

# On a law of Indo-European word order

Über ein Gesetz der  
indogermanischen Wortstellung

Jacob Wackernagel

Classics in Linguistics

The logo consists of five vertical bars of varying heights, with the tallest bar on the left and the others decreasing in height towards the right.

language  
science  
press

## Classics in Linguistics

Chief Editors: Martin Haspelmath, Stefan Müller

In this series:

1. Lehmann, Christian. Thoughts on grammaticalization.
2. Schütze, Carson T. The empirical base of linguistics: Grammaticality judgments and linguistic methodology.
3. Bickerton, Derek. Roots of language.
4. von der Gabelentz, Georg. Die Sprachwissenschaft: Ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse.

# On a law of Indo-European word order

Über ein Gesetz der  
indogermanischen Wortstellung

Jacob Wackernagel

Jacob Wackernagel. 2020. *On a law of Indo-European word order: Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung* (Classics in Linguistics ). Berlin: Language Science Press.

This title can be downloaded at:

<http://langsci-press.org/catalog>

© 2020, Jacob Wackernagel

Published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Licence (CC BY 4.0):

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISBN: 000-0-000000-00-0 (Digital)

000-0-000000-00-0 (Hardcover)

000-0-000000-00-0 (Softcover)

000-0-000000-00-0 (Softcover US)

ISSN: 2366-374X

Cover and concept of design: Ulrike Harbort

Translator: George Walkden, Morgan Macleod and Christina Sevdali

Typesetting: Anabel Roschmann and George Walkden

Fonts: Linux Libertine, Arimo, DejaVu Sans Mono

Typesetting software:  $\text{\LaTeX}$

Language Science Press

Habelschwerdter Allee 45

14195 Berlin, Germany

[langsci-press.org](http://langsci-press.org)

Storage and cataloguing done by FU Berlin

FU-Logo

Language Science Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Jacob Wackernagel and his law of Indo-European word order . .	1
1.1.1	Jacob Wackernagel (1853–1938) . . . . .	1
1.1.2	Wackernagel’s scholarship . . . . .	2
1.1.3	Wackernagel’s law . . . . .	3
1.2	Reception and implications . . . . .	5
1.2.1	Wackernagel’s Law in Indo-European (1892–1990) . . . .	6
1.2.2	Wackernagel, clitics, and the syntax-prosody interface (1977–present) . . . . .	8
1.2.3	The clitics and the critics (1990–present) . . . . .	13
1.3	Notes on the translation and edition . . . . .	16
<b>2</b>	<b>Translation</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1	Greek <i>min</i> , <i>nin</i> and <i>hoi</i> . . . . .	19
2.2	The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek . . . . .	37
2.3	The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek . . . . .	59
2.4	Genitives . . . . .	105
2.5	Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics . . . . .	121
2.6	Postpositive particles: <i>án</i> in subordinate clauses . . . . .	157
2.7	Postpositive particles: <i>án</i> in main clauses . . . . .	213
2.8	Indo-Iranian and Germanic . . . . .	261
2.9	Latin: personal pronouns . . . . .	265
2.10	Latin: more personal pronouns and indefinites . . . . .	285
2.11	Latin: particles and vocatives . . . . .	292
2.12	Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European . . . . .	308
	Addenda . . . . .	319
	List of critically discussed examples . . . . .	320
<b>3</b>	<b>Original text</b>	<b>323</b>
I.	. . . . .	323
II.	. . . . .	331
III.	. . . . .	338

*Contents*

IV. . . . .	346
V. . . . .	350
VI. . . . .	359
VII. . . . .	371
VIII. . . . .	379
IX. . . . .	382
X. . . . .	387
XI. . . . .	390
XII. . . . .	397
Nachträge . . . . .	405
Verzeichnis der kritisch behandelten Stellen . . . . .	405
<b>References</b>	<b>407</b>
<b>Index</b>	<b>427</b>
Name index . . . . .	427
Language index . . . . .	427
Subject index . . . . .	427

# 1 Introduction

Not every linguist has a law named after them, but, even among those who do, Jacob Wackernagel is exceptional. First, his law is one of very few (especially from the nineteenth century) that are *syntactic* in nature, having to do with the relative ordering of words. Secondly, it differs from the commonly recognized sound laws (e.g. those of Grimm, Verner, Grassmann and Holtzmann; see Collinge (1985) for an overview) in that its scope is tremendous: far from being a single, punctual event as were the sound laws of history under the Neogrammarian conception (Osthoff & Brugmann 1878), Wackernagel's law (he argues) has its traces in pretty much all of the Indo-European languages, even if its status as a synchronic principle of grammatical organization varies substantially. Thirdly, and relatedly, Wackernagel's law is still the subject of active research today among specialists in various languages, far beyond the Indo-European family which provided the context for the original law. That this is the case can be seen from the six-hundred-plus Google Scholar citations that Wackernagel's (1892) hundred-page article has accrued by the date of writing. Wackernagel's law can safely be said to have entered the coveted realm of 'more cited than read'.

This introduction does three things. In the following section we provide a brief biographical sketch, along with a quick summary of the article and a concise statement of the law itself. Section 1.2 discusses the law's subsequent reception from publication until the present day, again without pretence of being exhaustive. Section 1.3 outlines our rationale for, and the decisions we have made during, the translation process.

## 1.1 Jacob Wackernagel and his law of Indo-European word order

### 1.1.1 Jacob Wackernagel (1853–1938)

Jacob Wackernagel was born in Basel, Switzerland, in 1853, to a wealthy and academically-inclined family. Between 1872 and 1874 he studied at Göttingen under the Indologist Theodor Benfey, arguably the figure with the most influence

## 1 Introduction

on Wackernagel's own views and scholarship. Like many of the philological luminaries of the time, his studies took him to Leipzig, where in 1874–75 he took classes with the prolific and powerful Georg Curtius and the Neogrammarian founder-figure August Leskien. Shortly after this he returned to Basel, where from 1876 he taught Greek and Sanskrit, and in 1879 he was appointed Professor of Greek, this chair having been vacated by the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. Basel was where he would spend the rest of his academic career, with the exception of the years 1902–1915, when he occupied the Chair of Comparative Philology at Göttingen.

Wackernagel's publications for the most part focused on ancient and historical Greek, especially in the first half of his career: these include two book-length works, *Über einige antike Anredeformen* ('On some forms of address in antiquity'; 1912) and *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* ('Linguistic investigations of Homer'; 1916). Sanskrit was by no means neglected, however: his Sanskrit grammar (*Altindische Grammatik*) was his magnum opus (Langslow 2009: x), though only the first volume (1896) and the first part of the second (1905) were published during his lifetime. In 1936 he retired, and two years later, in 1938, he died, at the age of eighty-four. More detailed biographical treatments of Wackernagel can be found in Schwyzer (1938), Schlerath (1990), Langslow (2009: viii–xviii), and in particular Schmitt (1990).

### 1.1.2 Wackernagel's scholarship

On the whole, Wackernagel's attention was focused on concrete problems in the history or prehistory of specific Indo-European languages. He seldom wrote on general linguistic issues, with the most important exception being his two-volume *Vorlesungen über Syntax* ('Lectures on Syntax'; 1920; 1924), recently translated into English (Langslow 2009). Despite its name, this work is more focused on the nature and properties of morphological categories than on syntax proper.<sup>1</sup> Nor did he devote much attention to comparative Indo-European linguistics *per se*: only Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Iranian featured in the titles of his published works and his courses taught (Langslow 2009: xi). The article featured in the present book (Wackernagel 1892) is thus quite exceptional in its scope and generality.

---

<sup>1</sup> Delimiting the domain of syntax was a hot topic at the time Wackernagel was writing: Ries (1894) in particular had set the cat among the pigeons. Wackernagel was fully aware of what was missing from his treatment and planned to address it in a third volume, which unfortunately never saw the light of day.



### 1.1 *Jacob Wackernagel and his law of Indo-European word order*

The article is heavily dominated by discussion of Greek data: the first seven sections and 70 of 104 pages are devoted almost exclusively to Greek. Wackernagel turns his attention to Indo-Iranian in section VIII, closing with some suggestive remarks on Germanic (modern German and Gothic). Section IX starts with some similarly tentative comments on Celtic, but quickly moves on to Latin, which also occupies sections X and XI. From a comparative or general linguistic perspective, however, section XII – the final section, comprising the last ten pages – is the most immediately rewarding. Here Wackernagel engages in more detail with the modern German evidence, and discusses the scope of his theory and the diachronic development of the Indo-European daughter languages, especially as regards the position of finite verbs.

#### 1.1.3 Wackernagel's law

Wackernagel's law is given in 1.<sup>2</sup> For other overviews of the law, its scope and validity, see Collinge (1985: 218–219), Krisch (1990), and Goldstein (2014).

##### (1) Wackernagel's law

Enclitics occupy second position.

This simple statement immediately raises a number of related issues: i) Which languages or varieties does the law in 1 apply to? ii) What elements count as enclitics in these varieties? iii) What does 'second position' mean more precisely? iv) Why would such a law hold?

The article is devoted primarily to answering i) and ii). As regards i), Wackernagel is clear that the law's effects can be found in Greek (particularly Homeric Greek, with traces of the law to be found at later stages too), Latin, and Sanskrit, and on this basis concludes that it must have held in the ancestor language, Proto-Indo-European, as well. On Germanic and Celtic he is more tentative. The answer to ii) is extensional: a non-exhaustive list made up primarily of particles and pronouns, some of which – Wackernagel notes – are more prototypical than others.

iii) would be seen as crucial by most present-day linguists,<sup>3</sup> but Wackernagel

<sup>2</sup> Collinge (1985: 218) notes that Wackernagel himself did not claim credit for the law, instead crediting it in the first volume of his *Lectures* to Delbrück (1878) on Sanskrit (see Langslow (2009: 57)). Collinge therefore suggests that the law should be called 'the law of Delbrück and Wackernagel'. Since it was Wackernagel who established the wider validity of such a law outside Sanskrit alone, we have stuck with the traditional attribution here.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Zwicky (1977: 18–20) and Anderson (1993: 72–73). Halpern (1995), for instance, makes the case that there exist both 2W systems, in which enclitics follow the first word, and 2D systems,

## 1 Introduction

is not particularly explicit on this point (cf. Aziz Hanna (2015: 11)). The obvious answer is that second position is counted in terms of words; however, though most of Wackernagel's examples can all be characterized in this way, not all of them can. Though not operating with anything like a modern constituency or dependency grammar, Wackernagel does employ the notion of *Wortgruppe* 'word group', and discusses relations between words. Yet 'constituent' or 'unit of sense' does not seem to be the appropriate way to understand the second-position requirement either. The waters are muddied still further by Wackernagel's discussion (at the end of section VIII) of examples from Gothic in which *word-internal* second position appears to be crucial, e.g. Gothic *ga-u-laubeis* 'do you believe?', with the interrogative morpheme *-u-* occurring after the first morpheme of the verbal form. Finally, Wackernagel is also not very clear about the *domain* over which the law holds: he most often uses the word *Satz* ('clause'), but he is flexible as to where clause boundaries actually lie, and this is one area in which later linguists (e.g. Fraenkel (1932; 1933; 1965); Ruijgh (1990)) have sought to improve on Wackernagel's formulation. To some extent, then, second position for Wackernagel is a moveable feast.

Despite this uncertainty, Wackernagel's precision and level of detail when discussing the examples themselves can hardly be called into question. Sometimes (e.g. Harris & Campbell (1995: 24)) Wackernagel's law is framed as a tendency. For Wackernagel himself, though, it was clearly not intended to be understood in this way. The close attention paid in every section to potential counterexamples – and the effort expended in trying to explain them away – is more reminiscent of the modern theoretical linguist's *modus operandi* than of the cataloguing and quantification usually associated with Wackernagel's contemporaries (e.g. Ries (1880), Behaghel (1923–1932)). Moreover, given the use of the word *Gesetz* 'law' in the article's title, and given that Wackernagel would have been well aware of how the term had been appropriated by the Neogrammarians for exceptionless generalizations (e.g. Osthoff & Brugmann (1878)), it would have been bizarre for Wackernagel to aim for anything else – even though he himself never identified as a Neogrammarian.<sup>4</sup> Clearly, though, Wackernagel is ready to concede that the law is not equally operative in all the diachronic stages of the languages in question, and this may be the reason why more recent linguists have attempted to water down his statement of the law.

---

in which enclitics follow the first constituent.

<sup>4</sup> We thus fundamentally disagree with Aziz Hanna (2015: 250–251), who claims that Wackernagel never intended his law as a *Regel* 'rule'. The fact that Wackernagel attempts to explain away counterexamples where possible, and the fact that he himself uses the term *Regel* 'rule' at several points during the article, both militate against this interpretation.

## 1.2 Reception and implications

Wackernagel also shares with the Neogrammarians (and with probably the majority of modern linguists) an approach to linguistic generalizations that is mentalist at its core. We see this, for instance, in his use of the term *Stellungsgefühl* ‘position-feeling’, with its echoes of Wundtian psychologism (see recently Fortis (2019) on the notion of *Formgefühl* ‘form-feeling’ and its use by Wundt (1874)) – even if this mentalism is rarely at the forefront of Wackernagel’s article. We also see Wackernagel’s mentalism, for instance, in his *Lectures on Syntax*, where in the first volume he distinguishes three types of linguistic relatedness: the first is ‘based on human nature, on general laws of the human psyche, fundamental relatedness’ (Langslow 2009: 11), giving rise to syntactic features that are ‘best described precisely in terms of their universality’.

As to iv) – the ‘why’-question – Wackernagel hints at an answer without really spelling it out: enclitics are unstressed, and it was this property that led them to occupy the second position.<sup>5</sup> Wackernagel reaches this conclusion in section XII, where his aim is to account for the disparity in modern German between verbs in main and subordinate clauses. The suggestion is that the basic position of the verb was final, and that at an earlier stage verbs in main clauses ‘moved’ (*rückten*) to second position in order to be unstressed.<sup>6</sup> Here Wackernagel also explores a more restrictive version of his law, in which only mono- or disyllabic verb forms were affected. (Later the rule became purely syntactic, and affected all verb forms in main clauses, whether stressed or not.)

If Wackernagel’s explanation for his law is fundamentally prosodic, then it differs in a crucial way from more recent proposals that have sought to build on Wackernagel’s insights. It is to the legacy of his law that we now turn.

## 1.2 Reception and implications

Wackernagel’s law has been described by Calvert Watkins – himself a key figure in the understanding of Indo-European syntax – as “[o]ne of the few generally accepted syntactic statements about I[ndo-]E[uropean]” (Watkins 1964: 1036). Writing in the early 1990s, Alice Harris & Lyle Campbell likewise call it “one of the firmest discoveries in the history of syntactic change” (Harris & Campbell

<sup>5</sup> Hale (2017: 294–295) suggests that Wackernagel’s reasoning is based on Optimality-Theory-style competing motivations: there is a drive for enclitics to be initial, but they cannot occupy absolute initial position because that requires them to be stressed. Hence second position as a compromise.

<sup>6</sup> This movement-based account foreshadows early transformational proposals for German such as that of Bach (1962) by seventy years.

## 1 Introduction

1995: 29), and Krisch (1990) describes it as “perhaps the only word order rule for Indo-European which has remained undisputed in its essentials since its discovery”.<sup>7</sup> For more than a hundred years, Wackernagel’s law was taken to be a robust generalization about the history of Indo-European syntax. Even more importantly, perhaps, the article triggered an outpouring of research into (en)clitics and the relation between syntax and prosody that has showed no signs of abating in recent years. An overview of the first century of this work can be found in the bibliography of Nevis et al. (1994), supplemented by Janse (1994), and the papers in Eichner & Rix (1990) and Halpern & Zwicky (1996). Particularly in the early 1980s, with the simultaneous flourishing of theoretical studies on the syntax-prosody interface (e.g. Klavans (1982); Kaisse (1985); Selkirk (1984; 1986); Nespor & Vogel (1986)) and on cross-linguistic comparative syntax in the Principles and Parameters mould (e.g. Chomsky (1981); Rizzi (1982); Hale (1983)), a cottage industry of clitic studies developed, which in the 21st century can safely be said to have lost its cottage status and developed into full-scale heavy industry. In this section we first detail the reception of Wackernagel’s law within Indo-European studies, then discuss its more general relevance and implications during the latter part of the 20th century, before finishing with an examination of some more critical voices.

### 1.2.1 Wackernagel’s Law in Indo-European (1892–1990)

The impact of Wackernagel’s article within Indo-European studies and historical linguistics was tremendous from the beginning, and follow-up studies soon showed that other languages and varieties conformed to the same pattern that Wackernagel had identified.

Nilsson (1904) brings in Slavic varieties such as Old Bulgarian as well as varieties of modern Polish, aiming to show that Wackernagel’s law applies here too. Ivanov (1958) argued that Wackernagel’s law was relevant also to Lithuanian, and to Hittite and Tocharian, which had not yet been discovered at the time Wackernagel was writing (see also Carruba (1969); Hoffner (1973); Garrett (1990); Luraghi (1998) on Anatolian). As regards Celtic linguistics, the distinctive VSO order found in the Insular Celtic languages is explained by Watkins (1963), building on Vendryes (1912) and Dillon (1947), as closely linked to Wackernagel’s law: certain enclitics had a close relationship with the verb, and drew it along to the beginning of the sentence as a host, resulting in verb-initial clauses.

<sup>7</sup> “Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz ist die vielleicht einzige in ihren Grundzügen von ihrer Entdeckung bis heute immer unumstrittene Wortstellungsregel für das Indogermanische” (Krisch 1990: 64–65).

## 1.2 Reception and implications

Thurneysen (1892), who explicitly credits Wackernagel with the impetus to finish and publish his study, adduces word order evidence from Old French and connects its verb positioning to Wackernagel's law; this paper has itself been extremely influential within historical Romance linguistics, spawning a substantial literature on clitic pronouns (e.g. Wanner (1987) and Fontana (1993) for historical perspectives) and verb position (recently for instance Kaiser (2002); Wolfe (2018)).

Within Germanic linguistics in particular, the focus during this period was on something that Wackernagel himself addressed only tentatively: verb-second and the position of the finite verb. Ries (1907: 315–318) investigates word order in *Beowulf* and finds some support for Wackernagel's claims about the position of unstressed verbs, at least for auxiliaries and modals, but does not accept his diachronic reconstruction of asymmetric verb positioning for Proto-Germanic or Proto-Indo-European.<sup>8</sup> Kuhn (1933) built on Wackernagel through an empirical investigation of poetic texts from Old English, Old Norse and Old Saxon. He proposed two further laws: the Germanic *Satzpartikelgesetz* (clausal particle law) states that “clausal particles occur in the first dip in the clause, proclitic to either its first or second stressed word” (Kuhn 1933: 8), and the Germanic *Satzspitzengesetz* (clause-initial law), stating that “there must be clausal particles in an initial dip” (Kuhn 1933: 43). While Kuhn's second law is nowadays mostly considered to have been falsified (Momma 1997; Mines 2002), Kuhn's first law remains influential. Dewey (2006), for instance, posits a stage of ‘intonational verb-second’ during which the placement of the finite verb in Germanic was regulated primarily by prosodic considerations.

Among the languages that were Wackernagel's main focus – Greek, and to a lesser extent Latin and Sanskrit – research during this period primarily strove to make the law more precise and to test its predictions in different types of text and grammatical context. Work in this vein includes Dover (1960), Marshall (1987) and Ruijgh (1990) for historical Greek, Marouzeau (1907; 1953) and Fraenkel (1932; 1933; 1965) for Latin, and Hale (1987a,b) and Krisch (1990) for Sanskrit.

Not everyone was uniformly positive. Delbrück (1900: 81–83), while accepting Wackernagel's findings on enclitic positioning in general, argued against Wackernagel's view that the verb occupied second position in main clauses in Proto-Indo-European, since – he argued – verbs in Indo-European were in general weakly stressed rather than entirely unstressed.<sup>9</sup> In his review of Ries (1907)

<sup>8</sup> Hopper (1975: 15–16) claims that Ries (1907) and Delbrück (1907) both supported Wackernagel's view. In fact, neither of them did, at least as regards the specifics of the diachronic development.

<sup>9</sup> Delbrück (1900: 81) somewhat mischaracterizes Wackernagel (1892) when he claims that the

## 1 Introduction

he takes a similar but not identical position: in Proto-Indo-European, verbs were unstressed in main clauses and stressed in subordinate clauses, but their basic position was final in both cases; the development of asymmetric verb positioning as in modern German belonged to Germanic times (Delbrück 1907: 75–76).

Work on Wackernagel’s law in historically-attested Indo-European languages evidently did not stop with Watkins (1964) or with the papers in Eichner & Rix (1990). However, the 1970s and 1980s gave the law a new lease of life by extending its linguistic range, and it is to this development that we now turn.

### 1.2.2 Wackernagel, clitics, and the syntax-prosody interface (1977–present)

Although Wackernagel did have a concept of linguistic universals, it evidently did not occur to him to think of his law as universal, or as a reflex of universal pressures. This suggestion was first made much later, by Kuryłowicz (1958: 613), in a commentary on Ivanov (1958), and was not really taken seriously at the time (cf. Watkins (1964: 1036)). It was not until the flowering of work on clitics and prosody in generative linguistics of the late 1970s and particularly 1980s that this line of thinking came to be pursued more systematically.<sup>10</sup>

Important early work by Steele (1975) on constituent order typology identified a category of languages in which modals consistently occupy clausal second position; Steele links this to Wackernagel’s law. On the basis of Uto-Aztecan data, Steele (1977) suggests a diachronic relation between Wackernagel’s Law and topicalization (cf. also Hock (1982)). In both cases, the forces at work must necessarily be active far beyond Indo-European.

The decisive push towards more explicit theorizing of clitics came from Zwicky (1977). During the 1970s, with the rise of morphology as a separate domain in generative theorizing, clitics were occasionally alluded to as a challenge due to their apparently intermediate nature between bound and free forms (Matthews (1974: 166–169), Aronoff (1976: 3–4)), on the borderline between the morphological and syntactic components of the grammar. Zwicky (1977) draws a distinction between three types of clitic:

#### 1. Special clitics: clitics that show unusual syntactic behaviour and unusual

---

latter argued for a subject-verb word order: Wackernagel (1892) is silent on the issue of what element occupies first position.

<sup>10</sup> Wackernagel (1892) nowhere uses the simple term ‘clitic’, referring only to enclitics (*Enklitika*). The generalization of the term ‘clitic’ to refer to both proclitics and enclitics in the modern sense seems to be due to Nida (1946: 155) (Haspelmath 2015).

## 1.2 Reception and implications

phonological alternations as compared to their stressed free-form counterparts

2. **Simple clitics**: clitics that behave syntactically like their stressed free-form counterparts and are related to them through a general phonological rule
3. **Bound words**: clitics with no stressed free-form counterparts, which can be associated with words of various morphosyntactic categories

Zwicky (1977: 9) is also responsible for introducing crucial terminology in the study of clitics such as **host** (the word to which a clitic is attached)<sup>11</sup> and **group** (the host plus all of its clitics). Second-position clitics and Wackernagel's law also receive discussion. In fact, virtually all of the theoretical issues that more recent research on clitics has addressed are raised – if only briefly – in Zwicky's relatively short paper, including clitic positioning with respect to the host (pro-, en- or endoclititic<sup>12</sup>), relative ordering of clitics within a group, the phonological relation of clitics to corresponding nonclitic forms, the phonological integration of clitics with their hosts, and more.

A few years later, Zwicky (1985: 283) is able to speak of a “recent flurry of work on clitics”. Important roughly contemporary contributions include Klavans (1979; 1982; 1985), Kaisse (1982; 1985), and Zwicky & Pullum (1983); the latter, for instance, provide a set of diagnostics for distinguishing clitics from inflectional affixes, while Zwicky (1985) addresses the problem of distinguishing clitics from independent words. This flurry informed, and was informed by, more general proposals about prosody and the nature of the interface between syntax and phonology such as Selkirk (1984; 1986) and Nespor & Vogel (1986).<sup>13</sup> Klavans (1995) is a book-length treatment of clitics from the mid-1990s; a contemporary work is Halpern (1995), which deals with the placement of a set of second-position clitics through an operation of Prosodic Inversion at the syntax-prosody interface.

<sup>11</sup> Zwicky (1977: note 5) attributes the term to Hetzron (p.c.).

<sup>12</sup> Zwicky uses the term ‘endoclititic’ to refer to clitics that are word-internal but placed at morpheme boundaries. In more recent research the usual term for this is ‘mesoclititic’, with endoclititic reserved for the much rarer phenomenon of clitics that disrupt the root of the host; see e.g. Smith (2013).

<sup>13</sup> This is still a lively field today. To take just a few examples, Dehé (2014) challenges prominent theories of the syntax-prosody interface using corpus data; Bögel (2015) presents a full theory of the syntax-prosody interface within Lexical-Functional Grammar; and Güneş (2015) develops a derivational approach to prosody that is compatible with Minimalist assumptions about syntactic structure-building and the interfaces.



## 1 Introduction

Another factor pushing Wackernagel's law back into the spotlight, during roughly the same period, was the expansion of cross-linguistic work in generative syntactic theory. Hale (1973) on Warlpiri and Kayne (1975) on French were two early works in this vein engaging with the clitic question; however, with the advent of the Principles and Parameters research programme (Chomsky (1981; 1982); Borer (1981); Rizzi (1982); see Roberts (1997) for an accessible introduction), comparative generative syntax expanded dramatically. In this approach, language can be characterized in terms of a set of universal, invariant cognitive principles alongside a set of discrete points of variation, the parameters. Hale (1983) influentially proposed a Configurationality Parameter regulating the relation between syntax and the lexicon: one setting of this parameter allowed for 'nonconfigurational' languages exhibiting relatively flexible orderings of constituents. Since Hale's theory was built upon Warlpiri, a language with substantial constituent order flexibility and 'Wackernagel' clitic auxiliaries, it is unsurprising that this kind of analysis has also been popular for early Indo-European languages (see Ledgeway (2012) for extensive discussion).<sup>14</sup> Borer (1981), Rivero (1986) and the papers in Borer (1986) present parametric approaches to cliticization in various languages.

Cross-pollination from Principles and Parameters can also be seen in contemporaneous theorizing about the typology of clitics. Klavans (1985) develops a theory of clitic positioning based on three parameters: dominance (initial/final), precedence (before/after), and phonological liaison (proclitic/enclitic).<sup>15</sup> This theory derives a version of Wackernagel's law (Klavans 1985: 117).

Work in the 1990s and 2000s – by generative linguists and others – explored the morphology, phonology and syntax of clitics in a very wide range of languages (see e.g. Halpern & Zwicky (1996); Beukema & Den Dikken (2000); Franks & King (2000); Gerlach & Grijzenhout (2000); Bošković (2001); Anderson (2005); Roberts (2010); Spencer & Luis (2012); Salvesen & Helland (2013) for book-length treatments). Mention must be made of the now vast literature on clitics in Slavic (particularly South Slavic) languages (Radanović-Kocić 1988; 1996; Nevis & Joseph 1993; Schütze 1994; Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1995; 1998; Progovic 1996; 2000; Tomić

<sup>14</sup> For Warlpiri, in the meantime, the idea of nonconfigurationality has been debunked (Legate 2002), and at the current state of research it is not clear whether nonconfigurationality remains a useful notion in linguistic theory. See also Legate (2008), who shows, *pace* Hale, that the notion of second position is not relevant to the Warlpiri clitic system, and that clitic placement is not conditioned by syllable structure, instead being best viewed as syntactic.

<sup>15</sup> Klavans (1979; 1985) denies the existence of endoclefts in the sense of Zwicky (1977). The present consensus seems to be that endoclefts are cross-linguistically rare but possible (Harris 2002; Smith 2013).



## 1.2 Reception and implications

1996; 2000; Franks 1997; 2000; 2008; Franks & Bošković 2001; Franks & King 2000; Bošković 2000; 2001; 2002; 2016; Pancheva 2005; Migdalski 2010; 2012; 2016; Diesing & Zec 2011; Harizanov 2014; Despić 2017) and in other languages of the Balkans (e.g. Frâncu (2009) and Alboiu & Hill (2012) on Romanian).<sup>16</sup>

The modern understanding of Wackernagel and his insights has been shaped substantially by Anderson's (1993) influential paper 'Wackernagel's revenge'. Here, Anderson picks up on the notion that there is a deep connection between clitic placement and verb-second constituent order. Since (he argues) clitic placement cannot be accounted for using syntactic approaches to verb-second, the picture ought to be reversed: verb-second should be accounted for using a technical apparatus developed for clitic phenomena. Following the morphological theory developed in Anderson (1992), he proposes that (special) clitics are phrasal affixes, i.e. the reflex of word-formation rules applying to phrases. Verb-second is then derived using exactly such a rule, realizing the inflectional features of a clause in the position after its first constituent: movement of the verb is a byproduct of the need for these features to be spelled out affixally in second position (cf. recently Bayer & Freitag (2020)).<sup>17</sup> As Anderson acknowledges, his take on verb-second is substantially different from Wackernagel's in that he locates the explanatory action in morphology rather than in prosody, and substantially different from the consensus among generative syntacticians in that he locates the explanatory action in morphology rather than in syntax.

In Anderson (2005) this perspective is further developed, along with a new typology of clitics, building on and replacing that of Zwicky (1977). For Anderson, the crucial distinction is between **simple** and **special** clitics: Zwicky's category of bound words plays no role. Special clitics are those whose positioning is governed by a set of principles distinct from those regulating free forms. Crucially, for Anderson (unlike Zwicky), special clitics are purely morphosyntactically defined, and may or may not be phonological clitics. Simple clitics then are those phonological clitics that do *not* display any aberrant morphosyntactic behaviour. This dichotomy has been adopted in a variety of subsequent work (see e.g. Bögel (2015: 95)).<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Frâncu (2009) proposes that Wackernagel's law was operative in historical Romanian; Alboiu & Hill (2012) make the case that it wasn't.

<sup>17</sup> More recently the relation between second-position clitic systems and verb-second has also been explored in depth by Migdalski (2010; 2016). Bošković (2019) argues against a unification of verb-second and second-position clitics.

<sup>18</sup> Special clitics, although perhaps the most interesting type of clitic theoretically, are not uncontroversial: see Spencer & Luís (2012) and particularly Bermúdez-Otero & Payne (2011) for critical discussion.

## 1 Introduction

Clitics and Wackernagel's findings also become relevant to general linguistics during the same period as part of grammaticalization theory. Givón (1971), in making the case that bound morphemes originate diachronically via cliticization of originally independent words, had effectively rediscovered the phenomenon of grammaticalization (Meillet (1912); cf. also Kuryłowicz (1965)). Lehmann (2015), first published in working-paper form in 1982 and in wider circulation from 1995 onwards, gave the programmatic impetus to researchers in this area. Lehmann describes the increase in bondedness that grammaticalizing items undergo as the first step of coalescence: "the subordination of the grammaticalized item under an adjacent accent, called cliticization" (Lehmann 2015: 157). Though the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization remain better studied than its phonological and morphological aspects, there are several works within grammaticalization theory on the cline FREE WORD > CLITIC > AFFIX: Schiering (2006; 2010), for instance, presents a cross-linguistic study of the process, showing that the overall phonological profile of the language significantly influences the ultimate fate of individual words and clitics.

The development from affix to clitic has also been taken as evidence for the existence of degrammaticalization. Norde (2001), for instance, discusses the Swedish possessive *-s* in this connection. This *-s* originated as a well-behaved morphological genitive case ending, but in the Early Modern Swedish period appears to be a clitic marking possession, as it attaches at the end of a phrase, e.g. *konungen i Danmarcks krigzfolck* 'the king of Denmark's army'. In response, Börjars (2003) argues that the placement of an element must be distinguished from its attachment: Swedish *-s* is still an affix rather than a clitic, because it is attached as an affix, even though it is placed with respect to a phrase (cf. Anderson (1993) on phrasal affixes, discussed above). Börjars observes that true group genitives in which the *-s* ending is found on an element other than a noun are few and far between, suggesting that the ending still has a strong preference to be attached to nouns. If *-s* is not a clitic, then its development since Old Swedish is not an instance of degrammaticalization.<sup>19</sup> This is not the only purported instance of the development clitic > affix, however: Kiparsky (2012) lists many more, including the Setu and Võru (South Estonian) abessive case suffix *-lta*, which has become an abessive clitic. Debonding seems to exist, then, though the question remains why this direction of change appears to be rarer than the alternative. Kiparsky (2012) suggests that such instances of degrammaticalization only occur under

<sup>19</sup> In response, Norde (2010) downplays the importance of change in morphological status ('debonding'), arguing that other aspects also indicate that degrammaticalization has taken place.

## 1.2 Reception and implications

strong analogical pressure (cf. Plank (1995)).

This section has shown that research on clitics and on the relationship between syntax, phonology and morphology has blossomed beyond anything that Wackernagel could have foreseen in 1892 – both in terms of theoretical directions and in terms of languages investigated. Jacob Wackernagel undoubtedly deserves pride of place as progenitor of a large and fertile family of investigations. Closer to home, however, Wackernagel’s law has been called into question for the very languages for which it was proposed, and this is the topic of the next subsection.

### 1.2.3 The clitics and the critics (1990–present)

As we have seen, in summaries as late as the 1980s and 1990s Wackernagel’s law is still presented as a robust generalization about early Indo-European languages (cf. also Collinge (1985)). However, writing in the early 2000s, Clackson (2007: 168) observes that Wackernagel’s Law “now looks more problematic than it did forty years ago”.

The most robust challenge to Wackernagel’s law is presented in a pair of works by Adams (1994a,b). Noting that Wackernagel’s own treatment of the Latin evidence was less than systematic, Adams starts by arguing – following Fraenkel (1932; 1933; 1965) – that the proper domain for evaluation of Wackernagel’s law is the ‘colon’, not the clause, and that this allows a number of apparent exceptions to the law to be explained away.<sup>20</sup> Even with this corrective, however, a striking number of exceptions are still found, leading Adams to propose that what has traditionally been viewed as Wackernagel’s law (i.e. a second position requirement) in Latin is in fact better viewed as an epiphenomenon of a different law requiring enclitics to be placed after a focalized or emphasized constituent, which itself may or may not be in first position. Adams (1994a) explores this in relation to the Latin enclitic copula *esse*, while Adams (1994b) presents a parallel study on unstressed personal pronouns. Adams draws his material from classical Latin prose texts; Kruschwitz (2004) shows that Adams’s conclusions also hold for the corpus of Latin inscriptions.

For Indo-Iranian, too, the empirical picture that has emerged is substantially more complex than section VIII of Wackernagel (1892) suggests. Hale (1987b,a; 1996), Krisch (1990), and Hock (1996) do not (like Adams) aim to supplant Wack-

<sup>20</sup> The colon (plural *cola*), a semantico-syntactico-phonologically independent unit, has never been particularly easy to define or to identify in historical texts. Scheppers (2011) (on Ancient Greek) suggests that *cola* correspond to the intonation unit (IU) of discourse analysis. Ledge-way (2012: 259–262) suggests that *cola* correspond to the phases of Minimalist syntax: CP, vP, PP and DP.

## 1 Introduction

ernagel’s law entirely, but their work has nevertheless led to a picture in which the law must be relativized to particular syntactic positions or configurations. More recent contributions to the debate on clitics in Sanskrit include Keydana (2011), Lowe (2014) and Hale (2017), the latter stating that “the empirical data for these languages is relatively poorly understood ... even in the specialist literature” (2017: 290). Keydana (2011), for instance, argues that Wackernagel clitics are not a homogeneous bunch, and can be split into three different classes:

1. WL1: enclitics that follow a *wh*-word if one is present, but otherwise occupy second position in a sentence.
2. WL2: clitics that always follow the first word of a sentence.
3. WL3: clitics hosted by the element they take scope over.

While WL1 clitics and WL2 clitics can in some sense be said to be ‘true’ second-position clitics, WL3 clitics behave like the elements identified by Adams (1994b,a) in that they are always enclitic to a particular constituent with a particular information-structural role, which does not have to be clause-initial. Moreover, following Hale (1987b,a), most authors working on Sanskrit clitics and second position have acknowledged that there is a discourse-functional syntactic position in the clausal left periphery that is somehow ‘outside’ the clause proper and hence ‘does not count’ for the positioning of certain enclitics (Keydana’s WL1 elements). The literature on Wackernagel’s law in Indo-Iranian is by now too large to be done justice to here, but it is worth noting that some of this work is explicitly concerned with the implications of these facts for the architecture of the grammar, and with finding the right division of labour between prosodic mechanisms, syntactic mechanisms, and brute-force stipulation, rather than simply describing the facts. Were Wackernagel to be alive today, it might well take him some time to see the connection between his simple law and the theoretically and empirically far more nuanced picture found in this recent work. In this sense, Wackernagel’s law in its narrow sense can be said to have been falsified for Indo-Iranian too.

Even in Ancient Greek, the variety most intensively investigated by Wackernagel, complexities arise that are not obviously captured in terms of a single second-position law. Taylor (1990) argues that Wackernagel’s law in its usual formulation does not account for Ancient Greek: unlike e.g. Dover (1960) and Marshall (1987), it is necessary to take syntactic (constituent) structure into account in order to arrive at the correct statement of the generalizations. Moreover, once again, different clitics exhibit different behaviours. Goldstein (2016: 80–84) shows, for instance, that discourse particle *de* and *gar* ‘for’, both described as

## 1.2 Reception and implications

‘sentence-domain’ clitics, do not occur in the usual position following the first *prosodic* word, but instead show up after the first *morphosyntactic* word, where other clitics such as the unstressed personal pronouns behave more canonically. He also shows that there are instances in which *de* and *gar* appear to follow the first *constituent*, rather than the first word. In one respect, though, Goldstein (2016) actually maintains Wackernagel’s law in a stronger form than Wackernagel himself: *contra* e.g. Wackernagel (1892) and Taylor (1990), Goldstein argues that the law was fully operative in the Classical Greek period (6th–5th centuries BCE), and had not undergone a weakening since Homeric times.

The Kuhn-Thurneysen-Wackernagel hypothesis that Germanic and Romance verb-second order has its origins in Wackernagel’s law applied to finite verbs has also largely fallen out of favour in recent years. Ries (1907: 23–24, 315–318) had already expressed scepticism, claiming that in the earliest texts there was no asymmetry between main and subordinate clauses, and Fourquet (1938) had been very critical about Kuhn’s supposed laws. Kiparsky (1995: 159) notes that finite verbs in second position in early Germanic texts were (or at least could be) accented, thus rendering it unlikely that they were clitic elements. Getty (1997: 158) goes further, arguing that “the Wackernagel/Kuhn framework makes all the wrong predictions with respect to the behavior of finite verbs one can actually observe”, and that the crucial distinction instead seems to be between grammatical verbs (e.g. auxiliaries) and lexical verbs. Moreover, the question of how Germanic moved from a 2W system, in Halpern’s (1995) terms – in which the verb followed the first word – to a 2D system in which it followed the first constituent is crucial, and has nowhere been addressed; there is no robust evidence for 2W verb-second anywhere in Germanic. More recent accounts of the emergence of verb-second (e.g. Hinterhölzl & Petrova (2010); Walkden (2012; 2014; 2015; 2017)) propose scenarios in which prosody plays no role, and in which the interplay between narrow syntax and information structure are central. As for Romance, it has been debated whether the historically-attested languages are adequately characterized as verb-second at all. Kaiser (2002) makes the case that they are not, while Wolfe (2018) argues that they are. Neither author connects verb placement to prosody, however, and neither author argues for a strict linear second-position requirement.

Strictly speaking, then, even given an appropriate definition of second position and the domain to which it applies, Wackernagel’s law does not seem to hold at face value for *any* of the Indo-European languages for which it was originally motivated. This hardly means that the proposal was a failure, though. On the contrary, Wackernagel (1892) has been tremendously successful in stimulating

## 1 *Introduction*

research into clitics and second-position effects – within and beyond the Indo-European languages – even if an elegant, unified treatment is still lacking. At the very least, any theory of the prosody-syntax interface worth its salt will have to provide an account of the facts adduced by Jacob Wackernagel well over a century ago.

### 1.3 Notes on the translation and edition

Our aim with this translation is to enable today's linguists to understand Wackernagel's argumentation without prior knowledge of any language other than English. To that end, we've prioritized clarity over faithfulness, so that the translation is rather free. For instance, some of the English linguistic terms used in the translation would not have been current in the English of Wackernagel's time. Where possible we've tried to convey a sense of Wackernagel's rather idiosyncratic style, which jumps from stiffly legalistic to playful and back again within the space of a page. But this goal is secondary to conveying the linguistic point that he was trying to make. Those readers who are more interested in the history of language science or of philology should use this translation with care, and in conjunction with the German original, also provided in Section 3 of this book.

Wackernagel's original paper consisted of twelve numbered sections without names. For ease of navigation, we've added titles to these sections in the English translation. We also indicate, both in the translation and in the original text, where the page boundaries were, and link between the two; in the translated version the positions of these markers are necessarily approximate given the free nature of the translation.

Referencing norms in Wackernagel's day were substantially looser than they are now, and Wackernagel in his paper took for granted the existence of a canon of texts in classical philology that all his intended readers would have been familiar with. A major part of preparing this translated edition consisted in tracking down these references, in the versions that Wackernagel himself would have had access to, and referencing the in the text according to modern norms (author, year, and – where possible – page). The availability of many nineteenth-century books and journals via the Internet Archive and Google Books greatly facilitated this task. Where it is ambiguous which edition of a given text Wackernagel was intending to reference, we have assumed the most recent pre-1892 edition. All references from both the original and this introduction are given in full in the bibliography at the end of the volume.

The edition of the German text provided attempts to be as faithful to the orig-

### 1.3 Notes on the translation and edition

inal typesetting as possible. Where the original contains something ungrammatical or questionable, we have marked this with a following [sic].

George initially started this translation as a solo project, but it quickly became clear that the translation of the German on its own, without glosses and translations for Wackernagel's many examples, would be about as useful as a chocolate teapot. Christina came on board at this point, later also Morgan, and the decision was made to gloss and translate all examples of four words or more, except in particularly repetitive sections. None of us have Wackernagel's compendious knowledge of the early Indo-European languages, and so substantial help was needed here. Morgan and Christina prepared the Greek examples, of which there are well over a thousand. In translating the Greek examples, we have made reference to the previous translations available through the Perseus site (<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>), and where necessary other sources such as Lobel & Page (1968); while we accept full responsibility for the translations presented here, in some cases it was not considered possible to improve upon the wording of an earlier translation. When Wackernagel's rendition of an example differs from that found in modern editions, this is mentioned in a footnote.

We also offer profuse thanks to Moreno Mitrović for the Sanskrit examples, to Robin Meyer for the Old Persian examples, and to Christoph Dreier and Thomas Konrad for the Latin examples. Tina Bögel provided valuable comments on this introduction. For help with tracking down rare books, we also gratefully acknowledge the help of Samuel Andersson, Lieven Danckaert, Deepthi Gopal, and Bettelou Los; Lieven also helped out with a number of translations of Latin quotations from secondary literature. The new edition of the original text was prepared and typeset by Anabel Roschmann. Thanks to everyone for the team effort!





## 2 Translation

### 2.1 Greek *min*, *nin* and *hoi*

[p333] Four years ago, Albert Thumb (1887) made the claim that the Greek pronominal accusatives *min* and *nin* (3.ACC) arose through merger of particles with the old accusative of the pronominal *i*-stems.<sup>1</sup> In particular, he claimed that Ionic *min* was based on the unification of *im* ‘me.ACC’ with a particle *ma*, earlier *sma*, evidenced by Thessalonian *ma* and Sanskrit *sma* ‘indeed, certainly’. Thumb drew the main piece of evidence for this interpretation from the supposed fact that the position of *min* in Homer is essentially the same as the position of *sma* in the *Rgveda*. Even after the independent use of *sma* as a particle was lost and *min* had completely reached the status of a unitary pronominal form, the same rule that had regulated the position of *sma* still held for *min*, and a corresponding sense for positioning accompanied its use. And at any rate this sense was still valid for the composers of the Homeric poems.

However, if one looks at the material adduced by Thumb without limiting oneself to the perspective he proposes, this positional similarity is largely limited to the fact that *min*, like *sma*, in general rarely occurs directly after nouns or after adverbs of nominal origin (to be precise, *min* is much rarer in this position than *sma*). And there are significant deviations from this general banal similarity. Thumb makes a strange error in not being able to dig up any instances of Sanskrit *mā sma*, which under his hypothesis would correspond to the ten instances of *mē min* in Homer: [p334] not only does Böhtlingk-Roth (1855–1875) give numerous examples (s.v. *mā* 9), including one from the *Rgveda* (1), but there is also a well-known rule of Sanskrit grammar regarding the meaning and form of preterites after *mā sma* (Panini 3. 3. 176. 6, 4, 74. See Benfey (1852: 361, §808 note 4)).

---

<sup>1</sup> For the collections of examples in what follows I owe a lot to the well-known reference works on Greek grammar, as well as to the specialized dictionaries, though I will not always be able to acknowledge my sources of information individually. I could only briefly make use of Monro’s (1891) *Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*, second edition, pages 335–338 of which contain observations on Homeric word order that accord closely with what I present here, and I was not able to use Gehring’s (1891) *Index Homericus* at all.

## 2 Translation

- (1) *ma smaitāḍrg apa gūhaḥ samarye*  
 PROHIB EMPH-such.like away hide.2.SG.PRES clash.SG.LOC  
 ‘Don’t hide away such a thing in the clash.’ (*Ṛgveda*, 10.27.24b; trans.  
 Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1417)

But in other cases there is a genuine divergence between *min* and *sma*. According to Thumb, *min* is found in Homer after subordinating particles about 60 times (10% of all examples); *sma* is found only rarely in this environment in the *Ṛgveda*, and only after *yathā* ‘so, thus’. And while *sma* is happy to occur after prepositions, *min* is never found here.

Admittedly, Thumb wants to explain this deviation with reference to the fact that the Homeric language is not fond of inserting particles between prepositions and nominals. He even makes the bold claim that with this in mind the deviation comes close to supporting his theory. I freely admit that I do not understand this explanation. When *sma* follows a preposition in the *Ṛgveda*, the preposition is either verbal in tmesis (including for instance (2), cf. Grassmann (1873: 1598)) or, if cases of this second kind are attested at all, in ‘anastrophe’.

- (2) *ā smā rathaṃ vṛṣapāṇeṣu tiṣṭhasi*  
 PV EMPH chariot.SG.ACC bull-drink.PL.LOC mount.2.SG.PRES.  
 ‘You mount the chariot to the bullish drinks’ (*Ṛgveda*, 1.51.12a; trans.  
 Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1417)

If *min* shares the usual position of *sma*, then, we should not expect to find it after prepositions associated with a case, and when it is absent here we should not excuse this by means of an apparent Homeric aversion to infixation of particles: we should expect it to occur after independent prepositions, and if we find that it is absent here we should recognize this as counterevidence to Thumb’s proposal.

But even if we disregard these differences (as well as others that could be mentioned) between the placement of Homeric *min* and Vedic *sma*, in my view Thumb should have felt obliged to investigate whether the position of *min* in the Homeric clause could not also be explained from a different perspective, without reference to the quality of the preceding word, and whether similar positional regularities to those found with *min* could not also be found with other words (e.g. those that are related in meaning [p335] or similar in form) for which no connection with *sma* is conceivable.

In this connection it is worth observing that of the nine ‘isolated’ cases in which *min* follows a nominal adverb, five (E 181, Z 173, Λ 479, O 160, and δ 500) have it in second position of the clause, and furthermore that all the examples

2.1 Greek *min*, *nin* and *hoi*

Thumb gives of *min* following verbs, demonstratives or negation show the same. In light of this positional rule it also becomes clear why *min* occurs so freely after particles, particularly subordinating particles, in contrast to *sma*, as well as why it essentially only immediately follows pronouns when they serve a clause-linking role and hence are at the beginning of the clause.

Alternatively, counting from another point of view, the books N, Π and P, which together comprise 2,465 verses and so provide a good basis for conclusions about the language of the oldest part of the Iliad, yield instances of *min* in the following positions: 21 times as second word in the clause; 28 times as third or fourth word, but separated from the first word of the clause only by an enclitic or an enclitic-like particle such as *de* ‘but, and’ or *gar* ‘for, since’. In addition, we have *ei kai min* (‘if and him.CL.MASC.ACC’; N 58) and *touneka kai min* (‘therefore and him.CL.MASC.ACC’; N 432), where *kai* ‘and’ belongs closely with the first word of the clause; *epei ou min* (‘because not him.CL.MASC.ACC’; P 641), for which the tendency of negation to precede enclitics in the same clause must be taken into account (for the moment, compare *outis* ‘no one’, *oupō* ‘not yet, not at all’, *ou pote* ‘never’, and *ouk an* ‘not if’); and finally 3.

- (3) οὐδ’ εἰ μάλα μιν χόλος ἵκοι  
 oud’ ei mála **min** khólos híkoi  
 nor if very 3.ACC anger.NOM come-upon.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘even if great anger came over them’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.399)

We thus have 49 cases that obey the aforementioned rule precisely; 3 cases that are amenable to specific explanations; and only one genuine exception. (From the other books, Monro (1891: 337f.) gives only *oud’ ebalon min* (‘but.not strike.1SG.AOR.IND.ACT him’; Γ 368), 4, in which he thinks that *min* should be deleted, and 5.

- (4) εἴ περ γὰρ φθάμενός μιν ἢ οὐτάςῃ  
 eí per gàr phthámenós **min** è outásēi  
 if all then arrive.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.SG 3.ACC or wound.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘though the man be beforehand with her and smite her’ (Homer, *Iliad* 21.576)
- (5) ἄλλ’ ἐώμέν μιν πρῶτα παρεξελθεῖν πεδίοιο  
 all’ eômén **min** prôta parexeltheîn pedíoio  
 but allow.1PL.PRS.SBJV 3.ACC firstly pass.AOR.INF plain.GEN.SG  
 ‘But let us suffer him at the first to pass by us on the plain’ (Homer, *Iliad* 10.344)

## 2 Translation

All of this is in verse, i.e. under conditions that make it more difficult to keep to the usual word order. Particularly remarkable is the well-known, frequently-occurring phrase 6a in place of 6b; here the pressure to put *min* in second position is clearly enough in effect. Similarly in the common expression in 7, where *min* belongs to *prosēuda* and not to *phōnēsas*.

- (6) a. τῷ μιν ἐεικάμενος προσέφη / προσέφώνει  
 tōi **min** eisámenos proséphē/proséphōnee  
 him.DAT 3.ACC appear.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.SG address.3SG.IMP  
 ‘In his likeness addressed ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.326)
- b. τῷ ἐεικάμενος προσέφη μιν
- (7) καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα  
 kaí **min** phōnēsas épea  
 and 3.ACC produce-a-sound.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG word.ACC.PL  
 pteróenta prosēúda  
 winged.N.ACC.PL address.3SG.IMP  
 ‘and addressed him with winged words’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 8.407)

In addition, observe 8. [p336] Here the pronoun that belongs to the subordinate clause is moved to the main clause, without this being attributable to ‘prolepsis’, as the verb of the main clause would require the dative. Only the pressure towards sentence-initial position can explain the position of *min*.

- (8) χαίρει δέ μιν ὅστις ἐθείρη  
 khaírei dé **min** hóstis etheírēi  
 rejoice.3SG.IMP then 3.ACC who.M.NOM.SG prepare.3SG.AOR  
 ‘and glad is he that prepared it (the field)’ (Homer, *Iliad* 21.347)

For the post-Homeric use of *min*, Herodotus plays the role of primary witness, and, in addition to my sporadic reading across all books, his seventh book provided me with the necessary material. And here I can at least say that the majority of examples show *min* in second or near-second position, including such typical cases as 9 (in which *min* belongs to the participles), 10 (in which *min* belongs only to *anēke*), 11 and 12. Cf. also 13, on which I would like to add that the elegiac poets up to and including Theognis used *min* 12 times in second position and only once (Theognis 195) in third position.

---

\* *Translator’s note:* The modern Perseus edition has *hos tis* rather than *hóstis*.

## 2.1 Greek *min*, *nin* and *hoi*

- (9) πολλά τε γάρ *min* καὶ μεγάλα τὰ ἐπαείροντα καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα ἦν  
 pollá te gár *min* kai megála tà  
 many.N.ACC.PL and then 3.ACC and great.N.ACC.PL the.N.ACC.PL  
 epaeíronta kai epotrúnonta ên  
 choose.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.PL and urge.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.PL be.3PL.IMP  
 ‘For there were many weighty reasons that impelled and encouraged him  
 to do so’ (Herodotus, 1.204.7)
- (10) ὥς *min* ὃ τε οἶνος ἀνῆκε καὶ ἔμαθε ...  
 hós *min* hó te oínos anêke kai  
 that 3.ACC the.M.NOM.SG and wine.NOM.SG let-go.3SG.AOR and  
 émathe  
 learn.3SG.AOR  
 ‘after the wine wore off and he recognized (...)’ (Herodotus, 1.213.3)
- (11) ἀλλά *min* οἱ ἱερεὶς αὐτοὶ οἱ τοῦ Νείλου ... θάπτουσι  
 allá *min* hoi hirees autoi  
 but 3.ACC the.M.NOM.PL priests.NOM.PL themselves.M.NOM.PL  
 hoi toû Neíλου tháptousi  
 the.M.NOM.PL the.M.GEN.SG Nile.GEN bury.3PL.PRS  
 ‘But the priests of the Nile themselves buried him’ (Herodotus, 2.90.7)
- (12) οἱ γάρ *min* Σελινούσιοι ἐπαναστάντες ἀπέκτειναν καταφυγόντα ἐπὶ Διὸς  
 hoi gár *min* Selinoúsioi epanastántes  
 the.M.NOM.PL then 3.ACC Selinusian.NOM.PL rise.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL  
 apékteinan kataphugónta epì Diòs agoraíou  
 kill.3SG.AOR fleeing.PTCP.AOR.M.ACC.SG upon Zeus.GEN market.GEN.SG  
 bōmón  
 altar.ACC.SG  
 ‘the people of Selinus rose against him and slew him at the altar of Zeus  
 of the marketplace, to which he had fled for refuge’ (Herodotus, 5.46.11)
- (13) ὥσπερ γάρ *min* πύργον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶσιν  
 hósper gár *min* púrgon en ophthalmóisin horôsin  
 thus then 3.ACC tower.ACC.SG in eyes.DAT.PL see.3PL.PRS  
 ‘they thus see him in front of the tower’ (Kallinos, 1.20)

And it can be shown that that this pressure towards initial position for *min* is not based on some etymological relationship by looking at the very similar

## 2 Translation

treatment of the enclitic dative *hoi* (3.DAT), which is very close to the accusative *min* (3SG.ACC) in meaning and accent, but differs entirely in pronunciation. In the N, Π and P books of the *Iliad*, this *hoi* is found 92 times. Of these, 34 instances are in second position; 53 are in third or fourth position, but separated from the first word of the clause by one or two words which have even greater claim to the clausal second position, such as *de* ‘but, and’ or *te* or *ke* ‘and’. Only five instances differ: Π 251 *nēōn men hoi* ‘ships.GEN.PL then 3.DAT’ and P 273 *tōi kai hoi* ‘therefore and 3.DAT’, where *men* and *kai* belong closely to the first word of the clause, and also P 153 *nun d’ ou hoi* ‘now then not 3.DAT’ and P 410 *dē tote g’ ou hoi* ‘exactly then at.least not 3.DAT’, which follow the rule that when negation and enclitic are adjacent the negation must precede. This would also explain 14, [p337] if the inseparability of *ei* and *mē* did not already offer a satisfactory explanation. It is therefore justifiable to state that the rule established for *min* also holds for *hoi*.

- (14) εἰ μὴ οἱ ἀγάσσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων  
 ei mē **hoi** agássato Phoĩbos Apóllōn  
 if not 3.DAT envy.3SG.AOR Phoebus.NOM Apollo.NOM  
 ‘but that Phoebus Apollo begrudged it him’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.71)

This analogy between *min* and *hoi* is continued in Herodotus. In his writings, *hoi* is found roughly twice as often in second or almost-second position as in other positions. (In the works of the older elegiac poets, *hoi* appears only to be found in second position.)

Particularly remarkable, however, is the fact that, often in Homer and almost even more frequently in Herodotus (cf. Stein (1883: 138) on 1.115.8), this positional tendency has often led to *hoi* being assigned a position that contradicts the syntactic context or is unusual in another respect.

1) Distinctively dative *hoi* occurs far from its governing word and intervenes in another group of words at the beginning of the clause: 15–23. (In 18, *tis* precedes *hoi* because it is itself an enclitic.)

- (15) τὸ δέ οἱ κλέος ἔσsetai ὅσσον ἐμοί περ  
 tò dé **hoi** kléos éssetai hósson  
 the.N.NOM.SG then 3.DAT glory.NOM.SG be.3SG.FUT.MID as-much.N.ACC.SG  
 emoí per  
 me.DAT all  
 ‘and his glory shall be even as mine own’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.232)

- (16) τῷ δέ οἱ ὀγδοάτῳ κακὸν ἦλυθε δῖος Ὀρέστες

2.1 Greek *min, nin and hoi*

- tôi dé **hoi** ogdoátôi kakòn éluthe  
 the.N.DAT.SG then 3.DAT eighth.N.DAT.SG bad.ACC.SG come.3SG.AOR  
 díos Oréstes  
 divine.M.NOM.SG Orestes.NOM  
 ‘but in the eighth came as his bane the goodly Orestes’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 3.307)
- (17) Θαλῆς οἱ ὁ Μιλήσιος διεβίβαε  
 Thalês **hoi** ho Milésios diebíbase  
 Thales.NOM 3.DAT the.M.NOM.SG of-Miletus.M.NOM.SG carry-over.3SG.AOR  
 ‘Thales of Miletus carried them (the army) across’ (Herodotus 1.75.3)
- (18) ἢ τίς οἱ ξείνων ἀργύριον ἐμβαλὼν ἐς τὰ γούνατα μιχθῆι  
 é tis **hoi** xeínōn argúriōn  
 or some.M.NOM.SG 3.DAT stranger.GEN.PL money.ACC.SG  
 embalōn es tà gounata  
 place.PTCP.AOR.M.COM.SG in the.N.ACC.PL knees.N.ACC.PL  
 mikhthêi  
 mix-up.3SG.AOR.SBJV.PASS  
 ‘before some stranger has cast money into her lap’ (Herodotus 1.199.3)
- (19) τοὺς τέ οἱ λίθους ... οὗτοι ἤσαν οἱ ἐλκύσαντες  
 tous té **hoi** lithous hoûtoi êsan  
 the.M.ACC.PL and 3.DAT stone.ACC.PL this.M.NOM.PL be.3PL.IMP  
 hoi helkúsantes  
 the.M.NOM.PL drag.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL  
 ‘It was these who dragged the ... blocks of stone’ (Herodotus 2.108.2)
- (20) οὔτε ὅστις οἱ ἦν ὁ θέμενο [τοῦνομα] φαίνεται  
 oude hóstis **hoi** ên ho  
 nor who.M.NOM.SG 3.DAT be.3SG.IMP the.M.NOM.SG  
 thémenos toúnoma phainetai  
 put.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.SG the=name.ACC.SG seem.3SG.PRS  
 ‘nor is it clear who gave [the name]’ (Herodotus 4.45.4)
- (21) ἐκ δέ οἱ ταύτης τῆς γυναίκος οὐδ’ ἐξ ἄλλης παῖδες ἐγίνοντο  
 ek dé **hoi** taútēs tēs gunáikos oud’ ex  
 from then 3.DAT this.F.GEN.SG the.GEN.SG woman.GEN.SG nor from  
 állēs paides egínonto  
 other.F.GEN.SG child.NOM.PL become.3PL.IMP  
 ‘no sons were born to him by this wife or any other’ (Herodotus 5.92B.2)

## 2 Translation

- (22) ἐν δέ οἱ χρόνῳ ἐλάσσονι ἡ γυνὴ τίκτει τούτον  
 en dé **hoi** khronōi elássoni hē gunē  
 in then 3.DAT time.DAT.SG less.M.DAT.SG the.F.NOM.SG woman.NOM.SG  
 tíktei tóuton  
 birth.3SG.PRS this.M.ACC.SG  
 ‘His [new] wife gave birth to him in less time’ (Herodotus 6.63.1)

- (23) οὗτος μὲν οἱ ὁ λόγος ἦν τιμωρός  
 hoútos mén **hoi** ho lógos ên  
 this.M.NOM.SG then 3.DAT the.M.NOM.SG argument.NOM.SG be.3SG.IMP  
 timōrós  
 avenging.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘This argument was for vengeance’ (Herodotus 7.5.3)

2) Genitive or half-genitive *hoi* is separated from its following noun by other words: 24–29. (In 28, Herwerden (1878: 195) writes *z* ‘whom.DAT’ for *hoi*!)

- (24) τὰ οἷ ποτε πατρὶ φίλα φρονέων πόρε Χείρων  
 tá **hoi** pote patrì phíla  
 the.N.ACC.PL 3.DAT once father.DAT.SG dear.N.ACC.PL  
 phronéōn póre Kheirōn  
 think.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG give.3SG.AOR Cheiron.NOM  
 ‘which of old Cheiron had given to his father with kindly thought’  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 4.219)

- (25) ὅστις οἱ ἀρὴν ἐτάροισιν ἀμύναι  
 hóstis **hoi** arèn hetároisin amúnai  
 who.M.NOM.SG 3.DAT help.ACC.SG companion.DAT.PL keep-off.AOR.INF  
 ‘who would ward off bane from his comrades’ (Homer, *Iliad* 12.333)

- (26) ἃ οἱ θεοὶ οὐρανίωνες πατρὶ φίλῳ ἔπορον  
 há **hoi** theoi ouraníōnes patrì  
 which.N.ACC.PL 3.DAT God.NOM.PL heavenly.M.NOM.PL father.DAT  
 philōi époron  
 beloved.M.DAT.SG give.3PL.AOR  
 ‘that the heavenly gods had given to his (beloved) father’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.195–196)

- (27) θεὰ δέ οἱ ἔκλυεν ἀρῆς



## 2.1 Greek *min*, *nin* and *hoi*

theà dé **hoi** ékluen arês  
 Goddess.NOM.SG then 3.DAT hear.3SG.AOR prayer.GEN.SG  
 ‘and the goddess heard her prayer’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 4.767)

- (28) ὃ οἱ φόνος υἱὶ τέτυκται  
 hó **hoi** phónos huîi tétuktai  
 that.N.NOM.SG 3.DAT death.NOM.SG son.GEN.SG ready.3SG.PF  
 ‘(nor does she know at all) that death has been made ready for her son’  
 (Homer, *Odyssey* 4.771)

- (29) μή τί οἱ κρεμάμενον τῷ παιδὶ ἐμπέσῃ  
 mé tí **hoi** kremámenon tōi  
 lest some.N.NOM.SG 3.DAT hang.PTCP.PRS.PASS.N.NOM.SG the.M.DAT.SG  
 paidi empésēi  
 child.DAT.SG fall.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘lest one should fall on his son from where it hung’ (Herodotus 1.34.3)

3) Genitive or half-genitive *hoi* immediately precedes its noun and attributes, a position that is incomprehensible for an enclitic, in and of itself: 30–34. [p338] However, this word order is also found in Herodotus without *hoi* in second position, e.g. 35. But I believe the situation is as follows: because *hoi* in second position occurred so often preceding its governing noun, it became the case that *hoi* could also immediately precede its governing noun in clause-medial position.

- (30) μή οἱ ἀπειλας ἐκτελέσωσι θεοί  
 mé **hoi** apeilas ektelésōsi theoí  
 lest 3.DAT boasts.ACC.PL fulfil.3PL.AOR.SBJV God.NOM.PL  
 ‘lest the gods fulfill for him his boastings’ (Homer, *Iliad* 9.244)

- (31) ὅς οἱ παρὰ πατρὶ γέροντι κηρύσσων γήρασκε  
 hós **hoi** parà patri géronti  
 who.M.NOM.SG 3.DAT in father.DAT.SG old.M.DAT.SG  
 kērússōn géraske  
 herald.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG grow-old.3SG.AOR  
 ‘who in the house of his old father had grown old in his heraldship’  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 17.324)

- (32) δευτέρα οἱ τὸν παῖδα ἐπέμπε  
 deúterá **hoi** tòn paída épempe  
 then 3.DAT the.M.ACC.SG child.ACC.SG send.3SG.IMP  
 ‘[Cambyses] next made him go out’ (Herodotus 3.14.4)

## 2 Translation

- (33) τὴν οἱ ὁ πατὴρ εἶχε ἀρχήν  
tén hoi ho patēr eíkhe  
the.F.ACC.SG 3.DAT the.M.NOM.SG father.NOM.SG have.AOR.3SG  
arkhén  
power.ACC.FEM  
‘The father had the power’ (Herodotus 3.15.3)
- (34) καὶ οἱ (καὶ οἷ?) τῷ πατρὶ ἔφη Σάμιον τοῦνομα τεθῆναι, ὅτι οἱ ὁ πατὴρ  
Ἀρχίης ἐν Σάμῳ ἀριστεύσας ἐτελεύτησε  
kaí (/kaí) hoi (/hoi) tōi patrì éphē Sámion  
and 3.DAT the.M.DAT.SG father.DAT.SG said.3SG.IMP Samius.ACC  
tounoma tethênai, hóti hoi ho  
the=name.ACC.SG put.AOR.INF.PASS that him.DAT the.M.NOM.SG  
patēr Arkhías en Sámōi aristeúsas  
father.NOM.SG Archias.NOM in Samos.DAT be-best.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
eteleútēsē  
die.3SG.AOR  
‘and told me that his father had borne the name Samius because he was  
the son of that Archias who was killed fighting bravely at Samos’  
(Herodotus 3.55.2)
- (35) εἰ βούλοιτό οἱ τὴν θυγατέρα ἔχειν γυναῖκα  
ei bouloítō hoi tèn thugatéra ékhein  
if want.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID 3.DAT the.F.ACC.SG daughter.ACC.SG have.PRS.INF  
gunaika  
woman.ACC.SG  
‘If he wanted to take his daughter as a wife’ (Herodotus 1.60.2)
- 4) Genitive or half-genitive *hoi* intervenes between the first and second element of its governing expression, also an unusual position for an enclitic in itself.  
a) Between a preposition and a following particle and article, as in 36.
- (36) ἐκ γάρ οἱ τῆς ὄψιος οἱ τῶν μάγων ὄνειροπόλοι ἐσήμαινον  
ek gár hoi tēs ópsios hoi tōn  
from then 3.DAT the.F.GEN.SG sight.GEN.SG the.M.NOM.PL the.M.GEN.PL  
mágōn oneiropóloi esémainon  
magus.GEN.PL dream-interpreter.NOM.PL declare.3PL.AOR  
‘for the interpreters declared that the meaning of his dream’ (Herodotus 1.108.2)

## 2.1 Greek *min*, *nin* and *hoi*

b) Between an article and a following particle and noun: 37–39 (similar are Ξ 438, O 607, T 635 and many examples in the *Odyssey*) as well as 40–47.

- (37) τὼ δέ οἱ ὤμῳ κυρτώ  
 tò dé **hoi** ómō kurtó  
 therefore then 3.DAT shoulder.NOM.DU rounded.M.NOM.DU  
 ‘and his two shoulders were rounded’ (Homer, *Iliad* 2.217)
- (38) τὼ δέ οἱ ὅσσε ... χαμαὶ πέσον  
 tò dé **hoi** ósse khamàí péson  
 therefore then 3.DAT eyeballs.NOM.DU down fall.3SG.AOR  
 ‘and his two eyeballs fell down’ (Homer, *Iliad* 13.616)
- (39) τὼ δέ οἱ ὅσσε δακρυόφιν πλήσθεν  
 tò dé **hoi** ósse dakruóphin plêsthen  
 therefore then 3.DAT eyeballs.NOM.DU tears.N.GEN.PL fill.3PL.AOR.PASS  
 ‘and both his eyes were filled with tears’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.695 = 23.396)
- (40) αἱ δέ οἱ ἵπποι ἀμφὶς ὁδοῦ δραμέτην  
 hai dé **hoi** híppoi amphís hodoû  
 the.F.NOM.PL then 3.DAT horse.NOM.PL on-both-sides road.GEN.SG  
 dramétēn  
 run.3DU.AOR  
 ‘and his mares swerved to this side and that of the course’ (Homer, *Iliad* 23.392)
- (41) αἱ δέ οἱ ἵπποι ὑψός’ ἀειρέσθεν  
 hai dé **hoi** híppoi hupós’ aeirésthen  
 the.F.NOM.PL then 3.DAT horse.NOM.PL high leap.3DU.IMP  
 ‘and his horses leapt on high’ (Homer, *Iliad* 23.500)
- (42) τὸ δέ οἱ οὖνομα εἶναι ... Ἰοῦν  
 tò dé **hoi** oúnoma eínai Ioûn  
 the.N.ACC.SG then 3.DAT name.ACC.SG be.PRS.INF Io.ACC  
 ‘and her name to be Io’ (Herodotus 1.1.3)
- (43) τῶν δέ οἱ παίδων τὸν πρεσβύτερον εἶπεῖν  
 tôn dé **hoi** paídōn tôn presbúteron  
 the.GEN.PL then 3.DAT child.GEN.PL the.M.ACC.SG elder.M.ACC.SG  
 eipeîn  
 say.AOR.INF  
 ‘to name the eldest of his children’ (Herodotus 3.3.2)

## 2 Translation

- (44) τὸν τέ οἱ παῖδα ἐκ τῶν ἀπολλυμένων σώζειν  
 tón té **hoi** paída ek tòn  
 the.M.ACC.SG and 3.DAT child.ACC.SG from the.M.GEN.PL  
 apolluménōn sóizein  
 perish.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.GEN.PL save.PRS.INF  
 ‘to save then his child from perishing’ (Herodotus 3.14.11)
- (45) ὁ γάρ οἱ ἀστράγαλος ἐξεχώρησε ἐκ τῶν ἄρθρων  
 ho gár **hoi** astrágalos exekhórēse ek  
 the.M.NOM.SG then 3.DAT ankle.NOM.SG dislocate.3SG.AOR from  
 tōn árthrōn  
 the.N.GEN.PL sockets.GEN.PL  
 ‘and then his ankle was dislocated from its sockets’ (Herodotus 3.129.2)
- (46) τὰ δέ οἱ ὅπλα ἔχουσι Ἀθηναῖοι  
 ta de **hoi** hopla ekhousi Athēnaioi  
 the.N.ACC.PL then 3.DAT weapons.ACC.PL have.3PL.PRS Athenian.NOM.PL  
 ‘thus the Athenians have his weapons’ (Herodotus 5.95.1)
- (47) τὴν δέ οἱ πέμπτῃ τῶν νεῶν κατεῖλον διώκοντες οἱ Φοίνικες  
 tēn dé **hoi** pémpṭē tōn neōn  
 the.F.ACC.SG then 3.DAT fifth.F.ACC.SG the.F.GEN.PL ship.GEN.PL  
 kateîlon diókontes **hoi**  
 take-over.3PL.AOR chase.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL the.M.NOM.PL  
 Phoínikes  
 Phoenician.NOM.PL  
 ‘the Phoenicians took over one fifth of his ships by chasing (them)’  
 (Herodotus 6.41.7)

The Ionic poets also provide examples, e.g. 48 and 49.

- (48) ἡ δέ οἱ κόμη ὤμους κατεσκίαζε καὶ μετάφρενα  
 hē dé **hoi** kómē ómous kateskiáze  
 the.F.NOM.SG then 3.DAT hair.NOM.SG shoulder.ACC.PL shadow.AOR.3SG  
 kaì metáphrena  
 and chest.ACC.PL  
 ‘and his hair shadowed his shoulders and his chest’ (Archilochus 29.2)
- (49) ἡ δέ οἱ κάθη ... ἐπλήμυρεν

2.1 Greek *min*, *nin* and *hoi*

hē dé **hoi** sáthē eplēmmuren  
 the.F.NOM.SG then 3.DAT penis.NOM.SG be-full-of-blood.3SG.IMP  
 ‘and then his penis was erect’ (Archilochus 29.2)

c) Between an article and a noun: 50 and 51.

- (50) τῶν οἱ συλλοχίτεων διεφθαρμένων  
 tôn **hoi** sullokhitéōn diephtharménōn  
 the.M.GEN.PL 3.DAT fellow-men.GEN.PL kill.PTCP.PF.PASS.M.GEN.PL  
 ‘after all the men of his company had been killed’ (Herodotus 1.82.8)
- (51) τῶν οἱ σιτοφόρων ἡμιόνων μία ἔτεκε  
 tôn **hoi** sitophórōn hēmiónōn μία  
 the.F.GEN.PL 3.DAT wheat-carrying.F.GEN.PL mule.GEN.PL one.F.NOM.SG  
 éteke  
 birth.3SG.AOR  
 ‘one of their donkeys that carried the wheat gave birth’ (Herodotus 3.153.1)

The non-Ionic post-Homeric poets, for whom *hoi* was part of the traditional stock of poetic language, also provide parallels: here I present the examples that I have so far found. Category 1) includes 52 as well as 53 (=Meineke (1843: 164)).

- (52) ἄνευ οἱ Χαρίτων τέκεν γόνον ὑπερφιάλον  
 áneu **hoi** Kharitōn téken gónon  
 without 3.DAT Grace.GEN.PL birth.3SG.AOR offspring.ACC.SG  
 huperphíalon  
 monstrous.M.ACC.SG  
 ‘she bore to him, without the blessing of the Graces, a monstrous offspring’ (Pindar, *Pyth.*, 2.42)
- (53) ἀντὶ δέ οἱ πλοκαμῖδος ἐκηβόλε καλὸς ἐπειη ὡχαρνῆθεν αἰὲ κισσὸς  
 ánti dé **hoi** plokamídos hekēbóle kalòs  
 instead then 3.DAT braid.GEN.SG archer.VOC.SG beautiful.M.NOM.SG  
 epeiē hōkharnēthen aî kissòs  
 be-upon.3SG.PRS.OPT the=from-Acharnae always ivy.NOM.SG  
 aexoménōi  
 grow.PTCP.PRS.PASS.N.DAT.SG  
 ‘Instead of his locks, O Archer, may the beautiful ivy of Acharnae be

## 2 Translation

added to the eternal growth.’ (Anthologia Graeca 6.279)

Category 2) includes 54 from Theocritus (cf. Meineke (1856: 256) on Theocritus 7.88). Example 55 belongs to either 1) or 2).

- (54) ἐγὼ δέ οἱ ἄ ταχυπειθῆς χειρὸς ἐφαψαμένα  
 egò dé **hoi** ha takhupeithès kheiròs  
 I.NOM then 3.DAT the.F.NOM.SG credulous.F.NOM.SG hand.GEN.SG  
 ephapsaména  
 bind.PTCP.AOR.MID.F.NOM.SG  
 ‘then I, being credulous, bound her hands to him’ (Theocritus 2.138)

- (55) ἐν γάρ οἱ χθονὶ πηκτὸν τόδ’ ἔγχος περιπετές κατηγορεῖ  
 en gár **hoi** khthonì pēktòn tód’ énkhos  
 in then 3.DAT ground.DAT.SG fixed.N.NOM.SG this.N.NOM.SG spear.NOM.SG  
 peripetés katēgoreī  
 surrounded.N.NOM.SG convict.3SG.PRS  
 ‘His sword which he planted in the ground and on which he fell convicts him.’ (Sophocles, *Ajax* 907)

[p339] Example 56 belongs to 3), and 57 belongs to 4).

- (56) ἄτε οἱ αἵματος ἔσκεν  
 háte **hoi** haímatos éskēn  
 who.F.NOM.SG CL 3.DAT blood.GEN.SG be.3SG.IMP  
 ‘who was of his blood’ (Moschus, *Europa* 41)
- (57) ἃ δέ οἱ φίλα δάμαρ τάλαιναν δυστάλαινα καρδίαν παγκλαυτος αἰὲν ὄλλυτο  
 ha dé **hoi** phíla dāmar tálainan  
 she.NOM then 3.DAT dear.F.NOM.SG wife.NOM suffering.F.ACC.SG  
 dustálaina kardían panklautos aièn  
 most-miserable.F.NOM.SG heart.ACC.SG most-lamentable.F.NOM.SG always  
 ólluto  
 destroy.3SG.IMP.PASS  
 ‘She, his loving wife, miserable, was ever pining in her miserable heart, always weeping’ (Sophocles, *Trachiniai* 650)

---

\* Translator’s note: ‘Archer’ is an epithet of Apollo.

2.1 Greek *min*, *nin* and *hoi*

Inscriptions in the dialects that employ *hoi* are unrevealing. Among the Doric dialects, only Epidauric yields richer results, and these are well known to be relatively late. In No. 3339 and 3340 of Collitz (Prellwitz 1889) I can count fourteen instances of *hoi* in second position and eight of *hoi* elsewhere. The few non-Doric examples I have to hand all follow the rule: 58, 59 (cf. Meister (1889: 148), Hoffmann (1891: 67f.)), and by the same author 60.

- (58) μή οἱ ἔστω ἰνδικόν  
 mé **hoi** éstō índikon  
 not 3.DAT be.3SG.IMPER unjust.N.NOM.SG  
 ‘let it not be unjust to him’ (Inscription 1222.33 Collitz, Tegea)
- (59) ἀφ’ ᾧ φοι τὰς εὐχολὰς ἐπέτυχε / ἐπέδουκε  
 aph’ hô **woi** tàs eukhōlās epétukhe/epédouke  
 of whom.DAT 3.DAT the.F.ACC.PL prayer.ACC.PL succeed.3SG.AOR  
 ‘from whom his prayers were granted’ (Inscription 59.3 Collitz, Cyprus)
- (60) ἀνοσίῃα φοι γένοιτο  
 anosíja **woi** génoitu  
 unholy.N.NOM.PL 3.DAT become.3SG.AOR.MID  
 ‘may curses come upon him’ (Inscription 60.29 Collitz, Cyprus)

Despite all of this, however, one might nevertheless find it remarkable that Thumb could discover this idiosyncratic positional custom, apparently reminiscent of the position of *sma* in the *Rgveda*, and might still be inclined to suspect something of significance behind it. To shed light on this, it seems most appropriate to compare the statistics that Thumb (1887) gives for *min* against the use of *hoi* in NIIP. Thumb 1a: “in 68% of all cases, *min* follows a particle”; *hoi* does so in 66 of 92 cases, i.e. 72% (33 times after *de* ‘but, and’, just as *de* also most commonly precedes *min*; after that, in decreasing order of frequency, it is found after *ára* (interrogative), *rha*, *kaí* ‘and’, *gár* ‘for, since’, *oudé* ‘but not’, *te* ‘and’, *éntha* ‘there/where’, *allá* ‘but’, *é* ‘or, than’, *mén* ‘while, so’, *pōs* ‘in any way’, *tákha* ‘quickly, soon’). Thumb 1b: “in 10% of cases, *min* follows a subordinating conjunction”; *hoi* does so four times (after *hó(t)ti* ‘that/because’, *epei* ‘after, since’, *óphra* ‘in order that, as long as, until’), i.e. only in 4% of cases – a difference that is made even less meaningful by the fact that Thumb is obliged to note a difference between *min* and *sma* for this category, as *sma* is not keen on this position. Thumb 2: “*min* never immediately follows prepositions (in contrast to *sma*!)”; the same

\* Translator’s note: In this inscription the author seems to be using iv- like Attic ἄ-.

## 2 Translation

is true for *hoi*. Thumb 3: “*óu min*, *mé min* in 15 of 600 examples”, i.e. 2.5%; *óu hoi*, *mé hoi* in 3 of 92 examples, i.e. 3.25%. Thumb 4: “*min* very often occurs after pronouns”, apparently about 100 times or 16.67%; *hoi* is also often found here, in fact 17 times, i.e. 18.5%. Thumb 5 and 6: “*min* follows verbs and nominal words in 3% of cases”; *hoi* follows *aipu* ‘steep’ in N 317 and *haimati* ‘blood.DAT’ in P 51, i.e. in 2% of cases.

Thumb’s observations are thus just as valid for *hoi* as for *min*. *hoi* is found following the same [p340] words as *min* and with almost exactly the same frequency as *min*. What Thumb has demonstrated for *min* is therefore not a property specific to *min* but rather a consequence, common to *min* and *hoi*, of the positional law that assigns to both of them the second position in the clause.

This removes the main point in support of the argument that *min* has its origin in *sm(a)-im*, this argument is almost entirely refuted by the absence of any reflex of the hypothesized earlier initial cluster *sm-*. One would expect occasional instances of *de min* as a trochee or spondee; Thumb is mute on this point. A further consideration can be adduced. The combination of *sma* and *im* that supposedly gave rise to *min* could be seen as ancient: in this case, the loss of the original function of *sma* in the use of *min* makes sense, but one would expect Greek *\*(s)main* corresponding to Sanskrit *\*smēm*. The other possibility is that this combination arose not long before Homer, in which case the presence of the specifically Greek reduction, i.e. the development *ma in* → *m’ in* → *min*, makes sense – but then the complete loss of the function of *(s)ma*, the treatment of *min* exactly as any other normal pronoun, is inexplicable, especially since in Thessalonian a particle *ma* with the meaning ‘but’ occurs, which can however only debatably be connected with Sanskrit *sma*.

Thumb’s explanation of Doric *nin* as arising from *nu-im* seems to me to be even less successful, since here insurmountable phonetic difficulties seem to stand in its way. In his observation that “it is safe to assume that at an earlier stage it was possible to pronounce final *u* as a consonant (ʋ) under certain conditions, as in Sanskrit (e.g. (61), adducing examples such as *pros* from *proti*, *ein* from *eni*, *hupeir* from *hyperī* (= Sanskrit *upary* alongside *upari*), Lesbian *perr-* from *peri-*, in which *i* could stand in for *i* during the period of Indo-European unity, Thumb overlooks the fact that not all final *-is* and *-us* can be treated the same.

- (61) *kō*                      *nv atra*  
       who.NOM.SG now here  
       ‘Now who [has given liberally to you] here [, Maruts]?’ (*R̥gveda*, 1.165.13a;  
       trans. Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1417)



2.1 Greek *min*, *nin* and *hoi*

In the *Ṛgveda*, *-i* and *-u* only become *-y* and *-v* with any frequency in the word class in which Greek shows [p341] reflexes of such a change, namely in the disyllabic prepositions such as *abhi*, *prati*, *anu*, *pari*, *adhi*; otherwise, outside the later 10th book and the *Vāḷakhilyas* this occurs only very sporadically. In monosyllables it is only found in the compound *avyuṣṭā* (‘not yet dawned’; *Ṛgveda*, 2.28.9a) and then in *ny alipsata* (‘wiped out’; *Ṛgveda*, 1.191.3d, i.e. in a song that is known to be late (Oldenberg 1888: 438, note 4). And *nu* in particular (like *u*) avoids this sandhi completely, in fact often lengthening, even becoming disyllabic in extreme cases. And even if we could reconstruct Pre-Greek *n̄fin*, hence Doric *nin*, following a final vowel, a postconsonantal *nin* would still be inexplicable; the development *hós nu in*, *hós nw in*, *hós nin* is completely inconceivable.

Furthermore, when Thumb (1887: 646–647) suggests that the position of *nin* in the clause shows no special analogy with that of Sanskrit *nu* and Greek *nu*, and excuses this with reference to the young age of the sources that contain *nin* (Pindar and the tragic poets), it is certainly true that these authors can provide no clean results for *nin* like those from Homer and Herodotus for *min* – not only on chronological grounds, but also because of the more artificial nature of their word order. But one might well still ask whether certain tendencies can be recognized. And here it can be observed that, in 30 of 47 relevant examples from Aeschylus, *nin* follows the positional law established for *min* and *hoi* – and, remarkably, in 5 of 7 examples in *The Persians* and *Seven against Thebes*, 21 of 32 in the *Oresteia*, and 2 of 5 in *Prometheus Bound*. The ratio in Sophocles is less favourable: of 81 examples, 47 follow the law for *nin* and 34 do not. The first class includes the cases of tmesis, e.g. 62 and 63.

- (62) cùn dé viv θηρώμεθα  
 sùn dé **nin** thērōmetha  
 with then 3.ACC chase.1PL.PRS  
 ‘and at once closed upon our quarry’ (Sophocles, *Antigone* 432)

- (63) κατ’ αὖ νιν φοινία θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων ἀμᾶ κοπίς  
 kat’ aû **nin** phoinía theôn tôn  
 against again 3.ACC bloody.F.NOM.SG god.GEN.PL the.M.GEN.PL  
 nertérōn amâi kopís  
 lower.M.GEN.PL reap.3SG.PRS knife.NOM.SG  
 ‘that hope, in its turn, the blood-stained knife of the gods infernal cuts

\* Translator’s note: Wackernagel has *avyuṣṭāḥ*, with an <ḥ> that is not found in the original text.

\* Translator’s note: Wackernagel here has *kopís* ‘knife, sword’, while the modern Perseus edition has *kónis* ‘dust’.

## 2 Translation

down’ (Sophocles, *Antigone* 601)

A sense for the actual position of *nin* is alive elsewhere too: cf. Aristophanes *Acharnians* 775, and in particular 64–67 from Euripides; in addition, 68 and 69 from Theocritus.

- (64) ἄλλά νιν, ὃ φάος διογενές, κατεῖργε  
allá **nin**, ô pháos diogenés, kateîrge  
but 3.ACC O light.NOM.SG Zeus-born.F.NOM.SG check.2SG.IMPER  
‘O light begotten of Zeus, check her’ (Euripides, *Medea* 1258)
- (65) τίς δέ νιν ναυκληρία ἐκ τῆςδ’ ἀπῆρε χθονός  
tís dé **nin** nauklēría ek tēsδ’  
what.F.NOM.SG then 3.ACC voyage.NOM.SG from this.F.GEN.SG  
apēre khthonós  
lift-off.3SG.AOR earth.GEN.SG  
‘What ship carried her off from this land?’ (Euripides, *Helen* 1519)
- (66) ὑμεῖς δέ, νεάνιδές, νιν ἀγκάλαις ἐπι δέξασθε  
humeîs dè, neánidés, **nin** ankálais épi  
you.NOM.PL then young-woman.NOM.PL 3.ACC arm.ACC.PL in  
déxasthe  
accept.2PL.AOR.IMPER.MID  
‘You then, young women, take her in your arms’ (Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis* 615)
- (67) ὧν νιν οὔνεκα κτανεῖν Ζῆν’ ἐξεκαυχῶντ(ο)  
hôn **nin** hoúneka ktaneîn Zēn’ exekaukhônt(o)  
which.N.GEN.PL 3.ACC for kill.AOR.INF Zeus.ACC boast.3PL.IMP  
‘for which they boasted that Zeus killed her’ (Euripides, *Bacchae* 30)
- (68) ἐγὼ δέ νιν ὥς ἐνόησα  
egô dé **nin** hōs enóēsa  
I.NOM then 3.ACC as understand.1SG.AOR  
‘and when I felt him’ (Theocritus 2.103)
- (69) τὰ δέ νιν καλὰ κύματα φαίνει  
tà dé **nin** kalà kúmata phaínei  
the.N.ACC.PL then you good.N.ACC.PL wave.ACC.PL bring.3SG.PRES  
‘[She] brings the good waves to you’ (Theocritus 6.11)

## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

Finally, [p342] the ancient Rhodian inscription 70 recently presented by Selivanov (1891) is very striking: *nin* syntactically belongs with *pēmaínoi*, corresponding exactly to the *min* in example 8 discussed above.

- (70) *cāma tóζ' Ἰδαμενεὺς ποίησα ἵνα κλέος εἶη· Ζεὺς δέ νιν ὅστις πημαίνοι,*  
*λειώλη θείη*  
*sāma tóz' Idameneùs poiēsa hína kléos*  
*sign.ACC.SG this.N.ACC.SG Idomeneus.NOM make.1SG.AOR that fame.NOM*  
*eíē; Zeùs dé nin hóstis, pēmaínoi*  
*be.3SG.PRS.OPT Zeus.NOM then 3.ACC who.M.NOM.SG ruin.3SG.PRS.OPT*  
*leiólē theíē*  
*destructive.N.ACC.PL put.3SG.AOR.OPT*  
 'I, Idomeneus, have made this sign that it may be known, and that Zeus,  
 who shall ruin him, may send destruction' (IG XII,1 737)

This essential identity in position between *nin* and *min* is another spanner in the works for Thumb's argumentation. I agree with him on one point: that *m-in* and *n-in* should be segmented and that *\*in* is the accusative corresponding to Latin *is*, as well as that both the assumption of underlying reduplication *\*imim*, *\*inin* and the assumption of roots *mi-*, *ni-* preserved in *min* and *nin* are incorrect. In the absence of a better theory, it seems to me to be simplest to derive *n-* and *m-* from sandhi. Given the pairs *autíka-m-in* (from *-kmm im*) and *autíka mán*, *ára-m-in* and *ára mán*, and *rha-m-in* and *rha mán* (if we can assume a voiced bilabial nasal word-finally in *ára* and *rha*), it would have been possible for *alla min* to emerge alongside *alla man* and for *min* to spread further, little by little; *alla min* : *autíka min* = *mēkéti* : *oukéti*. Similarly, the *n-* of *nin* can be explained as originating in a word-final voiced dental nasal. See Wackernagel (1887: 119–125) on *atta* from *tta*, *ouneka* from *eneka* and related matters, as well as the Prakrit enclitic *m-iva*, *mmiva* for Sanskrit *iva*, where the *m* naturally arises from the final segment of neuters and accusatives (Lassen 1837: 370). See further Tobler (1877: 423), Meyer (1885: 943f.), Ziemer (1885: 1371), Schuchardt (1887: 181), Thielmann (1889: 167 fn).

## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

The preference for putting *min*, *nin* and *hoi* in the second position in the clause should be viewed in its broader context. Bergaigne (1877: 177–178) already suggested that enclitic pronouns in general “prefer to be placed after the first word in the clause”. As evidence he adduces 71 and 72.

## 2 Translation

- (71) ὁ σφιν εὖ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν  
 hó **sphin** eú phronéōn agorésato  
 PRO them.DAT well be-minded.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG assemble.3SG.AOR.MID  
 καὶ μετέειπεν  
 and address.3SG.AOR  
 ‘he with good intent addressed the gathering, and spoke among them’  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 1.73)
- (72) ὁ μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλῃ  
 hó moi géras érkhetai állei  
 which.N.ACC.SG me.DAT prize.NOM.SG go.3SG.PRES.PASS elsewhere  
 ‘that my prize goes elsewhere’ (Homer, *Iliad* 1.120)

This observation is confirmed as soon as one starts [p343] to collect examples. Beginning with the third person pronouns to follow on from *min*, *nin* and *hoi*, in the books NIIP that I have drawn upon as sources, *e* (3SG) is found four times, always in the second position or as close as possible to second position (in what follows I will disregard this distinction). There are twelve instances of *sphi(n)* (3PL.DAT), of which eleven follow the rule; the only exception is 73 (see also 74, where *sphin* has been inserted into the group *tòn dé ánakta*).

- (73) ἐπὶ δὲ πτόλεμος τέτατό σφιν  
 epì dè ptólemos tétatò **sphin**  
 against then war.NOM.SG strain.3SG.PLPF.PASS them.DAT  
 ‘and against them was strained a conflict’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.736)
- (74) τὸν δὲ σφιν ἄνακτ’ ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης ἔκτανε  
 tòn dé **sphin** ánakτ’ agathòs Diomédēs  
 the.M.ACC.SG then them.DAT king.ACC good.M.NOM.SG Diomedes.NOM  
 éktane  
 kill.3SG.AOR  
 ‘and brave Diomedes slew their lord’ (Homer, *Iliad* 10.559)

*sphisi* (3PL.DAT) is found six times, always following the rule. *spheas* (3PL.ACC) is found in 75, and *sphōe* (3DU.ACC) in 76. From elsewhere in Homer we can draw the hyperthetic example 77.

---

\* *Translator’s note:* The element marked PRO is a rare Ionic form of a pronoun, glossed as ‘who, which’ in Liddell-Scott, and not further specified in the gloss here.

## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

- (75) μάλα γάρ σφεας ὧκ' ἐλέλιξεν  
 málā gár **spheas** ôk' elélixen  
 very then them.ACC speedily whirl-round.3SG.AOR  
 'for full speedily did Aias rally them' (Homer, *Iliad* 17.278)
- (76) εἰ μὴ σφῶ' Αἴαντε διέκριναν μεμαῶτε  
 ei mé **sphō'** Aíante diékrinan  
 if not them.ACC.DU Aiantes.NOM.DU separate.3PL.AOR  
 memaôte  
 desire.PTCP.PF.M.ACC.DU  
 'but that the twain Aiantes parted them in their fury' (Homer, *Iliad* 17.531)
- (77) καί σφεας φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα  
 kaí **spheas** phōnēsas épea  
 and them.ACC.PL produce-a-sound.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG word.ACC.PL  
 pteróenta prosēúda  
 flying.N.ACC.PL address.3SG.IMP  
 'and he spoke and addressed them with winged words' (Homer, *Iliad* 4.284)

The same is true in the second person: *seo* and *seu* (2SG.GEN) are found five times, always in second position (for more examples see below); *toi* (2SG.DAT, for which I am counting the cases where it is used as a particle, for obvious reasons, but without *étôi* 'either, or' and *itoi*) can be found 47 times, 45 of which follow the rule, with only two exceptions: 78 and 79. In both cases the tendency for enclitics to attach to the negation has interfered with the operation of the main rule.

- (78) ἔπει οὐ τοι ἐδνωταὶ κακοί εἰμεν  
 epei ou **toi** eednōtai kakoí eimen  
 because not you.DAT father-of-bride.DAT.SG bad.M.NOM.PL be.1PL.PRS  
 'because you may be sure we deal not hardly in exacting wedding gifts'  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 13.382)
- (79) ἀτὰρ οὐ τοι πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι  
 atâr ou **toi** pântes epainéomen theoî álloi  
 but not CL all.M.NOM.PL applaud.1PL.PRS god.NOM.PL other.M.NOM.PL  
 'but be sure that we other gods don't all applaud' (Homer, *Iliad* 16.443)

---

\* *Translator's note:* Homeric clitic *toi* is translated by Liddell-Scott as 'let me tell you, mark you, look you'.

## 2 Translation

*se* (2SG.ACC) can be found 21 times, of which 19 instances follow the rule and two behave differently: 80 and 81.

- (80) εἰ καὶ ἐγὼ σε βάλοιμι  
 ei kai egō **se** báloimi  
 if and I.NOM you.ACC throw.1SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘if so be I should smite thee’ (Homer, *Iliad* 16.623)

- (81) ἧ τ’ ἐφάμην σε  
 ê t’ ephámēn **se**  
 in-truth and speak.1SG.IMP you.ACC  
 ‘in truth I deemed you ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.171)

The same is true in the first person: *meu* (1SG.GEN) can be found in N 626 and P 29, and in both it immediately follows the beginning of the clause; *moi* (1SG.DAT) is found 32 times (including *hō moi*), including 27 following the rule, and 82 can probably be adduced as a 28th example.

- (82) ἀλλὰ τί ἦ μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός  
 allà tí ê **moi** taûta phílos  
 but why in-truth me.DAT these.N.ACC.PL beloved.M.NOM.SG  
 dieléxato thumós  
 converse.3SG.AOR.MID soul.NOM.SG  
 ‘But why does my heart thus hold converse with me?’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.97)

The deviations are 83 (if written as *héspeté nûn moi*, the example would count as following the rule), 84, 85, and 86 – exceptions which neither quantitatively nor qualitatively challenge the rule, while conversely an example like 87, in which the attachment of *moi* to a vocative was already striking to the ancients, is evidence for the consistent validity of the rule.

- (83) ἔσπετε νῦν μοι  
 héspete nûn **moi**  
 say.2PL.AOR.IMPER now me.DAT  
 ‘tell me now’ (Homer, *Iliad* 16.112)
- (84) ἦδ’ ἔτι καὶ νῦν μοι τόδ’ ἐπικρήνην ἐέλδωρ  
 êd’ éti kai nûn **moi** tód’ epikréēnon  
 and yet even now me.DAT this.N.ACC.SG accomplish.2SG.AOR.IMPER

## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

eéldōr

desire.ACC.SG

‘even so now also fulfil you for me this my desire’ (Homer, *Iliad* 16.238)

- (85) ἄλλὰ σύ πέρ μοι ἄναξ τόδε καρτερὸν ἔλκος ἄκεσσαι  
 allà sú pér **moi** áanax tóde karteròn  
 but you.NOM all me.DAT king.VOC.SG this.N.ACC.SG strong.N.ACC.SG  
 hélkos ákessai  
 wound.ACC.SG heal.2SG.AOR.IMPER.MID  
 ‘Howbeit, do thou, O king, heal me of this grievous wound’ (Homer, *Iliad* 16.523)

- (86) αἰνὸν ἄχος τό μοί ἐστιν  
 ainòn ákhos tó **moi** estin  
 dire.N.NOM.SG pain.NOM.SG the.N.NOM.SG me.DAT be.3SG.PRS  
 ‘my pain is dire’ (Homer, *Iliad* 16.55)

- (87) Πάτροκλέ μοι δειλῇ πλεῖστον κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ  
 Pátroklé **moi** deilêi pleíston  
 Patroclus.VOC me.DAT cowardly.M.DAT.SG most  
 kekharisméne thumôi  
 gratify.PTCP.PF.PASS.M.VOC.SG soul.DAT.SG  
 ‘Patroclus, dearest to my hapless heart’ (Homer, *Iliad* 19.287)

[p344] Similarly striking is *moi* after *áll’ áge*, as in 88. Finally, *me* (1SG.ACC) can be found 15 times, always following the rule. (Monro (1891: 336ff.) discusses exceptions from the other books, in some cases proposing emendations.)

- (88) ἄλλ’ ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ  
 áll’ áge **moi** tóde eipé  
 but bring.2SG.PRS.IMPER me.DAT this.N.ACC.SG say.3SG.AOR  
 ‘but, he said, bring this to me’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 1.169)

Traces of the old rule can also be identified outside Homer. For instance, in the works of the elegiacs up to and including Theognis, *me* is found 42 times in second position and 4 times later; *moi* is found 36 times in second position and 5 times later; *se* is found 27 times in second position and 6 times later. The same is true in the dialectal texts that depend more on the elegiac poets than on Homer: although the Arcadians seem to have placed their *spheis* relatively freely, the Doric accusative *tu* fits the rule even better, e.g. 89–92.

## 2 Translation

- (89) καί τῷ φίλιππον ἔθηκεν  
 kaí **tu** philíppon éthēken  
 and you.ACC Philip.ACC place.3SG.AOR  
 ‘and he placed Philip with you’ (Theognis, *Fragmenta Lyrica Adespota* 43; Bergk (1882: 701))
- (90) ἐκάλεσε γάρ τῷ τις  
 ekálese gár **tú** tis  
 invite.3SG.AOR then you.ACC someone.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘Did someone invite you?’ (Epicharmus in Athenaeus 4.16)
- (91) τί τῷ ἐγὼν ποιέω  
 tí **tu** egōn poiéō  
 what.N.ACC.SG you.ACC I.NOM do.1SG.PRS  
 ‘What am I doing for you/to you?’ (Sophron in Apollonius Dyscolus, *De Pronominibus* 68B)
- (92) ἐπόθουν τῷ ναί τὸν φίλιον ἄπερ ματέρα  
 epóthoun **tu** naí tòn philíon  
 long-for.1SG.IMP you.ACC by the.M.ACC.SG friendly.M.ACC.SG  
 hâper matéra  
 which.F.DAT.SG mother.ACC.SG  
 ‘Let Zeus, the patron of friendship, witness, I regretted you as a mother [mourns her son].’ (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 730)

In addition there is the Doric oracle spell in 93 (from Ephorus; not mentioned by Ahrens (1843: 255)) and the majority of the roughly thirty examples from Theocritus, of which particularly noteworthy are 94 (=Attic *mētis se eirōta*), in which *mētis* is split in two by *tu*, and 95, in which *tu* (confidently emended by Brunck (1776: 290) from the better attested but unmetrical *toi*) is governed as an accusative by *zateûs(a)* but intervenes between the distant *ha* and *kōra*. (The only example in Callimachus, 96, is an exception to the rule.)

- (93) ποῖ τῷ λαβὼν ἄξω καὶ ποῖ τῷ καθίζω  
 poî **tu** labōn áxō kai poî  
 where you.ACC receive.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG carry.1SG.FUT and where  
**tu** kathízō  
 you.ACC place.1SG.PRS  
 ‘Where do I carry you and where do I place you?’ (Stephanus Byzantinus 73.14 M)

---

\* *Translator’s note:* The modern Perseus edition has *te* instead of *tu*.



## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

- (94) μή tú τις ἠρώτη  
mé **tú** tis ērótē  
not you.ACC someone.M.NOM.SG ask.3SG.IMP  
‘one shouldn’t ask you’ (Theocritus 5.74)
- (95) ἃ δέ tu κόρα πάσας ἀνὰ κρίνας, πάντ’ ἄλσεα ποσσὶ φορεῖται ...  
ζατεῦς(α)  
ha dé **tu** kōra pásas anà kránas,  
the.F.NOM.SG then you.ACC girl.NOM.SG all.F.ACC.PL up spring.ACC.PL  
pánt’ álsea possì phoreítai  
all.N.ACC.PL grove.ACC.PL foot.DAT.PL carry.3SG.PRS.PASS  
zateûs(a)  
seek.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.SG  
‘And the girl is borne on foot through all springs, all groves, seeking you.’  
(Theocritus 1.82)
- (96) οὐδ’ ὅσον ἀττάραγόν tu δεδοίκαμεν  
oud’ hóson attáragón **tu** dedoíkames  
neither as.much.M.ACC.SG crumb.ACC.SG you.ACC fear.1PL.PF  
‘and you couldn’t fear the smallest thing’ (Callimachus, Epigram 47.9  
(46.9))

Finally, the only example that I have to hand from an inscription is particularly remarkable: 97 (=Attic *eán se hugiâ p...*), in which *tu* occurs between the particles *aí* and *ka*, which are otherwise closely connected. The only exceptional example from the pre-Alexandrine era, 98, cannot be taken as a weighty counterexample as long as the reading cannot be established with any certainty.

- (97) αἶ tú κα ὑγιῆ ποιήσω  
aí **tú** ka hugiê poiēsō  
if you.ACC IRR healthy.N.ACC.PL make.1SG.AOR.SBJV  
‘if I made healthy [things] to/for you’ (Inscription 3339.70 Collitz, Epidauros)
- (98) οὐχ ὀδεῖν tu ἐπικάζε  
oukh hodeîn **tu** epíkaze  
not sell.PRS.INF you.ACC guess.3SG.IMP  
‘He did not suppose you to sell’ (Sophron in Apollonius Dyscolus, *De Pronominibus* 75A)

## 2 Translation

The Aeolian poets also show a close affinity to Homer. In the fragments of their poetry, which I cite following Bergk (1882), I count 38 (or, depending on the reading of Sappho fragment 2.7 and fragment 100 – see the immediately [p345] following – 36) examples of the enclitic forms of personal pronouns. 30 follow the Homeric rule, including 12 safe examples of *me* and 10 of *moi*. *toi* behaves exceptionally three times (Sappho 2.2, 8, 70.1) and *se* once (Sappho 104.2). There remain three examples with contested readings, for which I give the manuscript versions: 99, 100, and finally 101 following the fuller wording in Choricus (Graux 1886: 97).

- (99) ὥς γάρ σ' ἴδω βροχεῶς με φωνᾶς οὐδὲν ἔτ' εἴκει  
 hōs gár s' ídō brokheōs me phōnàs  
 as then you.ACC see.1SG.AOR.SBJV shortly me.ACC sound.GEN.SG  
 oudèn ét' eíkei  
 nothing.ACC still resemble.3SG.PLPF  
 'As I saw you there soon seemed nothing left of my voice.' (Sappho 2.7, Lobel & Page (1968: 31.7))
- (100) ὅτα πάννυχος ἄσφι κατάγρει  
 óta pánnukhos ásphi katágrei  
 when all-night.M/F.NOM.SG them.DAT overcome.3SG.PRS  
 '... when they are overcome all night ...' (Sappho 43, Lobel & Page (1968: 149.1))
- (101) σὲ τετίμηκεν ἐξόχως ἡ Ἀφροδίτη  
 sè tetímēken exókhōs hē Aphrodítē  
 you.ACC honour.3SG.PF prominently the.F.NOM.SG Aphrodite.NOM  
 'Aphrodite has honoured you especially' (Sappho 100 [Choricus 5.1.19]; Graux (1886: 97))

In the first case, 99, the reading *hōs se gár wídō ...* suggested by Ahrens (1839: 360) and promoted by Vahlen in his edition of the text *Peri Hýpsous* 'On the Sublime' (Vahlen 1887: section x.2) becomes more plausible, and the reading of Seidler (1829), followed by Bergk (1854) and Hiller (1890), in which *se* is moved to a position after *brokheōs* and *me* is deleted, appears less plausible. In the second

\* *Translator's note:* Our rendering of these examples is based on Lobel & Page (1968), whose numbering is added for convenience. Translations are adapted from <http://www.sacred-texts.com/cla/usappho/index.htm>. Note that not all of these examples are still attributed to Sappho.

\* *Translator's note:* Lobel & Page (1968) have *hōs gár és s' ídō brokhe' ōs me phōnais' oud' èn ét' eíkei*.

## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

case, I can advocate the reading I suggested in Wackernagel (1887: 141) (given in 102 below) with even more certainty. And in the third case, Weil's reading (given in 103 below), followed by Hiller (1890: fragment 97), is revealed to be distinctly improbable.

- (102) ὅτά σφι πάννυχος κατάγρεις  
 ótá **sphi** pánnukhos katágreis  
 when them.DAT all-night.M/F.NOM.SG overcome.2SG.PRS  
 '... when you overcome them all night ...' (Sappho 43, following Wackernagel (1887: 141), Lobel & Page (1968: 149.1))
- (103) τετίμακ' ἔξοχά σ' Ἀφροδίτα  
 tetímak' éxokhá s' Aphrodíta  
 honour.3SG.PF prominently you.ACC Aphrodite.NOM  
 'Aphrodite has honoured you especially' (Sappho 100, Hiller (1890: fragment 97), Lobel & Page (1968: 112.5))

By adding up the 30 cases discussed above, the *se* and *me* in Sappho 47, and the *sphi* for *ásphi* in Sappho 43, we reach 33 law-abiding examples against 4 exceptions and one (Sappho 100) where the textual transmission leaves us with a problem and we do not even know whether we are dealing with an enclitic. We take no account of Alcaeus 68, which some read as 104 following Bekker (1833: 175), but in which *d'* is much more robustly attested after *ék*; compare Bergk's (1882: 174) objections to Bekker's reading.

- (104) πάμπαν δὲ τυφῶς ἔκ σ' ἔλετο φρένας  
 pámpān dè tuphōs ék s' héleto  
 altogether then fever.NOM.SG out you.ACC take.3SG.AOR.MID  
 phrénas  
 midriff.ACC.PL  
 'and a fever has completely taken your wits' (Alcaeus, *Fragments* 68, Lobel & Page (1968: 336.1))

In some of the above 33 examples the enclitic pronoun breaks up a word group. The article and the noun are separated in 105 and 106.

- (105) ἃ δέ μ' ἰδρῶς ... κακχέεται

\* *Translator's note:* personal communication to Charles Graux, reproduced in Graux (1886: 98).

\* *Translator's note:* Lobel & Page (1968: 336.1) have *d' etúfōs* rather than *dè tuphōs*.

## 2 Translation

a                    dé    m'       idròs               kakkhéetai  
 the.F.NOM.SG then me.ACC sweat.NOM.SG pour-down.3s.PRS.PASS  
 'down courses in streams the sweat of emotion' (Sappho 2.13, Lobel & Page (1968: 31.13))

- (106) Αἰθιοπίᾳ με κόρα Λατοῦς ἀνέθηκεν Ἀρίστα  
 Aithopíai                me       kórāi       Latoûs       anéthēken  
 Ethiopian.F.DAT.SG me.ACC girl.DAT.SG Leto.GEN dedicate.3SG.AOR  
 Arísta  
 Aristas.NOM  
 'Aristas dedicated me to Leto's Ethiopian daughter' (Sappho 118.3, Lobel & Page (1968: Epigrammata 6.269))

Adjective and noun are separated in 107. In 108, preposition and verb are separated.

- (107) σμίκρα μοι πάϊς ἔμμεν ἐφαίνεο κάχαρις  
 smíkra                moi       páis               émmen       ephaíneo  
 small.F.NOM.SG me.DAT child.NOM.SG be.PRS.INF show.2SG.IMP.PASS  
 kákharis  
 and=graceless.F.NOM.SG  
 'to me you seemed to be a graceless little girl' (Sappho 34.1, Lobel & Page (1968: 59.2))

- (108) ἔκ μ' ἔλασας ἀλγέων  
 ék    m'       élasas               algéōn  
 out me.ACC drive.2SG.AOR pain.GEN.PL  
 'you have driven out my pains' (Alcaeus, *Fragments* 95)

Cf. also 109 and 110, in which *mán* and *gár* could have laid claim to the position after *tó* and *hós* respectively.

- (109) τό μοι μάν  
 tó                    moi       mán  
 the.N.NOM.SG me.DAT truly  
 (Sappho 2.5, Lobel & Page (1968: 31.5))

\* Translator's note: Lobel & Page (1968: 31.13) have *ékade* rather than *a dé*.

\* Translator's note: Lobel & Page (1968: 31.5) have *tó m' ê mán*.

## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

- (110) ὥς σε γάρ  
 hós se gár  
 as you.ACC then  
 (Sappho 2.7, Lobel & Page (1968: 31.7))

Equally noteworthy are the cases in which the pronoun is separated in an otherwise unusual way [p346] from the words to which it syntactically belongs: 111, 112 and 113.

- (111) τίς σ', ὦ Σάπφ' ἀδικήει  
 tís s', ô Psápph' adikéei  
 who.M.NOM.SG you.ACC O Sappho.VOC wrong.3SG.PRS  
 'Who has wronged you, O Sappho?' (Sappho 1.19, Lobel & Page (1968: 1.19))
- (112) τίω σ', ὦ φίλε γάμβρε, κάλως εἰκάσδω  
 tíōi s', ô phíle gámbre, kálōs  
 what.N.DAT.SG you.ACC O dear.M.VOC.SG in-law.VOC.SG beautifully  
 eikásdō  
 liken.1SG.PRS.SBJV  
 'To what, O dear bridegroom, shall I fairly compare thee?' (Sappho 104.1, Lobel & Page (1968: 115.1))
- (113) τί με Πανδίωνις ὄραννα χελίδων  
 tí me Pandíōnis óranna  
 what.N.NOM.SG me.ACC of-Pandion.F.NOM.SG O=Irene.VOC  
 khelídōn  
 swallow.NOM.SG  
 'What is that daughter of Pandion, the swallow, to me, Irene?' (Sappho 88, Lobel & Page (1968: 135.1))

In 114, *moi* leans on a clause-introducing vocative. Finally, I invite you to look at 115.

- (114) ἄγε δὲ, κῆλυ δία, μοι φωνάεσσα γένοιο  
 áge dè, khélu díá, moi  
 lead.2SG.PRS.IMPER exactly lyre.VOC.SG divine.F.VOC.SG me.DAT  
 phōnáessa génoio  
 vocal.F.NOM.SG become.2SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 'Come now, O divine lyre, begin to sing for me' (Sappho 45, Lobel & Page (1968: 118.1))

## 2 Translation

- (115) ἦ σε Κύπρος ἦ Πάφος ἦ Πάνορμος  
 é se Kúpros è Páphos è Pánormos  
 or you.ACC Cyprus.NOM or Paphos.NOM or Panormus.NOM  
 (Sappho 6, Lobel & Page (1968: 35.1))

It is the general norm, without dialectal differentiation, to place the archaic (Klein 1887: 13) *me* (1SG.ACC) immediately after the first word in dedicatory and sculptors' inscriptions. It will be useful to provide a full list of examples.

I begin with *m' anéthēke* 'me.ACC dedicate'. 116 is an Attic example.

- (116) Ὀνήσιμος μ' ἀνέθηκεν ἀπαρχὴν τᾷθηναιᾷ ὁ Σμικύθου υἱός  
 Onésimos m' anéthēken aparkhēn  
 Onesimus.NOM me.ACC dedicate.3SG.AOR offering.ACC  
 tathēnaíai ho Smikúthou huiós  
 the=Athenaea.DAT the.M.NOM.SG Smikythus.GEN son.NOM.SG  
 'Onesimos, the son of Smikythus, dedicated an offering to the Athenaea.'  
 (*Corpus inscriptionum atticarum* (CIA) 4<sup>2</sup>.373.90)

Also CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.87 -itos *m' anéthēken*, CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.120 [*ho deīna*] *m' anéthēken dekáthēn* (sic!) *Athēnaíai*, *Inscriptiones graecae antiquissimae* (IGA; Röhl (1882)) 1 (Attic or Euboean) *Sēmōnides m' anéthēken*. Cf. CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.100 [*Strón*] *gulós m' anéthēke*, in which a dative precedes, however. Many examples also in verse (although there is of course no absence of counterexamples here: CIA 1.343, CIA 1.374, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.81 etc.): CIA 1.349 -*thánēs m' anéthēken Athēnaía*[*i polioúkhps*], 1.352 *Iphidíkē m' anéthēken*, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.85 *Alkímakhós m' a[néthēke]*, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.99 *Tímarkhós m' anéthēke* *Diòs krateróphroni kóurēi*, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.215 (cf. Studniczka (1887: 145)) *Nēsiadēs kerameús me kai Andokídēs anéthēken*, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.216 *Palládi m' egremákhāi Dionúsio[s tó]d' ágalma stēse Koloíou país [euxá]menos dekátēn*, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.218 *anéthēke dé m' Eudíkou huiós*, Acropolis inscription (ed. Foucart (1889: 160)) [*Hermó?*] *dōrós m' anéthēken Aphrodítēi dōron aparkhēn*. – From Boeotia: inscription from Reinach (1885) treated by Kretschmer (1891: 123–125), *Timasíphilós m' anétheike tōpóllōni toî Ptōeîi ho Praólleios*. – From Corinth (in the following I will no longer distinguish between poetic and prose inscriptions): IGA 20.7 *Simiōn m' anéthēke Poteidáwōn*[*i wánakti*], 20.8 -ōn *m' anéthēke Poteidāni wán[akti]*, 20.9(=10=11) *Phlēbōn m' anéthēke Poteidā[ni]*, 20.42 *Dórkōn m' anéthēk[e]*, 20.43 *Igrōn m' an[éthēke]*, 20.47 *Kuloídas m' anéthēke*, 20.48 *Eurumédēs m' anéthēke*, 20.49 *Lukiádas m' [anéthēke]*, 20.83 ... *m' anéth[ēke]*, 20.87 and 20.89 -s *m' anéthēke*, 20.87a

\* Translator's note: Wackernagel indeed provides a full list of examples in the original, pp346–9. As these all serve to illustrate the same point, we have not glossed and translated all of them, taking only a representative example in each case.

## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

... **me** *anéth(ē)ke tōi* , 20.94 ... **m'** *anéthēke*, 20.102 [P] *éirilós m'* .... – Korkyra: IGA 341 (=3187 Collitz) *Lóphiós m'* *anéthēke*. [p347] Hermione: Kaibel (1878) 926 [Pan] *taklēs m'* *anéthēken*. – Kyra at Aegina: Inscription (ed. Jamot (1889: 186)) *hoi phrouroí m'* *a[néthesan?]* – Laconia: IGA 62a (p174) *Pleistiádas m'* *a[néthēke]*. – Naxos: IGA 407 *Nikándrē m'* *anéthēken hekēbólōi iokheairēi*, 408 *Deinagórēs m'* *anéthēken hekēbólōi Apóllōni*. – Inscription found in Delos edited by Homolle (1888: 464f.) *Ei(th)ukartídēs m'* *anéthēken ho Naxios poiēsas*. – Samos: IGA 384 *Khēramúes m'* *anéth(ē)ken tērēi ágalma*. Röhl (1882: 108) adds [*Entháde*] at the beginning and observes: “For now I leave aside the question as to whether the first word of the hexameter poem was omitted by the person who made the inscription or by he who copied its title”. It was certainly neither. Not the creator of the copy: Dümmler (p.c.) points out to me that the copy he saw showed no trace of a word before *Khēramúes*. But nor could it have been the mason: neither the sense nor (as we now know better than we did ten years ago) the metre demanded any additional material, and the placement of *me* excludes any such addition. – Kalymna: Kaibel (1878) 778 *Nikías me* *anéthēken Apóllōni huiós Thrasumédeos*. – Cyprus: inscription in Hoffmann (1891: 85) no. 163 (...) **m'** *a(né)thēkan tōi Apól(l)ōni*, Kaibel (1878) 794 (1st century CE) [*Kekro*] *pídēs m'* *anéthēke*. – Achaeae (Magna Grecia): IGA 543 *Kunískos me* *anéthēken hórtamos wérgōn dekátan*. – Syracuse: Kaibel (1890) 5 *Alkiádēs m'* [*anéthēken*]. – Naukratis: Gardner (1886: 60–63) no. 5 *Parménōnm* (sic!) **me** *anéthēke tōpóllōni* (sic!), 24 -s **me** *a[néthēke]*, 80 -s **m'** *anéthēken tōpóllōn[i]*, 114 -ōn **m** [*e anéthēke*], 137 -s **m'** *an[éthēke]*, 177 *Prótarkhós me* [*anéthēke t*] *ōpóllōni*, 186 [P] *rótarkhós me* *anéthēk[e]*, 202 [*ho deína*] **me** *anéthēke*, 218 *Phánēs me* *anéthēke tōpóllōn[i tōi Mī]lēsīōi ho Gláukou*, 220 *Kharidiōn me* *anéthē[ke]*, 223 [*Polú*] *kestós m'* *anéthēke t[ōpóllōni]*, 235 *Slēuēs m'* *anéthēke tōpóllōni*, 237 [*Kh*] *ar(ó)phēs me* *anéthēke tapó[llōni tōi M]ilasīōi*, 255 -ēs **m'** *anéthēke*, 259 -s **me** *a[néthēke]*, 326 *Na[úpli]ós me* [*anéthēke*], 327 -dēs **m'** *anéthēke tōpóllōni*, 446 -s **me** *ané[thēke]*, vol. II (Gardner 1888: 62–29) no. 701 *Sóstratós m'* *anéthēken tēphrodítēi*, 709 -os **m'** *anéthēke tē[i Aphrodítēi] epì tē ...*, 717 *Kaikos m'* [*ané*] *thēken*, 720 -oros **m'** *an[éthēken]*, 722 *Musós m'* *anéthēken Honomakrítou*, 723 Asos [p348] **m'** *anéthēken*, 734 -nax **m'** [*anéthēken*], 736 -ōn **me** *an[éthēken]*, 738 [*ho deína*] **m'** *anéthēken Aphrodítēi* (?), 742 -ēilos **m'** *anéthēken*, 748 *Hermēsiphánēs m'* *anéthēken tēphrodítēi*, 770 -mēs **me** *an[éthēke t]ēphrodítē[i]*, 771 *Khárm[ē]s me* [*anéthēke*], 775 [K] *leódēmos me* *a[ne]thēke tōi A[phrodítēi]*, 776–777 *Khármēs me* *anéthēke tēphrodítēi* (or *tēi A-*) *eukhōlēn*, 778 *Roikos m'* *anéthēke t[ēi Aphr]odítēi*, 780 *Philís m'* *anéthēke t[ēi Aphr]odí[tēi]*, 781 *Thoútímós me* *anéthēk[en]*, 785 [*ho deína*] **m'** *an[éthēke tēi Aphr]odítēi*, 794 *Polúermós m'* *an[éthēke] tēi Aphrodítēi*, 799 *Ōkhílos m'* *anéthēke*, 817 [*ho deína*] *kai*

## 2 Translation

*Kh[rus]ódōrós me anéth[ēkan]*, 819 [*L*]ákri[tó]s *m'* ané[thē]ke hourmo[th]ém[ios] tēphrodí[tēi, 876 Hermagórēs *m'* anéthēke ho T[éios] tōpóllōni (verse!), 877 Púr[rh]os *me* anéthēken. (Metapontum: 1643 Collitz *hó toi kerameús m'* anéthēke.)

The only deviations from the norm (with some poetic exceptions, see above p48) are Naukratis 1.303 [*ho deîna anéthēké*] *me* and 1.307 [*ho deîna anéthēk*]é *me* – both inscriptions which have been falsely expanded, as is now clear – and the two-line inscription Naukratis 2.750, in which the first line reads [*tēi Aphrodí*]tēi and the second *Hermagathînós m'* anéth[ēken]. Gardner (1888) thus gives the reading *tēi Aphrodítēi Hermagathînós m'* anéthēken. However, Dümmler (p.c.) points out to me that the top line cannot be the first line, because it is shorter and does not fill the space, and hence must instead have been the conclusion of the lower, longer line. As a consequence it is necessary to read *Hermagathînós m'* anéth[ēke] [*tēi Aphrodí*]tēi, quite independently of our positional rule.

Something quite analogous is true of the inscriptions formed with synonyms of *anéthēke*. *me katéthēke* ‘me.ACC down-lay’: Cyprus: Deecke (1884) 1 *Kás mi katéthēke tâi Paphíai Aphrodítai*, and 117.

- (117) αὐτάρ μι κατέ[θηκε] Ὀνασίθεμις  
autár **mi** katé[thēke] Onasíthemis  
besides me.ACC down-lay.3SG.AOR Onasithemis  
‘Besides, Onesithemis laid me down’ (Cyprus, Deecke (1884), 2)

Also Deecke (1884) 3 *autár me* [*katéthēke Onasí*]themí[s] and 15 *autár me* *katéthēke* [*A*]kestóthemis. – Naukratis II (Gardner 1888) no. 790 [*ho deîna m*]e *káththē[ke] o Mutilénaios*, 840 *Néarkhós me* *ká*[ththēke to]îs *D*[ioskóroisi]. – *m'* *epéthēke* ‘me.ACC on-put’: Aegina: IGA 362 *Diótímós m'* *epéthēke*. – *me* (*kat*)éstase ‘me.ACC erect’: Cyprus: Deecke (1884) 71 *ká men éstasan* [*ka*]sínētoi (verse!), Hoffmann (1891: 46) no. 67 *Gil(l)ika me* *katéstase ho Stasikréteos*. – *me* *éwexe* ‘me.ACC grant’: Cyprus: Hoffmann (1891: 46) no. 66 [*au*]tár *me* *éwexe* [*Onasí*]themis. – *m'* *édōke* ‘me.ACC give/grant/allow’: Sicyon: IGA 22 *Epaínetos m'* *édōken Kharópōi*. The Boeotian inscription 118 deviates from the rule.

- (118) Χάρης ἔδωκεν Εὐπλοίωνί με  
Khárēs édōken Euploíōnī **me**  
Charis.NOM give.3SG.AOR Euplion.DAT me.ACC  
‘Charis gave me to Euplion’ (IGA 2019)

Röhl (1882: 56) comments as follows: “Chares attempted to include a dedication in the form of a trimeter verse, but his attempt failed.” (Compare also the [p349] position of *soi* (2SG.DAT) in the Attic inscription IGA 2 *tēndí soi Thoudēmos dídōsi*.)



## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

In poetic dedicatory inscriptions, *me* is found in this position as late as the Roman era: 119–121. Compare also 122. (Kaibel (1878) 809, 813 and 843 have a different position for *me*.)

- (119) Βάκχῳ μ[ε] Βάκχον καὶ προσυμναίᾳ θεῶ στασαντο  
 Bákkhōi m[e] Bákkhon kai prosumnaíai  
 Bacchus.DAT me.ACC Bacchus.ACC and Prosymnians.F.DAT.SG  
 theōi stásanto  
 goddess.DAT.SG set-up.3PL.AOR.MID  
 ‘To Bacchus (= Dionysus) and to the goddess praised in hymns  
 (=Demeter); they set me up’ (Kaibel (1878), 821)
- (120) Δαδούχος με Κόρης, Βασιλᾶν, Διός, ἱερὰ κλειῖθρα φέρων  
 Daidōukhos me Kórēs, Basilân, Diós, hierà  
 torch-bearer me.ACC Kore.GEN queen.ACC Zeus.GEN sacred.N.ACC.PL  
 sēkōn Hēras kleíthra phérōn  
 precinct.GEN.PL Hera.GEN key.ACC.PL bear.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 bōmōn éthēke Rhēēi  
 altar.ACC.SG put.3SG.AOR Rhea.DAT  
 ‘The torch-bearer of Kore, bearing the sacred keys to the sanctuary of  
 Queen Hera, has dedicated me, the altar, to Rhea’ (Kaibel (1878), 822.9)
- (121) ἄνθετο μὲν μ’ Ἐπίδαυρος  
 ántheto men m’ Epídauros  
 dedicate.3SG.AOR.MID then me.ACC Epidauros  
 ‘Epidauros dedicated me’ (Kaibel (1878: XIX), 877b)
- (122) Ἀσκληπιοῦ με δμῶα πυρφόρο[ν θεοῦ/ξένε] Πείσωνα λεύσσει  
 Asklēpioû me dmōa purphóro[n theōû  
 Asclepius.GEN me.ACC slave.ACC.SG fire-bearing.M.ACC.SG god.GEN.SG  
 /xéne] Peísōna leússeis  
 stranger.VOC.SG Peison.ACC see.2SG.PRS  
 ‘Behold me, Peison, the fire-bearing slave of the god Asclepius(/of  
 Asclepius, O stranger)’ (Kaibel (1878), 868)

The artists’ inscriptions behave the same. *m’ epoíēse*, *m’ epoíei* ‘me.ACC create’: 123.

## 2 Translation

- (123) [E]ὐθυκλῆς μ' ἐποίησεν  
 [E]uthuklēs m' epoīesen  
 Euthecles.NOM me.ACC create.3SG.AOR  
 'Euthecles created me' (CIA 4<sup>2</sup> 373.206)

Also IGA 492 (Attic inscription from Sigeum) *kai m' epo(iē)sen Haísōpos kai hadēlphoí*, CIA 1.466 *Aristiōn m' epoēsen*, 1.469 (cf. Loewy (1885: 15)) *Aristiōn Pári[ós m' ep]ó[ēs]e* (the expansion is certain!), IGA 378 (Thasos) *Parménōn me e[poiēse]*, IGA 485 (Miletus) *Eúdēmós me epoiein*, IGA 557 (Elis?) *Koîós m' apōēsen*, IGA 22 (=Klein (1887: 40)) *Eksēkias m' epoīēse*, Klein (1887: 41) *Eksēkias m' epoīēsen eū*, Klein (1887: 31) *Theózotós m' epoēse*, Klein (1887: 34) *Ergótímós m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 43, 45 b, 48) *Amasís m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 48) *Khólkhos m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 66) *-s m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 71) *Nikosthénēs m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 75) *Anaklēs me epoīēsen* and *Nikosthénēs me epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 76) *Arkheklēs m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 77) *Glaukítēs m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 84 b) *Tlēnpólemós m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 85) *Gageos m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 90) *Panphaíós m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 213) *Lusías m' epoīēsen hēmikhōnēi*, as well as the metrical inscription IGA 536 [*Glaukía*] *i me Kálōn ge[nēai w]alei[o]s epoiei*. On the other hand, Loewy (1885: 281) no. 411 [*Artē*] *mōn me epoīēse* falls away because of the treatment of the inscription by Köhler (1888: 7) in CIA 2.1181. – 124 breaks the rule. Here it is likely that <e>*mé* was either originally present or at least intended. (On *emé* see below, page 58).

- (124) Χαριταῖος ἐποίησέν με  
 Kharitaíos epoīēsén me  
 Charitaeus.NOM create.3SG.AOR me.ACC  
 'Charitaeus created me' (Klein 1887: 51)

*m' égrapse*, *m' égraphe* 'me.ACC write': IGA 20.102 (Corinth) *-ōn m' [égrapse]* following the expansion by Blass (1888: 65) no. 3119e Collitz. Cypriot inscriptions in Hoffmann (1891: 90) no. 189 *-oikós me grápheí Selamínios*, Klein (1887: 29) *Timōnídas m' égraphe*, Klein (1887: 30) *Kharēs m' égrapse*, and 125.

- (125) Νέαρχός μ' ἔγραψεν καὶ <ἐποίησεν>  
 Néarkhós m' égrapsen kai epoīesen  
 Nearchus.NOM me.ACC write.3SG.AOR and make.3SG.AOR  
 'Nearchus engraved and made me' (Klein 1887: 38)

\* Translator's note: *emé* is the non-clitic counterpart of *me*, also a first person accusative pronoun form.

## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

IGA 474 (Crete) *-mōn égraphé **me*** deviates from the rule, but this exception can be set aside if we accept the reading *égraph' emé*: compare the inscription in Klein (1887: 40) [p350] *kapoíēs' emé* with just such an elision, in which *emé* can be read securely because of other instances of the same inscription with *epóēse emé*. (With regard to *me* in inscriptions, see also the Addenda.)

The inscriptions transmitted to us on stones and vases include some truly ancient ones brought to us from Olympia by Pausanias: 126–128.

- (126) υἱός μὲν με Μίκωνος Ὀνάτας ἐξετέλεσεν  
huiós mén **me** Míkōnos Onátas exetélessen  
son.NOM then me.ACC Mikon.GEN Onatas.NOM fulfill.3SG.AOR  
'Onatas, the son of Mikon, fulfilled me' (Pausanias 5.25.13 = 8.42.10 from Thasos)

- (127) Κλεοσθένης μ' ἀνέθηκεν ὁ Πόντιος ἐξ Ἐπιδάμνου  
Kleosthénēs **m'** anéthēken ho  
Kleosthenes.NOM me.ACC impart.3SG.AOR the.M.NOM.SG  
Póntios ex Epidámnou  
of.Pontus.M.NOM.SG from Epidamnus.GEN  
'Kleosthenes, the Pontic man from Epidamnus, imparted me' (Pausanias 6.10.17, fifth century)

- (128) Ζηνί μ' ἄγαλμ' ἀνέθηκαν  
Zēní **m'** ágalm' anéthēkan  
Zeus.DAT me.ACC statue.ACC devote.3PL.AOR  
'They raised a statue of Zeus for me' (Pausanias 6.19.6, ancient Attic)

F. Dümmler (p.c.) emends 129 to read **me** *Kleitóriois* 'me.ACC Cleitorian.DAT.PL' in place of *metreîť*.

- (129) καὶ μετρεῖť Ἀρίστων ἡδὲ Τελέστας αὐτοκασίγνητοι καλὰ Λάκωνες  
\*ἔσαν  
kaì metreîť Arístōn ēdè Teléstas  
and count.3SG.PRS.PASS Ariston.NOM and Telestas.NOM  
autokasígnētoi kalà Lákōnes ésan  
own-brothers.NOM.PL well Laconians.NOM.PL be.3PL.IMP  
'And Ariston and Telestas were well considered brothers and they were Laconians' (Pausanias 5.23.7, epigram)

\* *Translator's note:* This yields the translation 'And Ariston and Telestas, the Laconian brothers, were good to the Cleitorians for me.'

## 2 Translation

The examples brought to us by Herodotus from the Ismenion Hill also belong here: 130 and 131, of which the latter is the only counterexample to the rule in this group, and moreover, since it is metrical, is of little consequence.

- (130) Ἀμφιτρύων μ' ἀνέθηκεν \*ἔων ἀπὸ Τηλεβοάων  
 Amphitryōn m' anéthēken \*eōn apò  
 Amphitryon.NOM me.ACC devote.3SG.AOR be.PTCP.M.NOM.SG from  
 Tēleboāōn  
 Teleboan.GEN.PL  
 'Amphitryon, being from Teleboae, dedicated me' (Herodotus, 5.59.1)
- (131) Σκαῖος πυγμαχέων με ἐκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι νικήσας ἀνέθηκε  
 Skaïos pugmakhéōn me hekēbólōi Apóllōni  
 Scaeus.NOM boxer.NOM.SG me.ACC archer.DAT.SG Apollo.DAT  
 nikéśas anéthēke  
 win.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG dedicate.3SG.AOR  
 'Scaeus the boxer, victorious in the contest, gave me to Apollo, the  
 archer god.' (Herodotus, 5.60.1)

The later epigram-writers also kept to the norm with striking rigidity when they used the archaic *me* in their poetic inscriptions: 132–138.

- (132) ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα, Καλλιμάχου με ἴσθι Κυρηναίου  
 paĩdá te kai genétēn  
 hóstis emòn parà sēma phéreis  
 whoever.M.NOM.SG my.N.ACC.SG by tomb.ACC.SG bring.2SG.PRS  
 póda, Kallimákhōu me ísthi  
 foot.ACC.SG Callimachus.GEN me.ACC know.2SG.PF.IMP  
 Kurēnaíou paĩdá te kai genétēn  
 of-Cyrene.M.GEN.SG child.ACC.SG and and offspring.ACC.SG  
 'Whoever you are who walks past my tomb, know that I am the son of  
 Callimachus of Cyrene.' (Callimachus, Epigram 23.1 (21.1 Wilamowitz))
- (133) τίν με, λεοντάγχ' ὦνα κυοκτόνε, φήγινον ὄζον θῆκε  
 tín me, leontákh' ōna  
 you.NOM me.ACC lion-strangling.M.VOC.SG O=lord.VOC.SG

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *Amphitryōn m' anethēk' enārōn apò tēleboāōn* 'Amphitryon dedicated me from the spoils of Teleboae.'

## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

suoktône, phéginon ózon thêke  
 swine-slaying.M.VOC.SG oaken.M.ACC.SG branch.ACC.SG put.3SG.AOR  
 ‘O lion-strangling, swine-slaying lord, you have placed an oaken bough  
 upon me’ (Callimachus, Epigram 36.1 (34.1 Wilamowitz))

- (134) τῆς Ἀγοράνακτος με λέγε, ξένε, κωμικὸν ὄντως ἀγκεῖσθαι νίκη  
 μάρτυρα τοῦ Ῥοδίου Πάμφιλον  
 tês Agoránaktos **me** lége, xéne,  
 the.F.GEN.SG Agoranax.GEN me.ACC say.2SG.PRS.IMPER stranger.VOC.SG  
 kōmikòn óntōs ankeísthai níkēs mártura  
 funny.N.ACC.SG truly lay-up.PRS.INF.PASS victory.GEN.SG witness.ACC.SG  
 toû Rhodíou Pámphilon  
 the.M.GEN.SG of-Rhodes.M.GEN.SG Pamphilus.ACC  
 ‘Tell me, O foreigner from Agoranax, whether it is truly funny for  
 Pamphilus of Rhodes to be laid up as witness to the victory.’  
 (Callimachus, Epigram 50.1 (49.1 Wilamowitz))

- (135) τῷ με Κανωπίτῃ Καλλίστιον εἴκοσι μύξαις πλούσιον ἡ Κριτίου λύχνον  
 ἔθηκε θεῷ  
 tōi **me** Kanôpítēi Kallístion eíkosi  
 therefore me.ACC of-Canopus.M.DAT.SG Callistion.NOM twenty  
 múxais plousíon hē Kritíou lúkhnon  
 wick.DAT.PL rich.M.ACC.SG the.F.NOM.SG Critias.GEN lamp.ACC.SG  
 éthēke theōi  
 put.3SG.AOR god.DAT.SG  
 ‘Therefore Callistion, the daughter of Critias, dedicated me, a costly  
 lamp with twenty wicks, to the god of Canopus.’ (Callimachus, Epigram  
 56.1 (55.1 Wilamowitz))

- (136) Θαλῆς με τῷ μεδεῦντι Νείλεω δῆμου δίδωσι, τοῦτο δις λαβὼν ἀριστεῖον  
 Thalês **me** tōi medeûnti Neileō  
 Thales.NOM me.ACC the.M.DAT.SG protect.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG Neleus.GEN  
 démou dídōsi, toûto dis labôn  
 people.GEN.SG give.3PL.PRS this.N.ACC.SG twice take.PTCP.AOR.N.NOM.SG  
 aristeíon  
 prize.ACC  
 ‘Thales is giving me to the guardian of the people of Neleus, having  
 received this as a prize twice’ (Diogenes Laërtius 1.1.29 (Fragment 95))

- (137) καί μ’ ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ θῆκεν πόδας ὥκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς

## 2 Translation

kaí m' epì Patróklōi thêken pódas ōkùs  
 And me.ACC on Patroclus.DAT place.3SG.AOR foot.ACC.PL swift.M.NOM.SG  
 Akhilleús  
 Achilles.NOM  
 'And swift Achilles placed (his) feet on Patroclus' (Athen. 6, 232 B =  
 Palatine Anthology 6.49)

- (138) δέξαι μ' Ἡράκλεις Ἀρχεστράτου ἱερὸν ὄπλον  
 déxai m' Hērákleis Arkhestrátou  
 accept.2SG.AOR.IMPER.MID me.ACC Hercules.VOC Archestratus.GEN  
 hieròn hóplon  
 holy.N.ACC.SG weapon.ACC.SG  
 'Accept me, Hercules, the holy weapon of Archestratus' (Palatine  
 Anthology 6.178.1)

139–141 are deviations, but not significant ones.

- (139) Βιθυνὺς Κυθήρη με τεῆς ἀνεθήκατο, Κύπρι, μορφῆς εἰδῶλον λύγδινον  
 εὐξάμενη  
 Bithunìs Kuthérē me teês  
 Bithynian.F.NOM.SG Cytherea.NOM me.ACC your.F.GEN.SG  
 anethékato, Kúpri, morphês eídōlon  
 dedicate.3SG.AOR.MID Cyprus.VOC form.GEN.SG image.ACC.SG  
 lúgdinon euxaménē  
 marble.N.ACC.SG pray.PTCP.AOR.MID.F.NOM.SG  
 'O Cyprus, Bythinian Cytherea dedicated my marble image of your form  
 with a prayer' (Palatine Anthology 6.209.1)
- (140) κμήνεος ἔκ με ταμῶν γλυκερὸν θέρος ἀντὶ νομαίων γηραιὸς Κλείτων  
 σπεῖσε μελισσοπόνος  
 sméneos ék me tamōn glukeròn  
 hive.GEN.SG out me.ACC cut.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG sweet.N.ACC.SG  
 théros antì nomaíōn gēraiòs Kleítōn  
 harvest.ACC against customary.N.GEN.PL aged.M.NOM.SG Cleiton.NOM  
 speíse melissopónos  
 libate.3SG.AOR bee-keeping.M.NOM.SG  
 'Aged Cleiton the beekeeper makes a libation of me, cutting a sweet  
 harvest from the hive against custom' (Palatine Anthology 6.239.1)
- (141) χάλκεον ἀργυρέω με πανεῖκελον, Ἰνδικὸν ἔργον, ὅλην ... πέμπεν  
 γηθομένην cùn φρενὶ Κριναγόρης

## 2.2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

khálkeon          arguréōi          **me**          paneíkelon,  
 brazen.N.ACC.SG silver.N.DAT.SG me.ACC just-like.N.ACC.SG  
 Indikòn,          érgon          ólpēn          pémpen  
 Indian.N.ACC.SG work.ACC.SG flask.ACC send.3SG.IMP  
 gēthoménēi          sùn phrenì          Krinagórēs  
 rejoice.PTCP.PRS.F.DAT.SG with midriff.DAT Crinagoras.NOM  
 ‘With joyous heart Crinagoras sent me, a flask of Indian work, of bronze  
 but exactly like silver’ (Palatine Anthology 6.261.1)

On the other hand, for 142 the version transmitted in the Palatine Anthology has been superseded by the original in stone that has come to light, [p351] CIA 1.381 (=Kaibel (1878) 578), which contains no *m*’. This also reveals the *m*’ expanded by Hecker (1852: 147) in 143 to be superfluous.

(142) πρὶν μὲν Καλλιτέλης (μ’) ἰδρύσατο  
 prìn mèn Kallitélēs (m’) hidrúsato  
 before then Kallitelis.NOM (me.ACC) place.3SG.AOR.MID  
 ‘Before Kalliteles placed (me)’ (Palatine Anthology 6.138.1)

(143) παιδί φιλοστεφάνῳ Σεμέλας (μ’) ἀνέθηκε  
 paìdī philostephánōi Semelas (m’)  
 child.DAT.SG wreath-loving.M.DAT.SG Semele.GEN (me.ACC)  
 anéthēke  
 devote.3SG.AOR  
 ‘[Melanthus] devoted (me) to the wreath-loving child of Semele’  
 (Palatine Anthology 6.140.1)

Our survey of the examples with *me* thus reveals that this element is placed in second position preferentially in poetic compositions and almost exceptionlessly in prose. If we divide up IGA 474 as *égraph’ emé* ‘wrote me’, discount as uncertain Naukratis 1.303 and 1.307 in which only *ME* or *EME* is transmitted, and finally restore the sequence of words intended by the writer of the inscription in Naukratis 2.750, then only IGA 219 (=118 above), which is not a verse but an attempt at a verse, and Klein (1887: 51), example 124 above, remain. The latter is therefore the only real exception, which strengthens our suspicion that an error has crept in here.

On the other hand, our rule receives further confirmation. First, from the fact that, in archaic inscriptions in which the monument or the person commemorated by the monument speaks, *me* is in second position: 144 and 145.

## 2 Translation

- (144) Κοσμία ἡμί, ἄγε δέ με Κλιτομία  
 Kosmía ēmí, âge dé me Klitomías  
 Kosmia.VOC say.1SG.PRS bring.2SG.PRS.IMPER then me.ACC Klitomia.GEN  
 ‘And I say, “Kosmia, bring me Klitomia”.’ (IGA 473, Rhodes)

- (145) ὃς δ’ ἄν με κλέψει  
 hōs d’ án me klépsei  
 who.M.NOM.SG then IRR me.ACC steal.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘who then might steal me’ (IGA 524 (Cumae) = Kaibel (1890) 865)

Secondly (to anticipate a later section) from the analogous Latin inscriptions: *Manios med fefaked* ‘Manios me.ACC made’, *Duenos med feced* ‘Duenos me.ACC made’, and 146.

- (146) Novios Plautios med Romai fecid  
 Novios Plautios me.ACC Rome.LOC made  
 ‘Novios Plautios made me in Rome’

Particularly instructive, however, are the few inscriptions with *emé* ‘me.ACC’. In two cases, 147 and 148, this *emé* is also in second position.

- (147) Ἀπολλόδορος ἐμὲ ἀνέθ[ηκε]  
 Apollódōros emè anéth[ēke]  
 Apollodorus.NOM me.ACC devote.3SG.AOR  
 ‘Apollodorus dedicated me’ (IGA 20.8, Corinth)
- (148) Μεναΐδας ἐμ’ ἐποί(ε)ησε Χάροπ[ι]  
 Menaídas em’ epói(w)ēse Khárop[i]  
 Menaidas.NOM me.ACC create.3SG.AOR Charopus.DAT  
 ‘Menaidas created me for Charopus’ (Pottier 1888: 168)

But in six cases *emé* is in a different position: 149–151, as well as Klein (1887: 82) *Ermogénēs epoiēsen éme*, Klein (1887: 83) *Ermogénēs epoiēsen éne* (read *emé*), and Klein (1887: 85) *Sakōnīdēs égrapsen éme*.

- (149) Ἐzekías ἐγραψε καπόησε ἐμέ  
 Exekías égrapse kapōēse emé  
 Execius.NOM write.AOR.3SG and=create.3SG.AOR me.ACC  
 ‘Execius wrote and created me’ (Klein (1887: 39); verse?)



### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (150) Ἐξεκίας ἐγράψε κα(ι)ποίησ' ἐμέ  
 Exekias égrapse ka(i)poiēs' emé  
 Execius.NOM write.AOR.3SG and=create.3SG.AOR me.ACC  
 'Execius wrote and created me' (Klein (1887: 40); verse?)

- (151) Χαραिताῖος ἐποίησεν ἔμ' εὖ  
 Kharitaîos epoiēsen ém' eû  
 Charitaeus.NOM create.3SG.AOR me.ACC well  
 'Charitaeus created me well' (Klein 1887: 51)

These instances show that the regular positioning of *me* after the first word is not a coincidence, and that it is determined by its enclitic nature. (See also the Addenda.)

### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

More important for this question (as indeed for any linguistic research that goes beyond etymological trivialities) are, of course, the more extensive texts of Ionic and [p352] Attic literature, especially Herodotus. He, however, followed the old rule with the other enclitic pronouns just as little as he did with *min* and *hoi*.

In the seventh book of Herodotus, *spheōn* (3PL.GEN) is found 13 times, including 6 in second position; *sphi* (3PL.DAT) 70 times, including 46 in second position; *spheas* (3PL.ACC) 32 times, including 20 in second position; *sphea* (3PL.ACC) once, not in second position. Overall, of 116 instances of *sph*-forms, 72 follow the rule, i.e. roughly 62%. Incomplete collections from the other books revealed a similar ratio.

As for second-person pronouns, in Herodotus VII we have *seo* (2SG.GEN) once, following the rule; *toi* (2SG.DAT, excluding the cases in which it is clearly a particle) 45 times, including 18–20 in second position; *se* (2SG.ACC) 16 times, including 10 in second position. As for first-person pronouns: *meo* (1SG.GEN) 3 times, of which one follows the rule; *moi* (1SG.DAT) 37 times, including 24 in second position, if 152–154 can be included here; *me* (2SG.ACC) 6 times, including two instances following the rule. Thus, in the first and second person, we have 58 examples following the rule and 50 examples breaking it.

- (152) ἔγνων δὲ ταῦτα μοι ποιητέα ἔόντα  
 égnōn dè taûtá moi poiētéa  
 know.1SG.AOR then this.N.ACC.PL me.DAT do.GDV.N.ACC.PL

## 2 Translation

eón̄ta

be.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.PL

‘And I knew that these things were necessary for me to do.’ (Herodotus 7.15.2)

- (153) φέρε τοῦτό μοι ἀτρεκέως εἰπέ  
 phére toútó moi atrekeōs eipé  
 bear.2SG.PRS.IMPER this.N.ACC.SG me.DAT truly say.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 ‘Come, tell me this truly.’ (Herodotus 7.47.1)

- (154) ἄγε εἰπέ μοι  
 áge eipé moi  
 lead.2SG.PRS.IMPER say.2SG.PRS.IMPER me.DAT  
 ‘Come, tell me.’ (Herodotus 7.103.1)

These statistics show very clearly that the old rule cannot be said to be uncontroversially operative in Herodotus, and that other positional rules have come into force. But they also show that despite, and alongside, these new rules the old rule still had strength enough to determine the position of the pronoun in more than half of cases: admittedly this larger half includes those examples in which second position would also have been natural according to the newer rules.

Counts I have made in the works of the Attic poets demonstrate a further decline of the old rule. But unmistakable traces of this rule can still be found in particular set phrases and collocations in their work, as in Herodotus and the post-Homeric authors in general.

Every reader of the Attic orators is struck by how often the imperative clause permitting the reading of a charter or the calling of witnesses begins with *kaí moi*: it can safely be said that [p353] any clause beginning with *kaí* ‘and’ and containing *moi* (1SG.DAT) will exceptionlessly have *moi* immediately following *kaí*. In what follows I arrange the examples following the chronology of poets and the phrases following the dating of the earliest example.

*kaí moi kálei* ‘and me.DAT call’ with a following object: 155, Andocides 1.28, 1.112, Lysias 13.79, 17.2, 17.3, 17.9, 19.59, 31.16, Isocrates 17.12, 17.16, 18.8, 18.54, Isaeus 6.37, 7.10, 8.42, 10.7, Demosthenes 29.12, 29.18, 41.6, 57.12, 57.38, 57.39, 57.46, (Demosthenes) 44.14, 44.44, 58.32, 58.33, 59.25, 59.28, 59.32, 59.34, 59.40, Aeschines 1.100. Or with a different position for the object 156–158.

- (155) καὶ μοι κάλει Διόγνητον  
 kaí moi kálei Diógnēton  
 and me.DAT call.2SG.PRS.IMPER Diognetus  
 ‘And call Diognetus for me.’ (Andocides 1.14)

### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (156) καί μοι μάρτυρας τούτων κάλει  
 kaí **moi** márturas tóutōn kálei  
 and me.DAT witness.ACC.PL this.N.GEN.PL call.2SG.PRS.IMPER  
 ‘And call witnesses of these things for me.’ (Antiphon 5.56)
- (157) καί μοι πάντων τούτων τοὺς μάρτυρας κάλει  
 kaí **moi** hapántōn tóutōn toûs márturas  
 and me.DAT quite.all.GEN.PL this.N.GEN.PL the.M.ACC.PL witness.ACC.PL  
 kálei  
 call.2G.PRS.IMPER  
 ‘And call witnesses of all these things for me.’ (Andocides 1.127)
- (158) καί μοι τούτους κάλει πρῶτον  
 kaí **moi** tóutous kálei prōton  
 and me.DAT this.M.ACC.PL call.2SG.PRS.IMPER first  
 ‘And call these people for me first.’ (Isaeus 6.11)

*kaí moi labè kai anágnōthi* with a following object: 159 (also Andocides 1.15).

- (159) καί μοι λαβὲ καὶ ἀνάγνωθι αὐτῶν τὰ ὀνόματα  
 kaí **moi** labè kai anágnōthi autōn tà onómata  
 and me.DAT take.2SG.AOR.IMPER and read.2SG.AOR.IMPER them.GEN  
 tà onómata  
 the.N.ACC.PL name.ACC.PL  
 ‘And take and read their names for me.’ (Andocides 1.13)

*kaí moi anágnōthi* ‘and me.DAT read’ with a following object: 160, Andocides 1.76, 1.82, 1.85, 1.86, 1.87, 1.96, Lysias 10.14, 10.15, 13.35, 13.50, 14.8, Isocrates 15.29, 17.52, Isaeus 5.2b, 5.4, 6.7, 6.8, (Demosthenes) 34.10, 34.11, 34.20, 34.39, 43.16, 46.26, 47.17, 47.20, 47.40, 47.44, 48.30, 59.52, Aeschines 3.24. Or with a different position for the object 161–163. Without an object, (Demosthenes) 47.24.

- (160) καί μοι ἀνάγνωθι αὐτῶν τὰ ὀνόματα  
 kaí **moi** anágnōthi autōn tà onómata  
 and me.DAT read.2SG.AOR.IMPER them.GEN the.N.ACC.PL name.ACC.PL  
 ‘And read their names for me.’ (Andocides 1.34)
- (161) καί μοι τὰς μαρτυρίας ἀνάγνωθι ταύτας  
 kaí **moi** tàs marturías anágnōthi taútās  
 and me.DAT the.F.ACC.PL testimony.ACC.PL read.2SG.AOR.IMPER

## 2 Translation

taútas

this.F.ACC.PL

‘And read these depositions for me.’ (Isaeus 2.16; cf. Isaeus 2.34 with synonymous *tautasí* for *taútas*)

- (162) καί μοι τούτων ἀνάγνωθι τὴν μαρτυρίαν  
 kaí **moi** toutōn anágnōthi tēn  
 and me.DAT this.N.GEN.PL read.2SG.AOR.IMPER the.F.ACC.SG  
 marturían  
 testimony.ACC.SG  
 ‘And read the deposition of these things for me.’ ([Demosthenes] 50.42)

- (163) καί μοι λαβὼν ἀνάγνωθι πρῶτον τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον  
 kaí **moi** labōn anágnōthi prōton  
 and me.DAT take.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG read.2SG.AOR.IMPER first  
 tōn Sólōnos nómon  
 the.M.ACC.SG Solon.GEN law.ACC.SG  
 ‘And having taken the law of Solon, read (it) first for me.’ (Demosthenes 57.31)

*kaí moi anábēte mártures* (or *toutōn mártures*): 164, Lysias 1.42, 13.64, 16.14, 16.17, 32.37; contra Aeschinem Fragment 1 (Baiter & Sauppe 1850: 172.26) in Athen. 13.612 F, Isocrates 17.37, 17.41; *kaí moi toutōn anábēte mártures* 165; *kaí moi anábēte deũro* 166; *kaí moi anábēthi* 167 and also Isocrates 17.32).

- (164) καί μοι ἀνάβητε τούτων μάρτυρες  
 kaí **moi** anábēte toutōn mártures  
 and me.DAT ascend.2PL.AOR.IMPER this.N.GEN.PL witness.VOC.PL  
 ‘And witnesses of these things, come forward for me.’ (Lysias 1.29)

- (165) καί μοι τούτων ἀνάβητε μάρτυρες  
 kaí **moi** toutōn anábēte mártures  
 and me.DAT this.N.GEN.PL ascend.2PL.AOR.IMPER witness.VOC.PL  
 ‘And witnesses of these things, come forward for me.’ (Isocrates 17.14)

- (166) καί μοι ἀνάβητε δεῦρο  
 kaí **moi** anábēte deũro  
 and me.DAT ascend.2PL.AOR.IMPER hither  
 ‘And come up here for me.’ (Lysias 20.29)

### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (167) καί μοι ἀνάβηθι  
 kaí **moi** anábēthi  
 and me.DAT ascend.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 ‘And come forward for me.’ (Lysias 16.13)

*kaí moi deûr’ ite mártures*: 168.

- (168) καί μοι δεῦρ’ ἴτε μάρτυρες  
 kaí **moi** deûr’ ite mártures  
 and me.DAT hither go.2SG.PRS.IMPER witness.VOC.PL  
 ‘And come here for me, witnesses.’ (Lysias 7 10)

*kai moi labè* ‘and me.DAT take’ with a following object: 169, Isocrates 18.19, 19.14, Isaeus 6.16, 6.48, 8.17, 12.11, Lysurgus 125, Demosthenes 18.222, 30.10, 30.32, 30.34, 31.4, 36.4, 41.24, 41.28, 55.14, 55.35, 57.19, 57.25, (Demosthenes) 34.7, 34.17, 44.14, 48.3, 58.51, 59.87, 59.104, Aeschines 2.65; *kaí moi pálin labè* 170.

- (169) καὶ μοι λαβὲ τὸν νόμον  
 kai **moi** labè tòn nómon  
 and me.DAT take.2SG.AOR.IMPER the.M.ACC.SG law.ACC.SG  
 ‘And take the law for me.’ (Lysias 9.8)

- (170) καί μοι πάλιν λαβὲ τὸν νόμον τοῦτον  
 kaí **moi** pálin labè tòn nómon  
 and me.DAT again take.2SG.AOR.IMPER the.M.ACC.SG law.ACC.SG  
 toûton  
 this.M.ACC.SG  
 ‘And take this law again for me.’ (Demosthenes 58.49)

*kaí moi apókrinai*: 171.

- (171) καί μοι ἀπόκριναι  
 kaí **moi** apókrinai  
 and me.DAT answer.2SG.AOR.IMPER.MID  
 ‘And answer me.’ (Lysias 13.32)

[p354] *kaí moi epílabe tò húdor*: 172, and Lysias 23.8, 23.11, 23.14, and 23.15.

- (172) καί μοι ἐπίλαβε τὸ ὕδωρ  
 kaí **moi** epílabe tò húdor  
 and me.DAT hold.2SG.AOR.IMPER the.N.ACC.SG water.ACC.SG  
 ‘And stop the water for me.’ (Lysias 23.4)

## 2 Translation

*kaí moi anagígnōske* with a following object: 173 and [Demosthenes] 35.37.

- (173) *καί μοι ἀναγίγνωσκε λαβὼν ταύτην τὴν μαρτυρίαν*  
*kaí moi anagígnōske labōn taútēn*  
 and me.DAT read.2SG.PRS.IMPER take.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG this.F.ACC.SG  
*tēn marturían*  
 the.F.ACC.SG testimony.ACC.SG  
 ‘And having taken this testimony, read (it) for me.’ (Demosthenes 27.8)

*kaí moi lége* ‘and me.DAT say’ with a following object: 174, Demosthenes 19.154, 19.276, 18.53, 18.83, 18.105, 18.163, 18.218, 32.13, 37.17, 38.3, 38.14, (Demosthenes) 34.9, 56.38, Aeschines 2.91, 3.27, 3.32, 3.39.

- (174) *καί μοι λέγε τὸ ψήφισμα*  
*kaí moi lége tò pséphisma*  
 and me.DAT say.2SG.PRS.IMPER the.N.ACC.SG decree.ACC.SG  
 ‘And read the decree for me.’ (Demosthenes 19.130)

*kaí moi phére tò pséphisma tò tóte genómenon*: 175.

- (175) *καί μοι φέρε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ τότε γενόμενον*  
*kaí moi phére tò pséphisma tò*  
 and me.DAT bear.2SG.PRS.IMPER the.N.ACC.SG decree.ACC.SG the.N.ACC.SG  
*tóte genómenon*  
 then become.PTCP.AOR.MID.N.ACC.SG  
 ‘And bring me the decree made then.’ (Demosthenes 18.179)

The only deviation is 176. Here, however, we have not just *kaí* ‘and’ but *kaí ... dé* ‘and ... then’, and before this *dé* (and thus after *kaí*) a strongly emphasized word was required, ruling out *moi*.

- (176) *καί τελευταίαν δέ μοι λαβὲ τὴν αὐτοῦ Μισγόλα μαρτυρίαν*  
*kaí teleutaían dé moi labè tēn*  
 and final.F.ACC.SG then me.DAT take.2SG.AOR.IMPER the.F.ACC.SG  
*autoû Misgóla marturían*  
 same.M.GEN.SG Misgolas.GEN.SG testimony.ACC.SG  
 ‘And finally take for me the affidavit of Misgolas himself.’ (Aeschines 1.50)

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition lacks *kaí*.

2.3 *The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek*

Even outside this poetic usage, though, *kaí moi* clause-initially is particularly frequent (cf. Blass on Demosthenes 18.199). Here I give just a few examples, 177–212; similar ones can be found in any text.

- (177) *καί μ' οὐτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει*  
*kaí m' oút' iámbōn oúte terpōléōn mélei*  
 and me.DAT nor iamb.GEN.PL nor delight.GEN.PL matter.3SG.PRS  
 'And neither poetry nor pleasures matter to me.' (Archilochus Fragment 22)
- (178) *καί μοι σύμμαχος γουνουμένω ἦλαος γενεῦ*  
*kaí moi súmmakhos gounouménōi hilaos geneû*  
 and me.DAT ally.NOM.SG beg.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.DAT.SG gracious.M.NOM.SG  
 become.2SG.AOR.IMPER.MID  
 'And be a gracious ally to me, I beg you.' (Archilochus Fragment 108)
- (179) *καί μοι ...*  
*kaí moi*  
 and me.DAT  
 (Sappho 79, Lobel & Page (1968: 58.25))
- (180) *γινώσκω, καί μοι φρενὸς ἔνδοθεν ἄλγεα κεῖται, πρεσβυτάτην ἐcorῶν*  
*gaĩan Íaonías klinoménēn*  
*gignóskō, kaí moi phrenòs éndothēn álgea*  
 perceive.1SG.PRS and me.DAT midriff.GEN.SG within pain.NOM.PL  
*keítai, presbutátēn esorōn gaĩan*  
 lie.3SG.PRS.PASS oldest.F.ACC.SG behold.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG land.ACC.SG  
*Íaonías klinoménēn*  
 Ionia.GEN.SG decline.PTCP.PRS.F.ACC.SG  
 'I perceive Ionia's oldest land declining, and seeing (this) sorrows lie within my breast.' (Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians* 5.2 (Kenyon 1891: 14, line 3))
- (181) *καί μοι τοῦτ' ἀνηρότατον*

\* *Translator's note:* We have been unable to discover what work by Blass Wackernagel is referring to here. It may be his edition of Demosthenes (Dindorf & Blass 1887: 306–307), but there is no explicit comment on this passage.

\* *Translator's note:* Lobel & Page (1968) have *toûto* before *kaí moi* here.

## 2 Translation

- kaí **moi** toût' aniērótaton  
and me.DAT this.N.NOM.SG troublesome.SUPL.N.NOM.SG  
'... and this (is) most troublesome to me.' (Theognis, *Elegies* 257)
- (182) kaí **moi** kradíēn epátaxe mélainan  
and me.DAT heart.ACC.SG beat.3SG.AOR black.F.ACC.SG  
'And it bruised my heart black and blue.' (Theognis, *Elegies* 1198)
- (183) kaí **moi** tôn emòn pémpsat' ádelphón  
and me.DAT the.M.ACC.SG my.M.ACC.SG send.2PL.AOR.IMPER  
ádelphón  
brother.ACC.SG  
'... and send me my brother.' (Sophocles, *Electra* 117)
- (184) kaí **moi** τρίτον ρίπτοντι Δωτιεύς ἀνὴρ ἀγχοῦ προσῆψεν Ἐλατος ἐν  
δικκήματι  
kaí **moi** trítton rhíptonti Dōtieùs anèr  
and me.DAT third throw.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG Dotian.NOM.SG man.NOM.SG  
ankhoû prosêpsen Élatos en diskémati  
near fasten.3SG.AOR Elatus.NOM in quoit.DAT.SG  
'... and thirdly, a Dotian man, Elatus, came near my throw at quoits.'  
(Sophocles Fragment 380)
- (185) kaí **moi** μέχρι Μακεδονίης ἐλάσαντι [...] οὐδεὶς ἠντιώθη  
kaí **moi** mékhri Makedoníēs elásanti  
and me.DAT until Macedonia.GEN drive.PTCP.AOR.M.DAT.SG  
oudeis ēntiōthē  
nobody.M.NOM.SG oppose.3SG.AOR.PASS  
'And no one opposed me marching as far as Macedonia.' (Herodotus 7.9A.2)
- (186) kaí **moi** τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος ἐχέτω ἐς πάντα λόγον  
kaí **moi** toûto tò épos  
and me.DAT this.N.NOM.SG the.N.NOM.SG word.NOM.SG  
ekhétō es pánta lógon  
have.3SG.PRS.IMPER into all.M.ACC.SG account.ACC.SG  
'And let this statement hold for my entire history.' (Herodotus 7.152.3)



### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (187) καί μοι τὸ μὲν σὸν ἐκποδὼν ἔστω λόγου  
 kaí **moi** tò mèn sòn ekpodōn éstō  
 and me.DAT the.N.ACC.SG then yours.N.ACC.SG away be.3SG.PRS.IMPER  
 λόγου  
 account.GEN.SG  
 ‘And as for me, let your (fate) be unspoken.’ (Euripides, *Medea* 1222)
- (188) καί μοι εὐεργεσία ὀφείλεται  
 kaí **moi** euergesía opheíletai  
 and me.DAT good.work.NOM.SG owe.3SG.PRS.PASS  
 ‘And a good turn is owed to me.’ (Thucydides 1.137.4)
- (189) καί μοι φράσων  
 kaí **moi** phráson  
 and me.DAT tell.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 ‘And tell me ...’ (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 755)
- (190) καί μοι δοκεῖ κατὰ σχολὴν παρὰ τάνδρῳ ἐξελεῖν μόνη  
 kaí **moi** dokeî katà skholèn parà tandrō  
 and me.DAT seem.3SG.PRS down ease.ACC.SG from the=man.GEN.SG  
 exeltheîn mōnē  
 leave.AOR.INF alone.F.NOM.SG  
 ‘She alone seems to me to have got away from her husband with ease.’  
 (Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 47)
- (191) καί μοι ταῦτα ταῦτα ἔδοξε  
 kaí **moi** tautà taûta édoxe  
 and me.DAT the=same.N.NOM.PL this.N.NOM.PL seem.3SG.AOR  
 ‘... and these same things seemed (true) to me.’ (Plato, *Apology* 21d)
- (192) καί μοι ἀποκρίναι  
 kaí **moi** apókrinai  
 and me.DAT answer.2SG.AOR.IMPER.MID  
 ‘And answer me.’ (Plato, *Apology* 25a = Plato, *Gorgias* 462b)
- (193) καί μοι μὴ ἄχθεσθε λέγοντι τὰληθῆ  
 kaí **moi** mē ákhtheshe légonti  
 and me.DAT not grieve.2PL.PRS.IMPER.PASS say.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *kaitoi* for *kai moi*.

## 2 Translation

talēthē

the=true.N.ACC.PL

‘And do not be angry with me for speaking the truth.’ (Plato, *Apology* 31e)

- (194) καί μοι δοκεῖ ... μῦθον ἄν συνθεῖναι  
 kaí **moi** dokeî mûthon àn suntheînai  
 and me.DAT seem.3SG.PRS myth.ACC.SG IRR assemble.AOR.INF  
 ‘And it seems to me that he (Æsop) would have made a fable.’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 60c)

- (195) καί μοι δοκεῖ Κέβης εἰς σὲ τείνειν τὸν λόγον  
 kaí **moi** dokeî Kébēs eis sè teínein  
 and me.DAT seem.3SG.PRS Cebes.NOM into you.ACC spread.PRS.INF  
 tòn lógon  
 the.M.ACC.SG account.ACC.SG  
 ‘And Cebes seems to me to be aiming his argument at you.’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 63a)

- (196) καί μοι φράσκειν  
 kaí **moi** phráskein  
 and me.DAT tell.FUT.INF  
 (Plato, *Phaedo* 97d)

- (197) καί μοι ἔδοξεν ὁμοιότατον πεπονθέναι  
 kaí **moi** édoxen homoiótaton peponthénai  
 and me.DAT seem.3SG.AOR similar.SUPL.N.NOM.SG suffer.PRF.INF  
 ‘And to me it seemed most similar to having it be ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 98c)

- (198) καί μοι ὁμολόγει  
 kaí **moi** hōmológei  
 and me.DAT agree.3SG.IMP  
 ‘... and he agreed with me ...’ (Plato, *Symposium* 173b)

[p355]

- (199) καί μοι ἔστω ἄρρητα τὰ εἰρημένα  
 kaí **moi** éstō árrhēta tà  
 and me.DAT be.3SG.PRS.IMPER unsaid.N.NOM.PL the.N.NOM.PL  
 eirēména  
 say.PTCP.PRF.N.NOM.PL  
 ‘And let the things said be unsaid for me.’ (Plato, *Symposium* 189b)

### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (200) καί μοι φαίνῃ ὀκνεῖν  
 kaí **moi** phainēi okneîn  
 and me.DAT appear.2SG.PRS.PASS hesitate.PRS.INF  
 ‘And you appear to me to be hesitating ...’ (Plato, *Symposium* 218c)
- (201) καί μοι ἐπιδείξειν αὐτοῦ τούτου ποίησαι  
 kaí **moi** epideixein autoû toutou  
 and me.DAT display.FUT.INF same.N.GEN.SG this.N.GEN.SG  
 poîēsai  
 make.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 ‘And make sure to display to me this very thing.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 449c)
- (202) καί μοι ἐστιν τῶν ἐτέρων παιδικῶν πολὺ ἥττον ἐμπληκτος  
 kaí **moi** estin tôn hetérōn paidikōn polù  
 and me.DAT be.3SG.PRS the.GEN.PL other.GEN.PL darling.GEN.PL much  
 hêtton êmplêktos  
 less capricious.F.NOM.SG  
 ‘And (philosophy) is far less fickle to me than my other darlings.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 482a)
- (203) καί μοι δοκεῖ δουλοπρεπές τι εἶναι  
 kaí **moi** dokeî doulōprepés ti  
 and me.DAT seem.3SG.PRS slavish.N.ACC.SG something.N.ACC.SG  
 eînai  
 be.PRS.INF  
 ‘And it seems to me to be somehow more suitable for a slave.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 485b)
- (204) καί μοι λέγε  
 kaí **moi** lége  
 and me.DAT say.2SG.PRS.IMPER  
 ‘And tell me ...’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 492d = 494b)
- (205) καί μοι ὥσπερ παιδὶ χρῆ  
 kaí **moi** hósper paidì khreî  
 and me.DAT like child.DAT.SG use.2SG.PRS.PASS  
 ‘And you are treating me like a child.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 499b)

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has a nominal form *epídeixin* for *epídeixein*.

## 2 Translation

- (206) καί μοι πάνυ σφόδρα ἐνετέλλετο  
 kaí **moi** pánu sphódra enetélleto  
 and me.DAT quite exceedingly enjoin.3SG.IMP.PASS  
 ‘And he most particularly enjoined me ...’ (Plato, *Charmides* 157b)
- (207) καί μοι δοκεῖ θεὸς μὲν ἀνὴρ οὐδαμῶς εἶναι  
 kaí **moi** dokeî theòs mèn hanèr oudamôs  
 and me.DAT seem.3SG.PRS god.NOM.SG then the=man.NOM.SG in.no.way  
 eînai  
 be.PRS.INF  
 ‘And the man seems to me not to be a god at all.’ (Plato, *Sophist* 216b)
- (208) καί μοι πειρῶ προσέχων τὸν νοῦν εὖ μάλα ἀποκρίνασθαι  
 kaí **moi** peirô prosékhōn  
 and me.DAT try.2SG.PRS.IMPER.PASS direct.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 tòn noûn eû mála apokrínasthai  
 the.M.ACC.SG mind.ACC.SG well very answer.AOR.INF.MID  
 ‘And, focusing your mind, try to answer me very well.’ (Plato, *Sophist* 233d; *moi* is separated from its governing verb by *peirô*)
- (209) καί μοι νῦν ἣ τε φωνὴ προσφιλεῖς ὑμῶν  
 kaí **moi** nûn hê te phônê prospilês  
 and me.DAT now the.F.NOM.SG and sound.NOM.SG dear.F.NOM.SG  
 humôn  
 you.GEN.PL  
 ‘And your accent is now dear to me.’ (Plato, *Laws* 1.642c)
- (210) καί μοι δοκεῖς ... προελέσθαι  
 kaí **moi** dokeîs proelésthai  
 and me.DAT seem.2SG.PRS choose.AOR.INF.MID  
 ‘And you seem to me to have chosen ...’ (Demosthenes 18 280)
- (211) καί μοι λέγειν τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἁρμοστόν, Σόλων  
 kaí **moi** légein toût’ éstin harmostón, Sólōn  
 and me.DAT say.PRS.INF this.N.ACC.SG be.3SG.PRS fit.N.NOM.SG Solon.VOC  
 ‘And it is fitting to say this to me, Solon.’ (Philemon Fragment 4.4 (Kock 1884: 479))
- (212) καί μοι τέκν’ ἐγένοντο δὺ’ ἄρσενά

## 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

kaí **moi** tékn' egénonto dú' ársena  
 and me.DAT child.ACC.PL become.3PL.AOR.MID two male.N.ACC.PL  
 'And two male children were born to me.' (Callimachus, *Epigrams* 41.5;  
 40.5 in Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1882))

It is very rare for *moi* not to be attached to a clause-initial *kaí*: 213, 214, 215.  
 (*kaí moi* also in Euripides, *Hippolytus* 377.1373.)

- (213) καὶ πρέπει μοι δοκεῖ  
 kaí prépein **moi** dokeî  
 and befit.PRS.INF me.DAT seem.PRS.INF  
 'And it seems suitable to me.' (Plato, *Gorgias* 485c)
- (214) καὶ οὐδέν μοι δεῖ ἄλλης βασάνου  
 kaí oudén **moi** deî állēs  
 and nothing.ACC.SG me.DAT lack.3SG.PRS other.F.GEN.SG  
 basánu  
 touchstone.GEN.SG  
 'And I would have no need of another touchstone.' (Plato, *Gorgias* 486d)
- (215) καὶ ταῦτά μοι πάντα πεποιήται  
 kaí taútá **moi** pánta pepoíētai  
 and this.N.ACC.PL me.DAT all.N.ACC.PL do.3SG.PRF.PASS  
 'And on my part all these things have been done.' (Demosthenes 18.246)

As examples of so-called prodiorthosis (Blass on Demosthenes 18.199), the following examples particularly belong together: 216 (cf. the example 193 discussed above), 217, 218, and 219.

- (216) καί μοι, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, μὴ θορυβήσητε  
 kaí **moi**, ô ándres Athēnaíoi, mè thorubésēte  
 and me.DAT O man.VOC.PL Athenian.M.VOC.PL not clamour.2PL.AOR.SBJV  
 'And do not interrupt me, men of Athens.' (Plato, *Apology* 20e)
- (217) καὶ μοι μηδὲν ἀχθεσθῆς  
 kaí **moi** mēdèn akhthesthêis  
 and me.DAT nothing.ACC.SG grieve.2SG.AOR.SBJV.PASS  
 'And do not be at all angry with me.' (Plato, *Gorgias* 486a)

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has accusative *me* for *moi*.

## 2 Translation

- (218) καί μοι μὴ θορυβήσῃ μηδεῖς  
 kaí **moi** mè thorubḗsēi mēdeís  
 and me.DAT not clamour.3SG.AOR.SBJV nobody.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘And let no one interrupt me.’ (Demosthenes 5.15)
- (219) καί μοι μηδὲν ὀργισθῆς  
 kaí **moi** mēdèn orgisthêis  
 and me.DAT nothing.ACC.SG anger.2SG.AOR.SBJV.PASS  
 ‘And do not be at all angry.’ (Demosthenes 20.102)

And the following examples are very similar, except with a genitive pronoun: 220 and 221.

- (220) καί μου πρὸς Διὸς καὶ θεῶν μηδὲ εἷς τὴν ὑπερβολὴν θαυμάσῃ  
 kaí **mou** pròs Diòs kaì theôn mēdè heís  
 and me.GEN to Zeus.GEN and god.M.GEN.PL nor one.M.NOM.SG  
 tèn huperbolèn thaumásēi  
 the.F.ACC.SG hyperbole.ACC.SG wonder.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘And before Zeus and the gods, let nor one of you wonder at my exaggeration.’ (Demosthenes 18.199)
- (221) καί μου πρὸς Διὸς μηδεμίαν ψυχρότητα καταγνῶ μηδεῖς  
 kaí **mou** pròs Diòs mēdemían psukhrótēta  
 and me.GEN to Zeus.GEN no.F.ACC.SG coldness.ACC.SG  
 katagnōi mēdeís  
 condemn.3SG.AOR.SUBJ nobody.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘And before Zeus, let no one condemn me for any coldness.’  
 (Demosthenes 18.256)

The tendency to attach the pronoun to clause-initial *kaí* is by no means restricted to *moi*. *kaí mou* can be found in 222–226.

- (222) καί μου παῦρ' ἐπάκουσον ἔπη  
 kaí **mou** paûr' epákouson épē  
 and me.GEN few.N.ACC.PL listen.2SG.AOR.IMPER word.ACC.PL  
 ‘And listen to my few words.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 1366)
- (223) καί μου τὰ σπλάγχχιν' ἀγανακτεῖ  
 kaí **mou** tà splánkhn' aganakteî  
 and me.GEN the.N.ACC.PL innard.ACC.PL irritate.3SG.PRS  
 ‘And it gripes my guts.’ (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1006)

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has nominative *mēdeís* for *mēdè heís*.

### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (224) καί μου ταύτη σοφώτεροι ἦσαν  
 kaí **mou** taútēi sophōteroi êsan  
 and me.GEN thus wiser.NOM.PL be.3PL.IMP  
 ‘And thus they were wiser than I.’ (Plato, *Apology* 22d)
- (225) καί μου ὀπισθεν ὁ παῖς λαβόμενος τοῦ ἱματίου  
 kaí **mou** ôpisthen ho paîs  
 and me.GEN behind the.M.NOM.SG child.M.NOM.SG  
 labómenos toû himatiou  
 take.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.SG the.N.GEN.SG garment.GEN.SG  
 ‘And the boy, taking hold of my garment from behind ...’ (Plato, *Republic* 1.327b)
- (226) καί μου λαβόμενος τῆς χειρός  
 kaí **mou** labómenos tês kheirós  
 and me.GEN take.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.SG the.F.GEN.SG hand.GEN.SG  
 ‘And, taking my hand ...’ (Plato, *Parmenides* 126a)

For *kaí me* I refer the reader to the previously-mentioned dedicatory and artists’ inscriptions which contain it: IGA 492, Cypriot Deecke (1884) 1.71, Pausanias 5.23.7 (=129 above), Palatine Anthology 6.49 (=137 above). Cf. 227 and the younger Cypriot inscription 228.

- (227) καί μ’ ἔστεψε πατήρ (ε)ἰσαρίθμοις ἔπεσι  
 kaí **m’** éstēpse patēr (e)isaríthmois  
 and me.ACC crown.3SG.AOR father.NOM.SG equivalent.N.DAT.PL  
 épesi  
 word.DAT.PL  
 ‘And (his) father garlanded me with an equal number of verses.’ (Kaibel (1878), 806)
- (228) καί με χθὼν ἦδε καλύπτει  
 kaí **me** khthôn hêde kalýptei  
 and me.ACC earth.NOM this.F.NOM.SG hide.3SG.PRS  
 ‘And this earth hides me.’ (Deecke (1884), no. 30)

In addition, [p356] we have 229–246.

- (229) κἀδόκουν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ὄλβον εὐρήσειν πολὺν καί με κωτίλλοντα  
 λείως τραχὺν ἐκφανεῖν νόον

## 2 Translation

kadókoun hékastos autôn ólbon heurésein  
 and=think.3PL.IMP each.M.NOM.SG them.GEN wealth.ACC find.FUT.INF  
 polùn kaí **me** kōtillonta leíos  
 much.M.ACC.SG and me.ACC coax.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG smoothly  
 trakhùn ekphaneîn nóon  
 harsh.M.ACC.SG reveal.FUT.INF mind.ACC  
 ‘And they thought, each of them, that they would find great wealth and  
 that I, while coaxing gently, would reveal a harsh mind.’ (Solon in  
 Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians*; Kenyon (1891: 30, line 1))

- (230) καί μ' ἐπίβωτον κατὰ γείτονα ποιήσεις  
 kaí **m'** epibōton katà geítonas poiéseis  
 and me.ACC notorious.M.ACC.SG down neighbour.ACC.PL make.2SG.FUT  
 ‘And you will make me notorious among the neighbours.’ (Anacreon,  
 Fragment 9)

- (231) καί με δεσπότεω βεβροῦ λαχόντα λίσσομαι σε μὴ ραπίζεσθαι  
 kaí **me** despóteō bebroû lakhónτα líssomai se mē rhapízesthai  
 and me.ACC master.GEN.SG foolish.M.GEN.SG obtain.PTCP.AOR.M.ACC.SG  
 líssomai se mē rhapízesthai  
 pray.1SG.PRS you.ACC not beat.PRS.INF  
 ‘And I pray you not to beat me for having found a foolish master.’  
 (Hipponax, Fragment 64)

- (232) καί με βιάται οἶνος  
 kaí **me** biātai oīnos  
 and me.ACC constrain.3SG.PRS.PASS wine.NOM.SG  
 ‘And wine has got the better of me.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 503)

- (233) καί μ' ἐφίλευν προφρόνως πάντες ἐπερχόμενον  
 kaí **m'** ephileun prophrónōs pántes eperkhómenon  
 and me.ACC like.3PL.IMP willingly all.M.NOM.PL  
 eperkhómenon  
 approach.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG  
 ‘And they all freely enjoyed my approaching.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 785)

- (234) καί μ' ἤμαρ ἤδη xummetρούμενον χρόνῳ λυπεῖ τί πράσσει  
 kaí **m'** êmar édē xummetróúmenon khrónōi  
 and me.ACC day.ACC.SG already reckon.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.SG time.DAT.SG



### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

lupeî                      tí                      prássei  
trouble.3SG.PRS what.ACC.SG do.3SG.PRS  
'And what he is doing troubles me, with the days reckoned in time.'  
(Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 73)

- (235) φάναι Πέρσας τε λέγειν ἀληθέα καί με μὴ σωφρονέειν  
phánai Pérsas te légein alēthéa kaí me  
say.PRS.INF Persian.ACC.PL and speak.PRS.inf true.N.ACC.PL and me.ACC  
mē sōphronéein  
not be.sane.PRS.INF  
'Say that the Persians are telling the truth and that I am out of my mind.'  
(Herodotus 3.35.2)

- (236) καί μ' οὐ νομίζω παῖδα σὸν πεφυκέναι  
kaí m' ou nomízō paída sòn  
and me.ACC not consider.1SG.PRS child.ACC.SG your.M.ACC.SG  
pephukénai  
beget.PRF.INF  
'And I do not consider myself your begotten son.' (Euripides, *Alcestis* 641)

- (237) τέθνηκα τῇ σῇ θυγατρὶ καί μ' ἀπώλεσε  
téthnēka tēi sēi thugatrì kaí m'  
die.1SG.PRF the.F.DAT.SG your.F.DAT.SG daughter.DAT.SG and me.ACC  
apólese  
destroy.3SG.AOR  
'I have been killed by your daughter and she has destroyed me.'  
(Euripides, *Andromache* 335)

- (238) καί μ' ἀπάλλαξον πόνων  
kaí m' apállaxon pónōn  
and me.ACC deliver.2SG.AOR.IMPER trouble.GEN.PL  
'And free me from my troubles.' (Euripides, *Medea* 333)

- (239) πόσιν ποθ' ἥξειν καί μ' ἀπαλλάξειν κακῶν  
pósιν poth' héxein kaí m' apalláxein  
husband.ACC sometime arrive.FUT.INF and me.ACC deliver.FUT.INF  
kakōn  
evil.N.GEN.PL  
'... for my husband to come one day and free me from these evils.'  
(Euripides, *Helen* 278)

## 2 Translation

- (240) καί μ' ἔλων θέλει δοῦναι τυράννοις  
 kaí m' helòn thélei doûnai  
 and me.ACC take.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG want.3SG.PRS give.AOR.INF  
 turánnōis  
 king.DAT.PL  
 'And having taken me, he wants to give me to the royal house.'  
 (Euripides, *Helen* 551)
- (241) καί με πρὸς τύμβον πόρευσα πατρός  
 kaí me pròs túmbon póreusa patrós  
 and me.ACC to tomb.ACC convey.2SG.AOR.IMPER father.GEN.SG  
 'And guide me to my father's tomb.' (Euripides, *Orestes* 796)
- (242) καί μ' ἔφερβε còc δόμος  
 kaí m' épherbe sòs dómos  
 and me.ACC foster.3SG.IMP your.M.NOM.SG house.NOM.SG  
 'And your house reared me.' (Euripides, *Orestes* 866)
- (243) καί μ' ἀσφαλῶς πανήμερον παῖσαι τε καὶ χορεῦσαι  
 kaí m' asphalôs panήμερον paísai te kaì khoreûsai  
 and me.ACC safely all.day sport.AOR.INF and and dance.AOR.INF  
 '...and (allow) me to sport and dance safely all day.' (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 338; cf. *Knights* 862, and *Frogs* 389 *kaí ... me*)
- (244) καί με τοῦτ' ἔτερπεν  
 kaí me toût' éterpen  
 and me.ACC this.N.NOM.SG delight.3SG.IMP  
 'And this delighted me.' (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 916)
- (245) καί μ' οὐκ ἀρέσκει  
 kaí m' ouk aréskei  
 and me.ACC not please.3SG.PRS  
 '... and it does not please me.' (Aristophanes, *Plutus* 353)
- (246) καί με μηδεὶς ἀπαρτᾶν νομίῃ τὸν λόγον τῆς γραφῆς  
 kaí me mēdeis apartân nomíēi  
 and me.ACC nobody.M.NOM.SG detach.PRS.INF consider.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 τὸν λόγον τὲς γραφῆς  
 the.M.ACC.SG account.ACC.SG the.F.GEN.SG writ.GEN.SG  
 'And let no one consider that I am changing the subject from the

### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

indictment.’ (Demosthenes 18.59)

Second person pronouns: 247–262.

- (247) καί σε [...] νέοι ἄνδρες [...] ᾗσονται  
 kaí se néoi ándres áisontai  
 and you.ACC young.M.NOM.PL men.NOM.PL sing.3PL.FUT.MID  
 ‘And young men will sing of you.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 241)
- (248) καί σοι τὰ δίκαια φίλ’ ἔστω  
 kaí soi tà díkaia phíl’  
 and you.DAT the.N.NOM.PL righteous.N.NOM.PL dear.N.NOM.PL  
 éstō  
 be.3SG.PRS.IMPER  
 ‘And let the righteous things be dear to you.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 465)
- (249) καί σε Ποσειδάων χάρμα φίλοις ἀνάγοι  
 kaí se Poseidáōn khárma philoís anágoi  
 and you.ACC Poseidon.NOM joy.ACC.SG friend.DAT.PL lead.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘And may Poseidon bring you, a delight to your friends.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 692)
- (250) καί τοι ταύτην τὴν ἀτιμίην προκτίθῃμι ἐόντι κακῷ καὶ ἀθύμῳ  
 kaí toi taútēn tēn atimíēn prostíthēmi  
 and you.DAT this.F.ACC.SG the.F.ACC.SG disgrace.ACC.SG impose.1SG.PRS  
 eónti kakōi kaì athýmōi  
 be.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG bad.M.DAT.SG and spiritless.M.DAT.SG  
 ‘And on you, being base and spiritless, I lay this disgrace.’ (Herodotus 7.11.1)
- (251) καί σ’ ἐβουλόμεν μένειν  
 kaí s’ eboulómēn ménein  
 and you.ACC wish.1SG.IMP.PASS remain.PRS.INF  
 ‘...and I wanted you to stay.’ (Euripides, *Medea* 456)
- (252) καί σ’ οὐ κενᾶϊσι χερσὶ γῆς ἀποτελῶ  
 kaí s’ ou kenaîsi khersì gēs  
 and you.ACC not empty.F.DAT.PL hand.DAT.PL land.GEN.SG

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *hupolábēi*.

## 2 Translation

apostelô

dispatch.1SG.FUT

‘And I will not send you away from the land with empty hands.’

(Euripides, *Helen* 1280)

(253) καί σε προσποιούμεθα

kaí se prospoiούμεtha

and you.ACC claim.1PL.PRS.PASS

‘...and we claim from you...’ (Euripides, *Helen* 1387)

(254) καί σ’ ἀναγκαῖον θανεῖν

kaí s’ anankaïonthaneîn

and you.ACC necessary.N.NOM.SG die.AOR.INF

‘And (it is) necessary for you to die.’ (Euripides, *Orestes* 755)

(255) καί σ’ ἀμείψασθαι θέλω φιλότῃτι χειρῶν

kaí s’ améipsasthai thélō philótēti

and you.ACC repay.AOR.INF.MID want.1SG.PRS affection.DAT.SG

kheirôn

hand.GEN.PL

‘And I want to give you back a fond embrace.’ (Euripides, *Orestes* 1047)

(256) ὁρῶ καί σε δέξομαι κύγκωμον

horō kaí se déxomai súnkōmon

see.1SG.PRS and you.ACC receive.1SG.FUT.MID fellow.reveller.ACC.SG

‘I see and I will accept you as a fellow reveller.’ (Euripides, *Bacchae* 1172)

(257) καί σε φαίνω τοῖς πρυτάνεσιν

kaí se phaínō toîs prutánesin

and you.ACC show.1SG.PRS the.M.DAT.PL magistrate.DAT.PL

‘...and I am exposing you to the magistrates.’ (Aristophanes, *Knights* 300)

(258) καί σε θυσίαισιν ἱεραῖσι [...] ἀγαλοῦμεν

kaí se thusíaisin hieraîsi agaloûmen

and you.ACC sacrifice.DAT.PL holy.F.DAT.PL glorify.1PL.FUT

‘And we will glorify you with holy sacrifices.’ (Aristophanes, *Peace* 396)

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has the tonic form ‘se’, which Wackernagel also cites as a variant reading.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *phanô se*.

## 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (259) καί σοι τὰ μεγάλ' ἡμεῖς Παναθήναι' ἄξομεν  
 kaí **soi** τὰ megál' hēmeîs Panathénai'  
 and you.DAT the.N.ACC.PL great.N.ACC.PL we.NOM Panathenaea.ACC  
 áxomen  
 lead.1PL.FUT  
 '...and we will celebrate the great Panathenaea in your honour.'  
 (Aristophanes, *Peace* 418)
- (260) καί σου κατεγέλα  
 kaí **sou** kategéla  
 and you.GEN mock.3SG.IMP  
 'And he was mocking you.' (Plato, *Gorgias* 482d)
- (261) καί σε ἴσως τυπτήσῃ τις  
 kaí **se** ísōs tuptḗsei tis  
 and you.ACC perhaps hit.3SG.FUT someone.M.NOM.SG  
 '...and perhaps someone will hit you.' (Plato, *Gorgias* 527a)
- (262) καί σοι ἐπιρρήξει Γόργος χιμάραιο νομαίης αἷμα  
 kaí **soi** epirrhéxei Górgos khimároio  
 and you.DAT sacrifice.3SG.FUT Gorgos.NOM goat.GEN.SG  
 nomaíēs haîma  
 pastoral.F.GEN.SG blood.ACC  
 'And Gorgos will sacrifice the blood of a herdsman's goat to you.'  
 (Anthologia Graeca 6.157.3).
- Cf. also example 89 cited above.  
 Third person pronouns: 263–275.
- (263) καί σφεας ὄλλυ' ὥσπερ ὀλλύεις  
 kaí **spheas** óllu' hósper ollúeis  
 and them.ACC destroy.2SG.PRS.IMPER like destroy.2SG.PRS  
 '... and destroy them as you destroy.' (Archilochus Fragment 27.2)
- (264) καί σφιν θαλάσσης ἠχέεντα κύματα φίλτερ' ἡπείρου γένηται  
 kaí **sphin** thalássēs ēkhéenta kúmata phílter'  
 and them.DAT sea.GEN.SG roaring.N.ACC.PL billow.ACC.PL dearer.N.ACC.PL

\* *Translator's note:* Wackernagel cites 'kai soi' as a variant reading.

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has infinitive *katagelân*.

## 2 Translation

ēpeírou génētai  
land.GEN.SG become.3SG.AOR.SUBJ.MID  
‘... and the sea’s roaring billows shall become dearer than land to them.’  
(Archilochus Fragment 74.8)

- (265) καί μιν ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους βάξις ἔχει χαλεπή  
kaí **min** ep’ anthrōpous báxis ékhei  
and him.ACC upon person.ACC.PL rumour.NOM.SG have.3SG.PR  
khalepé  
harsh.F.NOM.SG  
‘And a harsh rumour keeps him against people.’ (Mimnermus Fragment 15)

- (266) καί οἱ ἔθηκε δοκεῖν  
kaí **hoi** éthēke dokeîn  
and him.DAT put.3SG.AOR seem.PRS.INF  
‘... and he made him think ...’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 405)

- (267) καί σφιν πολλ’ ἀμέλητα μέλει  
kaí **sphin** poll’ amélēta mélei  
and them.DAT many.N.NOM.PL unimportant.N.NOM.PL matter.3SG.PRS  
‘And many unimportant things occupy them.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 422)

- (268) καί σφιν τοῦτο γένοιτο φίλον  
kaí **sphin** toûto génoito philón  
and them.DAT this.N.NOM.SG become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID dear.N.NOM.SG  
‘... and this would become dear to them ...’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 732)

- (269) καί μιν ἔθηκεν δαίμονα  
kaí **min** éthēken daímona  
and him.ACC put.3SG.AOR demon.ACC.SG  
‘... and he made him divine.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 1348)

[p357]

- (270) καί σφρων ἐσχίσθησαν αἱ γνώμαι  
kaí **spheōn** eskhísthēsan hai gnōmai  
and them.GEN split.3PL.AOR.PASS the.F.NOM.PL opinion.NOM.PL  
‘... and their opinions were divided.’ (Herodotus 4.119.1)

## 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (271) καί νιν δοκῶ  
 kaí **nin** dokô  
 and him.ACC think.1SG.PRS  
 ‘And I think that he ...’ (Euripides, *Orestes* 1200)
- (272) καί σφας σιδεραῖς ἀρμόσας ἐν ἄρκυσι παύσω [...] τῆςδε βακχείας  
 kaí **sphas** sidēraîs harmósas en árkusi  
 and them.ACC iron.F.DAT.PL fit.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG in net.DAT.PL  
 paúsō têsde bakkheías  
 stop.1SG.FUT this.F.GEN.SG frenzy.GEN.SG  
 ‘And having put them in iron fetters, I will keep them from this frenzy.’  
 (Euripides, *Bacchae* 231)
- (273) καί σφιν ἀνιήρὸν μὲν ἐρεῖς ἔπος, ἔμπα δὲ λέξεις  
 kaí **sphin** aniērôn mèn ereîs épos, émpa  
 and them.DAT troublesome.N.ACC then say.2SG.FUT word.ACC.SG all  
 dè léxeis  
 then say.2SG.FUT  
 ‘And you will say a troublesome thing to them, and still you will say ...’  
 (Callimachus, Epigram 14.3; 12.3 in Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1882))

One example of *kaí me* and one of *kaí spehas* are particularly noteworthy: 274 and 275. In both examples the pronoun is extracted from the subordinate clause in which it belongs and attached to *kaí*. Moreover, *kaí* with a following enclitic pronoun is also found very often in Homer.

- (274) καί με ἐὰν ἐξελέγῃς, οὐκ ἀπεχθήσομαί σοι  
 kaí **me** eàn exelénkhēis, ouk apekhthésomai soi  
 and me.ACC if refute.2SJ.PRS.SBJV not hate.1SG.FUT.MID you.DAT  
 ‘And if you refute me, I will not be angry with you.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 506c)
- (275) καί σφας ὥς οὐδεὶς ἐκάλεε, ἐκτράπονται ἐπ’ Ἀθηνέων  
 kaí **sphas** hōs oudeîs ekálee, ektrápontai ep’  
 and them.ACC as nobody.M.NOM.SG call.3SG.IMP turn.3PL.PRS.PASS upon  
 Athēnéōn  
 Athens.GEN  
 ‘And as no one invited them, they turned toward Athens.’ (Herodotus 6.34.2)

\* Translator’s note: Both Perseus editions have *léxai* for *léxeis*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *akhthesthésomai* for *apekhthésomai*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *ektrépontai* for *ektrápontai*.

## 2 Translation

This attracting force also inheres in other particles that regularly or often occur clause-initially, e.g. *ou*, *mé* (NEG), *gár* ‘since’, *ei*, *eán* ‘if’. *allá* ‘but’ also belongs to this group, as in examples 276–282 (the latter is Euripidizing).

- (276) ἀλλά μοι σμικρός τις εἶη  
 allá **moi** smikrós tis eíē  
 but me.DAT small.M.NOM.SG someone.M.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘...but someone would be unimportant to me...’ (Archilochus Fragment 58.3)
- (277) ἀλλά μ’ ὁ λυσιμελής, ὅταῖρε δάμναται πόθος  
 allá **m’** ho lusimelēs, ôtaîre  
 but me.ACC the.M.NOM.SG limb-relaxing.M.NOM.SG O=companion.VOC.SG  
 dâmnatai póthos  
 overpower.3SG.PRS.PASS longing.NOM.SG  
 ‘But the limb-relaxing longing overpowers me, my friend.’ (Archilochus Fragment 85)
- (278) θέλω τι φείπην, ἀλλά με κωλύει αἴδως  
 thélō ti weípēn, allá **me** kōlúei  
 want.1SG.PRS something.ACC say.AOR.INF but me.ACC prevent.3SG.PRS  
 aídōs  
 shame.NOM  
 ‘I want to say something, but shame prevents me.’ (Alcaeus Fragment 55.2)
- (279) ἀλλά μ’ ἑταῖρος ἐκλείπει  
 allá **m’** hetaîros ekleípei  
 but me.ACC companion fail.3SG.PRS  
 ‘But my companion fails me.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 941)
- (280) ἀλλά μοι εἶη ζῆν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀλίγων  
 allá **moi** eíē zên apò tôn olígōn  
 but me.DAT be.3SG.PRS.OPT live.PRS.INF of the.GEN.PL little.GEN.PL  
 ‘...but for me (what I ask) would be to live on little.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 1155)
- (281) ἀλλά μοι φόβος τις εἰσελήλυθ(ε)  
 allá **moi** phóbos tis eiseléluth(e)  
 but me.DAT fear.NOM.SG some.M.NOM.SG enter.3SG.PRF  
 ‘But some fear has entered me.’ (Euripides, *Orestes* 1323)



## 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (282) ἀλλά μοι ἀμφίπολοι λύχνον ἄψατε  
 allá **moi** amphípoloi lúkhnon hápsate  
 but me.DAT attendant.M.VOC.PL lamp.ACC.SG touch.2PL.AOR.IMPER  
 ‘But, servants, light the lamp for me.’ (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1338)

*allá moi* ‘but me.DAT’ is common in Plato (*Apology* 39E, 41D, *Phaedo* 63E, 72D, *Symposium* 207C, 213A, *Gorgias* 453A, 476B, 517B etc.), and *allá se* ‘but you.ACC’ is found in Theognis 1287, 1333, Euripides, *Medea* 759, 1389, etc.

Furthermore, as with Homer and Sappho, we even find enclitic pronouns attached to a vocative when it is the first word of a clause or follows the first word of a clause: 283–291.

- (283) Μοῦσά μοι Εὐρυμεδοντιάδεα [...] ἐννεφ’ [...]  
 Moûsá **moi** Eurumedontiádea ennep’h’  
 muse.VOC.SG me.DAT wide.ruling.F.VOC.SG tell.2SG.PRS.IMPER  
 ‘Wide-ruling Muse, tell me...’ (Hipponax, Fragment 85.1)
- (284) Μοῖσά μοι ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον εὐρροον ἄρχομ’ αἶειδεν  
 Moîsá **moi** amphi Skámandron eúrroon  
 muse.VOC.SG me.DAT about Scamander.ACC well-flowing.M.ACC.SG  
 árkhom’ aeíden  
 begin.1SG.PRS.PASS sing.PRS.INF  
 ‘Muse, I begin to sing for myself about the well-flowing Scamander.’  
 (Fragmenta Lyrica Adespota 30A; Bergk (1882: 696))
- (285) μήτοι κασιγνήτη μ’ ἀτιμασῆς  
 métoi kasi gnḗtē **m’** atimasēis  
 not sister.VOC me.ACC dishonour.2SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘No, sister, do not deem me unworthy.’ (Sophocles, *Antigone* 544)
- (286) ὁδ’ ὃ ξένοι με, κοῦς ἀτιμάζων θεοῦς, ἔλκει  
 hod’ ô xénoi **me**, soûs  
 this.M.NOM.SG O stranger.VOC.PL me.ACC your.M.ACC.PL  
 atimázōn theoús, hélkei  
 dishonour.PTCP.M.NOM.SG god.ACC.PL drag.3SG.PRS  
 ‘Dishonouring your gods, strangers, this man drags me...’ (Euripides, *Heracleidae* 78)
- (287) ὁ Διός, ὁ Διός, ὃ πόσι με παῖς Ἑρμᾶς ἐπέλασεν Νεῖλω  
 ho Díos, ho Díos, ô pósi  
 the.M.NOM.SG Zeus.GEN the.M.NOM.SG Zeus.GEN O husband.VOC.SG

## 2 Translation

- me** païs Hermâs epélasen Neílōi  
 me.ACC child.NOM.SG Hermes.NOM bring.3SG.AOR Nile.DAT  
 ‘Zeus’s, Zeus’s son Hermes, brought me to the Nile, husband.’ (Euripides, *Helen* 670)
- (288) οἴκτιρε δ’ ὦ μήτέρ με  
 oiktire d’ ô mêtér **me**  
 pity.2SG.PRS.IMPER then O mother.VOC.SG me.ACC  
 ‘So pity me, Mother.’ (Euripides, *Bacchae* 1120)
- (289) ἔασον Ἀχοῖ με σὺν φίλαισιν γόου κόρον λαβεῖν  
 éason Akhoî **me** sùn philáisin  
 let.2SG.AOR.IMPER echo.VOC.PL me.ACC with friend.F.DAT.PL  
 góou kóron labeîn  
 wailing.GEN.SG surfeit.ACC.SG take.AOR.INF  
 ‘Echoes, let me have my fill of wailing with my friends.’ (Euripides, *Andromeda* Fragment 118)
- (290) μέμνησο Περσεῦ μ’ ὥς καταλείπεις  
 mémnêso Perseû **m’** hōs kataleípeis  
 remember.2SG.PRF.IMPER.PASS Perseus.VOC me.ACC how leave.2SG.PRS  
 ‘Remember, Perseus, how you are leaving me behind.’ (Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae* 1134)
- (291) εἶ’ ἄγε Θεστυλί μοι χαλεπᾶς νόσῳ εὐρέ τι μᾶχος  
 eî’ áge Thestulí **moi** khalepâs  
 on lead.2SG.PRS.IMPER Thestylis.VOC me.DAT harsh.F.GEN.SG  
 nósō heuré ti mâkhos  
 illness.GEN.SG find.2SG.AOR.IMPER some.N.ACC.SG remedy.ACC.SG  
 ‘Come now, Thestylis, find me some remedy for a harsh illness.’  
 (Theocritus 2.95)

Related to this is the attachment of the clitic to a preceding [p358] imperative element, as in Homeric *all’ áge moi*: 292–296.

- (292) δεῦρό σου στέψω κάρα  
 deûró **sou** stépsō kára  
 hither you.GEN crown.1SG.FUT head.ACC.SG  
 ‘Come here; I will crown your head.’ (Euripides, *Bacchae* 341)

\* *Translator’s note*: For *me païs Hermâs* the Perseus edition has *païs m’* followed by a lacuna.

\* *Translator’s note*: The Perseus edition has *ei d’ áge ... mêkhos*.

### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (293) παῦσαι με μὴ κάκιζε  
 paúsaí                      **me**      mē kákize  
 stop.2SG.AOR.IMPER.MID me.ACC not abuse.2SG.PRS.IMPER  
 ‘Stop; do not make me a coward.’ (Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis* 1435)
- (294) φέρε δέ σοι, ἐὰν δύνωμαι, σαφέστερον ἀποδείξω  
 phére                      dé **soi**,      eàn dúnōmai,      saphésteron  
 bear.2SG.PRS.IMPER then you.DAT if      can.1SG.PRS.SBJV clearly.COMP  
 apodeíxō  
 show.1SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘But come, let me show you more clearly, if I can ...’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 464b)
- (295) ἴθι δὴ μοι, ἐπειδὴ [...], διελοῦ τάδε  
 íthi                      dé **moi**,      epeidē dieloû  
 go.2SG.PRS.IMPER exactly me.DAT since      decide.2SG.AOR.IMPER.MID  
 táde  
 this.N.ACC.PL  
 ‘Go on, decide these things for me, since ...’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 495c)
- (296) ἔχε δὴ μοι τόδε εἰπέ  
 ékhe                      dé **moi**      tóde                      eipé  
 have.2SG.PRS.IMPER exactly me.DAT this.N.ACC.SG say.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 ‘Stop now and tell me this...’ (Plato, *Ion* 535b)

Also attachment to *boulei* ‘wish.2SG.PRS’ when a first person singular subjunctive follows: 297–300. Broadly similar are 301 and 302.

- (297) βούλει σε γεύσω  
 boulei                      **se**                      geúsō  
 wish.2SG.PRS you.ACC taste.1SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘Do you want me to give you a taste?’ (Euripides, *Cyclops* 149)
- (298) βούλει σοι ὁμολογήσω  
 boulei                      **soi**                      homologésō  
 wish.2SG.PRS you.DAT agree.1SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘Do you want me to agree with you?’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 516c)

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *epideíxō*.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has subjunctive *boulēi*.

## 2 Translation

- (299) βούλει σοι εἶπω  
 boulei soi eipō  
 wish.2SG.PRS you.DAT say.1SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘Do you want me to tell you...’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 521d)
- (300) βούλει σε θῶ φοβηθῆναι  
 boulei se thō phobēthēnai  
 wish.2SG.PRS you.ACC put.1SG.AOR.SBJV frighten.AOR.INF.PASS  
 ‘Do you want me to assume that you were frightened?’ (Aeschines 3.163)
- (301) νεωστί, μοι δοκεῖν, καταπεπλευκότι  
 neōstí, moi dokein, katapepleukóti  
 newly me.DAT seem.PRS.INF land.PTCP.PRF.M.DAT.SG  
 ‘... freshly, I fancy, arrived on shore ...’ (Plato, *Euthydemus* 297c)
- (302) τί οὖν, εἰπεῖν, μοι ἀποκρινεῖται  
 tí oûn, eipeîn, moi apokrineîtai  
 what.ACC.SG so say.AOR.INF me.DAT answer.3SG.FUT.MID  
 “‘Why, then,” he said, “shall I be answered?”” (Plato, *Parmenides* 137b)

Often, however, we find such a pronoun that has been separated from the words to which it syntactically belongs in order to be placed in clausal second position, e.g. 303. Differently again 304–306. See above p81 on *kaí me* and *kai spehas*. With participles: 307–312.

- (303) λῶστά σε μήτε λίην ἀφνεὸν κτεάτεσσι γενέσθαι μήτε cé γ’ ἐς πολλήν  
 chrēmōstá se mēte liēn aphneòn kteátessi  
 best you.ACC nor very rich.M.ACC.SG possession.DAT.PL  
 genésthai mēte sé g’es pollēn  
 become.AOR.INF.MID nor you.ACC then=into much.F.ACC.SG  
 khrēmosúnēn elásai  
 need.ACC.SG drive.AOR.INF  
 ‘(It is) best for you neither to become very rich in possessions nor to  
 plunge into great poverty.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 559)

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *tís*.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Teubner edition (Hiller 1890) has *hóste*.

## 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (304) οὐδέ μ' εἰ θανεῖν χρεών  
oudé **m'** ei thaneîn khreôn  
nor me.ACC if die.AOR.INF need  
'... not even if (it is) necessary for me to die.' (Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris* 987)
- (305) ἵνα μ' εἰ καταλάβοι ὁ τόκος ἔτ' ἐν πόλει, τέκοιμι  
hína **m'** ei kataláboi ho tókos ét' en  
that me.ACC if seize.3SG.AOR.OPT the.M.NOM.SG childbirth.NOM still in  
pólei, tékoimi  
city.DAT.SG beget.1SG.AOR.OPT  
'So that if labour should seize me while still in these precincts, I could give birth ...' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 753)
- (306) ὃς μοι δωδεκαταῖος ἀφ' ᾧ τάλας οὐδέποθ' ἵκει  
hós **moi** dōdekataîos aph' hō  
who.M.NOM.SG me.ACC twelfth.day.M.NOM.SG of which.GEN.SG  
tálas oudépoth' híkei  
wretched.M.NOM.SG never come.3SG.PRS  
'... who, wretched one, (has been) twelve days since he ever came to me.' (Theocritus 2.4)
- (307) οὐ γάρ τί μοι Ζεὺς ἦν ὁ κηρύξας τάδε  
ou gár tí **moi** Zeûs ên ho  
not then what.ACC.SG me.DAT Zeus.NOM be.3SG.IMP the.M.NOM.SG  
kērúxas táde  
proclaim.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG this.N.ACC.PL  
'Why, because Zeus was not the one proclaiming these things to me.' (Sophocles, *Antigone* 450)
- (308) τίς μ' εἰσὶν ἄξων  
tís **m'** eîsin áxōn  
who.M.NOM.SG me.ACC go.3SG.PRS lead.PTCP.FUT.M.NOM.SG  
'Who will go as my escort?' (Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis* 1458)
- (309) πονηρός τίς μ' ἔσται ὁ εἰκάγων  
ponērós tís **m'** éstai ho  
evil.M.NOM.SG some.M.NOM.SG me.ACC be.3SG.FUT.MID the.M.NOM.SG

---

\* Translator's note: The Persus edition has s'.

## 2 Translation

eiságōn

bring.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG

‘It will be some villain who brings me there.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 521d)

- (310) πολλά με τὰ παρακαλοῦντα ἦν  
pollá me tà parakaloûnta ên  
many.N.NOM.PL me.ACC the.N.NOM.PL urge.PTCP.PRS.N.NOM.PL be.3SG.IMP  
‘Many were the things urging me ...’ ([Demosthenes] 59.1; cf. also Kock (1864: 64) on Aristophanes, *Birds* 95)

- (311) τάδε τοι προσδόκα ἔσεσθαι  
táde toi prosdóka ésesthai  
this.N.ACC.PL you.DAT expect.2SG.PRS.IMPER be.FUT.INF.MID  
‘Expect these things for yourself.’ (Herodotus, 7.235.4)

- (312) μή μοι θάνῃς cὺ κοινά  
mé moi thánēis sù koiná  
not me.DAT die.2SG.AOR.SBJV you.NOM common.F.NOM.SG  
‘Do not die together with me.’ (Sophocles, *Antigone* 546)

In taking such a position, the pronoun easily separates words which belong tightly together. Thus, for instance, in 313 and 314 we find the particle *oukéti* ‘no longer’ split apart by *me* and *moi* (1SG); similarly 315–318, even though otherwise *ei mé* and *eân mé* ‘if not’ always occur closely connected to one another. 318 is also an example of this, as well as 319, since otherwise it is normal for *ôn* ‘then’ to occur immediately after the first word in the clause.

- (313) οὐ μ’ ἔτι, παρθενικαὶ μελιγάρυες ἡμερόφωνοι, γυῖα φέρειν δύναται  
ού m’ éti, parthenikà meligáruēs  
not me.ACC still maiden.VOC.PL sweet.voiced.F.VOC.PL  
himeróphōnoi, guía phérein dúnatai  
lovely.sounding.F.VOC.PL limb.ACC.PL bear.INF.PRS can.3SG.PRS  
‘Sweet-voiced, lovely-sounding maidens, I can no longer hold out my hands.’ (Alcman 26.1)

- (314) οὐ μοι ἔτ’ εὐκελάδων ὕμνων μέλει  
ού moi ét’ eukeládōn húmnōn mélei  
not me.DAT still melodious.M.GEN.PL hymn.GEN.PL matter.3SG.PRS  
‘Melodious hymns no longer matter to me.’ (Fragmenta Lyrica Adespota 5; Bergk (1882: 690))

### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (315) εἴ σε μὴν δειναῖσιν ὄντα συμφοραῖς ἐπαρκέσω  
 eí se mèn deinaîsin ónta sumphoraîs eparkésō  
 if you.ACC not=in terrible.F.DAT.PL be.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG mishap.DAT.PL  
 help.1SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘If I do not help you in these terrible straits ...’ (Euripides, *Orestes* 803)
- (316) εἴαν μοι μὴ δοκῇ  
 eán moi mē dokēi  
 if me.DAT not seem.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 ‘If he does not seem to me ...’ (Plato, *Apology* 29e)
- (317) εἴαν μοι μὴ εἴπῃς  
 eán moi mē eípēis  
 if me.DAT not say.2SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘If you do not tell me ...’ (Plato, *Phaedrus* 236e)
- (318) οὐδεὶς μέ πω ἠρώτηκεν καινὸν οὐδέν  
 oudeîs mé pō ērôtēken kainòn oudén  
 nobody.M.NOM.SG me.ACC yet ask.3SG.PRF new.N.ACC.SG nothing.ACC.SG  
 ‘No one has yet asked me anything new.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 448a)
- (319) θαυμά μοι ὦν καὶ τοῦτο γέγονεν  
 thōumā moi ōn kai tōuto gégonen  
 wonder.NOM.SG me.DAT then also this.N.NOM.SG become.3SG.PRF  
 ‘So this too is a wonder to me ...’ (Herodotus 7.153.4)

An attributive genitive is separated from its governing word [p359] by Ion when he writes 320 at the beginning of his *Triagmoí*. Similarly 321–325 and 287 above. (But *emé* is also found in this configuration: 326.)

- (320) ἀρχὴ δέ μοι τοῦ λόγου  
 arkhē dé moi toû lógou  
 beginning.NOM.SG then me.DAT the.M.GEN.SG account.GEN.SG  
 ‘And (this is) the beginning of my speech.’ (Harpocration s.v. *Ílon*)

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *mē ’n*.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *thōma ... gégone*.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *hēde*; Wackernagel also cites *hēdé* as a variant reading (Lobeck 1829: 385).

## 2 Translation

- (321) τίνος μ' ἕκατι γῆς ἀποτέλλεις  
 tínos m' hékati gês apostélleis  
 what.GEN.SG me.ACC for land.GEN.SG dispatch.2SG.PRS  
 'For what reason are you exiling me from this land?' (Euripides, *Medea* 281)
- (322) ἃ Δίος μ' ἄλοχος ὤλεσεν  
 ha Díos m' álokhos ólesen  
 the.F.NOM.SG Zeus.GEN me.ACC bedfellow.NOM.SG destroy.3SG.AOR  
 'The wife of Zeus has ruined me.' (Euripides, *Helen* 674)
- (323) εἰ οὖν τί σε τούτων ἀρέσκει  
 ei oûn tí se toútōn aréskei  
 if so anything.NOM.SG you.ACC this.N.GEN.PL please.3SG.PRS  
 'So if any of this pleases you ...' (Thucydides 1.128.7)
- (324) ὅσους μοι τῶν συγγόνων ἀπώλλυεν  
 hósous moi tōn sungónōn  
 how.many.M.ACC.PL me.DAT the.M.GEN.PL relative.M.GEN.PL  
 apólluen  
 destroy.3SG.IMP  
 '...how many of my relatives he was ruining.' (Andocides 1.47)
- (325) Ζηνός τοι θυγάτηρ ὑπὸ τὰν μίαν ἵκετο χλαῖαν  
 Zēnós toi thugatēr hupò tòn mían  
 Zeus.GEN you.DAT daughter.NOM.SG under the.F.ACC.SG one.F.ACC.SG  
 híketo khlaían  
 come.3SG.AOR.MID blanket.ACC.SG  
 'Zeus's daughter has come under the same blanket as you.' (Theocritus 18.19)
- (326) οὐδεὶς ἔμ' ἐχθρῶν προσβλέπων ἀνέξεται  
 oudeis ém' ekhthrōn prosblépōn  
 nobody.M.NOM.SG me.ACC enemy.GEN.PL behold.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 anéxetai  
 sustain.3SG.FUT  
 'None of the enemies will be able to bear looking at me.' (Euripides, *Heracleidae* 691)

In 327–356 an attributive adjective or pronoun or an appositive is separated from the phrase to which it belongs by an enclitic pronoun.



### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (327) δεσπότης σε Καμβύσης, Ψαμμήνιτε, εἰρωτᾷ  
 despótēs se Kambúsēs, Psamménite, eirōtāi  
 master.NOM.SG you.ACC Cambyses.NOM Psammenitus.VOC ask.3SG.PRS  
 ‘Psammenitus, Lord Cambyses asks you ...’ (Herodotus 3.14.9)
- (328) ἀπὸ ταύτης σφι τῆς μάχης ... κατεύχεται ὁ κῆρυξ ... Πλαταιεῦσι  
 apò taútēs sphi tēs mákhēs kateúkhetai  
 of this.F.GEN.SG them.DAT the.F.GEN.SG battle.GEN.SG pray.3SG.PRS  
 ho kêrux Plataieûsi  
 the.M.NOM.SG herald.NOM.SG Plataean.DAT.PL  
 ‘Since this battle, the herald prays for them, the Plataeans.’ (Herodotus 6.111.2; here *Plataieûsi* resumes the distantly removed *sphi*)
- (329) τά σε καὶ ἀμφοτέρα περιέκοντα ἀνθρώπων κακῶν ὁμιλίας φάλλουσιν  
 tá se kai amphótera periékonta anthrṓpōn  
 the.N.ACC.PL you.ACC also both.N.ACC.PL befall.N.ACC.PL person.GEN.PL  
 kakōn homiliai sphállousin  
 bad.M.GEN.PL company.NOM.PL trip.3PL.PRS  
 ‘The company of bad men overcomes both the things that have come to you.’ (Herodotus 7.16A.1; here *tá* belongs with *amphótera* and *se* with *periékonta*)
- (330) ὀλίγων γάρ σφι ἡμερέων  
 olígōn gár sphi hēmeréōn  
 few.F.GEN.PL then them.DAT day.GEN.PL  
 ‘For few days’ (provisions are left) to them.’ (Herodotus 9.45.2)
- (331) οὗτος δέ μοι λόγος καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων  
 hōutòs dé moi lógos kai hupèr tōn  
 the.M.NOM.SG then me.DAT account.NOM.SG also over the.N.GEN.PL  
 állōn  
 other.N.GEN.PL  
 ‘And this (is) also my argument for the others.’ ([Hippocrates,] *De arte*; Gomperz (1890: 52.18))
- (332) πολλή μ’ ἀνάγκη  
 pollē m’ anánkē  
 much.F.NOM.SG me.DAT need.NOM.SG  
 ‘(There is) great need for me (to do so).’ (Euripides, *Medea* 1013)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *oligéōn*.

## 2 Translation

- (333) Αἴας μ' ἀδελφὸς ὤλεσ' ἐν Τροίᾳ θανών  
 Aías m' adelphòs óles' en Troíai  
 Ajax.NOM me.ACC brother.NOM.SG destroy.3SG.AOR in Troy.DAT  
 thanón  
 die.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 'My brother Ajax undid me, dying at Troy.' (Euripides, *Helen* 94)
- (334) τοῦκεῖ με μέγεθος τῶν πόνων πείθει  
 toukeî me mégethos tòn pónōn  
 the=there me.ACC magnitude.N.NOM.SG the.M.GEN.PL trouble.GEN.PL  
 peíthei  
 persuade.3SG.PRS  
 'The magnitude of my troubles there convinces me.' (Euripides, *Helen* 593)
- (335) φήμας δέ μοι ἐσθλὰς ἐνεγκών  
 phémas dé moi esthlàs enenkōn  
 report.ACC.PL then me.DAT goodly.F.ACC.PL bear.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 'And having brought me good news ...' (Euripides, *Helen* 1281)
- (336) δισσοὶ δέ σε Διόσκοροι καλοῦσιν  
 dissoi dé se Dióskoroi kaloûsin  
 twin.M.NOM.PL then you.ACC Dioscuri.NOM.PL call.3PL.PRS  
 'And the twin Dioscuri are calling you.' (Euripides, *Helen* 1643)
- (337) Ἑλένη σ' ἀδελφὴ ταῖςδε δωρεῖται χοαῖς  
 Helénē s' adelphē taïsde dōreîtai  
 Helen.NOM you.ACC sister.NOM the.F.DAT.PL present.3SG.PRS  
 khoaís  
 libation.DAT.PL  
 'Helen, your sister, presents you with these libations.' (Euripides, *Orestes* 117)
- (338) φίλου μοι πατρός ἐστιν ἔκγονος  
 philou moi patrós estin ékgonos  
 dear.M.GEN.SG me.DAT father.GEN.SG be.3SG.PRS offspring.NOM.SG  
 'He is the son of a father dear to me.' (Euripides, *Orestes* 482)

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *d' emoi*.

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *kaloûmen*.

## 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (339) Φοιβός μ' ὁ Λητοῦς παῖς ὁδ' ἐγγὺς ὦν καλῶ  
 Phoibós m' ho Lētoûs país  
 Phoebus.NOM me.ACC the.M.NOM.SG Leto.GEN child.NOM.SG  
 hod' engûs òn kalô  
 this.M.NOM.SG near be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG call.1SG.PRS  
 'Being near, I call myself Phoebus, this son of Leto.' (Euripides, *Orestes* 1626)
- (340) χρύσεια δὲ μοι πτέρυγες περὶ νώτῳ  
 khrúseai dé moi ptéruges perì nótōi  
 golden.F.NOM.PL exactly me.DAT wing.NOM.PL around back.DAT.SG  
 'Golden (are) the wings upon my back.' (Euripides Fragment 911)
- (341) τίς γάρ σε κήρυξ ἢ γερουσία Φρυγῶν [...] οὐκ ἐπέσκηψεν πόλει  
 tís gár se kérux è gerosía  
 which.M.NOM.SG then you.ACC herald.NOM.SG or senate.NOM.SG  
 Phrugôn ouk epéskēpsen pólei  
 Phrygian.GEN.PL not adjure.3SG.AOR city.DAT  
 'For what herald or embassy from Phrygia did not summon you for the city?' (Euripides, *Rhesus* 401)
- (342) τίνα μοι δύστανον ὄνειρον πέμπεις  
 tína moi dústanon óneiron  
 which.M.ACC.SG me.DAT wretched.M.ACC.SG dream.M.ACC.SG  
 pémpεις  
 send.2SG.PRS  
 'What woeful dream do you send to me?' (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1332, imitating Euripides)
- (343) αὐτὴ τέ μοι δέσποινα μακαριωτάτη  
 auté té moi déspoina makariōtátē  
 same.F.NOM.SG and me.DAT mistress.NOM.SG blessed.SUPL.F.NOM.SG  
 '... and my mistress herself (is) happiest.' (Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 1113)
- (344) πολλὴ μέντ' ἄν με φιλοψυχία ἔχοι  
 pollè mént' an me philopsukhía ékhoi  
 much.F.NOM.SG yet=IRR me.ACC love.of.life.NOM.SG have.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 'Yet a great love of life would possess me ...' (Plato, *Apology* 37c)

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *s*'.

## 2 Translation

- (345) μέγα μοι τεκμήριον τούτου γέγονεν  
 méga moi tekmeríaon toutou gégonen  
 great.N.NOM.SG me.DAT sign.NOM.SG this.N.GEN.SG become.3SG.PRF  
 ‘A convincing proof of this has come to me.’ (Plato, *Apology* 40c)
- (346) οὗτος οὖν σοι ὁ λόγος ἐκείνῳ πῶς ξυνάσεται  
 hoûtos oûn soi ho lógos ekeinôï  
 this.M.NOM.SG so you.DAT the.M.NOM.SG account.NOM.SG that.M.DAT.SG  
 pôs xunásetai  
 how harmonize.3SG.FUT.MID  
 ‘So how can this theory be brought into harmony with that one for you?’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 92c)
- (347) μέγα δέ σοι τεκμήριον ἐρῶ  
 méga dé soi tekmeríaon erô  
 great.N.ACC.SG then you.DAT sign.ACC.SG say.1SG.FUT  
 ‘And I will tell you a striking proof.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 456b)
- (348) ἱκανόν μοι τεκμήριον ἔστιν  
 hikanón moi tekmeríaon estin  
 sufficient.N.NOM.SG me.DAT sign.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS  
 ‘There is proof enough for me.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 487d)
- (349) τοῦτό μοι αὐτὸ σαφῶς διόρισον  
 toûtó moi autò saphôs diórison  
 this.N.ACC.SG me.DAT same.N.ACC.SG clearly define.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 ‘Declare this very thing clearly for me.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 488d)
- (350) φέρε δὴ, ἄλλην σοι εἰκόνα λέγω  
 phére dhé, állēn soi eikóna  
 bear.2SG.PRS.IMPER exactly other.F.ACC.SG you.DAT likeness.ACC  
 légō  
 say.1SG.PRS.SBJV  
 ‘Come now, let me tell you another parable.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 493d)
- (351) ὅντινά μοι τρόπον δοκεῖς εὖ λέγειν  
 hóntiná moi trópon dokeîs eû légein  
 which.M.ACC.SG me.DAT way.ACC.SG seem.2SG.PRS well say.PRS.INF  
 ‘... in what way you seem to me to be speaking correctly.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 513c)

### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (352) τετάρτου μοι γένους αὖ προσδεῖν φαίνεται  
tetártou            **moi**    génous    aũ    prosdeîn  
fourth.N.GEN.SG me.DAT kind.GEN.SG again still.lack.PRS.INF  
phaínetai  
appear.3SG.PRS  
‘A fourth class as well appears to me to be necessary.’ (Plato, *Philebus* 23d)
- (353) ὁ ἀνὴρ σοὶ ὁ ἐμὸς καὶ τᾶλλα φίλος ἦν  
ho                    anér                    **soi**                    ho                    emòs                    kaì  
the.M.NOM.SG man.NOM.SG you.DAT the.M.NOM.SG my.M.NOM.SG also  
tâlla                    phîlos                    ên  
the=other.N.ACC.PL friend.NOM.SG be.3SG.IMP  
‘My husband was also a friend to you in all other ways.’ (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 3.1.11)
- (354) δύο δέ μοι τῆς κατηγορίας εἶδη λέλειπται  
dúo dé    **moi**    tês                    katēgorías    eídē  
two then me.DAT the.F.GEN.SG charge.GEN.SG form.N.NOM.PL  
léleiptai  
leave.3SG.PRF.PASS  
‘Two points of my plea remain for me.’ (Aeschines 1.116)
- (355) ἅ μεγάλα μοι Κύπρις ἔθ’ ὑπνώντι παρέστα  
ha                    megála                    **moi**    Kýpris    éth’  
the.F.NOM.SG great.F.NOM.SG me.DAT Cypris.NOM still  
hupnónti                    parésta  
sleep.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG stand.by.3SG.AOR  
‘Great Cypris still stood by me in my sleep.’ (Bion Fragment 5.1)

#### [p360]

- (356) Ξεῖνε, Συρηκόσιός τοι ἀνὴρ τόδ’ ἐφίεται Ὀρθῶν  
Xeîne,            Surēkósíós            **toi**    anēr            tód’  
stranger.VOC Syracusan.M.NOM.SG you.DAT man.NOM.SG this.N.ACC.SG  
ephíetai            Órthōn  
bid.3SG.PRS.PASS Orthon.NOM  
‘Stranger, Orthon, a Syracusan man, asks this of you.’ (Anthologia Graeca 7.660)

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *leípetai*.

## 2 Translation

I will not exhaustively list the numerous instances in which the verb immediately follows a pronoun so inserted, such as 357–359, although they too belong here, in my view. In a different respect, 360 and similar examples also belong here.

- (357) τρισαί μ' ἀναγκάζουσιν κυφορᾶς ὁδοί  
 trissai m' anankázousin sumphorâs hodoí  
 triple.F.NOM.PL me.ACC compel.3PL.PRS circumstance.GEN.SG way.NOM.PL  
 'Three paths of circumstance compel me ...' (Euripides, *Heracleidae* 232)

- (358) ταύτης μοι δοκεῖ [...] πολλὰ [...] μόρια εἶναι  
 taútēs moi dokeî pollà mória  
 this.F.NOM.SG me.DAT seem.3SG.PRS many.N.ACC.PL part.ACC.PL  
 εἶναι  
 be.PRS.INF  
 'This seems to me to have many branches.' (Plato, *Gorgias* 463b)

- (359) δοῖός με καλεῖ γάμος  
 doíós me kaleî gámos  
 double.M.NOM.SG me.ACC call.3SG.PRS marriage.NOM.SG  
 'A double marriage calls me.' (Callimachus Epigram 1.3)

- (360) ὅτι πολλή μοι ἀπέχθια γέγονεν καὶ πρὸς πολλούς  
 hótì pollē moi apékthia gégonen kai pròs  
 that much.F.NOM.SG me.DAT hatred.NOM.SG become.3SG.PRF also to  
 πολλούς  
 many.M.ACC.PL  
 '... that great hatred toward me has also arisen among many.' (Plato, *Apology* 28a)

In other cases, the pronoun is attached to the article. Sometimes immediately: 361–363. Mostly the article is immediately followed by a 'postpositive' particle: 364–371. (See also example 95 above on p43.)

- (361) οἱ με φίλοι προδιδούσιν  
 hoí me philoi prodidoûsin  
 the.M.NOM.PL me.ACC friend.NOM.PL forsake.3PL.PRS  
 'My friends forsake me.' (Theognis, *Elegies* 575; cf. also Theognis, *Elegies* 861)

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *sunnoías*.

## 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (362) οἱ με φίλοι προῦδωκαν  
 hoí me philoi proudōkan  
 the.M.NOM.PL me.ACC friend.NOM.PL forsake.3PL.PRS  
 ‘My friends have forsaken me.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 813)
- (363) τάν τοι, ἔφα, κορύναν δωρύττομαι  
 tán toi, épha, korúnan dōrúttomai  
 the.F.ACC.SG you.DAT say.3SG.IMP club.ACC.SG present.1SG.PRS.PASS  
 ‘“I present,” he said, “the club to you.”’ (Theocritus 7.43)
- (364) οἱ δέ σφι βόες οὐ παρεγένοντο  
 hoi dé sphi bóes ou paregénonto  
 the.M.NOM.PL then them.DAT ox.NOM.PL not be.present.3PL.IMP  
 ‘But the oxen had not returned to them.’ (Herodotus 1.31.2)
- (365) οἱ γάρ με ἐκ τῆς κώμης παῖδες [...] ἐστήσαντο βασιλέα  
 hoi gár me ek tēs kómēs  
 the.M.NOM.PL then me.ACC from the.F.GEN.SG village.GEN.SG  
 païdes estésanto basiléa  
 child.NOM.PL stand.3PL.AOR.MID king.ACC.SG  
 ‘For the boys of the village chose me as king.’ (Herodotus 1.115.2)
- (366) τὰ δέ μοι παθήματα τὰ ἔοντα ἀχάριτα μαθήματα γέγονε  
 tà dé moi pathémata tà  
 the.N.NOM.PL then me.DAT suffering.NOM.PL the.N.NOM.PL  
 éonta akhárita mathémata gégone  
 be.PTCP.PRS.N.NOM.PL graceless.N.NOM.PL lesson.NOM.PL become.3SG.PRF  
 ‘And disastrous misfortunes have come to be lessons for me.’ (Herodotus 1.207.1)
- (367) ὁ δέ μοι μάγος [...] ταῦτα ἐνετείλατο  
 ho dé moi mágos taûta  
 the.M.NOM.SG then me.DAT magus.NOM.SG this.N.ACC.PL  
 eneteílato  
 command.3SG.AOR.MID  
 ‘But the magus gave me this message.’ (Herodotus 3.63.2)
- (368) ἡ γάρ μοι μήτηρ βέβηκεν ἄλλῃ

## 2 Translation

hē gár moi mētēr bébēken állēi  
 the.F.NOM.SG then me.DAT mother.NOM.SG step.3SG.PRF elsewhere  
 ‘For my mother has gone out.’ (Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 913)

- (369) ó dé moi λόγος ὄρκος ἔσται  
 ho dé moi λόγος hórkos éstai  
 the.M.NOM.SG then me.DAT account.NOM.SG oath.NOM.SG be.3SG.FUT.MID  
 ‘And what I say will be an oath.’ (Plato, *Phaedrus* 236d)

- (370) ἡ μὲν μοι ἀρχὴ τοῦ λόγου ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν Εὐριπίδου Μελανίππην  
 hē mén moi arkhè tou̐  
 the.F.NOM.SG then me.DAT beginning.NOM.SG the.M.GEN.SG  
 λόγου ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν Euripídou  
 account.GEN.SG be.3SG.PRS down the.F.ACC.SG Euripides.GEN  
 Melaníppēn  
 Melanippe.ACC  
 ‘The beginning of my speech is in accordance with Euripides’  
 Melanippe.’ (Plato, *Symposium* 177a)

- (371) τὰ δέ τοι κύα καρπὸν ἐνεΐκει  
 tà dé toi sía karpòn  
 the.N.NOM.PL then you.DAT water.parsnip.NOM.PL fruit.ACC.SG  
 eneíkai  
 bear.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘And the water parsnip would bear fruit for you.’ (Theocritus 5.125; cf.  
 also Theocritus 1.82)

Or the pronoun is attached to a preposition and thus separates it from its case:  
 372–374. The preposition is followed immediately by a particle in 375–377.

- (372) ἀμφὶ μοι αὖτε ἄνακθ’ ἐκαταβόλον ἄδέτω ἅ φρήν  
 amphí moi aûte ánakth’ hekatabólon áidétō  
 about me.DAT again lord.ACC far.shooting.M.ACC.SG sing.3SG.PRS.IMPER  
 ha phrén  
 the.F.NOM.SG midriff.NOM.SG  
 ‘Let my heart again sing for me of the far-shooting lord.’ (Terpander  
 Fragment 2)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *állēi bébēke*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *t’ oísua*.



### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (373) ἀμφί μοι Ἑρμαῖαο φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε Μοῦσα  
 amphí **moi** Hermaíao philón gónon  
 about me.DAT Hermes.GEN dear.M.ACC.SG offspring.ACC.SG  
 énnepe Moûsa  
 say.2SG.IMPER Muse.VOC  
 ‘Tell me, Muse, about the dear son of Hermes.’ (Homeric Hymns 19.1)
- (374) κατὰ με γᾶς ζῶντα πόρευσον  
 katá **me** gâs zônta póreuson  
 down me.ACC earth.GEN.SG live.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG send.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 ‘Bury me alive beneath the earth.’ (Euripides, *Rhesus* 831)
- (375) ἐν γάρ σε τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ἀναιρέομαι  
 en gár **se** têi nukti taútēi anairéomai  
 in then you.ACC the.F.DAT.SG night.DAT.SG this.F.DAT.SG take.1SG.PRS.PASS  
 ‘For I conceived you that night.’ (Herodotus 6.69.4)
- (376) ἐν δέ σε Παρρασίῃ Ῥεῖη τέκεν  
 en dé **se** Parrhasíēi Rheíē téken  
 in then you.ACC Parrhasia.DAT Rhea.NOM beget.3SG.AOR  
 ‘And Rhea gave birth to you in Parrhasia.’ (Callimachus, *Hymns* 1.10)
- (377) ἐς δέ με δάκρυ ἤγαγεν  
 es dé **me** dákru ēgagen  
 into then me.ACC tear.ACC.SG lead.3SG.AOR  
 ‘And it brought me to tears.’ (Callimachus Epigram 2.1)

There is also the well-known case in which a *se* (2SG.ACC) dependent on a verb of asking (either one that is really present, or one whose reading can be supplied) occurs between *prós* ‘to’ and the genitive it ‘governs’, as in 378. Similar instances are Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 468 (=381 below), *Oedipus at Colonus* 250 and 1333 (=382 below), and Euripides, *Suppliants* 277. (In contrast, see 379.)

- (378) μή, πρὸς σε τοῦ σπείραντος ἄντομαι Διός  
 mé, prós **se** toû speírantos ántomai Diós  
 not to you.ACC the.M.GEN.SG sow.PTCP.PRS.M.GEN.SG pray.1SG.PRS  
 Diós  
 Zeus.GEN  
 ‘I beg you not to, by Zeus who begot you.’ (Euripides, *Alcestis* 1098)

## 2 Translation

- (379) μή, πρὸς γονάτων σε πάντως πάντῃ c' ἱκετεύομεν  
 mé, pròs gonátōn se pántōs pántē s'  
 not to knee.GEN.PL you.ACC all.ways every.way you.ACC  
 hiketeúomen  
 beseech.1PL.PRS  
 'We beseech you not to, by your knees and in each and every way ...'  
 (Euripides, *Medea* 853)

The verb of asking is to be supplied in 380, [p361] as well as in Euripides, *Medea* 324 and *Andromache* 89 (cf. *Iphigenia in Tauris* 1068). In all these instances, *se* takes second position following the nearest preceding punctuation; 381–383, where the enclitic *nún* 'now' precedes *se*, do not of course constitute exceptions.

- (380) μή, πρὸς σε τοῦ κατ' ἄκρον Οἰταῖον πάγον Διὸς καταστράπτοντος,  
 ἐκκλέψῃς λόγον  
 mé, pròs se toû kat' ákron Oitaïon  
 not to you.ACC the.M.GEN.SG down high.M.ACC.SG Oetan.M.ACC.SG  
 págon Diòs katastráptontos, ekklépsēis  
 rock.ACC Zeus.GEN strike.PTCP.PRES.M.GEN.SG steal.2SG.AOR.SBJV  
 lógon  
 account.ACC.SG  
 'By Zeus who hurls lightning down upon the high rock of Oeta, do not  
 rob me of the truth.' (Sophocles, *Women of Trachis* 436)
- (381) πρὸς νύν σε πατρός  
 pròs nún se patrós  
 to now you.ACC father.GEN.SG  
 'Now by your father (I beg) you ...' (Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 468)
- (382) πρὸς νύν σε κρηνῶν  
 pròs nún se krēnôn  
 to now you.ACC spring.GEN.PL  
 'Now by the streams (I ask) you ...' (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1333)
- (383) πρὸς νύν σε γονάτων τῶνδ(ε)  
 pròs nún se gonátōn tônd(e)  
 to now you.ACC knee.GEN.PL this.N.GEN.PL  
 'Now by these knees (I ask) you ...' (Euripides, *Helen* 1233)

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *pántai pántōs*.

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *nápos*.

2.3 *The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek*

From the non-Attic poets one can adduce 384. Apollonius, who we have to thank for this fragment, seems however to treat *te* as orthotonic and to recognize only *tu* as enclitic accusative form in Doric. But enclitic Doric *te* is confirmed by the words of the Megarian in 385, in which, because of unwillingness to recognize *tè*, one feels obliged to insert *tu* with an unattractive hiatus.

- (384) πρὸς δέ τε τῶν φίλων  
 pròs dé **te** tôn philōn  
 to then you.ACC the.M.GEN.PL friend.GEN.PL  
 ‘And by your friends (I sigh to) you.’ (Alcman Fragment 52.1)
- (385) πάλιν τ’ ἀποικῶ ναὶ τὸν Ἑρμᾶν οἴκαδις  
 pálin t’ apoisô naì tôn Hermân oíkadis  
 again you.ACC take.1SG.FUT yes the.M.ACC.SG Hermes.ACC home  
 ‘By Hermes, I will take you back home.’ (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 779)

In particular, though, we should compare example 386: *potí te Zēnòs* (from Codex Palatinus *potitezēnos*). Blomfield (1815: 234) unnecessarily emends to enclitic *tu*. Still, the accusation levelled at him by Schneider (1873: 383) that he ‘erred horribly’ should be turned back against Schneider himself and his preferred Vulgate reading *potì tè Zanòs* with senseless accenting and false genitive *Zanòs*.

- (386) ποτί τε Ζηνὸς ἰκνεῦμαι λιμενοσκόπῳ  
 potí **te** Zēnòs hikneûmai limenoskópō  
 to you.ACC Zeus.GEN beseech.1SG.PRS.PASS harbour.watching.M.GEN.SG  
 ‘I beseech you by Zeus, the guardian of the harbour.’ (Callimachus Fragment 114; Anthologia Graeca 13.10.1)

Without taking into consideration these last two examples, Christ (1891: 4f.) has expressed the opinion with regard to 387 that the *te*, which makes an unpromising particle, should be read as the accusative of the pronoun, much as Bergk (1866: 17) wanted to insert *se*. The position of *te* speaks in favour of this reading.

- (387) ὕδατος ὅτι τε πυρὶ ζέοισαν εἰς ἀκμὰν μαχαίρα τάμον κατὰ μέλη  
 húdatos hóti **te** purì zéoisan eis  
 water.GEN.SG that you.ACC fire.DAT.SG boil.PTCP.PRS.F.ACC.SG into

---

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *tu*.

## 2 Translation

akmàn makhaíraī támon katà mēlē  
 edge.ACC.SG knife.DAT.SG cut.3PL.AOR down limb.ACC.PL  
 ‘... that they cut you limb from limb with a knife into the full boiling of  
 the water on the fire.’ (Pindar, *Olympian Ode* 1.48)

The old positional law also makes its influence known with regard to the connection between the preposition and the verb (Krüger 1871: §68.48.3). The following examples of post-Homeric tmesis can be adduced: 388–395 [p362] and 396–402.

- (388) ἔκ μ’ ἔλασας ἀλγέων  
 ék m’ élasas algéōn  
 from me.ACC drive.2SG.AOR pain.GEN.PL  
 ‘You have driven out my pains.’ (Alcaeus Fragment 95)
- (389) ἀπό μοι θανεῖν γένοιτ(ο)  
 apó moi thaneîn génoit(o)  
 off me.DAT die.AOR.INF become.3SG.AOR.MID.OPT  
 ‘May death come to me.’ (Anacreon Fragment 50.1)
- (390) ἀπό σ’ ὀλέσειεν Ἄρτεμις, σὲ δὲ κώπόλλων  
 apó s’ oléseien Ártemis, sè dè  
 off you.ACC destroy.3SG.AOR.OPT Artemis.NOM you.ACC then  
 kōpóllōn  
 also=Apollo.NOM  
 ‘May Artemis destroy you, and Apollo too.’ (Hipponax Fragment 31)
- (391) κατὰ μοι βόασον  
 katá moi bóason  
 down me.DAT shout.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 ‘Shout down to me.’ (Sophocles, *Electra* 1067)
- (392) ἀπό μ’ ὀλεῖς  
 apó m’ oleîs  
 off me.ACC destroy.2SG.FUT  
 ‘You will destroy me.’ (Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 817)
- (393) κατὰ με φόνιος Αἴδας ἔλοι  
 katá me phónios Áidas héloi  
 down me.ACC murderous.M.NOM.SG Hades.NOM take.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘May murderous Hades take me.’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1689)

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *se*.

### 2.3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (394) διά μ' ὀλεῖτε  
 diá m' oleíte  
 through me.ACC destroy.2PL.FUT  
 'You will be my ruin.' (Euripides, *Heracleidae* 1053)
- (395) ἀνά μοι τέκνα λύσαι  
 aná moi tékna lûsai  
 up me.DAT child.ACC.PL loose.2SG.AOR.IMPER.MID  
 'Release my children.' (Euripides, *Suppliants* 45)
- (396) κατὰ με πέδον γᾶς ἔλοι  
 katá me pédon gâs héloi  
 down me.ACC ground.NOM.SG earth.GEN.SG take.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 'May the earth's floor swallow me.' (Euripides, *Suppliants* 829)
- (397) διά μ' ἔφθειρας  
 diá m' éphtheiras  
 through me.ACC destroy.2SG.AOR  
 'You have destroyed me.' (Euripides, *Hippolytus* 1357)
- (398) ἀνά μ' ἐκάλεσεν  
 aná m' ekálesen  
 up me.ACC call.3SG.AOR  
 '(Whence did the voice) summon me?' (Euripides, *Bacchae* 579)
- (399) κατὰ σε χόσομεν  
 katá se khôsomen  
 down you.ACC bury.1PL.FUT  
 'We will bury you.' (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 295)
- (400) ἀπό σ' ὀλῶ κακὸν κακῶς  
 apó s' olô kakòn kakôs  
 off you.ACC destroy.1SG.FUT bad.N.ACC.SG badly  
 'I will do you great harm.' (Aristophanes, *Plutus* 65)
- (401) ξύμ μοι λαβέσθε τοῦ μύθου  
 xúm moi labésthe toû mûthou  
 with me.DAT take.2PL.AOR.IMPER.MID the.M.GEN.SG myth.GEN.SG  
 'Assist me with the tale.' (Plato, *Phaedrus* 237a)

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *ánomoi*.

## 2 Translation

- (402) εἰ δ' ἄγε, κύμ μοι βούλευσον  
 ei d' áge, súm moi bóuleuson  
 if then lead.2SG.PRS.IMPER with me.DAT advise.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 'But come now, advise me.' (Callimachus Epigram 1.5)

With a preceding particle or similar: 403–406. See above p28 for similar examples with *nin*.

- (403) ἀπὸ νύν με λείπετ' ἤδη  
 apò nún me leípet' édē  
 off now me.ACC leave.2PL.PRS.IMPER already  
 'Leave me now immediately' (Sophocles, Phil. 1177)
- (404) ἔκ τοί με τήξει  
 ék toí me téxeis  
 out lo me.ACC melt.2SG.FUT  
 'Oh, you will melt my heart.' (Euripides, *Orestes* 1047)
- (405) ἔν τί σοι παγίχεται  
 én tí soi pagésetai  
 in something.NOM you.DAT stick.3SG.FUT.PASS  
 'Something will get stuck into you.' (Aristophanes, *Wasps* 437)
- (406) ἀνά τοί με πείθει  
 aná toí me peítheis  
 up lo me.ACC persuade.2SG.PRS  
 'You are convincing me.' (Aristophanes, *Wasps* 784)

If in isolated cases (Alcaeus Fragment 68 given by Bekker (1833), erroneously, as 407) the pronoun does not come to be in second position through such tmesis, this should not bother us much.

- (407) τύφῳς ἔκ σ' ἔλετο φρένας  
 túphōs ék s' héleto phrénas  
 fever.NOM.SG out you.ACC take.3SG.AOR.MID midriff.ACC.PL  
 'A fever has taken your wits.' (Alcaeus Fragment 68)

---

\* *Translator's note:* The TLG edition (Lobel & Page 1968) has *etúphōs*.

## 2.4 Genitives

The pronouns *moi* (1SG), *toi* (2SG), (*sphi* 3PL,) *meo/meu/mou* (1SG.GEN), *seo/seu/sou* (2SG.GEN), and *spheōn* (3PL.GEN) as attributive genitives deserve special consideration. I regard it as certain that *moi* and *toi*, like *hoi*, did not take on the genitive function only later, but rather had this function from the start, like their Indic correlates *mē*, *tē* and *sē*, and have nothing to do with the locative (cf. Delbrück (1888: 205)). That the genitive function is retained in Greek not only in Homer (see Brugmann (1890: 819), Wackernagel (1891: 39)) and the Ionic poets can be seen above all in Wilamowitz's (1889: 167) comment on example 408: "In the address, the drama is conveyed by the expression of the possessive relation in kinship terms using the dative, *thúgatér moi* 'daughter.VOC me.DAT', *téknon moi* 'child.VOC me.DAT' (Euripides *Ion* 1399, *Orestes* 124, *Iphigenia in Aulis* 613), *gúnai moi* 'woman.VOC me.DAT'. The genitive is not at all common; its entrance into the language, for instance in the Jewish-Christian literature, is rather a sign of the common folk."

- (408) σύ τ' ὦ γύναι μοι, σύλλογον ψυχή λάβέ  
 you.NOM and O woman.VOC me.DAT collection.ACC.SG soul.GEN.SG  
 labé  
 take.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 'You too, my wife, collect your courage.' (Euripides, *Heracleidae* 626)

The most natural position for these genitives seems to us to be following their nouns. As is well known, although this position often occurs, for instance in the vocative constructions discussed by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1889), the equally justifiable position preceding the noun and its attributives (including the article) is also found. The origin of this strange positioning becomes clear when we look at the oldest examples. Homer has this positioning in examples 409–417. In all of these cases, our positional rule effects this ordering. Later authors allowed themselves to remove these genitives further from the beginning of the clause, but nevertheless frequently retained the preposing that followed from the old positional rule. Various effects of the original connection between preposing and the old positional rule can, however, be seen.

- (409) καὶ μέν μευ βουλέων ξύνειν  
 kaì mén **meu** bouléōn xúnein  
 and then me.GEN will.GEN.PL heed.3PL.IMP  
 'And they listened to my counsel.' (Homer, *Iliad* 1.273)

## 2 Translation

[p363]

- (410) οἱ μευ κourδίην ἄλοχον καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ μάψ' οἴχεσθ' ἀνάγοντες  
 hoí **meu** kourdiēn álokhon kaì  
 who.M.NOM.PL me.GEN wedded.F.ACC.SG bedfellow.ACC.SG and  
 ktémata pollà máps' oíkhesth'  
 property.ACC.PL much.N.ACC.PL vainly go.2PL.PRS.PASS  
 anágontes  
 take.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL  
 'For you bare forth wantonly over sea my wedded wife and therewithal  
 much treasure.' (Homer, *Iliad* 13.626)
- (411) καὶ μευ κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί  
 kaì **meu** kléos êgon Akhaioí  
 and me.GEN fame.ACC.SG lead.3PL.IMP Achaeans.M.NOM.PL  
 'And the Achaeans would have spread my fame.' (Homer, *Odyssey* 5.311)
- (412) καὶ μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει  
 kaì **meu** kléos ouranòn híkei  
 and me.GEN fame.NOM.SG heaven.ACC.SG come.3SG.PRS  
 'And my fame reaches unto heaven.' (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.20)
- (413) ἦ μή τίς σευ μῆλα βροτῶν ἀέκοντος ἐλαύνει  
 ê mé tis **seu** mêla brotôn  
 in.truth not some.M.NOM.SG you.GEN sheep.ACC.PL mortal.GEN.PL  
 aékontos elaúnei  
 unwilling.M.GEN.SG drive.3SG.PRS  
 'Can it be that some mortal man is driving off your flocks against your  
 will?' (Homer, *Odyssey* 9.405)
- (414) οἱ μευ βοῦς ἔκτειναν  
 hoí **meu** boûs ékteinan  
 who.M.NOM.PL me.GEN cow.ACC.PL kill.3PL.AOR  
 '... who have slain my cows ...' (Homer, *Odyssey* 12.379)
- (415) οἱ μευ πατέρ' ἀμφεπένοντο  
 hoí **meu** patér' amphépénonto  
 who.M.NOM.PL me.GEN father.ACC.SG serve.3PL.IMP.PASS  
 '... who waited on my father' (Homer, *Odyssey* 15.467)



## 2.4 Genitives

- (416) καί σευ φίλα γούναθ' ἰκάνω  
 kaí **seu** philá góunath' hikánō  
 and you.GEN dear.N.ACC.PL knee.N.ACC.PL come.1SG.PRS  
 'I am come to your dear knees.' (Homer, *Odyssey* 13.231)
- (417) τῷ κέ σφεων γούνατ' ἔλυσα  
 tōi ké **spheōn** góunat' élusa  
 thus IRR them.GEN knee.ACC.PL loose.1SG.AOR  
 'So should I have loosened the knees of many of them.' (Homer, *Odyssey* 24.381)
- First, preposed genitives often occupy the second position in the clause after all. For *moi* and *toi* I refer you to examples 418–420.
- (418) μαρτυρέει δέ μοι τῇ γνώμῃ καὶ Ὅμηρου ἔπος  
 marturéei dé **moi** tēi gnómēi kaì Homērou  
 testify.3SG.PRS then me.DAT the.F.DAT.SG opinion.DAT.SG also Homer.GEN  
 épos  
 word.NOM.SG  
 'A verse of Homer also supports my opinion.' (Herodotus 4.29.1)
- (419) ὅς τοι τὸν πατέρα δωρήσατο  
 hós **toi** tòn patéra dōrésato  
 who.M.NOM.SG you.DAT the.M.ACC.SG father.ACC.SG present.3SG.AOR.MID  
 '... who presented to your father ...' (Herodotus 7.27.2)
- (420) ἥ μοι μητρὶ μὲν θανεῖν μόνη μετὰίτιος  
 hé **moi** mētri mèn thaneîn mónē  
 where me.DAT mother.DAT then die.AOR.INF alone.F.NOM.SG  
 metaitios  
 guilty.F.ACC.SG  
 '... when she alone (is) to blame for my mother's death' (Sophocles, *Women of Trachis* 1233)

For the actual genitive forms see example 223 above and examples 421–446 below, which of course do not come close to being an exhaustive list of attestations.

---

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *edōrésato* for *dōrésato*.

## 2 Translation

- (421) λαίμῃ δέ σευ τὸ χεῖλος  
 laimâi dé seu tò kheĩlos  
 hunger.3SG.PRS then you.GEN the.N.NOM.SG lip.NOM.SG  
 ‘Your lips are hungry.’ (Hipponax Fragment 76)
- (422) λάβετε μευ θαιμάτια  
 lábeté meu thaimátia  
 take.2PL.AOR.IMPER me.GEN the=garment.ACC.PL  
 ‘Take my clothes.’ (Hipponax Fragment 83)
- (423) ἔχεις δέ μευ τὸν ἀδελφεόν  
 ékheis dé meu tòn adelpheón  
 have.2SG.PRS then me.GEN the.M.ACC.SG brother.ACC.SG  
 ‘You have my brother with you.’ (Herodotus 4.80.3)
- (424) κύ δέ μευ συμβουλίην ἔνδεξαι  
 sù dé meu sumbouliēn éndexai  
 you.NOM then me.GEN advice.ACC.SG accept.2SG.AOR.IMPER.MID  
 ‘But take my advice.’ (Herodotus 7.51.1)
- (425) ὥς σου συμφορὰς οἰκτίρομεν  
 hós sou sumphoràs oiktíromen  
 how you.GEN mishap.ACC.PL pity.1PL.PRS  
 ‘How we pity your misfortune.’ (Euripides, *Medea* 1233)
- (426) ἥ μου τὰς τύχας ὥχει μόνη  
 hé mou tàs túkhas ókhei  
 which.F.NOM.SG me.GEN the.F.ACC.PL fortune.ACC.PL sustain.3SG.IMP  
 mónē  
 alone.F.NOM.SG  
 ‘... which alone sustained my fortunes ...’ (Euripides, *Helen* 277)
- (427) ἔθιγέ μου φρενῶν  
 éthigé mou phrenôn  
 touch.3SG.AOR me.GEN midriff.GEN.PL  
 ‘It touches my heart.’ (Euripides, *Suppliants* 1162)
- (428) κύ μου τὸ δεινὸν καὶ διαφθαρὲν φρενῶν ἵσχναινε  
 sù mou tò deinòn kai  
 you.NOM me.GEN the.N.ACC.SG terrible.N.ACC.SG and

## 2.4 Genitives

diaphtharèn                      phrenôn              ískhnaine  
corrupt.PTCP.AOR.PASS.N.ACC.SG   midriff.GEN.PL   reduce.2SG.PRS.IMPER  
'It is for you to calm the terrors and distorted fancies of my brain.'  
(Euripides, *Orestes* 297)

- (429) κυνοκοπήσῃ σου τὸ νῶτον  
kunokopēsō sou tò nōton  
dog.whip.1SG.FUT you.GEN the.N.ACC.SG back.ACC.SG  
'I will beat your back like a dog.' (Aristophanes, *Knights* 289)
- (430) ἀπονυχιῶ σου τὰν πρυτανείῳ σιτία  
aponukhiō sou tan prutaneíō sitía  
clip.1SG.PL you.GEN the=in court.DAT.SG loaf.ACC.PL  
'I will cut off your meals at the town hall.' (Aristophanes, *Knights* 709)
- (431) ἀλώλεσάς μου τὴν τέχνην καὶ τὸν βίον  
apōlesás mou tēn tékhnēn kai tòn  
destroy.2SG.AOR me.GEN the.F.ACC.SG craft.ACC.SG and the.M.ACC.SG  
bion  
living.ACC.SG  
'You have ruined my business and my livelihood.' (Aristophanes, *Peace* 1212)
- (432) καλῶς γέ μου τὸν υἱὸν ὃ Στιλβωνίδη [...] οὐκ ἔκυσας  
kalōs gé mou tòn huiōn ô Stilbōnídē ouk  
beautifully even me.GEN the.M.ACC.SG son.ACC O Stilbonides.VOC not  
ékusas  
kiss.2SG.AOR  
'Stilbonides, you kindly did not even kiss my son.' (Aristophanes, *Birds* 139)
- (433) ὀρχουμένης μου τῆς γυναικὸς ἐσπέρας ἢ βάλανος ἐκπέπτωκεν  
orkhouménēs mou tēs gunaikòs  
dance.PTCP.PRS.PASS.F.GEN.SG me.GEN the.F.GEN.SG woman.GEN.SG  
hespēras hē bālanos ekpéptōken  
evening.GEN.SG the.F.NOM.SG clasp.NOM.SG fall.out.3SG.PRF  
'The clasp fell off one night while my wife was dancing.' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 409)
- (434) διττοὺς μου τοὺς κατηγοροὺς γεγονέναι

## 2 Translation

- dittoús                    **mou**    toùs                    katēgōrous    gegonénai  
double.M.ACC.PL me.GEN the.M.ACC.PL accuser.ACC.PL become.INF.PRF  
'My accusers are twofold.' (Plato, *Apology* 18d)
- (435) εἰ μὲν σου τὸ υἱέε πῶλῳ ἢ μόσχῳ ἐγενέσθην  
ei mén **sou**        tò                    huiée            pólō            è    móskhō  
if then you.GEN the.M.NOM.DU son.NOM.DU foal.NOM.DU or calf.NOM.DU  
egenésthēn  
become.3DU.AOR.MID  
'If your two sons had been born foals or calves...' (Plato, *Apology* 20a)
- (436) καταψέσας οὖν μου τὴν κεφαλὴν  
katapsésas                    oûn **mou**    tēn                    kephalēn  
stroke.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG so    me.GEN the.F.ACC.SG head.ACC.SG  
'So, stroking my head ...' (Plato, *Phaedo* 89b)
- (437) ἐβίασέ μου τὴν γυναῖκα  
ebíasé                    **mou**    tēn                    gunaika  
force.3SG.AOR me.GEN the.F.ACC.SG woman.ACC.SG  
'He has violated my wife.' (Alcaeus, Comic Fragment 29; Kock (1880))
- (438) ἀφομοιοῖ γάρ μου τὴν φύσιν τοῖς Σειρήσιν  
aphomoioî gár **mou**    tēn                    phúsin            toîs  
liken.3SG.PRS then me.GEN the.F.ACC.SG nature.ACC.SG the.M.DAT.PL  
Seirêsin  
Siren.DAT.PL  
'For he likens my nature to the Sirens.' (Aeschines 3.228)
- (439) τί μευ μέλαν ἐκ χροὸς αἷμα [...] πέπωκας  
tí                    **meu**    mélan                    ek khroòs            haîma  
what.ACC.SG me.GEN black.N.ACC.SG out skin.GEN.SG blood.ACC.SG  
pépōkas  
drink.2SG.PRF  
'Why have you drunk the dark blood from under my skin?' (Theocritus 2.55)
- (440) φράζέό μευ τὸν ἔρωθ' ὅθεν ἵκετο

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *hueî* for *huiée*.

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *taîs* for *toîs*.

## 2.4 Genitives

phrázeó                      **meu**      tòn                      érōth'                      hóthen  
 tell.2SG.PRS.IMPER.PASS me.GEN the.M.ACC.SG love.M.ACC.SG whence  
 híketo  
 come.3SG.AOR.MID  
 'Tell me whence my love has come.' (Theocritus 2.69)

- (441) τόν μευ τὰν κύριγγα πρόαν κλέψαντα Κομάταν  
 tón                      **meu**      τὰν                      súringa      próan  
 the.M.ACC.SG me.GEN the.F.ACC.SG pipe.ACC.SG lately  
 klépsanta                      Komátan  
 steal.PTCP.AOR.M.ACC.SG Comatas.ACC  
 '... Comatas, who has just stolen my pipes.' (Theocritus 5.4)

- (442) οὗ τευ τὰν κύριγγα λαθὼν ἔκλεψε Κομάτας  
 οὗ **teu**      τὰν                      súringa      lathòn  
 not you.GEN the.F.ACC.SG pipes.ACC.SG hide.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 éklepse                      Komátas  
 steal.AOR.3SG Comatas.NOM  
 'Comatas has not stolen your pipes unnoticed.' (Theocritus 5.19)

- (443) καλὰ δέ μευ ἅ μία κόρα  
 kalà                      dé **meu**      ha                      μία                      kóra  
 beautiful.F.NOM.SG then me.GEN the.F.NOM.SG one.F.NOM.SG girl.NOM.SG  
 'And beautiful is my one girl.' (Theocritus 6.36)

- (444) τί μευ τὸ χιτώνιον ἄρδεις  
 tí                      **meu**      τὸ                      khitónion      árdeis  
 what.ACC me.GEN the.N.ACC.SG frock.ACC.SG water.2SG.PRS  
 'Why are you wetting my frock?' (Theocritus 15.31)

[p364]

- (445) δίχα μευ τὸ θέριςτριον ἤδη ἔσχιται  
 díkha **meu**      τὸ                      théristrion                      édē      éskhistai  
 apart me.GEN the.N.NOM.SG garment.N.NOM.SG already split.3SG.PRF.PASS  
 'My garment is already torn apart.' (Theocritus 15.69)
- (446) οἱ δέ σφῶν κατὰ πρύμναν αἰείραντες μέγα κῦμα  
 hoi                      dé **spheōn**      katà      prýmnan      aeíranτες      μέγα      κῦμα  
 the.M.NOM.SG then them.GEN down stern.ACC raise.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.P

## 2 Translation

méga kûma  
great.N.ACC.SG billow.ACC.SG  
'And they, raising a great billow along their stern ...' (Theocritus 22.10)

The influence of our positional law can be seen even more decisively in the striking examples in which the preceding pronominal genitive is separated from its governing noun by other words. This can be seen in the *toi* of 447; compare Meineke's (1856: 256) comments.

- (447) ὥς τοι ἐγὼν ἐνόμειον ἀν' ὄρεα τὰς καλὰς αἰγὰς φωνᾶς εἰσαΐων  
hós **toi** egōn enómeuon an' órea tàs  
as you.DAT I.NOM pasture.1SG.IMP on mountain.ACC.PL the.F.ACC.PL  
kalàs aîgas phōnâs eisaïōn  
beautiful.F.ACC.PL goat.ACC.PL sound.GEN.SG hear.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
'... that I might be tending your beautiful goats on the hillside, listening to your voice ...' (Theocritus 7.87)

Furthermore, in the examples of the genitive in this category in Homer, the genitive is regularly in second position: 448, where the position of the pronoun is particularly remarkable; 449–453. (Only 454, in which *meu* stands in third position, constitutes a counterexample, and not a very serious one at that.)

- (448) ἀλλὰ σευ ἢ κάματος πολυᾷξ γυῖα δέδουκεν ἢ νύ σέ που δέος ἴσχει  
allá **seu** è kámatos poluâix guîa  
but you.GEN or weariness.NOM.SG much.rushing.M.NOM.SG limb.ACC.PL  
déduken é nú sé pou déos ískhei  
enter.3SG.PRF or now you.ACC somewhere fear.NOM.SG hold.3SG.PRS  
'Yet either weariness born of your many onsets has entered into your limbs, or perhaps terror possesses you.' (Homer, *Iliad* 5.811)
- (449) μόγις δέ μευ ἔκφυγεν ὀρμήν  
mógis dé **meu** ékphugen hormén  
hardly then me.GEN escape.3SG.AOR onslaught.ACC.SG  
'And hardly did he escape my onset.' (Homer, *Iliad* 9.355)
- (450) νῦν δέ σευ ὠνοκάμην πάγχυ φρένας  
nûn dé **seu** ōnosámēn pánkhu phrénas  
now then you.GEN scorn.1SG.AOR.MID wholly midriff.ACC.PL  
'But now have I altogether scorn of your wits.' (Homer, *Iliad* 14.95; cf. also 17.173)

## 2.4 Genitives

- (451) χαίρω σευ Λαερτιάδη τὸν μῦθον ἀκούσας  
 khairō            **seu**        Laertiádē                    tòn  
 rejoice.1SG.PRS you.GEN Laertes.PATRON.VOC.SG the.M.ACC.SG  
 mûthon        akóusas  
 myth.ACC.SG hear.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘Glad am I, son of Laertes, to hear your words.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 19.185)
- (452) θεὰ δέ μευ ἔκλυεν αὐδῆς  
 theà                    dé **meu**        ékluen                    audès  
 goddess.NOM.SG then me.GEN hear.3SG.AOR voice.GEN.SG  
 ‘And the goddess heard my voice.’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 10.311)
- (453) οἱ μευ φθινύθουσι φίλον κῆρ  
 hoí                    **meu**        phthinúthousi phílon                    kêr  
 who.M.NOM.PL me.GEN waste.3PL.PRS dear.N.ACC.SG heart.ACC.SG  
 ‘... who make my poor heart to pine.’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 10.485)
- (454) ἦ μάλα μευ καταδάπτει ἀκούοντος φίλον ἦτορ  
 ê                    mála **meu**        katadáptet’                    akóuontos  
 in.truth greatly me.GEN devour.2PL.PRS hear.PTCP.PRS.M.GEN.SG  
 phílon                    êtor  
 dear.N.ACC.SG heart.N.ACC.SG  
 ‘Truly you rend my poor heart, as I hear your words.’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 16.92)

And in the late authors a pronominal genitive separated from its noun also takes second position, if not regularly then at least very frequently: examples 220, 225–226, 270 and 292 above, and 455–465 below (cf. also Menander Fragment 498).

- (455) πρίν σου κατὰ πάντα δαῖναι ἥθεα  
 prín **sou**        katà pánta        daênai                    êthea  
 before you.GEN down all.N.ACC.PL learn.AOR.INF custom.ACC.PL  
 ‘... before learning in accordance with all your customs.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 969)
- (456) μή μου κατείπης σὺ κασιγνήτῳ πόσιν  
 mé **mou**        kateípeis                    sôí                    kasignétôi  
 not me.GEN denounce.2SG.AOR.SBJV your.M.DAT.SG brother.DAT.SG

## 2 Translation

pósin

husband.ACC

‘Do not tell your brother that my husband ...’ (Euripides, *Helen* 898)

(457) οὐδέ σου συνῆψε χεῖρα

oudé **sou** sunêpse kheíra

nor you.GEN bind.3SG.AOR hand.ACC.SG

‘But did he not tie your hand?’ (Euripides, *Bacchae* 615)

(458) ἐμπλήσθητί μου πίων κελαινὸν αἷμα

emplésthēti **mou** piōn

fill.up.2SG.AOR.IMPER.PASS me.GEN drink.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG

kelainòn haîma

dark.N.ACC.SG blood.ACC.SG

‘Have your fill drinking my dark blood.’ (Euripides Fragment 687.1)

(459) οἶμοι, δράκων μου γίνεται τὸ ἥμισυ

oímoi, drákōn **mou** gígnetai tò

ah.me dragon.NOM.SG me.GEN become.3SG.PRS.PASS the.N.NOM.SG

hémisu

half.NOM.SG

‘Woe is me; half of me is becoming a dragon.’ (Euripides Fragment 930)

(460) ἐξαρπάσομαί σου τοῖς ὄνυξι τάντερα

exarpásomai **sou** toîs ónuxi tántera

tear.out.1SG.FUT.MID you.GEN the.M.DAT.PL nail.DAT.PL the=gut.ACC.PL

‘I will tear out your guts with my nails.’ (Aristophanes, *Knights* 708)

(461) εἴθε σου εἶναι ὥφελεν, ὃ λαζών, οὕτωςι θερμὸς ὁ πλευμὼν

eíthe **sou** eînai óphelen, ô lazōn,

if.only you.GEN be.PRS.INF owe.3SG.AOR O kick.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG

houtōsì thermòs ho pleumōn

so hot.M.NOM.SG the.M.NOM.SG lung.NOM.SG

‘You trouble-maker, if only your lungs could get this hot.’ (Aristophanes, *Peace* 1068)

(462) οἷς μου κατέφαγεν τὰ φορτία

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *kheire* for *kheira*.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *ôlazōn*, with crasis.



## 2.4 Genitives

hoîs                mou    katéphages    tà                phortía  
 which.M.DAT.PL me.GEN eat.up.2SG.AOR the.N.ACC.PL ware.ACC.PL  
 ‘... with which you ate up my wares.’ (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 573)

- (463) ἕως ἄν σου βάρος ἐν τοῖς σκέλεσι  
 héōs án sou báros en toîs skélesi  
 until IRR you.GEN weight.NOM.SG in the.N.DAT.PL leg.DAT.PL  
 génētai  
 become.3SG.AOR.SBJV.MID  
 ‘... until your legs feel heavy.’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 117a)

- (464) ὥς μευ περὶ θυμὸς ἰάφθη  
 hós meυ peri thumòs iáphthē  
 so me.GEN around spirit.NOM.SG wound.3SG.AOR.PASS  
 ‘So all my heart was fired.’ (Theocritus 2.82)

- (465) εἰ μευ καλὰ πέλει τὰ μελύδρια  
 eí meυ kalà pélei tà  
 if me.GEN beautiful.N.NOM.PL become.3SG.PRS the.N.NOM.PL  
 melúdria  
 song.DIM.NOM.PL  
 ‘If my little songs prove beautiful ...’ (Bion 7.2)

We have seen something very similar with the genitive *hoi* (see above p24f). And just as this word can occur in the middle of the governing phrase, i.e. after the first word, so also can the forms to be discussed here. For instance: a) Following a particle, 466–472. [p365]

- (466) οἱ δέ μευ πάντες ὀδόντες ἐντὸς ἐν γνάθοις κεινέαται  
 hoi dé meυ pántes odóntes entòs en  
 the.M.NOM.PL then me.GEN all.M.NOM.PL tooth.NOM.PL inside in  
 gnáthois kekinéatai  
 jaw.DAT.PL move.3PL.PRF.PASS  
 ‘And all the teeth inside my jaw have been moved.’ (Hipponax Fragment 62)

- (467) αἱ δέ μευ φρένες ἐκκεκωφέαται  
 hai dé meυ phrénes ekkkekōphéatai  
 the.F.NOM.PL then me.GEN midriff.NOM.PL deafen.3PL.PRF.PASS  
 ‘And my wits have been dulled.’ (Anacreon Fragment 81)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *moi* for *meu*.

## 2 Translation

- (468) αἱ γάρ cφι κάμηλοι ἵππων οὐκ ἔσσονές [...] εἰσιν  
 hai gár **sphi** kámēloi híppōn ouk  
 the.F.NOM.PL then them.DAT camel.NOM.PL horse.GEN.PL not  
 éssonés eisin  
 inferior.F.NOM.PL be.3PL.PRS  
 ‘For their camels are not inferior to horses.’ (Herodotus 3.102.3)
- (469) τῶν δέ cφι γυναικῶν τοὺς μαζοὺς ἀποταμοῦσα  
 tōn dé **sphi** gunaikōn toùs mazoùs  
 the.F.GEN.PL then them.DAT woman.GEN.PL the.M.ACC.PL breast.ACC.PL  
 apotamoûsa  
 cut.off.PTCP.AOR.F.NOM.SG  
 ‘And, cutting off the breasts of their women ...’ (Herodotus 4.202.1)
- (470) οἱ τέ cφεων ὁπέωνες [...] ἀπεκεκληίατο  
 hoí té **spheōn** opéōnes apekekklēiato  
 the.M.NOM.PL and them.GEN follower.NOM.PL exclude.3PL.PLUP.PASS  
 ‘And their followers had been cut off.’ (Herodotus 9.50.1)
- (471) τοὔτο γέ τοί σου τοῦργον ἀληθῶς γενναῖον καὶ φιλόδημον  
 toûtó gé toí **sou** tōurgon alēthōs  
 this.N.NOM.SG even lo you.GEN the=work.NOM.SG truly  
 gennaïon kaì philódēmon  
 noble.N.NOM.SG and popular.N.NOM.SG  
 ‘Well, this deed of yours at least is truly noble and democratic.’  
 (Aristophanes, *Knights* 787)
- (472) ταὶ δέ μοι αἶγες βόσκονται κατ’ ὄρος  
 taì dé **moi** aîges bóskontai kat’  
 the.F.NOM.PL then me.DAT goat.NOM.PL feed.3PL.PRES.PASS down  
 óros  
 mountain.ACC.SG  
 ‘And my goats are grazing on the hillside.’ (Theocritus 3.1)

(See also examples 338, 343 and 368 with *moi*, presented above on p92 and p98.)

b) Immediately following an article or preposition: 473. Identical is the Cypriot example 474, which Hoffmann (1891: 323) describes as “very peculiar”, while Meister (1889: 139–140) even felt compelled to construct a new word *homóipo-*

## 2.4 Genitives

sis “fellow husband”.<sup>2</sup>

- (473) *cù dé, ὃ βασιλεῦ, ἐμὲ ἐς τόδε ἡλικίης ἤκοντα οἰκτίρας, τῶν μοι παίδων  
παράλυσον ἕνα τῆς στρατιῆς*  
*sù dé, ô basileû, emè es tóde hēlikíēs*  
 you.NOM then O king.VOC me.ACC into this.N.ACC.SG age.GEN.SG  
*hékonta oiktíras, tòn moi*  
 arrive.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG pity.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG the.M.GEN.PL me.DAT  
*paídōn parályson hēna tēs*  
 child.GEN.PL release.2SG.AOR.IMPER one.M.ACC.SG the.F.GEN.SG  
*stratiēs*  
 service.GEN.SG  
 ‘And you, O king, pitying me in my advanced age, release one of my  
 sons from service.’ (Herodotus 7.38.3)

- (474) *ὁ μοι πόσις Ὀνασίτιμος*  
*ó moi pósis Onasítimos*  
 the.M.NOM.SG me.DAT husband.NOM.SG Onasitimos  
 ‘My husband (is) Onasitimus.’ (Deecke 1884: no. 26)

In addition, from the Attic poets we have examples 475–478. Cf. 479. Other than at the beginning of the clause, however, *mou* etc. are inserted in this way only extremely rarely, and in the examples where it happens, such as 480, we can assume that the insertion that occurred at the start of the clause was mirrored later in the clause.

- (475) *διά μου κεφαλᾶς φλόξ οὐρανία βαίη*  
*diá mou kephalās phlòx ouranía*  
 through me.GEN head.GEN.SG flame.NOM.SG heavenly.F.NOM.SG  
*baíē*  
 pass.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘May fire from heaven strike through my head.’ (Euripides, *Medea* 144)
- (476) *διά μου κεφαλᾶς ἄϊσσοις ὀδύναι*  
*diá mou kephalās áïssous’ odúnai*  
 through me.GEN head.GEN.SG dart.3PL.PRS pain.NOM.PL  
 ‘Pains dart through my head.’ (Euripides, *Hippolytus* 1351)

<sup>2</sup> At the request of Dr. Meister I should comment here that because of Wilamowitz’s (1889) observation on Euripides, *Heracleidae* 626 (example 408; see above p105) he became aware of the right reading of these words some time ago and intended to publicly withdraw his earlier explanation.

## 2 Translation

- (477) εἷς μου λόγος σοι πάντα σημαίνει τάδε  
 heís                **mou**      lógos                soi      pánta  
 one.M.NOM.SG me.GEN account.NOM.SG you.DAT all.N.ACC.PL  
 sēmaneî      táde  
 signify.3SG.FU this.N.ACC.PL  
 ‘One account from me will tell you all these things.’ (Euripides, *Heracleidae* 799)
- (478) ὦ σκυτοτόμε, τῆς μου γυναικὸς τοὺς πόδας  
 ô skutotóme, tês                **mou**      gunaikòs      toùs  
 O cobbler.VOC the.F.GEN.SG me.GEN woman.GEN.SG the.M.ACC.PL  
 pódas  
 foot.ACC.PL  
 ‘Cobbler, my wife’s feet ...’ (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 416)
- (479) τό μευ νάκος ἐχθὲς ἔκλεψεν  
 tó                **meu**      nákos      ekhthès      éklepsen  
 the.N.ACC.SG me.GEN fleece.ACC yesterday steal.3SG.AOR  
 ‘He stole my fleece yesterday.’ (Theocritus 5.2)
- (480) δείσαα γὰρ εἰς τὴν κάτω μου κοιλίαν καθεῖρπυεν  
 deísasa                                gār eis tèn                kátō                **mou**  
 fear.PTCP.AOR.F.NOM.SG then into the.F.ACC.SG downwards me.GEN  
 koilían      katheírupsen  
 belly.ACC.SG creep.3SG.AOR  
 ‘For, taking fright, it crept down into my bowels.’ (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 485)

I will not here investigate the position of the barytonic, hence originally enclitic, plural forms *hēmōn*, *hēmin* (1PL) etc., due to the difficulty of distinguishing them from genuinely orthotonic forms (but see example 481, just like *m’ anéthēken* ‘me.ACC dedicate’ otherwise, and [p366] 482); however, I would like to reiterate that, according to the evidence provided by Krüger (1871), to whose incisive categorization we owe the finer laws for the positioning of these genitives, *autoû*, *autês*, *autôn* ‘self/same’ with anaphoric meaning follow the same positional rules as *mou*.

- (481) [Ἐρ]μησιάνναξ ἦμας ἀνέθηκεν [ὁ ...]

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *toû podòs* for *toùs pódas*.

## 2.4 Genitives

[Her]mēsiánax **hēmeas** anéthēken [ho ...]  
 Hermesianax us.ACC dedicate.3SG.AOR the.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘Hermesianax the ... dedicated us.’ (IGA 486, Miletus)

- (482) ἔγραφε δ’ ἅμῃ Ἀρχῶν Ἠμοιβίχου  
 égraphe d’ **hāme** Árkhōn Hamoibíkhōu  
 write.3SG.IMP then us.ACC ruler.NOM.SG Hamoibikhos.GEN  
 ‘And the governor of Hamoibikhos inscribed us.’ (IGA 482a.5, Elephantine)

It is true that this does not hold for Homer, for whom the anaphoric meaning and the loss of tone on *autoû* are in their early stages, and who therefore also places it far from the start of the sentence even in places where we would render it with *eius* (3SG.GEN), as in 483, 484 (in *Odyssey* 7.263, on the other hand, the same expression contains emphasis on *autês*), and 485, which provides very valuable indirect proof of our positional rule. However, the Attic poets place *autoû*, *autês*, *autôn* before their governing nouns just as freely as *mou*, and then, just like *mou*, it is often near to the start of the clause, e.g. 486, 487, and 488. Similarly, αὐτοῦ, like μου, is also found preceding its noun such that the two are separated by one or more words, and in this case, like μου, it freely occurs in second position, e.g. 489.

- (483) ἄνυσις δ’ οὐκ ἔσsetai αὐτῶν  
 ánusis d’ ouk éssetai **autôn**  
 accomplishment.NOM.SG then not be.3SG.FUT.MID them.GEN  
 ‘Yet no accomplishment shall come therefrom.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 2.347)

- (484) δὴ γὰρ νόος ἐτράpet’ αὐτοῦ  
 dè gàr nóos etrápet’ **autoû**  
 exactly then mind.NOM.SG turn.3SG.AOR.MID him.GEN  
 ‘For lo, his mind was turned.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.546)

- (485) γόνος δ’ οὐ γίγnetai αὐτῶν  
 gónos d’ ou gígnetai **autôn**  
 offspring.NOM.SG then not become.3SG.PRS them.GEN  
 ‘And these bear no young.’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 12.130)

- (486) ἐθαύμαsé τε αὐτοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν  
 ethaúmasé te **autoû** tèn diánoian  
 wonder.3SG.AOR and him.GEN the.F.ACC.SG intention.ACC.SG  
 ‘And he approved his intention.’ (Thucydides 1.138.1)

## 2 Translation

- (487) καὶ αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν ἐμμείνας τῷ στρατῷ ἐδήρου  
 kai **autôn** tèn khōran emmeínas  
 and them.GEN the.F.ACC.SG land.ACC.SG abide.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 tōi stratōi edéiou  
 the.M.DAT.SG army.ACC.SG ravage.3SG.IMP  
 ‘And standing firm, he ravaged their land with his army.’ (Thucydides 4.109.5)

- (488) ἐγκωμιάζεις μὲν αὐτοῦ τὴν τέχνην  
 enkōmiázεις mèn **autoû** tèn tékhnēn  
 extol.2SG.PRS then him.GEN the.F.ACC.SG craft.ACC.SG  
 ‘You simply extol his art.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 448e)

- (489) ἐπεὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν γῆς ἀπηλλάχθη πατήρ  
 epēi gàr **autôn** gēs apēllákhthē patēr  
 when then them.GEN earth.GEN.SG deliver.3SG.AOR.PASS father.NOM.SG  
 ‘For when their father was released from this world ...’ (Euripides, *Heracleidae* 12)

Finally, anyone who looks at the Herodotan examples adduced by Stein (1866: 142) on 6.30.1, in which *autoû* stands between the article and the noun, will find *autoû* in second position in all of them (and also in 1.146.2, 1.177.1, 2.149.19, and 7.129.1), including 490 – just as with intervening *moi* and *mou*. The Attic poets are freer: 491–492. Perhaps it is relevant for the *autoû* in Isocrates, as for the *mou* in example 480 above (see p118), that the genitive is attached not to the article but to an adjective.

- (490) Μεγαρέας τε τοὺς ἐν Σικελίῃ, ὥς [...] προεχώρησαν, τοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν  
 παχέας [...] πολίτας ἐποίησε  
 Megaréas te toûs en Sikeliēi, hōs prosekhōrēsan,  
 Megarian.M.ACC.PL and the.M.ACC.PL in Sicily.DAT as surrender.3PL.AOR  
 toûs mèn **autôn** pakhéas poliétas epoiēse  
 the.M.ACC.PL then them.GEN thick.M.ACC.PL citizen.ACC.PL make.3SG.AOR  
 ‘When they surrendered he made the Megarians in Sicily, the wealthiest of them, citizens.’ (Herodotus 7.156.2)

- (491) γνώσεσθε τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ πονηρίαν  
 gnōsesthe tèn állēn **autoû**  
 know.2PL.FUT.MID the.F.ACC.SG other.F.ACC.SG him.GEN

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

ponērian

wickedness.ACC.SG

‘You will recognize his other wickedness.’ (Isocrates 18.52)

- (492) ὅπως [...] αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ αὐτῶν στρατιῶται ἐκπλεύσειαν  
 hópōs autoì kaì hoi **autôn** stratiôtai  
 so they.NOM and the.M.NOM.PL them.GEN soldier.NOM.PL  
 ekpleúseian  
 sail.away.3PL.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... so that they and their soldiers could sail away ...’ (Xenophon,  
*Anabasis* 6.2.14)

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

Bergaigne (1877: 177-178) assumes that the positional law for enclitic personal pronouns laid out in sections 2.2–2.4 originated with the [p367] anaphoric pronouns; there was a desire to place these as close as possible to the preceding clause in order to better mark the connection between them. From the anaphoric pronouns, so the account goes, this positional rule was then extended to the pronouns of the first and second person, and, because they were placed after and attached to the first word of the clause, the affected pronouns became enclitic.

This assumption has little to recommend it, since precisely the factor that favoured the position after the beginning of the clause for *hoi* (3SG.DAT) and *sphin* ‘them.DAT’ according to Bergaigne – the connection to the preceding clause – is absent for *moi* ‘me.DAT’ and *mou* ‘me.GEN’. On the other hand, the possibility, rejected by Bergaigne, that “the language became accustomed to place them after the first word because they were devoid of accent” is proven to be true by the fact that enclitics other than personal pronouns were also subject to this positional rule. Kühner (1869: 268, note 8) has already observed that “with the free word order of the Greek language it is no wonder that enclitics are often attached not to the word to which they belong but to another to which they do not belong”. Kühner does not discuss the direction in which these deviations go, but many examples that he presents in that section can be resolved by our positional rule.

Among the declinable enclitics, the indefinite pronoun should now be considered. It is very clear that the positional rule did not apply to this pronoun: if it seems significant that the archaic forms *tou* ‘someone.GEN’ and *tōi* ‘someone.DAT’, with the exception of 493, occur only immediately following *ei* or *eán*

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition places *gnôsesthe* after *ponērian*.

## 2 Translation

'if' (cf. the examples in Meisterhans (1888: 123, note 1106)), it is sufficient to point to Thucydides, who shows these forms in all kinds of positions in the clause.

- (493) [...] ἔχοντός του  
 ékhontós **tu**  
 have.PTCP.PRS.M/N.GEN.SG someone.GEN  
 (CIA. 4.61a.15)

Nevertheless, the tendency in Homer to place *tis* initially is unmistakable. Other than *hóstitis* and related forms, one should look at *ei tis* and *mē tis*, particularly the following examples: in separation from the governing noun, 494–499.

- (494) εἰ δέ τευ ἐξ ἄλλου γε θεῶν  
 ei dé teu ex álloú ge theôn  
 if then some.M.GEN.SG out other.M.GEN.SG even god.GEN.PL  
 ‘But (were you born) of any other god ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 5.897)

- (495) ἵνα τις στυγέῃσι καὶ ἄλλος  
hína tis stugéēsi kai állos  
that some.M.NOM.SG hate.3SG.PRS.SBJV also other.M.NOM.SG  
‘... that so others may dread to ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 8.515)

[p368]

- (496) εἴ περ τί σε κῆδος ἰκάνει  
 eí pér tí se kēdos hikánei  
 if all some.N.NOM.SG you.ACC grief.N.NOM.SG come.3SG.PRS  
 ‘... if in any wise grief for your kin cometh upon thee.’ (Homer, *Iliad*  
 13.464; also preceding the enclitic *se*!)

- (497) ἦ τευ σῆμα βροτοῖο πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος  
 é teu sêma brotoîo pálai  
 or some.M.GEN.SG sign.NOM.SG mortal.GEN.SG long.ago  
 katatethnêôtos  
 die.PTCP.PRF.M.GEN.SG  
 ‘Haply (it is) a monument of some man long ago dead’ (Homer, *Iliad*  
 23.331)

- (498) [...] ὥς ὑμεῖς παρ' ἐμεῖο θοὴν ἐπὶ νῆα κίοιτε ὥς τέ τευ ἢ παρὰ πάμπαν  
ἀνείμονος ἢ ἐπενιχροῦ



## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

hōs humeîs par' emeîo thoèn epì nêa  
 that you.NOM.PL from me.GEN swift.F.ACC.SG upon ship.ACC.SG  
 kíoi te hōs té teu è parà pámpan  
 go.2PL.PRS.OPT as and someone.M.GEN.SG or from altogether  
 anéimonos èè penikhroû  
 unclad.M.GEN.SG or poor.M.GEN.SG  
 '... that you should go from my house to your swift ship as from one  
 utterly without raiment or poor.' (Homer, *Odyssey* 3.347)

- (499) μηδέ τι μεσσηγύς γε κακὸν καὶ πῆμα πάθησιν  
 mēdé ti messēgús ge kakòn kaì pēma  
 nor some.N.ACC.SG meanwhile even ill.N.ACC.SG and harm.ACC.SG  
 páthēisin  
 suffer.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 'Nor shall he meanwhile suffer any evil or harm' (Homer, *Odyssey* 7.195)

With *tis* placed before a word that would otherwise be entitled to second position (cf. 496): 500–501 (cf. 502, Peppmüller (1890: 559)). Here belongs the not infrequent *hōs tís te* instead of *hōste tis* as in, for instance, 503.

- (500) καὶ τινά τοι παρ Ζηνὸς ἐπέφραδε πότνια μήτηρ  
 kaì tiná toi par Zēnòs epéphrade pótnia  
 and some.F.ACC.SG you.DAT from Zeus.GEN tell.3SG.AOR mistress.NOM.SG  
 méter  
 mother.NOM.SG  
 'and (if) your queenly mother has declared anything to you from Zeus  
 ...' (Homer, *Iliad* 16.37)
- (501) ὅτε τίς κε θάνῃσι  
 hóte tís ke thánēisi  
 when someone.M.NOM.SG IRR die.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 '... whenever someone dies.' (Homer, *Odyssey* 11.218)
- (502) εἰ γάρ τίς κ' ἐθέλῃ  
 ei gár tís k' ethélēi  
 if then someone.M.SOM.SG IRR want.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 'For whoever wishes to ...' (Hesiod, *Works and Days* 280)

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *ê* ... *ēdē*.

## 2 Translation

- (503) βῆ δ' ἰέναι ὥς τις τε λέων ἀπὸ μεσσηύλοιο  
 bê d' iénai hós tis te léōn apò  
 pass.3SG.AOR then go.PRS.INF as some.M.NOM.SG and lion.NOM.SG of  
 messauíoio  
 court.GEN.SG  
 '...but (he) went his way as a lion from a steading' (Homer, *Iliad* 17.657)

Examples in the first category can also be adduced from the later period (Kühner 1870: 572, note 6): 504–527; in addition, 528, in which the attachment of *tis* to the vocative is also noteworthy, cf. the comments above p41 on example 87.

- (504) οὐδέ τις ἡμῖν αἷτιος ἀθανάτων  
 oude tis hēmīn aítios athanátōn  
 nor someone.M.NOM.SG us.DAT guilty.M.NOM.SG immortal.GEN.PL  
 'Nor is one of the immortals guilty towards us.' (Theognis, *Elegies* 833)
- (505) εἴ τι παθὼν ἀπ' ἐμεῦ ἀγαθὸν μέγα μὴ χάριν οἶδας  
 eí ti pathōn ap' emēū  
 if something.ACC.SG suffer.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG of me.GEN  
 agathōn méga mē khárin oídas  
 good.N.ACC.SG great.N.ACC.SG not grace.ACC know.2SG.PRF  
 'If, receiving some great good from me, you know no gratitude ...'  
 (Theognis, *Elegies* 957)
- (506) ἀλλὰ τί μοι ζῶντι γένοιτ' ἀγαθόν  
 allá tí moi zōnti  
 but something.NOM.SG me.DAT live.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG  
 génoit' agathón  
 become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID good.N.NOM.SG  
 'Rather, let some good come to me while I live.' (Theognis, *Elegies* 1192)
- (507) οὐδέ τις ἀντ' ἀγαθῶν ἐστι χάρις παρὰ σοί  
 oude tis ant' agathōn esti kháris  
 nor some.F.NOM.SG against good.N.GEN.PL be.3SG.PRS grace.NOM.SG  
 parà soi  
 from you.DAT  
 'Yet there is not any gratitude from you for good things.' (Theognis, *Elegies* 1264)
- (508) οὐπω τις Ἀκταίων ἄθηρος ἡμέρα [...] ἔπεμψεν ἐς δόμους

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

οὐπό τις Aktaíōn' áthēros hēméra  
not.yet some.F.NOM.SG Actaeon.ACC beastless.F.NOM.SG day.NOM.SG  
épempsen es dómous  
send.3SG.AOR into house.ACC.PL  
'No day has yet sent Actaeon home without game.' (Aeschylus Fragment 241)

- (509) οὐ γάρ τίνα ἔγωγε οἶδα ποταμὸν Ὀκεανὸν εἶοντα  
ou gár tina égōge oída potamòn  
not then some.M.ACC.SG I.NOM.EMPH know.1SG.PRF river.ACC.SG  
Ōkeanòn eíonta  
Ocean.ACC.SG be.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG  
'For I know of no Ocean river.' (Herodotus 2.23.1)

- (510) αἰεὶ τι προσδοκῶν ἀπ' αὐτῆς τοιοῦτο ἔσεσθαι  
aiei ti prosdokôn ap' autês  
always some.N.ACC.SG expect.PTCP.M.NOM.SG of it.F.GEN.SG  
toioûto ésesthai  
such.N.ACC.SG be.FUT.INF.MID  
'... always expecting that some such thing would take place from there.'  
(Herodotus 7.235.2)

- (511) μή μοί τι δράσης παῖδ' ἀνήκεστον κακόν  
mé moi ti drásēis paíd' anékeston  
not me.DAT some.N.ACC.SG do.2SG.AOR.SBJV child.ACC.SG fatal.N.ACC.SG  
kakón  
evil.N.ACC.SG  
'... lest you should do some deadly harm to my daughter.' (Euripides, *Medea* 283)

- (512) μή τῷ λαθραίῳ τέκνα γένναίῳ τέκοι  
mé tōi lathraíōs tékna génnaíōi  
not some.M.DAT.SG secretly child.ACC.PL noble.M.DAT.SG  
tékoι  
bear.3SG.AOR.OPT  
'... lest she should secretly bear children to some nobleman.' (Euripides, *Electra* 26)

- (513) ἔστι γάρ τις ἐν δόμοις τύχη

## 2 Translation

- ésti            gár   tis                    en dómois            túkhē  
be.3SG.PRS then some.F.NOM.SG in house.DAT.PL fortune.NOM.SG  
‘For something is happening within.’ (Euripides, *Helena* 477)
- (514) εἴ τι τῶν τότε πόλιμα  
eí ti                    tōn            tóte pólisma  
if some.N.NOM.SG the.GEN.PL then town.NOM.SG  
‘If some town of that age ...’ (Thucydides 1.10.1)
- (515) καί τίς ἐστιν ἀστήρ  
kaí tíς                    estin            astér  
and who.M.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS star.NOM.SG  
‘And who is (that) star?’ (Aristophanes, *Peace* 834)
- (516) καὶ γάρ τιν’ ἐκφέρουσι τουτονὶ νεκρόν  
kai gár tin’                    ekphérousi            toutonì            nekron  
and then some.M.ACC.SG bear.out.3SG.PRS this.M.ACC.SG corpse.ACC.SG  
‘And now they’re bringing out some corpse here.’ (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 170)
- (517) μή τις ἡμῖν βασκανία περιτρέψῃ τὸν λόγον  
mé tis                    hēmīn baskanía            peritrépsēi  
not some.F.NOM.SG us.DAT sorcery.NOM.SG divert.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
tōn            lōgon  
the.M.ACC.SG account.ACC.SG  
‘... lest some sorcery disrupt our argument.’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 95b)
- (518) μή τις σοὶ ἐναντίος λόγος ἀπαντήσῃ  
mé tis                    soi            enantíos            lōgos  
not some.M.NOM.SG you.DAT opposite.M.NOM.SG account.NOM.SG  
apantēsēi  
encounter.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
‘... lest a certain counter-argument should meet you’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 101a)
- (519) καὶ τι ἔφη αὐτόθι γελοῖον παθεῖν  
kaí ti                    éphē            autóthi            geloïon  
and something.ACC.SG say.3SG.IMP just.there funny.N.ACC.SG  
patheîn  
suffer.AOR.INF  
‘And he said that just there he had a ridiculous experience.’ (Plato, *Symposium* 174e)

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

- (520) καί τις ἐστ' ἐν ἐμοὶ δύναμις  
 kaí tis est' en emoì dúnamis  
 and some.F.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS in me.DAT power.NOM.SG  
 'And there is a certain power in me' (Plato, *Symposium* 218e)
- (521) ἤδη του ἔγωγε καὶ ἤκουσα τῶν σοφῶν  
 édē tou égōge kai ékousa tōn  
 already someone.M.GEN.SG I.NOM.EMPH also hear.1SG.AOR the.M.GEN.PL  
 sophōn  
 wise.M.GEN.PL  
 'Once I even heard from one of the sages ...' (Plato, *Gorgias* 493e)
- (522) ὅταν τι τοῖς φίλοις ἀγαθὸν εὐρίσκω  
 hótan ti toîs philoîs agathòn  
 whenever some.N.ACC.SG the.M.DAT.PL friend.DAT.PL good.N.ACC.SG  
 heurískō  
 find.1SG.PRS  
 '... whenever I find some good thing for my friends.' (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 4.1.10)
- (523) εἴ τί που λαμβάνοι Ἀθηναίων πλοῖον  
 eí tí pou lambánoi Athēnaíōn  
 if some.N.ACC.SG somewhere take.3SG.PRS.OPT Athenian.M.GEN.PL  
 ploíon  
 vessel.ACC.SG  
 '... whatever vessel of the Athenians' he might capture anywhere.'  
 (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 4.8.33)
- (524) ἀλλά τις ἦν ἄκριτος καὶ παρὰ τούτοις καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔρις  
 allá tis ên ákritos kai parà toutoîs kai parà toîs állois éris  
 but some.F.NOM.SG be.3SG.IMP indiscriminate.F.NOM.SG and from  
 toutoîs kai parà toîs állois éris  
 this.N.DAT.PL and from the.N.DAT.PL other.N.DAT.PL strife.NOM.SG  
 'But in these and in the others was an indiscriminate strife.'  
 (Demosthenes 18.18)
- (525) ἦν ἄν τις κατὰ τῶν ἐναντιωθέντων οἷς ἔπραττεν ἐκεῖνος, μέμψις καὶ  
 κατηγορία

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *exeurískō* for *heurískō*.

## 2 Translation

ên            án tis                    katà tōn  
 be.3SG.IMP IRR some.F.NOM.SG down the.M.GEN.PL  
 enantiōthéntōn                    hoîs            épratten ekeînos,  
 oppose.PTCP.AOR.PASS.M.GEN.PL what.DAT.PL do.3SG.IMP that.M.NOM.SG  
 mémpsís      kaì katēgoría  
 blame.NOM.SG and charge.NOM.SG  
 ‘... there might have been some reproach and charge against those  
 opposed to what that man was doing.’ (Demosthenes 18.65)

- (526) ὅταν τι πράττης ὅσιον  
 hótan      ti                    prátteis            hósion  
 whenever something.ACC.SG do.2SG.PRS.SBJV holy.N.ACC.SG  
 ‘Whenever you perform anything religious ...’ (Menander Fragment 572;  
 Kock (1888))

- (527) ἀλλά τις ἄμμι δαίμων  
 allá tis                    ámmi daímōn  
 but some.M.NOM.SG us.DAT demon.NOM.SG  
 (Fragmenta Lyrica Adespota 58; Bergk (1882: 706))

- (528) εἰ γοῦν, ὦ ξένε, τις ἡμῖν ὑπόσχοιτο θεός  
 ei goûn, ô xéne,            tis                    hēmîn hupóskhoito  
 if at.least O stranger.VOC some.M.NOM.SG us.DAT supply.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 theós  
 god.NOM.SG  
 ‘At least, stranger, if some god were to grant us that ...’ (Plato, *Laws*  
 3.683b)

The word order in examples like [p369] 529 can be explained as imitation of this positioning, in which *tis* clause-medially is separated from the following part of the clause by other words.

- (529) καὶ αὐτῶν μέρος [...] ἐπέπεσεν ἐς τοῦ χωρίου ιδιώτου  
 kaì autōn      méros                    esépesen      és tou  
 and them.GEN member.NOM.SG in.fall.3SG.AOR into some.M.GEN.SG  
 khōrion      idiōtou  
 place.ACC.SG individual.GEN.SG  
 ‘And a division of them dashed into a field on some private property.’  
 (Thucydides 1.106.1)

---

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *kaì ti*.

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

And just like its Homeric counterpart, the post-Homeric *tis* prevents other words from being placed in the second position they would otherwise receive. In Attic literature, for instance, this is illustrated by the tmesis in 405 above and examples such as 530.

- (530) ὄντιν' ἄν τις τρόπον ὡς βέλτιστος εἴη  
 hóntin'            án **tis**                            trópon        hōs bélτιστος  
 what.M.ACC.SG IRR someone.M.NOM.SG way.ACC.SG as    best.M.NOM.SG  
 eíē  
 be.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 '... in what way someone can be as good as possible ...' (Plato, *Gorgias* 520e)

But the word order *tis ke* following the introductory word of a conjoined clause, which in the epic poetry is only found in one Homeric and one Hesiodic example (disregarding the common *hóstis ke*), is almost the rule in Doric, though of course with *ka* instead of *ke*. Compare Ahrens (1843: 383). In the Gortyn code, for instance, we have 531–535.

- (531) αἴ τις κα  
 aí **tis**                            ka  
 if someone.M.NOM.SG IRR  
 (Gortyn Code 9.43)
- (532) αἴ τινά κα  
 aí **tiná**                            ka  
 if someone.M.ACC.SG IRR  
 (Gortyn Code 7.13)
- (533) καὶ τί κ'  
 kaí **tí**                            k'  
 and something IRR  
 (Gortyn Code 3.29; identically 6.23, 6.43, 9.13)
- (534) καί μέν τίς κ'  
 kaí mén **tís**                            k'  
 and then someone.M.NOM.SG IRR  
 (Gortyn Code 8.17)
- (535) ὅτι δέ τις κα

## 2 Translation

hóti dé tís ka  
that then someone.M.NOM.SG IRR  
(Gortyn Code 3.9)

Deviating from this pattern are 536 and 537, where *mé* ‘not’ has attracted the indefinite, as well as 538.

(536) αἰ δέ κα μή τις  
ai dé ka mé tis  
if then IRR not someone.M.NOM.SG  
(Gortyn Code 5.13; also 5.17, 5.22)

(537) ᾧ δέ κα μή τις ἦ τέγᾱ  
hōi dé ka mé tis êi stéga  
which.DAT.SG then IRR not some.F.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS.SBJV roof.NOM.SG  
(Gortyn Code 4.14)

(538) ὁπῶ κά τιλ λῆ  
hopô cá til lêi  
whence IRR some wish.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
(Gortyn Code 10.33)

In later Cretan inscriptions, 539 (identically CIG 3049.9, 3058.13) and 540 (identically CIG 3049.14, 3058.16).

(539) εἰ δέ τινέс κα τῶν ὀρμιωμένων  
ei dé tinés ka tôn hormiōménōn  
if then some.M.NOM.PL IRR the.M.GEN.PL rush.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.GEN.PL  
(CIG 3048.33; Cauer (1883: 82, no. 123))

(540) εἴ τίс κα ἄγῃ  
eí tís ka ágēi  
if someone.M.NOM.SG IRR lead.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
‘If anyone should bring ...’ (CIG 3048.38)

On the Heracleian Tablets, 541–546.

(541) καὶ αἶ τινί κα ἄλλῳ  
kaí aí tiní ka állōi  
and if some.DAT.SG IRR other.DAT.SG  
(Heracleian Tablets 1.105)



## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

- (542) καὶ αἷ τινάϗ κα ἄλλουϗ  
 kaì aí **tinás** ka álloús  
 and if some.M.ACC.PL IRR other.M.ACC.PL  
 (Heracleon Tablets 1.117)
- (543) αἰ δέ τινά κα γήρᾱ [...] ἐκπέτωντι  
 ai dé **tiná** ka gérāi ekpétōnti  
 if then someone.M.ACC.SG IRR age.DAT.SG depart.PTCP.AOR.DAT.SG  
 (Heracleon Tablets 1.119; also 1.173, without *dé*)
- (544) καὶ εἷ τινέϗ κα μὴ πεφυτεύκωντι  
 kaì eí **tinés** ka mē pephuteúkōnti  
 and if some.M.NOM.PL IRR not plant.PTCP.PRF.DAT.SG  
 (Heracleon Tablets 1.127)
- (545) αἰ δέ τίϗ κα ἐπιβῆι  
 ai dé **tís** ka epibēi  
 if then someone.M.NOM.SG IRR enter.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘And if anyone should enter ...’ (Heracleon Tablets 1.128)
- (546) αἰ δέ τίϗ κα τῶν καρπιζομένων ἀποθάνει  
 ai dé **tis** ka tōn karpizoménōn  
 if then someone.M.NOM.SG IRR the.GEN.PL enjoy.PTCP.PRS.PASS.GEN.PL  
 apotháneí  
 die.3SG.FUT  
 ‘And if anyone dies of these enjoyments ...’ (Heracleon Tablets 1.151)

In the inscription of Orchomenos, 547. In the inscription from Mycenae, 548.

- (547) καὶ εἷ τίϗ κα μὴ ἐμμένῃ  
 kaì eí **tís** ka mē emménēi  
 and if someone.M.NOM.SG IRR not abide.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 ‘And if no one should remain ...’ (Orchomenos Inscription 178.10;  
 Dittenberger (1883: 278))
- (548) αἰ δέ τί κα πένηται  
 ai dé **tí** ka pénētai  
 if then something IRR labour.3SG.PRS.SBJV.PASS  
 (Mycenae Inscription 3316.8; (Prellwitz 1889: 137))

In the Korkyra inscriptions (Blass 1888: 93–98), 549–551.

## 2 Translation

- (549) εἰ δέ τί κ' ἀδύνατον γένοιτο  
 ei dé tí k' adúnaton génoito  
 if then something.NOM.SG IRR unable.N.NOM.SG become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 'And if anything impossible should come to pass ...' (Korkyra Inscription 3206.25)
- (550) εἰ δέ τί κα [...] μὴ ὀρθῶς ἀπολογίζονται [sic]  
 ei dé tí ka mē orthōs apologízōntai  
 if then something.ACC.SG IRR not straight reckon.3PL.PRS.SBJV.PASS  
 'But if they should give an incorrect account of anything ...' (Korkyra Inscription 3206.103)
- (551) εἴ τινός κα ἄλλου δοκῇ  
 eí tinós ka álloú dokê  
 if some.GEN.SG IRR other.GEN.SG seem.3SG.IMP  
 (Korkyra Inscription 3206.114)

Perhaps also 552. (See below p139.)

- (552) αἰ δέ τί κα με [...] λυπῇ  
 ai dé tí ka me lupêi  
 if then something.NOM.SG IRR me.ACC trouble.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 'And if anything should pain me ...' (Theocritus 2.159)

In view of such constant usage, in contrast to which the only counterexamples I can find (other than the Gortyn exceptions, in which sometimes *mē* 'not' is present and sometimes *ei* 'if' does not precede) are 553 and 554, it seems clear to me that in the Korkyra inscription 3213.3 [p370] the transmitted sequence *aí ka páskhē* should not be emended, with Boeckh (1843: 27), to *aí ka tí páskhē*, but rather to *aí tí ka páskhē*, as shown in 555.

- (553) καὶ κά τις ἀντίον <τι> λῆ τήνῳ λέγειν  
 kaí ká tis antíon ti  
 and=if IRR someone.M.NOM.SG contrary.N.ACC.SG something.ACC.SG  
 lēi tēnōi légein  
 wish.3SG.PRS.SBJV that.M.DAT.SG say.PRS.INF  
 'And if anyone should want to say something against that man ...'  
 (Epicharmus in Athenaeus 6.28; Lorenz (1864: 227) line 5)

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *d' éti kēmē lupêi*.

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

- (554) αἷ κά τις ἐκτρίψας καλῶς παρατιθῆναι  
 aí ká tis ektrípsas kalôs  
 if IRR someone.M.NOM.SG rub.out.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG beautifully  
 paratithêi nin  
 serve.3SG.PRS.SBJV CL  
 ‘If, having bruised them well, one were to serve them ...’ (Epicharmus in  
 Athenaeus 2.83; Lorenz (1864: 281))
- (555) αἷ <τί> κα πάσχη  
 aí tí ka páskhē  
 if something IRR suffer.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 (Korkyra Inscription 3213.3; Blass (1888: 100); = CIG 1850)

Moreover, this positional custom is not only Doric: the Idalion Tablet line 29 gives us example 556. See also 557, with separation of *árton turônta* ‘cheese bread’.

- (556) ὅπι τις κε τὰς φρήτας τάςδε λύσει  
 ôpi sís ke tàs wrétas tásde  
 that someone.M.NOM.SG IRR the.F.ACC.PL stated.F.ACC.PL this.F.ACC.PL  
 lúsē  
 loose.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 ‘... that someone rescind what was stated ...’ (Idalion Tablet 29)
- (557) ἄρτον γάρ τις τυρῶντα τοῖς παιδίοις ἵαλε  
 árton gár tis turônta  
 loaf.ACC.SG then someone.M.NOM.SG cheese-flavour.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG  
 toís paidíois íale  
 the.M.DAT.PL child.DAT.PL send.3SG.AOR  
 ‘For someone has given a loaf of cheese bread to the children.’  
 (Epicharmus in Athenaeus 3.75)

Finally, one might ask whether the insertion of *tis* between the article (and adjective if present) and the noun of the governed partitive genitive (e.g. 558–560), common from Herodotus to the prose writers, might have occurred in clauses where this separation caused *tis* to appear in second position.

- (558) τῶν τινὰ Λυδῶν  
 tôn tina Ludôn  
 the.M.GEN.PL someone.M.ACC.SG Lydian.M.GEN.PL  
 ‘one of the Lydians’

## 2 Translation

(559) ἐς τῶν ἐκείνων τι χωρίων  
 es tôn ekeinōn ti khōrion  
 into the.N.GEN.PL that.N.GEN.PL something.ACC.SG place.GEN.PL  
 ‘into some of that property’

(560) τῶν ἄλλων τινὰς Ἑλλήνων  
 tôn allōn tinàs Hellēnōn  
 the.M.GEN.PL other.M.GEN.PL some.M.ACC.PL Greek.M.GEN.PL  
 ‘some of the other Greeks’

The adverbs derived from the indefinite pronoun follow our rule quite strictly in Homer. In books 13, 16 and 17 of the *Iliad*, *pou* ‘somewhere’ can be found 14 times, always in second position: particularly noteworthy among these examples are 561, with separation of *mē* ‘not’ and *tis* ‘someone’, and 562. *pothi* ‘somewhere’ is found twice, in 563–564, where it is preceded by *ou* ‘not’.

(561) μή ποῦ τις ὑπερφιάλως νεμεσέσῃ  
 mē pou tis huperphiālōs nemesēsēi  
 not somewhere someone.M.NOM.SG excessively resent.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘... lest haply some man wax wroth beyond measure’ (Homer, *Iliad* 13.293)

(562) ἀλλά που  
 allá pou  
 but somewhere  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 13.225)

(563) ἀλλά ποθι  
 allá pothi  
 but somewhere  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 13.630)

(564) ἐπὶ οὐ ποθι ἔλπομαι  
 epì ou pothi élpomai  
 upon not somewhere hope.1SG.PRS.PASS  
 ‘Verily, methinks, in no other place ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 13.309)

Nine instances of *pōs* ‘somehow’ are found, seven of which are in second position, as well as 565 (twice).

---

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *epei*.

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

- (565) ἄλλ' οὐ πως  
all' ou̯ pōs  
but not somehow  
(Homer, *Iliad* 13.729 and 17.354)

*pote* 'sometime' is found four times, twice in second position, as well as 566 and 567.

- (566) ἄλλοτε δὲ ποτε μάλλον ἐρωῆσαι πολέμοιο μέλλω  
állote dé pote mállon erōēsai polémoio méllō  
another.time exactly sometime more withdraw.AOR.INF war.GEN.SG  
be.going.to.1SG.PRS  
'At some other time have I haply withdrawn me from war rather than now' (Homer, *Iliad* 13.776)

- (567) ἤμην δὲ ποτ' ἐμὸν ἔπος ἑκλυες εὐξαμένοιο  
ēmèn dé pot' emòn épos éklues  
both exactly sometime my.N.ACC.SG word.ACC.SG hear.2SG.AOR  
euxaménoio  
pray.PTCP.AOR.M.GEN.SG  
'Aforetime verily you did hear my word, when I prayed' (Homer, *Iliad* 16.236)

*pêi* 'somehow' is found only once (16.110), correctly. *pō* 'yet' is found five times correctly, and also in 568 and 569. (Monro (1891: 336ff.) provides exceptions from the other books.)

- (568) θέων δ' ἐκίχανεν ἑταίρους ὄκα μάλ', οὐ πω τῆλε, ποτὶ κραιπνοῖσι  
théōn d' ekíchanen hetáirous ôka  
run.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG then reach.3SG.IMP companion.ACC.PL swiftly  
mál', ou̯ pō têle, posì kraipnoîsi metaspôn  
very not yet far foot.DAT.PL swift.M.DAT.PL pursue.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
'(He) ran, and speedily reached his comrades not yet far off, hastening after them with swift steps' (Homer, *Iliad* 17.189)

- (569) δύο δ' οὐ πω φῶτε πεπύσθην  
dúo d' ou̯ pō phôte pepústhēn  
two then not yet man.NOM.DU learn.3DU.PLUP.PASS  
'Howbeit two men had not yet learned ...' (Homer, *Iliad* 17.377)

## 2 Translation

Texts from the post-Homeric period allow these particles a great deal of freedom. Remnants of the old rule can be seen (other than in *ērou* and *dērou*) in examples such as 570 and 571. (Following such a template also 572 and 573.) Compare also 574 and 575.

- (570) ἔν ποκ' ἄρα Σπάρτῃ  
 én **pok'** ára Spártai  
 in sometime then Sparta.DAT  
 'So once in Sparta ...' (Theocritus 18.1)
- (571) ἔκ ποτέ τις φρικτοῖο θεᾶς σεσοβημένος οἴστρω  
 ék **poté** tis phriktoío theâs  
 out sometime someone.M.NOM.SG awful.F.GEN.SG goddess.GEN.SG  
 sesobēmenos oístrōi  
 scare.PTCP.PRF.PASS.M.NOM.SG sting.DAT.SG  
 'Someone agitated at some time by a sting from an awful goddess ...'  
 (Anthologia Graeca 6.219.1)
- (572) ὅτι τε μεγαλοκευθέειν ἔν ποτε θαλάμοις  
 hóti te megalokeuthéesin én **pote** thalámois  
 that and much-concealing.M.DAT.PL in sometime chamber.DAT.PL  
 '... and because once, in the vast recesses of the bridal chamber ...'  
 (Pindar, *Pythian* 2.33)
- (573) Ἰξάλος εὐπώγων αἰγὸς πόσις ἔν ποθ' ἁλώῃ  
 Íxalos eupógōn aigòs  
 bounding.M.NOM.SG well-bearded.M.NOM.SG goat.GEN.SG  
 pósis én **poth'** halōēi  
 husband.NOM.SG in sometime yard.DAT.SG  
 'Once in a vineyard, the bounding, well-bearded husband of the she-goat ...' (Anthologia Graeca 9.99.1)
- (574) ἄλλη που ἐπιστήμη ἀνθρώπου καὶ λύρας  
 állē pou epistémē anthrópou kaì  
 other.F.NOM.SG somewhere knowledge.NOM.SG person.GEN.SG and  
 lýras  
 lyre.GEN.SG  
 'Knowledge of a man and of a lyre (are) in some way different.' (Plato, *Phaedo* 73d)

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

- (575) ὁ αὐτὸς γάρ που φόβος  
 ho autòs gár pou phóbos  
 the.M.NOM.SG same.M.NOM.SG then somewhere fear.NOM.SG  
 ‘For in some way (there would be) the same fear.’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 101b)

Looking at other enclitic particles is much more fruitful. It is true that the consistent appearance of *te* ‘and/also’ and *rha* ‘so, then, therefore’ in second position (in 576, [p371] the participle has the same role as a subordinate clause) could be explained with reference to their function as clausal connectors.

- (576) βωμοῦ ὑπαίξας πρὸς ῥα πλατάνιστον ὄρουσεν  
 bōmoû hupaíxas pròs rha plátaniston  
 altar.GEN.SG glide.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG to then plane.ACC.SG  
 órousen  
 dart.3SG.AOR  
 ‘(It) glided from beneath the altar and darted to the plane tree.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 2.310)

On the other hand, *ge* ‘at least/only/in fact’ is immune to any such consistent positional rule, because it may not occur on the word on which the main weight of affirmation falls; at most one could point out that in Thucydides there are several examples of a *ge* that belongs to a participle but is attached to a preceding word (Poppo & Stahl (1889: 79) on Thucydides 2.38.1): 577–579. Cf. example 580 (instead of *hṓs émoige dokeî*). What has been said for *ge* holds also for *per*.

- (577) ἀγῶσι μὲν γε καὶ θυσίαις διετησίαις νομίζοντες  
 agōsi mén ge kaì thusíais dietēsíais  
 gathering.DAT.PL then even and sacrifice.DAT.PL year.round.M.DAT.PL  
 nomízontes  
 practise.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL  
 ‘... celebrating games and sacrifices all the year round ...’ (Thucydides 2.38.1)

- (578) οὕτω τῇ γε παρούσῃ εὐτυχίᾳ χρώμενοι  
 hoútō tēi ge paróusēi eutukhíai  
 so the.F.DAT.SG even be.present.PTCP.PRS.F.DAT.SG success.DAT.SG  
 khrómenoi  
 use.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.PL  
 ‘Being so used to the present prosperity ...’ (Thucydides 4.65.4)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *te*.

## 2 Translation

- (579) πίστεις γε διδοῦς τὰς μεγίστας  
 písteis ge didoûs tàs megístas  
 faith.ACC.PL even give.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG the.F.ACC.PL greatest.F.ACC.PL  
 ‘... having given the greatest possible guarantees ...’ (Thucydides 4.86.2)

- (580) ὥς γ’ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ  
 hós g’ emoì dokeî  
 as even me.DAT seem.3PL.PRS  
 ‘... as it seems to me at least ...’ (Demosthenes 18.226)

But there is one constantly enclitic particle that, although not serving to connect clauses, has a wholly unmistakable preference for second position, namely *ke* (*ken*, *ka*; IRR). Hermann (1831: 7) has already indicated this with the words “*ken*, which is barred from the beginning of an utterance because it is enclitic, can also be placed before those words with whose meaning it is associated, as long as some word in the same sentence precedes it”, and illustrates this with the example 581.

- (581) ἦ κε μέγ’ οἰμῶξειε γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεΰς  
 ê ke még’ oimóxeie gérōn hippēláta  
 in.truth IRR greatly wail.3SG.AOR.OPT old.M.NOM.SG driver.NOM.SG  
 Pēleús  
 Peleus.NOM  
 ‘Verily aloud would old Peleus groan, the driver of chariots’ (Homer, *Iliad* 7.125)

However, it does not occur to Hermann that the particle belongs in the second position in the clause. And even the most recent overview of the Homeric use of *ke*, Eberhard (1885), although devoting seven closely printed columns to its position, does not go beyond Hermann theoretically, even though one would have thought that the material he had collected would put him on the right track – for instance, when he emphasizes, following Carolsfeld (1864: 34), that *ke* follows the verb only when it is clause-initial and follows the participle only in 582, or that this attachment of *ke* to a preceding word is found only “at the start of a verse”.

- (582) ἰδοῦσα κε θυμὸν ἰάνθης  
 idoûsa ke thumòn iánthēs  
 see.PTCP.AOR.F.NOM.SG IRR spirit.ACC.SG warm.2SG.AOR.PASS  
 ‘The sight would have warmed your heart with cheer.’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 23.47)



## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

It is generally recognized that, in every Greek dialect that has a form of *ke* at all, the particle immediately follows the clause-initial pronoun or subordinating conjunction without exception, unless other enclitics or quasi-enclitics like *te*, *dé*, *gár*, *mén*, and occasionally also *tis* (see above [p372] p129), *tu* (see above p41), and *toi* (as in example 583) intervene: *hós ke*, *eis hó ke*, *eí ke*, *aí ke*, *epeí ke*, *hóte ke* (Doric *hókka*), *éōs ke*, *hóphra ke*, *hós ke*, *ho(p)pōs ke* or *hos dé ke*, *ei dé ke* and similar. (But see 584 and 585 as well as 586 etc.)

- (583) ὃ τοί κ' ἐπὶ τὸν νόον ἔλθῃ  
 hó                      toí k'    epì    tòn                      nóon                      élthēi  
 which.N.NOM.SG lo    IRR upon the.M.ACC.SG mind.ACC.SG go.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 '... which, you see, would come to mind.' (Theognis, *Elegies* 633)

- (584) αἶκα δ' ἐντύχω τοῖς περιπόλοις  
 aíka    d'    entúkhō                      toís                      peripólois  
 if=IRR then encounter.1SG.AOR.SBJV the.M.DAT.PL watchman.DAT.PL  
 'And if I should ever encounter the watchmen ...' (Epicharmus in  
 Athenaeus 6.28; Lorenz (1864: 225))

- (585) αἶκα δ' αἶγα λάβῃ τῆνος γέρας  
 aíka    d'    aíga                      lábēi                      tēnos                      géras  
 if=IRR then goat.ACC.SG take.3SG.AOR.SBJV that.M.NOM.SG prize.ACC  
 'And if that one should win a goat as a prize ...' (Theocritus 1.5)

- (586) αἰ δέ κ' ἀρέσκει  
 ai dé    k'    aréskēi  
 if then IRR please.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 'And if it should please ...' (Theocritus 1.10)

Ahrens' (1855: 24) suggestion of *ai d' étí ká me ... lupēi* for Theocritus 2.159 (=552 above) accepted by Meineke (1856: 28, 213) and Fritzsche & Hiller (1890: 75), so that *ai* is separated from *ka* by *étí*, seems inconceivable to me. The context does not preclude the only grammatical possibility *ai dé tí ka me* and counting this example among those mentioned above on p129 with *tís* between *ai* and *ka*. (Hermann (1817: 12) has *ei d' étí kaí me ... lupeí*, which is less promising.)

Other clause types show a corresponding pattern. In Homer, main clauses and interrogative subordinate clauses with a subjunctive verb have *ke* exceptionlessly in second position, as in examples 587–589 from books 13, 16 and 17 of the *Iliad*.

\* *Translator's note:* Wackernagel here cites Theocritus 1.159 in the original, but this must be an error.

## 2 Translation

- (587) ἐγὼ δέ κε λαὸν ἀγείρω  
 egō dé ke laōn ageirō  
 I.NOM then IRR people.ACC gather.1SG.PRS  
 ‘And I will gather the host.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 16.129)
- (588) (ἐπιφρασσαίμεθα βουλήν) ἢ κεν ἐνὶ νήεσσι πολυκλήϊσι πέσωμεν [...] ἢ  
 κεν ἔπειτα παρ νηῶν ἔλθωμεν  
 epiphrassaímetha boulén é ken enì néessi  
 consider.1PL.AOR.OPT.MID counsel.ACC or IRR in ship.DAT.PL  
 polukléisi pēsōmen é ken épeita par nēōn  
 many-benched.F.DAT.PL fall.1PL.AOR.SBJV or IRR then from ship.GEN.PL  
 élthōmen  
 go.1PL.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘(We shall consider counsel,) whether we shall fall upon the  
 many-benched ships or thereafter shall return back from the ships.’  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 13.741)
- (589) ἢ κ’ αὐτὸς ἐνὶ πρότοισιν ἀλώῃ  
 é k’ autòs enì prōtoisin halóēi  
 or IRR same.M.NOM.SG in first.M.DAT.PL succumb.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... or haply himself be slain amid the foremost.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.506)
- The same is true of future clauses: 590–592. (This is true more generally, even to the extent of separating words which belong together: 593.)
- (590) ὥς κε τάχα Τρώων κορέει κύνας ἢ δ’ οἰονοῦς  
 hós ke tákha Trōōn koréei kúnas ēd’ oiōnoús  
 as IRR quickly Trojan.GEN.PL glut.3SG.FUT dog.ACC.PL and raptor.ACC.PL  
 ‘... as it shall presently glut the dogs and birds of the Trojans’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.241)
- (591) εἴ κ’ Ἀχιλῆος ἀγαυοῦ πιστὸν ἑταῖρον τεῖχει ὑπὸ Τρώων ταχέες κύνας  
 ἐλκήσουσιν  
 eí k’ Akhilēos agauoû pistòn  
 if IRR Achilles.GEN noble.M.GEN.SG trustworthy.M.ACC.SG  
 hetaïron téikhei hýpo Trōōn takhéēs  
 companion.ACC.SG wall.DAT.SG under Trojan.GEN.PL swift.M.NOM.PL

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *hós* for *hós*.

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

kúnes helkésousin  
dog.NOM.PL tear.3PL.FUT  
‘... if the trusty comrade of lordly Achilles be torn by swift dogs beneath  
the wall of the Trojans.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.557)

- (592) τὰ δέ κεν Διὶ πάντα μελήσει  
tà dé ken Diî pánta melései  
the.N.NOM.PL then IRR Zeus.DAT all.N.NOM.PL matter.3SG.FUT  
‘... and the issue shall rest with Zeus.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.515)

- (593) τῷ δέ κε νικήσαντι φίλῃ κεκλήσῃ ἄκοιτις  
tôi dé ke nikésanti philē  
the.M.DAT.SG then IRR win.PTCP.AOR.M.DAT.SG dear.F.NOM.SG  
keklēsēi ákoitis  
call.2SG.FPRF.PASS bedfellow.NOM.SG  
‘And whoso shall conquer, his dear wife shall you be called.’ (Homer,  
*Iliad* 3.138)

Usage with the optative and preterite is no different. In books 13, 16 and 17 we have 28 instances of *ke* in second or near-second position in optative clauses (including 594 and 595) and 7 instances in preterite clauses. Among these 35 examples, the following are particularly noteworthy: *allá ken* in *Iliad* 13.290 (as well as three instances in the *Odyssey*) and *kaí ken* in 13.377, 17.613 (and many other examples; see Eberhard (1885: 733); also cf. *kaí moi*), as well as 596 in which *ke* precedes negation. There is only one counterexample: 597, where the shift of interrogative *tís* from its usual position clause-initially has taken *ke* [p373] along with it, as the latter may not precede *tís*.

- (594) ἅς οὐτ’ ἄν κεν Ἄρης ὀνόσαιτο μετελθὼν οὔτε κ’ Ἀθηναίῃ  
hàs out’ án ken Árēs onósaito  
which.F.ACC.PL nor IRR IRR Ares.NOM scorn.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
metelthón oute k’ Athēnaíē  
enter.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG nor IRR Athene.NOM  
‘... that not Ares might have entered in and made light of them, nor yet  
Athene’ (Homer, *Iliad* 13.127)

- (595) ὦ πόποι, ἤδη μὲν κε [...] γνοίῃ  
ō pópoi, édē mén ke gnoíē  
O fie already then IRR know.3SG.AOR.OPT  
‘Out upon it, now may (any man) know ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.629)

## 2 Translation

- (596) ἀνδρὶ δέ κ' οὐκ εἶξε μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας  
 andrì dé k' ouk eíxeie mégas  
 man.DAT.SG then IRR not yield.3SG.AOR.OPT great.M.NOM.SG  
 Telamónios Aías  
 Telamonian.M.NOM.SG Ajax.NOM  
 'But to no man would great Telamonian Aias yield' (Homer, *Iliad* 13.321)
- (597) τῶν δ' ἄλλων τίς κεν ἦεν φρεσὶν οὐνόματ' εἶποι  
 tôn d' állōn tís ken hēisi  
 the.M.GEN.PL then other.M.GEN.PL who.M.NOM.SG IRR his.F.DAT.PL  
 phresìn ounómat' eípoi  
 midriff.DAT.PL name.ACC.PL say.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'But of the rest, what man of his own wit could name the names?'  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 17.260)

If we cast the net more widely in Homer, we can observe that the rule recognized for subjunctive embedded clauses, that *ke* should immediately follow the clause-initial word, also holds for the optative and indicative, and that in these clause types *hós ke*, *hoíos ke*, *hóthen ke*, *hóte ke*, *eis hó ke*, *éos ke*, *hóphra ke*, *hós ke*, *eí ke*, and *aí ke* belong just as tightly together as in subjunctive clauses. The exceptions to this rule, as for other *ke* clauses, are vanishingly rare: 598, in which *ei kaí* forms a unit similar to *eíper*; cf. *ei kaí min* 'if and 3.ACC' in *Iliad* 13.58. Also, just as with *min*, several examples with *ou* (NEG): 599–602, and perhaps some others too. Then also 603.

- (598) εἰ καὶ νύ κεν οἴκοθεν ἄλλο μείζον ἐπαίτῃσιν  
 ei kaí nú ken oíkothen állo meízon  
 if and now IRR from.home other.N.ACC.SG greater.N.ACC.SG  
 epaitéseias  
 ask.2SG.AOR.OPT  
 'And if you should ask some other better thing from out my house ...'  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 23.592)
- (599) μῦθον ὃν οὐ κεν ἀνὴρ γε διὰ στόμα πάντων ἄγοιτο  
 mûthon hōn ou ken anér ge dià  
 myth.ACC.SG which.M.ACC.SG not IRR man.NOM.SG even through  
 stōma pámpān ágoito  
 mouth.ACC.SG altogether lead.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 '... (this) word, that no man should in any wise suffer to pass through his mouth at all' (Homer, *Iliad* 14.91)

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

- (600) ἐπεὶ οὐ κε θανόντι περ ὧδ' ἀκαχοίμην  
 epei ou **ke** thanónti per hôd' akakhoímēn  
 since not IRR die.PTCP.AOR.M.DAT.SG all thus grieve.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 'For I should not so grieve for his death ...' (Homer, *Odyssey* 1.236)
- (601) ἐπεὶ οὐ κε κακοὶ τοιούσδε τέκοιεν  
 epei ou **ke** kakoi toiousde tékoien  
 since not IRR bad.M.NOM.PL such.M.ACC.PL beget.3PL.AOR.OPT  
 'For base churls could not beget such sons as you.' (Homer, *Odyssey* 4.64)
- (602) τά γ' οὐ κέ τις οὐδὲ ἴδοιτο  
 tá g' ou **ké** tis oudè idoi to  
 the.N.ACC.PL even not IRR someone.M.NOM.SG nor see.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 '... that no one could see ...' (Homer, *Odyssey* 8.280)
- (603) ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυμῷ  
 álloi te Trôes méga **ken** kekharoiato thumôi  
 other.M.NOM.PL and Trojan.NOM.PL greatly IRR rejoice.3PL.AOR.OPT.MID  
 thumôi  
 spirit.DAT.SG  
 '... and the rest of the Trojans would be most glad at heart' (Homer, *Iliad* 1.256)

A much rarer exception, insofar as *eí ke* is otherwise always indivisible, is 604. But numerous editors, most recently also Nauck (1877: 112, 187), have inserted the *ge* that the meaning requires. Nauck's (1874: 41) emendation of *Odyssey* 3.219 given in 605, with *ke* as opposed to the *ge* found in all the manuscripts, is all the more striking.

- (604) εἰ τούτω κε λάβοιμεν, ἀροίμεθά κεν κλέος ἐσθλόν  
 ei toutō **ke** láboimen, aroímethá **ken**  
 if this.M.ACC.DU IRR take.1PL.AOR.OPT get.1PL.AOR.OPT.MID IRR  
 kléos esthlón  
 fame.ACC.SG goodly.N.ACC.SG  
 'Could we but take these two, we should win us goodly renown.'  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 5.273; cf. also 8.196)
- (605) ὅθεν οὐκ ἔλποιτό κε θυμῷ, ἐλθέμεν

## 2 Translation

hóthen ouk élpōitó                      ke thumôî,        elthémen  
 whence not hope.3SG.PRS.OPT IRR spirit.DAT.SG go.AOR.INF  
 ‘... whence no one would hope in his heart to return’ (Homer, *Odyssey*  
 3.219)

In the inscriptions written in the dialects that possess *ke*, *ka*, the particle rarely occurs outside the aforementioned conjunctive subordinate clauses, which makes sense given the content of most of these. In Aeolian we have a couple of examples of *hōs ke* with the optative, and in Cypriot the very remarkable 606, where *ke* is in second position between the article and the noun with a future verb (cf. Hoffmann (1891: 70, 73), who recognized the right reading rather than the previously read *ge*). In Argive we have 607; in Korkyra we have 608; in Epidaurian we have 609 on line 60 of the large healing inscription, but line 84 610, and in Isyllus both 611 (line 26) [p374] in verse and 612 (line 35ff) in prose.

(606) τὰς κε ἄς τὰςδε [...] ἔξο(ν)σι αἰεῖ  
 tás                      ke zàs                      tásde                      éxo(n)si                      aiwei  
 the.F.ACC.PL IRR land.ACC.PL this.F.ACC.PL have.3PL.FUT always  
 ‘They shall have these lands forever.’ (Tablet of Idalion 30)

(607) ἄι κα δικάσσαιεν  
 hâi                      ka dikássaien  
 who.F.NOM.PL IRR judge.3PL.AOR.OPT  
 (Inscription 3277.8; Prellwitz (1889: 127))

(608) ἀφ’ οὗ κ’ ἀρχ(ᾶ) γένοιτο  
 aph’ hoû                      k’ arkh(à)                      génoito  
 of    which.GEN.SG IRR beginning.NOM.SG become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 (Inscription 3206.84; Blass (1888: 95))

(609) αἶ κα ὑγιῇ νιν ποιῆσαι  
 aí ka hugiê                      nin poiésai  
 if IRR healthy.ACC.SG 3.ACC make.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘And if he would make him healthy’ (Inscription 3339.60; Prellwitz (1889: 151–157))

(610) τοῦτον γὰρ οὐδέ κα ὁ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ Ἀσκληπιὸς ὑγιῇ ποιῆσαι δύναιτο  
 toûton                      gàr ouden ka ho                      en Epidaúrōi  
 this.M.ACC.SG then nor IRR the.M.NOM.SG in Epidaurus.DAT

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *ge* for *ke*, following the manuscripts and Wackernagel rather than Nauck (1874).

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

Asklapiòs hugiê poiêsai dúnaito  
 Asclepius.NOM healthy.ACC.SG make.AOR.INF can.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 ‘For nor could the Epidauran Asclepius heal this man’ (Inscription  
 3339.84; Prellwitz (1889: 151–157))

- (611) οὕτω τοί κ’ ἀμῶν περιφείδοιτ’ εὐρύοπα Ζεύς  
 hoútō toí k’ amôn peripheídoit’ eurúopa  
 thus lo IRR US.GEN spare.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS wide-eyed.M.NOM.SG  
 Zeús  
 Zeus.NOM  
 ‘So thus might wide-eyed Zeus spare us.’ (Inscription 3342.26; Prellwitz  
 (1889: 162–166))

- (612) ἢ λώιον οἱ κα εἴη ἀγγράφοντι τὸν παιᾶνα. Ἐμάντευσε λώιον οἱ κα εἶμεν  
 ἀγγράφοντι.  
 è lóion hoî ka eíē angráphonti  
 or better him.DAT IRR be.3SG.PRS.OPT engrave.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG  
 τὸν παιᾶνα. Emánteuse lóion hoí ka eímen  
 the.M.ACC.SG paean.ACC prophesy.3SG.AOR better him.DAT IRR be.PRS.INF  
 angraphonti.  
 engrave.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT  
 ‘Or it would be better for him, the engraver of the paean. It was  
 prophesied that it would be better for him, the engraver.’ (Inscription  
 3324.35; Prellwitz (1889: 162–166))

The Dodonian and Elian inscriptions furnish more examples for *ka*. And here we observe that questions to the Dodonian oracle beginning with *tíni theôn thúontes* or similar and ending in an optative verb always place *ka* (if they have it) immediately after *tíni* ‘whom.DAT’ and thus separate *tíni* from the nearest genitive it governs, a clear proof of the pressure to put *ka* in second position: Hoffmann (1890) 1562, 1563, 1566, 1582a, 1582b, e.g. 613. Example 614 is similar.

- (613) τίνι κα θεῶν [ἦ] ἡρώων θύοντες καὶ εὐχ[ό](μ)ενο(ι) ὁμονοοῖεν ἐ[π]ὶ  
 τῷγαθόν  
 tíni ka theôn [è] hērōōn  
 whom.M.DAT.SG IRR god.GEN.PL or hero.GEN.PL  
 thúontes kaì eukh[ó](m)eno(i)  
 sacrifice.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL and pray.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.PL

## 2 Translation

homonoôiēn e[p]ì tōgathón  
 agree.3PL.PRS.OPT upon the=good.N.ACC.SG  
 ‘By sacrificing and praying to which of the gods or heroes would they agree for good?’ (Inscription 1563; Hoffmann (1890))

- (614) τί κα θύσας [...]  
 tí ka thúsas  
 what.ACC IRR sacrifice.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 (Inscription 1572a; Hoffmann (1890))

When Blass (1888: 82–83) emends inscription 3184 (=1564) 615 to insert the particle *ka*, which certainly cannot have followed *tínas*, at the end of a line following *lóion* ‘better’ because it is supposedly necessary, he overlooks the fact that the Dodonian inscriptions potentially use the optative without *ka* many times, e.g. 616–618.

- (615) τίνας θεῶν ἱλασκόμενος λώιον καὶ ἄμεινον πράττει  
 tinas theōn hilaskómenos lóion kai  
 whom.M.ACC.PL god.GEN.PL appease.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.SG better and  
 ámeinson prássoi  
 stronger do.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘By appeasing which gods would he do better and more desirably?’  
 (Inscription 3184 = Inscription 1564; Hoffmann (1890))

- (616) τίνι θεῶν θύουσα λώιον καὶ ἄμεινον πράττει καὶ τᾶς νόσου παύσαιο  
 tini theōn thúousa lóion kai  
 whom.M.DAT.SG god.GEN.PL sacrifice.PTCP.AOR.F.NOM.SG better and  
 ámeinson prássoi kai tâs nósou  
 stronger do.3SG.PRS.OPT and the.F.GEN.SG illness.GEN.SG  
 paúsaito  
 stop.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘By sacrificing to which of the gods would she do better and more desirably, and put an end to the illness?’ (Inscription 1562B; Hoffmann (1890))

- (617) ἢ μὴ ν[α](υ)κλαρή(ν) λώιον καὶ ἄμεινον πράττειμι  
 ê mē n[a](u)klarê(n) lóion kai ámeinson prássoi  
 in.truth not captaincy[?].ACC better and stronger do.1SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘Truly I would not carry out the captaincy better and more desirably’  
 (Inscription 1583.2; Hoffmann (1890))



## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

- (618) τίνα θεῶν ἢ ἡρώων τιμᾶντι λώιον καὶ ἄμεινον εἶη  
 tína theôn è hērôôn timânti  
 whom.M.ACC.SG god.GEN.PL or hero.GEN.PL honour.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG  
 lóion kaì ámeinson eíē  
 better and stronger be.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘By honouring which of the gods or heroes would it be better and more  
 desirable?’ (Inscription 1587a; Hoffmann (1890))

Outside this fixed formula beginning with *tis* ‘what’, however, the position of *ka* in these inscriptions is free, as shown by examples 619–620.

- (619) ἡ τυγχάνοιμί κα  
 ê tunkhánoimí ka  
 in.truth happen.1SG.PRS.OPT IRR  
 (Inscription 1568.1; Hoffmann (1890))
- (620) [...] βέλτιον μοί κ’ εἶη  
 béltiom moí k’ eíē  
 better me.DAT IRR be.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘... would be better for me’ (Inscription 1573; Hoffmann (1890))

Among the Elia inscriptions, 1151.12, 1154.7, 1157.4 and 1158.2 must be left out of consideration, because, although *ka* is transmitted, its position in the sentence is not recognizable; the same holds for all examples in which *ka* has been inserted, except 1151.19, in which the position of the inserted *ka* can at least be determined negatively. That leaves 28 examples: 21 have *ka* in second or near-second position, including 621 and 622; these 21 stand opposite 7 counterexamples.

- (621) ἐν τηπιάρου κ’ ἐνέχοιτο  
 en tēpiároi k’ enékhōito  
 in the=sacrifice.DAT IRR hold.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 (Inscription 1149.9 Collitz)
- (622) ἐν ταῖ ζεκαμναίαι κ’ ἐνέχοιτο  
 en taí zekamnaíai k’ enékhōito  
 in the.F.DAT.SG ten.minae.DAT IRR hold.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 (Inscription 1152.7 Collitz)

The import of these figures is strengthened by the composition of examples 623–627, [p375] in all of which *ka* separates the article or an adjective from its noun. In addition there is 628, in which, although *ka* is not in second position,

## 2 Translation

the tmesis nevertheless betrays a pressure to move the particle towards the start of the clause.

- (623) τοὶ ζέ κα θεοκόλοι  
toì zé ka theokóloi  
the.M.DAT.SG then IRR priest.M.DAT.SG  
(Inscription 1154.1 Collitz)
- (624) πεντακατίας κα δαρχμάς [sic]  
pentakatías ka darkhmás  
five.hundred.F.ACC.PL IRR drachma.ACC.PL  
(Inscription 1154.3 Collitz)
- (625) ἃ δέ κα φράτρα  
a dé ka wrátra  
the.F.NOM.SG then IRR agreement.NOM.SG  
(Inscription 1156.2 Collitz)
- (626) τῶν δέ κα γραφέων  
tôn dé ka graphéōn  
the.GEN.PL then IRR scribe.GEN.PL  
(Inscription 1156.3 Collitz)
- (627) ὁ [sic] δέ κα ξένος  
o dé ka xénos  
the.M.NOM.SG then IRR stranger.NOM.SG  
(Inscription 1158.1 Collitz)
- (628) τῶν ζέ προστιζίων οὐζέ κα μί' εἴη  
tôn zè prostizíōn ouzé ka mí' eíē  
the.GEN then former.GEN.PL nor IRR one.F.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS.OPT  
'... nor would be one of the former' (Inscription 1157.7 Collitz)

For the post-Homeric poets, despite the sparsity of attestations, one can maintain that the rule remained in force until the end of the sixth century. The fragments of the pre-Pindarian Melic poets, like those of the elegiacs before Theognis, yield *ke*, *ka* only in second position (see in particular also 629).

- (629) ταῦτά χ' ἅπαντα λάχῃ  
taûtá kh' hápanta lákhai  
this.N.ACC.PL IRR quite.all.N.ACC.PL obtain.3SG.AOR.OPT  
'All these things would fall to him' (Xenophanes 2.10)

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

Sappho Fragment 66 (630) is poorly attested; Bergk (1882: 177) writes Alcaeus 83 as 631, but neither *autós* ‘same’ nor *ke* is attested. It will now be necessary to seek other ways to improve this sentence.

- (630) ὁ δ’ Ἄρεος φαίσι κεν Ἥφαιστον ἄγην  
 o d’ Áreus phaîsí **ken** Áphaiston  
 the.M.NOM.SG then Ares.NOM say.3SG.PRS IRR Hephaestus.ACC  
 ágēn  
 lead.PRS.INF  
 ‘And Ares says that he would bring Hephaestus’ (Sappho Fragment 66)

- (631) αἶ κ’ εἴπῃς, τὰ θέλεις, <αὐτὸς> ἀκούσῃς <κε>, τὰ κ’ οὐ θέλοις  
 aí k’ eípēis, tà théleis, <autòs>  
 if IRR say.2SG.AOR.SBJV the.N.ACC.PL want.2SG.PRS same.M.NOM.SG  
 akouúsais <ke>, tá k’ ou thélois  
 hear.2SG.AOR.OPT IRR the.N.ACC.PL IRR not want.2SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘If you said what you want, you yourself would hear what you would not want’ (Alcaeus Fragment 83)

Then it is clear that the Theognideian gnomic poems, Pindar and Epicharmus deviate from the old norm: Theognis (in addition to instances such as 632) 645, 653, 747, 765; many examples in Pindar; Epicharmus (against normal usage Lorenz (1864: 223) Busiris fragment 1, (1864: 264) fragment 33.1, and (1864: 267) verse 12) fragment 7.1, Lorenz (1864: 257); (1864: 267) verse 9; (1864: 268) verse 16; (1864: 269) verse 11; (1864: 274) fragment 53; verse 167 in Mullach (1860: 141); for which one can let the question of the genuineness of the individual examples rest.

- (632) μέγα κεν πῆμα βροτοῖσιν ἐπῆν  
 méga ken pēma brotoîsin epēn  
 great.N.NOM.SG IRR harm.NOM.SG mortal.DAT.PL be.upon.3SG.IMP  
 ‘... a great calamity would be at hand for mortals.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 900)

Of the remaining enclitic particles *thēn* ‘surely’, *nu* ‘now’ and *toi* ‘certainly’, in Homer *thēn* is always found in second position (naturally including 633 and 634); the same is true in 635; the same is true of Theocritus in the inherited phrases 636 (cf. Aeschylus in example 635) and *kai gár thēn* in 6.34 (cf. 633 from Homer), as well as in 637 and 638.

## 2 Translation

- (633) καὶ γάρ θην  
 kai gár **thēn**  
 and then surely  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 21.568)
- (634) οὐ μὲν θην  
 ou mén **thēn**  
 not then surely  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 8.448)
- (635) κύ θην ἄ χριζεις, ταῦτ' ἐπιγλωσσῶ Διός  
 sú **thēn** hà khréizeis, taût'  
 you.NOM surely what.ACC.PL want.2SG.PRS this.N.ACC.PL  
 epiglōssai Diós  
 reproach.2SG.PRS.PASS Zeus.GEN  
 'Surely, it is only your own desire that you utter as a curse against Zeus.'  
 (Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound* 928)
- (636) τύ θην  
 tú **thēn**  
 you.NOM surely  
 (Theocritus 1.97 and 7.83)
- (637) αἰνός θην  
 aînós **thēn**  
 fable.NOM surely  
 (Theocritus 14.43)
- (638) πείραθ θην  
 peírāi **thēn**  
 attempt.DAT.SG surely  
 (Theocritus 15.62)

Theocritus broke the rule twice (2.114, 5.111); before him also Epicharmus (639).

- (639) καίτοι νῦν γὰ θην εὖωνον αἰνεῖ σῖτον  
 kaítoi nún gá **thēn** eúōnon ainei sîton  
 and.yet now even surely cheap.M.ACC.SG praise.3SG.PRS bread.ACC.SG  
 'Yet now, surely, he at least praises cheap bread.' (Epicharmus in  
 Athenaeus 6.28; Lorenz (1864: 226) verse 2)

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *kàt tò ... aei*.

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

*nu* and *nun* ‘now’ in Homer are almost always in second position, if we go by the remark of Ebeling (1880–1885) s. v.: “as the particle is enclitic, it attaches itself to whatever is the most important word”. I do not consider 640 to be a counterexample.

- (640) καὶ γὰρ δὴ νύ ποτε Ζεὺς ἄσατο  
 kai gàr dé nú pote Zeùs ásato  
 and then exactly now sometime Zeus.NOM mislead.3SG.AOR.MID  
 ‘Aye, and on a time she blinded Zeus’ (Homer, *Iliad* 19.95)

By contrast, it is striking [p376] that *nu* regularly precedes other enclitics like *moi*, *toi*, *hoi*, *se*, *tis*, *ti*, *pote*, *pou* (though 641), *per* and *ken*, and is only preceded by *dé*: we also see *nú gár* ‘now then’ in *Iliad* 13.257 next to *gár nu* ‘then now’ in *Odyssey* 15.239 and *gár dé nu* ‘then exactly now’ in *Iliad* 19.95.

- (641) ὅσα πού νυν ἐέλπεται  
 hósa pouí nun eélpetai  
 as.much.N.ACC.PL somewhere now hope.3SG.PRS.PASS  
 ‘... even all that now he thinks’ (Homer, *Iliad* 10.105)

It is also striking that it often separates, or assists in separating, close connections: adjective and noun (642–644); article and noun (645–646); preposition and noun (647). The only rule-breaking example, as far as I can see, is (648).

- (642) ἥπεδανὸς δέ νύ τοι θεράπων  
 ēpedanòs dé nú toi therápōn  
 weakly.M.NOM.SG then now you.DAT attendant.NOM.SG  
 ‘... and your squire is a weakling’ (Homer, *Iliad* 8.104)
- (643) θαρσαλέον νύ τοι ἦτορ ἐνὶ φρεσὶν  
 tharsaléon nú toi êtor enì phresín  
 confident.N.NOM.SG now you.DAT heart.NOM.SG in midriff.DAT.PL  
 ‘Your heart within you is of good cheer’ (Homer, *Iliad* 19.169)
- (644) σιδῆρειόν νύ τοι ἦτορ  
 sidéreíon nú toi êtor  
 iron.N.NOM.SG now you.DAT heart.NOM.SG  
 ‘Of iron truly is your heart.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 24.205 = *Iliad* 24.521)

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *hoi* for *toi*.

## 2 Translation

- (645) οἱ δέ νυ λαοὶ θνήσκον  
 hoi dé **nu** laoi thnêskon  
 the.M.NOM.PL then now people.NOM.PL die.3PL.IMP  
 ‘Then the people began to die’ (Homer, *Iliad* 1.382)
- (646) ἡ δέ νυ μήτηρ τίλλε κόμην  
 hē dé **nu** mētēr tillē kómēn  
 the.F.NOM.SG then now mother.NOM.SG pluck.3SG.IMP hair.ACC.SG  
 ‘But his mother tore her hair’ (Homer, *Iliad* 22.405)
- (647) ἀντί νυ πολλῶν λαῶν ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ  
 antí **nu** pollōn laōn estin anér  
 against now many.M.GEN.PL people.GEN.PL be.3SG.PRS man.NOM.SG  
 ‘Of the worth of many hosts is the man ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 9.116)
- (648) ὥς δὲ ἔγωγ’ ὄφελον μάκαρός νύ τευ ἔμμεναι υἱὸς ἀνέρος  
 hōs dē égōg’ óphelon mákarós **nú**  
 as exactly I.NOM.EMPH owe.1SG.AOR blessed.M.GEN.SG now  
 teu émmenai huiòs anéros  
 some.M.GEN.SG be.PRS.INF son.NOM.SG man.GEN.SG  
 ‘Ah, would that I had been the son of some blessed man’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 1.217)

For post-Homeric usage I refer to *phére nun*, *áge nun* (649), *mé nun*, and to the *mén nun* so often found in second position in Herodotus, and finally to 650–654. Cf. also Lobeck (1835: 475) on *Ajax* verse 1332.

- (649) ἄγε νυν  
 áge **nun**  
 lead.2SG.PRS.IMPER now  
 ‘Come now!’ (Aristophanes, *Peace* 1056)
- (650) πρὸς νύν σε πατρός πρὸς τε μητρός [...] ἱκέτης ἰκνοῦμαι  
 prós **nún** se patrós prós te mētrós  
 to now you.ACC father.GEN.SG to and mother.GEN.SG  
 hikētēs hiknoûmai  
 suppliant.NOM.SG beseech.1SG.PASS  
 ‘Now by your father and by your mother, I beseech you as a suppliant.’  
 (Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 468)

## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

- (651) πρὸς νύν σε κρηνῶν καὶ θεῶν ὁμογνίων αἰτῶ πιθέσθαι  
 prós **nún** se krēnôn kaì theôn homogniôn  
 to now you.ACC spring.GEN.PL and god.GEN.PL akin.M.GEN.PL  
 aitô pithésthai  
 ask.1SG.PRS persuade.AOR.INF.MID  
 ‘Then, by the streams of water and gods of our race, I ask you to listen’  
 (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1333)
- (652) πρὸς νύν σε γονάτων τῶνδ(ε)  
 prós **nún** se gonátôn tōnd(e)  
 to now you.ACC knee.GEN.PL this.N.GEN.PL  
 ‘Now, by your knees ...’ (Euripides, *Helen* 1237)
- (653) ἀπό νυν με λείπετ’ ἤδη  
 apó **nun** me léipet’ édē  
 of now me.ACC leave.2PL.PRS.IMPER already  
 ‘Leave me then, immediately’ (Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 1177)
- (654) μετά νυν δός  
 metá **nun** dós  
 after now give.2SG.AOR.IMPER  
 ‘Then share ...’ (Euripides, *Suppliants* 56)

In Cypriot the position of *nu* is freer: 655–656. The same is true in Boeotian: 657 (equivalent to Attic *kaì hai hyperēmériai ákuroi éstōn*). It seems highly doubtful to me that the Cypriot words *hónu* ‘this.M.NOM’, *tónu* ‘this.M.ACC’ and Arcadian *tánu* ‘this.F.ACC’ contain the particle *nu*. It is more likely to be the *u* of *hoûtos* ‘this’; cf. Arcadian *tōnί, tannί*.

- (655) ἢ δοῦναι νῦ  
 è duwánoi **nu**  
 or give.3SG.AOR.OPT now  
 (Idalion 6)
- (656) ἢ δόκει νῦ  
 è dókoi **nu**  
 or give.3SG.AOR.OPT now  
 (Idalion 16)
- (657) κὴ τῇ οὐπεραμερίῃ ἄκουρὺ νῦ ἐνθῶ

## 2 Translation

kè tè                      houperameriē ákourú                      nu énthō  
 and the.F.NOM.PL default.NOM.PL invalid.F.NOM.PL now be.3PL.PRS.IMPER  
 ‘And let the overdue amounts now be annulled.’ (Inscription 488.88;  
 Meister (1884: 183))

Finally a word on *toi*, insofar as it has become a pure particle for which positioning according to our rule is generally recognized: cf. *kaítoi* and *méntoi*. Here we have 1) tmesis: 658, as well as examples 404 and 406 cited above.

- (658) ἔκ τοι πέπληγμαι  
 ék **toi** péplēgmai  
 out lo strike.1SG.PRF.PASS  
 ‘Surely I am stunned’ (Euripides, *Heracleidae* 1105)

2) 659; also, with *gár toi* ‘then lo’, examples 660–662.

- (659) διά τοι σὲ πόνους ἔχω  
 diá **toi** sè pónous ékhō  
 through lo you.ACC trouble.ACC.PL have.1SG.PRS  
 ‘Because of you I have these pangs’ (Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 975)

- (660) ἐν γάρ τοι πόλει ὧδε κακοψόγω ἀνδάνει οὐδέν  
 en gár **toi** pólei hôde kakopsógōi handánei  
 in then lo city.DAT.SG thus censorious.F.DAT.SG please.3SG.PRS  
 oudén  
 nothing.NOM.SG  
 ‘For nothing is pleasant in a censorious city.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 287)

- (661) περὶ γάρ τοι τῶν ποιημάτων  
 perì gár **toi** tôn poiēmátōn  
 about then lo the.N.GEN.PL poem.GEN.PL  
 ‘For about the poems ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 60c)

- (662) περὶ γάρ τοι γῆς [...] πολλὰ ἀκήκοα  
 perì gár **toi** gês pollà akékoa  
 about then lo earth.GEN.SG much.N.PL hear.1SG.PRF  
 ‘For I have heard many things about the earth.’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 108d)

3) 663–666; also, with *gár toi* ‘then lo’, examples 667–668.



## 2.5 Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics

- (663) ὦ παῖδες, ἦ τοι Κύπρις οὐ Κύπρις μόνον  
 ô paîdes, hê **toi** Kýpris ou Kýpris mónon  
 O child.VOC.PL the.F.NOM.SG lo Cypris.NOM not Cypris.NOM alone  
 ‘You see, children, Cypris is not just Cypris.’ (Sophocles Fragment 855.1)
- (664) τήν τοι Δίκην λέγουσι παῖδ’ εἶναι Χρόνου  
 tén **toi** Díkēn légousi paîd’ eînai  
 the.F.ACC.SG lo Justice.ACC.SG say.3PL.PRS child.ACC.SG be.PRS.INF  
 Khrónou  
 Time.GEN.SG  
 ‘They say that Justice is the child of Time.’ (Euripides Fragment 222)
- (665) οἱ τοι γεωργοὶ τοῦργον ἐξέλκουσι  
 hoí **toi** geōrgoî toûrgon exélkousi  
 the.M.NOM.PL lo farmer.NOM.PL the=work.ACC.SG extract.3PL.PRS  
 ‘The husbandmen are doing the work.’ (Aristophanes, *Peace* 511)
- (666) ἦ τοι τῆς διανοίας ὄψις  
 hê **toi** tēs dianoiás ópsis  
 the.F.NOM.SG lo the.F.GEN.SG intellect.GEN.SG sight.NOM.SG  
 ‘The intellectual sight ...’ (Plato, *Symposium* 219a)

[p377]

- (667) τὸ γάρ τοι πράγμα συμφορὰν ἔχει  
 tò gár **toi** prâgma sumphoràn ékhei  
 the.N.NOM.SG then lo deed.NOM.SG mishap.ACC.SG have.3SG.PRS  
 ‘This matter is surely an unfortunate one.’ (Euripides, *Helen* 93)
- (668) τὸ γάρ τοι θάνατον δεδιέναι  
 tò gár **toi** thánaton dediénai  
 the.N.NOM.SG then lo death.ACC.SG fear.PRF.INF  
 ‘The fear of death...’ (Plato, *Apology* 29a)

4) Examples 669–676 etc.

- (669) τοιοῦτός τοι ἑταῖρος ἀνὴρ φίλος  
 toioútós **toi** hetaîros anêr philós  
 such.M.NOM.SG lo companion.NOM.SG man.NOM.SG dear.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘Such a man (is) a dear companion.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 95; cf. Bergk’s *hetaíroî*)

## 2 Translation

- (670) πολλῶ τοι πλέονας λιμοῦ κόρος ὤλεεν ἤδη ἄνδρας  
 pollōi            **toi** pléonas            limoû            kóros  
 much.DAT.SG lo more.M.ACC.SG hunger.GEN.SG surfeit.NOM.SG  
 ólesen            édē            ándras  
 destroy.3SG.AOR already men.ACC.PL  
 ‘At present excess has ruined far more men than hunger.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 605)
- (671) διςαῖ τοι πόσιος κῆρες δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν  
 dissaí            **toi** pósios            kêres            deiloîsi  
 double.F.NOM.PL lo drink.GEN.SG doom.NOM.PL wretched.M.DAT.PL  
 brotoîsin  
 mortal.DAT.PL  
 ‘The perils of drink are twofold for wretched mortals.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 837)
- (672) πολλοί τοι κίβδηλοι [...] κρύπτουσ(ι)  
 polloi            **toi** kíbdēloi            krúptous(i)  
 many.M.NOM.PL lo base.M.NOM.PL hide.3PL.PRS  
 ‘Many false men hide ...’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 965)
- (673) ῥηιδίη τοι πρῆξις ἐν ἀνθρώποις κακότητος  
 rhēidíē            **toi** prêxis            en anthrōpois            kakótētos  
 easy.F.NOM.SG lo practice.NOM.SG in person.DAT.PL badness.GEN.SG  
 ‘The practice of evil is easy for people.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 1027)
- (674) δειλῶν τοι κραδίη γίγνεται ὀξυτέρη  
 deilôn            **toi** kratíē            gígnetai  
 wretched.M.GEN.PL lo heart.NOM.SG become.3SG.PRS.PASS  
 oxutérē  
 sharper.F.NOM.SG  
 ‘The heart of the wretched becomes sharper.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 1030)
- (675) Δία τοι ξένιον μέγαν αἰδοῦμαι  
 Día            **toi** xénion            mégan            aidoûmai  
 Zeus.ACC lo hospitable.M.ACC.SG great.M.ACC.SG revere.1SG.PRS.PASS  
 ‘I revere great Zeus, protector of guests’ (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 363)

---

\* Translator’s note: The Teubner ed. (Hiller 1890) has *kíbdēlon*.

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

- (676) ἀμήχανόν τοι κάλλος  
 amékhanon            **toi** kállos  
 immense.N.ACC.SG lo beauty.ACC.SG  
 ‘immense beauty’ (Plato, *Symposium* 218e; cf. also Euripides, *Orestes* 1167)

Attic *toigártoi* is also a sign of the particle’s forward movement. In Homer, *toigártoi* does not yet occur. In its place we have several instances of 677 (or another future verb), where it is easy to punctuate after *toigár*: “because it is so (*toi* = instrumental *tō* + *i*?), ...”.

- (677) τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι [...] καταλέξω  
 toigàr    egō toi kataléxō  
 therefore I    lo tell.1SG.FUT  
 ‘Therefore I will tell ...’

In the post-Homeric period, *toi* – and also *oûn* – was attached directly to *toigár*; *toigártoi* is to *toigár ... toí* as Latin *utrumne* is to *utrum ... ne* (see below p297).

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

Similar to the enclitics is a group of words that Krüger (1871) appropriately calls postpositive particles, because they are just as incapable of appearing clause-initially as the enclitics: *án*, *ár*, *ára*, *aû*, *gár*, *dé*, *dêta*, *mén*, *mén*, *oûn*, *toínun*. Investigating the origins of this similarity is not the goal of my investigation. However, various factors appear to come into consideration: one of these particles, *aû* ‘again, further’ could have originally been a true enclitic, since it corresponds to the Sanskrit *u*, as I maintain against Kretschmer (1892: 364). Then, *toínun* ‘therefore’ is composed of two enclitics *toi* ‘lo’ and *nun* ‘now’. The original, however, was, for example, *autós toi nun* ‘self/same lo now’. It cannot be established how long *autós toínun* ‘self/same therefore’ has been in use. For others it is conceivable that they were initially in general use postpositively, just like Latin *enim* ‘namely’ and, following this example, *namque* ‘for/since’ (*itaque* ‘therefore/and so’ following *igitur* ‘therefore’). It is difficult to thus distinguish *án* from the Latin and Gothic question particle *an*, which in both languages is prepositive. It seems plausible to say that in Greek the particle was drawn away [p378] from the first position in the clause and became postpositive under the influence of *ke* (IRR), with which it had become identical in meaning. Before our very eyes a similar change is happening with *dé* ‘now/truly/exactly’, which can introduce a clause in the language of Homer and the poets who follow his style, but which is

## 2 Translation

already becoming decisively postpositive in Homer's writings and is exclusively postpositive in prose.

But for both types of particles – those that were enclitic from the start, like *aû*, and those that became postpositive under the influence of an enclitic, like *án* – the question arises of whether they participate in the special positional rule for enclitics that has been established through our investigation. For those that serve as sentence connectives – in fact, for all but *án* – it is recognized that they do so, and well known that, just like the actual enclitics, they are able to induce tmesis and similar, e.g. 678 and 679.

- (678) κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων ἀμῆ κοπίς  
 kat' aû nin phoinía theôn tôn nertérōn  
 down again CL bloody.F.NOM.SG god.GEN.PL the.M.GEN.PL nether.GEN.PL  
 amâi kopís  
 mow.3SG.PRS dust.NOM.SG  
 'The blood-stained dust of the infernal gods cuts it down again'  
 (Sophocles, *Antigone* 601)

- (679) ἀν' αὖ βακχεύει Καδμείων πόλιν  
 an' aû bakkheúsei Kadmeíōn pólin  
 up again riot.3SG.FUT Cadmean.M.GEN.PL city.ACC.SG  
 'He will run riot again through the Cadmeans' city.' (Euripides,  
*Heracleidae* 1085)

*oûn* 'then' often occurs between preposition and case, or between article and noun. *dé* 'but/and' does this quite regularly, and with this word the rule is at its most effective, since it takes precedence over all enclitics and enclitoids and only extremely rarely takes third position. For the other particles, the rule is subject to certain restrictions: *ára* so/then', for instance, follows the verb, e.g. 680, 681.

- (680) Ἡρῇ δὲ μάστιγι θοῶς ἐπεμαίετ' ἄρ' ἵππους  
 Hérē dè mástigi thoôs epemaíet' ár' íppous  
 Hera.NOM then whip.DAT.SG quickly touch.3SG.IMP.PASS then  
 hippous  
 horse.ACC.PL  
 'And Hera swiftly touched the horses with the lash.' (Homer, *Iliad* 5.748)
- (681) πρότερον δὲ ἦν ἄρα ἀνώνυμος  
 próteron dè ên ára anónymos  
 before then be.3SG.IMP then anonymous.M.NOM.SG  
 'Before, it was apparently nameless.' (Herodotus 4.45.4)

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

*oûn* ‘then’ is often attracted by the preposition connected to a verb, and then occurs between it and the verb. This is found particularly often in Herodotus and Hippocrates: 682–684. The position of *δέ* ‘now/truly/exactly’ is very free.

- (682) ἑσπέρης καθεύδοντα ἅπ’ οὖν ἔδυσε  
 hespérēs katheúdonta ap’ **oûn** éduse  
 evening.GEN.SG sleep.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG of so clothe.3SG.AOR  
 ‘In the evening he undresses the one going to bed.’ (Hipponax (?)  
 Fragment 61)
- (683) τήνῳ κυδάζομαί τε κἀπ’ ὧν ἡχθόμαν  
 ténōi kudázomai te kap’ **ôn** êkthóman  
 that.M.DAT.SG revile.1SG.PRS.PASS and and=of so grieve.1SG.IMP.PASS  
 ‘Then I revile him and am vexed.’ (Epicharmus in Athenaeus 6.28)
- (684) τάχα δὲ τάχα τοὶ μὲν ἅπ’ ὧν ὄλοντο  
 tákha dè tákha toì mèn ap’ **ôn** ólonto  
 quickly exactly quickly lo then of so destroy.3PL.AOR.MID  
 ‘So they are ruined quickly, quickly.’ (Melanippides in Athenaeus 10.34)

*án* has a special position. Hermann (1831: 7) tells us “Given that *án* is not enclitic, but that it nevertheless cannot be placed in first position, it is clear that it must be placed after one of those words whose meaning it contributes to”, and sharply contrasts *án* with *ke*. According to Hermann, the difference between the two can be observed as early as the works of Homer, based on the examples [p379] *Iliad* 7.125 *ê ke még’ oimóxeie* (581 above), in which *ke* immediately follows *ê*, and 685, in which *án* attaches to the second word, *se*. This difference between *án* and *ken* is surprising. If the assumption that *án* became postpositive under the influence of *ke* is correct, then we should expect the position of *án* to be no different from that of *ken*.

- (685) ἦ c’ ἄν τιταίμην  
 ê s’ **àn** tisaímēn  
 in.truth you.ACC IRR pay.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘Verily I would avenge me on thee’ (Homer, *Iliad* 22.20)

Does the distinction reported by Hermann really exist, though? At any rate, it is not found in an extensive category of clauses, namely subordinate clauses with a subjunctive verb. For here immediate attachment to the clause-initial word is

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *oûn apōllúonto*.

## 2 Translation

just as much the rule for *án* as it is for *ke(n)*. In this context *hóstis* ‘who.M.NOM.SG’ is counted as a single unitary word, as is *hopoíós tis*: 686, 687.

- (686) ὅποῖ' ἅττ' ἄν καὶ μεμελετηκυῖαι τύχωσι  
 hopoí' átt' àn kai  
 of.what.sort.N.NOM.PL whatever.N.ACC.PL IRR also  
 memeletēkuiai túkhōsi  
 practise.PTCP.PRF.F.DAT.SG happen.3PL.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘... which correspond to the practices ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 81e)
- (687) ὅποιοί τινες ἄν οἱ προστάται ὦσι  
 hopoioí tines àn hoi prostátai  
 of.what.sort.M.NOM.PL some.M.NOM.PL IRR the.M.NOM.PL leader.NOM.PL  
 ôsi  
 be.3PL.PRS.SBJV  
 ‘... as the leaders are ...’ (Xenophon, *Ways* 1)

Furthermore, certain particles that themselves are required to appear at the start of the clause, namely *gár*, *ge*, *dé*, *mén*, *-per*, and *te*, regularly precede *án*; there are also isolated examples of *dé* ‘exactly’ behaving like this, e.g. 688, as well as *méntoi* ‘yet’, e.g. 689, and *oûn* ‘so’, e.g. 690 (although Herodotus in some instances gives *án* precedence over *mén* and *dé* ‘then’, e.g. 691–693).

- (688) οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄν δόξωσι διαφερόντως προκεκρίσθαι  
 hoí de dê àn dóxōsi diapheróntōs  
 who.M.NOM.PL then exactly IRR seem.3SG.AOR.SBJV differently  
 prokekristhai  
 prejudge.PRF.INF.PASS  
 ‘But whichever ones seem to have been found excellent ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 114b)
- (689) οἷ γε μέντ' ἄν αὐτῶν φεύγωσι  
 hoí ge mént' àn autôn pheúgōsi  
 who.M.NOM.PL even yet IRR them.GEN flee.3PL.PRS.SBJV  
 ‘... while whichever of them flee ...’ (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 2.1.9)
- (690) ὁπότερος οὖν ἄν τῇ πόλει παραινέειν μέλλει τι χρηστόν  
 hopóteros oûn àn têi pólei parainésein  
 which.M.NOM.SG so IRR the.F.DAT.SG city.DAT.SG advise.3SG.AOR.SBJV

\* Translator’s note: *prokekristhai* not in Perseus edition

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

méllei                      ti                      khrēstón  
 be.going.to.3SG.PRS something.NOM.SG useful.N.NOM.SG  
 ‘Whichever one advises the city is going to be of some use.’  
 (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1420)

- (691) ὁς ἂν δὲ τῶν ἀστῶν λέπρην [...] ἔχη  
 hòs                      àn δὲ      tôn                      astôn                      léprēn  
 who.M.NOM.SG IRR then the.M.GEN.PL townsman.GEN.PL leprosy.ACC.SG  
 ékhēi  
 have.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 ‘And whoever among the citizens has leprosy ...’ (Herodotus 1.138.1)

- (692) ὁς ἂν μὲν νυν τῶν πυλῶρων ἐκὼν παρίη  
 hòs                      àn μὲν      nun      tôn                      pulōrôn  
 who.M.NOM.SG IRR then now the.M.GEN.PL guard.GEN.PL  
 hekôn                      paríēi  
 willing.M.NOM.SG pass.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 ‘Now whoever of the guards willingly admits us ...’ (Herodotus 3.72.5)

- (693) ὁς ἂν δὲ ἔχων ἦκη  
 hòs                      àn δὲ      ékhôn                      hékēi  
 who.M.NOM.SG IRR then have.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG arrive.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 ‘And whoever comes having ...’ (Herodotus 7.8D.1)

But *án* takes precedence over all other words. The inexcusable counterexample 694, which cannot be explained away, has long since been corrected by Mätzner (1838: 78) based on the Oxoniensis manuscript’s *àn mēnúēi*.

- (694) καθ’ ὧν μηνύη ἂν τις  
 kath’ hōn                      mēnúēi                      án tis  
 down whom.GEN.PL inform.3SG.PRS.SBJV IRR someone.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘... against whom someone informs ...’ (Antiphon 5.38)

In Nauck (1889: 688) we encounter the even more unexpected verses in 695. Dümmler (p.c.) proposes *àn pléon* ‘IRR more’ instead of the problematic *mállon* *àn*. Or should *thélēis* be changed to *thélois*?

- (695) ἀρετὴ δ’ ὅσῳ περ μᾶλλον ἂν χρῆσθαι θέλησ, τοσῶδε μείζων γίγνεται  
 καθ’ ἡμέραν

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *mállon*.

## 2 Translation

aretè                      d'    hósōiper                      mállon àn khrêsthai  
 goodness.VOC.SG then how.much.DAT.SG more    IRR use.PRS.INF.PASS  
 thélēis,                      tosōide                      meízōn                      gígnetai  
 want.2SG.PRS.SBJV so.much.DAT.SG greater.M.NOM.SG become.3SG.PRS  
 kath' hēméran  
 down day.ACC.SG  
 'And, Your Excellency, however much more you wish to use, it becomes  
 greater by so much day by day.' (Euripides Fragment 1029)

We are on firmer ground with the correction of a third example where *án* is wrongly placed, 696. We should simply reorder this to read *hē phárunx hopóson àn hēmôn*, which does not negatively affect the reply in verse 264 (697).

(696) ὅποσον ἡ φάρυγξ ἂν ἡμῶν χανδάνῃ  
 hopóson hē                      phárunx                      àn hēmôn khandánēi  
 as.much the.F.NOM.SG throat.NOM.SG IRR US.GEN contain.3SG.PRS.SBJV  
 '... as much as ever our throats can hold.' (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 259)

(697) οὐδέποτε· κεκράξομαι γάρ  
 oudépote; kekráxomai    gár  
 nor.ever croak.1SG.FPRF then  
 '... never, for I will croak ...' (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 264)

The attachment of *án* to the connective has become very close in Ionic *én* [p380] and Attic *án*, in which the usual *eán* 'if' has arisen through *ei* 'if' repeatedly preceding *án*, and in *hótan*, *epeidán*, *epán* = Ionic *epén* 'whenever', where the requirement for *án* to be preceded by no more than one word is lost.

But in other clause types there is also no difference to be observed between the positions of *án* and *ke(n)* in the earliest texts. In main clauses, as well as in indicative and optative subordinate clauses, we find that *án* in Homer follows the positional rule of the enclitics. There are only a few cases in which *án* strays from the rule. First, following *ou*: 698–702.

(698) τῶν οὐκ ἂν τι φέροις  
 tôn                      ouk án ti                      phérois  
 the.N.GEN.PL not IRR something.N.ACC.SG bear.2SG.PRS.OPT  
 '... nothing will you take ...' (Homer, *Iliad* 1.301)

(699) πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω  
 plēthùn                      d'    ouk àn egō    muthēsomai                      oud'  
 multitude.ACC.SG then not IRR I.NOM tell.1SG.AOR.SBJV.MID nor



## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

onoménō

name.1SG.AOR.SBJV

‘But the common folk I could not tell nor name’ (Homer, *Iliad* 2.488)

- (700) ἐκὼν δ’ οὐκ ἄν τις ἑλοῖτο  
hekōn d’ ouk án tis héloito  
willing.M.NOM.SG then not IRR someone.M.NOM.SG take.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
‘... whereas by his own will could no man win them.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 3.66)

- (701) τὸ μὲν οὐκ ἄν ἐγὼ ποτε μὰς ὀμόσαιμι  
tò mèn ouk án egō pote mās omósaimi  
the.N.ACC.SG then not IRR I.NOM sometime vainly swear.1SG.AOR.OPT  
‘... whereby I verily would never forswear myself’ (Homer, *Iliad* 15.40)

- (702) ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄν ἐφορμηθέντε γε νῶϊ τλαῖεν ἐναντίβιον στάντες μαχέσασθαι  
Ἄρηι  
epeì ouk án ephormēthénte ge nōi  
since not IRR rouse.PTCP.AOR.PASS.M.ACC.DU even us.ACC.DU  
tlaïen enantíβion stántes  
endure.3PL.AOR.OPT opposing stand.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL  
makhésasthai Árei  
fight.AOR.INF.MID Ares.DAT  
‘... seeing the men would not abide the oncoming of us two, and stand to contend with us in battle.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.489)

Now, we have already observed repeatedly that enclitics tend to attach after negation. And if this phenomenon is less often seen with *ke* than with *án*, we should remember Fick’s (1831: xxiii) remark that *ouk an*, which occurs strikingly often in the transmitted text, often appears to occur in the place of *ou ken*. (Against this, however, see Monro (1891: 330).) There are three other relevant examples, one with *kai án*: 703, while in 704 the *kai án* can be viewed as the start of a new clause.

- (703) ὅς νῦν γε καὶ ἄν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο  
hós nún ge kai án Diì patri  
who.M.NOM.SG now even also IRR Zeus.DAT father.DAT.SG  
mákhoito  
fight.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
‘... that would now fight even with father Zeus.’ (Homer, *Iliad* 5.362; cf. also 5.457)

## 2 Translation

- (704) ἄλλον μὲν κεν ἔγωγε θεῶν αἰειγενετάων ῥεῖα κατευνήσαιμι καὶ ἄν  
 ποταμοῖο ῥέεθρα Ὠκεανοῦ  
 állon mén ken égōge theōn aieigenetáōn  
 other.M.ACC.SG then IRR I.NOM.EMPH god.GEN.PL everlasting.M.GEN.PL  
 rheía kateunésaimi kaì àn potamoío rhéethra Ōkeanoû  
 easily lull.1SG.AOR.OPT also IRR river.GEN.SG stream.ACC.PL Ocean.GEN.SG  
 ‘... another of the gods, that are for ever, might I lightly lull to sleep, aye,  
 were it even the streams of the river Oceanus’ (Homer, *Iliad* 14.244)

One with *tákh’ án*: 705. (Cf. *tákh’ án* at the beginning of the clause in 706).

- (705) ἦς ὑπεροπλίησι τάχ’ ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσσει  
 hêis huperoplíēisi tákh’ án pote thumòn  
 his.F.DAT.PL insolence.DAT.PL quickly IRR sometime spirit.ACC.SG  
 oléssēi  
 destroy.3SG.AOR.SBJV  
 ‘Through his own excessive pride shall he presently lose his life.’  
 (Homer, *Iliad* 1.205)

- (706) τάχ’ ἄν ποτε καὶ τίσις εἴη  
 tákh’ án pote kaì tísis eíē  
 quickly IRR sometime also compensation.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘Recompense would haply be made some day’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 2.76)

Finally one with *tót’ án*: 707. (Cf. *tót’ án* at the beginning of the clause in Homer, *Iliad* 18.397, 24.213, and *Odyssey* 9.211).

- (707) ἐμοὶ δὲ τότ’ ἄν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη  
 emoì dè tót’ àn polù kérdion eíē  
 me.DAT then then IRR much better.N.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘... but for me it were better far ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 22.108)

These few examples, however, are certainly not enough to justify Hermann’s clear-cut division between *án* and *ke(n)*. His own example (Hermann 1831: 7), *ê s’ àn tisaímēn* ‘truly you IRR pay.1PL.OPT’ as opposed to *ê ke még’ oimóxeie* ‘truly IRR greatly wail.3SG.OPT’, demonstrates nothing, because *s(e)* is enclitic. Similarly, of course, no conclusions can be drawn from *eí per án* ‘if all IRR’ as opposed to

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has a different reading.

\* Translator’s note: These two examples are also included above as 685 and 581 respectively.

2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

example 708. Compare, moreover, the collocations *óphr' àn mén ken* ‘that IRR then IRR’ and *óút' án ken* ‘nor IRR IRR, although admittedly these are contested.

- (708) αἶ κέ περ ὕμμι φίλον καὶ ἡδὺ γένοιτο  
 aí ké per úmmi phílon kai hēdù  
 if IRR all you.DAT.PL dear.N.NOM.SG and sweet.N.NOM.SG  
 génoito  
 become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘... if haply it be your wish and your good pleasure ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 7.387)

Post-Homeric literature has *án* firmly following the old rule in conjunctive subordinate clauses. Its [p381] use in subordinate clauses of other moods is more variable. However, even here *án* attached firmly to the first word in certain cases. The compounds *hōs án* ‘as IRR’, *hópōs án* ‘so IRR’, and *hósper án* ‘like IRR’ are particularly worthy of consideration in this connection.

The situation is clearest in final and consecutive clauses beginning with *hōs* ‘as’ and *hópōs* ‘so’ and containing the optative or indicative with *án*, thanks to the collections that Weber (1884; 1885) has collected and published. In such clauses we have *hōs án* adjacent to each other not only in Homer (e.g. 709) but also in 710–718, and in 719, in which *hōs án* should probably be read as consecutive.

- (709) ὥς ἄν πύρνα κατὰ μνηστῆρας ἀγείροι  
 hōs àn púrna katà mnēstēras ageíroi  
 as IRR bread.ACC.PL down suitor.ACC.PL gather.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘... to go among the wooers and gather bits of bread ...’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 17.362)

- (710) ὥς ἄν καὶ γέρον ἡράσσαςτο  
 hōs àn kai gérōn ērásato  
 as IRR also old.M.NOM.SG love.3SG.AOR.MID  
 ‘... that even an old man should love’ (Archilochus Fragment 30)

- (711) ὥς ἄν σε θωῖῃ λάβοι  
 hōs án se thōiē láboi  
 as IRR you.ACC penalty.NOM.SG take.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... that a penalty should overtake you’ (Archilochus Fragment 101)

\* Translator’s note: See e.g. *Iliad* 11.187 and 13.127 respectively.

## 2 Translation

- (712) ὥς ἂν θεᾷ πρῶτοι κτίσαιεν βωμόν  
**hōs àn** theāi prōtoi ktísaiēn bōmón  
as IRR goddess.DAT.SG first.M.NOM.PL build.3PL.AOR.OPT altar.ACC.SG  
‘... that they should be the first to build an altar for the goddess’ (Pindar, *Olympian Ode* 7.42)
- (713) ὥς ἂν ποταθείην  
**hōs àn** potatheîēn  
as IRR soar.1SG.AOR.OPT.PASS  
‘... that I might soar ...’ (Aristophanes, *Birds* 1338)
- (714) ὥς ἂν πυνθανόμενοι πλεῖστοι συνέλθοιεν Σπαρτιητέων  
**hōs àn** punthanómenoi pleístoi  
as IRR learn.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.PL most.M.NOM.PL  
sunélthoien Spartiētēōn  
assemble.3PL.AOR.OPT Spartan.GEN.PL  
‘... so that as many as possible of the Spartans might assemble to hear him’ (Herodotus 1.152.1; cf. also 5.37.2, 7.176.4, 8.7.1, 9.22.3, 9.51.3)
- (715) ὥς ἂν μάλιστα τὸν υἱὸν ἐχθρὸν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῇ πόλει ποιήσειε  
**hōs àn** málista tòn huiòn ekhthròn heautōi kaì  
as IRR most the.M.ACC.SG son.ACC.SG enemy.ACC.SG himself.DAT and  
tēi pólei poiēseie  
the.F.DAT.SG city.DAT make.3SG.AOR.OPT  
‘... so as best to make his son an enemy of himself and of the city’  
([Andocides] 4.23)
- (716) ὥς ἂν μάλιστα αὐτὸς ὁ δεδεμένος ξυλλήπτωρ εἴη τοῦ δεδέσθαι  
**hōs àn** málista autòs ho  
as IRR most same.M.NOM.SG the.M.NOM.SG  
dedeménos xulléptōr eíē  
bind.PTCP.PRF.PASS.M.NOM.SG accomplice.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS.OPT  
toû dedésthai  
the.N.GEN.SG bind.PRF.INF.PASS  
‘... so that the prisoner himself would be the greatest assistant in his imprisonment’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 82e)
- (717) τοῖς μὲν κοσμίοις τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὥς ἂν κοσμιώτεροι γίγνοιτο οἱ  
μή πω ὄντες, δεῖ χαρίζεσθαι

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *ampotatheîēn*.

2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

toîs mèn kosmiois tôn anthrôpôn, kai hōs  
 the.M.DAT.PL then orderly.M.DAT.PL the.M.GEN.PL person.GEN.PL and as  
 àn kosmióteroi gígnointo hoi mé pō  
 IRR orderly.COMP.M.NOM.PL become.3PL.PRS.OPT the.M.NOM.PL not yet  
 óntes, deî kharízesthai  
 be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL lack.3SG.PRS gratify.PRS.INF.PASS  
 ‘It is necessary to indulge the orderly, and so that those who are not yet  
 so may become more orderly.’ (Plato, *Symposium* 187d)

- (718) δοκῶ μοι [...] ἔχειν μηχανήν, ὥς ἂν εἶεν ἄνθρωποι καὶ παύσαιντο τῆς ἀκολακίας  
 dokô moi ékhein mēkhanén, hōs àn eîen  
 think.1SG.PRS me.DAT have.PRS.INF means.ACC.SG as IRR be.3PL.PRS.OPT  
 ánthrōpoi kai paúsainto tēs akolasías  
 person.NOM.PL and stop.3PL.AOR.MID the.F.GEN.SG intemperance.GEN.SG  
 ‘I think I have a means for man to be and yet cease his iniquity.’ (Plato, *Symposium* 190c)

- (719) ὥς δ’ ἂν ἐξετασθεῖη μάλιτ’ ἀκριβῶς, μὴ γένοιτο  
 hōs d’ àn exetastheîē málist’ akribôs, mē  
 as then IRR examine.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS most strictly not  
 génoito  
 become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘May it not come to pass that this be tested in the severest way.’  
 (Demosthenes 6.37)

Very frequent in Xenophon, the only Attic prose writer who often connects *hōs* with *án* and the optative in a purely final sense. Of the seventeen examples given in Weber (1885: 83ff.), fourteen have *án* immediately after *hōs*, and only three are separated from it: final 720 and 721, and consecutive 722. These are the only three cases in which the tradition demanding adjacency of *ōs* and *án* is broken.

- (720) ὥς μηδενὸς ἂν δέοιτο  
 hōs mēdenòs àn déoito  
 as nothing.GEN.SG IRR lack.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘... so that he should lack for nothing’ (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 5.1.18)

\* Translator’s note: The Persus ed. has *eîen te* for *eîen*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *endéoito* for *án déoito*.

## 2 Translation

(721) ὥς ὅτι ἥκιστα ἄν ἐπιφθόνοις σπάνιος τε καὶ σεμνὸς φανείη  
**hōs** hótī hékista **àn** epiphthónois spánios te kai  
 as that least IRR envious.M.DAT.PL rare.M.NOM.SG and and  
 semnòs phaneíē  
 solemn.M.NOM.SG show.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 ‘... in such a way that he would appear seldom and solemnly, and with  
 as little envy as possible.’ (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 7.5.37)

(722) ὥς πᾶς ἄν ἔγνω, ὅτι ἀσμένῃ ἤκουσε  
**hōs** pās **àn** égnō, hótī asménē ékouse  
 as all.M.NOM.SG IRR know.3SG.AOR that glad.F.NOM.SG hear.3SG.AOR  
 ‘... so that everyone would know that she was glad to hear’ (Xenophon,  
*Symposium* 9.3)

However, according to the transmitted manuscripts, there are a further two examples from Euripidean verse: 723 and 724. But the first verse has been treated by suspicion by critics since Markland (1811: 178), and in the [p382] second the usual reading is *hōs esidoíman*. (In 725, **hōs** is relative.)

(723) ὥς δὴ σκότος λαβόντες ἐκωθεῖμεν ἄν  
**hōs** dē skótos labóntes eksōtheímen  
 as exactly dark.ACC.SG take.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL save.1PL.AOR.OPT.PASS  
**án**  
 IRR  
 ‘... so that we might keep safe using the darkness’ (Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris* 1025)

(724) Ἀχαιῶν στρατιὰν ὥς ἴδοιμ’ ἄν  
 Akhaiôn stratiàn **hōs** ídoim’ **án**  
 Achaean.GEN.PL army.ACC.SG as see.1SG.AOR.OPT IRR  
 ‘... so that I might see the army of the Achaeans’ (Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis* 171)

(725) οὕτω προίῃ, ὥς μάλιστ’ ἄν [...] ποιοίῃ  
 hóutō proíēi, **hōs** málist’ **àn** poioíē  
 so proceed.3SG.PRS.SBJV as most IRR make.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘... so proceed as best to make ...’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 453c)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *epiphthónōs* for *epiphthónois*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition follows this usual reading

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *skóton* for *skótos*.

2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

The collocation *hópōs án* ‘so IRR’ is even more fixed in such clauses: 726–730.

- (726) ὅπως ἂν μήτε πρὸ καιροῦ μήθ’ ὑπὲρ ἄστρων βέλος ἡλίθιον κήψειεν  
**hópōs án** méte prò kairoû méth’ hupèr ástrōn  
 so IRR nor before point.GEN.SG nor over star.GEN.PL  
 bélos ēlithion sképsēien  
 dart.NOM.SG vain.N.NOM.SG land.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... so that his bolt would not land in vain either short of the target or beyond the stars.’ (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 364)
- (727) ὅπως ἂν τὸ στρατόπεδον ἰδρυμένον κατὰ νότου λάβοι  
**hókōs án** tò stratópēdon hidruménōn katà  
 so IRR the.N.ACC.SG camp.ACC.SG settle.PTCP.PRF.PASS.N.ACC.SG down  
 nótu láboi  
 back.GEN.SG take.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... so that it would arrive behind where the camp was situated.’  
 (Herodotus 1.75.5; see also 1.91.2, 1.110.3, 2.126.1, 3.44.1, 5.98.4, 8.13.1)
- (728) ὅπως ἂν ἀπολισθάνοι καὶ μὴ ἔχοι ἀντιλαβὴν ἢ χεῖρ  
**hópōs án** apolisthánōi kaì mè ékhoi antilabēn  
 so IRR slip.off.3SG.PRS.OPT and not have.3SG.PRS.OPT hold.ACC.SG  
 hē kheír  
 the.F.NOM.SG hand.NOM.SG  
 ‘... so that the hook would slip off and not take hold.’ (Thucydides 7.65.2)
- (729) ὅπως ἂν περιλάβοιμ’ αὐτῶν τινα  
**hópōs án** periláboim’ autôn tina  
 so IRR catch.1SG.AOR.OPT them.GEN someone.M.ACC.SG  
 ‘... so that I might catch one of them.’ (Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 881)
- (730) ὅπως ἂν εὐδαιμονοίῃς  
**hópōs án** eudaimonoíēs  
 so IRR prosper.2SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘... for you to be happy.’ (Plato, *Lysis* 207e)

Very frequent in Xenophon, twelve times (not counting *hópōs* ‘how’ following verbs of advising and thinking) according to the evidence of Weber (1885: 83ff.), and always such that *án* immediately follows *hópōs*; 731 is a peculiar case.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has interrog. *pōs* ... ?

## 2 Translation

- (731) σκοπῶ, ὅπως ἂν ὁ μὲν παῖς ὅδε ὁ cὸς καὶ ἡ παῖς ἥδε ὥς ῥᾶστα διάγοιεν,  
 ἡμεῖς δ' ἂν μάλιστα (ἂν) εὐφραιοίμεθα  
 skopō,                    **hópōs àn** ho                    mèn païs  
 consider.1SG.PRS so            IRR the.M.NOM.SG then child.NOM.SG  
 hóde                    ho                    sòs                    kai hē  
 this.M.NOM.SG the.M.NOM.SG your.M.NOM.SG and the.F.NOM.SG  
 païs                    hēde                    hōs rhâista            diágoien,  
 child.NOM.SG this.F.NOM.SG as    easily.SUPL continue.3PL.PRS.OPT  
 hēmeis d'            **àn** málista (**àn**) euphrainoímetha  
 we.NOM then IRR most    IRR cheer.1PL.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 'I am considering how this boy of yours and this girl could proceed as  
 easily as possible while we took the most pleasure.' (Xenophon,  
*Symposium* 7.2)

In 732, the subjunctive *apallagē* recommended by Herwerden (1880: 75–76) and Weber (1885: 3) is too short for the gap, whose extent can be determined by the spelling *stoikhēdon*.

- (732) ὅπως ἂν ὁ δῆμο[ς ἀπαλλαγείη τ]οῦ πολέμου  
**hópōs àn** ho                    dêmo[s                    apallageiē  
 so            IRR the.M.NOM.SG people.NOM.SG deliver.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 t]oû                    polémou  
 the.M.GEN.SG war.GEN.SG  
 '...so that the people may be delivered from war.' (CIA 2.300.20; Köhler  
 (1877: 123–124), 295/4 BCE)

After all of this there can be no doubt that Hermann (1816: 746) and Velsen (1883: 77) are wrong to want to read Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 916 as 733, and that, if *án* is to be inserted here at all, it should be in its normal position immediately following *hópōs*.

- (733) ὅπως αὐτῆς <ἂν> κατόναι(ο)  
**hópōs** sautēs                    <**àn**> katónai(o)  
 so            yourself.F.GEN.SG IRR    bless.2SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 '... so you may be blessed.' (Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 916)

Similar to final clauses with *hōs* and *hópōs* are indirect questions in the optative and containing *án*, introduced by the same particles or by *pōs* 'how'.

a) *hōs án* are immediately adjacent: 734–736. The only deviation, as far as I can tell, is the second part of the Demosthenian example 737. On Demosthenes 10.45 see below (example 750).



## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

- (734) ἐὰν οἷοί τε γενώμεθα εὐρεῖν, ὥς ἂν ἐγγύτατα τῶν εἰρημένων πόλις  
οικήσειεν  
eàn hoîoî                      te genômetha                      heureîn,                      hōs  
if    such.as.M.NOM.PL and become.1PL.AOR.SBJV.MID find.AOR.INF as  
àn engútata tōn                      eirēménōn                      pólis  
IRR nearest    the.N.GEN.PL say.PTCP.PRF.PASS.N.GEN.PL city.NOM.SG  
oikéseien  
settle.3SG.AOR.OPT  
‘If such as we may come to find how a state may be governed as closely  
as possible to what has been said ...’ (Plato, *Republic* 5.473a)
- (735) διδάσκει, ὥς ἂν καλλιστά τις αὐτῇ χρῶτο  
didáskei,                      hōs àn kallistá                      tis                      autêi  
teach.3SG.PRS as    IRR beautifully.SUPL someone.M.NOM.SG her.DAT.SG  
khrôito  
use.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
‘She teaches how one may treat her best.’ (Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 19.18)
- (736) τᾶλλ’ ὥς ἂν μοι βέλτιστα καὶ τάχιστα δοκεῖ παρασκευασθῆναι, καὶ δὴ  
πειράσομαι λέγειν  
táll’                      hōs àn moi                      bél-tista kai tákhista  
the=other.N.ACC.PL as    IRR me.DAT best    and fastest  
dokeî                      paraskeuasthênai, kai dê                      peirásomai  
seem.3SG.PRS.IND equip.AOR.INF.PASS also exactly try.1SG.FUT.MID  
légein  
say.PRS.INF  
‘I shall now attempt to speak of providing the rest in the way that seems  
best and fastest to me.’ (Demosthenes 4.13; cf. also 20.87)
- (737) ὥς μὲν ἂν εἴποιτε καὶ [...] συνεῖτε, ἄμεινον Φιλίππου παρεσκεύασθε, ὥς  
δὲ κωλύσαιτ’ ἂν ἐκείνον [...], παντελῶς ἀργῶς ἔχετε  
hōs mèn àn eípoite                      kai sunéite,                      ámeinson  
as    then IRR say.2PL.AOR.OPT and perceive.2PL.AOR.OPT better  
Philíppou pareskeúasthe,                      hōs dê kólúsait’                      àn  
Philip.GEN equip.2PL.PRF.PASS as    then hinder.2PL.AOR.OPT IRR  
ekéinon                      pantelôs argôs ékhete  
that.M.ACC.SG completely idly    have.2PL.PRS  
‘While you are better equipped than Philip for speaking and listening, as

## 2 Translation

for hindering him you remain completely idle.’ (Demosthenes 6.3)

b) *hópōs án* are immediately adjacent: 738. Also frequent in Xenophon: 739. Likewise *Anabasis* [p383] 3.2.27, 4.3.14, and 5.7.20, *Hellenica* 2.3.13, 3.2.1, 7.1.27, and 7.1.33, and *Cyropaedia* 1.4.13 and 2.1.4. I have no counterexamples to hand. (Cf., however, 740.)

- (738) οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅπως ἂν τις αὐτὰ νομίσειε μὴ ἔόντα  
 ouk oîd’                      **hópōs án** tis                      autà  
 not know.1SG.PRF so            IRR someone.M.NOM.SG them.N.ACC.PL  
 nomíseie                      mè éonta  
 consider.3SG.AOR.OPT not be.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.PL  
 ‘I do not know how anyone could consider them not to be so.’  
 ([Hippocrates.] *De arte*; Gomperz (1890: 42, line 20))

- (739) τὸν γὰρ θεῶν πόλεμον οὐκ οἶδα [...], ὅπως ἂν εἰς ἐχρὺρὸν χωρίον  
 ἀποσταίῃ  
 tòn                      gàr theôn                      pólemon                      ouk oîda                      **hópōs án**  
 the.M.ACC.SG then god.GEN.PL war.ACC.SG not know.1SG.PRF so            IRR  
 eis ekhuròn                      khōrion                      apostaiē  
 into secure.N.ACC.SG place.ACC.SG withdraw.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘For in war with the gods I know not how one could withdraw to a place  
 of safety.’ (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 2.5.7)

- (740) ὥς τύχῳ μαντευμάτων, ὅπῃ νεὼς τεύλαμι’ ἂν οὐρίον πτερόν  
 hōs túkhō                      manteumátōn, **hópēi**                      neōs  
 as happen.1SG.AOR.SBJV oracle.GEN.PL whereby ship.GEN.SG  
 steílaim’                      **án** ourion                      pterón  
 prepare.1S.AOR.OPT IRR fair-winded.N.ACC.SG wing.ACC.SG  
 ‘... so I might obtain an oracle: how I should steer a favourable course ...’  
 (Euripides, *Helen* 146)

c) *pōs an* are immediately adjacent, e.g. 741 and 742. I have no counterexamples here either.

- (741) συνβουλευέτο, πῶς ἂν τὴν μάχην ποιοῖτο  
 sunebouleúto,                      **pōs án** tēn                      mákhēn  
 counsel.3SG.IMP.PASS how IRR the.F.ACC.SG battle.ACC.SG  
 poioîto  
 make.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 ‘He took counsel as to how he should fight the battle.’ (Xenophon,

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

### *Anabasis* 1.7.2)

- (742) εἰ [...] ἐσκόπει [...], πῶς ἂν ἄριστ' ἐναντιωθεῖη τῇ εἰρήνῃ  
 ei eskópei                      **pōs án** árist' enantiōtheíē                      tēi  
 if consider.3SG.IMP how IRR best oppose.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS the.F.DAT.SG  
 eirénēi  
 peace.DAT.SG  
 'If he had considered how he might best oppose the peace ...'  
 (Demosthenes 19.14)

But also the relativizer *hōs*, *hōsper* 'as, how' shows the property of bonding *án* tightly to itself. To begin with *hōs*, it is true that we have cases such as 743–750.

- (743) ὥς μάλιστ' ἂν ἐν πόθῳ λάβοις  
**hōs** málist' **án** en póthōi                      lábois  
 as most IRR in longing.DAT.SG take.2SG.AOR.OPT  
 'Just as you might have most longed for' (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1678)
- (744) ὥς εἰκὸς δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι παρόντι πένθει  
**hōs** eikòs                      dóxeien                      **án** eínai  
 as resemble.PTCP.PRF.N.NOM.SG seem.3SG.AOR.OPT IRR be.PRS.INF  
 parónti                      pénthei  
 be.present.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG mourning.DAT  
 '... as might seem to be likely for one present at a scene of mourning'  
 (Plato, *Phaedo* 59a)
- (745) ὥς ἡμεῖς φαῖμεν ἂν  
**hōs** hēmeîs phaîmen                      **án**  
 as we.NOM say.1PL.PRS.OPT IRR  
 '... as we may say ...' (Plato, *Phaedo* 118a)
- (746) ὥς ἀπὸ τούτων ἂν τις εἰκάζειεν  
**hōs** apò toutōn                      **án** tis                      eikázeien  
 as of this.N.GEN.PL IRR someone.M.NOM.SG represent.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 '... as one might infer from this.' (Plato, *Symposium* 190a)
- (747) ὥς γοῦν ἐγὼ φαίην ἂν  
**hōs** goûn egò phaíēn                      **án**  
 as at.least I.NOM say.1SG.PRS.OPT IRR  
 'So I should say, at least.' (Plato, *Philebus* 15c)

---

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition adds *te* after the first word.

## 2 Translation

- (748) ὥς γ' ἡμεῖς ἂν οἰηθεῖμεν  
**hōs** g' hēmeis **àn** oiētheimen  
 as even we.NOM IRR think.1PL.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 '... which we might otherwise suppose.' (Plato, *Laws* 4.712c)
- (749) θᾶττον ἢ ὥς τις ἂν ᾤετο  
 thâtton è **hōs** tis **àn** ôieto  
 faster than as someone.M.NOM.SG IRR think.3SG.IMP.PASS  
 '... faster than one would have imagined' (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 1.5.8)
- (750) ὥς μὲν οὖν εἴποι τις ἂν, [...] ταῦτ' ἴσως ἐστίν  
**hōs** mèn oûn eîpoi tis **àn**, taût'  
 as then so say.3SG.AOR.OPT someone.M.NOM.SG IRR this.N.NOM.PL  
 isōs estin  
 perhaps be.3SG.PRS  
 'So while this is perhaps what one might say ...' ([Demosthenes] 10.45)
- (The remainder of the sentence in 750, given in 751, contains interrogative *hōs*.)
- (751) ὥς δὲ καὶ γένοιτ' ἂν, νόμῳ διορθώσασθαι δεῖ  
**hōs** dè kai génoit' **àn**, nómoī  
 as then also become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR law.DAT.SG  
 diorthósasthai deī  
 arrange.AOR.INF.MID lack.3SG.PRS  
 'It is necessary to arrange by law how it should come about.'  
 ([Demosthenes] 10.45)

However, in opposition to these we have not only the examples in 752–756; rather, we should also take into account the elliptical use of *hōs án*, which only makes sense if the close connection between *hōs* and *án* was firmly ingrained into linguistic consciousness. In fact, with such uses the verb of the main clause is to be understood as repeated in optative form, and we find such repetition realized in 754 and 755.

- (752) ἐκόντες, ὥς ἂν ἄριστα περὶ τῶν οἰκείων βουλευσάιντο, πρὸς τὴν  
 δύναντι τὴν αὐτῶν εὖ ποιοῦσιν  
 hekóntes, **hōs** **àn** árista perì tôn oikéiōn  
 willing.M.NOM.PL as IRR best about the.N.GEN.PL domestic.N.GEN.PL

---

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *en* for *án*.

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

bouleúsainto, pròs tèn dúnamin tèn  
 counsel.3PL.AOR.OPT.MID to the.F.ACC.SG power.ACC.SG the.F.ACC.SG  
 hautòn eû poioûsin  
 themselves.GEN well do.3PL.PRS  
 ‘They do good willingly, as seems advisable according to their interests,  
 to the best of their own ability.’ (Plato, *Phaedrus* 231a; cf. also Plato,  
*Apology* 34c)

- (753) ὥς ἂν συντομότατ’ εἴποι τις  
**hōs án** suntomótat’ eípoi tis  
 as IRR briefly.SUPL say.3SG.AOR.OPT someone.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘... as one might say as briefly as possible ...’ (Demosthenes 27.7)

- (754) στέρξας ὥς ἂν υἱόν τις στέρξαι  
 stérxas **hōs án** huión tis  
 love.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG as IRR son.ACC.SG someone.M.NOM.SG  
 stérxai  
 love.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... having loved as one might love a son ...’ (Demosthenes 39.22)

- (755) οὐδὲ μεμαρτύρηκεν ἀπλῶς, ὥς ἂν τις τάληθῇ μαρτυρήσειε  
 oudè memartúrēken haplōs, **hōs án** tis  
 nor testify.3SG.PRF simply as IRR someone.M.NOM.SG  
 talēthē marturéseie  
 the=true.N.ACC.PL testify.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... nor has (anyone) testified simply, as one would testify to the truth’  
 (Demosthenes 45.18)

- (756) τὸ [...] μὴ πάνθ’ ὥς ἂν ἡμεῖς βουλοίμεθ’ ἔχειν [...], οὐδὲν ἐστὶ θαυμαστόν  
 tò mè pánth’ **hōs án** hēmeís bouloímeth’  
 the.N.NOM.SG not all.N.ACC.PL as IRR we.NOM wish.1PL.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 ékhein oudén esti thaumastón  
 have.PRS.INF nothing.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS wonderful.N.NOM.SG  
 ‘That everything is not going as we might wish is nothing astonishing.’  
 (Demosthenes, *Exordia* 2.3)

This *hōs án* is found a) before *ei* ‘if’ in 757; cf. the *hōsaneí* of post-classical Greek;

- (757) ὥς ἂν εἰ λέγοι

## 2 Translation

**hōs àn** ei légoi

as IRR if say.3SG.PRS.OPT

‘... as if he were speaking’ (Plato, *Protagoras* 344b)

b) before participles: α) with a new subject: 758–762.

- (758) καὶ τὸν Κῦρον ἐρέσθαι προπετῶς, ὥς ἂν παῖς μηδέπω ὑποπτήσων  
 kai tòn Kûron erésthai propetôs, hōs àn  
 and the.M.ACC.SG Cyrus.ACC.SG ask.AOR.INF.MID precipitously as IRR  
 paîs mēdépo hupoptéssōn  
 child.M.NOM.SG nor.yet crouch.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘And Cyrus asked precipitously, like a boy not yet shy...’ (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 1.3.8)

- (759) ἀπεκρίνατο, οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ φυλαττόμενοι [...], ἀλλ’ ὥς ἂν πεπεισμένοι  
 apekrínato, oukh hóspēr hoi  
 answer.3SG.AOR.MID not like the.M.NOM.PL  
 phulattómenoi all’ hōs àn  
 guard.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.PL but as IRR  
 pepeisménoi málista práttein tà  
 persuade.PTCP.PRF.PASS.M.NOM.PL most do.PRS.INF the.N.ACC.PL  
 déonta  
 lack.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.PL  
 ‘He answered not like those defending themselves but like those most determined to do what is necessary.’ (Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 3.8.1)

- (760) ἔχει τὰ μέν, ὥς ἂν ἐλὼν τις πολέμῳ  
 ékhei tà mén, hōs àn helôn  
 have.3SG.PRS the.N.ACC.PL then as IRR take.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 tis polémōi  
 someone.M.NOM.SG war.DAT.SG  
 ‘He holds these as one who has taken by force’ (Demosthenes 4.6)

- (761) οὐδὲ ταῦθ’ ἀπλῶς [...] φανήσεται γεγραφώς, ἀλλ’ ὥς ἂν μάλιστά τις  
 ōudè taũth’ haplôs phanéseai geographôs,  
 nor this.N.ACC.PL simply show.3SG.FUT.PASS write.PTCP.PRF.M.NOM.SG

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *eperésthai* for *erésthai*.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition adds *ékhoi* after *tis*.

2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

all' *hōs án* *málistá tis* humâs exapatêsai kai  
 but as IRR most someone.M.NOM.SG you.ACC.PL deceive.AOR.INF and  
 parakroúsasthai boulómenos  
 mislead.AOR.INF.MID wish.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.SG  
 'Nor does he appear having written these things simply, but as one  
 wanting most to deceive and mislead you.' (Demosthenes 24.79)

[p384]

- (762) συγγραφὰς ἐποιήσαντο [...], ὥς ἂν οἱ μάλιστα ἀπιστοῦντες  
 sungraphàs epoiésanto *hōs án* hoi málista  
 contract.ACC.PL make.3PL.AOR.MID as IRR the.M.NOM.PL most  
 apistoúntes  
 distrust.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL  
 'They drew up two contracts, as with the greatest distrust'  
 ([Demosthenes] 34.32)

More frequently, β) without explicit mention of the indefinite subject actually intended ("as someone did in such and such a condition"), where *hōs án* comes very close to the meaning of *háte* 'as' and the participle takes the case of the word in the main clause whose referent is specified by the participle. Thus, for instance, 763–771.

- (763) γλῶσσαν οὐκέτ' Ἀττικὴν ἰέντας, ὥς ἂν πολλαχοῦ πλανωμένου  
 glōssan oukét' Attikēn hiéntas, *hōs án*  
 tongue.ACC.SG no.more Attic.F.ACC.SG send.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.PL as IRR  
 pollakhoû planōménous  
 many.places lead astray.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.ACC.PL  
 '... no longer uttering the Attic tongue, as wanderers in many places ...'  
 (Solon in Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians* 12.4; now confirmed by  
 Kenyon (1891: 31 line 10))
- (764) ἡ γυνὴ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἀπιέναι, ὥς ἂν ἀσμένῃ με ἑορακυῖα  
 hē gunē ouk éthelen apiénai, *hōs án*  
 the.F.NOM.SG woman.NOM.SG not want.3SG.IMP go.away.PRS.INF as IRR  
 asménē me heorakuía  
 glad.F.NOM.SG me.ACC see.PTCP.PRF.F.NOM.SG  
 'My wife was unwilling to go, as if (she were) glad to see me.' (Lysias  
 1.12)

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *pollakhêi* for *pollakhoû*.

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *hē dè tò mèn prōton ouk éthelen*.

## 2 Translation

- (765) διεσιώπησεν, ὥς ἂν τότε σκοπῶν, ὁπόθεν ἄρχοιτο  
diesiōpēsen,                    **hōs àn** τότε σκοπῶν,  
remain.silent.3SG.AOR as    IRR then consider.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
hopóthen árkhoito  
whence    begin.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
‘(He) remained silent, as if now considering how he should begin.’  
(Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 3.6.4)
- (766) κρότον τοιοῦτον ὥς ἂν ἐπαινοῦντές τε καὶ συνησθέντες ἐποιήσατε  
króton                    toioûton                    **hōs àn** epainoûntés                    te  
applause.ACC.SG such.M.ACC.SG as    IRR praise.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL and  
καὶ συνῆσθέντες                    ἐποιέσατε  
and sympathize.PTCP.AOR.PASS.M.NOM.PL make.2PL.AOR  
‘You made such applause as would those who approve of and rejoice  
with me.’ (Demosthenes 21.14)
- (767) θρυλοῦντος αἰί, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὥς ἂν εἰς κοινὴν γνώμην  
áποφαινομένου  
thruloûntos                    aeí,                    τὸ                    mèn prôton                    **hōs**  
chatter.PTCP.PRS.M.GEN.SG always the.N.ACC.SG then first.N.ACC.SG as  
**àn** eis koinèn                    gnómēn  
IRR into common.F.ACC.SG opinion.ACC.SG  
apophainoménu  
display.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.GEN.SG  
‘... always talking, at first as one communicating his opinion ...’  
(Demosthenes 19.156)
- (768) διαλεχθεὶς τι πρὸς αὐτὸν οὕτως ὥς ἂν μεθύων  
dialekhtheís                    ti                    pròs hautòn  
discuss.PTCP.AOR.PASS.M.NOM.SG something.ACC to    himself.ACC  
hoútōs **hōs àn** methúōn  
so                    as    IRR be.drunk.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
‘... saying something to himself, as a drunken man does...’  
(Demosthenes 54.7)
- (769) συνεδίπνει ἐναντίον πολλῶν Νέαιρα, ὥς ἂν ἑταίρα οὔσα  
sunedeípnei                    enantíon pollôn                    Néaira,                    **hōs àn**  
dine.together.3SG.IMP before    many.M.GEN.PL Neaera.NOM as    IRR

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *koinòn* for *koinèn*.



## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *ân* in subordinate clauses

hetaíra                      oûsa  
companion.NOM.SG be.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.SG  
‘Naeaera dined with them in public, as would one who was a courtesan.’  
([Demosthenes] 59.24)

- (770) σημεῖον δ’ ἐ<πi>φέρουσι τό τε ὄνομα τοῦ τέλους, ὥς ἂν ἀπὸ τοῦ  
πράγματος κείμενον  
sēmeíon d’ e<pi>phérousi tó                      te ónoma  
sign.ACC.SG then bring.3PL.PRS the.N.ACC.SG and name.ACC.SG  
toû                      téλους,                      hōs ân apò toû                      prágmato  
the.N.GEN.SG end.GEN.SG as                      IRR of                      the.N.GEN.SG deed.GEN.SG  
keímenon  
lie.PTCP.PRS.PASS.N.ACC.SG  
‘... and they adduce as a proof the name of the rating as being derived  
from the fact’ (Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians* 7.4; Kenyon (1891:  
19, line 12))

- (771) ἔπτη δ’ ὥς ἂν ἔχων τοὺς πόδας ἡμετέρους  
éptē d’ hōs ân ékhōn                      toùs  
fly.3SG.AOR then as                      IRR have.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG the.M.ACC.PL  
pódas                      hēmetérous  
feet.ACC.PL our.M.ACC.PL  
‘He flew as if he had our feet.’ (Anthologia Graeca 6.259)

c) Other: 772–780.

- (772) ἄγαν καλῶς κλύουσά γ’ ὥς ἂν οὐ φίλη  
ágan kalōs klúousá                      g’ hōs ân ou philē  
too beautifully hear.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.SG even as                      IRR not dear.F.NOM.SG  
‘... obeying rather too well, as if unfriendly’ (Aeschylus, *Suppliants* 718)
- (773) ὥς ἂν μάλιστα, μετὰ ἀειμνήστου μαρτυρίου τὴν χάριν καταθήσεσθε  
hōs ân málista, metà aeimnéstou                      marturiou  
as                      IRR most after ever-remembered.N.GEN.SG testimony.GEN.SG  
tên                      khárin katathéseste  
the.F.ACC.SG grace.ACC place.2PL.FUT.MID  
‘As far as possible, you will store up gratitude as an everlasting witness’  
(Thucydides 1.33.1)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition adds *hautēi* after *Néaira*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *dē phérousi* for *d’ e<pi>phérousi*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *toîsin* for *hōs ân*.

## 2 Translation

- (774) ἀπερискέπτως προσπερόντες καὶ ὥς ἂν μάλιστα δι' ὀργῆς  
aperisképtōs prospesóntes                      kaì hōs àn málista di'  
recklessly fall.upon.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL and as IRR most through  
orgēs  
anger.GEN.SG  
'... recklessly falling upon him in the greatest possible rage ...'  
(Thucydides 6.57.3)
- (775) δῶρα πολλὰ [...] φέρων καὶ ἄγων, ὥς ἂν ἐξ οἴκου μεγάλου  
dôra pollà phérōn kaì  
gift.ACC.PL many.N.ACC.PL bear.PTCP.PR.S.M.NOM.SG and  
ágōn,                      hōs àn ex oíkou megalou  
lead.PTCP.PR.S.M.NOM.SG as IRR out house.GEN.SG great.M.GEN.SG  
'... bearing and bringing many gifts, as from a great house' (Xenophon,  
*Cyropaedia* 5.4.29)
- (776) εἰ σοι πείσαιμι [...] (ἐπιτρέπειν) τὴν πόλιν ψευδόμενος, ὥς ἂν  
eí soi peísaimi (epitrépein) tēn  
if you.DAT persuade.1SG.AOR.OPT entrust.PR.S.INF the.F.ACC.SG  
pólin pseudómenos,                      hōs àn stratēgikôi te  
city.ACC.SG lie.PTCP.PR.S.PASS.M.NOM.SG as IRR military.M.DAT.SG and  
kaì dikastikôi kaì politikôi  
and juridical.M.DAT.SG and political.M.DAT.SG  
'If by lying I persuaded (them to entrust) the city to you, as if to a  
general and jurist and statesman ...' (Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 2.6.38)
- (777) οὐδ' ὥς ἂν καλλιστ' αὐτῷ τὰ παρόντ' ἔχει  
oud' hōs àn kallist' autôi tà  
nor as IRR beautifully.SUPL him.DAT the.N.NOM.PL  
parónt'  
be.present.PTCP.PR.S.N.NOM.PL have.3SG.PR.S  
'Nor is the present situation going as well as possible for him'  
(Demosthenes 1.21)
- (778) οὐχ ὥς ἂν εὖνοος καὶ δίκαιος πολίτης ἕχεε τὴν γνώμην  
oukh hōs àn eúnous kaì díkaios  
not as IRR right.minded.M.NOM.SG and righteous.M.NOM.SG

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

politēs éskhe tèn gnómēn  
 citizen.NOM.SG have.3SG.AOR the.F.ACC.SG opinion.F.ACC.SG  
 ‘... not as an honest and loyal citizen would have held’ (Demosthenes 18.291)

- (779) ἀφυλάκτων ὄντων, ὥς ἂν πρὸς φίλον τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ  
 aphuláktōn óntōn, hōs ἂν pròs philōn  
 ungarded.M.GEN.PL be.PTCP.PRS.M.GEN.PL as IRR to friend.ACC.SG  
 tōn en tēi khórai  
 the.M.GEN.PL in the.F.DAT.SG country.DAT.SG  
 ‘Those in the country being off their guard, as if toward a friend ...’  
 (Demosthenes 23.154)

- (780) ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱππέων τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ὥς ἂν ὑπὲρ πολιτῶν  
 hupèr tōn hippéōn tōn aikhmalótōn hōs  
 over the.M.GEN.PL horseman.GEN.PL the.M.GEN.PL captive.M.GEN.PL as  
 ἂν hupèr politōn  
 IRR over citizen.GEN.PL  
 ‘... over the captive horsemen as over citizens ...’ (CIA 2.243.34)

The use of *hósper* ‘like’ is perhaps even more striking. It is true that we read *hósper* ... *án* in 781–782. On the other hand, though, in 783 we have *hósper* *àn* etc., as well as in examples 784 and 785, the latter with a remarkable double *án*, and in 786.

- (781) ὥσπερ σελήνης ὅψις εὐφρόνας δύο στῆναι δύναιτ’ ἂν  
 hósper selénēs ópsis euphrónas dúo stēnai dúnait’ ἂν  
 like moon.GEN.SG face.NOM.SG night.ACC.PL two stand.AOR.INF  
 dúnait’ ἂν  
 can.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR  
 ‘... just as if the face of the moon could stand still for two nights’  
 (Sophocles Fragment 787)

- (782) τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ὥσπερ τῶν στρατευμάτων ἀξιόσειε τις ἂν τὸν  
 cτρατηγὸν ἡγεῖσθαι  
 tōn autōn trópon, hósper tōn  
 the.M.ACC.SG same.M.ACC.SG way.ACC.SG like the.N.GEN.PL  
 strateumátōn axióseié tis ἂν τὸν  
 troop.GEN.PL deem.3SG.AOR.OPT someone.M.NOM.SG IRR the.M.ACC.SG

## 2 Translation

stratēgōn hēgeîsthai

leader.ACC.SG lead.PRS.INF.PASS

‘... in the same way that someone from the army would expect the general to lead ...’ (Demosthenes 4.39)

- (783) ὥσπερ ἂν ἡδιστα καὶ ἐπιτηδειότατα ἀμφοτέροις ἐγίγνετο, ἐγὼ μὲν ἐκέλευον

**hósper àn** hédista kaì epitēdeiótata amphotérois

like IRR sweetly.SUPL and suitably.SUPL both.M.DAT.PL

egígneto, egō mèn ekéleuon

become.3SG.IMP.PASS I.NOM then order.1SG.IMP

‘Just as if it were happening in the most satisfactory and suitable way for both parties, I would urge ...’ (Antiphon 6.11)

- (784) δοκεῖ ὁμοίως λέγεσθαι ταῦτα, ὥσπερ ἂν τις περὶ ἀνθρώπου [...] λέγοι τοῦτον τὸν λόγον

dokēi homoiōs légesthai taûta, **hósper àn**

seem.3SG.PRS similarly say.PRS.INF.PASS this.N.ACC.PL like IRR

tis perì anthrōpou légoi toûton

someone.M.NOM.SG about person.GEN.SG say.3SG.PRS.OPT this.M.ACC.SG

tòn lōgon

the.M.ACC.SG account.ACC.SG

‘To say these things seems similar to one’s making this argument about someone ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 87b)

[p385]

- (785) ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ἂν μουσικὸς ἐντυχὼν ἀνδρὶ [...] οὐκ ἀγρίως εἴποι ἂν all’ **hósper àn** mousikòs entukhòn

but like IRR musical.M.NOM.SG encounter.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG

andri ouk agríōs eípoi àn

man.DAT not roughly say.3SG.AOR.OPT IRR

‘... but just as a musician, encountering (such) a man, would not say roughly ...’ (Plato, *Phaedrus* 268d)

- (786) ἐκείνῳ δὲ πιστευούσης [...], ὥσπερ ἂν γυνὴ γαμβρὸν ἀσπάζοιτο ekeinōi dè pisteuōsēs, **hósper àn** gunē

that.M.DAT.SG then trust.PTCP.PRS.F.GEN.SG like IRR woman.NOM.SG

gambròn aspázoiτο

son-in-law.ACC.SG welcome.3SG.PRS.OPT

‘... but trusting him, just as a woman would her son-in-law ...’

2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses(Xenophon, *Hellenica* 3.1.14)

In particular, when a conditional is inserted into the comparative clause, the word order *hósper án* *ei* ‘like IRR if’ is found throughout: 787–794.

- (787) ὥσπερ οὖν ἄν, εἴ τῳ ὄντι ξένος ἐτύγγανον ὦν, ξυνεγινώσκετε δήπου ἄν  
μοι  
**hósper** oûn **án**, **ei** tōi ónti xénos  
like so IRR if the.N.DAT.SG be.PTCP.PRS.N.DAT.SG stranger.NOM.SG  
etúnkhanon ōn, xunegnínōskete dépou án  
happen.1SG.IMP be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG agree.2PL.IMP doubtless IRR  
moi  
me.DAT  
‘So just as you would doubtless excuse me if I happened in fact to be a  
foreigner ...’ (Plato, *Apology* 17d)
- (788) ὥσπερ ἄν, εἰ ἐτύγγανεν ὦν ὑποδημάτων δημιουργός, ἀποκρίναιτο ἄν  
δήπου σοι  
**hósper** **án**, **ei** etúnkhanen ōn hupodēmátōn  
like IRR if happen.3SG.IMP be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG shoe.GEN.PL  
dēmiourgós, apokrínaito àn dépou soi  
craftsman.NOM.SG answer.3SG.AOR.MID IRR doubtless you.DAT  
‘Just as, if he had happened to be a maker of shoes, he would have  
answered you...’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 447d)
- (789) ὥσπερ ἄν, εἴ τίς με ἔροιτο [...], εἵτοιμι ἄν  
**hósper** **án**, **ei** tíς me éroito  
like IRR if someone.M.NOM.SG me ask.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
eípoim’ án  
say.1SG.AOR.OPT IRR  
‘Just as, if someone asked me ... I should say ...’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 451a)
- (790) ὥσπερ ἄν, εἰ ἐτύγγανον [...], ἄρ’ οὐκ ἄν δικαίως σε ἠρόμην;  
**hósper** **án**, **ei** etúnkhanon ár’ ouk àn dikáios se  
like IRR if happen.1SG.IMP then not IRR righteously you.ACC  
ērómēn  
ask.1SG.AOR.MID  
‘Just as, if I happened to ... then could I not fairly ask ...?’ (Plato, *Gorgias*  
453c)

## 2 Translation

- (791) ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ ἐπενόεις [...] ἀργύριον τελεῖν [...], εἴ τις σε ἥρετο [...], τί ἂν ἀπεκρίνω  
**hósper án, ei** epenóeis argúrion teleîn eí  
 like IRR if intend.2SG.IMP money.ACC.SG fulfil.PRS.INF if  
 tíς se éreto tí àn  
 someone.M.NOM.SG you.ACC ask.3SG.AOR.MID what.ACC.SG IRR  
 apekrínō  
 answer.2SG.AOR.MID  
 ‘Just as, if you intended to pay money, if someone asked you ... what would you answer?’ (Plato, *Protagoras* 311b)
- (792) ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ [...] Ἱπποκράτης ὅδε ἐπιθυμήσειε [...] καὶ [...] ἀκούσειεν [...], εἰ αὐτὸν ἐπανερόιτο [...], εἴποι ἂν αὐτῷ  
**hósper án, ei** Hippokratēs hóde epithuméseie kaì  
 like IRR if Hippocrates this.M.NOM.SG desire.3SG.AOR.OPT and  
 akóuseien ei autòn epanéroito eípoi  
 hear.3SG.AOR.OPT if him.ACC enquire.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID say.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 àn autōi  
 IRR him.DAT  
 ‘Just as, if Hippocrates here desired ... and heard ..., if he enquired of him ... he would say to him ...’ (Plato, *Protagoras* 318b)
- (793) ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ ζητοίης, τίς διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἑλληνίζειν, οὐδ’ ἂν εἷς φανείη  
**hósper án, ei** zētoíēs, tíς didáskalos  
 like IRR if seek.2SG.PRS.OPT who.M.NOM.SG teacher.NOM.SG  
 toû hellēnízein, oud’ àn heís  
 the.N.GEN.SG Hellenize.PRS.INF nor IRR one.M.NOM.SG  
 phaneíē  
 show.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 ‘Just as, if you tried to find who (was) a teacher of Greek, no one would appear.’ (Plato, *Protagoras* 327e)
- (794) ὥσπερ ἂν, εἴ τις [...] τάττοι, οὐκ ἂν αὐτός γ’ ἀδικεῖν παρεσκευάσθαι δόξαι  
**hósper án, eí** tis táttōi, ouk àn  
 like IRR if someone.M.NOM.SG assign.3SG.PRS.OPT not IRR  
 autós g’ adikeîn pareskeuásthai  
 same.M.NOM.SG even wrong.PRS.INF equip.PRF.INF.PASS

2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

dóxai

seem.3SG.AOR.OPT

‘Just as, if someone assigned ... he would not seem to be prepared to commit an offence himself.’ (Demosthenes 20.143)

Here, too, the tight attachment of *án* occurs particularly because *hósper án* is very often used elliptically without (optative or preterite) verb – either where a form of the verb *eimí* ‘be’ is to be understood, as in 795, or the verb of the higher clause: 796, which can be read as in 797; 798–806.

- (795) ὥσπερ ἄν, εἰ υἱὸς [...] διοῖκει τι μὴ καλῶς ἢ ὀρθῶς, αὐτὸ μὲν τοῦτ’ ἄξιον μέμψεος  
**hósper án**, ei huiòs dióikei ti mē  
 like IRR if son.NOM.SG administer.3SG.IMP something.N.ACC.SG not  
 kalòs è orthòs, autò mèn toút’  
 beautifully or straight same.N.ACC.SG then this.N.ACC.SG  
 áxion mémpseos  
 worthy.N.ACC.SG blame.GEN.SG  
 ‘Just as, if a son’s management were in some way not good or correct, this itself (would be) worthy of blame’ (Demosthenes 9.30)

- (796) χρὴ [...] ἀνθρωπίνως περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκλογίζεσθαι, ὥσπερ ἄν αὐτὸν ὄντα ἐν τῇ συμφορᾷ  
 khrè anthrōpínōs perì tōn pragmatōn  
 need.3SG.PRS humanely about the.N.GEN.PL deed.GEN.PL  
 eklogízesthai, **hósper àn** autòn ónta en  
 consider.FUT.INF.MID like IRR same.M.ACC.SG be.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG in  
 têi sumphorai  
 the.F.DAT.SG mishap.DAT.SG  
 ‘It is necessary to judge a case humanely, as if one were in those circumstances oneself.’ (Andocides 1.57)

- (797) ὥσπερ ἄν τις αὐτὸς ὦν [...] ἐκλογίζοιτο  
**hósper án** tis autòs òn  
 like IRR someone.M.NOM.SG same.M.NOM.SG be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 eklogízoito  
 consider.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 ‘... as if one were judging, being oneself ...’

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *kat’ autò* for *autò*.

## 2 Translation

- (798) τοῦτ' αὐτὸ ἐπιδεικνύτω ὥσπερ ἂν ὑμῶν ἕκαστος  
 toût' autò epideiknútō **hósper àn**  
 this.N.ACC.SG same.N.ACC.SG display.3SG.PRS.IMPER like IRR  
 humôn hékastos  
 you.GEN.PL each.M.NOM.SG  
 'Let him demonstrate this very thing, as each of you would.' (Isaeus 6.64)
- (799) οὐδὲ [...] ὁμοίως ὑμῖν, ὥσπερ ἂν τρυτάνη ρέπων ἐπὶ τὸ λῆμμα  
 συμβεβούλευκα  
 oudè homoiōs humîn, **hósper àn** trutánē  
 nor similarly you.DAT.PL like IRR scale.NOM.SG  
 rhépōn epì tò lēmma sumbeboúleuka  
 tilt.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG upon the.N.ACC.SG profit.ACC.SG advise.1SG.PRF  
 'Nor, like you, have I advised as if I were a scale biased toward profit.'  
 (Demosthenes 18.298; V. C. has *hósper àn ei*, Dindorf & Blass (1888) has  
 only *hósper*)
- (800) ὥσπερ ἂν παρεστηκότος αὐτοῦ  
**hósper àn** parestēkótos autoû  
 like IRR stand.by.PTCP.PRF.M.GEN.SG him.GEN  
 '... as if with him standing beside' (Demosthenes 19.226)
- (801) χρώμενος ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλος τις αὐτῷ τὰ πρὸ τούτου  
 khrómenos **hósper àn** állos  
 use.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.SG like IRR other.M.NOM.SG  
 tis autōi tà prò toutou  
 someone.M.NOM.SG him.DAT the.N.ACC.SG before this.N.GEN.SG  
 '... as familiar as anyone could be with him up to then' (Demosthenes  
 21.117)
- (802) δεῖ τοίνυν τούτοις βοηθεῖν, ὥσπερ ἂν αὐτῷ τις ἀδικουμένῳ  
 deî toínun toutoîs boētheîn, **hósper àn** hautōi  
 lack.3SG.PRS therefore this.M.DAT.PL help.PRS.INF like IRR himself.DAT  
 tis adikouménōi  
 someone.M.NOM.SG wrong.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.DAT.SG  
 'Therefore you must help these people, just as anyone (would help)  
 himself if wronged.' (Demosthenes 21.225)
- (803) ὥσπερ ἂν τις κυκοφαντεῖν ἐπιχειρῶν



2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

**hósper án** tis sukophanteîn  
 like IRR someone.M.NOM.SG defraud.PRS.INF  
 epikheirôn  
 attempt.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘... as would someone attempting to deceive’ (Demosthenes 29.30; see Dindorf & Blass (1888: 354) following A; most have *hósper án eí tis*, with which reading the example below should be understood.)

- (804) πλὴν εἰ σημεῖον ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλῳ τινί, τῷ χαλκίῳ προσέεται  
 plên ei sēmeîon **hósper án** álloi tiní,  
 except if sign.NOM.SG like IRR other.N.DAT.SG something.DAT.SG  
 tōi khalkíōi proséstai  
 the.N.DAT.SG copper.DAT.SG be.added.3SG.FUT.MID  
 ‘... unless some mark shall be attached to the tablet, as there might be to anything else’ (Demosthenes 39.10)
- (805) ὥσπερ ἂν δοῦλος δεσπότη διδοῦς  
**hósper án** doûlos despótēi didoús  
 like IRR slave.NOM.SG master.DAT.SG give.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘... as a slave giving to his master’ (Demosthenes 45.35)
- (806) ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλος τις ἀποτυχῶν  
**hósper án** állos tis apotukhôn  
 as IRR other.M.NOM.SG someone.M.NOM.SG miss.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘... as another might who failed to obtain what he wanted ...’  
 (Demosthenes 49.27)

This is often found with a following *ei* with optative [p386] or preterite verb: 807–808 and see 10.10, 15.2, 15.14, and 15.298 from Isocrates.

- (807) ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπολέμησαν  
**hósper án ei** pròs hápantas anthrópous epolémēsan  
 like IRR if to quite.all.M.ACC.PL person.ACC.PL war.3PL.AOR  
 ‘... as if they had fought the whole world.’ (Isocrates 4.69)
- (808) ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τῳ Φρυνώνδας πανουργίαν ὀνειδίσειεν  
**hósper án eí** tōi Phrunónidas panourgían  
 like IRR if someone.M.DAT.SG Phrynondas.NOM villainy.ACC.SG

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *án eí*, which Wackernagel cites as a variant.

## 2 Translation

oneidíseien

reproach.3SG.AOR.OPT

‘... as if Phrynondas should reproach someone with villainy’ (Isocrates 18.57)

The same is found in 809 and 810 from Plato. Cf. *Cratylus* 430a, *Gorgias* 479a, *Phaedo* 98c and 109c, *Symposium* 199d and 204e, *Republic* 7.529d, etc. The same is found in 811 from Xenophon.

(809) ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ ἤκουεν

**hōsper àn ei** êkouen

like IRR if hear.3SG.IMP

‘... as if he heard ...’ (Plato, *Protagoras* 341c)

(810) ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις [...] ὀνομάσειε καὶ εἴποι

**hōsper àn ei tis** onomáseie καὶ

like IRR if someone.M.NOM.SG name.3SG.AOR.OPT and

εἴποι

say.3SG.AOR.OPT

‘... as if someone were to call and say ...’ (Plato, *Cratylus* 395e)

(811) ἡσπάζετο αὐτόν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις [...] ἀσπάζοιτο

êspázeto autón, **hōsper àn ei tis**

welcome.3SG.IMP.PASS him.ACC like IRR if someone.M.NOM.SG

aspázoito

welcome.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS

‘He kissed him, just as someone would ...’ (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 1.3.2)

The same is true of Demosthenes (812–813; cf. §243) and other orators. 814.

(812) ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ πολεμοῦντες τύχοιτε

**hōsper àn ei** polemoûntes túkhoite

like IRR if war.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL happen.2PL.AOR.OPT

‘... as if you happened to be at war.’ (Demosthenes 6.8)

(813) ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις ναύκληρον [...] αἰτιῶτο

**hōsper àn ei tis** naúklêron aitiôito

like IRR if some.M.NOM.SG shipowner.NOM.SG accuse.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS

‘As if some shipowner were to be accused ...’ (Demosthenes 18.194)

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition adds *te* after the initial verb.

### 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

- (814) ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις εἰς Αἶγιναν ἢ εἰς Μέγαρα ὁρμίσαιτο  
**hósper àn eí tis**                                eis Aiginan      è eis Mégara  
like     IRR if someone.M.NOM.SG into Aegina.ACC or into Megara.ACC  
hormísaito  
anchor.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
‘... as if one were to anchor in Aegina or Megara’ ([Demosthenes] 35.28)

In addition to this we find the sequence *hōsper àn ei* (usually written *hōsper-aneí*) in the sense of *quasi* ‘how’, cf. *ōsei*, *ōspereí*, without use of a finite verb, e.g. 815, Isocrates 4.148, Xenophon, *Symposium* 9.4, and Demosthenes 18.194. On the use of *hōsperaneí* and *kathaperaneí* in Aristotle, see Bonitz (1870: 41).

- (815) ὥσπερανεὶ παῖς  
 hōsperaneì paîs  
 as.if child.NOM.SG  
 ‘like a child’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 479a)

Relative clauses also provide occasion for comment. First, in the sequence *ouk éstin hóstis* ‘not be.3SG.PRS who’ (or also interrogative *éstin hóstis ...* ‘be.3SG.PRS who ...’), in which the main clause only receives its content from the subordinate clause and hence the connection between the two clauses is particularly close, *án* regularly follows the relativizer: 816–825; cf. also 826.

- (816) οὐκ ἔστ' ἀδελφός, ὅστις ἂν βλάττοι ποτέ  
 ouk ést' adelphós, hóstis àn blástoi  
 not be.3SG.PRS brother.NOM.SG who.M.NOM.SG IRR bud.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 poté  
 sometime  
 'There is no brother that could ever bloom for me' (Sophocles, *Antigone*  
 912)

- (817) οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεὶς ὅστις ἄν μὲμψαιτό σε  
**ouk éstin**      **oudeis**      **hóstis**      **àn**  
 not be.3SG.PRS nobody.M.NOM.SG who.M.NOM.SG IRR  
 mémpsaitó      se  
 blame.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID you.ACC  
 ‘There is no one who would blame you.’ (Euripides, *Electra* 903; cf. also  
*Heracleidae* 972)

\* *Translator's note:* In these last two instances the Perseus edition has *hōsper an ei* written separately.

## 2 Translation

- (818) οὐκ ἔστιν εἰς ὃ τι ἂν ἀναγκαιότερον ἀναλίσκοιτε χρήματα  
**ouk éstin**      **eis hó.ti**      **àn** anankaióteron  
 not be.3SG.PRS into which.N.ACC.SG IRR necessary.COMP.N.ACC.SG  
 analískoite      khrémata  
 spend.2PL.PRS.OPT property.ACC.PL  
 ‘There is nothing more necessary on which you could spend your money.’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 78a)
- (819) οὐκ ἔστιν [...], ὅτι ἂν τις μεῖζον [...] πάθοι  
**ouk éstin,**      **hóti**      **án tis**      **meízon**  
 not be.3SG.PRS which.N.ACC.SG IRR someone.M.NOM.SG greater.N.ACC.SG  
 páthoi  
 suffer.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘There is nothing greater that one can suffer ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 89d)
- (820) τούτωνι [...] οὐκ ἔστιν, ἅττ’ ἂν ἐμοὶ εἴπῃς ἡδίω  
 toutōnì      **ouk éstin,**      **hátτ’**      **àn** emoi  
 this.N.GEN.PL.EMPH not be.3SG.PRS which.N.ACC.PL IRR me.DAT  
 eîpes      hēdíō  
 say.2SG.AOR sweeter.N.ACC.PL  
 ‘There is nothing more pleasant than this that you could say to me.’  
 (Plato, *Phaedrus* 243b)
- (821) οἶμαι γὰρ τοιοῦτον οὐδὲν εἶναι, ὅτου ἂν ἀπέσχετο  
 oîmai      gàr toioûton      **oudèn**      **eînai,**  
 think.1SG.PRS.PASS then such.M.ACC.SG nothing.ACC.SG be.PRS.INF  
**hótou**      **àn** apéskheto  
 which.N.GEN.SG IRR keep.off.3SG.AOR.MID  
 ‘For I think that there is nothing from which such a person would have kept his hands.’ (Demosthenes 24.138)
- (822) ἔστιν, ὅστις ἂν [...] ἐψηφίσεν [...];  
**éstin,**      **hóstis**      **àn** epséphisen?  
 be.3SG.PRS who.M.NOM.SG IRR vote.3SG.AOR  
 ‘Is there anyone who would have voted ...?’ (Demosthenes 24.157)
- (823) ἔστιν, ὅστις ἂν [...] ὑπέμεινεν [...];

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *eukairóteron* for *anankaióteron*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *epipséphisen* for *epséphisen*.

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

**éstin, hóstis án** hupémeinen?  
 be.3SG.PRS who.M.NOM.SG IRR abide.3SG.AOR  
 ‘Is there anyone who could bear ...?’ (Demosthenes 19.309)

- (824) οὐ γὰρ ἔν, **hó.ti án** epoieíte  
 ou gàr ên, hó.ti án epoieíte  
 not then be.3SG.IMP which.N.ACC.SG IRR do.2PL.IMP  
 ‘For there was nothing that you could do.’ (Demosthenes 18.43)

- (825) ἔστιν οὖν, ὅστις ἂν τοῦ ξύλου καὶ τοῦ χωρίου [...] τοσαύτην ὑπέμεινε  
 φέρειν μίσθῳ· ἔστι δ’ ὅστις ἂν [...] ἐπέτρεψεν;  
**éstin oún, hóstis án** toû xúlou kai  
 be.3SG.PRS so who.M.NOM.SG IRR the.N.GEN.SG wood.GEN.SG and  
 toû khōríou tosaútēn hupémeine pherein  
 the.N.GEN.SG place.GEN.SG so.much.F.ACC.SG abide.3SG.AOR bear.PRS.INF  
 místhōsin? ésti d’ hóstis án epétrepse?  
 rent.ACC.SG be.3SG.PRS then who.M.NOM.SG IRR entrust.3SG.AOR  
 ‘Now, is there any man who would have submitted to the payment of so  
 large a rental for the counter and the site? And is there any man who  
 would have entrusted ...?’ (Demosthenes 45.33)

- (826) οὐκ ἔστ’ οὐδεὶς, ὅστις ἂν εἴποι  
**ouk ést’ oudeís, hóstis án** eípoi  
 not be.3SG.PRS nobody.M.NOM.SG who.M.NOM.SG IRR say.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘There is no one who would say ...’ ([Demosthenes] 13.22)

Almost on the same level as *ouk éstin hóstis* are such phrasings as we find in 827 or in 828 and in 829.

- (827) οὐ γὰρ ἴδοις ἂν ἀθρῶν βροτῶν ὅστις ἂν εἰ θεὸς ἄγοι ἐκφυγεῖν δύναιτο  
**ou gàr ídois án athrôn brotôn**  
 not then see.2SG.AOR.OPT IRR observe.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG mortal.GEN.PL  
**hóstis án ei theòs ágoi ekphugeîn**  
 who.M.NOM.SG IRR if god.NOM.SG lead.3SG.PRS.OPT escape.PRS.INF  
 dúnaito  
 can.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 ‘If you observed, you would not see any mortal who could escape if a  
 god were to lead him on.’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 252)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *ésth’ hóstis* for *éstin, hóstis*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *oud’* for *ouk*.

## 2 Translation

- (828) οὐκ οἶδα εἰς ὅντιν' ἄν τις ἄλλον καιρὸν ἀναβάλλοιτο  
**ouk** oîda                    eis   **hóntin'**                    **án** tis  
 not know.1SG.PRF into which.M.NOM.SG IRR someone.M.NOM.SG  
 állon                    kairòn                    anabállōito  
 other.M.ACC.SG time.ACC.SG defer.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 'I do not know to what other time one could delay' (Plato, *Phaedo* 107a)
- (829) οὐκ οἶδα ὅ τι ἄν τις χρήσαιο αὐτῷ  
**ouk** oîda                    **hó.ti**                    **án** tis  
 not know.1SG.PRF which.N.ACC.SG IRR someone.M.NOM.SG  
 khrésaito                    autōi  
 use.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID him.DAT  
 'I do not know what use one could make of him' (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 3.1.40)

And the connection between main clause and subordinate clause [p387] is just as tight as in these examples when *hóstis* is announced by *hoútō*: 830.

- (830) οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστιν οὕτω ῥάθυμος ὅστις ἄν δέξαιο  
**oudeis**                    gár   estin                    **hoútō** rháithumos  
 nobody.M.NOM.SG then be.3SG.PRS so                    indifferent.M.NOM.SG  
**hóstis**                    **án** déxaito  
 who.M.NOM.SG IRR receive.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 'For there is no one so cavalier that he would receive ...' (Isocrates 9.35)

The connection between *hóstis* and *án* can, however, be interrupted, first by *pote* 'sometime', which is quite natural: 831. Secondly by *ouk* 'not': 832–835. (Cf. 836.)

- (831) τῶν δὲ κατὰ ταῦτα ἐχόντων οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτῳ ποτ' ἄν ἄλλῳ ἐπιλάβοιο  
 tōn                    dè   katà   taûta                    ekhóntōn                    **ouk**  
 the.N.GEN.PL then down this.N.ACC.PL have.PTCP.PRS.N.GEN.PL not  
**éstin**                    **hótōi**                    pot'                    **án** álloi  
 be.3SG.PRS which.N.DAT.SG sometime IRR other.N.DAT.SG  
 epiláboio  
 grasp.2SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 'But there is nothing else by which you could grasp the things that are always the same ...' (Plato, *Phaedo* 79a)

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *autois* for *autōi*.

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *t'autà*, with crasis, for *taûta*.

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

- (832) ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅστις οὐκ ἂν τις καταφρονήσειεν  
**hôn** **ouk éstin,** **hóstis** **ouk án**  
 whom.M.GEN.PL not be.3SG.PRS who.M.NOM.SG not IRR  
 tis  
 kataphronéseien  
 someone.M.NOM.SG despise.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... whom there is no one that would fail to despise’ (Isocrates 8.52)
- (833) οὐ γάρ ἐστιν, περὶ ὅτου οὐκ ἂν πιθανώτερον εἴποι ὁ ῥητορικός  
**ou gár estin,** **perì hótou** **ouk án** pithanōteron  
 not then be.3SG.PRS about which.N.GEN.SG not IRR persuasively.COMP  
 eípoi ho rhētorikós  
 say.3SG.AOR.OPT the.M.NOM.SG rhetorician.NOM.SG  
 ‘There is nothing about which a rhetorician would not speak more  
 persuasively’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 456c; cf. also 491e)
- (834) οὐδεὶς οὕτω κακός, ὅντινα οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἔρως ἐνθεὸν ποιήσειεν  
**oudeis** **hoútō kakós,** **hóntina** **ouk án**  
 nobody.M.NOM.SG so bad.M.NOM.SG whom.M.ACC.SG not IRR  
 autòs ho Érōs éntheon  
 same.M.NOM.SG the.M.NOM.SG Eros.NOM inspired.M.ACC.SG  
 poiéseien  
 make.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘(There is) no one so base whom Eros himself cannot inspire’ (Plato,  
*Symposium* 179a)
- (835) οὐδεὶς γάρ, ὅστις οὐκ ἂν ἀξιόσειεν  
**oudeis** **gár, hóstis** **ouk án** axiόseien  
 nobody.M.NOM.SG then who.M.NOM.SG not IRR deem.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘There is no one who would think ...’ (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 7.5.61)
- (836) τίς οὕτως [...] φθονερός ἐστιν [...] ὅς οὐκ ἂν εὖξαιτο [...];  
**tís** **hóutōs phthonerós** **estín** **hós** **ouk**  
 who.M.NOM.SG so envious.M.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS who.M.NOM.SG not  
**án** eúxaito  
 IRR pray.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘Who is so envious that he would not have prayed ...?’ (Lycurgus 1.69)

Note that none of the examples with immediately adjacent *hóstis án* contain negation in the relative clause, so that the insertion of *ouk* can be said to be a

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition lacks *tis*.

## 2 Translation

rule. This is also not at all surprising: compare what was observed above on p21, p24 and p39 on the placement of *ouk* before enclitics and on p162 on Homeric *ouk án*. Demosthenes 18.206 is peculiar. Here the best source texts, S and L, give 837. If the transmission is correct, the expression is based on a contamination driven by the need to conform to the usual sequences *hóstis án* and (*hóstis*) *ouk án*.

- (837) οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅστις ἂν οὐκ ἂν εἰκότως ἐπιτιμήσειέ μοι  
 ouk ésth' hóstis án ouk án eikótōs epitiméseieí  
 not be.3SG.PRS who.M.NOM.SG IRR not IRR justly evaluate.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 moi  
 me.DAT  
 'There is no one who would not justly censure me.' (Demosthenes  
 18.206)

The words *án ouk án* are also found immediately adjacent in Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 446, *Electra* 439, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1366, Fragment 673, Euripides, *Heraclidae* 74, and Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 361. And *án oud' án* in Sophocles, *Electra* 97 (more common, and still found in Aristotle, is *án ... ouk án* or *oudeis án* separated by several words). Since in any case the sequence *án ouk án* seems to be unknown in the fourth century and the repetition of *án* is only found after a lot of intervening material, the editors who delete the first *án* and simply write *hóstis ouk án* are perhaps right to do so.

Good Attic poets do not separate *hóstis* and *án* by words other than *pote* 'some-time' or *ou* 'not'. Admittedly, Xenophon writes 838 and 839.

- (838) οὐτ' ἔστιν ὅτου ἕνεκα βουλοίμεθα ἂν τὴν βασιλέως χώραν κακῶς ποιεῖν  
 out' éstin hótou héneka bouloímetha án  
 nor be.3SG.PRS which.N.GEN.SG because.of wish.1PL.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR  
 tèn basiléōs khóran kakôs poieîn  
 the.F.ACC.SG king.GEN.SG country.ACC.SG ill do.PRS.INF  
 '... nor is there any reason why we should desire to do harm to the  
 King's territory' (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 2.3.23)

[p388]

- (839) ἔστιν οὖν ὅστις τοῦτο ἂν δύναιτο ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατῆσαι

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition lacks the first *án*.

\* Translator's note: Not found in Perseus edition



2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

éstin oûn hóstis toûto án dúnaio  
 be.3SG.PRS so who.M.NOM.SG this.N.ACC.SG IRR can.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 humâs exapatêsai  
 you.PL.ACC deceive.AOR.INF  
 ‘Therefore, is there anyone who could deceive you in this ... ?’  
 (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 5.7.6)

Strikingly, 840 is similar.

(840) τίς δ' ἤν οὗτω ἡ μισόδημος τότε ἡ μισαθήναιος, ὅστις ἐδυνήθη ἄν  
 tís d' ên hoûtô è misódēmos tôte  
 who.M.NOM.SG then be.3SG.IMP so or people-hating.M.NOM.SG then  
 è misathēnaios, hóstis édunēthē án  
 or Athens-hating.M.NOM.SG who.M.NOM.SG can.3SG.AOR.PASS IRR  
 ‘And was there anyone then who hated either the people or Athens so  
 much that he could have ... ?’ (Lycurgus 1 39)

Perhaps the observation by Blass (1880: 103) is also applicable here: “what strikes one [in Lycurgus] as non-classical or ungrammatical must be blamed on its acknowledged poor transmission.” But in Blass’s text for 841 the *állo* ‘other’ is pure editorial conjecture. (However, see 842. Read *hétis án tód*’?)

(841) οὐ γὰρ ἤν ὅ τι ἄλλ' ἄν ἐποιεῖτε  
 ou gâr ên hó.ti ál' án epoieíte  
 not then be.3SG.IMP which.N.ACC.SG other.N.ACC.SG IRR do.2PL.IMP  
 ‘For there was nothing else that you could do.’ (Demosthenes 18.43;  
 Blass (1877))

(842) οὐκ ἔστιν, ἥτις τοῦτ' ἄν Ἑλληνὶς γυνὴ ἔτλη  
 ouk éstin, hétis toût' án Hellēnīs  
 not be.3SG.PRS who.F.NOM.SG this.N.ACC.SG IRR Greek.F.NOM.SG  
 gunè étlē  
 woman.NOM.SG endure.3SG.AOR  
 ‘There is no Greek woman who would have dared this.’ (Euripides,  
*Medea* 1339)

The tradition was less stable in clauses containing one of the relative adjectives or adverbs related to *hóstis*, and in clauses where *hóstis* itself was attached to a negative clause but was not absolutely necessary for its interpretation and

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition lacks Blass’s *ál*’.

## 2 Translation

therefore not so closely attached to it. From the first category we have 843 (non-negative interrogative!) and 844–848.

- (843) ἔσθ' οὖν ὅπως ἂν ὥσπερ εἰ σπονδῆς θεοῦ καὶ γὰρ λαβοίμην [...];  
 ést' oûn **hópōs àn** hōspereì spondēs theoû  
 be.3SG.PRS so how IRR as.if libation.GEN.SG god.GEN.SG  
 kagò laboímēn  
 also=I.NOM take.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘Then is there any way in which, as with a libation to a god, I too could take ... ?’ (Euripides, *Cyclops* 469)
- (844) οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἂν ἐγὼ ποθ' ἐκὼν τῆς σῆς γνώμης ἔτ' ἀφείμην  
 ouk éstin **hópōs àn** egó poth' hekòn  
 not be.3SG.PRS how IRR I.NOM sometime willing.M.NOM.SG  
 tēs sēs gnómēs ét' apheímēn  
 the.F.GEN.SG your.F.GEN.SG opinion.GEN.SG still discard.1SG.AOR.MID  
 ‘There is no way that I would ever again willingly ignore your advice.’  
 (Aristophanes, *Birds* 627)
- (845) οὐδὲν αὐτὸς ἐξηῦρον, ὁπόθεν ἂν εἰκότως ὑπερεΐδετε τὴν ἐμὴν ὁμίλιαν  
 oudèn autòs exēûron, **hopóthen àn** eikótōs  
 nothing.ACC.SG same.M.NOM.SG discover.1SG.AOR whence IRR justly  
 hupereíдете tēn emēn homilían  
 despise.2PL.AOR the.F.ACC.SG my.ACC.SG company.ACC.SG  
 ‘I myself have discovered nothing from which you could reasonably have despised my company.’ (Lysias 8.7)
- (846) οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅπως ἂν ἄμεινον οἰκήσειαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν  
 ouk éstin, **hópōs àn** ámeinon oikéseian tēn  
 not be.3SG.PRS how IRR better settle.3PL.AOR.OPT the.F.ACC.SG  
 heautôn  
 themselves.GEN  
 ‘There is no way in which they could be better citizens of their country’  
 (Plato, *Symposium* 178e)
- (847) οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως ἂν ἐνθάδε μέιναιμι  
 ouk ésth' **hópōs àn** entháde meínaimi  
 not be.3SG.PRS how IRR here stay.1SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘There is no way that I could stay here.’ (Plato, *Symposium* 223a)

2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

- (848) οὐκ εἶναι ἔθνος, ὅποιώ ἂν ἀξιόσειαν ὑπήκοοι εἶναι Θετταλοί  
 ouk eînai éthnos, **hopoiōi** **àn**  
 not be.PRS.INF people.NOM.SG of.what.sort.N.DAT.SG IRR  
 axiόseian hupékooi eînai Thettaloí  
 deem.3PL.AOR.OPT subject.M.NOM.PL be.PRS.INF Thessalian.NOM.PL  
 ‘... that there would be no people such that the Thessalians would  
 consider being subject to them.’ (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 6.1.9)

We also have 849 (although the revisor of Codex S has added a second *án* above *tis*, it is not legitimate to delete the *án* after *hópōs*, which is absent only in Augustanus, and transpose it to after *enantiótera*, as done by Weil (1886: 103) and, following him, Dindorf & Blass (1888)), and 850 (cf. also *ouk oíd’*, *hópōs án* – above p169).

- (849) ἔστιν οὖν ὅπως ἂν ἐναντιώτερὰ τις δύο θεῖη  
 éstin oûn **hópōs án** enantiótera **tis**  
 be.3SG.PRS so how IRR opposite.COMP.N.ACC.PL someone.M.NOM.SG  
 dúo theíē  
 two put.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘So is there any way in which one could propose two more  
 contradictory things ... ?’ (Demosthenes 24.64)
- (850) ἔστιν οὖν ὅπως ἂν μᾶλλον ἄνθρωποι πάνθ’ ὑπὲρ Φιλίππου πράττοντες  
 éstin oûn **hópōs án** mállon ánthrthpoi pánth’ hupèr  
 be.3SG.PRS so how IRR more person.NOM.PL all.ways over  
 Philíppou práttontes exelenkhtheíen  
 Philip.GEN do.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL convict.3PL.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 ‘Now is there any way in which people could be more clearly convicted  
 of acting for Philip in every way ... ?’ (Demosthenes 19.165)

These examples are not contradicted by 851, and probably not by 852; but the following are genuine counterexamples: 853–857 and 858 (for which sparser manuscripts have *hópōs án taút’*).

- (851) οὐκ ἔχω [...] ὅκως οὐκ ἂν ἴσον πλῆθος τοῖς Πέρσῃσι ἐξέβαλε  
 ouk ékhō **hókōs** ouk **àn** íson plêthos  
 not have.1SG.PRS how not IRR equal.N.ACC.SG quantity.ACC.SG  
 toís Pérsēisi exébale  
 the.M.DAT.PL Persian.DAT.PL cast.out.3SG.AOR  
 ‘I hold that there is no way in which he would have cast overboard a

## 2 Translation

number equal to that of the Persians ...’ (Herodotus 8.119.1)

- (852) τοὔτ’ οὖν ἐστὶν ὅπως τις ἂν ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσαι  
 toût’ oûn estin hópōs tis àn humâs  
 this.N.ACC.SG so be.3SG.PRS how someone.M.NOM.SG IRR you.ACC.PL  
 exapatésai  
 deceive.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘Therefore, is there any way in which someone could deceive you in this  
 ... ?’ (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 5.7.7)

- (853) οὐκ ἔσθ’ ὅποιον στάντ’ ἂν ἀνθρώπου βίον οὐτ’ αἰνέσαιμ’ ἂν οὔτε  
 ouk ésth’ hópoion stánt’ àn  
 not be.3SG.PRS of.what.sort.M.ACC.SG stand.PTCP.AOR.M.ACC.SG IRR  
 anthrópou bíon oút’ aínésaim’ àn oúte  
 person.GEN.SG life.ACC.SG nor praise.1SG.AOR.OPT IRR nor  
 mempsaímēn poté  
 blame.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID sometime  
 ‘There is no station of human life that I would ever praise or blame as  
 being settled.’ (Sophocles, *Antigone* 1156)

- (854) οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ’ ὅπως μί’ ἡμέρα γένοιτ’ ἂν ἡμέραι δύο  
 ou gàr ésth’ hópōs mí’ hēméra  
 not then be.3SG.PRS how one.F.NOM.SG day.NOM.SG  
 génoit’ àn hēmérai dúo  
 become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR day.NOM.PL two  
 ‘For there is no way that one day could become two days.’  
 (Aristophanes, *Clouds* 1181)

- (855) κοὐκ ἔσθ’ ὅπως [...] ἂν [...] λάθοι  
 kouk ésth’ hópōs àn láthoi  
 and=not be.3SG.PRS how IRR hide.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... and there is no way for him to escape notice.’ (Aristophanes, *Wasps*  
 212)

- (856) οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ’ ὅπως ἀπειπεῖν ἂν δοκῶ μοι τήμερον  
 ou gàr ésth’ hópōs apeipeîn àn dokô moi  
 not then be.3SG.PRS how refuse.AOR.INF IRR think.1SG.PRS me.DAT  
 témeron  
 today  
 ‘For there is no way that I could think of refusing today ...’

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

(Aristophanes, *Peace* 306; cf. also Plato, *Apology* 40c)

[p389]

- (857) οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως [...] εὖνοι γένοιντ' ἄν  
 ou gàr ésth' **hópōs** eúnoi  
 not then be.3SG.PRS how right-minded.M.NOM.PL  
 génoint' **án**  
 become.3PL.AOR.OPT.MID IRR  
 '... for there is no way in which they could become well-disposed ...'  
 (Demosthenes 15.18)
- (858) ἔστιν οὖν, ὅπως ταῦτ' ἄν, ἐκεῖνα προειρηκώς, [...] ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν  
 éstin oûn, **hópōs** taût' **án**, ekeîna  
 be.3SG.PRS so how this.N.ACC.PL IRR that.N.ACC.PL  
 proeirēkōs, etólmēsen eipeîn  
 say.before.PTCP.PRF.M.NOM.SG dare.3SG.AOR say.AOR.INF  
 'So is there any way in which he could have dared to say these things,  
 having previously said those ... ?' (Demosthenes 19.308)

A similar reading is given to 859 and 860 on the one hand, but also 861 on the other.

- (859) ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φίλων πέλας οὐδεῖς, ὅστις ἂν εἴποι  
 all' oudè philōn pélas oudeís, **hóstis** **án**  
 but nor friend.GEN.PL near nobody.M.NOM.SG who.M.NOM.SG IRR  
 eípoi  
 say.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'And neither is there any of his kin nearby who might say ...' (Euripides,  
*Alcestis* 80)
- (860) οὔτε τις ξένος ἀφίηται [...], ὅστις ἂν ἡμῖν αἰφάνει τι ἀγγεῖλαι οἷός τ' ἦν  
 ou̓te tis xénos aphîktai **hóstis**  
 nor some.M.NOM.SG stranger.NOM.SG arrive.3SG.PRF.PASS who.M.NOM.SG  
**án** hēmîn saphés ti angeîlai  
 IRR us.DAT clear.N.ACC.SG something.ACC.SG announce.3SG.AOR.OPT

---

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition adds *ést'* after *pélas*.

## 2 Translation

hoíós                      t'      ên                      perì      toútōn  
 such.as.M.NOM.SG and be.3SG.IMP about this.GEN.PL  
 ‘Nor has any stranger come who could tell us anything definite about  
 this matter’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 57a)

- (861) οὐδ’ ἄγγελός τις οὐδὲ συμπράκτωρ ὁδοῦ κατειδ’ ὅτου τις ἐκμαθὼν  
 ἐχρήσατ’ ἄν  
 oud’ angelós      tis                      oudè sumpráktōr      hodoû  
 nor messenger some.M.NOM.SG nor assistant.NOM.SG way.GEN.SG  
 kateid’                      hótou                      tis  
 observe.3SG.AOR whom.M.GEN.SG someone.M.NOM.SG  
 ekmathōn                      ekhrésat’                      án  
 learn.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG use.3SG.AOR.MID IRR  
 ‘(Was there) no messenger or travelling companion from whom one  
 might have learned something of use?’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 117)

A second group of relative clauses to be considered here are those that are introduced by *hōper* ‘which’, in which the *-per* conceptually serves to indicate sharp subordination to the main clause, and in which we would therefore expect to see *án* immediately following the relativizer, based on what was observed with *hóstis*. We find this position in full *hōsper*-sentences only in the majority of examples, however, and not always: 862–870.

- (862) κατήλπιδε εὐπετέως τῆς θαλάσσης κρατήσκειν, τάπερ ἄν καὶ ἦν  
 katēlpize eupetéōs tēs thalássēs kratésein,  
 hope.3SG.IMP easily the.F.GEN.SG sea.GEN.SG rule.FUT.INF  
 táper                      án kai ên  
 which.N.NOM.PL IRR also be.3SG.IMP  
 ‘He hoped that he would easily rule the seas, which might well have  
 been.’ (Herodotus 8.136.3)
- (863) τοιαῦτα θεραπεύσαντες ἑωυτούς, ὁποῖά περ ἄν ἐθεραπεύθησαν  
 toiaûta therapeúsantes heōutoús,  
 such.N.ACC.PL treat.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL themselves.ACC  
 hopoía                      per án etherapeúthēsan  
 of.what.sort.N.ACC.PL all IRR treat.3PL.AOR.PASS  
 ‘... treating themselves in just such a way as they would be treated’  
 ([Hippocrates,] *De arte* 46.12; Gomperz (1890: 46, line 12))
- (864) ἐνόμιζον [...] ὅσον οὐκ ἐσπλεῖν αὐτοῦς· ὅπερ ἄν, εἰ ἐβουλήθησαν μὴ  
 κατοκνήσαι, ῥαδίως ἄν ἐγένετο

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

enómizon hóson ouk espleîn autoús;  
 consider.3PL.IMP how.much not sail.in.PRS.INF them.ACC  
**hóper** **án**, ei ebouléthēsan mē katoknēsai, rhāidíōs  
 which.M.NOM.SG IRR if wish.3PL.AOR.PASS not shrink.AOR.INF easily  
**án** egéneto  
 IRR become.3SG.AOR.MID  
 ‘They believed that they were not far from sailing in upon them, which  
 might easily have come to pass if they had been unwilling to shrink  
 from it.’ (Thucydides 2.94.1)

- (865) ἐὰν συμβούλους ποιώμεθα τοιούτους [...], οἷους περ ἂν περὶ τῶν ἰδίων  
 ἡμῖν εἶναι βουλευθεῖμεν  
 eàn sumbólous poiómetha toiótous  
 if advisor.ACC.PL make.1PL.PRS.SBJV.PASS such.M.ACC.PL  
**hoíous** **per** **án** perì tōn idíōn hēmīn  
 such.as.M.ACC.PL all IRR about the.N.GEN.PL private.N.GEN.PL us.DAT  
 eīnai boulētheímen  
 be.PRS.INF wish.1PL.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 ‘... if we make such people advisors as we would wish to have for our  
 private affairs ...’ (Isocrates 8.133)

- (866) χρὴ τοιούτους εἶναι κριτάς [...], οἷων περ ἂν αὐτοὶ τυγχάνειν ἀξιόκειαν  
 khrē toiótous eīnai kritás **hoíōn**  
 need.3SG.PRS such.M.ACC.PL be.PRS.INF judge.ACC.PL such.as.M.GEN.PL  
**per** **án** autoì tunkhánein axióseian  
 all IRR same.M.NOM.PL happen.PRS.INF deem.3PL.AOR.OPT  
 ‘It is necessary (for them) as judges to be such as they themselves would  
 find worthy’ (Isocrates 15.23)

- (867) ἀξιῶν τὴν αὐτὴν Πασίῳνι [...] γίγνεσθαι ζημίαν, ἥσπερ ἂν αὐτὸς  
 ἐτύγχανεν  
 axíōn tēn autēn Pasíōni  
 deem.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG the.F.ACC.SG same.F.ACC.SG Pasion.DAT  
 gígnesthai zēmían, **hēesper** **án** autòs  
 become.PRS.INF.PASS penalty.ACC.SG which.F.GEN.SG IRR same.M.NOM.SG  
 etúnkhanen  
 happen.3SG.IMP  
 ‘... expecting the same penalty for Pasion that he would have incurred

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *óionto* and lacks the second *án*.

## 2 Translation

himself' (Isocrates 17.21)

- (868) πράττεις ἅπερ ἂν δοῦλος φαυλότατος πράξειεν  
 prátteis háper àn doûlos phaulótatos  
 do.2SG.PRS which.N.ACC.PL IRR slave.NOM.SG basest.M.NOM.SG  
 práxeien  
 do.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'You are doing what the meanest slave would do' (Plato, *Crito* 52c)

- (869) ὥμην [...] διαλέξεσθαι αὐτόν μοι, ἅπερ ἂν ἐραστῆς παιδικοῖς [...]  
 dialéxesthai autón moi, háper àn  
 think.1SG.IMP discuss.FUT.INF.MID him.ACC me.DAT which.N.ACC.PL IRR  
 erastès paidikoîs dialekhtheîe  
 lover.NOM.SG darling.DAT.PL discuss.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 'I thought that he would say to me what a lover would say to his  
 favourites.' (Plato, *Symposium* 217b)

- (870) ἐποιοῦν ἅπερ ἂν ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ποιήσειαν  
 epoíoun háper àn ánthrōpoi en erēmíai  
 do.3PL.IMP which.N.ACC.PL IRR person.NOM.PL in solitude.DAT.SG  
 poíēseian  
 do.3PL.AOR.OPT  
 '... they did what people would do in private.' (Xenophon, *Anabasis*  
 5.4.34)

But in examples 871–873, *án* is separated from *hósper*:

- (871) τὸν δὲ πόλεμον, δι' ὃνπερ χρήσιμοι ἂν εἴμεν, εἴ τις ὑμῶν μὴ οἶεται  
 ἔσεσθαι  
 tòn dè pólemon, di' hónper khrésimoi  
 the.M.ACC.SG then war.ACC.SG through which.M.ACC.SG useful.M.NOM.PL  
 àn eímen, eí tis humôn mè oíetai  
 IRR be.1PL.PRS if someone.M.NOM.SG you.GEN.PL not think.3SG.PRS.PASS  
 ésesthai  
 be.FUT.INF.MID  
 'But if any of you does not think there will be a war, through which we  
 could be useful ...' (Thucydides 1.33.3)

---

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition adds *te* and also *ho* before *phaulótatos*.



2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

- (872) Φίλιππος δ' ἄπερ εὖξαιθ' ἂν ὑμεῖς, [...] πράξει  
 Philíppos d' **háper** eúxaisth' **àn** humeîs  
 Philip.NOM then which.N.ACC.PL pray.2PL.AOR.OPT.MID IRR you.NOM.PL  
 práxei  
 do.3SG.FUT  
 '... and Philip will do just what you would have prayed for'  
 (Demosthenes 6.30)
- (873) ὑμεῖς δ', ἄπερ εὖξαιθ' ἂν, ἐλπίσαντες [...]  
 humeîs d', **háper** eúxaisth' **án**,  
 you.NOM.PL then which.N.ACC.PL pray.2PL.AOR.OPT.MID IRR  
 elpísantes  
 hope.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL  
 '... and you, hoping for just what you would have prayed for ...'  
 (Demosthenes 19.328)

Awareness of the close connection between *án* and *hósper* becomes particularly clear in cases of verb ellipsis: compare ellipsis of the subjunctive verb, e.g. 874–877.

- (874) φίλους νομίζουσ' οὗςπερ ἂν πόσις céθεν  
 philous nomízous' **hoúsper** **àn**  
 dear.M.ACC.PL consider.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.SG whom.M.ACC.PL IRR  
 pósis séthen  
 husband.NOM.SG you.GEN  
 '... holding them as dear as does your husband' (Euripides, *Medea* 1153)
- (875) φιλεῖν οἷεσθε δεῖν καὶ τιμᾶν, οὗςπερ ἂν καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς  
 phileîn oíesthe deîn kaì timân,  
 like.PRS.INF think.2PL.PRS.IMPER.PASS lack.PRS.INF and honour.PRS.INF  
**hoúsper** **àn** kaì ho basileús  
 whom.M.ACC.PL IRR also the.M.NOM.SG king.NOM.SG  
 'Believe that you should love and honour those whom your king loves  
 and honours' (Isocrates 3.60)
- (876) τὸ τοὺς αὐτοὺς μισεῖν καὶ φιλεῖν, οὗςπερ ἂν ἡ πατρίς  
 tò toùs autoùs miseîn kaì phileîn,  
 the.N.NOM.SG the.M.ACC.PL same.M.ACC.PL hate.PRS.INF and like.PRS.INF  
**hoúsper** **àn** hē patrís  
 whom.M.ACC.PL IRR the.F.NOM.SG fatherland.NOM.SG  
 '... having the same friends and the same enemies as your country.'

## 2 Translation

(Demosthenes 18.280)

[p390]

- (877) τελεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν τὰ αὐτὰ τέλη ἐν τῷ δήμῳ ἅπερ ἄγ καὶ Πειραιεῖς  
 teleîn dè autòn tà autà télē  
 fulfil.PRS.INF then him.M.ACC.SG the.N.ACC.PL same.N.ACC.PL end.ACC.PL  
 en tōi démōi háper àng kai Peiraiēis  
 in the.M.DAT.SG people.DAT.SG which.N.ACC.PL IRR also Peiraeans.NOM.PL  
 ‘... and for him to pay the same fees for the people that Peiraeans also  
 would’ (CIA 2.589.26; circa 300 BCE)

- (878) τοσαύτην ποιηκάμενοι σπουδὴν, ὅσῃν περ ἂν τῆς αὐτῶν χώρας  
 πορθουμένης  
 tosaútēn poiēsámenoi spoudēn,  
 so.much.F.ACC.SG make.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.PL speed.ACC.SG  
 hósēn per àn tēs hautōn khóras  
 as.much.F.ACC.SG all IRR the.F.GEN.SG themselves.GEN land.GEN.SG  
 porthouménēs  
 ravage.PTCP.PRS.PASS.F.GEN.SG  
 ‘... having made as great haste as if it had been their own country that  
 was being laid waste.’ (Isocrates 4.86)

The following serve as examples: 878–885.

- (879) νικῆσαι [...] τοσοῦτον, ὅσον περ ἂν εἰ ταῖς γυναῖξιν αὐτῶν συνέβαλον  
 nikēsai tosoûton, hóson per àn ei taís  
 win.AOR.INF so.much.N.ACC.SG as.much.N.ACC.SG all IRR if the.F.DAT.PL  
 gunaixìn autōn sunébalon  
 woman.DAT.PL them.GEN clash.3PL.AOR  
 ‘... to have won as complete a victory as if they had come to blows with  
 their womenfolk’ (Isocrates 5.90)
- (880) τοσοῦτον ἐφρόνησαν, ὅσον περ ἂν, εἰ πάντων ἡμῶν ἐκράτησαν  
 tosoûton ephrónēsan, hóson per àn, ei  
 so.much.N.ACC.SG understand.3PL.AOR as.much.N.ACC.SG all IRR if  
 pántōn hēmōn ekrátēsan  
 all.M.GEN.PL us.GEN rule.3PL.AOR  
 ‘... they were as filled with pride as if they had conquered us all’  
 (Isocrates 10.49)

## 2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

- (881) ἅπερ ἄν εἰς τοὺς πολεμιωτάτους, ἔξαμαρτεῖν ἐτόλμησαν  
**háper**            **àn** eis toùs            polemiōtátous,  
 which.N.ACC.PL IRR into the.M.ACC.PL hostile.SUPL.M.ACC.PL  
 examarteîn      etólmēsan  
 wrong.AOR.INF dare.3PL.AOR  
 ‘They dared to do wrong as to their greatest enemies’ (Isocrates 14.37)
- (882) εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν καθέστηκα κίνδυνον, εἰς ὃνπερ ἄν, εἰ πάντας ἐτύχχανον  
 ἡδίκηκός  
 eis tòn            autòn            kathéstēka kíndunon,      eis  
 into the.M.ACC.SG same.M.ACC.SG set.1SG.PRF danger.ACC.SG into  
**hónper**            **án**, ei pántas            etúnkhanon  
 which.M.ACC.SG IRR if all.M.ACC.PL happen.1SG.IMP  
 ēdikēkós  
 wrong.PTCP.PRF.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘I stand in the same peril in which I would stand if I happened to have  
 wronged everyone’ (Isocrates 15.28)
- (883) δοκεῖ μοι [...] τοιαύτην ποιήσασθαι ζήτησιν αὐτοῦ, οἷαν περ ἄν, εἰ  
 προσέταξέ τις  
 dokeî            moi      toiaútēn            poiēsasthai      zētēsīn            autoû,  
 seem.3SG.PRS me.DAT such.F.ACC.SG do.AOR.INF.MID search.ACC.SG it.GEN  
**hoían**            **per án**, ei prosétaxé            tis  
 such.as.F.ACC.SG all      IRR if command.3SG.AOR someone.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘It is apparent to me to use such an inquiry for this as we would if  
 someone commanded ...’ (Plato, *Republic* 2.368d)
- (884) μόνοι τε ὄντες ὅμοια ἔπραττον, ἅπερ ἄν μετ’ ἄλλων ὄντες  
 mónoi            te      óntes            hómoia            épratton,  
 alone.M.NOM.PL and be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL similar.N.ACC.PL do.3PL.IMP  
**háper**            **àn** met’ állōn            óntes  
 which.N.ACC.PL IRR with other.M.GEN.PL be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL  
 ‘And being alone, they would do the same things that they would with  
 others.’ (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 5.4.34)
- (885) ἀπεκρινάμην αὐτῷ, ἅπερ ἄν νέος ἄνθρωπος  
 apekrinámēn            autōi,      **háper**            **àn** néos  
 answer.1SG.AOR.MID him.DAT which.N.ACC.PL IRR young.M.NOM.SG

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *dokô* for *dokeî*.

## 2 Translation

ánthrōpos

person.NOM.SG

‘I answered him as a young man would’ (Demosthenes 53.12)

Among the relative clauses introduced by *hós* alone, those with an assimilated pronoun are most clearly marked as closely connected to the main clause. In accordance with this, most of the examples that I have to hand have *án* after *hós*: 886–889. But the number of examples is too small to justify a general rule, and 890 is a counterexample.

- (886) ἐγὼ δεδηγμένος [...] τὸ ἀλγεινότατον ὧν ἂν τις δηχθεῖη  
 egō dedēgménos tò algeinótaton  
 I.NOM bite.PTCP.PRF.PASS.M.NOM.SG the.N.ACC.SG painful.SUPL.N.ACC.SG  
**hōn** **án** tis dēkhtheíē  
 which.N.GEN.PL IRR someone.M.NOM.SG bite.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 ‘I have been bitten in the most painful way that one can be bitten’ (Plato, *Symposium* 218a)
- (887) ἐμμενεῖν οἷς ἂν οὔτοι γνοῖεν  
 emmeneîn hoís àn hoûtoi gnoîen  
 abide.PRS.INF which.N.DAT.PL IRR this.M.NOM.PL know.3PL.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... to abide by what these men would decide’ (Isaeus 5.31)
- (888) ἐμμενεῖν οἷς ἂν αὐτοὶ γνοῖεν  
 emmeneîn hoís àn autoi gnoîen  
 abide.PRS.INF which.N.DAT.PL IRR same.M.NOM.PL know.3PL.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... to abide by what they themselves would decide’ (Isaeus 5.33)
- (889) πρὸς ἅπασιν τοῖς ἄλλοις, οἷς ἂν εἰπεῖν τις ὑπὲρ Κτησιφῶντος ἔχοι  
 pròs hápasin toís állois, hoís àn  
 to quite.all the.N.DAT.PL other.N.DAT.PL which.N.DAT.PL IRR  
 eipeîn tis hupèr Ktēsiphōntos ékhoi  
 say.AOR.INF someone.M.NOM.SG over Ctesiphon.GEN have.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘As well as all the other things with which one might speak for Ctesiphon ...’ (Demosthenes 18.16)
- (890) μηδὲν ὧν ἰδίᾳ φυλάξαιθ’ ἂν  
 mēdèn hōn idíai phuláxaisth’ án  
 nothing.ACC which.N.GEN.PL private.F.DAT.SG guard.2PL.AOR.OPT.MID IRR  
 ‘... none of the things against which you would guard in your private

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition adds *oûn* after *egō*.

2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

lives' (Demosthenes 20.136)

In other types of relative clause, usage seems colourful and lawless. However, I think I can say that normal relative clauses have *án* almost as often immediately after the pronoun as in a later position in the clause. A natural consequence of this variation is that it is not unusual to find *án* twice in relative clauses, e.g. 891–893. Compare the double use of *án* in main clauses, discussed below.

- (891) ἅφ' ὧν ἄν τις σκοπῶν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὐθις ἐπιπέσοι, μάλιστα ἄν ἔχοι τι  
 προειδὼς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν  
 aph' hōn                      án tis                      skopōn,  
 of which.N.GEN.PL IRR someone.M.NOM.SG consider.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 eí pote              kaì aùthis epipésōi,                      málist' àn ékhoi  
 if sometime also again fall.on.3SG.AOR.OPT most IRR have.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ti                      proeidōs                      mè agnoeîn  
 something.ACC.SG foresee.PTCP.PRF.M.NOM.SG not overlook.PRS.INF  
 '... with which some observer, if it should ever come upon us again, may  
 have something to predict and recognize.' (Thucydides 2.48.3)

- (892) ὅσα γὰρ ἄν νῦν πορίσαιτ' ἄν  
 hósa                      gàr àn nûn porísait'                      án  
 as.much.N.ACC.PL then IRR now bring.2PL.AOR.OPT.MID IRR  
 'For the amount that you could provide ...' (Demosthenes 14.26)

- (893) οὗς ἄν τις δεόμενος [...] εἴποι ἄν  
 hoùs                      án tis                      deómenos  
 which.M.ACC.PL IRR someone.M.NOM.SG lack.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.SG  
 eípoi                      án  
 say.3SG.AOR.OPT IRR  
 '... which someone might say while beseeching ...' ([Demosthenes] 59.70)

Therefore, when we find an example like 894, in which *án* has clearly been omitted, it is completely impossible to establish, from our perspective, whether the right reading is *di' hōn an pausáimeth'* or rather *di' hōn pausáimeth' an* (as found in editions since Bekker (1823: 1539)).

- (894) ἃ δεῖ καὶ δι' ὧν παυσαίμεθ' αἰσχύνην ὀφλισκάνοντες

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition lacks the first *án*.

## 2 Translation

há                      deî                      kai di'                      hōn  
 which.N.ACC.PL lack.3SG.PRS and through which.N.GEN.PL  
 pausaímeth'                      aiskhúnēn                      ophliskánontes  
 stop.1PL.AOR.OPT.MID shame.ACC.SG incur.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL  
 '... what is necessary and by what means we may cease to incur disgrace'  
 (Demosthenes, *Exordia* 1.3)

[p391] On the other hand, where the relative pronoun simply serves in place of *hoûtos* 'this', Latin-style, to link two independent statements together – in other words, when we are dealing with a main clause rather than a relative clause – *án* is never found after the pronoun; cf. 895–897.

(895) ἐν οἷς ἐγὼ [...] δικαίως ἂν ὑπὸ πάντων ἐλεηθείην  
 en hoîs                      egō dikaiōs                      ân hupò pantōn  
 in which.N.DAT.PL I.NOM righteously IRR under all.M.GEN.PL  
 eleētheiēn  
 pity.1SG.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 '... in which (circumstances) I might rightly be pitied by all.' (Andocides 1.67)

(896) ὃ τίς ἰδὼν οὐκ ἂν ἐφοβήθη [...];  
 hó                      tis                      idōn                                           ouk ân  
 which.N.ACC.SG who.M.NOM.SG see.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG not IRR  
 ephobēthē  
 frighten.3SG.AOR.PASS  
 'Seeing which, who would not have been frightened?' (Lysias 2.34)

(897) ἐξ ὧν ἀφέετατ' ἂν τις ἴδοι  
 ex hōn                      saphéstat'                      ân tis                      ídoi  
 out which.N.GEN.SG clearly.SUPL IRR someone.M.NOM.SG see.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'From which one can most clearly see ...' (Demosthenes 18.49)

Correspondingly, in all other subordinate clauses, for instance those containing *án* with an optative or preterite, *án* is usually found in a later position in the clause. This is of course because in all such cases the subordinate clause has the mood in question not by virtue of being a subordinate clause but because it stands in for a main clause. For *hōs* 'that/as', for instance, we have the example

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *ouk ân idōn*.

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition adds *kai* after *hōn*.

2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

898 (but also 899); for *hóste* ‘so that’, for instance, 900; for *hóti* ‘that/because’, for instance, 901–903.

- (898) ὥς ἐγὼ οὐδ’ ἂν ἓνα ἄλλον ἐπαινέσαιμι  
 hōs egō oud’ **án** hēna állon epainésaimi  
 as I.NOM nor IRR one.M.ACC.SG other.M.ACC.SG praise.1SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘... as I could not praise another’ (Plato, *Symposium* 214d)
- (899) καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐλπίζαντες ὥς ἂν ἐπεξέλθοι τις  
 kai ouk **án** elpísantes hōs **án** epexélthoi tis  
 and not IRR hope.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL as IRR proceed.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 tis  
 someone.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘... and not expecting that anyone might sally forth ...’ (Thucydides 5.9.3)
- (900) ὥστε καὶ οὗτος Ἔρωτος ἂν εἶη μαθητής  
 hóste kai hoútōs Érōtos **án** eíē mathētēs  
 so also this.M.NOM.SG Eros.GEN IRR be.3SG.PRS.OPT pupil.NOM.SG  
 ‘... so that he too would be a pupil of Eros’ (Plato, *Symposium* 197b)
- (901) δῆλον ὅτι τοιαῦτ’ ἅττ’ ἂν λέγοι  
 délon hótī toiaút’ átt’ **án** légoi  
 evident.N.NOM.SG that such.N.NOM.PL which.N.ACC.PL IRR  
 légoi  
 say.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘(It is) evident that such things (are) what one might say ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 93c)
- (902) ὅτι οὕτως ἂν ἡμῶν τὸ γένος εὐδαιμον γένοιτο  
 hótī hoútōs **án** hēmōn tò génos eúdaimon  
 that so IRR us.GEN the.N.NOM.SG kind.NOM.SG fortunate.N.NOM.SG  
 génoito  
 become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘... that our kind would become happy in this way ...’ (Plato, *Symposium* 193c)
- (903) ὅτι τῶν ἀδικημάτων ἂν ἐμémνητο τῶν αὐτοῦ  
 hótī tōn adikēmátōn **án** emémnēto tōn  
 that the.N.GEN.PL wrong.GEN.PL IRR recall.3SG.PLPF.PASS the.N.GEN.PL

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *elpísantas* for *elpísantes*.

## 2 Translation

hautoù

himself.GEN

‘Because he would recall his own crimes ...’ (Demosthenes 18.79)

The same holds for *epei* ‘as/since’, for instance 904–905.

- (904) ἐπεὶ ἔχου γ’ ἄν τις εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτῶν  
 epei ékhoui g’ án tis eipeîn peri  
 when have.3SG.PRS.OPT even IRR someone.M.NOM.SG say.AOR.INF about  
 autôn  
 them.N.GEN.PL  
 ‘... while one might be able to speak about them’ (Plato, *Cratylus* 410a)

- (905) ἐπεὶ διὰ γ’ ὑμᾶς πάλοι ἄν ἀπωλώλειτουργ  
 epei dià g’ humâs pálai án apōlōleite  
 when through even you.ACC.PL long.ago IRR destroy.2PL.PLPF  
 ‘... when on your own you would have perished long ago.’ (Demosthenes 18.49)

The transmission gives us cause for doubt when it comes to temporal particles: *hótan* ‘when(ever)’ with the optative is transmitted in Aeschylus, *Persians* 450, and *héōs án* ‘until IRR’ with the optative in Isocrates 17.15 and Plato, *Phaedo* 101d. (Since Elmsley (1812: 453), Sophocles, *Women of Trachis* 687 is no longer taken to contain this.) We can be confident in 906–908. In example 909, *án* is deleted.

- (906) ἤνικ’ ἄν ἡμεῖς μὴ δυνάμεθ’ ἐκεῖς ἀφικέσθαι  
 hēnik’ án hēmeis mē dunaímeth’ ekeis’ aphikésthai  
 when IRR we.NOM not can.1PL.PRS.OPT.PASS thither arrive.AOR.INF.MID  
 ‘... when we could not arrive there.’ (Demosthenes 4.31)
- (907) πρὶν ἄν [...] μετέχοιεν  
 prîn án metékhoien  
 before IRR share.3PL.PRS.OPT  
 ‘... until they could share ...’ (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 2.3.48)
- (908) πρὶν ἄν [...] καταστήσειαν  
 prîn án katastéseian  
 before IRR share.3PL.PRS.OPT  
 ‘... until they could set ...’ (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 2.3.48)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition adds *autoûs* after *humâs*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition of Isocrates 17.15 lacks *án*.



2.6 Postpositive particles: *án* in subordinate clauses

- (909) πρὶν ἂν [...] ἢ πέσοι τις ἢ τρωθείη  
 prîn àn è pésoi tis è  
 before IRR or fall.3SG.AOR.OPT someone.M.NOM.SG or  
 trōtheiē  
 wound.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 ‘... until someone either fell or was wounded’ (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 2.4.18)

Without exception, *án* is separated from the conjunction in optative *ei*-clauses: *ei* ‘if’ introducing embedded questions, e.g. 910, and *ei* ‘if’ introducing an adverbial clauses, e.g. 911–914.

- (910) οὐκ οἶδ’ εἰ οἷός τ’ ἂν εἴη  
 ouk oîd’ ei hoîós t’ àn eîēs  
 not know.1SG.PRF if such.as.M.NOM.SG and IRR be.2GS.PRS.OPT  
 ‘I do not know if you would be of that sort.’ (Plato, *Symposium* 210a)
- (911) εἰ πῶς ἂν ἀναπείσαιμεν ἱκετεύοντέ νιν  
 ei pōs àn anapeísaimen hiketeúonté  
 if somehow IRR persuade.1PL.AOR.OPT supplicate.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.DU  
 nin  
 3.ACC  
 ‘If somehow we could persuade by supplicating her ...’ (Euripides, *Helen* 825)
- (912) οὐδ’ εἰ μὴ ποιήσαιτ’ ἂν ἤδη  
 oud’ ei mē poiésait’ àn édē  
 nor if not do.2PL.AOR.OPT IRR already  
 ‘Nor, if you should fail to do immediately ...’ (Demosthenes 4.18)
- (913) οὐκοῦν αἰσχρόν, εἰ μέλλοντες μὲν εὖ πάσχειν κυκοφάντην ἂν τὸν ταῦτα  
 λέγονθ’ ἡγοίεσθε, ἐπὶ τῷ δ’ ἀφελέεσθαι [...] ἀκούεσθε  
 oukoûn aiskhrón, ei méllontes mèn eû  
 not.then shameful.N.NOM.SG if be.going.to.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL then well  
 páskhein sukophántēn àn tòn taûta  
 suffer.PRS.INF informer.ACC.SG IRR the.M.ACC.SG this.N.ACC.PL

\* *Translator’s note:* The distinction here is between German *ob* ‘if/whether’ and *wenn* ‘if’.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *ísōs* for *pōs*.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition lacks *édē*.

## 2 Translation

légonth' hēgoîsthe, epì tōi d'  
 say.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG lead.2PL.PRS.OPT.PASS upon the.N.DAT.SG then  
 aphelésthai akouésthe  
 remove.AOR.INF.MID hear.2PL.FUT.MID  
 '(Is it) not then shameful if you consider the one saying these things a  
 pettifogger when about to benefit, but you will listen about removing ...'  
 (Demosthenes 20.62)

- (914) ἐξώληε ἀπολοίμην [...], εἰ προσλάβων γ' ἂν ἀργύριον [...] ἐπρέσβευσα  
 exólēs apoloímēn ei proslabōn  
 ruined.M.NOM.SG destroy.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID if accept.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 g' ἂν argúrion eprésbeusa  
 even IRR money.ACC.SG be.ambassador.1SG.AOR  
 'May I perish miserably if I would have become an ambassador even by  
 accepting money' (Demosthenes 19.172)

In these cases the hypothetical character of the clause provided by *án* is not determined by *ei*; see the commentators on the individual examples.

[p392] The cases in which *mē* 'not' with the optative and *án* follow expressions of fear and expectation are particularly significant: 915–918. Here it cannot be doubted that the use of the optative with *án* is due to the main clause influencing the subordinate clause with *mē*, and here only one of four examples contains *án* immediately following *mē*.

- (915) δέδοικα γάρ, μὴ πρὶ λέγοις ἂν τὸν πόθον  
 dédoika gár, mē prōi légois ἂν τὸν  
 fear.1SG.PRF then not early say.2SG.PRS.OPT IRR the.M.ACC.SG  
 póthon  
 longing.ACC.SG  
 'I am afraid lest you tell my longing too soon' (Sophocles, *Women of Trachis* 630)
- (916) οὔτε προσδοκία οὐδεμία ἦν, μὴ ἂν ποτε οἱ πολέμιοι ἐξαπιναίως οὕτως  
 épipleúceian  
 oúte prosdokía oudemía ên, mē án pote  
 nor expectation.NOM.SG none.F.NOM.SG be.3SG.IMP not IRR sometime  
 hoi polémioi exapinaíōs hoútōs  
 the.M.NOM.PL hostile.M.NOM.PL unexpectedly so

2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

epipleúseian

sail.upon.3PL.AOR.OPT

‘Nor was there any expectation lest the enemy should ever launch an attack so unexpectedly.’ (Thucydides 2.93.3)

- (917) ἐκεῖνο ἐννοῶ, μὴ λίαν ἄν ταχὺ σωφρονισθεῖην

ekeîno ennoô, mē lían án takhù

that.N.ACC.SG consider.1SG.PRS not very IRR quickly

sōphronistheîen

chasten.1SG.AOR.OPT.PASS

‘As for that I misdoubt that I should be recalled to my senses very quickly.’ (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 6.1.28)

- (918) φοβοῦνται, μὴ ματαία ἄν γένοιτο αὕτη ἡ παρασκευή

phoboúntai, mē mataía án génoito

frighten.3PL.PRS.PASS not vain.F.NOM.SG IRR become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID

haútē hē paraskeuē

this.F.NOM.SG the.F.NOM.SG preparation.NOM.SG

‘(Some) were afraid lest this plan should prove vain.’ (Xenophon, *Ways* 4.41)

This makes it clear why the position of *án* is so fixed in subjunctive clauses and so flexible in other subordinate clauses. In Classical Greek, *án* with subjunctive mood is found only in subordinate clauses; what would be the point in moving *án* from its traditional position? Conversely, *án* with the indicative and with the optative is not only more frequent in main than in subordinate clauses but also basically carried over to these subordinate clauses from the main clause. It was necessary for the positional tendencies of *án* in main clauses to be carried over to the subordinate clauses in question.

2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

But what is going on with the free positioning of *án* in main clauses? It is indisputable that *án* can be found a long way from the initial position in such clauses. The only word that it must precede is the final finite or non-finite verb modified by *án* in the clause, and here I particularly emphasize that participles equivalent to hypothetical subordinate clauses happily precede *án* (cf. e.g. 919).

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *kataskeuē* for *paraskeuē*.

## 2 Translation

- (919) γόνιμον δὲ ποιητὴν ἄν οὐχ εὔροις ἔτι ζητῶν ἄν  
 gónimon dè poiētèn àn oukh heúrois éti  
 fruitful.M.ACC.SG then poet.ACC.SG IRR not find.2SG.AOR.OPT still  
 zētôn án  
 seek.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG IRR  
 ‘If you looked, you wouldn’t find a fruitful poet any more.’  
 (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 96)

*án* may only follow this verb if it occurs immediately attached to it. However, there are examples in which *g’*, a single-syllable enclitic or other monosyllable intervenes between the verb and *án*. For *g’* ‘even’: 920.

- (920) ἐπεὶ ἔχοι γ’ ἄν τις εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτῶν  
 epei ékhoi g’ án tis eipeîn perì  
 when have.3SG.PRS.OPT even IRR someone.M.NOM.SG say.AOR.INF about  
 autôn  
 them.N.GEN.PL  
 ‘... while one might be able to speak about them’ (Plato, *Cratylus* 410A)

For *tis* ‘someone’: [Euripides, *Oresteia* 694 and] 921.

- (921) οὐ μὲν οὖν εἴποι τις ἄν ἡλίκας  
 ou mèn oûn eípoi tis àn hēlíkas  
 not then so say.3SG.AOR.OPT someone.M.NOM.SG IRR so.great.F.ACC.PL  
 ‘... indeed, one could not say enough ...’ (Demosthenes 18.282)

For *pot’* ‘ever’: 922.

- (922) κεῖνος δὲ πῶς τὰ ζῶντα τοῖς θανοῦσιν ἀποδοίη ποτ’ ἄν  
 keínos dè pōs tà zônta toîs thanoûsin apodoíē pot’ án  
 that.M.NOM.SG then how the.N.ACC.PL live.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.PL  
 toîs thanoûsin apodoíē pot’ án  
 the.M.DAT.PL die.PTCP.AOR.M.DAT.PL restore.3SG.AOR.OPT sometime IRR  
 ‘And how could he ever restore the living to the dead?’ (Euripides, *Helen* 912f.)

[p393] For *ou* (NEG): 923.

- (923) ἢ γὰρ εἶην οὐκ ἄν εὖ φρονῶν  
 ê gàr eîēn ouk àn eû phronōn  
 in.truth then be.1SG.PRS.OPT not IRR well reason.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘For truly I would not be in my right mind ...’ (Sophocles, *Ajax* 1330)

## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

For *takh'* 'quickly': 924.

- (924) τῇ δ' ἐπιστήμῃ σύ μου τρούχοις τάχ' ἄν που  
 tēi d' epistēmēi sú mou  
 the.F.DAT.SG then knowledge.F.DAT.SG you.NOM me.GEN  
 tróukhois tákh' **án** pou  
 have.before.2SG.PRS.OPT quickly IRR somewhere  
 'But perhaps you have an advantage in knowledge over me ...'  
 (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 1115f.)

For *tad'* 'this': 925.

- (925) τίς σῶφρονῶν τλαίῃ τάδ' ἄν  
 tís sōphronōn tlaíē  
 who.M.NOM.SG be.sane.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG endure.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 tād' **án**  
 this.N.ACC.PL IRR  
 'Who in his senses would dare this?' (Euripides, *Helen* 97)

For *taut'* 'this': 926.

- (926) συμμαρτυροίῃ ταῦτ' ἄν ἐν δίκῃ  
 summarturoíē taût' **án** en díkēi  
 corroborate.3SG.PRS.OPT this.N.ACC.PL IRR in judgement.DAT.SG  
 '(She) too would bear witness to these things in judgement ...' (Solon  
 Fragment 36.1)

For *ment'* 'yet': 927, 928, and Plato, *Apology* 30D.

- (927) ὅμῳξε μέντ' ἄν  
 ōimōxe mént' **án**  
 lament.3SG.AOR yet IRR  
 'He would certainly regret it.' (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 743)
- (928) βουλοίμην μέντ' ἄν  
 bouloímēn mént' **án**  
 wish.1SG.PRS yet IRR  
 'I would certainly wish so.' (Plato, *Phaedo* 76B)

However, these last three examples (926, 927, 928) also permit a different explanation. When the verb is clause-initial, the rule discussed above seems not to hold, e.g. 929–931.

## 2 Translation

- (929) προσέβα γὰρ οὐκ ἄν ἀκτιβὲς ἄλκοc ἔc  
 proséba gâr ouk ân astibès álsos és  
 approach.3SG.AOR then not IRR untrodden.N.ACC.SG grove.ACC.SG into  
 ‘For he would not have entered the untrodden grove ...’ (Sophocles,  
*Oedipus at Colonus* 125)

- (930) ὄλουντ’ ἰδοῦσαι τοῦcδ’ ἄν  
 óloint’ idoûsai toûsd’ ân  
 destroy.3PL.AOR.OPT.MID see.PTCP.AOR.F.NOM.PL this.M.ACC.PL IRR  
 ‘They would be undone, seeing them.’ (Euripides, *Suppliants* 944)

- (931) μάθοιτε δὲ τοῦτο μάλιστ’ ἄν  
 máthoite dê toûto málist’ ân  
 learn.2PL.AOR.OPT then this.N.ACC.SG most IRR  
 ‘But you would understand this best ...’ (Demosthenes 21)

Moreover, it is obvious that, if a clause contains multiple instances of *án*, the rule will affect the last *án*, as in 932 and 933. In 934, the distance between the second *án* and the verb can be explained by the initial position of the verb.

- (932) ἔδραc’ ἄν (εὔ τόδ’ ἴcθ’) ἄν  
 édras’ ân (eû tód’ ísth’) ân  
 do.1SG.AOR IRR well this.N.ACC.SG know.2SG.PRF.IMPER IRR  
 ‘I could have done – know this well – ...’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 1438)

- (933) δύναιτ’ ἄν οὐδ’ ἄν ἰcχύων φυγεῖν  
 dúnait’ ân oud’ ân iskhúōn  
 can.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR nor IRR be.strong.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 phugeîn  
 flee.AOR.INF  
 ‘... not even a strong man would be able to escape’ (Sophocles, *Electra* 697)

- (934) ἡλείψατο δ’ ἄν τοῦμφαλοῦ οὐδεῖc παῖc ὑπένερθεν τότ’ ἄν  
 ēleípsato d’ ân toumphaloû oudeis paîc hupénérthen tót’ ân  
 anoint.3SG.AOR.MID then IRR the=navel.GEN.SG none.M.NOM.SG  
 paîs hupénérthen tót’ ân  
 child.NOM.SG beneath then IRR  
 ‘And no boy then would anoint himself below the navel.’ (Aristophanes,  
*Clouds* 977)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *toût’* for *tód’*.

## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

The editors of Aristophanes's *The Knights* were therefore right to change the transmitted *phágois hédist'* in verse 707 to *phagòn hédoi'* (or *hédoi*), as in 935.

- (935) ἐπὶ τῷ φαγὼν ἥδοιτ'/ἥδοι' ἄν  
 epì tòi phagòn hédoi't'/hédoi'  
 upon what.N.DAT.SG eat.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG enjoy.3SG(2SG).PRS.OPT.PASS  
**án**  
 IRR  
 'What would he (you) most enjoy dining on?' (Aristophanes, *Knights* 707)

On the other hand, 936 is only an apparent counterexample, since for each of the consecutive nominatives an understood *élegen* 'speak' should be read. Cf. also Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 292 *pròs tout'* **án** 'to this.N.ACC.SG IRR' (and 937).

- (936) οὐδὲν παρήκ' ἄν ἀργόν, ἀλλ' ἔλεγεν ἡ γυνή τέ μοι χῶ δοῦλος οὐδὲν  
 ἦττον χῶ δεσπότης χῆ παρθένος χῆ γραῦς ἄν  
 oudèn parék' àn argón, all' élegen  
 nothing.ACC.SG permit.1SG.AOR IRR idle.N.ACC.SG but say.3SG.IMP  
 hē gunē té moi khō doûlos  
 the.F.NOM.SG woman.NOM.SG and me.DAT and=the.M.NOM.SG slave  
 oudèn hēttōn khō despótēs  
 nothing.N.ACC.SG less.N.ACC.SG and=the.M.NOM.SG master.NOM.SG  
 khē parthénos khē graûs  
 and=the.F.NOM.SG maiden.NOM.SG and=the.F.NOM.SG old.woman.NOM.SG  
**án**  
 IRR  
 'I would permit nothing idle; instead, my woman would speak, and the slave no less, and the master and the maiden and the old woman.'  
 (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 949f.)

- (937) κοὺ φθάνοι θνήσκων τις ἄν  
 kou phthánoi thnēskōn tis  
 and=not arrive.3SG.PRS.OPT die.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG someone.M.NOM.SG  
**án**  
 IRR  
 '... and it would not be too soon for anyone to die' (Euripides, *Orestes* 941)

From this rule, though, one can recognize what sort of tendencies have led to *án* being attracted away from the position it had occupied in Homeric times.

## 2 Translation

The verb whose modality was determined by *án* attracted it to itself, along with negation, adverbs, particularly superlatives, and all those constituents for which the hypothetical character of the clause represented by *án* was most relevant, just like how the enclitic pronouns lost their traditional position because of the growing requirement to assign them the place in the clause that their function seemed to demand. However, as with the [p394] enclitic pronouns, the tradition retained a certain influence with *án*.

First, the tendency to attach to clause-initial words can also be demonstrated for *án*. This is indisputable for *tis* ‘someone’ and its forms, particularly *pōs*. (Cf. Jebb (1889: 175) on Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1100, who makes reference to 938. Cf. Homer, *Iliad* 9.77, 24.367, and *Odyssey* 8.208 and 10.573.)

- (938) τίς ἄν ἐν τάχει μὴ περιόδυνος μὴ δεμνιοτήρης μόλοι  
 tís                      ἄν en tákhei              mē periódunos              mē  
 someone.F.NOM.SG IRR in haste.DAT.SG not very.painful.F.NOM.SG not  
 demniotērēs              móloi  
 bed-confining.F.NOM.SG come.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘May some (fate) come quickly, neither too painful nor too lingering ...’  
 (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1448)

Furthermore, we should make use of Werfer’s (1814: 264ff.) observation that there are ‘almost countless examples’ of *án* attaching to *gār* ‘then’. The number of examples makes it impossible to reproduce, or add to, Werfer’s collection here. I merely want to observe two things: first, although counterexamples can be adduced from all genres of literature, *gār an* is still infinitely more frequent than *gār ... an*; secondly, as a consequence of inserting *án* immediately after *gār*, the need is often felt to insert *án* again in a later position in the clause: 939–955 (cf. Vahlen (1865: 408) on 1460b.7).

- (939) τῷ γὰρ ἄν καὶ μείζονι λέξαιμ’ ἄν ἢ τοί  
 tōi                      gār ἄν kai meízoni              léxaim’              ἄν è  
 whom.M.DAT.SG then IRR also greater.M.DAT.SG say.1SG.AOR.OPT IRR than  
 soí  
 you.DAT  
 ‘For to whom more than to you would I speak ...’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 772)

\* *Translator’s note:* Wackernagel mentions line 1402, but the correct reference in Jebb (1889) is the similar example on line 1448. The Perseus edition has *mēdē* instead of the second *mē*.



2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

- (940) οὐδὲν γὰρ ἂν πράξαιμι' ἄν  
oudèn gār àn práxaim' án  
nothing.ACC.SG then IRR do.1SG.AOR.OPT IRR  
‘For I would do nothing ...’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 882)
- (941) κάμοι γὰρ ἂν πατήρ γε δακρύων χάριν ἀνήκτ' ἂν εἰς φῶς  
kamoì gār àn patér ge dakrúōn khárin  
and=me.DAT then IRR father.NOM.SG even tear.GEN.PL grace.ACC.SG  
anêkt' án eis phōs  
lead.up.3SG.PLPF IRR into light.ACC.SG  
‘For my father would at least have brought gratitude for tears into the light’ (Sophocles Fragment 513.6; Nauck (1889: 254))
- (942) ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἂν τὰ θεῖα κρυπτόντων θεῶν μάθοις ἂν  
all' ou gār àn tà theîa kruptóntōn  
but not then IRR the.N.ACC.PL divine.N.ACC.PL hide.PTCP.PRS.M.GEN.PL  
theōn máthois án  
god.GEN.PL learn.2SG.AOR.OPT IRR  
‘But you would not learn of divine things with the gods hiding them.’  
(Sophocles Fragment 833)
- (943) μόλις γὰρ ἂν τις αὐτὰ τὰναγκαῖ' ὁρᾶν δύναιτ' ἂν ἐστὼς πολεμίοις  
ἐναντίος  
mólis gār án tis autà  
scarcely then IRR someone.M.NOM.SG them.N.ACC.PL  
tanankai' horân dúnait' án  
the=necessary.N.ACC.PL see.PRS.INF can.3SG.PRS.OPT IRR  
hestòs polemíois enantíos  
stand.PTCP.PRF.M.NOM.SG hostile.M.DAT.PL opposite.M.NOM.SG  
‘For one would scarcely be able to see that which was necessary,  
standing opposite the foe.’ (Euripides, *Suppliants* 855)
- (944) τὴν Τροίαν γὰρ ἂν δειλοὶ γενόμενοι πλεῖστον αἰσχύνοιμεν ἂν  
tèn Troían gār àn deiloi  
the.F.ACC.SG Troy.ACC then IRR wretched.M.NOM.PL  
genómenoi pleíston aiskhúnoimen án  
become.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.SG most shame.1PL.PRS.OPT.ACT IRR  
‘For we would most greatly disgrace Troy by becoming cowardly.’  
(Euripides, *Helen* 948)

## 2 Translation

- (945) καὶ γὰρ ἂν κεῖνος βλέπων ἀπέδωκεν ἂν σοι τῇνδ' ἔχειν  
 kai gàr àn keínos blépōn apédōken án  
 and then IRR that.M.NOM.SG look.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG restore.3SG.AOR IRR  
 soi tēnd' ékhein  
 you.DAT this.F.ACC.SG have.PRS.INF  
 'For that man, if he could see, would have given that woman back to you  
 to have' (Euripides, *Helen* 1011)
- (946) εὐμενέστερον γὰρ ἂν τῷ φιλότατῳ μοι Μενέλεω τὰ πρόσφορα δρώης ἂν  
 eumenésteron gàr àn tōi philátōi moi  
 favourably.COMP then IRR the.M.DAT.SG dearest.M.DAT.SG me.DAT  
 Meneléōi tà prósphora dróies án  
 Menelaus.DAT the.N.ACC.PL suitable.N.DAT.PL do.2SG.PRS.OPT IRR  
 'For you would be better disposed towards my dearest Menelaus while  
 doing what is suitable ...' (Euripides, *Helen* 1298)
- (947) οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε τρέφειν δύναιτ' ἂν μία λόχμη κλέπτα δύο  
 ou gàr àn pote tréphein dúnait' án  
 not then IRR sometime rear.PRS.INF can.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR  
 μία lókhmē klépta dúo  
 one.F.NOM.SG lair.NOM.SG thief.ACC.DU two  
 'For the same lair can never support two thieves' (Aristophanes, *Wasps*  
 927)
- (948) οὐ γὰρ ἂν χαίροντες ἡμεῖς τήμερον παυσαίμεθ' ἂν  
 ou gàr àn khaírontes hēmeis témeron  
 not then IRR rejoice.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL we.NOM today  
 pausaímeth' án  
 stop.1PL.AOR.OPT.MID IRR  
 'For today we cannot cease rejoicing.' (Aristophanes, *Peace* 321)
- (949) ἄλλως γὰρ ἂν ἄμαχοι γυναῖκες καὶ μιαιραὶ κεκλήμεθ' ἂν  
 állōs gàr àn ámakhoi gunaíkes kai  
 otherwise then IRR invincible.F.NOM.PL woman.F.NOM.PL and  
 miarai kekléimeth' án  
 polluted.F.NOM.PL confine.1PL.PRF.PASS IRR  
 'For otherwise we would be confined as being unconquerable and foul  
 women' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 252)
- (950) καὶ γὰρ ἂν μαινοίμεθ' ἂν

## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

kai gàr *án* mainoímeth' *án*  
 and then IRR rave.1PL.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR  
 'For we would be mad.' (Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae* 196)

- (951) σαφῶς γὰρ ἄν, εἰ πείθοιμι ὑμᾶς ..., θεοὺς ἄν διδάσκειμι  
 saphôs gàr *án*, ei peíthoimi humâs theoùs *án*  
 clearly then IRR if persuade.1SG.PRS.OPT you.ACC.PL god.ACC.PL IRR  
 didáskoimi  
 teach.1PL.PRS.OPT  
 'For clearly if I persuaded you, I should be teaching that the gods ...'  
 (Plato, *Apology* 35d)

- (952) ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄν οἶμαι, εἰ ... δέοι ..., οἶμαι ἄν ... τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα  
 eûarithmêtoutos ἄν εὕρεϊν  
 egô gàr *án* oîmai, ei déoi oîmai  
 I.NOM then IRR think.1SG.PRS.PASS if lack.3SG.PRS.OPT think.1SG.PRS.PASS  
*án* tôn mégan basiléa euarithmétous *án*  
 IRR the.M.ACC.SG great.M.ACC.SG king.ACC.SG easily-counted.M.ACC.PL IRR  
 heureîn  
 find.AOR.INF  
 'For I think, if it were necessary ... I think that the great king would find  
 few ...' (Plato, *Apology* 40d; cf. example 892 above)

- (953) οὔτε γὰρ ἄν αἱ τῆς σελήνης ἐκλείψεις τοιαύτας ἄν εἶχον τὰς ἀποτομάς  
 οὔτε γὰρ *án* hai tês selénēs ekleipseis  
 nor then IRR the.F.NOM.PL the.F.GEN.SG moon.GEN.SG eclipse.NOM.PL  
 toiaútas *án* eíkhon tàs apotomás  
 such.F.ACC.PL IRR have.3PL.IMP the.F.ACC.PL division.ACC.PL  
 'For neither would the eclipses of the moon have such divisions.'  
 (Aristotle, *On the Heavens* 227b.24)

- (954) μέλλων γὰρ ἄν βαδίζειν τις οὐκ ἄν βαδίσειεν  
 méllōn gàr *án* badízein tis  
 be.going.to.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG then IRR walk.PRS.INF someone.M.NOM.SG  
 ouk *án* badíseien  
 not IRR walk.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'For someone about to walk would not have walked' (Aristotle, *On  
 Generation and Corruption* 337b.7)

- (955) οὕτως γὰρ ἄν ἔχον χρησιμώτατον ἄν εἴη



## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *àn* in main clauses

- (959) τίς ἂν οὖν γένοιτ' ἂν ὄρκος  
 tís àn oûn génoit' àn órkos  
 what.M.NOM.SG IRR so become.3SG.AOR.OPT IRR oath.NOM.SG  
 'What oath would suit us then?' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 191)
- (960) πῶς ἂν οὖν οὐκ ἂν δεινὰ πάσχοιμεν  
 pôs àn oûn ouk àn deinà páskhoimen  
 how IRR so not IRR terrible.N.ACC.PL suffer.1PL.PRS.OPT  
 'Then how could we not suffer terrible things?' ([Lysias] 20.15)
- (961) πῶς ἂν οὖν δὴ τοῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοι ..., ἐγὼ πειράσομαι φράσαι  
 pôs àn oûn dê toûth' hoútōs ékhoi egò  
 how IRR so exactly this.N.NOM.SG so have.3SG.PRS.OPT I.NOM  
 peirásomai phrásai  
 try.1SG.FUT.MID tell.AOR.INF  
 'So I will try to tell you how this would be.' (Plato, *Phaedo* 64a)
- (962) πῶς ἂν οὖν θεὸς εἴη ὃ γε τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἄμοιρος  
 pôs àn oûn theòs eíē hó ge tôn  
 how IRR so god.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS.OPT the.M.NOM.SG even the.N.GEN.PL  
 kalôn kai agathôn ámoiros  
 beautiful.N.GEN.PL and good.N.GEN.PL devoid.M.NOM.SG  
 'How then can he be a god, if he is devoid of things beautiful and good?'  
 (Plato, *Symposium* 202d)
- (963) πῶς ἂν οὖν ἔχοντες τοσούτους πόρους ... ἔπειτα ἐκ τούτων πάντων  
 τοῦτον ἂν τὸν τρόπον ἐξελοίμεθα ...  
 pôs àn oûn ékhontes tosoútos pórous  
 how IRR so have.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL so.many.M.NOM.PL way.NOM.PL  
 épeita ek toútōn pántōn toúton àn tôn  
 then out this.M.GEN.PL all.M.GEN.PL this.M.ACC.SG IRR the.M.ACC.SG  
 trópon exeloímetha  
 way.ACC.SG choose.1PL.AOR.OPT.MID  
 'Therefore, having so many ways, how then could we choose this way  
 out of all these ... ?' (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 2.5.20)
- (964) πῶς ἂν οὖν ἐγὼ ἢ βιασαίμην ὑμᾶς ... ἢ ἐξαπατήσας ἄγοιμι  
 pôs àn oûn egò é biasáimēn humâs è  
 how IRR so I.NOM or force.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID you.ACC.PL or

## 2 Translation

exapatésas                      ágoimi  
 deceive.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG lead.1SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘Then how could I either force you or lead you by deception?’  
 (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 5.7.8)

- (965) πῶς ἂν οὖν ἀνὴρ μᾶλλον δοίῃ δίκην  
 pôs àn oûn anêr mállon doíē dīkēn  
 how IRR so man.NOM.SG more give.3SG.AOR.OPT judgement.ACC.SG  
 ‘Then how could a man bring down punishment more surely ...’  
 (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 5.7.9)

- (966) οὐκ ἂν οὖν ῥαδίως γέ τις εὔροι Σπαρτιατῶν ... ὑγεινότερους  
 ouk àn oûn rhāidíōs gé tis heúroi  
 not IRR so easily even someone.M.NOM.SG find.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 Spartiatôn hugeinotérous  
 Spartan.GEN.PL healthier.M.ACC.PL  
 ‘So one could not easily find healthier men than the Spartans.’  
 (Xenophon, *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians* 5.9)

- (967) τίς ἂν οὖν εὖ φρονῶν αὐτὸν ἂν ἢ τὰ τῆς πατρίδος συμφέροντα ταύτῃ  
 tís àn oûn eû phronôn hautôn àn  
 who.M.NOM.SG IRR so well reason.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG himself.ACC IRR  
 è tà tēs patrídos sumphéronta  
 or the.N.ACC.PL the.F.GEN.SG fatherland.GEN.SG gather.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.PL  
 taútēi sunápseie  
 this.F.DAT.SG join.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘Then who in his right mind would bind himself or his country’s  
 interests to this?’ (Demosthenes 25.33)

- (968) πῶς ἂν οὖν μὴ εἰδῶς ὁ πατήρ αὐτὸν Ἀθηναῖον ἐκόμενον ἔδωκεν ἂν τὴν  
 êautoû gunaîka  
 pôs àn oûn mē eidōs ho patēr  
 how IRR so not know.PTCP.PRF.M.NOM.SG the.M.NOM.SG father.NOM.SG  
 autôn Athēnaïon esómenon édōken àn  
 him.ACC Athenian.ACC.SG be.PTCP.FUT.MID.M.ACC.SG give.3SG.AOR IRR  
 tēn heautoû gunaîka  
 the.F.ACC.SG himself.GEN woman.ACC.SG  
 ‘How, then, could my father, not knowing that he was to become an  
 Athenian citizen, have given him his own wife ...’ ([Demosthenes] 46.13)

2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

- (969) ἴσως ἂν οὖν τις θαυμάσειεν  
 ísōs      **àn**    oûn tis                      thaumáseien  
 perhaps IRR so    someone.M.NOM.SG wonder.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘So perhaps someone might wonder ...’ (Aeschines 1.17)
- (970) πῶς ἂν οὖν ἐγὼ προεδεικνύμην Ἀλεξάνδρῳ  
 pôs    **àn**    oûn egô    proedeiknûmēn              Alexándroï  
 how IRR so    I.NOM demonstrate.1SG.IMP.PASS Alexander.DAT  
 ‘How then could I have been already making a manifesto to Alexander?’  
 (Aeschines 3.219)

The fact that the *án* that precedes *oûn* is attached to *tís* ‘what’ or *pôs* ‘how’ fits with what was observed above on p218. (It should not be denied that *án* follows *oûn* even more frequently.) *án* precedes *te* in 971; it precedes *de* in 972 and perhaps 973 (the majority of the manuscripts and editions have *tákha d’ án* *ísōs*). However, in the last two examples the [p396] collocation of *tákha* with *án* is of more importance than the position itself.

- (971) τάχιστα ἂν τε πόλιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀπολέσειαν  
 tákhist’ **àn** te pólin      hoi              toioûtoi  
 fastest IRR and city.ACC.SG the.M.NOM.PL such.M.NOM.PL  
 apoléseian  
 destroy.3PL.AOR.OPT  
 ‘And such people would ruin a state most quickly’ (Thucydides 2.62.3)
- (972) τάχ’ ἂν δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ἐσπλεύσαντες  
 tákh’    **àn**    dè    kaì    állōs      espleúsantes  
 quickly IRR then also otherwise sail.in.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL  
 ‘... but perhaps also sailing in by another way’ (Thucydides 6.2.4)
- (973) τάχ’ ἂν δ’ ἴσως  
 takh’    **àn**    d’    ísōs  
 quickly IRR then perhaps  
 (Thucydides 6.10.4)

Fourth, *án* is happy to be separated by an intervening clause from the main elements of the clause to which it belongs: 974–983.

\* *Translator’s note:* This is also the version found in the modern Perseus edition.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition adds *pōs* after *állōs*.

## 2 Translation

- (974) οὐδ' ἄν, μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα, φροντίσαιμι γε  
 oud' **án**, mà tèn Démētra, phrontísaimí ge  
 nor IRR by the.F.ACC.SG Demeter.ACC consider.1SG.AOR.OPT even  
 'By Demeter, I wouldn't think of it.' (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1222)
- (975) cù δ' ... οἶμαι, ἄν, ὥς ἐγὼ λέγω, ποιοίηc  
 sù d' oîmai, **án**, hōs egō légō,  
 you.NOM then think.1SG.PRS.PASS IRR as I.NOM say.1SG.PRS  
 poioiēs  
 do.2SG.PRS.OPT  
 'But you, I think, will do as I say.' (Plato, *Phaedo* 101e)
- (976) τί οὖν ἄν, ἔφη, εἴη ὁ Ἔρως  
 tí oûn **án**, éphē, eíē ho  
 what.N.NOM.SG so IRR say.3SG.IMP be.3SG.PRS.OPT the.M.NOM.SG  
 Érōs  
 Eros.NOM  
 "What, then," he said, "could Eros be?" (Plato, *Symposium* 202d)
- (977) καὶ πῶς ἄν, ἔφη, ὃ Σώκρατες, ὁμολογοῖτο  
 kai pôs **án**, éphē, ô Sókrates, homologoîto  
 and how IRR say.3SG.IMP O Socrates.VOC agree.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 "And how," she said, "Socrates, could it be agreed ... ?" (Plato, *Symposium* 202b)
- (978) πρὸς γε ὑποδημάτων ἄν, οἶμαι φαίηc κτῆcιν  
 prós ge hupodēmátōn **án**, oîmai phaiēs  
 to even shoe.GEN.PL IRR think.1SG.PRS.PASS say.2SG.PRS.OPT  
 ktêsin  
 acquisition.ACC.SG  
 'For obtaining shoes, I think, you would say?' (Plato, *Republic* 1.333a)
- (979) ἴσως γὰρ ἄν, ἔφη, δοκοίη τι λέγειν ὁ ταῦτα λέγων  
 ísōs gàr **án**, éphē, dokoíē ti  
 perhaps then IRR say.3SG.IMP seem.3SG.PRS.OPT something.ACC.SG  
 légein ho taûta légōn  
 say.PRS.INF the.M.NOM.SG this.N.ACC.PL say.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 "Perhaps, then," he said, "someone saying this would seem to be saying something." (Plato, *Republic* 4.438a)

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *éphēn* for *éphē*.



2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

- (980) τί ἄν, εἰ ... (seven lines follow) τί ποτ' ἄν ἡγούμεθα ἐκ ταύτης τῆς  
 προρρήσεως ξυμβαίνειν  
 tí án, ei tí pot' àn hēgoúmetha ek  
 what.N.ACC.SG IRR if what.N.ACC.SG sometime IRR lead.1PL.IMP.PASS out  
 taútēs tēs prorrhéseōs xumbaínein  
 this.F.GEN.SG the.F.GEN.SG proclamation.GEN.SG occur.PRS.INF  
 'What, if ... what do we think would ever result from this proclamation?'  
 (Plato, *Laws* 2.658a)
- (981) οἶμαι ἄν, αὐτῶν εἰ καλῶς τις ἐπιμελοῖτο, οὐκ εἶναι ἔθνος  
 oímai án, autôn ei kalôs tis  
 think.1SG.PRS.PASS IRR them.GEN if beautifully someone.M.NOM.SG  
 epimeloîto, ouk eînai éthnos  
 manage.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS not be.PRS.INF people.M.NOM.SG  
 'I think that, if one managed them well, there would be no people ...'  
 (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 6.1.9)
- (982) ἐγὼ ἄν, εἰ ἔχοιμι, ὥς τάχιστα ὄπλα ἐποιούμην τοῖς Πέρσαις  
 egô án, ei ékhoimi, hōs tákhista hópla  
 I.NOM IRR if have.1SG.PRS.OPT as fastest armour.ACC.PL  
 epoióumēn toîs Pérsais  
 make.1SG.IMP.PASS the.M.DAT.PL Persian.DAT.PL  
 'I, if I could have it, would have armour made for the Persians as quickly  
 as possible.' (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 2.1.9)
- (983) τί ἄν, εἴ που τῆς χώρας τοῦτο πάθος συνέβη, προσδοκῆσαι χρῆν  
 tí án, eí pou tēs khóras  
 what.N.ACC.SG IRR if somewhere the.F.GEN.SG country.GEN.SG  
 toûto páthos sunébē, prosdokêsai  
 this.N.NOM.SG experience.NOM.SG occur.3SG.AOR expect.AOR.INF  
 khrên  
 need.3SG.PRS  
 'What, if this misfortune occurred somewhere in our country, would it  
 be necessary to expect?' (Demosthenes 18.195)

It is understandable that there is a tendency to insert *án* again after the intervening clause: see example 932 above, and 984–997 (also Xenophon, *Anabasis* 7.7.38).

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *egô mên án, éphē ho Kûros, ei su eîēn, hōs tákhista hópla poioímēn*.

## 2 Translation

- (984) οὐτ' ἄν, εἰ θέλοισ ἔτι πράσσειν, ἐμοῦ γ' ἄν ἡδέως πράσσοις μέτα  
 οὐτ' ἄν, ei thélois éti prássein, emou̐ g' ἄν hēdéōs  
 nor IRR if want.2SG.PRS.OPT still do.PRS.INF me.GEN even IRR sweetly  
 prássois méta  
 do.2SG.PRS.OPT with  
 '... nor, even if you still wanted to do so, would you willingly do so with  
 me.' (Sophocles, *Antigone* 69)
- (985) ἀλλ' ἄν, εἰ τὸν ἐξ ἐμῆς μητρὸς θανόντ' ἄθαρτον ἡνυχόμην νέκυν,  
 κείνοισ ἄν ἥλγουν  
 all' ἄν, ei tòn ex emês mētròs  
 but IRR if the.M.ACC.SG out my.F.GEN.SG mother.GEN.SG  
 thanónt' átharton ēnshómēn  
 die.PTCP.AOR.M.ACC.SG unburied.M.ACC.SG sustain.1SG.AOR.MID  
 nékun, kéinois ἄν ἑλγουν  
 corpse.ACC.SG that.N.DAT.PL IRR hurt.1SG.IMP  
 'But if I had endured the dead son of my mother as an unburied corpse, I  
 would have suffered from that.' (Sophocles, *Antigone* 466)
- (986) ὥστ' ἄν, εἰ σθένος λάβοιμι, δηλώσαιμ' ἄν  
 hóst' ἄν, ei sthénos láboimi, dēlósaim' ἄν  
 so IRR if strength.ACC.SG take.1SG.AOR.OPT show.1SG.AOR.OPT IRR  
 '... so that, if I could find strength, I would show ...' (Sophocles, *Electra*  
 333)
- (987) ἀρχὴν δ' ἄν, εἰ μὴ τλημονεστάτη γυνὴ πασῶν ἐβλαστε, ... χοὰς οὐκ ἄν  
 ποθ' ὄν γ' ἔκτεινε, τῷδ' ἐπέστεφε  
 arkhēn d' ἄν, ei mē tlēmonestátē  
 beginning.ACC.SG then IRR if not audacious.SUPL.F.NOM.SG  
 gunē pasōn éblaste khoàs ouk ἄν  
 woman.NOM.SG all.GEN.PL bud.3SG.AOR libation.ACC.PL not IRR  
 poth' hōn g' ékteine, tōid' epéstēphe  
 sometime whom.M.ACC.SG even kill.3SG.IMP this.M.DAT.SG pour.3SG.IMP  
 'To begin with, if she had not been born the most audacious woman of  
 all, she would never have poured offerings to this man whom she had  
 killed' (Sophocles, *Electra* 439)
- (988) ἐκείνον δ' ἄν, εἰ ἐκδοίη αὐτόν ..., σπηλιάς ἄν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποστερήσαι

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *drōiēs* for *prássois*.

2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

ekeinon d' án, ei ekdoiē autón sōtērias  
 that.M.ACC.SG then IRR if give.up.3SG.AOR.OPT him.ACC salvation.GEN.SG  
 án tēs psukhēs apostērēsai  
 IRR the.F.GEN.SG soul.GEN.SG rob.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'And if he gave him up, he would be depriving him of the safety of his  
 life' (Thucydides 1.136.4)

- (989) κἄν, ὑμῖν εἴ τις ἐνῆν νοῦς, ἐκ τῶν ἐρίων τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπολιτεύεσθ' ἄν  
 ἅπαντα  
 kán, humîn eí tis enên noûs, ek  
 and=IRR you.DAT.PL if someone.M.NOM.SG spin.3SG.IMP mind.ACC.PL out  
 tôn eríōn tôn hēmetérōn  
 the.N.GEN.PL wool.GEN.PL the.N.GEN.PL our.N.GEN.PL  
 epoliteúesth' án hápanta  
 be.citizen.2PL.IMP.PASS IRR quite.all.N.ACC.PL  
 'And if someone could spin minds for you out of our wool, you could  
 govern everything.' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 572)

- (990) κἄν, εἴ με τύπτοις, οὐκ ἄν ἀντείποιμί σοι  
 kán, eí me túptois, ouk án anteípoimí  
 and=IRR if me.ACC beat.2SG.PRS.OPT not IRR contradict.1SG.AOR.OPT  
 soi  
 you.DAT  
 'Even if you beat me, I'd never contradict you.' (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 585)

- (991) κἄν, εἰ Ὀρθαγόρᾳ τῷ Θεβαίῳ συγγενόμενος ... ἐπανερόιτο αὐτόν ...,  
 εἴποι ἄν  
 kán, ei Orthagórāi tōi Thēbaíōi  
 and=IRR if Orthagoras.DAT the.M.DAT.SG Theban.DAT.SG  
 sungenómenos epanéroito autón  
 converse.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.SG enquire.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID him.ACC  
 eípoi án  
 say.3SG.AOR.OPT IRR  
 'And if, having studied with Orthagoras the Theban, he enquired of him  
 ... he would say ...' (Plato, *Protagoras* 318c)

- (992) τάχα δ' ἄν, εἰ θεὸς ἐθέλοι, κἄν δυοῖν θάτερα βιασαίμεθα περὶ ἐρωτικῶν  
 tákha d' án, ei theòs ethéloi, kán duoîn  
 quickly then IRR if god.NOM.SG want.3SG.PRS.OPT also=IRR two.N.GEN.DU

## 2 Translation

- thátera biasáimetha perì erōtikôn  
 the=other.N.ACC.PL force.1PL.AOR.OPT.MID about erotic.N.GEN.PL  
 ‘Possibly, should God so grant, we might forcibly effect one of two things in this matter of sex-relations’ (Plato, *Laws* 8.841c)
- (993) ἐπισχὼν ἄν, ἕως ..., εἰ ..., ἡσυχίαν ἂν ἦγον  
 episkhōn án, héōs ei hēsukhían àn êgon  
 wait.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG IRR until if silence.ACC.SG IRR lead.1SG.IMP  
 ‘Having waited until ... if ... I should have held my peace.’ (Demosthenes 4.1)
- (994) ἄρ’ ἂν, εἴ γ’ εἶχε ..., ταῦτ’ ἂν εἵαθεν  
 âr’ án, eí g’ eíkhe taût’ àn eíasen  
 then IRR if even have.3SG.IMP this.N.ACC.PL IRR allow.3SG.AOR  
 ‘So if he had even had ... would he have allowed these things?’ (Demosthenes 21.115)
- (995) οὐδ’ ἂν, εἴ τι γένοιτ’, ᾧήθην ἂν δίκην μοι λαχεῖν ποτε τοῦτον  
 oud’ án, eí ti génoit’, gíēthēn àn díkēn moi lakheîn  
 nor IRR if something.NOM.SG become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 oíēthēn àn díkēn moi lakheîn  
 think.1SG.AOR.PASS IRR judgement.ACC.SG me.DAT obtain.AOR.INF  
 pote toûton  
 sometime this.M.ACC.SG  
 ‘Nor, if anything happened, did I think that this man would ever bring a suit against me.’ (Demosthenes 37.16)
- (996) καίτοι πῶς ἂν, εἰ μὴ πεπορισμένον τε ἦν ..., εὐθὺς ἂν ἀπέλαβον  
 kaitoi pôs án, ei mē peporisménon te ên  
 and.yet how IRR if not bring.PTCP.PRF.PASS.N.NOM.SG and be.3SG.IMP  
 euthús àn apélabon  
 straight IRR receive.3PL.AOR  
 ‘And yet how, if it had not been provided, would they have received it immediately?’ ([Demosthenes] 47.66)
- (997) οἶμαι δ’ ἂν, εἰ ..., ταῖς ὑμετέραις μαρτυρίαις ῥαδίως ἂν ἀπολύσασθαι  
 oîmai d’ án, ei taís humetérais  
 think.1SG.PRS.PASS then IRR if the.F.DAT.PL your.F.DAT.PL

## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

marturíais rhaidíōs *án* apolúsasthai toūs  
 testimony.DAT.PL easily IRR release.AOR.INF.MID the.M.ACC.PL  
 toû katēgōrou lógous  
 the.M.GEN.SG accuser.GEN.SG account.ACC.PL  
 ‘And I think that if ... your testimony would easily refute my accuser’s  
 words.’ (Aeschines 1.122)

The opposite tendency, so to speak, which nevertheless springs from the same positional rule, is found when an [p397] *án* belonging to an intervening clause or to a subordinate clause is drawn to appear after the first word in the superordinate clause: 998–1004.

(998) ἄλλο τι οὖν, ἂν φαίεν, ἢ ξυνθήκας τὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ...  
 παραβαίνειῃς  
 állo ti oûn, *án* phaíen, è  
 other.N.ACC.SG something.ACC.SG so IRR say.3PL.PRS.OPT than  
 xunthēkas tās pròs hēmās autoûs parabáineis  
 compact.ACC.PL the.F.ACC.PL to us.ACC same.M.ACC.PL overstep.2SG.PRS  
 “‘Then are you not,” they would say, “transgressing against something  
 besides your agreements with us ourselves?” (Plato, *Crito* 52d)

(999) τί οὖν, ἂν φαίῃ ὁ λόγος, ἔτι ἀπisteĩς  
 tí oûn, *án* phaíē ho lógos,  
 what.N.ACC.SG so IRR say.3SG.PRS.OPT the.M.NOM.SG account.NOM.SG  
 éti apisteĩs  
 still distrust.2SG.PRS  
 “‘Why, then,” the argument might say, “do you still disbelieve ... ?”  
 (Plato, *Phaedo* 87a)

(1000) μανθάνω, ἂν ἴσος φαίῃ, καὶ ἐγώ  
 manthánō, *án* ísos phaíē, kaì egó  
 learn.1SG.PRS IRR equal.M.NOM.SG say.3SG.PRS.OPT also I.NOM  
 “‘I too understand,” he would likewise say ...’ (Plato, *Hippias Major* 299a)

(1001) τί οὖν, ἂν τις εἴποι, ταῦτα λέγει  
 tí oûn, *án* tis eípoi,  
 what.N.ACC.SG so IRR someone.M.NOM.SG say.3SG.AOR.OPT

---

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *ísōs* for *ísos*.

## 2 Translation

taûta légeis  
this.N.ACC.PL say.2SG.PRS  
“Why, then,” someone might say, “do you say these things ... ?”  
(Demosthenes 1.14)

(1002) τί οὖν, ἄν τις εἴποι, σὺ  
tí oûn, án tis eípoi, sù  
what.N.ACC.SG so IRR someone.M.NOM.SG say.3SG.AOR.OPT you.NOM  
grápheis taût’ eînai stratiōtiká  
write.2SG.PRS this.N.ACC.PL be.PRS.INF military.N.ACC.PL  
“Why, then,” someone might say, “do you propose that these things  
should be for military purposes?” (Demosthenes 1.19)

(1003) τί οὖν, ἄν τις εἴποι, σὺ  
tí oûn, án tis eípoi, sù  
what.N.ACC.SG so IRR someone.M.NOM.SG say.3SG.AOR.OPT you.NOM  
paraineís  
advise.2SG.PRS  
“What, then,” someone might say, “do you advise ... ?” (Demosthenes,  
*Exordia* 35.4)

(1004) ὅτι νῆ Δί, ἄν εἴποι, τοῦτον εἰσπεποίηκα υἱόν  
hóti nè Dí, án eípoi, toûton eispepoiêka uíon  
that yes Zeus.ACC IRR say.3SG.AOR.OPT this.M.ACC.SG adopt.1SG.PRF  
huión  
son.ACC.SG  
“Yes, by Zeus,” he might say, “because I have had him adopted ...”  
([Demosthenes] 44.55)

Cf. also examples 1005, 1006, and similarly 1007 in the interior of the clause in Demosthenes 45.7. The Euripidean usage in example 1008 (also *Alcestis* 48, with *ou gàr* ‘not then’ instead of *ouk*) is, in turn, probably based on similar constructions. Thucydides 5.9.3 (899 above) is peculiar, and the first *án* can probably only be explained as an anticipation of the subordinate clause.

(1005) οὐκ ἂν οἶδ’ ὃ τι πλέον εὔροι τούτου  
ouk àn oîd’ hó ti pléon heúroi  
not IRR know.1SG.PRF which.N.ACC.SG more.N.ACC.SG find.3SG.AOR.OPT

## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

τούτου

this.N.GEN.SG

‘I do not know how much more than this it would fetch.’ (Isaeus 11.44)

- (1006) ἐγὼ γάρ, ἃ μὲν χθὲς ἤκουσα, οὐκ ἂν οἶδ’ εἰ δυνάμην ἅπαντα ἐν μνήμῃ  
 πάλιν λαβεῖν  
 egò gár, hà mèn khthès ékouσα, ouk àn  
 I.NOM then which.N.ACC.PL then yesterday hear.1SG.AOR not IRR  
 oíd’ ei dunáimēn hápanta en  
 know.1SG.PRF if can.1SG.PRS.OPT.PASS quite.all.N.ACC.PL in  
 mnémēi pálin labeîn  
 memory.DAT.SG again take.AOR.INF  
 ‘For I do not know if I could recall to mind everything that I heard  
 yesterday.’ (Plato, *Timaeus* 26b)

- (1007) οὐκ ἂν οἶδ’ ὅ τι  
 ouk àn oíd’ hó ti  
 not IRR know.1SG.PRF which.N.ACC.SG  
 ‘... I do not know what ...’ (Demosthenes 45.7)

- (1008) οὐκ οἶδ’ ἂν εἰ πείσαιμι  
 ouk oíd’ àn ei peísaimi  
 not IRR know.1SG.PRF if persuade.1SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘I do not know if I can persuade ...’ (Euripides, *Medea* 941)

Sixth, just like the enclitics, *án* often splits clause-initial word groups apart. Under this heading one could count *oud’ àn heîs*, as in 793 above as well as 1009–1015.

- (1009) οὐδ’ ἂν εἷς δύναιτ’ ἀνὴρ  
 oud’ àn heîs dúnait’ anér  
 nor IRR one.M.NOM.SG can.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS man.NOM.SG  
 ‘Nor could any man ...’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 281)
- (1010) οὐδ’ ἂν εἷς θνητῶν φράσειε  
 oud’ àn heîs thnētôn phráseie  
 nor IRR one.M.NOM.SG mortal.GEN.PL tell.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘Nor could any mortal tell ...’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1656)

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *ou gár ... hótí* for *ouk àn ... hó ti*. Wackernagel cites this as Demosthenes 11.44 but the correct reference is Isaeus 11.44.

## 2 Translation

- (1011) οὐδ' ἄν εἷς ἀμφιβητήσῃε  
 oud' **àn** heís amphibētéseie  
 nor IRR one.M.NOM.SG dispute.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'Not one could compete ...' (Plato, *First Alcibiades*, 122d)
- (1012) οὐδ' ἄν εἷς εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι φήσῃεν  
 oud' **àn** heís eû oîd' hótí phéseien  
 nor IRR one.M.NOM.SG well know.3SG.PRF that say.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'Nor does anyone not know well that he would say ...' (Demosthenes 19.312)
- (1013) οὐδ' ἄν εἷς ταῦτα φήσῃεν  
 oud' **àn** heís taûta phéseien  
 nor IRR one.M.NOM.SG this.N.ACC.PL say.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'Nor would anyone say these things.' (Demosthenes 18.69)
- (1014) οὐδ' ἄν εἷς εἰπεῖν ἔχοι  
 oud' **àn** heís eipeîn ékhoi  
 nor IRR one.M.NOM.SG say.AOR.INF have.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 'Nor would anyone say these things.' (Demosthenes 18.94)
- (1015) οὐδ' ἄν εἷς εἴποι  
 oud' **àn** heís eípoi  
 nor IRR one.M.NOM.SG say.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'Nor would anyone say ...' (Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians* 7.4)

However, this tmesis is found at least as often clause-internally (Lysias 19.60, 24.24, Isocrates 15.223, 21.20, Plato, *Symposium* 192e, 214d, 216e, *Gorgias* 512e, 519c, Demosthenes 14.1, 20.136, 18.68, 18.128, Lycurgus 49.57), and thus appears to be due to the attracting force of *oude* 'nor'.

The two instances of *g' an oun* 'even IRR so' instead of *goun an* in Thucydides, 1016 and 1017, constitute better evidence, as well as examples 1018–1057, in which *án* is inserted into the middle of a word group.

- (1016) ἄλλους γ' ἄν οὖν οἰόμεθα τὰ ἡμέτερα λαβόντες δεῖξαι ἄν  
 állous g' **àn** oûn oíómetha tà  
 other.M.ACC.PL even IRR so think.1PL.PRS.PASS the.N.ACC.PL

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition lacks *án*.

\* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *oudeis an*.



2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

hēmētera labóntes deîxai án  
 our.N.ACC.PL take.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL show.AOR.INF IRR  
 ‘We think that by taking others it would at least show ours ...’  
 (Thucydides 1.76.4)

- (1017) ὑμεῖς γ’ ἂν οὖν, εἰ ... ἄρξαιτε, τάχ’ ἂν ... μεταβάλοιτε  
 humeîs g’ àn oûn, ei árxaite, tákh’ àn  
 you.NOM.PL even IRR so if begin.2PL.AOR.OPT quickly IRR  
 metabáloite  
 exchange.2PL.AOR.OPT  
 ‘If you were to lead, then you would soon change ...’ (Thucydides 1.77.6)

- (1018) πολλῶν ἂν ἀνδρῶν ἥδ’ ἐχρηώθη πόλις  
 pollôn àn andrôn hêd’ ekhērôthē  
 many.M.GEN.PL IRR man.GEN.PL this.F.NOM.SG bereave.3SG.AOR.PASS  
 pólis  
 city.NOM.SG  
 ‘This city would have been bereft of many men.’ (Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians* 12.4)

- (1019) μόνος ἂν θνητῶν πέρας εἴποι  
 mónos àn thnētôn péras eípoi  
 alone.M.NOM.SG IRR mortal.GEN.PL end.ACC.SG say.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘He alone of mortals can declare how to bring it to accomplishment.’  
 (Aeschylus, *Persians* 632)

- (1020) ἀνθρώπεια δ’ ἂν τοι πῆματ’ ἂν τύχοι βροτοῖς  
 anthrópeia d’ àn toi pémat’ àn túkhoi  
 human.N.NOM.PL then IRR lo harm.NOM.PL IRR happen.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 brotoîs  
 mortal.DAT.PL  
 ‘Afflictions ordained for human life must, we know, befall mankind.’  
 (Aeschylus, *Persians* 706)

- (1021) κατὰ δ’ ἂν τις ἐμοῦ τοιαῦτα λέγων οὐκ ἂν πείθῃ  
 katà d’ àn tis emoû toiaûta légōn ouk àn peíthēi  
 down then IRR someone.M.NOM.SG me.GEN such.N.ACC.PL

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *labóntas* for *labóntes*.

## 2 Translation

légōn                      ouk àn peíthoi  
say.PTCP.PRS.MP.NOM.SG not IRR persuade.3SG.AOR.OPT  
'But someone saying such things against me would fail to convince'  
(Sophocles, *Ajax* 155)

[p398]

- (1022) ἄλλον δ' ἂν ἄλλω προσίδουι  
 állon d' àn állōi prosídois  
 other.M.ACC.SG then IRR other.M.DAT.SG behold.2SG.AOR.OPT  
 'And you can see one after another ...' (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 175)
- (1023) σοφίᾳ δ' ἂν σοφίαν παραμείψειεν ἀνὴρ  
 sophíai d' àn sophían parameípseien anér  
 wisdom.DAT.SG then IRR wisdom.ACC.SG pass.3SG.AOR.OPT man. NOM.SG  
 '... though man may surpass man in wisdom' (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 502)
- (1024) τίς οὖν ἂν ὑμῶν τοῖς ἔσω φράσειεν ἄν  
 tís oûn àn humôn toîs ésō phrásaien  
 who.M.NOM.SG so IRR you.GEN.PL the.M.DAT.PL inside tell.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ἄν  
 IRR  
 'Which of you, then, would tell those inside ...?' (Sophocles, *Electra* 1103)
- (1025) τίς ἂν θεῶν σοι τόνδ' ἄριστον ἄνδρ' ἰδεῖν δοίῃ  
 tís àn theôn soi tónd' áriston  
 who.M.NOM.SG IRR god.GEN.PL you.DAT this.M.ACC.SG best.M.ACC.SG  
 ándr' ideîn doíē  
 man.ACC.SG see.AOR.INF give.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 'Which of the gods might grant that you could see this best of men ...?'  
 (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1100)
- (1026) ἐφρόντιζε ἱστορέων, τοὺς ἂν Ἑλλήνων δυνατωτάτους ἐόντας  
 ephrōntize historéōn, toûs àn Hellénōn  
 consider.3SG.IMP enquire.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG whom.M.ACC.PL IRR  
 Hellénōn dunatōtátous eóntas  
 Greek.GEN.PL mightiest.ACC.PL be.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.PL

2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

prosktésaito philous  
 gain.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID friend.ACC.PL  
 ‘He took care to enquire about those whom he might win as friends,  
 being the most powerful of the Greeks.’ (Herodotus 1.56.1)

- (1027) ἐπειρώτεον, τίνα ἂν θεῶν ἱλασάμενοι κατύπερθε τῷ πολέμῳ Τεγεητέων  
 γενοίατο  
 epeiróteon, tína ἂn theôn  
 enquire.3PL.IMP whom.M.ACC.SG IRR god.GEN.PL  
 hilasámenoi katúperthe tōi polémōi  
 appease.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.PL above the.M.DAT.SG war.DAT.SG  
 Tegeētēōn genoíato  
 Tegean.GEN.PL become.3PL.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘They asked by appeasing which god they would be able to overcome  
 the Tegeans in war.’ (Herodotus 1.67.2)

- (1028) τὸ δὲ ἂν χρυσίον ἐγίνετο ἀπὸ τῶν εὐειδέων παρθένων  
 tò δὲ ἂn khrusíon egíneto apò  
 the.N.NOM.SG then IRR money.NOM.SG become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID of  
 tôn eueidēōn parthénōn  
 the.F.GEN.PL well-formed.F.GEN.PL maiden.GEN.PL  
 ‘And the money would come from the attractive girls’ (Herodotus  
 1.196.3)

- (1029) στρατοῦ ἂν ἄλλου τις τὴν ταχίστην ἄγερσιν ποιέοιτο  
 stratoû ἂn álloú tis tēn  
 army.GEN.SG IRR other.M.GEN.SG someone.M.NOM.SG the.F.ACC.SG  
 takhístēn ágersin poiéoi to  
 fastest.F.ACC.SG muster.ACC.SG do.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 ‘Someone should muster another army as soon as possible’ (Herodotus  
 7.48.1)

- (1030) ἕκαστος ἂν ὑμῶν ἄρχοι γῆς Ἑλλάδος  
 hékastos ἂn humōn árkhōi gēs  
 each.M.NOM.SG IRR you.GEN.PL begin.3SG.PRS.OPT land.GEN.SG  
 Helládos  
 Greece.GEN.SG  
 ‘Each of you might rule the land of Greece.’ (Herodotus 7.135.2)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *epeirótōn* for *epeiróteon*.

## 2 Translation

- (1031) κατά γε ἄν τήν ἡπειρον τοιάδε ἐγίνετο  
 katá ge àn tèn épeiron toíade  
 down even IRR the.F.ACC.SG mainland.ACC.SG so.much.F.NOM.SG  
 egíneto  
 become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘On land something like this would have happened’ (Herodotus 7.139.2)
- (1032) ἐν ἄλλοισιν ἄν λόγοισιν ἀφέντερον διδάχθειν  
 en álloisin àn lógoisin saphésteron  
 in other.M.DAT.PL IRR account.DAT.PL clearly.COMP  
 didakhtheî  
 teach.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 ‘It could be taught more clearly in other words’ (Hippocrates, *De arte*;  
 Gomperz (1890: 44, line 8))
- (1033) ἐπεὶ τῶν γε μὴ ἐόντων τίνα ἄν τις οὐσίην θεησάμενος ἀπαγγείλειεν ὥς  
 êpeî tôn ge mè eóntōn tína án  
 since the.GEN.PL even not be.PTCP.PRS.GEN.PL some.F.ACC.SG IRR  
 tis ousiēn theēsámenos  
 someone.M.NOM.SG being.ACC.SG behold.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.SG  
 apangeíleien hōs éstin  
 report.3SG.AOR.OPT as be.3SG.PRS  
 ‘... since someone observing some essence of those that are not would  
 report that it is so.’ (Hippocrates, *De arte*; Gomperz (1890: 42, line 19))
- (1034) πολλὴν ἄν οἶμαι ἀπιστίαν τῆς δυνάμεως ... τοῖς ἔπειτα πρὸς τὸ κλέος  
 pollèn àn oímai apistían tēs  
 much.F.ACC.SG IRR think.1SG.PRS.PASS distrust.ACC.SG the.F.GEN.SG  
 dunámeōs toîs épeita pròs tò kléos  
 power.GEN.SG the.M.DAT.PL then to the.N.ACC.SG fame.ACC.SG  
 autōn eînai  
 them.GEN be.PRS.INF  
 ‘I think that there would be much distrust among the people then of  
 their power in regard to their fame’ (Thucydides 1.10.2)
- (1035) βραχυτάτῳ δ’ ἄν κεφαλαίῳ ... τῷδ’ ἄν μὴ προέσθαι ἡμᾶς μάθοιτε  
 brakhutátōi d’ àn kephalaíōi tōid’ àn mè  
 shortest.N.DAT.SG then IRR heading.N.DAT.SG this.N.DAT.SG IRR not

## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

proésthai                      hēmâs máthoite  
 abandon.AOR.INF.MID us.ACC learn.2PL.AOR.OPT  
 ‘In summary, you should learn from this not to abandon us’ (Thucydides 1.36.3)

- (1036) πρὸς γὰρ ἂν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, εἰ ἐξῆν χωρεῖν  
 pròs gàr àn toùs Athēnaíous, ei exēn  
 to then IRR the.M.ACC.PL Athenian.ACC.PL if be.possible.3SG.IMP  
 khōreîn  
 withdraw.PRS.INF  
 ‘For if it were possible, the alliance of Athens would be shut against them.’ (Thucydides 5.22.2)

- (1037) τίς οὖν ἂν ἄγγελον πέμψαιμι ἐπ’ αὐτόν  
 tís oûn àn ángelon pémpsaim’ ep’  
 what.M.ACC.SG so IRR messenger.ACC.SG send.1SG.AOR.OPT upon  
 autón  
 him.ACC.SG  
 ‘What messenger could I send to him?’ (Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae* 768)

- (1038) σκεπτέον, τί ἂν ἀγαθὸν αὐτὰς ἐργασάμενος φανείης ἄξια ... πεποιηκώς  
 skeptéon, tí àn agathòn autàs  
 look.GDV.N.NOM.SG what.N.ACC.SG IRR good.N.ACC.SG them.F.ACC.PL  
 ergasámenos phaneíēs áxia  
 work.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.NOM.SG show.2SG.AOR.OPT.PASS worthy.N.ACC.PL  
 pepoiēkós  
 do.PTCP.PRF.M.NOM.SG  
 ‘It must be considered by doing them what good you can be seen to have done worthy things ...’ (Isocrates 5.35)

- (1039) πολλὴ γὰρ ἂν τις εὐδαιμονία εἴη περὶ τοὺς νέους  
 pollē gàr àn tis eudaimonía eíē  
 much.F.NOM.SG then IRR someone.M.NOM.SG prosperity.NOM.SG  
 eíē perì toùs néous  
 be.3SG.PRS.OPT about the.M.ACC.PL young.M.ACC.PL  
 ‘For it would be a great blessing for the young ...’ (Plato, *Apology* 25b)

- (1040) πολλὴ ἂν ἐλπὶς εἴη καὶ καλὴ

## 2 Translation

pollè                      àn elpìs                      eíē                      kaì kalè  
 much.F.NOM.SG IRR hope.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS.OPT and beautiful.F.NOM.SG  
 ‘... it would be a great and beautiful hope ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 70a)

- (1041) ἄλλου ἄν του δέοι λόγου  
 álloú                      án tou                      déoi                      lógou  
 other.M.GEN.SG IRR the.M.GEN.SG lack.3SG.PRS.OPT word.GEN.SG  
 ‘... further argument would be needed’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 70d and 106d)

- (1042) οὐδεμία ἄν εἴη ἄλλη ἀποφυγή  
 oudemía                      àn eíē                      állē                      apophugé  
 none.F.NOM.SG IRR be.3SG.PRS.OPT other.F.NOM.SG escape.NOM.SG  
 ‘... there would be no other escape ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 107c)

- (1043) ἐλθὼν δ’ ὁ Ξενοφῶν ἐπῆρετο τὸν Ἀπόλλω, τίνι ἄν θεῶν θύων καὶ  
 εὐχόμενος κάλλιστα καὶ ἄριστα ἔλθοι τὴν ὁδόν, ἣν ἐπινοεῖ, καὶ καλῶς  
 πράξας σωθεῖη  
 elthôn                      d’ ho                      Xenophôn  
 go.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG then the.M.NOM.SG Xenophon.NOM  
 epéreto                      tòn Apóllō, tíni àn  
 enquire.3SG.AOR.MID the.M.ACC.SG Apollo.ACC what.M.DAT.SG IRR  
 theôn thúōn                      kaì eukhómenos  
 god.GEN.PL sacrifice.PTCP.M.NOM.SG and pray.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.SG  
 kállista kaì árista élthoi tèn hodón,  
 beautifully.SUPL and best go.3SG.AOR.OPT the.F.ACC.SG way.ACC.SG  
 hèn epinoeí, kaì kalôs práxas  
 which.F.ACC.SG intend.3SG.PRS and beautifully do.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 sōtheíē  
 save.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS  
 ‘So Xenophon went and asked Apollo to which of the gods he should  
 sacrifice and pray in order best and most successfully to perform the  
 journey which he had in mind and, after meeting with good fortune, to  
 return home in safety’ (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 3.1.6; reminiscent of the *tíni*  
*ka theōn* of example 613 above)

- (1044) ἐπερωτᾷ ὁ δῆμος ... , ὅ τι ἄν δρῶσιν ... εἴη  
 eperōtái ho dêmos, hó ti àn  
 enquire.3SG.PRS the.M.NOM.SG people.NOM.SG which.N.ACC.SG IRR

## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

drôsin eíē

do.3PL.PRS be.3SG.PRS.OPT

‘The people enquire ... what they should do ... may be ...’

([Demosthenes] 43.66; cf. also example 1027 above)

- (1045) λαβόντες δὲ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, ἀναρχία ἂν καὶ ἀταξία ἐνόμιζον ἡμᾶς ἀπολέσθαι

labóntes δὲ toûs árkhontas, anarkhiái  
take.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL then the.M.ACC.PL ruler.ACC.PL anarchy.DAT.SG

án kai ataxiái enómizon hēmâs apolésthai  
IRR and disorder.DAT.SG consider.3PL.IMP us.ACC destroy.AOR.INF.MID

‘Having taken our commanders, they considered that we would be ruined through want of leadership and of discipline.’ (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 3.2.29)

- (1046) πολλή ἂν καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων πρόσοδος γίγνοιτο

pollè án kai apò toutōn prósodos  
much.F.NOM.SG IRR also of this.F.GEN.PL revenue.NOM.SG

gígnōito  
become.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS

‘A great revenue would also come from these.’ (Xenophon, *Ways* 3.14)

- (1047) πάμπολλα ἂν νομίζω χρήματα ... προσιέναι

pámpolla án nomízō khrémata  
very.much.N.ACC.PL IRR consider.1SG.PRS property.ACC.PL

prosiénai  
be.added.PRS.INF

‘I consider that a great sum of money would be added ...’ (Xenophon, *Ways* 4.1)

- (1048) ἀντὶ πολλῶν ἂν, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, χρημάτων ὑμᾶς ἐλέσθαι νομίζω

antì pollōn án, ô ándres Athēnaîoi,  
against much.N.GEN.PL IRR O men.VOC.PL Athenian.M.VOC.PL

khremátōn humâs helésthai nomízō  
property.GEN.PL you.ACC.PL take.AOR.INF.MID consider.1SG.PRS

‘You would, I expect, men of Athens, accept it as the equivalent of a large amount of money ...’ (Demosthenes 1.1)

- (1049) πλησίον μὲν ὄντες, ἅπασιν ἂν τοῖς πράγμασι τεταραγμένοις

ἐπιστάντες ὅπως βούλεσθε διοικῆσθαι

## 2 Translation

plēsion mèn óntes, hápasin àn toîs  
 near then be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL quite.all.N.DAT.PL IRR the.N.DAT.PL  
 prágmasin tetaragménois epistántes  
 deed.DAT.PL disturb.PTCP.PRF.PASS.N.DAT.PL establish.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL  
 hópōs boulesthe dioikésaisthe  
 so wish.2PL.PRS.PASS administer.2PL.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘... being at hand, you could manage things as you wish by attending to  
 the disturbances in everything’ (Demosthenes 4.12)

(1050) τί ἂν ποιῶν ὑμῖν χαρίσαιοτο  
 tí àn poiōn humîn  
 what.N.ACC.SG IRR do.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG you.DAT.PL  
 kharísaito  
 gratify.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘... what he might oblige you by doing’ (Demosthenes 19.48)

(1051) τί ἂν εἰπὼν cé τις ὀρθῶς προσείποι  
 tí àn eipōn sé tis  
 what.N.ACC.SG IRR say.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG you.ACC someone.M.NOM.SG  
 orthōs proseípoi  
 straight address.3SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘By saying what could someone call you correctly?’ (Demosthenes 18.22)

(1052) ὅτι πολλὰ μὲν ἂν χρήματα ἔδωκε Φιλιστίδης  
 hótí pollà mèn àn khrémata édōke  
 that much.N.ACC.PL then IRR property.ACC.PL give.3SG.AOR  
 Philistídēs  
 Philistides.NOM  
 ‘... that Philistides would have paid a great sum of money ...’  
 (Demosthenes 18.81)

(1053) μείζων ἂν δοθείη δωρεία  
 meízōn àn dotheíē dōreía  
 greater.F.NOM.SG IRR give.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS gift.NOM.SG  
 ‘... a greater gift would be given ...’ (Demosthenes 18.293)

(1054) θαυμασίως ἂν ὥς εὐλαβούμεν



## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

thaumasíōs *án* hōs eulabóumēn  
wonderfully IRR as beware.1SG.IMP.PASS  
‘... I should be wonderfully cautious ...’ (Demosthenes 29.1)

[p399]

- (1055) καίτοι, τίς ἂν ὑμῶν οἶεται τὴν μητέρα πέμψαι ... ;  
kaitoi, tís *án* humōn oíetai tèn  
and.yet who.M.NOM.SG IRR you.GEN.PL think.3SG.PRS.PASS the.N.ACC.SG  
mētéra pémpsai  
mother.ACC.SG send.AOR.INF  
‘And yet, who among you thinks that his mother would have sent ... ?’  
(Demosthenes 39.24)

- (1056) τί ἂν εἰπὼν μήθ’ ἀμαρτεῖν δοκοίην μήτε ψευσαίμην  
tí *án* eipōn méth’ hamarteîn  
what.N.ACC.SG IRR say.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG nor miss.AOR.INF  
dokoîēn méte pseusaímēn  
seem.1SG.PRS.OPT nor lie.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
‘By saying what could I neither seem to understate nor exaggerate?’  
(Demosthenes, *Letters* 3.37)

- (1057) τί ἂν τις ἄλλο ὄνομ’ ἔχοι θέσθαι τῷ τοιούτῳ  
tí *án* tis állo ónom’  
what.N.ACC.SG IRR someone.M.NOM.SG other.N.ACC.SG name.ACC.SG  
ékhoi thésthai tōi toioútōi  
have.3SG.PRS.OPT put.AOR.INF.MID the.M.DAT.SG such.M.DAT.SG  
‘What other name could one give to such a person ... ?’ ([Demosthenes]  
35.36)

In addition, there are numerous examples of the type in 1058.

- (1058) οὐκ ἂν οἴεσθε δημοσίᾳ πάντας ὑμᾶς προξένους αὐτῶν ποιήσασθαι  
ouk *án* oíesthe dēmosíai pántas humás  
not IRR think.2PL.PRS.PASS publicly all.M.ACC.PL you.ACC.PL  
proxénous hautōn poiésasthai  
patron.ACC.PL themselves.GEN make.AOR.INF.MID  
‘Do you not think that they would unanimously appoint you their  
protectors?’ (Demosthenes 21.50)

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *ēulabóumēn* for *eulabóumēn*.

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *toís toioútois* for *tōi toioútōi*.

## 2 Translation

Among these examples, whose number could moreover easily be doubled, there are several in which the later half of the clause contains a second *án* resuming the first *án*, as in the preceding categories. Here is a particularly instructive case: for example 1048 from Demosthenes there is a parallel version in *Exordia* in which the second part of the clause is heavily expanded, with the text in example 1059 instead of *khrēmátōn humâs helésthai nomízō*, and here, because of the expanded version of the clause, *án* is repeated after *pántas* ‘all’. (Blass’s (1892: 360) deletion of the first *án* after *pollōn*, against the better transmitted version, is wholly erroneous.)

- (1059) χρημάτων τὸ μέλλον συνοίσειν περὶ ὧν νῦν τυγχάνετε σκοποῦντες  
οἶμαι πάντας ὑμᾶς ἐλέσθαι  
khrēmátōn tò méllon  
property.GEN.PL the.N.ACC.SG be.going.to.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.SG  
sunoísen perì hōn nūn tunkhánete  
profit.FUT.INF about which.N.GEN.PL now happen.2PL.PRS  
skopoûntes oîmai pántas humâs  
consider.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL think.1PL.PRS.PASS all.M.ACC.PL you.ACC.PL  
helésthai  
take.AOR.INF.MID  
‘(Instead of) money, I think that you would choose what will benefit in  
those things about which you now happen to be deliberating’  
(Demosthenes, *Exordia* 3.1)

I believe we are able to say that, in all cases where *án* is inserted more than once, this is a compromise between the traditional pressure to place *án* near the beginning of the clause and the requirement – emerging in the classical language – to place *án* nearer the verb and other constituents (see above p217). This also explains why doubled *án* is not found in subjunctive clauses. Thus, all clauses with multiple instances of *án* in which the first *án* occupies the second position are of relevance for us, and not only those that have already been adduced. The examples that I have to hand are 933–934 above and 1060–1133, excluding of course *ούτ’ án ... οút’ án* ‘neither IRR ... nor IRR’, which does not belong here.

- (1060) οὐ τὰν ἐλόντες αὖθις ἀνθαλοῖεν ἄν  
ού τὰν helóntes aûthis anthaloïen án  
not and=IRR take.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL again be.captured.3PL.AOR.OPT IRR  
‘... the captors shall not be made captives in their turn’ (Aeschylus,

\* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition adds *humîn* after *sunoísen*.

### 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

*Agamemnon* 340)

- (1061) ἐντὸς δ' ἂν οὔσα μορσίμων ἀγρευμάτων πείθοι' ἄν  
entòs d' àn oûsa morsímōn ageumátōn  
inside then IRR be.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.SG destined.N.GEN.PL snare.GEN.PL  
peíthoi' àn  
persuade.2SG.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR  
'Since you are in the toils of destiny, perhaps you will obey' (Aeschylus,  
*Agamemnon* 1048)
- (1062) λιπὼν ἂν εὐκλειαν ἐν δόμοισιν ... πολύχωστον ἂν εἶχες τάφον  
lipōn àn eúkleian en dómoisin  
leave.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG IRR renown.ACC.SG in house.DAT.PL  
polúkhōston àn eíkhēs táphon  
high-heaped.M.ACC.SG IRR have.2SG.IMP tomb.ACC.SG  
'Having left a good name in your household, you would have found a  
high-heaped tomb ...' (Aeschylus, *Libation Bearers* 349)
- (1063) πῶς δ' ἂν γαμῶν ἄκουσαν ἄκοντος πάρα ἀγνὸς γένοιτ' ἂν  
pōs d' àn gamōn ákousan  
how then IRR marry.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG unwilling.F.ACC.SG  
ákontos pára hagnòs génoit' àn  
unwilling.M.GEN.SG from holy.M.NOM.SG become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR  
'And how can man be pure who would seize from an unwilling father an  
unwilling bride?' (Aeschylus, *Suppliants* 227)
- (1064) τί δῆτ' ἂν ὥς ἐκ τῶνδ' ἂν ὠφελοῖμί σε  
tí dêt' àn hōs ek tōnd' àn ōpheloímí  
what.N.ACC.SG then IRR as out this.N.GEN.PL IRR help.1SG.PRS.OPT  
se  
you.ACC  
'How, then, can I serve you, as things stand now?' (Sophocles, *Ajax* 537)
- (1065) ἡμεῖς μὲν ἂν τήνδ' ἦν ὅδ' εἴληχεν τύχην θανόντες ἂν προὔκειμεθ'  
hēmeis mèn àn tēnd' hèn hód'  
we.NOM then IRR this.F.ACC.SG which.F.ACC.SG this.M.NOM.SG  
eílēkhen túkhēn thanóntes àn  
obtain.3SG.PRF fortune.ACC.SG die.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL IRR

## 2 Translation

proukeímeth' aiskhístōi mórōi  
 forth=lie.1PL.IMP.PASS shameful.SUPL.M.DAT.SG doom.DAT.SG  
 'We would have been allotted the fate which he now has, and we would  
 be dead and lie prostrate by an ignoble doom' (Sophocles, *Ajax* 1058)

- (1066) ἀλλ' ἄνδρα χρὴ ... δοκεῖν, πεσεῖν ἂν κἄν ἀπὸ μικροῦ κακοῦ  
 all' ándra khrè dokeîn, peseîn àn kàn  
 but man.M.ACC.SG need.3SG.PRS think.PRS.INF fall.AOR.INF IRR also=IRR  
 apò smikroû kakoû  
 of small.N.GEN.SG ill.GEN.SG  
 'It is necessary for a man to think that he shall fall, even from a slight  
 harm.' (Sophocles, *Ajax* 1078)

- (1067) τάχ' ἂν κᾗμ' ἂν τοιαύτῃ χειρὶ τιμωρεῖν θέλοι  
 tákh' àn kám' àn toiaútēi kheirì timōreîn  
 quickly IRR also=me.ACC IRR such.F.DAT.SG hand.DAT avenge.PRS.INF  
 théloi  
 want.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 'He might perhaps wish to take vengeance on me with such a hand.'  
 (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 139)

## [p400]

- (1068) συθείς τ' ἂν οὐκ ἂν ἀλγύνοις πλέον  
 suthéis t' àn ouk àn algúnois  
 drive.PTCP.AOR.PASS.M.NOM.SG and IRR not IRR pain.2SG.PRS.OPT.ACT  
 pléon  
 more  
 'When you have gone, you will vex me no more.' (Sophocles, *Oedipus  
 Rex* 446)

- (1069) οὐτ' ἂν μετ' ἄλλου δρῶντος ἂν τλαίην ποτέ  
 out' àn met' álloou drôntos àn  
 nor IRR after other.M.GEN.SG do.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG IRR  
 tlaíēn poté  
 endure.1SG.AOR.OPT sometime  
 'Nor could I ever endure it after another's doing so.' (Sophocles, *Oedipus  
 Rex* 602)

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *timōrōunth' hēloi* for *timōreîn théloi*.

2.7 Postpositive particles: *ân* in main clauses

- (1070) ἥδ' ἄν τάδ' οὐχ' ἥκιστ' ἄν Ἰοκάστη λέγοι  
 hêd' ân tád' oukh' hékist' ân Iokástē légoi  
 this.F.NOM.SG IRR this.N.ACC.PL not least IRR Jocasta say.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 'Not least could this Jocasta say these things.' (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 1053)
- (1071) τίς οὖν ἄν ἀξίαν γε σοῦ πεφηνότος μεταβάλοιτ' ἄν ὥδε σιγὰν λόγων  
 tis oûn ân axían ge soû  
 who.M.NOM.SG so IRR worthy.F.ACC.SG even you.GEN  
 pephēnótos metabáloit' ân hôde  
 show.PTCP.PRF.M.NOM.SG exchange.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR thus  
 sigàn lógōn  
 silence.ACC.SG account.GEN.PL  
 'You having appeared, who then would thus change fitting silence for words?' (Sophocles, *Electra* 1260)
- (1072) ποίας ἄν ὑμᾶς πατρίδος (or πόλεος) ἢ γένους ποτὲ τύχοιμ' ἄν εἰπὼν  
 poías ân humâs patrídos/póleos è  
 of.what.sort.F.GEN.SG IRR you.ACC.PL fatherland.GEN/city.GEN.SG or  
 génous potè túkhoim' ân eipōn  
 kind.GEN.SG sometime happen.1SG.AOR.OPT IRR say.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG  
 'Of what country or family might I ever happen to say that you are?'  
 (Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 222)

Example 1072 is what is read by Dindorf (1882: 304) and Heimreich (1884: 18–19) in place of the manuscript's *poías pátras ân humâs è génous poté*, in which the metrical error caused by the placement of *humâs* is remedied less successfully by others.

- (1073) τίς δ' ἄν τοιοῦδ' ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς εὖ πράξειεν ἄν  
 tis d' ân toioûd' hup' andròs eû  
 who.M.NOM.SG then IRR such.M.GEN.SG under man.GEN.SG well  
 práxeien ân  
 do.3SG.AOR.OPT IRR  
 'And who could profit from such a man?' (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 391)
- (1074) ἄρ' ἄν ματαίου τηῖςδ' ἄν ἡδονῆς τύχοις  
 âr' ân mataíou tesd' ân hēdonês  
 then IRR vain.F.GEN.SG this.F.GEN.SG IRR pleasure.GEN.SG

## 2 Translation

túkhois

happen.2SG.AOR.OPT

‘Would you then find this pleasure vain?’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 780)

- (1075) πῶς ἂν τό γ’ ἄκον πράγμ’ ἂν εἰκότως ψέγοις  
 pôs ân tô g’ âkon prâgm’ ân eikôtôs  
 how IRR the.N.ACC.SG even unwilling.N.ACC.SG deed.ACC.SG IRR justly  
 pségois  
 blame.2SG.PRS.OPT.ACT  
 ‘How could you reasonably blame the unwitting deed?’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 976)

- (1076) ἢ τᾶν οὐκ ἂν ἦ  
 ê tân ouk ân ê  
 in.truth and=IRR not IRR be.1SG.IMP  
 ‘In truth I would be no more’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1366)

- (1077) οὐ γάρ ποτ’ ἂν γένοιτ’ ἂν ἀσφαλῆς πόλις  
 ou gár pot’ ân génoit’ ân asphalês  
 not then sometime IRR become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR safe.F.NOM.SG  
 pólis  
 city.NOM.SG  
 ‘For the city would never prove secure’ (Sophocles, *Phaedra* 622.1)

Example 1078 has three *âns*!

- (1078) πῶς ἂν οὐκ ἂν ἐν δίκῃ θάνοιμι ἂν  
 pôs ân ouk ân en díkēi thánoim’ ân  
 how IRR not IRR in judgement.DAT.SG die.1SG.AOR.OPT IRR  
 ‘How in justice could I not die?’ (Sophocles Fragment 673)
- (1079) ὁ ἥλιος ἂν ἀπελαυνόμενος ἐκ μέσου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ... ἦε ἂν τὰ ἄνω τῆς  
 Eûróπηc  
 ho hélios ân apelaunómenos ek  
 the.M.NOM.SG sun.NOM.SG IRR expel.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.SG out  
 méσου τοῦ ouranoû éie ân tà  
 mid.M.GEN.SG the.M.GEN.SG heaven.GEN.SG go.3SG.IMP IRR the.N.ACC.PL  
 ánō tēs Európēs  
 upward the.F.GEN.SG Europe.GEN.SG  
 ‘The sun, when driven from mid-heaven, would pass over the inland

2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

parts of Europe' (Herodotus 2.26.2)

- (1080) διεξιόντα δ' ἄν μιν διὰ πάσης Εὐρώπης ἔλπομαι ποίειν ἄν τὸν Ἴστρον  
 diexiōnta d' án min dià pásēs  
 pass.through.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG then IRR CL through all.GEN.SG  
 Eurōpēs élpomai poíein án τὸν Ístron  
 Europe hope.1SG.PRS.PASS do.PRS.INF IRR the.M.ACC.SG Ister.ACC  
 '... and I believe that passing across all Europe, it would do to the Ister ...'  
 (Herodotus 2.26.2)

- (1081) οὐδ' ἄν αὐτὸν ἔγωγε δοκέω τὸν θεὸν οὕτω ἄν κακῶς βαλεῖν  
 oud' án autòn égōge dokéō τὸν  
 nor IRR same.M.ACC.SG I.NOM.EMPH think.1SG.PRS the.M.ACC.SG  
 theòn hoútō án kakôs baleîn  
 god.ACC.SG so IRR badly throw.AOR.INF  
 'I think that not even the god himself could shoot so true.' (Herodotus 3.35.4)

- (1082) οὐδ' ἄν τούτων ὑπὸ πλήθεος οὐδεὶς ἄν εἴποι πλήθος  
 oud' án toutōn hupò plētheos oudeis án  
 nor IRR this.GEN.PL under quantity.GEN.SG nobody.M.NOM.SG IRR  
 eípoi plēthos  
 say.3SG.AOR.OPT quantity.ACC.SG  
 'And no one could tell the number, with such numbers of them.'  
 (Herodotus 7.187.1)

- (1083) πόλλ' ἄν σὺ λέξας οὐδὲν ἄν πλέον λάβοις  
 póll' án sù léxas oudèn án  
 many.N.ACC.PL IRR you.NOM say.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG nothing.ACC.SG IRR  
 pléon lábois  
 more.N.ACC.SG take.2SG.AOR.OPT  
 'Having said much, you will get nothing more.' (Euripides, *Alcestis* 72)

- (1084) πῶς ἄν ἔρημον τάφον Ἄδμητος κεδνῆς ἄν ἔπραξε γυναικός  
 pôs án érēmon táphon Ádmētos kednēs án  
 how IRR solitary.M.ACC.SG tomb.ACC.SG Admetus.NUM dear.F.GEN.SG IRR  
 épraxe gunaikós  
 do.3SG.AOR woman.GEN.SG  
 'How would Admetus have held the funeral of his good wife without

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *arithmón* for *plēthos*.

## 2 Translation

mourners?’ (Euripides, *Alcestis* 93)

- (1085) οὐκ ἂν ἔν γ’ ἐμοῖς δόμοις βλέπουσ’ ἂν αὐγὰς τᾶμ’ ἐκαρποῦτ’ ἂν λέχη  
 ouk ἂn én g’ emoîs dómois blépous’ ἂn  
 not IRR in even my.M.DAT.PL house.DAT.PL look.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.SG IRR  
 augàs tám’ ekarpoût’ ἂn lékhē  
 daylight.ACC.PL the=my.N.ACC.PL harvest.3SG.IMP.PASS IRR bed.ACC.PL  
 ‘She would never have reaped the fruits of my bed in my house and seen  
 daylight’ (Euripides, *Andromache* 934)

- (1086) ἄλγος ἂν προσθέιμεθ’ ἂν  
 álgos ἂn prostheímeth’ án  
 pain.ACC.SG IRR add.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR  
 ‘... I would add to my anguish’ (Euripides, *Hecuba* 742)

- (1087) τῷδ’ ἂν εὐστόχῳ πτερῷ ἀπόλαυσιν εἰκοῦς ἔθανες ἂν Διὸς κόρη  
 tōid’ ἂn eustókhōi pterōi apólausin  
 this.N.DAT.SG IRR well.aimed.N.DAT.SG feather.DAT.SG reward.ACC.SG  
 eikoûs éthanes ἂn Diòs kórēs  
 likeness.GEN.SG die.2SG.AOR IRR Zeus.GEN girl.GEN.SG  
 ‘You would have died by this well-aimed arrow as a reward for your  
 likeness to the daughter of Zeus.’ (Euripides, *Helen* 76)

- (1088) φθάνοις δ’ ἂν οὐκ ἂν τοῖςδε κόν κρύπτων δέμας  
 phthánois d’ ἂn oúk ἂn toîsde sòn  
 arrive.2SG.PRS.OPT then IRR not IRR this.N.DAT.PL your.N.ACC.SG  
 krúptōn démas  
 hide.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG body.ACC.SG  
 ‘It would not be premature to put it on.’ (Euripides, *Heracleidae* 721; cf.  
 Elmsley (1821: 119))

- (1089) ἄλλος τε πῶς ἂν μὴ διορθεύων λόγους ὀρθῶς δύναιτ’ ἂν δῆμος  
 állos te pōs ἂn mē diorthéúōn  
 otherwise and how IRR not judge.rightly.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 lógous orthōs dúnait’ ἂn dêmos  
 account.ACC.PL straight can.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR people.M.NOM.SG  
 euthúnein pólin  
 direct.PRS.INF city.ACC  
 ‘Besides, how would the people, if it cannot form true judgments, be  
 able rightly to direct the state?’ (Euripides, *Suppliants* 417)



2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

- (1090) τίν' ἄν λόγον, τάλαινα, ἰν' ἄν τῶνδ' αἰτία λάβοιμι  
 tín'                    *án* lógon,                    tálaina,                    tín'  
 what.M.ACC.SG IRR account.ACC.SG wretched.F.NOM.SG what.M.ACC.SG  
*án* tōnd'                    aítia                    láboimi  
 IRR this.N.GEN.PL guilty.F.NOM.SG take.1SG.AOR.OPT.ACT  
 'What, alas! will be said of me, who am the cause of it?' (Euripides, *Suppliants* 606)
- (1091) οὐκ ἄν δυναίμην οὔτ' ἐρωτῆσαι τάδε οὔτ' ἄν πιθέσθαι  
 ouk *án* dunaímēn                    oút' erôtēsai                    tåde                    oút' *án*  
 not IRR 1SG.PRS.OPT.PASS nor ask.AOR.INF this.N.ACC.PL nor IRR  
 pithésthai  
 persuade.AOR.INF.MID  
 'I could neither ask nor believe these things.' (Euripides, *Suppliants* 853)
- (1092) ἢ τᾷρ' ἄν ὄψε γ' ἄνδρες ἐξεύροιεν ἄν  
 ê                    târ'                    *án* ópse g'                    ándres                    exeúroien                    *án*  
 in.truth and=then IRR late even man.NOM.PL discover.3PL.AOR.OPT IRR  
 'And so truly, men would not soon discover ...' (Euripides, *Hippolytus* 480)
- (1093) οὔτ' ἄν ξένοισι τοῖσι κοῖς χρησαίμεθ' ἄν  
 oút' *án* xénoisi                    toîsi                    soîs                    khrēsáimeth'  
 nor IRR stranger.DAT.PL the.M.DAT.PL your.M.DAT.PL use.1PL.AOR.OPT.MID  
*án*  
 IRR  
 'I will accept no help from your friends' (Euripides, *Medea* 616)
- (1094) ἄρ' ἄν τύραννον διολέσαι δυναίμεθ' ἄν  
 âr' *án* túrannon                    diolésai                    dunaímeth'                    *án*  
 then IRR king.ACC.SG destroy.AOR.INF can.1PL.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR  
 'Could we murder the king?' (Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris* 1020)
- (1095) οὐκέτ' ἄν φθάνοις ἄν αὔραν ἱστίοις καρδοκῶν  
 oukét' *án* phthánois                    *án* aúran                    histíois  
 no.more IRR arrive.2SG.PRS.OPT IRR breeze.ACC.SG sheet.DAT.PL  
 karadokôn  
 await.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG  
 'It would no longer be too soon to await a breeze for your sails'

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *tálaina*, *tína lógon* for *tín' án lógon*, *tálaina*.

## 2 Translation

(Euripides, *Trojan Women* 456)

- (1096) ἀφανεῖς ἄν ὄντες οὐκ ἄν ὑμνηθεῖμεν ἄν  
 aphaneîs            ân óntes                            ouk ân humnêtheîmen  
 unseen.F.NOM.PL IRR be.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.PL not IRR hymn.1PL.AOR.PASS  
 ân  
 IRR  
 ‘Being unknown, we should have been unsung.’ (Euripides, *Trojan Women* 1240)

- (1097) μόνον δ’ ἄν ἀντὶ χρημάτων οὐκ ἄν λάβοις  
 mónon d’ ân anti khrēmátōn ouk ân lábois  
 alone then IRR against property.GEN.PL not IRR take.2SG.AOR.OPT  
 ‘But you alone would not take for money ...’ (Euripides, *Meleagros* Fragment 527; Nauck (1889: 528–529) would prefer *én* for the first *án*)

- (1098) λέγω ... καὶ καθ’ ἕκαστον, δοκεῖν ἄν μοι τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα παρ’ ἡμῶν  
 ἐπὶ πλεῖστ’ ἄν εἶδῃ καὶ μετὰ χαρίτων μάλιστα εὐτραπέλως τὸ σῶμα  
 αὐταρκεῖς παρέχεσθαι  
 légō            kai kath’ hékaston,            dokein            ân moi  
 say.1SG.PRS and down each.M.ACC.SG seem.PRS.INF IRR me.DAT  
 tòn            autòn            ándra            par’ hēmōn epì  
 the.M.ACC.SG same.M.ACC.SG man.ACC.SG from us.GEN upon  
 pleîst’            ân eîdē            kai metà kharitōn            málist’  
 most.N.ACC.PL IRR form.ACC.PL and with grace.GEN.PL most  
 eutrapélōs            tò            sōma            aútarkes  
 resourcefully the.N.ACC.SG body.ACC.SG independent.N.ACC.SG  
 parékhesthai  
 supply.PRS.INF.PASS  
 ‘I say ... and it seems to me that individually, the very man coming from us would display the most personal self-sufficiency in the most circumstances and with the greatest grace and resourcefulness.’  
 (Thucydides 2.41.1; cf. Poppo & Stahl (1889: 87) [p401] on this example)

- (1099) οὐδ’ ἄν σφῶν πειρασομένους ... αὐτοὺς δακεῖν ἥσσον, ἀλλὰ πολλῶ  
 μᾶλλον ... εὖνους ἄν σφίσι γενέσθαι  
 oud’ ân sphōn            peirasoménous            autoùs            dakeîn  
 nor IRR them.GEN try.PTCP.AOR.MID.M.ACC.PL them.ACC bite.AOR.INF  
 hêsson, allà pollōi            mállon eúnous            ân sphísi  
 less            but much.N.DAT.SG more            right-minded.M.ACC.PL IRR them.DAT

## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

genésthai

become.AOR.INF.MID

‘... that by giving them a trial they would annoy them less, and yet become much better-disposed toward them’ (Thucydides 4.114.4)

- (1100) τάχ’ ἂν δ’ ἴσως, εἰ ... λάβοιεν ... , καὶ πάνυ ἂν ξυνεπίθoinτο  
 tákh’ àn d’ ísōs, ei láboien kai pánu àn  
 quickly IRR than perhaps if take.3PL.AOR.OPT also quite IRR  
 xunepíthoin to  
 join.in.3PL.AOR.OPT.MID  
 ‘And it is only too probable that if they found ... they would attack us vigorously’ (Thucydides 6.10.4)

- (1101) Σικελιῶται δ’ ἂν μοι δοκοῦσιν, ὥς γε νῦν ἔχουσιν, καὶ ἔτι ἂν ἥccov  
 δεινοὶ ἡμῖν γενέσθαι  
 Sikeliôtai d’ án moi dokoûsin, hós ge nûn  
 Siceliot.NOM.PL then IRR me.DAT seem.3PL.PRS as even now  
 ékhousin, kai éti àn hêsson deinoi hēmîn  
 have.3PL.PRS also still IRR less terrible.M.NOM.PL us.DAT  
 genésthai  
 become.AOR.INF.MID  
 ‘And the Siceliot seem to me, even as they are now, to have become even less dangerous still to us.’ (Thucydides 6.11.2)

- (1102) βραχὺ ἂν τι προκτώμενοι αὐτῇ περὶ αὐτῆς ἂν ταύτης μᾶλλον  
 κινδυνεύοιμεν  
 brakhû án ti prosktômenoi  
 short.N.ACC.SG IRR something.ACC.SG gain.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.PL  
 autêi perî autês àn taútês mâllon  
 same.F.DAT.SG about same.F.GEN.SG IRR this.F.GEN.SG more  
 kinduneúoimen  
 endanger.1PL.PRS.OPT  
 ‘We should make but few new conquests, and should imperil those we have already won.’ (Thucydides 6.18.2)

- (1103) γενομένης δ’ ἂν ... ἀρχῆς ἀπορεῖν ἂν αὐτόν

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *dokein* for *dakein*.

\* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition starts with *tákha d’ àn ísōs*, which Wackernagel cites above as a variant.

## 2 Translation

genoménēs d' àn arkhēs aporeîn  
 become.PTCP.AOR.MID.F.GEN.SG and IRR beginning.GEN.SG puzzle.PRS.INF  
 àn autón  
 IRR him.ACC  
 ‘... and, the command having become ... he would be at a loss’  
 (Thucydides 8.46.2)

- (1104) οὔτε ἂν αὐτῷ τῷ λέγοντι οὔτε τοῖς ἀκούουσι δῆλα ἂν εἶη  
 ούτε àn autôi tôi légonti oude  
 nor IRR same.M.DAT.SG the.M.DAT.SG say.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG nor  
 toîs akóousi dêla àn eîē  
 the.M.DAT.PL hear.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.PL clear.N.NOM.PL IRR be.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ‘Neither to the speaker nor to the hearers would it be clear ...’  
 (Hippocrates, *On Ancient Medicine* 1; Littré (1839: 572))

- (1105) οὐδ' ἂν ἐλαφρῶς ἂν ἀπεπλίστατο  
 oud' àn elaphrôs àn apeplíxato  
 nor IRR lightly IRR trot.off.3SG.AOR.MID  
 ‘... nor would he have trotted off lightly’ (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 218)

- (1106) πῶς δέ γ' ἂν καλῶς λέγοις ἂν  
 pōs dé g' àn kalōs légois àn  
 how then even IRR beautifully say.2SG.PRS.OPT IRR  
 ‘But how can you say “well” ... ?’ (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 308)

- (1107) μᾶμᾰν δ' ἂν αἰτήσαντο ἥκόν σοι φέρων ἂν ἄρτον  
 mammân d' àn aitēsantos hékón soi  
 mother.ACC.SG then IRR ask.PTCP.AOR.M.GEN.SG arrive.1SG.IMP you.DAT  
 phérōn àn árton  
 bear.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG IRR loaf.ACC.SG  
 ‘When you cried for food I would come to you bringing bread.’  
 (Aristophanes, *Clouds* 1383)

- (1108) πῶς ἂν ποτ' ἀφικοίμην ἂν εὐθὺ τοῦ Διός  
 pōs àn pot' aphikoímēn àn euthù toũ Diós  
 how IRR sometime arrive.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR straight the.M.GEN.SG  
 Diós  
 Zeus.GEN  
 ‘However could I go straight to Zeus?’ (Aristophanes, *Peace* 68)

2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

- (1109) ἡ δ' Ἑλλάς ἄν ἐξερημωθείς ἄν ὑμᾶς ἔλαθε  
 hē d' Hellàs án éxerēmōtheís' án  
 the.F.NOM.SG then Greece.NOM IRR desolate.PTCP.AOR.PASS.F.NOM.SG IRR  
 humâs élathe  
 you.ACC.PL hide.3SG.AOR  
 'And Greece, having been left destitute, escaped your notice.'  
 (Aristophanes, *Peace* 646)
- (1110) οὐκ ἄν πριαίμην οὐδ' ἄν ἰσχάδος μιᾶς  
 ouk án priaímēn oud' án iskhádos miâs  
 not IRR buy.1SG.PRS.OPT.PASS nor IRR fig.GEN.SG one.F.GEN.SG  
 'I would not buy, not even for one fig.' (Aristophanes, *Peace* 1223)
- (1111) καὶ πῶς ἄν ἔτι γένοιτ' ἄν εὐτακτος πόλις  
 kai pôs án éti génoit' án eútaktos  
 and how IRR still become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR well-ordered.F.NOM.SG  
 pólis  
 city.NOM.SG  
 'And how could a city become so well-ordered ... ?' (Aristophanes, *Birds* 829)
- (1112) ἐγὼ δέ τ' ἄν κ' ἄν, εἴ με χρεῖη ... ἐκπιεῖν  
 egō dé t' án k' án, eí me khreíē  
 I.NOM then and=IRR and=IRR if me.ACC need.3SG.PRS.OPT  
 ekpieîn  
 drink.up.AOR.INF  
 'And so would I, even if I had to drink up ...' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 113)
- (1113) ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἄν κ' ἄν ὥσπερ εἰ ψῆτταν δοκῶ δοῦναι ἄν ἑμαυτῆς  
 egō dé g' án k' án hósper ei psêttan dokô  
 I.NOM then even IRR and=IRR like if turbot.ACC.SG think.1SG.PRS  
 doûnai án emautês partamoûsa  
 give.AOR.INF IRR myself.F.GEN.SG cut.off.PTCP.FUT.F.NOM.SG  
 thémisu  
 the=half.ACC.SG  
 'And I would too, even if I expected to cut off half of myself and give it  
 like a turbot.' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 115)

---

\* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *paratemoûsa* for *partamoûsa*.

## 2 Translation

- (1114) μάλλον ἂν διὰ τουτογὶ γένοιτ' ἂν εἰρήνη  
 mállon àn dià toutogì génoit' àn  
 more IRR through this.N.ACC.SG.EMPH become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR  
 eirénē  
 peace.NOM.SG  
 'Would peace come to pass rather through this?' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 147)
- (1115) φωνὴν ἂν οὐκ ἂν εἶχον  
 phōnēn àn ouk àn eîkhon  
 sound.ACC.SG IRR not IRR have.3PL.IMP  
 '... they would not make a sound' (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 361)
- (1116) ἧ τᾶν σε κωκύειν ἂν ἐκέλευον μακρά  
 ê tán se kōkúein àn ekéleuon makrá  
 in.truth and=IRR you.ACC wail.PRS.INF IRR order.1SG.IMP large.N.ACC.PL  
 'Truly I would make you wail more.' (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 34)
- (1117) οὐκ ἂν γενοίμην Ἡρακλῆς ἂν  
 ouk àn genoímēn Hēraklēs àn  
 not IRR become.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID Hercules.NOM IRR  
 'I won't be Hercules' (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 581)
- (1118) οὐκ ἂν φθάνοις τὸ γένειον ἂν περιδουμένη  
 ouk àn phthánois tò géneion àn  
 not IRR arrive.2SG.PRS.OPT the.N.ACC.SG beard.ACC.SG IRR  
 peridouménē  
 bind.up.PTCP.PRS.PASS.F.NOM.SG  
 'It wouldn't be too soon to tie on your beard.' (Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 118)
- (1119) ἴσως ἂν ἐγὼ περὶ τοῦ μεθύσκεσθαι ... τάληθ' ἴγνων ἂν εἶην ἀηδής  
 ísōs àn egō perì toû methúskesthai  
 perhaps IRR I.NOM about the.N.GEN.SG intoxicate.PRS.INF.PASS  
 talēthē légōn hêtton àn eíēn  
 the=true.N.ACC.PL say.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG less IRR be.1SG.PRS.OPT  
 aēdēs  
 distasteful.M.NOM.SG  
 'Perhaps I would be less disagreeable speaking the truth about intoxication.' (Plato, *Symposium* (*Apology* 41a) 176c)

## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *án* in main clauses

- (1120) εἰκότως ἂν τοὺς ἐρῶντας μᾶλλον ἂν φοβοῖο  
 eikótōs **àn** tous erôntas mállon **àn**  
 justly IRR the.M.ACC.PL love.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.PL more IRR  
 phoboío  
 frighten.2SG.PRS.OPT.PASS  
 ‘You would reasonably be more frightened for the lovers’ (Plato,  
*Phaedrus* 232c; Schanz (1882: 7) has *dé* for the first *àn*)
- (1121) τάχ’ οὖν ἂν ὑπὸ φιλοτιμίας ἐπίσχοι ἡμῖν ἂν τοῦ γράφειν  
 tákh’ oûn **àn** hypò philotimías epískhoi hēmîn  
 quickly so IRR under ambition.GEN.SG hold.back.3SG.AOR.OPT US.DAT  
**àn** toû gráphein  
 IRR the.N.GEN.SG write.PRS.INF  
 ‘So perhaps out of pride he may refrain from writing to us.’ (Plato,  
*Phaedrus* 257c)
- (1122) οὐκ ἂν ῥαδίως οὐδὲ πολλὰ ἂν εὔροις ὥς τοῦτο  
 ouk **àn** rhaidíōs oudè pollà **àn** heúrois hōs  
 not IRR easily nor many.N.ACC.PL IRR find.2SG.AOR.OPT as  
 toûto  
 this.N.ACC.SG  
 ‘You would not find many like this, nor easily.’ (Plato, *Republic* 7.526c)
- (1123) κἂν ὀλίγου, εἴ με κελεύοις ἀποδύντα ὀρχήσασθαι, χαρισαίμην ἂν  
 kàn olígu, eí me keleúois  
 and=IRR little.N.GEN.SG if me.ACC order.2SG.PRS.OPT  
 apodúnta orkhésasthai, kharisaímēn  
 undress.PTCP.AOR.M.ACC.SG dance.AOR.INF.MID gratify.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID  
**án**  
 IRR  
 ‘And I would almost gratify you if you were to bid me strip and dance’  
 (Plato, *Menexenus* 236d)
- (1124) πῶς οὖν ἂν ποτέ τις ... δύναιτ’ ἂν ὑγιέει τι λέγων ἀντειπεῖν  
 pôs oûn **án** poté tis dúnaít’ **àn**  
 how so IRR sometime someone.M.NOM.SG can.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR  
 hugiéis ti légōn  
 healthy.N.ACC.SG something.ACC.SG say.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG

## 2 Translation

anteipeîn

argue.AOR.INF

‘Then how could one ever argue ... saying anything sound?’ (Plato, *Sophist* 233a)

- (1125) *σκολῇ ποτ' ἂν αὐτοῖς τις χρήματα διδοὺς ἦθελεν ἂν ... μαθητῆς γίγνεσθαι*  
 skholēi pot'      ἂν autoîs      tis      khrémata  
 scarcely sometime IRR them.DAT someone.M.NOM.SG property.ACC.PL  
*διδούς*      éthelen      ἂν mathētēs  
 give.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG want.3SG.IMP IRR pupil.NOM.SG  
*γίγνεσθαι*  
 become.PRS.INF.PASS  
 'Scarcely anyone would ever want to become (their) pupil, giving them money.' (Plato, *Sophist* 233b; cf. also *Laws* 5.742c)
- (1126) *στὰς ἂν ὥσπερ οὗτος ἐπὶ τῇ εἰσόδῳ ... λέγοιμ' ἂν*  
 stàs      ἂν hósper hoútos      epì      têi  
 stand.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG IRR like      this.M.NOM.SG upon the.F.DAT.SG  
*εἰσόδῳ*      légoim'      ἂν  
 entrance.DAT.SG say.1SG.PRS.OPT IRR  
 'Standing at the door just like him, I would say ...' (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 1.3.11)
- (1127) *ὅμων δ' ἔρημος ὢν, οὐκ ἂν ἱκανὸς οἶμαι εἶναι οὔτ' ἂν φίλον ὠφελῆσαι οὔτ' ἂν ἐχθρὸν ἀλέξασθαι*  
 humôn      d'      érēmos      ὄν,      ouk ἂν  
 you.GEN.PL then solitary.M.NOM.SG be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG not IRR  
*hikanòs*      oîmai      eînai      oút' ἂn phílon  
 sufficient.M.NOM.SG think.1SG.PRS.PASS be.PRS.INF nor IRR friend.ACC  
*ōphelēsai*      oút' ἂn ekhthròn      aléxasthai  
 help.AOR.INF nor IRR enemy.ACC.SG ward.off.AOR.INF.MID  
 'But bereft of you I do not think I shall be able either to aid a friend or to ward off a foe.' (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 1.3.6)
- (1128) *δοκοῦμεν δ' ἂν μοι ταύτῃ προσποιούμενοι προσβαλεῖν ἐρημωτέρῳ ἂν τῷ ὄρει χρῆσθαι*  
 dokoûmen      d'      ἂn moi      taútēi prospoiouómenoi  
 seem.1PL.PRS then IRR me.DAT here      pretend.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.PL



## 2.7 Postpositive particles: *àn* in main clauses

prosbaleîn erēmōtērōi àn tōi órei  
 attack.AOR.INF solitary.COMP.N.DAT.SG IRR the.N.DAT.SG mountain.DAT.SG  
 khrêsthai  
 use.PRS.INF.PASS

‘I do think, however, that if we should make a feint of attacking here, we should find the rest of the mountain all the more deserted’ (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 4.6.13)

- (1129) διασπασθέντες δ’ ἂν καὶ κατὰ μικρὰ γενομένης τῆς δυνάμεως οὔτ’ ἂν τροφήν δύνασθε λαμβάνειν οὔτε χαίροντες ἂν ἀπαλλάξαίτε  
 diaspasthéntes d’ àn kai katà mikrà  
 separate.PTCP.AOR.PASS.M.NOM.PL then IRR and down small.N.ACC.PL  
 genoménēs tēs dunámeōs oút’ àn  
 become.PTCP.AOR.MID.F.GEN.SG the.F.GEN.SG power.GEN.SG nor IRR  
 trophēn dúnaisthe lambánein oúte  
 food.ACC can.2PL.PRS.OPT.PASS take.PRS.INF nor  
 kháirontes àn apalláxaite  
 rejoice.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL IRR deliver.2PL.AOR.OPT  
 ‘But separated and with your force in small parts, you could neither get food nor emerge safe.’ (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 5.6.32)

- (1130) ὧδ’ ἂν ... ἐπισκοποῦντες ... ἵσως ἂν καταμάθοιμεν  
 ôd’ àn episkopoûntes ísōs àn katamáthoimen  
 thus IRR oversee.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL perhaps IRR perceive.1PL.AOR.OPT  
 ‘Perhaps by considering ... we can thus discover ...’ (Xenophon, *The Economist* 4.5)

[p402]

- (1131) εἶδε δ’ ἂν αὐτῆς Φαρνάβαζον θάττον ἂν  
 eídes d’ àn autēs Pharnábazon thâtton àn  
 see.2SG.AOR then IRR her.GEN Pharnabazus.ACC faster IRR  
 ‘And you could see Pharnabazus more quickly than her.’ (Epicrates fragment 2/3, line 17; Kock (1884: 283))

- (1132) οὐκ ἂν ἡγεῖσθ’ αὐτὸν κἄν ἐπιδραμεῖν  
 ouk àn hēgeísth’ autòn kàn epidrameîn  
 not IRR lead.2PL.PRS.PASS him.ACC also=IRR rush.AOR.INF  
 ‘Don’t you believe he would even have rushed ...’ (Demosthenes 27.56)

## 2 Translation

- (1133) ὥδ' ἄν θεωροῦσιν γένοιτ' ἄν φανερόν  
 hôd' àn theōrou̓sin génoit' àn  
 thus IRR behold.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR  
 phanerón  
 visible.N.NOM.SG  
 'It might become clear by considering thus ...' (Aristotle, *Poetics* 1460b,  
 among many others; cf. Vahlen (1865: 408, 438) on this example)

(Example 1134 does not belong here, since the repetition of *án* is caused by the resumption of interrogative *tí*.)

- (1134) τί ἄν οἶεθ' εἰ ... ἀπῆλθον ... , τί ποιεῖν ἄν ἢ τί λέγειν τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς  
 ànthrōpous toutousí  
 tí àn oíesth' ei apêlthon tí  
 what.N.ACC.SG IRR think.2PL.PRS.PASS if leave.3PL.AOR what.N.ACC.SG  
 poieîn àn è tí légein toùs asebeís  
 do.PRS.INF IRR OR what.N.ACC.SG say.PRS.INF the.M.ACC.PL impious.ACC.PL  
 anthrōpous toutousí  
 person.ACC.PL this.M.ACC.PL.EMPH  
 'What do you think, if they had gone off ... what (do you think) these  
 ungodly persons would have done or said?' (Demosthenes 18.240)

Assuming my incomplete collection of examples is not too unrepresentative, there is a large decrease in this type of *án*-doubling in the fourth century. In particular, oratorical prose contains only few examples; as is well known, Lysias never doubled *án*. I do not doubt that this decrease is due to the gradual extinguishing of the tradition which demanded *án* in second position of the clause.

We also find instances of *án*-doubling in which *án* does not take clausal second position but rather a later position. This is quite natural, as various elements are known to be happily followed by *án*, and therefore, as soon as a clause became more extensive, various mutually conflicting demands had to take effect on the particle. It is beyond the scope of this research to consider the combinations this gives rise to and to adduce examples for each of them, since our task is only to investigate the remains of the old positional law – however interesting and important it would be for our appreciation of the younger language to illustrate in detail the tendencies that have become dominant there.

## 2.8 Indo-Iranian and Germanic

The positional law whose validity for Greek has been discussed over the preceding pages has long been recognized for certain of the Asian sister languages.

For Sanskrit prose, Delbrück (1878: 47) informs us: “Enclitic words move as close as possible to the beginning of the clause.” In essence, Bartholomae’s (1886: 3) comments on the *Ṛgveda* agree with this: “Even on a superficial assessment it becomes [p403] clear that in the *Ṛgveda* the enclitic forms of the personal pronouns, as well as certain particles, in most cases take the second position within the verse or the verse section.” See the same author (1887: 30) on *sīm* and *smā* as well as the hard tmesis in *Ṛgveda* 5.2.7 *śunaś cic chēpam nidiṭam sahasrad yūpād amuñcaḥ*.

The same scholar (1886: 3–31) has made corresponding observations on the Gathas of the Avesta. He proposes the following rule (1886: 11ff.): “Enclitic pronouns and particles attach to the first high tone in the verse”, and recognizes exceptions only in the case of *cīṭ*, which often needs to emphasize particular parts of the clause and is then attached to the relevant part. It is easy to see how this observation also relates to Delbrück’s rule.

However, this rule is apparently retained to the letter in Middle Indic prose (cf. e.g. Jacobi (1886: 8) line 18 *jena se parikkhemi balavisesaṃ*, in which *se* syntactically belongs to *balavisesaṃ*), and certainly in Old Persian, whose cuneiform inscriptions are particularly suitable for such observations due to their solemnly correct style and the precise differentiation of clitics in their script. I present the material in its entirety following Spiegel (1881), with the exception of the cases in which the enclitic is inserted editorially. The following are found exclusively in second position:

*mai* (1SG.GEN): following the gendered nominatives *Auramazdā* ‘Ahura Mazda’ in the Behistun inscription 1.25, 1.55, 1.87, 1.94, 2.24, 2.40, 2.60, 2.68, 3.6, 3.17, 3.37, 3.44, 3.60, 3.65, 3.86, 4.60, and Persepolis NR<sup>a</sup> 50, *dahyāuš* ‘country’ in Behistun 4.79, and *hauv* ‘he’ in Behistun 2.79 and 3.11; also following the neuter *tya* (REL) (excluding Behistun 4.65, on which nothing can be said with certainty because of the lacuna) in Xerxes A 24, A 30, Ca 13 (twice), Cb 22 (twice), D 19, and Ea 19; finally after *utā* ‘and’ in Behistun 4.74, 4.78, and Xerxes D 15 (and also NR<sup>a</sup> 52 and Xerxes D 18, E 18, and A 29, although in these cases *utā* links only constituents rather than clauses).

*tai* (2SG.GEN): following the gendered nominatives *Auramazdā* ‘Ahura Mazda’

---

\* *Translator’s note:* Genitive and dative are collapsed together in Old Persian. We gloss them as genitive in the following.

## 2 Translation

in Behistun 4.58, and 4.78, *hauv* ‘he’ in NR<sup>a</sup> 57 (where, however, according to Thumb’s analysis *taiy* should be in fifth position!), [p404] following the neuter *ava* ‘that’ in Behistun 4.76 and 4.79, following *ada* ‘then’ in NR<sup>a</sup> 43 and 45, and following *utā* (CONJ) in Behistun 4.58, 4.75, and 4.79.

*šai* (3SG.GEN): following *hauv* ‘he’ in Darius H 3, following *tayaḷ* (REL.NOM.PL) in Behistun 1.57, 2.77, 3.48, 3.51, and 3.73, following *avaθā* ‘then’ in 3.14, following *utā* (CONJ) in 2.74, 2.89, and 5.11, and following *pasāva* ‘afterward’ in 2.88.

*maj*, *taj* and *šai* thus follow the rule in all 56 instances, attaching to a wide variety of words, without a single counterexample. Particularly noteworthy is Behistun 1.57 (1135), as opposed to the *utā martiyā tayaḷšai fratamā* etc. of the other examples with *tayaḷšai*, and also Behistun 4.74 = 4.78 (1136), in which *maj* precedes the intervening clause while the verb comes after it; but especially Xerxes D 15 (1137) = *kaī moi ātta ho patēr epoiēsen* ‘and me.DAT that.N.ACC.PL the.M.NOM.SG father.NOM.SG make.3SG.AOR’, where the *maj* that belongs to the relative clause is placed before the relative pronoun in order to attach to *utā*.

- (1135) *avaθā adam hadā kamnaḷbiš martiyaḷbiš avam*  
 then 1.NOM.SG with few.INS.PL.M man.INS.PL.M DEM.ACC.SG.M  
*Gaumātam tayam magum avājanam utā*  
 G.ACC.SG.M REL.ACC.SG.M magus.ACC.SG.M slay.1.SG.PST CONJ  
*tayaḷ=šai fratamā martiyā*  
 REL.NOM.PL.M=3.GEN.SG foremost.NOM.PL.M man.NOM.PL.M  
*anušiyā āhantā*  
 follower.NOM.PL.M be.3.PL.PST  
 ‘then I with a few men slew that Gaumāta the magus and the men who  
 were his foremost followers’ (Behistun 1.57)

- (1136) *yadi imām dipim vaḷnāhi*  
 CONJ DEM.ACC.SG.F inscription.ACC.SG.F see.2.SG.SBJV  
*imai=vā patikarā, nai=diš vikanāhi*  
 DEM.ACC.PL.M=CONJ sculpture.ACC.PL.M NEG=3.ACC.PL destroy.2.SG.SBJV  
*utā=taj yāvā taumā ahati*  
 CONJ=2.SG.GEN CONJ strength.NOM.SG.N be.3.SG.SBJV  
*paribarāhi=diš*  
 protect.2.SG.IMP=3.ACC.PL  
 ‘If you shall look at this inscription or these sculptures, (and) shall not

\* *Translator’s note:* More recent editions (e.g. Kent (1953); Schmitt (1991)) read this enclitic as *taj* (2SG.GEN) rather than *maj* (1SG.GEN), but this does not alter Wackernagel’s general point.

## 2.8 Indo-Iranian and Germanic

destroy them and, as long as there is strength to you, shall care for them,  
...’ (Behistun 4.74 = 4.78)

- (1137) taya                      adam      akunavam      uta=maǐ  
REL.NOM/ACC.PL.N 1.NOM.SG make.1.SG.PST CONJ=1.SG.GEN  
taya                      pitā                      akunauš  
REL.NOM/ACC.PL.N father.NOM.SG.M make.3.SG.PST  
‘... which I built and which my father built.’ (Xerxes D 15)

The other pronominal enclitics yield very similar results. Enclitic *mām* (1SG.ACC), the only instance of which (Behistun 1.52) follows clause-initial *mātya* ‘lest, that not’; *šim* (3SG.ACC) following the nominatives *āpi* ‘water’ in Behistun 1.95, *kāra* ‘people’ in 1.50, *adam* (1SG.NOM) in 1.52, and *haruva* ‘whole’ in 2.75 and 2.90; following the accusative *šatram* ‘command, empire’ in 1.59; following the particles *avadā* ‘there, then’ in 1.59, 3.79, and 5.14, *nai* (NEG) in 4.49, and *pasāva* ‘afterwards’ in 2.90; *šiš* (3PL.ACC) following *avadā* ‘there, then’ in 3.52; *šām* (3SG.GEN) following the nominatives *adam* (1SG.NOM) in NR<sup>a</sup> 18 and *hya* (REL.M) in Behistun 2.13; following the accusative *avam* (3SG.M.ACC) in Behistun 2.20 and 2.83; following the neuter *tya* (REL) in Behistun 1.19 and NR<sup>a</sup> 20 and 36; following the particles *avaθā* ‘then’ in 2.27, 2.37, 2.42, 2.62, 2.83, 2.98, 3.8, 3.19, 3.40, 3.47, 3.56, 3.63, 3.68, and 3.84, and *utā* (CONJ) in 3.56.

These 35 instances can be added to the previous 56, but there are also three counterexamples, 1138–1140.

- (1138) vašnā                      Auramazdāha adam=šām                      xšāyaθiya  
will.INS.SG.M A.GEN.SG.M 1.NOM.SG=3.GEN.PL king.NOM.SG.M  
āham  
be.1.SG.PST  
‘By the favour of Auramazdā I was their king’ (Behistun I.14)
- (1139) vašna                      Auramazdāha adam=šiš                      ajanam                      utā  
will.INS.SG.M A.GEN.SG.M 1.NOM.SG=3.ACC.PL defeat.1.SG.PST CONJ  
navā                      xšāyaθiyā                      agrbāyam  
nine.ACC.PL.M king.ACC.PL.M capture.1.SG.PST  
‘By the favour of Auramazdā I defeated them and captured nine kings’  
(Behistun IV.6)

\* Translator’s note: The standard reference is XPa 15.

## 2 Translation

- (1140) vašna Auramazdāhā adam=**šim** gāθavā  
 will.INS.SG.M A.GEN.SG.M 1.NOM.SG=3.ACC.SG place.LOC.SG.M  
 niyašādayam  
 set-down.1.SG.PST  
 ‘By the favour of Auramazdā I put it in its proper place.’ (NR<sup>a</sup> 35)

In each of these cases the enclitic is attached to the subject *adam* ‘I’. And these examples are more than compensated for by such instances as 1141, in which the pronoun intervenes between adjective and noun, or 1142, in which *šām* (3PL.GEN) belongs [p405] syntactically to *maθištām* ‘greatest’.

- (1141) haruva=**šim** kāra avaina  
 whole.NOM=3.ACC.SG people.NOM see.3.SG.PST  
 ‘All the people saw him’ (Behistun II.75 = II.90)
- (1142) Vivāna nāma Pārsa, manā bandaka,  
 V.NOM.SG.M name.LOC.SG.N Persian.NOM.SG.M 1.GEN.SG vassal.NOM.SG.M  
 Harauvatiyā xšaçaṇpāvā, abi avam,  
 Arachosia.LOC.SG.F satrap.NOM.SG.M against DEM.ACC.SG.M  
 utā=**šām** aīvam martiyam maθištām  
 CONJ=3.GEN.PL one.ACC.SG.M man.ACC.SG.M greatest.ACC.SG.M  
 akunaṇṣ  
 make.3.SG.PST  
 ‘(there was) a Persian, Vivana by name, my vassal, satrap in Arachosia,  
 against him [he sent an army], and he made one single man their chief’  
 (Behistun III.56)

Setting aside *hacāma* ‘from me’ and *haca avadaša* ‘from there’, we are left with *-cī* (= Sanskrit *cit*, INDF/Q) and *dim*, *diš* (3SG.ACC, 3PL.ACC). The latter two follow the rule after the nominative *drauga* ‘lie’ in Behistun 4.34, the neuter *tya* (REL) in Behistun 1.65, the particles *nai* (NEG) in 4.73, 4.78 and *pasāva* ‘afterwards’ in Behistun 4.35 and NR<sup>a</sup> 33, and the verbal form *visanāha* ‘destroy’ in Behistun 4.77. Behistun 4.74 (=1136 above) hardly counts as a counterexample: (Spiegel (1881): “but you, as long as your family lasts, you maintain me”), because although *diš* (3PL.ACC) is not attached to the first word in the clause, it is attached to the first word following the intervening clause. Then the only counterexample is NR<sup>a</sup> 42 [*yath*]ā xšnās[*āhadiš*] “so that you know them”, and there it is tempting to ask

\* Translator’s note: The standard reference is DN<sup>a</sup> 35.

## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

whether the editorial additions might not be wrong.

*cī* (INDF/Q), on the other hand, has freed itself from the rule. Although it occurs in Behistun 1.53 following *kaš* ‘who’, in I 23 following *hauv* ‘he’, and in Xerxes D 20, Ca 14 and Cb 24 in second position, it occurs in third position or later in Behistun 1.46 following *kaš* ‘who’, 1.53 following *cis* ‘what’, 1.63, 1.67, and 1.69 following *paruvam* ‘before’, and 4.46 and Xerxes D 13 following *aniyaš* ‘other’. In these cases it follows the word that is to be emphasized; cf. the position of *cīt* in the Avesta (above p261).

This is the situation in the Indo-Iranian languages. But instructive parallels can also be found outside these languages. First, the treatment of weakly stressed personal pronouns in modern German shows that our positional rule is not alien to the Germanic languages. Above all, when *sich* (3.REFL) occurs in a subordinate clause and far removed from the verb, the rule makes itself known like an uncomfortable set of shackles, which we happily shed in written composition by placing the pronoun next to the verb. We believe that this creates greater clarity, but we nevertheless view this placement as unattractive. And often in oral conversation we produce a double *sich*: one in its traditional position at the start, and another next to the verb, just like the double *án* in Greek. Such a tendency can also be observed with the other personal pronouns.

However, I will not venture a more detailed commentary here, instead merely pointing to the cases of tmesis in Gothic that Kluge (1883: 80) [p406] has drawn attention to: *ga-u-laubeis* (PFV-Q-believe-2SG), *ga-u-ha-sēhi* (PFV-Q-what-see-SBJV.3SG), *us-nu-gibiþ* (out-now-give-IMP.2PL), as well as the examples in which *u(h)* (Q/CONJ) and similar Gothic particles separate a preposition from its case. Kluge correctly identifies a remnant of the language’s prehistory in this pressure to attach clitics immediately following the first word. The most informative example is undoubtedly *ga-u-ha-sēhi*, with its insertion of the indefinite *ha* ‘what/something’ = Greek *tī*.

## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

Leaving aside the question of whether this could also shed some light on the Celtic pronomen infixum (Zeuss 1871: 327ff), I turn now to Latin, and start by observing that old school Latinists have long taught that, at least in classical prose, the position after the first word of the clause is connected with tonal weakness,

\* *Translator’s note*: Modern editions of this text such as that in Kent (1953: 137) do not assume a pronominal clitic here.

\* *Translator’s note*: Wackernagel has S instead of I.

## 2 Translation

and that the words which occupy this position are either inherently enclitic or become enclitic through being placed there (Reisig & Haase (1839: 818); Madvig (1839: 43); Seyffert & Müller (1876: 49, 64); Stolz & Schmalz (1890: 557); etc.). For a detailed investigation, however, it is unfortunate that, unlike in Greek, the manuscripts do not provide us with any external indication of the difference between orthotonic and enclitic forms. Nevertheless, we can proceed quite confidently. Because assuming we find, for example, an oblique case form of the personal pronoun which, according to the evidence of the context, bore no emphasis, and which shows exactly the same positional properties that we found for *moi* and its friends, in my view this proves both the enclitic stress of the pronoun in question and the validity in Latin of the rule that we have demonstrated for Greek. And there are plenty of such cases.

First, instances of tmesis between preposition and verb (cf. p102 above for Greek), as in 1143.

- (1143) sub vos placo, ob vos sacro  
under you.ACC plead.PRES.1SG because-of you.ACC consecrate.PRES.1SG  
'I entreat you, I beseech you' (Festus, 190b.2, 309a.30)

Secondly, separation of other collocations that otherwise form a fixed unit by a weakly stressed pronoun seeking second position:

a) adjectives with *per* 'very': 1144–1149. [p407]

- (1144) in quo per mihi mirum visum  
in which.ABL.SG very I.DAT.SG strange.NOM.SG.N seem.PRF.3SG.PASS  
est  
is.PRES.3SG  
'wherein it seemed very strange to me' (Cicero, *de Oratore* 1.214)

- (1145) nam sicut, quod apud Catonem est ..., per mihi  
for just.as what in Cato.ACC.SG is.PRES.3SG very I.DAT.SG  
scitum videtur ...: sic profecto se  
sensible.NOM.SG.N seem.PRES.3SG.PASS so really itself  
res habet  
matter.NOM.SG.F has.PRES.3SG  
'for just as what Cato says ..., to me seems very sensible ...: so it really is'  
(Cicero, *de Oratore* 2.271)

- (1146) per mihi benigne respondit  
very I.DAT.SG kindly answer.IMPRES.3SG  
'he answered me very kindly' (Cicero, *ad Quintum Fratrem* 1.7(9).2)



## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

- (1147) quod ad me de Hermathena scribis, per  
 what.ACC.SG at I.ACC.SG. about Hermathena.ABL.SG write.PRES.2SG very  
**mihi** gratum est  
 I.DAT.SG dear.NOM be.PRES.3SG  
 ‘What you write to me about Hermathena I am very grateful for’  
 (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 1.4.3)
- (1148) per **mihi**, per, inquam, gratum feceris  
 very I.DAT.SG very say.VERB.DEFECT.1SG dear do.PRF.2SG.SUBJ  
 ‘You would, I say, make me very, very grateful’ (Cicero, *ad Atticum*  
 1.20.7)
- (1149) pergratum **mihi** feceris, spero item  
 very.grateful.ACC.SG I.DAT.SG do.PRF.2SG.SUBJ hope.PRES.1SG likewise  
 Scaevolae  
 Scaevolae.DAT  
 ‘you would make me very grateful, and, I hope, Scaevola, too’ (Cicero,  
*Laelius de Amicitia* 16)

The fact that in 1149 we find *pergratum mihi* and not *per mihi gratum* ‘very I.DAT.SG grateful.ACC.SG’, as Orelli (1828) would have it, serves to confirm our rule, as *mihi* must have been heavily stressed because of its opposition to *Scaevolae* (Seyffert & Müller 1876: 95). The other cases in which *per* undergoes tmesis will be discussed later, except 1150 and 1151, in both of which, moreover, a particle requiring second position has caused the tmesis.

- (1150) ista sunt pergrata perque  
 that.NOM.PL.N are.PRES.3PL very.pleasing.ACC.PL.N very.and  
 iucunda  
 delightful.ACC.PL.N  
 ‘that is very pleasing and very delightful’ (Cicero, *de Oratore* 1.205)
- (1151) per **enim** magni aestimo  
 very namely great.GEN.SG.N appraise.PRES.1SG  
 ‘for I very highly appraise’ (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 10.1.1)

b) Of the pronoun *quicumque* (Neue & Wagener 1892: 489) and its dependents (whose tmesis in cases like 1152–1157 and in the examples given by Neue from Gellius and Appuleius, as well as in 1158, is of a very special type): 1159–1168, and following this 1169.

## 2 Translation

- (1152) quod iudicium cunque subierat  
 what.ACC.SG.N trial.ACC.SG.N ever enter.PSTPRF.3SG  
 ‘whatever trial they (=everyone) had faced’ (Cicero, *pro Sestio* 68)
- (1153) qua re cunque  
 what.ABL.SG.F matter.ABL.SG.F ever  
 ‘because of whatever matter’ (Cicero, *de Divinatione* 2.7)
- (1154) quae loca cunque  
 what.ACC.PL.N place.ACC.PL.N ever  
 ‘(to) all places’ (Lucretius 4.867)
- (1155) qua de causa cunque  
 what.ABL.SG.F for reason.ABL.SG.F ever  
 ‘for whatever reason’ (Lucretius 6.85)
- (1156) quae semina cunque  
 what.ACC.PL.N seed.ACC.PL.N ever  
 ‘all seeds whatsoever’ (Lucretius 6.867)
- (1157) quam rem cunque  
 what.ACC.SG.F matter.ACC.SG.F ever  
 ‘whatever’ (Horace, *Odes* 1.6.3)
- (1158) quod ad cunque legis genus  
 what.ACC.SG.N to ever law.GEN.SG type.NOM.SG  
 ‘to whatever type of law’ (Cicero, *de Legibus* 4.26)
- (1159) quam se cunque in partem  
 what.ACC.SG.F himself.REFL.ACC ever in division.ACC.SG.F  
 dedisset  
 give.PSTPRF.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘whatever side he held on to’ (Cicero, *de Oratore* 3.60)
- (1160) quo ea me cunque ducet  
 where it.NOM.SG.F I.ACC.SG ever lead.FUT.3SG  
 ‘wherever it will lead me’ (Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes* 2.15)
- (1161) quo te cunque verteris  
 where you.ACC.SG ever turn.PRF.2SG.SUBJ  
 ‘wherever you turn’ (Cicero, *de Divinatione* 2.149)

## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

- (1162) quae            **me**            cunque vocant            terrae  
 what.NOM.PL.F I.ACC.SG ever    call.PRES.3PL earth.NOM.PL.F  
 ‘whichever lands summon me’ (Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.610)
- (1163) quo                    **te**                    cunque lacus  
 in.what.ABL.SG.N you.ACC.SG ever    lake.NOM.SG.M  
 miserantem                    incommoda            nostra            fonte  
 lament.PTCP.PRES.ACC trouble.ACC.PL.N our.ACC.PL.N spring.ABL.SG.M  
 tenet  
 hold.PRES.3SG  
 ‘in whatever spring the lake keeps you lamenting our troubles’ (Virgil, *Aeneid* 8.74)
- (1164) qui                    **te**                    cunque manent            isto  
 what.NOM.PL.M you.ACC.SG ever    await.PRES.PL that.ABL.SG.N  
 certamine                    casus  
 contest.ABL.SG.N calamity.NOM.PL.M  
 ‘whatever calamities await you in that contest’ (Virgil, *Aeneid* 12.61)
- (1165) quo    **nos**            cunque feret            melior  
 where we.ACC.PL ever    take.FUT.3SG good.NOM.SG.F.COMPARATIVE  
 Fortuna                    parente  
 Fortuna.NOM.SG.F father.ABL.SG.M  
 ‘wherever Fortune, who is better than my father, will take us’ (Horace, *Odes* 1.7.25)
- (1166) quae            **te**                    cunque domat            Venus  
 what.NOM.SG.F you.ACC.SG ever    tame.PRES.3SG Venus.NOM.SG.F  
 ‘whatever Venus tames you’ (Horace, *Odes* 1.27.14)
- (1167) delicias            legit            qui            **tibi**            cunque  
 delight.ACC.PL.F read.PRF.3SG who.NOM.SG you.DAT.SG ever  
 meas  
 my.ACC.PL.F  
 ‘whoever read to you my cheerful verse’ (Ovid, *Tristia* 2.78)
- (1168) nomen            quod                    **tibi**            cunque datur  
 name.NOM.SG.N what.NOM.SG.N you.DAT.SG ever    give.PRES.3SG.PASS  
 ‘whatever name is given to you’ (Martial 2.61.6)

## 2 Translation

- (1169) quae                    meo                    quomque animo                    lubitum  
           what.NOM.PL.N my.DAT.SG.M ever            heart.DAT.SG.M please.PTCP.PRF.N  
           est                    facere  
           be.PRES.3SG do.INF.PRES  
           ‘to do whatever pleased my heart’ (Terence, *Andria* 263)

Other than in these examples and in the others that will be discussed below because of enclisis, we only have Lucretius 6.1002, Horace 1.9.14, 1.16.2, and *Satires* 2.5.51, in which various words occur in between. (Cf. 1170.) In these examples we can safely recognize poetic license.

- (1170) garrulus                    hunc                    quando                    consumet  
           talkative.NOM.SG.M this.ACC.SG.M at.what.time take.completely.FUT.3SG  
           cunque  
           ever  
           ‘a chatterbox will devour him at some time or other’ (Horace, *Satires* 1.9.33)

c) Of the adverb *quomodo* ‘in what way’: [p408] 1171–1174. Cf. 1175 and 1176. More below; separation by fully stressed words does not seem to be found. Cicero, *de Lege agraria* 1.25 *quo uno modo* ‘in the only way’ is a special case.

- (1171) necesse est,                    quo tu                    me                    modo  
           necessary be.PRES.3SG how you.NOM.SG I.ACC.SG way.ABL.SG.M  
           voles                    esse, ita esse, mater  
           want.FUT.2SG be.INF so be.INF mother.VOC.SG  
           ‘it is necessary to be however you want me to be, mother’ (Plautus, *Cistellaria* 1.1.47)

- (1172) quo                    te                    modo                    iactaris  
           in.what.ABL.SG.N you.ACC.SG way.ABL.SG.M throw.IMPRF.2SG.SUBJ  
           ‘how you would show off’ (Cicero, *pro Roscio Amerino* 89)

- (1173) quo                    te                    modo                    ad tuam  
           in.what.ABL.SG.M you.ACC.SG way.ABL.SG.M to your.ACC.SG.F  
           intemperantiam                    innovasti  
           intemperance.ACC.SG.F renew.PRF.2SG  
           ‘how you returned to your extravagance’ (Cicero, *in Pisonem* 89)

- (1174) quo                    te                    nunc modo                    appelem  
           in.what.ABL.SG.M you.ACC.SG now way.ABL.SG.M speak.to.PRES.1SG.SUBJ  
           ‘how shall I address you’ (Cicero, *pro Scauro* 50)

## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

(1175) quonam se modo defendet  
in.what.ABL.SG.M ENCL.INTERR way.ABL.SG.M defend.FUT.3SG  
‘how will he defend himself (...)?’ (Cicero, *pro Rabirio Postumo* 19)

(1176) quo cunque igitur te modo ...  
in.what.ABL.SG.M ever therefore you.ACC.SG way.ABL.SG.M  
‘therefore, in whatever manner (...) you’ (Cicero, *pro Scauro* 50)

Thirdly, the separation of preposition and governed case in the well-known request formula should be mentioned: 1177–1185. (In 1184 and 1185 the verb of requesting is elided.) The *per* ‘very’, which the pronoun *te* (2SG) or *vos/vobis* (2PL) is attached to, is thus always at the beginning of the clause.

(1177) per te ere obsecro deos  
by you.ACC.SG master.VOC.SG.M implore.PRES.1SG god.ACC.PL.M  
immortales  
immortal.ACC.PL.M  
‘Master, I implore you by the immortal gods’ (Plautus, *Bacchides* 905)

(1178) per ego vobis deos atque homines dico  
by there you.DAT.PL god.ACC.PL.M and man.ACC.PL.M speak.PRES.1SG  
‘I assign to you by the gods and men’ (Plautus, *Menaechmi* 990)

(1179) per te deos oro et nostram  
by you.ACC.SG god.ACC.PL.M pray.PRES.1SG and our.ACC.SG.F  
amicitiam, Chremes  
friendship.ACC.SG.F Chremes.VOC.SG.M  
‘I beg you, Chremes, by the gods and our friendship’ (Terence, *Andria* 538)

(1180) per ego te deos oro  
by I.NOM.SG you.ACC.SG god.ACC.PL.M pray.PRES.1SG  
‘by the gods I beg you’ (Terence, *Andria* 834)

(1181) per te dulcissima furta perque  
by you.ACC.SG sweet.ELATIVE.ACC.PL.N theft.ACC.PL.N by-and  
tuos oculos per geniumque rogo  
your.ACC.PL.M eye.ACC.PL.M by spirit.ACC.SG.M ask.PRES.1SG  
‘by the sweetest thefts, your eyes, and your Genius I beg’ (Tibullus 3.11.7  
(=4.5.7))

## 2 Translation

- (1182) per ego te, inquit, fili, quaecunque  
by I.NOM.SG you.ACC.SG say.PRF.3SG son.VOC.SG.M whatever.ACC.PL.N  
iura iungunt liberos parentibus,  
right.ACC.PL.N attach.PRES.3PL child.ACC.PL.M parent.DAT.PL.M  
precor quaesoque  
pray.PRES.1SG.PASS beg.PRES.1SG-and  
“by whatever rights connect children to their parents,” he said, “I beg  
and entreat you, son” (Livius 23.9.2)
- (1183) per ego vos decora maiorum ...  
by I.NOM.SG you.ACC.PL ornament.ACC.PL.N ancestors.GEN.PL.M  
oro et obtestor  
beg.PRES.1SG and beseech.PRES.1SG.PASS  
‘by the dignity of your forbears ... I beg and beseech you’ (Curtius 5.8.16)
- (1184) per te quod fecimus una perdidimusque  
by you.ABL.SG REL.ACC.SG.N do.PRF.1PL at.once squander.PRF.1PL-and  
nefas ... ades  
sin.N.INDECL be.present.IMP.PRES.SG  
‘by the sin which we committed and squandered together with you ...,  
come’ (Lucan 10.370)
- (1185) per vos culta diu Rutulae  
by you.NOM.PL cared.for.PTCP.PRF.ACC.PL.N long Rutulian.GEN.SG.F  
primordia gentis ..., conserve  
beginning.ACC.PL.N race.GEN.SG.F preserve.IMP.PRES.PL  
pios  
pious.ACC.PL.M  
‘by the long-worshipped beginnings of the Rutulian race (...), leave the  
pious unharmed’ (Silius 1.658)

Fourthly, the examples of separation of less tightly linked word groups are given here which have been cited by the aforementioned Latinists as evidence for Cicero’s tendency to insert the unstressed pronoun after the first word: 1186–1191.

- (1186) his autem de rebus sol me  
this.ABL.PL.G but about matter.DAT.PL.F sun.NOM.SG.M I.ACC.SG  
ille admonuit  
that.NOM.SG.M warn.PRF.3SG  
‘but that sun warned me about these things’ (Cicero, *de Oratore* 309)

## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

- (1187) *populus se Romanus erexit*  
 people.NOM.SG.M itself.REFL.ACC.SG Roman.NOM.SG.M set.up.PRF.3SG  
 ‘a Roman people rose’ (Cicero, *Brutus* 12)
- (1188) *sentiebam, non te id sciscitari*  
 feel.IMPRF.1SG not you.ACC.SG that.ACC.SG.N examine.INF.PRES  
 ‘I supposed that you did not inquire’ (Cicero, *de Oratore* 52)
- (1189) *in agros se possessionesque*  
 to estate.ACC.PL.M itself.REFL.ACC.SG possessions.ACC.PL.-and  
*contulit*  
 turn.to.PRF.3SG  
 ‘turned itself to country estates’ (Cicero, *de Officiis* 1.151)
- (1190) *idque eo mihi magis est*  
 this.NOM.SG.N-and because.of.this.ABL.SG.N I.DAT.SG more be.PRES.3SG  
*cordi*  
 heart.DAT.SG  
 ‘and this lies more at my heart for the reason (...)’ (Cicero, *Laelius de Amicitia* 15)
- (1191) *ut aliquis nos deus ex hac*  
 that some.NOM.SG.M we.ACC.PL god.NOM.SG.M from this.ABL.SG.F  
*hominum frequentia tolleret*  
 of.people.GEN.PL.M crowd.ABL.SG.F take.away.IMPRF.  
 ‘that some god removes us from this crowd of people’ (Cicero, *Laelius de Amicitia* 87)

Fifthly, we can adduce some cases in which a pronoun belonging jointly to two clausal constituents is inserted into the first (see Seyffert & Müller (1876) on *Laelius de Amicitia* XX.72): 1192–1194.

- (1192) *sed item etiam illa vidi, neque te*  
 but likewise too that.ACC.PL.N see.PRF.1SG neither you.ACC.SG  
*consilium civilis belli ita*  
 plan.ACC.SG.N civil.GEN.SG.N war.GEN.SG.N in.this.manner  
*gerendi nec copias*  
 wage.GERUNDIUM.GEN.SG.N nor troops.ACC.PL.F  
*Cn. Pompeii ... probare*  
 of.Gnaeus.Pompeius.GEN.SG.M approve.of.INF.PRES  
 ‘but at the same time I also saw that you did not approve of the plan to

## 2 Translation

wage a civil war in this manner nor of Gnaeus Pompeius' troops'  
(Cicero, *Epistulae* 4.7.2)

- (1193) nec se comitem illius  
and.not himself.REFL.ACC.SG comrade.ACC.SG.M that.GEN.SG.M  
furoris, sed ducem praebuit  
fury.GEN.SG.F but leader.ACC.SG.M give.PRF.3SG  
'and he did not present himself as a comrade of that person's fury, but as  
the leader' (Cicero, *Laelius de Amicitia* 37)

- (1194) neque te provinciae neque leges neque  
neither you.ACC.SG province.NOM.PL.F nor law.NOM.PL.F nor  
di penates civem patiuntur  
god.NOM.PL.M Penates.NOM.PL.M citizen.ACC.SG.M bear.PRES.3PL  
'Neither the provinces nor the laws nor the tutelary gods tolerate you as  
a citizen' (Sallust, *Oratio Philippi* 16)

[p409] (The same, but without influence of the positional rule, is found in 1195, on which Paul (1889: XX), however, remarks: "word order shows that *se* should be deleted".)

- (1195) quae omnia et se tulisse  
which.ACC.PL.N.DEM all.ACC.PL.N both he.ACC.SG.M.REFL endure.INF.PRF  
patienter et esse laturum  
patiently and be.INF.PRES endure.PTCP.FUT.ACC.SG.M  
'(he said) that he had endured all this patiently and would further  
endure' (Caesar, *de Bello Civili* 1.85.11)

Previous research provides examples of a different use of the pronoun by the comic playwrights. Specifically, I would like to emphasize Kämpf's (1886: 31, 36) observation that in the vast majority of cases the personal pronouns attach immediately to question words and clause-introducing conjunctions (cf. e.g. in Bach (1891: 243) the juxtaposition of the cases with *quid tibi* 'what you.DAT' etc. with the accusative-governing verbal substantives in *-tio*), as well as to affirmative particles such as *hercle* 'by Hercules', *pol*, *edepol* 'by Pollux', etc. (Kämpf 1886: 40), which, as will be discussed later, assume either the first or the second position in the clause. Also very worthy of note is Kämpf's (1886) remark, coupled to an observation of Kellerhoff's, that in the very numerous cases in which negation is verse-initial a personal pronoun is attached to it wherever it is found.



## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

Most informative of all, however, is Langen's (1857: 426ff.) evidence concerning the assertion, wish and curse formulae with *di* 'gods', *di deaeque* 'gods and goddesses', or the name of a specific god as subject and a subjunctive (or future) verb as predicate. (Cf. also Kellerhoff (1891: 77f.)). When *di*, *di deaeque* or the god's name in question is clause-initial, it is immediately followed by any accusative or dative personal pronoun *me* (1SG), *te*, *tibi* (2SG) governed by the verb, and by the more rarely occurring *vos*, *vobis* (2PL), (*istum* 'that'), *istunc*, *istaec* 'this', and *illum* 'that, him'. When the subject consists of multiple words, it is true that the pronoun is occasionally found immediately after the whole constituent, as in 1196. Cf. 1197, which Langen (1857) and, following him, Götz (1878), emends to *di me hercle omnes*, and 1198 (emended to *me omnes* by Ritschl (1852)).

- (1196) Hercules                      dique                      **istam**                      perdant  
Hercules.NOM.SG.M god.NOM.PL.M that.ACC.SG.F destroy.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
'Hercules and the gods shall destroy her' (Plautus, *Casina* 275)
- (1197) di                      hercle                      omnes                      **me** adiuvant,  
god.NOM.SG.M Hercules.ABL.SG.M all.NOM.PL.M me help.PRES.3PL  
augent,                      amant  
bless.PRES.3PL love.PRES.3PL  
'all gods, by Hercules, help me, bless me, love me' (Plautus, *Epidicus* 192)
- (1198) di                      deaeque                      omnes                      **me**  
god.NOM.PL.M goddess.NOM.PL.F-and all.NOM.PL.M me  
pessumis                      exemplis                      interficant  
bad.ABL.PL.N.SUPERLATIVE manner.ABL.PL.N kill.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
'May all the gods and goddesses kill me in the worst ways' (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 192)

[p410] More often the pronoun is inserted after the first word, as in 1199 (likewise in Plautus, *Captivi* 868, *Curculio* 317, *Rudens* 1112) and 1200–1203.

- (1199) Iuppiter                      **te**                      dique                      perdant  
Jupiter.NOM.SG.M you.ACC.SG god.NOM.PL.M-and destroy.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
'May Jupiter and the gods destroy you' (Plautus, *Aulularia* 658)
- (1200) Diespiter                      **te**                      dique,                      Ergasile,  
Jupiter.NOM.SG.M you.ACC.SG god.NOM.PL.M-and Ergasilus.VOC.SG.M  
perdant  
destroy.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
'May Jupiter and the gods confound you, Ergasile' (Plautus, *Captivi* 919)

## 2 Translation

- (1201) di te deaeque ament  
 god.NOM.PL.M you.ACC.SG goddess.NOM.PL.F-and love.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
 ‘May the gods and goddesses love you’ (Plautus, *Pseudolus* 271)
- (1202) di te deaeque omnes  
 god.NOM.PL.M you.ACC.SG goddess.NOM.PL.F-and all.NOM.PL.M  
 faxint cum istoc ominē  
 do.PRF.3PL.SUBJ with that.of.yours.ABL.SG.N foreboding.ABL.SG.N  
 ‘may all the gods and goddesses confound you with your forebodings’  
 (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 463)
- (1203) di te deaeque omnes  
 god.NOM.PL.M you.ACC.SG goddess.NOM.PL.F-and all.NOM.PL.M  
 funditus perdant, senex  
 completely destroy.PRES.3PL.SUBJ old.man.VOC.SG.M  
 ‘may all the gods and goddesses completely destroy you, old man’  
 (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 684)

Similarly with attributive groups! 1204 and 1205 illustrate. The example in 1206 takes an intermediate position; similarly *Mostellaria* 192 according to Ritschl (1852) (see 1198 above).

- (1204) di illum omnes perdant  
 god.NOM.PL.M that.ACC.SG.M all.NOM.PL.M destroy.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
 ‘may all the gods destroy him’ (Plautus, *Menaechmi* 596)
- (1205) di tibi omnes id quod  
 god.NOM.PL.M you.DAT.SG all.NOM.PL.M this.ACC.SG.N because  
 es dignus dunt  
 be.PRES.2SG worthy.NOM.SG.M do.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
 ‘may all the gods do this to you because you deserve it’ (Terence,  
*Phormio* 519)
- (1206) di deaeque me omnes  
 god.NOM.PL.M goddess.NOM.PL.F-and I.ACC.SG all.NOM.PL.M  
 perdant  
 destroy.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
 ‘may all the gods and goddesses destroy me’ (Plautus, *Persa* 292)

This alone is remarkable; however, what is particularly important is that, whenever an *ita* ‘thus’, *itaque* ‘therefore’, *ut* (complementizer), *utinam* ‘if only’, *hercle*

## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

‘Hercules’, *qui* (relative pronoun) or *at* ‘but, yet, whereas’ is clause-initial, we find the pronoun preceding the nominal subject, and not, for instance, *di* ‘gods’ or the god’s name and then the pronoun. Where *at* and *ita* are together, the pronoun follows both in 1207 and 1208, but intervenes between the two particles in 1209, where for the sake of the metre I would rather emend *me* to *med* than follow the reordering proposed by more recent editors, *at ita me*.

(1207) *at ita me machaera et clypeus bene*  
 but as.truly.as I.ACC.SG sword.NOM.SG.F and shield.NOM.SG.M well  
*iuvent*  
 help.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
 ‘but as truly as sword and shield may help me well’ (Plautus, *Curculio* 574)

(1208) *at ita me di deaeque*  
 but as.truly.as I.ACC.SG god.NOM.PL.M goddess.NOM.PL.F-and  
*omnes ament*  
 all.NOM.PL.M love.PRES.SG.SUBJ  
 ‘but as truly as all the gods and goddesses may love me’ (Plautus, *Miles gloriosus* 501)

(1209) *at me ita dei servent*  
 but I.ACC.SG as.truly.as god.NOM.PL.M serve.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
 ‘but as truly as the gods may serve me’ (Plautus, *Poenulus* 1258)

The pronoun also precedes the subject *di* after initial words other than the particles mentioned: 1210–1212 etc. In 1212, *malum quod* = Greek *kakôn ti* ‘bad.ACC something’.

(1210) *si te di ament*  
 if you.ACC.SG god.NOM.PL.M love.PRES.PL.SUBJ  
 ‘if the gods are to love you’ (Plautus, *Pseudolus* 430)

(1211) *tantum tibi boni di*  
 as.much.CORRELATIVE you.DAT.SG good.GEN.SG.N god.NOM.PL.M  
*immortales duent*  
 immortal.NOM.PL.M give.PRES.PL.SUBJ  
 ‘may the immortal gods give you as much good’ (Plautus, *Pseudolus* 936)

## 2 Translation

- (1212) malum quod isti di  
 misfortune.ACC.SG.N that he.DAT.SG god.NOM.PL.M  
 deaeque omnes duint  
 goddess.NOM.PL.F-and all.NOM.PL.M give.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
 ‘may all the gods and goddesses give him misfortune’ (Plautus,  
*Mostellaria* 455)

Langen (1857), followed by Kellerhoff (1891: 78) and Schöll (1890: 70) in his edition, wants to reorder the countervailing example 1213 to *te di*, while Seyffert (1874) seeks to mitigate the damage by punctuating it as “*di te perant*”.

- (1213) quin hercle di te perant  
 but Hercules.ABL.SG.M god.NOM.PL.M you.ACC.SG destroy.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
 ‘but, by Hercules, may the gods destroy you’ (Plautus, *Casina* 609)

Langen’s (1857) observation also continues to be valid for classical Latin – at least insofar as, in assertion formulae containing *ita* and *sic* ‘thus’, the pronoun *me* (1SG), *te* (2SG) or *mihi* (1SG) almost always immediately follows these words. With *ita*: 1214–1222.

- (1214) ita mihi deos velim propitios  
 so I.DAT.SG god.ACC.PL.M wish.PRES.1SG.SUBJ favourable.ACC.PL.M  
 ‘I so want the gods to be favourable’ (Cicero, *Divinatio in Caecilium* 41)

- (1215) ita mihi meam voluntatem – vestra  
 as.truly.as I.DAT.SG my.ACC.SG.F will.ACC.SG.F your.NOM.SG.F  
 populique Romani existimatio  
 and.people.GEN.SG.M Roman.GEN.SG.M judgment.NOM.SG.F  
 comprobet  
 approve.PRES.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘as truly as your and the the Roman people’s judgment may approve of  
 my wishes’ (Cicero, *in Verrem* 5.35)

- (1216) ita mihi omnis deos propitios  
 so I.DAT.SG god.ACC.PL.M all.ACC.PL.M favourable.ACC.PL.M  
 velim  
 wish.PRES.1SG.SUBJ  
 ‘as truly as I want all gods to be favourable’ (Cicero, *in Verrem* 5.37)

- (1217) nam tecum esse, ita mihi commoda  
 for with.you.ABL.SG be.PRES.INF as I.DAT.SG convenience.NOM.PL.N

## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

omnia quae opto contingant, ut vehementer  
 all.NOM.PL.N NOM.PL.N wish.PRES.1SG touch.PRES.3PL.SUBJ as eagerly  
 velim  
 wish.PRES.1SG.SUBJ  
 ‘because as truly as I attain all conveniences I wish for I eagerly want to  
 be with you’ (Cicero, *Epistulae* 5.21.1)

[p411]

- (1218) saepe, ita **me** di iuvent, te ...  
 often so I.ACC.SG god.NOM.PL.M help.PRES.3PL.SUBJ you.ACC.SG  
 desideravi  
 desire.PRF.1SG  
 ‘I often called for you, so the gods help me’ (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 1.16.1)
- (1219) iurat “ita **sibi** parentis honores  
 swear.PRES.3SG so himself.DAT.SG father.GEN.SG honour.ACC.PL  
 consequi liceat”  
 follow.PRES.INF be.allowed.PRES.3SG.SUBJ.IMPERS  
 ‘he swears “as true as it shall be granted him to follow the honors of his  
 father”’ (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 15.16.3)
- (1220) at marite, ita **me** iuvent  
 but husband.VOC.SG.M so I.ACC.SG help.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
 caelites, nihilo minus pulcer  
 heavenly.NOM.PL.M nothing.ABL.SG less beautiful.NOM.SG.M  
 es  
 be.PRES.2SG  
 ‘but, husband, so the gods help me, you are not less beautiful’ (Catullus  
 61.196)
- (1221) non (ita **me** divi) vera gemunt  
 not so I.ACC.SG god.NOM.PL.M true.ACC.PL.N lament.PRES.3PL  
 (iuerint)  
 go.PRF.3PL.SUBJ  
 ‘they, so may the gods help me, do not lament false things’ (Catullus  
 66.18)
- (1222) non, ita **me** di ament, quicquam  
 not so I.ACC.SG god.NOM.PL.M love.PRES.3PL.SUBJ anything.ACC.SG.N

## 2 Translation

referre putavi  
bring.PRES.INF believe.PRF.3SG  
'I did not, so may the gods love me, think it mattered' (Catullus 97.1)

This position is retained even when another particle is inserted before *ita*, as in 1223 and 1224.

(1223) nam ita **mihi** salva republica  
because just.as I.DAT.SG unhar*Medea*ABL.SG.F state.ABL.SG.F  
vobiscum perfrui liceat,  
with.you.ABL.PL enjoy.PRES.INF be.allowed.PRES.3SG.SUBJ.IMPERS  
ut ...  
so.also.CORRELATIVE  
'as truly as I shall be allowed to enjoy the saved Republic, so also ...'  
(Cicero, *in Catilinam* 4.11)

(1224) tamen ita te victorem complectar ...,  
yet as you.ACC.SG victor.ACC.SG.M embrace.PRES.1SG.SUBJ  
ut ...  
so.also.CORRELATIVE  
'nevertheless, as truly as I might embrace you victorious, ...' (Cicero, *Epistulae* 10.12.1)

1225 and 1226 do not, of course, come into consideration.

(1225) ita ab imminentibus malis respublica  
so from threaten.PTCP.PRES.ABL.PL calamity.ABL.PL.N state.NOM.SG.F  
**me** adiuvante liberetur  
I.ABL.SG help.ABL.SG free.PRES.3SG.PASS.SUBJ  
'so may the state be freed from menacing calamities with my help'  
(Plancus, *ad Ciceronem epistulae* 10.9.2)

(1226) ita genium **meum** propitium  
just.as genius.ACC.SG.M my.ACC.SG.M favourable.ACC.SG.M  
habeam  
have.PRES.1SG.SUBJ  
'as truly as I wish to have my genius to be favourable' (Petronius, *Satyricon* 74)

With *sic* 'so': 1227–1236. Cf. 1237, in which the pronoun is not in second position but is still immediately after *sic*.

## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

- (1227) sic **tibi** bonus ex tua  
 so you.DAT.SG good.NOM.SG.M according.to your.ABL.SG.F  
 pons libidine fiat  
 bridge.NOM.SG.M desire.ABL.SG.F happen.PRES.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘so may you receive a good bridge as you desire’ (Catullus 17.5)
- (1228) sic **tibi**, cum fluctus supterlabere  
 so you.DAT.SG when wave.ACC.PL.M glide.over.IMPRF.2SG.SUBJ  
 Sicanos, Doris amara suam non  
 of.Sicily.ACC.PL.M Doris.NOM.SG.F bitter.NOM.SG.F her.ACC.SG.F not  
 intermisceat undam  
 intermix.PRES.3SG.SUBJ wave.ACC.SG.F  
 ‘so may not bitter Doris intermix her wave with you, when you glide  
 over the waves of Sicily’ (Virgil, *Eclogues* 10.4)
- (1229) sic **te** diva potens Cypri ...  
 so you.ACC.SG goddess.NOM.SG.F strong.NOM.SG.F Cyprus.GEN.SG.M  
 regat  
 lead.aright.PRES.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘may the goddess ruling over Cyprus guide you’ (Horace, *Odes* 1.3.1)
- (1230) sic **tibi** sint intonsi Phoebe  
 so you.DAT.SG be.PRES.3PL.SUBJ unshaven.NOM.PL.M Phoebus.VOC.SG.M  
 capilli  
 hair.NOM.PL.M  
 ‘so may your hair be unshaven, Phoebus’ (Tibullus 2.5.121)
- (1231) sic **mihi** te referas levis  
 so I.DAT.SG you.ACC.SG bring.back.PRES.2SG.SUBJ light.VOC.SG.M  
 ‘as truly as I wish that you come back to me, fickle one’ (Propertius  
 1.18.11)
- (1232) sic **tibi** sint dominae Lygdame  
 so you.DAT.SG be.PRES.3PL.SUBJ mistress.GEN.SG.F Lygdamus.VOC.SG.M  
 dempta iuga  
 remove.PTCP.PRF.NOM.PL.N yoke.NOM.PL.N  
 ‘may the mistress’s yokes be removed from you, Lygdamus’ (Propertius  
 3.6.2)
- (1233) sic **tibi** secretis agilis dea  
 so you.DAT.SG remote.ABL.PL.M nimble.NOM.SG.F goddess.NOM.SG.F

## 2 Translation

saltibus                      adsit  
 mountain.valley.ABL.PL.M help.PRES.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘so may the nimble goddess help you in remote mountain valleys’ (Ovid,  
*Heroides* 4.169)

(1234) sic **tibi**              dent                      nymphae  
 so you.DAT.SG give.PRES.3PL.SUBJ nymph.NOM.PL.F  
 ‘so may the nymphs give you’ (Ovid, *Heroides* 4.173)

(1235) sic **tibi**              nec verum              nascentia  
 so you.DAT.SG not vernal.NOM.SG.N growing.PTCP.PRES.ACC.PL.N  
 frigus              adurat              poma  
 cold.NOM.SG.N burn.PRES.3SG.SUBJ fruit.ACC.PL.N  
 ‘so may not the coldness of spring burn your growing fruit’ (Ovid,  
*Metamorphoses* 14.763)

(1236) presta              mi              sinceru(m): sic **te**              amet  
 give.PRES.IMP I.DAT.SG pure.ACC.SG so you.ACC.SG love.PRES.3SG.SUBJ  
 qui              custodit              ortu(m)              Venus  
 who.NOM.SG.F keep.PRES.3SG garden.ACC.SG Venus.NOM.SG.F  
 ‘Give me pure [wine] and Venus who tends the garden will love you’  
 (Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum 4.2776)

(1237) perpetuo liceat              sic **tibi**              ponte              frui  
 forever be.allowed so you.DAT.SG bridge.ABL.SG.M enjoy.INF.PRES  
 ‘so may you forever be allowed to enjoy (your) bridge’ (Martial 7.93.8)

With ablative absolutes (1238) and possessives (1239) we have no right to expect the rule to hold (though cf. 1240).

(1238) sic ... Venusinae              plectantur              silvae  
 so of.Venusia.NOM.PL.F beat.PRES.3PL.PASS.SUBJ forest.NOM.PL.F  
**te**              sospite  
 you.ABL.SG unharmed.ABL.SG  
 ‘so ... may the woods of Venusia be beaten, while you are safe’ (Horace,  
*Odes* 1.28.25)

(1239) rogo,              sic peculium              **tuum**  
 ask.PRES.1SG so property.ACC.SG.N your.ACC.SG.N  
 fruniscaris  
 enjoy.PRES.2SG.SUBJ.PASS  
 ‘I ask you, as truly as you wish to enjoy your property’ (Petronius 65)



## 2.9 Latin: personal pronouns

- (1240) sic tua                      Cyrneas                      fugiant                      examina  
          as your.NOM.PL.N Corsican.ACC.PL.F flee.PRES.3PL.SUBJ swarm.NOM.PL.N  
          taxos  
          yew.ACC.PL.F  
          ‘as truly as your swarms wish to flee the yews of Corsica’ (Virgil,  
          *Eclogues* 9.30)

We also cannot treat 1241 as a violation of the rule. On the other hand, 1242 and 1243 are striking.

- (1241) (sic habites                      terras                      et    te  
          so dwell.PRES.3SG.SUBJ earth.ACC.PL.F and you.ABL.SG  
          desideret                      aether) sic ad pacta                      tibi  
          want.PRES.3SG.SUBJ ether    so to promise.PTCP.PRF.ACC.PL.N you.DAT.SG  
          sidera                      tardus                      eas  
          star.ACC.PL.N late.NOM.SG.M go.PRES.2SG.SUBJ  
          ‘(so may you dwell on earth and heaven long for you) so may you go  
          late to the stars promised to you’ (Ovid, *Tristia* 5.2.51f.)

- (1242) sic umbrosa                      tibi                      contingant                      tecta  
          so shady.NOM.PL.N you.DAT.SG touch.PRES.3PL shelter.ACC.PL.N  
          Priape  
          Priapus.VOC.SG.M  
          ‘so may you attain a shelter full of shade, Priapus’ (Tibullus 1.4.1)

- (1243) sic felicem                      me                      videas  
          so fortunate.ACC.SG I.ACC.SG see.PRES.2SG.SUBJ  
          ‘as truly as I wish that you see me fortunate’ (Petronius 61)

The words *mehercule* ‘by Hercules’, *mediusfidius* ‘by God’, and *mecastor* ‘by Castor’ are well known to have developed out of expressions like the ones discussed. This also seems to me to explain their position. In the vast majority of examples they are in second position in the [p412] clause. This is true exceptionlessly for the first two in Cicero’s speeches. For *mehercule*, cf. also Terence, *Eunuchus* 416, Cicero, *de Oratore* 2.7, *Epistulae* 2.11.4, *ad Atticum* 10.13.1, 16.15.3, Caesar in Cicero, *ad Atticum* 9.7c 1, Caelius in Cicero, *Epistulae* 8.2.1, Plancus *ibid.* 10.11.3, and Pliny, *Epistulae* 6.30; for *mediusfidius* also Cicero, *Epistulae* 5.21.1, *Tusculanae Disputationes* 1.74 1244, Sallust, *Catiline* 35.2, Livius 5.6.1, 22.59.17, Seneca, *Suasoriae* 6.5, and Pliny, *Epistulae* 4.3.5.

## 2 Translation

- (1244) ne ille **mediusfidius** vir sapiens  
indeed that.NOM.SG.M by.God man.NOM.SG.M wise.NOM.SG.M  
'indeed, by God, that wise man' (Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes* 1.74)

Particularly probative is the not uncommon insertion of an assertion particle that belongs to a whole period after the first word of the clause: *si mehercule* 'if by Hercules' in Cicero, *pro Caecina* 64, *Catiline* 2.16, *pro Scauro* Fragment 10 (Müller 1886: 246), and Sallust, *Catiline* 52.35; *quanto mehercule* in Sallust, *Historiae, Oratio Philippi* 17; *si mediusfidius* 'if by God' in Cicero, *pro Sulla* 83, *pro Plancio* 9, and Livius 5.6.1 and 22.59.17. The examples in which one of these two particles assumes a later position in the clause are significantly less numerous (*mehercule*: Terence, *Eunuchus* 67, Catullus 38.2, Phaedrus 3.5.4, and Pliny, *Epistulae* 3.1.1; *mediusfidius*: Cato in Gellius 10.14.3, Cicero, *ad Atticum* 15.8A.2, Quintilian 5.12.17). Examples 1245 and 1246 are remarkable due to the very unusual placement of the particle.

- (1245) **mediusfidius**, ne tu emisti locum  
by.God indeed you.NOM buy.PRF.2SG place.ACC.SG.M  
preclarum  
excellent.ACC.SG.M  
'by God, you have indeed bought an excellent place' (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 4.4b.2)

- (1246) **mehercule** etiam adventu nostro reviviscunt  
by.Hercules also arrival.ABL.SG.M our.ABL.SG.M revive.3PL.PRES  
'by Hercules, they also come back to life by our arrival' (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 5, 16, 3)

As regards preclassical *mecastor*, 1247 and also 1248 obey the rule, while 1249 contradicts it.

- (1247) noenum **mecastor** quid ego ero  
not by.Castor what.NOM.SG.N I.NOM master.DAT.SG.M  
dicam meo ... queo comminisci  
say.1SG.PRES.SUBJ my.DAT.SG.M be.able.1SG.PRES invent.INF.PRES  
'by Castor, I cannot think of what I should say [has happened] to my master' (Plautus, *Aulularia* 67)

- (1248) ne istuc **mecastor** iam patrem accersam  
indeed to.this.place by.Castor now father.ACC.SG.M summon.1SG.FUT

## 2.10 Latin: more personal pronouns and indefinites

meum

my.ACC.SG.M

‘by Castor, I will indeed summon my father to this place now’ (Plautus, *Menaechmi* 734)

- (1249) novi            hominem    haud    malum    **mecastor**  
 know.1SG.PRF. man.ACC.SG.M not.at.all bad.ACC.SG.M by.Castor  
 ‘I know the man. By Castor, he is not bad at all’ (Plautus, *Aulularia* 172)

The difference between vocative *mehercule* ‘by Hercules’ etc. on the one hand and *hercule* ‘by Hercules’ etc. on the other (see below) is that the forms with *me-* are excluded from the first position in the clause (leaving aside the isolated examples in Cicero, *ad Atticum* 4.4b.2 and 5.16.3). Therefore, the tendency for these forms to occur in second position should not be attributed to that observed for *hercule* etc., but rather to the enclitic nature of *me* (1SG).

## 2.10 Latin: more personal pronouns and indefinites

Let’s move on to other forms! If the vocative *mī* ‘my’ is really identical to the *moi* (1SG) in Greek *téknōn moi* ‘my child’ etc. [p413] (see above p105), as Brugmann (1890: 819) assumes, then this word’s property of enclisis must already have been lost in prehistoric times, since as early as Plautus it is found in clause-initial position. It is not inconceivable that preposing of *mi* before the noun it belongs to occurred in clauses in which the vocative was not in first position, and in which, therefore, *mi* had to be placed before the vocative in order to be in the clausal second position it required.

We can be more confident that the oblique cases of *is* ‘he, it, this, that’, just like Attic *autoû* ‘here, there’ and Sanskrit’s enclitic *asmāi* ‘this.DAT’, behaved the same as *me* (1SG) and *te* (2SG). We therefore read e.g. 1250 like 1251 (see example 1187 above). We also find enclitic positioning with the demonstrative pronouns *iste* ‘that (PROX)’ and *ille* ‘that (DIST)’ in the clauses of wishing and cursing discussed above on pp275ff.

- (1250) quam            id            recte    fecerim  
 to.what.degree it.ACC.SG.N rightly do.PRF.1SG.SUBJ  
 ‘to what degree I acted correctly’ (Cicero, *Laelius de Amicitia* 10)

- (1251) populus            se            Romanus            erexit  
 people.NOM.SG.M himself.ACC.SG.M Roman.NOM.SG.M erexit.PRF.3SG  
 ‘the Roman people rose’ (Cicero, *Brutus* 12)

## 2 Translation

Some readers might have noticed, moreover, that in the examples where *me* (1SG) or *te* (2SG) disrupts a constituent because of its position it is often preceded by *ego*: for instance, 1252 and 1253. In addition, we have 1254. Also the nominative of *is*, *ea*, *id*: 1255.

(1252) per **ego** vobis deos ... dico  
through I.NOM.SG you.DAT.PL god.ACC.PL.M say.PRES.1SG  
'I order you in the name of the gods' (Plautus, *Menaechmi* 990)

(1253) per **ego** te deos oro  
through I.NOM.SG. you.ACC.SG god.ACC.PL.M say.PRES.1SG  
'I beg you in the name of the gods' (Terence, *Andria* 834)

(1254) quo tu me modo voles  
who.ABL.SG.M you.NOM.SG I.ACC.SG way.ABL.SG.M want.FUT.2SG  
esse  
be.INF.PRES  
'I'll behave the way you want me to' (Plautus, *Cistellaria* 1.1.47)

(1255) quo ea me cunque duxit  
where she.NOM.SG.F I.ACC.SG ever lead.PRF.3SG  
'wherever it (=Reason) led me' (Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes* 2.15)

It is indisputable that in such cases *ego*, *tu* and *ea* are also enclitic, and reminiscent of the enclisis of German *er* (3SG.NOM.M), *sie* (3SG.NOM.F), *es* (3SG.NOM.N) in subordinate clauses as well as in inverted and interrogative main clauses. In this way we can also explain examples like 1256–1261. Furthermore, the *ego* (1SG.NOM) or *tu* (2SG.NOM) that immediately follows the verb, like Greek *egō* (1SG.NOM) in the same position, should certainly also be considered enclitic.

(1256) quantum **id** cunque est  
how.little.NOM.SG.N it.NOM.SG.N ever is.PRES.3SG  
'how little soever it is' (Cicero, *de Oratore* 2.97)

(1257) quale **id** cunque est  
of.what.quality.NOM.SG.N it.NOM.SG.N ever is.PRES.3SG  
'of what quality soever it is' (Cicero, *de Natura Deorum* 2.76)

(1258) quonam igitur haec modo  
which.ABL.SG.M then this.NOM.PL.N way.ABL.SG.M  
gesta sunt  
happen.PTCL.PRF.NOM.PL.N be.PRES.3PL  
'Which way, then, did these things happen?' (Cicero, *pro Cluentio* 66)

## 2.10 Latin: more personal pronouns and indefinites

- (1259) cuius            haec            cunque modi            videntur  
 what.GEN.SG.M this.NOM.PL.N ever    kind.GEN.SG.M seem.PRES.3SG.PAS  
 ‘of whatever kind these things seem to be’ (Sallust, *Catiline* 52.10)
- (1260) ne            aut    ille            alserit            aut  
 that.not either that.NOM.SG.M suffer.from.cold.PERF.3SG.SUBJ or  
 ceciderit  
 fall.PERF.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘that he has neither suffered from cold nor fallen’ (Terence, *Adelphoe* 36)
- (1261) quonam            ille            modo            cum regno  
 what.ABL.SG.M that.NOM.SG.M way.ABL.SG.M with realm.ABL.SG.N  
 distractus            esset  
 tear.apart.PTCP.PERF.M be.IMPERF.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘how he would have been torn apart with his realm’ (Cicero, *pro rege Deiotaro* 15)

With indefinites, Latin holds more firmly to the old rule than Greek, and this has been [p414] recognized for a long time, although the formulation has not been entirely correct. If we jointly consider the linguistic usage of the ancient inscriptions, the commentaries of Caesar and the speeches of Cicero, following the index of *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinum* (CIL) I (Mommsen & Hensen 1887) and the lexica of Meusel (1887) and Merguet (1884), the result is that *quis* ‘who/what.M/F’ and *quid* ‘who/what.N’ in the overwhelming majority of examples attach to clause-introducing words such as *ē-* ‘out/away’, *nē* ‘no/not’, *dum nē* ‘provided-that not’, *num* ‘whether’, the relativizer *qui* and its forms, *quo* ‘where/why’, *cum* ‘when/because/although’, *quamvis* ‘however/although’, and *neque* ‘and not’. Of course, *-ve* (in *neve* ‘and not’, *sive* ‘or/but if’ etc.) takes precedence, and more rarely pronominal enclitics (only once in Caesar): 1262 and 1263. Cf. 1264–1266.

- (1262) neve    eorum            quod            saeptum  
 and.not this.GEN.PL.M who.ACC.SG.N fence.in.PTCL.ACC.SG.N  
 clausumve            habeto  
 close-or.PTCL.ACC.SG.N or    have.IMP.SG.FUT  
 ‘and you shall not possess their belongings which have been fenced in or locked’ (CIL I.206.71)
- (1263) dum    eorum            quid            faciet  
 while this.GEN.PL.M something.ACC.SG.N make.FUT.3SG  
 ‘while he will practice any of these’ (CIL I.206.94, I.206.104)

## 2 Translation

- (1264) qui ita quid confessus erit  
 who.NOM.SG.M so something.ACC.SG.N confess.PTCP.PRF.M be.FUT.3SG  
 ‘who will have confessed something this way’ (CIL I.205.II.15, 41)
- (1265) quod eum quis ignoret  
 because he.ACC.SG.M someone.NOM.SG.M not.know.PRES.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘because someone may not know him’ (Cicero, *in Verrem* 5.168)
- (1266) qui horum quid acerbissime  
 who.NOM.SG.M this.GEN.PL.M something.NOM.SG.N most.violently  
 crudelissimeque fecerat, is et vir et  
 most.cruelly-and do.PSTPRF3.SG. he.NOM.SG.M and man.NOM.SG.M and  
 civis optimus habebatur  
 citizen.NOM.SG.M best.NOM.SG.M have.IMP.3.SG.PASS  
 ‘Whoever of them had done something very violent and cruel, was  
 considered both the best man and citizen.’ (Caesar, *de Bello Civili* 3.32.3)

In these texts, the indefinite is found in true clause-internal position only after *alius* ‘else/other’ and *ali-*, and here it must be pointed out that we generally find *si quis alius* ‘if someone else’ and *ne quis alius* ‘not anyone else’, not *si alius quis* or *ne alius quis*. In addition, in Cicero’s speeches we always find *quis* and *quid* separated from the relativizer by one or two other words in relative clauses (7–8 examples). Also, 1267 is a striking example.

- (1267) nei quis in ieis locis inve  
 not someone.NOM.SG.M in this.ABL.PL.M place.ABL.PL.M in-or  
 ieis porticibus quid inaedificatum  
 this.ABL.PL.F portico.ABL.PL.F something.ACC.SG.N build.ACC.SG.N  
 immoliturve habeto  
 erect-or.ACC.SG.N have.IMP.SG.FUT  
 ‘no one shall have anything built or erected in these places or in these  
 porticoes’ (CIL I.206.70)

The same is true of the related indefinite adverbs, in particular *quando* ‘when’, and is also true for indefinites in general, as far as I can tell, in the other archaic and classical texts. Admittedly, it is sometimes necessary to emancipate oneself from modern editors in order to recognize this. Götz, for example, quite happily inserts enclitic *quid* ‘what’ in the middle of a clause and at the same time verse-initially in Plautus Mercator 774 (see his edition, Ritschl & Götz (1884: 92), as well as Götz (1876: 244)), although the manuscripts provide the correct *si quid*!

## 2.10 Latin: more personal pronouns and indefinites

Of course it is possible to dig up isolated exceptions, but the *quid* in 1268, for example, should probably be read as an exclamation, hence orthotonic.

- (1268) *tum captivorum        quid        ducunt*  
           then captive.GEN.PL.M what.ACC.SG.N bring.PRES.3PL  
*secum*  
           with.themselves.ABL.PL  
           ‘then, they are bringing so many captives with them’ (Plautus, *Epidicus* 210)

In view of this rigidity of the positional rule, neither the anastrophe in 1269 (cf. Seyffert & Müller (1876) on this example) nor the frequent [p415] separation of the attributive indefinite from its noun – reminiscent of the examples adduced above for Greek on pp122ff. – should be surprising, e.g. 1270, 1271, etc., etc. I should also mention, only in passing, that Oscan and Umbrian *pis*, *pid* and *pis*, *pir* ‘who/what’ usually immediately follow *svai*, *svae* and *sve*, so ‘if’ in the manuscripts.

- (1269) *si quos        inter        societas        aut est        aut*  
           if someone.ACC.PL.M between partnership.NOM.SG.F or    be.PRES.3SG or  
           fuit  
           was.PRF.3SG  
           ‘if there is or was partnership between some people’ (Cicero, *Laelius de Amicitia* 83)

- (1270) *ne        qua        oriatur        pecuniae*  
           that.not any.NOM.SG.F arise.PRES.3SG.SUBJ. money.GEN.SG.F  
           cupiditas  
           envy.NOM.SG.F.  
           ‘that no money envy may arise’ (Caesar, *de Bello Gallico* 6.22.3)

- (1271) *ne        qua        aut largitionibus        aut animi*  
           that.not any.NOM.SG.F or    bribery.ABL.PL.F or    courage.GEN.SG.M  
           confirmatione        aut falsis        nuntiis  
           affirmation.ABL.SG.F or    false.ABL.PL.M message.ABL.PL.M  
           commutatio        fieret        voluntatis  
           change.NOM.SG.F make.INF.PRES.PASS will.GEN.SG.F  
           ‘that not any change of will may take place due to bribery or boosting  
           courage or false messages’ (Caesar, *de Bello Civili* 1.21.1)

## 2 Translation

It is well known that *quisque* ‘each person/anyone’, deriving from enclitic *quis*, is an enclitic, and that, though it occurs clause-internally more often than *quis*, it is generally only found after superlatives, ordinals, *unus* ‘one/single/alone’ and *suus* ‘his/her/its/their own’, and otherwise after the first word in the clause. In the inscriptions of CIL I the positional rule is fully clear: *quisque* after *primus* ‘first’ in 198.46, 198.64 and 198.67, after *suus* in 206.92=102, otherwise word-internally only in 1272; in all other examples it is in second position, often admittedly such that the relativizer is followed first by the noun to which it belongs as an attribute and only then by *quisque*, e.g. 1273–1275, and with a following genitive e.g. in 1276.

- (1272) *quamque* *viam* *h[ac]* *l[ege]* ***quemque***  
 each.ACC.SG.F road.ACC.SG.F this.ABL.SG.F law.ABL.SG.F each.ACC.SG.M  
*tueri* *oportebit*  
 protect.INF.PRES.PASS be.necessary.FUT.3SG  
 ‘with this law, it will be necessary for everyone to protect each road’  
 (CIL I.206.I.22)

- (1273) *quo* *die* ***quisque*** *triumphabit*  
 whoever.ABL.SG.M day.ABL.SG.M each.NOM.SG.M win.FUT.3SG  
 ‘on whichever day everyone will win’ (CIL I.206.I.63)

- (1274) *quot* *annos* ***quisque*** *eorum* *habet*  
 how.many year.ACC.PL.M each.NOM.SG.M he.GEN.PL.M have.PRES.3SG  
 ‘how many years every one of them has’ (CIL I.206.I.147)

- (1275) *qua* *in parte* *urbis* ***quisque***  
 whoever.ABL.SG.F in part.ABL.SG.F city.GEN.SG.F each.NOM.SG.M  
*eorum* *curet*  
 he.GEN.PL.M take.care.of.PRES.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘in whichever part of the city every one of them should take care of [...]’  
 (CIL I.206.I.26)

- (1276) *quantum* *agri* *loci* ***quousque*** *in*  
 how.much land.GEN.SG.M place.GEN.SG.M each.GEN.SG.M in  
*populi* *leiberi* *... datus*  
 people.GEN.SG.M free.GEN.SG.M give.PTCL.PRF.PASS  
*adsignatusve* *est*  
 assign-or.PTCL.PRF.PASS be.PRES.3SG  
 ‘how much land and place has been given or assigned to any free people’  
 (CIL I.200.I.71)



## 2.10 Latin: more personal pronouns and indefinites

But even in these examples the preposing of *quisque* before the words with which it stands in an attributive relation makes sense only from the perspective of our positional law: *quisque eorum* ‘whichever of them’ in 1274–1275 (and many other such cases), *quousque in populi leiberi* ‘any of the free people’ in 1276. And examples in which *quisque* splits an attributively linked constituent through its striving to be placed near the start of the clause are not at all rare: see 1277–1279.

- (1277) quem                      **quisque**                      eorum                      agrum  
 whoever.ACC.SG.M each.NOM.SG.M he.GEN.PL.M land.ACC.SG.M  
 posidebit  
 possess.FUT.3SG  
 ‘whichever land each of them will possess’ (CIL I.199.39)
- (1278) quam                      in **quisque**                      decuriam                      ...  
 whoever.ACC.SG.F in each.NOM.SG.M detachment.ACC.SG.F  
 lectus                      erit  
 select.NOM.SG.M be.FUT.3SG  
 ‘into whichever detachment each will be selected’ (CIL I.202.I.33,  
 I.202.I.37, I.202.I.41, I.202.II.5)
- (1279) qua                      in                      **quisque**                      decuria                      est  
 whoever.ABL.SG.F each.NOM.SG.M detachment.ABL.SG.F be.PRES.3SG  
 ‘in whichever detachment each is’ (CIL I.202.II.27)

The last two examples show that in word sequences like *quam in decuriam* the preposition was perceived as belonging to the relativizer. Similarly, *quisque* may disrupt the connection between governing noun and genitive, for instance, as in *quantum viae* ‘how much of the road’ in 1280, and 1281.

- (1280) quantum **quousque**                      ante                      aedificium                      viae                      ...  
 how.much each.GEN.SG.M in.front building.ACC.SG.N road.GEN.SG.F  
 erit  
 be.FUT.3SG  
 ‘how much of the road will be in front of each one’s building’ (CIL I.206.I.39)
- (1281) quod                      **quibusque**                      in rebus                      ... iouris                      ...  
 who.NOM.SG.N each.ABL.PL.F in things.ABL.PL.F law.GEN.SG.N  
 fuit  
 be.PRF.3SG  
 ‘what of the law has been applied in all situations’ (CIL I.204.II.23)



## 2.11 Latin: particles and vocatives

- (1284) **qualis** **enim** **cunque** **est**  
of.what.kind.NOM.SG.M truly ever be.PRES.3SG  
‘of what kind ever it truly is’ (Ovid, *ex Ponto* 4.13.6)
- (1285) **quonam** **igitur** **haec** **modo**  
which.ABL.SG.M then this.NOM.PL.N way.ABL.SG.M  
**gesta** **sunt**  
happen.PTCL.PRF.NOM.PL.N be.PRES.3PL  
‘Which way, then, did these things happen?’ (Cicero, *pro Cluentio* 66)
- (1286) **quocunque** **igitur** **haec** **modo**  
whatever.ABL.SG.M then this.ABL.SG.M way.ABL.SG.M  
‘whatever way then these things’ (Cicero, *pro Scauro* 50)
- (1287) **jus** **igitur** **jurandum**  
law.NOM.SG.N then swear.GRND.NOM.SG.N  
‘an oath then’ (Cicero, *de Officiis* 3.104)
- (1288) **quo** **tandem** **modo**  
which.ABL.SG.M eventually way.ABL.SG.M  
‘which way eventually’ (Cicero, *in Verrem* 3.80)

A particularly tmesis-inducing word is *que* ‘and’, which has this effect not only in cases like those given above (e.g. 1289) but also separates prepositions from verbs (1290–1291) [p417] and prepositions from case, the latter especially when it means ‘if’: Old Latin 1292 (Plautus, *Trinummus* 832 with the freer word order *absque foret te*).

- (1289) **jurisque** **jurandi**  
law-andGEN.SG.N swear.GRND.GEN.SG.N  
‘and an oath’ (Cicero, *pro Caelio* 54)
- (1290) **transque** **dato**, **endoque** **plorato**  
across-and give.FUT.IMP in-and cry.FUT.IMP  
‘and he will surrender, and he will call/implore’ (Festus 309a.30)
- (1291) **disque** **tulissent**  
apart-and carry.PRF.3PL.SUBJ  
‘and they have carried away’ (Plautus, *Trinummus* 833)

## 2 Translation

- (1292) *absque* me *esset*; *absque* te  
 without-and I.ABL.SG.M be.IMPRF.3SG.SUBJ without-and you.ABL.SG.M  
*foret*; *absque* una hac  
 be.IMPRF.3SG.SUBJ without-and one.ABL.SG.F this.ABL.SG.F  
*foret*; *absque* eo *esset*  
 be.IMPRF.3SG.SUBJ without-and he.ABL.SG.M be.IMPRF.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘and if it wasn’t for me; and if it wasn’t for you; and if it wasn’t for this  
 one thing; and if it wasn’t for him’

It is to the demerit of Latinists that they have continued to view *absque* ‘without/apart from’ as a normal preposition long after Schömann (1871) and Brugman (1877) discovered the truth. For, assuming that Cicero, *ad Atticum* 1.19.1 should be read as in 1293, which I do not believe Wölfflin (1882) to have proven, and assuming also that the meaning ‘without’ does not derive from an error on the part of second-century archaists but rather was native to everyday language in Cicero’s time, it is of course possible that in the time between Terence and Cicero the phrase *absque me esset* could first lose the verb (so that simple *absque me* was used as a hypothetical “without me = if I had not been there”; cf. 1294 “without you, i.e. if you had not been there” and 1295) and, subsequent to the loss of the verb, the hypothetical meaning could have disappeared and *absque me* could have taken on the meaning of “without me” in the sense of “as I am not there”. Very similar developments can be demonstrated for the concessive particles. (On *absque* in general, see Praun (1889).)

- (1293) *absque* argumento ac sententia  
 without-and content.ABL.SG.N and purpose.ABL.SG.F  
 ‘and without any content and purpose’ (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 1.19.1)
- (1294) *absque* te uno forsitan lingua  
 without-and you.ABL.SG.M one.ABL.SG.M maybe language.NOM.SG.F  
 Graeca longe anteisset, sed tu  
 Greek.NOM.SG.F long precede.PSTPRF.3SG.SUBJ but you.NOM.SG.M  
 ‘and if it wasn’t for you alone, the Greek language would have preceded  
 but you’ (Gellius 2.21.20)
- (1295) *absque* te, satis superque et aetatis et  
 without-and you.ABL.SG.M enough and.more and time.GEN.SG.F and

\* *Translator’s note:* Wackernagel writes Brugmann here, but this must be a slip, possibly related to the better-known Karl Brugmann.

## 2.11 Latin: particles and vocatives

laboris

work.GEN.SG.M

‘and if it wasn’t for you, [I would have] more than enough of both time and work’ (Fronto 85.24 N)

The only particles that can count as fully sound support for our positional law are those that serve not to link clauses but to qualify the specific clause or constituent they belong to. First, *quidem* ‘in fact/indeed’, which is formally distinguished from Indo-Iranian *cid* only by the addition of *-em*, and essentially functionally identical to it. Like *cid*, it cannot follow unstressed words, and originally especially not the verb (cf. Bartholomae (1888: 73) on *cid*), and like *cid* it occupies a position either after the first word of the clause (see e.g. 1296) or after the [p418] stressed word whose meaning needs to be emphasized (for instance because of a contrast), depending on its function.

- (1296) Tiberium                      **quidem** Gracchum  
           Tiberius.ACC.SG.M indeed Gracchus.ACC.SG.M  
           ‘indeed, Tiberius Gracchus’ (Cicero, *Laelius de Amicitia* 37)

This positional alternation is particularly clear in archaic texts when it cooccurs with the assertion particles, especially with *hercle* ‘by Hercules’. There are innumerable examples of *quidem hercle* ‘indeed by Hercules’ etc. after the first word of the clause, but we also often find *hercle – quidem*. According to Kellerhoff (1891: 64f.), some examples of the latter order can be explained through metrical license, and others are inexplicable. But without exception they show *quidem* after a stressed personal pronoun, demonstrative, *si* ‘if’ or *nunc* ‘now’: in all these cases, *quidem* is attached to the orthotonic word following *hercle* etc. (Also 1297, an example not found in Kellerhoff (1891).)

- (1297) tam pol              id                      **quidem**  
           so by.Pollux he.NOM.SG.N indeed  
           ‘indeed, it [is] so’ (Plautus, *Bacchides* 1194)

As well as *quidem* we have *quoque*, which I believe should be identified with Sanskrit *kva ca* and therefore assigned the original meaning ‘wherever, however’. A word with the meaning ‘however’ was suitable for expressing the inclusion of a referent in a statement; this also explains the archaic connection between *quoque* and *etiam* ‘also’. It is because of the word’s function that it, like *ge* ‘in fact/at least/only’ and to an extent *quidem*, can occupy various positions in the clause despite being an enclitic – specifically, wherever the word is whose referent is

## 2 Translation

to be designated as added. But just as *ge* occasionally detaches itself from its word and removes itself to the start of the clause, following the general tendency of enclitics (see above p137), *quoque* does the same: 1298 with *quoque quattuor* rather than *quattuor quoque*, 1299 with *quoque ... Iuno* rather than *Iuno quoque* (cf. Spengel (1886) on this example), 1300 rather than *ab eo ... quoque quibus*, 1301 with *quoque stipem* rather than *stipem quoque*, 1302 with *quoque illa nomina* rather than *illa nomina quoque*. Likewise 1303 with *quoque ... Varro* rather than *Varro quoque* and 1304 with *quoque lascivi ... Catulli* rather than *lascivi Catulli quoque*.

(1298) ab hoc quoque quattuor partes urbis  
 from this.ABL.SG.N also four part.NOM.PL.F city.GEN.SG.F  
 tribus dictae  
 tribe.NOM.PL.F name.PTCL.ACC.PL.F  
 ‘from this, four parts of the city were used as names for the tribes’  
 (Varro, *de lingua Latina* 5.56)

(1299) quae ideo quoque videtur ab  
 who.NOM.SG.F therefore also seem.PRES.3SG.PASS. from  
 Latinis Iuno Lucina dicta  
 Latin.ABL.PL.M Juno Lucina name.PTCL.NOM.SG.F  
 ‘therefore, she also seems to be called Iuno Lucina by the Latins’ (Varro,  
*de lingua Latina* 5.69)

(1300) ab eo quoque, quibus ..., tribuni  
 from he.ABL.SG.M also who.ABL.PL.M tribune.NOM.PL.M  
 aerarii dicti  
 treasury.NOM.PL.M name.NOM.PL.M  
 ‘from this, these people ... were also called tribuni aerarii’ (Varro, *de lingua Latina* 5.181)

(1301) aes quoque stipem dicebant  
 copper.coin.ACC.SG.N also gift.ACC.SG.F name.IMP.F.3PL.  
 ‘they also call a copper coin a gift’ (Varro, *de lingua Latina* 5.182)

(1302) hinc quoque illa nomina  
 hence also that.NOM.PL.N name.NOM.PL.N  
 ‘hence also these names’ (Varro, *de lingua Latina* 8.84)

(1303) haec quoque perfecto ludebat Iasone  
 this.ACC.PL.N also finish.ABL.SG.M play.IMP.F.3SG Jason.ABL.SG

## 2.11 Latin: particles and vocatives

Varro

Varro.NOM.SG

‘having finished his work on Jason, Varro also played with these themes’  
(Propertius 2.34.85)

- (1304) haec                      **quoque** lascivi                      cantarunt  
    this.NOM.PL.N also                      playful.GEN.SG.M sing.PERF.3PL  
 scripta                      Catulli  
    write.PTCL.NOM.PL.N Catullus.GEN.SG  
 ‘the writings of Catullus also sang of these themes’ (Propertius 2.34.87)

The position of the question particle *ne* also seems significant. By virtue of its meaning, this particle has no more claim to stand close to the start of the clause than negation in Latin [p419] itself or in German *etwa* ‘for instance’ or *vielleicht* ‘perhaps’. Only enclisis explains the long-acknowledged rule that *ne* belongs immediately after the first word of the clause, whatever the nature of that word. It is beyond the scope of this paper to go through all the evidence and discuss the real and apparent exceptions, using the material in Hand (1845: 75ff.) and Kämpf (1886: 42–46) (on the latter see the review by Abraham (1887), who suggests punctuation after the pronoun in examples like 1305 and 1306). It is enough to point to the fact that the classical and later language still maintains this rule, and that the word *utrumne* instead of *utrum* ‘whether’, attested since Catullus, is derived from this. Post-Homeric Greek *toigār* ‘so/therefore’ attracted the particle *toi* (still separate at the time of Homer) to itself because it had become customary to view it as the first word of a clause rather than an independent clause; *utrum* attracted *ne* for similar reasons.

- (1305) sed ego                      sumne                      infelix?  
    but I.NOM.SG be.PRES.1SG-NE unhappy.NOM.SG.M  
 ‘but am I unhappy?’ (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 362)
- (1306) sed tu                      novistin                      fidicinam  
    but you.NOM.SG get.to.know.PRF.2SG-NE female.lutist.ACC.SG.F  
 Acrobolistidem?  
 Acrobolistides.ACC.SG.F  
 ‘but do you know the female lutist Acrobolistides?’ (Plautus, *Epidicus* 503)

A certain weakening of the old rule can be observed in that, if a sentence consisting of a protasis and an apodosis was to be marked as interrogative by

## 2 Translation

*ne*, the classical language inserted *ne* in the apodosis, while the earlier language attached *-ne* directly to the conjunction in the protasis. This is related to the common habit of attaching *ne* to the relativizer in a relative clause and then using such a relative clause without the addition of a main clause to ask whether the statement given in the previous clause holds for the referent described in the relative clause. Other subordinate clauses were also used in this way. (On all of this see Brix & Niemeyer (1888) on Trinummus 360 and Lorenz (1883b,a) on Miles 965 and Mostellaria 738.)

From here we have, I think, a way to understand a particle that has so far been incorrectly explained. Ribbeck (1869: 14f.), influenced by Stolz & Schmalz (1890: 526), derives *sin* ‘but if’ from the collocation of *si* ‘if’ with the negation *ne*. The meaning ‘if not’ that corresponds to this origin is, according to Ribbeck, still visible in [p420] examples like 1307. It then became customary to add *aliter* ‘otherwise’, *secus* ‘otherwise/differently’ or *minus* ‘less’ to *sin*, “tautologically or transitionally”, and also, when the other case hinted at by *sin* ‘if not’ needed to be formulated more specifically, did this in the form of simple parataxis. Thus, according to Ribbeck, *sin* eventually became a normal adversative conjunction.

- (1307) *si pares* *aeque inter se,*  
 if appropriate.NOM.PL.M equally between himself.ACC.PL.M  
*quiescendum;* *sin,* *latius* *manabit,* *et quidem ad*  
 rest.GRND.NOM.SG.N if.not more.broadly spread.FUT.3SG and indeed to  
*nos,* *deinde communiter*  
 we.ACC.PL then jointly  
 ‘if they are evenly matched, one has to rest; but if it spreads, and indeed  
 spreads to us, then [we must act] jointly’ (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 16.13b2)

There are several objections that can be made to this account. I do not want to dispute the possibility that there could have been a *sin* meaning ‘if not’, since *quin* shows that the negation *ne* could be enclitic and lose its vowel. (However, *sine* does not belong here, but rather equates to Indo-European \**sn̥nē*, i.e. the old locative of *senu-*, and crucially is cognate with Greek *āneu* ‘without’, which is not related to Gothic *inu* and Old High German *āno* ‘without’, since these correspond to Sanskrit *anu*, *ānu* ‘after, along, alongside’ = Proto-Indo-European \**enu*, \**ēnu*. The semantic change that needs to be assumed here, ‘along(side)’ > ‘aside from’ > ‘without’, is completely natural.) But there is no evidence at all for the claim that *sin* originally had this meaning ‘if not’. The examples that Ribbeck (1869) deploys or intends to deploy in this sense are suspect from the start, because there is no explanation of how this negative meaning, which had



## 2.11 Latin: particles and vocatives

already vanished by Plautus's time, could have returned to such common use by the time of Cicero. And looking at the examples oneself (1307 above plus 1308–1312) reveals that they do not show what they are supposed to show. Following a conjecture by Vahlen (1879: 347), 1313 (with *sin* where the manuscripts have *sed*) could be added to the list; but this reading is hardly likely to become generally accepted. (Stolz & Schmalz (1890) also mention [p421] examples in early Latin, but nowhere can I find evidence of these.) In all these examples we are simply dealing with aposiopesis, as is appropriate to Priapeian and epistolary style. It is particularly the first two examples, with their *quod di omen avertant* (1308) and *sed nihil opus est reliqua scribere* (1309), that eliminate all doubt.

(1308) qui si conservatus erit, vicinus;  
 who.NOM.SG.M if rescue.PTCP.PRF.NOM.SG.M be.FUT.3SG win.PRF.1PL  
**sin** ..., quod di omen avertant,  
 if.not who.ACC.SG.N god.NOM.PL.M omen.ACC.SG.N avert.PRES.3PL.SUBJ  
 omnis omnium cursus est ad vos  
 all.NOM.SG.M all.gen.pl.m road.nom.sg.m be.PRES.3SG to you.ACC.PL  
 'if he will be saved, we have won. If not ... this omen may the gods avert,  
 the whole road leads for all to you' (Cicero, *Epistulae* 12.6.2)

(1309) si perficitis quod agitis, me ad vos  
 if finish.PRES.2PL who.ACC.SG.N do.PRES.2PL I.ACC.SG to you.ACC.PL  
 venire oportet; **sin** autem ... Sed  
 come.INF.PRES be.necessary.PRES.3SG if.not on.the.other.hand but  
 nihil opus est reliqua  
 not.at.all work.NOM.SG.N be.PRES.3SG leave.behind.PTCP.NOM.PL.N  
 scribere.  
 write.INF.PRES  
 'if you finish what you are dealing with, I have to come to you; on the  
 other hand, if not ... But it is not necessary to spell out the rest.' (Cicero,  
*Epistulae* 14.3.5)

(1310) si vir esse volet, praeclara  
 if man.NOM.SG.M be.INF.PRES want.FUT.3SG great.NOM.SG.F  
 συνοδία. **Sin** autem, erimus  
 group.of.travellers.NOM.SG.F if.not on.the.other.hand be.FUT.1PL

\* *Translator's note:* this word refers to the rhetorical device in which a sentence is deliberately broken off mid-flow, with the reader being left to infer what follows.

## 2 Translation

nos, qui solemus.  
 we.NOM.PL who.NOM.PL.M be.used.to.PRES.1PL  
 ‘if he wants to be a man, it will be a great group of travellers. On the other hand, if not, we will continue as we are used to.’ (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 10.7.2)

- (1311) *atque utinam tu quoque eodem die!*  
 and hopefully you.NOM.SG also the.same.ABL.SG.M day.ABL.SG.M  
*sin quod ..., multa enim utique*  
 if.not who.NOM.SG.N much.ACC.PL.N because undoubtedly  
 postridie.  
 the.next.day  
 ‘and hopefully you [can come over] on the same day as well! If not, because many things [may come up], then undoubtedly the next day.’ (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 13.22.4)

- (1312) *donec proterva nil mei manu*  
 as.long.as wanton.ABL.SG.F nothing I.GEN.SG hand.ABL.SG.F  
*carpes, licebit ipsa sis*  
 harvest.FUT.2SG be.allowed.FUT.3SG himself.ABL.SG.F be.PRES.2SG.SUBJ  
*pudior Vesta. Sin, haec mei*  
 chaster.NOM.SG.M Vesta.NOM.SG.F if.not this.NOM.PL.N I.GEN.SG  
*te ventris arma laxabunt.*  
 you.ACC.SG.M belly.GEN.SG.M weapon.NOM.SG.N stretch.FUT.3PL  
 ‘as long as you will not steal anything from me with wanton hand, you may be chaster than Vesta herself. If not, these belly-weapons of mine will stretch you.’ (*Priapeia* 31)

- (1313) *sin, ne te capiant, primo si forte*  
 if.not that.not you.ACC.SG. capture.PRES.3PL.SUBJ at.first if maybe  
*negabit, taedia*  
 refuse.FUT.3SG sadness.NOM.PL.N  
 ‘if not, let not sadness capture you if he will refuse you at first’ (Tibullus 1.4.15)

Once these examples fall away, Ribbeck’s (1869) hypothesis is robbed of the one feature that particularly recommended it: the connection to actual linguistic usage. Now, of course, the hypothesis that *sin* initially meant ‘if not’ in the time before our literary attestation, and later developed into the only attested meaning ‘but if’, could nevertheless be correct. But this development is also not easy

## 2.11 Latin: particles and vocatives

to construe. Ribbeck only discusses this point very briefly. If I understand him correctly, he thinks that a clause like 1314 was understood by inserting ‘if this is not the case’ after *sin* ‘if not’, and let the more precise description of the opposite case follow from this: *ipse animum pepulit* “[in the case that] he himself had given direction to his inclinations”, and finally the apodosis *vivit* ‘he lives’. But an asyndetic connection such as the one proposed here between *sin* and what follows seems unthinkable to me: *sed* (or repetition of *si*) would surely be impermissible. There is probably an adversative asyndetic connection, but only insofar as the contrast is thus made perceptible by other means, through parallel structure of the two constituents or through preposing of the word that is the main carrier of the contrast in the second constituent.

- (1314) *si animum hominem pepulit, actumst,*  
 if heart.NOM.SG.M human.ACC.SG.M push.PRF.3SG do.PRF.3SG.PASS  
*animo servit, non sibi. sin*  
 heart.DAT.SG.M obey.PRES.3SG not himself.DAT.SG if.not  
*ipse animum pepulit, vivit*  
 himself.NOM.SG.M heart.ACC.SG.M push.PRF.3SG live.PRES.3SG  
 ‘if his heart brings forward the human part of him, it is done, he obeys  
 his heart and not himself. If he himself does not bring forward his heart,  
 he lives’ (Plautus, *Trinummus* 309)

I believe that a much simpler solution suggests itself. Among his examples of *ne* attached to the conjunction of the protasis, Brix gives the example of 1305 (Brix & Niemeyer 1888).

- (1315) *Acanthio: At ego maledicentior quam*  
 Acanthio.NOM.SG.M but I.NOM.SG. more.slandorous.ACC.SG.M than  
*te novi neminem. Charinus: Sin*  
 you.ACC.SG get.to.know.PRF.1SG nobody Charinus.NOM.SG.M if  
*saluti quod tibi esse censeo,*  
 health.DAT.SG.F what.ACC.SG.N you.DAT.SG.M be.PRES.INF think.PRES.1SG  
*id consuadeo? Acanthio: apage*  
 he.ACC.SG.N recommend.PRES.1SG Acanthio.NOM.SG.M go.away  
*istiusmodi salutem, cum cruciatu quae*  
 of.that.kind health.ACC.SG.F with torture.ABL.SG.M which.NOM.SG.M  
*advenit.*  
 arrive.PRES.3SG  
 ‘Acanthio: But I don’t know anyone who is more slanderous than you.

## 2 Translation

Charinus: If I recommend you something which I think is healthy for you? Acanthio: Go away with such health which comes with torture.’ (Plautus, *Mercator* 142f)

Brix reformulates Charinus’s words as in 1316. This is clearly in line with [p422] conversational style in Plautus, in which interrogative clauses marked as such by *-ne* are extraordinarily frequently used for objections, e.g. 1317–1320.

(1316) tumne maledicentem me dicis si tibi  
then slanderous.ACC.SG.M I.ACC.SG.M say.PRES.2SG if you.DAT.SG  
id consuadeo  
he.ACC.SG.N recommend.PRES.1SG  
‘then you call me slanderous if I recommend it to you’ (Brix & Niemeyer (1888))

(1317) egon ubi filius corrumpatur meus,  
I.NOM.SG-NE where son.NOM.SG.M corrupt.PRES.3SG.SUBJ my.NOM.SG.M  
ibi potem?  
there drink.PRES.1SG.SUBJ  
‘Am I supposed to drink there where my son was corrupted?’ (Plautus, *Bacchides* 1189)

(1318) egon quom haec cum illo  
I.NOM.SG-NE when this.NOM.SG.F with that.ABL.SG.M  
accubet, inspectem?  
lie.with.PRES.3SG.SUBJ look.at.PRES.1SG.SUBJ  
‘Shall I look at it when she is lying with him?’ (Plautus, *Bacchides* 1192)

(1319) egone indotatam te  
I.NOM.SG-NE not.provided.with.a.dowry.ACC.SG.F you.ACC.SG  
uxorem ut patiar?  
wife.ACC.SG.F that tolerate.PRES.1SG.SUBJ.PASS  
‘Should I tolerate that you take a wife with no dowry?’ (Plautus, *Trinummus* 378)

(1320) at scin quam iracundus siem  
but know.PRES.2SG-NE how angry.NOM.SG.M be.PRES.1SG.SUBJ  
‘but do you know how angry I am?’ (Plautus, *Bacchides* 194)

Clauses in which the interrogative consists (elliptically) only of a subordinate clause with *ne* – exactly the type of *ne*-clause to which the above example belongs – are particularly frequently used in this way: 1321–1325.

## 2.11 Latin: particles and vocatives

- (1321) Sosia: paulisper mane, dum  
 Sosia.NOM.SG.F for.a.brief.period.of.time stay.IMP.SG until  
 edormiscat unum somnum.  
 sleep.out.PRES.3SG.SUBJ one.ACC.SG.M sleep.ACC.SG.M  
 Amphitryon: quaene vigilans  
 Amphitryon.NOM.SG.M who.NOM.SG.F-NE watch.PTCP.PRES.NOM.SG.M  
 somniat?  
 sleep.PRES.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘Sosia: Stay for a moment until she has slept out one sleep. Amphitryon:  
 But is she sleeping while she’s watching?’ (Plautus, *Amphitryon* 297)
- (1322) Cappadox: dum quidem hercle ita  
 Cappadoxius.NOM.SG.M as.long.as indeed by.hercules so  
 iudices, ne quisquam a me  
 judge.PRES.2SG.SUBJ that anyone.NOM.SG.M from I.ACC.SG  
 argentum auferat. Therapontigonus:  
 money.ACC.SG.N take.away.PRES.3SG.SUBJ Therapontigonus.NOM.SG.M  
 quodne promisti?  
 what.ACC.SG.N-NE promise.PERF.2SG  
 ‘Cappadox: By Hercules, as long as you judge in a way that nobody  
 takes away money from me. Therapontigonus: [But it’s the money]  
 Which you promised?’ (Plautus, *Curculio* 704f)
- (1323) quemne ego excepi in mari  
 who.ACC.SG.M-NE I.NOM.SG catch.PERF.1SG in sea.ABL.SG.N  
 ‘but I caught him in the sea’ (Plautus, *Rudens* 1019)
- (1324) quodne ego inveni in mari?  
 who.ACC.SG.N-NE I.NOM.SG find.PERF.1SG in sea.ABL.SG.N  
 ‘but I found it in the sea?’ (Plautus, *Rudens* 1231)
- (1325) Demipho: illud mihi argentum rursum  
 Demipho.NOM.SG.M that.ACC.SG.N I.DAT.SG money.ACC.SG.N again  
 iube rescribi Phormio.  
 command.IMP.PRES write.back.INF.PRES.PASS Phormio.NOM.SG.M  
 Phormio: quodne ego discripsi  
 Phormio.NOM.SG.M who.ACC.SG.N-NE I.NOM.SG.M distribute.PERF.1SG  
 porro illis quibus debui?  
 further that.ABL.PL.M who.ABL.PL.M owe.PERF.1SG  
 ‘Demipho: Command that the money will be returned to me, Phormio.

## 2 Translation

Phormio: But I have transferred it further to the people I owed something to?’ (Terence, *Phormio* 923)

A second example with a similar use of *sin* is 1326.

- (1326) Paegnium:                    ne me            attrecta  
          Paegnium.NOM.SG.M not I.ACC.SG touch.IMP.SG.PRES  
          subigitatrix.                    Sophoclidisca:                    **sin** te  
          lascivious.woman.voc.sg.f Sophoclidisca.NOM.SG.F if    you.ACC.SG  
          amo?            Paegnium:                    male operam            locas.  
          love.PRES.1SG Paegnium.NOM.SG.M badly work.ACC.SG.F put.PRES.2SG  
          ‘Paegnium: Don’t touch me, you lascivious woman. Sophoclidisca: But if  
          I love you? Paegnium: Your effort is worthless.’ (Plautus, *Persa* 227)

Most readers of Plautus would, of course, translate *sin* in both examples as ‘but if’, identifying it as the normal *sin*. Far from wanting to criticize this, I in fact see it as evidence that the normal *sin* is identical to that found in these examples from Plautus. We can make an objection in the form of an interrogative clause not only to others, but also to ourselves. In this sense we find objecting *quine*, *quemne* in 1327 “but that one I have left” and 1328 “but he is fleeing” (see the above translation of *quine* in the examples from Plautus and Terence). And it is possible to respond to a self-addressed objection oneself with the type of apodosis found in the two examples of *sin* from Plautus, in which the first speaker objects and the second speaker responds to the objection using an asyndetically [p423] added apodosis: *apage istiusmodi salutem* “then away with that sort of benefit”, and *male operam locus* “well, then you are wasting your time”.

- (1327) an patris                    auxilium            sperem?                    **quemne**  
          or father.NOM.SG.M help.ACC.SG.N hope.PRES.1SG.SUBJ who.ACC.SG.M-NE  
          ipsa                    reliqui                    ... ?  
          herself.NOM.SG.F leave.PERF.1SG  
          ‘or should I hope for my father’s help? Who I myself left ... ?’ (Catullus  
          64.180)
- (1328) coniugis                    an fido                    consoler                    memet  
          spouse.GEN.SG.F or faithful.ABL.SG.M console.PRES.1SG.SUBJ I.ACC.SG  
          amore?                    **quine**                    fugit                    lentos  
          love.ABL.SG.M who.NOM.SG.M-NE flee.PRES.3SG slow.ACC.PL.M  
          incurvans                    gurgite                    remos?  
          bend.PTCP.PRES.NOM.SG.M eddy.ABL.SG.M oar.ACC.PL.M  
          ‘Or am I supposed to console myself with the faithful love of my spouse?’

## 2.11 Latin: particles and vocatives

But he is fleeing while he is bending his slow oars in the eddy.’ (Catullus 64.182f)

Correspondingly, in the example from Plautus analysed above according to Ribbeck’s (1869) hypothesis, the original use of *sin* is produced by the punctuation: *sin ipse animum pepulit? vivit*. ‘But how so, if he himself has given direction to his inclinations? Well, then he lives.’ It is an entirely natural development that over the course of time the clause type actually used for objections came to be used for an opposing case, and that in connection with this the *sin*-interrogative was perceived as protasis and the original answer as apodosis.

If Müller (1872: 210) is correct in reading *sin* in 1329 (where the manuscripts have *sint*, and the first printed edition has *si*; cf. Nonius 290.4 in Müller (1888: 456)), this adds a third instructive example to the two from Plautus, because here, too, *sin* serves to introduce an objection, the difference being that this is announced by *quid*, and that a *ne*-clause follows which further specifies the question. According to Müller (1872), this is an objection that one addresses to oneself. The same scholar’s *quodsin ulla* ‘but.if any.NOM.SG.F’ (Lucilius 4 fragment 22 verse 38) with inexplicable *sin* rather than *quodsi nulla* ‘but.if not.any.NOM.SG.F’ becomes redundant if the following line is read correctly.

(1329) ad non sunt            similes            neque dant.  
          but not be.PRES.3PL similar.NOM.PL.M and.not give.PRES.3PL  
 quid?            sin dare            vellent?  
          what.NOM.SG.N if give.PRES.INF want.IMPERF.3PL.SUBJ  
 acciperesne?            doce  
          accept.IMPERF.2SG teach.IMP.PRES  
 ‘But they are not similar nor do they give. What? But if they want to  
 give? Would you accept? Tell me.’ (Lucilius 29, fragment 87, verse 107)

Decisive evidence comes from the particles of affirmation and surprise *hercle* ‘by Hercules’, *pol*, *edepol* ‘by Pollux’, *ecastor* ‘by Castor’ and *eccere* ‘by Ceres’, which have the property of being able to occupy either the first or the second position in the clause without being able to occur further back in the clause, unless they are blocked by other enclitics such as *quidem* ‘indeed, in fact’, *autem* ‘but’ (Plautus, *Aulularia* 560), *obsecro* ‘I implore’, *quaeso* ‘I beg (for)’, *credo* ‘I believe’, or *ego* ‘1SG.NOM’, *tu* (2SG.NOM) or *ille* ‘that, he, it’ after *ne* (Q), or *tu* after *et* ‘and’, *at* ‘but, yet’ or *vel* ‘or’, by virtue of their own claim to this position. Various facts show us how strong the pressure is for this word class too to occupy second position. For one thing, while the collocation *pol ego* ‘by Pollux, I’ is sometimes in

## 2 Translation

initial position and sometimes preceded by another word (and hence *ego* is just as happy to occupy third position as second position), the reverse order *ego pol* ‘I, by Pollux’ is only [p424] found clause-initially (Kellerhoff 1891: 62), showing that *pol* avoids third position. For another thing, when affirmation particles relate to a whole sentence consisting of protasis and apodosis, they are attached to the first word of the protasis; *si hercle* ‘if by.Hercules’, *si quidem hercle* ‘if indeed by.Hercules’, *ni hercle* ‘if.not by.Hercules’, *postquam hercle* ‘after by.Hercules’, *si ecaster* ‘if by.Castor’, *si pol* ‘if by.Pollux’, and *si quidem pol* ‘if indeed by.Pollux’ are quite usual, while the placement of *hercle* ‘by Hercules’ in the apodosis is not unheard of (see Plautus, *Miles Gloriosus* 309, *Persa* 627), but rare. (Cf. Brix & Niemeyer (1888) on *Trinummus* 457, Lorenz (1883b,a) on *Miles Gloriosus* 156, 1239, on *Mostellaria* 229, Kellerhoff (1891: 72f.)) We have seen exactly the same phenomenon with interrogative *-ne*. But while this positioning is limited to earlier stages of the language for *-ne*, it is still very much alive in the classical language for *hercle* (*hercules*): see Seyffert & Müller (1876: 477, §78) on *Laelius*, who refer to Wichert (1856: 43, 239, 269), Weissenborn (1853) on Livius 5.4.10, etc. The classical language thus generally retains the traditional position of the particle *hercle* ‘by Hercules’, the only one that lives on in the classical language, but nevertheless such that the placement of this particle in absolute clause-initial position falls out of use. The Imperial Age, of course, permits more variability: Quintilian 1.2.4, Tacitus, *Dialogus* 1, *Historiae* 1.84, Pliny, *Epistulae* 6.19.6, Gellius 7.2.1, etc.

Furthermore, these particles, like the enclitics discussed earlier, often cause tmesis. Alongside 1330 (as opposed to 1331), 1332, and 1333 (as opposed to *nescio* ‘NEG.know.PRES.1SG’), this includes the splitting of collocations with *per*, as in 1334–1337, and the splitting of *quicumque* ‘whoever/whatever’, as in 1338.

(1330) *ne hercle operae pretium quidem*  
 not by.hercules work.GEN.SG.F price.ACC.SG.N indeed  
 ‘by Hercules, it is not even worth the work’ (Plautus, *Miles Gloriosus* 31)

(1331) *ne unum quidem hercle*  
 not one.ACC.SG.M indeed by.hercules  
 ‘not even a single one’ (Plautus, *Bacchides* 1027)

(1332) *cis hercle paucas tempestates*  
 within by.hercules few.ACC.PL.F time.period.ACC.PL.F  
 ‘by Hercules, soon’ (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 18)

---

\* *Translator’s note:* this refers to Latin produced in the period from the reign of Tiberius (14 CE) onwards.



## 2.11 Latin: particles and vocatives

- (1333) non **edepol** scio  
not by.Pollux know.PRES.1SG  
'by Pollux, I don't know' (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 18)
- (1334) per **pol** saepe peccas  
very by.Pollux often sin.PRES.2SG  
'by Pollux, you sin very often' (Plautus, *Casina* 370)
- (1335) per **ecastor** scitus puer est  
very by.Castor clever.NOM.SG.M boy.NOM.SG.M be.PRES.2SG  
natus Pamphilo  
be.born.PTCP.PERF.M Pamphilus.DAT.SG.M  
'by Castor, a very clever son was born to Pamphilus' (Terence, *Andria* 416)
- (1336) per **pol** quam paucos  
very by.Pollux very few.ACC.PL.M  
'by Pollux, very few' (Terence, *Hecyra* 1)
- (1337) per **hercle** rem mirandam  
very by.Hercules thing.ACC.SG.F astonish.PTCP.ACC.SG.F  
Aristoteles ... dicit  
Aristotle.NOM.SG.M name.PRES.3SG  
'by Hercules, Aristotle names a very astonishing thing' (Gellius 2.6.1)
- (1338) quoi **pol** quomque occasio est  
who.DAT.SG.M by.Pollux ever occasion.NOM.SG.F is  
'to whomever there is a chance' (Plautus, *Persa* 210)

*hercle* 'by Hercules' etc., therefore, occupy either the first or the second position in the clause; if they are not initial and heavily stressed, they are treated in the manner of enclitics. Anyone who it occurs to that these particles are actually vocatives (cf. 1339) will immediately recall that peculiar rule of the Sanskrit [p425] grammarians and transmitters of the accentuated Vedic texts, that the vocative, if clause-initial, is orthotonic, and if it is clause-internal it is enclitic. (Cf. the explanation given by Delbrück (1888: 34ff.)). One can add that, at least in the classical languages, the actual vocative also has an unmistakable tendency to occupy second position in the clause.

- (1339) doctis **Juppiter** et laboriosis  
teach.ABL.PL.M by.Jupiter and demanding.ABL.PL.M  
'by Jupiter, taught and demanding' (Catullus 1.7)

## 2 Translation

Now it is of course awkward that what is a firm law for the vocative-like particles is visible only as a tendency with the actual vocative. It can hardly be assumed that such a tendency is a weakening of an older, stricter law. The reverse is more probable: that the tendency found with the category of vocatives represented by *hercle* became a rule, and that the invocation of a god for the purpose of affirmation led to stronger conventionalization than in other invocations of gods or in addressing other people. (Greek shows great flexibility in the positioning of the corresponding *Hērakleis* and similar invocations, as far as can be judged from the usage of the comics and orators.) A consequence of this, if we may assume a connection between position and stress with the vocatives, is that Sanskrit enclisis was originally only a tendency and not an unconditional law, and that vocatives which were not clause-initial or verse-initial could also be orthotonic, a property which was then lost in Sanskrit by virtue of its drive to generalize.

It has not escaped me that the tendency for the vocative to occupy second position can also be explained without reference to earlier enclisis. It is thus even more valuable to me that Stolz & Schmalz (1890: 557), starting from a completely different descriptive standpoint, also claim weak stress for the Latin vocative in second position.

### 2.12 Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European

Our Modern German rule (cf. Erdmann (1886: 181ff., esp. 195)) that the verb occupies second position in main clauses and final position in subordinate clauses (both with certain exceptions that hold under specific [p426] conditions) was already valid for Old High German prose and poetry, as is well known. (In addition to the evidence Erdmann provides, see also Tomanetz (1879: 54ff.); 1890: 381.) In fact, given that this positional rule leaves clear traces not only in Old Saxon but also in Old English and Old Norse, it can probably be assumed to be Common Germanic. However, as far as I can tell, all researchers who have engaged in detail with this Germanic positional law are agreed that the difference in position between the two clause types should be considered an innovation. Bergaigne (1877: 139ff.), Behaghel (1878: 284) and Ries (1880: 88ff.) all maintain that verb-final order, as found in subordinate clauses, was originally a property of all clauses, and was later replaced only gradually in main clauses by a more recent rule with a different effect. However, when it comes to the how and why of such a change, the researchers in question have either remained silent or adduced reasons which are far from convincing when subjected to careful thought.

## 2.12 *Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European*

Ries (1880), for example, claims that the natural drive to express more important information before less important information must have led to the verb being placed near the start of the clause in main clauses and not in subordinate clauses, because the verb is more important in main clauses than in subordinate clauses!

The opposite point of view is represented by Tomanetz (1879: 82ff.). He believes that a general change caused the verb to shift to final position in subordinate clauses; originally, he claims, it would have occupied second position in these, just as in main clauses. Although Tomanetz's explanation has the advantage over Ries's in simplicity and clarity, he still does not succeed in avoiding the assumption – completely unjustifiable, in my view – that a pressure to differentiate main and subordinate clauses had taken effect.

[p427] Sanskrit, Latin and Lithuanian regularly place the verb at the end of the clause. It is believed that this reveals a custom in their ancestor language. And certainly for subordinate clauses the additional witness of Germanic confirms final placement of the verb as Indo-European. For main clauses this unanimity is lacking, and, when other considerations are not decisive, it is at least as conceivable that what held for subordinate clauses was extended to main clauses in Sanskrit, Latin and Lithuanian, rather than the alternative, that Germanic subsequently introduced a distinction between the two clause types. However, it is unlikely that the protolanguage stressed its verbs differently in main and subordinate clauses and yet placed them in the same position. Furthermore, based on what has been presented, we must expect that in the ancestor language the verb in the main clause was placed immediately after the first word in the clause because, and insofar as, it was enclitic. In other words: the German positional law already held in the ancestor language. It must be borne in mind that all clauses, not only those that we now view as subordinate clauses, were seen as hypotactic in Sanskrit and therefore, we may assume, had a stressed verb in the ancestor language, so that at any rate verb-final position must have been very common.

I do not wish to deny that the proposal put forward here could be made less general. For the law regarding the placement of enclitics (disregarding e.g. vocatives) we have only been able to adduce examples in which the enclitic is no larger than two syllables. It could therefore be said that the law was only valid for monosyllabic and disyllabic enclitics, and that those of more than two syllables remained in the position that the constituent in question would otherwise receive – or at least, to express the idea more carefully, that above a certain size threshold an enclitic was not bound by the positional law of the enclitics. Applying this to the verb would lead to the assumption that monosyllabic and disyllabic verb forms, or shorter verbal [p428] forms below a certain threshold, moved to

## 2 Translation

second position in main clauses, and that the other verbal forms in main clauses kept to the position that was dominant in subordinate clauses. It could then furthermore be assumed that Germanic has generalized the rule from the shorter verb forms to all others. Moreover, what happened in the languages that place all verbs finally becomes even clearer.

It is too much to ask for me to deliver a final verdict on the justification of this more limited version of my proposal. On the other hand, it is probably to be expected that I should take a further look around and ask whether the verbal positional law of the ancestor language has really left no traces outside Germanic. The absence of any hints of such a law could easily cause one to doubt the correctness of the explanations presented here.

Now, here it must be said that, other than the verb-final languages already mentioned, not only Celtic but also (much more significantly for this kind of investigation) Greek behaves very differently to Germanic. One should expect that Greek, since it has retained main clause stress on the verb, would also retain main clause positioning. But it is well known that this is not the case. The position of the verb is on the whole very free.

Against such facts it is welcome that two of the languages that prefer verb-finality display Germanic main clause positioning in a particular case. For Lithuanian, Kurschat (1876: §1637) states that, when the predicate consists of a copula and a noun, in contrast to the general rule, it is not the noun that precedes but rather the copula, which immediately follows the subject. A similar situation can be found with the verb *esse* ‘to be’ in Latin. Seyffert & Müller (1876: 441) on Cicero’s *Laelius de Amicitia* 70 has shown that *esse* has a preference for attaching to the first word of the clause, both when it is an interrogative pronoun or an interrogative functioning as a relative pronoun and when it is a demonstrative or belongs to another word class. There are, according to Seyffert, [p429] ‘innumerable’ examples. From *Laelius* he adduces: §56 *qui sint in amicitia* ‘who are in friendship’ (interrogative), 17 *quae est in me facultas* ‘what skill is in me’ (relative), 2 *quanta esset hominum admiratio* ‘how much amazement there was among people’, 53 *quam fuerint inopes amicorum* ‘how poor they were in friends’, 83 *eorum est habendus* ‘of them is to be had’, 5 *tum est Cato locutus* ‘at that time Cato was the speaker’, 17 *nihil est enim* ‘because nothing is ...’, 48 *ferream esse quandam* ‘to be something iron-like’, and 102 *omnis est e vita sublata iucunditas* ‘everything joyful is removed from life’.

A further phenomenon fits with this observation: extremely often in Cicero, in a clause that contains both *est/sunt* (be.3SG/PL) and *enim* ‘truly’/ *igitur* ‘therefore/then’/ *autem* ‘but’, it is not these particles that are attached to the first word

## 2.12 Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European

in the clause, despite their recognized claim to this position in other cases, but rather *est/sunt* pushing *enim, igitur, autem* into third position. The correct observation is made by Madvig (1839) on Cicero, *De finibus* 1.43: “The explanation for this word order pattern (*sapientia est enim*) is that by virtue of a heavy accent on the first word, which conveys the most important information, the enclitic word is shifted to the background. In the case of the alternative word order [*sapientia enim est*] the accent on the first word is less strong. It is my opinion that this rule – which goes against the teaching of Görenz and others, who, unaware of the nature of the enclitic word, thought that a certain emphasis is inherent to *est* when placed in second position – will become firmly established on the basis of the evidence of the best manuscripts, and of the correct interpretation.” (Cf. Seyffert & Müller (1876: 411).)

For further confirmation, one could point to examples such as 1340, where the position of *quid* ‘what’ presupposes enclitic placement of *est*. In particular, however, with *esse* ‘to be’ we find tmeses similar to those found with the enclitics discussed earlier: such as of *per-* in 1341 and 1342, in which the erroneous use of such tmesis in the middle of the clause betrays archaizing style.

(1340) etiamne est                      quid                      porro  
           also      be.PRES.3SG something.NOM.SG.N further  
           ‘is there anything further?’ (Plautus, *Bacchides* 274)

(1341) tunc mihi      ille                      dixit:                      quod classe                      tu  
           then I.DAT.SG that.NOM.SG.M say.PRF.3SG that    fleet.ABL.SG.F you.NOM.SG  
           velles                      decedere,                      per fore  
           want.IMP.2SG.SUBJ go.away.PRES.INF very be.FUT.INF  
           accommodatum                      tibi,                      si ad illam                      maritimam  
           convenient.NOM.SG.N you.DAT.SG if to that.ACC.SG.F maritime.ACC.SG.F  
           partem                      provinciae                      navibus                      accessissem  
           part.ACC.SG.F province.GEN.SG.F ship.ABL.PL.F arrive.PRF.1SG.SUBJ  
           ‘then he told me that you would like to leave with a fleet, [and] it would  
           be very convenient for you if I arrived at that close to the sea located  
           part of the province by ship’ (Cicero, *Epistulae* 3.5.3; 51 BCE)

(1342) Phaedo                      Elidensis                      ex      cohorte  
           Phaedo.NOM.SG.M of.Elis.NOM.SG.M from entourage.ABL.SG.F  
           illa                      Socratica                      fuit                      Socraticue                      et  
           that.ABL.SG.F Socratic.ABL.SG.F be.PRF.3SG Socrates-and.GEN.SG.M and

\* Translator’s note: ‘wisdom is truly’.

## 2 Translation

Platoni per fuit familiaris  
 Plato.GEN.SG.M very be.PRF.3SG familiar  
 ‘Phaedo of Elis was part of that Socratic entourage and he was very  
 familiar with Socrates and Plato’ (Gellius 2.18.1)

Tmesis of *qui ... cunque* ‘who/what ... ever’: 1343 and 1344. Also with a form  
 of *fieri* ‘become/happen’: 1345.

(1343) cum quibus erat quomque una, eis  
 with who.ABL.PL.M be.IMPRF.3SG ever together he.DAT.PL.M  
 se dedere  
 himself.ACC.SG.M devoted.PRES.INF  
 ‘whomever he was together with, he devoted himself to them’ (Terence,  
*Andria* 63)

(1344) quod erit cunque visum, ages  
 who.NOM.SG.N be.FUT.3SG ever see.PTCP.PRF.NOM.SG.N do.FUT.2SG  
 ‘whatever will be seen, you will do it’ (Cicero, *De finibus* 4.69)

(1345) istius hominis ubi fit quomque  
 that.GEN.SG.M man.GEN.SG.M where happen.PRES.3SG ever  
 mentio  
 mention.NOM.SG.M  
 ‘wherever that man is mentioned’ (Plautus, *Bacchides* 252)

If in Latin we find attachment to the first word of the clause only with one or  
 two verbs [p430] which have retained the tradition of original enclisis (and with  
 these verbs then of course in all clause types), in Greek we find a similar remnant  
 of the old positional norm with quite a number of verbs, but only in a particu-  
 lar clause type. In Ancient Greek inscriptions we often find clauses where the  
 subject is followed immediately by the verb, despite the fact that an appositional  
 description belongs to it; in these cases the apposition is strikingly separated by  
 the verb from the word that it belongs to. It makes no difference that sometimes  
 a clause-initial case form other than the subject nominative is separated in such  
 a way from its apposition, and that sometimes a *me* precedes the verb. Boeckh  
 (1828: 41–42) on CIG 25 was the first to recognize the archaic nature of this kind  
 of word order, and Schulze (1890: 1472) (pp26f. of the separate printing) in his  
 review of Meister (1889) emphasized its historical linguistic importance. It will  
 be useful to present the examples here.

Most commonly this order is found in dedicatory and sculptors’ inscriptions.  
 With *anéthēke* ‘dedicate’: 1346.

## 2.12 Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European

- (1346) Ἀλκίβιος ἀνέθηκεν κιθαρῳδὸς νησιώτης  
 Alkibios **anéthēken** kitharōidòs nēsiōtēs  
 Alkibios.NOM dedicate.3SG.AOR citharist.NOM.SG islander.NOM.SG  
 ‘Alkibios, a citharist of the island, dedicated (this).’ (CIA 1.357)

Also CIA 1.376 *Epikhárinos* [**ané**]**thēken** *ho O...*, 1.388 *Strónb*[*ikhos anéthēke*]  
*Stronbí*[*khou* (oder -*khídou*) *Euōnumeús*] (expansion almost certain!), 1.399 *Mēkhaníō*[*n*]  
**anéthēken** *ho gramma*[*teús*], 1.400 [*Pu*]*thogén*[*eia*] **anéthēke**[*n* *Ag*]*urriou eg*  
 [*L*]*akiadō*[*n*], 1.415 *Aiskhúlos* **anéthē**[*ke*] *Puthéou Paianieú*[*s*], 4<sup>1</sup>.373f. *Símōn*  
**a**[**néthēke**] *ho knapheús* [*érgōn*] *dekátēn*, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.90 *Onésimós m’ anéthēken* *aparkhēn*  
*Athēnaíai ho Smikúthou uiós*, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.198 [*ē deīna anéthēken*] *Eumēlídou gunē*  
*Sphēttóthen*, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.12 *Xenoklēs anéthēken* *Sōsíneō*, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.223 *Khnaíadēs anéthēken*  
*ho Pal*(*l*)*ēneús*, 4<sup>2</sup>.373.224 [*S*]*míkos anéth*[*ēke* ...] *ho skulodeps*[*ós*], 4<sup>2</sup>.373.226  
 [*ho deīna anéthēke*]**n** *Kēphisieús*, Acropolis inscription (Kabbadias (1886), Studniczka  
 (1887: 135)) *Néarkhos an*[*éthēke* *Néarkhou ui*] *ús érgōn aparkhēn* (according to  
 Robert (1887) *Néarkhos an*[*éthēke* *ho kerame*] *ús* ..., CIA 2.1648 (reign of Augus-  
 tus!) *Metrótimos anéthēken* *Oēthen*, IGA 48 *Aristoménēs a*[*n*]*éth*[*ēk*]**e** *Alexía*  
*taī Dámatri taī Khthoníai Ermioneús*, IGA 96 (Tegea) [*ho deīna ané*]**thēke**(**n**)  
*wastuókḥō*, IGA 486 (Milet) [*Er*]*mēsiánax émeas anéthēken* [*ho* ...] ... *ídeō tōpól-*  
*lōni*, IGA 512<sup>a</sup> (Gela) *Pantárēs m’* [**p431**] **anéthēke** *Menekrátios*, 543 (Achaean)  
*Kunískos me anéthēke* *órtamos wérgōn dekátan*, Delphic inscription in western  
 Greek alphabet (Haussoullier 1882: 445) *toī Kharopínou paídes anéthesan* *toū*  
*Paríou*, Naxian inscription from Delos (Homolle 1888: 464f.) *Ei*(*th*)*ukartidēs m’*  
**anéthēke** *ho Náxios poiésas*, Naukratis inscriptions I no. 218 *Phánēs me anéthēke*  
*tōpóllōn*[*i tōi Mī*] *lēsiōi ho Glaúkou*, II no. 722 *Musós m’ anéthēken* *Onomakritou*,  
 767 [*ho deīna anéthēken Aphrod*] *ítēi ho Ph*[*ilá*]*mm*[*ōnos*], 780 *Phílis m’ anéthēke*  
*oupiká*[*rte*]*os tēi Aphrodí*[*tēi*], 784 *Ermophánēs anéth*[*ēken*] *ho Nausité*[*leus*], 819  
 [*L*]*ákri*[*tó*]*s m’ ané*[*thē*]**ke** *ourmo*[*th*]*ém*[*ios*] *tēphrodí*[*tēi*], Boeotian inscription  
 (Kretschmer 1891: 123ff.) *Timasíphilos m’ anéthēke* *tōpóllōni toī Ptōieīi ho Praólleios*.

Also in verse: CIA 1.398 *Diogén*[*ēs*] **anéthēken** *Aiskhúl*(*l*)*ou uús Keph*[*a*] *lēos*,  
 IGA 95 *Praxitélēs anéthēke* *Surakósios tód’ ágalma*, Naukratis inscription II no.  
 876 *Ermagórēs m’ anéthēke* *ho T*[*éios*] *tōpóllōni*, Pausanias 6.10.7 (5th century)  
*Kleosthénēs m’ anéthēken* *ho Póntios ex Epidámnou*, Erythrae epigram (Kaibel  
 (1878: 312) no. 769; 4th century) [...] *-thérsēs anéthēken* *Athēnaíei polioukḥōi*  
*país Zōílou*, Kalymnos epigram (Kaibel (1878: 315) no. 778; also 4th century?)  
*Nikías me anéthēke* *Apóllōni uiòs Thrasumédeos*. Cf. also CIA 1.403 [*tónde Purēs*]  
**anéthēke** *Polumnéstou philó*[*s uiós*], IGA 98 (Arcadian) *Téllōn tónd’ anéthēke*  
*Daémonos aglaòs uiós*.

With Lesbian *káththēke* ‘lay.down/dedicate’: 1347. Also Naukratis II 789 and



## 2 Translation

790 [*ho deínā me*] **káththēke** o [sic] *Mut[ilénaios]*. Cf. 807 [*Aphrodí*] *tai ho M...*  
and 814 [*Aphrod*] *ítai ho Ke...*

- (1347) [ὁ δεῖνα κάθ]θηκε τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ ὁ [sic] Μυτιλήναιος  
ho deína **káththēke** tâi Aphrodítai  
the.M.NOM.SG such lay.3SG.AOR the.F.DAT.SG Aphrodite.DAT  
o Mutilénaios  
the.M.NOM.SG Mytilenean.M.NOM.SG  
'the Mytilenean dedicated (this) to Aphrodite' (Naukratis II, 788)

With *epoīēse/epoíei* 'make': 1348.

- (1348) Πύρρος ἐποίησεν Ἀθηναῖος  
Púrrhos **epoíēsen** Athēnaîos  
Pyrrhus.NOM make.3SG.AOR Athenian.M.NOM.SG  
'Pyrrhus the Athenian made (this).' (CIA 1.335)

Also CIA 1.362 (cf. Studniczka (1887: 144)) [*E*] *uphrónios* [**epoíēsen ho**] *ker-ameús* (the expansion is probably certain!), CIA 1.483 *Kallōnídēs* **epoíei ho** *Deiníou*, CIA 4.477<sup>b</sup> [*ho deína* **epoíēsen** or **epoíei P**] *ários*, CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.81 *Kálōn* **epoíēsen** *Ai[ginētēs]*, CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.95 [*á*] *rkhermos* **epoíēsen ho** *Khí[os]*, CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.220 *Leóbios* **epoíēsen** *Puretiádēs* (or *Purrētiádēs*), IGA 42 (Argos) *átōtos* **epoíwēe** *Argeíos k'Argeiádas* *Ageláida t'Argeíou*, IGA 44 (Argos) *Polúkleitos* **epoíei** *Argeíos*, IGA 44<sup>a</sup> (Argos) [*e*] *po[í]wēe* *Argeíos*, IGA 47 (Argos) *Krēsílas* **epoíēse** *Kudōniát[as]*, IGA 165 *Ypatódōros* *Aristo[geitōn]* **epoēsátan** *Thēbaíō*, IGA 348 *Paiōnios* **epoíēse** *Mendaíos*, IGA 498 *Míkōn* **epoíēsen** *Athēnaíos*, Loewy (1885) [p432] 44<sup>a</sup> -ōn **epóēse** *Thēbaíos*, 57 *X[e]no*-[... **epoíē**] *sen Eleu[therús?]*, 58 -ou [*e*] **póēsen** [*Sik*] *eliótēs*, 96 *Kléōn* **epóēse** *Sikuónios*, 103 [*Daídalos ep*] **oíēse** *Patroklé[ous]*, 135<sup>d</sup> (Loewy 1885: 388) [*Sp*] *oudías* **epoíēse** *Athēnaíos*, 277 *Timódamos* *T[imodámou e]* **poíēse** *Ampra[kiotēs]*, 297 (Apotheosis of Homer) *Arkhélaos Apollōníou* **epoíēse** *Priēneús*, 404 *Níkandros* *e[poíēsen]* *ánd[ríos]*, Klein (1887: 72) *Eúkheiros* **epoíēsen** *ourgotímou uiús* (twice), Klein (1887: 73) *Ergotélēs* **epoíēsen ho** *Neárkhou*, Klein (1887: 202) *Xenóphan-tos* **epoíēsen** *Athēn[aíos]*, Klein (1887: 202) (1 and 2) *Teisías* **epoíēsen** *Athēnaíos*, Klein (1887: 213) *Kritōn* **epoíēsen** *Le(i)poús ús*, i.e. *uiús* according to the reading in Studniczka (1887: 144), Pausanias 6.9.1 *tòn dè andriánta oi Ptolíkhos* **epoíēsen** *Aiginētēs*, which allows one to infer an original inscription *Ptolíkhos* **epoíēsen** *Aiginētēs* (see Boeckh (1828: 41–42) on CIG 25).

Also in verse: CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.105 *Thēbádēs* *e[póēse ...]-nou país tód' ágalma*, Acropolis inscription (Studniczka 1887: 135ff.) *Anténōr* *ep[óēsen]* 'o *Eumárous t[ód'*



## 2.12 Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European

ágalma], IGA 410 *Alxénōr epoiēsen ho Nákios, all' esídesthe*. Also IGA 349 *Eúphrōn exepoiēs' ouk adaēs Pários*.

With *égraphen, égrapsen, grápheí* 'write': 1349. Also Klein (1887: 29) *Timōnída[s m'] égrapse Bía*, Klein (1887: 196.7) *Euthumídēs égrapsen ho Pol(l)íou* (twice). Klein (1887: 194.2) should be read the same way according to the illustration in Gerhard (1847: Figure 188), as should Klein (1887: 195), both according to Dümmler. Cypriot inscription no. 147<sup>h</sup> in Meister (1889: 148), *-oikós me grápheí Se-lamínios*.

- (1349) Τήλεφος μ' ἔγραφε ὁ Ἰαλύσιος  
 Télephos m' égraphe ho Ialúsios  
 Telephos.NOM me.ACC write.3SG.IMP the.M.NOM.SG Ialysian.M.NOM.SG  
 'Telephos the Ialysian engraved me.' (IGA 482<sup>c</sup>)

Examples 1350–1352 contain various synonyms of the above verbs.

- (1350) [Δ]ωρόθεος ἐ[ε]ργάσατο Ἀργεῖος  
 Dōrótheos ewergásato Argeĩos  
 Dorotheus.NOM work.3SG.AOR.MID Argive.M.NOM.SG  
 'Dorotheus the Argive wrought (this)' (IGA 48, Argos)
- (1351) Πρίκων ἔ[π]α[ξ]α Κολότα  
 Prikōn épaxa Kolóta  
 Prikon.NOM fix.3SG.AOR Colotes.GEN  
 'Prikon, son of Colotes, built (this)' (IGA 555<sup>a</sup>, Opus?)
- (1352) Γίλικα ἀμὲ κατέστασε ὁ Στασικρέτεος  
 Gilika hamè katéstase ho Stasikréteos  
 Gilika.NOM me.ACC set.3SG.AOR the.M.NOM.SG Stasicrates.GEN  
 'Gilika, the son of Stasicrates, set (this) up' (Cypriot inscription no. 73, Deecke (1884))

With *eimí* 'be': 1353.

- (1353) [Π]όμπιος εἰμι τοῦ Δημοκρίνεος  
 Pómpiós eimi toũ Dēmokríneos  
 Pompeius.NOM be.1SG.PRS the.M.NOM.SG Democrines.GEN  
 'I am Pompeius, son of Democrines' (IGA 387, Samos)

Also IGA 492 (Sigeum), Ionic text: *Phanodíkou eimí tourmokráteos toũ Prokon-nēsíou*, Attic text: *Ph. eimí toũ Ermokrátous toũ P.*, IGA 522 (Sicily) *Longēnaiós*

## 2 Translation

**eimi** *dēmósios*, 528 (Cumae) *Dēmokháridós eimi tou̓ ...*, 551 (Antipolis) *érpōn eimi theās therápōn semnēs Aphrodītēs*, Rhodian inscription in Kirchhoff (1887: 49) *Philitōūs ēmi tās kalās a kúlix a poikíla*, Cypriot inscription 1 (Deecke 1884) *Pra-[p433]totímō ēmi tās Paphías tō ierēwos*, 16 *tās theō ēmi tās Paphías* (likewise 65 and 66 in Hoffmann (1891: 46)), 23 *Timokúpras ēmi Timodámō*, Hoffmann (1891) 78 *Stasagórou ēmi tō Stasándrō*, 79 *Timándrō ēmi tō Onasagórou*, 88 *Pnutíllas ēmi tās Pnutagórau paidós*, and 121 *Diweithémitós ēmi tō basilēwos*.

To these can be added 1354, where an adjective joined to *eînai* represents the position of the verb, and also the examples in which an adjective without *eînai* forms the predicate, e.g. 1355.

- (1354) τᾶς Ἡρας ἱερός εἰμι τᾶς ἐν πεδίῳ  
 tās Hēras hiarós eimi tās en  
 the.F.GEN.SG Hera.GEN holy.M.NOM.SG be.1SG.PRS the.F.GEN.SG in  
 pedíōi  
 plain.DAT.SG  
 ‘I am sacred to Hera of the plain.’ (IGA 543)

- (1355) Λέαγρος καλὸς ὁ παῖς  
 Léagros kalòs ho país  
 Leagros.NOM beautiful.M.NOM.SG the.M.NOM.SG child.NOM.SG  
 ‘The boy Leagros is beautiful.’ (Klein 1890: 44)

Also Klein (1890: 68) *Pantoxéna kalà Korin(th)í[a]*, as the form *KORINOI* given by Klein but not explained should probably be read; Klein (1890: 81) *Glaúkōn kalòs Leágrou*; Klein (1890: 82) *Drómippos kalòs Dromokleídou*, *Díphilos kalòs Melanórou*; (Klein 1890: 83) *Líkhas kalòs Sámios*, *Alkim[ē] dēs kalòs Aiskhulídou*; Klein (1890: 85) *Alkímakhos kalòs Epikhárou*.

Outside the previously listed categories are 1356, 1357 and 1358.

- (1356) Κλεισθένης ἐχορήγει Αὐτοκράτους  
 Kleisthénēs ekhorégei Autokráτους  
 Cleisthenes.NOM conduct.3SG.IMP Autocrates.GEN  
 ‘Cleisthenes, son of Autocrates, endowed (this)’ (CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.377<sup>a</sup>)
- (1357) ἐν τήπιάροι κ’ ἐνέχοιτο τοῖ ἵναυτ’ ἐργα(μ)ένοι  
 en tēpiároi k’ enékhoito toî  
 in the=sacrifice.DAT.IRR hold.3SG.PRS.OPT the.N.DAT.SG here  
 ἵναυτ’ erga(m)énoi  
 work.PTCP.PRF.PASS.N.DAT.SG  
 ‘He would be liable for a sacrifice performed here’ (IGA 110.9, Elis)

## 2.12 Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European

- (1358) Ἀκαμαντὶς ἐνίκᾳ φυλῇ  
 Akamantis **enika** phulè  
 Acamantis.NOM win.3SG.IMP tribe.NOM.SG  
 ‘The tribe of Acamantis conquered.’ (CIG 7806)

Among the examples with *anéthēke* and *kaththēke* listed above, thirteen also contain a dative in addition to subject, verb and apposition; three (CIA 4<sup>1</sup>.373f., IGA 95, IGA 543) also contain a substantivized accusative, and CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.90 contains both. While the accusative alone always follows the apposition (cf. also example 1359 as well as the Antenor inscription), the dative is only found four times following the apposition (IGA 486, Naukratis II.780, II.819, II.876) and eight times preceding it (Naukratis I.218, II.767, II.788, II.807, II.814, Hermes 26.123, Kaibel 769, Kaibel 778); finally, in IGA 48 the verb is followed by the genitive of the father’s name, then the dative of the god’s name with epithet, and only then the nominative demonym that belongs to the subject.

- (1359) Θεβάδης ἐποίησε ...]νου παῖς τόδ’ ἄγαλμα  
 Thēbādēs **epōēse** ...nou païs tód’  
 Thebades.NOM make.3SG.AOR ...-GEN child.M.NOM.SG this.N.ACC.SG  
 ágalma  
 statue.ACC.SG  
 ‘Thebades, son of ..., made this statue.’ (CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.105)

In CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.90 (=116 above), accusative and dative are both inserted between the verb and the apposition. This preposing of the case forms belonging to the verb over the apposition is easy to understand: the verb attracts what it governs.

Using this type we can also explain the strange word order in CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.82, expanded by Studniczka (1887: 143) as in 1360.

- (1360) Κρίτων Ἀθηναίᾳ ὁ Σκύθου ἀν[έθηκε καὶ ἐ]ποίη[σε] ([ἐ]ποίει?)  
 Kρίtōn Athēnaíai ho Skúthou  
 Crito.NOM Athenian.F.DAT.SG the.M.NOM.SG Scythes.GEN  
**anéthēke** kai **epoíēse** (epoíei?)  
 dedicate.3SG.AOR and make.3SG.AOR (make.3SG.IMP?)  
 ‘Crito, the son of Scythes, made and dedicated (this) to an Athenian woman.’ (CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.82)

The composer of the inscription originally [p434] envisaged the conventional word order *Kρίtōn anéthēken Athēnaíai ho Skúthou*, but then allowed the dative

## 2 Translation

*Athēnaiai* to precede the apposition when he was required by the addition of *kai epoīese* to place *anéthēke* after the apposition.

Loewy (1885: xv) believes that he can show that this word order did not remain common after the first decades of the fourth century (cf. also CIA 2.1621–2.1648 and the sculptors' inscriptions listed by Köhler (1888) under No. 1621). The handful of later examples can reasonably be considered archaisms, especially as two of these (Loewy (1885) 277, 297, see above p314) deviate from the original norm by preposing of the genitive of the father's name before the verb. Even for the earlier period we cannot maintain that this positional norm was absolute (Hoffmann 1891: 324), and in particular the Attic dedicatory inscriptions present us with numerous counterexamples. But the norm was very powerful, and in specific periods and specific areas it was decidedly dominant, justifying Schulze's (1890) treatment of it as an Indo-European inheritance.

Sanskrit provides striking parallels (Delbrück (1878: 51ff.), 1888: 23f.). In the language of the Brahmanas, we often find clauses that begin with *sa* or *sa ha* 'precisely this one', followed immediately by the verb, mostly *uvāca* ('speak/say'), and only then the more detailed description of the person announced by the pronoun, e.g. 1361 and 1362.

(1361) *sa* *hovāca* *gārgyaḥ*  
 he.MASC.NOM.SG PTC-spoke descendant-of-Garga.NOM.SG.MASC  
 'He, Gārgya, spoke' (e.g. *Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*)

(1362) *sa* *āikṣata* *prajāpatiḥ*  
 he.MASC.NOM.SG saw *Brahmā*  
 'He, Brahmā, saw (...)' (e.g. *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*)

Similar is 1363:

(1363) *ta* *u* *hāita* *ūcur* *devā*  
 REL.MASC.NOM PTC PTC-then spoke.3.PL.PERF gods.NOM.PL  
*ādityāḥ*  
 of-Aditi.NOM.PL  
 'The gods, sons of Aditi, then spoke' (*Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, 3.1.3.4)

Sometimes the subject is also more heavily stressed; sometimes, under the influence of the tendency to end the clause with the verb, the apposition is separated from the pronoun but still precedes the verb.

\* *Translator's note:* The English translation here is based on Eggeling (1885).

## 2.12 Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European

Furthermore, in the same Indic texts we find a striking placement of the verb in second position when the clause begins with *íti ha*, *tád u ha*, *tád u sma*, or *ápi ha*. These mostly involve the verbs *uvāca* and *āha* ('speak/say'); the name of the speaker then follows the verb – in just the same way as in German clauses with inversion.

[p435]

## Addenda

to Section 2.2 pp48–59 (concerning the inscriptions with *me* and *emé*).

On p48 and p59: Example 1364 must be left out of consideration due to the state of the inscription; cf. Röhl (1882: 155) on this example.

- (1364) [Π]εριφόνῳ [ἀνέθῃ]κέ με (or -κ ἐμέ?) Ξενάγατος  
 Periphónāi anéthēké **me** (-k **emé**) Xenágatos  
 Periphone.DAT dedicate.3SG.AOR me.ACC Xenagatos.NOM  
 'Xenagatos dedicated me to Periphone' (IGA 538)

On p51: Example 1365; Metapontum inscription (Collitz 1643) *Nikómakhós m' epóei*; vase inscription no. 48 from Klein (1887: 65) following Six (1888: 195) *Nikosthénēs em* (Six: **m' e-**)*poíēsen*.

- (1365) Οὐνπορίωνος Φίλων με ἐποίησεν  
 Hounporíōnos Philōn **me** epoiēsen  
 the=Emporion.GEN Philo.NOM me.ACC make.3SG.AOR  
 'Philo, the son of Emporion, made me.' (CIA 4<sup>2</sup>.373.103)

On p59: *emé* is also found twice in second position in the ancient vase inscription in Pottier (1888: 168): Example 1366 and *Oikōph(é)lēś em' égrapsen* (written *egraephsen*). See also Pottier (1888: 180): *-polón emé*.

- (1366) ἐκεράμευσεν ἐμεῖ Οἰκωφέλης  
 ekerámeusen **emei** Oikōphélēs  
 throw.pots.3SG.AOR me.GEN Oikopheles.NOM  
 'Oikopheles made me.' (Pottier 1888: 168)

\* *Translator's note:* Wackernagel writes 351, but this is a clear error based on the proximity of the page number 351.

\* *Translator's note:* Wackernagel refers to page 193 of Six (1888), but this is the first page of the article and does not contain the inscription in question.

## 2 Translation

### List of critically discussed examples

Homer 5.273 = 8.196 .....	p143
16.112 .....	p40
13.321 .....	p142
Alcman Fragment 52 .....	p101
Alcaeus Fragment 68 .....	p45
Fragment 83 .....	p149
Sappho Fragment 2.7 .....	p44
43 .....	p44
66 .....	p149
97.4 Hiller (=100) .....	p44
Pindar, <i>Olympian</i> 1.48 .....	p102
Euripides, <i>Medea</i> 1339 .....	p195
Fragment 1029.4 .....	p162
Antiphon 5.38 .....	p161
Aristophanes, <i>Acharnians</i> 779 .....	p101
<i>Frogs</i> 259 .....	p162
<i>Ecclesiazusae</i> 916 .....	p170
Demosthenes 18.43 .....	p195
18.206 .....	p194
24.64 .....	p197
<i>Exordia</i> 1.3 .....	p208
<i>Exordia</i> 3 .....	p244
Callimachus Fragment 114 .....	p101
Theocritus 2.159 .....	p132
Pausanias 5.23.7 .....	p53
Palatine Anthology 6.140 .....	p57
<i>Inscriptiones graecae antiquissimae</i> (Röhl 1882) 384 .....	p49
474 .....	p53
Collitz, <i>Collection of Greek dialect inscriptions</i> 26 .....	p117
3184.8 .....	p146
3213.3 .....	p133
[p436]	
<i>Greek vases with masters' autographs</i> (Klein 1887) p51 .....	p52
p194.2 .....	p315
p195.3 .....	p315
<i>Greek vases with kalos inscriptions</i> (Klein 1890) p68 .....	p316

### 2.12 Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European

<i>Naukratis</i> , by Flinders Petrie, I, inscription 303 .....	p50
I, inscription 307 .....	p50
II, inscription 750 .....	p50
Plautus, <i>Poenulus</i> 1258 .....	p277
Mercator 774 .....	p288

\* *Translator's note:* Wackernagel here writes *Bacchides* 1258 and *Mercator* 784, but these must both be errors.





### 3 Original text

#### Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung<sup>1</sup>

##### I.

[S. 333] Albert Thumb hat vor vier Jahren in den Jahrbüchern für Philologie CXXXV 641–648 die Behauptung aufgestellt, die griechischen Pronominalakkusative  $\mu\nu\nu$  und  $\nu\nu\nu$  seien durch Verschmelzung von Partikeln mit dem alten Akkusativ des Pronominalstammes *i* entstanden. Insbesondere das ionische  $\mu\nu\nu$  beruhe auf der Verbindung von *im* mit einer Partikel *ma*, älter *sma*, die in thessalischem  $\mu\alpha$  und altindischem *sma* belegt sei. Den Hauptbeweis für diese Deutung entnimmt Thumb der angeblichen Thatsache, dass die Stellung von  $\mu\nu\nu$  bei Homer wesentlich dieselbe sei wie die Stellung von *sma* im Rigveda. Es sei eben, auch nachdem der selbständige Gebrauch von *sma* als Partikel geschwunden sei und  $\mu\nu\nu$  durchaus die Geltung einer einheitlichen Pronominalform erlangt habe, doch an  $\mu\nu\nu$  die für *sma* gültig gewesene Stellungsregel haften geblieben, und es habe ein entsprechendes Stellungsgefühl dessen Anwendung begleitet. Und jedenfalls bei den Verfassern der homerischen Gedichte sei dieses Gefühl noch wirksam gewesen.

Nun beschränkt sich aber diese Ähnlichkeit der Stellung, wenn man das von Thumb beigebrachte Material nach den von ihm aufgestellten Gesichtspunkten unbefangen durchmustert, wesentlich darauf, dass  $\mu\nu\nu$  wie *sma* im ganzen selten (genau genommen noch viel seltener als *sma*) unmittelbar hinter Nomina und Adverbien nominalen Ursprungs steht. Und dieser allgemeinen farblosen Ähnlichkeit stehen wesentliche Abweichungen gegenüber. Zwar ist es ein seltsamer Irrtum Thumbs, wenn er zu dem zehnmaligen  $\mu\eta\ \mu\nu\nu$  Homers das [S. 334] nach

---

<sup>1</sup> In den nachfolgenden Beispielsammlungen verdanke ich vieles den bekannten Hauptwerken über griechische Grammatik, sowie den Spezialwörterbüchern, ohne dass ich im einzelnen meine Gewährsmänner immer werde nennen können. Monros Grammar of the Homeric Dialect 2. Aufl., wo S. 335–338 über homerische Wortstellung Bemerkungen gegeben sind, die sich mit meinen Aufstellungen sehr nahe berühren, konnte ich nur flüchtig, Gehrings Index Homericus (Leipzig 1891) gar nicht mehr benützen.

### 3 Original text

seiner Hypothese diesem im Altindischen entsprechende *mā sma* daselbst nicht aufzutreiben weiss, da doch nicht nur Böhrtlingk-Roth (s. v. *mā* 9) zahlreiche Beispiele aufführen, darunter eines aus dem Rigveda (10, 272, 24 *mā smāitādīg āpa gūhaḥ samaryē*), sondern es auch gerade über Bedeutung und Form der Präterita hinter *mā sma* eine bekannte Regel der Sanskritgrammatik gibt (Panini 3, 3, 176. 6, 4, 74. Vgl. Benfey Vollst. Gramm. § 808 I Bem. 4). Aber in andern Fällen ist die Divergenz zwischen  $\mu\nu$  und *sma* thatsächlich. Nach Thumb findet sich  $\mu\nu$  bei Homer ca. 60 mal, in 10% aller Belege, hinter subordinierenden Partikeln; *sma* im Rigveda in solcher Weise nur selten und nur hinter *yathā*. Und während *sma* gern hinter Präpositionen steht, findet sich  $\mu\nu$  nie hinter solchen.

Freilich will Thumb diese Abweichung daraus erklären, dass die homerische Sprache es nicht liebe zwischen Präposition und Substantiv noch eine Partikel einzuschieben. Ja er wagt sogar die kühne Behauptung, dass in Rücksicht hierauf diese Abweichung seine Theorie geradezu stütze. Ich gestehe offen, dass ich diese Erklärung nicht verstehe. Wo *sma* im Rigveda auf eine Präposition folgt, steht diese entweder als Verbalpräposition in tmesi (so wohl auch I, 51, 12 *ā smā rátham – tiṣṭhasi*, vgl. Grassmann Sp. 1598) oder, wenn überhaupt Fälle dieser zweiten Art belegt sind, in ‘Anastrophe’. Wenn also  $\mu\nu$  die Stellungsgewohnheit von *sma* teilt, so dürfen wir es nicht hinter den mit einem Kasus verbundenen Präpositionen suchen, und wenn es hier fehlt, dies nicht mit jener angeblichen homerischen Abneigung gegen Zwischenschiebung von Partikeln entschuldigen, sondern müssen es hinter selbständigen Präpositionen erwarten und in dem Umstand, dass es hier fehlt, eben einen Gegenbeweis gegen Thumbs Aufstellung erkennen.

Aber auch abgesehen von diesen und sonst etwa noch erwähnbaren Differenzen zwischen der Stellung des homerischen  $\mu\nu$  und des vedischen *sma*, war Thumb meines Erachtens verpflichtet zu untersuchen, ob sich die Stellung von  $\mu\nu$  im homerischen Satz nicht auch noch von einem andern Gesichtspunkt aus, als dem der Qualität des vorausgehenden Wortes, bestimmen lasse, und ob ähnliche Stellungsgewohnheiten wie bei  $\mu\nu$  sich nicht auch bei andern (etwa bedeutungs-[S. 335]verwandten oder formähnlichen) Wörtern finden, bei denen an Zusammenhang mit *sma* nicht gedacht werden kann.

Und da scheint mir nun bemerkenswert, dass von den neun ‘vereinzelten’ Fällen, wo  $\mu\nu$  auf ein nominales Adverb folgt, fünf (E 181. Z 173. A 479. O 160. S 500) es an zweiter Stelle des Satzes haben, und dass ferner alle von Thumb aufgeführten Beispiele für  $\mu\nu$  hinter dem Verb, dem Demonstrativum und den Negationen eben dasselbe zeigen. Von solcher Stellungsregel aus wird es nun auch verständlich, warum  $\mu\nu$  so gern auf Partikeln und namentlich auch in Abweichung von

*sma* so gern auf subordinierende Partikeln folgt, und warum es ferner auf Pronomina wesentlich nur insofern unmittelbar folgt, als sie satzverknüpfend sind, also am Satzanfang stehen.

Oder um von anderm Standpunkt aus zu zählen, so bieten die Bücher Ν Π Ρ, die mit ihren 2465 Versen über die Sprache der ältern Teile der Ilias genügend Aufschluss geben können, μιν in folgenden Stellungen: 21 mal als zweites Wort des Satzes, 28 mal als drittes oder viertes, aber in der Weise, dass es vom ersten Wort nur durch ein Enklitikum oder eine den Enklitika gleichstehende Partikel, wie δέ, γάρ, getrennt ist. Dazu kommt εἰ καὶ μιν Ν 58 und τούνεκα καὶ μιν Ν 432, wo καὶ eng zum ersten Satzwort gehört; ἐπεὶ οὐ μιν Ρ 641, für welches die Neigung der Negationen im gleichen Satz stehende Enklitika auf sich folgen zu lassen in Betracht kommt (vgl. vorläufig οὐτις, οὐπω, οὐ ποτε, auch οὐκ ἄν). Endlich Ρ 399 οὐδ' εἰ μάλα μιν χόλος ἴκοι. Wir haben also 49 Fälle, die unserer obigen Regel genau entsprechen; 3 Fälle, die besonderer Erklärung fähig sind, und nur 1 wirkliche Ausnahme. [Aus den andern Büchern verzeichnet Monro <sup>2</sup> 337 f. bloss noch Γ 368 οὐδ' ἔβαλόν μιν. Φ 576 εἴ περ γάρ φθάμενός μιν ἢ οὐτάσῃ, wo er μιν streichen will. Κ 344 ἀλλ' ἐῷμέν μιν πρῶτα παρεξελθεῖν πεδίοιο.] Dies alles in Versen, also unter Bedingungen, die es erschweren an der gemeinüblichen Wortstellung festzuhalten. Besonders bemerkenswert ist die bekanntlich auch sonst häufige Phrase τῷ μιν εἰσικάμενος προσέφη oder προσεφώνεε für τῷ εἰσικάμενος προσέφη μιν, wo der Drang μιν an die zweite Stelle zu setzen deutlich genug wirksam ist. Ähnlich in der häufigen Wendung καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, wo μιν zu προσηύδα gehört und nicht zu φωνήσας. Ferner beachte man Φ 347 χαίρει δέ μιν ὅστις ἐθείρη [S. 336] "es freut sich, wer es (das Feld) bearbeitet". Hier ist das zum Nebensatz gehörige Pronomen in den Hauptsatz gezogen, ohne dass man doch von sogen. Prolepse sprechen kann, da das Verb des Hauptsatzes den Dativ verlangen würde. Einzig der Drang nach dem Satzanfang kann die Stellung des μιν erklären.

Für den nachhomerischen Gebrauch von μιν tritt Herodot als Hauptzeuge ein, bei dem mir ausser, auf alle Bücher sich erstreckender, sporadischer Leküre das siebente Buch das nötige Material geliefert hat. Und da kann ich wenigstens sagen, dass die Mehrzahl der Beispiele μιν an zweiter oder so gut wie zweiter Stelle zeigt, darunter so eigentümliche Fälle, wie die folgenden: (ich zitiere hier und später nach Steins Ausgabe mit deutschem Kommentar, deren Zeilenzahlen in der Regel annähernd für alle Ausgaben passen) 1, 204, 7 πολλά τε γάρ μιν καὶ μέγала τὰ ἐπαίροντα καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα ἦν (μιν gehört zu den Partizipien). 1, 213, 3 ὥς μιν ὃ τε οἶνος ἀνῆκε καὶ ἔμαθε (μιν gehört bloß [sic] zu ἀνῆκε). 2, 90, 7 ἀλλά μιν οἱ ἱρέες αὐτοὶ οἱ τοῦ Νείλου — θάπτουσι. 5, 46, 11 οἱ γάρ μιν Σελινούσιοι

### 3 Original text

ἐπαναστάντες ἀπέκτειναν καταφυγόντα ἐπὶ Διὸς ἀγοραίου βωμόν. Vgl. Kallinos 1, 20 ὥσπερ γάρ μιν πύργον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώειν, wobei ich hinzufügen möchte, dass die Elegiker bis auf Theognis und diesen eingerechnet μιν 12 mal an zweiter Stelle, nur einmal (Theognis 195) an dritter Stelle bieten.

Und dass nun dieses Drängen nach dem Satzanfang bei μιν nicht auf irgend welchen etymologischen Verhältnissen beruht, geht aus der ganz gleichartigen Behandlung des enklitischen Dativs οἱ 'ihm' hervor, der dem Akkusativ μιν 'ihn' in Bedeutung und Akzent ganz nahe steht, aber in der Lautform von ihm gänzlich abweicht. In den Büchern NIIP der Ilias findet sich jenes οἱ 92 mal. Und zwar 34 mal an zweiter Stelle, 53 mal an dritter oder vierter, aber so, dass es vom ersten Wort des Satzes durch ein Wort oder zwei Wörter getrennt ist, das bezw. die auf die zweite Stelle im Satz noch grössern Anspruch haben, wie δέ, τε, κε. Anders geartet sind nur fünf Stellen. Π 251 νηῶν μὲν οἱ und P 273 τῷ καὶ οἱ, wo μὲν bezw. καὶ eng zum ersten Satzwort gehören; P 153 νῦν δ' οὐ οἱ und P 410 διὴ τότε γ' οὐ οἱ, die dem Gesetz unterliegen, dass bei Nachbarschaft von Negation und Enklitikum die Negation vorangehen muss. Daraus wäre auch P 71 εἰ [S. 337] μή οἱ ἀγάσσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων zu erklären, wenn hier nicht die Untrennbarkeit von εἰ und μή schon einen genügenden Erklärungsgrund böte. Man darf also wohl sagen, dass die für μιν erschlossene Stellungsregel durchaus auch für οἱ gilt. Diese Analogie zwischen μιν und οἱ setzt sich bei Herodot fort. Es findet sich bei ihm οἱ etwa doppelt so oft an zweiter oder so gut wie zweiter, als an anderweitiger Satzstelle. (Bei den ältern Elegikern scheint sich οἱ nur an zweiter Stelle zu finden.)

Besonders beachtenswert ist nun aber, dass diese Stellungsgewohnheit oft bei Homer und fast noch häufiger bei Herodot (vgl. Stein zu 1, 115, 8) dazu geführt hat, dem οἱ eine dem syntaktischen Zusammenhang widersprechende oder in anderer Hinsicht auffällige Stellung anzuweisen.

1) Entschieden dativisches οἱ steht von dem regierenden Worte weit ab und drängt sich mitten in eine am Satzanfang stehende sonstige Wortgruppe ein. P 232 τὸ δέ οἱ κλέος ἔσσεται ὅσων ἐμοί περ. γ 306 τῷ δέ οἱ ὀγδοάτῳ κακὸν ἤλυθε δῖος Ὀρέστης. — Herodot 1, 75, 10 Θαλῆς οἱ ὁ Μιλήσιος διεβίβασε. 1, 199, 14 ἢ τίς οἱ ξείνων ἀργύριον ἐμβαλὼν ἐς τὰ γούνατα μιχθῇ (τίς geht dem οἱ voran, weil es selbst ein Enklitikum ist). 2, 108, 4 τοὺς τέ οἱ λίθους (folgen 14 Worte) οὗτοι ἦσαν οἱ ἐλκύσαντες. 4, 45, 19 ὅστις οἱ ἦν ὁ θέμενος (scil. τοῦνομα). 5, 92, β 8 ἐκ δέ οἱ ταύτης τῆς γυναῖκος οὐδ' ἐξ ἄλλης παῖδες ἐγίνοντο. 6, 63, 2 ἐν δέ οἱ χρόνῳ ἐλάσσονι ἢ γυνὴ τίκτει τούτον. 7, 5, 14 οὗτος μὲν οἱ ὁ λόγος ἦν τιμωρός.

2) Genetivisches oder halbgenetivisches οἱ ist von seinem nachfolgenden Substantiv durch andre Worte getrennt: Δ 219 τά οἱ ποτε πατρὶ φίλα φρονέων πόρε

Χείρων. M 333 ὅστις οἱ ἀρὴν ἐτάροισιν ἀμύναι. P 195 ἃ οἱ θεοὶ οὐρανίωνες πατρὶ φίλῳ ἔπορον. δ 767 θεὰ δέ οἱ ἔκλυεν ἀρήϊα. δ 771 ὃ οἱ (Herwerden Revue de philologie II 195 φ!) φόνος οὐ τέτυκται. Herodot 1, 34, 16 μή τί οἱ κρεμώμενον τῷ παιδί ἐμπέσῃ.

3) Genetivisches oder halbgenetivisches οἱ geht seinem Substantiv und dessen Attributen unmittelbar voraus, eine bei einem Enklitikum an und für sich ungreifliche Stellung: I 244 μή οἱ ἀπειλὰς ἐκτελέσῃσι θεοί. P 324 ὅς οἱ παρὰ πατρὶ γέροντι κηρύσσων γήρασκε. — Herodot 3, 14, 14 δευτέρᾳ οἱ τὸν παῖδα ἔπεμπε. 3, 15, 12 τὴν οἱ ὁ πατήρ εἶχε ἀρχήν. [S. 338] 3, 55, 10 καὶ οἱ (καὶ οἱ?) τῷ πατρὶ ἔφη Σάμιον τοῦνομα τεθῆναι, ὅτι οἱ ὁ πατήρ Ἀρχίης ἐν Σάμῳ ἀριστεύσας ἐτελεύτησε. — Allerdings findet sich diese Wortfolge bei Herodot auch so, dass οἱ dabei nicht an zweiter Stelle steht, z. B. 1, 60, 8 εἰ βούλοιτό οἱ τὴν θυγατέρα ἔχειν γυναῖκα. Aber ich glaube, die Sache liegt so: weil das an zweiter Stelle stehende οἱ so oft ein regierendes Substantiv hinter sich hatte, kam es auf, auch mitten im Satz οἱ dem regierenden Substantiv unmittelbar vorausgehen zu lassen.

4) Genetivisches oder halb genetivisches οἱ steht zwischen dem ersten und zweiten Glied des regierenden Ausdrucks, auch dies eine für ein Enklitikum an sich auffällige Stellung. a) Zwischen Präposition nebst folgender Partikel und Artikel: Herodot 1, 108, 9 ἐκ γὰρ οἱ τῆς ὀψιός οἱ τῶν μάγων ὀνειροπόλοι ἐρήμαινον. b) Zwischen Artikel nebst folgender Partikel und Substantiv: B 217 τῷ δέ οἱ ὦμω κυρτῷ. N 616 τῷ δέ οἱ ὅσσε χαμαὶ πέσον. P 695 = Ψ 396 τῷ δέ οἱ ὅσσε δακρυόφιν πληθύν. Ähnlich Ξ 438, O 607, T 365 und mehrfach in der Odyssee. Ψ 392 αἱ δέ οἱ ἵπποι ἀμφὶς ὁδοῦ δραμέτην. Ψ 500 αἱ δέ οἱ ἵπποι ὑψὸς ἀειρέσθην. — Herodot 1, 1, 19 τὸ δέ οἱ οὐνομα εἶναι — Ἰοῦν. 3, 3, 10 τῶν δέ οἱ παιδων τὸν πρεσβύτερον εἰπεῖν. 3, 48, 14 τὸν τέ οἱ παῖδα ἐκ τῶν ἀπολλυμένων σώζειν. 3, 129, 5 ὁ γὰρ οἱ ἀστράγαλος ἐξεχώρησε ἐκ τῶν ἄρθρων. 5, 95, 4 τὰ δέ οἱ ὅπλα ἔχουσι Ἀθηναῖοι. 6, 41, 7 τὴν δέ οἱ πέμπτην τῶν νεῶν κατέϊλον διώκοντες οἱ Φοίνικες. — Ebenso die ionischen Dichter: Archilochus 29, 2 Bgk. ἡ δέ οἱ κόμη ὦμους κατεσκίαζε καὶ μετάφρενα. 97, 1 ἡ δέ οἱ κάθη — ἐπλήμμυρεν. c) Zwischen Artikel und Substantiv: Herodot 1, 82, 41 τῶν οἱ συλλοχιδέων διεφθαρμένων. 3, 153, 4 τῶν οἱ κιοφόρων ἡμιόνων μία ἔτεκε.

Parallelen hiezu liefern auch die nicht ionischen nachhomerischen Dichter, für die οἱ einen Bestandteil des traditionellen poetischen Sprachguts bildet. Ich bringe, was mir gerade vor die Augen gekommen ist. Zu 1) gehört Pindar Pyth. 2, 42 ἄνευ οἱ Χαρίτων τέκεν γόνον ὑπερφιάλον. Euphorion Anthol. Palat. 6, 278, 3 (= Meineke Analecta Alexandrina S. 164) ἀντὶ δέ οἱ πλοκαμίδος ἐκηβόλε καλὸς ἐπεὶ ὠχαρνήθεν αἰεὶ κισσὸς ἀεζομένη. — Zu 2) Theokrit 2, 138 ἐγὼ δέ οἱ ἄ ταχυπειθῆς χειρὸς ἐφραψάμενα (vgl. Meineke zu 7, 88). — Zu 1) oder zu 2) Sopho-

### 3 Original text

kles Aias 907 ἐν γάρ οἱ χθονὶ πηκτὸν [S. 339] τόδ' ἔγχος περιπετές κατηγορεῖ. — Zu 3) Europa 41 ἄτε οἱ αἵματος ἔσκειν. — Zu 4) Sophokles Trachin. 650 ἃ δέ οἱ φίλα δάμαρ τάλαιναν δυστάλαινα καρδίαν πάγκλαυτος αἰὲν ὥλλυτο.

Die Inschriften der οἱ anwendenden Dialekte sind unergiebig. Für die Doris liefern nur die epidaurischen reichere Ausbeute, und diese gehören bekanntlich in eine verhältnismässig späte Zeit. Ich zähle in No. 3339 und 3340 Collitz vierzehn οἱ an zweiter, acht οἱ an anderweitiger Stelle. Die wenigen nicht-dorischen Beispiele, die ich zur Hand habe, fügen sich sämtlich der Regel. Tegea 1222, 33 Coll. μή οἱ ἔττω ἰνδικον. Kypros 59, 3 Coll. ἄφ' ὧ φοι τὰς εὐχῶλας ἐπέτυχε oder ἐπέδυκε (vgl. Meister Griech. Dial. II 148. Hoffmann I 67 f.). id. 60, 29 Coll. ἀνοσίῃα φοι γένοιτο.

Nun könnte es aber jemand trotz alledem bemerkenswert finden, dass Thumb jene eigentümliche, angeblich an die Stellung von *sma* im Veda erinnernde Stellungsgewohnheit bei μιν hat aufdecken können, und könnte geneigt sein, doch noch dahinter irgend etwas von Bedeutung zu vermuten. Um darüber Klarheit zu schaffen, scheint es am richtigsten, die von Thumb für μιν gegebene Statistik am Gebrauch von οἱ in NIIP zu messen. Thumb 1<sup>a</sup>: “in 68% sämtlicher Fälle steht μιν hinter einer Partikel”; οἱ in 66 von 92 Fällen, also in 72% (33 mal hinter δέ, wie δέ auch vor μιν am häufigsten vorkommt; daneben in absteigender Häufigkeit hinter ἄρα, ῥα, καί, γάρ, οὐδέ, τε, ἐνθα, ἀλλά, ἦ, μέν, πως, τάχα). — Thumb 1<sup>b</sup>: “in 10% steht μιν hinter einer subordinierenden Konjunktion”; οἱ viermal (hinter ὅ(τ)τι, ἐπεί, ὅφρα), also nur in 4%, eine Differenz, die um so weniger ins Gewicht fällt, als Thumb für diese Kategorie eine Abweichung des μιν von *sma* konstatieren muss, da *sma* solche Stellung nicht liebt. — Thumb 2: “μιν niemals unmittelbar hinter Präpositionen (im Gegensatz zu *sma*!)”; οἱ auch niemals. — Thumb 3: “οὐ μιν, μή μιν in 15 von 600 Beispielen”, also in 2½%; οὐ οἱ, μή οἱ in 3 von 92 Beispielen, also in 3¼%. — Thumb 4: “μιν hinter Pronomina sehr häufig”, wie es scheint ca. 100 mal oder 16⅓%; οἱ auch häufig, nämlich 17 mal, also in 18½%. — Thumb 5 und 6: “μιν hinter Verbum und nominalen Wörtern in 3%”; οἱ hinter αἰπύ N 317, αἵματι P 51, also in 2%.

Die Thumbschen Beobachtungen gelten also gerade so gut für οἱ wie für μιν. Oi findet sich hinter denselben Wör-[S. 340]tern wie μιν und hinter diesen fast genau mit derselben Häufigkeit wie μιν. Wir haben es also bei dem, was Thumb für μιν nachweist, nicht mit irgend etwas für μιν Partikulärem zu thun, sondern mit einer, μιν und οἱ gemeinsamen Konsequenz des Stellungsgesetzes, das ihnen beiden die zweite Stellung im Satz anweist.

Wenn so der Herleitung des μιν aus *sm(a)-im* der Hauptstützpunkt entzogen ist, so wird dieselbe geradezu widerlegt durch das Fehlen jeder Wirkung des an-

geblich ehemals vorhandenen Anlautes *sm-*; man müsste doch bei Homer gelegentlich δέ μιν als Trochäus (oder Spondeus), ἀλλά μιν als Antibacchius (oder Molossus) erwarten; Thumb schweigt sich über diesen Punkt aus. Dazu kommt eine weitere Erwägung. Entweder ist die Zusammenrückung von *sma* und *im*, welche μιν ergeben haben soll, uralt. Dann ist das Vergessen der ursprünglichen Funktion von *sma* in der Anwendung von μιν begreiflich, aber man müsste entsprechend altindischem \**smēm* griechisch \*(c)μαιν erwarten. Oder die Zusammenrückung hat nicht lange vor Homer stattgefunden, in welchem Fall die Anwendung des spezifisch griechischen Elisionsgesetzes, also die Reihe μα ἰν – μ' ἰν – μιν, begreiflich wird: dann versteht man nicht den völligen Untergang der Funktion von (c)μα, die Behandlung von μιν ganz in Weise einer gewöhnlichen Pronominalform, zumal ja im Thessalischen in der Bedeutung 'aber' eine Partikel μα vorkommt, deren Gleichsetzung mit altind. *sma* allerdings bestreitbar ist.

Noch weniger glücklich scheint mir Thumbs Erklärung des dorischen νιν aus *nu-im*, da mir hier unüberwindliche lautliche Schwierigkeiten entgegenzustehen scheinen. Denn wenn er bemerkt: "dass auslautendes *u*, wie im Altindischen (z. B. *kō nv ātra*) vor Vokal unter gewissen Bedingungen ehemals als Konsonant (*u*) gesprochen wurde, darf unbedenklich angenommen werden": und sich hierfür auf Fälle wie πρὸς aus *proti*, εἰν aus *eni*, ὑπεῖρ aus *hyperī* (= altind. *upary* neben *upari*), lesb. πέρρ- aus *peri*- beruft, in denen *i* für *u* in die Zeit der indogermanischen Urgemeinschaft hinaufreiche, so ist dabei übersehen, dass nicht alle auslautenden *-i*, *-u* auf gleiche Linie gestellt werden dürfen. Im Rigveda findet sich Übergang von *-i*, *-u* zu *-y*, *-v* in etwelcher Häufigkeit gerade nur bei der Wortklasse, bei der das Griechische [S. 341] Reflexe solches Übergangs zeigt, nämlich bei den zweisilbigen Präpositionen, wie *abhi*, *prati*, *anu*, *pari*, *adhi*; sonst ausser dem jüngern X. Buch und den Vāḷakhilyas nur ganz sporadisch, bei Einsilblern nur in der Zusammensetzung *avyuṣṭāḥ* 2, 28, 9, und dann in *ny alipsata* 1, 191, 3, also in einem anerkannt späten Liede (Oldenberg Rigveda S. I 438 Anm.). Und speziell *nu* (ähnlich wie *u*) entzieht sich solchem Sandhi durchaus, wird umgekehrt öfters lang und sogar mit Zerdehnung zweisilbig gemessen. Und selbst wenn wir auch trotz alle dem urgriechisches νφιν, woraus dorisch νιν, hinter vokalischem Auslaut konstruieren könnten, so bliebe ein postkonsonantisches νιν doch unverständlich; eine Entwicklungsreihe ὄc νν ἰν, ὄc νφ ἰν, ὄc νιν lässt sich gar nicht denken.

Wenn übrigens Thumb S. 646 andeutet, dass die Stellung von νιν im Satz keine speziellen Analogieen mit derjenigen von altind. *nu*, griech. *νν* aufweise, und dies mit dem geringern Alter der νιν bietenden Sprachquellen (Pindars und der Tragiker) entschuldigt, so ist allerdings wahr, dass diese Autoren nicht bloss aus



### 3 Original text

chronologischen Gründen, sondern auch wegen der grössern Künstlichkeit ihrer Wortstellung kein so reinliches Resultat für νιν liefern können, wie Homer und Herodot für μιν. Aber man wird doch fragen dürfen, ob nicht gewisse Tendenzen zu erkennen sind. Und da ist zu konstatieren, dass an 30 unter 47 äschyleischen Belegstellen νιν dem für μιν und οἱ eruierten Stellungsgesetz folgt, und zwar, was vielleicht beachtenswert ist, an 5 unter 7 in den Persern und den Septem, an 21 unter 32 in der Orestie, in 2 unter 5 im Prometheus. Etwas ungünstiger ist das Verhältnis bei Sophokles, wo von 81 Belegstellen 47 νιν an gesetzmässiger, 34 an ungesetzmässiger Stelle haben. Zu ersterer Klasse gehören die Fälle von Tmesis: Sophokles Antig. 432 *cὺν δὲ νιν θηρώμεθα*. 601 *κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία θεῶν τῶν νεπτέρων ἀμᾶ κοπίς*. Übrigens ist eine Empfindung dafür, welches die eigentliche Stellung von νιν sei, auch sonst lebendig. Vgl. Aristoph. Acharn. 775, besonders aber Eurip. Medea 1258 *ἀλλὰ νιν, ὃ φάος διογενές, κατεῖργε*. Helena 1519 *τίς δὲ νιν ναυκληρία ἐκ τῆςδ' ἀπῆρε χθονός*. Iphig. Aul. 615 *ὑμεῖς δὲ, νεάνιδες, νιν ἀγκάλας ἐπι δέξασθε*. Bacch. 30 *ὦν νιν οὔνεκα κτανεῖν Ζῆν' ἐξεκαυχῶν(ο)*. – Dazu Theokrit. 2, 103 *ἐγὼ δὲ νιν ὡς ἐνόησα*. 6, 11 *τὰ δὲ νιν καλὰ κύματα φαίνει*. Höchst bemerkenswert ist endlich die kürzlich von Selivanov in den athen. Mitteil. XVI 112 ff. herausgegebene alte rhodische Inschrift *cāma τόζ' Ἰδαμενεὺς ποίησα ἵνα κλέος εἴη· Ζεὺς δὲ νιν ὅστις πημαῖνοι, λειώλη θείη*, wo das νιν syntaktisch zu πημαῖνοι gehört, also mit dem oben S. 332 f. erwähnten μιν in Φ 347 *χαίρει δὲ μιν ὅστις ἐθείρη* aufs genaueste zusammenstimmt.

Diese wesentliche Übereinstimmung von νιν und μιν in der Stellung wirkt Thumbs ganze Beweisführung nochmals um. Eines gebe ich ihm allerdings zu, dass μ-iv, ν-iv zu teilen und \*iv der Akk. zu lat. *is*, und das sowohl die Annahme zugrunde liegender Reduplikativbildungen \*ἰμῖμ, \*ἰνῖν, als die Annahme in μιν, νιν enthaltener Stämme *mi-*, *ni-* verkehrt ist. Mir scheint es, bessere Belehrung vorbehalten, am einfachsten μ-, ν- aus dem Sandhi herzuleiten. Wenn es nebeneinander hiess *αὐτίκα-μ-iv* (aus *-kḥm im*) und *αὐτίκα μάν*, ἄρα-μ-iv und ἄρα μάν, ῥα-μ-iv und ῥα μάν (falls man für den Auslaut von ἄρα, ῥα labiale Nasalis sonans annehmen darf), so konnte wohl auch ἀλλά μιν neben ἀλλά μάν sich einstellen und μιν allmählich weiterwuchern; ἀλλά μιν : αὐτίκα μιν = μηκέτι : οὐκέτι. In ähnlicher Weise kann das ν- von νιν auf auslautender dentaler Nasalis sonans beruhen. Vgl. Kuhns Zeitschr. XXVIII 119. 121. 125 über ἄττα aus ττα, οὔνεκα aus ἔνεκα und Verwandtes, sowie auch das prakritische Enklitikum *m-iva*, *mmiva* für sanskr. *iva*, dessen *m* natürlich aus dem Auslaut der Akkusative und der Neutra stammt (Lassen Institut. S. 370). Weiteres Tobler Kuhns Zeitschr. XXIII 423, G. Meyer Berliner philolog. Wochenschrift 1885 S. 943 f., Ziemer ibid. S. 1371, Schuchardt Litt. Blatt für rom. Philologie 1887 Sp. 181, Thielmann Archiv für lat.



Lexikogr. VI 167 Anm.

## II.

Die Vorliebe von  $\mu\upsilon\nu$ ,  $\nu\iota\nu$ ,  $\omicron\iota$  für die zweite Stelle im Satz gehört nun aber in einen grösseren Zusammenhang hinein. Bereits 1877 hat Bergaigne *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique* III 177. 178 darauf hingewiesen, dass die enklitischen Pronominalformen überhaupt “se placent de préférence après le premier mot de la proposition.” Er führt als Belege an A 73 ὃ  $\varsigma\phi\iota\nu$  εὖ  $\phi\rho\nu\omicron\nu\epsilon\omega\nu$  ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν. A 120 ὃ  $\mu\omicron\iota$  γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλη.

Diese Beobachtung bestätigt sich, sobald man anfängt [S. 343] Beispiele zu sammeln. In den von mir zugrunde gelegten Büchern NIP findet sich, um im Anschluss an  $\mu\upsilon\nu$ ,  $\nu\iota\nu$ ,  $\omicron\iota$  mit dem Pronomen der dritten Person zu beginnen, εἶ viermal, allemal an zweiter oder möglichst nahe bei der zweiten Stelle (ich werde im folgenden diesen Unterschied nicht mehr berücksichtigen).  $\varsigma\phi\iota(\nu)$  zwölfmal, und zwar elfmal regelmässig, regelwidrig nur P 736 ἐπὶ δὲ πτόλεμος τέτατό  $\varsigma\phi\iota\nu$  [sic] (beachte auch K 559 τὸν δὲ  $\varsigma\phi\iota\nu$  ἄνακτ' ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης ἔκτανε, wo  $\varsigma\phi\iota\nu$  sich in die Gruppe τὸν δὲ ἄνακτα eingedrängt hat).  $\varsigma\phi\iota\varsigma(\nu)$  sechsmal, immer regelmässig.  $\varsigma\phi\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$  in P 278 μάλα γάρ  $\varsigma\phi\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$  ὥκ' ἐλέλιξεν.  $\varsigma\phi\omega\epsilon$  P 531 εἰ μὴ  $\varsigma\phi\omega$  Ἀἴαντε διέκριναν μεμαῶτε. Aus dem sonstigen homerischen Gebrauch sei das hyperthetische καὶ  $\varsigma\phi\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$   $\phi\omega\nu\eta\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$  ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα angeführt.

Ebenso in der zweiten Person:  $\varsigma\epsilon\omicron$ ,  $\varsigma\epsilon\nu$  findet sich fünfmal, allemal an zweiter Stelle (weitere Beispiele s. unten);  $\tau\omicron\iota$  (bei dem ich aus naheliegenden Gründen die Fälle, wo es als Partikel gilt, mit einrechne, jedoch ohne ἦτοι, ἦτοι) findet sich 47 mal, und zwar 45 mal der Regel gemäss, nur zweimal anders: N 382 ἐπεὶ οὗ  $\tau\omicron\iota$  ἐδνωταὶ κακοὶ εἰμεν, und Π 443 ἀτὰρ οὗ  $\tau\omicron\iota$  πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι. An beiden Stellen hat die schon früher besprochene Tendenz der Negationen die Enklitika an sich anzulehnen die Hauptregel durchkreuzt. —  $\varsigma\epsilon$  findet sich 21 mal, davon 19 mal nach der Regel, zweimal anders: Π 623 εἰ καὶ ἐγὼ  $\varsigma\epsilon$  βάλοιμι, und P 171 ἦ  $\tau'$  ἐφάμην  $\varsigma\epsilon$ .

Ebenso in der ersten Person:  $\mu\epsilon\nu$  findet sich N 626. P 29, an beiden Stellen zunächst dem Satzanfang;  $\mu\omicron\iota$  findet sich mit Einrechnung von ὦμοι 32 mal, davon 27 mal der Regel gemäss, wozu als 28. Beleg wohl P 97 ἀλλὰ τί ἦ  $\mu\omicron\iota$  ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός γεφύγεται. Abweichend sind Π 112 ἔστετε νῦν  $\mu\omicron\iota$  (ἔστετέ νῦν  $\mu\omicron\iota$ ? bei welcher Schreibung diese Stelle zu den regelmässigen Beispielen gehören würde). Π 238 ἦδ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν  $\mu\omicron\iota$  τόδ' ἐπικρήνον ἐλδωρ. Π 523 ἀλλὰ  $\varsigma\upsilon$  πέρ  $\mu\omicron\iota$  ἄναξ τόδε καρτερόν ἔλκος ἄκεσσαι. Π 55 αἰνὸν ἄχος τό  $\mu\omicron\iota$  ἐστιν, Ausnahmen, die weder durch ihre Zahl noch durch ihre Beschaf-

### 3 Original text

fenheit die Regel erschüttern können, während umgekehrt eine Stelle wie T 287 Πάτροκλέ μοι δειλῇ πλείστον κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ, wo der Anschluss von μοι an einen Vokativ schon den Alten auffiel, einen Beleg für die durchgreifende Gültigkeit der Regel liefert. Ähn-[S. 344]lich auffällig ist μοι nach ἄλλ' [sic] ἄγε: α 169. ἄλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ — Endlich με findet sich 15 mal, immer nach der Regel. [Ausnahmen aus den andern Büchern bespricht Monro<sup>2</sup> 336 ff., z. T. mit Änderungsvorschlägen.]

Auch ausserhalb Homers lassen sich Spuren der alten Regel nachweisen. So bei den Elegikern bis Theognis (mit Einschluss desselben), die με 42 mal an zweiter, 4 mal an späterer; μοι 36 mal an zweiter, 5 mal an späterer; ce 27 mal an zweiter, 6 mal an späterer Stelle zeigen. So ferner auch in den von Homer weniger als die Elegiker abhängigen dialektischen Denkmälern. Denn wenn die Arkader ihr cφεῖc ziemlich frei gestellt zu haben scheinen, so stimmt um so besser der dorische Akkusativ τυ: Fragm. lyr. adesp. 43 A (poeta lyr. gr. ed. Bergk 3<sup>4</sup>, S. 701) καὶ τυ φίλιππον ἔθηκεν. Epicharm bei Athen. 4, 139 B ἐκάλεσε γάρ τυ τις; Sophron bei Apollonius de pron. 68 B τί τυ ἐγὼν ποιέω; Aristoph. Acharn. 730 ἐπόθουν τυ ναὶ τὸν φίλιον ἄπερ ματέρα. Dazu der (von Ahrens II 255 nicht erwähnte) dorische Orakelspruch bei Stephanus Byz. 73, 14 M. (aus Ephorus) ποῖ τυ λαβὼν <ἄξω> καὶ ποῖ τυ καθίζω und die Mehrzahl der ungefähr dreissig theokriteischen Beispiele, darunter bemerkenswert 5, 74 μή τυ τις ἡρώτη (= att. μήτις ce εἰρώτα), wo μήτις durch τυ entzwei gesprengt ist, und 1, 82 ἃ δέ τυ κώρα πάσας ἀνὰ κράνας, πάντ' ἄλγεα ποσσὶ φορεῖται ζατεῦc(α), wo das von Brunck aus dem best überlieferten aber unmetrischen τοι sicher hergestellte τυ als Akkusativ zu ζατεῦcα gehört, aber weit davon abstehend ἃ und κώρα von einander trennt. (Die einzige Stelle des Kallimachus epigr. 47 (46), 9 οὐδ' ὅcον ἀττάραγόν τυ δεδοίκαμεc, widerspricht der Regel.) Höchst beachtenswert ist endlich das einzige inschriftliche Beispiel, das ich zur Hand habe: Collitz 3339, 70 (Epidauror) αἶ τυ κα ὑγιῇ ποιήcω (= att. ἐάν ce ὑγιᾶ π.), wo τυ zwischen die sonst eng verbundenen Partikeln αἰ und κα getreten ist. Das einzige abweichende Beispiel der vor-alexandrinischen Zeit, Sophron bei Apollon. de pron. 75 A οὐχ ὁδεῖν τυ ἐπικάζε, kann, solange die Lesung nicht sicher gestellt ist, nicht ins Gewicht fallen.

Ganz nahe zu Homer stellen sich ferner die äolischen Dichter. Ich zähle in deren Fragmenten, die ich nach Bergks Poetae lyri, 4. Aufl., zitiere, 38 (oder je nach der Schreibung von Sappho fragm. 2, 7 und fragm. 100 — siehe gleich [S. 345] nachher — 36) Belege der enklitischen Formen des Personalpronomens. 30 folgen der homerischen Regel, darunter sämtliche sicheren (12) Beispiele von με und sämtliche 10 Beispiele von μοι. Abweichend ist τοι dreimal (Sappho 2,

2. 8. 70, 1) und  $\epsilon\epsilon$  einmal (Sappho 104, 2). Bleiben drei Stellen mit bestrittner Lesung, deren handschriftliche Überlieferung ich zunächst hersetze: Sappho 2, 7  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \epsilon\prime\ \acute{\iota}\delta\omega\ \beta\rho\omicron\chi\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\ \varphi\omega\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\prime\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\iota$ , Sappho 43  $\omicron\tau\alpha\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\chi\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\phi\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota$ , endlich Sappho 100 nach dem volleren Wortlaut bei Choirikios (Oeuvres de Charles Graux II 97) ...  $\epsilon\epsilon\ \tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\omicron}\chi\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\eta}\ \acute{\Lambda}\varphi\rho\omicron\delta\acute{\iota}\tau\eta$ . An der ersten wird nun die von Ahrens vorgeschlagene, von Vahlen in seiner Ausgabe der Schrift  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\upsilon}\psi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  (Kap. 10, 2) gebilligte Lesung  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \epsilon\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \xi\acute{\iota}\delta\omega$ ,  $\beta\rho\omicron\chi\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\ \varphi\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ . nur um so wahrscheinlicher und Seidlers von Bergk und Hiller gebilligte Versetzung des  $\epsilon\epsilon$  hinter  $\beta\rho\omicron\chi\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  und Streichung des  $\mu\epsilon$  nur um so unwahrscheinlicher. Für die zweite Stelle kann ich nun noch bestimmter die KZ. XXVIII 141 geforderte Lesung  $\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\phi\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\chi\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\gamma\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  [sic] als notwendig bezeichnen. Und an der dritten Stelle ergibt sich nun Weils von Hiller (Antholog. lyr. fragm. 97) rezipierte Schreibung  $\tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\kappa\prime\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\omicron}\chi\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\prime\ \acute{\Lambda}\varphi\rho\omicron\delta\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha$  als entschieden unwahrscheinlich.

So kommen wir durch Addition der 30 obigen Fälle, des  $\epsilon\epsilon$  und  $\mu\epsilon$  bei Sappho 47 und des  $\epsilon\phi\iota$  für  $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\phi\iota$  bei Sappho 43 auf 33 regelrechte Beispiele gegenüber 4 regelwidrigen und einem (Sappho 100), wo die Überlieferung uns im Stich lässt und wir nicht einmal wissen, ob wir es mit einem Enklitikum zu thun haben. Ganz ausser Rechnung fällt Alc. 68, wo manche nach Bekker  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\alpha\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\upsilon\varphi\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \epsilon\prime\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \varphi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\varsigma$  schreiben, aber hinter  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  vielmehr  $\delta\prime$  überliefert ist; vgl. was Bergk gegen Bekkers Schreibung bemerkt.

An mancher jener 33 Stellen werden obendrein durch das enklitische Pronomen Wortgruppen durchschnitten: Artikel und Substantiv Sappho 2, 13  $\acute{\alpha}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \mu\prime\ \acute{\iota}\delta\rho\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\chi\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ . 118, 3  $\acute{\Lambda}\theta\iota\omicron\pi\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\ \kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\ \Lambda\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\Lambda}\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma\tau\alpha$ . Attribut und Substantiv Sappho 34, 1  $\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\rho\alpha\ \mu\omicron\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\varphi\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\omicron\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$ . Präposition und Verba Alcaeus 95  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \mu\prime\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ . Vgl. auch Sappho 2, 5  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\ \mu\omicron\iota\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$  und 2, 7  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \epsilon\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ , wo  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$  und  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  auf die Stelle hinter  $\tau\acute{\omicron}$ , bzw.  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  Anspruch gehabt hätten. Ebenfalls beachtenswert sind die Fälle, wo das Pronomen in sonst auffälliger Weise von den Wörtern abgetrennt [S. 346] ist, zu denen es syntaktisch gehört: Sappho 1, 19  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \epsilon\prime\ \acute{\omega}\ \Psi\acute{\alpha}\pi\varphi\prime\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\epsilon\iota$ . 104, 1,  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varphi\ \epsilon\prime\ \acute{\omega}\ \varphi\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\rho\epsilon$ ,  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\delta\omega$ . 88  $\tau\acute{\iota}\ \mu\epsilon\ \Pi\alpha\nu\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\nu\nu\alpha\ \chi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\nu$ . An einen satzeinleitenden Vokativ ist  $\mu\omicron\iota$  angelehnt Sappho 45  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\ \delta\acute{\eta}$ ,  $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\ \delta\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\mu\omicron\iota\ \varphi\omega\nu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\epsilon\kappa\alpha\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\omicron$ . Endlich verweise ich auf Sappho 6  $\acute{\eta}\ \epsilon\epsilon\ \text{Κύπρος ἢ Πάφος ἢ Πάνορμος}$ .

Allgemein üblich ohne Unterschied der Dialekte ist es, das archaische (Klein Die griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen<sup>2</sup> S. 13)  $\mu\epsilon$  in Weih- und Künstlerinschriften gleich hinter das erste Wort zu setzen. Es wird dienlich sein, die Beispiele vollständig zusammen zu stellen.

Ich beginne mit  $\mu\prime\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon$ : Attika Corpus inscript. att. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 87 - $\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\prime$

3 *Original text*

ἀνέθηκεν. 373, 90 Ὀνήσιμος μ' ἀνέθηκεν ἀπαρχὴν τάθηναια ὁ Σμικύθου υἱός. 373, 120 [ὁ δεῖνα] μ' ἀνέθηκεν δεκάθην (sic!) Ἀθηναία. Inscript. graecae antiq. 1 (attisch oder euböisch) Σημωνίδης μ' ἀνέθηκεν. Vgl. 373, 100 [Στρόγ]γυλός μ' ἀνέθηκε, wo jedoch ein Dativ vorausgeht. Vielfach auch in Versen (obwohl hier natürlich Gegenbeispiele nicht fehlen: CIA. 1, 343. 374. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 81 u. s. w.): CIA. 1, 349 -θάνης μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ἀθηναία[ι πολιούχῃ]. 352 Ἰφιδίκη μ' ἀνέθηκεν, 4<sup>2</sup> 373, 85 Ἀλκίμαχος μ' ἀ[νέθηκε]. 373, 99 Τίμαρχος μ' ἀνέθηκε Διὸς κρατερόφρονι κούρη. 373, 215 (Vgl. Studnitzka Jahrbuch des archäol. Instituts II (1887) 145) Νησιάδης κεραμεύς με καὶ Ἀνδοκίδης ἀνέθηκεν. 373, 216 Παλλάδι μ' ἐγρεμάχα Διονύσιο[ς τό]δ' ἄγαλμα τήγχε Κολοίου παῖς [εὐξά]μενος δεκάτην. 373, 218 ἀνέθηκε δέ μ' Εὐδίκου υἱός. Inschrift von der Akropolis ed. Foucart Bull. de Corresp. hellén. 13, 160 [Ἐρμό?]δωρός μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ἀφροδίτῃ δῶρον ἀπαρξήν. — Böotien: Inschrift nach Reinach behandelt von Kretschmer Hermes XXVI 123 ff. Τιμασίφιλος μ' ἀνέθεικε τῷπόλλωνι τοῖ Πτωεῖ ὁ Πραόλλειος. — Korinth (von hier an scheide ich die poetischen und die prosaischen Inschriften nicht mehr): IGA. 20, 7 Σιμίων μ' ἀνέθηκε Ποτειδάφων[ι φάνακτι]. 20, 8 -ων μ' ἀνέθηκε Ποτειδᾶνι φάν[ακτι]. 20, 9 (= 10 = 11) Φλέβων μ' ἀνέθηκε Ποτειδᾶ[νι]. 20, 42 Δόρκων μ' ἀνέθηκ[ε]. 20, 43 Ἰγρων μ' ἀν[έθηκε]. 20, 47 Κυλοῖδας μ' ἀνέθηκε. 20, 48 Εὐρυμήδης μ' ἀνέθηκε. 20, 49 Λυσιάδας μ' [ἀνέθηκε]. 20, 83 — μ' ἀνέθ[ηκε]. 20, 87 und 89 -ς μ' ἀνέθηκε. 20, 87<sup>a</sup> — με ἀνέθ(η)κε τῷ. 20, 94 — μ' ἀνέθηκε. 20, 102 [Π]έριλός μ' —. — Korkyra: IGA. 341 (= 3187 Collitz) Λοφίος μ' ἀνέθηκε. [S. 347] — Hermione: Kaibel 926 [Παν]τακλῆς μ' ἀνέθηκεν. — Kyra bei Aegina: Inschrift ed. Jamot Bull. Corr. hellén. 13, 186 οἱ φρουροὶ μ' ἀ[νέθεσαν?]. — Lakonien: IGA. 62<sup>a</sup> (S. 174) Πλεισιτιάδας μ' ἀ[νέθηκε] Διοσκώροισιν ἄ[γαλμα]. — Naxos: IGA 407 Νικάνδρῳ μ' ἀνέθηκεν ἐκηβόλῳ ἰοχεαίρῃ. 408 Δειναγόρῃ μ' ἀνέθηκεν ἐκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι. In Delos gefundene Inschrift ed. Homolle Bull. Corresp. hellén. 12, 464 f. Εἰ(θ)υκαρτίδης [sic] μ' ἀνέθηκε ὁ Νάξιος ποιήσας. — Samos: IGA. 384 Χηραμύς μ' ἀνέθ(η)κεν τῇρῃ ἄγαλμα. Röhl ergänzt am Anfang [Ἐνθάδε] und bemerkt: “Primam vocem versus hexametri utrum is qui inscripsit an is qui descripsit titulum omiserit, nunc in medio relinquo”. Sicher weder der eine noch der andere. Nicht der Urheber der Abschrift: Dümmler bemerkt mir, dass der von ihm gesehene Abklatsch keine Spur einer [sic] vor Χηραμύς einst vorhandenen Wortes aufweise. Aber auch nicht der Steinmetz: weder der Sinn noch, wie man nun besser als vor zehn Jahren weiss, das Metrum verlangen eine Ergänzung; und die Stellung des με schliesst ein [sic] solche aus. — Kalymna: Kaibel 778 Νικίας με ἀνέθηκεν Ἀπόλλωνι υἱός Θρακυμήδεος. — Kypros: Inschrift bei Hoffmann Die griech. Dialekte 1, 85 No. 163 [—] μ' ἀ(νέ)θηκαν τῷ Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι. Kaibel 794 (1. Jahrhundert n. Ch.) [Κεκρο]πίδης μ' ἀνεθηκε. — Achäisch (Gross-

griechenland): IGA. 543 Κυνίκκος με ἀνέθηκεν ὄρταμος φέργων δεκάταν. — Syrakus: Inscriptiones Graecae Siciliae ed. Kaibel 5 Ἀλκιάδης μ' ἀνέθηκεν]. — Naukratis: Naukratis I by Flinders Petrie (die Inschriften von Gardner S. 60—63) No. 5 Παρμένωνμ (sic!) με ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι (sic!). 24 -c με ἀνέθηκε]. 80 -c με ἀνέθηκεν τῶπόλλωνι]. 114 -ων με ἀνέθηκε]. 137 -c μ' ἀνέθηκε]. 177 Πρώταρχος με ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι. 186 [Π]ρώταρχος με ἀνέθηκε]. 202 [ὁ δεινα] με ἀνέθηκε. 218 Φάνης με ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι τῷ Μιλησίῳ ὁ Γλαύκου. 220 Χαριδίων με ἀνέθηκε]. 223 [Πολύ]κεστός μ' ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι]. 235 Σλήης μ' ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι. 237 [Χ]αρ(ό)φης με ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι τῷ Μιλασίῳ. 255 -ης μ' ἀνέθηκε. 259 -c μ' ἀνέθηκε]. 326 Ναύπλιος με ἀνέθηκε [sic]. 327 -δης μ' ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι. 446 -c με ἀνέθηκε]. id. vol. II (by Gardner) S. 62—69: No. 701 Σώτρατος μ' ἀνέθηκεν τήφροδιτη. 709 -ος μ' ἀνέθηκε τῇ [Ἰ] Ἀφροδίτῃ ἐπὶ τῇ —. 717 Καϊκός μ' ἀνέθηκεν. 720 -ορος μ' ἀνέθηκεν]. 722 Μυός μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ὀνομακρίτου. 723 Ἄκος [S. 348] μ' ἀνέθηκεν. 734 -ναξ μ' ἀνέθηκεν]. 736 -ων με ἀνέθηκεν]. 738 [ὁ δεινα] μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ἀφροδίτη (?). 742 -ηλός μ' ἀνέθηκεν. 748 Ἑρμιφάνης μ' ἀνέθηκεν τήφροδιτη. 770 -μης με ἀνέθηκε τήφροδιτη]. 771 Χάρμης με ἀνέθηκεν]. 775 [Κ]λεόδημος με ἀνέθηκε τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ. 776—777 Χάρμης με ἀνέθηκε τήφροδιτη (bezw. τῇ Ἀ.) εὐχολήν. 778 Ροϊκός μ' ἀνέθηκε τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ. 780 Φιλίς μ' ἀνέθηκε τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ. 781 Θούτιμος με ἀνέθηκεν]. 785 [ὁ δεινα] μ' ἀνέθηκε τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ. 794 Πολύερμος μ' ἀνέθηκε τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ. 799 Ὠχίλος μ' ἀνέθηκε. 817 [ὁ δεινα] καὶ Χρυσόδοτος με ἀνέθηκεν]. 819 [Λ]άκρι(τ)ός μ' ἀνέθηκε οὐρμό[θ]έμ[ιος] τήφροδιτη]. 876 Ἑρμαγόρης μ' ἀνέθηκε ὁ Τήιος τῶπόλλωνι (Vers!). 877 Πύρρος με ἀνέθηκεν. [Metapont: 1643 Coll. ὁ [sic] τοι κεραμεύς μ' ἀνέθηκε.]

Von der Norm weichen ab (ausser einigen poetischen Inschriften, siehe oben S. 343) bloss Naukratis 1, 303 [ὁ δεινα ἀνέθηκε] με und 307 [ὁ δεινα ἀνέθηκε] με, beide Inschriften, wie sich nun ergibt, falsch ergänzt, und die zweizeilige Inschrift Naukratis 2, 750, wo die obere Linie [τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ], die untere Ἑρμαγαθίνος μ' ἀνέθηκεν] bietet. Gardner liest danach τῇ Ἀ. Ἐ. μ' ἀνέθηκεν. Aber Dümmler bemerkt mir, dass die obere Zeile, weil kürzer und den Raum nicht ausfüllend, nicht die erste Zeile sein könne, sondern offenbar den Schluss der untern längern Zeile bilde. Folglich muss, schon ganz abgesehen von unsererstellungsregel, Ἑρμαγαθίνος μ' ἀνέθηκε [τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ] gelesen werden.

Ganz Analoges gilt für die mit Synonymis von ἀνέθηκε gebildeten Aufschriften: με κατέθηκε Kypros: Deecke 1 Κάς με κατέθηκε τῷ Παφίῳ Ἀφροδίτῃ. 2 αὐτάρ με κατέθηκε Ὀνασίθεμις. 3 αὐτάρ με [κατέθηκε Ὀνασίθεμις]. 15 αὐτάρ με κατέθηκε [Α]κεστόθεμις. — Naukratis II No. 790 [ὁ δεινα με ἀνέθηκε] ὁ [sic]

### 3 Original text

Μυτιλήναιος. 840 Νέαρχος με κά[θθηκε το]ῖς Δ[ιοκόροις]. — μ' ἐπέθηκε Ae-gina: IGA. 362 Διότημός μ' ἐπέθηκε. — με (κατ)έτασε Kypros: Deecke 71 κά μεν ἔτασαν [κα]ρίγητοι (Vers!). Hoffmann I 46 No. 67 Γιλ(λ)ίκα με κατέτασε ὁ [sic] Στασικρέτεος. — με ἔφεξε Kypros: Hoffmann I 46 No. 66 [αὐ]τάρ με ἔφεξε [Ονασί]θεμις. — μ' ἔδωκε Sikyon: IGA. 22 Ἐπαίνετός μ' ἔδωκεν Χαρόπῳ. Abwei-chend die böotische Inschrift IGA. 219 Χάρης ἔδωκεν Εὐπλοίωνί με. Wozu Röhl: "Versu trimetro dedicationem includere studuit Chares, sed male ei cessit." (Vgl. übrigens auch die Stel-[S. 349]lung von coi in der attischen Inschrift IGA. 2 τηνδὶ coi Θοῦδημος δίδωμι.)

In poetischen Weihinschriften findet sich so gestelltes με bis in die Kaiserzeit: Kaibel 821 Βάκχῳ μ[ε] Βάκχον καὶ προσμυναίᾳ θεῶ στάσαντο. 822, 9 Δαδοῦχος με Κόρης, Βασιλᾶν, Διός, ἱερὰ σηκῶν Ἥρας κλειῖθρα φέρων βωμὸν ἔθηκε Ῥήη. 877<sup>b</sup> (S. XIX) ἄνθετο μέν μ' Ἐπίδαυρος. Vgl. 868 Ἀσκληπιοῦ με δμῶα πυρφόρο[ν θεοῦ oder ξένη] Πείκωνα λεύσσεις. (Mit anderer Stellung von με Kaibel 809, 813, 843.)

Ganz ebenso die Künstlerinschriften [sic]: μ' ἐποίησε, μ' ἐποίηι: CIA. 4<sup>2</sup> 373, 206 [Ε]ὐθυκλῆς μ' ἐποίησεν. IGA. 492 (attische Inschrift von Sigeum) καὶ μ' ἐπο(ι)ῶν Αἰώπος καὶ ἀδελφοί. CIA. 1, 466 Ἀριτίων μ' ἐποίησεν. 1, 469 (vgl. Löwy Inschrif-ten griechischer Bildhauer S. 15) Ἀριτίων Πάρι[ός μ' ἐπ]ό[η]σε (die Ergänzung sicher!). IGA. 378 (Thasos) Παρμένων με ἐ[ποίησε]. IGA. 485 (Milet) Εὐδημός με ἐποίησεν. IGA. 557 (Elis?) Κοῖός μ' ἀποίησεν. IGA. 22 (= Klein Griechische Vasen mit Meistersignaturen S. 40) Ἐξηκίας μ' ἐποίησε. Klein S. 41 Ἐξηκίας μ' ἐποίησεν εὖ. S. 31 Θεόζοτος μ' ἐποίησε. S. 34 Ἐργότιμος μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 43, 45 (bis!), 48 Ἀμασίς μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 48 Χόλχος μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 66 -ς μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 71 Νικοσθένης μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 75 Ἀνακλῆς με ἐποίησεν. S. 75 Νικοσθένης με ἐποίησεν. S. 76 Ἀρχεκλῆς μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 77 Γλαυκίτης μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 84 (bis!) Τληπόλεμος μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 85 Γάγρεος μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 90 Πανφαῖός μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 213 Λυκίας μ' ἐποίησεν ἡμιχώνη. Dazu die metrische Aufschrift IGA. 536 [Γλαυκία]ι με Κάλων γε[νεῖ] ἀλει[ο]ς ἐποίηι. Dagegen kommt Löwy No. 411 [Ἀρτέ]μων με ἐποίησε durch die Behandlung der Inschrift bei Köhler CIA. 2, 1181 in Wegfall. — Der Regel widerspricht Klein S. 51 Χαριταῖος ἐποίησεν με. Hier hat wohl <ἐ>μέ ent-weder ursprünglich dagestanden oder ist wenigstens beabsichtigt gewesen. (Vgl. über ἐμέ unten S. 351).

μ' ἔγραψε, μ' ἔγραφε: IGA. 20, 102 (Korinth) -ων μ' [ἔγραψε] nach der Ergän-zung von Blass No. 3119e Collitz. Kyprische Inschrift bei Hoffmann I 90 No. 189 -οικός με γράφει Σελαμίνιος. Klein S. 29 Τιμωνίδας μ' ἔγραφε. S. 30 Χάρης μ' ἔγραψε. S. 38 Νέαρχος μ' ἔγραψεν καὶ <ἐποίησεν>. — Abweichend IGA. 474 (Kreta) -μων ἔγραφέ με. Doch lässt sich diese Ausnahme leicht durch die Schrei-



bung ἔγραψ' ἐμέ beseitigen. Vergleiche die Inschrift bei Klein S. 40 κάποις [S. 350] ἐμέ mit eben solcher Elision, wo ἐμέ durch andere Aufzeichnungen derselben Inschrift mit ἐπόησε ἐμέ gesichert ist. [Vgl. in Betr. des inschriftlichen με noch die Nachträge.]

Zu den auf Steinen und Vasen überlieferten Inschriften mit με kommen einige z. T. recht alte von Pausanias aus Olympia beigebrachte hinzu. 5, 25, 13 = 8, 42, 10 (aus Thasos) υἱός μὲν με Μίκωνος Ὀνάτας ἐξετέλεσεν. 6, 10, 7 (5. Jahrhundert) Κλεοσθένης μ' ἀνέθηκεν ὁ Πόντιος ἐξ Ἐπιδάμνου. 6, 19, 6 (altattisch) Ζηνί μ' ἄγαλμ' ἀνέθηκαν. In dem Epigramm bei Paus. 5, 23, 7 Zeile 3 καὶ μετρεῖτ' Ἀρίστων ἡδὲ Τελέστας αὐτοκαίγνητοι καλὰ Λάκωνες \*ἔσαν verbessert F. Dümmler nach freundlicher Mitteilung καὶ με Κλειτορίοις Ἀρίστων κτλ. — Hierher gehören auch die von Herodot 5, 59 und 5, 60 aus dem Ismenion beigebrachten Aufschriften Ἀμφιτρώων μ' ἀνέθηκεν \*ἔων ἀπὸ Τηλεβοάων und Σκαῖος πυγμαχέων με ἐκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι νικήσας ἀνέθηκε, letztere die einzige regelwidrige in dieser Gruppe, zudem, weil metrisch, nicht schwer ins Gewicht fallend.

Auch die jüngern Epigrammatiker haben, wo sie das altertümliche με für ihre gedichteten Aufschriften anwandten, sich mit auffälliger Strenge an die Norm gehalten: Kallimachus Epigr. 23 (21 Wilamowitz), 1 ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα, Καλλιμάχου με ἴσθι Κυρηναίου παιδὰ τε καὶ γενέτην. 36 (34 W.), 1 τίν με, λεοντάγχ' ὦνα κυοκτόνε, φήγινον ὄζον θῆκε. 50 (49 W.), 1 τῆς Ἀγοράνακτος με λέγε, ξένε, κωμικὸν ὄντως ἀγκεῖσθαι νίκης μάρτυρα τοῦ Ῥοδίου Πάμφιλον. 56 (55), 1 τῷ με Κανωπίτῃ Καλλίστιον εἵκοσι μύσαις πλούσιον ἢ Κριτίου λύχνον ἔθηκε θεῷ. Fragm. 95 (Laertius Diog. 1, 29) Θαλῆς με τῷ μεδεῦντι Νεῖλεω δήμου δίδωσι, τοῦτο δις λαβὼν ἀριστεῖον. — Anthol. Pal. 6, 49 (Athen. 6, 232 B) καὶ μ' ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ θῆκεν πόδας ὦκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς. 6, 178, 1 δέξαι μ' Ἡράκλεις Ἀρχεστράτου ἱερὸν ὄπλον. — Abweichend, doch nur unbedeutend abweichend 6, 209 1 Βιθυνὶς Κυθήρη με τῆς ἀνεθήκατο, Κύπρι, μορφῆς εἰδωλὸν λύγδινον εὐξαμένη. 6, 239, 1 σμήνεος ἔκ με ταμῶν γλυκερὸν θέρος ἀντὶ νομαίων γηραιὸς Κλείτων σπεῖσε μελισσοπόνος. 6, 261, 1 χάλκεον ἀργυρέῳ με πανεῖκελον, Ἰνδικὸν ἔργον, ὄλπην — — πέμπεν γηθομένη σὺν φρενὶ Κριναγόρης. Dagegen wird für 6, 138, 1 πρὶν μὲν Καλλιτέλης μ' ἰδρύσατο die Überlieferung des Palatinus durch das auf einem Stein zum Vorschein gekommene Original [S. 351] CIA. 1, 381 = Kaibel 758 widerlegt, das kein μ' bietet. Hieraus ergibt sich auch für 6, 140, 1 παιδὶ φιλοστεφάνῳ Σεμέλας <μ'> ἀνέθηκε das von Hecker ergänzte μ' als überflüssig.

Unsere Durchmusterung der Inschriften mit με ergibt also, dass dasselbe bei poetischer Fassung mit Vorliebe, bei prosaischer so gut wie ausnahmslos an zweite Stelle gesetzt wurde. Denn wenn wir IGA. 474 ἔγραψ' ἐμέ abteilen, Naukratis 1, 303 und 307, wo bloss ME bzw. EME überliefert ist, als ganz unsicher

### 3 Original text

bei Seite lassen, endlich Naukratis 2, 750 die vom Schreiber der Inschrift wirklich gemeinte Wortfolge wiederherstellen, so bleiben nur IGA. 219 Χάρης ἔδωκεν Εὐπλοίωνί με, was zwar nicht ein Vers ist, aber ein Vers sein will, und Klein S. 51 Χαριταῖος ἐποίησέν με übrig. Letzteres ist also die einzige wirkliche Ausnahme; um so näher liegt die Vermutung eines Fehlers.

Andrerseits erhält unsre Regel noch weitere Bestätigung. Erstens dadurch, dass auch sonst in archaischen Inschriften, in welchen das Denkmal oder der durch das Denkmal Geehrte spricht, με die zweite Stelle hat: IGA. 473 (Rhodus) Κορμία ἡμί, ἄγε δέ με Κλιτομία. 524 (Cumae) = Inscript. Siciliae ed. Kaibel 865 ὁς δ' ἄν με κλέψει, —. Zweitens (um dies einem spätern Abschnitt vorwegzunehmen) durch die analogen lateinischen Inschriften: *Manios med fefaked*, *Duenos med feced*, *Novios Plautios med Romai fecid*.

Besonders belehrend sind aber die paar Inschriften mit ἐμέ. Zweimal steht dieses ἐμέ auch an zweiter Stelle: IGA. 20, 8 (Korinth) Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐμέ ἀνέθ[ηκε] und Gazette archéol. 1888 S. 168 Μενάιδας ἐμ' ἐποί(ε)σε Χάροπ[ι]. Aber sechsmal steht ἐμέ anders: Klein S. 39 Ἐξεκίας ἔγραψε κάπο(ε)σε ἐμέ (Vers?) S. 40 Ἐξεκίας ἔγραψε κά(ι)ποί(ε)ς ἐμέ (Vers?). S. 51 Χαριταῖος ἐποίησεν ἔμ' εὖ. S. 82 Ἑρμογένης ἐποίησεν ἐμέ. S. 83 Ἑρμογένης ἐποίησεν ἐνέ (liess ἐμέ). S. 85 Σακωνίδης ἔγραψεν ἐμέ. Diese Stellen zeigen, dass die regelmässige Stellung von με hinter dem ersten Wort nicht zufällig und dass sie durch seine enklitische Natur bedingt ist. [Vgl. noch die Nachträge.]

## III.

Wichtiger für diese Frage (wie überhaupt für jede über etymologische Spielereien hinausreichende Sprachforschung) sind natürlich die umfangreicheren Texte der ionischen und [S. 352] der attischen Litteratur, vor allem wieder Herodot. So wenig allerdings, als bei μιν und οἱ, hat er bei den übrigen enklitischen Pronomina die alte Regel festgehalten.

Im siebenten Buche des Herodot findet sich cφεων 13 mal, davon 6 mal an zweiter Stelle; cφι 70 mal, davon 46 mal an zweiter Stelle; cφεας 32 mal, davon 20 mal an zweiter Stelle; cφεα 1 mal, nicht an zweiter Stelle. Also von 116 Stellen, wo cφ-Formen vorliegen, folgen 72 der Regel, also ca. 62%. Unvollständige Sammlungen aus den übrigen Büchern ergaben ein analoges Verhältnis.

Im Pronomen der zweiten Person haben wir in Herodot VII. cεο einmal, regelmässig; τοι (mit Ausschluss der Fälle, wo es deutlich Partikel ist) 45 mal, davon 18—20 mal an zweiter Stelle; cε 16 mal, davon 10 mal an zweiter Stelle. — Im Pronomen der ersten Person: μεο 3 mal, hiervon einmal regelmässig; μοι 37 mal,



davon 24 mal an zweiter Stelle, wenn man 15, 6 ἔγνων δὲ ταῦτά μοι ποιητέα ἔοντα. 47, 8 φέρε τοῦτό μοι ἀτρεκέως εἰπέ. 103, 3 ἄγε εἰπέ μοι hierher stellen darf; με 6 mal, davon zweimal regelmässig. Also in der ersten und zweiten Person haben wir 58 mal regelmässige, 50 mal regelwidrige Stellung.

Es ergibt sich aus dieser Statistik zwar mit völliger Klarheit, dass die alte Regel bei Herodot nicht mehr ohne weiters gilt, dass andere Stellungsregeln in Wirkung getreten sind. Aber zugleich auch, dass trotz und neben diesen neuern Regeln die alte Regel doch noch Kraft genug hat, um in mehr als der Hälfte der Fälle die Stellung des Pronomens zu bestimmen: freilich sind in dieser grössern Hälfte die Beispiele mit begriffen, wo für das Pronomen die zweite Stelle im Satz auch nach den jüngern Regeln das Natürliche war.

Bei den Attikern lassen Zählungen, die ich vorgenommen habe, auf ein noch weiteres Zurückgehen der alten Regel schliessen. Aber unverkennbare Spuren derselben finden sich in bestimmten Wendungen und Wortverbindungen auch noch bei ihnen, wie bei Herodot und überhaupt den nachhomerischen Autoren.

Jedem Leser der attischen Redner muss es auffallen, wie häufig der Aufforderungssatz, wodurch die Verlesung einer Urkunde oder das Herbeirufen von Zeugen veranlasst werden soll, mit καὶ μοι beginnt, ja man kann sagen, dass wenn er [S. 353] überhaupt mit καὶ beginnt und μοι enthält, μοι sich ausnahmslos unmittelbar an καὶ anschliesst. Ich ordne die Beispiele nach der Chronologie der Redner, und die Wendungen nach der Zeit des ältesten Beispiels.

καὶ μοι κάλει mit folgendem Objekt Andoc. 1, 14. 1, 28. 1, 112. Lys. 13, 79. 17, 2. 17, 3. 17, 9. 19, 59, 31, 16. Isocrates 17, 12. 17, 16. 18, 8. 18, 54. Isaeus 6, 37. 7, 10. 8, 42. 10, 7. Demosth. 29, 12. 29, 18. 41, 6. 57, 12. 57, 38. 57, 39. 57, 46. [Demosth.] 44, 14. 44, 44. 58, 32. 58, 33. 59, 25. 59, 28. 59, 32. 59, 34. 59, 40. Aeschines 1, 100. Oder mit andrer Stellung des Objekts καὶ μοι μάρτυρας τούτων κάλει Antiphon 5, 56; καὶ μοι ἀπάντων τούτων τοὺς μάρτυρας κάλει Andoc. 1, 127; καὶ μοι τούτους κάλει πρῶτον Isäus 5, 11.

καὶ μοι λαβὲ καὶ ἀνάγνωθι mit folgendem Objekt Andoc. 1, 13. 1, 15.

καὶ μοι ἀνάγνωθι mit folgendem Objekt Andoc. 1, 34. 1, 76. 1, 82. 1, 85. 1, 86. 1, 87. 1, 96. Lysias 10, 14. 10, 15. 13, 35. 13, 50. 14, 8. Isokrates 15, 29. 17, 52. Isaeus 5, 2 bis. 5, 4. 6, 7. 6, 8. [Demosth.] 34, 10. 34, 11. 34, 20. 34, 39. 43, 16. 46, 26. 47, 17. 47, 20. 47, 40. 47, 44. 48, 30. 59, 52. Aeschines 3, 24. Oder mit andrer Stellung des Objekts καὶ μοι τὰς μαρτυρίας ἀνάγνωθι ταύτας (ταυτασί) Isaeus 2, 16. 2, 34; καὶ μοι τούτων ἀνάγνωθι τὴν μαρτυρίαν [Demosth.] 50, 42; καὶ μοι λαβὼν ἀνάγνωθι πρῶτον τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον Demosth. 57, 31. Ohne Objekt [Demosth.] 47, 24.

καὶ μοι ἀνάβητε μάρτυρες (oder τούτων μάρτυρες) Lysias 1, 29. 1, 42. 13, 64.

### 3 Original text

16, 14. 16, 17. 32, 27; contra Aeschinem Fr. 1 (Orat. att. ed. Sauppe 2, 172, 26) bei Athen. 13, 612 F. Isokrates 17, 37. 17, 41; καί μοι τούτων ἀνάβητε μάρτυρες Isokr. 17, 14; καί μοι ἀνάβητε δεῦρο Lysias 20, 29; καί μοι ἀνάβηθι Lysias 16, 13. Isokr. 17, 32.

καί μοι δεῦρ' ἴτε μάρτυρες Lysias 1, 10.

καί μοι λαβέ mit folgendem Objekt Lysias 9, 8. Isokr. 18, 19. 19, 14. Isaeus 6, 16. 6, 48. 8, 17. 12, 11. Lykurg 125. Demosth. 18, 222. 30, 10. 30, 32. 30, 34. 31, 4. 36, 4. 41, 24. 41, 28. 55, 14. 55, 35. 57, 19. 57, 25. [Demosth.] 34, 7. 34, 17. 44, 14. 48, 3. 58, 51. 59, 87. 59, 104. Aeschines 2, 65; καί μοι πάλιν λαβέ [Demosth.] 58, 49.

καί μοι ἀπόκριναι Lysias 13, 32.

[S. 354] καί μοι ἐπίλαβε τὸ ὕδωρ Lysias 23, 4. 23, 8. 23, 11. 23, 14. 23, 15.

καί μοι ἀναγίγνωσκε mit folgendem Objekt Demosth 27, 8. [Demosth.] 35, 27.

καί μοι λέγε mit folgendem Objekt Demosth. 19, 130. 19, 154. 19, 276. 18, 53. 18, 83. 18, 105. 18, 163. 18, 218. 32, 13. 37, 17. 38, 3. 38, 14. [Demosth.] 34, 9. 56, 38. Aeschines 2, 91. 3, 27. 3, 32. 3, 39.

καί μοι φέρε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ τότε γεγόμενον Demosth. 18, 179.

Abweichend ist blos [sic] Aeschines 1, 50 καί τελευταίαν δέ μοι λαβέ τὴν αὐτοῦ Μισγόλα μαρτυρίαν. Hier haben wir aber nicht blosses καί, sondern καί — δέ. Und vor diesem δέ, also hinter καί, war ein stark betontes Wort erforderlich, somit μοι unmöglich.

Aber auch ausserhalb dieser rednerischen Wendung ist καί μοι am Anfang von Sätzen in der ganzen nachhomerischen Litteratur merkwürdig häufig (vgl. Blass zu Demosth. 18, 199). Hier ein paar Beispiele; jedes Schriftwerk bietet solche. Archilochus Fragm. 22 Bgk. καί μ' οὐτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει. 45 καί μοι κύμμαχος γουνουμένω ἴλαος γενεῦ. Sappho Fragm. 79 καί μοι —. Solon bei Aristoteles Ἀθηναίων πολιτ. 14, 3 Kenyon. γιγνώσκω, καί μοι φρενὸς ἔνδοθεν ἄλγεα κεῖται, πρεσβυτάτην ἑσπορῶν γαῖαν Ἰαονίας. Theognis 258 καί μοι τοῦτ' ἀνιηρότατον. 1199 καί μοι κραδίην ἐπάταξε μέλαιναν. Sophokles Elektra 116 καί μοι τὸν ἐμὸν πέμψατ' ἀδελφόν. id. Λαριτσαῖοι Fragm. 349 Nauck καί μοι τρίτον ῥίπτοντι Δωτιεὺς ἀνὴρ ἀγχοῦ προσῆψεν Ἑλατος ἐν δισκήματι. Herodot 7, 9<sup>a</sup> 7 καί μοι μέχρι Μακεδονίης ἐλάσαντι οὐδεὶς ἠντιώθη. 7, 152, 13 καί μοι τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος ἐχέτω ἐς πάντα λόγον. Euripides Medea 1222 καί μοι τὸ μὲν σὺν ἐκποδῶν ἔστω λόγου. Thucyd. 1, 137, 4 καί μοι εὐεργεσία ὀφείλεται. Aristoph. Ran. 755 καί μοι φράσων. Ekkles. 47 καί μοι δοκεῖ κατὰ χολὴν παρὰ τάνδρὸς ἐξελθεῖν μόνη. Plato Apologie 21 D καί μοι ταῦτά ταῦτα ἔδοξε. 25 A (= Gorg. 462 B) καί μοι ἀπόκριναι. 31 E καί μοι μὴ ἄχθεσθε λέγοντι τάληθῃ. Phaedo 60 C καί μοι δοκεῖ (scil. Αἰώπος) — μῦθον ἂν συνθεῖναι. 63 A καί μοι δοκεῖ Κέβης εἰς σὲ τείνειν τὸν λόγον. (97 D καί μοι φράσκειν.) 98 C καί μοι ἔδοξεν (scil. Ἀναξαγόρας)

ὁμοιότατον πεπονθέναι. Sympos. 173 B καί μοι ὠμολόγει. [S. 355] 189 B καί μοι ἔστω ἄρρητα τὰ εἰρημένα. 218 C καί μοι φαίνῃ ὀκνεῖν. Gorgias 449 C καί μοι ἐπίδειξιν αὐτοῦ τούτου ποιῆσαι. 482 A καί μοι ἔστιν τῶν ἐτέρων παιδικῶν πολὺ ἦττον ἔμπληκτος. 485 B καί μοι δοκεῖ δουλοπρεπές τι εἶναι. 492 D = 494 B καί μοι λέγε. 499 C καί μοι ὥσπερ παιδὶ χρῆ. Charmides 157 B καί μοι πάνυ σφόδρα ἐνετέλλετο. Sophistes 216 B καί μοι δοκεῖ θεὸς μὲν ἀνὴρ οὐδαμῶς εἶναι. 233 D καί μοι πειρῶ προσέχων τὸν νοῦν εὖ μάλα ἀποκρίνασθαι, wo μοι vom regierenden Verbum durch πειρῶ getrennt ist. Leges 1, 642 C καί μοι νῦν ἢ τε φωνὴ προσφιλεῖς ὑμῶν. Demosth. 18, 280 καί μοι δοκεῖς προελέσθαι. Philemon Fragm. 4, 4 Kock (2 S. 479) καί μοι λέγειν τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἄρμοστόν, Σόλων. Kallimachus Epigr. 41 (40 Wilamow.), 5 καί μοι τέκν' ἐγένοντο δὴ ἄρσενά. (Recht selten ist μοι an ein satzeinleitendes καί nicht angeschlossen: Plato Gorg. 485 C καί πρέπει μοι δοκεῖ. 486 D καί οὐδέν μοι δεῖ ἄλλης βασιάνου. Demosth. 18, 246 καί ταῦτά μοι πάντα πεποῖται.) [καί μοι auch Eurip. Hippol. 377. 1373.]

Speziell gehören zusammen als Beispiele sogenannter Prodiorthose (Blass zu Demosth. 18, 199) Plato Apol. 20 E καί μοι, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, μὴ θορυβήσῃτε. Vgl. die oben angeführte Stelle 31 E. Gorgias 486 A καί μοι μηδὲν ἀχθεσθῆς. Demosth. 5, 15 καί μοι μὴ θορυβήσῃ μηδεῖς. 20, 102 καί μοι μηδὲν ὀργισθῆς. Und diesen Stellen sind wieder ganz ähnlich, nur dass wir den Genetiv des Pronomens haben, Demosth. 18, 199 καί μου πρὸς Διὸς καὶ θεῶν μηδὲ εἷς τὴν ὑπερβολὴν θαυμάσῃ. 18, 256 καί μου πρὸς Διὸς μηδεμίαν ψυχρότητα καταγνῶ μηδεῖς.

Überhaupt ist die Neigung, das Pronomen an satzeinleitendes καί anzuschließen, nicht auf μοι beschränkt. Gerade καί μου findet sich auch noch Theognis 1366 καί μου παῦρ' ἐπάκουσον ἔπη. Aristoph. Ran. 1006 καί μου τὰ σπλάγχν' ἀγανακτεῖ. Plato Apol. 22 D καί μου ταύτῃ σοφώτεροι ἦσαν. Republ. 1, 327 B καί μου ὅπισθεν ὁ παῖς λαβόμενος τοῦ ἱματίου. Parmen. 126 A καί μου λαβόμενος τῆς χειρός.

Für καί με erinnere ich an die schon vorher aufgeführten Weih- und Künstlerinschriften, die es enthalten: IGA. 492. Kyprisch Deecke 1, 71. Pausan. 5, 23, 7. Anthol. Pal. 6, 49. Vgl. Kaibel 806 καί μ' ἔστεψε πατήρ (ε)ἰσαρίθμοις ἔπεσι. Jung-kyprische Inschr. Deecke No. 30 καί με χθὼν ἦδε καλύπτει. Dazu kommt [S. 356] noch (Solon bei Aristot. Ἀθην. πολ. S. 30, 1 Kenyon. κἀδόκουν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ὄλβον εὐρήσειν πολὺν καί με κωτίλλοντα λείως τραχὺν ἐκφανεῖν νόον.) Anakreon Fragm. 60 καί μ' ἐπίβωτον κατὰ γείτονα ποιήσεις. Hipponax Fragm. 64 καί με δεσπότην βεβροῦ λαχόντα λίσσομαι σε μὴ ῥαπίζεσθαι. Theognis 503 καί με βιάται οἶνος. 786 καί μ' ἐφίλειεν προφρόνως πάντες ἐπερχόμενον. Sophokles Oed. Rex 72 καί μ' ἦμαρ ἤδη ξυμμετρούμενον χρόνῳ λυπεῖ τί πράσσει. (Herodot 3, 35, 7 φάναι Πέρσας τε λέγειν ἀληθέα καί με μὴ σφροονέειν). Eurip. Alkestis 641

### 3 Original text

καί μ' οὐ νομίζω παῖδα σὸν πεφυκέναι. Andromache 334 τέθνηκα τῇ σῇ θυγατρὶ καί μ' ἀπώλεσε. Med. 338 καί μ' ἀπάλλαξον πόνων. Helena (278 πόσιν ποθ' ἤξειν καί μ' ἀπαλλάξειν κακῶν.) 557 καί μ' ἐλὼν θέλει δοῦναι τυράννοισι. Orestes 796 καί με πρὸς τύμβον πόρουσα πατρός. 869 καί μ' ἔφερβε σὸς δόμος. Aristoph. [Eq. 862] Ran. (338 καί μ' ἀσφαλῶς πανήμερον παῖσαι τε καὶ χορεῦσαι.) [389 καί — με]. 916 καί με τοῦτ' ἔτερπεν. Plut. 353 καί μ' οὐκ ἀρέσκει. Demosth. 18, 59 καί με μηδεὶς ἀπαρτάν νομίσει τὸν λόγον τῆς γραφῆς.

Pronomen der II. Person: Theognis 241 καί σε — νέοι ἄνδρες — ἔσονται. 465 καί σοι τὰ δίκαια φίλ' ἔστω. 692 καί σε Ποσειδάων χάρμα φίλοις ἀνάγοι. Herodot 7, 11, 4 καί τοι ταύτην τὴν ἀτιμίην προστίθιμι ἐόντι κακῶ καὶ ἀθύμῳ. Eurip. Medea 456 καί σ' ἐβουλόμην μένειν. Helena 1280 καί σ' οὐ κεναιῖσι χερσὶ γῆς ἀποστελῶ. 1387 καί σε προσποιούμεθα (Nauck καὶ σέ). Orestes 755 καί σ' ἀναγκαῖον θανεῖν. 1047 καί σ' ἀμείψασθαι θέλω φιλότῃ χειρῶν. Bacch. 1172 ὁρῶ καί σε δέξομαι κύγκωμον. Aristoph. Equites 300 καί σε φαίνω τοῖς πρυτάνεσιν. Pax 396 καί σε θυσίαισιν ἱεραῖσι — ἀγαλοῦμεν. 403 καί σοι φράσω τι πρᾶγμα. 418 καί σοι (al. καὶ σοί) τὰ μεγάλ' ἡμεῖς Παναθήναι' ἄξομεν. Plato Gorg. 482 D καί σου κατεγέλα. 527 A καί σε ἴσως τυπτήσῃ τις. Anthol. Pal. 6, 157, 3 καί σοι ἐπιρρέξει Γόργος χιμάραιο νομαίης αἶμα. Vgl. das oben S. 344 angeführte Fragm. Iyr. adesp. 43 A καί τυ φίλιππον ἔθηκεν.

Pronomen der III. Person: Archilochus Fragm. 27, 2 καί σφας ὄλλυ' ὥσπερ ὄλλυεις. 74, 8 καί σφιν θαλάσσης ἡχέεντα κύματα φίλτερ' ἡπείρου γένηται. Mimnerm. Fragm. 15 καί μιν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους βάξισ ἔχει χαλεπή. Theognis 405 καί οἱ ἔθηκε δοκεῖν. 422 καί σφιν πολλ' ἀμέλητα μέλει. 732 καί σφιν τοῦτο γένοιτο φίλον. 1347 καί μιν ἔθηκεν δαίμονα. [S. 357] Herodot 4, 119, 2 καί σφεων ἐσχίσθησαν αἱ γνῶμαι. Eurip. Or. 1200 καί νιν δοκῶ. Bacch. 231 καί σφας σιδηραῖς ἀρμόσας ἐν ἄρκυσι παύσω — τῆςδε βακχείας. Kallimach. Epigr. 14 (12 Wilamow.), 3 καί σφιν ἀνιηρόν μὲν ἐρεῖς ἔπος, ἔμπα δὲ λέξεις.

Ein Beispiel für καί με und eines für καί σφας sei besonders herausgehoben: Plato Gorg. 506 B καί με ἐὰν ἐξελέγῃς, οὐκ ἀπεχθήσομαι σοι. Herodot 6, 34, 12 καί σφας ὥς οὐδεὶς ἐκάλεε, ἐκτράπονται ἐπ' Ἀθηνέων. An beiden Stellen ist das Pronomen aus dem Nebensatz, in den es gehört, herausgenommen und an καί angehängt. — Übrigens findet sich καί mit folgendem enklitischem Pronomen auch bei Homer schon oft.

Auch noch andern regelmässig oder oft am Anfang des Satzes stehenden Partikeln ist diese Attraktionskraft eigen: so οὐ, μή, γάρ, εἰ, ἐάν. Auch ἀλλά ist hier zu nennen: Archiloch. 58, 3 ἀλλά μοί [sic] μικρός τις εἶη. 85 ἀλλά μ' ὁ λυσιμελής, ὥταίρε δάμναται πόθος. Alcaeus 55, 2 θέλω τι φείπην, ἀλλά με κωλύει αἶδως. Theognis 941 ἀλλά μ' ἐταῖρος ἐκλείπει. 1155 ἀλλά μοι εἶη ζῆν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀλίγων.

Eurip. Or. 1323 ἀλλά μοι φόβος τις εἰσελήλυθ(ε). Aristoph. Ran. 1338 (euripidischerend) ἀλλά μοι ἀμφίπολοι λύχνον ἄψατε. Häufig ist ἀλλά μοι bei Plato (Apol. 39 E, 41 D, Phaedo 63 E, 72 D. Sympos. 207 C, 213 A. Gorgias 453 A, 476 B, 517 B u. s. w.). ἀλλά σε Theognis 1287, 1333. Eurip. Med. 759, 1389 u. s. w.

Ferner finden wir, wie bei Homer und Sappho, das enklitische Pronomen mehrmals sogar an einen Vokativ angelehnt, wenn ein solcher erstes Wort des Satzes ist oder auf das erste Wort des Satzes folgt: Hipponax Fragm. 85, 1 Μοῦκά μοι Εὐρυμεδοντιάδεα — ἐννεφ' —. Vgl. Fragm. lyr. adesp. 30 A (Poetae lyr. ed. Bergk 3, 696) Μοῖκά μοι ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον ἐύρροον ἄρχοι ἀείδειν. Sophokles Antig. 544 μήτοι κακινγήτη μ' ἀτιμάσῃς. Eurip. Heraclid. 79 ὁδ' ὃ ξένοι με, σοὺς ἀτιμάζων θεοῦς, ἔλκει. Helena 670 ὁ Διός, ὁ Διός, ὃ πόσι με παῖς Ἑρμᾶς ἐπέλασεν Νείλω. Bacch. 1120 οἴκτιρε δ' ὃ μήτέρ με. Andromeda Fragm. 118 N. ἕαρον Ἀχοῖ με σὺν φίλαισιν γόου κόρον λαβεῖν. Aristoph. Thesmoph. 1134 μέμνησο Περσεῦ μ' ὥς καταλείπεις. Theokrit. 2, 95 εἴ' ἄγε Θεκυλί μοι χαλεπᾶς νόσω εὐρέ τι μᾶχος.

Verwandt damit ist die Anlehnung an einen vorausge-[S. 358]schickten imperativischen Ausdruck, wie im homerischen ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι: Eurip. Bacch. 341 δεῦρό σου στέψω κάρα. Iphig. Aul. 1436 παῦσαί με μὴ κάκιζε, wo με zu κάκιζε gehört. Plato Gorg. 464 B φέρε δὴ σοι, ἐὰν δύνωμαι, σαφέστερον ἀποδείξω. 495 C ἴθι δὴ μοι, ἐπειδὴ —, διελοῦ τάδε. Ion 535 B ἔχε δὴ μοι τόδε εἰπέ. Ebenso die Anlehnung an βούλει, wenn eine 1. Sing. Konjunktivi folgt: Eurip. Kyklops 149 βούλει σε γεύσω. Plato Gorg. 516 C βούλει σοι ὁμολογῶ. 521 D βούλει σοι εἶπω. Aeschines 3, 163 βούλει σε θῶ φοβηθῆναι. — Im allgemeinen ähnlich sind Plato Euthydem. 297 C νεωστὶ, μοι δοκεῖν, καταπεπλευκότι und Parmen. 137 B τί οὖν, εἰπεῖν, μοι ἀποκρινεῖται.

Öfters finden wir nun aber ein solches Pronomen der zweiten Stelle im Satz zu lieb von den Wörtern getrennt, zu denen es syntaktisch gehört. Theognis 559 λῶστά σε μήτε λίην ἀφνεὸν κτεάτεσσι μήτε σέ γ' ἐς πολλὴν χρημοσύνην ἐλάσαι. Wieder anders Eurip. Iphig. Taur. 1004 οὐδέ μ' εἰ θανεῖν χρεών. Aristoph. Lysistr. 753 ἴνα μ' εἰ καταλάβοι ὁ τόκος ἔτ' ἐν πόλει, τέκοιμι. Theokrit 2, 4 ὅς μοι δωδεκαταῖος ἀφ' ὃ τάλας οὐδέποθ' ἵκει. Vgl. oben S. 357 über καί με, καί σφρασ. — Bei Partizipien: Sophokles Antig. 450 οὐ γάρ τί μοι Ζεὺς ἦν ὁ κηρύξας τάδε. Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 1459 τίς μ' εἶσιν ἄξων. Plato Gorg. 521 D πονηρός τίς μ' ἔσται ὁ εἰσάγων. [Demosth.] 59, 1 πολλὰ με τὰ παρακαλοῦντα ἦν. (Vgl. auch Kock zu Aristoph. Av. 95). — Herodot 7, 235, 18 τάδε τοι προσδόκα ἔσεσθαι. — Sophokles Antig. 546 μή μοι θάνῃς σὺ κοινά.

Leicht trennt das Pronomen vermöge derartiger Stellung eng zusammengehörige Wörter. So finden wir bei Alkman 26, 1 οὐ μ' ἔτι, παρθενικαὶ μελιγάρυες ἱμερόφωνοι, γυῖα φέρειν δύναται und fragm. lyr. adesp. 5 (Poetae lyr. ed. Bergk 3,

### 3 Original text

690) οὐ μοι ἔτ' εὐκελάδων ὕμνων μέλει durch με, μοι die Partikel οὐκέτι zerrissen. Ähnlich Eurip. Orest. 803 εἴ σε μῆν [sic] δειναῖσιν ὄντα συμφοραῖς ἐπαρκέσω. Plato Apol. 29 E εἴ μοι μὴ δοκῇ. Phaedrus 236E εἴ μοι μὴ εἴπῃς, obwohl es sonst stets εἰ μὴ, ἐν μὴ in enger Verbindung heisst. Plato Gorgias 448 A οὐδεὶς μέ πω ἡρώτηκεν καινὸν οὐδέν. Auch Herodot 7, 153, 17 θωῦμά μοι ὦν καὶ τοῦτο γέγονεν gehört hierher, da sonst ὦν unmittelbar hinter dem ersten Satzwort zu stehen pflegt.

Ein attributiver Genetiv ist vom regierenden Wort getrennt [S. 359] bei Ion, wenn er zu Beginn seiner Τριαγμοί (bei Harpokration s. v. Ἴων) sagt: ἀρχὴ δέ μοι τοῦ λόγου (Lobeck ἀρχὴ ἧδέ μοι). Ähnlich Eurip. Medea 281 τίνος μ' ἔκατι γῆς ἀποστέλλεις. Helena 674 ἃ Δίος [sic] μ' ἄλοχος ὤλεσεν. 670 ὁ Δίος, ὃ πόσι, με παῖς Ἑρμῆος ἐπέλασεν Νείλω. Thucyd. 1, 128, 7 εἰ οὖν τί σε τούτων ἀρέσκει für τι τούτων σε. Andoc. 1, 47 ὅσους μοι τῶν συγγόνων ἀπώλλυν. Theokrit. 18, 19 Ζηνός τοι θυγάτηρ ὑπὸ τὰν μίαν ἵκετο χλαῖαν. [Allerdings auch ἐμέ so: Eurip. Heraklid. 687 οὐδεὶς ἔμ' ἐχθρῶν προσβλέπων ἀνέξεται]

Ein attributives Adjektiv oder Pronomen oder eine Apposition ist durch ein enklitisches Pronomen von dem Satzteil, zu dem es oder sie gehört, abgetrennt: Herodot 3, 14, 34 δεσπότης σε Καμβύσης, Ψαμμήνιτε, εἰρωτᾷ. 6, 111, 8 ἀπὸ ταύτης σφί τῆς μάχης — κατεύχεται ὁ κῆρυξ Πλαταιεῦσι (durch Πλαταιεῦσι wird das weit abliegende σφί wieder aufgenommen). 7, 16<sup>a</sup> 2 τά σε καὶ ἀμφοτέρα περιήκοντα ἀνθρώπων κακῶν ὁμιλίας σφάλλουσιν, wo τά mit ἀμφοτέρα, σε mit περιήκοντα zusammengehört. 9, 45, 16 ὀλίγων γάρ σφί ἡμερέων λείπεται τιτία. [Hippokrates] περὶ τέχνης S. 52, 18 Gomp. οὗτος δέ μοι λόγος καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων. Eurip. Medea 1013 πολλὴ μ' ἀνάγκη. Helena 94 Αἴας μ' ἀδελφὸς ὤλεσ' ἐν Τροίᾳ θανών. 593 τοῦκέι με μέγεθος τῶν πόνων πείθει. 1281 φῆμας δέ μοι ἐσθλὰς ἐνεγκών. 1643 διςσοὶ δέ σε Διόσκοροι καλοῦσιν. Orestes 167 Ἑλένη σ' ἀδελφὴ ταῖςδε δωρεῖται χοαίς. 482 φίλου μοι πατρός ἐστιν ἔκγονος. 1626 Φοιβός μ' ὁ Λητοῦς παῖς ὁδ' ἐγγὺς ὦν καλῶ. Fragm. 911 χρύσεια δὴ μοι πτέρυγες περὶ νῶτω. Rhesos 401 τίς γάρ σε κῆρυξ ἢ γερουσία Φρυγῶν — οὐκ ἐπέσκηψεν πόλει. Aristoph. Ran. 1332 (Euripides nachbildend) τίνα μοι δύστανον ὄνειρον πέμπεις. Ekkles. 1113 αὐτὴ τέ μοι δέσποινα μακαριωτάτη. Plato Apol. 37 C πολλὴ μέντ' αὖν [sic] με φιλοψυχία ἔχοι. 40 C μέγα μοι τεκμήριον τούτου γέγονεν. Phaedo 92 C οὗτος οὖν σοι ὁ λόγος ἐκείνῳ πῶς ξυνάσσεται. Gorg. 456 B μέγα δέ σοι τεκμήριον ἐρῶ. 487 D ἱκανόν μοι τεκμήριον ἐστιν. 488 B τοῦτό μοι αὐτὸ σαφῶς διόρισον. 493 D φέρε δὴ, ἄλλην σοι εἰκόνα λέγω. 513 C ὄντινά μοι τρόπον δοκεῖς εὖ λέγειν. Phileb. 23 D τετάρτου μοι γένους αὖ προσδεῖν φαίνεται. Xenophon Hellen. 3, 1, 11 ὁ ἀνὴρ σοι ὁ ἐμὸς καὶ τᾶλλα φίλος ἦν. Aeschin. 1, 116 δύο δέ μοι τῆς κατηγορίας εἶδη λέλειπται. Bion 9, 1 ἃ μεγάλα μοι Κύ-[S. 360]πρις ἔθ' ὑπνῶντι παρέστα. Leonidas



Tarent. Anthol. Pal. 7, 660 Ξεῖνε, Συρηκόσιός τοι ἀνὴρ τόδ' ἐφίεται Ὀρθων. Die zahlreichen Stellen, wo auf so eingeschobenes Pronomen zunächst das Verbum folgt, wie Eurip. Heraclid. 236 τριῖσσι μ' ἀναγκάζουσιν κυφορᾶς ὁδοί. Plato Gorg. 463 B ταύτης μοι δοκεῖ πολλὰ — μόρια εἶναι. Kallimach. Epigr. 1, 3 δοῖός με καλεῖ γάμος, will ich nicht alle aufführen, obwohl sie m. E. auch hierher gehören. In anderer Weise gehört hierher Plato Apol. 28 A ὅτι πολλή μοι ἀπέχθεια γέγονεν καὶ πρὸς πολλούς u. dergl.

Oder das Pronomen schliesst sich an den Artikel an. Selten unmittelbar: Theognis 575=862 οἱ με φίλοι προδιδοῦσιν. 813 οἱ με φίλοι προῦδωκαν. Theokrit 7, 43 τάν τοι, ἔφα, κορύναν δωρύντομαι. Meist folgt dem Artikel zunächst eine 'postpositive' Partikel: Herodot 1, 31, 10 οἱ δέ σφι βόες οὐ παρεγένοντο. 1, 115, 8 οἱ γάρ με ἐκ τῆς κώμης παῖδες — ἐστήσαντο βασιλέα. 1, 207, 6 τὰ δέ μοι παθήματα τὰ ἔοντα ἀχάρिता μαθήματα γέγονε. 3, 63, 10 ὁ δέ μοι μάγος ταῦτα ἐνετείλατο. Aristoph. Ekkles. 913 ἡ γάρ μοι μήτηρ βέβηκεν ἄλλῃ. Plato Phaedrus 236 D ὁ δέ μοι λόγος ὄρκος ἔσται. Sympos. 177 A ἡ μὲν μοι ἀρχὴ τοῦ λόγου ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν Εὐριπίδου Μελανίπτην. Theokrit 5, 125 τὰ δέ τοι κύα καρπὸν ἐνεῖκαι. 1, 82 ἃ δέ τυ κώρα πάσας ἀνὰ κράνας — φορεῖται φοιτεῦς(α). (Siehe oben S. 344).

Oder das Pronomen lehnt sich an eine Präposition und trennt sie dadurch von ihrem Kasus: Terpander Fragm. 2 ἀμφὶ μοι αὐτε ἄναχθ' ἐκαταβόλον ᾔδεται ἄφρην. Hymn. auf Pan 1 ἀμφὶ μοι Ἑρμείαο φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε Μοῦσα. Rhesos 831 κατὰ με γὰρ ζῶντα πόρευσον. Auf die Präposition folgt zunächst noch eine Partikel Herodot 3, 69, 20 ἐν γάρ σι τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ἀναιρέομαι. Kallimach. Hymn. 1, 10 ἐν δέ σι Παρρασίῃ Πείη τέκεν. Epigr. 2, 1 ἐς δέ με δάκρυ ἤγαγεν.

Dazu der bekannte Fall, wo ein von wirklich gesetztem oder zu supplierendem Verbum des Bittens abhängiges σι zwischen πρὸς und den davon 'regierten' Genetiv getreten ist: Eurip. Alc. 1098 μή, πρὸς σι τοῦ σπείραντος ἄντομαι Διός. Ähnlich Soph. Phil. 468. Oed. Col. 250. 1333. Eurip. Hiket. 277. (Dagegen Eurip. Med. 853 μή, πρὸς γονάτων σι πάντως πάντῃ σ' ἱκετεύομεν). Das Verbum des Bittens ist zu ergänzen Soph. Trach. 436 μή, πρὸς σι τοῦ κατ' ἄκρον Οἰταῖον πάγον [S. 361] Διὸς καταστράπτοντος, ἐκκλέψης λόγον. Ebenso Eurip. Medea 324. Andromache 89. (Vgl. Iph. Taur. 1068.) In allen diesen Fällen nimmt σι die zweite Stelle hinter der nächst vorangehenden Interpunktion ein; Soph. Phil. 468 πρὸς νῦν σι πατρός, Oed. Col. 1333 πρὸς νῦν σι κρηγῶν und Eurip. Helena 1237 πρὸς νῦν σι γονάτων τῶνδε, wo das enklitische νῦν noch vorgeschoben ist, bilden natürlich keine Ausnahme. Aus den ausserattischen Dichtern kommt hinzu Alkman Fr. 52 πρὸς δέ τε τῶν φίλων. Apollonius, dem wir dieses Fragment verdanken, scheint allerdings τε hier als orthotonisch zu betrachten, und ausschliesslich τυ als enklitische Akkusativform für das Dorische anzuerkennen.

### 3 Original text

Aber enklitisches dorisches τε wird gesichert durch die Worte des Megarers Ar. Ach. 779 πάλιν τ' ἀποικῶ ναὶ τὸν Ἑρμῶν οἴκαδις, wo man, weil man eben τὲ nicht anerkennen wollte, sich genötigt glaubte τυ mit unschönem Hiatus einzusetzen. Besonders aber ist Kallim. Fr. 114 = AP. 13, 10 zu vergleichen: ποτὶ τε Ζηνός (der Cod. Pal. ποτιτεζηνος) ἰκνεῦμαι λιμενοκόπῳ; Bloomfield setzt unnötig das enklitische τυ. Immerhin fällt der von O. Schneider gegen ihn erhobene Vorwurf 'foede erravit' auf diesen selbst und die von ihm vorgezogene Vulgata-Schreibung ποτὶ τὲ Ζανός mit der sinnlosen Orthotonese und dem falschen Genetiv Ζανός zurück.

Ohne Bezugnahme auf die zwei letztgenannten Stellen hat kürzlich Christ Philologische Kleinigkeiten München 1891 S. 4 f. für Pindar Olymp. 1, 48 ὕδατος ὅτι τε πυρὶ ζέοικαν εἰς ἀκμὸν μαχαίρῃ τάμον κατὰ μέλη die Meinung geäußert, dass das als Partikel wenig ansprechende τε als Akkusativ des Pronomens zu nehmen sei, wie denn schon längst Bergk dafür hat εἰ einsetzen wollen. Die Stellung von τε empfiehlt diese Auffassung.

Aber auch gegenüber der Verbindung der Präpositionen mit dem Verbum macht das alte Stellungsgesetz seinen Einfluss geltend (Krüger Dialektische Syntax 68, 48, 3). Man durchmustere die folgenden Beispiele nachhomerischer Tmesis: Alcäus Fr. 95 ἔκ μ' ἔλασας ἀλγέων. Anakreon 50, 1 ἀπό μοι θανεῖν γένοιτ(ο). Hipponax Fr. 31 ἀπό σ' ὀλέσκειν Ἄρτεμις, σὲ δὲ κώπλων. Sophokles El. 1067 κατὰ μοι βόσcon. Philoktet 817 ἀπό μ' ὀλεῖς. Oed. Col. 1689 κατὰ με φόνιος Αἶδας ἔλοι. Eurip. Herakles 1053 διὰ μ' ὀλεῖτε. Hiket. 45 ἀνά [S. 362] μοι τέκνα λῦσαι. 829 κατὰ με πέδον γὰρ ἔλοι. Hippolyt 1357 διὰ μ' ἔφθειρας. Bacch. 579 ἀνά μ' ἐκάλεσεν. Aristoph. Acharn. 295 κατὰ σὲ χώσομεν. Plut. 65 ἀπό σ' ὀλῶ κακὸν κακῶς. Plato Phaedr. 237 Α ξύμ μοι λαβέσθε τοῦ μύθου. Kallimach. Epigr. 1, 5 εἰ δ' ἄγε, σύμ μοι βούλευcon. — Mit vorangehender Partikel u. dgl.: Sophokles Philoktet 1177 ἀπὸ νύν με λείπετ' ἤδη. Eurip. Or. 1047 ἔκ τοί με τήξεις. Aristoph. Vesp. 437 ἔν τί σοι παγίγεται. 784 ἀνά τοί με πείθεις. Vgl. oben S. 338 die ähnlichen Stellen mit νιν. Wenn vereinzelt (Alcäus Fr. 68 schrieb Bekker irrig τύφως ἔκ σ' ἔλετο φρένας) das Pronomen durch solche Tmesis nicht an die zweite Stelle gekommen sein sollte, wird uns das nicht stören.

## IV.

Besondere Betrachtung verdienen μοι, τοι, (σφι), μεο — μευ — μου, σεο — σευ — σου, σφρων als attribute Genetive. Dass μοι, τοι, wie auch οἱ, die Genetivfunktion nicht erst nachträglich übernahmen, sondern entsprechend ihren indischen Korrelaten *mē*, *tē*, *sē* von Haus aus besaßen und mit dem Lokativ nichts zu thun



haben (vgl. Delbrück Altind. Syntax S. 205), betrachte ich als sicher; dass die Genetivfunktion sich im Griechischen nicht bloss bei Homer (siehe Brugmann Grundriss II 819. Verf. Berliner philol. Woch. 1890 Sp. 39) und den Ioniern erhalten hat, ergibt sich zumal aus der Bemerkung von Wilamowitz zu Eurip. Herakles 626 (κύ τ' ὃ γύναι μοι, κύλλογον ψυχῆς λαβέ): "Das Drama drückt in der Anrede das possessive Verhältnis bei Verwandtschaftswörtern durch den Dativ aus, θύγατέρ μοι, τέκνον μοι [Eurip. Ion 1399. Orestes 124. Iph. Aul. 613] γύναι μοι. Der Genetiv ist überhaupt nicht üblich; sein Eindringen, z. B. in der jüdisch-christlichen Litteratur, vielmehr ein Zeichen des Plebeierts".

Die natürlichste Stellung für diese Genetive schiene uns die hinter ihren Substantiven. Bekanntlich findet sich nun zwar diese recht oft, wie z. B. gerade bei den von Wilamowitz besprochenen vokativischen Verbindungen, aber daneben als völlig gleichberechtigt die Stellung vor dem Substantiv und dessen Attributen mit Einschluss des Artikels. Der Ursprung dieser seltsamen Stellung wird klar, wenn wir die ältesten Beispiele derselben prüfen. Schon Homer hat diese Stellung A 273 καὶ μέν μεν βουλέων ξύνιεν. N 626 οἱ μεν [S. 363] κουριδίην ἄλοχον καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ μάλ' οἷχεσθ' ἀνάγοντες. E 311 καὶ μεν κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί. ι 20 καὶ μεν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει. (ι 405 ἣ μή τίς σευ μῆλα βροτῶν ἀέκοντος ἐλαύνει). μ 379 οἱ μεν βοῦς ἔκτειναν. ο 467 οἱ μεν πατέρ' ἀμφεπένοντο. κ 231 καὶ σευ φίλα γούναθ' ἱκάνω. ω 381 τῷ κέ σφεων γούνατ' ἔλυσα hier überall so, dass sie durch unser Stellungsgesetz bewirkt ist. Die spätern haben sich dann gestattet diese Genetive weiter vom Satzanfang zu entfernen, aber die aus dem alten Stellungsgesetz folgende Voranstellung dann doch noch vielfach beibehalten. Nachwirkungen des ursprünglichen Zusammenhangs zwischen der Voranstellung und dem alten Stellungsgesetz zeigen sich aber mancherlei.

Erstens nehmen die vorangestellten Genetive eben doch häufig die zweite Stelle im Satz ein. Für μοι, τοι verweise ich auf Herodot 4, 29, 3 μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι τῇ γνώμῃ καὶ Ὅμηρου ἔπος. 7, 27, 8 ὅς τοι τὸν πατέρα δωρήσατο. Sophokles Trachin. 1233 ἣ μοι μητρὶ μὲν θανεῖν μόνῃ μεταίτιος. Für die eigentlichen Genetivformen auf folgende, die Zahl der Belege natürlich bei weitem nicht erschöpfende Beispiele: Hipponax Fragm. 76 λαίμῃ δέ σευ τὸ χεῖλος. 83 λάβετέ μεν θαίματτα. Herodot 4, 80, 11 ἔχεις δέ μεν τὸν ἀδελφεόν. 7, 51, 3 σὺ δέ μεν συμβουλίην ἔνδεξαι. Eurip. Medea 1233 ὥς σου συμφορὰς οἰκτίρομεν. Helena 277 ἣ μου τὰς τύχας ὥχει μόνῃ. Hiket. 1162 ἔθιγέ μου φρενῶν. Orestes 297 κύ μου τὸ δεινὸν καὶ διαφθαρὲν φρενῶν ἵσχναινε. Aristoph. Eq. 289 κυνοκοπήσω σου τὸ νῶτον. 709 ἀπονυχιῶ σου τὰν πρυτανείω σιτία. Pax 1212 ἀπώλεσάς μου τὴν τέχνην καὶ τὸν βίον. Aves 139 καλῶς γέ μου τὸν υἱὸν ὃ Στιλβωνίδῃ οὐκ ἔκυσας. Lysistr. 409 ὀρχουμένης μου τῆς γυναικὸς ἐσπέρας ἢ βάλανος ἐκπέπτωκεν. Ra-

### 3 Original text

nae 1006 καί μου τὰ σπλάγχχν' ἀγανακτεῖ. Plato Apol. 18 D διττούς μου τοὺς κατηγοροὺς γεγονέναι. 20 A εἰ μὲν σου τῷ υἱέε πῶλῳ ἢ μόσχῳ ἐγενέσθην. Phaedo 89 B καταψήσας οὖν μου τὴν κεφαλὴν. Alcaeus com. Fragm. 29 Kock ἐβίασέ μου τὴν γυναῖκα. Aeschines 3, 16 ἀφομοιοῖ γάρ μου τὴν φύσιν τοῖς Σειρήσιν. Theokrit 2, 55 τί μεν μέλαν ἐκ χροὸς αἷμα — πέπωκας. 2, 69 u. s. w. φράζέο μεν τὸν ἔρωθ' ὅθεν ἵκετο. 5, 4 τόν μεν τὰν κύριγγα πρόαν κλέψαντα Κομάταν. 5, 19 οὐ τευ τὰν κύριγγα λαθὼν ἔκλειψε Κομάτας. 6, 36 καλὰ δέ μεν ἅ μία κῶρα. 15, 31 τί μεν τὸ χιτώνιον ἄρδεις. 15, 69 [S. 364] δίχα μεν τὸ θερίστριον ἤδη ἔσχισται. 22, 10 οἱ δέ σφρων κατὰ πρύμναν ἀείραντες μέγα κῦμα.

Noch entschiedener ist der Einfluss unseres Stellungsgesetzes in den ohnehin auffälligen Beispielen anzuerkennen, wo der vorausgehende pronominaler Genetiv vom regierenden Substantivum durch andre Worte getrennt ist. Dies zeigt sich an dem τοι Theokrits 7, 87 ὥς τοι ἐγὼν ἐνόμειον ἀν' ὄρεα τὰς καλὰς αἶγας φωνᾶς εἰσαΐων, wo Meinekes Bemerkungen zu vergleichen sind. Ferner steht bei Homer an den in diese Klasse gehörigen Stellen der Genetiv regelmässig an zweiter Stelle: E 811 ἀλλὰ σευ ἢ κάματος πολυῶϊς γυῖα δέδυκεν ἢ νύ σέ που δέος ἵσχει, wo die Stellung des Pronomens besonders bemerkenswert ist. I 355 μόγις δέ μεν ἔκφυγεν ὀρμήν. Z 95 = P 173 νῦν δέ σευ ὠνοκάμην πάγχυ φρένας. T 185 χαίρω σευ Λαερτιάδῃ τὸν μῦθον ἀκούσας. K 311 θεὰ δέ μεν ἔκλυεν αὐδῆς. K 485 οἱ μεν φθινύθουσι φίλον κῆρ. (Nur π 92 ἦ μάλα μεν καταδάπτει' ἀκούοντος φίλον ἦτορ, wo μεν erst an dritter Stelle steht, bildet eine, übrigens nicht sehr schwer wiegende Ausnahme.) — Und wenn nicht regelmässig, so doch überaus häufig nimmt auch bei den Spätern ein so von seinem Substantiv abgetrennter pronominaler Genetiv die zweite Stelle ein: Theognis 969 πρίν σου κατὰ πάντα δαῖναι ἦθεα. Herodot 4, 119, 2 καὶ σφρων ἐσχίσθησαν αἱ γυνῶμαι. Eurip. Helena 898 μή μου κατείπης σὺ κασιγνήτῳ πόσιν. Bacch. 341 δεῦρό σου στέψω κάρα. 615 οὐδέ σου συνῆψε χεῖρα. Fragm. 687, 1 ἐμπλήσθητί μου πίων κελαινὸν αἷμα. 930 οἶμοι, δράκων μου γίγνεται τὸ ἥμισυ. Aristoph. Eq. 708 ἐξαρκάσομαί σου τοῖς ὄνυξι τάντερα. Pax 1068 εἶθε σου εἶναι ὥφελεν, ὦ λαζών, οὕτωςι θερμὸς ὁ πλευμών. Ran. 573 οἷς μου κατέφαγες τὰ φορτία. Plato Phaedo 117 B ἕως ἄν σου βάρος ἐν τοῖς σκέλεσι γένηται. Republ. 1, 327 B καί μου ὅπισθεν λαβόμενος ὁ παῖς τοῦ ἱματίου. Parmen. 126 A καί μου λαβόμενος τῆς χειρός. Demosth. 18, 199 καί μου μηδὲ εἰς τὴν ὑπερβολὴν θαυμάσῃ. Theokrit 2, 82 ὥς μεν περὶ θυμὸς ἰάφθη. Bion 6, 1 εἰ μεν καλὰ πέλει τὰ μελύδρια [Menand. fr. 498].

Ganz Gleichartiges haben wir bei dem genetivischen οἱ getroffen (s. oben S. 337 f.). Und wie nun dieses auch mitten in der regierenden Wortgruppe, d. h. hinter deren erstem Wort, Stellung nehmen kann, so auch die von uns hier zu besprechenden Formen. Und zwar a) im Anschluss an eine Partikel [S. 365] Hippo-

nax Fr. 62 οἱ δέ μευ πάντες ὀδόντες ἐντὸς ἐν γνάθοις κεκινέαται. Anakreon fr. 81 αἱ δέ μευ φρένες ἐκκεκωφέαται. Herodot 3, 102, 19 αἱ γάρ ρφι κάμηλοι ἵππων οὐκ ἔσσονές εἰσιν. 4, 202, 3 τῶν δέ ρφι γυναικῶν τοὺς μαζοὺς ἀποταμοῦσα. 9, 50, 7 οἷ τέ ρφρων ὀπέωνες — ἀπεκεκληίατο. Aristoph. Eq. 787 τοῦτό γέ τοί σου τοῦργον ἀληθῶς γενναῖον καὶ φιλόδημον. Theokrit 4, 1 ταὶ δέ μοι αἶγες βόσκονται κατ' ὅρος (Vgl. auch die bereits oben S. 359. 360 angeführten Stellen mit μοι Eurip. Or. 482, Aristoph. Ekkles. 913. 1113). b) unmittelbar hinter Artikel oder Präposition Herodot 7, 38, 12 cὺ δέ, ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἐμὲ ἐς τόδε ἡλικίης ἦκοντα οἰκτίρας, τῶν μοι παίδων παράλυσον ἓνα τῆς στρατιῆς. Ganz ebenso kyprisch (Deecke Nr. 26) ὁ μοι πόσις Ὀνασίτιμος 'mein Gatte ist Onasitimos', was Hoffmann Die griechischen Dialekte I 323 als 'sehr eigentümlich' bezeichnet, während Meister Die griechischen Dialekte II 139. 140, sich sogar genötigt glaubt, ein neues Wort ὁμοίποσις 'Mitgatte' zu konstruieren<sup>1</sup>). — Dazu aus den attischen Dichtern Eurip. Medea 144 διὰ μου κεφαλᾶς φλόξ οὐρανία βαίη. Hippolyt 1351 διὰ μου κεφαλᾶς ἔσσου' ὀδύναι. Heraclid. 799 εἷς μου λόγος σοι πάντα σημαίνει τάδε. Aristoph. Lysistrate 416 ὦ σκυτοτόμε, τῆς μου γυναικὸς τοὺς πόδας. Vgl. Theokrit 5, 2 τό μευ νάκος ἐχθὲς ἔκλεψε. Ausser am Satzanfang findet sich μου u. s. w. jedenfalls höchst selten so eingeschoben, und für die Stellen, wo es geschieht, wie z. B. Aristoph. Ran. 485 δείσατο γὰρ εἰς τὴν κάτω μου κοιλίαν καθεῖπυεν, dürfen wir voraussetzen, dass die am Satzanfang aufgekommene Einschubung im Satzinnern nachgeahmt wurde.

Die Stellung der barytonetischen, also ursprünglich enklitischen Pluralformen ἡμῶν, ἡμῖν u. s. w. will ich angesichts der Schwierigkeit sie an den einzelnen Stellen von den echtorthotonischen zu unterscheiden, hier nicht untersuchen (man beachte immerhin IGA. 486 (Milet) [Ἐρ]μησιάνναξ ἡμεας ἀνέθηκεν [ό...], ganz wie sonst μ' ἀνέθηκεν und 482<sup>a</sup> 5 (Elephan-[S. 366]tine) ἔγραφε δ' ἄμε Ἄρχων Ἀμοιβίχου); wohl aber möchte ich daran erinnern, dass nach den Nachweisen Krügers, dessen ordnendem Scharfsinn wir ja überhaupt die feineren Gesetze für die Stellung dieser Genetive verdanken, αὐτοῦ, αὐτῆς, αὐτῶν in anaphorischer Bedeutung den gleichen Stellungsregeln wie μου unterliegt. Zwar gilt dies nicht für Homer, bei dem sich die anaphorische Bedeutung und die Tonlosigkeit von αὐτοῦ erst anzubahnen beginnt, und der es daher auch an Stellen, wo wir es mit *eius* wiedergeben, weit vom Satzanfang stellt, wie z. B. B 347 ἄνυσσι δ' οὐκ ἔσσειται αὐτῶν. P 546 δὴ γὰρ νόος ἐτράπετ' αὐτοῦ. (η 263 dagegen liegt in der gleichen Wendung ein Nachdruck auf αὐτῆς). μ 130 γόνος δ' οὐ γίγνεται

<sup>1</sup> Auf Wunsch des Herrn Dr. Meister bemerke ich, dass er auf Grund von Wilamowitz' Anmerkung zu Eurip. Herakles V. 626 (siehe oben S. 362) schon längst zur richtigen Auffassung dieser Worte gelangt war und vorgehabt hatte seine frühere Erklärung öffentlich zurückzunehmen.

### 3 *Original text*

αὐτῶν, was einen sehr wertvollen indirekten Beweis für unsere Stellungenregel liefert. Wohl aber ist bei den Attikern αὐτοῦ, αὐτῆς, αὐτῶν gerade so gern dem regierenden Substantiv vorangestellt wie μου, und dann gerade wie μου häufig dem Satzanfang nahe, z. B. Thycyd. 1, 138, 1 ἐθαύμασε τε αὐτοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν. 4, 109, 11 καὶ αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν ἐμμεῖναι τῷ στρατῷ ἐδήλου. Plato Gorg. 448 E ἐγκωμιάσεις μὲν αὐτοῦ τὴν τέχνην. Und ebenso findet sich αὐτοῦ wie μου seinem Substantiv so vorangestellt, dass es durch ein oder mehrere Wörter davon getrennt ist, und auch da, wie μου, gern an zweiter Stelle z. B. Eurip. Heraclid. 12 ἐπεὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν γῆς ἀπηλλάχθη πατήρ. Wer endlich die von Stein zu 6, 30, 7 aufgeführten herodoteischen Stellen durchmustert, an denen αὐτοῦ zwischen Artikel und Substantiv steht, wird an diesen allen (und ebenso auch 1, 146, 10. 1, 177, 3. 2, 149, 19. 7, 129, 3) αὐτοῦ an zweiter Stelle finden, wobei ich 7, 156, 11 Μεγαρέας τε τοὺς ἐν Σικελίῃ, ὥς — προεχώρησαν, τοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν παχέας — πολυήτας ἐποίησε mitrechne. Also ganz wie bei eingeschobnem μοι, μου. Die Attiker sind hier freier: Isokr. 18, 52 γνώσεσθε τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ πονηρίαν. Xenoph. Anab. 6, 2, 14 ὅπως — αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ αὐτῶν στρατιῶται ἐκπλεύσειαν. Vielleicht kommt für das αὐτοῦ bei Isokrates wie für das μου Aristoph. Ran. 485 (oben S. 365) in Betracht, dass der Genetiv sich nicht an den Artikel, sondern an ein Attribut anlehnt.

## V.

Bergaigne nimmt an, das in Abschnitt II–IV erörterte Stellungsgesetz der enklitischen Personalpronomina sei bei den [S. 367] anaphorischen Pronomina entstanden; diese habe man gern dem vorausgehenden Satze möglichst nahe gerückt, um dadurch die Verbindung mit diesem besser zu markieren. Von den anaphorischen Pronomina sei dann die Stellungenregel auch auf die Pronomina der ersten und zweiten Person übergegangen, und durch diese ihre Stellung nach dem ersten Wort des Satzes und ihre Anlehnung an dasselbe seien die betr. Pronomina enklitisch geworden (Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique III 177. 178).

Diese Annahme hat wenig für sich. Denn gerade was bei οἱ, σφιν nach Bergaigne die Stellung nächst dem Satzanfang begünstigte, die Beziehung auf den vorausgehenden Satz, fehlt ja bei μοι, τοι. Dagegen wird die von Bergaigne verworfene Möglichkeit, dass “le langage s’est habitué à les construire après le premier mot, parce qu’ils étaient privés d’accent”, als Tatsache durch den Umstand erwiesen, dass auch ausserhalb des persönlichen Pronomens die Enklitika dieser Stellungenregel unterworfen werden. Schon Kühner Griechische Grammatik I<sup>2</sup> 268 Anm. 8 bemerkt, “bei der freien Wortstellung der griechischen Sprache darf

man sich nicht wundern, wenn die Encliticae sich oftmals nicht an das Wort anschliessen, zu dem sie gehören, sondern an ein anderes, zu dem sie nicht gehören". In welcher Richtung diese Abweichungen liegen, lässt Kühner unerörtert. Aber sämtliche Beispiele, die er a. a. O. folgen lässt, erledigen sich aus unserm Stellungsgesetz.

Unter den deklinabeln Enklitika kommt bloss noch das indefinite Pronomen in betracht. Sehr evident tritt bei diesem diestellungsregel nicht zu Tage. Denn wenn man etwa darauf Gewicht legen wollte, dass die altertümlichen Formen του, τῷ auf den attischen Inschriften ausser CIA. 4, 61<sup>a</sup> 15 — ἔχοντός του, nur im unmittelbaren Anschluss an εἰ, εἰάν vorkommen (vgl. die Belege bei Meisterhans Grammatik der attischen Inschriften<sup>2</sup> S. 123 Anm. 1106), so genügt es auf Thucydides zu verweisen, der diese Formen an ganz beliebigen Stellen des Satzes bietet. Doch ist bei Homer die Neigung τὶς an den Anfang zu rücken unverkennbar. Man beachte, ausser ὅστις nebst Zubehör, εἷ τις, μή τις, besonders folgende Stellen: mit Losreissung zum gehörigen Nomen E 897 εἰ δέ τευ ἐξ ἄλλου γε θεῶν. Θ 515 ἵνα τις στυγέησι καὶ ἄλλος. N 464 [S. 368] εἰ πέρ τί σε κῆδος ἰκάνει (zugleich vor dem enklitischen σε!). Ψ 331 ἦ τευ σῆμα βροτοῖο πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος. γ 348 (— ὥς ὑμεῖς παρ' ἐμεῖο θοῖν ἐπὶ νῆα κίοιτε) ὥς τέ τευ ἦ παρὰ πάμπαν ἀνείμονος ἡ ἐπενιχροῦ. η 195 μηδέ τι μεσσηγύς γε κακὸν καὶ πῆμα πάθησιν. Mit Voranstellung von τις vor ein sonst zur zweiten Stelle berechtigtes Wort (vgl. N 464) Π 37 καὶ τινά τοι παρ [sic] Ζηνὸς ἐπέφραδε πότνια μήτηρ. λ 218 ὅτε τίς κε θάνησι (vgl. Hesiod Ἔργα 280 εἰ γάρ τίς κ' ἐθέλη. Peppmüller Berliner philolog. Wochenschrift 1890 Sp. 559). Hierher gehört das nicht seltene ὥς τίς τε statt ὥστε τις wie z. B. P 657 βῆ δ' ἰέναι ὥς τίς τε λέων ἀπὸ μεσσαιόιο.

Beispiele der ersten Kategorie lassen sich auch aus der Folgezeit beibringen (Kühner Gramm. II 572 Anm. 6): Theognis 833 οὐδέ τις ἡμῖν αἴτιος ἀθανάτων. 957 εἴ τι παθὼν ἀπ' ἐμεῦ ἀγαθὸν μέγα μὴ χάριν οἶδας. 1192 ἀλλὰ τί μοι ζῶντι γένοιτ' ἀγαθόν. 1265 οὐδέ τις ἀντ' ἀγαθῶν ἐστι χάρις παρὰ σοί. Aeschyl. Fragm. 241 οὐπω τις Ἀκταίων' ἄθηρος ἡμέρα — ἐπεμψεν ἐς δόμους. Herodot 2, 23, 3 οὐ γάρ τινα ἔγωγε οἶδα ποταμὸν Ὠκεανὸν ἑόντα. 7, 235, 9 αἰεὶ τι προσδοκῶν ἀπ' αὐτῆς τοιοῦτο ἔσεσθαι. Eurip. Medea 283 μὴ μοί τι δράσης παῖδ' ἀνήκεστον κακόν. Elektra 26 μὴ τῷ λαθραίως τέκνα γενναίῳ τέκοι. Helena 477 ἐστι γάρ τις ἐν δόμοις τύχη. Thucyd. 1, 10, 1 εἴ τι τῶν τότε πόλιςμα. Aristoph. Pax 834 καὶ τίς ἐστιν ἄστηρ. Ran. 170 καὶ γάρ τιν' ἐκφέρουσι τουτονὶ νεκρόν. Plato Phaedo 95 B μὴ τις ἡμῖν βασκανία περιτρέψη τὸν λόγον. 101 A μὴ τίς σοι ἐναντίος λόγος ἀπαντήσῃ. Sympos. 174 E καὶ τι ἔφη αὐτόθι γελοῖον παθεῖν. 218 E καὶ τίς ἐστ' ἐν ἐμοὶ δύναμις. Gorg. 493 A ἤδη του ἔγωγε καὶ ἤκουσα τῶν σοφῶν. Xenophon Hellen. 4, 1, 11 ὅταν τι τοῖς φίλοις ἀγαθὸν εὐρίσκω. 4, 8, 33 εἴ τί που λαμβάνοι

### 3 Original text

Ἀθηναίων πλοῖον. Demosth. 18, 18 ἀλλά τις ἦν ἄκριτος καὶ παρὰ τούτοις καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔρις. 18, 65 ἦν ἄν τις κατὰ τῶν ἐναντιωθέντων οἷς ἔπραττεν ἐκεῖνος, μέψις καὶ κατηγορία. Menander Fragm. 572 Kock ὅταν τι πράττης ὅσιον. Fragm. lyr. adesp. 58 Bgk. (3<sup>4</sup>, 706) ἀλλά τις ἄμμι δαίμων. Dazu Plato Leges 3, 683 B εἰ γοῦν, ὃ ξένη, τις ἡμῖν ὑπόχκοιτο θεός, wo zugleich auch noch die Anlehnung von τις an den Vokativ Beachtung verdient, vgl. das oben S. 343 über Πάτροκλέ μοι bemerkte. Aus Nachahmung derartiger Stellen ist dann die Wortfolge von Stellen wie Thucyd. 1, 106, 1 [S. 369] καὶ αὐτῶν μέρος — ἐπέτερεν ἔς του χωρίον ιδιώτου zu erklären, wo mitten im Satze stehendes τις von dem später nachfolgenden Satzteil durch andere Wörter getrennt ist.

Und wie das homerische, drängt auch das nachhomerische τις andere Wörter von der ihnen zukommenden zweiten Stelle weg. Aus der attischen Litteratur gehört bloss etwa die Tmesis Aristoph. Vesp. 437 ἐν τί σοι παγίγεται und Stellen wie Plato Gorg. 520 E ὄντιν' ἄν τις τρόπον ὡς βέλτιστος εἴη hierher. Aber die Wortfolge τις κε hinter dem Einleitungswort eines Konjunktivsatzes, welche die epische Sprache (abgesehen vom gemeinüblichen ὅστις κε) nur in Einem homerischen und Einem hesiodischen Beispiel kennt, ist im Dorischen (natürlich mit κα statt κε) geradezu die Regel. (Vgl. Ahrens Dial. II 383). So im gortynischen Gesetz: 9, 43 αἶ τις [sic] κα. 7, 13 αἶ τινά κα. 3, 29 (ebenso 6, 23. 6, 43. 9, 13) καὶ τί κ'. 8, 17 καὶ μὲν τίς κ'. 3, 9 ὅτι δέ τις κα. Abweichend 5, 13 = 17 = 22 αἶ δέ κα μή τις und 4, 14 ὃ δέ κα μή τις ἦ τέγας, wo μή das Indefinitivum attrahiert hat, sowie ὁπῶ κά τιλ λῆ 10, 33. — Auf jüngern kretischen Inschriften CIG. 3048 (= Cauer<sup>2</sup> 123), 33 εἰ δέ τινές κα τῶν ὀρμιωμένων (ebenso 3049, 9. 3058, 13). 3048, 38 εἶ τις κα ἄγῃ (ebenso 3049, 14. 3058, 16). — Auf den Tafeln von Heraklea 1, 105 καὶ αἶ τινί κα ἄλλῳ. 1, 117 καὶ αἶ τινά κα ἄλλους. 1, 119 αἶ δέ τινά κα γήρα — ἐκπέτῳντι. 1, 127 καὶ εἶ τινές κα μὴ πεφυτεύκῳντι. 1, 128 αἶ δέ τις κα ἐπιβῆ. 1, 151 αἶ δέ τις [sic] κα τῶν καρπιζομένων ἀποθάνει. 1, 173 αἶ τινά κα γήρα — ἐκπέτῳντι. — Auf der Inschrift v. Orchomenos Dittenberger Syll. 178, 10 καὶ εἶ τις κα μὴ ἐμμένη. — Auf der Inschrift von Mykene Collitz 3316, 8 αἶ δέ τί κα πένηται. — Auf den korkyräischen Inschriften Coll. 3206, 25 εἰ δέ τί κ' ἀδύνατον γένοιτο. 3206, 103 εἰ δέ τί κα — μὴ ὀρθῶς ἀπολογίζῳνται. 3206, 114 εἶ τινός κα ἄλλου δοκῇ. Dazu vielleicht Theokrit 2, 159 αἶ δέ τί κά με — λυπῆ. (Siehe unten S. 372).

Angeichts so konstanten Gebrauchs, dem ich, abgesehen von den gortynischen Ausnahmen, wo teils μή im Spiele ist, teils nicht εἰ vorhergeht, nur Epicharm S. 217 Lor. (Athen. 6, 236 A) Ζ. 5 καὶ κά τις ἀντίον <τι> λῆ τήνῳ λέγειν und S. 281 Lor. (Athen. 2, 70 F) αἶ κά τις ἐκτρίψας καλῶς παρατιθῆ νιν als Gegenbeispiele entgegenstellen kann, scheint es mir klar, dass auf der korkyräischen Inschrift 3213 Collitz (= CIG. [S. 370] 1850), 3 das überlieferte αἶ κα πάσχη nicht



mit Boeckh in αἱ κά <τι> πάσχη zu verbessern ist, sondern vielmehr in αἱ <τί> κα πάσχη. Übrigens ist diese Stellungsgewohnheit nicht bloss dorisch: Tafel von Idalion, Z. 29 ὅπι τίς κε τὰς φρήτας τάδε λύσει. — Vgl. ferner Sophron bei Athen. 3, 110 D ἄρτον γάρ τις τυρῶντα τοῖς παιδίοις ἴαλει, mit Trennung von ἄρτον τυρῶντα.

Endlich kann man die Frage aufwerfen, ob nicht die von Herodot an den Prosaisten geläufige Zwischenschiebung von τις zwischen den Artikel nebst eventuellem Attribut und das Substantiv des zugehörigen Genetivus partitivus (z. B. τῶν τινα Λυδῶν, ἐς τῶν ἐκείνων τι χωρίων, τῶν ἄλλων τινὰς Ἑλλήνων) in Sätzen aufgekomen sei, wo τις dadurch an zweite Stelle kam.

Die vom Indefinitum abgeleiteten Adverbia befolgen bei Homer unser Gesetz ziemlich streng. In NIIP findet sich που 14 mal, immer an zweiter Stelle, darunter beachtenswert N 293 μή ποῦ τις ὑπερφιάλως νεμεσῆσει mit Trennung von μή und τις und N 225 ἀλλὰ που. — ποθι zweimal, N 630 ἀλλὰ ποθι, N 309 ἐπὶ οὐ ποθι ἔλπομαι, wo noch οὐ vorhergeht. — πως neunmal, siebenmal an zweiter Stelle, dazu ἀλλ' οὐ πως N 729. P 354 — ποτε viermal, zweimal an zweiter Stelle, daneben N 776 ἄλλοτε δὴ ποτε μᾶλλον ἐρωῆσαι πολέμοιο μέλλω. Π 236 ἤμην δὴ ποτ' ἐμὸν ἔπος ἔκλυες εὐξαμένοιο. — πῇ nur einmal (Π 110), korrekt. — πω fünfmal korrekt, dazu P 190 θέων δ' ἐκίχανεν ἐταίρους ὧκα μάλ', οὐ πω τῆλε, ποτὶ κραιπνοῖσι μετασπών. P 377 δύο δ' οὐ πω φῶτε πεπύσθη. [Ausnahmen aus den andern Büchern verzeichnet Monro<sup>2</sup> S. 336 ff.]

Die nachhomerische Zeit verfährt bei diesen Partikeln recht frei. Reste des Alten liegen ausser in ἦπου, δήπου, vor in Stellen wie Theokrit 18, 1 ἔν ποκ' ἄρα Σπάρτα. — Antipater Anthol. Pal. 6, 219, 1 ἔκ ποτέ τις φρικτοῖο θεᾶς σεσοβημένος οἴστρω. (Nach solchen Mustern dann Pind. Pyth. 2, 33 ὅτι τε μεγαλοκευθέειν ἔν ποτε θαλάμοις. Leonidas Anthol. Pal. 9, 9 Ἴξαιος εὐπύγων αἰγὸς πόσις ἔν ποθ' ἄλωϊ). Vgl. auch Plato Phaedo 73 D ἄλλη που ἐπιστήμη ἀνθρώπου καὶ λύρας. 101 B ὁ αὐτὸς γάρ που φόβος.

Viel ergebnisreicher ist die Betrachtung sonstiger enklitischer Partikeln. Zwar wenn τε und ῥα stets an zweiter Stelle stehen (B 310 βωμοῦ ὑπαῖξας πρὸς ῥα πλατάνιστον ὄρου-[S. 371]θεν ist das Partizip einem Nebensatz gleichwertig), könnte man dies aus ihrer Funktion die Sätze zu verbinden erklären. Andererseits entzieht sich γε jeder durchgreifenden Stellungsregel, weil es an das Wort gebannt ist, auf dessen Begriff das Hauptgewicht der Bejahung fällt; höchstens könnte man darauf hinweisen, dass bei Thucydides mehrmals ein zu einem Partizip gehöriges γε nicht an dieses, sondern an ein früheres Wort angeschlossen ist (Stahl zu Thucyd. 2, 38, 1): 2, 38, 1 ἀγῶσι μὲν γε καὶ θυσίαις διετηρίοις νομίζοντες. 4, 65, 4 οὕτω τῇ γε παρούσῃ εὐτυχίᾳ χρώμενοι. 4, 86, 2 πίστεις γε διδοὺς τὰς

### 3 Original text

μεγίστας. Vgl. Demosth. 18, 226 ὥς γ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ statt ὥς ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ. — Ähnliches wie für γε, gilt für περ.

Aber Eine konstant enklitische Partikel kann doch genannt werden, die, obwohl durchaus nicht der Satzverbindung dienend, doch ganz unverkennbar Vorliebe für die zweite Stelle hat, nämlich κε (κεν, κα). Schon G. Hermann De particula ἄν (Opuscula IV) S. 7 deutet dies mit den Worten an: “κεν, quae quod enclitica est ab incipienda oratione arcetur, etiam ante ea verba, ad quorum sententiam pertinet, poni potest, dummodo aliqua vox in eadem constructione verborum praecesserit”, und bringt als Beispiel H 125 ἦ κε μέγ' οἰώξειε γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεΐδ. Doch denkt Hermann nicht daran, geradewegs der Partikel die zweite Stelle im Satz zu vindizieren. Und selbst der neueste Gesamtdarsteller des homerischen Gebrauchs von κε, E. Eberhard in Ebelings Lexikon, behandelt dessen Stellung zwar auf fast sieben eng gedruckten Spalten, aber ohne prinzipiell über Hermann hinauszukommen, so sehr das von ihm selbst zusammengebrachte Material ihn hätte auf die richtige Bahn bringen müssen. So wenn er im Anschluss an Schnorr hervorhebt, dass κε dem Verb nur dann folge, wenn dieses an der Spitze des Satzes stehe, und dem Partizip nur ψ 47 ἰδοῦσά κε θυμὸν ἰάνθη, oder dass sich die und die Verbindung von κε mit einem vorausgehenden Wort nur “in introitu versus” finde.

Allgemein anerkannt ist vorerst, dass in allen griechischen Mundarten, die κε oder eine Nebenform desselben überhaupt besitzen, die Partikel dem einleitenden Pronomen oder Fügewort konjunktivischer Nebensätze ausnahmslos unmittelbar folgt, es sei denn, dass sich sonstige Enklitika oder Quasi-Enklitika, wie τε, δέ, γάρ, μέν, vereinzelt auch τίς (siehe oben [S. 372] S. 369), τὸ (siehe oben S. 344) und τοῖ (Theognis 633 ὃ τοί κ' ἐπὶ τὸν νόον ἔλθη) dazwischen drängen: ὅς κε, εἰς ὃ κε, εἴ κε, αἶ κε, ἐπεί κε, ὅτε κε (dor. ὅκκα), ἕως κε, ὅφρα κε, ὥς κε, ὅ(π)πως κε oder ὅς δέ κε, εἰ δέ κε u. dergl. (Doch Epicharm S. 225 Lor. [Athen. 6, 236 A] Z. 10 αἶκα δ' ἐντόχῳ τοῖς περιπόλοις und Theokrit 1, 5 αἶκα δ' αἶγα λάβη τήνῃ γέρας neben 1, 10 αἰ δέ κ' ἀρέσκη u. s. w.). Udenkbar scheint mir die von Ahrens für Theokrit 1, 159 vorgeschlagene, von Meineke und Hiller akzeptierte Schreibung αἰ δ' ἔτι κά με — λυπῇ, so dass αἰ von κα durch ἔτι getrennt wäre. Der Zusammenhang hindert nicht das grammatisch einzig zulässige αἰ δέ τί κά με einzusetzen und diese Stelle den oben S. 369 aufgeführten mit τίς zwischen αἰ und κα einzureihen. (Gottfried Hermann εἰ δ' ἔτι καί με — λυπεῖ, was weniger anspricht.)

Ganz Entsprechendes zeigen nun aber die andern Satzarten. Auch die Hauptsätze und interrogativen Nebensätze mit konjunktivischem Verb haben bei Homer κε ausnahmslos an zweiter Stelle, so in NIIP an folgenden Stellen: Π 129 ἐγώ



δέ κε λαὸν ἀγείρω. N 742 (ἐπιφρασσαίμεθα βουλήν) ἢ κεν ἐνὶ νήεσσι πολυκλήϊσι πέσωμεν — ἢ κεν ἔπειτα παρ [sic] νηῶν ἔλθωμεν. P 506 ἢ κ' αὐτὸς ἐνὶ πρώτοισιν ἁλώῃ. Ebenso die Futursätze: P 241 ὥς κε τάχα Τρώων κορέει κύνας ἠδ' οἰωνούς. P 557 εἴ κ' Ἀχιλλῆος ἀγαυοῦ πιστὸν ἐταῖρον τείχει ὑπο Τρώων ταχέες κύνας ἐλκῆουσιν. P 515 τὰ δέ κεν Διὶ πάντα μελήσει. (So auch sonst, und zwar auch auf die Gefahr hin Zusammengehöriges zu trennen: Γ 138 τῷ δέ κε νικήσαντι φίλη κεκλήσῃ ἄκοιτις). Nicht anders ist der Gebrauch beim Optativ und beim Präteritum. In NIP haben wir κε 28 mal an zweiter oder so gut wie zweiter Stelle optativischer Sätze (mit Einschluss von N 127 ἄς οὐτ' ἂν κεν Ἄρης ὀνόσαιτο μετελθὼν οὔτε κ' Ἀθηναίη und von P 629 ὦ πόποι, ἦδη μὲν κε — γνοίη) und 7 mal an zweiter Stelle präteritaler Sätze. Diesen 35 Beispielen, worunter ἁλλὰ κεν N 290 [und dreimal in der Odyssee] und καί κεν N 377. P 613 [und sonst noch oft, s. Ebeling II 733] (vgl. καί μοι), ferner N 321 ἀνδρὶ δέ κ' οὐκ εἴξειε μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας mit seiner Voranstellung von κε vor die Negation besonders bemerkenswert sind, steht nur Ein Gegenbeispiel gegenüber: P 260 τῶν δ' ἁλλων τίς κεν ἦσι φρεσὶν οὐνόματ' εἴποι, wo die Entfernung des fragenden τίς von der ihm zukommenden Stelle am Satzanfang auch für κε, [S. 373] das dem τίς nicht vorangehen durfte, eine Verschiebung nach sich gezogen hat.

Halten wir bei Homer weitere Umschau, so können wir namentlich konstatieren, dass die für die konjunktivischen Nebensätze anerkannte Regel, dass sich κε an das satzeinleitende Wort unmittelbar anschliessen soll, gerade so auch für die optativischen und indikativischen gilt, und ὅς κε, οἷός κε, ὅθεν κε, ὅτε κε, εἰς ὃ κε, ἕως κε, ὅφρα κε, ὥς κε, εἴ κε, αἶ κε bei ihnen gerade so eng zusammenhängen, wie bei den konjunktivischen. Der Ausnahmen für diese wie für die sonstigen κε-Sätze sind verschwindend wenige: Ψ 592 εἰ καὶ νύ κεν οἴκοθεν ἄλλο μεῖζον ἐπατήσεται, wo eben εἰ καὶ eine ähnliche Einheit bildet wie εἴπερ; vgl. N 58 εἰ καὶ μιν. Sodann, wiederum wie bei μιν, mehrere Beispiele mit οὐ: Ξ 91 μῦθον ὃν οὐ κεν ἀνὴρ γε διὰ στόμα πάμπαν ἄγοιτο. α 236 ἐπεὶ οὐ κε θανόντι περ ὧδ' ἀκαχοίμην. δ 64 ἐπεὶ οὐ κε κακοὶ τοιοῦδες τέκοιεν. θ 280 τὰ γ' οὐ κέ τις οὐδὲ ἴδοιτο, und vielleicht noch einige andere. Dann A 256 ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυμῷ. Eine viel seltsamere Ausnahme wäre, zumal da εἴ κε sonst immer zusammenbleibt, E 273 = Θ 196 εἰ τούτῳ κε λάβοιμεν, ἀροίμεθά κεν κλέος ἐσθλόν. Aber schon zahlreiche Herausgeber, zuletzt auch Nauck, haben hier das sinngemässe γε eingesetzt. Um so auffälliger ist Naucks Schreibung γ 319 ὅθεν οὐκ ἔλποιτό κε θυμῷ, ἐλθέμεν gegenüber dem γε aller Handschriften.

Auf den inschriftlichen Denkmälern der Dialekte, welche κε, κα anwenden, kommt diese Partikel ausserhalb der bereits besprochenen konjunktivischen Nebensätze nur selten vor, was durch den Inhalt der meisten derselben bedingt ist.

### 3 Original text

Aeolisch haben wir ein paar mal ὥς κε c. optat, kyprisch das sehr bemerkenswerte τὰς κε ζᾶς τὰςδε — ἔξο(ν)σι αἰφεῖ, also κε an zweiter Stelle zwischen Artikel und Substantiv bei futurischem Verbum (Tafel von Idalion Z. 30; vgl. Hoffmann Griech. Dialekte I 70. 73, der gegenüber dem früher gelesenen γε das Richtige erkannt hat), argivisch (Collitz 3277, 8) ἄι κα δικάσσαιεν, korkyräisch (Collitz 3206, 84) ἀφ' οὗ κ' ἀρχ(ᾶ) γένοιτο, epidaurisch in der grossen Heilunginschrift (3339 Collitz) auf Z. 60 αἶ κα ὑγιῇ νιν ποιῆσαι, aber Z. 84 τοῦτον γὰρ οὐδέ κα ὁ ἐν Ἐπιδάυρῳ Ἀσκληπιὸς ὑγιῇ ποιῆσαι δύναιτο, sowie bei Isyllos (3342 Collitz) neben (Z. 26) οὕτω τοι κ' ἁμῶν περιφεῖ-[S. 374]δοιτ' εὐρύοπα Ζεύς im Vers, Z. 35 f. in Prosa ἢ λώιον οἷ κα εἴη ἀγγράφοντι τὸν παιᾶνα. Ἐμάντευσε λώιόν οἷ κα εἴμεν ἀγγράφοντι.

Ein bischen [sic] reicher an Beispielen für κα sind bloss die dodonäischen und die eleischen Inschriften. Und nun beachte man, dass sämtliche mit τίνι θεῶν θύοντες und Ähnlichem anfangenden und auf ein optativisches Verb ausgehenden Befragungen des dodonäischen Orakels, wenn sie κα haben, dieses unmittelbar hinter τίνι setzen und mit demselben also τίνι von dem nächst zugehörigen Genetiv trennen, ein deutlicher Beweis für den Drang von κα nach der zweiten Stelle: Collitz 1562, 1563, 1566, 1582<sup>a</sup>, 1582<sup>b</sup>, z. B. (1563) τίνι κα θεῶν [ἦ] ἡρώων θύοντες καὶ εὐχ[ό](μ)ενο(ι) ὁμονοοῖεν ἐ[π]ὶ τῷγαθόν. — Ähnlich 1572<sup>a</sup> τί κα θύσας —.

Wenn Blass in der Inschrift 3184 Coll. (= 1564 Coll.) τίνας θεῶν ἱλασκόμενος λώιον καὶ ἄμεινον πράσσοι, die Partikel κα, die allerdings hinter τίνας sicher nicht gestanden hat, an einem Zeilenende hinter λώιον einschieben will, weil sie unerlässlich sei, so übersieht er, dass die dodonäischen Inschriften den Optativ ohne κα mehrmals potenzial verwenden, z. B. 1562 B τίνι θεῶν θύουσα λώιον καὶ ἄμεινον πράσσοι καὶ τὰς νόσου παύσαιτο. 1583, 2 ἦ μὴ ν[α](ν)κλαρῆ(ν) λώιοι καὶ ἄμεινομ [sic] πράσσοιμι. 1587<sup>a</sup> τίνα θεῶν ἢ ἡρώων τιμᾶντι λώιον καὶ ἄμεινον εἴη. — Ausserhalb jener festen mit τίς beginnenden Formel ist allerdings auf diesen Inschriften die Stellung von κα eine freie: 1568, 1 ἦ τυγχάνοιμι κα. 1573 — βέλτιοι μοί κ' εἴη.

Bei den eleischen Inschriften müssen zunächst 1151, 12. 1154, 7. 1157, 4. 1158, 2 ausser Rechnung fallen, weil hier κα zwar überliefert, aber seine Stellung im Satz nicht erkennbar ist; ebenso alle Beispiele mit ergänztem κα, ausser 1151, 19, wo die Stelle des zu ergänzenden κα wenigstens negativ festgestellt werden kann. Es bleiben so 28 Beispiele: 21 bieten κα an zweiter oder so gut wie zweiter Stelle, wobei ich 1149, 9 ἐν τήπιάρῳ κ' ἐνέχοιτο und 1152, 7 ἐν ταῖ ζεκαμναῖαι κ' ἐνέχοιτο mit einrechne; diesen 21 stehen bloss 7 Gegenbeispiele gegenüber. Das Gewicht dieser Zahlen wird verstärkt durch die Beschaffenheit folgender Stellen: 1154, 1

τοὶ ζέ κα θεοκόλοι. 1154, 3 πεντακατίας κα δαρχμάς. 1156, 2 ἃ δέ κα φράτρα. 1156, 3 τῶν δέ κα γραφίων. 1158, 1 ὁ δέ κα ξένος, [S. 375] an welchen allen κα den Artikel oder ein Attribut von seinem Substantiv trennt. Dazu kommt 1157, 7 τῶν ζέ προσιζίων οὐζέ κα μί' εἴη, wo κα zwar nicht an zweiter Stelle steht, aber die Tmesis doch ein Drängen der Partikel nach dem Satzanfang verrät.

Für die nachhomerischen Dichter darf man trotz der Spärlichkeit der Belege Geltung der Regel bis an den Schluss des sechsten Jahrhunderts behaupten. Die Fragmente der vorpindarischen Meliker, wie die der Elegiker vor Theognis bieten κε, κα nur an zweiter Stelle (siehe bes. auch Xenophanes 2, 10 ταῦτά χ' ἅπαντα λάχοι). Sappho Fragm. 66 ὁ δ' Ἄρεος φαίσι κεν Ἀφαιστον ἄγην ist schlecht überliefert, und Alcaeus 83 schreibt zwar Bergk: αἶ κ' εἶπης, τὰ θέλεις, <αὐτός> ἀκούσας <κε>, τὰ κ' οὐ θέλοις. Aber weder αὐτός noch κε ist überliefert. Man wird jetzt andre Wege der Besserung versuchen müssen. Dann freilich die theognideische Spruchsammlung, Pindar und Epicharm gehn von der alten Norm ab: Theognis (neben Stellen wie 900 μέγα κεν πῆμα βροτοῖσιν ἐπὶν) 645, 653, 747, 765; Pindar öfters; Epicharm (gegenüber normalem Gebrauch S. 223, Busiris Fragm. 1; S. 264, Fragm. 33, 1 und S. 267 Vs. 12) S. 257, Fragm. 7, 1. S. 267, Vs. 9. S. 268, Vs. 16. S. 269, Vs. 11. S. 274, Fragm. 53; Vs. 167 Mullach: wobei man die Frage nach der Echtheit der einzelnen Stellen wohl auf sich beruhen lassen kann.

Von den noch übrigen enklitischen Partikeln θην, νυ, τοι steht θήν [sic] bei Homer immer an zweiter Stelle (natürlich mit Einrechnung von Φ 568 καὶ γάρ θην und Θ 448 οὐ μέν θην); ebenso Aeschylus Prom. 928 κύ θην ἃ χρῆζεις, ταῦτ' ἐπιγλωσσᾷ Διός; ebenso bei Theokrit in den ererbten Verbindungen τύ θην 1, 97, 7, 83 (vgl. Aeschylus a. a. O.) und καὶ γάρ θην 6, 34 (vgl. Φ 568), daneben noch in αἰνός θην 14, 43 und πείρα θην 15, 62. Zweimal (2, 114. 5, 111) hat Theokrit die Regel verletzt. Vor ihm schon Epicharm Ἐλπίς S. 226 Lor., Vs. 2 καίτοι νῦν γὰ θην εὖωνον αἰνεῖ σῖτον.

νυ, νυν stehen bei Homer so gut wie immer an zweiter Stelle, zu schliessen aus der Bemerkung bei Ebeling s. v.: "particula ut est enclitica, ita ad vocem gravissimam quamque se applicat." T 95 καὶ γάρ δή νύ ποτε Ζεὺς ἄκατο rechne ich nicht als Ausnahme. Umgekehrt fällt stark ins Gewicht, [S. 376] erstens dass νυ andern Enklitika, wie μοι, τοι, οἱ, σε, τις, τι, ποτε, που (doch K 105 ὅσα ποὺ νυν ἐέλπεται), περ, κεν regelmässig vorangeht, und nur δέ vor sich hat; dazu νὺ γάρ N 257 neben γάρ νυ O 239. γάρ δή νυ T 95. Zweitens trennt es öfters enge Verbindungen oder hilft solche trennen: Attribut und Substantiv Θ 104 ἡπεδανός δέ νύ τοι θεράπων. T 169 θαρσαλέον νύ τοι ἦτορ ἐνὶ φρεσίν. Ω 205 = 521 σιδήρειόν νύ τοι ἦτορ. Artikel und Substantiv A 382 οἱ δέ νυ λαοὶ θνησκον. X 405 ἡ δέ νυ μήτηρ τίλλε κόμην. Präposition und Substantiv I 116 ἀντί νυ πολλῶν λαῶν ἐστὶν

### 3 Original text

άνηρ. Gegen die Regel verstösst, so viel ich sehe, nur α 217 ὥς δὴ ἔγωγ' ὄφελον μάκαρός νύ τευ ἔμμεναι υἱὸς ἀνέρος.

Für den nachhomerischen Gebrauch verweise ich auf φέρε νυν, ἄγε νυν (Aristoph. Pax 1056), μή νυν, ferner auf das zumal bei Herodot so oft an zweiter Stelle zu lesende μέν νυν, sowie endlich auf Sophokles Philokt. 468 πρὸς νύν σε πατρός πρὸς τε μητρός — ἰκέτης ἰκνοῦμαι. Oed. Col. 1333 πρὸς νύν σε κρηνῶν καὶ θεῶν ὁμογνίων αἰτῶ πιθέσθαι. Eurip. Helena 137 πρὸς νύν σε γονάτων τῶνδ(ε). Ferner auf Sophokles Phil. 1177 ἀπὸ νύν με λείπετ' ἤδη. Eurip. Hiket. 56 μετὰ νυν δός. Vgl. auch Lobeck zum Aias Vs. 1332. — Im Kyprischen ist die Stellung von νυ freier: Tafel von Idal. 6 ἢ δυσάνοι νυ. 16 ἢ δώκοι νυ. Ebenso im Böotischen: Collitz 488, 88 κῆ τῇ οὐπεραμερίῃ ἄκουρὺ νυ ἔνθω (= καὶ αἱ ὑπερημέρια ἄκυροι ἔστων). — Ob übrigens in kypr. ὄνυ "hic", τόνυ "hunc", arkad. τάνυ "hanc" die Partikel νυ enthalten sei, scheint mir höchst zweifelhaft. Eher das υ von οὗτος; vgl. ark. τωνί, ταννί.

Endlich noch ein Wort über τοι, soweit es reine Partikel geworden ist, für das die Stellung nach unserer Regel allgemein anerkannt ist; vgl. καίτοι, μέντοι. Danach 1) Tmesis: Eurip. Herakles 1105 ἔκ τοι πέπληγμα. Orestes 1047 ἔκ τοί με τήξει. Aristoph. Vesp. 784 ἀνά τοί με πείθει. 2) Aristoph. Ekkles. 976 διὰ τοι σὲ πόνους ἔχω. Ferner mit γάρ τοι Theognis 287 ἐν γάρ τοι πόλει ὧδε κακοψόγω ἀνδάνει οὐδέν. Plato Phaedo 60 C περὶ γάρ τοι τῶν ποιημάτων. 108 D περὶ γάρ τοι γῆς πολλὰ ἀκήκοα. 3) Sophokles Fragm. 855, 1 ὦ παῖδες, ἢ τοι Κύπρις οὐ Κύπρις μόνον. Eurip. Fragm. 222 N.<sup>2</sup> τὴν τοι Δίκην λέγουσι παῖδ' εἶναι Χρόνου. Aristoph. Pax 511 οἱ τοι γεωργοὶ τοῦργον ἐξέλκουσι. Plato Sympos. [S. 377] 219 A ἢ τοι τῆς διανοίας ὄψις. Ferner mit γάρ τοι Eurip. Helena 93 τὸ γάρ τοι πρᾶγμα κυφορὰν ἔχει. Plato Apol. 29 A τὸ γάρ τοι θάνατον δεδιέναι. 4) Theognis 95 τοιοῦτός τοι ἐταῖρος (Bergk ἐταίρω) ἀνὴρ φίλος. 605 πολλῶ τοι πλέονα λμοῦ κόρος ὤλεσεν ἤδη ἄνδρας. 837 δις αἰ τοι πόσιος κῆρες δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν. 965 πολλοὶ τοι κίβδηλοι — κρύπτους(ι). 1027 ῥηιδίη τοι πρῆξις ἐν ἀνθρώποις κακότητος. 1030 δειλὼν τοι κραδίη γίγνεται ὀξυτέρη. Aeschyl. Agam. 363 Δία τοι ξένιον μέγαν αἰδοῦμαι. Eur. Or. 1167. Plato Sympos. 218 E ἀμήχανόν τοι κάλλος u. s. w.

Attisch τοιγάρτοι ist auch ein Zeichen für den Drang der Partikel nach vorn. Bei Homer kommt τοιγάρτοι noch nicht vor. Dafür haben wir noch mehrfach τοιγάρ ἐγώ τοι — καταλέξω (oder ein anderes Futurum), wo eigentlich hinter τοιγάρ leicht zu interpungieren ist: "weil es so (τοί = Instrumental τῷ + ι?) ist, —". Nachhomerisch wurde dann τοι — und ebenso οὖν — unmittelbar an τοιγάρ angeschlossen; τοιγάρτοι: τοιγάρ — τοι = latein. utrumne: utrum — ne (siehe unten).

## VI.

Dicht neben die Enklitika stellt sich eine Gruppe von Wörtern, die Krüger passend postpositive Partikeln nennt, weil sie gerade so wenig wie die Enklitika fähig sind an der Spitze eines Satzes zu stehen: ἄν, ἄρ, ἄρα, αὖ, γάρ, δέ, δήτα, μέν, μήν, οὖν, τοίνυν. Woher diese Ähnlichkeit mit den Enklitika herrührt, habe ich hier nicht zu untersuchen. Doch scheinen verschiedene Momente in Betracht zu kommen: eine dieser Partikeln, nämlich αὖ, könnte ursprünglich wirklich enklitisch gewesen sein, da sie dem altindischen Enklitikum *u* etymologisch entspricht, was ich gegenüber Kretschmer KZ. XXXI 364 festhalte. Sodann setzt sich τοίνυν aus zwei Enklitika τοι νυν zusammen. Das Ursprüngliche war jedenfalls z. B. αὐτός τοί νυν. Seit wann man αὐτόν τοίνυν sprach, lässt sich nicht mehr ermitteln. Bei andern lässt sich denken, dass sie erst allmählich postpositiv geworden seien, gerade wie im Lateinischen *enim* und nach dessen Vorbild später *namque* (*itaque* nach *igitur*). So wird man ἄν kaum von der lateinischen und gotischen Fragepartikel *an* trennen können, und die ist in beiden Sprachen präpositiv. Man wird wohl sagen dürfen, dass im Griechischen die Partikel durch den Einfluss [S. 378] von κε, mit dem sie bedeutungsgleich geworden war, von der ersten Stelle im Satz weggelenkt und postpositiv geworden sei. Vor unsern Augen vollzieht sich eine derartige Wendung bei δή, das bei Homer und bei den seiner Sprache folgenden Dichtern den Satz einleiten kann, aber schon bei Homer entschieden postpositiv zu werden beginnt und dies in der Prosa ausschliesslich ist.

Nun liegt aber bei beiden Arten von postpositiven Partikeln, sowohl bei den von Haus aus enklitischen wie αὖ, als bei den unter den Einfluss eines Enklitikums getretenen wie ἄν, die Frage nahe, ob sie an der speziellen Stellungsregel der Enklitika, wie sie sich bei unserer Betrachtung herausgestellt hat, Anteil nehmen. Für diejenigen unter ihnen, die der Satzverknüpfung dienen, überhaupt für alle ausser ἄν, ist wohl anerkannt, dass sie dies thun, und bekannt, dass sie gerade so wie die eigentlichen Enklitika vermöge der Stellungsregel oft Tmesis und Ähnliches bewirken z. B. Sophokles Antig. 601 κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία θεῶν τῶν νεπτέρων ἀμῶ κοπίς. Eurip. Herakles 1085 ἀν' αὖ βακχεύει Καδμείων πόλιν. Häufig tritt οὖν zwischen Präposition und Kasus, zwischen Artikel und Substantiv. Ganz regelmässig thut dies δέ, bei dem überhaupt die Regel am schärfsten ist, da es vor allen Enklitika und Enklitoiden den Vortritt hat und nur äusserst selten an dritter Stelle steht. Bei den andern erleidet die Regel gewisse Einschränkungen: ἄρα folgt etwa einmal erst dem Verb z. B. E 748 Ἥρη δὲ μάστιγι θεῶς ἐπεμαίετ' ἄρ' ἵππους. Herodot 4, 45, 21 πρότερον δὲ ἢν ἄρα ἀνώνυμος. Οὖν wird gern von

### 3 Original text

der mit einem Verb verbundenen Präposition attrahiert und tritt dann zwischen sie und das Verbum: so überaus oft bei Herodot und Hippokrates; Hipponax (?) *Fragm.* 61 ἐσπέρης καθεύδοντα ἀπ' οὖν ἔδυσε; Epicharm *S.* 225 *Lor.* (Athen. 6, 236 A) *V.* 76: τήνῳ κυδάζομαι τε κάπ' ὦν ἠχθόμαν. Melanippides bei *Ath.* 10, 429 C τάχα δὴ τάχα τοὶ μὲν ἀπ' ὦν ὄλοντο. Sehr frei ist die Stellung von δὴ.

Eine Sonderstellung nimmt ἄν ein. Gottfried Hermann lehrt *Opusc.* 4, 7 “ἄν cum non sit enclitica et tamen initio poni nequeat, apertum est poni eam debere post eorum aliquod vocabulorum, ad quorum sententiam constituendam pertinet”, und stellt ἄν in scharfen Gegensatz zu κε. Schon bei Homer trete der Unterschied der Stellung an den beiden Beispielen [*S.* 379] ἧ κε μέγ' οἰμῶξειε, wo κε unmittelbar auf ἧ folge, und ἧ c' ἄν τικάμην, wo sich ἄν erst an das zweite Wort, cε, anschliesse, deutlich hervor. Dieser Unterschied zwischen ἄν und κεν muss uns überraschen. Wenn die Annahme richtig ist, dass ἄν durch den Einfluss von κε postpositiv geworden ist, so können wir für ἄν keine andre Stellung als die von κεν erwarten.

Ist aber der von Hermann behauptete Gegensatz wirklich vorhanden? Jedenfalls nicht in einer umfänglichen Kategorie von Sätzen, den Nebensätzen mit konjunktivischem Verbum. Denn hier ist unmittelbarer Anschluss an das satzeinleitende Wort bei ἄν ebenso unbedingte Regel wie bei κε(ν). Hierbei gilt ὅστις als Worteinheit; ebenso ὅποιός τις: Plato *Phaedo* 81 E ὅποι' ἄττ' ἄν καὶ μεμελετηκυῖαι τύχωσι. Xenophon *Poroï* 1, 1 ὅποιοί τινες ἄν οἱ προεστάται ὦσι. Ferner gehen gewisse Partikeln, die selbst an den Satzanfang drängen, nämlich γάρ, γε, δέ, μέν, -περ, τε dem ἄν regelmässig voran, vereinzelt auch δὴ z. B. Plato *Phaedo* 114 B οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄν δόξωσι διαφερόντως προκεκρίσθαι, μέντοι z. B. Xenophon *Cyrop.* 2, 1, 9 οἱ γε μέντ' ἄν αὐτῶν φεύγωσι, οὖν z. B. Aristoph. *Ran.* 1420 ὁπότερος οὖν ἄν τῇ πόλει παραινέειν μέλλει τι χρηστόν, (wiewohl Herodot an einigen Stellen dem ἄν auch vor μέν und δέ den Vortritt lässt 1, 138, 5 ὅς ἄν δὲ τῶν ἄκτῶν λέρην — ἔχη. 3, 72, 25 ὅς ἄν μέν νυν τῶν πυλωρῶν ἐκὼν παρή. 7, 8<sup>δ</sup>3 ὅς ἄν δὲ ἔχων ἦκη. 7, 8<sup>δ</sup>3 ὅς ἄν δὲ ἔχων ἦκη). [sic] Aber vor allen andern Wörtern hat ἄν den Vortritt. Die nicht entschuldbare Ausnahme Antiphon 5, 38 καθ' ὦν μηνύη ἄν τις hat Mätzner längst aus dem Oxoniensis, welcher καθ' ὦν ἄν μηνύη τις schreibt, berichtigt. Um so unbegreiflicher ist noch in der zweiten Ausgabe der *Fragm. Trag.* von Nauck unter Euripides *Fragm.* 1029 den Versen zu begegnen ἀρετὴ δ' ὅσῳ περ μᾶλλον ἄν χρῆσθαι θέλῃς, τοσῶδε μείζων γίγνεται καθ' ἡμέραν. Für das fehlerhafte μᾶλλον ἄν vermutet Dümmler ἄν πλέον. Oder ist θέλῃς in θέλοισ zu ändern? — Sicherer scheint mir die Heilung einer dritten Stelle mit falsch gestelltem ἄν: Aristoph. *Ran.* 259 ὁπόσον ἢ φάρυγξ ἄν ἡμῶν χανδάνῃ. Es ist einfach umzustellen ἢ φάρυγξ ὁπόσον ἄν ἡμῶν, wodurch die



Responsion mit Vers 264 οὐδέποτε· κεκράζομαι γάρ nicht schlechter wird. Ganz eng ist der Anschluss von ἄν an das Fügewort geworden in ion. ἤν, [S. 380] att. ἄν, woraus durch nochmaligen Vortritt von εἰ das gewöhnliche ἔάν entstanden ist, in ὅταν, ἐπειδάν, ἐπάν = ion. ἐπήν, wo dann die Möglichkeit auch nur eine Partikel dem ἄν vorzuschieben wegfällt.

Aber auch in den andern Satzarten ist ursprünglich zwischen den Stellungsgewohnheiten von ἄν und denen von κε(v) kein wesentlicher Unterschied zu bemerken. In Hauptsätzen wie in indikativischen und optativischen Nebensätzen finden wir bei Homer auf ἄν die Stellungsregel der Enklitika angewandt. Nur in wenigen Fällen entfernt sich ἄν etwas weiter von der Regel. Erstens hinter οὐ: A 301 τῶν οὐκ ἄν τι φέροις. B 488 πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἄν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω. Γ 66 ἐκὼν δ' οὐκ ἄν τις ἔλοιτο. O 40 τὸ μὲν οὐκ ἄν ἐγὼ ποτε μὰς ὁμόσαιμι. P 489 ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄν ἐφορμηθέντε γε νῶϊ τλαῖεν ἐναντίβιον στάντες μαχέσασθαι Ἄρηι. Nun haben wir schon früher wiederholt beobachtet, dass die Negationen gern die Enklitika hinter sich nehmen. Und wenn bei κε diese Erscheinung weniger zu Tage tritt als bei ἄν, so darf an Ficks Bemerkung erinnert werden, dass das überhaupt im überlieferten Text auffallend häufige οὐκ ἄν mehrfach an die Stelle von οὐ κεν getreten scheine. (Doch siehe hiergegen Monro A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect 2. Ausg. S. 330). Dazu kommen noch drei weitere Stellen, eine mit καὶ ἄν: E 362 = 457 ὃς νῦν γε καὶ ἄν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο, während Ξ 244 f. ἄλλον μὲν κεν ἔγωγε θεῶν αἰειγενετάων ῥεῖα κατευνήσαιμι καὶ ἄν ποταμοῖο ῥέεθρα Ὀκεανοῦ das καὶ ἄν als neuer Satzanfang betrachtet werden kann. Eine mit τάχ' ἄν: A 205 ἧς ὑπεροπλήρῃσι τάχ' ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσσει. (Vgl. τάχ' ἄν am Satzanfang β 76 τάχ' ἄν ποτε καὶ τίς τις εἶη.) Endlich eine mit τότ' ἄν (vgl. τότ' ἄν am Satzanfang Σ 397, Ω 213, ι 211): X 108 ἐμοὶ δὲ τότ' ἄν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη. Diese paar Stellen genügen doch gewiss nicht, um Hermanns scharfe Trennung von ἄν und κε(v) zu rechtfertigen. Sein eigenes Beispiel ἦ c' ἄν τιταίμην gegenüber ἦ κε μέγ' οἰώξειε besagt nichts, da c(ε) enklitisch ist. Und aus εἶ περ ἄν gegenüber H 387 αἶ κε περ ὕμνι φίλον καὶ ἡδὺ γένοιτο lassen sich natürlich ebenfalls keine Folgerungen ziehen. Vergleiche überdies die freilich bestrittenen Verbindungen ὄφρ' ἄν μὲν κεν, οὗτ' ἄν κεν.

Die nachhomerische Litteratur hat ἄν streng nach der alten Regel in den konjunktivischen Nebensätzen. Schwan-[S. 381]kender ist der Gebrauch bei Nebensätzen mit anderm Modus. Doch haftet auch hier ἄν in gewissen Fällen fest am Einleitungswort. Besonders in betracht kommen die Verbindungen ὥς ἄν, ὅπως ἄν, ὥσπερ ἄν.

Am klarsten ist der Sachverhalt bei den mit ὥς und ὅπως beginnenden, den Optativ oder Indikativ mit ἄν enthaltenden Final- und Konsekutivsätzen, dank

### 3 Original text

den Sammlungen, die für die erstern Weber angelegt und publiziert hat (Weber Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze [Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache herausgegeben von M. Schanz II] 1 und 2). In solchen Sätzen haben wir  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  in unmittelbarer Folge nicht bloss bei Homer (z. B. ρ 562  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\pi\acute{\upsilon\rho\nu\alpha}$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\mu\eta\eta\sigma\tau\eta\rho\alpha\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omicron\iota$ ) sondern auch Archiloch. Fragm. 30  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu$   $\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$  und Fragm. 101  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\sigma\epsilon$   $\theta\omega\iota\grave{\eta}$   $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\omicron\iota$ . Pindar Olymp. 7, 42  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$   $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\iota$   $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\iota\epsilon\nu$   $\beta\omega\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$ . Sophokles bei Aristoph. Aves 1338  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta\nu$ . Herodot 1, 152, 4  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\pi\upsilon\nu\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$   $\pi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\iota$   $\sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\omicron\iota\epsilon\nu$   $\Sigma\pi\alpha\rho\tau\iota\eta\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ . Ebenso 5, 37, 9. 7, 176, 20. 8, 7, 2. 9, 22, 18. 9, 51, 14. [Andocides] 4, 23  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$   $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$   $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$   $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\tau\eta$   $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\iota$   $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\epsilon$ . Plato Phaedo 82 E  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$   $\acute{\omicron}$   $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\xi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\pi\tau\omega\rho$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\delta\epsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ . Sympos. 187 D  $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\nu$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\iota$   $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$   $\omicron\acute{\iota}$   $\mu\grave{\eta}$   $\pi\omega$   $\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$   $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ . 190 C  $\delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\omega}$   $\mu\omicron\iota$  —  $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$   $\mu\eta\chi\alpha\nu\eta\nu$ ,  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\epsilon\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota\nu\tau\omicron$   $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\lambda\alpha\varsigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ . Demosth. 6, 37  $\omega\varsigma$   $\delta'$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$   $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau'$   $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\iota\beta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ,  $\mu\grave{\eta}$   $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$ , wo das  $\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  doch wohl konsekutiv zu nehmen ist. Sehr häufig bei Xenophon, dem einzigen attischen Prosaisten, der häufig  $\omega\varsigma$  mit  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  und dem Optativ in rein finalem Sinne verbindet. Von den siebzehn bei Weber S. 83 ff. aufgeführten Belegstellen haben vierzehn  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  unmittelbar hinter  $\omega\varsigma$ , nur drei davon getrennt, final Cyrop. 5, 1, 18  $\omega\varsigma$   $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$ . 7, 5, 37  $\omega\varsigma$   $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$   $\eta\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\phi\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$   $\tau\epsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\sigma\epsilon\mu\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$   $\varphi\alpha\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$ , konsekutiv Sympos. 9, 3  $\omega\varsigma$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ ,  $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$   $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$   $\eta\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon$ : die ersten und einzigen Fälle, wo die den Zusammenschluss von  $\omega\varsigma$  und  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  verlangende Tradition durchbrochen ist. Allerdings kommen nach der handschriftlichen Überlieferung noch zwei euripideische Verse hinzu: Iphig. Taur. 1024  $\omega\varsigma$   $\delta\grave{\eta}$   $\sigma\kappa\acute{\omicron}\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\sigma\omega\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  und Iphig. Aul. 171  $\text{Ἀχαιῶν στρατιᾶν ὥς ἴδοιμι' ἄν}$ . Aber der erstere Vers ist seit Markland den Kritikern verdächtig, und im [S. 382] zweiten schreibt man jetzt allgemein  $\omega\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$  [Pl. Gorg. 453 C  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$   $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\iota\eta$ ,  $\omega\varsigma$   $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau'$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  —  $\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\iota\acute{\iota}$  ist  $\omega\varsigma$  relativ.]

Noch fester ist die Verbindung  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  in solchen Sätzen: Aeschylus Agam. 362  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  —  $\mu\grave{\eta}\tau\epsilon$   $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}$   $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\upsilon$   $\mu\grave{\eta}\theta'$   $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$   $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\rho\omega\nu$   $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\theta\iota\omicron\nu$   $\sigma\kappa\eta\psi\epsilon\iota\nu$ . Herodot 1, 75, 16  $\acute{\omicron}\kappa\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\tau\acute{\omicron}$   $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\pi\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\iota}\delta\rho\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\nu\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\omicron\iota$ . Ebenso 1, 91, 7. 1, 110, 16. 2, 126, 7. 3, 44, 5. 5, 98, 20. 8, 13, 9. — Thucydides 7, 65, 1  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\mu\grave{\eta}$   $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\iota$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\lambda\alpha\beta\eta\nu$   $\eta$   $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho$ . Aristoph. Ekkles. 881  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\tau\iota\nu\alpha$ . Plato Lysis 207 E  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\eta\varsigma$ . Sehr häufig bei Xenophon, zwölfmal (ungerechnet  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$  "wie" nach Verben des Beratens und Überlegens) nach den Nachweisen von Weber 2, S. 83 ff., überall so, dass  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  dem  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$  unmittelbar folgt; eigentümlich Sympos. 7, 2  $\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\acute{\omega}$ ,  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\omicron}$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$   $\acute{\omicron}\delta\epsilon$   $\acute{\omicron}$   $\sigma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\eta$   $\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$   $\eta\delta\epsilon$   $\omega\varsigma$   $\rho\acute{\alpha}\chi\tau\alpha$   $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\gamma\omicron\iota\epsilon\nu$ ,  $\eta\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$   $\delta'$   $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$   $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$  ( $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ )



εὐφραينوίμεθα. Corpus Inscr. Att. 2, 300, 20 (295/4 a. Ch.) ὅπως ἂν ὁ δῆμο[c ἀπαλλαγίῃ τ]οῦ πολέμου, wo der von Herwerden und Weber 2 S. 3 empfohlene Konjunktiv ἀπαλλαγῇ für die Lücke, deren Umfang durch die στοιχηδὸν-Schreibung feststeht, zu kurz ist. — Nach allem dem kann kein Zweifel sein, dass Hermann und Velsen Aristoph. Ekkles. 916 mit Unrecht ὅπως αὐτῆς <ἂν> κατόναι(ο) schreiben wollen, und dass, wenn hier überhaupt ἂν einzusetzen ist, es seine Stelle unmittelbar hinter ὅπως haben muss.

Den Finalsätzen mit ὥς, ὅπως ganz nahe stehn die mit denselben Partikeln oder auch mit πῶς eingeleiteten indirekten Fragesätze mit Optativ und ἂν. a) ὥς ἂν ist unmittelbar verbunden Plato Republ. 5, 473 A ἐὰν οἷοί τε γενώμεθα εὐρεῖν, ὥς ἂν ἐγγύτατα τῶν εἰρημένων πόλις οἰκῇσιν. Xenophon. Oeconom. 19, 18 διδάσκει, ὥς ἂν κάλλιστα τις αὐτῇ χρῶτο. Demosth. 4, 13 τᾶλλ' ὥς ἂν μοι βέλτιστα καὶ τάχιστα δοκεῖ παρασκευασθῆναι, καὶ δὴ πειράσομαι λέγειν. [20,87] Abweichend ist, so viel ich sehe, nur der zweite Teil des demosthenischen Beispiels 6, 3 ὥς μὲν ἂν εἴποιτε καὶ — συνεῖτε, ἄμεινον Φιλίππου παρεσκεύασθε, ὥς δὲ κωλύσαιτ' ἂν ἐκείνον —, παντελῶς ἀργῶς ἔχετε. [Demosth.] 10, 45 siehe unten, b) ὅπως ἂν ist unmittelbar verbunden [Hippokrates] περὶ τέχνης c. 2 pag. 42, 20 Gomp. οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἂν τις αὐτὰ νομίσειε μὴ ἔοντα. Auch häufig bei Xenophon: Anab. 2, 5, 7 τὸν γὰρ θεῶν πόλεμον οὐκ οἶδα —, ὅπως ἂν εἰς ἐχυρὸν χωρίον ἀποσταίῃ. Ebenso Anab. [S. 383] 3, 2, 27. 4, 3, 14. 5, 7, 20. Hellenika 2, 3, 13. 3, 2, 1. 7, 1, 27. 7, 1, 33. Cyropädie 1, 4, 13. 2, 1, 4. — Gegenbeispiele habe ich keine zur Hand. (Vgl. aber Eurip. Hel. 146 f. ὥς τύχῳ μαντευμάτων, ὅπῃ νεὸς στεῖλαιμι' ἂν οὐρίον περὶον.) c) πῶς ἂν unmittelbar verbunden z. B. Xenophon Anab. 1, 7, 2 συνεβουλεύετο, πῶς ἂν τὴν μάχην ποιοῖτο. Demosth. 19, 14 εἰ — ἐσκόπει —, πῶς ἂν ἄριστ' ἐναντιωθῇ τῇ εἰρήνῃ. Auch hier habe ich keine Gegenbeispiele.

Aber auch das relativische ὥς, ὥσπερ 'wie' zeigt die Eigentümlichkeit ἂν fest an sich zu fesseln; zwar haben wir, um mit ὥς zu beginnen, bei Sophokles Oed. Col. 1678 ὥς μάλιστα' ἂν ἐν πόθῳ λάβοις, bei Plato Phaedo 59 A ὥς εἰκὸς δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι παρόντι πένθει. 118 B ὥς ἡμεῖς φαῖμεν ἂν. Sympos. 190 A ὥς ἀπὸ τούτων ἂν τις εἰκάσειεν. Phileb. 15 C ὥς γοῦν ἐγὼ φαίην ἂν. Leges 4, 712 C ὥς γ' ἡμεῖς ἂν οἰηθεῖμεν und öfters; bei Xenoph. Anab. 1, 5, 8 θᾶττον ἢ ὥς τις ἂν ᾤετο, bei Pseudo-Demosth. 10, 45 ὥς μὲν οὖν εἴποι τις ἂν, — ταῦτ' ἴσως ἐστίν· (der Rest des Satzes: ὥς δὲ καὶ γένοιτ' ἂν, νόμῳ διορθώσασθαι δεῖ, enthält fragendes ὥς). Aber diesen Beispielen gegenüber haben wir nicht bloss bei Plato Phaedrus 231 A ἐκόντες, ὥς ἂν ἄριστα περὶ τῶν οἰκείων βουλεύσαιντο, πρὸς τὴν δύναμιν τὴν αὐτῶν εὖ ποιοῦσιν, [Apol. 34 C]; bei Demosth. 27, 7 ὥς ἂν συντομώτατ' εἴποι τις. 39, 22 στέρεξας ὥς ἂν υἱὸν τις στέρεξαι. 45, 18 οὐδὲ μεμαρτύρηκεν ἀπλῶς,

### 3 Original text

ὥς ἂν τις τάλιθῃ μαρτυρήσειε. Proöm. 2, 3 (Bβ bei Blass) τὸ — μὴ πάνθ' ὥς ἂν ἡμεῖς βουλοίμεθ' ἔχειν —, οὐδέν ἐστι θαυμαστόν, sondern vor allem kommt in betracht der elliptische Gebrauch von ὥς ἂν, der nur zu begreifen ist, wenn enge Verbindung von ὥς ἂν im Sprachbewusstsein festsass. Eigentlich ist bei solchem Gebrauch das Verb des Hauptsatzes in optativischer Form wiederholt zu denken, wie es an den angeführten Stellen Demosth. 39, 22 und 45, 18 wirklich wiederholt ist.

Es steht dieses ὥς ἂν a) vor εἰ Plato Protag. 344 B ὥς ἂν εἰ λέγοι; vgl. das ὥσανεί der nachklassischen Gräzität; b) vor Partizipien; α) mit neuem Subjekt: Xenophon Cyrop. 1, 3, 8 καὶ τὸν Κύρον ἐρέσθαι προπετῶς, ὥς ἂν παῖς μηδέπω ὑποπτῆσων. Memorab. 3, 8, 1 ἀπεκρίνατο, οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ φυλαττόμενοι —, ἀλλ' ὥς ἂν πεπεισμένοι μάλιστα πράττειν τὰ δέοντα. Demosth. 4, 6 ἔχει τὰ μέν, ὥς ἂν ἐλών τις πολέμῳ. 24, 79 οὐδὲ ταῦθ' ἀπλῶς — φανήσεται γεγραφώς, ἀλλ' ὥς [S. 384] ἂν μάλιστα τις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατῆσαι καὶ παρακρούσασθαι βουλόμενος. [Demosth.] 34, 22 συγγραφὰς ἐποιήσαντο —, ὥς ἂν οἱ μάλιστα ἀπιστοῦντες. Häufiger β) ohne ausdrückliche Nennung des eigentlich gedachten unbestimmten Subjekts ("wie einer thäte in der und der Verfassung"), wobei dann ὥς ἂν der Bedeutung von ἄτε sehr nahe kommt und das Partizip sich nach dem Kasus desjenigen Wortes im Hauptsatz richtet, dessen Begriff als Träger der partizipialen Bestimmung vorschwebt. So schon Solon Fragm. 36, 10 Bgk. (nun bestätigt durch Aristot. Ἀθην. πολιτεία S. 31, 10 Kenyon) γλῶσσαν οὐκέτ' Ἀττικὴν ἰέντας [sic] ὥς ἂν πολλαχοῦ πλανωμένους. Lysias 1, 12 ἡ γυνὴ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἀπιέναι, ὥς ἂν ἀσμένῃ με ἑορακῦα. Xenophon Memorab. 3, 6, 4 διεσιώπησεν, ὥς ἂν τότε σκοπῶν, ὁπόθεν ἄρχοιτο. Demosth. 21, 14 κρότον τοιοῦτον ὥς ἂν ἐπαινοῦντές τε καὶ συνησθέντες ἐποιήσατε. 19, 256 θρυλοῦντος ἀεί, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὥς ἂν εἰς κοινὴν γνώμην ἀποφαινομένου. 54, 7 διαλεχθεῖς τι πρὸς αὐτὸν οὕτως ὥς ἂν μεθύων. [Demosth.] 59, 24 συνεδείπνει ἐναντίον πολλῶν Νέαιρα, ὥς ἂν ἑταῖρα οὔσα. Aristot. Ἀθην. πολιτ. 19, 12 Keny. σημείον δ' ἐ<πι>φέρουσι τό τε ὄνομα τοῦ τέλους, ὥς ἂν ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος κείμενον. Anthol. Palat. 6, 259, 6 ἔπτη δ' ὥς ἂν ἔχων τοὺς πόδας ἡμετέρους. c) Sonst: Aeschylus Suppl. 718 ἄγαν καλῶς κλύουσά γ' ὥς ἂν οὐ φίλη. Thucyd. 1, 33, 1 ὥς ἂν μάλιστα, μετὰ ἀειμνήστου μαρτυρίου τὴν χάριν καταθήσεται. 6, 57, 3 ἀπερικέπτως προσπεσόντες καὶ ὥς ἂν μάλιστα δι' ὀργῆς. Xenophon. Cyrop. 5, 4, 29 δῶρα πολλὰ — φέρων καὶ ἄγων, ὥς ἂν ἐξ οἴκου μεγάλου. Memorab. 2, 6, 38 εἴ σοι πείσαιμι — (ἐπιτρέπειν) τὴν πόλιν ψευδόμενος, ὥς ἂν στρατηγικῶς τε καὶ δικαστικῶς καὶ πολιτικῶς. Demosth. 1, 21 οὐδ' ὥς ἂν καλλιστ' αὐτῶ τὰ παρόντ' ἔχει. 18, 291 οὐχ ὥς ἂν εὖνους καὶ δίκαιος πολίτης ἔσχε τὴν γνώμην. 23, 154 ἀφυλάκτων ὄντων, ὥς ἂν πρὸς φίλον τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ. Corpus Inscr. Att. 2, 243 (vor 301 a. Chr.), 34 ὑπὲρ τῶν

ἰππέων τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ὥς ἂν ὑπὲρ πολιτῶν.

Noch schlagender vielleicht ist der Gebrauch von ὥσπερ. Zwar sagt Sophokles Fragm. 787 ὥσπερ σελήνης ὄψις εὐφρόνας δύο στήναι δύναιτ' ἂν und Demosthenes 4, 39 τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ὥσπερ τῶν στρατευμάτων ἀξιώσειε τις ἂν τὸν στρατηγὸν ἡγεῖσθαι. Aber dafür lesen wir bei Antiphon 6, 11 ὥσπερ ἂν ἦδιστα καὶ ἐπιτηδειώτατα ἀμφοτέροισι ἐγίγνετο, ἐγὼ μὲν ἐκέλευον u. s. w., bei Plato Phaedo 87 B δοκεῖ ὁμοίως λέγεσθαι [S. 385] ταῦτα, ὥσπερ ἂν τις περὶ ἀνθρώπου — λέγοι τοῦτον τὸν λόγον. Phaedrus 268 D ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἂν μουσικὸς ἐντυχὼν ἀνδρὶ — οὐκ ἀγρίως εἴποι ἂν mit beachtenswertem doppeltem ἂν, bei Xenophon Hellen. 3, 1, 14 ἐκείνῳ δὲ πιστευούσης, ὥσπερ ἂν γυνὴ γαμβρὸν ἀσπάζοιτο. Besonders aber, wenn dem Vergleichungssatz ein konditionaler eingefügt ist, herrscht durchaus die Wortfolge ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ —: Plato Apologie 17 D ὥσπερ οὖν ἂν, εἰ [sic] τῷ ὄντι ξένος ἐτύγχανον ὦν, ξυνεγιγνώσκετε δήπου ἂν μοι. Gorgias 447 D ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ ἐτύγχανεν ὦν ὑποδημάτων δημιουργός, ἀποκρίναιτο ἂν δήπου σοι. 451 A ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ τίς με ἔροιτο —, εἴποιμ' ἂν. 453 C ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ ἐτύγχανον —, ἄρ' οὐκ ἂν δικαίως σε ἡρόμην; Protag. 311 B ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ ἐπενόεις — ἀργύριον τελεῖν —, εἰ τίς σε ἥρετο —, τί ἂν ἀπεκρίνω. 318 B ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ — Ἰπποκράτης ὅδε ἐπιθυμήσειε — καὶ — ἀκούσειεν —, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐπανέροιτο —, εἴποι ἂν αὐτῷ. 327 E ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ ζητοίης, τίς διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἐλληνίζειν, οὐδ' ἂν εἷς φανείη, und öfters. Demosth. 20, 143 ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ τις — τάττοι, οὐκ ἂν αὐτός γ' ἀδικεῖν παρεσκεύασθαι δόξαι.

Auch hier tritt der enge Anschluss von ἂν besonders daran zu Tage, dass ὥσπερ ἂν überaus oft elliptisch ohne (optativisches oder präteritales) Verbum steht, entweder indem eine Form des Verbums εἰμί zu ergänzen ist, wie Demosth. 9, 30 ὥσπερ ἂν, εἰ υἱὸς — διώκει τι μὴ καλῶς ἢ ὀρθῶς, αὐτὸ μὲν τοῦτ' ἄξιον μέμψεως, oder das Verbum des übergeordneten Satzes: Andoc. 1, 57 χρὴ ἀνθρωπίνως περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκλογίζεσθαι, ὥσπερ ἂν αὐτὸν ὄντα ἐν τῇ συμφορᾷ (= ὥσπερ ἂν τις αὐτὸς ὦν — ἐκλογίζοιτο). Isäus 6, 64 τοῦτ' αὐτὸ ἐπιδεικνύτω ὥσπερ ἂν ὑμῶν ἕκαστος. Demosth. 18, 298 οὐδὲ — ὁμοίως ὑμῖν, ὥσπερ ἂν τρυτάνη ρέπων ἐπὶ τὸ λῆμμα συμβεβούλευκα (V. C. ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ, Blass bloss ὥσπερ). 19, 226 ὥσπερ ἂν παρεστηκότος αὐτοῦ. 21, 117 χρώμενος ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλος τις αὐτῷ τὰ πρὸ τούτου. 21, 225 δεῖ τοίνυν τούτοις βοηθεῖν, ὥσπερ ἂν αὐτῷ τις ἀδικουμένῳ. 29, 30 ὥσπερ ἂν τις συκοφαντεῖν ἐπιχειρῶν. (S. Blass nach A; die meisten ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ τις, mit welcher Lesart die Stelle unten einzufügen wäre.) 39, 10 πλὴν εἰ σημείον ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλῳ τινί, τῷ χαλκίῳ προσέεται. 45, 35 ὥσπερ ἂν δοῦλος δεσπότη διδούς. 49, 27 ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλος τις ἀποτυχών.

Zumal findet sich dieses bei folgendem εἰ c. optativo [S. 386] oder praeterito: Isocrates 4, 69 ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ (‘‘wie wenn’’) πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπολέμησαν. 18, 59 ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ τῷ Φρυωνίδας πανουργίαν ὀνειδίσειεν. Vgl. 10, 10. 15, 2.

### 3 Original text

15, 14. 15, 298. Ebenso Plato Protag. 341 C ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ ἤκουεν. Kratyl. 395 E ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις ὀνομάσειε καὶ εἴποι. Vgl. Krat. 430 A. Gorg. 479 A. Phaedo 98 C, 109 C, Sympos. 199 D, 204 E. Republik 7, 529 D u.s.w. Ebenso Xenophon Cyrop. 1, 3, 2 ἡσπάζετο αὐτόν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις — ἀσπάζοιτο. Ebenso Demosthenes 6, 8 ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ πολεμοῦντες τύχοιτε. 18, 194 ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις ναύκληρον αἰτιῶτο (vgl. § 243) und andere Redner. [Demosth.] 35, 28 ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις εἰς Αἴγιναν ἢ εἰς Μέγαρα ὀρμίσαιτο. — Daran knüpft sich wieder ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ (meist geschrieben ὥσπερανεῖ) im Sinne von *quasi* 'wie'; vgl. ὡσεῖ, ὥσπερεῖ, ohne Verbum finitum gebraucht z. B. Plato Gorgias 479 A ὥσπερανεῖ παῖς. Isokrates 4, 148. Xenophon Sympos. 9, 4. Demosth. 18, 214. Über ὥσπερανεῖ, καταπερανεῖ bei Aristoteles belehrt der Bonitzsche Index S. 41.

Auch die Relativsätze geben zu Bemerkungen Anlass. Erstens folgt in der Verbindung οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις (oder auch in fragender Form ἔστιν ὅστις...), wo der Hauptsatz erst durch den Nebensatz seinen Inhalt erhält und also der Zusammenschluss beider Sätze ein besonders enger ist, das ἂν regelmässig unmittelbar auf das Relativum: Soph. Antig. 912 οὐκ ἔστ' ἀδελφός, ὅστις ἂν βλάστοι ποτέ. Eurip. El. 903 οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεὶς ὅστις ἂν μέμψαιτό σε. [Heracl. 972]. Pl. Phaedo 78 A οὐκ ἔστιν εἰς ὃ τι ἂν ἀναγκαιότερον ἀναλίσκοιτε χρήματα. 89 D οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅτι ἂν τις μεῖζον — πάθοι. Phaedrus 243 B τουτωνὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, ἅττ' ἂν ἐμοὶ εἶπες ἡδίω. Demosth. 24, 138 οἶμαι γὰρ τοιοῦτον οὐδὲν εἶναι, ὅτου ἂν ἀπέσχετο. 24, 157 ἔστιν, ὅστις ἂν — ἐψήφισεν; 19, 309 ἔστιν, ὅστις ἂν — ὑπέμεινεν; 18, 43 οὐ γὰρ ἦν, ὃ τι ἂν ἐποιεῖτε. 45, 33 ἔστιν οὖν, ὅστις ἂν τοῦ ξύλου καὶ τοῦ χωρίου — τοσαύτην ὑπέμεινε φέρειν μίσθωσιν; ἔστι δ' ὅστις ἂν — ἐπέτρεψεν; vgl. auch [Demosth.] 13, 22 οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδεὶς, ὅστις ἂν εἴποι. Fast gleichwertig mit οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις sind solche Wendungen, wie die bei Sophokles Oed. Col. 252 vorliegende οὐ γὰρ ἴδοις ἂν ἀθρῶν βροτῶν ὅστις ἂν εἰ θεὸς ἄγοι ἐκφυγεῖν δύναιτο oder die bei Plato Phaedo 107 A οὐκ οἶδα εἰς ὅντιν' ἂν τις ἄλλον καιρὸν ἀναβάλλοιτο und bei Xenophon Anab. 3, 1, 40 οὐκ οἶδα ὃ τι ἂν τις χρήσεται αὐτῷ. Und ebenso eng wie in allen diesen [S. 387] Beispielen ist der Zusammenschluss von Haupt- und Nebensatz, wenn ὅστις durch οὕτω angekündigt ist: Isokrates 9, 35 οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔστιν οὕτω ῥάθυμος ὅστις ἂν δέξατο.

Die Verbindung von ὅστις und ἂν kann in solchen Sätzen allerdings unterbrochen werden, erstens durch ποτε, was ganz natürlich ist: Plato Phaedo 79 A τῶν δὲ κατὰ ταῦτα ἐχόντων οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτῳ ποτ' ἂν ἄλλῳ ἐπιλάβοιο. Zweitens durch οὐκ: Isokr. 8, 52 ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅστις οὐκ ἂν τις καταφρονήσειεν. Plato Gorgias 456 C οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν, περὶ ὅτου οὐκ ἂν πιθανώτερον εἴποι ὁ ῥητορικός. [491 E.] Symposium 179 A οὐδεὶς οὕτω κακός, ὅντινα οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἔρως ἐνθεον ποιήσειεν. Xenophon Cyrop. 7, 5, 61 οὐδεὶς γὰρ, ὅστις οὐκ ἂν ἀξιώσειεν.

(Vgl. Lykurg 69 τίς οὕτως — φθονερός ἐστιν —, ὃς οὐκ ἄν εὖξαιτο —;) Man beachte, dass von den Beispielen mit unmittelbar verbundenem ὅστις ἄν keines im Relativsatze die Negation enthält, sodass also die Zwischenschiebung von οὐκ als Regel gelten kann. Sie ist auch gar nicht verwunderlich; man vergleiche, was oben S. 335, 336, 343 über die Voranstellung von οὐκ vor Enklitika und S. 380 über homerisches οὐκ ἄν zu bemerken war. Eigentümlich ist Demosth. 18, 206: Hier geben S und L, also die beste Textquelle: οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅστις ἄν οὐκ ἄν εἰκότως ἐπιτιμήσειέ μοι. Wenn die Überlieferung richtig ist, so beruht die Ausdrucksweise auf einer Kontamination, auf dem Bedürfnis der üblichen Verbindung ὅστις ἄν und der üblichen Verbindung (ὅστις) οὐκ ἄν gleichmässig gerecht zu werden. In unmittelbarer Folge finden sich ἄν οὐκ ἄν auch Sophokles Oed. Rex 446. Elektra 439. Oed. Col. 1366. Fragm. inc. 673. Eurip. Heraklid. 74. Aristoph. Lysistr. 361 und ἄν οὐδ' ἄν Sophokles Elektra 97 (noch öfter, und selbst bei Aristoteles noch, ἄν — οὐκ ἄν oder οὐδεὶς ἄν durch mehrere Wörter getrennt). Da immerhin dem vierten Jahrhundert ἄν οὐκ ἄν fremd und die Wiederholung von ἄν überhaupt nur nach längerem Zwischenraum eigen zu sein scheint, haben vielleicht die Herausgeber recht, die mit den übrigen Handschriften das erste der beiden ἄν streichen und einfach ὅστις οὐκ ἄν schreiben.

Durch andere Wörter als ποτε oder οὐ werden ὅστις und ἄν in solchen Sätzen bei den guten Attikern nicht getrennt. Freilich Xenophon hat Anabasis 2, 3, 23 οὗτ' ἔστιν ὅτου ἕνεκα βουλοίμεθα ἄν τὴν βασιλέως χώραν κακῶς ποιεῖν. 5, 77 ἔστιν [S. 388] οὗν ὅστις τοῦτο ἄν δύναται ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατῆσαι. Ihm folgt auffälliger Weise Lykurg 39 τίς δ' ἦν οὕτω ἡ μισόδημος τότε ἡ μισαθήναιος, ὅστις ἐδυνήθη ἄν. Ist auch hierauf die Bemerkung von Blass, attische Beredsamkeit 3, 2, 103 anwendbar: "was (bei L.) als unklassisch oder sprachwidrig auffällt, muss auf Rechnung der anerkannt schlechten Überlieferung gesetzt werden?" Aber bei Demosthenes 18, 43 ist in dem Texte von Blass οὐ γὰρ ἦν ὅ τι ἄλλ' ἄν ἐποιεῖτε das ἄλλο bloss Konjektur des Herausgebers. [Doch Eurip. Med. 1339 οὐκ ἔστιν, ἦτις τοῦτ' ἄν Ἑλληνὶς γυνὴ ἔτλη. Lies ἦτις ἄν τόδ'?] ]

Weniger sicher war die Tradition in den Sätzen, wo eines der zu ὅστις gehörigen relativen Adjektiva oder Adverbia in solchen Sätzen stand, oder wo zwar ὅστις selbst sich an einen negativen Satz anschloss, aber zu dessen Ergänzung nicht unbedingt notwendig und daher nicht so eng mit ihm verbunden war. Zwar haben wir aus erster Kategorie Eurip. Kyklops 469 ἔστ' οὗν ὅπως ἄν ὥσπερ εἰ σπονδῆς θεοῦ καὶ γὰρ λαβοίμην —; (nicht negativer Fragesatz!) Aristoph. Aves 627 οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἄν ἐγὼ ποθ' ἐκὼν τῆς σῆς γνώμης ἔτ' ἀφείμην. Lysias 8, 7 οὐδὲν αὐτὸς ἐξηῦρον, ὁπόθεν ἄν εἰκότως ὑπερίδετε τὴν ἐμὴν ὁμιλίαν. Plato Sympos. 178 E οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅπως ἄν ἄμεινον οἰκίσειαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν. 223 A οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως ἄν

3 *Original text*

ἐνθάδε μείναιμι. Xenophon Hellen. 6, 1, 9 οὐκ εἶναι ἔθνος, ὁποῖω ἂν ἀξιώσκειαν ὑπήκοοι εἶναι Θετταλοί. Demosth. 24, 64 ἔστιν οὖν ὅπως ἂν ἐναντιώτερα τις δύο θείη. (Obwohl der Revisor des Codex S oben an τις ein zweites ἂν eingezeichnet hat, ist doch die von Weil und nach ihm von Blass vorgenommene Streichung des bloss im Augustanus fehlenden ἂν hinter ὅπως und Versetzung desselben hinter ἐναντιώτερα unzulässig.) 18, 165 ἔστιν οὖν ὅπως ἂν μᾶλλον ἄνθρωποι πάνθ' ὑπὲρ Φιλίππου πράττοντες ἐξελεγχθεῖεν. (Vgl. auch οὐκ οἶδ', ὅπως ἂν — oben S. 382.) Zu diesen Beispielen würde nicht in Widerspruch stehen Herodot 8, 119, 9 οὐκ ἔχω ὅκως οὐκ ἂν ἴσον πλήθος τοῖς Πέρσῃ ἐξέβαλε, und wohl auch nicht Xenophon Anab. 5, 7, 7 τοῦτ' οὖν ἔστιν ὅπως τις ἂν ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσαι; aber wirklich in Widerspruch stehn Sophokles Antigone 1156 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὁποῖον στάντ' ἂν ἀνθρώπου βίον οὐτ' αἰνέσαιμι' ἂν οὔτε μεμψάμην ποτέ. Aristoph. Nubes 1181 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως μί' ἡμέρα γένοιτ' ἂν ἡμέραι δύο. Vesp. 212 κοῦκ ἔσθ' ὅπως — ἂν — — λάθοι. Pax 306 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως [S. 389] ἀπειπεῖν ἂν δοκῶ μοι τήμερον. [Pl. Apol. 40 C.] Demosth. 15, 18 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως — εὖνοι γένοιτ' ἂν. 19, 308 ἔστιν οὖν, ὅπως ταῦτ' ἂν, ἐκεῖνα προειρηκώς, — ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν (geringere Handschriften: ὅπως ἂν ταῦτ'). — Ähnlich lesen wir zwar Eurip. Alkestis 80 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φίλων πέλας οὐδεῖς, ὅστις ἂν εἴποι. Plato Phaedo 57 B οὔτε τις ξένος ἀφίκεται —, ὅστις ἂν ἡμῖν αἰφάνει τι ἀγγεῖλαι οἷός τ' ἦν περὶ τούτων, aber andererseits Sophokles Oed. Rex 117 οὐδ' ἄγγελός τις οὐδὲ κυμπράκτωρ ὁδοῦ κατεῖδ' ὅτου τις ἐκμαθὼν ἐχρήσατ' ἂν.

Eine zweite Gruppe hier in betracht kommender Relativsätze sind die mit ὅπερ eingeleiteten, bei denen ja das -περ begrifflich scharfe Unterordnung unter den Hauptsatz andeutet, also nach dem bei ὅστις Beobachteten unmittelbaren Anschluss von ἂν an das Relativum fordern würde. Nun gilt zwar dieser Anschluss bei vollen ὅπερ-Sätzen nicht immer, sondern bloss in der Mehrzahl der Beispiele: Herodot 8, 136, 16 κατήλιπε εὐπετέως τῆς θαλάσσης κρατήσκειν, τάπερ ἂν καὶ ἦν. [Hippokrates] περὶ τέχνης Kap. 5 S. 46, 12 Gomperz τοιαῦτα θεραπεύσαντες ἐωυτούς, ὁποῖα περ ἂν ἐθεραπεύθησαν. Thucydides 2, 94, 1 ἐνόμιζον — ὅσον οὐκ ἐσπλεῖν αὐτούς· ὅπερ ἂν, εἰ ἐβουλήθησαν μὴ κατοκνήσαι, ῥαδίως ἂν ἐγένετο. Isokrates 8, 133 ἐὰν συμβούλους ποιῶμεθα τοιούτους —, οἷους περ ἂν περὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἡμῖν εἶναι βουλευθεῖμεν. 15, 23 χρή τοιούτους εἶναι κριτάς —, οἷων περ ἂν αὐτοὶ τυγχάνειν ἀξιώσκειαν. 17, 21 ἀξίων τὴν αὐτὴν Πασίῳ — γίγνεσθαι ζημίαν, ἥσπερ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐτύγχανεν. Plato Kriton 52 D πράττεις ἅπερ ἂν δοῦλος φαυλότατος πράξειεν. Sympos. 217 B ὦμην διαλέξεσθαι αὐτόν μοι, ἅπερ ἂν ἐρατῆς παιδικοῖς διαλεχθεῖη. Xenophon Anab. 5, 4, 34 ἐποίουν ἅπερ ἂν ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ποιήσκειαν. Aber mit Trennung des ἂν von ὅπερ Thucyd. 1, 33, 3 τὸν δὲ πόλεμον, δι' ὃνπερ χρήσιμοι ἂν εἴμεν, εἴ τις ὑμῶν μὴ οἶεται ἔσεσθαι. Demosth. 6, 30



Φίλιππος δ' ἄπερ εὖξαιθ' ἄν ὑμεῖς, — πράξει. 19, 328 ὑμεῖς δ', ἄπερ εὖξαιθ' ἄν, ἐλπίζαντες —.

Deutlich indessen tritt das Bewusstsein von der engen Zusammengehörigkeit von ἄν mit ὅπερ bei Ellipse des Verbuns zu Tage, wobei die Ellipse des konjunktivischen Verbuns z. B. Eurip. Medea 1153 φίλους νομίζουσ' οὗπερ ἄν πόσις céθεν. Isokrates 3, 60 φιλεῖν οἶεσθε δεῖν καὶ τιμᾶν, οὗπερ ἄν καὶ ὁ βασιλεύς. Demosth. 18, 280 τὸ τοὺς αὐτοὺς μισεῖν καὶ φιλεῖν, οὗπερ ἄν ἡ πατρίς. CIA. 2, 589, 26 (um [S. 390] 300 a. Ch.) τελεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν τὰ αὐτὰ τέλη ἐν τῷ δήμῳ ἄπερ ἄγ καὶ Πειραιεῖς verglichen werden kann. Als Beispiele mögen dienen Isokrates 4, 86 τοσαύτην ποιητάμενοι σπουδὴν, ὅσην περ ἄν τῆς αὐτῶν χώρας πορθουμένης. 5, 90 νικῆσαι — τοσοῦτον, ὅσον περ ἄν εἰ ταῖς γυναιξίν αὐτῶν συνέβαλον. 10, 49 τοσοῦτον ἐφρόνησαν, ὅσον περ ἄν, εἰ πάντων ἡμῶν ἐκράτησαν. 14, 37 ἄπερ ἄν εἰς τοὺς πολεμιοτάτους, ἐξαμαρτεῖν ἐτόλμησαν. 15, 28 εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν καθέστηκε κίνδυνον, εἰς ὃνπερ ἄν, εἰ πάντας ἐτύγχανον ἡδίκηκός. Plato Republ. 2, 368 C δοκεῖ μοι — τοιαύτην ποιήσασθαι ζήτησιν αὐτοῦ, οἷαν περ ἄν, εἰ προσέταξέ τις. Xenophon Anab. 5, 4, 34 μόνοι τε ὄντες ὅμοια ἔπραττον, ἄπερ ἄν μετ' ἄλλων ὄντες. Demosth. 53, 12 ἀπεκρινάμην αὐτῷ, ἄπερ ἄν νέος ἄνθρωπος.

Unter den mit blosser ὅς eingeleiteten Relativsätzen sind die mit assimiliertem Pronomen am meisten als dem Hauptsatz eng verbunden gekennzeichnet. Dem entspricht, dass die meisten mir zur Hand liegenden Beispiele ἄν hinter ὅς haben: Plato Sympos. 218 A ἐγὼ δεδηγμένον τὸ ἀλγεινότατον ὧν ἄν τις δηχθείη. Isäus 5, 31 ἐμμενεῖν οἷς ἄν οὔτοι γνοῖεν. 5, 33 ἐμμενεῖν οἷς ἄν αὐτοὶ γνοῖεν. Demosth. 18, 16 πρὸς ἅπασιν τοῖς ἄλλοις, οἷς ἄν εἰπεῖν τις ὑπὲρ Κτησιφῶντος ἔχοι. Doch ist die Zahl der Beispiele zu klein, um darauf eine Regel zu gründen, und Dem. 20, 136 μηδὲν ὧν ἰδίᾳ φυλάξαιθ' ἄν widerspricht.

Ganz bunt und regellos scheint der Gebrauch bei den übrigen Relativsätzen. Doch glaube ich sagen zu können, dass die gewöhnlichen Relativsätze ἄν wohl beinahe eben so oft unmittelbar hinter dem Pronomen, als an einer spätern Stelle des Satzes haben. Eine natürliche Folge dieses Schwankens ist die nicht seltene Doppelsetzung von ἄν in Relativsätzen, z. B. Thucyd. 2, 48, 3 ἄφ' ὧν ἄν τις σκοπῶν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐπιπέσοι, μάλιστ' ἄν ἔχοι τι προειδὼς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν. Demosth. 14, 27 ὅσα γὰρ ἄν νῦν πορίσται' ἄν. [Demosth.] 59, 70 οὐκ ἄν τις δεόμενος — εἴποι ἄν. Vgl. das unten zu besprechende doppelte ἄν im Hauptsatz. Daher ist auch an einer Stelle, wie Demosth. Proöm. 1, 3 ἃ δεῖ καὶ δι' ὧν παυσαίμεθ' αἰσχύνῃν ὀφλίσκάνοντες, wo sicher ein ἄν ausgefallen ist, von unserm Standpunkt der Betrachtung aus schlechterdings nicht auszumachen, ob δι' ὧν <ἄν> παυσαίμεθ' oder δι' ὧν παυσαίμεθ' <ἄν> (so die Herausgeber seit Bekker) zu [S. 391] schreiben sei. Wo dagegen das Relativpronomen in der Weise des

### 3 Original text

Latein an Stelle von οὗτος bloss dazu dient eine zweite Hauptaussage an eine erste anzuknüpfen, wo wir also keinen Relativsatz, sondern einen Hauptsatz haben, steht ἄν nie hinter dem Pronomen; vgl. Andocides 1, 67 ἐν οἷς ἐγὼ — δικαίως ἄν ὑπὸ πάντων ἐλεηθείην. Lysias 2, 34 ὁ τίς ἰδὼν οὐκ ἄν ἐφοβήθη; Demosth. 18, 49 ἐξ ὧν καφέστατ' ἄν τις ἴδοι.

Dem entspricht, dass in allen übrigen Nebensätzen, die etwa ἄν c. optat. oder praeterito enthalten, das ἄν zumeist an einer spätern Stelle des Satzes steht, da ja in allen solchen Fällen der Nebensatz nicht als Nebensatz, sondern als Vertreter eines Hauptsatzes den betr. Modus hat. So bei ὥς 'dass' z. B. Plato Sympos. 214 D ὥς ἐγὼ οὐδ' ἄν ἓνα ἄλλον ἐπαινέσαιμι (doch Thucyd. 5, 9, 3 ὥς ἄν ἐπεξέλθοι τις), ὥστε 'so dass' z. B. Plato Sympos. 197 A ὥστε καὶ οὗτος Ἑρωτος ἄν εἴη μαθητής, ὅτι 'dass, weil' z. B. Plato Phaedo 93 C δῆλον ὅτι τοιαῦτ' ἄττ' ἄν λέγοι. Sympos. 193 C ὅτι οὕτως ἄν ἡμῶν τὸ γένος εὐδαιμον γένοιτο. Demosth. 18, 79 ὅτι τῶν ἀδικημάτων ἄν ἐμέμνητο τῶν αὐτοῦ u. s. w. u. s. w. Ebenso bei ἐπεὶ 'denn' z. B. Plato Kratyl. 410 A ἐπεὶ ἔχοι γ' ἄν τις εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτῶν. Demosth. 18, 49 ἐπεὶ διὰ γ' ὑμᾶς πάλαί ἄν ἀπωλώλειτε. Bei den Zeitpartikeln giebt die Überlieferung zu Zweifeln Anlass: ὅταν c. opt. ist überliefert Aeschyl. Pers. 450, ἕως ἄν c. opt. Isokrat. 17, 15 und Plato Phaedo 101 D. (Sophokles Trach. 687 wird es seit Elmsley nicht mehr geschrieben). Sicher steht Demosth. 4, 31 ἡνίκ' ἄν ἡμεῖς μὴ δυναίμεθ' ἐκεῖς' ἀφικέσθαι. — Xenophon Hellen. 2, 3, 48 πρὶν ἄν μετέχοιεν. *ibid.* πρὶν ἄν — καταστήσειαν. 2, 4, 18 πρὶν ἄν ἡ πέκοι τις ἡ τρωθείη wird ἄν gestrichen.

Von der Konjunktion ausnahmslos getrennt ist ἄν in optativischen εἰ-Sätzen: εἰ 'ob' z. B. Plato Sympos. 210 B οὐκ οἶδ' εἰ οἷός τ' ἄν εἴη, εἰ 'wenn' z. B. Eurip. Helena 825 εἰ πῶς ἄν ἀναπείσαιμεν ἱκετεύοντέ νιν. Demosth. 4, 18 οὐδ' εἰ μὴ ποιήσαιτ' ἄν ἦδη. 20, 62 οὐκοῦν αἰσχρόν, εἰ μέλλοντες μὲν εὖ πάσχειν κυκοφάντην ἄν τὸν ταῦτα λέγονθ' ἡγοῖσθε, ἐπὶ τῷ δ' ἀφελέσθαι — ἀκούσεσθε. 19, 172 ἐξώλης ἀπολοίμην —, εἰ προσλαβὼν γ' ἄν ἀργύριον — ἐπρέσβευσα. Hier überall ist der durch ἄν angegebene hypothetische Charakter des Satzes nicht durch εἰ bedingt; vgl. die Erklärer zu den einzelnen Stellen.

[S. 392] Besonders bezeichnend sind aber die Fälle, wo nach Ausdrücken des Befürchtens und Erwartens μὴ mit dem Optativ und ἄν steht: Sophokles Trachin. 631 δέδοικα γάρ, μὴ πρῶ λέγοις ἄν τὸν πόθον. Thucyd. 2, 93, 3 οὔτε προσδοκία οὐδεμία ἦν, μὴ ἄν ποτε οἱ πολέμοι ἐξαπινάϊως οὕτως ἐπιπλεύσειαν. Xenophon Anab. 6, 1, 28 ἐκεῖνο ἐννοῶ, μὴ λίαν ἄν ταχὺ σωφρονισθείην. Poroi 4, 41 φοβοῦνται, μὴ ματαία ἄν γένοιτο αὕτη ἡ παρασκευή. Hier ist es ausser allem Zweifel, dass der Optativ mit ἄν auf einer Beeinflussung des μὴ-Satzes durch den Hauptsatz beruht, und da hat unter vier Beispielen nur eines ἄν unmittelbar hinter μὴ.



Und hieraus wird es nun auch klar, warum die Stellung des ἄν in Konjunktivsätzen so ganz fest, in den andern Nebensätzen schwankend ist. In der klassischen Gräzität kommt ἄν cum conj. nur in Nebensätzen vor; was hätte also dieses ἄν aus seiner traditionellen Stellung bringen sollen? Dagegen ἄν c. indic. und c. opt. ist nicht bloss häufiger in den Haupt- als in den Nebensätzen, sondern auch in den letztern vielfach geradezu aus den Hauptsätzen übertragen. Notwendig mussten sich die Stellungsgewohnheiten, die ἄν im Hauptsatz hat, auf die betr. Nebensätze übertragen.

## VII.

Wie verhält es sich nun aber mit dieser freien Stellung von ἄν im Hauptsatz? Es ist unbestreitbar, dass in diesem das ἄν sehr weit vom Anfang entfernt stehen kann. Eine Grenze nach hinten bildet bloss das letzte im betr. Satz stehende und durch ἄν irgendwie qualifizierte Verbum finitum oder infinitum, wobei ich besonders darauf hinweise, dass Partizipien, die mit hypothetischen Nebensätzen gleichwertig sind, gern ἄν hinter sich haben (vgl. z. B. Aristoph. Ranae 96 γόνιμον δὲ ποιητὴν ἄν οὐχ εὖροις ἔτι ζητῶν ἄν). Auf dieses Verbum darf ἄν nur in der Weise folgen, dass es sich ihm unmittelbar anschliesst. Doch finden sich Stellen, wo γ' oder ein einsilbiges Enklitikon oder sonst ein Monosyllabon zwischen dem Verbum und ἄν steht: γ': Plato Kratyl. 410 A ἐπεὶ ἔχοι γ' ἄν τις εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτῶν. — τις: [Eur. Or. 694.] Demosth. 18, 282 τί δὲ μείζον ἔχοι τις ἄν εἰπεῖν. 18, 316 οὐ μὲν οὖν εἴποι τις ἄν ἡλίκας. — ποτ': Eurip. Helena 912 f. κεῖνος δὲ πῶς τὰ ζῶντα τοῖς θανούσιν ἀπο-[S. 393]δοίη ποτ' ἄν. — οὐ: Sophokles Aias 1330 ἧ γὰρ εἶην οὐκ ἄν εὔφρονῶν. — τάχ': Oed. Rex 1115 f. τῇ δ' ἐπιστήμῃ κύ μου προύχοις τάχ' ἄν που. — τάδ': Eurip. Helena 97 τίς σφφρονῶν τλαίῃ τάδ' ἄν. — ταῦτ': Solon Fragm. 36, 1 συμπαρτυροίη ταῦτ' ἄν ἐν δίκῃ. — μέντ': Aristoph. Ran. 743 ὥμωξε μέντ' ἄν. Plato Phaedo 76 B βουλοίμην μέντ' ἄν. Apol. 30 D. Doch lassen die drei letzten Stellen (Solon, Ar. Ran. 743, Pl. Phaedo 76 B) auch noch eine andere Erklärung zu. Wenn nämlich das Verbum am Anfang des Satzes steht, scheint jene obige Regel überhaupt nicht zu gelten: Sophokles Oed. Col. 125 προσέβα γὰρ οὐκ ἄν ἀτιβὲς ἄλκος ἔς. Eurip. Hiketiden 944 ὅλουντ' ἰδοῦσαι τοῦςδ' ἄν. Demosth. 20, 61 μάθοιτε δὲ τοῦτο μάλιτ' ἄν. Übrigens versteht es sich von selbst, dass wenn ein Satz mehrere ἄν enthält, die Regel für das letzte ἄν gilt. Sophokles Oed. Rex 1438 ἔδρας' ἄν (εὔ τόδ' ἴσθ') ἄν. Elektra 697 δύναιτ' ἄν οὐδ' ἄν ἰσχύων φυγεῖν. Aristoph. Nubes 977 ἡλείψατο δ' ἄν τοῦμφαλοῦ οὐδεὶς παῖς ὑπένερθεν τότ' ἄν ist die Entfernung des zweiten ἄν vom Verbum aus der Anfangsstellung des Verbums zu erklären. — Sonach haben

### 3 Original text

die Herausgeber von Aristoph. Rittern Recht gehabt, wenn sie Vs. 707 das überlieferte ἐπὶ τῷ φαγόισ ἥδιτ' ἄν in ἐπὶ τῷ φαγῶν ἥδοιτ' (oder ἥδοι') ἄν ändern; dagegen Aristophanes Ran. 949 f. οὐδὲν παρήκ' ἄν ἄργόν, ἀλλ' ἔλεγεν ἡ γυνή τέ μοι χῶ δοῦλος οὐδὲν ἥττον χῶ δεσπότης χῆ παρθένος χῆ γραῦς ἄν bildet nur eine scheinbare Ausnahme, da bei jedem der aneinandergereihten Nominative ἔλεγεν hinzuzudenken ist. Vgl. Soph. Phil. 292 πρὸς τοῦτ' ἄν. [Eurip. Or. 941 κοὺ φθάνοι θνήσκων τις ἄν.]

Aus dieser Regel lässt sich aber schon erkennen, was für Tendenzen dazu geführt haben, das ἄν des selbständigen Satzes in nachhomerischer Zeit von der Stelle wegzuziehen, die es in homerischer Zeit noch einnahm. Das Verb, dessen Modalität durch ἄν bestimmt wird, zog es an sich, daneben die Negationen, die Adverbia, besonders die superlativischen, überhaupt derjenige Satzteil, für den der durch ἄν angezeigte, hypothetische Charakter des Satzes am meisten in betracht kam, gerade wie die enklitischen Pronomina ihrer traditionellen Stellung dadurch verlustig gingen, dass das Bedürfnis immer stärker wurde, ihnen den Platz zu geben, den ihre Funktion im Satze zu fordern schien. Wie aber bei den en-[S. 394]klitischen Pronomina, so hat auch bei ἄν die Tradition immer einen gewissen Einfluss bewahrt.

Erstens lässt sich auch bei ἄν die Neigung für Anlehnung an satzbeginnende Wörter nachweisen. So unbestreitbar an τίς und die zugehörigen Formen, besonders πῶς (Vgl. Jebb zu Sophokles Oed. Col. 1100, der auf Aeschyl. Agam. 1402 τίς ἄν ἐν τάχει μὴ περιώδυνος μὴ δεμνιοτήρης μόλοι verweist. Vgl. Θ 77. Ω 367. θ 208. κ 573). Ferner ist hiefür die Beobachtung Werfers Acta philologorum Monacensium I 246 ff., zu verwerten, dass sich ἄν "paene innumeris locis" an γάρ anschliesse. Die Fülle der Beispiele verbietet eine Wiederholung und Ergänzung von Werfers Beispielsammlung an dieser Stelle. Ich will nur bemerken, erstens, dass zwar aus allen Litteraturgattungen Gegenbeispiele beigebracht werden können, aber doch γάρ ἄν unendlich häufiger ist als γάρ — ἄν, und zweitens, dass infolge der Setzung von ἄν gleich hinter γάρ sehr oft das Bedürfnis empfunden wird, in einem spätern Teil des Satzes ἄν nochmals einzufügen: Sophokles Oed. Rex 772 τῷ γάρ ἄν καὶ μείζονι λέξαιμι' ἄν ἢ σοί. 862 οὐδὲν γάρ ἄν πράξαιμι' ἄν. Fragm. 513 Nauck<sup>2</sup>, 6 κάμοι γάρ ἄν πατήρ γε δακρύων χάριν ἀνῆκτ' ἄν εἰς φῶς. Fragm. 833 ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ ἄν τὰ θεῖα κρυπτόντων θεῶν μάθοις ἄν. Eurip. Hiket. 855 μόλις γάρ ἄν τις αὐτὰ τὰναγκαῖ' ὀρᾶν δύναται' ἄν ἐστὼς πολεμίοις ἐναντίος. Helena 948 τὴν Τροίαν γάρ ἄν δειλοὶ γενόμενοι πλεῖστον αἰχχύνουμεν ἄν. 1011 καὶ γάρ ἄν κείνος βλέπων ἀπέδωκεν ἄν σοι τὴνδ' ἔχειν. 1298 εὐμένεστερον γάρ ἄν τῷ φιλάτῳ μοι Μενέλεω τὰ πρόσφορα δρώης ἄν. Aristoph. Vesp. 927 οὐ γάρ ἄν ποτε τρέφειν δύναται' ἄν μία λόχη κλέπτα δύο. Pax 321 οὐ γάρ ἄν χαίροντες

ἡμεῖς τήμερον πανυαίμεθ' ἄν. Lysistr. 252 ἄλλως γὰρ ἄν ἄμαχοι γυναῖκες καὶ μιαιραὶ κεκλήμεθ' ἄν. Thesmoph. 196 καὶ γὰρ ἄν μαινοίμεθ' ἄν. Plato Apol. 35 D κατὰ γὰρ ἄν, εἰ πείθοιμι ὑμᾶς —, θεοὺς ἄν διδάσκειμι. 40 D ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄν οἶμαι, εἰ — δέοι —, οἶμαι ἄν — τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα εὐαριθμήτους ἄν εὐρεῖν. (Vgl. Demosth. 14, 27 ὅσα γὰρ ἄν νῦν πορίσασθαι ἄν). Aristot. de caelo 227<sup>b</sup> 24 οὔτε γὰρ ἄν αἱ τῆς κελήνης ἐκλείψουσιν τοιαύτας ἄν εἶχον τὰς ἀποτομάς. De gener. et corr. 337<sup>b</sup> 7 μέλλων γὰρ ἄν βαδίζειν τις οὐκ ἄν βαδίσκειν. De part. anim. 654<sup>a</sup> 18 οὕτως γὰρ ἄν ἔχον χρησιμώτατον ἄν εἴη. (vgl. Vahlen Zur Poetik 1460<sup>b</sup> 7) u. s. w.

[S. 395] Sodann ist darauf hinzuweisen, dass die Verbindungen καὶ ἄν aus καὶ ἄν 'auch wohl' und τάχ' ἄν, in denen ἄν mit seinem Vorworte bis zur völligen Verblässung seiner eigenen Bedeutung verschmolzen ist, in der Mehrzahl der Fälle am Satzanfang stehen. Doch dürfen wir hierauf kein Gewicht legen, da gerade καὶ ἄν und τάχ' ἄν sich schon bei Homer im Innern von Sätzen finden und überhaupt kein Grund vorhanden ist, den engen Anschluss von ἄν an καὶ und τάχα aus den Fällen herzuleiten, wo καὶ und τάχα den Satz beginnen. (καὶ 'und' hat ἄν unmittelbar hinter sich Herodot 4, 118, 21 καὶ ἄν ἐδήλου).

Zweitens findet man ἄν [sic] vereinzelt wie die Enklitika hinter einem Vokativ: Aristoph. Pax 137 ἄλλ' ὦ μέλ' ἄν μοι κίτιων διπλῶν ἔδει.

Drittens verdrängt es öfters οὖν, seltener τε, δέ von ihrem Platze: Herodot 7, 150, 8 οὕτω ἄν ὧν εἶμεν. [Eur. Med. 504.] Ar. Lysistr. 191 τίς ἄν οὖν γένοιτ' ἄν ὄρκος. [Lysias] 20, 15 πῶς ἄν οὖν οὐκ ἄν δεινὰ πάσχομεν. Plato Phaedo 64 A πῶς ἄν οὖν δὴ τοῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοι —, ἐγὼ πειράσομαι φράσαι. Sympos. 202 D πῶς ἄν οὖν θεὸς εἴη ὃ γε τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἄμειρος, und öfters. Xen. Anab. 2, 5, 20 πῶς ἄν οὖν ἔχοντες τοσούτους πόρους — ἔπειτα ἐκ τούτων πάντων τοῦτον ἄν τὸν τρόπον ἐξελοίμεθα —; 5, 7, 8 πῶς ἄν οὖν ἐγὼ ἢ [sic] βιασαίμην ὑμᾶς — ἢ ἐξαπατήσας ἄγοιμι. 5, 7, 9 πῶς ἄν οὖν ἀνὴρ μᾶλλον δοίη δίκην. Respubl. Lacedaem. 5, 9 οὐκ ἄν οὖν ῥαδίως γέ τις εὔροι Σπαρτιατῶν ὑγιεινότερους. Demosth. 25, 33 τίς ἄν οὖν εὖ φρονῶν αὐτὸν ἄν ἢ τὰ τῆς πατρίδος συμφέροντα ταύτῃ συνάψει. [Demosth.] 46, 13 πῶς ἄν οὖν μὴ εἰδὼς ὁ πατήρ αὐτὸν Ἀθηναῖον ἐσόμενον ἔδωκεν ἄν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα. Aeschines 1, 17 ἴσως ἄν οὖν τις θαυμάσειεν. 3, 219 πῶς ἄν οὖν ἐγὼ προειδενύμην Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. Dass in der Mehrzahl der Beispiele das dem οὖν vorausgeschickte ἄν sich an τίς oder πῶς anlehnt, passt zu dem oben S. 394 bemerkten. (Dass ἄν dem οὖν häufiger noch folgt, soll nicht geleugnet werden.) — Einem τε geht ἄν voraus Thucyd. 2, 63, 3 τάχιςτ' ἄν τε πόλιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀπολέσειαν, einem δέ Thucyd. 6, 2, 4 τάχ' ἄν δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ἐπλεύσαντες und vielleicht 6, 10, 4 ταχ' ἄν δ' ἴσως (die Mehrzahl der Handschr. und die Ausgaben τάχα δ' ἄν ἴσως). Doch ist bei den beiden letzten Stellen der Zu-[S. 396]sammenschluss mit τάχα für ἄν von wesentlicherer Bedeutung, als

### 3 Original text

die Stellung an sich.

Viertens lässt sich ἄν gern durch einen Zwischensatz von den Hauptbestandteilen des Satzes, zu dem es gehört, trennen: Aristoph. Ran. 1222 οὐδ' ἄν, μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα, φροντίσαιμί γε. Plato Phaedo 102 A *cū* δ' — οἶμαι, ἄν, ὥς ἐγὼ λέγω, ποιούη. Sympos. 202 D τί οὖν ἄν, ἔφη, εἴη ὁ Ἔρω. 202 B καὶ πῶς ἄν, ἔφη, ὃ Σώκρατες, ὁμολογοῖτο. Republ. 1, 333 A πρὸς γε ὑποδημάτων ἄν, οἶμαι, φαίης κτῆσιν. 4, 438 A ἴσως γὰρ ἄν, ἔφη, δοκοίη τι λέγειν ὁ ταῦτα λέγων. Leges 2, 658 A τί ἄν, εἰ — (folgen sieben Zeilen), τί ποτ' ἄν ἡγούμεθα ἐκ ταύτης τῆς προρρήσεως ξυμβαίνειν. Xenophon Hellen. 6, 1, 9 οἶμαι ἄν, αὐτῶν εἰ καλῶς τις ἐπιμελοῖτο, οὐκ εἶναι ἔθνος. Cyrop. 2, 1, 5 ἐγὼ ἄν, εἰ ἔχοιμι, ὥς τάχιστα ὅπλα ἐποιούμην τοῖς Πέρσας. Demosth. 18, 195 τί ἄν, εἴ που τῆς χώρας τοῦτο πάθος συνέβη, προσδοκῆσαι χρῆν.

Dass man dann gern nach dem Zwischensatz ἄν wiederholte, ist verständlich: Sophokles Antig. 69 οὐτ' ἄν, εἰ θέλοις ἔτι πράσσειν, ἐμοῦ γ' ἄν ἡδέως πράσσοις μέτα. 466 ἀλλ' ἄν, εἰ τὸν ἐξ ἐμῆς μητρὸς θανόντ' ἄθαρτον ἡνυχόμεν νέκυν, κείνοις ἄν ἤλγουν. Oed. Rex 1438 ἔδρα. ἄν, εἴ τόδ' ἴσθ', ἄν, εἰ μὴ — ἔχρηζον. Elektra 333 ὥστ' ἄν, εἰ *cθένος* λάβοιμι, δηλώσαιμ' ἄν. 439 ἀρχὴν δ' ἄν, εἰ μὴ τλημονεστάτη γυνὴ πατρὶος ἐβλαστε, — χοὰς οὐκ ἄν ποθ' ὄν γ' ἔκτεινε, τῷδ' ἐπέστεφε. Thucyd. 1, 136, 5 ἐκείνον δ' ἄν, εἰ ἐκδοίη αὐτόν —, *cωτηρίας* ἄν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποστερῆσαι. Aristoph. Lysistr. 572 κἄν, ὑμῖν εἴ τις ἐνῆν νοῦς, ἐκ τῶν ἐρίων τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπολιτεύεσθ' ἄν ἅπαντα. Ranae 585 κἄν, εἴ με τύπτοις, οὐκ ἄν ἀντίποιμί σοι. Plato Protag. 318 C κἄν, εἰ Ὀρθαγόρα τῷ Θηβαίῳ συγγενόμενος — ἐπανερόιτο αὐτόν —, εἴποι ἄν. Leges 8, 841 C τάχα δ' ἄν, εἰ θεὸς ἐθέλοι, κἄν δυοῖν θάτερα βιασαίμεθα περὶ ἐρωτικῶν. Demosth. 4, 1 ἐπισχὼν ἄν, ἔω —, εἰ —, ἡσυχίαν ἄν ἦγον. 21, 115 ἄρ' ἄν, εἴ γ' εἶχε —, ταῦτ' ἄν εἶαεν. 37, 16 οὐδ' ἄν, εἴ τι γένοιτ', ὥθηθην ἄν δίκην μοι λαχεῖν ποτε τοῦτον. [Demosth.] 47, 66 καίτοι πῶς ἄν, εἰ μὴ πεπορισμένον τε ἦν —, εὐθὺς ἄν ἀπέλαβον. Aeschines 1, 122 οἶμαι δ' ἄν, εἰ —, ταῖς ὑμετέραις μαρτυρίαις ῥαδίως ἄν ἀπολύσασθαι τοὺς τοῦ κατηγοροῦ λόγους. [Hen. [sic] Anabasis 7, 7, 38.]

Das Umgekehrte, wenn man will, aber doch etwas aus derselben Stellungenregel entspringendes liegt vor, wenn ein [S. 397] syntaktisch zu einem Zwischensatz oder zu einem abhängigen Satz gehöriges ἄν hinter das erste Wort des übergeordneten Satzes gezogen wird: Plato Kriton 52 D ἄλλο τι οὖν, ἄν φαίεν, ἡ ξυνθήκας τὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς — παραβαίνει. Phaedo 87 A τί οὖν, ἄν φαίη ὁ λόγος, ἔτι ἀπιστεῖς. Hippas major 299 A μανθάνω, ἄν ἴσος φαίη, καὶ ἐγώ. Demosth. 1, 14 τί οὖν, ἄν τις εἴποι, ταῦτα λέγει. 1, 19 τί οὖν, ἄν τις εἴποι, *cū* γράφεις ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά. Proöm. 35, 4 τί οὖν, ἄν τις εἴποι, *cū* παραινεῖς; [Demosth.] 45, 55 ὅτι νῆ Δί', ἄν εἴποι, τοῦτον εἰσπεποίηκα υἱόν. — Vgl. auch Demosth. 11,

44 οὐκ ἂν οἶδ' ὅ τι πλέον εὐροι τούτου. Plato Timäus 26 B ἐγὼ γάρ, ἃ μὲν χθὲς ἤκουσα, οὐκ ἂν οἶδ' εἰ δυναίμην ἅπαντα ἐν μνήμῃ πάλιν λαβεῖν. Ähnliches οὐκ ἂν οἶδ' ὅ τι im Satzinnern Demosth. 45, 7. Auf dergleichen Wendungen basiert dann wohl wiederum das euripideische οὐκ (bezw. οὐ γὰρ) οἶδ' ἂν εἰ πείσαιμι Medea 941. Alcestis 48. Eigentümlich Thucyd. 5, 9, 3 καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐλπίζαντες ὥς ἂν ἐπεξέλθοι τις, wo das erste ἂν nur als Antizipation aus dem Nebensatz erklärt werden kann.

Sechstens sprengt ἂν, gerade wie die Enklitika, öfters am Satzanfang stehende Wortgruppen auseinander. Dahin könnte man οὐδ' ἂν εἰς stellen: Sophokles Oed. Rex 281 οὐδ' ἂν εἰς δύναιτ' ἀνήρ. Oed. Col. 1656 οὐδ' ἂν εἰς θνητῶν φράσειε. Plato Prot. 328 A οὐδ' ἂν εἰς φανείη. Alcib. 122 D οὐδ' ἂν εἰς ἀμφοιβητήσειε. Demosth. 19, 312 οὐδ' ἂν εἰς εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι φήσειεν. 18, 69 οὐδ' ἂν εἰς ταῦτα φήσειεν. 18, 94 οὐδ' ἂν εἰς εἰπεῖν ἔχοι. Aristot. Ἀθην. πολ. 21, 2 K. οὐδ' ἂν εἰς εἴποι. Doch findet sich diese Tmesis wenigstens ebenso häufig im Satzinnern: Lys. 19, 60. 24, 24. Isokr. 15, 223. 21, 20. Plato Sympos. 192 E, 214 D, 216 E. Gorg. 512 E. 519 C. Demosth. 14, 1. 20, 136. 18, 68. 18, 128. Lykurg 49. 57, und scheint somit wesentlich auf der Attraktionskraft des οὐδέ zu beruhen.

Einen bessern Beweis bildet das zweimalige γ' ἂν οὖν statt γοῦν ἂν bei Thucydides: 1, 76, 4 ἄλλους γ' ἂν οὖν οἰόμεθα τὰ ἡμέτερα λαβόντες δεῖξαι ἂν und 1, 77, 6 ὑμεῖς γ' ἂν οὖν, εἰ — ἄρξαιτε, τάχ' ἂν μεταβάλοιτε, sowie folgende Fälle, wo ἂν mitten in eine Wortgruppe eingedrungen ist: Solon fragm. 37, 4 πολλῶν ἂν ἀνδρῶν ἧδ' ἐξηρώθη πόλις. Aeschyl. Pers. 632 μόνος ἂν θνητῶν πέρας εἴποι. 706 ἀνθρώπειά δ' ἂν τοι πῆματ' ἂν τύχοι βροτοῖς. Sophokles Aias 155 κατὰ δ' ἂν τις [S. 398] ἐμοῦ τοιαῦτα λέγων οὐκ ἂν πείθοι. Oed. Rex 175 ἄλλον δ' ἂν ἄλλῳ προσίδοις. 502 σοφία δ' ἂν σοφίαν παραμείψειεν ἀνήρ. Elektra 1103 τίς οὖν ἂν ὑμῶν τοῖς ἔσω φράσειεν ἂν. Oed. Col. 1100 τίς ἂν θεῶν κοίτονδ' ἄριστον ἄνδρ' ἰδεῖν δοίη. Herodot 1, 56, 5 ἐφρόντιζε ἱστορέων, τοὺς ἂν Ἑλλήνων δυνατωτάτους ἐόντας προσκτῆσαιτο φίλους. 1, 67, 7 ἐπειρώτεον, τίνα ἂν θεῶν ἱλασάμενοι κατύπερθε τῷ πολέμῳ Τεγεγτέων γενοίαιτο. 1, 196, 22 τὸ δὲ ἂν χρυσίον ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τῶν εὐειδέων παρθένων. 7, 48, 8 στρατοῦ ἂν ἄλλου τις τὴν ταχίστην ἄγερσιν ποιεοίτο. 7, 135, 12 ἕκαστος ἂν ὑμῶν ἄρχοι γῆς Ἑλλάδος. 7, 139, 9 κατὰ γε ἂν τὴν ἡπειρον τοιάδε ἐγένετο. [Hippokrates] περὶ τέχνης c. 3 (s. 44, 8 Gomperz) ἐν ἄλλοις ἂν λόγοις σαφέστερον διδασχθεῖη. (Vgl. auch c. 2, s. 42, 19 G. ἐπεὶ τῶν γε μὴ ἐόντων τίνα ἂν τις οὐσίην θεοσάμενος ἀπαγγεῖλειεν ὥς ἔστιν). Thucyd. 1, 10 πολλὴν ἂν οἶμαι ἀπιστίαν τῆς δυνάμεως — τοῖς ἔπειτα πρὸς τὸ κλέος αὐτῶν εἶναι. 1, 36, 3 βραχυτάτῳ δ' ἂν κεφαλῶν τῷδ' ἂν μὴ προσέσθαι ἡμᾶς μάθοιτε. 5, 22, 2 πρὸς γὰρ ἂν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, εἰ ἐξῆν χωρεῖν. Aristoph. Thesmoph. 768 τίν' οὖν ἂν ἀγγελον πέμψαμι' ἐπ' αὐτόν. Isokrates 5, 35 σκεπτέον,

### 3 Original text

τί ἂν ἀγαθὸν αὐτὰς ἐργασάμενος φανείησ ἄξια — πεποιηκώς. Plato Apologie 25 B πολλή [sic] γὰρ ἂν τις εὐδαιμονία εἴη περὶ τοὺς νέους. Phaedo 70 A πολλή ἂν ἐλπίς εἴη καὶ καλή. 70 D 106 D ἄλλου ἂν του δέοι λόγου. 107 C οὐδεμία ἂν εἴη ἄλλη ἀποφυγή. Xenophon Anab. 3, 1, 6 ἐλθὼν δ' ὁ Ξενοφῶν ἐπήρετο τὸν Ἀπόλλω, τίνι ἂν θεῶν θύων καὶ εὐχόμενος κάλλιτα καὶ ἄριστα ἔλθοι τὴν ὁδόν, ἣν ἐπινοεῖ, καὶ καλῶς πράξας σωθεῖη, was sofort an das τίνι κα θεῶν u. s. w. der dodonäischen Orakeltäfelchen (siehe oben S. 374) erinnert. Vgl. auch das Orakel bei [Demosth.] 43, 66 ἐπερωτᾷ ὁ δῆμος, ὅ τι ἂν δρῶσιν — εἴη, und Herodot 1, 67, 7 oben. — Anab. 3, 2, 29 λαβόντες δὲ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, ἀναρχία ἂν καὶ ἀταξία ἐνόμιζον ἡμᾶς ἀπολέσθαι. Poroi 3, 14 πολλή ἂν καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων πρόσοδος γίγνοιτο. 4, 1 πάμπολλα ἂν νομίζω χρήματα — προσιέναι. Demosth. 1, 1 ἀντὶ πολλῶν ἂν, ὧς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, χρημάτων ὑμᾶς ἐλέσθαι νομίζω. 4, 12 πλησίον μὲν ὄντες, ἅπασιν ἂν τοῖς πράγμασιν τεταραγμένοις ἐπιστάντες ὅπως βούλεσθε διοικήσαιο. 19, 48 τί ἂν ποιῶν ὑμῖν χαρίζαιτο. 18, 22 τί ἂν εἰπὼν cé τις ὁρθῶς προσείποι; (18, 81 ὅτι πολλὰ μὲν ἂν χρήματα ἔδωκε Φιλιστίδης). 18, 293 μείζων ἂν δοθείη δωρεά. 29, 1 θαυμασίως ἂν ὥς εὐλαβούμην. 39, [S. 399] 24 καίτοι, τίς ἂν ὑμῶν οἶεται τὴν μητέρα πέμψαι; epist. 3, 37 τί ἂν εἰπὼν μήθ' ἁμαρτεῖν δοκοῖην μήτε ψευδαίμην. [Demosth.] 35, 26 τί ἂν τις ἄλλο ὄνομ' ἔχοι θέσθαι τῷ τοιούτῳ. — Dazu kommen die zahlreichen Stellen nach Art von Demosth. 21, 50 οὐκ ἂν οἶεσθε δημοσίᾳ πάντας ὑμᾶς προξένους αὐτῶν ποιήσασθαι.

Unter diesen Beispielen, deren Zahl sich übrigens ohne grosse Mühe verdoppeln liesse, finden sich, wie unter den vorhergehenden Kategorien, mehrere, wo die spätere Hälfte des Satzes ein zweites ἂν enthält, mit dem das erste ἂν wieder aufgenommen wird. Ich füge einen besonders instruktiven Fall hinzu. Zu Demosth. 1, 1 (s. oben) findet sich in proöm. 3 eine parallele Fassung, worin der zweite Teil des Satzes stark erweitert ist, statt χρημάτων ὑμᾶς ἐλέσθαι νομίζω: χρημάτων τὸ μέλλον κυνοῖσιν περὶ ὧν νῦν τυγχάνετε σκοποῦντες οἶμαι πάντας ὑμᾶς ἐλέσθαι, und hier ist nun der erweiterten Fassung des Satzes wegen hinter πάντας das ἂν wiederholt. (Ganz irrig ist es, wenn Blass im Proöm deswegen das erste ἂν hinter πολλῶν gegen die bessere Überlieferung streicht). Ich glaube wir dürfen sagen, dass in allen Fällen, wo ἂν mehrfach gesetzt ist, dies einen Kompromiss darstellt zwischen dem traditionellen Drang ἂν nah beim Satzanfang zu haben und dem in der klassischen Sprache aufgekommenen Bedürfnis die Partikel dem Verb und andern Satzteilen (siehe oben S. 393) anzunähern: wodurch sich auch erklärt, warum doppeltes ἂν konjunktivischen Sätzen fremd ist. So sind für uns überhaupt alle Sätze mit mehrern ἂν, deren erstes die zweite Stelle inne hat, von Wert, nicht bloss die bereits angeführten. Ich lasse die mir unter die Hand gekommenen Beispiele folgen, natürlich mit Ausschluss von οὗτ' ἂν —



οὐτ' ἄν, das nicht hierher gehört.

Aeschyl. Agam. 340 οὐ τὰν ἐλόντες αὐθις ἀνθαλοῖεν ἄν. 1048 ἐντὸς δ' ἄν οὔσα μορσίμων ἀγρευμάτων πείθοι' ἄν. Choeph. 349 λιπὼν ἄν εὐκλειαν ἐν δόμοισιν — πολύχωστον ἄν εἶχες τάφον. Hiket. 227 πῶς δ' ἄν γαμῶν ἄκουσαν ἄκοντος πάρα ἀγνὸς γένοιτ' ἄν. Sophokles Aias 537 τί δῆτ' ἄν ὥς ἐκ τῶνδ' ἄν ὠφελοῖμί σε. 1058 ἡμεῖς μὲν ἄν τήνδ' ἦν ὅδ' εἵληχεν τύχην θανόντες ἄν προὔκειμεθ' αἰσχίστῳ μόρῳ. 1078 ἀλλ' ἄνδρα χρή — δοκεῖν, πεσεῖν ἄν κἂν ἀπὸ μικροῦ κακοῦ. Oed. Rex 139 τάχ' ἄν κᾶμ' ἄν τοιαύτη χειρὶ τιμωρεῖν θέλοι. 446 [S. 400] συθείς τ' ἄν οὐκ ἄν ἀλγύνοις πλέον. 602 οὐτ' ἄν μετ' ἄλλου δρῶντος ἄν τλαίην ποτέ. 1053 ἦδ' ἄν τάδ' οὐχ' ἦκιστ' ἄν Ἰοκάστη λέγοι. Elektra 697 δύναιτ' ἄν οὐδ' ἄν ἰσχύων φυγεῖν. 1216 τίς οὖν ἄν ἀξίαν γε σοῦ πεφνηνόςτος μεταβάλοιτ' ἄν ὥδε σιγὰν λόγων. Philoktet 222 ποίας ἄν ὑμᾶς πατρίδος (oder πόλεος) ἢ γένους ποτέ τύχοιμ' ἄν εἰπών; (so Dindorf und Heimreich für das handschriftliche ποίας πάτρας ἄν ὑμᾶς ἢ γένους ποτέ, wo der durch die Stellung von ὑμᾶς bewirkte metrische Fehler von andern weniger glücklich gebessert wird). Oed. Col. 391 τίς δ' ἄν τοιοῦδ' ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς εὖ πράξειεν ἄν. 780 ἄρ' ἄν ματαίου τῆςδ' ἄν ἡδονῆς τύχοις. 977 πῶς ἄν τό γ' ἄκον πράγμ' ἄν εἰκότως ψέγοις. 1366 ἦ τὰν οὐκ ἄν ἦ. Phaedra fr. 622, 1 N. οὐ γάρ ποτ' ἄν γένοιτ' ἄν ἀσφαλὲς πόλις. Fragm. inc. 673 πῶς ἄν οὐκ ἄν ἐν δίκη θάνοιμ' ἄν (mit drei ἄν!)

Herodot 2, 26, 9 ὁ ἥλιος ἄν ἀπελαννόμενος ἐκ μέσου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ — ἦε ἄν τὰ ἄνω τῆς Εὐρώπης. 2, 26, 11 διεξιόντα δ' ἄν μιν διὰ πάσης Εὐρώπης ἔλπομαι ποιεῖν ἄν τὸν Ἴστρον. 3, 35, 17 οὐδ' ἄν αὐτὸν ἔγωγε δοκέω τὸν θεὸν οὕτω ἄν κακῶς βαλεῖν. 7, 187, 5 οὐδ' ἄν τούτων ὑπὸ πλήθεος οὐδεὶς ἄν εἴποι πλήθος. Eurip. Alk. 72 πόλλ' ἄν σὺ λέξας οὐδὲν ἄν πλέον λάβοις. id. 96 πῶς ἄν ἔρημον τάφον Ἀδμητος κεδνῆς ἄν ἔπραξε γυναικός. Androm. 934 οὐκ ἄν ἐν γ' ἐμοῖς δόμοις βλέπουσ' ἄν αὐγὰς τᾶμ' ἐκαρποῦτ' ἄν λέχη. Hekabe 742 ἄλγος ἄν προσθείμεθ' ἄν. Helena 76 τῷδ' ἄν εὐστόχῳ πτερῷ ἀπόλαυσιν εἰκοῦς ἔθανες ἄν Διὸς κόρης. Heraclid. 721 φθάνοις δ' ἄν οὐκ ἄν τοῖςδε σὸν κρύπτων δέμας. (Vgl. hiezu Elmsley). Hiketiden 417 ἄλλος τε πῶς ἄν μὴ διορθεύων λόγους ὀρθῶς δύναιτ' ἄν δῆμος εὐθύνειν πόλιν. (606 τίν' ἄν λόγον, τάλαινα, τίν' ἄν τῶνδ' αἰτία λάβοιμι). 853 οὐκ ἄν δυναίμην οὐτ' ἐρωτῆσαι τάδε οὐτ' ἄν πιθέσθαι. Hippolyt. 480 ἦ τᾶρ' ἄν ὅψε γ' ἄνδρες ἐξεύροιεν ἄν. Iphig. Taur. 1020 ἄρ' ἄν τύραννον διολέσαι δυναίμεθ' ἄν. Medea 616 οὐτ' ἄν ξένοις τοῖς κοῖς χρῆσθαιμεθ' ἄν. Troades 456 οὐκέτ' ἄν φθάνοις ἄν αὔραν ἰστίοις καρδοκῶν. 1244 ἀφανεῖς ἄν ὄντες οὐκ ἄν ὑμνηθεῖμεν ἄν. Meleagros fragm. 527 Nauck<sup>2</sup> μόνον δ' ἄν (Nauck: malim ἔν) ἀντὶ χρημάτων οὐκ ἄν λάβοις.

Thucyd. 2, 41, 1 λέγω — καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον, δοκεῖν ἄν μοι τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα παρ' ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πλείστ' ἄν εἶδη καὶ μετὰ χαρίτων μάλιστα εὐτραπέλως τὸ σῶμα

3 *Original text*

αὐταρκες παρέχεσθαι. (Vgl. [S. 401] Stahl zu d. Stelle). 4, 114, 4 οὐδ' ἄν σφῶν πειρασομένους — αὐτοὺς δακεῖν ἥσσον, ἀλλὰ πολλῶ μᾶλλον — εὖνους ἄν σφίσι γενέσθαι. 6, 10, 4 τάχ' ἄν δ' ἴσως, εἰ — λάβοιεν —, καὶ πάνυ ἄν ξυνεπίθοντο. 6, 11, 2 Σικελιώται δ' ἄν μοι δοκοῦσιν, ὥς γε νῦν ἔχουσιν, καὶ ἔτι ἄν ἥσσον δεινοὶ ἡμῖν γενέσθαι. 6, 18, 2 βραχὺ ἄν τι προσκτώμενοι αὐτῇ περὶ αὐτῆς ἄν ταύτης μᾶλλον κινδυνεύοιμεν. 8, 46, 2 γενομένης δ' ἄν — ἀρχῆς ἀπορεῖν ἄν αὐτόν. Hippokrates περὶ ἀρχαίης ἱητρικῆς 1, 572 Littré οὔτε ἄν αὐτῷ τῷ λέγοντι οὔτε τοῖς ἀκούουσι δῆλα ἄν εἴη. Aristoph. Acharn. 218 οὐδ' ἄν ἐλαφρῶς ἄν ἀπεπλίζατο. 308 πῶς δέ γ' ἄν καλῶς λέγοις ἄν. Nubes 977 ἡλείψατο δ' ἄν τοῦμφοῦ οὐδεὶς παῖς ὑπένερθεν τότ' ἄν. 1383 μαμμᾶν δ' ἄν αἰτήσαντος ἥκόν σοι φέρων ἄν ἄρτον. Pax 68 πῶς ἄν ποτ' ἀφικοίμην ἄν εὐθὺ τοῦ Διός. 646 ἢ δ' Ἑλλὰς ἄν ἐξερημωθεῖς ἄν ὑμᾶς ἔλαθε. 1223 οὐκ ἄν πριαίμην οὐδ' ἄν ἰσχάδος μιᾶς. Aves 829 καὶ πῶς ἄν ἔτι γένοιτ' ἄν εὐτακτος πόλις. Lysistr. 113 ἐγὼ δέ τᾶν κᾶν (scil. ἐθέλωμι), εἰ με χρεῖη — ἐκπιεῖν. 115 ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἄν κᾶν ὥσπερ εἰ ψῆτταν δοκῶ δοῦναι ἄν ἐμαυτῆς παρταμοῦσα θῆμις. 147 μᾶλλον ἄν διὰ τουτογὶ γένοιτ' ἄν εἰρήνη. 361 φωνὴν ἄν οὐκ ἄν εἶχον. Ranae 34 ἢ τᾶν σε κωκύειν ἄν ἐκέλευον μακρά. 581 οὐκ ἄν γενοίμην Ἑρακλῆς ἄν. Ekkles. 118 οὐκ ἄν φθάνοις τὸ γένειον ἄν περιδουμένη.

Plato Sympos. [Apol. 41 A.] 176 C ἴσως ἄν ἐγὼ περὶ τοῦ μεθύσκεσθαι — τᾶληθῇ λέγων ἦττον ἄν εἴην ἀηδής. Phaedrus 232 C εἰκότως ἄν (Schanz konj. δῆ) τοὺς ἐρῶντας μᾶλλον ἄν φοβοῖο. 257 C τάχ' οὖν ἄν ὑπὸ φιλοτιμίας ἐπίσχοι ἡμῖν ἄν τοῦ γράφειν. Republ. 7, 526 C οὐκ ἄν ῥαδίως οὐδὲ πολλὰ ἄν εὖροις ὥς τοῦτο. Menexenus 236 D κᾶν ὀλίγου, εἰ με κελεύοις ἀποδύντα ὀρχήσασθαι, χαρισαίμην ἄν. Sophist. 233 A πῶς οὖν ἄν ποτέ τις — δύναιτ' ἄν ὑγιές τι λέγων ἀντειπεῖν. 233 B σχολῇ ποτ' ἄν αὐτοῖς τις χρήματα διδοὺς ἤθελεν ἄν — μαθητῆς γίγνεσθαι. [Legg. 5, 742 C]. Xen. Cyrop 1, 3, 11 στὰς ἄν ὥσπερ οὗτος ἐπὶ τῇ εἰσόδῳ — λέγοιμ' ἄν. Xen. Anab. 1, 3, 6 ὑμῶν δ' ἔρημος ὢν, οὐκ ἄν ἱκανὸς οἶμαι εἶναι οὔτ' ἄν φίλον ὠφελῆσαι οὔτ' ἄν ἐχθρὸν ἀλέξασθαι. 4, 6, 13 δοκοῦμεν δ' ἄν μοι ταύτῃ προσποιούμενοι προσβαλεῖν ἐρημωτέρῳ ἄν τῷ ὄρει χρῆσθαι. 5, 6, 32 διασπαθέντες δ' ἄν καὶ κατὰ μικρὰ γενομένης τῆς δυνάμεως οὔτ' ἄν τροφήν δύνασθε λαμβάνειν οὔτε χαίροντες ἄν ἀπαλλάξαιτε. Oecon. 4, 5 ὧδ' ἄν — ἐπισκοποῦντες — ἴσως ἄν [S. 402] καταμάθοιμεν. II S. 283. Epikrates (fragm. com. ed. Kock) fr. 2/3, V. 17 εἶδες δ' ἄν αὐτῆς Φαρνάβαζον θάττον ἄν. (De-mosth. 18, 240 τί ἄν οἶεσθ' εἰ — ἀπῆλθον —, τί ποιεῖν ἄν ἢ τί λέγειν τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς ἀνθρώπους τουτουσί gehört, da die Wiederholung des ἄν durch die Wiederaufnahme des fragenden τί bewirkt ist, nicht hierher.) 27, 56 οὐκ ἄν ἡγείσθ' αὐτόν κᾶν ἐπιδραμεῖν. Aristot. poet. 25, 1460<sup>b</sup> 7 ὧδ' ἄν θεωροῦσιν γένοιτ' ἄν φανερόν und öfters; vgl. Vahlen zu d. Stelle und Wiener Sitzungsber. LVI 408. 438.

Wenn meine Beispielsammlung in ihrer Unvollständigkeit nicht gar zu un-



gleichmässig ist, ergibt sich starke Abnahme dieser Art von Doppelsetzung von *äv* im vierten Jahrhundert. Zumal die rednerische Prosa zeigt nur ganz spärliche Beispiele; bekanntlich hat Lysias *äv* gar nie doppelt gesetzt. Ich zweifle nicht, dass diese Abnahme auf fortschreitendes Erlöschen derjenigen Tradition zurückzuführen ist, welche *äv* an zweiter Stelle des Satzes forderte.

Nun findet sich Doppelsetzung des *äv* auch so, dass das erste *äv* nicht die zweite Stelle im Satz einnimmt, sondern eine spätere. Dies ist ganz natürlich, da ja die verschiedensten Satzteile *äv* gern hinter sich hatten, und folglich, sobald ein Satz breiter angelegt war, sich verschiedene mit einander kollidierende Ansprüche auf die Partikel geltend machen mussten. Die hieraus sich ergebenden Kombinationen zu betrachten und für eine jede die betr. Beispiele beizubringen, liegt ausserhalb unserer Aufgabe, die nur die Erforschung der Reste des alten Stellungsgesetzes in sich schliesst, so interessant und so wichtig für die Würdigung der jüngern Sprache es auch wäre, die in dieser herrschend gewordenen Tendenzen im Einzelnen klar zu legen.

## VIII.

Das Stellungsgesetz, dessen Geltung im Griechischen auf den vorausgehenden Seiten besprochen worden ist, ist für einzelne der asiatischen Schwestersprachen längst anerkannt.

Für die Altindische Prosa lehrt Delbrück Syntakt. Forschungen III 47: "Enklitische Wörter rücken möglichst nah an den Anfang des Satzes". Wesentlich stimmt dazu die Bemerkung, die Bartholomae Ar. Forschungen II 3 für den Rigveda giebt: "Auch bei oberflächlicher Betrachtung drängt [S. 403] sich die Wahrnehmung auf, dass im RV. die enklitischen Formen der Personalpronomina, sowie gewisse Partikeln, in den meisten Fällen die zweite Stelle innerhalb des Verses oder des Vers-Abschnitts einnehmen". Vgl. denselben Ar. Forschungen III 30 Anm. über *sīm*, *smā*, sowie die harte Tmesis RV. 5, 2, 7 *śunaś cic chēpam niditya sahasrād yūpād amuñcaḥ*.

Entsprechende Beobachtungen hat derselbe Gelehrte an den Gathas des Avesta gemacht (Ar. Forschungen II 3–31). Er stellt dort S. 11 f. für diese die Regel auf: "Enklitische Pronomina und Partikeln lehnen sich an den ersten Hochtton im Versglied an", und ist dabei zur Anerkennung von Ausnahmen bloss bei *cīt* genötigt, das eben oft einzelne Satzteile hervorzuheben hat und dann an die betr. Satzteile geheftet ist. Auch dies lässt sich zu der Delbrückschen Regel leicht in Beziehung setzen.

Ganz genau bewährt sich aber diese, wie es scheint, in der mittellindischen

### 3 Original text

Prosa (vgl. z. B. Jacobi Māhārāṣṭri-Erzählungen S. 8 Z. 18 *jena se parikkhemi balavisesaṃ*, wo *se* syntaktisch zu *balavisesaṃ* gehört) und sicher im Altpersischen, dessen Keilschriftdenkmäler sich durch ihre feierlich-korrekte Sprechweise und ihre genaue Unterscheidung der Enklitika in der Schrift für derartige Beobachtungen besonders eignen. Ich gebe das Material nach Spiegels zweiter Ausgabe vollständig, mit Ausnahme der Stellen, wo das Enklitikum ergänzt ist. Ausnahmslos an zweiter Stelle finden sich zunächst

*mai*y: hinter den geschlechtigen Nominativen *Auramazdā* Bh. 1, 25. 55. 87. 94. 2, 24. 40. 60. 68. 3, 6, 17. 37. 44. 60. 65. 86. 4, 60. NR<sup>a</sup> 50. *dahyāuš* Bh. 4, 39 *hauv* Bh. 2, 79. 3, 11; sodann hinter dem neutralen *tya* (ausser Bh. 4, 65, über das der Lücke wegen nichts bestimmtes gesagt werden kann), Xerxes A 24. 30. C<sup>a</sup> 13 (zweimal), C<sup>b</sup> 22 (zweimal). D 19. E<sup>a</sup> 19; endlich hinter *utā* Bh. 4, 74. 78. Xerxes D 15 (dazu NR<sup>a</sup> 52, Xerxes D 18. E<sup>a</sup> 18. A 29, obwohl *utā* an diesen Stellen nicht Sätze, sondern nur Satzglieder verbindet).

*tai*y: hinter den geschlechtigen Nominativen *Auramazdā* Bh. 4, 58. 78, *hauv* NR<sup>a</sup> 57, [wo allerdings nach Thumbs Deutung KZ. XXXII 132 ff. *tai*y an fünfter Stelle stände!] [S. 404] hinter dem Neutrum *ava* Bh. 4, 76. 79, hinter *ada* NR<sup>a</sup> 43. 45, hinter *utā* Bh. 4, 58. 75. 79.

*šai*y hinter *hauv* Darius H 3. *tyai*y (Nom. Pl.) Bh. 1, 57. 2, 77. 3, 48. 51. 73. *avaṇā* 3, 14. *utā* 2, 74. 89. 5, 11. *pasāva* 2, 88.

Also *mai*y, *tai*y, *šai*y folgen der Regel an im ganzen 56 Stellen im Anschluss an die verschiedensten Wörter, und ohne dass eine einzige Stelle widerspricht. Besonderer Beachtung wert sind Bh. 1, 57 *utā tyaišaiy fratamā martiyā anušiyā āhantā*, gegenüber dem *uta martiyā tyaišaiy fratamā* u. s. w. der übrigen Stellen mit *tyaišaiy*, ferner Bh. 4, 74 = 4, 78, *utāmai*y, *yāvā taumā ahatiy*, *parikarāha-diš*, wo *mai*y vor dem Zwischensatz, das Verbum erst dahinter kommt; vorzüglich aber Xerxes D 15 *utamai*y *tya pitā akunauš* = καὶ μοι ἄττα ὁ πατήρ ἐποίησεν, wo das in den Relativsatz gehörige *mai*y dem Anschluss an *utā* zu liebe vor das Relativpronomen gestellt ist.

Ganz ähnliche Resultate ergeben sich bei den übrigen personalen Enklitika: beim enklitischen *mām*, das an der einzigen Belegstelle (Bh. 1, 52) auf satzeinleitendes *mātya* folgt; bei *šim*: hinter den Nominativen *āpi* Bh. 1, 95. *kāra* 1, 50. *adam* 1, 52, sowie *haruva* 2, 75. 90; hinter dein Akkusativ *šatram* 1, 59; hinter den Partikeln *avadā* 1, 59. 3, 79. 5, 14. *nai* 4, 49. *pasāva* 2, 90; bei *šiš* hinter *avadā* 3, 52; bei *šām* hinter den Nominativen *adam* NR<sup>a</sup> 18; *hya* Bh. 2, 13; dem Akkusativ *avam* Bh. 2, 20. 83., dem Neutrum *tya* Bh. 1, 19. NR<sup>a</sup> 20. 36; hinter den Partikeln *avathā* 2, 27. 37. 42. 62. 83. 98. 3, 8. 19. 40. 47. 56. 63. 68. 84, und *utā* 3, 56.

Diesen 35 Stellen, die damit zu den obigen 56 hinzukommen, stehen allerdings

3 abweichende gegenüber: Bh. 1, 14 *vašnā Auramazdāha adamšām xšāyaφiya āham*; 4, 6 *vašn[ā Aurama]zdāha adamšām ajanam*; NR<sup>a</sup> 35 *vašnā Auramazdāha adamšim gāpvā niyašādayam*; immerhin schliesst sich an allen drei das Enklitikon unmittelbar an das Subjekt *adam* an. Und mehr als ausgeglichen werden diese Ausnahmen durch solche Stellen wie Bh. 2, 75 = 2, 90 *haruvašim kāra avaina* (“universus eum populus videbat”) wo das Pronomen zwischen Attribut und Substantiv getreten ist, oder wie Bh. 3, 56 *utāsām 1 martiyam maφištam akunauš*, wo *šām* syn-[S. 405]taktisch zu *maφištam* gehört (“und er machte einen Menschen zum Obersten derselben”).

Sieht man von *hacāma* ‘von mir’ und *haca avadaša* ‘von da aus’ ab, so bleiben noch *-ciy* (= altind. *cit*) und *dim*, *diš*. Letztere folgen der Regel hinter dem Nominativ *drauga* Bh. 4, 34, dem neutralen *tyā* Bh. 1, 65, der Partikel *naiy* 4, 73. 78, *pasāva* Bh. 4, 35. NR<sup>a</sup> 33, der Verbalform *visanāha* Bh. 4, 77. Kaum als Ausnahme kann 4, 74 gelten: *utāmai, yāvā taumā ahatiy, parikarāhadiš* (Spiegel: “sondern sie mir, so lange deine Familie dauert, bewahrst”): denn wenn sich hier *diš* auch nicht an das erste Wort des Satzes schlechthin anschliesst, so doch an das erste auf den Zwischensatz folgende Wort. So widerspricht nur NR<sup>a</sup> 42 [*yath]ā xšnās[āhadiš]* “damit du sie kennst”, und da mag man billig fragen, ob nicht die Ergänzung falsch sei.

Dagegen *ciy* emanzipiert sich von der Regel. Zwar steht es Bh. 1, 53 hinter *kaš*, S. 23 hinter *hauv* und Xerxes D 20. C<sup>a</sup> 14.<sup>b</sup> 24 an zweiter, aber Bh. 1, 46 hinter *kaš*, 1, 53 hinter *ciš*, 1, 63. 67. 69 hinter *paruvam*, 4, 46 und Xerxes D 13 hinter *aniyaš* an dritter Stelle oder noch weiter hinten im Satz. Es steht eben hinter dem Wort, das der Hervorhebung bedarf; vgl. die Stellung von *cī* im Avesta (oben S. 403).

So die indoiranischen Sprachen. Aber auch ausserhalb derselben bieten sich belehrende Parallelen dar. Dass vorerst den germanischen Sprachen unser Stellungsgesetz nicht fremd ist, zeigt schon die Behandlung der schwachbetonten Personalpronomina im Neuhochdeutschen. Zumal, wenn *sich* im Nebensatz und dann in weiter Entfernung vom Verbum steht, kommt uns das Gesetz zum Bewusstsein, freilich als eine unbequeme Fessel, deren wir uns in schriftlicher Darstellung gern dadurch entledigen, dass wir das Pronomen zum Verbum ziehen. Wir glauben hierdurch deutlicher zu sein, empfinden aber solche Stellung doch als unschön. Und oft entschlüpft uns in mündlicher Rede doppeltes *sich*, eines am traditionellen Platze zu Anfang, und eines beim Verbum: ganz analog dem doppelten *äv* der Griechen. — Auch bei den andern persönlichen Pronomina kann man solche Tendenz beobachten.

Doch wage ich auf diesem Gebiet eingehendere Erörterungen nicht, und möchte nur noch an die von Kluge KZ. [S. 406] XXVI 80 in ihrer Bedeutung hervorge-

### 3 Original text

hoben den gotischen Tmesen *ga-u-laubeis*, *ga-u-ha-sēhi*, *us-nu-gibiþ* und die Fälle erinnern, wo *u(h)* und ähnliche Partikeln im Gotischen Präposition und Kasus trennen. Mit Recht erkennt Kluge in diesem Drang der Enklitika sich unmittelbar an das erste Wort anzuschließen, einen alten Rest aus der Vorzeit. Das lehrreichste Beispiel ist unstreitig *ga-u-ha-sēhi* mit seinem Einschub des Indefinitums *ha* = *τὶ*.

## IX.

Indem ich dahingestellt lasse, ob das Pronomen infixum des Keltischen (Zeuss *Grammatica celtica* S. 327 ff.) nicht von hier aus Licht empfangen, wende ich mich sogleich zum Latein, und konstatiere hier zum voraus, dass die Latinisten alter Schule schon längst lehren, dass zumal in klassischer Prosa die Stelle unmittelbar hinter dem ersten Wort des Satzes mit Tonschwäche verbunden sei, und die dorthin gestellten Wörter entweder von Haus aus enklitisch seien oder es durch eben diese Stellung werden (Reisig Vorlesungen über latein. Sprachwissenschaft S. 818; Madvig zu Cic. *de finibus* I 43; Seyffert-Müller zu Cic. *Laelius*<sup>2</sup> S. 49. 64; Schmalz *Latein. Syntax*<sup>2</sup> S. 557 u. s. w.) Für die Einzeluntersuchung ist es nun allerdings unbequem, dass die Überlieferung anders als im Griechischen keine äussern Kennzeichen zur Unterscheidung orthotonischer und enklitischer Formen liefert. Trotzdem können wir ziemlich sicher gehen. Denn gesetzt z. B. es zeige ein *Casus obliquus* eines persönlichen Pronomens, auf dem nach Ausweis des Zusammenhangs keinerlei Nachdruck liegt, genau dieselben Stellungseigentümlichkeiten, die wir bei *μοι* und seinen Genossen gefunden haben, so muss in einem solchen Fall sowohl die enklitische Betonung des betr. Pronomens als die Gültigkeit des fürs Griechische aufgestellten Stellungsgesetzes auch fürs Latein m. E. als erwiesen gelten. Und solche Fälle finden sich genug.

Erstens eigentliche Tmesis zwischen Präposition und Verbum (vgl. fürs Griechische oben S. 361): *sub vos placo*, *ob vos sacro* (Festus 190<sup>b</sup> 2. 309<sup>a</sup> 30). Zweitens Zertrennung anderer, sonst zur Einheit verwachsener Wortverbindungen durch ein der zweiten Stelle zustrebendes schwach betontes Pronomen: a) mit *per* verbundener Adjektive: Cicero *de orat.* [S. 407] (1, 214 *in quo per mihi mirum visum est*). 2, 271 *nam sicut, quod apud Catonem ist [sic] —, per mihi scitum videtur —: sic profecto se res habet.* ad Quintum fr. 1, 7 (9), 2 *per mihi benigne respondit.* ad Att. 1, 4, 3 *quod ad me de Hermathena scribis, per mihi gratum est.* 1, 20, 7 *per mihi, per, inquam, gratum feceris.* Dass Lael. 16 *pergratum mihi feceris, spero item Scaevolae* steht und nicht *per mihi gratum*, wie Orelli verlangte, dient zur Bestätigung unserer Regel, da *mihi* wegen des Gegensatzes zu *Scaevolae* stark betont

gewesen sein muss (Seyffert-Müller zu d. St. S. 95<sup>2</sup>). Die weiteren Fälle, in denen *per* Tmesis erleidet, werden im Verlauf zur Erwähnung kommen, ausser de or. 1. 205 *ista sunt per grata perque iucunda* und ad. Att. 10, 1, 1 *per enim magni aestimo*, in welch beiden Beispielen übrigens eine, die zweite Stelle verlangende, Partikel die Trennung bewirkt hat.

b) Des Pronomens *qui-cunque* (Neue<sup>3</sup> 2, 489), nebst Zubehör (dessen Tmesis in Fällen wie Cicero pro Sest. 68 *quod iudicium cunque subierat*. De divin. 2, 7 *quare cunque*. Lucrez 4, 867 *quae loca cunque*. 6, 85 *qua de causa cunque*. 6, 867 *quae semina cunque*. Horaz Oden 1, 6, 3 *quam rem cunque* und in den von Neue aus Gellius und Appuleius angeführten Stellen; ferner in Cicero de legibus 2, 46 *quod ad cunque legis genus* besondrer Art ist). Cicero de orat. 3, 60 *quam se cunque in partem dedisset*. Tuscul. 2, 15 *quo ea me cunque ducet*. De divin. 2, 149 *quo te cunque verteris*. Verg. Aen. 1, 610 *quae me cunque vocant terrae*. 8, 74 *quo te cunque lacus miserantem incommoda nostra fonte tenet*. 12, 61 *qui te cunque manent isto certamine casus*. Horaz Oden 1, 7, 25 *quo nos cunque feret melior Fortuna parente*. 1, 27, 14 *quae te cunque domat Venus*. (Ovid. trist 2, 78 *delicias legit qui tibi cunque meas*.) Martial 2, 61, 6 *nomen quod tibi cunque datur*. Darnach Terenz Andria 263 *quae meo quomque animo lubitum est facere*. Ausser an diesen Stellen und den unten wegen anderer Enklitika anzuführenden kommt Tmesis von *quicunque* nur Lucrez 6, 1002. Horaz 1, 9, 14. 1, 16, 2. Sat. 2, 5, 51 vor, wo ganz beliebige Wörter dazwischen getreten sind. (Vgl. Horaz Sat. 1, 9, 33 *garrulus hunc quando consumet cunque*.) Wir dürfen ruhig hierin poetische Freiheiten erkennen.

c) Des Adverbs *quomodo*. Plautus Cistell 1, 1, 47 *ne-[S. 408]cesse est, quo tu me modo voles esse, ita esse mater*. Cicero pro Rosc. Am. 89 *quo te modo iactaris*. in Pisonem 89 *quo te modo ad tuam intemperantiam innovasti*. pro Scauro 50 *quo te nunc modo appellem*. Vgl. pro Rab. Post. 19 *quonam se modo defendet*. pro Scauro 50 *quocunque igitur te modo* —. Weiteres unten; Trennung durch volltonige Wörter scheint sich nicht zu finden. Denn Cicero de lege agr. 1, 25 *quo uno modo* ist besondrer Art.

Drittens ist die Trennung von Präposition und regiertem Kasus in der bekannten Bittformel zu nennen: Plautus Bacch. 905 *per te ere obsecro deos immortales*. Menaechmi 990 *per ego vobis deos atque homines dico*. Terenz Andria 538 *per te deos oro et nostram amicitiam*, Chremes. 834 *per ego te deos oro*. Tibull 3, 11 (= 4, 5,) 7 *per te dulcissima furta perque tuos oculos per geniumque rogo*. Livius 23, 9, 2 *per ego te, inquit, fili, quaecunque iura iungunt liberos parentibus, precor quaeesoque*. Curtius 5, 8, 16 *per ego vos decora maiorum — oro et obtestor*. Lucan 10, 370 *per te quod fecimus una perdidimusque nefas — ades* (das Verbum des Bittens ist hier, wie im folgenden Beispiel, weggelassen). Silius 1, 658 *per vos culta diu Rutulae*

### 3 Original text

*primordia gentis* —, *conservate pios*. Das *per*, woran sich das Pronomen *te*, *vos*, *vobis* anhängt, steht also immer am Anfang des Satzes.

Viertens seien die paar Beispiele von Trennung minder enger Wortgruppen angeführt, die von den vorgenannten Latinisten als Belege für Ciceros Neigung das tonlose Pronomina hinter dem ersten Wort einzuschieben beigebracht werden: (de orat. 3, 209 *his autem de rebus sol me ille admonuit*.) Brutus 12 *populus se Romanus erexit*. orator 52 *sentiebam, non te id sciscitari*. de offic. 1, 151 *in agros se possessionesque contulit*. (Laelius 15 *idque eo mihi magis est cordi*. 87 *ut aliquis nos deus ex hac hominum frequentia tolleret*.)

Fünftens sind einige Fälle zu nennen, wo ein zwei Gliedern des Satzes gemeinsames Pronomen ins erste eingeschoben wird (Müller zum Laelius XX 72). Cic. epist 4, 7, 2 *sed idem etiam illa vidi, neque te consilium civilis belli ita gerendi nec copias Cn. Pompei — probare*. Laelius 37 *nec se comitem illius furoris, sed ducem praebuilt*. Sallust or. Philippi 16 *neque te provinciae neque leges neque di penates* [S. 409] *civem patiuntur*. (Ebenso, aber ohne Einfluss des Stellungsgesetzes Caesar bell. civ. 1, 85, 11 *quae omnia et se tulisse patienter et esse laturum*, wozu jedoch Paul: “*se omittendum esse verborum consecutio docet*”.)

Anderes geben die bisherigen Forschungen über die Stellung des Pronomens bei den Komikern an die Hand. (Vgl. Kämpf De pronominum personalium usu et conlocatione apud poëtas scenicos Romanorum: Berliner Studien für klass. Philologie u. Archäologie III 2. 1886). Aus Kämpf hebe ich namentlich die Beobachtung hervor (S. 31. 36), dass sich die Personalpronomina in der grossen Mehrzahl der Fälle an Fragewörter und an satzeinleitende Konjunktionen unmittelbar anschliessen; (vgl. z. B. bei Joseph Bach in Studemunds Studien auf d. Gebiete des archaischen Lateins II 243 die Zusammenstellung der Fälle mit *quid tibi* und folgendem den Akkusativ regierenden Substantivum verbale auf *-tio*), ebenso (S. 40) an die Affirmativpartikeln, wie *hercle*, *pol*, *edepol* u. s. w., die, worauf später die Rede kommen wird, entweder die erste oder die zweite Stelle im Satz einnehmen. Sehr beachtenswert ist auch die an eine Beobachtung Kellerhoffs geknüpfte Bemerkung Kämpfs, dass in den überaus zahlreichen Fällen, wo die Negation an der Spitze des Verses steht, sich ein allfällig vorhandenes Pronomen personale daran anlehnt.

Am lehrreichsten ist aber der Nachweis, den Langen Rhein. Museum XII (1857) 426 ff. betreffend die Beteuerungs-, Wunsch- und Verwünschungsformeln mit *di*, *di deaeque* oder einem einzelnen Gottesnamen als Subjekt und konjunktivischem (oder futurischem) Verbum als Prädikat gegeben hat. (Vgl. auch Kellerhoff in Studemunds Studien II 77 f.). Wo *di*, *di deaeque*, oder der betr. Gottesname am Satzanfang steht, folgen die vom Verb regierten pronominalen Akkusative und



Dative *me, te, tibi*, ebenso die in diesen Wendungen seltener vorkommenden *vos, vobis, (istum), istunc, istam, istunc, istaec, illum* dem Subjekt unmittelbar. Wo das Subjekt mehrgliedrig ist, findet sich das Pronomen zwar vereinzelt erst nach der ganzen Subjektgruppe: Plautus *Casina* 275 *Hercules dique istam perdant*. Vgl. Epidicus 192 *di hercle omnes me adiuuant, augent, amant*, wo Langen (und nach ihm Götz) *di me hercle omnes* ändert. Mostell. 192 *di deaeque omnes me pessumis exemplis interficiant*. (Ritschl [S. 410] *me omnes*). Öfter ist das Pronomen nach dem ersten Gliede eingeschoben: Aulul. 658 *Iuppiter te dique perdant*. (Dasselbe Captivi 868. Curculio 317. Rudens 1112). Captivi 919 *Diespiter te dique, Ergasile, perdant*. Pseudolus 271 *di te deaeque ament*. Mostell. 463 *di te deaeque omnes faxint cum istoc omine*. 684 *di te deaeque omnes funditus perdant, senex*. Ebenso bei attributiver Gruppe: Menaechmi 596 *di illum omnes perdant*. Terenz Phormio 519 *di tibi omnes id quod es dignus duint*. Eine Mittelstellung nimmt Plautus *Persa* 292 ein: *di deaeque me omnes perdant*; ebenso Mostell. 192 nach Ritschls Schreibung, siehe oben.

Schon dies ist beachtenswert; von besondrer Bedeutung ist aber, dass wenn an der Spitze des Satzes ein *ita, itaque, ut, utinam, hercle, qui, at* steht, darauf nicht etwa zuerst *di* oder der Göttername und dann erst das Pronomen folgt, sondern in diesem Fall das Pronomen dem nominalen Subjekt vorangeht. Wo *at* und *ita* verbunden sind, steht das Pronomen dahinter Curculio 574 *at ita me machaera et clypeus bene iuvent*. Miles glor. 501 *at ita me di deaeque omnes ament*; dagegen zwischen beiden Partikeln Poenulus 1258 *at me ita dei servant*, wo ich dem Metrum lieber mit der Schreibung *med*, als mit der von den Neuern vorgezogenen Umstellung *at ita me* aufhelfen würde. Auch hinter andern Anfangswörtern, als den angeführten Partikeln, geht das Pronomen dem Subjekt *di* voraus: Pseudolus 430 *si te di ament*. 936 *tantum tibi boni di immortales duint*. Mostell. 655 *malum quod (= κακόν τι) isti di deaeque omnes duint* u. s. w. An der widerstrebenden Stelle Plautus *Casina* 609 *quin hercle di te perdant* will Langen, dem sich Kellerhoff a. a. O. und Schöll in seiner Ausgabe anschliessen, *quin hercle te di perdant* umstellen, während Seyffert mittelst der Interpunktion *quin hercle "di te perdant"* dem Schaden abzuhelpen sucht.

Die Beobachtung von Langen bewährt sich auch an der klassischen Latinität. Insofern wenigstens als die Beteuerungsformeln mit *ita, sic* auch hier das *me, te, mihi* fast ausnahmslos unmittelbar hinter *ita, sic* haben. Mit *ita*: Cicero *divinatio* in Caec. 41 *ita mihi deos velim propitios*. Verrina 5, 35 *ita mihi meam voluntatem — vestra populiue Romani existimatio comprobet*. 5, 37 *ita mihi omnis deos propitios velim*. Epistulae 5, 21, 1 *nam tecum esse, ita mihi com-[S. 411]moda omnia quae opto contingant, ut vehementer velim*. ad Atticum 1, 16, 1 *saepe, ita me di iuvent, te*

### 3 Original text

— *desideravi*. 16, 15, 3 [Octavianus] *iurat* “*ita sibi parentis honores consequi liceat*”. Catull 61, 196 *at marite, ita me iuvent caelites, nihilo minus pulcer es*. 66, 18 *non (ita me divi) vera gemunt (iuerint)*. 97, 1 *non, ita me di ament, quicquam referre putavi*. Diese Stellung bleibt auch, wenn dem *ita* noch eine Partikel vorgeschoben wird: Cicero in Catil. 4, 11 *nam ita mihi salva republica vobiscum perfrui liceat, ut* —. epist. 10, 12, 1 *tamen ita te victorem complectar* —, *ut* —. (Plancus ad Ciceronem epist. 10, 9, 2 *ita ab imminentibus malis respublica me adiuvante liberetur* und Petron. 74 *ita genium meum propitium habeam* kommen natürlich nicht in betracht.

Mit *sic*: Catull. 17, 5 *sic tibi bonus ex tua pons libidine fiat*. Virgil Ecl. 10, 4 *sic tibi, cum fluctus supterlabere Sicanos, Doris amara suam non intermisceat undam*. Horaz Oden 1, 3, 1 *sic te diva potens Cypri — regat*. Tibull 2, 5, 121 *sic tibi sint intonsi Phoebe capilli*. Properz 1, 18, 11 *sic mihi te referas levis*. 3, 6, 2 *sic tibi sint dominae Lygdame dempta iuga*. Ovid. Heroid. 4, 169 *sic tibi secretis agilis dea saltibus adsit*. 4, 173 *sic tibi dent nymphae*. Metamorph. 14, 763 *sic tibi nec vernum nascentia frigus adurat poma*. Corpus inscr. lat. 4, 2776 *presta mi sinceru(m): sic te amet que custodit ortu(m) Venus*. Vgl. Martial 7, 93, 8 *perpetuo liceat sic tibi ponte frui*, wo das Pronomen zwar nicht an zweiter Stelle, aber doch unmittelbar hinter *sic* steht. Bei einem Ablativus absolutus (Horaz Oden 1, 28, 25 *sic — Venusinae plectantur silvae te sospite*) und beim Possessivum (Petron. 75 *rogo, sic peculium tuum fruniscaris*; doch Virgil Ecl. 9, 30 *sic tua Cyrneas fugiant examina taxos*) haben wir kein Recht Geltung der Regel zu erwarten. Auch Ovid Trist. 5, 2, 51 f. (*sic habites terras et te desideret aether*) *sic ad pacta tibi sidera tardus eas* kann nicht als Verletzung der Regel gelten. Dagegen ist auffällig Tibull 1, 4, 1 *sic umbrosa tibi contingant tecta Priape*. Petron 61 *sic felicem me videas*.

Aus Ausdrücken wie die eben besprochenen sind *mehercule*, *mediusfidius*, *mecastor* bekanntlich verkürzt. Daraus scheint sich mir auch ihre Stellung zu erklären. In der grossen Mehrzahl der Beispiele stehn sie an zweiter Stelle des [S. 412] Satzes. So die beiden ersten ausnahmslos in Ciceros Reden. Vgl. für *mehercule* auch Terenz Eunuch. 416. Cicero de or. 2, 7. Epist. 2, 11, 4. ad Atticum 10, 13, 1. 16, 15, 3. Caesar bei Cic. ad Att. 9, 7<sup>c</sup> 1. Caelius bei Cic. epist. 8, 2, 1. Plancus ibid. 10, 11, 3. Plin. Epist. 6, 30; für *mediusfidius* auch Cicero epist. 5, 21, 1. Tuscul. 1, 74 (*ne ille mediusfidius vir sapiens*). Sallust Catil. 35, 2. Livius 5, 6, 1. 22, 59, 17. Seneca suas 6, 5. Plin. epist. 4, 3, 5. Besonders beweiskräftig ist die nicht seltene Einschlebung der zu einer ganzen Periode gehörigen Beteuerungspartikel hinter die einleitende Partikel des Vordersatzes: *si mehercule* Cicero pro Caecina 64. Catil. 2, 16. pro Scauro fragm. 10 Müller. Sallust Catil. 52, 35. *quanto mehercule* Sallust Histor. oratio Philippi 17. *si mediusfidius* Cicero pro Sulla 83. pro Plancio



9. Livius 5, 6, 1. 22, 59, 17. Die Stellen wo eine dieser beiden Partikeln an einer spätern Stelle des Satzes steht, sind bedeutend weniger zahlreich (*mehercule*: Terenz Eunuch. 67. Catull 38, 2. Phaedrus 3, 5, 4. Plin. epist. 4, 1, 1. — *mediusfidius*: Cato bei Gellius 10, 14, 3. Cicero ad Atticum 8, 15 A 2. Quintil. 5, 12, 17). Bemerkenswert sind Cicero Att. 4, 4<sup>b</sup> 2 *mediusfidius, ne tu emisti locum praeclarum*, und 5, 16, 3 *mehercule etiam adventu nostro reviviscunt* —, durch die ganz eigentümliche Voranstellung der Partikel. — Was das vorklassische *mecastor* betrifft, so entsprechen Plautus Aulul. 67 *noenum mecastor quid ego ero dicam meo — queo comminisci* und auch Men. 734 *ne istuc mecastor iam patrem accersam meum* der Regel, Aulul. 172 *novi hominem haud malum mecastor* widerspricht ihr.

Von der Stellungsregel für das vokativische *hercule* und dessen Genossen (siehe unten) unterscheidet sich die für *mehercule* und Genossen darin, dass, von den isolierten Stellen Cicero Att. 4, 4<sup>b</sup> 2. 5, 16, 3 abgesehen, die mit *me-*gebildeten von der ersten Stelle im Satz ausgeschlossen sind. Hiernach wird man ihre Neigung für die zweite Stelle nicht mit der bei *hercule* beobachtbaren zusammenstellen, sondern aus der enklitischen Natur des *me* herleiten.

## X.

Gehn wir zu andern Formen über! Wenn der Vokativ *mī* wirklich dem *μοι* in griechischem τέκνον μοι u. dergl. (s. [S. 413] oben S. 362) gleichzusetzen ist, wie Brugmann Grundriss II 819 annimmt, so ist jedenfalls dem Wort in dieser Verwendung die Enklisis schon in vorhistorischer Zeit abhanden gekommen, da es sich bereits bei Plautus im Satzanfang findet. Es wäre nicht undenkbar, dass die Voranstellung von *mi* vor das Substantivum, zu dem es gehört, in solchen Sätzen aufgekomen wäre, wo der Vokativ nicht an erster Stelle stand, ihm also *mi*, um an die ihm zukommende zweite Stelle im Satz zu gelangen, dem Vokativ vorangestellt werden musste.

Sicherer als dies ist, dass die obliquen Kasus von *is*, gerade wie att. αὐτοῦ und das enklitische *asmāi* des Altindischen, der Weise von *me*, *te* folgen. Und so lesen wir z. B. Cicero Lael. 10 *quam id recte fecerim*, wie Brutus 12 *populus se Romanus erexit* (s. oben S. 408). Ja auch bei den demonstrativeren Pronomina *iste*, *ille* haben wir enklitische Stellung in den S. 409 ff. besprochenen Wunsch- und Verwünschungssätzen.

Weiterhin ist es vielleicht einem oder andern Leser aufgefallen, dass in den Beispielen wo ein *me*, *te* seiner Stellung wegen eine Wortgruppe zerreisst, demselben mehrfach ein *ego*, vorhergeht: Plautus Men. 990 *per ego vobis deos — dico*. Terenz Andr. 834 *per ego te deos oro*. Ähnlich Livius 23, 9, 2. Curtius 5, 8, 16.

### 3 Original text

Ferner Plautus Cistell. 1, 1, 47 *quo tu me modo voles esse*. Auch der Nominativ von *is, ea, id*: Cicero Tusc. 2, 15 *quo ea me cunque duxit*. Man wird nicht bestreiten können, dass in solchen Fällen *ego, tu, ea* eben auch enklitisch sind, und wird sich an die Enklisis von deutschem *er, sie, es* im Nebensatz, und bei Inversion und Frage, auch im Hauptsatz erinnern. Dann sind auch Stellen wie Cicero de orat. 2, 97 *quantulum id cunque est*; de nat. deorum 2, 76 *quale id cunque est*, weiterhin pro Cluent. 66 *quonam igitur haec modo gesta sunt*, Sallust Cat. 52, 10 *cuius haec cunque modi videntur*, Terenz Ad. 36 *ne aut ille alserit aut ceciderit*, pro Deiot. 15 *quonam ille modo cum regno distractus esset*, auf diese Weise zu erklären. Übrigens ist auch das aufs Verb unmittelbar folgende *ego, tu*, wie im Griechischen ἐγώ in gleicher Stellung, gewiss als wesentlich enklitisch zu fassen.

Bei den Indefinita hält das Latein noch strenger an der alten Regel fest als das Griechische und erkennt man [S. 414] dieselbe auch schon längst an, allerdings nicht mit ganz richtiger Formulierung. Nehmen wir den Sprachgebrauch der alten Inschriften, der Kommentarien Caesars und der Reden Ciceros nach dem Index zu CIL. I und den Lexica von Meusel und Merguet zusammen, so ergibt sich, dass sich *quis, quid* in der unendlichen Mehrzahl der Belege an satzeinleitende Wörter wie *ē-, nē* nebst *dum nē, num*, das Relativum *qui* nebst seinen Formen, *quo, cum, quamvis, neque* anschliesst. Natürlich hat *-ve* (in *neve, sive* u. sonst) vor ihm den Vortritt, seltener — bei Caesar nur einmal — haben ihn pronominale Enklitika: CIL. I 206, 71 *neve eorum quod saeptum clausumve habeto*. ibid. 94 und 104 *dum eorum quid faciet*. Vgl. 205 II 15. 41 *qui ita quid confessus erit*. Cicero Verrina 5, 168 *quod eum quis ignoret*. Caesar bell. civ. 3, 32, 3 *qui horum quid acerbissime crudelissimeque fecerat, is et vir et civis optimus habebatur*. Im eigentlichen Satzinfern findet sich in den genannten Texten das Indefinitum im ganzen nur hinter *alius* und *ali-*, wobei zu beachten ist, dass es *si quis alius, ne quis alius*, nicht *si alius quis, ne alius quis* zu heissen pflegt. Daneben finden wir in Ciceros Reden *quis, quid* in Relativsätzen vom Relativum stets (an 7—8 Stellen) durch ein oder zwei andre Wörter getrennt. Eine auffällige Ausnahme ausserdem bildet CIL. I 206, 70 *nei quis in iis locis inve iis porticibus quid inaedificatum immoliturve habeto*.

Ganz dasselbe gilt für die zugehörigen indefiniten Adverbia, besonders *quando*, und gilt andererseits für die Indefinita überhaupt, so viel ich sehe, in den sonstigen archaischen und klassischen Texten. Freilich muss man sich, um das zu erkennen, gelegentlich von den modernen Herausgebern emanzipieren. Hat doch z. B. Götz in Plautus Mercator 774 ganz fröhlich das enklitische *quid* mitten in einen Satz und zugleich an den Anfang des Verses gestellt (s. dessen Ausgabe sowie Acta societ. phil. Lips. VI 244), obgleich die Überlieferung das korrekte *si quid* bietet!

Vereinzelte Ausnahmen lassen sich natürlich auftreiben, doch ist z. B. Plaut. Epid. 210 *tum captivorum quid ducunt secum* das *quid* wohl exclamativ zu fassen, also orthotoniert.

Angeichts solcher Strenge der Stellungsregel kann weder die Anastrophe Cicero Lael. 83 *si quos inter societas aut est aut fuit* (vgl. Seyffert z. d. St.), noch die häufige, [S. 415] an die oben S. 367, 368 zusammengestellten Beispiele des Griechischen erinnernde Abtrennung des attributiven Indefinitums von seinem Nomen befremden z. B. Caesar bell. gall. 6, 22, 3 *ne qua oriatur pecuniae cupiditas*. bell. civ. 1, 21, 1 *ne qua aut largitionibus aut animi confirmatione aut falsis nuntiis commutatio fieret voluntatis* u. s. w. u. s. w. Daran, dass im Oskischen und Umbrischen *pis, pid; pis, pir* meist in unmittelbarem Anschluss an *svaì, svae; sve*, so ‘wenn’ überliefert sind, sei nur im Vorbeigehn erinnert.

Dass *quisque* als auf enklitischem *quis* beruhend ein Enklitikum ist und dass es zwar häufiger als *quis* im Satzinnern steht, aber in der Regel doch nur hinter Superlativen, Ordinalien, *unus* und *suus*, sonst hinter dem ersten Satzwort, ist bekannt. In den Inschriften von CIL. I zeigt sich die Stellungsregel in voller Deutlichkeit: *quisque* hinter *primus* 198, 46. 64. 67, hinter *suus* 206, 92 = 102, sonst im Wortinnern nur 206, 22 *quamque viam h. l. quemque tueri oportebit*; in allen übrigen Beispielen an zweiter Stelle, öfters freilich so, dass auf das Relativum zuerst das Substantiv, zu dem dasselbe als Attribut gehört, und dann erst *quisque* folgt, z. B. 206, 63 *quo die quisque triumphabit*, id. 147 *quot annos quisque eorum habet*, id. 26 *qua in parte urbis quisque eorum curet*, ebenso bei folgendem Genetiv z. B. 200, 71 *quantum agri loci quousque in populi leiberi — datus adsignatusve est*. Aber auch in diesen Beispielen ist die Voranstellung von *quisque* vor die Wörter, zu denen es selbst im Attributivverhältnis steht: *quisque eorum* (so auch sonst noch öfter), *quousque in populi leiberi*, nur aus unserm Stellungsgesetz begreiflich. Und insbesondere sind die Beispiele gar nicht selten, wo *quisque* der Anfangsstellung zu lieb eine attributiv verbundene Wortgruppe spaltet: 199, 39 *quem quisque eorum agrum posidebit*; 202 I 33. 37. 41. II 5 *quam in quisque decuriam — lectus erit*; 202 II 27 *qua in quisque decuria est*. Die beiden letzten Beispiele zeigen, dass in Wortfolgen nach der Art von *quam in decuriam* die Präposition als zum Relativum gehörig empfunden wurde. Ähnlich zerreiht *quisque* auch etwa die Verbindung zwischen regierendem Substantiv und Genetiv, so *quantum viae* in 206, 39 *quantum quousque ante aedificium viae — erit*, 204, 2, 23 *quod quibusque in rebus — iouris — fuit*. So die alten In-[S. 416]schriften. Die übrige ältere Litteratur gibt ähnliches, darunter die beachtenswerte Tmesis *quod quoique quomque inciderit in mentem* (Terenz Heaut. 484). Allerdings ist *quisque* allmählich auch orthotonischer Verwendung und der Stellung am Satzanfang fä-

### 3 Original text

hig geworden. Noch viel mehr ist dies bei *uterque* der Fall, dessen ursprüngliche Enklisis selbstverständlich ist und auch in Stellen wie Plaut. Menaechmi 186 *in eo uterque proelio potabimus* noch hervortritt. Andererseits ist *ubique* um so länger dem Ursprünglichen treu geblieben; Cicero in seinen Reden und ebenso Caesar haben es nicht nur immer in seiner eigentlichen Bedeutung “an jedem einzelnen Ort” verwendet, (– “überall” wird von beiden mit *omnibus locis* gegeben –), sondern es auch immer an ein Relativum (Caesar de bello civ. 2, 20, 8 an interrogatives *quid*) angelehnt.

Dass der andere Indefinitstamm des Latein, der mit *u*-beginnende, überhaupt denselben Stellungsregeln wie der gutturale unterlag, zeigt, abgesehen von der unverkennbaren Neigung, die *ullus, unquam, usquam* für die zweite Stelle haben, Festus 162<sup>b</sup> 22.

## XI.

Unter den Partikeln des Latein finden sich einige von jeher und immer an die zweite Stelle gefesselte: *que, autem, ne*; einige, die zwischen erster und zweiter Stelle teils von Anfang an schwanken teils durch den wechselnden Gebrauch hin und her geschoben werden, wie die Beteuerungspartikeln, wie ferner *enim, igitur*; endlich einige, bei denen Schwanken und Freiheit noch grösser ist: so *tandem*. Alle diese Partikeln bewirken gelegentlich die beim Pronomen nachgewiesenen Tmesen; so z. B. *enim* die von *cunque*: Ovid ex Ponto 4, 13, 6 *qualis enim cunque est*; *igitur* und *tandem* die von *quomodo* und Genossen, auch von *jusjurandum*: Cicero pro Cluentio 66 *quonam igitur haec modo gesta sunt*. pro Scauro 50 *quocunque igitur te modo*, de officiis 3, 104 *jus igitur jurandum*. Verrina 3, 80 *quo tandem modo*. Besonders tmetisch ist *que*, insofern es nicht bloss in Fällen wie die oben genannten in solcher Weise wirkt (z. B. Cicero pro Caelio 54 *jurisque jurandi*), sondern auch Präposition und Verbum (Festus 309<sup>a</sup> 30 *transque dato, endoque plo*–[S. 417]*rato*; Plautus Trinummus 833 *disque tulissent*) und Präposition und Kasus trennt, letzteres zumal in der Bedeutung ‘wenn’: altlateinisch *absque me esset, absque te foret, absque una hac foret, absque eo esset* (Trinummus 832 mit freierer Wortfolge *absque foret te*). Es ist kein Ruhm für die Latinisten, dass sie, nachdem von Schömann und Brugmann längst das Richtige gesagt ist, noch immer *absque* als gewöhnliche Präposition ansehen mögen. Denn gesetzt auch, dass bei Cicero ad Atticum 1, 19, 1 wirklich *absque argumento ac sententia* “ohne – Inhalt” zu lesen sei, was mir Wölfflin nicht bewiesen zu haben scheint, gesetzt also, dass die Bedeutung ‘ohne’ nicht auf einem Irrtum der Archaisten des zweiten Jahrhunderts beruhe, sondern schon der Umgangssprache der ciceronischen

Zeit eigen gewesen sei, so konnte ja in der Zeit zwischen Terenz und Cicero die Phrase *absque me esset* zunächst das Verb verlieren, so dass blosses *absque me* als hypothetisches “ohne mich = wenn ich nicht gewesen wäre” gebraucht wurde: vergleiche Gellius 2, 21, 20 *absque te uno forsitan lingua Graeca longe anteisset, sed tu* – “ohne dich d. h. wenn du nicht gewesen wärest”, und Fronto 85, 24 N. *absque te, satis superque et aetatis et laboris* und infolge der Weglassung des Verbuns sich dann weiter die hypothetische Bedeutung verflüchtigen, *absque me* die Bedeutung “ohne mich” im Sinne von “indem ich nicht (dabei) bin” annehmen. Ganz ähnliche Entwicklungen lassen sich bei den Konzessivpartikeln nachweisen. (Vgl. über *absque* im allgemeinen Praun in Wölfflins Archiv für latein. Lexikogr. VI 197–212).

Als ganz sichere Stützen unseres Stellungsgesetzes können indessen nur die Partikeln gelten, die nicht der Satzverbindung, sondern bloss der Qualifizierung des Satzes oder Satztheiles dienen, zu dem sie speziell gehören. Erstens *quidem*, das sich von indoiran. *cid* formell nur durch den Zusatz von *-em*, in der Funktion nur unwesentlich unterscheidet. Wie dieses kann es nicht hinter unbetonten Wörtern, besonders ursprünglich nicht hinter dem Verbum stehen (vgl., was *cid* betrifft, Bartholomae in Bezzensbergers Beitr. XIII 73), und nimmt wie *cid* je nach seiner Funktion entweder hinter dem ersten Wort des Satzes (beachte z. B. Cic. Lael. 37 *Tiberium quidem Gracchum*) oder aber hinter demjenigen be- [S. 418]tonten Wort seine Stellung, dessen Begriff (etwa eines Gegensatzes wegen) hervorgehoben werden soll. Besonders klar zeigt sich dieser Wechsel der Stellung bei der archaischen Zusammenordnung mit den Beteuerungspartikeln, namentlich mit *hercle*. Unzähligmal findet sich *quidem hercle* u. s. w. hinter dem ersten Wort des Satzes, oft aber auch *hercle — quidem*. Nach Kellerhoff in Studemunds Studien a. d. G. d. archaischen Lateins II 64 f. sind die Beispiele letzterer Stellung teils durch metrische Lizenz zu entschuldigen, teils unerklärbar. Aber ohne Ausnahme zeigen sie *quidem* hinter einem betonten Personale, Demonstrativum, *si* oder *nunc*: in allen diesen Fällen ist *quidem* durch das auf *hercle* und dergl. folgende Orthotonomen angezogen worden. (Auch Plaut. Bach. 1194 *tam pol id quidem*, welche Stelle bei Kellerhoff fehlt.)

An *quidem* sei *quōque* angeschlossen, das ich gleich altind. *kva ca* setzen und ihm also als ursprüngliche Bedeutung ‘*jederorts, jedenfalls*’ geben zu müssen glaube. Ein Wort mit der Bedeutung *jedenfalls* war geeignet das Miteingeschlossensein eines Begriffs in eine Aussage auszudrücken; die archaische Verbindung von *quoque* mit *etiam* wird so auch ganz verständlich. Es liegt in der Funktion des Wortes, dass es, wie γε und z. T. *quidem*, trotz seiner Enklise an beliebigen Stellen des Satzes stehen kann, wo eben das Wort steht, dessen Begriff als hin-

### 3 Original text

zugefügt zu bezeichnen ist. Aber wie γε gelegentlich etwa (s. oben S. 371) der allgemeinen Gewohnheit der Enklitika folgend sich von seinem Wort weg zum Satzanfang entfernt, so auch *quoque*: Varro de lingua lat. 5, 56 *ab hoc quoque quattuor partes urbis tribus dictae* (statt *quattuor quoque*). 5, 69 *quae ideo quoque videtur ab Latinis Iuno Lucina dicta* (st. *Iuno quoque*) [vgl. A. Spengel zu der St.]. 5, 181 *ab eo quoque, quibus —, tribuni aerarii dicti* (st. *ab eo [ii] quoque quibus —*). 5, 182 *aes quoque stipem dicebant* (st. *stipem quoque*). 8, 84 *hinc quoque illa nomina —* (st. *illa nomina quoque*). Ebenso Properz 2, 34, 85 *haec quoque perfecto ludebat Iasone Varro* (st. *Varro quoque*). 2, 34, 87 *haec quoque lascivi cantarunt scripta Catulli* (st. *lascivi Catulli quoque*).

Bedeutsam scheint ferner die Stellung der Fragepartikel *ne*, die ihrer Bedeutung wegen doch nicht mehr Anspruch hatte dicht beim Satzanfang zu stehen, als im Latein selbst [S. 419] die Negation oder als im Deutschen z. B. *etwa* oder *vielleicht*. Nur die Enklisis erklärt die übrigens längst anerkannte Regel, das [sic] *ne* unmittelbar hinter das erste Wort des Satzes gehöre, von welcher Natur immer dasselbe auch sei. Es ist nicht meine Aufgabe, im Anschluss an Hand Tursellinus 4, 75 ff. und Kämpf De pronominum personalium usu et collocatione S. 42–46 (vgl. zu letzterm die Rezension von Abraham Berliner philologische Wochenschrift 1886, 227, welcher für Sätze wie Plautus Mostell. 362 *sed ego sumne infelix?* Epidicus 503 *sed tu novistin fidicinam Acrobolistidem?* Interpunktion hinter dem Pronomen verlangt) das gesamte Material zu durchgehen und die wirklichen und scheinbaren Ausnahmen zu besprechen. Es genüge darauf hinzuweisen, dass noch die klassische und spätere Sprache diese Regel kennt und darauf das seit Catull zu belegende *utrumne* statt *utrum — ne* zurückzuführen ist. Wie im nachhomerischen Griechischen τοιγάρ, weil man sich gewöhnt hatte darin nicht mehr einen selbständigen Satz, sondern das erste Wort eines Satzes zu erblicken, das bei Homer noch davon getrennte τοι an sich zog (s. oben S. 377), so *utrum* aus gleichartigem Grunde das *-ne*.

Eine gewisse Abschwächung der alten Regel ist nur darin zu erkennen, dass, wenn eine aus Vordersatz und Nachsatz bestehende Periode durch *ne* als interrogativ zu bezeichnen war, die klassische Sprache *ne* erst im Nachsatz anzubringen pflegt, während in solchem Fall die alte Sprache *-ne* gleich an das Fügewort des Vordersatzes anknüpfte. Mit letzterm hängt der häufige Gebrauch zusammen, in einem Relativsatz *ne* an das Relativum anzuhängen und dann mit solchem Relativsatz ohne Beifügung eines Hauptsatzes zu fragen, ob die im vorausgehenden Satz gegebene Aussage für den im Relativsatz beschriebenen Begriff gelte. Auch andere Nebensätze finden sich so verwendet. (Vgl. zu dem allem Brix zum Trinummus 360. Lorentz zum Miles 965, zur Mostellaria 738.)



Von da aus wird m. E. eine bisher falsch erklärte Partikel verständlich. Ribbeck Beiträge zur Lehre v. d. latein. Partikeln (1869) S. 14 f. leitet unter dem Beifall von Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik (Iwan Müllers Handbuch der klass. Altertumswiss. II) <sup>2</sup> 526 *sin* “wenn aber” aus einer Verbindung von *si* mit der Negation *ne* her. Die dieser Herkunft entsprechende Bedeutung “wenn nicht” zeige sich noch an [S. 420] Stellen wie Cic. Att. 16, 13<sup>b</sup> 2 *si pares aequae inter se, quiescendum; sin, latius manabit, et quidem ad nos, deinde communiter*. Zu *sin* habe man dann auch noch oft “tautologisch oder hinüberleitend” *aliter, secus, minus* hinzugefügt; auch, wenn der durch solches *sin* “wenn nicht” angedeutete andere Fall bestimmter zu formulieren war, dies in der Form einfacher Parataxis gethan. So sei *sin* schliesslich eine gewöhnliche adversative Konjunktion geworden.

Gegen diese Erklärung können mehrere Einwendungen erhoben werden. Ich will die Möglichkeit, dass es ein *sin* “wenn nicht” geben konnte, nicht bestreiten, da *quin* zeigt, dass die Negation *ne* enklitisch werden und ihren Vokal verlieren konnte. (Jedenfalls gehört *sine* nicht hierher, sondern ist = indog. *sg̃n̥é*, d. h. alter Lokativ von *senu-*, und der Hauptsache nach mit ἄνευ gleichzusetzen, mit welchem got. *inu*, ahd. *āno* nichts zu thun haben, da diese altindischen *anu*, *ānu* = indog. *enu*, *ēnu* entsprechen. Die hiefür anzunehmende Bedeutungsentwicklung “entlang, längs” – “*praeter*” – “ohne” ist durchaus natürlich.) Aber dass *sin* ursprünglich diese Bedeutung “wenn nicht” wirklich gehabt habe, dafür fehlt es völlig an Belegen. Denn diejenigen Beispiele, die Ribbeck teils beibringt, teils im Auge hat, in diesem Sinne zu verwenden, ist von vorn herein schon darum bedenklich, weil man nicht versteht wie die zu Plautus Zeit bereits verflüchtigte negative Bedeutung in ciceronischer Zeit wieder so lebendig sein konnte. Und sieht man die Beispiele selbst an, so ergibt sich, dass sie das nicht beweisen, was sie beweisen sollen. Cicero Epist. 12, 6, 2 *qui si conservatus erit, vicimus; sin —, quod di omen avertant, omnis omnium cursus est ad vos*. 14, 3, 5 *si perficitis quod agitis, me ad vos venire oportet; sin autem —. Sed nihil opus est reliqua scribere*. ad Att. 10, 7, 2 *si vir esse volet, praeclare cūvoδία. Sin autem, erimus nos, qui soleamus*. 13, 22, 4 *atque utinam tu quoque eodem die! sin quod —, multa enim utique postridie*. 16, 13<sup>b</sup> 2 s. oben. — Priap. 31 *donec proterva nil mei manu carpes, licebit ipsa sis pudicior Vesta. Sin, haec mei te ventris arma laxabunt*. Dazu käme nach einer Konjektur Vahlens Tibull 1, 4, 15 *sin* (Codd. *sed*), *ne te capiant, primo si forte negabit, taedia*; doch wird diese Schreibung wohl kaum allgemein rezipiert werden. (Schmalz spricht auch [S. 421] von Belegen im alten Latein, doch finde ich nirgends solche nachgewiesen.) An allen diesen Stellen liegt einfach eine Aposiopese vor, wie solche dem Priapeen- und dem Briefstil ziemt. Besonders die beiden ersten Stellen mit ihrem *quod di omen avertant* und *sed nihil opus est*

### 3 Original text

*reliqua scribere* schliessen jeden Zweifel aus.

Mit dem Wegfall dieser Stellen ist aber der Ribbeckschen Hypothese dasjenige entzogen, was sie besonders empfahl, die Anknüpfung an einen tatsächlichen Sprachgebrauch. Nun könnte die Hypothese freilich trotzdem richtig sein, *sin* in der, hinter der litterarischen Überlieferung zurückliegenden Zeit zuerst “wenn nicht” bedeutet und sich dann zu der historisch allein bezeugten Bedeutung “wenn aber” entwickelt haben. Aber auch diese Entwicklung ist nicht so leicht konstruierbar. Ribbeck äusserst sich nur sehr kurz über diesen Punkt. Wenn ich ihn recht verstehe, so meint er, ein Satz wie z. B. Plautus Trin. 309 [*si animus hominem pepulit, actumst, animo servit, non sibi.*] *sin ipse animum pepulit, vivit* sei ursprünglich so gemeint gewesen, dass man hinter *sin* “wenn nicht” “wenn dies nicht der Fall ist” interpungiert hätte und darauf asyndetisch die genauere Bezeichnung des gegenteiligen Falles hätte folgen lassen: *ipse animum pepulit* “[im Falle dass] er selbst seinen Neigungen die Richtung gegeben hat”, schliesslich die Apodosis *vivit*. Mir schiene ein Asyndeton, wie das hier zwischen *sin* und dem folgenden statuierte, undenkbar: *sed* (oder eine Wiederholung des *si*) wäre doch wohl unerlässlich. Wohl gibt es ein Asyndeton adversativum, aber nur in der Weise, dass der Gegensatz dabei auf andere Weise fühlbar gemacht wird, durch parallele Gestaltung der beiden Glieder oder durch Voranstellung des Wortes, das den Gegensatz hauptsächlich trägt im zweiten Gliede.

Ich glaube, es bietet sich ein viel einfacherer Weg. Brix giebt zum Trinummus 360 unter den Beispielen des an das Fügewort des Vordersatzes angeschlossenen *ne* am Schluss folgende Stelle des Mercator 142 f.: Acanthio: *At ego maledicentior quam te novi neminem.* Charinus: *Sin saluti quod tibi esse censeo, id consuadeo?* Acanthio: *apage istiusmodi salutem, cum cruciatu quae advenit.* Brix umschreibt die Worte des Charinus mit *tumne maledicentem me dicis, si tibi id consuadeo*. Offenbar ganz gemäss der Weise plau-[S. 422]tinischen Konversationsstils, wo Fragesätze, die als solche durch *-ne* bezeichnet sind, ausserordentlich oft für Einwendungen dienen z. B. Bacchides 1189 *egon ubi filius corrumpatur meus, ibi potest?* 1192 *egon quom haec cum illo accubet, inspectem?* Trin. 378 *egone indotatam te uxorem ut patiar?* Bacch. 194 *at scin quam iracundus siem?* Besonders häufig sind in dieser Weise die *ne*-Sätze gebraucht, wo der Fragesatz elliptisch nur aus einem Nebensatz mit *ne* besteht, also gerade die *ne*-Sätze, zu denen obiges Beispiel gehört. Amphitr. 297 Sosia: *paulisper mane, dum edormiscat unum somnum.* Amph.: *quaene vigilans somniat?* “aber dann träumt sie ja mit offenen Augen.” Curculio 704 f. Cappadox: *dum quidem hercle ita iudices, ne quisquam a me argentum auferat.* Therapontigonus: *quodne promisti?* “aber du hast es ja versprochen”. Rudens 1019 *quemne ego excepi in mari?* “aber ich habe



ihn ja im Meere aufgefangen". 1231 *quodne ego inveni in mari?* "aber ich habe es ja im Meere gefunden." Terenz Phormio 923 Demipho: *illud mihi argentum rursum iube rescribi Phormio*. Phormio: *quodne ego discipuli porro illis, quibus debui?* "aber ich habe es ja meinen Gläubigern gutgeschrieben."

Ein zweite Stelle, wo *sin* so steht, ist Persa 227: Paegnium: *ne me attrecta subigitatrix*. Sophoclidisca: *sin te amo?* Paegnium: *male operam locas*.

Die meisten Plautusleser werden freilich an beiden Stellen das *sin* einfach mit "wenn aber" übersetzen und darin das gewöhnliche *sin* erkennen. Weit entfernt dies tadeln zu wollen, erkenne ich darin gerade einen Beweis dafür, dass das gewöhnliche *sin* mit dem *sin* jener plautinischen Stellen identisch ist. Wir können nicht bloss ändern, sondern auch uns selbst einen Einwurf in der Form eines Fragesatzes machen. In solcher Weise steht einwendendes *quine*, *quemne* Catull 64, 180 *an patris auxilium sperem? quemne ipsa reliqui?* "aber den habe ich ja verlassen". 182 f. *coniugis an fido consoler memet amore? quine fugit lentos incurvans gurgite remos?* "aber der flieht ja" (s. oben die Übersetzung von *quine* in den Beispielen aus Plautus und Terenz). Und wie an den beiden plautinischen *sin*-Stellen auf die vom zweiten Sprecher als Einwendung gebrachte Möglichkeit der erste Sprecher zur Beseitigung der Einwendung als asyndetisch an-[S. 423]gefügte Apodosis dasjenige giebt, was in dem betr. Fall eintreten würde: *apage istiusmodi salutem* "dann fort mit solchem Heil", und *male operam locas* "nun dann verschwendest du deine Mühe" —, so kann man auch eine selbstgemachte Einwendung selbst mit derartiger Apodosis erledigen.

Demgemäss würde an der oben nach der Ribbeck'schen Hypothese analysierten Plautusstelle der ursprüngliche Gebrauch von *sin* hergestellt durch die Interpunktion: *sin ipse animum pepulit? vivit*. "Wie aber, wenn er selbst seinen Neigungen die Richtung gegeben hat? Nun dann lebt er." Dass im Verlauf die eigentlich für Einwendungen aufgekommene Satzform überhaupt für Setzung eines entgegengesetzten Falls verwendet, und dass im Zusammenhang damit der *sin*-Fragesatz schlechtweg als Vordersatz, der ursprüngliche Antwortsatz schlechtweg als Nachsatz empfunden wurde, ist eine ganz natürliche Entwicklung.

Wenn Lucian Müller Lucil. 29, Fr. 87, V. 107 (vgl. zu Nonius 290, 4) richtig schreibt *ad non sunt similes neque dant. quid? sin* (codd. *sint*, ed. princ. Non. *si*) *dare vellent? acciperesne? doce*, so tritt hiermit zu den zwei loci didascalici des Plautus ein dritter. Denn auch hier dient *sin* einem Einwand, mit dem Unterschied, dass derselbe durch *quid* angekündigt ist, und dass ein die Frage näher präzisierender *ne*-Satz folgt. Nach Lucian Müller ist es ein Einwand, den einer sich selbst macht. — Das *quodsin ulla* (Lucil 4 Fr. 22 Vs. 38) desselben Gelehrten st. *quodsi nulla* mit unerklärbarem *-sin* wird durch richtige Schreibung der

### 3 Original text

folgenden Zeile überflüssig.

Den Beschluss mögen die Beteuerungs- und Verwunderungspartikeln, *hercle*, *pol*, *edepol*, *ecastor*, *eccere* bilden, die die Eigentümlichkeit haben, bald die erste bald die zweite Stelle im Satz einzunehmen, weiter hinten aber nicht stehen zu können, ausser wenn ihnen andre Enklitika, wie *quidem*, *autem* (Aulul. 560), *obsecro*, *quaeso*, *credo*, oder *ego*, *tu*, *ille* hinter *ne*, oder *tu* hinter *et*, *at*, *vel*, kraft eignen Anspruchs auf diese Stelle den Platz versperren. Wie stark der Drang nach der zweiten Stelle auch bei dieser Wortklasse ist, zeigt sich an manchem. So daran, dass während die Verbindung *pol ego* bald am Satzanfang steht, bald ihr noch ein anderes Wort vorangeht und also *ego* gleich gern an dritter wie an zweiter Stelle des Satzes steht, das umgekehrte *ego pol* nur [S. 424] am Satzanfang vorkommt (Kellerhoff in Studemunds Studien, a. d. G. d. arch. Latein II 62), *pol* also die dritte Stelle scheut. So daran, dass die Beteuerungspartikeln, wenn sie sich auf eine ganze Periode beziehen, dem ersten Wort des Vordersatzes angefügt werden; *si hercle*, *si quidem hercle*, *ni hercle*, *postquam hercle*, *si ecaster*, *si pol*, *si quidem pol* sind ganz gewöhnlich, während die Setzung von *hercle* erst im Nachsatz zwar nicht unerhört (siehe Mil. Glor. 309, Persa 627), aber selten ist. (Vgl. Brix zum Trinum. 457, Lorentz zum Miles 156. 1239, zur Mostell. 229, Kellerhoff Studien II 72 f.) Genau die gleiche Erscheinung haben wir beim fragenden *-ne* getroffen. Aber während bei *-ne* diese Stellung auf die alte Sprache beschränkt ist, lebt sie bei *hercle*, (*hercules*) in der klassischen Sprache fort (Müller zum Laelius § 78<sup>2</sup> S. 477, der auf Wichert Latein. Stilistik S. 43, 239, 269 verweist. Weissenborn zu Livius 5, 4, 10 u. s. w.), wie denn die klassische Sprache überhaupt die traditionelle Stellung der Partikel *hercle*, der einzigen, die eben in die klassische Sprache fortlebt, festhält, immerhin so, dass die Setzung derselben an die Spitze des Satzes ausser Gebrauch kommt. Die Kaiserzeit gestattet sich dann freilich grössere Willkür: Quintil. 1, 2, 4. Tacitus Dial. 1. Histor. 1, 84. Plin. Epist. 6, 19, 6. Gell. 7, 2, 1 u. s. w.

Ferner veranlassen auch diese Partikeln, wie die früher besprochenen Enklitika, öfters Tmesis. Dahin gehört neben Miles Glor. 31 *ne hercle operae pretium quidem* (gegenüber Bacchides 1027 *ne unum quidem hercle*) und Mostell. 18 *cis hercle paucas tempestates* und *non edepol scio* gegenüber *nescio* besonders die Spaltung der Zusammensetzungen mit *per*: Plautus Casina 370 *per pol saepe peccas*. Terenz Andria 416 *per ecaster scitus puer est natus Pamphilo*. Hecyra 1 *per pol quam paucos*. Gellius 2, 6, 1 *per hercle rem mirandam Aristoteles — dicit*, und die Spaltung von *quicunque*: Plautus Persa 210 *quoi pol quomque occasio est*.

Also *hercle* und Genossen haben entweder die erste oder die zweite Stelle im Satz inne; sie werden, wenn sie nicht stark betont am Anfang stehen, nach Art

der Enklitika behandelt. Wer nun bedenkt, dass diese Partikeln eigentlich Vokative sind (vgl. Catull 1, 7 *doctis Juppiter et laboriosis*), wird sich sofort jener eigentümlichen Regel der Sanskritgram-[S. 425]matiker und Überlieferer der akzentuierten Vedentexte erinnern, dass der Vokativ, wenn am Satzanfang stehend, orthotoniert, wenn im Satzinnern stehend, enklitisch sei. (Vgl. die Erklärung, die Delbrück Syntakt. Forsch. V 34 f. dafür gibt.) Es kommt hinzu, dass, wenigstens in den klassischen Sprachen, auch der wirkliche Vokativ unverkennbare Neigung für die zweite Stelle im Satz zeigt.

Nun macht freilich gerade der Umstand Schwierigkeit, dass was bei den vokativischen Partikeln Gesetz ist, sich beim wirklichen Vokativ nur als Neigung zeigt. Kaum darf man wohl annehmen, dass solche Neigung Abschwächung eines ältern strengern Gesetzes war. Viel wahrscheinlicher ist das Umgekehrte, dass bei der durch *hercle* repräsentierten Kategorie von Vokativen die Neigung zur Regel geworden war, und dass sich die Anrufung eines Gottes zum Zweck der Beteuerung früh in strengerer Konventionalität bewegte, als sonstige Anrufungen von Göttern und gar als Anreden an Menschen. (Das Griechische verfährt in der Stellung des entsprechenden Ἡράκλειε und ähnlicher Anrufungen, soweit der Gebrauch der Komiker und der Redner ein Urteil gestattet, mit grosser Freiheit.) Daraus folgt aber weiter, wenn wir anders bei den Vokativen innern Zusammenhang zwischen Stellung und Betonung annehmen dürfen, dass die altindische Enklisis von Hause aus nur Neigung, nicht unbedingtes Gesetz war, und dass gelegentlich auch der nicht am Satz- oder Versanfang stehende Vokativ orthotoniert sein konnte, was dann dem Altindischen vermöge seines Generalisierungstribs verloren ging.

Es entgeht mir nicht, dass die Neigung des Vokativs für die zweite Stelle auch ohne Hinzunahme der alten Enklisis erklärt werden könnte. Um so wertvoller ist mir, dass von ganz anderm Standpunkt der Betrachtung aus Schmalz Lateinische Syntax<sup>2</sup> S. 557 für den an zweiter Stelle stehenden Vokativ des Latein schwachen Ton behauptet.

## XII.

Unsere neuhochdeutsche Regel (vgl. Erdmann Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax S. 181 ff., besonders 195), dass dem Verbum im Hauptsatz die zweite, im Nebensatz die letzte Stelle zu geben sei (beides mit bestimmten, in besondern Verhältnissen begründeten Ausnahmen) hat bekanntlich der Hauptsache nach schon in der althochdeutschen Prosa und Poesie gegolten. (Vgl. ausser den Nachweisen Erdmanns besonders Tomanetz Die Relativsätze bei den ahd. Übersetzern

### 3 *Original text*

des 8. und 9. Jahrhunderts, S. 54 ff., sowie denselben im Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum XVI (1890) 381.) Ja diese Stellungsregel kann in Rücksicht auf die deutlichen Spuren, die sich von ihr nicht bloss im Altsächsischen, sondern auch im Angelsächsischen, und weiterhin auch im Nordischen zeigen, wohl als gemein germanisch angesetzt werden. Trotzdem sind alle Forscher, die sich eingehender mit diesem germanischen Stellungsgesetz beschäftigt haben, so viel ich sehe, darin einig, die sich hier äussernde Scheidung der beiden Satzarten für unursprünglich zu erklären. Bergaigne (*Mémoires Soc. de Linguistique* III 139 f.), Behaghel (*Germania* XXIII 284) und Ries (*Die Stellung von Subjekt und Prädikatsverbum im Heliand, Quellen und Forschungen* XLI [1880] S. 88 ff.) behaupten, dass die Endstellung des Verbums, wie sie im Nebensatz vorliegt, ursprünglich allen Sätzen eigen gewesen und in den Hauptsätzen nur allmählich durch eine später aufgekommene entgegengesetzt wirkende Regel verdrängt worden sei. Über das Wie und die Möglichkeit einer solchen Verdrängung haben sich aber die genannten Forscher teils nicht ausgesprochen, teils haben sie dafür Gründe beigebracht, die mit Scharfsinn ausgedacht aber alles eher als überzeugend sind: wie wenn z. B. Ries behauptet, der natürliche Trieb, das Wichtigere vor dem weniger Wichtigen zum Ausdruck zu bringen, habe darum nur im Hauptsatz und nicht auch im Nebensatz zur Annäherung des Verbums an den Anfang führen müssen, weil das Verb für den Hauptsatz einen höhern Wert habe, als für den Nebensatz!

Den entgegengesetzten Standpunkt vertritt Tomanetz (a. a. O. S. 82 ff.): er glaubt, erst durch eine allmähliche Verschiebung sei das Verb im Nebensatz ans Ende gerückt; ursprünglich habe es auch hier wie im Hauptsatz die zweite Stelle inne gehabt. So sehr sich auch Tomanetz' Ausführungen vor denen von Ries durch Einfachheit und Klarheit auszeichnen, vermag er doch nicht ohne die m. E. völlig unzulässige Annahme durchzukommen, dass ein Streben Haupt- und Nebensatz zu differenzieren wirksam gewesen sei.

[S. 427] Altindisch, Latein und Litauisch stellen das Verbum regelmässig ans Ende des Satzes. Man glaubt hierin eine Gewohnheit der Grundsprache erkennen zu können. Und gewiss wird für den Nebensatz durch das hier hinzukommende Zeugnis des Germanischen die Endstellung des Verbums als indogermanisch gesichert. Beim Hauptsatz fehlt diese Übereinstimmung und, wenn sonstige Erwägungen nicht den Entscheid geben, ist es zum mindesten ebenso gut denkbar, dass im Altindischen, Lateinischen und Litauischen etwas bloss für den Nebensatz Gültiges auf den Hauptsatz ausgedehnt worden sei, als dass das Germanische nachträglich eine Unterscheidung der beiden Satzarten eingeführt habe. Nun ist es aber ganz unwahrscheinlich, dass die Grundsprache das Verbum im Hauptsatz und im Nebensatz verschieden betont, aber doch in beiden Satzarten gleich

gestellt hätte. Und weiterhin müssen wir auf Grund des früher Vorgetragenen erwarten, dass in der Grundsprache das Verbum des Hauptsatzes, weil und insofern es enklitisch war, unmittelbar hinter das erste Wort des Satzes gestellt worden sei. Mit andern Worten: das deutsche Stellungsgesetz hat schon in der Grundsprache gegolten. Dabei muss man sich gegenwärtig halten, dass nicht bloss die Sätze, die wir als Nebensätze ansehen, sondern alle als hypotaktisch empfundenen im Altindischen und somit, wie wir wohl annehmen dürfen, in der Grundsprache betontes Verbum hatten, also unter allen Umständen die Endstellung des Verbums sehr häufig vorkommen musste.

Ich will nicht verschweigen, dass die aufgestellte These einer Einschränkung fähig wäre. Für das Gesetz über die Stellung der Enklitika haben wir aus den verschiedenen Sprachen (etwa von den Vokativen abgesehen) nur solche Belege beibringen können, in denen das Enklitikum den Umfang von zwei Silben nicht überschritt. Man könnte also sagen, dass das Gesetz nur für ein- und zweisilbige Enklitika galt, mehr als zweisilbige dagegen an der dem betr. Satzteil sonst zukommenden Stellung festhielten. [sic] oder wenigstens, wenn man sich vorsichtiger ausdrücken will, dass von irgend einem bestimmten Umfang an ein Enklitikum nicht an das Stellungsgesetz der Enklitika gebunden war. Dies auf das Verbum angewandt, würde zu der Annahme führen, dass die ein- und zweisilbigen Verbalformen, oder überhaupt die kürzern Verbal-[S. 428]formen bis zu einem gewissen Umfang, im Hauptsatz an die zweite Stelle rückten, dass dagegen die andern Verbalformen auch im Hauptsatz die im Nebensatz herrschende Endstellung besaßen. Es wäre dann weiter anzunehmen, dass das Germanische die für die kürzern Verbalformen gültige Regel generalisiert hätte. Und jedenfalls wäre dann die Praxis der das Verb überhaupt an das Ende stellenden Sprachen noch leichter verständlich.

Man wird nicht verlangen, dass ich über die Berechtigung dieser eventuellen Einschränkung meiner These ein abschliessendes Urteil abgebe. Wohl aber wird man erwarten, dass ich ein wenig weitere Umschau halte und frage, ob denn das verbale Stellungsgesetz der Grundsprache ausserhalb des Germanischen gar keine Spuren hinterlassen habe. Das Fehlen aller Anklänge an ein solches Gesetz könnte leicht Zweifel an der Richtigkeit der hier gegebenen Ausführungen rege machen.

Nun, da muss allerdings gesagt werden, dass ausser den bereits erwähnten, die Endstellung durchführenden Sprachen nicht bloss das Keltische, sondern, was bei einer derartigen Untersuchung weit schwerer ins Gewicht fällt, auch das Griechische der germanischen Weise fern steht. Man sollte erwarten, dass das Griechische, wie und weil es beim Verbum den Hauptsatz-Akzent durchgeführt

### 3 Original text

hat, so auch die Hauptsatz-Stellung durchführen werde. Aber das ist bekanntlich nicht der Fall. Die Stellung des Verbums ist im Ganzen eine sehr freie.

Solchem Sachverhalt gegenüber ist es zunächst willkommen, dass gerade zwei die Endstellung bevorzugende Sprachen in einem bestimmten Fall die germanische Hauptsatzstellung aufweisen. Für das Litauische lehrt Kurschat Grammatik § 1637, dass, wenn das Prädikat aus Kopula und Nomen bestehe, gegen die allgemeine Regel nicht das Nomen vorausgehe, sondern die Kopula unmittelbar auf das Subjekt folge. Ganz ähnliches findet sich beim Verbum *esse* im Latein. Seyffert zu Ciceros Laelius 70 (S. 441<sup>2</sup>) hat ausgeführt, dass *esse* sich gern an das erste Wort des Satzes anlehne, sowohl wenn dasselbe ein interrogativ oder relativ fungierenden [sic] Interrogativpronomen, als wenn es ein Demonstrativum sei oder sonst einer Wortklasse angehörte. Der Beispiele seien [S. 429] ‘unzählige’ viele. Aus dem Laelius führt er unter anderm an: § 56 *qui sint in amicitia* (Interrog.). 17 *quae est in me facultas* (Relat.). 2 *quanta esset hominum admiratio*. 53 *quam fuerint inopes amicorum*. 83 *eorum est habendus*. 5 *tum est Cato locutus*. 17 *nihil est enim*. 48 *ferream esse quandam*. 102 *omnis est e vita sublata iucunditas*.

Zu dieser Beobachtung stimmt eine weitere Erscheinung: in einem Satz, der sowohl *est*, *sunt* als *enim*, *igitur*, *autem* enthält, werden namentlich bei Cicero überaus oft nicht diese Partikeln trotz ihres sonst anerkannten Anspruchs auf die zweite Stelle, sondern *est*, *sunt* an das erste Wort des Satzes angelehnt und *enim*, *igitur*, *autem* auf die dritte Stelle zurückgedrängt. Das Richtige darüber hat Madvig gesagt zu Cicero de finibus 1, 43: *ea est huius positus (sapientia est enim) ratio, ut elata voce in primo vocabulo, quo gravissima notio contineatur, obscuretur enclitica; in altero positu [sapientia enim est] vox minus in primum vocabulum incidit. — Hanc regulam contrariam prorsus Goerenzii aliorumque praeceptis, qui naturam encliticae vocis ignorantes, adseverationem aliquam in est secundo loco posito inesse putarunt adhibito optimorum codicum testimonio — et recta interpretatione stabilitum iri puto.* (Vgl. Müller zum Laelius<sup>2</sup> S. 411.)

Zur weitem Bestätigung könnte man auf Stellen wie Plaut. Bacch. 274 *etiamne est quid porro* verweisen, wo die Stellung von *quid* enklitische Stellung von *est* voraussetzt. Besonders finden sich aber bei *esse* ähnliche Tmesen, wie bei den früher besprochenen Enklitika: solche von *per-* bei Cicero epistul. 3, 5, 3 (51 a. Ch.) *tunc mihi ille dixit: quod classe tu velles decedere, per fore accommodatum tibi, si ad illam maritimam partem provinciae navibus accessissem* und bei Gellius 2, 18, 1 *Phaedo Elidensis ex cohorte illa Socratica fuit Socraticus et Platoni per fuit familiaris*, wo die fehlerhafte Anwendung solcher Tmesis mitten im Satzinnern den Archaisten verrät. Tmesis von *qui* — *cunque*: Terenz Andria 63 *cum quibus erat quomque una, eis se dedere*. Cicero de finibus 4, 69 *quod erit cunque visum*,



ages. Dazu bei einer Form von *fieri*: Plautus Bacchides 252 *istius hominis ubi fit quomque mentio*.

Wenn das Latein nur bei ein, zwei Verben, wo sich die Tradition ursprünglicher Enklisis lebendig erhalten hatte, An-[S. 430]lehnung an das erste Satzwort kennt (und bei diesem dann natürlich in allen Satzarten), so zeigt sich im Griechischen ein solcher Rest alter Stellungsgewohnheit bei einer ganzen Anzahl von Verben, aber nur in einer bestimmten Satzform. Auf altgriechischen Inschriften finden sich oft Sätze, wo auf das Subjekt, obwohl eine appositionelle Bestimmung dazu gehört, doch zuerst das Verbum und dann erst die appositionelle Bestimmung folgt, diese also in auffälliger Weise von dem Wort, zu dem sie gehört, durch das Verbum abgetrennt ist. Dass statt eines Subjektsnominativs auch etwa ein anderer Kasus, der an der Spitze des Satzes steht, in solcher Weise von seiner Apposition getrennt wird, und dass gelegentlich ein *με* dem Verbum noch vorgeschoben wird, macht keinen Unterschied. Boeckh zu CIG. 25 hat zuerst die Altertümlichkeit dieser Art von Wortstellung, Wilhelm Schulze in seiner Rezension von Meisters griech. Dialekten, Berliner philolog. Wochenschrift 1890, S. 1472 (S. 26 f. des Separatabdrucks) die sprachgeschichtliche Bedeutung derselben betont. Es wird nicht undienlich sein, hier die Beispiele zusammenzustellen.

Am häufigsten findet sich diese Stellung in Weih- und Künstlerinschriften. Mit ἀνέθηκε: CIA. 1, 357 Ἀλκίβιος ἀνέθηκεν κιθαρωδὸς νησιώτης. 1, 376 Ἐπιχαρῖνος [ἀνέ]θηκεν ὁ Ὅ—. 1, 388 Στρόνβ[ιχος ἀνέθηκε] Στρονβί[χου oder — χίδου Εὐω-  
νυμεύς] (fast sichere Ergänzung!). 1, 399 Μηχανίω[ν] ἀνέθηκεν ὁ γραμμα[τεύς]. 1, 400 [Πυ]θογέν[εια] ἀνέθηκε[ν Ἀγ]υρρίου ἐγ[ Λ]ακιάδω[ν]. 1, 415 Αἰσχύλος ἀνέθη[κε] Πυθέου Παιανιεύ[ς]. 4<sup>1</sup>, 373 f. Σίμων ἀ[νέθηκε] ὁ κναφεὺς [ἔργων] δεκάτην. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 90 Ὀνήσιμος μ' ἀνέθηκεν ἀπαρχὴν Ἀθηναίᾳ ὁ Σμικύθου υἱός. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 198 [ἡ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκεν] Εὐμηλίδου γυνὴ Σφηττόθεν. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 12 Ξενοκλῆς ἀνέθηκεν Σωκίνηω. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 223 Χναϊάδης ἀνέθηκεν ὁ Παλ(λ)ηνεύς. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 224 [Σ]μῖκος ἀνέθ[ηκε —] ὁ σκυλοδεψ[ός]. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 226 [ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκε]ν Κηφισιεύς. Inschrift von der Akropolis Νέαρχος ἀν[έθηκε Νεάρχου υἱ]ὺς ἔργων ἀπαρχήν. So nach Kabbadias Studnitzka, Jahrbuch II (1887), S. 135 ff.; Robert: Νέαρχος ἀν[έθηκε ὁ κεραμε]ύς —. CIA. 2, 1648 (augusteische Zeit!) Μετρότιμος ἀνέθηκεν Ὁθήεν. — Inscript. graecae antiq. 48 Ἀριστομένης ἀ[ν]έθ[ηκε] Ἀλεξία τῷ Δάματρι τῷ Χθονίᾳ Ἑρμιονεύς. 96 (Tegea) [ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέ]θηκε(ν) φατυόχω. 486 (Milet) [Ερ]μησιάνᾳς ἡμεας ἀνέθηκεν [ὁ —] — ἰδεω τῷ πώλλωνι. 512<sup>a</sup> (Gela) Παντάρης μ' [S. 431] ἀνέθηκε Μενεγράτιος. 543 (achäisch) Κυνίσκος με ἀνέθηκε ὠρταμος φέργων δεκάταν. — Delphische Inschrift in westgriech. Alphabet, Bull. Corr. Hellén. 6, 445 τοῖ Χαροπίνου παῖδες ἀνέθεσαν τοῦ Παρίου. Naxische Inschrift von Delos ed. Homolle ibid. 12, 464 f., 12, 464 f. Εἰ(θ)υκαρτίδης μ'

3 *Original text*

ἀνέθηκε ὁ Νάξιος ποιήσας. — Inschriften von Naukratis I No. 218 Φάνης με ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλων[ι τῷ Μι]λησίῳ ὁ Γλαύκου. II No. 722 Μυρός μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ὀνομακρίτου. 767 [ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκεν Ἀφροδί]τη ὁ Φ[ιλά]μμ[ωνος]. 780 Φίλις μ' ἀνέθηκε οὐπικά[ρτε]ος τῇ Ἀφροδί[τῃ]. 784 Ἑρμοφάνης ἀνέθ[ηκεν] ὁ Ναυσιτέ[-λευς]. 819 [Λ]άκρι[τό]ς μ' ἀνέ[θη]κε οὐρμ[ο]θ[έ]μ[ιος] τῇφροδί[τῃ]. — Böotische Inschrift ed. Kretschmer Hermes XXVI 123 ff. Τιμασίφιλος μ' ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι τοῖ Πτωιεῖ ὁ Πραόλλειος.

Auch in Versen: CIA. 1, 398 Διογέν[ης] ἀνέθηκεν Αἰσχύ(λ)ου υἱὸς Κεφ[α]λήος. IGA. 95 Πραξιτέλης ἀνέθηκε Συρακόσιος τόδ' ἄγαλμα. Inschrift von Naukratis II No. 876 Ἑρμαγόρης μ' ἀνέθηκε ὁ Τ[ή]ιος τῶπόλλωνι. Pausanias 6, 10, 7 (5. Jahrhundert) Κλεοθένης μ' ἀνέθηκεν ὁ Πόντιος ἐξ Ἐπιδάμνου. Epigramm von Erythrae Kaibel No. 769 (4. Jahrhundert) [—]θέρης ἀνέθηκεν Ἀθηναίη πολιούχῳ παῖς Ζωΐλου. Von Kalymna Kaibel No. 778 (id.?) Νικίας με ἀνέθηκε Ἀπόλλωνι υἱὸς Θρακυμήδεος. Vgl. auch CIA. 1, 403 [τόνδε Πυρῆς] ἀνέθηκε Πολυμνήστου φίλο[ς υἱός]. IGA. 98 (Arkadisch) Τέλλων τόνδ' ἀνέθηκε Δαήμονος ἀγλαὸς υἱός.

Mit lesbischem κάθθηκε: Inschriften von Naukratis II No. 788 [ὁ δεῖνα κάθ]θηκε τῷ Ἀφροδίτῃ ὁ Μυτιλήναιος. 789 und 790 [ὁ δεῖνά με] κάθθηκε ὁ Μυτ[ιλή]ναιος. Vgl. 807 [Ἀφροδί]τῃ ὁ Μ—. 814 [Ἀφροδί]τῃ ὁ Κε—.

Mit ἐποίησε, ἐποiei: CIA. 1, 335 Πύρρος ἐποίησεν Ἀθηναῖος. 1, 362 (vgl. Studnitzka Jahrbuch II [1887], S. 144) [Ε]ὐφρόνιος [ἐποίησεν ὁ] κεραμεύς (die Ergänzung wohl sicher!). 1, 483 Καλλωνίδης ἐποiei ὁ Δεινίου, 4, 477<sup>b</sup> [ὁ δεῖνα ἐποίησεν oder ἐποiei Π]άριος. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 81 Κάλων ἐποίησεν Αἰ[γινήτης]. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 95 [Ἀ]ρχερμος ἐποίησεν ὁ Χί[ος]. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 220 Λεώβιος ἐποίησεν Πυρετιάδης (oder Πυρρητιάδης). IGA. 42 (Argos) Ἀτῶτος ἐποίησεν Ἀργεῖος κ' Ἀργειάδας Ἀγελάδας Ἀργεῖου. 44 (id.) Πολύκλειτος ἐποiei Ἀργεῖος. 44<sup>a</sup> (id.) — [ἐ]πο[ί]ησεν Ἀργεῖος. 47 (id.) Κρησίλας ἐποίησε Κυδωνιάτ[ας]. 165 Ὑπατόδωρος Ἀριστο[γείτων] ἐποησάταν Θηβαῖω. 348 Παιώνιος ἐποίησε Μενδαῖος. 498 Μίκων ἐποίησεν Ἀθηναῖος. Loewy Inschriften [S. 432] griechischer Bildhauer No. 44<sup>a</sup> -ων ἐπόησε Θηβαῖος. 57 Ξ[ε]νο[—] ἐποίησεν Ἐλευ[θερέυς?] No. 58. -ου [ἐ]πόησεν [Σικ]ελιώτης. 96 Κλέων ἐπόησε Σικωνίος. 103 [Δαίδαλος ἐ]ποίησε Πατροκλέ[ους]. 135<sup>d</sup> (S. 388) [Σπ]ουδίας ἐποίησε Ἀθηναῖος. 277 Τιμόδαμος Τ[ιμοδάμου] ἐποίησε Ἀμπρα[κιώτης]. 297 (Apotheose Homers) Ἀρχέλαος Ἀπολλωνίου ἐποίησε Πριηνεύς. 404 Νίκανδρος ἐ[ποίησεν] Ἀνδ[ρίος]. Klein Griechische Vasen mit Meister-signaturen S. 72 Εὐχειρος ἐποίησεν οὐργοτίμου υἱός (zweimal). S. 73 Ἐργοτέλης ἐποίησεν ὁ Νεάρχου. S. 202 Ξενοφάντος ἐποίησεν Ἀθην[αῖος]. S. 202, 1 und 2 Τεισίας ἐποίησεν Ἀθηναῖος. S. 213 Κρίτων ἐποίησεν Λε(ι)ποῦς ὅς d. i. υἱός, nach der Lesung von Studnitzka Jahrbuch II 1887 S. 144. Pausanias 6, 9, 1 τὸν δὲ ἀνδριάντα οἱ Πτολίχως ἐποίησεν Αἰγινήτης, was auf eine Originalinschrift



Πτόλιχος ἐποίησεν Αἰγινήτης schliessen lässt (vgl. Boeckh zu CIG. 25).

Auch in Versen: CIA. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 105 Θηβάδης ἐ[ποίησε —]-νου παῖς τόδ' ἄγαλμα. Inschrift von der Akropolis ed. Studnitzka Jahrbuch II 1887 S. 135 ff. Ἀντήνωρ ἐπ[όησεν] ὁ Εὐμάρους τ[όδ'] ἄγαλμα IGA. 410 Ἀλξήνωρ ἐποίησεν ὁ Νάξιος, ἀλλ' ἐσίδεσθε. Auch 349 Εὐφρων ἐξεποίησ' οὐκ ἄδαῖς Πάριος.

Mit ἔγραφεν, ἔγραψεν, γράφει IGA. 482<sup>c</sup> Τήλεφος μ' ἔγραφε ὁ Ἰαλύσιος. Klein Griechische Vasen mit Meistersignaturen. S. 29 Τιμωνίδα[ς μ'] ἔγραψε Βία. S. 196, 7 Εὐθυμίδης ἔγραψεν ὁ Πολ(λ)ίου (zweimal). Ebenso ist 194, 2 (nach der Abbildung in Gerhards Vasenbildern 188) und ebenso 195 zu lesen, beides nach Dümmler. Kyprische Inschrift No. 147<sup>h</sup> bei Meister Griechische Dialekte II 148 -οικός με γράφει Σελαμίνιος.

Mit verschiedenen Synonymis obiger Verba: IGA. 48 (Argos) [Δ]ωρόθεος ἐ-ρ[ε]ργάσατο Ἀργεῖος. 555<sup>a</sup> (Opus?) Πρίκων ἔ[π]α[ξ]α Κολῶτα. Kyprische Inschrift No. 73 Deecke Γίλικα ἀμὲ κατέστασε ὁ Στασικρέτεος.

Mit εἰμί: IGA. 387 (Samos) [Π]όμπιος εἰμι τοῦ Δημοκρίνεος. 492 (Sigeum) ionischer Text: Φανοδίκου εἰμι τοῦρμοκράτεος τοῦ Προκοννησίου; attischer Text: Φ. εἰμι τοῦ Ἑρμοκράτους τοῦ Π. 522 (Sizilien) Λονγηναῖός εἰμι δημόσιος. 528 (Cumae) Δημοχάριδος εἰμι τοῦ —. 551 (Antipolis) Τέρπων εἰμι θεᾶς θεράπων σεμνῆς Ἀφροδίτης. Rhodische Inschrift bei Kirchhoff Studien zur Gesch. des griech. Alph.<sup>4</sup> S. 49 Φιλτοῦς ἡμὶ τὰς καλᾶς ἀ κύλιξ ἀ ποικίλα. Kyprische Inschr. 1 Deecke Πρα-[S. 433]τοτίμω ἡμὶ τὰς Παφίας τῷ ἱερῆρος. 16 D. τὰς θεῶ ἡμὶ τὰς Παφίας (ebenso 65. 66 Hoffm.). 23 D. Τιμοκύπρας ἡμὶ Τιμοδάμω. 78 H. Στασαγόρου ἡμὶ τῷ Στασάνδρῳ. 79 H. Τιμάνδρῳ ἡμὶ τῷ Ὀνασαγόρου. 88 H. Πνυτίλλας ἡμὶ τὰς Πνυταγόραν παιδός. 121 H. Διφειθέμιτός ἡμὶ τῷ βασιλῆρος.

Daran schliesst sich IGA. 543 τὰς Ἦρας ἱερός εἰμι τὰς ἐν πεδίῳ, wo ein Adjektiv verbunden mit εἶναι die Stelle des Verbums vertritt, und daran wieder die Beispiele, wo ein Adjektiv ohne εἶναι das Prädikat bildet: Klein Die griechischen Vasen mit Lieblingsinschriften S. 44 Λέαγρος καλὸς ὁ παῖς. S. 68 Παντοξένα καλὰ Κοριν(θ)ί[α], wie das von Klein gegebene aber nicht erklärte KOPINOI wohl zu lesen ist. S. 81 Γλαύκων καλὸς Λεάγρου. S. 82 Δρόμιππος καλὸς Δρομοκλείδου, Δίφιλος καλὸς Μελανώπου. S. 83 Λίχας καλὸς Σάμιος, Ἀλκιμ[ή]δης καλὸς Αἰσχυλίδου. S. 85 Ἀλκίμαχος καλὸς Ἐπιχάρου.

Ausserhalb der bisher aufgeführten Kategorien liegen CIA. 4<sup>2</sup>, 337<sup>a</sup> Κλεισθένης ἐχορήγει Αὐτοκράτους. IGA. 110, 9 (Elis) ἐν τήπιάροι κ' ἐνέχοιτο τοῖ ἵναυτ' ἔγρα(μ)μένοι. CIG. 7806 Ἀκαμαντὶς ἐνίκᾳ φυλή.

Unter den aufgeführten Beispielen von ἀνέθηκε und κάθθηκε enthalten dreizehn ausser Subjekt, Verbum und Apposition auch noch einen Dativ, drei (CIA. 4<sup>1</sup>, 373 f. IGA. 95. 543) einen substantivischen Akkusativ, 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 90 beides. Wäh-

### 3 Original text

rend nun der blosser Akkusativ überall auf die Apposition folgt (vgl. auch CIA. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 105  $\Theta\eta\beta\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}[\pi\acute{o}\eta\varsigma -]\nu\omicron\upsilon \pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma \tau\acute{o}\delta' \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha$ , sowie die Inschrift des Antenor), findet sich der Dativ nur viermal (IGA. 486. Naukratis II 780. 819. 876) hinter der Apposition, achtmal (Naukratis I 218. II 767. 788. 807. 814. Hermes 26, 123. Kaibel 769. 778) davor; endlich in IGA. 48 folgt auf das Verbum zunächst der Genetiv des Vaternamens, dann der Dativ des Götternamens samt Epitheton und dann erst das zum Subjekt gehörige nominativische Ethnikon. In CIA. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 90 sind Akkusativ und Dativ zusammen zwischen Verbum und Apposition eingeschoben. — Diese Voranstellung der zum Verb gehörigen Kasus vor die Apposition ist leicht verständlich; das Verb attrahiert seine Bestimmungen.

Aus diesem Typus erklärt sich die seltsame Wortfolge in CIA. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 82, ergänzt von Studnitzka Jahrbuch II 1887 S. 143:  $\text{Κρίτων Ἀθηναίᾳ ὁ Σκύθου ἀν[έ]θηκε καὶ ἐ[π]οίη[ce]}$  oder  $\text{ἐ[π]οίει}$ . Der Verfasser der Inschrift hatte zunächst die kon-[S. 434]ventionelle Wortfolge  $\text{Κρίτων ἀνέθηκεν Ἀθηναίᾳ ὁ Σκύθου}$  vor Augen und liess hiernach, als er durch die Beifügung von  $\text{καὶ ἐποίησε}$  genötigt war,  $\text{ἀνέθηκε}$  hinter die Apposition zu rücken, doch den Dativ  $\text{Ἀθηναίᾳ}$  vor der Apposition stehen.

Loewy Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer S. XV glaubt erweisen zu können, dass diese Wortstellung über die ersten Jahrzehnte des vierten Jahrhunderts hinaus nicht üblich gewesen sei (vgl. auch CIA. 2, 1621–1648 und die von Köhler zu No. 1621 verzeichneten Künstlerinschriften). Die paar spätern Beispiele darf man füglich als Archaismen betrachten, zumal zwei derselben (Loewy 277. 297, s. oben S. 431) durch Voranstellung des Genetivs des Vaternamens vor das Verbum von der ursprünglichen Weise abgehen. Ausnahmslose Herrschaft dieser Stellungsgewohnheit kann man auch für frühere Zeit nicht behaupten (Hoffmann Griech. Dialekte I 324), und namentlich weisen die attischen Weihinschriften zahlreiche Gegenbeispiele auf. Aber sehr mächtig und zu gewissen Zeiten und in gewissen Gegenden entschieden vorherrschend war diese Gewohnheit doch, um so berechtigter ist Schulze's Auffassung derselben als eines indogermanischen Erbteils.

Das Altindische liefert augenfällige Parallelen. (Delbrück Syntaktische Forschungen III 51 ff. V 23 f.). Häufig sind in der Brahmanasprache Sätze, die mit *sa* oder *sa ha* "dieser eben" beginnen, darauf gleich das Verbum, meist *uvāca*, folgen lassen, und dann erst die nähere Bezeichnung der vorher mittelst des Pronomens angekündigten Person beifügen z. B. *sá hovāca gárgyaḥ*, *sá āikṣata prajāpatiḥ*. Ähnlich Cat. Br. 3, 1, 3, 4 *tá u hāitá ūcur devā ādityāḥ*. Manchmal ist auch das Subjekt stärker belastet; manchmal, unter dem Einfluss der Gewohnheit den Satz mit dem Verbum zu schliessen, die Apposition zwar vom Pronomen getrennt,

aber doch dem Verbum vorangeschickt.

Weiterhin findet sich nun auch in denselben indischen Texten auffälliges Setzen des Verbums an zweite Stelle, wenn der Satz mit *íti ha, tād u ha, tād u sma, āpi ha* beginnt. Es handelt sich dabei meist um die Verba *uvāca, āha*; der Name des Sprechers folgt dann erst nach dem Verbum. Also ganz die Weise deutscher Sätze mit Inversion.

Jacob Wackernagel.

[S. 435]

## Nachträge

zu Abschnitt II S. 346—351 (betr. die Inschriften mit με, ἐμέ).

Zu S. 346, 351: IGA. 351 (lokrisch) [Π]εριφόνῳ [ἀνέθῃ]κέ με (oder -κ ἐμέ?) Ἐνάγατος muss wegen des Zustandes der Inschrift ausser Betracht fallen; vgl. Röhl z. d. St.

Zu S. 349: CIA. 4<sup>2</sup>, 373, 103 Οὐνπορίωνος Φίλων με ἐποίησεν. — Inschrift von Metapont Collitz 1643 Νικόμαχος μ' ἐποίησεν. — Vaseninschrift Klein S. 65 No. 48 nach Six Gazette archéol. 1888, 193 Νικοθένης ἐμ (Six: μ' ἐ-)ποίησεν.

Zu S. 351: ἐμέ noch zweimal an zweiter Stelle in der alten Vaseninschrift bei Pottier Gazette archéol. 1888, 168: ἐκεράμευσεν ἐμεῖ Οἰκωφέλης und Οἰκωφ(ἐ)λης ἐμ' ἔγραψεν (geschrieben ἐγραφεσεν). Vgl. auch ibid. 1888, 180: -πόλον ἐμέ.

## Verzeichnis der kritisch behandelten Stellen

Homer E 273 = Θ 196 .....	S. 373
„ Π 112 .....	„ 343
„ γ 319 .....	„ 373
Alkman Fragm. 52 Bgk. ....	„ 361
Alcaeus Fragm. 68 Bgk. ....	„ 345
„ Fragm. 83 Bgk. ....	„ 375
Sappho Fragm. 2, 7 Bgk. ....	„ 345
„ „ 43 Bgk. ....	„ 345
„ „ 66 Bgk. ....	„ 375
„ „ 97, 4 Hiller (=100 Bgk.) .....	„ 345
Pindar Olymp. 1, 48 .....	„ 361
Euripides Medea 1339 .....	„ 388
„ Fragm. 1029, 4 .....	„ 379
Antiphon 5,38 .....	„ 379

3 *Original text*

Aristophanes Acharn. 779 .....	„ 361
„ Ranae 259 .....	„ 379
„ Eccles. 916 .....	„ 382
Demosthenes 18, 43 .....	„ 388
„ 18, 206 .....	„ 387
„ 24, 64 .....	„ 388
„ prooem. 1, 3 .....	S. 390 f.
„ „ 3 .....	S. 399
Callimachus Fragn. 114 .....	„ 361
Theokrit 2, 159 .....	„ 372
Pausanias 5, 23, 7 .....	„ 350
Anthol. Palat. 6, 140 .....	„ 351
Inscriptiones graecae antiquissimae ed. Röhl 384 .....	„ 347
„ „ „ „ „ 474 .....	„ 349
Sammlung der griech. Dialektinschr. v. Collitz 26 .....	„ 365
„ „ „ „ „ „ 3184, 8 .....	„ 374
„ „ „ „ „ „ 3213, 3 .....	S. 369 f.
[S. 436] Die griech. Vasen mit Meistersignaturen v. W. Klein S. 51 .....	S. 349
„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ S. 194, 2 .....	„ 432
„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ S. 195, 3 .....	„ 432
„ „ „ „ Lieblingsinschr. „ „ „ S. 68 .....	„ 433
Naukratis. By Flinders Petrie I Inschrift No. 303 .....	„ 348
I „ „ 307 .....	„ 348
II „ „ 750 .....	„ 348
Plautus Bacchides 1258 .....	„ 410
„ Mercator 784 .....	„ 414
	J. W.

## References

- Abraham, Wilhelm. 1887. Review of Kämpf (1886), ‘De pronominum personalium usu et collocatione apud poëtas scaenicos Romanorum’. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 6 (9). 265–267.
- Adams, James N. 1994a. *Wackernagel’s law and the placement of the copula esse in Classical Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Adams, James N. 1994b. Wackernagel’s law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Classical Latin. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92 (2). 103–178.
- Ahrens, Franz Heinrich Ludolf. 1843. *De dialecto dorica*. Vol. 2 (De graecae linguae dialectis). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ahrens, Franz Heinrich Ludolf. 1855. *Bucolicum graecorum Theocriti, Bionis, Moschi reliquiae*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Ahrens, Heinrich Ludolf. 1839. Conjecturen zu Alcaeus, Sappho, Corinna (Fortsetzung). *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 6. 351–365.
- Alboiu, Gabriela & Virginia Hill. 2012. Early Modern Romanian and Wackernagel’s law. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 25. 7–28.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1993. Wackernagel’s revenge: clitics, morphology, and the syntax of second position. *Language* 69 (1). 68–98.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 2005. *Aspects of the theory of clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1976. *Word formation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Aziz Hanna, Patrizia Noel. 2015. *Wackernagels Gesetz im Deutschen: zur Interaktion von Syntax, Phonologie und Informationsstruktur*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bach, Emmon. 1962. The order of elements in a transformational grammar of German. *Language* 38 (3). 263–269.
- Bach, Joseph. 1891. De usu pronominum demonstrativorum apud priscos scriptores Latinos. In Wilhelm Studemund (ed.), *Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins*, vol. 2, 145–415. Berlin: Weidmann.

## References

- Baiter, Johann Georg & Hermann Sauppe (eds.). 1850. *Oratores attici*. Vol. 2. Zürich: Hoehr.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1886. *Arische Forschungen*. Vol. 2. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1887. *Arische Forschungen*. Vol. 3. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1888. Beiträge zur altiranischen Grammatik. *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 13. 54–93.
- Bayer, Josef & Constantin Freitag. 2020. How much verb moves to second position? In Horst Lohnstein & Antonios Tsiknakis (eds.), *Verb second: grammar internal and grammar external interfaces*, 77–122. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Behaghel, Otto. 1878. Die neuhochdeutschen Zwillingswörter. *Germania* 23. 257–292.
- Behaghel, Otto (ed.). 1923–1932. *Deutsche Syntax*. 4 volumes. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Bekker, Immanuel. 1823. *Demosthenes*. Vol. 4, part 4 (Oratores attici). Oxford: Clarendon.
- Bekker, Immanuel. 1833. *Harpocraton et Moeris*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Benfey, Theodor. 1852. *Vollständige Grammatik der Sanskritsprache*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Bergaigne, Abel. 1877. Essai sur la construction grammaticale considérée dans son développement historique, en sanskrit, en grec, en latin, dans les langues romanes et dans les langues germaniques (sections III–VII). *Mémoires de la Société linguistique de Paris* 3. 169–186.
- Bergk, Theodor. 1854. *Anthologia lyrica*. 1st edn. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Bergk, Theodor. 1866. *Pindari carmina continens*. 3rd edn. Vol. 2 (Poetae lyrici Graeci). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Bergk, Theodor. 1882. *Poetas melicos continens*. 4th edn. Vol. 3 (Poetae lyrici Graeci). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo & John Payne. 2011. There are no special clitics. In Alexandra Galani, Glyn Hicks & George Tsoulas (eds.), *Morphology and its interfaces*, 57–96. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Beukema, Frits & Marcel Den Dikken (eds.). 2000. *Clitic phenomena in the languages of europe*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blass, Friedrich. 1877. *Demosthenes*. Vol. 3, part 1 (Die attische Beredsamkeit). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Blass, Friedrich. 1880. *Demosthenes' Genossen und Gegner*. Vol. 3, part 2 (Die attische Beredsamkeit). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Blass, Friedrich. 1888. Die Inschriften von Korinthus, Kleonai, Sikyon, Phleius und den korinthischen Colonieen. In Hermann Collitz & Fritz Bechtel (eds.),

- Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, vol. 3, 60–115. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Blomfield, Charles James. 1815. *Callimachi quae supersunt*. London: J. Mawman.
- Boeckh, August. 1828. *Pars I–VI*. Vol. 1 (*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*). Berlin: Reimer.
- Boeckh, August. 1843. *Pars VII–XVI*. Vol. 2 (*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*). Berlin: Reimer.
- Bonitz, Hermann. 1870. *Index aristotelicus*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Borer, Hagit. 1981. *Parametric variation in clitic constructions*. MIT PhD thesis.
- Borer, Hagit (ed.). 1986. *The syntax of pronominal clitics*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Bošković, Željko. 2000. Second position cliticization: syntax and/or phonology? In Frits Beukema & Marcel Den Dikken (eds.), 71–120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Bošković, Željko. 2002. Clitics as non-branching elements and the Linear Correspondence Axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33. 329–340.
- Bošković, Željko. 2016. On second position clitics crosslinguistically. In Franc Lanko Marušič & Rok Žaucer (eds.), *Formal studies in Slovenian syntax: in honor of Janez Orešnik*, 23–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bošković, Željko. 2019. On the syntax and prosody of verb second and clitic second. In Rebecca Woods & Sam Wolfe (eds.), *Rethinking verb second*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brix, Julius & Max Niemeyer. 1888. *Trinummus*. 4th edn. Vol. 1 (Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus für den Schulgebrauch). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Brugman, Oscar. 1877. Absque. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 32. 485–487.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1890. *Wortbildungslehre*. Vol. 2 (Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen). Strasbourg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Brunck, Richard Franz Philipp. 1776. *Analecta veterum poetarum graecorum*. Argentori: Bibliopolium Academicum.
- Bögel, Tina. 2015. *The syntax-prosody interface in Lexical-Functional Grammar*. Universität Konstanz PhD thesis.
- Böhtlingk, Otto von & Rudolph Roth. 1855–1875. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. 7 volumes. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Börjars, Kersti. 2003. Morphological status and (de)grammaticalisation: the Swedish possessive. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26. 133–163.

## References

- Carolsfeld, Franz Schnorr von. 1864. *Verborum collocatio Homerica quas habeat leges et qua utatur libertate*. Berlin: Calvary.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1969. *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Cauer, Paul. 1883. *Delectus inscriptionum Graecarum propter dialectum memorabilium*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding: the Pisa lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of Government and Binding*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Christ, Wilhelm von. 1891. Zum Dialekte Pindars. In Wilhelm von Christ & Gustav Oehmingen (eds.), *Philologische Kleinigkeiten der XLI. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner*, 1–62. Munich.
- Clackson, James. 2007. *Indo-European linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collinge, N. E. 1985. *The laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Deecke, Wilhelm. 1884. Die griechisch-kyprischen Inschriften in epichorischer Schrift. In Hermann Collitz (ed.), *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, vol. 1, 1–80. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Dehé, Nicole. 2014. *Parentheticals in spoken English: the syntax-prosody relation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1878. *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Çatapathabrähmaṇa*. Vol. 3 (Syntaktische Forschungen). Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1888. *Altindische Syntax*. Vol. 5 (Syntaktische Forschungen). Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1900. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 3. Strasbourg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1907. Review of Ries (1907), 'Die Wortstellung im Beowulf'. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 49. 65–76.
- Despić, Miloje. 2017. Suspended morphology in Serbian: clitics vs. affixes. *Glossa* 2 (1.12). 1–43.
- Dewey, Tonya Kim. 2006. *The origins and development of Germanic V2*. UC Berkeley PhD thesis.
- Diesing, Molly & Draga Zec. 2011. Interface effects: Serbian clitics. *Syntax and Semantics* 37. 1–30.
- Dillon, Myles. 1947. Celtic and the other Indo-European languages. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 46 (1). 15–24.



- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila. 1995. Clitics in Slavic. *Studia Linguistica* 49. 54–92.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila. 1998. Are Bulgarian pronominal clitics in the Wackernagel position? In Karen Gammelgaard, Audun J. Mørch & Ole Michael Selberg (eds.), *Norwegian contributions to the Twelfth International Congress of Slavists*, 7–32. Oslo: Universitetet i Oslo.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm. 1882. *Sophocles*. New York: Harper.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm & Friedrich Blass. 1887. *Orationes XVIII–XIX*. 4th edn. Vol. 1, part 2 (Demosthenis Orationes). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm & Friedrich Blass. 1888. *Orationes XX–XL*. 4th edn. Vol. 2 (Demosthenis Orationes). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm & Friedrich Blass. 1892. *Orationes XLI–LXI, prooemia, epistulae, index historicus*. 4th edn. Vol. 3 (Demosthenis Orationes). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Dittenberger, Wilhelm. 1883. *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Dover, Kenneth J. 1960. *Greek word order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ebeling, Heinrich (ed.). 1880–1885. *Lexicon Homericum*. 2 volumes. Stuttgart: Weidmann.
- Eberhard, Eugen. 1885. Κε. In Heinrich Ebeling (ed.), A–ξ, vol. 1 (Lexicon Homericum), 691–735. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Eggeling, Julius (ed.). 1885. *The Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, according to the text of the Mādhyandina school; part II, books III and IV*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Eichner, Heiner & Helmut Rix (eds.). 1990. *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Elmsley, Peter. 1812. Review of Markland (1811), ‘Euripides Supplices’ &c. *The Quarterly Review* 7 (14). 441–464.
- Elmsley, Peter. 1821. *Euripidis Heraclidae*. Leipzig: Hartmann.
- Erdmann, Oskar. 1886. *Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Vol. 1. Stuttgart: Cotta’schen Buchhandlung.
- Fick, August. 1831. *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Fontana, Josep. 1993. *Phrase structure and the syntax of clitics in the history of Spanish*. University of Pennsylvania PhD thesis.
- Fortis, Jean-Michel. 2019. On Sapir’s notion of form/pattern and its aesthetic background. In James McElvenny (ed.), *Form and formalism in linguistics*, 59–88. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Foucart, Paul-François. 1889. Inscriptions de l’acropole. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 13. 156–178.

## References

- Fourquet, Jean. 1938. *L'ordre des éléments de la phrase en germanique ancien: études de syntaxe de position*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. 1932. Kolon und Satz: Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes I. In *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 197–213.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. 1933. Kolon und Satz: Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes II. In *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 319–354.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. 1965. Noch einmal Kolon und Satz. In *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, vol. 2, 1–73.
- Franks, Steven. 1997. South Slavic clitic placement is *still* syntactic. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 4. 111–126.
- Franks, Steven. 2000. Clitics at the interface. In Frits Beukema & Marcel Den Dikken (eds.), 1–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Franks, Steven. 2008. Clitic placement, prosody, and the Bulgarian verbal complex. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 16 (1). 91–137.
- Franks, Steven & Željko Bošković. 2001. An argument for multiple spell-out. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32. 174–183.
- Franks, Steven & Tracy Holloway King (eds.). 2000. *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fritzsche, Hermann & Eduard Hiller. 1890. *Theokrits Gedichte*. 3rd edn. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Frâncu, Constantin. 2009. *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521–1780)*. Iași: Demiurg.
- Gardner, Ernest A. 1886. The inscriptions. In William Matthew Flinders Petrie (ed.), *Naukratis*, vol. 1, 54–63. London: Trübner.
- Gardner, Ernest A. 1888. *Naukratis*. Vol. 2. London: Trübner.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1990. Hittite enclitic subjects and transitive verbs. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42 (2). 227–242.
- Gehring, August. 1891. *Index Homericus*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Gerhard, Eduard (ed.). 1847. *Heroenbilder, meistens homerisch*. Vol. 3 (Auserlesene griechische Vasenbilder, hauptsächlich etruskischen Fundorts). Berlin: Reimer.
- Gerlach, Birgit & Janet Grijzenhout (eds.). 2000. *Clitics in phonology, morphology and syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Getty, Michael. 1997. Was finite verb placement in Germanic prosodically conditioned?: evidence from *Beowulf* and *Heliand*. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 96 (2). 155–181.

- Givón, Talmy. 1971. Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: an archeologist's field trip. *Chicago Linguistics Society* 7. 394–415.
- Goldstein, David M. 2014. Wackernagel's Law I. In Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek language and linguistics*, vol. 3, 508–513. Leiden: Brill.
- Goldstein, David M. 2016. *Classical Greek syntax: Wackernagel's law in Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gomperz, Theodor. 1890. Die Apologie der Heilkunst: eine griechische Sophistenrede des 5. vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts. *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 120 (9). 1–196.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Graux, Charles. 1886. *Textes grecs*. Vol. 2 (Oeuvres de Charles Graux). Paris: Vieweg.
- Götz, Georg. 1876. Dittographien im Plautustexte nebst methodischen Folgerungen: eine kritische Untersuchung. *Acta societatis philologiae Lipsiensis* 6. 233–328.
- Götz, Georg. 1878. *T. Macci Plauti Epidicus*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Güneş, Güliz. 2015. *Deriving prosodic structures*. University of Groningen PhD thesis.
- Hale, Ken. 1973. Person marking in Walbiri. In Stephen R. Anderson & Paul Kiparsky (eds.), *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, 308–344. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hale, Ken. 1983. Warlpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1 (1). 5–47.
- Hale, Mark. 1987a. *Studies in the comparative syntax of the oldest Indo-Iranian languages*. Harvard University PhD thesis.
- Hale, Mark. 1987b. Wackernagel's law in the language of the Rigveda. In Calvert Watkins (ed.), *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill*, 38–50. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hale, Mark. 1996. Deriving Wackernagel's law: prosodic and syntactic factors determining clitic placement in the language of the Rigveda. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold Zwicky (eds.), 165–197. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hale, Mark. 2017. Preliminaries to the investigation of clitic sequencing in Greek and Indo-Iranian. In Claire Bower, Laurence Horn & Raffaella Zanuttini (eds.), *On looking into words (and beyond)*, 289–310. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Halpern, Aaron L. (ed.). 1995. *On the placement and morphology of clitics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Halpern, Aaron L. & Arnold Zwicky (eds.). 1996. *Approaching second: second position clitics and related phenomena*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

## References

- Hand, Ferdinand Gotthelf. 1845. *Tursellinus, seu de particulis latinis commentarii*. Vol. 4. Leipzig: Weidmann.
- Harizanov, Boris. 2014. Clitic doubling at the syntax-morphophonology interface. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32 (4). 1033–1088.
- Harris, Alice C. 2002. *Endoclititics and the origins of Udi morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, Alice C. & Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2015. Defining vs. diagnosing linguistic categories: a case study of clitic phenomena. In Joanna Błaszczak, Dorota Klimek-Jankowska & Krzysztof Migdalski (eds.), *How categorical are categories?*, 273–303. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haussoullier, Bernard. 1882. Inscriptions de Delphes. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 6. 445–466.
- Hecker, Alphons. 1852. Vol. 1 (Commentationis criticae de Anthologia graeca). Leiden: Brill.
- Heimreich, Christian. 1884. *Kritische Beiträge zur Würdigung der alten Sophokles-scholien*. Ploen: Hirt.
- Hermann, Gottfried. 1816. *Elementa doctrinae metrica*. Leipzig: Fleischer.
- Hermann, Gottfried. 1817. *Theocritus, bion et moschus*. Leipzig: Weigel.
- Hermann, Gottfried. 1831. Vol. 4 (Opuscula). Leipzig: Fleischer.
- Herwerden, Henrik van. 1878. Observationes criticae, I. in Homerum, II. in Xenophon-tis Cyropaediam. *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes* 2. 195–203.
- Herwerden, Henrik van. 1880. *Lapidum de dialecto Attica testimonia*. Utrecht: Beijers.
- Hiller, Eduard. 1890. *Anthologia lyrica*. 4th edn. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland & Svetlana Petrova. 2010. From V1 to V2 in West Germanic. *Lingua* 120. 315–328.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1982. AUX-cliticization as a motivation for word order change. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 12 (1). 91–101.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1996. Who’s on first? Towards a prosodic account of P2 clitics. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold Zwicky (eds.), 199–270. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hoffmann, Otto. 1890. Die Orakelinschriften aus Dodona. In Hermann Collitz & Fritz Bechtel (eds.), *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, vol. 2, 91–132. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Hoffmann, Otto. 1891. *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange, mit den wichtigsten ihrer Quellen*. Vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hoffner, Harry A. 1973. Studies of the Hittite particles, I. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93 (4). 520–526.
- Homolle, Théophile. 1888. Sur une base de statue portant une signature d’artiste et décorée de reliefs. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 12. 463–479.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1975. *The syntax of the simple sentence in Proto-Germanic*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. 1958. The importance of new data concerning Hittite and Tocharian languages for the comparative historical grammar of Indo-European languages. In Eva Sivertsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists*, 611–614. Oslo: Oslo University Press.
- Jacobi, Hermann. 1886. *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Mâhârâshṭri zur Einführung in das Studium vom Prâkṛiṭ*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. & Joel P. Brereton. 2014. *The Rigveda*. 1st edn. Vol. 1 (South Asia Research). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jamot, Paul. 1889. Inscriptions d’Argolide. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 13. 185–200.
- Janse, Mark. 1994. Clitics and word order since Wackernagel: one hundred years of research into clitics and related phenomena. *Orbis* 37. 389–410.
- Jebb, Richard C. 1889. *The Oedipus Coloneus*. 2nd edn. Vol. 2 (Sophocles: the plays and fragments). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kabbadias, Panagiōtēs. 1886. Anaskaphai en tē akropolei. *Archaiologike Ephemeris* 1886 (2). 73–82.
- Kaibel, Georg. 1878. *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Kaibel, Georg. 1890. *Inscriptiones graecae siciliae et italiae*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Kaiser, Georg. 2002. *Verbstellung und Verbstellungswandel in den romanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Kaisse, Ellen M. 1982. Sentential clitics and Wackernagel’s law. In *Proceedings of the First West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 1–14.
- Kaisse, Ellen M. 1985. *Connected speech: the interaction of syntax and phonology*. London: Academic Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1975. *French syntax: the transformational cycle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kellerhoff, Eduard. 1891. De collocatione verborum Plautina quaestiones selectae. In Wilhelm Studemund (ed.), *Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins*, vol. 2, 47–84. Berlin: Weidmann.

## References

- Kent, Roland G. (ed.). 1953. *Old Persian: grammar, texts, lexicon*. 2nd edn. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society.
- Kenyon, Frederic George. 1891. *Aristotle on the constitution of Athens*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Keydana, Götz. 2011. Wackernagel in the language of the Rigveda: a reassessment. *Historische Sprachforschung* 124. 106–133.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1995. Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax. In Adrian Batty & Ian Roberts (eds.), *Clause structure and language change*, 140–169. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2012. Grammaticalization as optimization. In Dianne Jonas, John Whitman & Andrew Garrett (eds.), *Grammatical change: origins, nature, outcomes*, 15–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirchhoff, Adolf. 1887. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Alphabets*. 4th edn. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.
- Klavans, Judith L. 1979. On clitics as words. *Chicago Linguistics Society* 15. 68–80.
- Klavans, Judith L. 1982. *Some problems in a theory of clitics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Klavans, Judith L. 1985. The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Language* 61 (1). 95–120.
- Klavans, Judith L. 1995. *On clitics and cliticization*. New York, NY: Garland.
- Klein, Wilhelm. 1887. *Die griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Gerold.
- Klein, Wilhelm. 1890. *Die griechischen Vasen mit Lieblingsinschriften*. 1st edn. Vienna: Tempsky.
- Kluge, Friedrich. 1883. Zur altgermanischen Sprachgeschichte. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 26. 68–103.
- Kock, Theodor. 1864. *Die Vögel*. Vol. 4 (Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Kock, Theodor. 1880. *Antiquae comoediae fragmenta*. Vol. 1 (Comicorum atticorum fragmenta). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Kock, Theodor. 1884. *Novae comoediae fragmenta, pars I*. Vol. 2 (Comicorum atticorum fragmenta). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Kock, Theodor. 1888. *Novae comoediae fragmenta, pars II*. Vol. 3 (Comicorum atticorum fragmenta). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Kretschmer, Paul. 1891. Epigraphische Bemerkungen. *Hermes* 26. 118–127.

- Kretschmer, Paul. 1892. Indogermanische accent- und lautstudien. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 31 (3). 325–472.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1990. Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutiger Sicht. In Heiner Eichner & Helmut Rix (eds.), 64–81. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Kruschwitz, Peter. 2004. *Römische Inschriften und Wackernagels Gesetz: Untersuchungen zur Syntax epigraphischer Texte aus republikanischer Zeit*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Krüger, Karl Wilhelm. 1871. *Ueber die Dialekte: Poetisch-dialektische Syntax*. 5th edn. Vol. 2, part 2 (Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen). Berlin: K. W. Krüger.
- Kuhn, Hans. 1933. Zur Wortstellung und -betonung im Altgermanischen. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 57. 1–109.
- Kurschat, Friedrich. 1876. *Grammatik der litauischen Sprache*. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1958. Remarks on Ivanov. In Eva Sivertsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists*, 613. Oslo: Oslo University Press.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1965. The evolution of grammatical categories. *Diogenes* 51. 55–71.
- Kämpf, Wilhelm. 1886. De pronominum personalium usu et collocatione apud poëtas scaenicos Romanorum. *Berliner Studien für classische Philologie und Archaeologie* 3 (2). 1–48.
- Köhler, Ulrich. 1877. *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora*. Vol. 2 (Corpus inscriptionum atticarum (CIA)). Part 1. Berlin: Reimer.
- Köhler, Ulrich. 1888. *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora*. Vol. 3 (Corpus inscriptionum atticarum (CIA)). Part 3: *dedicationes, tituli honorarii, statuarum subscriptiones, tituli artificum, tituli sacri, inscriptiones ararum, oracula, similia, tituli sepulcrales*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Kühner, Raphael. 1869. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. 2nd edn. Vol. 1, part 1. Hanover: Hahnsche Hofbuchhandlung.
- Kühner, Raphael. 1870. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. 2nd edn. Vol. 2, part 1. Hanover: Hahnsche Hofbuchhandlung.
- Langen, Peter. 1857. De execrandi formulis plautinis terentianisque observatio grammatica. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 12. 426–433.
- Langslow, David (ed.). 2009. *Jacob Wackernagel, Lectures on Syntax, with special reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lassen, Christian. 1837. *Institutiones linguæ practicae*. London: Black & Armstrong.



## References

- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. *From Latin to Romance: morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2002. *Warlpiri: theoretical implications*. MIT PhD thesis.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2008. Warlpiri and the theory of second position clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26 (1). 3–60.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2015. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. 3rd edn. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Littré, Émile. 1839. *Oeuvres complètes d’Hippocrate*. Vol. 1. Paris: Baillière.
- Lobeck, Christian August. 1829. *Aglaophamus, sive, De theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis libri tres*. Königsberg: Borntraeger.
- Lobeck, Christian August. 1835. *Sophoclis Ajax*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Weidmann.
- Lobel, Edgar & Denys Page (eds.). 1968. *Poetarum lesbiorum fragmenta*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Loewy, Emanuel. 1885. *Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer mit Facsimiles*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Lorenz, August Otto Friedrich. 1864. *Leben und Schriften des Koers Epicharmos: nebst einer Fragmentensammlung*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Lorenz, August Otto Friedrich. 1883a. *Miles gloriosus*. 2nd edn. Vol. 3 (Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus für den Schulgebrauch). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Lorenz, August Otto Friedrich. 1883b. *Mostellaria*. 2nd edn. Vol. 2 (Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus für den Schulgebrauch). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Lowe, John. 2014. Accented clitics in the R̥gveda. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 112 (1). 5–43.
- Luraghi, Sylvia. 1998. The grammaticalization of the left sentence periphery in Hittite. In Anna Giacalone Ramat & Paul Hopper (eds.), *The limits of grammaticalization*, 189–210. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Madvig, Johan Nikolai. 1839. *M. Tullii Ciceronis, De finibus bonorum et malorum libri quinque*. Lund: Impensis Librariae Gylldendalianae.
- Markland, Jeremiah. 1811. *Euripidis Supplices mulieres, Iphigenia in Aulide, et in Tauris*. Oxford: Cooke & Parker.
- Marouzeau, Jules. 1907. *Place du pronom personnel sujet en latin*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Marouzeau, Jules. 1953. *L’ordre des mots en latin: volume complémentaire*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Marshall, Marlene H. B. 1987. *Verbs, nouns, and postpositives in Attic prose*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Matthews, Peter H. 1974. *Morphology: an introduction to the theory of word-structure*. 1st edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Meillet, Antoine. 1912. L'évolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia (Rivista di Scienza)* 12 (26). 6.
- Meineke, August. 1843. *Analecta alexandrina*. Berlin: Enslin.
- Meineke, August. 1856. *Theocritus, Bion, Moschus*. 3rd edn. Berlin: Reimer.
- Meister, Richard C. 1884. Die böotischen Inschriften. In Hermann Collitz (ed.), *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, vol. 1, 144–309. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Meister, Richard C. 1889. *Die griechischen Dialekte auf Grundlage von Ahrens' Werk*. Vol. 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Meisterhans, Konrad. 1888. *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*. 2nd edn. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Merguet, Hugo. 1884. *Lexikon zu den Reden des Cicero, mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen*. Vol. 4. Jena: Gustav Fischer.
- Meusel, Heinrich. 1887. *Lexikon Caesarianum*. Vol. 2. Berlin: Weber.
- Meyer, Gustav. 1885. Auszüge aus Zeitschriften, Programmen und Dissertationen. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 5 (29–30). 942–947.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2010. On the relation between V2 and the second position cliticization. *Lingua* 120. 329–353.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2012. Against a uniform treatment of second position effects as force markers. In Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman & Rachel Nye (eds.), *Main clause phenomena: new horizons*, 345–364. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2016. *Second position effects in the syntax of Germanic and Slavic languages*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Mines, Rachel. 2002. An examination of Kuhn's second law and its validity as a metrical-syntactical rule. *Studies in Philology* 99 (4). 337–355.
- Momma, Haruko. 1997. *The composition of Old English poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mommsen, Theodor & Wilhelm Henzen. 1887. *Inscriptiones Latinae antiquissimae ad C. Caesaris mortem*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Monro, David B. 1891. *A grammar of the Homeric dialect*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Mullach, Friedrich Wilhelm August. 1860. *Fragmenta philosophorum graecorum*. Vol. 1. Paris: Didot.
- Mätzner, Eduard. 1838. *Antiphontis, Orationes XV*. Berlin: Mittler.
- Müller, Carl Friedrich Wilhelm. 1886. *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orationes: De provinciis consularibus, Pro L. Cornelio Balbo, In L. Calpurnium Pisonem, Pro Cn. Plancio, Pro M. Aemilio Scauro, Pro C. Rabirio Postumo*. Leipzig: Teubner.

## References

- Müller, Lucian (ed.). 1872. *C. Lucili Saturarum reliquiae*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Müller, Lucian (ed.). 1888. *Noni Marcelli Compendiosa doctrina*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Nauck, Augustus. 1874. *Odyssea*. Vol. 1 (Homerica carmina). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Nauck, Augustus. 1877. *Ilias*. Vol. 2 (Homerica carmina). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Nauck, Augustus. 1889. *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Nespor, Marina & Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Neue, Christian Friedrich & Carl Wagener. 1892. *Adjectiva, Numeralia, Pronomina, Adverbia, Präpositionen, Konjunktionen, Interjektionen*. 3rd edn. Vol. 2 (Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache). Leipzig: O. R. Reisland.
- Nevis, Joel A. & Brian D. Joseph. 1993. Wackernagel affixes: evidence from Balto-Slavic. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1992*, 93–111. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Nevis, Joel A., Brian D. Joseph, Dieter Wanner & Arnold M. Zwicky. 1994. *Clitics: a comprehensive bibliography 1892–1991*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nida, Eugene A. 1946. *Morphology: the descriptive analysis of words*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Nilsson, Elof. 1904. Wackernagel's gesetz im Slavischen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 37 (2). 261–264.
- Norde, Muriel. 2001. Deflexion as a counterdirectional factor in grammatical change. *Language Sciences* 23. 231–264.
- Norde, Muriel. 2010. Degrammaticalization: three common controversies. In Katerina Stathi, Elke Gehweiler & Ekkehard König (eds.), *Grammaticalization: current views and issues*, 123–150. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1888. *Die Hymnen des Rigveda*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz.
- Orelli, Johann Kaspar von. 1828. *M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera quae supersunt omnia*. Vol. 4. Zürich: Typis Orellii, Fuesslini et sociorum.
- Osthoff, Hermann & Karl Brugmann. 1878. *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Pancheva, Roumyana. 2005. The rise and fall of second-position clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23. 103–167.
- Paul, Wilhelm Theodor. 1889. *C. Iulii Commentarii de bello civili*. Vienna: F. Tempsky.
- Peppmüller, Rudolf. 1890. Review of Fick (1887), 'Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen Fassung und Sprachform wiederhergestellt'. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 10 (18). 557–564.

- Plank, Frans. 1995. Entgrammatikalisierung – Spiegelbild der Grammatikalisierung?  
In Norbert Boretzky (ed.), *Natürlichkeitstheorie und Sprachwandel*, 199–219. Bochum:  
Brockmeyer.
- Poppo, Ernest Friedrich & Johann Matthias Stahl. 1889. *Thucydidis De Bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo*. 3rd edn. Vol. 1, part 2. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Pottier, Edmond. 1888. Études sur la céramique Greque. *Gazette archéologique: revue des Musées Nationaux* 13 (7–8). 167–181.
- Praun, J. 1889. Absque. *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 6. 197–212.
- Prellwitz, Walther. 1889. Die argivischen Inschriften. In Hermann Collitz & Fritz Bechtel (eds.), *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, vol. 3, 117–190. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1996. Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold Zwicky (eds.), 411–428. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 2000. Where do clitics cluster? In Frits Beukema & Marcel Den Dikken (eds.), 249–258. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Radanović-Kocić, Vesna. 1988. *The grammar of Serbo-Croatian clitics: a synchronic and diachronic perspective*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign PhD thesis.
- Radanović-Kocić, Vesna. 1996. Placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics: a prosodic approach. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold Zwicky (eds.), 429–445. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Reinach, Salomon. 1885. Inscribed base of an archaic bronze statue from Mount Ptous. *American Journal of Archaeology* 1. 358–360.
- Reisig, Karl Christian & Friedrich Haase. 1839. *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*. Leipzig: Verlag der Zehnhold'schen Buchhandlung.
- Ribbeck, Otto. 1869. *Beiträge zur Lehre von den lateinischen Partikeln*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Ries, John. 1880. *Die Stellung von Subject und Prädicatsverbum im Héliand*. University of Strasbourg PhD thesis.
- Ries, John. 1894. *Was ist Syntax? Ein kritischer Versuch*. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Buchhandlung.
- Ries, John. 1907. *Die Wortstellung im Beowulf*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Ritschl, Friedrich Wilhelm. 1852. *T. Macchi Plauti Mostellaria*. Leipzig: H. B. König.
- Ritschl, Friedrich Wilhelm & Georg Götz. 1884. *T. Macchi Plauti Mercator*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Teubner.

## References

- Rivero, María Luisa. 1986. Parameters in the typology of clitics in Romance and Old Spanish. *Language* 62 (4). 774–807.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Robert, C. 1887. Eine attische Künstlerinschrift aus kleisthenischer Zeit. *Hermes* 22 (1). 129–135.
- Roberts, Ian. 1997. *Comparative syntax*. London: Arnold.
- Roberts, Ian. 2010. *Agreement and head movement: clitics, incorporation and defective goals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ruijgh, Cornelis J. 1990. La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel. In Heiner Eichner & Helmut Rix (eds.), 213–233. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Röhl, Hermann. 1882. *Inscriptiones graecae antiquissimae praeter atticas in attica repertas*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Salvesen, Christine Meklenborg & Hans Petter Helland (eds.). 2013. *Challenging clitics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schanz, Martin. 1882. *Phaedrus*. Vol. 5 part 2 (Platonis Opera quae feruntur omnia). Leipzig: Tauchnitz.
- Scheppers, Frank. 2011. *The colon hypothesis: word order, discourse segmentation and discourse coherence in Ancient Greek*. Brussels: Brussels University Press.
- Schiering, René. 2006. *Cliticization and the evolution of morphology: a cross-linguistic study on phonology in grammaticalization*. Universität Konstanz PhD thesis.
- Schiering, René. 2010. Reconsidering erosion in grammaticalization: evidence from cliticization. In Katerina Stathi, Elke Gehweiler & Ekkehard König (eds.), *Grammaticalization: current views and issues*, 73–100. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schlerath, Bernfried. 1990. Jacob Wackernagel und die indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft. In Heiner Eichner & Helmut Rix (eds.), 10–32. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1990. Jacob Wackernagel. In Ward W. Briggs & William M. Calder (eds.), *Classical scholarship: a biographical encyclopedia*, 479–488. New York: Garland.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger (ed.). 1991. *The Bisitun inscriptions of Darius the Great: Old Persian text*. Vol. I.1.1 (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum). London: SOAS.
- Schneider, Otto. 1873. *Fragmenta a Bentleio collecta et explicata, ab aliis aucta: accedunt commentationes et indices tres*. Vol. 2 (Callimachea). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1887. Review of Krumbacher (1886), 'Ein irrationaler Spirant im Griechischen'. *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie* 8. 179–182.

- Schulze, Wilhelm. 1890. Review of Meister (1889), ‘Die griechischen Dialekte auf Grundlage von Ahrens’ Werk “De graecae linguae dialectis’, vol. 2. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 10 (46). (Translator’s note: Review is distributed over issues 44–47), 1469–1475.
- Schwyzer, Eduard. 1938. Jacob Wackernagel. *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 14. 227–228.
- Schöll, Fritz. 1890. *T. Macci Plauti Casina*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Schömann, Georg Friedrich. 1871. *Miscellanea*. Vol. 4 (Opuscula academica). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Schütze, Carson T. 1994. Serbo-Croatian second position clitic placement and the phonology-syntax interface. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 21. 373–473.
- Seidler, J. V. A. 1829. Über einige Fragmente der Sappho und des Alcaeus. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Geschichte und griechische Philosophie* 3. 153–228.
- Selivanov, S. 1891. Inscriptiones rhodiæ ineditæ. *Mitteilungen des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts, athenische Abteilung* 16. 107–126.
- Selkirk, Elizabeth. 1984. *Phonology and syntax: the relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Selkirk, Elizabeth. 1986. On derived domains in sentence phonology. *Phonology Yearbook* 3. 371–405.
- Seyffert, August Oskar. 1874. *Studia Plautina*. Berlin: Sophien-Gymnasium.
- Seyffert, Moritz & Carl Friedrich Wilhelm Müller. 1876. *M. Tullii Ciceronis Laelius de amicitia dialogus*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Otto Holtze.
- Six, Jean. 1888. Vases polychromes sur fond noir de la période archaïque. *Gazette archéologique: revue des Musées Nationaux* 13 (7–8). 193–210.
- Smith, Peter W. 2013. On the cross-linguistic rarity of endocclisis. In *Proceedings of Berkeley Linguistics Society* 39, 227–244.
- Spencer, Andrew & Ana R. Luís. 2012. *Clitics: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spengel, Andreas. 1886. Bemerkungen zu Varro de lingua latina. *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und historischen Classe der k. b. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München* 1885. 243–272.
- Spiegel, Friedrich. 1881. *Die altpersischen Keilinschriften im Grundtexte mit Übersetzung, Grammatik und Glossar*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann.
- Steele, Susan M. 1975. On some factors that affect and effect word order. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Word order and word order change*, 197–268. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Steele, Susan M. 1977. Clisis and diachrony. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Mechanisms of syntactic change*, 539–579. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

## References

- Stein, Heinrich. 1866. *Buch V und VI*. 2nd edn. Vol. 3 (Herodotos). Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Stein, Heinrich. 1883. *Einleitung und Übersicht des Dialektes; Buch I*. 5th edn. Vol. 1, book 1 (Herodotos). Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Stolz, Friedrich & Joseph Herrmann Schmalz. 1890. *Lateinische Grammatik: Laut- und Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik*. 2nd edn. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Studniczka, Franz. 1887. Antenor der Sohn des Eumares und die Geschichte der archaischen Malerei. *Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 2. 135–168.
- Taylor, Ann. 1990. *Clitics and configurationality in Ancient Greek*. University of Pennsylvania PhD thesis.
- Thielmann, Philipp. 1889. Abscondo. *Archiv für lateinische lexicographie und grammatik* 6. 151–167.
- Thumb, Albert. 1887. Die pronomina *μν* und *νν*. *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie (Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik)* 135. 631–648.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1892. Zur Stellung des Verbuns im Altfranzösischen. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 16. 289–307.
- Tobler, Adolf. 1877. Miscellen zur griechischen grammatik. *Französische etymologien* 23. 414–423.
- Tomanetz, Karl. 1879. *Die Relativsätze bei den ahd. uebersetzern des 8. u. 9. Jahrh.* Vienna: Gerold's Sohn.
- Tomanetz, Karl. 1890. Review of Max Rannow (1888), *Der satzbau des althochdeutschen Isidor im verhältnis zur lateinischen vorlage: ein beitrag zur deutschen syntax. Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 16. 379–384.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeška. 1996. The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14 (4). 811–872.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeška. 2000. On clitic sites. In Frits Beukema & Marcel Den Dikken (eds.), 293–316. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vahlen, Johannes. 1865. *Beiträge zu Aristoteles' Poetik*. Special printing of vol. LVI of the *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (published 1867). Vienna: Gerold's Sohn.
- Vahlen, Johannes. 1879. Über drei Elegien des Tibullus. *Monatsberichte der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Berlin* 1878. 343–356.
- Vahlen, Johannes. 1887. *Διονυσίου ἡ λογιῶν περὶ ὑψους = de sublimitate libellus in usum scholarum*. 2nd edn. First edition edited by Otto Jahn, 1867. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Velsen, Adolf von. 1883. *Aristophanis Ecclesiazusae*. Leipzig: Teubner.



- Vendryes, Joseph. 1912. La place du verbe en celtique. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 17. 337–351.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1887. Miscellen zur griechischen grammatik. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 28. 109–145.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1891. Review of Cauer (1890), ‘Homeri Ilias’. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 11 (2). (Translator’s note: Review is distributed over issues 1–2), 37–1475.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1 (1). 333–436.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1896. *Lautlehre*. Vol. 1 (Altindische Grammatik). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1905. *Einleitung zur Wortlehre; Nominalkomposition*. Vol. 2, part 1 (Altindische Grammatik). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1912. *Über einige antike anredeformen*. Göttingen: Dieterich.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1916. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1920. *Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Vol. 1. Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1924. *Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Vol. 2. Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Walkden, George. 2012. *Syntactic reconstruction and Proto-Germanic*. University of Cambridge PhD thesis.
- Walkden, George. 2014. *Syntactic reconstruction and Proto-Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walkden, George. 2015. Verb-third in early West Germanic: a comparative perspective. In Theresa Biberauer & George Walkden (eds.), *Syntax over time: lexical, morphological, and information-structural interactions*, 236–248. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walkden, George. 2017. Language contact and V3 in Germanic varieties new and old. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 20(1). 49–81.
- Wanner, Dieter. 1987. *The development of Romance clitic pronouns*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1963. Preliminaries to a historical and comparative reconstruction of the Old Irish verb. *Celtica* 6. 1–49.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1964. Preliminaries to the reconstruction of Indo-European sentence structure. In Horace G. Lunt (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*, 1035–1045. The Hague: Mouton.

## References

- Weber, Philipp. 1884. *Von Homer bis zur attischen Prosa*. Vol. 1 (Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze). Volume II of Schanz (ed.), *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Würzburg.
- Weber, Philipp. 1885. *Die attische Prosa und Schlussergebnisse*. Vol. 2 (Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze). Würzburg.
- Weil, Henri. 1886. *Androtion, Aristocrate, Timocrate, Aristogiton*. Vol. 2 (Les plaidoyers politiques de Démosthène). Paris: Hachette.
- Weissenborn, Wilhelm. 1853. *Titi Livi ab urbe condita libri*. Leipzig: Weidmann.
- Werfer, F. 1814. Observationes criticae et grammaticae in Herodoti historiarum libros, pars posterior. *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie* 1. 225–276.
- Wichert, Georg. 1856. *Die lateinische Stillehre*. Königsberg: Verlag der Gebrüder Bornträger.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. 1882. *Callimachi hymna et epigrammata*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. 1889. *Text und Commentar*. Vol. 2 (Euripides Herakles). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2018. *Verb second in medieval Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wundt, Wilhelm. 1874. *Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie*. Leipzig: Engelmann.
- Wölfflin, Eduard. 1882. Ueber die Aufgaben der lateinischen Lexikographie. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Geschichte und griechische Philosophie* 37. 83–123.
- Zeuss, Johann Kaspar. 1871. *Grammatica Celtica*. 2nd edn. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Ziemer, Hermann. 1885. Auszüge aus Zeitschriften, Programmen und Dissertationen. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 5 (43). 1371.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1977. *On clitics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1985. Clitics and particles. *Language* 61 (2). 283–305.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. & Geoffrey Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't*. *Language* 59 (3). 502–513.





# Did you like this book?

This book was brought to you for free

Please help us in providing free access to linguistic research worldwide. Visit <http://www.langsci-press.org/donate> to provide financial support or register as a community proofreader or typesetter at <http://www.langsci-press.org/register>.





# On a law of Indo-European word order

Change your blurb in localmetadata.tex

