AN

HISTORICAL

GREEK GRAMMAR

CHIEFLY OF THE ATTIC DIALECT

AS WRITTEN AND SPOKEN
FROM CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY DOWN TO THE PRESENT TIME

FOUNDED UPON THE

ANCIENT TEXTS, INSCRIPTIONS, PAPYRI

AND PRESENT POPULAR GREEK

BY

A. N. JANNARIS, PH.D.

LECTURER ON POST-CLASSICAL AND MODERN GREEK AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS,
AUTHOR OF
' AN ANCIENT GREEK LEXICON FOR GREEKS,' 'A MODERN GREEK AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY,'
'A MODERN GREEK GRAMMAR FOR GERMANS,' ETC., ETC.

London

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.

1897

βούλησθε. Dem. 50, 37 λέγοντος ἐμοῦ ταῦτ' ἀποκρίνεται μοι ὅτι ὁ συντριήραρχος αὐτῷ οὐχ ἥκοι ἐπὶ τὴν ναῦν· οὔκουν παραλήψομαι μόνος τὴν τριήρη·

NT Luke 5, 14 παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε κτλ. Acta Tho. 16, 20 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς πάνυ ὀργισθεὶς ἐκέλευσεν ὑπὸ δεσμὸν γενέσθαι τόν τε ἔμπορον καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθῆναι ἕως ἀνακρίνας μάθῃ τίνι ἐδόθη τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως· καὶ οὕτως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσω μετὰ τοῦ ἐμπόρου.

2032. In this popular mode of direct discourse, it is very common to indicate the dependence of the verbatim clause by placing before it the conjunction ὅτι, which then seems redundant (so in NT about 120 times) and corresponds to our modern colon (:) or quotation marks (80), as :

Th. 1, 137 ἐδήλου δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι Θεμιστοκλῆς ἥκω παρὰ σέ. So 1, 139. 8, 53. Xen. An. 1, 6, 8 ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι Οὐδ' εἰ γενοίμην (φίλος), ὦ Κῦρε, σοί γ' ἂν ἔτι ποτὲ δόξαιμι. Cyr. 3, 1, 8 εἶπε δὲ ὅτι Εἰς καιρὸν ἥκεις, ἔφη. Pl. Crit. 50 ὁ ἴσως ἂν εἴποιεν (οἱ νόμοι) ὅτι, Ὦ Σώκρατες, μὴ θαύμαζε τὰ λεγόμενα. Antiph. 5, 21 αὐτὰ ταῦτα σκοπεῖτε ὅτι Μὴ προνοίᾳ μᾶλλον ἐγένετο ἢ τύχῃ.

NT Matt. 26, 74 τότε ἤρξατο καταναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύειν ὅτι Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον. 26, 75. 27, 43 εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι Θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός. Mark 14, 58 ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον κτλ. John 10, 34 ἀπεκρίθη· Οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ὅτι Ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοί ἐστε ; Acta Tho. 2, 3 οὐκ ἐβούλετο δὲ ἀπελθεῖν λέγων μὴ δύνασθαι μήτε χωρεῖν διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ ὅτι Ἄνθρωπος ὢν Ἑβραῖος πῶς δύναμαι πορευθῆναι ἐν τοῖς Ἰνδοῖς κηρῦξαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν ; 5, 2 ἔλεγον δὲ αὐτῷ οἱ ἐκεῖσε ὅτι Καὶ σὲ οἱ θεοὶ ἤγαγον ἵνα εὐωχηθῇς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ. 9, 26 ; 27. 15, 20 etc. (Cp. Evang. Tho. A 14, 3 παρήγγειλε τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ ὅπως Ἔξω τῆς θύρας μὴ ἀπολύσεις [read -σῃς] αὐτόν.) Callin. 57, 20 βιαζόμενος ἔλεγεν ὅτι Εἴ τι παρ' ἐμοῦ ζητεῖτε, ταῦτα ἐν τῇ θεοπνεύστῳ γραφῇ εὑρήσετε. 71, 12 ἔλεγεν ὅτι Λόγον ἔχετε δοῦναι, et passim. Acta Pil. Λ, 1, 2 εἴπατέ μοι ὅτι Πῶς δύναμαι ἐγὼ ἡγεμὼν ὢν βασιλέα ἐξετάσαι ;

2032^b. So now very often in N : ΑΒ 83, 28 ἐμήνυσέ τον μιὰν αὐγήν· Κυρά μου ὅτι ἀγαπῶ σε.—μᾶς ἐφώναζαν πῶς Ἐσεῖς δὲν εἶστε χρήσιμοι ἀθρῶποι 'they shouted to us : you ain't respectable men.' Καὶ τότες εἶπε πῶς Δέ σου τό 'λεγα ἐγώ ; 'then he said : didn't I tell you so ?'

INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES.

2033. So far as they are not indicated by the mere tone of the voice, interrogative clauses are introduced in *A*, as well as *N*, either—

a. By interrogative pronouns and adverbs, also by εἰ (N ἄνε) 'whether,' as in English ; in which case they are called *Word-questions* ; τίς εἶ καὶ πόθεν ἥκεις ; or—

b. By special interrogative particles referring to the whole clause, in which case they are called *Sentence-questions* (2046 ff.).

2034. Contrary to English usage, the syntactical position of the subject in Greek interrogative clauses is not influenced by the presence of the interrogation (cp. 1158).

ἔστι πλούσιος ἢ πένης ὁ ἀνήρ ;—ὁ ἀνὴρ πλούσιός ἐστιν ἢ πένης ;—πλούσιος ἢ πένης ὁ ἀνήρ ἐστιν ; τὸν υἱὸν φιλεῖ ὁ πατήρ ;
So still in *N*.

2035. Either form of interrogative clauses can be *direct* or *indirect* (*dependent*), according as it represents a question either put directly or subordinated to an antecedent verb of *enquiring, saying, knowing.*

A. *Direct question* : τίς εἶ καὶ πόθεν ἥκεις; 'who are you and whence have you come?'

B. *Indirect question*: ἐρωτῶ τίς εἶ καὶ πόθεν ἥκεις, 'I ask who you are and whence you have come.'

2036. Since *A* times the scope of indirect questions has become gradually narrower in consequence of the decided predilection of popular speech for the more simple and vivid direct discourse (1703. 1710. 1930. 1939. 2031). Hence *P-N* is very fond of putting a direct question after verbs of *asking, deliberating, seeing, knowing, saying,* etc.

NT John 9, 19 ἠρώτησαν· Οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμῶν; 5, 6 λέγει αὐτῷ· Θέλεις ὑγιὴς γενέσθαι;

2037. Whether direct or indirect, interrogative clauses have commonly the form and construction of independent clauses. In *A*, however, *indirect* questions equally admit (*a*) of *relative* beside interrogative pronouns and adverbs ; (*b*) after secondary tense, of the *secondary subjunctive* beside either the indicative or the interrogative primary subjunctive (1909).

a. ἐρωτῶ σε ὅϲτιϲ (beside τίϲ) εἶ καὶ ὁπόθεν (πόθεν) ἥκειϲ.

b. ἠρόμην σε τίϲ or ὅϲτιϲ εἴηϲ (beside εἶ) καὶ πόθεν or ὁπόθεν ἥκοιϲ (beside ἥκειϲ).

a. Th. 1, 137 Θεμιστοκλῆς φράζει τῷ ναυκλήρῳ ὅϲτιϲ ἐστὶ καὶ δι᾽ ἃ φεύγει. Pl. Gorg. 500 Α ἆρ᾽ οὖν παντὸς ἀνδρός ἐστιν ἐκλέξασθαι ποῖα ἀγαθὰ τῶν ἡδέων ἐστὶ καὶ ὁποῖα κακά. 448 Ε οὐδεὶς ἐρωτᾷ ποία τις εἴη ἡ Γοργίου τέχνη, ἀλλὰ τίς καὶ ὅντινα δέοι καλεῖν τὸν Γοργίαν. Xen. Mem. 4, 4, 13 οὐ γὰρ αἰσθάνομαί σου ὁποῖον νόμιμον ἢ ποῖον δίκαιον λέγεις. — See also 1446.

b. Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 15 ἡ μήτηρ ΔΙΗΡώΤΑ τὸν Κῦρον πόΤΕΡΟΝ ΒΟΫΛΟΙΤΟ μένειν ἢ ἀπιέναι. An. 7, 2, 25 ἐπήρετο τὸν Μηδοσάδην εἰ ἀληθῆ ταῦτα εἴΗ. Dem. 19, 122 συνελθόντες ἐΒΟΫΛΕΫΟΝΘ᾽ ΟΫΤΟΙ ΤΙΝ᾽ αὐτοῦ ΚΑΤΑΛΕΊΨΟΥϹΙΝ. Pl. Apol. 21 Β ΗΠόΡΟΫΝ τί ποτε λέγει. Th. 1, 63 ΗΠόΡΗϹΕ μὲν ὁποτέρωσε ΔΙΑΚΙΝΔΥΝΕΫϹΗ χωρήσας. 2, 4, 6 οἱ Πλαταιῆς ἐΒΟΫΛΕΫΟΝΤΟ ΕΪΤΕ ΚΑΤΑΚΑΫϹΩϹΙΝ ὥσπερ ἔχουσιν ἐμπρήσαντες τὸ οἴκημα, ΕΪΤΕ τι ἄλλο ΧΡΉϹΩΝΤΑΙ. Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 23 ὁρῶ σε ἀΠΟΡΟΫΝΤΑ ΠΟΊΑΝ ὁδὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βίον τράπΗ.—See also 1446.

2038. The use of the relatives in indirect questions brought them into association with the ordinary or direct interrogatives and thus rendered them admissible in questions also, especially in *A* dialogue. This peculiarity is unusual in narrative *A* prose, but fairly common in *P-B* compositions, apparently owing to the influence of the parallel use in Latin of relatives which acted as interrogatives as well.

Eur. Rh. 703 ὁποῖον ἐπεύχεται τὸν ὕπατον θεῶν ; Pl. Rep. 578 Ε ἐν ποίῳ ἄν τινι καὶ ὁπόσῳ φόβῳ οἴει γενέσθαι αὐτόν ; Lys. 212 C ὁπόΤΕΡΟϹ οὖν αὐτῶν ποτέρου φίλος; Ar. Ran. 198 οὗτος, τί ποιεῖς ;—ΔΙ. ὅ,τι ποιῶ ; Ach. 594 ἀλλὰ τίς γὰρ εἶ ;—ΔΙΚ. ὅϲτιϲ ; πολίτης χρηστός. Pl. Euthyph. 2 C ἀλλὰ δὴ τίνα γραφήν σε γέγραπται ;—ΣΩ. ΉΝΤΙΝΑ ; οὐκ ἀγεννῆ, ἐμοί γε

473

δοκεῖ. Hipp. I, 292 C. Leg. 662 A καὶ πῶς ἂν ταῦτα γ' ἔτι ξυγχωροῖμεν; —ΑΘ. ὅπωс;

Sept. I Chron. 17, 6 ὅ,τι οὐκ ᾠκοδομήσατέ μοι οἶκον κέδρινον; NT Mark 9, 11 ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες· Ὅ,τι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἡλίαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον; ib. 28 ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν· Ὅ,τι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; (where Euthym.: τὸ ὅ,τι ἀντὶ τοῦ διατί). Mark 2, 16. Matt. 26, 50 ἐφ' ὃ πάρει; (cp. Jas. 3, 5 ἰδοὺ ἡλίκον πῦρ ἡλίκην ὕλην ἀνάπτει.) Jul. Frg. 276 E θεοτόκον ὑμεῖς ἀνθ' ὅΤΟΥ τὴν παρθένον εἶναι φατέ; 'wherefore?' Just. Cohort. 5 (p. 253 A) δι' ἫΝ αἰτίαν .. ὡς ἀληθεύοντι προσέχεις Ὁμήρῳ; [Just.] 1288 B ὅ,τι οὖν τῶν δύο ἀληθέστερον; Method. 165 C. Cyrill. A. i. 204 A ἀνθ' ὅΤΟΥ δὴ οὖν ἀνίησι μὲν τοὺς ἐν ἥβῃ καὶ ἐν ἀκμῇ; Theod. iv. 512 A ἀνθ' ὅΤΟΥ τὰ βρέφη βαπτίζομεν; Stud. 380 B ὅΤΟΥ χάριν; so Barn. 748 B ὅτι (read ὅ,τι) δὲ τὸ ἔριον ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον; Apophth. 105 C Ἀρσένιε, δι' ὃ ἐξῆλθες; CGL 231, 15 ὅΠΟΥ ἦν; ubi erat? 642, 21 ὅΠΟΥ οὖν λουσώμεθα; ὅπου θέλεις. ubi ergo lauemur? ubi uis. Mal. 256, 20 εἰ ὁ αὐτοῦ μαθητὴς τοιαῦτα θαυμάσια ἐποίει, ὁ ὁποῖος ὑπῆρχεν ἐκεῖνος δυνατός;

2038 b. That in *G–N*, interrogatives and their relative substitutes can be preceded by the definite article τὸ in indirect questions, will be explained in 2041.

2039. As regards the use of moods in indirect questions among *P–N* scribes, the *A* practice holds good even in the case of the secondary subjunctive which lingers as late as *T*, if we may judge from the NT writings. (1934.)

Luke 1, 29 διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἴΗ ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος. 1, 62 ἐνένευον δὲ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι καλεῖσθαι αὐτό. 3, 15 διαλογιζομένων περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου μή ποτε αὐτὸς εἴΗ ὁ Χριστός. 6, 11 διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τί ἂν ΠΟΙΉΣΑΙΕΝ τῷ Ἰησοῦ. 8, 9. 9, 46 εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ τίς ἂν εἴΗ μείζων αὐτῶν. 15, 26 ἐπυνθάνετο τί εἴΗ ταῦτα. 18, 36. 22, 23 ἤρξαντο συνζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴΗ ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ μέλλων τοῦτο πράσσειν. Acts 5, 24 διηπόρουν περὶ αὐτῶν τί ἂν ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ τοῦτο. 10, 17 διηπόρει ὁ Πέτρος τί ἂν εἴΗ τὸ ὅραμα ὃ εἶδεν. 17, 11 ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφὰς εἰ ἔχοι ταῦτα οὕτως. 21, 33 ἐπυνθάνετο τίς εἴΗ καὶ τί ἐστιν πεποιηκώς.—Clem. R. 14, 3 κατεσκόπουν τὸ τί ἂν ἐν κρυφαίῳ εἰσιόντες πράττοιτε. Gr. Urk. Berlin 347² († 170), 10 Σερηνειανὸς ἐπύθετο τῶν κορυφαίων εἰ σημεῖόν τι ἔχοι ὁ παῖς. (See also App. v. 10.)

[**2040.** From the above list which is nearly complete for the NT writings, it appears that the secondary subjunctive lingered longer in indirect questions than in any other case of dependent speech. At the same time it must be noted that most of the instances cited, coming as they do from Luke, point to a Hellenizing tendency. It is further significant that they all express a speculative or potential contingency, often intensified by the insertion of some modal particle (ἄν, ἄρα, πῶς, τί, ποτέ, 1749), and so border on potential clauses (1925). Finally it is rather striking that in all these cases we should meet either with the ever recurring εἴη and γένοιτο —standing formulas in the devotional language of the church—or with endings homophonous in both the primary and secondary subjunctive (οι = η), so that one might be tempted to suspect an itacistic mis-spelling traceable to the scholastic zeal of the copiers (cp. App. iv. 9. v. 14). And the suspicion becomes the more warrantable as in these cases the other NT writers (sometimes also Luke himself) use the interrogative *primary subjunctive* (1909), perhaps also its associated future indicative (1888):

Mark 9, 6 οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ. 14, 1 ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς πῶς αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσαντες ἀποκτείνωσιν. ib. 11 ἐζήτει πῶς αὐτὸν παραδοῖ (App. v. 8°). ib. 40 οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τί ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῷ. Luke 22, 2 ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν. ib. 4 ἀπελθὼν συνελάλησεν τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ στρατηγοῖς τὸ πῶς αὐτοῖς παραδῷ αὐτόν. Acts 4,

21 ἀπέλυσαν αὐτοὺς μηδὲν εὑρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσωνται αὐτούς, and elsewhere.
—(John 21, 19 τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ δοξάσει [read -σῃ App.
v. 14 ff.] τὸν θεόν.   Mark 3, 2 παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν θερα-
πεύ(σ)ει αὐτόν.)—Cp. further Matt. 6, 25.   Mark 6. 36.   13, 11.   Luke 12, 5;
11 ; 22 ; 29.   John 12, 49.   Protev. Jac. 14, 1 διελογίζετο τὸ τί αὐτὴν ποιήσει
(write -σῃ).   22, 3 περιεβλέπετο ποῦ αὐτὸν κρύψει (-ψῃ).   Callin. 67, 8 ἥριζον
ὅ τε Ὑπάτιος καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος τίς πλέον νηστεύσει ἢ ἀγρυπνήσει ἢ εὔξεται ἢ ταπεινο-
φρονήσει ἢ ἐλεήσει (write everywhere -σῃ for -σει).   58, 15 ἐτήρει καιρὸν πότε
ἀπέλθῃ.   84, 2.   87, 8 κλαίει πῶς περάσῃ καὶ εἰσέλθῃ.   88, 5.]

2041. Another peculiarity characteristic of *G-N* speech is the
frequent practice of introducing indirect word-questions by means of
the neuter article τό, as if the question were a direct quotation con-
ceived as one object (1217 ff.).   Though very common in *M* Greek,
this peculiarity is now obsolescent.

Aristid. 8, 88, 91 καὶ τὸ ὅστις ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ ἥντινα ἔχει τὴν φύσιν.   Luke
1, 62 ἐνένευον τῷ πατρὶ τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι καλεῖσθαι αὐτό.   9, 46. 19, 48. 22, 2
ἐζήτουν τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν.   Acts 22, 30 βουλόμενος γνῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλὲς τὸ τί
κατηγορεῖται παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.   Clem. Rom. 14, 3 κατεσκόπουν τὸ τί ἂν
ἐν κρυφαίῳ εἰσιόντες πράττοιτε.   Protev. Jac. 14, 1 διελογίζετο τὸ τί αὐτὴν
ποιήσει (write -σῃ).   Acta Pil. A 1, 4 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸ σχῆμα τῶν σίγνων
τὸ πῶς ἐκάμφθησαν.   Narr. Josephi 2, 2 οὐκ εἶχον τὸ πῶς τὸ πάσχα ποιῆσαι.   5, 2
οὐκ ἔτι τὸν λῃστὴν ἐθεασάμεθα τὸ τί ἐγένετο.   Acta Phil. in Hellad. 7 ἵνα αὐτὸς
ἡμῖν ἀπαγγείλῃς τὸ τί βούλεται εἶναι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο.   Amphil. 177 ὁ διηγήσομαι
τὸ ὅπως ἐκ θείας ἐπιφανείας αὐτόπτης ἐγένετο.   JMoschos 27 θέλων παρ' αὐτοῦ
μαθεῖν τὸ τίς ἐστιν.   Mul. 206, 17 γνοὺς περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὸ
τί πέπραχαν κατ' αὐτοῦ.   231, 17 ἐπηρώτησε τὴν Πυθίαν τὸ διατί οὐκ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ
ἀπόκρισις.   Leont. Neap. V. J. 5, 12 κανονίζων τὸ τί ἐποίησεν.   19, 11 μὴ δυνη-
θέντες γνωρίσαι τὸ ποῦ ὑπάγομεν.   21, 22 ἐρωτᾷ αὐτὸν τὸ τί ἔλαβεν.   74, 18
ἐξωμολογεῖτο τὸ τί ἦν ποιήσας.   47, 2 μετενόουν καὶ ἐκόπτοντο ἅπαντες . . . τὸ
ἐν ποίᾳ ἀτιμίᾳ εἶχον αὐτόν.   Chron. 729, 18 ἐσημάναμεν τὸ πῶς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἡ
δέσποινα ἡμῶν ἡ Θεοτόκος συνέπραξεν ἡμῖν.   Porph. Adm. 220, 14 περιέχον τὸ
τί ὀφείλουσιν.

So still in *N*: μοῦ εἶπε τὸ τί ἔπαθε.   νά σου διηγηθῶ τὸ πῶς ἐγλύτωσα.

2042. Sometimes two interrogative words are found in the same
clause, side by side, but without connective:

Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 3 τίνας ὑπὸ τίνων εὕροιμεν ἂν μείζονα εὐεργετημένους ἢ
παῖδας ὑπὸ γονέων ;   Pl. Theaet. 280 Ε πῶς τί τοῦτο ;   Rep. 400 Α ποῖα δ' ὁποῖου
βίου μιμήματα οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν ;   Od. α 170 τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν ;

2043. In this case *N* inserts the conjunction καί : ἀπὸ ποῦ καὶ πῶς καὶ πόσα ;

2044. The question *why?* is expressed in *A* Greek by τί ;
also by διὰ τί (διατί), ἵνα τί ;-- indirectly by ὅτι (διότι)—but when it
implies surprise or disapprobation (*why on earth? why should?*)
recourse is very fondly had to the idiomatic phrase τί παθών ;
(sometimes τί μαθών), also τί ἔχων ;—indirect by ὅ,τι παθών
(μαθών), ἔχων, as :

Ar. Nub. 341 λέξον δή μοι, τί παθοῦσαι θνηταῖς εἴξασι γυναιξίν ;   Pl.
Phaedr. 236 Ε τί δῆτα ἔχων στρέφει ;

Protev. Jac. 13, 2 τί τοῦτο ἐποίησας ;   τί ἐταπείνωσας τὴν ψυχήν μου ;   Callin.
101, 27 τί ἔχεις μετ' ἐμοῦ, ἄνθρωπε ;   τί ἐπαίρεις τοὺς ἐμούς ; . . τί ἔχεις μετ'
ἐμοῦ ;   τί τὰ ἐμὰ πραιδεύεις ;   CGL 233, 6 τί στήκεις ;   *quid stas?*   So 652, 11.

2045. So still in *N*: τί φωνάζεις; διατί (γιατί) φωνάζεις; but after the retreat of the active participle (2166 ff.), the above terms παθών, (μαθών), ἔχων, have been necessarily turned into finite co-ordinate verbs: τί ἔπαθες καὶ κλαίεις; τί ἔχεις καὶ κλαίεις; (EGeorg. Const. 426.) [1]

2046. So far as it is not indicated by the mere tone of the voice (2033), a *direct* SENTENCE-*question* is introduced by—

ᾶρα, ἤ (=Latin -*ne*), 'I wonder,' suggesting the answer yes or no;
*οὐ, ἆρ’ οὐ (=Latin *nonne*)   ,,   ,,   ,,   yes (cp. 1812);
‡μή, ἆρα μή, μῶν (Latin *num*)   ,,   ,,   ,,   no (cp. 1812);

while the second member, if any, is invariably introduced by ‡ἤ 'or.'

Eur. I. T. 575 ἆρ’ εἰσίν; ἆρ’ οὐκ εἰσί; τίς φράσειεν ἄν; Xen. Mem. 3, 10, 1 ἆρα γραφικῇ ἐστιν ἡ εἰκασία τῶν ὁρωμένων; Ἀληθῆ λέγεις, ἔφη. 4, 2, 22 ἆρ’ οὖν διὰ τὴν τοῦ χαλκεύειν ἀμαθίαν τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου τυγχάνουσιν; οὐ δῆτα. Pl. Rep. 341 E ἤ ὀρθῶς σοι δοκῶ ἂν εἰπεῖν οὕτω λέγων ἤ οὔ; Ὀρθῶς, ἔφη. Soph. El. 997 οὐκ εἰσορᾶς; O. C. 883 ἆρ’ οὐχ ὕβρις τάδε; Aesch. Pr. 962 μή τι σοι δοκῶ ταρβεῖν; Xen. Mem. 4, 2, 10 ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀρχιτέκτων βούλει γενέσθαι; 2, 6, 34 ἆρα μὴ διαβάλλεσθαι δόξεις ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ; Soph. El. 446 ἆρα μὴ δοκεῖς λυτήρι’ αὐτῇ ταῦτα τοῦ φόνου φέρειν; Pl. Prot. 310 D μῶν τί σε ἀδικεῖ Πρωταγόρας;—Callin. 96, 31 μή τι κακὸν διεπράξω; 97, 21 μή τι προσέκρουσας τῷ θεῷ;—See also 1747 ff. & 1812.

2047. With certain modifications, the leading representatives of the above particles (ἆρα, οὐ, μή) still survive in *N*, and even preserve their *A* usage and construction.

[2047^b. For εἰ=ἆρα in Biblical Greek see 2055 f.]

2048. In particular, ἆρα is now very common in the amplified form ἆραγες, though it is open to doubt whether its present popularity be not rather a revival than a survival of *A* ἆρα, due to the influence of literary style. At all events the NT writers hardly use it (only Luke twice : 18, 8 and Acts 8, 30; preferring ἤ instead 2050), unless we are willing, as we ought, to admit its presence in such cases as τίς ἄρα, τί ἄρα (writing τίς ἄρα, τί ἄρα, 1748) and the like (cp. AButtmann 247);—while it is completely absent from some *N* dialects [2].

2049. On the other hand, οὐ in its modification οὐ]δέν (1798 f.), and μή are still universally common in their *A* use and sense : δέ” σου τό ’λεγα ’γώ; 'did I not tell you so?' μή σου ἔγινα δοῦλος; 'I haven't become your servant, have I?'

2049^b. The latter particle (μή), however, is now generally amplified to μήπως or more commonly to μήμπας (with or without a following καὶ or νά). Of these two amplifications, the former (μήπως), though the one generally received in cultivated speech, is open to the suspicion of being an Hellenized form of μήμπας (1749. 1957), the more so as the latter appears 'unclas-

[1] The participle μαθών has no corresponding substitute in *N* (never τί ἔμαθες καὶ . .) and this circumstance adds strength to the suspicion that μαθών may be a corruption of παθών.

[2] E.g. in Crete, where in the western parts its place is held by παιδιά (cp. John 21, 5 παιδία, μή τι προσφάγιον ἔχετε;) and in the eastern commonly by κά, this being an abbreviation of the universal vocative καλέ (251^b), used chiefly in exclamations implying surprise : καλέ, τί λές!

476

sical' and therefore unpalatable to the scribes. In reality, however, this colloquialism is a corruption of μὴν πά(γ)ει(s) νὰ or καί (1749), analogous and equivalent to μὴν τύχῃ νὰ or καί (cp. P τυχόν), μὴ λάχῃ νὰ or καί, combinations also current in popular speech (1717 f. 1749), as: φοβοῦμαι ΜΗΝ ἀποθάνῃ, —ΜΗΜΠΆ ν' ἀποθάνῃ (— ΜΗΜΠΆ ˢ ΚΑῚ πεθάνῃ)—ΜΗ ΛΆΧΗ ΚΑῚ ἀποθάνῃ. —The complex μὴν πᾷˢ καὶ is often shortened to (μ)πᾷˢ καί (as: (μ)πᾳs κ' ἐτρελάθηκες; 'have you perchance gone mad?' very different from πῶς κ' ἐτρελάθηκες; 'how is it that you have gone mad?'),—a circumstance clearly disproving the presence of πῶς in μήμπᾳˢ, and strengthening the suspicion against μήπως as a direct survival of A.

2050. Of the remaining two particles, μῶν (from μὴ οὖν or Doric μὴ ὦν) was peculiar to A and apparently never passed to P discourse (the NT shows no trace of it), its place having been taken by its associates μὴ ἆρα (Moeris 242 : μῶν Ἀττικῶς, μὴ ἆρα Ἑλληνικῶς. Cp. RKühner ii.² 1024 f.), or rather μὴ γάρ (1948) (N μηγάριˢ), μή τι, μή πως (1749), as: Pl. Crat. 429 c ΜΗ ΓᾺΡ οὐδὲ τοῦτο αὖ ᾖ; Epict. 21, 19 ΜΗ ΓᾺΡ ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἦλθες; ΜΗ ΓᾺΡ τούτου ἕνεκά μοι παρακάθησαι; ΜΗ ΓᾺΡ διὰ τοῦτο ποτὲ λύχνον ἦψας ἢ ἠγρύπνησας; ib. 21 ΜΗ ΓᾺΡ ἐπύθου;—On the other hand ἦ, an alternative and equivalent of ἆρα, enjoyed a far wider and longer popularity, since it appears even in Homer as a very common particle and remains so through A, especially in colloquial speech (dialogue), down to post-christian times (2055).

Plut. Apophth. 10 (ii. 209 A) ἦ δοκεῖ σοι ὃ καὶ τῷ πατρί; Ael. V. H. 6, 6 ἦ γὰρ οὐ καὶ ταῦτα Λακωνικά; Aristid. 1, 1, 4.—NT Matt. 26, 53 ἦ (ubi male ἢ) δοκεῖς ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι παρακαλέσαι τὸν πατέρα μου; Rom. 3, 29. 6, 3. 11, 2 ἦ οὐκ οἴδατε; so 1 Cor. 6, 9. 14, 36 ἦ ἐξῆλθεν; 2 Cor. 11, 7 ἦ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα; Jas. 4, 5 ἦ δοκεῖτε; 1 Thes. 2, 19. Stob. Ecl. 3, 23, p. 567 ἦ ποιοῦμεν; ib. ἦ οὖν ἔγνωμεν; etc.

2051. The two interrogative particles μή and οὐ are frequently joined together in the complex μὴ οὐ (nonne?) when the interrogator confidently expects an emphatic affirmation: *yes indeed!*

Xen. Mem. 4, 2, 12 ΜΗ οὖν οΥ δύναμαι ἐγὼ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἔργα ἐξηγήσασθαι; NT Rom. 10, 18 ΜΗ οΥκ ἤκουσαν;—μενοῦνγε. so ib. 19. 1 Cor. 9, 4–5 ΜΗ οΥκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν; ΜΗ οΥκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν; so 11, 22.

So still in N: ΜΗ ΔῈΝ ἔβαλα τὰ δυνατά μου; 'haven't I done my best?' μὴ δέ σου τό 'λεγα; 'didn't I tell you so?' ΜΗ ΔῈΝ τό 'ξερες; 'surely you did know it?'

2051ᵇ. For the alleged converse complex οὐ μή, see 1827 f.

2052. *Alternative* or *disjunctive* questions, whether direct or indirect, are often introduced by πότερον—ἤ, *utrum—an*, as:

Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 12 ἢν ἄρχων τις τύχῃ σοι καὶ ἁμάρτῃ, πότεΡΟΝ ἐᾶς ἄρχειν ἢ ἄλλον καθίστης ἀντ' αὐτοῦ; Aesch. Cho. 118 πότεΡΑ δικαστήν ἢ δικηφόρον λέγεις; Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 15 διηρώτα πότεΡΟΝ βούλοιτο μένειν ἢ ἀπιέναι. Dem. 23, 79 πότεΡΟΝ δέδρακεν ἢ οὔ;

2053. But the introductory πότερον can be omitted, as: Pl. Prot. 310 B ἐγρήγορας ἢ καθεύδεις; and this is the regular practice in P-N.

2053ᵇ. In fact the custom of introducing the question by πότερον had become obsolete as early as the Iˢᵗ A D., if we may judge from the NT writers who scarcely ever use it (only once, John 7, 17). Cp. Matt. 11, 3 σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν; Mark 12, 14 ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι ἢ οὔ; δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν;

477

Hosted by Google

2054. When they are conditional ('whether'), indirect sentence-questions are introduced, if simple, by εἰ (uncommonly by ἐάν) 'whether' (German *ob*), if double or alternative, by εἰ . . . ἤ or εἴτε . . . εἴτε 'whether . . . or.'

Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 10 ἐρωτᾷς εἴ που ἂν ἀπὸ σοῦ πόρος προσγένοιτο; Mem. 2, 5, 2 σκοποῦμαι τοῦτο, εἰ ἆρα ὥσπερ τῶν οἰκετῶν οὕτω καὶ τῶν φίλων εἰσίν ἄξιαι. An. 1, 10, 5 ἐβουλεύετο εἰ πέμποιέν τινας ἢ πάντες ἴοιεν ἀρήξοντες. Pl. Gorg. 452 c σκόπει δῆτα ἐάν σοι πλούτου φανῇ τι μεῖζον ἀγαθὸν ὄν. Xen. Mem. 4, 4, 12 σκέψαι ἐάν τόδε σοι μᾶλλον ἀρέσκῃ. Cyr. 2, 4, 6 ἄκουε τοίνυν ἄν τι σοι δόξω λέγειν. Lys. 20, 34 οὔπω ἴστε εἴτε ἀγαθοὶ εἴτε κακοὶ ἡβήσαντες ἔσονται.

2054^b. So still in N where εἰ has naturally made room for (ἐάν) ἄν (1772), as :

μ’ ἐρώτησε ἄν ἔχω ἀδερφούς. στοχάζεται ἄν πρέπῃ νὰ μείνῃ ἢ νὰ πάγῃ. μοῦ εἶν’ ἀδιάφορο εἴτε ἔχασες εἴτ’ ἐκέρδισες.

2055. It is alleged that εἰ occurs as a *direct* interrogative particle (equivalent to ἆρα), rarely in A, but often in NT Greek, as : NT Acts 21, 37 μέλλων εἰσάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ὁ Παῦλος λέγει τῷ χιλιάρχῳ· εἰ ἔξεστίν μοι εἰπεῖν τι πρὸς σέ; Matt. 12, 10 ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες· εἰ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύειν; So further Matt. 13, 3. 19, 3. 20, 15. Mark 8, 23. Luke 13, 23. 22, 49. Acts 1, 6. 7, 1. 19, 2. 21, 37. 22, 25. 23, 9. But this assumption, though general among Biblical scholars, is based on a misconception, since εἰ here is nothing but an itacistic misspelling of the colloquial ἤ (2050). The copiers of our MSS, in whose time ἤ (= ὄντως, ἆρα) had disappeared from the living language, finding H unaccented and being unable to account for any other than disjunctive and comparative ἤ—either mistook it for such and transcribed ἤ, or, where this was too obviously inadmissible, changed it to its homophonous εἰ (37 ff.), which they imagined to be the nearest approximate in sense, associating it with the conditional εἰ in indirect questions. In other cases again where ἤ was followed by μήν—a very frequent occurrence —the asseverative combination ἤ μήν, then pronounced as one word ἠμήν [1], was mistaken by Biblical readers and Christian copiers for the now familiar Hebrew ἀμήν and changed accordingly [2], notwithstanding that its position at the opening of a clause ought to have served as a criterion. Hence ἤ is to be restored not only in all direct questions like the above (2050), but also in asseverative clauses (ἤ = *verily*), like Rom. 7, 1. 11, 2. 1 Cor. 6, 9. 14, 36, and elsewhere where ἤ or εἰ now stands, as well as in the numerous instances where (especially in John) it opens an assertion (ἤ μὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, so for ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν).

Cp. Sept. Gen. 22, 17 ἦ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε, where Et. M. 416, 50 observes ἤ ἐπίρρημα ὁρκικόν, ὅπερ καὶ διὰ διφθόγγου (i. e. ηι or ῃ) γράφεται· ἦ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε. ἦ ὄντως καὶ ἀληθῶς). Ezek. 33, 27 ζῶ ἐγὼ (= *by my life*), ἦ μὴν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἠρημωμέναις μαχαίραις πεσοῦνται. So 34, 8.

---

[1] Hrdn. (ALentz) i. 508, 17 τὸ δὲ ἡμῆν ὁρκικὸν ἐπίρρημα ὀξύνεται (1744, 2).

[2] If not direct, the process of interpolation and corruption is not difficult to trace : the asseveration ἤ μήν, written HMHN, which since early Christian centuries became obsolescent, appeared obscure to some Christian reader or commentator who 'explained' it, on the margin or above the line, by the more familiar Biblical term AMHN. The next copier then mistook this explanation for part of the text and interpolated it, thus producing HMIN AMIIN, a complex which naturally struck the third copier as being a 'clerical error,' and so he in his turn unhesitatingly corrected HMHN AMIIN to AMHN AMIIN (ἀμὴν ἀμήν), a phrase both Christian-like and grammatically not incorrect, since at that time a term could be strengthened by its mere repetition. (513. 521. 603.)

35, 6. Num. 14, 28. Job 27, 3 ⟨ῇ ὁ θεὸς (= *by God*) ῆ ΜΗΝ λαλήσει τὰ χείλη μου ἄνομα. Judith 1, 12 ὤμοσε . . . ῆ ΜΗΝ ἐκδικήσειν πάντα τὰ ὅρια τῆς Κιλικίας. Baruch 2, 29 ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσητε τῆς φωνῆς μοῦ ῆ ΜΗΝ ἡ βόμβησις ἀποτρέψει κτλ.—NT Hebr. 6, 14 (= Sept. Gen. 22, 17).—Polyb. 6, 21, 2 ἐξορκίζουσιν ῆ ΜΗΝ πειθαρχήσειν. 6, 58, 3 ὁρκίσας ῆ ΜΗΝ ἐπανήξειν πρὸς αὐτόν. 11, 30, 4 ὤμνυον ῆ ΜΗΝ πειθαρχήσειν τοῖς παραγγελλομένοις. 12, 6, 3 ὁμολογίας ποιήσαιντο ῆ ΜΗΝ εὐνοήσειν αὐτοῖς. 9, 30, 9 ῆ που ἀξιόχρεως ἂν εἴη. (Cp. 12, 11, 9 ῆ που γ' ἂν οὗτος πορεσιώπησεν). Plut. C. Mar. 29, 2 (i. 422 c) ὀμόσαι ῆ ΜΗΝ ἐμμενεῖν οἷς ἂν ὁ δῆμος ψηφίσαιτο. id. Alex. 47, 4 (i. 692 A) ἐπώμοσεν ῆ ΜΗΝ μάλιστα φιλεῖν ἀνθρώπων ἀπάντων ἐκείνους. Cat. min. 32, 2 (ii. 775 A). Tib. Grac. 14, 3 (i. 831 B) εἰς ὁρισμόν τινα προυκαλεῖτο τὸν Τιβέριον ῆ ΜΗΝ ἠτιμωκέναι τὸν συνάρχοντα. Cic. 23, 1 (i. 872 B). Pyth. Or. 1 (ii. 394 F) ῆ φιλοθεάμων τις ἡμῖν καὶ περιττῶς φιλήκοος ὁ ξένος. Aelian N. A. 1, 32 ῆ δεινὸν κακὸν καὶ νόσημα ἄγριον ἡ ἔχθρα. Babr. 40, 3 ῆ κακῶς πράσσω. Apoc. Mar. 122, 15 ῆ ΜΗΝ οὐχ ἑώρακας τὰς μεγάλας κολάσεις.

ANSWERING A QUESTION.

2056. The answer to a question is expressed—

A. In *word*-questions by a term corresponding to that which leads the question :

Τίς λέγει ;—Δημοσθένης, ὁ ξένος, οὗτος, ὃς ἂν βούληται, ὁ βουλόμενος.
πῶς ;—μετρίως, πράως, καθ' ἡσυχίαν, γελῶν.
πότε ;—χθές, νύκτωρ, τότε, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ, ἐπειδὰν ἔλθῃ, ἐλθών.
ποῦ ; ποῖ ;—ἐνθάδε, ἐκεῖ, ἄνω, πανταχοῦ, ἐν 'Αθήναις, εἰς τὴν 'Ασίαν.
So too in *N*.

2057. *B.* In *sentence*-questions the notion of *yes* or *no* is expressed—

a. By repeating in the affirmative or negative the word bearing the stress of the question :

Eur. Hipp. 1396 ὁρᾷς με, δέσποιν', ὡς ἔχω, τὸν ἄθλιον ;—'Ορῶ. Pl. Phaed. 65 D φαμέν τι εἶναι δίκαιον αὐτὸ ἢ οὐδέν ;—φαμέν μέντοι, νὴ Δία. Soph. Ant. 512 οὔκουν ὅμαιμος χὼ καταντίον θανών ;—'Όμαιμος.

2057b. So too in *N*, though less frequently than in *A*, as : ἔχεις χρήματα ;—ἔχω. Μ' ἄκουσες ποὺ σοῦ 'φώναζα ;—Δὲ σ' ἄκουσα.

2058. *b.* By means of ἐγώ, ἐγώ γε, οὐκ ἐγώ γε—φημί, οὐ φημί :

Pl. Rep. 352 E δοκεῖ τι σοι εἶναι ἵππου ἔργον ;—'Εμοί γε. Soph. Ant. 498 θέλεις τι μεῖζον ἢ κατακτεῖναι μ' ἑλών ;—'Εγὼ μὲν οὐδέν. Dem. 1, 19 σὺ γράφεις ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά ;—Μὰ Δι' οὐκ ἐγώ γε. Pl. Crat. 391 E.

2058b. This mode of answering is questionable in *G–B* speech and foreign to *N*.

2059. *C.* By means of certain affirmative or negative particles, such as—

ναί 'yes,' πάνυ μὲν οὖν, (καὶ) πάνυ (γε), μάλα γε, καὶ μάλα (γε), ἔγωγε, ἔμοιγε (529 b), 'certainly,' ἦ 'surely,' 'verily' (2055), etc.—πῶς γὰρ οὔ ; 'why not ?'
οὔ 'no,' οὐχί, οὐδαμῶς (μηδαμῶς), ἥκιστά γε, οὐ μὰ Δία, 'by no means,' etc.

2060. This is the commonest way of answering a sentence-question in *N* also. The particles still fully surviving and universally used in *N* are ναί 'yes' and ὄχι 'no,'—such other terms as μάλιστα 'yes (indeed),' βέβαια 'certainly,' ἐννοεῖται 'of course,' καθ' ὅλου (καθόλου), δι' ὅλου (διόλου) 'not at all,' and the like being due to literary influence.

479

2061. For the sake of emphasis A οὐ and ναί were often amplified to οὐχί (οὔχι? cp. Et. M. 607, 29 ; 638, 49.) and ναίχι (ναιχί? [1]). The former is found even in Homer (beside οὐκί [or οὔκι ?]) and served as pattern for the latter (οὔχί and ναίχί, cp. μηκέτι after οὐκέτι). Their respective representatives in N are ὄχι (dialectally also ὄι 155ᶜ), often amplified to M ὄχικα (i. e. ὄχι καλέ cp. 251ᵇ), ὄχεσκε (NSophianos 81) or ὄγεσκε, then contracted to (*ὄϊσκε) ὄσκε, 'no indeed,' and, after it, ναίσκε 'yes indeed,'—all these lengthened forms being considered, in popular parlance, as politer than ὄχι (ὄϊ) and ναί respectively.

INFINITIVE.

INTRODUCTORY.

2062. The infinitive is a verbal substantive partaking of the nature of both the substantive and the verb. Its *nominal* nature is clearly shown by its combination with the article (τό, τοῦ, τῷ) : τὸ λέγειν, τοῦ ἰέναι, τῷ ἐπαινεῖσθαι.   On the other hand, its *verbal* nature is fully borne out by the following principal facts: (a) like an ordinary verb, it is qualified by adverbs (not adjectives) : τὸ εὖ ζῆν (2071). (b) it takes an object and that in the case required by the other verbal forms : τὸ ἀσκεῖν τήν ἀρετὴν, τὸ τοῖς νόμοις πείθεσθαι (ἀσκοῦμεν τήν ἀρετήν, πείθονται τοῖς νόμοις) ; (c) it shows the nature and voice of the verb : παιδεῦσαι, παιδεύσασθαι, παιδευθῆναι.   (d) it specializes time : φυγεῖν, φεύγειν, πεφευγέναι. (e) it can be accompanied by the modal particle ἄν.

2063. Notwithstanding its convenience, the Greek infinitive, compared with its two associates— noun and finite verb—from the outset laboured under several serious disadvantages. In the first place, as a noun, it lacked nominal inflection, having neither case-endings nor plural form, and thus appeared abnormal and foreign to the genius of the Greek language which at no time admitted of a noun without inflectional properties (App. vi. 2 & 25). Then as a verb, it was still more indefinite, since it indicated neither number nor person, often also no precise time. Now when it is remembered that the cardinal points aimed at in popular discourse are simplicity, perspicuity, and emphasis, and that, speaking of the Greek language in particular, these conditions have at all times (A-N) been fulfilled by means of inflectional properties (endings, prefixes, etc.), it is evident that the absence of these requisites from the infinitive often rendered it unfit for the purpose.   As a natural consequence, popular discourse began as early as G times to dispense with the infinitive and replace it either by equivalent abstract nouns (in -μα, -ιον, -μός, -σις, -σία, 1021) or finite moods (ἵνα with primary subjunctive, ὅτι with indicative).   This process of retreat and substitution, though slow in its manifestation, advanced steadily and reached its close in early B times.   All subsequent (M-N) cases of the infinitive, whether nominal or verbal, savour of scholasticism or literary mannerism. For fuller particulars see App. vi.

---

[1] Hdn. in JACramer's An. iii. 279 : τὰ εἰς ι λήγοντα (ἐπιρρήματα) ὀξύνεται· ἀμισθί, δευρί.   προπερισπῶνται δὲ ταῦτα· αὖθι, ἦχι, ἴφι.   τὸ ΝΑί, ΧΙΙ (read ΝΑΙΧΊ) ὀξύνεται.   Et. M. 315, 21 ; 607, 20.

480