

On a law of Indo-European word order

Über ein Gesetz der
indogermanischen Wortstellung

Jacob Wackernagel

translated by

George Walkden

Christina Sevdali

Morgan Macleod

Classics in Linguistics 7



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.
5. Stefan Müller, Marga Reis & Frank Richter (Hrsg.). Beiträge zur deutschen Grammatik: Gesammelte Schriften von Tilman N. Höhle.
6. Anderson, Stephen R. & Louis de Saussure (eds.). René de Saussure and the theory of word formation.
7. Wackernagel, Jacob. On a law of Indo-European word order.

On a law of Indo-European word order

Über ein Gesetz der
indogermanischen Wortstellung

Jacob Wackernagel

Wackernagel, Jacob. 2020. *On a law of Indo-European word order: Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung* (Classics in Linguistics 7). Berlin: Language Science Press.

This title can be downloaded at:

<http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/270>

© 2020, the authors

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

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

ISBN: 978-3-96110-271-6 (Digital)

978-3-96110-272-3 (Hardcover)

ISSN: 2366-374X

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3978908

Source code available from www.github.com/langsci/270

Collaborative reading: paperhive.org/documents/remote?type=langsci&id=270

Cover and concept of design: Ulrike Harbort

Translator: George Walkden, Morgan Macleod and Christina Sevdali

Typesetting: Anabel Roschmann and George Walkden

Proofreading: Andreas Hölzl Brett Reynolds, Christopher Straughn, Felix

Hoberg, Geoffrey Sampson, Ivica Jedud, Jeroen van de Weijer, Jezia Talavera,

Karolina Grzech, Lachlan Mackenzie, Tom Bossuyt

Fonts: Libertinus, Arimo, DejaVu Sans Mono

Typesetting software: Xe_{La}TeX

Language Science Press

xHain

Grünberger Str. 16

10243 Berlin, Germany

langsci-press.org

Storage and cataloguing done by FU Berlin

Contents

1	Introduction	
	George Walkden	3
1	Jacob Wackernagel and his law of Indo-European word order	4
2	Reception and implications	8
3	Notes on the translation and edition	18
2	Translation	33
1	Greek <i>min, nin</i> and <i>hoi</i>	33
2	The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek	52
3	The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek	73
4	Genitives	119
5	Indefinite pronouns and other enclitics	136
6	Postpositive particles: <i>án</i> in subordinate clauses	172
7	Postpositive particles: <i>án</i> in main clauses	229
8	Indo-Iranian and Germanic	277
9	Latin: personal pronouns	282
10	Latin: more personal pronouns and indefinites	302
11	Latin: particles and vocatives	310
12	Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European	326
	Addenda	337
	List of critically discussed examples	338
3	Original text	341
	I.	341
	II.	349
	III.	356
	IV.	364
	V.	368
	VI.	376
	VII.	388
	VIII.	396
	IX.	399

Contents

X.....	404
XI.....	407
XII.....	414
Nachträge	421
Verzeichnis der kritisch behandelten Stellen	422
References	425
Index	437
Name index	437
Language index.....	443
Subject index	445

Part I

Chapter 1

Introduction

George Walkden

University of Konstanz

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) left 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 nearly 700 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 being "more cited than read".

This introduction has three aims. 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 2 discusses the law's subsequent reception from publication until the present day, again without pretence of being exhaustive. Section 3 outlines our rationale for, and the decisions we have made during, the translation process.



1 Jacob Wackernagel and his law of Indo-European word order

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 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).

1.2 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.* 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 the courses he taught (Langslow 2009: xi). The article featured in the present book (Wackernagel 1892) is thus quite exceptional in its scope and generality.

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 with the modern German evidence in more detail, 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.

1.3 Wackernagel’s law

Wackernagel’s law is given in (1).[†] 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

* Delimiting the domain of syntax was a hot topic at the time Wackernagel was writing: Ries (1894) in particular had opened up controversy. Wackernagel was fully aware of the limitations of his treatment of syntax and planned to address it in a third volume, which unfortunately never saw the light of day. [†] 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 retained the traditional attribution here.

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,* but Wackernagel 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 'semantic unit' 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 flexible notion.

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

* 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, in which enclitics follow the first constituent.

Wackernagel to aim for anything else, even though he himself never identified as a Neogrammarian.* 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.

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.† Wackernagel reaches this conclusion in section XII, where he aims 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.‡ 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.

* 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 in the article, both militate against this interpretation. † 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 they occupy second position as a compromise. ‡ This movement-based account foreshadows early transformational proposals for German such as that of Bach (1962) by seventy years.

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 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”.^{*} 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.

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;

^{*} “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).

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.

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 linguistics, spawning a substantial literature on clitic pronouns (see 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 had 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.* 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 texts and grammatical contexts. 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 Wack-

* 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.

ernagel'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.* In his review of Ries (1907), 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.

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 the 1980s that this line of thinking came to be pursued more systematically.†

Important early work by Steele (1975) on constituent order typology identified a category of languages in which modals consistently occupy second position; Steele links this to Wackernagel's law. On the basis of Uto-Aztec 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:

* Delbrück (1900: 81) somewhat mischaracterizes Wackernagel (1892) when he claims that the latter argued for a subject-verb word order: Wackernagel (1892) is silent on the issue of what element occupies first position. † 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. **Special clitics:** clitics that show unusual syntactic behaviour and unusual 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)* 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 endoclitic[†]), 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).[‡] Klavans (1995) is a book-length treatment of clitics from the mid-1990s, contemporaneous with 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.

* Zwicky (1977: note 5) attributes the term to Hetzron (p.c.). † 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). ‡ 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.

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 that engaged 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).^{*} 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).[†] 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 & Luís 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; Progovac 1996; 2000; Tomić 1996; 2000; Franks 1997; 2000; 2008; Franks & Bošković 2001; Franks & King 2000;

^{*} 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. [†] Klavans (1979; 1985) denies the existence of endocclisis in the sense of Zwicky (1977). The present consensus seems to be that endocclisis is cross-linguistically rare but possible (Harris 2002; Smith 2013).

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).*

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).† 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).‡

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

* Frâncu (2009) proposes that Wackernagel's law was operative in historical Romanian; Alboiu & Hill (2012) make the case that it wasn't. † 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. ‡ Special clitics, although perhaps the most interesting type of clitics theoretically, are not uncontroversial: see Spencer & Luís (2012) and particularly Bermúdez-Otero & Payne (2011) for critical discussion.

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.* 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 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

* In response, Norde (2010) downplays the importance of change in morphological status (“debonding”), arguing that other aspects also indicate that degrammaticalization has taken place.

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.

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.* 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 (1987a,b; 1996), Krisch (1990), and Hock (1996) do not (like Adams) aim to supplant Wackernagel'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

* 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. Ledgeway (2012: 259–262) suggests that cola correspond to the phases of Minimalist syntax: CP, vP, PP and DP.

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 Adams (1994a,b) identified 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 (1987a,b), 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 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 the discourse particles *de* ‘but, and’ and *gar* ‘for’, both described as “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 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.

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

I (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, and 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.

I'd like to thank Morgan and Christina for joining the team and putting in so much of their time and effort. We also offer profuse thanks to Moreno Mitrović for help with 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 Anderson, Lieven Danckaert, Deepthi Gopal, and Bettelou Los; Lieven also helped out with a number of translations of Latin quotations from secondary literature, and Laura Grestenberger provided useful feedback on part of the translation. The new edition of the original text was prepared and typeset by Anabel Roschmann. Thanks to everyone for the team effort!

This book is dedicated to my dad, Bob Walkden – I've learned more about what it means to be a translator from him than from anyone else, and long before that he was helping me to learn how to be a person. Thanks, Dad!

References

- 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. 103–178.
- 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. 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. 263–269.
- 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 (ed.). 1923–1932. *Deutsche Syntax*. 4 volumes. Heidelberg: Winter.
- 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.
- Bögel, Tina. 2015. *The syntax-prosody interface in Lexical-Functional Grammar*. Universität Konstanz. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Borer, Hagit. 1981. *Parametric variation in clitic constructions*. MIT. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Borer, Hagit (ed.). 1986. *The syntax of pronominal clitics*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Börjars, Kersti. 2003. Morphological status and (de)grammaticalisation: The Swedish possessive. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26. 133–163.
- Bošković, Željko. 2000. Second position cliticization: Syntax and/or phonology? In Frits Beukema & Marcel den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic phenomena in the languages of Europe*, 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. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198844303.001.0001.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1969. *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- 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.
- Clackson, James. 2007. *Indo-European linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collinge, N. E. 1985. *The laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dehé, Nicole. 2014. *Parentheticals in spoken English: The syntax-prosody relation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1878. *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Çatapathabrāhmaṇa* (Syntaktische Forschungen 3). 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 John 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. 1–43.
- Dewey, Tonya Kim. 2006. *The origins and development of Germanic V2*. UC Berkeley. (Doctoral dissertation).
- 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. 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.
- Dover, Kenneth J. 1960. *Greek word order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eichner, Heiner & Helmut Rix (eds.). 1990. *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.

- Fontana, Josep. 1993. *Phrase structure and the syntax of clitics in the history of Spanish*. University of Pennsylvania. (Doctoral dissertation).
- 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.
- 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.
- Frâncu, Constantin. 2009. *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521–1780)*. Iași: Demiurg.
- 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.), *Clitic phenomena in the languages of Europe*, 1–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Franks, Steven. 2008. Clitic placement, prosody, and the Bulgarian verbal complex. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 16. 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.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1990. Hittite enclitic subjects and transitive verbs. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42. 227–242.
- 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. 155–181.
- Givón, Talmy. 1971. Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: An archeologist's field trip. In *Papers from the seventh Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, April 16–18, 1971*, 394–415. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- 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.
- Güneş, Güliz. 2015. *Deriving prosodic structures*. University of Groningen. (Doctoral dissertation).
- 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. 5–47.
- Hale, Mark. 1987a. *Studies in the comparative syntax of the oldest Indo-Iranian languages*. Harvard University. (Doctoral dissertation).
- 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 M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, 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 M. Zwicky (eds.). 1996. *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Harizanov, Boris. 2014. Clitic doubling at the syntax-morphophonology interface. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32. 1033–1088.
- Harris, Alice C. 2002. *Endoclitics 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.

- 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. 91–101.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1996. Who's on first? Towards a prosodic account of P2 clitics. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, 199–270. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hoffner, Harry A. 1973. Studies of the Hittite particles, I. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93. 520–526.
- 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.
- Janse, Mark. 1994. Clitics and word order since Wackernagel: One hundred years of research into clitics and related phenomena. *Orbis* 37. 389–410.
- 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.
- 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 Bat-tye & 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.
- 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. 95–120.

- Klavans, Judith L. 1995. *On clitics and cliticization: The interaction of morphology, phonology, and syntax*. New York, NY: Garland.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1990. Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutiger Sicht. In Heiner Eichner & Helmut Rix (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, 64–81. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Kruschwitz, Peter. 2004. *Römische Inschriften und Wackernagels Gesetz: Untersuchungen zur Syntax epigraphischer Texte aus republikanischer Zeit*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Kuhn, Hans. 1933. Zur Wortstellung und -betonung im Altgermanischen. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 57. 1–109.
- 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* 13. 55–71.
- Langslow, David (ed.). 2009. *Jacob Wackernagel, lectures on syntax, with special reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2002. *Warlpiri: Theoretical implications*. MIT. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2008. Warlpiri and the theory of second position clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26. 3–60.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2015. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. 3rd edn. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Lobel, Edgar & Denys Page (eds.). 1968. *Poetarum lesbiorum fragmenta*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lowe, John. 2014. Accented clitics in the Ṛgveda. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 112. 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.
- 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. 384–400.
- 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. 337–355.
- Momma, Haruko. 1997. *The composition of Old English poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nespor, Marina & Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- 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. 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.
- 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.
- Plank, Frans. 1995. Entgrammatikalisierung – Spiegelbild der Grammatikalisierung? In Norbert Boretzky & Andreas Bittner (eds.), *Natürlichkeitstheorie und Sprachwandel: Beiträge zum Internationalen Symposium über "Natürlichkeitstheorie und Sprachwandel" an der Universität Maribor*

- vom 13.5.–15.5.1993 = *Teorija naravnosti in jezikovno spreminjanje*, 199–219. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1996. Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, 411–428. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 2000. Where do clitics cluster? In Frits Beukema & Marcel den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic phenomena in the languages of Europe*, 249–258. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Radanović-Kocić, Vesna. 1996. Placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics: A prosodic approach. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, 429–445. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Radanović-Kocić, Vesna. 1988. *The grammar of Serbo-Croatian clitics: A synchronic and diachronic perspective*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Ries, John. 1880. *Die Stellung von Subject und Prädicatsverbum im Heliand*. University of Strasbourg. (Doctoral dissertation).
- 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.
- Rivero, María-Luisa. 1986. Parameters in the typology of clitics in Romance and Old Spanish. *Language* 62. 774–807.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- 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.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, 213–233. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Salvesen, Christine Meklenborg & Hans Petter Helland (eds.). 2013. *Challenging clitics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 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. (Doctoral dissertation).

- 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.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, 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.
- Schütze, Carson T. 1994. Serbo-Croatian second position clitic placement and the phonology-syntax interface. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 21. 373–473.
- Schwyzer, Eduard. 1938. Jacob Wackernagel. *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 14. 227–228.
- 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.
- Smith, Peter W. 2013. On the cross-linguistic rarity of endoclitisis. In *Proceedings of Berkeley Linguistics Society* 39, 227–244.
- Spencer, Andrew & Ana R. Luís. 2012. *Clitics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Taylor, Ann. 1990. *Clitics and configurationality in Ancient Greek*. University of Pennsylvania. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1892. Zur Stellung des Verbuns im Altfranzösischen. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 16. 289–307.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeška. 1996. The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14. 811–872.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeška. 2000. On clitic sites. In Frits Beukema & Marcel den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic phenomena in the languages of Europe*, 293–316. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vendryes, Joseph. 1912. La place du verbe en celtique. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 17. 337–351.

- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1. 333–436.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1896. *Lautlehre* (Altindische Grammatik 1). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1905. *Einleitung zur Wortlehre; Nominalkomposition* (Altindische Grammatik 2, part 1). 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. (Doctoral dissertation).
- 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.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2018. *Verb second in medieval Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wundt, Wilhelm. 1874. *Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie*. Leipzig: Engelmann.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1977. *On clitics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1985. Clitics and particles. *Language* 61. 283–305.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. & Geoffrey Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't*. *Language* 59. 502–513.

Part II

Chapter 2

Translation

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.¹ 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’s main piece of evidence for this interpretation came 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-

¹ 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.

Translation

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).

- (1) *mā smaitādr̥g 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.' (*R̥gveda*, 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 *R̥gveda*, 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 *R̥gveda*, 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 bull's drinks' (*R̥gveda*, 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 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 appear 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 ἴκοι
 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; three 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) εἶπερ γὰρ φθάμενός μιν ἢ οὐτάσῃ
 eípēr gàr phthámenós *min* è outásēi
 if EMPH for 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)

Translation

- (5) ἄλλ' ἐῷμέν μιν πρῶτα παρεξελθεῖν πεδίοιο
 all' eōmén *min* prōta 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)

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 / προσεφώνεε
 tōi *min* eeisámenos proséphē/prosephōnee
 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 loudly 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 but 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

* *Translator's note:* The modern Perseus edition has *hós tis* rather than *hóstis*.

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), where 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.

- (9) πολλά τε γάρ μιν καὶ μεγάλα τὰ ἐπαείροντα καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα ἦν
 pollá te gár *min* kai megála tà
 many.N.ACC.PL and for 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 μιν ὁ τε οἶνος ἀνῆκε καὶ ἔμαθε ...
 hós *min* hó te oínos anēke kai
 when 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 μιν οἱ ἱερεὲς αὐτοὶ οἱ τοῦ Νείλου ... θάπτουσι
 allá *min* hoi hirees autoì
 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 μιν Σελινούσιοι ἐπαναστάντες ἀπέκτειναν καταφυγόντα ἐπὶ Διὸς ἀγοραίου βωμόν
 hoi gár *min* Selinoúsioi epanastántes
 the.M.NOM.PL for 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
 ‘since 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, 5.46.2)

Translation

- (13) ὥσπερ γάρ μιν πύργον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώσιν
hōsper gár *min* púrgon en ophthalmoîsin horôsin
thus for 3.ACC tower.ACC.SG in eyes.DAT.PL see.3PL.PRS
'For they see him in their (own) eyes as the tower' (Kallinos, 1.20)

And it can be shown that this pressure towards initial position for *min* is not based on some etymological relationship by looking at the very similar 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 mé *hoi* agássato Phoîbos 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 ἔσσειται ὄσσοι ἐμοί περ

tò dé hoi kléos éssetai hósson
 the.N.NOM.SG but 3.DAT glory.NOM.SG be.3SG.FUT.MID as-much.N.ACC.SG
 emoí per
 me.DAT EMPH

‘and his glory shall be even as mine own’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.232)

- (16) τῷ δέ οἱ ὀγδοάτῳ κακὸν ἦλυθε δῖος Ὀρέστες
 tōi dé hoi ogdoátōi kakòn éluthe
 the.N.DAT.SG but 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 godly Orestes’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 3.307)

- (17) Θαλῆς οἱ ὁ Μιλήσιος διεβίβασε
 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 μίχθη
 é tis hoi xeínōn argúriōn
 or some.M.NOM.SG 3.DAT stranger.GEN.PL money.ACC.SG
 embalōn es tà góunata
 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 (and) has united with her’ (Herodotus 1.199.3)

- (19) τοὺς τέ οἱ λίθους ... οὔτοι ἦσαν οἱ ἐλκύσαντες
 toús té hoi líthous hoútoi 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 ὄστις οἱ ἦν ὁ θέμενος [τοῦνομα] φαίνεται
 oúte hóstis hoi ên ho
 nor who.M.NOM.SG 3.DAT be.3SG.IMP the.M.NOM.SG

- (26) ἃ οἱ θεοὶ οὐρανίωνες πατρὶ φίλω ἔπορον
há hoi theoì ouraniōnes patri
which.N.ACC.PL 3.DAT God.NOM.PL heavenly.M.NOM.PL father.DAT
phílōi 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
theà dé hoi ékluen arès
Goddess.NOM.SG but 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 huìi 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 παιδί ἐμπέσῃ
mé tí hoi kremámenon tōi
lest some.N.NOM.SG 3.DAT hang.PTCP.PRS.PASS.N.NOM.SG the.M.DAT.SG
paidì 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 ἀπειλὰς ἐκτελέσωσι θεοί
mé hoi apeilàs 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)

Translation

- (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) δεύτερά οἱ τὸν παῖδα ἔπεμπε
 deúterá hoi tòn paída épempe
 then 3.DAT the.M.ACC.SG child.ACC.SG send.3SG.IMP
 ‘[Cambyses] next made the child go out (before) him’ (Herodotus 3.14.4)
- (33) τὴν οἱ ὁ πατήρ εἶχε ἀρχήν
 tén hoi ho patèr 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) καί οἱ (καὶ οἷ?) τῷ πατρὶ ἔφη Σάμιον τοῦνομα τεθῆναι, ὅτι οἱ ὁ πατήρ
 Ἀρχίης ἐν Σάμῳ ἀριστεύσας ἐτελεύτησε
 kaí (/kaí) hoi (/hoí) tōi patri 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
 patèr Arkhiês en Sámōi aristeúsas
 father.NOM.SG Archias.NOM in Samos.DAT be-best.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG
 eteleútēse
 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
 if want.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID 3.DAT the.F.ACC.SG daughter.ACC.SG
 ékhein gunaíka
 have.PRS.INF 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 ὄψις οἱ τῶν μάγων ὄνειροπόλοι ἐκήμαινον
 ek gár *hoi* tês ópsios *hoi* tôn
 from for 3.DAT the.F.GEN.SG sight.GEN.SG the.M.NOM.PL the.M.GEN.PL
 mágōn oneiropóloi esémainon
 magus.GEN.PL dream-interpretet.NOM.PL declare.3PL.AOR
 ‘for the interpreters declared that to be the meaning of his dream’
 (Herodotus 1.108.2)

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 ὤμω κυρτῶ
 tò dé *hoi* ómō kurtō
 the.NOM.DU but 3.DAT shoulder.NOM.DU rounded.M.NOM.DU
 ‘and his two shoulders were rounded’ (Homer, *Iliad* 2.217)
- (38) τὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε ... χαμαὶ πέσον
 tò dé *hoi* ósse khamai péson
 the.NOM.DU but 3.DAT eye.NOM.DU down fall.3SG.AOR
 ‘and his two eyeballs fell down’ (Homer, *Iliad* 13.616)
- (39) τὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε δακρυόφιν πλήσθεν
 tò dé *hoi* ósse dakruóphin plésthen
 the.NOM.DU but 3.DAT eye.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 but 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’ ἀειρέσθην
 hai dé *hoi* híppoi hupsós’ aeirésthēn
 the.F.NOM.PL but 3.DAT horse.NOM.PL high leap.3DU.IMP
 ‘and his horses leapt on high’ (Homer, *Iliad* 23.500)

Translation

- (42) τὸ δὲ οἱ οὖνομα εἶναι ... Ἰοῦν
tò dé *hoi* oúnoma eínai Ioûn
the.N.ACC.SG but 3.DAT name.ACC.SG be.PRS.INF Io.ACC
'and her name to be Io' (Herodotus 1.1.3)
- (43) τῶν δὲ οἱ παίδων τὸν πρεσβύτερον εἰπεῖν
tôn dé *hoi* paídōn tòn presbúteron
the.GEN.PL but 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)
- (44) τὸν τέ οἱ παῖδα ἐκ τῶν ἀπολλυμένων σώζειν
tón té *hoi* paída ek tôn
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 γὰρ οἱ ἀστράγαλος ἐξεχώρησε ἐκ τῶν ἄρθρων
ho gár *hoi* astrágalos exekhórēse ek
the.M.NOM.SG for 3.DAT ankle.NOM.SG dislocate.3SG.AOR from
tôn árthrōn
the.N.GEN.PL sockets.GEN.PL
'and then his ankle was dislocated from its sockets' (Herodotus 3.129.2)
- (46) τὰ δὲ οἱ ὄπλα ἔχουσι Ἀθηναῖοι
ta dé *hoi* hopla ekhousi Athēnaioi
the.N.ACC.PL but 3.DAT weapons.ACC.PL have.3PL.PRS Athenian.NOM.PL
'thus the Athenians have his weapons' (Herodotus 5.95.1)
- (47) τὴν δὲ οἱ πέμπτην τῶν νεῶν κατεῖλον διώκοντες οἱ Φοίνικες
tēn dé *hoi* pémp̄tēn tôn neōn
the.F.ACC.SG but 3.DAT fifth.F.ACC.SG the.F.GEN.PL ship.GEN.PL
kateilon diókōntes *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 kateskíaze kai
 the.F.NOM.SG but 3.DAT hair.NOM.SG shoulder.ACC.PL shadow.IMP.3SG and
 metáphrena
 chest.ACC.PL
 ‘and his hair shadowed his shoulders and his chest’ (Archilochus 29.2)

- (49) ἡ δέ οἱ κάθη ... ἐπλήμμυρεν
 hē dé *hoi* sáthē eplémmuren
 the.F.NOM.SG but 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
 tōn *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 κιτοφόρων ἡμιόνων μία ἔτεκε
 tōn *hoi* sitophórōn hēmiónōn mía
 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
 áneú *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)

Translation

- (53) ἀντὶ δὲ οἱ πλοκαμίδος ἐκηβόλε καλὸς ἐπεὶ ὠχαρνήθεν αἰεὶ κισσὸς
ἀεξομένῳ
anti dé *hoi* plokamidos hekēbóle kalòs
instead but 3.DAT braid.GEN.SG archer.VOC.SG beautiful.M.NOM.SG
epeîē hōkharnēthen aei 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
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 δὲ οἱ ἄ ταχυπειθής χειρὸς ἐφαψαμένα
egō dé *hoi* ha takhupeithēs kheiròs
I.NOM but 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 for 3.DAT ground.DAT.SG fixed.N.NOM.SG this.N.NOM.SG spear.NOM.SG
peripetéēs katēgoreî
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 αἷματος ἔσκεν
háte *hoi* haímatos éskēn
who.F.NOM.SG 3.DAT blood.GEN.SG be.3SG.IMP
'who was of his blood' (Moschus, *Europa* 41)
- (57) ἄ δὲ οἱ φίλα δάμαρ τάλαιναν δυστάλαινα καρδίαν παγκλαυτος αἰὲν
ὄλλυτο

* *Translator's note:* 'Archer' is an epithet of Apollo.

ha dé *hoi* philá dámar tálainan
 she.NOM but 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)

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 ἴνδικον
 mé *hoi* éstō índikon
 not 3.DAT be.3SG.IMP.ER unjust.N.NOM.SG
 ‘let it not be unjust to him’ (Inscription 1222.33 Collitz, Tegea)*
- (59) ἀφ’ ᾧ φοι τὰς εὐχῶλας ἐπέτυχε / ἐπέδυκε
 aph’ hô woi tàs eukhōlās epétukhe/epéduke
 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) ἀνοσίγια φοι γένοιτο
 anosíjia woi génoitu
 unholy.N.NOM.PL 3.DAT become.3SG.AOR.OPT.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 *dé* ‘but, and’, just as *de* also most

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

Translation

commonly precedes *min*; after that, in decreasing order of frequency, it is found after *ára* (interrogative), *rha*, *kai* ‘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’, *ópbra* ‘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 is true for *hoi*. Thumb 3: “*ou min*, *mé min* in 15 of 600 examples”, i.e. 2.5%; *ou 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 *aiþú* ‘steep’ in N 317 and *haímati* ‘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 like 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 (ɯ) 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 *perī-*, in which *ī* 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)

In the *R̥gveda*, *-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 *avyuṣṭāḥ** (‘not yet dawned’; *R̥gveda*, 2.28.9a) and then in *ny alipsata* (‘wiped out’; *R̥gveda*, 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, it often lengthens, 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* thērómetha
 with but 3.ACC chase.1PL.PRS
 ‘and at once closed upon our quarry’ (Sophocles, *Antigone* 432)

* *Translator’s note*: The form attested in the text is *avyuṣṭā*, with sandhi.

Translation

- (63) κατ' αὖ νιν φοινία θεῶν τῶν νερτέρων ἀμῆ κοπίς
kat' aũ nin phoinía theõn tõn
against again 3.ACC bloody.F.NOM.SG god.GEN.PL the.M.GEN.PL
nertérõn 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
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) ἀλλά νιν, ὃ φάος διογενές, κατεῖργε
allá nin, ô pháos diogenés, kateĩrge
but 3.ACC O light.VOC.SG Zeus-born.F.VOC.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 but 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 δὲ, νεάνιδές, νιν ἀγκάλαις ἐπι δέξασθε
humeis dé, neánidés, nin ankálais épi
you.NOM.PL then young-woman.VOC.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 οὐνεκα κτανεῖν Ζῆν' ἐξεκαυχῶντ(ο)
hõn nin hoúneka ktaneîn Zên' exekaukhõnt(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)

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

- (68) ἐγὼ δὲ νιν ὡς ἐνόησα
 egò dé *nin* hōs enōēsa
 I.NOM but 3.ACC as understand.1SG.AOR
 ‘and when I felt him’ (Theocritus 2.103)
- (69) τὰ δὲ νιν καλὰ κύματα φαίνει
 tà dé *nin* kalà kúmata phaínei
 the.N.ACC.PL but you good.N.ACC.PL wave.ACC.PL show.3SG.PRES
 ‘[She] shows the good waves to you’ (Theocritus 6.11)

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 tóz’ Ἰδαμενεὺς ποίησα ἵνα κλέος εἴη· Ζεὺς δὲ νιν ὄστις πημαίνοι,
 λειώλη θείη
 sâma tóz’ Idameneùs poíēsa 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 but 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 there be fame (to me), 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 *-kṃm 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 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).

- (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, *he* (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 dé ptólemos tétató *sphin*
 against but war.NOM.SG strain.3SG.PLPF.PASS them.DAT
 ‘and against them was strained a conflict’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.736)

* *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.

- (74) τὸν δὲ σφιν ἄνακτ' ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης ἔκτανε
 tòn dé sphin ának't' agathòs Diomédēs
 the.M.ACC.SG but 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).

- (75) μάλα γάρ σφεας ὄκ' ἐλέλιξεν
 mála gár spheas ôk' elélixen
 very for 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 phōnēsás 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 *étoi* '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.

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

Translation

- (78) ἐπει οὐ τοι ἐεδνωταὶ κακοὶ εἶμεν
 epei ou̅̅̅ toi eednōtai kakoí eimen
 because not you.DAT father-of-bridе.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
 atàr ou̅̅̅ toi pántes epainéomen theoì 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)

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 egó se báloimi
 if and I.NOM you.ACC throw.1SG.AOR.OPT
 ‘if so be I should smite thee’ (Homer, *Iliad* 16.623)

- (81) ἦ 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 taũta 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 *hēspeté nún 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’ ἐπικρήηνον ἐέλδωρ
 êd’ éti kai nûn moi tód’ epikréēnon
 and yet even now me.DAT this.N.ACC.SG accomplish.2SG.AOR.IMPER
 eéldōr
 desire.ACC.SG
 ‘even so now also fulfil you for me this my desire’ (Homer, *Iliad* 16.238)
- (85) ἀλλὰ σύ πέρ μοι ἀναξ τόδε καρτερόν ἔλκος ἄκεσσαι
 allà sú pér moi ánaξ 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 δειλῆ πλεῖστον κεχαρισμένε θυμῶ
 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.IMPER
 ‘but, he said, come (and) tell me this’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 1.169)

Translation

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).

- (89) καί τυ 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 τυ τίς
ekálese gár *tú* tis
invite.3SG.AOR for you.ACC someone.M.NOM.SG
'Did someone invite you?' (Epicharmus in Athenaeus 4.16)
- (91) τί τυ ἐγῶν 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 τυ ναί τὸν φίλιον ἄπερ ματέρα
epóthoun *tu* naí τὸν 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 *zateús(a)* but intervenes between the distant *ha* and *kōra*.^{*} (The only example in Callimachus, (96), is an exception to the rule.)

^{*} *Translator's note:* The modern Perseus edition has *te* instead of *tu*.

- (93) ποῖ *tu* λαβὼν ἄξω καὶ ποῖ *tu* 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)
- (94) μή *tú* τις ἠρώτη
 mē *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 κράνας, πάντ’ ἄλσεια ποσσὶ φορεῖται ... ζατεῦσ(α)
 ha dé *tu* kōra pásas anà kránas, pánt’ álseia possì phoreítai ... zateûs(a)
 the.F.NOM.SG but 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 *éan 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 poiésō
 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)

Translation

- (98) οὐχ ὀδεῖν τυ ἐπίκαζε
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)

The Aeolic 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 for 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, Fragment 2.7, Lobel & Page 1968: 31.7)[†]
- (100) ὄτα 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, Fragment 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, Fragment 100 [Choricus 5.1.19]; Graux 1886: 97)

* *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' eikei*.

2 The position of enclitic pronouns in Archaic Greek

In the first case, (99), the reading *hōs se gār 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 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) ὄτά σφι πάννυχος κατάγρεις
 óta *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 ἐκ σ’ ἔλετο φρένας
 pámpfan dè tufhōs ék s’ héleto phrénas
 altogether but fever.NOM.SG out you.ACC take.3SG.AOR.MID mind.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).

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

[†] *Translator’s note*: Lobel & Page (1968: 336.1) have *d’ etúphōs* rather than *dè tufhōs*.

Translation

- (105) ἄ δέ μ' ἰδρῶς ... κακχέεται
a dé m' idrōs kakkhéetai
the.F.NOM.SG but 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) Αἰθιοπία με κόρα Λατοῦς ἀνέθηκεν Ἄριστα
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 κᾶχαρις
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' é mán*.

- (110) ὥς σε γάρ
 hōs se gār
 as you.ACC for
 (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 Ψάπφ' ἀδικήει
 tís s', ô Psápph' adikéēi
 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 δῆ, χέλυ διά, μοι φωνάεσσα γένοιο
 áge dē, khélu díá, moi
 lead.2SG.PRS.IMPER exactly lyre.VOC.SG divine.F.VOC.SG me.DAT
 phōnáessa génoiō
 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)

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 τὰθηναίᾳ ὁ Σμικύθου υἱός
 Onēsimos 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) 4².373.90)

Also CIA 4².373.87 *-itos m' anéthēken*, CIA 4².373.120 [*ho deína*] *m' anéthēken dekáthēn* (sic!) *Athēnaíai*, *Inscriptiones graecae antiquissimae* (IGA; Röhl 1882) 1 (Attic or Euboean) *Sēmōnides m' anéthēken*. Cf. CIA 4².373.100 [*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, 4².373.81 etc.): CIA 1.349 *-thánēs m' anéthēken Athēnaía* [*i polioúkhps*], 1.352 *Iphidíkē m' anéthēken*, 4².373.85 *Alkímakhós m' a[néthēke]*, 4².373.99 *Tímarkhós m' anéthēke Diòs krateróphroni kourēi*, 4².373.215 (cf. Studniczka 1887: 145) *Nēsidadēs kerameús me kai Andokídēs anéthēken*, 4².373.216 *Palládi m' egremákhāi Dionúsio[s tó]d' ágalma stēse Koloíou país* [*euxá*] *menos dekátēn*, 4².373.218 *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 toí Ptōieii ho Praólleios*. – From Corinth (in the following I will no longer distinguish between poetic and prose inscriptions): IGA 20.7 *Simíōn m' anéthēke Poteidáwōn* [*i wánakti*], 20.8 *-ōn m' anéthēke Poteidāni wán* [*akti*], 20.9(=10=11) *Phlēbōn m' anéthēke Poteidá* [*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.

... 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 Nákios 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 the one 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 huiòs 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*. – Achaean (Magna Grecia): IGA 543 *Kunískos me anéthēken hōrtamos wérgōn dekátan*. – Syracuse: Kaibel & Lebègue (1890) 5 *Alkiádēs m' [anéthēken]*. – Naukratis: Gardner (1886: 60–63) no. 5 *Parménōnm* (sic!) *me anéthēke tōppóllōni* (sic!), 24 -s *me a[néthēke]*, 80 -s m' *anéthēken tōpollōn[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 Mi]lēsíōi ho Glaukōu*, 220 *Kharidíōn me anéthē[ke]*, 223 [*Polú*] *kestós m' anéthēke t[ōpóllōni]*, 235 *Sléuēs m' anéthēke tōpóllōni*, 237 [*Kh*] *ar(ó)phēs me anéthēke tapó[l-lōni tōi M]ilasíōi*, 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 *Kaïkos 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 *Roïkos m' anéthēke t[ēi Aphr]odítēi*, 780 *Philís m' anéthēke t[ēi Aphr]odítēi*, 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 Kh[rus]ódōrós me anéth[ēkan]*, 819 [L] *ákri[tó]s m' ané[thē]ke*

Translation

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 p62) 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*] *themis*[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]ís 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*] *signētoi* (verse!), Hoffmann (1891: 46) no. 67 *Gil(l)íka 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 didōsi.*)

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 στάσαντο
 Bákkhōi *m[e]* Bákkhon kai prosumnaíai
 Bacchus.DAT me.ACC Bacchus.ACC and Prosymnian.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) Δαδοῦχος με Κόρης, Βασιλᾶν, Διός, ἱερὰ κλειθρὰ φέρων
 βωμὸν ἔθηκε Ἴη
 Daidoukhos *me* Kórēs, Basilân, Diós, hierà
 torch-bearer me.ACC Kore.GEN queen.ACC Zeus.GEN sacred.N.ACC.PL
 sēkôn Hēras kleithra phérōn
 precinct.GEN.PL Hera.GEN key.ACC.PL bear.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG
 bōmòn éthēke Rhēi
 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 Epidaurus
 ‘Epidaurus dedicated me’ (Kaibel (1878: XIX), 877b)
- (122) Ἀσκληπιοῦ με δμῶα πυρφόρο[ν θεοῦ/ξένε] Πείσωνα λεύσσει
 Asklepíoiū *me* dmôa purphóro[n theōi
 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’ epoiēse, m’ epoiēi* ‘me.ACC create’: (123).

Translation

- (123) [E]ὕθυκλῆς μ' ἐποίησεν
 [E]uthuklēs m' epoīesen
 Euthycles.NOM me.ACC create.3SG.AOR
 'Euthycles created me' (CIA 4² 373.206)

Also IGA 492 (Attic inscription from Sigeum) *kai m' epo(iē)sen Haísōpos kai hadelphoí*, CIA 1.466 *Aristiōn m' epoēsen*, 1.469 (cf. Loewy 1885: 15) *Aristiōn Pári[ós m' ep]ó[ēs]e* (the emendation is certain!), IGA 378 (Thasos) *Parménōn me e[poiēse]*, IGA 485 (Miletus) *Eúdēmós me epoiein*, IGA 557 (Elis?) *Koíos 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) *Amasis m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 48) *Khólkhos m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 66) *-s m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 71) *Nikosthēnes m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 75) *Anaklēs me epoīēsen* and *Nikosthēnes me epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 76) *Arkheklēs m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 77) *Glaukītēs m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 84 b) *Tlēnpólemós m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 85) *Gageos m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 90) *Panphaiós m' epoīēsen*, Klein (1887: 213) *Lusías m' epoīēsen hēmikhōnēi*, as well as the metrical inscription IGA 536 [*Glaukía*]i me *Kálōn ge[neāi w]alei[o]s epoiei*. On the other hand, Loewy (1885: 281) no. 411 [*Arté*]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 72).

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

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

- (125) Νέαρχός μ' ἔγραψεν καὶ <ἐποίησεν>
 Néarkhós m' égrapsen kai epoīēsen
 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.

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] *καροίēs' 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 complete.3SG.AOR
 ‘Onatas, the son of Mikon, completed 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 dedicate.3SG.AOR the.M.NOM.SG
 Póntios ex Epidámnou
 of.Pontus.M.NOM.SG from Epidamnus.GEN
 ‘Kleosthenes, the Pontic man from Epidamnus, dedicated 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 me, a statue, for Zeus’ (Pausanias 6.19.6, ancient Attic)

F. Dümmler (p.c.) emends (129) to read *me Kleitoríois* ‘me.ACC Cleitorian.DAT.PL’ in place of *metreít'*.*

- (129) καὶ μετρεῖτ' Ἀρίστων ἠδὲ Τελέστας αὐτοκασίγνητοι καλὰ Λάκωνες
 *ἔσαν
 kaì metreít' 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.’

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
Amphitrúōn m' anéthēken *eōn apò
Amphitryon.NOM me.ACC devote.3SG.AOR be.PTCP.M.NOM.SG from
Tēleboáōn
Teleboan.GEN.PL
'Amphitryon, being from Teleboae, dedicated me' (Herodotus, 5.59.1)*
- (131) Σκαῖος πυγμαχέων με ἐκηβόλω Ἀπόλλωνι νικήσας ἀνέθηκε
Skaíos pugmakhéōn me hekēbólōi Apóllōni
Scaeus.NOM boxer.NOM.SG me.ACC archer.DAT.SG Apollo.DAT
nikésas 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
παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην
hóstis emòn parà sēma phéreis
whoever.M.NOM.SG my.N.ACC.SG by tomb.ACC.SG bring.2SG.PRS
póda, Kallimákhου me ísthi
foot.ACC.SG Callimachus.GEN me.ACC know.2SG.PF.IMP
Kurēnaíου paída te kai genētēn
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' ὄνα 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 *Amphitrúōn m' anethēk' enārōn apò tēleboáōn* 'Amphitryon dedicated me from the spoils of Teleboae.'

suoktóne, 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 ἀγκειῖσθαι νίκης
 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 μύξαισι πλούσιον ἢ 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 δήμου δίδωσι, τοῦτο δις λαβῶν ἀριστεῖον
 Thalês me tōi medeûnti Néileō
 Thales.NOM me.ACC the.M.DAT.SG protect.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG Neleus.GEN
 démou didōsi, toûto dis labōn
 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))

Translation

- (137) καί μ' ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ θῆκεν πόδας ὠκύς Ἀχιλλεύς
kaí *m'* epì Patròklōi 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 ἱερόν 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 Arcestratus' (Palatine
Anthology 6.178.1)

(139)–(141) are deviations, but not significant ones.

- (139) Βιθυνὶς Κυθήρη με τεῆς ἀνεθήκατο, Κύπρι, μορφῆς εἶδωλον λύγδινον
εὐξαμένη
Bithunís Kuthéré *me* teês
Bithynian.F.NOM.SG Cytherea.NOM me.ACC your.F.GEN.SG
anethékato, Kúpri, morphês eídolon
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* tamòn glukeròn
hive.GEN.SG out me.ACC cut.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG sweet.N.ACC.SG
théros antì nomaiōn gēraiòs Kleitōn
harvest.ACC against customary.N.GEN.PL aged.M.NOM.SG Cleiton.NOM
speise 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 πανείκελον, Ἴνδικὸν ἔργον, ὄλπην ... πέμπεν
 γηθομένην σὺν φρενὶ Κριναγόρης
 khálkeon arguréōi me paneíkelon,
 brazen.N.ACC.SG silver.N.DAT.SG me.ACC just-like.N.ACC.SG
 Índikòn, 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
 prîn mèn Kallitélēs (m’) hidrúsato
 before then Kallitelis.NOM (me.ACC) place.3SG.AOR.MID
 ‘Before Kalliteles placed (me)’ (Palatine Anthology 6.138.1)

- (143) παιδὶ φιλοστεφάνῳ Σεμέλας (μ’) ἀνέθηκε
 paîdi 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.

Translation

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).

- (144) Κοσμία ἡμί, ἄγε δέ με Κλιτομία
Kosmía ēmí, âge dé *me* Klitomías
Kosmia.VOC say.1SG.PRS bring.2SG.PRS.IMPER but me.ACC Klitomia.GEN
'And I say, "Kosmia, bring me Klitomia".' (IGA 473, Rhodes)

- (145) ὃς δ' ἄν με κλέψει
hòs 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 & Lebègue (1890) 865)

Secondly (to anticipate a later section) from the analogous Latin inscriptions: *Manios med fefaker* '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) Ἀπολλόδωρος 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(φ)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) *Sakōnidēs égrapsen éme*.

- (149) Ἐξεκίας ἔγραψε κάποιε' ἐμέ
 Exekias égrapse kapóēse emé
 Execius.NOM write.AOR.3SG and=create.3SG.AOR me.ACC
 'Execius wrote and created me' (Klein 1887: 39; verse?)
- (150) Ἐξεκίας ἔγραψε κά(ι)ποιίε' 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) Χαρिताῖος ἐποίησεν ἔμ' εὖ
 Kharitaios 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.)

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, *sphēōn* (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.

Translation

- (152) ἔγνων δὲ ταῦτα μοι ποιητέα ἔόντα
égnōn dè taútá *moi* poiētéa
know.1SG.AOR but this.N.ACC.PL me.DAT do.GDV.N.ACC.PL
éonta
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* atrekéōs 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 the 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).

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (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)
- (156) καὶ 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) καὶ μοι ἀπάντων τούτων τοὺς μάρτυρας κάλει
 kaí *moi* hapántōn tóutōn toús 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) καὶ 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) καὶ μοι λαβὲ καὶ ἀνάγνωθι αὐτῶν τὰ ὀνόματα
 kaí *moi* labè kai anágnōthi autōn
 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) καὶ 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)

Translation

- (161) καί μοι τὰς μαρτυρίας ἀνάγνωθι ταύτας
kaí *moi* τὰς marturías anágnōthi
and me.DAT the.F.ACC.PL testimony.ACC.PL read.2SG.AOR.IMPER
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* τούτων 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
tòn 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 *τούτων 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 tούτων anábēte mártures* (165); *kaí moi
anábēte deúro* (166); *kaí moi anábēthi* (167) and also Isocrates 17.32).
- (164) καί μοι ἀνάβητε τούτων μάρτυρες
kaí *moi* anábēte tούτων 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* τούτων 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)

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

(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)

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

kaí moi deũr' ite mártures: (168).

(168) καί μοι δεῦρ' ἴτε μάρτυρες
kaí *moi* deũr' 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) καί μοι λαβέ τὸν νόμον
kaí *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 λαβέ τὸν νόμον τοῦτον
kaí *moi* pálin labè tòn nómon
and me.DAT again take.2SG.AOR.IMPER the.M.ACC.SG law.ACC.SG
toũton
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)

Translation

[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)

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

- (173) *καί μοι ἀναγίγνωσκε λαβῶν ταύτην τὴν μαρτυρίαν*
kaí moi anagígnōske labòn 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 γινόμενον*
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*.*

* *Translator's note*: The Perseus edition lacks *kaí*.

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

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

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’ οὔτ’ ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει*
kaí m’ oút’ iámbōn oúte terpoléōn 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 ἴλαος γενεῦ*
kaí moi súmmakhos gounouménō hílaos
 and me.DAT ally.NOM.SG beg.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.DAT.SG gracious.M.NOM.SG
geneû
 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 κείται, πρεσβυτάτην ἑσορῶν*
γαῖαν Ἰαονίας κλινομένην
gignóskō, kaí moi phrenòs éndothen álgea
 perceive.1SG.PRS and me.DAT midriff.GEN.SG within pain.NOM.PL

* *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.

Translation

keîtai, presbutátēn esorôn gaîan
 lie.3SG.PRS.PASS oldest.F.ACC.SG behold.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG land.ACC.SG
 Iaonías 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’ ἀνιηρότατον
 kaí moi toút’ aniērótaton
 and me.DAT this.N.NOM.SG troublesome.SUPL.N.NOM.SG
 ‘... and this (is) most troublesome to me.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 257)
- (182) καί μοι κραδίην ἐπάταξε μέλαιναν
 kaí moi kradiēn 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) καί μοι τὸν ἐμὸν πέμψατ’ ἀδελφόν
 kaí moi tòn emòn pémpsat’
 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) καί μοι τρίτον ρίπτοντι Δωτιεὺς ἀνὴρ ἀγχοῦ προκῆψεν Ἐλατος ἐν
 diskímatti
 kaí moi tríton rhíptonti Dōtieùs anèr
 and me.DAT third throw.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG Dotian.NOM.SG man.NOM.SG
 ankhoû prosèpsen 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) καί μοι μέχρι Μακεδονίης ἐλάσαντι [...] οὐδεὶς ἦντιώθη
 kaí moi mékhri Makedoniēs elásanti
 and me.DAT until Macedonia.GEN drive.PTCP.AOR.M.DAT.SG
 oudeis èntiíthē
 nobody.M.NOM.SG oppose.3SG.AOR.PASS
 ‘And no one opposed me marching as far as Macedonia.’ (Herodotus 7.9A.2)

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (186) καί μοι 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)
- (187) καί μοι τὸ μὲν σὸν ἐκποδῶν ἔστω λόγου
 kaí *moi* tò mèn sòn ekpodòn
 and me.DAT the.N.ACC.SG then yours.N.ACC.SG away
 éstō lógu
 be.3SG.PRS.IMPER account.GEN.SG
 ‘And as for me, let your (fate) be unspoken.’ (Euripides, *Medea* 1222)
- (188) καί μοι εὐεργεσία ὀφείλεται
 kaí *moi* euergesía ophéiletai
 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 φράσον
 kaí *moi* phráson
 and me.DAT tell.2SG.AOR.IMPER
 ‘And tell me ...’ (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 755)
- (190) καί μοι δοκεῖ κατὰ σχολὴν παρὰ τάνδρῶς ἐξελθεῖν μόνῃ
 kaí *moi* dokeî katà skholèn parà tandròs
 and me.DAT seem.3SG.PRS down ease.ACC.SG from the=man.GEN.SG
 exeltheîn mónē
 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)

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

Translation

- (192) καί μοι ἀπόκριναι
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 τᾶληθῆ
kaí *moi* mē ákhthesthe légon̄ti
and me.DAT not grieve.2PL.PRS.IMPER.PASS say.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG
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* dokeí 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* dokeí 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 φράσειν
kaí *moi* phrásein 'And to tell me ...'
and me.DAT tell.FUT.INF
(Plato, *Phaedo* 97d)
- (197) καί μοι ἔδοξεν ὁμοιότατον πεπονθέναι
kaí *moi* édoxen homoiótaton peponthé̄nai
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 ὡμολόγει
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)
- (200) καί μοι φαίνη ὀκνεῖν
 kaí *moi* phaínēi 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 ἐπίδειξεν αὐτοῦ τούτου ποίησαι
 kaí *moi* epídeixein autoû tóutou
 and me.DAT display.FUT.INF same.N.GEN.SG this.N.GEN.SG
 poíēsai
 make.2SG.AOR.IMPER
 ‘And make sure to display to me this very thing.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 449c)*
- (202) καί μοι ἐστὶν τῶν ἐτέρων παιδικῶν πολὺ ἥττον ἔμπληκτος
 kaí *moi* estin tôn hetérōn paidikōn polù
 and me.DAT be.3SG.PRS the.GEN.PL other.GEN.PL darling.GEN.PL much
 hētton émplēktos
 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)

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

Translation

- (204) καί μοι λέγε
kaí *moi* lége
and me.DAT say.2SG.PRS.IMPER
'And tell me ...' (Plato, *Gorgias* 492d = 494b)
- (205) καί μοι ὡσπερ παιδὶ χρῆ
kaí *moi* hósp^{er} paidì khrêi
and me.DAT like child.DAT.SG use.2SG.PRS.PASS
'And you are treating me like a child.' (Plato, *Gorgias* 499b)
- (206) καί μοι πάνυ σφόδρα ἐνετέλλετο
kaí *moi* pánu sphódra enetéll^{eto}
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 anḗr oudamôs eînai
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 ἢ τε φωνῆ προσφιλεῖς ὑμῶν
kaí *moi* nûn hê te phōnè prosp^{hilè}s
and me.DAT now the.F.NOM.SG and sound.NOM.SG dear.F.NOM.SG
humōn
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 ἄρμοστόν, Σόλων*
kaí moi légein toút' éstin harmostón, Sólon
 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 ἄρσενα*
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 πρέπειν μοι δοκεῖ*
kaí prépein moi dokeí
 and befit.PRS.INF me.DAT seem.PRS.INF
 'And it seems suitable to me.' (Plato, *Gorgias* 485c)
- (214) *καὶ οὐδέν μοι δεῖ ἄλλης βασιάνου*
kaí oudén moi deí állēs
 and nothing.ACC.SG me.DAT lack.3SG.PRS other.F.GEN.SG
basánou
 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) *καὶ μοι, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, μὴ θορυβήσητε*
kaí moi, ô ándres Athēnaíoi, mē 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)

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

Translation

- (217) καί 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)
- (218) καί μοι μὴ θορυβήσῃ μηδεῖς
kaí *moi* mē thorubēsēi 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 kai 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 not 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).

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

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (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 σπλάγχχν' 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)
- (224) καί μου ταύτη σοφώτεροι ἦσαν
 kaí mou taútēi sophóteroi êsan
 and me.GEN thus wiser.NOM.PL be.3PL.IMP
 'And thus they were wiser than I.' (Plato, *Apology* 22d)
- (225) καί μου ὄπισθεν ὁ παῖς λαβόμενος τοῦ ἱματίου
 kaí mou ópisthen 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 (εἰ)σαριθμοῖς 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)

Translation

- (228) καί με χθῶν ἦδε καλύπτει
kaí me khthōn hēde kalúptei
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
kadókoun hékastos autōn ólbon heurésein
and=think.3PL.IMP each.M.NOM.SG them.GEN wealth.ACC find.FUT.INF
polūn kaí me kōtíllonta leíōs
much.M.ACC.SG and me.ACC coax.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG smoothly
trakhūn 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 γείτονας ποιήσεις
kaí m’ epibōton katà géitonas poíēseis
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 rapízesthai
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 biátai oînos
and me.ACC constrain.3SG.PRS.PASS wine.NOM.SG
‘And wine has got the better of me.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 503)

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (233) *καί μ' ἐφίλειν προφρόνως πάντες ἐπερχόμενον*
kaí m' ephíleun prophrónōs pántes
 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 ζυμμετρούμενον χρόνῳ λυπεῖ τί πράσσει*
kaí m' êmar édē xummetroúmenon khrónōi
 and me.ACC day.ACC.SG already reckon.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.SG time.DAT.SG
lypeî 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
mè 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' ἀπόλεσε*
téthnēka têi sêi 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)

Translation

- (238) καί μ' ἀπάλλαξον πόνων
καί *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' ἦξειν καί μ' ἀπαλλάξειν κακῶν
pósin 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)
- (240) καί μ' ἔλων θέλει δοῦναι τυράννοισ
καί *m'* helōn 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
καί *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 σὸς δόμος
καί *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
καί *m'* asphalōs panēmeron paísai te kai 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 καί ... *me*)
- (244) καί με τοῦτ' ἔτερπεν
καί *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 μηδεῖς ἀπαρτᾶν νομίσει τὸν λόγον τῆς γραφῆς
 kaí me mēdeis apartân nomísēi
 and me.ACC nobody.M.NOM.SG detach.PRS.INF consider.3SG.AOR.SBJV
 τὸν λόγον τῆς 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 indictment.' (Demosthenes 18.59)*
- Second person pronouns: (247)–(262).
- (247) καί σε [...] νέοι ἄνδρες [...] ᾄσονται
 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 phil'
 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 προκτίθημι ἐόντι κακῶ 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 kai athúmōi
 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)

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

Translation

- (251) καί σ' ἐβουλόμην 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 ἀποστελῶ
kaí s' ou kenaîsi khersì gês
and you.ACC not empty.F.DAT.PL hand.DAT.PL land.GEN.SG
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 prospoióumetha
and you.ACC claim.1PL.PRS.PASS
'...and we claim from you...'
(Euripides, *Helen* 1387)*
- (254) καί σ' ἀναγκαῖον θανεῖν
kaí s' anankaîon thaneîn
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 σύγκωμον
horô 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)†

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has the tonic form 'sè', which Wackernagel also cites as a variant reading. † *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *phanô* se.

- (258) καί σε θυσίασιν ἱεραῖσι [...] ἀγαλοῦμεν
 kaí se thusíaisin hieráisi agaloúmen
 and you.ACC sacrifice.DAT.PL holy.F.DAT.PL glorify.1PL.FUT
 ‘And we will glorify you with holy sacrifices.’ (Aristophanes, *Peace* 396)
- (259) καί σοι* τὰ μεγάλ’ ἡμεῖς Παναθήναι’ ἄξομεν
 kaí soi tà 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 τυπήσει τις
 kaí se ísōs tuptései tis
 and you.ACC perhaps hit.3SG.FUT someone.M.NOM.SG
 ‘...and perhaps someone will hit you.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 527a)
- (262) καί σοι ἐπιρρέξει Γόργος χιμάροιο νομαίης αἶμα
 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 sφeas óllu’ hósper ollúeis
 and them.ACC destroy.2SG.PRS.IMP like destroy.2SG.PRS
 ‘... and destroy them as you destroy.’ (Archilochus, Fragment 27.2)

* *Translator’s note:* Wackernagel cites ‘kaí soi’ as a variant reading. † *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has infinitive *katagelân*.

Translation

(264) καί σφιν θαλάσσης ἤχέεντα κύματα φίλτερ' ἠπειροῦ γένηται
 kaí *sphin* thalássēs ēkhéenta kúmata phílter'
 and them.DAT sea.GEN.SG roaring.N.ACC.PL billow.ACC.PL dearer.N.ACC.PL
 ēpeírou génetai
 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' anthrópous 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* toúto génoito phílon
 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 σφεῶν ἐσχίσθησαν αἱ γνώμαι
 kaí *sphēōn* 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)

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (271) καί νιν δοκῶ
 kaí *nin* dokō
 and him.ACC think.1SG.PRS
 ‘And I think that he ...’ (Euripides, *Orestes* 1200)
- (272) καί σφας σιδηραῖς 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 tēσde 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 ἀνιηρόν μὲν ἐρεῖς ἔπος, ἔμπα δὲ λέξεις
 kaí *sphin* aniērōn mēn ereîs épos, émpa
 and them.DAT troublesome.N.ACC then say.2SG.FUT word.ACC.SG all
 dē léxeis
 but 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 sphas* 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 apekhthēsomaí 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 σφεας ὡς οὐδεὶς ἐκάλεε, ἐκτρέπονται ἐπ’ Ἀθηνέων
 kaí *sphas* hōs oudeîs ekálee, ektráponται 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 *akhthesthēsomaí* for *apekhthēsomaí*. ‡ Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *ektrépontai* for *ektrápontai*.

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 μικρός 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, ὄταῖρε δάμναται πόθος*
allá *m’* ho lusimelés, ôtaîre
but me.ACC the.M.NOM.SG limb-relaxing.M.NOM.SG O=companion.VOC.SG
dámnnatai 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* kólúei
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 zēn apò tōn 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)

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’ [...]
 Moúsá *moi* Eurumedontiádea enneph’
 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 ἐύρροον ἄρχομ’ αἰίδεν
 Moísá *moi* amphì Skámandron eúrroon árkhom’ aíiden
 muse.VOC.SG me.DAT about Scamander.ACC well-flowing.M.ACC.SG
 árkhom’ aéiden
 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’* atimasḗis
 not sister.VOC me.ACC dishonour.2SG.AOR.SBJV
 ‘No, sister, do not deem me unworthy.’ (Sophocles, *Antigone* 544)
- (286) ὁδ’ ὃ ξένοι με, σοὺς ἀτιμάζων θεοῦς, ἔλκει
 hod’ ὃ xénoi *me*, soús
 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)

Translation

- (287) ὁ Διός, ὁ Διός, ὃ πόσι με παῖς Ἑρμᾶς ἐπέλασεν Νεῖλω
 ho Diós, ho Diós, ô pósi
 the.M.NOM.SG Zeus.GEN the.M.NOM.SG Zeus.GEN O husband.VOC.SG
 me paîs Hermâs epélasen Néilōi
 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 μητέρα 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
 γόου κόρον 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) εἰ ἄγε Θεστυλί μοι χαλεπᾶς νόσῳ εὐρέ τι μᾶχος
 eî áge Thestylí 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 enclitic to a preceding [*p358*] imperative element, as in Homeric *all’ áge moi*: (292)–(296).

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

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

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (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)
- (293) παῦσαι με μὴ κάκιζε
 paûsaí *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, καφέτερον ἀποδείξω
 phére dé *soi*, eàn dúnōmai, saphésteron
 bear.2SG.PRS.IMPER but 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 táde
 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 *boúlei* ‘wish.2SG.PRS’ when a first person singular subjunctive follows: (297)–(300). Broadly similar are (301) and (302).

- (297) βούλει σε γεύσω
 boúlei *se* geúsō
 wish.2SG.PRS you.ACC taste.1SG.AOR.SBJV
 ‘Do you want me to give you a taste?’ (Euripides, *Cyclops* 149)†

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

Translation

- (298) βούλει σοι ὁμολογήσω
 boulei soi homologēsō
 wish.2SG.PRS you.DAT agree.1SG.AOR.SBJV
 ‘Do you want me to agree with you?’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 516c)
- (299) βούλει σοι εἶπω
 boulei soi eípō
 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, καταπεπλευκότητι
 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 apokrineítai
 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 p95 on *kai me* and *kai spheas*. With participles: (307)–(312).
- (303) λῶστά σε μήτε λίην ἀφνεὸν κτεάτεσσι γενέσθαι μήτε σέ γ’ ἐς πολλήν
 χρημοσύνην ἐλάσσει
 lôistá se méte líēn aphneòn kteátessi
 best you.ACC nor very rich.M.ACC.SG possession.DAT.PL
 genésthai méte sé g’es pollēn
 become.AOR.INF.MID nor you.ACC then=into much.F.ACC.SG

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

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)*

- (304) οὐδέ μ’ εἰ θανεῖν χρεῶν
 oudé m’ ei thaneîn khreón
 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’ ὧ τάλας οὐδέποθ’ ἵκει
 hós moi dōdekataîos aph’ hô
 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 Zeùs ên ho
 not for 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’ εἶσιν ἄξιων
 tíς 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)

* *Translator’s note:* The Teubner edition (Hiller 1890) has *hōste*. † *Translator’s note:* The Persus edition has *s’*.

Translation

- (309) πονηρός τίς μ' ἔσται ὁ εἰσάγων
 ponēros tís m' éstai ho
 evil.M.NOM.SG some.M.NOM.SG me.ACC be.3SG.FUT.MID the.M.NOM.SG
 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 parakaloúnta 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 cù 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 *ean 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 *ōn* 'then' to occur immediately after the first word in the clause.

- (313) οὐ μ' ἔτι, παρθενικαὶ μελιγάρυες ἡμερόφωνοι, γυῖα φέρειν δύναται
 ou 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)

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (314) οὐ μοι ἔτ' εὐκελάδων ὕμνων μέλει
 οὐ *moi* ἔτ' 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)
- (315) εἰ σε μὴν δειναῖσιν ὄντα συμφοραῖς ἐπαρκέσω
 εἰ *se* mēn deinaîsin ónta sumphoraîs
 if you.ACC not=in terrible.F.DAT.PL be.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG mishap.DAT.PL
 eparkésō
 help.1SG.AOR.SBJV
 'If I do not help you in these terrible straits ...' (Euripides, *Orestes* 803)*
- (316) ἐάν μοι μὴ δοκῆ
 εἶν *moi* mē dokēi
 if me.DAT not seem.3SG.PRS.SBJV
 'If he does not seem to me ...' (Plato, *Apology* 29e)
- (317) ἐάν μοι μὴ εἴπῃς
 εἶν *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) θωῦμά μοι ὦν καὶ τοῦτο γέγονεν
 thōúmá *moi* ōn kai tòuto 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).)

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *mē 'n*. † *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *thōma ... gégone*.

Translation

- (320) ἀρχὴ δέ μοι τοῦ λόγου
arkhḗ dé moi toû lógu
beginning.NOM.SG but me.DAT the.M.GEN.SG account.GEN.SG
'And (this is) the beginning of my speech.' (Harpocration s.v. *Íōn*)*
- (321) τίνοσ μ' ἔκατι γῆσ ἀποστέλλεις
tínos m' hékati gḗs apostéllεις
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) ἡ 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
apólluyen
destroy.3SG.IMP
'... how many of my relatives he was ruining.' (Andocides 1.47)
- (325) Ζηνός τοι θυγάτηρ ὑπὸ τῆν μίαν ἵκετο χλαῖαν
Zēnós toi thugatēr hupò tḗn 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)

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *hêde*; Wackernagel also cites *hêdé* as a variant reading (Lobeck 1829: 385).

- (326) οὐδεὶς ἔμ' ἐχθρῶν προσβλέπων ἀνέξεται
 oudeis ém' ekhthrôn 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.

- (327) δεσπότης σε Καμβύσης, Ψαμμήνιτε, εἰρωτᾷ
 despótēs se Kambúsēs, Psamménite, eirōtái
 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 περιήκοντα ἀνθρώπων κακῶν ὁμίλιαι σφάλλουσιν
 tá se kai amphótera periékonta anthrōpōn
 the.N.ACC.PL you.ACC also both.N.ACC.PL befall.N.ACC.PL person.GEN.PL
 kakōn homíliai 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 for them.DAT day.GEN.PL
 'For few days' (provisions are left) to them.' (Herodotus 9.45.2)*

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

Translation

(331) ωὗτος δέ μοι λόγος καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων
hōutòs dé moi lógos kaì hupèr tôn
the.M.NOM.SG but 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
pollé m' anánkē
much.F.NOM.SG me.DAT need.NOM.SG
'(There is) great need for me (to do so).' (Euripides, *Medea* 1013)

(333) Αἴας μ' ἀδελφὸς ὄλεσ' ἐν Τροίᾳ θανῶν
Aías m' adelphòs óles' en Troiái
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 tôn 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 ἐνεγκῶν
phémas dé moi esthlàs enenkōn
report.ACC.PL but 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 but you.ACC Dioscuri.NOM.PL call.3PL.PRS
'And the twin Dioscuri are calling you.' (Euripides, *Helen* 1643)[†]

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

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (337) Ἑλένη σ' ἀδελφή ταῖσδε δωρεῖται χοαίς
 Helénē s' adelphè taísde dōreítai
 Helen.NOM you.ACC sister.NOM the.F.DAT.PL present.3SG.PRS
 khoáis
 libation.DAT.PL
 'Helen, your sister, presents you with these libations.' (Euripides, *Orestes* 117)
- (338) φίλου μοι πατρός ἐστιν ἕκγονος
 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)
- (339) Φοιβός μ' ὁ Λητοῦς παῖς ὁδ' ἐγγύς ὦν καλῶ
 Phoibós m' ho Lētoús país
 Phoebus.NOM me.ACC the.M.NOM.SG Leto.GEN child.NOM.SG
 hod' engús òn kaló
 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 δὴ μοι πτέρυγες περὶ νότῳ
 khryseai dé moi ptéruges peri nótoi
 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 γερούσια Φρυγῶν [...] οὐκ ἐπέσκηψεν πόλει
 tís gár se kēruks è gerousía
 which.M.NOM.SG for you.ACC herald.NOM.SG or senate.NOM.SG
 Phrygôn 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

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

Translation

pémpeis

send.2SG.PRS

‘What woeful dream do you send to me?’ (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1332, imitating Euripides)

- (343) αὐτή τέ μοι δέσποινα μακαριωτάτη
autḗ té moi déspoina makariōtātē
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) πολλή μέντ' ἄν με φιλοψυχία ἔχοι
pollḗ mént' ἄn 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)

- (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 ekeinōi
this.M.NOM.SG so you.DAT the.M.NOM.SG account.NOM.SG that.M.DAT.SG
pōs 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 erō
great.N.ACC.SG but you.DAT sign.ACC.SG say.1SG.FUT
‘And I will tell you a striking proof.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 456b)

- (348) ἰκανόν 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
 toútó 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 dé, 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) ὄντινά 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)
- (352) τετάρτου μοι γένους αὖ προσδεῖν φαίνεται
 tetártou moi génous aû prosdeîn pháinetai
 fourth.N.GEN.SG me.DAT kind.GEN.SG again still.lack.PRS.INF
 appear.3SG.PRS
 ‘A fourth class as well appears to me to be necessary.’ (Plato, *Philebus* 23d)
- (353) ὁ ἀνὴρ σοι ὁ ἐμὸς καὶ τᾶλλα φίλος ἦν
 ho anér soi ho emòs kai
 the.M.NOM.SG man.NOM.SG you.DAT the.M.NOM.SG my.M.NOM.SG also
 tâlla phílos 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 tēs katēgorías eídē
 two but 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)*

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

Translation

- (355) ἄ μεγάλα μοι Κύπρις ἔθ' ὑπνώντι παρέστα
 ha megála moi Kýpris éth'
 the.F.NOM.SG great.F.NOM.SG me.DAT Cyprus.NOM still
 hupnónti parésta
 sleep.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG stand.by.3SG.AOR
 'Great Cyprus still stood by me in my sleep.' (Bion, Fragment 5.1)

[p360]

- (356) Ξεῖνε, Συρηκόσιός τοι ἀνὴρ τόδ' ἐφίεται Ὀρθῶν
 Xeíne, Surēkósíós toi anḗr 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)

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 κυμφορᾶς ὁδοί
 trissáí m' anankázousin sumphorás 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
 eînai
 be.PRS.INF
 'This seems to me to have many branches.' (Plato, *Gorgias* 463b)
- (359) δοῖός με καλεῖ γάμος
 doíos me kaleî gámos
 double.M.NOM.SG me.ACC call.3SG.PRS marriage.NOM.SG
 'A double marriage calls me.' (Callimachus Epigram 1.3)

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

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (360) ὅτι πολλή μοι ἀπέχθια γέγονεν καὶ πρὸς πολλούς
 hóti pollé *moi* apékthia gégonen kaì pròs
 that much.F.NOM.SG me.DAT hatred.NOM.SG become.3SG.PRF also to
 pollóús
 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 p57.)

- (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)
- (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
 hoí dé *sphi* bóes ou paregénonto
 the.M.NOM.PL but 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
 hoí gár *me* ek tēs kómēs paides
 the.M.NOM.PL for me.ACC from the.F.GEN.SG village.GEN.SG child.NOM.PL
 estésanto basiléa
 stand.3PL.AOR.MID king.ACC.SG
 ‘For the boys of the village chose me as king.’ (Herodotus 1.115.2)

Translation

- (366) τὰ δέ μοι παθήματα τὰ ἔοντα ἀχάρिता μαθήματα γέγονε
tà dé moi pathémata tà
the.N.NOM.PL but me.DAT suffering.NOM.PL the.N.NOM.PL
eónta akhárिता 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 taúta
the.M.NOM.SG but me.DAT magus.NOM.SG this.N.ACC.PL
eneteílatο
command.3SG.AOR.MID
'But the magus gave me this message.' (Herodotus 3.63.2)
- (368) ἡ γάρ μοι μήτηρ βέβηκεν ἄλλῃ
hē gár moi métēr bébēken állēi
the.F.NOM.SG for me.DAT mother.NOM.SG step.3SG.PRF elsewhere
'For my mother has gone out.' (Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 913)*
- (369) ὁ δέ μοι λόγος ὄρκος ἔσται
ho dé moi lógos hórkos éstai
the.M.NOM.SG but 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 arkhē tou̅
the.F.NOM.SG then me.DAT beginning.NOM.SG the.M.GEN.SG
lóγου estì katà tèn Euripíδου
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 σία καρπὸν ἐνεΐκει
tà dé toi sía karpòn
the.N.NOM.PL but you.DAT water.parsnip.NOM.PL fruit.ACC.SG

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

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

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) ἀμφί μοι αὐτε ἄναχθ' ἑκαταβόλον ἀδέτω ἄ φρήν
 amphí moi aûte ánakth' hekatabólon aídētō
 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)

(373) ἀμφί μοι Ἑρμαῖαιο φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε Μοῦσα
 amphí moi Hermaíao phílon 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 for 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 Parrhasiē Rheīē téken
 in but you.ACC Parrhasia.DAT Rhea.NOM beget.3SG.AOR
 ‘And Rhea gave birth to you in Parrhasia.’ (Callimachus, *Hymns* 1.10)

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

Translation

- (377) ἐς δέ με δάκρυ ἤγαγεν
es dé me dákru égagen
into but 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 tou spéirantos ántomai
not to you.ACC the.M.GEN.SG sow.PTCP.PRS.M.GEN.SG pray.1SG.PRS
Díós
Zeus.GEN
'I beg you not to, by Zeus who begot you.' (Euripides, *Alcestis* 1098)

- (379) μή, πρὸς γονάτων σε πάντως πάντη σ' ἱκετεύομεν
mé, prós gonátōn se pántōs pántē s' hiketeúomen
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, prós se tou kat' ákron Oitaíon págon Díōs katastráptontos, ekklépsēis
not to you.ACC the.M.GEN.SG down high.M.ACC.SG Oetan.M.ACC.SG
págon Díōs katastráptontos, ekklépsēis
rock.ACC Zeus.GEN strike.PTCP.PRES.M.GEN.SG steal.2SG.AOR.SBJV

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

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 νῦν σε πατρός

prós nún se patrós

to now you.ACC father.GEN.SG

‘Now by your father (I beg) you ...’ (Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 468)

(382) πρὸς νῦν σε κρηνῶν

prós nún se krēnôn

to now you.ACC spring.GEN.PL

‘Now by the streams (I ask) you ...’ (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1333)

(383) πρὸς νῦν σε γονάτων τῶνδ(ε)

prós nún se gonátōn tōnd(e)

to now you.ACC knee.GEN.PL this.N.GEN.PL

‘Now by these knees (I ask) you ...’ (Euripides, *Helen* 1233)

From the non-Attic poets one can adduce (384). Apollonius, whom 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 tōn philōn

to but 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 οἴκαδι

pálin t’ apoisô naì tòn 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

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

Translation

horribly' should be turned back against Schneider himself and his preferred Vulgate reading *poti tè Zanòs* with senseless accenting and false genitive *Zanòs*.

- (386) ποτί τε Ζηνός ἰκνεῦμαι λιμενοσκόπῳ
potí *te* Zēnòs hikneúmai 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 ἀκμὴν 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
akmàn makhaírāi támon katà mélē
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 γένοι(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)

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

3 The position of enclitic pronouns in later Greek

- (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 but
 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' oleís
 off me.ACC destroy.2SG.FUT
 'You will destroy me.' (Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 817)
- (393) κατὰ με φόνιος Ἄϊδας 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)
- (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 λῦσαι
 aná moi tékna lúsai
 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)

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

Translation

- (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 khōsomen
down you.ACC bury.1PL.FUT
'We will bury you.' (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 295)
- (400) ἀπό σ' ὀλώ 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) ζύμ μοι λαβέσθε τοῦ μύθου
xúm moi labésthe toû múthou
with me.DAT take.2PL.AOR.IMPER.MID the.M.GEN.SG myth.GEN.SG
'Assist me with the tale.' (Plato, *Phaedrus* 237a)
- (402) εἰ δ' ἄγε, σύμ μοι βούλευσον
ei d' áge, súm moi bouléuson
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 p43 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 τήξεισ
ék toí me téxeis
out lo me.ACC melt.2SG.FUT
'Oh, you will melt my heart.' (Euripides, *Orestes* 1047)

- (405) ἔν τί σοι παγήσεται
 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) τύφως 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)*

4 Genitives

The pronouns *moi* (1SG), *toi* (2SG), (*sphi* 3PL), *meo/meu/mou* (me.GEN), *seo/seu/sou* (you.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.”

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

Translation

- (408) κύ τ' ὦ γύναι μοι, κύλλογον ψυχῆς λαβέ
 sú t' ô gúnai moi, súllogon psukhês
 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 μὲν μευ βουλέων ξύνειν
 kai mén meυ bouléōn xúnein
 and then me.GEN will.GEN.PL heed.3PL.IMP
 'And they listened to my counsel.' (Homer, *Iliad* 1.273)

[p363]

- (410) οἷ μευ κουρδίην ἄλοχον καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ μάψ' οἷχεσθ' ἀνάγοντες
 hoí meυ kourdíēn álokhon kai
 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
 kai meυ kléos êgon Akhaioí
 and me.GEN fame.ACC.SG lead.3PL.IMP Achaean.M.NOM.PL
 'And the Achaeans would have spread my fame.' (Homer, *Odyssey* 5.311)

- (412) καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει
 kaí *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)
- (416) καί σευ φίλα γούναθ’ ἰκάνω
 kaí *seu* phíla goúnath’ 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 σφεῶν γούνατ’ ἔλυσα
 tōi ké *sphēōn* goúnat’ 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) μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι τῇ γνώμῃ καὶ Ὅμηρου ἔπος
 marturēei dé *moi* tēi gnómēi kaì Homérou
 testify.3SG.PRS but me.DAT the.F.DAT.SG opinion.DAT.SG also Homer.GEN

Translation

épos

word.NOM.SG

‘A verse of Homer also supports my opinion.’ (Herodotus 4.29.1)

- (419) ὅς τοι τὸν πατέρα δωρήσατο
hós toí 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) ἢ μοι μητρὶ μὲν θανεῖν μόνῃ μεταίτιος
hē moi mētrī mèn thaneîn mónē
where me.DAT mother.DAT then die.AOR.INF alone.F.NOM.SG
metaítios
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.

- (421) λαίμῃ δέ σευ τὸ χεῖλος
laimāi dé seu tò kheílos
hunger.3SG.PRS but you.GEN the.N.NOM.SG lip.NOM.SG
‘Your lips are hungry.’ (Hipponax, Fragment 76)

- (422) λάβετέ μευ θαμίτια
lābeté 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 but me.GEN the.M.ACC.SG brother.ACC.SG
‘You have my brother with you.’ (Herodotus 4.80.3)

- (424) cù δέ μευ συμβουλίην ἔνδεξι
sù dé meu sumboulíēn éndexai
you.NOM but me.GEN advice.ACC.SG accept.2SG.AOR.IMPER.MID
‘But take my advice.’ (Herodotus 7.51.1)

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

- (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) ἣ μου τὰς τύχας ὄχει μόνη
 hē 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 ἴσχναινε
 sú mou tò deinòn kai
 you.NOM me.GEN the.N.ACC.SG terrible.N.ACC.SG and
 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) κυνοκοπήσω 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 prutaneíōi 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) ἀπώλεσάς μου τὴν τέχνην καὶ τὸν βίον
 apólesás mou tēn tékhnēn kai tòn
 destroy.2SG.AOR me.GEN the.F.ACC.SG craft.ACC.SG and the.M.ACC.SG

Translation

bíon

living.ACC.SG

‘You have ruined my business and my livelihood.’ (Aristophanes, *Peace* 1212)

- (432) καλῶς γέ μου τὸν υἱὸν ὃ Στιλβωνίδη [...] οὐκ ἔκυσας
kalôs gé mou tòn huión ô Stilbōnídē ouk
well 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) ὄρχουμένης 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
hespéras hē bálanos 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) διττοῦς μου τοὺς κατηγοροὺς γεγονέναι
dittoús mou toús 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 huiéē pōlō ē 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) καταψήσας οὖν μου τὴν κεφαλὴν
katapsésas oún mou tèn kephalèn
stroke.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG so me.GEN the.F.ACC.SG head.ACC.SG
‘So, stroking my head ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 89b)

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *huei* for *huiéē*.

- (437) ἐβίασέ μου τὴν γυναῖκα
 ebíasé mou tèn gunaíka
 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
 arhomoioí gár mou tèn phúsin toîs
 liken.3SG.PRS for 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 χροῶς αἷμα [...] πέπωκα
 tí meu mélan ek khroôs haíma
 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) φράζεό μευ τὸν ἔρωθ’ ὅθεν ἵκετο
 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 tàn 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) οὐ τευ τὰν κύριγγα λαθῶν ἔκλειψε Κομάτας
 ou teu tàn súringa lathōn
 not you.GEN the.F.ACC.SG pipes.ACC.SG hide.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG

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

Translation

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 kōra
beautiful.F.NOM.SG but 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 ἄρδει
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 θέριτριον ἤδη ἔσχιται
díkha *meu* τὸ théristrion édē
apart me.GEN the.N.NOM.SG garment.N.NOM.SG already
éskhistai
split.3SG.PRF.PASS
‘My garment is already torn apart.’ (Theocritus 15.69)

- (446) οἱ δέ σφεων κατὰ πρύμναν αἰείραντες μέγα κῦμα
hoi dé *sphēōn* katà prýmnan aeíranτες méga kŷma
the.M.NOM.SG but them.GEN down stern.ACC raise.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.P
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) ὡς τοι ἐγὼν ἐνόμειον ἀν’ ὄρεα τὰς καλὰς αἶγας φωνᾶς εἰσαΐων
hós *toi* egōn enómeuon an’ órea tàs kalàs aîgas phōnâs eisaïōn
as you.DAT I.NOM pasture.1SG.IMP on mountain.ACC.PL the.F.ACC.PL
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) ἄλλά σευ ἢ κάματος πολυᾶϊξ γυῖα δέδυκεν ἢ νύ σέ που δέος ἴσχει
 allá *seu* è kámatos poluâïx 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 but 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* ônosámên pánkhu phrénas
 now but 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)
- (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 akóúsas
 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 audês
 goddess.NOM.SG but me.GEN hear.3SG.AOR voice.GEN.SG
 ‘And the goddess heard my voice.’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 10.311)
- (453) οἳ 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)

Translation

- (454) ἦ μάλα μευ καταδάπτει' ἀκούοντος φίλον ἦτορ
ê mála meú katadáptet' akóúontos
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 ἦθεα
prín sou katà pánta daînai 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 κατείπεις σὸν κασιγνήτω πόσιν
mé mou kateípēis sōi kasignētōi
not me.GEN denounce.2SG.AOR.SBJV your.M.DAT.SG brother.DAT.SG
pósin
husband.ACC
'Do not tell your brother that my husband ...' (Euripides, *Helen* 898)
- (457) οὐδέ σου συνήψε χεῖρα
oudé sou sunēpse kheíra
nor you.GEN bind.3SG.AOR hand.ACC.SG
'But did he not tie your hand?' (Euripides, *Bacchae* 615)*
- (458) ἐμπλήσθητί μου πῶν κελαινὸν αἶμα
emplésthēti mou piōn
fill.up.2SG.AOR.IMPER.PASS me.GEN drink.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG
kelainòn haíma
dark.N.ACC.SG blood.ACC.SG
'Have your fill drinking my dark blood.' (Euripides, Fragment 687.1)

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

- (459) οἶμοι, δράκων μου γίγνεται 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) ἔξαρπάσομαί σου τοῖς ὄνυξι τάντερα
 exarpásomai sou toís ónuxi tántera
 tear.out.1SG.FUT.MID you.GEN the.M.DAT.PL nail.DAT.PL the=got.ACC.PL
 ‘I will tear out your guts with my nails.’ (Aristophanes, *Knights* 708)
- (461) εἴθε σου εἶναι ὄφρην, ὃ λαζών, οὕτωσι θερμὸς ὁ πλευμῶν
 eíthe sou eínai óphelen, ô lazón,
 if.only you.GEN be.PRS.INF owe.3SG.AOR O kick.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG
 houtōsi 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 κατέφαγε τὰ φορτία
 hoís 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 κέλεσι γένηται
 héōs án sou báros en toís 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 perì thumòs íaphthē
 so me.GEN around spirit.NOM.SG wound.3SG.AOR.PASS
 ‘So all my heart was fired.’ (Theocritus 2.82)

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

Translation

- (465) εἴ μευ καλὰ πέλει τὰ μελύδρια
eí *meu* 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 p38f). And just as this word can occur in the middle of the governing phrase, i.e. after the first word, so 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 κεινέεται
hoi dé *meu* pántes odóntes entòs en
the.M.NOM.PL but me.GEN all.M.NOM.PL tooth.NOM.PL inside in
gnáthois keinéatai
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 ἐκκεκωφέεται
hai dé *meu* phrénes ekkekōphéatai
the.F.NOM.PL but me.GEN midriff.NOM.PL deafen.3PL.PRF.PASS
'And my wits have been dulled.' (Anacreon, Fragment 81)

- (468) αἱ γάρ σφι κάμηλοι ἵππων οὐκ ἔσσανές [...] εἰσιν
hai gár *sphi* kámēloi híppōn ouk
the.F.NOM.PL for 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 σφι γυναικῶν τοὺς μαζοὺς ἀποταμοῦσα
tôn dé *sphi* gunaikôn toùs mazoùs
the.F.GEN.PL but 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)

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

- (470) οἱ τέ σφεων ὀπέωνες [...] ἀπεκεκληίατο
 hoí té *sphēōn* 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) τοῦτό γέ τοί σου τοῦργον ἀληθῶς γενναῖον καὶ φιλόδημον
 toútó gé toí *sou* tou̅rgon 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 but 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 p107 and p112.)

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 *homóiposis* “fellow husband”.²

- (473) cὺ δέ, ὦ 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, tōn *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

² 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 p119) he became aware of the right reading of these words some time ago and intended to publicly withdraw his earlier explanation.

Translation

stratiês

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
ὁ *moi* πόσις 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. also (479). Other than at the beginning of the clause, however, *mou* etc. are inserted in this way only extremely rarely. 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 βαιή
diá mou kephalâs 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 ἄκκουσ’ ὀδύνας
diá mou kephalâs áissous’ odúnai
through me.GEN head.GEN.SG dart.3PL.PRS pain.NOM.PL
‘Pains dart through my head.’ (Euripides, *Hippolytus* 1351)
- (477) εἷς μου λόγος σοὶ 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
ὦ 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) δείσασα γὰρ εἰς τὴν κάτω μου κοιλίαν καθείρπυεν

deísasa γὰρ εἰς τὴν κάτω *mou*

fear.PTCP.AOR.F.NOM.SG then into the.F.ACC.SG downwards me.GEN

koilían kathéirpusen

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 *hémōn*, *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) [Ἑρ]μησιάνναξ ἡμεᾶς ἀνέθηκεν [ὁ ...]

[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’ ἅμε Ἄρχων Ἄμοιβίχου

égraphe d’ *hāme* Árkhōn Hamoibíkhou

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

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

- (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
 epeî gàr *autôn* gês apēllákhthē patér
 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 p133), that the genitive is attached not to the article but to an adjective.

- (490) Μεγαρέας τε τοὺς ἐν Σικελίῃ, ὡς [...] προεχώρησαν, τοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν
 παχέας [...] πολίητας ἐποίησε
 Megaréas te toûs en Sikeliíēi, hōs prosekhórēsan,
 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
 ponērian
 wickedness.ACC.SG
 ‘You will recognize his other wickedness.’ (Isocrates 18.52)*
- (492) ὅπως [...] αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ αὐτῶν στρατιῶται ἐκπλεύσειαν
 hópōs autoî kai hoi *autôn* stratiôtai
 so they.NOM and the.M.NOM.PL them.GEN soldier.NOM.PL

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

Nevertheless, the tendency in Homer to place *tis* initially is unmistakable. Other than *hóstis* and related forms, one should look at *ei tis* and *mé 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 but 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 στυγέησι καὶ ἄλλοι
 hína *tis* stugéēsi kai állois
 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 πέρ 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* sēma brotoío pálai
 or some.M.GEN.SG sign.NOM.SG mortal.GEN.SG long.ago
 katatethnēōtos
 die.PTCP.PRF.M.GEN.SG
 ‘Haply (it is) a monument of some man long ago dead’ (Homer, *Iliad* 23.331)

(498) [...] ὡς ὑμεῖς παρ’ ἐμεῖο θοῆν ἐπὶ νῆα κίοιτε ὥς τέ τευ ἢ παρὰ πάμπαν
 ἀνείμονος ἢ ἐπενιχροῦ
 hōs humeís par’ emeío thoèn epì nēa
 that you.NOM.PL from me.GEN swift.F.ACC.SG upon ship.ACC.SG
 kíoite hós té *teu* è parà pámpan
 go.2PL.PRS.OPT as and someone.M.GEN.SG or from altogether
 aneímonos ēè 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)*

* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *ê ... êdê*.

Translation

- (499) μηδέ τι μεσσηγύς γε κακὸν καὶ πῆμα πάθησιν
mēdé ti messēgús ge kakòn kai 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 *hós tis te* instead of *hóste tis* as in, for instance, (503).

- (500) καὶ τινά τοι παρ Ζητὸς ἐπέφραδε πότνια μήτηρ
kai tiná toi par Zēnòs epéphrade pótnia
and some.F.ACC.SG you.DAT from Zeus.GEN tell.3SG.AOR mistress.NOM.SG
mētēr
mother.NOM.SG
‘and (if) your queenly mother has declared anything to you from Zeus ...’
(Homer, *Iliad* 16.37)

- (501) ὅτε τίς κε θάνησι
hóte tis ke thánēisi
when someone.M.NOM.SG IRR die.3SG.AOR.SBJV
‘... whenever someone dies.’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 11.218)

- (502) εἰ γάρ τίς κ’ ἐθέλη
ei gár tis k’ ethélēi
if for someone.M.SOM.SG IRR want.3SG.PRS.SBJV
‘For whoever wishes to ...’ (Hesiod, *Works and Days* 280)

- (503) βῆ δ’ ἰέναι ὡς τίς τε λέων ἀπὸ μεσσαύλοιο
bē d’ iénai hós tis te léōn apò
pass.3SG.AOR then go.PRS.INF as some.M.NOM.SG and lion.NOM.SG of
messaúloio
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 p55 on example (87).

- (504) οὐδέ τις ἡμῖν αἷτιος ἀθανάτων
 oude *tis* hēmîn 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 οἶδα
 eí *ti* pathōn ap’ emeû
 if something.ACC.SG suffer.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG of me.GEN
 agathōn méga mē khárin oída
 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) ἀλλά 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 soí
 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
 oupō *tis* 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 τινα ἔγωγε οἶδα ποταμὸν Ὠκεανὸν ἐόντα
 ou gár *tina* égōge oída potamōn
 not for some.M.ACC.SG I.NOM.EMPH know.1SG.PRF river.ACC.SG

Translation

Ōkeanòn eónta
 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
 τοιοῦτο ἐσεσθαι
 such.N.ACC.SG be.FUT.INF.MID
 ‘... always expecting that some such thing would take place from there.’
 (Herodotus 7.235.2)

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

(512) μὴ τῷ λαθραίῳς τέκνα γένναίῳ τέκοι
 mê tōi lathraíōs tékna génnaíōi tékoi
 not some.M.DAT.SG secretly child.ACC.PL noble.M.DAT.SG
 τέκοι
 bear.3SG.AOR.OPT
 ‘... lest she should secretly bear children to some nobleman.’ (Euripides,
Electra 26)

(513) ἔστι γάρ τις ἐν δόμοις τύχη
 ésti gár tis en dómois túkhē
 be.3SG.PRS for 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 pólima
 if some.N.NOM.SG the.GEN.PL then town.NOM.SG
 ‘If some town of that age ...’ (Thucydides 1.10.1)

- (515) καί τις ἐστιν ἀστήρ
 kaí *tís* estin astḗr
 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
 kaí gár *tin’* ekphérousi toutonì nekron
 and for 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 περιτρέψει τὸν λόγον
 mé *tis* hēmîn baskanía peritrépsēi
 not some.F.NOM.SG us.DAT sorcery.NOM.SG divert.3SG.AOR.SBJV
 tòn lógon
 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 lógos
 not some.M.NOM.SG you.DAT opposite.M.NOM.SG account.NOM.SG
 apantésēi
 encounter.3SG.AOR.SBJV
 ‘... lest a certain counter-argument should meet you’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 101a)
- (519) καί τι ἔφη αὐτόθι γελοῖον παθεῖν
 kaí *ti* éphē autóthi geloíon
 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)
- (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)

Translation

- (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
sophôn
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
τούτοις καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔρις
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 ἐπραττεν ἐκεῖνος, μέμψις καὶ
κατηγορία
ên án tis katà tōn
be.3SG.IMP IRR some.F.NOM.SG down the.M.GEN.PL
enantiōthéntōn hoîs épratten ekeínos,
oppose.PTCP.AOR.PASS.M.GEN.PL what.DAT.PL do.3SG.IMP that.M.NOM.SG

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

mémpsis 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 práttēis 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, ὃ 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 ἔς του χωρίον 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)*

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).

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

Translation

- (530) ὄντιν' ἄν τις τρόπον ὡς βέλτιστος εἶη
hóntin' án *tis* trópon hōs béltistos
what.M.ACC.SG IRR someone.M.NOM.SG way.ACC.SG as best.M.NOM.SG
εἶε
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 μὲν τίς κ'
kaí *mén tíς* k'
and then someone.M.NOM.SG IRR
(Gortyn Code 8.17)
- (535) ὅτι δέ τίς κα
hóti dé *tís* ka
that but 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 but IRR not someone.M.NOM.SG
 (Gortyn Code 5.13; also 5.17, 5.22)
- (537) ᾧ δέ κα μή τις ἦ στέγα
 hōi dé ka mé tis êi stéga
 which.DAT.SG but IRR not some.F.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS.SBJV roof.NOM.SG
 (Gortyn Code 4.14)
- (538) ὅπῳ κά τιλ λῆ
 hopō ká 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 τινέσ κα τῶν ὀρμιωμένων
 ei dé tinés ka tōn hormiōménōn
 if but 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 τίς κα ἄγη
 eí tis 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 αἴ τινί κα ἄλλῳ
 kai aí tiní ka álloi
 and if some.DAT.SG IRR other.DAT.SG
 (Heracleian Tablets 1.105)
- (542) καὶ αἴ τινάσ κα ἄλλουσ
 kai aí tinás ka álloús
 and if some.M.ACC.PL IRR other.M.ACC.PL
 (Heracleian Tablets 1.117)

Translation

- (543) αἰ δέ τινά κα γήρρα [...] ἐκπέτωντι
ai dé *tiná* ka *gérāi* ekpētōnti
if but someone.M.ACC.SG IRR age.DAT.SG depart.PTCP.AOR.DAT.SG
(Heracleon Tablets 1.119; also 1.173, without *dé*)
- (544) καὶ εἴ τινές κα μὴ πεφυτεύκωντι
kai 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 τίς κα ἐπιβῆῃ
ai dé *tís* ka epibēi
if but someone.M.NOM.SG IRR enter.3SG.AOR.SBJV
'And if anyone should enter ...' (Heracleon Tablets 1.128)
- (546) αἰ δέ τίς κα τῶν καρπιζομένων ἀποθάνει
ai dé *tís* ka tōn karpizoménōn
if but someone.M.NOM.SG IRR the.GEN.PL enjoy.PTCP.PRS.PASS.GEN.PL
apotháne
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 εἴ τίς κα μὴ ἐμμένῃ
kai 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 τίς κα πένηται
ai dé *tís* ka pénētai
if but something IRR labour.3SG.PRS.SBJV.PASS
(Mycenae Inscription 3316.8; (Prellwitz 1889: 137))

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

- (549) εἰ δέ τίς κ' ἀδύνατον γένοιτο
ei dé *tís* k' adúnaton génoito
if but 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 apologízontai
 if but 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) εἶ τινός κα ἄλλου δοκῆ
 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 p154.)

(552) αἰ δέ τί κα με [...] λυπῆ
 ai dé tí ka me lupêi
 if but 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 *mê* ‘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 *ai ka páskhē* should not be emended, with Boeckh (1843: 27), to *ai ka tí páskhē*, but rather to *ai tí ka páskhē*, as shown in (555).

(553) καὶ κά τις ἀντίον <τι> λῆ τήνω λέγειν
 kaí ká tis antíon ti
 and=if IRR someone.M.NOM.SG contrary.N.ACC.SG something.ACC.SG
 lèi ténōi 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)

(554) αἶ κά τις ἐκτρίψας καλῶς παρατιθῆ νιν
 aí ká tis ektrípsas kalôs
 if IRR someone.M.NOM.SG rub.out.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG well
 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)

* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *d’ éti kēmè lupêi*.

Translation

- (555) αἴ <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 turōnta* ‘cheese bread’.

- (556) ὅπι σίς κε τὰς φρήτας τάσδε λύση
ópi síς ke τὰς 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 ἴαλε
áرتون γάρ tis turōnta
loaf.ACC.SG for 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 τινα Λυδῶν
tôn tina Ludôn
the.M.GEN.PL someone.M.ACC.SG Lydian.M.GEN.PL
‘one of the Lydians’
- (559) ἐς τῶν ἐκείνων τι χωρίων
es tôn ekeinōn ti khōríōn
into the.N.GEN.PL that.N.GEN.PL something.ACC.SG place.GEN.PL
‘into some of that property’

- (560) τῶν ἄλλων τινᾶς Ἑλλήνων
 tōn ἄllōn tinās 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 *mé* ‘not’ and *tis* ‘someone’, and (562). *pothi* ‘somewhere’ is found twice, in (563)–(564), where it is preceded by *ou* ‘not’.

- (561) μή πού τις ὑπερφιάλωσ νεμεσῆσσι
 mé pou tis huperphiálōs 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).

- (565) ἀλλ’ οὐ πως
 all’ ou pōs
 but not somehow
 (Homer, *Iliad* 13.729 and 17.354)

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

Translation

pote ‘sometime’ is found four times, twice in second position, as well as (566) and (567).

- (566) ἄλλοτε δὴ ποτε μᾶλλον ἐρωῆσαι πολέμοιο μέλλω
 állote dé *pote* mállon erōēsai polémoio
 another.time exactly sometime more withdraw.AOR.INF war.GEN.SG
 méllō
 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 δὴ ποτ’ ἐμὸν ἔπος ἔκλυες 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)

pēi ‘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
 theōn d’ ekíchanen hetairous ôka
 run.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG then reach.3SG.IMP companion.ACC.PL swiftly
 mál’, ou *pō* tēle, posì kraipnoìsi metaspōn
 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’ ou *pō* phōte pepústhēn
 two then not yet man.NOM.DU learn.3DU.PLUP.PASS
 ‘Howbeit two men had not yet learned ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.377)

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
 sesobēménos 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 μεγαλοκευθέεσιν ἔν ποτε θαλάμοις
 hóti te megalokeuthéésin 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) Ἴξalos εὐπώγων αἰγὸς πόσις ἔν ποθ' ἄλωῃ
 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 *rou* epistémē anthrópou kaì
 other.F.NOM.SG somewhere knowledge.NOM.SG person.GEN.SG and
 lúras
 lyre.GEN.SG
 'Knowledge of a man and of a lyre (are) in some way different.' (Plato,
Phaedo 73d)
- (575) ὁ αὐτὸς γὰρ που φόβος
 ho autòs gár *rou* phóbos
 the.M.NOM.SG same.M.NOM.SG for somewhere fear.NOM.SG
 'For in some way (there would be) the same fear.' (Plato, *Phaedo* 101b)

Translation

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* plataníston
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 *hōs émoige dokeî*). What has been said for *ge* holds also for *per*.

- (577) ἀγῶσι μὲν γε καὶ θυσίασι διετηγίοισι νομίζοντες
agōsi mén *ge* kai thusíais dietēsíois
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 παρουσίᾳ εὐτυχίᾳ χρώμενοι
hoútō têi *ge* parousēi eutukhíai
so the.F.DAT.SG even be.present.PTCP.PRS.F.DAT.SG success.DAT.SG
khrómēnoi
use.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.PL
‘Being so used to the present prosperity ...’ (Thucydides 4.65.4)*
- (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)

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

- (580) ὥς γ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ
 hōs 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 γέρον ἰππηλάτα Πηλεῦς
 ê ke még' oimóxēie 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 Schnorr von 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)

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*,

Translation

dé, gár, mén and occasionally also *tis* (see above [p372] p143), *tu* (see above p56) and *toi* (as in example (583)) intervene: *hós ke, eis hó ke, eí ke, aí ke, epeíke, 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 tònn nóon élhēi
 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) αἴκα δ' ἐντύχῳ 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) αἴκα 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 but 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 *éti*, 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 p144 with *tis* between *ai* and *ka*. (Hermann 1817: 12 has *ei d' étí kaí me ... lupeî*, 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*.

(587) ἐγὼ δέ κε λαὸν ἀγείρω
 egō dé ke laòn ageíró
 I.NOM but IRR people.ACC gather.1SG.PRS
 'And I will gather the host.' (Homer, *Iliad* 16.129)

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

- (588) (ἐπιφρασσαίμεθα βουλήν) ἢ κεν ἐνὶ νήεσσι πολυκλήϊσι πέσωμεν [...] ἢ
 κεν ἔπειτα παρ νηῶν ἔλθωμεν
 epiphraassaímetha boulén é ken enì néessi
 consider.1PL.AOR.OPT.MID counsel.ACC or IRR in ship.DAT.PL
 polukléisi pésōmen 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 πρώτοισιν ἀλώη
 é k’ autòs enì prótoisin halōēi
 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 ἠδ’ οἰωνούς
 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 τείχει ὑπο Τρώων ταχέες κύνες
 éi k’ Akhilēos agauōu pistòn
 if IRR Achilles.GEN noble.M.GEN.SG trustworthy.M.ACC.SG
 hetaïron teíkhei hýpo Trōōn takhées
 companion.ACC.SG wall.DAT.SG under Trojan.GEN.PL swift.M.NOM.PL
 kúnēs 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)

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

Translation

- (592) τὰ δέ κεν Διὶ πάντα μελήσει
 tà dé *ken* Diî pánta melései
 the.N.NOM.PL but 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 φίλην κεκλήσῃ ἄκοιτις
 tōi dé *ke* nikésanti philē
 the.M.DAT.SG but IRR win.PTCP.AOR.M.DAT.SG dear.F.NOM.SG
 keklésēi 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)–(595)) and seven 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) ἄς οὐτ’ ἄν κεν Ἄρης ὀνόσαιτο μετελθῶν οὔτε κ’ Ἀθηναίη
 hás out’ án *ken* Árēs onósaito
 which.F.ACC.PL nor IRR IRR Ares.NOM scorn.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID
 metelthón oúte *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 [...] γνοίη
 ô pópoi, édē mén *ke* gnoiē
 O fie already then IRR know.3SG.AOR.OPT
 ‘Out upon it, now may (any man) know ...’ (Homer, *Iliad* 17.629)
- (596) ἀνδρὶ δέ κ’ οὐκ εἴξειε μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας
 andrî dé *k’* ouk éixeie mégas
 man.DAT.SG but 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 ἦσι φρεσὶν οὐνόματ’ εἶποι
 tōn d’ állōn tís ken hēisi
 the.M.GEN.PL then other.M.GEN.PL who.M.NOM.SG IRR his.F.DAT.PL
 phresin 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*, *éōs 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 ἐπαιτήσειας
 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 πάμπαν ἄγοιτο
 mûthon hòn ou ken anér ge dià
 myth.ACC.SG which.M.ACC.SG not IRR man.NOM.SG even through
 stóma pámpan 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)

Translation

- (600) ἐπεὶ οὐ κε θανόντι περ ὧδ' ἀκαχοίμην
epeî 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
epeî ou ke kakoî 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 ídoito
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 θυμῶ
álloi te Trôes méga ken kekharoíato thumô
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
 hóthen ouk élpoitó ke thumôi, 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 subjunctive subordinate clauses, which makes sense given the content of most of these. In Aeolic we have a couple of examples of *hós 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 ζῶς τὰςδε [...] ἔξο(ν)σι αἰφεῖ
 tás ke zás tásde éxo(n)si aiweí
 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) ἧι κα δικάσσαιεν
 hâi ka dikássaien
 who.F.NOM.PL IRR judge.3PL.AOR.OPT
 (Inscription 3277.8; Prellwitz 1889: 127)
- (608) ἃφ’ 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 ὑγιῆ 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)

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

Translation

- (610) τοῦτον γὰρ οὐδέ κα ὁ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ Ἄσκληπιὸς ὑγιῆ ποιῆσαι δύναιτο
 toûton gàr oudé ka ho en Epidaúrōi
 this.M.ACC.SG then nor IRR the.M.NOM.SG in Epidaurus.DAT
 Asklepiòs 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 Ζεὺς
 hoútō toí k’ amōn 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 οἷ κα εἶη ἀγγράφοντι τὸν παιᾶνα. Ἐμάντευσε λώιον οἷ κα εἶμεν
 ἀγγραφοντι.
 è lóion hoí 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 paeian.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 paeian. 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 theōn 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, clear evidence of the pressure to put *ka* in second position: Hoffmann (1890) 1562, 1563, 1566, 1582a and 1582b, e.g. (613). Example (614) is similar.

- (613) τίني κα θεῶν [ἢ] ἠρώων θύοντες καὶ εὐχ[ό](μ)ενο(ι) ὁμονοοῖεν ἐ[π]ὶ
 τῶγαθόν
 tíni ka theōn [è] hērōōn
 whom.M.DAT.SG IRR god.GEN.PL or hero.GEN.PL

Translation

(617) ἦ μὴ ν[α](υ)κλαρῆ(ν) λώιογ καὶ ἄμεινον πράσσομι
ê mè n[a](u)klarê(n) lóiong kai ámeinson prássomi
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)

(618) τίνα θεῶν ἢ ἡρώων τιμᾶντι λώιον καὶ ἄμεινον εἶη
tína theôn è hērōōn timânti
whom.M.ACC.SG god.GEN.PL or hero.GEN.PL honour.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG
lóion kai 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) ἦ τυγχάνοιμί κα
ê tunkhánoimí ka
in.truth happen.1SG.PRS.OPT IRR
(Inscription 1568.1; Hoffmann 1890)

(620) [...] βέλτιομ 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 Elian 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 τηπιάροι κ' ἐνέχοιτο
en tēpiároi k' enékhuito
in the=sacrifice.DAT IRR hold.3SG.PRS.OPT
(Inscription 1149.9 Collitz)

- (622) ἐν ταῖ ζεκαμναίαι κ' ἐνέχοιτο
 en taî zekamnaíai k' enékhoito
 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, the tmesis nevertheless betrays a pressure to move the particle towards the start of the clause.

- (623) τοὶ ζέ κα θεοκόλοι
 toî 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 but IRR agreement.NOM.SG
 (Inscription 1156.2 Collitz)
- (626) τῶν δέ κα γραφέων
 tōn dé ka graphéōn
 the.GEN.PL but IRR scribe.GEN.PL
 (Inscription 1156.3 Collitz)
- (627) ὁ [sic] δέ κα ξένος
 o dé ka xénos
 the.M.NOM.SG but IRR stranger.NOM.SG
 (Inscription 1158.1 Collitz)
- (628) τῶν ζέ προστιζίων οὐζέ κα μί' εἶη
 tōn zè prostiziōn 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)

Translation

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 λάχου
taûtá kh' hápanta lákhoi
this.N.ACC.PL IRR quite.all.N.ACC.PL obtain.3SG.AOR.OPT
'All these things would fall to him' (Xenophanes 2.10)

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 φαΐσι 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' εἶπης, τὰ θέλεις, <αὐτὸς> ἀκούσαις <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
akóúsais <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).

(633) καὶ γάρ θην
 kai gár *thēn*
 and for surely
 (Homer, *Iliad* 21.568)

(634) οὐ μὲν θην
 ou mén *thēn*
 not then surely
 (Homer, *Iliad* 8.448)

(635) cú θην ἃ χρήζεις, ταῦτ' ἐπιγλωσσῶ Διός
 sú *thēn* hà khréizeis, taút'
 you.NOM surely what.ACC.PL want.2SG.PRS this.N.ACC.PL
 epiglōssâi 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
 aínós *thēn*
 fable.NOM surely
 (Theocritus 14.43)

(638) πείρω θην
 peírâi *thēn*
 attempt.DAT.SG surely
 (Theocritus 15.62)

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

Translation

- (639) καίτοι νῦν γὰ θην εὔωνον αἰνεῖ σῖτον
 kaítoi nûn gá thēn eúōnon ainei sítōn
 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)*

nu and *nun* ‘now’ in Homer are almost always in second position, if we go by the remark of Ebeling (1880–1885) on this word: “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 gár dé nú pote Zeús 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 poú 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 but now you.DAT attendant.NOM.SG
 ‘... and your squire is a weakling’ (Homer, *Iliad* 8.104)

- (643) θαρσαλέον νύ τοι ἦτορ ἐνὶ φρεσίν
 tharsaleón 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)†

* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *kàt tò ... aei*. † Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *hoi* for *toi*.

- (644) *σιδήρειόν νύ τοι ἦτορ*
sidéreión 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)
- (645) *οἱ δέ νυ λαοὶ θνήσκον*
hoi dé nu laoì thnêskon
 the.M.NOM.PL but 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 tille kómēn
 the.F.NOM.SG but 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 δὴ ἔγωγ’ ὄφελον μάκαρός νύ τευ ἔμμεναι υἱὸς ἀνέρος*
hōs dè 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.IMP now
 ‘Come now!’ (Aristophanes, *Peace* 1056)
- (650) *πρὸς νύν σε πατρός πρὸς τε μητρός [...] ἰκέτης ἰκνοῦμαι*
prós nún se patròs pròs te mētrós
 to now you.ACC father.GEN.SG to and mother.GEN.SG

Translation

hikétēs hiknoûmai
suppliant.NOM.SG beseech.1SG.PASS

‘Now by your father and by your mother, I beseech you as a suppliant.’
(Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 468)

(651) πρὸς νῦν σε κρηνῶν καὶ θεῶν ὁμογνίων αἰτῶ πιθέσθαι
prós *nún* se krēnôn kai theôn homogníōn
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 νῦν σε γονάτων τῶνδ(ε)
prós *nún* se gonátōn 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 *kai hai hyperēmériaí 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 *tōní, tanní*.

(655) ἢ δωάνοι νυ
è duwánoi *nu*
or give.3SG.AOR.OPT now
(Idalion 6)

- (656) ἦ δώκοι νυ
 è dókoi nu
 or give.3SG.AOR.OPT now
 (Idalion 16)
- (657) κῆ τῆ οὐπεραμερίῃ ἄκουρῦ νυ ἐνθῶ
 kè tè houerameriē 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 πόνου ἐχῶ
 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 ᾧδε κακοψόγῳ ἀνδάνει οὐδέν
 en gár *toi* pólei hōde kakopsógōi handánei
 in for 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* tōn poiēmátōn
 about for lo the.N.GEN.PL poem.GEN.PL
 ‘For about the poems ...’ (Plato, *Phaedo* 60c)

Translation

- (662) περι γάρ τοι γῆς [...] πολλὰ ἀκήκοα
perì gár toi gês pollà akékoa
about for 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).

- (663) ὦ παῖδες, ἢ τοι Κύπρις οὐ Κύπρις μόνον
ô paîdes, hé toi Kýpris ou Kýpris mónon
O child.VOC.PL the.F.NOM.SG lo Cyprus.NOM not Cyprus.NOM alone
'You see, children, Cyprus is not just Cyprus.' (Sophocles, Fragment 855.1)

- (664) τὴν τοι Δίκην λέγουσι παῖδ' εἶναι Χρόνου
tên toi Díkēn légousi paîd' einai
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) ἢ τοι τῆς διανοίας ὄψις
hé 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 for lo deed.NOM.SG mishap.ACC.SC 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 for 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* hetaíros anèr philos
 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 *hetaíroi*)
- (670) πολλῶ τοι πλέονας λιμοῦ κόρος ὤλεσεν ἤδη ἄνδρα
 pollôi *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) διςσαί τοι πόσιος κῆρες δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν
 dissái *toi* pósiος kêres deiloísi
 double.F.NOM.PL lo drink.GEN.SG doom.NOM.PL wretched.M.DAT.PL
 brotoísin
 mortal.DAT.PL
 ‘The perils of drink are twofold for wretched mortals.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 837)
- (672) πολλοί τοι κίβδηλοι [...] κρύπτου(ι)
 polloí *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 anthrópois 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
 oxutéré
 sharper.F.NOM.SG
 ‘The heart of the wretched becomes sharper.’ (Theognis, *Elegies* 1030)

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

Translation

- (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)
- (676) ἀμήχανόν τοι κάλλος
amēkhanón *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 *tó* + *i*?), ...".

- (677) τοιγάρ ἐγώ τοι [...] καταλέξω
toigàr *egó* *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* ... *toi* as Latin *utrumne* is to *utrum* ... *ne* (see below p314).

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 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 *aú*, 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 ἀμῶ κοπίς
 kat’ aú 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 βακχεύσει Καδμείων πόλιν
 an’ aú 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)

oún ‘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) Ἥρη δὲ μάστιγι θεῶς ἐπεμαίετ’ ἄρ’ ἵππους
 Hērē dè mástigi thoôs epemaíet’ ár’
 Hera.NOM but whip.DAT.SG quickly touch.3SG.IMP.PASS then

Translation

híppous

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 but be.3SG.IMP then anonymous.M.NOM.SG

‘Before, it was apparently nameless.’ (Herodotus 4.45.4)

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 *dé* ‘now/truly/exactly’ is very free.

(682) ἐσπέρης καθεύδοντα ἀπ’ 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 ἠχθόμαν

ténōi kudázomai te kap’ ôn êkhthóman

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 τοῖ μὲν ἀπ’ 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*.

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *oûn apōllúonto*.

- (685) ἦ c' ἄν τιθαίμην
 ê s' án tisáimēn
 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 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 *hopoíos tis*: (686), (687).

- (686) ὅποῖ ἅττ' ἄν καὶ μεμελετηκυῖαι τύχῳσι
 hopoí' átt' án kai
 of.what.sort.N.NOM.PL whatever.N.ACC.PL IRR also
 memeletēkuíai túkhōsi
 practise.PTCP.PRF.F.DAT.SG happen.3PL.AOR.SBJV
 '... which correspond to the practices ...' (Plato, *Phaedo* 81e)

- (687) ὅποῖοί τινες ἄν οἱ προστάται ὦσι
 hopoíoi tines án 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* 'but', e.g. (691)–(693)).

- (688) οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄν δόξῳσι διαφορεόντως προκεκρίθαι
 hoí de dh' án dóxōsi diapheróntōs
 who.M.NOM.PL but exactly IRR seem.3SG.AOR.SBJV differently
 prokekristhai
 prejudge.PRF.INF.PASS
 'But whichever ones seem to have been found excellent ...' (Plato, *Phaedo* 114b)*

* Translator's note: *prokekristhai* not in Perseus edition

Translation

- (689) οἳ 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 παραινέσειν 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
 mēlleí 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) ὃς ἄν δὲ τῶν ἀκτῶν λέπρην [...] ἔχη
 hòs àn dè tōn astōn 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) ὃς ἄν μὲν νυν τῶν πυλωρῶν ἐκὼν παρίη
 hòs àn mén nun tōn pulōrōn
 who.M.NOM.SG IRR then now the.M.GEN.PL guard.GEN.PL
 hekōn paríēi
 willing.M.NOM.SG pass.3SG.PRS.SBJV
 'Now whoever of the guards willingly admits us ...' (Herodotus 3.72.5)
- (693) ὃς ἄν δὲ ἔχων ἦκη
 hòs àn dè ékhōn 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 ἄν τις
 kath' hōn mēnúēi àn tis
 down whom.GEN.PL inform.3SG.PRS.SBJV IRR someone.M.NOM.SG
 '... against whom someone informs ...' (Antiphon 5.38)

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

In Nauck (1889: 688) we encounter the even more unexpected verses in (695). Dümmler (p.c.) proposes *án pléon* ‘IRR more’ instead of the problematic *mállon án*. Or should *thélēis* be changed to *thélois*?

- (695) ἀρετὴ δ' ὅσῳπερ μᾶλλον ἄν χρῆσθαι θέλησ, τοσῶδε μείζων γίγνεται
καθ' ἡμέραν
aretè d' hósōiper mállon án 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 án hēmôn*, which does not negatively affect the reply in verse 264 ((697)).

- (696) ὅπόσον ἢ φάρυγξ ἄν ἡμῶν χανδάνη
hopóson hē phárunx án 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).

Translation

- (698) τῶν οὐκ ἄν τι φέροις
 tōn 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 ἄν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ’ ὀνομήνω
 plēthùn d’ ouk *án* egò muthésomai oud’
 multitude.ACC.SG then not IRR I.NOM tell.1SG.AOR.SBJV.MID nor
 onoménō
 name.1SG.AOR.SBJV
 ‘But the common folk I could not tell nor name’ (Homer, *Iliad* 2.488)
- (700) ἐκῶν δ’ οὐκ ἄν τις ἔλοιτο
 hekōn d’ ouk *án* tis hēloito
 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* egò pote màps 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 τλαΐεν ἐναντίβιον στάντες μαχέσασθαι
 Ἄρηι
 epei 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 Árēi
 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
 hòs nûn ge kai àn 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)

- (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 kai àn potamoío rhéethra Ōkeanoú
 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) ἧς ὑπεροπλίησι τάχ’ ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσσει
 hêis huperoplíēisi tákh’ àn pote thumòn oléssēi
 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 εἶη
 tákh’ àn pote kai 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).

* *Translator’s note*: The Perseus edition has a different reading.

Translation

- (707) ἐμοὶ δὲ τότ' ἄν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη
emoī dè tót' àn polù kérdion eīē
me.DAT but 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 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 kaì 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 subjunctive 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 assembled 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)

* *Translator's note:* These two examples are also included above as (685) and (581) respectively.

† *Translator's note:* See e.g. *Iliad* 11.187 and 13.127 respectively.

- (710) ὥς ἂν καὶ γέρων ἠράσσοτο
hōs án καὶ γέρων ἠράσσοτο
 as IRR also old.M.NOM.SG love.3SG.AOR.MID
 ‘... that even an old man should love’ (Archilochus, Fragment 30)
- (711) ὥς ἂν σε θωϊῆ λάβοι
hōs án σε θωϊῆ λάβοι
 as IRR you.ACC penalty.NOM.SG take.3SG.AOR.OPT
 ‘... that a penalty should overtake you’ (Archilochus, Fragment 101)
- (712) ὥς ἂν θεᾷ πρώτοι κτίσαιεν βωμόν
hōs án θεᾷ πρώτοι κτίσαιεν βωμόν
 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 án ποταθείην
 as IRR soar.1SG.AOR.OPT.PASS
 ‘... that I might soar ...’ (Aristophanes, *Birds* 1338)*
- (714) ὥς ἂν πυνθανόμενοι πλεῖστοι συνέλθοιεν Σπαρτιητέων
hōs án πυνθανόμενοι πλεῖστοι
 as IRR learn.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.PL most.M.NOM.PL
 συνέλθοιεν Σπαρτιητέων
 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 án μάλιστα τὸν υἱὸν ἐχθρὸν ἑαυτῷ καὶ
 as IRR most the.M.ACC.SG son.ACC.SG enemy.ACC.SG himself.DAT and
 τῇ πόλει ποιήσειε
 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)

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *ampotatheîen*.

Translation

- (716) ὡς ἂν μάλιστα αὐτὸς ὁ δεδεμένος ξυλλήπτωρ εἴη τοῦ δεδέσθαι
hōs ἂn 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 ὡς ἂν κοσμιώτεροι γίγνοιτο οἱ
 μὴ πῶ ὄντες, δεῖ χαρίζεσθαι
 toîs mèn kosmioîs tôn anthrōpōn, kai hōs
 the.M.DAT.PL then orderly.M.DAT.PL the.M.GEN.PL person.GEN.PL and as
 ἂn kosmiōteroi 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, ὡς ἂν εἶεν ἄνθρωποι καὶ παύσαιντο τῆς
 ἀκολασίας
 dokō moi ékhein mēkhanén, hōs ἂn eíen
 think.1SG.PRS me.DAT have.PRS.INF means.ACC.SG as IRR be.3PL.PRS.OPT
 anthrōpoi 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) ὡς δ’ ἂν ἐξετασθεῖη μάλιστα ἀκριβῶς, μὴ γένοιτο
 hōs d’ ἂn exetasthéiē málíst’ akribōs, 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)

* Translator’s note: The Persus ed. has *eíen te* for *eíen*.

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 *hōs* and *án* is broken.

- (720) ὥς μηδενὸς ἄν δέοιτο
hōs mēdenòs án déoito
 as nothing.GEN.SG IRR lack.3SG.PRS.OPT
 ‘... so that he should lack for nothing’ (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 5.1.18)*
- (721) ὥς ὅτι ἥκιστα ἄν ἐπιφθόνοις σπάνιος τε καὶ σεμνὸς φανεῖη
hōs hóti hékista án epiphthónois spánios te kai
 as that least IRR envious.M.DAT.PL rare.M.NOM.SG and and
semnòs phaneîē
 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 ἀμμένη ἤκουσε
hōs pās án égnō, hóti 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 with 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 dhē skótos labóntes eksōtheîmen
 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)§

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *endéoi* for *án déoito*. † *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*.

Translation

(724) Ἀχαιῶν στρατιᾶν ὡς ἴδοιμ' ἄν
 Akhaiōn stratiān 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 προίη, ὡς μάλιστ' ἄν [...] ποιοίη
 hóutō proíēi, hōs málist' án poioiē
 so proceed.3SG.PRS.SBJV as most IRR make.3SG.PRS.OPT
 '... so proceed as best to make ...' (Plato, *Gorgias* 453c)

The collocation *hópōs an* 'so IRR' is even more fixed in such clauses: (726)–(730).

(726) ὅπως ἄν μήτε πρὸ καιροῦ μήθ' ὑπὲρ ἄστρων βέλος ἠλίθιον σκήψειεν
 hópōs án méte prò kairoû méth' hupèr ástrōn
 so IRR nor before point.GEN.SG nor over star.GEN.PL
 bélos ēlithion sképseien
 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 ἄν τὸ στρατόπεδον ἰδρυμένον κατὰ νότου λάβοι
 hókōs án tò stratópēdon hidruménon 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 ἄν ἀπολιθάνοι καὶ μὴ ἔχοι ἀντιλαβὴν ἢ χεῖρ
 hópōs án apolisthánoi kai mē ékhoi antilabèn
 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 περιλάβοιμι' 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 εὐδαιμονοίησ
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 typical case.

- (731) σκοπῶ, ὅπως ἂν ὁ μὲν παῖς ὅδε ὁ σὸς καὶ ἡ παῖς ἦδε ὡς ῥᾶστα διάγοιεν,
 ἡμεῖς δ' ἂν μάλιστα (ἂν) εὐφραينوίμεθα
 skopô, *hópōs án* ho mèn païs
 consider.1SG.PRS so IRR the.M.NOM.SG then child.NOM.SG
 hóde ho sòs kaì 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' *án* málista (*án*) 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 in the inscription, whose extent can be determined by the spelling *stoikhēdon*.

- (732) ὅπως ἂν ὁ δῆμο[σ ἀπαλλαγείη τ]οῦ πολέμου
hópōs án ho dêmo[s apallageiē
 so IRR the.M.NOM.SG people.NOM.SG deliver.3SG.AOR.OPT.PASS
 t]oũ poléμου
 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)

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has interrog. *pōs* ... ?.

Translation

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 <άν> κατόναι(ο)
hópōs sautês <*án*> *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)).

- (734) ἐὰν οἰοί τε γενώμεθα εὐρεῖν, ὥς ἂν ἐγγύτατα τῶν εἰρημένων πόλις
οικήσειεν
eàn hoioí te *genómetha* *heureîn*, *hōs*
if such.as.M.NOM.PL and become.1PL.AOR.SBJV.MID find.AOR.INF as
án engútata tōn *eirēménōn* *pólis*
IRR nearest the.N.GEN.PL say.PTCP.PRF.PASS.N.GEN.PL city.NOM.SG
oikéσειen
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 án* *kallistá tis* *autēi*
teach.3SG.PRS as IRR well.SUPL someone.M.NOM.SG her.DAT.SG
chrōito
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 án moi* *béltista kai tákhista*
the=other.N.ACC.PL as IRR me.DAT best and fastest

dokeî paraskeuasthênai, kai dè 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 *án* eípoite kai suneíte, ámeínon
 as then IRR say.2PL.AOR.OPT and perceive.2PL.AOR.OPT better
 Philíppou pareskeúasthe, *hōs* dè kōlúsait’ *án*
 Philip.GEN equip.2PL.PRF.PASS as but hinder.2PL.AOR.OPT IRR
 ekeínon pantelōs argōs ékhete
 that.M.ACC.SG completely idly have.2PL.PRS

‘While you are better equipped than Philip for speaking and listening, as 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 εἶναι
 ouk oíd’ *hópōs án* tis autà
 not know.1SG.PRF so IRR someone.M.NOM.SG them.N.ACC.PL
 nomíseiε μὲ εἶναι
 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 ἐχρῶν χωρίον ἀποσταίῃ
 tòn gàr theôn pólemon ouk oída *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)

Translation

- (740) ὥς τύχω μαντευμάτων, ὅπη νεὸς κτείλαμι ἄν οὐρίον πτερόν
 hōs túkhō manteumátōn, hópēi neòs
 as happen.1SG.AOR.SBJV oracle.GEN.PL whereby ship.GEN.SG
 steilaim' àn oúrimon 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) σὺνεβουλεύτο, πῶς ἄν τὴν μάχην ποιοῖτο
 sunebouleúto, pōs àn tèn mákhēn
 counsel.3SG.IMP.PASS how IRR the.F.ACC.SG battle.ACC.SG
 poioíto
 make.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS
 'He took counsel as to how he should fight the battle.' (Xenophon,
Anabasis 1.7.2)*

- (742) εἰ [...] ἐσκόπει [...], πῶς ἄν ἄριστ' ἐναντιωθεῖη τῇ εἰρήνῃ
 ei eskópei pōs àn árist' enantiōtheiē 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' ἄν ἐν πόθῳ λάβοις
 hōs málist' àn 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 ἄν εἶναι παρόντι πένθει
 hōs eikòs dóxeien àn eînai
 as resemble.PTCP.PRF.N.NOM.SG seem.3SG.AOR.OPT IRR be.PRS.INF

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition adds *te* after the first word.

Translation

- (751) ὡς δὲ καὶ γένοιτ' ἄν, νόμῳ διορθώσασθαι δεῖ
hōs dè kai génoit' án, nómoī
 as but also become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR law.DAT.SG
 diorthósasthai deî
 arrange.AOR.INF.MID need.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, ὡς ἄν ἄριστα περὶ τῶν οἰκείων βουλευέσαιντο, πρὸς τὴν
 δύναμιν τὴν αὐτῶν εὖ ποιοῦσιν
hekóntes, hōs án árista perì tōn oikeíōn
 willing.M.NOM.PL as IRR best about the.N.GEN.PL domestic.N.GEN.PL
 bouleúsainto, pròs tèn dúnamin tèn
 counsel.3PL.AOR.OPT.MID to the.F.ACC.SG power.ACC.SG the.F.ACC.SG
 hautōn 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) ὡς ἄν συντομώτατ' 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 ὡς ἄν 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)

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *en* for *án*.

- (755) οὐδὲ μεμαρτύρηκεν ἀπλῶς, ὡς ἂν τις τάληθῆ μαρτυρήσει
 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’ ὡς ἂν ἡμεῖς βουλοίμεθ’ ἔχειν [...], οὐδὲν ἐστὶ θαυμαστόν
 tò mè pánth’ hōs *án* hēmeis 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) ὡς ἂν εἰ λέγοι
 hōs *án* 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, ὡς ἂν παῖς μηδέπω ὑποπτήσων
 kai tòn Kûron erésthai propetōs, hōs *án*
 and the.M.ACC.SG Cyrus.ACC.SG ask.AOR.INF.MID precipitously as IRR
 país 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’ ὡς ἂν πεπεισμένοι
 apekrínato, oukh hōsper hoi
 answer.3SG.AOR.MID not like the.M.NOM.PL

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *eperésthai* for *erésthai*.

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, ὡς ἂν πολλαχοῦ πλανωμένουσ
 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, ὡς ἂν ἀσμένῃ με ἑορακυῖα
 hē gunè 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)†

(765) διεσιώπησεν, ὡς ἂν τότε σκοπῶν, ὁπόθεν ἄρχοιτο
 diesiōpēsen, hōs án tóte skorōn,
 remain.silent.3SG.AOR as IRR then consider.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG
 hopóthen árkhōito
 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 ὡς ἂν ἐπαινοῦντές τε καὶ συνῆσθέντες ἐποιήσατε
 króton toiouton hōs án epainoúntés te
 applause.ACC.SG such.M.ACC.SG as IRR praise.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL and
 kai sunēsthéntes epoiésate
 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)

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *pollakhēi* for *pollakhoû*. † *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *hē dè tò mèn prōton ouk éthelen*.

Translation

- (767) θρυλοῦντος ἀεί, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὡς ἂν εἰς κοινὴν γνώμην
 ἀποφαινομένου
 thruloûntos aeí, tò mèn prôton hōs
 chatter.PTCP.PRS.M.GEN.SG always the.N.ACC.SG then first.N.ACC.SG as
 ἂν εἰς κοινὴν γνώμην
 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) διαλεχθεῖς τι πρὸς αὐτὸν οὕτως ὡς ἂν μεθύων
 dialekththeís ti pròs hautòn
 discuss.PTCP.AOR.PASS.M.NOM.SG something.ACC to himself.ACC
 houtōs hōs ἂν methúōn
 so as IRR be.drunk.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG
 ‘... saying something to himself, as a drunken man does...’
 (Demosthenes 54.7)
- (769) συνεδείπνει ἐναντίον πολλῶν Νέαιρα, ὡς ἂν ἑταίρα οὔσα
 sunedeípnei enantíon pollôn Néaira, hōs ἂn
 dine.together.3SG.IMP before many.M.GEN.PL Neaera.NOM as IRR
 hetaíra oúsa
 companion.NOM.SG be.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.SG
 ‘Neaera dined with them in public, as would one who was a courtesan.’
 ([Demosthenes] 59.24)†
- (770) σημεῖον δ’ ἐ<πι>φέρουσι τὸ τε ὄνομα τοῦ τέλους, ὡς ἂν ἀπὸ τοῦ
 πράγματος κείμενον
 sēmeíon d’ e<pi>phérousi tò te ónoma
 sign.ACC.SG then bring.3PL.PRS the.N.ACC.SG and name.ACC.SG
 τοῦ τέλους, hōs ἂn ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος
 the.N.GEN.SG end.GEN.SG as IRR of the.N.GEN.SG deed.GEN.SG
 kéimenon
 lie.PTCP.PRS.PASS.N.ACC.SG

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *koinòn* for *koinèn*. † *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition adds *hautēi* after *Néaira*.

‘... 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’ ὡς ἂν ἔχων τοὺς πόδας ἡμετέρου
 éptē d’ hōs àn ékhōn toùs
 fly.3SG.AOR then as IRR have.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG the.M.ACC.PL
 pódas hēmetérou
 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’ ὡς ἂν οὐ φίλη
 ágan kalōs klúousá g’ hōs àn ou philē
 too well 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) ὡς ἂν μάλιστα, μετὰ ἀειμνήστου μαρτυρίου τὴν χάριν καταθήσεσθε
 hōs àn málista, metá aeimnéstou marturiou
 as IRR most after ever-remembered.N.GEN.SG testimony.GEN.SG
 tēn khárin katathésēste
 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)
- (774) ἀπερικήπτως προσπεδόντες καὶ ὡς 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, ὡς ἂν ἐξ οἴκου μεγάλου
 dôra pollà phérōn kai
 gift.ACC.PL many.N.ACC.PL bear.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG and

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *dè phérousi* for *d’ e<pi>phérousi*. † *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *toisin* for *hōs àn*.

Translation

- ἀγῶν, *hōs ἄν* ex οἴκου megάλου
 lead.PTCP.PRS.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) εἴ σοι πείσαιμι [...] (ἐπιτρέπειν) τὴν πόλιν ψευδόμενος, ὡς ἂν
 στρατηγικῶ τε καὶ δικαστικῶ καὶ πολιτικῶ
 εἴ σοι peísaimi (epitrépein) tèn
 if you.DAT persuade.1SG.AOR.OPT entrust.PRS.INF the.F.ACC.SG
 πόλιν pseudómenos, *hōs ἄν* stratēgikōi te
 city.ACC.SG lie.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.SG as IRR military.M.DAT.SG and
 καὶ dikastikōi καὶ politikōi
 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’ ὡς ἂν καλλιστ’ αὐτῶ τὰ παρόντ’ ἔχει
 oud’ *hōs ἄν* kallist’ autōi tà
 nor as IRR well.SUPL him.DAT the.N.NOM.PL
 parónt’ ékhei
 be.present.PTCP.PRS.N.NOM.PL have.3SG.PRS
 ‘Nor is the present situation going as well as possible for him’
 (Demosthenes 1.21)
- (778) οὐχ ὡς ἂν εὖνους καὶ δίκαιος πολίτης ἔσχε τὴν γνώμην
 oukh *hōs ἄν* eúnous καὶ díkaios
 not as IRR right.minded.M.NOM.SG and righteous.M.NOM.SG
 polítēs 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, ὡς ἂν πρὸς φίλον τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ
 aphuláktōn óntōn, *hōs ἄν* pròs philon
 unguarded.M.GEN.PL be.PTCP.PRS.M.GEN.PL as IRR to friend.ACC.SG
 tōn en tēi khórāi
 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 ἰππέων τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ὡς ἂν ὑπὲρ πολιτῶν
 hupèr tôn hippéōn tōn aikhmalōtōn hōs
 over the.M.GEN.PL horseman.GEN.PL the.M.GEN.PL captive.M.GEN.PL as
án hupèr politōn
 IRR over citizen.GEN.PL
 ‘... over the captive horsemen as over citizens ...’ (CIA 2.243.34)

The use of *hōsper* ‘like’ is perhaps even more striking. It is true that we read *hōsper ... án* in (781)–(782). On the other hand, though, in (783) we have *hōsper án* etc., as well as in examples (784) and (785), the latter with a remarkable double *án*, and in (786).

- (781) ὥσπερ σελήνης ὄψις εὐφρόνας δύο στῆναι δύναιτ’ ἂν
hōsper selénēs ópsis euphrónas dúo stēnai
 like moon.GEN.SG face.NOM.SG night.ACC.PL two stand.AOR.INF
 dúnait’ *án*
 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
 στρατηγὸν ἡγεῖσθαι
 τὸν autòn trópon, *hōsper* tōn
 the.M.ACC.SG same.M.ACC.SG way.ACC.SG like the.N.GEN.PL
 strateumatōn axiōseié tis *án* tòn
 troop.GEN.PL deem.3SG.AOR.OPT someone.M.NOM.SG IRR the.M.ACC.SG
 stratēgòn hēgeísthai
 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 ἥδιστα καὶ ἐπιτηδειότατα ἀμφοτέροις ἐγίγνετο, ἐγὼ μὲν
 ἐκέλευον
hōsper án hédista kai epitēdeiótata amphotérois
 like IRR sweetly.SUPL and suitably.SUPL both.M.DAT.PL
 egígneto, egò 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)

Translation

- (784) δοκεῖ ὁμοίως λέγεσθαι ταῦτα, ὥσπερ ἂν τις περὶ ἀνθρώπου [...] λέγοι
τοῦτον τὸν λόγον
dokeî homoíōs légesthai taûta, hósper ân
seem.3SG.PRS similarly say.PRS.INF.PASS this.N.ACC.PL like IRR
tis perî anthrôpou légoi toûton
someone.M.NOM.SG about person.GEN.SG say.3SG.PRS.OPT this.M.ACC.SG
tôn lógon
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 εἶποι ἂν
all’ hósper ân mousikòs entukhôn
but like IRR musical.M.NOM.SG encounterer.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG
andrî ouk agríōs eípoi ân
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 ἀπάζοιτο
ekeínōi dè pisteuousēs, hósper ân gunè
that.M.DAT.SG but trust.PTCP.PRS.F.GEN.SG like IRR woman.NOM.SG
gambròn aspázoito
son-in-law.ACC.SG welcome.3SG.PRS.OPT
‘... but trusting him, just as a woman would her son-in-law ...’
(Xenophon, *Hellenica* 3.1.14)

In particular, when a conditional is inserted into the comparative clause, the word order *hósper ân eí* ‘like IRR if’ is found throughout: (787)–(794).

- (787) ὥσπερ οὖν ἂν, εἰ τῷ ὄντι ξένος ἐτύγχανον ὦν, ξυνεγιγνώσκετε δῆπου ἂν
μοι
hósper oûn ân, eí tōi ónti xénos
like so IRR if the.N.DAT.SG be.PTCP.PRS.N.DAT.SG stranger.NOM.SG
etúnkhanon ón, xunegignôskete dépou ân
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 ἐτύγχανεν ὢν ὑποδημάτων δημιουργός, ἀποκρίναιτο ἄν
δήπου σοι

hōsper án, ei etúnkhanen òn hupodēmátōn

like IRR if happen.3SG.IMP be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG shoe.GEN.PL

dēmiourgós, apokrínaito án 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 [...], εἶποίμ’ ἄν

hōsper án, eí tíς me éroitō [...], eípoim’ án

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 ἐτύγχανον [...], ἄρ’ οὐκ ἄν δικαίως σε ἠρόμην;

hōsper án, ei etúnkhanon ár’ ouk án dikaiōs 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)

- (791) ὥσπερ ἄν, εἰ ἐπενόεις [...] ἀργύριον τελεῖν [...], εἴ τίς σε ἤρετο [...], τί ἄν
ἀπεκρίνω

hōsper án, ei epenóeis argúrion teleîn eí

like IRR if intend.2SG.IMP money.ACC.SG fulfil.PRS.INF if

tís se éreto tí án

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)

Translation

- (792) ὥσπερ ἄν, εἰ [...] Ἱπποκράτης ὅδε ἐπιθυμήσειε [...] καὶ [...] ἀκούσειεν [...],
 εἰ αὐτὸν ἐπανερόιτο [...], εἴποι ἄν αὐτῷ
hōsper án, ei Hippokratēs hóde epithuméseie kai
 like IRR if Hippocrates this.M.NOM.SG desire.3SG.AOR.OPT and
 akouéseien 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 ἄν, εἰ ζητοίης, τίς διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἑλληνίζειν, οὐδ’ ἄν εἷς φανεῖη
hōsper án, ei zētoíēs, tís 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 ἄν, εἴ τις [...] τάττοι, οὐκ ἄν αὐτός γ’ ἀδικεῖν παρεσκευάσθαι
 δόξαι
hōsper 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
 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 *hōsper 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 [...] διώκει τι μὴ καλῶς ἢ ὀρθῶς, αὐτὸ μὲν τοῦτ’ ἄξιον
 μέμψεο

hóspēr 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' áxion
 well or straight same.N.ACC.SG then this.N.ACC.SG worthy.N.ACC.SG
 mémpseos
 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) χρῆ [...] ἀνθρώπινως περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκλογίζεσθαι, ὥσπερ ἂν
 αὐτὸν ὄντα ἐν τῇ συμφορᾷ
 khrē anthrōpínōs perì tōn pragmatōn
 need.3SG.PRS humanely about the.N.GEN.PL deed.GEN.PL
 eklogízesthai, *hóspēr án* autòn ónta en
 consider.FUT.INF.MID like IRR same.M.ACC.SG be.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG in
 têi sumphorâi
 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 ἂν τις αὐτὸς ὦν [...] ἐκλογίζοιτο
hóspēr 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 ...'

- (798) τοῦτ' αὐτὸ ἐπιδεικνύτω ὥσπερ ἂν ὑμῶν ἕκαστος
 toút' autò epideiknútō *hóspēr án*
 this.N.ACC.SG same.N.ACC.SG display.3SG.PRS.IMP like IRR
 humōn 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

* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *kat' autò* for *autò*.

Translation

oudè homoíōs humîn, *hōsper 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 *hōsper àn ei*, Dindorf & Blass (1888) has
only *hōsper*)

- (800) ὥσπερ ἄν παρεστηκότος αὐτοῦ
hōsper àn parestēkōtos autoû
like IRR stand.by.PTCP.PRF.M.GEN.SG him.GEN
‘... as if with him standing beside’ (Demosthenes 19.226)
- (801) χρώμενος ὥσπερ ἄν ἄλλος τις αὐτῷ τὰ πρὸ τούτου
khrōmenos *hōsper 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 ἄν αὐτῷ τις ἀδικουμένῳ
deî toínun toutoîs boētheîn, *hōsper àn*
need.3SG.PRS therefore this.M.DAT.PL help.PRS.INF like IRR
hautōi tis adikouménōi
himself.DAT 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 ἄν τις συκοφαντεῖν ἐπιχειρῶν
hōsper àn tis sukophanteîn
like IRR someone.M.NOM.SG defraud.PRS.INF
epikheirōn
attempt.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG
‘... as would someone attempting to deceive’ (Demosthenes 29.30; see
Dindorf & Blass (1888: 354) following A; most have *hōsper àn eî tis*, with
which reading the example below should be understood.)*

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *àn eî*, which Wackernagel cites as a variant.

- (804) πλὴν εἰ σημεῖον ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλῳ τινί, τῷ χαλκίῳ προσέεται
 plēn ei sēmeion hōsper án állōi tini,
 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
 hōsper án doúlos 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
 hōsper án állos tis apotukhón
 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
 hōsper án ei pròs hápantas anthrōpous 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 Φρυωνῆδα πανουργίαν ὀνειδίσειεν
 hōsper án eí tōi Phrunóndas panourgían
 like IRR if someone.M.DAT.SG Phrynondas.NOM villainy.ACC.SG
 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.

- (809) ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ ἤκουεν
 hōsper án ei ḗkouen
 like IRR if hear.3SG.IMP
 ‘... as if he heard ...’ (Plato, *Protagoras* 341c)

In addition to this we find the sequence *hósper án ei* (usually written *hōsper-aneí*) in the sense of *quasi* ‘how’, cf. *ōseí, 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) ὡσπερανεὶ παῖς
hōsperaneí país
 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 βλάστοι ποτέ
ouk ést’ adelphós, *hóstis* *án* 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 ἂν μέμψαιτό σε
ouk éstin oudeis *hóstis* *án*
 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)

- (818) οὐκ ἔστιν εἰς ὃ τι ἂν ἀναγκαιότερον ἀναλίσκοιτε χρήματα
ouk éstin eis *hó.ti* *án* anankaióteron
 not be.3SG.PRS into which.N.ACC.SG IRR necessary.COMP.N.ACC.SG

* *Translator’s note:* In these last two instances the Perseus edition has *hósper án ei* written separately.

Translation

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 ἄν τις μείζον [...] 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) τουτωνὶ [...] οὐκ ἔστιν, ἄττ’ ἄν ἐμοὶ εἶπεε ἡδίω
 toutōnì ouk éstin, hátt’ àn emoi
 this.N.GEN.PL.EMPH not be.3SG.PRS which.N.ACC.PL IRR me.DAT
 eípes 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 ἄν ἀπέσχετο
 oímai 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 ἄν [...] ἐψήφισεν [...];
 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 ἄν [...] ὑπέμεινεν [...];
 éstin, hóstis àn hupémeinen?
 be.3SG.PRS who.M.NOM.SG IRR abide.3SG.AOR
 ‘Is there anyone who could bear ...?’ (Demosthenes 19.309)[‡]

* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *eukairóteron* for *anankaióteron*. † Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *epipséphisen* for *epséphisen*. ‡ Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *ésth’ hóstis* for *éstin, hóstis*.

- (824) οὐ γὰρ ἦν, ὅ τι ἂν ἐποιεῖτε
ou gàr ên, hó.ti án epoiéite
 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 μίσθωσιν; ἔστι δ’ ὅστις ἂν [...] ἐπέτρεψεν;
éstin oún, hóstis án τοῦ xύλου καὶ
 be.3SG.PRS so who.M.NOM.SG IRR the.N.GEN.SG wood.GEN.SG and
 τοῦ khōríou tosaútēn hupémeine phérein
 the.N.GEN.SG place.GEN.SG so.much.F.ACC.SG abide.3SG.AOR bear.PRS.INF
 místhōsin? ésti d’ hóstis án epétrepsen?
 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 εἴποι
 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)
- (828) οὐκ οἶδα εἰς ὄντιν’ ἂν τις ἄλλον καιρὸν ἀναβάλλοιτο
ouk oída eis hóntin’ án tis
 not know.1SG.PRF into which.M.NOM.SG IRR someone.M.NOM.SG

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *oud’* for *ouk*.

Translation

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 ὃ τι ἄν τις χρήσταιτο αὐτῷ
ouk oída 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 *houútō*: (830).

(830) οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστιν οὕτω ράθυμος ὅστις ἄν δέξαιτο
oudeîs gár estin houútō rháithumos
nobody.M.NOM.SG for 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
tôn de katà taûta ekhóntōn ouk
the.N.GEN.PL but down this.N.ACC.PL have.PTCP.PRS.N.GEN.PL not
éstin hótōi pot’ án álloï
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 *autoîs* for *autōi*. † Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *t’autà*, with crasis, for *taûta*.

- (832) ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅστις οὐκ ἂν τις καταφρονήσειεν
hōn 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 pithanóteron
 not for 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, ὄντινα οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἔρως ἐνθεὸν ποιήσειεν
oudeis houtō 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 ἀξιώσειεν
oudeis gár, hóstis ouk án axiōseien
 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 εὐξάιτο [...];
tís houtōs phthonerós estin 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*.

Translation

rule. This is also not at all surprising: compare what was observed above on p35, p38 and p53 on the placement of *ouk* before enclitics and on p177 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 ἄν οὐκ ἄν 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 ἄν 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
tên basiléōs khóran kakōs 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 ἄν δύναίτο ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατῆσαι

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition lacks the first *án*. † *Translator's note:* Not found in Perseus edition

éstin oûn *hóstitis* tou̓to *án* dúnaito
 be.3SG.PRS SO who.M.NOM.SG this.N.ACC.SG IRR can.PRS.OPT.PASS
 humâs exapatêσαι
 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' ἦν οὕτω ἢ μισόδημος τότε ἢ μισαθήναιος, ὅστις ἐδυνήθη ἄν
 tíς d' ên hou̓tō è misódēmos tóte
 who.M.NOM.SG then be.3SG.IMP so or people-hating.M.NOM.SG then
 è misathénaios, *hóstitis* édunéthē *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 *hētis án tód*?)

(841) οὐ γὰρ ἦν ὅ τι ἄλλ' ἄν ἐποιεῖτε
 ou gàr 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 Ἑλληνικὴ γυνὴ ἔτλη
 ouk éstin, *hētis* tou̓t' *án* Hellēnìs
 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 *hóstitis*, and in clauses where *hóstitis* itself was attached

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition lacks Blass’s *állo*.

Translation

to a negative clause but was not absolutely necessary for its interpretation and therefore not so closely attached to it. From the first category we have (843) (non-negative interrogative!) and (844)–(848).

- (843) ἔστ' οὖν ὅπως ἂν ὥσπερ εἰ σπονδῆς θεοῦ κάγω λαβοίμην [...];
ést' oûn hópōs ân hōsperei spondês 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 ân egó poth' hekòn
not be.3SG.PRS how IRR I.NOM sometime willing.M.NOM.SG
tês sês 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 ὁμιλίαν
oudèn autòs exēûron, hopóthen ân eikótōs
nothing.ACC.SG same.M.NOM.SG discover.1SG.AOR whence IRR justly
hupereídete 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 ân ámeinson oikéseian tēn
not be.3SG.PRS how IRR better settle.3PL.AOR.OPT the.F.ACC.SG
heautōn
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 μείναιμι
ouk ésth' hópōs ân 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)

- (848) οὐκ εἶναι ἔθνος, ὁποῖω ἂν ἀξιόσειαν ὑπήκοοι εἶναι Θετταλοί
 ouk eînai éthnos, hopoíōi ân
 not be.PRS.INF people.NOM.SG of.what.sort.N.DAT.SG IRR
 axióseian 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 *enantióterá*, as done by Weil 1886: 103 and, following him, Dindorf & Blass 1888), and (850) (cf. also *ouk oîd’*, *hópōs án* – above p184).

- (849) ἔστιν οὖν ὅπως ἂν ἐναντιώτερα τίς δύο θεῖη
 éstin oûn hópōs ân enantióterá 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 ân 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 [...] ὅπως οὐκ ἂν ἴσον πλῆθος τοῖς Πέρσῃσι ἐξέβαλε
 ouk ékhō hókōs ouk ân íson pléthos
 not have.1SG.PRS how not IRR equal.N.ACC.SG quantity.ACC.SG

Translation

toís Pársēisi exébate
 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
 number equal to that of the Persians ...’ (Herodotus 8.119.1)

- (852) τοῦτ’ οὖν ἐστὶν ὅπως τις ἂν ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσῃ
 toút’ 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 οὔτ’ αἰνέσῃμ’ ἂν οὔτε
 μεμψαίμην ποτέ
 ouk ésth’ hopoion 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’ hēmera
 not then be.3SG.PRS how one.F.NOM.SG day.NOM.SG
 génoit’ àn hēmerai 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 ἄν δοκῶ μοι τήμερον
 ou gàr ésth' hópōs apeipeîn án dokō 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 ...'
 (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, ekeína
 be.3SG.PRS so how this.N.ACC.PL IRR that.N.ACC.PL
 proeirēkós, 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 ἄν εἴποι
 all' oudè philōn pélas oudeís, hóstis án eípoi
 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 ἀφίκται [...], ὅστις ἄν ἡμῖν καφέε τι ἀγγεῖλαι οἶός τ' ἦν
 περὶ τούτων

* Translator's note: The Perseus edition adds *ést'* after *pélas*.

Translation

οὐτε τις ξένος ἀφῆκται ἥστis
 nor some.M.NOM.SG stranger.NOM.SG arrive.3SG.PRF.PASS who.M.NOM.SG
 ἂν ἡμῖν σαφές τι ἀγγεῖλαι
 IRR us.DAT clear.N.ACC.SG something.ACC.SG announce.3SG.AOR.OPT
 ἡοῖός τ' ἔν περὶ τοῦτον
 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 κατεῖδ' 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' ἄν
 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 *hóper* ‘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 *hóspēr*-sentences only in the majority of examples, however, and not always: (862)–(870).

- (862) κατήλιπε εὐπετέως τῆς θαλάσσης κρατήσῃν, τάπερ ἂν καὶ ἦν
 katélpize eupetéōs tēs thalássēs kratésein,
 hope.3SG.IMP easily the.F.GEN.SG sea.GEN.SG rule.FUT.INF
 táper ἂν καὶ ἔν
 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 ἑωυτοῦς, ὅποιά περ ἂν ἐθεραπεύθησαν
 toiaûta therapeúsantes heōutoús,
 such.N.ACC.PL treat.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL themselves.ACC

tòn dè pólemon, di' hónper khrésimoi
 the.M.ACC.SG but war.ACC.SG through which.M.ACC.SG useful.M.NOM.PL
án 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)

(872) Φίλιππος δ' ἄπερ εὔξαισθ' ἄν ὑμεῖς, [...] πράξει
 Philíppos d' háper eúxaisth' án 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 εὔξαισθ' ἄν, ἐλπίζαντες [...]
 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' οὔσπερ ἄν πόσις céθεν
 philous nomízous' hoúsper án
 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 οἶεσθε δεῖν καὶ τιμᾶν, οὔσπερ ἄν καὶ ὁ βασιλεύς
 phileîn oíesthe deîn καὶ timân,
 like.PRS.INF think.2PL.PRS.IMPER.PASS need.PRS.INF and honour.PRS.INF

Translation

hoúsper *àn* *kai* *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* *kai* *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.’
 (Demosthenes 18.280)

[p390]

- (877) *τελεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν τὰ αὐτὰ τέλη ἐν τῷ δήμῳ ἄπερ ἂν καὶ Πειραιεῖς*
teleîn *dè* *autòn* *tà* *autà* *télé*
 fulfil.PRS.INF but him.M.ACC.SG the.N.ACC.PL same.N.ACC.PL end.ACC.PL
en *toì* *démōi* *háper* *àng* *kai* *Peiraiéis*
 in the.M.DAT.SG people.DAT.SG which.N.ACC.PL IRR also Peiraeian.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 ποιησάμενοι σπουδῆν, ὅσῃν περ ἂν τῆς αὐτῶν χώρας*
πορθουμένης
tosautēn *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 γυναίξιν αὐτῶν συνέβαλον*
nikēsai *tosouton*, *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 autôn 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 ἄν, εἰ πάντων ἡμῶν ἐκράτησαν
tosoúton ephrónēsan, hóson per án, 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)

- (881) ἄπερ ἄν εἰς τοὺς πολεμιωτάτους, ἕξαμαρτεῖν ἐτόλμησαν
háper án 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 they would to their greatest enemies’ (Isocrates 14.37)

- (882) εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν καθέστηκα κίνδυνον, εἰς ὃνπερ ἄν, εἰ πάντας ἐτύγχανον
ἠδίκηκός
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, οἶαν περ ἄν, εἰ
προσέταξέ τις
dokeî moi [...] toiaútēn poiēsasthai zētēsīn
seem.3SG.PRS me.DAT such.F.ACC.SG do.AOR.INF.MID search.ACC.SG
autoû, hoían per án, ei prosétaxé tis
it.GEN 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

Translation

someone commanded ...' (Plato, *Republic* 2.368d)*

- (884) μόνοι τε ὄντες ὅμοια ἔπραττον, ἄπερ ἂν 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 ἂν μετ' ἄλλων ὄντες
 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, ἄπερ ἂν νέος ἄνθρωπος
 apekrinámēn autōi, *háper* ἂν néos
 answer.1SG.AOR.MID him.DAT which.N.ACC.PL IRR young.M.NOM.SG
 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 ἂν τις δέκθθειῖ
 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 ἂn hoûtoi gnoïen
 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 ἂn autoì gnoïen
 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)

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *dokô* for *dokei*. † *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition adds *oûn* after *egô*.

- (889) πρὸς ἅπασιν [...] τοῖς ἄλλοις, οἷς ἄν εἰπεῖν τις ὑπὲρ Κτησιφῶντος ἔχοι
 pròs hápasin toís állois, hoís án
 to quite.all the.N.DAT.PL other.N.DAT.PL which.N.DAT.PL IRR
 eipeîn tis hupèr Ktēsiphôntos 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 φυλάξαισθ’ ἄν
 mēdèn hōn idíai phuláxaisth’
 nothing.ACC which.N.GEN.PL private.F.DAT.SG guard.2PL.AOR.OPT.MID
 án
 IRR
 ‘... none of the things against which you would guard in your private
 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) ἀφ’ ὧν ἄν τις σκοπῶν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὖθις ἐπιπέσοι, μάλιστ’ ἄν ἔχοι τι
 aph’ hōn án tis
 of which.N.GEN.PL IRR someone.M.NOM.SG
 skopōn, eí pote kaì aũthis epipésōi,
 consider.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG if sometime also again fall.on.3SG.AOR.OPT
 málist’ án ékhoi ti
 most IRR have.3SG.PRS.OPT something.ACC.SG
 proeidōs mē agnoeîn
 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
 hōsa gàr án nūn 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)*

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition lacks the first *án*.

Translation

- (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
 εἶποι ἄν
 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
há deî kaì di’ hōn
 which.N.ACC.PL need.3SG.PRS and through which.N.GEN.PL
 pausáimeth’ 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 *hoútōs* ‘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 ἄν ὑπὸ πάντων ἐλεηθεῖην
en hoís egò dikaiós án hupò pantōn
 in which.N.DAT.PL I.NOM righteously IRR under all.M.GEN.PL
 eleētheíēn
 pity.1SG.AOR.OPT.PASS
 ‘... in which (circumstances) I might rightly be pitied by all.’ (Andocides 1.67)

- (896) ὃ τίς ἰδὼν οὐκ ἄν ἐφοβήθη [...];
hó tíς idōn ouk án
 which.N.ACC.SG who.M.NOM.SG see.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG not IRR
 ephobéthē
 frighten.3SG.AOR.PASS
 ‘Seeing which, who would not have been frightened?’ (Lysias 2.34)*

* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *ouk án idōn*.

- (897) ἐξ ὧν σαφέστατ' ἄν τις ἴδοι
 ex *hôn* saphéstat' *án* 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 (898) (but also (899)); for *hóste* 'so that', for instance, (900); for *hóti* 'that/because', for instance, (901)–(903).

- (898) ὡς ἐγὼ οὐδ' ἄν 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 ἄν ἐλπίζαντες ὡς ἄν 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 ἄν εἶη μαθητής
 hóste kai hoútos Érōtos *án* eíē mathētés
 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' ἄττ' ἄν λέγοι
 délon hóti 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)

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition adds *kai* after *hôn*.

† *Translator's note:* The Perseus

edition has *elpísantas* for *elpísantes*.

Translation

(902) ὅτι οὕτως ἂν ἡμῶν τὸ γένος εὐδαιμον γένοιτο
 hótī houtōs *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 tôn adikēmátōn *án* emémnēto tôn
 that the.N.GEN.PL wrong.GEN.PL IRR recall.3SG.PLPF.PASS the.N.GEN.PL
 hautoû
 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 ἔχοι γ’ ἂν τις εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτῶν
 epei ékhoi g’ *án* tis eipeîn perî
 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 πάλαι ἂν ἀπωλώλειτε
 epei dià g’ humâs pálai *án* apólōleite
 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’ ἂν ἡμεῖς μὴ δυνάιμεθ’ ἐκεῖς’ ἀφικέσθαι
 hēník’ *án* hēmeis mē dunaímeth’ ekeís’ 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)

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition adds *autoûs* after *humâs*. † *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition of Isocrates 17.15 lacks *án*.

- (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)
- (909) πρὶν ἄν [...] ἢ πέσοι τις ἢ τρωθείη
 prîn án è pésoi tis è
 before IRR or fall.3SG.AOR.OPT someone.M.NOM.SG or
 trōtheíē
 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 adverbial clauses, e.g. (911)–(914).*

- (910) οὐκ οἶδ’ εἰ οἷός τ’ ἄν εἴη
 ouk oíd’ ei hoíos t’ án eíēs
 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 ἄν ἀναπείσαιμεν ἱκετεύοντέ νιν
 ei pōs án 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’ ἄν ἤδη
 oud’ ei mē poiésait’ án édē
 nor if not do.2PL.AOR.OPT IRR already
 ‘Nor, if you should fail to do immediately ...’ (Demosthenes 4.18)[‡]

* *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*.

Translation

- (913) οὐκοῦν αἰσχρόν, εἰ μέλλοντες μὲν εὖ πάσχειν κυκοφάντην ἄν τὸν ταῦτα
λέγονθ' ἠγοίσθε, ἐπὶ τῷ δ' ἀφελέσθαι [...] ἀκούσεσθε
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 ân tôn taûta
suffer.PRS.INF informer.ACC.SG IRR the.M.ACC.SG this.N.ACC.PL
légonth' hēgoísthe, epì tōi d'
say.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG lead.2PL.PRS.OPT.PASS upon the.N.DAT.SG then
aphelésthai akousethe
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) ἐξώλης ἀπολοίμην [...], εἰ προσλαβὼν γ' ἄν ἀργύριον [...] ἐπρέσβευσα
exólēs apoloímēn ei proslabōn
ruined.M.NOM.SG destroy.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID if accept.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG
g' ân argúriον 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 ἄν τὸν πόθον
dédoika gár, mē prōi légois ân tôn
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 ἄν ποτε οἱ πολέμοι ἐξαπιναίως οὕτως
ἐπιπλεύσειαν

οὔτε προσδοκία οudemía 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
 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
 ekeíno ennoô, *mē lían án* takhù
 that.N.ACC.SG consider.1SG.PRS not very IRR quickly
 sōphronistheíēn
 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 ἢ παρασκευή
 phobouñtai, *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.

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.

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *kataskeuē* for *paraskeuē*.

Translation

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)).

- (919) γόνιμον δὲ ποιητὴν ἄν οὐχ εὔροισ ἔτι ζητῶν ἄν
gónimon dè poiētèn àn oukh heúrois éti
fruitful.M.ACC.SG but 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
epeì 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 εἶποι τις ἄν ἡλίκα
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) κείνος δὲ πῶς τὰ ζῶντα τοῖς θανοῦσιν ἀποδοίη ποτ' ἄν
keînos dè pōs tà zōnta toîs
that.M.NOM.SG but how the.N.ACC.PL live.PTCP.PRS.N.ACC.PL the.M.DAT.PL
thanoûsin apodoíē pot' án
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) ἦ γὰρ εἶην οὐκ ἂν εὖ φρονῶν
 ê gâr eîēn ouk ân eû phronôn
 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)

For *takh’* ‘quickly’: (924).

- (924) τῆ δ’ ἐπιτήμη κύ μου τρούχοις τάχ’ ἂν πού
 têi d’ epistēmēi sú mou
 the.F.DAT.SG then knowledge.F.DAT.SG you.NOM me.GEN
 tróukhois tákh’ ân 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 σωφρονῶν τλαίη τάδ’ ἂν
 tís sōphronôn tlaíē
 who.M.NOM.SG be.sane.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG endure.3SG.AOR.OPT
 tád’ ân
 this.N.ACC.PL IRR
 ‘Who in his senses would dare this?’ (Euripides, *Helen* 97)

For *taut’* ‘this’: (926).

- (926) συμμαρτυροίη ταῦτ’ ἂν ἐν δίκῃ
 summarturoíē taût’ ân 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) ὧμῶξε μέντ’ ἂν
 óimōxe mént’ ân
 lament.3SG.AOR yet IRR
 ‘He would certainly regret it.’ (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 743)

Translation

- (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).

- (929) προσέβα γὰρ οὐκ ἄν ἀκτιβῆς ἄλκοσ ἔσ
 proséba gār ouk *án* astibēs 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 τοῦσδ' ἄν
 óloint' idoûsai toûsd' *án*
 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 dè toûto málist' *án*
 learn.2PL.AOR.OPT but 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) ἔδρασ' ἄν (εὖ τόδ' ἴσθ') ἄν
 édras' *án* (eû tód' ísth') *án*
 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 ἰσχύων φυγεῖν
 dúnait' *án* oúd' *án* 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)

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *toût'* for *tód'*.

- (934) ἠλείψατο δ' ἄν τοῦμφαλοῦ οὐδεὶς παῖς ὑπένερθεν τότ' ἄν
 ēleípsato d' *án* toumphaloû oudeîs
 anoint.3SG.AOR.MID then IRR the=navel.GEN.SG none.M.NOM.SG
 paîs hupénerthen tót' *án*
 child.NOM.SG beneath then IRR
 'And no boy then would anoint himself below the navel.' (Aristophanes, *Clouds* 977)

The editors of Aristophanes's *The Knights* were therefore right to change the transmitted *phágois hédist'* in verse 707 to *phagōn hédoi'* (or *hédoi*), as in (935).

- (935) ἐπὶ τῷ φαγῶν ἥδοιτ'/ἥδοι' ἄν
 epì tōi phagōn
 upon what.N.DAT.SG eat.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG
 hédoi'/hédoi' *án*
 enjoy.3SG(2SG).PRS.OPT.PASS 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 toút' 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 parêk' *án* argón, all' élegen
 nothing.ACC.SG permit.1SG.AOR IRR idle.N.ACC.SG but say.3SG.IMP
 hē guné té moi khō doûlos
 the.F.NOM.SG woman.NOM.SG and me.DAT and=the.M.NOM.SG slave
 oudèn hêtton 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.)

Translation

- (937) κού φθάνοι θνήσκων τις ἄν
 kou phthánoi thnḗskōn 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. 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, in the same way that 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 περιώδυνος μὴ δεμνιοτήρης μόλοι
 tīs án en tákhei mè periódunos mè
 someone.F.NOM.SG IRR in haste.DAT.SG not very.painful.F.NOM.SG not
 demniotérēs 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 *gàr* ‘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, *gàr an* is still infinitely more frequent than *gàr ... an*; secondly, as a consequence of inserting *án* immediately after *gàr*, 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).

* *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 *mēdè* instead of the second *mè*.

- (939) τῷ γὰρ ἄν καὶ μείζονι λέξαιμι' ἄν ἢ σοί
 tōi gār án kai meízoni léxaim' án è
 whom.M.DAT.SG then IRR also greater.M.DAT.SG say.1SG.AOR.OPT IRR than
 σοί
 you.DAT
 'For to whom more than to you would I speak ...' (Sophocles, *Oedipus
 Rex* 772)
- (940) οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄν πράξαιμι' ἄν
 oudèn gār án práxaim' án
 nothing.ACC.SG then IRR do.1SG.AOR.OPT IRR
 'For I would do nothing ...' (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 882)
- (941) κάμοι γὰρ ἄν πατήρ γε δακρύων χάριν ἀνήκτ' ἄν εἰς φῶς
 kamoì gār án patér ge dakrúōn khárin
 and=me.DAT then IRR father.NOM.SG even tear.GEN.PL grace.ACC.SG
 anèkt' 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) ἄλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἄν τὰ θεῖα κρυπτόντων θεῶν μάθοις ἄν
 all' ou gār án tà theía 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 ἄν τις αὐτὰ τἀναγκαῖ' ὀρᾶν δύναιτ' ἄν ἐστὼς πολεμίοις
 éναντιοῦς
 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
 hestōs 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)

Translation

- (944) τὴν Τροίαν γὰρ ἂν δειλοὶ γενόμενοι πλεῖστον αἰσχύνομεν ἂν
 tèn Troían gàr àn deiloì
 the.F.ACC.SG Troy.ACC then IRR wretched.M.NOM.PL
 genómenoì 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)
- (945) καὶ γὰρ ἂν κείνος βλέπων ἀπέδωκεν ἂν σοὶ τῆνδ’ ἔχειν
 kaì gàr àn keínos blérōn apédōken soi tēnd’ ékhein
 and then IRR that.M.NOM.SG look.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG restore.3SG.AOR IRR
 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 philtátōi 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 λόχημ κλέπτα δύο
 ou gàr àn pote tréphein dúnait’ án
 not then IRR sometime rear.PRS.INF can.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR
 μία lókhēm 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 hēmeís 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 μιαραὶ κεκλήμεθ' ἂν
 állōs gār *án* ámakhoi gunaïkes 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
 kai gār *án* mainoímeth' *án*
 and then IRR rave.1PL.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR
 'For we would be mad.' (Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae* 196)
- (951) σαφῶς γὰρ ἂν, εἰ πείθοιμι ὑμᾶς ..., θεοὺς ἂν διδάσκειμι
 saphōs gār *án*, ei peithoimi humās theōus *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 ἂν οἶμαι, εἰ ... δέοι ..., οἶμαι ἂν ... τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα
 egō gār *án* oîmai, ei déoi oîmai
 I.NOM then IRR think.1SG.PRS.PASS if lack.3SG.PRS.OPT think.1SG.PRS.PASS
án τὸν μέγαν basiléa euarithmétous
 IRR the.M.ACC.SG great.M.ACC.SG king.ACC.SG easily-counted.M.ACC.PL
án heureîn
 IRR 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 ἂν αἰ τῆς σελήνης ἐκλείψεις τοιαύτας ἂν εἶχον τὰς ἀποτομάς
 oude gār *án* hai tēs selénēs ekleipseis
 nor then IRR the.F.NOM.PL the.F.GEN.SG moon.GEN.SG eclipse.NOM.PL
 toiaútas *án* eikhon tās 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)

- (958) οὕτω ἂν ὧν εἶμεν
 hoútō *án* ōn eímen
 so IRR so be.1PL.PRS
 ‘Therefore we would thus be ...’ (Herodotus 7.150.2; cf. Euripides, *Medea* 504)*
- (959) τίς ἂν οὖν γένοιτ’ ἂν ὄρκος
 tís *án* oûn génoit’ *án* 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 *án* oûn ouk *án* 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 *án* oûn dê toúth’ hoútōs ékhoi egō
 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 εἶη ὃ γε τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἄμοιρος
 pôs *án* oûn theòs eíē hó ge
 how IRR so god.NOM.SG be.3SG.PRS.OPT the.M.NOM.SG even
 tōn kalōn kaì agathōn ámoiros
 the.N.GEN.PL 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 τοσοῦτος πόρους ... ἔπειτα ἐκ τούτων πάντων
 τοῦτον ἂν τὸν τρόπον ἐξελοίμεθα ...
 pôs *án* 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 *án* tòn
 then out this.M.GEN.PL all.M.GEN.PL this.M.ACC.SG IRR the.M.ACC.SG

* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *eíēmen* for *eímen*.

Translation

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 ân oûn egò é biasáimēn humâs è
how IRR SO I.NOM or force.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID you.ACC.PL or
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 ân oûn anêr mâllon doíē díkēn
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 ân oûn rháidíōs 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
cunáψειε
tís ân oûn eú phronôn hautôn ân
who.M.NOM.SG IRR SO well reason.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG himself.ACC IRR
è tà tês 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
ἐαυτοῦ γυναῖκα

pôs *án* oûn mē eidòs ho patēr
 how IRR so not know.PTCP.PRF.M.NOM.SG the.M.NOM.SG father.NOM.SG
 autòn Athēnaïon esómenon édōken *án*
 him.ACC Athenian.ACC.SG be.PTCP.FUT.MID.M.ACC.SG give.3SG.AOR IRR
 tēn heautoû gunaïka
 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)

(969) ἴσως ἄν οὖν τις θαυμάσειεν
 ísōs *án* oûn tis thaumáσειεν
 perhaps IRR so someone.M.NOM.SG wonder.3SG.AOR.OPT
 ‘So perhaps someone might wonder ...’ (Aeschines 1.17)

(970) πῶς ἄν οὖν ἐγὼ προεδεικνύμην Ἀλεξάνδρῳ
 pôs *án* oûn egò proedeiknúmēn 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 p234. (It should not be denied that *án* follows *oûn* even more frequently.) In (971) *án* precedes *te*; 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) τάχιςτ’ ἄν τε πόλιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀπολέσειαν
 tákhist’ *án* te pólin hoi toioûtoi apoléσειαν
 fastest IRR and city.ACC.SG the.M.NOM.PL such.M.NOM.PL
 apoléσειαν
 destroy.3PL.AOR.OPT
 ‘And such people would ruin a state most quickly’ (Thucydides 2.62.3)

(972) τάχ’ ἄν δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ἐσπλεύσαντες
 tákh’ *án* dè kai állos espleúsantes
 quickly IRR but also otherwise sail.in.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL
 ‘... but perhaps also sailing in by another way’ (Thucydides 6.2.4)†

* *Translator’s note:* This is also the version found in the modern Perseus edition. † *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition adds *pôs* after *állos*.

Translation

- (973) ταχ' ἄν δ' ἴσως
takh' *án* 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).

- (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) cὺ δ' ... οἶμαι, ἄν, ὡς ἐγὼ λέγω, ποιοίης
sù d' oĩmai, *án*, hōs egō légō,
you.NOM then think.1SG.PRS.PASS IRR as I.NOM say.1SG.PRS
poioíēs
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 oũn *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 pōs *án*, éphē, ô Sókrates, homologoíto
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 φαίης κτήσιν
prós ge hupodēmátōn *án*, oĩmai pháíēs ktēsín
to even shoe.GEN.PL IRR think.1SG.PRS.PASS say.2SG.PRS.OPT
acquisition.ACC.SG
'For obtaining shoes, I think, you would say?' (Plato, *Republic* 1.333a)

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *éphēn* for *éphē*.

- (979) ἴσως γὰρ ἄν, ἔφη, δοκοίη τι λέγειν ὁ ταῦτα λέγων
 ísōs gàr *án*, éphē, dokoiē ti
 perhaps then IRR say.3SG.IMP seem.3SG.PRS.OPT something.ACC.SG
 légein ho taúta 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)
- (980) τί ἄν, εἰ ... (seven lines follow) τί ποτ’ ἄν ἡγοῦμεθα ἐκ ταύτης τῆς
 προρρήσεως ξυμβαίνειν
 tí *án*, ei tí pot’ *án* hēgōúmētha 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*, autōn ei kalōs tis
 think.1SG.PRS.PASS IRR them.GEN if well someone.M.NOM.SG
 epimeloíto, ouk eínai 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, ὡς τάχιστα ὄπλα ἐποιοῦμην τοῖς Πέρσαις
 egō *án*, ei ékhoimi, hōs tákhista hópla
 I.NOM IRR if have.1SG.PRS.OPT as fastest armour.ACC.PL
 epoioumēn toῖς 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

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *egō mēn án, éphē ho Kúros, ei su eíēn, hōs tákhista hópla poiouímēn.*

Translation

toûto páthos sunébē, prosdokêσαι
 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).

(984) οὐτ’ ἄν, εἰ θέλοισ ἔτι πράσσειν, ἐμοῦ γ’ ἄν ἠδέως πράσσοις μέτα
 οὐτ’ *án*, ei thélois éti prássein, emoû g’ *án* 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) ἄλλ’ ἄν, εἰ τὸν ἐξ ἐμῆς μητρὸς θανόντ’ ἄθαπτον ἠνυχόμην νέκυν,
 κείνοισ ἄν ἦλγουν
 all’ *án*, ei tòn ex emês mētròs
 but IRR if the.M.ACC.SG out my.F.GEN.SG mother.GEN.SG
 thanónt’ áthapton ênskhómēn
 die.PTCP.AOR.M.ACC.SG unburied.M.ACC.SG sustain.1SG.AOR.MID
 nékun, kéinois *án* élgoun
 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, δηλώσαιμι ἄν
 hóst’ *án*, ei sthénos láboimi, dēlósaim’ *án*
 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 ἔβλαπτε, ... χοὰς οὐκ ἄν
 ποθ’ ὄν γ’ ἔκτεινε, τῷδ’ ἐπέστεφε

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *dróies* for *prássois*.

arkhèn d' án, ei mè tlēmonestátē
 beginning.ACC.SG then IRR if not audacious.SUPL.F.NOM.SG
 gunè pasôn éblaste khoàs ouk án
 woman.NOM.SG all.GEN.PL bud.3SG.AOR libation.ACC.PL not IRR
 poth' hōn g' ékteine, tōid' epéstephe
 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) ἐκεῖνον δ' ἄν, εἰ ἐκδοίη αὐτόν ..., σωτηρίας ἄν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποστερηῆσαι
 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 aposterēsai
 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 ἐνήν νοῦς, ἐκ τῶν ἐρίων τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπολιτεύεσθ' ἄν
 ἅπαντα
 kán, humîn eí tis enēn noûs, ek
 and=IRR you.DAT.PL if someone.M.NOM.SG spin.3SG.IMP mind.ACC.PL out
 tōn eríōn tōn hēmetērōn
 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 Ὁρθαγόρα τῷ Θηβαίῳ συγγενόμενος ... ἐπανερόιτο αὐτόν ...,
 εἴποι ἄν

Translation

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
 éipoi 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
 quickly then IRR if god.NOM.SG want.3SG.PRS.OPT also=IRR
 duoîn thátera biasáimetha perì
 two.N.GEN.DU the=other.N.ACC.PL force.1PL.AOR.OPT.MID about
 erōtikôn
 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 ἄν ἦγον
 episkhôn án, héōs ei hēsukhían án 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’ ἄν, εἴ γ’ εἶχε ..., ταῦτ’ ἄν εἶαεν
 âr’ án, eí g’ eíkhe taût’ án 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’ ἄν, εἴ τι γένοιτ’, ᾧήθην ἄν δίκην μοι λαχεῖν ποτε τοῦτον
 oud’ án, eí ti génoit’, ghēthēn án díkēn moi lakheîn pote toûton
 nor IRR if something.NOM.SG become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID
 oíéthēn án 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 ἄν, εἰ μὴ πεπορισμένον τε ἦν ..., εὐθὺς ἄν ἀπέλαβον*
kaítoi pōs án, ei mē peporisménon te ên
 and.yet how IRR if not bring.PTCP.PRF.PASS.N.NOM.SG and be.3SG.IMP
euthùs án 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’ ἄν, εἰ ..., ταῖς ὑμετέραις μαρτυρίαις ῥαδίως ἄν ἀπολύσασθαι*
toùs τοῦ κατηγοροῦ λόγους
oímai d’ án, ei taís humetérais
 think.1SG.PRS.PASS then IRR if the.F.DAT.PL your.F.DAT.PL
marturíais rhaidíōs án apolúsasthai toùs
 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 attracted to a position after the first word in the superordinate clause: (998)–(1004).

- (998) *ἄλλο τι οὖν, ἂν φαίεν, ἢ ξυνθήκας τὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ...*
paraibaíneis
áλλο τι οὖν, án phaíen, è
 other.N.ACC.SG something.ACC.SG so IRR say.3PL.PRS.OPT than
xunthékas tàs pròs hēmâs autoùs parabaíneis
 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 ἀπιστεῖς*
tí oûn, án phaíē ho lógos,
 what.N.ACC.SG so IRR say.3SG.PRS.OPT the.M.NOM.SG account.NOM.SG
éti apisteís
 still distrust.2SG.PRS
 ‘‘Why, then,’’ the argument might say, ‘‘do you still disbelieve ... ?’’
 (Plato, *Phaedo* 87a)

Translation

- (1000) μανθάνω, ἄν ἴσος φαίῃ, καὶ ἐγὼ
manthánō, *án* ísos pháíē, kaì egṓ
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, ἄν τις εἴποι, ταῦτα λέγεις
tí oûn, *án* tis eípoi, taûta légeis
what.N.ACC.SG so IRR someone.M.NOM.SG say.3SG.AOR.OPT
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, cὺ γράφεις ταῦτ’ εἶναι στρατιωτικά
tí oûn, *án* tis eípoi, sù grápheis taût’ eínai stratiōtiká
what.N.ACC.SG so IRR someone.M.NOM.SG say.3SG.AOR.OPT you.NOM
grápheis taût’ eínai 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, cὺ παραινέῃς
tí oûn, *án* tis eípoi, sù paraineís
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 εἰσπεποιήκα υἰόν
hóti nè Dí, *án* eípoi, toûton eispepoiéka 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)

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *ísos* for *isos*.

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 gár* ‘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 ἄν οἶδ’ ὅ τι πλέον εὔροι τούτου
 ouk *án* oíd’ hó ti pléon heúroi
 not IRR know.1SG.PRF which.N.ACC.SG more.N.ACC.SG find.3SG.AOR.OPT
 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 ἄν οἶδ’ εἰ δυνάμιην ἅπαντα ἐν μνήμῃ
 πάλιν λαβεῖν
 egò gár, hà mèn khthès ékouσα, ouk *án*
 I.NOM then which.N.ACC.PL then yesterday hear.1SG.AOR not IRR
 oíd’ ei dunaímēn 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 ἄν οἶδ’ ὅ τι
 ouk *án* oíd’ hó ti
 not IRR know.1SG.PRF which.N.ACC.SG
 ‘... I do not know what ...’ (Demosthenes 45.7)

(1008) οὐκ οἶδ’ ἄν εἰ πείσαιμι
 ouk oíd’ *án* 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’ án heís*, as in (793) above as well as (1009)–(1015).

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *ou gár ... hóti* for *ouk án ... hó ti*. Wackernagel cites this as Demosthenes 11.44 but the correct reference is Isaeus 11.44.

Translation

- (1009) οὐδ' ἄν εἷς δύναιτ' ἀνήρ
oud' *án* heís 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' ἄν εἷς θνητῶν φράσειε
oud' *án* heís thnētôn phrásēie
nor IRR one.M.NOM.SG mortal.GEN.PL tell.3SG.AOR.OPT
'Nor could any mortal tell ...' (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 1656)
- (1011) οὐδ' ἄν εἷς ἀμφιβητήσειε
oud' *án* 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 φήσειεν
oud' *án* heís eû oîd' hóti 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 φήσειεν
oud' *án* 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' *án* 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' *án* 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'.

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition lacks *án*. † *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *oudeis an*.

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' *án* oûn oiómetha tà
 other.M.ACC.PL even IRR so think.1PL.PRS.PASS the.N.ACC.PL
 hēmétera labóntes deíxai 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' ἄν οὖν, εἰ ... ἄρξαιτε, τάχ' ἄν ... μεταβάλοιτε
 humeîs g' *án* oûn, ei árxaite, tákh' *án*
 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 ἄν ἀνδρῶν ἧδ' ἐχηρώθη πόλις
 pollôn *án* andrôn héd' ekhēróthē
 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 ἄν θνητῶν πέρας εἴποι
 mónos *án* 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' ἄν τοι πῆματ' ἄν τύχοι βροτοῖς
 anthrópeia d' *án* toi pémat' *án* 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)

* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *labóntas* for *labóntes*.

Translation

- (1021) κατὰ δ' ἄν τις ἐμοῦ τοιαῦτα λέγων οὐκ ἄν πείθοι
katà d' àn tis emoû toiaûta
down then IRR someone.M.NOM.SG me.GEN such.N.ACC.PL
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' ἄν ἄλλῳ προσίδοις
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' ἄν 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 ἄν ὑμῶν τοῖς ἔσω φράσειεν ἄν
tís oûn àn humôn toîs ésō phráseien
who.M.NOM.SG so IRR you.GEN.PL the.M.DAT.PL inside tell.3SG.AOR.OPT
àn
IRR
'Which of you, then, would tell those inside ... ?' (Sophocles, *Electra* 1103)
- (1025) τίς ἄν θεῶν σοι τόνδ' ἄριστον ἀνδρ' ἰδεῖν δοίη
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 ἄν Ἑλλήνων δυνατωτάτους ἐόντας
προεκτήχαιτο φίλου

ephróntize historéōn, toús án
 consider.3SG.IMP enquire.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG whom.M.ACC.PL IRR
 Hellénōn dumatōtátous eóntas
 Greek.GEN.PL mightiest.ACC.PL be.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.PL
 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 ἄν θεῶν ἰλακάμενοι κατύπερθε τῷ πολέμῳ Τεγεητέων γενοίατο
 epeiróteon, tína án theōn
 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
 Tegeētéōn genoíato
 Tegean.GEN.PL become.3PL.AOR.OPT.MID

‘They asked which god to appease so as to overcome the Tegeans in war.’ (Herodotus 1.67.2)*

- (1028) τὸ δὲ ἄν χρυσίον ἐγίνετο ἀπὸ τῶν εὐειδέων παρθένων
 tò δὲ án khrusíon egíneto apò
 the.N.NOM.SG but IRR money.NOM.SG become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID of
 tōn eueidéōn 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 ἄν ἄλλου τις τὴν ταχίστην ἄγερσιν ποιέοιτο
 stratoû án álloú tis tēn
 army.GEN.SG IRR other.M.GEN.SG someone.M.NOM.SG the.F.ACC.SG
 takhístēn ágersin poiéοito
 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)

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *epeirótōn* for *epeiróteon*.

Translation

- (1030) ἕκαστος ἄν ὑμῶν ἄρχοι γῆς Ἑλλάδος
 hékastos ἄν humōn árkhōi gēs
 each.M.NOM.SG IRR you.GEN.PL rule.3SG.PRS.OPT land.GEN.SG
 Helládos
 Greece.GEN.SG
 ‘Each of you might rule the land of Greece.’ (Herodotus 7.135.2)
- (1031) κατὰ γε ἄν τὴν ἡπειρον τοιάδε ἐγίνετο
 katá ge ἄν tēn épeiron toιάde
 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 σαφέστερον διδάχθειν
 en álloisin ἄν lógoisin saphésteron
 in other.M.DAT.PL IRR account.DAT.PL clearly.COMP
 didakhtheíē
 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 θεηράμενος ἀπαγγείλειεν ὡς
 ἔστιν
 epeì tōn ge mē éontōn tína ἄν
 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
 arangeíleien 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
 αὐτῶν εἶναι
 pollēn ἄν oímai apistían tēs
 much.F.ACC.SG IRR think.1SG.PRS.PASS distrust.ACC.SG the.F.GEN.SG
 dunámeōs toís épeita pròs tò kléos
 power.GEN.SG the.M.DAT.PL then to the.N.ACC.SG fame.ACC.SG

- autôn 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' ἂν κεφαλαίῳ ... τῷδ' ἂν 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
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 exèn
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) τί ν' οὖν ἂν ἄγγελον πέμψαμι' ἐπ' αὐτόν
tín' oûn àn ángelon pémpsam' 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 ... πεποιηκῶς
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)

Translation

- (1039) πολλή γὰρ ἂν τις εὐδαιμονία εἶη περὶ τοὺς νέους
 pollè gàr àn tis eudaimonía
 much.F.NOM.SG then IRR someone.M.NOM.SG prosperity.NOM.SG
 εἰε̄ 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) πολλή ἂν ἐλπὶς εἶη καὶ καλὴ
 pollè àn elpìs eíē kai 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 ἂν τοῦ δέοι λόγου
 állou àn 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 ἂν εἶη 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 ἐπήρετο τὸν Ἀπόλλω, τίνη ἂν θεῶν θύων καὶ
 elthòn d’ ho Xenophôn
 go.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG then the.M.NOM.SG Xenophon.NOM
 epéreto τὸν Ἀπόλλω, τίνη ἂν
 enquire.3SG.AOR.MID the.M.ACC.SG Apollo.ACC what.M.DAT.SG IRR
 theôn thúων καὶ eukhómenos
 god.GEN.PL sacrifice.PTCP.M.NOM.SG and pray.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.SG
 kállista kai árista élthoi tèn hodón,
 well.SUPL and best go.3SG.AOR.OPT the.F.ACC.SG way.ACC.SG
 hèn epinoeí, kai kalôs práxas
 which.F.ACC.SG intend.3SG.PRS and well 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 ἂν δρῶσιν ... εἴη
 eperōtāi ho dêmos, hó ti án
 enquire.3SG.PRS the.M.NOM.SG people.NOM.SG which.N.ACC.SG IRR
 drōsin eīē
 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 de tous árkhontas, anarkhíai
 take.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL but the.M.ACC.PL ruler.ACC.PL anarchy.DAT.SG
 án kai ataxíai 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) πολλὴ ἂν καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων πρόσοδος γίγνοιτο
 pollē án kai apò toutōn prósoδος
 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
 prosíénai
 be.added.PRS.INF
 'I consider that a great sum of money would be added ...' (Xenophon,
Ways 4.1)
- (1048) ἀντὶ πολλῶν ἂν, ὧ 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

Translation

khrēmátōn 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 πράγμασιν τεταραγμένοις
 ἐπιτάξαντες ὅπως βούλεσθε διοικήσαιθε
 plēsíon mèn óntes, hápasin àn toîs
 near then be.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.PL quite.all.N.DAT.PL IRR the.N.DAT.PL
 prágmasin tetaragménōis
 deed.DAT.PL disturb.PTCP.PRF.PASS.N.DAT.PL
 epístantes hópōs boulesthe
 establish.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL so wish.2PL.PRS.PASS
 dioikéσαιθε
 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 χαρίσαιτο
 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 σέ τίς 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
 hóti 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 ἄν δοθείη δωρεία
 meízōn *án* 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 ἄν ὥς εὐλαβούμην
 thaumasíōs *án* hōs eulabóumēn
 wonderfully IRR as beware.1SG.IMP.PASS
 ‘... I should be wonderfully cautious ...’ (Demosthenes 29.1)*
- [p399]
- (1055) καίτοι, τίς ἄν ὑμῶν οἶεται τὴν μητέρα πέμψαι ... ;
 kaítōi, tíς *án* humōn oíetai tēn
 and.yet who.M.NOM.SG IRR you.GEN.PL think.3SG.PRS.PASS the.N.ACC.SG
 mēτέρα pémpσαι
 mother.ACC.SG send.AOR.INF
 ‘And yet, who among you thinks that his mother would have sent ... ?’
 (Demosthenes 39.24)
- (1056) τί ἄν εἰπὼν μήθ’ ἀμαρτεῖν δοκοίην μήτε ψευσαίμην
 tí *án* eipōn mēth’ hamarteîn
 what.N.ACC.SG IRR say.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG nor miss.AOR.INF
 dokoíēn méte pseusáimēn
 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 ἄν τις ἄλλο ὄνομ’ ἔχοι θέσθαι τῷ τοιοῦτῳ
 tí *án* tis állo ónom’
 what.N.ACC.SG IRR someone.M.NOM.SG other.N.ACC.SG name.ACC.SG
 ékhōi 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).

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *ēulabóumēn* for *eulabóumēn*. † *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition has *tois toioútois* for *tōi toioútōi*.

Translation

- (1058) οὐκ ἂν οἴεσθε δημοσίᾳ πάντας ὑμᾶς προξένους αὐτῶν ποιήσασθαι
 ouk ἂν oíesthe dēmosiāi pántas humâs
 not IRR think.2PL.PRS.PASS publicly all.M.ACC.PL you.ACC.PL
 proxénous hautôn 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)

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 ἐλέεσθαι
 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
 skopoúntes oímai 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 p234). 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

* *Translator’s note:* The Perseus edition adds *humín* after *sunoísen*.

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' άν ... οút' άν* ‘neither IRR ... nor IRR’, which does not belong here.

- (1060) οὐ τὰν ἐλόντες αὐθις ἀνθαλοῖεν ἄν
 οὐ τὰν helóntes aúthis anthaloíen
 not and=IRR take.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.PL again be.captured.3PL.AOR.OPT
άν
 IRR
 ‘... the captors shall not be made captives in their turn’ (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 340)
- (1061) ἐντὸς δ' ἄν οὔσα μορσίμων ἀγρευμάτων πείθοι' ἄν
 entòs d' àn oúsa morsímōn agreumátōn
 inside then IRR be.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.SG destined.N.GEN.PL snare.GEN.PL
 peíthoi' *άν*
 persuade.2SG.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR
 ‘Since you are in the toils of destiny, perhaps you will obey’ (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1048)
- (1062) λιπὼν ἄν εὐκλειαν ἐν δόμοισιν ... πολύχωστον ἄν εἶχε τάφον
 lipōn àn eúkleian en dómoisin
 leave.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG IRR renown.ACC.SG in house.DAT.PL
 polúkhōston àn eíkhes 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' ἄν γαμῶν ἄκουσαν ἄκοντος πάρα ἀγνὸς γένοιτ' ἄν
 pôs d' àn gamōn ákousan ákontos pára hagnòs génoit' *άν*
 how then IRR marry.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG unwilling.F.ACC.SG
 ákontos pára hagnòs génoit' *άν*
 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' ἄν ὡς ἐκ τῶνδ' ἄν ὠφελοῖμί σε
 tí dhēt' àn hōs ek tōnd' àn ōpheloîmí se
 what.N.ACC.SG then IRR as out this.N.GEN.PL IRR help.1SG.PRS.OPT

Translation

se

you.ACC

‘How, then, can I serve you, as things stand now?’ (Sophocles, *Ajax* 537)

- (1065) ἡμεῖς μὲν ἂν τήνδ’ ἦν ὄδ’ εἴληχεν τύχην θανόντες ἂν προύκειμεθ’
aíchíctw mórō
hēmeis mèn àn ténd’ 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
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 χρῆ ... 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 κάμ’ ἂν τοιαύτη 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 ἀλγύνοισι πλέον
sutheís t’ àn ouk àn algýnois
drive.PTCP.AOR.PASS.M.NOM.SG and IRR not IRR pain.2SG.PRS.OPT.ACT

* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *timōrounth’ héloi* for *timōreîn théloi*.

- pléon
more
'When you have gone, you will vex me no more.' (Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 446)
- (1069) οὐτ' ἄν μετ' ἄλλου δρῶντος ἄν τλαίην ποτέ
oút' *án* met' álloú drōntos *án*
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)
- (1070) ἧδ' ἄν τάδ' οὐχ' ἤκιστ' ἄν Ἰοκάστη λέγοι
hêd' *án* tád' oukh' hékist' *án* Iokástē
this.F.NOM.SG IRR this.N.ACC.PL not least IRR Jocasta
légoi
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 ᾧδε σιγὰν λόγων
tís oûn *án* axían ge soû
who.M.NOM.SG so IRR worthy.F.ACC.SG even you.GEN
pephēnótos metabáloit' *án* hōde
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 (οἱ πόλεος) ἢ γένους ποτέ τύχοιμι' ἄν εἰπὼν
poías *án* humâs patrídos/póleos è
of.what.sort.F.GEN.SG IRR you.ACC.PL fatherland.GEN/city.GEN.SG or
génous poté túkhoimi' *án* eipón
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)

Translation

Example (1072) is what is read by Dindorf (1882: 304) and Heimreich (1884: 18–19) in place of the manuscript's *poías pátras àn humâs ê 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
 tís d' àn toioûd' hup' andròs eû
 who.M.NOM.SG then IRR such.M.GEN.SG under man.GEN.SG well
 práxeien àn
 do.3SG.AOR.OPT IRR
 'And who could profit from such a man?' (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 391)
- (1074) ἄρ' ἄν ματαίου τῆςδ' ἄν ἡδονῆς τύχοις
 âr' àn mataίου tesd' àn hēdonēs
 then IRR vain.F.GEN.SG this.F.GEN.SG IRR pleasure.GEN.SG
 túkhois
 happen.2SG.AOR.OPT
 'Would you then find this pleasure vain?' (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 780)
- (1075) πῶς ἄν τό γ' ἄκον πράγμα ἄν εἰκότως ψέγοις
 pôs àn tó g' âkon prâgm' àn eikótōs
 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) ἦ τᾶν οὐκ ἄν ἦ
 ê tân ouk àn 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' ἄν γένοιτ' ἄν ἀσφαλῆς πόλις
 ou gár pot' àn génoit' àn asphalēs
 not for 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 *áns*!

- (1078) πῶς ἄν οὐκ ἄν ἐν δίκῃ θάνοιμ' ἄν
 rōs *án* ouk *án* en díkēi thánoim' *án*
 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 ἄν ἀπελαυνόμενος ἐκ μέσου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ... ἦε ἄν τὰ ἄνω τῆς
 Eὐρώπης
 ho hēlios *án* apelaunómenos ek
 the.M.NOM.SG sun.NOM.SG IRR expel.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.SG out
 méσου τοῦ ouranoῦ ἔie *án* tà
 mid.M.GEN.SG the.M.GEN.SG heaven.GEN.SG go.3SG.IMP IRR the.N.ACC.PL
 ἀνω τῆς Európe̅s
 upward the.F.GEN.SG Europe.GEN.SG
 'The sun, when driven from mid-heaven, would pass over the inland
 parts of Europe' (Herodotus 2.26.2)
- (1080) διεξιόντα δ' ἄν μιν διὰ πάσης Εὐρώπης ἔλπομαι ποίειν ἄν τὸν Ἴστρον
 diexiónta d' *án* min dià pásēs
 pass.through.PTCP.PRS.M.ACC.SG then IRR CL through all.GEN.SG
 Európe̅s élpomai poíein *án* τὸν Ἴστρον
 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* kakōs 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 πλῆθος οὐδεὶς ἄν εἴποι πλῆθος
 oud' *án* toutōn hypò plétheos oudeis *án*
 nor IRR this.GEN.PL under quantity.GEN.SG nobody.M.NOM.SG IRR
 eípoi pléthos
 say.3SG.AOR.OPT quantity.ACC.SG
 'And no one could tell the number, with such numbers of them.'
 (Herodotus 7.187.1) *

* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *arithmón* for *pléthos*.

Translation

- (1083) πόλλ' ἄν σὺ λέξῃς οὐδὲν ἄν πλέον λάβοις
 póll' àn sù léxas oudèn àn
 many.N.ACC.PL IRR you.NOM say.PTCP.AOR.M.NOM.SG nothing.ACC.SG IRR
 πλέον λάβοις
 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 àn érēmon táphon Ádmētos kednēs àn
 how IRR solitary.M.ACC.SG tomb.ACC.SG Admetus.NUM dear.F.GEN.SG IRR
 ἔπραξε γυναικός
 do.3SG.AOR woman.GEN.SG
 'How would Admetus have held the funeral of his good wife without mourners?' (Euripides, *Alcestis* 93)
- (1085) οὐκ ἄν ἔν γ' ἐμοῖς δόμοις βλέπουσ' ἄν ἀγὰς τᾶμ' ἐκαρπούτ' ἄν λέχη
 ouk àn én g' emoîs dómois blēpous' àn
 not IRR in even my.M.DAT.PL house.DAT.PL look.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.SG IRR
 augàs tám' ekarpou't' àn 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 ἄν προσθείμεθ' ἄν
 álgos àn prostheímeth' àn
 pain.ACC.SG IRR add.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR
 '... I would add to my anguish' (Euripides, *Hecuba* 742)
- (1087) τῷδ' ἄν εὐστόχῳ πτερῷ ἀπόλαυσιν εἰκοῦς ἔθανες ἄν Διὸς κόρη
 tōid' àn eustókhōi pterōi apólausin
 this.N.DAT.SG IRR well.aimed.N.DAT.SG feather.DAT.SG reward.ACC.SG
 eikoûs éthanes àn 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' ἄν οὐκ ἄν τοῖσδε σὸν κρύπτων δέμας
 phthánois d' àn ouk àn toîsde sòn
 arrive.2SG.PRS.OPT then IRR not IRR this.N.DAT.PL your.N.ACC.SG

- κρύπτων 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 διορθέων λόγους ὀρθῶς δύναιτ' ἂν δῆμος
εὐθύνειν πόλιν
állós te pōs *án* mē diorthéōn
otherwise and how IRR not judge.rightly.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG
lógos orthōs dúnait' *án* 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)
- (1090) τίς ἂν λόγον, τάλαινα, ἰν' ἂν τῶνδ' αἰτία λάβοιμι
tín' *án* lógon, tálaina, tίν'
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 ἂν δυναίμην οὔτ' ἐρωτῆσαι τάδε οὔτ' ἂν πιθέσθαι
ouk *án* dunaímēn oút' erōtēsai táde oút' *án*
not IRR can.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 τᾶρ' ἂν ὄψε γ' ἄνδρες ἐξεύροιεν ἂν
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)

* Translator's note: The Perseus edition has *tálaina, tína lógon* for *tín' án lógon, tálaina*.

Translation

- (1093) οὐτ' ἄν ξένοισι τοῖσι σοῖς χρηαίμεθ' ἄν
 out' *án* xénoisi toîsi soîs
 nor IRR stranger.DAT.PL the.M.DAT.PL your.M.DAT.PL
 khrēsaímeth' *án*
 use.1PL.AOR.OPT.MID IRR
 'I will accept no help from your friends' (Euripides, *Medea* 616)
- (1094) ἄρ' ἄν τύραννον διολέσαι δυναίμεθ' ἄν
 ar' *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 φθάνοισι ἄν αὔραν ἰστίοισι καραδοκῶν
 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'
 (Euripides, *Trojan Women* 456)
- (1096) ἀφανεῖς ἄν ὄντες οὐκ ἄν ὑμνηθεῖμεν ἄν
 aphanéis *án* óntes ouk *án* humnētheímen
 unseen.F.NOM.PL IRR be.PTCP.PRS.F.NOM.PL not IRR hymn.1PL.AOR.PASS
án
 IRR
 'Being unknown, we should have been unsung.' (Euripides, *Trojan Women* 1240)
- (1097) μόνον δ' ἄν ἀντὶ χρημάτων οὐκ ἄν λάβοις
 mónon d' *án* anti khrēmátōn ouk *án* 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
 épi pléict' *án* eídē kai metá charítōn málicit' eútrapelōs tò cōma
 autarkes parécheθai
 légō kai kath' hékaston, dokeîn *án* moi
 say.1SG.PRS and down each.M.ACC.SG seem.PRS.INF IRR me.DAT

tòn autòn ándra par' hēmôn epì
 the.M.ACC.SG same.M.ACC.SG man.ACC.SG from us.GEN upon
 pleíst' àn eídē kài metà kharítōn 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' ἂν σφῶν πειρασομένους ... αὐτοὺς δακεῖν ἤσσαν, ἀλλὰ πολλῶ
 μάλλον ... εὖρους ἂν σφίσι γενέσθαι
 oud' àn 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 àn
 less but much.N.DAT.SG more right-minded.M.ACC.PL IRR
 sphísi genésthai
 them.DAT 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 ξυνεπίθοιντο
 tákh' àn d' ísōs, ei láboien kài pánu àn
 quickly IRR than perhaps if take.3PL.AOR.OPT also quite IRR
 xunepíthointo
 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) Σικελιώται δ' ἂν μοι δοκοῦσιν, ὥς γε νῦν ἔχουσιν, καὶ ἔτι ἂν ἤσσαν
 δεινοὶ ἡμῖν γενέσθαι
 Sikeliôtai d' àn moi dokoûsin, hós ge nûn
 Siceliot.NOM.PL then IRR me.DAT seem.3PL.PRS as even now

* *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition has *dokeîn* for *dakeîn*. † *Translator's note:* The Perseus edition starts with *tákha d' àn ísōs*, which Wackernagel cites above as a variant.

Translation

ékhou·sin, kai éti àn hêsson deinoî hêmîn
 have.3PL.PRS also still IRR less terrible.M.NOM.PL us.DAT
 genésthai
 become.AOR.INF.MID

‘And the Siceliots seem to me, even as they are now, to have become even less dangerous still to us.’ (Thucydides 6.11.2)

- (1102) βραχὺ ἄν τι προσκτώμενοι αὐτῇ περὶ αὐτῆς ἄν ταύτης μᾶλλον
 kinduneúoimēn
 brakhù àn ti prosktómēnoi
 short.N.ACC.SG IRR something.ACC.SG gain.PTCP.PRS.PASS.M.NOM.PL
 autēi perì autēs àn taútēs mállon
 same.F.DAT.SG about same.F.GEN.SG IRR this.F.GEN.SG more
 kinduneúoimēn
 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’ ἄν ... ἀρχῆς ἀπορεῖν ἄν αὐτόν
 genoménēs d’ àn arkhēs
 become.PTCP.AOR.MID.F.GEN.SG and IRR beginning.GEN.SG
 aporeîn àn autón
 puzzle.PRS.INF IRR him.ACC

‘... and, the command having become ... he would be at a loss’
 (Thucydides 8.46.2)

- (1104) οὔτε ἄν αὐτῷ τῷ λέγοντι οὔτε τοῖς ἀκούουσι δῆλα ἄν εἶη
 oute àn autōi tōi légonti oute
 nor IRR same.M.DAT.SG the.M.DAT.SG say.PTCP.PRS.M.DAT.SG nor
 toîs akóousi déla àn eíē
 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’ ἄν ἐλαφρῶς ἄν ἀπεπλίζατο
 oud’ àn elaphrōs àn apeplízato
 nor IRR lightly IRR trot.off.3SG.AOR.MID

‘... nor would he have trotted off lightly’ (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 218)

- (1106) πῶς δέ γ' ἄν καλῶς λέγοις ἄν
 rṓs dé g' *án* kalōs légois *án*
 how but even IRR well say.2SG.PRS.OPT IRR
 'But how can you say "well" ... ?' (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 308)
- (1107) μαμμᾶν δ' ἄν αἰτήσαντος ἤκόν σοι φέρων ἄν ἄρτον
 mammân d' *án* aitēsantos hēkón soi
 mother.ACC.SG then IRR ask.PTCP.AOR.M.GEN.SG arrive.1SG.IMP you.DAT
 phērōn *án* 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 ἄν ποτ' ἀφικοίμην ἄν εὐθὺ τοῦ Διός
 rṓs *án* pot' aphikoímēn *án* euthū tou̅
 how IRR sometime arrive.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR straight the.M.GEN.SG
 Díos
 Zeus.GEN
 'However could I go straight to Zeus?' (Aristophanes, *Peace* 68)
- (1109) ἡ δ' Ἑλλὰς ἄν ἐξερημωθεῖς ἄν ὑμᾶς ἔλαθε
 hē d' Hellās *án* éxerēmōtheís'
 the.F.NOM.SG then Greece.NOM IRR desolate.PTCP.AOR.PASS.F.NOM.SG
án humâs élathe
 IRR you.ACC.PL hide.3SG.AOR
 'And Greece, having been left destitute, escaped your notice.'
 (Aristophanes, *Peace* 646)
- (1110) οὐκ ἄν πρῆαίμην οὐδ' ἄν ἰσχάδος μιᾶς
 ouk *án* prhaiímēn 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 εὐτάκτος πόλις
 kai rṓs *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)

Translation

- (1112) ἐγὼ δὲ τὰν κᾶν, εἴ με χρεῖη ... ἐκπιεῖν
 egò dé tàn kân, eí me khreíē
 I.NOM but 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 δὲ γ’ ἂν κᾶν ὥσπερ εἰ ψῆτταν δοκῶ δοῦναι ἂν ἑμαυτῆς
 παρταμοῦσα θῆμισυ
 egò dé g’ àn kân hósper ei pséttan dokô
 I.NOM but even IRR and=IRR like if turbot.ACC.SG think.1SG.PRS
 doûnai àn 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)*
- (1114) μᾶλλον ἂν διὰ τουτογὶ γένοιτ’ ἂν εἰρήνη
 mâllon àn dià toutogì génoit’ àn
 more IRR through this.N.ACC.SG.EMPH become.3SG.AOR.OPT.MID IRR
 eiréné
 peace.NOM.SG
 ‘Would peace come to pass rather through this?’ (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 147)
- (1115) φωνήν ἂν οὐκ ἂν εἶχον
 phōnēn àn ouk àn eíkhon
 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)

* Translator’s note: The Perseus edition has *paratemoûsa* for *partamoûsa*.

- (1117) οὐκ ἄν γενοίμην Ἡρακλῆς ἄν
 ouk *án* genoímēn Hēraklēs *án*
 not IRR become.1SG.AOR.OPT.MID Hercules.NOM IRR
 ‘I won’t be Hercules’ (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 581)
- (1118) οὐκ ἄν φθάνοις τὸ γένειον ἄν περιδουμένη
 ouk *án* phthánois τὸ géneion *án*
 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 ἄν ἐγὼ περὶ τοῦ μεθύσκεσθαι ... τάληθῃ λέγων ἦττον ἄν εἶην
 áηδής
 ísōs *án* egō perì toû methúskesthai
 perhaps IRR I.NOM about the.N.GEN.SG intoxicate.PRS.INF.PASS
 talēthē légōn hētton *án* 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)
- (1120) εἰκότως ἄν τοὺς ἐρῶντας μᾶλλον ἄν φοβοῖο
 eikótōs *án* toús erōntas mállon *án*
 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 *án*)
- (1121) τάχ’ οὖν ἄν ὑπὸ φιλοτιμίας ἐπίσχοι ἡμῖν ἄν τοῦ γράφειν
 tákh’ oûn *án* hupò philotimías epískhoi hēmîn
 quickly so IRR under ambition.GEN.SG hold.back.3SG.AOR.OPT US.DAT
án 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)

Translation

- (1122) οὐκ ἂν ῥαδίως οὐδὲ πολλὰ ἂν εὔροις ὡς τοῦτο
 ouk *àn* rhaidiōs oudè pollà *àn* heúrois hōs
 not IRR easily nor many.N.ACC.PL IRR find.2SG.AOR.OPT as
 toúto
 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
 pōs oûn *án* poté tis dúnait’ *án*
 how so IRR sometime someone.M.NOM.SG can.3SG.PRS.OPT.PASS IRR
 hugiées ti légōn
 healthy.N.ACC.SG something.ACC.SG say.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG
 anteipeîn
 argue.AOR.INF
 ‘Then how could one ever argue ... saying anything sound?’ (Plato,
Sophist 233a)
- (1125) σκολῆι ποτ’ ἂν αὐτοῖς τις χρήματα διδοῦς ἤθελεν ἂν ... μαθητῆς
 gínesthai
 skholēi pot’ *àn* autois tis khrémata
 scarcely sometime IRR them.DAT someone.M.NOM.SG property.ACC.PL
 didoûs éthelen *án* mathētēs
 give.PTCP.PRS.M.NOM.SG want.3SG.IMP IRR pupil.NOM.SG
 gínesthai
 become.PRS.INF.PASS
 ‘Scarcely anyone would ever want to become (their) pupil, giving them
 money.’ (Plato, *Sophist* 233b; cf. also *Laws* 5.742c)

poieîn àn è tí légein toùs
 do.PRS.INF IRR OR what.N.ACC.SG say.PRS.INF the.M.ACC.PL
 asebeîs anthrópous toutousí
 impious.ACC.PL 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.

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 nidityam 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 balavisesam*, in which *se* syntactically belongs to *balavisesam*), 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 enclitics 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:

maj̄ (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^a 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^a 52 and Xerxes D 18, E 18, and A 29, although in these cases *utā* links only constituents rather than clauses).

taj̄ (2SG.GEN): following the gendered nominatives *Auramazdā* 'Ahura Mazda' in Behistun 4.58, and 4.78, *hauv* 'he' in NR^a 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^a 43 and 45, and following *utā* (CONJ) in Behistun 4.58, 4.75, and 4.79.

šaj̄ (3SG.GEN): following *hauv* 'he' in Darius H 3, following *tayaj̄* (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.

maj̄, *taj̄* and *šaj̄* 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 tayaj̄šai fratamā* etc. of the other examples with *tayaj̄šai*, and also Behistun 4.74 = 4.78 ((1136)), in which *maj̄* precedes the intervening clause while the verb comes after it;† but especially Xerxes D 15 ((1137)) = *kaí moi átta ho patēr epoíesen* 'and me.DAT that.N.ACC.PL the.M.NOM.SG father.NOM.SG make.3SG.AOR', where the *maj̄* that belongs to the relative clause is placed before the relative pronoun in order to attach to *utā*.

* *Translator's note*: Genitive and dative are collapsed together in Old Persian. We gloss them as genitive in the following. † *Translator's note*: More recent editions (e.g. Kent 1953; Schmitt 1991) read this enclitic as *taj̄* (2SG.GEN) rather than *maj̄* (1SG.GEN), but this does not alter Wackernagel's general point.

- (1135) *avaθā adam hadā kamnaḡbiš martiyaḡbiš avam*
 then 1.NOM.SG with few.INS.PL.M man.INS.PL.M DEM.ACC.SG.M
Gaḡmātam tayam magum avājanam utā
 G.ACC.SG.M REL.ACC.SG.M magus.ACC.SG.M slay.1.SG.PST CONJ
tayaḡ=šajī 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 vajnāhi*
 CONJ DEM.ACC.SG.F inscription.ACC.SG.F see.2.SG.SBJV
imaiḡ=vā patikarā, naiḡ=diš vikanāhi
 DEM.ACC.PL.M=CONJ sculpture.ACC.PL.M NEG=3.ACC.PL destroy.2.SG.SBJV
utā=taḡ yāvā taḡmā 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
 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=maḡ*
 REL.NOM/ACC.PL.N 1.NOM.SG make.1.SG.PST CONJ=1.SG.GEN
taya pitā akunaḡš
 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. The 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^a 18 and *hya* (REL.M) in Behistun 2.13; following the accusative *avam* (3SG.M.ACC) in Behistun 2.20 and 2.83;

* *Translator’s note:* The standard reference is XPa 15.

Translation

following the neuter *tya* (REL) in Behistun 1.19 and NR^a 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)
- (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^a 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 *māθištam* ‘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 xšaçaṣpāvā, abi avam,
Arachosia.LOC.SG.F satrap.NOM.SG.M against DEM.ACC.SG.M

* *Translator’s note*: The standard reference is DNa 35.

utā=šam aivam martiyam maθištam
 CONJ=3.GEN.PL one.ACC.SG.M man.ACC.SG.M greatest.ACC.SG.M
 akunauš
 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^a 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^a 42 [*yath*]ā *xšnās*[*āhadiš*] “so that you know them”, and there it is tempting to ask 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 *cī* in the Avesta (above p277).

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.

* *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.

However, I will not venture a more detailed commentary here, instead I will merely point 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-hva-sēhi* (PFV-Q-what-see-SBJV.3SG), *us-nu-gibiþ* (out-now-give-IMP.2PL), as well as the examples where *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 enclitics immediately following the first word. The most informative example is undoubtedly *ga-u-hva-sēhi*, with its insertion of the indefinite *hva* 'what/something' = Greek *tì*.

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, 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 is evidence for 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. p116 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.IMPRF.3SG
 ‘he answered me very kindly’ (Cicero, *ad Quintum Fratrem* 1.7(9).2)
- (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,

Translation

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 iucunda*
that.NOM.PL.N are.PRES.3PL very.pleasing.ACC.PL.N very.and
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).

(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)
- (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)

Translation

- (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)
- (1169) quae meo quomque animo
what.NOM.PL.N my.DAT.SG.M ever heart.DAT.SG.M
lubitum est facere
please.PTCP.PRF.N 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.IMPREF.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)
- (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.

Translation

- (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))
- (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 ..., conservate
 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)

(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.IMP.F.1SG not you.ACC.SG that.ACC.SG.N examine.INF.PRES
 ‘I supposed that you did not inquire’ (Cicero, *de Oratore* 52)

Translation

- (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 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.

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

Translation

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)

- (1201) di te deaque 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 deaque omnes
 god.NOM.PL.M you.ACC.SG goddess.NOM.PL.F-and all.NOM.PL.M
 faxint cum istoc ominem
 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 deaque 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 deaque 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)

Translation

This alone is remarkable; however, what is particularly important is that, whenever an *ita* ‘thus’, *itaque* ‘therefore’, *ut* (complementizer), *utinam* ‘if only’, *hercule* ‘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 deaque*
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 *kakón 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)

- (1212) malum quod isti di
 misfortune.ACC.SG.N that he.DAT.SG god.NOM.PL.M
 deaque 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 perdant*”.

- (1213) quin hercle di te perdant
 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 Caecilius* 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)

Translation

- (1217) nam tecum esse, ita mihi commoda
for with.you.ABL.SG be.PRES.INF as I.DAT.SG convenience.NOM.PL.N
omnia quae opto contingant, ut
all.NOM.PL.N NOM.PL.N wish.PRES.1SG touch.PRES.3PL.SUBJ as
vehementer velim
eagerly 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
 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)

Translation

With *sic* ‘so’: (1227)–(1236). Cf. (1237), in which the pronoun is not in second position but is still immediately after *sic*.

- (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 supteralbere*
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
 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 vernum 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)

Translation

- (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)
- (1240) sic tua Cyrneas fugiant
as your.NOM.PL.N Corsican.ACC.PL.F flee.PRES.3PL.SUBJ
examina taxos
swarm.NOM.PL.N 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
want.PRES.3SG.SUBJ ether so to promise.PTCP.PRF.ACC.PL.N
tibi sidera tardus eas
you.DAT.SG 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.

(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

Translation

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
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).

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 p119), 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 pp291ff.

- (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)

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) *quantulum 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)

Translation

- (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)
- (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
cecidarit
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 & Henzen 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)
- (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.IMPRF.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.

Translation

- (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!* 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 pp137ff. – 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
 encouragement or false messages’ (Caesar, *de Bello Civili* 1.21.1)

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)

Translation

(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)

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 *quouisque* 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)

So much for the older [p416] inscriptions. The other older literature provides similar results, including the notable tmesis in (1282). However, *quisque* has generally also become able to be used orthotonically and to take clause-initial position. This is even more true for *uterque* ‘both/each of two’, whose original enclitic nature is clear and can still be seen in examples like (1283). On the other hand, *ubique* remained true to its origins even longer: Cicero in his speeches and Caesar always use it in its actual meaning “in each individual place” (“everywhere” is written by both as *omnibus locis*), but it is also always attached to a relativizer (Caesar, *de Bello Civili* 2.20.8 attaches it to interrogative *quid*).

(1282) quod *quoique* quomque inciderit in
 who.ACC.SG.N each.DAT.SG.M each.ACC.SG.M fall.intoPRF.3SG.SUBJ. in
 mentem
 mind.ACC.SG.F
 ‘anything that may come into anyone’s mind’ (Terence, *Heauton Timorumenos* 484)

(1283) in eo *uterque* proelio potabimus
 in this.ABL.SG.M each.of.two.NOM.SG.M battle.ABL.SG.N drink.FUT.1PL
 ‘both of us will drink in this battle’ (Plautus, *Menaechmi* 186)

Translation

That the other class of indefinites in Latin, those beginning with *u-*, were subject to the same positional rules as those beginning with velar consonants, is shown by Festus 162b.22, quite apart from the unmistakable tendency of *ullus* ‘any’, *unquam* ‘ever’ and *usquam* ‘anywhere’ to occupy second position.

11 Latin: particles and vocatives

Among the particles of Latin one finds some that have always been bound to the second position (*que* ‘and’, *autem* ‘but’, *ne* ‘NEG/Q’), some that either vacillate between first and second position from the very start or are pulled hither and thither through changing usage (the affirmative particles and also *enim* ‘truly/because’ and *igitur* ‘therefore’), and finally some for which the vacillation and freedom is even greater, like *tandem* ‘at last’. All these particles occasionally cause the sort of tmesis demonstrated for the pronouns; for example, *enim* separates *cunquē* in (1284), and *igitur* and *tandem* separate *quomodo* and friends, and also *jusjurandum*, in (1285)–(1288).

- (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)
- (1292) *absque* *me* *esset*; *absque* *te*
 without-and I.ABL.SG.M be.IMPRF.3SG.SUBJ without-and you.ABL.SG.M
foret;
 be.IMPRF.3SG.SUBJ without-and one.ABL.SG.F this.ABL.SG.F
foret;
 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*

* *Translator’s note*: Wackernagel writes Brugmann here, but this must be a slip, possibly related to the better-known Karl Brugmann.

Translation

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
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 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 p152), *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)

Translation

- (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.IMPRF.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.IMPRF.3SG Jason.ABL.SG
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 *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 aequè 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

Translation

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 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, vicimus;
who.NOM.SG.M if rescue.PTCP.PRF.NOM.SG.M be.FUT.3SG win.PRF.1PL
sin ..., quod di omen
if.not who.ACC.SG.N god.NOM.PL.M omen.ACC.SG.N
avertant, omnis omnium cursus
avert.PRES.3PL.SUBJ all.NOM.SG.M all.gen.pl.m road.nom.sg.m
est ad vos
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)

* *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.

- (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
 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
 pudicior Vesta. Sin, haec mei
 chaster.NOM.SG.M Vesta.NOM.SG.F if.not this.NOM.PL.N I.GEN.SG

Translation

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 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 animus 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 animus 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 maledicentio rem quam
 Acanthio.NOM.SG.M but I.NOM.SG. more.slanderous.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.
 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)

Translation

(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).

(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. 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) Paegnum: ne me attrecta
 Paegnum.NOM.SG.M not I.ACC.SG touch.IMP.SG.PRES
 subigitatrix. Sophoclidisca: sin te
 lascivious.womanvoc.sg.f Sophoclidisca.NOM.SG.F if you.ACC.SG
 amo? Paegnum: male operam locas.
 love.PRES.1SG Paegnum.NOM.SG.M badly work.ACC.SG.F put.PRES.2SG
 ‘Paegnum: Don’t touch me, you lascivious woman. Sophoclidisca: But if I love you? Paegnum: 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

Translation

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? 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 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 ecastor* '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

Translation

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.periodACC.PL.F
‘by Hercules, soon’ (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 18)

(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)

* *Translator’s note*: this refers to Latin produced in the period from the reign of Tiberius (14 CE) onwards.

- (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)

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.

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. 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 evidence from 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 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 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

* *Translator's note*: 'wisdom is truly'.

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*
 then I.DAT.SG that.NOM.SG.M say.PRF.3SG that fleet.ABL.SG.F
tu velles decedere, per fore
 you.NOM.SG want.IMPRF.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 Socratique et
 that.ABL.SG.F Socratic.ABL.SG.F be.PRF.3SG Socrates-and.GEN.SG.M and
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 *feri* ‘become/happen’: (1345).

- (1343) *cum quibus erat quomque una, eis*
 with who.ABL.PL.M be.IMPRF.3SG ever together he.DAT.PL.M

Translation

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 particular 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).

(1346) Ἀλκίβιος ἀνέθηκεν κιθαρῳδὸς νησιώτης
 Alkíbios *anéthēken* kitharōidōs 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 *Mē-*

khaníō[n] anéthēken *ho gramma[teús]*, 1.400 [*Pu*]thogén[eia] anéthēke[n Ag]ur-riou eg [*L*]akiadō[n], 1.415 *Aiskhúlos* anéthē[ke] *Puthéou Paianieú[s]*, 4¹.373f. *Símōn* a[néthēke] *ho knapheús* [érgōn] *dekátēn*, 4².373.90 *Onésimós* m' anéthēken *aparkhēn Athēnaíai* *ho Smikúthou uiós*, 4².373.198 [*ē deína* anéthēken] *Eumēlídou gunē Sphēttóthen*, 4².373.12 *Xenokléēs* anéthēken *Sósineō*, 4².373.223 *Khniádēs* anéthēken *ho Pal(l)ēneús*, 4².373.224 [*S*]míkros anéth[ēke ...] *ho skulodeps[ós]*, 4².373.226 [*ho deína* 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 Augustus!) *Metrótimos* anéthēken *Oēthen*, IGA 48 *Aristoménēs* a[n]éth[ēk]e *Alexía tai Dámatri tai Khthoníai Ermioneús*, IGA 96 (Tegea) [*ho deína* ané]thēke(n) *was-tuókhō*, IGA 486 (Milet) [*Er*]mēsiánax émeas anéthēken [*ho ...*] ... *ídeō tōpóllōni*, IGA 512^a (Gela) *Pantárēs* m' [*p431*] anéthēke *Menekrátiōs*, 543 (Achaean) *Kunískos* me anéthēke *órtamos wérgōn dekátan*, Delphic inscription in western Greek alphabet (Haussoullier 1882: 445) *toí Kharopínou paídes* anéthesan *toú Paríou*, Naxian inscription from Delos (Homolle 1888: 464f.) *Ei(th)ukartidēs* m' anéthēke *ho Náxios poíēsas*, Naukratis inscriptions I no. 218 *Phánēs* me anéthēke *tōpóllōn[i tōi Mi]lēsíōi ho Gláu kou*, II no. 722 *Musós* m' anéthēken *Onomakrítou*, 767 [*ho deína* 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[tós] m' ané[thē]ke *ourmo[th]ém[ios] tēphrodí[tēi]*, Boeotian inscription (Kretschmer 1891: 123ff.) *Timasíphilos* m' anéthēke *tōpóllōni toí Ptōieîi ho Praólleios*.

Also in verse: CIA 1.398 *Diogén[ēs]* anéthēken *Aiskhúl(l)ou uús Keph[a]léos*, 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 *Athēnaíēi polioúkhōi 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 phílo[s uiós]*, IGA 98 (Arcadian) *Téllōn tónd'* anéthēke *Daémonos aglaòs uiós*.

With Lesbian *káththēke* 'lay.down/dedicate': (1347). Also Naukratis II 789 and 790 [*ho deíná me*] *káththēke* o [sic] *Mut[ilénaios]*. Cf. 807 [*Aphrodí]tai ho M...* and 814 [*Aphrod*]ítai *ho Ke...*

- (1347) [ó deína κάθ]θηκε τῷ Ἀφροδίτῳ ὁ [sic] Μυτιλήναιος
 ho deína *káththēke* tái Aphrodítai
 the.M.NOM.SG such lay.3SG.AOR the.F.DAT.SG Aphrodite.DAT

Translation

ο Μυτιλήναιος
the.M.NOM.SG Mytilenean.M.NOM.SG
'the Mytilenean dedicated (this) to Aphrodite' (Naukratis II, 788)

With *epoíēse/epoíei* 'make': (1348).

(1348) Πύρρος ἐποίησεν Ἀθηναῖος
Pýrrhos *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*] kerameús (the expansion is probably certain!), CIA 1.483 Kallōnídēs *epoíei ho Deiníou*, CIA 4.477^b [*ho deína* *epoíēsen* or *epoíei P*]ários, CIA 4².373.81 Kálōn *epoíēsen Ai*[ginētēs], CIA 4².373.95 [*á*]rkhermos *epoíēsen ho Khí*[os], CIA 4².373.220 Leóbios *epoíēsen Puretiádēs* (or *Purrētiádēs*), IGA 42 (Argos) *átōtos epoíwēe Argeíos k'Argeiádas Ageláida t'Argeíou*, IGA 44 (Argos) *Polúkleitos epoíei Argeíos*, IGA 44^a (Argos) [*e*]po[í]wēe *Argeíos*, IGA 47 (Argos) *Krēsílas epoíēse Kudōniát[as]*, IGA 165 *Ypatódōros Arissto[geitōn]* *epoēsátan Thēbaíō*, IGA 348 *Paiónios epoíēse Mendaíos*, IGA 498 *Míkōn epoíēsen Athēnaíos*, Loewy (1885) [*p*432] 44^a -ōn *epōēse Thēbaíos*, 57 *X[e]no-[... epoíē]sen Eleu[theréus?]*, 58 -ou [*e*]pōēsen [*Sik*]eliótēs, 96 *Kléōn epōēse Sikuōnios*, 103 [*Daidalos* *ep*]oíēse *Patroklé[ous]*, 135^d (Loewy 1885: 388) [*Sp*]oudías *epoíēse Athēnaíos*, 277 *Timódamos T[imodámou e]poíēse Ampra[kiótēs]*, 297 (Apotheosis of Homer) *Arkhélaos Apollōníou epoíēse Priēneús*, 404 *Níkandros e[poíēsen] ánd[rios]*, Klein (1887: 72) *Eúkheiros epoíēsen ourgotímou uiús* (twice), Klein (1887: 73) *Ergotélēs epoíēsen ho Neárkhou*, Klein (1887: 202) *Xenóphantos epoíēsen Athēn[aíos]*, Klein (1887: 202) (1 and 2) *Teisías epoíēsen Athēnaíos*, Klein (1887: 213) *Krítōn 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 4².373.105 *Thēbádēs e[pōēse ...]-nou país tód' ágalma*, Acropolis inscription (Studniczka 1887: 135ff.) *Anténōr ep[óēsen]o Eumárous t[ód' ágalma]*, IGA 410 *Alxénōr epoíēsen ho Náxios, all' esídesthe*. Also IGA 349 *Eúphrōn exepoíēs' ouk adaēs Pários*.

With *égraphen, égrapsen, gráphēi* '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^h in Meister (1889: 148), *-oikós me grápheí Selamínios*.

- (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^c)

Examples (1350)–(1352) contain various synonyms of the above verbs.

- (1350) [Δ]ωρόθεος ἐφ[ε]ργάσατο Ἀργεῖος
 Dōrótheos ewergásato Argeîos
 Dorotheus.NOM work.3SG.AOR.MID Argive.M.NOM.SG
 'Dorotheus the Argive wrought (this)' (IGA 48, Argos)
- (1351) Πρίκων ἔ[π]α[ξα Κο]λώτα
 Prikōn épaxa Kolóta
 Prikon.NOM fix.3SG.AOR Colotes.GEN
 'Prikon, son of Colotes, built (this)' (IGA 555^a, 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
 Pómpeios eimi toû 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 eimì tourmokráteos toû Prokon-nēsiou*, Attic text: *Ph. eimì toû Ermokrátous toû P.*, IGA 522 (Sicily) *Longēnaiós eimì dēmósios*, 528 (Cumae) *Dēmokháridós eimì toû ...*, 551 (Antipolis) *érpōn eimì theâs therápōn semnēs Aphrodítēs*, Rhodian inscription in Kirchhoff (1887: 49) *Philtoús ēmi tâs kalâs a kúlix a poikíla*, Cypriot inscription 1 (Deecke 1884) *Pra-[p433]totímō ēmi tâs Paphías tō ierēwos*, 16 *tâs theō ēmi tâs Paphías* (likewise 65

Translation

and 66 in Hoffmann 1891: 46), 23 *Timokúpras* ēmi *Timodámō*, Hoffmann (1891) 78 *Stasagórou* ēmi *tō Stasándrō*, 79 *Timándrō* ēmi *tō Onasagórou*, 88 *Pnutillas* ēmi *tās Pnutagórau paidós*, and 121 *Diweithémitós* ēmi *tō basilēwos*.

To these can be added (1354), where an adjective joined to *eínai* represents the position of the verb, and also the examples in which an adjective without *eínai* 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 Epikhárous*.

Outside the previously listed categories are (1356), (1357) and (1358).

- (1356) Κλειθένης ἐχορήγει Ἀυτοκράτους
 Kleisthénēs ekhorégei Autokrátous
 Cleisthenes.NOM conduct.3SG.IMP Autocrates.GEN
 ‘Cleisthenes, son of Autocrates, endowed (this)’ (CIA 4².377^a)
- (1357) ἐν τῆπιάροι κ’ ἐνέχοιτο τοῖ ἴναυτ’ ἐργα(μ)μένοι
 en tēpiároi k’ enékhōito toî
 in the=sacrifice.DAT.IRR hold.3SG.PRS.OPT the.N.DAT.SG here
 ἴναυτ’ erga(m)ménoi
 work.PTCP.PRF.PASS.N.DAT.SG
 ‘He would be liable for a sacrifice performed here’ (IGA 110.9, Elis)

- (1358) Ἀκαμαντὶς ἐνίκᾳ φυλῇ
 Akamantis *enika* phulē
 Acamantis.NOM win.3SG.IMP tribe.NOM.SG
 ‘The tribe of Acamantis conquered.’ (CIG 7806)

Among the examples with *anēthēke* and *kaththēke* listed above, thirteen also contain a dative in addition to subject, verb and apposition; three (CIA 4¹.373f., IGA 95, IGA 543) also contain a substantivized accusative, and CIA 4².373.90 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 ἐ[ποίησε ...]νου παῖς τόδ’ ἄγαλμα
 Thebādēs *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 4².373.105)

In CIA 4².373.90 (=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 4².373.82, expanded by Studniczka (1887: 143) as in (1360).

- (1360) Κρίτων Ἀθηναίᾳ ὁ Σκύθου ἀν[έθηκε καὶ ἐ]ποίη[σε] ([ἐ]ποιεῖ?)
 Kritōn Athēnaíai ho Skúthou
 Crito.NOM Athenian.F.DAT.SG the.M.NOM.SG Scythes.GEN
anēthēke καὶ *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 4².373.82)

The composer of the inscription originally [*p434*] envisaged the conventional word order *Kritōn anēthēken Athēnaíai ho Skúthou*, but then allowed the dative

Translation

Athēnaíai to precede the apposition when he was required by the addition of *kai epoīēse* 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 p332) deviate from the original norm by preposing 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. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*)

(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).

Furthermore, in the same Indic texts we find a striking placement of the verb in second position when the clause begins with *iti 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

These addenda add to Section 2 pp62–73 (concerning the inscriptions with *me* and *emé*).

On p62 and p73: Example (1364) must be left out of consideration due to the state of the inscription; cf. Röhl (1882: 155) on this example.

- (1364) [Π]εριφόνω [ἀνέθη]κέ με (or -κ ἐμέ?) Ξενάγατος
 Periphónāi anéthēké me (-k *emé*) Xenáगतos
 Periphone.DAT dedicate.3SG.AOR me.ACC Xenagatos.NOM
 'Xenagatos dedicated me to Periphone' (IGA 538)*

On p65: 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
 Hounporiōnos Philōn me epoiēsen
 the=Emporion.GEN Philo.NOM me.ACC make.3SG.AOR
 'Philo, the son of Emporion, made me.' (CIA 4².373.103)

On p73: *emé* is also found twice in second position in the ancient vase inscription in Pottier (1888: 168): Example (1366) and *Oikōph(é)lēš em' égrapsen* (written *egraephšen*). 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.

List of critically discussed examples

Homer 5.273 = 8.196	p158
16.112	p55
13.321	p157
Alcman, Fragment 52	p115
Alcaeus, Fragment 68	p59
Fragment 83	p164
Sappho, Fragment 2.7	p58
43	p58
66	p164
97.4 Hiller (=100)	p58
Pindar, <i>Olympian Ode</i> 1.48	p116
Euripides, <i>Medea</i> 1339	p211
Fragment 1029.4	p177
Antiphon 5.38	p176
Aristophanes, <i>Acharnians</i> 779	p115
<i>Frogs</i> 259	p177
<i>Ecclesiazusae</i> 916	p186
Demosthenes 18.43	p211
18.206	p210
24.64	p213
<i>Exordia</i> 1.3	p224
<i>Exordia</i> 3	p260
Callimachus, Fragment 114	p116
Theocritus 2.159	p147
Pausanias 5.23.7	p67
Palatine Anthology 6.140	p71
<i>Inscriptiones graecae antiquissimae</i> (Röhl 1882) 384	p63
474	p67
Collitz, <i>Collection of Greek dialect inscriptions</i> 26	p132
3184.8	p161
3213.3	p148
[p436]	
<i>Greek vases with masters' autographs</i> (Klein 1887) p51	p66
p194.2	p333
p195.3	p333
<i>Greek vases with kalos inscriptions</i> (Klein 1890) p68	p334
<i>Naukratis</i> , by Flinders Petrie, I, inscription 303	p64

12 *Verb position in Germanic and Proto-Indo-European*

	I, inscription 307	p64
	II, inscription 750	p64
Plautus, <i>Poenulus</i> 1258		p294
<i>Mercator</i> 774*		p306

* *Translator's note:* Wackernagel here writes *Bacchides* 1258 and *Mercator* 784, but these must both be errors.

Chapter 3

Original text

≤headOriginal text *Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung*¹

I.

[S. 333] Albert Thumb hat vor vier Jahren in den Jahrbüchern für Philologie CXXXV 641–648 die Behauptung aufgestellt, die griechischen Pronominalakkusative $\mu\nu$ und $\nu\nu$ seien durch Verschmelzung von Partikeln mit dem alten Akkusativ des Pronominalstammes *i* entstanden. Insbesondere das ionische $\mu\nu$ 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 $\mu\nu$ 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 $\mu\nu$ durchaus die Geltung einer einheitlichen Pronominalform erlangt habe, doch an $\mu\nu$ 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 $\mu\nu$ wie *sma* im ganzen selten (genau genommen noch viel seltener als *sma*) unmittelbar hinter Nomina und

¹ 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.

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 $\mu\nu$ Homers das [S. 334] nach seiner Hypothese diesem im Altindischen entsprechende *mā sma* daselbst nicht aufzutreiben weiss, da doch nicht nur Böhlingk-Roth (s. v. *mā* 9) zahlreiche Beispiele aufführen, darunter eines aus dem Rigveda (10, 272, 24 *mā smāitādīg āpa gūhah 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 rātham – 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. Λ 479. O 160. δ 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 *μιν* 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 N II P, 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 καί μιν* N 58 und *τούνεκα καί μιν* N 432, wo *καί* eng zum ersten Satzwort gehört; *ἐπεὶ οὐ μιν* P 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 P 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 Monro² 337 f. bloss noch Γ 368 *οὐδ' ἔβαλόν μιν*. Φ 576 *εἶ περ γὰρ φθάμενός μιν ἦ οὐτάςτη*, wo er *μιν* streichen will. K 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 εἰσκάμενος προσέφη* oder *προσεφώνεε* für *τῷ εἰσκάμενος προσέφη μιν*, wo der Drang *μιν* an die zweite Stelle zu setzen deutlich genug wirksam ist. Ähnlich in der häufigen Wendung *καί 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 μεγάλα τὰ ἐπαίροντα καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα ἦν* (*μιν* gehört zu den Partizipien). 1, 213, 3 *ὥς μιν ὁ τε οἶνος ἀνῆκε καὶ ἔμαθε* (*μιν* gehört blos [sic] zu *ἀνῆκε*). 2, 90, 7 *ἀλλά*

μιν οἱ ἱρέες αὐτοὶ οἱ τοῦ Νείλου — θάπτουσι. 5, 46, 11 οἱ γάρ μιν Σελινούσιοι ἐπανακτάντες ἀπέκτειναν καταφυγόντα ἐπὶ Διὸς ἀγοραίου βωμόν. Vgl. Kallinos 1, 20 ὥσπερ γάρ μιν πύργον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώσιν, 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 τῶ καὶ οἱ, wo μὲν bezw. καὶ eng zum ersten Satzwort gehören; P 153 νῦν δ' οὐ οἱ und P 410 δὴ 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] μὴ οἱ ἀγάσσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων zu erklären, wenn hier nicht die Untrennbarkeit von εἰ und μὴ 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 ἔσσειται ὄσσον ἐμοί περ. γ 306 τῶ δέ οἱ ὀγδοάτῳ κακὸν ἦλυθε διὸς Ὀρέστης. — Herodot 1, 75, 10 Θαλῆς οἱ ὁ Μιλήσιος διεβίβασε. 1, 199, 14 ἢ τίς οἱ ξείνων ἀργύριον ἐμβαλὼν ἐς τὰ γούνατα μιχθῆ (τίς geht dem οἱ voran, weil es selbst ein Enklitikum ist). 2, 108, 4 τοὺς τέ οἱ λίθους (folgen 14 Worte) οὔτοι ἦσαν οἱ ἐλκύσαντες. 4, 45, 19 ὄστις οἱ ἦν ὁ θέμενος (scil. τοῦνομα). 5, 92, β 8 ἐκ δέ οἱ ταύτης τῆς γυναίκος οὐδ' ἐξ ἄλλης παῖδες ἐγίνοντο. 6, 63, 2 ἐν δέ οἱ χρόνῳ ἐλάσσονι ἢ γυνὴ τίκτει τούτον. 7, 5, 14 οὔτος 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 ἀρῆν ἐτάροισιν ἀμύναι. P 195 ἄ οἱ θεοὶ οὐρανίωνες πατρὶ φίλῳ ἔπορον. δ 767 θεὰ δέ οἱ ἔκλυεν ἀρῆς. δ 771 ὃ οἱ (Herwerden Revue de philologie II 195 ῶ!) φόνος υἱὶ τέτυκται. Herodot 1, 34, 16 μὴ τί οἱ κρεμάμενον τῷ παιδὶ ἐμπέσῃ.

3) Genetivisches oder halbgenetivisches οἱ geht seinem Substantiv und dessen Attributen unmittelbar voraus, eine bei einem Enklitikum an und für sich unbegreifliche Stellung: I 244 μὴ οἱ ἀπειλάς ἐκτελέσῃσι θεοί. P 324 ὅς οἱ παρὰ πατρὶ γέροντι κηρύσσων γήρασκε. — Herodot 3, 14, 14 δευτέρῳ οἱ τὸν παῖδα ἔπεμπε. 3, 15, 12 τὴν οἱ ὁ πατήρ εἶχε ἀρχὴν. [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 ὄψιός οἱ τῶν μάγων ὄνειροπόλοι ἐσήμαινον. b) Zwischen Artikel nebst folgender Partikel und Substantiv: B 217 τῷ δέ οἱ ὦμον κυρτῷ. N 616 τῷ δέ οἱ ὅσσε χαμαὶ πέσον. P 695 = Ψ 396 τῷ δέ οἱ ὅσσε δακρυόφιν πλησθεν. 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 παίδων 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 ὄπλα ἔχουσι Ἀθηναῖοι. 6, 41, 7 τὴν δέ οἱ πέμπτην τῶν νεῶν κατεῖλον διώκοντες οἱ Φοίνικες. — Ebenso die ionischen Dichter: Archilochus 29, 2 Bgk. ἡ δέ οἱ κόμη ὦμος κατεσκίαζε καὶ μετὰφρανα. 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 κιτοφόρων 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 ὑπερφίαλον. Euphorion Anthol. Palat. 6, 278, 3 (= Meineke Analecta Alexandrina S. 164) ἀντι δέ οἱ πλοκαμίδος ἐκηβόλε

καλὸς ἐπεὶ ἡ ὠχαρνῆθεν αἰεὶ κισσὸς ἀεξομένω. — Zu 2) Theokrit 2, 138 ἐγὼ δέ οἱ ἄταχυπειθῆς χειρὸς ἐφαψαμένα (vgl. Meineke zu 7, 88). — Zu 1) oder zu 2) Sophokles Aias 907 ἐν γάρ οἱ χθονὶ πηκτὸν [S. 339] τὸ δ' ἔγχος περιπετέε κατηγορεῖ. — Zu 3) Europa 41 ἄτε οἱ αἵματος ἔσκεν. — Zu 4) Sophokles Trachin. 650 ἄ δέ οἱ φίλα δάμαρ τάλαιναν δυστάλαινα καρδίαν πάγκλαυτος αἰὲν ὄλλυτο.

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 ἔστω ἴνδικον. Kypros 59, 3 Coll. ἀφ' ὧ φοι τὰς εὐχολὰς ἐπέτυχε oder ἐπέδυκε (vgl. Meister Griech. Dial. II 148. Hoffmann I 67 f.). id. 60, 29 Coll. ἀνοσίχα 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^a: “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^b: “in 10% steht *μιν* hinter einer subordinierenden Konjunktion”; οἱ viermal (hinter ὅ(τ)ι, ἐπεὶ, ὄφρα), 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 16⅔%; 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*. Οἱ 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 $\mu\nu$ aus *sm(a)-im* der Hauptstützpunkt entzogen ist, so wird dieselbe geradezu widerlegt durch das Fehlen jeder Wirkung des angeblich ehemals vorhandenen Anlautes *sm-*; man müsste doch bei Homer gelegentlich $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \mu\nu$ als Trochäus (oder Spondeus), $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\nu$ 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 $\mu\nu$ ergeben haben soll, uralte. Dann ist das Vergessen der ursprünglichen Funktion von *sma* in der Anwendung von $\mu\nu$ begreiflich, aber man müsste entsprechend altindischem **smēm* griechisch **(c)μαiv* erwarten. Oder die Zusammenrückung hat nicht lange vor Homer stattgefunden, in welchem Fall die Anwendung des spezifisch griechischen Elisionsgesetzes, also die Reihe $\mu\alpha\ \acute{\iota}\nu - \mu' \acute{\iota}\nu - \mu\nu$, begreiflich wird: dann versteht man nicht den völligen Untergang der Funktion von *(c)μα*, die Behandlung von $\mu\nu$ ganz in Weise einer gewöhnlichen Pronominalform, zumal ja im Thessalischen in der Bedeutung 'aber' eine Partikel $\mu\alpha$ vorkommt, deren Gleichsetzung mit altind. *sma* allerdings bestreitbar ist.

Noch weniger glücklich scheint mir Thumbs Erklärung des dorischen $\nu\nu$ aus *nu-im*, da mir hier unüberwindliche lautliche Schwierigkeiten entgegenzustehen scheinen. Denn wenn er bemerkt: "dass auslautendes *u*, wie im Altindischen (z. B. *kó nv átra*) vor Vokal unter gewissen Bedingungen ehemals als Konsonant (*u*) gesprochen wurde, darf unbedenklich angenommen werden": und sich hierfür auf Fälle wie $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ aus *proti*, $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\nu$ aus *eni*, $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\rho$ aus *hyperi* (= altind. *upary* neben *upari*), lesb. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho-$ aus *peri-* beruft, in denen *i* für *i* 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 Vālahilyas nur ganz sporadisch, bei Einsilblern nur in der Zusammensetzung *avyuṣṭāh* 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 $\nu\acute{\nu}\acute{\iota}\nu$, woraus dorisch $\nu\nu$, hinter vokalischem Auslaut konstruieren könnten, so bliebe ein postkonsonantisches $\nu\nu$ doch unverständlich; eine Entwicklungsreihe $\acute{o}\varsigma\ \nu\nu\ \acute{\iota}\nu$, $\acute{o}\varsigma\ \nu\acute{\nu}\ \acute{\iota}\nu$, $\acute{o}\varsigma\ \nu\nu$ lässt sich gar nicht denken.

Wenn übrigens Thumb S. 646 andeutet, dass die Stellung von $\nu\nu$ im Satz keine speziellen Analogieen mit derjenigen von altind. *nu*, griech. $\nu\nu$ aufweise, und dies mit dem geringern Alter der $\nu\nu$ bietenden Sprachquellen (Pindars und der

Tragiker) entschuldigt, so ist allerdings wahr, dass diese Autoren nicht bloss aus 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 *οί* 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 *κὺν δέ 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 *ἀλλά νιν, ὃ φάος διογενές, κατείργε*. Helena 1519 *τίς δέ νιν ναυκληρία ἐκ τῆςδ' ἀπῆρε χθονός*. Iphig. Aul. 615 *ὕμεῖς δέ, νεάνιδές, νιν ἀγκάλας ἐπιδέξασθε*. Bacch. 30 *ὧν νιν οὔνεκα κτανεῖν Ζῆν' ἐξεκαυχῶντ(ο)*. — Dazu Theokrit. 2, 103 *ἐγὼ δέ νιν ὡς ἐνόησα*. 6, 11 *τὰ δέ νιν καλὰ κύματα φαίνει*. Höchst bemerkenswert ist endlich die kürzlich von Selivanov in den athen. Mitteil. XVI 112 ff. herausgegebene alte rhodische Inschrift *καμα τόζ' Ἰδαμενεὺς ποίησα ἵνα κλέος εἶη· Ζεὺς δέ νιν ὄστις πημαῖνοι, λειώλη θείη*, wo das *νιν* syntaktisch zu *πημαῖνοι* gehört, also mit dem oben S. 332 f. erwähnten *μιν* in Φ 347 *χαίρει δέ μιν ὄστις ἐθείρη* aufs genaueste zusammenstimmt.

Diese wesentliche Übereinstimmung von *νιν* und *μιν* in der Stellung wirft Thumbs ganze Beweisführung nochmals um. Eines gebe ich ihm allerdings zu, dass *μ-ιν*, *ν-ιν* zu teilen und **ιν* der Akk. zu lat. *is*, und das sowohl die Annahme zugrunde liegender Reduplikativbildungen **ιμμ*, **ινιν*, 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 *αὐτικά-μ-ιν* (aus *-kḥm im*) und *αὐτικά μάν*, *ἄρα-μ-ιν* und *ἄρα μάν*, *ῥα-μ-ιν* 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* : *αὐτικά 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*, *mmi-va* 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,

II.

Die Vorliebe von $\mu\nu$, $\nu\nu$, $\omicron\iota$ 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 ὁ $\sigma\phi\nu\nu$ εὖ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν. A 120 ὁ μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλῃ.

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 $\mu\nu$, $\nu\nu$, $\omicron\iota$ mit dem Pronomen der dritten Person zu beginnen, ϵ viermal, allemal an zweiter oder möglichst nahe bei der zweiten Stelle (ich werde im folgenden diesen Unterschied nicht mehr berücksichtigen). $\sigma\phi\nu(\nu)$ zwölfmal, und zwar elfmal regelmässig, regelwidrig nur P 736 ἐπὶ δὲ πτόλεμος τέτατό $\sigma\phi\nu\nu$ [sic] (beachte auch K 559 τὸν δὲ $\sigma\phi\nu\nu$ ἄνακτ' ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης ἔκτανε, wo $\sigma\phi\nu\nu$ sich in die Gruppe τὸν δὲ ἄνακτα eingedrängt hat). $\sigma\phi\nu\nu(\nu)$ sechsmal, immer regelmässig. $\sigma\phi\epsilon\alpha\sigma$ in P 278 μάλα γάρ $\sigma\phi\epsilon\alpha\sigma$ ὦκ' ἐλέλιξεν. $\sigma\phi\omega\epsilon$ P 531 εἰ μὴ $\sigma\phi\omega$ ' Αἴαντε διέκριναν μεμαῶτε. Aus dem sonstigen homerischen Gebrauch sei das hyperthetische καὶ $\sigma\phi\epsilon\alpha\sigma$ φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα angeführt.

Ebenso in der zweiten Person: $\sigma\epsilon\omicron$, $\sigma\epsilon\nu$ 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 οὐ $\tau\omicron\iota$ ἔεδνωταὶ κακοὶ εἶμεν, und Π 443 ἀτὰρ οὐ $\tau\omicron\iota$ πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι. An beiden Stellen hat die schon früher besprochene Tendenz der Negationen die Enklitika an sich anzulehnen die Hauptregel durchkreuzt. — $\sigma\epsilon$ findet sich 21 mal, davon 19 mal nach der Regel, zweimal anders: Π 623 εἰ καὶ ἐγὼ $\sigma\epsilon$ βάλοιμι, und P 171 ἦ τ' ἐφάμην $\sigma\epsilon$.

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 μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός gefügt werden darf. Abweichend sind Π 112 ἔσπετε νῦν μοι (ἔσπετέ νῦν μοι? bei welcher Schreibung diese Stelle zu den regelmässigen Beispielen gehören würde). Π 238 ἦδ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν μοι τόδ' ἐπικρήνην ἐέλωρ. Π 523 ἀλλὰ κύ πέρ μοι ἄναξ τόδε καρτερόν ἔλκος ἄκεσσαι. Π 55 αἰνὸν ἄχος

τό μοί ἐστιν, Ausnahmen, die weder durch ihre Zahl noch durch ihre Beschaffenheit die Regel erschüttern können, während umgekehrt eine Stelle wie T 287 Πάτροκλέ μοι δειλῆ πλειστον κεχαρισμένε θυμῶ, 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 εἶπέ — Endlich με findet sich 15 mal, immer nach der Regel. [Ausnahmen aus den andern Büchern bespricht Monro² 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; σε 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 σεῖς 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 3⁴, S. 701) καί τυ φίλιππον ἔθηκεν. Epicharm bei Athen. 4, 139 B ἐκάλεσε γάρ τύ τις; Sophron bei Apollonius de pron. 68 B τί τυ ἐγὼν ποιέω; Aristoph. Acharn. 730 ἐπόθουν τυ ναί τὸν φίλιον ἄπερ ματέρα. Dazu der (von Ahrens II 255 nicht erwähnte) dorische Orakelspruch bei Stephanus Byz. 73, 14 M. (aus Ephorus) ποῖ τυ λαβῶν <ἄξω> καὶ ποῖ τυ καθίζω und die Mehrzahl der ungefähr dreissig theokratischen Beispiele, darunter bemerkenswert 5, 74 μή τύ τις ἠρώτη (= att. μή τις σε εἰρώτα), wo μή τις durch τυ entzwei gesprengt ist, und 1, 82 ἄ δέ τυ κώρα πάσας ἀνὰ κράνας, πάντ' ἄλσεα ποσσὶ φορεῖται ζατεῦς(α), wo das von Brunck aus dem best überlieferten aber unmetrischen τοι sicher hergestellte τυ als Akkusativ zu ζατεῦσα gehört, aber weit davon abstehend ἄ und κώρα von einander trennt. (Die einzige Stelle des Kallimachus epigr. 47 (46), 9 οὐδ' ὄσον ἀττάραγόν τυ δεδοίκαμεν, widerspricht der Regel.) Höchst beachtenswert ist endlich das einzige inschriftliche Beispiel, das ich zur Hand habe: Collitz 3339, 70 (Epidaurus) αἶ τύ κα ὑγιῆ ποιήσω (= att. ἐάν σε ὑγιᾶ π.), wo τυ zwischen die sonst eng verbundenen Partikeln αἶ und κα getreten ist. Das einzige abweichende Beispiel der vor-alexandrinischen Zeit, Sophron bei Apollon. de pron. 75 A οὐχ ὀδεῖν τυ ἐπίκαζε, 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 lyriici, 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 *ce* einmal (Sappho 104, 2). Bleiben drei Stellen mit bestrittner Lesung, deren handschriftliche Überlieferung ich zunächst heretze: Sappho 2, 7 ὡς γάρ *c'* ἴδω βροχέως με φωνὰς οὐδὲν ἔτ' εἴκει, Sappho 43 ὅτα πάννυχος ἄσφι κατάργει, endlich Sappho 100 nach dem volleren Wortlaut bei Choirikios (Oeuvres de Charles Graux II 97) ... *ce* τετίμηκεν ἐξόχως ἡ Ἀφροδίτη. An der ersten wird nun die von Ahrens vorgeschlagene, von Vahlen in seiner Ausgabe der Schrift *περὶ ὕψους* (Kap. 10, 2) gebilligte Lesung ὡς *ce* γάρ φίδω, βροχέως με φώνας κτέ. nur um so wahrscheinlicher und Seidlers von Bergk und Hiller gebilligte Versetzung des *ce* hinter βροχέως und Streichung des *me* nur um so unwahrscheinlicher. Für die zweite Stelle kann ich nun noch bestimmter die KZ. XXVIII 141 geforderte Lesung ὅτα *ce* φι πάννυχος κατάργει[sic] als notwendig bezeichnen. Und an der dritten Stelle ergibt sich nun Weils von Hiller (Antholog. lyr. fragm. 97) rezipierte Schreibung τετίμακ' ἔξοχα *c'* Ἀφροδίτα als entschieden unwahrscheinlich.

So kommen wir durch Addition der 30 obigen Fälle, des *ce* und *me* bei Sappho 47 und des *ce* für ἄσφι 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 πάμπαν δὲ τυφῶς ἐκ *c'* ἔλετο φρένας schreiben, aber hinter ἐκ vielmehr δ' 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 ἃ δὲ *me* ἰδρῶς κακχέεται. 118, 3 Αἰθουσία *me* κόρα Λατοῦς ἀνέθηκεν Ἄριστα. Attribut und Substantiv Sappho 34, 1 *me* κίμικρα μοι πάις ἔμμεν ἐφαίνεο κάχαρις. Präposition und Verba Alcaeus 95 ἐκ *me* ἔλασας ἀλγέων. Vgl. auch Sappho 2, 5 τό μοι μάν und 2, 7 ὡς *ce* γάρ, wo μάν und γάρ auf die Stelle hinter τό, bezw. ὡς 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 τίς *c'*, ὦ Ψάπφ' ἀδικήει. 104, 1, τίς *c'*, ὦ φίλε γάμβρε, κάλωσ ἐϊκάσδω. 88 τί *me* Πανδίονις ὠραννα χελίδων. An einen satzeinleitenden Vokativ ist μοι angelehnt Sappho 45 ἄγε δὴ, χέλυ διά, μοι φωνάεσσα γένοιο. Endlich verweise ich auf Sappho 6 ἢ *ce* Κύπρος ἢ Πάφος ἢ Πάνορμος.

Allgemein üblich ohne Unterschied der Dialekte ist es, das archaische (Klein Die griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen² S. 13) *me* in Weih- und Künstlerinschriften gleich hinter das erste Wort zu setzen. Es wird dienlich sein, die Beispiele vollständig zusammen zu stellen.

Ich beginne mit *me* ἀνέθηκε: Attika Corpus inscript. att. 4², 373, 87 -ιτός *me* ἀνέθηκεν. 373, 90 Ὀνημόσ *me* ἀνέθηκεν ἀπαρχὴν τάθηναία ὁ Σμυκύθου υἱός. 373, 120 [ὁ δεινα] *me* 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. 4², 373, 81 u. s. w.): CIA. 1, 349 -θάνης μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ἀθηναία[ι πολιούχψ]. 352 Ἰφιδίκη μ' ἀνέθηκεν, 4² 373, 85 Ἀλκίμαχος μ' ἀνέθηκε]. 373, 99 Τίμαρχός 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 στήθε Κολοίου παῖς [εὐξά]μενος δεκάτην. 373, 218 ἀνέθηκε δέ μ' Εὐδίκου υἱός. Inschrift von der Akropolis ed. Foucart Bull. de Corresp. hellén. 13, 160 [Ερμό?]δωρός μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ἀφροδίτη δῶρον ἀπαρξήν. — Böotien: Inschrift nach Reinach behandelt von Kretschmer Hermes XXVI 123 ff. Τιμασίφιλος μ' ἀνέθεικε τῶπόλλωνι τοῖ Πτωεῦ ὁ Πραόλλειος. — Korinth (von hier an scheidet sich die poetischen und die prosaischen Inschriften nicht mehr): IGA. 20, 7 Σιμίων μ' ἀνέθηκε Ποτειδάφω[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^a — με ἀνέθ(η)κε τῶ. 20, 94 — μ' ἀνέθηκε. 20, 102 [Π]έριλος μ' —. — Korkyra: IGA. 341 (= 3187 Collitz) Λόφιός μ' ἀνέθηκε. [S. 347] — Hermione: Kaibel 926 [Παν]τακλῆς μ' ἀνέθηκεν. — Kyra bei Aegina: Inschrift ed. Jamot Bull. Corr. hellén. 13, 186 οἱ φρουροί μ' ἀνέθεσαν? — Lakonien: IGA. 62^a (S. 174) Πλεισιτιάδας μ' ἀνέθηκε] Διοσκώροισιν ἄ[γαλμα]. — Naxos: IGA 407 Νικάνδρη μ' ἀνέθηκεν ἐκηβόλω ἰοχεαίρη. 408 Δειναγόρης μ' ἀνέθηκεν ἐκηβόλω 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 Χηραμύης μ' ἀνέθ(η)κεν τῆρη ἄγαλμα. Röhl ergänzt am Anfang [Ενθάδε] 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 Χηραμύης 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 υἱὸς Θρασυμήδεος. — Kypros: Inschrift bei Hoffmann Die griech. Dialekte 1, 85 No. 163 [—] μ' ἀνέθηκαν τῶ Ἀπόλλ(λ)ωνι. Kaibel 794 (1. Jahrhundert n. Ch.) [Κεκρο]πίδης μ' ἀνέθηκε. — Achäisch (Grossgriechenland): IGA. 543 Κυνίκκος με ἀνέθηκεν ὠρταμος 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 ἀ[νέθηκε]. 80 -c με ἀνέθηκεν τῶπόλλων[ι]. 114 -ων μ[ε ἀνέθηκε]. 137 -c μ' ἀν[έθηκε]. 177 Πρώταρχός με [ἀνέθηκε τ]ῶπόλλωνι. 186 [Π]ρώταρχός με ἀνέθηκ[ε]. 202 [ὁ δεῖνα] με ἀνέθηκε. 218 Φάνης με ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλων[ι τῶ Μι]λησίῳ ὁ Γλαύκου. 220 Χαριδίων με ἀνέθη[κε]. 223 [Πολύ]κεστός μ' ἀνέθηκε τ[ῶπόλλωνι]. 235 Σλη-ύης μ' ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι. 237 [X]αρ(ὸ)φης με ἀνέθηκε τᾶπό[λλωνι τῶ Μ]ιλα-σίῳ. 255 -ης μ' ἀνέθηκε. 259 -c μ' ἀ[νέθηκε]. 326 Να[ύπλι]ός με [ἀνέθηκε [sic]. 327 -δης μ' ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι. 446 -c με ἀνέ[θηκεν]. id. vol. II (by Gardner) S. 62–69: No. 701 Σώτρατος μ' ἀνέθηκεν τήφροδίτη. 709 -ος μ' ἀνέθηκε τῆ[ι Ἀφροδίτῃ] ἐπὶ τῆ —. 717 Καϊκός μ' [ἀνέ]θηκεν. 720 -ορος μ' ἀν[έθηκεν]. 722 Μυρός μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ὀνομακρίτου. 723 Ἄσος [S. 348] μ' ἀνέθηκεν. 734 -ναξ μ' [ἀνέθηκεν]. 736 -ων με ἀν[έθηκεν]. 738 [ὁ δεῖνα] μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ἀφροδίτη (?). 742 -ηλός μ' ἀνέθηκεν. 748 Ἑρμησιφάνης μ' ἀνέθηκεν τήφροδίτη. 770 -μης με ἀν[έθηκε τ]ήφροδίτη[ι]. 771 Χάρμη[η]c με [ἀνέθηκεν]. 775 [K]λεόδημος με ἀ[νέ]θηκε τῆ Ἀ[φροδίτῃ]. 776–777 Χάρμης με ἀνέθηκε τήφροδίτη (bezw. τῆ Ἀ.) εὐχολήν. 778 Ροϊκός μ' ἀνέθηκε τ[ῆ Ἀφρ]οδίτη. 780 Φιλίς μ' ἀνέθηκε τ[ῆ Ἀφρ]οδί[τῃ]. 781 Θούτιμος με ἀνέθηκ[εν]. 785 [ὁ δεῖνα] μ' ἀν[έθηκε τῆ Ἀφρ]οδίτη. 794 Πολύερμός μ' ἀν[έθηκε] τῆ Ἀφροδίτη. 799 Ὀχίλος μ' ἀνέθηκε. 817 [ὁ δεῖνα] καὶ X[ρυσ]τόδωρος με ἀνέθ[ηκαν]. 819 [Λ]ά-κρι[τό]c μ' ἀνέ[θη]κε οὐρμιο[θ]έμ[ι]ος τήφροδί[τῃ]. 876 Ἑρμαγόρης μ' ἀνέθηκε ὁ Τ[ή]ιος τῶπόλλωνι (Vers!). 877 Πύρ(ρ)ος 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 δεῖνα ἀνέθηκέ] με und 307 [ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκ]έ με, beide Inschriften, wie sich nun ergibt, falsch ergänzt, und die zweizeilige Inschrift Naukratis 2, 750, wo die obere Linie [τῆ Ἀφροδί]τῃ, die untere Ἑρμαγα-θῖνός μ' ἀνέθ[ηκεν] bietet. Gardner liest danach τῆ 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 unserer Stellungenregel, Ἑρμαγαθῖνός μ' ἀνέθ[ηκε] [τῆ Ἀφροδί]τῃ gelesen werden.

Ganz Analoges gilt für die mit Synonymis von ἀνέθηκε gebildeten Aufschriften: με κατέθηκε Kypros: Deecke 1 Κάς μι κατέθηκε τᾶ Παφία Ἀφροδίτα. 2 αὐτάρ μι κατέ[θηκε] Ὀνασίθεμις. 3 αὐτάρ με [κατέθηκε Ὀνασί]θεμι[ς]. 15 αὐτάρ με κατέθηκε [Ἀ]κεστόθεμις. — Naukratis II No. 790 [ὁ δεῖνα μ]ε κάθη[κε] ὁ [sic] Μυτιλήναιος. 840 Νέαρχός με κά[θη]θη το[ῖς Δ]ιοσκόροις. — μ' ἐπέθηκε Aegina: IGA. 362 Διότιμος μ' ἐπέθηκε. — με (κατ)έστασε Kypros: Deecke 71 κά μεν ἔστασαν [κα]σίγητοι (Vers!). Hoffmann I 46 No. 67 Γιλ(λ)ίκα με κατέστασε ὁ [sic] Στασικρέτεος. — με ἔφεξε Kypros: Hoffmann I 46 No. 66 [αὐ]τάρ με ἔφεξε

[Ονασί]θεμικ. — μ' ἔδωκε Sikyon: IGA. 22 Ἐπαίνετός μ' ἔδωκεν Χαρόπῳ. Abweichend die böotische Inschrift IGA. 219 Χάρης ἔδωκεν Εὐπλοίωνι 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 τηνδί coi Θούδημος δίδωσι.)

In poetischen Weihinschriften findet sich so gestelltes με bis in die Kaiserzeit: Kaibel 821 Βάκχῳ μ[ε] Βάκχον καὶ προσκυναίᾳ θεῶ στασαντο. 822, 9 Δαδοῦχος με Κόρης, Βασιλᾶν, Διός, ἱερὰ σηκῶν Ἴηρας κλειῖθρα φέρων βωμὸν ἔθηκε Ῥήη. 877^b (S. XIX) ἄνθετο μὲν μ' Ἐπίδουρος. Vgl. 868 Ἀσκληπιοῦ με δμῶα πυρφόρο[ν θεοῦ oder ξένε] Πείωνά λεύσσειε. (Mit anderer Stellung von με Kaibel 809, 813, 843.)

Ganz ebenso die Künstlerinschriften [sic]: μ' ἐποίησε, μ' ἐποίηει: CIA. 4² 373, 206 [E]ὐθυκλῆς μ' ἐποίησεν. IGA. 492 (attische Inschrift von Sigeum) καὶ μ' ἐπο(ιη)σεν Αἰώπος καὶ ἀδελφοί. CIA. 1, 466 Ἀριτίων μ' ἐπόησεν. 1, 469 (vgl. Löwy Inschriften 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 ἐποίηειν. IGA. 557 (Elis?) Κοῖός μ' ἀπόησεν. IGA. 22 (= Klein Griechische Vasen mit Meistersignaturen S. 40) Ἐξηκίας μ' ἐποίησε. Klein S. 41 Ἐξηκίας μ' ἐποίησεν εὖ. S. 31 Θεόζοτος μ' ἐπόησε. S. 34 Ἐργότιμος μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 43, 45 (bis!), 48 Ἀμακίς μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 48 Χόλχος μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 66 -c 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 Γάγεος μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 90 Πανφαῖός μ' ἐποίησεν. S. 213 Λυκίας μ' ἐποίησεν ἡμιχώνη. Dazu die metrische Aufschrift IGA. 536 [Γλαυκία]ι με Κάλων γε[νεῖς] αλει[ο]ς ἐποίηει. 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 entweder 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 Ergänzung 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 Νεάρχος μ' ἔγραψεν καὶ <ἐποίησεν>. — Abweichend IGA. 474 (Kreta) -μων ἔγραφέ με. Doch lässt sich diese Ausnahme leicht durch die Schreibung ἔγραψ' ἐμέ beseitigen. Vergleiche die Inschrift bei Klein S. 40 κάποιος [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) Κλεοθένης μ' ἀνέθηκεν ὁ Πόντιος ἐξ Ἐπιδάμου. 6, 19, 6 (altattisch) Ζηνί μ' ἄγαλμ' ἀνέθηκαν. In dem Epigramm bei Paus. 5, 23, 7 Zeile 3 καὶ μετρεῖτ' Ἀρίτων ἠδὲ Τελέστας αὐτοκασίγητοι καλὰ Λάκωνες *ἔσαν verbessert F. Dümmler nach freundlicher Mitteilung καὶ με Κλειτορίοις Ἀρίτων κτλ. — Hierher gehören auch die von Herodot 5, 59 und 5, 60 aus dem Ismenion beigebrachten Aufschriften Ἀμφιτρῶν μ' ἀνέθηκεν *ἔων ἀπὸ Τηλεβοάων und Σκαῖος πυγμαχέων με ἐκηβόλω 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 συοκτόνε, φήγινον ὄζον θῆκε. 50 (49 W.), 1 τῆς Ἀγοράνακτος με λέγε, ξένε, κωμικὸν ὄντως ἀγκείσθαι νίκης μάρτυρα τοῦ Ῥοδίου Πάμφιλον. 56 (55), 1 τῶ με Κανωπίτη Καλλίτιον εἴκοσι μύξαις πλούσιον ἢ Κριτίου λύχνον ἔθηκε θεῶ. Fragm. 95 (Laertius Diog. 1, 29) Θαλῆς με τῶ μεδεῦντι Νεῖλεω δήμου δίδωσι, τοῦτο δις λαβὼν ἀριστεῖον. — Anthol. Pal. 6, 49 (Athen. 6, 232 B) καὶ μ' ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ θῆκεν πόδας ὡκὺς 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 εἶδωλον λύγδινον εὐξαμένη. 6, 239, 1 σμήνεος ἔκ με ταμῶν γλυκερὸν θέρος ἀντι νομαίων γηραιὸς Κλείτων σπεῖσε μελισσοπόνος. 6, 261, 1 χάλκεον ἀργυρέω με πανεῖκελον, Ἴνδικὸν ἔργον, ὄλην — — 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 ἔγραφ' ἐμέ abteilen, Naukratis 1, 303 und 307, wo bloss ME bzw. EME überliefert ist, als ganz unsicher 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) Κομμία ἡμί, ἄγε δέ με Κλιτομίας. 524 (Cumae) = Inscript. Siciliae ed. Kaibel 865 ὄς 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)ησε Χάροπ[ι]. Aber sechsmal steht ἐμέ anders: Klein S. 39 Ἐξεκίας ἔγραψε κάποησε ἐμέ (Vers?) S. 40 Ἐξεκίας ἔγραψε κά(ι)ποίησ' ἐμέ (Vers?). S. 51 Χαριταῖος ἐποίησεν ἔμ' εἶ. S. 82 Ἐρμογένης ἐποίησεν ἐμέ. S. 83 Ἐρμογένης 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 umfangreichern Texte der ionischen und [S. 352] der attischen Litteratur, vor allem wieder Herodot. So wenig allerdings, als bei μν und οἰ, hat er bei den übrigen enklitischen Pronomina die alte Regel festgehalten.

Im siebenten Buche des Herodot findet sich σφρων 13 mal, davon 6 mal an zweiter Stelle; σφι 70 mal, davon 46 mal an zweiter Stelle; σφρα 32 mal, davon 20 mal an zweiter Stelle; σφρα 1 mal, nicht an zweiter Stelle. Also von 116 Stellen, wo σφ-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. σε einmal, regelmässig; τοι (mit Ausschluss der Fälle, wo es deutlich Partikel ist) 45 mal, davon 18—20 mal an zweiter Stelle; σε 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 ἔγνω 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 *καί μοι* beginnt, ja man kann sagen, dass wenn er [S. 353] überhaupt mit *καί* beginnt und *μοι* enthält, *μοι* sich ausnahmslos unmittelbar an *καί* anschliesst. Ich ordne die Beispiele nach der Chronologie der Redner, und die Wendungen nach der Zeit des ältesten Beispiels.

καί 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 anderer Stellung des Objekts *καί μοι μάρτυρας τούτων κάλει* Antiphon 5, 56; *καί μοι ἀπάντων τούτων τοὺς μάρτυρας κάλει* Andoc. 1, 127; *καί μοι τούτους κάλει πρῶτον* Isäus 5, 11.

καί μοι λαβὲ καὶ ἀνάγνωθι mit folgendem Objekt Andoc. 1, 13. 1, 15.

καί 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. Isocrates 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 anderer Stellung des Objekts *καί μοι τὰς μαρτυρίας ἀνάγνωθι ταύτας (ταυτασί)* Isaeus 2, 16. 2, 34; *καί μοι τούτων ἀνάγνωθι τὴν μαρτυρίαν* [Demosth.] 50, 42; *καί μοι λαβῶν ἀνάγνωθι πρῶτον τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον* Demosth. 57, 31. Ohne Objekt [Demosth.] 47, 24.

καί μοι ἀνάβητε μάρτυρες (oder *τούτων μάρτυρες*) Lysias 1, 29. 1, 42. 13, 64. 16, 14. 16, 17. 32, 27; contra Aeschinem Fr. 1 (Orat. att. ed. Sauppe 2, 172, 26) bei Athen. 13, 612 F. Isocrates 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 σύμμαχος γουνομένω ἴλαος γενεῦ*. Sappho Fragm. 79 *καί μοι –*. Solon bei Aristoteles Ἀθηναίων πολιτ. 14, 3 Kenyon. *γιγνώσκω, καί μοι φρενὸς ἔνδοθεν ἄλγεα κείται, πρεσβυτάτην ἑσορῶν γαῖαν Ἰαονίαν*. Theognis 258 *καί μοι τοῦτ' ἀνηρότατον*. 1199 *καί μοι κραδίην ἐπάταξε μέλαιναν*. Sophokles Elektra 116 *καί μοι τὸν ἔμὸν πέμψατ' ἀδελφόν*. id. Λαριεσσαῖοι Fragm. 349 Nauck *καί μοι τρίτον ρίπτοντι Δωτιεὺς ἀνὴρ ἀγχοῦ προσῆψεν Ἐλατος ἐν δικήματι*. Herodot 7, 9^a 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 σὸν ἐκποδὼν ἔστω λόγου*. Thucyd. 1, 137, 4 *καί μοι εὐεργεσία ὀφείλεται*. Aristoph. Ran. 755 *καί μοι φράσον*. Ekkles. 47 *καί μοι δοκεῖ κατὰ σχολὴν παρὰ τάνδρὸς ἐξελθεῖν μόνη*. Plato Apologie 21 D *καί μοι ταῦτ' αὐτὰ ἔδοξε*. 25 A (= Gorg. 462 B) *καί μοι ἀπόκριναι*. 31 E *καί μοι μὴ ἄχθεσθε λέγοντι τάληθῆ*. Phaedo 60 C *καί μοι δοκεῖ (scil. Αἴσωπος) – μῦθον ἂν συνθεῖναι*. 63 A *καί μοι δοκεῖ Κέβης εἰς σὲ τείνειν τὸν λόγον*. (97 D *καί μοι φράσειν*.) 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 ἐστὶν 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 φωνῆ προσφιλῆς 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 πεποιήται.) [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 θορυβήσητε. Vgl. die oben angeführte Stelle 31 E. Gorgias 486 A καί μοι μηδὲν ἀχθεσθῆς. Demosth. 5, 15 καί μοι μὴ θορυβήση 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 θαυμάση. 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 ταύτη σοφώτεροι ἦσαν. Republ. 1, 327 B καί μου ὄπισθεν 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 (εἰ)σαρίθμοις ἔπεσι. Jungkyprische Inschr. Deecke No. 30 καί με χθῶν ἦδε καλύπτει. Dazu kommt [S. 356] noch (Solon bei Aristot. Ἄθην. πολ. S. 30, 1 Kenyon. κἀδόκουσιν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ὄλβον εὐρήσειν πολὺν καί με κωτίλλοντα λείως τραχὺν ἐκφανεῖν νόον.) Anakreon Fragm. 60 καί μ' ἐπίβωτον κατὰ γείτονας ποιήσεις. Hipponax Fragm. 64 καί με δεσπότεω βεβροῦ λαχόντα λίσσομαι σε μὴ ῥαπίζεσθαι. Theognis 503 καί με βιάται οἶνος. 786 καί μ' ἐφίλευν 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 σωφρονεῖν.) Eurip. Alkestis 641 καί μ' οὐ νομίζω παῖδα σὸν πεφυκέναι. Andromache 334 τέθηκα τῇ σῆ θυγατρὶ καί μ' ἀπώλεσε. Med. 338 καί μ' ἀπάλλαξον πόνων. Helena (278 πόσιν ποθ' ἦξειν καί μ' ἀπαλλάξειν κακῶν.) 557 καί μ' ἐλὼν θέλει δοῦναι τυράννοισ. Orestes 796 καί με πρὸς τύμβον πόρευσα 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 μηδεῖς ἀπαρτᾶν νομίση τὸν λόγον τῆς γραφῆς.

Pronomen der II. Person: Theognis 241 καί σε — νέοι ἄνδρες — ἄσσονται. 465 καί σοι τὰ δίκαια φίλ' ἔστω. 692 καί σε Ποσειδάων χάρμα φίλοισ ἀνάγοι. He-

rodot 7, 11, 4 καί τοι ταύτην τήν ἀτιμίην προστίθημι ἐόντι κακῶ καί ἀθύμῳ. Eurip. Medea 456 καί c' ἐβουλόμην μένειν. Helena 1280 καί c' οὐ κενάϊσι χερσὶ γῆς ἀποστελῶ. 1387 καί ce προσποιούμεθα (Nauck καί cέ). Orestes 755 καί c' ἀναγκαῖον θανεῖν. 1047 καί c' ἀμείψασθαι θέλω φιλότῃ χειρῶν. Bacch. 1172 ὀρῶ καί ce δέξομαι κύγκωμον. Aristoph. Equites 300 καί ce φαίνω τοῖς πρυτάνεσιν. Pax 396 καί ce θυσίαισιν ἱεραῖσι — ἀγαλοῦμεν. 403 καί σοι φράσω τι πρᾶγμα. 418 καί σοι (al. καί σοί) τὰ μεγάλ' ἡμεῖς Παναθήναι' ἄξομεν. Plato Gorg. 482 D καί σου κατεγέλα. 527 A καί ce 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 cφραc ὄλλυ' ὥσπερ ὄλλύεις. 74, 8 καί cφιν θαλάσσης ἠχέεντα κύματα φίλτερ' ἠπείρου γένηται. Mimnerm. Fragm. 15 καί μιν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους βάξιc ἔχει χαλεπή. Theognis 405 καί οἱ ἔθηκε δοκεῖν. 422 καί cφιν πολλ' ἀμέλητα μέλει. 732 καί σφιν τοῦτο γένοιτο φίλον. 1347 καί μιν ἔθηκεν δαίμονα. [S. 357] Herodot 4, 119, 2 καί cφρων ἐσχίθησαν αἱ γνῶμαι. Eurip. Or. 1200 καί νιν δοκῶ. Bacch. 231 καί cφραc κιδηραῖc ἀρμόσας ἐν ἄρκυσι παύσω — τῆcδε βακχείας. Kallimach. Epigr. 14 (12 Wilamow.), 3 καί cφιν ἀνηρὸν μὲν ἐρεῖc ἔπος, ἔμπα δὲ λέξεις.

Ein Beispiel für καί με und eines für καί cφραc sei besonders herausgehoben: Plato Gorg. 506 B καί με ἐὰν ἐξελέγῃς, οὐκ ἀπεχθήσομαι σοι. Herodot 6, 34, 12 καί cφραc ὡc οὐδεῖc 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] cμικρός τις εἶη. 85 ἀλλά μ' ὀλυσιμελής, ὄπαιρε δάμναται πόθος. Alcaeus 55, 2 θέλω τι φείπην, ἀλλά με κωλύει αἶδωc. 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 (euripidischer) 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 ce 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 Μοῦcά μοι Εὐρυμεδοντιάδεα — ἐννεφ' —. Vgl. Fragm. Iyr. adesp. 30 A (Poetae Iyr. ed. Bergk 3, 696) Μοῦcά μοι ἀμφὶ Σκάμανδρον εὐρροον ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν. Sophokles Antig. 544 μήτοι κασιγνήτη μ' ἀτιμάσῃς. Eurip. Heraclid. 79 ὄδ' ὦ ξένοι με, σοῦc ἀτιμάζων

θεούς, ἔλκει. Helena 670 ὁ Διός, ὁ Διός, ὃ πόσι με παῖς Ἑρμᾶς ἐπέλασεν Νείλω. Bacch. 1120 οἴκτιρε δ' ὃ μῆτέρ με. Andromeda Fragm. 118 N. ἔαον Ἀχοῖ με σὺν φίλαισιν γόου κόρον λαβεῖν. Aristoph. Thesmoph. 1134 μέμνησο Περσεῦ μ' ὡς καταλείπεις. Theokrit. 2, 95 εἶ ἄγε Θεστυλί 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, καφέτερον 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 ὁμολογήσω. 521 D βούλει σοι εἶπω. Aeschines 3, 163 βούλει σε θῶ φοβηθῆναι. — Im allgemeinen ähnlich sind Plato Euthydem. 297 C νεωστί, μοι δοκεῖν, καταπεπλευκότει 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 χρεῶν. Aristoph. Lysistr. 753 ἵνα 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 μὴ 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 ἡμερόφωνοι, γυῖα φέρειν δύναται und fragm. lyr. adesp. 5 (Poetae lyr. ed. Bergk 3, 690) οὐ μοι ἔτ' εὐκελάδων ὕμνων μέλει durch με, μοι die Partikel οὐκέτι zerrissen. Ähnlich Eurip. Orest. 803 εἶ σε μῆν [sic] δειναῖσιν ὄντα κυμοφοραῖς ἐπαρκέσω. Plato Apol. 29 E ἐὰν μοι μὴ δοκῇ. Phaedrus 236E ἐὰν μοι μὴ εἴτης, obwohl es sonst stets εἰ μή, ἐὰν μή in enger Verbindung heisst. Plato Gorgias 448 A οὐδεὶς μέ πω ἠρώτηκεν 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 ἡδέ μοι). Ähnlich Eurip. Medea 281 τίνος μ' ἔκατι γῆς ἀποστέλλεις. Helena 674 ἁ Διός [sic] μ' ἄλοχος ὤλεσεν. 670 ὁ Διός, ὃ πόσι,

με παῖς Ἑρμῆος ἐπέλασεν Νεῖλω. Thucyd. 1, 128, 7 εἰ οὖν τί σε τούτων ἀρέσκει für τι τούτων σε. Andoc. 1, 47 ὅσους μοι τῶν συγγόνων ἀπώλλυεν. Theokrit. 18, 19 Ζηνός τοι θυγάτηρ ὑπὸ τὰν μίαν ἴκετο 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 σε φησὶ τῆς μάχης — κατεύχεται ὁ κῆρυξ Πλαταιεῦσι (durch Πλαταιεῦσι wird das weit abliegende σε wieder aufgenommen). 7, 16^a 2 τὰ σε καὶ ἀμφοτέρα περιήκοντα ἀνθρώπων κακῶν ὁμιλία σφάλλουσιν, wo τὰ mit ἀμφοτέρα, σε mit περιήκοντα zusammengehört. 9, 45, 16 ὀλίγων γὰρ σε ἡμερέων λείπεται σιτία. [Hippokrates] περὶ τέχνης S. 52, 18 Gomp. οὗτος δέ μοι λόγος καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων. Eurip. Medea 1013 πολλή μ' ἀνάγκη. Helena 94 Αἴα μ' ἀδελφὸς ὦλες ἐν Τροίᾳ θανῶν. 593 τοῦκέι με μέγεθος τῶν πόνων πείθει. 1281 φήμας δέ μοι ἐσθλὰς ἐνεγκῶν. 1643 δισσοὶ δέ σε Διόσκοροι καλοῦσιν. Orestes 167 Ἑλένη σε ἀδελφὴ ταῖςδε δωρεῖται χοαίς. 482 φίλου μοι πατρός ἐστιν ἔκγονος. 1626 Φοῖβός μ' ὁ Λητοῦς παῖς ὁδ' ἐγγὺς ὦν καλῶ. Fragm. 911 χρύσεια δὴ μοι πτέρυγες περὶ νῶτω. Rhesos 401 τίς γὰρ 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 πολλή μὲν τῶν [sic] με φιλοψυχία ἔχει. 40 C μέγα μοι τεκμήριον τούτου γέγονεν. Phaedo 92 C οὗτος οὖν σοὶ ὁ λόγος ἐκείνῳ πῶς ξυνάσεται. Gorg. 456 B μέγα δέ σοι τεκμήριον ἐρῶ. 487 D ἱκανόν μοι τεκμήριον ἐστίν. 488 B τοῦτό μοι αὐτὸ σαφῶς διόρισον. 493 D φέρε δὴ, ἄλλην σοὶ εἰκόνα λέγω. 513 C ὄντινά μοι τρόπον δοκεῖς εὖ λέγειν. Phileb. 23 D τετάρτου μοι γένους αὖτε προσδεῖν φαίνεται. Xenophon Hellen. 3, 1, 11 ὁ ἀνὴρ σοὶ ὁ ἐμὸς καὶ τᾶλλα φίλος ἦν. Aeschin. 1, 116 δύο δέ μοι τῆς κατηγορίας εἶδη λέλειπται. Bion 9, 1 ἄμεγάλα μοι Κύ- [S. 360]πρις ἔθ' ὑπώνοντι παρέστα. Leonidas Tarent. Anthol. Pal. 7, 660 Ξεῖνε, Συρηκόσιός τοι ἀνὴρ τόδ' ἐφέεται Ὀρθων. Die zahlreichen Stellen, wo auf so eingeschobenes Pronomen zunächst das Verbum folgt, wie Eurip. Heraclid. 236 τρισσαὶ μ' ἀναγκάζουσιν συμφορᾶς 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 πολλοὺς u. dergl.

Oder das Pronomen schliesst sich an den Artikel an. Selten unmittelbar: Theognis 575=862 οἱ με φίλοι προδιδοῦσιν. 813 οἱ με φίλοι προὔδωκαν. Theokrit 7, 43 τὰν τοι, ἔφα, κορύναν δωρῦττομαι. Meist folgt dem Artikel zunächst eine 'postpositive' Partikel: Herodot 1, 31, 10 οἱ δέ σε βίος οὐ παρεγένοντο. 1, 115, 8 οἱ γὰρ 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 ἄλλη. Plato Phaedrus 236 D ὁ δέ μοι λόγος ὄρκος ἔσται. Sympos. 177 A ἡ μὲν μοι ἀρχὴ τοῦ λόγου ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν Εὐριπίδου Μελανίπην. Theokrit 5, 125 τὰ δέ τοι εἰς καρπὸν ἐνεῖκαι. 1, 82 ἄ δέ τυ κῶρα 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 ἀδέτω ἀφρήν. Hymn. auf Pan 1 ἀμφὶ μοι Ἑρμείω φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε Μοῦσα. Rhesos 831 κατὰ με γὰς ζῶντα πόρευσον. Auf die Präposition folgt zunächst noch eine Partikel Herodot 3, 69, 20 ἐν γάρ σε τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ἀναιρέομαι. Kallimach. Hymn. 1, 10 ἐν δέ σε Παρρασίη Ἑρῖη 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 *σε* zwischen *πρός* und den davon 'regierten' Genetiv getreten ist: Eurip. Alc. 1098 μή, *πρός σε τοῦ σπείραντος ἄντομαι Διός*. Ähnlich Soph. Phil. 468. Oed. Col. 250. 1333. Eurip. Hiket. 277. (Dagegen Eurip. Med. 853 μή, *πρός γονάτων σε πάντως πάντη σ' ἵκετεύομεν*). Das Verbum des Bittens ist zu ergänzen Soph. Trach. 436 μή, *πρός σε 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 *σε* die zweite Stelle hinter der nächst vorangehenden Interpunktion ein; Soph. Phil. 468 *πρός νύν σε πατρός*, Oed. Col. 1333 *πρός νύν σε κρηῶν* und Eurip. Helena 1237 *πρός νύν σε γονάτων τῶνδ(ε)*, wo das enklitische *νυν* noch vorgeschoben ist, bilden natürlich keine Ausnahme. Aus den ausserattischen Dichtern kommt hinzu Alkman Fr. 52 *πρός 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. Aber enklitisches dorisches *τε* wird gesichert durch die Worte des Megarers Ar. Ach. 779 *πάλιν τ' ἀποικῶ ναὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν οἴκαδ*, 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: *ποτί τε Ζηνός* (der Cod. Pal. *ποτιτεζηνος*) *ἱκνεῦμαι 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 *ποτί 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 ζέοισαν εἰς ἀκμᾶν μαχαίρα 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 *ce* 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). Hippoanax Fr. 31 ἀπό *c'* ὀλέσειεν Ἄρτεμις, *ce* δὲ κώπλων. Sophokles El. 1067 κατὰ μοι βόασον. 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 *ce* χώσομεν. Plut. 65 ἀπό *c'* ὀλῶ κακὸν κακῶς. Plato Phaedr. 237 Α ζῦμι μοι λαβέσθε τοῦ μύθου. Kallimach. Epigr. 1, 5 εἰ δ' ἄγε, κύμ μοι βούλευσον. — Mit vorangehender Partikel u. dgl.: Sophokles Philoktet 1177 ἀπὸ νῦν με λείπεται ἤδη. Eurip. Or. 1047 ἔκ τοί με τήξεις. Aristoph. Vesp. 437 ἔν τί σοι παγήσεται. 784 ἀνά τοί με πείθεις. Vgl. oben S. 338 die ähnlichen Stellen mit *νιν*. Wenn vereinzelt (Alcäus Fr. 68 schrieb Bekker irrig τύφος ἔκ *c'* 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, (cφi), μεο — μευ — μου, ceο — ceυ — cou, cφeων* 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' ὦ 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 Plebeiertums".

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 μὲν μευ βουλέων ζύνιεν. N 626 οἱ μευ [S. 363] κουριδίην ἄλοχον καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ μάψ' οἴχεσθ' ἀνάγοντες. E 311 καὶ μευ κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί. ι 20 καὶ μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἴκει. (ι 405 ἦ μή τίς σευ μῆλα βροτῶν ἀέκοντος ἐλαύνει). μ 379 οἱ μευ βοῦς ἔκτειναν. ο 467 οἱ μευ πατέρ' ἀμφεπένοντο. κ 231 καὶ σευ φίλα γούναθ' ἰκάνω. ω 381 τῶ κέ σεων 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 Ὀμήρου ἔπος. 7, 27, 8 ὅς τοι τὸν πατέρα δωρήσατο. Sophokles Trachin. 1233 ἦ 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 λαμῶ δέ σευ τὸ χεῖλος. 83 λάβετέ μευ θαϊμάτια. Herodot 4, 80, 11 ἔχεις δέ μευ τὸν ἀδελφεόν. 7, 51, 3 εὐ δέ μευ συμβουλίην ἔνδεξαι. Eurip. Medea 1233 ὡς σου συμφορὰς οἰκτίρομεν. Helena 277 ἦ μου τὰς τύχας ὄχει μόνῃ. Hiket. 1162 ἔθιγέ μου φρενῶν. Orestes 297 εὐ μου τὸ δεινὸν καὶ διαφθορὴν φρενῶν ἴσχναινε. Aristoph. Eq. 289 κυνοκοπήσω σου τὸ νῶτον. 709 ἀπονυχῶ σου τὰν πρυτανείῳ κιτία. Pax 1212 ἀπώλεσάς μου τὴν τέχνην καὶ τὸν βίον. Aves 139 καλῶς γέ μου τὸν υἱόν ὃ Στιλβωνίδῃ οὐκ ἔκυκας. Lysistr. 409 ὀρχουμένης μου τῆς γυναικὸς ἐσπέρας ἡ βάλανος ἐκπέπτωκεν. Ranae 1006 καὶ μου τὰ σπλάγχχν' ἀγανακτεῖ. Plato Apol. 18 D διττοῦς μου τοὺς κατηγοροὺς γεγονέναι. 20 A εἰ μὲν σου τῷ υἱέε πῶλω ἡ μόσχῳ ἐγενέσθην. Phaedo 89 B καταψήσας οὖν μου τὴν κεφαλὴν. Alcaeus com. Fragm. 29 Κοκκ ἐβίασέ μου τὴν γυναῖκα. Aeschines 3, 16 ἀφομοιοῖ γάρ μου τὴν φύσιν τοῖς Σειρήσιν. Theokrit 2, 55 τί μευ μέλαν ἐκ χροὸς αἶμα — πέπωκας. 2, 69 u. s. w. φράζεό μευ τὸν ἔρωθ' ὅθεν ἴκετο. 5, 4 τόν μευ τὰν κύριγγα πρόαν κλέψαντα Κομάταν. 5, 19 οὐ τευ τὰν κύριγγα λαθῶν ἐκλειψε Κομάτας. 6, 36 καλὰ δέ μευ ἅ μία κώρα. 15, 31 τί μευ τὸ χιτώνιον ἄρδεις. 15, 69 [S. 364] δίχα μευ τὸ θερίστριον ἤδη ἔσχιται. 22, 10 οἱ δέ σεων κατὰ πρύμναν αἰείραντες μέγα κῦμα.

Noch entschiedener ist der Einfluss unseres Stellungsgesetzes in den ohnehin auffälligen Beispielen anzuerkennen, wo der vorausgehende pronominale Genetiv vom regierenden Substantivum durch andre Worte getrennt ist. Dies zeigt sich an dem τοι Theokrits 7, 87 ὡς τοι ἐγὼν ἐνόμειον ἀν' ὄρεα τὰς καλὰς αἶγας

φωναῖς εἰκαίῳν, 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 ἀλλά σευ ἡ κάματος πολυᾶϊζ γυῖα δέδυκεν ἢ νύ σέ που δέος ἴσχει, wo die Stellung des Pronomens besonders bemerkenswert ist. I 355 μόγις δέ μευ ἔκφυγεν ὀρμήν. Z 95 = P 173 νῦν δέ σευ ὠνοκάμην πάγχυ φρένας. T 185 χαίρω σευ Λαερτιάδη τὸν μῦθον ἀκούσας. K 311 θεὰ δέ μευ ἔκλυεν ἀυδῆς. K 485 οἷ μευ φθινύθουσι φίλον κῆρ. (Nur π 92 ἦ μάλα μευ καταδάπτει ἀκούοντος φίλον ἦτορ, wo μευ 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 πρὶν σου κατὰ πάντα δαῖναι ἦθεα. Herodot 4, 119, 2 καὶ σφεων ἐσχίσθησαν αἰ γνῶμαι. Eurip. Helena 898 μή μου κατείπησεν σὺ κασιγνήτω πόσιν. Bacch. 341 δεῦρό σου στέψω κάρρα. 615 οὐδέ σου συνῆψε χεῖρα. Fragm. 687, 1 ἐμπλήθητί μου πίων κελαινὸν αἶμα. 930 οἶμοι, δράκων μου γίγνεται τὸ ἦμισυ. Aristoph. Eq. 708 ἐξαρπάσομαί σου τοῖς ὄνουξι τᾶν τερα. Pax 1068 εἶθε σου εἶναι ὄφελεν, ὃ λαζών, οὕτωςι θερμὸς ὁ πλεμῶν. Ran. 573 οἷς μου κατέφαγες τὰ φορτία. Plato Phaedo 117 B ἕως ἂν σου βάρος ἐν τοῖς σκέλεσι γένηται. Republ. 1, 327 B καὶ μου ὄπισθεν λαβόμενος ὁ παῖς τοῦ ἱματίου. Parmen. 126 A καὶ μου λαβόμενος τῆς χειρός. Demosth. 18, 199 καὶ μου μηδὲ εἰς τὴν ὑπερβολὴν θαυμάσῃ. Theokrit 2, 82 ὥς μευ περὶ θυμὸς ἰάφθη. Bion 6, 1 εἶ μευ καλὰ πέλει τὰ μελύδρια [Menand. fr. 498].

Ganz Gleichartiges haben wir bei dem genetivischen οἰ 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] Hipponax Fr. 62 οἱ δέ μευ πάντες ὀδόντες ἐντὸς ἐν γνάθοις κενιέαται. Anakreon fr. 81 αἰ δέ μευ φρένες ἐκκεκωφέαται. Herodot 3, 102, 19 αἰ γὰρ σφι κάμηλοι ἵππων οὐκ ἔσσαν εἰσιν. 4, 202, 3 τῶν δέ σφι γυναικῶν τοὺς μαζοὺς ἀποταμοῦσα. 9, 50, 7 οἱ τέ σφεων ὀπέωνες — ἀπεκεκληῖατο. Aristoph. Eq. 787 τοῦτό γέ τοί σου τοῦργον ἀληθῶς γενναῖον καὶ φιλόδημον. Theokrit 4, 1 ταὶ δέ μοι αἶγες βόσκονται κατ' ὄρος (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 σὺ δέ, ὃ βασιλεῦ, ἐμὲ ἐς τὸδε ἡλικίης ἦκοντα οἰκτίρας, τῶν μοι παιδῶν παράλυσον ἕνα 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

ὁμοίωσις ‘Mitgatte’ zu konstruieren²). — Dazu aus den attischen Dichtern Eurip. Medea 144 διὰ μου κεφαλᾶς φλόξ οὐρανία βαίη. Hippolyt 1351 διὰ μου κεφαλᾶς ἄσσοις ὀδύναι. Heraclid. 799 εἶς μου λόγος κοί πάντα σημαίνει τάδε. Aristoph. Lysistrate 416 ὦ σκυτοτόμε, τῆς μου γυναικὸς τοὺς πόδας. Vgl. Theokrit 5, 2 τό μευ νάκος ἐχθὲς ἔκλεψεν. 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 δείσακα γὰρ εἰς τὴν κάτω μου κοιλίαν καθείρπυεν, dürfen wir voraussetzen, dass die am Satzanfang aufgekommene Einschlebung im Satzinnern nachgeahmt wurde.

Die Stellung der barytonetischen, also ursprünglich enklitischen Pluralformen ἡμων, ἡμιν 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) [Ερ]μησιάνναξ ἡμεας ἀνέθηκεν [ό...], ganz wie sonst μ’ ἀνέθηκεν und 482^a 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 Stellungenregeln 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 ἄνυσις δ’ οὐκ ἔσεται αὐτῶν. P 546 δὴ γὰρ νόος ἐτρέπεται αὐτοῦ. (η 263 dagegen liegt in der gleichen Wendung ein Nachdruck auf αὐτῆς). μ 130 γόνος δ’ οὐ γίγνεται 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 ἐθαύμασέ τε αὐτοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν. 4, 109, 11 καὶ αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν ἐμμείνας τῷ στρατῷ ἐδήου. Plato Gorg. 448 E ἐγκωμιάζει 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, ὡς — πορευώρησαν, τοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν παχέας — πολήτας

² 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.

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 Stellungsregel 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 Thatsache durch den Umstand erwiesen, dass auch ausserhalb des persönlichen Pronomens die Enklitika dieser Stellungsregel unterworfen werden. Schon Kühner Griechische Grammatik I² 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 die Stellungsregel 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^a 15 — ἔχοντός του, nur im unmittelbaren Anschluss an εἰ, ἐάν vorkommen (vgl. die Belege bei Meisterhans Grammatik der attischen Inschriften² 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 τῖς an den Anfang zu rücken unverkennbar. Man

beachte, ausser ὅστις nebst Zubehör, εἴ τις, μή τις, besonders folgende Stellen: mit Losreissung zum gehörigen Nomen E 897 εἰ δέ τευ ἐξ ἄλλου γε θεῶν. Θ 515 ἴνα τις στυγέηαι καὶ ἄλλος. N 464 [S. 368] εἴ πέρ τί σε κῆδος ἰκάνει (zugleich vor dem enklitischen σε!). Ψ 331 ἦ τευ σῆμα βροτοῖο πάλαι κατατεθηῶτος. γ 348 (— ὡς ὑμεῖς παρ' ἐμεῖο θοὴν ἐπὶ νῆα κίοιτε) ὡς τέ τευ ἢ παρὰ πάμπαν ἀνείμονος ἠὲ πενιχροῦ. η 195 μηδέ τι μεσσηγύς γε κακὸν καὶ πῆμα πάθῃσιν. Mit Voranstellung von τις vor ein sonst zur zweiten Stelle berechtigtes Wort (vgl. N 464) Π 37 καὶ τινά τοι παρ [sic] Ζηνός ἐπέφραδε πότνια μήτηρ. λ 218 ὅτε τίς κε θάνῃσι (vgl. Hesiod Ἔργα 280 εἰ γάρ τίς κ' ἐθέλῃ. Peppmüller Berliner philolog. Wochenschrift 1890 Sp. 559). Hierher gehört das nicht seltene ὡς τίς τε statt ὥστε τις wie z. B. P 657 βῆ δ' ἰέναι ὡς τίς τε λέων ἀπὸ μεσσαύλοιο.

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 παθῶν 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 — ἔπεμψεν ἐς δόμοις. Herodot 2, 23, 3 οὐ γάρ τινα ἔγωγε οἶδα ποταμὸν Ὀκεανὸν ἔοντα. 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 ἔστι γάρ τις ἐν δόμοις τύχη. Thucyd. 1, 10, 1 εἴ τι τῶν τότε πόλιςμα. Aristoph. Pax 834 καὶ τίς ἐστιν ἀστήρ. 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 Ἀθηναίων πλοῖον. Demosth. 18, 18 ἀλλὰ τις ἦν ἄκριτος καὶ παρὰ τούτοις καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔρις. 18, 65 ἦν ἂν τις κατὰ τῶν ἐναντιωθέντων οἷς ἔπραττεν ἐκεῖνος, μέμψις καὶ κατηγορία. Menander Fragm. 572 Kock ὅταν τι πράττης ὅσιον. Fragm. lyr. adesp. 58 Bgk. (3⁴, 706) ἀλλὰ τις ἄμμι δαίμων. Dazu Plato Leges 3, 683 B εἰ γοῦν, ὦ ξένη, τις ἡμῖν ὑπόσχοιτο 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 — ἐκέπεσεν ἔς του χωρίον ἰδιώτου zu erklären, wo mitten im Satze stehendes τίς von dem später nachfolgenden Satzteil durch andere Wörter getrennt ist.

Und wie das homerische, drängt auch das nachhomerische τίς andere Wörter von der ihnen zukommenden zweiten Stelle weg. Aus der attischen Litteratur gehört bloss etwa die Tmesis Aristoph. Vesp. 437 ἐν τί σοι παγήσεται und Stellen wie Plato Gorg. 520 E ὄντιν' ἂν τις τρόπον ὡς βέλτιςτος εἴη hierher. Aber die

Wortfolge *τίς 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) *καἶ τί κ'*. 8, 17 *καί μὲν τίς κ'*. 3, 9 *ὅτι δέ τις κα*. Abweichend 5, 13 = 17 = 22 *αἶ δέ κα μή τις* und 4, 14 *ᾧ δέ κα μή τις ἦ στέγα*, wo *μή* das Indefinitivum attrahiert hat, sowie *ὅπῳ κά τιλ λῆ* 10, 33. — Auf jüngern kretischen Inschriften CIG. 3048 (= Cauer² 123), 33 *εἰ δέ τινέσ κα τῶν ὀρμιωμένων* (ebenso 3049, 9. 3058, 13). 3048, 38 *εἴ τις κα ἄγη* (ebenso 3049, 14. 3058, 16). — Auf den Tafeln von Heraklea 1, 105 *καὶ αἶ τινί κα ἄλλῳ*. 1, 117 *καὶ αἶ τινάσ κα ἄλλουσ*. 1, 119 *αἶ δέ τινά κα γήρα* — *ἐκπέτωντι*. 1, 127 *καὶ εἴ τινέσ κα μή πεφυτεύκωντι*. 1, 128 *αἶ δέ τις κα ἐπιβῆ*. 1, 151 *αἶ δέ τις* [sic] *κα τῶν καρπιζομένων ἀποθάνει*. 1, 173 *αἶ τινά κα γήρα* — *ἐκπέτωντι*. — Auf der Inschrift v. Orchomenos Dittenberger Syll. 178, 10 *καὶ εἴ τις κα μή 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* — *μή ὀρθῶσ ἀπολογίζωνται*. 3206, 114 *εἴ τινός κα ἄλλου δοκῆ*. Dazu vielleicht Theokrit 2, 159 *αἶ δέ τί κά με* — *λυπῆ*. (Siehe unten S. 372).

Angesichts so konstanten Gebrauchs, dem ich, abgesehen von den gortynischen Ausnahmen, wo teils *μή* im Spiele ist, teils nicht *εἰ* vorhergeht, nur Epi-
charm S. 217 Lor. (Athen. 6, 236 A) Z. 5 *καἶ κά τις ἀντίον <τι> λῆ τήνω λέγειν*
und S. 281 Lor. (Athen. 2, 70 F) *αἶ κά τις ἐκτριψασ καλῶσ παρατιθῆ νιν* als Gegen-
beispiele 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 *αἶ κά <τι> πάσχη* zu verbessern ist, sondern vielmehr in *αἶ <τί>*
κα πάσχη. Übrigens ist diese Stellungsgewohnheit nicht bloss dorisch: Tafel von
Idalion, Z. 29 *ὅπι σίς κε τὰσ φρήτασ τάδε λύση*. — Vgl. ferner Sophron bei Athen.
3, 110 D *ἄρτον γάρ τις τυρώντα τοῖσ παιδίοισ ἴαλε*, mit Trennung von *ἄρτον*
τυρώντα.

Endlich kann man die Frage aufwerfen, ob nicht die von Herodot an den Pro-
saisten geläufige Zwischenschiebung von *τίς* zwischen den Artikel nebst even-
tuellen Attribut und das Substantiv des zugehörigen Genetivus partitivus (z. B.
τῶν τινα Λυδῶν, ἐσ τῶν ἐκείνων τι χωρίων, τῶν ἄλλων τινάσ Ἑλλήνων) in Sätzen
aufgekommen sei, wo *τίς* dadurch an zweite Stelle kam.

Die vom Indefinitivum abgeleiteten Adverbia befolgen bei Homer unser Gesetz
ziemlich streng. In NIP findet sich *που* 14 mal, immer an zweiter Stelle, darunter
beachtenswert N 293 *μή που τις ὑπερφιάλωσ νεμεσῆση* mit Trennung von *μή*
und *τίς* und N 225 *ἀλλά που*. — *ποθι* zweimal, N 630 *ἀλλά 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 ἔρωῆσαι πολέμοιο μέλλω. Π 236 ἤμην δὴ ποτ' ἐμὸν ἔπος ἔκλυες εὐξαμένοιο. — πῆ nur einmal (Π 110), korrekt. — πω fünfmal korrekt, dazu P 190 θέων δ' ἐκίχανεν ἑταίρους ὄκα μάλ', οὐ πω τῆλε, ποτὶ κραιπνοῖσι μετασπών. P 377 δύο δ' οὐ πω φῶτε πεπύσθην. [Ausnahmen aus den andern Büchern verzeichnet Monro² S. 336 ff.]

Die nachhomerische Zeit verfährt bei diesen Partikeln recht frei. Reste des Alten liegen ausser in ἦπου, δῆπου, 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 θαλάμοιο. Leonidas Anthol. Pal. 9, 9 Ἴξαλος εὐπύγων αἰγὸς πόσις ἔν ποθ' ἄλωῃ). 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 ὑπαίξις πρὸς ῥα πλατάνιστον ὄρου-[S. 371]εν 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 διετησίαις νομίζοντες. 4, 65, 4 οὕτω τῆ γε παρούσῃ εὐτυχίᾳ χρώμενοι. 4, 86, 2 πίστεις γε διδοῦς τὰς μεγίστας. Vgl. Demosth. 18, 226 ὥς γ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ statt ὥς ἐμοίγε 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' οἰμώξειε γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεῦς. 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 ἰάνθησ, 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 τις (siehe oben [S. 372] S. 369), τὸ (siehe oben S. 344) und τοῖ (Theognis 633 ὃ τοῖ κ' ἐπὶ τὸν νόον ἔλθη) dazwischen drängen: ὅς κε, εἰς ὃ κε, εἴ κε, αἶ κε, ἐπεὶ κε, ὅτε κε (dor. ὄκκα), ἕως κε, ὄφρα κε, ὥς κε, ὀ(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' ἐντύχω τοῖς περιπόλοις und Theokrit 1, 5 αἶκα δ' αἶγα λάβη τῆνος γέρας neben 1, 10 αἰ δέ κ' ἀρέσκη u. s. w.). Undenkbar scheint mir die von Ahrens für Theokrit 1, 159 vorgeschlagene, von Meineke und Hiller akzeptierte Schreibung αἰ δ' ἔτι κά με — λυπῆ, so dass αἰ von κά 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 τις zwischen αἰ und κά 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 NIP an folgenden Stellen: Π 129 ἐγὼ δέ κε λαὸν ἀγείρω. N 742 (ἐπιφρασσαίμεθα βουλήν) ἢ κεν ἐνὶ νῆεσσι πολυκλήρι πέσσωμεν — ἢ κεν ἔπειτα παρ [sic] νηῶν ἔλθωμεν. P 506 ἢ κ' αὐτὸς ἐνὶ πρώτοισιν ἄλωη. Ebenso die Futursätze: P 241 ὥς κε τάχα Τρώων κορέει κύνας ἠδ' οἰωνούς. P 557 εἴ κ' Ἀχιλλῆος ἀγαυοῦ πιπτόν ἑταῖρον τείχει ὑπο Τρώων ταχέες κύνας ἐλκήσουσιν. 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 κεκλήσει 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 οὔτ' ἂν κεν Ἄρης ὀνόσαιτο μετελθὼν οὔτε κ' Ἀθηναίη und von P 629 ὦ πόποι, ἦδη μέν κε — γνοίη) und 7 mal an zweiter Stelle präteritaler Sätze. Diesen 35 Beispielen, worunter ἀλλά 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' ἄλλων τις κεν ἦσι φρεσὶν οὐνόματ' εἶποι, wo die Entfernung des fragenden τις 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*, *οἷος κε*, *ὄθεν κε*, *ὅτε κε*, *εἰς ὃ κε*, *ἕως κε*, *ὄφρα 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 μῆζον ἐπαιτήσας*, wo eben *εἰ καὶ* eine ähnliche Einheit bildet wie *εἶπερ*; vgl. N 58 *εἰ καὶ μιν*. Sodann, wiederum wie bei *μιν*, mehrere Beispiele mit *οὐ*: Ξ 91 *μῦθον ὄν οὐ κεν ἀνήρ γε διὰ στόμα πάμπαν ἄγοιτο*. α 236 *ἐπεὶ οὐ κε θανόντι περ ὄδ' ἀκαχοίμην*. δ 64 *ἐπεὶ οὐ κε κακοὶ τοιοῦδε τέκοιεν*. θ 280 *τά 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 τοῦτω 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 *ὄθεν 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. Aeolisch haben wir ein paar mal *ὥς κε* c. optat, kyprisch das sehr bemerkenswerte *τάς κε ζᾶς τάςδε* — *ἔξο(ν)ι 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(ὰ) γένοιτο*, epidaurisch in der grossen Heilungsinschrift (3339 Collitz) auf Z. 60 *αἶ κα ὑγιῆ νιν ποιῆσαι*, aber Z. 84 *τοῦτον γὰρ οὐδέ κα ὁ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ Ἀσκληπιὸς ὑγιῆ ποιῆσαι δύναιτο*, sowie bei Isyllos (3342 Collitz) neben (Z. 26) *οὕτω τοί κ' ἀμῶν περιφεῖ- [S. 374]δοιτ' εὐρύοπα Ζεύς* im Vers, Z. 35 f. in Prosa *ἢ λώιον οἶ κα εἶη ἀγγράφοντι τὸν παιᾶνα. Ἐμάντευσε λώιον οἶ κα εἶμεν 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^a, 1582^b, z. B. (1563) τίνι κα θεῶν [ἦ] ἠρώων θύοντες καὶ εὐχ[ό](μ)ενο(ι) ὁμονοοῖεν ἐ[π]ὶ τῶγαθόν. — Ähnlich 1572^a τί κα θύσας —.

Wenn Blass in der Inschrift 3184 Coll. (= 1564 Coll.) τίνας θεῶν ἰλασκόμενος 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 τᾶς νόσου παύσαιτο. 1583, 2 ἦ μὴ ν[α](υ)κλαρῆ(ν) λώιοι καὶ ἄμεινομ [sic] πράσσοιμι. 1587^a τίνα θεῶν ἢ ἠρώων τιμᾶντι λώιον καὶ ἄμεινον εἶη. — 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' εἶη.

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 τῆπιάρου κ' ἐνέχοιτο und 1152, 7 ἐν ταῖ ζεκαμναίαι 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 ἄ δέ κα φράτρα. 1156, 3 τῶν δέ κα γραφῶν. 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 προτιζίων οὐζέ κα μί' εἶη, 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 φαΐκι κεν Ἄφαικτον ἄγην ist schlecht überliefert, und Alcaeus 83 schreibt zwar Bergk: αἶ κ' εἶπες, 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 ἐπῆν) 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 μὲν θην*); ebenso Aeschylus Prom. 928 *κύ θην ἄ χρήζεις, ταῦτ' ἐπιγλωσσῶ 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 *πεῖρα θην* 15, 62. Zweimal (2, 114, 5, 111) hat Theokrit die Regel verletzt. Vor ihm schon Epicharm *Ἐλπὶς* S. 226 Lor., Vs. 2 *καίτοι νῦν γὰ θην εὔωνον αἰνεῖ ἰτόν*.

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 δὴ 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 *ὄσα πού νυν ἐέλεπται*), *περ*, *κεν* regelmässig vorangeht, und nur *δέ* vor sich hat; dazu *νὺ γάρ Ν* 257 neben *γάρ νυ* O 239. *γάρ δὴ νυ* T 95. Zweitens trennt es öfters enge Verbindungen oder hilft solche trennen: Attribut und Substantiv Θ 104 *ἠπεδανός δέ νύ τοι θεράπων*. T 169 *θαρκαλέον 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 ἀνήρ*. Gegen die Regel verstösst, so viel ich sehe, nur α 217 *ὡς δὴ ἔγωγ' ὄφελον μάκαρός νύ τευ ἔμμεναι υἱός ἀνέρος*.

Für den nachhomerischen Gebrauch verweise ich auf *φῆρε νυν*, *ἄγε νυν* (Aristoph. Pax 1056), *μή νυν*, ferner auf das zumal bei Herodot so oft an zweiter Stelle zu lesende *μὲν νυν*, sowie endlich auf Sophokles Philokt. 468 *πρός νύν σε πατρός πρὸς τε μητρός — ἰκέτης ἰκνοῦμαι*. Oed. Col. 1333 *πρός νύν σε κρηγῶν καὶ θεῶν ὁμογνίων αἰτῶ πιθέσθαι*. Eurip. Helena 137 *πρός νύν σε γονάτων τῶνδ(ε)*. Ferner auf Sophokles Phil. 1177 *ἀπό νύν με λείπεται ἦδη*. Eurip. Hiket. 56 *μετά νυν δός*. Vgl. auch Lobeck zum Aias Vs. 1332. — Im Kyprischen ist die Stellung von *νυ* freier: Tafel von Idal. 6 *ἡ δυφάνοι νυ*. 16 *ἡ δώκοι νυ*. Ebenso im Böotischen: Collitz 488, 88 *κὴ τὴ οὔπεραμερὶ ἄκουρός νυ ἐνθῶ (= καὶ αἱ ὑπερημέρια ἄκουροι 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 *οὔτος*; 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 τήξεις*. Aristoph. Vesp. 784 *ἀνά τοί με πείθεις*. 2) Aristoph. Ekkles. 976 *διὰ τοι σέ*

πόνους ἔχω. Ferner mit γάρ τοι Theognis 287 ἐν γάρ τοι πόλει ὧδε κακοφύγω ἀνδάνει οὐδέν. Plato Phaedo 60 C περι γάρ τοι τῶν ποιημάτων. 108 D περι γάρ τοι γῆς πολλὰ ἀκήκοα. 3) Sophokles Fragm. 855, 1 ὦ παῖδες, ἦ τοι Κύπρις οὐ Κύπρις μόνον. Eurip. Fragm. 222 N.² τὴν τοι Δίκην λέγουσι παῖδ' εἶναι Χρόνου. Aristoph. Pax 511 οἶ τοι γεωργοὶ τοῦργον ἐξέλκουσι. Plato Sympos. [S. 377] 219 A ἦ 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 ἑταῖρος (Bergk ἑταίρω) ἀνήρ φίλος. 605 πολλῶ τοι πλέονα λμοῦ κόρος ὤλεσεν ἦδη ἄνδρα. 837 δισσαί τοι πόσιος κῆρες δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν. 965 πολλοὶ τοι κίβδηλοι — κρύπτουσι. 1027 ῥηιδίη τοι πρῆξις ἐν ἀνθρώποις κακότητος. 1030 δειλῶν τοι κραδίη γίγνεται ὄξυτέρη. Aeschyl. Agam. 363 Δία τοι ξένιον μέγαν αἰδοῦμαι. Eur. Or. 1167. Plato Sympos. 218 E ἀμήχανόν τοι κάλλος u. s. w.

Attisch τοιγάροισι ist auch ein Zeichen für den Drang der Partikel nach vorn. Bei Homer kommt τοιγάροισι noch nicht vor. Dafür haben wir noch mehrfach τοιγάρ ἐγὼ 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; τοιγάροισι: 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 αὐτὸς 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 δῆ, 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 Enklitiks 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 ἀμᾶ κοπίς. Eurip. Herakles 1085 ἄν' αὖ βακχεύσει 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 ἦν ἄρα ἀνώνυμος. Οὖν wird gern von 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' ὧν ἠχθόμαν. Melanippides bei Ath. 10, 429 C τάχα δὲ τάχα τοι μὲν ἀπ' ὧν ὄλοντο. Sehr frei ist die Stellung von δῆ.

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] ἢ κε μέγ' οἰώξειε, wo κε unmittelbar auf ἢ folge, und ἢ c' ἄν τιγαίμην, 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(v). Hierbei gilt ὅτις als

Worteinheit; ebenso ὅποῖός τις: Plato Phaedo 81 E ὅποῖ ἄττ' ἄν καὶ μεμελετηκυῖαι τύχῳσι. Xenophon Poroi 1, 1 ὅποῖοί τινες ἄν οἱ προεστάται ὄσι. 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 δόξῳσι διαφερόντως προκεκρίσθαι, μέντοι z. B. Xenophon Cyrop. 2, 1, 9 οἱ γε μέντ' ἄν αὐτῶν φεύγῳσι, οὖν z. B. Aristoph. Ran. 1420 ὁπότερος οὖν ἄν τῇ πόλει παραινέσειν 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 ἀκτῶν λέπρην — ἔχη. 3, 72, 25 ὅς ἄν μέν νυν τῶν πυλωρῶν ἐκῶν παρή. 7, 8^δ3 ὅς ἄν δὲ ἔχων ἦκη. 7, 8^δ3 ὅς ἄν δὲ ἔχων ἦκη). [sic] Aber vor allen andern Wörtern hat ἄν den Vortritt. Die nicht entschuld bare Ausnahme Antiphon 5, 38 καθ' ὧν μηνύη ἄν τις hat Mätzner längst aus dem Oxoniensis, welcher καθ' ὧν ἄν μηνύη τις schreibt, berichtet. Um so unbegreiflicher ist noch in der zweiten Ausgabe der Fragm. Trag. von Nauck unter Euripides Fragm. 1029 den Versen zu begegnen ἀρετῇ δ' ὄσπερ μάλλον ἄν χρῆσθαι θέλης, τοσῶδε μείζων γίγνεται καθ' ἡμέραν. Für das fehlerhafte μάλλον ἄν vermutet Dümmler ἄν πλέον. Oder ist θέλης in θέλοισ zu ändern? — Sicherer scheint mir die Heilung einer dritten Stelle mit falsch gestelltem ἄν: Aristoph. Ran. 259 ὁπόσον ἢ φάρυγξ ἄν ἡμῶν χανδάνη. 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. ἦν, [S. 380] att. ἄν, woraus durch nochmaligen Vortritt von εἰ das gewöhnliche ἐάν entstanden ist, in ὅταν, ἐπειδάν, ἐπάν = ion. ἐπὴν, 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 Regel 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' ὄνομήνω. Γ 66 ἐκῶν δ' οὐκ ἄν τις ἔλοιτο. O 40 τὸ μὲν οὐκ ἄν ἐγὼ ποτε μάψ ὁμόσομαι. 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 ὅς νῦν γε καὶ ἄν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο, während Ξ 244 f.

ἄλλον μὲν κεν ἔγωγε θεῶν αἰειγενετῶν ῥεῖα κατευνήσαιμι καὶ ἄν ποταμοῖο ῥέεθρα Ὀκεανοῦ das καὶ ἄν als neuer Satzanfang betrachtet werden kann. Eine mit τάχ' ἄν: A 205 ἦc ὑπεροπλήει τάχ' ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσσει. (Vgl. τάχ' ἄν am Satzanfang β 76 τάχ' ἄν ποτε καὶ τίσις εἶη.) Endlich eine mit τότε ἄν (vgl. τότε ἄν am Satzanfang Σ 397, Ω 213, ι 211): X 108 ἐμοὶ δὲ τότε 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 τιχαίμην gegenüber ἦ κε μέγ' οἰώξειε besagt nichts, da c(ε) enklitisch ist. Und aus εἶ περ ἄν gegenüber H 387 αἶ κε περ ὕμμι 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 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 ὥς ἄν in unmittelbarer Folge nicht bloss bei Homer (z. B. ρ 562 ὥς ἄν πύρνα κατὰ μνηστῆρας ἀγείροι) sondern auch Archiloch. Fragm. 30 ὥς ἄν καὶ γέρων ἡράσσατο und Fragm. 101 ὥς ἄν σε θωῖη λάβοι. Pindar Olymp. 7, 42 ὥς ἄν θεῶν πρῶτοι κτίσαιεν βωμόν. Sophokles bei Aristoph. Aves 1338 ὥς ἄν ποταθεῖην. Herodot 1, 152, 4 ὥς ἄν πυνθανόμενοι πλεῖστοι συνέλθοιεν Σπαρτητέων. Ebenso 5, 37, 9. 7, 176, 20. 8, 7, 2. 9, 22, 18. 9, 51, 14. [Andocides] 4, 23 ὥς ἄν μάλιστα τὸν υἱὸν ἐχθρὸν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῇ πόλει ποιήσειε. Plato Phaedo 82 E ὥς ἄν μάλιστα αὐτὸς ὁ δεδεμένος ξυλλήπτωρ εἶη τοῦ δεδέσθαι. Sympos. 187 D τοῖς μὲν κοσμίσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὥς ἄν κοσμιώτεροι γίγνοιτο οἱ μὴ πω ὄντες, δεῖ χαρίζεσθαι. 190 C δοκῶ μοι — ἔχειν μηχανήν, ὥς ἄν εἶεν ἄνθρωποι καὶ παύσαιτο τῆς ἀκολασίας. Demosth. 6, 37 ὥς δ' ἄν ἐξετασθεῖη μάλιστ' ἀκριβῶς, μὴ γένοιτο, wo das ὥς ἄν doch wohl konsekutiv zu nehmen ist. Sehr häufig bei Xenophon, dem einzigen attischen Prosaisten, der häufig ὥς mit ἄν und dem Optativ in rein finalem Sinne verbindet. Von den siebzehn bei Weber S. 83 ff. aufgeführten Belegstellen haben vierzehn ἄν unmittelbar hinter ὥς, nur drei davon getrennt, final Cyrop. 5, 1, 18 ὥς μηδενὸς ἄν δέοιτο. 7, 5, 37 ὥς ὅτι ἦκιστα ἄν ἐπιφθόνους πάντιος τε καὶ σεμνὸς φανείη, konsekutiv Sympos. 9, 3 ὥς πᾶς ἄν ἔγνω, ὅτι ἀκμήνῃ ἦκουσε: die ersten und einzigen Fälle, wo die

den Zusammenschluss von ὥς und ἄν verlangende Tradition durchbrochen ist. Allerdings kommen nach der handschriftlichen Überlieferung noch zwei euripideische Verse hinzu: Iphig. Taur. 1024 ὥς δὴ κότος λαβόντες ἐκωθεῖμεν ἄν und Iphig. Aul. 171 Ἀχαιῶν στρατιᾶν ὥς ἴδοιμ' ἄν. Aber der erstere Vers ist seit Markland den Kritikern verdächtig, und im [S. 382] zweiten schreibt man jetzt allgemein ὥς ἐκιδόιμαν [Pl. Gorg. 453 C οὕτω προίη, ὥς μάλιτ' ἄν — ποιοίη ist ὥς relativ.]

Noch fester ist die Verbindung ὅπως ἄν in solchen Sätzen: Aeschylus Agam. 362 ὅπως ἄν — μήτε πρὸ καιροῦ μήθ' ὑπὲρ ἄκτρων βέλος ἠλίθιον κηψέειν. Herodot 1, 75, 16 ὅκως ἄν τὸ στρατόπεδον ἰδρυμένον κατὰ νότου λάβοι. Ebenso 1, 91, 7. 1, 110, 16. 2, 126, 7. 3, 44, 5. 5, 98, 20. 8, 13, 9. — Thucydides 7, 65, 1 ὅπως ἄν ἀπολιθάνοι καὶ μὴ ἔχοι ἀντιλαβῆν ἢ χεῖρ. Aristoph. Ekkles. 881 ὅπως ἄν περιλάβοιμ' αὐτῶν τινα. Plato Lysis 207 E ὅπως ἄν εὐδαιμονοίης. Sehr häufig bei Xenophon, zwölfmal (ungerechnet ὅπως "wie" nach Verben des Beratens und Überlegens) nach den Nachweisen von Weber 2, S. 83 ff., überall so, dass ἄν dem ὅπως unmittelbar folgt; eigentümlich Sympos. 7, 2 σκοπῶ, ὅπως ἄν ὁ μὲν παῖς ὄδε ὁ δὲ καὶ ἡ παῖς ἦδε ὥς ῥᾶστα διάγοιεν, ἡμεῖς δ' ἄν μάλιτα (ἄν) εὐφραينوίμεθα. Corpus Inscr. Att. 2, 300, 20 (295/4 a. Ch.) ὅπως ἄν ὁ δῆμο[c ἀπαλλαγείη τ]οῦ πολέμου, wo der von Herwerden und Weber 2 S. 3 empfohlene Konjunktiv ἀπαλλαγῆ 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 <ἄν> κατόνα(ο) schreiben wollen, und dass, wenn hier überhaupt ἄν 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 ἄν. a) ὥς ἄν ist unmittelbar verbunden Plato Republ. 5, 473 A ἐὰν οἷοί τε γενώμεθα εὐρεῖν, ὥς ἄν ἐγγύτατα τῶν εἰρημένων πόλις οἰκῆσειεν. Xenophon. Oeconom. 19, 18 διδάσκει, ὥς ἄν κάλλιστα τις αὐτῇ χρῶτο. Demosth. 4, 13 τᾶλλ' ὥς ἄν 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 ἄν εἶποιτε καὶ — συνεῖτε, ἄμεινον Φιλίππου παρεσκεύασθε, ὥς δὲ κωλύσαιτ' ἄν ἐκείνον — παντελῶς ἀργῶς ἔχετε. [Demosth.] 10, 45 siehe unten, b) ὅπως ἄν ist unmittelbar verbunden [Hippokrates] περὶ τέχνης c. 2 pag. 42, 20 Gomp. οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἄν τις αὐτὰ νομίσειε μὴ ἐόντα. Auch häufig bei Xenophon: Anab. 2, 5, 7 τὸν γὰρ θεῶν πόλεμον οὐκ οἶδα —, ὅπως ἄν εἰς ἐχυρὸν χωρίον ἀποσταίη. 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 τύχω μαντευμάτων, ὅπη νεὸς στείλαμι'

ἄν οὐριον πτερόν.) c) πῶς ἄν unmittelbar verbunden z. B. Xenophon Anab. 1, 7, 2 συνεβουλεύετο, πῶς ἄν τὴν μάχην ποιοῖτο. Demosth. 19, 14 εἰ — ἐσκόπει —, πῶς ἄν ἄριστ' ἐναντιωθεῖη τῇ εἰρήνῃ. Auch hier habe ich keine Gegenbeispiele.

Aber auch das relativische ὥς, ὥσπερ 'wie' zeigt die Eigentümlichkeit ἄν fest an sich zu fesseln; zwar haben wir, um mit ὥς zu beginnen, bei Sophokles Oed. Col. 1678 ὥς μάλιστ' ἄν ἐν πόθῳ λάβοις, bei Plato Phaedo 59 A ὥς εἰκὸς δόξειεν ἄν εἶναι παρόντι πένθει. 118 B ὥς ἡμεῖς φαῖμεν ἄν. Sympos. 190 A ὥς ἀπὸ τούτων ἄν τις εἰκάσειεν. Phileb. 15 C ὥς γοῦν ἐγὼ φαίην ἄν. Leges 4, 712 C ὥς γ' ἡμεῖς ἄν οἰηθεῖμεν und öfters; bei Xenoph. Anab. 1, 5, 8 θᾶπτον ἢ ὥς τις ἄν ᾤετο, bei Pseudo-Demosth. 10, 45 ὥς μὲν οὖν εἶποι τις ἄν, — ταῦτ' ἴσως ἐστίν· (der Rest des Satzes: ὥς δὲ καὶ γένοιτ' ἄν, νόμῳ διορθώσασθαι δεῖ, enthält fragendes ὥς). Aber diesen Beispielen gegenüber haben wir nicht bloss bei Plato Phaedrus 231 A ἐκόντες, ὥς ἄν ἄριστα περὶ τῶν οἰκείων βουλεύσαιντο, πρὸς τὴν δύναμιν τὴν αὐτῶν εὔ ποιοῦσιν, [Apol. 34 C]; bei Demosth. 27, 7 ὥς ἄν συντομώτατ' εἶποι τις. 39, 22 στέρξας ὥς ἄν υἰὸν τις στέρξει. 45, 18 οὐδὲ μεμαρτύρηκεν ἀπλῶς, ὥς ἄν τις τάληθῆ μαρτυρήσειε. Proöm. 2, 3 (Bβ bei Blass) τὸ — μὴ πάνθ' ὥς ἄν ἡμεῖς βουλοίμεθ' ἔχειν —, οὐδὲν ἐστὶ θαυμαστόν, sondern vor allem kommt in betracht der elliptische Gebrauch von ὥς ἄν, der nur zu begreifen ist, wenn enge Verbindung von ὥς ἄν 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 ἄν a) vor εἰ Plato Protag. 344 B ὥς ἄν εἰ λέγοι; vgl. das ὥσανεὶ der nachklassischen Gräzität; b) vor Partizipien; α) mit neuem Subjekt: Xenophon Cyrop. 1, 3, 8 καὶ τὸν Κύρον ἐρέσθαι προπετῶς, ὥς ἄν παῖς μηδέπω ὑποπτήσων. Memorab. 3, 8, 1 ἀπεκρίνατο, οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ φυλαττόμενοι —, ἀλλ' ὥς ἄν πεπεισμένοι μάλιστα πράττειν τὰ δέοντα. Demosth. 4, 6 ἔχει τὰ μὲν, ὥς ἄν ἐλών τις πολέμῳ. 24, 79 οὐδὲ ταῦθ' ἀπλῶς — φανήσεται γεγραφῶς, ἀλλ' ὥς [S. 384] ἄν μάλιστά τις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατηῆσαι καὶ παρακρούσασθαι βουλόμενος. [Demosth.] 34, 22 συγγραφὰς ἐποίησαντο —, ὥς ἄν οἱ μάλιστα ἀπιστοῦντες. Häufiger β) ohne ausdrückliche Nennung des eigentlich gedachten unbestimmten Subjekts ("wie einer thäte in der und der Verfassung"), wobei dann ὥς ἄν 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 ἰέναι [sic] ὥς ἄν πολλαχοῦ πλανωμένου. Lysias 1, 12 ἢ γυνὴ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἀπιέναι, ὥς ἄν ἀκμήνῃ με ἑορακῦια. Xenophon Memorab. 3, 6, 4 διεκώπησεν, ὥς ἄν τότε σκοπῶν, ὁπόθεν ἄρχοιτο. Demosth. 21, 14 κρότον τοιοῦτον ὥς ἄν ἐπαινοῦντές

τε καὶ συνησθέντες ἐποιήσατε. 19, 256 θρυλοῦντος ἀεὶ, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὡς ἂν εἰς κοινήν γνώμην ἀποφαινομένου. 54, 7 διαλεχθεὶς τι πρὸς αὐτὸν οὕτως ὡς ἂν μεθύων. [Demosth.] 59, 24 συνεδείπνει ἐναντίον πολλῶν Νέαира, ὡς ἂν ἑταίρα οὔσα. Aristot. Ἀθην. πολιτ. 19, 12 Keny. σημεῖον δ' ἐ<πι>φέρουσι τό τε ὄνομα τοῦ τέλους, ὡς ἂν ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος κείμενον. Anthol. Palat. 6, 259, 6 ἔπτη δ' ὡς ἂν ἔχων τοὺς πόδας ἡμετέρους. c) Sonst: Aeschylus Suppl. 718 ἄγαν καλῶς κλύουσα γ' ὡς ἂν οὐ φίλη. Thucyd. 1, 33, 1 ὡς ἂν μάλιτα, μετὰ ἀειμνήστου μαρτυρίου τὴν χάριν καταθήσεσθε. 6, 57, 3 ἀπερικέπτως προσπερόντες καὶ ὡς ἂν μάλιτα δι' ὀργῆς. Xenophon. Cyrop. 5, 4, 29 δῶρα πολλὰ — φέρων καὶ ἄγων, ὡς ἂν ἐξ οἴκου μεγάλου. Memorab. 2, 6, 38 εἴ σοι πείσαιμι — (ἐπιτρέπειν) τὴν πόλιν ψευδόμενος, ὡς ἂν στρατηγικῶ τε καὶ δικαστικῶ καὶ πολιτικῶ. Demosth. 1, 21 οὐδ' ὡς ἂν καλλιςτ' αὐτῶ τὰ παρόντ' ἔχει. 18, 291 οὐχ ὡς ἂν εὔνους καὶ δίκαιος πολίτης ἔσχε τὴν γνώμην. 23, 154 ἀφυλάκτων ὄντων, ὡς ἂν πρὸς φίλον τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ. Corpus Inscr. Att. 2, 243 (vor 301 a. Chr.), 34 ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰπέων τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ὡς ἂν ὑπὲρ πολιτῶν.

Noch schlagender vielleicht ist der Gebrauch von ὡςπερ. Zwar sagt Sophokles Fragm. 787 ὡςπερ ἐλήνης ὄψις εὐφρόνας δύο στήναι δύναιτ' ἂν und Demosthenes 4, 39 τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ὡςπερ τῶν στρατευμάτων ἀξιώσειε τις ἂν τὸν στρατηγὸν ἠγεῖσθαι. Aber dafür lesen wir bei Antiphon 6, 11 ὡςπερ ἂν ἡδιστα καὶ ἐπιτηδειότατα ἀμφοτέροις ἐγίγνετο, ἐγὼ μὲν ἐκέλευον u. s. w., bei Plato Phaedo 87 B δοκεῖ ὁμοίως λέγεσθαι [S. 385] ταῦτα, ὡςπερ ἂν τις περὶ ἀνθρώπου — λέγοι τοῦτον τὸν λόγον. Phaedrus 268 D ἀλλ' ὡςπερ ἂν μουσικὸς ἐντυχὼν ἀνδρὶ — οὐκ ἀγρίως εἴποι ἂν mit beachtenswertem doppeltem ἂν, bei Xenophon Hellen. 3, 1, 14 ἐκείνῳ δὲ πιστευούσης, ὡςπερ ἂν γυνὴ γαμβρὸν ἀσπάζοιτο. Besonders aber, wenn dem Vergleichungssatz ein konditionaler eingefügt ist, herrscht durchaus die Wortfolge ὡςπερ ἂν εἰ —: Plato Apologie 17 D ὡςπερ οὖν ἂν, εἴ [sic] τῶ ὄντι ξένος ἐτύχανον ὦν, ξυνεγιγνώσκετε δήπου ἂν μοι. Gorgias 447 D ὡςπερ ἂν, εἰ ἐτύχανεν ὦν ὑποδημάτων δημιουργός, ἀποκρίναιτο ἂν δήπου σοι. 451 A ὡςπερ ἂν, εἴ τίς με ἔροιτο —, εἴπομ' ἂν. 453 C ὡςπερ ἂν, εἰ ἐτύχανον —, ἄρ' οὐκ ἂν δικάως σε ἠρόμην; Protag. 311 B ὡςπερ ἂν, εἰ ἐπενόεις — ἀργύριον τελεῖν —, εἴ τίς σε ἠρετο —, τί ἂν ἀπεκρίνω. 318 B ὡςπερ ἂν, εἰ — Ἴπποκράτης ὄδε ἐπιθυμήσειε — καὶ — ἀκούσειεν —, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐπανερόιτο —, εἴποι ἂν αὐτῶ. 327 E ὡςπερ ἂν, εἰ ζητοίης, τίς διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἐλληνίζειν, οὐδ' ἂν εἰς φανείη, und öfters. Demosth. 20, 143 ὡςπερ ἂν, εἴ τις — τάττοι, οὐκ ἂν αὐτός γ' ἀδικεῖν παρεσκευάσθαι δόξαι.

Auch hier tritt der enge Anschluss von ἂν besonders daran zu Tage, dass ὡςπερ ἂν überaus oft elliptisch ohne (optativisches oder präteritales) Verbum steht, entweder indem eine Form des Verbuns εἰμί zu ergänzen ist, wie Demosth. 9, 30 ὡςπερ ἂν, εἰ υἱός — διώκει τι μὴ καλῶς ἢ ὀρθῶς, αὐτὸ μὲν τοῦτ' ἄξιον μέμψεως,

oder das Verbum des übergeordneten Satzes: Andoc. 1, 57 *χρῆ 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 ῥέπων ἐπὶ τὸ λῆμμα κυμβεβούλευκα* (V. C. ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ, Blass bloss ὥσπερ). 19, 226 ὥσπερ ἂν παρεστηκότος αὐτοῦ. 21, 117 *χρῶμενος ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλος τις αὐτῷ τὰ πρὸ τούτου*. 21, 225 *δεῖ τοίνυν τούτοις βοηθεῖν, ὥσπερ ἂν αὐτῷ τις ἀδικουμένῳ*. 29, 30 ὥσπερ ἂν τις *κυκοφαντεῖν ἐπιχειρῶν*. (S. Blass nach A; die meisten ὥσπερ ἂν εἶ τις, mit welcher Lesart die Stelle unten einzufügen wäre.) 39, 10 *πλὴν εἰ σημεῖον ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλω τινί, τῷ χαλκίῳ προσέεται*. 45, 35 ὥσπερ ἂν *δοῦλος δεσπότη διδούς*. 49, 27 ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλος τις *ἀποτυχῶν*.

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 εἶ τῷ Φρυγῶνδαι πανουργίαν ὀνειδίσειεν. Vgl. 10, 10. 15, 2. 15, 14. 15, 298. Ebenso Plato Protag. 341 C ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ ἤκουεν. Kratyl. 395 E ὥσπερ ἂν εἶ 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 *ἠσπάζετο αὐτόν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἶ τις — ἀσπάζοιτο*. Ebenso Demosthenes 6, 8 ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ *πολεμοῦντες τύχοιτε*. 18, 194 ὥσπερ ἂν εἶ τις *ναύκληρον αἰτιῶτο* (vgl. § 243) und andere Redner. [Demosth.] 35, 28 ὥσπερ ἂν εἶ τις *εἰς Αἴγιναν ἢ εἰς Μέγαρα ὀρμίαιτο*. — Daran knüpft sich wieder ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ (meist geschrieben ὥσπερανεῖ) im Sinne von *quasi* ‘wie’; vgl. ὡσεῖ, ὡσπερεῖ, ohne Verbum finitum gebraucht z. B. Plato Gorgias 479 A ὥσπερανεῖ παῖς. Isokrates 4, 148. Xenophon Sympos. 9, 4. Demosth. 18, 214. Über ὥσπερανεῖ, *καθαπερανεῖ* 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 βλάττοι 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 ἠδίω*. Demosth. 24, 138 *οἴμαι 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 ἄν ἀθρῶν βροτῶν ὅστις ἄν εἰ θεὸς ἄγοι ἐκφυγεῖν δύναίτο oder die bei Plato Phaedo 107 A οὐκ οἶδα εἰς ὄντιν' ἄν τις ἄλλον καιρὸν ἀναβάλλοιτο und bei Xenophon Anab. 3, 1, 40 οὐκ οἶδα ὅ τι ἄν τις χρίσταιτο 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 ἄν δέξαιτο.

Die Verbindung von ὅστις und ἄν 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 ὅτω ποτ' ἄν ἄλλω ἐπιλάβοιο. Zweitens durch οὐκ: Isokr. 8, 52 ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅστις οὐκ ἄν τις καταφρονήσειεν. Plato Gorgias 456 C οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν, περὶ ὅτου οὐκ ἄν πιθανώτερον εἶποι ὁ ῥητορικός. [491 E.] Symposion 179 A οὐδεὶς οὕτω κακός, ὄντινα οὐκ ἄν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἔρωσ ἐνθεον ποιήσειεν. Xenophon Cyrop. 7, 5, 61 οὐδεὶς γὰρ, ὅστις οὐκ ἄν ἀξιώσειεν. (Vgl. Lykurg 69 τίς οὕτως — φθονερός ἔστιν —, ὅς οὐκ ἄν εὔξαιτο —;) 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 οὐτ' ἔστιν ὅτου ἔνεκα βουλοίμεθα ἄν τὴν βασιλέως χώραν κακῶς ποιεῖν. 5, 77 ἔστιν [S. 388] οὗν ὅστις τοῦτο ἄν δύναίτο ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσαι. Ihm folgt auffälliger Weise Lykurg 39 τίς δ' ἦν οὕτω ἢ μιλόδημος τότε ἢ μιναθῆναιος, 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 blosse Konjektur des Herausgebers. [Doch Eurip. Med. 1339 οὐκ ἔστιν, ἦτις τοῦτ' ἄν Ἑλληνικὴ 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' οὖν ὅπως ἄν ὡςπερὶ σπονδῆς θεοῦ κάγω λαβοίμην —; (nicht negativer Fragesatz!) Aristoph. Aves 627 οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἄν ἐγὼ ποθ' ἐκὼν τῆς κῆς 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 ἐνθάδε μείναιμι. Xenophon Hellen. 6, 1, 9 οὐκ εἶναι ἔθνος, ὁποῖω ἄν ἀξιόσειαν ὑπήκοοι εἶναι Θετταλοί. Demosth. 24, 64 ἔστιν οὖν ὅπως ἄν ἐναντιωτέρα τις δύο θεῖη. (Obwohl der Revisor des Codex S oben an τις ein zweites ἄν eingezeichnet hat, ist doch die von Weil und nach ihm von Blass vorgenommene Streichung des bloss im Augustanus fehlenden ἄν hinter ὅπως und Versetzung desselben hinter ἐναντιώτερα unzulässig.) 18, 165 ἔστιν οὖν ὅπως ἄν μᾶλλον ἄνθρωποι πάνθ' ὑπὲρ Φιλίππου πράττοντες ἐξελεγχθεῖεν. (Vgl. auch οὐκ οἶδ', ὅπως ἄν — oben S. 382.) Zu diesen Beispielen würde nicht in Widerspruch stehen Herodot 8, 119, 9 οὐκ ἔχω ὅκως οὐκ ἄν ἴσον πλῆθος τοῖς Πέρσῃσι ἐξέβαλε, und wohl auch nicht Xenophon Anab. 5, 7, 7 τοῦτ' οὖν ἔστιν ὅπως τις ἄν ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσαι; aber wirklich in Widerspruch stehn Sophokles Antigone 1156 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὁποῖον στάντ' ἄν ἀνθρώπου βίον οὐτ' αἰνέσαιμι' ἄν οὔτε μεμψαίμην ποτέ. Aristoph. Nubes 1181 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως μί' ἡμέρα γένοιτ' ἄν ἡμέραι δύο. Vesp. 212 κοῦκ ἔσθ' ὅπως — ἄν — — λάθοι. Pax 306 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως [S. 389] ἀπειπεῖν ἄν δοκῶ μοι τήμερον. [Pl. Apol. 40 C.] Demosth. 15, 18 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως — εὔνοι γένοιτ' ἄν. 19, 308 ἔστιν οὖν, ὅπως ταῦτ' ἄν, ἐκεῖνα προειρηκώς, — ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν (geringere Handschriften: ὅπως ἄν ταῦτ'). — Ähnlich lesen wir zwar Eurip. Alkestis 80 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φίλων πέλας οὐδεῖς, ὅστις ἄν εἶποι. Plato Phaedo 57 B οὔτε τις ξένος ἀφίκεται —, ὅστις ἄν ἡμῖν σαφές τι ἀγγεῖλαι οἶός τ' ἦν περὶ τούτων, aber andererseits Sophokles Oed. Rex 117 οὐδ' ἀγγελός τις οὐδὲ συμπράκτωρ ὁδοῦ κατεῖδ' ὅτου τις ἐκμαθὼν ἐχρήσατ' ἄν.

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 ἄν 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 κατήλιξε εὐπετέως τῆς θαλάσσης κρατήσιν,

τάπερ ἄν και ἦν. [Hippokrates] περι τήχνης Kap. 5 S. 46, 12 Gomperz τοιαῦτα θεραπεύσαντες ἔωτοῦς, ὁποῖά περ ἄν ἐθεραπεύθησαν. Thucydides 2, 94, 1 ἐνόμιζον — ὄσον οὐκ ἐσπλεῖν αὐτοῦς· ὅπερ ἄν, εἰ ἐβουλήθησαν μὴ κατοκνήσαι, ῥαδίως ἄν ἐγένετο. Isokrates 8, 133 ἐὰν συμβούλους ποιῶμεθα τοιούτους —, οἷους περ ἄν περι τῶν ἰδίων ἡμῖν εἶναι βουληθεῖμεν. 15, 23 χρῆ τοιούτους εἶναι κριτάς —, οἷων περ ἄν αὐτοὶ τυγχάνειν ἀξιῶσαι. 17, 21 ἀξίων τὴν αὐτὴν Πασίῳνι — γίγνεσθαι ζημίαν, ἧς περ ἄν αὐτὸς ἐτύγχανεν. Plato Kriton 52 D πράττεις ἅπερ ἄν δοῦλος φαυλότατος πράξειεν. Sympos. 217 B ὦμην διαλέξεσθαι αὐτόν μοι, ἅπερ ἄν ἐραστῆς παιδικοῖς διαλεχθεῖη. Xenophon Anab. 5, 4, 34 ἐποίουν ἅπερ ἄν ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ποιήσαι. Aber mit Trennung des ἄν von ὄσπερ Thucyd. 1, 33, 3 τὸν δὲ πόλεμον, δι' ὃν περ χρήσιμοι ἄν εἶμεν, εἴ τις ὑμῶν μὴ οἶεται ἔσεσθαι. Demosth. 6, 30 Φίλιππος δ' ἅπερ εὔξαιθ' ἄν ὑμεῖς, — πράξει. 19, 328 ὑμεῖς δ', ἅπερ εὔξαιθ' ἄν, ἐλπίσαντες —.

Deutlich indessen tritt das Bewusstsein von der engen Zusammengehörigkeit von ἄν mit ὄσπερ bei Ellipse des Verbuns zu Tage, wobei die Ellipse des konjunktivischen Verbuns z. B. Eurip. Medea 1153 φίλους νομίζουσ' οὐς περ ἄν πόσις σέθεν. Isokrates 3, 60 φιλεῖν οἶεσθε δεῖν και τιμᾶν, οὐς περ ἄν και ὁ βασιλεύς. Demosth. 18, 280 τὸ τοῦς αὐτοῦς μισεῖν και φιλεῖν, οὐς περ ἄν ἡ πατρίς. CIA. 2, 589, 26 (um [S. 390] 300 a. Ch.) τελεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν τὰ αὐτὰ τέλη ἐν τῷ δήμῳ ἅπερ ἄγ και Πειραιεῖς verglichen werden kann. Als Beispiele mögen dienen Isokrates 4, 86 τοσαύτην ποιητάμενοι σπουδὴν, ὄσην περ ἄν τῆς αὐτῶν χώρας πορθουμένης. 5, 90 νικῆσαι — τοσοῦτον, ὄσον περ ἄν εἰ ταῖς γυναιξίν αὐτῶν συνέβαλον. 10, 49 τοσοῦτον ἐφρόνησαν, ὄσον περ ἄν, εἰ πάντων ἡμῶν ἐκράτησαν. 14, 37 ἅπερ ἄν εἰς τοῦς πολεμιοτάτους, ἐξαμαρτεῖν ἐτόλμησαν. 15, 28 εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν καθέστηκα κίνδυνον, εἰς ὃν περ ἄν, εἰ πάντα ἐτύγχανον ἡδικηκῶς. 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 ὁμοια ἔπραττον, ἅπερ ἄν μετ' ἄλλων ὄντες. Demosth. 53, 12 ἀπεκρινάμην αὐτῷ, ἅπερ ἄν νέος ἄνθρωπος.

Unter den mit blosser ὄσ 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 ὄσ haben: Plato Sympos. 218 A ἐγὼ δεδηγμένον τὸ ἀλγεινότατον ὦν ἄν τις δηχθεῖη. 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 ὦν 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 ἀφ' ὧν ἄν τις σκοπῶν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὐθις ἐπιπέσοι, μάλιστ' ἄν ἔχοι τι προειδῶς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν. Demosth. 14, 27 ὅσα γὰρ ἄν νῦν πορίσασθαι 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' αἰσχρὴν ὀφλισκάνοντες, 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 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 ἐλεθθῆην. Lysias 2, 34 ὁ τις ἰδὼν οὐκ ἄν ἐφοβήθη; Demosth. 18, 49 ἐξ ὧν ἀφέστατ' 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 ὡς 'dass' z. B. Plato Sympos. 214 D ὡς ἐγὼ οὐδ' ἄν ἓνα ἄλλον ἐπαινέσασμι (doch Thucyd. 5, 9, 3 ὡς ἄν ἐπεξέλθοι τις), ὥστε 'so dass' z. B. Plato Sympos. 197 A ὥστε καὶ οὗτος Ἔρωτος 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 εὐδαίμων γένοιτο. Demosth. 18, 79 ὅτι τῶν ἀδικημάτων ἄν ἐμὲνητο 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 πάλαι ἄν ἀπωλώλιτε. 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 ἢ πέσοι τις ἢ τρωθῆιη 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 ἀναπείσομεν ἰκετεύοντέ νιν. Demosth. 4, 18 οὐδ' εἰ μὴ ποιήσασθαι ἄν ἤδη. 20, 62 οὐκοῦν αἰσχρὸν, εἰ μέλλοντες μὲν εὖ πάσχειν συκοφάντην ἄν τὸν ταῦτα λέγονθ' ἠγοῖσθε, ἐπὶ τῷ δ' ἀφελέσθαι — ἀκούσεσθε. 19, 172 ἐξώλης ἀπολοίμην —, εἰ προσλαβῶν 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 μή mit dem Optativ und ἄν steht: Sophokles Trachin. 631 δέδοικα γάρ, μή πρῶ λέγοις ἄν τὸν πόθον. Thucyd. 2, 93, 3 οὔτε προσδοκία οὐδεμία ἦν, μή ἄν ποτε οἱ πολέμοιοι ἐξαπιναιίως οὕτως ἐπιπλεύσειαν. Xenophon Anab. 6, 1, 28 ἐκεῖνο ἐννοῶ, μή λῖαν ἄν ταχὺ σωφρονισθεῖην. Poroi 4, 41 φοβοῦνται, μή ματαία ἄν γένοιτο αὕτη ἢ παρασκευή. Hier ist es ausser allem Zweifel, dass der Optativ mit ἄν auf einer Beeinflussung des μή-Satzes durch den Hauptsatz beruht, und da hat unter vier Beispielen nur eines ἄν unmittelbar hinter μή.

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 εὐροιοῖ 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 μεῖζον ἔχοι τις ἄν εἰπεῖν. 18, 316 οὐ μὲν οὖν εἴποι τις ἄν ἡλίκας. — ποτ': Eurip. Helena 912 f. κείνο δὲ πῶς τὰ ζῶντα τοῖς θανοῦσιν ἀπο-[S. 393]δοίη ποτ' ἄν. — οὐ: Sophokles Aias 1330 ἦ γὰρ εἶην οὐκ ἄν εἶ φρονῶν. — τάχ': Oed. Rex 1115 f. τῆ δ' ἐπιτιμήμην σύ μου προύχοις τάχ' ἄν που. — τάδ': Eurip. Helena 97 τίς σωφρονῶν τλαίη τάδ' ἄν. — ταῦτ': Solon Fragm. 36, 1 συμμαρτυροίη ταῦτ' ἄν ἐν δίκῃ. — μεντ': Aristoph. Ran. 743 ὦ μωξε 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 ἀκτιβὲς ἄλλοσ ἔσ.* Eurip. Hiketiden 944 *ὄλοιντ' 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 (εὖ τόδ' ἴσθ') ἄν.* Elektra 697 *δύναιτ' ἄν οὐδ' ἄν ἰσχύων φυγεῖν.* Aristoph. Nubes 977 *ἠλείψατο δ' ἄν τοῦμφαλοῦ οὐδεὶς παῖς ὑπένερθεν τότ' ἄν* ist die Entfernung des zweiten ἄν vom Verbum aus der Anfangsstellung des Verbuns zu erklären. — Sonach haben die Herausgeber von Aristoph. Rittern Recht gehabt, wenn sie Vs. 707 das überlieferte *ἐπὶ τῷ φάγοις ἦδιτ' ἄν* in *ἐπὶ τῷ φαγῶν ἦδοιτ' (oder ἦδοι) ἄν* ändern; dagegen Aristophanes Ran. 949 f. *οὐδὲν παρῆκ' ἄν ἀργόν, ἀλλ' ἔλεγεν ἡ γυνή τέ μοι χῶ δοῦλοσ οὐδὲν ἦττον 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 *κοῦ 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 μῆ περιώδυνοσ μῆ 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 γὰρ ἄν καὶ μείζονι λέξαιμι ἄν ἢ σοί. 862 οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄν πράξαιμι ἄν. Fragm. 513 Nauck², 6 κάμοι γὰρ ἄν πατήρ γε δακρύων χάριν ἀνήκτ' ἄν εἰς φῶς. Fragm. 833 ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἄν τὰ θεῖα κρυπτόντων θεῶν μάθοις ἄν. Eurip. Hiket. 855 μόλις γὰρ ἄν τις αὐτὰ τἀναγκαῖ' ὄραν δύναιτ' ἄν ἐστὼς πολεμίοις ἐναντίος. Helena 948 τὴν Τροίαν γὰρ ἄν δειλοὶ γενόμενοι πλεῖστον αἰσχύνοιμεν ἄν. 1011 καὶ γὰρ ἄν κείνος βλέπων ἀπέδωκεν ἄν σοι τὴνδ' ἔχειν. 1298 εὐμενέστερον γὰρ ἄν τῷ φιλτάτῳ μοι Μενέλεω τὰ πρόσφορα δρώης ἄν. Aristoph. Vesp. 927 οὐ γὰρ ἄν ποτε τρέφειν δύναιτ' ἄν μία λόχμη κλέπτα δύο. Pax 321 οὐ γὰρ ἄν χαίροντες ἡμεῖς τήμερον παυσαίμεθ' ἄν. Lysistr. 252 ἄλλως γὰρ ἄν ἄμαχοι γυναῖκες καὶ μισαὶ κεκλήμεθ' ἄν. Thesmoph. 196 καὶ γὰρ ἄν μαινοίμεθ' ἄν. Plato Apol. 35 D σαφῶς γὰρ ἄν, εἰ πειθοίμι ὑμᾶς —, θεοὺς ἄν διδάσκοιμι. 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^b 24 οὕτε γὰρ ἄν αἰ τῆς σελήνης ἐκλείψαις τοιαύτας ἄν εἶχον τὰς ἀποτομάς. De gener. et corr. 337^b 7 μέλλων γὰρ ἄν βαδίζειν τις οὐκ ἄν βαδίσαιεν. De part. anim. 654^a 18 οὕτως γὰρ ἄν ἔχον χρησιμώτατον ἄν εἶη. (vgl. Vahlen Zur Poetik 1460^b 7) u. s. w.

[S. 395] Sodann ist darauf hinzuweisen, dass die Verbindungen 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 ἀλλ' 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 πάσχοιμεν. Plato Phaedo 64 A πῶς ἄν οὖν δὴ τοῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοι —, ἐγὼ πειράσομαι φράσαι. Sympos. 202 D πῶς ἄν οὖν θεὸς εἶη ὃ γε τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἄμοιρος, und öfters. Xen. Anab. 2, 5, 20 πῶς ἄν οὖν ἔχοντες τοσοῦτος 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 ἀνήρ μάλλον δοίη δίκην. Respubl. Lacedaem. 5, 9 οὐκ ἄν οὖν ῥαδίως γέ τις εὔροι Σπαρτιατῶν ὑγιεινοτέρους. Demosth. 25, 33 τίς ἄν οὖν εὖ φρονῶν αὐτὸν ἄν ἢ τὰ τῆς πατρίδος συμφέροντα ταύτη συνάψαιε. [Demosth.] 46, 13 πῶς ἄν οὖν μὴ εἰδὼς ὁ πατήρ αὐτὸν Ἀθηναῖον ἐκόμενον ἔδωκεν ἄν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα. Aeschines 1, 17 ἴσως ἄν οὖν τις θαυμάσειεν. 3, 219 πῶς ἄν οὖν ἐγὼ προεδεικνύμην 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 ἐσπλεύσαντες 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 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, φροντίσαιμι γε. Plato Phaedo 102 A cὺ δ' — οἶμαι, ἄν, ὡς ἐγὼ λέγω, ποιίης. Sympos. 202 D τί οὖν ἄν, ἔφη, εἴη ὁ Ἔρωσ. 202 B καὶ πῶς ἄν, ἔφη, ὃ Σώκρατες, ὁμολογοῖτο. Republ. 1, 333 A πρὸς γε ὑποδημάτων ἄν, οἶμαι, φαίησ κτήσιν. 4, 438 A ἴσως γὰρ ἄν, ἔφη, δοκοῖη τι λέγειν ὁ ταῦτα λέγων. Leges 2, 658 A τί ἄν, εἰ — (folgen sieben Zeilen), τί ποτ' ἄν ἡγοῦμεθα 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, ὡς τάχιςτα ὄπλα ἐπιούμην τοῖς Πέρσαις. 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' ἄθαστον ἠνυχόμην νέκυν, κείνοισ ἄν ἤλγουν. Oed. Rex 1438 ἔδρασ' ἄν, εἴ τόδ' ἴσθ', ἄν, εἰ μὴ — ἐχρηζον. Elektra 333 ὥστ' ἄν, εἰ χθένος λάβοιμι, δηλώσαιμι' ἄν. 439 ἀρχὴν δ' ἄν, εἰ μὴ τλημονεστάτη γυνὴ πασῶν ἔβλαστε, — χοὰς οὐκ ἄν ποθ' ὄν γ' ἔκτεινε, τῶδ' ἐπέστεφε. Thucyd. 1, 136, 5 ἐκείνον δ' ἄν, εἰ ἐκδοίη αὐτόν —, σωτηρίας ἄν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποστερηθῆναι. 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 ἀντείποιμί σοι. Plato Protag. 318 C κἄν, εἰ Ὀρθαγόρα τῶ Ἰθηβαίῳ συγγενόμενος — ἐπανερόιτο αὐτόν —, εἴποι ἄν. Leges 8, 841 C τάχα δ' ἄν, εἰ θεὸς ἐθέλοι, κἄν δυοῖν θάτερα βιασαίμεθα περὶ ἐρωτικῶν. Demosth. 4, 1 ἐπιχωῶν ἄν, ἕως —, εἰ —, ἡσυχίαν ἄν ἤγον. 21, 115 ἄρ' ἄν, εἴ γ' εἶχε —, ταῦτ' ἄν εἶσεν. 37, 16 οὐδ' ἄν, εἴ τι γένοιτ', φήθην ἄν δίκην μοι λαχεῖν ποτε τοῦτον. *[Demosth.]* 47, 66 καίτοι πῶς ἄν, εἰ μὴ πεπορικμένον 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 derselbenstellungsregel 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, ἢ ἕσθηκα τὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς — παραβαίνεις. Phaedo 87 A τί οὖν, ἄν φαίη ὁ λόγος, ἔτι ἀπιστεῖς. Hippias major 299 A μανθάνω, ἄν ἴσος φαίη, καὶ ἐγώ. Demosth. 1, 14 τί οὖν, ἄν τις εἴποι, ταῦτα λέγεις. 1, 19 τί οὖν, ἄν τις εἴποι, σὺ γράφεις ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά. Proöm. 35, 4 τί οὖν, ἄν τις εἴποι, σὺ παραινεῖς; [Demosth.] 45, 55 ὅτι νῆ Δί, ἄν εἴποι, τοῦτον εἰσπεποίηκα υἰόν. — Vgl. auch Demosth. 11, 44 οὐκ ἄν οἶδ' ὅ τι πλέον εὔροι τούτου. Plato Timäus 26 B ἐγὼ γάρ, ἃ μὲν χθὲς ἤκουσα, οὐκ ἄν οἶδ' εἰ δυναίμην ἅπαντα ἐν μνήμῃ πάλιν λαβεῖν. Ähnliches οὐκ ἄν οἶδ' ὅ τι im Satzinnern Demosth. 45, 7. Auf dergleichen Wendungen basiert dann wohl wiederum das euripideische οὐκ (bezw. οὐ γὰρ) οἶδ' ἄν εἰ πείσαιμι Medea 941. Alcestis 48. Eigentümlich Thucyd. 5, 9, 3 καὶ οὐκ ἄν ἐλπίζαντες ὡς ἄν ἐπεξέλθοι τις, wo das erste ἄν nur als Antizipation aus dem Nebensatz erklärt werden kann.

Sechstens sprengt ἄν, gerade wie die Enklitika, öfters am Satzanfang stehende Wortgruppen auseinander. Dahin könnte man οὐδ' ἄν εἶς stellen: Sophokles Oed. Rex 281 οὐδ' ἄν εἶς δύναιτ' ἀνήρ. Oed. Col. 1656 οὐδ' ἄν εἶς θνητῶν φράσειε. Plato Prot. 328 A οὐδ' ἄν εἶς φανείη. Alcib. 122 D οὐδ' ἄν εἶς ἀμφιβητήσειε. Demosth. 19, 312 οὐδ' ἄν εἶς εὐοῖδ' ὅτι φήσειεν. 18, 69 οὐδ' ἄν εἶς ταῦτα φήσειεν. 18, 94 οὐδ' ἄν εἶς εἰπεῖν ἔχοι. Aristot. Ἀθην. πολ. 21, 2 K. οὐδ' ἄν εἶς 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' ἄν οὖν statt γοῦν ἄν bei Thucydides: 1, 76, 4 ἄλλους γ' ἄν οὖν οἰόμεθα τὰ ἡμέτερα λαβόντες δεῖξαι ἄν und 1, 77, 6 ὑμεῖς γ' ἄν οὖν, εἰ — ἄρξαιτε, τάχ' ἄν μεταβάλοιτε, sowie folgende Fälle, wo ἄν mitten in eine Wortgruppe eingedrungen ist: Solon fragm. 37, 4 πολλῶν ἄν ἀνδρῶν ἦδ' ἐχηρώθη πόλις. Aeschyl. Pers. 632 μόνος ἄν θνητῶν πέρασ εἴποι. 706 ἀνθρώπεια δ' ἄν τοι πῆματ' ἄν τύχοι βροτοῖς. Sophokles Aias 155 κατὰ δ' ἄν τις [S. 398] ἐμοῦ τοιαῦτα λέγων οὐκ ἄν πείθοι. Oed. Rex 175 ἄλλον δ' ἄν ἄλλω προσίδοις. 502 σοφία δ' ἄν σοφίαν παραμείψειεν ἀνήρ. Elektra 1103 τίς οὖν ἄν ὑμῶν τοῖς ἔσω φράσειεν ἄν. Oed. Col. 1100 τίς ἄν θεῶν κοί τόνδ' ἄριστον ἀνδρ' ἰδεῖν δοίη. Herodot 1, 56, 5 ἐφρόντιζε ἱστορέων, τοὺς ἄν Ἑλλήνων δυνατωτάτους ἐόντας προσκτῆσαιτο φίλους. 1, 67, 7 ἐπειρώτεον, τίνα ἄν θεῶν ἱλακάμενοι κατύπερθε τῷ πολέμῳ Τεγεγέτων γενοῖατο. 1, 196, 22 τὸ δὲ ἄν χρυσίον ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τῶν εὐειδέων παρθένων. 7, 48, 8 στρατοῦ ἄν ἄλλου τις τὴν ταχίστην ἀγερσιν ποιεοίτο. 7, 135, 12 ἕκαστος ἄν ὑμῶν ἄρχοι γῆς Ἑλλάδος. 7, 139, 9 κατὰ γε ἄν τὴν ἡπειρον τοιαύδε ἐγένετο. [Hippokrates] περὶ τέχνης c. 3 (s. 44, 8 Gomperz) ἐν ἄλλοισιν ἄν λόγοισιν σαφέστερον διδασχθεῖν. (Vgl. auch c. 2, s. 42, 19 G.

ἐπεὶ τῶν γε μὴ ἐόντων τίνα ἄν τις οὐσίην θεηράμενος ἀπαγγείλειεν ὡς ἔστιν). Thucyd. 1, 10 πολλὴν ἄν οἶμαι ἀπιστίαν τῆς δυνάμεως — τοῖς ἔπειτα πρὸς τὸ κλέος αὐτῶν εἶναι. 1, 36, 3 βραχυτάτῳ δ' ἄν κεφαλαίῳ τῷδ' ἄν μὴ προέσθαι ἡμᾶς μάθοιτε. 5, 22, 2 πρὸς γὰρ ἄν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, εἰ ἐξῆν χωρεῖν. Aristoph. Thesmoph. 768 τίν' οὖν ἄν ἄγγελον πέμψαιμ' ἐπ' αὐτόν. Isokrates 5, 35 σκεπτέον, τί ἄν ἀγαθὸν αὐτὰς ἐργασάμενος φανείης ἄξια — πεποικώς. Plato Apologie 25 B πολλή [sic] γὰρ ἄν τις εὐδαιμονία εἴη περὶ τοὺς νέους. Phaedo 70 A πολλή ἄν ἐλπὶς εἴη καὶ καλή. 70 D 106 D ἄλλου ἄν του δέοι λόγου. 107 C οὐδεμία ἄν εἴη ἄλλη ἀποφυγή. Xenophon Anab. 3, 1, 6 ἐλθὼν δ' ὁ Ξενοφῶν ἐπήρητο τὸν Ἀπόλλω, τίμη ἄν θεῶν θύων καὶ εὐχόμενος κάλλιστα καὶ ἄριστα ἔλθοι τὴν ὁδόν, ἦν ἐπινοεῖ, καὶ καλῶς πράξας σωθῆι, was sofort an das τίμη 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 ἄν δρῶσιν — εἴη, und Herodot 1, 67, 7 oben. — Anab. 3, 2, 29 λαβόντες δὲ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, ἀναρχίᾳ ἄν καὶ ἀταξίᾳ ἐνόμιζον ἡμᾶς ἀπολέσθαι. Poroï 3, 14 πολλή ἄν καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων πρόσοδος γίγνοιτο. 4, 1 πάμπολλα ἄν νομίζω χρήματα — προσιέναι. Demosth. 1, 1 ἀντὶ πολλῶν ἄν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, χρημάτων ὑμᾶς ἐλέσθαι νομίζω. 4, 12 πλησίον μὲν ὄντες, ἅπασι ἄν τοῖς πράγμασι τεταραγμένοις ἐπιστάντες ὅπως βούλεσθε διοικήσασθε. 19, 48 τί ἄν ποιῶν ὑμῖν χαρίσαιοτο. 18, 22 τί ἄν εἰπὼν σέ τις ὀρθῶς προσείποι; (18, 81 ὅτι πολλὰ μὲν ἄν χρήματα ἔδωκε Φιλιστίδης). 18, 293 μείζων ἄν δοθείη δωρεά. 29, 1 θαυμασίως ἄν ὡς εὐλαβούμην. 39, [S. 399] 24 καίτοι, τίς ἄν ὑμῶν οἶεται τὴν μητέρα πέμψαι; epist. 3, 37 τί ἄν εἰπὼν μήθ' ἁμαρτεῖν δοκοίην μήτε ψευσαίμην. [Demosth.] 35, 26 τί ἄν τις ἄλλο ὄνομ' ἔχοι θέσθαι τῷ τοιούτῳ. — Dazu kommen die zahlreichen Stellen nach Art von Demosth. 21, 50 οὐκ ἄν οἶσθε 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 ἄν enthält, mit dem das erste ἄν 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 συνοίσειν περὶ ὧν νῦν τυγχάνετε σκοποῦντες οἶμαι πάντας ὑμᾶς ἐλέσθαι, und hier ist nun der erweiterten Fassung des Satzes wegen hinter πάντας das ἄν wiederholt. (Ganz irrig ist es, wenn Blass im Proöm deswegen das erste ἄν hinter πολλῶν gegen die bessere Überlieferung streicht). Ich glaube wir dürfen sagen, dass in allen Fällen, wo ἄν mehrfach gesetzt ist, dies einen Kompromiss darstellt zwischen dem traditionellen Drang ἄν 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 ἄν konjunktivischen Sätzen fremd ist. So sind für uns überhaupt alle Sätze mit mehrern ἄν, 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 οὐτ' ἄν — οὐτ' ἄν, das nicht hierher gehört.

Aeschyl. Agam. 340 οὐ τᾶν 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 ἀγνός γένοιτ' ἄν. Sophokles Aias 537 τί δήτ' ἄν ὡς ἐκ τῶνδ' ἄν ὠφελοῖμι σε. 1058 ἡμεῖς μὲν ἄν τήνδ' ἦν ὄδ' εἴληχεν τύχην θανόντες ἄν προὔκειμεθ' αἰσχίτω μόρφῳ. 1078 ἀλλ' ἄνδρα χρηῖ — δοκεῖν, πεσεῖν ἄν κἄν ἀπὸ μικροῦ κακοῦ. Oed. Rex 139 τάχ' ἄν κἄμ' ἄν τοιαύτη χειρὶ τιμωρεῖν θέλοι. 446 [S. 400] κυθείς τ' ἄν οὐκ ἄν ἀλγύνοις πλέον. 602 οὐτ' ἄν μετ' ἄλλου δρῶντος ἄν τλαιῖν ποτέ. 1053 ἦδ' ἄν τάδ' οὐχ' ἦκιστ' ἄν Ἰοκάστη λέγοι. Elektra 697 δύναται' ἄν οὐδ' ἄν ἰσχύων φυγεῖν. 1216 τίς οὖν ἄν ἀξίαν γε σοῦ περηνότος μεταβάλοιτ' ἄν ὧδε σιγᾶν λόγων. Philoktet 222 ποίας ἄν ὑμᾶς πατρίδος (oder πόλεος) ἢ γένους ποτὲ τύχοιμ' ἄν εἰπὼν; (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 πράξιμ' ἄν εἰκότως ψέγοις. 1366 ἦ τᾶν οὐκ ἄν ἦ. Phaedra fr. 622, 1 N. οὐ γάρ ποτ' ἄν γένοιτ' ἄν ἀσφαλῆς πόλις. Fragm. inc. 673 πῶς ἄν οὐκ ἄν ἐν δίκη θάνοιμ' ἄν (mit drei ἄν!)

Herodot 2, 26, 9 ὁ ἥλιος ἄν ἀπελαυνόμενος ἐκ μέσου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ — ἦε ἄν τὰ ἄνω τῆς Εὐρώπης. 2, 26, 11 διεξιόντα δ' ἄν μιν διὰ πάσης Εὐρώπης ἔλπομαι ποιεῖν ἄν τὸν Ἴκτρον. 3, 35, 17 οὐδ' ἄν αὐτὸν ἔγωγε δοκέω τὸν θεὸν οὕτω ἄν κακῶς βαλεῖν. 7, 187, 5 οὐδ' ἄν τούτων ὑπὸ πλήθος οὐδεὶς ἄν εἴποι πλήθος. Eurip. Alk. 72 πόλλ' ἄν σὺ λέξας οὐδὲν ἄν πλεον λάβοις. id. 96 πῶς ἄν ἔρημον τάφον Ἄδμητος κεδνῆς ἄν ἔπραξε γυναικός. Androm. 934 οὐκ ἄν ἐν γ' ἐμοῖς δόμοις βλέπουσ' ἄν αὐγάς τᾶμ' ἐκαρποῦτ' ἄν λέχη. Hekabe 742 ἄλγος ἄν προσθεῖμεθ' 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 διορθέων λόγους ὀρθῶς δύναται' ἄν δῆμος εὐθύνην πόλιν. (606 τίν' ἄν λόγον, τάλαινα, τίν' ἄν τῶνδ' αἰτία λάβοιμι). 853 οὐκ ἄν δυναίμην οὐτ' ἐρωτῆσαι τάδε οὐτ' ἄν πιέσθαι. Hippolyt. 480 ἦ τᾶρ' ἄν ὅψε γ' ἄνδρες ἐξεύροιεν ἄν. Iphig. Taur. 1020 ἄρ' ἄν τύραννον διολέσαι δυναίμεθ' ἄν. Medea 616 οὐτ' ἄν ξένοις τοῖσι σοῖς χρῆσαιμεθ' ἄν. Troades 456 οὐκέτ' ἄν φθάνοις ἄν αὐραν ἰστίοις καρδοκῶν. 1244 ἀφανεῖς ἄν ὄντες οὐκ ἄν

ὕμνηθεῖμεν ἄν. Meleagros fragm. 527 Nauck² μόνον δ' ἄν (Nauck: malim ἔν) ἀντι
χρημάτων οὐκ ἄν λάβοις.

Thucyd. 2, 41, 1 λέγω — καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον, δοκεῖν ἄν μοι τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα
παρ' ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πλείετ' ἄν εἶδη καὶ μετὰ χαρίτων μάλιετ' εὐτραπέλωσ τὸ σῶμα
αὐταρκεσ παρέχεσθαι. (Vgl. [S. 401] Stahl zu d. Stelle). 4, 114, 4 οὐδ' ἄν σφῶν
πειρασομένους — αὐτοὺς δακεῖν ἤσσον, ἀλλὰ πολλῶ μᾶλλον — εὖνους ἄν σφίσι
γενέσθαι. 6, 10, 4 τάχ' ἄν δ' ἴσως, εἰ — λάβοιεν —, καὶ πάνυ ἄν ξυνεπίθοιντο. 6, 11,
2 Σικελιώται δ' ἄν μοι δοκοῦσιν, ὥσ γε νῦν ἔχουσιν, καὶ ἔτι ἄν ἤσσον 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 ἰητρικῆς 1, 572 Littré οὔτε ἄν αὐτῶ τῶ λέγοντι οὔτε τοῖς ἀκούουσι
δηλα ἄν εἶη. Aristoph. Acharn. 218 οὐδ' ἄν ἐλαφρῶσ ἄν ἀπεπλίξατο. 308 πῶσ
δέ γ' ἄν καλῶσ λέγοις ἄν. Nubes 977 ἠλείψατο δ' ἄν τοῦμφαλοῦ οὐδεὶς παῖς
ὑπένερθεν τὸτ' ἄν. 1383 μαμμᾶν δ' ἄν αἰτήσαντος ἤκόν σοι φέρων ἄν ἄρτον. Pax
68 πῶσ ἄν ποτ' ἀφικοίμην ἄν εὐθὺ τοῦ Διός. 646 ἢ δ' Ἑλλάς ἄν ἐξερημωθεῖτ' 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. ἐθέλομι), εἰ με
χρεῖη — ἐκπιεῖν. 115 ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἄν κᾶν ὥσπερ εἰ ψῆτταν δοκῶ δοῦναι ἄν ἐμαυτῆς
παρταμοῦσα θῆμι. 147 μᾶλλον ἄν διὰ τουτογὶ γένοιτ' ἄν εἰρήνη. 361 φωνῆν
ἄν οὐκ ἄν εἶχον. Ranae 34 ἢ τᾶν σε κωκύειν ἄν ἐκέλευον μακρά. 581 οὐκ ἄν
γενοίμην Ἡρακλῆς ἄν. Ekkles. 118 οὐκ ἄν φθάνοις τὸ γένειον ἄν περιδουμένη.

Plato Sympos. [Apol. 41 A.] 176 C ἴσως ἄν ἐγὼ περὶ τοῦ μεθύσκεσθαι — τάληθῆ
λέγων ἦττον ἄν εἶην ἀηδῆς. Phaedrus 232 C εἰκότως ἄν (Schanz konj. δῆ) τοὺς
ἐρώντας 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 εὔροις ὥσ τοῦτο.
Menexenus 236 D κᾶν ὀλίγου, εἰ με κελεύοις ἀποδύντα ὀρχήσασθαι, χαρῖκαίμην
ἄν. Sophist. 233 A πῶσ οὖν ἄν ποτέ τις — δύναιτ' ἄν ὑγιές τι λέγων ἀντειπεῖν.
233 B σχολῆ ποτ' ἄν αὐτοῖς τις χρήματα διδοὺς ἠθελεν ἄν — μαθητῆς γίνεσθαι.
[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 ἰκανὸς οἶμαι εἶναι οὔτ' ἄν
φίλον ὠφελῆσαι οὔτ' ἄν ἐχθρὸν ἀλέξασθαι. 4, 6, 13 δοκοῦμεν δ' ἄν μοι ταύτη
προσποιοῦμενοι προσβαλεῖν ἐρημωτέρῳ ἄν τῶ ὄρει χρῆσθαι. 5, 6, 32 διασπασθέν-
τες δ' ἄν καὶ κατὰ μικρὰ γενομένης τῆς δυνάμεως οὔτ' ἄν τροφήν δύνασθε
λαμβάνειν οὔτε χαίροντες ἄν ἀπαλλάξαίτε. Oecon. 4, 5 ὦδ' 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 θᾶπτον ἄν. (Demosth. 18, 240 τί ἄν οἶεσθ'
εἰ — ἀπῆλθον —, τί ποιεῖν ἄν ἢ τί λέγειν τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς ἀνθρώπους τουτουσί ge-
hört, da die Wiederholung des ἄν durch die Wiederaufnahme des fragenden τί
bewirkt ist, nicht hierher.) 27, 56 οὐκ ἄν ἠγεῖσθ' αὐτὸν κᾶν ἐπιδραμεῖν. Aristot.

poet. 25, 1460^b 7 ὄδ' 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 ungleichmässig ist, ergibt sich starke Abnahme dieser Art von Doppelsetzung von ἄν im vierten Jahrhundert. Zumal die rednerische Prosa zeigt nur ganz spärliche Beispiele; bekanntlich hat Lysias ἄν gar nie doppelt gesetzt. Ich zweifle nicht, dass diese Abnahme auf fortschreitendes Erlöschen derjenigen Tradition zurückzuführen ist, welche ἄν an zweiter Stelle des Satzes forderte.

Nun findet sich Doppelsetzung des ἄν auch so, dass das erste ἄν nicht die zweite Stelle im Satz einnimmt, sondern eine spätere. Dies ist ganz natürlich, da ja die verschiedensten Satzteile ἄν 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 Rig-veda 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 niditaṃ 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 *cīṭ* 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 mittelindischen Prosa (vgl. z. B. Jacobi Māhārāṣṭrī-Erzählungen S. 8 Z. 18 *jena se parikkhemi balavisesam*, wo *se* syntaktisch zu *balavisesam* 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^a 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^a 13 (zweimal), C^b 22 (zweimal). D 19. E^a 19; endlich hinter *utā* Bh. 4, 74. 78. Xerxes D 15 (dazu NR^a 52, Xerxes D 18. E^a 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^a 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^a 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. *avaḫā* 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 *utamaiy tya pitā akunauš* = καί 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^a 18; *hya* Bh. 2, 13; dem Akkusativ

Translation

avam Bh. 2, 20. 83., dem Neutrum *tya* Bh. 1, 19. NR^a 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 xšāyaḥiya āham*; 4, 6 *vašn[ā Aurama]zdāha adamšām ajanam*; NR^a 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 maḥištām akunauš*, wo *šām* syn-[S. 405]taktisch zu *maḥištām* 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^a 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^a 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^a 14.^b 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 *cīṭ* 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 hervorgehobenen gotischen Tmesen *ga-u-laubeis*, *ga-u-hva-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-hva-sēhi* mit seinem Einschub des Indefinitums *hva* = τὸ.

IX.

Indem ich dahingestellt lasse, ob das Pronomen infixum des Keltischen (Zeuss *Grammatica celtica* S. 327 ff.) nicht von hier aus Licht empfangt, 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*² S. 49. 64; Schmalz *Latein. Syntax*² S. 557 u. s. w.) Für die Einzeluntersuchung ist es nun allerdings unbequem, dass die Überlieferung anders als im Griechischen keine äusseren 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^b 2. 309^a 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. 95²). 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 welcher beiden Beispielen übrigens eine, die zweite Stelle verlangende, Partikel die Trennung bewirkt hat.

b) Des Pronomens *qui-cunque* (Neue³ 2, 489), nebst Zubehör (dessen Tmesis in Fällen wie Cicero pro Sest. 68 *quod iudicium cunque subierat*. De divin. 2, 7 *qua re 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* besonderer 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 besonderer 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 quaesoque*. 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 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 duces praebuit*. 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 poetas 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 deaque* 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 deaque*, oder der betr. Gottesname am Satzanfang steht, folgen die vom Verb regierten pronominalen Akkusative und

Translation

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 vorgeht. 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 abzuhelfen 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 populique 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 — 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 salibus 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^c 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^b 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^b 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 $\mu\omicron\iota$ in griechischem $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\ \mu\omicron\iota$ 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 aufgekommen 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. $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ 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. 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 cunq̄e 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 Satzinnern 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 ieis locis inve ieis porticibus quid inaedificatum immolatumve 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.

Angesichts 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 *svai, 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 quouisque 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), *quouisque in populi leiberi*, nur aus unserm Stellungsge-
setz 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 possidebit*; 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 zerreisst *quisque* auch etwa die Verbindung zwischen regierendem Substantiv und Genetiv, so *quantum viae* in 206, 39 *quantum quouisque 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 quoi que quomque incidit in mentem* (Terenz Heaut. 484). Allerdings ist *quisque* allmählich auch orthotonischer Verwendung und der Stellung am Satzanfang fähig 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^b 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 Beteuerungspartikel, 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 *cunquē*: Ovid ex Ponto 4, 13, 6 *qualis enim cunquē 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 *quocunquē igitur te modo*, de officiis 3, 104 *jus igitur jurandum*. Verrius 3, 80 *quo tandem modo*. Besonders tmesisch 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^a 30 *transquē dato, endoque plo-[S. 417]rato*; Plautus Trinummus 833 *disquē tulissent*) und Präposition und Kasus trennt, letzteres zumal in der Bedeutung ‘wenn’: altlateinisch *absquē me esset, absquē te foret, absquē una hac foret, absquē eo esset* (Trinummus 832 mit freierer Wortfolge *absquē foret te*). Es ist kein Ruhm für die Latinisten, dass sie, nachdem von Schömann und Brugmann längst das Richtige gesagt ist, noch immer *absquē* als gewöhnliche Präposition ansehen mögen. Denn gesetzt auch, dass bei Cicero ad Atticum 1, 19, 1 wirklich *absquē 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 *absquē me esset* zunächst das Verb verlieren, so dass blosses *absquē me* als hypothetisches “ohne mich = wenn ich nicht gewesen wäre” gebraucht wurde: vergleiche Gellius 2, 21, 20 *absquē 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 Bezenbergers 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*. Unzähligemal 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 Orthotonumenon 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 $\gamma\epsilon$ und z. T. *quidem*, trotz seiner Enklise an beliebigen Stellen des Satzes stehen kann, wo eben das Wort steht, dessen Begriff als hinzugefügt zu bezeichnen ist. Aber wie $\gamma\epsilon$ 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 Tur sellinus 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 sum-ne 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 τοῖγάρ, 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 τοῖ 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) ² 526 *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^b 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. *synē*, 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 covoδία. Sin autem, erimus nos, qui solemus*. 13, 22, 4 *atque utinam tu quoque eodem die! sin quod —, multa enim utique postridie*. 16, 13^b 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 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 thatsächlichen 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 potes?* 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 rursus iube rescribi Phormio*. Phormio: *quodne ego discipsi porro illis, quibus debui?* “aber ich habe es ja meinen Gläubigern gutgeschrieben.”

Ein zweite Stelle, wo *sin* so steht, ist Persa 227: Paegnum: *ne me attrecta subigitatrix*. Sophoclidisca: *sin te amo?* Paegnum: *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 Ribbeckschen 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 folgenden Zeile überflüssig.

Den Beschluss mögen die Beteuerungs- und Verwunderungspartikel, *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 ecastor, 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 § 78² 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 pecas*. Terenz Andria 416 *per ecastor 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 Generalisierungstriebes 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 Syntax² 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 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 Wichtigem 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 durchgeföhrt hat, so auch die Hauptsatz-Stellung durchföhren 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. 441²) hat ausgeföhrt, 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] ‘unzählig’ 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 Laelius² 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 *feri*: 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 Ὀ—. 1, 388 Στρόνβ[ιχος ἀνέθηκε] Στρονβί[χου oder — χίδου Εὐωνυμέυς] (fast sichere Ergänzung!). 1, 399 Μηχανιώ[ν] ἀνέθηκεν ὁ γραμμα[τεύς]. 1, 400 [Πυ]θογέν[εια] ἀνέθηκε[ν Ἀγ]υρρίου ἐγ [Λ]ακιαδῶ[ν]. 1, 415 Αἰσχύλος ἀνέθη[κε] Πυθέου Παιανιεύ[ς]. 4¹, 373 f. Σίμων ἀ[νέθηκε] ὁ κναφεύς [ἔργων] δεκάτην. 4², 373, 90 Ὀνήσιμος μ' ἀνέθηκεν ἀπαρχὴν Ἀθηναίᾳ ὁ Σμικύθου υἱός. 4², 373, 198 [ἡ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκεν] Εὐμηλίδου γυνὴ Σφηττόθεν. 4², 373, 12 Ξενοκλῆς ἀνέθηκεν Σωκίνεω. 4², 373, 223 Χναϊάδης ἀνέθηκεν ὁ Παλ(λ)ηνεύς. 4², 373, 224 [Σ]μικρος ἀνέθ[ηκε —] ὁ κκυλοδεψ[ός]. 4², 373, 226 [ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκεν] ν Κηφισιεύς. Inschrift von der Akropolis Νεάρχος ἀν[έθηκε Νεάρχου υἱ]ὺς ἔργων ἀπαρχὴν. So nach Kabbadias Studnitzka, Jahrbuch II (1887), S. 135 ff.; Robert: Νεάρχος ἀν[έθηκε ὁ κεραμε]ύς —. CIA. 2, 1648 (augusteische Zeit!) Μετρότιμος ἀνέθηκεν Ὀῆθεν. — Inscript. graecae antiq. 48 Ἀριστομένης ἀ[ν]έθ[ηκε] Ἐλεξία τῶ Δάματρι τῶ Χθονίᾳ Ἐρμιονεύς. 96 (Tegea) [ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέ]θηκε(ν) φατυόχω. 486 (Milet) [Ἐρ]μησιάνᾳ ἤμας ἀνέθηκεν [ὁ —] — ἰδew τῶπόλλωνι. 512^a (Gela) Παντάρης μ' [S. 431] ἀνέθηκε Μενεκράτιος. 543 (achäisch) Κυνίκκος με ἀνέθηκε ὄρταμος 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' ἀνέθηκε ὁ Νάξιος ποιήσας. — Inschriften von Naukratis I No. 218 Φάνης με ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλων[ι τῶ Μι]λησίῳ ὁ Γλαύκου. II No. 722 Μυός μ' ἀνέθηκεν Ὀνομακρίτου. 767 [ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκεν Ἀφροδι]τή ὁ Φ[ιλά]μμ[ωνος]. 780 Φίλις μ' ἀνέθηκε οὐπικά[ρτε]ος τῆ Ἀφροδι[τή]. 784 Ἐρμοφάνης ἀνέθ[ηκεν] ὁ Ναυσιτέ[λευς]. 819 [Λ]άκρι[τό]ς μ' ἀνέ[θη]κε οὐρμο[θ]έμ[ιος] τῆφροδι[τή]. — Böotische Inschrift ed. Kretschmer Hermes XXVI 123 ff. Τιμασίφιλος μ' ἀνέθηκε τῶπόλλωνι τοῖ Πτωιεῦ 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 Ἐρμαγόρης μ' ἀνέθηκε ὁ Τ[ή]σιος τῶπόλλωνι. Pausanias 6, 10, 7 (5. Jahrhundert) Κλεοθένης μ' ἀνέθηκεν ὁ Πόντιος ἐξ Ἐπιδάμνου. Epigramm von Ery-

thrae Kaibel No. 769 (4. Jahrhundert) [-]-θήρης ἀνέθηκεν Ἀθηναίη πολιούχω παῖς Ζωίλου. Von Kalymna Kaibel No. 778 (id.?) Νικίας με ἀνέθηκε Ἀπόλλωνι υἱός Θρακυμήδεος. Vgl. auch CIA. 1, 403 [τόνδε Πυρῆς] ἀνέθηκε Πολυμνήστου φίλο[ς υἱός]. IGA. 98 (Arkadisch) Τέλλων τόνδ' ἀνέθηκε Δαήμονος ἀγλαός υἱός.

Mit lesbischem κάθθηκε: Inschriften von Naukratis II No. 788 [ὁ δεῖνα κάθθη]κε τῷ Ἀφροδίτῃ ὁ Μυτιλήναιος. 789 und 790 [ὁ δεῖνά με] κάθθηκε ὁ Μυτ[ιλήναιος]. Vgl. 807 [Ἀφροδίτῃ ὁ Μ—]. 814 [Ἀφροδίτῃ ὁ Κε—].

Mit ἐποίησε, ἐποίει: 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 ἐποίει ὁ Δεινίου, 4, 477^b [ὁ δεῖνα ἐποίησεν oder ἐποίει Π]άριος. 4², 373, 81 Κάλων ἐποίησεν Αἰ[γινήτης]. 4², 373, 95 [Ἀ]ρχερμος ἐποίησεν ὁ Χί[ος]. 4², 373, 220 Λεώβιος ἐποίησεν Πυρρητιάδης (oder Πυρρητιάδης). IGA. 42 (Argos) Ἄτωτος ἐποίησέ Ἀργεῖος κ' Ἀργειάδας Ἀγελάδα τ' Ἀργεῖου. 44 (id.) Πολύκλειτος ἐποίει Ἀργεῖος. 44^a (id.) — [ἐ]πο[ί]ησέ Ἀργεῖος. 47 (id.) Κρησίλας ἐποίησε Κυδωνιάτ[ας]. 165 Ὑπατόδωρος Ἀριστο[γείτων] ἐποίησεν Ἐθβαῖος. 348 Παιώνιος ἐποίησε Μενδαῖος. 498 Μίκων ἐποίησεν Ἀθηναῖος. Loewy Inschriften [S. 432] griechischer Bildhauer No. 44^a -ων ἐποίησε Ἐθβαῖος. 57 Ξ[ε]νο[—] ἐποίησεν Ἐλευ[θερέως?] No. 58. -ου [ἐ]ποίησεν [Σικ]ελιώτης. 96 Κλέων ἐποίησε Σικυώνιος. 103 [Δαί]δαλος ἐποίησε Πατροκλέ[ους]. 135^d (S. 388) [Σπ]ουδίας ἐποίησε Ἀθηναῖος. 277 Τιμόδαμος Τ[ιμοδάμου] ἐποίησε Ἀμπρα[κίω]της. 297 (Apotheose Homers) Ἀρχέλαος Ἀπολλωνίου ἐποίησε Πριηνεύς. 404 Νικάνδρος ἐποίησεν Ἄνδ[ριος]. Klein Griechische Vasen mit Meistersignaturen 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 Πτολίχος ἐποίησεν Αἰγινήτης, was auf eine Originalinschrift Πτόλιχος ἐποίησεν Αἰγινήτης schliessen lässt (vgl. Boeckh zu CIG. 25).

Auch in Versen: CIA. 4², 373, 105 Θηβάδης ἐ[ποίησε —]-νου παῖς τόδ' ἄγαλμα. Inschrift von der Akropolis ed. Studnitzka Jahrbuch II 1887 S. 135 ff. Ἀντήνωρ ἐπ[ό]ησεν ἴο Εὐμάρου τ[όδ' ἄγαλμα] IGA. 410 Ἀλξήνωρ ἐποίησεν ὁ Νάξιος, ἀλλ' ἐσίδεσθε. Auch 349 Εὐφρων ἐξεποίησ' οὐκ ἄδαῆς Πάριος.

Mit ἔγραψεν, ἔγραψεν, γράφει IGA. 482^c Τήλεφος μ' ἔγραψε 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^h 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^a (Opus?) Πρίκων ἔ[π]α[ξ]α Κο]λώτα. Kyprische In-
 schrift No. 73 Deecke Γιλίκα ἀμὲ κατέστασε ὁ Στασικρέτεος.

Mit εἰμί: IGA. 387 (Samos) [Π]όμπιός εἰμι τοῦ Δημοκρίνεος. 492 (Sigeum) io-
 nischer Text: Φανοδίκου εἰμι τούρμοκράτεος τοῦ Προκοννησίου; attischer Text:
 Φ. εἰμί τοῦ Ἐρμοκράτους τοῦ Π. 522 (Sizilien) Λονγηναῖός εἰμι δημόσιος. 528
 (Cumae) Δημοχάριδός εἰμι τοῦ —. 551 (Antipolis) Τέρπων εἰμι θεᾶς θεράπων σεμ-
 νῆς Ἀφροδίτης. Rhodische Inschrift bei Kirchhoff Studien zur Gesch. des griech.
 Alph.⁴ S. 49 Φιλτοῦς ἡμὶ τὰς καλᾶς ἀ κύλιξ ἀ ποικίλα. Kyprische Inschr. 1 Deecke
 Πρα-[S. 433]τοτίμω ἡμὶ τὰς Παφίας τῷ ἱερῆος. 16 D. τὰς θεῶ ἡμὶ τὰς Παφίας
 (ebenso 65. 66 Hoffm.). 23 D. Τιμοκύπρας ἡμὶ Τιμοδάμω. 78 H. Στασαγόρου ἡμὶ
 τῷ Στασάνδρω. 79 H. Τιμάνδρω ἡμὶ τῷ Ὀνασαγόρου. 88 H. Πνυτίλλας ἡμὶ τὰς
 Πνυταγόρου παιδός. 121 H. Διφειθέμιτός ἡμὶ τῷ βασιλῆος.

Daran schliesst sich IGA. 543 τὰς Ἦρας ἱαρός εἰμι τὰς ἐν πεδίῳ, wo ein Adjek-
 tiv verbunden mit εἶναι die Stelle des Verbums vertritt, und daran wieder die Bei-
 spiele, wo ein Adjektiv ohne εἶναι das Prädikat bildet: Klein Die griechischen Vas-
 sen mit Lieblingsinschriften S. 44 Λεάγρος 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, Ἄλκιμ[ή]δης καλὸς Αἰς-
 χυλίδου. S. 85 Ἀλκίμαχος καλὸς Ἐπιχάρου.

Ausserhalb der bisher aufgeführten Kategorien liegen CIA. 4², 337^a Κλεισθένης
 ἐχορήγει Ἀυτοκράτους. IGA. 110, 9 (Elis) ἐν τῆπιάροι κ' ἐνέχοιτο τοῖ ἵναυτ'
 ἐγρα(μ)μένοι. CIG. 7806 Ἀκαμαντὶς ἐνίκα φυλή.

Unter den aufgeführten Beispielen von ἀνέθηκε und κάθθηκε enthalten drei-
 zehnteils ausser Subjekt, Verbum und Apposition auch noch einen Dativ, drei (CIA.
 4¹, 373 f. IGA. 95. 543) einen substantivischen Akkusativ, 4², 373, 90 beides. Wäh-
 rend nun der blosser Akkusativ überall auf die Apposition folgt (vgl. auch CIA.
 4², 373, 105 Θηβάδης ἐ[π]όησε —]νου παῖς τόδ' ἄγαλμα, 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. 4²,
 373, 90 sind Akkusativ und Dativ zusammen zwischen Verbum und Apposition
 eingeschoben. — Diese Voranstellung der zum Verb gehörigen Kasus vor die Ap-
 position ist leicht verständlich; das Verb attrahiert seine Bestimmungen.

Aus diesem Typus erklärt sich die seltsame Wortfolge in CIA. 4², 373, 82, er-
 gänzt von Studnitzka Jahrbuch II 1887 S. 143: Κρίτων Ἀθηναῖα ὁ Σκύθου ἀν[έ]θηκε

καὶ ἐ]ποίη[ce] oder [ἐ]ποίηι. Der Verfasser der Inschrift hatte zunächst die kon-[S. 434]ventionelle Wortfolge Κρίτων ἀνέθηκεν Ἀθηναίᾳ ὁ Σκύθου vor Augen und liess hiernach, als er durch die Beifügung von καὶ ἐποίησε genötigt war, ἀνέθηκε hinter die Apposition zu rücken, doch den Dativ 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 gārgyaḥ, sá āikṣata prajāpatiḥ*. Ähnlich Cat. Br. 3, 1, 3, 4 *tá u hāitá ūcur devá 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 Verbuns an zweite Stelle, wenn der Satz mit *iti 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).

Translation

Zu S. 346, 351: IGA. 351 (lokrisch) [Π]εριφόνω [ἀνέθη]κέ με (oder -κ ἐμέ?)
Ἐνάγατος muss wegen des Zustandes der Inschrift ausser Betracht fallen; vgl.
Röhl z. d. St.

Zu S. 349: CIA. 4², 373, 103 Οὐνπορίωνος Φίλων με ἐποίησεν. — Inschrift von
Metapont Collitz 1643 Νικόμαχος μ' ἐπόει. — Vaseninschrift Klein S. 65 No. 48
nach Six Gazette archéol. 1888, 193 Νικοςθένης εμ (Six: μ' ἐ-)ποίησεν.

Zu S. 351: ἐμέ noch zweimal an zweiter Stelle in der alten Vaseninschrift bei
Pottier Gazette archéol. 1888, 168: ἐκεράμευσεν ἐμεὶ Οἰκωφέλης und Οἰκωφ(έ)λης
ἐμ' ἔγραψεν (geschrieben εγραφεσεν). 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
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 Fragm. 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 Wilhelm Kämpf (1886), 'De pronominum personalium usu et collocatione apud poëtas scaenicos Romanorum'. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 6. 265–267.
- Ahrens, Franz Heinrich Ludolf. 1843. *De dialecto dorica* (De graecae linguae dialectis 2). 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. An Professor Schneidewin (Fortsetzung). *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 6. 351–365.
- 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.
- Baiter, Johann Georg & Hermann Sauppe (eds.). 1850. *Oratores Attici: Scholia, fragmenta, indices*. 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.
- Behaghel, Otto. 1878. Die neuhochdeutschen Zwillingswörter. *Germania* 23. 257–292.
- Bekker, Immanuel. 1823. *Demosthenes* (Oratores attici 4, part 4). 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.

Translation

- Bergk, Theodor. 1866. *Pindari carmina continens*. 3rd edn. (Poetae lyrici Graeci 2). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Bergk, Theodor. 1882. *Poetas melicos continens*. 4th edn. (Poetae lyrici Graeci 3). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Blass, Friedrich. 1877. *Demosthenes* (Die attische Beredsamkeit 3, part 1). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Blass, Friedrich. 1880. *Demosthenes' Genossen und Gegner* (Die attische Beredsamkeit 3, part 2). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Blass, Friedrich. 1888. Die Inschriften von Korinthos, 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* (Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum 1). Berlin: Reimer.
- Boeckh, August. 1843. *Pars VII–XVI* (Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum 2). Berlin: Reimer.
- Böhtlingk, Otto von & Rudolph Roth. 1855–1875. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. 7 volumes. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Bonitz, Hermann. 1870. *Index aristotelicus*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Brix, Julius & Max Niemeyer. 1888. *Trinummus*. 4th edn. (Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus für den Schulgebrauch 1). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Brugman, Oscar. 1877. Absque. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 32. 485–487.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1890. *Wortbildungslehre* (Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen 2). Strasbourg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Brunck, Richard Franz Philipp. 1776. *Analecta veterum poetarum graecorum*. Argentori: Bibliopolium Academicum.
- Cauer, Paul. 1883. *Delectus inscriptionum Graecarum propter dialectum memorabilem*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- 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.
- 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.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1878. *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Çatapathabrähmana* (Syntaktische Forschungen 3). Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

- Delbrück, Berthold. 1888. *Altindische Syntax* (Syntaktische Forschungen 5). Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm. 1882. *Sophocles*. New York: Harper.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm & Friedrich Blass. 1887. *Orationes XVIII–XIX*. 4th edn. (Demosthenis Orationes 1, part 2). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm & Friedrich Blass. 1888. *Orationes XX–XL*. 4th edn. (Demosthenis Orationes 2). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm & Friedrich Blass. 1892. *Orationes XLI–LXI, prooemia, epistolae, index historicus*. 4th edn. (Demosthenis Orationes 3). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Dittenberger, Wilhelm. 1883. *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- 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-Brâhmana, according to the text of the Mâdhyandina school; part II, books III and IV*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Elmsley, Peter. 1812. Review of Jeremiah Markland (1811), ‘Euripides Supplices’ &c. *The Quarterly Review* 7. 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.
- Foucart, Paul-François. 1889. Inscriptions de l’acropole. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 13. 156–178.
- Fritzsche, Hermann & Eduard Hiller. 1890. *Theokrits Gedichte*. 3rd edn. Leipzig: Teubner.
- 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.
- Gehring, August. 1891. *Index Homericus*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Gerhard, Eduard (ed.). 1847. *Heroenbilder, meistens homerisch* (Auserlesene griechische Vasenbilder, hauptsächlich etruskischen Fundorts 3). Berlin: Reimer.
- 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. 1–196.

Translation

- 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.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Graux, Charles. 1886. *Textes grecs* (Oeuvres de Charles Graux 2). Paris: Vieweg.
- Hand, Ferdinand Gotthelf. 1845. *Tursellinus, seu de particulis latinis commentarii*. Vol. 4. Leipzig: Weidmann.
- Haussoullier, Bernard. 1882. Inscriptions de Delphes. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 6. 445–466.
- Hecker, Alphons. 1852. *Commentationis criticae de Anthologia graeca*. Vol. 1. 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. *Opuscula*. Vol. 4. Leipzig: Fleischer.
- Herwerden, Henrik van. 1878. Observationes criticae, I. In Homerum, II. In Xenophontis 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.
- 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.
- Homolle, Théophile. 1888. Sur une base de statue portant une signature d'artiste et décorée de reliefs. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 12. 463–479.
- Jacobi, Hermann. 1886. *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Mâhârâshtrî zur Einführung in das Studium vom Prâkrîṭ*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. & Joel P. Brereton. 2014. *The Rigveda*. 1st edn. (South Asia Research 1). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jamot, Paul. 1889. Inscriptions d'Argolide. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 13. 185–200.
- Jebb, Richard C. 1889. *The Oedipus Coloneus*. 2nd edn. (Sophocles: the plays and fragments 2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kabbadias, Panagiōtēs. 1886. Anaskaphai en tē akropolei. *Archaiologike Ephemeris* 1886. 73–82.
- Kaibel, Georg. 1878. *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Kaibel, Georg & Albert Lebègue. 1890. *Inscriptiones graecae siciliae et italiae*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Kämpf, Wilhelm. 1886. De pronominum personalium usu et collocatione apud poētas scaenicos Romanorum. *Berliner Studien für classische Philologie und Archæologie* 3. 1–48.
- 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.
- 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.
- Kirchhoff, Adolf. 1887. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Alphabets*. 4th edn. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.
- 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* (Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes 4). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Kock, Theodor. 1880. *Antiquae comoediae fragmenta* (Comicorum atticorum fragmenta 1). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Kock, Theodor. 1884. *Novae comoediae fragmenta, pars I* (Comicorum atticorum fragmenta 2). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Kock, Theodor. 1888. *Novae comoediae fragmenta, pars II* (Comicorum atticorum fragmenta 3). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Köhler, Ulrich. 1877. *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora* (Corpus inscriptionum atticarum (CIA) 2). Part 1. Berlin: Reimer.
- Köhler, Ulrich. 1888. *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora* (Corpus inscriptionum atticarum (CIA) 3). Part 3: *dedicationes, tituli honorarii, statuarum subscriptiones, tituli artificum, tituli sacri, inscriptiones ararum, oracula, similia, tituli sepulcrales*. Berlin: Reimer.

Translation

- 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. 325–472.
- Krüger, Karl Wilhelm. 1871. *Ueber die Dialekte: Poetisch-dialektische Syntax*. 5th edn. (Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen 2, part 2). Berlin: K. W. Krüger.
- 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.
- Kurschat, Friedrich. 1876. *Grammatik der littauischen Sprache*. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Langen, Peter. 1857. De execrandi formulis Plautinis Terentianisque observatio grammatica. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 12. 426–433.
- Lassen, Christian. 1837. *Institutiones linguæ practicæ*. London: Black & Armstrong.
- Littré, Émile. 1839. *Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*. Vol. 1. Paris: Baillière.
- Lobeck, Christian August. 1829. *Aglaophamus, sive, De theologiae mysticæ 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. (Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus für den Schulgebrauch 3). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Lorenz, August Otto Friedrich. 1883b. *Mostellaria*. 2nd edn. (Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus für den Schulgebrauch 2). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Madvig, Johan Nikolai. 1839. *M. Tullii Ciceronis, De finibus bonorum et malorum libri quinque*. Lund: Impensis Librariae Gyldendaliansae.
- Markland, Jeremiah. 1811. *Euripidis Supplices mulieres, Iphigenia in Aulide, et in Tauris*. Oxford: Cooke & Parker.
- Mätzner, Eduard. 1838. *Antiphontis, Orationes XV*. Berlin: Mittler.
- 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. *Lexicon Caesarianum*. Vol. 2. Berlin: Weber.
- Meyer, Gustav. 1885. Auszüge aus Zeitschriften, Programmen und Dissertationen. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 5. 942–947.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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* (Homeric carmina 1). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Nauck, Augustus. 1877. *Ilias* (Homeric carmina 2). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Nauck, Augustus. 1889. *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Neue, Christian Friedrich & Carl Wagener. 1892. *Adjectiva, Numeralia, Pronomina, Adverbia, Präpositionen, Konjunktionen, Interjektionen*. 3rd edn. (Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache 2). Leipzig: O. R. Reisland.
- 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.
- Paul, Wilhelm Theodor. 1889. *C. Iulii Commentarii de bello civili*. Vienna: F. Tempsky.

Translation

- Peppmüller, Rudolf. 1890. Review of August Fick (1887), 'Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen Fassung und Sprachform wiederhergestellt'. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 10. 557–564.
- 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. 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.
- 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. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Ritschl, Friedrich Wilhelm. 1852. *T. Macci Plauti Mostellaria*. Leipzig: H. B. König.
- Ritschl, Friedrich Wilhelm & Georg Götz. 1884. *T. Macci Plauti Mercator*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Robert, C. 1887. Eine attische Künstlerinschrift aus kleisthenischer Zeit. *Hermes* 22. 129–135.
- Röhl, Hermann. 1882. *Inscriptiones graecae antiquissimae praeter atticas in attica repertas*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Schanz, Martin. 1882. *Phaedrus* (Platonis Opera quae feruntur omnia 5 part 2). Leipzig: Tauchnitz.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger (ed.). 1991. *The Bisitun inscriptions of Darius the Great: Old Persian text* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum I.1.1). London: SOAS.
- Schneider, Otto. 1873. *Fragmenta a Bentleio collecta et explicata, ab aliis aucta: Accedunt commentationes et indices tres* (Callimachea 2). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Franz. 1864. *Verborum collocatio Homerica quas habeat leges et qua utatur libertate*. Berlin: Calvary.
- Schöll, Fritz. 1890. *T. Macci Plauti Casina*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Schömann, Georg Friedrich. 1871. *Miscellanea* (Opuscula academica 4). Berlin: Weidmann.

- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1887. Review of Karl Krumbacher (1886), 'Ein irrationaler Spirant im Griechischen'. *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie* 8. 179–182.
- Schulze, Wilhelm. 1890. Review of Richard Meister (1889), 'Die griechischen Dialekte auf Grundlage von Ahrens' Werk "De graecae linguae dialectis", vol. 2. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 10. (Translator's note: Review is distributed over issues 44–47), 1469–1475.
- Seidler, J. V. A. 1829. Über einige Fragmente der Sappho und des Alcäus. *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.
- 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. 193–210.
- 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.
- Stein, Heinrich. 1866. *Buch V und VI*. 2nd edn. (Herodotos 3). Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Stein, Heinrich. 1883. *Einleitung und Übersicht des Dialektes; Buch I*. 5th edn. (Herodotos 1, book 1). 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.
- Thielmann, Philipp. 1889. Abscondo. *Archiv für lateinische lexicographie und grammatik* 6. 151–167.
- Thumb, Albert. 1887. Die pronomina $\mu\nu$ und $\nu\nu$. *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie (Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik)* 135. 631–648.
- 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.

Translation

- 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.
- 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 ἢ λογγίνου περί 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.
- 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 Paul Cauer (1890), 'Homeri Ilias'. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 11. (Translator's note: Review is distributed over issues 1–2), 37–1475.
- Weber, Philipp. 1884. *Von Homer bis zur attischen Prosa* (Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze 1). Volume II of Schanz (ed.), *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Würzburg.
- Weber, Philipp. 1885. *Die attische Prosa und Schlussergebnisse* (Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze 2). Würzburg.
- Weil, Henri. 1886. *Androtion, Aristocrate, Timocrate, Aristogiton* (Les plaidoyers politiques de Démosthène 2). 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* (Euripides Herakles 2). Berlin: Weidmann.
- 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.
Ziener, Hermann. 1885. Auszüge aus Zeitschriften, Programmen und Dissertationen. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 5. 1371.

Name index

- Abraham, Wilhelm, 314
Adams, James N., 15, 16
Ahrens, Franz Heinrich Ludolf, 56,
144
Ahrens, Heinrich Ludolf, 59
Alboiu, Gabriela, 13
Anderson, Stephen R., 6, 12–14
Andersson, Samuel, 19
Aronoff, Mark, 10
Aziz Hanna, Patrizia Noel, 6, 7
- Bach, Emmon, 7
Bach, Joseph, 291
Baiter, Johann Georg, 76
Bartholomae, Christian, 312
Bayer, Josef, 13
Behaghel, Otto, 6, 326
Bekker, Immanuel, 59, 119, 224
Benfey, Theodor, 4, 34
Bergaigne, Abel, 52, 136, 326
Bergk, Theodor, 56, 58, 59, 97, 103,
116, 143, 164
Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo, 13
Beukema, Frits, 12
Blass, Friedrich, 66, 79, 85, 146, 148,
159, 161, 202, 211, 213
Blomfield, Charles James, 115
Boeckh, August, 147, 330, 332
Bögel, Tina, 11, 13, 19
Bonitz, Hermann, 205
Borer, Hagit, 12
Börjars, Kersti, 14
- Bošković, Željko, 12, 13
Brereton, Joel P., 34, 49
Brix, Julius, 315, 319, 323
Brugman, Oscar, 311
Brugmann, Karl, 3, 6, 119, 302, 311
Brunck, Richard Franz Philipp, 56
- Campbell, Lyle, 6, 8
Carruba, Onofrio, 8
Cauer, Paul, 145
Chomsky, Noam, 8, 12
Christ, Wilhelm von, 116
Clackson, James, 15
Collinge, N. E., 3, 5, 15
Curtius, Georg, 4
- Danckaert, Lieven, 19
Deecke, Wilhelm, 64, 87, 88, 132, 333
Dehé, Nicole, 11
Delbrück, Berthold, 5, 9, 10, 119, 277,
278, 325, 336
Den Dikken, Marcel, 12
Despić, Miloje, 13
Dewey, Tonya Kim, 9
Diesing, Molly, 13
Dillon, Myles, 9
Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila, 12
Dindorf, Wilhelm, 79, 202, 213, 264
Dittenberger, Wilhelm, 146
Dover, Kenneth J., 9, 16
Dümmler, Ferdinand, 63, 64, 67, 177,
333

Name index

- Ebeling, Heinrich, 166
Eberhard, Eugen, 153, 156
Eggeling, Julius, 336
Eichner, Heiner, 8, 10
Elmsley, Peter, 226, 267
Erdmann, Oskar, 326
- Fontana, Josep, 9
Fortis, Jean-Michel, 7
Foucart, Paul-François, 62
Fourquet, Jean, 17
Fraenkel, Eduard, 6, 9, 15
Frâncu, Constantin, 13
Franks, Steven, 12
Freitag, Constantin, 13
Fritzsche, Hermann, 154
- Gardner, Ernest A., 63, 64
Garrett, Andrew, 8
Gerhard, Eduard, 333
Gerlach, Birgit, 12
Getty, Michael, 17
Givón, Talmy, 13
Goldstein, David M., 5, 16, 17
Gomperz, Theodor, 106, 187, 217, 254
Gopal, Deepthi, 19
Görenz, Johann August, 328
Götz, Georg, 292, 306
Grassmann, Hermann, 3, 34
Graux, Charles, 58, 59
Grijzenhout, Janet, 12
Grimm, Jacob, 3
Güneş, Güliz, 11
- Haase, Friedrich, 282
Hale, Ken, 8, 12
Hale, Mark, 7, 9, 15, 16
Halpern, Aaron L., 6, 8, 11, 12
Hand, Ferdinand Gotthelf, 314
- Harizanov, Boris, 13
Harris, Alice C., 6, 8, 12
Haspelmath, Martin, 10
Haussoullier, Bernard, 331
Hecker, Alphons, 71
Heimreich, Christian, 264
Helland, Hans Petter, 12
Henzen, Wilhelm, 304
Hermann, Gottfried, 153, 154, 174,
175, 180, 186
Herwerden, Henrik van, 40, 185
Hill, Virginia, 13
Hiller, Eduard, 59, 101, 154, 171
Hinterhölzl, Roland, 17
Hock, Hans Henrich, 10, 15
Hoffmann, Otto, 47, 63, 64, 66, 131,
159–162, 334, 336
Hoffner, Harry A., 8
Holtzmann, Adolf, 3
Homolle, Théophile, 63, 331
Hopper, Paul J., 9
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav V., 8, 10
- Jacobi, Hermann, 278
Jamison, Stephanie W., 34, 49
Jamot, Paul, 63
Janse, Mark, 8
Jebb, Richard C., 234
Joseph, Brian D., 12
- Kabbadias, Panagiōtēs, 331
Kaibel, Georg, 63, 65, 71, 72, 87, 331
Kaiser, Georg, 9, 17
Kaisse, Ellen M., 8, 11
Kämpf, Wilhelm, 291, 314
Kayne, Richard S., 12
Kellerhoff, Eduard, 291, 295, 312, 313,
323

- Kent, Roland G., 278, 281
Kenyon, Frederic George, 80, 88, 193, 195
Keydana, Götz, 15, 16
King, Tracy Holloway, 12
Kiparsky, Paul, 14, 17
Kirchhoff, Adolf, 333
Klavans, Judith L., 8, 11, 12
Klein, Wilhelm, 62, 66, 67, 71–73, 332–334, 337, 338
Kluge, Friedrich, 282
Kock, Theodor, 85, 102, 125, 143, 276
Köhler, Ulrich, 66, 185, 336
Kretschmer, Paul, 62, 172, 331
Krisch, Thomas, 5, 8, 9, 15
Krüger, Karl Wilhelm, 116, 133, 172
Kruschwitz, Peter, 15
Kuhn, Hans, 9, 17
Kühner, Raphael, 136, 138
Kurschat, Friedrich, 328
Kuryłowicz, Jerzy, 10, 14

Langen, Peter, 292, 295
Langslow, David, 4, 5, 7
Lassen, Christian, 52
Lebègue, Albert, 63, 72
Ledgeway, Adam, 12, 15
Legate, Julie Anne, 12
Lehmann, Christian, 14
Leskien, August, 4
Liddell, Henry George, 52, 53
Littré, Émile, 270
Lobeck, Christian August, 104, 167
Lobel, Edgar, 19, 58–62, 79, 119
Loewy, Emanuel, 66, 332, 336
Lorenz, August Otto Friedrich, 147, 154, 164, 166, 315, 323
Los, Bettelou, 19
Lowe, John, 15

Luís, Ana R., 12, 13
Luraghi, Sylvia, 8

Madvig, Johan Nikolai, 282, 328
Markland, Jeremiah, 183
Marouzeau, Jules, 9
Marshall, Marlene H. B., 9, 16
Matthews, Peter H., 10
Mätzner, Eduard, 176
Meillet, Antoine, 14
Meineke, August, 45, 46, 154
Meister, Richard C., 47, 131, 169, 330, 333
Meisterhans, Konrad, 136
Merguet, Hugo, 304
Meusel, Heinrich, 304
Meyer, Gustav, 52
Meyer, Robin, 19
Migdalski, Krzysztof, 13
Mines, Rachel, 9
Mitrović, Moreno, 19
Momma, Haruko, 9
Mommsen, Theodor, 304
Monro, David B., 35, 55, 150, 179
Mullach, Friedrich Wilhelm August, 164
Müller, Carl Friedrich Wilhelm, 282, 284, 290, 301, 306, 324, 328, 329
Müller, Lucian, 322, 323

Nauck, Augustus, 158, 159, 177, 235, 268
Nespor, Marina, 8, 11
Neue, Christian Friedrich, 284
Nevis, Joel A., 8, 12
Nida, Eugene A., 10
Niemeyer, Max, 315, 319, 323
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 4

Name index

- Nilsson, Elof, 8
Norde, Muriel, 14
- Oldenberg, Hermann, 49
Orelli, Johann Kaspar von, 283
Osthoff, Hermann, 3, 6
- Page, Denys, 19, 58–62, 79, 119
Pancheva, Roumyana, 13
Panini, 34
Paul, Wilhelm Theodor, 291
Payne, John, 13
Peppmüller, Rudolf, 138
Petrova, Svetlana, 17
Plank, Frans, 14
Poppo, Ernest Friedrich, 152, 269
Pottier, Edmond, 72, 337
Praun, J., 312
Prellwitz, Walther, 47, 146, 159, 160
Progovac, Ljiljana, 12
Pullum, Geoffrey, 11
- Radanović-Kocić, Vesna, 12
Reinach, Salomon, 62
Reisig, Karl Christian, 282
Ribbeck, Otto, 315, 316, 318
Ries, John, 5, 6, 9, 10, 17, 326
Ritschl, Friedrich Wilhelm, 292, 293,
306
Rivero, María-Luisa, 12
Rix, Helmut, 8, 10
Rizzi, Luigi, 8, 12
Robert, C., 331
Roberts, Ian, 12
Röhl, Hermann, 62–64, 337, 338
Ruijgh, Cornelis J., 6, 9
- Salvesen, Christine Meklenborg, 12
Sauppe, Hermann, 76
Schanz, Martin, 273
- Scheppers, Frank, 15
Schiering, René, 14
Schlerath, Bernfried, 4
Schmalz, Joseph Herrmann, 282, 315,
316, 326
Schmitt, Rüdiger, 4, 278
Schneider, Otto, 115
Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Franz, 153
Schöll, Fritz, 295
Schömann, Georg Friedrich, 311
Schuchardt, Hugo, 52
Schulze, Wilhelm, 330
Schütze, Carson T., 12
Schwyzer, Eduard, 4
Scott, Robert, 52, 53
Seidler, J. V. A., 59
Selivanov, S., 51
Selkirk, Elizabeth, 8, 11
Seyffert, August Oskar, 295, 328
Seyffert, Moritz, 282, 284, 290, 306,
324, 328, 329
- Six, Jean, 337
Smith, Peter W., 11, 12
Spencer, Andrew, 12, 13
Spengel, Andreas, 313
Spiegel, Friedrich, 278, 281
Stahl, Johann Matthias, 152, 269
Steele, Susan M., 10
Stein, Heinrich, 38, 135
Stolz, Friedrich, 282, 315, 316, 326
Studniczka, Franz, 62, 331, 332, 335
- Taylor, Ann, 16, 17
Thielmann, Philipp, 52
Thumb, Albert, 33, 34, 47–49, 51, 278
Thurneysen, Rudolf, 9, 17
Tobler, Adolf, 52
Tomanetz, Karl, 326
Tomić, Olga Mišeška, 12

- Vahlen, Johannes, 59, 234, 276, 316
Velsen, Adolf von, 186
Vendryes, Joseph, 9
Verner, Karl, 3
Vogel, Irene, 8, 11
- Wackernagel, Jacob, 5, 10, 15, 17, 51,
59, 119
Wagener, Carl, 284
Walkden, George, 17
Wanner, Dieter, 9
Watkins, Calvert, 8–10
Weber, Philipp, 180, 183, 185
Weil, Henri, 59, 213
Weissenborn, Wilhelm, 324
Werfer, F., 234
Wichert, Georg, 324
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich
von, 85, 95, 120
Wolfe, Sam, 9, 17
Wölfflin, Eduard, 311
Wundt, Wilhelm, 7
- Zec, Draga, 13
Zeuss, Johann Kaspar, 282
Ziemer, Hermann, 52
Zwicky, Arnold M., 6, 8, 10–13

Language index

- Anatolian, 9
- Avestan, 277, 281
- Bulgarian, Old, 8
- Celtic, 5, 6, 9, 282, 328
 - Insular, 9
- English, 4, 18
- English, Old, 9, 326
- Estonian, 14
- French, 12
 - Old French, 9
- German, 5, 7, 10, 18, 227, 281, 314, 326, 327, 337
 - Old High, 316, 326
- Germanic, 5, 6, 9, 10, 17, 281–282, 326–328
 - Common, 326
- Gothic, 5, 6, 173, 282, 316
- Greek, 4, 5, 9, 19, 33–277, 281, 282, 294, 302–304, 306, 315, 316, 325, 328, 330
 - Aeolic, 58, 159
 - Ancient, 4, 15, 16, 330–336
 - Archaic, 52–73, 136
 - Attic, 47, 56, 57, 62, 65, 66, 73, 74, 115, 132, 134, 135, 143, 168, 172, 177, 183, 210, 302, 333, 336
 - Classical, 17, 36–38, 73–136, 138–144, 150–152, 167–168, 210, 229
 - Cypriot, 66, 87, 131, 159, 168, 333
 - Doric, 47–49, 56, 115, 144, 148, 154
 - Homeric, 6, 33–36, 52–73, 95, 98, 120–121, 127–128, 133–134, 137–138, 143, 144, 149–150, 153–159, 165–167, 172–174, 177–180, 234, 238
 - Ionic, 33, 45, 52, 73, 119, 177, 333
 - post-Classical, 191
 - Thessalonian, 33, 48
- Hittite, 8
- Indo-Iranian, 5, 15, 16, 119, 277–281, 312, 337
- Latin, 5, 6, 9, 15, 19, 72, 172, 282–330
 - Old Latin, 311
- Lithuanian, 8, 327, 328
- Norse, Old, 9, 326
- Oscan, 306
- Persian, Old, 19, 278–281
- Polish, 8
- Prakrit, 51
- Pre-Greek, 49
- Proto-Germanic, 9

Language index

Proto-Indo-European, 6, 9, 10, 316,
327

Romance, 9, 17

Romanian, 13

Sanskrit, 4–6, 9, 15, 16, 19, 33, 34, 48,
49, 51, 172, 277, 281, 302, 313,
316, 325–327, 336–337

Saxon, Old, 9, 326

Setu, 14

Slavic, 8, 12

Slavic, South, 12

Swedish, 14

 Early Modern, 14

 Old, 14

Tocharian, 8

Umbrian, 306

Uto-Aztecan, 10

Võru, 14

Warlpiri, 12

Subject index

- ablative, 299
accusative, 33, 38, 51, 52, 56, 66, 85,
115, 116, 279, 291, 335
adjectives, 60, 105, 135, 148, 163, 166,
211, 280, 282, 334
adverbs, 33, 35, 149, 211, 227, 234, 287,
306
analogy, 14
anastrophe, 34, 306
apposition, 330, 335, 336
Basel, 4
cola, 15
configurationality, 12
copula, 15, 328
dative, 36, 38, 62, 119, 278, 292, 335
degrammaticalization, 14
doubling, 197, 223–224, 260–277, 281
elegiac poets, 37, 38, 56, 164
ellipsis, 67, 190, 200, 219, 287, 320
emendation, 55, 56, 66, 67, 115, 147,
158, 161, 292, 294
enclitics, 5–12, 15, 16, 35, 38, 41, 43,
51–119, 133, 136, 137, 152,
153, 165, 166, 172–174, 177,
178, 180, 210, 230, 234, 238,
249, 277–280, 282, 286, 302,
303, 305–307, 309, 313, 314,
316, 323–330
enclitoids, 173
endoclitics, 11, 12
future, 155, 159, 172, 291
genitive, 14, 40, 41, 43, 86, 103, 114,
116, 119–136, 148, 160, 278,
307, 309, 335, 336
grammaticalization, 13–14
Göttingen, 4
hypotaxis, 327
hypotheticals, 228, 230, 234, 311
indefinites, 136–152, 193, 282, 302,
304–310
indicative (mood), 157, 177, 180, 229
infixes, 34, 282
inscriptions, 15, 47, 51, 57, 62–
73, 87–88, 144–149, 159–164,
168–169, 185–186, 278–281,
299, 304, 307–309, 330–333,
335–337
interrogatives, 6, 16, 48, 154, 156, 185,
189, 205, 212, 276, 303, 309,
314, 315, 319, 320, 322, 323,
328
Kuhn's laws, 9, 17
Lectures on Syntax, 4, 5, 7
Lexical-Functional Grammar, 11
mentalism, 7

Subject index

- mesoclitics, 11
Minimalist Program, 11, 15
morphological theory, 13
- negation, 35, 38, 53, 156, 178, 209, 212,
234, 291, 314–316
Neogrammarians, 3, 4, 6, 7
nominative, 86, 233, 278, 279, 281,
303, 330, 335
- oblique (case), 282, 302
optative, 156, 157, 159–161, 177, 180,
183, 186, 190, 200, 203, 225–
229
Optimality Theory, 7
- parataxis, 315
participles, 37, 100, 152, 153, 191, 193,
230
particles, 6, 9, 16, 33–35, 43, 47, 48, 53,
57, 73, 96, 102, 111, 113, 116,
118, 130, 150, 152, 153, 159,
161, 163, 165, 166, 168, 169,
172–277, 279–282, 284, 291,
294, 297, 301, 310–325, 328
personal pronouns, 15, 16, 58, 136,
277, 281–304, 313
poetry, 9, 33, 36–38, 45, 49, 56, 58,
62–65, 68, 71, 73, 74, 79, 115,
119, 132, 134, 135, 144, 153,
159, 164, 173, 183, 210, 286,
326
postpositive particles, 111, 172–277
prepositions, 34, 43, 48, 49, 60, 113,
116, 131, 166, 173, 174, 282,
287, 309, 311
preterite, 34, 156, 200, 203, 225
Principles and Parameters, 8, 12–13
proclitics, 9–12
prodiorthosis, 85
pronouns, 6, 9, 15, 16, 33, 35, 36,
48, 52–119, 126–128, 136–
153, 222–224, 234, 277–310,
313, 314, 328, 336
prose, 15, 62, 71, 148, 159, 173, 183, 277,
278, 282, 326
- relative clauses, 205–225, 278, 305,
315, 328
relative pronouns, 183, 205, 211, 216,
223, 224, 278, 294, 315, 328
request formula, 287–289
- semantic change, 14, 173, 238, 312,
316, 318
special clitics, 11, 13
subjunctive, 99, 154, 157, 159, 175, 180,
185, 219, 229, 260, 291
subordination, 7, 10, 14, 17, 34–36, 48,
95, 152–154, 157, 159, 172–
230, 247, 249, 281, 303, 315,
320, 326, 327
syntax-prosody interface, 8, 10–13
- tnesis, 34, 49, 116–119, 143, 163, 169,
173, 250, 277, 282, 284, 309–
312, 324, 329
- universals, 7, 10, 12
- verb position, 5, 7, 9–10, 13, 17, 230–
234, 278, 281, 326–337
verb-second, 7, 9–10, 13, 17, 326–327,
337
vocative, 54, 61, 97, 120, 138, 238, 302,
325–327

On a law of Indo-European word order

Jacob Wackernagel's 1892 essay on second-position enclitics in the Indo-European languages has long been hailed as groundbreaking in both historical and theoretical linguistics. Until now, however, it has only been available in the original German. This book provides a full translation into English, including glossed and translated examples from several early Indo-European languages and varieties and full bibliographical details of the references drawn upon, as well as a new edition of the German original. It should be of interest to researchers in historical and Indo-European linguistics and in general linguistics working on the interfaces between morphology, prosody and syntax.

ISBN 978-3-96110-271-6



9 783961 102716