε στείχησι, § 363, 4).

So perhaps Π. 2. 397 παντοίων ἀνέμων, ὅτ' ἄν ἐνθ' ἧ ἔνθα γένωνται :
 9. 101 κρηῆναι δὲ καὶ ἄλλω, ὅτ' ἄν τινα κτλ. and Od. 13. 100 ἐν-
 τοσθεν δέ τ' ἄνευ δεσμοῖο μένουσι νῆες ἐύσσελμοι, ὅτ' ἄν ὄρμου
 μέτρον ἴκωνται (in contrast to those outside). But cp. the remark
 as to ὅτ' ἄν in the last note.

(2) When there is a change from Plural to Singular :—

Π. 9. 501 λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβῆῃ καὶ ἀμάρτη.

Od. 11. 218 ἀλλ' αὐτῆ δίκη ἐστὶ βροτῶν, ὅτε τίς κε θάνησι.

This last instance is doubtful, since the order ὅτε τίς κε is not Homeric (§ 365). We should probably read ὅτε τίς τε.

290.] εὔτε, ἦμος. The word εὔτε is only once found with a pure Subj., viz. Od. 7. 202 (in a general assertion): εὔτ' ἄν occurs after a Future (Il. 1. 242., 19. 158), and an Imperative (Il. 2. 34); also in one or two places where the use of ἄν is more difficult to explain, viz. Il. 2. 227 (read εὔτε πολλίεθρον ἔλωμεν), Od. 1. 192., 17. 320, 323., 18. 194. The combination εὔτε κέν is not found.

The pure Subj. with ἦμος occurs in one place—

Od. 4. 400 ἦμος δ' ἥελιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκη

where the reference is general, 'each midday.'

The Subjunctive with εἰ, &c.

291.] Clauses with εἰ. The use of the Particle εἰ (or αἶ), in the Clauses with which we have now to do, is to make an *assumption* or *supposition*. In most cases (1) this assumption is made in order to assert a consequence (εἰ=if): in other words, it is a *condition*. But (2) an assumption may also be made in order to express *end*: εἶμι . . αἶ κε πίθηται *I go—suppose he shall listen*= 'I go in order that if he will listen (he may do so):' accordingly the Clause may be virtually a Final Clause. Again (3) with certain Verbs an assumption may be the Object: *e. g.* τίς οἶδ' εἶ κεν . . ὀρίνω *who knows—suppose I shall rouse*= who knows whether I shall rouse. We shall take these three groups of Clauses in order.

292.] Conditional Protasis with εἰ. The chief point of interest under this head is the use of κεν or ἄν. The rules will be found to be essentially the same as those already laid down for the corresponding Clauses with the Relative (§ 283, *b*) and the Relational Adverbs (see esp. § 289, *b*), and to be even more uniform in their application.

(a) The pure Subj. is used in general sayings, and in similes:

Il. 1. 80 κρείσσω γὰρ βασιλεὺς ὅτε χάσεται ἀνδρὶ χέρηϊ·
εἶ περ γὰρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψῃ,
ἀλλὰ τε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον.

12. 238 τῶν οὐ τι μετατρέπομ' οὐδ' ἀλεγίζω,
εἶ τ' ἐπὶ δεξιῖ ἴωσι πρὸς ἧῶ τ' ἥελίον τε,
εἶ τ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ τοῖ γε κτλ.

Od. 16. 97 κασιγνήτοις . . οἰσί περ ἀνῆρ
μαρναμένοισι πέποιθε καὶ εἰ μέγα νεῖκος ὄρηται.

Π. 11. 116 ἢ δ' εἴ πέρ τε τύχησι κτλ. (so Π. 4. 261., 9. 481., 10. 225., 16. 263., 21. 576., 22. 191, Od. 1. 188., 7. 204., 12. 96., 14. 373.

If the principal Verb is a Future (or implies reference to the future), the pure Subj. with εἴ indicates that the supposed occasion is *indefinite*,—one that happens repeatedly, or at any time, or may not happen at all; so Π. 1. 340 εἴ ποτε δὴ αὐτε χρεῖω ἐμεῖο γένηται κτλ.; 12. 245 εἴ περ γάρ τ' ἄλλοι γε περικτεινόμεθα πάντες κτλ.; Od. 1. 204 οὐδ' εἴ πέρ τε σιδήρεα δέσματ' ἔχησι. This form is naturally employed by a speaker who does not wish to imply that the occasion will actually arise: thus in—

Π. 12. 223 ὧς ἡμεῖς εἴ πέρ τε πύλας καὶ τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν
 ῥηξόμεθα σθένει μεγάλῳ, εἴξωσι δ' Ἀχαιοί,
 οὐ κόσμῳ παρὰ ναῦφιν ἔλευσόμεθ' αὐτὰ κέλευθα

Polydamas is interpreting an omen which he wishes to remain unfulfilled. Similarly Π. 5. 248 εἴ γ' οὖν ἕτερός γε φύγησι: Π. 22. 86 εἴ περ γάρ σε κατακτάνη, οὐ σ' ἔτ' ἔγωγε κλαύσομαι ἐν λεχέεσσι: Od. 5. 221 εἰ δ' αὖ τις ῥάησι θεῶν κτλ.: Od. 12. 348 εἰ δὲ χολωσάμενός τι . . νῆ' ἐθέλη ὀλέσαι κτλ. The object of the speaker in these examples is to treat the supposed case as imaginary or unpractical.

(b) The Subj. with *κεν* or *ἄν* indicates that a particular future occasion is contemplated: hence—

Π. 4. 353 ὄφραι ἦν ἐθέλησθα καὶ αἶ κέν τοι τὰ μεμήλη.

11. 404 μέγα μὲν κακὸν (sc. ἔσται) αἶ κε φέβωμαι.

24. 592 μή μοι . . σκυδμαινέμεν, αἶ κε πύθηαι κτλ.

Od. 2. 218 εἰ μὲν *κεν* πατρὸς βίωτον καὶ νόστον ἀκούσω,
 ἦ τ' ἄν τρυχόμενός περ ἔτι τλαίην ἐνιαυτόν.

11. 112 εἰ δέ κε σίνηαι, τότε τοι τεκμαίρομ' ὄλεθρον
 (*I prophesy your destruction*).

So, though the Verb of the governing Clause is a Present—

Π. 6. 442 αἰδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας ἑλκεσιπέπλους,
 αἶ κε κτλ. (= *I fear what they will think if &c.*).

8. 477 σέθεν δ' ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀλεγίζω
 χωομένης, οὐδ' εἶ κε τὰ νεῖατα πείραθ' ἴκηαι
 = *I do not care for you, (and shall not) even if &c.*

Instances of *κεν* or *ἄν* in a sentence of *general* meaning are—

Π. 3. 25 μάλα γάρ τε κατεσθίει, εἴ περ ἄν αὐτὸν
 σεύωται κτλ. (*even in the case when—*, § 363, 1, b).

11. 391 ἦ τ' ἄλλως ὑπ' ἐμεῖο, καὶ εἰ κ' ὀλίγον περ ἐπαύρη,
 ὄξυν βέλος πέλεται.

12. 302 εἴ περ γάρ χ' εὔρησι παρ' αὐτόφι κτλ.

Od. 11. 158

τὸν οὗ πῶς ἔστι περῆσαι
πεζὸν ἔοντ', ἦν μή τις ἔχῃ εὐεργέα νῆα.

But with εἴ κε there is the same doubt as with ὅς κε (§ 283), and ἐπεὶ κε (§ 296). As to ἦν, which occurs in a general saying in Il. 1. 166 and Od. 11. 159, see § 362.

293.] Final Clauses with εἰ. After a principal Verb expressive of the speaker's *will* (an Imperative, or First Person), a Final Clause may be introduced by εἴ κε or ἦν: as—

Il. 8. 282 βάλλ' οὕτως εἴ κέν τι φόως Δαναοῖσι γένηαι.

Il. 1. 791 ταῦτ' εἵποις Ἀχιλλῆϊ δαίφρονι εἴ κε πίθηται.

Od. 4. 34 δεῦρ' ἰκόμεθ' αἶ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς . . παύση κτλ.

The effect of using εἰ (instead of ὡς or ἵνα) is to express some degree of uncertainty. The end aimed at is represented as a *supposition*, instead of being a direct *purpose*.

In the existing text the pure Subj. occurs only in Il. 14. 165 ἀρίστη φαίνεται βουλή ἐλλεῖν . . εἴ πῶς ἱμείραιτο . . τῷ δ' . . χεύῃ (where we should perhaps read χεύαι; or change χεύῃ ἐπὶ το χεύειε); and in Od. 5. 471 εἰ δέ κεν . . καταδράθω, εἴ με μεθήῃ ῥίγος καὶ κάματος, γλυκερὸς δέ μοι ὕπνος ἐπέλθῃ, where the MSS. have the Opt. μεθείῃ, ἐπέλθοι. But if ἦν has sometimes crept in instead of εἰ, as is probable (§ 362) there may be other examples: as—

Il. 22. 418 λίσσωμ' ἀνέρα τοῦτον . . ἦν πῶς κτλ.

Od. 1. 281 ἔρχεο πεισόμενος πατρός δὴν οἰχομένοιο,
ἦν τίς τοι εἴπησι κτλ.

294.] Object Clauses with εἰ. This term will serve to describe the form of Clause in which the supposition made by εἰ takes the place of an Acc. of the thing. It may be regarded as a special form of the Final Clause (cp. § 285, 2): thus Il. 18. 600 ὡς ὅτε τις τροχὸν . . πειρήσεται εἴ κε θέησι 'tries in respect to the supposition that it will run,' hence *tries whether it will run*: so—

Il. 4. 249 ὄφρα ἴδῃτ' εἴ κ' ὕμμιν ὑπερσχῆ χεῖρα Κρονίων.

Il. 15. 32 ὄφρα ἴδῃ ἦν τοι χραίσμη κτλ.

that you may see whether it will avail. Note that the Subj. here has a distinctly *future* meaning, as in Final Clauses; the same words taken as a Conditional Protasis would mean *if it has availed*. So after εἰπεῖν, Il. 7. 375 καὶ δὲ τόδ' [leg. τὸ] εἰπέμεναι πυκνὸν ἔπος, αἶ κ' ἐθέλωσι *say the word supposing that they shall be willing* (=ask if they will agree), Il. 17. 692 εἰπεῖν, αἶ κε τάχιστα νέκυν ἐπὶ νῆα σαώσῃ: and οἶδα in the phrase τίς οἶδ' εἴ κεν *who knows but* (Il. 15. 403, 16. 860, Od. 2. 332), and οὐ μὲν οἶδ' εἰ (Il. 15. 16).

The use of the *Accusativus de quo* (§ 140, 3) should be noticed; especially after οἶδα, anticipating the Clause with εἰ: as—

Π. 8. 535 αὔριον ἦν ἀρετὴν διαείσεται εἰ κ' ἐμὸν ἔγχος
μείνη ἐπερχόμενον

meaning 'he will know as to his prowess whether it will enable him to withstand my spear.' So Od. 22. 6 σκοπὸν ἄλλον . . εἴσομαι αἶ κε τύχωμι (cp. § 140, 3, b).

In one place the Clause with εἰ serves as explanation of a Neuter Pronoun in the *Nominative*:

Π. 20. 435 ἀλλ' ἦ τοι μὲν ταῦτα θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κείται,
εἴ κέ σε χειρότερός περ ἔων ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἔλωμαι.

295.] The Subj. with ὥς εἰ occurs in a single place only, viz.—

Π. 9. 481 καὶ με φίλησ' ὥς εἴ τε πατὴρ ὄν παῖδα φιλήσῃ.

Here the assumption εἰ . . φιλήσῃ is made for the purpose of comparison. Thus the meaning is nearly the same as with ὥς ὅτε (§ 289, 2), and the Clause is essentially Conditional.

296.] ἐπεὶ with the Subj. The use of ἐπεὶ implies that the action is prior in time to the action of the principal Clause; hence Clauses with ἐπεὶ properly fall under the definition of the Conditional Clause.

A pure Subj. after ἐπεὶ is found in four places, one a gnomic passage, Od. 20. 86 ἐπεὶ ἄρ βλέφαρ' ἀμφικαλύψῃ (*sleep makes men forget everything*) when it has spread over their eyelids; the other three in similes, viz. Π. 11. 478., 15. 363, 680. In Π. 16. 453 the best MSS. give αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τὸν γε λίπη ψυχὴ τε καὶ αἰὼν, πέμπειν μιν κτλ., others ἐπὶ δὴ. The pure Subj. implies that the command is meant to be *general* in form: cp. § 292, a.

κεν or ἄν is invariably used when the principal Verb is future. It is also found after a Present, and even in similes: *e.g.*—

Π. 2. 474 τοὺς δ' ὥς τ' αἰπόλια πλατέ' αἰγῶν αἰπόλοι ἄνδρες
ρεῖα διακρίνωσι, ἐπεὶ κε νομῶ μιγέωσι.

So ἐπεὶ κε(ν), Π. 7. 410., 9. 324., 21. 575, Od. 8. 554., 11. 221., 24. 7: and ἐπὶν, Π. 6. 489., 19. 223, Od. 8. 553., 10. 411., 11. 192., 14. 130., 19. 206, 515. In Π. 1. 168 should perhaps be read ἐπεὶ κεκάμω (instead of ἐπεὶ κε κάμω), and so Π. 7. 5 ἐπεὶ κεκάμωσι, and Π. 17. 657 ἐπεὶ ἄρ κεκάμησι.

Regarding ἐπεὶ κε(ν) in this use there is the same question as with ὅς κε (§ 283). Out of 10 instances there is only one in which the form κεν appears, viz. Π. 21. 575 ἐπεὶ κεν ὑλαγμὸν ἀκούσῃ, and there Zenodotus read κυνυλαγμὸν, which is strongly supported by the metre (§ 367, 2). Thus there is the same reason as before for supposing that κε is often merely a corrup-

tion of τε. The use of ἐπεὶ τε is sufficiently established in Homer (§ 332).

The form ἐπὶν is open to doubt on other grounds, which it will be better to discuss in connexion with other uses of the Particle ἄν (§ 362).

297.] πρίν with the Subj. In general, as we have seen (§ 236), πρίν is construed with an Infinitive. If, however, the event is insisted upon as a *condition*,—the principal Verb being an Imperative or emphatic Future,—the Subj. may be used ; as—

Il. 18. 134 ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν μὴ πω καταδύσαιο μῶλον ἄρῃος
πρίν γ' ἐμὲ δεῦρ' ἔλθοῦσαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδῃαι

do not enter the battle before you see me coming hither.

Od. 10. 174 ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γὰρ πρίν καταδυσόμεθ' ἀχνύμενοί περ
εἰς Αἴδαο δόμους πρίν μόρσιμον ἡμᾶρ ἐπέλθῃ.

So Il. 18. 190., 24. 551, 781, Od. 13. 336., 17. 9. The Subj. is used in these examples without κεν or ἄν, because it is not meant to lay stress on a particular occasion when the condition will be fulfilled. When such an occasion is contemplated Homer sometimes uses πρίν γ' ὄτ' ἄν *before the time when* (Od. 2. 374., 4. 477): cp. Il. 16. 62 οὐ πρίν μῆτις μὲν καταπαυσέμεν, ἀλλ' ὄπότ' ἄν κτλ. The use of πρίν ἄν with the Subj. is post-Homeric.

It is evident that a conditional Clause of this kind can only occur after a *negative* principal Clause. 'Do not do this before I come' makes my coming into a condition, and a condition which may or may not be realised : but 'do this before I come' is merely a way of fixing the time of doing.

This construction is usually explained from Parataxis : thus it is held that in Il. 24. 551 οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις πρίν καὶ κακὸν ἄλλο πάθησθα stands for—

οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις· πρίν καὶ κακὸν ἄλλο πάθησθα,

you will not raise him, sooner shall you suffer passing into 'you will not raise him before you suffer.' So Sturm (p. 26), and Goodwin (§ 624). But (1) this use of the Subj. in a Principal clause without κεν or ἄν, whether as a Future (§ 275, b) or as an Imperative, is not Homeric, and therefore cannot be used to explain a use which is only beginning in Homer. And (2) the change from *you will not raise, you will suffer before you do to you will not raise before you suffer* is not an easy one : it involves shifting πρίν as an Adverb from one clause to another. Above all (3) it is probable that the new construction of πρίν with the Subj. was directly modelled on the existing use with the Inf. : that is to say, πρίν πάθησθα simply took the place of πρίν παθεῖν when a more definite conditional force was wanted. This is confirmed by the analogy of the later change to the Indic. : thus in Aesch. P. V. 479 πρίν γ' ἐγὼ σφισιν εἰδεία is used instead of πρίν ἐμὲ δεῖξαι because the poet wishes to make the *assertion εἰδεία*. So with the transition from the Inf. to the Indic. after ὥστε (Goodwin, § 585) : the finite mood is not a survival of parataxis, but is used when the Infinitive is not sufficiently positive.

298.] **Subjunctive after a Secondary Tense.** The rule in Homer is that the Subj. is not used in a Subordinate Clause to express a *past* purpose, condition, &c. It may be used however (1) when the governing Verb is a 'gnomic' Aorist:—

Il. 1. 218 ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπειθῆται μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ.

Od. 20. 85 ὁ γάρ τ' ἐπέλησεν ἀπάντων
ἔσθλων ἠδὲ κακῶν, ἐπεὶ ἄρ βλέφαρ' ἀμφικαλύψῃ.

Or an Aor. used to express a *general* denial, as—

Od. 10. 327 οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ τις ἄλλος ἀνὴρ τάδε φάρμακ' ἀνέτλη,
ὅς κε πῖη κτλ. (cp. Od. 12. 66).

Or in a simile, as Il. 4. 486 ἐξέταμ', ὄφρα ἴτυν κάμψῃ κτλ.

Further (2) if the action expressed by the Subordinate Clause is still future at the time of speaking; as—

Il. 5. 127 ἀχλὺν δ' αὖ τοι ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἔλον ἢ πρὶν ἐπῆεν,
ὄφρ' εὖ γιγνώσκῃς ἡμὲν θεὸν ἠδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα
I have taken away the mist—that you may know &c.

7. 394 καὶ δὲ τόδ' ἠνώγει εἰπεῖν ἔπος, αἶ κ' ἐθέλητε κτλ.

18. 189 μήτηρ δ' οὐ με φίλη πρὶν γ' εἶα θωρήσσοσθαι
πρὶν γ' αὐτὴν . . ἴδωμαι (*before I shall see her &c.*).

Od. 11. 434 οἳ τε κατ' αἴσχος ἔχευε καὶ ἔσσομένησιω ὀπίσσω
θηλυτέρῃσι γυναιξί, καὶ ἦ κ' εὐεργὸς ἔησι.

So Il. 9. 99., 20. 126., 24. 781. In these places the governing Verb is generally to be translated by the English Perfect with *have* (cp. § 73).

The real exceptions to this rule are not numerous, and may be due in several cases to alteration of the text through the influence of the later usage. The reading is uncertain (*e.g.*) in—

Od. 14. 327 τὸν δ' ἐς Δωδώνην φάτο βήμεναι ὄφρα θεοῖο
(= 19. 296) ἐκ δρυὸς ὑψικόμοιο Διὸς βουλὴν ἐπακούσῃ,

where the Subj. was read by Aristarchus, the Opt. ἐπακούσαι by Aristophanes and Herodian. Again in—

Od. 10. 65 ἦ μὲν σ' ἐνδυκέως ἀπεπέμπομεν, ὄφρ' ἂν ἴκηαι
the best MSS. have ἴκηαι, but others have ὄφρ' ἂν ἴκοιο and ὄφρ' ἀφίκοιο. See also Il. 15. 23, Od. 15. 300., 22. 98: and cp.—

Il. 5. 567 μὴ τι πάθοι, μέγα δέ σφας ἀποσφῆλειε

15. 598 ἐμβάλοι . . Θέτιδος δ' ἐξαισίον ἀρῆν
πᾶσαν ἐπικρήνιε.

In these places the MSS. generally have πάθη, ἐμβάλη: but the Opt. in the clause following has led the editors to adopt πάθοι, ἐμβάλοι.

Other places where the Subj. is contrary to the rule now laid down are Il. 13. 649., 14. 165., 16. 650 (see La R.), 19. 354., 24. 586, Od. 9. 102., 10. 24., 16. 369., 17. 60., 22. 467. In all

οὐκ ἐπὶ
οὐκ ἐπὶ
οὐκ ἐπὶ
οὐκ ἐπὶ

οὐκ ἐπὶ
οὐκ ἐπὶ
οὐκ ἐπὶ
οὐκ ἐπὶ
οὐκ ἐπὶ

the Opt. may be substituted without affecting the metre; and when we consider the number of places where the MSS. vary between Subj. and Opt. forms, we can hardly doubt that it would generally be right to make the change.

The Homeric rule is observed by Plato (see Riddell, *Dig.* §§ 90, 91), but not by Attic writers in general.

The Optative in Simple Sentences.

299.] The uses of the Optative in Simple Sentences range from the expression of a wish on the part of the speaker to the expression of mere supposition, or admission of possibility.

Without *κεν* or *ἄν* the Optative may express—

(a) Simple *wish* or *prayer*: as—

Π. 1. 42 *τίσειαν Δαναοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα σοῖσι βέλεσσι.*

Od. 1. 403 *μὴ γὰρ ὃ γ' ἔλθοι κτλ. never may he come &c.*

Regarding the Opt. of wish with *εἰ* or *αἶ*, *εἴθε*, *αἴθε*, &c. see § 311.

(b) A gentle or deferential Imperative, conveying *advice*, *suggestion*, or the like: as—

Π. 4. 17 *εἰ δ' αὖ πως τόδε πᾶσι φίλον καὶ ἡδὺν γένοιτο,
ἦ τοι μὲν οἰκέοιτο πόλις Πριάμοιο κτλ.*

(= *I presume the city is to remain inhabited*).

Od. 4. 735 *ἀλλὰ τις ὀτρηνῶς Δολίον καλέσειε γέροντα
(as we say, would some one call &c.).*

18. 141 *τῷ μὴ τίς ποτε πάμπαν ἀνὴρ ἀθεμίστιος εἴη,
ἀλλ' ὃ γε σιγῇ δῶρα θεῶν ἔχοι*

I would have a man not be lawless, but &c.

Note especially this use of the Second Person, as in—

Od. 4. 193 *πίθοιό μοι pray listen to me: so in the formal
phrase ἦ ρά νύ μοί τι πίθοιο (Π. 4. 93, &c.).*

Π. 11. 791 *ταῦτ' εἴποις Ἀχιλῆϊ suppose you say this to Achilles.*

Od. 15. 24 *ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἔλθων αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψειας ἕκαστα. (*

Π. 3. 406 *ἦσο παρ' αὐτὸν λῦσα, θεῶν δ' ἀπόεικε κελεύθου,
μηδ' ἔτι σοῖσι πόδεσσιν ὑποστρέψειας Ὀλυμπον.*

Hence in Π. 1. 20 we should read (with the best MSS.) *παῖδα δ' ἐμοὶ λύσαίτε* (not *λύσαί τε*, Wolf's conjecture).

(c) Rhetorical wish, implying *willingness*, or *indifference* to the happening of some evil: as in imprecations—

Π. 2. 340 *ἐν πυρὶ δὴ βουλαί τε γενοίατο μῆδεα δ' ἀνδρῶν.*

6. 164 *τεθναίης, ᾧ Προῖτ', ἦ κάκτανε Βελλεροφόντην
(= *I care not if you were dead, unless you &c.*).*

Od. 7. 224 *ιδόντα με καὶ λίποι αἰὼν κτήσιν ἐμῆν κτλ. *Oh, &c.*
(= *I am content to die when I have seen &c.*).*

(d) *Concession* or acquiescence:—

Il. 21. 359 λήγ' ἔριδος, Τρῶας δὲ καὶ αὐτίκα δῖος Ἀχιλλεὺς
ἄσπετος ἐξέλασε (cease strife, and I consent that &c.).

Od. 1. 402 κτήματα δ' αὐτὸς ἔχοις καὶ δώμασι σοῖσιν ἀνάσσοις.

2. 232 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ χαλεπὸς τ' εἶη καὶ αἴσυλα ῥέζοι
(i. e. he may as well be unjust as just).

Hes. Op. 270 νῦν δὴ ἐγὼ μήτ' αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δίκαιος
εἶην μήτ' ἐμὸς υἱός.

The following are instances of the First Person used in this way:

Il. 15. 45 αὐτάρ τοι καὶ κείνῳ ἐγὼ παραμυθησαίμην
I am willing to advise him (a concession).

So Il. 4. 318 μάλα μὲν τοι ἐγὼν ἐθέλομι κτλ., but some MSS. have μὲν κεν.

Il. 23. 150 νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὐ νέομαι γε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
Πατρόκλῳ ἥρωϊ κόμην ὀπάσαιμι φέρεσθαι
since I am not to return, I may as well &c.

Od. 16. 383 ἀλλὰ φθέωμεν ἐλόντες ἐπ' ἀγροῦ νόσφι πόλλης
ἢ ἐν ὄδῳ, βίοντον δ' αὐτοὶ καὶ κτήματ' ἔχωμεν
δασσάμενοι κατὰ μοῖραν ἐφ' ἡμέας, οἰκία δ' αὐτὴ
κείνου μητέρι δοῖμεν ἔχειν ἢδ' ὅς τις ὀπίοι.

Here what the Suitors are to do for themselves is put in the Subj., what they do or allow to be done for Penelope in the Opt.

Compare Hdt. 7. 5. 4 τὸ μὲν νῦν ταῦτα πρήσσοις τά περ ἐν χερσὶ ἔχεις, ἡμερώσας δὲ Αἴγυπτον τὴν ἐξυβρίσασαν στρατηλάτεις ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας, i. e. 'I consent to your doing what you have in hand, but when it is done, march against Athens.'

(e) Strong *denial* is sometimes implied, under the form of *deprecation*, by the Opt. with μή: as—

Od. 7. 316 μὴ τοῦτο φίλον Διὶ πατρὶ γένοιτο let us not admit
that this is the will of father Zeus.

22. 462 μὴ μὲν δὴ καθαρῶ θανάτῳ ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἐλοίμην.

(f) *Admission of possibility*, i. e. willingness to *suppose* or believe that the thing will happen. This use is rarely found without κεν or ἄν: an instance is—

Od. 3. 231 ῥεῖα θεός γ' ἐθέλων καὶ τηλόθεν ἄνδρα σαώσσει.

This is said as a concession: 'we men must allow that a god can save even from afar.' So perhaps Il. 10. 247, 557: also—

Il. 15. 197 θυγατέρεσσιν γάρ τε καὶ υἰάσι βέλτερον εἶη κτλ.

Here the Opt. is in contrast to the preceding Imper. μή τί με δευδισσέσθω: 'let him not threaten me: for his own children it may be well enough that he should scold.' Other instances are *negative*, viz.—

Il. 19. 321 οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακώτερον ἄλλο πάθοιμι.

Od. 14. 122 ὦ γέρον, οὗ τις κείνον ἀνὴρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθὼν
ἀγγέλλων πείσειε γυναῖκά τε καὶ φίλον υἷόν.

So in the Relative clauses, Il. 5. 303 (= 20. 286) ὃ οὐ δύο γ' ἀνδρὲ φέροιεν, Od. 3. 319 ὅθεν οὐκ ἔλποιστό γε θυμῷ ἐλθέμεν. And in one or two *interrogative* clauses, with implied negation: Il. 11. 838 πῶς τ' ἄρ' εἰοί τάδε ἔργα; Od. 5. 100 τίς δ' ἂν ἐκὼν διαδράμοι (since we should probably read τίς δὲ Φεκῶν). In such case the absence of *κεν* or *ἄν* marks the negation as sweeping and unconditional. We should compare the corresponding Homeric use of οὐ with the pure Subj., which differs in the degree of confidence expressed: οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι *I am sure I shall never see*, οὐ πάθοιμι *I suppose I shall never suffer*.

300.] With *κεν* or *ἄν* the Optative does not express *wish* (which is essentially unconditional), or even direct *willingness* on the part of the speaker, but only *willingness to admit a consequence*: hence *expectation* in view of *particular* circumstances: *e. g.*—

Il. 1. 100 τότε κέν μιν ἱλασσάμενοι πεπιθόμεν
then we may expect to appease him and gain grace.

The character of a Clause of this kind depends chiefly on the manner in which the *condition* is indicated. The following are the main points to be observed:—

(a) An Opt. with *κεν* or *ἄν* often follows an independent Clause with a Future, Imperative, &c.:—

Il. 22. 108 ὧς ἐρέουσιν, ἐμοὶ δὲ τότ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη κτλ.
Od. 10. 269 φεύγωμεν' ἔτι γάρ κεν ἀλύξαιμεν κακὸν ἡμᾶρ.

Il. 3. 410 κείσε δ' ἐγὼν οὐκ εἴμι, νεμεσητὸν δὲ κεν εἴη.

(b) Or the preceding Clause may contain a *wish*:—

Il. 7. 157 εἴθ' ὧς ἡβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἐμπεδος εἴη
τῷ κε τάχ' ἀντήσειε κτλ.

Cp. Il. 4. 93 (where the preceding Opt. is a gentle Imper.).

(c) The case supposed may be in past time, so that the Optative expresses what *would have* followed on an event which did not occur: *e. g.*—

Il. 5. 311 καὶ νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὄξυ νόησε κτλ.

Od. 5. 73 ἔνθα κ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἀθάνατός περ ἐπελθὼν

²⁴²⁾ θηήσαιο ἰδῶν.

So Il. 2. 81, 3. 220, 4. 223, 429, 539, 5. 85, 311, 388, 12. 58, 13. 127, 343, 15. 697, 17. 70, 366, 398, Od. 7. 293, 13. 86. This use of the Optative is confined to Homer, and is chiefly found in the Iliad.

A somewhat similar idiom occurs in Herodotus; *e. g.* Hdt. 1. 2 εἴσαν δ' ἂν οὔτοι Κρήτες 'these may have been Cretans' (= probably were), 7. 180 τάχα δ'

ἄν τι καὶ τοῦ οὐνόματος ἐπαύροιο. But there the meaning is different—not *would have happened* (= *did not*), but *would be found to have happened* (if we knew more).

(d) The case supposed may be vague or imaginary :—

Il. 8. 143 ἀνὴρ δέ κεν οὐ τι Διὸς νόον εἰρύσσαιτο,
where the emphatic ἀνὴρ suggests a condition: *if a man, he cannot &c.*; cp. Od. 4. 78., 23. 125, also—

Od. 12. 102 πλησίον ἀλλήλων· καὶ κεν διοϊστεύσεις
one may (on occasion arising) shoot an arrow across.

9. 131 οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακὴ γε, φέροι δέ κεν ὄρια πάντα.

It is natural that an *admission* that something *may* happen should generally be made more or less in view of circumstances, given or supposed. Hence the use of κεν or ἄν with an Opt. of this force became the prevailing use, and exceptions are rare, even in Homer.

The principal clause or Apodosis of an ordinary Complex Conditional Sentence belongs to this head. It is erroneous, however, to regard the varieties now explained as complex sentences with the Protasis understood. In this, as in some other cases, the complex is to be explained from the simple, not *vice versâ*.

In some instances the Opt. with κεν appears to be *concessive* (expressing *willingness*). Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* I. p. 200) gives as examples—

Il. 22. 252 νῦν αὐτὲ με θυμὸς ἀνήκε
στήμεναι ἀντία σείο· ἔλοιμί κεν ἢ κεν ἀλοίην.

Od. 8. 570 τὰ δέ κεν θεὸς ἢ τελέσειεν
ἢ κ' ἀτέλεστ' εἶη, ὥς οἱ φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ.

To which may be added Od. 14. 183 ἢ κεν ἀλοίη ἢ κε φύγοι κτλ. (but Il. 13. 486 is different). Possibly the use of κεν in these places is due to the opposition made between the two alternatives: cp. § 285, 3, *b*, § 286, and § 289, 2, *b*.

Il. 24. 618 ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ νῶϊ μεδώμεθα, δῖε γεραιέ,
σίτου· ἔπειτά κεν αὔτε φίλον παῖδα κλαίοισθα.

Hes. Op. 33 τοῦ κε κορεσάμενος νείκεα καὶ δῆριν ὀφέλλοις.

Also Od. 16. 391., 21. 161. But these instances need not be separated from others in which expectation rather than concession is recognised. We may notice as on the border between the two meanings—

(a) Uses of the First Person (esp. in the Odyssey): *e. g.*—

Od. 15. 506 ἠῶθεν δέ κεν ὕμμιν ὄδοιπόριον παραθείμην.

22. 262 ὦ φίλοι, ἦδη μὲν κεν ἐγὼν εἴποιμι καὶ ἄμμιν κτλ.

16. 304 ἀλλ' οἶοι σύ τ' ἐγὼ τε γυναικῶν γνώωμεν ἰθύν,
καὶ κέ τεο δμῶων ἀνδρῶν ἔτι πειρηθείμεν.

14. 155 πρὶν δέ κε, καὶ μάλα περ κεχρημένος, οὗ τι δεχοίμην.
So Od. 2. 219., 4. 347., 12. 387., 15. 313, 449., 18. 166., 19. 579.,
20. 326., 21. 113, 193, Il. 9. 417., 24. 664.

(β) Negative Clauses, with the Second Person :—

Il. 14. 126 τῷ οὐκ ἂν με . . φάντες | μῦθον ἀτιμήσαιτε
I do not think you will (I expect you not to) &c.

Od. 20. 135 οὐκ ἂν μιν νῦν, τέκνον, ἀναίτιον αἰτιόφο.

So Il. 2. 250 τῷ οὐκ ἂν βασιλῆας ἀνὰ στόμ' ἔχων ἀγορεύοις is to be understood as ironical courtesy (*you will not if you are advised by me*). This, again, when turned into a question yields another form of polite Imperative; as Il. 3. 52 οὐκ ἂν δὴ μείνειας *will you not await?* So Il. 5. 32, 456., 10. 204, Od. 6. 57., 7. 22.

The fact that οὐ is the negative Particle in all these instances shows that the Optative is grammatically more akin to a Future than to an expression of *wish*. So far as wish is intended, the use is a *rhetorical* one, implying what it does not directly express, like the similar use of the Future Indicative in Attic.

It will be seen that, except in one or two rare Homeric uses of the pure Opt., the usage of the Opt. in independent Sentences is nearly the same in Homer as in later Greek.

Optative in Subordinate Clauses.

301.] The classification which has been followed in discussing the Subordinate Clauses with the Subjunctive will also be the most convenient in the case of the Optative. Indeed there is so close a parallelism between the uses of these two Moods that little is now left to do except to take clauses of the several types already analysed, and show in each case the difference which determines the use of one Mood rather than the other.

The reason for using an Optative will generally be found in the circumstance that the governing Verb is incompatible with a subordinate clause expressing either the *will* or the *assured expectation* of the speaker. If the occasion to which the whole sentence refers is *past*, or is a mere *possibility*, or an *imaginary* case, these two meanings of the Subjunctive are generally out of place—and we can only have the Mood which expresses a wish, or an admission of possibility. Hence it is a general rule—to which however we have found important exceptions (§ 298)—that the Optative must be used when the principal Verb is an Optative, or one of the Secondary Tenses.

302.] Clauses with ἤέ—ἤε. The Optative in the Homeric examples is generally to be explained as the translation of the Subjunctive into *oratio obliqua*; that is to say, it expresses a doubt or deliberation thrown back into the past.

speaker's present point of view, not subordinated to the point of view fixed by the governing Verb. Thus in—

Od. 4. 698 ἀλλὰ πολὺ μείζον τε καὶ ἀργαλέωτερον ἄλλο
μνηστῆρες φράζονται, ὃ μὴ τελέσειε Κρονίων

we have an independent *parenthetical wish*: and in—

Il. 3. 234 νῦν δ' ἄλλους μὲν πάντας ὄρω . . οὓς κεν ἐὺ γνοίην κτλ.

5. 303 (= 20. 286) μέγα ἔργον, ὃ οὐ δύο γ' ἄνδρε φέροιεν
a *parenthetical expectation* (§ 299, *f*). In other places the Relative Clause is connected, by implication at least, with the action of the principal Clause, and expresses an *intended* or *expected consequence*. We may distinguish the following cases:—

(1) In Final Clauses—

(a) The choice of the Opt. shows *want of confident expectation* of the result intended:—

Il. 1. 62 ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τινα μάντιν ἐρείομεν ἢ ἱερῆα, . .
ὅς κ' εἴποι κτλ. (*with the view that he may tell*: cp.
7. 342., 21. 336, Od. 5. 166).

7. 231 ἡμεῖς δ' εἰμὲν τοῖοι οἳ ἂν σέθεν ἀντιόσαιμεν
καὶ πολέες (= *many of us are ready to meet thee*).

Od. 10. 431 τί κακῶν ἱμέρετε τούτων,
Κίρκης ἐς μέγαρον καταβήμεναι, ἣ κεν ἅπαντας
ἢ σῆς ἢε λύκους ποιήσεται ἢε λέοντας,
οἳ κέν οἱ μέγα δῶμα φυλάσσοιμεν καὶ ἀνάγκη.

Here *ποιήσεται* (Subj.) expresses the immediate result, *φυλάσσοιμεν* the *further* and therefore (in the nature of things) *less confidently* asserted consequence.

In this group of Clauses the Opt. always takes *κεν* or *ἂν* (cp. the corresponding Subj., § 282).

(b) The Opt. with *κεν* is especially common after a principal Clause of *negative* meaning (in which case the consequence is necessarily matter of mere *surposition*): as— *Amieis ad H342*

Il. 5. 192 ἵπποι δ' οὐ παρέασι καὶ ἄρματα τῶν κ' ἐπιβαίην. *Od. 12. 285*

Od. 1. 253 ἣ δὴ πολλὸν ἀποικομένον Ὀδυσῆος
δέυη, ὃ κε μνηστῆρσιν ἀναιδέσι χεῖρας ἐφέιη.

5. 16 οὐ γάρ οἱ πάρα νῆες ἐπήρετμοι καὶ ἑταῖροι,
οἳ κέν μιν πέμποιεν.

The pure Opt. occurs in Il. 22. 348 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς . . ἀπαλάλκοι.

(c) The Opt. is used if the governing Verb is an Optative, or a Secondary Tense: *e.g.*—

Il. 14. 107 νῦν δ' εἴη ὅς τῆσδέ γ' ἀμείνονα μῆτιν ἐνίσποι.

Od. 6. 113 ὡς Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔγροιτο, ἴδοι τ' εὐόπιδα κούρην,
ἣ οἱ Φαιήκων ἀνδρῶν πόλιν ἠγήσαιτο.

Od. 5. 240 *αἶα πάλαι, περίκηλα, τὰ οἱ πλώοιεν ἐλαφρῶς*
dry, such as would float.

(2) After Verbs that express *asking* or *finding out* the Clause acquires the force of a dependent Interrogative, and so of an *Object* Clause:—

Od. 9. 331 *αὐτὰρ τοὺς ἄλλους κλήρω πεπαλάσθαι ἄνωγον*
ὅς τις τολμήσειεν κτλ. (for the man) who should &c.

Il. 3. 316 *κλήρους πάλλον . . ὀπότερος ἀφείη*
they cast lots for which of the two should throw.

14. 507 (= 16. 283) *πάπτηνεν δὲ ἕκαστος ὄπη φύγοι.*

So Il. 6. 177., 10. 503, Od. 9. 88., 10. 101, 110., 19. 464. As to the form of the Relative Clause see § 267, 2, c.

The Dependent Interrogative properly so called is rare in Homer:—

Il. 5. 85 *Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ἂν γνοίης ποτέροισι μετείη.*

Od. 15. 423 *εἰρώτα δὴ ἔπειτα τίς εἶη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι.*

17. 368 *ἀλλήλους τ' ἐρέουτο τίς εἶη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι.*

It is evidently akin to the Optatives with ἦ—ἦ which express *past doubt* (§ 302, b): *τίς εἶη who he should be* comes to mean *who he should prove to be*. Cp. the Subj. in the corresponding Clauses relating to present time (§ 280).

305.] **Relative Clauses—Conditional.** When the event to which the condition attaches is matter of *wish* or mere *expectation*, or is in *past* time, the condition is generally expressed by the Optative. Hence we find the Optative—

(a) With an Optative of *wish* in the principal Clause:—

Il. 3. 299 *ὀπότεροι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὄρκια πημήνεια,*
ᾧδέ σφ' ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέοι ὡς ὄδε οἶνος.

Od. 1. 47 *ὡς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι.*

(b) With an Optative of *expectation*:—

Il. 9. 125 *οὐ κεν ἀλήϊος εἶη ἀνὴρ ᾧ τόσσα γένοιτο*
he will not be poor to whom such things come.

12. 228 *ᾧδέ χ' ὑποκρίναιτο θεοπρόπος ὃς σάφα θυμῷ*
εἰδείη τεράων καὶ οἱ πειθοίαιτο λαοί
so will a diviner answer, who knows &c.

Od. 4. 222 *ὃς τὸ καταβρόζειεν . .*

οὐ κεν ἐφημέριός γε βάλαι κατὰ δάκρυ παρειῶν.

The Opt. of the governing Clause may be itself subordinate:—

Od. 2. 53 *ὡς κ' αὐτὸς ἐδυνώσαιτο θύγατρα,*
δοίη δ' ᾧ κ' ἐθέλοι καὶ οἱ κεχαρισμένος ἔλθοι.

(c) After a Present or Future, in one or two places where the time is purposely vague :—

Od. 6. 286 καὶ δ' ἄλλη νεμεσῶ, ἢ τις τοιαυτὰ γε ῥέξοι
= *I am ready to be angry with any other who shall.*

19. 510 καὶ γὰρ δὴ κοίτοιο τάχ' ἔσσεται ἠδέος ὄρη,
ὄν τινὰ γ' ὕπνος ἔλοι κτλ. (ἔλλη La R.)

The Opt. avoids assuming that the case will ever occur.

The reading is very doubtful in Il. 5. 407 ὅτι μάλ' οὐ δηναῖος ὃς ἀθανάτοισι μάχοιτο, the Ambrosian and some others having μάχηται.

(d) When the principal Verb is in a past Tense; the Relative Clause generally expressing *indefinite frequency*, iteration, &c.: as—

Il. 2. 188 ὄν τινα μὲν βασιλῆα καὶ ξεσοχὸν ἄνδρα κιχείη,
τὸν δ' ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσσιν ἐρητύσασκε.

15. 22 ὄν δὲ λάβοιμι ῥίπτασκον τεταγὼν κτλ.

Od. 22. 315 παύεσκον μνηστῆρας ὅτις τοιαυτὰ γε ῥέξοι.

In these uses, and generally, the Opt. is pure. Exceptions are—

Od. 4. 600 δῶρον δ' ὅτι κέ μοι δοίης κειμήλιον ἔστω
(where the Opt. may be substituted for the Subj. for the sake of courtesy, to avoid assuming the certainty of the gift),—

Od. 21. 161 ἦ δέ κ' ἔπειτα
γῆμαιθ' ὅς κε πλείστα πόροι καὶ μόρσιμος ἔλθοι.

Clauses formed by a Relative and the *pure* Optative are strictly parallel to the Conditional Clauses formed by a Relative and the *pure* Subjunctive, such as χαίρει δέ μιν ὅς τις ἐθείρη, or βέλτερον ὅς φεύγων προφύγη (§ 283, a). In both groups of Clauses the reference is *indefinite*; but with the Subj. the instances must be thought of as *future* instances, and consequently the governing Verb must not imply that they are *past* or *imaginary*.

It may happen that the condition is expressed by the Subj. (because regarded as certain to be fulfilled), while the main action is uncertain, and therefore put in the Opt. : as—

Il. 14. 126 τῷ οὐκ ἂν με γένος γε κακὸν καὶ ἀνάγκιδα φάντες
μῦθον ἀτιμήσαιτε πεφασμένον, ὄν κ' ἐν εἶπω.

20. 250 ὄπποῖόν κ' εἴρησθα ἔπος, τοῖόν κ' ἐπακούσαιο.

So with εἰ, as Od. 2. 218 εἰ μὲν κεν ἀκούσω, ἢ τ' ἂν τλαίην, cp. II. 104, 110., 12. 137. But the general rule is to let the subordinate Clause follow the Mood of the governing Verb: hence the so-called 'Attraction' of the Optative.

306.] Clauses with ὡς, ὅπως, ἵνα and the Opt. are either Final or Object Clauses (not Conditional in Homer, see the note at the end of this section).

(1) In Final Clauses the Opt. may be used either (a) to

indicate that the consequence is not immediate or certain (the governing Verb having a present or future meaning), or (*b*) because the governing Verb is an Opt., or (*c*) a Secondary Tense. Thus we have the Opt.—

(*a*) After a Present, &c. in the principal Clause; especially when the Clause bears a *negative* meaning (so that the occasion is necessarily imaginary):—

Il. 1. 343 οὐδέ τι οἶδε νοῆσαι ἄμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω,
ὅππως οἱ παρὰ νηυσὶ σόοι μαχέονται Ἀχαιοί.

(μαχέονται however is not a good Homeric form, and makes an intolerable hiatus: read probably μαχέονται, cp. § 326, 3).

Od. 2. 52 οἱ πατὸς μὲν ἐς οἶκον ἀπερρίγασιν νέεσθαι
Ἰκαρίου, ὥς κ' αὐτὸς ἐεδνώσασατο θύγατρα.

But also after an affirmative Clause:—

Od. 23. 134 ἡγείσθω φιλοπαίγμονος ὄρχηθμοῖο,
ὥς κέν τις φαίη γάμον ἔμμεναι ἐκτὸς ἀκοῶν
= so that any one who happens to hear may think &c.

12. 156 ἀλλ' ἐρέω μὲν ἐγὼν ἵνα εἰδότες ἢ κε θάνομεν
ἢ κεν ἀλευάμενοι θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγομεν
(the Opt. of the less emphatic alternative, § 275, *b*).

17. 249 τὸν ποτ' ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νηὸς εὐσσέλωμοιο μελαίνης
ἄξω τῆλ' Ἰθάκης, ἵνα μοι βλοστον πολλὴν ἄλλοι
(ποτέ indicates a *distant* occasion).

13. 401 κνυζώσω δέ τοι ὅσσε πάρος περικαλλεῖ ἑόντε,
ὥς ἂν ἀεικέλιος πᾶσι μνηστῆρσι φανείης (so 16. 297).

24. 532 ἴσχεσθε . . ὥς κεν . . διακριθῆίτε (leg. διακριθῆτε?).

(*b*) After an Optative, either of *wish* or of *expectation*: especially in the Odyssey, as—

Od. 14. 407 τάχιστα μοι ἔνδον ἑταῖροι
εἶεν, ἵν' ἐν κλισίῃ λαρὸν τετυκοίμεθα δόρπον.

15. 537 τῷ κε τάχα γνοίης . . ὥς ἂν τίς σε . . μακαρίζοι.

So Od. 18. 369., 20. 81: and *à fortiori* after an implied *prohibition*—

Od. 3. 346 Ζεὺς τό γ' ἀλεξήσειε . . ὥς ὑμεῖς . . κίοιτε
Zeus avert that you should go &c.

(*c*) After a Past Tense—a use of which it is needless to give examples.

Regarding the use of κεν and ἄν, it is to be observed that—

1. The Opt. with ἵνα and ὅπως is always pure.

2. The Opt. with ὥς takes κεν or ἄν in a few places where there is clear reference to a single occasion, as in Od. 2. 52

(quoted above), Il. 19. 331, Od. 17. 362; and in the combinations ὡς ἄν τις (Od. 15. 538), ὡς κέν τις (Od. 23. 135).

(2) The corresponding Object Clause with ὡς and ὅπως is found (a) after Verbs of *trying, considering how, &c.* as—

Il. 2. 3 ἀλλ’ ὃ γε μερμήριξε κατὰ φρένα ὡς Ἀχιλλῆα
τιμήσει’ δλέσαι δὲ κτλ.

The reading τιμήσει’ is supported by Ven. A, which has τιμήσηι (τιμήσει εὐκτικόν Schol. A. B.): all other authorities have τιμήση, and all have δλέση.

Il. 9. 181 πειρᾶν ὡς πεπίθουεν (*bade them try how to persuade*).

21. 137 ὄρμηεν δ’ ἀνὰ θυμὸν ὅπως παύσειε (so 24. 680).

Od. 14. 329 ὅπως νοστήσει’ Ἰθάκης ἐς πλοῖνα δῆμον.

This reading is proved (against νοστήση of the MSS.) by the parallel Od. 19. 298 ὅπως νοστήσειε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν. Cp. also Od. 9. 420., 11. 479.

In one place ὡς with the Opt. follows a Verb of *saying*, viz. in Od. 24. 237 (μερμήριξε) εἰπεῖν ὡς ἔλθοι καὶ ἴκοιτ’ εἰς πατρίδα γαίαν *to tell how he had come*. This is the only Homeric instance of ὡς with the Opt. in *oratio obliqua*. The next is H. Ven. 215 εἶπεν δὲ ἕκαστα, ὡς εἰ ἀθάνατος κτλ.

An example of ὅπως and the Opt. with iterative meaning (nearly=ὔτε, § 308, 1, d) occurs in Hesiod, Theog. 156 καὶ τῶν μὲν ὅπως τις πρῶτα γένοιτο πάντας ἀποκρύπτασκε. This use is to be classed as Conditional, like the corresponding uses of ὡς and ὅπως with the Subj., § 285, 3.

307.] Clauses with ἕως (ἦος) and ὅφρα. These also are Final in character: *i. e.* the Conjunction has the meaning *till the time that*, hence (commonly) *in order that*,—not *while, so long as*.

The notion of *time* is distinct in—

Od. 12. 437 νωλεμέως ἐχόμεν ὄφρ’ ἐξεμέσειεν ὄπισσω
until it should vomit forth again (so 12. 428., 20. 80).

Od. 23. 151 εἶρυσθαι μέγα δῶμα διαμπερὲς ἦος ἴκοιτο
till he should come (so 5. 386., 9. 376).

It is indistinct, or lost, in the ordinary use of ὅφρα, as—

Il. 6. 170 δεῖξαι δ’ ἠνώγει φῖ πενθερῷ ὄφρ’ ἀπόλοιτο.

Od. 12. 427 ἦλθε δ’ ἐπὶ Νότος ὦκα, φέρων ἐμῷ ἄλγεα θυμῷ,
ὄφρ’ ἔτι τὴν ὀλοὴν ἀναμετρήσαιμι Χάρυβδι
to the end that I should measure again &c.

and with ἕως in Od. 4. 799 πέμπε δέ μιν . . ἦος Πηνελόπειαν παύσειε κλαυθμοῦ, and other places in the Odyssey (5. 386., 6. 80., 19. 367).

The corresponding form of Object Clause with these Conjunctions may be traced in one instance of each, viz. Il. 4. 465 λελη-
μένος ὄφρα τάχιστα τεύχεα συλήσειε, and Od. 19. 367 ἀρώμενος ἦος ἴκοιο. Here, after a Verb of *wishing*, the meaning *until* passes into the simple *that*. EG70, Z3

With *ἕως* and *ὄφρα* the Opt. is nearly always pure: but we have *ὄφρ' ἄν* in Od. 17. 298 (*until*), 24. 334: and *ἕως κεν* in—

Od. 2. 77 *τόφρα γὰρ ἄν κατὰ ἄστν ποτιπτυσσοίμεθα μύθῳ
χρήματ' ἀπαιτίζοντες, ἕως κ' ἀπὸ πάντα δοθείη,*
where there is a stress on the *particular* time contemplated. So—

Il. 15. 69 *ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἄν τοι ἔπειτα παλίωξιν παρὰ νηῶν
αἰὲν ἐγὼ τεύχοιμι διαμπερές, εἰς ὃ κ' Ἀχαιοὶ
Ἴλιον αἰπὺν ἔλοιεν* (the only instance with *εἰς ὃ*).

The similar uses of *ἔστε*, *ἄχρι*, *μέχρι* are post-Homeric.

The chief instance of *ὄφρα* with an Opt. following a Fut. or Subj. is Il. 7. 339 *πύλας ποιήσομεν . . ὄφρα . . ὀδὸς εἴη*. But the example is open to doubt, partly because there may be a Subj. *εἴη* (see § 80), partly because the line also occurs (7. 349) where the governing Verb is an Imperfect, and it may have been wrongly inserted in v. 339. In other places—as Il. 7. 72, Od. 5. 378., 15. 51., 22. 444—where some editions have Opt. forms, the Subj. is to be restored. It is true that the Opt. is found after the Future with other Conjunctions, to express remoteness or uncertainty; but a word which literally means *till the time that* could not naturally be used to express a *remote* end or consequence.

308.] **Clauses with ὅτε, ὁπότε, &c.** Most Clauses of this kind are essentially—

(1) Conditional. The Verb of the principal Clause may be—

(a) An Optative of *wish*: as—

Il. 21. 428 *τοιούτοι νῦν πάντες, ὅσοι Τρώεσσι ἀρωγοί,
εἶεν ὄτ' Ἀργείοισι μαχοίατο* (ep. Il. 18. 465, &c.).

(b) An Optative of *expectation*: as—

Od. 13. 390 *καί κε τριηκοσίοισιν ἐγὼν ἀνδρεσσι μαχοίμην
σὺν σοί, πότνα θεά, ὅτε μοι πρόφρασσ' ἐπαρήγοις.*

Il. 14. 247 *Ζηνὸς δ' οὐκ ἄν ἐγῶγε Κρονίονος ἄσπον ἰκοίμην,
οὐδὲ κατευνήσαιμ' ὅτε μὴ αὐτός γε κελεύοι.*

(c) A Future: in one place, viz. Il. 13. 317 *αἰπὺ οἱ ἐσσεῖται . . νῆας ἐνιπρήσαι ὅτε μὴ αὐτός γε Κρονίων ἐμβάλοι κτλ.*, where the speaker does not wish to imply the fulfilment of the condition.

In Od. 24. 343 *ἔνθα δ' ἀνὰ σταφυλαὶ παντοῖα ἔασιν, ὁπότε δὴ Διὸς ὤραι ἐπιβρίσειαν* the Present *ἔασιν* is open to suspicion, because all the rest of the description is in the past tense; with which the Opt. is in harmony.

In Il. 4. 263 *ἔστηχ' ὥς περ ἐμοί, πῆεν ὅτε θυμὸς ἀνάγοι* the Opt. is read by most MSS. It may be regarded as an Opt. of the *remoter* event (§ 305, c), depending on *πῆεν*, which is an Inf. of *purpose* (Goodwin § 555). But La Roche reads *ἀνάγη*.

(d) A Past Tense, generally of an event which happens repeatedly or habitually, as—

Il. 1. 610 *ἔνθα πάρος κοιμᾶθ' ὅτε μιν γλυκὺς ὕπνος ἰκάνοι.*

21. 265 ὄσάκι δ' ὀρμήσειε κτλ. *as often as he started &c.*

Od. 8. 87 ἦ τοι ὅτε λήξειεν . . ἔλεσκεν (iterative).

So with ὅτε after πρίν, in Il. 9. 486 οὐκ ἐθέλεσκες . . πρίν γ' ὅτε δῆ . . ἄσαιμι = *you would only . . when &c.*: cp. § 297.

In these cases the Opt. after a past tense answers to the pure Subj. after a Present, § 289, 2, a. In one place the Opt. with ὅτε represents the Subj. with ὅτε κεν, viz. in Od. 20. 138 ἀλλ' ὅτε δῆ κοίτοιο καὶ ὕπνου μιμνήσκειτο, ἦ μὲν δέμνι' ἄνωγεν ὑποστορέσαι δμωῆσι *bade them spread the couch against the time when he should bethink him &c.*

In this group of uses the Opt. is pure, except in—

Il. 9. 524 οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπειθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν
ἠρώων, ὅτε κέν τι' ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἴκοι,

where the κέν may be accounted for by the change from the Plural to the Singular: cp. § 283, b, c.

(2) After a Past Tense of a Verb of *waiting* ὁπότε with the Aorist Opt. forms a kind of Object Clause; as Il. 7. 415 ποτιδέγμενοι ὀππότε' ἄρ' ἔλθοι *waiting for (the time) when he should come*; so Il. 9. 191., 18. 524, and (after μένοντες) 4. 334. Cp. § 289 (1).

309.] Clauses with ἐπεὶ. The few examples of this use show the same varieties as with ὅτε. Thus, (a) after another Opt.—

Il. 9. 304 νῦν γάρ χ' Ἔκτορ' ἔλοις, ἐπεὶ ἂν μάλα τοι σχεδὸν
ἔλθοι.

24. 226 αὐτίκα γάρ με κατακτείνειεν Ἀχιλλεύς
ἀγκὰς ἐλόντ' ἐμόν νιόν, ἐπὴν γόου ἐξ ἔρον εἶην.

Od. 4. 222 ὃς τὸ καταβρόξειεν, ἐπὴν κρητῆρι μιγείη, κτλ.

(b) After a Present, in the statement of a supposed consequence—

Od. 24. 254 τοιούτῳ δὲ ἔοικας, ἐπεὶ λούσαιτο φάγοι τε,
εὐδέμεναι (*such a one as would sleep after that &c.*).

(c) After a Past tense, in the iterative sense:—

Il. 24. 14 ἀλλ' ὃ γ' ἐπεὶ ζεύξειεν κτλ., Od. 2. 105 (= 19. 150.,
24. 140) ἐπὴν δαΐδας παραθείτο (*v. l. ἐπεὶ*).

The use of ἂν is intelligible in the first of these passages (Il. 9. 304), since it refers to an event in the immediate future; perhaps also in Il. 24. 227, after an Opt. of *concession*. But as to the form ἐπὴν see § 362.

310.] πρίν. The peculiar way of expressing a condition by a Negative followed by πρίν (§ 297) is transferred to the past, the Subj. becoming an Opt., in one passage—

Il. 21. 580 οὐκ ἔθελεν φεύγειν πρίν πειρήσαιτ' Ἀχιλλῆος.

The Optative with εἰ, &c.

311.] **Optative with εἰ—Conditional Protasis.** The Clause with εἰ expresses a *supposition*, made in order to lead up to the Clause which expresses the *expected consequence*: as—

Od. 1. 163 εἰ κείνόν γ' Ἰθάκηνδε ἰδοίαιτο νοστήσαντα,
πάντες κ' ἄρησάιατ' ἐλαφρότεροι πόδας εἶναι κτλ.

Il. 7. 129 τοὺς νῦν εἰ πτώσσοντας ὑφ' Ἑκτορι πάντας ἀκούσαι,
πολλά κεν ἀθανάτοισι φίλας ἀνὰ χεῖρας ἀείραι.

The Clause with εἰ may follow the other, as—

Il. 22. 20 ἦ σ' ἂν τισαίμην, εἴ μοι δύναμις γε παρέιη.

The apodosis is generally given by the Opt. with κεν, as in the examples quoted: but we may have the Subj. with κεν, the Future, or the Present. In such cases there is some change of tone between Protasis and Apodosis: as Il. 11. 386 εἰ μὲν δὴ ἀντίβιον σὺν τεύχεσι περὶθρείης, οὐκ ἂν τοι χραίσμησι κτλ., where the Subj. is more peremptory than the Opt.: cp. Od. 17. 539 and (Fut.) Il. 10. 222. So with the εἰ-Clause following the other, as Il. 9. 388 κούρην δ' οὐ γαμέω, οὐδ' εἰ ἐρίζοι *I shall not wed the maiden (and would not) even if she rivalled &c.*; cp. Il. 2. 488, Od. 17. 539. The instances of the Opt. following a Present are nearly all in the Odyssey: 1. 414 οὐτ' οὖν ἀγγελίῃ ἔτι πείθομαι εἴ ποθεν ἔλθοι, also 7. 52., 14. 56. In these cases the Present has the force of a general statement (see Goodwin, §§ 409–501). So when the Verb is understood, as—

Il. 9. 318 ἴση μοῖρα μένοντι καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζοι.

Od. 8. 138 οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγέ τί φημι κακώτερον ἄλλο θαλάσσης
ἄνδρα γε συγγεῦναι, εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερὸς εἴη
no matter if he is very strong (= even if he should be).

The combination ὡς εἰ (or ὡς εἴ τε) expresses supposition for the purpose of *comparison*; the principal Clause being in a past Tense, as—

Il. 2. 780 οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἴσαν ὡς εἴ τε πυρὶ χθῶν πᾶσα νέμοιο
(cp. Il. 11. 467., 22. 410, Od. 9. 314., 10. 416, 420., 17. 366).

Or else negative—

Il. 11. 389 οὐκ ἀλέγω ὡς εἴ με γυνὴ βάλοι ἢ πᾶσις ἄφρων.

The use of εἰ with the Opt. in the iterative sense (*if ever, whenever*), which is common in later Greek, is not Homeric: the only passage which might be quoted as an example is—

Il. 24. 768 ἀλλ' εἴ τίς με καὶ ἄλλος ἐνὶ μεγάρουισιν ἐνίπτοι . .
ἀλλὰ σὺ τόν γ' ἐπέεσσι παραιφάμενος κατέρυκες.

312.] Optative with εἰ—Wish. The Conditional Protasis, when used without an Apodosis, becomes a form of expressing *wish*:—

Il. 15. 569 Ἀντίλοχ', οὗ τις σείο νεώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν,
οὔτε ποσὶν θάσσων οὔτ' ἄλκιμος ὡς σὺ μάχεσθαι·
εἴ τιwά που Τρώων ἐξάλμενος ἄνδρα βάλουσθα.

So Il. 10. 111., 16. 559., 24. 74. More frequently a wish is introduced by εἰ γάρ or αἰ γάρ, as in—

αἰ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἀπόλλων, κτλ.

Such a wish is sometimes used as a form of asseveration, as—

Il. 18. 464 αἰ γάρ μιν θανάτοιο δυσηχέος ᾧδε δυναίμην
νόσφιν ἀποκρύψαι, ὅτε μιν μόρος αἰνὸς ἰκάνοι,
ὡς οἱ τεύχεα καλὰ παρέσσειται

i. e. fair arms shall be his as surely as I wish I could save him from death: so Il. 8. 538, Od. 9. 523: and ironically—

Od. 21. 402 αἰ γάρ δὴ τοσοῦτον ὀνήσιος ἀντιάσειεν,
ὡς οὗτός ποτε τοῦτο δυνήσεται ἐντανύσασθαι.

Here also we must place the wishes expressed by εἶθε or αἶθε, which have generally the character of hopeless *regret*: as εἶθ' ὡς ἠβώοιμι κτλ. It may be noted that in the *Odyssey* *wish* is not expressed by εἰ except in the combinations εἰ γάρ and εἶθε.

A *wish* is often followed by a Clause expressing an expected consequence of its fulfilment; as—

Il. 2. 371 αἰ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ . .
τῷ κε τάχ' ἠμύσειε πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος.

Od. 7. 331 Ζεῦ πάτερ, αἶθ' ὅσα εἶπε τελευτήσειεν ἅπαντα
'Ἀλκίνοος' τοῦ μὲν κεν ἐπὶ ζεῖδωρον ἄρουραν
ἄσβεστον κλέος εἶη.

So we should probably punctuate—

Il. 13. 485 εἰ γάρ ὀμηλική γε γενοίμεθα τῷδ' ἐπὶ θυμῷ·
αἰψά κεν ἠὲ φέροιτο μέγα κράτος ἠὲ φεροίμην.

Or we may take αἰψά κεν κτλ. closely with the preceding line, and then it becomes the Apodosis to a Conditional clause. Other examples of this ambiguity are given in § 318.

313.] Optative with εἴ κεν—Conditional Protasis. This is a comparatively rare form; it can generally be explained in accordance with the other uses of κεν:—

Il. 5. 273 εἰ τοῦτω κε λάβοιμεν ἀροίμεθά κε κλέος ἐσθλόν *ubi Henze im.*
if (as I propose) we take them, we should do.
(But perhaps we should read τοῦτω γε.)

9. 141 εἰ δέ κεν Ἀργος ἰκοίμεθ' Ἀχαιϊκόν κτλ.
if (as a further step) we reach Argos do.

Il. 23. 591

ἵππον δέ τοι αὐτὸς
δώσω, τὴν ἀρόμην· εἰ καὶ νύ κεν οἴκοθεν ἄλλο
μεῖζον ἐπαιτήσῃας, ἄφαρ κέ τοι αὐτίκα δοῦναι
βουλοίμην *if (after that) you demand more &c.*

Od. 2. 76 εἰ χ' ὑμεῖς γε φάγοιτε, τάχ' ἂν ποτε καὶ τίσις εἴη
if (as I say is better, see v. 74) you devour, then &c.

See also Il. 2. 123., 8. 196, 205., 13. 288., 23. 592, Od. 2. 246.,
12. 345., 13. 389., 19. 590. And with the Clause with εἰ fol-
lowing the other—

Il. 6. 49 τῶν κέν τοι χαρίσαιο πατὴρ ἀπερείσι' ἄποια,
εἰ κεν ἐμὲ ζῶν πεπύθοιτ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.

So Il. 1. 60., 10. 381; cp. Od. 7. 315., 8. 353, and the use of οὐδ'
εἰ κεν *not even in case*, Il. 9. 445., 19. 322., 22. 220., 23-346

There is one instance of the Opt. with εἰ—*ἂν*, viz.

Il. 2. 597 εἰ περ ἂν αὐταὶ Μοῦσαι ἀεῖδοιεν.

314.] Opt. with εἰ—Final and Object Clauses. These are
generally found after a past Tense in the Principal Clause; *e.g.*—

Il. 2. 97 κήρυκες βοόωντες ἐρήτουν, εἰ ποτ' αὐτῆς
σχοίαιτ', ἀκούσειαν δὲ κτλ. (*in view that they should &c.*)

Od. 4. 317 ἦλυθον, εἰ τινά μοι κληθδὸνα πατρὸς ἐνίσποις
I have come in case you may tell me some &c.

With Verbs of *seeking, trying, desiring, &c.* the Clause with εἰ
has the character of an Object Clause: as—

Il. 4. 88 Πάνδαρον ἀντίθεον διζημένη εἰ πον ἐφεύροι
seeking in the hope of finding (= seeking to find).

So Il. 12. 333, Od. 13. 415., 22. 381.

With Verbs of *telling, knowing, seeing, thinking, &c.* this idiom
is almost confined to the Odyssey; *e.g.*—

Od. 1. 115 ὀσσομένος πατέρ' ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, εἰ ποθεν ἔλθων
μνηστήρων τῶν μὲν σκέδασιν κατὰ δώματα θείη

i. e. with the thought in his heart, whether his father would
come and scatter the suitors: cp. 5. 439., 9. 317, 421., 18. 375.

Od. 12. 112 εἰ δ' ἄγε δή μοι τοῦτο, θεά, νημερτὲς ἐνίσπες
εἰ πως τὴν ὄλοην μὲν ὑπεκπροφύγοιμι Χάρυβδι
tell me as to the hope that I may escape &c.

In a few places an Object Clause of this kind follows a present
Tense:—

Od. 2. 350
δν σὺ φυλάσσεις
κείνον διόμενον τὸν κάμμορον εἰ ποθεν ἔλθοι.

14. 119 Ζεὺς . . οἶδε . . εἰ κέ μιν ἀγγεῖλαιμι ἰδῶν.

20. 224 ἀλλ' ἔτι τὸν δύστηνον ὄτομαι εἰ ποθεν . . θείη.

So in the only example of the kind found in the Iliad:—

Il. 11. 792 τίς δ' οἶδ' εἴ κέν οἱ σὺν δαίμονι θυμὸν ὀρίναις ;

The pure Optative is used in all the places quoted, except the two in which εἴ κεν follows οἶδε (Il. 11. 792, Od. 14. 119). In these the structure is the same as in the corresponding *independent* Clauses (§ 300). That is to say, the phrase τίς οἶδεν εἰ is treated as a mere 'perhaps' (Lat. *nescio an*).

An Opt. in a Final Clause depending upon a Subj. is perhaps to be found in Od. 5. 471 εἰ δέ κεν . . καταδράθω εἰ με μεθείη (so all MSS. : μεθήη Bekk.). Cp. § 293.

History of the Subjunctive and Optative.

315.] **Uses in Independent Clauses.** The uses of the Subj. and Opt. in independent Clauses have been shown to fall in each case into two main groups. In one set of meanings the Mood expresses *desire on the part of the speaker*; to this belong the Subj. of *command* and *prohibition*, and the Opt. of *wish*. In the other the Mood is a kind of Future; the Subj. being an emphatic or confident Future (like our Future with *shall*), the Opt. a softened Future, expressing expectation, or mere admission of possibility (the English *may* or *should*).

These two sets of meanings may be called the 'quasi-Imperative,' and the 'quasi-Future.' We must remember however that they are not always clearly separable, but are connected by transitional or intermediate uses: such as (*e.g.*) the Subj. which expresses *necessity* (§ 277), and the Opt. of *concession* (§ 299, *d*).

316.] **Uses in Subordinate Clauses.** Passing over for the present the question whether the quasi-Imperative or the quasi-Future use is to be regarded in each case as representing the *original* meaning of the Mood, we proceed to consider the uses in Subordinate Clauses. Here the main distinction is that between 'Final' and 'Conditional,' if these terms are used with some latitude: especially if we rank with the Final Clauses not only those which distinctly express the *end* or purpose of an action, but also all Clauses which are referred to the time of the governing Verb. It is true that this distinction does not always apply; *e.g.* to the Subj. in—

Δαναῶν ὀλοφυρόμεθ' αἰχμητάων,
οἷ κεν δὴ κακὸν οἶτον ἀναπλήσαντες ὄλωνται

or to the Opt. in—

ἀλλὰ πολὺ μείζον . .
μνηστῆρες φράζονται, ὃ μὴ τελέσειε Κρονίων.

For there the Relative Clause is in sense a *parenthesis*, and is construed accordingly as an independent Sentence. Again, in—

ἔσσεται ἡμᾶρ ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὀλώλη κτλ.
 φρασσόμεθ' ἢ νεώμεθ' ἐφ' ἡμέτερ' ἢ μένωμεν.
 δεῖδιε γὰρ μὴ λαίμῶν ἀποτμήσειε κτλ.

and generally in *Object* Clauses, the Subordinate Clause does not express *end*; but the time from which it is regarded as spoken is fixed by the governing Verb, in the same way that the time of a true Final Clause is fixed by the action of which it gives the end. For the present purpose, accordingly, there are two kinds of Clause to be considered, (1) Final and Object Clauses, and (2) Conditional Clauses.

Regarding the meaning of the Subjunctive and Optative in Final Clauses there can be little doubt. The Subj. in most instances follows either a First Person (Present or Future), or an Imperative: that is to say, it expresses the immediate purpose with which the speaker announces his own action, or commands the action of others. Hence, by a natural transference, it comes to express the purpose of another person (viz. the Subject of the Principal Clause). Similarly the Opt., whether as the Mood of *wish* or of *expectation*, comes to express a wish or expectation not now felt, but spoken of. Again, by virtue of its character as a softened or less confident Future, it naturally expresses a *purpose* that does not lie within the speaker's own sphere of action or direct influence.

It should be noticed, too, that the relation which we imply by the term 'Final Clause' may exist without grammatical Subordination, *i. e.* without a Particle such as *ἵνα* or *ὡς* to introduce the clause. Thus in II. 6. 340 ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐπίμεινον ἀρήϊα τεύχεα δύω the meaning would not be altered by saying ἐπίμεινον ἵνα δύω. So in II. 18. 121-125 νῦν δὲ κλέος ἀροίμην καὶ . . στοναχῆσαι ἐφείην, γνοίεν δ' ὡς δὴ δηρὸν ἐγὼ πολέμοιο πέπαυμαι: the last wish is evidently also the *result* hoped for from the fulfilment of the preceding wishes (so that γνοίεν δέ = ὡς γνοίεν).

In Conditional Clauses, on the other hand, the condition or supposition is not subordinated to the time of the governing Verb, but is made from the *present* point of view of the speaker. The question arises: What is the original force of the Subj. and Opt. in this use?

In the case of the Subj. we naturally look to the quasi-Imperative use. It is common to use the Imperative as a way of stating a supposition; as when we say 'let it be so,' meaning 'if it is so' (cp. Latin *cras petito, dabitur*). This view is confirmed by the fact that negative Conditional Clauses take μὴ, not οὐ: that is to say, they are felt to be akin to *prohibition* rather than *denial*. Thus ὅς μὴ ἔλθῃ literally means not 'who will not come' but 'who is not to come'. Characteristic, at conj. med εἰ ἄρα φῦδες ἰ δετ γαυλ ἐως πρῶτῃ.

(ὄς οὐκ ἂν ἔλθῃ), but ‘who *shall* not come,’ *i. e.* whom we are not to suppose coming.

Similarly we may understand the Opt. in these Clauses as the Mood of *concession*; ‘admitting this to be so’: and so in a negative sentence, ὄς μὴ ἔλθοι ‘whom I agree to suppose not coming.’ For the choice of the Mood does not depend on the greater or less *probability* of the supposition being true, but on the *tone* in which it is made—on the degree of *vividness*, as Mr. Goodwin says, with which it is expressed (*Moods and Tenses*, § 455).

It may be objected that on this view we ought to have εἰ οὐ, not εἰ μὴ, whenever the Verb is in the Indicative. But there is no difficulty in supposing that μὴ was extended to the Indicative on the analogy of the Clauses with the Subj. and Opt.; just as μὴ ὄφελον is an extension from the common use of μὴ in wishes. And this is strongly supported by the circumstance that in fact εἰ οὐ with the Indicative occurs several times in Homer:—

Il. 15. 162 εἰ δέ μοι οὐκ ἐπέεσσ’ ἐπιπέσειται κτλ. (so 178).

20. 129 εἰ δ’ Ἀχιλεὺς οὐ ταῦτα θεῶν ἐκ πύσεται ὀμφῆς.

24. 296 εἰ δέ τοι οὐ δώσει ἐδὼν ἄγγελον κτλ.

Od. 2. 274 εἰ δ’ οὐ κείνου γ’ ἐσσι γόνος κτλ.

See also Il. 4. 160, Od. 12. 382., 13. 143. On the other hand, in the very few examples of εἰ οὐ with a Subj., the οὐ goes closely with the Verb, viz. Il. 3. 289 (οὐκ ἐθέλωσιν), 20. 139 (οὐκ εἰῶσι). On the whole, therefore, it is probable that the Subj. in Conditional Clauses represents the tone of *requirement* in which the speaker *asks us to suppose* the condition to be true: and that the Opt. implies *concession*, or willingness to make the supposition involved.

317.] **Original meaning.** Whether the use of the Subj. as an emphatic Future was derived from its use to express Will, or *vice versa*, and whether the Optative originally expressed *wish* or *supposition*, are questions which take us back to a very early period in the history of Indo-European speech. The two Moods are found in the same uses (generally speaking) in Homer and in the Veda: the formation of these uses therefore belongs in the main to the period before the separation of the different languages,—to the period, indeed, when the original parent language was itself in course of formation. The problem therefore is one on which comparison of the earliest forms of the known Indo-European languages can hardly throw any light. It is as though we were asked to divine whether the use of *shall* in commands (*thou shalt not kill*) or in predictions (*ye shall see me*) is the older, without recourse to earlier English, or to other Germanic languages. Some considerations of a general character may however be suggested:—

(a) The Subj. is strongly differentiated from the Imperative by its Person-Endings, and especially by the existence of a First Person.

(b) In most languages it will be found that the Imperative meaning is expressed in more than one way. Thus in Sanscrit we find the Imperative

proper, the Injunctive, the Subj., and the Optative : in Greek the Imper., the Subj. and certain uses of the Future. The reason of this is evident. Variety in the expression of will and wish is one of the first needs of human society. The form which has been appropriated to express *command* is unsuitable to courteous *request*, still more unsuitable to humble *entreaty*. Accordingly other forms are used, precisely because they are not Imperatives. In time these acquire a quasi-Imperative character, and fresh forms are resorted to as the same want of a non-Imperative mode of expression is again perceived.

(c) The use of the Secondary Endings in the Optative points to the conclusion that in its origin it was a Mood of past time. The tendency to use a past Tense in wishes, and in some kinds of suppositions, may be amply illustrated from English and other modern languages.

(d) The uses with οὐ go far to show that the quasi-Future sense of the Subj. and Opt. is at least as primitive as the quasi-Imperative sense. If the strong negation οὐ γένηται is derived by gradual change of meaning from a *prohibition*, the appearance of οὐ is difficult to explain.

(e) The use of the Subj. as an Imper. may be compared to the Attic use of the Future in a 'jussive' sense, and in Final Clauses to express purpose (Goodwin, p. 373). The change from an expression of will to one of expectation is one to which it would be much more difficult to find a parallel.

318.] **Conditional Protasis with εἰ.** The derivations that have been proposed for the Particle εἰ or αἰ are too uncertain to furnish ground for any theory as to the manner in which the Conditional Protasis may have been formed. The question arises for us on the passages in which εἰ with the Opt. is used to express a wish. Thus in εἰ τις καλέσειε *I pray some one to call we may take the Clause as Conditional, with a suppressed Apodosis (καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι or the like).* Or we may follow L. Lange in holding that the Clause is not Subordinate at all, the Particle εἰ being originally a kind of affirmative Interjection, used to introduce expressions of wish and supposition ; and we can thus explain the ordinary Complex Conditional Sentence as made up of two originally independent Clauses, viz. (1) a *wish or supposition*, introduced by εἰ, and (2) an assertion of the consequence to be expected from its being realised. On this theory the Clause of Wish introduced by εἰ is not an incomplete Sentence, derived from a Complex Sentence by omission of the Apodosis, but is one of the elements from which the Complex Sentence was itself developed.

The latter of these views has *a priori* the advantage of deriving the complex from the simple : and it has some apparent support in Homeric usage. We find in Homer—

(1) Wish, standing alone :—

ὡς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε βέξοι.

(2) Wish followed by an independent Clause expressing expectation of a consequence :—

Od. 15. 180 οὕτω νῦν Ζεὺς θείη, ἐρίγδουπος πόσις Ἕρης·
τῷ κέν τοι καὶ κείθι θεῶ ὡς εὐχετοῦμίμην.

Il. 13. 55 σφῶϊν δ' ὦδε θεῶν τις ἐνὶ φρεσὶ ποιήσειεν,
αὐτῷ θ' ἐστάμεναι κρατερῶς καὶ ἀνωγέμεν ἄλλους·
τῷ κε καὶ ἐσσύμενόν περ ἔρωσμαι ἀπὸ νηῶν.

- (3) Wish, with εἰ, εἰ γάρ, εἴθε, &c., but without 'Apodosis':—

Il. 4. 189 αἰ γὰρ δὴ οὕτως εἶη, φίλος ᾧ Μενέλαε.

11. 670 εἴθ' ὡς ἠβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἶη, κτλ.

- (4) Wish, with εἰ, εἰ γάρ, εἴθε, &c., followed by a Clause of Consequence:—

Il. 7. 157 εἴθ' ὡς ἠβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἶη·

τῷ κέ τάχ' ἀντήσειε κτλ.

Od. 15. 536 αἰ γὰρ τοῦτο, ξεῖνε, ἔπος τελέσειε Κρονίων·
γνωῖς χ' οὔη ἐμῇ δύναμις καὶ χεῖρες ἔπονται.

- (5) Supposition, with εἰ, followed by a Clause of expectation:—

Il. 7. 129 τοὺς νῦν εἰ πτώσσοντας ὑφ' Ἔκτορι πάντας ἀκούσαι,
πολλὰ κεν ἀθανάτοισι φίλας ἀνὰ χεῖρας ἀείραι.

The similarity in these examples is manifest. The type in the first four sets consists of a Clause of Wish, either alone (1 and 3) or followed by a Clause of Consequence (2 and 4). Again, (5) only differs from (4) in punctuation, so to speak: the two Clauses are taken together, and thus the εἰ-Clause is no longer an independent *supposition*, but is one made with a view to the *consequence* expressed in the Clause with κεν. And this, it is contended, was the result of a gradual process, such as we find whenever parataxis passes into hypotaxis.

319.] Final Clauses with εἰ. An argument for Lange's view of the original force of εἰ is found in the use in Final Clauses, such as εἴμι εἰ κε πίθηται. The meaning here is essentially different from that of the Conditional sentence *I go if he listens*; and on the ordinary hypothesis, that εἰ originally expressed a condition, it is difficult to account for the two uses. But if εἰ is a mere interjection, introducing wish or supposition, it is intelligible that the Clause should be Conditional or Final, as the context may determine.

320.] The formula εἰ δ' ἄγε, with the varieties εἰ δ' ἄγετ' (Il. 2. 381) and εἰ δέ (Il. 9. 46, 262), is often used in Homer to introduce an Imperative or Subjunctive (§ 275). It has generally been supposed to be elliptical, standing for εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις ἄγε, or the like. And εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις is actually found with an Imperative in a few places: Il. 19. 142 εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις ἐπίμενον, Od. 16. 82., 17. 277 (cp. 3. 324). It has been pointed out, however, by Lange, in his dissertation on this question,* that εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις is only found where it introduces a distinct *second alternative*. Thus in Od. 16. 82 the context is: 'I will send the stranger wherever he desires; or if you choose (εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις) take him into your house.' So Od. 3. 323 ἀλλ' ἴθι νῦν σὺν νηϊ. . εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις πεζός κτλ. But with εἰ δ' ἄγε this is not the case. We find it at the beginning of a speech; as—

Il. 6. 376 εἰ δ' ἄγε μοι, δμοαί, νημέρτεα μυθήσασθε.

Od. 2. 178 ᾧ γέρον, εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν μαντεύεο κτλ.: so Il. 16. 697., 17. 685,

Od. 12. 112., 22. 391., 23. 35.

Or in the Apodosis of a Conditional sentence, as—

Od. 4. 831 εἰ μὲν δὴ θεός ἐσσι, θεοῦ τε ἔκλυες αὐδῆς,

εἰ δ' ἄγε μοι κτλ.: so Il. 22. 379–381.

Or to express an appeal which is *consequent* upon something just said: as—

Il. 1. 301 τῶν οὐκ ἄν τι φέροις ἀνελῶν ἀέκοντος ἐμῆο·

εἰ δ' ἄγε μὴν πείρησαι (ay, come now and try): cp. Il. 8. 18.

* *De formula Homericā εἰ δ' ἄγε commentatio*, Lipsiæ 1873.

- Il. i. 523 $\epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \kappa\epsilon\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \upsilon\phi\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\omega$
 $\epsilon\iota\ \delta'$ ἄγε τοι κεφαλῇ κατανέυσομαι (*so come, I will nod my head*).
23. 579 $\epsilon\iota\ \delta'$ ἄγ' ἐγὼν αὐτὸς δικάσω, καὶ μ' οὐ τινά φημι
 ἄλλον ἐπιπλήξειν Δαναῶν· ἰθεὶα γὰρ ἔσται·
 'Ἀντίλοχ', $\epsilon\iota\ \delta'$ ἄγε δεῦρο . . ὄμνυθι κτλ.
come I will be judge myself . . so come, Antilochus, take this oath;
 see also Od. i. 271., 9. 37., 21. 217., 24. 336.

Hence, Lange argues, it is probable that $\epsilon\iota$ does not express condition, but has an interjectional character (cp. Latin *eia age*): and if so it may be the same with the use in Clauses expressing wish.

321.] Conclusion. Notwithstanding these arguments, the common explanation of the $\epsilon\iota$ -Clause of wish (as primarily a Clause of supposition) seems to be the more probable one.* For—

(1) The uses of $\epsilon\iota$ present a marked correspondence with those of the Relative and its derivatives. Note especially the use of $\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \mu\acute{\eta}$ as almost exactly = $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\acute{\eta}$.

(2) The analogy $\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha : \epsilon\iota :: \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha : \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$ makes it likely that $\epsilon\iota$ was originally temporal. The fact that $\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$ is not Homeric takes something from the force of this argument.

(3) The use of alternative forms of wish, and the use of some form of supposition to express wish, are phenomena which can be exemplified from many languages: cp. the Latin *o si*, German *wenn, wenn nur*, &c. And ellipse of the apodosis occurs with $\epsilon\iota$ -clauses of other kinds; see § 324.*

(4) The $\epsilon\iota$ -clause, whether of supposition or of wish, is specifically Greek, whereas the chief meanings of the Optative—wish, concession, supposition—are much older, being common to Greek and Sanscrit. Hence the $\epsilon\iota$ -clause was formed at a time when the Opt. of wish had long been established in use. The presumption surely is that the $\epsilon\iota$ -clause, when it came to be used as a form of wish, was a *new* way of expressing wish. It would probably be adopted at first as a less direct form, suited for wishes couched in a different tone (as $\epsilon\iota\theta\epsilon$ is confined to hopeless wish).

(5) The only use of $\epsilon\iota$ not obviously expressive of supposition is that which is seen in the isolated phrase $\epsilon\iota\ \delta'$ ἄγε, of which Lange has given an exceedingly probable analysis. Possibly however the $\epsilon\iota$ of $\epsilon\iota\ \delta'$ ἄγε is not the same word as $\epsilon\iota$ *if*, but an interjection, like $\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu$ and Latin *eia*. We may go further, and point out that the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ of $\epsilon\iota\ \delta'$ ἄγε has been shown by Lange himself to be out of place, hence the true form may be $\epsilon\iota'$ ἄγε, like Latin *eia age*.

It may be observed, in conclusion, that the question of the $\epsilon\iota$ -clause is quite distinct from the question of the original meaning of the Optative. It is possible to combine Lange's theory of $\epsilon\iota$ with Delbrück's earlier view of the Optative as originally the Mood of wish,† but Lange himself does not do so. He regards the $\epsilon\iota$ -clause of supposition (*Fallsatzung*) as developed independently of the $\epsilon\iota$ -clause of wish. His main thesis is that $\epsilon\iota$ does not

* This is also the conclusion maintained by Mr. Goodwin, who discusses the question very fully in the new edition of his *Moods and Tenses* (pp. 376 ff.).

† This view was proposed in Delbrück's *Syntaktische Forschungen* (vol. i. p. 13), but is withdrawn in his recent work (*Altindische Syntax*, § 172).

imply a correlative particle, or an apodosis (*καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι* or the like), so that the two meanings of *εἰ γένοιτο*—*suppose it happened* and *would that it happened*—belong to originally distinct meanings of the Opt. *γένοιτο*. That is to say, the development of *εἰ* if with various Moods—Opt., Subj., Indic.—was parallel to an entirely distinct development of interjectional *εἰ* with the Opt. of wish.

322.] Homeric and Attic uses. The main difference between Homer and later writers in regard to the Moods may be said to be that the later uses are much more restricted. Thus the Subj. is used by Homer in Principal Clauses of every kind—Affirmative and Negative, as well as Prohibitive, Interrogative, &c. In Attic it is confined to the Prohibitive use with *μή*, and the idiomatic ‘Hortatory’ and ‘Deliberative’ uses.

Again, in Subordinate Clauses the important Homeric distinction between the ‘pure’ Subj. and the Subj. with *ἄν* or *κεν* is almost wholly lost in Attic. In Clauses of Conditional meaning, whether Relational, Temporal, or introduced by *εἰ*, the Subj. with *ἄν* has become the only generally allowable construction: the pure Subj. being confined to a few instances in poetry. With the Optative, on the other hand, an equal uniformity has been attained by the loss of the use with *ἄν* or *κεν*. In short, of the four distinct Homeric constructions—

1. *ὄς ἔλθῃ* (*ὅτε ἔλθῃ, εἰ ἔλθῃ, &c.*)
2. *ὄς ἄν* (or *ὄς κεν*) *ἔλθῃ* (*ὅτ’ ἄν ἔλθῃ, ἐὰν ἔλθῃ, &c.*)
3. *ὄς ἔλθοι* (*ὅτε ἔλθοι, εἰ ἔλθοι, &c.*)
4. *ὄς ἄν* (or *ὄς κεν*) *ἔλθοι* (*ὅτ’ ἄν ἔλθοι, ἐὰν ἔλθοι, &c.*)

the language dropped the first and last: with the result that as *ἄν* always accompanied the Subj. and was absent from the Opt., it ceased to convey a distinct meaning, independent of the meaning given by the Mood. In other words, the use became a mere idiom. The change, though apparently slight, is very significant as an evidence of linguistic progress.

In regard to Final Clauses the most noticeable point is the use of the Relative with a Subjunctive. In this respect Homeric Greek agrees with Latin: while in later Greek the Subj. was replaced, generally speaking, by the Future Indicative. It is also worth observing here that in Homer, as has been said (§ 316), the Final Clause in the great majority of instances expresses the speaker’s own purpose, not a purpose which he attributes to a person spoken of: see §§ 280, 281, 285, 286. In other words, the subordination of the Clause to the governing Verb does not often go so far as to put the Third Person for the First (*e. g.* *φράσεται ὡς κε νέηται* = *he will consider—‘how am I to return’*). The further license by which a past purpose is thought of as if still present—so that the Subj. is used instead of the Opt.—is not Homeric (§ 298).

Modal Uses of the Indicative.

323.] The Indicative is primarily the Mood of *assertion*: from which it is an easy step to the use in Negative and Interrogative sentences. It is also used in Greek (as in other languages) to express mere *supposition*: thus we have *εἰ* in a Conditional Protasis with all Tenses (*εἰ ἦν, εἰ ἔστι, εἰ ἔσται*),

where there need be no implication either for or against the truth of the supposition thus made. Further, the Indicative may be used in certain cases in a Conditional Apodosis, expressing an imaginary *consequence*. Again, it may be used in Final and Object Clauses referring to the past or to the future. All such uses, in which the Indicative does not *assert*, may be called *Modal Uses*.

The tendency of language appears to be to extend the Modal Uses of the Indicative, and consequently to diminish the range of the other Moods. It is found possible, and more convenient, to show the modal character of a Clause by means of Particles, or from the drift of the context, without a distinct Verbal form. It will be seen, on comparing the Homeric and Attic usage, that the Indicative has encroached in several points upon the other Moods.

324.] **Conditional Clauses (Apodosis).** The Secondary Tenses or Tenses of *past time* (Aor. Impf. and Plupf.), are used with *κεν* or *ἄν* to express a supposed consequence: as—

Il. 4. 420 δεινὸν δ' ἔβραχε χαλκὸς ἐπὶ στήθεσσι ἀνακτος
ὀρνημένου· ὑπὸ κεν ταλασίφρονά περ δέος εἶλεν
fear would have seized even the stout-hearted.

This way of speaking of a conditional event ordinarily implies that the condition on which it depended was not fulfilled. For if (*e.g.*) the assertion ἦλθεν *he came* is true, we can hardly ever have occasion to limit it by saying ἦλθεν ἄν *he came in that case*. Hence a Past Tense with *κεν* or *ἄν* naturally came to be used where the event in question had not happened, owing to the non-fulfilment of the condition.

The rule does not apply to events that occur *repeatedly*, or on no particular occasion; for there is no contradiction in saying of such an event that it happened when a condition was fulfilled. Hence the use in the *iterative* sense (as Hdt. 3. 119 κλαίεσκε ἄν καὶ ὀδυρέσκετο, Thuc. 7. 71 εἴ τινες ἴδοιεν . . ἀνεθάρσασάν τε ἄν κτλ.). This use, however, is not Homeric. In Od. 2. 104 ἔνθα κεν ἡματιῇ μὲν ὑφαίνεσκεν has slender authority, most MSS. reading ἔνθα καί. Another supposed instance is—

Od. 18. 263 ἵππων τ' ὠκυπόδων ἐπιβήτορας, οἳ κε τάχιστα
ἔκριναν μέγα νεῖκος κτλ.,

where the commentators (Fäsi, Ameis, Merry) take ἔκριναν as a 'gnomic' Aorist. The words as they stand can only mean 'who would most speedily have decided mighty strife' (so Goodwin, § 244): but this does not suit the context. The difficulty is best met by reading οἳ τε: cp. § 283, b.

An exceptional use of a different kind is—

Od. 4. 546 ἢ γάρ μιν ζῶν γε κινήσει, ἢ κεν Ὀρέστης
κτεῖνεν ὑποφθάμενος.

Here *κεν* marks the alternative (§ 283, n. 2): *either you will find him alive or (in the other case) Orestes has killed him (i.e. must have killed him)*. Thrown into

a Conditional form the sentence would be: 'if you do not find him alive, then Orestes has killed him.' So with an Infinitive—

II. 22. 108 ἔμοι δὲ τότ' ἂν πολλὸν κέρδιον εἶη
 ἄντην ἢ Ἀχιλλῆα κατακτείναντα νέεσθαι
 ἢ ἐκεν αὐτῷ ἄλέσθαι ἐυκλειῶς πρὸς πόληος.

In the Protasis *κεν* with the Indicative occurs only once, viz. II. 23. 526 εἰ δὲ κ' ἔτι προτέρω γένετο δρόμος (see Leaf's note *a. l.*). This may be compared with the occasional use of *κεν* with εἰ and an Opt. (§ 313). The rarity of the use with an Indic. need not be felt as a difficulty: cp. the oracle in Hdt. 1. 174 Ζεὺς γάρ κ' ἔθηκε νῆσον εἰ κ' ἐβούλετο, also Erinna, fr. 4, 4, and Ar. Lys. 1098 (Hartung, ii. p. 240).

In later Greek the Imperfect with ἄν may express either a continuous action which *would have occurred* at some past time, or an action (continuous or momentary) which *would have been occurring* at the moment of speaking. The latter of these uses, as Mr. Goodwin points out (§ 435), is not Homeric. He sees an approach to it in II. 24. 220 εἰ μὲν γάρ τις μ' ἄλλος ἐκέλευεν *were it any one else who bade me*. Another may be found in Od. 20. 307 καὶ κέ τοι ἀντὶ γάμοιο πατῆρ τάφον ἀμφεπονείτο ἐνθάδε (*if you had struck the stranger*) *your father would have had to busy himself here with your burial in place of wedding*: cp. also Od. 4. 178 καὶ κε θάμ' ἐνθάδ' ἕοντες ἐμισγόμεθ', οὐδέ κεν ἡμέας ἄλλο διέκριεν.

The Impf. without ἄν or *κεν* may express what *ought to have been*, if the meaning of *fitness, obligation, &c.* is given by the Verb or Predicate. Thus we have Od. 20. 331 κέρδιον ἦεν *it would have been better*. So in Attic with ἐχρήν, εἶδει, and similar words.

The Opt. with ἄν or *κεν*, as we have seen (§ 300, *c*), is not unfrequently used in Homer with the same meaning as the Aor. or Impf. with ἄν has in later Greek. This is one of the points in which the use of the Indicative gained on that of the Optative.

324.*] Ellipse of the Apodosis. We may notice here the cases in which εἰ with an Indic. or Subj. is not followed by a corresponding Clause expressing the *consequence* of the supposition made. This occurs—

(*a*) When two *alternative* suppositions are made, the second being the one upon which the speaker wishes to dwell: as II. 1. 135 εἰ μὲν δώσουσι γέρας . . εἰ δὲ κε μὴ δώσωσι, ἐγὼ δὲ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι *if they give* (there is nothing to be said), *but if not, &c.*

(*b*) When the consequence is sufficiently *implied* in the εἰ-*Clause*: as II. 6. 150 εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι *if you wish to be told this* (I will do so): II. 7. 375 αἶ κ' ἐθέλωσι παύσασθαι

if they wish to cease (let them): Od. 21. 260 ἀτὰρ πελέκεάς γε καὶ εἴ κ' εἰῶμεν ἅπαντας ἐστάμεν: Il. 19. 147., 20. 213., 21. 487, Od. 4. 388., 15. 80.

(c) When the speaker prefers to *suggest* the consequence in an indirect way: as Il. 1. 580 εἴ περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλησιν Ὀλύμπιος ἀστεροπητῆς ἐξ ἐδέων στυφελίξαι, ὁ γὰρ πολὺν φέρτατός ἐστιν *if he wishes* (he will), *for he is strong enough*; [Il. 14. 331], 21. 567, Od. 3. 324.

There is a similar omission of the apodosis in Causal Clauses with ἐπεὶ at the beginning of a speech, as Il. 3. 59 Ἔκτορ, ἐπεὶ με κατ' αἴσαν ἐνείκεσας: Il. 6. 382 Ἔκτορ, ἐπεὶ μάλ' ἄνωγας κτλ.; Il. 13. 68, 775, Od. 1. 231., 3. 103, 211. The full form appears in Il. 6. 333 ἐπεὶ με κατ' αἴσαν ἐνείκεσας . . τοῦνεκά τοι ἐρέω.

In such sentences as εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις . . δαήμεναι some commentators obtain an apodosis by taking the Inf. as equivalent to an Imperative: 'if you wish, then learn &c.' But this is exceedingly forced, and indeed impossible in some places. *e. g.* Il. 7. 375, Od. 21. 260. Elsewhere the apodosis is *forgotten* (anacoluthon); so after εἰ in Il. 22. 111, after ἐπεὶ in Il. 18. 101, Od. 4. 204., 6. 187, 262., 8. 236., 17. 185.

325.] Past Tense by 'Assimilation.' When a Past Tense relating to an event which has not happened is followed by a Subordinate Clause, the Verb of the Subordinate Clause may also be in a Past Tense (the event which it expresses being equally imaginary): as—

Il. 6. 345 ὧς μ' ὄφελ' ἤματι τῷ ὅτε . .
οἴχεσθαι προφέρουσα κακῇ ἀνέμοιο θύελλα,
ἔνθα με κύμ' ἀπέερσε κτλ.

and so v. 350 ἀνδρὸς ἐπειτ' ὄφελλον . . ὅς ἤδη κτλ., and Od. 1. 218: also the use with πρὶν, Od. 4. 178 οὐδέ κεν ἡμέας ἄλλο διέκρινεν . . πρὶν γ' ὅτε δὴ θανάτοιο μέλαν νέφος ἀμφεκάλυψεν *nothing would have parted us before the dark cloud of death had wrapped us round.*

This idiom is the same in principle as the use of Past Tenses in Final Clauses, which is common in Attic with ἵνα and ὧς: as Soph. O. T. 1393 τί μ' οὐ λαβῶν ἔκτεινας εὐθύς, ὧς ἔδειξα μή ποτε κτλ. *that so I might never have shown &c.* When the context has once shown that we are dealing with a purely imaginary event, the Indicative serves to carry on the train of suppositions. The Indic. is similarly used in an Object Clause after a Verb of *fearing*, as δαίδω μὴ δὴ πάντα θεὰ νημερτέα εἶπεν.

326.] Future Indicative. The following points have to be noticed:—

1. Homer not unfrequently uses κεν with the Future, the effect being (as with the Subj.) to indicate a limitation or condition: as—

Il. 1. 139 ὁ δέ κεν κεχολώσεται *and he (if I do so) will be angry.*

Π. 1. 522 ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν ἀδῖτις ἀπόστιχε μή τι νοήσῃ
 Ἕρῃ· ἐμοὶ δὲ κε ταῦτα μελήσεται (*to me, as my part*).

4. 76 καὶ κέ τις ᾧδ' ἐρέει *in such case men will say*.

This use of *κεν* is chiefly found after *δέ*, as Π. 1. 139., 6. 260., 8. 419., 14. 267, &c.: and in Relative Clauses, as Π. 12. 226., 17. 241., 22. 70, Od. 5. 36., 8. 318., 16. 438: perhaps with *ὅτε*, Π. 20. 335 *ὅτε κεν συμβλήσεται* unless we read *συμβλήεαι* as 2 Aor. Subj. (Dindorf, *Thes. Ling. Gr. s. v. βάλλω*). Cp. the use of *κεν* with the Subj., § 275, *b*.

The Future with *ἄν* is very rare: see Π. 9. 167., 22. 66.

2. The use of the Future with the force of a *gentle Imperative* has been ascribed to Homer, but without sufficient ground. Where it appears to take the place of an Imperative it will be found in reality to express the *indifference* of the speaker; as—

Π. 6. 70 ἀλλ' ἄνδρας κτείνωμεν· ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τὰ ἔκηλοι
 νεκροὺς ἄμ πεδίον συλήσετε τεθηῶτας
then you can (if you like) strip the dead of their arms.

20. 137 ἡμεῖς μὲν καθεζώμεσθα . . πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσι
 μελήσει (*we will leave war to men*).

The forms *οἴσεται* and *ἄξετε*, which are sometimes given as instances of this use, do not belong to the Future, but are Imperatives of an Aorist (§ 41).

3. The Future is occasionally found in Final Clauses with nearly the force of the Subj.: viz. with the Conjunctions *ὅπως* in Od. 1. 57 *θέλγει ὅπως Ἰθάκης ἐπιλήσεται charms so that he may forget Ithaca*, also in Π. 1. 344 (if with Thiersch we read *ὅπως μαχέονται Ἀχαιοί* for the anomalous *μαχέονται*), and with *ὄφρα*, as—

Π. 8. 110 Τρωσὶν ἐφ' ἵπποδάμοις ἰθύνομεν, ὄφρα καὶ Ἔκτωρ
 εἴσεται κτλ. (so Π. 16. 242, Od. 4. 163., 17. 6).

So with *μή*, Π. 20. 301 *μή πως καὶ Κρονίδης κεχολώσεται*, Od. 24. 544.

The Future with *κεν* in Relative Clauses sometimes appears to express *end*, as in Π. 1. 174 *πάρ' ἐμοιγε καὶ ἄλλοι οἳ κέ με τιμήσουσι*: cp. 2. 229., 23. 675, Od. 8. 318., 16. 438. So without *κεν* in Π. 24. 154, Od. 14. 333. In all these places, however, as in the corresponding uses of the Subj. (§ 282), and Opt. (§ 304), it is difficult to say how far the notion of *end* is distinctly expressed: in other words, how far the future action is subordinated to that of the main Verb.

4. The use of the Future in *Object Clauses* (common in Attic after Verbs of *striving*, &c.) may perhaps be seen in Π. 12. 59 *μενοῖνεον εἰ τελέουσι*, also Od. 5. 24., 13. 376.

It is sometimes impossible to decide whether a form is a Future or an Aorist Subj.: e. g. in Od. 1. 269 *σὲ δὲ φράζεσθαι ἀναγα ὅπως κε μνηστήρας*

ἀπώσσει, where the Verb may be a Future, as in the places now quoted, or a Subj., according to the commoner Homeric construction. So in Il. 10. 44, 282., 17. 144.

The use of the Future in Final Clauses is probably later than that of the Subjunctive. In general, as we have seen, the Subj. is akin to the Imperative, and therefore expresses the speaker's *purpose* directly, by its own force; whereas the Fut. Ind. properly expresses *sequence*. Thus θέλγει ὡς λάθηται literally means 'charms so that he shall forget': θέλγει ὅπως λήσεται 'charms so that he will forget.' The same conclusion seems to follow from the rule that ὅπως and ὄφρα may be used with a Future, but not ὡς or ἵνα (Goodwin, § 324). For ὡς in the manner that fits a direct purpose better than ὅπως in some such manner that, or ὄφρα till the time that. It would seem probable, then, that in Final Clauses the Future is a less emphatic and positive expression of end. Thus when Achilles prays (Il. 16. 242), 'embolden him so that Hector will know,' the Future conveys a shade of indifference, as though Hector's knowledge were the natural consequence rather than the direct object. And so in Il. 1. 175 οἱ κέ με τιμήσουσι who will (*I presume*) honour me.

5. In Clauses with εἰ the Future is chiefly used of events regarded as necessary, or as determined by some power independent of the speaker: as—

Il. 14. 61 ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζώμεθ' ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα,
εἴ τι νόος ῥέξει (if wil is to be of any avail).

17. 418 εἰ τοῦτον Τρώεσσι μεθήσομεν (if we are going to do).

So Il. 1. 61, 294., 5. 350., 12. 248, 249., 13. 375., 15. 162., 24. 57, Od. 2. 115.

We may compare the Conditional Relative Clause—

Il. 23. 753 ὄρνυσθ' οἱ καὶ τούτου ἀέθλου πειρήσεσθε
rise, ye that will make trial of this contest.

And with κεν—

Il. 15. 213 αἶ κεν ἄνευ ἐμέθεν . . πεφιδήσεται κτλ.

So Il. 2. 258., 5. 212., 17. 588, Od. 15. 524.

The Imperative.

327.] The Homeric uses of the Imperative present little or no difficulty. We may notice the use in *concession*, ironical or real:—

Il. 4. 29 ἔρδ', ἀτὰρ οὗ τοι πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι.

The forms ἄγε and ἄγετε are often combined with other Imperatives for the sake of emphasis: and sometimes ἄγε is treated as indeclinable, and used where the context requires a Plural; as—

Il. 2. 331 ἀλλ' ἄγε μίμνετε πάντες κτλ. (so 1. 62., 6. 376, &c.).

Similarly ἴθι is a kind of Interjection in Il. 4. 362 ἀλλ' ἴθι, ταῦτα δ' ὀπισθεν ἀρεσσόμεθ' κτλ.: and so we have βάσκ' ἴθι (like εἶπ' ἄγε). And δεῦτε *hither!* is evidently an Imperative: cp. Il. 14. 128 δεῦτ' ἴομεν πόλεμόνδε. The corresponding 2 Sing. doubtless enters into the formation of δεῦρο; but it is not clear how that word is to be analysed.

328.] **Prohibition.** The Aorist Imperative is very rarely used with μή: examples are—

Il. 4. 410 τῶ μή μοι πατέρας ποθ' ὁμοίῃ ἔνθεο τιμῇ T 403.
(so Od. 24. 248 σὺ δὲ μή χόλον ἔνθεο θυμῶ).

18. 134 σὺ μὲν μή πω καταδύσειο μῶλον Ἄρηος.

Od. 16. 301 μή τις ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀκουσάτω.

Il. 16. 200 μή λελαθέσθω.

For the rule which is the complement of this one, forbidding the use of the Present Subj. with μή, see § 278 *fin.*

Regarding the origin of this curious idiom a very probable conjecture has been made by Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 120). In the Veda it has been shown by Grassmann that the prohibitive Particle mā is never found with the forms of the Imperative proper, but only with the so-called 'spurious Conjunctive' or 'Injunctive.' Hence it may be inferred that the Imperative was only used originally in positive commands, not in prohibitions. Again, it appears that in Sanscrit the Imperative is nearly confined to the Present Tense: and in Greek the forms of the First Aor. Imper. (κλέψον, Mid. κλέψαι) are certainly of late origin. The fine distinction which is made, in the Imperative as well as in other Moods, between the continuous action expressed by the Present Stem and the momentary action expressed by the Aorist belongs to the specific development of Greek. Accordingly Delbrück suggests that the extension of the Imperative to express prohibition took place at a time when the Aorist Imperative had not come into general use: and hence it was only carried into the Present Tense. In other words, the form μή κλέπτε came into use in pre-historic Greek as an extension of the positive κλέπτε, and superseded μή κλέπτῃς: but μή κλέψῃς kept its ground, because the form κλέψον did not then exist. This account of the idiom seems much more probable than any attempt to explain it on psychological grounds.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PARTICLES.

329.] Under the term *Particles* it is convenient to group together a number of words that are mainly used to show the relations between other words, and between Clauses. In respect of this office they are akin to the various syllables or letters used as Endings: and with them go to constitute what are called the 'formal elements' of the language, in contradistinction to the roots or stems which compose its 'matter.'

The Particles which connect successive Clauses in any way form the *Conjunctions*. As such they may be distinguished, according to the nature of the connexion which they indicate,

as *Copulative* (καί, τε, ἠδέ, &c.), *Adversative* (δέ, ἀλλά, αὐτάρ), *Disjunctive* (ἢ—ἢ), *Conditional* (εἰ, ἄν, κεν), *Illative* (ἄρα, δή, οὖν), *Causal* (γάρ), &c.

Those Particles, again, which affect single Clauses may either serve to show the character of the whole Clause (as Affirmative, Interrogative, Conditional, &c.), or to influence particular words in it. We cannot, however, make a satisfactory classification of the Particles on the basis of these uses, because some of them are employed in several distinct ways: and moreover they enter into various combinations in which they often acquire new meanings. It will be best therefore to take them separately, beginning with the most familiar.

καί.

330.] The uses of καί are in the main the same in all periods of Greek. It is (1) a Copulative Conjunction, conveying the idea of *addition* to what has preceded: Ζηνὶ φόως ἐρέουσα καὶ ἄλλοις *to Zeus and the others besides*: ὧς ἄρ' ἔφη καὶ κτλ. *thus he spoke and thereupon &c.*: and (2) a strengthening or emphasising Participle meaning *also, even, just*: as—

II. 1. 63 ἢ καὶ ὄνειροπόλον *or even a dream-prophet.*

3. 176 τὸ καὶ κλαίουσα τέττακα *which is the very reason that I am wasted with weeping.*

It is especially used with words that imply *comparison*, increase or diminution, extension of time or the reverse, &c.; as καὶ ἄλλος *another* (not this only), καὶ αὐτός *himself* (as well as others): καὶ πάλαι *long ago* (not merely now), καὶ αὖθις *another time* (if not now), καὶ μάλα, καὶ λίην (in a *high* degree, not merely in an *ordinary* degree): so with Comparatives, καὶ μείζον, καὶ ῥίγιον, &c. Both terms of a comparison may be strengthened in this way; as—

II. 1. 81 εἴ περ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψη,
ἀλλά τε καὶ μετόπισθεν κτλ.

Notice, too, the use at the beginning of an Apodosis, esp. with Adverbs of *time*, as—

II. 1. 477 ἦμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος ἠώς,
καὶ τότε ἔπειτ' κτλ. *Od. 5.371, 376*

καί precedes the word which it emphasises, but is sometimes separated from it by other Particles, enclitic Pronouns, &c.: as II. 1. 213 καὶ ποτέ τοι τρεῖς τόσσα (not merely compensation but) *three times as much*: 2. 292 καὶ γάρ τις θ' ἔνα μῆνα μένων *a man who stays even one month*. So 7. 281 καὶ ἴδμεν ἅπαντες (= ἴσμεν καὶ πάντες).

καὶ εἰ and εἰ καί. The combination καὶ εἰ indicates that the

whole condition is an extreme one: *even on the supposition that—*. But with the order εἰ καὶ the καὶ emphasises particular words: εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερός ἐστι *even if he is* (I will go so far as to say) *very strong*. Hence εἰ καὶ usually implies that the supposition is more or less true.

ΤΕ.

331.] The enclitic τε has two main uses which it is essential to distinguish; besides one or two special uses of less importance.

(a) As a Conjunction τε connects clauses and single words. It is especially used when a new fact or new object is to take its place *pari passu* with what has been already said: κύνεσσι οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι *to dogs and birds as well: αἱ πᾶσι κακὸν Τρώεσσι γέγοντο οἱ τ' αὐτῷ which were a bane to all the Trojans, and to himself* (equally). This meaning is given still more distinctly by the Correlative τε—τε: thus we have the pairs ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, δῆμός τε πόλις τε, κλαγγῇ τ' ἐνοπῇ τε, &c. and the pairs of Clauses expressing *simultaneous* action, such as—

ἄψ τ' ἀνεχώρησεν, ὦχρός τέ μιν εἶλε παρειάς.

Hence τε—τε sometimes marks that two things are *mutually dependent*: ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε = 'not less dear because small,' λυσόμενός τε θύγατρα φέρων τ' ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα = 'bringing vast ransom for the deliverance of his daughter': Il. 5. 359 κόμισαί τέ με δός τέ μοι ἵππους.

The combinations τε—καὶ and τε—ἤδέ (or ἰδέ) are also common in Homer, and not sensibly different in meaning from τε—τε: as—

ῥμωξέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ὦ πεπλήγετο μηρό.
χλαῖνάν τ' ἠδὲ χιτῶνα.

As to the *place* of τε the general rule is that it follows the first word in the Clause. Hence when standing first in the pair τε—τε it does not always follow the word which it couples: *e. g.* Il. 6. 317 ἐγγύθι τε Πριάμοιο καὶ Ἔκτορος *near both Priam and Hector*; Il. 5. 878 σοὶ τ' ἐπιπέιθονται καὶ δεδμήμεσθα ἕκαστος (*cp.* 2. 136, 198., 4. 505., 7. 294-5).

The use of τε as a Particle of *transition* (to begin a fresh sentence after a pause) is not Homeric, though common in later Greek. This may indicate that the use as a connecting Particle was originally confined to the Correlative τε—τε (Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 145).

332.] (b) In its other use—which is distinctively Homeric—*ἤκη. α* τε serves to mark an assertion as general or indefinite. Hence it is found in *gnomic* passages: as—

Il. 1. 218 ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπέιθηται, μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ.

9. 509 τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὤνησαν καὶ τ' ἔκλυον εὐξαμένοιο.

Od. 6. 185 μάλιστα δέ τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοί.

Π. 16. 688 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τε Διὸς κρείσσων νόος ἢ ἐπερ ἀνδρῶν.

19. 221 αἰψά τε φυλόπιδος πέλεται κόρος (cp. Od. 1. 392).

Hes.Th. 87 αἰψά τε καὶ μέγα νεῖκος ἐπισταμένως κατέπανσε.

So in many short maxims, such as *ῥεχθεν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω—στρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοί*. In *similes* it is very common, and is often repeated in the successive Clauses; *e.g.*—

Π. 4. 482 ὁ δ' ἐν κοίῃσι χαμαὶ πέσειν, αἴγειρος ὧς,
ἢ ῥά τ' ἐν εἰαμενῇ ἔλεος μεγάλοιο πεφύκη
λείη, ἀτάρ τέ οἱ ὄζοι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῃ πεφύασι·
τὴν μὲν θ' ἄρματοπηγὸς ἀνὴρ αἰθωνι σιδήρῳ
ἐξέταμ', ὄφρα κτλ.

16. 156

οἱ δὲ λύκοι ὧς
ὠμοφάγοι, τοῖσιν τε περὶ φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή,
οἷ τ' ἔλαφον κεραὸν μέγαν οὖρεσι δηῶσαντες
δάπτουσιν· πᾶσιν δὲ παρήιον αἵματι φοινόν·
καὶ τ' ἀγελῆδον ἴασιν ἀπὸ κρήνης μελανύδρου
λάψοντες γλώσσησιν ἀραιῆσιν μέλαν ὕδωρ
ἄκρον, ἐρευγόμενοι φόνον αἵματος· ἐν δέ τε θυμὸς
στήθεσιν ἄτρομός ἐστι, περιστένεται δέ τε γαστήρ.

So where the meaning is frequentative:—

Od. 4. 102 ἄλλοτε μὲν τε γόφῳ φρένα τέρπομαι (cp. 5. 55., 12. 64).

Π. 19. 86 καὶ τέ με νεικεῖσκον (20. 28, Od. 5. 331, &c.).

So Π. 1. 521 νεικεῖ καὶ τέ μέ φησι κτλ. *and says* (habitually) *that I &c.*: cp. 9. 410., 17. 174, Od. 1. 215., 4. 387., 10. 330., 17. 25. Hence it is used of *names*, as Π. 1. 403 ἀνδρες δέ τε πάντες (καλέουσι), 2. 814., 5. 306, &c.; of characteristic attributes, as—

Π. 2. 453 οὐδ' ὄ γε Πηνεῖῳ συμμίσγεται . .
ἀλλά τέ μιν καθύπερθεν ἐπιρρέει ἡντ' ἔλαιον.

5. 340 ἰχώρ, οἶός πέρ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσι.

And generally of any fixed condition of things, as Π. 4. 247 ἐνθα τε νῆες εἰρύατ' εὐπρυμνοί: 5. 477 οἷ πέρ τ' ἐπικούροι ἐνεμειν: 15. 187 τρεῖς γάρ τ' ἐκ Κρόνου εἰμὲν ἀδελφοί (a fact of permanent significance): 22. 116 ἢ τ' ἐπλετο νεϊκεὸς ἀρχή. It may be laid down as a general rule that τε in the combinations μὲν τε, δέ τε, καὶ τε, γάρ τε, ἀλλά τε, and the like, is not a Conjunction, and does not affect the meaning of the Conjunction which it follows.

In a Conditional sentence of gnomic character the τε is often used in both members, as—

Π. 1. 81 εἴ περ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτήμαρ κατεπέψη,
ἀλλά τε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον.

The use with the Article and the different forms of the Relative has been already discussed in the chapter on the Pronouns (see §§ 263, 266). It was there pointed out that τε is used when the Clause serves to describe a *class*, as—

ἀγρια πάντα, τὰ τε τρέφει οὔρεσιν ὕλη.
 ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίγνωτος γόνος ἀνέρος ᾧ τε Κρονίων κτλ.

or to express a permanent characteristic, as—

γῆρας καὶ θάνατος, τὰ τ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλονται.
 χόλος, ὅς τ' ἐφέηκε πολύφρονά περ χαλεπήναι.
 Λωτοφάγων, οἷ τ' ἀνθινον εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν.

So ὡς τε, ὅτε τε, ἵνα τε, ἔνθα τε, ὅσος τε, οἴός τε, ὡς εἶ τε, &c. Of these ὡς τε (or ὥστε) and οἴός τε, with the adverbial ἄτε and ἐφ' ᾧ τε, are the only forms in which this use of τε has remained in Attic Greek. ἐπεὶ τε, which is regular in Herodotus, is rare in Homer: see II. 11. 87, 562., 12. 393.

Further, the Indefinite τις is not unfrequently strengthened in its meaning (*any one*) by τε (cp. Latin *quisque*):—

II. 3. 12 τόσον τις τ' ἐπιλεύσσει ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ λᾶαν ἦσιν.

14. 90 σίγα, μή τις τ' ἄλλος . . ἀκούσῃ (so Od. 19. 486).

So καὶ γάρ τις τε, καὶ μὲν τις τε, and in Relative Clauses, ὅς τις τε, ὅτε τις τε, ὡς τις τε, &c.: also ἦν τις τε (Od. 5. 120).

Notice also the use with the disjunctive ἢ after a Comparative, in Od. 16. 216 ἀδιώτερον ἢ τ' οἰωνοί. This is akin to the use in similes. So in II. 4. 277 μελάντερον ἢ τε πίσσα *blacker than pitch*. The true reading is probably ἢ τε, as was suggested by Bekker (*H. B.* i. p. 312): see however Buttmann, *Lexil.*, s. v. ἢ τε. On ἢ τε—ἢ τε *either—or* see § 340.

The two uses of τε may sometimes be distinguished by its place in the sentence. Thus τε is a Conjunction in II. 2. 522 οἷ τ' ἄρα *and who*—(cp. εἶ τ' ἄρα, οὔτ' ἄρα), and in II. 23. 277 ἀθάνατοί τε γάρ εἰσι κτλ.; also in the combinations οὔτε τις, μήτε τις. With the indefinite τε we should have the order ἄρα τε, γάρ τε, τίς τε. Both uses may even occur in the same clause; as II. 5. 89 τὸν δ' οὔτ' ἄρ τε γέφυραι ἐεργμέναι ἰσχανόωσω.*

The places in which τε appears to be used in statements of single or definite facts can generally be corrected without difficulty. In several places δέ τ' (οὐδέ τ', μηδέ τ') has crept into the text instead of δ' ἔτ'. Thus we find—

II. 1. 406 τὸν καὶ ὑπέδισαν μάκαρες θεοὶ οὐδέ τ' ἔδησαν
 (Read οὐδ' ἔτ',—*they no longer bound, gave up binding*).

2. 179 ἀλλ' ἔθι νῦν κατὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν μηδέ τ' ἐρώει.
 (Read μηδ' ἔτ' with four of La Roche's MSS.).

II. 437 οὐδέ τ' ἔασε
 (Read οὐδ' ἔτ' with the *Lipsiensis*, and so in II. 21. 596).

* The account now given of the uses of τε was suggested (in substance) by Dr. Wentzel, whose dissertation (*Ueber den Gebrauch der Partikel τέ bei Homer*, Glogau, 1847) appears to have been overlooked by subsequent writers.

Il. 23. 474 αἰ δέ τ' ἄρευθαι

(Read αἰ δ' ἔτ' with the *Towleianus*).

Similarly we should read οὐδ' ἔτ' in Il. 15. 709., 17. 42., 21. 248., 22. 300., 23. 622, 730., 24. 52, Od. 12. 198. In such a matter manuscript authority is evidently of no weight, and it will be found that the MSS. often have δέ τ' where the editors have already corrected δ' ἔτ' (e.g. in Il. 1. 573., 2. 344., 12. 106, Od. 2. 115., 11. 380., 21. 186., 24. 401). In Il. 11. 767 the editions have νῶϊ δέ τ' ἔνδον, but all MSS. νῶϊ δὲ ἔνδον: so perhaps we may correct Il. 21. 456 νῶϊ δέ τ' ἄψορροι κίομεν. Perhaps ἔτι should be restored in Il. 16. 836 σὲ δέ τ' ἐνθάδε γῦπες ἔδονται, Od. 15. 428 πέρασαν δέ τε δεῦρ' ἀγαγόντες. *cod. u.*

Two isolated Epic uses remain to be noticed:—

(1) After an Interrogative in the combination τ' ἄρα, τ' ἄρ: as—

Il. 1. 8 τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;

18. 188 πῶς τ' ἄρ' ἴω μετὰ μῶλον; (so πῆ τ' ἄρ Il. 13. 307).

Od. 1. 346 μῆτερ ἐμή, τί τ' ἄρα φθονέεις κτλ.

The ancient grammarians regarded ταρ as a single enclitic Particle (so Herodian, Schol. Il. 1. 65). As the force of the τε seems to have merged in the compound, this is probably right: just as γ' ἄρ having become a single Particle is written γάρ. But if so, we must also recognise the form ταρα.

(2) With ἦ in strong Affirmation: as ἦ τ' ἐφάμην *I did indeed think*. This may originally belong to the same head as the indefinite use: ἦ τε = *surely anyhow*. But a distinct force of the τε is no longer perceptible.

The Latin *que*, which is originally identical with τε, shows the same separation into two main uses. In the use as a Conjunction the agreement between τε and *que* is close. It is less so in the other use, chiefly because τε in Homer is still a distinct word, whereas *que* in Latin is confined to certain combinations, viz. *at-que*, *nam-que* (cp. καὶ τε, ἀλλά τε, γάρ τε, &c.), *ita-que*, the Indefinite *quisque* (with the corresponding forms *ubique*, *quandoque*, *uterque*, &c.), and the Relative *quicumque*. The two uses are also united in the Sanscrit *ca*, which as a connecting Particle agrees closely with τε, and is also found after the Indefinite *kas*, especially in the combination *yāh kāś ca* (ὅς τις τε). See Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 144, A. S. § 284.

δέ.

333.] The chief use of the Adversative Particle δέ is to show that a Clause stands in some *contrast* to what has preceded. Ordinarily, however, it merely indicates the continuation of a narrative (*i. e.* shows that the new fact is not *simultaneous*). It is especially used to introduce a parenthesis or subordinate statement (whereas τε introduces something parallel or coordinate: e.g.—

νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὦρσε κακὴν, δλέκοντο δὲ λαοί,
οὔνεκα κτλ.

Here a prose writer would say *ὀλεθρίαν*, or *ὥστε ἀπόλλυσθαι τὸν λαόν*, or *ὑφ' ἧς ὁ λαὸς ἀπόλλυτο*, &c. So—

Ἀντίλοχος δὲ Μύδωνα βάλ', ἠνίοχον θεράποντα,
ἔσθλὸν Ἀτυμνιάδην, ὃ δ' ὑπέστρεφε μώνυχας ἵππους,
χερμαδίῳ ἀγκῶνα τυχῶν μέσον.

I. e. 'struck him as he was turning the horses.'

δέ is nearly always the *second* word in the Clause. It is occasionally put after (1) a Preposition and Case-form, as *ἐπ' αὐτῶν δ' ὠμοθέτησαν*, or (2) an Article and Numeral, as *τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' κτλ.*: but not after other combinations. Hence *καὶ δέ*, as *Il. 7. 113 καὶ δ' Ἀχιλεὺς* and even *Achilles* (never *καὶ Ἀχιλεὺς δέ*, as in later Greek).

334.] *δέ* of the Apodosis. While *δέ* generally stands at the beginning of a new independent Sentence, there are certain uses, especially in Homer, in which it marks the beginning of the principal Clause after a Relational, Temporal or Conditional Protasis. This is found where there is an *opposition* of some kind between the two members of the Sentence: *e. g.*—

Il. 4. 261 εἶ περ γάρ τ' ἄλλοι γε κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ
δαιτρὸν πίνωσι, σὸν δὲ πλεῖον δέπας κτλ. (so *Il. 2. 245*).

5. 260 αἶ κέν μοι πολύβουλος Ἀθήνη κῦδος ὀρέξῃ
ἀμφοτέρω κτεῖναι, σὺ δὲ . . ἐρυκακέειν κτλ.

Od. 7. 108 ὅσσον Φαίηκες περὶ πάντων ἴδριες ἀνδρῶν
νῆα θοῆν ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἐλαυνέμεν, ὡς δὲ γυναικες
ἴστων τεχνήσσαι (cp. *Od. 14. 178, 405., 18. 62*).

With *οὐ* and *μή*, giving *οὐδέ, μηδέ*, as—

Il. 5. 788 ὄφρα μὲν ἐς πόλεμον πωλέσκετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,
οὐδέ ποτε Τρῶες κτλ.

6. 58 μηδ' ὄν τινα γαστέρι μήτηρ
κοῦρον ἐόντα φέροι, μηδ' ὄς φύγοι.

Od. 1. 16 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἔτος ἦλθε . . οὐδ' ἔνθα κτλ.

10. 17 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ ἐγὼ ὀδὸν ἤτεον . . οὐδέ τι κείνος κτλ.

This use, which was called by the ancient grammarians the *δέ ἀποδοτικόν*, or '*δέ* of the apodosis,' has been variously explained by scholars.

1. In many places the Clause introduced by this *δέ* stands in a double opposition, first to the immediate protasis, and then to a preceding sentence. Thus in—

Il. 2. 716 οἱ δ' ἄρα Μηθώνην . . ἐνέμοντο,
τῶν δὲ Φιλοκτῆτης ἦρχεν κτλ.

Philoctetes is opposed as commander to the people of Methone, and the whole statement is opposed to the previously mentioned peoples with their commanders. So in a period composed of two pairs of correlated Clauses, as—

- II. 1. 135 ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν δώσουσι γέρας . .
 εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώωσιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι.
 9. 508 ὃς μὲν τ' αἰδέσεται κόρας Διὸς ἄσσον ἰούσας,
 τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὤνησαν καὶ τ' ἔκλονον εὐχομένοιο·
 ὃς δέ κ' ἀνήνηται καὶ τε στερεῶς ἀποείπη,
 λίσσονται δ' ἄρα ταί γε Δία κτλ.

Here the δέ of the last Clause appears to carry on the opposition of the second pair to the first, and so to repeat the δέ of its own protasis. This use of δέ in apodosis to repeat or carry on the opposition of the whole sentence is regular in Attic; *e. g.* Xen. Anab. 5. 6, 20 εἰ δὲ βούλεσθε . . πλοῖα δ' ὑμῖν πάρεστι: Isocr. 4. 98 ἃ δ' ἐστὶν ἴδια . . ταῦτα δ' ἐμὸν ἔργον ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν (Kühner, § 533, 2). It has been regarded as the key to the Homeric usage now in question: * but this would compel us in many cases to give different explanations of uses to which the same explanation is evidently applicable. For instance, in the four lines last quoted, if we account for the δέ of λίσσονται δ' ἄρα κτλ. as a repetition of the δέ of its protasis ὃς δέ κ' κτλ., how do we treat the δέ of the first apodosis (τὸν δὲ κτλ.)? The two forms are essentially similar.

2. The δέ of the Apodosis is commonly regarded as a survival from a period in which the Relative Clause or Conditional Protasis was not yet subordinate, so that the Apodosis, if it followed the other, still needed or at least admitted of a connecting Particle. Such an explanation is attractive because it presents us with a case of the general law according to which the complex sentence or period is formed by the welding together of originally distinct simple sentences. † It is to be observed, however, that the phenomenon in question is not necessarily more than a particular use of δέ. The survival may be, not of a paratactic form of sentence, but only of a use of δέ where it is not a Conjunction. Such a use has been already seen in the Particle καί. In the correlation ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ—καὶ τότε δὴ we need find nothing

* So in the first edition of this book, following the discussion of Nägelsbach in his *Anmerkungen zur Ilias* (p. 261 and p. 271, ed. 1834). The Excursus on the subject was omitted in later editions. For the view adopted in the text the author is indebted almost wholly to Dr. R. Nieberding, *Ueber die paratactische Anknüpfung des Nachsatzes in hypotaktischen Satzgefügen, insbesondere bei Homer*, Gross Glogau, 1882.

† On the danger of explaining the Syntax of complex sentences by recourse to a supposed survival of paratactic structure there is a timely warning given by Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* § 203.

more than the ordinary use of *καί* with the meaning *also, even*; that is to say, it emphasises the *sequence* of the apodosis, just as it often emphasises single words or phrases. Similarly *δέ* may have been used to mark the *adversative* character of an apodosis.

3. These points may be illustrated by the parallel between *καί also, even* and *οὐδέ* or *μηδέ* = *not even, also not*. In this use *δέ* is clearly not a Conjunction, but merely serves to mark the natural opposition between the negative and some preceding affirmation (expressed or implied). Thus it is closely akin to the use in apodosis, the difference being only that it belongs to a single word rather than a Clause.

4. It is a confirmation of this view that among the cases of *δέ* in the apodosis we never find one in which the protasis is introduced by the corresponding *μέν*.* Where this is apparently the case it will be found that the *μέν* refers forward, not to the *δέ* of the immediate apodosis, but to a new sentence with *δέ* or some equivalent Particle: *e.g.*—

Il. 2. 188 ὃν τινα μὲν βασιλῆα καὶ ἕξοχον ἄνδρα κιχείη,
τὸν δ' ἀγαυοῖς ἐπέεσσιν κτλ.
ὃν δ' αὖ δῆμον τ' ἄνδρα ἴδοι κτλ.

where the correspondence is not *ὃν μὲν—τὸν δέ*—, but *ὃν μὲν—ὃν δ' αὖ*—. See also Il. 9. 508, 550., 12. 10., 18. 257., [20. 41,] Od. 9. 56., 11. 147., 19. 329.

It has been observed that when the Protasis is a Relative Clause, *δέ* of the Apodosis is generally found after a Demonstrative. The only exceptions to this rule are, Il. 9. 510 ὃς δέ κ' ἀνήνεται . . λίσσονται δ' ἄρα ταί γε κτλ., and Il. 23. 319 ἀλλ' ὃς μὲν θ' ἵπποισι . . ἵπποι δὲ πλανώονται κτλ. (Schömann, *Opusc. Acad.* ii. p. 97.)

335.] **Enclitic δέ.** There are two uses which may be noticed under this heading:—

(1) The *δε* of *δ-δε, τόσος-δε, τοῖός-δε* is properly an Enclitic (as the accent shows).

The form *τοῖσ-δεσι* or *τοῖσ-δεσσι* may be a trace of an inflected Pronoun akin to *δέ* (related to it perhaps as *τις* to *τε*); or it may be merely a form created by the analogy of other Datives in *-εσσι, -εσι*.

(2) The *δε* which is suffixed to Accusatives expressing *motion to* is generally treated as an Enclitic in respect of accent: as *οἰκόνδε, πόλεμόνδε*. The ancient grammarians, however, wrote *δέ* as a distinct orthotone word, hence *οἶκον δέ, πόλεμον δέ, &c.* (but *οἶκαδε, φύγαδε* were made exceptions).

* Nieberding, *op. cit.* p. 4.

It seems likely that the -δε of these two uses is originally the same. The force in both cases is that of a *local* Adverb. Whether it is to be identified with the Conjunction δέ is a further question.

ἀλλά, αὐτάρ, ἀτάρ, αὖ, αὐτε.

336.] The remaining Adversative Particles do not need much explanation.

ἀλλά and αὐτάρ are used (like δέ) in the apodosis, especially after a Clause with εἴ περ : as—

Il. 1. 81 εἴ περ γάρ τε . . ἀλλά τε (cp. 8. 153., 19. 164).

22. 390 εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ . . αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κτλ.

αὐτάρ and ἀτάρ express a slighter opposition than ἀλλά, and accordingly are often used as Particles of transition ; *e.g.* in such formulae as ὧς οἱ μὲν . . αὐτὰρ κτλ. A similar use of ἀλλά may be seen with Imperatives ; as ἀλλ' ἴθι, ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ, and the like. It is evident that the stronger Adversative is chosen where greater *liveliness* of tone is to be conveyed.

337.] αὖ and αὐτε (*again, on the contrary*) have nearly the same force as αὐτάρ, but do not begin the sentence : hence νῦν αὖ, τίς δ' αὖ, τίπτ' αὐτε, &c. : and so in correspondence to μὲν or ἦ τοι, as Il. 4. 237 τῶν ἦ τοι . . ἡμεῖς αὐτε κτλ. They also serve to mark the apodosis of a Relative or Conditional Clause, as Il. 4. 321 εἰ τότε κούρος ἔα, νῦν αὐτέ με γῆρας ὀπάξει. Thus they have the two chief uses of δέ.

Originally, doubtless, αὖ meant *backwards*, but in Homer this sense is only found in the form αὐτις : though perhaps it survives in the sacrificial word ἀέρουσαν.

The form ὄμως is later, the Homeric word being ἔμπης.

ὄμως is usually read in Il. 12. 393 ὄμως δ' οὐ λήθετο χάρμης, and Od. 11. 565 ἐνθα χ' ὄμως προσέφη. In both places however the Scholia indicate that the word was anciently circumflexed by some authorities.

ἦ.

338.] The Particle ἦ at the beginning of a sentence gives it the character of a strong *affirmation* :—

Il. 1. 240 ἦ ποτ' Ἀχιλλῆος ποθῆ ἴξεται *be sure that one day &c.*
So, with an ironical tone,—

Il. 1. 229 ἦ πολὺν λώϊόν ἐστι κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν
δῶρ' ἀποαιρείσθαι κτλ.

It is often used *interrogatively*, esp. in questions of surprise indignation, irony, &c. : as—

Il. 2. 229 ἦ ἔτι καὶ χρυσοῦ ἐπιδύειαι κτλ.

15. 504 ἦ ἔλπεσθ' ἦν νῆας ἔλη κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ
ἐμβαδὸν ἴξεσθαι κτλ. (*do you really hope &c.*).

Od. 3. 312 ἦ οὐχ ἄλλῃς ὧς κτλ. (*is it not—? = surely it is*): cp.
§ 358, c.

Occasionally, in short parenthetical sentences, ἦ has a concessive force, *it is true that*, hence *and yet, although*: as—

Il. 3. 214 παῦρα μὲν, ἀλλὰ μάλα λιγέως, ἐπεὶ οὐ πολύμυθος, ^{cf p 462}
οὐδ' ἀφαρμαρτοεπής· ἦ καὶ γένοι ὕστερος ἦεν.

7. 393 οὐ φησω δώσειν· ἦ μὴν Τρῶές γε κέλονται (§ 344).

II. 362 ἐξ αὖ νῦν ἐφνυγες θάνατον, κύον· ἦ τέ τοι ἄγχι
ἦλθε κακόν (so 18. 13).

22. 280 ἦ τοι ἔφην γε (= *though I did think*; so 22. 280).

The question whether ἦ (or ἦ) can be used to introduce a Dependent Interrogative depends upon a few passages. Bekker favours ἦ in this use, and reads accordingly, e. g. Il. 1. 83 σὺ δὲ φράσαι ἦ με σαώσεις. The majority of the editors recognise it in three or four places:—

Il. 8. 111 εἴσεται ἦ καὶ ἐμὸν δόρυ μαινεται κτλ.

Od. 13. 415 ᾗχετο πενσόμενος μετὰ σὸν κλέος, ἦ που ἔτ' εἴης.

16. 137 ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἶπε καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον,

ἦ καὶ Λαέρτη αὐτὴν ὄδον ἄγγελος ἔλθω.

19. 325 πῶς γὰρ ἐμεῦ σύ, ξείνε, δάησαι, ἦ τι γυναικῶν

ἀλλάνων περίεμι;

In all these places, however, there is manuscript support for εἶ, and so La Roche reads in the two last. For the use of εἶ with the Subj. see § 294, with the Opt. § 314. It is difficult to derive the use of ἦ which Bekker supposes either from the emphatic ἦ, or from the disjunctive ἠέ or ἦ (*Hom. Bl.* p. 59). In any case there is no sufficient ground for deserting the MSS.

ἦ is often combined more or less closely with other Particles: as ἦ τε (§ 332, 2), ἦ μάν, &c. (§§ 343-5), ἦ τοι (or ἦτοι), ἦδη (for ἦ δῆ), and the correlative ἦμὲν—ἦδέ. In these combinations ἦ strengthens the other Particle. Note that—

ἦμὲν—ἦδέ are used of slightly opposed things, especially when *alternation* is implied: as—

Od. 2. 68 λίσσομαι ἦμὲν Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου ἦδὲ Θέμιτος,
ἦ τ' ἀνδρῶν ἀγορὰς ἦμὲν λύει ἦδὲ καθίξει·

i. e. 'assembles and dissolves again in turn' (Lat. *tum—tum*). Cp. Il. 8. 395 ἦμὲν ἀνακλῖναι . . ἦδ' ἐπιθεῖναι: and so Il. 7. 301, Od. 1. 97., 8. 383, and probably Il. 6. 149 ἦμὲν φύει ἦδ' ἀπολήγει. The original emphasis may sometimes be traced, as in the formula Il. 14. 234 ἦμὲν δῆ ποτ' ἐμὸν ἔπος ἔκλυες ἦδ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν πείθην *surely you have heard me before, and even so listen now.*

ἦδέ is also used (= *and*) without a preceding ἦμὲν: but not to begin a fresh sentence. Cp. § 331 *fin.* for the similar use of τε.

339.] ἦ after τί, ἐπεί. In most editions of Homer we find the

forms *τίη* (or *τιή*) and *ἐπειή*, which are evidently *τί*, *ἐπεί* with a suffix *-η* of an affirmative or emphasising kind.

The ancient grammarians seem generally to have considered this *η* as a distinct word. They lay down the rule that after *ἐπεί* it is circumflexed, after *τί* oxytone. The form *ἐπεί η̄* is supported by the fact that it is chiefly found in the combination *ἐπεί η̄ πολὺ κτλ.* (Il. I. 169., 4. 56, 307, &c.); also with *μάλα* (Il. I. 156 *ἐπεί η̄ μάλα πολλὰ μετὰξὺν κτλ.*, Od. 10. 465 *ἐπεί η̄ μάλα πολλὰ πέπασθε*, cp. *η̄ μάλα*, Il. 17. 34), and *καί* (Il. 20. 437, Od. 16. 442).

The case of *τί* is different. There is no ground for writing *τί η̄* (like *ἐπεί η̄*). The form *τί η̄*, which is adopted by the most recent editors on the authority of the ancients, is not satisfactory. If this *η̄* was originally the affirmative *ἦ*, the change of accent would indicate that it had lost its character as a separate word. And this is confirmed by the combination *τί η̄ δὲ σὺν κτλ.* (Il. 6. 55, &c.), which as now written is contrary to the general rule for the place of *δέ*. Moreover the ancients were not unanimous on the point, since Trypho wrote *τίη* in one word (Apollonius, *de Conj.* p. 523).

It may be observed that the opinion of the grammarians as to *τίη* has more weight than in the case of *ἐπεί η̄*, since *τίη* and *ὄτιη* were Attic. We may suspect therefore that the accentuation *ἐπεί η̄* rests on mere inference.

With *τίη* is to be placed the emphatic Nom. *τύν-η* *thou*, a form which occurs in the Iliad only (cp. the Doric *ἐγών-η*).

ἦέ, ἦ.

340.] *ἦέ* and *ἦ* are used in Homer as equivalent forms of the same Particle: which is (1) Disjunctive (*or*) and (2) used after Comparatives (*than*).

The use of the Correlative *ἦέ* (*ἦ*)—*ἦέ* (*ἦ*)=*either—or* is also common in Homer: as Il. I. 504 *ἦ ἔπει η̄ ἔργω*: 3. 239 *ἦ οὐχ ἔσπασθην . . ἦ δεύρω μὲν ἔποντο κτλ.*

When a question is asked in a disjunctive form, the accent of the Particle *ἦέ*, *ἦ* is thrown back, *i. e.* it is written *ἦε* or *ἦ̄*:—

Il. 13. 251 *ἦέ τι βέβληαι, βέλεος δέ σε τείρει ἀκωκή,*
ἦέ τευ ἀγγελίης μετ' ἔμ' ἦλυθες;

Od. 4. 362 *Ἀντίω', ἦ ρά τι ἴδμεν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἦε καὶ οὐκί*;

So when the first part of the question is not introduced by a Particle; Il. 10. 534 *ψεύσομαι ἦ ἔτυμον ἔρεω*; *shall I speak falsehood or the truth?* Od. I. 226 *εἰλαπίνη ἦε γάμος*; cp. 4. 314, 372. Indeed the first half of the sentence need not be interrogative; as Od. 21. 193 *ἔπος τί κε μυθησάιμεν, ἦ αὐτὸς κεύθω*;

I would say a word ; or shall I keep it to myself ? (so perhaps Il. 14. 190).

One of the members of a disjunctive question may be itself Disjunctive: *e.g.*—

Il. 6. 377 πῆ ἔβη Ἀνδρομάχη λευκώλενος ἐκ μεγάροιο ;
ἤέ πη ἐς γαλόων ἢ εἰνατέρων εὐπέπλων,
ἢ ἐς Ἀθηναίης ἐξοίχεται κτλ.

Here ἢ εἰνατέρων offers an alternative for γαλόων, but the main question is between these two alternatives on one side and ἐς Ἀθηναίης κτλ. on the other.

Most editors of Homer recognise an *interrogative* use of the form ἦε, but erroneously.* The questions in which ἦε is found are all *disjunctive*, so that we must write ἦέ—ἦε (Il. 6. 378., 13. 251., 15. 735., 16. 12, 13, 17, Od. 1. 408., 2. 30., 11. 399). In—

Od. 13. 233 τίς γῆ ; τίς δῆμος ; τίνες ἀνέρες ἐγγεγάασιν ;
ἢ ποῦ τις νήσων εὐδείελος, ἦέ τις ἀκτῆ | κείθ' κτλ.

ἢ που means *surely methinks*: the sense being, 'what land is this? It must be some island or else promontory.' Hence we should read ἦέ in the last clause, not ἦε (as Ameis, &c.).

ἦε or ἦ = *than* is found after Comparatives ; also after Verbs implying comparison, as βούλομαι *I prefer*, φθάνω *I come sooner*.

The correlative ἦ τε—ἦ τε appears in three places, viz. Il. 9. 276 ἦ τ' ἀνδρῶν ἦ τε γυναικῶν (where it seems to be = ἡμέν—ἡδέ), 11. 410 ἦ τ' ἔβλητ' ἦ τ' ἔβαλ' ἄλλον, and 17. 42 ἦ τ' ἀλκῆς ἦ τε φόβοιο (where however Aristarchus read ἦδ'—ἦδέ). The single ἦ τε occurs with the meaning *or* in Il. 19. 148 ἦ τ' ἐχέμεν παρὰ σοί : and with the meaning *than* in Od. 16. 216 (§ 332). Considering the general difficulty of deciding between εἰ and ἦ in the text of Homer, we cannot regard the form ἦ τε as resting on good evidence : see the next section.

341.] **Dependent Interrogative Clauses.** A Disjunctive question after a Verb of *asking, saying, knowing, &c.* is generally expressed by the Correlatives ἦέ (ἦ)—ἦε (ἦ) : as—

Od. 1. 174 καί μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐτήτυμον, ὄφρ' εὖ εἰδῶ,
ἦέ νέον μεθέπεις, ἦ καὶ πατρώϊός ἐσσι κτλ.

Il. 2. 99 τλήτε φίλοι καὶ μέλαινα' ἐπὶ χρόνον, ὄφρα δαῶμεν,
ἦ ἔτεον Κάλχας μαντεύεται, ἦε καὶ οὐκί.

Other examples have been given in the account of the Subjunc-

* This has been well shown by Dr. Praetorius, in a dissertation to which I am largely indebted (*Der homerische Gebrauch von ἦ (ἦε) in Fragesätzen*, Cassel, 1873). The rule as to the accentuation in a disjunctive question rests upon the unanimous testimony of the ancient grammarians, and is now generally adopted. The MSS. and the older editors give ἦέ or ἦ only.

tive (§ 280) and the Optative (§ 302). In general it will be seen that these Dependent Clauses are the same in form as the corresponding direct questions.

In a very few instances the first member of a sentence of this kind is without ἤε (ἦ): as—

Od. 4. 109 οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν | ζῶει ὃ γ' ἦ τέθνηκε (4. 837., 11. 464).

So Il. 10. 544 εἴπ' ἄγε . . ὄππως τούσδ' ἵππους λάβετεον, καταδύντες ὄμιλον Τρώων, ἦ τίς σφωε πόρεν κτλ., Od. 4. 643.

The combination εἰ—ἦε (ἦ) is often found in the MSS. of Homer; see Il. 2. 367., 8. 532, Od. 4. 28, 712, 789., 16. 238, 260., 17. 308., 18. 265., 24. 217. La Roche (following Bekker) reads ἦ—ἦε (ἦ) in all these places.

The common texts have in one place εἴ τε—ἦε,

Il. 2. 349 γνώμεναι εἴ τε ψεῦδος ὑπόσχεσις ἦε καὶ οὐκί.

In this instance, if the reading is right, there is a slight irregularity: the speaker beginning as if he meant to use εἴ τε—εἴ τε, and changing to the familiar ἦε καὶ οὐκί. But the best MSS. have εἴ τε—εἴ τε.

A change of construction may also be seen in Od. 24. 235-8 μερμήριξε . . κῦσσαι καὶ περιφῦναι . . ἦ πρῶτ' ἐξέροιτο *he debated about embracing &c., or should he first ask &c.*

μάν, μῆν, μέν.

342.] The three words μάν, μῆν, μέν agree so nearly in meaning and usage that they are to be regarded as etymologically connected, if not merely varieties of the same original form. The two former (with the long \bar{a} , η) express strong affirmation (= *surely, indeed, &c.*). The shorter form μέν is also originally a Particle of affirmation, but has acquired derivative uses of which the chief are: (1) the concessive use, preparing us for a Clause with an Adversative δέ, αὐτάρ, ἀλλά, &c.: and (2) the use in the second of two Clauses with the meaning *yet, nevertheless*.

Taking the generally received text of Homer, we find that μάν occurs 24 times, and that there are only two places in which it is not followed by a vowel. The exceptions are, Il. 5. 895 ἀλλ' οὐ μάν σ' ἔτι δηρὸν ἀνέξομαι ἄλγ' ἔχοντα, where μάν may be due to the parallel Il. 17. 41 ἀλλ' οὐ μάν ἔτι δηρὸν ἀπέριητος πόνος ἔσται, and Il. 5. 765 ἄγρει μάν οἱ (*i. e. Φοι*) ἔπορον κτλ. (*cp. Il. 7. 459 ἄγρει μάν ὅτ' ἂν κτλ.*). On the other hand μῆν, which occurs 10 times, is followed by a consonant in every place except Il. 19. 45 καὶ μῆν οἱ τότε γ' εἰς ἀγορὴν ἴσαν. These facts have not yet been satisfactorily explained. Bekker in his second edition (1858) wrote μῆν throughout for μάν, and sought to distinguish μῆν and μέν as far as the metre allowed according to Attic usage (*H. B. pp. 34, 62*). Cobet on the contrary proposed to restore μέν for μῆν (*Misc. Crit. p. 365*), and so far as these two forms are concerned his view is probable enough. But how are we to explain the peculiar facts as to μάν? We can hardly account for it except as a genuine Homeric form, and such a form must have been used before consonants as well as vowels. If so, we

can only suppose that an original μάν was changed into μέν whenever it came before a consonant, and preserved when the metre made this corruption impossible.

It is to be observed also that μάν and μήν are almost confined to the Iliad, in which μάν occurs 22 times and μήν 7 times. In the Odyssey μάν is found twice, viz. in II. 344, 17. 470, and μήν three times, in II. 582, 593., 16. 440 (= II. 23. 410). It appears then that μέν is the only form which really belongs to the language of the Odyssey. Consequently the substitution of μέν for μάν in the Iliad may have taken place very early. The change of μέν to μήν probably belongs to the later period when μήν had been established in Ionic and Attic prose.

343.] μάν has an affirmative and generally a hortatory or interjectional force: as in ἄγρει μάν *now come!* (II. 5. 765., 7. 459), and ἦ μάν, οὐ μάν, used when a speech begins in a tone of surprise, triumph, or the like; as—

II. 2. 370 ἦ μάν αὐτ' ἀγορήν νικᾶς, γέρον, υἱας Ἀχαιῶν.

12. 318 οὐ μάν ἀκληεῖς Λυκίην κάτα κοιρανέουσιν
ἡμέτεροι βασιλῆες (cp. 4. 512., 13. 414., 14. 454, &c.).

An approach to the force of an emphatic *yet* appears in—

II. 8. 373 ἔσται μάν ὅτ' ἂν αὐτε φίλην γλαυκώπιδα εἶπη·

and in ἀλλ' οὐ μάν (II. 5. 895., 17. 41, 418, &c.), μὴ μάν (II. 8. 512., 15. 476., 22. 304).

344.] μήν with a hortatory force occurs in II. 1. 302 εἰ δ' ἄγε μὴν πείρησαι *come, do but try*. The combination ἦ μήν is affirmative (rather than merely *concessive*),—not so much admitting as insisting upon an objection or reply: II. 2. 291 ἦ μήν καὶ πόνος ἐστί *it is true enough that there is toil*: 7. 393 ἦ μήν Τρῳῆς γε κέλονται *I assure you that the Trojans bid him*: 9. 57 ἦ μήν καὶ νέος ἐσσί *we must remember that you are young*. In καὶ μήν it emphasises the fact introduced by καί: II. 19. 45 καὶ μὴν οἱ τότε γ' εἰς ἀγορὴν ἴσαν *observe that even these then went*.

345.] μέν is very common in Homer. The original simply affirmative force appears especially in the combinations ἦ μέν, καὶ μέν, and the like, in which it is indistinguishable in sense from μήν.*

ἦ μέν is regularly used in *oaths*, and is even found with an Inf. in *oratio obliqua*, as II. 1. 76 καὶ μοι ὄμοσσον ἦ μέν μοι . . ἀρήξειν. So in a strong asseveration, as II. 7. 97 ἦ μέν δὴ λῶβη τάδε γ' ἔσσειται *this will really be a foul shame*, Od. 19. 235 ἦ μὲν πολλά γ' αὐτὸν ἐθηήσαντο γυναῖκες *you may be sure that many women gazed with wonder at it*. In these and similar passages μέν

* On the uses of μέν see the dissertation of Carl Mutzbauer, *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel MEN*, Köln, 1884–86.

strengthens a purely affirmative ἦ, and there is no sense of *contrast*. The adversative use may be perceived, as with the simple ἦ (§ 338) and ἦ μὴν, when a speaker insists on his assertion as true along with or in spite of other facts: *e.g.* in Od. 10. 64 πῶς ἦλθες, Ὀδυσσεῦ; τίς τοι κακὸς ἔχραε δαίμων; ἦ μὲν σ' ἐνδυκέως ἀπεπέμπομεν *surely we sent you on your way with due provision*: and in the common form of reproach, Il. 11. 765 ὦ πέπον, ἦ μὲν σοί γε Μενότιος ᾧδ' ἐπέτελλε (cp. 5. 197., 9. 252). So with ironical emphasis, Il. 3. 430 ἦ μὲν δὴ πρὶν γ' εὐχέ' κτλ. *why surely you boasted &c.*, cp. 9. 348.

The corresponding negative form μὴ μὲν occurs in formal oaths (§ 358, *b*), and with the Opt. in a sort of imprecation in Od. 22. 462 μὴ μὲν δὴ καθαρῶ θανάτῳ ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἐλοίμην κτλ. (cp. μὴ μάν). Denial insisted upon in view of some state of things is expressed by οὐ μὲν, as Il. 4. 372 οὐ μὲν Τυδεί γ' ᾧδε φίλον πτωσκαζέμεν ἦεν (*why do you shrink?*) *surely Tydeus did not*.

The form καὶ μὲν answers closely to the Attic καὶ μὴν, which is used to call attention to a fact, especially as the ground of an argument; as Il. 18. 362 καὶ μὲν δὴ πού τις μέλλει βροτὸς κτλ. *a mortal, remember, will accomplish his will*: (*much more a great goddess*): Il. 1. 269 καὶ μὲν τοῖσιν ἐγὼ μεθομίλειον (*these were the mightiest of men*): *yes, and I was of their fellowship*. Sometimes the fact is first indicated, then dwelt upon in a fresh clause with καὶ μὲν: Il. 9. 497 στρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοί, . . καὶ μὲν τοὺς θυέεσσι κτλ. *even gods may be moved . . they are indeed turned from their anger by sacrifice &c.*: cp. 24. 488, Od. 7. 325., 14. 85. Similarly when a new point in the narrative is reached: as Il. 6. 194 καὶ μὲν οἱ Λύκιοι τέμενος τάμον *yes and* (besides what the king gave) *the Lycian people made him a τέμενος* (cp. 6. 27., 23. 174., 24. 732).

The adversative sense—*but yet, but surely*—is chiefly found after a negative, μὲν being used either alone or in combination with an adversative Conjunction (ἀλλά, ἀτάρ): as—

Il. 1. 602 δαίνυντ', οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδέετο δαιτὸς ἔϊσῃς
οὐ μὲν φόρμιγγος *nor yet the phorminx*.

2. 703 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' οἱ ἀναρχοὶ ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν.

Od. 15. 405 οὐ τι περιπληθῆς λίην τόσον, ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ μὲν.

Il. 6. 123 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ὄπωπα . . ἀτὰρ μὲν νῦν γε κτλ.

Also after a question—

Il. 15. 203 ἦ τι μεταστρέψεις; στρεπταὶ μὲν τε φρένες ἐσθλῶν.

With the Article μὲν is sometimes used to bring in a parenthesis, which may be simply affirmative, or indicate some opposition:—

Il. 1. 234 ναὶ μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον, τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτε φύλλα καὶ

ὄζους φύσει (= *by this sceptre, even as it shall never be*).

5. 892 μητρός τοι μένος ἐστὶν ἀάσχετον, οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν,
 Ἥρης, τὴν μὲν ἐγὼ σπουδῇ δάμνημ' ἐπέεσσι
she is indeed one whom I can hardly tame.

Cp. Il. 10. 440., 15. 40., 16. 141. A less emphatic use (merely to bring out a new point in the story) is not uncommon: as Il. 2. 101 ἐστὴ σκῆπτρον ἔχων, τὸ μὲν κτλ.: cp. Il. 18. 84, 131., 23. 328, 808, Od. 9. 320, 321. Further, the interposed statement may have a double reference, a corresponding Clause with δέ or αὐτάρ serving to resume the narrative: as—

- Il. 8. 256 ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρῶτος Τρώων ἔλεν ἄνδρα κορυστήν,
 Φραδμουίδην Ἀγέλαον· ὁ μὲν φύγαδ' ἔτραπεν ἵππους,
 τῷ δὲ μεταστρεφθέντι κτλ. (so *ibid.* 268–271).

Again, the return to the main story after a digression may be marked by a similar form: *e.g.* in Od. 6. 13 (after a parenthetical account of the Phaeacians and Alcinous) τοῦ μὲν ἔβη πρὸς δῶμα κτλ. *now it was to his house that she went*: cp. Od. 9. 325.

ΤΟΙ.

346.] The enclitic τοι seems properly to express a *restricted* affirmation, generally qualifying a preceding statement: *at least, yet surely, &c.* It is especially used of a *concession*, whether made by the speaker or claimed from the person addressed: as Il. 4. 405 ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι: 5. 801 Τυδεὺς τοι μικρὸς μὲν ἔην δέμας, ἀλλὰ μαχητὴς *Tydeus, you must admit, &c.*: 5. 892 μητρός τοι μένος ἐστὶν ἀάσχετον *I admit (as an excuse)*: 8. 294 οὐ μὲν τοι ὄση δύναμις γε πάρεστι πάομαι: cp. 5. 873., 6. 211., 10. 250, Od. 2. 280, &c. So again in maxims, Od. 2. 276 παῦροι γάρ τοι παῖδες κτλ. *few children, it must be said, &c.*: Il. 23. 315 μήτι τοι δρυτόμος κτλ. *it is by understanding, after all, that the woodman &c.*: Od. 9. 27 οὐ τοι ἐγῶγε ἦς γαίης δύναμαι κτλ. *I cannot, when all is said, &c.*: Il. 22. 488, Od. 8. 329, &c.

τοι is combined in Homer with Adversative Particles, as αὐτάρ τοι, ἀλλά τοι (Il. 15. 45, Od. 18. 230); and with μὲν (but not closely, as in the later μέντοι *but*). So with the Affirmative ἦ in ἦ τοι (or ἦτοι), which expresses a restricted concession (Il. 1. 140, 211., 5. 724, &c.). But the combinations καίτοι *and yet*, τοίνυν *so then*, and the Disjunctive ἦτοι *either, or*, are post-Homeric.

τοι has the first place in the sentence in the compound τοιγάρ, which is used to begin speeches; as Il. 1. 76 τοιγάρ ἐγὼν ἐρέω *so then I will speak*. It is generally used with the First Person, and has a kind of apologetic force (= *I will say, since I must speak*). In Attic it survives in the compounds τοιγάρτοι, τοιγαροῦν: and the same meaning is commonly expressed by τοίνυν.

It has sometimes been thought that **τοι** is originally the same as the Dat. of **σύ**, meaning 'I tell you' or the like. The orthotone **τοιγάρ** (or **τοι γάρ**, as some MSS. read) is difficult to explain on this view. It has also been explained as the Locative of **τό**: cp. the Dat. **τῷ** = *in that case, therefore*. Or it may be from the same stem as **τις** and **τε** (as Kühner holds, § 507): cp. **ποῦ** (**δὴ ποῦ**) = *somehow*, thence *surely*. But the Loc. of this stem exists already in the form **ποῖ** *whither*.

ἄρα, γάρ.

347.] The Adverb **ἄρα** properly means *fittingly, accordingly* (root **ἄρ-** *to fit*). The forms **ἄρ** and **ῥα** seem to be varieties produced by difference of stress, answering to the different values which the Particle may have in the sentence. Of these **ἄρ** retains its accent, but **ῥα**, the shortest form, is enclitic.

The ordinary place of **ἄρα** is at the beginning of a Clause which expresses what is *consequent* upon something already said. But occasionally it follows a Participle in the same Clause, as in the formula **ἦ τοι ὃ γ' ὧς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο** (cp. Il. 2. 310., 5. 748).

It is to be observed, however, that **ἄρα** may indicate a *reason* (as well as a consequence): that is to say, we may go back from a fact to the *antecedent* which falls in with and so *explains* it. *E.g.* Il. 1. 429 **χωόμενον κατὰ θυμὸν εὐζώνιοιο γυναικός, τὴν ῥα . . ἀπηύρων** *whom (and this was the reason of his anger) they had taken away*. So in the combinations **ὅς ῥα, ἐπεὶ ῥα, ὅτι ῥα, οὐνεκ' ἄρα** = *because (and this is the explanation)*: also in **γάρ ῥα**, as Il. 1. 113 **καὶ γάρ ῥα Κλυταιμνήστρης προβέβουλα**.

ἄρα is also found in the first of two correlative Clauses, as—

εἴ τ' ἄρ' ὃ γ' εὐχολῆς ἐπιμέμφεται εἴ θ' ἐκατόμβης.

ὧς ἄγαγ' ὧς μήτ' ἄρ τις ἴδη μήτ' ἄρ τε νοήση.

The parallel form of the sentence enables us to regard the first Clause, by anticipation, as falling in with and completing the second.

The Attic **ἄρα** is unknown to Homer. Whether it is identical with **ἄρα** seems doubtful. It is worth while noticing that **ἄρα** answers in usage to the Homeric combination **ἦ ῥα** (*is it then—?*).

348.] The Causal Particle **γάρ** is originally a compound of **γε** and **ἄρα**, but the two elements have so completely united into a new whole that the fresh combination **γάρ ῥα** is found in Homer.

γάρ serves to indicate that the Clause in which it is used is a *reason* or *explanation*, usually of something just mentioned or suggested: as **τῷ γὰρ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη κήδετο γὰρ Δαναῶν, κτλ.** Thus it follows the *sequence of thought*—by which we go back from a consequent to an antecedent—whereas

ἄρα more commonly (though not always) indicates the sequence of the facts themselves.

Compare the double use of ὅ, ὅτι, ὅ τε (1) to express a cause, (2) to express a consequent used as an argument (cp. τοίον γὰρ καὶ πατρός, ὃ καὶ πεπνυμένα βίξεις, and other examples in § 269). To understand the ordinary use of γάρ we have only to suppose that when a speaker was going back upon an antecedent fact, he generally used the combination γε ἄρα (γ' ἄρ, γάρ), rather than the simple ἄρα. The principle of this usage is that a causal relation may be indicated by a distinction of emphasis, such as γε would express (as indeed γε alone sometimes has a distinctly causal force).

As subordinate or exceptional uses, we have to note the following:—

I. The use of γάρ to introduce a mere explanation, which became very common in Attic (e.g. Thuc. I. 8 μαρτύριον δέ Δήλου γὰρ κτλ.) and may be traced back to Homer. Thus—

Il. 8. 147 ἀλλὰ τόδ' αἰνὸν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἰκάνει.
Ἐκτωρ γὰρ ποτε φήσει κτλ.

This idiom—by which the Clause with γάρ becomes a kind of Object-Clause, in apposition to a Pronoun—may be compared with the use of ὅτι and οὐνεκα with the meaning *that*, instead of *because*: see §§ 268, 269. In both cases the language does not clearly distinguish between the *ground* of a fact (which is properly a separate and prior fact), and a mere *analysis*, or statement of circumstances in which a fact consists.

2. The inversion (as it may be regarded) by which the Clause with γάρ precedes the fact explained; as—

Il. 2. 802 Ἐκτορ, σοὶ δὲ μάλιστ' ἐπιτέλλομαι ὧδέ γε ῥέξαι:
πολλοὶ γὰρ κατὰ ἄστν μέγα Πριάμου ἐπίκουροι,
ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλώσσα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων
τοῖσιω ἕκαστος ἀνὴρ σημαιέτω (Il. 13. 736., 23.
890, Od. I. 337., 9. 319., 10. 174, 190, 226,
383., 11. 69., 12. 154, 208, 320, &c.).

Here the speaker begins by stating something that leads up to his main point. Sometimes, especially when the reason is stated at some length, the main point is marked as an inference by τῷ so, *therefore*: as—

Il. 7. 328 πολλοὶ γὰρ τεθνήσι κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί,
τῶν νῦν αἶμα κελαινὸν . .

331 τῷ σε χρὴ πόλεμον μὲν ἄμ' ἧοὶ παῦσαι Ἀχαιῶν.

So Il. 13. 228., 15. 739., 17. 221, 338., 23. 607; there is no instance in the Odyssey.

When the Clause with γάρ precedes, it may be opposed to the preceding context: hence the γάρ may be combined with adversative Conjunctions, as—

Il. 12. 326 νῦν δ' ἔμπησ γὰρ κήρες ἐφεστᾶσιν θανάτω . .
ἴομεν κτλ. (cp. Il. 7. 73., 17. 338., 24. 223).

Od. 14. 355 ἄλλ' οὐ γάρ σφιν ἐφαίμετο κέρδιον εἶναι
μαίεσθαι προτέρω· τοῖ μὲν πάλιν αὐτίς ἔβαινον
νηὸς ἐπὶ γλαφυρῆς (cp. Od. 19. 591).

ἀλλὰ—γάρ also occurs without a subsequent Clause :—

Od. 10. 201 κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως, θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντες·
ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις ἐγγίγνετο μυρομένοισι.

Here it has the force of 'but be that as it may,' 'but the truth is' (Riddell, *Dig.* § 147). That is, ἀλλὰ—γάρ meets what has preceded not by a simple opposition, but by one which consists in going back to a *reason* for the opposite: which may be enough to convey the speaker's meaning.

In these uses of γάρ the peculiarity is more logical than grammatical. The γάρ (or rather the ἄρα contained in it) indicates that the Clause gives a *reason* or *explanation*, which the speaker chooses to mention before the consequent or thing to be explained. The use only strikes us because the English *for* is restricted to causal clauses placed in the more natural order.

With δέ—γάρ and ἀλλὰ—γάρ it is incorrect (as Riddell shows, *l. c.*) to treat the Clause with γάρ as a parenthesis (writing *e. g.* νῦν δ'—ἐμπης γὰρ κτλ.). The Clause so introduced is always in opposition to the preceding context, so that the δέ or ἀλλὰ has its full force.

3. After the Relative ὅς, ἧ, ὅ : as—

Il. 12. 344 ἀμφοτέρω μὲν μάλλον· ὁ γάρ κ' ὄχ' ἄριστον ἀπάντων
εἶη (so Il. 23. 9, Od. 24. 190).

Od. 1. 286 (Μενέλαος) ὅς γὰρ δεύτατος ἦλθεν (cp. 17. 172).

So with ὡς γάρ = *for thus*, and ἵνα γάρ (Il. 10. 127).

These are generally regarded as instances of the original use of ὅς as a Demonstrative (§ 265). But it is only the use of γάρ that is peculiar; or rather, this is only another case in which γάρ is not translated by *for*. It will be seen that ὅς γάρ may always be replaced by ὅς ἄρα without changing the sense.

4. In abrupt *questions*, and expressions of *surprise* : as—

Il. 1. 123 πῶς γάρ τοι δώσουσι γέρας μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί ;
why, how are the Greeks to give you a prize ?

18. 182 Ἴρι θεά, τίς γάρ σε θεῶν ἐμοὶ ἄγγελον ἦκε ;

1. 293 ἦ γάρ κεν δειλός τε καὶ οὐτιδανὸς καλοοίμην κτλ.
why, I should be a coward &c.

So in the formulae of *wish*, εἰ γάρ, αἶ γάρ, &c. In all such cases the γάρ seems to be mainly interjectional. Properly it implies that the speaker is taking up the thread of a previous speech, and as it were continuing the construction: the new Clause being one that gives a reason, or affects to do so ironically. Particles so used easily acquire an irrational character. We may compare

the use of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and τ' ἄρα in questions, $\omega\varsigma$ in expressions of *wish*, ἀλλά before an imperative (§ 336): also the English use of *why*, *well*, and similar pleonasms.

οὖν, δῆ, νυ, θην.

349.] οὖν in Homer does not properly express *inference*, or even *consequence* (like ἄρα). Its use is to affirm something with reference to other facts, already mentioned or known; hence it may generally be represented by a phrase such as *after all*, *be this as it may*, &c. *E. g.*—

Il. 2. 350 φημὶ γὰρ οὖν *for I do declare that &c.*

Od. 11. 350 ξείνος δὲ τλήτω, μάλα περ νόστοιο χατίζων,
ἔμπης οὖν ἐπιμείναι ἐς αὔριον (*nevertheless to wait*).

Like ἄρα, it is used to emphasise correlative Clauses, but only with the negative οὔτε—οὔτε and μήτε—μήτε: as—

Od. 6. 192 οὗτ' οὖν ἐσθήτος δευήσσαι οὔτε τευ ἄλλου.

Il. 16. 97 αἰγὰρ. . . μήτε τις οὖν Τρώων . . . μήτε τις Ἀργείων, κτλ.
(so Il. 8. 7., 17. 20., 20. 7, Od. 1. 414., 2. 200.,
11. 200., 16. 302., 17. 401).

The combination γ' οὖν (not to be written γοῦν in Homer) occurs only twice, with the meaning *in any case*:—

Il. 5. 258 εἴ γ' οὖν ἕτερός γε φύγησι *if one of the two does (after all) escape*.

16. 30 μὴ ἐμέ γ' οὖν οὗτός γε λάβοι χόλος
(cp. 19. 94 κατὰ δ' οὖν ἕτερόν γε πέδησεν).

As an emphatic Particle of *transition* οὖν is found in μὲν οὖν (Il. 9. 550, and several times in the Odyssey), much more frequently in the combinations ἐπεὶ οὖν, ὡς οὖν. In these an approach to the *illative* force may perhaps be observed.

350.] δῆ is properly a *temporal* Particle, meaning *now*, at *length* (Lat. *jam*): hence it implies arriving at a result, as ἐξ οὗ δῆ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην *from the time that the point was reached when they quarrelled*: εἰ δῆ *if it has come to this that*, and so *if finally, if really*. With Superlatives it expresses that the highest stage has been reached, as Il. 1. 266 κάρτιστοι δῆ κείνοι κτλ. *these were quite (finally) the mightiest*. So in questions, πῶς δῆ *how has it come to be that*—; and prohibitions, μὴ δῆ *do not go so far as to*—.

δῆ may begin a sentence in Homer, as Il. 15. 437 Τεῦκρε πέπον, δῆ νῶϊν ἀπέκτατο πιστὸς ἑταῖρος: and often in the combinations δῆ τότε (*tum vero*), and δῆ γάρ. The original meaning is best seen in these forms (where δῆ is emphatic), and in ἦδη (for ἦ δῆ), and ἐπεὶ δῆ.

As δῆ is one of the words which unite with a following vowel,

so as to form one syllable, it is sometimes written δ', and so is liable to be confused with δέ. This occurs especially in the combinations δὴ αὐ, δὴ αὐτός, δὴ οὕτως: as Il. 1. 131 μὴ δὴ οὕτως, 340 εἴ ποτε δὴ αὐτε, 10. 385 πῆ δὴ οὕτως, 20. 220 ὅς δὴ ἀφνειότατος κτλ. So in εἰ δ' ἄγε the sense generally requires δὴ: see § 321.

Note that δῆτα, δῆθεν (cognate or derivative forms) are post-Homeric; as also are the combinations δῆπου, καὶ δῆ.

351.] νυ is obviously a shortened form of νῦν now. It is used as an affirmative Particle (like δῆ, but somewhat less emphatic), especially in combinations such as ἦ ῥά νυ, καὶ νύ κε, οὐ νυ, μὴ νυ, ἐπεὶ νυ, and after Interrogatives, as τίς νυ *who now*, τί νυ *why now* (see Od. 1. 59-62).

The form νυ is exclusively Epic: νυν (ῥ), which is used by Attic poets (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* ii. p. 183) appears in Il. 10. 105 ὄσα πού νυν ἐέλπεται, and Il. 23. 485 δεῦρό νυν, ἦ τρίποδος κτλ.: but it is probably not Homeric.

In Il. 10. 105 the sense is distinctly temporal, and accordingly we should probably read νῦν ἐλπεται. The temporal sense also suits Il. 23. 485, where moreover there is a variant δεῦρό γε νῦν τρίποδος, found in the Scholia on Aristophanes (Ach. 771, Eq. 788).

352.] θην is an affirmative enclitic, giving a mocking or ironical force, like the later δῆπου and δῆθεν (which is perhaps originally δῆ θην): as Il. 2. 276 οὐ θῆν μιν πάλιν αὐτίς ἀνήσει θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ *his bold spirit will not I imagine impel him again*: Il. 13. 620 λείψετε θην οὕτω γε *methinks in this fashion you will leave &c.* It is only Epic.

περ.

353.] The enclitic Particle περ is evidently a shorter form of the Preposition περί, which in its adverbial use has the meaning *beyond, exceedingly* (§ 185). Accordingly περ is *intensive*, denoting that the word to which it is subjoined is true in a high degree, in its fullest sense, &c.: *e.g.*—

Il. 23. 79 λάχε γεινόμενόν περ *was my fate even from my birth.*

Od. 1. 315 μὴ μ' ἔτι νῦν κατέρυκε λιλαιόμενόν περ ὄδοιο.

8. 187 στιβαρότερον οὐκ ὀλίγον περ.

Il. 2. 236 οἴκαδέ περ σὺν νηυσὶ νεώμεθα

(= *let us have nothing short of return home*).

8. 452 σφῶϊν δὲ πρὶν περ τρόμος ἔλλαβε φαίδιμα γυῖα
even beforehand trembling seized your knees.

13. 72 ἀρίγνωτοι δὲ θεοὶ περ *gods, surely, are easily known.*

Od. 4. 34 αἶ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς | ἐξοπίσω περ παύσῃ οὐζύος.

So with Relatives, ὅς περ *the very one who*, ὡς ἔσεται περ (Attic ὡσπερ καὶ ἔσται) *just as it will be*, ὅτε περ *just when*. Also εἴ περ *even if*, and ἢ περ or ἣ περ *even than*.

Usually, however, περ implies a sense of opposition; *i. e.* it emphasises something as true *in spite of* a preceding assertion: as οὐ τι δυνήσεται ἀχνύμενός περ *thou wilt not be able, however much vexed*, πολέες περ ἔόντες *many as they are*, πίνοντά περ ἔμπης *even though drinking, &c.*; and with Substantives, Il. 20. 65 τὰ τε στυγέουσι θεοί περ *which even the gods* (gods though they are) *dread*. So Il. 1. 353 ἐπεὶ μὲν ἔτεκές γε, μινυθὰδιόν περ ἔόντα *since you are my mother, short-lived though I am*. Or it may imply compensation for the absence of something else: Il. 1. 508 ἀλλὰ σύ μιν τίσῃ *do thou honour him* (since Agamemnon will not); 17. 121 αἶ κε νέκυν περ Ἀχιλλῆϊ προφέρωμεν γυμνόν· ἀτὰρ τὰ γε τεύχε' κτλ.

The intensive καί and περ are often used with the same word or phrase: as καὶ ὄψε περ *even though late*, καὶ πρὸς δαίμονά περ *even though it were against a higher power*, καὶ πεζός περ ἔών *though only on foot*: εἰ δὲ καὶ Ἔκτορά περ φιλέεις, &c. So with οὐδέ *not even*, as οὐδέ θεοί περ *not even the gods*, οὐδ' ὡς περ *not even so*, οὐδέ νυ σοί περ *not even to you*.

The combination καί περ (or καίπερ) occurs in Homer in one place only, viz. Od. 7. 224 καί περ πολλὰ παθόντα.

When καί precedes a word followed by περ, it is always = *even* (not *and*). Hence in Il. 5. 135 καὶ πρὶν περ μεμαώς means *even though formerly eager*, and is to be taken with the preceding line, not with the succeeding δὴ τότε μιν κτλ. Thus there is no anacoluthon, as is generally assumed.

ΓΕ.

354.] γε is used, like περ, to emphasise a particular word or phrase. It does not however *intensify* the meaning, or insist on the fact as *true*, but only calls attention to the word or fact, distinguishing it from others: *e. g.*—

Il. 1. 81 εἴ περ γὰρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψῃ,
ἀλλά τε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον.

Here γε shows that the word χόλος is chosen in order to be contrasted with κότος. So too—

Il. 2. 379 εἰ δὲ ποτ' ἔς γε μίαν βουλεύσομεν, οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα κτλ.
(if we could ever agree, instead of contending).

Again, where an idea is repeated—

Il. 5. 350 εἰ δὲ σύ γ' ἔς πόλεμον πωλήσῃ, ἢ τέ σ' ὅτω
ρίγῃσειν πόλεμόν γε.

Cr. also Il. 1. 299 ἐπεὶ μὲν ἀφέλεσθέ γε δόντες *since you have but*

taken away what you gave (where we should rather emphasise *δόντες*): Od. 4. 193 οὐ τοι ἔγωγε τέρπομ' ὀδυρόμενος . . νεμεσῶμαι γε μὲν οὐδὲν κλαίειν κτλ. *I do not take pleasure in lamenting, but yet I do not say that I complain of a man weeping* &c.: 9. 393 τὸ γὰρ αὐτε σιδήρου γε κράτος ἐστί *that is the strength of iron (in particular)*: 10. 93 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ἀέξετο κῦμά γ' ἐν αὐτῷ, οὔτε μέγ' οὐτ' ὀλίγον, λευκὴ δ' ἦν ἀμφὶ γαλήνη *no wave at all (nothing that could be called a wave) rose in it, &c.*

So too γε emphasises a word as a strong or appropriate one, or as chosen under the influence of feeling (anger, contempt, &c.). As examples may be quoted, Od. 9. 458 τῷ κέ οἱ ἐγκέφαλός γε . . ραίοιτο κτλ.: 17. 244 τῷ κέ τοι ἀγλαίας γε διασκοδάσειεν ἀπάσας: Il. 7. 198 ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ νῆϊδά γ' οὕτως ἔλπομαι κτλ. So in the phrase εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε, which means *if he lived at all*, and thus is a form of asseveration; e.g. Il. 3. 180 δαῖρ αὐτ' ἐμὸς ἔσκε κυνώπιδος εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε *he was my brother-in-law if he was anything, i. e. that he was so is as sure as that there was such a person.*

γε is common with the Article (§ 257, 2) and the Personal Pronouns (so that it is usual to write ὄγε, ἔγωγε as one word), also with ὄδε, οὗτος, κείνος, and the corresponding Adverbs ὄδε, τότε, &c. It serves chiefly to bring out the contrast which these Pronouns more or less distinctly imply. Similarly with words implying comparison, as ἄλλος and ἕτερος, πρὶν, πάρος, &c. When a special emphasis is intended, Homer usually employs περ, as Od. 1. 59 οὐδέ νυ σοὶ περ ἐντρέπεται φίλον ἦτορ *not even are you moved* (who are especially bound to care for Ulysses). So too, as Nauck has pointed out (*Mél. gr.-rom.* iv. 501), πάρος γε means *before (not now)*, while πάρος περ means *even before (not merely now)*. Hence in Il. 13. 465 ὅς σε πάρος γε γαμβρὸς ἐὼν ἔθρεψε the γε of the MSS. is right; and so we should read (with A against other MSS.) Il. 17. 587 ὅς τὸ πάρος γε μαλθακὸς αἰχμητῆς, but (again with A) in Il. 15. 256 ὅς σε πάρος περ ῥύομαι.

In a Conditional Protasis (with ὅς, ὅτε, εἰ, &c.), γε emphasises the condition as such: hence εἴ γε *if only, always supposing that*; cp. Od. 2. 31 ἦν χ' ὑμῖν σάφα εἴποι, ὅτε πρότερός γε πύθοιτο *which he would tell you, if and when he had been first to hear it*. On the other hand, εἴ περ means *supposing ever so much*, hence *if really* (Lat. *si quidem*). So when πρὶν expresses a condition (§ 297) it takes γε, as Il. 5. 288 πρὶν γ' ἢ ἕτερόν γε πεσόντα κτλ.

οὐ, μή.

355.] οὐκί, οὐκ, οὐ. The full form οὐκί occurs in the formula *ἢ καὶ οὐκί or else not* (Il. 2. 238, &c.), and one or two similar phrases: Il. 15. 137 ὅς τ' αἴτιος ὅς τε καὶ οὐκί, and Il. 20. 255 πόλλ' ἔτεά τε καὶ οὐκί.

The general use of οὐ is to *deny* the predication to which it is attached (while μή *forbids* or *deprecates*). In some instances, however, οὐ does not merely negative the Verb, but expresses the *opposite* meaning: οὐ φημι is not *I do not say*, but *I deny, refuse*; οὐκ ἐῶ *I forbid*, &c. (Krüger, § 67, 1, 1).

The uses of οὐ in Subordinate Clauses, and with the Infinitive and Participle, will be best treated along with the corresponding uses of μή (§§ 359, 360).

According to Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 147) the negative Particle was treated originally like the Prepositions, *i.e.* it was placed immediately before the Verb, and closely connected with it: as in the Latin *ne-scio, ne-queo, nolo*, and in some parallel Slavonic forms. The same relation appears in the accent of οὐ φημι, and in the use of οὐ in the combinations οὐκ ἐθέλω, οὐκ ἐάω, &c., in which οὐ is retained where general rules would require μή (§ 359).

356.] οὐδέ, μηδέ. These forms are generally used as negative *connecting* Particles (*but not, and not*). Sometimes however they have a strengthening or emphatic force, corresponding to the similar use of καί in affirmative sentences; as Il. 5. 485 τὴν δ' ἑστηκας, ἀτὰρ οὐδ' ἄλλοισι κελεύεις *you stand still (yourself), and (what is more) do not call on the others to fight*: and in combination with περ, as Il. 4. 387 ἐνθ' οὐδὲ ξείνός περ ἔων κτλ. So καὶ ὅς *even he*, οὐδ' ὅς *not even he*, &c.

οὐδέεις is originally an emphatic form (like the later οὐδέ εἰς). In Homer the Neut. οὐδέν is occasionally found, sometimes as an emphatic Adverb, = *not at all*, as Il. 1. 244 ὃ τ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισας (so Il. 1. 412., 16. 274., 22. 332, 513., 24. 370, Od. 4. 195., 9. 287): sometimes as a Substantive, *nothing at all* (Nom. and Acc.), as Od. 9. 34 ὡς οὐδὲν γλύκιον *no single thing is sweeter* (cp. 18. 130., 22. 318). The adjectival use is found with ἔπος (Od. 4. 350., 17. 141), also in Il. 10. 216 τῇ μὲν κτέρας οὐδὲν ὁμοίον, and perhaps Il. 22. 513 οὐδὲν σοί γ' ὄφελος (where οὐδέν may be adverbial). The Gen. Neut. appears in the Compound οὐδενός-ωρος *worth nothing* (Il. 8. 178). The Masc. occurs only in the phrase τὸ ὄν μένος οὐδενὶ εἴκων (Il. 22. 459, Od. 11. 515).

The form μηδέεις is post-Homeric, except the form μηδέν, which occurs only in Il. 18. 500 ὃ δ' ἀναίμετο μηδὲν ἐλέσθαι.

357.] Double negation. This characteristic feature of Greek is caused by the tendency to *repeat* the negative Particle with any word or phrase to which the negation especially applies: as Il. 1. 114 ἐπεὶ οὐ ἐθέν ἐστι χερσίων, οὐ δέμας κτλ. *since she is not inferior—not in form* &c. The emphatic οὐδέ and μηδέ are chiefly used in this way: as οὐ μὰν οὐδ' Ἀχιλεὺς κτλ. *no, not even Achilles* &c.: Il. 2. 703 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' οἱ ἀναρχοὶ ἔσαν: Od. 8. 280 τὰ γ'

οὐ κέ τις οὐδὲ ἴδοιτο, οὐδὲ θεῶν μακάρων: Il. 6. 58 μηδ' ὄν τινα γαστέρι μήτηρ κοῦρον ἔοντα φέροι μηδ' ὄς φύγοι.

358.] μή is commonly used (as we should expect) with the Moods expressive of *command* or *wish*, viz. the Imperative, the Subjunctive and the Optative. These uses having been discussed (§§ 278, 281, 299, 303, &c.), it only remains to notice some idiomatic uses in which μή is found with the Mood of simple *assertion* or *denial*.

With the **Indicative** μή is used in Homer—

(a) In the phrase μη ὄφελλον (or ὄφελον) *would that I had not &c.* Logically the μή in this idiom belongs to the following Infinitive (cp. § 355).

(b) In *oaths*, to express solemn or impassioned denial:—

Il. 10. 329 ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς αὐτός, ἐρίγδουπος πόσις Ἕρης,
μη μὲν τοῖς ἵπποισιν ἀνὴρ ἐποχήσεται ἄλλος
(*I swear that no one else shall ride &c.*)

15. 36 ἴστω νῦν τόδε γαῖα . . .

41 μη δὲ ἐμὴν ἰότητα Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων | πημαίνει.

In this use μη denies by *disclaiming* (as it were) or protesting against a fact supposed to be within the speaker's power (= *far be it from me that &c.*). We should probably add—

Il. 19. 258 ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα κτλ.

μη μὲν ἐγὼ κούρη Βρισηίδι χεῖρ' ἐπένεικα,

where the MSS. have ἐπενείκαι. The Indie. form was restored conjecturally by Stephanus.

(c) After ἦ, to express incredulity, &c.:—

Od. 6. 200 ἦ μή πού τινα δυσμενέων φάσθ' ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν
(*surely you do not suppose it is any enemy!*)

9. 405 ἦ μή τίς σευ μῆλα βροτῶν ἀέκοντος ἐλαύνει;
ἦ μή τίς σ' αὐτὸν κτείνει δόλω ἢ ἐ βίηφι;
(*surely no one is driving off your sheep? &c.*)

This is the common type of 'question expecting a negative answer,' viz. a strong form of denial uttered in a hesitating or interrogative tone. Compare the quasi-interrogative use of ἦ (§ 338) to indicate surprise or indignation.

(d) After Verbs of *fearing* which relate to a past event:—

Od. 5. 300 δεῖδω μη δὴ πάντα θεὰ νημερτέα εἶπεν.

Here, as with the Subj. (§ 281, 1), the Clause with μη passes into an Object-Clause. The difference is that the Indicative shows the event to be past.

So perhaps Od. 13. 216 μη τί μοι οἴχονται *I fear they are gone*: but the better reading is οἴχονται, the Subj. being understood as in Il. 1. 555 μη σε παρέιπη

lest she have persuaded thee (i. e. prove to have persuaded); cp. Od. 21. 395 μὴ κέρα ἴπες ἔδοιεν lest worms should (be found to) have eaten (§ 303, 1). Cp. Matth. xvi. 5 ἐπελάθοντο ἄρτους λαβεῖν they found that they had forgotten (Field's *Otium Norvicense*, Pt. 3, p. 7).

The use of the Past Indicative after Verbs of *fearing* is closely parallel to the use in Final Clauses, noticed in § 325. While the Clause, as an expression of the speaker's mind about an event—his fear or his purpose—should have a Subj. or Opt., the sense that the happening of the event is matter of past fact causes the Indicative to be preferred. Cp. the Modal uses noticed in §§ 324–326, and the remark in § 323 as to the tendency in favour of the Indicative.

The essence of these idioms is the combination of the imperative *tone*—shown in the use of μὴ—with the Mood proper to a simple assertion. The tendency to resort to the form of *prohibition* in order to express strong or passionate *denial* may be seen in the use of μὴ with the Optative in *deprecating* a supposition (§ 299, e), and of μὴ with the Subj. in *oaths*, as Od. 12. 300., 18. 56.

359.] Conditional Clauses. The rule which prescribes μὴ as the negative Particle to be used in every Clause of Conditional meaning does not hold universally. In Homer—

(a) When the Verb is a Subjunctive or Optative μὴ is used: the very few exceptions being confined to οὐκ ἐθέλω (Il. 3. 289., 15. 492) and οὐκ ἔάω (Il. 20. 139), which are treated almost as Compounds (§ 355). Cp. the use of οὐκ ἐθέλω in Final Clauses, as Il. 5. 233 μὴ . . ματήσεται οὐδ' ἐθέλητον κτλ.

(b) With the Relatives οἷς, ὅσος, &c. when the Verb is an Indicative οὐ is generally used; as—

Il. 2. 143 πᾶσι μετὰ πληθύν, ὅσοι οὐ βουλῆς ἐπάκουσαν.

Od. 3. 348 ὡς τέ τευ ἢ παρὰ πάμπαν ἀνεύμονος ἢ ἐπενιχροῦ,
ὃ οὐ τι χλαῖναι κτλ. (a general description).

Il. 2. 338 νηπιάχοις, οἷς οὐ τι μέλει κτλ. (so 7. 236., 18. 363). The only clear instance of μὴ is Il. 2. 301 ἐστὲ δὲ πάντες μάρτυροι, οὐδὲ μὴ κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτοιο φέρουσαι, where the speaker wishes to make an *exception* to what he has just said. In Od. 5. 489 ὃ μὴ πάρα γείτονες ἄλλοι we may supply either εἰσί or ἔωσι: the latter is found in the similar cases Od. 4. 164., 23. 118. But Hesiod uses μὴ with the Indic.; see Theog. 387, Op. 225.

(c) With εἰ and the Indicative οὐ is used when the Clause with εἰ precedes the Principal Clause: as—

Il. 4. 160 εἰ περ γάρ τε καὶ αὐτίκ' Ὀλύμπιος οὐκ ἐτέλεσσε,
and similarly in Il. 9. 435., 15. 213, Od. 19. 85, and the (eight) other places quoted in § 316. But when the Clause with εἰ follows the other, μὴ is used, as in the sentences of the form—

Il. 2. 155 ἔνθα κεν . . νόστος ἐτύχθη | εἰ μὴ κτλ.

The only instance in which this rule fails seems to be—

Od. 9. 410 εἰ μὲν δὴ μὴ τίς σε βιάζεται οἶον ἐόντα,
τοῦσόν γ' οὐ πῶς ἔστι Διὸς μεγάλου ἀλέασθαι.

Here μὴ τίς may be used rather than οὐ τίς in order to bring out more clearly the misunderstanding of the οὔτις of Polyphemus.

This curious law was pointed out by A. R. Vierke, in a valuable dissertation *De μὴ particulae cum indicativo conjunctae usu antiquiore* (Lipsiae, 1876). With regard to the ground of it, we may observe that a Clause with εἰ in most cases precedes the apodosis; and this is probably the original order. When it is inverted it may be that the use of μὴ instead of οὐ has a prohibitive character, as though the condition were added as an afterthought, *in bar* of what has been already said. In any case the inversion throws an *emphasis* on the Clause, which would account for the preference for μὴ; see § 358.

360.] **Infinitive and Participle.** It appears from comparison with the forms of negation in the oldest Sanscrit that the negative Particles were originally used only with *finite Verbs*. The negation of a Noun was expressed by forming it into a Compound with the prefix *an-* or *a-* (Greek ἀν-, ἀ-): and the Infinitives and Participles were treated in this respect as Nouns. The first exception to this rule in Greek was probably the use of οὐ with the Participle—a use which is well established in Homer.

οὐ with the Infinitive is used in Homer (as in Attic) after Verbs of *saying, thinking, knowing, &c.* (§ 237); as in Il. 16. 61 ἦ τοι ἔφην γε οὐ πρὶν μνηθμόν καταπαυσέμεν κτλ.: Od. 5. 342 δοκέεις δέ μοι οὐκ ἀπινύσσειν.

This use however is to be compared with that noticed above (§ 355), in which an οὐ which belongs in sense to the Infinitive is placed before the governing Verb; as οὐ φησιν δάσειν *he says he will not give*. Sometimes the Homeric language seems to hesitate between the two forms, or to use them indifferently: compare (*e. g.*) Il. 12. 106 οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔφαντο σχήσεσθ' κτλ. and (a few lines further) l. 125 ἔφαντο γὰρ οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοὺς σχήσεσθ' κτλ. Occasionally the negative is used with the Verb and repeated with the Infinitive:—

Il. 17. 641 ἐπεὶ οὐ μὲν ὄτομαι οὐδὲ πεπύσθαι (cp. 12. 73).

Od. 3. 27 οὐ γὰρ ὄτω | οὐ σε θεῶν ἀέκητι γενέσθαι κτλ.

It may be conjectured that the use of οὐ with the governing Verb is the more ancient; the use with the Infinitive is obviously the more logical.

361.] **μὴ with the Infinitive and Participle.** The Homeric uses of this kind are few and simple in comparison with those of later Greek.

The **Infinitive** when used for the Imperative (§ 241) naturally takes μὴ instead of οὐ: as Il. 4. 42 μὴ τι διατριβεῖν τὸν ἐμὸν χόλον, ἀλλά μ' ἔασαι.

An Infinitive which stands as Object of a Verb of *saying, &c.* takes μὴ when it expresses *command* or *wish*: as Il. 3. 434 παύσθαι κέλομαι μῆδὲ κτλ. *I bid you stop and not &c.* (so 9. 12): Od.

1. 37 ἐπεὶ πρό οἱ εἶπομεν ἡμεῖς μήτ' κτλ. *we told him before not to &c.* So Od. 9. 530 δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα . . ἰκέσθαι *grant that Ulysses may not come.*

Again, a dependent Infinitive takes μὴ in oaths, as Il. 19. 176 ὀμνυέτω . . μὴ ποτε τῆς εὐνῆς ἐπιβήμεναι κτλ. *let him swear that he never &c.*; cp. Od. 5. 184 ἴστω νῦν τόδε γαῖα . . μὴ τί σοι αὐτῷ πῆμα κακὸν βουλευσέμεν ἄλλο, and Il. 19. 258 (but see § 358 b). So generally after Verbs of promising, &c. as Il. 14. 45 ὡς ποτ' ἐπηπείλησεν . . μὴ πρὶν κτλ. *threatened that he would not &c.*; Il. 18. 500 ὁ δ' ἀναίετο μηδὲν ἐλέσθαι *refused to accept anything* (see Mr. Leaf's note *a. l.*). This use of μὴ is evidently parallel to the use with the Indicative, § 358. Compare also Il. 19. 22 οὔ' ἐπιεικὲς ἔργ' ἔμεν ἀθανάτων μηδὲ βροτῶν ἄνδρα τελέσσαι, where the μὴ may be emphatic (*such as we must not suppose any mortal to have made*)*. Or this may be an instance of the use of μὴ in Relative Clauses containing a general description (§ 359, b).

The use of μὴ with the Participle appears in one Homeric instance:—

Od. 4. 684 μὴ μνηστεύσαντες μηδ' ἄλλοθ' ὀμιλήσαντες
ἴστατα καὶ πύματα νῦν ἐνθάδε δειπνήσειαν.

Here μὴ belongs to ὀμιλήσαντες, and expresses a wish: 'may they (after their wooing) have no other meeting, but sup now for the last time.' For the parenthetical μνηστεύσαντες and the repetition of the negative with ἄλλοτε, cp. the parallel place Od. 11. 613 μὴ τεχνησάμενος μηδ' ἄλλο τι τεχνησάιτο.

κεν and ἄν.

362.] The Particles κεν and ἄν, as we have seen, are used to mark a predication as *conditional*, or made with reference to a particular or *limited* state of things: whereas τε shows that the meaning is *general*. Hence with the Subj. and Opt. κεν or ἄν indicates that an event holds a *definite* place in the expected course of things: in other words, κεν or ἄν points to an *actual occurrence* in the future.†

κεν is commoner in Homer than ἄν. In the existing text κεν occurs about 630 times in the Iliad, and 520 times in the Odyssey: while ἄν (including ἦν and ἐπήν) occurs 192 times in

* This would be akin to the later use with Verbs of *belief*. As to the Verbs which take μὴ see Prof. Gildersleeve in the *Am. Jour. Phil.* vol. i. p. 49.

† 'Im Allgemeinen steht das Resultat durchaus fest: κεν beim Conjunctiv und Optativ weist auf das Eintreten der Handlung hin' (Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* i. p. 86). This view is contrary to the teaching of most grammarians (see especially Hermann on Soph. O. C. 1446). It will be found stated very clearly in an article in the *Philological Museum*, vol. i. p. 96 (Cambridge 1832).

the Iliad and 157 times in the Odyssey. Thus the proportion is more than 3 : 1, and is not materially different in the two poems.

It is part of Fick's well known theory that $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ was unknown in the original Homeric dialect (see Appendix F): and a systematic attempt to restore the exclusive use of $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ in Homer has been made by a Dutch scholar, J. van Leeuwen,* who has proposed more or less satisfactory emendations of all the places in which $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ now appears. It is impossible to deny the soundness of the principles on which he bases his enquiry. When the poems were chiefly known through oral recitation there must have been a constant tendency to modernise the language. With Attic and Ionic reciters that tendency must have led to $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ creeping into the text, sometimes in place of $\kappa\epsilon\nu$, sometimes where the pure Subj. or Opt. was required by Homeric usage. Evidence of this kind of corruption has been preserved, as Van Leeuwen points out, in the *variae lectiones* of the ancient critics. Thus in Il. 1. 168 $\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota \kappa\epsilon \kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega$ is now read on the authority of Aristarchus; but $\epsilon\pi\acute{\eta}\nu \kappa\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega$ and $\epsilon\pi\acute{\eta}\nu \kappa\epsilon \kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega$ were also ancient readings, and $\epsilon\pi\acute{\eta}\nu$ is found in all our MSS. Similarly in Il. 7. 5 Aristarchus read $\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota \kappa\epsilon \kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega\sigma\iota\nu$, and the MSS. are divided between $\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota \kappa\epsilon$ and $\epsilon\pi\acute{\eta}\nu \kappa\epsilon$ (or $\epsilon\pi\acute{\eta}\nu \kappa\epsilon\kappa.$). There is a similar variation between the forms $\tilde{\eta}\nu$ and $\epsilon\acute{\iota} \kappa\epsilon$ (or $\alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa\epsilon$) in the phrases $\alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa' \epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\theta\alpha$, $\alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa' \epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\iota$, &c. Thus in Il. 4. 353 (=9. 359) the MSS. nearly all have—

$\delta\psi\epsilon\alpha\iota \tilde{\eta}\nu \epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\theta\alpha \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\omicron\iota \tau\grave{\alpha} \mu\epsilon\mu\acute{\eta}\lambda\eta$,

but $\alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa' \epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\theta\alpha$, which gives a better rhetorical effect, is found in Il. 8. 471 $\delta\psi\epsilon\alpha\iota \alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa' \epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\theta\alpha$ (so all MSS., $\tilde{\eta}\nu \epsilon\theta$. as a *v. l.* in A), also in Il. 13. 260., 18. 457, Od. 3. 92, &c. Similarly in Il. 16. 453 $\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota \delta\eta \tau\omicron\nu \gamma\epsilon \lambda\acute{\iota}\pi\eta$ the *v. l.* $\epsilon\pi\acute{\eta}\nu$ is given by good MSS. (D, G, L, and as a variant in A). And the line Il. 11. 797 $\text{Μυρμιδόνων, } \alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\iota \phi\acute{o}\omega\varsigma \Delta\alpha\nu\alpha\omicron\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\alpha\iota$ is repeated in Il. 16. 39 with the variation $\tilde{\eta}\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon$ for $\alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa\epsilon\nu$. In such cases we can see the intrusion of $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ actually in process.

Again, the omission of $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ may be required by the metre, or by the *indefinite* character of the sentence (§ 283): *e. g.* in Il. 15. 209 $\delta\pi\pi\acute{o}\tau' \tilde{\alpha}\nu \iota\sigma\acute{o}\mu\omicron\rho\omicron\nu \epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\iota$ both these reasons point to $\delta\pi\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon \text{ Φισ}\acute{o}\mu\omicron\rho\omicron\nu \kappa\tau\lambda.$ So in Il. 2. 228 $\epsilon\upsilon\tau' \tilde{\alpha}\nu \tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\iota}\epsilon\theta\rho\nu \epsilon\lambda\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ read $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon \tau\tau.$, and in Od. 11. 17 $\omicron\upsilon\theta' \delta\pi\acute{o}\tau' \tilde{\alpha}\nu \sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\chi\eta\sigma\iota$ read $\omicron\upsilon\theta' \delta\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ ($\omicron\tau\epsilon \kappa\epsilon$, which Van Leeuwen proposes in these two places, is not admissible, since the reference is general).

Several reasons combine to make it probable that the forms $\tilde{\eta}\nu$

* *De particularum κέν et ἄν apud Homerum usu (Mnemosyne, xv. p. 75).* The statistics given above are taken from this valuable dissertation.

and ἐπὶν are post-Homeric. The contraction of εἰ ἄν, ἐπεὶ ἄν is contrary to Homeric analogies (§ 378*), and could hardly have taken place until ἄν became much commoner than it is in Homer. Again, the usage with regard to the order of the Particles excludes the combinations ἦν δέ, ἦν περ, ἦν γάρ—for which Homer would have εἰ δ' ἄν, εἰ περ ἄν, εἰ γὰρ ἄν (§ 365). Again, ἦν cannot properly be used in a *general* statement or simile, and whenever it is so used the metre allows it to be changed into εἰ : *e.g.* in Il. 1. 166 ἀτὰρ ἦν ποτε δασμὸς ἴκηται : Od. 5. 120 ἦν τίς τε φίλον ποιήσεται ἀκοίτην (ἦ τίς τε in several MSS.) : Od. 11. 159 ἦν μὴ τις ἔχῃ εὐεργέα νῆα : Od. 12. 288 ἦν πως ἐξαπίνης ἔλθῃ : Il. 20. 172 ἦν τινα πέφνη (in a simile). Similar arguments apply with even greater force to ἐπὶν. Of the 48 instances there are 18 in general sentences, and several others (Il. 4. 239., 16. 95, Od. 3. 45., 4. 412., 5. 348., 11. 119., 15. 36., 21. 159) in which the reference to the future is so indefinite that ἐπεὶ with a pure Subj. is admissible. It cannot be accidental that in these places, with one exception (Od. 11. 192), ἐπὶν is followed by a consonant, so that ἐπεὶ can be restored without any metrical difficulty. On the other hand, in 13 places in which ἐπὶν is followed by a vowel the reference is to a definite future event, and accordingly we may read ἐπεὶ κ'. In the combination ἐπὶν δῆ, which occurs seven times, we should probably read ἐπεὶ δῆ, or in some places ἐπεὶ κεν (as in Od. 11. 221). The form ἐπειδάν occurs once, in a simile (Il. 13. 285) : hence we should read ἐπεὶ δῆ (not ἐπεὶ κεν, as Bekker and Nauck, or αἶ κεν as Menrad).

The distinction between general statements and those which refer to an actual future occurrence has hardly been sufficiently attended to in the conjectures proposed by Van Leeuwen and others. Thus in Od. 5. 121 ἦν τίς τε φίλον ποιήσεται ἀκοίτην (in a general reflexion) Van Leeuwen would read αἶ κέν τίς τε : and in Od. 12. 288 ἦν πως ἐξαπίνης ἔλθῃ he proposes αἶ κέ που. So in Il. 6. 489, Od. 8. 553 ἐπὶν τὰ πρῶτα γένηται (of the lot of man) he bids us read ἐπεὶ κε. If any change is wanted beyond putting ἐπεὶ for ἐπὶν, the most probable would be ἐπεὶ τε : see § 332. On the other hand he would put ἐπεὶ for ἐπὶν in such places as Od. 1. 293 ἀτὰρ ἐπὶν δὴ ταῦτα τελευτήσῃς τε καὶ ἔρξης (cp. Od. 5. 363., 18. 269), where a definite future occasion is implied, and consequently ἐπεὶ κεν (which he reads in Od. 4. 414) would be more Homeric. In Od. 6. 262 ἀτὰρ ἐπὶν πόλιος ἐπιβόμεν we should perhaps read ἐπεὶ κε πόλιος (ο -) : see § 94, 2.

In a few places the true reading may be εἰ or ἐπεὶ with the Opt. : as Od. 8. 511 αἶσα γὰρ ἦν ἀπολέσθαι, ἐπὶν πόλις ἀμφικαλύψῃ (ἐπεὶ . . ἀμφικαλύψαι, as in Il. 19. 208 we should read ἐπεὶ τισαίμεθα) : Od. 21. 237 (= 383) ἦν δέ τις . . ἀκούσῃ μὴ τι εὐράξει προβλάσκειν (εἰ δέ τις . . ἀκούσαι) : Il. 15. 504., 17. 245., 22. 55, 487.

The form ὄτ' ἄν occurs in our text in 29 places, and in 22 of these the metre admits ὅτε κ' (χ'), which Van Leeuwen accordingly would restore. The mischief however must lie deeper. Of the 22 places there are 13 in which ὄτ' ἄν appears in the leading clause of a simile (ὡς δ' ὄτ' ἄν—), and in three

others (Il. 2. 397, Od. 11. 18., 13. 101) the sense is general; so that *ὅτε κ'* is admissible in six only (Il. 7. 335, 459., 8. 373, 475, Od. 2. 374., 4. 477). It cannot be an accident that there are so many cases of *ὅτ' ἄν* where Homeric usage requires the pure Subj., and no similar cases of *ὅτε κεν*: but for that very reason we cannot correct them by reading *ὅτε κ'*. Meanwhile no better solution has been proposed, and we must be content to note the 16 places as in all probability corrupt or spurious.

It is one thing, however, to find that *ἄν* has encroached upon *κεν* in Homer, and another thing to show that there are no uses of *ἄν* which belong to the primitive Homeric language.

The restoration of *κε(ν)* is generally regarded as especially easy in the combination *οὐκ ἄν*, for which *οὐ κεν* can always be written without affecting either sense or metre. The change, however, is open to objections which have not been sufficiently considered. It will be found that *οὐκ ἄν* occurs 61 times in the ordinary text of Homer: while *οὐ κεν* occurs 9 times, and *οὐ κε* 7 times. Now of the forms *κεν* and *κε* the first occurs in the Iliad 272 times, the second 222 times. Hence, according to the general laws of probability, *οὐ κεν* and *οὐ κε* may be expected to occur in the same proportion: and in the ordinary text this is the case (9:7). But if every *οὐκ ἄν* were changed into *οὐ κεν*, there would be 70 instances of *οὐ κεν* against 7 of *οὐ κε*. This clearly could not be accidental: hence it follows that *οὐκ ἄν* must be retained in all or nearly all the passages where it now stands.* And if *οὐκ ἄν* is right, we may infer that the other instances of *ἄν* with a negative—22 in number—are equally unassailable.

Another group of instances in which *ἄν* is evidently primitive consists of the dactylic combinations *ὅς περ ἄν*, *ἦ περ ἄν*, *εἶ περ ἄν*. Van Leeuwen would write *ὅς κέ περ*, &c.; but in Homer *περ* usually comes immediately after the Relative or *εἶ*, and before *κεν* (§ 365). Similarly *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄν* (Il. 24. 566) and *τόφρα γὰρ ἄν* (Od. 2. 77) cannot be changed into *οὐδέ κε γάρ*, *τόφρα κε γάρ*, since the order *γάρ κεν* is invariable in Homer. In these uses, accordingly, *ἄν* may be defended by an argument which was inapplicable to *οὐκ ἄν*, viz. the impossibility of making the change to *κεν*.

The same may be said of the forms in which *ἄν* occurs under the ictus of the verse, preceded by a short monosyllable (υ' -), as—

Il. 1. 205 ἦς ὑπεροπλήρησι τάχ' ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσση.

Od. 2. 76 εἶ χ' ὑμεῖς γε φάγοιτε, τάχ' ἄν ποτε καὶ τίσις εἶη.

Il. 9. 77 τίς ἄν τάδε γηθήσειε (so τίς ἄν, Il. 24. 367, Od. 8. 208., 10. 573).

* It will be seen that the argument is of the same kind as that by which it was shown above (§ 283 *b*) that *τε* must have been often changed into *κε*. The decisive fact in that case was the excessive occurrence of *κε*: here it is the absence of any such excess which leads us to accept the traditional text.

Π. 4. 164 ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὄτ' ἄν ποτ' κτλ. (cp. I. 519., 4. 53., 6. 448., 9. 101).

8. 406 ὄφρ' εἰδῆ γλαυκῶπις ὄτ' ἄν δὲ πατρὶ μάχηται (= 420).

So καὶ ἄν and τότε ἄν (see the instances, § 363, 2, c), σὺ δ' ἄν (Π. 6. 329), ὅς ἄν (Od. 21. 294, cp. Od. 4. 204., 18. 27, Π. 7. 231). In this group, as in the last, we have to do with recurring forms, sufficiently numerous to constitute a *type*, with a fixed rhythm, as well as a certain tone and style.

The combination of ἄν and κεν in the same Clause is found in a very few places, and is probably not Homeric. In four places (Π. 11. 187, 202, Od. 5. 361., 6. 259) we have ὄφρ' ἄν μὲν κεν κτλ., where the place of ἄν is anomalous (§ 365). For οὗτ' ἄν κεν (Π. 13. 127) we should probably read οὗτ' ἄρ κεν, and so in Od. 9. 334 τοὺς ἄρ κε (or rather οὗς ἄρ κε) καὶ ἤθελον αὐτὸς ἐλέσθαι (cp. Π. 7. 182 ὃν ἄρ' ἤθελον αὐτοί). In Od. 18. 318 ἦν περ γάρ κε should be εἶ περ γάρ κε (*supra*). *Causes* 110.

363.] Uses of κεν and ἄν. It will be convenient, by way of supplement to what has been said in the chapter on the uses of the Moods, (1) to bring together the chief exceptions to the general rule for the use of κεν or ἄν in Subordinate Clauses; and (2) to consider whether there are any differences of meaning or usage between the two Particles.

1. In Final Clauses which refer to what is still future, the use of κεν or ἄν prevails (§§ 282, 285, 288, 293, 304). But with certain Conjunctions (especially ὥς, ὅπως, ἵνα, ὄφρα) there are many exceptions: see §§ 285–289, 306–307. When the purpose spoken of is not an actual one, but either past or imaginary, the Verb is generally 'pure.'

In Conditional Clauses the Subj. and Opt. generally take κεν or ἄν when the governing Verb is in the Future, or in a Mood which implies a future occasion (Imperative, Subjunctive, Optative with κεν or ἄν). On the other hand in similes, maxims, and references to frequent or *indefinite* occasions, the Particle is not used. But—

(a) Sometimes the pure Subj. is used after a Future in order to show that the speaker avoids referring to a particular occasion: cp. Π. 21. 111 ἔσσεται ἢ ἡὼς ἢ δειλη ἢ μέσον ἡμαρ ὁππότε. . ἔληται, and the examples quoted in § 289, 2, a and § 292, a.

(b) In our texts of Homer there are many places in which κεν or ἄν is used although the reference is *indefinite*: but the number is much reduced if we deduct the places in which it is probable that κε (or κ') has crept in instead of τε (τ'): see § 283, b. The

real exceptions will generally be found where a Clause is added to restrict or qualify a general supposition already made:—

Il. 3. 25 μάλα γάρ τε κατεσθίει, εἴ περ ἂν αὐτὸν
σεύωνται (even in the case when &c.).

Od. 21. 293 οἰνός σε τρώει μελιηδής, ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλους
βλάπτει, ὅς ἄν μιν χανδὸν ἔλη (in the case of him
who takes it greedily).

So Il. 6. 225., 9. 501, 524., 20. 166, Od. 15. 344., 19. 332 (§§ 289, 292, 296). In these places we see the tendency of the language to extend the use of *κεν* or *ἂν* beyond its original limits, in other words, to state indefinite cases as if they were definite—a tendency which in later Greek made the use of *ἂν* universal in such Clauses, whether the event intended was definite or not.

The change is analogous to the use of the Indicative in a general Conditional protasis; when, as Mr. Goodwin expresses it, 'the speaker refers to one of the cases in which an event *may* occur as if it were the only one—that is, he states the general supposition as if it were particular' (*Moods and Tenses*, § 467). The loss of the Homeric use of *τε*, and the New Ionic use of *ὃ ἢ τό* as a Relative with indefinite as well as definite antecedents, are examples of the same kind.

2. Up to this point the Particles *κεν* and *ἂν* have been treated as practically equivalent. There are however some differences of usage which remain to be pointed out.

(a) In *Negative Clauses* there is a marked preference for *ἂν*. In the ordinary text of the Iliad *ἂν* is found with a negative 53 times (nearly a third of the whole number of instances), *κεν* is similarly used 33 times (about one-twentieth). The difference is especially to be noticed in the Homeric use of the Subj. as a kind of Future (§§ 275, 276). In affirmative clauses of this type *κεν* is frequent, *ἂν* very rare: in negative clauses *ἂν* only is found.

(b) *κεν* is often used in two or more successive Clauses of a Sentence: *e.g.* in both protasis and apodosis, as—

Il. 1. 324 εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώησιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι κτλ.

In Disjunctive Sentences, as—

Il. 18. 308 στήσομαι, ἢ κε φέρησι μέγα κράτος ἢ κε φεροίμην.

Od. 4. 692 ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρησι βροτῶν, ἄλλον κε φιλοίη.

And in parallel and correlative Clauses of all kinds:—

Il. 3. 41 καὶ κε τὸ βουλοίμην καὶ κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη.

23. 855 ὅς μὲν κε βάλῃ . . ὅς δέ κε μηρίνθοιο τύχη, κτλ.

Od. 11. 110 τὰς εἰ μὲν κ' ἀσυνέας ἑάας νόστου τε μέδῃαι,
καὶ κεν ἔτ' εἰς Ἴθάκην κακὰ περ πάσχοντες ἴκοισθε
εἰ δέ κε σίνηαι κτλ.

ἄν, on the other hand, is especially used in the *second* of two parallel or connected Clauses: as—

Il. 19. 228 ἀλλὰ χρῆ τὸν μὲν καταθάπτειν ὅς κε θάνησι . .
ὄσσοι δ' ἄν πολέμοιο περὶ στυγεροῖο λίπωνται κτλ.

Od. 19. 329 ὅς μὲν ἀπηγῆς αὐτὸς ἔη καὶ ἀπηγέα εἰδῆ . .
ὅς δ' ἄν ἀμύμων αὐτὸς ἔη κτλ.

So Il. 21. 553 εἰ μὲν κεν . . εἰ δ' ἄν κτλ.; Il. 3. 288 ff. εἰ μὲν κεν
εἰ δέ κε—εἰ δ' ἄν (the last an alternative to the second).

The only instance of ἄν in two parallel Clauses is—

Od. 11. 17 οὐθ' ὀπότ' ἄν στείχησι πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα
οὐθ' ὄτ' ἄν ἄψ ἐπὶ γαίαν κτλ.

and there we ought to read ὀπότε στείχησι, according to the regular Homeric use of the Subj. in *general* statements (§ 289, 2, a).

(c) There are several indications of the use of ἄν as a more *emphatic* Particle than κεν. Thus the combination ἦ τ' ἄν *surely in that case* occurs 7 times in the Iliad, ἦ τέ κεν only twice. Compare the force of καὶ ἄν in—

Il. 5. 362 (=457) ὅς νῦν γε καὶ ἄν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο

Od. 6. 300 ρεία δ' ἀρίγνωτ' ἔστί, καὶ ἄν πάϊς ἠγήσαιτο.

So Il. 14. 244 ἄλλον μὲν κεν . . ρεία κατευνήσαιμι, καὶ ἄν ποταμοῖο
ῥέεθρα Ὠκεανοῦ *I would put any other to sleep, even Oceanus, &c.*

Cp. also τότε ἄν (*then indeed, then at length*), in—

Il. 18. 397 τότε ἄν πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῶ.

22. 108 ἐμοὶ δὲ τότε ἄν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη κτλ.

24. 213 τότε ἄν τιτὰ ἔργα γένοιτο.

Od. 9. 211 τότε ἄν οὐ τοι ἀποσχέσθαι φίλον ἦεν.

And τίς ἄν (*quid tandem*) in Il. 9. 77 τίς ἄν τάδε γηθήσειεν; Il. 24.
367 τίς ἄν δῆ τοι νόος εἶη; Od. 8. 208 τίς ἄν φιλέοντι μάχοιτο;
Od. 10. 573 τίς ἄν θεὸν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα κτλ.

The general effect of these differences of usage between the two Particles seems to be that ἄν is used either in an *adversative* sense—with a second or opposed alternative—or when greater *emphasis* has to be expressed.

This account of the matter is in harmony with the predominance of ἄν in negative sentences. When we speak of an event as *not happening* in certain circumstances, we generally do so by way of contrast to the *opposite* circumstances, those in which it will happen; as οὐκ ἄν τοι χραίσμη κίθαρις *the lyre will not avail you* (viz. *in battle—whatever it may do elsewhere*).

The *accent* of the Particles must not be overlooked as a confirmation of the view now taken. Evidently ἄν is more likely to convey emphasis than the enclitic κεν. We may find an analogy

in the orthotone and adversative δέ, which stands to τε and the correlated τε—τε somewhat as we have supposed ἄν to stand to κεν and κεν—κεν.

364.] Original meaning of ἄν and κεν. The identity of the Greek ἄν with the Latin and Gothic *an* has been maintained with much force and ingenuity by Prof. Leo Meyer. The following are some of the chief points established by his dissertation.*

1. The Latin *an* is used by the older poets in the second member of a disjunctive question, either direct, as *egone an ille injurie facimus?* or indirect, as *utrum scapulae plus an collus calli habeat nescio* (both from Naevius). The use in single questions is a derivative one, and properly implies that the question is put as an alternative: as—

Plaut. Asin. 5. 1, 10 credam istuc, si te esse hilarum videro. AR. An tu me tristem putas? *do you then think me (the opposite, viz.) sad?*

Amph. 3. 3, 8 derides qui scis haec dudum me dixisse per jocum. SO. an illut joculari dixisti? *equidem serio ac vero ratus.*

In these places † we see how *an* comes to mean *then on the contrary, then in the other case, &c.* So in Naevius, *eho an vicimus?* *what then, have we conquered?*

2. In Gothic, again, *an* is used in questions of an adversative character: as in Luke x. 29 *an hvas ist mis nehvundja* ('he willing to justify himself, said): and who is my neighbour?' John xviii. 37 *an nuh thiudans is thu* 'art thou a king then?'

3. These instances exhibit a close similarity between the Latin and the Gothic *an*, and suggest the possibility of a Disjunctive Particle (*or, or else*) coming to express recourse to a second alternative (*if not, then —*), and so acquiring the uses of the Greek ἄν. This supposition, as Leo Meyer goes on to show, is confirmed by the Gothic *aiththau* and *thau*, which are employed (1) as Disjunctive Particles, *or, or else*, and (2) to render the Greek ἄν, chiefly in the use with the Past Indicative. Thus we have, as examples of *aiththau*—

Matth. v. 36 *ni magt ain tagl hveit aiththau svart gataujan thou canst not make one hair white or black.*

Matth. ix. 17 *aiththau distaurnand balgeis (neither do men put new wine into old bottles) else the bottles break.*

John xiv. 2 *niba veseina, aiththau qvethjau if it were not so, I would have told you [= it is not so, else I would have told you].*

John xiv. 7 *ith kuntheideith mik, aiththau kuntheideith &c. if ye had known me, ye should have known &c.*

Similarly *thau* is used (1) to translate ἢ in double questions, as in Matth. xxvii. 17 *whom will ye that I release unto you, Barabbas or (thau) Jesus?* and after a Comparative (= *than*): frequently also (2) in a Conditional Apodosis. esp. to translate ἄν with Past Tenses, as—

Luke vii. 39 *sa ith vesi praufetus ufkunthedi thau this man, if he were a prophet, would have known.*

* 'AN in Griechischen, Lateinischen und Gothischen, Berlin 1880. The parallel between the Greek ἄν and the Gothic *thau* and *aiththau* was pointed out by Hartung (*Partikeln*, ii. p. 227).

† Taken from Draeger's *Historische Syntax*, i. p. 321, where many other examples will be found.

Sometimes also with the Present (where there is no *άν* in the Greek),—the meaning being that of a solemn or emphatic Future :—

Mark xi. 26 *ιθ jabai jus ni afētith, ni thau . . afētith if ye do not forgive neither will . . forgive (οὐδὲ . . ἀφήσει).*

Matth. v. 20 *ni thau qvimith (except your righteousness shall exceed &c.) ye shall in no case enter &c. (οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε).*

This use evidently answers to the Homeric *κεν* or *άν* with the Subj. and Fut. Ind. : *ni thau qvimith = οὐκ άν ἔλθῃτε, ni thau afētith = οὐδ' άν ἀφήσει.*

4. If now we suppose that *άν*, like *aiththau* and *thau*, had originally two main uses, (1) in the second member of a Disjunctive sentence (= *else, or else*), and (2) in the Conditional apodosis (= *in that case rather*), we can explain the Gothic and Latin *an* from the former, the Greek *άν* from the latter. The idiomatic 'ellipsis' in *ἦ γὰρ άν . . ὕστατα λωβήσαιο else you would outrage for the last time* will represent an intermediate or transitional use. We can then understand why *άν* should often accompany negatives, and why it should be used in the latter Clause of a sentence. The main difference of the two uses evidently is that in the first the Clauses are co-ordinate, in the second the Clause with *άν* is the apodosis or principal Clause. Thus the two uses are related to each other as the two uses of *δέ* (1) as an adversative Conjunction, (2) in the apodosis.

5. The use of *άν* in Final Clauses may be illustrated by that of *thau* in Mark vi. 56 *bēdun ina ei thau . . attaitōkeina παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κὰν . . ἄψωνται that they might touch if it were but &c.* With *ἵνα, ὡς, &c.* *άν* may have had originally the same kind of emphasis as *κὰν* in this passage : 'that in any case,' 'that if no more then at least &c.' The use in a Conditional Protasis following the Principal Clause may be compared with Luke ix. 13 *niba thau . . bugjaima (we have no more) except we should buy (= unless indeed we should buy).*

The Particle *κε(v)* is found in Æolic, in the same form as in Homer (see Append. F), and in Doric, in the form *κα*. It is usually identified with the Sanscrit *kam*, which when accented means *well (wohl, gut, bene)*, and as an enclitic appears to be chiefly used with the Imperative, but with a force which can hardly be determined (Delbrück, *A. S.* pp. 150, 503). A parallel may possibly be found in the German *wohl*, but in any case the development of the use of *κε(v)* is specifically Greek.

Order of the Particles and Enclitic Pronouns.

365.] The place of a Particle in the Homeric sentence is generally determined by stricter rules than those which obtain in later Greek : and similar rules are found to govern the order of the enclitic Pronouns and Adverbs.

1. The two enclitics *περ* and *γε*, when they belong to the first word in a clause, come before all other Particles. Hence we have the sequences *εἰ περ γάρ—εἰ περ άν—τοῦ περ δή—πόθεόν γε μέν, &c.* Exceptions are to be found in Il. 9. 46 *εἰς ὃ κέ περ Τροίην διαπέροσμεν* (read perhaps *εἰς ὅτε περ*), Il. 7. 387 *εἰ κέ περ ὕμμι . . γένοιτο*, Od. 3. 321 *ὄθεν τέ περ*, Il. 8. 243 *αὐτοὺς δή περ ἔασον*.

2. μέν and δέ, also τε in its use as a *connecting* word, come before other Particles. Hence we have οἱ δὲ δῆ—εἰ δέ κεν—ἐγὼ δέ κέ τοι—εἰ δ' ἄν—οὐ μὲν γάρ—οὔτε κε—οὔτ' ἄρα, &c.

μέν may be placed later when it emphasises a particular word, or *part* of a clause, especially in view of a following clause with δέ, as Il. 9. 300 εἰ δέ τοι Ἀτρεΐδης μὲν ἀπήχθετο . . σὺ δ' ἄλλους περ κτλ., Od. 4. 23., II. 385., 18. 67, &c.; and in such collocations as σοὶ δ' ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ κτλ., ἔνθ' ἦ τοι τοὺς μὲν κτλ. Cp. also Od. 15. 405 οὗ τι περιπληθῆς λίην τόσον, ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ μὲν.

The form ὄφρ' ἂν μὲν κεν is probably corrupt, see § 362 *ad fin.*

3. Of the remaining Particles γάρ comes first: as ἦ γάρ κε—τίς γάρ κε—εἴ περ γάρ κε—τόφρα γὰρ ἄν—ὡς γάρ νύ τοι, &c. Among the other Particles note the sequences καί νύ κεν—ἕξ ἄρα δῆ—ὀππότε κεν δῆ—ἦ ρά νυ—τίς τοί νυ. But ἄρα is sometimes put later in the clause, as ὡς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἕξετο, cp. Il. 5. 748 Ἥρη δὲ μάστιγι θοῶς ἐπιμαίετ' ἄρ' ἵππους.

τε in its *generalising* use comes after other Particles: hence δέ τε—μὲν τε—γάρ τε—ἀλλὰ τε—δ' ἄρα τε—ὅς ρά τε—οὔτ' ἄρ τε—οὔ νύ τε.

4. The Indefinite τις and the corresponding Adverbs, που, πως, πω, ποτε, &c. follow the Particles. Hence we have ὅτε κέν τις—αἶ κέν πως—ὄτ' ἄν ποτε—ὄν ρά τις—δῆ που—νύ που—ἦ πού τί σε, &c.

But τε follows τις (§ 332), as in καὶ γάρ τις τε, ὅς τις τε. And sometimes ὅς τις is treated as a single word, as in ὄν τινα μὲν (Il. 2. 188), ὅς τις δέ (Il. 15. 743), ὅς τις κε (Il. 10. 44, Od. 3. 355). Similarly we find εἴ ποτε in the combination εἴ ποτε δῆ, as well as the more regular εἰ δῆ ποτε.

τις sometimes comes later, as Il. 4. 300 ὄφρα καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλων τις κτλ., especially after a Gen. which it governs, as Il. 13. 55 σφῶν δ' ὦδε θεῶν τις κτλ.; cp. also Il. 22. 494 τῶν δ' ἐλεησάντων κοτύλην τις τυτθὸν ἐπέσχευ, and Od. 21. 374.

So ποτε, as in Il. 4. 410 τῷ μῆ μοι πατέρας ποθ' ὁμοίῃ ἐνθεοι τιμῆ, Il. 6. 99 οὐδ' Ἀχιλλῆα ποθ' ὦδε κτλ., Il. 10. 453, Od. 2. 137. In these places ποτε seems to be attracted to an emphatic word. Cp. που in Il. 12. 272, ποθεν in Od. 18. 376.

5. The enclitic Personal Pronouns come after the Particles and Pronouns already mentioned: οὗ ποτέ με—ἦ πῆ με—οὐδέ νύ πώ με—οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μοι—ἐγὼ δέ κέ τοι—ἐπεὶ ἄρ κέ σε—ὀππότε κέν μιν—αἶ κέν πῶς μιν—οὐ γάρ πῶ σφιν—ἦ πού τίς σφιν, &c.

Sometimes however an enclitic form follows the emphatic Pronoun αὐτός: as Il. 5. 459 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' αὐτῷ μοι ἐπέσσυτο, Il. 22. 346 αἶ γάρ πως αὐτόν με κτλ.

Occasionally an enclitic is found out of its place at the end of

a line which has the bucolic caesura: Il. 3. 368 οὐδ' ἔβαλον μιν (v. l. οὐδ' ἐδάμασσα), 5. 104 εἰ ἐτεόν με, 7. 79 ὄφρα πυρός με, II. 380 ὡς ὄφελόν τοι: so with τις, Il. 4. 315 ὡς ὄφελέν τις; and without bucolic caesura, Il. 17. 736 ἐπὶ δὲ πτόλεμος τέτατό σφιν.

6. The negative Particles οὐ and μή, which regularly begin the clause, are often put later in order that some other word may be emphasised, and in that case the Indefinite τις, ποτε, &c. follow οὐ or μή: as μετάλλησάν γε μὲν οὐ τι (for οὐ μὲν τι μετάλλησάν γε), κείνοισι δ' ἂν οὐ τις (for οὐ δ' ἂν τις κείνοισι), σὺ δὲ μή τι, τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτε, &c. Similarly κεν and ἂν are attracted to the negation, as in πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ (for οὐδ' ἂν ἐγὼ πληθύν), and when the negative is repeated, as in οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ κεν κτλ.: cp. Od. 15. 321 δρηστοσύνη οὐκ ἂν μοι ἐρίσσειε βροτὸς ἄλλος.

7. The place of the enclitic is perhaps explained by the pause of the verse in Od. 15. 118 ὅθ' ἐὸς δόμος ἀμφεκάλυψε | κείσέ με νοστήσαντα, Od. 14. 245 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα | Αἴγυπτόνδε με κτλ. (unless we read κείσ' ἐμέ, Αἴγυπτόνδ' ἐμέ, cp. Od. 16. 310); and so in—

Il. 1. 205 ἧς ὑπεροπλήσι τάχ' ἂν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσση.

1. 256 ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυμῷ.

5. 362 Τυδείδης, ὃς νῦν γε καὶ ἂν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο.

22. 108 ὡς ἐρέουσιν' ἐμοὶ δὲ τότ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη.

Od. 1. 217 ὡς δὴ ἐγὼ γ' ὄφελον μάκαρός νύ τευ ἔμμεναι υἱός.

The second half of the line is treated as a fresh beginning of a sentence.

Without assuming that the Homeric usage as to the place of Particles and Enclitics is invariable, we may point out that in several places where these rules are violated the text is doubtful on other grounds. Thus—

Il. 3. 173 ὡς ὄφελεν θανάτος μοι ἀδεῖν. Read ὡς μ' ὄφελεν θάνατος φαδέειν: for the elision μ(ει) cp. Il. 6. 165 ὅς μ' ἔθελεν φιλότῃτι μιγήμεναι (§ 376).

Il. 6. 289 ἐνθ' ἔσαν οἱ πέπλοι κτλ. Read ἐνθα φ' ἔσαν (see § 376). Similarly in Il. 20. 282 καδ δ' ἄχος οἱ χύτο Van Leeuwen reads καδ δέ φ' ἄχος χύτο.

Od. 1. 37 ἐπεὶ πρό οἱ εἶπομεν ἡμεῖς. Bekker would omit πρό (Hom. Bl. ii. 21).

Od. 2. 327 ἐπεὶ νύ περ ἴεται αἰνῶς (read νύ τε φέται?).

Od. 15. 436 ὄρκω πιστωθῆναι ἀπήμονά μ' οἶκαδ' ἀπάξειν. Omit μ'.

Od. 11. 218 ἀλλ' αὕτη δικὴ ἐστὶ βροτῶν, ὅτε κέν τε θάνωσιν, with v. l. (in five MSS.) ὅτε τίς κε θάνησιν. Read ὅτε τίς τε θάνησιν (§ 289 ad fin.).

Il. 20. 77 τοῦ γὰρ βα μάλιστά ἐθυμὸς ἀνώγει: so Aristarchus, but the other ancient reading was μάλιστά γε.

Il. 21. 576 εἰ περ γὰρ φθάμενός μιν ἢ οὐτάση κτλ.: for μιν the 'city-editions' had τις, but neither word is needed.

Od. 7. 261 (= 14. 287) ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ὕγδοόν μοι ἐπιπλόμενον ἔτος ἦλθεν: Dind. reads ὕγδατον, to avoid the unusual synizesis. Read ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μ' ὕγδαον: an earlier ὕγδαος (= Lat. octāvus) is almost necessary to account for ὕγδος (Brugmann, M. U. v. 37).

Il. 5. 273 εἰ τοῦτω κε λάβοιμεν κτλ. For κε (without meaning here) read γε.
 Il. 14. 403 ἐπεὶ τέτραπτο πρὸς ἰθὺ οἱ. The sense seems to require πρὸς ἰθὺν
 in the direction of his aim, cp. πᾶσαν ἐπ' ἰθὺν for every aim, ἀν' ἰθὺν straight onwards
 (Il. 21. 303, Od. 8. 377).

Il. 24. 53 μῆ . . νεμεσσηθῶμεν οἱ ἡμεῖς. Read-θήομεν, omitting οἱ.

A less strict usage may be traced in the 10th book of the Iliad : cp. l. 44
 ἢ τίς κεν, 242 εἰ μὲν δὴ ἔταρόν γε κελεύετε μ' αὐτὸν ἐλεῖσθαι, 280 νῦν αὖτε μάλιστα
 με φίλαι, 344 ἀλλ' ἰῶμέν μιν, 453 οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα σὺ πῆμά ποτ' ἔσσειαι. The subject,
 however, needs more detailed investigation.

CHAPTER XIV.

METRE AND QUANTITY.

The Hexameter.

366.] The verse in which the Homeric poems are composed—the *heroic hexameter*—consists of six feet, of equal length, each of which again is divided into two equal parts, viz. an accented part or *arsis* (on which the rhythmical beat or *ictus* falls), and an unaccented part or *thesis*. In each foot the arsis consists of one long syllable, the thesis of one long or two short syllables ; except the last thesis, which consists of one syllable, either long or short.

The fifth thesis nearly always consists of two short syllables, thus producing the characteristic — ∪ ∪ — ∽ which marks the end of each hexameter.

The last foot is probably to be regarded as a little shorter than the others, the time being filled up by the pause at the end of the verse. The effect of this shortening is heightened by the dactyl in the fifth place, since the two short syllables take the full time of half a foot.

367.] **Diaeresis and Caesura.** Besides the recognised *stops* or pauses which mark the separation of sentences and clauses there is in general a slight pause or break of the voice between successive words in the same clause, sufficient to affect the rhythm of the verse. Hence the rules regarding *Diaeresis* and *Caesura*.

By *Diaeresis* is meant the coincidence of the division between words with the division into feet. The commonest place of diaeresis in the hexameter is after the fourth foot: as—

ἡρώων αὐτοῦς δὲ ἐλώρια | τεύχε κύνεσσιν.

This is called the *Bucolic Diaeresis*.

Caesura (τομή) occurs when the pause between two words falls within a foot, so as to 'cut' it into two parts. The caesura which separates the arsis from the thesis (so as to divide the foot equally) is called the *strong* or *masculine* caesura: that which falls between the two short syllables of the thesis is called the *weak* or *feminine* or *trochaic* caesura.

The chief points to be observed regarding caesura in the Homeric hexameter are as follows:—

1. There is nearly always a caesura in the third foot. Of the two caesuras the more frequent in this place is the trochaic (τομή κατὰ τρίτον τροχαίου), as—

ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα | πολύτροπον ὃς μάλα πολλά.

The strong caesura, or 'caesura after the fifth half-foot' (τομή πενθημιμερής), is rather less common: as—

μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, | Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος.

In the first book of the Iliad, which contains 611 lines, the trochaic caesura of the third foot occurs in 356, and the corresponding strong caesura in 247.*

On the other hand, there must be no diaeresis after the third foot; and in the few cases in which the third foot lies wholly in one word there is always a strong caesura in the fourth foot (τομή ἐφθημιμερής), as—

ὃς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπεῖσθαι | μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ
Ἥρη τ' ἠδὲ Ποσειδάων | καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.

The division between an enclitic and the preceding word is not sufficient for the caesura in the third foot: hence in Od. 10. 58 we should read—

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτιοί τ' | ἐπασσάμεθ' ἠδὲ ποτῆτος

not σίτιοί τε πασσάμεθ' (as La Roche).

The remaining exceptions to these rules are—

Il. 1. 179 οἴκαδ' ἰὼν σὺν νηυσὶ τε σῆς καὶ σοῖς ἐτάροισι,

which is an adaptation of the (probably conventional) form σὺν νηὶ τ' ἐμῇ καὶ ἐμοῖς ἐτάροισι (1. 183). We may help the rhythm by taking νηυσὶ τε σῆς closely together, so as to avoid the break in the middle of the line.

Il. 3. 205 ἦδη γὰρ καὶ δεῦρό ποτ' ἦλυθε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.

Il. 10. 453 οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα σὺ πῆμά ποτ' ἔσσειαι Ἀργείοισι.

Where ποτέ, as an enclitic, is in an unusual place in the sentence (§ 365, 4), but it is perhaps in reality an emphatic 'one day.' Similarly, in—

Il. 3. 220 φαίης κε ζῆακτόν τε τιν' ἔμμεναι ἄφρονά τ' αὐτως,
τῶνα may be slightly emphatic. Or should we read τὸν ἔμμεναι?

Il. 15. 18 ἢ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε τ' ἐκρέμων ἠψόθεν, ἔκ τε ποδοῖν.

We may read ὅτε τε κρέμων: but possibly the peculiar rhythm is intentional, as being adapted to the sense.

* In this calculation no lines are reckoned twice, short monosyllables being taken either with the preceding or the following word, according to the sense.

2. Trochaic caesura of the fourth foot is very rare, and is only found under certain conditions, viz.—

(1) when the caesura is preceded by an enclitic or short monosyllable (such as μέν, δέ, &c.); as—

καί κεν τοῦτ' ἐθέλοισι Διός γε διδόντος ἀρέσθαι.

(2) when the line ends with a word of four or five syllables; as—

αὐτὰρ ὁ μῦθος ἔην μετὰ πέντε κασιγνήτησι.

πολλὰ δ' ἄρ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθ' ἴθυσε | μάχη πεδίοιο.

The commonest form of this kind of caesura (especially in the Iliad) is that in which these two alleviations are both present; as—

Θερσίτ' ἀκριτόμυθε, λιγύς περ ἔων ἀγορητής.

The first fifteen books of the Iliad contain eleven instances of trochaic caesura in the fourth foot, of which seven are of this form.

In Il. 9. 394 the MSS. give—

Πηλεὺς θήν μοι ἔπειτα γυναικα | γαμέσσεται αὐτός.

But we should doubtless read, with Aristarchus,—

γυναϊκά γε μάσσεται αὐτός.

Similarly we should probably read τὰ δέ μ' οὐκ ἄρα μέλλον δνήσειν (Il. 5. 205, &c.), instead of ἔμελλον: and conversely θαλερῇ δ' ἐμιαίνετο χαίτη (Il. 17. 439), and ῥαφαὶ δ' ἐλέλυτο ἰμάντων (Od. 22. 186), instead of μιαίνετο, λέλυτο. In Od. 5. 272 we may treat ὄψ' ἐ δύοντα as one word in rhythm. But it is not easy to account for the rhythm in Od. 12. 47 ἐπὶ δ' οὐατ' ἀλείψαι ἑταίρων.

The result of these rules evidently is that there are two chief breaks or pauses in the verse—the *caesura* in the third foot, and the *diaeresis* between the fourth and fifth—and that the *forbidden* divisions are the diaeresis and caesura which lie nearest to these pauses. Thus—

Best caesura - ˘ - ˘ - ˘ | ˘ - ˘ - ˘ - -

Worst diaeresis - ˘ - ˘ - ˘ | - ˘ - ˘ - -

Again—

Best diaeresis - ˘ - ˘ - ˘ - ˘ | - ˘ - -

Worst caesura - ˘ - ˘ - ˘ - ˘ | ˘ - ˘ - -

It is also common to find a diaeresis with a slight pause after the first foot; ep. the recurring ὦς φάτο, ὦς ἔφατ', ὦς ὃ γε, αὐτὰρ ὁ, and forms of address, as τέκνον, δαιμόνι', ὦ φίλοι, ὦ πόποι, &c. Hence the occasional hiatus in this place, as Il. 2. 209 ἡχῆ, ὦς κτλ., Il. 1. 333 αὐτὰρ ὁ ἔγνω ἦσις ἐνὶ φρεσίν. *Od. 1. 276*,

368.] Spondaic verses. The use of a spondee in the fifth

place occurs most commonly in verses which end with a word of four or more syllables, as—

στέμματ' ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος.

* Ἀρεῖ δὲ ζώνην, στέρνον δὲ Ποσειδάωνι.

It is also found with words of three long syllables, as—

τῷ δ' ἦδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

And once or twice when the last word is a monosyllable: as *νομῆσαι βῶν* (Il. 7. 238), *ἐστήκει μείς* (Il. 19. 117).

A spondee in the fifth place ought not to end with a word. Hence we should correct the endings *ἦω δῖαν* &c. by reading *ἦῶα*, and *δήμου φῆμυς* (Od. 14. 239), by restoring the archaic *δήμοο*. In Od. 12. 64 the words *λῖς πέτρῃ* at the end of the line are scanned together.

Words of three long syllables are very seldom found before the Bucolic diaeresis. Examples are:—

Il. 13. 713 οὐ γάρ σφι σταδίῃ | ὑσμῖνῃ | μίμνε φίλον κῆρ.

Od. 10. 492 ψυχῇ χρησομένους | Θηβαίου | Τειρεσίαο.

The rarity of verses with this rhythm may be judged from the fact that it is never found with the oblique cases of *ἄνθρωπος* (*ἀνθρώπων* &c.), although these occur about 150 times, and in every other place in the verse: or with *ἀλλήλων* &c., which occur about 100 times.

Syllabic Quantity—Position.

369.] The quantity of a syllable—that is to say, the time which it takes in pronunciation—may be determined either by the length of the vowel (or vowels) which it contains, or by the character of the consonants which separate it from the next vowel sound. In ancient technical language, the vowel may be long by its own *nature* (*φύσει*), or by its *position* (*θέσει*).

The assumptions that all long syllables are equal, and that a long syllable is equal in quantity to two short syllables, are not strictly true of the natural quantity in ordinary pronunciation. Since every consonant takes *some* time to pronounce, it is evident that the first syllables of the words *ᾄς*, *ὄφρῦς*, *ὄμφῃ*, *ὄμβρος* are different in length; and so again are the first syllables of *ᾠτος*, *ὠτρυνον*. Again, the diphthongs *η*, *ηυ*, &c. are longer than the single vowels *η*, *ω*, &c., and also longer than the diphthongs *ει*, *ευ*, *οι*, *ου*. In short, the poetical ‘quantities’ must not be supposed to answer exactly to the natural or inherent length of the syllables. The poetical or metrical value is founded upon the natural length, but is the result of a sort of compromise, by which minor varieties of quantity are neglected, and the syllables thereby adapted to the demands of a simple rhythm.

It has been shown, however, that the general rule of Position rests upon a sound physiological basis. 'The insertion of a consonant may be regarded as equivalent in respect of time to the change of a short vowel into a long one.' Brücke, *Die physiologischen Grundlagen der neuhochdeutschen Verskunst*, p. 70; quoted by Hartel).

370.] **Position.** The general rule is that when a short vowel is followed by two consonants the syllable is long.

Regarding this rule it is to be observed that—

(1) Exceptions are almost wholly confined to combinations of a Mute (esp. a *tenuis*) with a following Liquid. But even with these combinations the general rule is observed in the great majority of the instances.

(2) Most of the exceptions are found with words which could not otherwise be brought into the hexameter: such as Ἄφροδίτη, Ἀμφιτρύων, βροτῶν, τράπεζα, προσηΰδα, &c.

(3) The remaining exceptions are nearly all instances in which the vowel is separated by Diaeresis from the following consonants: as Il. 18. 122 καὶ τινα̅ Τρωϊάδων, 24. 795 καὶ τὰ γε χρυσεῖην.

The chief exceptions in Homer are as follows* :—

τρ : in Ἀμφιτρύων, ἐτράφην (Il. 23. 84—but see the note on § 42 in the Appendix, p. 390), τετράκυκλον (Il. 24. 324), φαρέτρης (Il. 8. 323), Ὀτρυντεύς (Il. 20. 383-4); and in ἀλλότριος (unless we scan -ιος, -ιου, &c.).

Before τράπεζα, τρίαίνα, τρίτη (τριήκοντα, &c.), τραπέομεν (τράποντο, προ-τραπέσθαι, &c.), τράγους, τροποῖς, τρέφει (Od. 5. 422., 13. 410), τροφοῦ (Od. 19. 489), τρέμον (Od. 11. 527).

Before a diaeresis, καὶ τινα Τρωϊάδων (Il. 18. 122).

πρ : in ἀλλοτρύσαλλος (Il. 5. 831); before προσηΰδα, πρόσωπον, προϊκτης, πρόσω, and other Compounds of πρό and πρόσ (προκείμενα, προσαΐζας, &c.); also before πρὸς ἀλλήλους, πρὸ ἄστεος, and one or two similar phrases (cp. Il. 13. 799., 17. 726).

Before Πριαμίδης (Il.), πρῖν (Il. 1. 97 οὐδ' ὅ γε πρῖν κτλ., cp. 19. 313, Od. 14. 334., 17. 597); πρῶτος (Od. 3. 320., 17. 275), προσφάσθαι (Od. 23. 106).

κρ : in δακρύοισι (Od. 18. 173), δακρυπλῶειν (Od. 19. 122), ἐνέκρυσε (Od. 5. 488), κερκρυμένα (Od. 23. 110).

Before Κρονίων, Κρόνου παῖς, κραταῖός, Κραταιΐς, κράτος μέγα (Il. 20. 121), κράνεια, κρυφηδόν, κραδαίνω, κρατευτάων, κρεῶν.

Add Il. 11. 697 εἶλετο κρινάμενος; Od. 8. 92 κατὰ κρᾶτα (καὶ κρᾶτα?), 12. 99 δέ τε κρᾶτί.

βρ : in βροτός and its derivatives, as ἀβρότη, ἀμφίβροτος: also before βραχίων.

δρ : in ἀμφι-δρυφής (Il. 2. 700), and before δράκων, Δρύας, δρόμους. Also Il. 11. 69 τὰ δὲ δράγματα (unless we read δάργματα, as Hartel suggests).

θρ : in ἀλλό-θροος (Od. 1. 183, &c.), and before θρόνων, &c. and θρασειάν. Also in Il. 5. 462 ἡγήτορι Θρηκῶν.

* They are enumerated by La Roche, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, pp. 1-41, with his usual care and completeness.

φρ: in Ἐφροδίτη: and Od. 15. 444 ἡμῖν δ' ἐπι-φράσσειτ' ὄλεθρον. Cp. Hes. Op. 655 προπεφραδμένα.

χρ: before χρέος or χρέως (Od. 8. 353): and in Il. 23. 186 ῥοδόεντι δὲ χρίεν, Il. 24. 795 καὶ τὰ γε χρυσεῖην.

τλ: in σχετλίη (Il. 3. 414), which however may be scanned --.

κλ: in Πάτροκλε (Il. 19. 287), ἐκλίθη (Od. 19. 470—should perhaps be read ἐτέρωσε κλίθη), προσέκλινε (Od. 21. 138, 165—read perhaps πρόσκλινε or ἔκλινε): and before Κλυταιμνήστρη, Κλεωναί, κλύδων, κληγδών, κλιθῆναι (Od. 1. 366). Also, in Od. 12. 215 τύπετε κληΐδεσσιν, 20. 92 τῆς δ' ἄρα κλαιούσης.

πλ: in the Compounds τειχεσι-πλήτα (Il. 5. 31, 455), πρωτό-πλοος, προσέπλαξε (Od. 11. 583—read perhaps πρόσ-πλαξε): before Πλάταια, πλέων sailing, πλέων ποιε (Il. 10. 252), πλέων full (Od. 20. 355). Add Il. 9. 382 (=Od. 4. 127) Αἴγυπτιάς, ὅθι πλείστα (with v. l. ἦ πλείστα, cp. Od. 4. 229), and Il. 4. 329 αὐτὰρ ὁ πλησίον.

χλ: in Od. 10. 234 καὶ μέλι χλωρόν, 14. 429 ἀμφὶ δὲ χλαῖναν.

To these have to be added the very few examples of a vowel remaining short before σκ and ζ: viz.—

σκ: before Σκάμανδρος, σκέπαρνον (Od. 5. 237, 9. 391), σκίη (Hes. Op. 589).

ζ: before Ζάκυνθος (Il. 2. 634, Od. 1. 246, &c.), Ζέλεια (Il. 2. 824, &c.).

στ: before στέατος in Od. 21. 178, 183—unless it is a case of Synizesis.

A comparison of these exceptions will show that in a sense we are right in attributing them to metrical necessity. There are comparatively few instances in which the two consonants do not come at the beginning of a word of the form υ —, so that the last syllable of the preceding word must be a short one. On the other hand, the extent to which neglect of position is allowed for metrical convenience is limited, and depends on the *natural quantity* of the consonants in question, *i. e.* the actual time occupied by their pronunciation. Sonant mutes (*mediae*) are longer than surd mutes (*tenues*); gutturals are longer than dentals or labials; and of the two liquids λ is longer than ρ. Thus shortening is tolerably frequent before πρ and τρ, less so before κρ, πλ, κλ, θρ, χρ. With other combinations of mute and liquid, as φρ, βρ, δρ, and with σκ and ζ, it seems to be only admitted for the sake of words which the poet was absolutely compelled to bring in: such as Ἐφροδίτη, Σκάμανδρος, Ζάκυνθος, βροτός, with its compounds, &c. No exceptions are found before γρ, γλ, φλ, κυ, κμ, or any combination other than those mentioned. In short, the harshness tolerated in a violation of the rule usually bears a direct relation to its necessity. It was impossible to have an Iliad without the names Aphrodite and Scamander, but these are felt and treated as exceptions.

The word ἀνδρότης, which appears in the fixed ending λιπούσ' ἀνδρότητα καὶ ἦβην, should probably be written ἀδρότης. As the original μρ of βροτός becomes either μβρ (as ἄ-μβροτος, φησι-μβροτος), or βρ (as νῦξ ἄ-βρότη, ἀμφί-βροτος), so νρ might become νδρ (as ἀνδρός), or δρ. So perhaps Ἐνναλίφ ἀνδρεΐφόντη should be Ἐνναλίφ ἀδριφόντη (υ υ —): cp. ἀνδρε-φόνος (Hdn. ap. Eustath. 183, 6).

The plea on which a short vowel is allowed before *Σκάμανδρος* and *σκέπαρνον* may be extended, as Fick points out (*Bezz. Beitr.* xiv. 316), to some forms of *σκίδνημι* now written without the *σ*, viz. *κέδασθεν* (Il. 15. 657), *κεδασθέντες*, &c. Metrical necessity, however, would not justify the same license with *σκιδναται* *ἐπικιδναται* (Il. 2. 850, &c.), *ἐ-σκιδνατο*, *ἐ-σκέδασσε* (for which *ἐσκέδασε* is available).

Neglect of Position is perceptibly commoner in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*. Apart from cases in which the necessities of metre can be pleaded, viz. proper names and words beginning with *σ* -, it will be found that the proportion of examples is about 3 : 1. It will be seen, too, that some marked instances occur in Books 23 and 24 of the *Iliad*. In *Hesiod* and the *Homeric Hymns* the rule is still more lax. Thus in *Hesiod* a vowel is allowed to be short before *κν* (*Op.* 567, *Fr.* 95), and *πν* (*Theog.* 319). In the scanty fragments of the *Cyclic poets* we find *πέπρωται* (*Cypria*), *πᾶτρι* (*Little Iliad*), *ἄρχισαιο κλυτὸν κτλ.* (*ibid.*), *ἄκριβία* (*Liupersis*).

371.] **Lengthening before ρ, λ, μ, ν, σ, δ.** There are various words beginning with one of these letters (the liquids *ρ, λ, μ, ν*, the spirant *σ*, and the *media δ*), before which a short final vowel is often allowed to have the metrical value of a long syllable. Initial *ρ* appears always to have this power of lengthening a preceding vowel; but in the case of the other letters mentioned it is generally confined to certain words. Thus we have examples before—

ρ, in *λίσσομαι, λήγω, λείβω, λιγύς, λιαρός, λιπαρός, λίσ, λαπάρη, λόφος*, and occasionally in a few others: but not (*e.g.*) in such frequently occurring words as *Λύκιος, λέχος, λείπω*.

μ, in *μέγας, μέγαρον, μοῖρα, μαλακός, μέλος, μελή, μᾶστιξ, μόθος*: but not (*e.g.*) *μάχομαι, μένος, μέλας, μάκαρ, μῦθος*.

ν, in *νευρή, νέφος, νφάς, νύμφη, νότος, νητός, νύσσα*: once only before *νηῦς* (Il. 13. 472): not before *νέκυς, νόος, νέμεσις*, &c.

σ, in *σεύω, σάρξ*: once before *σύ* (Il. 20. 434), and once before *συφεός* (Od. 10. 238).

δ, in *δέος, δεινός, δει-σας* &c. (Stem *δφει-*), *δήν, δηρόν* (§ 394).

This lengthening, it is to be observed, is almost wholly confined to the syllables which have the metrical ictus: the exceptions are, *πολλά λισσομένη* (Il. 5. 358, so Il. 21. 368., 22. 91), *πυκνὰ ῥωγαλήν* (Od. 13. 438, &c.), *πολλά ῥυστάξεσκεν* (Il. 24. 755). Further, it is chiefly found where the sense requires the two words to be closely joined in pronunciation: in particular—

(1) In the final vowel of Prepositions followed by a Case-form: as *ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι, ποτὶ λόφον, ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσι, κατὰ μοῖραν, ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ, κατὰ μόθον, διὰ νεφέων, ἀπὸ νευρήφιν, κατὰ συφειοῖσιν, κατὰ δεινούς, ἐπὶ δηρόν*, and similar combinations.

(2) In fixed phrases: *ὥς τε λίσ* (Il. 11. 239., 17. 109., 18. 318), *κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως* (Od. 10. 201, &c.), *ἀπήμονά τε λιαρὸν τε* (Il. 14. 164, &c.), *καλή τε μεγάλη τε, εἰδός τε μέγεθός τε, Τρῶες δὲ μεγά-*

θυμοι, τρίποδα μέγαν, Πηλιάδα μελίην, ὡς τε νιφάδες, σὺν δὲ νεφέεσσι κάλυψε, ὅτε σεύαίτο, οὗ τι μάλα δῆν, and the like.

These facts lead us to connect the lengthening now in question with the peculiar *doubling of the initial consonant* which we see in Compounds, as ἀπο-ρρίπτω, ἐϋ-ρροος, ἄ-ρρηκτος, τρί-λλιστος, ἐϋ-μμελίης, ἀγά-ννιφος, ἐπι-σσεύω, ἐϋ-σσελμος, ἄ-δδεής: and after the Augment (§ 67), as ἔ-ρριψα, ἔ-ρρηξα, ἔ-ρρεον, ἐ-λλίσσετο, ἔ-μμορε, ἔ-ννεον, ἔ-σσενά, ἔ-δδεῖσα (so the MSS., but Aristarchus wrote ἔδεισα). The words and stems in which this doubling occurs are in the main the same as those which lengthen a preceding final vowel: and the explanation, whatever it be, must be one that will apply to both groups of phenomena.

With most of these words the lengthening of a preceding vowel (or doubling of the consonant, as the case may be) is optional. But there is no clear instance in Homer of a short vowel remaining short before the root δφει- (*e.g.* in the 2 Aor. δίον, the 1 Aor. ἔδεισα, the Nouns δέος, δεινός, δειλός, even the proper names Δεισήνωρ, &c.), or the Adverb δῆν. The same may be said of ῥάκος, ῥήγνυμι, ῥύομαι, ῥητός, ῥίπτω, ῥίον, also μαλακός, μελίη, νιφάς. Lengthening is also the rule, subject to few exceptions, with λίσσομαι, λόφος, νέφος, νευρή, ῥινός, ῥός, ῥάβδος, ῥίζα, and some others (La Roche, *H. U.* pp. 47 ff.).

372.] **Origin of the lengthening.*** The most probable account of the matter is that most of the roots or stems affected originally began with *two consonants*, one of which was lost by phonetic decay. Thus initial ρ may stand for Fρ (as in Fρήγ-νυμι), or σρ (as *σρέω, Sanscrit *sravāmi*): λῖς is probably for λφῖς (with a weaker Stem than the form seen in λέφ-ων): ννός is for σννός (Sanscr. *snushā*): νιφ-άς goes back to a root *sneibh* (Goth. *snaivs*, snow): μοῖρα is probably from a root *smar*: σέλμα is for σφέλμα (Curt. *s. v.*): and δει- in δει-νός &c. is for δφει- (cp. δει-δοικα for δέ-δφοικα). It is not indeed necessary to maintain that in these cases the lost consonant was pronounced at the time when the Homeric poems were composed. We have only to suppose that the *particular combination* in question had established itself in the usage of the language before the two consonants were reduced by phonetic decay to one. Thus we may either suppose (*e.g.*) that κατὰ ῥόον in the time of Homer was still pronounced κατὰ σρόον, or that certain combinations—κατα-σρέω, ἐϋ-σροος, κατὰ σρόον, &c.—passed into κατα-ρρέω, ἐϋ-ρροος, κατὰ ῥρόον (or κατὰ ῥόον). There are several instances in which a second form of a word appears in combinations of a fixed type. Thus we have

* On this subject the chief sources of information are, La Roche, *Homeriche Untersuchungen* (pp. 49-65); Hartel, *Homeriche Studien* (Pt. i. pp. 1-55); and Knös, *De Digammo Homericis Quaestiones* (Pt. iii. 225 ff.).

the form *πτόλις*, in *ποτὶ πτόλιος*, Ἀχιλλῆα *πολίπορθον*, &c.: *πτόλεμος*, in *μέγα πτολέμοιο μεμηλώς*, ἀνὰ *πτολέμοιο γεφύρας*. Similarly a primitive *γδοῦπος* survives in *ἐρί-γδουπος* (also *ἐρί-δουπος*), ἐ-γδοῦπησε: and *γνόος* in ἀ-γνοέω. Cp. also the pairs *σμικρός* and *μικρός*, *σκίδναμαι* and *κίδναμαι*, *σῦς* and *ῦς*, *ξύν* and *σύν*. It is at least conceivable that in the same way the poet of the Iliad said *μοῖραν* and also *κατὰ σμοῖραν*, *μειδιάων* but *φιλοσμειδής*, *δὴν ἦν* at the beginning of a line, but *μάλα δ' ἦν* at the end: and so in other cases.

It is true that the proportion of the words now in question which can be proved to have originally had an initial double consonant is not very great. Of the liquids, the method is most successful with initial *ρ*, which can nearly always be traced back to *vr* or *sr*. And among the words with initial *ν* a fair proportion can be shown to have begun originally with *σν* (*νευρή*, *νυός*, *νιφάς*, *νέω*, *νύμφη*). The difficulty is partly met by the further supposition that the habit of lengthening before initial liquids was extended by analogy, from the stems in which it was originally due to a double consonant to others in which it had no such etymological ground. This supposition is certainly well founded in the case of *ρ*, before which lengthening became the rule.

373.] Final *ι* of the Dat. Sing. The final *ι* of the Dat. (Loc.) Sing. is so frequently long that it may be regarded as a 'doubtful vowel.' The examples are especially found in lines and phrases of a fixed or archaic type:—

ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἐν δεινῷ σάκεϊ ἔλασ' ὄβριμον ἔγχος.

οὕτω που Διὶ μέλλει ὑπερμενεῖ φίλον εἶναι (thrice in the Il.).

τὸ τρίτον αὖθ' ὕδατι (Od. 10. 520., 11. 28).

αὐτοῦ παρ νηῖ τε μένειν (Od. 9. 194., 10. 444).

ἦλυθον εἰκοστῷ ἔτει ἐς κτλ. (6 times in the Od.).

So in *Αἶαντι δὲ μάλιστα*, Ὀδυσσῆϊ δὲ μάλιστα, &c. and the fixed epithet *Διὶ φίλος*. Considering also that this vowel is rarely elided (§ 376), it becomes highly probable that *ι* as well as *ῑ* was originally in use. † ε415

It is an interesting question whether these traces of *-ῑ* as the ending of the Homeric Dat. are to be connected with the occasional *-ῑ* of the Locative in the Veda (Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 256, p. 610). The Vedic lengthening appears to be one of a group of similar changes of quantity which affect a short final vowel, and which are in their origin rhythmical, since they generally serve to prevent a succession of short syllables (Wackernagel, *Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Composita*, p. 12 ff., quoted by Brugmann *l. c.*). The same thing may evidently be said of the Homeric *-ῑ* in many of the cases quoted, as

† The priority in this as in so many inferences from Homeric usage belongs (as Hartel notices) to H. L. Ahrens (*Philologus*, iv. pp. 593 ff.).

πατέρι, σάκει, ἐτεί. Hence it is probable that the lengthening dates from the Indo-European language, and is not due in the first instance to the requirements of the hexameter. But in such a case as Ὀδυσσῆι it may be that the Greek poet treats it as a *license*, which he takes advantage of in order to avoid the impossible quantities υ--υ (cp. διζυρότερος for the unmetrical διζυρότερος). *Od.* 5.105 ^{11.17}

374.] **Final α.** The metrical considerations which lead us to recognise -ī in the Dat. Sing. might be urged, though with less force, in favour of an original -ā as the ending of the Neut. Plur. We have—

Il. 5. 745 (= 8. 389) ἐς δ' ὄχρα φλόγα ποσὶ βήσето.

8. 556 φαίνετ' ἀριπρεπέα, ὅτε κτλ.

Il. 678 (Od. 14. 100) τόσα πῶεα οἰῶν (*v. l.* μήλων).

20. 255 πόλλ' ἐτέα τε καὶ οὐκί.

21. 352 τὰ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα.

23. 240 ἀριφραδέα δὲ τέτυκται.

24. 7 ὅποσα τολύπενσε.

Od. 9. 109 ἄσπαρτα καὶ ἀνήροτα.

10. 353 πορφύρεα καθύπερθ'.

12. 396 ὀπταλέα τε καὶ ὠμά.

14. 343 ῥωγαλέα, τὰ καὶ αὐτός.

23. 225 ἀριφραδέα κατέλεξας.

In the majority of these instances, however, the final α is preceded by the vowel ε, from which it was originally separated by a spirant (ὄχε-σ-α, πορφύρε-κ-α). Cp. Il. 1. 45 ἀμφηρεφέα τε φαρέτρην, 5. 576 Πυλαιμένεα ἐλέτην, 5. 827 Ἄρηα τό γε, 14. 329 Περσηῆα πάντων, Od. 1. 40 ἐκ γὰρ Ὀρέσταιο τίσις. As two successive vowels are often found to interchange their quantity (βασιλῆα, βασιλέα), so perhaps, even when the first vowel retains its metrical value, there may be a slight transference of quantity, sufficient to allow the final vowel, when reinforced by the *ictus*, to count as a long syllable. Cp. § 375, 3.

The scanning ε̄α (in Il. 4. 321 εἰ τότε κοῦρος ε̄α νῦν κτλ., cp. 5. 887, Od. 14. 352) may be explained by transference of quantity, from ἦα.

375.] **Short syllables ending in a consonant** are also occasionally lengthened in arsis, although the next word begins with a vowel: as—

οὔτε ποτ' ἐς πόλεμον ἄμα λαῶ θωρηχθῆναι.

αἶψ' ὄφελος ἄγονός τ' ἔμεναι κτλ.

χερσὶν ὑπ' Ἀργείων φθίμενος ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ.

The circumstances under which this metrical lengthening is generally found differ remarkably, as has been recently

shown,* from those which prevail where short final vowels are lengthened before an initial consonant. In those cases, as we saw (§ 371), the rule is that the two words are closely connected, usually in a set phrase or piece of epic commonplace. In the examples now in question the words are often separated by the punctuation: and where this is not the case it will usually be found that there is a slight pause. In half of the instances the words are separated by the penthemimeral caesura, which always marks a pause in the rhythm. Further, this lengthening is only found in the syllable with the *ictus*. The explanation, therefore, must be sought either in the force of the *ictus*, or in the pause (which necessarily adds something to the time of a preceding syllable), or in the combination of these two causes.

In some instances, however, a different account of the matter has to be given: in particular—

(1) With $\omega\varsigma$ following the word to which it refers: as *Il.* 2. 190 *κακὸν ὦς* (υ — —), and so *θεὸς ὦς*, *κύνες ὦς*, *ὄρνιθες ὦς*, *ἀθάνατος ὦς*, &c. In these instances the lengthening may be referred to the original palatal *ι* or *γ* of the Pronoun (Sanser. *yas*, *yā*, *yad* = *ōs*, *ī*, *ō*). It is not to be supposed that the actual form *ιῶς* existed in Homeric times: but the habit of treating a preceding syllable as long by Position survived in the group of phrases. Others explain this $\omega\varsigma$ as *Ῥῶς* (Sanser. *sva-*), comparing Gothic *své* 'as' (Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* § 98); or *σῶς* (§ 108, 3).

(2) In the case of some words ending with *-ις*, *-ιν*, *-υς*, *-υν*, where the vowel was long, or at least 'doubtful,' in Homer.

In *βλοσυρῶπις* and *ἦνις* the final syllable is long before a vowel even in thesis. So the *ι* may have been long in *θοῦρις* (cp. the phrase *θοῦριω ἐπιειμένος ἀλκήν*): and traces of the same scansion may be seen in the phrases *ἔρις ἄμοτον μεμανία*, *Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος*, although *ἔρις*, *μῆτις* are more common.

Final *-υς* (Gen. *-υος*) is long in Feminine Substantives (§ 116, 4), as *ἰθύς αἴμη* (\bar{u} in thesis, *Il.* 6. 79., 21. 303), *πληθύς* (*Il.* 11. 305), *ἀχλύς* (*Il.* 20. 421), *ἰλύς* (Gen. *-ῦος*), *βρωτύς* (*Od.* 18. 407) and other Nouns in *-τύς*: also in the Masc. *ἰχθύς*, *νέκυς*, *βότρυς* (*βοτρῦδόν*), and perhaps *πέλεκυς* (*Il.* 17. 520). *κλίτην* 570

(3) Where the vowel of the final syllable is preceded by another, especially by a long vowel; as *οἰκῆας ἄλοχόν τε* (*Il.* 6. 366), *Ἀχιλλῆος ὄλοδον κῆρ* (*Il.* 14. 139), *ὄς λαὸν ἠγειρα* (*Od.* 2. 41), *δμῶες ἐνὶ οἴκῳ* (*Od.* 11. 190), *πλείον ἐλέλειπτο* (*Od.* 8. 475), *χρεῖος ὑπαλύξαι* (with *v. l.* *χρεῖως*, *Od.* 8. 355): and so in *νῆας* (\bar{a} , *Il.* 2. 165., 18. 260), *νηός* (*Od.* 12. 329), *Τρῶες* (*Il.* 17. 730), *βοός* (*Il.* 11. *ἔπειτον* 776), also *Ἄρηα*, *Περσῆα*, and the other examples given in § 374.

In such cases there is a tendency to lengthen the second

* By Hartel, in the *Homeric Studies* already quoted, i. p. 10.

vowel, as in the Attic forms βασιλέᾱ, Ἀχιλλέως, &c. In Homer we may suppose that the second of the two vowels borrows some of the quantity of the other, so that *with the help of the ictus* it can form the arsis of a foot. Actual lengthening of the second vowel may be seen in Homer in the form ἀπ-ήωρος *hanging loose* (cp. μετ-ήωρος and the later μετ-έωρος) also in δυσασήων (Gen. Plur. of δυσασής).

(4) In the Ending -οῖν of the Dual, as ᾄμοιῖν (Il. 13. 511., 16. 560, Od. 6. 219), ἵπποῖν, σταθμοῖν: also in νῶῖν, σφῶῖν. We may compare the doubtful ι of ἡμῖν, ὑμῖν, and the two forms of the Dat. Plur. in Latin (-bīs, -bīs). Similarly there are traces of ι in μῖν (Il. 5. 385., 6. 501., 10. 347., 11. 376, &c.). In the case of -οῖν and -ωῖν the account given under the last head would apply.

In a few places it appears as though the 3 Plur. of Secondary Tenses in -ν (for -ντ) were allowed to be long: as ἔφαν ἀπιόντες (Od. 9. 413), καὶ κύνειον ἀγαπαζόμενοι (Od. 17. 35, &c.), &c. This is confined (curiously enough) to the Odyssey and the Catalogue of the Ships. In the latter it occurs seven times: ^{504, 537, 574, 581} in the Odyssey eleven times, in the rest of the Iliad once (7. 206).

Elision, Crasis, &c.

376.] A final vowel cut off before a word beginning with a vowel is said to suffer *Elision* (ἐκθλιψις): as μὲν Ἀχαιοὶς ἀλγεῖ ἔθηκε. Whether an elided vowel was entirely silent, or merely slurred over in such a way that it did not form a distinct syllable, is a question which can hardly be determined.

The vowels that are generally liable to elision are α, ε, ο, ι. But—

(1) The ο of δ, τό, πρό is not elided.

Final -ο is not elided in the Gen. endings -οιο, -ᾱο, and very rarely in the Pronouns ἐμείο, &c. This however may be merely because the later forms of these endings, viz. -ου, -εω, -ευ, took the place of -οι(ο), -ᾱ(ο), -ει(ο) when a vowel followed. In the case of ᾱο this supposition is borne out by the fact that -εω is often found before a vowel, as Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος (I. Πηληϊάδα'): and by the rarity of the contraction of εο to ευ (§ 378*). There is less to be said for elision of -ο in the ending -οιο. That ending in Homer is archaic (§ 149), therefore the presumption is against emendations which increase the frequency of its occurrence. And the cases of -ου remaining long before hiatus are not exceptionally common (Hartel, *H. S.* ii. 6).

(2) The ι of τί, περί is not elided in Homer; regarding ὅτι see § 269. But περί is elided in Hesiod: as περοίχεται, περιάχε.

(3) The ι of the Dat. Sing. is rarely elided; but see § 105, 1. Exceptions are to be seen in Il. 4. 259 ἦδ' ἐν δαίθ' ὅτε κτλ.; 5. 5

ἀστέρ' ὀπωριῶ κτλ.; Il. 3. 349., 10. 277., 12. 88., 16. 385., 17. 45., 324., 23. 693., 24. 26., Od. 5. 62, 398., 10. 106., 13. 35., 15. 364., 19. 480. The *i* of the Dat. Plur. is often elided in the First and Second Declensions, and in the forms in *-σι* of the Third Declension. On the other hand, elision is very rare in the forms in *-εσι*, *-ᾶσι*, *-ῦσι*, &c.

The diphthong *-αι* of the Person-Endings *-μαι*, *-σαι*, *-ται*, *-νται*, *-σθαι* is frequently elided: as βούλομ' ἐγώ, κείσονται ἐν προθύροισι, πρὶν λύσασθ' ἐτάρους. But not the *-αι* of the 1 Aor. Inf. Act. or of the Inf. in *-ναι*: hence in Il. 21. 323 read *τυμβοχόης*, not the Inf. *τυμβοχοῆσ'*.

The diphthong *-οι* of the enclitic Pronouns *μοι* and *σοι* (*τοι*) is elided in a few places: Il. 6. 165 ὅς μ' ἔθελεν φιλότῃ μιγήμεναι οὐκ ἐθελούσῃ; 13. 481 καὶ μ' οἴφ' ἀμύνετε (so Od. 4. 367); 17. 100 τῷ μ' οὐ τις νεμεσήσεται; also Il. 1. 170., 9. 673., 13. 544., 23. 310, 579, Od. 1. 60, 347., 23. 21 (Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* p. 345). Other instances may be recovered by conjecture: thus in Il. 3. 173 ὡς ὄφελεν θανάτος μοι ἀδεῖν should probably be ὡς μ' ὄφελεν θάνατος ἀδέειν (§ 365); and in Il. 24. 757 νῦν δέ μοι ἐρσήεις Van Leeuwen reads *νῦν δέ μ' ἐερσήεις*.

In the case of the enclitic *οἱ* (*φοι*) elision involved the disappearance of the Pronoun from the later text. In Il. 6. 289 (= Od. 15. 105) ἐνθ' ἔσαν οἱ πέπλοι the original was probably ἐνθα *ῖ*(οἱ) ἔσαν (cp. Od. 15. 556 ἐνθα οἱ ἦσαν ἕες). In Il. 5. 310 (= 11. 356) ἀμφὶ δὲ ὅσσε κελαινῇ νύξ' ἐκάλυψε read ἀμφὶ δέ *ῖ*. In Od. 9. 360 ὡς φάτ', ἀτάρ οἱ αὐτίς, where some MSS. have ὡς ἔφατ', ἀτάρ οἱ αὐτίς, read *αὐτάρ ῖ*.*

377.] **Crasis.** When a final vowel, instead of being elided, coalesces with the initial vowel of the next word, the process is termed *Crasis*.

The use of *Crasis* in Homer is limited. It is seen in οὔνεκα and τοὔνεκα, also in τᾶλλα for τὰ ἄλλα (Il. 1. 465, &c.), καὶτός for καὶ αὐτός (in Il. 6. 260., 13. 734, Od. 3. 255., 6. 282—the three last being passages where κ' αὐτός for κε αὐτός is inadmissible), and χῆμεῖς for καὶ ἡμεῖς (Il. 2. 238). In these cases either *Crasis* or *Elision* is required by the metre. Most texts also have ᾠριστος, οὔμός (Il. 8. 360), ωῦτός for ὁ αὐτός (Il. 5. 396), κάγώ, τῶμῳ, τῆμῃ: also προῦ- for προ-ε- (in προῦφαινε, προῦχούσας, &c.). But since the full forms ὁ ᾠριστος, &c. are equally allowed by the

* J. van Leeuwen, *Mnemos.* xiii. 188 ff. Of the numerous other emendations of this kind which he proposes few are positively required. The style of Homer constantly allows an unemphatic Pronoun to be supplied from the context. Moreover, he frequently proposes to insert enclitics in a part of the sentence in which they seldom occur (§ 365). It would be difficult (e.g.) to find a parallel for ἐπεὶ μ' ἀφέλεσθέ *ῖ*φε δόντες or χειρὶ δὲ νεκταρέου φεανῷ *ῖ*ετίναξε λαβοῦσα.

metre we cannot but suspect that the spelling with Crasis may be due to later usage. The forms *κάκείνος*, *κάκείσε*, &c. (for *καὶ κείνος*, &c.) are certainly wrong, as *ἐκείνος* is not the Homeric form.

378.] Synzesis is the term used when the two coalescing vowels are written in full, but 'sink together' (*συνιζάνω*) into one syllable in pronunciation.

The Particle *δή* unites with the initial vowel of a following vowel, especially with *αἶ*, *αὐτός* and *οὔτως* (§ 350); also with *Ἀντιμάχοιο* (Il. II. 138), *ἀφνειότατος* (Il. 20. 220), *ἄγρην* (Od. 12. 330).

Synzesis is also found with *ἦ*, in the combination *ἦ οὐχ* (Il. 5. 439, &c.), *ἦ εἰς ὃ κεν* (Il. 5. 466), *ἦ εἰπέμεναι* (Od. 4. 682); with *ἐπεὶ οὐ* (Od. 4. 352, &c.); with *μὴ ἄλλοι* (Od. 4. 165); and in—

Il. 17. 89 *ἀσβέστω· οὐδ' υἷὸν λάθειν Ἀτρείος*: where we may perhaps read *ἀσβέστω· οὐδ' υἷα λάθ' Ἀτρείος*.

18. 458 *υἱεὶ ἐμῶ ὤκνυμόρφ* (one or two MSS. give *υἷ' ἐμῶ*).

Od. 1. 226 *εἰλαπίνη ἦε γάμος κτλ.*

In Il. 1. 277 *Πηλείδῃ ἕθελ'*, and Od. 17. 375 *ὦ ἀρίγνωτε* the case is different: a *short* vowel is absorbed in a preceding long one.

Other examples of Synzesis are to be found in the monosyllabic pronunciation of *εα*, *εο*, *εω*, both in Verbs (§ 57) and Nouns (§ 105, 3). It will be seen that in the cases now in question (apart from some doubtful forms) an E-sound (*η*, *ει*, *ε*) merges in a following *α* or *ο*.

The term Synzesis may also be applied to the monosyllabic pronunciation of the vowels in *Αἰγυπτίῃ* (Od. 4. 229), &c. *σχετλίῃ* (Il. 3. 414), *Ἰστίαια* (Il. 2. 537). It has been thought that in these cases the *ι* was pronounced like our *y*: but this is not a necessary inference from the scansion. In Italian verse, for instance, such words as *mio*, *mia* count as monosyllables, but are not pronounced *myo*, *mya*. For *πόλιος* (υ — in Il. 2. 811, 21. 567) it is better to read *πόλεος* (§ 107); and for *πόλιας* (Od. 8. 560, 574) *πόλις*. The corresponding Synzesis of *υ* is generally recognised in the word *Ἐνναλίφ* (commonly scanned *υα* in the phrase *Ἐνναλίφ ἀνδρείφοντῃ*): but see § 370 *ad fin.*

378.*] **Contraction.** The question of the use of contracted forms has been already touched upon in connexion with the different grammatical categories which it affects: see §§ 56, 81, 105. It will be useful here to recapitulate the results, and to notice one or two attempts which have been made to recover the original usage of Homer in this respect.*

* See especially J. van Leeuwen, *Mnemosyne*, Nov. Ser. xiii. p. 215, xiv. p. 335: and Menrad, *De contractionis et synzeseos usu Homeric* (Monachii, 1886).

1. Contraction is most readily admitted between similar sounds, or when the second is of higher vowel pitch, *i. e.* higher in the scale \omicron , ω , α , η , ϵ . Thus we have many instances with the combinations $\epsilon\epsilon$, $\omicron\omicron$, $\alpha\epsilon$, $\omicron\epsilon$; few with $\epsilon\alpha$, $\alpha\omega$, $\alpha\omicron$, still fewer with $\epsilon\omega$, $\epsilon\omicron$.

2. In most cases in which contraction is freely admitted we find that the sound which originally separated the vowels was the semi-vowel ι or γ . In case of the loss of σ it is comparatively rare; with F it is probably not Homeric at all (§ 396). Hence (*e. g.*) although it is common with the combinations $\epsilon\epsilon$, $\epsilon\epsilon\iota$ in most Verbs in $-\epsilon\omega$ (§ 56), it is not found in $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ($\chi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\text{-}\omega$) and is extremely rare in $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ($\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\text{-}\omega$, see § 29, 6). But it is admitted with loss of $\sigma\iota$, as in the Gen. ending $-\omicron\upsilon$ from $-\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron$ ($-\omicron\lambda\omicron$, $-\omicron\omicron$), and the Verbs in $-\epsilon\omega$ from stems in $-\epsilon\sigma$, as $\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ($\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\epsilon\sigma\text{-}\omega$).

(a) On these principles we should expect the 2 Sing. endings $-\epsilon\alpha\iota$, $-\epsilon\omicron$, $-\eta\alpha\iota$, $-\alpha\omicron$ (for $-\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$, &c.) to remain uncontracted; and this view is borne out on the whole by the very careful investigation made by J. van Leeuwen. Omitting the Verbs in $-\alpha\omega$ and $-\epsilon\omega$ we find that there are about 522 occurrences of these endings, and that of these 434 present uncontracted forms: while in 66 instances the contracted syllable comes before a vowel, so that it can be written with elision of $-\alpha\iota$ or $-\omicron$ (*e. g.* Il. 3. 138 $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon' \acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\iota\tau\iota\varsigma$, for $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\eta$; Il. 9. 54 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\epsilon' \acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, for $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$). In the case of $-\epsilon\omicron$ this mode of writing finds some support in the MSS.: *e. g.* $\psi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon'$ (Il. 4. 404), $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon'$ (Il. 9. 260, Od. 1. 340), $\acute{\epsilon}\psi\chi\epsilon'$ (Il. 3. 430, Od. 4. 752), also $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon'$, read by Aristarchus in Il. 10. 146 ($\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\upsilon$ MSS.). Against these 500 instances there are only 22 exceptions, 7 in the Iliad and 15 in the Odyssey, some of which can be readily corrected. Thus Il. 4. 264 (= 19. 139) $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\sigma\epsilon\upsilon \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\nu\delta\epsilon$ should be $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\sigma\omicron \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\nu\delta\epsilon$ (Nauck): in Il. 2. 367 $\gamma\acute{\nu}\omega\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota \delta' \epsilon\iota$ omit $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (Barnes): in Il. 24. 434 for $\delta\varsigma \mu\epsilon \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$ read $\delta\varsigma \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\alpha\iota$, and so in Od. 4. 812, 5. 174. In Od. 18. 107 for $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\eta$ read the Act. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\eta\varsigma$ (Van L.): as in Il. 1. 203 we may retain $\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\varsigma$ (so the MSS.; Ar. $\acute{\iota}\delta\eta$,—but the corruption lies deeper). The greater frequency of instances in the Odyssey (and in book xxiv of the Iliad) is hardly enough to indicate a difference of usage within the Homeric age.

(b) In the corresponding forms of Verbs in $-\alpha\omega$ and $-\epsilon\omega$ there is a concurrence of three vowels, which in our text are always reduced to two syllables, either by contraction, as in $\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\iota\omicron$, $\mu\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota$, $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\alpha$, $\mu\acute{\nu}\alpha\alpha$, or by hyphaeresis (§ 105), as $\mu\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\omicron$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\omicron$, $\pi\acute{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\alpha\iota$ (Od. 4. 811). A single vowel appears in $\pi\epsilon\iota\acute{\rho}\alpha$ for $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\epsilon\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\omega}$ for $\acute{\eta}\rho\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\epsilon\omicron$. The metre requires $\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\iota\omicron$, $\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\omicron$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\omicron$, $\pi\acute{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\alpha\iota$; for $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}$ it allows $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}\alpha\iota$ (becoming $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}'$ in Il. 24. 390, 433, Od. 4. 545). The isolated form $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ (Od. 14. 343) for $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\epsilon\alpha\iota$ should perhaps be $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\alpha\iota$ or $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\alpha$. If the ending is in its original form it belongs to the Non-Thematic conjugation (§ 19): another example may be found in $\delta\rho\eta\tau\omicron$ (or $\delta\rho\eta\tau\omicron$), read by Zenodotus in Il. 1. 56.

(c) In the Future in $-\epsilon\omega$ (for $-\epsilon\sigma\omega$) contraction is less frequent than in the Present of Verbs in $-\epsilon\omega$ ($-\epsilon\iota\omega$ or $-\epsilon\sigma\iota\omega$). Forms such as $\delta\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$, $\kappa\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\alpha\iota$, $\mu\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\alpha\iota$, $\delta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\alpha\iota$, $\kappa\omicron\mu\acute{\omega}$, $\kappa\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}$, $\kappa\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$, evidently could not otherwise come into the verse. In Il. 17. 451 $\sigma\phi\acute{\omega}\iota\upsilon \delta' \acute{\epsilon}\nu \gamma\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota \beta\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}$ we may read $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega$ (Fick).

Π. 4. 161 ἔκ τε καὶ ὄψε̄ τελεῖ we should take τελεῖ as a Present. The remaining exceptions are, κτενεῖ in Π. 15. 65, 68 (probably an interpolation), κατακτενεῖ in Π. 23. 412, and ἐκφανεῖ in Π. 19. 104.

(d) Similarly in the declension of stems in -εσ the ending -εες is rarely contracted. In the phrase φαίνονται (or φαίνεσθαι) ἐναργεῖς (Π. 20. 131, Od. 7. 201., 16. 161) Fick happily reads ἐναργές, to be taken as an adverb. The same remedy is applicable in Π. 9. 225 δαιτὸς μὲν εἴσης οὐκ ἐπιδευεῖς, and Π. 13. 622 ἄλλης μὲν λώβης τε καὶ αἴσχεος οὐκ ἐπιδευεῖς, where the Nom. Plur. is unexplained: read οὐκ ἐπιδευές there is no lack. *Od. 14. 255*

(e) The contraction of εο to ευ is rare in the Gen. of stems in -εσ (§ 105, 3), but frequent in the Pronominal Genitives ἐμεῦ (μευ), σεῦ, εὔ, τεῦ. Here again, however, we are struck by the number of cases in which we can substitute the forms in -ειο or -εο, with elision of -ο. In our MSS. the elision actually occurs in ἐμεῖ (Π. 23. 789, Od. 8. 462) and σεῖ (Π. 6. 454, also Hom. H. xxxiv. 19). In Π. 17. 173 νῦν δέ σευ ἀνοσάμην Zenodotus is said to have read νῦν δέ σε, i. e. probably νῦν δέ σε'. The full forms in -ειο or -εο occur 121 times, and may be restored without elision 9 times, with elision 56 times. To these we should add the instances in which we may put the form *μεο (6 times) or με' (19 times). There remain altogether about fifty-five exceptions, which are discussed by J. van Leeuwen (*Mnem.* xiii. 215). In the phrase κέκλυτέ μευ, which occurs 19 times, he would read μοι, according to the Homeric construction (§ 143, 3). So in the formula κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μευ, Ἰθακήσιοι (5 times in the Odyssey), where however we are tempted to restore ἐμεῖ (cp. Π. 3. 97 κέκλυτε νῦν καὶ ἐμεῖο). He suggests putting the Dat. for the Gen. also in Od. 10. 485 οἱ μευ φθινύθουσι φίλον κῆρ, Od. 15. 467 οἱ μευ πατέρ' ἀμφεπένοντο, Od. 16. 92 ἡ μάλα μευ καταδάπτει ἀκούοντος φίλον ἦτορ. In the last passage it is needless to alter the Gen. ἀκούοντος (§ 243, 3, d), and we may even read in Π. 1. 453 ἐμοὶ πάρος ἔκλυες εὐξαμένοιο (cp. Π. 16. 531 ὅττι οἱ ὦκ' ἤκουσε μέγας θεὸς εὐξαμένοιο). The substitution of the Dat. seems the most probable correction in various places where Leeuwen proposes other changes: Od. 4. 746 ἐμεῦ δ' ἔλετο μέγαν ὄρκον (cp. Π. 22. 119 Τρωσὶν δ' αὖ . . ὄρκον ἔλωμαι), Π. 2. 388 ἰδρώσει μὲν τευ τελαμῶν ἀμφὶ στήθεσφι, Π. 22. 454 αἱ γὰρ ἀπ' οὐατος εἴη ἐμεῦ ἔπος (cp. 18. 272); also Π. 1. 273., 9. 377., 16. 497., 19. 185., 20. 464., 24. 293, 311, 750, 754, Od. 5. 311., 9. 20., 13. 231., 19. 108., 24. 257; and perhaps Π. 19. 137 καί μευ φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεὺς (unless the με of some MSS. is right), so Π. 9. 377 and Π. 9. 335. In Od. 19. 215 νῦν μὲν δὴ σεῦ, ξεῖνε, δὴω πειρήσασθαι εἰ κτλ. Leeuwen restores the Acc. σέ (as in Π. 18. 600). In Od. 17. 421 (= 19. 77) we may perhaps read καὶ ὅτι κεχηρμένος ἔλθοι (ὅτι as in Π. 20. 434 οἶδα δ' ὅτι σὺ μὲν κτλ.). The remaining exceptions are Π. 5. 896 ἐκ γὰρ ἐμεῦ γένος ἐσσί, Π. 23. 70 οὐ μὲν μευ ζῶντος ἀκῆδεις, Π. 24. 429 δέξαι ἐμεῦ πάρα, and Π. 1. 88 οὐ τις ἐμεῦ ζῶντος κτλ., where the contraction ζῶντος and the Dat. Plur. κοίλης before a consonant are also suspicious (Fick, *Ilias*, p. xvii).

(f) The contraction of οα, οε (from οσ-α, οσ-ε) is doubtful in the Nouns in -ω and -ως (§ 105, 6), but appears in the forms of the Comparative, viz. ἀμείνω, ἀρείω, ἀρείους, καίους, πλείους, and μέζω (Hesiod). The uncontracted forms in -οα, -οες do not occur, since the metre allows either -ω, -ους or else the later -ονα, -ονες. But in such a phrase as ἀμείνω δ' αἴσιμα πάντα (where Nauck reads ἀμείονα) we may suspect that ἀμείοα was the original form.

(g) Vowels originally separated by F are so rarely contracted that instances in our text must be regarded with suspicion. Thus ἄκων (ἀ-φέκων) should

καὶ σὺν ἰεὶ ὀδ.

10. 287

δὲ ἰπόμεν μ
εἶπον
εἶτα ἀφ' ἑ
συμ-δὴ εἶπ
δὲ ἰναι ἀφ' ἡ
δὲ σὺν ἰαί

always be *ἀέκων*: *ἄτη* (*ἀφάτη*) may be written *ἀάτη* except in Il. 19. 83 *φρῆσιν ἐμβαλον ἄγριον ἄτην* (where the use of *ἄγριον* as a Fem. is also anomalous, § 119). In Il. 3. 100., 6. 356., 24. 28 (where *ἄτης* comes at the end of the line) the better reading is *ἀρχῆς*. *κοῖλος* may be *κούλος* (cp. Lat. *cavus*), except in Od. 22. 385. *εἶδον* (*ἐ-φιδον*) may be *ἴδον*, except in four places (Il. 11. 112., 19. 292, Od. 10. 194., 11. 162). *πολέας* (Acc. Plur. of *πολύς*) is not uncommon, but should probably be *πολύς* (§ 100): *πολέων* occurs once (Il. 16. 655). Other instances with Nouns in *-us* and *-eus* are raro (Nauck, *Mél. gr.-rom.* iii. 219; Menrad, p. 60). The Fem. in *-εία* is not contracted from *-εφία*, *-εία* but comes directly from *-εφία*. So *οἶός*, *οἶων* for *ὀφι-ός*, *ὀφι-ῶν* (cp. *ὑεσι* for *ὀι-εσι*), and *δίος* for *δίφ-ιος*. *ἔως* and *τέως*, which occur several times in our text, are nearly always followed by a Particle (*μέν*, *περ*, &c.), which has evidently been inserted for the sake of the metre (*ἔως μέν* for *ἦος*, &c.). For *ἀλλοειδέα* in Od. 13. 194 we should doubtless read *ἀλλο-ἰδέα* (§ 125, 2).

εἴρussa may be from *ἐ-φρussa* (but see Schulze in *K.Z.* xxix. 64): as to *ἴαχον*, which has been supposed to stand for *εἶαχον*, from *ἐ-φίφαχον*, see § 31, 1.

The most important example of contraction notwithstanding *f* is the word *παῖς* (*παῖς*, *παῖδος*, &c.). Other words which present the same difficulty are: *ἄσε* (Od. 11. 61), *ἄσατο* (Il. 19. 95)—in both places Nauck would read *ἄασε*—*ἀθλοφόρος* (Il. 9. 266., 11. 699), *ἀθλεύων* (Il. 24. 734), *ἄθλον* (Od. 8. 160), *ἄσασιν* *we slejpt* (Od. 16. 367), *ἔᾶ* (Il. 5. 256) and other forms of *ἔάω* (Il. 10. 344., 23. 77, Od. 21. 233), *νέα* (Od. 9. 283), *ρέα* (Il. 12. 381, 17. 461., 20. 101, 263), *κρέα* (Od. 9. 347), *χεῖσθαι* (Od. 10. 518), *τιμῆντα* (Il. 18. 475), *τεχνῆσαι* (Od. 7. 110), *ἥλιος* (Od. 8. 271), *ἑωσφόρος* (Il. 23. 226), *πλέων* (Od. 1. 184), *τεθνεῶτι* (Od. 19. 331), *πεπτεῶτα*, *-τας* (Il. 21. 503, Od. 22. 384), *βεβῶσα* (Od. 20. 14), *νόον* (Il. 24. 354), *καιρουσσῶν* (Od. 7. 107), the compounds of *ἐννέα*—*ἐννήμαρ*, *ἐννέωρον*, *ἐννεόργυις*—and the proper names *Εὐρύκλεια* *Ἀντίκλεια* (*-κλῆια* Nauck). Some of these may be disposed of by more or less probable emendation: others occur in interpolated passages (*e.g.* *ἥλιος* in the Song of Demodocus): others (as *πλέων*, *τεθνεῶς*) may be explained by the loss of *f* before *ω*, *ο* (§ 393). On the whole they are too few and isolated to be of weight against the general usage of Homer.

The general result of the enquiry seems to be that the harshness of a synizesis or a contraction is a matter admitting of many degrees. With some combinations of vowels contraction is hardly avoided, with others it is only resorted to in case of necessity. We have already seen that the rules as to lengthening by Position (§ 370) are of the same elastic character. And as there is hardly any rule of Position that may not be overborne by the desire of bringing certain words into the verse, so there is no contraction that may not be excused by a sufficiently cogent metrical necessity. Thus the synizesis in such words as *Ἰστίαια*, *Αἰγυπτίους*, *χρυσέοισι* stands on the same footing as the neglect of Position with *Σκάμανδρος* or *σκέπαρνον*: and again the synizesis in *τεμένεα*, *ἀσνέας*, or the contraction in *πονεύμενος*, *ἀμφιβαλεῖμαι* is like the shortening of a vowel before *προσηύδα*, or the purely metrical lengthening of a short vowel (§ 386).

On the same principles harshness of metre may be tolerated for the sake of a familiar phrase: *e.g.* the hiatus *ἄφθιτα αἰεὶ* in

Π. 13. 22 (ἄφθιτον ἀέι in Π. 2. 46, 186., 14. 238). So when the formula *καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα κτλ.* is used of a goddess (Π. 15. 35, 89) it becomes *καὶ μιν φωνήσασα ἔπεα*. Again the harsh lengthening in *μέροπες ἀνθρωποι* (Π. 18. 288, at the end of the line) is due to the familiar *μερόπων ἀνθρώπων*.

Hiatus.

379.] **Hiatus** is a term which is used by writers on metre in more than one sense. It will be convenient here to apply it to every case in which a word ending with a vowel or diphthong is followed by a word beginning with a vowel, and the two vowel-sounds are not merged together (as by elision, crasis, &c.) so as to form one syllable for the metre.

It would be more scientific, perhaps, to understand the word **Hiatus** as implying that the two vowels are separated by a break or stoppage of vocal sound, so that the second begins with either the rough or the smooth 'breathing.' Thus it would be opposed to every form of *diphthong* (including *synizesis*), the characteristic of which is that the two vowels are slurred together, by shifting the position of the organs without any perceptible interruption of the current of breath. This definition, however, might exclude the case of a long vowel or diphthong shortened before an initial vowel (as *τῆν δ' ἐγὼ οὐ*, where the final *ω* seems to be partly merged in the following *ου*). Again when a final *ι* or *υ* comes before a vowel without suffering elision, it is probable that the corresponding 'semi-vowel' (= our *y* or *w*) is developed from the vowel-sound, and prevents complete hiatus.

380.] **Long vowels before Hiatus.** The general rule is that a long final vowel or diphthong coming before a vowel forms a short syllable in the metre. This shortening is very common in Homer: cp. Π. 1. 299 *οὔτε σοὶ οὔτε τῷ ἄλλῳ, ἐπεὶ κτλ.*, where it occurs in three successive feet.

But the natural quantity may be retained before hiatus when the vowel is in the arsis of the foot, as *Ἀτρεΐδῃ Ἀγαμέμνονι, ὅς κ' εἶποι ὄτι κτλ.* And in a few instances a long vowel or diphthong is allowed to remain long in thesis, as Π. 1. 39 *Σμινθεῦ εἶ ποτέ τοι κτλ.*

The readiness with which long syllables are allowed before hiatus varies with the several long vowels and diphthongs; partly also it depends on the *pauses* of the sense.

The long diphthongs (as they may be called), viz. *η* and *ω*, 04.11.159. are the most capable of resisting the shortening influence of hiatus; next to them are *ευ* and *ου*, and the long vowels *η* and *ω*: while *ει*, *οι* and *αι* are at the other end of the scale. A

measure of this may be gained by observing how often each of these terminations is long before a vowel, and comparing the number with the total number of times that the same termination occurs. Thus it appears that out of every 100 instances of final φ , it is long before hiatus about 23 times. Similarly final $-\eta$ is long 19 times, $-\epsilon\upsilon$ 6·7 times, $-\omicron\upsilon$ 6 times, $-\eta$ 5·7 times, $-\omega$ 4 times, $-\epsilon\iota$ 1·8 times, $-\omicron\iota$ 1·6 times, and $-\alpha\iota$ only 1·3 times. Thus hiatus after φ and η is scarcely avoided, while after $\epsilon\iota$, $\omicron\iota$ and $\alpha\iota$ it is very rare.

In a large proportion of the instances in which a long vowel retains its quantity before hiatus it will be found that the hiatus coincides with a division either in the sense or the rhythm. Of the examples in the arsis of the foot, more than half occur before the penthemimeral caesura, where there is almost always a pause: while in thesis the same thing is chiefly found to occur either after the first foot, as Il. 2. 209 $\eta\chi\eta$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon \kappa\tau\lambda.$, Od. 11. 188 $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\rho\acute{\omega}$, $\omicron\upsilon\delta\grave{\epsilon} \kappa\tau\lambda.$; or after the fourth foot (in the Bucolic diaeresis).

381.] **Shortening of diphthongs before Hiatus.** Regarding the nature of the process by which a diphthong before hiatus was reduced to the time or metrical value of a short syllable two probable views have been maintained.

1. Curtius holds that whenever long syllables are shortened by the effect of hiatus something of the nature of *Elision* takes place. Thus η and ω lose the second half of the vowel sound, while $\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\iota$, $\omicron\iota$ lose the ι . In support of this he points to the facts of Crasis: thus $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ in becoming $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ may be supposed to pass through the stage $\kappa\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$.

2. According to an older view, which has been revived and defended with great ingenuity by Hartel,* the ι or υ in a diphthong is turned into the corresponding spirant; so that $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ becomes $\kappa\alpha\text{-}\iota\text{-}\epsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}$, and $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \Pi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$ becomes $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \Pi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\text{-}f\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$.

It is certainly in favour of this latter supposition that it does not oblige us to suppose the frequent elision of the two vowels which in general are the least liable to be elided. The explanation however is not a complete one. It does not account for the shortening of η and ω , which on the principle assumed by Hartel would become $\eta\iota$, $\omega\iota$. On the whole it seems most probable that the shortening in question was effected, for diphthongs as well as for simple long vowels, by a process in which ancient grammarians would have recognised rather 'Synizesis'—viz. the slurring of vowels together without complete loss of any sound—

* *Homerische Studien*, iii. pp. 7 ff.

than either Elision or Contraction. And this conclusion is supported by the general tendencies of the Ionic dialect, which was especially tolerant of hiatus, and allowed numerous combinations of vowels, such as *εα*, *εο*, *εω*, *εοι*, to have the value either of one syllable or two.*

382.] Hiatus after short syllables. The vowels which are not liable to elision may generally stand before hiatus: thus we find *ζωστῆρι ἀρηρότι* (§ 376, 3), *πρὸ ὁδοῦ, πρὸ Ἀχαιῶν, αὐτὰρ ὁ ἔμμεμαῶς, ἐτάροιο ἐνηέος*, and the like.

Hiatus is also tolerated occasionally in the pauses of the verse:

(1) In the trochaic caesura of the third foot: as—

Il. 1. 569 *καὶ ῥ' ἀκούσασα καθῆστο, ἐπιγνάμψασα κτλ.* *Od. 11. 147*

Od. 3. 175 *τέμνειν, ὄφρα τάχιστα ὑπέκ κτλ.*

(2) In the Bucolic diaeresis: as—

Il. 8. 66 *ὄφρα μὲν ἦὼς ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἡμαρ.*

Od. 2. 57 *ἰλαπινάζουσιν πίνουσί τε αἶθοπα οἶνον.*

The vowel of the Person-endings *-το*, *-ντο* seems to be especially capable of standing before hiatus in these places. It appears in more than a fourth of the whole number of instances given by Knös (pp. 42–45).

Hiatus in the Bucolic diaeresis is commoner in the Odyssey than in the Iliad, in the proportion 2 : 1. Hiatus after the vowel *ε* is also comparatively rare in the Iliad: Knös reckons 22 instances (many of them doubtful), against 40 in the Odyssey. It is worth notice that in both these points books xxiii and xxiv of the Iliad agree with the Odyssey, also that book xxiv of the Odyssey contains an unusual number of instances of hiatus, both legitimate (Il. 63, 215, 328, 374, 466) and illegitimate (Il. 209, 351, 430).

Illegitimate hiatus, like other anomalies, may be diminished by emendation. Thus in Od. 5. 135 *ἠδὲ ἔφασκον* we may read *ἠδέ F' ἔφασκον*: in 5. 257 *ἐπιχεύατο ὕλην* we may insert *ἄρ'*, on the model of Il. 5. 748 *ἐπεμαίετ' ἄρ' ἵππους*. But in Il. 13. 22 *ἄφθιτα αἰεὶ* must stand because *ἄφθιτος αἰεὶ* is a fixed phrase. It is unlikely, then, that Hiatus was ever absolutely forbidden in Epic verse.

Doubtful Syllables.

383.] Besides the cases in which the metrical value of a syllable may be made uncertain by its place in a particular verse—*i. e.* by the circumstances of Position, Hiatus, Ictus, &c.—there are many instances in which the 'natural' quantity of the vowel appears to be indeterminate.

* The use of *εο* for *ευ* in Ionic inscriptions shows, not indeed that *ευ* and *εο* were identical in pronunciation, or that *εο* was a true diphthong, but certainly that *εο* was very like *ευ*, and might be monosyllabic *in scansion*. Probably monosyllabic *εο* (when it was not a mere error for *ευ*) stood to *ευ* as the Synizesis *εα*, *εω*, *εοι*, &c. to the contracted *η*, *ω*, *ου*. See Erman in *Curt. Stud.* v. 292 ff.

Under the heading of 'doubtful vowels' should be classed, not only the words in which the same letter may stand either for a long or a short vowel, as ἄρης, ἀνήρ, but also those in which the change is shown by the spelling, *i. e.* in which a short vowel interchanges with a long vowel or diphthong: as νεός and νηός, ὄνομα and οὔνομα, &c. And with these variations, again, we may place, as at least kindred phenomena, the doubtful syllables which arise from the interchange of single and double consonants: Ὀδυσσεύς and Ὀδυσεύς, Ἀχιλλεύς and Ἀχιλεύς. As we speak of doubtful vowels, these might similarly be called 'doubtful consonants.'

In all such words the variation of quantity may either mean that there were two distinct forms between which the poet had a choice, or that the quantity as it existed in the spoken language was in fact intermediate. The former case would usually arise when a vowel or syllable which had come to be short in the spoken language was allowed to retain its older quantity as a poetical archaism. In the latter case the poet could give the syllable either metrical value; or (as in so many instances) he might treat the syllable as ordinarily short, but capable of being lengthened by the *ictus*, or by the pauses of the verse.

384.] Doubtful vowels appear to rise chiefly in two ways:—

(1) By the shortening of a long vowel or diphthong before a vowel: *viz.*—

ā, in ἴλαος (ā in Il. 1. 583, ἄ in Il. 9. 639., 19. 178).

η, in the oblique cases of νηός (except the Dat. νηῖ) and of several Nouns in -εως, as Πηλῆος, Πηλέος: the forms ἦται and ἔται (ἦμαι): ἀφήη and ἀφέη (§ 80); ἦός and ἔός, ληῖστοί and λείσθή (Il. 9. 408); perhaps also in Θρήϊκες, δῆϊος, ἦια, which shorten η when the case-ending is naturally long (Θρηῖκων, δηῖων, ἦτων, &c. scanned ∪ ∪ —, unless we suppose contraction or synizesis).

ι, in ἱερός, κολή, λίην: Comparatives in -ων: Patronymics, as Κρονίων: ἴομεν, ἴημι (ἀφῆι, &c.), ἰαίω, and Verbs in -ιω, as τῖω, δῖω (§ 51, 1): probably also in the abstract Nouns in -ιη, the ι being treated as long in ὑπεροπλίη, προθυμίη, ὑποδεξιή, ἀτιμίη, ἀκομιστή. φ 284 c f § 98 A205 B588

ū, in Verbs in -ω (§ 51, 4).

ω, in ἦρωος (— ∪ ∪ in Od. 6. 303): ἦρω, *leg.* ἦρωϊ (Il. 7. 453).

αι, in αἰεί for αἰεῖ, ἔμπαιος (— ∪ ∪ in Od. 20. 379), and the Compound χαμαιεῖναι, χαμαιενάδες: also Verbs in -αιω, as ἀγαίόμενος and ἀγάασθε, κέραιε and κεράασθε, ναῖον and νάει, νάουσι.

ει, in ὠκέα, βαθής (for ὠκεῖα, βαθειής): Adjectives in -ειος, as χάλκειος and χάλκεος: ρεῖα and ρέα: πλεῖον, &c. and πλέονες: βείομαι and βέομαι (§ 80), and many Verbs in -εω (§ 51, 3).

οι, in ὀλοός and ὀλοιός; also οἶος (οῦ οῦ), as in Il. 13. 275 οἶδ' ἀρετὴν οἶός ἐσσι, cp. Il. 18. 105, Od. 7. 312., 20. 89.

ευ, in δεύομαι and δέομαι, ἔχευα and ἔχεα, ἠλεύατο and ἀλέασθαι.

υι, in υἱός (Il. 4. 473., 5. 612, &c.).

The Gen. endings -ᾶων, -εων fall under this head, if -εων represents an older Ionic -ηων.

In some cases of this kind our texts have ει where it is probable that the original vowel was η: so in πλείος *full* (Attic πλέως from πλήος), χρεῖος *debt* and χρεῖώ *need* (from χρη-, χρᾶ-). See Appendix C.

Sometimes ει has taken the place of ευ before another vowel, as in the Verbs θέω, πνέω, πλέω, χέω, κλέω (§ 29, 3), also in λείουσι, Dat. Plur. of λέων (λεών or λέφων), and perhaps in the Pf. εἶωθα (cp. εὐέωκε Hesych.), εἰοικνύαι (Il. 18. 418). Similarly ᾱ may stand for αυ, as φάεα *eyes* (φαν-), ἄηρ (cp. αὔρα) and other derivatives of ἄφρημι (ἀλιᾶής, ἀκρ-ᾶής), ἀέσαμεν *we slept* (ιαύω), ἀασάμην (ἀφάτη), and probably μεμᾶότες, ἄϊον, ἀεῖδω, *Aἶδος. We even find οι for ου (from of), in οἰετέας for ὁ-φετέας *of like age* (Il. 2. 765), πνουή for πνοφή: cp. οἶες (-οῦ οῦ in Od. 9. 425).

η for ευ may perhaps be seen in ἠεῖδης, ἠεῖδει (ἐ-φεῖδεας, -εε): but see the explanation suggested in § 67, 3.

Interchange of quantity is occasionally found: στέωμεν, κτέωμεν, φθέωμεν for στήομεν, &c. (§ 80): ἔως and τέως (if these forms are Homeric) for ἦος and τήος. So the Gen. ending -εω, for -ᾶο (-ηο).

(2) By compensatory lengthening, of—

ε to ει, in ξένιος (ξένφος) but ξενίη, κεινός and κενός, πείραρ and πέρας (ἀπειρέσιος), εἴνατος, εἴνεκα.

ο to ου, μόννος (but μονωθείς Il. 11. 470); οὔρος (*a watcher*) but ὄρ-άω: οὔρα and ὄρος (ὄρφος?).

ᾱ in παρέχη (παρ-σέχω), Od. 19. 113; ῥ in συνεχές, Il. 12. 26.

Under this head we should place double forms arising by Epenthesis, as ἔταρος and ἐταῖρος (for ἐταρ-ρος): ἐνί, ἐν and εἰν. But ἀπειρέσιος *boundless* should be ἀπερήσιος, from *πέρη (πέρην).

Other variations, of which no general account can be given, are seen in *Ἀρης, ἀνήρ, ἀμᾶω *I rear* (ᾱ generally in the simple Verb, ᾱ in the compounds); φίλος (ῖ in φίλε κασίγνητε); ἄπιτος and τίτος; ὕδωρ, ἀντικρύ; δύο and δύω, δεῦρο and (once) δεῦρω, Διόνυσος and Διώνυσος. The chief cases of a doubtful vowel

being long without the help of the ictus are, ἀρή, ἀλῶναι (ἀλόντε with ā in Il. 5. 487), πρίν, ἰμάς, πιφαύσκω.

385.] **Double consonants**, causing doubtful syllables: chiefly—
σσ, in the First Aorist (§ 39, 1), and Dat. Plur. (§ 102); also
ὄσσος, μέσσος, ρεμεσσάω (where σσ = ττ), Ὀδυσσεύς. So for
ἴσασι (— — υ) we should write ἴσσασι (for ἴδ-σασι, § 7, 3).

λλ, in Ἀχιλλεύς.

κκ, in πελέκκω (κκ = κφ ?), cp. πέλεκυς.

As to ππ and ττ, in ὄππως, ὄττι, &c. see § 108, 2.

386.] **Metrical licence**. In a few cases the use of a vowel as long appears to be merely due to the necessities of the metre. Such are:—

α in ἀθάνατος, ἀκάματος, ἀπονέεσθαι, ἀποδίωμαι, ἀγοράασθε, ^{ἀιδόμειν} ἀιδόμειν.

ε in ἐπίτορος (Od. 12. 423), ζεφυρή (Od. 7. 119).

ι in Πριαμίδης, διά (in διὰ μὲν ἀσπίδος κτλ. Il. 3. 357, &c.).

υ in θυγατέρες (Il. 2. 492, &c.), δυναμένοιο (Od. 1. 276, &c.).

In these cases there is every reason to believe that the vowel was naturally short, and the lengthening must therefore be regarded as a necessary *licence*, to be compared with the neglect of Position before Σκάμανδρος, &c. (§ 370), or the synizesis of Αἴγυπτή and Ἰστίαια (§ 378 *fin.*). The diphthong of εἰαρινός (ἔαρ), εἰρεσίη, οὐλόμενος, οὔνομα, Οὐλύμποιο, is of the same nature. The ου of πουλύς perhaps began in compounds in which it was required by the metre, as πουλυβότειρα, &c., and was extended to the simple word. It is apparently a poetical form only (but see H. W. Smyth, *Vowel System*, p. 98).

Similarly a short vowel between two long syllables is sometimes treated as long: as in ἠγάασθε (Od. 5. 122), Ἡρακληείη (properly -κλειη), Ὀϊκλείης (Od. 15. 244). So τετράκυκλος is scanned — — — υ in Od. 9. 242, but υ υ — υ in Il. 24. 324.

Vocatives.

387.] The short final syllable of the Vocative appears in several places as a metrically long syllable: as—

Il. 4. 155 φίλε κασίγνητε, θάνατον κτλ. and so 5. 359: also

Il. 19. 400 Ξάνθε τε καὶ Βάλιε, 21. 474 νηπίτε,

Od. 3. 230 Τηλέμαχε.

4. 338 ὦ υἱὲ Πετewω κτλ. ^{Od. 11. 478}

18. 385 ὄρσο Θέτι ταυύπεπλε: so Od. 24. 192 Λαέρταο παῖ.

14. 357 Ποσειδαον ἐπάμυνε: so Il. 24. 569., Od. 8. 408, &c.

23. 493 Αἶαν Ἴδομενεύ τε.

42 σ 15 1452, φ 15, 10 15. — 25 Χ 236, 2154. — Β 369 ε 15, 4195. —
η 15 519. — π 15 102, 1475. — *Christ. prob. 11 p. 1204*

The reason may be found (as Hartel thinks*) in the nature of the Vocative as an interruption of the natural flow of a sentence. It is very possible, however, that the Nominative ought to be read in these places : see § 164.

The Digamma.

388.] In seeking to arrive at general conclusions as to the rules and structure of the Homeric hexameter, it was necessary to leave out of sight all the words whose metrical form is uncertain on account of the possible or probable loss of an initial consonant. It is time to return to this disturbing element of the enquiry.

The scholars who first wrote on this subject had few materials for their investigations outside of the Homeric poems. To them, therefore, the 'Digamma' was little more than a symbol—the unknown cause of a series of metrical anomalies. In the present state of etymological knowledge the order of the enquiry has been to a great extent reversed. It is known in most cases which of the original sounds of the Indo-European languages have been lost in Greek, and where in each word the loss has taken place. Hence we now come to Homer with this knowledge already in our possession. Instead of asking what sounds are wanting, we have only to ask whether certain sounds, of whose former existence we have no doubt, were still living at the time when the poems were composed, and how far they can be traced in their effect on the versification.

389.] **Nature of the evidence from metre.** The questions which are suggested by the discovery in Homer of traces of a lost 'Digamma' cannot be answered without some reference to the very exceptional circumstances of the text.

Whatever may be the date at which writing was first used in Greece for literary purposes, there can be no doubt that the Homeric poems were chiefly known for some centuries through the medium of oral recitation, and that it was not till the time of the Alexandrian grammarians that adequate materials were brought together for the study and correction of the text. Accordingly when these scholars began to collect and compare the manuscripts of Homer, they found themselves engaged in a problem of great complexity. The various readings, to judge from the brief notices of them preserved in the *Scholía*, were very numerous; and they are often of a kind which must be attributed to failure of memory, or the licence of oral recitation, rather than to errors of transcription. And the amount of

* *Homerische Studien*, i. p. 64.

interpolation must have been considerable, if there was any ground for the suspicions so often expressed by the ancient critics.

It follows from these circumstances that an attempt to restore the lost *F* throughout the text of Homer cannot be expected to succeed. Such an attempt necessarily proceeds on the assumption that the text which we have is sound as far as it goes, or that it is so nearly right that we can recover the original by conjecture. With an imperfect text the process can only be approximate. We may be satisfied if the proportion of failure is not greater than the history of the text would lead us to expect.

The loss of the *F*-sound, moreover, must have been itself a cause of textual corruption. It led to irregularities of metre, especially to frequent hiatus, and there would be a constant tendency to cure these defects by some slight change. The insertion of the *ν* ἐφελευστικόν was almost a matter of course (see however § 391). The numerous alternative forms used in the poetical language, and the abundance of short Particles such as γέ, τε, ῥα, &c. made it easy to disguise the loss of *F* in many places. We cannot be surprised, therefore, if we have often to make the reverse changes.

A few instances will serve to show the existence in pre-Alexandrian times of corruption arising from the tendency to repair defects of metre.

In Il. 9. 73 the MSS. have πολέεσσι δ' ἀνάσσεις, Aristarchus read πολέσιν γὰρ ἀνάσσεις. Both are evidently derived from πολέσιν δὲ ἀνάσσεις (*i. e.* φανάσσεις), corrected in two different ways.

In Il. 13. 107 the MSS. have νῦν δ' ἔκαθεν, the reading of Aristarchus: but Zenodotus and Aristophanes had νῦν δὲ ἔκας (*i. e.* φέκας).

In Il. 9. 88 the reading of Aristarchus was τίθεντο δὲ δόρπα ἕκαστος: other ancient sources had δόρπον (the reading of most MSS.).

In Il. 14. 235 πείθειν, ἐγὼ δὲ κέ τοι εἶδew χάριν ἡματα πάντα, the order χάριν εἶδew was preferred by Aristarchus.

Two very similar instances are—

Il. 5. 787 κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, εἶδος ἀγητοί (Ar. ἐλεγγέες).

9. 128 γυναικας ἀμύμονα ἔργα ἰδυίας (Ar. ἀμύμονας).

In Od. 5. 34 ἡματί κ' εἰκοσῶ . . ἵκοιτο the 'common' texts of Alexandrian times (*ai κοινότεραι*) omitted the κ', which is not necessary, and may have been inserted in imitation of ἡματί κε τριτάτῳ κτλ. (Il. 9. 363).

In Od. 1. 110 οἱ μὲν ἄρ' οἶνον ἔμμογον some MSS. omit ἄρ'. So in Od. 3. 472 most MSS. have οἶνον οἰνοχοεῖντες (*vulg.* ἐνοινοχ.).

In Od. 2. 331., 8. 174., 13. 125 the ε of αἰτε is elided before a word with *f*. But in each case there is MS. authority for reading αἰ.

In Od. 8. 526 the MSS. are divided between ἀσπαίροντ' ἐσιδοῦσα and ἀσπαίροντα ἰδοῦσα.

It should be observed that the argument from these instances is equally good, whether the readings ascribed to Zenodotus, Aristarchus, &c. are conjectures made by them, or were derived (as is more probable) from older sources. They equally serve to illustrate the process by which traces of an

original *F* were liable to be gradually effaced. And it is not likely that there was any deliberate attempt to emend Homer on metrical grounds. It is enough to suppose that the metre helped to determine the preference given (consciously or unconsciously) to one or other of the existing variants.

390.] **Words with initial *F*.** The former existence of the *F* in a given Homeric word may be inferred either from its appearance in some other dialect of Greek, or (where this kind of evidence fails) from the corresponding forms in the cognate languages. Thus an original *Φείκοσι* is supported by the forms *Φίκατι* and *Φείκατι* on Doric and Boeotian inscriptions, by the Laconian *βείκατι* (given by Hesychius), and again by Latin *viginti*, Sanscrit *vimcati*, &c.: an original *Φέσπερος* by the form *Φεσπαρίων* on a Locrian inscription, as well as by Latin *vesper*: original *Φιδείν*, *Φοῖδα*, &c. by *Φιστορες* on inscriptions, *γοῖδα* and *γοῖδημι* in Hesychius (erroneously so written, as Ahrens showed, for *Φοῖδα* and *Φοῖδημι*), and also by Latin *video*, Sanscrit *vedmi*, *veda*, Engl. *wit*, &c. We do not, however, propose to discuss the external evidence, as it may be called, by which the loss of an initial *F* is proved, but only to consider the degree and manner in which the former existence of such a letter can be shown to have affected the versification of Homer. For this purpose it will be enough to give a list of the chief words in question, and in a few cases a statement, by way of specimen, of some of the attempts made to restore the *F* to the text.*

ἄγνυμι.

The initial *F* is to be traced by the hiatus in Il. 5. 161 ἐξ αὐχένα ἄξῃ, Il. 8. 403 κατὰ θ' ἄρματα ἄξω (similar phrases in 8. 417., 23. 341, 467); less decisively by the lengthening of the final *-w* of the preceding word in Il. 4. 214 πάλιν ἄγεν ὀξέες ὄγκου. The evidence against an initial consonant is very slight. In Od. 19. 539 πᾶσι κατ' αὐχένας ἦξε we should read αὐχέν' ἔαξε (Bekk.), understanding the Singular distributively (§ 170). In Il. 23. 392 for ἵππειον δέ οἱ ἦξε may be read ἵππειόν οἱ ἔαξε.

* The first systematic attempt to restore the digamma was made by Heyne in his edition of the Iliad (1802). It was based upon Bentley's manuscript annotations, of which Heyne had the use. The first text with restored *F* was published by Payne Knight (1820). Much was done by the thorough and methodical *Quaestiones Homericæ* of C. A. J. Hoffmann (Clausthal, 1842-48). The *F* was again printed in the text of Bekker's second edition (Bonn, 1858). The light of the comparative method was brought to bear upon it by Leskien (*Rationem quam I. Bekker in restituendo digammo secutus est examinavit Dr. A. Leskien*, Lipsiae, 1866). The most complete treatise on the subject is that of Knös (*Upsaliae*, 1872). The most important contributions, in addition to those mentioned, have been made by Leo Meyer (*K. Z.* xviii. 49), and by W. Hartel (*Hom. Stud.* iii). Most of the conjectures given in this chapter come from one or other of these sources.

ἄναξ (ἄνασσα. ἀνάσσειν).

The words of this group occur in Homer about 300 times, and in about 80 instances they are preceded by a final short vowel which would ordinarily be elided. This calculation does not include the phrase ἴφι ἀνάσσειν, or the numerous examples of hiatus after the Dat. Sing. in -ι and the Genitives in -οιο, -ειο, -ᾶο.*

The cases in which a slight correction of the text is needed to make room for the *f* are as follows:—

- Il. 1. 288 πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν (read πᾶσιν δέ).
 9. 73 πολέεσσι δ' ἀνάσσεις (read πολέσιν δέ, § 389).
 2. 672 Χαρόποιό τ' ἀνακτος (read Χαρόπου τε).
 7. 162 (= 23. 288) πρώτος μὲν ἀναξ (read perhaps πρώτιστα).
 15. 453 κροτέοντες ἀναξ (read κροτέοντε, the Dual).
 16. 371 (= 507) λίπον ἄρματ' ἀνάκτων (read ἄρμα, § 170).
 523 σύ πέρ μοι, ἀναξ, τόδε καρτερὸν ἔλκος ἄκεσσαι (read με).
 23. 49 ὄτρυνον, ἀναξ (read ὄτρυνε, the Pres. Imper.).
 517 ὅς βρά τ' ἀνακτα (read ὅς τε or ὅς βα).
 Od. 9. 452 ἦ σύ γ' ἀνακτος (omit γ').
 17. 189 χαλεπαὶ δέ τ' ἀνάκτων (omit τ').
 21. 56 (= 83) τόξον ἀνακτος (read τόξα).

The Imperfect ἤνασσε, which occurs five times, can always be changed into ἔνασσε. The remaining passages are:—

- Il. 19. 124 σὸν γένος' οὗ οἱ ἀεικὲς ἀνασόμεν Ἀργείοισιν (a verse which is possibly interpolated).
 20. 67 ἐναντα Ποσειδάωνος ἀνακτος (in the probably spurious θεομαχία).
 24. 449, 452 ποίησαν ἀνακτι.
 Od. 14. 40 ἀντιθέου γὰρ ἀνακτος κτλ.
 395 εἰ μὲν κεν νοστήσῃ ἀναξ.
 438 κύδαινε δὲ θυμὸν ἀνακτος.
 24. 30 ἦς περ ἄνασσεσ.

ἄρνα (ἄρνες, &c.).

The *f* is supported by three instances of hiatus, viz. Il. 4. 158 αἰμά τε ἀρνῶν, 4. 435 ὄπα ἀρνῶν, 8. 131 ἠύτε ἄρνες: and by the metrical length given to the preceding syllable in Il. 3. 103 ἐς δίφρον ἄρνας, 16. 352 λύκοι ἄρνεσσι.

The passages which need correction are—

- Il. 3. 103 οἴσετε δ' ἄρν' (the δέ is better omitted).
 119 ἦδ' ἄρν' ἐκέλευεν (read ἰδὲ ἄρν').
 22. 263 οὐδὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες (omit τε).
 Od. 4. 86 ἵνα τ' ἄρνες ἄφαρ κεραοὶ τελέθουσι (omit τ').
 9. 226 ἐρίφους τε καὶ ἄρνας.

* For a complete analysis of the examples in the Iliad see Dawes, *Miscellanea Critica*, Sect. IV.

Note, however, that the evidence for *F* is confined to the Iliad, and that the derivative ἀρνεῖός shows no trace of it.

ἄστν.

The presence of an initial consonant is shown by hiatus in nearly 80 places. In two places the text is uncertain: Il. 24. 320 ὑπὲρ ἄστειος (but διὰ ἄστειος in the Bankes papyrus, and several MSS.), Od. 3. 260 ἐκὰς ἄστειος (ἐκὰς Ἀργείος in most MSS.).

Two passages admit of the easiest correction:—

Il. 3. 140 ἀνδρός τε προτέρωιο καὶ ἄστειος (read προτέρου).

15. 455 τοὺς μὲν ὄ γ' Ἀστυνόμῳ (omit γε or μὲν).

Two remain, viz.—

Il. 11. 733 ἀμφίσταντο δὴ ἄστν (ἀμφέσταν Bekk.).

18. 274 νύκτα μὲν εἰν ἀγορῇ σθένος ἔξομεν ἄστν δὲ πύργου (ἔξετε Bekk.).

The changes made by Bekker in these places are not improbable, but are hardly so obvious as to exclude other hypotheses.

ἔαρ, εἰαρινός.

Hiatus is found in Il. 8. 307 νοτίησί τε εἰαρινῆσι, and a short final syllable is lengthened in Od. 19. 519 αἰέδησιν ἔαρος. In the phrase ὄρη ἐν εἰαρινῇ we should doubtless omit the ἐν, as in Od. 5. 485 ὄρη χειμερίῃ (Bentl.).

εἴκοσι.

The *F* appears in ἀνὰ εἴκοσι (Od. 9. 209), and the combination καὶ εἴκοσι (which occurs 9 times, including the compounds with δουκαιοκοσι-). *Od. 1. 220: ἐπὶ τῆσιν ἐξήκοσιν ὠκυπέτεσσι φεινοσίν?*

In Il. 11. 25 χρυσοῖο καὶ εἴκοσι read χρυσοῦ: and in the combination τε καὶ εἴκοσι (in three places) omit τε. In the recurring ἦλθον εἰκοστῷ ἔτει κτλ. Bekker reads ἦλθον ἐικοστῷ (Cobet well compares Od. 23. 102 ἔλθοι ἐικοστῷ κτλ.). On Od. 5. 34 ἤματι κ' εἰκοστῷ κτλ. see § 389.

εἴκω.

Two instances of hiatus indicate *F*, in Il. 24. 100, 718, besides many places in which the word is preceded by a Dat. Sing., as οὐδένι εἴκων, κάρτεϊ εἴκων.

Two places may be easily corrected: Il. 4. 509 μῆδ' εἴκετε (read μὴ εἴκετε, with asyndeton, as Od. 24. 54 ἴσχεσθ' Ἀργεῖοι, μὴ φεύγετε), and 12. 48 τῇ τ' εἴκοσι (omit τε). In Od. 12. 117 for θεοῖσιν ὑπέιξεαι read θεοῖς ὑποείξεαι (Bekk.) There remains Il. 1. 294 εἰ δὴ σοὶ πᾶν ἔργον ὑπέιξομαι.

ἔοικα, ἔϊσκω, εἴκελος.

The *F* of ἔοικα appears from hiatus in 46 instances (not counting the numerous places in which it follows a Dative in -ι). The adverse instances are 11 in number, besides the form ἐπ-έοικε (which occurs 11 times). The corresponding Present εἴκω is generally recognised in Il. 18. 520 ὅθι σφίσιον εἴκε λοχῆσαι where it suited them to be in ambush. The form ἐϊσκω has hiatus before

it in 3 places, but twice rejects *F* (Od. 9. 321., II. 363). The adjective *εἶκελος* or *ἴκελος* usually needs an initial consonant (except II. 19. 282, Od. II. 207).

It seems probable that this is the same word as *εἶκω* to yield. The notion of giving way easily passes into that of suiting or fitting, hence conforming to, resembling.

έκών, έκητι, έκηλος.

Hiatus indicating *F* is found in 22 places (not reckoning οὐ τι *έκών* II. 8. 81, &c.).

In Od. 4. 649 for *αὐτὸς έκών* we may read *αὐτὸς έγών* (cp. Od. 2. 133, where both these forms are found in good MSS.). In Od. 17. 478 *έσθι' έκηλος* two MSS. have *έσθ' (i. e. έσθε)*. The remaining exceptions are; with *έκών*, II. 23. 434, 585, Od. 5. 100 (where we may read *τίς κε*, or perhaps *τίς δέ έκών . . διαδρόμοι*; the Opt. without *άν* being used as in negative Clauses, § 299*f*): with *έκηλος*, II. 8. 512, Od. 2. 311 (*έϋφραίνεσθ' έτηκλον* Bekk.).

έκάς, έκατος, &c.

Traces of *F* are to be seen in the hiatus *νύν δέ έκάς* (II. 5. 791., 13. 107), *άλλά έκάς* (Od. 15. 33), *οὐδέ έκηβολίαι* (II. 5. 54): and in the lengthening in *Άπόλλωνος έκάτοιο* (II. 7. 83., 20. 295), *έϋπλόκαμος Έκαμήδη*, &c.

The exceptions are, II. 1. 21, 438., 17. 333., 20. 422., 22. 15, 302, Od. 7. 321—mostly admitting of easy correction.

έκαστος.

The original *F* of this word (recently found on a Locrian inscription, see *Curt. Stud.* ii. 441 ff.) is traced by means of hiatus in 115 places. The adverse instances, however, are about 50 in number, and the proportion that can be removed by emendation is not so large as in most cases (see L. Meyer, *K. Ζ.* viii. 166. About a fourth of the exceptions appear in the recurring phrase *μένος καί θυμὸν έκάστου*.

The form *έκάτερθε* shows slight traces of initial *F* in Od. 6. 19 *σταθμοῖν έκάτερθε*, II. 578 *γῦπε δέ μιν έκάτερθε*, 22. 181 *τῷ δ' έσταν έκάτερθε*. It is preceded by elision in II. 20. 153 (omit *ρ'*), and in II. 24. 273, Od. 7. 91 (omit *δ'*).

έλω (έλσαι, έάλην), άλώναι, άλις.

The *F* is shown by hiatus in II. 1. 409 *άμφ' άλα έλσαι*: 16. 403 *ήστο άλείς* (and five other examples of this Tense, viz. II. 5. 823., 21. 571, 607., 22. 308, Od. 24. 538): II. 18. 287 *κεκόρησθε έέλμένοι*: II. 12. 172 *ήέ άλώναι* (so 14. 81), II. 21. 281 *έζμαρτο άλώναι* (so Od. 5. 312., 24. 34), II. 81. 495 *τῇ γε άλώμεναι*. Before *άλις* hiatus occurs in about 12 places: cp. also II. 23. 420 *είνάτερες άλις ήσαν*.

In II. 21. 236 *κατ' αὐτὸν άλις έσαν* some MSS. read *έσαν άλις*, and at l. 344 the same transposition may be made. The only other instance against *F* is II. 17. 54 *οθ' άλις άναβέβροχεν (άναβέβροχεν Zenod.)*, where Bentley read *δ άλις άναβέβροχεν*.

ἐλίσσω, εἰλύω.

Before ἐλίσσω hiatus is found in four places, and the recurring phrases καὶ ἔλικας βοῦς and εἰλίποδας ἔλικας βοῦς point in the same direction. The only exceptions are Od. 12. 355 βοσκοέσκονθ' ἔλικες κτλ., and Il. 18. 401 γναμπτάς θ' ἔλικας.

It is probable that in many places the forms ἐλέλιτο, ἐλελίθη, &c. are old errors for ἐφέλιτο, ἐφελίθη, &c.: see Dawes, *Misc. Crit.* 177: also Heyne on Il. 1. 530.

Traces of *F* in εἰλύω should perhaps be recognised in Od. 5. 403 (ἔρευρόμενον, εἰλυτο) and 15. 479 σάκεσιν εἰλυμένοι: cp. Il. 20. 492 φλόγα εἰλυφάξει. In Il. 18. 522 ἴζοντ' εἰλυμένοι it is easy to read ἴζον (as Bekker). The Aor. Part. ἔλυσθεις has no *F*: but it may be from a different Verb-stem (see Buttm. *Lexil.* s. v. εἰλύω).

ἔλπω (ἔολπα).

The initial *F* of this word is proved by 10 instances of hiatus (including καὶ ἐλπιδος, Od. 16. 101., 19. 84). The Perfect ἔολπα also shows traces of *F* in the reduplicated syllable, viz. in Od. 2. 275., 3. 375., 5. 379.

In Il. 8. 526 εὐχομαι ἐλπόμενος should be εὐχομ' ἐελπόμενος (Hoffm.) or perhaps (as Zenodotus read) ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος. In four places φέλω can be restored by very slight corrections:—

Il. 15. 701 Τρωσὶν δ' ἔλπετο (Τρωσὶ δέ Heyne).

18. 194 ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὄδ', ἔλπομ' (αὐτὸς ἐέλπομ' Heyne).

Od. 2. 91 (= 13. 380) πάντας μὲν ῥ' ἔλπει (omit ῥ').

Two others are less easy; Il. 15. 539 πολέμιζε μένων, ἔτι δ' ἔλπετο (μένων δ' ἔτι ἔλπετο Bentl.), and Il. 24. 491 ἐπὶ τ' ἔλπεται (καὶ ἔλπεται Bentl.).

The passages which tell against *F*έ*F*ολπα are Il. 20. 186 χαλεπῶς δέ σ' ἔολπα τὸ βέειν (read σέ ἔολπα), 21. 583 μάλ' ἔολπας (μάλα ἔλπε' Hoffm.), 22. 216 νῶϊ γ' ἔολπα (omit γ'), Od. 8. 315., 24. 313.

ἔπος, εἰπεῖν.

The *F* of ἔπος is supported by about 26 instances of hiatus, and a much larger number in which preceding syllables are lengthened (as in the common line καὶ μιν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπεα κτλ.).

Of the apparent exceptions, about 35 are removed by reading ἔπεσσι for ἐπέεσσι (as in Il. 5. 40 χειρὸς ἐλοῦσ' ἐπέεσσι προσήδα, read ἐλοῦσα ἔπεσσι). This is justified by the fact that in similar words (esp. βέλος) the form in -εσσι is less frequent than that in -εσσι. A group of 11 may be corrected by scanning ἔπεα as a disyllable (υ -) in the formula φωνήσασα ἔπεα πτερύοντα προσήδα. Another small group of exceptions is formed by phrases such as Od. 4. 706 ὄψ' ἐ δὲ δὴ μιν ἔπεσιν κτλ., where perhaps ἐ may be put for μιν. There remain two instances in the Iliad (5. 683., 7. 108), and seven in the Odyssey (11. 146, 561., 14. 509., 15. 375., 16. 469., 17. 374., 24. 161).

In εἰπεῖν the *F* is proved by about 80 instances of hiatus, besides lengthening such as we have in the forms ὄδε δέ τις εἴπεσκε, ὦς ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι, &c. The exceptions number about 35.

Of these exceptions 10 are found in the recurring line ὄφρ' εἶπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει. It has been suggested as possible that εἶπω has here taken the place of an older ἔπω (φέπω), or ἔσπω (cp. ἔσπετε). This supposition would of course explain other instances of neglected *F*, as Il. 1. 64., 11. 791, Od. 1. 10, 37, &c.

ἔρδω, ἔργον, &c.

The Verb ἔρδω is preceded by hiatus in two clear instances, Il. 14. 261, Od. 15. 360. In Il. 9. 540 πόλλ' ἔρδεσκειν there is an ancient *v. l.* ἔρρεξεν. In Il. 10. 503 ὅτι κύντατον ἔρδοι we may read κύντατα. But there are several instances on the other side in the Odyssey (viz. 1. 293., 5. 342, 360., 6. 258., 7. 202., 8. 490., 11. 80).

The reduplicated form ἔοργα (for *F*έφοργα) is preceded by hiatus in 7 places. Instances on the other side are, Il. 3. 351 ὃ με πρότερος κάκ' ἔοργε (where the Aor. ἔρεξε is more Homeric, cp. § 28), 21. 399 ὄσσα μ' ἔοργας (ὄσσα ἔοργας Ambr.), 22. 347 οἶά μ' ἔοργας (here also *με* may be omitted), Od. 22. 318 οὐδὲν ἔοργῶς (read οὐ *τι*, cp. § 356).

The Noun ἔργον, with its derivative ἐργάζομαι, occurs in Homer about 250 times, and the *F* is required to prevent hiatus in about 165 places. There are about 18 instances against *F*.

εἶρω, ἐρέω.

The *F* of εἶρω is required by hiatus in the three places where it occurs, viz. Od. 2. 162., 11. 137., 13. 7; that of ἐρέω by about 50 instances of lengthening (such as ἀλλ' ἔκ τοι ἐρέω, ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει, and the like), against which are to be set three instances of elision (Il. 4. 176., 23. 787, Od. 12. 156).

ἐννυμι, εἶμα, ἐσθής.

The *F* is shown by hiatus in more than 80 places, including the instances of the Perfect Mid. (εἶμαι, ἔσσαι, &c., see § 23, 5). The contrary instances are of no weight. The superfluous *ρ*' may be omitted in ἐπεὶ *ρ*' ἔσσαντο (three places), and *τ*' similarly in Od. 14. 510., 24. 67. This leaves Il. 3. 57, Od. 6. 83., 7. 259.

ἐμέω.

The *F* (which is inferred from Lat. *vomo*) may be restored by reading ἐφέμεσσε for ἀπέμεσσε (Il. 14. 437) and αἶμα *F*εμέων, or possibly *F*έμων (L. Meyer), for αἶμ' ἐμέων (Il. 15. 11).

ἔσπερος.

Hiatus occurs in six places, after the Prepositions ποτί (Od. 17. 191) and ἐπί. There are no instances against *F*.

ἔτος.

The *F* is supported by the lengthening of the preceding syllable in five places, such as Il. 24. 765 ἐεικοστὸν ἔτος ἐστί.

In the only adverse instance, Il. 2. 328 *τοσσαῦτ' ἔτρεα*, we may read and scan *τοσσαῦτα ἔτρεα*, as in the case of *ἔπρεα* (*supra*).

ιάχω, ιαχή, ἦχη.

The *F* in *ιάχω* and *ιαχή* is chiefly indicated by 23 instances of a peculiar hiatus, viz. after a naturally short final vowel in arsis; as *ἦ δὲ μέγα λάχουσα, ἦμεῖς δὲ λάχοντες, γένετο ιαχή*, and the like. There are 3 instances of lengthening by Position. The *F* is also proved by *αῦλιαχος* (= *à-FiFaχος*) *without a cry*. The exceptions are confined to the Aor. or Impf. *ιαχων* (*i*), which never admits *F* in Homer: see § 31, 1, *note*.

The derivative *ἦχηεις* follows hiatus in two places (Il. 1. 157, Od. 4. 72): elsewhere in Homer *ἦχη* only occurs at the beginning of the line. The compound *δυσ-ηχής* (*πολέμοιο δυσηχέος*, Il. 2. 886, &c.) is best derived from *ἄχος* (see Wackernagel, *Dehnungsgesetz*, p. 42).

ιδεῖν, οἶδα, εἶδος.

In the different forms of the Second Aor. *ιδεῖν* the *F* is shown by upwards of 180 instances of hiatus, and about 12 instances of lengthening of a short syllable. The Indicative (*εἶδον* in Attic) is nearly always a trisyllable (*i. e.* *ἔFιδον*) in Homer. On the other side we have to set nearly 50 instances of neglected *F*, about half of which are susceptible of easy emendation (such as putting *ιδεῖν* for *ιδέειν*, omitting superfluous *δέ*, and the like).

In the Perfect *οἶδα* there are about 125 instances of hiatus, against 24 which need emendation. Of these, however, only about seven or eight present any difficulty. The proportion is much the same with the other forms, as *εἶδομαι, εἴσομαι, &c.*, and the Nouns *εἶδος* (11 instances of hiatus, two adverse), *ἴστωρ, ἰδρεΐη, εἶδωλον, &c.*

ἴον (ἰόεις, ἰοδυφές).

The *F* is supported by hiatus in Od. 4. 135., 9. 426, and is nowhere inadmissible.

ἴς, ἴφι (ἴφια), ἴνες.

These words, with the derived proper names *Ἰφιάνασσα, Ἰφιτος, &c.*, show *F* in about 27 places, while seven or eight places need slight emendation. *ἴφθιμος*, which shows no trace of *F*, is probably from a different root.

ἴσος.

The *F* is traced in about 30 instances of hiatus; the adverse passages being 8 or 9 in number. In three of these, containing the phrase *ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης* (Il. 11. 705, Od. 9. 42, 549) the form *ἴσης* should perhaps be changed to *αῖσης share*. Or we may recognise the Æolic form of the word, viz. *ἴσσα* (Fick, *Odysee*, p. 20). The other places are easily corrected.

ἴτυς, ἰτέη.

The *F* is shown by hiatus (Il. 4. 486, Od. 10. 510). The Particle τε may be left out before καὶ ἰτέαι in Il. 21. 350.

οἶκος.

The *F* is required in 105 places by hiatus, in 14 by the lengthening of a short syllable. About 25 places are adverse.

οἶνος.

The *F* is required by hiatus in nearly 100 places. The adverse places are about 20 (including the names Οἶνός and Οἶνόμαος).

391.] Words with initial σ*F* (*F*). Since the change of initial σ into the rough breathing must have been much earlier than the loss of *F*, it may be presumed that words which originally began with σ*F* were pronounced at one time with the sound 'F (=our *wh*). The following are the chief examples in Homer:—

ἔο, οἶ, ἔ, ὄς, &c.

The *F* is proved by hiatus in upwards of 600 instances, by lengthening of a preceding short syllable in 136 instances. There are also about 27 places in which a short vowel in arsis is lengthened before it: as ἀπὸ ἔο, προτὶ οἶ (υ — —), θυγατέρα ἦν, πατέρι ᾧ, &c. About 43 places do not admit *F* without some change; of these 30 are instances of the Possessive ὄς.

This Pronoun is noticeable as the only word in which the original *F* is recognised in the spelling of our texts. The movable -ν is not used before the forms οἶ, ἔ: thus we have δαῖτέ οἶ, ὄς κέ οἶ, &c.; and, similarly, οὐ οἶ, οὐ ἔθεν (not οὐχ οἶ, οὐχ ἔθεν). This rule is observed not only in Homer but also in the later Elegiac and Lyric poets, and even the lyrical parts of Tragedy (Soph. El. 195, Trach. 650). It does not apply, however, to the forms of the Possessive ὄς.

When the forms 'Fε, 'Fοι suffer elision (§ 376), the word is reduced to 'F' and consequently disappears from our texts. Thus in Il. 24. 154 ὄς ἄξει κτλ. it is plain from the parallel l. 183 ὄς σ' ἄξει that the original was ὄς 'F' ἄξει (Bekker, *Hom. Bl.* i. 318). Other corrections of the kind are:—

Il. 1. 195 πρὸ γὰρ ἦκε, read πρὸ δέ 'F,' as in l. 208 πρὸ δέ μ' ἦκε.

4. 315 ὄς ὄφελέν τις ἀνδρῶν ἄλλος ἔχειν, read ὄς 'F.'

16. 545 μὴ ἀπὸ τεύχε' ἔλονται, read μὴ 'F' (Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* 265).

Od. 5. 135 ἦδὲ ἔφασκον θήσειν ἀθάνατον, read ἦδὲ 'F.'

Examples of the restoration of 'F(οι) will be found in § 376.*

* The whole subject is fully treated by J. van Leeuwen, *Mnemos.* xiii. 188 ff. from whom these emendations are taken.

ἀνδάνω, ἡδύς, ἦδος.

The *F* appears in 12 or 15 instances of hiatus, and in the 2 Aor. form εὔαδε (for ἔFαδε). The exceptions are, Il. 3. 173 ὡς ὄφελεν θανάτος μοι ἀδέιν (read ὡς μ' ὄφελεν θάνατος ἀδέειν, see § 365) and 6 places with ἡδύς, two of which (Il. 4. 131, Od. 19. 510) may be easily emended. The Substantive ἦδος occurs chiefly in the phrase ἔσσεται ἦδος, where ἔσται may perhaps be read.

ἔθος, ἦθος.

The *F* is indicated by the hiatus κατὰ ἦθεα (Od. 14. 411). In μετὰ τ' ἦθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων (Il. 6. 511., 15. 268) the τε is better omitted. The Pf. εἴωθα or ἔωθα probably had no initial *F*, since σF- would give in reduplication σεσF- or ἔσF- (not σFεσF-).

ἔκυρός.

The only place bearing on the question before us is Il. 3. 172 φίλε ἔκυρέ, where the metre points to an initial consonant.

ἔξ.

The *F* may be traced by hiatus in Il. 5. 270 τῶν οἱ ἐξ κτλ., by lengthening in Il. 24. 604, Od. 10. 6. Adverse instances are Il. 23. 741, Od. 3. 115, 415., 14. 20.

ἔτης.

The *F* appears from hiatus in seven places, and can always be restored. The word is probably formed from the pronominal stem σFε- (so that it is=*unus e suis*).

392.] *F* inferred from metre. A few words may be added here which in all probability had initial *F*, though the traces of it in the metre are not supported by independent evidence.

ἄραιός.

The hiatus in three places indicates the loss of a consonant.

ἔθνος (perhaps akin to ἔθος, ἦθος).

Hiatus precedes in 12 places, and there is only one instance on the other side, viz. Il. 11. 724 τὰ δ' ἐπέρρειον ἔθνεα πεζῶν (where ἐπέρρειε is better, see § 172).

ἐρύω, ἔρρω.

Hiatus is found before ἐρύω to draw in 14 places (not counting those which are indecisive, such as ξίφος δὲν ἐρυσσάμενος, or ἐπ' ἠπείροιο ἔρυσσαν), and preceding short syllables are lengthened in 17 places. There are 17 instances against *F*, one of the strongest being Il. 1. 141 νῆα μέλαιναν ἐρύσσομεν (=Od. 8. 34., 16. 348). The Verb ῥύομαι to protect is unconnected with ἐρύω.

The Verb ἔρρω (probably Lat. *verro*) shows hiatus in the phrase ἐνθάδε ἔρρων (Il. 8. 239., 9. 364); cp. ἀπό-ερσε, ἀπο-έρσειε.

ἦνοψ.

The word occurs six times (counting the proper name ἦνοψ), and except in one place (where it begins the line) always requires an initial consonant.

ἦρα.

In the phrase ἐπὶ ἦρα φέρειν : referred to the root *var* meaning to *choose* or *wish*.

ἦρίον.

The only instance of this word (Il. 23. 126 μέγα ἦρίον) is in favour of initial *F*.

ἔμαι.

An initial consonant is shown by hiatus in 23 places (ὁ δὲ ἔετο, οἴκαδε ἰεμένων, &c.): there are four adverse places, viz. Il. 18. 501, Od. 2. 327., 10. 246., 14. 142. It is not connected with ἔημι, but is to be referred to root *vī*, meaning to *aim at*, *wish* (L. Meyer, *Bezz. Beitr.* i. 301).

ἦλιος.

An initial consonant is indicated in about 50 places; the number of adverse instances is 14. The derivation of this important word is unknown.

ἦρος, ἦρις.

These words may be connected with εἶρω to *tell*. If so, the *F* of ἦρις is to be traced in ὠκέα ἦρις (19 times), ὧς ἔφατ', ὄρω δὲ ἦρις (three times), βάσκ' ἔθι, ἦρι κτλ.; that of ἦρος, Od. 18. 73, 334 (but not always, see vv. 38, 56, 233).

393.] **Loss of *F* in Homer.** The chief instances in which loss of an original *F* can be shown to have taken place in the language of Homer fall under the following rule:—

When the original initial *F* is followed by the vowels ο, ω, or the diphthong ου, it produces no effect on the metre of Homer.

The following are words to which this rule will apply* :—

ὄραω, οὔρος (and οὔρεϋς) a *watcher*; ὄρεσθαι to *watch*. The original *F* (Germ. *wahr-*) will account for the forms ἑώρων and ἐπί-ουρος, but there are no traces in the *metre* of such forms as *Forάω*, &c.

ὄρος *mountain* (cp. Βορέας), and ὄρθός *upright*, which may be from the same root (cp. the Laconian Ἄρτεμις Βωρθία). There is only one instance of hiatus (viz. Od. 3. 290 ἴσα ὄρεσσιν).

ὄρτυξ (Sanscr. *vartakas* a *quail*) appears in the name Ὀρτυγίη, which does not admit *F* (Od. 5. 123).

* See an article by Leo Meyer, *K. Z.* xxiii. pp. 49 ff.

ῥος chariot (Lat. *veho*); *ῥχλος* (lit. *movement, tossing*), *ῥχλέω* to disturb (cp. *ῥχλεύς* and Lat. *vectis*); *ῥχθέω* (Lat. *vehe-mens*). A trace of *F* appears in the form *συνεοχμός* (Il. 14. 465).

ῥψ, ῥσσα, ῥμφή voice. The traces of *F* are, one instance of hiatus before *ῥπα* (Od. 11. 421), two of lengthening of a short syllable (Il. 18. 222, Od. 12. 52), and one or two phrases such as *ἄμειβόμεναι ὀπί κалῆ*, &c.; while there are three undoubtedly adverse places (Il. 11. 137., 21. 98, Od. 5. 61). In the case of *ῥμφή* the evidence is clear against *F*; in *ῥσσα* it is indecisive.

ῥρανός (Sanscr. *varuṇas*).

ῥλαι *coarsely ground barley*, connected with the root *Fελ-*, meaning *to roll*, &c. Neither this word nor the derivative *ῥλοχύται* admits *F*.

ῥλαμός *crowd, press of battle*, shows traces of initial *F* in Il. 20. 379 *ἔδύσετο ῥλαμόν ἀνδρῶν* and the phrase *ἀνὰ ῥλαμόν ἀνδρῶν* (Il. 4. 251, 273., 20. 113). It does not occur except in these places.

ῥτάω, ῥτειλή *wound*: cp. *ἄ-ουτος unwounded*, and the form *γατάλαι* in Hesychius.

ῥθέω (*ἔώθειον, ἔωσα*), root *vadh* to beat.

ῥνος *price*, Impf. *ἔωνούμην* (Sanscr. *vasnas*, Lat. *vēnum*).

Other words which may have originally had initial *F* are, *ῥρκος* (cp. *ἐπί-ορκος*), *ῥνίγημι* (*ἐρι-ούνιος*), *ῥγγυμι* (*ἀνα-οίγεσκον, ἀνέφγε*, &c.), *ῥπυλώ*, *ῥκνος*, *ῥρή*, &c. (L. Meyer, *l. c.*). However this may be, none of them show traces of *F* in Homer. There remain the forms of the Possessive *ῥς* to which the rule would apply, viz. *οῦ, ῥν, ῶ, ῶν, οῦς*. Hiatus is found before *ῥν* in 18 places (before *ῥνδε* *δόμουδε* seven times, *ῥν κατὰ θυμόν* six times, in *προτὶ ῥν* four times), *οῦς* twice (Il. 2. 832., 11. 330), *οῦ* once (Od. 15. 358). On the other hand there are 22 places in which the forms in question do not admit *F*. The significance of this proportion appears when we know that in the case of the remaining forms of the Possessive *ῥς* the places with hiatus number 50, the adverse instances 8, and that with the forms of the Personal Pronoun (*ἔο, οἶ, &c.*) the proportion is 728 to 19. It seems probable, therefore, that in the forms *οῦ, ῥν, &c.* the *F* was no longer pronounced, though *traces* of the former pronunciation remained (as in the case of *ῥλαμός* and *ῥψ*). Similarly in English the sound of *w* is lost before the vowel *o* in *who, whom, whose*, but retained in *which, what, &c.*

The retention of *f* before the diphthong *οι*, as in *οἶ, οἶο, οἶς*, also in *οἶκος* and *οἶνος*, may indicate that *o* before *i* had not its ordinary sound, but one approaching to *ε* (possibly like French *eu*). This agrees with the fact that *οι*

and υ were afterwards identical in sound, and that in the modern language both are = τ.

Words with initial υ are not found in Homer with *F*; but we cannot in this case speak of the loss of *F*—the combination *Fυ* having been *originally* impossible.

The remaining instances in which loss of *F* may be assumed in Homeric words are few, and for the most part open to question.

ἔλκω, root *valk* or *vlak* (Knös, following Curtius): *F* is perhaps seen in κατὰ ὠλκα (Il. 13. 707., Od. 18. 375). This account of the word separates it from Lat. *sulcus*.

ἔλειν, ἔλωρ, possibly to be connected with Lat. *vultur* the bird of *prey*. The instances of hiatus before ἔλωρ are hardly enough to prove *F*.

ἔλος, from which the name *Velia* is said by Dionysius Hal. (*Arch.* 1. 20) to be derived, has no *F* in Homer (Il. 2. 584, 594., 20. 221, Od. 14. 474). The *F* of this word is also wanting in the Cyprian dialect (Deecke and Siegismund, *Curt. Stud.* vii. 249).

ἦλος, ἦλειος is without *F* in Homer: *Φαλήϊοι* is the form found on Elean and Laconian inscriptions.

ἦλος (Lat. *vallus*) rejects *F* in Il. 11. 29 ἐν δέ οἱ ἦλοι: the two other places where it occurs prove nothing. *ἦλοι γὰρ δεινός*

ἰδίω, ἰδρώς (root *svid*): the σ*F* is lost in Homer.

ἴκω, ἰκνέομαι: the derivation from the root *vig* is quite uncertain.

ἴστιη (Lat. *Vesta*): the forms ἀν-έστιος, ἐφ-έστιος show that the *F* is lost in Homer (as also in the Laconian, Loerian, and Boeotian dialects, see § 404).

394.] Initial δ*F*. This combination is to be recognised in two groups of words:—

δ*F*ει- (δ*F*ει-), εἰδεια (so Ar.), δέος, δεινός, δειλός, &c.

A short vowel is frequently lengthened before these words, as Il. 1. 515 οὗ τοι ἐπι δέος, Il. 11. 37 περὶ δὲ Δεῖμός τε Φόβος τε, Od. 5. 52 ὅς τε κατὰ δεινούς, Od. 9. 236 ἡμεῖς δὲ δείσαντες.

The cases in which a vowel is allowed to count as short before the δ of this root are extremely few: Il. 8. 133 βροντήσας δ' ἄρα δεινόν, Od. 12. 203 τῶν δ' ἄρα εἰσάντων (read ἄρ); Il. 13. 165 ἀπὸ ἔο δείσε δέ. There remain only Il. 13. 278 ἐνθ' ὅ τε δειλὸς ἀνὴρ (read ἐνθ' ὅς τε δειλός), Il. 15. 626, and the forms ὑποδείσατε (Od. 2. 66), δεδίασι (Il. 24. 663), ἀδειής (Il. 7. 117).

δήν, δηρόν, δηθά.

In δήν the *F* is required in the phrases οὗ τι μάλα δήν, οὐδ' ἄρ' ἐτι δήν, &c.; there are no contrary instances. In δηρόν it is traced in two places, Il. 9. 415 (ἐπὶ δηρόν δέ μοι αἰών), Od. 1. 203: but is more commonly absent (οὐκέτι δηρόν, &c.). The instances of δηθά do not show anything.

It is to be observed that except in εἰδεια the original δ*F* does not lengthen a vowel without the ictus. Compare the rule as to initial *F* lengthening a short syllable by Position, § 391.

395.] Initial Fρ, &c. The metrical value of an initial ρ which represents Fρ differs in the several words. It has always the effect of a double consonant in ῥήγγυμι, ῥίπτω, ῥάκος, ῥυ- (in ῥυτός, &c.), ῥη- (in ῥητός, ῥητήρ), and nearly always in ῥινός (except Od. 5. 281), ῥίζα (Od. 9. 390). But lengthening is optional in ῥέζω, ῥιγέω, ῥεία: thus we have ἔρρεξα and ἔρεξα (in 27 places); ἵπποι δὲ ῥέα (Il. 8. 179), but ἔνθα κε ῥεία κτλ.; ἔρριγσαν, but ὡς φάτο ῥιγισεν δὲ κτλ. As to ρ- standing for an older σρ-, and the other letters (λ, μ, ν) which lengthen a preceding short vowel, see § 371.

396.] F not initial. The metrical tests by which initial F is discovered generally fail us when the sound occurs in the middle of a word. Loss of F may be shown either (1) by the contraction or synizesis of two vowels originally separated by it, or (2) by the shortening of the first of two such vowels. We have seen that the instances of contraction and synizesis are too rare or doubtful to prove much (§ 378*, 4). The cases in which hiatus is indicated by the shortening of a vowel are somewhat more important. In the declension of νηῦς the forms νεός, νέες, νεών, νέεσσι, νέας (§ 94, 1) cannot be derived phonetically from νητός, &c., unless we suppose loss of F to have taken place. The same applies to the double forms of Nouns in -εως, as Πηλῆος and Πηλέος, &c. Unless the short vowel is explained on some other hypothesis (e.g. by variation in the stem, as in Ζεύς and βούς, § 106, 2), we must suppose that F had ceased to be sounded in the middle of a word. The loss of F would also explain the metathesis of quantity in ἔως for ἦος in Od. 2. 79 (see § 171, 1), τέως for τῆος in Il. 19. 189 αὔθι τέως ἐπειγόμενος (where G. Hermann read αὐτοῦ τῆος), Il. 24. 658, Od. 18. 190: but this, as these instances show, is even rarer than synizesis in these words, and is almost certainly post-Homeric.

Compound Verbs usually recognize F, as ἀπο-ειπών, δια-ειπέμεν, also with apocope παρ-ειπών (ᾱ), &c. Exceptions are: ἀπ-ειπέμεν (Od. 1. 91), ἀπ-ειπόντος (Il. 19. 75), δι-ειπε (Il. 10. 425), πᾶρ-είπη (Il. 1. 555): κατ-είρυσται (Od. 8. 151, 14. 332, 19. 289): ἐσ-ίδεσκε, ἐσ-ιδέσθη, ἐσ-ιδούσα, ἐκκατ-ιδών, ἐπ-ιδόντα: ἐπ-έοικε (11 places): ὑπέζομαι (Il. 1. 294, Od. 12. 117). In some of these forms metrical necessity may be pleaded; thus ἐπι-φέβοικε and ἐπ-φέβοικε, κατα-φιδών and κατ-φιδών (-ο-) are alike impossible in the hexameter. Hence we may suppose a licence by which (as in the case of φρ, βρ, &c. § 370) the combinations νF, τF, πF, did not 'make Position.' The instances to which this excuse does not apply are very few.

On the other hand there are several examples of words in which F between two vowels, or between a vowel and a liquid (ρ or λ), is vocalised as υ; αὐίαχοι (ἀ-φίφαχοι), αὔερνον, ἀγανός, ταλαύριος (ταλά-φρινος), εὔαδε, ἔχουα, ἀλευάσθαι, δεύομαι, εὔληρα, αὔριον, λυβ: αὔως, λα: ἀβούρ = αουρα; αὔέλιος < ἀφ-έελ-ιος. cf. κρο-αὔε, Aurelius, αὐα: Αουκλις; ἔφ-ιος, ἄγανός; ἔφ15, αὔη. δολίς; αὔος;

ἀπούρας (§ 13), ἀκουή. It is very possible that many more such forms were to be found in the original text: cp. § 384, 1.

397.] **Loss of initial σ and ι (γ).** The traces of these sounds in the metre of Homer are chiefly of interest for the purpose of comparison with the facts relating to *F*.

The effects of initial σ may be seen in a few cases of the non-elision of prepositions: ἐπι-άλμενος (Lat. *salio*), ἀμφί-αλος (Lat. *sal*), ἀμφί-επον (Lat. *sequor*), κατα-ίσχεται (ἴσχω for σίσχω), and the lengthening in πᾶρέχῃ (Od. 19. 113) and σῦνεχές (Od. 9. 74). Hiatus is also found twice before ἔλη (Il. 14. 285, Od. 5. 257), once before ἔπνος (Od. 10. 68), and 18 times before ἐός (mostly in the principal caesura). These instances however are too few to prove anything.

Initial ι or γ is chiefly traced in the Adverb ὦς, which when used after the Noun to which it refers is allowed to lengthen the final syllable: as θεὸς ὦς, ὄρνιθες ὦς, &c. (so in 36 places). On the other hand there are nearly as many places which do not admit an initial consonant: as κτίλος ὦς (Il. 3. 196), λέονθ' ὦς (Il. 11. 383., 12. 293., 16. 756), θεὸς δ' ὦς κτλ. Probably therefore no spirant was heard, and the lengthening of the syllable before ὦς was a mere 'survival' or traditional rule (§ 375, 1).

398.] **Summary.** According to the computation of Prof. Hartel there are 3354 places in which the effect of the Digamma can be traced on the metre of Homer. In 2324 places its presence is shown by hiatus after a short vowel (*i. e.* it prevents elision); in 359 places it justifies the lengthening of a short syllable ending in a consonant, in other words, it helps to make 'Position'; in 164 places it follows a long vowel or diphthong which is without ictus: in 507 places it follows a long vowel or diphthong with ictus. It is further to be noticed that in many places a short final vowel in arsis is lengthened before the *F*: see especially the instances given under εὖο (§ 390), and ἰάχῳ (§ 389).* On the other hand there are 617 places where the *F* is neglected. Short vowels suffer Elision before it in 324 places: it fails to lengthen by Position after another consonant in 215 places: and long vowels or diphthongs are shortened before it in 78 places. Also the power to lengthen by Position is confined, except in the case of the enclitic εὖο, οἶ, to lengthening of syllables which have the ictus.

399.] **Theories of the *F*.** The main question which arises on these facts evidently is: How can the great number of passages

* A short vowel is also lengthened with ictus before ἔπος (Od. 10. 246), ἔρξαν (Od. 14. 411), and in the Compounds ἀπο-ειπών (Il. 19. 35) and ἀπο-έρση, ἀπο-έρσειε (Il. 21. 283, 329).

in which the *F* affects the metre of Homer be reconciled with the not inconsiderable number of passages in which it is neglected?

The scholars who first became aware of the traces of a lost letter in Homer assumed that in the original form of the poems this letter, or at least the consonantal sound for which it afterwards stood, was consistently used—that it was in fact one of the ordinary sounds of the language—; and accordingly they directed their efforts to restoring it to the text. This was the principle on which Bentley made his famous series of emendations: and which was carried out by Bekker in his edition of 1858. Of late years, however, different views of the matter have been taken. Leskien seems to have been the first to maintain that the passages which do not admit *F* are not necessarily corrupt or spurious, but are to be regarded as evidence of an original fluctuation in the use of the sound. His view is adopted and defended by Curtius (*Grundz.* p. 560, 5th ed.). Prof. Hartel has more recently put forward a theory which agrees with that of Curtius in treating the apparent neglect of the *F* as part of the original condition of the text. But he ascribes this neglect, not to irregularity in the use of the sound, but to the intermediate half-vowel character of the sound itself.

400.] If we are not satisfied that the *F* had the value of an ordinary consonant at the time when the Homeric poems were produced (or when they received their present form), we may explain the influence which it has on the metre in several ways.

Hypothesis of alternative forms. We may suppose that each word that originally had initial *F* was known to Homeric times in two forms, an older form with the *F*—confined perhaps to the archaic or poetical style—and a later in which *F* was no longer heard. Just as the poet could say either *σῆς* or *ῆς*, either *πόλις* or *πóλις*, either *τελέσσαι* or *τελέσαι*, so he may have had the choice between *Fάναξ* and *ἄναξ*, *Fηδύς* and *ἦδύς*, &c.

In order to test the probability of this hypothesis, let us take a few common words of different metrical form, and which show no trace of *F*, the words **Ἀρης*, *ἄριστος*, *ἔγχος*, *ἦμαρ*, *ὄμιλος*, *ὄφθαλμός*, *ῥωρ*, *ῥπνος*. These words, with their immediate derivatives, occur in the Iliad 1022 times; and the places that would not admit an initial consonant number 684, or just two-thirds of the whole. Again, take some of the commonest words with *F*, *ἄναξ*, *ἄστυ*, *ἔργον*, *οἶκος*, and the Aorist *ἰδεῖν*. These occur in the Iliad 685 times, and the exceptions are hardly 50, or about one-fourteenth. Compared with the other proportion this surely proves that the recognition of the *F* in these words was not arbitrary, but was the rule in Homeric verse.

401.] **Explanation from fixed phrases, &c.** The traces of *F*

may also be ascribed to the conventional phrases of the early epic style. The word *ἄστυ*, for example, is found very frequently in the combinations *πρὸς ἄστυ*, *ἀνὰ ἄστυ*, *κατὰ ἄστυ*, &c. ; but these do not prove the pronunciation *Ἔάστυ* for Homeric times any more than (*e.g.*) *ἐπιεικῆς* proves an Attic *ἐπιφεικῆς*. Such phrases, it may be said, were handed on ready-made, with a fixed metrical value, and served as models for fresh combinations, in which the hiatus was retained as part of the familiar rhythm.

This explanation is inadequate, for the following reasons:—

(1) The instances of *F* are not confined to the commonest words, or to frequently recurring phrases. Thus it is found in *ἴον* a violet, *ἴτυς* the fellow of a wheel, *ἰτέη* a willow, *ἄρνες* lambs. And it is used (generally speaking) in all the different forms of each Verb or Noun, whether of common occurrence or not (*ἰδεῖν* as well as *ἰδέειν*, *ἴνεσι* as well as *ἴς* and *ἴφι*, &c.).

(2) The other cases in which tradition can be shown to have had the effect of retaining older phrases and combinations are not really parallel. In the Homeric Hymns the *F* can be clearly traced: but the proportion of instances which do not admit *F* is markedly different. Taking the words already used as examples, viz. *ἄναξ*, *ἄστυ*, *ἔργον*, *οἶκος*, *ἰδεῖν*, we find them in the Hymns 152 times, while the *F* is neglected in 36 places, or nearly one-fourth of the whole. Again if we look at the words which begin with *ο*, as *οὐλαμός*, *ὄψ*, &c. (§ 393), we find similar conditions. The traces of *F* are undoubted, but do not predominate as with *ἄναξ* or *ἄστυ*. Other examples may be seen in the traces of the double consonants, *σρ*, *σλ*, *σν*, *φρ* discussed in § 371. Compare the free use of alternate forms, as *ἔρεξα* and *ἔρρεξα*, *προ-ρέω* and *ἐπιρρέω*, with the almost invariable recognition of *δF* in *δέος*, *δείσας*, &c. We seem to be able to draw a broad distinction between the predominating influence of the *F* in Homer and the arbitrary or occasional influence of the older forms in other cases. And these other cases, we may conclude, give us a measure of the force of tradition in such matters, while in the case of the Homeric *F* the effect is due to its retention as a living sound.

(3) A further argument in favour of *F* as a real sound in Homer has been derived from the places in which *φε*, *φοι* suffer elision (§ 391); see Leaf's note on Il. 24. 154. The argument has much force, and would be conclusive if we could assume that an elided vowel was not sounded at all.

402.] **Hiatus &c. as a survival.** Another supposition, akin to the last discussed, is that in the words which originally had initial *F* the ordinary effects of an initial consonant remained after the sound itself was no longer heard. Such a phenomenon would be by no means without parallel in language. In French,

for instance, elision is not allowed before certain words beginning with *h*, as *le héros*, *la hauteur*, though the *h* is no longer pronounced. Similarly, then, it may be held that the facts of Homeric metre only prove the habit or rule of treating certain words as if they began with *F*.

On the other side it may be urged that the *h* of *héros*, *hauteur*, &c. is only traced in one way, viz. by hiatus, and that only in a small number of combinations; whereas the *F* not only protects hiatus, but also makes Position. Moreover the retention of a traditional usage of this kind is very much easier in an age of education. Anomalies which would naturally disappear in a few years are kept alive by being taught to successive generations of children. It seems difficult to believe that the *F* would have kept its present place in the memory of the poets unless it were familiar, either to the ear as a present sound, or to the eye as a letter in the written text.

403.] Explanation from the nature of the *F*. The theory recently advanced by Prof. Hartel is one to which it is difficult to do justice in a short statement. The careful re-examination which he has made of the metrical facts has convinced him that the influence of the *F* is not occasional or arbitrary, but in the strictest sense universal in Homer. He does not however regard the passages in which the *F* appears to be neglected as corrupt or spurious, but explains them on the theory that the *F* in Homer has not the full value of an ordinary consonant: comparing it, for instance, not with the initial *V* of Latin, but with the sound which that letter has in the combination *QV*.

Hartel's chief argument is that hiatus after short vowels is the most common of the metrical facts pointing to a lost *F*, and especially that it is much commoner than lengthening by Position, the numbers being 2995 and 359 respectively. But the force of this argument depends in the case of each word on the metrical form: thus before a word of iambic form the syllable must be short, hence we may find hiatus, but not lengthening: before an anapaest the reverse holds good. If (using Hartel's list) we take the instances in which *F* is followed in the verse by two short syllables—the words being *ἄγεν*, *ἄλις*, *ἕαρος*, *ἕλικες* (with *ἐλίκωπες*, &c.), *ἔπος*, *ἐρύω*, *ἔτος*, *ιαχή*, *ἴδον*—we shall find that they number 415, and the *F* makes Position in 98. But this is not materially different from the proportion which will be found to obtain in the case of any common word of the same metrical form (such as *πόλεμος*).

404.] *F* in other Greek dialects. It seems desirable here to say something of the uses of the Digamma which are found on the older inscriptions of the chief Doric and Æolic dialects.

The forms preserved on these inscriptions do not indeed prove anything directly as to the Homeric digamma. We cannot infer from them, for instance, that the symbol *F* was ever used in any written copies of the poems, or that the sound which it represented in other dialects was known to the Homeric language. But they may serve by way of analogy to direct our conjectures on these questions.

The most striking examples of *F* are found on the inscriptions of Corinth and its colony Coreyra (as *Ἰεκάβα*, *Ἰούλαφος*, *Ἰίφίτος*, *Ἰφειρίας*, *Αἴφας*, *Ξένφων*, *Ξενφάρεος*, *ὄρφος*, *Γλασίαφο*, &c.). With these may be placed the Argive inscriptions (in one of which occurs *Διφί*), and the few Laconian inscriptions. In the older monuments of these dialects initial *F* is never wanting; but omission in the body of the word is occasionally found, as in *Δαίφοβος* and *Πολυξίνα* (on the same Corinthian vase), and several names ending in *-κλής* (for *-κλέφης*), and *-λας* (for *-λαφος*). The scanty Phocian inscriptions yield the important forms *Ἰέξ*, *αἰφέι*, *κλέφος*, with no early examples of omission; and the little known Pamphylian dialect is equally constant, so far as it has been made out. The Locrian dialect shows more decided indications of falling off in the use of the digamma. On the inscriptions of that dialect (discussed by Prof. Allen in *Curt. Stud.* iii. 207 ff.) we find it in *Ἰαστός*, *Ἰέκαστος*, *Ἰεκών*, *Ἰέτος*, *Ἰεσπάριος*, *Ἰοῖκος* and its compounds (*ἐπίἸοῖκος*, &c.), also in *καταἸεῖ*, *Ἰεφαδηκότα*: but not in *δαμωργός*, *ξένος*, *έννεά*, *Ὀπώντιος* (for original *Ὀποφέντιος*). The only initial *F* which is wanting is in the word *Ἰστῖαι* (we may compare the Laconian and Homeric *ἐφέστιος*). Similarly in the older Elean inscriptions initial *F* is regular (*Ἰάργον*, *Ἰέπος*, *Ἰράτρα*, &c.); and we have also *Ἰερφαοῖοι* (*people of Heraea?*), *ἐἸέρεν* (prob. an Infinitive), but *ξένος*, *Διός* without *F*. In the great inscription of Gortyn initial *F* appears in *Ἰός* (*suus*), *Ἰίν* (= *Ἰοῖ*), *Ἰέκαστος*, *Ἰεκάτερος*, *Ἰέρξαι*, *Ἰεργασία*, *Ἰήμα* (*εἶμα*), *Ἰεῖπαι*, *Ἰοικεύς*, *Ἰοῖνος*, *Ἰίκατι*, *Ἰεξήκοντα*, and is only lost in *ώνά*, *ώνάω* (before *ω*, § 393). The *F* is also found in Compounds, as *ένἸοικῆ*, *προἸειπάτω*, *δυοδεκαἸετίες*, and in the body of the word *Ἰισφόμοιος*, but disappears between vowels, as in *λάω* (Gen. of *lāos a stone*), *αἰέι*, *παιδίον*, the oblique Cases of Nouns in *-υς* and *-ευσ* (*νιέες*, *Ἰοικέα*, *δρομέες*, &c.), and the contracted words *ἄτα* (*ἄφάτη*) and *ἄς* (for *ἄφος*, = *ἔως*). It is also lost before *ρ*, as in *ἄπορρηθέντι*.*

A somewhat later stage in the use of *F* is well exemplified by the numerous Boeotian inscriptions. In these the general rule is that initial *F* is retained: the only word from which it is regularly absent is *Ἰέκαστος*. On the other hand the only instances of

* Baunack, *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, pp. 37-39, 68.

F in the body of a word are, the compound *ΦικατιΦέτιες* (*εἰκοσι-ετέες*), and a group of derivatives of *αἰδῶ* (*αὐλαΦυδός*, *τραγα-Φυδός*, &c.). The same rule applies to the Arcadian inscriptions, which however are too few to be of importance. The further progress of decay may be seen in the Doric dialect of Heraclea, of which a specimen remains in the well known *Tabulae Hera-cleenses* (of the 4th cent.). We there find *Φέξ*, *Φέτος*, *Φίδιος*, *Φικατι* and the compound *ἐγ-Φηληθίῶντι* (= *ἐξ-εἰληθῶσι*), but *ἐκαστος*, *ἴσος*, *ἀφ-ερξόντι*, *πενταέτηρίς*, *ἐργάζομαι*, *οἰκία*, *ρήτρα*: from which it follows that the use of *F* even as an initial sound must have been fluctuating. A similar condition of at least partial loss of *F* is found in inscriptions of Melos.

If we do not confine our view to the *character F*, but look to the other indications of the sound which it represented, the most important evidence is that furnished by the Cyprian inscriptions. The forms which they yield belong, generally speaking, to an earlier period of the language than is known from alphabetical inscriptions. Yet the use of the sounds answering to *F* is not uniform: we have *ΔιΦός* and *Διός*, *βασιλέΦος* and *βασιλέος*.

An original *F* is represented by *β* in several parts of Greece, especially Laconia, Elis, Crete: but probably the *β* is merely a graphical substitute for *F*. It is found in the inscriptions of later times, when *β* was probably = our *v*.

The substitution of *υ* for *F* is characteristic of the Æolic of Lesbos, as *εὔιδε* (for *ἔΦιδε*), *αὔως*, *δεύομαι*, *ἐνδενής* (= *ἐνδεής*). In these forms the *F* is vocalised; cp. Homeric *αὐίαχος* (= *ἄ-Φίαχος*), *εὔαδε*, *ταλαύρινος*.

It is necessary here to notice a group of uses of the *F* in which it seems to have been developed from a neighbouring vowel (*υ* or *ο*). The vowel usually precedes, as in Laconian *ἐδήδοΦας*, *ἐδήδοΦε*, Coreycean *ἀριστεύΦοντα*, Boeotian *ΕὐΦαρα*, *βακευΦαι*, Cyprian *ΕὐΦέλθων*, *ΕὐΦαγόρω*, *κατεσκευΦασε*: but we also find *ΦλασίαΦο* (Coreyr.), *ΓίλγαΦος* (Cypr.), *ΤιμοχάριΦος* (Cypr.), *Φότι* (Locr.). So perhaps the Boeotian *αὐλαΦυδός*, *τραγαΦυδός*, &c. (see above). With the former instances we might compare Italian *Genōva*, *Padōva* (for Genua, Padua); with the latter the *υ* of Italian *uomo*, *uoro*, the *w* of *whole*, the provincial English *wuts* for *oats*, &c. With *Φότι* we should compare the form *ΝαΦάκτιος*, also Locrian. Both are exceptional, and indeed must be considered as mere errors:* but they help to show how near *F* was to a pure vowel sound. It is evident that this redundant *F*, growing

* The ordinary form *Ναύπακτος* occurs on the inscription 19 times, the form with *ΝαΦ-* only once. Similarly against the single instance of *Φότι* are to be set 2 instances of *δτι*, and 5 others of the Relative *δς*, in the older Locrian inscription. See Allen in *Curt. Stud.* iii. p. 252; Brugmann, *ibid.* iv. p. 133, n. 57: Tudeer, *De digammo*, p. 45.

out of the vowel *υ* or *ο*, is a parallel phenomenon to the loss of *F* before these vowels which was noticed above as a characteristic of Homer (§ 393).

405.] *F* in Ionic. There remains the interesting question whether the existence of the *F* in Ionic can be traced in inscriptions. The evidence appears to be as follows (Tudeer, *De digammo* &c. pp. 5 ff.):—

(1) The form ΑΨΥΤΟ (= *αὐτοῦ*) on a Naxian inscription of the end of the 6th century B.C. But, as has been pointed out,* the *F* of ἀΨυτός indicates at most a special way of pronouncing the *υ*, and is to be compared with the erroneous ΝάΨπακτος noticed above.

(2) The name of the city of Velia, which was founded by exiles from Phocaea (*Φέλεα marshes*; but see § 393).

(3) The forms FIO, ΓΑΡΥΦΟΝΕΣ, ΟΨΑΤΙΕΣ—all proper names—on vases found in Magna Graecia, and supposed to have come from Chalcis in Euboea, or one of its Italian colonies.

It is inferred by Tudeer (*l. c.*) that the *F* must have been a living sound in the Ionic dialect of Euboea at the time when the colonies of Chalcis were sent to Magna Graecia, *i. e.* probably in the 8th century B.C. On the other hand, since there is no example on the inscriptions of Euboea itself, the sound does not seem to have survived there down to the date of the earliest examples of writing, *viz.* the 6th century B.C. Hence Tudeer puts the loss of the *F* in Ionic Euboea at some time between the 8th and the 6th centuries.

It has been recently pointed out by P. Kretschmer (*K. Z.* xxxi. 285) that the Ionic change of *ā* to *η* cannot be placed very early. The name Μῆδοι underwent the change,—the original *ā* appears in the form Μᾶδοι on the monument of Idalion—and the Medes must therefore have become known to the Ionians before it was completed. The Persian names which reached Ionia later—*Δᾶρείος*, *Μιθριδάτης*, &c.—retain their *ā*. Similarly the old Carian Μίλατος became the Ionic Μίλητος. Hence the Ionic *η* is later than the contact of Ionians with the nations of Asia Minor. Now the anomalous *η* after *ρ* in the Attic *κόρη* and *δέρη* is to be explained from the older forms *κόρφη*, *δέρφη* (*cp.* *κόρρη* from *κόρση*). Consequently the loss of *F* in Attic must be later than the change of *ā* to *η*, and *a fortiori* later than the Ionian migration. This inference is confirmed by the *ο* of the Comparatives *κενότερος* and *στενότερος*, pointing as it does to the forms

* By Brugmann, *Curt. Stud.* iv. p. 132, n. 55, and Tudeer, p. 7.

κενFός, στενFός (since the lengthening of the ϵ , as in Ionic κεινός, στεινός, never took place in Attic).

The former use of F as a letter in all Greek alphabets is shown by its use as a numeral, and also by the existence of the first non-Phocnician letter, Υ . The addition of Υ , which was the earliest made, and perhaps contemporaneous with the introduction of the alphabet, shows that the Greeks felt the need of a vowel distinct from the labial spirant Vau. Otherwise the Phoenician Vau would have served for the vowel υ , just as the Yod was taken for the vowel ι . And as there is no Greek alphabet without Υ , it follows that the consonant F was equally universal.*

Combining these inferences with the independent evidence furnished by the metre, we may arrive at some approximate conclusions regarding the value of F in the Ionic of Homer.

(a) Initial F had the value of a consonant, except before \omicron or ω (§ 393).

(b) δF was retained, not only at the beginning of a word (§ 394), but also in $\acute{\epsilon}\delta F\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha$, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta F\iota\alpha$, &c.: we can hardly suppose compensatory lengthening in these forms.

(c) F between vowels is more doubtful (§ 396). Since initial F was lost as early as Homer before \omicron or ω , it probably vanished before most Case-endings of the Second Declension, and before the $-\omicron\varsigma$, $-\omega\nu$ of the Third Declension. Thus for $\lambda\alpha F\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, &c. we should have $\lambda\alpha\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon$, &c. (but F possibly in $\lambda\alpha F\omicron\lambda$, $\lambda\alpha F\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$): and again $\acute{\eta}\delta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\acute{\eta}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\eta}\delta\acute{\epsilon}F\iota$, &c., $\Pi\eta\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, $\Pi\eta\lambda\acute{\eta}\omicron\varsigma$, $\Pi\eta\lambda\acute{\eta}F\iota$, &c. Then other Cases might follow the analogy of the Gen. Sing. and Plur., and so drop the F altogether. However this may be, it is clear that F between vowels was generally lost much earlier than F at the beginning of the word (cp. Italian *amai* for *amavi*, &c.). The absence of contraction proves little, as we see from the Attic $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\alpha$, $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\epsilon$, &c. At the same time we occasionally find a partial survival of F in a vocalised form, making a diphthong with the preceding vowel (§ 396).

* As the Vau is written Υ on the Moabite Stone, it has been suggested that it was the source of the Greek Υ . It seems not improbable that the letters F and Υ were at first only two forms of Vau, appropriated in course of time to the consonant F and vowel υ ,—just as our u and v come from the two uses of Latin V . If this is so, the place of Υ at the end of the then alphabet is significant, as showing the importance attached to the original order of the letters. See Roberts, *Greek Epigraphy*, § 11: Taylor, *The Alphabet*, ii. p. 82.

APPENDIX.*

C. On η and ει in Homer.

THIS seems the most convenient place for a short statement of the question as to the spelling of the Subjunctives formed from Stems in -η, and of some other forms about which similar doubts have arisen.

1. In the case of Stems in which -η represents an older -ā the MSS. usually have ει before ο, ω, but η before ε, η. Thus in the Subj. of ἔβην, ἔστην we find βείω, στείωσι, &c., but βήης, στήετον, &c. There are one or two exceptions: καταβήομεν once in A (Il. 10. 97), ἐπιβήομεν in good MSS. of the Odyssey (6. 262., 10. 334). Aristarchus however wrote περιστήωσ' in Il. 17. 95 (where all the MSS. have περιστείωσ'), and βήομαι in Il. 22. 431 (where the MSS. have either βείομαι or βίομαι): from which it may be inferred that he wrote η in all similar forms.

2. In the Subjunctives from Stems in -η (the short Stem ending in -ε), the MSS. always have ει before ο, ω, and usually before ε, η. Thus we find θείω, θείης, θείη, and less commonly θήης, θήη, &c. But Aristarchus wrote θήης, θήη, &c., and so in all similar cases, δαμήη, σαπήη, &c. As to θείω, δαμείω, &c., no express statement of his opinion has been preserved. If we may argue from this silence, we should infer that the question had not arisen, and therefore that with these Stems the spelling -ειω, -ειομεν, &c. was anciently universal.

3. The spelling with ει appears in some forms of the Aor. ἔκηα (for ἔκηνα, see § 15), esp. κείομεν, κείαντες, κείαντο, κείαμενοι, κακ-κείαι; also in the Pf. Part. τεθνηώς, and the 3 Plur. forms εἶται, εἶατο, ἀκαχέιατο. Aristarchus certainly wrote ἔκηα, τεθνηώς: and the form ἦαται (for ἦσ-αται) is supported by ancient authority (Eust. Od. 20. 354.)

4. In the declension of Stems in -εεσ (for -εφεσ-) we sometimes find η throughout, as Ἡρακλῆος, Ἡρακλῆϊ, Ἡρακλῆα, sometimes η before ει and ι, but ει before α, ο, ω: as ἀκλειεῖς, ζαχρηεῖς; but ἀκλειῶς, ἐκλειῆας, ἐϋρρεῖως, ζαχρειῶν. So δειούς, σπείους, but σπηῖ, σπήεσσι. In all these cases, however, the uncontracted εε should probably be substituted for η or ει (§ 105, 15). In χέρηϊ, χέρηες, χέρηια (Aristarchus and most MSS.) the origin of the long vowel is not quite certain (§ 121).

* The matter contained in the Appendix to the first edition under the headings A, B, D and E has now been incorporated with the body of the work.

5. The Attic -εω- in πλέως, κρεω-φάγος, χρεωκοπέω points to original φλήος, κρήας, χρήος, instead of the usual πλείος, κρείας, χρείος. And εώς, τέως are for ἦος, τῆος (not εῖως, as in the MSS.).

6. So Attic -εᾶ points to -ηα, and accordingly we should have φρήαρ, στήαρ (instead of φρείαρ, &c.); and similarly ὄνηαρ.

The rule adopted by Bekker and La Roche is phonetic. They write εἰ before ο, ου, ω, α, but η before ε, εἰ, η, ι. Thus they give στείω, στήης; θείω, θήης; ἦμαι, εἶται: and so on. This rule, however, is purely empirical.

On the other hand the scholars who look at the question as an etymological one are inclined to prefer η in all the instances in question. They hold that if (*e.g.*) we find the strong Stem θη- in τίθη-μι, θή-σω, ἔθηκα, &c., it must also be found in the Subjunctive. And they point out that in this and similar cases there is a special reason for distrusting, not only the extant MSS. (which are admittedly liable to error from itacism), but also the statements of the ancient grammarians, so far at least as they may be regarded as founded upon MSS. of the 4th century B.C. The older alphabet, which was used in Athens down to 400 B.C., employed the same character E for three distinct sounds, viz. the short ε, the long η, and (in many words) the diphthong εἰ. This would not lead to practical difficulty with a living language, but in the case of Homeric forms there was nothing to prevent confusion except the metre, and (it may be) the traditional pronunciation of the rhapsodists. There is therefore no good ground for believing that the spelling even of the 4th century B.C. could be trusted to decide between η and εἰ in any form which was then obsolete.

The substitution of εἰ for η, however, is not a matter of chance, but depends on the circumstance that in later Greek εἰ represented a single long vowel of the same quality as the short ε (probably a close e, such as French ê), while η was of different quality (a more open e, French è). Accordingly when Homeric η passed into ε in Attic, as in τεθυώς, τεθνεώς, there was a special tendency to make the archaic long vowel (which the metre requires) as like as possible to the ε of the living speech. So the forms στήω, βήω, θήω, στήομεν, &c. would be liable to change their η to εἰ under the influence of the New Ionic στέω, στέομεν, &c.; and so too ἦος, τῆος became εῖως, τεῖως from the influence of εῖω, τέως. We may even suppose that η first became ε, and this ε was afterwards lengthened to fit the metre,—just as Wackernagel supposes ὄράω to have been changed to ὄρώω through the intermediate form ὄρῶ (§ 55).

A similar account is to be given of the forms which exhibit ϵ for $\epsilon\upsilon$ or $\epsilon\phi$, as $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota$ *breathes*, $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota\nu$ *to run*, $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$ (Subj.) *shall pour*, $\pi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ *sailing*, $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\sigma\iota$ *celebrate* (§ 29, 3). The original Present is preserved in $\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega$ and $\delta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, cp. the Aorists $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$, $\eta\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\tau\omicron$. When $-\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ passed into $-\epsilon\phi\omega$ and then $-\epsilon\omega$, the ϵ was lengthened by the force of the metre, and became $\epsilon\iota$. So the $\epsilon\iota$ of $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (for $\kappa\eta\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ or $\kappa\acute{\eta}\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, from $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega$) is to be attributed to the Attic 1 Aor. Part. $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$. But the Verbs in $-\epsilon\iota\omega$ (§ 51, 3), or some of them, may be Verbs in $-\eta\omega$: e.g. $\delta\acute{\omicron}\kappa\eta\acute{\omega}$, like \mathcal{A} olic $\pi\omicron\theta\acute{\eta}\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\omega$.

It is probable that in the same way the \bar{a} of $\phi\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\alpha$ (Plur. of $\phi\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$), $\acute{\alpha}\eta\rho$, $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\sigma\epsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\sigma\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\omicron\rho$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\eta\varsigma$, $\zeta\acute{\alpha}\eta\varsigma$, &c. represents $\alpha\upsilon$. The lengthening cannot well be merely metrical, as in $\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ &c. (§ 386).

In some cases $\epsilon\iota$ takes the place of an ϵ which was long by Position: as $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha$ for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\phi\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha$, and perhaps $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\rho$ for $\epsilon\acute{\zeta}\delta\text{-}\phi\alpha\rho$.

The readiness to put $\epsilon\iota$ for ϵ , especially before a vowel, appears in Ionic inscriptions of the 4th century B.C. where we find (e.g.) the forms $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$, $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$, $\acute{\iota}\delta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota\omega\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\varsigma$, and Genitives in $-\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (H. Weir Smyth, *The Vowel System of the Ionic Dialect*, in the *Trans. of the Am. Phil. Ass.* xx. p. 74: G. Meyer, *Griech. Gr.*² § 149). It is worth observing that these inscriptions belong to the same period as the MSS. in which, as we gather from the criticism of Aristarchus, such forms as $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\alpha\varsigma$, $\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\iota$, $\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega$, &c. first found their way into the text.

F. Fick's theory of the Homeric dialect.

The theory put forward by Aug. Fick in his two works on Homer (*Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*, 1883: *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*, 1886) admits of being stated in a very few words. He holds that the poems (with certain exceptions) were originally composed in an \mathcal{A} olic dialect; that some three centuries later (about 540 B.C.) they were translated into Ionic; and that in this process every \mathcal{A} olic word for which there was no metrically equivalent form in Ionic was simply left unchanged. Thus, in his view, was formed the Epic dialect of literature,—a dialect mainly Ionic, but with a considerable admixture of \mathcal{A} olic forms.

The arguments which Fick advances in favour of this theory are not entirely linguistic. The scene of the *Iliad*, he reminds us, is

laid in Æolis; the heroes and legends are largely those of the Æolic race; the parts of Ionia which tradition connects with Homer adjoin Æolic settlements; and Smyrna, which figures in some of the oldest traditions as his birthplace, was for a time an Æolic city. Now if the poems were first composed in some Æolic district of the north-west of Asia Minor, and passed thence to Ionia, they would take an Ionic form; and, as the result of the supremacy of Ionia in art and literature, that form, though full of anomalies and half-understood archaisms, would naturally hold its ground as the accepted text of Homer, and become the standard to which later poets, both of the Homeric and the Hesiodic school, would be obliged to conform.

The linguistic arguments upon which Fick chiefly relies are as follows:

1. The *f* or 'digamma,' which is required by the metre of Homer, is an Æolic letter, unknown to the earliest extant Ionic. Moreover the vocalisation of the *f* seen in a number of Homeric words (*αῦιαχος* and the like, § 396) is characteristically Æolic: cp. the Æolic *εὔιδε* (for *ἔ-φιδε*), *αῦηρ* (for *ἄφῆρ*), *αὔατα* (= *ἄτη*), &c. The prothetic *ε-* of *ἔεδνα* (*ἔ-φεδνα*), *ἑέικοσι*, *ἑέργω*, &c. is also Æolic.

In order to prove that *f* never existed in Ionic Fick appeals to the Ionic inscriptions, and the early Ionic poets. This evidence, however, does not go back beyond the 7th century B.C., and therefore proves nothing for the original language of Homer. As we have seen (§ 405), there is reason to believe that the loss of *f* in the Ionic dialect was subsequent to the first settlements of Ionians in Asia.

2. The Æolic accent and breathing are found in a number of Homeric words. Thus the barytone accent appears in the Nominatives in *-ᾶ* (as *μητίετα*, &c.), in the Perfect forms *ἀκάχησθαι*, *ἀκαχήμενος*, *ἀλάλησθαι*, *ἀλαλήμενος*, *ἐγρήγορθαι*, also in *ἀπούρας*, *ζᾶης*, *ἄλλυδις*, *πόποι*; the smooth breathing in *ἔλτο* (*ἐπ-άλμενος*), *ἔμμορε*, *ὑββάλλειν*, *ἦμβροτον*, *ἦμαρ*, *ἄμαξα*, *ἄμυδις*, *ἀμόθεν*, *ἦμος*, *ἐπ-ίστιον*, *αὐτ-όδιον* (*όδός*); and both peculiarities in the Pronouns *ἄμμες* and *ὑμμες*.

The answer is suggested by Fick himself,—though he makes it apply to a small part only of these forms.* It is that the accent and breathing of the Æolic words in Homer was determined by the

* 'Für ὑμμες, ὕμμυ, ὕμμε und ὑββάλλειν mag die psilose aus dem äolischen dialect erschlossen sein, in den übrigen fällen liegt wohl ächte überlieferung vor' (*Odysee*, p. 12). Where is the evidence of any such tradition? Whenever the grammarians have to do with a form which was obsolete or archaic in their time, they are evidently quite at a loss.

living Æolic dialect. Let us take the form $\check{\alpha}\mu\mu\iota(\nu)$ as a typical instance. Fick holds that the Æolic $\check{\alpha}\mu\mu\check{\iota}(\nu)$ was adopted by the Ionic reciters and preserved with all its Æolic features—the double μ , the smooth breathing, the barytone accent—for several generations, because the Ionic $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ is metrically different (— instead of — ∪). The alternative is to suppose that the original Homeric language had a form with short $\check{\iota}$ —as in Doric $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ —and that in later times, when this form had gone out of use, the Æolic $\check{\alpha}\mu\mu\iota(\nu)$ took its place in the text. Such a substitution is eminently natural. The rhapsodists were doubtless familiar with the Æolic Pronouns, and their adoption of the form $\check{\alpha}\mu\mu\iota(\nu)$ was simply putting the known in place of the unknown. In the case of $\check{\upsilon}\mu\mu\iota(\nu)$ and $\check{\iota}\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\omega$ Fick himself takes this view. But if the form $\check{\upsilon}\mu\mu\iota(\nu)$ was maintained by the influence of contemporary Æolic, we need go no further for an explanation of the whole group of forms of which it is the type.

3. Several of the inflexional forms of Æolic are more or less frequent in Homer, and their occurrence, according to Fick, is subject to a law which holds almost without exception, viz. that the Æolic form is used (1) whenever the corresponding Ionic form is different in quantity, and therefore is not admitted by the metre, and (2) when the word itself is wanting in Ionic. In either case the simple substitution of Ionic for Æolic was impossible. On the other hand the Ionic of Homer can be translated back into Æolic without encountering any difficulty of the kind.

The forms to which Fick applies his argument are: the Fem. Voc. in $-\check{\alpha}$ ($\nu\acute{\iota}\mu\phi\check{\alpha}$), the Gen. in $-\omicron\iota\omicron$ ($-\omicron\omicron$), $-\acute{\alpha}\omicron$, $-\acute{\alpha}\omega\omicron$: the Dat. Plur. in $-\epsilon\omicron\sigma\iota(\nu)$: the Gen. of Pronouns in $-\theta\epsilon\omicron\nu$: the forms $\check{\alpha}\mu\mu\epsilon\varsigma$, $\check{\alpha}\mu\mu\iota\nu$, $\check{\upsilon}\mu\mu\epsilon\varsigma$, $\check{\upsilon}\mu\mu\iota\nu$, $\check{\upsilon}\mu\mu\epsilon$: the Pres. in $-\acute{\alpha}\omega$. $-\eta\omega$ ($-\epsilon\iota\omega$), $-\omega\omega$: the Inf. in $-\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ and $-\mu\epsilon\nu$: the Pf. Part. in $-\omega\omicron\nu$ (as $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\gamma\omega\omicron\nu$ for $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\gamma\acute{\omega}\varsigma$): the Nouns in $-\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$, $-\acute{\alpha}\omega\omicron\nu$ ($\lambda\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\acute{\rho}\acute{\alpha}\omega\omicron\nu$, $\delta\iota\delta\nu\acute{\mu}\acute{\alpha}\omega\omicron\nu$, and many proper names); $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$, Ναυσικάα , and some proper names in $-\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}$, $-\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ (in Ionic $-\epsilon\eta\varsigma$). Other Æolic words in Homer are $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ($\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\varsigma$), $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\varsigma$ ($\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$), $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\upsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ (Ion. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma$), $\acute{\eta}\mu\beta\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$ ($\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\nu$)—all metrically different from the Ionic form. In several instances the corresponding Ionic form would have suited the metre, but was not in use; so $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ (Ionic only $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$), $\pi\omicron\lambda\nu\text{-}\pi\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega\omicron\nu$ (Æol. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\iota = \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\mu\alpha\iota$), $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\omicron\rho\epsilon$ (in Ionic only Middle $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\iota$), $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\eta\mu\alpha\rho$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\beta\epsilon\nu\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma$. So $\delta\pi\pi\omega\varsigma$ was retained because the Ionic form was $\delta\kappa\omega\varsigma$, never $\delta\kappa\kappa\omega\varsigma$: and $\delta\pi\pi\omega\varsigma$ again led to the retention of $\delta\pi\pi\omega\varsigma$.

In order to determine how far these forms are proofs of an Æolic

Homer, it is necessary to distinguish between those which are specifically Æolic, *i.e.* Æolic modifications of a common original, and those which are simply the older forms, which Ionic and other dialects modified each in its own way. To the latter class belong the Gen. endings **-οιο** (Indo-Eur. *-osyo*), **-ᾶο**, **-ᾶων** (New Ion. **-εω**, **-εων**), the Voc. in **-ᾶ**, the Inf. in **-μεναι**, **-μεν**. These are forms which would be found everywhere in Greece, if we could trace the different dialects far enough back. They are 'Æolic' only because they were retained in Æolic (among other dialects), but were altered or lost in Attic and Ionic. The same may be said of the endings of the Pronouns **ἄμμες**, &c. They appear also in the corresponding Doric forms **ἄμέ**, **ὑμέ**, **ὑμέ**, **ὑμέ**, **ὑμέ**, **ὑμέ**, **ὑμέ**, **ὑμέ**. In these cases, then, we only know that a form is *archaic*, not that it belongs to any one dialect.*

On the other hand there are some forms to which this account does not apply. The Dat. Plur. in **-εσσι** is not proved to be 'Pan-hellenic,' and is certainly less primitive than the form in **-σι** (§ 102). The case stands thus: Ionic has only **-σι**, Æolic only **-εσσι**, in Homer both are found (**-εσσι** being rather less frequent). Therefore, says Fick, the language of Homer is Æolic,—not the later Æolic, in which every Dat. Plur. ended in **-εσσι**, but an earlier, in which **-εσσι** had begun to take the place of **-σι**. The same may be said *mutatis mutandis* of the Genitives **ἐμέθεν**, **σέθεν**, **ἔθεν**, and the Participles **κεκλήγων**, **κεκόπων** (§ 27). The argument here has greater weight than in the case of Pan-hellenic inflexions, but it is not conclusive. The forms now in question are not confined to Æolic: they appear occasionally in Doric, and in the dialects of northern Greece. There was therefore a general tendency towards these forms, and the dialect of Homer may have shared in this tendency without being thereby proved to be non-Ionic.

In the case of the Genitives in **-οιο** and the Voc. in **-ᾶ** the argument may be pressed somewhat further. The forms **-οιο** and **-ου**, which are found together in Homer, represent different steps of a phonetic process (**-οιο**, **-οιο**, **-οο**, **-ου**): therefore they cannot have subsisted together in any spoken dialect, and **-οιο** in Homer must be an archaism, preserved by literary tradition. This conclusion is

* Undue stress has been laid upon the variety of forms of the Infinitive in Homer: *e.g.* **θέμεναι**, **θέμεν**, **θεῖναι**. Originally there were as many Infinitive endings as there were different ways of forming an abstract Substantive. In Vedic Sanscrit, where the Infinitive is less developed than in Greek, the variety of formation is much greater (Whitney, § 970).

confirmed by the Homeric use of the ending (§ 149, 3). If then Fick is right in regarding -οιο in Alcaeus as taken from the living Æolie of Lesbos (*Odyssee*, p. 14), it follows that Lesbian retained a form which had died out of the supposed old Æolic of Homer's time. Again, the Fem. Voc. in -ᾶ appears to be regular in Lesbian Æolic: whereas in Homer it is found only in the isolated *νύμφᾶ*. This is therefore another point in which historical Æolic is more primitive than Homer. The argument would apply also to the Gen. in -ᾶο and -ᾶων, if it were certain that -εω and -εων belong to the original Homeric language.

4. Among the forms now in question there are many instances of \bar{a} for which Ionic must have had η , and which therefore—Fick argues—cannot have come to Homer from Ionic. Such are, the Gen. in -ᾶο, -ᾶων, which must have appeared in Old Ionic as -ηο, -ηων, whence New Ionic -εω, -εων: the Participles *πεινάων*, *διψάων*: the Nouns in -ᾶος, -ᾶων: the word *θεά*, and some proper names, *Ἐρμείας*, *Αἰνείας*, *Ῥεΐα*, *Φεΐα*, *Ναυσικία*: the words *λάας*, *ἀήρ* (Gen. *ἡέρος*), *δαήρ* (§ 106, 1), *τετρ-άορος* (Od. 13, 81), perhaps also the Perfects *ἑᾶδός*, *ἕαγα* (§ 22, 1). The normal change to η appears in *νηῦς* (*νηός* for *νηφός*, &c.), *νηός* temple, *ἡώς*, *ἡέλιος*, *παρ-ήορος*, *δήϊος* (Æol. *δᾶφιος*), *κληΐς*, *ρήϊδιος*, *πηός*. Against the Nouns in -ᾶων we can only set the single form *παιήων*.

In the first place, it is very probable (as has been shown in § 405), that the Ionic of Homer's time still had the sound of \bar{a} in all these forms. This however is not a complete answer to Fick. We have to explain how this primitive \bar{a} was retained in these particular cases, when the change of \bar{a} to η took place generally in the dialect. For we can hardly suppose that the change of -ᾶο, -ᾶων to -ηο, -ηων (on the way to -εω, -εων) could have been made in the spoken language without extending to the recitation of poetry.

The true answer seems to be that the retention of \bar{a} in Homer was due, generally speaking, to the influence of the literary dialects, especially Attic and Æolic.

Let us take the case of *λαός* (*λαφός*), which in some ways is typical. The Ionic form *ληός* is quoted from Hipponax (fr. 88 Bergk), and is preserved, as Nauck acutely perceived (*Mél. gr.-rom.* iii. 268), in the Homeric proper names *Λήϊτος*, *Λειώκριτος* (for *Ληόκριτος*), and *Λειώδης* (*Ληο-φάδης*). Fick supposes that when Homer was translated into Ionic the form *ληός* had become antiquated, and accordingly, as *λεός* was metrically different, *λαός* was retained. If so, however, the proper names would *à fortiori* have remained in their Æolic form

(*Λαῖτος*, *Λαόκριτος*), just as the older form **θέρσος* for *θάρσος* is preserved in the names *Θερσίτης*, *Θερσίλοχος*, *Ἀλιθέρης*, *Πολυθερσεΐδης*, &c. For in a proper name a stem is comparatively isolated, and thus may escape the influence of later usage. It follows that there was a time when *ληός* was the proper Homeric form. Why then do we find *λαός* in our text? Doubtless because it was the established form in Old Attic, and in other dialects familiar to the rhapsodists of the 6th and 5th centuries. In the case of so common a word this influence was sufficient to change *ληός* back into *λαός*, or (it may be) to prevent the change to *ληός* from taking place.*

The same considerations apply to *ἴλαος*, the form *ἴλος* occurring on a metrical inscription (Epigr. Kaib. 743, quoted by Nauck, *Mél. gr.-rom.* iv. 579): and to the name *Ἀμφιάραος*, for which *Ἀμφιάρηος* was read by Zenodotus (Schol. Od. 15. 244), and is found in the MSS. of Pindar. So we find in Il. 11. 92 *Βιήνορα* (MSS.), *Βιάνορα* (Aristarchus); in Il. 14. 203 *Ῥείης* (MSS.), *Ῥείας* (Ar. Aristoph.); in Il. 13. 824 *Βουγῆε* (Ar. and MSS.), *Βουγῆε* (Zenod.); in Il. 18. 592 *Ἀριήδνη* (Zenod. — for *Ἀριάδνη*?); in Od. 13. 81 *τετράροισι*, but elsewhere in Homer *συνήροισι*, *παρήροισι*. These variations show that the question between *ā* and *η* was often unsettled even in Alexandrian times †. On the same principle Fick would read *Ποσειδῆωνος* in Archilochus (fr. 10), comparing the month *Ποσειδηῖων* (Anacr. fr. 6).

As a negative instance, we may notice the case of *ἔως* and *τέως*. These go back to a primitive Greek *āfos*, *tāfos*, which would become in Old Ionic *ἦος*, *τῆος*, in New Ionic and Attic *ἔως*, *τέως*. The existence in Homer of such metrical deformities as *ἔως ὁ ταῦθ' ὄρμαινε* is proof that later usage had the strongest influence on the formation of the text. *Herm. elem. doct. met. p. 58. — Curtius Rh. M. IV p. 42. — Christ. Prosl. p.*

The *ā* of Genitives in *-āō* and *-āων* (for *-āσων*) stands on a somewhat different footing, since the loss of the intervening spirant is much more ancient. Hence it is possible that the change to an *E*-sound took place after the *ā* in these endings had been shortened,

* The occurrence of *λαός* in Callinus (i. 18) and Xenophanes (ii. 15) shows that it became the usual Epic form from a very early time.

† Note however that Zenodotus sometimes gave *η* for *ā* where the true Ionic form had *ā*: thus he read *ὄρητο* for *ὄρᾶτο* (Il. 1. 198), *κρητός* for *κρατός* (Il. 1. 530). Perhaps *βουγῆος* and *Ἀριήδνη* fall under this head: and *ὄρηται*, which stands in our text (Od. 14. 343), is to be placed with *ὄρητο*. The most probable account of these forms surely is that they are 'hyper-Ionic,' i. e. are produced by the habit of regarding *η* as in every case the Ionic equivalent of Attic *ā*. On this view they are parallel to the hyper-Doric forms which are produced by indiscriminately turning Attic *η* into *ā*.

in other words, that the steps were $-\bar{\alpha}o$, $-\bar{\alpha}\omega$, $-\epsilon\omega$ and $-\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$, $-\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$, $-\epsilon\omega\nu$ (not $-\bar{\alpha}o$, $-\eta o$, &c.). It is also not improbable that the shortening had taken place in the time of Homer, so that $-\bar{\alpha}o$ and $-\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ were then archaic (as $-oio$ almost certainly was). There are 54 instances of the Gen. Plur. Fem. in $-\epsilon\omega\nu$ ($-\hat{\omega}\nu$) in Homer, against 306 in $-\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ (Menrad, pp. 36, 38). Considering the strength of tradition in such matters we may infer that the vowel was doubtful in quantity, if not actually short, in the spoken language of the time. As to $-\bar{\alpha}o$ see § 376, 1. Now if the forms in $-\bar{\alpha}o$ and $-\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ were then archaic, they might be exempted, by the force of a poetical tradition, from the general phonetic law or tendency which turned $\bar{\alpha}$ into η in the Ionic dialect. And the influence of Old Attic and other literary dialects which retained the $\bar{\alpha}$ would operate the more decisively. However this may be, it is clear that the causes which retained the $\bar{\alpha}$ of $\lambda\acute{\alpha}o\varsigma$, $\nu\acute{\alpha}o\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\alpha}\rho o\varsigma$, $\xi\nu\acute{\nu}\acute{\alpha}\rho o\varsigma$, $\delta\acute{\alpha}o\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}o\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\pi}\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\iota$ in the Old Attic of tragedy, may have operated at an earlier time in favour of $-\bar{\alpha}o$ and $-\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$.

The question between $\bar{\alpha}$ and ϵ in the later form of these endings would naturally be settled by the example of Ionic in favour of $-\epsilon\omega$, $-\epsilon\omega\nu$: but it is worth noticing that the result has not been the same in the Gen. of Neuters in $-\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ (§ 107, 3). Here the Ionic ϵ appears in Homer in the declension of $o\acute{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $k\acute{\omega}\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $k\acute{\tau}\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, but not in $\gamma\acute{\eta}\rho\acute{\alpha}-o\varsigma$, $\delta\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}-\omega\nu$, $\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}-\omega\nu$. The tendency to uniformity works much more powerfully on a large class of words, such as the Nouns in $-\bar{\alpha}$ ($-\eta$), than on a small group, like the Neuters in $-\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$. But the survival of $-\acute{\alpha}o\varsigma$, $-\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$ in the latter makes it probable that $-\bar{\alpha}\omega$, $-\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ were at one time the Homeric forms, anterior to $-\epsilon\omega$, $-\epsilon\omega\nu$.*

A singular problem is presented by the $\bar{\alpha}$ in the two forms $\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$ (Acc. $\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu\tau\alpha$) and $\delta\iota\psi\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$, as to which see § 55, 8. As these verbs belong to the small group in which contraction gives η instead of $\bar{\alpha}$, it seems at first sight strange that they should be the only examples of $-\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ in the Participle. But the connexion between the two phenomena appears when we consider that the contraction in $\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, &c. implies the steps $\bar{\alpha}\epsilon > \eta\epsilon > \eta$, consequently that the exceptional feature in it is precisely the retention of the long vowel. Thus it remains only to explain the combination $\bar{\alpha}\omega$, $\bar{\alpha}o$, which in Ionic should become $\eta\omega$, ηo .

* The fact that $-\epsilon\omega$ and $-\epsilon\omega\nu$ are scanned with synizesis, except in $\theta\upsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ and $\pi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$, is unimportant. Obviously an ending such as $-\epsilon\omega\nu$ can only be scanned \cup - when it is preceded by one, and not more than one, short syllable. It will be found that $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\eta$ and $\pi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta$ are the only Nouns in $-\eta$ which fulfil this condition.

5. In his earlier work on the *Odyssey* Fick recognised both $\check{\alpha}\nu$ and $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ as Homeric; but subsequently he came to the conclusion that $\check{\alpha}\nu$ is everywhere due to the Ionic translators (*Iliad*, p. xxiii). His main argument is that of the 43 instances of $\check{\alpha}\nu$ in the Ionic poets (Archilochus, &c.) there are not more than 21 in which it could be changed into $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ ($\kappa\epsilon$, κ') without affecting the metre, whereas in Homer the change can be made in a much larger proportion of cases. The inference is that in making the change in Homer we are restoring the original form. But his induction is far too narrow. In the first three books of Apollonius Rhodius there are 46 instances of $\check{\alpha}\nu$, and only 13 in which it cannot be changed into $\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$. Again in *Æschylus* (excluding chorus) there are 212 instances of $\check{\alpha}\nu$, of which 73 are unchangeable. In the *Ædipus Tyrannus* the number is 31 out of 107. In the *Iliad*, without counting $\eta\nu$ and $\epsilon\pi\eta\nu$, the instances of unchangeable $\check{\alpha}\nu$ are 43 out of 156. This is nearly the same proportion; and we admit that in a few cases $\check{\alpha}\nu$ has replaced an original $\kappa\epsilon\nu$. Moreover it has been already shown, on quite independent grounds, that the combination $\omicron\kappa\ \check{\alpha}\nu$ is Homeric (§ 362). There can be little doubt, therefore, that while $\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$ is distinctive of *Æolic*, as $\check{\alpha}\nu$ of *Ionic* and *Attic*, the Homeric dialect possessed both Particles. It may seem strange that $\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$, which is commoner than $\check{\alpha}\nu$ in Homer, should have died out of *Ionic*. On the other hand $\check{\alpha}\nu$ was the more emphatic Particle, and the desire of emphasis is a frequent cause of change in the vocabulary of a language.

It may be objected that we have still to explain the remarkable coincidence on which Fick's argument rests, viz. the fact that in so many cases the non-Ionic forms are precisely those which are different in metrical value from the Ionic equivalents. The answer is that the same coincidence would be found with *archaisms* of any dialect. It is only the metre of Homer (generally speaking) that has preserved or could preserve such things. Why do we find (*e.g.*) $\sigma\eta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\sigma\eta\eta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, but $\sigma\eta\eta\varsigma$, $\sigma\eta\eta$, $\sigma\eta\omega\sigma\iota$ (not $\sigma\eta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\sigma\eta\epsilon\iota$, $\sigma\eta\omicron\sigma\iota$)? Evidently because the metre admits the modernised forms in the latter case, not in the former. Thus all words or inflexions which do not belong to the New *Ionic* or *Attic* dialect, be they Old *Ionic* or Old *Æolic*, will be found to be metrically different from the later forms.

It has been sought thus far to show that phenomena which Fick explains by supposing a translation from *Æolic* into New *Ionic* may

be equally well accounted for, partly by the changes which must have taken place within the Attic-Ionic dialect itself, and partly by the influence of the post-Homeric spoken language. We may now consider what Homeric peculiarities cannot be explained on Fick's principles, and may therefore be held to turn the scale in favour of the alternative view.

(a) The Dual is wanting in the earliest Æolic, whereas it is in living use in Homer, and also in Attic down to the 5th century B.C. It is true, as Fick urges, that the loss of the Dual may have taken place in Æolic between the 9th and the 7th centuries. But the gap thus made between the earliest known Æolic and the supposed Æolic of Homer is a serious weakening of his case.

(b) The moveable *-v* is unknown in Æolic, as also in New Ionic. Fick strikes it out whenever it is possible to do so, but is very far from banishing it from the text. Thus in the first book of the *Iliad* he has to leave it in ll. 45, 60, 66, 73, 77, &c.

(c) The psilosis which Fick introduces (*ἀπίη* for *ἀφίει*, &c.) is common to Æolic and New Ionic. Why then does it not appear in Homer?

(d) The forms of the type of *ὀρώω*, *ὀρώωντες*, &c. (§ 55) are not accounted for by Fick's theory. This is recognised by Fick himself (*Odys.* p. 2). He adopts the view of Wackernagel, supposing that the Attic forms *ὀρῶν*, *ὀρῶντες* were introduced into the recension of Pisistratus, and that these were afterwards made into *ὀρόων*, *ὀρόωντες* to fit the metre. This view is doubtless in the main correct. Setting aside the mythical 'recension of Pisistratus,' and putting in its place the long insensible influence of Attic recitation upon the Homeric text, we obtain a probable account of *ὀρώω*, and of much besides. But it can hardly be reconciled with a translation into New Ionic about 540 B.C. It is uncertain, indeed, whether the New Ionic form was *ὀρέω* or *ὀρῶ* (see H. Weir Smyth, *Vowel-system &c.* p. 111); but the argument holds in either case. If the form was *ὀρέω* (as is made probable by the Homeric *ὀμόκλειον*, &c. § 55, 10), that form is metrically equivalent to the original, and on Fick's theory would have been adopted. If it was *ὀρῶ*, which is metrically different, then on Fick's theory the original Æolic would have been retained.

(e) The forms *ἔως* and *τέως*, as has been already noticed, have crept into the text in spite of the metre; on Fick's theory the original *ἄως* and *ῥᾶως* must have been preserved.

(f) Many Attic peculiarities may be noted: *οὖν* for *δὺν* (which Aristarchus counted among the proofs that Homer was an Athenian): *πῶς*, *πότε*, &c. for *κῶς*, *κότε*, &c.: the two Genitives *δείους* and *σπέιους* (for *δέεος*, *σπέεος*): Neuters in *-ας*, Gen. *-αος* (instead of *-εος*): *ἄρσῃν* (for *Æolic* and *Ionic* *ἔρσῃν*): *τέσσαρες* for *Ionic* *τέσσερες*; *κρείσσων*, *μείζων* for *κρέσσων*, *μέζων*. Cp. also *ἔαγα* (*Ionic* *ἔηγα*), and *ἑάδοτα* (§ 22, 1), for which *Ionic* analogy would require *ἑηδότα*.

(g) The *Æolic* forms *ἄμμι(ν)*, *ῥμμι(ν)* are not used quite consistently: thus we find the form *ἄμμιν* in three places (Il. 13. 379., 14. 85, Od. 12. 275), but *ῥμῖν* in three others (Od. 8. 569., 11. 344., 17. 376). On Fick's theory *ῥμμιν*, if it was an *Ionic* form, would have been adopted. Again *ῥμμιν* is occasionally used where *ῖμῖν* is admitted by the metre (Il. 10. 380, Od. 4. 94., 20. 367).

Several of these arguments may be met by admitting an *Atticising* tendency, subsequent to the *Ionicising* which Fick supposes. Some such *Attic* influence clearly was exerted, and also an *Æolic* influence (as Fick allows in the case of *ῥμμιες*). But if the *Ionic* Homer only dates from 540 B.C., what room is there for these other processes? And if we suppose a *modernising* process, as wide in place and time as the knowledge of Homer, but in which *Attic* and *Ionic* naturally predominated, what ground is left for an original *Æolic* element?

(h) The Iterative forms in *-εσκον* (§ 48) appear to be characteristic of Homer and also of later *Ionic*. This is one of the points—in the nature of the case not numerous—in which the *Ionic* character of Homer is guaranteed by the metre.

Another point of this kind is the use of *μῑν* in *ἦ μῑν*, *καὶ μῑν*, and other combinations where *Attic* would have *μῑν* (§ 345). On the other side it may be said that the retention of *μῑν* (see § 342) was due to the want of the form *μῑν* in *Ionic*. But if *μῑν* were an original *Æolic* form we should expect on Fick's theory to find it in the older parts of the *Odyssey* as well as in the *Iliad*.

Other words which show a difference of quantity between the *Homeric* and the *Æolic* forms are: *Πρίαμος* (*Æol.* *Πέρραμος*), *τρίτος* (*Æol.* *τέρτος*), *κᾶλός* (*Æol.* *κᾶλος*, see Meyer, *G. G.* § 65).

The ancients supposed that Homer of set purpose employed a mixture of dialects. Modern scholars have condemned this notion as uncritical, but have generally held that his language is a poetical and conventional one, a *Sängersprache*, never used in actual speech. It may be allowed that there is a measure of truth in both these views,

provided that we distinguish between the dialect of the time of Homer and the 'Epic' of our texts. For—

1. Even in the time of Homer there was doubtless an element of conventionality in the style and vocabulary, and even in the grammatical forms of poetry. Such phrases as *μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, νήδυμος* (or *ἡδυμος*) *ἕπνος, ἀνὰ πτολέμοιο γεφύρας*, are used with little or no sense of their original meaning, but evidently as part of a common poetical stock. Doubtless the Gen. in *-οιο* was already poetical, perhaps also the Gen. in *-ᾶο* and in *-ᾶων*. These forms then were genuinely Homeric, but not part of the living speech of the time.

2. Many primitive Homeric forms were lost in Ionic and Attic, but survived elsewhere in Greece. These seemed to the ancients to be borrowed from the dialects in which they were known in historical times, and thus gave support to the notion of a mixture of dialects.

3. The poems suffered a gradual and unsystematic because generally unconscious process of modernising, the chief agents in which were the rhapsodists, who wandered over all parts of Greece and were likely to be influenced by all the chief forms of literature. In this way forms crept in from various dialects,—from Ionic, from Lesbian Æolic, and from Attic. The latter stages of this process may be traced in the various readings of the ancient critics, and even in our MSS., in which a primitive word or form is often only partially displaced by that of a later equivalent. The number of instances of this kind may be materially increased as the MSS. of Homer become better known.

Other Notes and Corrections.

§ 23, 5 (p. 27). With the instances here given we may place the Cretan *καταφελμένοι*, which occurs in the inscription of Gortyn with the meaning *gathered together, assembled* (cp. Homeric *ἐελμένοι crowded*). Bannack however takes it for *καταφηλμένοι*, supposing loss of *f* and contraction from *καταφεφελμένοι*.

§ 27 (p. 30). The Present *ἀκούω* *I hear* appears to 'be originally a Perfect which has gone through the process here exemplified. The true Present form is *ἀκεύω*, which survived in Cyprus (*ἀκεύει* *τηρεὶ Κύπριοι*) and Crete (*Law of Gortyn*, ii. 17). Hence the Attic *ἀκήκοα* (for *ἀκ-ήκοα*), and presumably also an earlier form **ἄκοα*, formed like *ἄνωγα*, and passing into *ἀκούω* as *ἄνωγα* passed into *ἀνώγω*. This

explains the use of ἀκούω with the Perfect meaning (§ 72, 4), which accordingly is not quite parallel to the similar use of πυνθάνομαι, μανθάνω, &c. Other Homeric examples are διώκω (§ 29), in which the want of reduplication may be original (§ 23, 5), and ἰλήκω (§ 22, 9, b.). The form ἦκω, which is probably of this nature, occurs in our MSS. of Homer (Il. 5. 473., 18. 406, Od. 13. 325., 15. 329), but Bekker F substituted the undoubtedly Homeric ἴκω (La Roche, *H. T.* 287).

The form ἐνέπιπε *rebuked*, which occurs several times in Homer (usually with the variants ἐνέπιπτε and ἐνέπισπε), should perhaps be placed here. It is usually classed as a Reduplicated Aorist (so Curt. *Verb.* ii. 26), but there is no analogy for this, and the Homeric passages do not prove that it is an Aorist. The ι of the stem may be due to the influence of the Pres. ἐνίπτω and the Noun ἐνιπή (cp. § 25, 3). Buttmann acutely compared it with ἐπέπληγον, which is evidently related to πλήσσω and πληγή as ἐνέπιπτο to ἐνίπτω (ἐνίσσω) and ἐνιπή. The reduplication is of the type of ἐρέριπτο.

§ 42 (p. 44). The Aor. ἐτράφην, which occurs four times in our texts of the Iliad, is probably post-Homeric. In Il. 2. 661 for the vulgate τράφη ἐν (μεγάρω) nearly all MSS. have τράφ' ἐνί. If this is right we should doubtless read τράφ' ἐνί in the two similar places, Il. 3. 201 and 11. 222. In Il. 23. 84 the MSS. have ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ ὡς ἐτράφην περ, with the *v. l.* ἐτράφημεν: the quotation in Æschines (Timarch. 149) gives ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐτράφεμέν περ, from which Buttmann (*Ausf. Sprachl.* ii. 307) restored ὡς δ' ὁμοῦ ἐτράφομέν περ. On the other hand the Thematic ἔτραφον occurs with intransitive or passive meaning in Il. 5. 555., 21. 279 (where ἔτραφ' is the only possible reading), and in the recurring phrase γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε. The variation in the MSS. (including the *vox nihili* ἐτράφεμεν) is sufficient evidence of the comparative lateness of the forms of ἐτράφην. Buttmann's reading (adopted by Nauck) is supported by the apodosis in l. 91 ὡς δὲ καὶ ὄστ' ἔα κτλ. See Christ (*Proll.* p. 115) to whom I am indebted for the reference to Buttmann.

§ 62 (p. 56). The derivative verbs in -αἴω are often frequentative or intensive, but with a tone of contempt: e. g. μιμνάω *I loiter*, ἀλυσκάω *I shirk*, πτωσκάω *I cower* (stronger than πτώσσω, cp. Il. 4. 371 τί πτώσσεις, τί δ' ὀπιπέεις πολέμοιο γεφύρας; οὐ μὲν Τυδεΐ γ' ᾤδε φίλον πτωσκαζέμεν ἦεν): ἀκούάζομαι *I please myself with hearing* (Il. 4. 343 δαιτὸς ἀκούάζεσθον, Od. 13. 9 ἀκούάζεσθε δ' ᾠοιδοῦ): so νεύω and νευστάζω (Il. 20. 162), μίγνυμι and μιγάζομαι (Od. 8. 271), ῥίπτω and ῥιπτάζω, ἐρύω and ῥυστάζω, εἰλύω and εἰλυφάζω.

§ 67 (p. 61). With *ἤνδανον* compare the Aor. form *ἔηξα* (for *ἔαξα*), preserved in the text of Zenodotus in Il. 13. 166 (*ξυνέηξε* for *ξυνέαξε*) and 257 (*κατείξαμεν* for *κατέαξαμεν*). In this case the change to *η* did not make its way into the vulgate—perhaps because the form *ἦξα*, which suggested it, was a rarer word than *ἤνδανον*.

§ 71 (p. 63). The use of the Present stem to express *relative* time is well exemplified by the following sentence from an early Attic inscription: *εἰσπραξάντων αὐτοὺς οἱ ἡρημένοι, συνεισπραττόντων δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ οἱ στρατηγοί* (Meisterhans, § 48 *a.*).

§ 72, 2, n. 2 (p. 64). In the Law of Gortyn *ἄγω* and *φέρω* are employed where the Aor. is the usual tense: see especially i. 12 *ἀδ' ἀννίωτο μὴ ἄγεν* if he deny that he has taken away (Baunack, *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, p. 79).

§ 77 (p. 66). Some valuable remarks on this and similar uses of the Aor. Part. are to be found in an article by Mr. Frank Carter in the *Classical Review* (Feb. 1891, p. 4). He observes that it is really a *timeless* use, *i.e.* that the speaker does not wish to indicate a relation in time between the action of the Participle and that of the finite verb. The Participle expresses a predication, but one which is only a part or essential circumstance of that which the verb expresses. See below, on § 245, 1.

§ 80 (p. 68). As to the MS. authority for some forms of the Pf. Subj. see § 283, *a.*

§ 92 (p. 79). The Nominative is used for the Vocative in the case of oxytones in *-ων*, and all Nouns in *-ην* (Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 206, p. 544).

§ 99* (p. 84). To the examples of metaplastic Neut. Plur. used with collective meaning add *ἔσπερα evening-time* (Od. 17. 191), *νεῦρα sinews* (used in Il. 16. 316 of *one* bowstring), *πλευρά side* (Il. 4. 468), *παρεῖα cheeks* (Neut. Plur. in Il. 22. 491 according to Aristarchus). It may be suspected that *ἔρετμά oars* belongs to this group, since the Sing. in later Greek is always *ἔρετμός*, and a Neut. *ἔρετμόν* is contrary to analogy, and only rests on the phrase *εὐήρες ἔρετμόν* (Od.), for which we can read *εὐήρε' ἔρετμόν*.

§ 102 (p. 86). It appears that the stems in *-ā* originally formed a Loc. Plur. in *-ās* (as well as *-āsu* and *-āsī*): hence Lat. *forās, aliās, devās* (Inscr.). Hence it is possible that the few Homeric forms in *-αις* or *-ης* which cannot be written *-ησ'* represent this *-ās* (Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 358, p. 704).

§ 110 (p. 95). The question between *πάντη* and *πάντη* cannot be

decided, as Joh. Schmidt supposes (*Pluralb.* p. 40), by the circumstance that the final vowel is frequently shortened before another vowel in Homer. It is true, as was observed by Hoffmann (*Quaest. Hom.* i. p. 58, quoted by Schmidt *l. c.*), that final η is oftener shortened than final η . In the first four books of the Iliad and Odyssey, as Hartel shows (*Hom. Stud.* ii. p. 5), $-\eta$ is shortened 41 times, $-\eta$ 19 times: and further examination confirms this ratio. But, as Hartel also points out, $-\eta$ occurs in Homer about three times as often as $-\eta$: consequently the shortening of $-\eta$ is *relatively* more frequent.

§ 116, 4 (p. 109). For ἡδὺς αὔτημή in Od. 12. 369 we may read ἡδὺς αὔτημήν, as suggested by Baumeister on Hom. H. Merc. 110.

§ 116, 5 (p. 109). ὑγής has been explained as a Compound, viz. of the prefix *su-* (*su-manas*, &c.) and a stem from the root *gyā* (Saussure, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* vi. 161).

§ 117 (p. 110). Adjectives in $-\iotaος$ are often used with some of the meaning of a Comparative, *i. e.* in words which imply a contrast between two sides: as in ἑσπέριος *evening* and ἡοῖος or ἡέριος *morning*, ἡμάτιος *day* and νύχιος *night*, ἄγριος (cp. ἀγρότερος), θεῖος (cp. θεώτερος), ἄλιος (opposed to *dry land*), νότιος, ζεφύριος (opp. to *north* and *east*), δαιμόνιος, ξείνιος, δούλιος. The suffix serves to form a kind of softened Superlative in ἐσχάτιος and ἰστιάτιος, lit. 'of the last': and the same analogy yields ὀσσάτιος from ὄσσος, a formation like Lat. *quantulus*. The Comparative force of $-\iotaος$, $-\ιος$ in the Pronouns is noticed by Brugmann (see § 114, p. 101).

§ 121 (p. 115 *foot*). The ω of σοφώτερος, &c. has lately been discussed by J. Wackernagel (*Das Dehnungsgesetz der griech. Composita*, pp. 5 ff.). He treats it along with the ω which we find in ἐτέρωθι, ἐτέρωσε, ἀμφοτέρωθεν, &c., also in ἱερωσύνη, and shows that if we derive it from a Case-form in $-\omega$ (as κατωτέρω from κάτω, &c.), we have still to explain the rhythmical law according to which ω and \circ interchange: for a law which governed common speech in all periods cannot have arisen merely from the needs of the hexameter. Accordingly he connects the phenomenon with a rhythmical lengthening of final short vowels (among others of the final ι of the Locative, see § 378), which is found in Vedic Sanscrit.

λαρώτατος (Od. 2. 350) points to a Homeric form λαερός, which we can always substitute for λαρός. It is probably for λασ-ερός from λασ-*desire*: see Curtius, *Grundz.* p. 361 (5th edit).

§ 125, 8 (p. 121). This peculiar lengthening in the second member of a Compound has been explained by Wackernagel (*Dehnungsgesetz*,

pp. 21 ff.) as the result of a primitive contraction, or Crasis, with the final vowel of the first part: *e. g.* ὀμώνυμος for ὀμο-ονυμος. The chief argument for this view is that the lengthening is only found in stems beginning with a vowel—a fact which can hardly be accounted for on any other supposition. Such cases as δυσώνυμος, in which no contraction can have taken place, may be extensions by *analogy* of the original type. It is to be understood of course that the contraction was governed by different laws from those which obtain in the Greek which we know. The chief rule is that the resulting long vowel is fixed by the *second* of the two concurrent vowels: ὀμήγυρις for ὀμο-αγυρις, πεμπώβολον for πεμπε-οβολον, &c. Whether this was a primitive phonetic rule, or partly due to the working of analogy, it finds an exact parallel in the Temporal Augment, which must have been due to the influence of a prefix ἐ- upon the initial vowel of the verb-stem. We may compare also the Subjunctive forms δύνᾱμαι, τίθηντι, &c. (§ 81). Thus the later contraction, as in σκηπτοῦχος, Λυκοῦργος, stands in the same relation to the older forms now in question as εἶχον, &c. (with εε for εε) to ἦλασα, ᾤμοσα, &c.

The primitive Indo-European ‘sandhi,’—crasis of the final vowel of one word with the initial vowel of the next,—was generally given up in Greek, and the system of *elision* took its place. In Compounds we constantly find elision of a short final vowel along with the lengthening (which is then a mere survival): as ἐπ-ήρατος, ἀμφ-ήριστος, φθισ-ήνωρ (cp. φθισί-μβροτος). But lengthening does not take place if the vowel is long by position (*e. g.* ἔτερ-αλκῆς, Ἄλέξ-ανδρος, ἀναιδῆς), which seems to indicate that the preservation—though not the origin—of the lengthened stem was a matter of rhythm (as in σοφώ-τερος). Other exceptions to the rule of lengthening may be variously explained. In some cases, as Wackernagel suggests (p. 51), an initial short vowel may have been retained from the original formation: as in the ancient Compounds βωτιάνεира (ἀντιάνεира, κυδιάνεира), ἀργιόδοτες, εὐρύοπα, εὐράγνια, where the metre stood in the way of lengthening by analogy. More generally it is a mark of lateness: *e. g.* in the forms compounded with πάν-, as παν-άποτος, παν-αφήλιξ, παν-αώριος, Παν-αχαιοί, and with Prepositions, as ἐν-αριθμῖος, ὑπεναντίος (p. 55). Such words as αἰν-αρέτης (Il. 16. 31), λαβρ-αγόρης (Il. 23. 479), ἀν-όλεθρος (Il. 13. 761 τοὺς δ' εὐρ' οὐκέτι πάμπαν ἀπήμονας οὐδ' ἀνολέθρους), ἀνάποινον (Il. 1. 99), δυσ-αριστοτόκεια (Il. 18. 54), have all the appearance of being of the poet's own coinage.

On the view here taken the lengthening in ὠλεσίκαρπος and the

similar cases given at the end of the section must be otherwise explained. It is probably of the kind noticed in § 386.

§ 170 (p. 159). Another example of the distributive use of the Singular is Od. 13. 78 ἀνερίπτουν ἄλα πηδῶ *they threw up the salt sea (each) with his oar-blade*. So in the recurring phrase of the Odyssey ἄλα τύπτον ἑρεμοῖς we should probably read ἑρεμῶ (§ 102), which may be similarly distributive. Or we may take ἑρεμός in a collective sense, *oarage*.

§ 173, 2 (p. 162). For the use of the Dual with a large number which contains the numeral δύο, cp. πεντακοσίαις εἴκοσι δυοῖν δραχμαῖν in an Attic inscription of the 5th century (Meisterhans, p. 45, 4). This is a good parallel to Od. 8. 35, 48 κούρω δύο καὶ πενήκοντα.

§ 198 (p. 180). Notice under this head the use of ἐπί with a Comparative, Od. 7. 216 οὐ γάρ τι στυγερῇ ἐπὶ γαστέρι κύντερον ἄλλο *nought else is more shameless with (when you have to do with) a hungry belly, = more shameless than the belly*. So Hdt. 4. 118 οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἔσται ἐλαφρότερον.

§ 241 (p. 206). In Il. 17. 155 it is better to take οἴκαδ' ἴμεν with ἐπιείσεται, leaving the apodosis to be understood: 'if any one will be persuaded to go home (let him do so), &c.' Thus the sentence is of the type exemplified in § 324* b.

§ 245, 1 (p. 212). The Aor. Part. in such a sentence as εἰ ἴδοιμι κατελθόντα seems to be 'timeless,' meaning *if I were to see him go down* (Goodwin, § 148). Mr. Carter, in the article quoted above, ranks ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα as an instance of timeless use in an attributive sense. It should be observed, however, that there is a distinction between a Participle which expresses a *single* action or event (however timeless), and one which has become a mere adjective, as in περιπλομένον ἐνιαυτοῦ, &c. (§ 243, 1). Thus ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα means *to the setting of the sun* (not *to the setting sun*): and so with the other examples given in § 245, 1. It is otherwise perhaps with Od. 1. 24 οἱ μὲν δυσσομένον Ὑπερίονος οἱ δ' ἀιόντος, where the place of sun-set—not of a particular sun-set—is intended.

§ 297 (p. 269). In the Law of Gortyn πρὶν κα with the Subj. is repeatedly used after an affirmative principal clause: see Baunack, *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, p. 82.

§ 324*, b, c. The omission of the principal Verb in passages of this kind (especially when it is suggested by an Infinitive in the protasis) finds a perfect parallel in the Law of Gortyn: iii. 37 κόμιστρα αἶ κα λῆ δόμεν ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνά, ἢ φῆμα ἢ δυώδεκα στατήρῃς ἢ δυώδεκα στατήρων χρῆος,

πλῖον δὲ μὴ (sc. δότω) *if man or wife choose to give payment for nurture, let him or her give a garment or twelve staters or something of the value of twelve staters, but not more*: cp. the other places quoted by Baunack, *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, p. 77. This shows that the usage must have been well established in Greek prose from an early period.

§ 338 (p. 309). In Il. 3. 215 most MSS. have εἰ καὶ γένοι ὕστερος ἦεν, but ἦ καὶ is found in the two Venetian (AB) and the Townley and Eton MSS. The scholia show that the ancients knew nothing of εἰ, and only doubted between ἦ (in the sense of *if*) and ἦ̄.

§ 348, 4 (p. 318). In Il. 18. 182 one of the editions of Aristarchus had τίς τὰρ σε (for τίς γάρ σε). Cobet adopts this, and would read τὰρ for γάρ in the similar places Il. 10. 61, 424, Od. 10. 501., 14. 115., 15. 509., 16. 222 (*Misc. Crit.* p. 321). In the two last passages Bekker had already introduced τ' ἄρ into his text.

§ 370 (p. 342). To the instances of shortening before -βρ- should be added ἀβροτάξομεν (Il. 10. 65), which is a derivative verb from the stem which we have in the two forms ἀμαρτ- and ἀ(μ)βροτ- (cp. ἦμβροτον). The appearance of ρο instead of ρα (for γ) is Æolic.

§ 405 (p. 382). A parallel to the Naxian ΑΦΥΤΟ has now been found in the form ΑΦΥΤΑΡ on an Attic inscription of the VIth cent. B. C. (see J. van Leeuwen, *Mnemos.* xix. 21). Further instances of Chalcidian F (Φοικέων, σαφοί?) are given by Roberts, *Epigraphy*, p. 204.

§ 69 (p. 62). In an article on the Augment in Homer in the last number of the *Journal of Philology* (xix. p. 211 ff.), Mr. Arthur Platt has shown that, in the case of the Aorist, the choice between the augmented and the unaugmented form is largely determined by the sense in which the tense is used. In the common historical or narrative use the augment is often wanting; but in the uses which we may call *non-narrative*—the use for the *immediate past* (§ 76), and the *gnomic* use (§ 78)—the augmented form prevails. With the gnomic use the rule appears to be especially strict. This is obviously a valuable extension and generalisation of the facts observed by Koch. In the case of the Imperfect there seems to be a preference for unaugmented forms in continuous narrative; but the difference is much less marked. Mr. Platt gives some good reasons for believing that the number of unaugmented forms was originally greater than it is in our text. In this we find a fresh example of the modernising process to which the poems were subjected from a very early time.

INDEX I.

OF HOMERIC FORMS.

N.B. The figures refer to the *sections*.

Compound verbs are not indexed if the same form of the simple verb occurs.

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| ἀάσατο }
ἀάσθη } 44, 384 (1). | ἀγχιστίνοσ 117. | Αἰγεύσ 129. |
| ἀβλήσ 125 (4), 128 (3). | ἀγχοῦ 110. | αἰγι- 124 <i>b</i> . |
| ἀβροτάξομεν App. p.
402. | ἄγω 30, 70, 72, App. p.
398. | Αἴγισθοσ 129. |
| ἀβρότη 370. | ἀγωγή 114. | Αἴγυπτή 378 <i>n</i> . |
| ἀγάσθε 51 (2), 55 β,
384 (1). | ἀγών 114. | αἰδέιο 5. |
| Ἀγάθων 129. | ἀδάμασ 114, 243 (1). | αἰδέο 32. |
| ἀγαίόμενοσ 51 (2). | ἀδδέέσ 371. | αἰδέσεται 63. |
| ἀγακλήσ 105 (5). | ἀδελφέοσ 98. | αἰδετο 31 (3), 32. |
| ἀγαμαι 11. | ἀδηκώσ 22 (9) 26, 28. | Ἀἰδησ 107, 116 (2), 384
(1). |
| ἀγάννιφοσ 371. | ἄδην 110, 136 (2). | αἰδόμενοσ 32. |
| ἀγάσσεσθαι 63. | ἀδμήσ 125 (4). | αἰδώς 114. |
| ἀγανόσ 396. | αἰεί 384 (1). | αἰείσ 30. |
| ἀγγελίησ 116 (2). | αἰείδω 384 (1). | αἰέν 99. |
| ἀγείρομεν 80. | αἰεικῶ 63, 64. | αἰθήρ 114. |
| ἀγελείη 124 <i>d</i> . | αἰείρω 32. | Αἰθιοπηῆσ 107 (5), 124 <i>b</i> . |
| ἀγέροντο 33. | αἰεσι 12. | αἰθόμενοσ 31 (3), 32. |
| ἀγηγέρατο 22 (8), 23. | αἰέκτη 110. | αἰθουσα 243 (1). |
| ἀγκάσ 106 (3), 110. | αἰέκων (ἄκων) 378. | αἰθοψ 124 <i>d</i> . |
| ἀγλαῖείσθαι 63, 64. | αἰελλόποσ 124 <i>a</i> . | αἰκῶσ 125 (2). |
| ἀγνυμι 17, 390. | αἰερίποδεσ 124 <i>c</i> . | αἰναρέτη 92. |
| ἀγνώσ 125. | αἰεσα 34, 39 (2), 384 (1). | Αἰνείασ 95, 116 (2), 129,
App. F (4). |
| ἀγοράσθε 386. | αἰεσίφρωσ 124 <i>c</i> . | αἴνυμαι 17. |
| ἀγρίοσ 98. | αἰζαλέοσ 118. | Αἰόλοσ 98. |
| ἀγρόμενοσ 31 (5), 33. | αἴη, αἴη 18. | αἴον 31 (3), 32, 384 (1). |
| ἀγρότεροσ 122. | αἴηδῶν 118. | αἴρεο 5, 105 (4), 378 <i>b</i> . |
| ἀγυαί 111, 114. | αἴημι 11, 12. | αἴσχιον } 121.
αἴσχιτοσ } |
| ἄγχε 30. | αἴηται 85. | αἰχμάσσοσσι 63. |
| ἀγχέμαχοσ 124 <i>d</i> . | αἴηρ 114, 384 (1), App.
F (4). | αἰχημτά 96. |
| ἄγχι 110. | αἰθάνατοσ 386. | αἴψα 110. |
| ἀγχιμόλοσ 128 (1). | αἰθλοφόροσ 378 <i>g</i> , 396. | αἰψηρόσ 120. |
| Ἀγχιήησ 116 (2). | αἶ, see εἶ. | αἰκάκητα 96. |
| | αἶγεσι 102. | |

ἀκαλαρρείτης 124 *f*.
 ἀκάμας 114, 243 (1).
 ἀκάματος 386.
 ἀκαχέιατο App. C (3).
 ἀκάχημαι 22 (9), 23 (3).
 ἀκαχήμενος } 25, 89,
 ἀκάχησθαι } App. F(2).
 ἀκαχήμενος 22 (1).
 ἀκειόμενος 51 (3).
 ἀκερσεκόμης 124 *d*.
 ἄκην 110.
 ἀκηχέδαται 24 (3, 4), 53.
 ἀκηχεμένους 23 (3).
 ἄκλεα, ἀκλέες 105 (4).
 ἀκλειῶς }
 ἀκληεῖς } 105(5), App. C.
 ἀκμηῆτες 125 (4).
 ἀκομιστή 384 (1).
 ἀκοάξομαι App. p. 397.
 ἀκούω 143 (3), App. p.
 396.
 ἀκραῆς 384 (1).
 ἄκρις 114.
 ἀκταῖς 102.
 ἄκτωρ 129.
 ἀκωκή 114.
 ἄκων 114.
 ἀλάλημαι 22 (9), 23 (3).
 ἀλάλησθαι, 25, 89, App.
 F (2).
 ἄλαλκε 36 (4).
 ἀλαλύκτημαι 22 (9).
 ἀλασκοπιή 125 (7).
 ἄλγιον }
 ἄλγιστος } 121.
 ἀλείαιτο, ἀλείσθαι, 15,
 384 (1).
 ἀλεγινός 118.
 ἄλειφαρ 107 (2).
 ἄλειφε 29 (2).
 ἀλεξάνεμος 124 *d*.
 ἀλεξιάκακος 124 *b*.
 ἄλεσσαν 39 (2).
 ἄλεται 80.
 ἀλεύσθαι 396.
 ἀλεύεται 80.

ἀλεωρή 120.
 ἄληται 31 (1).
 ἄλθαιμένης 124 *b*.
 ἄλθετο 31 (1), 32.
 ἄλι- 124 *b*.
 ἄλιαῆς 384 (1).
 ἄλις 110, 390.
 ἀλιτέσθαι 31 (3).
 ἀλιτήμενος 19.
 ἄλκαθός 124 *f*.
 ἄλκι 107 (1).
 ἄλκι- 124 *b*.
 ἄλλα (use) 336.
 ἄλλοειδέα 125 (2), 396.
 ἄλλυδις 109, 110, App.
 F (2).
 ἄλους 13.
 ἄλώω 55.
 ἄλσο, ἄλτο 40, App. F
 (2).
 ἄλυσκάζω App. p. 397.
 ἄλφεισίβοιος 124 *c*.
 ἄλφοι 31 (1), 32.
 ἄλφον (3 Pl. Opt.) 83.
 ἄλώμεναι } 13, 20, 42,
 ἄλῶναι } 390.
 ἄλώω 80.
 ἄμα 110.
 ἄμαξα App. F (2).
 ἄμαρτε 31 (5), 32.
 ἄμαρτοεπίης 126.
 ἄματροχή 125 (7).
 ἄμαχητή 110.
 ἄμειβε 29 (2), 32.
 ἄμείζοντες 243 (1).
 ἄμελγε 29 (4), 32.
 ἄμεναι 11.
 ἄμμε 97, 100.
 ἄμμι(ν) 102, App. F (2).
 ἄμογητή 110.
 ἄμόθεν App. F (2).
 ἄμοιβηδῖς 110.
 ἄμπεπαλών 36 (1).
 ἄμπνυε 31 (4), 32.
 ἄμπνύνθη 44.
 ἄμπνῦτο 13, 32.

ἄμυδις 109, App. F (2).
 ἄμύντωρ 129.
 ἄμφαδίην 110.
 ἄμφηρηφῆς 125 (8).
 ἄμφήριστος 125 (8).
 ἄμφί 180, 181-184.
 ἄμφιάλος 397.
 ἄμφιάραιος App. F (4).
 ἄμφιαχυῖα 23 (5), 28.
 ἄμφίεπον 397.
 ἄμφίς 110, 228.
 ἄν (use) 362-365, App.
 F (5).
 ἀνά, ἀνα 180, 180*, 209,
 210.
 ἀναβέβρυχε 25 (3).
 ἀναβῆ 81.
 ἀναβροχέν 42.
 ἀναιμωτί 110.
 ἀνακήκῃ 51 (1).
 ἀνάκτεσι 102.
 ἀνάκτιδα, ἀνακτιν 97.
 ἀναξ 390.
 ἀνάσσω.(c. Gen.) 151 *f*.
 ἀναψύχειν 29.
 ἀνδάνω 47, 391.
 ἀνδρακάς 109.
 ἀνδραπόδεσσι 107 (1),
 124 *a*.
 ἀνδρεῖφόντης 370.
 ἀνδροκτασίη 125 (7).
 ἀνδρότης 370.
 ἀνδροφόνος 124 *a*.
 ἀνέκραγον 31 (1).
 ἀνέπαλτο 40.
 ἀνεταί 47.
 ἀνεψιόω 98.
 ἀνέφωγον 67.
 ἀνήη 80.
 ἀνήκεστος 125 (8).
 ἀνήμελκτος 125 (8).
 ἀνήνοθε 22 (8), 27, 68.
 ἀνήροτος 125 (8).
 ἀνιδρωτί 110.
 ἀνιείς 18.
 ἀνιηρέστερος 121.

ἀνουητή 110.
 ἄντεσθαι 32.
 ἄντην 110.
 ἀντί 180, 226.
 ἀντιάειρα App. p. 400.
 ἀντιάσεις 63.
 ἀντιάσητον 82.
 Ἄντικλεια 378 g.
 ἀντικρύ 110.
 ἀντιώ 63.
 ἀντίσχεσθε 226.
 Ἄντιφατή 107 (5).
 ἀντόμενος 31 (1), 32.
 ἀνύσσεσθαι 63.
 ἀνύω 18, 63.
 ἄνω 110.
 ἄνωγα 21 (1), 23, 27.
 ἀνώγει }
 ἀνώγοιμι } 27, 68.
 ἄνωγον }
 ἀνωϊστί 110.
 ἀνώϊστος 125 (8).
 ἄνωχθι 28.
 ἀξέμεναι }
 ἀξέτε } 41.
 ἄορ 114.
 ἀοσητήρ 114.
 ἄπαξ 110.
 ἀπαφίσκει 48.
 ἀπειλήτην 19.
 ἀπειπέμεν 396.
 ἀπείρων 114.
 ἀπερείσιος 384 (2).
 ἀπεχθάνει 47.
 ἀπηλεγέως 125 (8).
 ἀπηύρα 13.
 ἄπο 180, 180*, 224.
 ἀποδίωμαι 386.
 ἀποδρύφου 30.
 ἀπόεργε 39 (3).
 ἀποθείομαι 80.
 ἀπόθωμαι 88.
 ἀπομόργην 17.
 ἀπονέεσθαι 386.
 ἀπόνητο 13.
 ἀποπρό 227.

ἀπορρώξ 128.
 ἀπούρας 13, 396. App.
 F (2).
 ἀπουρίσσοι 63.
 ἀποφθίμην 83 (1).
 ἀπριάτην 110.
 ἄπτω 46.
 ἄρα 110, (use) 347.
 ἀραϊός 392.
 ἀράρισκε 48.
 ἀραρυία 22 (1), 23.
 ἀργαλέος 118.
 ἀργεννός 118, App. F
 (3).
 ἀργέτα, ἀργήτα 114.
 ἀργι- 124 b.
 ἀργιόδοντες 124 b, App.
 p. 400.
 ἀρείων 121.
 Ἄρες 107.
 ἀρεσσόμεθα 63.
 ἄρετο 31 (1).
 ἀρήγει 29 (1).
 ἀρήϊ- 124 f, 125 (6).
 ἀρήμεναι 19.
 ἀρημένος 26 (5).
 Ἄρην 97, 107 (5).
 ἄρηρε 22 (1), 23, 28.
 ἀρήρη 80.
 ἀρηρόμενος 23.
 ἀρηρός 26.
 ἀριστερός 121.
 ἀρκέσει 63.
 ἀρματοπηγός 124 a.
 ἀρματοροχίη 128.
 ἄρμενος 40.
 ἀρμόζω 53.
 ἄρνός 106 (2), 390.
 ἀρνούσθην 17.
 ἀρόωσι 55.
 ἀρπάξων 63.
 ἄρπυια 114.
 ἄρρηκτος 371.
 ἄρσαι 39 (3).
 ἀρτίπος 124 b.
 ἀρχε- 124 d.

ἄρχει 30.
 ἄσαμεν 378 g.
 ἄσε, ἄσατο 378 g.
 Ἄσκληπίου 98, 243 (1).
 ἄσμενος 40, 86.
 ἄσσα 108 (2).
 ἄσσον 121.
 ἄσσοτέρω 110, 121.
 ἀστράπτει 46.
 ἄστν 390.
 ἀστνυβοώτης 55.
 ἀταλάφρων 124 f.
 ἀτάρ (use) 336.
 ἄτη 378 g.
 ἀτιμῆ 384 (1).
 Ἄτρεϊδη 92.
 ἀτρέμα(s) 110.
 ἄττα 92.
 αὐ (use) 337.
 Αὐγείας 95, 116 (2), 129.
 αὐε 31 (4), 32.
 αὐέρνον 396.
 αὐη 31 (4), 32.
 αὐίαχοι 396, App. F.
 αὐτάρ (use) 336.
 αὐτε (use) 337.
 αὐτις 109.
 αὐτμήν 114, App. p. 399.
 αὐτόδιον App. F (2).
 αὐτονονχεῖ 110.
 αὐτός (use) 252.
 αὐτοῦ 110.
 αὐτόφι 157.
 αὐτως 111.
 ἀφέη 80, 384.
 ἀφίκεσθον (3 Du.) 5.
 ἀφύξων 63.
 ἀφυσάμενος 63.
 Ἄχαιϊκός 117.
 ἄχνημαι 17.
 ἄχομαι 30.
 ἄχος 114.
 ἄχρι(s) 110.
 ἄωρο 25 (1).
 βαθέης 384 (1).

βάλοισθα 5.
 βαμβαίνων 61.
 βαρδίστες 121.
 βασιλεύτερος 121, 122.
 βίσκε 48.
 βάτην 13.
 βεβάσι 7.
 βεβαρηότα 22 (9), 28.
 βέβασαν 7, 68.
 βεβαῶτα 26 (1).
 βέβηκα 22 (9).
 βεβήκει 68.
 βεβίηκε 22 (9).
 βέβηται 5.
 βεβλήται 5.
 βεβλήκει 22 (7), 28.
 βεβλήκοι 27, 83.
 βέβηται 22 (9).
 βεβολήατο 28.
 βέβουλα 22 (3).
 βέβριθε 22 (6).
 βεβριθυία 26 (3).
 βέβρυχε 28.
 βεβρώθεις 22 (10), 27, 83.
 βεβρωκώς 22 (9), 26 (4),
 28.
 βεβρώσεται 22 (9), 65.
 βεβῶσα 26 (3), 378 g.
 βείομαι, βέομαι 80, 384
 (1).
 βείω (βήω) 80, App. C.
 βέλτερος 121.
 βένθος 114.
 βήμενα 13.
 βήσομεν 80.
 βήω 80.
 Βιάνωρ App. F (4).
 βιβάς 16.
 βιβάντα, βιβῶσα 18.
 βιῶναι 13, 42.
 βιώτω 13, 20.
 βλάβεται 30.
 βλάπτει 46.
 βλήεται 80, 326 (1).
 βλήτο 13, 14.
 βλοσυρῶπις 116.

βοηλασίη 125 (7), (8).
 βόλεσθε, βόλεται 30.
 Βορέας 116 (2).
 Βορέω 98.
 βόσκει 48.
 βούβρωστις 125.
 βουγαῖος App. F (4).
 βουλεύησθα 5.
 βουλεύσωμεν 82.
 βουλυτός 125.
 βουπλήξ 125, 128.
 βοῦς 100.
 βοῶπις 116 (3), 128 (3).
 βράσσων 121.
 βρέμει 29 (5).
 βρίθον 29 (4).
 βῶν 97, 106 (2).
 βῶσι 81.
 βωπιάνειρα 124 c, App.
 p. 400.

γαιήοχος 124 a.
 γαίων 51 (2).
 γαμέσσειται 63, 367 (2).
 γαμψῶνυξ 124 c, 125 (8).
 γάνυται 17.
 γανύσσειται 63.
 γάρ 348: cp. 257 (1),
 259 (3), 265, 365 (3).
 γε 354: cp. 257 (2).
 γεγάσι 7.
 γέγαμεν 22 (7).
 γεγαῶτας 26 (1).
 γέγηθε 22 (1), 28.
 γέγονε 22 (7), 28.
 γέγωνε 22 (1), 28.
 γεγωνεῖν } 27.
 γεγωνέμεν }
 γέλος App. F (3).
 γέλως 107 n.
 γελῶν 55.
 γενέσθαι 31 (6).
 γέντο 40.
 γένυσι 102.
 γέρα 105 (4).
 γεραίτερος 121.

γέρων 114, 243 (1).
 γηράς 20, 42.
 γήρας 114.
 γηροκόμος 124 a.
 γίγνομαι 35.
 γιγνώσκω 48.
 γλαυκῶπις 128 (3).
 γλήνος 114.
 γνῶ, γνώμεν 81.
 γνώσι 81.
 γνώτην 13.
 γνώω, γνώομεν 80.
 γοάοιεν 55 (6).
 γοήμεναι 19.
 γόνυ 107 (2).
 γόον 32.
 γουνάσομαι 63.
 γράφω 30, 70.
 γρηῖ 107 (5).

δάδων 111.
 δαέρων 106 (1).
 δαήρ App. F (4).
 δαήσει 65.
 δάηται 31 (1), (6), 32.
 δαῖ 105 (4).
 δαιδάλλω 61.
 δαικτάμενος 124 f, 125
 (6).
 δαίνυ 5, 17.
 δαινυάτο 83 (1).
 δαινυή (Subj.) 18, 80.
 δαίνυσαι 5.
 δαινυτο 83 (1).
 δαιψῶν 124 b.
 δαίω 51 (2).
 δακείεν 31 (6).
 δάκρυ 114.
 δακρυόφι 154.
 δακρυχέων 125 (6).
 δαμᾶ 63.
 δάμνασαι, δαμᾶ 5, 18.
 δάμνημι 17.
 δαμόω 63.
 δάσονται 63.
 δαῶμεν 81.

- δέ (use) 257 (1), 259
(1), 333-335.
δέατο 11.
δέγμενος 23 (5).
δεδάσθαι 36 *n*.
δέδιεν 36 (5).
δεδάηκε 22 (9).
δεδαηκώς 26 (4).
δεδαίεται 22 (1).
δεδάκρυσαι 28.
δέδασται 22 (1).
δεδαώς 22 (7).
δέδεγμα 22 (8), 28.
δεδειπνήκει 22 (9).
δεδέξομαι 65.
δέδηκε 22 (1), 28.
δεδήη 68.
δεδίασι 7.
δέδορκε 22 (6), 28.
δέδοται 22 (3).
δεδουπάτος 22 (5), 26
(5).
δέδρομε 22 (4).
δέδυκε 22 (9).
δειδέχεται 23 (6), 24 (2),
(3), 28.
δείδια 23 (2), 28, 394.
δείδιε (Plpf.) 27, 68.
δείδισαν 7.
δειδίσσεσθαι 8, 61.
δείδοικα 22 (9), 23 (2).
δείδω 22 (4), 27, 372.
δεικνῦσι 5, 87 (2).
δεινός 372, 394.
δείους 105 (5), App. C.
δείσητε 82.
δέκτο 40.
δέμας 136 (2).
δέμον 29 (5).
δενδύλων 61.
δεξιτερῆφι(ν) 155, 157.
δεξιτερός 121.
δέξο 40.
δέομαι 384 (1).
δέος 394.
δέπα 105 (4).
δέρκομαι 29 (4).
δέρον 29 (4).
δέσματα 107 (2).
δέυομαι 384 (1), 396.
δέυτατος 121.
δέχεται 23 (5).
δέχθαι 40.
δέχομαι 29 (6), 143 (2).
δή (use) 350, 378.
δήεις 80.
δηθά 394.
δήτιος 384 (1), App. F
(4).
δηϊόφεν } 55 *c*.
δηϊόωντο }
Δηϊφοβος 124 *b*.
δηλήσεται 82.
Δημήτηρ 129.
δήμοο 98, 368.
δήν 371, 394.
δηρόν 110, 394.
διά 180, 214-216, 386.
διάθωμα 88.
διαπρό 227.
διαφθέρσει 63.
διδασκέμεν 48.
δίδη 16.
διδοίς, διδοῖ 18.
διδοῖσθα 5.
δίδου 18.
διδούμαι 85.
διδοῦσι 5, 87 (2).
δίδωθι 5, 16.
διδώσομεν 63.
δίε 31 (3), 32 (1).
δίειπε 396.
διέκριθεν 43.
δίενται 11, 31 (3).
διέξ 227.
δίεσθαι 31 (3).
διέτμαγεν 42.
διέτμαγον 31 (1).
διέφθορας 22 (6), 23, 28.
δίξε 35.
δίζηαι 5, 16.
δικόσιοι 125 (8).
διηνεκής 125 (8).
διῦ- 124 *f*.
δικασπόλος 124 *f*.
διογενής 124 *a*.
Διόθεν 109, 159.
δίοιτο 31 (3), 83.
διόν 31 (3).
Διόνυσος 129.
διος 114.
δίπτυχα 107 (1).
διψάων 19, 55 (8), App.
F (4).
διώκειν 29, 45, App. p.
397.
διώκετον (3 Du.) 5.
διώμαι 31 (3).
δημητός 14.
δμῶων 111.
δοιά 133.
δοιλήχρητος 125 (8).
Δόλων 129.
δόμεν 85.
δόρυ 107 (2).
δός 5.
δοτήρ 114.
δοῦναι 85.
δοιρηνεκής 125 (8).
δοιρι- 124 *f*.
δοιροδόκη 124 *a*.
δοιραίνεις 59.
δοιράκος 243 (1).
δοιρίον 29 (4).
δοιρμά 99*.
δοιρώσει 55 *d*.
δοιή (Opt.) 83 (1).
δοῦθι 13.
δοῦμεναι, δοῦναι 13, 85.
δοιναμένιοι 386.
δοιναμεις 114.
δοινασαι 5, 11, 386.
δοινασθη 44.
δοῦνε 47.
δοῦνηαι 81, 87 (3).
δοῦνωμαι 87 (3).
δοῦο, δοῦω 130 (2).
δοιηλεγής 125 (8).

δυσκλέα 105 (4).
 δυσόμενος 41.
 δύω 51 (4), (Subj.) 80.
 δωδέκα 130 (2).
 δῶ, δῶς, &c. 81.
 δῶη, δῶσι 80, 82.
 δῶομεν 80.
 δῶτωρ 114.
 εἶ, εἶε 97.
 εἶα 12.
 εἶαγε 22 (1), App. F (4).
 εἶαγή 42, 67.
 εἶαδοῦτα 22 (1), 26 (2),
 App. F (4).
 εἶαλή 42, 67, 390.
 εἶαξε 67.
 εἶαρ 390.
 εἶασι 5.
 εἶαφθη 46 η.
 εἶβαλον 31 (5).
 εἶβαν 5.
 εἶβδόματος 121.
 εἶβην 13.
 εἶβήσето 41.
 εἶβήτην 13.
 εἶβλαβεν 42.
 εἶβόλοντο 30.
 εἶβραχε 31 (5).
 εἶγγύς 110.
 εἶγδοῦπησαν 67.
 εἶγέγωνε 27, 68.
 εἶγμα 39 (3).
 εἶγήρα 13, 20.
 εἶγων 13, 14.
 εἶγρεκίδοιμος 124 d.
 εἶγρετο 31 (5), 33.
 εἶγρήγορα 22 (7), 23.
 εἶγρηγόρθασι 22 (10), 24.
 εἶγρήγορθε 25 (1).
 εἶγρηγορτί 110.
 εἶγροίτο 33.
 εἶγχείη 29 (3).
 εἶγχεσίμωρος 124 f.
 εἶδάη 42, 44.
 εἶδάμασσα 39 (2).

εἶδάμη 42.
 εἶδάμνα 18.
 εἶδάσαστο 39 (1).
 εἶδδισε, εἶδισε 39, 67,
 371, 394.
 εἶδέγμην 23 (5), 40.
 εἶδει 29 (6).
 εἶδειδιμεν, εἶδειδισαν 68.
 εἶδήδαται (-εται) 27.
 εἶδηδῶς 22 (2), 25, 28.
 εἶδιδον 5.
 εἶδίδους, -ου 18.
 εἶδμεναι 11.
 εἶδομαι 80.
 εἶδρακον 31 (5).
 εἶδραμον 31 (5).
 εἶδου, εἶδυτε 13.
 εἶδῶν (3 Pl.) 5.
 εἶδύσето 41.
 εἶδωδή 114.
 εἶδωκα, εἶδωκαν 7, 15.
 εἶκοσάβοις 130.
 εἶεπα 37.
 εἶεπον 36 (6), 67, 72.
 εἶεσάμενος 67.
 εἶεἶσαστο 39, 400.
 εἶέλωρ 114* (8) d.
 εἶέλμένος 22 (6), 23 (1),
 25 (2), 390.
 εἶέργει 29 (4), App. F
 (1).
 εἶέργυνυ 17.
 εἶερμένος 22 (6), 23 (1),
 25 (2).
 εἶεἶσαστο 67.
 εἶεἶστο 23 (5).
 εἶζετο 31 (7).
 εἶζευμέναι 22 (5), 23 (2),
 25 (2).
 εἶηκα 15, 67.
 εἶην 12.
 εἶηδανε 67.
 εἶηξα App. p. 398.
 εἶηος 94 (2).
 εἶης, εἶη 80.
 εἶησθα 5, 12.

εἶησι 80, 82.
 εἶθανε 31 (6).
 εἶθέλει 29 (4).
 εἶθέλησθα 5.
 εἶθεμεν, εἶθεσαν 15.
 εἶθεν 109, App. F (3).
 εἶθηκα, εἶθηκαν 7, 15.
 εἶθλασε 39 (1).
 εἶθνος 392.
 εἶθορον 31 (5).
 εἶθος 391.
 εἶθων 31 (2), 243 (1).
 εἶ (use) 291-295, 311-
 314, 318-321, 324*.
 εἶα 67.
 εἶαρινός 386, 390, 396.
 εἶαται 11, App. C (3).
 εἶατο (Fes-) 23 (5).
 εἶβει 29 (2).
 εἶδαρ 107 (2), 114.
 εἶδειή 83 (1).
 εἶδεται 29 (2).
 εἶδέω, εἶδῆς, &c. 80.
 εἶδομεν, εἶδετε 80.
 εἶδον 67, 72, 390.
 εἶδος 390.
 εἶδουία 26.
 εἶδω, εἶδης, &c. 80.
 εἶδῶς 26 (2).
 εἶκελος 390.
 εἶκοσι 390.
 εἶκτον, εἶκτην 22 (4), 68.
 εἶκυία 22 (4), 26 (3).
 εἶκω 29 (2), 390.
 εἶκῶς 26 (2).
 εἶλαρ 114.
 εἶλήλουθα 22 (5).
 εἶλήλουθμεν 25 (1).
 εἶλίποδες 124 b.
 εἶλον 31 (5), 67.
 εἶλυτο 23 (1), 390.
 εἶλυφάζω App. p. 397.
 εἶλυω 390, 396.
 εἶλω 390.
 εἶμα 390.
 εἶμαι 23 (5), 390.

- εἴμαρται 22 (6), 23 (2).
 εἰμέν 12.
 εἴμεν 67.
 εἰμένος 23.
 εἰμί 11, 12, 70.
 εἴμι 11, 12, 70.
 εἶν 384 (2).
 εἶναι 12.
 εἶνατος 130 (5), 384 (2).
 εἶνεκα 384 (2).
 εἶο 98.
 εἰοικῦια 26 (3), 384 (1).
 εἶπα 37.
 εἰπέ 87 (4).
 εἰπεῖν 390.
 εἶπετο 67.
 εἶπησθα 5.
 εἰρεσίη 386.
 εἰρήσεται 65.
 εἶρηται 22 (9), 23 (2).
 εἶροκόμος 124 *a*.
 εἶρύαται 5, 23, 28.
 εἶρυσσα 67, 378 *g*, 396.
 εἶρω 390.
 εἶς 222.
 εἶς, εἶς, ἐσσί 5, 12.
 εἶσαν 67.
 εἶσανιδῶν 396 *n*.
 εἶσατο 67.
 εἶσθα 5, 12.
 εἶσι 12.
 εἶσσω 48, 390.
 εἶσομαι 63.
 εἶσω 110, 228.
 εἶται 23 (5).
 εἶχον 67.
 εἶωθε 22 (2), 23 (2), 384
 (1).
 εἰκαίνυτο 17.
 εἴκαμον 31 (6).
 εἴκαμπυσε 39 (2).
 εἴκας 110, 390.
 εἴκαστέρω }
 εἴκαστάτω } 110.
 εἴκαστος 390.
 εἴκατηβόλος 124 *a*.
- Ἐκατος 129, 390.
 ἐκεγατήν 68.
 ἐκδύμεν 83 (1).
 ἐκείθι 109.
 ἐκέκλετο 36 (4).
 ἔκερσε 39 (3).
 ἐκεύθανον 47.
 ἔκηα 15, App. C (3).
 ἔκηλος 390.
 ἔκητι 110, 390.
 ἐκίδνατο 370.
 ἔκιον 31 (3), 32.
 ἐκίρνα 18.
 ἐκκατιδῶν 396 *n*.
 ἐκκλεαθον 36 (1).
 ἔκλεο 5.
 ἐκλίθη }
 ἐκλίνθη } 43.
 ἔκλυον 18, 31 (4), 32.
 ἔκλων 51.
 ἔκμολε 31 (5).
 ἐκορέσασατο 39 (2).
 ἐκπέποται 22 (3).
 ἐκρέμω 5, 11.
 ἔκτα, ἔκταμεν, ἔκταν 5,
 13.
 ἔκταθεν 43.
 ἔκτανον 31 (6).
 ἔκτατο 13.
 ἐκτῆσθαι 23 (2).
 ἐκτήσω 5.
 ἔκτυπε 31 (4).
 Ἐκτωρ 129.
 ἐκυρός 391.
 ἐκών 243 (1), 390.
 ἐλάαν 63.
 ἐλάγχανον 47.
 ἐλάσσων 121.
 ἐλαύνω 47.
 ἐλαφηβόλος 124 *a*.
 ἔλαχον 31 (6).
 ἐλεγχέες 116.
 ἐλέγχει 29 (5).
 ἐλέγχιστος 121.
 ἔλεκτο 40.
 ἐλέλικτο 40, 53, 390.
- ἐλέχθην 44.
 ἐλεόθρεπτος 124 *a*.
 ἐληλάδατ' 24 (4).
 ἐλήλαται 23 (3).
 ἐλήλυθα 25.
 ἐλθέ 87 (4).
 ἐλίσσω 53, 390.
 ἐλκεσίπεπλος 124 *c*, 126.
 ἐλκεχίτωνες 124 *d*, 126.
 ἐλκυστάζω 60.
 ἔλκω 29 (4), 393.
 ἔλλαβε 31 (1), 67.
 Ἐλλησποντος 124 *f*.
 ἐλλισάμην 39 (1), 371.
 ἔλον 31 (5), 393.
 ἔλος 393.
 ἐλόω 63.
 ἔλπομαι 29 (4), 390.
 ἐλπωρή 120.
 ἔλσαν 39 (3), 390.
 ἔλων 51.
 ἔλωρ 114* (8) *d*.
 ἔμαρπτε 46.
 ἐμέ 97.
 ἐμέθεν 109, App. F (3).
 ἐμείο 98.
 ἐμέμηκον 27, 68.
 ἔμεν, ἔμεναι 12, 85.
 ἐμέο, ἐμεῦ 98, 378* *e*.
 ἐμέω 390.
 ἐμίγη 42.
 ἔμικτο 40.
 ἐμογέσκοντο 69.
 ἐμίχθη 44.
 ἔμμαθε 67.
 ἔμμεν, ἔμμεναι 12, 85.
 ἔμμορε 22 (6), 23, 28,
 371, App. F (2), (3).
 ἔμπαιος 384 (1).
 ἐμπίπληθι 5, 16.
 ἐμπυριβήτης 124 *f*.
 ἔνατος 130 (5).
 ἐνδίεσαν 11, 31 (3), 32.
 ἐνεΐκα, ἐνεΐκαμεν, ἐνεΐκαν
 15, 37.
 ἐνεΐκέμεν 37.

- ἐνεήκοντα 130 (5).
 ἐνένιπε App. p. 397.
 ἐνεροι 121.
 ἐνέρτεροι 121.
 ἐνήκαμεν 15.
 ἐνι 180, 180*, 220.
 ἐνιπλήξωμεν 82.
 ἐνιπτε 46.
 ἐνισπε, ἐνίσπες 5, 88.
 ἐνισπήσω 14.
 ἐνίσσω 46.
 ἐννεον 29 (3), 67, 371.
 ἐννεπε 29 (6).
 ἐννώρος 130 (5).
 ἐννήμαρ 130 (5), App. F (3).
 ἐννοσίγαιος 124 c, App. F (3).
 ἐννυμ 17, 390.
 ἐνοσίχθων 124 c.
 ἐνταιθοῖ 109.
 ἐντεσιεργός 124 f.
 ἐντυπάς 110.
 ἔνωπα 107 (2).
 ἔξ 222.
 ἔξ 391.
 ἔξάετες 130.
 ἔξἔπτῃ 13.
 ἔξεσύθη 43.
 ἔξήλατος 125 (8).
 ἔξημοιβός 125 (8).
 ἔξήπαφε 36 (1).
 ἔξω 110.
 ἔο, &c. 98, 253, 391.
 ἔοι, ἔοις 29 (6), 83.
 ἔοικα 22 (4), 23, 390.
 εὐοίκεσαν 68.
 εὐοικώς, εὐοικυῖα 26 (2).
 ἔολπα 22 (6), 23, 28.
 ἔον, ἔοι 29 (6).
 ἔοργα 22 (6), 23, 28.
 ἐοργώς 26 (2).
 εὐός (use) 254, 255.
 εὐὸ (= εὐ) 98.
 ἔπαγη 42.
 ἔπαθον 31 (6).
 ἐπάλλεσι 102.
 ἔπαλτο, ἐπάλμενος 40.
 ἐπαμοιβαδῖς 109.
 ἐπασσύτεροι 121.
 ἐπαυρέιν 31 (4).
 ἐπαυρίσκονται 48.
 ἐπέι (use) 296, 309.
 ἐπενήνοθε 22 (8), 68.
 ἐπέοικε 396.
 ἐπέπιθμεν 22 (4), 68.
 ἐπέπληγον 27, 68.
 ἐπέπλωσ 13, 20.
 ἔπερσε 39 (3), 40.
 ἐπεσβολή 125 (7).
 ἔπεσον 41.
 ἔπεται 29 (6).
 ἐπέτειλα 39 (3).
 ἔπεφνε 36 (5).
 ἐπέφραδε 36 (2).
 ἐπεφράσω 5.
 ἐπέφυκον 68.
 ἐπήν (use) 363 (4).
 ἔπηξα 40.
 ἐπήρατος 125 (8).
 ἐπι 180, App. p. 401.
 ἐπιάλμενος 397.
 ἐπιβησόμενος 41, 244.
 ἐπιβήτην 81.
 ἐπιβλής 125 (4).
 ἐπιδέδρομε 22 (6).
 ἐπιδόντα 396.
 ἐπιδώμεθα 81.
 ἐπικίνδυνται 370.
 ἐπίθοντο 31 (3).
 ἐπίκλησιν 135.
 ἐπιμέφομαι 29 (5).
 ἐπίμιξ 110.
 ἔπιον 31 (3).
 ἐπιπλόμενος 33.
 ἐπιπλώς 13, 20.
 ἐπιπτέσθαι 31 (7).
 ἐπισπέσθαι 31(7), 36(6).
 ἐπισπόμενος 36 (6).
 ἐπίσταιτο 87 (3).
 ἐπίσταμαι 11.
 ἐπίστηται 81, 87(3), 280.
 ἐπισχοῖης 83.
 ἐπιτετράφαται 24.
 ἐπίτονος 386.
 ἔπλε, ἔπλετο 31 (5), 33, 78.
 ἐπλήγη 42.
 ἔπορον 31 (5).
 ἔπος 136 (3), 390.
 ἐπράθομεν 31 (5).
 ἔπρεπε 29 (4).
 ἔπταρε 31 (5).
 ἔπτατο 13.
 ἔπταχα 109.
 ἐπώχατο 22 (2), 23.
 ἐράασθε 51 (3).
 ἔραμαι 11.
 ἔργον 136 (3), 390.
 ἐρεβεννός 118, App. F (3).
 Ἐρέβευς 105 (3).
 ἔρειδε 29 (2).
 ἐρεικόμενος 29 (2).
 ἐρείομεν 80.
 ἔρειπε 29 (2).
 ἐρείπια 114.
 ἐρείσθη 44.
 ἐρέριπτο 23, 25.
 ἐρέσθαι 31 (5).
 ἐρετμόν 114, App. p. 398.
 ἐρεύγετα 29 (3).
 ἐρεύθων 29 (3).
 ἐρέω 309.
 ἐρηρέδαται 23, 24.
 ἐρήριπε 23.
 ἔριδα, ἔριν 97.
 ἐρίρηρας, ἐρίρηρες 107.
 ἐριούνης 125 (8).
 Ἐρμείας 92, 95, 116, 129, App. F (4).
 ἔρος 107.
 ἔρπει 29 (4).
 ἐρπύζω 53.
 ἐρράδαται 22 (1), 24.
 ἔρρεεν 67.
 ἔρρεξε 67, 395.
 ἔρρηκται 23, 25.

- ἔρρηξα 67, 395.
 ἔρριγα 22 (6), 28.
 ἔρρίγησε 67, 395.
 ἔρρίγησι 80, 82.
 ἔρρίζωται 23.
 ἔρρωγα 22 (1).
 ἔρρων 29 (4), 392.
 ἔρκανόωσι 60.
 ἔρύκει 29.
 Ἐρύλαος 124 *d*.
 ἔρυσάρματες 124 *c*, 125
 (5).
 ἔρυσίπολις 124 *c*.
 ἔρύσσαμεν 39 (2).
 ἔρύσσεσθαι } 63.
 ἔρύσσεται }
 ἔρυτο 11, 12, 18.
 ἔρύω 18, 63, 392.
 ἔρχαται 22 (6), 23, 24, 25.
 ἔρωσ 107.
 ἔσαν 12.
 ἔσας, ἔσασθαι 39 (1).
 ἔσβη 13, 44.
 ἔσεμάσαστο 39 (1).
 ἔσθην 23.
 ἔσθής 390.
 ἔσθίει 51 (1).
 ἐσίδσκε 396.
 ἔσκε 49.
 ἔσπειρα 39 (3).
 ἔσπερα App. p. 398.
 ἔσπερος 390.
 ἔσπετο 31 (7).
 ἔσπονται, ἐσποίμην,
 ἐσπόμενος 36 (6).
 ἔσσαι 22 (8).
 ἔσατο 39 (1).
 ἐσσεῖται 64.
 ἔσσενα 15, 67, 371.
 ἐσσεύοντο 29 (3).
 ἐσσί 5, 12.
 ἔσσο 12.
 ἔσσο 23.
 ἐσσόμενος 244 (1).
 ἔσσο, ἔσσοτο 13, 15.
 ἔσσονται 22 (5), 23.
- ἔσσω 64.
 ἐστάθη 43.
 ἐσταότες 26 (1).
 ἔσται 23 (5).
 ἔσταν, ἔστησαν 5, 13.
 ἔστασαν (1 Aor.) 72 (2)
n. i.
 ἐστᾶσι, ἔστασαν 7, 68, 72.
 ἐστέ 12, 87 (1).
 ἔστεφε 29 (6).
 ἔστηκα 22 (9) *a*, 23.
 ἐστήκασι 7, 24.
 ἐστήκη 80, 283.
 ἔστητε 13 (ἔστητε 25).
 ἔστι 12, 87 (1).
 ἔστιχον 31 (3).
 ἔστο 23.
 ἐστόν 12, 87 (1).
 ἔστρωτο 13, 14.
 ἔστρυγον 31 (4).
 ἔστω, ἔστων 12.
 ἐσχαρόφιν 157.
 ἔσχατος 121.
 ἔσχεθον, ἔσχον 31 (7).
 ἐτάλασσα 39 (2).
 ἔταμον 31 (6).
 ἐτάνυσσα 39 (2).
 ἐτεθήπεα 68.
 ἔτεκον 31 (7).
 ἐτέρωθι 109.
 ἐτέαλτο 22 (6).
 ἔτεμε 36 (6).
 ἐτεύχετον (3 Du.) 5.
 ἔτης 116 (2), 391.
 ἔτι 180.
 ἐτίθει 18.
 ἔτλην, -ημεν 13, 14.
 ἔτορε 31 (5).
 ἔτος 390.
 ἔτραπον 31 (5).
 ἔτραφε 31 (5).
 ἐτράφην App. p. 397.
 ἔτρεμε 29 (5).
 ἐτύχηθ 43.
 εὖ 98, 378*.
 εὐαθε 31 (1).
- εὐήνωρ 125 (8).
 εὐηφηνής 125 (8).
 εὐκλείας, -ῶς 105.
 εὐκτίμενος 125 (6).
 εὐμμελίω 98, 371.
 εὐναιετάων 125 (6).
 εὐνάσω 63.
 εὐνις 116.
 εὐόμενοι 29 (3).
 εὐρε 31 (4).
 εὐρέα 97.
 εὐρίσκω 48.
 εὐρρείος 105.
 Εὐρυμίδης 129.
 εὐρύσπα 96, App. p. 400.
 εὐρυρέων 125 (6).
 Εὐρυτος 129.
 εὐς 94, 384.
 εὐτε (use) 290.
 εὐχετάομαι 60.
 εὐώνυμος 125 (8).
 ἐφάμην 12.
 ἔφαν 5, 12.
 ἐφάνη 42.
 ἔφασκον 49.
 ἐφείω 80, App. C.
 ἐφετμή 114.
 ἔφην, -αμεν, &c. 12.
 ἐφήπται 23.
 ἔφησθα 5, 11.
 ἔφθην 13.
 ἐφθιάτο 23.
 ἔφθιε 51 (1).
 ἔφθιθεν 43.
 ἔφθιτο 13.
 ἐφίλατο 39 (3).
 ἐφοπλίσσουσι 63.
 ἐφρασάμην 39 (1).
 ἐφράσθης 44.
 ἔφυν, ἔφυσαν 13.
 ἔφϋν 5.
 ἔχαδε 31 (6).
 ἐχάρη 42.
 ἐχάνδανον 47.
 ἐχάρη 42, 44.
 ἐχε-, ἐχεπευκές 124.

*Εχετος 129.
 ἔχευα, ἐχέυατο 15.
 ἔχθεσθαι (ἐχθέσθαι),
 ἐχθόμενος 31 (7).
 ἐχολώθη 44.
 ἔχραε 31 (1), 32.
 ἔχραισμε 31 (3), 32.
 ἔχυτο 15.
 ἔχω 29 (6).
 ἔω 80.
 ἔωθα 23.
 ἐώθειον 67.
 ἐώκει 67.
 ἐώλπει 67.
 ἔωμεν 80.
 ἐών 29 (6).
 ἐφνοχόει 67.
 ἐώργει 67.
 ἔως 265 (2), 273, 288,
 307, App. F (e).

ζαῖν 97.
 Ζάκυνθος 370.
 ζαχρειῶν }
 ζαχρηεῖς } 105.
 ζεῖ 29 (6).
 ζεῖδωρος 124.
 ζευγνύμεν 17, 85 (1).
 ζεύγνουον 18.
 ζεφυρή 386.
 Ζῆν 97, 106 (2).
 ζητέω 60.
 ζώννυνται 81.
 ζώννυτο 17.
 ζώος 14.

ἦ, see ἦέ.
 ἦ 338, 339.
 ἦ (ἦμί) 11.
 ἦ 109.
 ἦα 12.
 ἦα 67.
 ἦται, ἦατο 5, 11, App.
 C.
 ἦβώωσα 55 d.
 ἦγάασθε 55 a.

ἦγαγον 36 (1).
 ἦγάσασατο 39 (2).
 ἦγειρα 39 (2).
 ἦγερέθονται 125 (8).
 ἦδέ 338.
 ἦδεα, ἦδη 68.
 ἦδησθα 5, 68.
 ἦδύς 114, 116 (4), 391.
 ἦέ, ἦ (ἦε, ἦ) 340, 341.
 ἦεῖδης, ἦεῖδει 67, 68.
 ἦειρε 67.
 ἦεις, ἦει 12, 67.
 ἦεν, ἦην, ἦμεν 12.
 ἦέριος 114* (8).
 ἦθεῖε 92, 96.
 ἦθελέτην (2 Du.) 5.
 ἦθος 391.
 ἦῖα 12, 67.
 ἦῖκτο 23.
 ἦῖον, ἦῖσαν 5, 12, 30.
 ἦῖσκε 67.
 ἦκα 110.
 ἦκαχε 36 (1).
 ἦκω App. p. 397.
 ἦλάσκουσι 48.
 ἦλασσα 39 (2).
 ἦλείατο 15.
 ἦλήλατο 67, 68.
 ἦλίβατος 124.
 *Ἠλις 393.
 ἦλιτεν 31 (3).
 ἦλιτόμηνος 125 (8).
 ἦλος 393.
 ἦλυθον 31 (4).
 ἦλφον 31 (1), 32.
 ἦλω 67 *footn.*
 ἦμαρ 107 (2), App. F
 (2).
 ἦμάρτανε 47.
 ἦμβροτε 31 (5), App. F
 (2).
 ἦμέας, ἦμας 100.
 ἦμείων, ἦμέων 101.
 ἦμέν 338.
 ἦμερσε 39 (3).
 ἦμίν, ἦμιν 102.

ἦμος 290, App. F (2).
 ἦν (3 Sing.) 12.
 ἦν (3 Pl.) 5, 12.
 ἦν (use) 292 b, 293, 294,
 362.
 ἦνεια 15, 37.
 ἦνεμόεις 125 (8).
 ἦνιοχῆα 107 (5).
 ἦνίπαπε 36 (7).
 ἦνις 116 (3).
 ἦνορέη 125 (8).
 ἦνοψ 392.
 ἦντεον 55 (10).
 ἦντετο 31 (1).
 ἦντο 5.
 ἦνυτο 17.
 ἦνώγεα 68.
 ἦνωγον 27.
 ἦξε 390 (p. 363).
 ἦος 273.
 ἦπαρ 107 (2), 114* (8).
 ἦπύτα 96.
 ἦπύω 51 (4).
 ἦρα 392.
 Ἠρακλῆος &c. 105 (5).
 ἦραρε 36 (1).
 ἦρασάμην 39 (2).
 ἦρατο 39 (3).
 ἦρήρειστο 23 (3), 25, 28.
 ἦρικε 31 (3).
 ἦρίον 392.
 ἦριπε 31 (3).
 ἦρπαξε, ἦρπασε 39 (1),
 63.
 ἦρυγε 31 (4).
 ἦρύκακε 36 (7).
 ἦρωος, ἦρωφ, 384 (1).
 ἦσαν 5, 12.
 ἦσαν 12.
 ἦσθα 5, 12.
 ἦσι 81.
 ἦσται 11.
 ἦστην 12.
 ἦτε 12.
 ἦτορ 114.
 ἦὺς 94 (2), 384.

ἡχή 390.
ἡχθετο 31 (7), 32.
ἡχι 109.
ἡώς 114, ἡῶ 368.

θαλαμηπόλος 124 α.
θάλος 114.
θάλπω 29 (1).
θαλπωρή 120.
θάμα 110.
θάμβευς 105 (3).
θαμειά 111.
θανέεσθαι 66.
θάπτε 46.
θάρσευς 105 (3).
θάρσος 114.
θαυμάσεται 63.
θεά 95, App. F.
θείαινα 114.
θεαῖς 102.
θεεῖ 29 (3).
θειέιν 29 (3), 51 (3).
θεῖναι 85.
θειώ 10, App. C (2).
θέμεν, θέμεναι 15, 85.
θέντων 15.
θέο 5.
θεόθεν 159.
Θεοκλύμενος 125 (3).
θεουδέα }
θεουδής } 105 (4).
θεόφιν 155.
θέρεσθαι 29 (4).
θέρευς 105 (3).
θέρμετε, θέρμετο 32.
Θερσίτης 114, 129.
θερσόμενος 63.
θές 5, 15.
Θέτιν 97.
θέωμεν 80.
θεώτεροι 122.
θῆαι 81.
θῆγει 29 (1).
θῆη 80.
θῆκατο 15.
θῆκη 22 (9) *footn.*

θῆλυσ 114, 115 (4), 116
(4).
θηλύτεροι 122.
θην (use) 352.
θῆς 114.
θῆσθαι 19.
θλάσσε 39 (1). -
θνησκον 48.
θοῦριν 97.
θοῦρις 116 (3).
Θόων 129.
θρασύς 114.
θρήνυς 114.
θρόσκουσι 48 (1).
θυγάτηρ 111, 115 (6).
Θυέστα 96, 129.
θυηλή 120.
θυμηγερέων 125 (8).
θῦνον 47.
θύρη, θύραι 171.
θύρηφιν 157.
θύω 51 (4).
θωρήσσεσθον (3 Du.) 5.
θῶων 111.

ἴα 130 (1).
ιά 99*.
ιάπτῃ 46.
ἴασι 5, 11.
ιάύω 35.
ἴαχον 31 (1), 35, 390,
396.
ιάχων 31 (1).
ιδεῖν 390.
ἴδιον 51 (1), 393.
ἴδμεν (Inf.) 85.
ἴδρις 114, 116.
ιδρώς 107 n.
ιδυῖα 26 (3).
ἴει, ἰεῖς 18.
ἰείη 83.
ἴεν 5.
ἴεν 12.
ἰέναί 85.
ἰερευτο 23 (5).
ἰερός 384.

ἴετο 12.
ἰζάνει 47.
ἴζω 35.
ἴησθα 5, 80.
ἴησι 16.
ἴησι 80, 82.
ἰθαιγενής 124 f.
ἰθύς 110, 116 (4).
ἰθύω 51 (4).
ἰκάνω 47.
ἰκέσθαι 31 (3).
ἴκμενος 40, 86, 243 (1).
ἰκριόφιν 154.
ἴκω 39 (2), 393.
ἰλάονται 51.
ἴλαος App. F (4).
ἰλάσκονται 48.
ἰλάσσονται 39 (2).
ἴληθι 11, 16.
ἰλήκησι 22 (9), 80, App.
p. 397.
Ἰλίοο 98.
Ἰλιος 392.
ἴμεν, ἴμεναι 85.
ἴμερος 114.
ἴνα (use) 284, 286, 306.
ἴνεσι 102.
ἴξον 41.
ἴοι 30, 83.
ἴομεν 80, 384.
ἴον 390.
ἰππηλάτα 96, 125 (8).
Ἰππημολγός 125 (8).
ἰππότα 96, 117.
Ἰριν 97.
Ἰρις, Ἰρος 392.
ἴς 390.
ἴσαν 5, 7.
ἴσασι 7.
ἴσχω 48.
ἴσος 390.
ἴστα 18.
ἴστη (Imper.) 5, 20.
Ἰστίαια 378.
ἰστίη 393.
ἰσχάνει 47.

- ἰσχανόωσι 60.
 ἴσχω 35.
 ἰτέη 390.
 ἴτην 12.
 ἴτυς 390.
 ἴφι 110.
 Ἰφίτιο 98, 129.
 ἴχνος 114.
 ἰχώρ 107.
 ἰώ 80.
 ἰῶ 130 (1).
 ἰῶκα 107 (1).
 ἰών 12, 30.
 καί (use) 259 (3), 265
 (1), 330, 353.
 καίνυμαι 17.
 καίω 51 (2).
 κακκείοντες 59.
 καλέουσα 63.
 καλέσσαι 39 (2).
 καλήμεναι 19.
 καλλιγύναικα 124 *b*.
 Κάλχα 92, App. (p. 321).
 καμέτην (2 Du.) 5.
 κάμνε 47.
 κάρη 107 (5).
 κερηκομόωντες 125 (6).
 κάρκαιρε 61.
 κάρτα 110.
 κάρτιστος 121.
 κάρτος 114.
 κασίγνητος 14.
 Καστιάνειρα 124 *c*.
 κατά 180.
 καταίσχηται 397.
 κατάκρης 107.
 κατακτανέουσι 63.
 κατακτάς 13.
 καταλέγμενος 40.
 καταπτήτην 13.
 κατέδραθον 31 (5).
 κατέρυσται 396.
 κατέκταθεν 43.
 κατέπηκτο 40.
 κατεσκίαον 55 (10).
 κατήκισται 23.
 κατηρεφής 125 (8).
 κατίσχηαι (Subj.) 82.
 κάτω 110.
 καυστειρής 111.
 καυτός 377.
 κέδασθεν 370.
 κείαντες App. C (3).
 κείθι 109.
 κείνος 250.
 κεινός 114, 384 (2).
 κείομεν App. C (3).
 κείται 11, 81.
 κείων 51 (3).
 κεκαδησόμεθα 65.
 κεκαδών 36 (1).
 κεκάμω 35, 296.
 κεκασμένος 22 (1).
 κεκαφητότα 22 (9), 28.
 κέκευθε 22 (5), 28.
 κέκλετο 8, 35.
 κεκλήγοντες 27, App. F
 (3).
 κεκληγυῖα 26 (3).
 κεκληγώς 22 (1), 27, 28.
 κεκληγώτες 26 (1).
 κέκλημα 22 (9).
 κεκλήση 65.
 κέκλυθι 22 (5), 28.
 κέκμηκας 22 (9), 28.
 κεκμηῶτα 26 (1).
 κεκόπων 27, App. F (3).
 κεκοπώς 22 (8), 26 (5),
 28.
 κεκορηότα 22 (9), 28.
 κεκοτηότε 22 (9), 28.
 κεκράνται 55.
 κεκύθωσι 36 (3).
 κέλαδος 114.
 κέλευθα 99*.
 κελευτιών 60.
 κέλως 114.
 κέλομαι 29 (4).
 κέλσαι 39 (3).
 κεν, see ἄν.
 κένσαι 39 (3).
 κέονται 29 (6).
 κέρα 105 (4).
 κέρα, κέραι 99.
 κέραε 51 (2).
 κεραοξόδος 124 *a*.
 κέρασσε 39 (1).
 κέρδιον, κέρδιστος 121.
 κέρωνται 87 (3).
 κεφαλῆφιν 157.
 κεχανδώς 22 (7), 25 (2).
 κεχαρηότα 22 (9), 28.
 κεχαρησέμεν 65.
 κεχάροντο 36 (1).
 κεχηρότα 22 (1), 28.
 κεχολώσεται 65.
 κέχυνται 5.
 κέχυται 22 (5).
 κήθει 29 (1).
 κηρρσισφόρητος 124 *j*.
 κίκλησκειν 48.
 κίνυντο 17.
 κίρην 17, 29 (4).
 κιχάνω 47.
 κίχε, κίχεις 18.
 κιχειή, κιχήτην 11, 12.
 κιχειώ, κιχείομεν 80.
 κιχήμεναι 12.
 κιών 31 (3), 89.
 κλάδος 114.
 κλαίουσθα 5.
 κλαίω 51 (2).
 κλέα 105 (4).
 κλείω 51 (3).
 κλέομαι 29 (3).
 κλέπτε 46.
 κλητός 14.
 κλίνω 54.
 κλισίηφι 157.
 κλιζώ 53.
 κλιῦθι 13, 32.
 Κλυμένη 13, 129.
 κνη 19.
 κοίλος 378* *g*.
 κομίδη 114.
 κομῶ 63, 64.
 κονίοντες 51 (1).

- κόπτε 46.
 κορέεις 63.
 κορέσθη 44.
 κόρυν 97.
 κοτέσσατο 39 (2).
 κοτυληθονόφιν 157.
 κουρότεροι 122.
 κραδάω 55 (6).
 κραδίη 114.
 κραναήπεδος 124 α.
 κράτεσφι 107 (5).
 κρέα 105 (4).
 κρειῶν 105 (5).
 κρεμάσαι 39 (2).
 κρεμός 63.
 κρηῆναι 39 (3), 55.
 κρήθεν 107 (5).
 κριθή 29 (4).
 κρίκε 31 (3).
 κρινθέντες 43.
 κρίνω 29 (4), 54.
 κριός 29 (4).
 κρίπτω 46.
 κτάμενος 13.
 κτανέοντα 63, 244.
 κτάσθαι 13.
 κτέαρ 107 (2).
 κτέρα 107 (3).
 κτεριούσι 63, 64.
 κτέωμεν 80.
 κτίμενος 13.
 κυανοχαίτα 96.
 κυδάνει 47.
 κυδιάνειρα 124 β, 126,
 App. p. 400.
 κυδιῶν 60.
 κύδιστος 121.
 κύθε 31 (4).
 κυκειῶ 107.
 κύντερος 122.
 κύκλα 99*.
 κυκλόσθε 109.
 κυνάμνια 124 ε.
 Κύπριδα, Κύπριν 97.
 κύρσας 39 (3).
 κύων 106 (2).
- κῶας 107 (3), 114.
 λᾶας, λᾶαν 107 (5).
 λαβέσθε 87 (4).
 λαβέτην (2 Du.) 5.
 λάε 31 (1), 32.
 λάθε 31 (1).
 λαθικηδής 124 δ, 126.
 λάιγγες 117.
 λαιός 114.
 λαῖτμα 114.
 λάκε 31 (1).
 λαμπετόωντι 60.
 λανθανόμην 47.
 Λαοδάμα 92.
 λαός App. F (4).
 λᾶος &c. 107 (5).
 λαρῶτατος App. p. 399.
 λαφύσσετον (3 Du.) 5.
 λείαινα 114.
 λέβηθς 114.
 λέγε 29 (6).
 λείβειν 29 (2).
 λείπει 29 (2).
 λειστός, ληϊστός 384.
 Λειῶδης App. F (4).
 Λειῶκριτος App. F (4).
 λέκτο 40.
 λελαβέσθαι 36 (1).
 λελακυία 22 (1).
 λέλασται 22 (1).
 λελάχητε 36 (5).
 λέλειπται 25 (2).
 λελείψεται 65.
 λεληκώς 22 (1), 26 (2),
 28.
 λελημένος 28.
 λελόγγασι 5, 7, 22 (7).
 λέλοιπα 22 (4), 28.
 λέλυνται 5.
 λελύτο 83 (1).
 λέξεο 41.
 λέξο 40.
 Λεοντεύς 129.
 λεπταλέος 118.
 λεχποίη 124 δ.
- λήγει 29 (1).
 ληθάνει 47.
 λήθομαι 29 (1).
 ληϊσσομαι 63.
 Ληϊτός 129, App. F (4).
 λίγα 110.
 λίην 136 (2), 384.
 λικριφίς 109.
 λιλαιαί 51 (2).
 λίπα 110.
 λίσ 371, 372.
 λίσσομαι 53, 371.
 λιτέσθαι 31 (3).
 λοιγός 115 (1).
 λοῦσθαι 11, 29.
 λυσιμελής 124 ε.
 λύθη 43, 44.
 λύτο 13.
 λύω 51 (4).
 λύων 121.
- μάθον 31 (6).
 μαῖα 92.
 μαίεσθαι 51 (2).
 μαιμαίε 55 (6), 61.
 μάκαρ 114.
 μακῶν 31 (1).
 μάλα 110.
 μάν (use) 342, 343.
 μάντις 116 (3).
 μαρμαίροντες 61.
 μάρναο 5, 17.
 μᾶσσεται 63.
 μᾶστιε 51 (1).
 μαχεῖται 63.
 μαχειόμενος 51 (3).
 μαχήσατο } 63.
 μαχήσομαι }
 μάψ 110.
 με 97.
 μέγαρον, μέγας 371.
 Μέγην 97.
 μέδοτον 31 (2).
 μεθειίς, μεθειί 18.
 μεθίησι 81.
 μεθῶμεν 81.

- μέλας 114.
 Μελέαργος 124.
 μέλι 107 (2).
 μέλλω (usc) 238.
 μέλπεσθαι 29 (4).
 μεμάασι }
 μέμασαν } 7, 68.
 μεμακνία 22 (1).
 μεμᾶοτε, μεμαῶτε 26 (1).
 μέματε 22 (7), 28.
 μέμβλεται, μέμβλετο 27.
 μέμβλωκε 22 (9).
 μεμηκῶς 22 (1), 26 (2),
 28.
 μέμηλε 22 (2), 28.
 μεμνέωτο 27.
 μεμνήσομαι 64.
 μεμνώμεθα 81.
 μέμονα 22 (7).
 μέμυκε 22 (9), 28.
 μέν (use) 257 (1), 259
 (2), 265 (2), 342, 345.
 μενε- 124 *d.*
 μενοεικής 124.
 μενοινήσει 55.
 μενοινῶω 55 *a.*
 Μέντης, Μέντωρ 129.
 μένω 29 (5).
 μέριμνα 114.
 μέσσατος 121.
 μεσσηγύ(ς) 110.
 μέσφα 109.
 μέτα 180.
 μετάβηθι 13.
 μεταπανόμενοι 193.
 μετεῖω 80.
 μέχρι(ς) 110.
 μή (use) 278, 281, 303,
 316, 328, 358-361.
 μηδέν 356.
 Μηδεσικάστη 124 *f.*
 μήδεται 29 (1).
 μήν 342, 344.
 μήνιε 51 (1).
 μήρα 99*.
 μητέρι, μητέρος 106 (1).
 μήτηρ 111, 115 (6).
 μητίετα 96.
 μητρο- 124 *a.*
 μία, μιῆς 111.
 μαιφόνος 124 *b.*
 μιάνθην 5, 40.
 μιγάζομαι App. p. 397.
 μιγέωσι 80.
 μιγήσεσθαι 65.
 μίκτο 40.
 μιμνάζω App. p. 397.
 μιμνήσκειται 48.
 μίμνω 35.
 μισγάγκεια 124 *d.*
 μίσγον 48.
 μνάα, μνάασθε 55 *a.*
 μνησθῆναι 44.
 μνησώμεθα 82.
 μνωόμενοι 55 *a.*
 μόγις 110.
 μοιρηγενής 124 *a.*
 μοῦνος 384 (2).
 Μοῦσα 243 (1).
 μῦθαι, μυθεΐαι 5.
 μῦθος 136 (3).
 μυχοΐατος 121.
 ναιετᾶω 55 (6), 60.
 ναιετᾶωσα 55, 60.
 ναίω 51 (2).
 νάσθη 44.
 Ναυσικάα 95, 106 (4),
 124 *f.*, App. F (3).
 ναυσικλυτός 106 (4),
 124 *f.*
 ναυτίλεται 82.
 ναῦφιν 106 (4), 156.
 νεάτος 121.
 νεήλυδες 125.
 νεηνίης 116 (2).
 νεήφατος 124 *f.*
 νεΐαι 5.
 νεικεΐω 51 (3).
 νέκυσσι 102.
 νέμει 29 (5).
 νέομαι 29 (6).
 Νεοπόλεμος 126.
 νεός, &c., 94 (1), 384(1).
 νεῦον 29 (3).
 νεῦρα App. p. 398.
 νευστάζω App. p. 397.
 νεφεληγερέτα 96.
 νήϊδα 125 (1).
 νηλέα }
 νηλεί } 105 (4).
 νηῦς 94 (1).
 νίζω 46.
 νίπτεσθαι 46.
 νίσομαι 35.
 νίφω 29 (2).
 νομός 115 (1).
 νόσφι 109.
 νυ, νυν 351.
 νύκτωρ 114*.
 νύμφᾶ 92, App. F (3).
 νῶϊν 103.
 ξεῖνος 384 (2).
 ξύμβληντο 5.
 ξύμβληται 88.
 ξυμβλήτην 13, 14.
 ὀγδύατος 121.
 ὀγδοος 130.
 ὀδάξ 110.
 ὀ 133, ὀδε 249.
 ὀδοιπόρος 124 *f.*
 ὀδώδει 22 (3).
 ὀδωδῆ 114.
 ὀδῶδυσται 23 (3).
 ὀθομαι 30.
 ὀϊγννμι 17, 67, 392.
 οἶδα 22 (4), 23 (5), 390.
 οἰδάνει 47.
 οἶδας 5, 24.
 οἶσει 102.
 οἶζύω 51 (4).
 οἶκοι 99.
 οἶκος 390.
 οἶμαι 11.
 Οἶνεύς 129.
 οἶνοβαρείων 51 (3).

- οἰνοποτάζων 60.
οἶνος 390.
οἶον (Adv.) 267 (3).
οἶός, οἶων 378* g.
οἰσόμεναι, οἴσετε 41, 326
(2).
οἴσθα 5.
ὀκνείω 51 (3), 393.
ὀκρυόεις 98.
ὀκτάκνημος 130 (5).
ὀκτώ 130 (4).
ὀλεῖται 63.
ὀλέκω 45.
ὀλέσθαι 31 (5).
ὀλέσσαι 39 (2).
ὀλέσσει 63.
ὀλιγηπελών 124 f.
ὄλισθε 31 (3).
ὄλλυμι 17.
ὄλοοῖτροχος 124 f.
ὄλωλε 22 (3), 28.
ὄμαρτήτην 19.
ὄμνέτω 18.
ὄμνυμι 17.
ὄμοῖο 98.
ὄμόσαι 39 (2).
ὄμουμαι 63, 66.
ὄμφή 393.
ὄναιο 87 (3).
ὄνειαρ 107 (2), 114.
ὄνείρατα 107 (2).
ὄνήμενος 13, 16, 86,
243 (1).
ὄνησο 5, 13.
ὄννησι 16, 393.
ὄνοιτο 87 (3).
ὄνομάκλυτος 124 e.
ὄνοσαι 5, 11, 39 (2).
ὄνόσεται 63.
ὄο, ὄον 98.
ὄπάσσομεν 63.
ὄπατρας 125 (2).
ὄπιδα, ὄπιν 97.
ὄπίσσω 110.
ὄπλεσθαι 32.
ὄπλοτεροι 122.
ὄποτε 289, 308.
ὄππ- 108 (2).
ὄπταλέος 118.
ὄπυι 51 (4), 393.
ὄπωπα 22 (3), 23, 28.
ὄπωπή 114.
ὄπωρινός 117.
ὄπως 285, 306, 326 (3).
ὄργυια 114.
ὄρεγνύς 17.
ὄρεσίτροφος 124 f.
ὄρέστερος 122.
ὄρέστης 129.
ὄρεσφι 154, 157, 158
(5).
ὄρηαι }
ὄρητο } 378* b.
ὄρθαι, ὄρμενος 40.
ὄρνηθι 17.
ὄρνηον 18.
ὄρονται 30, 393.
ὄρόω 55 b.
ὄρσο 41.
ὄρσητε 82.
ὄρσο 40.
ὄρσουσα 63.
ὄρσωμεν 82.
ὄρφανικός 117.
ὄρωρε 22 (3), 28.
ὄρώρει 22 (3).
ὄρώρεται 27.
ὄρώρηται 27.
ὄρωρέχεται 23 (3), 24
(2), 28.
ὄσσα 393.
ὄσσε, ὄσσοισι 107 (1).
ὄσσομαι 53.
ὄστεόφιν 154, 158 (3).
ὄταν (ὄτ' ἄν) 289 (2) a.
ὄτε 289, 308.
ὄτέοισι 108.
ὄτι 133, 269, 270.
ὄτινα 108.
ὄυ 276, 300, 316, 355-
357, 360.
ὄυδus 107 (3), 114.
ὄυδει 105 (1).
ὄυδέν 133, 356.
ὄυδενόσωρος 124 f.
ὄυκαλέγων 125 (3).
ὄυθαρ 107 (2).
ὄυκί, see οὔ.
ὄυλόμενος 86, 243 (1).
ὄυλος 114.
ὄυν 349.
ὄυνεκα 268.
ὄυς 107 (2).
ὄυτα 13, 392.
ὄυται 55 (10).
ὄυτάμεναι }
ὄυτάμενος } 13.
ὄυτιδανός 118.
ὄυτος 251.
ὄυτω 110.
ὄφείλω 53.
ὄφέλλει 39 (3).
ὄφρα 273, 287, 307.
ὄχεσφι 154, 158 (5).
ὄχθέω 393.
ὄχλος 393.
ὄχος 114, 393.
ὄψ 393.
ὄψει 5.
ὄψειντες 59.
παιδοφόνος 124 a.
παίδων 111.
παιφάσσω 61.
πάλαι 99.
παλαιότερος 121.
παλαιάφατος 124 f.
παλιμπλαγθέντας } 125
παλινώμενος } (6).
πάλιν 110.
παλιώξις 125 (7).
πάλτο 40.
παμφαίνων 61.
πάντη 110, App. p. 398.
πάντοσε 109.
πάππα 92.
παπταίνων 61.
πάρα 180.

παραβλῶπες 128 (3).
 παραπλήγας 128 (3).
 παραφθαίησι 51 (2), 83.
 παρειά App. p. 398.
 παρείθη 67.
 παρείπη 396 η.
 παρελάσσεις 63.
 παρέξ 227.
 παρέχη 384 (1), 397.
 παρθενική 117.
 παροίτεροι 121.
 πάρος 236.
 παρώχηται 22 (9).
 πάσαις 102.
 πασίμην 39 (1).
 Πασιθέη 124 f.
 πασιμέλουσα 125 (6).
 πάσων 121.
 πάσχω 48.
 πατέρος, πατρός 106 (1).
 πατρο- 124 α.
 Πατρόκλεες }
 Πατροκλήα } 105 (5).
 Πατροκλήος }
 Πάτροκλος 129.
 παυσωλή 120.
 παύσωμεν }
 παυσώμεσθα } 82.
 παφλάζοντα 61.
 πεζός 114.
 πείθω 29 (2).
 πείκετε 29 (2).
 πεινών 19, 55 (8), App.
 F (4).
 πεινήμενοι 19.
 πείραρ 107 (2).
 πειρηθήτων 81.
 Πειρίθοος 124.
 Πεισίστρατος 124 c.
 πείσομαι 63.
 πέλας 110.
 Πελασγικός 117.
 πελάσσετον 41.
 πέλει 29 (4), 33.
 πελέκεσσι 102.
 πέλωρ 114*.

πεμπώβολον 125 (8).
 πέμψωμεν 82.
 πένεσθαι 29 (5).
 πενθείετον 51 (3).
 πενθήμενοι 19.
 πένθος 114.
 πενήη 114.
 πεντάτες 130.
 πένταχα 109.
 πεπαθῦα 22 (7).
 πεπαρμένος 22 (6).
 πέπασθε 22 (7), 28.
 πεπάσμην 22 (1).
 πέπηγε 22 (1).
 πεπιθήσω 65.
 πεπίθοιμεν 36 (2).
 πέπληγον 27, 68.
 πεπληγῦα 26 (3), 28.
 πεπληγώς 22 (1), 27, 28.
 πεπλημένος 22 (9).
 πέπνυται 22 (7), 28.
 πέποιθα 22 (4).
 πεποίθασι 7, 24.
 πεποίθεα 68.
 πεποίθης, πεποίθοιμεν 80.
 πεποιθώς 26 (2).
 πέπονθα 22 (7).
 πέποσθε 22 (5).
 πεποτήαται 28.
 πεπρωμένος 22 (9).
 πέπτανται 23.
 πεπτηῦα 26 (3).
 πεπτηώς 14, 26 (1), 28.
 πεπύθοιτο 36 (3).
 πέπυσμαι 22 (5).
 περ 353, 365 (1).
 περάαν 63.
 πέραον 55 (10).
 περάσθητε 82.
 πέρθαι 40.
 πέρθετο 29 (4).
 πέρι 180.
 περιδόμεθον 5, 81, 188.
 περιπλομένων 33, 243(1).
 περνάς 17.
 Περσεύς 129.

Περσεφόνηα 124 d, 129.
 πεσέονται 64, 66.
 πέσσω 46, 53.
 πετηνός 117.
 πέτεται 29 (6).
 πέτεσθον (3 Du.) 5.
 Πετέω 98.
 πέυθομαι 29 (3), 72 (4).
 πέφαται 22 (7).
 πεφεύγει 27, 68.
 πεφεύγοι 27, 83.
 πεφευγώς 22 (5), 28.
 πεφήσειαι 65.
 πεφήσεται 65.
 πεφιδέσθαι 36 (2).
 πεφιδήσεται 65.
 πέφραδε 36 (4).
 πεφρικῦα 22 (6), 26 (3).
 πεφύασι 7, 22 (9) α.
 πεφυγμένος 22 (5), 28.
 πεφυζότες 26 (5).
 πέφυκα 22 (9) α, 28.
 πεφύκῃσι 5, 7.
 πεφύκη 80, 283.
 πεφυλαγμένος 28.
 πεφυῶτε 26 (1).
 πηγεσίμαλλος 124 c.
 πίαρ, πείρα 114.
 πίρησθα 82.
 πίθεσθε (πιθέσθε) 87 (4).
 πίλναται 17.
 πιμπλάνεται 47.
 πιμπλάσι 16.
 πίομενα 59.
 πίπτω 35.
 πίσυρες 130 (3), App.
 F (3).
 πίτνα 18.
 πίτυσσι 102.
 πifaύσκω 48.
 πίων 114.
 πλέας, πλέες 121, App.
 F (3).
 πλείων 29 (3), 51 (3).
 πλευρά App. p. 398.
 πλέων 29 (3), 396.

πλήξιππος 124 *c*.
 πλησίστιος 124 *c*.
 πλήσσω 53.
 πλήτο 13, 14.
 πνέει, 29 (3).
 πνεΐει 51 (3).
 ποδάνιπτρον 124 *f*.
 ποδηεκής 125 (8).
 ποδήνεμος 125 (8), 126.
 πόθεσαν 39 (2).
 ποθήμεναι 19.
 πολέας 100.
 πόλεος 94 (2).
 πολέεσι 102.
 πόληος, &c., 94 (2).
 πόλι 94 (2), 99.
 πόλιος }
 πόλιος } 378.
 πόλις 94 (2), 100.
 Πολίτης 129.
 πολλός 107.
 Πόλυβος 129.
 πολυήρατος 125 (8).
 πολυνάμων App. F (3).
 πολὺς 100.
 πόρκης 116 (2).
 πόρφυρε 61.
 πόσε 109.
 πόσεϊ 94 (2).
 πουλὺς 116.
 πρέσβα 110.
 πρήσσω 53.
 πρίατο 13.
 πρίν 236, 297, 310, 354,
 App. p. 401.
 προβέβουλα 22 (3), 25
 (3), 28.
 προβλωσκέμεν 48.
 πρόσες 5.
 προΐει, προΐειν 18.
 πρόμος 121.
 προσαρήρεται 80.
 προσανδήτην 19.
 πρόσσω 110.
 προσώπατα 107 (2).
 προτέρω 110.

πρότιθεν 5.
 πρόφρασσα 114* (5).
 προφύγοισθα 5.
 Πρωτεσίλαος 124 *c*.
 Πρωτεύς 129.
 πρώτιστος }
 πρώτος } 121.
 πτήται 81.
 πτολίπορθος 128 (1).
 πτύσσω 53.
 πτωσκάζω App. p. 397.
 πτώσσω 53.
 πυθμήν 114.
 πυθόμην 31 (4).
 πύκα 110.
 πυκιμηδής 124 *b*.
 πύλαι 171.
 Πυλογενής 124 *f*.
 πύματος 121.
 πυνθάνομαι 47.
 πύξ 110.
 πυρηφόρος 124 *a*.
 πυρικής 124 *f*.
 πυρικάστος 124 *e*.
 Πυριφλεγέθων 124 *e*, 125
 (3).
 πάλει 378* *b*.
 πατάομαι 55 (9).
 ράβδος 114.
 ράπτειν 46.
 ράσσετε 39 (1).
 ρέα, ρεία 110, 395.
 ρέει 29 (3).
 ρέζω 395.
 'Ρεία 95, App. F (4).
 ρέπε 29 (4).
 ρερυπωμένα 23 (2).
 ρηγμίν 114.
 ρηγνύσι 17, 395.
 ρήξήνωρ 124 *c*.
 ρήτός 395.
 ρίγέω 395.
 ρίγιον, ρίγιστα 121.
 ρίζα 29 (4).
 ρίμφα 110.

ρίνος 395.
 ριπτάζω App. p. 397.
 ρίπτω 395.
 ρύεται, ρύετο 18.
 ρήη 44.
 ρυπόωντα 55 *c*.
 ρύσθαι 12, 14.
 ρυσίπτολις 124 *c*.
 ρυτός 14, 395.
 σαπήη 80.
 σάφα 110.
 σάω 19.
 σβέννυμι 17.
 σβέσαι 39 (1).
 σέ 97.
 σέθεν 109.
 σείο, σέο, σεῦ 98, 378*.
 σέλα, σέλαι 99.
 σέσηπε 22 (1), 23.
 σήπεται 29 (1).
 Σθένελος 129.
 σῖγα 110.
 Σκάμανδρος 370.
 σκέπτεο 46.
 σκίδνεται 17.
 σόςος 55.
 σόφς, σόφ 55, 81, 83, 285.
 σπάσατο 39 (1).
 σπείους, σπηῖ 105 (5),
 App. C.
 σπένδων 29 (5).
 σπέρχουσι 29 (4).
 σπέεσι, σπήεσι 105 (5).
 σπεύδειν 29 (3).
 σταίησαν 83.
 στέαρ 107 (2).
 στείβον 29 (2).
 στείχειν 29 (2).
 στένει 29 (5).
 στεροπηγερέτα 96.
 στεύται 11.
 στέωμεν 80.
 στήη, στήομεν, &c., 80.
 στήθεσφι 154.
 στήτην, &c., 13.

στορέσαι 39 (2).
 στόρνυμι 17.
 στρέφει 29 (4).
 στροφάλιγξ 117.
 στρωφάω 55 (9).
 συλήτην 19.
 συμβλήσει 326 (1).
 συναντήτην 19.
 συνεχές 384 (2), 397.
 συνοχωκότε 22 (2), 28.
 συνώμεθα 81.
 σύριγξ 117.
 σφέ, σφέας, σφᾶς 100.
 σφείων, σφέων, σφῶν,
 101.
 σφέλα 105 (4).
 σφί(ν), σφίσι(ν) 102.
 σφωέ, σφωῖν 103.
 σφῶϊ, σφῶϊν, σφῶ
 103.
 σχεδῖην 110.
 σχετλή 378.
 σχήσω 14.
 σχίζα 114.
 σώοντες 55.
 τάθη 43.
 ταλα- 124 *d*.
 ταλαίπωρος 124 *b*.
 τάλας 114.
 ταλασίφρων 124 *c*.
 ταλαύρινος 124 *d*.
 ταμεσίχως 124 *c*.
 ταμίη, ταμίης 114, 116
 (2).
 τάμυε 47.
 τανυ- 124 *d*.
 τανυσίπτερος 124 *c*.
 τάνυται 17.
 τανύω 18, 63.
 ταρ 332, App. p. 402.
 τάρπημεν 42.
 ταρπώμεθα 31 (5).
 ταρφειαί 111.
 τάρφθη 43.
 τάχα 110.

τε 263, 266, 269, 270,
 272, 331, 332.
 τεθαλυία, τεθήλει 21 (1).
 τεθαρσήκασι 22 (9), 24.
 τέθηπα 22 (1), 28.
 τεθνᾶσι, τέθνασαν 7, 68.
 τεθνήκασι 22 (9), 24.
 τεθνηυία 26 (3).
 τεθνηώς 26 (1), App. C.
 τεῖν 99.
 τείρεα 107 (3).
 Τειρεσίας 116 (2), 129.
 τειχεσιπλήτα 124 *f*.
 τέκμωρ 114*.
 τέλειον 51 (3).
 τελέω 63, 378 *c*.
 τέμει 29 (5).
 τέμενος 114.
 τένων 114, 243 (1).
 τέξεσθαι 66.
 τεοῖο 98.
 τέρην 115 (6).
 τέρπειν 29 (4).
 τερπικέραυτος 124, 126.
 τερπωλή 120.
 τερσήμεναι 19, 42.
 τερψίμβροτος 124 *c*.
 τεσσαράβιοις 130 (3).
 τεταγών 36 (1).
 τετάρπετο 36 (4).
 τέταται 22 (7).
 τετεύξεται 65.
 τετεύχεται 7, 22 (5).
 τέτηκα 22 (1), 28.
 τετιηότες 22 (9), 28.
 τέτληκα 22 (9), 28.
 τετράορος App. F (4).
 τέτραπτο 22 (6).
 τέτρατος 130 (3).
 τετράφατο 24 (2), 28.
 τετραχθά 109.
 τετρήχει 22 (1), 28.
 τετρηχυῖα 26 (3).
 τετριγυῖα 22 (6), 26 (3).
 τετριγῶτας 26 (1), 28.
 τέτροφε 22 (6), 28.

τέττα 92.
 τετύκοντο 36 (3).
 τέτυκται 22 (5), 28.
 τετύχηκε 22 (9).
 τετυχηκώς 26 (4).
 τεῦ, τευ 378 *e*.
 τηλεθώσα 60, 125 (8).
 τηλοῦ 110.
 τί 133.
 τιθεῖ, τίθει 18.
 τιθεῖσι 5, 87 (2).
 τιθήμεναι }
 τιθήμενος } 16, 20.
 τίθησθα 5, 16.
 τίθησι 16.
 τίκτω 35.
 τίνα, &c., 108 (2).
 τίνυνται 47.
 τίνω 17.
 τίς 108 (2), 248.
 τιτύσκετο 48.
 τίω 51 (1), 384 (1).
 Τληπόλεμος 126.
 τλήτε, τλήτω 13.
 τό 133, 262.
 τοιγάρ 346.
 τοῖσδεσι 108 (3).
 τράπεζα 130 (3).
 τραπήομεν 42, 80.
 τράφη 42.
 τραφθῆναι 43.
 τρεῖ 29 (6).
 τρέπε 29 (4).
 τρέσσαι 39 (1).
 τρέφει 29 (4).
 τριβέμεναι 29 (4).
 τριηκόσιοι 125 (8).
 τριστοιχίαι 110.
 τρίτατος 121.
 τρίχα, τριχθά 109.
 τρόπεον 55 (10).
 τρόφις 114, 116.
 τρυφάλεια 130.
 τρύχουσι 29.
 τρώγειν 29.
 Τρωϊκός 117.

- τρωπῶα 55 (9).
 τρώσῃτε 82.
 τρωχῶα 55 (9).
 Τρώων 111.
 τύγχανε 47.
 τύπτε 46.
 τυτθά, τυτθόν 134.
 τύχε 31 (4).
 ὑββάλλειν App. F (2).
 ὑγιής 116 (5), App. p. 399.
 ὑδατοτρεφῆς 124 a.
 ὕδωρ 107 (2), 114*.
 υἱός 107 (5).
 ὑλαίε 55 (6).
 ὕλαον 55 (10).
 ὑμέας 100.
 ὑμείων, ὑμέων 101.
 ὑμῖν, ὕμιν, ὕμι(ν) 102.
 ὕμμε 97, 100, App. F (2).
 ὑπαί 180.
 ὕπατος 121.
 ὑπείξομαι 396 n.
 ὑπείρ 180.
 ὑπεμνήμυκε 22 (9).
 ὑπέξ 227.
 ὕπερ 180.
 ὑπέρβασαν 13.
 ὑπερδέα 105 (4).
 ὑπερήφανος 124 a.
 ὑπέρτερος 121.
 ὑπνώοντες 19, 58.
 ὕπο 180.
 ὑπολιζονες 121.
 ὑπώρεια 125 (8).
 ὑπωρόφιος 125 (8).
 ὕσμῖνι 107 (1), 114.
 ὑψαγόρη 92.
 ὕψηλός 120.
 ὕψι, ὕψου 110.
 φαάνθη 55.
 φάγον 31 (1).
 φάε 31 (1), 32.
 φαεσίμβροτος 124 c.
 φαθί, φαμέν, &c., 12, 87 (1).
 φάμεν, φάο, &c., 12.
 φάνεσκε 49.
 φανῆ 81.
 φανῆη 80.
 φάνηθι 5.
 φάσκε 48.
 φάτις 114.
 Φεία 95.
 φεῖδεο 29 (2).
 φειδολή 120.
 Φέρεκλος 124, 129.
 φερέσβιος 124 c.
 φέρτε 11.
 φέρτερος 121.
 φεύγω 29 (3).
 φῆ 81.
 φῆη 80.
 φημί 11, 12, 70, 87 (1).
 φῆμυς 114.
 φῆς 12, 87 (1).
 φῆσθα, φῆσθα 5.
 φθαίω 51 (2).
 φθάμενος 13.
 φθάν 5.
 φθάνει 47.
 φθέγγεο 29 (5).
 φθέωσι 80.
 φθῆη 80.
 φθῆσι 81.
 φθίεται, φθιόμεσθα 80.
 φθίης 285 (2).
 Φθίηφι 157.
 φθίνω 47.
 φθισήνωρ 124 c.
 φθισίμβροτος 124 c.
 φθίτο 83 (1).
 φθίω 51 (1).
 φιλήμεναι 19.
 φιλήρετμος 125 (8).
 φιλοίη 83.
 φιλοπτόλεμος 126.
 φίλτερος 121.
 φοιτήτην 19.
 φορήμεναι }
 φορήναι } 19, 85.
 φόρμυξ 117.
 φοροῖη 83.
 φόως 55 (10) *footn.*
 φόρτις 116 (3).
 φραδέος 116 (5).
 φρασί 106 (3).
 φράσσομαι 63.
 φρεῖαρ 107 (2).
 φρήτρηφω 158.
 φρόνις 114.
 φύγον 31 (4).
 φυγοπτόλεμος 126.
 φύζα 114.
 φυλάκους 107.
 φύξιλις 120.
 φύρσω 39 (3).
 φυσίζους 124 c.
 φύω 51 (4).
 χαλέπτει 46.
 χαλίφρων 124 b.
 χαμάδις 109.
 χαμαί 99.
 χαμαιεύνης 124 f.
 χάριν 136 (4).
 χάρις 107 (2).
 χάσσατο 39 (1).
 χέει 29 (3).
 χείρεσι 102.
 χειρότερος 121.
 χεῖσεται 63.
 χεῖω 51 (3).
 χερείοτερος 121.
 χέρηα 121.
 Χερσιδάμας 124 f.
 χῆμεις 377.
 χήρατο 39 (3).
 χθές 110.
 χοροιτυπή 124 f.
 χρίον 29 (4).
 χρώμαδος 114.
 χρώς 107 (2).
 χύτο 13.
 χωρίς 110.

ψευδάγγελος 124 *d*.
 ψευδέσει 116 (5).
 ψεύδονται 29 (3).

ὦδε 108, 110.
 ὠδύσατο 39 (1).
 ὠθέω 393.
 ὠἴγγυντο 17.
 ὠἶξα 67.
 ὠίσθη 44.
 ὠκα 110.
 ὠκός 114.

ὠλεσίκαρπος 124 *c*, 125.
 ὠλετο 31 (5).
 ὠμνυε 18.
 ὠνατο 11.
 ὠνος 393.
 ὠνοσάμην 78.
 ὠπα 107 (2).
 ὠρείθνια 125 (8).
 ὠρετο 31 (4).
 ὠριστος 377.
 ὠρμήθη 44.
 ὠρσα 39 (3), 40.

ὠρτο 40.
 ὠς (Demonstr.) 265.
 ὠς 375 (1), 397; (use)
 235, 267, 285, 306.
 ὠς εἰ 295, 312.
 ὠσασκε 49.
 ὠσι 81.
 ὠσί 107 (2).
 ὠς τε 235, 285 (3) *a*.
 ὠυτός 377.
 ὠφελον } 33.
 ὠφελλον }

POST-HOMERIC FORMS

(including Hesiodic, Ionic and Attic forms quoted.)

αἶνμη 12.
 αισθέσθαι 32 (2), 34.
 αἰῶ (Acc.) 107.
 ἀμαρτίνοος 126.
 ἀνδράποδον 107 (1).
 ἄνωγμεν 25 (1).
 ἀπέφατο 13.
 ἄρα 347.
 ἀρήρεται (Subj.) 80.
 ἀρηρυία 26 (3).
 βάθος 114.
 βεβρωτες 26 (4).
 βλαστέιν 34.
 γεγονώς 26 (4).
 γούν 349.
 δέδοιγμεν 25 (1).
 δῆθεν, δῆτα 350.
 διδάσι 7.
 δικεῖν 34.
 ἐαυτῇ 108.
 ἔδον (2 Aor.) 7, 15.
 ἔθεν (2 Aor.) 7, 15.
 εἰ (2 Sing.) 5.
 εἴληφα 23 (2).
 εἴξασι 7 (3).
 εἴτα 318.

ἐκεῖ 109.
 ἔοιγμεν 25 (1).
 ἐπέφυκον 68 (1).
 ἐπίσχε 88.
 ἐρήρισται 23 (3).
 ἔρρωγα 22 (1).
 ἔρσην App. F (*f*).
 ἔρωτα (Acc.) 107.
 ἐτεύχθην 43.
 ἔχθομαι 31 (7).
 ἦν (1 Sing.) 12.
 ἦς, ἦστε 12.
 θιγεῖν 34.
 ἱκτο 40.
 ἴλαμαι 16.
 καίτοι 346.
 κανεῖν 34.
 κἄλός App. F (*h*).
 κέκοφα 24 (2).
 κέκραγα 28, 31 (1).
 κεκρύφαται 24 (2).
 κέκτημαι 23 (2).
 κλύω 31 (4).
 κρύφα 110.
 κτίννυμι 17.

μέντοι 346.
 μηδέις 356.
 οἶδαμεν, οἶδασι 24 (1).
 ὄμως 337.
 ὄσσοισι 107 (1).
 πάθος 114.
 πίθι 32 (1).
 πίνω 17.
 πλέως 384.
 πόλεως 94 (2).
 σχές 5.
 τανύπτερος 126.
 τεθληνία 26 (3).
 τεθηκώς 26 (4).
 Τερψιχόρη 124 *c*.
 τέτοκα 22 (8).
 τιθέασι 7.
 τοῖνον 346.
 ὑμνεῖω 51 (3).
 φερέοικος 124 *d*.
 φερεσσακῆς 124 *f*.
 φρασί 106 (3).
 χρέα 105 (4).
 ὦν (οὖν) App. F (*f*).
 ὠς (Prep.) 228.

INDEX II.

OF SUBJECTS.

N.B.—The figures refer to the *sections*.

- Ablative**: the Ending -ως 110, 160 : Ablative Genitive 146, 152, 153 : with Prepositions 178, cp. *περί* 188 (1), *παρά* 192, *ὑπό* 204 (1), (3), *ἀνά* 209, *κατά* 213 (1), *ὑπέρ* 219, *ἐξ* 223, *ἀπό* 224, *πρό* 225 : -φι(ν) 156 : -θεν 159.
- Accentuation**: the Verb 87 : Compound Verbs 88 : Inf. and Part. 89 : Nom. Sing. in -ᾶ 96 : Acc. in -ιν 97 : Case-forms 111 : the Vocative 112 : Primary Nouns 115 : Compounds 128 : Prepositions 180 : the Reflexive Pronoun 253 (2) : *ἀνυῶ*, *ἐρυνῶ* (Fut.) 64 : -δε 335 : *ἐπειή*, *τιή* or *τίη* 339 : *ἡέ*—*ἦε* 340.
- Accusative**: Singular 97 : Plural 100 : Adverbial 110, 133-6 : in Compounds 124 *f.* : Internal Object 132 *ff.* : 'part affected' 137, 139 (3) : Time and Space 138 : with Adjectives 139 : External Object 140 : Acc. *de quo* 140 (3), 237 (2), 245 (2) : of the *terminus ad quem* 140 (4) : Double Acc. 141 : Whole and Part 141 : with Prepositions 178 : with *παρέξ* 227 : with the Infinitive 237, cp. 240 : with a Participle 245 : *ὄ*, *ὄτι*, *ὄ τε* 269, 270 : with -δε 335.
- Adjective** 165 : Adverbial uses 134 : predicative 162 : Gender 166 : Participle 243 : the Article with Adjectives 260 : in -ύς 116 (4) : in -ης 116 (5) : in -ειος, -πος, -ιμος, -ινος, -εις, -ικός 117 : -αλέος, -άλμιος, -εινός (-εινός), -διος, -δανος 118 : Comparison of Adjectives 121, 122.
- Adverbs** 90 : Adverbial Suffixes 109, 110, 160 : use of Neuter Pronouns 133 : Neuter Adjectives 134, 139 (1) : other Accusatives 135-139 : -θεν 159 : -ως 160 : -ως in the Predicate 162 (5) *a* : adverbial use of Prepositions 175, 176 : see esp. *ἀμφί*, *πέρι*, *πάρα*, *μέτα*, *ἔπι*, *ὑπο*, *πρότι*, *ἀνά*, *ἐν*, *πρό*, and cp. 227 : Relative Adverbs 267 : *ὄ*, *δοι*, *ὄ τε* 269, 270.
- Æolic**: Verbs in -μι 12, 19 : Opt. in -σεια 83 (3) : Opt. in -φην, -οιην 19, 83 : Nom. Sing. Masc. in -ᾶ 96 : *ἄορ*, *ἦτορ* 114 : *κεν* 364 : *ν* for *φ* 404 : Fick's Theory, App. p. 486 *ff.* *πίσυρες* 130 (3) : *ἄβροτάζομεν* App. p. 402.
- Anacoluthon** 163, 243 (3) *a*, 353.
- Anaphoric Pronouns** 247 : *ὄδε* 249 : *κεῖνος* 250 : *οὗτος* 251 : *αὐτός* 252 : *ἔο*, &c. 253 : *ὄ ἢ τό* 256.
- Antecedent to Relative**: definite 262 : omitted 267 (2), (3) : attracted by the Rel. 267 (4) : attracting the Rel. 267 (5) : *τό* 269.
- Aorist** 13-15 : Thematic 31-34 : Reduplicated 36 : in -ᾶ 37 : Sigmatic or Weak 39, 40 : in -σε (ο) 41 : in -ην 42 : in -θην 43 : meaning 21, 44, 75-8, cp. 298 : Aor. Inf. after *πρίν* and *πάρος* 236.
- Apocope of Prepositions** 180*.
- Apodosis**: Ellipse of 324*, *δέ* in apodosis 334.
- Archaic forms**: in Composition 124 *b* : Gen. in -οιο 149 : in -οο 98, 368 : forms in -φι(ν) 154 : *αὔεμσαν* 337 : false archaism 82, 83, 158 *fin.*, 216.

Aristarchus: 2 Dual in -την 5: Voc. of Κάλχας, &c. 92: Dual 173: Accent of Prepositions 180: Aor. and Fut. Inf. 238: Reflexive Pronoun 255: Subj. after a past tense 298: readings due to loss of *F* 389: *πρότιθεν* 5: *ἦσθα(ς)*, *οἶσθα(ς)* 5: *ἐβήσεται*, *ἐδύσεται* 41: *γε* μάσσεται (γამέσσεται) 63: *ἔδεισα* 67, 394: *βεβλήκοι* 83: *Ῥεῖα* 95, App. F (4): *φυλακούς* 107 (1): *Βιάνωρ* App. F (4): *παρεῖά* App. p. 398.

Aristophanes (Gramm.) 298, 389.

Article, ὁ ἢ τό, 256-264: Articular Infinitive 242 *fin.*

Attraction 239: in Infinitival Clauses 240: of the Relative 267 (4), (5), 271 (1).

Augment 9, 67 (ep. 371), 68, 69, App. p. 402.

Cases 90-112: in Compounds 124 *f.*

Causative or Transitive meaning: the Non-Thematic Present 21: Reduplicated Aorist 36: Verbs in -εω and -οω 58: Future Active 66.

Cause or Reason: Dat. of 144: *ὑπό* c. Gen. 204 (3): *διά* c. Acc. 215: *ὡς* = *ὅτι* *οὕτως*, &c. 267 (3) *a*: Causal Conjunctions 268, 270: Clauses 270*, 273 (1): Particles, *ἄρα* 347, *γάρ* 348.

Comitative sense of the Dative 144: of forms in -φι(ν) 155: see **Instrumental**.

Comparison of Adjectives 121, 122, App. p. 399: Gen. with Comparatives 152.

Concession: Opt. of 299 *d*, 300 *d*.

Condition 273 (3): Conditional Purpose 275: Expectation 300: Protasis, with the Relative 283, 305: with *ὡς*, *ὅπως* 285 (3), 306 (1): *ὄφρα* 287 (2): *ὅτε* 289 (2), 308 (1): *ἐπεὶ* 296, 309: *πρίν* 297, 310: *εἰ* 292, 311, 313, 317, 318, 326 (4): with a Past Indic. 324: with the Future 326 (1): with *γε* 354: *οὐ* and *μή* 316, 359.

Conditional Particles, *κε(ν)* and *ἄν*: in—

Principal Clauses, with the Subj. 275, 276 *b*, the Opt. 300, Secondary Tenses 324, the Fut. Ind. 326 (1).

Final Clauses, with *ὅς* and the Subj. 282, *ὅς* and the Opt. 304 (1) *b*, *ὅς* and the Fut. Ind. 326 (3): *ὡς*, *ὅπως* and the Subj. 285 (2), *ὡς*, *ὅπως* and the Opt. 306 (1): *ἵνα* and the Subj. 286: *ὄφρα* and the Subj. 287 (1), *ὄφρα* and the Opt. 307: *ἕως*, *εἰς* *ὅ* and the Subj. 288, *ἕως*, *εἰς* *ὅ* and the Opt. 307: *ὅτε*, *ὅποτε* and the Subj. 289 (1) *b*: *εἰ* and the Subj. 293.

Object Clauses, with *ὡς*, *ὅπως* and the Subj. 285 (2): *εἰ* and the Subj. 294, *εἰ* and the Opt. 314.

Conditional and Temporal Clauses: with *ὅς* and the Subj. 283 *b*, *ὅς* and the Opt. 305: *ὡς*, *ὅπως* and the Subj. 285 (3) *b*, *ὡς* and the Opt. 306 (1) *fin.*: *ὄφρα* and the Subj. 287 (2): *ἕως*, *εἰς* *ὅ* and the Subj. 288: *ὅτε*, *ὅποτε* and the Subj. 289 (2), *ὅτε* and the Opt. 308 (1) *fin.*, *εἴτε* and the Subj. 290: *ἐπεὶ* and the Subj. 296, *ἐπεὶ* and the Opt. 309: *πρίν* and the Subj. 297: *εἰ* and the Subj. 292 *b*, *εἰ* and the Opt. 313, *εἰ* and the Fut. Ind. 326 (5).

Infinitival Clauses 238.

Conjunctive, see **Subjunctive**.

Contraction 378*: in Non-Thematic Verbs 19: Verbs in -αω, -εω 56: Future 64: Subjunctive 81: Infinitive 85: Nouns 105: Comparatives 107 (4), 378* *f*: words with original *F* 378* *g*, 396.

Correlation 262, 267.

Crisis 377, App. p. 399.

Dative: Singular 99: quantity of -ι 373: Plural 102: Dual 103: accent 111: in Compounds 124 *f*: uses 142-5: forms in -φι(ν) 158: with Prepositions 178, 229 (3): with *ἅμα*, *μίγδα*, *ὁμῶς* 228: with the Infinitive 239: Attraction 240: see also **Infinitive**.

- Deictic Pronouns 247: ὅδε 249: κείνος 250: οὗτος 251: ὁ ἢ τό 261 (2).
- Deliberation: Subj. of 277, 280: Opt. (past) 302.
- Demonstrative Roots 90: Pronouns 247: ὅς, &c. 265: Correlatives 267.
- Denominative Nouns 113: Suffixes 117: Verbs 120.
- Desiderative Verbs 59.
- Diaeresis 367, 382.
- Digamma 388-405: 23, 67, 372, 378* *g*.
- Diminutives not Homeric, 117.
- Dual 173: Endings 5.
- Elision 376: ep. 398 (*F*).
- Ellipse (real or supposed): after Prepositions 177: of the antecedent to a Relative 267 (2), (3): of the Verb to be after a Relative 271: of a Verb of fearing 278 *b*: of a Conditional Apodosis 318-321, 324*.
- Enclitic Verbs (εἰμί, φημί) 87 (1), 88: Pronouns 98, 100, 103: Particles, viz. τε 331, 332, -δε 335, τοι 346, ῥα 347, νυ 351, θην 352, περ 353, γέ 354, κεν 363 *fin.*: order 365.
- End: Inf. 231, 242: Final Clauses 273 (4): Subj. of purpose 275: μή 278, 281 (1), 303 (1): Relative Clauses 282, 304, 322: ὡς, ὅπως, ἵνα 285, 286, 306 (1): ὄφρα, ἕως 287, 288, 307: εἰ 293, 314, 319: Past Tenses 325: Fut. Indic. 326 (3).
- Final, see *End*.
- Frequentative Verbs 60.
- Future in -σω 63: in -σεω 64: from Perfect and Aorist Stems 65: Middle 66: with κεν 326 (1): for the Imperative 326 (2): in Final Clauses 326 (3): in Object Clauses 326 (4): with εἰ 326 (5).
- Gender: of Primary Nouns 116: Denominative Nouns 119: Adjectives 166: Pronouns 167.
- Genitive: Singular 98: Gen. in -οο 98: Plural 101: Dual 103: accent 111: in Compounds 124 *f*: uses 146-153: forms in -φ(ν) 158: with Prepositions 178, 179: Double Prepositions 227: Improper Prepositions 228: Gen. Absolute 246: see *Ablative*.
- Herodian: ἐπίσχοις 83: φῆς 87 (1): ἰσῆσι, &c. 87 (2): δίνωμαι 87 (3): διάθωμαι 88: ἐνίσπες, &c. 88: ἀκάχησθαι, &c. 89: -ας, Dat. -α, 99: ἐπακούσαι (after a past tense) 298: τὰρ 332 (1).
- Hiatus 379-382: proof of loss of *f* 390-393, 401-403: of σ 397.
- Homeric and later Greek:
- A. Differences of form:—ἐσσί, εἰ 5: 2 Sing. -σθα 5: 3 Plur. -εσι, -ουσι, -ῦσι 5: 3 Plur. Pf. -ᾶσι 5: 3 Plur. -ν, -σαν 5: 3 Plur. Mid. -ᾶται, -ᾶτο, 5: 3 Du. Impf. -τον 5: Aorists in -κα 15: Present with -νη, -νυ 17: Non-Thematic Contracted Pres. 19: Variation in Perfect Stem 22: Pf. of Verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω, -νω 22 (9): aspiration in the Pf. 24 (2): Pf. Part. 26: Thematic Aorists 34: Reduplicated Aorists 36: Aorists in -σσα 39: Aorists in -σ 40: Aorists in -σε (-σο) 41: Aorists in -θην 43: Iterative forms 49: Verbs in -ιω, -αιω, -εω, -νω 51: Assimilation 55: Contraction 56, 105, 378*: Synizesis 57, 105 (3), 378: Frequentatives 60: Intensives 61: Future in -σσω 63: Future Passive 65: Pluperfect 68: Loss of Augment 69: Subj. of Non-Thematic Tenses 80, 81: -ωμι, -ησι in the Subj. 82: Inf. in -μεναι, -μεν 85: Masc.-Nouns in -τᾶ 96: Acc. in -ῖν, -ῦν 97: Gen. in -οο, -οιο 98: Dat. Sing. in -ῖ 99, 373: Acc. Plur. in -ῖς, -ῦς 100: Dat. Plur. in -εσσι 102: Instrum. in -φ(ν) 104: Hypphaeresis 105 (4): variation of the Stem 106: Heteroclitite Nouns 107: -δε 109: Adverbs in -ᾶ 110: Nouns in -τους 114: Fem. θῆλυς, ἡδύς, πολύς 116 (4): Adjectives in -ης (-εσ) 116 (5), App. p. 399: in -ικός 117: Diminutives 117: -άλειος, -άλιμος, -εννός 118: Verbs in -ιαω 60:

- Abstract Nouns in *-ωρη, -ωλη* 120 : Stems in *-ι, -σῖ, -ε, -σε* 124 : Verbals in *-τεος* 246* : *ἔστε, ἄχρη, μέχρη* with Opt. 307 : *ἦέ* 340 : *ἄρα* 347 : *νύ* 351 : *οὐκί* 355 : *μηδείς* 356 : Rules of 'Position' 370 : lengthening before *λ, μ, ν, σ, δ* 371 : short syllables lengthened in *arsis* 375 : Elision 377 : Synzesis 378 : Contraction 378* : shortening of long vowels and diphthongs before Hiatus 380, 381 : 'doubtful' syllables 383-6 : Digamma 388-403.
- B. *Differences of usage (Syntax)* :— Middle Voice 8 : Perfects expressing attitude, &c. 28 : intransitive Perfects 28 : *ἄγω* 72 (2), 2, App. p. 398 : historical Present 74 : Aorist of the immediate past 76 : gnomic Aorist 78 (2) : Adverbs in *-ως* 110, 160 : Acc. Neut. as an Adverb 134 : Dat. of the *reason* 144 : comitative Dat. 144 : locative Dat. 145 : objective Gen. 147 (1) : Gen. of Place 149 : ablative Gen. 152 n. : uses of *-φι(ν)* 154-158 : uses of *-θεν* 159 : interjectional Nom. 163 : Plural of single objects 171 : Neut. Plur. with Singular Verb 172 : Prepositions 175, 176, 178, 229 : Anastrophe 180 : *ἀμφί* c. Dat. 182 : *πέρι* beyond 185 : *περί* c. Dat. 186 : c. Gen. 188 (1) : *παρά* c. Dat. 190 : c. Gen. 192 : *μετά* c. Dat. 194 : c. Gen. 196 : *ὑπό* c. Gen. 204 (3) : *πρὸς* c. Acc. 207 : *ἀνά* c. Dat. 209 : *διά* c. Acc. of *space* 215 : *σύν* c. Dat. 221 : *πρό* of *time* 225 : *ἀντί* 226 : Double Prepositions 227 : Infinitive 231 : Inf. as Subject 234 : after *ὡς, οἷος, ὅσος* 235 : as an Imperative 241 : as an indeclinable Noun 242 : Future Participle 244 : *οὔτος* 251 : *ἔο, οἶ, ἕ, ἕός* (ὅς) as a 'general' Reflexive 255 : the Article 257-264, esp. 257 (1), 259, 260 *b, e, f, g, 261* (2), (3) : *ὅς, ὡς, &c.* Demonstrative 265 : *ὃ τε, ὅς τε, 266, 272 : οὐνεκα* 268 : *ὃ* 269 (1), 270 : *ὃ τε* 269 (3), 270 : the Subj. with *κεν* or *ἄν* in Principal Clauses 275 *a, b, 276, 279 : μή οὐ* 278 : *ὅς* with Subj. of *purpose* 282 : pure Subj. with *ὅς* 283 *a* : with *ὅτε, ὁπότε* 289 (1) *a, (2) a* : with *εὔτε* and *ἦμος* 290 : with *εἰ* 292 *a* : with *ὡς εἰ* 295 : with *ἐπεὶ* 296 : *πρὶν ἄν* 297, App. p. 400 : the Subj. after a Past Tense 298 : the Opt. of *supposition* used without *κεν* or *ἄν* 299*f* : with *κεν* or *ἄν* of an event which has not occurred 300 *c* : Opt. and *κεν* or *ἄν* with *ὡς* 306 (1) : with *ἕως* and *ὄφρα* 307 : with *ὅτε* 308 (1) : with *εἰ* 313 : *εἰ οὐ* 316 *fin.*, 359 : *εἰ δ' ἄγε* 320 : Moods 322 : Indicative 323 : Past Tense with *κεν* or *ἄν* in the *iterative* use 324 : Impf. with *κεν* or *ἄν* referring to the present 324 : Fut. Ind. with *κεν* or *ἄν* 326 (1), (2) : *τε* as a Particle of transition 331 *n.* : *τε* in *general* statements 332 : *τ' ἄρα, ἦ τε* 332 : enclitic *δέ* 335 : *αὐτάρ, ἀτάρ* 336 : *αὐ, αὔτε* 337 : *ὄμῳς, ἔμπης* 337 : *μάν, μέν* (= *μήν*) 345 : *τοιγάρ, τοίνυν* 346 : *ῥα, ἄρα* 347 : *γάρ* 348 (3) : *οὖν, γ' οὖν* 349 : *δή* beginning the Clause 350 : *δήτα, δῆθεν, δήπου, καὶ δή* 350 : *νυ* 351 : *θην* 352 : *περ, καὶ—περ* 353 : *οὐδέν* 356 : *μή* 358 *a, b, 359, 361* : *κεν, ἄν* 362, 363 : Order of Particles 365.
- Hyphaeresis* 5 (2 Sing. of Verbs in *-εω*), 105 (4), 378* *b*.
- Iliad* and *Odyssey*, differences: *ἔθεν* 109 : *ἀμφί* c. Gen. with Verbs of *saying*, &c. 182 : *περί* 188 (3) : *μετά* c. gen. 196 : *ἐπί* c. Acc. of *persons* 199 (2) : of *extent* 199 (4) : with forms in *-φι(ν)* 157 : *πρὸς* c. Dat. *in addition to* 206 : *ἀνά* c. Gen. 209 : *ἀνά* with Collectives 210 : *κατά* with Collectives 212 (1) : *κατὰ πρῆξιν, &c.* 212 (3) : *διὰ νύκτα* 215 : *ἐνί* of *persons* 220 : *ἐξ* *in consequence of* 223 : Inf. after a Rel. (*ὡς, &c.*) 235 : Acc. c. Inf. 237 (3) : Gen. Absolute 246 : *τίς* 248 : Reflexive use of *ἔο* 253 : Art. with *δέ, αὐτάρ, &c.* 259 *a* : with *μέν* 259 (2) :

- Defining Art. 261 (1, 3) : **τό** *wherefore* 262 (3) : **ὅς** as a Demonstr. 265 : **οὐνεκα** *that* 268 : **ὅτι** *that* 269 (2) : Indirect Discourse 270* : Attraction of Rel. 271 (1) : Final Rel. Clauses 282 *fin.* : **κε(ν)** in *general* sentences 283 *b* : Opt. with **κεν** of *unfulfilled condition* 300 *c* : of *concession* 300 *d* (a) : **εἰ** and Opt. after a Present 311 : **εἰ γάρ, εἴθε** 312 : Object-Clauses with **εἰ** and Opt. 314 : **τύνη** 339 : **μάν, μήν, μέν** 342 : **μὲν οὖν** 349 : **ἦ μή** 358 *c* : neglect of Position 370 *fin.* : Hiatus 382 : *F* of *ἀρνα, ἔρδω* 390.
- Iliad*, characteristics of particular books (esp. ix, x, xxiii, xxiv):—Pf. in **-κα** 22 (8) : **χρωτ-ός** 107 (2) : **ἐπί** *c.* Acc. of *extent* 199 (4) : **διὰ νύκτα** 215 : **ἐνί** with *persons* 220 (1) : with abstract words 220 (2) : **ἐκ γενεῆς, ἐκ θυμοῦ** 223 : Attributive Art. 260 *f, g* : defining Art. 261 (3) : Art. in book x 264 *n.* : Opt. with **κεν** or **ἄν** in First Person 300 *n.* (a) : Opt. in iterative sense 312 : **δέ** of the Apodosis 334 *fin.* : **νῦν** 351 : **οὐδέν** 356 : Inf. with **ἄν** 362 (8) : neglect of Position 370 *n.* : Hiatus 382.
- Imperative 327, 328 : Imperative use of the Inf. 241 : Subj. 274, 275, 278 : Opt. 299 *b*, 300 *n.* (β).
- Imperfect 9, 71, 73, 74, see Present.
- Impersonal Verbs 161, 162 (5) : with an Inf. 233, 234 (2).
- Indicative 323-6.
- Indirect Discourse, introduced by **ὅ, ὅ τε, ὅτι, ὡς, οὐνεκα** 270* : Impf. in 71 (2) : Indirect or Dependent Question 248, 267 (2) *c* : Subj. in 280 : Opt. in, with **ἦ—ἦ** 302 : Opt. with **ὡς** 306 (2).
- Infinitive 84 : form 85 : accent 89 : uses 231-241 : origin and history 242 : with the Article 259 *fin.* : **οὐ** 360 : **μή** 361 : with **ἄν** 238.
- Instrumental in **-φι(ν)** 104 : uses of **-φι(ν)** 154-8 : Instrumental Dat. 144.
- Intensive Verbs 61.
- Interrogative Pronouns 108 (2), 248.
- Interrogative Clauses 273 : Subj. 277, 280 : Opt. 302 : Particles (ἦ) 338 : Disjunctive question (**ἦέ, ἦ**) 340 : Dependent question 341 : expecting a negative answer 358 *c*.
- Intransitive uses of the Middle Voice 8 (3) : Non-Thematic Tenses 21 : the Perfect Active 28 : Aorists in **-ην** and **-θην** 44 : Verbs in **-εω** 58.
- Iterative Verbs 48 : Tenses 49 : Opt. with **ὅπως** 306 (2) : with **ὅτε** 308 (1) *d* : with **εἰ** 311.
- Locative: Dative 145 : **-θι** 109 : **-φι(ν)** 157 : in Compounds 124 *e* : with **πρό** 225.
- Manner, Adverbs of 109, 110 : Dat. of 144 : **-ως** 160 : Adj. in the Predicate 162 (2).
- Metathesis 14 : of Quantity 55 (1), 98.
- Metre 366-405 : affecting forms, Dual in **-την** 5, **σχεθέειν** 31 (7), **στορέσαι, κρεμάσαι** 39 (2) : affecting syntax, Gender 119, forms in **-φι(ν)** 154, **μετά** 195, **ἐπί** 199 (1), **ὑπό** 202, **διά** 216.
- Negative Clauses 273 : Subj. 276 : Opt. 299 *e*, 300 *n.* (β) : **οὐ, μή** 355-361 : **ἄν** 363 (2) *a*.
- Neuter : Pronouns 133, 161 : Adjectives 134, 162 (5) *a*, 166 (3) : Neut. Plur. 99* : of *things* 166 (2) : with a Singular Verb 172 : Article 257 (4), (5) *b*, 260 *b* : Relative 269, 270 : quantity of **-α** 374.
- Nominative: Sing. 96 : use in the Predicate 162, 245 : interjectional Nom. 163.
- Number 169-173.
- Object: Acc. of (External and Internal) 132-140 : Gen. of 147 (1) : 'Objective' Compounds 126 : Object Clauses 273 (2) : with **οὐνεκα** 268 : **ὅ, ὅτι, ὅ τε** 269, 270, 270* : **μή** 281 (2), 303 (2) : Relative 282, 304 (2) : **ὡς, ὅπως, ἵνα** (Subj.) 285 (2), 286, (Opt.) 306 (2) : **ὅποτε** 308 (2) : **εἰ** 294, 314.

- Obligation*, expressed by the Inf. 231, 241 : by an abstract Noun 162.
- Odyssey*, see *Iliad*.
- Optative** : form 83 : uses 299-314, 362 : history 315-322.
- Oratio Obliqua*, see *Indirect Discourse*.
- Order** : in Compounds 126, 127 : Art. 261 (1) : Clauses 311, 359 c : Particles 365, cp. 330 : τ 331, 332 : δέ 333.
- Parataxis** 267 (3) n., 318-321 : cp. 277, 278 b, 281 (2), 297.
- Participle** 84, 86, 230 : accent 89 : uses 77, 86, 243-6.
- Particles** 329-365.
- Passive use of the Middle Voice** 8 : Aorists 42-4.
- Perfect form** 22-26 : meaning 28.
- Person-Endings** 2-5 : -ω, -α 4 (*footn.*) : -μῖ, -σῖ (Subj.) 82 : -ου (Opt.) 83.
- Personal** (opp. to *Impersonal*), 234 : see **Pronouns**.
- Persons* (opp. to *Things*) : Acc. 140 (2), (3) a, 141 : 'true' Dat. 143 : locative Dat. 145 (7) : Gen. with Verbs of hearing, &c. 151 d : Gen. of material 151 e : Gen. with Verbs of ruling 151 f : Gender κατὰ σύνεσιν 166, 167 : (Number) 172 : παρὰ c. Dat. 190, c. Gen. 192 : μετὰ c. Dat. 194 : ἐπί c. Acc. 199 (2) : πρὸς c. Gen. 208 : ἐνί 220.
- Place** : Adverbs of 109, 110 : Accusative 138 : Dative 145 : Genitive 149, 152 (Abl.) : Prepositions 229 (5).
- Pluperfect** 9, 68 : cp. 73, 76, 283 a.
- Plural** : form 100-102 : Dat. Plur. 145 (7) : Collective Nouns 169 : of *Things* 171 : Neuter 166 (2) : Neuter, with a Singular Verb 172 : after ἐνί 220 : ἔ, ἑός, &c. 255.
- Position** 370, cp. 397.
- Predicate** 1, 2 : Gen. in the 148 : Nom. in the 162 : Secondary 162 (3) : Tertiary (implied Predication) 168, 245 : Preposition as the 177 : Acc. as Predicate with an Infinitive 240 : Participle in the 243 (2), (3), 245.
- Predicative** (opp. to *Demonstrative*) Stems and Roots 90.
- Prepositions** 174-229 : accent of Verbs in Composition 88 : in Composition with Nouns 125 (4), 127 : governing the Acc. 140 (4) : the Dat. 144 (Instr.), 145 (Loc.), 229 (3) : the Gen. Abl. 152, 229 (4) : forms in -φι(v) 155-7, 158 (5) : forms in -θεν 159 : with εἰο, οἶ, ἔ 253 : with the Art. 257 (5) a.
- Present** 9, 10 : Simple Non-Thematic 11 : Reduplicated Non-Thematic 16 : in -vη (-vā) and -vυ 17 : Thematic forms 18 : Non-Thematic contracted forms 19 : Simple Thematic 29 : *id.* with weak Stem 30 : Reduplicated Thematic 35 : with Suffix 45-57 : collateral forms 62 : meaning 70-74 : meaning of the I-Class 58-61.
- Price** : Gen. of 153 : Dat. (Instr.) 144.
- Prohibition** 273, 355 : μῆ with the Subj. 278, 281 : *denial* under the form of prohibition 299 e, 358 b.
- Pronouns** 90 : Declension 93, 97-103 : uses 247-272 : Heteroclitite 108 : forms in -θεν 109, 159 : in -τερος 122 : Neuter used adverbially 133 : Subject of a quasi-Impersonal Verb 161, 162 (5) a, 234 (2) : Gender 167 : Interrogative 248 : Reflexive 253-255 : Article 256-264 : Relative 265-272 : see **Anaphoric, Deictic, Demonstrative, Relative**.
- Pseudo-archaic**, see **Archaic**.
- Purpose**, see **End**.
- Reason**, see **Cause**.
- Reduplication** : Non-Thematic Present 16 : Perfect 22, 23 : Thematic Present 35 : Aorist 36 : T-Class 46 : Nasal Class 47 : Iterative Class 48 : I-Class 52, 53 : Intensives 61 : Future 65 : Primitive Nouns 114.
- Reflexive**, εἰο, &c. 253 : ἑός, ὄς 254 : use as a general Reflexive Pronoun 255.

- Relative**, ὅς ἢ ὃ 265-272 : ὃ τῆς, ὅς τε 108 (2), 266, 272, 332 : ὃ, ὃ τε (Neut.) 269, 270 : the Art. (ὃ ἢ τό) as a Relative 262 : ὃ τε (Masc.) 263 : Correlative Clauses 267 : Omission of the Verb *to be* in Relative Clauses 271 : Attraction 271 : Double Relative Clauses 271 : Final Clauses 282, 304 : Object-Clauses 282, 304 : Conditional Clauses 283, 305.
- Similes** : use of the Aorist 78 (2) : Subj. in Relative Clauses 283 *a* : with ὡς and ὡς τε 285 (3) *a* : with ὡς ὅτε, ὡς ὁπότε 289 (2) *a*.
- Space** : Acc. of 138 : Gen. of 149 : Instrum. of 158 : Acc. of, with Prepositions 183, 187, 191 (3), 199 (3), (4), 203 (2), 210, 212, 215, 218.
- Stem** 2, 9 : Nominal 90, 106, 113, 120 : Pronominal 90, 108 : Variation 6, 12, 22, 25, 31, 32, 106, 114*.
- Subject 1** : expressed by the Person Ending 2 : by a Noun or Pronoun 131 (2) : unexpressed (vague) 161 : attracted to the Gender of the Predicate 167 : Infinitive as Subject 234 : Acc. with Inf. 237.
- Subjunctive** : form 80-82 : uses 274-298, 362 : history 315-322 : forms in -εω, -ηω App. C.
- Substantive** (opp. to *Adjective*) 165 : the substantival Art. 257.
- Suffix** : in Verb-stems 14 : -κα in the Aor. 15 : in the Pf. 22 (9) : -νη, -νῦ 17 : Nominal 113 : Primary 114-116 : Variation 114* : Secondary 117-120 : of Comparison 121 : derived from the second part of a Compound 126 *fin.*
- Superlative** 121, 122 : Art. with 260 *b* : with δῆ 350.
- Supposition** : Opt. of 299 *f* : Opt. with κεν or ἄν 300 : in Relative Clauses 304 : Clauses with εἰ 311 : Indicative 323.
- Swearing**, Verbs of, with Fut. Inf. 238 : with μή and the Indic. 358 *b* : with μή and the Inf. 361.
- Synizesis** 378 : in Verbs 57 : Case-forms 105 (2), (3) : δῆ 350.
- Tenses** 9, 10 : meaning 28, 62, 66, 70-78.
- Thematic Vowel** (ε, ο) 4 : forms 4, 10, 18, 27, 41, 80, 82, 83 (2), 85 (2).
- Time**, not expressed by the Tense-stem 28, 70 : relative (Impf.) 71, 73, (Aor.) 77, 78 : Acc. of 138 : Dat. of 145 (4) : Gen. of 150 : Adj. of Time in Predicate 165 : Prepositions expressing, μετὰ 195 (3) : ὑπό 203 : διά 215 : εἰς 222 : ἐξ 223 : πρό 225.
- Transitive**, see *Causative*.
- Trypho** 339.
- Tyrannio** 32 (2), 80, 87 (1).
- Vocative** 92 : Vocatives turned into Nominatives 96, 111 (2) : accent 112 : use 164 : metrical anomaly 387.
- Way** : Adverbs of, in -χι 109, in -η 110 : Dat. of 144 : Instrum. 158.
- Wish** : Opt. 299 : in a Relative Clause 304 : with εἰ, εἰ γάρ, εἴθε 312, 318 : Negative 358.
- Zenodotus** : 2 Dual in -την 5 : Voc. of Κάλχας, &c. 92 : πολλῶς (Acc. Pl.) 100 : Dual 173 (2) : Reflexive Pronoun 255 : readings due to loss of *f* 389 : η for ā App. p. 391 *footn.* : readings, ἀφίκεσθον (3 Dual) 5, ἀναβέβροχε 23 (5), εἰὺ (ἔο) 98, χαλκίην (ῥπα) 119, κυνυλαγμόν 296, δρῆτο 378* *b*, Ἀμφιάρητος, βουγῆιε, Ἀρήδνη, κρητός (κρᾶτός) App. F (p. 391) : ἕητα App. p. 398.

INDEX III.

CHIEF PASSAGES REFERRED TO.

<i>Niad.</i>		
1. 18 ... § 105 (2)	2. 4 ... 100	59 ... 324 <i>c</i>
20 ... 259 <i>a</i> , 299 <i>b</i>	81 ... 140 (3) <i>b</i> , 300 <i>c</i>	98 ... 238
31 ... 136 (1), 151 <i>b</i>	119 ... 244 (1)	100 ... 378 <i>g</i>
67 ... 82	148 ... 144	112 ... 238
89 ... 378* <i>e</i>	153 ... 243 (3) <i>b</i>	138 ... 260 <i>e</i>
103 ... 181	179 ... 332	173 ... 365, 391
106 ... 260 <i>e</i>	196 ... 255 (1)	205 ... 367 (1)
111 ... 153	228 ... 290, 362	215 ... 338, App. p. 402
125 ... 262 (1)	229 ... 326 (3)	235 ... 170
167 ... 261 (3)	234 ... 243 (3) <i>c</i>	244 ... 255 (3)
168 ... 296, 362	250 ... 210, 300 <i>d</i> (B)	277 ... 164
179 ... 367 (1)	275 ... 261 (2)	278 ... 173 (1)
184 ... 275 <i>a</i>	285 ... 145 (7) <i>c</i>	287 ... 282
203 ... 378 <i>a</i>	291 ... 233 <i>n.</i> , 243 (3) <i>c</i>	301 ... 243 (3) <i>d</i>
205 ... 275 <i>b</i> , 365 (7)	302 ... 359 <i>b</i>	407 ... 299 <i>b</i>
218 ... 298 (1), 332	303 ... 267 (2) <i>b</i>	415 ... 78
231 ... 163	323 ... 76	4. 18 ... 299 <i>b</i>
244 ... 269 (3)	340 ... 299 <i>c</i>	32 ... 269 (3)
250 ... 143	349 ... 341	105 ... 147
257 ... 151 <i>d</i>	353 ... 163	142 ... 170
262 ... 276 <i>a</i>	356 ... 147 (1)	160 ... 316
263 ... 271 (1)	363 ... 158	164 ... 289 (1) <i>b</i>
277 ... 378	367 ... 378* <i>a</i>	207 ... 136 (4)
288 ... 390 (p. 364)	384 ... 184	243 ... 76
294 ... 136 (3)	397 ... 289 (2) <i>b</i> (1)	247 ... 234 (3)
319 ... 262	409 ... 140 (3) <i>b</i> , 267 (3) <i>b</i>	263 ... 308 (1) <i>c</i>
322 ... 140 (4)	413 ... 241	264 ... 378 <i>a</i>
344 ... 306 (1) <i>a</i> , 326 (3)	488 ... 276 <i>b</i> , 311	277 ... 332
393 ... 255 (3)	590 ... 147 (1)	295 ... 183
406 ... 332	669 ... 145 (7) <i>a</i>	318 ... 299 <i>d</i>
410 ... 151 <i>e</i>	686 ... 151 <i>d</i>	353 ... 362
412 ... 269 (3)	775 ... 170	357 ... 151 <i>d</i>
453 ... 378* <i>e</i>	811 ... 378	382 ... 225
470 ... 151 <i>e</i>	873 ... 167	410 ... 328, 365 (4)
484 ... 212 (4)	3. 25 ... 292 <i>b</i> , 363	431 ... 182
518 ... 269 (3)	28 ... 238	465 ... 307
541 ... 240	49 ... 170	500 ... 192
559 ... 100, 285 (2)	55 ... 261 (2)	509 ... 390 (p. 365)
580 ... 324* <i>c</i>		5. 33 ... 282
		46 ... 41, 244 (2)

- 85 ... 300 *c*, 304 (2)
 135 ... 353
 140 ... 166 (2)
 162 ... 243 (3) *b*
 253 ... 240
 258 ... 292 *a*, 349
 265-8 ... 151 *e*, 271 (1)
 271 ... 260 *c*
 273 ... 313, 365
 303 ... 299 *f*, 304
 331 ... 269 (3)
 349 ... 270
 406 ... 163
 407 ... 305 *c*
 487 ... 170
 523 ... 150
 566 ... 186 (1)
 582 ... 151 *c*
 604 ... 162 (3)
 638 ... 267 (3) *c*
 682 ... 144
 702 ... 140 (3) *b*
 715 ... 136 (3)
 750 ... 234 (1)
 757 ... 136 (3)
 6. 50 ... 140 (3) *b*
 70 ... 141, 326 (2)
 87 ... 72 (2)
 88 ... 140 (4)
 92 ... 241
 117 ... 181
 126 ... 105 (1), 269
 (3)
 150 ... 140 (3) *a*,
 324**b*
 164 ... 299 *c*
 222 ... 140 (3) *a*
 225 ... 289, 363 (1) *b*
 236 ... 153
 284 ... 245 (1), App.
 p. 401
 292 ... 136 (1)
 340 ... 275 *a*
 348 ... 325
 356 ... 378 *g*
 382 ... 324**c*
 396 ... 267 (4)
 411 ... 240
 459 ... 275 *b*
 477 ... 145 (7) *d*
 500 ... 254
 7. 5 ... 362
- 29 ... 82
 73 ... 145 (6)
 79 ... 241
 87 ... 275 *b*
 197 ... 276 *a*
 239 ... 233, 262
 247 ... 216
 290 ... 82
 305 ... 71 (1)
 342 ... 304 (1) *a*
 358 ... 249
 363 ... 72 (2) 2
 375 ... 294, 324**b*
 401 ... 267 (2) *a*
 409 ... 234 (5)
 452 ... 262 (2)
 8. 24 ... 144
 110 ... 326 (3)
 111 ... 338
 163 ... 226
 186 ... 173 (1)
 219 ... 77, 240
 223 ... 232
 229 ... 267 (2) *b*
 230 ... 271 (1)
 251 ... 269 (3)
 378 ... 245 (2)
 470 ... 150
 526 ... 390 (p. 367)
 535 ... 140 (3) *b*,
 294
 9. 42 ... 235
 54 ... 195
 73 ... 389
 88 ... 389
 115 ... 136 (2)
 121 ... 275 *a*
 133 ... 261 (3)
 141 ... 313
 214 ... 151 *e*
 219 ... 149 (2)
 225 ... 378 *d*
 230 ... 231
 245 ... 303 (2)
 275 ... 261 (3)
 276 ... 340
 304 ... 309 *a*
 320 ... 260 *e*
 342 ... 252 (1), 260 *g*
 389 ... 311
 394 ... 367 (2)
 399 ... 240
- 413 ... 78 (1)
 414 ... 255 (3)
 433 ... 186 (1)
 481 ... 295
 493 ... 270
 501 ... 289, 363
 (1) *b*
 503 ... 170
 505 ... 268
 525 ... 308 (1) *d*
 527 ... 140 (3) *a*
 540 ... 141, 390
 (p. 368)
 559 ... 260 *b*
 580 ... 151 *e*
 592 ... 262 (3)
 608 ... 238
 647 ... 141
 664 ... 72 (2) *n. 2*
 684 ... 238
 701 ... 275 *b*
 10. 82 ... 162 (3)
 101 ... 281 (2)
 142 ... 269 (2)
 185 ... 158 (5), 216
 188 ... 243 (3) *d*
 216 ... 356
 240 ... 186 (1)
 247 ... 299 *f*
 259 ... 170
 330 ... 358 *b*
 353 ... 149 (3)
 361 ... 82
 398 ... 255 (2)
 408 ... 260 *g*
 416 ... 267 (4)
 437 ... 163
 453 ... { 365 (4)
 367 (1)
 545 ... 341
 547 ... 163
 557 ... 299 *f*
 11. 58 ... 145 (7) *c*
 69 ... 370 (p. 342)
 100 ... 144
 106 ... 153
 142 ... 255 (3),
 261 (3)
 174 ... 260 *c*
 187, 202 ... 362 *fin.*
 244 ... 166 (2)
 350 ... 158 (4)

- 391 ... 292 *b*
 410 ... 340
 433 ... 275 *b*
 437 ... 332
 482 ... 178
 535 ... 271
 557 ... 186 (1)
 657 ... 151 *d*
 691 ... 150
 697 ... 166 (2)
 705 ... 390 (p. 369)
 761 ... 147 (2)
 791 ... 299 *b*
 838 ... 162 (5) *a*,
 299 *f*
 12. 28 ... 144
 41 ... 82
 59 ... 326 (4)
 213 ... 116 (2)
 223 ... 292 *a*
 302 ... 157, 292 *b*
 356 ... 82
 374 ... 143, 246
 407 ... 238
 410 ... 240
 13. 38 ... 245 (1)
 53 ... 261 (2)
 68 ... 324* *c*
 96 ... 240
 107 ... 389
 127 ... 362
 217 ... 145 (7) *a*
 263 ... 231 (2), 238
 275 ... 140 (3) *b*
 278 ... 394
 285 ... 362
 308 ... 158 (5)
 317 ... 240
 353 ... 245 (2)
 465 ... 354
 485 ... 116 (2), 312
 545 ... 245 (1)
 622 ... 378* *d*
 649 ... 281 (1), 298
 667 ... 238
 700 ... 156, 196
 732 ... 78 (2)
 775 ... 324* *c*
 14. 26 ... 8, 243 (3) *d*
 71, 72 ... 269 (3)
 75 ... 267 (4)
 81 ... 267 (2) *a*
 95 ... 78 (1), 267
 (3) *a*
 108 ... 143
 121 ... 151 *e*
 141 ... 243 (3) *d*
 154 ... 223
 165 ... 293, 298
 190 ... 340
 221 ... 255 (3)
 235 ... 275 *a*, 389
 274 ... 260 *b*
 331 ... 324* *c*
 403 ... 365
 437 ... 390 (p. 368)
 484 ... 82
 15. 18 ... 267 (2) *b*,
 367 (1)
 23 ... 298
 33 ... 136 (1)
 41 ... 358 *b*
 45 ... 299 *d*
 58 ... 240
 70 ... 307
 87 ... 143 (2)
 117 ... 240
 138 ... 255 (3)
 162 ... 316
 197 ... 299 *f*
 209 ... 362
 256 ... 354
 282 ... 144
 349 ... 276 *a*
 453 ... 390 (p. 364)
 468 ... 269 (3)
 496 ... 240
 539 ... 390 (p. 367)
 571 ... 312
 642 ... 139 (2)
 709 ... 332
 716 ... 159
 744 ... 136 (4)
 16. 17 ... 267 (3) *a*,
 340
 31 ... 151 *e*
 35 ... 269 (2)
 39 ... 362
 53 ... 260 *c*
 83 ... 285 (3) *a*
 129 ... 275 *a*
 200 ... 328
 242 ... 326 (3)
 243 ... 280
 265 ... 170
 281 ... 156, 169, 238
 343 ... 244 (2)
 371 ... 170, 390
 433 ... 269 (3)
 509 ... 269 (3)
 516 ... 143 (3)
 523 ... 390 (p. 364)
 531 ... 243 (3) *d*
 559 ... 312
 628 ... 144
 650 ... 298
 667 ... 141, 225
 688 ... 332
 753, 800 ... 254
 830 ... 238
 835 ... 269 (1)
 836 ... 332
 17. 42 ... 332, 340
 54 ... 390 (p. 366)
 89 ... 378
 145 ... 262 (3)
 155 ... App. p. 401
 207 ... 270
 242 ... 186 (1)
 260 ... 170
 372 ... 149 (1)
 406 ... 258
 451 ... 378* *c*
 587 ... 354
 647 ... 105 (1)
 655 ... 270*
 658 ... 296
 692 ... 294
 710 ... 338
 18. 134 ... 328
 191 ... 180 (2)
 192 ... 248
 194 ... 390 (p. 367)
 244 ... 202
 245 ... 236
 308 ... 275 *b*
 309 ... 63, 244 (3)
 345 ... 141
 362 ... 238
 385 ... 164
 458 ... 378
 467 ... 282
 500 ... 356, 361
 506 ... 144
 515 ... 166 (2)
 522 ... 390 (p. 367)

574 ... 151 *e*
 601 ... 140(3) *b*, 294
 604 ... 169
 19. 22 ... 361
 57 ... 269 (3)
 73 ... 170
 88 ... 119, 378 *g*
 124 ... 390 (p. 364)
 137 ... 378 *e*
 139 ... 378 *a*
 147 ... 324* *b*
 148 ... 340
 174 ... 255 (3)
 176 ... 261(3), 361
 221 ... 332
 254 ... 224
 255 ... 157, 252 (4)
 261 ... 358 *b*, 361
 321 ... 147, 299 *f*
 322, 331 ... 261 (3)
 337 ... 267 (2) *b*,
 289 (1)
 342 ... 255 (3)
 354 ... 298
 20. 55 ... 262 (4)
 77 ... 365
 85 ... 238
 129 ... 316
 131 ... 378* *d*
 139 ... 316
 166 ... 289 (2) *b*,
 363 (1) *b*
 178 ... 76
 181 ... 151 *f*, 260 *g*
 213 ... 324* *b*
 243 ... 285 (3) *b*
 301 ... 326 (3)
 306 ... 78 (1)
 335 ... 326 (1)
 365 ... 238
 436 ... 294
 500 ... 271
 21. 40 ... 140 (4)
 45 ... 144
 81 ... 267 (2) *b*
 83 ... 238
 103 ... 282
 112 ... 289 (1) *a*, 363
 122 ... 141, 194
 150 ... 269 (1)
 236 ... 390 (p. 366)
 248 ... 332

252 ... 260 *f*
 295 ... 158 (1)
 323 ... 289 (2) *a*, 376
 336 ... 304 (1) *a*
 353 ... 271
 360 ... 143, 151 *e*
 367 ... 158 (2)
 399 ... 390 (p. 368)
 411 ... 269 (2)
 412 ... 261 (3)
 421 ... 261 (2)
 456 ... 332
 458 ... 196
 467 ... 82
 487 ... 324* *b*
 488 ... 269 (2)
 499 ... 171
 562 ... 76
 567 ... 324 *c*, 378
 575 ... 296
 576 ... 365
 596 ... 332
 22. 27 ... 150
 59 ... 261 (2)
 72 ... 240
 110 ... 324
 118, 120 ... 238
 122 ... 76
 235 ... 238
 253 ... 300 *d*
 300 ... 332
 347 ... 390 (p. 368)
 404 ... 254
 418 ... 275 *a*, 293
 439 ... 71 (2), 270*
 450 ... 275 *a*
 459 ... 356
 505 ... 275 *b*
 513 ... 356
 23. 49 ... 390 (p. 364)
 75 ... 261 (3)
 151 ... 299 *d*
 247 ... 241
 319 ... 334 (4)
 325 ... 260 *e*
 345 ... 282
 348 ... 260 *g*
 361 ... 140 (3) *a*
 362 ... 170
 376 ... 260 *g*
 379 ... 41, 244 (2)
 392 ... 390 (p. 363)

413 ... 173 (1)
 474 ... 332
 493 ... 164, 387
 515 ... 105 (1)
 526 ... 324
 529 ... 138
 545 ... 270
 556 ... 144
 592 ... 313
 622 ... 332
 639 ... 105 (1)
 649 ... 153, 271 (1)
 675 ... 326 (3)
 730 ... 332
 735 ... 8 (4)
 773 ... 238
 24. 14 ... 309 *c*
 28 ... 378 *g*
 52 ... 332
 53 ... 365
 74 ... 312
 154 ... 326 (3), 391
 227 ... 309 *a*
 239 ... 116 (5)
 240 ... 269 (2)
 296 ... 316
 320 ... 390 (p. 365)
 400 ... 196
 434 ... 378* *a*
 491 ... 390 (p. 367)
 550 ... 255 (3)
 560 ... 238
 586 ... 298
 655 ... 275 *b*
 768 ... 311

Odyssey.

1. 9 ... 143
 24 ... 149 (2), App.
 p. 401
 37 ... 365 *n*.
 51 ... 163
 71 ... 145 (7) *a*
 110 ... 389
 140 ... 151 *e*
 164 ... 122
 192 ... 290
 204 ... 292 *a*
 226 ... 167, 378
 231 ... 324*
 270 ... 326 (4)
 273 ... 173

- 396 ... 275 *b*
 402 ... 255 (3),
 299 *d*
 414 ... 311
 2. 43 ... 282
 45 ... 269 (1)
 46 ... 133
 53 ... 306 (1) *a*
 60 ... 232, 271 (3)
 76 ... 313
 78 ... 173, 307
 105 ... 309 *c*
 116 ... 270
 134 ... 261
 171 ... 238
 206 ... 261
 222 ... 275 *a*
 227 ... 231
 274 ... 316
 311 ... 243 (3) *c*,
 390
 327 ... 365 *n*.
 351 ... 261 (1), 314
 373 ... 238, 361
 404 ... 149 (3)
 416 ... 209
 3. 18 ... 275 *a*
 103 ... 324*
 125 ... 238
 171 ... 200 (3)
 182 ... 72 (2) *n. I*
 211 ... 324*
 231 ... 299 *f*
 243 ... 136 (3)
 251 ... 149 (1)
 270 ... 259 *b*
 319 ... 299 *f*
 321 ... 365 (1)
 327 ... 286
 363 ... 144
 408 ... 151 *e*
 445 ... 140 (1)
 476 ... 149 (3)
 4. 19 ... 246
 41 ... 210
 80 ... 275 *b*
 110 ... 341
 163 ... 326 (3)
 180 ... 325
 192 ... 255 (3)
 193 ... 299 *b*
 206 ... 269 (1)
- 211 ... 237 (3)
 222 ... 309 *a*
 240 ... 276 *b*
 242 ... 267 (3) *c*
 244 ... 253
 247 ... 252 (4)
 269 ... 267 (3) *c*
 300 ... 170
 349 ... 262 (1)
 388 ... 324* *b*
 389 ... 265, 282
 391 ... 275 *b*
 406 ... 116 (1)
 478 ... 140 (4)
 546 ... 324
 600 ... 305 *d*
 643 ... 341
 646 ... 243 (3) *d*
 649 ... 390 (p. 366)
 672 ... 82
 678 ... 149 (2)
 684 ... 361
 692 ... 170, 275 *b*
 735 ... 299 *b*
 746 ... 378* *e*
 789 ... 302 *b*
 837 ... 341
 5. 24 ... 326 (4)
 34 ... 389
 68 ... 188 (2)
 73 ... 300 *c*
 100 ... 299 *f*, 390
 130 ... 188 (2)
 187 ... 361
 206 ... 255 (3)
 216 ... 268
 221 ... 292 *a*
 224 ... 194
 300 ... 358 *d*
 340 ... 269 (2)
 356 ... 269 (3)
 361 ... 362
 471 ... 293
 484 ... 235
 489 ... 359 *b*
 6. 126 ... 275 *a*
 157 ... 243 (3) *d*
 159 ... 283 *b*
 165 ... 136 (1)
 180 ... 255 (3)
 200 ... 358 *c*
 201 ... 282
- 221 ... 276 *b*
 224 ... 141
 259 ... 136 (1), 362
 262 ... 362
 276 ... 162 (3)
 286 ... 272
 7. 52 ... 311
 77 ... 255 (3)
 201 ... 378* *d*
 211 ... 245 (2)
 224 ... 353
 261 ... 365 *n*.
 297 ... 136 (2)
 300 ... 268
 311 ... 241
 316 ... 299 *e*
 8. 23 ... 136 (1), 151 *e*
 35 } ... 173, App.
 48 } ... p. 401
 63 ... 71 (1)
 78 ... 269 (3)
 139 ... 311
 172 ... 144
 174 ... 389
 186 ... 252 (2)
 267 ... 184
 332 ... 262
 408 ... 164
 435 ... 72 (2) *n. I*
 511 ... 362
 526 ... 389
 570 ... 300 *d*
 9. 19 ... 144
 28 ... 255 (3)
 42 ... 143, 390
 68 ... 144
 102 ... 151 *e*
 177 ... 209
 209 ... 210
 225 ... 151 *e*, 240
 239 ... 149 (2)
 257 ... 243 (3) *d*
 334 ... 262 (2)
 405 ... 358 *c*
 458 ... 243 (3) *d*
 475 ... 238
 496 ... 238
 10. 24 ... 298
 64 ... 76
 65 ... 298
 75 ... 133
 113 ... 271 (1)

140 ... 144
 167 ... 271 (1)
 202 ... 348 (2)
 320 ... 196
 434 ... 304 (1) *a*
 495 ... 240
 507 ... 275 *b*
 517 ... 271 (1)
 539 ... 282
 11. 17 ... 289 (2) *b*,
 363 (2) *b*
 25 ... 271 (1)
 61 ... 378* *g*
 91 ... 166
 161 ... 144
 218 ... 289 (2) *b*,
 365 *n*.
 327 ... 153
 328 ... 276 *b*
 443 ... 241
 452 ... 151 *e*
 464 ... 341
 519 ... 267 (3) *c*,
 276 *b*
 540 ... 270
 608 ... 244
 12. 27 ... 149 (2)
 64 ... 151 *e*
 75 ... 167
 113 ... 261 (2)
 156 ... 286, 306 (1) *a*
 198 ... 332
 243 ... 144
 252 ... 260 *e*
 331 ... 166 (2)
 348 ... 292 *a*
 369 ... App. p. 399
 375 ... 270
 382 ... 316
 383 ... 275 *a*
 388 ... 134
 428 ... 307
 13. 61 ... 255 (3)
 78 ... App. p. 401
 86 ... 300 *c*
 101 ... 289 (2) *b*
 125 ... 389
 129 ... 269 (3)
 143 ... 316
 173 ... 238
 216 ... 358 *d*
 234 ... 340

263 ... 262 (2)
 320 ... 255 (3)
 340 ... 270*
 362 ... 255 (3)
 376 ... 326 (4)
 402 ... 306 *a*
 415 ... 338
 435 ... 166 (2)
 14. 56 ... 311
 61 ... 260 *e*
 77 ... 144
 90 ... 269 (3)
 97 ... 149 (1)
 120 ... 314
 122 ... 299 *f*
 147 ... 96
 161 ... 150
 183 ... 300 *d*
 206 ... 144
 227 ... 262 (2)
 235 ... 261 (2)
 245 ... 144
 287 ... 365 *n*.
 299 ... 144
 328, 329 ... 298, 306 *fin*.
 366 ... 269 (3)
 367 ... 269 (2)
 422 ... 224
 15. 23 ... 151 *d*
 24 ... 299 *b*
 80 ... 324* *b*
 98 ... 151 *e*
 111 ... 255 (3)
 214 ... 238
 227 ... 145
 300 ... 298
 305 ... 302 *b*
 345 ... 283 *b*, 363
 (1) *b*
 422 ... 283 *b*
 423 ... 248, 304 (2)
 428 ... 332
 436 ... 365 *n*.
 453 ... 82
 16. 70 ... 144
 74 ... 277, 280
 92 ... 378* *e*
 138 ... 338
 140 ... 196
 216 ... 332, 340
 234 ... 82
 263 ... 262 (3)

268 ... 289 (2) *a*
 293 ... 82
 297 ... 306 *a*
 301 ... 328
 369 ... 82, 298
 386 ... 299 *d*
 437 ... 276 *a*
 447 ... 159
 17. 6 ... 326 (3)
 20 ... 235, 271 (3)
 60 ... 298
 140 ... 262 (1)
 189 ... 390 (p. 364)
 218 ... 228, 261 *e*
 250 ... 306 (1) *a*
 320 }
 323 } ... 290
 354 ... 241
 368 ... 248, 304 (2)
 373 ... 248
 375 ... 378
 418 ... 275 *a*
 423 ... 144
 454 ... 198 (3)
 478 ... 390 (p. 366)
 489 ... 243 (3) *b*
 539 ... 311
 555 ... 243 (3) *d*
 18. 26 ... 261 (2)
 107 ... 378* *a*
 114 ... 261 (2)
 141 ... 299 *b*
 194 ... 290
 263 ... 324
 307 ... 72 (2) *n*. 1
 318 ... 362 *fin*.
 333 ... 261 (2)
 335 ... 282
 392 ... 269 (1)
 19. 12 ... 82
 139 ... 240
 150 ... 309 *c*
 160 ... 235
 215 ... 378* *e*
 233 ... 271 (1)
 284 ... 240
 297 ... 298
 325 ... 338
 332 ... 363 (1) *b*
 367 ... 307
 372 ... 261 (2)
 393 ... 136 (1), 262

444 ... 170	115 ... 143, 246	462 ... 299 <i>e</i> , 345
475 ... 236	162 ... 305 <i>d</i>	467 ... 298
511 ... 305 <i>c</i>	173 ... 235	23. 2 ... 245
539 ... 390 (p.363)	254 ... 152, 269 (3)	135 ... 306 (1) <i>a</i>
573 ... 262 (2)	260 ... 324* <i>b</i>	257 ... 289 (2) <i>a</i>
20. 52 ... 242, 259	294 ... 283 <i>c</i> , 363	24. 29 ... 276 <i>a</i>
83 ... 289 (2) <i>b</i>	(1) <i>b</i>	89 ... 81
138 ... 308 (1) <i>d</i>	395 ... 303 (2),	140 ... 309 <i>c</i>
224 ... 314	358 <i>d</i>	238 ... 341 <i>fin.</i>
242 ... 264	22. 6 ... 294	248 ... 328
295 ... 283 <i>b</i>	36 ... 269 (2)	344 ... 308 (1) <i>c</i>
333 ... 270	98 ... 298	357 ... 255 (3)
348 ... 170	166 ... 277	380 ... 241
383 ... 82, 304 (1) <i>a</i>	176 ... 210	491 ... 281 (2)
21. 20 ... 136 (1)	220 ... 260 <i>b</i>	497 ... 260 <i>g</i>
56 ... 390 (p.364)	318 ... 390 (p.368)	532 ... 306 <i>a</i>
108 ... 149	367 ... 281 (2)	544 ... 326 (3)

THE END.

Clarendon Press, Oxford.

SELECT LIST OF STANDARD WORKS.

STANDARD LATIN WORKS	Page 1
STANDARD GREEK WORKS	3
MISCELLANEOUS STANDARD WORKS	7
STANDARD THEOLOGICAL WORKS	8
NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY	8

1. STANDARD LATIN WORKS.

Avianus. *The Fables.* Edited, with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Commentary, &c., by Robinson Ellis, M.A., LL.D. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Catulli Veronensis Liber. Iterum recognovit, Apparatum Criticum Prolegomena Appendices addidit, R. Ellis, A.M. 8vo. 16s.

Catullus, a Commentary on. By Robinson Ellis, M.A. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 18s.

Cicero. De Oratore Libri Tres. With Introduction and Notes. By A. S. Wilkins, Litt.D. 8vo. 18s.

Also, separately,

Book I. 7s. 6d. Book II. 5s.

Book III. 6s.

— **Philippic Orations.** With Notes. By J. R. King, M.A. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— **Pro Milone.** Edited by A. C. Clark, M.A. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Cicero. Select Letters. With English Introductions, Notes, and Appendices. By Albert Watson, M.A. *Fourth Edition.* 8vo. 18s.

Horace. With a Commentary. By E. C. Wickham, D.D. *Two Vols.*
Vol. I. The Odes, Carmen Seculare, and Epodes. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 12s.

Vol. II. The Satires, Epistles, and De Arte Poetica. 8vo. 12s.

Juvenal. Thirteen Satires. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by C. H. Pearson, M.A., and Herbert A. Strong, M.A., LL.D. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 9s.

Manilius. Noctes Manilianae; sive Dissertationes in Astronomica Manilii. Accedunt Coniecturae in Germanici Aratea. Scripsit R. Ellis. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Merry. Selected Fragments of Roman Poetry. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by W. W. Merry, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

- Ovid.** *P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis.*
Ex Novis Codicibus edidit, Scholia
Vetera Commentarium cum Pro-
legomenis Appendice Indice addidit,
R. Ellis, A.M. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tris-
tium Libri V.* Recensuit S. G. Owen,
A.M. 8vo. 16s.
- Persius.** *The Satires.* With
a Translation and Commentary.
By John Conington, M.A. Edited
by Henry Nettleship, M.A. *Third
Edition.* 8vo. 8s. 6d.
- Plautus.** *Rudens.* Edited,
with Critical and Explanatory
Notes, by E. A. Sonnenschein,
M.A. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
- Quintilian.** *Institutionis
Oratoriae Liber Decimus.* A Revised
Text, with Introductory Essays,
Critical Notes, &c. By W. Peterson,
M.A., LL.D. 8vo. 12s. 6d.
- Rushforth.** *Latin Historical
Inscriptions, illustrating the History of
the Early Empire.* By G. McN.
Rushforth, M.A. 8vo. 10s. net.
- Tacitus.** *The Annals.* Edited,
with Introduction and Notes, by
H. Furneaux, M.A. 2 Vols. 8vo.
Vol. I, Books I-VI. 18s.
Vol. II, Books XI-XVI. 20s.
- *De Germania.* By the
same Editor. 8vo. 6s. 6d.
- *Dialogus de Oratoribus.*
A Revised Text, with Introductory
Essays, and Critical and Explanatory
Notes. By W. Peterson, M.A.,
LL.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Virgil.** *With an Introduc-
tion and Notes.* By T. L. Papillon,
M.A., and A. E. Haigh, M.A.
2 vols. Crown 8vo. 12s.
-
- King and Cookson.** *The Prin-
ciples of Sound and Inflection, as illus-
trated in the Greek and Latin Languages.*
By J. E. King, M.A., and Christopher
Cookson, M.A. 8vo. 18s.
- *An Introduction to the
Comparative Grammar of Greek and
Latin.* Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.
- Lindsay.** *The Latin Lan-
guage.* An Historical Account of
Latin Sounds, Stems and Flexions.
By W. M. Lindsay, M.A. Demy
8vo. 21s.
- Nettleship.** *Lectures and
Essays on Subjects connected with Latin
Scholarship and Literature.* By Henry
Nettleship, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- *Second Series,* edited by
F. J. Haverfield, with Memoir by
Mrs. Nettleship. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Nettleship.** *Ancient Lives of
Vergil.* 8vo, sewed, 2s.
- *Contributions to Latin
Lexicography.* 8vo. 21s.
- Sellar.** *Roman Poets of the
Augustan Age.* By W. Y. Sellar,
M.A.; viz.
- I. VIRGIL. *New Edition.* Crown
8vo. 9s.
- II. HORACE and the ELEGIAC
POETS. With a Memoir of the
Author by Andrew Lang, M.A.,
and a Portrait. 8vo. 14s.
- *Roman Poets of the Re-
public. Third Edition.* Crown 8vo. 10s.
- Wordsworth.** *Fragments and
Specimens of Early Latin.* With Intro-
ductions and Notes. By J. Words-
worth, D.D. 8vo. 18s.

2. STANDARD GREEK WORKS.

- Chandler.** *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation*, by H. W. Chandler, M.A. *Second Edition*. 10s. 6d.
- Haigh.** *The Attic Theatre*. A Description of the Stage and Theatre of the Athenians, and of the Dramatic Performances at Athens. By A. E. Haigh, M.A. 8vo. 12s. 6d.
- Head.** *Historia Numorum*: A Manual of Greek Numismatics. By Barclay V. Head. Royal 8vo, half-bound, 2l. 2s.
- Hicks.** *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. By E. L. Hicks, M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- King and Cookson.** *The Principles of Sound and Inflection, as illustrated in the Greek and Latin Languages*. By J. E. King, M.A., and Christopher Cookson, M.A. 8vo. 18s.
- Liddell and Scott.** *A Greek-English Lexicon*, by H. G. Liddell, D.D., and Robert Scott, D.D. *Seventh Edition, Revised and Augmented throughout*. 4to. 1l. 16s.
- Aeschinem et Isocratem, Scholia Graeca in.** Edidit G. Dindorfius. 8vo. 4s.
- Aeschylus. In Single Plays.** With Introduction and Notes, by Arthur Sidgwick, M.A. *Third Edition*. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. each.
- I. Agamemnon.
II. Choephoroi.
III. Eumenides.
IV. Prometheus Bound. With Introduction and Notes, by A. O. Prickard, M.A. *Third Edition*. 2s.
- Aeschyli quae supersunt in Codice Laurentiano quoad effci potuit et ad cognitionem necesse est visum typis descripta edidit R. Merkel.** Small folio. 1l. 1s.
- Aeschylus: Tragoediae et Fragmenta, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. Second Edition.** 8vo. 5s. 6d.
- *Annotationes* Guil. Dindorfii. Partes II. 8vo. 10s.
- Apsinis et Longini Rhetorica.** E Codicibus mss. recensuit Joh. Bakius. 8vo. 3s.
- Archimedis quae supersunt omnia cum Eutocii commentariis ex recensione J. Torelli, cum nova versione Latina.** Fol. 1l. 5s.

Aristophanes. *A Complete*

Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments. By H. Dunbar, M.D. 4to. 1l. 1s.

— *Comoediae et Fragmenta*, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. Tomi II. 8vo. 11s.

— *Annotationes* Guil. Dindorfii. Partes II. 8vo. 11s.

— *Scholia Graeca ex Codicibus aucta et emendata* a Guil. Dindorfio. Partes III. 8vo. 1l.

— *In Single Plays.* Edited, with English Notes, Introductions, &c., by W. W. Merry, D.D. Extra fcap. 8vo.

The Acharnians. *Third Edition*, 3s.

The Birds. 3s. 6d.

The Clouds. *Third Edition*, 3s.

The Frogs. *Second Edition*, 3s.

The Knights. *Second Edition*, 3s.

The Wasps. 3s. 6d.

Aristotle. Ex recensione

Im. Bekkeri. *Accedunt Indices Sylburgiani.* Tomi XI. 8vo. 2l. 10s.

The volumes (except Vols. I and IX) maybe had separately, price 5s. 6d. each.

— *Ethica Nicomachea*, recognovit brevique Adnotatione critica instruxit I. Bywater. 8vo. 6s. *Also in crown 8vo, paper cover*, 3s. 6d.

— *Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the Nicomachean Ethics.* By I. Bywater. 2s. 6d.

— *Notes on the Nicomachean Ethics.* By J. A. Stewart, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 3s.

— *The Politics*, with Introductions, Notes, &c., by W. L. Newman, M.A. Vols. I and II. Medium 8vo. 28s.

— *The Politics*, translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. 2 vols. 21s.

Aristotle. *Aristotelian Studies.*

I. On the Structure of the Seventh Book of the Nicomachean Ethics. By J. C. Wilson, M.A. 8vo, stiff covers, 5s.

— *The English Manuscripts of the Nicomachean Ethics*, described in relation to Bekker's Manuscripts and other Sources. By J. A. Stewart, M.A. (Anecdota Oxon.) Small 4to. 3s. 6d.

— *On the History of the process by which the Aristotelian Writings arrived at their present form.* By R. Shute, M.A. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— *Physics.* Book VII. Collation of various MSS.; with Introduction by R. Shute, M.A. (Anecdota Oxon.) Small 4to. 2s.

Choerobosci *Dictata in Theodosii Canones, necnon Epimerismi in Psalmos.* E Codicibus mss. edidit Thomas Gaisford, S.T.P. Tomi III. 8vo. 15s.

Demosthenes. Ex recensione G. Dindorfii. Tomi IX. 8vo. 2l. 6s.

Separately:—

Text, 1l. 1s. Annotations, 15s.

Scholia, 10s.

Demosthenes and Aeschines.

The Orations of Demosthenes and Aeschines on the Crown. With Introductory Essays and Notes. By G. A. Simcox, M.A., and W. H. Simcox, M.A. 8vo. 12s.

Demosthenes. *Orations*

against Philip. With Introduction and Notes, by Evelyn Abbott, M.A., and P. E. Matheson, M.A.

Vol. I. Philippic I. Olynthiacs I-III. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Vol. II. De Pace, Philippic II. De Chersoneso, Philippic III. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Euripides. *Tragoediae et Fragmenta*, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. Tomi II. 8vo. 10s.

- Euripides.** *Annotationes*
Guil. Dindorfii. Partes II. 8vo.
10s.
- *Scholia Graeca*, ex Codicibus aucta et emendata a Guil. Dindorfio. Tomi IV. 8vo. 1l. 16s.
- Hephaestionis** *Enchiridion*,
Terentianus Maurus, Proclus, &c. Edidit
T. Gaisford, S.T.P. Tomi II. 10s.
- Heracliti Ephesii Reliquiae.**
Recensuit I. Bywater, M.A. Appendicis loco additae sunt Diogenis Laertii Vita Heracliti, Partieuſae Hippocratei De Diaeta Lib. I., Epistolae Heracliteae. 8vo. 6s.
- Herodotus.** *Books V and VI*,
Terpsichore and Erato. Edited,
with Notes and Appendices, by
Evelyn Abbott, M.A., LL.D. 8vo,
with two Maps, 10s. 6d.
- Homer.** *A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey and Hymns of Homer*; to which is added a Concordance to the Parallel Passages in the Iliad, Odyssey, and Hymns. By Henry Dunbar, M.D. 4to.
1l. 1s.
- *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect.* By D. B. Monro, M.A.
8vo. *Second Edition.* 14s.
- *Ilias*, ex rec. Guil. Dindorfii. 8vo. 5s. 6d.
- *Scholia Graeca in Iliadem.* Edited by W. Dindorf, after a new collation of the Venetian mss. by D. B. Monro, M.A. 4 vols.
8vo. 2l. 10s.
- *Scholia Graeca in Iliadem Townleyana.* Recensuit Ernestus Maass. 2 vols. 8vo.
1l. 16s.
- Homer.** *Odyssea*, ex rec. G. Dindorfii. 8vo. 5s. 6d.
- *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam.* Edidit Guil. Dindorfius. Tomi II. 8vo. 15s. 6d.
- *Odyssey.* Books I–XII.
Edited with English Notes, Appendices, &c. By W. W. Merry, D.D., and James Riddell, M.A. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16s.
- *Hymni Homerici.* Codicibus denuo collatis recensuit Alfredus Goodwin. Small folio.
With four Plates. 21s. net.
- Oratores Attici**, ex recensione Bekkeri:
I. Antiphon, Andocides, et Lysias.
8vo. 7s.
II. Isocrates. 8vo. 7s.
III. Isaeus, Aeschines, Lycurgus, Dinarchus, &c. 8vo. 7s.
- Paroemiographi Graeci**, *quorum pars nunc primum ex Codd. mss. vulgatur.* Edidit T. Gaisford, S.T.P.
1836. 8vo. 5s. 6d.
- Plato.** *Apology*, with a revised Text and English Notes, and a Digest of Platonic Idioms, by James Riddell, M.A. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
- *Philebus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by Edward Poste, M.A. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- *Republic.* The Greek Text. Edited, with Notes and Essays, by the late B. Jowett, M.A. and Lewis Campbell, M.A. In three vols. Medium 8vo. 2l. 2s.
- *Sophistes and Politicus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. 8vo.
18s.

Plato. *Theaetetus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. *Second Edition.* Svo. 10s. 6d.

— *The Dialogues*, translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions, by B. Jowett, M.A. *Third Edition.* 5 vols. medium Svo. Cloth, 4l. 4s.; half-morocco, 5l.

— *The Republic*, translated into English, with Analysis and Introduction, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium Svo. 12s. 6d.; half-roan, 14s.

— *With Introduction and Notes.* By St. George Stock, M.A. Extra feap. 8vo.

I. The Apology, 2s. 6d.

II. Crito, 2s. III. Meno, 2s. 6d.

— *Selections. With Introductions and Notes.* By John Purves, M.A., and Preface by B. Jowett, M.A. *Second Edition.* Extra feap. 8vo. 5s.

— *A Selection of Passages from Plato for English Readers; from the Translation by B. Jowett, M.A.* Edited, with Introductions, by M. J. Knight. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, gilt top. 12s.

Plotinus. Edidit F. Creuzer. Tomi III. 4to. 1l. 8s.

Polybius. *Selections.* Edited by J. L. Strachan-Davidson, M.A. With Maps. Medium 8vo. 21s.

Plutarchi Moralia, id est, Opera, exceptis Vitis, reliqua. Edidit Daniel Wyttenbach. Accedit Index Graecitatis. Tomi VIII. Partes XV. 1795-1830. 8vo, cloth, 3l. 10s.

Sophocles. *The Plays and Fragments.* With English Notes and Introductions, by Lewis Campbell, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo, 16s. each.

Vol. I. Oedipus Tyrannus. Oedipus Coloneus. Antigone.

Vol. II. Ajax. Electra. Trachiniae. Philoctetes. Fragments.

Sophocles. *Tragoediae et Fragmenta*, ex recensione et cum commentariis Guil. Dindorfii. *Third Edition.* 2 vols. Feap. 8vo. 1l. 1s. Each Play separately, limp, 2s. 6d.

— *Tragoediae et Fragmenta cum Annotationibus Guil. Dindorfii.* Tomi II. 8vo. 10s.

The Text, Vol. I. 5s. 6d.

The Notes, Vol. II. 4s. 6d.

Stobaei Florilegium. Ad mss. fidem emendavit et supplevit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. Tomi IV. 8vo. 1l.

— *Eclogarum Physicarum et Ethicarum libri duo.* Accedit Hierocli Commentarius in aurea carmina Pythagoreorum. Ad mss. Codd. recensuit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. Tomi II. 8vo. 11s.

Strabo. *Selections, with an Introduction on Strabo's Life and Works.* By H. F. Tozer, M.A., F.R.G.S. 8vo. With Maps and Plans. 12s.

Theodreti Graecarum Affectionum Curatio. Ad Codices mss. recensuit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Thucydides. Translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices. By B. Jowett, M.A. 2 vols. Medium 8vo. 1l. 12s.

Xenophon. Ex recensione et cum annotationibus L. Dindorfii.

Historia Graeca. Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Expeditio Cyri. Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Institutio Cyri. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Memorabilia Socratis. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Opuscula Politica Equestris et Venatica cum Arriani Libello de Venatione. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

3. MISCELLANEOUS STANDARD WORKS.

- Arbuthnot.** *The Life and Works of John Arbuthnot.* By George A. Aitken. 8vo, cloth extra, with Portrait, 16s.
- Bacon.** *The Essays.* Edited with Introduction and Illustrative Notes, by S. H. Reynolds, M.A. 8vo, half-bound, 12s. 6d.
- Casaubon (Isaac), 1559-1614.** By Mark Pattison, late Rector of Lincoln College. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16s.
- Finlay.** *A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the present time, B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864.* By George Finlay, LL.D. A new Edition, revised throughout, and in part re-written, with considerable additions, by the Author, and edited by H. F. Tozer, M.A. 7 vols. 8vo. 3l. 10s.
- Gaii Institutionum Juris Civilis Commentarii Quattuor;** or, Elements of Roman Law by Gaius. With a Translation and Commentary by Edward Poste, M.A. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 18s.
- Fragmenta Herculaneusia.** A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oxford copies of the Herculanean Rolls, together with the texts of several papyri, accompanied by facsimiles. Edited by Walter Scott, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Royal 8vo. 21s.
- Hodgkin.** *Italy and her Invaders.* With Plates and Maps. By Thomas Hodgkin, D.C.L. A.D. 376-744. 8vo. Vols. I and II, 2l. 2s. Vols. III and IV, *Reprinting.* Vols. V and VI, 1l. 16s.
- Justinian.** *Imperatoris Iustiniani Institutionum Libri Quattuor;* with Introductions, Commentary, Excursus and Translation. By J. B. Moyle, D.C.L. *Second Edition.* 2 vols. 8vo. 22s.
- Machiavelli.** *Il Principe.* Edited by L. Arthur Burd. With an Introduction by Lord Acton. 8vo. 14s.
- Pattison.** *Essays by the late Mark Pattison,* sometime Rector of Lincoln College. Collected and Arranged by Henry Nettleship, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.
- Raleigh.** *Sir Walter Raleigh.* A Biography. By W. Stebbing, M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Ramsay.** *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia;* being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia, from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest. By W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D. Vol. I. *The Lycos Valley and South-Western Phrygia.* Royal 8vo, linen, 18s. net.
- Selden.** *The Table Talk of John Selden.* Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by Samuel Harvey Reynolds, M.A. 8vo, half-roan, 8s. 6d.
- Stokes.** *The Anglo-Indian Codes.* By Whitley Stokes, LL.D. Vol. I. Substantive Law. 8vo. 30s. Vol. II. Adjective Law. 8vo. 35s.
- Strachey.** *Hastings and The Rohilla War.* By Sir John Strachey, G.C.S.I. 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Thomson.** *Notes on Recent Researches in Electricity and Magnetism,* intended as a sequel to Professor Clerk Maxwell's 'Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism.' By J. J. Thomson, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Experimental Physics in the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 18s. 6d.

4. STANDARD THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

St. Basil: *The Book of St. Basil on the Holy Spirit.* A Revised Text, with Notes and Introduction by C. F. H. Johnston, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Bigg. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria;* being the Bampton Lectures for 1886. By Charles Bigg, D.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Bright. *Chapters of Early English Church History.* By W. Bright, D.D. Second Edition. 8vo. 12s.

Canons of the First Four General Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. With Notes, by W. Bright, D.D. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Book of Enoch. *Translated from Dillmann's Ethiopic Text (emended and revised), and Edited by R. H. Charles, M.A.* 8vo. 16s.

Hatch and Redpath. *A Concordance to the Greek Versions and Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament.* By the late Edwin Hatch, M.A., and H. A. Redpath, M.A.
Parts I-IV. Α-ΜΥΡΕΥΙΚΟΣ. Imperial 4to. 21s. each.
Part V. *Immediately.*

Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica. *Essays in Biblical and Patristic Criticism, and kindred subjects.* By Members of the University of Oxford. 8vo.
Vol. I. 10s. 6d. Vol. II. 12s. 6d.
Vol. III. 16s. Vol. IV. *In the Press.*

5. A NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY on Historical Principles, founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Imperial 4to.

PRESENT STATE OF THE WORK.

			£	s.	d.										
Vol. I.	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{A} \\ \text{B} \end{array} \right\}$	Edited by Dr. Murray	Half-morocco	2	12 6										
Vol. II.						C	Edited by Dr. Murray	Half-morocco	2	12 6					
Vol. III.	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$	Edited by Dr. Murray	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$										
						$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$									
										$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$			
													$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{D} \\ \text{E} \end{array} \right\}$
Vol. IV.	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$										
						$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$							
									$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$				
												$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{F} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{H} \end{array} \right\}$	

(The remainder of the Letter D is far advanced.)

(The remainder of the Letter F is far advanced.)

In Preparation.

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON: HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

DEC 3 2000

REC'D YRI DEC 3 4 00

MAR 1 2005



A 000 667 713 2

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
y of California, San Diego

DATE DUE

3 1975

