

SYNTAX OF THE MOODS AND TENSES OF THE GREEK VERB

by Goodwin

Goodwin's technical linguistic study of Greek verb moods and tenses, providing a detailed grammatical analysis of the indicative, subjunctive, optative, and imperative moods and their various constructions. An important reference work for students of classical and biblical Greek.

7 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 1. General View of the Moods.
2. 2. The Tenses
3. 3. The Particle ■v.
4. 4. Use of the Moods
5. 5. The Infinitive.
6. 6. The Participle.
7. 7. Verbal Adjectives in -τ■ος and -τ■οv

1. General View of the Moods.

Chapter I General View of the Moods.

[*] 1. The Mood of a verb shows the manner in which the assertion of the verb is made. The Greek verb has four moods, properly so called,—the indicative, the subjunctive, the optative, and the imperative. The infinitive, which is a verbal noun, and the participle and the verbal in -τμός, which are verbal adjectives, are so closely connected with the moods in many constructions, that they are discussed with them in Syntax. The four proper moods, as opposed to the infinitive, are sometimes called the finite moods. The subjunctive, optative, imperative, and infinitive, as opposed to the indicative, are sometimes called the dependent moods.

I. Indicative.

[*] 2. The indicative, in its most primitive use, makes a simple, absolute assertion, or asks a question which includes or concerns such an assertion. e.g. Γράφει, he is writing; ἔγραφεν, he was writing; ἔγραψεν, he wrote; γράψει, he will write. Γράφει;, is he writing? ἔγραψατε;, did you write? γράψετε;, will you write? τί ἔγραψεν;, what did he write?

[*] 3. The indicative may also express

(a) A dependent statement (or quotation) of such an absolute assertion or question. e.g., Λέγει ἔτι γράφει, he says that he is writing (he says γράφω); λέγει ἔτι γράψει, he says that he will write (he says γράψω); ῥωτᾷ τί ἔγραψαμεν, he asks what we wrote; ῥωτᾷ εἰ ἔγραψα, he asks whether I wrote.

(b) A distinct statement of an object aimed at or feared. e.g., πειλεῖται πῶστοι γενέσεται, he takes care that this shall be done (339); φοβοῦμεθα μὴ μφοτρῶν μαρτυκάμεν, we fear that we have missed both (369, 2).

(c) A distinct supposition of an absolute statement, that is, a supposition that such a statement is, was, or will be true. E.g., Ἐἴ γράφει, if he is writing; εἴ ἔγραψεν, if he wrote; εἴ γέγραφε, if he has written; εἴ γράψει, if he shall write or if he is to write. What is supposed in each case could be expressed by γράφει, ἔγραψεν, γέγραφε, or γράψει.

[*] 4. The past tenses of the indicative may, further, express a supposition that some statement either had been or were now true, while it is implied that really it was not or is not true. E.g.

Ἐἴ ἔγραψα, if I had written; εἴ ἔγραφον, if I were now writing or if I had been writing; the context indicating that really I did not write or am not writing (410). These expressions originally always referred to the past, as they do in Homer.

[*] 5. Out of the form of unreal supposition (4) were developed after Homer the use of the past tenses of the indicative with εἴθε or εἴ γάρ in wishes (732); and also the Attic construction of the past tenses of the indicative to express an unaccomplished purpose (333), where there is an assimilation of the final clause to a preceding indicative. E.g. Ἐἴ γάρ τοι ποήσῃ, O if I had

only done this! Εἴθε τοῦτο εἴχες, O if you only had this!

Εἴθε τὸ πῦρ ἴσθαι, εἴνα μὲν τοῦτο πάθω, would that I had then perished, that I might not have suffered this. For the indicative with ἴν or κἴ, the potential indicative, see 243.

II. Subjunctive.

[*] 6.

(a) The subjunctive, in its simplest and apparently most primitive use, seen in Homer (284), expresses futurity, like the future indicative, and has οἴ for its negative. E.g.,

“Οὐ γὰρ πρωτοῖσιν ἴδον ἴν’ ἴρασοῖδ’ ἴδωμαι,” “for never did I see such men nor shall I ever see them,” Il. i. 262 ;

“καὶ ποτὶ τις ἐπιείσιν,” “and some one will some time say,” Il. vi. 459.

(b)

Though this primitive use disappears in the later language, the subjunctive still remains closely related in sense to the future indicative, and in most of its constructions can be interchanged with it.

[*] 7. The subjunctive in questions of appeal as to the future (287) has, even in Homer, developed the idea of propriety or expediency. E.g. “Ἄθιμ’ ἴνω εἴθ’ ἴω;” “shall I remain here or run?” Il. x. 62. So “πῶς ἴω;” “whither shall I go?” Od. xv. 509. But the future indicative can be used in the same sense; as τῆδ’ ἄδρα μὲν; μητ’ ἴρ’ ἴ φονεῖσόμεν; “ what are we to do? shall we slay our mother?” EUR. El. 967. See 68.)

[*] 8.

(a) In exhortations and in prohibitions with μῆ (250, 259) the subjunctive has an imperative force, and is always future; as in ἴωμεν, let us go; μῆ θαυμάσητε, do not wonder. The future indicative occasionally occurs in prohibitions with μῆ (70).

(b) The subjunctive with μῆ, especially in Homer, may express a future object of fear with a desire to avert it; as in μῆ νῆας ἴλωσι, may they not seize the ships (as I fear they will). (See 261.) From such expressions combined with verbs of fearing arose the dependent use of μῆ with the subjunctive expressing a future object of fear; as φοβοῦμαι μῆ πῆληται, I fear that he may perish.

[*] 9. In the constructions with οἴ μῆ (294) the subjunctive and the future indicative are used, without apparent distinction, in a future sense; as οἴ μῆ γῆνηται and οἴ μῆ γενῆσεται, it will not happen.

[*] 10. The subjunctive may express a future purpose or a future object of care or exertion. E.g. ἴρχεται ἴπρωστοῦτο ἴδ’, he comes that he may see this (317); ἴπιμελεῖται ἴπρωστοῦτο γῆνηται (or γενῆσεται), he takes care that this shall be done (339). In clauses of purpose the future indicative is sometimes used (324), and in the construction of 339 it became the regular Attic form.

[*] 11. In conditional clauses the subjunctive expresses either a future supposition (444), or a general supposition which is indefinite (never strictly present) in its time (462).

(a) In the former it supposes such a future case as the Homeric subjunctive (6) states; as εἴπῃ τις, if one shall say (the thing supposed being εἴπῃ τις, one will say); here the future indicative may be used in essentially the same sense (447). In the general condition it supposes an event to occur at any time, as we say if any one ever goes or whoever goes, with an apodosis expressing repetition or a general truth; as κλεψῆτις κλέψῃ (or κλεψῆτις κλέψῃ, κολάζεται, if any one steals (or whoever steals), he is always punished.

(b) The subjunctive in general suppositions is the only subjunctive which does not refer to future time, and here the future indicative can never be used. In most other languages (as in English and generally in Latin), and sometimes in Greek, such a condition is expressed by the present indicative, like an ordinary present supposition; but the Greek, in its desire to avoid a form denoting present time, generally fell into one which it uses elsewhere only for future time. The construction, however, appears in Homer imperfectly established, except in relative clauses (468): this indicates that it does not belong to the primitive uses of the subjunctive. (See 17.) For the Homeric subjunctive with κῆ or ῖν in independent sentences, which does not differ perceptibly in meaning from the future with κῆ or ῖν, see 201, 1.

III. Optative.

[*] 12. The optative is commonly a less distinct and direct form of expression than the subjunctive, imperative, or indicative, in constructions of the same general character as those in which these moods are used.

[*] 13. This is seen especially in independent sentences, where the optative either expresses a wish or exhortation, or is used (regularly with ῖν or κῆ) in a potential sense.

Thus οἴμεν, may we go, corresponds as a weaker form to ὠμεν, let us go. Corresponding to ἐξέλθῃ τις δῶτω, let some one go out and see, we have “ἐξέλθῃ τις δῶι,” “may some one go out and see,” Od. xxiv. 491 . λῴτο ῖν, he would take or he might take, corresponds to the Homeric λήται or λήτακε, he will take or he may take (201, 1).

We find in Homer a few optatives expressing concession or permission, which have a neutral sense and can hardly be classed as either potential or wishing. See Il. iv. 17, “εἴ δ᾽ ἄπωστ᾽ ἔπεισι φέλονκα δ᾽ ἔπειλοιο, τοῖ μνοκῴτο πῆλις Πριμοιο νακτος, ἄτις δ᾽ ἔργῃν ἔλνῃν Μενῆλαος ἔγοιτο”, where we may translate the apodosis either let the city still be a habitation and let M. carry away Helen, or the city may still be a habitation and M. may carry away Helen. In iii. 72 we have γυνακῆ τεοκάδ᾽ ἔγσθω, and in iii. 255 τῆ δ᾽ κενικῆσαντι γυνῆ κακῆ κτῆμαθῆ ποιτο, where ἔγσθω and ποιτῆκε refer to essentially the same thing with ἔγοιτο in iv. 19. Following Il. iii. 255(above) we have οἱ δ᾽ ἄλλοιναοἴμεν Τροῆν, τοῖ δ᾽ νῶνται, i. e. the rest of us may remain dwellers in Troy, while they will return to Greece. From such neutral future expressions were probably developed the two distinct uses of the optative. In its hortatory sense as a form of wishing, the optative was distinguished by the use of μῆ as a negative; while in its potential sense it had οἶ as its negative (as in οἶ μῆν γῆρτικακῆτερον ἄλλοπῆθοιμι, for really I can suffer nothing worse, Il. xix. 321), and it was soon further marked by the addition of κῆ or ῖν. (See Appendix I.)

[*] 14. In dependent clauses expressing purpose or the object of exertion or of fear, the optative is never an original form; but it always represents a dependent subjunctive or future indicative (8, b; 10) in the changed relation in which either of them is placed when its leading verb is changed from present or future to past time.

We represent this change in English by a change from may to might, or from shall or will to should or would; as ῥχεται να δ, he comes that he may see, λθεν να δοι, he came that he might see; πιμελεται πωςτοτογενσεται, he takes care that this shall be done, πιμελετο πωςτοτογενσοιτο, he took care that this should be done; φοβεταμ τοτοπθ, he fears that he may suffer this; φοβθημ τοτοπθιοι, he feared that he might suffer this. Here the original subjunctive or future indicative (especially the latter) is very often used in place of the optative.

[*] 15. In all forms of indirect discourse the same principle (14) holds, that the optative after past tenses represents (in a changed relation) an indicative or a subjunctive of the direct form, which original mood is always used after present and future tenses, and may be retained after past tenses (667, 1).

Here again we see what the change is, for we represent it by our change from is to was, have to had, shall and will to should and would, etc.; as λγει τι ληθς στιν, he says that it is true; λεξεν τι ληθςεη (or στιν), he said that it was true; λγει τιγρψει, he says that he will write; λεξεν τιγρψοι (or γρψει), he said that he would write. So οκοδατ επω, I know not what I shall say; οκ δειντεποιμι (or επω), I knew not what I should say.

[*] 16. In future conditions the optative expresses the supposition in a weakened future form, as compared with the stronger future of the subjunctive and the future indicative.

Compare εν λθω, if I (shall) go (444), with ε λθοιμι, if I should go (455). Often the form of the leading sentence (the apodosis) decides whether a given supposition shall be expressed by a subjunctive or by an optative; thus in DEM. iv. 11 we have νοτςτιπθ, if anything happens (shall happen) to him (Philip), depending on ποισεται; and in the next sentence, referring to precisely the same contingency, we have ε τιπθιοι, depending on two optatives with εν.

[*] 17. The only remaining form of dependent optative is that found in past general suppositions, as ε τικλψειεν (or κκλψειεν), κολζετο, if ever any one stole (or whoever stole), he was (always) punished (462; 531).

Here the optative after a past tense represents an original subjunctive after a present tense (11), differing in this from the optative in future conditions (16), which is in an original construction. The late development of this optative appears from its almost total absence in protasis with εν in Homer (468), where the corresponding subjunctive in protasis is also infrequent. It may therefore be disregarded in considering the primitive uses of the optative. (See 11 b. For a more full discussion of the relations of the optative to the other moods, see Appendix I.

IV. Imperative.

[*] 18. The imperative expresses a command, exhortation, entreaty, or prohibition (250 and 259). E.g. Φεγε, begone! λθτω, let him come. Δςμοιτοτο, give me this. Μ ποει δικα, do not do what is unjust.

2. The Tenses

Chapter I General View of the Moods.

[*] 1. The Mood of a verb shows the manner in which the assertion of the verb is made. The Greek verb has four moods, properly so called,—the indicative, the subjunctive, the optative, and the imperative. The infinitive, which is a verbal noun, and the participle and the verbal in -τμός, which are verbal adjectives, are so closely connected with the moods in many constructions, that they are discussed with them in Syntax. The four proper moods, as opposed to the infinitive, are sometimes called the finite moods. The subjunctive, optative, imperative, and infinitive, as opposed to the indicative, are sometimes called the dependent moods.

I. Indicative.

[*] 2. The indicative, in its most primitive use, makes a simple, absolute assertion, or asks a question which includes or concerns such an assertion. e.g. Γράφει, he is writing; ἔγραφεν, he was writing; ἔγραψεν, he wrote; γράψει, he will write. Γράφει;, is he writing? ἔγραψατε;, did you write? γράψετε;, will you write? τί ἔγραψεν;, what did he write?

[*] 3. The indicative may also express

(a) A dependent statement (or quotation) of such an absolute assertion or question. e.g., Λέγει ὅτι γράφει, he says that he is writing (he says γράφω); λέγει ὅτι γράψει, he says that he will write (he says γράψω); ῥωτᾷ τί ἔγραψαμεν, he asks what we wrote; ῥωτᾷ εἰ ἔγραψα, he asks whether I wrote.

(b) A distinct statement of an object aimed at or feared. e.g., ἐπιμελεῖται ὅπως τοιοῦτον γένηται, he takes care that this shall be done (339); φοβοῦμεθα ἅμφοτερον μάρτυκαμεν, we fear that we have missed both (369, 2).

(c) A distinct supposition of an absolute statement, that is, a supposition that such a statement is, was, or will be true. E.g., Ἐάν γράφει, if he is writing; εἰ ἔγραψεν, if he wrote; εἰ γέγραφε, if he has written; εἰ γράψει, if he shall write or if he is to write. What is supposed in each case could be expressed by γράφει, ἔγραψεν, γέγραφε, or γράψει.

[*] 4. The past tenses of the indicative may, further, express a supposition that some statement either had been or were now true, while it is implied that really it was not or is not true. E.g.

Ἐάν ἔγραψα, if I had written; εἰ ἔγραφον, if I were now writing or if I had been writing; the context indicating that really I did not write or am not writing (410). These expressions originally always referred to the past, as they do in Homer.

[*] 5. Out of the form of unreal supposition (4) were developed after Homer the use of the past tenses of the indicative with εἴθε or εἰ γάρ in wishes (732); and also the Attic construction of the past tenses of the indicative to express an unaccomplished purpose (333), where there is an assimilation of the final clause to a preceding indicative. E.g. Ἐάν γάρ τοιοῦτο ποίησα, O if I had

only done this! Εἴθε τοῦτο εἴχες, O if you only had this!

Εἴθε τὸ πῦρ ἴσθαι, εἴνα μὲν τοῦτο πάθω, would that I had then perished, that I might not have suffered this. For the indicative with ἴν or κἴ, the potential indicative, see 243.

II. Subjunctive.

[*] 6.

(a) The subjunctive, in its simplest and apparently most primitive use, seen in Homer (284), expresses futurity, like the future indicative, and has οἴ for its negative. E.g.,

“Οὐ γὰρ πρῶτοῦς ἴδον ἴν’ ῥαζοῖδ’ ἴδωμαι,” “for never did I see such men nor shall I ever see them,” Il. i. 262 ;

“καὶ ποτὶ τις ἐπιείν,” “and some one will some time say,” Il. vi. 459.

(b)

Though this primitive use disappears in the later language, the subjunctive still remains closely related in sense to the future indicative, and in most of its constructions can be interchanged with it.

[*] 7. The subjunctive in questions of appeal as to the future (287) has, even in Homer, developed the idea of propriety or expediency. E.g. “Ἄθιμ’ ἴνω εἴθ’ ἴω;” “shall I remain here or run?” Il. x. 62. So “πῶς ἴω;” “whither shall I go?” Od. xv. 509. But the future indicative can be used in the same sense; as τῆδ’ ἄδρ’ ἴμεν; μητ’ ῥ’ ἴ φονεῖσόμεν; “ what are we to do? shall we slay our mother?” EUR. El. 967. See 68.)

[*] 8.

(a) In exhortations and in prohibitions with μῖ (250, 259) the subjunctive has an imperative force, and is always future; as in ἴωμεν, let us go; μῖ θαυμῆσῃτε, do not wonder. The future indicative occasionally occurs in prohibitions with μῖ (70).

(b) The subjunctive with μῖ, especially in Homer, may express a future object of fear with a desire to avert it; as in μῖ νῆας ἴλωσι, may they not seize the ships (as I fear they will). (See 261.) From such expressions combined with verbs of fearing arose the dependent use of μῖ with the subjunctive expressing a future object of fear; as φοβοῦμαι μῖ πῆληται, I fear that he may perish.

[*] 9. In the constructions with οἴ μῖ (294) the subjunctive and the future indicative are used, without apparent distinction, in a future sense; as οἴ μῖ γῆνηται and οἴ μῖ γενῆσεται, it will not happen.

[*] 10. The subjunctive may express a future purpose or a future object of care or exertion. E.g. ἴρχεται ἴπρωστοῦτο ἴδ’, he comes that he may see this (317); ἴπιμελεῖται ἴπρωστοῦτο γῆνηται (or γενῆσεται), he takes care that this shall be done (339). In clauses of purpose the future indicative is sometimes used (324), and in the construction of 339 it became the regular Attic form.

[*] 11. In conditional clauses the subjunctive expresses either a future supposition (444), or a general supposition which is indefinite (never strictly present) in its time (462).

(a) In the former it supposes such a future case as the Homeric subjunctive (6) states; as εἴπῃ τις, if one shall say (the thing supposed being εἴπῃ τις, one will say); here the future indicative may be used in essentially the same sense (447). In the general condition it supposes an event to occur at any time, as we say if any one ever goes or whoever goes, with an apodosis expressing repetition or a general truth; as κλεψῆται (or κλεψῆται, κολάζεται, if any one steals (or whoever steals), he is always punished.

(b) The subjunctive in general suppositions is the only subjunctive which does not refer to future time, and here the future indicative can never be used. In most other languages (as in English and generally in Latin), and sometimes in Greek, such a condition is expressed by the present indicative, like an ordinary present supposition; but the Greek, in its desire to avoid a form denoting present time, generally fell into one which it uses elsewhere only for future time. The construction, however, appears in Homer imperfectly established, except in relative clauses (468): this indicates that it does not belong to the primitive uses of the subjunctive. (See 17.) For the Homeric subjunctive with κῆ or ῆν in independent sentences, which does not differ perceptibly in meaning from the future with κῆ or ῆν, see 201, 1.

III. Optative.

[*] 12. The optative is commonly a less distinct and direct form of expression than the subjunctive, imperative, or indicative, in constructions of the same general character as those in which these moods are used.

[*] 13. This is seen especially in independent sentences, where the optative either expresses a wish or exhortation, or is used (regularly with ῆν or κῆ) in a potential sense.

Thus οἰμεν, may we go, corresponds as a weaker form to ὠμεν, let us go. Corresponding to ἐξέλθῃ τις δῶτω, let some one go out and see, we have “ἐξέλθῃ τις δῶι,” “may some one go out and see,” Od. xxiv. 491 . λῆιτο ῆν, he would take or he might take, corresponds to the Homeric λήται or λήτακε, he will take or he may take (201, 1).

We find in Homer a few optatives expressing concession or permission, which have a neutral sense and can hardly be classed as either potential or wishing. See Il. iv. 17, “εἴ δ᾽ ἄπωστ᾽ ἔπεισι φέλονκα δ᾽ ἔπειλοιο, τοῖμνο κῆιτο πῆλιξ Πριμοιο νακτος, ἄτις δ᾽ ἔργῃν ἔλῃνην Μενῆλαος ἔγοιτο”, where we may translate the apodosis either let the city still be a habitation and let M. carry away Helen, or the city may still be a habitation and M. may carry away Helen. In iii. 72 we have γυναῖκ᾽ ἔτεο καδ᾽ ἔγῃσθω, and in iii. 255 τῆ δ᾽ κενικῆσαντι γυνῆ κακῆ κτῆμαθῆ ποιτο, where ἔγῃσθω and ποιτῆκε refer to essentially the same thing with ἔγοιτο in iv. 19. Following Il. iii. 255(above) we have οἱ δ᾽ ἄλλοινα οἰμεν Τροῆν, τοῖ δ᾽ νῆονται, i. e. the rest of us may remain dwellers in Troy, while they will return to Greece. From such neutral future expressions were probably developed the two distinct uses of the optative. In its hortatory sense as a form of wishing, the optative was distinguished by the use of μῆ as a negative; while in its potential sense it had οἶ as its negative (as in οἶ μῆν γῆρτικα κῆτερον ἔλλοπιθοιμι, for really I can suffer nothing worse, Il. xix. 321), and it was soon further marked by the addition of κῆ or ῆν. (See Appendix I.)

[*] 14. In dependent clauses expressing purpose or the object of exertion or of fear, the optative is never an original form; but it always represents a dependent subjunctive or future indicative (8, b; 10) in the changed relation in which either of them is placed when its leading verb is changed from present or future to past time.

We represent this change in English by a change from may to might, or from shall or will to should or would; as ῥχεται να δ, he comes that he may see, λθεν να δοι, he came that he might see; πιμελεται πωςτοτογενσεται, he takes care that this shall be done, πιμελετο πωςτοτογενσοιτο, he took care that this should be done; φοβεταμ τοτοπθ, he fears that he may suffer this; φοβθημ τοτοπθ, he feared that he might suffer this. Here the original subjunctive or future indicative (especially the latter) is very often used in place of the optative.

[*] 15. In all forms of indirect discourse the same principle (14) holds, that the optative after past tenses represents (in a changed relation) an indicative or a subjunctive of the direct form, which original mood is always used after present and future tenses, and may be retained after past tenses (667, 1).

Here again we see what the change is, for we represent it by our change from is to was, have to had, shall and will to should and would, etc.; as λγει τι ληθς στιν, he says that it is true; λεξεν τι ληθςεη (or στιν), he said that it was true; λγει τιγρψει, he says that he will write; λεξεν τιγρψοι (or γρψει), he said that he would write. So οκοδατ επω, I know not what I shall say; οκ δειντεποιμι (or επω), I knew not what I should say.

[*] 16. In future conditions the optative expresses the supposition in a weakened future form, as compared with the stronger future of the subjunctive and the future indicative.

Compare εν λθω, if I (shall) go (444), with ε λθοιμι, if I should go (455). Often the form of the leading sentence (the apodosis) decides whether a given supposition shall be expressed by a subjunctive or by an optative; thus in DEM. iv. 11 we have νοτςτιπθ, if anything happens (shall happen) to him (Philip), depending on ποισεται; and in the next sentence, referring to precisely the same contingency, we have ε τιπθ, depending on two optatives with εν.

[*] 17. The only remaining form of dependent optative is that found in past general suppositions, as ε τικλψειεν (or κκλψειεν), κολζετο, if ever any one stole (or whoever stole), he was (always) punished (462; 531).

Here the optative after a past tense represents an original subjunctive after a present tense (11), differing in this from the optative in future conditions (16), which is in an original construction. The late development of this optative appears from its almost total absence in protasis with εν in Homer (468), where the corresponding subjunctive in protasis is also infrequent. It may therefore be disregarded in considering the primitive uses of the optative. (See 11 b. For a more full discussion of the relations of the optative to the other moods, see Appendix I.

IV. Imperative.

[*] 18. The imperative expresses a command, exhortation, entreaty, or prohibition (250 and 259). E.g. Φεγε, begone! λθτω, let him come. Δςμοιτοτο, give me this. Μ ποει δικα, do not do what is unjust.

Examples of a different class (without κ or ν) are obviously corrupt, and have now almost disappeared from our texts. One of the last relics, Leg. 712E, “γ δ οτω ν ν ξαφνης ν ρωτηθες ντως περ επον, οκ χω επεν” , is now simply emended by reading νερωτηθες.

[*] 196. The future indicative is often used with κ or ν by the early poets, especially Homer. The addition of ν seems to make the future more contingent than that tense naturally is, sometimes giving it a force approaching that of the optative with ν. E.g. λλ θ, γ δ κ τοι Χαρτων μαν πλοτερων δσω, πνιμεναι κα σν κεκλθαι κοιτιν, I will give you one of the younger Graces, etc. Il. xiv. 267. Κα κ τις δ ρει Τρων περηνορεντων, and some one will (or may) thus speak. Il. iv. 176. δ κεν κεχολσεται ν κεν κωμαι, “and he may be angry to whom I come.” Il. i. 139. “Ε δ γε, τος ν γν πιψομαι: ο δ πιθσθων” Il. ix. 167. Παρ μοι γε κα λλοι, ο κ με τιμσουσι, others, who will honour me. Il. i. 174. “Ε δ δυσες λθοι κα κοιτς πατρδα γαν, αψ κε σν παιδ βας ποτσεται νδρν” Od. xvii. 539. Here ποτσεται κε, which may be aorist subjunctive (201, 1), is used nearly in the sense of the optative, corresponding to the optatives in the protasis.

Κ is much more common with the future than ν.

[*] 197. The use of ν with the future indicative in Attic Greek is absolutely denied by many critics, and the more careful revision of the texts has greatly diminished the number of examples cited in support of it. Still, in several passages, even of the best prose, we must either emend the text against the Mss., or admit the construction as a rare exception. E.g. Αγυπτους δ οχ ρ πο δυνμει συμμχ χρσμενοι μλλον ν κολσσεσθε τς νν σν μο οσης. XEN. An. ii. 5. 13 φη ον τν ρωτμενον επεν, οχ κει, φναι, οδ ν ξει δερο, he said that the one who was asked replied, “He hasn’t come, and he won’t come this way.” PLAT. Rep. 615D. (The only other reading is ξοι. The colloquial style here makes ν less objectionable; see SOPH. Ant. 390, quoted in 208.) φη λγων πρς μςς, ε διαφευξομην, δη ν μν ο υες πντες παντπασι διαφθαρσονται. Id. Ap. 29C. Κν τ τι φνιον ψομαι αμα (so the Mss.). EUR. El. 484.

See 208 and 216, on the future infinitive and participle with ν.

[*] 198. The most common use of ν with the indicative is with the secondary tenses, generally the imperfect and aorist, in the apodosis of an unfulfilled condition (410) or in a potential sense (243).

[*] 199. The imperfect and aorist indicative are sometimes used with ν in an iterative sense (162), which construction must not be confounded with that just mentioned (198).

Subjunctive and Optative with ν.

[*] 200. In Attic Greek ν is regularly used with the subjunctive in protasis and in conditional relative sentences, and sometimes in final clauses with ς and πως, being always closely joined with the particle or the relative; but never in independent sentences. See 325, 381, and 522.

[*] 201. 1. In epic poetry, when the independent subjunctive has nearly the sense of the future indicative (284), it sometimes takes κ or ν. This forms a future potential expression, nearly equivalent to the future indicative with κ or ν, and sometimes approaching the optative with κ or ν. E.g. “Ε δ κε μ δσιν, γ δ κεν ατς λωμαι,” “and if he does not give her up, I

will take her myself." II. i. 324 ; see also i. 137.

See 285 and 452. For the variety of nearly equivalent future potential forms which the Homeric language presents, reduced to one in Attic Greek, see 235.

2. The epic language has κ or ν with the subjunctive in the constructions of 192, 2; but its use of κ or ν in conditions is less strict, and that with final particles is more free, than the Attic use of ν.

See 325-328; 450-454; 468-471; 538-541.

[*] 202. The optative with ν forms the apodosis of the less vivid future condition (like the English form with would or should), or has a potential sense. E.g. Ε το το ποισειεν, θλιος ν εη, if he should do this, he would be wretched. δως ν ρομην ατν, I should like to ask him. (See 233 and 455.) For construction of ν or κ with ε or the final particles and the optative, see 460; and 329, 330, 349, 350, 351.

[*] 203. As the future optative came into common use after the future indicative with ν (196) was nearly extinct, it was never used with ν.

Infinitive with ν.

[*] 204. The infinitive can be used with ν in all cases in which a finite verb would have ν if it stood in its place. This is found chiefly in indirect discourse, in which each tense of the infinitive with ν represents the corresponding tenses of the indicative or optative with ν in the direct form. The context must decide whether the indicative or optative is represented in each case.

[*] 205. Present.) The present infinitive, which represents also the imperfect (119), when used with ν, may be equivalent either to the imperfect indicative with ν or to the present optative with ν. It can represent no other form, as no other form of these tenses has ν joined with the verb in a finite mood. E.g. Φησν ατος λευθρους ν εναι, ε το το πραξαν, he says that they would (now) be free if they had done this (εναι ν representing σαν ν). Φησν ατος λευθρους ν εναι, ε το το πρξιαν, he says that they would (hereafter) be free if they should do this (εναι ν representing εησαν ν). Οεσθε γρ τν πατρα οκ ν φυλττειν κα τν τιμν λαμβνεν τν ξλων; do you think he would not have taken care and have received the pay for the timber? DEM. xlix. 35. (Here the direct discourse would be φλαττειν ν κα λμβανεν.) Μαρτυρ χρντο, μ ν τος γε σοψφους κοντας, ε μ τι δκουν ος πεσαν, ξυστρατεειν, they used us as an argument, that people who had an equal vote with themselves (like us) would not be serving with them against their will, unless those whom they attacked were guilty of some wrong. THUC. iii. 11. Ομαι γρ ν οκ χαρστως μοι χειν, for I think it would not be a thankless labour (οκ ν χοι). XEN. An. ii. 3, 18.

[*] 206. Perfect.) The perfect infinitive, which represents also the pluperfect (123), when used with ν, may be equivalent either to the pluperfect indicative with ν or to the perfect optative with ν. E.g. Ε μ τς ρετς πρ ατν κενας ο Μαραθνι κα Σαλαμνι παρσχοντο, . . . πντα ταθ π τν βαρβρων ν αλωκναι (sc. φσειεν ν τις), if those at Marathon and Salamis had not exhibited those deeds of valour in their behalf, any one would say that all these would have been captured by the barbarians. DEM. xix. 312. (Here αλωκναι ν represents αλκεσαν ν.) "λλ οκ ν γομαι ατος δκην ξαν δεδωκναι, ε

■κροασ■μενοι α■τ■ν καταψηφ■σαισθε,” “but I do not believe they would (then) have suffered sufficient punishment, if you after hearing them should condemn them.” LYS. xxvii. 9. (Here the protasis in the optative shows that δεδωκ■ναι ■ν represents δεδωκ■τες ■ν ε■εν (103); but if the protasis were ε■ καταψηφ■σαισθε, if you had condemned them, δεδωκ■ναι ■ν would represent ■δεδ■κεσαν ■ν, they would have suffered.) See also, in xxvii. 8, ο■κ ■ν ■πολωλ■ναι, ■λλ■ δ■κην δεδωκ■ναι, representing perfect optatives with ■ν. ■νδραποδ■δεις ■ν δικα■ως κεκλ■σθαι (■γε■το). XEN. Mem. i. 1, 16. (Here κεκλ■σθαι ■ν represents κεκλημ■νοι ■ν ε■εν.) These constructions are of course rare, as are the forms of the finite moods here represented.

[*] 207. ■Aorist.) The aorist infinitive with ■ν may be equivalent either to the aorist indicative with ■ν or to the aorist optative with ■ν. E.g. Ο■κ ■ν ■γε■σθ■ α■τ■ν κ■ν ■πιδραμε■ν; do you not believe that (if this had been so) he would even have run thither? i.e. ο■κ ■ν ■π■δραμεν; DEM. xxvii. 56. ■νευ δ■ σεισμο■ ο■κ ■ν μοι δοκε■ τ■ τοιο■το ξυμβ■ναι γεν■σθαι (ο■κ ■ν ξυμβ■ναι representing ο■κ ■ν ξυν■βη), but unless there had been an earthquake, it does not seem to me that such a thing could by any chance have happened. THUC. iii. 89. Το■ς ■θηνα■ους ■λπιζεν ■σως ■ν ■πεξελθε■ν κα■ τ■ν γ■ν ο■κ ■ν περιδε■ν τμηθ■ναι (i.e. ■σως ■ν ■πεξ■λθοιεν κα■ ο■κ ■ν περι■δοιεν). Id. ii. 20. Ο■δ■ ■ν κρατ■σαι α■το■ς τ■ς γ■ς ■γο■μαι (i.e. κρατ■σειαν ■ν). Id. vi. 37.

[*] 208. ■Future.) The future infinitive with ■ν can be equivalent only to the Homeric construction of the future indicative with ■ν. But as ■ν is not found in Homer with the future infinitive, this construction rests chiefly on the authority of passages in Attic writers, and is subject to the same doubts and suspicions as the future indicative with ■ν in those writers. (See 197.) Unless we exterminate the latter, there can be no objection to this as its representative. In the following passages it is still retained on the best MS. authority.

Νομ■ζοντες, ε■ τα■την πρ■την λ■βοιεν, ■■δ■ως ■ν σφ■σι τ■λλα προσχωρ■σειν. THUC. ii. 80. (Here the direct discourse would regularly have had either the future indicative without ■ν, or the aorist optative with ■ν.) The same may be said of THUC. v. 82, νομ■ζων μ■γιστον ■ν σφ■ς ■φελ■σειν (where one MS. reads by correction ■φελ■σαι). See also THUC. vi. 66; viii. 25 and 71; and PLAT. Crit. 53D ; PLAT. Crat. 391A. “Σχολ■ ποθ■ ■ξειν δε■ρ■ ■ν ■ξη■χουν ■γ■,” “I declared that I should be very slow to come hither again.” SOPH. Ant. 390. (Here the colloquial style may account for ■ξειν ■ν, as for ■ξει ■ν in PLAT. Rep. 615 D, unless we take ■ν with ■ξη■χουν. See 197.) In PIND. Ol. i. 108, we have ε■ δ■ μ■ ταχ■ λ■ποι, ■τι γλυκυτ■ραν κεν ■λπομαι σ■ν ■ρματι θο■ κλε■ξειν. As the future optative is never used with ■ν (203), this can never be represented by the future infinitive with ■ν.

[*] 209. The infinitive with ■ν is rare in the early poets, occurring but once in Homer, Il. ix. 684 (quoted under 683), and three times in Pindar, Pyth. viii. 20 (present), Pyth. iii. 110 (aorist), and Ol. i. 108 (future, quoted in 208).

[*] 210. The infinitive with ■ν sometimes represents an iterative imperfect or aorist indicative with ■ν (162). This must be carefully distinguished from the potential use. E.g. ■κο■ω Λακεδαιμον■ους τ■τε ■μβαλ■ντας ■ν κα■ κακ■σαντας τ■ν χ■ραν ■ναχωρε■ν ■π■ ο■κου π■λιν, I hear that the Lacedaemonians at that time, after invading and ravaging the country, used to return home again. DEM. ix. 48. (Here ■ναχωρε■ν ■ν represents ■νεχ■ρουν ■ν in its iterative sense, they used to return.) Φασ■ μ■ν γ■ρ α■τ■ν ■ρεπτ■μενον τ■ τ■ν ■χ■ντων ■νρων ο■κ

■ν ■ξελεθε■ν ■π■ τ■ς σιπ■ης: το■ς δ■ ■ντιβολε■ν ■ν ■μο■ως, they say that, when he was feeding on men of wealth, he never would get away from the meal-tub; and they all alike used to implore him (ο■κ ■ν ■ξε■λθεν, ο■ δ■ ■ντιβ■λουν ■ν). AR. Eq. 1295.

[*] 211. The infinitive with ■ν, in the cases already mentioned, stands in indirect discourse after a verb of saying or thinking. Sometimes, however, it is found in other constructions, where the present or aorist infinitive (without ■ν) would be expected. In such cases there is an approach to the usage of indirect discourse, so far at least that the infinitive with ■ν has the force of the corresponding tense of the indicative or optative. E.g. Τ■ δ■ ■ντ■ς ο■τω■ς ■κα■ετο, ■στε ■διστα ■ν ■ς ■δωρ ψυχρ■ν σφ■ς α■το■ς ■■πτειν, so that they would most gladly have thrown themselves into cold water (■■πτειν ■ν here being equivalent to ■ρριπτον ■ν). THUC. ii. 49. Μι■ς τρ■φει πρ■ς νυκτ■ς, ■στε μ■τ■ ■μ■ μ■τ■ ■λλον, ■στις φ■ς ρ■, βλ■ψαι ποτ■ ■ν, so that you could harm (βλ■ψειας ■ν) neither me nor any other who beholds the light. OSOPH. .T. 374. So SOPH. Tr. 669. ■φθασαν παρελθ■ντες τ■ν τ■ν ■θηνα■ων ο■κοδομ■αν, ■στε μηκ■τι μ■τε α■το■ κωλ■εσθαι ■π■ α■τ■ν, ■κε■νους τε κα■ παντ■πασιν ■πεστερηκ■ναι, ε■ κα■ κρατο■εν, μ■ ■ν ■τι σφ■ς ■ποτειχ■σαι, so as to be no longer themselves obstructed by them, and so as to have deprived them absolutely of the power of ever again walling them in, even if they should be victorious. THUC. vii. 6. “■σομεν τ■ν ν■κτα π■σαν: ■στ■ ■σως βουλ■σεται κ■ν ■ν Α■γ■πτ■ τυχε■ν ■ν μ■λλον ■ κρ■ναι κακ■ς,” “we will rain all night long, so that perhaps he will wish to have the luck to be (that he might by chance find himself) in Egypt rather than to judge unfairly.” AR. Nub. 1130. (Here τυχε■ν ■ν follows βο■λομαι like the future infinitive in THUC. vi. 57: see 113.) We have ■λπ■ζω followed by the infinitive and ■ν in THUC. vii. 61, τ■ τ■ς τ■χη■ς κ■ν μεθ■ ■μ■ν ■λπ■σαντες στ■ναι, hoping that fortune may take sides with us (στα■η ■ν). See also SOPH. El. 1482, ■λλ■ μοι π■ρες κ■ν σμικρ■ν ε■πε■ν, but permit me at least to say a little (that I might say even a little, ε■ποιμι ■ν).

See the corresponding use of the future infinitive in similar expressions, where there is the same approach to indirect discourse (113).

[*] 212. Even the infinitive with the article occasionally takes ■ν, as in ANT. v. 8, το■το ■μ■ς διδ■ζω, ο■ τ■ φε■γειν ■ν τ■ πλ■θος τ■ ■μ■τερον, this I will teach you, not because I would avoid your people. In SOPH. Ant. 236, “τ■ς ■λπ■δος τ■ μ■ παθε■ν ■ν ■λλο”, the hope that I could not suffer anything else, the construction is practically that of indirect discourse (794).

Participle with ■ν.

[*] 213. When the participle is used with ■ν, each tense represents the corresponding tenses of the indicative or optative with ■ν. The participle with ■ν is not, like the infinitive with ■ν, found chiefly in indirect discourse; but ■ν is more frequently added to an attributive or a circumstantial participle (822) to give it a potential force equivalent to that of the indicative or optative with ■ν. The participle with ■ν is not found in Homer or Pindar.

[*] 214. ■Present.) The present participle (like the present infinitive) with ■ν represents the imperfect indicative or the present optative with ■ν. E.g. Ο■δα α■το■ς ■λευθ■ρους ■ν ■ντας, ε■ το■το ■πραξαν, I know they would (now) be free, if they had done this. Ο■δα α■το■ς ■λευθ■ρους ■ν ■ντας, ε■ το■το πρ■ξειαν, I know they would (hereafter) be free, if they should do this. (In the former ■ντας ■ν represents ■σαν ■ν, in the latter ε■ησαν ■ν.) Τ■ν

λαμβάνοντων δίκην ντες ν δικαως (i.e. μεν ν), whereas we should justly be among those who inflict punishment. DEM. I.vii. 3. περ σχε μ κατ πλεις ατν πιπλόντα τν Πελοποννησον πορθεν, δυντων ν ντων (μν) πιβοηθεν, when you would have been unable to bring aid (δνατοι ν τε). THUC. i. 73. Πλλν ν χων τερ επεν περ ατς παραλεπω, although I might be able to say many other things about it, I omit them. DEM. xviii. 258. π παντς ν φρων λγου δικαου μηχνημα ποικλον (i.e. ς ν φροις), thou who wouldst derive, etc. SOPH. O.C. 761.

[*] 215. Aorist.) The aorist participle with ν represents the aorist indicative or the aorist optative with ν. E.g. Οτε ντα οτε ν γενμενα λογοποιουσιν, they relate things which are not real, and which never could happen (i.e. οκ ν γνοιτο). THUC. vi. 38. φ μν ο γεγονς οδ οδα ε γενμενον ν, (a thing) which has not occurred in our day, and I doubt whether it ever could occur (γνοιτο ν). PLAT. Rep. 414 C. λλλν δως ν φεθες, ε κα μετρως τι τοτων ποησε, προελετο ποθανεν, whereas he might easily have been acquitted, etc. XEN. Mem. iv. 4, 4. Κα ε πχθησθε σπερ μες, ε σμεν μ ν σσον μς λυπηρος γενομνους τος ξυμμοχοις, κα νναγκασθντας ν ρχειν, κ.τ.λ. (i.e. οκ ν γνεσθε, κα νναγκσθητε ν), if you had become odious as we have, we are sure that you would have been no less oppressive to your allies, and that you would have been forced, etc. THUC. i. 76. ρν τ παρατεχισμα πλον ν κα, ε πικρατσει τις τς νναβσεως, δως ν ατ ληφθν (i.e. δως ν ληφθεη), seeing that it would easily be taken, etc. Id. vii. 42. So ς τχ ν συμβντων, DEM. xxiii. 58 (see 918).

[*] 216. Future.) A few cases of the future participle with ν, representing the future indicative with ν, are found in Attic writers. These rest on the same authority as those of the future indicative and the future infinitive with ν (197 and 208). E.g. φετε μ φετε, ς μο οκ ν ποισοντος λλα, οδ ε μλλω πολλκς τεθνναι (i.e. οκ ν ποισω λλα): so all MSS. PLAT. Ap. 30B. Τος τιον ν κεενν ποισοντας νρηκτες κ τς πλεως σεσθε. DEM. xix. 342. (Here most MSS., including Σ, have ποισοντας, but A has ποισαντας.) Πλαι τις δως ν σως ρωτσων κθηται, many a one has long been sitting here who perhaps would be very glad to ask (so all MSS.). DEM. ix. 70.

[*] 217. The participle with ν can never represent a protasis, because there is no form of protasis which could be represented by a participle, where ν is separable from the conditional particle. (See 224.) Position of ν.

[*] 218. 1. When ν is used with the subjunctive, if it does not coalesce with the relative or particle into one word (as in νν, νταν, etc.), it is generally separated from it only by such monosyllables as μν, δ, τ, γρ, κα, ν, πρ, etc., rarely τς.

See examples under 444 and 529.

2. In Homer and Hesiod two such words may precede κ; as ε περ γρ κεν, ε γρ ν κε, ε γρ τς κε, ς μν γρ κε. This is rare with ν in prose; see DEM. iv. 45, ποι μν γρ ν. Exceptional are ποι τις ν, ομαι, προσθ, DEM. ii. 14; τι λλο ν δοκ μν, XEN. Cyr. iv. 5, 52. The strange καθν ν μηνν ν τις, ANT. v. 38, is now corrected to ν μηνν, but still stranger is ποσον φρυξ ν μν χανδν (?), AR. Ran. 259.

[*] 219. When **■v** is used with the optative or indicative, it may either stand near the verb, or be attached to some other emphatic word. Particularly, it is very often placed directly after interrogatives, negatives, adverbs of time, place, etc., and other words which especially affect the sense of the sentence. E.g. **■λλ■ τ■ς δ■ θε■ν θεραπε■α ε■η ■v ■ ■σι■της**; PLAT. Euthyph. 13D. **■λλ■ ■μ■ς τ■ κεφ■λαιον α■τ■v ■■δ■ως ■v ε■ποις**. Id. 14 α. **Ο■κ ■v δ■ τ■vδ■ ■vδρα μ■χης ■ρ■σαιο μετελθ■v, Τυδε■δην, ■ς v■v γε ■v κα■ Δι■ πατρ■ μ■χοιτο**; Il. v. 456. **“Π■ς ■v τ■v α■μυλ■τατον, ■χθρ■v ■λημα, το■ς τε δισσ■ρχας ■λ■σσας βασιλ■ς, τ■λος θ■νοιμι κα■τ■ς”** SOPH. Aj. 389. **“Πολλ■ κ■v ■κων ■δρων”** Id. O.T. 591. **Τ■χιστ■ ■v τε π■λιν ο■ τοιο■τοι ■τ■ρους πε■σαντες ■πολ■σειαν**. THUC. ii. 63.

[*] 220. 1. By a peculiar usage, **■v** is often separated from its verb by such verbs as **ο■ομαι, δοκ■, φημ■, ο■δα**, etc. In such cases care must be taken to connect the **■v** with the verb to which it really belongs. E.g. **Κα■ v■v ■δ■ως ■v μοι δοκ■ κοινων■σαι**, and now I think I should gladly take part (**■v** belonging to **κοινων■σαι**). XEN. Cyr. viii. 7, 25. So AESCHIN. iii. 2 (end). **Ο■δ■ ■v ■με■ς ο■δ■ ■τι ■πα■σασθε πολεμο■ντες**, nor would you (I am sure) have ceased fighting. DEM. vi. 29. **Π■τερα γ■ρ ■v ο■εσθε ■■ον ε■vναι**; DEM. xlix. 45. **■κλ■ξαντα ■ μ■τε προ■δει μηδε■ς μ■τ■ ■v ■■θη τ■μερον ■ηθ■vναι**, “selecting what nobody knew beforehand and nobody thought would be mentioned to-day.” DEM. xviii. 225. (Here **■ηθ■vναι ■v = ■ηθε■η ■v**. If **■v** were taken with **■■θη**, the meaning would be, what nobody would have thought had been mentioned.) **Τ■ ο■v ■v, ■φην, ε■η ■ ■ρως**; Symp. 202D.

2. Especially irregular are such expressions as **ο■κ ο■δα ■v ε■**, or **ο■κ ■v ο■δα ε■**, followed by an optative or indicative to which the **■v** belongs. E.g. **Ο■κ ο■δ■ ■v ε■ πε■σαιμι**, “I do not know whether I could persuade him.” EUR. Med. 941. (The more regular form would be **ο■κ ο■δα ε■ πε■σαιμι ■v**.) So Alc. 48. **Ο■κ ■v ο■δ■ ε■ δυνα■μην**. PLAT. Tim. 26B. **Ο■κ ο■δ■ ■v ε■ ■κτησ■μην πα■δα τοιο■τον**. XEN. Cyr. v. 4, 12. So **ο■κ ■v ο■δ■ ■ τι ■λλο ε■χον ψηφ■σασθαι**, I do not know what other vote I could have given (**τ■ ■λλο ε■χον ■v ψηφ■σασθαι**;), DEM. xlv. 7.

[*] 221. **■Τ■χ■ ■v**.) Among the words to which **■v** is very frequently joined is **τ■χα**, perhaps (i.e. quickly, soon), the two forming **τ■χ■ ■v**, which expression is sometimes supposed to mean perhaps. But **τ■χ■ ■v** cannot be used unless the **■v** belongs in its ordinary sense to the verb of the sentence.

Thus **τ■χ■ ■v γ■νοιτο** means it might perhaps happen, and **τ■χ■ ■v ■γ■νετο** means it might perhaps have happened; but the latter can never mean perhaps it happened, like **■σως ■γ■νετο**. **Τ■χα** alone often means perhaps, as in XEN. An. v. 2, 17. Aristotle writes **τ■χα** and **■v** separately in the same sense as **τ■χ■ ■v**; as **τ■χα δ■ κα■ μ■λλον ■v τα■την ■πολ■βοι**, Nic. i. 5, Nic. 6.

[*] 222. **■v** never begins a sentence, or a clause before which a comma could stand. But it may directly follow a parenthetical clause, provided some part of its own clause precedes. E.g. **■λλ■ ■ μ■λ■ ■v μοι σιτ■ων διπλ■v ■δει**, Pac. 137. So **τ■ μ■λλον, ■πε■ γ■νοιτ■, ■v κλ■οις** (or without the commas), the future you can hear when it comes, AESCH. Ag. 250.

Repetition of **■v**.

[*] 223. **ν** is sometimes used twice, or even three times, with the same verb. This may be done in a long sentence, to make the conditional force felt through the whole, especially when the connexion is broken by intermediate clauses. It may also be done in order to emphasise particular words with which **ν** is joined, and to make them prominent as being affected by the contingency. E.g. **στ** **ν**, **ε** **σθ** **ν**ος **λ** **βοι**μι, **δηλ** **σαι**μ **ν** **οι** **α** **το**ς **φρον**. SOPH. El. 333. **ο** **τ** **ν** **λ** **ν**τες **α** **θι**ς **ν** **θα**λο **εν** **ν**. AESCH. Ag. 340. **λλους** **γ** **ν** **ο** **ν** **ο** **με**θα **τ** **μ** **τε**ρα **λαβ** **ν**τας **δε** **ξαι** **ν** **μ** **λισ**τα **ε** **τι** **με**τρι **ζο**μεν. THUC. i. 76. (See 220.) “**ο** **τ** **ν** **κε**λε **σαι**μ, **ο** **τ** **ν**, **ε** **θ** **λοι**ς **τι** **πρ** **σσει**ν, **μ**ο **γ** **ν** **δ** **ως** **δρ** **ης** **μ** **τα**” SOPH. Ant. 69. **λ** **γω** **καθ** **κ** **ασ**τον **δο**κε **ν** **ν** **μοι** **τ** **ν** **α** **τ** **ν** **ν** **δρα** **παρ** **μ** **ν** **π** **λε** **στ** **ν** **ε** **δη** **κα** **με**τ **χαρ** **των** **μ** **λισ**τ **ν** **ε** **τρα**π **λω**ς **τ** **σ** **μα** **α** **ταρ**κες **παρ** **χε**σθαι. THUC. ii. 41. (Here **ν** is used three times, belonging to **παρ** **χε**σθαι.) **μ** **ν** **δ** **ρη**μος **ν** **ο** **κ** **ν** **κ** **αν**ς **ο** **μαι** **ε** **ν**αι **ο** **τ** **ν** **φ** **λον** **φ** **ε** **λ** **σαι** **ο** **τ** **ν** **γ** **θρ** **ν** **λ** **ξ** **ασ**θαι. XEN. An. i. 3, 6. (Here **ν** is used three times, belonging to **ε** **ν**αι.) **ο** **κ** **ν** **γ** **ε** **σθ** **α** **τ** **ν** **κ** **ν** **π** **ιδρα** **με** **ν**; DEM. xxvii. 56.

[*] 224. A participle representing a protasis (472) is especially apt to have an emphatic **ν** near it. This, by showing that the verb is to form an apodosis, tends to point out the participle as conditional in an early part of the sentence. E.g. **Νομ** **σα**τε **τ** **τε** **φ** **α** **λον** **κα** **τ** **μ** **σον** **κα** **τ** **π** **νυ** **κ** **ρι**β **ς** **ν** **ξυ** **κρ**αθ **ν** **μ** **λισ**τ **ν** **σ** **χ** **ειν**, believe that these, if they should be united, would be especially strong. THUC. vi. 18. (Here **ξυ** **κρ**αθ **ν**, not with **ν**, is equivalent to **ε** **ξυ** **κρ**αθ **ε** **η**.) **γ** **ν** **α**ς **ν** **τ** **ς** **μοι** **δο**κε, **φ** **η**, **π** **τερ**, **πρ**οει **π** **ν** **κ** **στοι**ς **κα** **θ** **λα** **πρ**οτι **θε** **ς** **μ** **λισ**τ **ν** **ποι** **ε** **ν** **ε** **σ** **κε** **σ** **θ** **αι**, it seems to me, said he, father, that if any one should proclaim contests, etc., he would cause, etc. XEN. Cyr. i. 6, 18. (Here the protasis implied in the participles is merely emphasised by **ν**, which belongs to **ποι** **ε** **ν**.) See also **λ** **γον**τος **ν** **τι** **νος** **πι** **στε** **σαι** **ο** **ε** **σ** **θε**; (i.e. **ε** **τι**ς **λ** **ε** **γ** **εν**, **π** **σ** **τε** **υ** **σαν** **ν**;) do you think they would have believed it, if any one had told them? DEM. vi. 20. (Here **ν** stands near **λ** **γον**τος only to point this out as the protasis to which its own verb **πι** **στε** **σαι** is the apodosis, with which **ν** is not repeated.) [*] 225. a) Repetition of **κ** is rare; yet it sometimes occurs. E.g.

τ **κε** **μ** **λ** **κ** **εν** **μ** **ει**νε **κα** **σ** **σ** **μ** **ε** **ν** **ς** **περ** **δο** **ο**, **κ** **με** **τε** **θ** **νη** **ν** **αν** **ν** **ι** **μ** **ε** **γ** **ρ**οισιν **λ** **ει** **π** **εν**. Od iv. 733.

b) On the other hand, Homer sometimes joins **ν** and **κ** in the same sentence for emphasis. E.g.

Καρ **τε** **ρα**, **ς** **ο** **τ** **ν** **κ** **εν** **ρη**ς **ν** **σαι** **το** **με** **τε** **λ** **θ** **ν** **ο** **τε** **κ** **θη** **να** **η** **λα** **ο** **σ** **σ** **ο** **ς**. Il. xiii. 127.

[*] 226. When an apodosis consists of several co-ordinate clauses with the same mood, **ν** is generally used only in the first and understood in the others, unless it is repeated for emphasis or for some other special reason. E.g. **ο** **δ** **ν** **μ**, **ν** **κα** **δε** **ρο** **π** **ο** **π** **λε** **ν** **β** **ου** **λ** **μ** **η** **ν**, **κα** **τε** **κ** **λ** **υ** **εν**, **ο** **δ** **τοια** **τα** **λ** **γ** **ειν** **το** **τ** **πρ**ο **σ** **τα** **τ** **τε** **ν**, **ξ** **ν** **κ** **ισ** **θ** **μ** **ε** **ς** **μ** **μ** **λλ** **ε** **τ** **ξ** **ι** **ν** **αι**. DEM. xix. 51. (Here **ν** is understood with **πρ**ο **σ** **τα** **τ** **τε** **ν**.) **ο** **τ** **ω** **δ** **δρ** **ν** **ο** **δ** **ν** **ν** **δι** **φ** **ο** **ρ** **ον** **το** **τ** **π** **ου** **ποι** **ο**, **λλ** **π** **τα** **τ** **ν** **οι** **εν** **μ** **φ** **τε** **ροι**. PLAT. Rep. 360 C. **ο** **κ** **ο** **ν** **κ** **ν**, **ε** **πρ** **ς** **α** **τ** **τ** **φ** **ς** **ν** **α** **γκ** **ζ** **οι** **α** **τ** **ν** **β** **λ** **π** **ειν**, **λ** **γ** **ε** **ν** **τε** **ν** **τ** **μ** **μ** **α** **τα** **κα** **φ** **ε** **γ** **ειν** **π** **ο** **σ** **τ** **ρ** **ε** **φ** **μ** **ε** **ν** **ο** **ει**; Ib. 515E. (**κ** **ν** belongs to the infinitives; 223.) See also XEN. An. ii. 5, 14. **π** **ν** **τα** **ρ** **ει** **φ** **λι** **π** **ο** **ς**, **πο** **λλ** **λ** **γ** **ον** **τος** **μ** **ο** **κα** **θ** **ρυ** **λο** **ν** **τος** **ε**, **τ** **μ** **ν** **πρ** **ο** **ν** **ς** **ν** **ε** **ς** **κοι** **ν** **ν** **γ** **μ** **η** **ν** **π** **ο** **φ** **αι** **νο** **μ** **ν** **ου**, **με** **τ** **τα** **τα** **δ** **ς** **γ** **η** **νο** **ο** **ν** **τας**

διδσκοντος, τελευτντος δς νν πρς πεπρακτας ατος κα ννοσιωτους νθρπους οδν ποστελλομνου. DEM. xix. 156. The clauses with ς represent (1) ς λεγον ν ε φαινμην, as I should have spoken if I had been merely informing my colleagues; (2) ς λεγον (ν) ε γνοοτας δδασκον, as I should have spoken if I had been instructing ignorant men; (3) ς λγοιμι ν, as I should speak to men who had sold themselves, etc. In the second clause, the construction remaining the same, ν is omitted; but in the third, where an optative is implied, ν reappears. In PLAT. Rep. 398 A, we find ν used with two co-ordinate optatives, understood with a third, and repeated again with a fourth to avoid confusion with a dependent optative in a relative clause. ν may be understood with an optative even in a separate sentence, if the construction is continued from a sentence in which ν is used with the optative; as in PLAT. Rep. 352 E: σθ τ ν λλ δοις φθαλμος; Ο δτα. Τ δ; κοσαις λλ σν; So with πρτοι after γρ, ib. 439 Elliptical uses of ν.

[*] 227. ν is sometimes used elliptically without a verb, when one can be supplied from the context. E.g. “Ο οκται γκουσιν: λλ οκ νν πρ το” (sc. ρρεγκον), “the slaves are snoring; but they wouldn’t have been doing so at this hour in old times.” AR. Nub. 5. “ς οτ νν στν τνδ ν ξεποιμ τ, οτ νν τκνοισι τος μος σξ. ξεποιμι, στργων μωξ” SOPH. O.C. 1528. Τ νν δοκε σοι Πραμος (sc. πρξαι), ε τδ ννυσεν; “but what think you Priam would have done if he had accomplished what you have?” AESCH. Ag. 935. Σφρων μν οκ νν μλλον, ετυχς δ σως (sc. οσα). EUR. Alc. 182: cf. AR. Eq. 1252. (See 483.) So πς γρ νν (sc. εη; how could it? πς οκ νν; and similar phrases; especially σπερ νν ε (also written as one word, σπερανε), in which the νν belongs to the verb that was originally understood after ε; as φοβομενος σπερ νν ε πας, fearing like a child (originally for φοβομενος σπερ νν φοβετο ε πας νν). PLAT. Gorg. 479A. See DEM. xviii. 194: τ χρ ποιεν; σπερ νν ε τις νακληρον πντ π σωτηρα πρξαντα . . . τς ναυαγας ατιτο, what are we to do? (We are to do) just what a shipowner would do (ποιο νν) if any one should blame him for the wreck of his ship, etc. See φσειεν νν, which explains the omitted verb, just afterwards.

[*] 228. Κνν in both its meanings (as κα with the adverb νν, and as κα with α?ν = νν) may stand without a verb. E.g. “λλ ννδρα χρ δοκεν πεσεν νν κνν π μικρο κακο” SOPH. Aj. 1077. (Here κνν, for κα νν, which we may express by even or though it be, belongs to πεσεν understood.) κανς ον τοτο χομεν, κνν ε πλεοναχ σκοπομεν; are we then satisfied of this (and should we be so) even if we were to look at it in various ways? PLAT. Rep. 477A. (We must supply κανς χοιμεν with κνν.) See different cases of κνν ε in 195, in which a verb follows to which νν cannot belong.

Κα ποι τις νν, ομαι, προσθ κνν μικρν δναμιν, πντ φελε, and, I think, wherever we add even (though it be) a little power, it all helps. DEM. ii. 14. (Here κνν = κα νν τις προσθ, even though we add.) Μτρησον ερνης τ μοι, κνν πντ τη, measure me out some peace, even if it be only for five years (κα νν μετρσς). AR. Ach. 1021.

[*] 229. νν may be used with a relative without a verb, as it is with ε (in νν = ε νν) in the last examples (228). So in XEN. An. i. 3, 6, ς μο ον νντος πνν κα μες, οτω τνν γμην χετε (i.e. πνν κα μες ητε), “be of this mind, that I shall go wherever you go.”

1 See Monro, Homeric Grammar, pp. 265-267. For Pindar, see Gildersleeve in Jour. Phil. iii. pp. 446-455, where may be found a complete enumeration of the passages in Pindar containing either ν (30 cases) or κ (33 cases).

4. Use of the Moods

Chapter IV Use of the Moods.

[*] 230. This chapter treats of all constructions which require any other form of the finite verb than the simple indicative in absolute assertions and direct questions (2). The infinitive and participle are included here so far as either of them is used in indirect discourse, in protasis or apodosis, and in other constructions (as with $\pi\rho\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ and $\sigma\tau\epsilon$) in which the finite moods also are used.

[*] 231. These constructions are discussed under the following heads:—

I. The potential optative and indicative.

II. The imperative and subjunctive in commands, exhortations, and prohibitions.—Subjunctive and indicative with μ and $\mu\omicron$ in cautious assertions.— $\pi\omega\varsigma$ and $\pi\omega\varsigma\mu$ with the independent future indicative or subjunctive.

III. The subjunctive (like the future indicative) in independent sentences.—The interrogative subjunctive.

IV. $O\mu$ with the subjunctive or future indicative.

V. Final and object clauses after $\nu\alpha$, ς , $\pi\omega\varsigma$, $\phi\rho\alpha$, and μ .

VI. Conditional sentences.

VII. Relative and temporal sentences, including consecutive sentences with $\sigma\tau\epsilon$, etc.

VIII. Indirect discourse.

IX. Causal sentences.

X. Expressions of a wish.

Section I: The Potential Optative and Indicative.

[*] 232. We find fully established in the Homeric language a use of the optative and the past tenses of the indicative with ν or κ , which expresses the action of the verb as dependent on circumstances or conditions; as $\lambda\theta\omicron\iota\nu$, he might (could or would) go; $\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu\nu$, he might (could or would) have gone. Such an optative or indicative is called potential.

I. Potential Optative.

[*] 233. It has already been seen (13) that Homer sometimes uses the optative in a weak future sense, without κ or ν , to express a concession or permission. Such neutral forms seem to form a connecting link between the simple optative in wishes and the optative with ν , partaking to a certain extent of the nature of both. (For a full discussion of these forms and their relations, see Appendix I.) Such expressions seem to show that the early language used forms like $\lambda\theta\omicron\iota\mu\iota$ and

■δοιμι in two senses, I may go and I may see, or may I go and may I see, corresponding to ■λθω and ■δω in their two Homeric senses I shall go and I shall see (284), or let me go and let me see (257).

[*] 234. The neutral optatives like Il. iv. 18 are rare even in Homer, the language having already distinguished the two meanings in sense, and marked them in most cases by external signs. The optative expressing what may happen in the future took the particle κ■ or ■ν, and was negated by ο■, denoting the relations which we express by our potential mood with may, can, might, could, would, and should. Thus ■λοιμ■ κε ■ κεν ■λο■ην, I may slay or I may be slain, Il. xxii. 253; ■ν■ρ δ■ κεν ο■ τι Δι■ς ν■ον ε■ρ■σσαιτο, a man cannot contend against the will of Zeus, Il. viii. 143.1 On the other hand, the simple optative (without κ■ or ■ν) was more and more restricted to the expression of a wish or exhortation, and was negated by μ■; as μ■ γ■νοιτο, may it not happen, “π■θοι■ μοι,” “listen to me” (Hom. Od. iv. 193), as opposed to ο■κ ■ν γ■νοιτο, it could not happen. The potential forms ■λθοιμι ■ν and ■δοιμι ■ν differ from the more absolute future indicative and the old subjunctive forms ■λθω and ■δω, I shall go and I shall see, by expressing a future act as dependent on some future circumstances or conditions, which may be more or less distinctly implied. The freedom of the earlier language extended the use of the potential optative to present and sometimes even to past time. See 438 and 440.

[*] 235. In most cases the limiting condition involved in the potential optative is not present to the mind in any definite form, and can be expressed in English only by such words as perchance, possibly, or probably, or by the auxiliaries could, would, should, might, etc. with the vague conditions which these imply (like if he should try, if he pleased, if he could, if what is natural should happen, etc.) Sometimes a more general condition is implied, like in any possible case; as ο■κ ■ν δεχο■μην το■το, I would not accept this (on any terms); here the expression becomes nearly absolute, and may often be translated by our future, as ο■κ ■ν μεθε■μην το■ θρ■νον, I will not give up the throne (AR. Ran. 830), or (in positive sentences) by must, as π■ντες θαυμ■ζοιεν ■ν το■το, all must admire this. The optative thus used with no conscious feeling of any definite condition, but still implying that the statement is conditioned and not absolute, is the simplest and most primitive potential optative. It is equivalent to the Latin potential subjunctive, as credas, dicas, cernas, putes, etc., you may believe, say, perceive, think, etc. The Homeric language has six forms, all expressing futurity with different degrees of absoluteness and distinctness; as ■ψομαι, ■ψομα■ κε, ■δωμαι, ■δωμα■ κε, ■δο■μην, ■δο■μην κε (or ■ν), containing every step from I shall see to I should see. Of these only the first and the last (with a tradition of the second) survived the Homeric period, and the others (especially the fifth) were already disappearing during that period (240), being found unnecessary as the language became settled, and as the optative with κ■ or ■ν became more fixed as a future potential form.

[*] 236. In the following examples of the potential optative no definite form of condition is present to the mind:—

“■μο■ δ■ τ■τ■ ■ν πολ■ κ■ρδιον ε■η,” “but it would at that time (be likely to) profit me far more.” Il. xxii. 108. “Φε■γωμεν: ■τι γ■ρ κεν ■λ■ξαιμεν κακ■ν ■μαρ,” “let us flee; for perchance we may still escape the evil day.” Od. x. 269. “Πλησ■ον ■λλ■λων: κα■ κεν διο■στε■σειας,” “the rocks are close together: you might perhaps shoot an arrow across the space.” Od. xii. 102. So Od. xxiii. 125. “Ο■κο■ν π■ροις ■ν τ■νδε δωρε■ν ■μο■,” “would you then grant me this favour?” AESCH.

Prom. 616. So “π■ν γ■ρ ■ν .π■θοι■ μου,” “for you can learn anything (you please) from me.” Ib. 617. “Τ■ τ■νδ■ ■ν ε■ποις ■λλο;” “what else could you say of this man?” SOPH. Ant. 646. So Ant. 552 and 652. Πολλ■ς ■ν ε■ροις μηχαν■ς, “you can find many devices.” And. 85. ■ψομα■ τοι κα■ ο■κ ■ν λειφθε■ην, “I will follow you and in no case will I be left behind.” HDT. iv. 97. Ο■ μ■ν (sc. λ■γοντες) ■ς ο■δεν■ ■ν τρ■π■ ■λθοιεν ο■ ■θηνα■οι. THUC. vi. 35. ■νθα πολλ■ν μ■ν σωφροσ■νην καταμ■θοι ■ν τις. XEN. An. i. 9, 3. So Mem. i. 3, Mem. 5, Mem. iii. 5, Mem. 1 and 7. Δ■ς ■ς τ■ν α■τ■ν ποταμ■ν ο■κ ■ν ■μβα■ης, you cannot step twice into the same river (saying of Heraclitus). PLAT. Crat. 402A. Ο■ μ■ν ■στι καλλ■ων ■δ■ς ο■δ■ ■ν γ■νοιτο, “there is none and there could be none.” Ib. Phil. 16B; so 64 B. ■κο■οις ■ν, “you can hear.” Rep. 487E. Δειξ■τω ■ς ο■ Θετταλο■ ν■ν ο■κ ■ν ■λε■θεροι γ■νοιντο ■σμενοι, “let him show that they would not now gladly become free.” DEM. ii. 8. ■δ■ως δ■ ■ν ■γωγ■ ρο■μην Δεπτ■νην, “but I would gladly ask Leptines.” Id. xx. 129. Ε■ ■γν■ησε τα■τα, γ■νοιτο γ■ρ ■ν κα■ το■το, if he did not know this,—and it might easily so happen. Ib. 143. Ο■τ■ ■ν ο■τος ■χοι λ■γειν ο■θ■ ■με■ς πεισθε■ητε. Id. Ib. xxii. 17. Πο■ ο■ν τραπο■μεθ■ ■ν ■τι; “in what other direction could we possibly turn?” PLAT. Euthyd. 290A. Ο■κ ■ν μεθε■μην το■ θρ■νου, “I will not give up the throne.” AR. Ran. 830. So ο■κ ■ν δεχο■μην, AESCH. Eum. 228. Τ■ς ο■κ ■ν ■γ■σαιτο τ■ν ■νδρ■ν ■κε■νων τ■ς ■ρετ■ς; who would not admire the valour of these men? (i.e. every one must admire their valour). DEM. xviii. 204.

Βουλο■μην ■ν, I should like, is used like velim. For ■βουλ■μην ■ν, vellem, see 246.

[*] 237. The potential optative in the second person may have the force of a mild command or exhortation. E.g.

“Σ■ μ■ν κομ■ζοις ■ν σεαυτ■ν ■ θ■λεις,” “you may take yourself off whither you please (a milder expression than κ■μιζε σεαυτ■ν).” SOPH. Ant. 444. So Ant. 1339.

“Κλ■οις ■ν ■δη, Φο■βε προστατ■ριε,” “hear me now.” EI. 637.

“Χωρο■ς ■ν ε■σω” Id. Ph. 674. So probably Il. ii. 250: τ■ ο■κ ■ν βασιλ■ας ■ν■ στ■μ■ ■χων ■γορε■οις, therefore you must not take kings upon your tongue and talk (or do not take, etc.)

[*] 238. Occasionally the potential optative expresses what may hereafter prove to be true or to have been true. E.g. Πο■ δ■τ■ ■ν ε■εν ο■ ξ■νοι; where may the strangers be? (i.e. where is it likely to turn out that they are?—SOPH. EI. 1450. ■ γ■ρ ■μ■ (sc. σοφ■α) φα■λη τις ■ν ε■η, “for it may turn out that my wisdom is of a mean kind.” Symp. 175E. ■λλ■νων τιν■ς φασι ■ρπ■σαι Ε■ρ■πην: ε■ησαν δ■ ■ν ο■τοι Κρ■τες, and these would prove to be Cretans (or to have been Cretans). HDT. i. 2. Α■ται δ■ ο■κ ■ν πολλα■ ε■ησαν, and these (the islands) would not prove to be many. THUC. i. 9. This has nothing to do with the Homeric use of the optative with κ■ or ■ν in a present or a past sense (438; 440). See the similar use of the subjunctive with μ■ after verbs of fearing (92).

[*] 239. The potential optative may express every grade of potentiality from the almost pure future ο■κ ■ν μεθε■μην, I will not give up (under any circumstances), to “ο■κ ■ν δικα■ως ■ς κακ■ν π■σοιμ■ τι,” “I could not justly fall into any trouble,” SOPH. Ant. 240, where δικα■ως points to the substance of a limiting condition, if justice should be done. From this the step is but slight to such cases as ο■τε ■σθ■ουσι πλε■ω ■ δ■νανται φ■ρειν: διαρραγε■εν γ■ρ ■ν, they do not eat more than they can carry; for (if they should) they would burst, XEN. Cyr. viii. 2, 21, where ε■ . . .

σθοιεν is necessary to complete the sense and is clearly understood from the preceding words. A final step in the same direction is taken when the condition is actually stated as part of the sentence. As λθοι ν means he would go (under some future circumstances), if these limiting circumstances are to be definitely expressed it is natural to use the corresponding form of condition, ε with the optative, as ε κελεσειας λθοι ν, if you should command he would go. The protasis is thus assimilated to the apodosis in form, as it conforms to it in sense and general character. So when a conclusion is to follow such a condition as ε κελεσειας, the corresponding optative with ν, i.e. the potential optative, is naturally chosen, although nothing but regard to harmony and symmetry makes either if you should command he will go or if you command he would go, or the equivalent Greek forms, objectionable. In fact, these very forms are far more common in the more fluid Homeric language than in the fixed and regular style of Attic prose. There is, therefore, no necessary or logical bond of union between two forms like ε κελεσειας and λθοι ν. This connexion is, indeed, far more the effect of assimilation in form, as appears especially when the apodosis contains an optative in a wish; as in “ς πλοιοτο καλλος τις τοιαυτ γε ζοι,” “may another perish also who shall do the like” (Hom. Od. i. 47), where if πολσθω had been used we should naturally have had ζ. For examples of the optative with ν or κ with a definite protasis expressed or implied in the context, see 455 and 472.

[*] 240. The use of ν or κ with the potential optative had already become fixed in the Homeric language. A few cases of “neutral optatives” in Homer, which seem to show an early potential use without κ or ν, have been given above (13). Besides these, a few more distinctly potential optatives without ν or κ occur in Homer, but they are exceptions to the general usage even there. Such are the following:—

“Ο τι κακτερον λλο πθοιμι” Il. xix. 321. “Τοτου γε σπομνοιο κα κ πυρς αθομνοιο μφω νοστσαιμεν” Il. x. 246. “εα θες γ θλων μενονας δωρσαιτο” Il. x. 556 : see Od. iii. 231. “Χερμειδιον λβε, ο ο δο γ νδρε φροιεν” Il. v. 302 : so xx. 285. “Ο τις πεσειε γυνακα” Od. xiv. 122. So also Il. vii. 48, Il. xiv. 190, Il. xv. 45, Il. 197.

See, further, Theog. 723 and 725; PIND. Ol. x. 21, Py. iv. 118.

[*] 241. Some cases of the optative without ν occur with the indefinite στιν ς in Homer, and with στιν στις, στιν πως, στιν ποι, in the Attic poets. These form a class by themselves. E.g. Οκ σθ ς σς γε κνας κεφαλς παλλκοι. Il. xxii. 348. Ο γρ ην ς τς σφιν π στχας γσαιτο. Il. ii. 687. Οκ σθ πως λξαιμι τ ψευδ καλ. AESCH. Ag. 620. “Οκ σθ τ μεζονα μοραν νεμαιμ σοι” Id. Prom. 292. Οκ στιν στις πλν μο κεραιτ νιν. Id. Cho. 172. στ ον πως λκηστις ς γρας μλοι; EUR. Alc. 52. σθ ποι τις στελλας παραλσαι ψυχν; Ibid. 113.

[*] 242. On the other hand, a few other cases in the Attic poets are mere anomalies, even if we admit that the text is sound. E.g.

“Τεν, Ζε, δνασιν τς νδρν περβασα κατσχοι;” “ what transgression of man can check thy power?” SOPH. Ant. 605.

“λλ προτολμον νδρς φρνημα τς λγοι;” AESCH. Cho. 594.

“Π■ς ο■ν τ■δ■, ■ς ε■ποι τις, ■ξημ■ρτανες;” i.e. “as one might say.” (?) EUR. Andr. 929.

“Θ■σσον ■ λ■γοι τις π■λους ■στ■σαμεν” Id. Hipp. 1186.

“■σπερ ε■ποι τις τ■πος;” “as one would say τ■πος (?)” AR. Av. 180. The cases cited from Attic prose are now generally admitted to be corrupt. See Krüger, ii. 54, 3, Anm. 8.

II. Potential Indicative.

[*] 243. As the potential optative represents a future act as dependent on future circumstances (234), so the potential indicative originally represents a past act as dependent on past circumstances. Therefore, while ■λθεν means he went, ■λθεν ■ν means he would have gone (under some past circumstances). It is probable that no definite limiting circumstances were present to the mind when this form first came into use, so that ■λθεν ■ν naturally signified merely that it was likely, possible, or probable that he went or (as we express it) that he might have gone or would have been likely to go, sometimes that he must have gone. In this sense it appears as a past form of the potential optative, e.g. of ■λθοι ■ν in the sense he might perchance go or he would be likely to go (in the future). The same relation appears in Latin, where credas, putes, cernas, dicas, you would be likely to believe, think, etc., are transferred to past time as crederes, putares, cerneres, diceres, you would have believed, thought, etc.² Here putet and putaret are precisely equivalent to ο■οιτο ■ν, he would be likely to think, and ■ετο ■ν, he would have been likely to think.

[*] 244. We find the potential indicative in its simplest use (last mentioned)—with no reference to any definite condition, but merely expressing past possibility, probability, or necessity—in all classes of Greek writers. E.g. Ο■δ■ ■ν ■τι φρ■δμων περ ■ν■ρ Σαρπηδ■να δ■ον ■γνω, “no longer would even a shrewd man have known Sarpedon.” Il. xvi. 638. ■π■ κεν ταλασ■φρον■ περ δ■ος ε■λεν, “fear might have seized even a man of stout heart.” Il. iv. 421. See other Homeric examples below.

“■λλ■ ■λθε μ■ν δ■ το■το το■νειδος τ■χ■ ■ν ■ργ■ βιασθ■ν μ■λλον ■ γν■μ■ φρεν■ν,” “but this reproach may perhaps have come from violence of wrath, etc.” SOPH. O. T. 523. (Here τ■χ■ ■ν ■λθε expresses past possibility, with no reference to any definite condition, unfulfilled or otherwise.) “Θεο■ς γ■ρ ■ν ο■τω φ■λον τ■χ■ ■ν τι μην■ουσιν ε■ς γ■νος π■λαι,” “for perchance it may have been thus pleasing to Gods who of old bore some wrath against our race.” Id. O.C. 964. (According to the common punctuation τ■χ■ ■ν would be taken with μην■ουσιν, = ο■ τ■χ■ ■ν τι ■μ■νιον, who may perchance have borne some wrath, see PLAT. Phaedr. 265B, below; but the analogy of O. T. 523 favours the other interpretation.) Ιρ■ς πο■ον ■ν τ■νδ■ α■τ■ς ο■δυσσε■ς ■πλει; i.e. who might this man have been to whom Ulysses was sailing? Ph. 572. ■ θεασ■μενος π■ς ■ν τις ■ν■ρ ■ρ■σθη δ■ιος ε■ναι, every man who saw this drama (the “Seven against Thebes”) would have been eager to be a warrior. AR. Ran. 1022. (This is the past form of π■ς ■ν τις ■ρασθε■η δ■ιος ε■ναι, every one would be eager, having no more reference to an unfulfilled condition than the latter has.) Δι■βησαν, ■ς μ■ν ε■κ■ς κα■ λ■γεται, ■π■ σχεδι■ν, τ■χα ■ν δ■ κα■ ■λλως πως ■σπλε■σαντες, i.e. while they probably crossed on rafts, they may perhaps have crossed in some other way by sailing (δι■βησαν with τ■χα ■ν in the latter clause meaning they may have, or might have, perhaps crossed under other (possible) circumstances). THUC. vi. 2. ■περρ■σθη δ■ ■ν τις ■κε■νο ■δ■ν, “and any one would have

been encouraged who saw that.” XEN. Hell. iii. 4, 18. Θ■ττον ■ ■ς τις ■ν ■ετο, “sooner than one would have thought.” Id. An. i. 5, Id. An. 8. ■νθα δ■ ■γνω ■ν τις ■σου ■ξιον ε■η τ■ φιλε■σθαι ■ρχοντα, there any one might have learned, etc. Id. Cyr. vii. 1, Id. Cyr. 38. ■ν τα■τ■ τ■ ■λικ■ ■ λ■γοντες πρ■ς ■μ■ς ■ν ■ ■ν μ■λιστα ■πιστε■σατε, “talking to you at that age at which you would have been most likely to have put trust in them.” PLAT. Ap. 18 C. “■σως μ■ν ■ληθο■ς τινος ■παπτ■μενοι, τ■χα δ■ ■ν κα■ ■λλοσε παραφερ■μενοι, μυθικ■ν τινά ■μνον προσεπα■σαμεν ■ρωτα,” “while perhaps we were clinging to some truth, although perchance we may have been led aside into some error ■παραφερ■μενοι ■ν = παρεφερ■μεθα ■ν■, we celebrated Eros in a mythical hymn.” Id. Phaedr. 265 B. Τ■ γ■ρ κα■ βουλ■μενοι μετεπ■μπεσθ■ ■ν α■το■ς ■ν το■τ■ τ■ καιρ■; “for with what wish even could you possibly have been summoning them at this time?” DEM. xviii. 24. Π■ς ■ν ■ μ■ παρ■ν μηδ■ ■πιδημ■ν ■γ■ τ■ σε ■δ■κησα; i.e. how was I likely to do you any wrong? Id. xxxvii. 57. Τ■ν χορ■ν συν■λεξα ■σπερ ■ν ■διστα κα■ ■πιτηδει■τατα ■μφοτ■ροις ■γ■γενετο, “I collected the chorus in the way which was likely to be most agreeable and convenient to both.” ANT. vi. 11.

Two Homeric examples are peculiar in their reference to time:—

“■λλ■ τ■χιστα πε■ρα ■πως κεν δ■ σ■ν πατρ■δα γα■αν ■κηαι: ■ γ■ρ μιν ζω■ν γε κιχ■σαι, ■ κεν ■ρ■στης κτε■νεν ■ποφθ■μενος, σ■ δ■ κεν τ■φου ■ντιβολ■σαις,” “but strive with all speed to come to your fatherland; for either you will find him (Aegisthus) alive (and so can kill him yourself), or else Orestes may have already killed him before you come, and then you can go to his funeral.” Od. iv. 544. (Here ■ κεν κτε■νεν, by a change in the point of view, expresses what will be a past possibility at the time of the arrival of Menelaus, to which time the following optative is future.) “Κα■ γ■ρ Τρ■ς φασι μαχητ■ς ■μμεναι ■νδρας, ο■ κε τ■χιστα ■κριναν μ■γα νε■κος,” “for they say that the Trojans are men of war, who would most speedily have decided a mighty strife (implying that they would therefore speedily decide any impending strife).” Od. xviii. 261. (This was said by Ulysses before he went to Troy. See 249.)

[*] 245. In most cases of the past tenses of the indicative with ■ν there is at least an implied reference to some supposed circumstances different from the real ones, so that ■λθεν ■ν commonly means he would have gone (if something had not been as it was). When we speak of a past event as subject to conditions, we are apt to imply that the conditions were not fulfilled, as otherwise they would not be alluded to. This reference to an unfulfilled condition, however, does not make it necessary that the action of the potential indicative itself should be unreal, although this is generally the case. (See 412.) The unfulfilled past condition to which the potential indicative refers may be as vague and indistinct as the future condition to which the potential optative refers (235); as if he had wished, if he had tried, if it had been possible, in any case, and others which are implied in our auxiliaries might, could, would, should, etc., but are seldom expressed by us in words. Compare ο■δ■ν ■ν κακ■ν ποι■σειαν, they could do no harm (i.e. if they should try), with ο■δ■ν ■ν κακ■ν ■πο■ησαν, they could have done no harm (i.e. if they had tried). E.g. “Ο■ γ■ρ κεν δυν■μεσθα θυρ■ων ■ψηλ■ων ■π■σασθαι λ■θον,” “for we could not have moved the stone from the high doorway.” Od. ix. 304. “Μ■νοιμ■ ■ν: ■θειλον δ■ ■ν ■κτ■ς ■ν τυχε■ν,” “I will remain; but I should have preferred to take my chance outside.” SOPH. Aj. 88. “Το■του τ■ς ■ν σοι τ■νδρ■ς ■με■νων ε■ρ■θη;” “who could have been found, etc.?” Ib. 119. ■κλυον ■ν ■γ■ ο■δ■ ■ν ■λπισ■ α■δ■ν, “I heard a voice which I could never even have hoped to hear.” Id. El. 1281. Δ■ ■ξ■λεξας, ο■ν ■γ■ ■κιστ■ ■ν ■θ■λησ■ ■λωλ■τοιν κλ■ειν. Id. Ph. 426. Κλ■ειν ■ν

with ν may here refer to present time. E.g. “λλ κε κενα μλιστα δν λοφραο θυμ,” “but you would have lamented most in your heart if you had seen this δν = ε εδες.” Od. xi. 418. Οδ κεν ατς πκφυγε κρα μλαιναν, λλ φαιστος ρυτο, nor would he by himself have escaped, but Hephaestus rescued him. Il. v. 22. λλ εκσαι μν, δς: ο γρ ν κρα πολυστεφς δ ερπε, but, as it seems, he has good news; for (otherwise) he would not be coming with head thus thickly crowned. SOPH. OT 83 ; so O. C. 125, 146. Πολλο γρ ν τ ργανα ν ξια, for instruments would be worth much (if they had this power). PLAT. Rep. 374D. ηετε τν ερνην μως: ο γρ ν τι ν ποιετε, for there was nothing that you could have done (if you had not kept the peace). DEM. xviii. 43. Σημεον δ: ο γρ ν δερ κον ς μς, for (otherwise) they would not have come hither to you. Id. xix. 58. Ττε Φιλππ προδεδωκναι πντας ν σχεν αταν, in that case she (Athens) would have had the blame of having betrayed all to Philip Id. xviii. 200. See other examples in 472.

[*] 248. The final step is taken when an unreal condition is expressed as part of the sentence, forming the protasis to which the potential indicative is the apodosis; as λθεν ν ε κλευσα, he would have gone if I had commanded him. The dependent protasis, by a natural assimilation, has a past tense of the indicative corresponding to the form of the apodosis. On the other hand, when an unreal condition has been expressed, as ε κλευσα, the potential indicative is the natural form to state what would have been the result if the condition had been fulfilled. (See 390, 2; and 410.) The potential indicative does not change its essential nature by being thus made part of an unreal conditional expression, and it is not necessarily implied that its action did not take place (see 412). Although the latter is generally implied or inferred, while the reverse seldom occurs, still it is important to a true understanding of the nature of the indicative with ν to remember that it is not essential or necessary for it either to refer to an unreal condition or to denote in itself what is contrary to fact. For a periphrastic form of potential indicative with δει, χρν, etc., with the infinitive, see 415. For the Homeric use of the present optative with κ or ν as a present potential form (like the later imperfect with ν), see 438. For the rare Homeric optative with κ in the sense of the past tenses of the indicative with κ or ν, see 440.

[*] 249. From the primitive use of the past tenses of the indicative to express what was likely to occur under past circumstances, we may explain the iterative use of these tenses with ν (162), which is generally thought to have no connection with the potential indicative with ν. Thus λθεν ν, meaning originally he would have gone (under some past circumstances), might easily come to have a frequentative sense, he would have gone (under all circumstances or whenever occasion offered), and hence to mean he used to go. See SOPH. Ph. 443, ς οκ ν ελετ εσπαξ επεν, που μηδες η, (Thersites) who used never to be content to speak but once when all forbade him (lit. when nobody permitted him). Originally οκ ν ελετο would mean he would not have been content (under any circumstances), hence he was never content. The optative η (532) shows the nature of the expression here. See the examples under 162, and the last example under 244. This construction is not Homeric; but it is found in Herodotus and is common in Attic Greek. There is no difficulty in understanding it as an offshoot of the potential indicative, when it is seen that the latter did not involve originally any denial of its own action.

Section II. The Imperative and Subjunctive in Commands, Exhortations, and Prohibitions.—Subjunctive and Indicative with μ and μ ο in Cautious Assertions.—πως and πως μ with the Independent Future Indicative, etc.

Imperative in Commands, etc.

[*] 250. The imperative is used to express a command, an exhortation, or an entreaty. E.g. Λήγε, speak thou. Φεγήγε, begone! λήθτω, let him come. Χαίρντων, let them rejoice. ἄρχεσθον κλισίην Πηληιδεω χιλιός. Il. i. 322. Ζεῖ, θεωρῶς τίνδε πραγμάτων γενοῖ. AESCH. Cho. 246. For prohibitions, i.e. negative commands, see 259 and 260.

[*] 251. The imperative is often emphasised by ἴγε or ἴγετε, φέρε, ἴθι, δεῦρο or δεῦτε, come, look here; or by εἰ δὲ ἴγε (474). ἴγε, φέρε, and ἴθι may be singular when the imperative is plural, and in the second person when the imperative is in the third. E.g. “Ἐπεὶ ἴγε μοι κατὰ τίνδε, φύλον τῆκος, ἴς τις ἴδῃ στήν.” Il. iii. 192. , “ἴλλῃ ἴγε μῦντε πίντες, ἄκνῃμιδες χαίω” Il. ii. 331. “Βῆσκῃ ἴθι, ὀλέ νειρε, θοῖς πῖ νῆας χαίω.” Il. ii. 8. “ἴγε δὲ ἴκοῖσατε.” XEN. Ap. 14. “ἴγετε δειπνῆσατε” XEN. Hell. v. 1, 18. “Φέρε εἰπεὶ δὲ μοι” SOPH. Ant. 534. “Φέρε δὲ μοι τῆδε εἰπεῖ” PLAT. Crat. 385B. “ἴθι δὲ λῆξον μῖν πρῶτον τοῦτο” XEN. Mem. iii. 3, 3. “ἴθι νῦν παρῆστασθον” AR. Ran. 1378. “ἴθι νῦν λιβανώτην δερῶ τις καὶ πῖρ δῆτω” Ib. 871. “Καὶ μοι δεῦρο, ἴ Μῆλητε, εἰπεῖ” PLAT. Ap. 24 C . “Δεῦτε, λείπετε στήγας” EUR. Med. 894.

[*] 252. The poets sometimes use the second person of the imperative with πῖς in hasty commands. E.g. ἴκουε πῖς, hear, every one! AR. Thes. 372. Χῖρει δεῦρο πῖς ἴπηρτης; τῆξενε, παῖε: σφενδῆνην τῖς μοι δῆτω. Id. Av. 1186. ἴγε δὲ σῖπα πῖς ἴνῖρ. Id. Ran. 1125.

[*] 253. The imperative is sometimes used by the dramatists after ὀσθῆ and similar interrogative expressions, the imperative being really the verb of the relative clause.³ The difficulty of translating such expressions is similar to that of translating relatives and interrogatives with participles. E.g. ἴλλῃ ὀσθῆ ἴ δρῶσον; τῆ σκῆλει θῆνε τῖν πῖτραν, “but do you know what you must do?—strike the rock with your leg!” AR. Av. 54. ὀσθῆ ἴ μοι σῖμπραξον; “do you know what you must do for me?” EUR. Her. 451. ὀσθῆ νῦν ἴ μοι γενῆσθω; δεσμῖ τοῖς ἴνοισι πρῆσθες, do you know what must be done for me?—put bonds on the strangers. Id. IT 1203. ὀσθῆ ἴς ποῆσον; do you know how you must act? SOPH. O.T. 543. (Compare EUR. Cyc. 131, “ὀσθῆ ὀν ἴ δρῶσεις;” do you know what you are to do?) The English may use a relative with the imperative, as in which do at your peril. See HDT. i. 89, κῖτισον φυλῖκους, ὀ λειντων ἴς ἴναγκῶς ἴχει. So SOPH. O.C. 473. A peculiar interrogative imperative is found in μῖ ἴξῖτω; “is it not to be allowed?” PLAT. Polit. 295E ; and ἴπανερωτῖ εἰ κῖσθω, I ask whether it is to stand, Leg. 800E. (See 291.)

[*] 254. The imperative sometimes expresses a mere assumption, where something is supposed to be true for argument’s sake. E.g. “ἴλοῖται τε γῖρ κατῖ ὀκον, εἰ βῖλει, μῖγα, καὶ ἴ τῖρῖνον σχῖμῖ ἴχων,” “i.e. grant that you are rich and live in tyrant’s state (lit. be rich, etc.)” SOPH. Ant. 1168. Προσειπῖτω τινῖ φιλικῖς ἴ τε ἴρχων καὶ ἴδῖτης, “suppose that both the ruler and the private man address one in a friendly way.” XEN. Hier. viii. 3.

First Person of Subjunctive as Imperative.

[*] 255. The want of a first person in the imperative is supplied by the first person of the subjunctive, which expresses both positive and negative exhortations and appeals (the negative with μῖ). ἴγε, ἴγετε, εἰ δὲ ἴγε, φέρε, ἴθι, δεῦρο, and δεῦτε (251) may precede this subjunctive; so sometimes ἴα, permit, let.

[*] 256. The first person plural is most common, and generally expresses an exhortation of the speaker to others to join him in doing or in not doing some act. E.g. ὠμεν, let us go; μὴ ὠμεν, let us not go. “Ὁκαδὸν περ σὺν νηυσὶ νεμέμεθα, τὸνδε δὴ ἴμεν,” “let us sail homeward with our ships, and leave him.” Il. ii. 236. “Ἄλλο γέ μηκῆτι τάτα λεγόμεθα,” “but come, let us no longer talk thus.” Il. xiii. 292 ; so ii. 435. “Ἄλλο γέ δὲ καὶ νῆι μεδόμεθα θοῦριδος ἄλκις,” Il. iv. 418. “Ἐδὲ γέ τ’ ἔμφ’ ἔπι λιν σὺν τεύχεσι πειρηθόμεν,” Il. xxii. 381 ; so 392. “Δεῦτε, φίλοι, τὸν ξείνον ἔρμεθα,” Od. viii. 133. “Μὴ δὲ πῶ λῶμεθα ἴππους, ἄλλο ἴντες Πέτροκλον κλάωμεν,” Il. xxiii. 7. “Ἄλλο εἰ δοκεῖ, πλῶμεν, ἔρμ’ ἴσθω ταχῆς,” SOPH. Ph. 526. “ἴπ’ σχετον, μῦθωμεν,” Ib. 539 , “Φέρε δὲ διαπερὶ νῶμεν ἄλγους” EUR. And. 333. “Δεῦρ’ σου στῆψω κῆρα,” Bacch. 341. “ἴπ’ σχές, ἔμβλωμεν εἰς ἄλλον ἄλγον,” El. 962. “Παρμὺν τε οὐν ἴσπερ Κέρος κελεύει, ἴσκημὺν τε δὲ ἴν μάλιστα δυνήσμεθα καταχεῖν ἴδε, παρ’ ἡμῶν τε ἔμεις ἀπτόμεν, κ.τ.λ.” XEN. Cyr. viii. 1, 5. “Μὴ ποτε φέμεν νεκὰ τοῦτων μηδὲν μἄλλ’ ἢ ποτε ψυχὴν ἴπ’ ἄλλυσθαι” PLAT. Rep. 610B. “ἴα δὲ νῆν ἴν σοῦ σκεψόμεθα” Id. Soph. 239B.

[*] 257. The less common first person singular is, in affirmative exhortations, generally preceded by a word like γέ, etc. (251), or by some other command, and the speaker appeals to himself to do something or to others for permission to do it. In negative appeals with μὴ the first person singular is rare and poetic; the speaker may call on others to avert some evil from himself, or he may utter a threat or a warning. E.g. “Ἄλλο γέ δὲ τὴ χρῆματ’ ἴριθμῶ καὶ ἴδωμαι,” “come, let me count the things and see.” Od. xiii. 215. “Ἄλλο γέ θ’ ἴμ’ ἴν τεύχε’ ἴνεκῶ θωρηθῆναι” Od. xxii. 139. Θῆπτε με ἴττι τῆχιστα, πῆλας ἴδαο περῶσω, “bury me as quickly as possible; let me pass the gates of Hades.” Il. xxiii. 71. Ἄλλο γέ νῆν ἴπ’ μείνον, ἴρῆια τεύχεα δῶ. Il. vi. 340. Φέρε ἴκοῶσω, come, let me hear. HDT. i. 11. “Σῆγα, πνοῆς μῦθω: φέρε πρὸς οἴς βῆλω” EUR. H.F. 1059. ἴπ’ σχετ’, ἀδῆν τῆν ἴσωθεν ἴκμηθω. Id. Hipp. 567. Ἄγε δὲ, ἴδω. PLAT. Rep. 457 C.

Μὴ σε, γέρον, κολλῶσιν ἴγ’ παρ’ νηυσὶ κίχῶ, “let me not find you at the ships!” Il. i. 26. Μὴ σευ ἴκοῶσω ἐχόμῆνον. Il. xxi. 475. Ἄλλο μὴ ἴκ γε τῶσδε γῆς πῆρθμευσον ἴς τῆχιστα, μῦδ’ ἀπτόθῆνω. SOPH. Tr. 801. “ἴξείνοι, μὴ δῆτ’ ἴδικηθῆ.” Id. O.C. 174.

[*] 258. In the first person (255-257) both present and aorist subjunctive are used with μὴ, the distinction of 259 applying only to the second and third persons. In affirmative exhortations the second and third persons of the subjunctive are not regularly used, the imperative being the only recognised form. But in SOPH. Ph. 300, φέμεν, ἴ τῆκνον, νῆν καὶ τῆ τῆς νῆσου μῦθῆς (if the text is sound), the positive μῦθῆς seems strangely to follow the analogy of the negative μὴ μῦθῆς. Nauck reads μῦθε here. See also τῆ ψῆφισμα ἴνατεθῆ in an inscription quoted in Appendix I. p. 385.

Imperative and Subjunctive in Prohibitions.

[*] 259. In prohibitions, in the second and third persons, the present imperative or the aorist subjunctive is used with μὴ and its compounds. The distinction of tense here is solely the ordinary distinction between the present and aorist (87), and has no reference to the moods. E.g. Μὴ ποῖε τοῦτο, do not do this (habitually), or do not go on doing this (or stop doing this); μὴ ποιῶσῆς τοῦτο, (simply) do not do this. “ἴξῆδα, μὴ κέθε νῆν, ἴνα εἴδομεν ἴμφω” Il. i. 363. “ἴτρεῖδη, μὴ ψέδε ἴπιστῆμενος σῆφα εἴπεῖν” Il. iv. 404. “ἴργεοι, μὴ πῆ τι μεθῆτε

θοοριδος λκς” Il. iv. 234. “Επι μοι ερομν νημερτα, μηδ πικεσς” Od. xv. 263. “δη ν σ παιδ πος φο, μηδ πκευθε” (compare the last example). Od. xvi. 168. “Τν μ μοι μλλον ν λγεσι θυμν ρνς” Il. xxiv. 568. See Il. xxiv. 778. “Μ δ με λωρ Δαναοσιν σς κεσθαι” Il. v. 684. “Κλθι μηδ μεγρς” Od. iii. 55. “Μ πως νδρσι δυσμενεσσιν λωρ κα κρμα γνησθε,” “do not become prey and spoil to hostile men.” Il. v. 487. “Μ ποτε π πσαν λσσς γλαην” Od. xix. 81. “μες δ τ γ τδε μ βαρν κτον σκψησθε, μ θυμοσθε, μηδ καρπαν τεξητε” AESCH. Eum. 800. “ν μτ κνετε, μτ φτ πος κακν” SOPH. O.C. 731. Μ θσθε νμον μηδνα, λλλ τος βλπτοντας μς λσατε. DEM. iii. 10. (Here θσθε would not be allowed; but λσατε, an affirmative command, is regular.) Μ κατ τος νμους δικσητε: μ βοηθησητε τ πεπονθητι δειν: μ εορκετε. Id. xxi. 211. “Μ πρ, πα, δδα” AR. Nub. 614. Κα μηδες πολβ με βολεσθαι λαθεν. Isoc. v. 93. Κα μηδες οσθω μ γνοεν. Id. iv. 73.

[*] 260. The third person of the aorist imperative is sometimes used with μ in prohibitions; but the second person with μ is very rare and only poetic. E.g. “Μηδ β σε μηδαμς νικηστω” SOPH. Aj. 1334. “Μηδ σοι μεληστω” AESCH. Prom. 332 ; so 1002. Κα μηδες μν προσδοκηστω λλωσ. PLAT. Ap. 17 C.

“Τ μ μοι πατρρας ποθη μο νθεο τιμ” Il. iv. 410 ; see Od. xxiv. 248. “Μ πω καταδσεο μλον ρηος” Il. xviii. 134. Μ ψεσον, Ζε, μ μ λς νευ δορς in SOPH. Peleus, Frag. 450, is parodied in AR. Thes. 870, “μ ψεσον, Ζε, τς πιοσης λπδος” .

Independent Subjunctive with μ Implying Fear (Homeric).

[*] 261. In the following Homeric examples the independent subjunctive with μ expresses apprehension, coupled with a desire to avert the object of fear, both ideas being inherent in the construction. The third person is the most common here.

“Μ δ νας λωσι κα οκτι φευκτ πλωνται,” “may they not (as I fear they may) seize the ships and make it no longer possible to escape.” Il. xvi. 128. “Μ δ μοι τελσωσι θεο κακ κδεα θυμ,” “may the Gods not bring to pass (as I fear they may) bitter woes for my soul.” Il. xviii. 8. “Μ τι χολωσμενος ξ κακν υας χαιν,” “may he not (as I fear he may) in his wrath do anything to harm the sons of the Achaeans.” Il. ii. 195. “μ μοι γ, μ τς μοι φανσιν δλον ατε θαντων” Od. v. 356. “Μ πς μ κβαννοντα βλλ λθακι προτ πτρ κμα μγ ρπξαν, μεληη δ μοι σσεται ρμ,” “I fear that some great wave may dash me against a solid rock, and my effort will (then) be in vain” (the expression of fear being merged in an assertion). Od. v. 415. See also Il. xxi. 563; Od. v. 467, Od. xvii. 24, Od. xxii. 213. “Τν ε κεν πντων ντισομεν, μ πολπικρα κα αν βας ποτσεαι λθν,” “I fear you may punish their violence only to our bitter grief (and may you not do this).” Od. xvi. 255. “Μ τι κακν ξωσι κα μας ξελσωσιν, λλων δ φικμεθα γαν,” “may they not (as I fear) do us some harm and drive us out, and may we not come to some land of others.” Od. xvi. 381. “Μ μιν γ μν κωμαι ν, δ μ οκ λεσει,” “I fear I may approach him as I come, while he will not pity me.” Il. xxii. 122 (see Od. v. 415, above). “Μ τοι κατ πντα φγωσιν κματα δασσμενοι, σ δ τησσην δν λθς” Od. xv. 12. The present subjunctive occurs in Od. xv. 19, “μ τι φρηται” , and in xvi. 87, “μ μιν κερτομωσιν” . See also πλωνται in Il. xvi. 128, above. (See 258.) In these examples sometimes the fear itself, and sometimes the desire to avert its object, is more prominent.

[*] 262. (a) By prefixing δεῖδω or φοβομαι to any of the subjunctives with μ in 261, we get the full construction with verbs of fearing; as δεῖδω μ νᾶς ἴλωσι, I fear they may seize the ships, in which μ ἴλωσι represents an original construction which at first followed δεῖδω paratactically—I fear: may they not seize the ships—and afterwards became welded with it as a dependent clause. So if δεῖδω were removed from a sentence like δεῖδω μ τι πῆθσιν, Il. xi. 470, we should have an independent clause like those quoted above. See μ δαμῖσσ and δεῖδω μ γῖνωμαι, Od. v. 467 and 473.

(b) In like manner, by prefixing other verbs than those of fearing to such clauses, the original negative final clause with μ is developed; as μαχομεθα μ νᾶς ἴλωσι, we will fight that they may not seize the ships. Again, if the leading clause were removed from a sentence like ἀτομῖν ππργ, μ παδῖ ρφανικῖν θῖς χρηην τε γυνακα, remain here on the tower, lest you make your child an orphan and your wife a widow, Il. vi. 431, there would remain μ . . . θῖς, do not make, or may you not make, in the originally independent form, like the clauses with μ in 261. (See 307.)

[*] 263. μ ο, with the Subjunctive.) The clause with μ expressing desire to avert an object of fear, in its original simple form as well as in the developed final construction, may refer to a negative object, and express fear that something may not happen. Here μ ο is used with the subjunctive, like ne non in Latin.

Thus μ νᾶς ἴλωσι being may they not seize the ships, μ ο νᾶς ἴλωσι would be may they not fail to seize the ships, implying fear that they may not seize them. Homer has one case of μ ο after a verb of fearing: δεῖδω μ ο τς τοι πσχηται τδε ργον, Il. x. 39. He has several cases of μ ο in final clauses and one in an object clause (354). Il. i. 28, μ ν τοι ο χρασμ σκπτρον κα στμμα θεοο, is often cited as a case of independent μ ο, meaning beware lest the staff and fillet of the God shall prove of no avail to you. So Delbrück (l. p. 119), who nevertheless quotes Il. i. 565, λλ κουσα κθησο μ δ πιπεθεο μθ, μ ν τοι ο χρασμωσιν σοι θεο εσ ν λμπ, as containing a dependent final clause. In the two other cases of μ ο with the subjunctive in Homer, Il. xv. 164 (an object clause, see 354), and xxiv. 569 (final), the dependence of the clause with μ ο is even more obvious; and in Il. xxiv. 584 we have in μ ο κ ρσαιτο the decisive proof that this clause is felt to be dependent in the change from the subjunctive to the optative after a past tense. It is therefore more than doubtful whether μ ο χρασμ in Il. i. 28 is not dependent on μ σε κτεω in vs. 26. Plato in paraphrasing this passage (Rep. 393E takes the clause as final and dependent (see 132). But, whether we have a case of independent μ ο with the subjunctive in Homer or not, there can be no doubt that this is the original form from which came the dependent final clause with μ ο.

[*] 264. After Homer we have the independent clause with μ in Aeschylus, Ag. 134 and 341; in Euripides we have independent μ in Alc. 315 (μ σος διαθερ γμους), Orest. 776 (μ λβωσ σ σμενοι), H. F. 1399 (αμα μ σος ξομρξωμαι ππλοις), and μ ο in Tro. 982 (μ ο πεσς σοφος), besides Rhés. 115 (μ ο μλς). Aristophanes, Eccl. 795, has a doubtful μ ο λβς (Heindorf and Meineke, for MSS. λβοις). Besides these few cases, we have in Plato three of μ with the subjunctive implying apprehension in the Homeric sense (261): Euthyd. 272C (μ ον τις νειδσ), Symp. 193B (μ μοι πολβ), Leg. 861E (μ τις οηται).

Euripides and Herodotus are the first after Homer to use $\mu\ \omicron$ in dependent clauses of fear (306).

Subjunctive with μ and $\mu\ \omicron$ in Cautious Assertions.

[*] 265. In Herodotus v. 79 we have $\lambda\lambda\ \mu\lambda\ \omicron\ \tau\ \tau\ \mu\alpha\nu\tau\ \iota\omicron\nu$, but I suspect rather that this may prove not to be the meaning of the oracle. This is the first example of a construction, very common in Plato, used also by Aristotle, and found once in Demosthenes, in which μ with the subjunctive expresses a suspicion that something may be (or may prove to be) true, and $\mu\ \omicron$ with the subjunctive a suspicion that something may not be true; the former amounting to a cautious assertion, the latter to a cautious negation. Examples from Plato are:—

$\omicron\ \gamma\omicron\iota\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \tau\ \lambda\eta\theta\ \epsilon\ \pi\epsilon\ \nu$, “I am afraid the truth may be too rude a thing to tell.” Gorg. 462 ε. $\omicron\ \lambda\eta\theta\ \tau\alpha\ \sigma\kappa\ \mu\mu\alpha\tau\ \tau\ \delta\ \omicron\ \pi\omicron\kappa\tau\iota\nu\nu\ \nu\tau\omega\nu$, I suspect these may prove to be considerations for those, etc. Crit. 48 C. $\omicron\ \phi\alpha\ \omicron\ \kappa\alpha\ \omicron\ \kappa\alpha\theta\ \delta\ \nu$, I think it will be bad and not in the right way (i.e. $\mu\ \omicron$). Crat. 425B. $\lambda\lambda\ \mu\ \omicron\ \chi\ \omicron\ \tau\omega\varsigma\ \chi$, $\lambda\lambda\ \nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\ \omicron\ \epsilon\ \delta\ \tau\ \tau\ \theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (i.e. μ). Crat. 436B. $\lambda\lambda\ \mu\ \omicron\ \tau\ \chi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\pi\ \nu$, $\theta\ \nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\ \kappa\ \phi\upsilon\gamma\ \nu$, “but I suspect this may not be the hard thing, to escape death.” Ap. 39A. $\mu\ \omicron\ \delta\ \omicron\ \lambda\lambda\ \omicron\ \sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\ \tau\ \omicron\nu$, “I am inclined to think we have nothing else to consider.” Crit. 48 C. $\omicron\ \delta\ \omicron\ \pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\ \zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, I think there will be no need of taking into account, etc. Crit. 48D. $\omicron\ \kappa\ \delta\ \iota\delta\alpha\kappa\ \tau\ \nu\ \rho\epsilon\tau$, “it will probably turn out that virtue is not a thing to be taught.” Men. 94E $\lambda\lambda\ \mu\ \omicron\ \chi\ \omicron\ \tau\omicron\iota\ \mu\ \epsilon\ \mu\epsilon\nu$, “but I think we shall not prove to be of this kind.” Symp. 194C4

See also Aristotle, Eth. x. 2. 4, $\mu\ \omicron\ \delta\ \nu\ \lambda\ \gamma\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ (v. l. $\lambda\ \gamma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$), there can hardly be anything in what they say. (See 269.) In DEM. i. 26 we have $\mu\ \lambda\ \omicron\nu\ \pi\iota\kappa\ \nu\ \epsilon\ \pi\epsilon\ \nu$, I am afraid it may be too harsh a thing to say. The present subjunctive here, as in dependent clauses of fear (92), may refer to what may prove true.

[*] 266. In these cautious assertions and negations, although no desire of the speaker to avert an object of fear is implied, there is always a tacit allusion to such a desire on the part of some person who is addressed or referred to, or else an ironical pretence of such a desire of the speaker himself.

[*] 267. The subjunctive with μ in this sense is sometimes found in dependent clauses. E.g. $\omicron\ \mu\ \lambda\lambda\ \omicron\ \tau\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\ \omicron\nu\ \kappa\ \tau\ \gamma\alpha\theta\ \nu\ \tau\ \sigma\ \zeta\epsilon\iota\nu\ \kappa\ \sigma\ \zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, see to it lest (it prove true that) these may be different things, etc. PLAT. Gorg. 512D. The common translation, see whether they may not be different, gives the general sense, but not the construction, which is simply that of $\mu\ \lambda\lambda\ \omicron\ \tau$ (265) transferred to a dependent clause.

[*] 268. In a few cases Plato has μ with the subjunctive in a cautious question with a negative answer implied. As $\mu\ \lambda\lambda\ \omicron\ \tau\ \tau\ \omicron$ means this may possibly be something else, so the question $\mu\ \lambda\lambda\ \omicron\ \tau\ \tau\ \omicron$; means can this possibly be something else? The four examples given by Weber are:—

$\omicron\ \tau\ \lambda\lambda\ \omicron\ \pi\alpha\rho\ \tau\ \omicron$; “can there be any other besides these?” Rep. 603C. $\omicron\ \mu\ \lambda\lambda\ \omicron\ \tau\ \theta\ \nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\ \omicron$; “is it possible that death can prove to be anything but this?” Phaed. 64C. So $\mu\ \tau\ \lambda\lambda\ \omicron$, κ.τ.λ.; Parm. 163D. $\lambda\lambda\ \mu\ \mu\ \mu\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\rho\gamma\ \alpha\ \kappa\ \tau\ \rho\omega\tau\ \sigma\alpha\ \sigma\epsilon\ \pi\epsilon\rho$

το■του; but can it be that even asking you about this is inquisitiveness on my part? Sisyph. 387 C (this can be understood positively, it may be that it is, etc.). In XEN. Mem. iv. 2, 12, the same interrogative construction occurs with μ■ ο■: μ■ ο■ν ο■ δ■νωμαι ■γ■ τ■ τ■ς δικαιοσ■νης ■ργα ■ξηγ■σασθαι; do you suspect that I shall be unable to explain the works of Justice? In PLAT. Phil. 12D we have π■ς γ■ρ ■δον■ γε ■δον■ μ■ ο■χ ■μοι■τατον ■ν ε■η; for how could one pleasure help being most like another? Here ε■η ■ν takes the place of ■, and π■ς shows that the original force of μ■ is forgotten.

Indicative with μ■ and μ■ ο■ in Cautious Assertions.

[*] 269. The present or past tenses of the indicative with μ■ or μ■ ο■ may express a similar cautious assertion or suspicion about a present or past act. As φοβο■μαι μ■ π■σχει (or ■παθεν) means I fear that he is suffering (or suffered), so μ■ π■σχει or μ■ ■παθεν may mean I suspect he is suffering or I suspect he suffered, and μ■ ο■ π■σχει or μ■ ο■κ ■παθεν may mean I suspect he does not (or did not) suffer. (Cf. 265.) E.g. Μ■ γ■ρ το■το μ■ν, τ■ ζ■ν ■ποσονδ■ χρ■νον, τ■ν γε ■ς ■ληθ■ς ■νδρα ■ατ■ον ■στ■ κα■ ο■ φιλοψυχητ■ον (i.e. κα■ μ■ ο■ φιλ.), for I am of the opinion that this, merely living for a certain time, is what one who is truly a man should disregard, and that he should not be fond of life. PLAT. Gorg. 512D. (This passage is often strangely emended and explained.) ■λλ■ ■ρα μ■ ο■ τοια■την ■πολαμβ■νεις σου τ■ν μ■θησιν ■σεσθαι, "I suspect that you do not think your learning will be like this." Prot. 312A. ■λλ■ μ■ το■το ο■ καλ■ς ■μολογ■σαμεν, "but perhaps we did not do well in assenting to this." Men. 89C. (This may be interrogative (268): can it be that we did not do well, etc.?) So Aristotle, Eth. x. 1, Eth. 3, μ■ ποτε δ■ ο■ καλ■ς λ■γεται, but it may be that this is not well said: compare x. 2, Eth. 4, quoted in 265.

[*] 270. Apart from independent sentences with μ■ ο■ (263-269), this double negative occurs chiefly in ordinary clauses after verbs of fearing where the object of fear is negative (305; 365).

■πως and ■πως μ■ with the Independent Future Indicative, etc.

[*] 271. The Athenians developed a colloquial use of ■πως or ■πως μ■ with the future indicative to express either a positive exhortation or command or a prohibition. Thus ■πως το■το ■ρε■ς, see that you say this, is a familiar way of saying ε■π■ το■το. So ■πως μ■ το■το ■ρε■ς is equivalent to μ■ το■το ε■π■ς. This expression was probably suggested and certainly encouraged by the common Attic construction of ■πως and the future after verbs of striving, taking care, etc. (339); so that it is common to explain this form by an ellipsis of σκ■πει in σκ■πει ■πως το■το ■ρε■ς, see to it that you say this. But we may doubt whether any definite leading verb was ever in mind when these familiar exhortations were used (see 273).

[*] 272. The earliest example is AESCH. Prom. 68, "■πως μ■ σαυτ■ν ο■κτιε■ς ποτε", beware lest at some time you may have yourself to pity, which conveys a warning, like μ■ σε κιχε■ω, Il. i. 26. In AESCH. Ag. 600, we have the first person singular with ■πως (used like the subjunctive in 257): ■πως δ■ ■ριστα τ■ν ■μ■ν α■δο■ον π■σιν σπε■σω δ■ξασθαι (not mentioned by Weber). In Sophocles there is only one case, O. T. 1518, "γ■ς μ■ ■πως π■μυεις ■ποικον", send me forth an exile from the land (like π■μυον με). Five examples in Euripides are simple exhortations, as "■λλ■ ■πως ■ν■ρ ■σει," "but see that you are a man," Cycl. 595; so also Cycl. 630, H. F. 504, I. T. 321, Or. 1060 (with doubtful construction): one conveys a warning, Bacch. 367, "Πενθε■ς δ■

■πως μ■ π■νθος ε■σο■σει δ■μοις το■ς σο■σι” , beware lest Pentheus bring sorrow (π■νθος) into your house.

[*] 273. We find the greater part of the examples of 271 in the colloquial language of Aristophanes,⁵ who often uses the imperative and ■πως with the future as equivalent constructions in the same sentence. E.g. Κατ■θου σ■ τ■ σκε■η ταχ■ως, χ■πως ■ρε■ς ■ντα■θα μηδ■ν ψε■δος, “put down the packs quickly, and tell no lies here.” Ran. 627. ■λλ■ ■μβα χ■πως ■ρε■ς τ■ν Σ■τειραν. Ib. 377. See also Eq. 453, Eq. 495, Eccl. 952, Ach. 955. “N■ν ο■ν ■πως σ■σεις με,” “so now save me.” Nub. 1177. ■πως παρ■σει μοι κα■ σ■ κα■ τ■ παιδ■α, be on hand, you and your children (an invitation). Av. 131. “■γε νυν ■πως ε■θ■ως ■φαρπ■σει” Nub. 489.

[*] 274. (Examples from Prose.) ■πως ο■ν ■σεσθε ■νδρες ■ξιοι τ■ς ■λευθερ■ας, “prove yourselves men worthy of freedom.” XEN. An. i. 7, 3. ■πως μοι, ■ ■νθρωπε, μ■ ■ρε■ς ■τι ■στι τ■ δ■δεκα δ■ς ■ξ, “see that you do not tell me that twice six are twelve.” PLAT. Rep. 337 B: so 336 δ. Φ■ρε δ■ ■πως μεμνησ■μεθα τα■τα. Gorg. 495D. ■πως γε, ■ν τι το■των γ■γνηται, το■τους ■παιν■σεσθε κα■ τιμ■σετε κα■ στεφαν■σετε, ■μ■ δ■ μ■: κα■ μ■ντοι κ■ν τι τ■ν ■ναντ■ων, ■πως το■τοις ■ργιε■σθε. DEM. xix. 45. ■πως το■νυν περ■ το■ πολ■μου μηδ■ν ■ρε■ς, “see therefore that you say nothing about the war.” Ib. 94.

One case occurs in Herodotus in iii. 142. (See also 280, below.)

[*] 275. Although the second person is naturally most common in these expressions, the first and third persons also occur. E.g. ■πως δ■ τ■ σ■μβολον λαβ■ντες ■πειτα πλησ■ον καθεδο■μεθα. AR. Eccl. 297. Ο■μοι τ■λας, ■ Ζε■ς ■πως μ■ μ■ ■γεται, “don’t let Zeus see me!” Id. Av. 1494. Κα■ ■πως, ■σπερ ■ρωτ■σι προθ■μως, ο■τω κα■ ποιε■ν ■θελ■σουσιν. DEM. viii. 38. (See also 278.)

[*] 276. ■γε and φ■ρε (251) sometimes introduce this construction. See examples above (273 and 274).

[*] 277. In a few cases the prohibition with ■πως μ■ takes the form of a warning. Besides AESCH. Prom. 68 and Bacch. 367, quoted above, see XEN. Cyr. i. 3, 18 , ■πως ο■ν μ■ ■πολε■ μαστιγο■μενος, look out that you are not flogged to death. So PLAT. Prot. 313 C, quoted in 283.

[*] 278. ■πως μ■ with the future indicative or the subjunctive sometimes occurs in independent sentences implying a desire to avert something that is not desired, like μ■ with the subjunctive in Homer and sometimes in Attic Greek (261; 264). E.g. ■πως μ■ α■σχρο■ μ■ν φανο■μεθα ■σθενε■ς δ■ ■σ■μεθα, let us not appear base and be weak (as I fear we may). XEN. Cyr. iv. 2, 39. ■πως μ■ ■ναγκ■σωμεν (so most MSS.) α■το■ς, κ■ν μ■ βο■λωνται, ■γαθο■ς γεν■σθαι, there is danger of our compelling them to become brave, even against their will. Ib. iv. 1, Ib. 16. Κα■ ■πως γε μηδ■ τ■ χωρ■ον ■δ■ως ■ρ■σιν ■νθα κατ■κανον ■μ■ν το■ς συμμ■χους, “and let us not allow them even to enjoy the sight of the place where they slew our allies.” Ib. v. 4, Ib. 21. ■πως μ■ φ■σ■ τις ■μ■ς ■δυπαθε■ν, take care lest any one say of us, etc. Id. Symp. iv. 8. ■λλ■ ■πως μ■ ο■χ ο■ς τ■ ■σομαι, προθυμο■μενος δ■ γ■λωτα ■φλ■σω, but I am afraid that I shall not have the power, but that in my zeal I shall make myself ridiculous. PLAT. Rep. 506D. So Men. 77A.

[*] 279. These cases (278) are analogous to those of **πως μ** with the future indicative or the subjunctive after verbs of fearing, in place of the simple **μ** (370). They are also a connecting link between the subjunctive with **μ** in prohibitions and the rare future indicative with **μ** in the same sense; as **τατην φυλξετε τιν πιστιν, κα μ βουλσεσθε εδναι**, hold fast to this security, and do not wish to know, etc., DEM. xxiii. 117 (see other examples in 70).

[*] 280. In a few cases **πως μ** with the subjunctive expresses a cautious assertion, where the simple **μ** is generally used (265). E.g. **Κα πως μ ν μν τος ζωγραφμασιν τοτο**, “and it may be that this will prove true in the case of pictures.” PLAT. Crat. 430D. Weber (p. 264) quotes HDT. vi. 85 for this sense: **κως ξ στερης μ τι μν, ν τατα ποισητε, πανλεθρον κακν ς τν χρην μβλωσι**, it is not unlikely that they will turn about and bring some fatal harm on your country; but this can be understood like the examples in 278.

[*] 281. “**ς ν σκοπο νν τε τν ερημωνων**,” “mind now and guard what I have said (i.e. be watchful to do it),” SOPH. Ant. 215, must be brought under this head (271). In the early stage of the Attic construction of **πως** with the future, of which only two cases occur in Aeschylus and one in Sophocles (272), **ς ν τε** was here used like **πως σεσθε**. Compare “**πιμελεσθαι ς ν πραχθ**,” Hipp. ix. 2 (see 351).

[*] 282. In AR. Ach. 343 is the single case of **πως μ** with a present tense, expressing a suspicion and apprehension concerning a present ground of fear: **λλ πως μ ν τος τρβωσιν γκθηντα που λθοι**, but I am afraid they now have stones hidden somewhere in their cloaks. This bears the same relation to the common **πως μ** with the future (272) that **φοβομαι μ πσχουσιν**, I fear that they are suffering (369, AR. Ach. 1), bears to **φοβομαι μ πσχουσιν**, I fear that they may suffer (365); and the same that **μ τοτο ατον στ** (269) bears to **μ σκεπτον** (265).

[*] 283. Positive independent sentences with **πως** all have the future indicative, the regular form in dependent object clauses of this nature (339). Among the 33 independent clauses with **πως μ** which are cited (excluding AR. Ach. 343) ten have the subjunctive, and four others have more or less MS. support for the subjunctive. Of the ten, the two quoted in 280, and the three from Xenophon quoted in 278, are either in cautious assertions or in sentences implying fear or the averting of danger, where the subjunctive is the regular form. The other five express warning, and are quoted here:—

“**Οπως δ τοτο μ διδξς μηδνα**,” “but be sure that you teach this to nobody.” AR. Nub. 824. **Κα πως γε μ σοφιστς ξαπατσ μς**, “and do not let the sophist cheat us.” PLAT. Prot. 313 C. **λλ πως μ τι μς σφλλ τ ε τοτο**. Id. Euthyd. 296A. **πως μηδες σε πεσ**, do not let anybody persuade you, etc. Charm. 157B. **Κα πως μ ποισητε πολλκς μς βλαπεν**, “and see that you do not do what has often harmed you.” DEM. iv. 20.

Four of these subjunctives are of the **σ**- class, easily confounded with the future indicative, and the judgment of scholars on these has depended to a great extent upon their opinion about the admissibility of the subjunctive with **πως** and **πως μ** in dependent object clauses (339). This question will be discussed in 364. But it may fairly be claimed, independently of the main question, that these cases of **πως μ** with the subjunctive in prohibitions are supported by the analogy of **μ** with the subjunctive in the same sense. Thus **μ διδξς**, do not teach, makes **πως μ**

διδ[ξ]ς in the same sense much more natural than the positive [π]ως διδ[ξ]ς would be, for which there is no such analogy and little or no MS. authority. On this ground the examples are given above as they stand in the MSS.

Section III: Subjunctive, like the Future Indicative, in Independent Sentences.—Interrogative Subjunctive.

Homeric Subjunctive.

[*] 284. In the Homeric language the subjunctive (generally the aorist) may be used in independent sentences, with the force of a future indicative. The negative is ο[μ]. E.g. “Ο[μ] γ[α]ρ πω το[μ]ους [μ]δον [μ]ν[ρ]ας ο[μ]δ[μ] [μ]δωμαι,” “for I never yet saw nor shall I ever see such men.” Il. i. 262. “[μ]ν [μ]ν π[μ]ντεσσι περικλυτ[μ] δ[μ]ρ[μ] [μ]νομ[μ]νω,” “I will enumerate the gifts before you all.” Il. ix. 121. “[μ]σομαι [μ]ς [μ]δαο κα[μ] [μ]ν νεκ[μ]εσσι φαε[μ]νω,” “I will descend to Hades and shine among the dead (said by the Sun).” Od. xii. 383. (Here the future δ[μ]σομαι and the subjunctive φαε[μ]νω do not differ in force.) “[μ]ν[μ]σομαι ο[μ]δ[μ] λ[μ]θωμαι [μ]π[μ]λλωνος [μ]κ[μ]τοιο,” “I will remember and will not forget the far-shooting Apollo.” Hymn. Ap. 1. “[μ]το[μ] ο[μ] θ[μ]νατον μητ[μ]σομαι, ο[μ]δ[μ] νυ τ[μ]ν γε γνωτο[μ] τε γνωτα[μ] τε πυρ[μ]ς λελ[μ]χωσι θαν[μ]ντα,” “i.e., they shall not give his dead body the honour of a funeral pyre.” Il. xv. 349. “[μ] δ[μ] κε τεθνη[μ]τος [μ]κο[μ]σω, σ[μ]μ[μ] τ[μ] ο[μ] χε[μ]ω κα[μ] [μ]π[μ] κτ[μ]ρεα κτερε[μ]ξω,” “I will raise a mound for him, and pay him funeral honours.” Od. ii. 222. “Ο[μ] γ[α]ρ τ[μ]ς με β[μ] [μ] γε [μ]κ[μ]ν [μ]κοντα δ[μ]ηται” Il. vii. 197. “Κα[μ] ποτ[μ] τις ε[μ]π[μ]σιν,” “and some one will say.” Il. vi. 459. (In vs. 462, referring to the same thing, we have [μ]ς ποτ[μ] τις [μ]ρ[μ]ει.) “Ο[μ]κ[μ] [μ]σθ[μ] ο[μ]τος [μ]ν[ρ] ο[μ]δ[μ] [μ]σεται ο[μ]δ[μ] γ[μ]νηται, [μ]ς κεν Τηλεμ[μ]χ[μ] σ[μ] υ[μ] [μ]ι χε[μ]ρας [μ]πο[μ]σει” Od. xvi. 437. “Ο[μ]δ[μ] μιν [μ]νστ[μ]σεις: πρ[μ]ν κα[μ] κακ[μ]ν [μ]λλο π[μ]θ[μ]σθα,” “nor will you bring him back to life; sooner will you suffer some new evil besides.” Il. xxiv. 551 (the only example of the second person).

[*] 285. This Homeric subjunctive, like the future indicative, is sometimes joined with κ[μ] or [μ]ν in a potential sense. This enabled the earlier language to express an apodosis with a sense between that of the optative with [μ]ν and that of the simple future indicative, which the Attic was unable to do. (See 201 and 452.) E.g. Ε[μ] δ[μ] κε μ[μ] δ[μ]σιν, [μ]γ[μ] δ[μ] κεν α[μ]τ[μ]ς [μ]λωμαι, but if he does not give her up, I will take her myself. Il. i. 324. (Here [μ]λωμα[μ] κεν has a shade of meaning between [μ]λο[μ]μην κεν, I would take, and α[μ]ρ[μ]σομαι, I will take, which neither Attic Greek nor English can express. See 235, end.) Τ[μ]ν μ[μ]ν π[μ]μψω, [μ]γ[μ] δ[μ] κ[μ] [μ]γω Βριση[μ]δα, “her I will send; but I shall take Briseis.” Il. i. 184. Ν[μ]ν δ[μ] [μ]ν πολλ[μ] π[μ]θ[μ]σι φ[μ]λου [μ]π[μ] πατρ[μ]ς [μ]μαρτ[μ]ν, but now he must suffer much, etc. Il. xxii. 505. [μ]ις [μ]περοπλ[μ]σιν τ[μ]χ[μ] [μ]ν ποτε θυμ[μ]ν [μ]λ[μ]σσο[μ], “by his own insolence he may perchance lose his life.” Il. i. 205.

[*] 286. In the following cases the subjunctive and the optative with κ[μ] or [μ]ν are contrasted:—

“[μ]λλον κ[μ] [μ]χθα[μ]ρ[μ]σι βροτ[μ]ν, [μ]λλον κε φιλο[μ]η,” “one mortal he (a king) will hate, and another he may love.” Od. iv. 692. “[μ] τ[μ]ς σε [μ]δοιτο, α[μ]τ[μ]κ[μ] [μ]ν [μ]ξε[μ]ποι [μ]γαμ[μ]μνονι, κα[μ] κεν [μ]ν[μ]βλησις λ[μ]σιος νεκρο[μ]ο γ[μ]νηται,” “if any one should see you, he would straightway tell Agamemnon, and there might (may) be a postponement, etc.” Il. xxiv. 653. “[μ] μ[μ]ν δ[μ] [μ]ντ[μ]βιον σ[μ]ν τε[μ]χεσι πειρηθε[μ]ης, ο[μ]κ[μ] [μ]ν τοι χρα[μ]σμ[μ]σι βι[μ]ς κα[μ] ταρφ[μ]ες [μ]ο[μ],” Il. xi. 386. Compare “[μ]ν χ[μ] [μ]μ[μ]ν σ[μ]φα ε[μ]πω τε πρ[μ]τερ[μ]ς γε πυθο[μ]μην,” “(a message) which I will (would) tell you plainly so soon as I shall (should) hear it,” Od. ii. 43, with “[μ]ν χ[μ] [μ]μ[μ]ν σ[μ]φα ε[μ]ποι [μ]τε

πρ[ε]τερ[ε]ς γε π[ρ]οιτο,” Od. ii. 31 , — both referring to the same thing.

Interrogative Subjunctive.

[*] 287. The first person of the subjunctive is used in questions of appeal, where the speaker asks himself or another what he is to do. The negative is μ[η]. In Attic Greek this subjunctive is often introduced by βο[υ]λει or βο[υ]λεσθε, sometimes in poetry by θ[ε]λεις or θ[ε]λετε. E.g. Ε[γ]ω το[υ]το; shall I say this? or βο[υ]λει ε[γ]ω το[υ]το; do you wish that I should say this? Μ[η] το[υ]το ποι[ο]μεν (or ποι[ο]σωμεν; shall we not do this? Τ[ι] ε[γ]ω; or τ[ι] βο[υ]λεσθε ε[γ]ω; what shall I say? or what do you want me to say?

“Π[ο]υ τ[ι] ρ[η]γ[η], φ[ι]λε τ[ο]κνον, [ω]; τε[ρ] δ[ι]μαθ[η] κωμαι; [θ]ς σ[υ]ς μητρ[ε]ς [ω] κα[ι] σο[φ]ο δ[ι]μοιο;” “whither shall I go? to whose house shall I come? etc.” Od. xv. 509. “[α]τ[ε]ς κε[θ]ω; φ[ι]σθαι δ[ι] με θυμ[ο]ς ν[ε]γ[η]ι” Od. xxi. 194. “[Ζε]υ[ς], τ[ι] λ[ε]ξω; πο[υ] φρεν[ε]ν [λ]θω, π[ρ]τερ;” SOPH. O.C. 310. [μοι] γ[η], π[η] β[η]; π[η] στ[η]; π[η] κ[λ]σω; EUR. Hec. 1056. Πο[υ] τρ[ι]πωμαι; πο[υ] πορευθ[η]; Ib. 1099. Ε[γ]ω τι τ[ι]ν ε[ω]θ[η]των, [δ]σποτα; “ shall I make one of the regular jokes?” AR. Ran. 1. Τ[ι]να γ[η]ρ μ[ε]ρτυρα με[ζ]ω παρ[ο]σχωμαι; i.e. how shall I bring forward a greater witness? DEM. xix. 240. Μηδ[η], [η]ν τι [η]ν[ο]μαι, [ρ]ωμαι [π]σου πωλε[η]; may I not ask, etc.? Μηδ[η] [πο]κρ[ι]νωμαι ο[η], [η]ν τ[η]ς με [ρ]ωτ[η] ν[ο]ς, [η]ν ε[δ]η; and may I not answer, etc.? XEN. Mem. i. 2, 36. Μ[η] [πο]κρ[ι]νωμαι, [λλ] [τε]ρον ε[π]ω; PLAT. Rep. 337B. So μ[η] φ[η]μεν; Ib. 554B Μισθωσ[η]μεθα ο[η]ν κ[η]ρυκα, [α]τ[ε]ς ν[ε]π[ω]; Ib. 580B. Μεθ[η]οντα [η]δρα π[η]νυ σφ[η]δρα δ[ι]ξεσθε συμπ[η]την, [η] [π]ωμεν; “ will you receive him, or shall we go away?” Symp. 212E. [ρα] μ[η] [α]ς χυνθ[η]μεν τ[η]ν Περσ[η]ν βασιλ[η]α μιμ[η]σασθαι; “ shall we then be ashamed to imitate the king of the Persians? —we shall not be ashamed; shall we?” XEN. Oec. iv. 4.

“Πο[υ] δ[η] βο[υ]λει καθιζ[η]μενοι ν[α]γν[η]μεν;” “where wilt thou that we sit down and read?” PLAT. Phaedr. 228E. (So Ib. 263 E.) Βο[υ]λει ο[η]ν [π]ισκοπ[η]μεν [που] [δη] τ[η] δυνατ[η]ν [στι]; XEN. Mem. iii. 5, 1. Βο[υ]λει λ[η]βωμαι δ[η]τα κα[ι] θ[η]γω τ[η] σου; SOPH. Phil. 761. Βο[υ]λεσθ[η] [π]εισπ[η]σωμεν; EUR. Hec. 1042. Θ[η]λεις με[η]νωμεν α[το] κ[η]νακο[η]σωμεν γ[η]ων; SOPH. El. 81. Τ[η] σοι θ[η]λεις δ[η]τ[η] ε[κ]θ[η]; Id. O.T. 650. “Θ[η]λετε θηρασ[η]μεθα Πενθ[η]ως [γ]α[η]ην μητρ[ε]ς [κ] βακχευμ[η]των, χ[η]ριν τ[η] ν[α]κτι θ[η]μεν;” EUR. Bacch. 719. “Βο[υ]λεσθε τ[η] [η]λον πρ[η]γμα [φ]μεν κα[ι] μ[η] ζητ[η]μεν;” AESCHIN. i. 73. So with κελε[η]ετε: [λλ] [π]ς; ε[π]ω κελε[η]ετε κα[ι] ο[η]κ [ρ]γε[η]σθε; do you command me to speak, and will you not be angry? DEM. ix. 46. In PLAT. Rep. 372 E, we find ε[η] δ[η] α[η] βο[υ]λεσθε κα[ι] φλεγμα[η]νουσαν π[η]λιν θεωρ[η]σωμεν, ο[η]δ[η]ν [πο]κωλ[η]ει, but if, again, you will have us examine an inflamed state, there is nothing to prevent. This shows that βο[υ]λεσθε is not parenthetical, but is felt to be the leading verb on which the subjunctive depends (see 288). In Phaed. 95E, [η]να μ[η] τι διαφ[η]γ[η] μ[η]ς, ε[η] τ[η] τι βο[υ]λει προσθ[η]ς [η] [φ]λ[η]ς, the subjunctives may depend on [η]να.

[*] 288. Ε[η] βο[υ]λεσθε θεωρ[η]σωμεν, if you wish us to examine, quoted in 287, shows that we have in βο[υ]λεσθε with the subjunctive a parataxis not yet developed into a leading and a dependent clause. It is probable that nothing like this was felt in the simple subjunctive as it is found in Homer. The original interrogative subjunctive is probably the interrogative form corresponding to the subjunctive in exhortations (256); [η]λωμεν, let us go, becoming [η]λωμεν; shall we go? (See Kühner, § 394, 5.) When βο[υ]λει and βο[υ]λεσθε were first introduced in appeals to others, the two questions were doubtless felt to be distinct; as βο[υ]λεσθε; ε[η]πω; do you wish? shall I speak?— which were gradually welded into one, do you wish that I speak? Compare in Latin cave facias, —

visne hoc videamus? etc. No conjunction could be introduced to connect βοῦμαι or θῶμαι to the subjunctive in classic Greek, as these verbs could have only the infinitive; but in later Greek, where ἴνα could be used after θῶμαι, the construction was developed into θῶμαί τε ἴνα εἴπω; do you wish me to speak? See πῦντα ἴσα ἴν θῶμαί τε ἴνα ποιῶσιν ἴμῶν οἴ ἴνθρωποι, whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, N. T. MATTH. vii. 12. So θῶμαι ἴνα δῶς μοι τῶν κεφαλῶν ἴωῖνον τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ. MARC. vi. 25. These forms appear in the New Testament side by side with the old construction without ἴνα; as τῶ σοι θῶμαι ποιῶσω; what wilt thou that I should do unto thee? with the answer, ἴνα ἴνα βλῶψω, that I may receive my sight, LUC. xviii. 41. So βοῦλασθε ἴμῶν ἴπολλῶσω τῶν βασιλῶα τῶν ἴουδαῶων; IOH. xviii. 39. From θῶμαί τε ἴνα εἴπω; comes the modern Greek θῶμαί τε ἴνα εἴπω; will you that I speak? and probably also the common future θῶ εἴπω, I shall speak (if θῶ represents θῶμαι ἴνα).

[*] 289. The third person of the subjunctive is sometimes used in these questions of appeal, but less frequently than the first, and chiefly when a speaker refers to himself by τῶς. E.g. Πῶτερ ἴν σῶ τις, Ἀσχῶνη, τῶς πῶλεως ἴχθρῶν ἴ ἴμῶν εἴναι φῶ; i.e. shall we call you the city's enemy, or mine? DEM. xviii. 124. Εἴτα ταῦθ οἴ τοι πεισθῶσιν ἴπῶρ ἴατῶν σε ποιεῶν, καῦ τῶ τῶς σῶς πονηρῶας ἴργα ἴφῶ ἴαυτοῶς ἴνα δῶξονται; i.e. are these men to believe, etc.; and are they to assume, etc.? Id. xxii. 64. Τῶ τις εἴναι τοῦτο φῶ; Id. xix. 88. Πῶς τῶς τοι πεῶθεται; "how can any one obey you?" II. i. 150. "Θῶγατερ, ποῦ τις φροντῶδος ἴλθῶ;" SOPH. O.C. 170. "Ποῦ τις οἴν φῶγῶ;" Id. Aj. 403. "Πῶθεν οἴν τις ταῦτης ἴρξεται ἴμῶς;" Phil. 15

"Πῶς οἴν ἴτῶ εἴπῶς ἴτι συνῶσταλμαί κακοῶς;" EUR. H. F. 1417, the only case of the second person, is probably corrupt. Dindorf reads ἴν εἴποις.

[*] 290. The subjunctive is often used in the question τῶ πῶθω; what will become of me? or what harm will it do me? literally, what shall I undergo? E.g.

"ἴ μοι ἴγῶ, τῶ πῶθω; τῶ νῶ μοι ἴμῶκιστα γῶνηται;" Od. v. 465. So II. xi. 404.

"Τῶ πῶθω; τῶ δῶ δρῶ; τῶ δῶ μῶσωμαι;" AESCH. Sept. 1057.

"Τῶ πῶθω τῶ μῶων;" Pers. 912; Ar. Pl. 603.

"Τῶ πῶθω; τῶ δῶ μῶσωμαι; οἴ μοι" SOPH. Tr. 973.

"Τῶ μῶλλον, εἴ χρῶ, πεῶσωμαι: τῶ γῶρ πῶθω;" "I shall suffer what is to come, if it must be; for what harm can it do me?" EUR. Ph. 895. (The difference between τῶ πῶθω; and πῶσχω in its ordinary use is here seen.)

"ἴ μολῶγῶκα: τῶ γῶρ πῶθω;" PLAT. Euthyd. 302D. So in the plural, "τῶ γῶρ πῶθωμεν ἴ βουλομῶων ἴμῶων τιμωρῶειν;" HDT. iv. 118.

[*] 291. (Negative μῶ.) The negative μῶ of the interrogative subjunctive is explained by the origin of the construction (288). If ἴλθωμεν; shall we go? is the interrogative of ἴλθωμεν, let us go, then μῶ ἴλθωμεν; shall we not go? is the interrogative of μῶ ἴλθωμεν, let us not go, and implies (addressed to others) do you wish not to have us go? This is still more evident when βοῦλασθε is prefixed to the subjunctive (288). Similar to this interrogative form of the subjunctive of exhortation is the rare interrogative imperative (also negated by μῶ); as ἴν ἴ μετῶ τῶχνης γρῶψας ἴφῶκηται, ἴμῶ ἴξῶστω δῶ ἴτερα προστῶττειν; i.e. is he not to be allowed to give other orders?

PLAT. Polit. 295E, where μὴ ξύστω; is the interrogative of μὴ ξύστω, let him not be allowed, as μὴ λθωμεν; (above) is that of μὴ λθωμεν, let us not go. See also the indirect question in Leg. 800E, πᾶνερωτῶ πάλιν, τὸν κμοαγεῶν τάς δαίς εἰ πρῶτον ἢν τοῦθ' ἢμῶν ῥῶσκον κέσθω, I ask again, whether first this is to stand approved by us as one of our models for songs. We cannot express such an imperative precisely in English; and there is the same difficulty with οἴσθ' ἢ δρῶσον; etc., in 253. See also ἴστε with imperative forms (602).

[*] 292. 1. When the future indicative is used in the sense of the interrogative subjunctive (68), it may be negated by μὴ; as πῶς οἴν μῦτε ψεῦσομαι φανερῶς; how then shall I escape telling an open lie? (where there is some MS. authority for ψεῦσωμαι), DEM. xix. 320 (see Shilleto's note).

2. A similar use of μὴ is found with the potential optative (with ἴν) in questions, if the idea of prevention is involved in it; as τῶ οἴν οἴ σκοποῦμεν πῶς ἴν ἀτῖν μὴ διαμαρτῖνομεν; why then do we not consider how we can avoid mistaking them? (the direct question here would differ little from πῶς μὴ διαμαρτῖνωμεν;). XEN. Mem. iii. 1, 10. So πῶς ἴν τις μὴ θυμῶ λῶγοι περῶ θεῖν; "how can one help being excited when he speaks of Gods?" Leg. 887C. Sometimes such an optative with μὴ is in a second clause, preceded by a positive question, so that the harshness of μὴ ἴν with the optative is avoided; as τῶ ἴν λῶγοντες εἴκῶς ἢ ἀτοῦ ῥοκνοῦμεν ἢ πρῶς τοῶς κέξυμ: μῶχους σκηπτῖμενοι μὴ βοηθοῦμεν; i.e. what good ground can we give for holding back ourselves, or what decent excuse can we make to our allies there for withholding our aid from them? THUC. vi. 18. So τῖνα ἴν τρῶπον γῶ μῶγα δυναῦμην καῦ μηδεῶς με ἴδικοῦ; "in what way can I have great power and prevent any one from doing me wrong?" PLAT. Gorg. 510D. See also ISOC. v. 8, ISOC. xv. 6. In DEM. xxi. 35, πῶτερα μὴ δῖ διτῶτο δῖκην ἢ μεῖζω δοῖη δικάῶς; shall he escape punishment for this, or would he rather deserve a still greater penalty?—δοῖη is used as if οἴκ ἴν δοῖη had preceded (Schaefer inserts κῖν). In PLAT. Phaed. 106 D is the singular expression, σχολῶ γῶρ ἴν τι ἢλλο φθορῖν μὴ δῖχοιτο, εἴ γε τῶ θῖνατον ἢδιον ἴν φθορῖν δῖξεται, for hardly can anything else escape from admitting destruction if the immortal, which is eternal, is to admit it. This differs from the preceding interrogative examples merely in the substitution of σχολῶ, hardly, for πῶς or τῖνα τρῶπον.

[*] 293. As οἴ cannot be used with the interrogative subjunctive, μὴ here sometimes introduces a question which expects an affirmative answer. See XEN. Mem. i. 2, 36, and PLAT. Rep. 337 B, PLAT. Rep. 554 B, quoted in 287; and compare XEN. Oec. iv. 4 (ibid.), where a negative answer is expected. In PLAT. Rep. 552 E, we must read μὴ οἴμεθα (not οἴμεθα, Herm.), shall we not think? as the answer must be affirmative (see Stallbaum's note).

Section IV: οἴ μὴ with the Subjunctive and the Future Indicative.

[*] 294. The subjunctive and the future indicative are used with the double negative οἴ μὴ in independent sentences, sometimes expressing a denial, like the future indicative with οἴ, and sometimes a prohibition, like the imperative or subjunctive with μὴ. The compounds of both οἴ and μὴ can be used here as well as the simple forms. For a discussion of the origin of this construction, and of the relation of the sentences of denial to those of prohibition, see Appendix II.

[*] 295. (Denial.) The subjunctive (usually the aorist), and sometimes the future indicative, with οἴ μὴ may have the force of an emphatic future with οἴ. Thus οἴ μὴ τοῦτο γῖνηται, sometimes οἴ μὴ τοῦτο γενῖσεται, means this surely will not happen. E.g.

■Aor. Subj.) Κα■ τ■νδ■ ■κο■σας ο■ τι μ■ ληφθ■ δ■λ■, “I shall not be caught by any trick.” AESCH. Sept. 38. So Sept. 199, Supp. 228. Ο■ μ■ π■θηται, “he will not obey.” SOPH. Ph. 103. Ο■ γ■ρ σε μ■ γν■σι. Id. El. 42. “Κα■ ο■ τι μ■ λ■χωσι το■δε συμμ■χου” Id. O.C. 450. “Ο■τοι σ■ ■χαι■ν, ο■δα, μ■ τις ■βρ■σ■” Id. Aj. 560. “δ■ ο■ π■ρεστιν, ο■δ■ μ■ μ■λ■ ποτ■,” “but he is not here, and he never will come.” EUR. H.F. 718. Κο■ μ■ ποθ■ ■λ■. AR. Ach. 662. Τ■ν ■ν κρατ■σωμεν, ο■ μ■ τις ■μ■ν ■λλος στρατ■ς ■ντιστ■ κοτε ■νθρ■πων. HDT. vii. 53. So i. 199. Ο■ μ■ ποτε ■σβ■λωσιν. THUC. iv. 95; cf. v. 69. Ο■ μ■ σε κρ■ψω πρ■ς ■ντινα βο■λομαι ■φικ■σθαι. XEN. Cyr. vii. 3, 13. ■ς ο■ ■ρμ■νιοι ο■ μ■ δ■ξωνται το■ς πολεμ■ους. Ib. iii. 2, Ib. 8 (see 296, b). ■ν καθ■μεθα ο■κοι, ο■δ■ποτ■ ο■δ■ν ■μ■ν ο■ μ■ γ■νηται τ■ν δε■ντων. DEM. iv. 44; so ix. 75. Ο■τε γ■ρ γ■γνεται ο■τε γ■γονεν ο■δ■ ο■ν μ■ γ■νηται ■λλο■ον ■θος πρ■ς ■ρετ■ν, for there is not, nor has there been, nor will there ever be, etc. PLAT. Rep. 492E. (Here ο■δ■ μ■ γ■νηται seems merely more emphatic than the ordinary ο■δ■ γεν■σεται.)

■Aor. Subj. 2d Pers.) Ο■ γ■ρ τι μ■λλον μ■ φ■γ■ς τ■ μ■ρσιμον, “for you shall none the more escape your fate.” Sept. 281. ■λλ■ ο■ ποτ■ ■ξ■ μο■ γε μ■ π■θ■ς τ■δε. SOPH. El. 1029. Ο■ μ■ ποτ■ ■ς τ■ν Σκ■ρον ■κπλευσ■ς ■χων. Id. Ph. 381. ■λλ■ ο■ τι μ■ φ■γητε λαιψηρ■ ποδ■. EUR. Hec. 1039. “Κο■χ■ μ■ πα■σησθε,” “you will never cease.” AR. Lys. 704.

■Pres. Subj.) ■ν γ■ρ ■παξ δ■ο ■ τρι■ν ■μερ■ν ■δ■ν ■π■σχωμεν, ο■κ■τι μ■ δ■νηται βασιλε■ς ■μ■ς καταλαβε■ν. XEN. An. ii. 2, 12. So ο■ μ■ δ■νωνται, Id. Hier. xi. 15. Πρ■ς τα■τα κακο■ργει κα■ συκοφ■ντει, ε■ τι δ■νασαι: ■λλ■ ο■ μ■ ο■■ς τ■ ■ς, “but you will not be able.” PLAT. Rep. 341B. Ο■ γ■ρ μ■ δυνατ■ς ■.Phil. 48D. In the much-discussed passage, SOPH. OC 1023 , ■λλοι γ■ρ ο■ σπε■δοντες, ο■ς ο■ μ■ ποτε χ■ρας φυγ■ντες τ■σδ■ ■πε■χωνται θεο■ς, for there are others in eager pursuit; and they (the captors) will never (be in a condition to) be thankful to the Gods for escaping these and getting out of this land, the chief force is in φυγ■ντες, as if it were ο■ μ■ φ■γωσι ■στε ■πε■χεσθαι θεο■ς, the present subjunctive expressing a state of thankfulness.

■Fut. Ind.) Ο■ σοι μ■ μεθ■ψομα■ ποτε. SOPH. El. 1052. “Ο■ τοι μ■ποτ■ σ■ ■κ τ■ν ■δρ■νων, ■ γ■ρον, ■κοντ■ τις ■ξει” Id. O.C 176 ; so “ο■κ ο■ν μ■ ■δοιπορ■σεις” O. C. 848. Μ■ τ■ν ■π■λλω ο■ μ■ σ■ ■γ■ περι■ψομ■πελθ■ντ■ (i.e. περι■ψομαι ■πελθ■ντα). AR. Ran. 508. Το■ς πονηρο■ς ο■ μ■ ποτε βελτ■ους ποι■σετε. AESCHIN. iii. 177.

[*] 296. Ο■ μ■ with the subjunctive or the future indicative can stand in various dependent sentences:—

■a) Especially in indirect discourse; as ε■ γ■ρ ο■δ■ σαφ■ς ■τι τα■θ■ . . . ο■ μ■ ■πιλ■θ■. Pac. 1302. So XEN. Cyr. viii. 1, 5 , XEN. Hell. iv. 2, 3 ; PLAT. Rep. 499B. See also THUC. v. 69. We have ο■ μ■ with the future optative after ■ς, representing the future indicative of the direct form, in SOPH. Ph. 611: τ■ τ■ ■λλα π■ντ■ ■θ■σπισεν, κα■ τ■π■ Τρο■ας π■ργαμ■ ■ς ο■ μ■ ποτε π■ρσοιεν ε■ μ■ τ■νδε ■γοιντο. (The direct discourse was ο■ μ■ ποτε π■ρσετε ■■ν μ■ τ■νδε ■γησθε.) In a similar construction in XEN. Hell. i. 6, 32 , the future indicative is retained after a past tense: ε■πεν ■τι ■ Σπ■ρτη ο■δ■ν μ■ κ■κιον ο■κιε■ται α■το■ ■ποθαν■ντος. In EUR. Phoen. 1590, we have the future infinitive of indirect discourse with ο■ μ■: ε■πε Τειρεσ■ας ο■ μ■ ποτε, σο■ τ■νδε γ■ν ο■κο■ντος, ε■ πρ■ξιν π■λιν, representing ο■ μ■ ε■ πρ■ξει π■λις.

■b) In causal sentences with ■ς; as AR. Av. 461: λ■γε θαρρ■σας, ■ς τ■ς σπονδ■ς ο■ μ■ πρ■τερον παραβ■μεν, for we will not break the truce before you have spoken. So XEN. Cyr. iii. 2, 8 (see 295).

■c) In consecutive sentences with ■στε; as PLAT. Phaedr. 227D : ο■τως ■πιτεθ■μηκα ■κο■σαι, ■στ■, ■■ν ποι■ τ■ν περ■πατον Μ■γαρ■δε, ο■ μ■ σου ■πολειφθ■. In AESCH. Ag. 1640, τ■ν δ■ μ■ πειθ■νορα ζε■ξω βαρε■αις ο■τι μ■ σειραφ■ρον κριθ■ντα π■λον, and I will yoke him who is not obedient under a heavy yoke, (and I will let him run) by no means as a wanton colt in traces, ο■τι μ■ belongs grammatically to ζε■ξω, though its position makes it affect the following words in sense: cf. κα■ μ■ν τ■δ■ ε■π■ μ■ παρ■ γν■μην ■μο■, AESCH. Ag. 931, where the force of μ■ falls on the words that follow it. See Paley's note on AESCH. Ag. 1640 (1618).

[*] 297. ■Prohibition.) In the dramatic poets, the second person singular of the future indicative (occasionally of the subjunctive) with ο■ μ■ may express a strong prohibition. Thus ο■ μ■ λαλ■σεις means you shall not prate, or do not prate, being nearly equivalent to μ■ λ■λει or μ■ λαλ■σ■ς. E.g. ■ πα■, τ■ θροε■ς; ο■ μ■ παρ■ ■χλ■ τ■δε γηρ■σει, do not (I beg you) speak out in this way before the people. EUR. Hipp. 213. ■ θ■γατερ, ο■ μ■ μ■θον ■π■ πολλο■ς ■ρε■ς. Id. Supp. 1066. Ο■ μ■ γυναικ■ν δειλ■ν ε■σο■σεις λ■γον, "do not adopt the cowardly language of women." And. 757. Ο■ μ■ ■ξεγρε■ς τ■ν ■πν■ κ■τοχον κ■κ- κιν■σεις κ■ναστ■σεις φοιτ■δα δειν■ν ν■σον, ■ τ■κνον, do not wake him and arouse, etc. SOPH. Tr. 978. (Here ο■ μ■ belongs to three verbs.) "Τ■ ποιε■ς; ο■ μ■ καταβ■σει," "don't come down." AR. Vesp. 397. "Το■ος Ζε■ς; ο■ μ■ ληρ■σ■ς; ο■δ■ ■στι Ζε■ς," "Zeus indeed! Don't talk nonsense; there isn't any Zeus." Id. Nub. 367. (Here all MSS. have ληρ■σ■ς. See Id. Nub. 296, quoted in 298; and section 301 below.)

[*] 298. A prohibition thus begun by ο■ μ■ with the future or subjunctive may be continued by μηδ■ with another future form. An affirmative command may be added to the prohibition by a future or an imperative with ■λλ■ or δ■. E.g. Ο■ μ■ καλε■ς μ■, ■νθρωφ■, ■κετε■ω, μηδ■ κατερε■ς το■νομα, do not call to me, I implore you, nor speak my name. AR. Ran. 298. Ο■ μ■ προσο■σεις χε■ρα μηδ■ ■ψει π■πλων, "do not bring your hand near me nor touch my garments." EUR. Hipp. 606. "Ο■ μ■ προσο■σεις χε■ρα, βακχε■σεις δ■ ■■ν, μηδ■ ■ξομ■ρξει μωρ■αν τ■ν σ■ν ■μο■," "do not bring your hand near me; but go and rage, and do not wipe off your folly on me." Bacch. 343. (Here μηδ■ continues the original prohibition as if there had been no interruption.)

"Ο■ μ■ λαλ■σεις, ■λλ■ ■κολουθ■σεις ■μο■," "do not prate, but follow me." AR. Nub. 505. Ο■ μ■ διατρ■ψεις, ■λλ■ γε■σει τ■ς θ■ρας, do not delay, but taste of the door. Id. Ran. 462. Ο■ μ■ φλυαρ■σεις ■χων, ■ Ξανθ■α, ■λλ■ ■ρ■μενος ο■σεις π■λιν τ■ στρ■ματα. Ib. 524. Ο■ μ■ δυσμεν■ς ■σει φ■λοις, πα■σει δ■ θυμο■ κα■ π■λιν στρ■ψεις κ■ρα, . . . δ■ξει δ■ δ■ρα κα■ παραιτ■σει πατρ■ς, be not inimical to friends, but cease your rage, etc. EUR. Med. 1151. "Ο■ μ■ σκ■ψ■ς μηδ■ ποι■σ■ς ■σο αλλ τηε μς.■ περ ο■ τρυγοδα■μονες ο■τοι, ■λλ■ ε■φ■μει," "do not scoff, nor do what these wretches do; but keep silence!" AR. Nub. 296. (Here the imperative is used precisely like the future with ■λλ■ or δ■ in the preceding examples.) The clause with μηδ■ is here a continuation of that with ο■ μ■, ο■ belonging to both. The future in the clause with ■λλ■ or δ■ is like that in "π■ντως το■το δρ■σεις," "by all means do this" AR. Nub. 1352 (see 69). A

single ο μ may introduce a prohibition consisting of several futures connected by κα, as in SOPH. Tr. 978 (quoted in 297).

[*] 299. Sometimes ο with the future indicative in a question implying an affirmative answer (thus equivalent to an exhortation) is followed by μ or μηδ with the future in a question implying a negative answer (and thus equivalent to a prohibition). Here there is no case of ο μ. E.g.

“Ο σγ νξει, μηδ δειλαν ρε;” “will you not keep silence, and not become a coward?” SOPH. Aj. 75. (Here μ δειλαν ρε; is an independent question, will you be a coward? = do not be a coward.)

“Ο θσον οσεις, μηδ πιστσεις μο;” “ will you not extend your hand. and not distrust me?” Id. Tr. 1183.

“Οκ ε σ τ οκους, σ τε Κρωων κατ σγας, κα μ τ μηδν λγος ες μγ οσετε;” Id. O.T. 637.

[*] 300. All the examples under 297 and 298 are usually printed as interrogative, in accordance with Elmsley’s doctrine, stated in his note to EUR. Med. 1120 (1151) and in the Quarterly Review for June 1812. He explains ο μ λαλσεις; as meaning will you not stop prating? (lit. will you not not prate?); and when a second clause in the future with μηδ or λλ follows, he extends the interrogative force of ο also to this. But this explanation requires an entirely different theory to account for ο μ in clauses of denial (295), where no question is possible. Moreover, the five examples of the second person of the subjunctive quoted under 295, taken in connection with those in 297 and 298, are sufficient to show the impossibility of separating the two constructions in explanation. One of the examples in 298 (AR. Nub. 296), where the imperative εφμει follows in the clause with λλ, seems decisive against the interrogative theory. The examples under 299 are really interrogative; but they consist practically of an exhortation followed by a prohibition (both being interrogative), and contain no construction with ο μ at all.

[*] 301. In most modern editions of the classics the subjunctive is not found in the construction of 297; and in many cases the first aorist subjunctive in -σς has been emended to the future, against the authority of the MSS., in conformity to Dawes’s rule. (See 364.) Thus, in AR. Nub. 296 and 367 the MSS. have the subjunctive; and in 296, “ο μ σκψς” could not be changed to ο μ σκψεις, as the future of σκπτω is σκψομαι. Elmsley’s emendation σκψει, which is adopted by most editors, requires a greater change than should be made merely to sustain an arbitrary rule, which rests on no apparent principle. If both constructions (295 and 297) are explained on the same principle, there is no longer any reason for objecting to the subjunctive with ο μ in prohibitions; and it seems most probable that both future indicative and subjunctive were allowed in both constructions, but that the subjunctive was more common in clauses of denial, and the future in clauses of prohibition.

Section V.: Final and Object Clauses after να, ς, πως, φρα, and μ.

Classification.—Negatives.

[*] 302. The final particles are να, ς, πως, and (in epic and lyric poetry) φρα, that, in order that. To these must be added μ, lest, which became in use a negative final particle.

[*] 303. The clauses which are introduced by these particles, all of which are sometimes called final clauses, may be divided into three classes:—

Pure A. final clauses, in which the end or purpose of the action of any verb may be expressed; as ἔρχεται ἵνα τοῦτο ἴδῃ, he is coming that he may see this; ἀπέρχεται ἵνα μὴ τοῦτο ἴδῃ, he is departing that he may not see this; ἦλθεν ἵνα τοῦτο ἴδοι, he came that he might see this. Here all the final particles are used, but with different frequency in various classes of writers (see 311-314).

Object B. clauses with ὡς or ὡς μὴ after verbs of striving, etc.; as σκεπτεῖ ὡς γένησεται, see that it happens; σκεπτεῖ ὡς μὴ γένησεται, see that it does not happen. These clauses express the direct object of the verb of striving, etc., so that they may stand in apposition to an object accusative like τοῦτο; as σκεπτεῖ τοῦτο, ὡς μὴ σε ἴψεται, see to this, viz., that he does not see you. They also imply the end or purpose of the action of the leading verb, and to this extent they partake of the nature of final clauses.

C. Clauses with μὴ after verbs of fearing, etc.; as φοβοῦμαι μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, I fear that this may happen; φοβήθη μὴ τοῦτο γένοιτο, he feared that this might happen. These clauses have in use become object clauses, though in their origin they are of a very different nature (262; 307).

[*] 304. Although the object clauses of class B partake slightly of the nature of final clauses, so that they sometimes allow the same construction (the subjunctive for the future indicative), still the distinction between classes A and B is very strongly marked. An object clause, as we have seen, can stand in apposition to a preceding τοῦτο; whereas a final clause would stand in apposition to τοῦτου ἕνεκα, as ἔρχεται τοῦτου ἕνεκα, ἵνα ἡμῶν βοηθῆσῃ, he comes for this purpose, viz., that he may assist us. The two can be combined in one sentence; as σπουδάζει ὡς πλουτῆσει, ἵνα τοῖς φίλους ἐπιποιῇ, he is eager to be rich, that he may benefit his friends.

Care must be taken not to mistake the nature of an object clause with ὡς when its subject is attracted by the leading verb; as σκεπτεῖ τὴν πόλιν ὡς σωθῆσεται for σκεπτεῖ ὡς ἡ πόλις σωθῆσεται, see that the city is saved. So also when an object clause of the active construction becomes a subject clause in the equivalent passive form; as ἐπῆρτετο ὡς συμμαχῆσαν εἶναι ψηφισθεῖ, it was brought about that you should vote to have an alliance made (AESCHIN. iii. 64), which represents the active construction ἐπραττον ὡς ψηφισθεῖ.

[*] 305. The regular negative after ἵνα, ὡς, ὡς, and ὅφρα is μὴ; but after μὴ, lest, οὐ is used. E.g. ἀπέρχεται, ἵνα μὴ τοῦτο ἴδῃ, he is departing that he may not see this. φοβέται μὴ οὐ τοῦτο γένηται, he is afraid that this may not happen.

[*] 306. This use of μὴ οὐ (305) occurs in Homer in a few final clauses (263) and once after δεῖδω (Il. x. 39). After this it is confined to clauses after verbs of fearing, with the exception of XEN. Mem. ii. 2, 14, Cyneg. vii. 10, and the peculiar μὴ οὐκ ἵπαρκεσοι in PLAT. Rep. 393 E (132). This use of οὐ after μὴ is naturally explained by the origin of the dependent clause with μὴ (262); but after μὴ had come to be felt as a conjunction and its origin was forgotten, the chief objection to μὴ . . . μὴ was probably in the sound, and we find a few cases of it where the two particles are so far apart that the repetition is not offensive. Such a case is XEN. Mem. i. 2, 7 : ἠθάμαζε δὲ εἰ τις φοβότο μὴ ἔγενετο καλῶς κἄγαθῶς τῷ τῷ μῆγιστα ἐεργετῶσαντι μὴ τὴν μεγίστην χῆρην ἔξοι, where we should expect μὴ οὐχ ἔξοι. So THUC. ii. 13: ποτοπῶσας μὴ . . .

παρὰ λ[] π[] κα[] μ[] δη[] σ[]. So in a final clause, μ[] . . . μ[] προσδ[] χοιτο, PLAT. Euthyd. 295D.

Development of Clauses with ν[] α[], [] ζ[], π[] ω[], φ[] ρ[] α[], and μ[].

[*] 307. The development of final clauses and of clauses with μ[] after verbs of fearing from an original parataxis, or co-ordination of two independent sentences, is especially plain in dependent negative clauses with the simple μ[]. Thus π[] σ[] τι χε, μ[] τι νο[] σ[] [] ρη, withdraw, lest Hera notice anything (Il. i. 522), presents the form of an original paratactic expression, which would mean withdraw:—may not (or let not) Hera notice anything, the latter clause being like μ[] δ[] ν[] α[] ζ[] λωσι, may they not take the ships (Il. xvi. 128), and μ[] δ[] μοι τε λ[] σωσι θεο[] κακ[] κ[] δεα (Il. xviii. 8). (See 261.) Such sentences as these last imply fear or anxiety lest the event may happen which μ[] with the subjunctive expresses a desire to avert; and in a primitive stage of the language they might naturally be preceded by a verb of fearing, to which the (still independent) subjunctive with μ[] would stand in the relation of an explanatory clause defining the substance of the fear. Thus δε[] δω:—μ[] ν[] α[] ζ[] λωσι would originally be two independent sentences, I fear:—may they not take the ships; but would in time come to be felt as a single sentence, equivalent to our I fear that (lest) they may take the ships. After φοβο[]μαι μ[] το[] το π[] θωσιν (for example) was domesticated in the sense I fear lest they may suffer this, the second clause followed the ordinary course, and began to be felt as a thoroughly dependent clause; and when the leading verb became past, the subjunctive became optative, as φ[] οβ[] θην μ[] το[] το π[] θοιεν, I feared lest they might suffer this. When this stage is reached, all feeling of the original independence may be said to have vanished and a dependent clause is fully established. As this decisive evidence of complete dependence is constantly found in the Homeric language, we cannot suppose that such an expression as δε[] δοικα μ[] τι π[] θωσιν (Il. x. 538) was still felt to be composed of two independent sentences, although the original paratactic form is precisely preserved. Indeed, we have no evidence that the step from parataxis to hypotaxis was taken after the Greek language had an independent existence.⁶

[*] 308. It was a simple and natural step to extend the construction thus established to present and past objects of fear, although we cannot assume for the primitive language such independent indicatives with μ[] as we find later (see 269). In Homer we find “δε[] δω μ[] θε[] νημερτ[] α ε[] πεν,” “I fear that the Goddess spoke the truth” (Od. v. 300) . This use was greatly extended in Attic Greek (see 369).

[*] 309. This simple construction of a dependent verb introduced by μ[] with no connecting conjunction remained the established form after verbs of fearing in all periods of the language; and occasional exceptions, like μ[] φοβο[] [] ζ[] πορ[] σεις, do not fear that you will be at a loss (371), ο[] φοβε[] π[] ως μ[] ν[] σιον π[] γμα τυγχ[] ν[] ζ[] π[] ττων; (370), and ο[] φοβο[] μεθα [] λασσ[] σεσθαι, we are not afraid that we shall have the worst of it (372), in place of the regular μ[] πορ[] σ[] ζ[], μ[] τυγχ[] ν[] ζ[], μ[] λασσ[] σωθ[] μεν, only prove the rule. The original independent sentence with μ[], expressing an object of fear which it is desired to avert, like μ[] ν[] α[] ζ[] λωσι, is well established in Homer and appears occasionally in the Attic poets (261; 264). But in Plato it suddenly appears as a common construction, expressing, however, not an object of fear but an object of suspicion or surmise (265), so that μ[] with the subjunctive is a cautious expression of a direct assertion; as μ[] γ[] ροικ[] τερον [] τ[] ληθ[] ε[] πε[] ν, I rather think the truth may be too rude to tell (Gorg. 462E).

[*] 310. In like manner, the simple negative form of the pure final clause, as πστιχε, μτι νοσρη (quoted above), was already established in Homer, the negative μ serving as a connective, so that the want of a final conjunction was not felt. Here also the feeling of dependence is shown by the subjunctive becoming optative when the leading verb is past; as in φεξομαι μ τς με δ and φυγον μ τς με δοι. But it is obvious that only negative purpose could be expressed by this simple form, in which μ could serve as a connective. We find, it is true, a few positive sentences in which a purpose is implied by the mere sequence of two clauses; as “λλ γε νν θς κε Νστορος ποδομοιο: εδομεν συβινξτιν τινα μτιν νν σθεσσι κκευθεν,” “i.e.go straightway to Nestor : let us know what counsel he buries in his breast” (Hom. Od. iii. 17) , and θπτε με τι τχιστα: πλας δαο περσω, burg me as quickly as possible: let me pass the gates of Hades (Hom. Il. xxiii. 71). But these disconnected expressions, with no particle to unite them, could never satisfy the need of a positive sentence of purpose. To supply this want, several final particles were developed, and were already in familiar use in Homer. These are να, ς, πως, and φρα, which will be discussed separately.

[*] 311. να.) να is the only purely final particle, having nothing of the relative character of ς and πως, or of the temporal character of φρα. Its derivation is uncertain. It appears in Homer as a fully developed final conjunction, and occasionally also in the sense of where (Od. ix. 136) and whither (Od. xix. 20). It is overshadowed in epic and lyric poetry by φρα, and in tragedy by ς; but Aristophanes uses it in threefourths of his final sentences, and in Plato and the orators it has almost exterminated the other final particles. As να is purely final, both in use and in feeling, it never takes ν or κ, which are frequently found with the other final particles, especially with the relative ς.

[*] 312. Ως.) 1. ς is originally an adverb of manner, derived from the stem - of the relative ς, like οτως from the stem of οτος. As a relative it means originally in which way, as; as an indirect interrogative it means how, whence comes its use in indirect discourse (663, 2). Since purpose can be expressed by a relative pronoun, which in Homer regularly takes the subjunctive (568), as “γεμν σθλν πασσον, ς κ με κεσ γγ,” “send me a good guide, ,to lead me thither” (Od. xv. 310) , so can it be by the relative adverb of manner, as κννδρας κατ φλα, κατ φρτρας, ς φρτρη φρτρηφιν ργ, φλα δ φλοις, divide the men in that way by which clan may help clan, etc., i.e. (so) divide them that clan may help clan, etc. (Il. ii. 362). Here the original force of ς can be seen; but in Od. xvii. 75, “τρυνον μν ποτ δμα γνακας, ς τοι δρ ποπμψω” , in order that I may send you the gifts, the final force is as strong as if we had να ποπμψω.

2. ς, however, always retained so much of its original relative nature that it could take κ or ν in a final sentence with the subjunctive, like other final relatives, which in Homer hardly ever omit κ before a subjunctive (568). Compare ς κ με κες γγ (above) with the equivalent ς κ με κεσ γγ. The final clause thus receives a conditional form, with which it must have received originally more or less conditional force.⁷ Thus an expression like πεθεο ς ν κδος ρηαι probably meant originally obey in whatever way you may gain glory, or obey in some way in which you may gain glory, ς ν ρηαι being chiefly a conditional relative clause (529); but before the Homeric usage was established, the final element had so far obliterated the relative, that the conditional force of ς ν must have been greatly weakened. The expression in Homer (

ll. xvi. 84) may have meant obey that (if so be) you may gain me glory. (See examples under 326.) The same is true of the less common use of $\kappa\upsilon$ or $\alpha\nu$ with $\phi\rho\alpha$ and $\pi\omega\varsigma$ in Homer (327; 328). How far the original conditional force survived in the Attic ζ ν and $\pi\omega\varsigma$ ν with the subjunctive, especially in $\pi\omega\varsigma$ ν of Attic prose, is a question which at this distant day we have hardly the power to answer, and each scholar will be guided by his own feeling as he reads the expressions. (See 326; 328; 348.) It certainly can be seen in some of Xenophon's uses of ζ ν with the subjunctive; see Cyr. ii. 4 and Eques. i. 16, quoted in Appendix IV.

3. ζ and ζ $\kappa\epsilon$ with the subjunctive are used in Homer also in object clauses after verbs of planning, considering, etc. (341), where $\pi\omega\varsigma$ with the future indicative is the regular Attic form. ζ (with ζ ν) is by far the most common final particle in tragedy; it seldom occurs in Aristophanes and Herodotus; while in Attic prose it almost entirely disappears,⁸ except in Xenophon, with whom it is again common, though less so than $\pi\omega\varsigma$ or $\nu\alpha$. (See Weber's tables in Appendix III.)

[*] 313. $\pi\omega\varsigma$.) 1. $\pi\omega\varsigma$ is related to ζ as $\pi\tau\epsilon$ to $\tau\epsilon$, being the adverb of the relative stem π - and the indefinite stem $\pi\omega$ - combined.⁹ Like ζ , it is originally a relative adverb, meaning as; and it can always be used in this sense, as in $\omicron\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\pi\omega\varsigma$ $\delta\nu\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, thus as they can, THUC. vii. 67. Then it is used in indirect questions, in the sense of $\tau\tau$ $\tau\rho\pi$, how, in what way, and is followed by the future indicative; as $\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\epsilon\nu$ $\pi\omega\varsigma$ $\pi\lambda\iota\varsigma$ $\sigma\omega\theta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, to see how the city can be saved. So $\tau\omega\zeta$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\omicron\zeta$, $\pi\omega\varsigma$ μ $\delta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ $\delta\kappa\eta\nu$, $\delta\nu$ $\delta\epsilon\kappa\nu\upsilon\sigma\iota$, he shows those who have been rascals how they can avoid suffering punishment (= $\tau\tau$ $\tau\rho\pi$ μ $\delta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$), DEM. xxiv. 106. Then, by a slight modification in sense, it may denote also the object to which the striving, etc., is directed; so that $\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\epsilon\nu$ (or $\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\omega\tau\omicron$) $\pi\omega\varsigma$ $\pi\lambda\iota\varsigma$ $\sigma\omega\theta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ may mean to see (to this, viz.) that the city shall be saved. Here, however, the subjunctive is sometimes allowed, as the interrogative force of $\pi\omega\varsigma$ is lost sight of and its force as a final particle, in order that, begins to appear. From this it becomes established as a final particle, and denotes the purpose in ordinary final clauses. From the original force of $\pi\omega\varsigma$ as a relative, used in indirect questions in the sense of how, we must explain its occasional use in indirect questions in the sense of ζ (706). The interrogative force of $\pi\omega\varsigma$ can be seen from passages in which other interrogative words take its place in the same sense; as DEM. xvi. 19, $\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\epsilon\nu$ ξ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\rho\pi\omicron\upsilon$ μ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ ($\phi\lambda\omicron\iota$), to see in what way they can be prevented from becoming friends; and THUC. i. 65, $\pi\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$ π $\phi\epsilon\lambda\alpha$ $\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, he negotiated to have some help come (how some help should come). So THUC. iv. 128, $\pi\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$ τ $\tau\rho\pi$ τ $\chi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$ $\tau\omega\zeta$ μ ν $\xi\upsilon\mu\beta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ τ ν δ $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$.¹⁰

2. Although $\pi\omega\varsigma$ is fully established in the Homeric language, both in its half-interrogative use after verbs of planning, etc. (341), and also in its final sense, it seldom occurs in Homer in either construction. It first becomes frequent in the Attic poets. In Thucydides and Xenophon it is the most common final particle; and in these writers, as in tragedy, its final use greatly exceeds its use in object clauses. The latter, however, far exceeds the final use in Herodotus, Plato, and the orators; but here $\nu\alpha$ has gained almost undisputed possession of the field as a final particle.

3. $\pi\omega\varsigma$ never takes κ or $\alpha\nu$ in pure final clauses in Homer. $\pi\omega\varsigma$ ν with the subjunctive appears for the first time in final clauses in Aeschylus (328), and afterwards maintains itself vigorously by the side of the simple $\pi\omega\varsigma$. In object clauses $\pi\omega\varsigma$ $\kappa\epsilon$ with the subjunctive is found in a few places in Homer, and $\pi\omega\varsigma$ ν in a few in the Attic poets, while $\pi\omega\varsigma$ ν in these clauses

in prose is found chiefly in Plato and Xenophon (348).

[*] 314. (φρα.) The most common final particle in Homer is φρα, which is originally a temporal particle, meaning while (so long as) and then until. From the last meaning the final force was naturally developed, as the idea of until, when it looks forward to the future, may involve that of aiming at an object to be attained, as in English we shall fight until we are free. Another temporal particle meaning both while and until, ως, is used in a final sense in a few passages of the Odyssey (614, 2). Both of the temporal uses of φρα appear in full vigour in Homer; but its final character must have been more distinctly marked at an earlier period than that of either ς or πως, so that it seldom took either κ or ν before the subjunctive.

φρα is found only in epic and lyric poetry.

[*] 315. (Negative Final Clauses.) The need of these final particles was first felt, as has been shown (310), in positive clauses of purpose, as a negative purpose could always be expressed by the simple μ, which thus became in use a conjunction. Still the final particles were as well suited to negative as to positive final clauses, and they could always be prefixed to μ, which thus was restored to its natural place as a negative adverb. Thus φεξομαι να μ τς με δ has the same meaning as the older φεξομαι μ τς με δ, I shall flee, that no one may see me. The history of the Greek language shows a gradual decrease of final μ and an increase of the final particles with μ in negative final clauses.¹¹ The tendency in this direction was so strong that πως μ sometimes took the place of μ even after verbs of fearing, to express the object of the fear (370), while it became the regular form after verbs of striving, etc., to express the object aimed at (339). The different origin of the negative final clause (with να μ, etc.) and of the clause with μ explains the fact that, while clauses introduced by the final particles are negated by μ, those introduced by μ, lest, are negated by ο. (See 306.)

[*] 316. Finally, the Attic Greek took the last step in developing the final clause, by using the past tenses of the indicative with να, ς, and πως to express a purpose which failed of attainment because of the failure of the action of the leading sentence; as τ μ οκ κτεινας, ς μ ποτε τοτ δειξα; why did you not kill me, that I might never have shown this? (See 333.) Pure Final Clauses.

[*] 317. Pure final clauses regularly take the subjunctive if the leading verb is primary, and the optative if the leading verb is secondary. E.g.

“Νν δ ρχεσθ π δεπνον, να ξυνγωμεν ρηα” Il. ii. 381.

“Σο δ δε μνηστρες ποκρνονται, ν εδς ατς σ θυμ εδσι δ πντες χαιο.” Od. ii. 111.

“Επω τι δτα κλλ ν ργζ πλον;” SOPH. O.T. 364.

“Κα γρ βασιλες αρεται, οχ να αντο καλς πιμελται, λλ να κα ο λμενοι δ ατν ε πρτωσι.” XEN. Mem. iii. 2, 3.

“Δοκε μοι κατακασαι τς μξας, να μ τ ξεγη μν στρατηγ.” Id. An. iii. 2.27 .

“Πρὸς τοὺς ζῆντας, ἵνα μηδὲν ἄλλο ἐπὼ, τὸν ζῆντα ἐξῆταζε.” DEM. xviii. 318. (Here the final clause depends on some implied expression like I say this.)

“Ἄρνηθι, ἵνα ἴθιαν τοῖσι φῶς φέροι δὲ βροτοῖσιν.” Hom. Od. v. 2.

“Φίλος βόλλετο εἶναι τοὺς μάλιστα δυναμῶνις, ἵνα δίκην μὲ διδοῖη δίκην.” XEN. An. ii. 6, 21.

“Τὸ ψέφισμα τοῦτο γρῶφω ἱστοριζάτω πρᾶσεντ, ἵνα ὁτὼ γῆνοιθι ὁ ἄρκος, καὶ μὲ κῆριος τῆς Θρᾶκης κατασταθῆ.” DEM. xviii. 27.

“Βουλὴν δὲ ἄργεῖοις ἐποθησάμεθ, ἵ τις ἴνῃσει, ἵς μὲ πῆντες ἴλωνται ἴδυσσαμῶνοιο τεοῦ” Il. viii. 36.

“Διανοεῖται ἀτῆν ἵ γῆφυραν ἵ λῆσαι, ἵς μὲ διαβῆτε, ἵλλῆ ἵν μῆσῆ ἐποληφθῆτε” XEN. An. ii. 4, 17.

“Πῆφνε δὲ Ἐῆρυτον, ἵς Ἀγῆαν λῆτριον μισθῆν πρᾶσσοιτο” Pind. Ol. x. (xi.) 31.

“Καὶ σῆ ἐξῆπεμπον, ἵς μῆνη κλῆοις” SOPH. Ant. 19.

“Ἄπεμψα ἵς πῆθιοτο” Id. O.T. 71.

“Τοῦτο ὁπῆρ ἵνεκα φῆλων ἴετο δεῆσθαι, ἵς συνεργῶς ἵχοι” XEN. An. i. 9, 21.

“Τῆν δὲ μνηστῆρες λοχῆσιν, ἵπως πῆ φῆλον ἴληται ἵξ ἵθηκης” Od. xiv. 181.

“Μῆθες τῆδῆ ἵγγος ἵν, ἵπως τῆ πῆν μῆθῆς” SOPH. El. 1205.

“Ἐῆς καιρῆν ἵκεις, ἵπως τῆς δῆκῆς ἵκοῆσῆς” XEN. Cyr. iii. 1, 8.

“Παρακαλεῆς ἵατροῆς, ἵπως μῆ ἵποθῆνῆ” Id. Mem. ii. 10. 2

“Ὀμῆαι δὲ ταῦτα γῆγενεσθαι, ὁχ ἵπως τοῆς ἀτῆς χοροῆς κρῆνωσιν ὁ πολῆται, ὁδῆ ἵπως τοῆς ἀτῆς ἀλητῆς ἵπαινῆσιν, ὁδῆ ἵπως τοῆς ἀτῆς ποιητῆς ἀρῆνται, ὁδῆ ἵνα τοῆς ἀτῆς ἵδωνται, ἵλλῆ ἵνα τοῆς ἵμοις πεῆθωνται” Id. Mem. iv. 4. 16

“ἵν γεῆρεσιν ἵθηκεν, ἵπως ἵτι πῆμα φῆγοιμι” Hom. Od. xiv. 312.

“ἵφικῆμην, ἵπως σοῆ πρῆς δῆμους ἵλθῆντος εἵ πρῆξαιμῆ τι” SOPH. O.T. 1005.

“ἵπρεσβεῆοντο ἵγκλῆματα ποιοῆμενοι, ἵπως σφῆσιν ἵτι μεγῆστη πρῆφασις εἵη τοῆ πολεμεῆν” THUC. i. 126.

“Κεφαλῆ κατανεῆσομαι, ἵφρα πεποῆθῆς” Il. i. 524.

“ἵρσειο δὲ ἵν, ἵξῆνε, πῆλινδῆ ἵμεν, ἵφρα σε πῆμψω” Od. vi. 255.

“Ἀτῆρ ἵμοῆ γῆρας ἀτῆχῆ ἵτοιμῆσατῆ, ἵφρα μῆ ὁῆος ἵργῆων ἵγῆραστος ἵω” Il. i. 118.

“Ἄμῆον Φερσεφῆνας ἵλθῆ, ἵφρῆ ἵδοῆσῆ ἵνῆν εἵπῆς” PIND. Ol. xiv. 20.

“ἵς ἵ μῆν ἵνθα κατῆσχετῆ ἵπειγῆμενῆς περ ἵδοῆο, ἵφρῆ ἵταρον θῆπτοι καῆ ἵπῆ κτῆρεα κτερῆσειεν” Hom. Od. iii. 284.

“λλ σ μ ν ν α τις π στιχε, μ τι νο σ ρη: μο δ κε τα τα μελ σεται φρα τελ σσω” Il. i. 522.

“Ο δ τ α τ ν ζεις δε ρο, μ τις ν αρπ σ;” SOPH. Aj. 986.

“Λυσιτελε σαι ν τ παρ ντι, μ κα το τον πολ μιον προσθ μεθα” XEN. Cyr. ii. 4, 12.

Λ γεται επε ν τι πι ναι βο λοιτο, μ πατρ τι χθοιτο κα π λικς μ μφοιτο Ib. i. 4. 25

“Λο σαι κ λετ, ς μ Πρ αμος δοι υ ν, μ μ ν χνυ μ ν κραδ χ λον ο κ ρ σαιτο” Il. xxiv. 582. For the relative frequency of the final particles, see Appendix III.

[*] 318. As final clauses after past tenses express some person's previous purpose or motive, they allow the double construction of indirect discourse (667, 1); so that, instead of the optative, they can have the mood and tense which the person himself would have used in conceiving the purpose. Thus we can say either λθεν να δοι, he came that he might see, or λθεν να δ, because the person himself would have said ρχομαι να δω, I come that I may see.

Hence the subjunctive in final clauses after past tenses is very common, in some writers even more common than the regular optative. E.g.

“πεκλ σαντο δ λεθρον ν θρ ποις, να σι κα σσομ νοισιν οιδ” Od. viii. 579.

“χ λ ν δ α τοι π π φθαλ μ ν λον, π ρ ν π π εν, φρ γ γ ν σ κ ς μ ν θε ν δ κα νδρα” Il. v. 127.

“ριστε ς ξυ νεβο λευεν κ λε σαι, πως π π λ ον σ τος ν τ σ χ” THUC. i. 65.

“λθον πρεσβευ σ μ ενοι, πως μ σ φ σι τ τικ ν ναυτικ ν προσγεν μ ενον μ π διον γ νηται” Id. i. 31.

“χ ρουν κ τ ν ο κ ι ν, πως μ κατ φ ς θαρσαλεωτ ροις ο σι προσφ ρωνται κα σ φ σιν κ το σου γ γ νωνται, λ λ σ σους σι” Id. ii. 3.

“Κα π π τηδ ς σε ο κ γειρον, να ς διστα δι γ ς” PLAT. Crit. 43B.

“Πλο α κατ καυσεν να μ Κ ρος διαβ” XEN. An. i. 4, 18.

“Τα τας να κω λ ηθ ο ν μοι συν γαγον μ ς, ο χ να κυρ ς το ς δικο σι ποι τε” DEM. xix. 1.

“Κα περ το των μ ν σθην, να μ τα τ π θητε” Id. iii. 6. (Here the purpose was conceived in the form να μ τα τ π θωσιν.)

[*] 319. This principle applies also to clauses with πως after verbs of striving (339) and with μ after verbs of fearing, etc. (365).

[*] 320. This is a favourite construction with certain authors, especially Thucydides, who also, on the same principle, prefers the indicative and subjunctive to the optative in ordinary indirect discourse after past tenses (670). The early poets, on the other hand, especially Homer, use it very sparingly.12

[*] 321. The subjunctive thus used for the optative makes the language more vivid, by introducing more nearly the original form of thought of the person whose purpose is stated. As the two forms are equally correct, we sometimes find both in the same sentence, just as we find the indicative and optative interchanged in indirect discourse (670; see 677 and 690). E.g. ξακοςους λογδας ξκριναν, πως τν τε πιπολν εησαν φλακες κα, νς λλο τι δ, ταχξυνεσττες παραγγωνται, i.e. they selected them, that they might be guards of Erioplae, and that they might be on hand if they should be needed for anything else. THUC. vi. 96. Παρανσχον δ φρυκτους, πως σαφ τ σημεα τους πολεμοις κα μ βοηθοεν, they raised fire-signals at the same time, in order that the enemy's signals might be unintelligible to them, and that they (the enemy) might not bring aid. Id. iii. 22. A common interpretation of the latter and of similar passages, that "the subjunctive mood indicates the immediate, and the optative the remote consequence of the action contained in the principal verbs, the second being a consequence of the first" (Arnold), manifestly could not apply to the first example.

[*] 322. The use of the optative for the subjunctive in final clauses after primary tenses is, on the other hand, very rare, and is to be viewed as a mere irregularity of construction. See "ξω τλ θκης, να μοι βοτον πολν λφοι" Od. xvii. 250 ; ππως μαχοιντο, Il. i. 344; and vii. 340, Il. xviii. 88. So SOPH. El. 56, O. C. 11; HDT. ii. 93 (να μ μρτοιεν). Most of these are emended by various editors; and no good reason for the anomaly appears in any of them.

[*] 323. Sometimes the optative is properly used after a leading verb which implies a reference to the past as well as the present. E.g. Τοτον χει τν τρον νμος, να μηδ πεισθναι μηδ ξαπατηθναι γνοιτ π τ δμ. DEM. xxii. 11. (Here χει implies also the past existence of the law; the idea being, the law was made as it is, so that it might not be possible, etc.) So DEM. xxiv. 145, DEM. 147. In DEM. iii. 34 να τοθ πρχοι depends on a past verb of saying to be mentally supplied. In AR. Ran. 23, τοτον δ χ, να μ ταλαιπωροτο μηδ χθος φοροι, I am letting him ride, that he might not be distressed, etc., the meaning of χ goes back to the time when Dionysus first let the slave mount the ass.

[*] 324. (Future Indicative.) The future indicative occasionally takes the place of the subjunctive in pure final clauses. It occurs chiefly with πως, very seldom with φρα, ς, and μ, and never with να. 13 It has essentially the same force as the subjunctive. E.g. "Αε δ μαλακοσι κα αμυλοισι λγοισι θλγει, πως θκης πιλσεται" Od. i. 56. Μ πρσλευσσε, μν πως μ τν τχην διαφθερες. SOPH. Ph. 1068. "πομυκτον δ σο γ, πως ληγει πιεν" EUR. Cycl. 561. "ρδ σ πως μβλαστανες." AR. Lys. 384. π ατος τος προλγους σου τρψομαι, πως τ προν τς τραγδδας μρος πριστον βασανι. AR. Ran. 1120. Προιναι (δε) τν τπων νθυμομενον, πως μ διαμαρτσεται. Cyneg. XEN. ix. 4. Χρ ναβιβζειν π τν τροχν τος ναγραφντας, πως μ πρτερον νξ σται πρν πυθσθαι τος νδρας παντας. AND. i. 43.

Θρσνον δ ο τον φρεσν, φρα κα κτωρ εσεται. Il. xvi. 242. "ς τ ξομεν;" "that we may do what?" SOPH. O.C. 1724. "στ εκς μς μ βραδνειν στ, μ κα τις ψεται χμν σως κατεπ" AR. Eccl. 495. So μ κεχολσεται, Il. xx. 301.

ν, or κ, in Final Clauses with Subjunctive.

[*] 325. The final particles which have a relative origin, **κα**, **πως**, and **φρα**, sometimes have **ν** or **κ** in final clauses with the subjunctive. They did this originally in their capacity as conditional relatives; and it is probable that at first **κ** or **ν** with the relative gave the clause a combined final and conditional force, in which the conditional element gradually grew weaker as the relative particles came to be felt chiefly or only as final particles (312, 2). **να** and **μ** never take **ν** or **κ** in this way.¹⁴

[*] 326. **κα**.) 1. **κα** **κε** and **κα** **ν** are together much more common in Homer with the subjunctive than simple **κα**. **κα** **ν** with the subjunctive is not uncommon in the Attic poets, and it occurs in Herodotus; but (like **κα** itself) it almost disappears in Attic prose. E.g. Πειθεο, **κα** **ν** μοι τιμην μεγαλην κακιδος ρηαι, obey, that thou mayest gain for me great honour and glory. II. xvi. 84. "Ατρω ο προφρν ποθσομαι, **κα** **κε** μλ σκηθς **ν** πατρδα γαν κηται" Od. v. 143. "Πασατε, **κα** **χ**, **ξ**ενος **ν**σπ οσι φλοισιν" Od. viii. 251. **λλ** **θ**, **μ** **μ** **ρ** **θ** **ι** **ζε**, σατερος **κα** **κε** **ν** **η** **ι**, "that thou mayest go the more safely." II. i. 32. Προσδεμεθα . . . συμμψαι **μ** **ν**, **κα** **ν** **μ** **ν** **ξ** **λω** **μ** **ν** **κ** **τ** **ς** **χ** **ρ** **η** **ς**. HDT. i. 36. "Τος **μ** **ο** **ς** **λ** **γ** **ο** **υ** **ς** **θ** **υ** **μ** **β** **λ**, **κα** **ν** **τ** **ρ** **μ** **α** **τ** **κ** **μ** **θ** **ς** **δ** **ο**" AESCH. Prom. 705. **λλ** **σ** **ω** **μ** **ε** **ν**, **φ** **λ** **ο** **ι**, **κ** **η** **λ** **ο** **ν** **α** **τ** **ν**, **κα** **ν** **ε** **ς** **π** **ν** **ο** **ν** **π** **σ**. SOPH. Ph. 825. "Καθερξατ **α** **τ** **ν**, **κα** **ν** **σ** **κ** **τ** **ι** **ο** **ν** **ε** **ρ** **ο** **ρ** **κ** **ν** **φ** **α** **ς**" Bacch. 510. Τουτ λαβν μου τ σκιδειον πρεχε **ν** **ω** **θ** **ε** **ν**, **κα** **ν** **μ** **μ** **ρ** **σ** **ι** **ν** **ο** **θ** **ε** **ο**. AR. Av. 1508.

2. In Attic prose **κα** **ν** with the subjunctive is found only in Xenophon and in one passage of Thucydides. The last is THUC. vi. 91: (πμψετε) **ν** **δ** **ρ** **α** **σ** **π** **α** **ρ** **τ** **ι** **τ** **η** **ν** **ρ** **χ** **ο** **ν** **τ** **α**, **κα** **ν** **τ** **ο** **ς** **τ** **ε** **π** **α** **ρ** **ν** **τ** **α** **ς** **ξ** **ν** **κ** **α** **τ** **ο** **ς** **μ** **θ** **λ** **ο** **ν** **τ** **α** **ς** **π** **ρ** **ο** **σ** **α** **ν** **α** **γ** **κ** **σ**. See XEN. An. ii. 5, 16, **κα** **δ** **ν** **μ** **θ** **ς**, **ν** **τ** **κ** **ο** **υ** **σ** **ο** **ν**. So XEN. An. vi. 3, 18. See other examples of Xenophon's peculiar use of **κα** **ν** with the subjunctive in Appendix IV.

[*] 327. **φρα**.) **φρα** **κε** and **φρα** **ν** have the subjunctive in a few final clauses in Homer. E.g. "Οτος **ν** **σο** **μ** **ψ** **ε** **τ** **α** **ι**, **φρα** **κ** **ε** **ν** **ε** **δ** **σο** **σ** **ι** **ν** **ν** **μ** **ε** **γ** **ρ** **ο** **ι** **σ** **ι** **ν**" Od. iii. 359. "ομεν, **φρα** **κε** **θ** **σ** **σ** **ο** **ν** **γ** **ε** **ρ** **ο** **μ** **ε** **ν** **ξ** **ν** **ρ** **η** **α**" II. ii. 440. "Τ **ν** **ξ** **ε** **ν** **ο** **ν** **γ** **λ** **ς** **π** **λ** **ι** **ν**, **φρα** **ν** **κ** **ε** **θ** **ι** **δ** **α** **τ** **α** **π** **ω** **χ** **ε**" Od. xvii. 10. For **φρα** **κε** and **φρα** **ν** with the optative, see 329, 1.

[*] 328. **πως**.) **πως** does not occur in Homer in pure final clauses with either **κ** or **ν**. **πως** **ν** final with the subjunctive appears first in Aeschylus, and remains in good use in Attic poetry and prose, being almost the only final expression found in the formal language of the Attic inscriptions. One case of **κως** **ν** occurs in Herodotus. E.g. Φλασσε **τ** **ν** **ο** **κ** **κα** **λ** **ς**, **πως** **ν** **ρ** **τ** **κ** **ο** **λ** **λ** **α** **σ** **υ** **μ** **β** **α** **ν** **τ** **δ** **ε**, watch what goes on in the house, that these things may work harmoniously. AESCH. Cho. 579: so AESCH. Prom. 824, AESCH. Eum. 573, AESCH. Eum. 1030, Suppl. 233. **σ** **θ** **ι** **π** **ν** **τ** **δ** **ρ** **μ** **ε** **ν** **ο** **ν**, **πως** **ν** **ε** **δ** **ς** **μ** **ι** **ν** **γ** **γ** **ε** **λ** **ς** **σ** **α** **φ**. SOPH. El. 40. "Τ **τ** **α** **τ** **ν** **α** **τ** **ν** **δ** **δ** **α** **σ** **χ**, **πως** **ν** **κ** **μ** **θ** **ω**" Id. O.C. 575. "Ο **κ** **π** **ι** **θ**, **πως** **ν** **ο** **λ** **κ** **ω** **ν** **ε** **ς** **κα** **θ** **ο** **ς** **υ** **χ** **α** **ν** **π** **ω** **σ** **ι** **ν**;" AR. Lys. 1223. Τα **τ** **α** **δ** **πο** **ε** **ε** **τ** **ν** **δ** **ε** **ε** **ν** **ε** **κ** **ε** **ν**, **κως** **ν** **κ** **ρ** **υ** **ξ** **γ** **ε** **λ** **λ** **υ** **τ** **τ**. HDT. i. 22 (see 318). Δι **τ** **ς** **σ** **ς** **χ** **ρ** **α** **ς** **ξ** **ε** **ι** **ς** **μ** **μ** **ς**, **πως** **ν** **ε** **δ** **μ** **ε** **ν**, κ.τ.λ. XEN. Cyr. v. 2, 21. Κα **φ** **α** **τ** **ε** **α** **τ** **ν** **τ** **ο** **ι** **ο** **ν** **ε** **ν** **α** **ι**, **πως** **ν** **φ** **α** **ν** **η** **τ** **α** **ς** **κ** **λ** **λ** **ι** **σ** **τ** **ο** **ς** **κα** **ρ** **ι** **σ** **τ** **ο** **ς**. Symp. 199A. **ν** **γ** **τι** **ν** **α** **ς** **π** **ο** **π** **τ** **ε** **λε** **θ** **ε** **ρ** **α** **φ** **ρ** **ο** **ν** **μ** **α** **τ** **α** **χ** **ο** **ν** **τ** **α** **ς** **μ** **π** **ι** **τ** **ρ** **ψ** **ε** **ι** **ν** **α** **τ** **ρ** **χ** **ε** **ι** **ν**, (πολ **μ** **ο** **υ** **ς** **κ** **ι** **ν** **ε** **ι**) **πως** **ν** **τ** **ο** **τ** **ο** **υ** **ς** **μ** **ε** **τ** **π** **ρ** **ο** **φ** **σ** **ε** **ω** **ς** **πο** **λ** **λ**, "that he may destroy them." Rep. 567A. Ε **σ** **ε** **β** **ο** **μ** **ε** **ν** **κα** **τ** **ν** **δ** **ικ** **α** **ι** **ο** **σ** **ν** **η** **ν** **σ** **κ** **ο** **μ** **ε** **ν**, **ο** **χ** **ν** **α** **τ** **ν** **λλ** **ω** **ν** **λα** **τ** **τ** **ο** **ν** **χ** **ω** **μ** **ε** **ν**, **λλ** **πως** **ν** **ς** **μ** **ε** **τ** **π** **λ** **ε** **σ** **τ** **ω** **ν** **γα** **θ** **ν** **τ** **ν** **β** **ο** **ν**

διγόμεν. ISOC. iii. 2 (να and πως v may here be compared in sense: see 312, ISOC. 2). Τν πλιν συνχειν, πως v μαν γμην χωσιν παντες κα μ τος χθρος δονν ποισιν. DEM. xix. 298: so xiv. 23.

v, or κ, in Final Clauses with Optative.

[*] 329. 1. (ς, and φρα, in Homer and ς, and κως, in Herodotus.) In Homer ς κε and ς v sometimes have the optative in final clauses after both primary and secondary tenses. φρα κε and φρ v occur each once in Homer with the optative after past tenses. Herodotus has ς v and κως v with the optative after past tenses, and κως v once after a present tense. This optative with κ or v after primary tenses is certainly potential as well as final; and this analogy makes it difficult or impossible to take it in any other sense after secondary tenses, though here the potential force is less obvious.

a) After primary tenses six cases occur in the Odyssey and one in Herodotus:—

“περραγασι νεσθαι ς κ ατς εδνσαιτο θγατρα” “they dread to go to him that he may settle (if he will) the bridal gifts of his daughter, lit. that he would settle, etc.” Od. ii. 53 .

“Κνυζσω δ τοι σσε, ς v εικλιος φανεης” “I will dim your eyes, to the end that you might appear unseemly.” Od. xiii. 401.

“Δο δορε καλλιπειν, ς v πιθσαντες λομεθα” Od. xvi. 297.

“Τ κε τχα γνοης φιλητητ τε πολλ τε δρα ξ με, ς v τς σε συναντμενος μακαρζοι,” “so that one would call you blessed.” Od. xvii. 164 (= xv. 537, Od. xix. 310).

“γεσθω ρχηθμοο, ς κν τις φαη γμον μμεναι κτς κοων” “let him lead off the dance, so that any one who should hear without would say there was a marriage.” Od. xxiii. 134.

“σχεσθε πολμου, ς κεν ναμωτ γε διακρινθετε τχιστα” Od. xxiv. 531.

“Κελεει σε τ παιδον θεναι, κως v τχιστα διαφθαρεη,” “he bids you so expose the child that he would be likely to perish most speedily.” HDT. i. 110.

b) After past tenses the following cases occur¹⁵:—

ε δ ρα Ζες συνεχς, φρα κε θσσον λπλοα τεχα θεη. II. xii. 25. λπειν σε Φθηγηνδε νεσθαι, ς v μοι τν παδα Σκυρθεν ζαγγοις, i.e. I hoped for your coming, that you might perchance bring my son away from Scyros. II. xix. 330. “Κα μιν μακρτερον κα πσσονα θκεν δσθαι, ς κεν Φαικεσσι φλος πντεσσι γνοιτο” Od. viii. 20. “Τμβον χεαμεν, ς κει τηλεφανς κ ποντφιν νδρσιν εη” Od. xxiv. 83. “Σ δ με προεις, φρ v λομην δρα βεκκερ νελομην.” Ib. 333.

Λγεται διρυχα ρσσειν, κως v τ στρατπεδον δρυμνον κατ ντου λβοι, i.e. he is said to have dug (119 a channel, in order that the river might flow behind the army. HDT. i. 75. Τατα δ περ ωυτν σμνυε τνδε ενεκεν, κως v μ ροντες ο μλικες λυπεοατο κα πιβουλεοιεν, λλ τερος σφι δοκοι εναι μ ρσι, in order that his companions might not be offended by seeing him and plot against him, but that he might appear to them to be of another nature when they did not see him. Id. i. 99. Ποφρεον εμα

περιβαλ■μενος, ■ς ■ν πυνθαν■μενοι πλε■στοι συν■λθοιεν. Id. i. 152. Τ■ δωρ τ■τε ■π■καν, ■ς ■ν χαραδρωθε■η ■ χ■ρος, they let in the water, in order that the country might be gullied. Id. vii. 176. Περι■πεμπον ■ξωθεν Σκι■θου, ■ς ■ν μ■ ■φθε■ησαν περιπλ■ουσαι Ε■βοιαν. Id. viii. 7. ■λαυνον το■ς ■ππους, ■ς ■ν τ■ν νεκρ■ν ■νελο■ατο. Id. ix. 22. Μετακιν■εσθαι ■δ■κεε τ■τε, ■ς ■ν μ■ ■δο■ατο ο■ Π■ρσαι ■ξορμεομ■νους. Ib. 51.

2. ■ς ■ν with the optative in Attic prose is found chiefly in Xenophon. It is never strictly final; but ■ς is relative or interrogative, and the optative with ■ν is potential. E.g. ■δοξεν α■τ■ το■το ποι■σαι, ■ς ■τι ■κιστα ■ν ■πιφθ■νωσ σπανι■ς τε κα■ σεμν■ς φανε■η, he decided to do this in such a way that he might appear, etc. (i.e. in the way by which.) XEN. Cyr. vii. 5, 37. (Here the separation of ■ν from ■ς makes the potential character plainer.) ■ς δ■ ■ν κα■ ο■ π■δες ε■εν τ■ ■π■ κρ■τιστοι, ε■ μ■ν τις ■χει ■■ω ■σκησιν, κ.τ.λ., “as to means by which the horse’s feet could be kept strongest.” Hipp. i. 16. See other examples in Appendix IV. This is the same relative use of ■ς with the potential optative which we find in DEM. vi. 3, ■ς μ■ν ■ν ε■ποιτε δικα■ους λ■γους ■μεινον Φιλ■ππου παρεσκε■ασθε: ■ς δ■ κωλ■σαιτ■ ■ν ■κε■νον προ■ττειν τα■τα, παντελ■ς ■ργ■ς ■χετε, as to means by which you could make just speeches, you are better equipped than Philip; but as to steps by which you could prevent him from doing what he does, you are wholly inactive. See also DEM. vi. 37, ■ς δ■ ■ν ■ξετασθε■η μ■λιστ■ ■κριβ■ς, μ■ γ■νοιτο, as to any means by which the truth could be tested most thoroughly,—may this never come!

[*] 330. ■πως ■ν with a final potential optative occurs once in Thucydides, four times in Xenophon, and once in Aeschylus.

Τ■ς προ■ρας κατεβ■ρσωσαν, ■πως ■ν ■πολισθ■νοι ■χε■ρ ■πιβαλλομ■νη, they covered the prows with hides, that the (iron) hand when thrown on might be likely to slip off. THUC. vii. 65. ■δωκε χρ■ματα ■ντακ■δ■, ■πως ■ν, πληρωθ■ντος ναυτικο■ π■ Λακεδαιμον■ων, ο■ ■θηνα■οι μ■λλον τ■ς ε■ρ■νης προσδ■οιντο. XEN. Hell. iv. 8, 16. (Here πληρωθ■ντος ναυτικο■, if a navy should be manned, stands as protasis to προσδ■οιντο ■ν.) ■πως δ■ ■ν ■ς ■ρρωμεν■στατον τ■ στρ■τευμα ποι■σαιτο, ■ξ ■λλων π■λεων ■ργυρολ■γει. Ib. iv. 8, Ib. 30. Π■σιν ■δ■δου βο■ς τε, ■πως ■ν θ■σαντες ■στι■ντο, κα■ ■κπ■ματα. Id. Cyr. viii. 3, Id. Cyr. 33 (one MS. omits ■ν). Τ■ν λε■αν ■π■πεμψε διατ■θεσθαι ■ρακλε■δην, ■πως ■ν μισθ■ς γ■νοιτο το■ς στρατι■ταις. Id. An. vii. 4, Id. An. 2 (most MSS. have ■πως γ■νηται). SO AESCH. Ag. 364. In these cases the final force is equally strong with the potential.

Elliptical Constructions.

[*] 331. In colloquial Greek we often find ■να τ■; that what?— where τ■ takes the place of a final clause, which generally appears in the answer to the question. E.g. ΒΛ. ■να τ■; ΠΠ. δ■λον τουτογ■: ■να . . . ■χωσιν. AR. Eccl. 719. So AR. Nub. 1192, Pac. 409. So DEM. xix. 257: ■να τ■; ■ν■ ■ς μετ■ πλε■στης συγγ■μης παρ■ μ■ν κατηγορ■. Just before this we have δι■ τ■; ■να μ■τε ■λλ■ου μ■τε συγγ■μης τ■χ■. So PLAT. Ap. 26 C.

[*] 332. A final clause may stand without a leading verb expressed, when the omission can easily be supplied; as ■τι ■ρξα, μ■ ■ποδημ■σω; ■να γε μ■ προλαβ■ν χρ■ματα τ■ς π■λεως ■ προ■ξεις δρασμ■ χρ■σ■, because I held an office, may I not leave the country? No: that you may not take to flight, etc. AESCHIN. iii. 21.

Secondary Tenses of Indicative in Final Clauses.

[*] 333. In Attic Greek the secondary tenses of the indicative are used in final clauses with **■να**, sometimes with **■πως** or **■ς**, to denote that the purpose is dependent upon some unaccomplished action or unfulfilled condition, and therefore is not or was not attained. The tenses of the indicative differ here as in conditional sentences, the imperfect (the most frequent tense) referring to present time or to continued or repeated action in past time, the aorist and pluperfect to past time (410). Thus **■να το■το ■πραττεν** means in order that he might be doing this (but he is not doing it), or that he might have been doing this (but he was not); **■να το■το ■πραξεν** means that he might have done this (but he did not); **■να το■το ■πεπρα■χει** means that he might have done this (but he has not). E.g. **Ο■κ ■ν ■σχ■μην, ■ν■ ■ τυφλ■ς τε κα■ κλ■ων μηδ■ν**, in that case I should not have forbore (to destroy my hearing), so that I might (now) be both blind and devoid of hearing (implying that really he is not so). SOPH. O.T. 1387. **Φε■, φε■, τ■ μ■ τ■ πρ■γματ■ ■νθρ■ποις ■χειν φων■ν, ■ν■ ■σαν μηδ■ν ο■ δεινο■ λ■γοι**, Alas! alas! that the facts have no voice for men, so that words of eloquence might be as nothing. EUR. Fr.(EUR. Hipp.) 442. **■βουλ■μην μ■ν ■τερον ■ν τ■ν ■θ■δων λ■γειν τ■ β■λιτισθ■, ■ν■ ■καθ■μην ■συχος**. AR. Eccl. 151. **■χρ■ν ε■σκαλ■σαντας μ■ρτυρας πολλο■ς παρασημ■νασθαι κελε■σαι τ■ς διαθ■κας**, AR. Eccl. i **■ν■, ε■ τι ■γ■γνετο μ■φισβητ■σιμον, ■ν ε■ς τ■ γρ■μματα τα■τ■ ■πανελθε■ν**. DEM. xxviii. 5. (This implies that they did not have the will thus sealed, so that it is not now possible to refer to it in case of dispute.) **■ξ■τησεν ■ν με τ■ν πα■δα, ■ν■ ε■ μ■ παρεδ■δουν μηδ■ν δ■καιον λ■γειν ■δ■κουν**. DEM. xxix. 17. **■χρ■ν α■το■ς τ■ν προ- τ■ραν ζ■τησιν ζητε■ν, ■να ■πηλλ■γμεθα το■του το■ δημαγωγο■**, they ought to have made the previous investigation, in order that we might have been already freed from this demagogue (but we have not been freed from him). DIN. i. 10. See LYS. i. 40 and 42; ISOC. ix. 5, ISOC. xviii. 51. **■λλ■ σ■ ■χρ■ν ■μ■ν συγχωρε■ν, ■να συνουσ■α ■γ■γνετο**, but you ought to give way to us, that our conversation might not be interrupted (as it is). PLAT. Prot. 335 C.

“**Τ■ δ■τ■ ο■κ ■ρριψ■ ■μαυτ■ν τ■σδ■ ■π■ π■τρας, ■πως τ■ν π■ντων π■νων ■πηλλ■γην;**” “why did I not throw myself from this rock, that I might have been freed from all my toils?” AESCH. Prom. 747 : so AESCH. Cho. 195. See SOPH. El. 1134. **Ο■κο■ν ■χρ■ν σε Πηγ■σου ξε■ξαι πτερ■ν, ■πως ■φά■νου το■ς θεο■ς τραγικ■τερος;** Pac. 135.

Τ■ μ■ ο■ λαβ■ν ■κτεινας ε■θ■ς, ■ς ■δειξα μ■ποτε ■μαυτ■ν ■νθρ■ποισιν ■νθεν ■ γεγ■ς; that I might never have shown, as I have done. SOPH. O.T. 1391. “**Ε■ γρ■ μ■ ■π■ γ■ν ■κεν, ■ς μ■τε θε■ς μ■τε τις ■λλος το■σδ■ ■πεγ■θει,**” “would that he had sent me under the earth, so that neither any God nor any one else should be rejoicing at these things (as they are).” AESCH. Prom. 152. **■δει τ■ ■ν■χυρα τ■τε λαβε■ν, ■ς μηδ■ ε■ ■βο■λετο ■δ■νατο ■ξαπατ■ν**. XEN. An. vii. 6, 23 (the only case in Xenophon).

[*] 334. This construction is the result of an assimilation, which makes more distinct the connection in thought between the two clauses. It is especially common after secondary tenses implying unfulfilled conditions and unaccomplished wishes.

[*] 335. **■ν** cannot properly be added to the indicative in this construction. In the two examples in which it is found, it would seem that the construction has slipped into an apodosis, or that copyists have been misled by the resemblance to an apodosis and inserted **■ν**.

Ζ■ντι ■δει βοηθε■ν, ■πως ■τι δικαιο■τατος ■ν κα■ ■σι■τατος ■ζη τε ζ■ν κα■ τελευτ■σας ■τιμ■ρητος ■ν κακ■ν ■μαρτημ■των ■γ■γηετο, in order that he might thus live while he lives, and (so that) after death he would be (as a consequence of such a life) free from punishment (?). Leg. 959 β. Τ■ν γε πρ■ττοντ■ τι δ■καιον ο■ προσ■κεν ■πορε■ν ■λλ■ ε■θ■ς λ■γειν, ■να μ■λλον ■ν ■πιστε■ετο ■φ■ ■μ■ν, (possibly) that the result might be that he would be (in that case) the more trusted by you. ISAE. xi. 6.

[*] 336. The indicative can never be used in this construction, unless the final clause refers to present or past time, and unless also it is distinctly implied that the purpose is not (or was not) attained. If the purpose is future (at the time of speaking), or if it is left uncertain whether the object is or was attained, it must be expressed in the ordinary way by the subjunctive or optative, even though it depends on one of the class of verbs mentioned above. Both constructions may occur in the same sentence. E.g. Ο■ς (τ■ν ν■ων το■ς ■γαθο■ς) ■με■ς ■ν ■φυλ■ττομεν ■ν ■κροπ■λει, ■να μηδε■ς α■το■ς δι■φθειρεν, ■λλ■ ■πειδ■ ■φ■κοιντο ε■ς τ■ν ■λι- κ■αν, χρ■σιμοι γ■γνοιτο τα■ς π■λεσιν, we should guard (in that case) in the Acropolis, that no one might corrupt them (as some now corrupt them), and that when (in the future) they should become of age they might become useful to their states. PLAT. Men. 89B. (Here it is not implied that they never become useful, this depending partly on the future.) Τα■τ■ ■ν ■δη λ■γειν πρ■ς ■μ■ς ■πεχε■ρουν, ■ν■ ε■δ■τε πολλο■ δε■ν ■ξιον ■ντα τυχε■ν το■ ψηφ■σματος α■τ■ν τουτου■, "I should (if that were so) be now undertaking to explain this to you, that you might (after hearing me) know that he is far from deserving the honour of the proposed decree." DEM. xxiii. 7. Κα■τοι χρ■ν σε ■ το■τον μ■ γρ■φειν ■ κε■νον λ■ειν, ο■χ, ■να ■ βο■λει σ■ γ■νηται, π■ντα συνταρ■ξαι, i.e. you ought not to have confused everything in order that what you want might be done. DEM. xxiv. 44.

[*] 337. Clauses with μ■ after verbs of fearing are never thus assimilated to a preceding indicative, as there is no reference here to the attainment of a purpose.

[*] 338. A purpose can be expressed in various forms besides that of the final clause; as by the relative with the future indicative, or in Homer with the subjunctive (565; 568); by the infinitive (770) or the infinitive with ■στε or ■ς (587, 3); by the future participle (840); by ■π■ρ with the genitive of the articular infinitive (802).

Object Clauses with ■πως and ■πως μ■ after Verbs of Striving, etc.

[*] 339. In Attic Greek and in Herodotus, object clauses with ■πως and ■πως μ■ after verbs signifying to strive, to plan, to care for, to effect, regularly have the future indicative after primary tenses to express the object aimed at. The subjunctive also is used, but less frequently than the future indicative.

After secondary tenses the future optative may be used, corresponding to the future indicative after primary tenses; but generally the future indicative is retained, as the original form of the thought (319). The other tenses of the optative are sometimes used, to correspond to the same tenses of the subjunctive, or the subjunctive itself may be retained (318). E.g. ■πιμελε■ται ■πως (or ■πως μ■) γεν■σεται or γ■νηται, he takes care that it may (or may not) happen. ■πεμελε■το ■πως γεν■σεται, γεν■σοιτο, or γ■νοιτο, he took care that it should happen.

after secondary tenses, being rarely used. (See 128.) Homeric and other Early Usages.

[*] 341. In Homer, verbs signifying to plan, to consider, and to try, chiefly φραζομαι, βουλεω, μερμηρζω, and πειρ, have πως or ς with the subjunctive after primary tenses, and the optative (never future) and sometimes the subjunctive (318) after secondary tenses. Κ is almost always used here with ς and the subjunctive, less frequently with πως (313, 3).

[*] 342. The original relative and interrogative force of πως and ς is more apparent here than in the Attic construction of πως with the future indicative, especially after verbs of considering; though after πειρ the dependent clause comes nearer the later meaning. E.g. “Ατο δ φραζμεθ πως χ ριστα γνηται,” “let us ourselves consider how the very best things may be done.” Od. xiii. 365. “Φραζμεθ τιπερφεξτ ργεοισιν πως χ ριστα γνοιτο” Od. iii. 129. “Φρζεσθαι ππως κε μνηστρας κτενς” Od. i. 295. “Περιφραζμεθα πντες νστον, πως λθσιν” “i.e. how he may come.” Od. i. 76. “Φρζωμεσθ ς κν μιν πεπθωμεν” Il. ix. 112. “Φρσσεται ς κε νηται, πε πολυμχανς στιν” Od. i. 205. “μα πρσσω κα πσσω λεσσει πως χ ριστα γνηται,” “i.e. he looks to see how, etc.” Il. iii. 110. “ννησε θε ς δυσες γροιτο” Od. vi. 112. “Ο γρ δ τοτον μν βολευσας νον ατ, ς τοι κενους δυσες ποτσεται λθν;” Od. v. 23. “Βολευον πως χ ριστα γνοιτο” Od. ix. 420. “λθον, ε τινα βουλν εποι πως θκην ς παιπαλεσσαν κομην” Od. xi. 479. “Μερμριζεν πως πολοατο πσαι νες” Od. ix. 554. “Μερμριζε κατ φρνα ς χιλια τιμσ” (or τιμσε), i.e. how he might honour Achilles. Il. ii. 3. “λλ γε μτιν φηνον πως ποτσομαι ατος” Od. xiii. 386. “ρμηνεν ν θυμν πως πασειε πνοιο δον χιλλα” Il. xxi. 137. “Μνησμεθ ς χ ξενος ν πατρδα γαν κηται, μηδ τι μεσσηγς γε κακν κα πμα πθσιν” Od. vii. 192. In Hymn. Pyth. Ap. 148 we have τεχνσομαι ς κε γνηται. “Περα πως κεν δ σν πατρδα γαν κηται,” “i.e. try to find means by which you may go, etc.” Od. iv. 545. “Πειρ ς κε Τρες περφαλοι πλωνται” Il. xxi. 459. “Τοσι δ πλλ πτελλε πειρν ς πεπθοιεν μμονα Πηλεωνα” Il. ix. 179. In Il. xv. 164 we have φραζεσθω μ μ οδ ταλσσ μεναι (354). For a full citation of the Homeric examples with πως and ς, see Appendix III. 3.

[*] 343. The frequent addition of κ to ς or πως in Homer shows the relative origin of the construction (312, 2). For κως ν in Herodotus, see 350; for πως ν in this construction in Attic writers, see 348, 349.

[*] 344. In Homer πως takes the future indicative chiefly when it is merely an indirect interrogative, with no reference to purpose, as in Il. ii. 252, “οδ τ πω σφα δμεν πως σται τδε ργα” , we do not yet even know certainly how these things are to be; or in Od. xiii. 376, “φρζεευ πως μνηστρσιν ναιδσι χερας φσεις” , consider how you will lay hands on the shameless suitors. See Il. ix. 251; Od. xx. 38. In Od. xx. 28 the future indicative is retained after a past tense, there being as yet no future optative (128); νθα κα νθα λσσετο μερμηρζων ππως δ μνηστρσιν ναιδσι χερας φσει. πως may take the future (like other tenses) as a simple relative; as in Il. i. 136, πως ντξιον σται, as shall be an equivalent.

[*] 345. φρα has the subjunctive in an object clause in Il. vi. 361, “δη γρ μοι θυμς πσσνται, φρ παμνω Τρεςσι” , and the optative in Od. iv. 463, “τς συμφρσσατο βουλς φρα μ λοις;” In Il. i. 523, “μο δ κε τατα μελσεται φρα τελσσω” , φρα may mean until.

[*] 346. The single object clause of this class in Pindar is Pyth. i. 72, “νεσον μερον φρα κατ οκον Φοινιξ Τυρσαν τ λλατος χ”, grant that the Phoenician, with the Etruscan war-cry, may keep quiet at home. (See 359.)

[*] 347. As relics of the Homeric usage we find ζ with the subjunctive in sentences of this class in EUR. Med. 461, I. T. 467, PLAT. Rep. 349 C; and with the optative in AESCH. Prom. 203 (see 353, below). Herodotus has ζ with the future indicative in iii. 84, 159, vii. 161 (in the last ζ στρατηγσεις γλχεαι). Herodotus has ζ ν with the subjunctive in iii. 85, μηχαν ζ ν σχμεν τοτο τ γρας, which is cited as the solitary case of ζ ν in these object clauses after Homer, except in Xenophon (351). See also Sept. 627, Eum. 771; SOLON xiii. 38; SOPH. Ant. 215 (in 281, above).

πως ν, in Attic Greek and Herodotus.: ζ, and ζ ν, in Xenophon.

[*] 348. The Attic writers sometimes use πως ν with the subjunctive in these object clauses. This occurs chiefly in Aristophanes, Xenophon, and Plato. E.g. Σκπει πως ν ποθνωμεν νδρικτατα, “see that we die most manfully.” AR. Eq. 80. Διαμηχανσομαι πως ν στον σαπρ ν λβζ, I will contrive that (somehow?) you get a rotten mast. Ib. 917. So AR. Nub. 739, AR. Eccl. 623, AR. Ach. 1060, AR. Eq. 926. Μλλον πρθεν εσει ατοζ πως ν κα χοντζ τι οκαδε φκωνται. XEN. An. vi. 1, 17. (Here some word like πιμλεια is understood as the subject of εσει.) Τν λλων πιμελεται πως ν θηρσιν. Id. Cyr. i. 2, Id. Cyr. 10. κλευσε τν Φεραλαν πιμεληθναι πως ν οτω γνηται αριον ξλασις. Ib. viii. 3, Ib. 6: so v. 5, Ib. 48. See also XEN. Cyneg. vi. 23; Eques. iv. 3. Μλου φιμενοι δικσουσιν τοτου, πως ν καστοι μτ χωσι τλλτρια μτε τν ατν στρωνται; PLAT. Rep. 433E. Πντα ποιοντας πως ν σφσι τ πηδλιον πιτρψ. Ib. 488C. ν δ λθ, μηχανητον πως ν διαφγ κα μ δ δκην χθρζ. Gorg. 481A.

Besides the examples cited above, Weber gives fifteen of Plato, and the following: SOPH. Tr. 618; EUR. I. A. 539; ISAE. vii. 30; DEM. xvi. 17, DEM. xix. 299. He adds HDT. i. 20, where κως ν is certainly final.

[*] 349. The only case of πως ν with the optative in an object clause in Attic Greek, except in Xenophon (351), is PLAT. Lys. 207E, προθυμοννται πως ν εδαμονοης, which is potential and on the Xenophontic model (see 351, 2). In DEM. xxxv. 29, κελεομεν τοτους πιμελεσθαι πως ν ζ τχιστ πολβοιμεν τ χρματα, Cod. A reads πολβωμεν.

[*] 350. Herodotus has κως ν with the potential optative four times after past tenses. E.g. Προθυμομου δ Λοξεω κως ν γνοιτο, being zealous that it might (in some way) be done. i. 91. So ii. 126, iii. 44, v. 98.

[*] 351. (Xenophon.) Although Xenophon generally follows the Attic usage in these object clauses (339), he yet violates this signally by having ζ and ζ ν with both subjunctive and optative, and πως ν with the optative; and further by having the optative with ζ ν and πως ν after both primary and secondary tenses. He also has ζ twice with the future indicative (like πως) and once with the future optative.

1. ζ or ζ ν with the subjunctive, ζ with the future indicative, and ζ with the optative, are used by Xenophon like πως in the construction of 339. E.g. πιμελονται ζ χ οτως. Oec.

xx. 8. (Here the regular Attic usage requires **πως ξει**.) **πιμελεσθαι** **ς** **ν** **πραχθ**, “to take care that they shall be done.” Hipp. ix. 2. **πεμλοντο** **ς** **μ** **κωλ**οιντο. Cyr. vi. 3, Cyr. 2. **ς** **δ** **καλ**ς **ξει** **τ** **μ** **τερα**, **μο** **μελ**σει. Ib. iii. 2, Ib. 13. Προε**πεν** **ς** **μηδε**ς **κιν**σοιτο **μηδ** **ν** **ξοιτο**. Hell. ii. 1, Hell. 22 (see 355). For Xenophon’s regular use of **πως** in all these constructions, see examples under 339. For his regular use of **πως** **ν** with the subjunctive, see 348.

2. When the optative follows **ς** **ν** or **πως** **ν**, it is always potential, and the original relative and interrogative force of **ς** and **πως** plainly appears. E.g. **πιμλονται** **ς** **ν** **βλτιστοι** **εν** **ο** **πολ**ται, they take care that the citizens may be best (to see how they might be best). Cyr. i. 2, Cyr. 5. **ς** **ν** **σφαλ**στατ **γ** **εδε**ην **πο**ουν, I took steps that (by which) I might know most accurately. Ib. vi. 3, Ib. 18. Σκοπ **πως** **ν** **ς** **στα** **δι**γοιεν, “I am considering how they might live the easiest lives.” Symp. vii. 2. (Cf. PLAT. Lys. 207E, quoted in 349.) For a full enumeration of all the irregular passages of this class in Xenophon, see Appendix IV.

Negative Object Clauses.

[*] 352. None of the object clauses with **πως** or **ς** in Homer (341) are negative, except that Od. vii. 192 combines **ς** **κε** **κηται** with **μηδ** **τι** **π**θσιν. Negative object clauses are expressed in Homer, like most negative final clauses (315), by the simple **μ** with the subjunctive or optative, as in Il. v. 411, “**φραζ**εσθω **μ** **τ**ς **ο** **με**νων **σε**ο **μ**χηται”, and Il. xv. 164, Il. xxii. 358, Od. xvii. 595, all with **φρ**ζομαι **μ** and the subjunctive. So **μ** **μβλετο** **τε**χος **μ** **Δαναο** **π**ρσειαν, Il. xxi. 517. These examples show a common origin with clauses after verbs of fearing, but the optative in the last example indicates that the original parataxis is no longer felt.

[*] 353. The earliest example of a negative object clause with a final particle and **μ** is AESCH. Prom. 203, “**σπε**δοντες **παστ** **ς** **Ζε**ς **μ**ποτ **ρ**ξειεν **θε**ν”. In all the Attic writers and in Herodotus the development of the negative object clause with **πως** **μ** and the future keeps pace with that of the negative final clause with **να** **μ**, etc.

[*] 354. **Μ**, for **πως** **μ**, in Object Clauses.) Verbs of this class (339) which imply caution, especially **ρ** and **σκοπ**, may have the simple **μ** with the subjunctive (rarely with the future indicative), even in Attic prose, like ordinary verbs of fear and caution (365), as well as **πως** **μ** with the future. Such verbs belong equally to the two classes B and C (303). E.g. “**Σκ**πει **μ** **σοι** **πρ**νο **το** **θεο** **φυλακτ**α” SOPH. O.C. 1180. **ρα** **σ** **μ** **ν** **μ** **ν** **τις** **ε** **χερ**ς **παρ**ς. Id. Ph. 519. “**ρα** **μ** **παρ** **γν**μην **π**σς” EUR. H.F. 594. **Σκ**πει **τ**δε, **μ** **ν** **ν** **φυγ**ντες **ε**θ **λ**μεν **στερον**. And. 755. “**Τηρο** **μ** **λ**βς **π**πια” AR. Vesp. 1386. **ρα** **μ** **μ**την **κ**μπος **λ**γος **ο**τος **ε**ρημνος, i.e. lest this may prove to have been spoken, etc. HDT. vii. 103. **ρα** **μ** **πολλ**ν **κ**στ **μ** **ν** **χειρ**ν **δε**σει. XEN. Cyr. iv. 1, 18. Σκοπε **δ** **μ** **το** **τοις** **α**τ **ν** **ξαιτ**σηται **κα** **καταγελ**σ. DEM. xxi. 151. **ρα** **ο** **ν** **μ** **τι** **κα** **ν** **ν** **ργ**σηται. PLAT. Symp. 213D So Il. xv. 164 (see 342).

See the corresponding use of **πως** **μ** for **μ** after verbs of fearing (370).

πως, after Verbs of Asking, Commanding, etc.

[*] 355. Verbs of asking, entreating, exhorting, commanding, and forbidding, which regularly take an object infinitive, sometimes have an object clause with **πως** or **πως** **μ** in nearly or quite the

same sense. E.g.

Δίδοις δ' τινδε φροζ' πωσ μηδεζ βροτ'ν κενου π'ροιθεν μ'φιδ'σεται χρο', i.e. tell him that no one shall put on the robe before himself. SOPH. Tr. 604: so SOPH. Aj. 567.

“Λακεδαιμωνων δ'οντο τ' ψ'φισμ' πωσ μεταστραφε'η” AR. Ach. 536.

Κα' σ' α'τ' βραχ', πωσ σομα' σοι Φαν'ς. Id. Eq. 1256.

κως κωυτ'ν γ'νηται τ' ργον παρακελευσ'μενοι, ργου ε'χοντο προθυμ'τερον. HDT. ix. 102.

Τ' Π'νακτον δ'οντο Βοιωτο'ς (?) πωσ παραδ'σουσι Λακεδαιμων'οις. THUC. v. 36.

“πωσ μ'ν μ' ποθ'ν' ντιβ'λει κα' κ'τευεν,” LYS. i. 29.

Παραιτε'σθαι πωσ α'τ'ν μ' κατανηφ'σησθε. ANT. i. 12.

Δε'σεται δ' μ'ν πωσ δ'κην μ' δ'. Ib. 23: so α'το'μαι πωσ δ', Ibid.

Διακελε'ονται πωσ τιμωρ'σεται π'ντας το'ς τοιο'τους. PLAT. Rep. 549E.

Παραγγ'λλει πωσ μ' σονται. Ib. 415B

μοιγε πηγ'ρευες πωσ μ' το'το ποκρινο'μην (fut. opt.) Ib. 339A.

πειρημ'νον α'τ' πωσ μηδ'ν ρε' ν γε'ται, “when he is forbidden to say a word of what he believes.” Ib. 337 E.

[*] 356. This is rare in Homer; but twice in the Odyssey λ'σσομαι has an object clause with πωσ:—

“Λ'σσεσθαι δ' μιν α'τ'ς πωσ νημερτ'α ε'π’,” “and implore him yourself to speak the truth.” Od. iii. 19. (Compare the regular construction, “ο'δ' σε λ'σσομαι μ'νειν” Il. i. 174. ■

“Λ'σσετο δ' α'ε' φαιστον κλυτοεργ'ν πωσ λ'σειεν ρηα,” “he implored him to liberate Ares.” Od. viii. 344.

[*] 357. Λ'σσομαι with να and the subjunctive is found in Od. iii. 327: “λ'σσεσθαι δ' μιν α'τ'ς να νημερτ'ς ν'σπ’”, and implore him yourself that he may speak the truth. With this we may compare DEM. xvi. 28, δ'λοι σονται ο'χ' να Θεσπια' κατοικισθ'σι μ'νον ποιο'μενοι τ'ν σπουδ'ν, it will be evident that they take an interest not merely in having Thespieae established; in both cases the object clause falls into the construction of a pure final clause. This is very rare in classic Greek; but it reappears in the later language, as in the New Testament: thus ντολ'ν καιν'ν δ'δωμι μ'ν, να γ'απ'τε λ'λλ'λους, a new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, IOH. Evang. xiii. 34. So δε'θην να κβ'λλωσιν, LUC. ix. 40. Compare the Latin, rogat ut liceat.

[*] 358. In Od. xvii. 362 we find τρυν'ς ν π'ρνα κατ' μνηστ'ρας γε'ροι, she exhorted him that he should collect bread among the suitors. (See 329, 1).

[*] 359. The singular case of 'ς with the subjunctive in Il. i. 558, τ' σ' ω κατανε'σαι τ'τυμον, 'ς χιλ'α τιμ'σ'ς, λ'σ'ς δ' πολ'ας π' νησ'ν χαι'ν, i.e. I believe that

you promised by your nod to honour Achilles, etc. has the appearance of indirect discourse; but probably *κατανεω* is used with the same feeling as *λίσσομαι* in 356, promising to act here taking the same construction as entreating to act. See PIND. Py. i. 72 (in 346). *ως*, as an adverb of manner, is here clearly on its way to its use in indirect discourse. Some read *τιμῶς* and *λίσσῶς*.

[*] 360. A singular use of *πως* and the future indicative with *δεσε* in place of the regular infinitive occurs in SOPH. Aj. 556, “*δεσε πως δεξείεις*”, for *δεσε δεξαι*, and Ph. 54, *τιν Φιλοκτου σε δε ψυχν πως λγοισιν κκλψεις λγων*. So Cratinus, Ph. Fr. 108, *δεσε πως εσχμονος λεκτρυνος μηδν διοσεις*. This would be like *δομαι πως* (355) except for the object *σε*, which is like *σε* in *δεσε τοτου*, the *πως* clause representing the genitive.

Object Infinitive and Indirect Questions.

[*] 361. Some verbs which regularly take an object clause with *πως* sometimes take an object infinitive, which may have the article *το* or *τι*. (See 373 and 374.) E.g. *ετινα πεμλοντο σφν ατν ν τας ρχας εναί*, they always took care that one of their own number should be in the offices (where we should expect *πως τις σται* or *σοιτο*). THUC. vi. 54. *οδ πεμελθην το διδασκαλν μοτινα γενσθαι τν πισταμνων*. XEN. Mem. iv. 2, 4. *Τμν ον λεκτικος γγενεσθαι τος συνντας οκ σπευδεν*. Ib. iv. 3, lb. 1. (See 793.)

[*] 362. Verbs signifying to see or look out (like *σκοπ*) may be followed by an indirect question with *ε*, whether; as *εξυμπονσεις καξυνεργσει σκπει*, see whether you will assist me, etc. SOPH. Ant. 41. For independent clauses with *πως* and *πως μ* with the future, often explained by an ellipsis of *σκπει* or *σκοπετε*, see 271-283.

Aorist Subjunctive in *-σω* and *-σωμαι* -- Dawes's Canon.

[*] 363. When an aorist subjunctive active or middle was to be used with *πως* or *πως μ* in any construction, the second aorist was preferred to a first aorist in *-σω* or *-σωμαι*, if both forms were in use. This preference arose from the great similarity in form between these sigmatic aorists and the future indicative (as between *βουλεσ* and *βουλεσει*, *βουλεσηται* and *βουλεσεται*). This made it natural also for a writer to avoid those forms of the subjunctive which were nearly identical with the future indicative where the latter could be used as well. This of course does not apply to the first aorist subjunctive passive, which has no resemblance to the future; and there is no reason for applying it to liquid aorists like *μενω* and *σφλω*.

[*] 364. The general rule laid down by Dawes more than a century ago (Misc. Crit. pp. 222 and 228), the so-called Canon Davesianus, which declared the first aorist subjunctive active and middle a solecism after *πως μ* and *ο μ*, was extended by others so as to include *πως* (without *μ*), and the Greek authors were thoroughly emended to conform to it. As this rule has no other foundation than the accidental circumstance just mentioned (363), it naturally fails in many cases, in some of which even emendation is impossible. In the first place, there is no reason for applying the rule to pure final clauses, in which the future indicative is exceptional (324); and here it is now generally abandoned in theory, though not always in practice. There is, therefore, no objection whatever to such sentences as these: *ν νεκα πιταθναι*, *πως πολασωμεν κα πως γενμεθα*, XEN. Cyr. vii. 5, 82 ; *κκλησαν ξυνγαγον*, *πως πομνσω κα μμψομαι*, THUC. ii. 60; and *τιν γορν π τν θλλασσαν κομσαι*, *πως παρ τς νας*

ριστοποιῶνται, καὶ δὲ ἄλλοι τοὺς ἠθηναίους πειρῶσιν, THUC. vii. 39, in which the best Mss. have the subjunctive. Indeed, where the reading is doubtful, the subjunctive should be preferred in these cases. Secondly, in independent prohibitions with ἴπῳ μὴ, although the future is the regular form, there is less objection to the subjunctive (even the first aorist) than in positive commands with simple ἴπῳ, since the analogy of the common μὴ ποιεῖς τοῦτο, do not do this, supports ἴπῳ μὴ ποιεῖς τοῦτο in the same sense (283). There is no such analogy, however, to justify such a positive command as ἴπῳ ποιεῖς τοῦτο, do this, and this form has much less manuscript authority to rest on. Thirdly, in the case of οὐ μὴ, if both constructions (denials and prohibitions) are explained on the same principle, no reason exists for excluding the subjunctive from either; and it cannot be denied that both the first and the second aorist subjunctive are amply supported by the manuscripts. (See 301.) Fourthly, in object clauses with ἴπῳ there is so great a preponderance of futures over subjunctives, that the presumption in all doubtful cases is here in favour of the future, as it is in favour of the subjunctive in pure final clauses. A much stronger case, therefore, is made out by those who (like Weber and most modern editors) change all sigmatic aorist subjunctives in this construction to futures. Some cases, however, resist emendation; as XEN. An. v. 6, 21, κέλευσι προστάτῃσαι ἴπῳ κλέσῃ στρατιῇ, where we cannot read κλέσει, as the future is κλέσομαι or κλευσομαι. In DEM. i. 2, all Mss. except one read παρασκευασθαι τὴν ταχυστήν ἴπῳ νῦνδε βοηθησῆτε καὶ μὴ πῆθητε ταῦτ' ἐν, and it seems very arbitrary to change βοηθησῆτε to βοηθετε and leave πῆθητε. But a few cases like these weigh little against the established usage of the language, and we must perhaps leave the venerable Canon Davesianus undisturbed in the single department of object clauses with ἴπῳ, although we may admit an occasional exception even there.

See Transactions of the American Philological Association for 186970, pp. 46-55, where this question is discussed more fully.

Clauses with μὴ after Verbs of Fearing, etc.

[*] 365. Verbs and phrases which express or imply fear, caution, or danger take μὴ, lest or that, with the subjunctive if the leading verb is primary, and with the optative if the leading verb is secondary. The subjunctive can also follow secondary tenses to retain the mood in which the object of the fear originally occurred to the mind.

Μὴ (like Latin ne) denotes fear that something may happen which is not desired; μὴ οὐ (ut = ne non) denotes fear that something may not happen which is desired. E.g.

Φοβομαι μὴ γῆνηται (vereor ne accidat), I fear that it may happen: φοβομαι μὴ οὐ γῆνηται (vereor ut accidat), I fear that it may not happen. “Δεῖδω μὴ θῆρεσσιν ἄλωρ καὶ κῆρμα γῆνωμαι.” Od. v. 473. “Δεῖδω μὴ οὐ τῆς τοι πῆσχηται τῆδε ἔργον.” Il. x. 39. (This is the only case of μὴ οὐ in these sentences in Homer. The next that are found are EUR. And. 626, El. 568, Phoen. 263. See 264, above.) “Ὁ φόβος μὴ σῆ ἔργος ποκτεῖναι θῆλλ.” EUR. Or. 770. “Ποῖον ἔθνος οὐ δοκεῖ ἔπερητῆσιν φοβομενον μὴ τι πῆθῃ;” XEN. Cyr. i. 6, 10 “Φροντίζω μὴ κρῆτιστον μοι σῆν.” Id. Mem. iv. 2, 39 “Φυλατῆμενος μὴ δῆξῃ μανθῆνεν τι.” Ib. iv. 2, 3 “Δδοικα μὴ οὐδῆ σιον ἔπαγορεῖν.” PLAT. Rep. 368B. “Τῆ περ τῆς ψυχῆς πολλῶν πῆσταν παρῆχει τοῖς ἔνθροποις, μὴ πῆιδῶν παλλαγῆ τοῖ σῆματος οῖδαμοῖ τι ἔλλ, ἔλλ διαφθερῆτα τε καὶ ἔπολληται.” Plat. Phaed. 70A. “Ὁκοῖν νῆν καὶ τοῦτο

κινδυνος, μὴ λήβωσι προστάτας ἀτὴν τινὰς τοῦτων,” “there is danger of this, that they may take, etc.” XEN. An. vii. 7, 31 “Κινδυνὸς ἴσθι, μὴ μεταβλῶνται καὶ γίνωνται μετὰ τὴν πολέμων.” Isoc. xiv. 38. “κινὸς μοι ἴσθι Λυσίας ταπεινὸς φανῶ” PLAT. Phaedr. 257C “Ἐλάβομαι δὲ μὴ φανῶς κακῶς γεγῶς.” SOPH. Tr. 1129. “Ὁδὸν δεινὸν ἴσονται μὴ βοηθῶσι τὰτῶν.” HDT. vii. 235. “ποπτεομεν καὶ ἴσθι μὴ οὐ κοινοῦ ποβῶτε.” THUC. iii. 53. “Ἀσχυνομενος μὴ φορτικῶς σκοπομεν.” PLAT. Theaet. 183E. “Ὁ μῦθοι στρῆφουσιν ἀτὸ τὴν ψυχῆν, μὴ ληθεῖς ἴσθι,” “torment his soul with fear lest they may prove true (92).” Id. Rep. 330 D.

Δείσας μὴ πῶς οὐκ ἴσθι ῥυσατο νεκρὸν ἴσθι. Il. v. 298. ἴσθι γὰρ μὴ Νυκτὸς θεοῦ ποθῶμια ἴσθι. Il. xiv. 261. ἴσθι γὰρ ἴσθι μὴ κτεπληγμένη φῶβῶ, μὴ μοι τὸ κῆλλος ἴσθι ἴσθι ποτῶ. SOPH. Tr. 24. ἴσθισαν οὐκ ἴσθι ληνες μὴ προσῆγοιεν πρὸς τὸ κῆρας καὶ ἀτὸς κατακῶψειαν. XEN. An. i. 10, 9. Ὁκῶτι ἴσθι πετῶθεντο, δεδοικῶτες μὴ ἴσθι ποτῶθησαν. Ib. iii. 4, Ib. 29. ἴσθισαν μὴ ἴσθι τῶς ἴσθι κῶς μὴ ἴσθι μπεπῶκοι. Ib. v. 7, Ib. 26. ἴσθι ποτῶσας μὴ τὴν θυγατῶρα λῶγοι, ἴσθι, “having suspected that he might mention his daughter.” Id. Cyr. v. 2, Id. Cyr. 9. ἴσθι μῶσθι τινες, ἴσθι νοομενοι μὴ τὸ ἴσθι πῶθι οὐκ ἴσθι χῶιεν ἴσθι πῶθεν λαμβῶνιεν. Id. An. iii. 5, Id. An. 3. Ὁδεῶς γὰρ κινδυνος ἴσθι κῶι εἶναι μὴ τῶς ἴσθι πορευομῶνων ἴσθι τὸ ἴσθι πῶσθι. Ib. iv. 1, Ib. 6.

Ὁ Φωκαῖες τῶς νῶσους οὐκ ἴσθι βῶλοντο πῶλῶειν, δειμαῶνοντες μὴ ἴσθι μῶριον γίνωνται. HDT. i. 165. Τῶ γὰρ δεδιῶναι μὴ ἴσθι ἴσθι σῶσους ἴσθι, τολμηρῶς πρὸς τὸ ἴσθι ἴσθι χῶρον. THUC. iii. 83. Περιδεῶς γενῶμενος μὴ ἴσθι πῶπλεσῶσιν ἀνῶες. Id. iii. 80. ἴσθισα μὴ Τροῶαν ἴσθι σῶ καὶ ξυνοικῶσ πῶλι. EUR. Hec. 1138. Ὁ θεῶμενοι ἴσθι φοβῶντο μὴ τῶ πῶθῶ. Symp. ii. 11. Δῶλος ἴσθι πῶσιν (Κῶρος) ἴσθι πῶρεφοβῶτο μὴ οὐκ ἴσθι πῶπτος ποθῶν. Cyr. i. 4, Cyr. 2. For the present subjunctive in these sentences denoting what may hereafter prove to be an object of fear, see 92.

[*] 366. The manner in which this complex sentence expressing fear was developed from an independent sentence like μὴ νῶας ἴσθι, may they not seize the ships, and a preceding verb of fearing like δεῶ, the two gradually becoming one sentence, has already been explained (307). As the fear and the desire to avert the cause of fear are both implied in μὴ with the subjunctive, it is not strange that this expression can follow verbs like ἴσθι and οὐδα which do not imply fear in themselves; as ἴσθι τῶς ἴσθι, μὴ δῶ σῶδῶν ἴσθι κῶντες, let some one go out and see that they do not approach near (cf. videat ne accedant); originally, let some one go out and look to it: may they not approach, Od. xxiv. 491. So οὐδα τῶ δῶμεν, μὴ πῶς καὶ διῶ νῶκτα μενοινῶσῶσι μῶχῶσθαι, nor do we know any way to prevent their being impelled to fight even during the night; originally, nor have we any knowledge: may they not be impelled to fight, Il. x. 100. See also PLAT. Phaed. 91 D, τῶδε ἴσθι δῶλον παντῶ, μὴ πολλῶ σῶματα κατατρῶψασα ἴσθι ψυχῶ τῶ τελευτῶον ἀτῶ ἴσθι πῶλλῶηται, i. e. no one knows any security against the soul itself finally perishing, etc. The indirect question sometimes used in translating such a clause with μὴ, as whether they may not approach or whether they may not be impelled, is merely an attempt to express the hesitation which the apprehension involves, as there can be, of course, no real indirect question. See especially the cases of μὴ with the present indicative (369, 1), which are often called interrogative. See the corresponding construction in 492.

[*] 367. (Future Indicative.) Sometimes, though seldom, μ has the future indicative after verbs of fearing. The examples are:—

Φρ ν μ σσεται φ β, μ π λις π θηται . . . κα τ Κισσ ων π λισμ ντ δουπον σσεται, βυσσ νοις δ ν π πλοις π σ λακ ζ. AESCH. Pers. 115. Τα τ ο ν φοβο μαι, μ π σις μ ν ρακ λ ζ μ ζ καλε ται (fut.), τ ζ νεωτ ρας δ ν ρ. SOPH. Tr. 550. Δ δοικα μ λλου τιν ζ μεθ ξω. XEN. Cyr. ii. 3, 6. Φοβο μαι δ μ τινας δον ζ δονα ζ ε ρ σομεν ναντ ζας. Phil. 13 α. λ λ (φοβερ ν κα σφαλερ ν) μ σφαλε ζ κε σομαι. Rep. 451A. (The last two examples are not given by Weber.) For three cases of μ with the future optative after past tenses of verbs of fearing, representing the future indicative, see 131.

[*] 368. The particles ν and κ are never used with μ and the subjunctive. But a potential optative with ν can follow μ after a verb expressing fear or anxiety, after both primary and secondary tenses (168). E.g. Δ δοικα γ ρ μ πρ λ γοις ν τ ν π θον τ ν ξ μο, “I fear that you might perhaps tell.” SOPH. Tr. 631. Ο τε προσδοκ α ο δεμ α (ν) μ ν ποτε ο πολ μιοι πιπλε σειαν. THUC. ii. 93. κε νο ννο μ λ αν ν ταχ σωφρονισθε ην, lest (in that case) I should be very soon brought to my senses. XEN. An. vi. 1, 28. “Δεδι τες μ καταλυθε η ν δ μος” LYS. xiii. 51.

[*] 369. (Present and Past Tenses of Indicative with μ.) Verbs of fearing may refer to present or past objects. (See 308.) M can therefore be used with the present and past tenses of the indicative after these verbs.

1. M with the present indicative expresses a fear that something is now going on. E.g.

“Δ δοικα μ π λη γ ν δ ει,” “I am afraid that you need blows.” AR. Nub. 493. ρ μεν μ Νικ ζας ο ετα τι λ γειν, “let us be cautious lest Nicias is thinking that he says something.” PLAT. Lach. 196 C. (Here ο ηται would have meant lest Nicias may think, in the future.) ρα μ κε νον κω λ ει. Id. Charm. 163A. Φοβε σθε μ δυσκολ τερ ν τι ν δι κειμαι ν τ πρ σθεν β, you are afraid that I am now in a more peevish state of mind than I used to be in (where the subjunctive would have been future, lest I may hereafter be). Plat. Phaed. 84E. π σχες, ζ ν προ ξερευν σω στ βον, μ τις πολιτ ν ν τρ β φαντ ζεται, κ μο μ ν λθ φ α λος ζ δο λ ψ γος. EUR. Phoen. 92. (Here μ φαντ ζεται means lest any one is now to be seen; and μ λθ, lest any report may come hereafter.) λ λ ε σ μεσθα μ τι κα κατ σχετον κρυφ κα λ πτει καρδ θυμουμ νη, δ μους παραστε χοντες. SOPH. Ant. 1253. (The idea is, we shall learn the result of our anxiety lest she is concealing, etc.16) Κ μαυτ ζς π ρι θ λω πυθ σθαι, μ π το ζς π λαι κακο ζ προσκε μεν ν τι π μα σ ν δ κνει φρ ννα, and I wish to inquire about myself, (in fear) lest, etc. EUR. Her. 481. ναξ, μο τοι, μ τι κα θε λατον το ργον τ δ, ξ ννοια βουλε ει π λαι. SOPH. Ant. 278. (The idea is, my mind has long been deliberating in anxiety lest this is the work of the Gods, σ τ ν being understood after μ.17) ρα, φυλ σσου, μ τις ν στ β βροτ ν (sc. στιν). I. T. EUR. 67.

2. M with the perfect indicative expresses a fear that something has already happened. The difference between this and the perfect subjunctive is often very slight, the latter expressing rather a fear that something may hereafter prove to have happened (103). E.g. Ν ν δ φοβο μεθα μ μφοτ ρων μα μαρτ καμεν, “but now we fear that we have missed both at once.” THUC. iii. 53. (The perfect subjunctive here would mean lest it may hereafter prove that we have missed.)

Δδοικα μ λελθαμεν (τν ερνην) π πολλ γοντες, “I fear that we have been unconsciously enjoying peace borrowed at high interest.” DEM. xix. 99. Φοβομαι μ λγοις τισ ψευδσιν ντετυχκαμεν. PLAT. Lys. 218 D

3. M can be used with the imperfect or the aorist indicative, to express fear that something happened in past time.

“Δεδω μ δ πντα θε νημερτα επεν,” “I fear that all that the Goddess said was true.” Od. v. 300.

“λλ ρα μ παζων λεγεν,” “but be careful lest he was speaking in jest.” PLAT. Theaet. 145B.

[*] 370. πως μ, for μ, with Verbs of Fearing.) Verbs denoting fear and caution are sometimes followed by an object clause with πως μ and the future indicative, the subjunctive, or the optative, like verbs of striving, etc. (339). It will be noticed that πως μ here is exactly equivalent to μ in the ordinary construction, so that φοβομαι πως μ γενσεται (or γνηται) means I fear that it will happen (not I fear that it will not happen). E.g. Δδοικ πως μ κ τς σιωπς τσδ ναρρξει (Laur. ναρρξη) κακ, “I fear that a storm of evil will burst forth from this silence.” SOPH. OT 1074 (the earliest example). Το δαμονος δδοικ πως μ τεξομαι κακοδαμονος, “I fear that the luck that I shall get will be bad luck.” AR. Eq. 112. Ελαβομενοι πως μ οχσομαι. PLAT. Phaed. 91 C. Δδοικα πως μ νγκη γενσεται, “I fear that there may be a necessity.” DEM. ix. 75. Ο φοβε πως μ νσιον πγμα τυχνς πρτων; PLAT. Euthyph. 4E. Φυλττου πως μ ες τοναντον λθς. XEN. Mem. iii. 6, 16. δως ν (θρψαμι τν νδρα), ε μ φοβομην πως μ π ατν με τρποιτο. Ib. ii. 9, 3. Τος πρεσβυτροις ντιπαρακελεομαι μ καταισχυνθναι πως μ δξει μαλακς εναι, i.e. not to be shamed into fear lest he may seem to be weak. THUC. vi. 13.

Compare the corresponding use of μ for πως μ in ordinary object clauses, especially with ρ and σκοπ, which belong equally to both classes, B and C. (See 354.)

[*] 371. Indirect Discourse with ς, or πως.) In curious contrast with the preceding construction with πως μ for μ (370) is that by which verbs of fearing sometimes take the construction of ordinary indirect discourse. Here ς and even πως, that, may introduce the object of the fear, thus taking the place of μ in the common construction. This apparently occurs only when the leading verb is negated. E.g. M δεσς ποθ ς γλωτι τομν φαιδρν ψεται κρα, do not fear that she will ever see my face joyful (=μ δ). SOPH. El. 1309: so 1426. νδρς μ φοβο ς πορσεις ξου, “do not fear that you will be at a loss.” XEN. Cyr. v. 2, 12. (Here the direct discourse would be πορσω, I shall be at a loss.) M δεσητε ς οχ δως καθευδσετε, “do not fear that you will not sleep sweetly.” Id. Cyr. vi. 2, Id. Cyr. 30. (Here μ οχ would be the ordinary expression.) Ο τοτο δδοικα, ς ν κροσθε ατν ποψηφιεσθε, I have no fear of this, that you will acquit them if you hear them. LYS. xxvii. 9. M τρσς πως σ τις ποσπσει β, “that any one shall tear you away by force.” EUR. Her. 248. M φοβε μ τε μ, ς σεο πειρμενος λγω λγον τνδε, μ τε γυνακα τν μν, μ τ τοι ξ ατς γνηται βλβος, do not fear either that I am saying this to try you (ς λγω), or lest any harm shall come (μ γνηται). HDT. i. 9. (Here the two constructions after φοβε make the principle especially clear.) In all these cases μ or πως μ would be regular, and exactly

equivalent to **■**ς and **■**πως here. In the same way, we say in English he fears lest this may happen and he fears that this may happen in the same sense. In Greek we might have **μ■** **τρ■σ■**ς **■**πως **μ■** **σ■** **τις** **■**ποσπ■σει (370) in the same sense as **μ■** **τρ■σ■**ς **■**πως **σ■** **τις** **■**ποσπ■σει (above).

[*] 372. **■**Infinitive.) The future infinitive may stand in indirect discourse after verbs of fearing, to represent a future indicative of the direct course. E.g. **Ο■** **φοβο■**μεθα **■**λασσ■σεσθαι, “we are not afraid that we shall have the worst of it.” THUC. v. 105. (Here **μ■** with the subjunctive would be the regular form.)

[*] 373. The present or aorist infinitive (without **μ■**), not in indirect discourse, may follow verbs of fearing, to denote the direct object of the fear; as in English, I fear to go. This infinitive may have the article. E.g. **Φοβο■**μαι **ο■**ν **διελ■**γγειν σε, **μ■** **■**πολ■β■ς, κ.τ.λ., I am afraid to refute you, lest you may suspect, etc. PLAT. Gorg. 457E. **Φοβ■**σεται **■**δικε■ν, “he will be afraid to do wrong.” XEN. Cyr. viii. 7,15. (But **φοβ■**σεται **μ■** **■**δικ■, he will fear that he may do wrong.) **Δεδι■**ναι **φασκ■**ντων **Κερκυρα■**ων **■**χειν **α■**τ■ν. THUC. i. 136. **Ο■** **κατ■**δεισαν **■**σελθε■ν. Id. iv. 110. **Π■**φρικα **■**ριν■ν **τελ■**σαι **τ■**ς **κατ■**ρας, “I shudder at the idea of the Fury fulfilling the curses.” Sept. 720. (But in vs. 790, **τρ■**ω **μ■** **τελ■**σ■ means I tremble lest she may fulfil them.) See also XEN. An. i. 3, 17. **Τ■** **■**ποθν■σκειν **ο■**δε■ς **φοβε■**ται, **τ■** **δ■** **■**δικε■ν **φοβε■**ται. PLAT. Gorg. 522E.

[*] 374. Verbs of caution may be followed by an infinitive (with or without **μ■**), which sometimes has the article; the infinitive or the infinitive with **μ■** having the same meaning as a clause with **μ■** and the subjunctive or optative. E.g. **Π■**ς **ο■**κ **■**ξιον **α■**τ■ν **γε** **φυλ■**ξασθαι **τοιο■**τον **γεν■**σθαι; “why ought he not to guard against becoming such a man himself?” XEN. Mem. i. 5, 3. (Here **γεν■**σθαι is equivalent to **μ■** **γ■**νηται.) **Φυλατ■**μενος **τ■** **λυπ■**σα■ **τινα**, “taking care to offend no one.” DEM. xviii. 258. **Φυλ■**σσειν **μηδ■**να **περαιο■**σθαι, “to guard against any one’s crossing over.” THUC. vii. 17. **Φυλατ■**μενον **κα■** **προορ■**μενον **μ■** **καταισχ■**ναι **τα■**την. DEM. xxv. 11. (For **μ■** in this construction see 815, DEM. 1.) In THUC. vii. 77, we find the infinitive with **■**στε after **φυλ■**σσω.

[*] 375. **Κ■**νδυν■ς **■**στι, the principal expression denoting danger, which takes **μ■** and a finite verb, is quite as regularly followed by the infinitive. E.g. **Ο■** **σμηκρ■**ς **κ■**νδυν■ς **■**στιν **■**ξαπατηθ■ναι, “there is no little danger of their being deceived.” PLAT. Crat. 436B.

Κινδυνε■ω is regularly followed by the infinitive (747).

[*] 376. **■**Indirect Questions.) Verbs of fearing may be followed by an indirect question introduced by **ε■**, whether, or by some other interrogative. **■**πως as an interrogative here must not be confounded with **■**πως as a conjunction. E.g. **Ο■** **δ■**δοικα **ε■** **Φ■**λιππος **ζ■**, **■**λλ■ **ε■** **τ■**ς **π■**λεως **τ■**θηκε **τ■** **το■**ς **■**δικο■ντας **μισε■**ν **κα■** **τιμωρε■**σθαι, I have no fear (on the question) whether Philip is alive; but I have fear (about this), whether our city’s habit of hating and punishing evil-doers is dead. DEM. xix. 289. **Φ■**βος **ε■** **μοι** **ζ■**σιν **ο■**ς **■**γ■ **θ■**λω. EUR. Her. 791. **Φ■**ρουσ■ σοι **ν■**ους **■**κω **λ■**γους, **φ■**β■ **μ■**ν **ε■** **τις** **δεσποτ■**ν **α■**σθ■σεται, through fear whether any one will perceive it (where **μ■** **α■**σθηται would have meant lest any one shall perceive it). EUR. Andr. 60. See XEN. Cyr. vi. 1, 17. **Φοβο■**νται **■**ποι **ποτ■** **προβ■**σεται **■** **το■** **■**νδρ■ς **δ■**ναμις. XEN. Hell. vi. 1, 14. (The direct question would be **πο■** **προβ■**σεται;) **Τ■**ν **θε■**ν **δ■** **■**πως **λ■**θω **δ■**δοικα, I am in fear (about the question) how I shall escape the Goddess. I. T. EUR. 995. (The

direct question was π[ς λ[θω; 287.) So SOPH. Ph. 337. [πορο[ντες π[ς χρ[[πειθε[ν, φοβο[μενοι δ[π[ς χρ[[πειλο[ντι [πακο[σαι. XEN. Cyr. iv. 5, 19.

[*] 377. [Causal [τι.) Verbs of fearing may be followed by [τι, because, and an ordinary causal sentence with the indicative (713). E.g. Ο[κ [ξιον δι[το[το φοβε[σθαι το[ς πολεμ[ους, [τι πολλο[τυγχ[νονουσιν [ντες, to fear them, because they happen to be many. ISOC. vi. 60. Φοβουμ[νης τ[ς μητρ[ς, [τι τ[χωρ[ον [πυνθ[νετο νοσ[δες ε[ναι. Id. xix. 22. [τι δ[πολλ[ν [ρχουσι, μ[φοβηθ[τε, [λλ[πολ[μ[λλον δι[το[το θαρρε[τε, do not be afraid because they rule many, etc. XEN. Hell. iii. 5, 10. [φοβε[το, [τι [φθ[σεσθαι [μελλε τ[βασ[λεια ο[κοδομε[ν [ρχ[μενος, he was afraid, because he was about to be seen beginning to build the palace. Id. Cyr. iii. 1, Id. Cyr. 1. Φοβο[μενος τ[κ[εσθαι κα[τ[τ[μνεσθαι, [τι [λγειν[ν, “fearing them because they are painful.” PLAT. Gorg. 479A. So THUC. vii. 67.

Section VI: Conditional Sentences.

[*] 378. A conditional sentence consists of two clauses, a dependent clause containing the condition, which usually precedes and is called the protasis, and the leading clause containing the conclusion, which is called the apodosis. The protasis is regularly introduced by the particle ε[, if, negatively ε[μ[.

[*] 379. Α[is a Doric and Aeolic form for ε[, and is sometimes used in epic poetry in the forms α[θε and α[γ[ρ, and less frequently in α[κε.18

[*] 380. The name protasis is often restricted to clauses introduced by a particle meaning if. But it applies equally to all conditional relative and temporal clauses (520), and it properly includes all clauses which naturally precede their leading clauses in the order of thought, as [πε[[σθετο το[το, [π[λθεν, after he perceived this, he departed. Such a clause may still be called a protasis, even when it follows its leading clause, provided the order of thought is not changed.

[*] 381. The adverb [ν (epic κ[or κ[ν, Doric κ[) is regularly joined with ε[in the protasis when the verb is in the subjunctive, ε[with [ν (α^) forming the compound [ν, [ν, or [ν (α_). (See 200.) The simple ε[is used in the protasis with the indicative and the optative. The same adverb [ν is regularly used in the apodosis with the optative, and also with the past tenses of the indicative when non-fulfilment of the condition is implied.

[*] 382. The only Ionic contraction of ε[[ν is [ν, which is used in Homer and Herodotus. The Attic Greek has [ν, [ν, and [ν (α_); but α?ν, if, was probably never used by the tragedians or by Thucydides, although the Mss. have it in a few cases.

[*] 383. The negative particle of the protasis is regularly μ[, that of the apodosis is ο[.

[*] 384. When ο[is found in a protasis, it is generally closely connected with a particular word (especially the verb), with which it forms a single negative expression; so that its negative force does not (like that of μ[) affect the protasis as a whole. E.g.

Π[ντως δ[που (ο[τως [χει), [ν τε σ[κα[[νυτος ο[φ[τε [ν τε φ[τε, if you deny it, as well as if you admit it. PLAT. Apol. 25B. “Ε[το[ς θαν[ντας ο[κ [ς [κωλ[εις[θ[πτειν,” “if you forbid burying the dead.” SOPH. Aj. 1131. Ε[μ[ν ο[πολλο[(= [λ[γοι) [σαν, καθ[[καστον [ν περ[το[των [κο[ετε, if there were only a few, etc. LYS. xiii. 62: cf. 76. Τ[νδε μ[ν

οδὲν σὸν στῆν, εἴγε φῶ μὲν γε τῆν ν μὲσ οδεδεῖς οδῆποτε ρξεται, there is no fairness in this, if (it is the plan, that) no one is ever to begin with us. XEN. Cyr. ii. 2, 3. In all these cases μ could be used, even where ο seems especially proper; as in ἔν τ γ φ ἔν τε μ φ, whether I admit or deny it, DEM. xxi. 205. See EUR. Hipp. 995, οδδ ἔν σ μ φς. The use of μ or ο was determined by the feeling of the speaker at the moment as to the scope of his negation. The following example makes the difference between ο and μ particularly clear, ο affecting merely the verb, and μ affecting the whole clause (including the ο): ε μ Πρξενον οχ πεδξαντο, σθησαν ν, if it had not been that they did not receive Proxenus, they would have been saved, DEM. xix. 74.

[*] 385. Ε ο with the indicative is sometimes found in Homer where the Attic Greek would have ε μ; as in “ε δ μοι οκ πεσσ ππεσεται λλ λογσει,” Il. xv. 162. See also Il. xx. 129; Od. ii. 274, Od. xii. 382.

[*] 386. After verbs expressing wonder, delight, and similar emotions (494), where a protasis seems to take the place of a causal sentence, ε ο can be used, on the principle of 384, though here μ is more common. See examples of ε μ under 494; and for ε ο see ISOC. i. 44, μ θαυμσς ε πολλ τν ερημνων ο πρπει σοι. See also 387.

[*] 387. When two clauses introduced by μν and δ depend upon a single ε which precedes them both, ο is used even more frequently than μ; as such clauses have their own construction independently of the ε, which merely introduces each of them as a whole, not affecting the construction of particular words. E.g. Δεινν ν εη, ε ο μν κενων ξμμαχοι π δουλε τ ατν φροντες οκ περοσιν, μες δ π τ ατο σζεσθαι οκ ρα δαπανσομεν, it would be a hard thing, if (it is a fact that) their allies will not refuse, etc. while we will not contribute. THUC. i. 121. Ετ οκ ασχρν, ε τ μν ργεων πλθος οκ φοβθη τν Λακεδαιμωνων ρχν μες δ βρβαρον φοβσεσθε; is it not then disgraceful, if (it is true that), while the Argive people did not fear, you are going to be afraid, etc. DEM. xv. 23. See also PLAT. Phaed. 97 A; LYS. xxx. 32; ISAE. vi. 2; DEM. xxxviii. 18; AESCHIN. iii. 242.

Classification of Conditional Sentences.

[*] 388. The most obvious natural distinction is that of (a) present and past conditions and (b) future conditions. Present and past conditions (a) are divided into two classes by distinguishing (1) those which imply nothing as to the fulfilment of the condition from (2) those which imply that the condition is not or was not fulfilled. Future conditions (b) have two classes (1, 2), distinguished by the manner in which the supposition is stated. Class 1 of present and past conditions is further distinguished on the ground of the particular or general character of the supposition, as explained below in II. (394).

[*] 389. Excluding from the class (a) 1 the present and past general suppositions which have a peculiar construction (395, a and b), we have—

I. Four Forms of Ordinary Conditions: (a) Present and Past Conditions.

[*] 390. In present or past conditions, the question of fulfilment has already been decided, but we may or may not wish to imply by our form of statement how this has been decided. In Greek (as in

English or Latin) we may, therefore, state such a condition in either of two ways:—

1. We may simply state a present or past condition, implying nothing as to its fulfilment; as if he is (now) doing this, εἰ τοῦτο πράσσει,—if he was doing it, εἰ ἔπρασσε,—if he did it, εἰ ἔπραξε,—if he has (already) done it, εἰ ἔπραξε,—if he had (already) done it (at some past time), εἰ ἔπραξε. The apodosis here expresses simply what is (was or will be) the result of the fulfilment of the condition. Thus we may say:—

Εἰ πράσσει τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔχει, if he is doing this, it is well; εἰ πράσσει τοῦτο, ἠμάρτηκεν, if he is doing this, he has erred; εἰ πράσσει τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔξει, if he is doing this, it will be well. Εἰ ἔπραξε (or ἔπρασσε) τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔχει (ἔχεν, ἔσχεν, or ἔξει), if he did this, it is (was or will be) well. Εἰ ἔπραξε τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔξει, if he has done this, it will be well. So with the other tenses of the indicative in the apodosis. (See 402.) So in Latin: Si hoc facit, bene est; Si hoc fecit, bene erit; etc.

2. On the other hand, we may state a present or past condition so as to imply that it is not or was not fulfilled; as if he were (now) doing this, εἰ τοῦτο ἔπρασσε;—if he had done this, εἰ τοῦτο ἔπραξε (both implying the opposite). The apodosis here expresses what would be (or would have been) the result if the condition were (or had been) fulfilled. The adverb ἂν in the apodosis distinguishes these forms from otherwise similar forms under (a) 1. Thus we may say:—

Εἰ ἔπρασσε τοῦτο, καλῶς ἂν ἔχεν, if he were (now) doing this, it would be well; or if he had been doing this, it would have been well.

Εἰ ἔπραξε τοῦτο, καλῶς ἂν ἔσχεν (or ἂν ἔχεν), if he had done this, it would have been well (or it would now be well). On the other hand, εἰ ἔπραξε τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔσχεν (without ἂν) would mean if he did this, it was well. (See 410.) In Latin: Si hoc faceret, bene esset (present); Si hoc fecisset, bene fuisset (past).

[*] 391. The Greek has no form implying that a condition is or was fulfilled, and it is hardly conceivable that any language should find such a form necessary or useful.

(b) Future Conditions.

[*] 392. The question as to the fulfilment of a future condition is still undecided. We may state such a condition in Greek (as in English and Latin) in either of two ways:—

1. We may say if he shall do this, ἂν πράσῃ (or πράξῃ) τοῦτο (or, still more vividly, εἰ πράξει τοῦτο), making a distinct supposition of a future case. The apodosis expresses what will be the result if the condition shall be fulfilled. Thus we may say:—

ἂν πράσῃ (or πράξῃ) τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔξει, if he shall do this (or if he does this), it will be well (sometimes also εἰ πράξει τοῦτο). (See 444 and 447.) In Latin: Si hoc faciet (or si hoc fecerit), bene erit.

2. We may also say if he should do this, εἰ πράσσοι (or πράξειε) τοῦτο, still supposing a case in the future, but less distinctly and vividly than before. The apodosis corresponds to this in form (with the addition of ἂν), and expresses what would be the result if the condition should be fulfilled. Thus we may say:—

Ε■ πρ■σσοι (or πρ■ξιε) το■το, καλ■ς ■ν ■χοι, if he should do this, it would be well. (See 455.)
In Latin: Si hoc faciat, bene sit.

[*] 393. The Latin commonly employs the future indicative, si hoc faciet (corresponding strictly to ε■ το■το πρ■ξει, if he shall do this), or the future perfect, si hoc fecerit, to express the form of protasis which the Greek expresses by ■■ν and the subjunctive (■■ν το■το πρ■σσο or πρ■ξ■); and it uses the form si hoc faciat to represent the Greek ε■ το■το πρ■σσοι, if he should do this.

II. Present and Past General Suppositions.

[*] 394. The supposition contained in a protasis may be either particular or general. A particular supposition refers to a definite act or to several definite acts, supposed to occur at some definite time (or times); as if he (now) has this, he will give it; if he had it, he gave it; if he had had the power, he would have helped me; if he shall receive it (or if he receives it), he will give it; if he should receive it, he would give it. So if he always acts justly (or if he never commits injustice), I honour him; if he acted justly on all these occasions, he will be rewarded. A general supposition refers indefinitely to any act or acts of a given class which may be supposed to occur or to have occurred at any time; as if ever he receives anything, he (always) gives it; if ever he received anything, he (always) gave it; if he had (on any occasion) had the power, he would (always) have helped me; if ever any one shall (or should) wish to go, he will (or would) always be permitted. So if he ever acts justly, I (always) honour him; if he ever acted justly, he was (always) rewarded.

[*] 395. Although this distinction is seen in all classes of conditions, present, past, and future (as the examples show), it is only in present and past conditions which do not imply nonfulfilment (i.e. in those of 390, 1) that the Greek distinguishes general from particular suppositions in construction. Here, however, we have two classes of conditions which contain only general suppositions.

■a) When the apodosis has a verb of present time expressing a customary or repeated action, the protasis may refer (in a general way) to any act or acts of a given class which may be supposed to occur at any time within the period represented in English as present. Thus we may say:—

■■ν τις κλ■πτ■, κολ■ζεται, if (ever) any one steals, he is (in all such cases) punished; ■■ν τις πρ■σσο (or πρ■ξ■) τοιο■τ■ν τι, χαλεπα■νομεν α■τ■, if (ever) any one does such a thing, we are (always) angry with him; ■■ν τις το■του π■, ■πθν■σκει, if any one (ever) drinks of this, he dies. (See 462.)

■b) When the apodosis has a verb of past time expressing a customary or repeated action, the protasis may refer (in a general way) to any act or acts of a given class which may be supposed to have occurred at any time in the past. Thus we may say:—

Ε■ τις κλ■πτοι, ■κολ■ζετο, if (ever) any one stole, he was (in all such cases) punished; ε■ τις πρ■σσοι (or πρ■ξιε) τοιο■τ■ν τι, ■χαλεπα■νομεν α■τ■, if (ever) any one did such a thing, we were (always) angry with him; ε■ τις το■του π■οι, ■πθν■σκεν, if any one (ever) drank of this, he died. (See 462.)

[*] 396. Although the Latin sometimes agrees with the Greek in distinguishing general conditions from ordinary present and past conditions, using si faciat and si faceret in a general sense, like ■■ν πρ■σσο and ε■ πρ■σσοι above, it yet commonly agrees with the English in not recognising

the distinction, and uses the indicative alike in both classes. Even the Greek sometimes (especially in poetry) neglects the distinction, and uses the indicative in these general conditions (467).

[*] 397. In external form the general present condition coincides with the more vivid future condition, 392, 1, as both are expressed by $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$ and the subjunctive, the form of the apodosis alone distinguishing them. But in sense there is a much closer connexion between the general present condition and the ordinary present condition expressed by $\epsilon\upsilon$ and the present indicative, 390, 1, with which in most languages (and sometimes even in Greek) it coincides also in form (see 396). On the other hand, $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$ with the subjunctive in a future condition agrees substantially in sense with $\epsilon\upsilon$ and the future indicative (447), and is never interchangeable with $\epsilon\upsilon$ and the present indicative.

Origin of the Greek Conditional Sentence.—Early Combinations of $\epsilon\upsilon$ with $\kappa\iota$ or υ .

[*] 398. It is impossible to discuss intelligently the origin of the conditional sentence until the etymology and original meaning of the particles $\epsilon\upsilon$, α , υ , and $\kappa\iota$ are determined. On these questions we have as yet little or no real knowledge. The theory of $\epsilon\upsilon$ or α which identifies it with the pronominal stem *sva* ($\sigma\upsilon\epsilon$), Oscan *svai*, and Latin *si*, is perhaps the most common. By this the original meaning of $\epsilon\upsilon$, or rather of one of its remote ancestors in some primitive language, would be at a certain time (or place), in a certain way.¹⁹ But, even on this theory, we can hardly imagine any form of $\epsilon\upsilon$ as existing in the Greek language until the word had passed at least into the relative stage, with the force of at which time (or place), in which way, under which circumstances. It cannot be denied that the strong analogy between conditional and relative sentences and the identity of most of their forms give great support to any theory by which the conditional sentence is explained as an outgrowth of the relative, so that the conditional relative sentence is made the original conditional construction. Thus $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ might at some time have meant in the case in which he went, and $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\lambda\theta\theta$, in the case in which he shall go (or in case he shall go), etc. But here we are on purely theoretical ground; and we must content ourselves practically with the fact, that in the earliest Greek known to us $\epsilon\upsilon$ was fully established in its conditional sense, like our *if* and Latin *si*.

[*] 399. The regular types of the conditional sentence, which are given above (390-395) as they appear in Attic prose, have been mainly sifted from a rich variety of forms which are found in earlier Greek. In Homer we have all tenses of the indicative used as in Attic Greek, except that the imperfect has not yet come to express an unreal present condition, but is still confined to the past. The future indicative sometimes has $\kappa\iota$ in protasis, and the future with $\kappa\iota$ or υ can stand in apodosis. The subjunctive in protasis can have $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\kappa\epsilon$ (even $\epsilon\upsilon$ υ), υ , or $\epsilon\upsilon$ alone; and it can stand in a future apodosis either alone or with υ or $\kappa\iota$ (like the optative). The optative sometimes has $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\kappa\epsilon$ in protasis, and occasionally stands in apodosis without υ or $\kappa\iota$. Once we find $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\kappa\epsilon$ with the aorist indicative (Il. xxiii. 526).

Thus, while we have in Attic prose two stereotyped forms of future conditional sentences, υ (υ , $\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$ δ , $\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\delta\omicron\eta$, $\lambda\omicron\mu\eta\nu$ υ , we have in Homer υ δ , $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\kappa\epsilon$ δ , $\epsilon\upsilon$ δ , and $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\delta\omicron\eta$, $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\kappa\epsilon$ $\delta\omicron\eta$, in protasis; and $\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, $\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha$ $\kappa\epsilon$, $\lambda\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, $\lambda\omega\mu\alpha$ $\kappa\epsilon$, and $\lambda\omicron\mu\eta\nu$ $\kappa\epsilon$ (or υ), rarely $\lambda\omicron\mu\eta\nu$ alone, in apodosis; with every variety of combination of these. (For the details and examples, see 450-454 and 460.)

[*] 400. There is a tendency in Homer to restrict the subjunctive with simple ε (without κ or ν) to general conditions (468), and a similar but less decided tendency to restrict the subjunctive with conditional relatives without κ or ν to the generic relative construction (538). But the general condition with ε appears in Homer in a primitive stage, compared with the corresponding relative construction, which is fully developed. Both subjunctive and optative are freely used in general relative conditions in Homer, as in Attic Greek; while in general conditions with ε the subjunctive occurs only nineteen times and the optative only once (468). On the supposition that the clause with ε is derived from the relative clause, this would appear as the ordinary process of development.

[*] 401. It is perhaps the most natural view of the various conditional expressions, ε, ε κε, ε ν, etc. to suppose that at some early stage the Greek had two perfectly analogous forms in future conditions, one with two subjunctives, and one with two optatives, e.g. ε δ το το, λωμαι and ε δο η το το, λο μ η ν. The particle κ would then begin to be allowed in both of these conditions and conclusions, giving to each more distinctly its force as a protasis or an apodosis.²⁰ It would thus be allowed to say ε κε δ το το, λωμα κε and ε κε δο η το το, λο μ η ν κε, both of which forms actually occur in Homer. Gradually the tendencies of the language restricted the use of κ more and more to the subjunctive in protasis and the optative in apodosis, although for a time the usage was not strict. This state of transition appears in Homer, who preserves even a case of an otherwise extinct use of ε κε with the aorist indicative. Shortly before this stage, however, a new tendency was making itself felt, to distinguish the present general condition from the particular in form, the way being already marked out by the conditional relative sentence. As this new expression was to be distinguished from both the really present condition ε βο λ η τ α ι and the future ε κε βο λ η τ α ι, the half-way form ε βο λ η τ α ι (which had nearly given place to ε κε βο λ η τ α ι in future conditions) came into use in the sense if he ever wishes.²¹ This would soon develop a corresponding form for use after past tenses, ε βο λ ο ι τ ο, if he ever wished, of which we see only the first step in Homer, Hom. Il. xxiv. 768. (See 468.) It would hardly be possible to keep the two uses of ε with the subjunctive distinct in form, and in time the form with κ (or ν) was established in both (381). But we see this process too in transition in Homer, where ε κε or some form of ε ν is used in all future conditions except nine, and has intruded itself into five of the nineteen general conditions. We must suppose a corresponding process in regard to κ or ν in conditional relative clauses to have gone on before the Homeric period, with more complete results.²² In Attic Greek, except in a few poetic passages, the usage is firmly established by which the subjunctive in protasis requires ν in both particular and general conditions.

I. Four Forms of Ordinary Conditional Sentences: (a) Present and Past Conditions.

1. Simple Suppositions (chiefly Particular).

[*] 402. When the protasis simply states a present or past particular supposition, implying nothing as to the fulfilment of the condition, it takes a present or past tense of the indicative with ε. Any form of the verb may stand in the apodosis to express the result if the condition is or was fulfilled. E.g. Ε β ρ ν η τ η σ ε, κ α σ τ ρ α ψ ε ν, if it thundered, it also lightened. (This implies no opinion of the speaker as to the reality of the thunder.) Ε δ ο τ ω το τ σ τ ν, μ ο μ λ λ η ι φ λ ο ν ε ν α ι. Il. i. 564. Ε τ τε κο ρ ο ς α, ν ν α τ με γ ρ α ς π ζ ε ι. Il. iv. 321. Ε μ λ λ α κ α ρ τ ε ρ ς σ σ ι, θ ε ς π ο υ σ ο τ γ δ ω κ ε ν. Il. i. 178. Ε δ χ ρ κ α π ρ σ ο φ ν ν τ ι φ ε ρ ξ α ι, ρ ω,

but if I must match myself against the wise one, I will speak. PIND. Py. ix. 54. Ε θεο τι δρσιν ασχρν, οκ εσν θεο, if Gods do aught that is base, they are not Gods. EUR. Bell. Fr. 294. “Ε γ Φαδρον γνο, κα μαυτο πιλλησμαι: λλ γρ οδτερ στι τοτων,” “if I do not know Phaedrus, I have forgotten myself; but neither of these is the case.” PLAT. Phaedr. 228 A. Ε μν (σκληπις) θεο ν, οκ ν ασχροκερδς: ε δ ασχροκερδς, οκ ν θεο. Rep. 408C. Ε δ κενος σθενστερος ν, αυτ το πθους ατιον γσατο. DEM. xxiii. 54.

[*] 403. The imperative, the subjunctive in exhortations or prohibitions, the optative in wishes, the potential optative or indicative with ν, or the infinitive may stand in the apodosis. E.g. λλ ε δοκε σοι, στεχε, if thou art resolved, go. SOPH. Ant. 98. (Here ν δοκε would refer to the future, while ε δοκε is strictly present in its time. Cf. Ant. 76. λλ ε δοκε, πλωμεν, ρμσθω ταχς. Ph. 526. Ε μν στε με τοιοτον, . . . μηδ φων ν νσχησθε. DEM. xviii. 10. “λλ ε που πτωχν γε θεο κα ρινες εσν, ντνοον πρ γμοιο τλος θαντοιο κιχηη” Hom. Od. xvii. 475. λλ ε δοκε σοι ταθ, πα τις ρβλας λοι τχος, but if this pleases you, let some one quickly loose my shoes. AESCH. Ag. 944. Κκιστ πολομην, Ξανθαν ε μ φιλ. AR. Ran. 579. Πολλ γρ ν εδαιμονα εη περ τος νους, ε ε μν μνος ατος διαφθερει ο δ λλοι φελοσιν. PLAT. Ap. 25B. See also Il. vi. 128, ε . . . ελλουθας, οκ ν . . . μαχομην. Τν περεδην, επερ ληθ μου νν κατηγορε, μλλον ν εκτως τνδ δωκεν, if he is now bringing true charges against me, he would have prosecuted Hypereides with much more reason than he does this man. DEM. xviii. 223. (See 479, DEM. 2; 503.)

[*] 404. This form of condition may be used even when the supposition is notoriously contrary to fact, if the speaker does not wish to imply this by the construction; as in DEM. xviii. 12, τν μντοι κατηγοριν, . . . επερ σαν ληθες, οκ νι τ πλει δκην ξαν λαβεν, but if the charges were true (=erant, not essent), the state cannot obtain adequate satisfaction. So in English, we can say if three times six are twenty as well as if three times six were twenty, or if all men are liars as well as if all men were liars,—from different points of view.

[*] 405. A present or past general supposition is sometimes expressed by the indicative: see examples in 467. Here the Greek neglects the distinction which it regularly makes between general and particular suppositions of this class.

[*] 406. Pindar uses these simple conditions with ε and the indicative more than all other forms.²³ But among his forty-eight cases are many general conditions (467), which most writers would have expressed by the subjunctive.

[*] 407. (Future Indicative in Present Suppositions.) Even the future indicative with ε may be used in a present condition, if it expresses merely a present intention or necessity that something shall be done hereafter; as when ε τοτο ποισει means if he is (now) about to do this, and not (as it does in an ordinary future condition) if he shall do this (hereafter). E.g. Αρε πλκτρον, ε μαχε, raise your spur, if you are going to fight. AR. Av. 759. (Ε μαχε in protasis commonly means if you shall fight, like νν μχ.) νν γ μν οκ νρ, ατη δ νρ, ε τατ νατ τδε κεσεται κρη, i.e. if this is to pass unpunished. SOPH. Ant. 484. Τ διαφρουσι τν ξ νγκης κακοπαθοντων, ε γε πεινσουσι κα διψσουσι κα ιγσουσι κα γρυπνσουσι κα τλλα πντα μοχθσουσιν κντες; how do they differ, etc., if they are to

suffer hunger, thirst, etc.? XEN. Mem. ii. 1, 17. So ε■ π■λεμ■ς τε δαμ■ κα■ λοιμ■ς ■χαιο■ς, if both war and pestilence are to lay the Achaeans low, Il. i. 61; and ε■ διαβληθ■σομαι, if I am to be slandered, EUR. Hec. 863. In Il. v. 715, ■ ρ■ ■λιον τ■ν μ■θον ■π■στημεν Μενελο■, . . . ε■ ο■τω μα■νεσθαι ■σομεν ο■λον ρ■α, vain is the word we pledged, if we are to permit, etc., the verb of the apodosis is past, showing that the condition is not future.

[*] 408. It is important to notice that a future indicative of this kind could not be changed to a subjunctive with ■■ν without an entire change of sense and time. It must therefore be distinguished from the future in future conditions, where it is generally interchangeable with the subjunctive (447). Here it is nearly equivalent to the periphrastic future expressed by μ■λλω and the infinitive (73), in which the tense of μ■λλω (as in ε■ μ■λλουσι το■το ποιε■ν = ε■ το■το ποι■σουσιν) shows that the condition is really present and not future. So with the Latin periphrastic future, si hoc facturus est.

[*] 409. A present condition may be expressed by a potential optative in the protasis, and a present or past condition by a potential indicative; as ε■ περ ■λλ■ τ■ ■νθρ■πων πειθο■μην ■ν, κα■ σο■ πε■θομαι, if (it is true that) I would trust any one of mankind, I trust you, PLAT. Prot. 329 B; ε■ το■το ■σχυρ■ν ■ν ■ν το■τ■ τεκμ■ριον, κ■μο■ γεν■σθω τεκμ■ριον, ■τι, κ.τ.λ., if (it is true that) this would have been a strong proof for him (if he had used it), so let it be a proof for me, that, etc., DEM. xlix. 58. (See 458, and other examples in 506.) 2. With Supposition contrary to Fact.

[*] 410. When the protasis states a present or past supposition, implying that the condition is not or was not fulfilled, and the apodosis expresses what would be (or would have been) the result if that condition were (or had been) fulfilled, the past tenses of the indicative are used in both protasis and apodosis, and the apodosis contains the adverb ■ν. The imperfect here, in either protasis or apodosis, refers to present time or to an act as going on or repeated in past time, the aorist to a simple occurrence in past time, and the (rare) pluperfect to an act completed in past or present time. E.g. Ε■ το■το ■πρασσε, καλ■ς ■ν ε■χεν, if he were (now) doing this, it would be well (implying that he is not doing it). This may also mean if he had been doing this, it would have been well (implying that he was not doing it). The context must decide, in each case, to which time the imperfect refers. Ε■ το■το ■πραξε, καλ■ς ■ν ■σχεν, if he had done this, it would have been well (implying that he did not do it). Ε■ το■το ■πεπραχει, καλ■ς ■ν ε■χεν, if he had finished doing this (now or at any past time), it would be well (implying either he has not or he had not finished it).

(Impf. of Present Time.) Ε■ δ■ μ■ ■δ■ ■ε■ λ■γους ■ξ■ρχες, ο■κ ■ν ■σθα λυπηρ■ κλ■ειν, if you always began your talk to me in this way, you would not be offensive to listen to (as you are). SOPH. El. 556. So SOPH. El. 992, SOPH. El. 1331, O. T. 1511; and Sept. 662, Ag. 1395. Κα■ ν■ν ε■ φοβερ■ν τι ■νωρ■μεν, π■ν ■ν σοι προεφρ■ζομεν, if we saw any cause of alarm, we should tell it all to you. HDT. i. 120. Τα■τα ο■κ ■ν ■δ■ναντο ποιε■ν, ε■ μ■ κα■ δια■τ■ μετρ■ ■χρ■ντο, they would not be able to do this, if they did not lead an abstemious life. XEN. Cyr. i. 2, 16. Ε■ ■σθ■ ■τι ε■ τι ■μο■ ■κ■δου, ο■δεν■ς ■ν ο■τω με ■ποστερε■ν φυλ■ττου ■ς ■ξι■ματος κα■ τιμ■ς, if you cared for me at all, you would take precaution, etc. Ib. v. 5, Ib. 34. Πολ■ ■ν θαυμαστ■τερον ■ν, ε■ ■τιμ■ντο, it would be much more wonderful, if they were honoured. PLAT. Rep. 489B. Λ■γουσι π■ντα ■ ■χει: κα■τοι ε■ μ■ ■τ■γγανεν α■το■ς ■πιστ■μη ■νο■σα, ο■κ ■ν ο■ο■ τ■ ■σαν το■το ποι■σειν, they tell everything as it is: and yet if knowledge did not chance to be in them, they could not do this. Plat. Phaed. 73A. Ο■χ ο■τω δ■

■ν προθ■μως ■π■ τ■ν π■λεμον ■μ■ς παρεκ■λουν, ε■ μ■ τ■ν ε■ρ■νην ■■ρων α■σχυρ■ν ■σομ■νην, I should not exhort you, did I not see (as I do), etc. ISOC. vi. 87.

■Impf. of Past Time.) “Κα■ τα■τ■ ■ν ο■κ ■πρασσον, ε■ μ■ μοι πικρ■ς α■τ■ τ■ ■ρ■ς ■ρ■το,” “and this I should never have done, had he not invoked bitter curses on myself.” SOPH. O.C. 951. Ο■κ ■ν ν■σων ■κρ■τει, ε■ μ■ τι κα■ ναυτικ■ν ε■χεν, he would not have been master of islands, if he had not had also some naval force (implying ναυτικ■ν ε■χεν and ν■σων ■κρ■τει, he had a navy, for he was master of islands). THUC. i. 9. (Τα■τα) ο■κ ■ν προ■λεγεν, ε■ μ■ ■π■στευεν ■ληθε■σειν, he would not have declared these things (referring to several), had he not been confident that he should speak the truth. XEN. Mem. i. 1, 5. Ε■ ■σαν ■νδρες ■γαθο■, ■ς σ■ φ■ς, ο■κ ■ν ποτε τα■τα ■πασχον, if they had been good men, as you say, they would never have suffered these things (referring to several cases). PLAT. Gorg. 516E.

■Aorist of Past Time.) Ε■ μ■ ■ρκοις ■ρ■θην, ο■κ ■ν ποτ■ ■σχον μ■ ο■ τ■δ■ ■ξειπε■ν πατρ■, had I not been bound by oaths, I should never have refrained, etc. EUR. Hipp. 657. Κα■ ■σως ■ν δι■ τα■τ■ ■π■θανον, ε■ μ■ ■ ρχ■ δι■ ταχ■ων κατελ■θη. PLAT. Ap. 32D. Τ■ ποτ■ ■ν ■παθον ■π■ α■τ■ν, ε■ πλε■ω χρ■νον ■πετροπε■θην; ε■ κατελε■φθην μ■ν ■νια■σιος, ■ξ■ τη δ■ προσεπετροπε■θην ■π■ α■τ■ν, ο■δ■ ■ν τ■ μικρ■ τα■τα παρ■ α■τ■ν ■π■λαβον. DEM. xxvii. 63. Ε■ το■νυν ■ Φ■λιππος τ■τε τα■την ■σχε τ■ν γν■μην, ο■δ■ν ■ν ■ν νυν■ πεπο■ηκεν ■πραξεν, ο■δ■ τοσα■την ■κτ■σατο δ■ναμιν. Id. iv. 5.

■Different tenses in Protasis and Apodosis.) Ε■ μ■ ■με■ς ■λθετε, ■πορευ■μεθα ■ν ■π■ βασιλ■α, if you had not come, we should (now) be on our way to the King. XEN. An. ii. 1, 4. ■ ε■ ■πεκρ■νω, XEN. An. i ■καν■ς ■ν ■δη παρ■ σο■ τ■ν ■σι■τητα ■μεμαθ■κη, if you had given this answer, I should have already learned, etc. PLAT. Euthyph. 14 C. Λοιπ■ν δ■ ■ν ■ν ■μ■ν ■τι περ■ τ■ς π■λεως διαλεχθ■ναι τ■ς ■μετ■ρας, ε■ μ■ προτ■ρα τ■ν ■λλων τ■ν ε■ρ■νην ■πεπο■ητο. (This implies ■λλ■ τ■ν ε■ρ■νην προτ■ρα πεπο■ηται.) ISOC. v. 56. Ε■ γρ■ κ το■ παρεληλυθ■τος χρ■νου τ■ δ■οντα ο■τοι συνεβο■λευσαν, ο■δ■ν ■ν ■μ■ς ν■ν ■δει βουλε■εσθαι, if they had given the necessary advice in time past, there would now be no need of your deliberating. DEM. iv. 1. Τ■ν ■δικημ■των ■ν ■μ■μνητο τ■ν α■το■, ε■ τι περ■ ■μο■ γ■ γραφεν. Id. xviii. 79.

These examples show the fully developed construction, as it appears in the Attic writers and in Herodotus. For the more primitive Homeric usage, see 435 and 438.

[*] 411. This construction is equivalent to that of the Latin imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive in protasis and apodosis. With regard to the tenses, the Latin imperfect subjunctive represents the Greek imperfect indicative referring to present time, and rarely that referring to past time; while the Latin pluperfect subjunctive represents the Greek aorist and pluperfect indicative, and also most cases of the Greek imperfect referring to past time.

[*] 412. 1. It will be seen that, when this construction is used, it is usually implied not merely that the condition of the protasis is not (or was not) fulfilled but also that the action of the apodosis does not (or did not) take place; thus ε■ το■το ε■πον, ■πε■σθη ■ν, if I had said this, he would have been persuaded, generally implies not merely that I did not say this but also that he was not persuaded. But this denial of the apodosis is not an essential character of the construction, as we can see if we change the apodosis to ο■κ ■ν ■πε■σθη, he would not have been persuaded,

when it is not implied that he really was persuaded. We have seen that there is nothing in the nature of the potential indicative which makes a denial of its action necessary (244); and when this form is made the apodosis of an unreal condition, it simply states that something would happen (or would have happened) in a case which did not arise. Denial of the apodosis can follow as a logical inference from denial of the protasis only in the rare cases in which the unreal condition is the only one under which the action of the apodosis could have taken place, as when we say if the moon had entered the earth's shadow, she would have been eclipsed, where the denial of either clause carries with it by necessity the denial of the other. But if we say if it had rained, the ground would be wet, the denial of the protasis cuts off only one of many conditions under which the ground might be wet. Such sentences as this are, however, very common, though they are not used to prove the opposite of the apodosis (that the ground is not wet); but they are arguments in which the apodosis is assumed to be false (on the ground of observation or experience), and from this it is argued that the assumption of the protasis is false; that is, since the ground is not wet (as we can see), it cannot have rained, which is a good argument. This is the case in THUC. i. 9, and PLAT. Gorg. 516 E (quoted in 410, above); where it is argued that Agamemnon had a navy because this was a necessary condition of his ruling islands, and that certain persons were not good men because they suffered what they did, the facts of ruling islands and of suffering being assumed in the argument as established on independent evidence. In other cases, where it is stated that the apodosis would follow as a consequence from the fulfilment of the condition, as in SOPH. Aj. 45, “κ■ν ■ξεπρ■ξατ■ ε■ κατημ■λησ■ ■γ■” , he would even have accomplished it, if I had been careless, whatever negation of the apodosis is implied (here ο■κ ■ξεπρ■ξατο) comes from a feeling that when the only condition under which it is stated that an action would have taken place fails, there is no reason for believing it to have taken place at all. We may doubt whether any negation of the apodosis is implied in the form of expression in such cases. Certainly, in many cases in which the apodosis states a consequence which would follow from the action of an unreal protasis, this negation is assumed as already known apart from the construction; thus in SOPH. El. 556 (quoted in 410) the apodosis means you would not then be offensive to listen to, and the only ground on which we mentally add as you now are is our knowledge of Clytaemnestra's feeling towards Electra. If the sentence were if all men began their speeches politely, they would not be offensive, we should not think of supplying as they now are without some knowledge of the facts.

2. When the sentence merely affirms or denies that one act, if it had occurred, would be accompanied by another act, and there is no necessary relation between the two acts as cause and effect, and there is no argument drawn from the admitted unreality of the conclusion to prove the opposite of the condition, no denial of the apodosis is implied in the expression, although we may know from the context or in some other way that the action of the apodosis does not (or did not) occur. Thus in PLAT. Ap. 17D, ε■ τ■ ■ντι ξ■νος ■τ■γγανον ■ν, ξυνεγγν■σκετε δ■που ■ν μοι ε■ ■ν ■κε■ν τ■ φων■ ■λεγον, etc., if I were really a foreigner, you would surely pardon me if I spoke in my own dialect, etc., it is not implied that now you do not pardon me. We should rather say that nothing at all is implied beyond the statement you would pardon me in that case. If the apodosis were you would not be angry with me, the impossibility of understanding but now you are angry would make this plainer. Again, in XEN. An. vi. 1, 32 , ο■δ■ ■ν ■γωγε ■στασ■αζον ε■ ■λλον ε■λεσθε, neither should I (any more than Xenophon) be quarrelsome if you had chosen another man, nothing like στασι■ζω is implied; on the other hand, any such implication as ο■στασι■ζω must come from the circumstances of the case, not from the form of expression. In

SOPH. OT 220 , ο γρη μν μακρην χνευον ατς, if the protasis is ε χνευον ατς, if I were undertaking the search by myself (alone), the apodosis I should not be very far on the track does not imply μακρην χνεω, or anything more than the sentence states. (See 511.) Again, in SOPH. Tr. 896, ε παροσα πλησα λευσσεσ οιδρασε, κρητν κτισαα, the statement does not imply οκ κτισαα, although this may be true.

3. Further, in concessive sentences introduced by κα ε or ε, even if or although, or οδ ε, not even if, where it is stated that something would be true even in a supposed case (which does not arise), we have what amounts to a statement that the thing in question would be true in any case. Here, therefore, the action of the apodosis is distinctly affirmed; as in ISOC. xxi. 11, Νικαα μν, ε κα τν λλον χρνον εθιστο συκοφαντεν, ττν πασατο: Εθνονυσ δ, κα ε μηδ ποτε διενοθη δικεν, ττν πρηθη, i.e. N. would then have stopped, while E. would have been urged on, in any case. So DEM. xxx. 14, and xl. 23. See PLAT. Rep. 620 D, τ ατν ν πραξε κα πρη λαχοσα (=κα ε πρη λαχεν), it would have done the same even if it had drawn the first choice.

[*] 413. In the unreal conditional sentence, therefore, the unreality of the supposition is always implied, and that of the apodosis is generally either assumed or implied. The implied opposite of an imperfect is always a present or imperfect, that of an aorist is an aorist, and that of a pluperfect is usually a perfect or pluperfect. Thus ε πρασσε, when it means if he were doing, implies λλ ο πρσσει, but really he is not doing; when it means if he had been doing, it implies λλ οκ πρασσε, but really he was not doing: ε μ πραξεν, if he had not done, implies λλ πραξεν, but really he did do: ε πεποικει τοτο, if he had already done this, implies either λλ ο πεποηκεν, but really he has not done it, or λλ οκ πεποικει, but really he had not done it, according to the context. The aorist, however, is very often used here, as elsewhere, where the pluperfect would express the time intended more exactly; as in the sentence quoted in 410 from DEM. iv. 5, οδν ν νυν πεποηκεν πραξεν, where the perfect πεποηκεν shows that the pluperfect might have been used for πραξεν (see 58).

[*] 414. Sometimes an aorist not referring to past time is found in the apodosis, after a protasis in the imperfect referring to the present. This occurs chiefly in Plato, and generally with επον ν, πεκρινμην ν, or a similar verb, meaning I should at once reply. The aorist excludes the idea of duration which the imperfect would express, and for the same reason it cannot be strictly present; in effect it does not differ much from an aorist optative with ν, the apodosis really being the result (in the case supposed) would be (ν ν) that I should reply (εποιμι ν), etc. E.g. Ε μν ον σ με ρταα τι τν νν δ, επον ν, κ.τ.λ., if then you were asking me any one of the questions before us, I should (at once) say, etc. PLAT. Euthyph. 12D σπερ ν ε τγγανεν ν ποδημτων δημιουργς, πεκρινατο ν δ πο σοι τι σκυτοτμος, as, if he chanced to be a maker of shoes, he would answer that he was a cobbler. Gorg. 447D. See also Symp. 199D, Men. 72B, Theag. 123B; ANT. Tetr. A. b. 13. In PLAT. Prot. 311 B, C, we have ε τς σε ρετο, τν πεκρινω; with the answer επον ν ς, κ.τ.λ., twice, referring to present time; but in D, “ε ον τις μς ροιτο” (future), followed by τν ν ατν ποκριναμεθα; An example of this is found in SOPH. Ant. 755: ε μ πατρ σθη, επον ν σ οκ ε φρονεν, if you were not my father, I should say you were not right in mind. See EUR. Alc. 125, λθεν ν, i.e. (the result would be that) she would return. So Alc. 360.

Apodosis without ■v.—■δει, χρ■v, etc. with the Infinitive.

[*] 415. A peculiar form of potential indicative without ■v consists of an infinitive depending on the imperfect of a verb of obligation, propriety, or possibility, like ■δει, χρ■v or ■χρ■v, ε■κ■ς ■v, or προσ■κεν. This expression refers to past or present time, and generally implies a denial of the action of the infinitive. Thus ■δει το■τον ■ποθανε■v in this idiomatic use means he ought to have perished (but did not); ■δει ■μ■ς το■το ποιε■v means we ought to be doing this (but we are not) or we ought to have done this (but we did not do it). This combination contains in other words what might have been expressed substantially by a past indicative with ■v of the verb of the infinitive, qualified by an adverb or other expression denoting obligation, propriety, or possibility: thus ■δει το■τον ■ποθανε■v is (as a construction) equivalent to ο■τος δικα■ως (or ■ξ■ως) ■v ■π■θανεν, he would justly have perished, and ε■κ■ς ■v σε το■το παθε■v is equivalent to το■το ε■κ■τως ■v ■παθες, you would properly have suffered this (implying ο■κ ■παθες). Strictly, the expression involves also an unreal protasis, as (in the last case) ε■ τ■ ε■κ■ς ■παθες, which with the apodosis το■το ■παθες ■v appears substantially in ε■κ■ς ■v σε το■το παθε■v. (See 511.) When the present infinitive is used, the expression is present or past; with the aorist infinitive it is always past.

[*] 416. The following imperfects may take the infinitive in this sense: ■δει, χρ■v or ■χρ■v, ε■κ■ς ■v, προσ■κεν, ■v■v, ■ξ■v, ■v (or ■π■ρχεν²⁴), it was possible, one might, the impersonal ■v with adjectives or nouns expressing obligation, propriety, possibility, and similar ideas, as δ■καιον ■v, ■ξιον ■v, καλ■v (κ■λλιον,²⁵ κρε■ττον,²⁶ κρ■τιστον²⁷) ■v, α■σchr■v ■v, προσ■κον ■v, ο■θαυμαστ■v ■v,²⁸ ■σφαλ■στερον ■v,²⁹ ■σον ■v,³⁰ ε■λογον ■v,³¹ συγγνωστ■v ■v, ο■ς τ■ ■v, ■ργον ■v, ■v with the verbal in -τ■ος,—also ■πρεπεν, συν■φερεν,³² ■λυσιτ■λει,³³ with other verbs of the same nature. To these must be added the expressions specially mentioned below in 424-431.

[*] 417. These are all originally expressions of past necessity, obligation, etc., involving no reference to any condition (unfulfilled or otherwise); and in this sense they may always be used, as in DEM. xix. 124, ■δει μ■νειν, he was obliged to stay (and did stay), and HDT. i. 8, χρ■v γ■ρ Κανδα■λ■ γεν■σθαι κακ■ς, for C. was doomed to fall into trouble. It is only by idiomatic usage that the denial of the action of the infinitive comes to be implied in them, and that a past tense comes to express present time, both of which characteristics are found in Greek, Latin, and English; as ■δει σε α■τ■v φιλε■v, debes eum colere, you ought to love him (but you do not), ought being the past of owe. The infinitive is felt to be negated, even when the negative belongs to the leading verb.

[*] 418. Like the potential indicative, this form of expression can either (1) be used alone, with no external protasis expressed or distinctly implied, as in χρ■v σε ■λθε■v, you ought to have gone; or (2) stand as apodosis to an unreal protasis, as in ε■ ■κ■λευσε, χρ■v σε ■λθε■v, if he had commanded it, you ought to have gone.

[*] 419. I. When these expressions are used alone, the denial of the action of the infinitive is always implied. E.g. Το■σδε γ■ρ μ■ ζ■v ■δει, for these ought not to be living (as they are). SOPH. Ph. 418. ■δει μ■v το■ς λ■γοντας ■παντας μ■τε πρ■ς ■χθραν ποιε■σθαι λ■γον μηδ■να μ■τε πρ■ς χ■ριν, i.e. the speakers ought not to say a word out of regard either to enmity or to favour (and yet they do so). DEM. viii. 1. Σιγ■σας ■v■κ■ ■δει λ■γειν, “keeping silence

when he ought to speak.” Id. xviii. 189: cf. xviii. 191.

Χρῖν γῶρ σε μῦτῳ ἀτῖν ποτῆ εἰς Τροῖαν μολεῖν, μῦς τῆ περῶγειν, for you ought yourself never to have gone to Troy, and you ought (now) to keep me away from it. SOPH. Ph. 1363. See AESCH. Ag. 879, AESCH. Cho. 930; SOPH. El. 1505. Θανεῖν, θανεῖν σε, πρῶσβυ, χρῖν πῶρος τῆκνων. And. 1208. Τῆ χρῖν με ποιεῖν; μῦ προσῶγειν γῶψαι (τοῖς πρῶσβεις; what ought I to have done (which I did not do? Ought I not to have proposed (as I did) to invite the ambassadors? DEM. xviii. 28. χρῖν μῖν οῖν καῖ δῆκαιον ῖν τοῖς τῖν στῶφανον οῖομῖνους δεῖν λαβεῖν ἀτοῖς ῆξῖους ῖπιδεικνῖναι τοῖτου, μῦ μῦ κακῖς λῶγειν: ῖπειδῖ δῖ τοῖτο παρῖντες ῖκεῖνο ποιοῖσιν, κ.τ.λ., i.e. those who think they ought to receive the crown ought to show that they deserve it themselves, and not be abusing me; but since now they have neglected the former and do the latter, etc. Ild. i. 3.

“Σφῖν δῖ, ῖ τῆκνῖ, οῖς μῖν εῖκῖς ῖν πονεῖν τῖδε,” “those of you who ought to be bearing these labours.” SOPH. O.C. 342. Πρῖς τοῖτους τῖν ῖγῖνα καταστῖναι, οῖς εῖκῖς ῖν τῖ μῖν τεθνεῖτι τιμωροῖς γενῖσθαι τῖ δῖ πεξῖντι βοηθοῖς, “who properly should have come forward to avenge the dead and to help the prosecutor.” ANT. i. 2. Εῖ πῖ τῖν πολεμῖων μῖν ῖσῖθημεν, οῖς εῖκῖς ῖν διακωλῖειν μῖ σῖζεσθαι, i.e. who would naturally have tried to prevent us from being saved. LYS. xx. 36. See DEM. xl. 30. Καῖ μῖλιστα εῖκῖς ῖν μῖς προορῖσθαι ἀτῖ καῖ μῖ μαλακῖς, ῖσπερ νῖν, ξυμμαχεῖν. THUC. vi. 78. (The orator adds, ῖλλ οῖθῖ μῖς νῖν γῖ πω οῖθῖ οῖ ῖλλοι πῖ ταῖτα ῖρμησθε.) Μῖνεν γῶρ ῖξῖν τῖ κατηγοροῖντι τῖν ῖλλων, he might have stood his ground (but really he ran away). DEM. iii. 17: cf. xviii. 14, DEM. xxvii. 58; LYS. xii. 31.

Τῖν διαθῖκην ῖφῖνικατε, ῖξ ῖς ῖν εῖδῖναι περῖ πῖντων τῖν ῖλῖθειαν, you have concealed the will, from which we (now) might know the truth about the whole matter. DEM. xxviii. 10. Τῖς ῖμετῖρας ῖχθρας ῖμῖς ῖφῖ μῖν ἀτῖν δῖκαιον ῖν τῖν ῖξετασμῖν ποιεῖσθαι, i.e. we should justly settle up our quarrel by ourselves. Id. xviii. 16: cf. 13, where δῖκαιον ῖν is understood with χρῖσθαι, he would justly have used them. Πρῖτων πολῖ βῖλτιον ῖ σῖ προσῖκον ῖν (sc. πρῖττειν), being much better off than you deserve to be. xIld. v. 69. Καῖ μῖν ῖξῖν γῖ ῖν ῖκοῖσαι, indeed, it was worth your while to hear them (ῖξῖως ῖν ῖκοῖσατε). PLAT. Euthyd. 304D. The person addressed had just said οῖκ οῖς τῖ ῖ κατακοῖειν.

ῖλλῖ ῖπρεπεν λῶγειν ῖ λῶγεις, another would have becomingly said what you say (ῖλλος ῖν ῖλεγε πρεπῖντως). PLAT. Rep. 474D. Τῖ δυσχερῖστατον τῖν ῖνομῖτων, ῖ τῖν φθονοῖντων ῖργον ῖν λῶγειν, ῖλλῖ οῖ τῖν προεστῖτων τῖς τοιαῖτης παιδεῖσεως, the most disagreeable of names (Sophist), which the envious ought to use rather than those who stand at the head of the business in question. ISOC. xiii. 19.

[*] 420. II. When this form is made the apodosis of an unreal condition (expressed or distinctly implied), it states that what the infinitive denotes would necessarily, properly, or possibly be done (or have been done) if the case supposed were a real one. The chief force of the apodosis here always lies in the infinitive, while the leading verb acts as an auxiliary (which we can generally express by ought, might, or could, or by an adverb), modifying the idea of the infinitive more or less in different cases. But when the chief stress is laid on the necessity, propriety, or possibility of the act, and not on the act itself, so that the real apodosis is in the leading verb, this takes ῖν, like any other imperfect in such an apodosis (423). In some cases, however, even when no ῖν is

added, the force of the infinitive is so modified by the idea of the leading verb that the opposite of the apodosis (which is generally inferred) cannot be expressed without including both ideas (see examples in 422, 1).

[*] 421. In the following examples the infinitive represents the real apodosis, and its action is denied as when no protasis is added (419):—

Εἰ ἢ πῶς μῶς μοῦνος στρατηλάτῃ Πέρσης, χρὴν ἀτὴν πῆντων τῶν ἄλλων περχόμενον εἶναι οἴτω πῶς τῶν μετῴρη: καὶ ἢν δόλου πῶσι ἢς πῶς Σκῆθας ἴλασσει, if the Persian were making his expedition against us alone, he should leave all others and be marching directly into our country; then he would show everybody that he was marching against Scythians. HDT. iv. 118. Δεῖν (=δει) δεῖ, εἴπερ ἢν δυνατῶν, ἢνευ τῶν ἄλλων ἀτῶν λῆγεσθαι: νῦν δεῖ δόνατον. PLAT. Theaet. 202A. Χρὴν ἢς, εἴπερ ἢσθα μῶ κακῶς, πεῖσαντῶ με γαμεῖν γῶμον τῶνδῶ, ἢλλῶ μῶ σιγῶ φῶλων, i.e. if you were not base, you should make this marriage with my consent, and not (as you do) in secret from your friends. EUR. Med. 586. Εἰ τινα (προῖκα) δόδου, εἴκῶς ἢν καὶ τῶν δοθεῖσαν πῶς τῶν παραγενῶσθαι φασκῶντων μαρτυρεῶσθαι, i.e. if he had given any dowry, it would naturally have been attested by witnesses. ISAE. iii. 28. See Id. iv. 18. μῶ εἴ μῶν ἢν ἢλλαις τισῶν μῶραις δόκησῶ τι τοῖτων δῶιτην ἢντα, Id. i. δόκα δόκην προσῶκεν ἀτῶ δῶδῶναι, i.e. in that case he would properly have given satisfaction by a private suit (as if he had said προσῶκῶντως δόκα δόκην ἢν δόδου). DEM. xxi. 33; see xxxiii. 25 and 38. Οἴ γῶρ ἢνῶν μῶ παρακρουσῶντων μῶν (=εἴ μῶ παρεκροῶσθητε) μεῖναι Φιλῶππῶ, for Philip could not have remained (as he did) unless you had been deceived. Id. xix. 123. Εἴ ἢσαν ἢνδρες, ἢσπερ φασῶν, ἢγαθοῶ, ἢσῶ ἢληπτῶτεροι ἢσαν τοῖς πῶλας, τοῖδε φανερωτῶραν ἢξῶν ἀτοῖς τῶν ἢρετῶν δεικῶνναι, i.e. in that case they might all the more plainly manifest their virtue (which they do not do). THUC. i. 37. Εἴ ἢβοῶλετο δόκακος εἶναι, ἢξῶν ἀτῶ μισθῶσαι τῶν οἴκων, ἢ γῶν περιῶμενος ἢκ τῶν προσῶντων τοῖς παῶδας τρῶφειν, i.e. he might have let the house, or have bought land and supported the children from the income. LYS. xxxii. 23. ἢν ἀτῶ τῶ δόκα ἢξῶν σοι φυγῶς τιμῶσασθαι, εἴ ἢβοῶλου. PLAT. Crit. 52C. (See ISOC. xvii. 29.) Πολλοῖς δόξω, ἢς οἴκῶς τῶ ἢν σε σῶζειν εἴ ἢθελον ἢναλῶσκειν χρῶματα, ἢμελῶσαι, many will think that, whereas I might have saved you if I had been willing to spend money, I neglected it. Ib. 44

[*] 422. 1. In the following examples the idea of the infinitive is so modified by that of the leading verb, that the real apodosis (the opposite of which is implied) includes both ideas; but the chief force still remains in the infinitive, so that no ἢν is added.

Εἴ γῶρ πῶ δόντος τοῖ εἴπε τελευτῶσειν με, χρὴν δεῖ σε ποιῶειν τῶ ποιῶεις: νῦν δεῖ πῶ ἀχμῶς, for if the dream had said that I was to be killed by a tooth, then you would properly do what you now do; but it really said I was to be killed by a spear. HDT. i. 39. (Here the real apodosis is not in ποιῶειν alone, which is affirmed in τῶ ποιῶεις, but in the combined idea you would do with propriety; and it is the opposite of this which is implied. Χρὴν ἢν, which might have been used, would throw the main force on the χρὴν, with the meaning it would be your duty to do.) Εἴ μῶν οἴν ἢπαντες ἢμολογῶμεν Φῶλιππον τῶ πῶλει πολεμεῖν, οἴδῶν ἢλλο ἢδει τῶν παριῶντα λῶγειν καὶ συμβουλεῶειν ἢ ἢπως ἢσφάλῶστατα ἀτῶν ἢμυνοῶμεθα, i.e. if then we were all agreed that Philip is at war with us, the speaker ought to say nothing else and to give no other advice than this, etc. (but it is added that, as there is a difference of opinion, it is necessary,

■ν■γκη ■στ■ν, to speak on another subject also). DEM. ix. 6. (This implies not he does speak, etc., but he is bound to speak, etc. ■δει ■ν would merely have thrown the balance of force upon the necessity, whereas now it falls on the speaking and advising.) Ε■ γ■ρ παρ■ ■μο■ ■τ■θη τ■ γραμματε■ον, ■ν■ν α■τι■σασθαι ■πατουρ■ ■ς ■γ■ ■φ■νικα τ■ς συνθ■κας, for if the account-book had been given me to keep, A. might possibly have charged me with putting the contract out of the way (implying that, as it was, he could not charge me with this). Id. xxxiii. 37. Ε■ μ■ν ■■ρα μεταμ■λον τ■ π■λει τ■ν πεπραγμ■νων, ο■κ ■ξιον ■ν θαυμ■ζειν α■το■, if he had seen that the state repented of her acts, we should have no good reason for being surprised at him (implying we now have good reason for surprise, ■ξ■ως θαυμ■ζομεν). ISOC. xviii. 21. The preceding examples confirm the reading of the best MSS. in EUR. Med. 490, ε■ γ■ρ ■σθ■ ■παις ■τι, συγγνωστ■ν ■ν σοι το■δ■ ■ρασθ■ναι λ■χους, which may be translated, for if you had remained still childless, you might pardonably have become enamoured of this new marriage, the apodosis being equivalent to ■ρ■σθης ■ν with an adverb meaning pardonably (if you had done what would have been pardonable). This implies not you were not enamoured, but you were not pardonably enamoured. If no protasis had been added, συγγνωστ■ν ■ν ■ρασθ■ναι (in its potential sense) must have meant you might pardonably have become enamoured (but you did not), and then ■ν would have been required to give the sense it would have been pardonable (but is not so). The other reading, συγγν■στ■ ■ν ■ν, would make the same change in the balance of force that χρ■ν ■ν, ■δει ■ν, ■ν■ν ■ν, and ■ξιον ■ν ■ν would make in the preceding examples.

2. In concessive sentences introduced by κα■ ε■, even if, ο■δ■ ε■, not even if, or ε■, although, containing unreal conditions, where the action of the apodosis is not denied but affirmed (see 412, 3), the real apodosis may be represented by an infinitive and a leading verb like ■δει, ■ξ■ν, etc. combined. E.g. Ο■κ ■ξ■ν α■τ■ δικ■ζεσθαι περ■ τ■ν τ■τε γεγενημ■νων, ο■δ■ ε■ π■ντα τα■τ■ ■ν πεποιηκ■ς ■ φησιν ο■τος, he could not maintain a suit about what was then done, even if I had really done what he says I did (implying ο■κ ■ξεστιν α■τ■ δικ■ζεσθαι, but with the chief force on δικ■ζεσθαι). ISOC. xviii. 19. Ο■δ■ ε■ γν■σιοι ■σαν ε■σποιητο■ δ■, ■ς ο■τοι ■φασαν, ο■δ■ ο■τω προσ■κεν α■το■ς Ε■κτ■μονος ε■ναι, not even if they were genuine sons and were afterwards adopted into another family, would they now properly belong to E. 's house (implying they do not properly belong there). ISAE. vi. 44. See also HDT. vii. 56; DEM. xviii. 199, DEM. xxiii. 107.

Ο■δ■ ε■ γ■ρ ■ν τ■ πρ■γμα μ■ θε■λατον, ■κ■θαρτον ■μ■ς ε■κ■ς ■ν ο■τως ■■ν, for even if the duty were not urged upon you by a God, you ought not to leave the guilt unpurged as you do. SOPH. O.T. 255. (Here the apodosis as a whole is affirmed, although the infinitive itself, not to leave, is denied. So in the two following examples.) Καλ■ν δ■ ■ν, ε■ κα■ ■μαρτ■νομεν, το■σδε ε■ξαι τ■ ■μετρ■ ■ργ■, ■μ■ν δ■ α■σχυρ■ν (sc. ■ν) βι■σασθαι τ■ν μετρι■τητα, if we had even been in the wrong, they might fairly have yielded to our wrath, while we could not have done violence to their moderation without disgrace. THUC. i. 38. ■ξιον ■ν, ε■ κα■ μηδ■ν α■τα■ς πρ■τερον ■π■ρχεν ■γαθ■ν, (τα■τας) τ■ς μεγ■στης δωρε■ς παρ■ τ■ν ■λλ■νων τυχε■ν, i.e. these cities, even if they had had no other merit to rely on, deserved to receive (ought to have received) the greatest reward from the Greeks (which, it is said, they did not receive). ISOC. xii. 71.

[*] 423. ■■δει ■ν, etc.) The examples in 421, 1 and 2, show that the common rule for distinguishing ■δει etc. with the infinitive (without ■ν) from ■δει ■ν etc. with the infinitive,—that

the former is used when the action of the infinitive is denied, the latter when the obligation, propriety, or possibility is denied, —often cannot be applied, though as a working rule it can be used in the great majority of cases. While there are many sentences in which either form would express the required sense, the essential distinction is, that the form without **■v** is used when the chief force of the apodosis falls on the infinitive, the leading verb being an auxiliary (see 420); but the leading verb takes **■v** when the chief force falls on the necessity, propriety, or possibility of the act, rather than on the act itself. The following examples will illustrate the form with **■v**:—

Ε■ μ■ν γ■ρ γ■τι ■ν δυν■μει ■ν το■ ■δ■ως πορε■εσθαι πρ■ς τ■ ■στν, ο■δ■ν ■ν σε ■δει δε■ρο ■■ναι: ■λλ■ ■με■ς ■ν παρ■ σ■ ■μεν: ν■ν δ■ σε χρ■ πυκν■τερον δε■ρο ■■ναι, i.e. in that case there would be no need (as there now is) of your coming hither. PLAT. Rep. 328 C. Τ■ μ■ν πατρ■ α■τ■ς, ε■ πα■δες ■ρρενες μ■ ■γ■νοντο, ο■κ ■ν ■ξ■ν ■νευ τα■της διαθ■σθαι, her father, if he had had no male children, would not have been allowed to leave her out of his will (implying ■λλ■ ■ξ■ν). ISAE. x. 13. Ε■ ο■ν παρεκαλο■μεν ■λλ■λους ■π■ τ■ ο■κοδομικ■, π■τερον ■δει ■ν ■μ■ς σκ■ψασθαι ■μ■ς α■το■ς κα■ ■ξετ■σαι ε■ ■πιστ■μεθα τ■ν τ■χνην; ■δει ■ν ■ ο■; i.e. in that case would it be needful or not to examine ourselves and inquire whether we understand the art? PLAT. Gorg. 514A. See also DEM. iv. 1, quoted in 410. A comparison of these examples with those in 422, 1, will show the distinction between the two forms and also the narrowness of the line which sometimes separates them. For a discussion of χρ■ν and χρ■ν ■ν in DEM. xviii. 195, and of χρ■ν and ■χρ■ν ■ν in LYS. xii. 32 and 48, and for other remarks on these constructions, see Appendix V.

[*] 424. 1. The imperfect ■φελλον or ■φελλον of ■φ■λλω (Epic of ■φε■λω), owe, debeo, and the aorist ■φελον or ■φελον are sometimes used with the infinitive in Homer like χρ■ν, ■δει, etc. in the later construction (415). E.g. Τιμ■ν π■ρ μοι ■φελλεν ■λ■μπιος ■γγυαλ■ξαι Ζε■ς ■ψιβρεμ■της: ν■ν δ■ ο■δ■ με τυτθ■ν ■τισεν, i.e. Zeus ought to have secured me honour; but now he has not honoured me even a little. Il. i. 353. Ν■ν ■φελεν κατ■ π■ντας ■ριστ■ας πον■εσθαι λισσ■μενος, now ought he to be labouring among all the nobles, beseeching them. Il. x. 117. ■λλ■ ■φελεν ■θαν■τοισιν ε■χεσθαι, “but he ought to have prayed to the Gods.” Il. xxiii. 546. For the reference to present time in Il. x. 117, see 246 and 734.

2. From this comes the common use of this form in expressions of a wish, in Homer and in Attic Greek; as ■φελε Κ■ρος ζ■ν, would that Cyrus were living (lit. Cyrus ought to be living), XEN. An. ii. 1, 4. (See 734.)

[*] 425. Similar to this is the occasional use of ■βουλ■μην (with out ■ν) and the infinitive, to express what some one wishes were now true (but which is not true). E.g. ■βουλ■μην μ■ν ο■ν κα■ τ■ν βουλ■ν κα■ τ■ς ■κκλησ■ας ■ρθ■ς διοικε■σθαι κα■ το■ς ν■μους ■σχ■ειν, I would that both the Senate and the assemblies were rightly managed, and that the laws were in force (implying the opposite of ■ρθ■ς διοικε■σθαι and ■σχ■ειν). This is analogous to ■φελεν ε■ναι, would that it were, and ■δει ε■ναι, it ought to be (but is not). AESCHIN. iii. 2. ■βουλ■μην μ■ν ο■κ ■ρ■ζειν ■νθ■δε, I would that I were not contending here (as I am), or I would not be contending here. AR. Ran. 866. ■βουλ■μην τ■ν δ■ναμιν το■ λ■γειν ■ξ■ σου μοι καθεστ■ναι τ■ συμφορ■, “I would that power of speech equal to my misfortune were granted me.” ANT. v. i. ■βουλ■μην κ■γ■ τ■ληθ■ πρ■ς ■μ■ς ε■πε■ν δυνηθ■ναι, “I would that I had found the power to tell you the truth.” ISAE. x. 1. ■βουλ■μην μηδ■ ■φ■ ■ν■ς ■δικε■σθαι τ■ν πολιτ■ν, I would I

had not been wronged by a single one of the citizens. Frag. Id. 4 (Scheibe): see Frag. 22.

[*] 426. **βουλήμην** **ν**, *vellem*, I should wish or I should have liked, can always be used as a potential indicative, like **δει** **ν** etc. (423): see AR. Eccl. 151; AESCHIN. iii. 115. (See 246.)

[*] 427. **a)** The aorist of **κινδυνεύω** is used with the infinitive, as a periphrasis for the verb of the infinitive with **ν**. E.g. **πῆλις κινδυνεύσε πῶσα διαφθαρεῖναι εἰ νῆμος πέγνετο**, “the city ran the risk of being utterly destroyed if a wind had arisen.” THUC. iii. 74. **Εμὺ ξεφύγομεν εἰς Δελφούς κινδυνεύσαμεν πολεῖσθαι**, we ran the risk of perishing had we not fled to Delphi, i.e. we should very probably have perished if we had not fled. AESCHIN. iii. 123. For **κινδυνεύσα** **ν** see (b) below. So with **κινδυνός** **ν**: as in AND. ii. 12, **εἰ τότε τῆς πειτῶδεια μὲν εἰσῆχθη, οὐκ ἔπειτα τῶν σῶσαι τῶν θύνας κινδυνός ν ἄτοκος μύλλον**, κ.τ.λ., i.e. they ran a risk, in case the supplies had not then been brought in, not so much about saving Athens, as, etc.

b) When the chief force of the apodosis lies in **κινδυνεύσα**, even though the meaning is not much affected by the distinction in form, **ν** is used (as with **δει** etc. in 423). So in XEN. An. iv. 1, 11, **εἰ πλεῖους συνελέγησαν, κινδυνεύσεν ν πολὺ διαφθαρεῖναι τὸ στρατεύματος**, if more had been collected, there would have been danger of much of the army being destroyed.

[*] 428. **a)** The imperfect of **μύλλω** with the infinitive may express a past intention or expectation which was not realised, and so take the place of the verb of the infinitive with **ν**. E.g. **μύλλα δὲ γάμμονος φθῆσεσθαι κακῶν ὄντων μέλλον, εἰ μὲν . . . εἶπες**, i.e. I should have perished like A. (lit. I was to have perished), if thou hadst not spoken. Hom. Od. xiii. 383. **Μύλλεν μὲν ποτε οἶκος δὲ φνεῖς καὶ μύμων μμῆναι: νῶν δὲ τῶρος ββλόντο θεοί**, “this house was to have been rich and glorious; but now the Gods have willed it otherwise.” Hom. Od. i. 232. **Ὀσυστρατεύσειν μέλλον**, they were not going to join him, or they would not have joined him (in that case). DEM. xix. 159; see xviii. 172. **τὸν τῆς δίκημα πολλῶν ὄσῶν μέλλε δῆλον ῆσεσθαι**, the offence would have been less plain when there were many (olive trees). LYS. vii. 24. See THUC. v. 38, **μύλλοντες πρῶτον, εἰ ταῦτα πείσαν, πειρῆσεσθαι**. Compare the Latin: *Hoc facturi erant, nisi venisset, they were to have done this (would have done this), had he not come.*³⁴

b) A single case of **ν** with **μέλλεν** occurs in AND. i. 21: **εἰ καὶ πατρὸς βόλετο πομῆναι, τὸς φίλους ν ὄεσθε . . . πειρῆσαι αὐτῶν, ἵλλ οὐκ ἔν παραιτεῖσθαι καὶ δεῖσθαι πῆναι πού ν μέλλεν σωθῆσεσθαι**; i.e. to depart to a place where he would have been likely to be safe. Most critics repudiate this **ν**; but it seems perfectly analogous to **ν** with **δει**, **χρῆν**, etc. (423).

[*] 429. Similar is the use of **φην** in Od. iv. 171: **καμὶν φην ἴθῆντα φίλῆμεν ξοχὸν ἴλλων, εἰ νῆν νῆστον δώκεν (Ζεῦς)**, i.e. I intended to love him (and should have done so) had Zeus granted us a return.

[*] 430. An analogous case is LYS. xii. 60: **πολεῖσαι παρεσκευάζοντο τῆν πῆν εἰ μὲν δὲ νδραξ γαθοῦς**, they were preparing to destroy the city (and would have destroyed it) had it not been for good men.

[*] 431. A few expressions which have no dependent infinitive are practically equivalent to a potential indicative with **ν**, and so can stand as the apodosis of an unreal condition. E.g. **Τὸτῶν**

δ■ ε■ μ■ ■μολ■γουν ■ ο■τος ■βο■λετο, ο■δεμ■ ζημ■ ■νοχος ■ν, but if they had not acknowledged to him what he wanted, he was liable to no charge (i.e. he could not have been accused). LYS. vii. 37. ■ς, ε■ μ■ν τ■ ■π■ α■τοφ■ρ■ μ■ προσεγ■γραπτο, ■νοχος ■ν (=■ν) τ■ ■παγωγ■, assuming that, if the words ■π■ α■τοφ■ρ■, had not been added, he might properly have been tried by ■παγωγ■. Id. xiii. 85. Πιστε■οντος γ■ρ ■μο■ ■μο■ ε■δ■ναι ■ λ■γω, καλ■ς ε■χεν ■ παραμυθ■α, i.e. for if I trusted (=ε■ ■π■στευον) to any knowledge of my own about what I am saying, the consolation which you offer would encourage me (lit. your consolation was good on that supposition). PLAT. Rep. 450D. (We might have had καλ■ν ■ν σε παραμυθε■σθαι in the same sense.) Ε■ τ■ κωλ■σαι τ■ν τ■ν ■λλ■νων κοινων■αν ■πεπρ■κειν ■γ■ Φιλ■ππ■, σο■ τ■ μ■ σιγ■σαι λοιπ■ν ■ν, in that case it remained for you not to keep silent (i.e. you should not have kept silent). DEM. xviii. 23. (The article with σιγ■σαι only slightly distinguishes this from the examples under 421.)

[*] 432. The same explanation applies to other cases in which a rhetorical omission of ■ν in apodosis is commonly assumed; as in EUR. Hec. 1113, ε■ δ■ μ■ Φρυγ■ν π■ργους πεσ■ντας ■σμεν ■λλ■νων δορ■, φ■βον παρ■σχεν ο■ μ■σως ■δε κτ■πος, but if we had not known that the Phrygian towers had fallen, this noise gave us cause for terror in earnest (i.e. would easily have terrified us).

[*] 433. Occasionally a protasis takes the place of the infinitive in the construction of 419. E.g. ■πε■ τ■δε κ■ρδιον ■εν, ε■ ν■στησ■ ■δυσε■ς κα■ ■π■τροπος ■κετο δ■μα, for it had been a greater gain if Ulysses had returned (for κ■ρδιον ■εν ■δυσ■α νοστ■σαι). Od. xx. 331. Compare MATTH. Ev. xxvi. 24, καλ■ν ■ν α■τ■, ε■ ο■κ ■γενν■θη ■ ■νθρωπος ■κε■νος, it had been good for that man if he had not been born (for καλ■ν ■ν α■τ■ μ■ γεννηθ■ναι). Ε■ δ■ ■ποφε■ξεται, κρε■ττων ■ν ■ ■γ■ν μ■ γεγενημ■νος (=ε■ μ■ ■γεγ■νητο), but if he is acquitted, it were better that the trial had never taken place (for κρε■ττων ■ν τ■ν ■γ■να μ■ γεγεν■σθαι). AESCHIN. i. 192. This occasional substitution of a protasis does not indicate that the infinitive in κρε■ττων ■ν α■τ■ ■λθε■ν, he had better have gone, was felt as a protasis. We could substitute for this English it were better if he had gone, but only by a change of construction.

Homeric Peculiarities.

[*] 434. In Homer the construction of the unreal conditional sentence is not completely developed. It is not improbable that in the primitive language the optative could express in a rough way both present and past unreal conditions, and in Homer the present unreal condition is still expressed only by the present optative (438).

[*] 435. The aorist indicative in Homer, both in protasis and in apodosis with ■ν or κ■, is used as in Attic Greek; but the imperfect is always past, never present.³⁵ E.g. Κα■ ν■ κε δ■ ξιφ■εσσ■ α■τοσχεδ■ν ο■τ■ζοντο, ε■ μ■ κ■ρυκες ■λθον, they would have wounded each other, had not heralds come. Il. vii. 273. ■νθα κε λοιγ■ς ■ην κα■ ■μ■χανα ■ργα γ■νοντο, ε■ μ■ ■ρ■ ■ξ■ ν■ησε πατ■ρ ■νδρ■ν τε θε■ν τε, then there would have been, etc. Il. viii. 130. So viii. 366. Κα■ ν■ κε δ■ προτ■ρω ■τ■ ■ρις γ■νετ■ ■μφ■τεροισιν, ε■ μ■ ■χιλλε■ς α■τ■ς ■ν■στατο κα■ κατ■ρυκεν. Il. xxiii. 490. See Il. xi. 504; Od. xvi. 221, Od. xxiv. 51.

Κα■ ν■ κ■ ■τι πλ■ονας Λυκ■ων κτ■νε δ■ος ■δυσσε■ς, ε■ μ■ ■ρ■ ■ξ■ ν■ησε μ■γας κορυθα■ολος ■κτωρ, i.e. Ulysses would have killed still more, had not Hector perceived him. Il. v.

679. Κα ν κεν ια πντα κατφθιτο κα μν νδρν, ε μ τς με θεν λοφρατο κα μ σωσεν. Od. iv. 363. But φελον with the present infinitive may be present, even in Homer, both as a potential expression (424) and in wishes (734).

[*] 436. We find the imperfect referring to present time in Theognis: see vs. 905, ε μν γρ κατιδεν βιτου τλος ν, εκς ν ν. See Nem. iv. 13.

[*] 437. In Il. xxiii. 526, ε κε is found with the aorist indicative in protasis, κ apparently adding nothing to the sense:—

Ε δ κ τι προτρω γνεντο δρμος μφοτροισιν, Τ κν μιν παρλασσ οδ μφριστον θηκεν.

[*] 438. Optative in present unreal Conditions.) In Homer a present unfulfilled condition is regularly expressed by the present optative with ε, and its apodosis (if present) by the present optative with κ or ν. The only instance of this form in both protasis and apodosis is Il. xxiii. 274, ε μν νν π λλ εθλεοιμεν χαιο, τ ν γ τ πτα λαβν κλισηνδε φερομην, if we were now contending in honour of any other (than Patroclus), I should take the first prize and bear it to my tent. Twice we have the optative with ν in apodosis with the regular imperfect or aorist indicative (past) in the protasis: Il. ii. 80, ε μν τς τν νειρον λλος νισπεν, ψεδς κεν φαμεν κα νοσφιζομεθα μλλον, if any other had told the dream, we should call it a lie and rather turn away from it; and the same apodosis after ε τς μ λλος κλευεν, in Il. xxiv. 222. In Od. ii. 184, οκ ν τσσα θεοπροπων γρευες, οδ κε Τηλμαχον κεχολωμνον δ νιεης, we have first the imperfect with ν as a past apodosis, (in that case) you would not have made this speech with all its divination; and then the present optative with κ as present, nor would you be urging Telemachus on, as you now are; both referring to an unfulfilled past condition, if you had perished, suggested by καταφθσθαι φελες in vs. 183.

[*] 439. See the corresponding use of the present optative in Homer to express an unaccomplished present wish (739). In both wishes and conditional sentences, it must be remembered, the use of the optative in its ordinary future sense is completely established in Homer. See examples in 455 and 722.

[*] 440. Optative in past unreal Apodosis.) Homer has four cases of the optative with κ (three aorist and one present) in the apodosis referring to the past, with the regular indicative in the protasis expressing a past unfulfilled condition. These are—

Κα ν κεν νθ πλοιτο ναξ νδρν Ανεας, ε μ ρ ξ νησε Δις θυγτηρ φροδτη, Aeneas would have perished, had not Aphrodite quickly perceived him. Il. v. 311. Κα ν κεν νθ πλοιτο ρης τος πολμοιο, ε μ εριβοα ρμ ξγγειλεν. Il. v. 388. Ο κε θανντι περ δ καχομην, ε μετ ος ττροισι δμη Τρων ν δμ, I should not have felt so grieved if he had perished, θανντι (=ε θανεν) being further explained by ε . . . δμη. Od. i. 236. νθα κε εα φροι κλυτ τεχεα, ε μ ο γσσατο Φοβος πλλων, "he would easily have borne away the famous armour had not Phoebus Apollo grudged him." Il. xvii. 70. Here πλετο, καχομην, and φερε would be the regular forms even in Homer, corresponding to the regular protases.

[*] 441. In the transitional state of the Homeric language we see that the past tenses of the indicative had fully established themselves in the protasis of past unreal conditions, but not so thoroughly in the apodosis, where the optative occasionally occurs. In present unreal conditions, the optative alone is used in both protasis and apodosis.

[*] 442. Besides the full conditional sentences above quoted, we find in Homer many potential optatives with κ or ν which seem to belong to the borderland between past and future conclusions, and are not definitely fixed in the past (like the apodoses in 440) by a past tense in the protasis.

Such are especially φαης κε, as in Il. iii. 220, Il. xv. 697, and οδ κε φαης, as in Il. iv. 429, Il. xvii. 366, Od. iii. 124, Il. iii. 392. In the first four cases it seems most natural to translate them as past, you would have said, nor would you have said; but in the last two cases it is more natural to translate nor would you say (future), and so with φαην κεν, Il. vi. 285. But in the fluid state of the language which allowed both πλετ κε and πλοιτ κε to mean he would have perished, and φροι κε to mean both he would carry (fut.) and he would have carried, according to the protasis which was used with them, it is easy to understand how φαης κε (without a protasis) might have a vague potential force, you might perchance say, which could be felt as either past or future as the context demanded. We must, therefore, hold that the optative with κ in such cases expresses merely what could happen, without any limitations of time except such as are imposed by the context; and according to the limitations thus imposed we translate such optatives (with more exactness than they really possess) either as past or as future. In one case the feeling of past time is seen in the dependent verb: Il. v. 85, Τυδεδην δ οκ ν γοης ποτροισι μετεη, you would not have known to what side he belonged. (This occurs in the same book of the Iliad with both the examples of πλοιτ κε for πλετ κε.) Other examples are the following:—

Οκ ν πειτ δουσ γ ρσσειεν βροτς λλος, no other mortal could then vie with Ulysses (after a past verb). Il. iii. 223. νθ οκ ν βρζοντα δοις γαμμνονα δον. Il. iv. 223. νθ ο κεν α ππος σβαη, πεζο δ μενονεον ε τελουσιν (the connection with μενονεον gives σβαη a past direction). Il. xii. 58. νθα κ πειτα κα θνατς περ πελθν θησαιτο δν κα ταρφθεη φρεσν σιν. Od. v. 73. ς οκ ν λποιο νετερον ντισαντα, i.e. as you would not expect (?) a younger person to do. Od. vii. 293. Οδ κεν ρηξ κρκος μαρτσειεν. Od. xiii. 86. Further, compare Od. ix. 241 with Il. i. 271 and v. 303.

Homeric Usages in Herodotus and in Attic Greek.

[*] 443. a) Herodotus has a few cases of the potential optative with the same vague reference to time which has been noticed in Homer (442), and we may sometimes translate these, like those in Homer, by past expressions. E.g. Τχα δ ν κα ο ποδμενοι λγοιεν πικμενοι ς Σπρτην ς παιρεθεησαν π Σαμων, and perhaps those who sold it (the cup) might come to Sparta and tell that they had been robbed of it. HDT. i. 70 (see Stein's note). All that the optative itself seems to express is that this would be a natural story for them to tell. In vii. 214, εδεη μν γρ ν κα ν μ Μηλιες τατην τν τραπν ντης, ε τ χρρ πολλ μιληκς εη, for Onetes, even if he was not a Malian, might know this path, supposing him to have had much acquaintance with the country, the optative in protasis (expressing no condition contrary to fact) shows that εδεη ν is not felt to be past. See also vii. 180, τχα δ ν τι παροιτο; viii.

136, τυχόν ἢν προλγοί, might perhaps warn him; ix. 71, ταῦτα ἢν εἰποιεν, they might say this. For εἴησαν δὲ ἢν οἱτοί Κρῆτες, HDT. i. 2, and similar expressions, see 238.

■b) In EUR. Med. 568, “οἷδ’ ἢν σὺ φαίης εἰ σε μὲν κνύζοι λῆχος” , the condition seems to be present and contrary to fact, like εἰ μὲν κνύζεν. See also PLAT. Menex. 240 D, “ἢν τοῦτ’ δὲ ἢν τις γενόμενος γνοῖη οἱοί ῥα τῆγγανον ἢντες, κ.τ.λ.” Such examples are extremely rare in Attic Greek.

(b) Future Conditions: 1. Subjunctive or Future Indicative in Protasis with a future Apodosis.

[*] 444. When a supposed future case is stated distinctly and vividly (as if I shall go or if I go in English) the protasis generally takes the subjunctive with ἢν, ἢν, or ἢν (α_) (Epic εἰ κε or αἰ κε). The apodosis takes the future indicative or some other form expressing future time, to denote what will be the result if the condition of the protasis is fulfilled. E.g. ἢν τι λῆβω, δῶσω σοι, if I (shall) receive anything, I will give it to you. ἢν τι λῆβῃς, δῶς μοι, if you receive anything, give it to me. Εἰ δὲ κεν ἢς ῥξῖς καὶ τοι πεῖθονται ἢχαιοί, γνῶσθ’ ἢπειθῆ ἢς θῆ ἢγεμῶνων κακῖς ἢς τῆ νυ λαῖν, but if you shall do thus and the Achaeans obey you, you will then learn both which of the leaders and which of the soldiers is bad. Il. ii. 364. Αἰ κ’ αἰτῶν γνῶ νημερτῆα πῆντ’ ἢν ποντα, ἢσσω μιν χλαῖν ἢν τε χιτῶν τε, εἰματα καλῆ. Od. xvii. 549. So αἰ κε δῶσι, Il. i. 128. Εἰ μὲν κεν Μενῆλαον ἢλξάνδρος καταπῆφν, αἰτῖς ἢπειθῆ ἢλῆνην ἢχῆτω καὶ κτῆματα πῆντα, ἢμεῖς δὲ ἢν νῆεσσι νῆμεθα ποντοπῆροισιν: εἰ δὲ κ’ ἢλξάνδρον κτεῖν ἢ ξανθῖς Μενῆλαος, Τρῆας ἢπειθῆ ἢλῆνην καὶ κτῆματα πῆντ’ ἢποδοῖναι. Il. iii. 281. Here ἢχῆτω, νῆμεθα (subj. in exhortation), and ἢποδοῖναι (infin. for imperative) are in the apodosis. Αἰκα τῆνος ἢλ κερῶν τρῆγον, αἰγα τῆ λαῖν. THEOC. i. 4. ἢν δὲ τις ἢνθιστῆται, σῆν ἢμῆν πειρασῆμεθα χειροῖσθαι, if any one shall stand opposed to us, with your help we will try to overcome him. XEN. An. vii. 3, 11. Κῆν μὲ νῆν ἢθῆλωμεν ἢκεῖ πολεμῆν αἰτῆ, ἢνθῆδῆ ἢσως ἢναγκασθῆσῆμεθα τοῦτο ποιῆν, and if we shall not now be willing to fight him there, we shall perhaps be forced to do so here. DEM. iv. 50. (Here νῆν refers to time immediately following the present: if we are not now willing would be εἰ μὲ νῆν ἢθῆλωμεν.) ἢν γῆρ ταῦτα καλῖς ἢρισῆμεθα, ἢμεινον βουλευσῆμεθα καὶ περῆ τῆν ἢλλων. ISOC. viii. 18. ἢν δὲ τῆν εῆρῆνην ποιησῆμεθα, καὶ τοιοῦτους ἢμῖς αἰτοῖς παρῆσχωμεν, μετῆ πολλῖς ἢσφαλεῖας τῆν πῆλιν οἰκῆσομεν. Id. viii. 20. ἢν οἰν ἢς νῆν, πῆτε ἢσει οἰκοί; XEN. Cyr. v. 3, 27. Καὶ χρῆ αἰτοῖς, ἢν δῆ τι, and use them, if there shall be any need. Ib. v. 4, Ib. 30. ἢν μῆν πῆλεμον αῆρῆσθε, μηκῆτι ἢκετε δεῆρο ἢνευ ἢπλων, εἰ σωφρονῆτε: ἢν δὲ εῆρῆνης δοκῆτε δεῆσθαι, ἢνευ ἢπλων ἢκετε: ἢς δὲ καλῖς ἢξει τῆ ἢμῆτερα, ἢν φῆλοι γῆνησθε ἢμοῖ μελῆσει. Ib. iii. 2, Ib. 13. ἢν γῆρ τῆ σε φανῆ κακῆν πεποηκῖς, ἢμολογῆ ἢδικῆν: ἢν μῆντοι μηδῆν φαῖνωμαι κακῆν πεποηκῖς μηδῆ βουληθεῖς, οἰ καὶ σῆ αἰ μολογῆσεις μηδῆν ἢπῆ ἢμοῖ ἢδικῆσθαι; Ib. v. 5, Ib. 13. (Here ἢμολογῆ, I am ready to confess, refers to the future.) ἢν μῆ ἢ οἰ φιλῆσοφοί βασιλεῖσωσιν ἢ οἰ βασιλῖς φιλοσοφῆσωσιν, οἰκ ἢστι κακῆν παῖλα ταῖς πῆλεσιν, unless either the philosophers shall become kings or the kings philosophers, there is no escape from troubles for states. PLAT. Rep. 473D. Δῆδωσῆ κῆν κτεῖναι ἢαυτῆν, ἢν τῆδε ψευσθῆ λῆγων, “he offers himself willingly to suffer death in case he shall be proved false in this that he says.” SOPH. Ph. 1342. Μηχανῆτον, ἢν τε χρυσῆον ῆρακῖς ἢ πολῆ, μῆ ἢποδῆ τοῦτο, ἢν τε θανῆτου ἢξια ἢδικικῖς ἢ, ἢπως μῆ ἢποθανῆται, if he shall (prove to) have stolen much gold, we must contrive that he shall not restore it; and if he shall have committed crimes deserving death, that he

shall not die. PLAT. Gorg. 481 A (for the perfects see 103). $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\ \sigma\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota\upsilon\pi\omicron\ \pi\omicron\tau\ \phi\lambda\omega\mu\alpha\iota\ \chi\rho\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\ \kappa\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\ \pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\mu\eta\nu$, i.e. may I perish, if I ever take them away. AR. Ran. 586. (See 181.)

[*] 445. It will be seen that the apodosis here (444) may consist of any future expression,—the future indicative, the imperative, the subjunctive in exhortations and prohibitions, the infinitive in any future sense, the potential optative with $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$, or the optative in a wish. It may also contain a present indicative including a reference to the future, like $\chi\rho\omicron$ or $\delta\epsilon$ or the verbal in $\tau\omicron\omicron\varsigma$, or the present used emphatically for the future, like $\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma$ above quoted (444) from XEN. Cyr. v. 5, 13, or $\pi\alpha\lambda\ \sigma\tau\iota$ in PLAT. Rep. 473D.

[*] 446. The English, especially the colloquial language, seldom expresses the distinction between this form of the future condition and the present condition (402). Thus modern custom allows us to use the inexact expression if he wishes, not merely for $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, if he now wishes, but also for $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\ \beta\omicron\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, if he shall wish. The sense, however, generally makes the distinction in time clear.

It is worth noting that the Authorised Version of the English New Testament never uses forms like if he does, if he is, in either future or present conditions, even when the Greek has the present indicative with $\epsilon\mu$; but it has either the subjunctive or the future indicative in future conditions, and the subjunctive in present conditions. The Revised Version, on the other hand, admits the present indicative (as if he is) in present conditions, but not consistently. See LUC. xxiii. 35, $\epsilon\omicron\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, V. A. if he be Christ, R. V. if this is the Christ; but in MATTH. vi. 23, $\epsilon\omicron\ \omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\phi\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \nu\ \sigma\omicron\ \sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$, both versions have if therefore the light that is in thee be darkness. See also Cor. ii. v. 17.

[*] 447. **Future Indicative in Protasis.** The future indicative with $\epsilon\mu$ is often used in the protasis to express a future condition. This is a still stronger form of expression than the subjunctive, though it sometimes alternates with it in the same sentence. Both, however, correspond to the English if I shall do this, if I do this, etc. The future, as an emphatic form, is especially common when the condition contains a strong appeal to the feelings or a threat or warning.³⁶ It is thus a favourite construction with the tragedians. E.g. $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\r \chi\iota\lambda\lambda\epsilon\varsigma\ \omicron\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\ \tau\rho\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota\ \mu\alpha\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, $\omicron\delta\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\nu\nu\theta\ \xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\ \pi\omicron\delta\kappa\epsilon\alpha\ \Pi\eta\lambda\epsilon\omega\nu\alpha$, if Achilles shall fight alone against the Trojans, not even a little while will they keep back the swift son of Peleus. II. xx. 26. $\epsilon\delta\ \sigma\ \gamma\ \varsigma\ \pi\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu\ \pi\omega\lambda\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota$, $\tau\ \sigma\ \omega\ \iota\gamma\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu\ \pi\lambda\epsilon\mu\upsilon\nu\ \gamma\epsilon$, $\kappa\alpha\ \epsilon\ \chi\ \tau\omicron\r\omega\theta\iota\ \pi\omicron\theta\eta\alpha\iota$, if you shall mingle in the battle, verily do I believe you will shudder at the very name of battle, even if you hear it elsewhere (away from the war). II. v. 350. $\epsilon\delta\ \mu\omicron\iota\ \omicron\ \tau\omicron\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\ \beta\omicron\upsilon\nu\ \pi\iota\epsilon\iota\kappa\ \mu\omicron\iota\beta\upsilon\nu$, $\delta\omicron\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\varsigma\ \delta\alpha\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\ \nu\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota\ \phi\alpha\epsilon\nu\omega$, but if they do not pay me a proper requital for my cattle, I (the Sun) will descend to Hades and shine among the dead. Od. xii. 382. $\epsilon\delta\ \pi\rho\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\ \tau\iota\ \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \tau\upsilon\nu\ \beta\omicron\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\mu$, $\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\upsilon\nu\ \sigma\ \zeta\eta\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \lambda\beta\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \xi\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\tau\iota$, and if besides he shall still end his life well, he is that happy man you are seeking. HDT. i. 32. $\lambda\lambda\ \epsilon\ \sigma\epsilon\ \mu\omicron\r\psi\epsilon\iota\ \psi\omicron\phi\omicron\varsigma$, $\lambda\lambda\ \omicron\r\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\chi\alpha$, but if the judgment shall lay hold of you, you will soon tell another story. AESCH. Eum. 597. See AESCH. Prom. 311, Sept. 196, Suppl. 472, Sept. 474, Sept. 924, Cho. 683. $\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \lambda\lambda\ \xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\chi\theta\alpha\r\epsilon\ \mu\upsilon\nu\ \xi\ \mu\omicron\omicron$. SOPH. Ant. 93. See Ant. 229, Ant. 324, O. T. 843, 846, O. C. 628, Ph. 75, El. 465, El. 834, El. 1004. $\epsilon\tau\delta\ \omicron\r\kappa\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\kappa\varsigma\ \phi\alpha\nu\epsilon$, if you did this man, you will appear base. EUR. Hec. 1233. “ $\mu\zeta\eta\nu$, $\epsilon\ \mu\ \phi\sigma\gamma\alpha\nu\omicron\nu\ \sigma\pi\sigma\omega$ ” Id. Or. 1147. See Id. Hec. 802, Id. Or. 157, Id. Or. 272, Id. Or.

1212, Id. Med. 346, Id. Med. 352, Id. Med. 381. Ε μ καθξεις γλσσαν, σται σοι κακ. Aeg. EUR. Fr. 5. Ε δ μ τοτ πιδεξει, πς χρ τατ τ προκλσει προσχειν μς τν νοv. DEM. xxvii. 52. Ε δ μες λλο τι γνσεσθε, μ γνοιτο, τνα οεσθε ατν ψυχv ξειν; but if you shall give any other judgment, etc. Id. xxviii. 21. (Referring to the same thing, Id. xxvii. 67, Demosthenes had said νν γρ ποφγ με οτος, μ γνοιτο, τν πωβελαν φλσω.) ν θλωμεν ποθνσκειν πρ τν δικαων, εδοκιμσομεν: ε δ φοβησμεθα τος κινδvους, ες πολλς ταραχς καταστσομεν μς ατος. ISOC. vi. 107. Here what is feared is expressed by the emphatic future as a warning, while the alternative that is preferred has the subjunctive. See also DEM. xviii. 176, where ε προαιρσομεθ μες, ε τι δσκολον ππρακται Θηβαοις πρς μς, τοτου μεμvσθαι, if we shall prefer to remember every unpleasant thing the Thebans have ever done to us, is vividly stated by the future, as this is the course which the orator specially fears and wishes to warn the people against; while he puts his own proposition into the milder subjunctive form, ν μvντοι πεισθτ μοκα πρς τ σκοπεv λλ μ φιλονεικεv γνησθε. See also ISOC. xv. 130. In other cases it is difficult to detect any distinction, as in DEM. xxvii. 67 and xxviii. 21 (above), and in HDT. i. 71; cf. Il. i. 135 and 137.

[*] 448. The future in protasis is also appropriately used when a future apodosis is implied in a past tense; as in SOPH. OT 843, ε λξει τν ατν ριθμv, οκ γ κτvον, if he shall tell the same number (it will follow that) I did not kill him. So EUR. Med. 1249.

[*] 449. This use of the future must be distinguished from its use in present conditions (407), where it is equivalent to μλλω and the infinitive and cannot be interchanged with the subjunctive.

Homeric Peculiarities. In the Homeric language the following peculiarities appear in this construction:—

[*] 450. By far the most common Homeric form with the subjunctive in future conditions is ε κε, often ε μv κε, ε δ κε, etc. (218). ν also is frequent, being the only Homeric contraction of ε v. Ε δ v occurs in Il. iii. 288, and ε περ v in Il. v. 224 and 232. ν περ γρ κ θλωσιν is found in Od. xviii. 318.

[*] 451. Ε κε or α κε is sometimes found even with the future indicative in Homer. E.g. Α κεv νευ μθεν λου πεφιδσεται οδ θελσει κπρσαι, στω τοτο. Il. xv. 213. (See 196.)

[*] 452. The subjunctive with κ is sometimes used in the apodosis instead of the future indicative, thus making the apodosis correspond in form to the protasis. E.g. Ε δ κε μ δσσιν, γ δ κεν ατς λωμαι, and if he do not give her up, I will take her myself. Il. i. 324 (compare i. 137). This gives a form with two subjunctives analogous to that which has the optative in both protasis and apodosis (460). See 399. (For δ in apodosis see 512.) For the Epic use of the future indicative with κ or v in apodosis, see 196.

[*] 453. The simple ε (without κ or v) is sometimes used with the subjunctive in future conditions in Homer, apparently in the same sense as ε κε or v. E.g. Ε περ γρ σ κατακτv, ο σ τ γ γε κλασομαι. Il. xxii. 86. Ε δ α τις ασι θεv v οvοπι πvτ, τλσομαι v στθεσσιν χων ταλαπενθα θυμv. Od. v. 221. So Il. i. 341, Il. v. 258, Il. xii. 223, Il. 245; Od. i. 204, Od. i. 188, Od. xii. 348. Only these nine cases occur, and the more

common use of the simple ε with the subjunctive in Homer is in general suppositions (see 468).

[*] 454. 1. This Homeric use of the simple ε with the subjunctive in future conditions was allowed by poetic license in a few passages of the Attic drama, chiefly in tragedy, even in the dialogue. E.g. “Ε γρ θνς κα τελευτσας φς.” SOPH. Aj. 496. “Δυστλαινα τρ γ ε σου στερηθ.” Id. O.C. 1443. So Ant. 887. “Ε μ σ κφγω κ τσδε τς γς, οδποτε βισομαι.” AR. Eq. 698. So AESCH. Pers. 791; EUR. Or. 1534, I. A. 1240, “ε πεισθς” (MSS.); all in dialogue. In Sappho 118. 1A, we have α τις ρηται.

2. In Attic prose, this construction is extremely rare and always doubtful. The MSS., however, have it in a few passages, as THUC. vi. 21: Ο ναυτικς στρατικς μνον δε, λλ κα πεζν πολν ζυμπλεν, λλωσ τε κα ε ζυστσιν α πλιεις φοβηθεσαι. (Here a few inferior MSS. read ν.) 2. Optative in Protasis and Apodosis.

[*] 455. When a supposed future case is stated less distinctly and vividly than the subjunctive would state it (as if I should go in English), the protasis takes the optative with ε. The apodosis takes the optative with ν to denote what would be the result if the condition of the protasis should be fulfilled. E.g. Ε λθοι, πντν δοι, if he should go, he would see all. Ε σ οτως θλοι φιλειν κδοιτ τε θυμ, τ κν τις κνων γε κα κλελθοιτο γμοιο, if she should be willing thus to love you, etc., then some of them would cease even to think of marriage. Od. iii. 223. κεν γηθσαι Πραμος Πριμοι τε παδες, λλοι τε Τρες μγα κεν κεχαροατο θυμ, ε σφιν τδε πντα πυθοατο μαρναμνουιν. Il. i. 255. λλ ε μο τι πθοιο, τ κεν πολ κρδιον εη. Il. vii. 28. “Εης φορητς οκ ν, ε πρσσοις καλς,” “you would not be bearable if you should ever be in prosperity.” AESCH. Prom. 979. Οκος δ ατς, ε φογγν λβοι, σαφστατ ν λξειεν. Id. Ag. 37. Οδ γρ ν Μδοκς με βασιλες παινοη, ε ξελανοιμι τος εεργτας. XEN. An. vii. 7, 11. Οδ ε πντες λθοιεν Πρσαι, πλθει γε οχ περιβαλομεθ ν τος πολεμους. Id. Cyr. ii. 1, Id. Cyr. 8. Ο πολλν ν λογα εη, ε φοβοτο τν θνατον τοιοτος; PLAT. Phaed. 68B. Ε δ τις τος κρατοντας το πλθους π ρετν προτρψειεν, μφοτρρους ν νσειε. ISOC. ii. 8. Ε τις τν σοι συνντων παρθεη ποιεν σ τυγχνεις ελογν, πς οκ ν θλιτατος εη; Id. xi. 47. Πς ον οκ ν: ο κτρτατα πντων γ πεπονθς εην, ε μ ψηφσαιντο εναι ξνον; how then should I not have suffered (lit. be hereafter in the condition of having suffered) the most pitiable of all things, if they should vote me a foreigner? DEM. lvii. 44. (See 103 for other examples of the perfect optative.)

[*] 456. This form of the conditional sentence in its fully developed use, as it appears in Attic Greek, must be carefully distinguished from that of 410; the more so, as we often translate both εη ν and ν ν by the same English expression, it would be; although the latter implies that the supposition of the protasis is a false one, while the former implies no opinion of the speaker as to the truth of the supposition. We have seen (438-440) that the more primitive Homeric language had not yet fully separated these two constructions, and still used the optative in the apodosis of present, and sometimes of past, unreal conditions. On the other hand, the distinction between this form and that of 444 is less marked, and it is sometimes of slight importance which of the two is used. As it is often nearly indifferent in English whether we say if we shall go (or if we go) it will be well, or if we should go it would be well, so may it be in Greek whether we say ν λθωμεν καλς ξει or ε λθοιμεν καλς ν χοι. In writing Greek, this distinction can generally be

[*] 462. In present or past general suppositions, the apodosis expresses a customary or repeated action or a general truth in present or past time, and the protasis refers in a general way to any act or acts of a given class. Here the protasis has the subjunctive with **■** after present tenses, and the optative with **ε** after past tenses. The apodosis has the present or imperfect indicative, or some other form which implies repetition. E.g. **■** **■**γγ**■**ς **■**λθ**■** θ**■**νατος, ο**■**δε**■**ς βο**■**λεται θ**■**ν**■**σκειν, if (or when) death comes near, no one is (ever) willing to die. EUR. Alc. 671. **■**ν μ**■**ν **■**δ**■** κα**■** ν**■**φουσι, χρ**■**ωνται α**■**τ**■**: **■**ν δ**■** μ**■** **■**δ**■**, μετιε**■**σι. HDT. i. 133. Διατελε**■** μισ**■**ν, ο**■**κ **■**ν τ**■**ς τι α**■**τ**■**ν **■**δικ**■**, **■**λλ**■** **■**ν τ**■**να **■**ποπτε**■**σ**■** βελτ**■**ονα **■**αυτο**■** ε**■**ναι, he continues to hate, not if any one wrongs him, but if he ever suspects that any one is better than himself. XEN. Cyr. v. 4, 35. **■**πας λ**■**γος, **■**ν **■**π**■** τ**■** πρ**■**γματα, μ**■**ται**■**ν τι φα**■**νεται κα**■** κεν**■**ν, all speech, if deeds are wanting, appears mere emptiness and vanity. DEM. ii. 12. **■**ν δ**■** δ**■**ξ**■** τ**■** δ**■**καια **■**γκαλε**■**ν κα**■** **■**λλ**■** τ**■**ν δεδρακ**■**τα το**■** φ**■**νου, ο**■**δ**■** ο**■**τω κ**■**ριος γ**■**γνεται το**■** **■**λ**■**ντος. Id. xxiii. 69 (so 74, Id. 75, Id. 76).

■λλ**■** ε**■** τι μ**■** φ**■**ροιμεν, **■**τρυνεν φ**■**ρειν, but if we ever stopped bringing him food, he always urged us to bring it. EUR. Alc. 755. Ε**■** τις **■**ντε**■**ποι, ε**■**θ**■**ς τεθ**■**κει, if any one objected, he was a dead man at once (52). THUC. viii. 66. Ε**■** τ**■**να πυνθ**■**νοιτο **■**βρ**■**ζοντα, το**■**τον **■**δικα**■**ευ. HDT. i. 100. Ε**■** δ**■** τ**■**νας θορυβου**■**νους α**■**σθ**■**ι- το, τ**■** α**■**τιον το**■**του σκοπ**■**ν κατασβεν**■**ναι τ**■**ν ταραχ**■**ν **■**πειρ**■**το, whenever he saw any making a disturbance, he always tried, etc. XEN. Cyr. v. 3, 55. Ο**■**κ **■**πελε**■**πετο **■**τι α**■**το**■**, ε**■** μ**■** τι **■**ναγκα**■**ον ε**■**η, he never left him, unless there was some necessity for it. Id. Mem. iv. 2, Id. Mem. 40. **■**ν το**■**ς μ**■**ν **■**φθαλμο**■**ς **■**πικο**■**ρημα τ**■**ς χ**■**νος, ε**■** τις μ**■**λαν τι **■**χων πρ**■** τ**■**ν **■**φθαλμ**■**ν πορε**■**οιτο, τ**■**ν δ**■** ποδ**■**ν ε**■** τις κ**■**νο**■**το. Id. An. iv. 5, Id. An. 13. **■**πειδ**■** δ**■** ε**■**δον α**■**τ**■**ν τ**■**χιστα, συλλαβ**■**ντες **■**γουσιν **■**ντικρ**■**ς **■**ς **■**ποκτενο**■**ντες, ο**■**περ κα**■** το**■**ς **■**λλους **■**π**■**σφαττον ε**■** τ**■**να λ**■**στ**■**ν **■**κακο**■**ργον συλλ**■**βοιεν, i.e. where they had been in the habit of killing any others whom they took. LYS. xiii. 78.

[*] 463. This optative referring to past time must be especially distinguished from the optative in ordinary protasis referring to the future (455). Ε**■** and **■**ν in this construction are often almost equivalent to **■**τε or **■**ταν (which are the more common expressions), and the protasis has precisely the same construction as the relative sentences of 532.

[*] 464. The present and aorist subjunctive and optative here do not differ except as explained in 87. The future optative of course is never used here (128).

[*] 465. The examples in 462 exhibit the ordinary Attic usage. In Homer we find this construction in a partially developed state: see 468.

[*] 466. The gnomic aorist (154) and other gnomic and iterative expressions (162; 163) may be used in the apodosis of these general conditions. The gnomic aorist, as a primary tense, is followed by the subjunctive. E.g. **■**ν σφαλ**■**σιν, **■**ντελπ**■**σαντες **■**λλα **■**πλ**■**ρωσαν τ**■**ν χρε**■**αν, if they fail, they always supply the deficiency, etc. THUC. i. 70. **■**ν δ**■** τις το**■**των τι παραβα**■**ν**■**, ζημ**■**αν α**■**το**■**ς **■**π**■**θεσαν, they (always[■] impose a penalty upon every one who transgresses. XEN. Cyr. i. 2, 2. Ε**■** τ**■**νες **■**δοι**■**ν π**■** το**■**ς σφετ**■**ρους **■**πικρατο**■**ντας, **■**νεθ**■**ρσησαν **■**ν, whenever any saw their friends in any way victorious, they would be encouraged (i.e. they were encouraged in all such cases). THUC. vii. 71. See XEN. Mem. iv. 6, 13, quoted in 162.

[*] 467. ■Indicative.) The indicative is sometimes found in the place of the subjunctive or optative in these general conditions, that is, these follow the construction of ordinary present and past suppositions, as in Latin and English. Here the speaker refers to one of the cases in which the event may occur, as if it were the only one,—that is, he states the general supposition as if it were particular. E.g.

Μο■ραι δ■ ■φ■σταντ■, ε■ τις ■χθρα π■λει ■μογ■νοις, α■δ■ καλ■ψαι, the Fates stand aloof to hide their shame, if there is enmity among kindred. PIND. Py. iv. 145; cf. Ol. i. 64. (See 406.) Ε■ τις δ■ο ■ κα■ πλ■ους τις ■μ■ρας λογ■ζεται, μ■ται■ς ■στιν, if any one ever counts upon two or even more days, he is a fool. SOPH. Tr. 944. ■λευθ■ρωσ πολιτε■ομεν, ο■ δ■ ■ργ■ς τ■ν π■λας, ε■ καθ■ ■δον■ν τι δρ■, ■χοντες, i.e. not (having a habit of) being angry with our neighbour if he ever acts as he pleases. THUC. ii. 37. (Here the indicative δρ■ is used as if some particular act of one neighbour, and not any act of any neighbour, were in mind.) Ε■ γ■ρ τις ■ν δημοκρατ■ ■ τετιμη■νος τολμ■ βοηθε■ν το■ς παρ■νομα γρ■φουσιν, καταλ■ει τ■ν πολιτε■αν ■φ■ ■ς τετ■μηται. AESCHIN. iii. 196. Ε■ τ■ς τι ■πηρ■τα, ■πεκρ■νοντο, if any one asked anything, they replied (to all such). THUC. vii. 10. ■μ■σει ο■κ ε■ τις κακ■ς π■σχων ■μυνετο, ■λλ■ ε■ τις ε■εργετο■μενος ■χ■ριστος φα■νοιτο. Xen. Ag. xi. 3. Here, without any apparent reason, the writer changes from the indicative to the optative. (See 534.) Homeric and Other Poetic Peculiarities.

[*] 468. In Homer the subjunctive appears in protasis in general suppositions (462) only nineteen times, and the optative only once. Here the subjunctive generally (in fourteen cases) has the simple ε■ (without κ■ or ■ν). E.g. Ε■ περ γ■ρ τε χ■λον γε κα■ α■τ■μαρ καταπ■ψ■, ■λλ■ γε κα■ μετ■πισθεν ■χει κ■τον, ■φρα τελ■σσ■, for even if he swallows his wrath for the day, still he keeps his anger hereafter, until he accomplishes its object. Il. i. 81. Τ■ν ο■ τι μετατρ■πομ■ ο■δ■ ■λεγ■ζω, ε■ τ■ ■π■ δεξ■ ■ωσι, ε■ τ■ ■π■ ■ριστερ■, I do not heed them nor care for them, whether they go to the right or to the left. Il. xii. 238. So Il. iv. 262, Il. x. 225, Il. xi. 116, Il. xvi. 263, Il. xxi. 576, Il. xxii. 191 (the last four in similes); Od. i. 167, Od. vii. 204, Od. xii. 96, Od. xiv. 373, Od. xvi. 98 (= 116).

■ν ποτε δασμ■ς ■κηται, σο■ τ■ γ■ρας πολ■ μεζον, if ever a division comes, your prize is always much greater. Il. i. 166. So Od. xi. 159, ■ν μ■ τις ■χ■. Besides these two cases of ■ν, Homer has two of ε■ κε, Il. xi. 391, Il. xii. 302; and one of ε■ περ ■ν, Il. iii. 25 (five in all). The single case of ε■ with the optative in a past general condition in Homer is Il. xxiv. 768: ■λλ■ ε■ τ■ς με κα■ ■λλος ■ν■πτοι, ■λλ■ σ■ τ■ν γε κατ■ρυκες, but if any other upbraided me, you (always) restrained him.

[*] 469. Pindar has only eight cases of the subjunctive in protasis. These all have general suppositions and all have the simple ε■;38 as πολλο■ δ■ μ■μνανται, καλ■ν ε■ τι ποναθ■, but many remember it if a noble work is done, Ol. vi. 11.

[*] 470. The other lyric and elegiac poets show no preference for the simple ε■. The following cases may be cited: CALL. i. 13 ε■ ■ (but ■ν in 17); TYRT. xii. 35 ε■ φ■γ■ (but ■ν xi. 16); SOL. iv. 30 ε■ ■? (but ■ν xii. 1, SOL. xiii. 29); THEOG. 121, THEOG. 122 ε■ λελ■θ■ . . . ■χ■, and 321 ε■ ■π■σσ■ (but ■ν 93, THEOG. 186, THEOG. 379, THEOG. 697, THEOG. 929, THEOG. 932, THEOG. 1355, THEOG. 1356, THEOG. 1385); all (both ε■ and ■ν) in general conditions. See SIM. AMORG. vii. 15, THEOG. 69, THEOG. 97 (■ν).

[*] 471. In the Attic poets we find a few cases of the simple ε in general conditions. E.g. ἄλλ' ἄνδρα, κέ τις σοφός, τὸ μανθάνειν πᾶλλ' ἀσχροῦν ὀδὸν καὶ τὸ μὲν εἶναι ἴγαν. SOPH. Ant. 710. So SOPH. Aj. 521; O. T. 198, SOPH. Aj. 874; O. C. 509; AESCH. Supp. 91, AESCH. Eum. 234. For the simple ε in future conditions, see 453; 454. For the probable relation of ε to ε κε, ἔν, ἔνν, etc., see 401.

Peculiar Forms of Conditional Sentences: Substitution and Ellipsis in Protasis.—Protasis without a Verb.

[*] 472. Often the protasis is not expressed in its regular form with ε or ἔνν, but is contained in a participle, or implied in an adverb like ὁτωσ or δικαίως, in a preposition with its case, or in some other form of expression. When a participle represents the protasis (841), its tense is always that in which the verb itself would have stood in the indicative, subjunctive, or optative. The present (as usual) includes the imperfect, and the perfect includes the pluperfect. E.g. Τοῦτο ποιοῦντες ἐπιξοῦσιν (i.e. ἔνν ποιῶσιν), if they (shall) do this, they will prosper. Τοῦτο ποιῶσαντες ἐπιξοῦσιν (i.e. ἔνν ποιῶσιν). Τοῦτο ποιοῦντες εἴ ἔνν προῦτοιεν (i.e. εἴ ποιοῦεν), if they should do this, they would prosper. Τοῦτο ποιῶσαντες εἴ ἔνν προῦτοιεν (i.e. εἴ ποιοῦσαιεν). Τοῦτο ποιοῦντες εἴ ἔνν πράττον (i.e. εἴ ποιοῦον), if they were doing this (or if they had been doing this), they would be in prosperity. Τοῦτο ποιῶσαντες εἴ ἔνν πράττον (i.e. εἴ ποιοῦσαν), if they had done this, they would be in prosperity.

“Πῶς δὲτα δίκης ὀψης Ζεὺς ὀκῶ πᾶλλωλεν τὸν πατὴρ ἄτο δσας;” “i.e. how is it that Zeus has not been destroyed, if Justice exists?” AR. Nub. 904. (Here δίκης ὀψης represents ε δίκη ὀστν.) ἄλλ' ἐσμεσθα δμους παραστεχοντες (ἔνν παραστεχόμεν), but we shall know, if we enter the house. SOPH. Ant. 1255. Σὺ δὲ κλῶν εσει τῆχα (ἔνν κλῶς), but you will soon know, if you listen. AR. Av. 1390. So μὲ μαθῶν, unless I learn, for ἔνν μὲ μῦθω, AR. Nub. 792. Καὶ κεν τοῦτ' ἔθλοισιμι Διὶς γε διδόντος ῤσθαι (Διὶς δδόντος = ε Ζεὺς διδοῦη), and this I should like to obtain, if Zeus would only give it. Hom. Od. i. 390. Τοιαῦτα τὸν γυναιξὶ συνναῶν ῤχοις (εἴ συνναῶις), such things would you suffer, if you should live with women. Sept. 195. Ὀδὲ ἔνν σιωπῶσαιμι τὸν τὴν ῤρὸν στεχουσαν ὀστος (i.e. εἴ ῤρῆν). SOPH. Ant. 185. ἔθηνᾶων δὲ τ' ἄτ' τοῦτο παθόντων, διπλασᾶν ἔνν τὸν δναμιν ἐκῆζεσθαι (ὀμμαι), but if the Athenians should ever suffer this (παθόντων = εἴ πῦθαιεν), I think it would be inferred that their power was twice as great. THUC. i. 10. (Here only the context shows that παθόντων does not represent ε πᾶθον, if they had ever suffered.) Πρὸν γενῶσθαι πῶστησεν ἔνν τις ῤκοσας (i.e. εἴ ῤκουσεν), before it happened, any one would have disbelieved such a thing if he had heard it. THUC. vii. 28. Ὀ γῤρ ἔνν μεταπεῦθαι μῦς ῤζῶται μὲ τοιαῦτης ὀψης τῶς ῤπαρχῶσης ῤπολῦψεως, for he would not be seeking to change your minds, if such were not the prevailing opinion (i.e. εἴ μὲ τοιαῦτη ἔνν). DEM. xviii. 228. ὀστιν ὀν πῶς ταῦτ' ἔνν, ῤκεῖνα προειρηκῶς, ῤ ἄτῶς ἔνν ῤρ μὲ διαφθαρεῶς τῶλμησεν ἐπεῖν; is it possible then that the same man, after saying that, would have dared to say this unless he had been corrupted (εἴ μὲ διεφθῤρη;? Id. xix. 308. Μὲ κατηγορῶσαντος Ἀσχνου μηδὲν ῤξω τῶς γραφῶς ὀδὲ ἔνν γῤ λῶγον ὀδῶνα ῤποιοῦμην ῤτερον (εἴ μὲ κατηγορῶσεν). Id. xviii. 34. Τ' ἄτ' ἔνν πρᾶξε καὶ πρῶτη λαχοῶσα (i.e. εἴ πρῶτη ῤλαχεν), it (the soul) would have done the same, even if it had had the first choice by the lot. PLAT. Rep. 620D. “Μαμμῶν δὲ ἔνν ἄτῶσαντος ῤκῶν σοι φῤρων ἔνν ῤρτον,” “and if you ever asked for something to eat, I used to come bringing you bread.” AR. Nub. 1383. (Here ἄτῶσαντος represents ε ἄτῶσειας in a

general supposition, AR. Nub. 462. For κόν ν see 162.)

Οτε σθουσι πλεω δνανται φρειν, διαρραγεεν γρ ν: οτ μφιννυνται πλεω δνανται φρειν, ποπνιγεεν γρ ν, they do not eat more than they can bear, for (if they should) they would burst, etc. XEN. Cyr. viii. 2, 21. Ατο ν πορεθησαν ολλοι: τ δ ποζγια οκ ν λλλ τ τ κβναι, “they would have gone themselves where the others went; but the animals could not go otherwise than as they did.” Id. An. iv. 2, Id. An. 10. So γρ ν λωβσαιο, Il. i. 232.

μν δ ξ πολλς ν περιουσας νεν μλις τοτο πρχε κα μ νανακαζομνοις, σπερ νν, πσαις φυλσσειν, but we should hardly have this advantage if we had a great superiority in number of ships (= ε πολλν περιουσαν εχομεν) and if we were not compelled (ε μ νανακαζμεθα), as we are, to use our whole fleet in guarding. THUC. vii. 13. Τ μν π κενν πολλκικς ν διελθησαν, if it had depended on him, they often would have been disbanded. ISOC. iv. 142. Τι γε μς ατος πλαι ν πολλειτε, if it had depended on yourselves, you would long ago have been ruined. DEM. xviii. 49. (So sometimes καθ μς.) Πλαι γρ ν νεκ γε ψηφισμτων δεδκει δκην, for, if decrees were of any avail, he would long ago have suffered punishment. Id. iii. 14. (Here the protasis is implied in νεκα ψηφισμτων.) Οτω γρ οκτι το λοιπο πσχοιμεν ν κακς, “for in that case we should no longer suffer.” Id. iv. 15. So οτω περιγενμενος ν, XEN. An. i. 1, 10. Οδ ν δικαως κς κακν πσοιμ τι. SOPH. Ant. 240. In such cases the form of the apodosis generally shows what form of protasis is implied. When the apodosis is itself expressed by an infinitive or participle (479), as in THUC. i. 10 (above), the form of the protasis is shown only by the general sense of the passage.

[*] 473. The future participle is not used to represent the future indicative in future conditions (447); it may, however, represent the future in present conditions (407), where it is equivalent to μλλω and the infinitive; as in DEM. xxiv. 189, μ περ τοτων μν οσντων τν ψφον, τ δε τατα λγοντα νοχλεν με ννν; if you are not to give your vote about this, μ οσντων representing ε μ οσετε = ε μ μλλετε φρειν. The present and aorist participles, when they represent the present and aorist subjunctive, express future conditions, thus making the future participle unnecessary. The aorist participle in protasis can always represent an aorist subjunctive in the sense explained in 90.

[*] 474. The verb of the protasis is suppressed in the Homeric ε δ γε, come now! This is commonly explained by an ellipsis of βολει, if you will, come now! But it is probable that no definite verb was in the speaker’s mind in such expressions, even when we find it necessary to supply one. E.g. Ε δ γε, τοι κεφαλ κατανεσομαι, “come now! I will nod my assent to thee.” Il. i. 524. Ε δ γε μν, περησαι, να γνωσι κα οδε, well! come now, try it. Il. i. 302. Ε μν δ θες σσι θεο τε κλυες αδς, ε δ γε μοι κα κενον ιζυρν κατλεξον (the apodosis being introduced by ε δ γε, come now, tell me). Od. iv. 831.

[*] 475. (ς ε.) There is a probably unconscious suppression of the verb of the protasis when ε or κς ε τε is used in comparisons (especially in Homer) with a noun or adjective or with a participle. E.g. Τν νες κειαι κς ε πτερν ννημα, their ships are swift as (if a wing or thought. Od. vii. 36. κς μ σφηλον ρεξεν τρεδης κς ε τιν τμητον μετανστην, for the son of Atreus insulted me like (i.e. as if he were insulting) some despised wanderer. Il. ix. 648.

πλομεν βορρην μνηδως ε τε κατνον, we sailed on with the northeast wind easily, as if (we were sailing) down stream. Od. xiv. 253. In all these cases no definite verb was in mind after ε, but the addition of ε to ζ shows that a conditional force was felt (at least originally) in addition to the comparison; and this is the only difference between these examples and those with the simple ζ or ζ τε, as στκειν ζ τς τε λων, he stood like a lion.³⁹ In Attic poetry we find μηρ σε τις πιστ, like some faithful mother, SOPH. El. 234; and πτσας σε τε δυσμεν, spurning her as an enemy, Ant. 653. With Hom. Od. vii. 36 compare Hymn. Py. Ar. 8, “πρζ λυμπον στε νημα εσι”, and 270, “π ν α νημ ζ λτο πτεσθαι”.

λοφυρμενοι ζ ε θανατνδε κιντα, bewailing him as if going to his death (in full as if they were bewailing him going), for which we say (changing the construction) as if he were going. Il. xxiv. 328. See also Il. xvi. 192, Il. v. 374. μφ δ καπνζ γγεται ζ ατς ζ ε πυρζ αθομνοιο, i.e. the smoke rises from it (the fountain) as if (it rose from a blazing fire. Il. xxii. 150. So Od. xix. 39. What seems like a more natural construction with ζ ε or ζ ε τε is that of the optative with the apodosis suppressed (485). In all these cases there is also a suppression of the verb of the apodosis (see 485). For the participle in such expressions see 867-869.

[*] 476. Ε μ.) Ε μ is used without a verb in various expressions to introduce an exception.

1. With nouns and adjectives. E.g. Τς γρ τοι χαιν λλος μοος, ε μ Πτροκλος; who is like to you, except (unless it be) Patroclus? Il. xvii. 475. See Il. xviii. 192, Il. xxiii. 792; Od. xii. 325, Od. xvii. 383. Such expressions are like the simple ε τ γ μεινον, if this is better, Il. i. 116; ε τε ν περ, Il. xiv. 125; ε περ ν γκη, Il. xxiv. 667.

2. With participles. E.g. “Ε μ κρεμσας τ νημα,” “i.e. I could never have done it, except by suspending thought.” AR. Nub. 229. So οδν ποτ ε μ ξυνθανουμνην, AESCH. Ag. 1139; ε μ καταδσαντες, THUC. vii. 38; ν μ τς δεας δοθεσης, DEM. xxiv. 46.

3. In the expression ε μ δι τοτο (or τοτον). E.g. Κα ε μ δι τν πρτανιν, ν πεσεν ν, and, had it not been for the Prytanis, he would have been thrown in. PLAT. Gorg. 516E. (Compare δι γε μς, DEM. xviii. 49, quoted in 472.) Ο γρ ζ ε μ δι Λακεδαιμονους, οδς ε μ Πρξενον οχ πεδξαντο, οδς ε μ δ γσιππον, οδς ε μ δι τ κα τ, σθησαν ν ο Φωκες, οχ οτω τε τε πγγειλεν, for he did not then report that if it had not been for the Lacedaemonians, or if they had not refused to receive Proxenus, or if it had not been for Hegesippus, or if it had not been for this and that, the Phocians would have been saved. DEM. xix. 74.

4. In the rare expression ε μ ε, except if, except in case that. E.g.

χρηματιστικς τν το τιμσθαι δονν τν το μανθνειν οδενς ξαν φσει ενοι, ε μ ε τι ατν ργριον ποιε, the money-maker will say that the pleasure of receiving honour or that of learning is not worth anything, unless (it is worth something) in case either of them produces money. PLAT. Rep. 581D. In Prot. 351C, “γ γρ λγω, καθ ζ δα στν, ρα κατ τοτο οκ γαθ, μ ε τι π ατν ποβσεται λλο;” —for I ask this: so far as they are pleasant, are they not just so far good, without taking into account any other result (i.e. other than their pleasantness) which may come from them?—μ is not a mistake for ε μ, but it seems to imply a conditional participle like πολογιζμενος (though no precise word can be supplied), very much as μ τι and μ πως imply a verb of saying (707). The meaning

clearly is, Are not things good just so far as they are pleasant, if we take no account of any other (i.e. unpleasant) element in them? This sense would hardly be found in the emended reading ε μ τ. In THUC. i. 17 the Cod. Vat. reads ε μ τ, although ε μ ε τ can be understood as in PLAT. Rep. 581 D (above).

[*] 477. Equivalent to ε μ ε (476, 4) is π λ ε, except if or unless, in which π λ ε represents the apodosis. E.g. Ο δ τ ν ματα ο ν τε α τ ν ε δ ναι, π λ ε τις κω μ διο ποι τς τυ γ γ νει ν, it is not possible to know even their names, except in case one happens to be a comedian. PLAT. Ap. 18 C.

[*] 478. In alternatives, ε δ μ, otherwise, regularly introduces the latter clause, even when the former clause is negative. Ε δ μ is much more common here than ν δ μ, even when ν μ ν with the subjunctive precedes. The formula ε δ μ was fixed in the sense of otherwise, in the other case, and no definite form of the verb was in mind.

“Π ρ ς τα τα μ τ π τ: ε δ μ, σ αυ τ ν πο τ α τ σ ει,” “therefore do not beat me; but if you do, you will have yourself to blame for it.” AR. Nub. 1433. Ε μ θ αν ο μ α γ: ε δ μ, ο λ ε ψ ω πο τ, if I do not die (I will leave the place); otherwise (if I die) I shall never leave it. And. 254. See SOPH. Tr. 587. Π λ ε μ ο κ ε ω ν πο ι ε ν: ε δ μ, κ α α το ν α γ κ α σ θ σ ε σ θ αι φ α σ α ν φ λ ο υ ς πο ι ε σ θ αι ο ο β ο λ ο ν τ αι, they said that otherwise (ε δ μ) they should be obliged, etc. THUC. i. 28. Ε π ο ν (Π αυ σ α ν) το κ ρ υ κ ο ς μ λ ε π ε σ θ αι: ε δ μ, π λ ε μ ο ν α τ Σ πα ρ τ ι τ α ς π ρ ο α γ ο ρ ε ει ν, they ordered him not to be left behind by the herald: and if he should be (ε δ μ), (they told him) that the Spartans declared war against him. Id. i. 131. Μ πο ι σ ς τα τα: ε δ μ, α τ αν ξ ει ς. XEN. An. vii. 1, 8. ν μ ν τ μ ν δο κ λ η θ ς λ γ ει ν, ξ υ νο μ ο λ ο γ σα τε: ε δ μ, π αν τ λ γ ν ν τι τε ν ε τε. PLAT. Phaed. 91 C. So ν μ ν πε σ η τε, . . . ε δ μ, κ.τ.λ., DEM. ix. 71.

Ε δ alone is sometimes used for ε δ μ; as in Symp. 212C, ε μ ν β ο λ ει, . . . ε δ. So ε δ ο ν (sc. μ), SOPH. Ant. 722, EUR. Hipp. 508. The potential optative and indicative with ν, so far as they are apodoses, might be classed here; but these have higher claims to be treated as independent sentences. See Chapter IV., Section I.

Substitution and Ellipsis in Apodosis.

[*] 479. The apodosis, in any of its forms, may be expressed by an infinitive or participle, if the structure of the sentence requires it.

1. It may be expressed by the infinitive or participle in indirect discourse, each tense representing its own tenses of the indicative or optative, the present including the imperfect, and the perfect the pluperfect. If the finite verb in the apodosis would have taken ν, this particle is used with the infinitive or participle. E.g. γ ο μ αι, ε το το πο ι ε τε, π ν τ α κα λ ς χ ει ν, I believe that, if you are doing this, all is well. γ ο μ αι, ν το το πο ι ε τε, π ν τ α κα λ ς ξ ει ν, I believe that, if you (shall) do this, all will be well. γ ο μ αι, ε το το πο ι ο τε, π ν τ α κα λ ς ν χ ει ν, I believe that, if you should do this, all would be well. γ ο μ αι, ε το το πο ι σα τε, π ν τ α κα λ ς ν χ ει ν, I believe that, if you had done this, all would now be (or would have been) well. Ο δ α μ ς, ν το το πο ι ε τε, ε π ρ ξ ο ν τ α ς, I know that, if you do this, you will prosper.

Πῶς γὰρ οἴεσθε δυσχερῶς κοῖνιν ἄλυνθους, εἰ τις τι λόγοι κατὰ Φιλίππου κατὰ κείνους τοῦ χρόνου; “how unwillingly do you think the O. heard it, if any one said anything against Philip in those times?” DEM. vi. 20. (Here κοῖνιν represents the imperfect κοῖνον, and εἰ λόγους is a general supposition, 462.) For examples of each tense of the infinitive and participle, see 689. For the use of each tense of the infinitive or participle with ἵναι and examples, see 204-208; 213-216.

2. It may be expressed by the infinitive in any of its various constructions out of indirect discourse, especially by one depending on a verb of wishing, commanding, advising, preparing, etc., from which the infinitive receives a future meaning. Such an infinitive is a common form of future apodosis with a protasis in the subjunctive or indicative. E.g. Βοῦλεται ἔλθην ἵναι τοῦτο γίνηται, he wishes to go if this shall be done. Παρασκευαζόμεθα ἐλθεῖν ἵναι δυνήμεθα, we are preparing to depart if we shall be able. Κελεύει σε ἐλθεῖν εἰ βούλει, he bids you depart if you please. (See 403 and 445.)

3. The apodosis may be expressed in an attributive or circumstantial participle. E.g. ὡς ἴσως ἴναι φεθεῖς εἰ καὶ μετρώς τι τούτων ποῖησε, προέλετο ποθανεῖν, whereas he might easily have been acquitted ἐφείθη ἵναι, if he had done any of these things even in a moderate degree, he chose to die. XEN. Mem. iv. 4, 4 Σκῆμματα τῶν ὡς ποκτιννόντων καὶ ἀναβιωσκομένων γὰρ ἵναι, εἰ οὐοῖ τε ἴσαν, “considerations for those who readily put men to death, and who would bring them to life again too if they could.” PLAT. Crit. 48C. (ἀναβιωσκομένων ἵναι = νεβίσκοντο ἵναι.) ἵς οὐκ ἴς τῶν σε σῆζειν εἰ θελον ἀλάσκειν χρέματα, “whereas I might have saved you if I had been willing to spend money.” Ib. 44B.

[*] 480. A verbal noun may take the place of an apodosis. E.g. ἵς ἵναι ἀσθητῶρα Καδμείων χθονῆς εἰ μὴ θεῖν τις ἔμποδῖν ἴστη δορῆ, as one who would have laid waste (= ἵναι ἴστησεν ἵναι) the Cadmeans’ land, if some one of the Gods had not stood in the way of his spear. Sept. 1015.

[*] 481. Other forms in which an apodosis may appear, as a final clause, need no discussion. (See 445.) In indirect discourse, after past tenses, an optative in the apodosis often represents an original indicative or subjunctive. (See 15 and 457.)

[*] 482. The apodosis is sometimes omitted, when some such expression as it is well or it will be done can be supplied, or when some other apodosis is at once suggested by the context. E.g. ἄλλο εἰ μὴ δῖσοις γὰρας μεγάλθυμοι χαίω, ἴρσαντες κατὰ θυμῶν, ἴπως ἵναι ἴξιον ἴσται,—εἰ δὲ κε μὴ δῖωσιν, ἴγὰρ δὲ κεν ἀτῆς ἴλωμαι, if they give me a prize,—well; but if they do not, I shall take one for myself. Il. i. 135. (Here we must understand something like εἰ ἴξει, it will be well, after ἴσται.) Εἰ περ γὰρ κῆθῆλῖσιν ἴλμπιος ἴστεροπητῆς ἴξ ἴδῶν στυφελῆξαι:—ἴ γὰρ πολὺ φῆρτατῆς ἴσται. Il. i. 580. (Here we must understand he can do it after the protasis. The following γὰρ refers to this suppressed apodosis.) Εἰ μὴ ἴγὰρ ἴμῆς ἴκανῆς διδῆσκω οὐοῖς δεῖ πρῆς ἴλλῆλους εἴναι:—εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ παρὰ τῶν προγεγεννημένων μανθῆνετε. XEN. Cyr. viii. 7, 24.

Εἴνοι πατρῖοι εἴχμεθῆ εἴναι, εἰ πῆρ τε γῆροντῆ εἴρηαι ἐπελθῶν Λαῆρτην, we boast that we are friends by inheritance, (as you may know) if you go and ask Laertes. Od. i. 187. “Προσηγορεῖθης ἴ Διῆς κλεινῆ δῆμαρ μῆλλουσῆ ἴσεσθῆ, εἰ τῶνδε προσσῆνει σῆ τι”

AESCH. Prom. 834 .

[*] 483. Sometimes the adverb **■ν**, without a verb expressed, represents an apodosis in the indicative or optative, when the verb can easily be supplied. E.g. “**Ο■ ο■κ■ται ■γκουσιν: ■λλ■ ο■κ ■ν πρ■ το■**” (sc. **ο■τως ■ρρεγκον**), “but they would not have been snoring at this late hour in old times.” AR. Nub. 5. (See 227.) So **π■ς γ■ρ ■ν**; (sc. **ε■η**), how could it be?

[*] 484. In **■σπερ ■ν ε■** with a noun, as **■σπερ ■ν ε■ πα■ς**, like a child, there is originally a suppression of the verbs of both protasis and apodosis (227; 485); but in use the expression hardly differs from **■σπερ**. (See 868-870.)

[*] 485. **■■ς ε■**, and **■σπερ ε■**.) There is an unconscious suppression of the verb of the apodosis when **■ς ε■**, **■ς ε■ τε**, and **■σπερ ε■** are used in similes and comparisons. E.g. **Λαο■ ■πονθ■, ■ς ε■ τε μετ■ κτ■λον ■σπετο μ■λα**, “the hosts followed as if sheep followed a ram.” Il. xiii. 492. (No definite verb is understood here, either with **■ς** in Greek or with **as** in English, but the origin of the expression is the same in both.) **Φι■λαν ■ς ε■ τις δωρ■σεται**. PIND. Ol. vii. 1. **Κα■ με φ■λησ■ ■ς ε■ τε πατ■ρ ■ν πα■δα φιλ■σ■**. Il. ix. 481. **Ο■ δ■ ■ρ■ ■σαν ■ς ε■ τε πυρ■ χθ■ν π■σα ν■μοιτο**, i.e. their march was as if the whole land should flame with fire (originally as it would be if, etc.) Il. ii. 780. **Β■ δ■ ■μεν, π■ντοσε χε■ρ■ ■ρ■γων ■ς ε■ πτωχ■ς π■λαι ε■η**, holding out his hand as if he had long been a beggar (438). Od. xvii. 366. For other optatives with **■ς ε■**, see Il. xi. 467, Il. xxii. 410; Od. ix. 314, Od. x. 416, Od. 420.

■σπερ ε■ παρεστ■τεις, “as if you had dwelt near by.” AESCH. Ag. 1201. **■μοια ■σπερ ε■ τις πολλ■ ■σθ■ων μηδ■ποτε ■μπ■πλαιτο**, “just as if one should eat much and never be filled.” XEN. Symp. iv. 37.

There is the same suppression of the apodosis in the examples in 475, where the protasis also is wanting with **■ς ε■** and similar expressions.

Apodosis contained in the Protasis.

[*] 486. A protasis may depend on a verb which is not its apodosis, the real apodosis being so distinctly implied in the form of expression that it need not be stated separately.

[*] 487. 1. This is found especially in Homer, where **ε■ κε (α■ κε)** or **■ν** (without an expressed apodosis) often seems to have the force of **in the hope that**; as in **πατρ■ς ■μο■ κλ■ος μετ■ρχομαι, ■ν που ■κο■σω**, I am going to seek tidings of my father, if I shall chance to hear of him, i.e. that I may hear of him if perchance I shall, or in the hope that I shall hear of him (Od. iii. 83). Here the protasis carries with it its own apodosis, which consists of an implied idea of purpose.⁴⁰ The whole sentence (both protasis and apodosis) is thus condensed into the protasis; but the apodosis is always felt in the implied idea of purpose or desire which is inherent in the idiom. As we have seen (312, Od. 2) that final clauses with **■ν** or **κ■** and the subjunctive originally included both a conditional relative clause and a final sentence, so here we have both a conditional and a final force included under a single conditional form; and this double force is felt also in the English translation, if haply, in the hope that, in case that, etc. E.g. **Α■τ■ρ σο■ πυκιν■ς ■ποθ■σομεθ■, α■ κε π■θηαι**, but we will make you a wise suggestion, for you to obey it if you will. Il. xxi. 293. (Here the protasis **α■ κε π■θηαι** with its implied apodosis seems like **πε■θο■ ■ν ε■ πε■θο■**, you can obey if you please, AESCH. Ag. 1049, and **χα■ροιτ■ ■ν ε■**

χαίρουσι, lb. 1394.) So Il. i. 207, Il. 420, Il. xi. 791, Il. xxiii. 82; Od. i. 279. Πῦψω δὲ Σπάρτην . . . νῆστον πευσόμενον πατρὸς φίλου, ἢν που κοῖσῃ, ἢδ' ἢνα μιν κλέος ἔχῃσιν, I will send him to Sparta, to ask about his father's return, in hope that he may hear of it, and in order that glory may possess him. Od. i. 93. (Here the added final clause shows the distinction between this and the protasis ἢν που κοῖσῃ.) So Od. i. 281, Od. ii. 216, Od. 360, Od. iii. 83. Ἐπιμοι, ἀκ' ποθὶ γνῶ τοιοῦτον ἔντα, "if haply I may recognise him." Od. xiv. 118. Βάλλ' οἴτως, ἀκ' ἢν τι φῶς Δάναοσι γένηται, if haply you may become (i.e. in hope that you may become), etc. Il. viii. 282. So Il. xi. 797, Il. 799, Il. xiii. 236, Il. xiv. 78, Il. xvi. 39, Il. 41 (cf. 84), Il. xvii. 121, 692, Il. xviii. 199. Κά' οἱ προσχῆσθαι δυοκάδεκα βοῖς ἔρευσόμεν, ἀκ' ἢ λῆσῃ στυ, . . . ἀκ' ἢν Τυδέος υἱὸν Πύσχη Ἰλίου ῥῆς, let her promise to sacrifice twelve oxen (to Athena), in hope that she may pity the city, . . . if haply she may keep the son of Tydeus from sacred Ilios, etc. Il. vi. 93. (For ἀκ' ἢν Πύσχη Aristarchus read ἢς ἢν.) Ἐφήμισα τε κλέσθε, φρα Διὶ Κρονίδῃ ῥσομεθ', ἀκ' ἢ λῆσῃ, in order that we may pray to Zeus to pity us if he will (if haply he shall pity us). Il. ix. 171. So Il. vi. 281, Il. 309, Il. xvii. 245, Il. xxii. 419, Il. xxiv. 116, Il. 301, Il. 357; Od. xiii. 182. See also εἰ κ' ἢν πῶς βόλεται λοίγῃν μῆναι, Il. i. 66. Πατρὸς κλέεπε κρατερῆνυχας ἢππους, ἀκ' ἢν πῆς μιν ἴλῃς, δῖος δῖοι εἰχος ἢπῶλων. Il. xvi. 724. So Il. xv. 297; Od. xxii. 76. Δεῖρ' ἢκ' μεθ', ἀκ' ἢ ποθὶ Ζεὺς ἔξοπσω περ παῖσ' ἢζῆος. Od. iv. 34. So Od. i. 379, Od. ii. 144, Od. xii. 215, Od. xvii. 51, Od. 60, Od. xxii. 252. Ἐκτορὸς ῥσωμεν κρατερῆν μῆνος, ἢν τινῆ που Δάναον προκαλῆσεται. Il. vii. 39. ἢψε δ' ἀγῆ γέγνηται ἢσσοῦσα περικτινέσσι ἢδῆσθαι, ἀκ' ἢν πῶς σῆν νηυσῆν ῥῆς ἢκτρῆς κῶνται. Il. xviii. 211. Ἐδ' κ' ἢν τι προτέρω παρανῆξομαι, ἢν που φέρω ἢτῆνας, δεῖδω, κ.τ.λ., but if I shall swim on still farther, to find a shore if haply I may, I fear, etc. Od. v. 417. (Here ἢν που φέρω depends on an ordinary protasis, which, however, is not its apodosis.) ἢλλ' ἢγεται, ἀκ' ἢν πῶς θωῆξομεν ἢας ἢχαιῆν, i.e. let us arm them if we can. Il. ii. 72 (so 83). Σκῆπτεο νῆν, ἀκ' ἢ δῆται ζῶν ἢτ' ἢντῆλοχον, "if haply you may see." Il. xvii. 652. Σ' οἰκ' δῖρον ποτιδῆμενος, ἀκ' ἢ πῆρσιν, expecting a gift, if haply he shall give one (i.e. in hope that he will give one). Od. ii. 186. So Od. xv. 312. ἢλλ' οἰ γῆρ σῆθῆλω βάλλειν τοιοῦτον ἔντα ἢθρ' ἢπιπεῆσας, ἢλλ' ἢμφαδῆν, εἰ κε τῆχῶμι, "if haply I may hit you." Il. vii. 242. Νῆν ἀτῆ ἢγχεῆ πειρῆσομαι, ἀκ' ἢ τῆχῶμι, I will try with my spear, if haply I may hit you. Il. v. 279. ἢς ἢτε τις τροχῆν κερამῆς πειρῆσεται, ἀκ' ἢ θῆσιν, i.e. tries a wheel, in case it will run (i.e. to let it run if it will). Il. xviii. 600. (The analogy of the two preceding examples shows that there is no indirect question.)

Παρῆζεο κά' λαβῆ γόνων, ἀκ' ἢν πῶς ἢθῆλῆσιν ἢπ' Τρῆεσσιν ῥῆξαι, i.e. clasp his knees in the hope that he will aid the Trojans (that he may aid them in case he will). Il. i. 407. So Il. vii. 394, Il. x. 55, Il. xiii. 743, Il. xviii. 457; Od. iii. 92, Od. iv. 322. For these last examples, see 490, Od. 2. For ἀκ' ἢν in the common text of Homer, here as elsewhere, Bekker and Delbrück write εἰ κ' (see footnote to 379).

2. In alternatives with two opposite suppositions, this construction implies that the subject is ready for either result, though the former is hoped for or expected. E.g. ἢθῆς φῆρεται μῆναι, ἢν τινα πῆφον ἢνδρῆν ἢ ἀτῆς φῆεται πῆτῆ ἢν μῆλῆ, i.e. he (a lion) rushes on, ready to slay or to perish. Il. xx. 172. In Od. xxiv. 216, the common text has πατρὸς πειρῆσομαι, ἀκ' ἢν (or εἰ κ' ἢν) μῆ πῆγῆ . . . ἢ κῆν ἢγνοῆσι, I will try my father (ready for either result), in case he shall recognise me or shall not know me (where κῆν alone in the second clause is very strange). But La

Roche reads κ μ πηγν, as an indirect question, one MS. having κε: see also Od. xviii. 265. πηγν is Hermann's conjecture for πιγνοη or γνοη.

[*] 488. The optative with ε (rarely ε κε) is sometimes used in Homer like the subjunctive after primary tenses in sentences of this class. It is also very common after past tenses, representing a subjunctive of the original form, though occasionally the subjunctive is retained in indirect discourse (696). E.g. λλ τι τν δστηνον ομαι, ε ποθεν λθν νδρν μνηστρων σκδασιν κατ δματα θεη, but I am still expecting the poor man, if haply he should come and scatter the suitors. Od. xx. 224. So Od. ii. 351. λλ τις εη γαμμνονι, ε πλεονας παρναφιν ποτρνει νεσθαι, let some one go to A. , in hope that he may exhort, etc. Hom. Od. xiv. 496. See also 491, below.

Βολευον πως χ ριστα γνοιτο, ε τιν ταροιισιν θαντου λσιν ερομην, i.e. if haply I might find some escape. Od. ix. 420. λλ γ ο πιθμην, φρ ατν τε δοιμι κα ε μοι ξενια δοη, but I disobeyed them, in order that I might see him (the Cyclops) and in hope that he would show me hospitality. Od. ix. 228. (The final clause and the protasis are here again clearly distinguished: see Od. i. 93 under 487, Od. 1.) Πολλ δ τ γκ πλθε μετ νρος χν ρευνν, ε ποθεν ξεροι. Il. xviii. 321. Πειρθη δ ε ατο ν ντεσι, ε ο φαρμσσειε κα ντρχοι γλαα γνα, i.e. he tried himself in his armour, eager for it to fit him and for his limbs to play freely in it (if haply it should fit him, etc.). Il. xix. 384. (See the cases of the subjunctive after πειρμαι in 487, Il. 1. Here there is no indirect question, for Achilles can have no real doubt about the fit.) ν δ πθοι ονοι σταςαν, ε ποτ δυσες οκαδε νοστσειε, i.e. the casks of wine were waiting for the return of Ulysses. Od. ii. 340. στο κτω ρων, ποτιδγμενος ε τ μιν εποι, i.e. he sat looking down, waiting for Penelope to speak. Od. xxiii. 91. Τδ ν γει επεν πως, ε κ θλητε πασασθαι πολμου, he bade me say this word, if haply you might be willing to stop the war. Il. vii. 394. (This appears in vs. 387 as ε κε γνοιτο, and the direct form of the command in vs. 375 is ε κ θλωσιν.) In Il. xiv. 163-165 we have ε πως μερατο . . . τ δ χε after a past tense. Νχε παρξ, ε που φεροι ινας. Od. v. 439. (Compare vs. 417, ε δ κε παρανξομαι, ν που φερω, under 487, Od. 1.)

See also Il. ii. 97, Il. iii. 450, Il. iv. 88, Il. x. 19, Il. xii. 122, Il. 333, Il. xiii. 807, Il. xx. 464, Il. xxiii. 40; Od. i. 115, Od. iv. 317, Od. ix. 267, Od. 317, Od. 418, Od. x. 147, Od. xi. 479, Od. 628, Od. xii. 334, Od. xiv. 460, Od. xxii. 91, Od. 381.

[*] 489. This construction (487; 488) with both subjunctive and optative is found also in Attic Greek and in Herodotus, but with less variety of expression, and at the same time with some extension of the usage. Especially to be noticed are the protases depending on verbs like βολομαι and θλω in Herodotus. E.g. "Θβας μς πμψον, ν πως διακωλσωμεν ντα φνον τοσιν μαμοις," "send us to Thebes, to prevent, if haply we may, etc." SOPH. O.C. 1769. "Τς μς γμης κουσον, ν τ σοι δοκ λγειν," "hear my judgment, in the hope that you may think there is something in what I say." EUR. H.F. 278. δοντο το ρισταγρεω, ε κως ατοσι παρσχοι δναμν τινα κα κατλθοιεν ς τν ωυτν, they besought A. , if in any way he might supply them with an armed force and they might be restored to their own land (to do this). HDT. v. 30. Φρονσαντες ε κως ν γνοιτο τ λληνικν, having it at heart that, if it were in any way possible, the Hellenic race should be made one. Id. vii. 145. Βουλομνην ε κως

■μ■φ■τεροι γενο■ατο βασιλ■ες, i.e. wishing that both might be made kings, if in any way this could be done. Id. vi. 52. ■βουλε■ετο θ■λων ε■ κως το■τους πρ■τους ■λοι. Id. ix. 14. Πρ■θυμοι ■σαν ■πιχειρ■ειν (sc. τ■σι νηυσ■), ε■ κως ■λοιεν α■τ■ς. Id. viii. 6. Π■μψαντες παρ■ ■θηνα■ους πρ■σβεις, ε■ πως πε■σειαν μ■ σφ■ν π■ρι νεωτερ■ζειν μηδ■ν, to persuade them if they might, etc. THUC. i. 58. Πορευ■μενοι ■ς τ■ν ■σ■αν ■ς βασιλ■α, ε■ πως πε■σειαν α■τ■ν, followed by βουλ■μενοι πε■σαι α■τ■ν, ε■ δ■ναιντο, στρατε■σαι, in nearly the same sense. Id. ii. 67. Πυνθαν■μενοι το■ς ■θηνα■ους ■ς τ■ν Καμ■ριναν πρεσβε■εσθαι, ε■ πως προσαγ■γοινοτο α■το■ς, that they went on an embassy to C., to bring the town over if they could. Id. vi. 75. (Compare ■ς ■κρ■γαντα Σικαν■ν ■π■στειλαν, ■πως ■παγ■γοιτο τ■ν π■λιν ε■ δ■ναιτο, Id. vii. 46. This might have been ε■ πως ■παγ■γοιτο τ■ν π■λιν, and in vi. 75 we might have had ■πως προσαγ■γοινοτο α■το■ς ε■ δ■ναιντο, with nearly the same force, but with different constructions.) See v. 4, ε■ πως . . . διασ■σειαν. ■κ■ται πρ■ς σ■ δερ■ ■φ■γμεθα, ε■ τινα π■λιν φρ■σειας ■μ■ν ε■ερον, we have come hither to you as suppliants, in the hope that you might tell us of some city soft as a fleece (to have you tell us, if perchance you might do so). AR. Av. 120. ■κουσον κα■ ■μο■, ■■ν σοι τα■τ■ δοκ■, listen to me too, in the hope that you may think the same (in case the same shall seem true to you). PLAT. Rep. 358 B: so 434 A. ■ρα ο■ν κα■ προθυμο■ κατιδε■ν, ■■ν πως πρ■τερος ■μο■ ■δ■ς κα■ ■μο■ φρ■σ■ς, i.e. for the chance that you may see it first and tell me. Ib. 432C: so 618 C, Theaet. 192C, Soph. 226 C.. See also XEN. An. ii. 1, 8, ■ν τι δ■νωνται, and AR. Nub. 535. On this principle we must explain AR. Ran. 339, “ο■κουν ■τρ■μ■ ■ξεις, ■ν τι κα■ χορδ■ς λ■β■ς”, will you not keep quiet then, in the hope of getting some sausage too? (i.e. to have some sausage if you chance to get any■

[*] 490. 1. The apodosis may, further, be suggested by the context, even by the protasis itself, without implying that the protasis expresses a purpose or desire of the leading subject. This gives rise to a variety of constructions. E.g. Κτανε■ν ■μο■ νιν ■δοσαν, ε■τε μ■ κταν■ν θ■λοιμ■ ■γεσθαι π■λιν ■ς ■ργε■αν χθ■να, they gave her (Helen) to me to slay, or, in case I should prefer not to slay her but to carry her back to the land of Argos (for me to do this). EUR. Tro. 874. ■ν (τ■ν ξυμμαχ■αν) γε ο■κ ■π■ το■ς φ■λοις ■ποι■σασθε, τ■ν δ■ ■χθρ■ν ■ν τις ■φ■ ■μ■ς ■■, i.e. you made it (to use) in case any of your enemies should come against you. THUC. vi. 79. Πρ■ς τ■ν π■λιν, ε■ ■πιβοηθο■εν, ■χ■ρουν, they marched towards the city, (to be ready) in case the citizens should rush out. Id. vi. 100. Τ■λλα, ■ν ■τι ναυμαχε■ν ο■ ■θηνα■οι τολμ■σωσι, παρεσκευ■ζοντο, they made other preparations, (to be ready) in case the Athenians should venture on further sea-fights. Id. vii. 59. Κ■ρυγμα ποιο■νται . . . τ■ν νησιωτ■ν ε■ τις βο■λεται ■π■ ■λευθερ■ ■ς σφ■ς ■πι■ναι, they make proclamation, in case any of the islanders wishes to come over to them with promise of freedom (for him to do so). Id. vii. 82. Ο■δεμ■α βλ■βη τ■ν πρ■ς τ■ς π■λεις διαπομπ■ν ■ς τε κατασκοπ■ν κα■ ■ν τι ■λλο φα■νηται ■πιτ■δειον, there is no harm in the envoys whom we have sent to the various cities, partly for inquiry, and also in case any other advantage may appear (to secure this), i.e. to secure any other advantage that may appear. Id. vi. 41. So κα■ ε■ τινα πρ■ς ■λλον δ■οι, Id. v. 37. ■ρ■ς ποιο■νται, ε■ τις ■πικηρυκε■εται Π■ρσαις, they invoke curses, if any one (i.e. to fall on any one who) sends heralds to the Persians. ISOC. iv. 157. Φιλοτιμε■σθαι μηδ■ ■ν ■φ■ ■λλ■ ■π■ χρημ■των κτ■σει κα■ ■■ν τι ■λλο ε■ς το■το φ■ρ■, i.e. for anything else that may lead to this. PLAT. Rep. 553D See ARISTOT. Eth. x. 9, 2: “■χειν■τ■ν ■ρετ■ν■κα■ χρ■σθαι πειρατ■ον, ■ ε■ πως ■λλως ■γαθο■ γιν■μεθα”, we must try to possess and employ virtue, or if there is any other means of becoming virtuous (to use this).

2. In the Homeric examples in which the protasis consists of an infinitive depending on ἄλλω (487, 1, end), the apodosis is suggested by the infinitive rather than by ἄλλω. This shows that α κ ἄλλωσι, in itself has no final force. See also Od. xxii. 381, ππτηνεν δ δυσες κατ μων, ε τις τ νδρ ζως ποκλοπιτο λσκων κρα μλαιναν, he peered through his house, in case any man might still be alive and hiding himself (i.e. to find any such man), where no desire or hope is implied, and the construction is like that of THUC. vi. 100 (above). In PLAT. Rep. 327 C, οκο ν τι λλεπεται τ ν πεσωμεν μς ς χρ μς φεναι; the subject of λλεπεται is a protasis introduced by τ, into which the apodosis has been wholly absorbed. The construction is, is there not still left the supposition of our persuading you that you must let us go? But the meaning is, is it not left for us to persuade you that you must let us go, if we can (i.e. πεσαι ν πεσωμεν)? This is an important example for explaining this whole class of sentences (486-490). The cases in 490 make it plain that the final force often ascribed to ε or ν comes from the suppression of an apodosis containing the idea of purpose or desire, since the same form of protasis which is sometimes called final has no final force when a slightly different apodosis is implied (as in THUC. vi. 79, THUC. 100, THUC. vii. 59).

[*] 491. Sometimes a clause with ε κε or ν (rarely ε) and the subjunctive, or with ε κε or ε and the optative, in Homer is the object of οδα, εδον, or a verb of saying, expressing in a conditional form a result which is hoped for or desired. These clauses have the appearance of indirect questions; but the analogy of the preceding examples (487-490) shows that all are based on the same idiom,—a protasis which involves its own apodosis so that it would be useless to express the latter separately. The examples are these:—

Τς οδ ε κε κα ατς ν κολης π νης τλε φλων πληται, who knows the chances that he too may perish, etc.? or who knows the chances of his perishing, etc., if haply he may? Od. ii. 332. (We may translate colloquially: who knows? supposing he too shall perish?) Τς οδ ε κ χιλες φθ μ π δουρ τυπες π θυμν λσαι; who knows the chances that Achilles may first be struck (the chances of his being first struck, if haply he shall be)? Il. xvi. 860. (We should naturally express this by a different construction, whether he may not be first struck.) Τς οδ ε κ ν ο σ ν δαμονι θυμν ρνω παρειπν; who knows the chances of my rousing his spirit by persuasion, if haply I shall do so? Il. xv. 403. In Il. xi. 792 we have Nestor's advice to Patroclus, τς οδ ε κ ν ο σ ν δαμονι θυμν ρναις παρειπν; who knows the chances that you could rouse his spirit by persuasion? (ρναις κε being potential). Ο μ ν οδ ε ατε κακορραφης λεγεινς πρη παρηαι κα σε πληγσιν μσσω, I am not sure of the chances of your being the first to enjoy your own device, etc., i.e. I am not so sure that you may not be the first to enjoy it, if it shall so chance. Il. xv. 16. Ζες γρ που τ γε οδε κα θνατοι θεο λλοι, ε κ μιν γελαμι δν: π πολλ δ λθην, Zeus and the other immortals (alone) know this, the chance of my bringing news of him, if haply I have seen him and so might do this. Od. xiv. 119. Ε δ γε δ μοι τοτο, θε, νημερτς νσπες, ε πως τν λον μν πεκπροφγοιμι Χρυβδιν, τν δ κ μυναμην τε μοι σνοιτο γ ταρους, i.e. tell me this without fault, the chance of my escaping Charybdis if haply I should do this, and of my then keeping Scylla off if I could (lit. tell me this, supposing I should escape Charybdis and could then keep Scylla off). Od. xii. 112 (this translation supposes κ to be potential, affecting only μυναμην).

■ μ■νετε Τρ■ας σχεδ■ν ■λθ■μεν, ■φρα ■δητ■ α■ κ■ ■μμιν ■π■ρσχ■ γε■ρα Κρον■ων; are you waiting for the Trojans to come near, that you may see the chances of the son of Cronos holding his hand over you?—or that you may see him hold his hand over you, if haply he may do this? Il. iv. 247. (We might say, is it that you may see it,—supposing the son of Cronos to hold his hand over you?) Τ■ν σ■ α■τις μν■σω, ■ν■ ■πολλ■ξ■ς ■πατ■ων, ■φ■ ■δ■ς ■ν τοι χρα■σμ■ φιλ■της τε κα■ ε■ν■, i.e. that you may see the chances of your device availing you, or that you may see it if perchance your device shall avail you. Il. xv. 31.

See also Il. xx. 435, ■λλ■ ■ τοι μ■ν τα■τα θε■ν ■ν γο■νασι κε■ται, α■ κ■ σε χειρ■τερ■ς περ ■■ν ■π■ θυμ■ν ■λωμαι, i.e. this rests with the Gods, for me to take your life away, weaker though I am, if perchance I may. The conditional construction is more obvious here than in Il. iv. 247 and xv. 31; but in all three we naturally fall into an indirect question when we attempt to express the thought in English.

[*] 492. A comparison of these peculiar conditional constructions (491) expressing hope or desire with clauses with μ■ expressing anxiety and desire to prevent a result, both depending on ο■δα or ε■δον, is suggestive. With Od. ii. 332 and Il. xvi. 860 (in 491) compare Il. x. 100, ο■δ■ τι ■δμεν, μ■ πως κα■ δι■ ν■κτα μνοιν■σωσι μ■χεσθαι, nor do we know any way to prevent their being impelled, etc., and PLAT. Phaed. 91 D (quoted in 366); and with Il. iv. 247 and xv. 31 (491) compare Od. xxiv. 491, ■δοι μ■ δ■ σχεδ■ν ■σι κι■ντες (366). This comparison shows that ε■δ■ναι (or ■δε■ν) ε■ κε το■το γ■νηται means to know (or see) the chances of gaining this (object of desire); while ε■δ■ναι (or ■δε■ν) μ■ το■το γ■νηται means to know (or see) some way to prevent this (object of fear). The idea of desire or anxiety belongs to the dependent clause, and not at all to the leading verb.

[*] 493. These Homeric expressions (491), in which nearly all the force is in the protasis, so that the apodosis is not only suppressed but hardly felt at all, helps to show how the particle ε■ came to be an indirect interrogative, in the sense of whether. But in Attic Greek, where the interrogative use is fully established, only the simple ε■ (never ■ν or ■■ν) can mean whether, even when the verb is subjunctive (680).

ε■ after Expressions of Wonder, Indignation, etc.

[*] 494. After many expressions of wonder, delight, contentment, indignation, disappointment, pity, and similar emotions, a protasis with ε■ may be used to express the object of the emotion. When the supposition of the protasis is present or past, a causal sentence would generally seem more natural. Such expressions are especially θαυμ■ζω, α■σχ■νομαι, ■γαπ■, ■γανακτ■, and δειν■ν ■στιν. E.g. Θαυμ■ζω δ■ ■γωγε ε■ μηδε■ς ■μ■ν μ■τ■ ■νθυμε■ται μ■τ■ ■ργ■ζεται, ■ρ■ν, κ.τ.λ., I wonder that no one of you is either concerned or angry, when he sees, etc. (lit. if no one is either concerned or angry, I wonder). DEM. iv. 43. ■λλ■ ■κε■νο θαυμ■ζω, ε■ Λακεδαιμον■οις μ■ν ποτε ■ντ■ρατε, νυν■ δ■ ■κνε■τε ■ξι■ναι κα■ μ■λλετε ε■σφ■ρειν, but I wonder at this, that you once opposed the Lacedaemonians, but now are unwilling, etc. Id. ii. 24. (The literal meaning is, if (it is true that) you once opposed, etc., then I wonder.) Ο■κ ■γαπ■ ε■ μ■ δ■κην δ■δωκεν, ■λλ■ ε■ μ■ κα■ χρυσ■ στεφ■ν■ στεφανωθ■σεται ■γανακτε■, he is not content if he has not been punished; but if he is not also to be crowned with a golden crown, he is indignant. AESCHIN. iii. 147. Κα■ ■ς ■ληθ■ς ■γανακτ■, ε■ ο■τωσ■ ■ νο■ μ■ ο■■ς τ■ ε■μ■ ε■πε■ν, I am indignant that (or if) I am not able, etc. PLAT. Lach. 194A. Ο■ δ■ θαυμαστ■ν ■στιν, ε■

στρατευόμενος καὶ πονῶν κενός αὐτὸς μὲν μελλόντων καὶ ψηφίζομένων καὶ πυνθανομένων περιγίγνεται, it is no wonder that he gets the advantage of you, etc. DEM. ii. 23. Μηδὲ μὲντοι τοῦτο μεῖον δέξητε χεῖν, εἰ οἱ Κυραεοὶ πρόσθεν σὺν μὲν ταττούμενοι νῦν φεστκάσιν, i.e. do not be discontented, if (or that) the Cyraeans have now withdrawn. XEN. An. iii. 2, 17. Ἄν σε, εἰ κτενεῖς δμαρτα σὺν. EUR. Tro. 890.

Δεινὸν ἔν ἐη πρῆγμα, εἰ Σκάκας μὲν δόλους ἔχομεν, ἄλληνας δὲ οὐ τιμωρησόμεθα. HDT. vii. 9. Ἀσχρὸν ἔστιν, εἰ γὰρ μὲν τῆ ἔργα πῆμεινα, μεῖς δὲ μηδὲ τοὺς λήγους νῆξεσθε. DEM. xviii. 160. Δεινὸν ἔν ἐη, εἰ οἱ μὲν κένων ξῆμμαχοὶ οὐκ ἔπεροσιν, μεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἔρα δαπανῶσομεν. THUC. i. 121. Τῆρας λήγεις, εἰ . . . οὐκ ἔν δναιντο λαθεῖν. PLAT. Men. 91 D (see 506). Δεινὸν εἰ οὐ αὐτοὶ μῆρτυρες τοῦτοις μὲν ἔν μαρτυροῦντες πιστοὶ ἔσαν, ἔμοῦ δὲ μαρτυροῦντες ἔπιστοὶ ἔσονται, it is hard that the same witnesses testifying for them would have been trustworthy, and testifying for me are to be untrustworthy. ANT. vi. 29. See AESCHIN. i. 85. In all the preceding examples the protasis belongs under 402, the futures expressing present suppositions (407). For εἰ οὐ see 386 and 387, with examples.

[*] 495. The same construction is sometimes used when the leading verb is past. E.g. Κατεμῆμφετο αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐ ἄλλοι κμῆζειν μῆλλον αὐτὸν ἔδκουν. XEN. Cyr. iv. 3, 3. But generally such sentences are affected by the principle of indirect discourse, and have either the optative or the form of the direct discourse: see XEN. Cyr. ii. 2, 3, ἔχθῆσθην εἰ τι μεῖον δοκοῖεν ἔχειν (where δοκοῖσι might have been used). See EUR. Med. 931, εἰ σῆλθὲ μὲ οὐκτος, εἰ γενῆσεται, and XEN. An. i. 4, 7, ἔκτειρον εἰ ἔλῆσοιντο. For such sentences see 697.

[*] 496. These expressions may also be followed by ἔτι and a causal sentence, as in PLAT. Theaet. 142A, ἔθαμαζον ἔτι οὐχ οὐκ τῆ ἔρεβν. The construction with εἰ gives a milder or more polite form of expression, putting the object of the wonder etc. into the form of a supposition, instead of stating it as a fact as we should do in English. They may also be followed by protases expressing ordinary conditions, which have nothing peculiar: see ISOC. xv. 17, ἔγαπητὸν (sc. ἔστν) ἔν ἔκλαβεῖν δυνηθῆσι τῆ δῆκαιον, they must be content if they are able (cf. xix. 20); and PLAT. Prot. 315 E, DEM. ii. 23 (εἰ περιῆμεν).

[*] 497. This construction must not be mistaken for that in which εἰ is used in the sense of whether, to introduce an indirect question; as ἔρωτων εἰ ἔλθεν, I asked whether he had come.

Mixed Constructions.

[*] 498. The forms of protasis and apodosis which are contained in the classification above (388-397) include by far the greater number of the examples found in the classic authors. Many cases remain, however, in which the protasis and apodosis do not belong to the same form. Especially, the great wealth of conditional expressions which the Homeric language exhibits in both protasis and apodosis (399) allowed great variety of combination; and the early poets used much greater freedom in these sentences than suited the more exact style of Attic prose.

I. Optative in Protasis, with Future or Present Indicative or an equivalent form in Apodosis.

[*] 499. a) In the earlier language a protasis with the optative is not infrequently followed by an apodosis with the future indicative or imperative or (in Homer) with the subjunctive. The subjunctive or future indicative in Homer may also take κ or ν (452). E.g. Ε τς μοι νρ μ ποιτο καλλος, μλλον θαλπωρ κα θαρσαλετερον σται, if any other man should follow with me, there will be more comfort and greater courage. Il. x. 222. (The want of symmetry in the Greek is here precisely what it is in the English; and εη ν is no more required in the apodosis than would be is, though both are the conventional forms.) See Il. ix. 388, and xxiii. 893, πρωμεν, ε θλοις. Τν γ ε πως σ δναιο λοχησμενος λελαβσθαι, ς κν τοι επσι δν, he will tell you, etc. Od. iv. 388. See Il. xi. 386, ε πειρηθεης, οκ ν τοι χρασμοσι βις; and Il. ii. 488, Il. xx. 100, Od. xvii. 539. Ε δ δμων γενθλιος ρποι, Δ τοτ νναλ τ κδσομεν πρσσειν. PIND. Ol. xiii. 105.41 So in an old curse, ε τις τδε παραβανοι, νναγς στω, AESCHIN. iii. 110. See SOPH. OT 851, ε τι κκτρποιτο, οτοι τν γε Λαου φνον φανε δικαως ρθν.

[*] 500. b) A present indicative in the apodosis with an optative in the protasis is sometimes merely an emphatic future expression. E.g. Πντ χεις, ε σε τοτων μορ φκοιτο καλν, you have the whole, should a share of these glories fall to your lot. PIND. Isth. iv.(v.) 14. So καιρν ε φθγξαιο, μεων πεται μμος νθρπων, i.e. should you speak seasonably, you are sure to be followed by less censure of men, Py. i. 81. In THUC. ii. 39 we have κατοι ε αθυμ μλλον πνων μελτ θλοιμεν κινδυνεειν, περιγγνεται μν, κ.τ.λ., and now supposing that we should choose to meet dangers with a light heart rather than with laborious training, we secure the advantage, etc. This sentence is loosely jointed, like the others which have this combination; the condition is stated as a remotely supposed case, in the vague future form, but the apodosis, we at once gain this advantage, etc., is adapted to a present supposition. The optative is generally emended to θλομεν, although it is one of the best attested words in Thucydides, being in the best Mss. and also being quoted by Dion. Hal. as a faulty expression. The criticism of Dionysius (de thuc. Idiom. 12, 1) is instructive: νταθα γρ τ μν θλομεν μα το μλλοντς στι χρνου δηλωτικν, τ δ περιγγνεται το παρντος: κλουθον δ ν ν ε συνζευξε τ θλομεν τ περισται, i.e. the future expression ε θλομεν should have a future form like περισται to correspond to it. In DEM. xviii. 21, ε γρ ενα τι δοκοη τ μλιστα ν τοτοις δδκημα, οδν στι δπου πρς μ, the apodosis refers to the real protasis if there is any apparent fault.

[*] 501. c) In most cases, however, the present indicative in the apodosis precedes, containing a general statement, and the optative adds a remote future condition where we should expect a general present supposition. E.g. Ο μοι θμικς στ, οδ ε κακων σθεν λθοι, ξενον τιμσαι, "it is not right for me—even supposing a more wretched man than you should come—to dishonour a stranger." Od. xiv. 56. Θαρσαλος γρ νρ ν πσιν μενων ργοισιν τελθει, ε κα ποθεν λλοθεν λθοι. Od. vii. 51. So v. 484, Od. viii. 138; Il. ix. 318. Οτ ον γγελ τι πεθομαι, ε ποθεν λθοι, οτε θεοπροπης μπζομαι, ν τινα μτηρ ξερηται, "neither do I any longer put trust in reports— should any one come—nor do I regard any divination which my mother may ask." Od. i. 414. (Here the remoteness of the supposition in ε λθοι is contrasted with the greater vividness of that expressed in ξερηται). Δεινν τ, ε κ φ μαξαν πρβιον χθος ερας ξονα καυκξαις τ δ φρτ μαυρωθεη, it is hard, . . . supposing you should break your axle and your load should perish.

HES. Op. 692. Κέρδος δὲ φιλτατον, κέντος εἰ τις δμῶν φῆροι, it is the dearest gain, if one should bring it from the house of a willing giver. PIND. Py. viii. 13. See Isth. ii. 33. So SOPH. Ant. 1032. In most of these examples a general supposition with the subjunctive (or present indicative) in the protasis would have agreed more closely with the thought. If the protasis had preceded, so as to determine the character of the sentence, the apodosis would naturally have had the optative with κῆ or ῆν, or some future form (as in the cases under a).

[*] 502. d) The optative in protasis sometimes depends on the present of a verb of obligation, propriety, or possibility with an infinitive, the two forming an expression that is nearly equivalent in sense to an optative with ῆν. E.g. Εἴ γὰρ ἐήσαν δὲο τινὲς νῶνταιοι νῆμοι, οἷκ μῆφοτῆροις ῆνι δῆπου ψηφῆσασθαι, for if there should be two laws opposed to each other, you could not surely vote for both. DEM. xxiv. 35. This is analogous to the apodosis formed by ῆδει, χρῆν, ῆνῆν, etc., with the infinitive (415). There, for example, ῆνῆν ἀτῆ ῆλθεῆν, he could have gone, is nearly equivalent to ῆλθεν ῆν, and here ῆνεστιν ἀτῆ ῆλθεῆν, he could go, is nearly equivalent to ῆλθοι ῆν. This use of the optative is more common in the corresponding relative conditional sentences (555).

II. Indicative or Subjunctive in Protasis, with Potential Optative or Indicative in Apodosis.

[*] 503. a) A present or past tense of the indicative in the protasis with a potential optative or indicative (with ῆν) in the apodosis is a perfectly natural combination, each clause having its proper force. E.g. Εἴ δὲ τις θῆαντων γε κατῆ οῆρανοῆ εῆλλουθῆς, οἷκ ῆν ῆγωγε θεοῆσιν ῆπουρανῆοισι μαχοῆμην, but if thou art one of the immortals come from heaven, I would not fight against the Gods of heaven. II. vi. 128. Πολλῆ γὰρ ῆν εῆδαιμονῆα εῆη περῆ τοῆς νῆους, εῆ εῆς μῆν μῆνος ἀτῆς διαφθεῆρει, οἷ δὲ ῆλλοι ῆφέλοῆσιν, for there would (naturally) be great happiness, etc. PLAT. Ap. 25B. Εἴ τι θῆσφατον πατρῆ χρησιμοῆσιν ῆκνεῆθῆ, ῆστε πρῆς παῆδων θανεῆν, πρῆς ῆν δικῆως τοῆτῆ ῆνειδῆζοις ῆμοῆ; if a divine decree came to my father through oracles that he was to die by his sons' hands, how can you justly reproach me with this? SOPH. OC 969 ; so 974-977. ῆστῆ εῆ μοι καῆ μῆσως ῆγοῆμενοι μῆλλον ῆτρῆων προσεῆναι ἀτῆ πολεμεῆν ῆπεσθητε, οἷκ ῆν εῆκῆτως νῆν τοῆ γε ῆδικεῆν ἀτῆαν φεροῆμην, if you were persuaded to make war by thinking, etc., I should not now justly be charged with injustice. THUC. ii. 60. Εἴ γὰρ οῆτοι ῆρθῆς ῆπῆστησαν, ῆμεῆς ῆν οῆ χρεῆν ῆρχοιτε, for if these had a right to secede, it would follow that your dominion is unjust. Id. iii. 40: see vi. 92, and DEM. xxi. 37. Καῆτοι τῆτε τῆν ῆπερεῆδην, εῆπερ ῆληθῆ μου νῆν κατηγορεῆ, μῆλλον ῆν εῆκῆτως ῆ τῆνδῆ ῆδῆωκεν, and yet, if he is now making true charges against me, he would then have prosecuted Hypereides with much more reason than (he now has for prosecuting) this man. DEM. xviii. 223. "Εἴ γὰρ γυναῆκες εῆς τῆδῆ ῆξουσιν θρῆσους, . . . παρῆ οῆδῆν ἀτῆς ῆν ῆν ῆλλῆναι πῆσεις," "for if women are to come to this height of audacity (407) it would be as nothing for them to slay their husbands." EUR. Or. 566. Τοῆτο, εῆ καῆ τῆλλα πῆντα ῆποστεροῆσιν, ῆποδοῆναι προσῆκεν, even if they steal all the rest, they ought to have restored this (415). DEM. xxvii. 37.

[*] 504. b) An unreal condition in the indicative followed by a potential optative seldom occurs and is not a strictly logical combination. E.g. Εἴ τοῆτῆ ῆπεχεῆρουν λῆγειν, οἷκ ῆσθῆ ῆστις οἷκ ῆν εῆκῆτως ῆπιτιμῆσει ῆμοι, if I were undertaking to say this, (the result would be that) every one would censure me with reason. DEM. xviii. 206. (Here many Mss. and Dion. Hal. p. 1054 read ῆπετῆμῆσε, the ordinary form in such an apodosis.) See [LYS.] xv. 8.

[*] 505. c) When a subjunctive or a future indicative in protasis has a potential optative in the apodosis, there is sometimes a distinct potential force in the apodosis (as in 503), and sometimes the optative with ν is merely a softened expression for the future indicative (235). E.g. $\text{Ε}\mu\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\text{ πατρ}\epsilon\varsigma\beta\iota\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\text{ κα}\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\text{ κο}\epsilon\omega\text{, τ}\nu\text{ τρυχ}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\text{ς περ τι τλα}\eta\text{ν νιαυτ}\nu\text{,}$ “if I hear of my father’s life and return, wasted as I am, I can still endure it for a year.” Od. ii. 218. (See the next verses, Od. 220-223, $\epsilon\delta\kappa\epsilon\text{ τεθνε}\tau\omicron\varsigma\text{ κο}\epsilon\omega\text{,}$ with future forms in the apodosis. See also the corresponding verses, Od. i. 287-292.) $\lambda\lambda\text{ τι μ}\nu\text{ κε κα}\epsilon\varsigma\text{ κακ}\epsilon\text{ περ π}\sigma\chi\omicron\text{ντες κοι}\sigma\theta\epsilon\text{, α}\kappa\theta\lambda\epsilon\varsigma\text{ σ}\nu\text{ θυμ}\nu\text{ ρυκακ}\epsilon\iota\upsilon\text{ν,}$ but still even so, though suffering evils, you may come home, if you will curb your passion. Od. xi. 104; so xi. 110 and xii. 137. See II. xxi. 556. $\text{Ε}\delta\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\text{ ψ}\rho\sigma\epsilon\varsigma\text{, τ}\delta\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\iota\text{ φ}\rho\mu\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\text{ ε}\eta\text{,}$ but if you plough late, this may be your remedy. HES. Op. 485; so 665. $\lambda\lambda\text{ ν φ}\epsilon\varsigma\text{ μοι, . . . λ}\xi\alpha\iota\mu\text{ν ρ}\theta\epsilon\varsigma\text{,}$ i.e. I would fain speak. SOPH. El. 554. So O. T. 216, Phil. 1259; EUR. Hel. 1085. $\text{Ο}\delta\gamma\epsilon\text{ρ ν πολλ}\alpha\gamma\phi\upsilon\text{ραι σ}\nu\text{, χ}\omicron\iota\mu\epsilon\upsilon\text{ν ποι φυγ}\nu\text{ντες με}\epsilon\varsigma\text{ σωθ}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\text{ν,}$ for not even if there are (shall be) many bridges, could we (in the case supposed) find a place to fly to and be safe. XEN. An. ii. 4, 19.

$\text{Ε}\gamma\epsilon\text{ρ τι λ}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\text{ χ}\omicron\lambda\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\text{ στρατ}\epsilon\varsigma\text{, ο}\tau\text{ν ταφε}\eta\text{ πα}\epsilon\delta\text{ ο}\tau\text{ ο}\kappa\tau\omicron\upsilon\text{ τ}\chi\omicron\iota\text{,}$ for if you say anything by which the army shall be made angry, this child cannot be buried or find pity. EUR. Tro. 730; see Suppl. 603, EUR. Cycl. 474. $\text{Φρο}\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon\text{ν ε}\text{ ποι}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\text{νται, τ}\epsilon\text{ς μ}\nu\text{ γ}\epsilon\beta\lambda\pi\tau\omicron\iota\epsilon\upsilon\text{ν τι μ}\rho\omicron\varsigma\text{, ο}\mu\text{ντοι καν}\nu\text{ γε}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\text{ κωλ}\epsilon\iota\upsilon\text{ν μ}\epsilon\varsigma\text{, κ.τ.λ.},$ if they (shall) build a fort, they might perhaps injure some part of our land; but it will not be sufficient to prevent us, etc. THUC. i. 142. In the following examples the optative with ν seems to form a future apodosis to the future protasis; though in some of them it may be thought to be potential:—

$\text{Ε}\delta\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\text{ επλο}\eta\text{ν δ}\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\text{ ε}\nu\omicron\sigma\gamma\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma\text{, ματ}\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\text{ τριτ}\tau\Phi\theta\eta\text{ν ρ}\beta\omega\lambda\omicron\upsilon\text{ν κο}\mu\eta\text{ν,}$ i.e. on the third day I shall arrive. II. ix. 362. (The reference to this in PLAT. Crit. 44B shows that $\text{κο}\mu\eta\text{ν}\nu$ is a mere future.) See II. xiii. 377, II. xvii. 38; Od. xxi. 114. $\text{δ}\iota\kappa\omicron\eta\mu\epsilon\upsilon\text{ν ε}\mu\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\omega\text{,}$ I should be guilty of wrong, should I (shall I) not restore her. EUR. Hel. 1010. See EUR. Ion. 374, Suppl. 520, I. A. 1189, Cycl. 198. “ $\nu\text{ ο}\nu\text{ μ}\theta\epsilon\varsigma\text{ μοι τ}\nu\text{ δ}\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\text{ν το}\tau\omicron\upsilon\text{ν λ}\eta\gamma\omicron\upsilon\text{ν, ο}\kappa\text{ ν π}\omicron\delta\omicron\eta\text{ν ο}\delta\text{ ν β}\omicron\lambda\text{ν ο}\delta\epsilon\upsilon\text{,}$ ” “if you (shall) learn this cheating reason for me, I will not (or: I would not) pay even an obol to any one.” AR. Nub. 116. $\text{Κ}\alpha\text{ ο}\tau\omega\varsigma\text{ ν δειν}\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\text{ π}\nu\tau\omega\text{ν π}\theta\omicron\iota\epsilon\upsilon\text{ν, ε}\text{ ο}\tau\omicron\iota\text{ μ}\psi\eta\phi\omicron\iota\text{ κατ}\kappa\epsilon\text{ν}\omega\text{ν τ}\nu\text{ νδρ}\nu\text{ το}\epsilon\text{ τρι}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\text{ντα γεν}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\text{νται.}$ LYS. xiii. 94. (Here we should expect $\text{ε}\gamma\text{ν}\omicron\iota\upsilon\text{ντο.}$) $\text{Τ}\nu\text{ τοπ}\omega\text{-τ}\tau\omega\text{ν μ}\nu\text{τ}\nu\text{ ε}\eta\text{, ε}\nu\text{ν}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\text{ν φ}\lambda\iota\sigma\kappa\text{ν}\omega\text{ν μ}\omega\varsigma\text{ κλαλε}\text{, τα}\tau\alpha\text{ δυνηθε}\epsilon\varsigma\text{ μ}\pi\epsilon\text{ρι.}$ DEM. i. 26.

III. Potential Optative or Indicative (with ν) in the Protasis.

[*] 506. A potential optative (with ν) in the protasis may express a present condition, and a potential indicative (with ν) a present or past condition. E.g. $\text{Ε}\mu\eta\delta\text{ δο}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\text{ν κρατ}\delta\epsilon\zeta\alpha\mu\epsilon\theta\theta\text{ν, π}\epsilon\varsigma\text{ ο}\kappa\zeta\iota\omicron\upsilon\text{ν α}\tau\text{ν γε φυλ}\xi\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\text{ τοιο}\tau\omicron\upsilon\text{ν γεν}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\text{;}$ if we would not take even a slave who was intemperate, how can it be other than fitting to guard oneself against becoming so? XEN. Mem. i. 5, 3. $\text{Κ}\alpha\gamma\epsilon\text{, ε}\pi\epsilon\text{ρ λ}\lambda\text{ τ}\nu\text{νθρ}\pi\omega\text{ν πειθο}\mu\eta\text{ν}\nu\text{, κα}\sigma\omicron\pi\epsilon\theta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\text{,}$ and I, if I would trust any man, trust you. PLAT. Prot. 329B. $\text{Ο}\tau\omicron\iota\text{ παντελ}\epsilon\varsigma\text{, ο}\delta\text{ ε}\mu\pi\omicron\iota\sigma\alpha\iota\text{τ}\nu\text{ το}\tau\omicron\epsilon\varsigma\text{ γωγ}\phi\eta\mu\iota\text{ δε}\nu\text{, ε}\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\text{ρ}\nu\eta\tau\text{ν}\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon\text{ν,}$ this (preparation) is not wholly to be despised, even if you would not do this as I say you ought. DEM. iv. 18. Notice the

difference between this supposition that you would not do this if you could (i.e. οκ ν ποισαιτε τοτο) and the ordinary εμ ποισαιτε τοτο, supposing you not to do this.

Ε το νυν τοτο σχυρ ν ν ν τοτ τεκμριον, κμο γενσθω τεκμριον, κ.τ.λ., if then this would have been a strong proof for him (sc. had he had it), so let it be also a proof for me, etc. DEM. xlix. 58. Εμ δι τ τοτους βολεσθαι σσαι, ξλης πολομην κα προλης ε προσλαβ ν γ ν ργριον π νυ πολ μετ τοτων πρς βευσα, had it not been for my wish to save these (captives), may I perish utterly and before my day if I would have gone on an embassy with these men even for very high pay. DEM. xix. 172. (Here the protasis to which the apodosis πολομην refers is really the whole expression ε . . . πρσβευσα ν εμ . . . σσαι, if I would have gone except to save these, πρσβευσα ν in the protasis being itself the apodosis to εμ . . . σσαι.) In DEM. xviii. 101, κα τς οκ ν πκτειν με δικαως, ε τι τν παρχντων τ πλει καλ ν λγ μνον καταισχνειν πεχερησ ν; —if we retain the final ν (strongly supported by Mss.), we must translate if (it is true that) I would (under any circumstances) have undertaken, etc., and not simply if I had undertaken (ε πεχερησα). (See 557.)

[*] 507. It is obvious that such forms (506) express simple present or past conditions, the real protasis always being if it IS (or WAS) the case that something would now be (or would have been), or if it IS the case that something would hereafter be under certain circumstances. (See 409.) IV. Irregular Combinations.—Present or Past with Future in one Protasis.

[*] 508. In a few irregular constructions, which are only cases of anacoluthon, the speaker adapts his apodosis to a form of protasis different from that which he has actually used. E.g. γ μ ν ν, ε χοιμι, ς τχιστα πλα ποιομην πσι Πρσαις. XEN. Cyr. ii. 1, 9. (Here ποιομην ν is used as if ε εχον, if I were able, had preceded. We should expect ποιομην ν, which is found in one Ms.) Ε ο ν εδεεν τι θεται ατος, XEN. Cyr. i εντο ν π τος π νους . . . κα κατεργζοιντο ν ατν, if then they knew that she (virtue) sees them, they would rush into labours and would secure her. XEN. Cyn. xii. 22. “Ε μ ν γρ ες γυνακα σωφρονεστραν ξφος μεθεμεν, δυσκλες ν ν φνος” EUR. Or. 1132. (Here we should expect εη; or μεθεμεν may be indicative.)

[*] 509. The same protasis may have one verb in the indicative referring to present or past time, and another in the optative referring to the future. E.g. γ ο ν δειν ν εην εργασμνος, ε, τε μ ν με ο ρχοντες ταττον, τε μ ν μενον, το δ θεο τττοντος λποιμι τν τξιν, I should therefore (prove to) have behaved outrageously, if when the state authorities stationed me I stood my ground, but (if) now when God stations me I should desert my post. PLAT. Ap. 28E. (Here the supposed combination of the two acts is the future condition to which the future apodosis refers.) πεχομαι πσι τοτοις, ε ληθ πρς μς εποιμι κα επον κα ττ εθς ν τ δμ, ετυχαν μοι δο ναι, i.e. if I should speak the truth and if I did speak it then, etc. DEM. xviii. 141. Ε δ μ τ στι μ τε ν μ τε ν επεν χοι μηδες μηδπω κα τμερον, τ τν σμβουλον χρν ποιεν; but if there neither is nor was (any such thing), and if no man yet even at this day could possibly tell of any, what ought the statesman to have done? lb. 190.

V. Several Protases in one Sentence.

[*] 510. Two or more protases, not co-ordinate, may belong to the same sentence; but one always contains the leading condition, to which the rest of the sentence (including the other conditions) is the conclusion. Here several protases may belong to one apodosis; or the leading condition may be followed by two subordinate conditions, each with its own apodosis. E.g. Κα■ γ■ρ ■ν ο■τ■ς τι π■θ■, ταχ■ως ■με■ς ■τερον Φ■λιππον ποι■σετε, ■νπερ ο■τω προσ■χητε το■ς πρ■γμασι τ■ν νο■ν, for if anything shall happen to this Philip, you will soon create another if this is your way of attending to the business. DEM. iv. 11. So xviii. 195, DEM. 217 (two cases in each). Ε■ δ■ ■μεν ν■οι δ■ς κα■ γ■ροντες, ε■ τις ■ξημ■ρτανε, διπλο■ β■ου λαχ■ντες ■ξωρθο■μεθ■ ■ν, if we were twice young and twice old, in case any one of us was in fault we should secure a double life and set ourselves right. EUR. Supp. 1084. See AR. Ran. 1449. Ε■ ξ■νος ■τ■γγανον ■ν, ξυνεγιγ■σκετε δ■που ■ν μοι ε■ ■ν ■κε■ν τ■ φων■ τε κα■ τ■ τρ■π■ ■λεγον ■ν ο■σπερ ■τεθρ■μμην, i.e. if I were a foreigner, you would pardon me if I spoke in my own dialect, etc. PLAT. Ap. 17D. Ε■ τ■ς σε ■ν■ροιτο το■το, τ■ ■στι σχ■μα; ε■ α■τ■ ε■πες ■τι στρογγυλ■της, ε■ σοι ε■πεν ■περ ■γ■, ε■πες δ■που ■ν ■τι σχ■μ■ τι. Men. 74 B.

Ε■ μ■ν περ■ καινο■ τινος πρ■γματος προυτ■θετο λ■γειν, ■πισχ■ν ■ν ■ως ο■ πλε■στοι τ■ν ε■ωθ■των γν■μην ■πεφ■ναντο, ε■ μ■ν ■ρεσκ■ τ■ μοι τ■ν ■π■ το■των ■ηθ■ντων, ■συχ■αν ■ν ■γον, ε■ δ■ μ■, τ■τ■ ■ν α■τ■ς ■πειρ■μην ■ γιν■σκω λ■γειν, i.e. if the subject of debate were new, I should have waited for others to speak; and then, if I liked anything that was said, I should keep quiet, and if not, I should try to say something myself. DEM. iv. 1; see also xxxiii. 25.

[*] 511. It will be noticed that when the leading condition is unreal (as in EUR. Supp. 1084, PLAT. Ap. 17 D, and DEM. iv. 1, above), this makes all subordinate past or present conditions also unreal, so far as the supposed case is concerned, without regard to their own nature. Thus, in DEM. iv. 1 and xxxiii. 25 we have two directly opposite suppositions both stated as contrary to fact, which could not be unless the leading supposition had made the whole state of things supposed in the sentence unreal like itself. It is obvious, therefore, that such a subordinate condition may refer to a case which is not in itself unreal, although it is part of a supposition which as a whole is unreal. This can be seen more easily in English. We can say, if he had been an Athenian, he would have been laughed at if he had talked as he did; but we are far from implying that the latter supposition (the subordinate one) is contrary to fact, although it would be expressed in Greek by ε■ ■λεγεν. Still it is part of a supposed unreal state of things. This explains an apparent inconsistency in respect to sentences like ε■κ■ς ■ν σε το■το παθε■ν, you ought properly to have suffered this, when the opposite of the infinitive is implied (415), the expression being practically equivalent (as a conditional form) to το■το ■παθες ■ν ε■ τ■ ε■κ■ς ■παθες. As το■το and τ■ ε■κ■ς are here identical, the apodosis is denied in the denial of the protasis. But if a new unreal protasis is added, the opposite of the infinitive is not necessarily implied (see 422, DEM. 1); and if we add a concessive protasis and say κα■ ε■ μηδ■ν ■δ■κησας, ε■κ■ς ■ν σε το■το παθε■ν, even if you had done nothing unjust, you ought (still) to have suffered this, το■το generally represents what actually took place (see 422, DEM. 2). Here a new chief protasis has come in and changed the whole relation of the apodosis to the sentence. This offers a satisfactory explanation of the apparent anomaly in SOPH. OT 221, ο■ γ■ρ ■ν μακρ■ν ■χνευον α■τ■ς, μ■ ο■κ ■χων τι σ■μβολον, where μ■ ο■κ ■χων is obviously equivalent to the condition ε■ μ■ ε■χων, while there is yet no such opposite implied as but I have a clue. The chief condition lies in the emphatic α■τ■ς, which is especially forcible after ξ■νος μ■ν and ξ■νος δ■, and involves ε■ μ■νος

■χνευον. The meaning is, for I should not be very far on the track, if I were attempting to trace it alone without a clue. Thus without a clue becomes part of the unreal supposition without being itself contrary to fact, while μ■ in μ■ ο■κ ■χων shows that ■χων is conditional, and not merely descriptive (as if it were ο■κ ■χων). For μ■ ο■ with the participle, see 818.

δ■, ■λλ■, and α■τ■ρ in Apodosis.

[*] 512. The apodosis is sometimes introduced by δ■, ■λλ■, or α■τ■ρ, but, as if the apodosis were co-ordinate with the protasis, and were not the leading sentence. This occurs when the apodosis is to be emphatically opposed to the protasis. It is especially common in Homer and Herodotus. E.g. Ε■ δ■ κε μ■ δ■ωσιν, ■γ■ δ■ κεν α■τ■ς ■λωμαι, but if they do not give it to me, (then■ I will take one myself. Il. i. 137. Ε■ περ γ■ρ τ■ ■λλοι γε περικτειν■μεθα π■ντες νηυσ■ν ■π■ ■ργε■ων, σο■ δ■ ο■ δ■ος ■στ■ ■πολ■σθαι. Il. xii. 245. Ε■ περ . . . καταπ■ψ■, ■λλ■ τε κα■ μετ■πισθεν ■χει κ■τον. Il. i. 81. Ε■ δ■ θαν■ντων περ καταλ■θοντ■ ε■ν ■■δαο, α■τ■ρ ■γ■ κα■ κε■θι φ■λου μεμν■σομ■ ■τα■ρου. Il. xxii. 389. Ε■ ■μ■ν ■στι το■το μ■ δυνατ■ν ποι■σαι, ■με■ς δ■ ■τι κα■ ν■ν ■κ το■ μ■σου ■μ■ν ■ζεσθε. HDT. viii. 22. ■λλ■ ε■ μηδ■ το■το βο■λει ■ποκρ■νασθαι, σ■ δ■ το■ντε■θεν λ■γε. XEN. Cyr. v. 5, 21.

[*] 513. This apodotic δ■ cannot be expressed in English; as our adverbs then, yet, still, etc., necessarily fail to give the force of the Greek δ■, which is always a conjunction. The expression ■λλ■ ν■ν, now at least, is elliptical for ε■ μ■ πρ■τερον ■λλ■ ν■ν (with apodotic ■λλ■); as ■■ν τ■ δ■καιον ■λλ■ ν■ν ■θ■λητε δρ■ν, if even now (though not before) you will do what is right, AR. Av. 1598. See DEM. iii. 33. Sometimes ■λλ■ alone seems to imply ε■ μ■ τι ■λλο; as in AR. Nub. 1364, “■κ■λευσ■ α■τ■ν ■λλ■ μυρρ■νην λαβ■ντα τ■ν Α■σχ■λου λ■ξαι τ■ μοι” , I bade him at least (if nothing more) take a myrtle branch and give me a bit of Aeschylus. So 1369. In PLAT. Rep. 509 C, ε■ μ■ τι ■λλ■ . . . διεξι■ν, if for nothing (else), that you may at least describe, etc., ■λλ■ introduces an apodosis after ε■ μ■ τι (sc. ■λλο). For δ■ used in the same way to introduce the sentence upon which a relative clause depends, see 564.

Section VII: Relative and Temporal Sentences.

[*] 514. Relative sentences may be introduced by relative pronouns and pronominal adjectives, or by relative adverbs of time, place, or manner. They include therefore all temporal sentences.

Clauses introduced by ■ως, πρ■ν, and other particles meaning until have many peculiarities, and are treated separately (611-661).

[*] 515. Relative sentences may be divided into two classes:—

First, those in which the antecedent of the relative is definite; that is, in which the relative pronouns refer to definite persons or things, and the relative adverbs to definite points of time, place, etc. Secondly, those in which the antecedent is indefinite; that is, in which no such definite persons, things, times, or places are referred to.

[*] 516. Both the definite and the indefinite antecedent may be either expressed or understood. E.g.

(Definite.) Τα■τα ■ ■χω ■ρ■ς, you see these things which I have; or ■ ■χω ■ρ■ς. ■τε ■βο■λετο ■λθεν, (once) when he wished, he came.

(Indefinite.) Πάντα ἃ ἐν βούλωνται ἔξουσιν, they will have everything which they may want; or ἃ ἐν βούλωνται ἔξουσιν, they will have whatever they may want. ἔταν ἄθ, τότε τοτο προξω, when he shall come (or when he comes), then I will do this. τε βουλοίτο, τοτο πρασεν, whenever he wished, he (always) did this. ζ ἐνω, οτωσ ποιμεν, as I shall direct, so let us act.

[*] 517. The relative may be used to express a purpose (565), or in a causal sense (580). The antecedent may then be either definite or indefinite.

[*] 518. When the antecedent is indefinite, the negative of the relative clause is μ; when it is definite, ο is used unless the general construction requires μ (as in prohibitions, wishes, final expressions, etc.).

Relative with Definite Antecedent.

[*] 519. A relative with a definite antecedent has no effect upon the mood of the following verb; and it therefore may take the indicative (with ο for its negative) or any other construction that can occur in an independent sentence. E.g. Ἄγω οδα, I say what I know. Ἄγω κκουσα. Ἄξω κκκοα. λεξαν κκουσαν. Πάντα λγει γενσεται. Προσσοουσιν βουλονται (or ζ βουλονται), they are doing what (or as) they please. (On the other hand, προξουσιν ἐν βουλωνται, or ζ ἐν βουλωνται, they will do what they please, or as they please; the antecedent being indefinite.) Ἄγω οκ γνο, I am saying that of which I am not ignorant.

“λλ τε δ ρ κ το ο δυωδεκτη γνετ κς, κα τε δ προς λυμπον σαν θεο αν ντες,” “but when now the twelfth day from that came, etc.” Il. i. 493. “Τς σθ κ χρος δτ, εν βεβκαμεν” SOPH. O. C. 52. “ως στ καιρς, ντιλβεσθε τν πραγμτων,” “i.e. now, while there is an opportunity, etc.” DEM. i. 20. (If the exhortation were future, he would say ως εν καιρς, so long as there shall be an opportunity. “δ ναβς, ως μν βσιμα εν, π το ππου γεν: πε δ βατα εν, καταλιπν τν ππον σπευδε πεζ” XEN. An. iii. 4, 49. So Il. i. 193, “εος ρμαινε” . “Οπερ δ κα τν ποβαινντων τ πλον τς ατας ξομεν, οτοι κα καθ σσχαν τι ατν προδωμεν,” “we who are to bear the greater part of the blame, etc.” THUC. i. 83. “θεν δ ον στα μαθσεσθε περ ατν, ντεθεν μς κα γ προν πειροσμοι διδσκειν” DEM. xxvii. 3. (Here ντεθεν refers to the point at which he intends to begin.) “δ λογια ργ, τε μ χθοδοπσαι φσεις ρ, τ εν μ ρθσιν νειδεοις πεσσιν,” “surely there will be sad work, when you shall impel me, etc.” Il. i. 518. (Here τε refers to some time conceived as definite; whereas τν ρθσιν, when (if ever) she shall provoke me, is indefinite; see 530.) “Νξ δ στα τε δ στυερς γμος ντιβολσει ολομνης μθεν, τς τε Ζες λβον πηρα” Od. xviii. 272. (The time is conceived as definite.) “Τηνικατα, τε οδ κ τι χρ ποιεν νξετε,” “then, when you will not even be able to do what you ought.” DEM. xix. 262.

ρξομαι δ ντεθεν θεν κα μες στ εν μθοιτε κγ τχιστ εν διδξαιμι. DEM. xxix. 5. (With the potential optative compare the future indicative in DEM. xxvii. 3, above.) Νν δ τοτο οκ ποησεν, εν τν δμον τμησεν εν, but he did not do this, in which he might have honoured the people. Id. xxi. 69. Ες καλν μν νυτος δε παρεκαθζετο, μεταδμεν τς ζητσεως. PLAT. Men. 89 E (subjunctive in exhortation). Οκουν ξιον τς τν κατηγορων λγοις πιστεσαι μλλον τς ργοις κα τ χρν, εν μες σαφστατον

■λεγχον το ■ληθο■ς νομ■σατε. LYS. xix. 61. (Here the imperative νομ■σατε is used in a sort of exclamation after ■ν, where ordinarily δε■ νομ■σαι would be used. See 253.) ■ν γ■ρ ■ποφ■γ■ με ο■τος, ■ μ■ γ■νοιτο, τ■ν ■πωβελ■αν ■φλ■σω. DEM. xxvii. 67 (optative in wish). So in μ■μνημαι ■τε and similar expressions. E.g. Ο■ μ■μν■ ■τε τ■ ■κρ■μω ■ψοθεν; do you not remember (the time) when you hung aloft? II. xv. 18. Ε■ μ■μνησαι ■τ■ ■γ■ σοι ■πεκριν■μην. PLAT. Men. 79D. Ο■σθ■ ■τε ■φ■νη. EUR. Hec. 112. (See 913.) Relative with Indefinite Antecedent. —Conditional Relative.

[*] 520. A relative with an indefinite antecedent gives a conditional force to the clause in which it stands, and is called a conditional relative. The conditional relative clause stands in the relation of a protasis to the antecedent clause, which is its apodosis (380). The negative particle is μ■.

Thus, when we say ■ νομ■ζει τα■τα λ■γει, he is saying what he (actually) thinks, or ■ ■ν■μιζε τα■τα ■λεγεν, he was saying what he thought, the actions of νομ■ζει and ■ν■μιζε are stated as actual facts, occurring at definite times; but when we say ■ ■ν νομ■ζ■ (τα■τα) λ■γει, he (always) says whatever he thinks, or ■ νομ■ζοι (τα■τα) ■λεγεν, he (always) said whatever he happened to be thinking, νομ■ζ■ and νομ■ζοι do not state any such definite facts, but rather what some one may think (or may have thought) on any occasion on which he may speak or may have spoken. So, when we say ■ νομ■ζει τα■τα λ■ξει, he will say what he (now) thinks, νομ■ζει denotes a fact; but when we say ■ ■ν νομ■ζ■ λ■ξει, he will say whatever he happens to be (then) thinking, νομ■ζ■ denotes a supposed future case. Again,—to take the case in which the distinction is most liable to be overlooked,—when we say ■ ο■κ ο■δα ο■κ ο■ομαι ε■δ■ναι, what I do not know, I do not think that I know, ο■κ ο■δα, as before, denotes a simple fact, and its object ■ has a definite antecedent; but when Socrates says ■ μ■ ο■δα ο■δ■ ο■ομαι ε■δ■ναι, the meaning is whatever I do not know (i.e. if there is anything which I do not know), I do not even think that I know it. In sentences like this, unless a negative is used (518), it is often difficult to decide whether the antecedent is definite or indefinite: thus ■ ο■δα ο■ομαι ε■δ■ναι may mean either what I (actually) know, I think that I know, or whatever I know (if there is anything which I know), I think that I know it.

[*] 521. The analogy of these indefinite relative clauses to conditional sentences will be seen at once. The following examples will make this clearer:—

■ τι βο■λεται δ■σω, I will give him whatever he (now) wishes. Ε■ τι βο■λεται, δ■σω, if he wishes anything, I will give it. (402.)

■ τι ■βο■λετο ■δωκα ■ν, I should have given him whatever he had wished. ■ τι μ■ ■γ■νετο ο■κ ■ν ε■πον, I should not have told what had not happened. Ε■ τι ■βο■λετο, ■δωκα ■ν, if he had wished anything, I should have given it. Ε■ τι μ■ ■γ■νετο, ο■κ ■ν ε■πον, I should not have told anything if it had not happened. (410.)

■ τι ■ν βο■ληται, δ■σω, I will give him whatever he shall wish. ■■ν τι βο■ληται, δ■σω, if he shall wish anything, I will give it. (444.)

■ τι βο■λοιτο δο■ην ■ν, I should give him whatever he might wish. Ε■ τι βο■λοιτο, δο■ην ■ν, if he should wish anything, I should give it. (455.)

■ τι ■ν βο■ληται δ■δωμι, I (always) give him whatever he wishes. ■ τι βο■λοιτο ■δ■δουν, I always gave him whatever he wished. ■■ν τι βο■ληται, δ■δωμι, if he ever wishes anything, I (always) give it. Ε■ τι βο■λοιτο, ■δ■δουν, if he ever wished anything, I (always) gave it. (462.)

[*] 522. The particle ■ν (Epic κ■) is regularly joined with all relative words when they are followed by the subjunctive. With ■τε, ■π■τε, ■πε■, and ■πειδ■, ■ν forms ■ταν, ■π■ταν, ■π■ν or ■π■ν (Ionic ■πε■ν), and ■πειδ■ν. In Homer, where κ■ is generally used for ■ν, we have ■τε κε, ■πε■ κε, etc. (like ε■ κε), also ■τ■ ■ν, where in Attic we have ■ταν, ■π■ταν, ■πειδ■ν. ■π■ν, however, occurs often, and ■πε■ ■ν once, in Homer. Both ■π■ν and ■π■ν are rare in

[*] 523. The classification of common conditional sentences, with four classes of ordinary conditions and two of general conditions, given in 388-395, applies equally to conditional relative sentences.

I. Four Forms of Ordinary Conditional Relative Sentences.

[*] 524. The conditional relative sentence has four forms, two of present and past (525 and 528) and two of future conditions (529 and 531), which correspond to the four forms of ordinary protasis.

(a) Present and Past Conditions.

[*] 525. When the relative clause simply states a present or past supposition, implying nothing as to the fulfilment of the condition, the verb is in one of the present or past tenses of the indicative. The antecedent clause can have any form of the verb, like an ordinary apodosis. (See 402.) E.g. ■ μ■ ο■δα, ο■δ■ ο■ομαι ε■δ■ναι (like ε■ τινα μ■ ο■δα). PLAT.Ap. 21D. (See 520.) “Χρ■σθων ■ τι βο■λονται” “let them deal with me as they please (i.e. ε■ τι βο■λονται).” AR. Nub. 439. ■π■σταμαι ■ρ■ν θ■ ■ δε■ με, κο■χ ■ρ■ν ■ μ■ πρ■πει, I know how to see anything which I ought to see, and not to see anything which I ought not. InoEUR. , EUR. Fr. 417. (■ δε■ is nearly equivalent to ε■ τινα δε■, and ■ μ■ πρ■πει to ε■ τινα μ■ πρ■πει.) Το■ς πλε■στους ■νθαπερ ■πεσον ■κ■στους ■θαψαν: ο■ς δ■ μ■ ε■ρισκον, κενοτ■φιον α■το■ς ■πο■ησαν, i.e. they raised a cenotaph for any of them whom they did not find (like ε■ τινας μ■ ε■ρισκον). XEN. An. vi. 4, 9. Τ■ γ■ρ; ■στις δαπανηρ■ς ■ν μ■ α■τρ■κης ■στ■ν, ■λλ■ ■ε■ τ■ν πλησ■ον δε■ται, κα■ λαμβ■νων μ■ δ■νεται ■ποδιδ■ναι, μ■ λαμβ■νων δ■ τ■ν μ■ διδ■ντα μισε■, ο■ δοκε■ σοι κα■ ο■τος χαλεπ■ς φ■λος ε■ναι; (i.e. supposing a case, ε■ τις . . . μ■ α■τρ■κης ■στ■ν, κ.τ.λ.). Id. Mem. ii. 6, Id. Mem. 2. So ■τις μηδαμο■ ξυμμαχε■, THUC. i. 35. ■ γ■ρ τις μ■ προσεδ■κησεν, ο■δ■ φυλ■ξασθαι ■γγωρε■, for there is no opportunity even to guard against what we did not expect (like ε■ τινα μ■ προσεδ■κησ■ τις). ANT. v. 19. Ε■ς τ■ πλο■α το■ς τε ■σθενο■ντας ■νεβ■βασαν κα■ τ■ν σκευ■ν ■σα μ■ ■ν■γκη ■ν ■χειν (like ε■ τινα τ■ν σκευ■ν μ■ ■ν■γκη ■ν ■χειν), i.e. any which they did not need. XEN. An. v. 3, 1. ■νθρ■πους δι■φθειρεν (■ θ■λασσα) ■σοι μ■ ■δ■ναντο φθ■ναι πρ■ς τ■ μετ■ωρα ■ναδραμ■ντες, i.e. if any were unable to escape soon enough to the high land, so many the sea destroyed. THUC. iii. 89. Ο■ς μ■ν α■ρεσις γεγ■νηται τ■λλα ε■τυχο■σι, πολλ■ ■νοια πολεμ■σαι: ε■ δ■ ■ναγκα■ον ■ν, κ.τ.λ., for any who have had the choice given them, while they are prosperous in other respects, it is great folly to go to war (i.e. ε■ τισιν α■ρεσις γεγ■νηται). Id. ii. 61. Π■ντες ■σμεν Χαβρ■αν ο■τε τ■πτοντα ο■θ■ ■ρπ■ζοντα τ■ν στ■φανον ο■θ■ ■λως προσι■νθ■ ■ποι μ■ προσ■κεν α■τ■, nor going anywhere at all where it was not lawful for him (i.e. ε■ ποι μ■

προσ■κεν). DEM. xxi. 64. Π■ς ο■ν ο■ ■γαθο■ το■ς ■γαθο■ς φ■λοι ■σονται, ο■ μ■τε ■π■ντες ποθεινο■ ■λλ■λοις μ■τε παρ■ντες χρε■αν α■τ■ν ■χουσι; (i.e. ε■ μ■ ■χουσι). Lys. 215 B. Νικ■η δ■ ■ τι π■σιν ■μ■ν μ■λλει συνο■σειν (i.e. ε■ τι μ■λλει), may any plan prevail which will benefit you all. DEM. iv. 51.

[*] 526. Care must be taken here (as in conditional sentences) not to include in this class general suppositions which require the subjunctive or optative (532). On the other hand, the examples falling under 534, in which the indicative is allowed, might properly be placed here, as they state a general supposition as if it were a particular one.

[*] 527. A conditional relative clause (like a clause with ε■, 407) may take the future indicative to express a present intention or necessity. E.g. ■ν το■τ■ κεκωλ■σθαι ■δ■κει ■κ■στ■ τ■ πρ■γματα ■ μ■ τις α■τ■ς παρ■σται, "each man felt that all progress was at an end in any affair in which he was not personally to take part." THUC. ii. 8. The direct form was ■ν το■τ■ κεκ■λυται (51; 122■ μ■ παρ■σομαι. Ο■ δ■ ■ληθε■ας τις ■τυχ■σει, ποτ■ το■του ■πιστ■μων ■σται; but if one is to miss the truth of anything, will he ever understand it? PLAT. Theaet. 186 C. So probably XEN. Cyr. i. 5, 13, ■ τι γ■ρ μ■ τοιο■τον ■ποβ■σεται παρ■ ■μ■ν, ε■ς ■μ■ τ■ ■λλε■πον ■σται, i.e. if there is to be any failure on your part to come up to my expectations, the loss will fall on me. This is the only form of conditional relative sentence that regularly takes the future indicative. (See 530.)

[*] 528. When a relative clause expresses a present or past condition, implying that it is not or was not fulfilled (like a protasis of the form 410), the verb is in a past tense of the indicative. The antecedent clause generally has a past tense of the indicative with ■ν; but it may have a past tense of the indicative in an unreal condition, in an unaccomplished wish, or in a final clause. E.g. ■ μ■ ■βο■λετο δο■ναι, ο■κ ■ν ■δωκεν, he would not have given what he had not wished to give (i.e. ε■ τινα μ■ ■βο■λετο δο■ναι, ο■κ ■ν ■δωκεν). ■π■τερον το■των ■πο■ησεν, ο■δεν■ς ■ν ■ττον ■θηνα■ων πλο■σιοι ■σαν, whichever of these he had done (he did neither), they would be as rich as any of the Athenians. LYS. xxxii. 23. Ο■τε γ■ρ ■ν α■το■ ■πεχειρο■μεν πρ■ττειν ■ μ■ ■πιστ■μεθα, ο■τε το■ς ■λλοις ■πετρ■πομεν ■ν ■ρχομεν ■λλο τι πρ■ττειν ■ ■ τι πρ■ττοντες ■ρθ■ς ■μελλον πρ■ξειν: το■το δ■ ■ν ■ν ο■ ■πιστ■μην ε■χον, for (if that were so) we should not be undertaking (as we are) to do things which we did not understand, nor should we permit any others whom we were ruling to do anything else than what they were likely to do properly; and this would be whatever they had knowledge of. PLAT. Charm. 171E. (Here ■ μ■ ■πιστ■μεθα=ε■ τινα μ■ ■πιστ■μεθα, if there were any things which we did not know,—■ν ■ρχομεν=ε■ τινων ■ρχομεν,—■ τι ■μελλον=ε■ τι ■μελλον,—and ο■ ■πιστ■μην ε■χον=ε■ τινος ε■χον. E. It is implied that none of the cases here supposed ever actually arose. ■σπερ το■νυν ■λλων τιν■ν τεττ■ρων, ε■ ■ν τι ■ζητο■μεν α■τ■ν ■ν ■τ■ο■ν, ■π■τε πρ■τον ■κε■νο ■γνωμεν, ■καν■ς ■ν ε■χεν ■μ■ν, ε■ δ■ τ■ τρ■α πρ■τερον ■γνωρ■σαμεν, α■τ■ ■ν το■τ■ ■γνωριστο τ■ ζητο■μενον. PLAT. Rep. 428A. (Here the antithesis of ■π■τε πρ■τον ■κε■νο ■γνωμεν, in (whatever) case we had recognised this first, and ε■ τ■ τρ■α πρ■τερον ■γνωρ■σαμεν, if we had recognised the three sooner, makes the force of the relative especially clear.) ■βασ■νιζον ■ν μ■χρι ο■ α■το■ς ■δ■κει, they would have questioned them (under torture) so long as they pleased. DEM. liii. 25. Ε■ δ■ ο■κοι ε■χον ■καστοι τ■ς δ■κας, το■τους ■ν ■π■λλυσαν ο■τινες φ■λοι μ■λιστα ■σαν ■θηνα■ων τ■ δ■μ■, if each had their trials at home, they would ruin any who were especially friendly, etc. Ath. i. 16. (Here ο■τινες ■σαν,=ε■

τινες ■σαν, forms a second protasis to the apodosis ■π■λλυσαν ■ν. See 511.) Κα■ ■πην■κα ■φα■νετο τα■τα πεποικ■ς, ■μολογε■τ■ ■ν ■ κατηγορ■α το■ς ■ργοις α■το■, and if he ever appeared to have done this, his form of accusation would agree with his acts. DEM. xviii. 14.

Ε■ ξ■νος ■τ■γγανον ■ν, ξυνεγιν■σκετε δ■που ■ν μοι ε■ ■ν ■κε■ν■ τ■ φων■ τε κα■ τ■ τρ■π■ ■λεγον ■ν ο■σπερ ■τεθρ■μμην, if I happened to be a foreigner, you would surely pardon me, if I were (now) addressing you in both the language and the manner in which I had been brought up. PLAT. Ap. 17D. ■ς δ■ ■γ■ γ■ ■φελον μ■καρ■ς ν■ τευ ■μμεναι υ■■ς ■ν■ρος, ■ν κτε■τεσσιν ■ο■ς ■πι γ■ρας ■τετμεν, O that I were the son of some fortunate man, whom old age had found upon his own estate (i.e. if old age had found any such man, would that I had been his son). Hom. Od. i. 217. So Hom. Il. vi. 348 and 351. So when the relative sentence depends on a past indicative in a final clause (333); as in DEM. xxiii. 48, τα■τ■ γε δ■που προσ■κε γρ■ψαι, ■να ■τ■ ποτ■ το■ργον ■πρ■χθη, το■τ■ τ■ ■κ τ■ν ν■μων ■πρ■ρχε δ■καια, he ought to have written it in this way, in order that any one by whom the deed had been done might have his rights according to the laws. (This implies that the law was not so written, so that the case supposed in ■τ■ ■πρ■χθη never arose.) So DEM. liii. 24, ■ν■ ■κο■σαντες ■κ το■των ■ψηφ■σασθε ■πο■■ν τι ■μ■ν ■δ■κει, that you might have voted whatever seemed good to you.

All examples of this form fall equally well under the general rule for assimilation (559).

(b) Future Conditions.

[*] 529. ■Subjunctive.) When the relative clause expresses a future condition of the more vivid form (like a protasis of the form 444), and the verb of the antecedent clause also refers to the future, the relative is joined with ■ν (or κ■) and takes the subjunctive. E.g. Τ■ων ■ν κ■ ■θ■λωμι φ■λην ποι■σομ■ ■κοιτιν (like ε■ κ■ τινα ■θ■λωμι), whomsoever of these I may wish I shall make my wife. Il. ix. 397. ■κ γ■ρ ■ρ■σταο τ■σις ■σσεται ■τρε■δαο, ■ππ■τ■ ■ν ■β■σ■ τε κα■ ■ς ■με■ρεται α■ης, i.e. vengeance will come from Orestes, when he shall grow up, etc. (like ■■ν ποτε ■β■σ■). Od. i. 40. Τ■τε δ■ α■τε μαχ■σεται, ■ππ■τε κ■ν μιν θυμ■ς ■ν■ στ■θεσσιν ■ν■γ■ κα■ θε■ς ■ρσ■. Il. ix. 702. ■λλ■ ■γεθ■, ■ς ■ν ■γ■ν ε■πω, πειθ■μεθα π■ντες, let us obey as I may direct, i.e. if I give any direction (■■ν πως ε■πω), let us obey it. Il. ii. 139. ■με■ς α■τ■ ■λλ■χους τε φ■λας κα■ ν■πια τ■κνα ■ξομεν ■ν ν■εσσιν, ■π■ν πτολ■εθρον ■λωμεν, "when we shall have taken the city." Il. iv. 238. So ε■τ■ ■ν π■πτωσιν, Il. i. 242. Ο■κο■ν, ■ταν δ■ μ■ σθ■νω, πεπα■σομαι, therefore, when I shall have no more strength, I will cease. SOPH. Ant. 91. Τα■τα, ■πειδ■ν περ■ το■ γ■νους ε■πω, τ■τε ■ρ■, I will speak of this, when I shall have spoken about my birth. DEM. Ivii. 16. (See 90.) ■πειδ■ν διαπρ■ξωμαι ■ δ■ομαι, ■ξω. XEN. An. ii. 3, 29. Τ■να ο■εσθε α■τ■ν ψυχ■ν ■ξειν, ■ταν ■μ■ ■δ■ τ■ν πατρ■ων ■πεστερημ■νον; what feelings do you think she will have, when (or if at any time) she shall see me, etc.? DEM. xxviii. 21. Το■των δ■ ■θηνα■ους φημ■ δε■ν ε■ναι πεντακοσ■ους, ■ξ ■ς ■ν τινος ■μ■ν ■λικ■ας καλ■ς ■χειν δοκ■, from whatever age it shall seem good to you to take them (i.e. if from any particular age, etc.) Id. iv. 21. Τ■ν πραγμ■των το■ς βουλευομ■νους (■γε■σθαι δε■), ■να ■ ■ν ■κε■νοις δοκ■ τα■τα πρ■ττηται, "in order that whatever shall seem good to them shall be done." Ib. 39. Ο■ μοι φ■βου μ■λαθρον ■λπ■ς ■μπατε■ν, ■ως ■ν α■θ■ τ■ρ ■φ■ ■στ■ας ■μ■ς Α■γισθος, "so long as Aegisthus shall kindle fire upon my hearth." AESCH. Ag. 1434.

[*] 530. The future indicative is very rarely used in conditional relative clauses, as it is in common protasis (447), in the place of the subjunctive; as it would generally be ambiguous, appearing as if the ante cedent were definite. Some cases of σοσ with the future, as σοι βουλοσονται, THUC. i. 22, are perhaps exceptions. (See 527.)

[*] 531. Optative.) When the relative clause expresses a future condition of the less vivid form (like a protasis of the form 455), and the antecedent clause contains an optative referring to the future, the relative takes the optative (without ν). The optative in the antecedent clause may be in an apodosis with ν, in a protasis, in an expression of a wish, or in a final clause. E.g. Μλα κεν θρασυκρδιος εη, ς τε γηθσειεν δν πνον οδ κχοιτο (i.e. ε τις γηθσειε, μλα κεν θρασυκρδιος εη), any one who should then rejoice would be very stout-hearted. Il. xiii. 343. Βουλομην κ προυρος ν θητευμεν λλ . . . μ βοτος πολς εη, I should wish to be a serf attached to the soil, serving another man who had not much to live on. Od. xi. 489. Ζηνς οκ ν σσον κομην, τε μ ατς γε κελεοι, “unless he should himself bid me.” Il. xiv. 247. So Il. vi. 329 and 521; and “στις κλσειε,” AR. Nub. 1250. Οκ ν ον θρψαις νδρα, στις θλοι τε κ δναιτο σο περκειν τος πιχειροντας δικεν σε; would you not support any man who should be both willing and able, etc.? XEN. Mem. ii. 9, 2. Πεινν φγοι ν πτε βολοιοιτο, when he is hungry, he would eat whenever he might wish (like ε ποτε βολοιοιτο). Ib. ii. 1, lb. 18. So i. 5, lb. 4; i. 7, lb. 3; iv. 2, lb. 20. Πς ον ν εδεης περ του του προγματος ο παντπασιν πειρος εης; “how then could you know about that thing of which you had no experience at all?” PLAT. Men. 92 C. ρ ν γοο τατα σ εναι, σοι ξεη κ ποδσθαι κ δοναι κ θσαι τ βολοιο θεν; Id. Euthyd. 302A. Τν παθεν (δναιτο), μ κ φ ατο πθοι; what could he suffer, unless he should suffer it also from himself? (i.e. ε μ πθοι). Lys. 214E. δ μ γαπη, οδ ν φιλο (i.e. ε τι μ γαπη, οδ ν φιλο τοτο). Ib. 215B. δαν καστος ν κατασκευν κατασκευζοιτο, τις καστον ρσκοι. Rep. 557B. σ δ πρεσβτερος γγνοιτο, μλλον ε σπζοιτο ν (χρματα), the older he should grow, the more he would always cling to it (i.e. ε τι πρεσβτερος γγνοιτο, τοσοτ μλλον σπζοιτο ν). Ib. 549 B. So 412D. Φσομεν μηδποτε μηδν ν μεζον μηδ λαττον γενσθαι, ως σον εη ατ αντ, “so long as it should remain equal to itself.” Theaet. 155A.

Ε δ βολοιο τν φλων τιν προτρψασθαι πτε ποδημοης πιμελεσθαι τν σν, τν ποιοης; XEN. Mem. ii. 3, 12. Εκκτως ν κ αρ θεν πρακτικτερος εη, στις μ πτε ν προις εη τε κολακεοι, λλ τε τ ριστα προττοι τε μλιστα τν θεν μεμντο. Id. Cyr. i. 6, Id. Cyr. 3. ς πλοιο κ λλος, τις τοιατ γε ζοι, O that any other man might likewise perish who should do the like (i.e. ε τις τοιατα ζοι). Hom. Od. i. 47. Ε γρ μιν θαντοιο δυσηχος δε δυναμην νσφιν ποκρψαι, τε μιν μρος ανς κνοι. Hom. Il. xviii. 464. Δρα θεν χοι, ττι διδοεν, may he have gifts of the Gods, whatever they may give. Hom. Od. xviii. 142. γγνωσκε δεν τος πηρτας τοτο σκεν, ς πντα νομζοιεν προπειν ατος προττειν σα ρχων προσττοι. XEN. Cyr. ii. 1, 31. For κ or ν in these relative sentences in Homer, see 542. All these examples fall also under the general rule for assimilation (558).

II. General Conditional Relative Sentences.

[*] 532. A conditional relative sentence may express a general supposition, when the verb of the antecedent clause denotes a customary or repeated action or a general truth, while the relative clause refers in a general way to any act or acts of a given class. Here the subjunctive with **■ς ■ν**, **■ταν**, etc., follows primary tenses, and the optative (without **■ν**) follows secondary tenses. (See 462.) E.g. **■χθρ■ς γ■ρ μοι κε■νος ■μ■ς ■■δαο π■λλ■σιν**, **■ς χ■ ■τερον μ■ν κε■θ■ ■ν■ φρεσ■ν**, **■λλο δ■ ε■π■**, for that man (i.e. any man) is hated by me like the very gates of Hades, who conceals one thing in his mind and speaks another. Il. ix. 312. **Νεμεσσ■μα■ γε μ■ν ο■δ■ν κλα■ειν ■ς κε θ■ν■σι βροτ■ν κα■ π■τμον ■ν■σπ■**, I am never at all indignant at weeping for any mortal who may die, etc. Od. iv. 195. **Ο■νος**, **■ς τε κα■ ■λλους βλ■πτει**, **■ς ■ν μιν χ■νδον ■λ■ μηδ■ α■σιμα π■ν■**. Od. xxi. 293. **Κα■ γ■ρ συμμαχε■ν το■τοις ■θ■λουσιν ■παντες**, **ο■ς ■ν ■ρ■σι παρεσκευασμ■νους**, for all men are (always) willing to be allies to those whom they see prepared. DEM. iv. 6. **Κα■περ τ■ν ■νθρ■πων**, **■ν ■ μ■ν ■ν πολεμ■σι**, **τ■ν παρ■ντα (π■λεμον) ■ε■ μ■γιστον κριν■ντων**, although men always consider the present war the greatest, so long as they are engaged in it. THUC. i. 21. **Πορε■οντα■ τε γ■ρ α■ ■γ■λαι ■ ■ν α■τ■ς ε■θ■νωσιν ο■ νομε■ς**, **ν■μοντα■ τε χωρ■α ■φ■ πο■α ■ν α■τ■ς ■φι■σιν**, **π■χοντα■ τε ■ν ■ν α■τ■ς ■πε■ργωσι**: **κα■ το■ς καρπο■ς ■■σι το■ς νομ■ας χρ■σθαι ο■τως π■ως ■ν α■το■ βο■λωνται**: **■νθρωποι δ■ ■π■ ο■δ■νας μ■λλον συν■στανται ■π■ το■τους ο■ς ■ν α■σθωνται ■ρχειν α■τ■ν ■πιχειρο■ντας**. XEN. Cyr. i. 1, 2. **Νομ■ζω προστ■του ■ργον ε■ναι ο■ου δε■**, **■ς ■ν ■ρ■ν το■ς φ■λους ■ξαπατωμ■νους μ■ ■πιτρ■π■**, i.e. such as one ought always to be, who, etc. Id. Hell. ii. 3, Id. Hell. 51. **Καταφρ■νησις δ■ (■γγ■γεται)**, **■ς ■ν κα■ γ■μ■ πιστε■ τ■ν ■ναντ■ων προ■χειν**, **■ μ■ν ■π■ρχει**. THUC. ii. 62. (Here the **■** refers to all that precedes, as a definite antecedent.)

Ο■ μ■ν γ■ρ με■ζον κλ■ος ■ν■ρος, **■φρα κ■ ■■σιν**, **■ ■ τι ποσσ■ν τε ■■ξ■ κα■ χερσ■ν**. Od. viii. 147. (**■φρα κ■ ■■σιν**, so long as he lives.) (**Θεο■ς**) **παρατρωπ■σ■ ■νθρωποι λισσ■μενοι**, **■τε κ■ν τις ■περβ■■ κα■ ■μ■ρτ■**. Il. ix. 500. **■μισυ γ■ρ τ■ ■ρετ■ς ■ποα■ννται ε■ρ■οπα Ζε■ς ■ν■ρος**, **ε■τ■ ■ν μιν κατ■ δο■λιον ■μαρ ■λλ■σιν**. Od. xvii. 322. **Φιλ■ει δ■ κως προσημα■νειν**, **ε■τ■ ■ν μ■λλ■ μεγ■λα κακ■ ■ π■λι ■ ■θνε■ ■σεσθαι**. HDT. vi. 27. **Φε■γουσι γ■ρ τοι χο■ θρασε■ς**, **■ταν π■λας ■δη τ■ν ■ιδην ε■σορ■σι το■ β■ου**. SOPH. Ant. 580. **■ν■κ■ ■ν δ■ ο■κοι γ■νωνται**, **δρ■σιν ο■κ ■νασχετ■**. Pac. 1179. **■πειδ■ν δ■ ■ κφορ■ ■**, **λ■ρνακας γουσιν ■μαξαι**. THUC. ii. 34. **■πειδ■ν δ■ κρ■ψωσι γ■**, **■ν■ρ ■ρημ■νος π■ τ■ς π■λεως**, **■ς ■ν γν■μ■ τε δοκ■ μ■ ■ξ■νετος ε■ναι**, **λ■γει ■π■ α■το■ς παινον τ■ν προ■ποντα**. Ibid. **■ως ■ν σ■ζηται τ■ σκ■φος**, **τ■τε χρ■ προθ■μους ε■ναι**: **■πειδ■ν δ■ ■ θ■λαττα ■π■ρσχ■**, **μ■ταιος ■ σπουδ■**. DEM. ix. 69. **So ■στ■ ■ν δε■σωσιν**, XEN. Mem. iii. 5, 6.

■ν δ■ α■ δ■μου ■νδρα ■δοι β■ωντ■ τ■ ■φε■ροι, **τ■ν σκ■πτρ■ ■λ■σασκεν**, whatever man of the people he saw and found brawling, he drove him with his sceptre. Il. ii. 198; see ii. 188. **Ο■τινα γ■ρ τ■εσκον ■πιχθον■ων ■νθρ■πων**, **ο■ κακ■ν ο■δ■ μ■ν ■σθλ■ν**, **■ τ■ς σφεας ε■σαφ■κοιτο**, i.e. they were never in the habit of honouring any one who came to them. Od. xxii. 414. **■τε μ■ν σκιρτ■εν**, . . . **θ■ον**. Il. xx. 226: so 228. See Od. xx. 138. **Κα■ ο■ς μ■ν ■δοι ε■τ■κτως κα■ σιωπ■ ■■ντας**, **προσελα■νων α■το■ς τ■νες τε ε■εν ■ρ■τα**, **κα■ ■πε■ π■θοιτο π■νει**. XEN. Cyr. v. 3, 55. (Here **■ρ■τα** and **π■νει** denote the habit of Cyrus.) **Κα■ το■ς μ■ν ■θηνα■οις η■ξετο τ■ ναυτικ■ν π■ τ■ς δαπ■νης ■ν ■κε■νοι ξυμφ■ροιεν**, **α■το■ δ■**, **π■τε ■ποστα■εν**, **παρ■σκευοι κα■ ■πειροι ■ς τ■ν π■λεμον καθ■σταντο**, and the Athenian navy continued to increase from the money which these contributed (pres.), and they,

whenever they revolted (aor.), always found themselves unprepared and inexperienced for war. THUC. i. 99.

■π■ Μο■ριος βασιλ■ος, ■κως ■λθοι ■ ποταμ■ς ■π■ ■κτ■ π■χεας, ■ρδεσκε Α■γυπτον τ■ν ■νερθε Μ■μφιος, i.e. whenever the river rose. HDT. ii. 13. Τ■ν δ■ χο■ν τ■ν ■κφορε■μενον, ■κως γ■νοιτο ν■ξ, ■ς τ■ν Τ■γριν ■ξεφ■ρεον, i.e. they carried it away every night. Id. ii. 150. Ο■ δ■ (Κ■ρες), ■κως Μ■νωσ δ■οιτο, ■πλ■ρουν ο■ τ■ς ν■ας. Id. i. 171. ■πειδ■ δ■ ■νοιχθε■η, ε■σ■ειμεν παρ■ τ■ν Σωκρ■τη, i.e. each morning, when the prison was opened, etc. PLAT. Phaed. 59D. ■τε ■ξω το■ δεινο■ γ■νοιτο, πολλο■ α■τ■ν ■π■λειπον, “many used to leave him when they were out of danger.” XEN. An. ii. 6, 12. (If ■γ■νοντο had been used, the whole sentence would refer to a particular case.)

[*] 533. The gnomic aorist and the other gnomic and iterative tenses (154-164) can be used in the antecedent clause of these general propositions. The gnomic aorist, as usual, is a primary tense, and is followed by the subjunctive (171). E.g.

“■ς κε θεο■ς ■πιπε■θηται, μ■λα τ■ ■κλυον α■το■” “whoever obeys the Gods, to him they are ready to listen ■κλυον is aoristic.” Il. i. 218.

“■ταν τις ■σπερ ο■τος ■σχ■σ■, ■ πρ■τη πρ■φασις ■παντα ■νεχα■τισε κα■ δι■λυσεν” DEM. ii. 9.

“■π■τε προσβλ■ψει■ τινας τ■ν ■ν τα■ς τ■ξεσι, ε■πεν ■ν, ■ ■νδρες, κ.τ.λ., i.e. ηε υσεδ το σαψ, ετζ.” XEN. Cyr. vii. 1, 10.

“Ο■τ■ ■λλοτε π■ποτε πρ■ς χ■ριν ε■λ■μην λ■γειν, ■ τι ■ν μ■ κα■ συνο■σειν πεπεισμ■νος ■,” “I have never on other occasions preferred to say anything to please which I have not been convinced would also be for your advantage.” DEM. iv. 51. (Here ε■λ■μην has a sense approaching that of the gnomic aorist, and is followed by a subjunctive. See 156.)

Homeric examples of relatives with κ■ or ■ν and the subjunctive in general conditions are here included with the others, because this construction is fixed in the Homeric usage. In the greater number of general relative conditions which have the subjunctive, however, Homer uses the relative without κ■ or ■ν, as he prefers the simple ε■ in the corresponding conditional sentences (468). See examples in 538.

[*] 534. ■Indicative.) The indicative is sometimes used instead of the subjunctive and optative in relative sentences of this class. (See 467.) Here one of the cases in which the event may occur is referred to as if it were the only one. This use of the indicative occurs especially after the indefinite relative ■στις; as the idea of indefiniteness, which is usually expressed by the subjunctive or optative, is here sufficiently expressed by the relative itself. E.g.

■χθρ■ς γ■ρ μοι κε■νος ■μ■ς ■■δαο π■λ■σιν Γ■γνεται, ■ς πεν■ε■κων ■πατ■λια β■ζει. Od. xiv. 156.

Compare this with Il. ix. 312, the first example under 532.

■μο■ γ■ρ ■στις π■σαν ε■θ■νων π■λιν Μ■ τ■ν ■ρ■στων ■πτεται βουλευμ■των, ■λλ■ ■κ φ■βου του γλ■σσαν ■γκλε■σας ■χει, Κ■κιστος ε■ναι ν■ν τε κα■ π■λαι δοκε■: Κα■ με■ζον■

■στις ■ντ■ τ■ς α■το■ π■τρας Φ■λον νομ■ζει, το■τον ο■δαμο■ λ■γω. SOPH. Ant. 178.

(Here we might have had ■ς ■ν . . . μ■ ■πτηται, ■λλ■ . . . ■χ■, and ■ς ■ν νομ■ζ■, without any essential difference in meaning.)

Ο■τινες πρ■ς τ■ς ξυμφορ■ς γν■μ■ μ■ν ■κιστα λυπο■νται, ■ργ■ δ■ μ■λιστα ■ντ■χουσιν, ο■τοι κα■ π■λεων κα■ ■διωτ■ν κρ■τιστο■ ε■σιν. THUC. ii. 64. So in the same chapter, ■στις λαμβ■νει. ■στις δ■ ■φικνε■το τ■ν παρ■ βασιλ■ως πρ■ς α■τ■ν, π■ντας ο■τω διατιθε■ς ■πεπ■μπετο, whoever came to him, he always sent away, etc. XEN. An. i. 1, 5. ■που δ■ χιλ■ς σπ■νιος π■νυ ε■η, α■τ■ς δ■ ■δ■νατο παρασκευ■σασθαι, διαπ■μπων ■κ■λευε το■ς φ■λους ■πποις ■μβ■λλειν το■τον. Ib. i. 9, Ib. 27. (In the last two examples there is some Ms. authority for the more regular ■φικνο■το and δ■ναιτο.) [*] 535. This use of the indicative (534) is rare in temporal sentences. See, however, the following:—

Περ■ τ■ν ■λλων τ■ν ■δικο■ντων, ■τε δικ■ζονται, δε■ παρ■ τ■ν κατηγο■ρων πυθ■σθαι. LYS. xxii. 22. Ε■χον μαχα■ριον, ■ ■σφαττον ■ν κρατε■ν δ■ναιντο, κα■ ■ποτ■μνοντες ■ν τ■ς κεφαλ■ς ■χοντες ■πορε■οντο, ■π■τε ο■ πολ■μιοι α■το■ς ■ψεσθαι ■με λλον. XEN. An. iv. 7, 16. So ■π■τε ■φ■στατο, XEN. An. ii. 6, 27.

All these examples fall under the first class of conditional relative sentences (525).

[*] 536. The Greek generally uses the indicative in relative clauses depending on general negative sentences, where in Latin a subjunctive is more common. A general negation is really particular. E.g. Παρ■ ■μο■ δ■ ο■δε■ς μισθοφορε■, ■στις μ■ ■καν■ς ■στιν ■σα πονε■ν ■μο■, i.e. no one who is not able (no one unless he is able), nemo qui non possit. XEN. Hell. vi. 1, 5. Ο■δε■ς γ■ρ ο■δεν■ ■ργ■ζετο ■στις μ■ ■ετο ■πολε■σθαι, for no one was angry with any one who did not think that he was about to perish (i.e. ε■ μ■ ■ετο). Ib. vii. 4, Ib. 37. Ο■δαμο■ π■ποθ■, ■ποι πρεσβευτ■ς ■π■μφθην ■φ■ ■μ■ν ■γ■, ■ττηθε■ς ■π■λθον τ■ν παρ■ Φιλ■ππου πρ■σβεων, nowhere, whither I was sent as ambassador, did I ever come off worsted by Philip's ambassadors. DEM. xviii. 244. Here the leading sentence is particular, on no single occasion was I worsted, so that ■π■μφθην is regular; if the nearly equivalent universal affirmative on every occasion I proved superior had been intended, we should have had πεμφθε■ην. See xviii. 45, προ■λεγον κα■ διεμαρτυρ■μην κα■ παρ■ ■μ■ν ■ε■ κα■ ■ποι πεμφθε■ην; and the following in 244, ■ν ο■ς κρατηθε■εν ο■ πρ■σβεις α■το■ τ■ λ■γ■, τα■τα το■ς ■πλοις ■πι■ν κατεστρ■φετο. Notice the imperfects in the two affirmative examples, and the aorist in the preceding negative example.

[*] 537. 1. The indicative is generally used in Greek (as in Latin) in parenthetical relative clauses, like ■ τι ποτ■ ■στ■ν, whatever it is (quidquid est), ■στις ποτ■ ■στ■ν (or ■σται), etc. E.g. Ζε■ς, ■στις ποτ■ ■στ■ν, ε■ τ■δ■ α■τ■ φ■λον κεκλημ■ν■, το■τ■ νιν προσενν■πω, Zeus, whoever he may be, etc. AESCH. Ag. 160. "Δουλε■ομεν θεο■ς, ■ τι ποτ■ ε■σ■ν θεο■" EUR. Or. 418. ■μ■ν γε κρ■σσον . . . δουλη■ην ■πομε■ναι ■τις ■σται, but it is better for us to submit to slavery, whatever it may be. HDT. vi. 12. So ■ τι δ■ κοτ■ ■στι, HDT. vii. 16.

2. But ■στις in such expressions can have the construction of an ordinary conditional relative, so that in future and general conditions it may take the subjunctive. E.g. ■λλ■ ■ προσαψ■μενος α■τ■ν, ■στις ■ν ■, λ■γον παρ■χει, but each one who has to do with them, whoever he may be, gives his own account of them. AESCHIN. i. 127. ■λλ■ ■φ■ ■μ■ν ■δει κεχειροτονημ■νον ε■ναι το■τον, ■στις ■ν ■, but this officer ought always to be elected by you, whoever he may be.

DEM. iv. 27. See THEOG. 964.

Homeric and other Poetic Peculiarities in Conditional Relative Sentences: Subjunctive without κ or ν.

[*] 538. In general conditions which take the subjunctive, Homer commonly uses the relatives without κ or ν. This corresponds to his preference for the simple ε in general conditions (468); but relative clauses of this class are much more frequent with him than the clauses with ε. E.g. ἄττι μὲν οὐκ ἰθὺναι ἔς ἄθἰν τοἰσι μὲν χἰται. Il. v. 407. ἄνθρἰποὺς φορἰ, κατἰνυται ἔς τις μὲν ρτἰ. Od. xiii. 214. Ζεὺς δὲ ἄτἰς νἰμει ἄλβον ἄλἰμπιος ἄνθρἰποἰσιν, ἄσθλοἰς δὲ κακοἰσιν, ἄπως ἄθἰλἰσιν, ἄκἰστἰ. Od. vi. 188. Οἰ μὲν σοἰ ποτε ἄσον ἄχω γἰρας, ἄππἰτἰ ἄχαιοἰ Τρἰων ἄκπἰρσωσἰ εἰναι μἰμενον πτολἰεθρον. Il. i. 163. So also Il. i. 554, Il. iii. 109, Il. xiv. 81; Od. viii. 546, Od. xviii. 134. Here the meaning is essentially the same as when κ or ν is added, as in the examples under 532. The greater development of the general relative condition in Homer, especially in the use of the optative, compared with the less developed general condition with ε, has already been noticed (17; 400; 468).

[*] 539. The relative (like ε) is sometimes found in Homer without κ or ν in future conditions. E.g. Γἰμασθἰ ἔς τις ἄριστος ἄνρ κατἰ πλεἰστα πἰρἰσιν, (tell her) to marry whoever may be the best man and may offer the most. Od. xx. 335. But in vs. 342, referring to the same thing, we have γἰμασθἰ κἰ ἄθἰλἰ, to marry whom she may please. Πἰθεο δὲ ἔς . . . ἄν φρεσἰ θεἰω. Il. xvi. 83; so Od. vi. 189. Οἰ μὲν γἰρ ποτἰ φἰσι κακἰν πεἰσεσθἰ ἄπἰσσω, ἄφρἰ ρετἰν παρἰχἰσι θεοἰ κατἰ γἰνατἰ ρἰρἰ, he says he shall never suffer evil hereafter, so long as the Gods shall supply valour, etc. Od. xviii. 132. So Il. xiii. 234.

[*] 540. ν is sometimes omitted in relative conditions with the subjunctive in lyric, elegiac, and dramatic poetry, as in Homer; chiefly in general conditions. A few examples occur in Herodotus; and even in Attic prose exceptional cases are occasionally found in the manuscripts. (See 469-471.) E.g. Μἰγα τοἰ κλἰος ἄεἰ, ἄτινι σἰν γἰρας ἄσπἰτἰ ἄγλαἰν, great always is his glory, whom thy illustrious honour (Olympia) follows. PIND. Ol. viii. 10. So Ol. iii. 11, Nem. ix. 44. Πἰντας ἄπαἰνημι κατἰ φιλἰω κἰν ἄστις ἄρδἰ μηδἰν ἄσχρἰν. SIMON. v. 20 (but ἔς ἄν μἰ κακἰς ἄ in the same ode). See TYRT. xii. 34; SOL. xiii. 9 and 55, SOL. xxvii. 3; SIMON. Iviii. 5, lxxxv. 7 (ἄφρα . . . ἄχἰ, but ἄταν ἄ in vs. 10).

“Γἰροντα δὲ ἄρθοἰν φλαἰρον, ἔς νἰος πἰσἰ” SOPH. O.C. 395. Τἰν δὲ πἰμονἰν μἰλιστα λυποἰσἰ ἄ φανἰσἰ ἄθἰα ρετοἰ. Id. O.T. 1231. So Sept. 257, Eum. 211, Eum. 661, and probably 618 (ἄ μἰ κελεἰσἰ, for Mss. κελεἰσει, after εἰπον denoting a habit). Τοἰσι γἰρ μἰτε ἄστεα μἰτε τεἰχεα ἄ κἰτισμἰνα, . . . κἰς οἰκἰν εἰησαν οἰτοἰ ἄμαχοἰ; HDT. iv. 46. So i. 216, HDT. ii. 85, HDT. iv. 66. ἄπἰχἰριον ἄν μἰν οἰ μἰν βραχεἰς ἄρκἰσι μἰ πολλοἰς χρἰσθἰ, “it being our national habit not to use many words where few suffice.” THUC. iv. 17. (Here οἰ μἰν . . . πολλοἰς make five feet of an iambic trimeter, and the words are probably quoted from some poet. See Classen’s note. The sentence continues, πλεἰοσι δὲ ἄν ἄν καιρἰς ἄ, κ.τ.λ.) See also Leg. 737B, οἰς ἄ and ἄσοἰς μετἰ. In SOPH. El. 225, ἄφρα ἄχἰ is particular.

[*] 541. In the lyric and elegiac poets, as in Homer, the form with ν or κ was in good use in these sentences. See PIND. Py. i. 100 “ἔς ἄν ἄγκἰρσἰ”, v. 65 “οἰς ἄν ἄθἰλἰ”;

MIMN. ii. 9,

MIMN. iii. 1 “πν παραμεψεται” ;

SOL. xiii. 75;

THEOGN. 405,

SOL. 406 “ μν κακ, . . . δν χρσιμα” .

(For ordinary protasis see 469 and 470.) In the dramatists the relative with ν is completely established with the subjunctive as the regular form (like ν, etc.) in both general and particular conditions. (See 471.) Relative with κ or ν and the Optative in Conditions.

[*] 542. In Homer the conditional relative (like ε) sometimes takes κ or ν with the optative, the particle apparently not affecting the sense. E.g. δ κ πειτα γμαιθς κεν πλεστα προι κα μρσιμος λθοι, and she then would marry whoever might give the most gifts, etc. Od. xxi. 161. ς κε . . . δοη κ θλοι, “that he might give her to whomsoever he pleased.” Od. ii. 54. In these two cases ς προι and θλοι would be the common expressions. In Od. iv. 600, however, δρον δ τι κ μοι δοης, κειμλιον στω, whatever gift you might choose to give me, etc., may be potential. Νν γρ χ κτορ λοις, πε ν μλα τοι σχδον λθοι. Il. ix. 304. ς τ καταβρξιεν πν κρητρι μιγεη, ο κεν φημρις γε βλοι κατ δκρυ παρειν, whoever should drink this when it was mingled in the bowl, would let no tear fall down his cheeks on that day. Od. iv. 222. So πν . . . εην, Il. xxiv. 227.

One case occurs of τε κε with the optative in a general relative sentence of past time: πευθμεθα . . . τε κν τιν πιζφελος χλος κοι, Il. ix. 525.

Homeric Similes with ς etc.

[*] 543. In Homer similes and comparisons may be expressed by the subjunctive with ς τε (rarely ς πτε), as when, sometimes by ς or ς τε, as. Except in a few cases of ς τ ν, neither ν nor κ is found in these expressions.

[*] 544. With ς τε or ς πτε the subjunctive clearly expresses a general condition, and the meaning is as happens when, etc. E.g.

ς δ τε κινσ Ζφυρος βαθ λιον λθν, λβρος παιγζων, π τ μμει σταχεσσιν, ς τν πσ γορ κινθη, and as (happens) when the west wind comes and moves a deep grain field, and it bows with its ears, so was their whole assembly moved. Il. ii. 147.

ς δ τ πωρινς Βορης φορσσιν κνθας μ πεδον, πυκινα δ πρς λλλλσιν χονται, ς τν μ πλαγος νεμοι φρον νθα κα νθα. Od. v. 328.

See Il. v. 597, Il. vi. 506, Il. viii. 338; Od. ix. 391, Od. xix. 518; for ς πτε, Od. iv. 335, Od. xvii. 126.

ς δ τ ν στρπτ πσις ρης σκμοιο, ς πυκνν ν στθεσσιν νεσενχιζ γαμμνων. Il. x. 5. So Il. xi. 269, Il. xv. 170; Od. v. 394, Od. xxii. 468.

[*] 545. With ς or ς τε the conditional force of the subjunctive is not so obvious, especially as it depends directly on the verb of the antecedent clause, which is always particular and generally past. Here we should expect the present indicative, which sometimes occurs (548). We may

suppose that the analogy of the far more frequent clauses with **■ς ■τε** (544)⁴² caused the same construction to be used also in these, in which the meaning is clearly the same. E.g.

■ς δ■ γυν■ κλα■σι φ■λον π■σιν ■μφιπεσο■σα, ■ς τε ■■ς πρ■σθεν π■λιος λα■ν τε π■σ■σιν, ■ς ■δυσε■ς ■λειν■ν ■π■ ■φρ■σι δ■κρυον ε■βεν, i.e. Ulysses wept as a wife weeps, etc. Od. viii. 523.

■ς δ■ λ■ων ■ν βουσ■ θορ■ν ■ξ α■χ■να ■ξ■ π■ρτιος ■■ βο■ς, . . . ■ς το■ς ■μφοτ■ρους ■ξ ■ππων Τυδ■ος υ■■ς β■σε, and as a lion leaps among the cattle and breaks the neck of a heifer or an ox, so did the son of Tydeus dismount them both from their chariot. Il. v. 161. So Il. ix. 323, Il. x. 183, Il. 485; Od. v. 368.

[*] 546. In all the cases of **■ς τε** the pronominal article **ο■** or **το■ς** precedes, referring to the subject or object of the antecedent clause. E.g. **Ο■ δ■, ■ς τ■ ■μητ■ρες ■ναντ■οι ■λλ■λοισιν ■γμον ■λα■νωσιν, ■ς Τρ■ες κα■ ■χαιο■ ■π■ ■λλ■λοισι θορ■ντες δ■ουν**, and they,—as reapers against each other drive their swaths,— so did Trojans and Achaeans leap upon each other and destroy. Il. xi. 67. So Il. xii. 167, Il. xv. 323; Od. xxii. 302.

[*] 547. When a simile has been introduced by the subjunctive with **■ς** or **■ς ■τε**, it may be continued by verbs in the present indicative, which seem to be independent of the original construction. Even the aorist indicative may be used to add vividness to the description. E.g.

■ς δ■ ■τε τ■ς τ■ ■λ■φαντα γυν■ φο■νικι μι■ν■ Μ■ον■ς ■■ Κ■ειρα, παρ■ιον ■μμεναι ■ππ■: κε■ται δ■ ■ν θαλ■μ■, πολ■ες τ■ μιν ■ρ■σαντο ■ππ■ες φορ■ειν: βασιλ■ι δ■ κε■ται ■γαλμα: το■ο■ τοι, Μεν■λαε, μι■νθην α■ματι μηρο■. Il. iv. 141.

■ς δ■ ■τ■ ■φ■ ■ψηλ■ς κορυφ■ς ■ρεος μεγ■λοιο κιν■σ■ πυκιν■ν νεφ■λην στεροπηγερ■τα Ζε■ς: ■κ τ■ ■φανεν π■σαι σκοπια■ κα■ πρ■ονες ■κροι κα■ ν■παι, ο■ραν■θεν δ■ ■περρ■γη ■σπετος α■θ■ρ: ■ς Δαναο■ νη■ν μ■ν ■πωσ■μενοι δ■ιον π■ρ τυτθ■ν ■ν■πνευσαν πολ■μου δ■ ο■ γ■ηγνετ■ ■ρω■. Il. xvi. 296.

■ς δ■ ■τε καπν■ς ■■ν ε■ς ο■ραν■ν ε■ρ■ν ■κηται ■στεος α■θομ■νοιο, θε■ν δ■ ■ μ■νις ■ν■κεν, π■σι δ■ ■θηκε π■νον, πολλο■σι δ■ κ■δ■ ■φ■κεν, ■ς ■χιλε■ς Τρ■εσσι π■νον κα■ κ■δ■ ■θηκεν. Il. xxi. 522.

[*] 548. Sometimes the first clause of the simile has the present or aorist indicative. E.g. **■ς δ■ ■ναμαιμ■ει βαθ■ ■γκεα θεσπιδα■ς π■ρ, ■ς ■ γε π■ντη θ■νε. Il. xx. 490. ■ς δ■ ■π■τε πλ■θων ποταμ■ς πεδ■ονδε κ■τεισιν, πολλ■ς δ■ δρ■ς ■σφ■ρεται, ■ς ■φεπεν. Il. xi. 492. ■ριπε δ■ ■ς ■τε τις δρ■ς ■ριπεν**, and he fell as when an oak falls (once fell). Il. xiii. 389. **■ς δ■ ■τε τ■ς τε δρ■κοντα ■δ■ν παλ■νορσος ■π■στη. Il. iii. 33: so ■ς τε λ■ων ■χ■ρη, Il. iii. 23.**

[*] 549. Another form of Homeric simile consists of **■ς** with a noun, followed by a relative with the subjunctive, which may be followed by an indicative as in 547. E.g.

■ δ■ ■ν κον■σι χαμα■ π■σεν, α■γειρος ■ς, ■ ■■ τ■ ■ν ε■αμεν■ ■λεος μεγ■λοιο πεφ■κ■ λε■η, ■τ■ρ τ■ ο■ ■ζοι ■π■ ■κροτ■τ■ πεφ■ασιν: τ■ν μ■ν θ■ ■ρματοπηγ■ς ■ν■ρ α■θωνι σιδ■ρ■ ■ξ■ταμ■, ■φρα ■τυν κ■μψ■ περικαλλ■ι δ■φρ■: ■ μ■ν τ■ ■ζομ■νη κε■ται ποταμο■ο παρ■ ■χθας: το■ον ■ρ■ ■νθεμ■δην Σιμοε■σιον ■ξεν■ριξεν Α■ας διογεν■ς. Il. iv. 482. For ■ς ε■ or ■ς ε■ τε with the optative in Homeric similes, see 485.

τι μ and σον μ without a Verb.

[*] 550. τι μ and σον μ, like ε μ (476), are used in the sense of except, unless, with no verb expressed. E.g. τι γ ρ μ θ ναι, ν ο δ ν λλο π λισμα λ γμον, for except Athens (what was not Athens) there was no (Ionic) city of any account. HDT. i. 143. So i. 18, ο δ αμο τι μ Χ οι μο νοι. Ο γ ρ ν κρ νη, τι μ μ α ν α τ τ κροπ λει, for there was no spring, except one on the very citadel. THUC. iv. 26: so iv. 94, THUC. vii. 42. “Ο τ π θεωρ αν ξ λθες τι μ παξ ες σθμ ν, ο τε λλοσε ο δ αμ σε ε μ ποι στρατευσ μενος.” PLAT. Crit. 52B . So Plat. Phaed. 67A, Plat. Rep. 405C.

σθι γ ρ δοκ ν μο κα ξυμφυτεσαι το ργον ε ργ σθαι θ, σον μ χερσ κα νων, i.e. and to have done the deed too, except so far as you did not slay with your own hands. SOPH. O.T. 346.

[*] 551. Homer once has τι μ or τε μ in the same sense: ο τ τε σπ νδεσκε θε ν τι μ Δι πατρ, i.e. except to Zeus (τι μ = ε μ), Il. xvi. 227. Here Lange (p. 161) reads τε μ.

Special Forms of Antecedent Clause.

[*] 552. A conditional relative clause (like a protasis with ε) may depend on an infinitive or participle (with or without ν), on a final clause, on a protasis, or on a verbal noun representing the antecedent clause (or apodosis). E.g.

See DEM. xxi. 64 (quoted in 525); PLAT. Ap. 17 D, DEM. xxiii. 48 (quoted in 528); AESCH. Ag. 1434, DEM. iv. 21 and 39, DEM. xxviii. 21 (quoted in 529); PLAT. Euthyd. 302 A, Theaet. 155A, XEN. Mem. ii. 3, 12 , Cyr. i. 6, Cyr. 3, Cyr. ii. 1, Cyr. 31 (quoted in 531). ρ σοι το των δε σον ταν πιθυμ σς φιλ αν ρς τινας ποιε σθαι. XEN. Mem. ii. 6, 29.

Κα μ δε πηλλ χθαι κατ τς συνθ κας, πειδ τ περ το Πρωταγ ρου λ γου τ λος σχο η, i.e. I ought to be released according to what we agreed to do when the discussion of the doctrine of Protagoras should come to an end. PLAT. Theaet. 183 C.

[*] 553. After past verbs of waiting or expecting in Homer π τε with the optative sometimes has the meaning of until, like ως. E.g. “Ο δ ατ . . . ποτιδ γμενοι ππ τ ρ λθοι δ α ος,” “and they sat waiting until (for the time when) Idaeus should come.” Il. vii. 414. So iv. 334, Il. ix. 191, Il. xviii. 524. (See 698.) Mixed Conditional Constructions.

[*] 554. The relative with the optative sometimes depends on a present or future tense. This occurs chiefly in Homer, and arises from the slight distinction between the subjunctive and optative in such sentences. E.g. Α π ο σσε ται ν ας νιπρ σαι, τε μ α τ ς γε Κρον ων μ β λοι α θ μενον δ α λ ν ν ε σσι, it will be a hard task for him to fire the ships, unless the son of Kronos should himself hurl a flaming brand upon the ships. Il. xiii. 317. (Regularly τε κε μ μ β λ, unless he shall hurl.) So Od. xix. 510. Κα δ λ λ νεμεσς τις τοια τα γε ζοι, and I am angry with any other woman who says (should say) the like. Od. vi. 286. (This resembles the loosely jointed examples in 500.)

Τοιο τ δ οικας, πε λο σαιτο φ γοι τε, ε δ μεναι μαλακ ς, and you seem like such a man as would sleep comfortably (like one likely to sleep comfortably) after he had washed and

See 506, and for the optative with κ in conditional relative sentences in Homer (probably not potential), see 542.

Assimilation in Conditional Relative Clauses.

[*] 558. When a conditional relative clause referring to the future depends on a subjunctive or optative referring to the future, it regularly takes by assimilation the same mood with its leading verb. The leading verb may be in a protasis or apodosis, in another conditional relative clause, in an expression of a wish, or in a final clause. E.g. οτις τις ο δυνωνται τοτο ποισει, καλς ξει, if any who shall be able do this, it will be well. Ετις ο δδναιντο τοτο ποιοεν, καλς νχοι, if any who should be able should do this, it would be well. Εθε πντες ο δδναιντο τοτο ποιοεν, O that all who may be able would do this. (Here the principle of assimilation makes ο δδναιντο after an optative preferable to ο ν δδνωνται, which would express the same idea.) Τεθναην τε μοι μηκτι τατα μλοι, “may I die when these are no longer my delight.” MIMN. i. 2. So in Latin: Si absurde canat is qui se haberi velit musicum, turpior sit. — Sic injurias fortunae quas ferre nequeas defugiendo relinquo. For examples see 529 and 531.

[*] 559. When a conditional relative clause depends on a past tense of the indicative implying the non-fulfilment of a condition, it regularly takes a past tense of the indicative by assimilation. The leading verb may be in a protasis or apodosis, in another conditional relative clause, in an expression of a wish, or in a final clause. E.g. Ετις ο δδδναντο τοτο ππραξαν, καλς νσχεν, if any who had been able had done this, it would have been well. Εθε πντες ο δδδναντο τοτο ππραξαν, O that all who had been able had done this. So in Latin: Nam si solos eos diceres miseros quibus moriendum esset, neminem tu quidem eorum qui viverent exciperes. For examples see 528.

[*] 560. It will be seen that this principle of assimilation accounts for the unreal indicative and the optative in conditional relative sentences, which have been already explained by the analogy of the forms of protasis. (See 528 and 531.) In fact, wherever this assimilation occurs, the relative clause stands as a protasis to its antecedent clause. Occasionally this principle is disregarded, so that a subjunctive depends on an optative (178). For the influence of assimilation in determining the mood of a dependent sentence, see 176.

[*] 561. The indicative in the construction of 525, referring simply to the present or past, cannot be affected by assimilation, as this would change its time. E.g. μες δ λοισθε τι κα τ πλει κα πασι συνοσειν μν μλλει, “and may you choose what is likely to benefit the state and all of you.” DEM. iii. 36. Compare this with DEM. ix. 76, τι δ μν δξειε (so Σ originally), τοτ, πντες θεο, συνενγκοι, whatever you may decide, may this be for our good. In SOPH. Ant. 373, ς τδ ρδει would belong here; but ς τδ ρδοι (Laur.), =ε τις τδ ρδοι, falls under 558.

[*] 562. The principle of 558 and 559 applies only to conditional relative clauses. If the relative refers to a definite antecedent, there can be no assimilation, and the indicative or any other construction required by the sense is used. E.g. Ε τν πολιτν οσι νν πιστεομεν, τοτοις πιστσαιμεν, ος δ ο χρμεθα, τοτοισι χρσαμεσθ, σως σωθεμεν ν. AR. Ran. 1446. Εθ σθα δυνατς δρν σον πρθυμος ε, “O that thou couldst do as much as thou

art eager to do.” EUR. Her. 731. (With εἴθε for εἴ the meaning would be as much as thou wert (or mightest be) eager to do.)

[*] 563. Conditional relative clauses depending on a subjunctive or optative in a general supposition (462; 532) are generally assimilated to the subjunctive or optative; but sometimes they take the indicative (534). E.g. Οὐδὲν, πειθεῖν ἢ ἢν πρῆται κῆριος γίνηται, τὸ προδῶν συμβοῦλῳ περὶ τὸν λοιπὸν ἢ τι χρῆται. DEM. xviii. 47. See PLAT. Rep. 508 C and D (reading ἢ ἢλιος καταλῦμπε); PLAT. Charm. 164B. ἢ δὲ τε μῦστα χαίρειν, ἢ τε τῆχιστα τυχόντας ἢ δῶιντο ποπῦμοι. XEN. Ag. ix. 2.

Ἀτῶα μὲν γῶρ ἴστιν, ἴταν τις ψιλῶ χρησῦμενος λῶγῶ μὲ παρῶσχηται πῶστιν ἢν λῶγει, ἢλεγχος δὲ, ἴταν ἢν ἢν εῦπῶ τις κατῶληθῶς ἢμοῦ δεῶξῶ. DEM. xxii. 22. (Here ἢν λῶγει and ἢν ἢν εῦπῶ are nearly equivalent.) ἢκῶλει δὲ κατῶτῶμα ἢπῶτε τινῶς ἢδοι τοιοῦτον ποιῶσαντας ἢ πῶντας ἢβοῶλετο ποιῶν. XEN. Cyr. ii. 1, 30. (Here βοῶλοιο for ἢβοῶλετο would correspond to δῶιντο in Ag. ix. 2, above.) δῶ in the Antecedent Clause.

[*] 564. The conjunction δὲ sometimes introduces the clause on which a relative depends. Its force here is the same as in apodosis (512). E.g. Οἴη περὶ φῶλλων γενεῶ, τοῶη δὲ κατῶνδρῶν. II. vi. 146. ἢπεῶ τε ἢ πῶλεμος κατῶστη, ἢ δὲ φαῦνεται κατῶ ἢν τοῦτῶ προγνοῶς τῶν δῶναμιν, and when the war broke out, (then) he appears, etc. THUC. ii. 65. Μῶχρι μὲν οἴν οἴ τοῶξῶται εῶχον τε τῶ βῶλη αῶτοῶς κατῶ οἴοῶ τε ἢσαν χρῶσθαι, οἴ δὲ ἢντεῶχον, so long as their archers both had their arrows and were able to use them, they held out. Id. iii. 98. ἢπειδῶ δὲ ἢφικῶμενοι μῶχῶ ἢκρῶτησαν . . . φαῦνονται δὲ οἴδῶ ἢνταῶθα πῶσῶ τῶ δυνῶμει χρῶσῦμενοι. Id. i. 11. ἢσπερ οἴ ἢπῶται, οἴτω δὲ κατῶ οἴ πελτασταῶ. XEN. Cyr. viii. 5, 12.

Final Relative Clauses Expressing Purpose.

[*] 565. (Future Indicative.) In Attic Greek a relative with the future indicative often expresses a purpose, like a final clause. Its negative is μὲ. E.g. Πρεσβεῶαν δὲ πῶμπειν, ἢτις ταῶτῶ ἢρεῶ κατῶ παρῶσται τοῶς πρῶγμασιν, and to send an embassy to say these things, and to be present at the transaction. DEM. i. 2. Φημῶ δὲ δεῶν ἢμῶς πρῶς Θετταλοῶς πρεσβεῶαν πῶμπειν, ἢ τοῶς μὲν διδῶξει ταῶτα, τοῶς δὲ παροξυνεῶ. Id. ii. 11. ἢδοξε τῶ δῶμῶ τριῶκοντα ἢνδρας ἢλῶσθαι, οἴ τοῶς πατρῶους νῶμους ξυγρῶψουσι, καθῶ οἴς πολитеῶσουσι, the people voted to choose thirty men, to compile the ancestral laws by which they were to govern. XEN. Hell. ii. 3, 2. Εῶσω δὲ πῶμψαι (ἢκῶλευσε) τινῶς, οἴτινες αῶτῶ τῶ ἢνδον ἢδῶντες ἢπαγγελοῶσιν. XEN. Cyr. v. 2, 3. Ναυτικῶν παρεσκεῶάζον ἢ τι πῶμψουσιν ἢς τῶν Ἰῶσβον, κατῶ ναῶαρχον προσῶταῶξαν ἢλκῶδαν, ἢς ἢμελλεν ἢπιπλεῶσεσθαι. THUC. iii. 16. See DEM. xxi. 109. Οἴ γῶρ ἢστι μοι χρῶματα, ἢπῶθεν ἢκῶσω, “for I have no money to pay the fine with.” PLAT. Ap. 37 C.

Πῶψῶν με γῶς ἢκῶ τῶσδε, ἢπου θνητῶν φανοῶμαι μηδενῶς προσῶγορος. SOPH. OT 1437 ; so 1412. Μῶλλουσι γῶρ οἴ ἢνταῶθα πῶμψειν, ἢνθα μὲ ποθῶ ἢλῶου φῶγγος προσῶψει, ζῶσα δὲ ἢμνῶσεις κακῶ, they are to send you where you shall never behold the sun’s light (to some place, that there you may never behold, etc.). Id. El. 379. So Id. Aj. 659; Id. Tr. 800.

[*] 566. The antecedent of the relative in this construction may be either definite or indefinite; but the negative is always μὲ because of the final force. The future indicative is regularly retained after past tenses, as in object clauses with ἢπως (340); but see 573 and 574.

[*] 567. A past purpose may be expressed by the imperfect of $\mu\lambda\lambda\omega$. See 76; and THUC. iii. 16, quoted in 565.

[*] 568. (Subjunctive and Optative in Homer.) In Homer these final relative clauses have the subjunctive (generally with κ) after primary tenses, and the present or aorist optative (without κ) after secondary tenses. E.g. $\text{Κα}\mu\gamma\epsilon\mu\nu\sigma\theta\lambda\nu\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$, $\kappa\mu\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\sigma\gamma\gamma$, and also send a good guide, who shall lead me thither (to lead me thither). Od. xv. 310. $\text{Α}\tau\zeta\nu\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\rho\epsilon\omicron$, $\tau\iota\kappa\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota\pi\alpha\iota\delta\zeta\pi\alpha\iota\delta\phi\lambda$, “find a name to give the child.” Od. xix. 403. $\text{Τ}\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\epsilon\pi$, $\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\delta\zeta\epsilon\nu\iota\omicron\nu$, $\kappa\epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\rho\zeta$. Od. ix. 355. $\text{Α}\tau\kappa\alpha\mu\nu\omicron\tau\iota\zeta\lambda\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, $\kappa\nu\tau\omicron\iota\epsilon\pi\sigma\iota\nu\delta\nu$. Od. x. 538. $\lambda\kappa\omicron\varsigma\delta\eta\tau\pi\pi\iota\mu\sigma\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, $\delta\pi\iota\theta\sigma\epsilon\iota\phi\omicron\rho\mu\alpha\chi$, $\kappa\epsilon\nu\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\nu\delta\upsilon\nu\omicron\nu$. Il. iv. 191. $\lambda\lambda\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\zeta\tau\rho\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\kappa\epsilon\tau\chi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\theta\omega\sigma\zeta\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\eta\nu\text{Π}\eta\lambda\eta\iota\delta\epsilon\omega\chi\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. Il. ix. 165. $\kappa\delta\omicron\tau\epsilon$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\iota\mu\nu\pi\omicron\tau\iota\nu\mu\epsilon\nu\nu\tau\iota\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\nu$, $\tau\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\nu\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\nu\theta\rho\pi\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\pi\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$. Il. iii. 459. The last verse (found also iii. 287) and Od. xviii. 336 are the only cases in Homer of the subjunctive without κ in these sentences.

$\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\kappa\alpha\nu$, $\zeta\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa$, “they sent a messenger to tell the woman.” Od. xv. 458. $\text{Π}\pi\tau\eta\nu\epsilon\nu\delta\nu\nu\pi\rho\gamma\omicron\nu\chi\alpha\iota\nu$, $\epsilon\tau\iota\nu\delta\omicron\iota\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\nu$, $\zeta\tau\omicron\zeta\omicron\rho\nu\tau\pi\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu\mu\nu\alpha\iota$. Il. xii. 333. This optative is rare.

[*] 569. The earlier Greek here agrees with the Latin in using the subjunctive and optative, while the Attic adopts a new construction with the future indicative.

[*] 570. The future indicative occurs in Od. xiv. 333, $\mu\omicron\sigma\epsilon\nu\alpha\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\rho\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\tau\alpha\varsigma\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha\rho\upsilon\varsigma$, $\omicron\delta\mu\iota\nu\pi\mu\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\iota\phi\lambda\eta\nu\zeta\pi\alpha\tau\rho\delta\alpha\gamma\alpha\nu$. The potential optative with κ may take the place of a future form; as $\omicron\delta\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\epsilon\zeta$, $\omicron\kappa\epsilon\nu\kappa\alpha\tau\delta\mu\omicron\nu\lambda\lambda\kappa\omicron\iota\epsilon\nu\kappa\alpha\kappa\tau\eta\tau\alpha$, Od. iv. 166. So $\tau\nu\kappa\pi\iota\beta\alpha\eta\nu$, Il. v. 192 (cf. xxii. 348). In none of the Homeric examples of this construction is the relative clause negative.

[*] 571. A final force is seen in a few Homeric temporal clauses with $\tau\epsilon$ ($\tau\nu$, $\tau\epsilon\kappa\epsilon$) or $\pi\tau\epsilon$ with the subjunctive, which are chiefly expressions of emphatic prediction:—

$\sigma\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\rho\tau\nu\pi\omicron\tau\lambda\lambda\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma\rho$, $\text{Ζ}\epsilon\zeta\delta\sigma\phi\iota\nu\alpha\tau\zeta\pi\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu\p\rho\epsilon\mu\nu\nu\alpha\gamma\delta\alpha\pi\sigma\iota\nu$, a day shall come when sacred Ilios shall fall (i.e. a day for the fall of Ilios) and when Zeus shall shake his terrible aegis before them all. Il. iv. 164; so vi. 448. See Il. viii. 373, Il. xxi. 111. See Monro, Gr. Hom. p. 209.

[*] 572. 1. In Attic Greek the subjunctive is not used in final relative sentences as it is in Homer (568). A few expressions like $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\iota\epsilon\pi$, he has something to say, follow the analogy of $\omicron\kappa\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\iota\epsilon\pi$, he knows not what to say, which contains an indirect question (667). E.g. $\text{Τ}\omicron\iota\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma\pi\alpha\rho\delta\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\sigma\tau\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\rho\upsilon\varsigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu\phi\omicron\omicron\zeta\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\tau\iota\mu\eta\theta\sigma\iota\nu$, “that both may have things in which they may glory.” Isoc. iv. 44. (Here there is really no indirect question, for the meaning is not that they may know in what they are to glory. $\text{Ο}\delta\nu\tau\iota\delta\iota\omicron\sigma\epsilon\iota\alpha\tau$, $\nu\mu\nu\omicron\nu\chi\tau\delta\iota\alpha\lambda\gamma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, “if only he shall have some one to talk with.” Symp. 194D. $\text{Τ}\omicron\zeta\mu\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu\tau\iota\epsilon\sigma\phi\p\rho\omega\sigma\iota\nu$. XEN. Oec. vii. 20. Compare $\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\zeta\tau\iota\lambda\gamma\zeta$ and $\epsilon\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\zeta\tau\iota\lambda\gamma\zeta$ in the same sentence, PLAT. Ion 536B.

2. The subjunctive and optative may be used with a deliberative force, even when the relative has an antecedent, provided the leading clause expresses doubt or perplexity. E.g. Ο γάρ ἄλλον οὐδ' ἔτι λήγω. SOPH. Ph. 938. Οὐκ ἔχω σφίσι μὲν τι πημονῆς παλλάλαγ. AESCH. Pr. 470. Οὐδ' ἔτι εἶχον στίσι πιστολῆς πῦρ μύειε. I. T. EUR. 588. So κανονῆς οὐδ' ἔτι, XEN. An. i. 7, 7 (cf. 677). See SOPH. Ph. 281.

[*] 573. The present or aorist optative occurs rarely in Attic with a final sense, where there is no deliberative force. E.g. Κρῖψασθ' αὐτὸν ἵνα μὲν τις ἐσθῆδοι, βρυχῆτο. SOPH. Tr. 903. So στίσι λῆκοι, AR. Ran. 97. See PLAT. Rep. 398 B and 578E. For the construction of 572 and 573 see Appendix VI (p. 411).

[*] 574. The future optative also occasionally occurs, as the natural correlative of the regular future indicative, which is generally retained after past tenses (566). E.g. φευγον ἵνα μὲν ποτ' ἴψομην ἵνα ἔδη τελοῦμενα, I fled to (some place) where I might never see the disgrace accomplished. SOPH. O.T. 796. σκῆπτει πῶς σοίτο αὐτὸ στίσι ζῆντα γηροτροφῆσοι καὶ τελευτῆσαντα θῆσοι αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ νομιζόμενα αὐτὸ ποιῆσοι. ISAE. ii. 10. Ἀρεθῆντες φῆτε ξυγγρῆσαι νόμους, καθ' οὐστίνας πολιτεῖσιντο, having been chosen with the condition that they should compile laws, by which they were to govern. XEN. Hell. ii. 3, 11. (See Ib. ii. 3, Ib. 2, quoted in 565, where καθ' οὐς πολιτεῖσουςι is used in the same sense.) Consecutive Relative Clauses Expressing Result. -- Causal Relative.

[*] 575. (Indicative, with negative οὐ.) The relative with any tense of the indicative can be used to denote a result, in the sense of ὅστε with the indicative (582). The negative here is οὐ. This occurs chiefly after negative clauses, or interrogatives implying a negative. E.g. Τῆς οὐτω μαίνεται στίσι οὐ βόλεται σοι φίλος εἶναι; "who is so mad that he does not wish to be your friend?" XEN. An. ii. 5, 12. (Here ὅστε οὐ βόλεται might be used.) "ὅκοσας τοιαῦθ' ἔτι τοῦδ' οὐ ποτ' ἐφράνε βῆον" SOPH. O.C. 1352. So HDT. vii. 46. Τῆς οὐτως ἐσθῆς στήν μιν, στίσι ἴγνοε τὸν κέθεν πῆλεμον δεῖρο ζῶντα, ἵνα μὲν ἴσωμεν; i.e. who of you is so simple that he does not know, etc. ? DEM. i. 15. (Here ὅστε ἴγνοε might be used.) Τῆς οὐτω πῆρω τὸν πολιτικὸν ἵνα πραγμάτων, στίσι οὐκ ἴγγῆς ἵναγκῆσθη γενῆσθαι τὸν συμφῶρον; ISOC. iv. 113. Τῆς οὐτως ἐσθῆς στίσι, στίσι οὐ μετασχεῖν βουλῆσεται ταῦτης τῆς στρατείας; Id. iv. 185. So also with the potential optative; as οὐδεὶς ἵνα γῆνοιτο οὐτως ἄμῆντινος, ἵνα μὲν εἶεν ἵνα τὸ δικαιοσύνῃ, "no one would ever become so adamant that he would remain firm in justice." PLAT. Rep. 360 B.

[*] 576. (Future or Present Indicative, with negative μὲν.) The relative with the future (sometimes the present) indicative may denote a result which is aimed at, in the same general sense as ὅστε with present or aorist infinitive (582), but with more exactness (577). The negative is μὲν. E.g. Εἴχετο μηδεμῶν οὐ συντυχῆν τοιαύτην γενῆσθαι, ἵνα μιν παῖσει καταστρῆψασθαι τὸν Εὐρώπην, i.e. no such occurrence as to prevent him from subjugating Europe. HDT. vii. 54. (We might have ὅστε μιν παῖσαι. Compare εἰς τοσαύτην ἴλθε μεταβολῆν ἐσθῆ πῆσης τῆς ὁσῆς γενῆσθαι δεσπότης, ISOC. v. 66.) ἵνα ἦτον πῆ τοιοῦτους ἵνα ἵνα κρατῆσας μὲν κατασχῆσει τις, "it is absurd to attack men of such a kind that if we overcome them we shall not hold them." THUC. vi. 11. (Here ὅστε μὲν κατασχῆν, so as not to hold them, could express only the general sense of the construction.) ἵνα γρῆφον ἔδῃ τι Χαριδῆμῃ τοιοῦτον ἵνα μὲν πῆσι καὶ μὲν ἵσται. DEM. xxiii. 86. Τοιαῦτ' ἵνα παγγελοῖσι ἵνα ζῆ ἵνα μηδῆ ἵνα τιοῦν ἵνα κινήθῆσονται. Id.

xix. 324. Τίς οκ ν δξαιτο τοιατης πολιτεας μεταχειν, ν μ διαλσει χρηστς ν; ISOC. iii. 16. Οδ τοιατα λγειν (πρπει) ξ ν βος μηδν πιδσει τν πεισθντων. Id. iv. 189. Τοιατα ζητσεις λγειν ξ ν μτε ατς χειρων εναι δξεις μτε τος μιμουμνους λυμανε. Id. xi. 49. Βουληθες τοιοτον μνημεον καταλιπεν, μ τς νθρωπνης φσες στιν (=στε μ εναι). Id. iv. 89.

[*] 577. The construction of στε after τοιοτος (584), which best corresponds to this relative expression, is not common, as οτως is the natural antecedent of στε, while τοιοτος is naturally followed by οος or ς. The relative clause with the future is a much more definite expression, with its power of designating time, number, and person, than the infinitive. (See THUC. vi. 11, under 576.) Τοιοτος may also be followed by οος and the infinitive (759).

[*] 578. πως as a relative is sometimes used in this construction in a way which illustrates its use as a final particle. (See 313.) E.g. Ποεε δ οτω κως τν σν νδεσει μηδν, and act so that there shall be nothing wanting on your part; lit. act in that way by which, etc. HDT. vii. 18. Τ οτως πστασθαι νθρπων λλων προστατεειν πως ξουσι πντα τ πιδεια, . . . τοτο θαυμαστν φανετο, i.e. in such a way that they should have, etc. XEN. Cyr. i. 6, 7. So Cyr. ii. 4, Cyr. 31.

[*] 579. Optative.) The relative in this consecutive construction does not take the subjunctive. The optative occurs occasionally depending upon another optative. We find the future optative in PLAT. Rep. 416 C, φαη ν τις δεν κα τς οκσεις κα τν λλην οσαν τοιατην ατος παρασκευσασθαι, τις μτε τος φλακας ς ρστους εναι πασοι ατος, κακουργεν τε μ παρο περ τος λλους πολτας, with which compare 415 E, τοιατας οας χειμνς τε σγειν κα θρους κανς εναι. The aorist occurs in DEM. vi. 8, τ μετρπ πλει οδν ν νδεξαιτο τοσοτον οδ ποισειεν, φ ο πεισθντες τινς λλνων κενν προεσθε, i.e. nothing so great as to persuade you to sacrifice any of the Greeks to him (=στε μς πεισθντας προσθαι). The practical difference between the pure optative here and the potential προεσθε ν, like ς ν μενειεν in PLAT. Rep. 360 B (quoted in 575), is slight; but it would be seen if we had στε προσθαι here (so great as to make you sacrifice) and στε μενειεν ν there (so firm that he would remain).

[*] 580. The relative may have a causal signification, being equivalent to τι, because, and a personal pronoun or demonstrative word. The verb is generally in the indicative, as in ordinary causal sentences (713); but it may be in the potential optative or potential indicative. The negative is ο; but when the relative clause is conditional as well as causal, the negative is μ. E.g. Θαυμαστν ποιεις, ς μν οδν δδως, you do a strange thing in giving us nothing (like τι σ οδν δδως). XEN. Mem. ii. 7, 13. Δξας μαθα εναι, ς . . . κλευε, believing him to be unlearned, because he commanded, etc. HDT. i. 33. Τν μητρα (μακριζον), οων τκνων κρησε (like τι τοων). Id. i. 31. Εδαμων φανετο, ς δες κα γενναως τελετα, i.e. because he died so fearlessly and nobly (ς being equivalent to τι οτως). PLAT. Phaed. 58E.

Ταλαπωρος ε, μτε θεο πατροο εσι μθ ερ, you are wretched, since you have no ancestral Gods (if you really have none), etc. Euthyd. 302B. Πς ν ρθς μο καταγιγσκοιτε, τ παρπαν πρς τουτον μηδν συμβλαιν στιν; i.e. since I have no contract at all with this man (or if I have no contract). DEM. xxxiii. 34. που τοννν μηδες

τετλημηκε τιν οκεων τοτ μαρτυρσαι, πς οκ εκς στιν μς γεσθα με τληθη λγειν; whereas then (or if then) no one has dared, etc. xld. ix. 38. So lv. 26. πτε αμν ξ ρχς συνθκαι φανσθησαν τεραι δ μ γρφησαν, πς ρθς ν μο δικζοιτο, καθ ο μ χει παρασχσθαι συνθκας; whereas the original agreement disappeared and the other was never written, how can he justly go to law with me, when (or if) he cannot bring forward any agreement against me? Id. xxxiii. 30. So SOPH. OT 817, SOPH. O.T. 1335, O. C. 1680, Ant. 696, Ph. 178, Ph. 255; AR. Ran. 1459; HDT. i. 71 (τοσ γε μ στι μηδν); THUC. iv. 126 (ο γε μηδ . . . κετε). The potential imperfect occurs in ANT. v. 66, μ το ννν μο νεμητε τ πορον τοτο, ν μηδ ν ατο ε πορετε, do not then bring upon me this perplexity, in which you yourselves would not know what to do (half causal, half conditional).

[*] 581. In the last examples with μ, the causal and the conditional forces are united, but in English we can express only one of them. Thus μτε θεο πατροο εσι, besides its causal force, implies a condition; so that we might translate equally well if (as it appears) you have no ancestral Gods, you are wretched. The same combination of cause and condition is seen in the Latin siquidem.

Consecutive Clauses with στε or ς and with φ or φ τε.

Consecutive Clauses with στε or ς and with φ or φ τε.43

[*] 582. A consecutive clause expresses a consequence, that is, the effect or result (actual or potential) of something that is stated in the leading clause. Such a clause is introduced by some relative word, generally by στε, so as, so that. (See 575.) The consequence may be either one which the action of the leading verb aims at and tends to produce, or one which that action actually does produce. This is the fundamental distinction between στε with the infinitive (with μ for its negative) and στε with the indicative (with ο for its negative). E.g. Πν ποιοσιν στε δικην μ διδναι, they do everything in such a way as (i.e. so as) not to suffer punishment, i.e. they aim, in all they do, at not being punished; it is not, however, implied that they actually escape. PLAT. Gorg. 479 C. On the other hand, πν ποιοσιν στε δικην ο διδασιν would mean they do everything in such a way that (i.e. so that) they are not punished.

[*] 583. Though this illustrates the fundamental distinction in thought on which the distinction in form is based, there are many examples in which στε with the infinitive and στε with the indicative seem to amount to essentially the same thing, although the processes by which the meaning is expressed in the two constructions are essentially different. Thus we can say οτωσ στ δεινς στε δικην μ διδναι, he is so skilful as not to be punished, and also οτωσ στ δεινς στε δικην ο δδωσιν, he is so skilful that he is not punished; and though we should receive the same impression from both statements, so that both might be made of the same man under the same circumstances, yet the two constructions (one stating a tendency and the other a fact) are very different, and they seemed far more so to a Greek than they do to us.

[*] 584. στε is properly a relative particle of comparison, meaning as. Its correlative so may be expressed in a demonstrative like οτωσ, or implied; as οτωσ στ δεινς στε σε πεσαι, he is so skilful as to persuade you, or πλις τετεχισται στε καν εναι σζειν τος νοικο ντας, the city is walled so as to be able to keep its inhabitants safe. (See τοιοτους κα

οὐτω τρῆφειν κίνας ἵστε πιχειρῶσαι, PLAT. Rep. 416 A; and compare τοιοῦτος οὐος with the infinitive in 759.) These expressions in Greek state no more than he has the skill to persuade you and the city has walls enough to be able, etc.; the further ideas that he does persuade and the city is able are inferences, which are strongly suggested and generally felt when the expressions are used, but they do not lie in the words. When the Greek wishes to express these facts definitely and not to leave them to inference, it uses the indicative with ἵστε; as οὐτως ἵστειν ἵστε σε πεθεῖ, he is so skilful that he persuades you, or πῆλις τετεχίσται ἵστε κων ἵστιν. But here the use of a finite verb compels the writer to make his expression more definite than it was before; for, whereas ἵστε πεῶσαι and ἵστε κων εῶσαι meant only (so as to persuade and (so) as to be able, without limiting the expressions to past, present, or future time, he cannot use a tense of the indicative without fixing its time, that is, without making a definite statement. So long as the infinitive has no subject and can be translated by our simple infinitive (as above), we can generally express its force without putting into our translation more than we find in the Greek; the formal distinction between so skilful as to persuade and so skilful that he persuades being apparent even when we mean substantially the same by both. When the clause with ἵστε is negative, a marked distinction appears in Greek to show the different point of view taken in the two expressions, and we have ἵστε μὴ πεῶσαι and ἵστε οὐ πεθεῖ. This is of course lost in English with our single negative. But when the infinitive has a subject, it must be translated by a finite verb in some definite tense, number, and person, that is, by a statement and not by a mere expression of tendency, although the force of the infinitive in Greek is the same as before. Thus we generally translate σχολῆεις, ἵστε θαυμῆειν μὴ (EUR. Hec. 730), you delay, so that I am astonished, as if it were ἵστε θαυμῆω γ, simply because we cannot use our infinitive with a subject expressed. If, however, we substitute an equivalent form which avoids this difficulty, like so as to astonish me, we see that there is really no such definite character in ἵστε θαυμῆειν μὴ as we impose upon it, and that it no more expresses a statement than ἵστε σε πεῶσαι (above) does. The same difficulty of translating the Greek infinitive with its subject has done much to obscure the force of the tenses of the articular infinitive and of the infinitive with ἵν. (See also 603.) In many uses of the infinitive with ἵστε it is not even inferred that the result towards which the infinitive expresses a tendency is actually reached. Thus, in clauses with ἵστε expressing a purpose or a condition, and where the infinitive is generally used without ἵστε, we cannot substitute the indicative for the infinitive (see the examples under 587, 2 and 3, and 588).44

[*] 585. In Homer ἵστε (or rather ἵς τε) is found, with two exceptions (589), only in the sense of as, like ἵσπερ. See its use in similes, as ἵς τε λῶν χῆρη, Il. iii. 23. The τε here is like that commonly added to relatives in Homer (as in ἵς τε) and to ἵπερ in Herodotus. The Attic poets are the first to use ἵστε freely with the infinitive. In Sophocles we first find ἵστε with the finite moods; this seems to have arisen from a desire to express definitely the accomplishment of the result, which the infinitive expressed only by inference.

[*] 586. ἵς, originally of the same meaning with ἵς τε, was seldom used in consecutive sentences except in certain authors. (See 608.) ἵστε with the Infinitive.

[*] 587. ἵστε with the infinitive, with a demonstrative expressed or implied, means so as; but when the infinitive has a subject which must be expressed in English, we are generally obliged to translate the particle with its antecedent by so that. The expression properly means only that one action or state is of such a nature as to be followed by another as a consequence; but it is often

implied also, apart from the words, that the second action or state actually does follow.

1. The consequence may be simply a result which a previous act tends to produce. E.g. **μφο δκυκλοντο πσαν νσον, στ μηχανεν ποι τρποιντο**, and they encircled the whole island, so that they (the Persians) knew not whither to turn (i.e. so as to perplex the Persians, etc.) AESCH. Pers. 457. “**Τσονδε μισεν στε τν δκην πατεν**,” “to hate so violently as to trample on justice.” SOPH. Aj. 1335 ; so 1325. **Σ δ σχολζεις, στε θαυμζειν μ**, but you delay, so that I am astonished (see 584). EUR. Hec. 730. **Πντας οτω διατιθεζ επμπετο στε ατμλλον φλους εναι τ βασιλε**. XEN. An. i. 1, 5. Δυσκολα καμανα πολλκις ες τν δινοιαν μππτουσιν οτως στε κα τς πιστμας κβλλειν. Id. Mem. iii. 12, Id. Mem. 6. **ν πεπαιδευμνος οτως στε πνυ μικρ κκτημνος πνυ δως χειν ρκοντα**, he had been so educated as very easily to have enough, although he possessed very little. Ib. i. 2, Ib. 1. **Φναι δ Κρος λγεται φιλοτιμτατος, στε πντα μν πνον νατλναι πντα δ κνδυνον πομεναι**. Id. Cyr. i. 2, Id. Cyr. 1. **πχρη γρ ν τοζ γνωσθεσιν μμνειν, στε μηδεμναν μν εναι πρς τοτον διαφορν**, “for we should be content to abide by the decision so as to have no difference with him.” DEM. xxvii. 1. **Πολλζ λπδας χω ρκοντως ρεν, στε μς μτ πολειθναι τν πραγμτων μτ γνοσαι, κ.τ.λ**. Id. xxvii. 2. **Τοιοτον θος μν παρδοσαν, στε σπεισαμνους συνελθεν ζ τατν**. ISOC. iv. 43. So iv. 42. **Ε τοιοτον εη σοφια, στ κ το πληρεστρου ες τν κεντερον εν μν**, “of such a nature as to flow.” PLAT. Symp. 175D

Πεσομαι γρ ο τοσοτον οδν στε μ ο καλζς θανεν, “for I shall suffer nothing so terrible as to prevent me from dying gloriously.” SOPH. Ant. 96. (For μ ο see 815, SOPH. Ant. 2.)

2. The consequence may have the form of a stipulation, condition, or limitation. E.g. **Ποιονται μολογαν πρς Πχητα, στε θηναοις ζεναι βουλεσαι περ τν Μυτιληναων**, they make a treaty with Paches, to the effect that the Athenians shall be permitted, etc. THUC. iii. 28. **ναστσας ατοζ στε μ δικσαι**, having removed them on condition of doing them no harm. Ibid. So i. 29, THUC. vii. 83. So Id. iii. 114, **ξυμαχαν ποισαντο π τοσδε, στε μ στρατεειν. ζν ατοζ τν λοιπν ρχειν λλνων, στ ατοζ πακοειν βασιλε**, it being in their power to rule the rest of the Greeks, on condition that they should themselves serve the King. DEM. vi. 11.

3. The consequence may be aimed at as a purpose, the consecutive clause becoming also final. E.g. **Πν ποιοσιν, στε δκην μ διδναι**, they do everything in such a way as not to suffer punishment, i.e. that they may not suffer. PLAT. Gorg. 479 C. (Here **να μ** with the subjunctive might be used, but it would express only the final element.) **βουλθησαν λευσνα ξιδισασθαι, στε εναι σφσι καταφυγν εν δεσειε**, they wished to appropriate Eleusis, so that they might have a refuge if they should need it. XEN. Hell. ii. 4, 8. **Μηχανα πολλα εσιν, στε διαφεγειν θνατον**, “there are many devices for escaping death.” PLAT. Ap. 39A. (Here we might have **πως διαφευξετα τις**.) **Μηχανζ ερσομεν, στ ζς τ πν σε τνδ παλλζια πνων**, we will find devices to free you, etc. (= **πως σε παλλζιομεν**). AESCH. Eum. 82.

[*] 588. The infinitive with **στε** sometimes follows verbs of wishing, commanding, etc., which regularly take a simple infinitive of the object (746), less frequently verbs which take an infinitive of

the subject (745); and sometimes adjectives and nouns which regularly take the simple infinitive (758). E.g. Κ■πρις γ■ρ ■θελ■ ■στε γ■γενεσθαι τ■δε, for the Cyprian Goddess wished this to be done, i.e. had (such) a wish (as) that this should be done. EUR. Hipp. 1327. “Δικαι■ν ■στ■ ■μο■ κλ■ειν λ■γους” “asking that he (Polynices) should hear my words (to the effect that he should hear).” SOPH. O. C. 1350. Το■ς στρατηγο■ς τ■ν π■λεων ■δ■δασκεν ■στε δ■ντα χρ■ματα α■τ■ν πε■σαι, “he instructed him to give money and persuade the generals.” THUC. viii. 45. “Τ■ μ■ν δ■νασθαι, ■ Φα■δρε, ■στε ■γωνιστ■ν τ■λεον γεν■σθαι,” “the ability to become a finished disputer (i.e. having such power as to become).” PLAT. Phaedr. 269 D. ■λθ■ντες πρ■ς α■το■ς πε■θουσιν ■στε μετ■ σφ■ν ■ργει ■πιχειρ■σαι. THUC. iii. 102. (In the same chapter, πε■θει ■καρν■νας βοηθ■σαι Ναυπ■κτ■.) ■πεισαν το■ς ■θηνα■ους ■στε ■ξαγαγε■ν ■κ Π■λου Μεσσην■ους. Id. v. 35. Ψηφισ■μενοι α■το■ πρ■τοι ■στε π■σ■ προθυμ■ ■μ■νειν, having voted to defend them, etc. Id. vi. 88. Ε■ς ■νγκην καθ■σταμεν ■στε κινδυνε■ειν. ISOC. vi. 51. (See 749.) So δ■ναμιν ■στε ■γγεν■σθαι, power to grow up in it, PLAT. Rep. 433B. “Ε■ τι θ■σφατον πατρ■ χρησιμο■σιν ■κνε■θ■, ■στε πρ■ς πα■δων θανε■ν,” “if my father was warned by oracles that he should perish by his children’s hands.” SOPH. O.C. 969.

Π■νυ μοι ■μ■λησεν ■στε ε■δ■ναι, “it concerned me very much to know.” XEN. Cyr. vi. 3, 19. ■δ■νατον μ■ν ■στε Πρωταγ■ρου το■δε σοφ■τερ■ν τινα ■λ■σθαι, it is impossible for you to choose any one wiser than Protagoras here (you have not such power as to choose). PLAT. Prot. 338 C. So XEN. Mem. i. 3, 6. Ξυν■βη ε■θ■ς μετ■ τ■ν μ■χην ■στε πολ■μου μ■ν μηδ■ν ■τι ■ψασθαι μηδετ■ρους, πρ■ς δ■ τ■ν ε■ρ■νην μ■λλον τ■ν γν■μην ε■χον. THUC. v. 14. (Here the construction changes suddenly to the indicative in ε■χον.) ■ρ■ ■στιν ■στε κ■γγ■θεν θ■αν λαβε■ν; “is it possible for me to have a sight of it near by?” SOPH. Ph. 656.

Π■ς γ■ρ τις ■καν■ς γ■νοιτ■ ■ν ■στε ■ε■ προστ■ττειν τ■ προσ■κον; for how could one become capable of always giving the proper command (so capable as)? PLAT. Polit. 295A. Π■τερα πα■δ■ς ε■σι φρονιμ■τεροι ■στε μαθε■ν τ■ φραζ■μενα ■ ■νδρες; i.e. are they wiser than men in learning, etc.? XEN. Cyr. iv. 3, 11. Ν■οι ■στε τοσο■το πρ■γμα διελ■σθαι, “too young to decide.” PLAT. Prot. 314B. So γ■ρων ■στε σ■ ■φελε■ν, EUR. Andr. 80. Ψυχρ■ν (■στι τ■ ■δωρ) ■στε λο■σασθαι, “the water is too cold to bathe in.” XEN. Mem. iii. 13, 3. (Cf. λο■σασθαι ψυχρ■τερον and θερμ■τερον πιε■ν, in the same section.) In many of these cases it seems impossible to believe that ■στε added anything to the sense, even as it was felt by the Greeks. The expressions were probably stereotyped in usage, and their origin was forgotten. Indeed, ■στε and ■ς (608) sometimes seem to have no more meaning than our to with the infinitive, which in some cases we can use or omit at pleasure, though with some change of sense, as in I dare say and I dare to say. Compare I command you to go and I bid you go. The examples show that there is hardly a construction in which the simple infinitive was used where ■στε is not occasionally prefixed to it. It is important here to remember that ■στε means only as (or, including the antecedent, so as); never so that, except in the construction with the finite moods, although this is often a necessary makeshift in our translation. For ■στε or ■ς with the infinitive after the comparative and ■, see 764 (b).

[*] 589. ■■ς τε, in Homer.) The only two Homeric examples of ■στε (■ς τε) with the infinitive are Il. ix. 42, ε■ δ■ σο■ α■τ■ θυμ■ς ■π■σσυται ■ς τε ν■εσθαι, ■ρχεο, but if your own mind is eagerly set upon returning, go; and Od. xvii. 20, ο■ γ■ρ ■π■ σταθμο■σι μ■νειν ■τι τηλ■κος ε■μ■, ■ς τ■ ■πιτειλαμ■ν■ σημ■ντορι π■ντα πιθ■σθαι, for I am no longer of a fit age to abide at the

sheepfolds, (and there) to obey in everything a master's command (this comes under 587, Od. 2, above). These cases seem to show that the usage was already established; although Lehrs (de Aristarchi Stud. Hom. p. 157) proposes to expunge ἄς τε in both. Op. 43 we have ἠιδῶς γάρ κεν κάπματι ῥγῶσσαιο, ἄς τ σε κεῖς (= κά εῖς) νιαυτν χεῖν κά ἐργν ντα, i.e. so as to have enough for a year, even without working.

[*] 590. Tenses.) The tenses of the infinitive most frequently used with ἄστε are the present and aorist, with their usual distinction (87). See the examples above. The perfect is sometimes used to express completion or decisiveness of the action (109; 110). E.g. Νεωστπ ν σου βραχ τι λελωφκαμεν, ἄστε κά χρμασι κά τος σμασιν ηξῶσθαι, i.e. we have recovered a little, so as to have increased. THUC. vi. 12. Λγων κά βουλευμτων κοινωνν ν σε ποιοντο, ἄστε μηδ ν σε λεληθναι ν βουλμεθα εδναι, "so that not a single one of the things we wish to know should have escaped you." XEN. Cyr. vi. 1, 40. Τοιατα πολιτεματα λσθαι (μοπρξεν) ἄστε πολλκικς στεφανσθαι, κά μηδ τος χθρος πιχειρεν λγειν, κ.τ.λ., so as often to have been crowned (perfect), and so as not even to have my enemies undertake (present) to say, etc. DEM. xviii. 257. See Id. xxiii. 68; LYS. xxxii. 27; ISOC. iii. 32, ISOC. iv. 45; ISAE. x. 1; and the examples quoted in 109 and 110.

[*] 591. 1. The future infinitive with ἄστε is common only when it depends on an infinitive in indirect discourse and represents a future indicative of the direct form; so εῖς τοτ ναιδεῖς ἄτν ξειν κοω, ἄστε Λακεδαιμωνων κατηγορειν, DEM. xix. 72. So LYS. v. 2. See other examples under 594.

2. Elsewhere it is rare and perhaps doubtful. In DEM. xxix. 5 and xxx. 5, ἄσθ μς παντας εσεσθαι is found in all MSS., and it is no more objectionable than other exceptional uses of the future, as that after βολομαι and διομαι (see 113), or than ἄστε with the infinitive with ν not in indirect discourse (211; 592). In DEM. xvi. 4 we have, ἄστι τονν ν τινι τοιτ καιρ τ πργματα νν, . . . ἄστε Θηβαοις μν σθενες γενσθαι, Λακεδαιμωνους δ, εποισονται τν ρκαδαν φ αυτος, πλιν σχυρος γενσεσθαι, the change of time making the change of tense natural. In THUC. iii. 34 we have, προκαλεσμενος ἄς λγους ππαν, ἄστε, ν μηδν ρσκον λγ, πλιν ἄτν καταστσειν ἄς τ τεχος σν κά γι, on the condition that, if his proposals should not be satisfactory, he would restore H. to the fort safe and sound. Here καταστσειν represents καταστσω in the words of Paches; but the future is still exceptional in its use (see 113). In THUC. i. 29, THUC. iii. 28 (two passages) and 114, vii. 83, where there was the same ground for the future, we find the present or aorist infinitive with ἄστε.

[*] 592. The infinitive with ν (not in indirect discourse) can follow ἄστε to express a consequence in a potential form, corresponding to the potential optative or indicative. E.g. ποτετειχισμνοι νσαν, ἄστε μηδ ε μετπεμψαν τι μοως ν ατος φελεν, they would have been already walled in, so that, even if they had sent for them, it would not any longer have been of as much use to them. THUC. vii. 42. Τν οκεων μοι πραγμων τοιτων συμβεβηκτων ἄστε μς ν κοσαντας λεσαι, such as would make you pity me if you should hear them. L. DEM. 59. ποληφθντος, ἄστε μ ν δνασθαι πανελθεν οκαδε, "so that he would not be able to return." Id. viii. 35. See also the examples under 211, and the cases of indirect discourse with ἄστε ν under 594. (The translation of the infinitive here is necessarily inexact. See 584.)

[*] 593. Herodotus often writes οτω στε together, οτω referring to the whole leading sentence, and not (as it generally does) to a single word or expression. E.g. πδρη ς Τεγην, τς μν νκτας πορευμενος, τς δ μμρας καταδνων ς λην, οτω στε ττ εφρν γενσθαι ν Τεγη, he escaped to Tegea, travelling by night and hiding in the woods by day, (in such wise) as on the third night to arrive at Tegea. HDT. ix. 37. So iii. 105, HDT. viii. 27, HDT. ix. 61, HDT. 73. For the same usage before a finite verb, see 601 (end).

[*] 594. στε, with Infinitive in Indirect Discourse. (στε ο.) When a clause with στε depends on an infinitive in indirect discourse, and is itself a part of the quotation, its verb representing a finite mood of the direct form, it regularly has the infinitive, in the tense of the direct discourse, even when on other grounds a finite verb would seem more natural. Here the future infinitive and the infinitive with ν may be used, as in other indirect discourse (135; 204). The negative ο of the direct form is generally retained with such an infinitive. E.g. φασαν το ς στρατιτας ες τοτο τρυφ ς λθεν στ οκ θλειν πνειν ε μ νθοσμ ς εη (they said ες τοτο τρυφ ς λθον στε οκ θελον πνειν), they said that the soldiers became so fastidious that they would not drink any wine unless it had a strong bouquet. XEN. Hell. vi. 2, 6. μ ς εδναι γομαι τοτον οτω σκαιν εναι στε ο δνασθαι μαθεν τ λεγμενα. LYS. x. 15. Οτω δ τπους τιν ς ν τ πλει εναι στε οκ ασχνεσθαι λοιδορομνους ατ (i.e. οτως τοποι στε οκ ασχνονται). DEM. xix. 308. So xviii. 283, DEM. xix. 152. Εναι δ πολλο ς λλους (sc. φη), ο ς βολεσθαι κοινωνεν τς συντζεως, στε οτε χρημτων οτε στρατιωτν σεσθαι πορ αν (i.e. λλοι εσν, ο ς βολομαι (see 755) κοινωνεν, στε οκ σται πορ α). AESCHIN. iii. 96: so i. 174. Τοσοτον φρονσαι φ ς ατο ς στε οχ γσασθαι σφ ς ατο ς ξους εναι ζν, κ.τ.λ. (i.e. τοσοτον φρνησαν στε οχ γσαντο). ISOC. xii. 255. Εναι δ (sc. λγεται) ταχυτητα οδεν τρ μοιον, οτω στε, ε μ προλαμβνειν το ς νδο ς τ ς δο ν το ς μρμηκας συλλγεσθαι, οδνα ν σφεων ποσζεσθαι (i.e. ε μ προλαμβνοιεν τ ς δο ν συλλγοιντο, οδε ς ν ποσζοιτο). HDT. iii. 105 (see 755): so i. 189. Τοιατα νομζετο τ πρχοντα ατ εναι, στε οκ ν ποθ τρας πιθυμσαι πολιτε ς (i.e. οκ ν πιθυμσειε). LYS. xviii. 6: so xxi. 18. See also THUC. v. 40, THUC. viii. 76; ISAE. iii. 39, ISAE. xi. 27; PLAT. Ap. 26 D, PLAT. Euthyd. 305 C, Leg. 806A, Alcib. ii. 143D

[*] 595. στε μ, however, as the ordinary form with the infinitive, may be used in indirect discourse (594), even with the future infinitive or the infinitive with ν. E.g. Τηλικατην γεσθαι πλιν οκεν τ μγεθος, στε μηδ ν τιον δεινν πεσεσθαι. DEM. ix. 67. μμην οτως μφαν ς εναι το ς λαζονευομνοι ς πολεμν, στε μηδν ν ποτε γενσθαι πιστν τν λεγντων. ISOC. xii. 20: so xii. 144. In ISAE. iii. 51, στε μηδ κδοναι would have been the same in the direct form.

[*] 596. Cases of στε with a finite verb in indirect discourse are rare, but sometimes occur; as “οομα σ νναπεσειν, στε γε οδν νντερε ς,” AR. Nub. 1342. So EUR. Tro. 973; Leg. 692

[*] 597. 1. Occasionally στε ο with the infinitive represents a finite mood with ο of direct discourse, even when there is no preceding infinitive to assimilate it (as there is in all the cases in 594). E.g. ννοηστω τι οτως δη τε πρρω τ ς λικ ς ν στ, ε κα μ τε, οκ ν πολλ στερων τελευτσαι τν βον, let him reflect that he (Socrates) was then already

so far advanced in life that he would have ended his days not much later, etc. (i.e. οκ ν πολλο στερων τελετησεν). XEN. Mem. iv. 8, 1. (Seume classes this with the cases in 597, XEN. Mem. 2 because of ο πολλο. But the infinitive depends directly on a clause with τι in indirect discourse.) So in ARISTOT. Pol. ii. 9, 17: ληγουσι ς μετεδδοσαν τς πολιτεας, στ ο γνεσθαι τε τν λιγανθρωπων.

2. Sometimes ο is found with στε and the infinitive when the negative belongs to a single word, as in ο πολλο for λλοι. See ISOC. viii. 107: οτω κακς προστησαν τν πραγμων σθ μς ο πολλος τεσιν στερων πλιν πιπολσαι. So ISAE. ix. 17.

[*] 598. In a few cases, however, στε ο is found with the infinitive where none of the preceding explanations (594; 597) will apply. Such are the following:—

στ οτε νυκτς πνον οτ ξ μρας μ στεγζειν δν, λλ προστατν χρονς διγ μ αν ς θανουμνην, “so that neither by night nor by day did sweet sleep spread her wings over me.” SOPH. El. 780. (Here there is an easy transition from the infinitive to the following indicative.) Ο μακρν γρ τειχων περιπτυχα, στ οχ παντ σ εδναι τ δρμενα, not so large that you do not know all (i.e. the city is so small, that you know all) that is done. EUR. Ph. 1357. στ οδς χνος γε τειχων εναι σαφς, “yes; so that not even a trace of the walls is to be seen.” Id. Hel. 107. Νν δ περιστηκεν ες τοτο, στε τν δς κινδυνεοντα ο φιλοπολιν λλ φιλοπρημονα δοκεν εναι. LYCURG. 3. Οδς α οτως πορος ν οδς φιλος στ οκ ν ξευρεν τν πογρηψοντα, nor, moreover, was I so helpless or friendless that I could not find one to bring an πογραφ (οκ ν ξεροιμι). DEM. liii. 1. Οτω δ ρχαως εχον, μλλον δ πολιτικς, στε οδς χρημων νεσθαι παρ οδενς οδν. Id. ix. 48. (This may be explained as oratio obliqua, on the ground of κοω and the infinitive in the preceding clause. But I agree with Seume in thinking this connection too remote to account for στε ο. Here there is neither an assimilating infinitive, as in the examples in 594, nor a leading clause with τι or ς, as in those in 597, Id. 1. In fact, στε ο gives the only ground for calling the clause with εχον indirect discourse.)

[*] 599. The examples in 598 have one common character: in all of them the thought could be expressed equally well by στε with the infinitive or στε with a finite verb, for even in EUR. Ph. 1357 and DEM. liii. 1 a fact rather than a mere tendency is expressed. We can, therefore, easily suppose a mixture of two constructions by which, for example in EUR. Hel. 107, instead of στε μ εναι or στε οκ στιν, either of which would express the sense, we have στε οκ εναι.⁴⁵ This occasional confusion would be made easier by familiarity with στε ο and the infinitive in indirect discourse.

[*] 600. In a few cases στε seems to be omitted, even when its antecedent is expressed; as in AESCH. Ag. 478, τς δε παιδνς φρενν κεκομνος, φλογς παραγγλμασιν νοις πυρωθντα καρδαν πειτ λλαγ λγον καμεν; who is so childish, etc., (as) to be inflamed in heart, etc., and then to suffer from a change of report? See also HDT. iii. 12, οτω σχυρα, μγς ν λθ πασας διαρρηξιας, so strong, you could hardly break them with a stone.

στε with the Finite Moods.

[*] 601. στε with the indicative means properly so that, and expresses the actual result of the action of the leading verb. E.g. Οτως γνωμνως χετε, στε λπζετε ατ χρηστ

γεν■σεσθαι, κ.τ.λ.; are you so senseless that you expect, etc.? DEM. ii. 26. (Here ■στε ■λπ■ζειν, so senseless as to expect, would express the senselessness of expecting, without necessarily implying that you do expect.) “Β■βηκεν, ■στε π■ν ■ν ■σ■χ■, π■τερ, ■ξεστι φωνε■ν,” “he has gone, so that we can say everything in quiet.” SOPH. O.C. 82 . So Ph. 75, El. 1204. Ο■τως ■μ■ν δοκε■ παντ■ς ■ξια ε■ναι, ■στε π■ντες τ■ καταλιπε■ν α■τ■ μ■λιστα φε■γομεν, so that we all especially avoid, etc. XEN. Mem. ii. 2, 3. Ο■χ ■κεν: ■σθ■ ο■ ■λληνες ■φρ■ντιζον. Id. An. ii. 3, Id. An. 25. Ε■ς το■τ■ ■πληστ■ας ■λθον, ■στ■ ο■κ ■ξ■ρκεσεν α■το■ς ■χειν τ■ν κατ■ γ■ν ■ρχ■ν, ■λλ■ κα■ τ■ν κατ■ θ■λατταν δ■ναμιν ο■τως ■πεθ■μησαν λαβε■ν, ■στε το■ς συμμ■χους το■ς ■μετ■ρους ■φ■στασαν. ISOC. xii. 103. Τα■τα πεπο■ηκα ■κ■ντων ■θηνα■ων, ■στ■, ε■περ ε■ φρονε■τε, το■τους μ■ν ■χθρο■ς ■πολ■ψεσθε, ■μο■ δ■ πιστε■σετε. DEM. xviii. 40. Ο■τως ■ναργ■ς ■στι, ■σθ■ ε■ρ■σετε. AESCHIN. i. 128. ■στ■ ■■ν τ■τταρας μ■νον π■λεις πε■σ■ς, κα■ τ■ς ■λλας πολλ■ν κακ■ν ■παλλ■ξεις. ISOC. v. 31. (Examples like ■στ■ . . . πιστε■σετε in DEM. xviii. 40 might be punctuated in this way.) So ο■τω ■στε in Herodotus (see 593); as ■ς π■ν κακο■ ■π■κατο, ο■τω ■στε ■ν■στατοι ■γ■νοντο, vii. 118.

[*] 602. As ■στε in this construction has no effect upon the mood of its verb, it may have any construction that would be allowed in an independent sentence. It may thus take a potential optative or indicative with ■ν, a prohibitory subjunctive, an imperative, or an interrogative. E.g. “■στ■ ο■κ ■ν α■τ■ν γνωρ■σαιμ■ ■ν ε■σιδ■ν.” EUR. Or. 379. “Παθ■ν μ■ν ■ντ■δρων, ■στ■, ε■ φρον■ν ■πρασσον, ο■δ■ ■ν ■δ■ ■γιγ■μην κακ■ς.” SOPH. O.C. 271. “■στ■, ε■ μακρ■ περ■οδος, μ■ θανμ■σ■ς.” PLAT. Phaedr. 274A. “Θνητ■ς δ■ ■ρ■στης: ■στε μ■ λ■αν στ■νε.” SOPH. El. 1172. “■στε π■θεν ■σασιν;” “so how do they know?” DEM. xxix. 47. So ο■ μ■ and the subjunctive (296); “ο■τως ■πιθεθ■μηκα ■κο■σαι, ■στε . . . ο■ μ■ σου ■πολειφθ■,” PLAT. Phaedr. 227D (see 296, above).

[*] 603. Occasionally there is a change from the infinitive to a finite verb in a sentence after ■στε, with a corresponding change in meaning; as in THUC. iii. 21, ■στε π■ροδον μ■ ε■ναι παρ■ π■ργον, ■λλ■ δ■ α■τ■ν μ■σων δι■εσαν, i.e. the towers were built SO AS to allow no passage by a tower outside, but SO THAT the men passed through the inside of them. (See 584.)

[*] 604. A few cases occur of a peculiar assimilation of a clause with ■στε to a preceding optative in protasis, ■στε having apparently the force of a conditional relative. E.g. Ε■ τις τ■ν γυνά■κα τ■ν σ■ν ο■τω θεραπε■σειεν ■στε φιλε■ν α■τ■ν μ■λλον ποι■σειεν ■αντ■ν ■ σ■, ■ρ■ ■ν σε ε■φρ■ναι; if one should court your wife so as to make her more fond of himself than of you, etc. XEN. Cyr. v. 5, 30 (two MSS. have ποι■σειν). So v. 3, XEN. Cyr. 47 (ε■σοιτο). Ε■ τις χρ■το τ■ ■ργυρ■ ■στε πρι■μενος ο■ον ■τα■ραν δι■ τα■την κ■κιον μ■ν τ■ σ■μα ■χοι, κ■κιον δ■ τ■ν ψυχ■ν, π■ς ■ν ■φ■λιμον ε■η; Id. Oec. i. 13. Καταγελαστ■τερον ε■ . . . ■με■ς ε■ς τοσο■τον μικροψυχ■ας ■λθοιμεν, ■στε τ■ προστ■γματα το■των ■πομε■ναιμεν (so Cod. Urb.; other MSS. ■πομε■ναι). ISOC. vi. 84.

[*] 605. A few cases occur of ■στε with the optative in indirect discourse. E.g. ■λογ■ζοντο δ■ κα■ τ■ ■πικ■ν, ■ς τ■ μ■ν ■ντ■παλον πολ■, τ■ δ■ α■τ■ν ■λ■γον ε■η, τ■ δ■ μ■γιστον, ■τι ο■ νεκρο■ ■π■ τ■ τε■χει ■κειντο, ■στε ο■δ■ κρε■ττοσιν ο■σι ■διδιον ε■η ■νελ■σθαι. XEN. Hell. iii. 5, 23. See also ISOC. xvii. 11.

[*] 606. As the regular negative of the infinitive after **■στε** is **μ■**, so that of the indicative and potential optative is **ο■**. In DEM. xix. 218 we have **■στε μ■τε . . . μ■τε . . . μ■τε . . . ■λλ■ κα■ . . . ε■τα τ■ν ε■ρ■νην ■ποι■σασθε ■γαπητ■ς**, where the force of a preceding **ε■** seems really to govern the verb, that of **■στε** being wasted in the eight lines which separate the verb from it. In DEM. liv. 15, **μηδ■ ■τιο■ν ■σται** can be taken with **ε■**. In SOPH. Tr. 575, **■σται το■το κηλητ■ριον, ■στε μ■τιν■ ε■σιδ■ν στ■ρξει γυνά■κα κε■νος ■ντ■ σο■ πλ■ον**, i.e. a charm to prevent him from loving more than you any other woman whom he may see, **■στε μ■** seems to have a final sense with the future, like a final relative. Compare **■στε μ■** with the infinitive in PLAT. Gorg. 479 C (quoted in 587, 3).

■στε with the Participle.

[*] 607. ■a) As a clause with **■στε** depending on an infinitive in indirect discourse is generally assimilated to that infinitive, so one depending on a participle in indirect discourse may be assimilated to the participle. E.g. **Ο■δ■ ο■τως ■γν■μονα ο■δ■ ■τοπον ο■δ■να** (sc. **■ρ■ ■ντα**) **■στε, ε■ μ■ ποι■σουςιν ■παντες ■σ■ ■ν α■τ■ς, ο■ φ■σκοντα ποι■σειν ο■δ■ν ο■δ■ α■τ■ν**, nor do I see that any one is so unwise or absurd, that, if all will not do whatever he does, he too refuses to do anything (i.e. **ο■δε■ς ο■τως ■γν■μων ■στ■ν ■στε ο■ φ■σκει**). DEM. x. 40. **Τ■ δ■ πρ■γματα (■ρ■) ε■ς το■το προ■κοντα, ■στε ■πως μ■ πεισ■μεθα α■το■ πρ■τερον κακ■ς σκ■ψασθαι δ■ον**, but I see things have come to this, that we must (**■στε δε■**) consider how we may not ourselves suffer harm first. Id. iii. 1. **■πιδε■ξω ■στ■φιλον ο■τω σφ■δρα μισο■ντα το■τον, ■στε πολ■ ■ν θ■ττον διαθ■μενον μηδ■να ποτ■ τ■ν ■αυτο■ ο■κε■ων διαλεχθ■ναι Κλ■ωνι, μ■λλον ■ τ■ν το■του υ■■ν ποιησ■μενον**, I will show that Astyphilus so hates him, that he would much sooner have ordered in his will that no one of his relatives should ever speak to Cleon, than have adopted his son as his own (**πολ■ ■ν θ■ττον δι■θετο**). ISAE. ix. 16. Other examples are [DEM.] Erot. 3; ISOC. iv. 64; PLAT. Rep. 519 A.

■b) In two cases there is a like assimilation to a participle not in indirect discourse:—

Τ■ν θεατ■ν συμφιλονεικο■ντων ■κε■ν■ κα■ μισο■ντων το■τον, ■στε τ■ν χορ■ν τ■ν μ■ν ■παινο■ντων, το■ δ■ ■κρο■σασθαι ο■κ ■θελ■ντων. AND. iv. 20. **Συγγν■μην ■χειν ε■, προεληλυθ■ς ε■ς το■το ■στε ■π■ τ■ν ■μαυτο■ δο■λων ■βρισθε■ς, ο■ δ■ναμαι κατασχε■ν, κ.τ.λ.** DEM. xlv. 83. The last examples seem to show that clauses with **■στε** can be assimilated to a preceding participle as we have seen them assimilated to an optative (604). Compare with this construction ISOC. iv. 21, **ο■δε■ς γ■ρ ■ν ■τ■ραν π■λιν ■πιδε■ξειε τοσο■τον ■ν τ■ πολ■μ■ τ■ κατ■ γ■ν ■περ■χουσαν, ■σον τ■ν ■μετ■ραν ■ν το■ς κινδ■νοις το■ς κατ■ θ■λατταν διαφ■ρουσαν**.

■ς used like **■στε**.

[*] 608. In their original use **■ς** and **■ς τε** are related precisely as **■ς** and **■ς τε** in Homer. But in consecutive sentences **■στε** gradually gained almost exclusive control, so that **■ς** here became very rare. **■ς** occurs chiefly in Aeschylus, Sophocles, Herodotus, and Xenophon, where it is used in the same constructions and in the same sense as **■στε**. E.g.

(With Infin.) **■κουσιν ■κφυγ■ντες: ■ς στ■νειν π■λιν Περσ■ν**. AESCH. Pers. 510. **Πεπωκ■ς γ■, ■ς θρασ■νεσθαι μ■λλον, βρ■τειον α■μα, κ■μος ■ν δ■μοις μ■νει**, having drunk of mortals' blood so as to be more emboldened, a band of revellers abides in the house. Id. Ag. 1188. So

Pers. 437, Ag. 546, Eum. 36, Eum. 427, Eum. 799, Eum. 895. Σμμετρος γρ κλειν, “for he is near enough for us to hear.” SOPH. O.T. 84. Οδ π ζυγ λφον δικαως εχον, ς στργειν μ. Id. Ant. 292. So Id. Tr. 1125. Οκ ς τοτο φροσνης πικμενος ς δξαι τν ωυτο δναμιν περισεσθαι τς βασιλος. HDT. iii. 146. ψηλν δ οτω δ τι λγεται, ς τς κορυφς ατο οχ ο τε ενα δσθαι, and it (the mountain) is said to be so high, that it is not possible to see its summits. Id. iv. 184. ποταμς τοσοτος τ βθος, ς μηδ τ δρατα περχειν το βθους. XEN. An. iii. 5, 7. So ii. 3, XEN. An. 10. Φρονται κθωνα, ς π το ποταμο ρσασθαι. Id. Cyr. i. 2, Id. Cyr. 8. ν τ σφαλε δη σομαι, ς μηδν ν τι κακν παθεν. Ib. viii. 7, Ib. 27. See iv. 2, Ib. 8. Οτω γρ δοκομεν παρεσκευσθαι ς, ν μν ληθεητε, Ib. i κανο εναι μς ε ποιεν: ν δ ξαπατε, οτω νομζομεν χειν ς οχ μς φ μν σεσθαι, λλ μλλον μς φ μν γενσεσθαι. Ib. iv. 2, Ib. 13. (In the last clauses we have ς in indirect discourse, like στε in 594, the direct form being οχ μες σμεθα, λλ μλλον μες γενσεσθε. Most MSS., however, have γενσθαι.)

(With Indic.) Πρς τδ ς Σοσων μν στν πν κενανδραν στνει. AESCH. Pers. 730. Οτως χει γ πστις, ς τ μν δοκεν νεστι, περ δ ο προσωμλησ πω, so stands my confidence, that belief is in it, while I have had nothing to do yet with testing it. SOPH. Tr. 590. Οτω δ τι κλειν γνετο ς κα ο πντες λληνες οδπιος τ ονομα ξμαθον, i.e. so that all the Greeks came to know well the name of Rhodopis. HDT. ii. 135. Τοτ προσφιλες οτω δ τι γνοντο ς σφεας κλευε τς αυτο χρης οκσαι. HDT. i. 163. So iii. 130. Οτω μοι προθμως βοθησας ς νν τ μν π μο οχομαι, τ δ π σο σσωσμαι. XEN. Cyr. v. 4, 11. Τοσοτ πλεονεκσει ς πεινσας τν δστων σιτων τεξεται. Ib. vii. 5, Ib. 81. So Hell. iv. 4, Hell. 16.

[*] 609. Besides the authors above mentioned, Euripides has one example of ς with the infinitive like στε, Cycl. 647; Thucydides one, vii. 34; and Plato one, Rep. 365D. We have ς with the indicative in PLAT. Men. 71 A; and with the participle in XEN. Cyr. vii. 5, 46, and PLAT. Tim. 56 C (ς here having both the participle and the infinitive). For ς with the infinitive after the comparative and , see 764.

φ and φ τε with the Infinitive and the Future Indicative.

[*] 610. 1. φ and φ τε, on condition that, for the purpose of, take the infinitive, like στε in some of its senses. E.g. Επεν τι πεσασθαι βολιτο, φ μτε ατς τος λληνας δικεν μτε κενους κειν τς οκας, λαμβνειν τε τπιτδεια σων διοιντο. XEN. An. iv. 4, 6. Πς ν οτος θλοι τ λλτρια ποστερεν φ κακδοξος εναι; Ag. iv. 1. φεμν σε, π τοτ μντοι, φ τε μηκτι φιλοσοφεν, “on condition that you will no longer be a philosopher.” PLAT. Ap. 29 C. Αρεθντες φ τε ξυγγψαι νμους, καθ οστινας πολιτεσσοιντο, “for the purpose of compiling laws.” XEN. Hell. ii. 3, 11. (For πολιτεσσοιντο, see 574.) Διωμολογη ατ ποσταλσεσθαι θναζε το νιαυτο κστου μς εκοσι, φ τε βοηθσειν τος μπισσεσιν. AESCHIN. iii. 114. (For the future infinitive, see 113.)

2. Herodotus and Thucydides sometimes have φ or φ τε, on condition that, with the future indicative. E.g. π τοτ δ πεξσταμαι τς ρχς, φ τε π οδενς μων ρξομαι, I withdraw upon this condition, that I shall be ruled by none of you. HDT. iii. 83. Τοτοιτσι

δ■ ■ν π■συνος ■■ν κατ■γαγε, ■φ■ ■τε ο■ ■π■γονοι α■το■ ■ροφ■νται τ■ν θε■ν ■σονται. Id. vii. 153. Κα■ τ■ν Βοιωτ■αν ■ξ■λιπον ■θηνα■οι π■σαν, σπονδ■ς ποιησ■μενοι ■φ■ ■ το■ς ■νδρας κομιο■νται. THUC. i. 113. Ξυν■βησαν ■φ■ ■τε ■ξ■ασιν ■κ Πελοπονν■σου ■π■σπονδοι κα■ μηδ■ποτε ■πιβ■σονται α■τ■ς, they made an agreement with the condition that they should depart from Peloponnesus under truce, and never again set foot in it. Id. i. 103.

Temporal Particles signifying Until and Before.: ■ως, ■φρα, ε■ς ■ or ε■σ■κε, ■στε, ■χρι, μ■χρι, until.

Temporal Particles signifying Until and Before.: ■ως,46 ■φρα, ε■ς ■ or ε■σ■κε, ■στε, ■χρι, μ■χρι, until.

[*] 611. All of these words are used also in the sense of while, so long as, and have the constructions of ordinary relative clauses (514). In common with dum, donec, and quoad in Latin, and while or whiles in Elizabethan English,47 they mean not only during the time when, but also up to the time when. As relatives, in the former sense they can have an antecedent like τ■ως, so long, ■ως etc. meaning as; in the latter sense they can have one like μ■χρι το■του, down to that time, ■ως etc. supplementing this by at which or when. The idea of a clause with until is that the action (or negation) of the leading clause continues to a time at which that of the dependent clause takes place. That the former action then ceases is an inference generally made, but not positively implied in the language, and not necessary. Our word until thus includes what the Greek may express by μ■χρι το■του ■ως or (omitting the antecedent) by ■ως alone.

Τ■ως is occasionally used like ■ως, as in DEM. xxi. 16.

[*] 612. A clause with until referring to an actual past occurrence (613) is simply a temporal clause of this peculiar character, with the construction of a relative clause with a definite antecedent (519). But when it refers to the future, it becomes a conditional relative clause, and μαχο■μαι ■ως ■ν τ■ν π■λιν ■λω, I shall (continue to) fight to the time at which I shall take the city, has the conditional force which comes from the indefinite antecedent; for even if μ■χρι το■του were inserted here, it would denote no definite period, but only one limited or conditioned by the future capture of the city. The actual apodosis to the condition is not μαχο■μαι alone, but rather the whole implied idea, I shall go on fighting to the future time, the limit of which is set by ■ως ■ν ■λω. It has been seen (486; 490) that ordinary conditional clauses may condition not their expressed leading clause, but one which the context implies; as ξυμμαχ■αν ποιο■μεν, ■ν τις ■φ■ ■μ■ς ■■, we are making an alliance, (to be ready) in case any one shall attack us. Again, a conditional clause may refer to an object which is aimed at in the action of the leading verb; as Π■τροκλον ■φεπε ■ππους, ε■ κ■ν μιν ■λ■ς, turn your horses on P., if haply you may take him, i.e. that you may take him, if haply you may (487, 1). In like manner a conditional relative clause with until is very apt to refer to an object aimed at, and thus to become at once final, relative, and conditional: thus in Il. iii. 291 (see 613, Il. 3), it is distinctly implied that the end of the war (τ■λος πολ■μοιο) is a condition which is to limit the time of fighting, and also an object at which the fighting aims. The same is true in general of the other forms of conditional relative sentence which the clause with until may take. It will be seen (614, Il. 2) that in the Odyssey ■ως develops a peculiar force in this direction, which makes it almost a final particle.

[*] 613. ἄως.) 1. When ἄως, until, refers to a definite past action, it takes the indicative, usually the aorist. E.g. Νῆχον πῆλιν, εἰς ἄως πῆλθον εἰς ποταμῶν, “I swam on again until I came into a river.” Od. vii. 280. Ἀτῆρ πεζῆς θῆνε διπρομῆχων, εἰς ἄως φῆλον ἔλεσε θυμῶν. Il. xi. 341. So Od. v. 123. Ὀμῶγ κατεῆχε πελαγῶν ἄλα, ἄως κελαινῆς νυκτῆς ἄμμῆ φεῖλετο, “until the eye of dark night interrupted.” AESCH. Pers. 426. Πῆνει ἄως ἄθῆρμην ἄτῆν ἄμφιβῆσα φῆξ οῆνου. EUR. Alc. 758. ἄμειναν ἄως ἄφῆκοντο οἰ στρατηγῶ. XEN. Hell. i. 1, 29. Κατῆ τοτῆ ποῆουν ἄως ἄκτῆς χῆρας πῆν. Id. Cyr. iii. 3, Id. Cyr. 4. Ὀ πῆτερον πῆσαντο, ἄως τῆν πῆλιν εἰς στῆσεις κατῆστησαν. LYS. xxv. 26. Μῆχρι τοτῆτου φῆλος ἄνομῆζετο, ἄως προῆδωκεν ἄλυθον. DEM. xviii. 48. In the last two examples πῆτερον and μῆχρι τοτῆτου are antecedents of ἄως, until, as τῆως often corresponds to ἄως, while.

2. When a clause with ἄως, until, refers to a result which was not attained in past time in consequence of the non-fulfilment of a condition, it takes a past tense of the indicative, like a conditional relative clause in a similar case (528). E.g. ἄδῆως ἄν τοτῆ ἄτι διελεγῆμην, ἄως ἄτῆ τῆν τοτῆ μῆφῆονος πῆδωκα ἄσιν ἄντῆ τῆς τοτῆ Ζῆθου, I should gladly have continued to talk with him, until I had paid him back Amphion’s speech in return for Zethus’s. PLAT. Gorg. 506B. Ὀκ ἄν πῆλυμην, ἄως ἄπεπειῆθην τῆς σοφῆας ταυτησῆ. Crat. 396C. ἄπισχῆν ἄν, ἄως οἰ πῆεστοι τῆν εἰωθῆτων γῆμην πῆφῆναντο, . . . ἄσυχῆν ἄν ἄγον, i.e. I should have waited until most of the regular speakers had declared their opinion, etc. DEM. iv. 1. (For ἄν here, see 223.) So AR. Pac. 71. In LYS. xxii. 12 we have ἄως πῆλιπε after ἄχρῆν φῆνεσθαι. The leading verb must be an indicative with ἄν, or some other form implying the non-fulfilment of a condition. (See 559.)

3. When a clause with ἄως refers to the future, and depends on a verb of future time (not an optative), ἄως has ἄν or κῆ and the subjunctive, like a conditional relative clause (529). E.g. Μαχῆσομαι ἄθι μῆνων, εἰς ἄως κε τῆλος πολῆμοιο κιχεῶ, I shall remain here and fight, until I (shall) find an end of the war. Il. iii. 291. So xxiv. 183. ἄως δῆ ἄν οἰν πῆς τοτῆ παρῆντος κῆμῆθῆς, ἄχῆ ἄλπῆδα, until you learn the whole from him who was present, continue to hope. SOPH. O.T. 834. So AR. Nub. 1489. “Μῆχρι γῆρ τοτῆτου νομῆζω χῆρῆναι κατηγορεῆν, ἄως ἄν θανῆτου δῆξῆ τῆ φεῆγοντι ἄξια εῆργῆσθαι” , for so far do I think I ought to proceed in my accusation, until it shall appear that deeds deserving death have been done by the defendant. LYS. xii. 37. Δεῆ μῆ περιμῆνειν ἄως ἄν πῆιστῆσιν, “we must not wait until they are upon us.” ISOC. iv. 165. Ὀκ ἄναμῆνομεν ἄως ἄν ἄμετῆρα χῆρα κακῆται, we are not waiting until our land shall be ravaged (i.e. until the ravaging shall be going on). XEN. Cyr. iii. 3, 18. The present subjunctive is rare; but when it is needed, it is unobjectionable: see THUC. i. 90 (quoted in 614, THUC. 1).

4. When a clause with ἄως refers to the future and depends on an optative with ἄν, it generally has the optative (without ἄν by assimilation, like a conditional relative clause (531). E.g. Εῆ δῆ πῆνυ σπουδῆζοι φαγεῆν, εἰ ποιμῆ ἄν ἄτι παρῆ ταῆς γῆναιξῆν ἄστιν, ἄως παρατεῆναιμι τοτῆτον, but if he should be very eager to eat, I should tell him that his dinner is with the women, until I put him to torture. XEN. Cyr. i. 3, 11. Κατῆ τῆ μῆν ἄν ἄξῆλεῆφοιεν, τῆ δῆ πῆλιν ἄγγρῆφοιεν, ἄως ἄτι μῆλιστῆ ἄνθρῆπειῆ ἄθη θεοφῆλῆ ποιῆσειαν, and they would blot out one thing and again put in another, until they made human characters as pleasing as possible to God. PLAT. Rep. 501B. ἄσαῆτως ἄν διδοῆης (λῆγον), ἄως πῆ τι ἄκανῆν ἄλθοις. Plat. Phaed. 101D. So after an infinitive depending on an optative; as δῆοιτῆ γῆ ἄν ἄτομῆ μῆνειν ἄως

πλθοις, he would ask him to remain until you departed (should depart). XEN. Cyr. v. 3, 13. In Hom. Od. ii. 77 we have ὡς κε with the optative (542): τῆφρα γὰρ ἐν κατῆστου ποτιπτυσσομένηθ' ἤματι χροματῆ πατιζόντες, ὡς κ' ἐπὶ πέντα δοθεῖη. In PLAT. Phaed. 101 D, ὡς ἐν σκῆψαιο represents ὡς ἐν σκῆψωμαι of direct discourse (see 702). The optative with ὡς is most common after past tenses, in the construction of 614.

5. When the clause introduced by ὡς, until, depends upon a verb denoting a customary or repeated action or a general truth, and refers in a general way to any act or acts of a given class, it takes ἐν and the subjunctive after primary tenses, and the simple optative after secondary tenses. (See 532.) E.g. ἴδ' ἐν σίντακτα, ἐν γκη ταῦτα εἴη προγματα παρχειν, ὡς ἐν χῆραν λῆβ', "they must always make trouble until they are put in order." XEN. Cyr. iv. 5, 37. "Ποιοῦμεν ταῦθ' ἕκστοθ', ὡς ἐν ἀτῆν μβλῶμεν ἕς κακῆν," "we always treat him thus, until we cast him into trouble." AR. Nub. 1458. Περιεμνομεν οἶν ἕκστοτε, ὡς ἐνοιχθεῖη τῆ δεσμοτῆριον, "we waited every day until the prison was opened." PLAT. Phaed. 59D.

[*] 614. Final use of ὡς.) 1. It will be seen by the examples under 613 (see the first under 3 and the first three under 4) that the clause with ὡς very often implies a purpose, the attainment of which is aimed at or expected. When such a clause, implying a purpose which would originally be expressed by a subjunctive, depends on a past tense, it generally takes the optative; but the subjunctive also may be used, to retain the mood in which the purpose would be originally conceived, as in final clauses (318). E.g. Οὐδ' ἔτλη πῆσιος εἰρυσθαι μῆγα δῆμα διαμπερῆς, εἰος κοιτο, "nor did she dare to guard her husband's great house constantly until he should come." Od. xxiii. 150. ἔσχαζε τῆ στρητῆ, ὡς τοῆς μπρακιταῖς δῶι βοθηῆν, "he kept quiet until it should be necessary to help the Ambraciots." THUC. iii. 102. (The present optative is rare.) So LYS. xiii. 25. Σπονδῆς ποιῶσαντο, ὡς παγγελεῖη τῆ λεχθῆντα εἰς Λακεδαίμονα, they made a truce, (to continue) until what had been said should be announced at Sparta. XEN. Hell. iii. 2, 20. (Here ὡς ἐν παγγελεῖη might have been used, as in the following examples.) ὡς δ' ἐν ταῦτα διαπρῆζονται, φυλακῆν καὶ μισθῆν τοῆς φρουροῆς ἕξ μηνῆν κατῆλιπε. Ib. v. 3, Ib. 25. ἄλλ' ἐπισχεῖν (τοῆς πρῆσβεις κῆλευεν μῆχρι τοσοῦτου, ὡς ἐν τῆ τεχῆς κῆαν ἐν ἀρῶσιν ἔστε πομῆχεσθαι, but he bade them detain the ambassadors until they (the Athenians) should be getting their wall high enough to defend. THUC. i. 90. (Most editors emend ἀρῶσιν to the aorist ἠρῶσιν, which with ὡς would mean until they should get the wall high enough, the former being less definite and exact in its time, and therefore more appropriate here.) For the intermediate form of ὡς ἐν with the optative in such sentences, see SOPH. Tr. 687, AND. i. 81, ISOC. xvii. 15 (in 702).

2. In five passages in the Odyssey ὡς with the optative after a past tense has an unusually strong final force, so that it appears almost like a final particle.

Πῆμπε δ' ἐμιν πρῆς δῆματῆ δῆσσος, εἰως Πηνελῆπειαν δῆρομῆνην γῶωσαν παῆσειε κλαυθμοῆο, she sent her to the house of Ulysses, (to the end) that she might cause Penelope to cease her lamenting. iv. 799. ῆρσε δ' ἐπῆ κραιπνῆν Βορῆην πρῆ δ' κῆματῆ ἀξεν, ὡς ῆ γε Φαιῆκεσσι φιληρῆτμοισι μιγεῖη, and she roused swift Boreas and broke the waves before him, that Ulysses might come to the oar-loving Phaeacians. v. 385. Μοχλῆν ἐπῆ σποδοῆ ῆλασα πολλῆς, εἰως θερμαῆνοῖτο, I pushed the club under the deep ashes, that it might be heated (to

remain until it should be heated). ix. 375. So δκεν λαιον, εως χυτλσαιτο, vi. 79; and ρμενος εος κοιτο, xix. 367. In none of these cases will until express the final force of the clause with ως. It appears as if ως here began the same course by which φρα, ς, and πως became final particles (312-314), but did not complete the change.

[*] 615. φρα.) In epic poetry φρα, until, is used like ως. E.g. ς μν Θρικας νδρας πχετο Τυδος υς, φρα δυδεκ πεφεν, "until he had slain twelve." Il. x. 488. ρχ μεν, φρ φκοντο κατ στρατν, μιν νγαι. Il. xiii. 329. ιεν, φρα μγα σπος κετο. Od. v. 57. (See 613, Od. 1.)

λλ μν, φρα κ τοι μελιδ α ονον νεκω, but wait, until I shall bring you honey-sweet wine. Il. vi. 258. Τφρα δ π Τρ εσσι τθει κρτος, φρ ν χαλιο υν μν τσωσιν, φλλωσν τ τμ. Il. i. 509. So Il. xv. 232. (See 613, Il. 3.)

Νωλεμως δ χμην, φρ ξεμσειεν πσσω στν κα τρπιν ατις, I clung steadfastly, until she (Charybdis) should vomit forth again the mast and keel. Od. xii. 437. (See 614, Od. 1.)

[*] 616. Ες κ and ς .) Homer uses ες κ (or εσκε), until, like ως κ, with the subjunctive, and once with the optative. Herodotus uses ς κ and ς ο, until, like ως, with the indicative, and ς κ ν with the subjunctive. E.g. Μμνετε ες κ κε στν μγα Πριμοιο λωμεν, "wait until we capture Priam's great city." Il. ii. 331. ψι δ π ενων ρμσσομεν, ες κ κεν λθ νξ μβρτη, and we will moor them far out by stones, until divine night shall come. Il. xiv. 77. In Il. xv. 70 we have ες κ χαλιο λιον λοιεν, depending on an optative with ν (613, Il. 4; 542).

Οτος δ νηκοστε τε κα λγον εχε οδνα, ς κ λαβε τν δκην, but he disobeyed and paid no attention to me, until he got his punishment. HDT. i. 115. Δηικης ν πολλς ανεμενος, ς κ τον καταινουσι βασιλ α σφσι εναι. Id. i. 98. So i. 158, Id. 202; v. 92; vi. 75. πεχον τς ξευρσιος οδν λασσον, ς ο δ Λχης νερε. Id. i. 67. (Many editors change ς ο to ς .) In ii. 143, ως ο πδεξαν πσας ατς, until they had shown them all, ως ο of the MSS. is generally emended to ς . λλ ατ γ τ λληνι ξεν φυλξω, ς κ ν ατς λθν κενος παγαγσθαι θλλ, "I shall keep them until he comes himself and wishes to take them away." Id. ii. 115. A singular case of ς κ occurs in THUC. v. 66, ς κ μμνηντο, as far back as they remembered (Schol. μετ τν τν νθρπων μμην).

[*] 617. στε.) στε, until, is not found in Homer, but is used like ως in tragedy, in Attic prose (especially in Xenophon), and in Herodotus. E.g. Χρννον τδ ν τοσοτον, στν αθρι μσ καστη λαμπρς λου κκλος κα καμ θαλπε. SOPH. Ant. 415: so SOPH. El. 753; AESCH. Prom. 457. Ξνερον πιντες, στε π τας σκηνας γνοντο, they marched away without stopping, until they came to the tents. XEN. Cyr. vii. 5, 6; so XEN. An. iii. 4, 49.

"Τν παροσαν ντλσω τχην, στν Δις φρνημα λωφσ χλου" AESCH. Prom. 375; so 697. φθογγον εναι τν παλαμναον νμος, στν σφαγα καθαιμξωσι, "it is the law that the murderer shall be speechless until streams of blood have been poured upon him." Id. Eum. 448. Ατο τδε μενομεν στν κα τελευτσωμεν. HDT. vii. 141. Περιμνετε στ

■ν ■γ■ ■λθω. XEN. An. v. 1, 4.

■πιμε■ναι κελε■σαντες ■στε βουλε■σαιντο, ■θ■οντο, bidding them wait until they had consulted, they made sacrifice. An. v. 5, An. 2. (■στ■ ■ν βουλε■σωνται might have been retained from the direct form, as in the next example.) ■πεκρ■νατο φυλ■ττειν α■τ■, ■στ■ ■ν α■τ■ς ■λθ■ν λ■β■ τ■ δ■ρα, “until he should come and take the gifts.” Hell. iii. 1, Hell. 15. So An. vii. 1, An. 33; HDT. viii. 4.

■π■τε ■ρα ε■η ■ρ■στου, ■ν■μενεν α■το■ς ■στε ■μφ■γοι■ν τι, ■ς μ■ βουλιμι■εν, “he always waited until they had eaten something.” XEN. Cyr. viii. 1, 44.

[*] 618. ■■χρι and μ■χρι.) ■χρι and μ■χρι, until, are used like ■ως, but chiefly in prose and in later Greek. E.g. Κα■ τα■τα ■πο■ουν μ■χρι σκ■τος ■γ■νετο, “until darkness came on.” XEN. An. iv. 2, 4 ; so iii. 4, XEN. An. 8. Ε■στ■κει μ■χρι ■ως ■γ■νετο. PLAT. Symp. 220D.

Μ■χρι δ■ ■ν ■γ■ ■κω, α■ σπονδα■ μεν■ντων, but until I come, let the truce remain. XEN. An. ii. 3, 24 ; so i. 4, XEN. An. 13. Ε■πε το■ς προφ■λαξι κελε■ειν το■ς κ■ρυκας περιμ■νειν ■χρι ■ν σχολ■σ■, “to wait until he should find leisure.” Ib. ii. 3, Ib. 2. Μ■χρι δ■ το■το ■δωμεν, μεν■ομεν παρ■ ■μ■ν α■το■σι, but until we see this, we shall remain by ourselves. HDT. iv. 119 (for the omission of ■ν see 620). Herodotus prefers the form with ο■ (619).

■χρι is much less common in this sense than μ■χρι. The forms ■χρις and μ■χρις are not used by the best writers.

[*] 619. ■χρι ο■ and μ■χρι ο■ are used like ■χρι and μ■χρι. E.g. Τ■ν δ■ τα■τα πραξ■ντων, ■χρι ο■ ■δε ■ λ■γος ■γρ■φετο, Τις■φονος πρεσβ■τατος ■ν τ■ν ■δελφ■ν τ■ν ■ρχ■ν ε■χε. XEN. Hell. vi. 4, 37. So Cyr. v. 4, Cyr. 16; THUC. v. 26; HDT. i. 187, HDT. vii. 60. Το■ς ■λληνας ■πελ■σατο δουλε■ας, ■στ■ ■λευθ■ρους ε■ναι μ■χρι ο■ π■λιν α■το■ α■το■ς κατεδουλ■σαντο. PLAT. Menex. 245A.

Παραδ■δομι ■ντειλ■μενος θε■να■ μιν ■ς ■ρημον ■ρος κα■ φυλ■σσειν ■χρι ο■ τελευτ■σ■, “to watch him until he dies.” HDT. i. 117 (see 614). Κατατ■θεται ■ς Τ■νεδον μ■χρι ο■ το■ς ■θηνα■οις τι δ■ξ■, until the Athenians shall pass some vote about them (see 620). THUC. iii. 28.

[*] 620. (Omission of ■ν.) ■ν is sometimes omitted after ■ως and the other particles meaning until (including πρ■ν), when they take the subjunctive. This is most frequent in tragic poetry, but it occurs sometimes with ■ς ■ or ■ς ο■ in Herodotus, and with μ■χρι and μ■χρι (or ■χρι) ο■ in Herodotus and Thucydides. E.g. “■ως τ■ χα■ρειν κα■ τ■ λυπε■σθαι μ■θ■ς.” SOPH. Aj. 555. “■ρ■γετ■ ■στ■ ■γ■ μεληθ■.” Ib. 1183. So O. C. 77, Tr. 148, Ph. 764. ■ς ο■ ■ποθ■νωσι ■ σφι παρευρεθ■ τι ■δικον, μ■χρι το■του. HDT. iii. 31. Μηδ■να ■κβ■ναι μ■χρι πλο■ς γ■νηται, that nobody should leave the ship before she sailed. THUC. i. 137. Α■το■ς ■ς φυλακ■ν διεκ■μισαν, μ■χρι ο■ ■θ■ναζε πεμφθ■σιν. Id. iv. 46; see iv. 16 and 41, and iii. 28 (quoted in 619). See also μ■χρι δ■ το■το ■δωμεν, HDT. iv. 119, and ■χρι ο■ τελευτ■σ■, Id. i. 117. The only case in Homer of this omission of κ■ or ■ν is the doubtful one, ■χει κ■τον ■φρα τελ■σσ■, Il. i. 82, where ■φρα may perhaps be final. (See 468.) For πρ■ν without ■ν with the subjunctive, even in Attic prose, see 648.

πρ■ν, before, until: Meaning and General Use of πρ■ν.

πρ■v, before, until48: Meaning and General Use of πρ■v.

[*] 621. Πρ■v was originally a comparative adverb (= πρ■τερον and π■ρος), formed from πρ■ and meaning before. It appears in the usual adverbial relations; as πρ■v μοι ■π■σχετο, he once promised me; πρ■v ■v, having been of old; ■v τ■ πρ■v χρ■v■, in the former time; and it once takes the genitive like a preposition in PIND. Py. iv. 43, πρ■v ■ρας, before its time. With the infinitive it originally expressed a simple temporal relation, πρ■v ■λθε■v being the equivalent of the later πρ■ το■ ■λθε■v, before going. With the finite moods πρ■v always expresses a limit of time and means until, like ■ως, having become a conjunction, not losing, however, its original meaning of before. From this original comparative meaning, πρ■v has a negative force, implying that something does or does not happen before (i.e. in the absence of) another event; so that ο■πω or μ■πω with a temporal participle may generally be substituted for πρ■v and the infinitive. Thus, in να■ε δ■ Π■δαιον πρ■v ■λθε■v υ■ας ■χαι■v, Il. xiii. 172, for πρ■v ■λθε■v, before they came, we could substitute ο■πω ■λθ■vτων, etc. So πρ■v ■v with the subjunctive is often interchangeable with ■v μ■, and always implies it; thus μ■ ■π■λθ■ς πρ■v ■v ■κο■σ■ς, do not depart until you hear, implies ■v μ■ ■κο■σ■ς, without hearing. One result of this negative character of πρ■v is its strong affinity for the aorist, the tense which denotes simple occurrence. (See Jour. Phil. ii. pp. 466 ff.)

[*] 622. In Homeric Greek πρ■v generally takes the primitive construction with the infinitive without regard to the nature of the leading verb. In lyric poetry, Herodotus, and Attic Greek, πρ■v takes the infinitive chiefly when the leading clause is affirmative; otherwise, it takes one of the finite moods, like ■ως, having the sense of until. But, while the indicative may sometimes follow πρ■v, meaning until, when the leading clause is affirmative, the subjunctive and optative are never used unless the leading clause is negative or involves a negative idea.

Development of the Constructions with πρ■v.

[*] 623. The Attic uses of πρ■v with the indicative, subjunctive, and optative, are seen in a primitive stage of development in Homer. The construction of πρ■v itself with the indicative was yet unknown; but four cases of πρ■v γ■ ■τε with the indicative show a tendency in this direction. Six cases of πρ■v (without ■v or κ■) with the subjunctive and one with the optative (in indirect discourse) mark the beginning of the later usage with these moods. On the other hand, 81 cases of πρ■v with the infinitive show the prevailing Homeric construction. Here, as in all periods of the language, when πρ■v takes the infinitive, we have simply a statement of fact, that one thing precedes another; in να■ε δ■ Π■δαιον πρ■v ■λθε■v υ■ας ■χαι■v, and he dwelt in Pedaeum before the coming of the sons of the Greeks, πρ■v ■λθε■v implies no more than πρ■ ■φ■ξεως or the later πρ■ το■ ■λθε■v. Any further idea that may be implied comes from the context, and is not found in the words. This use of πρ■v has little analogy in Greek syntax, its nearest parallel being the later use of ■στε or ■ς with the infinitive. The simplest theory, which best suits the Homeric usage, seems to be that πρ■v has a “quasi-prepositional” relation to the infinitive, which is a verbal noun, a relation the same in effect as that of πρ■ in πρ■ το■ ■λθε■v in the later Attic construction. (See XEN. Mem. ii. 6, 6, and DEM. xix. 73.) A similar use of ■vτ■ with the infinitive in a few cases in Herodotus (see 803) shows a tendency to go further in the same direction.

[*] 624. The Homeric language was generally contented with the simple πρ■v and the infinitive, even when it was implied that the clause with πρ■v set a limit to the action (or negation) of the

leading clause, i.e. when $\pi\rho$ could be expressed by until. So in Il. xxi. 100, $\pi\rho$ Πτροκλον π πισπεν α σιμον μ αρ, τ φρα τ μοι πεφιδσθαι ϕ λτερον ϵ ν Τρων, i.e. until the death of Patroclus I preferred to spare the Trojans (which he will no longer do); and xix. 312, \omicron δ τι θυμ τ ρπετο $\pi\rho$ πολμου σ μα δ μεναι, i.e. he felt no pleasure until he entered the battle; in both cases the Attic Greek might have used $\pi\rho$ with the indicative. So also when the clause with $\pi\rho$ is future and conditional; as in Il. xix. 423, \omicron λξω $\pi\rho$ Τρας δ ην λ σαι πολμοιο, I will not stop until I have given the Trojans enough of war. It was in cases like the last, where the mere temporal $\pi\rho$ λ σαι expresses the future condition very imperfectly, that the need of a more exact form was first felt. The need existed only after negative sentences, as here only could such a future condition be expressed by $\pi\rho$ consistently with its original meaning before. I shall not cease fighting until (before) I see the end of the war contains a future condition (= ν μ) which $\pi\rho$ can properly express; but the equivalent affirmative, I shall go on fighting until I see the end of the war, could not be expressed by $\pi\rho$, as we cannot substitute before for until, but it would require ω s, which is until with no sense of before. The forms of parataxis suggested a simple and natural way of meeting this want, through the adverbial use of $\pi\rho$. In a sentence like \omicron δ μ ιν ν στσεις: $\pi\rho$ κ α κ ακ ν λ λο π θσθα, nor will you recall him to life:—sooner than this will you suffer some new affliction, Il. xxiv. 551, we have only to remove the colon and make $\pi\rho$ a conjunction to obtain the regular construction of $\pi\rho$ with the subjunctive, nor will you recall him to life before (until) you suffer some new affliction. This result could not have been attained with an affirmative leading clause; for while \omicron τοτο ποισω: $\pi\rho$ μ ε κελεσς, I shall not do this:—you shall command me first, gives the meaning I shall not do this before you command me, the paratactic affirmative, τοτο ποισω: $\pi\rho$ μ ε κελεσς, would give only you will command me before I do this. I shall do this before you command me would be τοτο ποισω $\pi\rho$ σ ε κελεσαι, which is not the result of any form of parataxis. The six cases of $\pi\rho$ with the subjunctive in Homer are all without ν or κ , and all follow negatives. The primitive character and the rarity of this construction seem to show that we are nearer the original parataxis here than in any other form; while the change of the subjunctive to the optative after a past tense in Il. xxi. 580 (see 639) shows that the dependence of the clause with $\pi\rho$ is thoroughly established (cf. 307). An attempt to arrive at the same result in a more awkward way appears in two cases of $\pi\rho$ γ τ ν with the subjunctive in the Odyssey (641), where $\pi\rho$ introduces the subjunctive with τ ν very much as it introduces the infinitive.

[*] 625. No case of $\pi\rho$ with the indicative occurs in Homer; but the want was supplied by $\pi\rho$ γ τ δ with the indicative, which resembles $\pi\rho$ γ τ ν with the subjunctive just mentioned. As this construction is not the result of parataxis, and there is no such obstacle to combining the ideas of until and before in statements of past fact after affirmative clauses as was felt in future conditions (624), we find $\pi\rho$ γ τ with the indicative after both affirmative and negative sentences (see the examples in 636). It thus appears that $\pi\rho$ was not sufficiently established as a conjunction in Homer to take the indicative without the intervention of τ , although $\pi\rho$ with the subjunctive had become a fixed construction. The history of the uses of $\pi\rho$ after Homer will be found below. (See 627; 632-634; 637; 642; 643; 645.) $\pi\rho$ with the Infinitive.

[*] 626. (In Homer.) In Homer the infinitive regularly follows $\pi\rho$ after both affirmative and negative sentences, often where the Attic Greek would have the finite moods. E.g. Ναε δ

Πιδαιον πρην λθεν υας χαίν. Il. xiii. 172. Το δ φθη ρεξμενος πρην οτσαι, οδ φμαρτεν. Il. xvi. 322. Σφιν δ πρην περ τρμος λλαβε φαδιμα γυα, πρην πλεμν τ δειν πολμοι τε μρμερα ργα, before they saw the war, etc. Il. viii. 452. (See 657.) Φεγει πρην περ μιλον ολλισθμεναι νδρν. Il. xv. 588. κ τι πολλο γαν δξ ελλον πρην λιον εσαφικσθαι. Il. xxii. 17. λλ ο ατ Ζες λσειε βην πρην μν πμα φυτεσαι. Od. iv. 668. Αθ φελλ λλοθ λσθαι πρην λθεν. Od. xviii. 402. Οδ πολγει πρην χρος νδρομοιο διελθεν. Il. xx. 100. Ο λξω πρην Τρας δην λσαι πολμοιο. Il. xix. 423. Ο μ ποτρψεις πρην χαλκ μαχσασθαι. Il. xx. 257. Οδ γε λοιγν πσει πρην γ π πατρ φλ δμεναι κορην. Il. i. 97. In the last three examples the subjunctive would be regular in Attic, and even Homer uses it in a few such cases (639). In Il. xx. 100 πρην διλθεν would have been the common Attic form. In the other examples, in which a mere temporal relation is expressed, the infinitive would be required in Attic Greek.

Hesiod has one example (Scut. 40) and the Homeric Hymns one (Ven. 151) of πρην with the infinitive, both after negative sentences.

[*] 627. (After Homer.) The lyric poets, Herodotus, and the Attic writers use the infinitive after πρην chiefly when the leading sentence is affirmative. But the infinitive is always required when πρην means simply before, not until. E.g.

Πρην κτελσαι κατβη δμον ιδος. THEOG. 917. σταμαι μπνων πρην τι φμεν, "I stand taking breath before I speak." Nem. viii. 19; so Py. ix. 113. Πρην ν παρεναι κενον ς τν ττικν, μας καιρς στι προβοηθσαι ς τν Βοιωταν, before he comes into Attica, etc. HDT. viii. 144. "Πρην νν τ πλεον στορεν, κ τσδ δρας ξελθ," "before seeking further, etc." SOPH. O.C. 36. ποπμπουσιν ον ατν πρην κοσαι. THUC. ii. 12. So ii. 13, πρην σβαλεν ες τν ττικν. φεσαν τ βλη πολ πρην ξικνεσθαι. XEN. Cyr. iii. 3, 60. μες τονν Μεσσνην ελομεν πρην Πρσας λαβεν τν βασιλεαν κα κρατσαι τς περου, κα πρην οκισθνα τινας τν πλεων τν λληνδων. ISOC. vi. 26. Κα πρην ξ μνας γεγονναι, πδωκε. PLAT. Prot. 320A. πολμεσθ, ε κακν προσοσομεν νον παλαι, πρην τδ ξηνητηκνναι, we are ruined, then, if we shall add a new calamity to the former one, before we shall have exhausted this (109). EUR. Med. 78. In the following cases the infinitive is necessary, even after negatives. Πρην ς φοβον λθεν μαν μραν οκ χρευσεν, she was not a widow a single day before she went to Aphobus (where until would be absurd). XXX. DEM. 33. Οδ γρ πρην ττηθνναι τν δκην εχεν ν δικαζμεθα, i.e. he did not have it even before he lost the suit (much less afterwards). ISAE. v. 21. So AR. Av. 964; THUC. i. 39, THUC. 68. See also ISOC. v. 70, ταν δεδωσι μ πρτερν τι πθς πρην τλος πιθενναι τος πραττομνοις, when they fear lest you may meet with some disaster before you finish what you are doing (not until you finish). Indeed, μ after a verb of fearing does not make a negative sentence so far as the sense is concerned, what affects the dependent clause being the positive idea in πθς: see SOPH. Tr. 632.

[*] 628. An infinitive with πρην sometimes depends on a negative clause, where a finite mood might be allowed, because the temporal relation is still so prominent as to determine the construction. This may happen when the clause with πρην precedes, so that the dependence which until expresses is obscured by the position. E.g. πως μ πρτερον νξ σται πρην πυθσθαι παντας, i.e. lest night should come before they had heard them all. AND. i. 43. Πρην

τὴν ναυμαχίαν νικήσαι μὲν, γὰρ οὐκ ἔν ἄλλῳ χωρῆδιον μικρῶν, before we gained the naval victory, he had only a little piece of land (the argument tries to prove that he died poor). LYS. xix. 28. Καὶ μοι μὴ θορυβῆσαι μηδέ τις πρὶν ἰκοῦσαι, and let no one interrupt me before he hears (where πρὶν ἰκοῦσαι, until he hears, would suggest the wrong idea). DEM. v. 15. Πρὶν δὲ ταῦτα πρῆξαι, μὴ σκοπεῖτε τὰς ἐπιπύκνους βέλτιστά πολεσθαι βουλοῦσεται (where the irony of the question would make until absurd). Id. iii. 12: so 13. Πρὶν μὲν γὰρ τοῦτο πρῆξαι Λεωκρῆτην ἠδηλὸν ἔπειτα οἱ τινες ἔντες ἐγγυῶνται: νῦν δὲ πᾶσι φανερῶν (where the temporal relation in πρὶν μὲν and νῦν δὲ is the only important one). LYCURG. 135. See also AESCH. Sept. 1048, Ag. 1067; SOPH. Aj. 1419; XEN. Cyr. iv. 3, 10.

[*] 629. The infinitive sometimes follows πρὶν after negative sentences where we might have the optative, which for some reason was not common after πρὶν. E.g. Οὐκ ἔν μεθεῖτο πρὶν καθῆδον κλεῖν, he would not give it up until he should hear (before hearing) what he desired. SOPH. Tr. 197. (We might have πρὶν κλεῖν: cf. SOPH. Tr. 2, οὐκ ἔν ἀλλῶν κμῆθις βροτῶν, πρὶν ἔν θῆναι τις, where πρὶν θῆναι might have been used.) So AESCH. Supp. 772. Οὐδὲ διαβουλεύσασθαι τι φη, πρὶν τρῆς ἔννα μῆρας μεῖναι, until he should wait, etc. THUC. vii. 50. ἔκτενον μηδαμῶς ποτὶ πεσεσθαι, πρὶν ἔμβάλεῖν εἰς τὴν χώραν, until they should invade the country. XEN. Hell. vi. 5, 23. Οὐτε ἀτῆς ποτε πρὶν ἔδρῆσαι δεῖπνον ῥεῖτο. Id. Cyr. viii. 1, Id. Cyr. 38. (Here πρὶν ἔδρῆσαι in the generic sense would be the natural expression; but it is doubtful whether this construction was ever used with πρὶν. For Id. An. iv. 5, Id. An. 30, see 646.)

[*] 630. There remain some cases of πρὶν with the infinitive after negative clauses where the older usage seems to be retained in place of the more exact later use of the indicative or subjunctive. E.g. Οὐδὲ πρῆς δικαστηρῶν οὐδὲ βουλευτηρῶν φθηνὸν δεῖποτε, πρὶν ταῦτην τὴν συμφορῶν γενέσθαι, i.e. never, until this calamity befell me. LYS. xix. 55. ἔπειδὲ δὲ οὐκ ἔν τῶν σπῆν ἀσθῆσθαι (τοῖς πονηροῖς) πρὶν κακῶς τινὰ παθεῖν ἔπειτα αἰτῆν, but since it is not possible to recognise them until somebody is hurt by them (for πρὶν ἔν πῆθαι τις). ISOC. xx. 14. In such cases the temporal relation seems to exclude the other in the writer's mind.

[*] 631. (πρὶν.) We sometimes find πρὶν, than before, with the infinitive, a past verb being understood after πρὶν. E.g. Οὐ πολλοὶ μὲν ἄλλῶν ἔσιν νῦν πρὶν ἔτθηθῆναι, πολλοὶ δὲ ἄλλῶν ἔντε ἔπειδρασαν μὲν, they are much fewer now than (they were) before they were beaten, etc. XEN. Cyr. v. 2, 36. So vii. 5, XEN. Cyr. 77. Παραλαβῶν τὴν πῆλιν χεῖρον μὲν φρονοῦσαν (sc. ἔφθηνει) πρὶν κατασχέῖν τὴν ῥχῶν. ISOC. viii. 126. This ellipsis occurs first in Xenophon.

πρὶν with the Indicative.

[*] 632. (Early Poets.) Πρὶν with the indicative does not occur in the Iliad or Odyssey, except in πρὶν γὰρ ἔτε (see 636). The first case of simple πρὶν with the indicative is Hymn. Py. Ap. 178, “ἔς τὴν γὰρ ἔντισεῖε, φῆρεσκὴ γὰρ μιν ἀσιμον ἔμαρ, πρὶν γὰρ οὐκ ἔν φῆκεν ἔπῆλων”, i.e. every one was slain, until Apollo sent an arrow at the monster. Three cases occur in Pindar: Ol. ix. 57, xiii. 65; Nem. iv. 28. The last is the first case of πρὶν with the indicative after a negative sentence. These are the only cases before the Attic writers.

[*] 633. Attic Poets.) Aeschylus has one example, after a negative: οκ ν λξημ οδν, λλ φαρμκων χρε κατεσκλλοντο, πρν γ γ σφισιν δειξα κρσεις πων κεσμτων, until I showed them, etc., Prom. 479. So likewise Aristophanes: πρτερον δ οκ ν γνος θαντων, πρν ρως ξυνμιξεν παντα, Av. 700. Sophocles has one, after an affirmative: “γμην δ νρ στν μγιστος, πρν μοι τχη τοιδ πστη,” “until this fortune befell me,” O. T. 775. Euripides has seven examples, all (according to Sturm) after affirmatives, as follows:—

ν εδ δ πως στη, πρν δ τις φθγξατο. And. 1145. φρων νες τ ν, πρν σεδον οον ν, I was a witless youth, until I saw, etc. I. A. 489 (where there is a negative force in φρων). νω- λλυξε, πρν γ ρ, she shouted, until she saw, etc. Med. 1173. (Here the contrast of ετ κεν μγαν κκυτον in 1176 gives the idea that she did not begin the loud wailing until she saw the foam.) Σπουδα σαν σαι, πρν Λαερτιδης πεθει στρατιν. Hec. 132. The others are Alc. 128; Rhes. 294, Alc. 568.

These are all the cases of πρν with the indicative which precede those in prose. It will be seen that the idea of until is always conspicuous, even when the leading verb is affirmative; and in the earlier stages of the construction little regard was paid to the character of the leading sentence. With prose a new and stricter usage begins (634).

[*] 634. Prose.) In Attic prose and in Herodotus, πρν, until, referring to a definite past action, regularly takes the indicative after negative sentences or those implying a negative, very rarely after affirmative sentences. E.g. Οτι κω συμβολν ποιετο πρν γε δ ατο πρυτανηη γνετο, “he did not yet make an attack until his own day of command came.” HDT. vi. 110. So vi. 79, HDT. vii. 239, HDT. ix. 22; all with πρν γε δ. Τοτου το πεος λγον οδνα ποιεντο πρν δ πετελσθη. Id. i. 13. For πρν in Herodotus see 651; and for πρτερον in Herodotus and Thucydides, see 653.

Ο πρτερον πασαντο ν ργ ρχοντες ατν, πρν ζημωσαν χρμασιν, “they did not cease to regard him with wrath until they fined him.” THUC. ii. 65. Οδ ξωσαν νετερν τι ποιεν ρς ατν, πρν γε δ ατο ρ νρ ργλιος μηνυτς γγεται, i.e. until he becomes, etc. Id. i. 132. Οτε τε νναι θελε, πρν ν γυν ατν πεισε. XEN. An. i. 2, 26. Ο πρτερον θλησεν πελθεν, πρν ατν ξλασαν β. LYS. iii. 7. Μεσσηνους πολιορκοντες ο πρτερον πασαντο, πρν ξβαλον κ τς χρας. ISOC. xii. 91. (Isocrates has the formula ο πρτερον πασαντο πρν with the indicative nine times.) Οκ ν ν Θβαις σφαλς, πρν τν Βοιωταν πδωκε κα τος Φωκας νελεν. DEM. viii. 65. “Πλιν τοτο τμνων οκ πανκε, πρν φευρν σκαιν τιν ρωτα λοιδρησε μλ ν δκ.” PLAT. Phaedr. 266A. (This is the only case in Plato; but he has three indicatives in unfulfilled conditions. See 637.)

[*] 635. The only examples in prose of πρν with the indicative after strictly affirmative sentences are these three:—

π πολ διγον τς μρας πειρμενοι λλλων, πρν δ ρστων πεθει τος ρχοντας. THUC. vii. 39. Παραπλσια πασχον, πρν γε δ ο Συρακσιοι τρεψν τε τος θηναους κα κατεδωκον ρς τν γν. Id. vii. 71. Προσεπολμει ριστοφντι, πρν ατν ατν τατην πελησεν παγγελαν ν τ δμ νπερ γ Τιμρχ πγγειλα, he

continued to attack Aristophan, until A. threatened him before the people with this same kind of summons (to δοκιμασ[α]) which I served on Timarchus. AESCHIN. i. 64. In these cases the force of until in πρ[εν] is made especially emphatic by the continuation of the state of things described by the leading imperfects. There seems to be a feeling implied like that in ο[ν] πρ[ω]τερον [πα]σαντο πρ[εν] (see Sturm, p. 333).

Sturm cites also THUC. i. 51 and 118, THUC. iii. 29 and 104, as examples. But the first two have actual negatives in the leading sentence; in iii. 29, το[ι]ς [θη]να[ι]ους λανθ[ου]νουσι, πρ[εν] δ[ε] τ[ο] Δ[η]λ[ο]σ[χο]ν, the idea is that the Athenians did not see them until, etc.; in iii. 104, τ[ο] περ[ι] το[ι]ς [γ]υ[ν]ακ[ων] κατελ[η]θη [π] ξυμφορ[ων], πρ[εν] δ[ε] ο[ν] [θη]να[ι]οι τ[ε]τε τ[εν] [γ]υ[ν]α [πο]ησαν, the meaning is, the games were broken up (i.e. were no longer held) until the Athenians renewed them at this time. (See Jour. Phil. ii. p. 469.)

[*] 636. Πρ[εν] γ[α]ρ [τε], until, has the indicative in Homer, after affirmative as well as negative sentences. These cases occur:—

[π] [σα] μ[η]χη τ[α]τατο, πρ[εν] γ[α]ρ [τε] δ[ε] Ζε[υ]ς κ[ε]δος [π]ρ[ω]τερον [κ]τορι δ[ε]κεν, the battle hung equally balanced, until (when) Zeus gave higher glory to Hector. Il. xii. 436. [μ]εθ[ι] [τυ]ζ[υ]μεναι, πρ[εν] γ[α]ρ [τε] δ[ε] με σ[υ]ς υ[ι]ος [π] μεγ[α]ροιο κ[ε]λεσεν, “until your son called me.” Od. xxiii. 42. Ο[δ] [ς] το[ν] θυμ[ον] [π]ειθον, πρ[εν] γ[α]ρ [τε] δ[ε] θ[η]λαμος π[ε]κ[ε] [β]λλετο, i.e. until the battering began. Il. ix. 587. So in the suspected verses, πρ[εν] γ[α]ρ [τε] . . . θ[η]ρσυνας, Od. xiii. 322. For Od. iv. 178, see 637.

Four cases of πρ[εν] γ[α]ρ [τε] δ[ε] with the indicative are found in the Homeric Hymns: Del. 49; Cer. 96, Cer. 195, Cer. 202; after which this strange construction disappears.

[*] 637. [Indicative with πρ[εν], in unfulfilled conditions.) When the clause introduced by πρ[εν], until, refers to a result not attained in past time in consequence of the non-fulfilment of some condition, it takes a past tense of the indicative like the corresponding clause with [ως] (613, 2). We find examples only of the aorist indicative after negative sentences:—

[χρ[εν] το[ι]ς [α]λλοις μ[η] πρ[ω]τερον περ[ι] τ[εν] [μ]ολογουμ[εν]ων συμβουλε[ειν], πρ[εν] περ[ι] τ[εν] [μ]φισβητουμ[εν]ων [μ] [ς] [δ]δαξαν, they ought not to have given advice about undisputed matters, until they had instructed us about what is in dispute. ISOC. iv. 19. Χρ[εν] το[ν]υν Λεπ[τ]νην μ[η] πρ[ω]τερον τιθ[εν]αι τ[εν] [α]υτο[ν] ν[ο]μον, πρ[εν] το[τον] [λ]υσε, “before he had repealed this one.” DEM. xx. 96. Ο[κ] [ν] [π]εσκεψ[υ]μεθα πρ[ω]τερον ε[τε] διδακτ[εν] ε[τε] ο[κ] διδακτ[εν] [ρε]τ[εν], πρ[εν] [τι] [στι] πρ[ω]τον [ζη]τ[ου]σαμεν α[τ], we should not have inquired whether virtue was teachable or not, until we had first asked what it is in itself. PLAT. Men. 86 D; so 84 C, and Theaet. 165D.

Besides these five cases in prose, we have the same construction with πρ[εν] γ[α]ρ [τε] δ[ε] in Od. iv. 178: ο[δ] κεν [μ] [ς] [α]λλο δι[κ]ρινεν, πρ[εν] γ[α]ρ [τε] δ[ε] θαν[το]ιο μ[ε]λαν ν[ο]φος [μ]φεκ[ε]λυψεν, nor would aught else have separated us until the black cloud of death had covered us. For the same construction with πρ[ω]τερον [ν] in HDT. viii. 93, see 653.

πρ[εν] with the Subjunctive and Optative: Subjunctive.

[*] 638. When a clause with πρ[εν], until, refers to the future, and depends on a negative clause of future time (not containing an optative), πρ[εν] takes the subjunctive, like [ως] in a similar case

(613, 3).

[*] 639. In Homer $\pi\rho\nu$ does not take κ or ν with the subjunctive, the form of the original parataxis being still retained (624). The examples of the subjunctive are these:—

$\text{Ο γρ πω καταδσομεθ ες δαο δμους, πρν μρσιμον μαρ πλθ}$, we shall not yet descend to the house of Hades, until the fated day shall come. Od. x. 174. (Here, if we insert a colon after $\delta\muους$ and take $\pi\rho\nu$ as an adverb, sooner than this, we have the paratactic form.) So Il. xviii. 135; Od. xiii. 335, Od. xvii. 7. In Il. xviii. 190, $\text{ο με πρν γ εα θωρσσεσθαι, πρν γ ατν δωμαι}$, she did not permit me to arm myself until I should see her, the subjunctive of direct discourse (seen in xviii. 135) is retained after a past tense. So Il. xxiv. 781. In Il. xxi. 580 a similar subjunctive has been changed to the optative (644).

[*] 640. Hesiod has two cases of $\pi\rho\nu$ with the subjunctive, Th. 222, Op. 738, still without κ or ν as in Homer. $\Pi\rho\nu \nu$ first occurs in THEOGN. 963 (see 642).

[*] 641. Two cases of $\pi\rho\nu \gamma \tau \nu$ (used like $\pi\rho\nu$) with the subjunctive occur in the Odyssey. The first is especially instructive, ii. 373: $\text{λλ μοσον μ μητρ φλ τδε μυθσασθαι, πρν γ τ ν νδεκτη τε δωδεκτη τε γνηται, ατν ποθσαι κα φορμηθντος κοσαι}$, but swear not to tell this to my mother until the eleventh or twelfth day shall come, or (until) she shall miss me and hear of my departure. Here $\pi\rho\nu$ first introduces $\tau \nu \gamma \nu η τ α ι$ and then the two infinitives, having the same prepositional force with both. But in iv. 746, where the same scene is described, we have $\text{με δ λετο μγαν ρκον, μ πρν σο ρειν πρν δωδεκτην γε γενσθαι σ ατν ποθσαι κα φορμηθντος κοσαι}$, the simpler and more common $\pi\rho\nu \gamma \nu \sigma θ α ι$ taking the place of the unwieldy $\pi\rho\nu \gamma \tau \nu \gamma \nu η τ α ι$. The other case is iv. 475: $\text{ο πρν μορα φλους δεειν, πρν γ τ ν Αγπτοιο δωρ λθς}$.

[*] 642. After Homer and Hesiod $\pi\rho\nu \nu$ is established as the regular form with the subjunctive. E.g. $\text{Μ ποτ παινσς πρν ν εδς νδρα σαφηνως}$. THEOG. 963 (the earliest case of $\pi\rho\nu \nu$). “ $\text{Οδ λξει πρν ν κορσσ καρ λ τις ρχν}$ ” AESCH. Prom. 165. “ $\text{Ο γρ ποτ ξει πρν ν κενας ναργες δερ μοι στσς γων}$,” “you shall not depart until you bring those girls and place them before my eyes.” SOPH. O.C. 909. $\text{Ο μ νας φορμσς χθονς, πρν ν κρην σν φιγνεια ν ρτεμις λβς σφαγεσαν}$. EUR. I. T. 19. “ $\text{Μ προκαταγγωσκ, πτερ, πρν ν γ κοσς μφοτρων}$ ” AR. Vesp. 919. $\text{Ο κ σε γ λγω (εδαμονα), πρν ν τελευτσαντα καλς τν ανα πθωμαι}$, “until I shall hear that you have ended your life happily.” HDT. i. 32. $\text{Ο χρ μ νθνδε πελθεν, πρν ν δ δκην}$. XEN. An. v. 7, 5. $\text{Οκ ον τε μς πρτερον εδναι, πρν ν κα μο κοσητε πολογουμνου}$. AND. i. 7. $\text{Τος δ ο πρτερον πασονται πρν ν οτως σπερ μς διαθσιν}$. ISOC. xiv. 18. “ $\text{Μπω γε, πρν ν τ καμα παρλθ}$,” “not yet, — until the heat of the day is past.” PLAT. Phaedr. 242A.

Optative.

[*] 643. When a clause with $\pi\rho\nu$, until, referring to the future, depends on a negative clause containing an optative in protasis or apodosis, in a wish, or in a final clause, it may have the optative (without ν) by assimilation, like a conditional relative clause (613, 4), or it may take the infinitive. These cases of the optative occur:—

Ο γρ ν εδεης νδρς νον οδ γυναικς, πρν πειρηθεης, “for you cannot know the mind of a man or a woman until you have tested it.” THEOG. 125 (the earliest example). “Οποτ γωγ ν, πρν νδοιμ ρθν πος, μεφομνων ν καταφαην,” “never would I assent when men blame him, until I should see the word proved true.” SOPH. O.T. 505. Μσταη πολκωπον χημα νας ατ, πρν τνδε πρς πλιν νσειε, “may his ship of many oars not stop until it makes its way to this city.” Id. Tr. 655; so Phil. 961 (both after optative of wish). Παρανσχον φρυκτος, πως μ βοηθοεν πρν σφν ο νδρες ο ξιντες διαφγοιεν, they raised signal torches, that the enemy might not come to the rescue until their own men who had gone forth had escaped. THUC. iii. 22. Νομσαντες οκ ν τι τν Βρασδαν σφν προσαποστσαι οδν πρν παρασκευσαιντο, “thinking that B. would not cause any further secessions of their allies until they had made preparations.” Id. iv. 117. So XEN. Hell. ii. 3, 48 (two examples). Οκ ν πρτερον ρμσειε, πρν τ βεβαωσαιτο τν σκψιν τς πορεας. Leg. 799 δ. Ελλκοι τις ατν, κα μ ννεη πρν ξελκσειεν ες τ το λλου φς, if one should drag him, and not let him go until he had dragged him out into the sunlight. Rep. 515E.

These are all the cases of this use of the optative with πρν cited by Sturm. In many cases where the optative could have been used, the infinitive appears (see 629).

[*] 644. The optative with πρν is more frequent in indirect discourse after a negative verb of past time, representing a subjunctive of the direct form, which is often retained. (See the corresponding use of ως, 614.) E.g. Οκ θελεν φεγειν πρν πειρσαιτ χιλος, he would not fly until he should try Achilles. Il. xxi. 580. (The direct form was πρν πειρσωμαι, and πειρσηται might have been used here. See Il. xviii. 190, in 639.) So Hymn. Cer. 334; HES. Scut. 18. νδοξ μοι μ σγα, πρν φρσαιμ σοι, τν πλον ποιεσθαι. SOPH. Ph. 551. (In SOPH. Aj. 742 we have πρν τχ in a similar sentence.) νδοντο μ πελθεν πρν παγγοι τ στρευμα (v. I. πρν ν παγγγ). XEN. An. vii. 7, 57. (See επον μηδνα τν πισθεν κινεσθαι πρν ν πρσθεν γται, Cyr. ii. 2, Cyr. 8.) πηγρευε μηδνα βλλειν, πρν Κρος μπλησθεη θηρν, “until Cyrus should be satisfied.” Cyr. i. 4, Cyr. 14. γονθ οδν οο τ ενα κινεν, πρν κποδν κενος ατος γνοιτο. ISOC. xvi. 5. So PLAT. Ap. 36 C, PLAT. Rep. 402 B, Leg. 678D. For the infinitive, often preferred to the optative in such sentences, see 629.

πρν with Subjunctive in General Suppositions.

[*] 645. When the clause introduced by πρν, until, is generic, and depends on a negative clause of present time expressing customary or repeated action or a general truth, we have πρν ν with the subjunctive (613, 5). E.g. ρσι τος πρεσβυτρους ο πρσθεν πιντας γαστρς νεκα, πρν ν φσιν ο ρχοντες. XEN. Cyr. i. 2, 8. Ο γρ πρτερον καταγορος παρ τος κοουσιν σχει, πρν ν φεγων δυνατσ τς προειρημνας ατας πολσασθαι. AESCHIN. ii. 2. Οδες πποτε πθετο (gnomic) πτερον τ το δμου καταλσει, πρν ν μεζον τν δικαστηρων σχσ. Id. iii. 235. Ο πρτερον παονται, πρν ν πεσωσιν ος δκησαν. PLAT. Phaed. 114B. So Leg. 968C.

[*] 646. It is doubtful whether the optative was ever used with πρν in the corresponding generic sense. In XEN. An. iv. 5, 30, for πρν παραθεεν the weight of MSS. authority seems to favour πρν παραθεναι. In Il. ix. 488 πρν γ τε δ σσαιμι is of this class.

[*] 647. The principle by which $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu$ takes the subjunctive and optative only after negative sentences, or sentences which were felt as negative, seems to have allowed of no exceptions. The two following cases have been cited:—

$\text{Α}\sigma\chi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \pi\rho\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota,\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu\ \mu\epsilon\zeta\ \tau\iota\ \nu\ \beta\omicron\lambda\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \psi\eta\phi\sigma\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon,$ which is practically equivalent to I refuse to stop until you have voted what you wish, $\alpha\sigma\chi\rho\upsilon\nu$ having elsewhere a negative force (see 817). LYS. xxii. 4. $\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \omicron\nu\ \omicron\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\zeta\ \lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\omicron\iota\nu\ \tau\iota\ \pi\rho\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu\ \gamma\alpha\theta\upsilon\nu,\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu\ \tau\omicron\zeta\ \pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\tau\upsilon\nu\ \delta\iota\alpha\lambda\lambda\zeta\ \lambda\alpha\nu\ \pi\lambda\zeta\ \chi\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\alpha\ \pi\omicron\rho\rho\omega\ \tau\upsilon\nu\ \pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\tau\omega\nu\ \sigma\tau\upsilon\nu,$ which amounts to this: nobody but a simpleton thinks that the others will do anything in common until their leaders are united. ISOC. iv. 16. In Semonides i. 12, $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \kappa\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ cannot be correct, as $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu$ here does not mean until, but merely before.

[*] 648. $\Pi\rho\upsilon\nu$, like $\omega\varsigma$, etc. (620), sometimes takes the subjunctive without ν , even in Attic Greek. E.g. $\text{Μ}\sigma\tau\upsilon\nu\alpha\zeta\epsilon\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \mu\theta\zeta.$ SOPH. Ph. 917. So Ant. 619, Aj. 742, Aj. 965, Tr. 608, Tr. 946. “ $\text{Ο}\kappa\ \sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\tau\upsilon\nu\ \zeta\alpha\iota\rho\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota,\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\kappa\ \mu\omicron\ \mu\epsilon\theta\mu$ ” EUR. Alc. 848. So EUR. Or. 1218, EUR. Or. 1357. “ $\text{Μ}\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \gamma\ \kappa\omicron\sigma\zeta\ \chi\tau\omicron\rho\alpha\nu\ \sigma\tau\upsilon\nu\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\nu$ ” AR. Ran. 1281. So AR. Eccl. 629. See HDT. i. 32, HDT. iv. 157, HDT. vi. 82. Even in Attic prose the MSS. omit ν in some places; as THUC. vi. 10, THUC. 29, THUC. 38, THUC. viii. 9; XEN. Oec. xii. 1, XEN. Cyn. iii. 6; AESCHIN. iii. 60; HYPER. Eux. xx. 10 (§ 4); PLAT. Theaet. 169 B, Tim. 57B; but many editors insert ν in all these places on their own responsibility.

[*] 649. A few cases of $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu$ with the optative, if the text is sound, are to be explained (like those of $\omega\varsigma\ \nu$, 613, 4, end) as indirect discourse in which the direct form had $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu$ with the subjunctive. See XEN. Hell. ii. 4, 18 (quoted in 702).

[*] 650. In sentences with $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu$ we sometimes have a subjunctive depending on an optative with ν , as in conditional relative sentences (556). E.g. $\text{Ο}\kappa\ \nu\ \alpha\upsilon\ \kappa\mu\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \beta\rho\omicron\tau\upsilon\nu,\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu\ \theta\upsilon\nu\ \tau\iota\varsigma,$ you cannot fully understand the life of mortals, until one dies. SOPH. Tr. 2. $\text{Ο}\kappa\ \nu\ \pi\lambda\theta\omicron\iota\mu\iota\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \gamma\omicron\rho\ \lambda\upsilon\theta\mu.$ XEN. Oec. xii. 1. $\lambda\gamma\omicron\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\ \nu\ \tau\iota\ \lambda\eta\theta\zeta,\ \omicron\ \mu\upsilon\nu\ \sigma\alpha\phi\zeta\ \gamma\epsilon\ \omicron\delta\ \tau\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \alpha\ \text{(?)}\ \kappa\alpha\ \tau\alpha\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\tau\upsilon\ \pi\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\lambda\omega\mu\epsilon\nu;$ PLAT. Polit. 281D. The leading verb here has merely the effect of a future form on the clause with $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu$.

$\pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu$, $\pi\rho\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \nu$, and $\pi\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$, in the sense of $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu$.

[*] 651. $\Pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu$, sooner than, which is a more developed form of $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu$, is found twice in the Iliad with the infinitive; and very frequently in Herodotus with the infinitive (only after past tenses), the indicative, and the subjunctive (without ν). E.g. $\text{Ο}\ \mu\upsilon\nu\ \sigma\phi\ \gamma\ \omega\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \gamma\ \pi\omicron\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu\ \tau\epsilon\rho\upsilon\nu\ \gamma\epsilon\ \pi\epsilon\sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\ \alpha\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\iota\ \rho\eta\alpha.$ Il. v. 287. The same words occur after $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu$ in xxii. 266. $\text{Ο}\ \delta\ \text{Α}\gamma\pi\tau\iota\omicron\iota,\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \mu\upsilon\nu\ \Psi\alpha\mu\mu\tau\iota\chi\omicron\nu\ \sigma\phi\omega\nu\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota,\ \nu\ \mu\iota\zeta\omicron\nu\ \omega\upsilon\tau\omicron\zeta\ \pi\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \pi\upsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \nu\theta\rho\pi\omega\nu.$ HDT. ii. 2. $\Pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \gamma\omicron\rho\ \nu\ \pi\sigma\omega\ \sigma\phi\alpha\varsigma\ \nu\ \alpha\pi\lambda\sigma\alpha\iota\ \zeta\ \tau\zeta\ \Sigma\omicron\rho\delta\iota\varsigma\ \lambda\omega\ \text{Κ}\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\varsigma.$ Id. i. 78. $\text{Ο}\ \gamma\omicron\rho\ \delta\ \pi\rho\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \pi\alpha\nu\sigma\tau\eta,\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu\ \sigma\phi\epsilon\alpha\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron.$ Id. vi. 45. $\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\ \nu\ \alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu\ \tau\rho\epsilon\kappa\omega\varsigma\ \kappa\mu\theta\mu.$ Id. vii. 10. $\text{Ο}\ \pi\rho\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \pi\alpha\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu\ \lambda\omega\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\ \nu\rho\sigma\omega\ \tau\zeta\ \theta\upsilon\nu\alpha\varsigma.$ Id. vii. 8.

[*] 652. A few cases of $\pi\rho\upsilon\nu\ \nu$ occur in the MSS. in Attic prose, as in THUC. v. 61, and XEN. Cyr. i. 4, 23, Ag. ii. 4, An. iv. 5, 1; but many editors omit ν .

[*] 653. Πρῶτον is sometimes used like πρῶν, in the sense of πρῶν. This occurs chiefly with the infinitive in Herodotus and Thucydides, and with the subjunctive in Herodotus. Πρῶτον with the indicative is sometimes used like πρῶν, but it more frequently expresses a looser relation between two sentences which are independent in their construction (654). E.g.

(Infin., only after past tenses.) Ταῦτα ἔξαγγέθη πρῶτον τῶν Δαυρῶσιν ἐπικῆσθαι, “this was announced before D. arrived.” HDT. v. 118. ἴσαν οἱ τοὶ τῶν μὲν πρῶτον Πύρσας ῥῆξαι Μῆδων κατῆκοι, τότε δὲ Κέρου. Id. i. 72. (Πρῶτα as adj. for πρῶτον): ταῦτα καὶ πῶντε γενέσιν ἄνδρῶν πρῶτερ ἴσθη ἰρακλῆα ἢ τῶν ἄλλῶν γενέσθαι. Id. ii. 44. ἴπ τοὺς πομπῆς πρῶτον ἄσθησθαι ἄτοῦς ἐθῶς ἔχρησεν, “before they perceived them.” THUC. vi. 58. So i. 69. Besides the cases in Herodotus and Thucydides, a few occur in the orators: see DEM. xxxi. 14, and iv. 14 (πρῶτον and πρῶν together).

(Subj., without ἄν.) Μὲν ἴπανστασθαι ἴπ τῶς πῆλιος πρῶτον ἴξῶσιν. HDT. ix. 86; so ix. 87. In iv. 196 we have οἴτε πρῶν ἴν ἴπισωθῶ οἴτε πρῶτον ἴλῶσιν. Besides five cases in Herodotus, we have only THUC. vii. 63, μὲν πρῶτον ἴξιοῦν ἴπολῆσθαι ἴπαρῆξητε, and A. a. 2, οἴ πρῶτον ἴπιχειροῦσιν ἴποῖσωνται.

(Indic.) Οἴδῶ ἴδεσαν οἴσαν (τῶν ἴτραπον) πρῶτον ἴπερ ἴπῆθοντο Τρηχινῶν, “until they learned of it.” HDT. vii. 175. Οἴ πρῶτον ἴνῶδοσαν ἴατοῦ ἴν σῶσι περιπεσῶντες ἴσῶλησαν. THUC. ii. 65. Οἴδῶ ἴατῶν τῶν ἴπῆστασιν πρῶτον ἴτῶλησαν ποιῶσασθαι ἴμετῶ πολλῶν ἴσυμῶχων ἴμελλον ἴξνκινδυνέσειν. Id. viii. 24 (see the following example). Οἴκ ἴν ἴνῶ ἴχοντες ταῦτης τῶς ἴμῆρης ἴπιθῶσεσθαι, οἴδῶ πρῶτον ἴτῶ σῶνθημῶ σῶ ἴμελλε φανῶσεσθαι, i.e. nor did they mean to make an attack until the signal was ready to appear to them. HDT. viii. 7. (With πρῶν we should probably have had πρῶν ἴν μῶλλῶ.) Εἴ ἴμαθε, οἴκ ἴν ἴπαῶσάτο πρῶτον ἴελλῶ μῶν ἴκαῶ ἴατῶς ἴλω, if he had known it, he would not have stopped until he had either captured her or had been captured himself (indicative in unfulfilled condition). Id. viii. 93.

[*] 654. In other cases of πρῶτον with the finite moods or the infinitive, there is no meaning of until, and ἴ merely connects two verbs as when it follows μῶλλον. E.g. ἴκῶλευε τῶν ἴγγελον ἴπαγγέλλειν ἴτι πρῶτον ἴξοι ἴατῶς βουλοῶσεται, he bade the messenger announce that he should come sooner than he wanted him (the direct form being ἴξῶ πρῶτον ἴβουλοῶσει). HDT. i. 127. Πολῶ πλεῶον πῶθος περιεστῶκει βουλοῶντων προσῶναι, καῶ πολῶ πρῶτον ἴοἴ φῶλοι παρῶσαν, i.e. much sooner than his friends arrived. XEN. Cyr. vii. 5, 41. Πρῶτον ἴν τῶς μοι δοκεῶ ἴν τῶ ἴδῶ εῶρεῶν ἴδανειζῶμενος λαβεῶν (i.e. πρῶτον εῶροι ἴν ἴλῶβοι). Id. Mem. ii. 7, Id. Mem. 2: see i. 2, Id. Mem. 17. “Πρῶτον ἴπεθῶμησαν ἴτῶν τρῶπον ἴγῶσαν.” PLAT. Phaedr. 232E. Compare μῶλλον ἴζῶν, XEN. Mem. iv. 4, 4. So with πρῶσθεν ἴ, which is not used like πρῶν; as “πρῶσθεν ἴσῶ ἴφῶνου, τοῦτῶ ἴκηρῶχθη” SOPH. O.T. 736. See also XEN. An. ii. 1, 10, ἴπεκρῶνετο ἴτι πρῶσθεν ἴν ἴποθῶνοῖεν ἴτῶ ἴπῶλα παρῶδοῶσαν, they answered, that they would die before they would give up their arms.

[*] 655. Thucydides once uses ἴστερον with the infinitive, after the analogy of πρῶτον ἴ: πρῶν δῶ ἴναστῶναι, ἴτεσιν ἴστερον ἴκατῶν ἴατοῦς οἴκῶσαι, Πῶμιλον πῶμῶντες Σελῶντα κτῶζουσιν, before they were removed, and a hundred years after their own settlement, vi. 4.

[*] 656. Προς, before, which is originally an adverb like πριν, is used in Homer with the infinitive, but never with the other moods. E.g. Τίκνα γρηται ξελοντο προς πετεην γενσθαι. Od. xvi. 218. νθα με κμ περσε, προς τδε ργα γενσθαι. Il. vi. 348. Οδ ο πνος ππτεν π βλεφοροισι προς καταλξαι παντα. Od. xxiii. 309.

Προς with the infinitive occurs twelve times in Homer, always after affirmative sentences (except in Od. xxiii. 309).

πριν (as Adverb), προς, προτερον, προσθεν, etc., before πριν, in the Leading Sentence.

[*] 657. Homer very frequently has the adverb πριν, and occasionally other adverbs of the same meaning, in the clause on which πριν with the infinitive or subjunctive depends. E.g. Μ πριν π λιον δναι, πριν με καττηνς βαλειν Πριμοιο μλαθρον, may the sun not (sooner) go down before I have thrown to the ground Priam's palace (the first πριν emphasising in advance the idea of the second). Il. ii. 413. So Il. i. 97, Il. ii. 348, Il. 354, Il. iv. 114; Od. iv. 747; Il. ix. 403 (τ πριν). Ο γρ μιν προσθεν πασεσθαι ω, πριν γ ατην με δηται. Od. xvii. 7. So with ο γρ πω, Od. x. 174.49

[*] 658. In Attic Greek προτερον or προσθεν frequently stands in the clause on which πριν depends, like the adverb πριν in Homer (657). E.g. ποθνσκουσι προτερον πριν δλοι γγενεσθαι οοι σαν. XEN. Cyr. v. 2, 9. Κα τι προτερον, πριν ς τν δον ατοϋς ναστ- ναι, τδε προσσετο. THUC. viii. 45. Προτερον οκ ν γνος θανατων, πριν ρως ξυνμιξεν παντα. AR. Av. 700. Ο προτερον προς μϋς τν πλεμον ξφηναν, πριν νμισαν, κ.τ.λ. XEN. An. iii. 1, 16. Ο τοννν ποκρινομαι προτερον, πριν ν πθωμαι. PLAT. Euthyd. 295 C. Κα ο προσθεν στησαν, πριν () προς τοϋς πεζοϋς τν σσυρων γνοντο. XEN. Cyr. i. 4, 23. Δεται ατο μ προσθεν καταλσαι πριν ν ατη συμβουλεσηται. XEN. An. i. 1, 10. The formula ο προτερον πασασθαι πριν with the indicative in the orators is familiar (see 634).

[*] 659. Other adverbs of time sometimes occur in the leading clause: thus προιθεν . . . πριν, SOPH. El. 1131; οπω . . . πριν, THUC. vi. 71, THUC. viii. 9. Πριν (used as in Homer) occurs twice in Euripides, and before πριν in HDT. i. 165. Even προ in composition may refer to a following πριν, as προφαιριν τϋς κκλησας πριν πιδημσαι τοϋς προςβεις, AESCHIN. ii. 61. See DEM. iv. 41, οδ προ τν πραγμων προορτε οδν, πριν ν πθησθε.

[*] 660. Φθνω in the leading sentence may emphasise a following πριν. E.g. φθην ανσας πριν σου κατ πντα δαναι θεα. THEOG. 969 (see 887). So Il. xvi. 322, φθη ρξμενος πριν οτσαι. φθησαν πικμενοι πριν τοϋς βαρβρους κειν, "they arrived before the barbarians came." HDT. vi. 116: so ix. 70. Φθσονται πλεσαντες πριν Χους ασθσθαι. THUC. viii. 12. Φθναι συμβαλντες πριν λθεν τοϋς βοηθσοντας, "to join battle before the auxiliaries should come up." ISOC. iv. 87.

[*] 661. In HDT. vi. 108 we find the infinitive depending on φθνω . . . , the verb implying προτερον or πριν: φθαητε ν πολλκικς ξανδραποδισθντες ν τινα πυθσθαι μων, you would often be reduced to slavery before any of us heard of it.

Section VIII: Indirect Discourse or Oratio Obliqua, including Indirect Quotations and Questions.

[*] 662. The words or thoughts of any person may be quoted either directly or indirectly. A direct quotation is one which gives the exact words of the original speaker or writer. An indirect quotation is one in which the original words conform to the construction of the sentence in which they are quoted. Thus the expression ταῦτα βούλομαι may be quoted either directly (in oratio recta), as λέγει τις “ταῦτα βούλομαι”; or indirectly (in oratio obliqua), as λέγει τις ὅτι ταῦτα βούλεται or φησὶ τις ταῦτα βούλεσθαι, some one says that he wishes for these.

[*] 663. Indirect quotations may be introduced by ὅτι or ὅς and occasionally by other particles (negatively οὐτι οὐ, ὅς οὐ, etc.) with a finite verb; sometimes by the infinitive without a particle; sometimes also by the participle.

1. ὅτι, that, was originally the neuter relative ὅ τι, used as a limiting accusative, in respect to which (or what), as to which, how far, etc. In Homer ὅ, neuter of the relative ὅς, is used like ὅτι (709, 1). Thus οἶδα ὅ τι (or ὅ) κακὸν μὲδεταί at first meant I know as to what he plans evil, or I know about his planning evil, and afterwards came to mean I know that he plans evil.

2. ὅς, the relative adverb of manner (312, 1), in this construction originally meant in what manner, how; and afterwards became established in the same sense as ὅτι, that. Compare the German use of wie (how) in narration. How for that is heard in vulgar English (as I told him how I saw this), and how that was once in good use in this sense for that. ὡς is sometimes used like ὅς in indirect discourse (706).

3. By a use similar to that of ὅς (2), οὐνεκα and ὁθονεκα are sometimes weakened from their meaning for which purpose, wherefore, to the same sense as ὅτι and ὅς, that (710, 1). These words are also used in a causal sense, because, like ὅτι, ὅ, and ὅς (712). On the other hand, διὅτι, because, sometimes has the sense of ὅτι, that (710, 2).

4. ὅτε, when, in Homer sometimes loses its temporal force, and approaches ὅτι in meaning (709, 3).

[*] 664. 1. Indirect quotations with ὅτι, ὅς, etc., form the chief part of the class of substantive sentences, in which an assertion introduced by one of these particles is the subject or the object of a verb. But these sentences have no peculiar construction, except after verbs implying thought or the expression of thought (verba sentiendi et declarandi), as they elsewhere have the simple indicative or any other form which would be used in the corresponding independent assertions. See οὐχ ἴλις ὅς κεῖρετε κτήματ' ἄμ', “is it not enough that you wasted my property?” Od. ii. 312; πολλὸν κέρδιον πλετο ὅτι πείξεν, Il. xv. 227; ὅτο ξίον παίνεῖν, ὅτι τὸν φέβον διύλυσαν τὸν ἄλλων (668), PLAT. Menex. 241 B; ὅτ' ἴδικε, ὅτι χρεῖον τὸν πεικείαν καθῆστησιν, DEM. xx. 155.

2. The infinitive of indirect discourse belongs to the large class of subject and object infinitives (745; 746; 751), being distinguished from the others of this class by preserving the time of its tense from the finite verb which it represents (85; 667, 3).⁵⁰

[*] 665. 1. Indirect questions may be introduced by εἴ, whether (rarely by ἤρα), and also by interrogative pronouns, pronominal adjectives, and adverbs, and by most relatives. Alternative indirect questions may be introduced by πῶτερον (πῶτερῶ) . . . ἢ, εἴτε . . . εἴτε, εἴ . . . ἢ, εἴ . . . εἴτε, whether . . . or.

■v or ■v never means whether (see 493).

2. In Homer single indirect questions (when they are not introduced by interrogatives) generally have ■ or ε■, whether; and alternative questions have ■ (■■) . . . ■ (■ε), sometimes ε■ τε . . . ε■ τε, whether . . . or.

Bekker never allows ε■ or ε■ τε in indirect questions in Homer, always writing ■ or ■ τε, without regard to the MSS.

3. Indirect questions follow the same principles as indirect quotations with ■τι or ■ς, in regard to their moods and tenses. (For examples, see 669.)

[*] 666. The term indirect discourse or oratio obliqua includes all clauses which express indirectly the words or thoughts of any person (including those of the speaker himself), after verbs which imply thought or the expression of thought (verba sentiendi et declarandi), and after such expressions as φα■νεται, it appears, δοκε■, it seems, δ■λ■ν ■στιν, it is evident, σαφ■ς ■στιν, etc. The term may be further applied to any single dependent clause, in any sentence, which indirectly expresses the thought of any other person than the speaker (or past thoughts of the speaker himself), even when the preceding or following clauses are not in indirect discourse. (See 694 and 684.) General Principles of Indirect Discourse.

[*] 667. The following are the general principles of indirect discourse, the particular applications of which are shown in 669710.

1. In indirect quotations after ■τι or ■ς and in indirect questions,

■a) after primary tenses, each verb retains both the mood and the tense of the direct discourse, no change being made except (when necessary) in the person of the verb;

■b) after secondary tenses, each primary tense of the indicative and each subjunctive of the direct discourse may be either changed to the same tense of the optative or retained in its original mood and tense. The imperfect and pluperfect, having no tenses in the optative, are generally retained in the indicative (but see 673). An aorist indicative belonging to a dependent clause of the direct discourse remains unchanged, but one belonging to the leading clause may be changed to the optative like a primary tense.

2. Secondary tenses of the indicative expressing an unreal condition, indicatives with ■v, and all optatives (with or without ■v), are retained, with no change in either mood or tense, after both primary and secondary tenses.

3. When the quotation depends on a verb which takes the infinitive or participle, the leading verb of the quotation is changed to the corresponding tense of the infinitive or participle, after both primary and secondary tenses, ■v being retained if it is in the direct form; and the dependent verbs follow the preceding rules.

4. The adverb ■v is never joined with a verb in indirect discourse unless it stood also in the direct form. On the other hand, ■v is never omitted in indirect discourse if it was used in the direct form; except that, when it is joined to a relative word or a particle before a subjunctive in direct discourse, it is regularly dropped when the subjunctive is changed to the optative after a past

tense in indirect discourse.

5. The indirect discourse regularly retains the same negative particle which would be used in the direct form. But the infinitive and participle sometimes take μ in indirect discourse where \omicron would be used in the direct form. (See examples under 685 and 688.) In indirect questions introduced by ϵ , whether, and in the second part of alternative indirect questions (665), μ can be used as well as \omicron .

[*] 668. As an indirect quotation or question is generally the object or subject of its leading verb, it may stand in apposition with a pronoun like $\tau\omicron\tau\omicron$ which represents such an object or subject; as $\tau\omicron\tau\omicron$ $\lambda\gamma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\tau\iota$ $\sigma\omicron\phi\varsigma$ $\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, we say this, that he is wise; $\tau\omicron\tau\omicron$ $\delta\lambda\iota\nu$ $\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, $\tau\iota$ $\sigma\omicron\phi\varsigma$ $\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, this is plain, that he is wise; $\tau\omicron\tau\omicron$ $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, ϵ $\lambda\eta\theta\lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, we shall inquire into this, whether you tell the truth.

Simple Sentences in Indirect Discourse: Indicative and Optative after $\tau\iota$ and ς , and in Indirect Questions.

[*] 669. When the direct form is an indicative (without ν) in a simple sentence, we have (667, 1) the following rules for indirect quotations after $\tau\iota$ or ς and for indirect questions:—

1. After primary tenses the verb stands in the indicative, in the tense of the direct discourse. E.g. $\Lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\iota$ $\gamma\rho\phi\epsilon\iota$, he says that he is writing; $\lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\iota$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\nu$, he says that he was writing; $\lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\iota$ $\gamma\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\nu$, he says that he has written; $\lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\iota$ $\gamma\epsilon\rho\rho\phi\epsilon\iota$, he says that he had written; $\lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\iota$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\psi\epsilon\nu$, he says that he wrote; $\lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\iota$ $\gamma\rho\psi\epsilon\iota$, he says that he shall write.

$\epsilon\phi$ $\tau\iota$ \omicron $\sigma\varsigma$ $\epsilon\mu\iota$ $\kappa\alpha$ κ $\Pi\lambda\omicron\upsilon$ $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\alpha$, “say that I am safe and have come from Pylos.” Od. xvi. 131. $\tau\rho\nu\nu\omicron\nu$ δ $\chi\iota\lambda\iota$ $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\tau\iota$ \omicron $\mu\omicron\lambda$ $\phi\lambda\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\lambda\epsilon\theta$ $\tau\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma$, “urge him to tell Achilles that his dearest friend perished.” Il. xvii. 654. (See 663, Il. 1.) $\Gamma\nu\omega\tau\iota\nu$ δ ς $\delta\eta$ $\tau\rho\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota\nu$ $\lambda\theta\omicron\rho\upsilon$ $\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau$ $\phi\pi\tau\alpha\iota$. Il. vii. 401.

$\Lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\rho$ ς \omicron $\delta\iota\nu$ $\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ $\delta\iota\kappa\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ $\phi\mu\eta\varsigma$. AESCHIN. i. 125. \omicron $\gamma\rho$ ν $\tau\omicron\tau$ γ $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$, ς $\lambda\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu$. Id. ii. 151. ϵ δ $\sigma\tau\epsilon$, $\tau\iota$ $\pi\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ $\delta\iota\alpha\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\iota$ $\phi\mu\eta$ $\kappa\alpha$ $\sigma\upsilon\kappa\omicron\phi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$. Ib. 145. $\lambda\lambda$ $\nu\nu\omicron\epsilon\nu$ $\chi\rho$ $\tau\omicron\tau\omicron$ μ , $\gamma\nu\alpha\chi$ $\tau\iota$ $\phi\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$. SOPH. Ant. 61. $\kappa\alpha$ $\tau\alpha\theta$ ς $\lambda\eta\theta$ $\lambda\gamma\omega$, $\kappa\alpha$ $\tau\iota$ $\omicron\tau\epsilon$ $\delta\theta\eta$ $\psi\phi\omicron\varsigma$ ν $\mu\alpha\sigma\iota$ $\pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ τ $\gamma\upsilon\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\omicron$ ν $\psi\eta\phi\iota\sigma\alpha\mu\omicron\nu\omega\nu$, $\mu\omicron\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$ μ ν $\mu\alpha\rho\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, I shall bring witnesses to show that I speak the truth, etc. DEM. Ivii. 14.

(Indirect Questions.) $\mu\omicron\upsilon\omega\tau$ τ $\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, he asks what they want; $\mu\omicron\upsilon\omega\tau$ τ $\mu\omicron\iota\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, he asks what they will do.

Σ δ $\phi\rho\sigma\alpha\iota$ ϵ $\mu\epsilon$ $\sigma\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (Bekker $\mu\epsilon$), and do you consider whether you will save me. Il. i. 83. $\Sigma\phi\alpha$ δ $\omicron\kappa$ $\omicron\delta$ ϵ $\theta\epsilon\varsigma$ $\sigma\tau\iota\nu$. Il. v. 183. $\mu\phi\rho\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha$ $\kappa\tau\omega\rho$ $\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\alpha$ μ ν $\delta\rho\nu$ $\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ ν $\mu\alpha\lambda\mu\mu\sigma\iota\nu$ (v. I. ϵ $\kappa\alpha$). Il. viii. 111. $\mu\phi\rho\alpha$ $\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\epsilon\nu$ $\kappa\lambda\chi\alpha\varsigma$ $\mu\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ ϵ $\kappa\alpha$ $\omicron\kappa$. Il. ii. 299; so Od. iv. 487, Od. 712. ς $\epsilon\pi$ $\tau\iota$ $\tau\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$ $\chi\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$ $\Phi\omicron\beta\omicron\varsigma$ $\mu\pi\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$, ϵ τ $\mu\rho$ γ $\epsilon\chi\omega\lambda\varsigma$ $\mu\mu\mu\phi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ ϵ θ $\kappa\alpha\tau\mu\beta\eta\varsigma$ (Bekker τ . . . θ). Il. i. 64; see ii. 349. $\Pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon\omega\tau\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ϵ $\lambda\sigma\tau\alpha$ $\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, “asking whether they are pirates.” THUC. i. 5. ϵ $\xi\upsilon\mu\pi\omicron\nu\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha$ $\xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\sigma\epsilon\iota$ $\sigma\kappa\mu\pi\epsilon\iota$. SOPH. Ant. 41. See EUR. Alc. 784. $\epsilon\beta\omicron\iota\varsigma$: ν δ $\beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu$ $\omicron\kappa$ $\chi\omega$ $\lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$. SOPH. Tr. 401. $\mu\omicron\upsilon\omega\tau$ ς ϵ \omicron $\kappa\alpha\lambda$ $\mu\omicron\iota$ $\delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon$ $\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, “you ask whether it does not seem to me to be fine.” PLAT. Gorg. 462D. $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$

ρσθαι εμαθν τς τι μεμνημνος μ οδεν. Theaet. 163D. Σκοπμεν ε μν προπει ο. Rep. 451D. Τοτ ατ, ε χαρεις μ χαρεις, νγκη δ πο σε γνοεν. Phil. 21B. (For ο and μ in the last four examples, representing ο of the direct question, see 667, 5.) Θαυμζω πτερα ς κρατν ατε τ πλα ς δι φιλαν δρα. XEN. An. ii. 1, 10. Σμαιν ετ χει χρον προς ατν τνδε γ ετ λλ κυρε. SOPH. Ph. 22. Ετε κατ τροπον κεεται ετε μη, οτω θεσθαι. PLAT. Crat. 425 B (667, 5). See also XEN. Cyr. ii. 1, 7 (ε . . . ετε μ); EUR. Alc. 139 (ε . . . ετε). Περ πντων δωμεν, ρ οτωσ γγεται πντα. PLAT. Phaed. 70D. (ρα regularly introduces only direct questions.)

It is to be noticed that indirect questions after primary tenses retain an indicative of the direct question in Greek, where the subjunctive is used in Latin. Thus, nescio quis sit, I know not who he is, in Greek is simply γνο τς στιν. This does not apply to indirect questions which would require the subjunctive in the direct form (677).

2. After secondary tenses the verb may be either changed to the optative or retained in the indicative, the tense of the direct discourse being retained in either case. The optative is the more common form. E.g. λεξεν τι γρφοι (or τι γρφει), he said that he was writing; i.e. he said γρφω. λεξεν τι γεγραφς εη (or τι γγραφεν), he said that he had written; i.e. he said γγραφα. λεξεν τι γρψοι (or τι γρψει), he said that he should write; i.e. he said γρψω. λεξεν τι γρψειεν (or τι γραψεν), he said that he had written; i.e. he said γραψα. (For the imperfect and pluperfect, see 672.)

(Optative.) νπλησε φρονματος τος ρκδας, λγων ς μνοις μν ατος πατρς Πελοπννησος εη, πλεστον δ τν λληνικν φλον τ ρκαδικν εη, κα σματα γκρατστατα χοι. XEN. Hell. vii. 1, 23. (He said μνοις μν μν στι, πλεστον δ στι, κα σματα χει: these indicatives might have been used in the place of εη, εη, and χοι.) λεγε δ ν Πελοπδας τι Αργεοι κα ρκδες μχ μττημνοι εεν π Λακεδαιμωνων, i.e. he said that they had been defeated (he said ττηνται). Ib. vii. 1, Ib. 35. So HDT. i. 83 (perf. and pres.) πειπν τλλα τι ατς τκε προξοι, χετο, "having hinted that he would himself attend to affairs there." THUC. i. 90. (He said τκε προξω, and προξει might have been retained. See 128.) δ επεν τι σοιντο (he said σονται). XEN. Cyr. vii. 2, 19. λεξαν τι πμψειε σφς νδν βασιλες, κελεων ρωτν ξ του πλεμος εη, they said that the king of the Indians had sent them, commanding them to ask on what account there was war. Ib. ii. 4, Ib. 7. (They said πεμψεν μς, and the question to be asked was κ τνος στν πλεμος;) λεγον τι ο πποθ οτος ποταμς διαβατς γνοιτο πεζ ε μ ττε, they said that this river had never been (γνετο) fordable except then. Id. An. i. 4, Id. An. 18. Περικλς προηγρενε τος θηναοις, τι ρχδαμος μν ο ξνος εη, ο μντοι π κακ γε τς πλεως γνοιτο, he announced that A. was his friend, but that he had not been made his friend to the injury of the state. THUC. ii. 13. (He said ξνος μο στιν, ο μντοι γνετο. See 116, THUC. 1; 124, THUC. 1.) γωσαν τι κενς φβος εη. XEN. An. ii. 2, 21. Προδντες τι σοιτο πλεμος, βολοντο τν Πλταιαν προκαταλαβε. THUC. ii. 2. πειρμην ατ δεικνναι, τι οοιτο μν εναι σοφς, εη δ ο. PLAT. Ap. 21 C.

(Indicative.) λεγον ς λπζουσιν σ κα τν πλιν ξειν μοι χριν, they said that they hoped, etc. ISOC. v. 23. (They said λπζομεν, which might have been changed to λπζοιεν.) κε δ γγλλων τις ς τος πρυτνεις ς λτεια κατεληπται, "some one had come with

the report that Elatea had been taken.” DEM. xviii. 169. (Here the perf. opt. might have been used.) Δεινο■ λ■γους ■τ■λμα περ■ μο■ λ■γειν, ■ς ■γ■ τ■ πρ■γμ■ ε■μ■ το■το δεδρακ■ς. Id. xxi. 104. Α■πιασ■μενος γ■ρ με ■ κα■ λ■γειν ■ν ■κν■σει■ τις, τ■ν πατ■ρα ■ς ■π■κτονα ■γ■ τ■ν ■μαυτο■, κ.τ.λ. Id. xxii. 2. Φανερ■ς ε■πεν ■τι ■ μ■ν π■λις σφ■ν τετε■χισται ■δη, “he said that their city had already been fortified.” THUC. i. 91. ■ποκριν■μενοι ■τι π■μψουσιν πρ■σβεις, ε■θ■ς ■π■λλαξαν. Id. i. 90. (Cf. ■τι πρ■ξοι, quoted above from the same chapter.) ■ιδεσαν ■τι το■ς ■πενεγκ■ντας ο■κ■τας ■ξαιτ■σομεν. DEM. xxx. 23. (■ξαιτ■σοιμεν might have been used.) ■τ■λμα λ■γειν ■ς ■π■ρ ■μ■ν ■χθρο■ς ■φ■ ■αυτ■ν ε■λκυσε κα■ ν■ν ■ν το■ς ■σχ■τοις ■στ■ κινδ■νοις. Id. xxii. 59.

(Indirect Questions.) ■ρ■τησεν α■τ■ν τ■ ποιο■η (or τ■ ποιε■), he asked him what he was doing; i.e. he asked τ■ ποιε■ς; ■ρ■τησεν α■τ■ν τ■ πεποιηκ■ς ε■η (or τ■ πεπο■ηκεν), he asked him what he had done; i.e. he asked τ■ πεπο■ηκας; ■ρ■τησεν α■τ■ν τ■ ποι■σοι (or τ■ ποι■σει), he asked him what he should do; i.e. he asked τ■ ποι■σεις; ■ρ■τησεν α■τ■ν τ■ ποι■σειεν (or τ■ ■πο■ησεν), he asked him what he had done; i.e. he asked τ■ ■πο■ησας;

■ιχετο πευσ■μενος μετ■ σ■ν κλ■ος, ■ που ■τ■ ε■ης, i.e. he went to inquire whether you were still living. Od. xiii. 415. ■λλ■λους τ■ ε■ροντο τ■ς ε■η κα■ π■θεν ■λθοι (i.e. τ■ς ■στιν κα■ π■θεν ■λθεν;). Od. xvii. 368. ■ρετο, ε■ τις ■μο■ ε■η σοφ■τερος, “he asked whether any one was wiser than I.” PLAT. Ap. 21A. (The direct question was ■στι τις σοφ■τερος;) ■ τι δ■ ποι■σοι ο■ διεσ■μηγε, “but he did not indicate what he would do.” XEN. An. ii. 1, 23. (The direct question was τ■ ποι■σω;) ■πειρ■τα, τ■να δε■τερον μετ■ ■κε■νον ■δοι, he asked whom he had seen (who came) next to him. HDT. i. 31. (The direct question was τ■να ε■δες;) Ε■ρετο κ■θεν λ■βοι τ■ν πα■δα, “he asked whence he had received the boy.” Id. i. 116. ■ρ■των α■τ■ν ε■ ■ναπλε■σειεν ■χων ■ργ■ριον, I asked him whether he had set sail with the money. L. DEM. 55. (The direct question was ■ν■πλευσας; See 125 and 670, b.■

Ε■ρετο ■ττεν χρη■ζων ■κ■μην, “he asked what I wanted that I came.” Od. xvii. 120. ■π■ρουν τ■ ποτε λ■γει, “I was uncertain what he meant.” PLAT. Ap. 21B. (Here λ■γοι might have been used.) ■βουλε■ονθ■ ο■τοι τ■ν■ α■το■ καταλε■ψουσιν, “they were considering whom they should leave here.” DEM. xix. 122. ■ρωτ■ντων τιν■ν δι■ τ■ ■π■θανεν, παραγγ■λλειν ■κ■λευεν, κ.τ.λ. XEN. Hell. ii. 1, 4.

[*] 670. ■a) After past tenses the indicative and optative are in equally good use; the optative being used when the writer incorporates the quotation entirely into his own sentence, and the indicative when he quotes it in the original words as far as his own construction allows. The indicative here, like the subjunctive in final clauses after past tenses (318), is merely a more vivid form of expression than the optative, with no difference in meaning. We even find both moods in the same sentence. E.g. Ο■τοι ■λεγον ■τι Κ■ρος μ■ν τ■θνηκεν, ■ρια■ος δ■ πεφευγ■ς ■ν τ■ σταθμ■ ε■η κα■ λ■γοι, κ.τ.λ. XEN. An. ii. 1, 3. (Here τ■θνηκεν contains the most important part of the message.) ■κ δ■ το■του ■πυνθ■νετο ■δη α■τ■ν κα■ ■π■σην ■δ■ν δι■λασαν, κα■ ε■ ο■κο■το ■ χ■ρα. Id. Cyr. iv. 4, Id. Cyr. 4. ■τ■λμα λ■γειν, ■ς χρ■α τε π■μπολλα ■κτ■τικεν ■π■ρ ■μο■ κα■ ■ς πολλ■ τ■ν ■μ■ν λ■βοιεν. DEM. xxvii. 49. ■μοιοι ■σαν θαυμ■ζειν ■ποι ποτ■ τρ■ψονται ο■ ■λληγες κα■ τ■ ■ν ν■ ■χοιεν. XEN. An. iii. 5, 13.

■b) The perfect and future were less familiar than the other tenses of the optative, so that these tenses were sometimes retained in the indicative even when the present or the aorist was

changed to the optative. See the last two examples under (a). In indirect questions the aorist indicative was generally retained (see 125). Some writers (as Thucydides) preferred the more direct forms in all indirect discourse (320).

[*] 671. In Homer this construction (669) is fully developed in indirect questions: see examples of both indicative and optative in 669, 1 and 2. But in indirect quotations, while the indicative is freely used after both present and past tenses, the change of the indicative to the optative after past tenses had not yet been introduced. In the single case of ε■πε■ν ■ς with the optative, μερμ■ριξε . . ■καστα ε■πε■ν, ■ς ■λθοι κα■ ■κοιτ■ ■ς πατρ■δα γα■αν, he hesitated about telling him each event, how he had returned, etc., Od. xxiv. 237, ■ς appears only on its way from its meaning how (663, Od. 2) to its later use with the optative as that. We first find the optative in genuine oratio obliqua (with ■ς) Hymn. Ven. 214, ε■πεν ■ς ■οι. Further, the later principle by which the indicative after past tenses (when it is not changed to the optative) retains the tense of the direct form is almost unknown in the Homeric language. Here a present or perfect indicative of the direct discourse after a past tense is changed to an imperfect or pluperfect; so that I knew that he was planning evil, which in Attic would be ■γ■γνωσκον ■τι κακ■ μ■δοιτο (or μ■δετα), in Homer is γ■γνωσκον ■ (= ■τι) κακ■ μ■δετο, Hom. Od. iii. 166. (For examples, see 674.) The aorist indicative, which has no corresponding tense to express its own time referred to the past, was always retained after past tenses; as in γν■ ο■ ο■τι ■λθεν, Hom. Il. xi. 439; so i. 537, Hom. Il. xxii. 445. Likewise the future indicative is once retained, in Hom. Od. xiii. 340, ■δ■ ■ νοστ■σεις, I knew that you would return; but elsewhere the past future with ■μελλον is used, as in Hom. Il. xx. 466, ο■δ■ τ■ ■δη ■ ο■ πε■σεσθαι ■μελλον, and Hom. Od. xix. 94, Hom. Il. xi. 22. These examples show the need of the later future optative (129). In Hom. Il. xxii. 10, ο■δ■ ν■ π■ με ■γνως ■ς θε■ς ε■μι, and xx. 265 the present expresses a present truth rather than a past fact.

It thus appears that the peculiar constructions with ■τι and ■ς in oratio obliqua (667, 1, b), which gave such grace and variety to the later language, were not yet developed in Homer; but clauses with ■τι, ■ς, etc., were still connected with the leading verb by the same looser construction which we use in English (as I knew that he was planning evil), the dependent verb expressing its own absolute time (see 22), as it did in the relative clauses in which these clauses originated, or in the more primitive parataxis. Thus γ■γνωσκον ■ κακ■ μ■δετο (above) meant originally I knew as to what he was planning evil; and without ■, in a still earlier stage, I knew: he was planning evil (which we can say in English). Even after the more thorough incorporation of the dependent clause was established, by which either μ■δετα or μ■δοιτο became the regular form, the more primitive imperfect is occasionally found, even in Attic prose (see 674, 2). The most common Homeric construction in indirect discourse is that of φημ■ with the infinitive, of which 130 examples occur.⁵¹

[*] 672. An imperfect or pluperfect of the direct discourse is regularly retained in the indicative, after past tenses, for want of an imperfect or pluperfect optative. E.g. ■κο■σας δ■ Ξενοφ■ν ■λεγεν ■τι ■ρθ■ς ■τι■ντο κα■ α■τ■ τ■ ■ργον α■το■ς μαρτυρο■η, he said that they had accused him rightly, and that the fact itself bore witness to them; i.e. he said ■ρθ■ς ■τι■σθε κα■ τ■ ■ργον ■μ■ν μαρτυρε■. XEN. An. iii. 3, 12. Ε■χε γ■ρ λ■γειν, κα■ ■τι μ■νοι τ■ν ■λλ■νων βασιλε■ συνεμ■χοντο ■ν Πλαταια■ς, κα■ ■τι ■στερον ο■δ■ποτε στρατε■σαιντο ■π■ βασιλ■α (he said μ■νοι συνεμαχ■μεθα, κα■ ο■δ■ποτε ■στρατευς■μεθα). Id. Hell. vii. 1, Id. Hell. 34. Το■των ■καστον ■ρ■μην ε■ τινες ε■εν μ■ρτυρες ■ν ■ναντ■ον τ■ν προ■κ■

■π■δοσαν, α■τ■ν δ■ ■φοβον, ε■ τινες παρ■σαν ■τ■ ■πελ■μβανεν, I asked each of these men whether there were any witnesses before whom they had paid the dowry; and Aphobus, whether there had been any present when he received it. DEM. xxx. 19. (The two questions were ε■σ■ μ■ρτυρ■ς τινες; and παρ■σ■ν τινες;)

[*] 673. ■Imperfect Optative.) In a few cases, the present optative is used after past tenses to represent the imperfect indicative. The present optative thus supplies the want of an imperfect, like the present infinitive and participle (119 and 140). This can be done only when the context makes it perfectly clear that the optative represents an imperfect, and not a present. E.g. Τ■ν Τιμαγ■ραν ■π■κτειναν, κατηγορο■ντος το■ Λ■οντος ■ς ο■τε συσκηνο■ν ■θ■λοι ■αυτ■ μετ■ τε Πελοπ■δου π■ντα βουλε■οιτο. XEN. Hell. vii. 1, 38. (The words of Leon were ο■τε συσκηνο■ν ■θελ■ μοι, μετ■ τε Πελ. π■ντα ■βουλε■ετο.) Τ■ πεπραγμ■να διηγο■ντο, ■τι α■το■ μ■ν ■π■ το■ς πολεμ■ους πλ■οιεν, τ■ν δ■ ■να■ρεσιν τ■ν ναυαγ■ν προστ■ξαιεν ■νδρ■σιν ■κανο■ς. Ib. i. 7, lb. 5. (The direct discourse was α■το■ μ■ν ■πλ■ομεν, τ■ν δ■ ■να■ρεσιν προσετ■ξαμεν.) Κα■ μοι π■ντες ■πεκρ■ναντο, ■τι ο■δε■ς μ■ρτυς παρε■η, κομ■ζοιτο δ■ λαμβ■νων καθ■ ■ποσονο■ν δ■οιτο ■φοβος παρ■ α■τ■ν, they all replied, that no witness had been present, and that Aphobus had received the money from them, taking it in such sums as he happened to want. DEM. xxx. 20. (The direct discourse was ο■δε■ς μ■ρτυς παρ■ν, ■κομ■ζετο δ■ λαμβ■νων καθ■ ■ποσονο■ν δ■οιτο. Παρε■η contains the answer to the question ε■ τινες παρ■σαν in the preceding sentence, quoted in 672. The imperfect in that sentence prevents the optatives in the reply from being ambiguous.) ■κο■σας πιστε■ω το■τ■, ■ς ■ρα Λε■ντιος, α■σθ■μενος νεκρο■ς παρ■ τ■ δημ■■ κειμ■νους, ■μα μ■ν ■δε■ν ■πιθυμο■, ■μα δ■ α■ δυσχερα■νοι κα■ ■ποτρ■ποι ■αυτ■ν, κα■ τ■ως μ■χοιτ■ τε κα■ παρακαλ■πτοιτο. PLAT. Rep. 439E. (All the optatives represent imperfects.) See also HDT. ix. 16 (end).

[*] 674. 1. In Homer, where clauses with ■τι, ■ς, etc. are not yet constructed on the principles of indirect discourse (see 671), a present or perfect of the direct form appears as an imperfect or pluperfect in these clauses after past tenses. E.g. Ο■δ■ τι ■δη ■ττι δηι■ωντο λαο■. Il. xiii. 674 (here the present optative or indicative would be regular in Attic Greek). ■π■ρουσε, γιγ■σκων ■ ο■ α■τ■ς ■πε■ρεχε χε■ρας ■π■λλων (later ■περ■χοι or ■περ■χει). Il. v. 433. Ο■ γ■ρ ο■ τις ■γγειλ■ ■ττι ■■ ο■ π■σις ■κτοθι μ■μνε πυλ■ων. Il. xxii. 438. See Od. xxiv. 182; and iii. 166, discussed in 671.

2. We sometimes find the imperfect and pluperfect with ■τι or ■ς representing the present or perfect of the direct form after past tenses, even in Attic Greek. In such cases the context always makes it clear that the tense represented is not an imperfect or pluperfect (672). E.g. ■ν πολλ■ ■πορ■■ ■σαν ο■ ■λληνες, ■ννοο■μενοι μ■ν ■τι ■π■ τα■ς βασιλ■ως θ■ραις ■σαν, κ■κλ■ δ■ α■το■ς πλ■εις πολ■μιαι ■σαν, ■γορ■ν δ■ ο■δε■ς ■τι παρ■ξειν ■μελλεν, ■πε■χον δ■ τ■ς ■λλ■δος ο■ με■ον ■ μ■ρια στ■δια, προ■δεδ■κεσαν δ■ α■το■ς κα■ ο■ β■ρβαροι, μ■νοι δ■ καταλειμ■νοι ■σαν ο■δ■ ■π■α ο■δ■να σ■μμαχον ■χοντες, the Greeks thought: We are at the king's gates; hostile cities surround us; no one will supply us a market; we are not less than ten thousand stades from Greece; the barbarians have betrayed us, and we have been left alone. XEN. An. iii. 1, 2. (The direct forms would be the present and perfect indicative.) “Δι■ τ■ν χθιζιν■ν ■νθρωπον, ■ς ■μ■ς διεδ■ετ■, ■ξαπατ■ν κα■ λ■γων ■ς φιλαθ■ναιος ■ν κα■ τ■ν Σ■μ■ πρ■τος κατε■ποι,” “i.e. saying φιλαθ■ναι■ς ε■μι κα■ τ■ν Σ■μ■ πρ■τος κατε■πον.” AR. Vesp. 283. (Here ε■μ■ is changed to ■ν, not to ε■η or ο■στ■: κατε■πον could be changed only

to κατεποι.)

3. In such cases the more thorough incorporation of the dependent clause which is required to make the oratio obliqua complete is wanting, and the clause stands in the loose relation in which, for example, causal sentences usually stand to their leading verb (see 715). For the same incomplete oratio obliqua in dependent clauses of a quotation, see 691 and 701.

[*] 675. 1. An indirect quotation with τι or ς and the optative is sometimes followed by an independent optative, generally introduced by γρ, which continues the quotation as if it were itself dependent on the τι or ς. E.g. κουνον δ γων τινων οδ το ς λιμνας κα τ ς γορ ς τι δσοιεν ατ καρποσθα: τ γρ κοιν τ Θεταλν π τοτων δοι διοικεν, for (as they said) they must administer, etc. DEM. i. 22. πεκρναναντο ατ τι δνατα σφσιν εη ποιεν προκαλεται νευ θηναων: παδες γρ σφν κα γυνακες παρ κενοις εησαν. THUC. ii. 72. λεγον τι παντ ς ςια λγοι Σεθης: χειμν γρ εη, κ.τ.λ. XEN. An. vii. 3, 13.

2. Such independent optatives are sometimes found even when no optative precedes; but the context always contains some allusion to another's thought or expression. E.g. πσχετο τν νδρ χαιο ς τνδε δηλσειν γων: οιοτο μν μλισθ κοσιον λαβν, ε μ θλοι δ, κοντα, i.e. he thought (as he said), etc. SOPH. Ph. 617. λλ γρ οδν τι μλλον ν θνατον, λλ κα ατ τ ε ς νθρπου σμα λθεν ρχ ν ατ λθρου, σπερ νσος: κα ταλαιπωρουμνη τε δ τοτον τν βον ζη, κα τελευτσ γε ν τ καλουμν θαντ πολλοιοτο, and (according to the theory it lives in misery, etc., and finally perishes in what is called death. PLAT. Phaed. 95D. (Plato is here stating the views of others.)

[*] 676. We may even have τι or ς with the optative when the leading verb is not past, if there is an implied reference to some former expression of the thought quoted. E.g. ρ ον δ ο μετρως πολογησμεθα, τι πρ ς τ ν πεφυκ ς εη μιλλσθαι, κα οκ πιμνοι, . . . λλ οι κα οκ μβλνοιτο οδ πολγοι το ρωτος, κ.τ.λ., i.e. shall we not defend him very properly by stating (what we once said) that it is (was) his nature to press on towards pure Being, etc. (the optatives representing indicatives). PLAT. Rep. 490A.

Subjunctive or Optative representing the Interrogative Subjunctive.

[*] 677. In indirect questions, after a primary tense, an interrogative subjunctive (287) retains its mood and tense; after a secondary tense, it may be either changed to the same tense of the optative or retained in the subjunctive. E.g. Φραζμεθ . . . ρ ατις πλεμον ρσομεν (subj.) φιλητητα μετ μφοτροισι βλωμεν, "let us consider whether we shall again rouse war or cast friendship upon both armies." II. iv. 14. Σ δ μοι νημερτ ς νσπες, μιν ποκτενω ε σο νθδ γω, "and do you tell me truly whether I shall slay him or bring him hither to you." Od. xxii. 166. See Od. xvi. 73, Od. xix. 524. Πρ ς μφτερα πορ, τατην θ πω ς κδ κα τλλ πθεν διοικ, I am at a loss on both questions, how I shall give her a dowry (π ς τατην κδ;), and how (whence I shall pay my other expenses (πθεν τλλα διοικ;). DEM. xxvii. 66. Βουλεομαι πω ς σε ποδρ, I am trying to think how I shall escape you (π ς σε ποδρ;). XEN. Cyr. i. 4, 13. Οκ χω τ λγω, "I know not what I shall say." DEM. ix. 54. So in Latin, non habeo quid (or quod) dicam. "Οκ χω σφισμ τ παλλαγα," "I have no device (i.e. I know not) how I shall escape." AESCH. Prom. 470. Ο γρ δ δ πειρναν γε

ο φσεις χειν τι επς, for it is not surely through inexperience that you will declare that you know not what to say (i.e. τ επω;). DEM. xix. 120. So τι δ and ος δ, XEN. An. i. 7, 7. (See 572.) Τ δ κπματα οκ οδ ε Χρυσντ τοτ δ, I do not know whether I shall give them, etc. Id. Cyr. viii. 4, Id. Cyr. 16. πανερομνου Κτησιφντος ε καλσ Δημοσθνην, “when Ctesiphon asks whether he shall call Demosthenes.” AESCHIN. iii. 202. (For ε see 680.)

ν δ ο τωρ μερμριξεν, γε τος μν ναστσειεν, δ τρεδην ναρζοι, ε χλον πασειεν ρητσει τε θυμν. II. i. 188. (The direct questions were τος μν ναστσω; τρεδην δ ναρζο; πασω ρητσω τε;) Κλρους πλλον, ππτερος δ πρσθεν φεη χλκεον γχος, i.e. they shook the lots (to decide) which should first throw his spear, the question being πτερος πρσθεν φ; II. iii. 316. χρηστηριζετο ε κβλοι τν δρηστον. HDT. v. 67. προντο ε παραδοεν Κορινθοις τν πλιν, they asked whether they should give up their city, the question being παραδμεν τν πλιν; THUC. i. 25. βουλεοντο ε τ σκευοφρα νταθα γοιντο πποιεν π τ στρατπεδον. XEN. An. i. 10, 17 : so i. 10, XEN. An. 5. πρει τι χρσαιτο τ πργματι, he was at a loss how to act in the matter, i.e. τ χρσωμαι; Id. Hell. vii. 4, Id. Hell. 39. Ο γρ εχομεν πως δρντες καλς πρξαιμεν, “for we could not see how we should fare well if we did it.” SOPH. Ant. 270.

πωροντος δ βασιλος τι χρσηται τ παρεντι πργματι, πιλτης λθ ος λγους. HDT. vii. 213. πρησε μν ποτ- ρωσε διακινδυνεσ χωρσας. THUC. i. 63. Ο Πλαταις βουλεοντο ετε κατακασωσιν σπερ χουσιν, μπρσαντες το οκημα, ετε τι λλο χρσωνται, whether they should set the house on fire and burn them as they were, or should dispose of them in some other way. Id. ii. 4. πωρσαντες π καθορμσωνται, ς Πρτην τν νσον πλευσαν. Id. iv. 13.

[*] 678. The context must decide whether the optative in an indirect question represents a subjunctive (as here) or an indicative (669). The distinction is especially important with the aorist optative (see 125).

[*] 679. When the leading verb is an optative referring to the future, the optative can be used, by assimilation, to represent the subjunctive in these indirect questions. E.g. Χαρεντα γοιν πθοιμν, ε μ χοιμ ποι τατα καταθεην, if I should not have anywhere to put these down (know where to put them). AR. Eccl. 794. (See other examples under 186.)

[*] 680. Ε, whether, can introduce the subjunctive here, as well as the indicative or optative: see XEN. Cyr. viii. 4, 16 , and AESCHIN. iii. 202, quoted in 677. ν cannot mean whether, and wherever this introduces a subjunctive the expression is conditional. (See 493.) Indicative or Optative with ν.

[*] 681. An indicative or optative with ν retains its mood and tense (with ν) unchanged in indirect discourse with τι or ος and in indirect questions, after both primary and secondary tenses. E.g. Λγει τι τοτο ν γννετο, he says that this would have happened: λεγεν τι τοτο ν γννετο, he said that this would have happened. Λγει (or λεγεν) τι οτος δικαως ν θνοι, he says (or said) that this man would justly be put to death.

Θεμιστοκλς πεκρνατο, τι οτ ν ατς Σερφιος ν νομαστς γννετο οτ κενος θηναος, he replied that he should not have become famous himself if he had been a Seriphian, nor would the other if he had been an Athenian. PLAT. Rep. 330A. ννοετε, τι

■ττον ■ν στ■σις ε■η ■ν■ς ■ρχοντος ■ πολλ■ν. XEN. An. vi. i. 29. Απεκρ■νατο, ■τι πρ■σθεν ■ν ■ποθ■νοιεν ■ τ■ ■πλα παραδο■ησαν. Ib. ii. 1, Ib. 10. (The direct discourse was πρ■σθεν ■ν ■ποθ■νοιμεν.) Ο■κ ■ν ■λπ■σαντας ■ς ■ν ■πεξ■λθοι τις α■το■ς ■ς μ■χην, “when they would never have expected that any one would come out to fight with them.” THUC. v. 9. Παρελθ■ν τις δειξ■τω, ■ς ο■ Θεταλο■ ν■ν ο■κ ■ν ■λε■θεροι γ■νοινοτο ■σμενοι. DEM. ii. 8. Ο■δ■ ε■δ■ναι φησ■ τ■ ■ν ποι■ν ■μ■ν χαρ■σαιτο, “he says he does not even know what he could do to gratify you.” Id. xix. 48. “Ο■κ ■χω τ■ς ■ν γενο■μαν” AESCH. Prom. 905 ; so 907. “■ρ■των ε■ δο■εν ■ν το■των τ■ πιστ■” XEN. An. iv. 8, 7.

[*] 682. The same principle applies when a secondary tense of the indicative without ■ν in the construction of 415 is quoted. E.g.

■■λεγεν■ ■τι κρε■ττον ■ν α■τ■ τ■τε ■ποθανε■ν, “he said that he had better have died at once.” LYS. x. 25. (The direct discourse was κρε■ττον ■ν μοι ■ποθανε■ν.) Infinitive in Indirect Discourse.

[*] 683. When the infinitive stands in indirect discourse, its tense represents the corresponding tense of the finite verb in the direct form, the present and perfect including the imperfect and pluperfect. If ■ν was used in the direct form, it must be retained in the quotation, each tense with ■ν representing the corresponding tenses of either indicative or optative with ■ν. E.g. Φησ■ γρ■φειν, he says that he is writing; ■φη γρ■φειν, he said that he was writing; φ■σει γρ■φειν, he will say that he is (then) writing. (He says γρ■φω.) Φησ■ (■φη) γρ■φειν ■ν, ε■ ■δ■νατο, he says (or said) that he should now be writing, if he were able. (He says ■γραφον ■ν.) Φησ■ (■φη) γρ■φειν ■ν, ε■ δ■ναιτο, he says (or said) that he should write, if he should (ever) be able. (He says γρ■φοιμι ■ν.)

Φησ■ γρ■ψαι, he says that he wrote; ■φη γρ■ψαι, he said that he had written; φ■σει γρ■ψαι, he will say that he wrote. (He says ■γραψα.) Φησ■ (■φη) γρ■ψαι ■ν, ε■ ■δυν■θη, he says (or said) that he should have written, if he had been able. (He says ■γραψα ■ν.) Φησ■ (■φη) γρ■ψαι ■ν, ε■ δυνηθε■η, he says (or said) that he should write, if he should (ever) be able. (He says γρ■ψαιμι ■ν.)

Φησ■ (φ■σει) γεγραφ■ναι, he says (or will say) that he has written; ■φη γεγραφ■ναι, he said that he had written. (He says γ■γραφα.) For the perfect with ■ν, see below and 206.

Φησ■ (φ■σει) γρ■ψειν, he says (or will say) that he will write; ■φη γρ■ψειν, he said that he would write. (He says γρ■ψω.)

(Present.) Κα■ τ■ μ■ φησι μ■χ■ Τρ■εσσιν ■ρ■γειν. Il. i. 521. Π■ς δ■ φ■ς πολ■μοιο μεθι■μεν; Il. iv. 351. So Il. xvii. 338. Σκ■ζεσθα■ ο■ ε■π■ θεο■ς, ■μ■ δ■ ■ξοχα π■ντων ■θαν■των κεχολ■σθαι, “tell him that the Gods are angry with him and that I am enraged with him beyond all the immortals.” Il. xxiv. 113. ■ρρωστε■ν προφασ■ζεται, he pretends that he is sick: ■ξ■μοσεν ■ρρωστε■ν τουτον■, “he took his oath that this man was sick.” DEM. xix. 124. Ο■κ ■φη α■τ■ς ■λλ■ ■κε■νον στρατηγε■ν, i.e. Cleon said that not he himself, but Nicias, was general; i.e. he said, ο■κ ■γ■ α■τ■ς ■λλ■ ■κε■νος στρατηγε■. THUC. iv. 28. Τ■νας ο■ν ε■χ■ς ■πολαμβ■νετ■ ε■χεσθαι τ■ν Φ■λιππον ■τ■ ■σπενδεν; what prayers do you suppose Philip made, etc.? DEM. xix. 130. (Ε■χεσθαι represents η■χετο: see 119.) Ο■μαι γ■ρ ■ν ο■κ ■χαρ■στως μοι ■χειν, for I think it would not be a thankless labour; i.e. ο■κ ■ν ■χοι. XEN. An. ii.

3, 18. Ο■εσθε γ■ρ τ■ν πατ■ρα ο■κ ■ν φυλ■ττειν κα■ τ■ν τιμ■ν λαμβ■νειν τ■ν πωλουμ■νων ξ■λων; do you think that my father would not have taken care and have received the pay for the timber sold? i.e. ο■κ ■ν φ■λλαττεν κα■ ■λ■μβανεν; DEM. xlix. 35. (See 205.)

(Aorist.) Ο■δ■ κε φα■ης ■νδρ■ μαχησ■μενον τ■ν γ■ ■λθ■μεν, “nor would you say that he came after a battle with a man.” Il. iii. 393. Κατασχε■ν φησι το■τους, he says that he detained them. Το■ς δ■ α■χμαλ■τους ο■δ■ ■νθυμηθ■να■ φησι λ■σασθαι, “but he says that he did not even think of ransoming the prisoners.” DEM. xix. 39. (He says κατ■σχον and ο■δ■ ■νεθυμ■θην.) ■ Κ■ρος λ■γεται γεν■σθαι Καμβ■σεω, “Cyrus is said to have been the son of Cambyses.” XEN. Cyr. i. 2, 1. Το■ς ■θηνα■ους ■λπιζεν ■σως ■ν ■πεξελθε■ν κα■ τ■ν γ■ν ο■κ ■ν περιδε■ν τμηθ■ναι, he hoped that the Athenians would perhaps march out and not allow their land to be laid waste; i.e. ■σως ■ν ■πεξ■λθοιεν κα■ ο■κ ■ν περιδουειν. THUC. ii. 20. ■π■εσαν νομ■σαντες μ■ ■ν ■τι ■κανο■ γεν■σθαι κωλ■σαι τ■ν τειχισμ■ν. Id. vi. 102. (Here ο■κ ■ν γενο■μεθα would be the direct form: see 685.) So i. 139. Ο■κ ■ν ■γε■σθ■ α■τ■ν κ■ν ■πιδραμε■ν, do you not believe that (in that case) he would have run thither? i.e. ■πιδραμεν ■ν. DEM. xxvii. 56. (See 223.) A single infinitive with ■ν occurs in Homer: κα■ δ■ ■ν το■ς ■λλοισιν ■φη παραμυθ■σασθαι, Il. ix. 684. (The direct discourse is given in the words of Achilles in vs. 417, κα■ δ■ ■ν παραμυθησα■μην.) (See 207.)

(Perfect.) Φρον■ω τετιμ■σθαι Δι■ς α■σ■, “I feel that I have been honoured.” Il. ix. 608. Φησ■ν α■τ■ς α■τιος γεγεν■σθαι, he says α■τιος γεγ■νημαι. DEM. xix. 37. Ε■καζον ■ δι■κοντα ο■χεσθαι ■ καταληψ■μεν■ν τι προεληλακ■ναι. XEN. An. i. 10, 16. (Their thought was ■ δι■κων ο■χεται, ■ προελ■λακεν.) ■φη χρ■μαθ■ ■αυτ■ το■ς Θηβα■ους ■πικεκηρυχ■ναι, “he said that the Thebans had offered a reward for him.” DEM. xix. 21. ■ντ■λεγον μ■ δικα■ως σφ■ν καταδεδικ■σθαι, λ■γοντες μ■ ■πηγγ■λθαι πω ■ς Λακεδα■μονα τ■ς σπονδ■ς ■τ■ ■σ■πεμψαν το■ς ■πλ■τας, they rejoined that they (the Eleans) had not justly condemned them, saying that the truce had not yet been announced at Sparta when they sent in the soldiers (they said ο■ καταδεδικ■κασθε, and ο■κ ■πηγγελμ■ναι ■σ■ν πω α■ σπονδα■ ■τ■ ■σεπ■μψαμεν). THUC. v. 49. So ■κπεπλ■χθαι, representing ■ξεπ■πληκτο, XEN. Cyr. i. 4, 27. (See 123, above.)

(For examples of the perfect infinitive with ■ν, representing the pluperfect indicative and the perfect optative, see 206.)

(Future.) ■φης σ■ς ■σσεσθαι. Il. xxii. 331. So Od. iv. 664. Κα■ μοι ■ειπεν Μυρμιδ■νων τ■ν ■ριστον λε■ψειν φ■ος ■ελ■οιο, he told me ■ριστος . . . λε■ψει. Il. xviii. 9. Κα■ δ■ μοι γ■ρας α■τ■ς α■φαιρ■σεσθαι ■πειλε■ς. Il. i. 161. ■παγγ■λλεται τ■ δ■καια ποι■σειν, “he promises to do what is right.” DEM. xix. 48. ■φη ■ντ■ς ■μερ■ν ε■κοσιν ■ ■ξειν Λακεδαιμον■ους ζ■ντας ■ α■το■ ■ποκτενε■ν, “he said that within twenty days he would either bring them alive or kill them where they were.” THUC. iv. 28. (Cleon said ■ ■ξω ■ ■ποκτεν■.) Τα■τα (φησ■) πεπρ■ξεσθαι δυο■ν ■ τρι■ν ■μερ■ν, he says that this will have been accomplished within two or three days (137). DEM. xix. 74. (For the rare future infinitive with ■ν, see 208.)

[*] 684. The infinitive is said to stand in indirect discourse and its tenses correspond to those of the indicative or optative, when it depends on a verb implying thought or the expression of thought (one of the class of verba sentiendi et declarandi), and when also the thought, as originally conceived, would have been expressed by some tense of the indicative (with or without ■ν) or optative (with ■ν), so that it can be transferred without change of tense to the infinitive. Thus in

βολευται λθεν, he wishes to go, λθεν represents no form of either aorist indicative or aorist optative, and is therefore said to be not in indirect discourse. But in φησεν λθεν, he says that he went, λθεν represents λθον of the direct discourse. The distinction in the time of the infinitive (especially of the aorist infinitive) in these two uses is obvious.

It may be asked why the infinitive after certain other verbs should not be said to stand in indirect discourse; for example, why in κελεσει σε λθεν or μ λθεν we should not say that λθεν represents λθ or μ λθ of direct discourse. This might perhaps be done; and we might possibly make λθεν in βολομαι λθεν represent λθοιμι, may I go. But with other verbs of the same class, as those of advising, teaching, striving, choosing, no form of direct discourse can even be imagined. It is much harder to draw a line between these last verbs and verbs like κελεω and βολομαι, or even between these two, than where it is drawn above. It is impossible to say where a Greek would have drawn the line, or to be sure that he would have drawn any line at all; for our own use, the usual definition of the infinitive in oratio obliqua (as given above) is certainly the most convenient.

[*] 685. M, with Infinitive.) The negative particle of the infinitive in indirect discourse is regularly ο, which is retained from the direct form (667, 5). But, after certain verbs which belong to the intermediate class between those which take the infinitive in indirect discourse and those which do not (see 136), the infinitive regularly takes μ for its negative. Such are verbs of hoping, promising, and swearing; with those signifying to agree or consent (μολογ), to trust (πιστεω), to be persuaded (ππεισμαι), to testify (μαρτυρ).⁵² The infinitive occasionally has μ even after the verbs which most regularly take the infinitive with ο in indirect discourse, as φημ, λγω, νομζω, γομαι, etc. E.g. Χρ εν μσαι μ κεντα λθεν, "he had to swear that he did not come intentionally." HDT. ii. 179; so i. 165. "μνυσιν μ ποτ μενον πη μηδεν κοσαι," "he swears that nobody ever heard better verses." AR. Vesp. 1047. μνυε μηδεν ερηκναι. DEM. xxi. 119. ταν λπσωσιν οτοι μ λλωσ τν νον καθξειν. PLAT. Rep. 572E. Οδεμ αν μων χω λπδα μ ο δσειν μας δκην. HDT. vi. 11. (For μ ο see 815, HDT. 2.) Μαιδος υς ποσχμενος κατνευσε μ ποτ ποκλψειν σκηβλος κτετισται. Hymn. Merc. 521; so μ τινα σεσθαι. Ibid. 525.

μολογσαμεν μποτ εν ατν ναντα δειν. PLAT. Phaed. 94 C. Μεμαρτυρασιν ο πρτερον ργαζμενοι μ εναι σηκν εν τ χωρ. LYS. vii. 11. So DEM. xlv. 15. Σωκρτη γε γ γγυμαι μ πιλσεσθαι. PLAT. Prot. 336D. Πιστεω μ ψεισειν με τατας τς γαθς λπιδας. XEN. Cyr. i. 5, 13. Ππεισμαι γ μηδενα δικεν νθρωπων. PLAT. Ap. 37 A: so 37B.

Φαην δ εν γωγε μηδεν μηδεμ αν εναι παδευσιν παρ το μ ρσκοντος. XEN. Mem. i. 2, 39. So PLAT. Theaet. 155A. Πντες ροσι τ λοιπν μηδεν εναι κερδαλετερον ρετς. XEN. Cyr. vii. 1, 18. ενμισε δ μ εν γενσθαι ποτ πιστν νθρωπον. Ib. vii. 5, Ib. 59. Κα ρτι λεγον μηδενα θλειν κεντα ρχειν. PLAT. Rep. 346E. Τς εν θεν μν παδας γοτο εναι, θεος δ μ; Ap. 27 D. Προλεγον μ εν γγενεσθαι πλεμον (i.e. οκ εν γγοιτο πλεμος). THUC. i. 139. See also THUC. v. 49, THUC. vi. 102, quoted in 683. The examples in the last paragraph are opposed to the regular usage of the language, which would demand ο in all of them. We must suppose that the use of μ with the infinitive was so fixed, before the infinitive began to be used in indirect discourse, that μ always seemed natural, even

after ο had become the regular form after verbs of saying, thinking, etc. We sometimes find strange uses of μ. In THUC. i. 118, ντες μν κα πρ το μ ταχες ναι τς πολμους, having even before this been not hasty to go into wars, it may be difficult to find a better explanation of the anomalous μ than the perhaps heretical one, that το μ ταχες ναι had a more natural sound than το ο ταχες ναι, although neither το nor the negative has anything to do with the infinitive. So some people say between you and I, merely because you and me sounds vulgar.

[*] 686. With μ and the infinitive in indirect discourse we may compare the rare τι μ with the indicative, which occurs in THEOG. 659, οδ μσαι χρ τοθ, τι μποτε πργμα τδ σται, and ANT. v. 21, τατα σκοπετε, τι μ προνο μλλον γγνετο τχ: see also SOPH. Ant. 685, πως σ μ λγεις ρθς τδε. τι μ with the indicative became a regular construction in later Greek (as in Lucian). μσαι τι μ σται in Theognis suggests the still more puzzling cases of μ alone with the indicative after oaths in Homer and Aristophanes: στω Ζες, μ μν τος πποισιν νρ ποιχσεται λλος, Il. x. 329; στω νν τδε γαα . . . μ δ μν τητα Ποσειδων νοσχθων πημανει Τρας, Il. xv. 36; “μ τν πλλω μ σ γ κατακλιν χαμα,” AR. Lys. 917 ; so AR. Eccl. 1000; μ γν, μ παγδας, . . . μ γ νημα κομψτερον κουσ πω, AR. Av. 194. I have no explanation, even to suggest, of the strange use of μ in these last examples.

Participle in Indirect Discourse.

[*] 687. When the participle stands in indirect discourse, it follows the rules already given for the infinitive (683), in regard to its tense and the use of ν. E.g. γλλει τοτους ρχομνους, he announces that they are coming; γειλε τοτους ρχομνους, he announced that they were coming. (The announcement is οτοι ρχονται.) γλλει τοτους λθντας, he announces that they came; γειλε τοτους λθντας, he announced that they had come. (He says λθον.) γλλει τοτους ληλυθτας, he announces that they have come; γειλε τοτους ληλυθτας, he announced that they had come. (He says ληλθασιν.) γλλει (γειλε) τοτο γενησμενον, he announces (or announced) that this is (or was) about to happen. (He says τοτο γενσεται.)

οδ ρα π τι δη Πτροκλον τεθνητα δος χιλλες, “nor yet did Achilles have any knowledge that Patroclus was dead.” Il. xvii. 402. Γγνωσκε θεο γνον ν ντα. Il. vi. 191. Τηλμαχος δ ρα μιν πλαι δεεν νδον ντα. Od. xxiii. 29: so xvii. 549, Od. 556. Τος τε γρ πιχειρμασιν ρων ο κατορθοντες κα τος στρατιτας χθομνους τ μον, for they saw that they were not succeeding in their attempts, and that the soldiers were distressed by the delay; i.e. they saw ο κατορθομεν κα ο στρατιται χθονται. THUC. vii. 47. μμνομεν ος μολογσαμεν δικαιοις οσιν; do we abide by what we acknowledged to be just (i.e. δκαι στιν)? PLAT. Crit. 50A. Πνθ νεκα αυτο ποιν ξελλεγκται, “it has been proved that he is doing everything for his own interest.” DEM. ii. 8. Ατ Κρον πιστρατεοντα πρτος γειλα, “I first announced to him that Cyrus was on his march against him.” XEN. An. ii. 3, 19. See SOPH. O.T. 395.

σφα οδε νοστσαντ σε δερο, “whether she is perfectly certain that you have returned hither.” Od. xxiv. 404. πιστμενοι κα τν βρβαρον ατν περ ατ τ πλεω σφαλντα, κα πρς ατος τος θηναους πολλ μς δη τος μαρτμασιν ατν μλλον τ

οφίμιν τιμωρ περιγεγεννημῶνους (i.e. βίρβαρος σφίλη, καί μες περιγεγενμεθα). THUC. i. 69. So in the same chapter, τῶν Μῆδων ἀτοῦ σμεν κ πειρῶτων γς π τῶν Πελοπννησον λθίντα, i.e. Μῆδος λθεν. πειδ γνωσαν ο μετ θηναῶν πραχθεσαν τ τῶν Βοιωτῶν ζυμαχῶν, λλς διαφορῶν μεγλήν καθεσττας ἀτοῦς πρς τοῦς Λακεδαίμονους (i.e. οκ πρχθη and καθεστσιν). Id. v. 44. Ο γρ δεσαν ἀτῶν τεθηκτα, for they did not know that he was dead (i.e. τθηκεν). XEN. An. i. 10, 16. See AND. i. 23; SOPH. Tr. 739. πδειξα οδῶν ληθς πηγγελκτα λλ φενακσανθμς, I have shown that he has reported nothing that is true, and that he deceived you (πγγελκεν and φενκισεν). DEM. xix. 177.

Ε εδιν κα τῶν συμμαχῶν μοι γενησομνην, if I were sure that I should obtain an alliance also (i.e. συμμαχῶ μοι γενσεται). Ibid. 40. So XEN. Hell. iv. 7, 3. δ ντοφεῶν μβλτερος, εδς οκς χριν λλς φελημα τῶν ρετῶν ποδσων, knowing that he shall not return the benefit, etc. (i.e. οκ ποδσω). THUC. ii. 40. Γνντες οτ ποκωλσειν δυνατο ντες, ε τ πομονωθσονται τς ζυμβσεως, κινδυνεσοντες, ποιονται μολογῶν (i.e. οτε δυνατο σμεν, ε τ πομονωθησμεθα, κινδυνεσομεν). Id. iii. 28.

Ε δ σθι μηδῶν ν με τοῦτων πχειρσαντα σε πεθειν, ε δυναστεῶν μνον πλοτον ῶρων ξ ἀτῶν γενησμενον. ISOC. v. 133 (μηδῶν ν πχειρσαντα represents οδῶν ν πεχερησα, and γενησμενον represents γενσεται). Ε σμεν μ ν σσον μς λυπηρος γενομῶνους (i.e. οκ ν γνεσθε). THUC. i. 76. Σκοπομενος ον ερισκον οδαμς ν λλωσ τοτο διαπραξμενος, I found that I could accomplish this (διαπραξαμην ν) in no other way. ISOC. xv. 7.

πως δ γε τοῦς πολεμῶνους δναισθε κακς ποιεν, οκ οσθα μανθνοντας μς πολλς κακουργας; do you not know that you learned, etc.? XEN. Cyr. i. 6, 28. (Here δναισθε and the whole context show that μανθνοντας represents μανθνετε.) Μμνημαι δ γωγε κα πας ν Κριτῶν τδε ζυνντα σε, I remember that you were with (ζυνσθα) this Critias. PLAT. Charm. 156A. (See 140 and the examples.) See other examples in 904.

[*] 688. (Negative μ.) The participle of indirect discourse, like the infinitive, regularly retains the negative ο from the direct form. But, as in the case of the infinitive (685), we find many exceptions. Compare ISOC. v. 133 and THUC. i. 76, which have μ after οδα, with THUC. ii. 40 and ISOC. xv. 7, which have οδα ο (all quoted in 687). See also SOPH. OC 656, SOPH. 797 (οδα μ), Ph. 79 (ξοιδα μ), O. C. 1121 (πσταμαι μ); EUR. Tro. 970 (δεξω μ); THUC. ii. 17 (προδει μ). Here also the irregularity may be explained by the fixed earlier use of μ in other constructions affecting the later construction of indirect discourse (685).

Indirect Quotation of Complex Sentences.

[*] 689. When a complex sentence is indirectly quoted, its leading verb follows the principles already stated for simple sentences (669-688).

1. If the quotation depends on a primary tense, all the dependent verbs of the original sentence retain the mood and tense of the direct discourse.

2. After a secondary tense, all dependent verbs of the original sentence which there stood in the present, perfect, or future indicative, or in any tense of the subjunctive, may either be changed to the same tense of the optative or retain both the mood and tense of the direct discourse, the optative being the more common form. When the subjunctive is changed to the optative, **ν** is dropped, **ων**, **ταν**, etc., becoming **ει**, **τε**, etc.

3. But dependent secondary tenses of the indicative and all dependent optatives remain unchanged after all tenses (see, however, 693). E.g.

1. (After primary tenses.) **ν** **δ** **με** **ς** **λ** **η** **γ** **η** **τ** **ε**, **ποι** **σει** **ν** (**φ** **η** **σ** **ει**) **μ** **τ** **α** **σ** **χ** **η** **ν** **η** **ν** **μ** **τ** **δ** **ο** **ξ** **α** **ν** **α** **τ** **φ** **ρ** **ε** **ι**. DEM. xix. 41 (i.e. **ποι** **σω**, **μ** **τ** **μ** **ο** **φ** **ρ** **ε** **ι**). **Νομ** **ζ** **ω** **γ** **ρ**, **ν** **το** **τ** **κ** **ρι** **β** **ς** **μ** **θ** **η** **τ** **ε**, **μ** **λ** **λ** **ο** **ν** **μ** **ς** **το** **τ** **ο** **ι** **ς** **μ** **ν** **πι** **σ** **τ** **σει** **ν** **μ** **ο** **δ** **βο** **η** **θ** **σει** **ν**. Id. xxx. 25. **ν** **κε** **ν** **ο** **ε** **δ** **μ** **ε** **ν**, **τι** **παν** **θ** **σα** **π** **πο** **τ** **λ** **π** **σα** **μ** **ν** **τι** **να** **π** **ρ** **ξ** **ει** **ν** **π** **ρ** **μ** **ν** **κα** **θ** **μ** **ν** **ε** **ρ** **η** **τ** **α** **ι**, **κ** **ν** **μ** **ν** **θ** **λ** **ω** **μ** **ε** **ν** **κε** **πο** **λ** **ε** **μ** **ε** **ν** **α** **τ** **ν** **θ** **δ** **σ** **ω** **ς** **να** **γκ** **α** **σ** **θ** **η** **σ** **μ** **ε** **θ** **α** **το** **το** **ποι** **ε** **ν**, κ.τ.λ. Id. iv. 50. **Προ** **λ** **γ** **ω** **τι**, **π** **τ** **ε** **ρ** **ν** **πο** **κ** **ρ** **ν** **η** **τ** **α** **ι**, **ξ** **ε** **λ** **ε** **γ** **θ** **σ** **ε** **τ** **α** **ι**. PLAT. Euthyd. 275E See DEM. xxi. 66, where two such conditional sentences depend on **ε** **π** **ρ** **δ** **η** **λ** **ο** **ν** **γ** **ν** **ο** **ι** **τ** **ο**, and II. xiii. 741 (see 178 and 184, above).

ρ **σο** **το** **των** **δε** **σον**, **ταν** **πι** **θυ** **μ** **σ** **ς** **φι** **λ** **αν** **π** **ρ** **ς** **τι** **νας** **ποι** **ε** **σ** **θ** **αι**. XEN. Mem. ii. 6, 29. **Πα** **ρ** **δ** **ει** **γ** **μα** **σα** **φ** **ς** **κα** **τα** **σ** **τ** **σ** **α** **τ** **ε**, **ς** **ν** **φ** **ι** **σ** **τ** **α** **ι**, **θ** **αν** **τ** **ζ** **η** **μ** **ι** **ω** **σ** **μ** **ε** **ν** **ο** **ν**. THUC. iii. 40. See 687.

2. (Optative after secondary tenses.) **Ε** **π** **ε** **τι** **ν** **δ** **ρ** **α** **γ** **ο** **ι** **ν** **ε** **ρ** **ξ** **αι** **δ** **ο** **ι**, he said that he was bringing a man whom it was necessary to confine, i.e. he said **ν** **δ** **ρ** **α** **γ** **ω** **ν** **ε** **ρ** **ξ** **αι** **δε**. XEN. Hell. v. 4, 8. **π** **ε** **κ** **ρ** **ν** **α** **τ** **ο** **τι** **μ** **αν** **θ** **ν** **ο** **ι** **ε** **ν** **ο** **μ** **αν** **θ** **ν** **ο** **ν** **τ** **ε** **ς** **ο** **κ** **π** **σ** **τ** **α** **ι** **ν** **τ** **ο**, i.e. he replied, **μ** **αν** **θ** **ν** **ο** **υ** **σ** **ι** **ο** **κ** **π** **σ** **τ** **α** **ν** **τ** **α** **ι**. PLAT. Euthyd. 276E.. (Here **ο** **κ** shows that **τι** has a definite antecedent, and takes the optative only because it is in indirect discourse. So with **ν** in the preceding example.) **γ** **η** **σ** **λ** **α** **ο** **ς** **λ** **ε** **γ** **ε** **ν** **τι**, **ε** **β** **λ** **α** **β** **ε** **ρ** **π** **ε** **π** **ρ** **α** **χ** **ς** **ε** **η**, **δ** **κ** **α** **ι** **ο** **ς** **ε** **η** **ζ** **η** **μ** **ι** **ο** **σ** **θ** **αι**, i.e. he said **ε** **β** **λ** **α** **β** **ε** **ρ** **π** **π** **ρ** **α** **χ** **ε**, **δ** **κ** **α** **ι** **ς** **σ** **τ** **ι** **ζ** **η** **μ** **ι** **ο** **σ** **θ** **αι**. XEN. Hell. v. 2, 32. So XEN. An. ii. 1, 3, XEN. An. iii. 5, 15, XEN. An. vi. 6, 25.

Ε **δ** **τι** **να** **φ** **ε** **γ** **ο** **ν** **τ** **α** **λ** **ψ** **ο** **ι** **τ** **ο**, **π** **ρ** **ο** **γ** **ρ** **ε** **υ** **ε** **ν** **τι** **ς** **πο** **λ** **ε** **μ** **ο** **ς** **χ** **ρ** **σ** **ο** **ι** **τ** **ο**. Cyr. iii. 1, Cyr. 3. (This is a quotation of **ε** **τι** **να** **λ** **ψ** **ο** **μ** **α** **ι**, **χ** **ρ** **σ** **ο** **μ** **α** **ι**.) **Γ** **ν** **ν** **τ** **ε** **ς** **δ** **τι**, **ε** **δ** **σ** **ο** **ι** **ε** **ν** **ε** **θ** **ν** **α** **ς**, **κ** **ι** **ν** **δ** **υ** **ν** **ε** **σ** **ο** **ι** **ε** **ν** **πο** **λ** **σ** **θ** **αι**, **π** **μ** **π** **ο** **υ** **σ** **ι** **ν** **κα** **δι** **δ** **σ** **κ** **ο** **υ** **σ** **ι** **ν** **το** **ς** **θ** **η** **β** **α** **ο** **υ** **ς** **ς**, **ε** **μ** **στ** **ρ** **α** **τ** **ε** **σ** **ο** **ι** **ε** **ν**, **κ** **ι** **ν** **δ** **υ** **ν** **ε** **σ** **ο** **ι** **ε** **ν** **ο** **ρ** **κ** **δ** **ε** **ς** **π** **λ** **ι** **ν** **λα** **κ** **ω** **ν** **σ** **α** **ι**. Hell. vii. 4, Hell. 34. **ο** **ι** **δ** **ει** **γ** **ρ** **τι**, **ε** **μ** **χ** **η** **ς** **πο** **τ** **δε** **σ** **ο** **ι**, **κ** **το** **των** **α** **τ** **π** **α** **ρ** **α** **σ** **τ** **α** **ς** **λη** **π** **τ** **ο** **ν** **ε** **η**. Id. Cyr. viii. 1, Id. Cyr. 10. (The direct discourse was **ε** **τι** **δε** **σ** **ει**, **λη** **π** **τ** **ο** **ν** **σ** **τ** **ν**.)

λ **ο** **γ** **ζ** **ο** **ν** **τ** **ο** **ς**, **ε** **μ** **μ** **χ** **ο** **ι** **ν** **τ** **ο**, **π** **ο** **σ** **τ** **σ** **ο** **ι** **ν** **τ** **ο** **α** **π** **ε** **ρ** **ι** **ο** **ικ** **δ** **ε** **ς** **π** **λ** **ε** **ι** **ς**. Hell. vi. 4, Hell. 6. (**ν** **μ** **μα** **χ** **μ** **ε** **θ** **α**, **π** **ο** **σ** **τ** **σ** **ο** **ν** **τ** **α** **ι**.) **Χ** **ρ** **μ** **α** **θ** **π** **ι** **σ** **χ** **ν** **ε** **τ** **ο** **δ** **σ** **ει** **ν**, **ε** **το** **π** **ρ** **γ** **μ** **α** **τ** **ο** **ς** **α** **τ** **ι** **ν** **τ** **ο** **μ**. DEM. xxi. 104. (**Δ** **σ** **ω**, **ν** **α** **τ** **ι** **σ** **θ** **ε**.) **γ** **ε** **τ** **ο** **γ** **ρ** **π** **αν** **ποι** **σει** **ν** **α** **τ** **ν**, **ε** **τι** **ς** **ρ** **γ** **ρ** **ι** **ο** **ν** **δι** **δο** **η**. LYS. xii. 14. **Ε** **ξ** **αν** **τ** **ο** **σ** **ω** **τ** **ρ** **ια** **θ** **σει** **ν**, **ν** **θ** **α** **π** **ρ** **τ** **ο** **ν** **ε** **ς** **φ** **ι** **λ** **αν** **γ** **ν** **φ** **ο** **κ** **ο** **ι** **ν** **τ** **ο**. XEN. An. v. 1, 1. (The dependent clause is found in the direct form in iii. 2, XEN. An. 9: **δο** **κε** **μ** **ο** **ι** **ε** **ξ** **ασ** **θ** **αι** **τ** **θ** **ε** **το** **τ** **θ** **σει** **ν** **σ** **ω** **τ** **ρ** **ια** **π** **ο** **υ** **ν** **π** **ρ** **τ** **ο** **ν** **ε** **ς** **φ** **ι** **λ** **αν** **χ** **ρ** **αν** **φ** **ικ** **μ** **ε** **θ** **α**.) **Τ** **ο** **π** **ρ** **α** **γ** **μ** **α** **τ** **ε** **ε** **τ** **ο** **νο** **μ** **ζ** **ω** **ν**, **σ** **α** **τ** **ς** **π** **λ** **ε** **ω** **ς** **π** **ρ** **ο** **λ** **β** **ο** **ι**, **π** **ν** **τ** **α** **τ** **α** **β** **ε** **β** **α** **ω** **ς** **ξ** **ει** **ν** (**σ** **ν** **π** **ρ** **ο** **λ** **β** **ω**, **β** **ε** **β** **α** **ω** **ς** **ξ** **ω**). DEM. xviii. 26. **λ** **π** **ι** **ζ** **ο** **ν** **π** **τ** **ν** **π** **α** **δ** **ω** **ν**, **π** **ε** **ι** **δ** **ν** **τ** **ε** **λ** **ε** **υ** **τ** **σ** **ω** **μ** **ε** **ν**, **τ** **α** **φ** **η** **σ** **μ** **ε** **θ** **α** (**π** **ε** **ι** **δ** **ν** **τ** **ε** **λ** **ε** **υ** **τ** **σ** **ω** **μ** **ε** **ν**, **τ** **α** **φ** **η** **σ** **μ** **ε** **θ** **α**). LYS. xiii.

45. Κωνων δδασκεν ς οτω μν ποιοντι πσαι ατ α πλεις φιλαι σοιντο, ε δ δουλοσθαι βουλμενος φανερς σοιτο, λεγεν ς μα κστη πολλ προγματα καν εη παρχειν, κα κνδυνος εη μ κα ο λληνες, ε τατα ασθoinτο, συσταεν. XEN. Hell. iv. 8, 2. Επε τε τι πσα νγκη εη τοτον λλγιμον γενσθαι, επερ ες λικαν λθοι (νγκη στν, ν λθ). PLAT. Theaet. 142D. νμισε μ ν γενσθαι ποτ πιστν νθρωπον στις λλον μλλον φιλοσοι το τς φυλακς δεομνου, he believed that no man could ever be made faithful who was to love (see 527) any one more than the one needing his guardianship (οκ ν γνοιτο ε φιλοσει). XEN. Cyr. vii. 5, 59. μοσεν γεσιλλ, ε σπεσαιτο ως λθοιεν ος πμψειε προς βασιλα γγλους, διαπρξεσθαι, κ.τ.λ. Ag. i. 10. (The oath was ν σπεσ ως ν λθωσιν γελοι ος ν πμψω, διαπρξομαι.) Even in Homer, Il. ii. 597, we find στετο γρ εχμενος νικσμεν, ε περ ν ατα Μοσαι εδοιεν, for he promised with a boast that he would be victor, even if the Muses themselves should sing. (For ε ν with the optative, see 460; or εδοιεν may represent a subjunctive, 692.)

τι δ γινσκειν φασαν φθονοντας μν ατος ε τι σφσιν γαθν γνοιτο, φηδομνους δ ε τις συμφορ προσππτοι, they said they knew that they (the Mantineans) were envious if any good came to them, but pleased if any calamity befell them. XEN. Hell. v. 2, 2. (Φθονετε μν νν τι μν γαθν γγνηται, φδεσθε δ νν τις συμφορ προσππτ.) Τν αταν, πδηλος ν ππ κενους ξουσα ε τι πθοι Χαρδημος (ξει, νν τι πθ Χαρδημος). DEM. xxiii. 12.

(Subjunctive and Indicative retained after secondary tenses.) λεγον τι κρα τ στιν νδον κα ο πολμοιοι πολλο, ο παουσιν τος νδον νθρπους, they said that there was a height, etc. XEN. An. v. 2, 17. (Here εν and παοιεν might have been used.)

δκει μοι τατ πειρσθαι σωθναι, νθυμουμν τι, νν μν λθω, σωθσομαι, κ.τ.λ. LYS. xii. 15. (Here ε λθοιμι, σωθησομην might have been used.) Φσκων τε, ν σωθ οκαδε, κατ γε τ ατ δυνατν διαλλξειν θηναους κα Λακεδαιμονους, ππλευσεν. XEN. Hell. i. 6, 7. (He said ν σωθ, which might have been changed to ε σωθεη.) Ταθ μς πεισε πρξαι, ε εδς τι, ε μ πασν τν λπδων ποστερηθσεσθε, ταχεαν παρ ατο τν τιμωραν κομεισθε. LYS. xii. 70. πσχοντο ατος, ν π Ποτδαιαν ωσιν θηναοι, ς τν ττικν σβαλεν (ν ωσιν, σβαλομεν). THUC. i. 58. Κα οκ φασαν νναι, νν μ τις ατος χρματα διδ: δ πσχετο νδρ κστ δσειν πντε μς, πν ες Βαβυλνα κωσι, κα τν μισθν ντελ, μχρι ν καταστσ τος λληνας ες ωναν πλιν. XEN. An. i. 4, 12 and 13. φη χρναι, ο ν λεγθσι διαβλλοντες τν λλνων, ς προδτας ντας τιμωρηθναι. Ib. ii. 5, lb. 27. See AESCHIN. iii. 145.

Ε δ μ, κα ατο φασαν ατν τος νδρας ποκτενεν ος χουσι ζντας, otherwise, they said, they should themselves kill their men whom they had in their hands alive (χοιεν might have been used). THUC. ii. 5. Κατασχσειν τς πλας φασαν, ε μ κντες νοξουσιν. XEN. An. vii. 1, 16. (Ε μ νοξοιεν might have been used.) So THUC. i. 137. Ατος τοιατη δξα παρειστκει, ς, ε μν προτερον ππ λλην πλιν ασιν, κενοις κα θηναοις πολεμσουσιν: ε δ νθδε προτον φξονται, οδνας λλους τολμσειν, κ.τ.λ. LYS. ii. 22. Οδν φελος φη τν χθς ερημνων εναι λγων, ε ταθ

ο Φιλίππου μ συμπεισθόνται πρσβεις. AESCHIN. iii. 71. πρδῆλον ν σμενον, ε μ μες κωλσετε, it was manifest that this would be so unless you should prevent it (i.e. σται, ε μ κωλσετε). Id. iii. 90. (Κωλσοιτε might be used; and ε μ κωλσαιτε representing ν μ κωλσητε is in one Ms.)

3. (Past tenses of Indicative retained after secondary tenses.) πιστελαι δ σφσιν ατος τος φρους (φασαν) επεν, ς ν μν πρσθεν ποουν μμφοιντο ατος, that the Ephors charged them to say that they blamed them for what they had done before (i.e. ν πρσθεν ποιετε μεμφμεθα μν). XEN. Hell. iii. 2, 6.

λπίζον τος Σικελος τατ, ος μετπεμψαν, παντσεσθαι, "they hoped that the Sikels whom they had sent for would meet them here." THUC. vii. 80. Λγουσι δ τινες κα κοσιον φαρμκ ποθανεν ατν, δνατον νομσαντα εναι πιτελσαι βασιλε πσχετο, and some say even that he (Themistocles) died a voluntary death by poison, believing that it was impossible to perform for the King what he had promised (δνατν στιν πιτελσαι πσεχμην). Id. i. 138. ντλεγον, λγοντες μ πηγγλθαι πω τς σπονδς τς σπεμψαν τος πλτας. Id. v. 49. λεγον ς Ξενοφν οχοιτο ς Σεθην οκσων κα πσχετο ατ ποληψμενος. XEN. An. vii. 7, 55. καστον ρμην, ε τινες εν μρτυρες ν ναντον τν προκ πδοσαν (εσ μρτυρες, ν ναντον πδοτε;). DEM. xxx. 19. The aorist indicative is not changed to the aorist optative here, to avoid confusion, as the latter tense in such dependent clauses generally represents the aorist subjunctive of the direct form. Thus φη εροι δσειν means he said that he would give whatever he might find (ν ερω δσω); but if εροι could also represent ερον, it might also mean he said that he would give what he had found. In the leading clause the ambiguity is confined to indirect questions, in which the aorist indicative is generally retained for the same reason (see 125).

(Past tenses of the Indicative in unreal conditions retained.) δκει, ε μ φθασαν ξυλλαβντες τος νδρας, προδοθναι ν τν πλιν. THUC. vi. 61. (If φθασαν were optative, it would represent an optative of direct discourse.) Οεσθε τν πατρα, ε μ Τιμοθου ν τ ξλα κα δεθη οτος ατο παρασχεν τ ναλον, σσαι ν ποτε, κ.τ.λ., λλλ οκ ν φυλττειν κα τν τιμν λαμβνειν, ως κομσατο τ ναυτο; DEM. xlix. 35. Τοτων ε τι ν ληθς, οεσθ οκ ν ατν λαβεν; Id. xxvii. 56. δως ν μν πυθομην, τν ν ποτε γμην περ μμο εχετε ε μ πετριηρρχησα λλ πλων χμην. L. Id. 67.

(Dependent Optatives retained.) Επεν τι λθοι ν ες λγους ε μρους λβοι (he said λθοιμι ν ε μρους λβοιμι). XEN. Hell. iii. 1, 20. ττον ν δι τοτο τυγχνειν (δοκε μοι), ε τι δοισθε παρ ατν. Id. An. vi. 1, Id. An. 26. λεγεν τι οκ ν ποτε προτο, πε παξ φλος ατος γνεντο, οδ ε τι μν μεους γνοιντο τι δ κικιον πρξειαν. Ib. i. 9, Ib. 10. Δειν ν τι παθεν σαυτν λπιζες, ε πθοινθ οτοι τ πεπραμνα σοι. DEM. xix. 240.

Sentences such as these are often translated like those which had a future and a dependent subjunctive in the direct discourse. Thus λεγεν τι χαροι ν ε τοτο γνοιτο or λεγε χαρειν ν ε τοτο γνοιτο, as well as λεγεν τι χαρσοι ε τοτο γνοιτο or λεγε χαρσειν ε τοτο γνοιτο, may all be translated he said that he should rejoice if this should happen; although in the first two sentences the direct discourse was χαροιμι ν ε τοτο γνοιτο, I should rejoice if this should happen, and in the last two, χαρσω νν τοτο γνηται,

I shall rejoice if this shall happen. (See 456.)

[*] 690. The dependent verbs of a quotation may be changed to the optative in indirect discourse, even when the leading verb retains the indicative; and sometimes (though rarely) a dependent verb retains the subjunctive or indicative, when the leading verb is changed to the optative. This may give rise to a great variety of constructions in the same sentence. E.g. Δηλ[ο]σας [ο]τι [ο]τοιμο[ς] ε[σ]τι μ[η]χεσθαι ε[σ]τις [ο]ξ[υ]ρχοιτο. XEN. Cyr. iv. 1, 1. ([ο]τοιμο[ς] ε[σ]τιν [ο]τις [ο]ξ[υ]ρχηται.) Λ[ε]σανδρος ε[πε]τι παρασπ[ιν]δους [ο]μ[η]ς [ο]χοι, κα[ι] [ο]τι ο[ς] περ[ι] πολιτε[ας] [ο]μ[η]ν [ο]σται [ο]λλ[ο] περ[ι] σωτηρ[ια]ς, ε[σ]τι μ[η] ποι[ο]σαιθ[η] [ο] Θηραμ[ην]ης κελε[ο]ι. LYS. xii. 74. ([ο]χω, κα[ι] ο[ς] [ο]σται [ο]τι μ[η] ποι[ο]σηθ[η] [ο] Θ. κελε[ο]ι. There is no need of the emendations ποι[ο]σεται and κελε[ο]ι.) [ο]δ[ο]κει δ[ο]λον ε[σ]τιναι [ο]τι α[ρ]χ[ο]νται α[ρ]χ[ο]ν ε[σ]τις [ο]πιψηφ[ο]ζοι. XEN. An. vi. 1, 25. Ο[κ] [ο]γν[ο]ει Ε[β]βουλ[η]δος [ο]τι, ε[σ]τι λ[ο]γος [ο]ποδοθ[η]σοιτο κα[ι] παραγ[ο]νιντ[ο] μοι π[ο]ντες ο[ς] δημ[ο]ται κα[ι] [ο] ψ[υ]φος δικα[ι]ως δοθε[ο]η, ο[ς]δαμο[ς] γεν[ο]νται ο[ς] μετ[ο] του συνεστηκ[ο]τες. DEM. lvi. 16. (Ε[σ]τι [ο]ποδοθ[η]σεται κα[ι] [ο]τιν παραγ[ο]νινται κα[ι] ψ[υ]φος δοθ[η], ο[ς]δαμο[ς] γεν[ο]νται.) [ο]γν[ο]σ[α]λαος γν[ο]ς [ο]τι, ε[σ]τι μ[η]ν μηδετ[ρ] συλλ[ο]ψοιτο, μισθ[ο]ν ο[ς]δ[ο]τερος λ[ο]σει το[ς] [ο]λλησιν, [ο]γορ[ο]ν δ[ο] ο[ς]δ[ο]τερος παρ[ο]ξει, [ο]π[ο]τερος τ[ο]ν κρατ[ο]σ[ο], ο[ς]τος [ο]χθρ[ο]ς [ο]σται: ε[σ]τι δ[ο] τ[ο]τ[ρ] συλλ[ο]ψοιτο, ο[ς]τ[ο]ς γε φ[ο]λος [ο]σοιτο, κ.τ.λ. Ag. ii. 31.

[ο]λεγον [ο]τι ε[κ]τα δοκο[ο]εν λ[ο]γειν βασιλε[ο], κα[ι] [ο]κοιεν [ο]γημ[ην]ας [ο]χοντες, ο[ς] α[το]ς, [ο]τιν σπονδα[ς] γ[ο]νωνται, [ο]ξουσιν [ο]νθεν [ο]ξουσι τ[ο]πιτ[ο]δεια. An. ii. 3, An. 6. [ο]πρη[ο]τα, πο[ο]α ε[ο]η τ[ο]ν [ο]ρων [ο]π[ο]θεν ο[ς] Χαλδα[ο]ι καταθ[ο]ντες λη[ο]ζονται. Cyr. iii. 2, Cyr. 1. [ο]λεξας [ο]τι μ[η]ριστον ε[ο]η μαθε[ο]ν [ο]πως δε[ο] [ο]ξεργ[ο]ζεσθαι [ο]καστα: ε[σ]τι δ[ο] μ[η], ο[ς]δ[ο] τ[ο]ς [ο]πιμελε[ο]ας [ο]φησθα [ο]φελος ο[ς]δ[ο]ν γ[ο]γνεσθαι, ε[σ]τι μ[η] τις [ο]π[ο]σταιτο [ο]δε[ο] κα[ο]ς δε[ο] ποιε[ο]ν. Id. Oec. xv. 2. In DEM. xviii. 148, we have both constructions of 689, DEM. 2 in the same sentence: ε[σ]τι μ[η]ν το[το] τ[ο]ν [ο]κε[ο]νου συμμ[ο]χων ε[ο]σηγο[ο]τ[ο] τις, [ο]π[ο]ψεσθαι τ[ο] πρ[ο]γμα [ο]ν[ο]μιζε π[ο]ντας: [ο]ν δ[ο] [ο]θηνα[ο]ς [ο] το[το] ποι[ο]ν, ε[ο]π[ο]ρωσ λ[ο]σειν. Here ε[ο] ε[ο]σηγο[ο]το represents [ο]ν (= [ο]ν) ε[ο]σηγ[ο]ται, corresponding to [ο]ν [ο]. By keeping the subjunctive in the latter case, the expression is made more vivid by contrast. In PLAT. Rep. 337 A we have το[τοις] προ[ο]λεγον, [ο]τι ε[ο]ρωνε[ο]σοιο κα[ο] π[ο]ντα μ[ο]λλον ποι[ο]σοις [ο] [ο]ποκρino[ο], ε[ο] τ[ο]ς τ[ο] σε [ο]ρωτ[ο], which must mean I warned them that you would dissemble and would do anything rather than answer if any one should ask you anything. The direct discourse must be ε[ο]ρωνε[ο]σεται κα[ο] π[ο]ντα μ[ο]λλον ποι[ο]σει [ο] [ο]ποκρινε[ο]ται [ο]τιν τ[ο]ς τι α[ρ]χ[ο]ν [ο]ρωτ[ο] (subj.). [ο]τιν [ο]ρωτ[ο] must have been retained or changed to ε[ο] with the optative; and [ο]ρωτ[ο] in the text is probably a copyist's mistake for [ο]ρωτ[ο], a form of the optative frequently found in the Cod. A Parisin. of Plato. See in the Republic 516 A (καθορ[ο]), 518 A (γελ[ο]), 559 A (μελετ[ο]), 598 C ([ο]ξαπατ[ο]). There is, however, a various reading [ο]ροιτο in a few Mss. in 337 A.

[*] 691. The imperfect or pluperfect sometimes stands irregularly in a dependent (as well as in the leading) clause of the indirect discourse after a secondary tense, to represent a present or perfect indicative, which would regularly be retained or changed to the present or perfect optative. Such clauses are really not included in the indirect discourse. (See 674; 701.) E.g. [ο]λεγον ο[ς] καλ[ο]ς τ[ο]ν [ο]λλ[ο]δα [ο]λευθερο[ο]ν α[ρ]χ[ο]ν, ε[ο] [ο]νδρας διεφθειρεν ο[ς]τε χε[ο]ρας [ο]νταιρομ[ο]νους ο[ς]τε πολεμ[ο]ους (ο[ς] καλ[ο]ς [ο]λευθερο[ο]ς, ε[ο] διαφθε[ο]ρεις). THUC. iii. 32. Ο[ς]τε γ[ο]ρ το[ς] θεο[ς] [ο]φη καλ[ο]ς [ο]χειν, ε[ο] τα[ς] μεγαλαις θυσ[ο]αις μ[ο]λλον [ο] τα[ς] μικρα[ς] [ο]χαιρον (ε[ο] χα[ο]ρουσιν). XEN. Mem. i. 3, 3. Κα[ο] [ο]φη ε[ο]ναι παρ[ο] [ο]αυτ[ο] [ο]σον μ[η] [ο]ν [ο]νηλωμ[ο]νον ([ο]σον μ[η] [ο]στιν [ο]νηλωμ[ο]νον). DEM. xlvi. 16. [ο] μ[η]ν ε[ο]λλ[ο]φει τ[ο]ς π[ο]λεως [ο]ποδ[ο]σειν ([ο]γο[ο]μην), I thought that

■ρα τ■χως■ τινες ■ζωγημ■νοι, for they wished that, if they should capture any one, he might be a hostage for their friends within the city, in case any should chance to have been taken prisoners (■ν λ■βωμεν, and ■ν τ■χωσι). THUC. ii. 5. Ο■ δ■ ■λλοι Θηβα■οι, ο■ς ■δει παραγεν■σθαι ε■ τι μ■ προχωρο■η το■ς ■σεληλυθ■σιν, ■πεβο■θουν, who were to come up if anything should go wrong with those who had entered the city (■ν τι μ■ προχωρ■). Ibid.

Προε■πον α■το■ς μ■ ναυμαχε■ν Κορινθ■οις, ■ν μ■ ■π■ Κ■ρκυραν πλ■ωσι κα■ μ■λλωσιν ■ποβα■νειν. Id. i. 45. Κα■ παρ■γγειλαν ■πειδ■ δειπν■σειαν συνεσκευασμ■νους π■ντας ■ναπα■εσθαι, κα■ ■πεσθαι ■ν■κ■ ■ν τις παραγγ■λλ■. XEN. An. iii. 5, 18. (■πειδ■ν δειπν■σητε, and ■ν■κ■ ■ν τις παραγγ■λλ■.) Περ■ α■τ■ν κρ■φα π■μπει, κελε■ων μ■ ■φε■ναι πρ■ν ■ν α■το■ π■λιν κομισθ■σιν, "he sent bidding the Athenians not to let them go until they should themselves have returned." THUC. i. 91. (Πρ■ν κομισθε■εν might be used.) Κα■ πολλ■κισ το■ς ■θηνα■οις παρ■νει, ■ν ■ρα ποτ■ κατ■ γ■ν βιασθ■σι, καταβ■ντας ■ς α■τ■ν τα■ς ναυσ■ πρ■ς ■παντας ■νθ■στασθαι. Id. i. 93. (Ε■ βιασθε■εν might be used.) ■ξ■ουν α■το■ς ■γεμ■νας σφ■ν γεν■σθαι, κα■ Πausan■ μ■ ■πιτρ■πειν ■ν που βι■ζηται. Id. i. 95. (Ε■ που βι■ζοιτο might be used.) ■φικνο■νται ■ς Σιτ■λκην, βουλ■μενοι πε■σαι α■τ■ν, ε■ δ■ναιντο, στρατε■σαι ■π■ τ■ν Ποτ■δαϊαν. Id. ii. 67. ■τοιμος ■ν ■ποτ■νειν, ε■ καταγνο■εν α■το■. ISOC. xvii. 16. Ε■πον μηδ■να τ■ν ■πισθεν κινε■σθαι πρ■ν ■ν ■ πρ■σθεν ■γ■ται, "I commanded that no one at the rear should move until the one before him should lead." XEN. Cyr. ii. 2, 8.

Παρηγγ■λλετο γ■ρ α■το■ς δ■κα μ■ν ο■ς Θηραμ■νης ■π■δειξε χειροτον■σαι, δ■κα δ■ ο■ς ο■ ■φοροι κελε■οιεν, they were bidden to choose ten whom Theramenes had nominated, and ten whom the Ephors commanded (i.e. ο■ς ■π■δειξε and ο■ς κελε■ουσιν). LYS. xii. 76. ■κ■λευσ■ με τ■ν ■πιστολ■ν ■ν ■γραψα ο■καδε δο■ναι, "the letter which I had written." XEN. Cyr. ii. 2, 9. (■ν γρ■ψαιμι would mean whatever letter I might write, representing ■ν ■ν γρ■ψ■ς.) Διενοο■ντο α■το■ς π■λιν ■θεν ■λθον ■ς Θρ■κην ■ποπ■μπειν, they planned to send them back to Thrace, whence they had come. THUC. vii. 27. (See 689, THUC. 3.■

[*] 696. II. Clauses containing a protasis, the apodosis of which is implied in the past leading verb or its adjuncts. E.g. Διδ■ντος δ■ α■τ■ π■μπολλα δ■ρα Τιθρα■στου, ε■ ■π■λθοι, ■πεκρ■νατο, when T. offered (to give) him many gifts, if he would go away. Ag. iv. 6. (■■ν ■π■λθ■ might be used.) Φ■λακας συμπ■μπει, ■πως φυλ■ττοιεν α■τ■ν, κα■ ε■ τ■ν ■γρ■ων τι φανε■η θηρ■ων, and (to be ready) in case any wild beast should appear; his thought being ■■ν τι φαν■. Cyr. i. 4, Cyr. 7. Πρ■ς τ■ν π■λιν, ε■ ■πιβοηθο■εν, ■χ■ρουν, they marched towards the city, in case they (the citizens) should rush out (i.e. so as to meet them, if they should rush out), the thought being ■ν ■πιβοηθ■σιν (490, Cyr. 1). THUC. vi. 100. Ο■δ■ ■ν το■ πολ■μου π■ρας ο■δ■ ■παλλαγ■ Φιλ■ππ■, ε■ μ■ Θηβα■ους κα■ Θετταλο■ς ■χθρο■ς ποι■σειε τ■ π■λει, i.e. Philip saw that he could neither end nor escape the war unless he should make the Thebans and Thessalians hostile to the city (the original apodosis, I cannot end or escape the war, to which ■■ν μ■ ποι■σω was the protasis, is implied in ο■δ■ ■ν . . . Φιλ■ππ■). DEM. xviii. 145.

■ν δ■ τις ε■π■ ■ ■πιψηφ■σ■ κινε■ν τ■ χρ■ματα τα■τα ■ς ■λλο τι, θ■νατον ζημ■αν ■π■θεντο, they set death as the penalty (i.e. voted that death should be the penalty) if any one should move, or put to vote a motion, to divert this money to any other purpose. THUC. ii. 24. (Ε■ ε■ποι ■ ■πιψηφ■σειεν might be used.) Τ■λλα, ■ν ■τι ναυμαχε■ν ο■ ■θηνα■οι τολμ■σωσι,

παρεσκευάζοντο, i.e. they made their other preparations, (to be ready) in case the Athenians should still dare to risk a sea fight (their thought being we will be ready in case they shall dare, τολμῶσιν). Id. vii. 59. So οὐκ ἔμελλον εἰ μὴ ναυκρατούσουσιν, they were not likely to have them (provisions) for the future (as they thought) unless they should hold the sea. Id. vii. 60. οὐκ ἔμελλον μᾶλλον ἢ ἄλλοι καθ' ἑμὲν οὐδὲ οὐτω πρῆξαι, εἰ μὴ τοῖς Φωκίαις πολέμῳ, he was none the more able even then to do you any great harm (he thought) unless he should destroy the Phocians (εἰ μὴ ἴπολλοι). DEM. xix. 317. See Il. v. 301. Καὶ ἄγε τὴν Ἐθνην μακρῖσα, εἰς ἄληθες χεῖρα τῆν τε χην καὶ οὐτως ἡμελῆς διδῶσκει, I congratulated him (told him he was happy), if he really had this art. PLAT. Ap. 20B. (Here ἄχοι and διδῶσκοι might be used.)

[*] 697. III. Clauses containing a protasis depending on a past verb of emotion, like θαυμάζω, ἀσχηνομαί, etc. (494). E.g. θαύμαζε δὲ εἰ τις ἄρετὴν παγγελλόμενος ἄργυριον πρῆτοίτο, he wondered that any demanded money, etc. XEN. Mem. i. 2, 7. (But in i. 1, XEN. Mem. 13, we find θαύμαζε δὲ εἰ μὴ φανερόν ἄτολόν ἐστιν, he wondered that it was not plain.) χαίρον γὰρ ἐν εἰς τις ἴσοι, I rejoiced, being content if any one would let it pass. PLAT. Rep. 450A. Οὐκ ἄσχηνήν ἐστι τοιοῦτο κακὸν πᾶσι τῶν, he was not ashamed if (or that) he was bringing such a calamity on any one. DEM. xxi. 105. Τὸ δὲ μὴδὲν αὐτὸ συνειδῆτι δεινὸν εἴσσει, εἰ πονηρὸν ἄργον δόξει κοινῶν τῶν σιωπῆσαι, it seemed hard, if he was to appear to be implicated, etc.; he thought, δεινὸν ἐστὶν εἰ δόξω (407). Id. xix. 33. (Here δόξοι might be used like ἴσοι above.) Οὐ δὲ κτερον, εἰ ἄλλοισιν, and others pitied them if they were to be captured, the direct thought being we pity them if they are to be captured, εἰ ἄλλοισιν, which might be retained (see the next example). XEN. An. i. 4, 7. Οὐκ ἔφασαν πειτῆσαι, οὐκ ἔλεοντες τὴν τεχνη εἰ πεσεῖται, οὐδὲ κηδόμενοι τὴν νεῦν εἰ Λακεδαιμονίοις παραδοθῆσονται, i.e. they felt no pity for the walls if they were to fall, nor care for the ships if they were to be surrendered. LYS. xiii. 15.

[*] 698. IV. Temporal sentences expressing a past intention, purpose, or expectation, especially those introduced by ὡς or πρὶν, until, after past tenses. E.g. ἄρσε δὲ πρὶν κραιπνὴν Βορῆν, πρὶν δὲ κῆματ' ἄξεν, ὡς ἔγε Φαιάκεσσι φίληρῆτοισι μιγεῖν, i.e. to the end that (until) Ulysses should get to the Phaeacians; originally ὡς ἐν μιγῆ (614, 2). Od. v. 385. So εἰ ὡς θερμάνοιτο, Od. ix. 376. Σπονδῆς ποιῶσαντο ὡς ἄπαγγελθεῖν τὴν λεχθῆντα εἰς Λακεδαίμονα, they made a truce (to continue) until what had been said should be announced at Sparta; i.e. ὡς ἐν ἄπαγγελθῆν, which might have been retained. XEN. Hell. iii. 2, 20. πηγῆρευε μὴδὲνα βῆλλειν πρὶν Κῆρος ἡμψηθεῖν θηρῆν, "until Cyrus should be satisfied." Id. Cyr. i. 4, Id. Cyr. 14. (His words were πρὶν ἐν ἡμψηθεῖν.) Οὐ δὲ μῆνοντες ἴστασαν ἡπῆτε πᾶργος ἄχαιν ἄλλος ἡπελθῆν Τρῶων ἄρμῆσειε καὶ ἄρξειαν πολῆμοιο, i.e. they stood waiting for the time when, etc. Il. iv. 334. So Il. ii. 794. Πρὶν κῆνησαν τὴν σῆφος, ἄς παυσομῆνους τοῦ διωγμοῦ ἡπεῖ σῆς ἄδοιεν προορμῆσαντας, when they should see them, etc. XEN. Cyr. i. 4, 21.

Οὐ γὰρ δὲ σφεας ἡπῆει ἡ θεῆς τῆς ἡποικῆς πρὶν δὲ ἡπῆκωνται ἄς ἄτῆν Λιβῆν. HDT. iv. 157. (ἡπῆκοιντο might be used.) Οὐ δὲ Κορῆνοι οὐ προεθυμῆθησαν ζυμπλεῖν πρὶν τῆ ἡσθμια, ἡ τῆτε ἐν, διεορῆσωσιν, until they had (should have) finished celebrating the Isthmian games, which were then going on. THUC. viii. 9.

[*] 699. V. Past causal sentences in which the cause is stated as one assigned by another, so far as these allow the optative (714). E.g. κικίζον τι στρατηγος οκ πεξγοι, they abused him because (as they said) he did not lead them out. THUC. ii. 21. See other examples under 714.

Though the optative is allowed here, on the principle of indirect discourse, the indicative of the direct form (e.g. πεξγει in the above example) seems not to have been allowed (see 715). Causal sentences are usually constructed without reference to the principle of indirect discourse (see 713).

[*] 700. VI. Even some ordinary relative sentences expressing the previous thought of another, which allow the optative in place of the ordinary indicative. E.g. Κα τεε σμα δσθαι, τι ο γαμβροο προτοιο φροιο, he asked to see the token, which (he said) he was bringing from Proetus, i.e. he said φροιοι. II. vi. 176. So Od. v. 240. Ερετο παδα τν Εδνα τκοι, "he asked for the child which Euadne had borne." PIND. Ol. vi. 49. Κατηρεον τν Αγνητων τ πεποικοιεν προδντες τν λλδα, i.e. they accused them for what (as they said) they had done. HDT. vi. 49. So τ πεπονθς εη, HDT. i. 44. "Καλε τν Λιον, μμην παλαιν σπερμτων χους, φ ν θνοι μν ατς, τν δ τκτουςαν λποι," "by which (as she said) he had perished himself, and had left her the mother, etc." SOPH. O.T. 1245. If the relative clause contained merely the idea of the speaker, θανε and λιπε would be used. Here no ambiguity can arise from the use of the aorist optative (see 693). Τ το κρεττονος ζυμφρον λεγεν γοτο κρετων ατ ζυμφρειν, "he meant the superior's advantage which the superior believed to be his own advantage." PLAT. Rep. 340B. This construction is rare in Attic Greek, but is not uncommon in Herodotus.

[*] 701. The imperfect and pluperfect occasionally represent the present and perfect indicative in this construction. Such clauses are simply not included in the indirect discourse. (See 674; 691.) E.g. τομος ν, ε μν των τι εργαστο, δκην δοναι, ε δ πολυθεη, ρχειν, he was ready, if he had done any of these things, to be punished; but if he should be acquitted, to hold his command. THUC. vi. 29. (Ε εργαστο represents ε εργασμαι, while ε πολυθεη represents ν πολυθ.)

[*] 702. ν is occasionally retained with relatives and temporal particles in sentences of this kind, even when the subjunctive to which they belonged has been changed to the optative. (See 692.) E.g. Τος δ λαμβνοντας τς μιλλας μισθν νδραποδιστς αυτν πεκλει, δι τ ναγκαον ατος εναι διαλγεσθαι παρ ν ν λβοιεν τν μισθν, because they were obliged (as he said) to converse with those from whom they received the pay. XEN. Mem. i. 2, 6. (Here ν ν λβοιεν represents ν ν λβωσιν.) Κα μοι τδ ν προρητα, τ φρμακον τοτο σζειν μ ως ν ρτχριστον ρμσαμ που. SOPH. Tr. 687 (see Schneidewin's note). ξουν ατος μαστιγον τν κδοθντα ως ν τληθ δξειεν ατος λγειν. ISOC. xvii. 15. Χαρειν ης ν κα οκ ποκρναιο ως ν τ πκενης ρμηθντα σψαιο, you would not answer (you would say) until you should have examined, etc. (ως ν σψωμαι). PLAT. Phaed. 101D. Here we must place ταν κςζοατο, AESCH. Pers. 450, if the text is sound. Παργγειλεν ατος μ προτερον πιτθεσθαι προν ν τν σφετρων πσοι τις τρωθεη. XEN. Hell. ii. 4, 18 ; so προν ν μετχοιεν, XEN. Hell. ii. 3, 48. See ως ν ο νμοι τεθεεν. AND. i. 81. Many scholars repudiate this use of ν and emend the passages: see Dindorf on SOPH. Tr. 687.

It is doubtful whether οὐκ was ever thus used with the optative.

[*] 703. Upon this principle (694) final and object clauses with να, ζ, πως, φρα, and μ, after past tenses, admit the double construction of indirect discourse, and allow the subjunctive or the future indicative instead of the optative, to retain the form in which the purpose would be originally conceived. (See 318 and 339.)

[*] 704. The principles of indirect discourse (689, 2) apply to future conditional and conditional relative clauses which depend upon final and object clauses or other expressions of purpose after past tenses. E.g. λθόντες ζ Λακεδαίμονα (πρασσον) πως τοιμύσαιντο τιμωραν, ν δ. THUC. i. 58. (Here ε δμοι might have been used.) φοβετο γρ μ ο Λακεδαιμόνιοι σφζ, πτε σαφζ κοσειαν, οκτι φσιν. Id. i. 91. (Here πταν κοσωσιν is changed to πτε κοσειαν, although φσιν is retained.) οδμτι, without a Verb.

[*] 705. Οδμτι sometimes means I am sure, when the context readily suggests a verb for τι. E.g. Πρειμι δμκων οχ κοσιν, οδμτι, and here I am, against my will, and against your will, I am sure. SOPH. Ant. 276. Μτν Δμ οκουν τ γε σ, σφμ σθμτι, i.e. be assured. AR. Pl. 889. Πντων οδμτι φησντων γμν, when all, I am sure, would say. DEM. ix. 1. Βολομαι μνημονεοντας μν οδμτι τοζ πολλοζ πομνσαι, i.e. I wish to remind you, though I am sure most of you remember it. Id. xix. 9. In such cases it would be useless or impossible to add the implied verb.

πως, ο, ονεκα, and θεονεκα, in Indirect Quotations.

[*] 706. πως is sometimes (especially in poetry) used in indirect quotations in the sense of ζ. E.g. Τοτ ατμ μοι φρζ, πως οκ ε κακζ, this very thing tell me not, that you are not base. SOPH. O.T. 548. ναξ, ρμν οχ πως τχους πο δσπνους κνω, "I will not say exactly that I come breathless with haste." Id. Ant. 223. Μ γρ λπσζ πως μμ κβαλεζ, "for do not hope that you will expel me." EUR. Her. 1051. So SOPH. El. 963. νπεισον κως μοι μενω στ τατα οτω ποιεμενα. HDT. i. 37. Ομν οδμ φσω κως Αγγπτιοι παρμ λλνων λαβον τοτο. Id. ii. 49. So iii. 115, Id. 116. See also πως οπντα πσταμαι, PLAT. Euthyd. 296E. In most of these, the original modal force of πως, how, can be seen. In SOPH. Ant. 685, we have πως σμ μ λγεις ρθζ τδε, where μ is a standing puzzle. It probably must be classed with the very rare τι μ with the indicative, and with the irregular μ with the infinitive after verbs of saying and thinking (for all these see 685 and 686, above).

[*] 707. Οοχ πως, οοχ τι, etc.) Οοχ πως or (rarely) μ πως, and οοχ τι or μ τι, by the ellipsis of a verb of saying, often mean I do not speak of or not to speak of. λλ, λλ κα, λλ οδμ, or λλ μηδ usually follows in a clause which expresses a strong antithesis. After οοχ the implied verb of saying would be an indicative, after μ it would be an imperative or subjunctive; but, like most elliptical idioms, this is often used where the ellipsis cannot be precisely supplied. What is mentioned in the former clause as not to be spoken of may be understood to be either affirmed or negated by the expression, according to the context; so that the force of οοχ πως may sometimes be conveniently given by not only, sometimes by so far from (not only not). E.g. Οοχ πως τσκεη πδοσθε, λλ κα α θραι φηρπσθησαν, not to speak of your selling the furniture (i.e. not only did you sell the furniture, but), even the doors were carried off.

LYS. xix. 31. (With λγω supplied with οχ πως we have I do not speak of your selling the furniture; but this would be awkward, and probably no precise verb was thought of.) Εκατρωσεν κενος, οχ τι των ντων ν πεστερμην, λλλ οδν ζην, if he had succeeded, not to speak of being deprived of my property, (not only should I have been deprived of my property, but) I should not even be alive. DEM. xxiv. 7. Οκ στιν ξια μ τι δυον ταλντοιν προσδου, λλλ οδ εκοσι μνν, it is not sufficient to represent an income even of twenty minas, not to speak of two talents. Id. xxxvi. 39. Τνδε οχ πως κωλυτα γενσεσθε, λλλ κα π τς μετρρας ρχς δναμιν προσλαβεν περιψεσθε, not to speak of (so far from) your becoming a hindrance to them, you will even permit them to add to their power from your own dominions. THUC. i. 35. Μ πως ρχεσθαι ν υθυμ, λλλ οδ ρθοσθαι δνασθε, not to speak of dancing in time, you could not even stand erect. XEN. Cyr. i. 3, 10. Τος Θηβαους γετο σειν πως βολεται πρτειν αυτν, κα οχ πως ντιπρξειν κα διακωλσειν, λλλ κα συστρατεσειν, he thought the Thebans would let him do as he pleased, and—not to speak of opposing and hindering him—would even join forces with him. DEM. vi. 9. (Here no definite verb can be supplied.) δδασκον τν δμον ς οχ πως τιμωρσαιντο, λλλ κα παινσαιεν τν Σφοδραν, that, so far from having punished S. , they had even praised him (οχ πως with an optative after ς in indirect discourse). XEN. Hell. v. 4, 34.

[*] 708. Occasionally one of these expressions stands in the second clause; as δι τν χειμνα οδ πλεν, μ τι ναιρεσθαι τος νδρας, δυνατν ν, on account of the storm it was not possible even to sail, much less to pick up the men (not to speak of picking up the men). XEN. Hell. ii. 3, 35. So πεπαμεθ μες, οχ πως σε πασομεν, we have been stopped ourselves; there is no talk of our stopping you, SOPH. El. 796.

Compare DEM. xix. 137: πθετο ατν οδ το ζν ντα κριον ατ βεβαισαι, μ τι γ κεν πσχετο πρξαι, i.e. not at all (much less) to do what he had promised him.

[*] 709. 1. In Homer , the neuter of ς, is used like τι, that. E.g.

Γιγσκων ο ατς περεχε χερας πλλων, “knowing that Apollo himself held over him his hands.” Il. v. 433. Ε νυ κα μες δμεν τοι σθνος οκ πεικτν. Il. viii. 32. Λεσσετε γρ τ γε πντες, μοι γρας ρχεται λλλ, “that my prize goes elsewhere.” Il. i. 120. So Od. xii. 295. (See 663, Od. 1, and 671.)

2. In the following cases τ for τε (neuter of ς τε) is used in Homer like and τι:—Γιγσκων τ ναλκις ην θες, “knowing that the Goddess was weak.” Il. v. 331: so xvii. 623, Od. viii. 299. ς εδονθ τ ρ κ Δις λυθεν ρνις. Il. viii. 251. Νν δ δη τδε δλον, τ οκτι νστιμς στιν. Od. xx. 333.

Since τι does not allow elision, it is now customary to write this form τ (as above). But Schmitt (after Capelle) writes τ in all these cases, assuming the form to be an elided τε (709, 3).

3. In a few cases τε, when, is used in Homer in a sense which approaches very near that of τι, that. E.g.

οὐδὲ λαθ' Ἀγαντα Ζεῦς, τε δὲ Τρῆεσσι δῶδον ἔκιν, i.e. nor was Ajax unaware that Zeus was giving victory to the Trojans (lit. when Zeus was giving). Il. xvii. 626. Compare Il. xxiv. 563, οὐδὲ με λήθεις, ἅτι θεὸν τῆς σῆγε. See Schmitt, pp. 40-50. This occasional use of τε seems hardly to justify the assumption that τ in all the cases in 709, 2 stands for τε.

[*] 710. 1. Ονεκα in Homer, and θενεκα and ονεκα in the tragedians, are sometimes used like τι or ς, that. E.g.

Πεθετο γὰρ Κίπρονδε μῆγα κλέος, ονεκα χαίοι ς Τροίην νεσσιν ναπλεσεσθαι μελλον, for in Cyprus he heard a mighty rumour, that the Achaeans were about to sail for Troy in ships. Il. xi. 21. So Od. v. 216, Od. xiii. 309. γγελλε θενεκα τθνηκ ρστης, "report that Orestes is dead." SOPH. El. 47; see SOPH. El. 1478. σθι τοτο, ονεκα λλην ς σμεν, know this, that we are Greeks. Id. Ph. 232. κδιδαχθε ς ονεκα κουσα ρξειεν τεδε. Id. Tr. 934.

2. Διτι is sometimes used in the sense of τι, that, by Aristotle, and occasionally by Herodotus and even by Isocrates. E.g. Διτι μν τονυν οχ ατ (sc. στ), φανερν κ τοτων, i.e. that it is not the same, is plain from this. ARISTOT. Pol. iii. 4, 7. So Metaph. x. 5, 3. Διτι κ τν βαρβρων κει, πυθανμενος οτω ερσσκω ν. HDT. ii. 50: see ii. 43 (with Stein's note). See ISOC. iv. 48: συνειδυα τι τοτο . . . φυμεν χοντες, κα διτι . . . ατν διηνγκαμεν.

τι, before Direct Quotations.

[*] 711. Even direct quotations are sometimes introduced by τι, rarely by ς, without further change in the construction. τι or ς here cannot be expressed in English. E.g. δ πεκρνατο τι Οδ ε γενομην, Κρε, σο γ ν ποτε τι δξαμι. XEN. An. i. 6, 8. πεκρνατο τι δσποτα, ο ζ. Id. Cyr. vii. 3, Id. Cyr. 3. Επε δ τι Ες καιρν κεις, φη, πως τς δκης κοσς. Ib. iii. 1, Ib. 8. ρομεν πρς ατος, τι δκκει γρ μς πλις, κα οκ ρθς τν δκην κρινε,—τατα τ ρομεν; PLAT. Crit. 50B ; so Phaed. 60A. ν λγ τις τληθ, τι Ληρετε, νδρες θηναοι. DEM. viii. 31: so xviii. 40, 174; xix. 22, 40, 253. See also HDT. ii. 115 (the earliest example); THUC. i. 137, THUC. iv. 38; AND. i. 49; LYS. i. 26; AESCHIN. iii. 22, AESCHIN. 120; DIN. i. 12 102 (both with ς).53 Section IX: Causal Sentences.

[*] 712. Causal sentences express the cause of something stated in the leading sentence. They may be introduced by τι, διτι or διπερ, ς, ονεκα or θενεκα, because; by πε, πειδ, τε, πτε, ετε, and sometimes που, since, seeing that; and in Homer by ο or τε (τ), because.

[*] 713. (Indicative.) Causal sentences regularly take the indicative, after both primary and secondary tenses; past causes being expressed by the past tenses of the indicative. The negative particle is ο. E.g. Κδετο γὰρ Δαναον, τι α θνσκοντας ρτο, for she pitied the Danans, because she saw them dying. Il. i. 56. Χωμενος, τ ριστον χαίν οδν τισας, angry, because you did in no way honour the best of the Achaeans. Il. i. 244. Δημοβρος βασιλες, πε οτιδανοσιν νσσεις. Il. i. 231. Μ δ οτως κλπτε ν, πε ο παρελεσεαι οδ με πεσεις. Il. i. 132. Νοσον ν στρατν ρσε κακν, λκοντο δ λαο, ονεκα τν Χρσην τμασεν ρητρα τρεδης. Il. i. 11. Τηλμαχον θαμαζον, θαρσαλως γρευν, "because he spoke boldly." Od. i. 382. Κα τριρης δ τοι σεσαγμνη νθρπων

δι■ τ■ ■λλο φοβερ■ν ■στι ■ ■τι ταχ■ πλε■; δι■ τ■ δ■ ■λλο ■λυποι ■λλ■λοις ε■σ■ν ο■
 ■μπλ■οντες ■ δι■τι ■ν τ■ξει κ■θηνται; XEN. Oec. viii. 8. Ο■ ■μο■ φ■λοι ο■τως ■χοντες
 περ■ ■μο■ διατελο■σιν, ο■ δι■ τ■ φιλε■ν ■μ■, ■λλ■ δι■περ κα■ α■το■ ■ν ο■ονται
 β■λλιτσιστοι γ■γγεσθαι. Id. Mem. iv. 8, Id. Mem. 7. Ο■ ■θηνα■οι ■ν■μιζον ■σσ■σθαι ■τι ο■
 πολ■ ■ν■κων, "the Athenians thought they were defeated because they were not signally
 victorious." THUC. vii. 34. Μ■λλ■ν τι ■δεινολογε■το ■τι μιν ■π■κτεινε τ■ν α■τ■ς φ■νου
 ■κ■θηρε. HDT. i. 44. Πρ■ς τα■τα κρ■πτε μηδ■ν, ■ς ■ π■νθ■ ■ρ■ν κα■ π■ντ■ ■κο■ων
 π■ντ■ ■ναπτ■σσει χρ■νος, i.e. since time develops all things. SOPH. Fr. 280. Μ■γα δ■ τ■
 ■μο■ τραφ■ναι, ■πε■ κα■ το■ς θηρ■οις π■θος τις ■γγ■γεται τ■ν συντρ■φων. XEN. Mem. ii.
 3, 4. ■τ■ ο■ν παραινο■σ■ ο■δ■ν ■ς πλ■ον ποι■, XEN. Mem. i ■κ■τις ■φ■γμαi. SOPH. O.T.
 918. ■π■τε ο■ν π■λις μ■ν τ■ς ■δ■ας ξυμφορ■ς ο■α τε φ■ρειν, ε■ς δ■ ■καστος τ■ς κέ■νης
 ■δ■νατος (sc. ■στ■), π■ς ο■ χρ■ π■ντας ■μ■νειν α■τ■; THUC. ii. 60. ■τε το■νυν το■θ■
 ο■τως ■χει, προσ■κει προθ■μως ■θ■λειν ■κο■ειν τ■ν βουλομ■νων συμβου-
 λε■ειν. DEM. i. 1. For ε■τε, since, see SOPH. Aj. 715, O. C. 84; for ■που (■κου) see HDT. i. 68.

[*] 714. (Optative.) When, however, the speaker implies that a cause was assigned by some other person, the principle of indirect discourse (694), after past tenses, allows the verb to stand in the optative, in the tense originally used by the person who assigned the cause (699). E.g. Τ■ν Περικλ■α ■κ■κιζον, ■τι στρατηγ■ς ■ν ο■κ ■πεξ■γοi, they abused Pericles, because being general he did not lead them out. THUC. ii. 21. (This states the reason of the Athenians for reproaching Pericles (■τι ■μ■ς ο■κ ■πεξ■γει); if Thucydides had wished to assign the cause merely on his own authority, he would have used ■τι ο■κ ■πεξ■γεν. Cf. THUC. vii. 34 in 713.) Το■ς συν■ντας ■δ■κει ποιε■ν ■π■χεσθαι τ■ν ■νοσ■ων, ■πε■περ ■ γ■σαιντο μηδ■ν ■ν ποτε ■ν πρ■ττοιεν θεο■ς διαλαθε■ν (see 693). XEN. Mem. i. 4, 19. Ο■σθα ■παιν■σαντα α■τ■ν (■μηρον■τ■ν ■γαμ■μνονα, ■ς βασιλε■ς ε■η ■γαθ■ς, because (as he said) he was a good king. Symp. iv. 6. ■κ■λλε . . . τ■ν μ■ν ■π■στιον (Δ■α), δι■τι φον■α το■ παιδ■ς ■λ■νθανε (694, 2) β■σκων, τ■ν δ■ ■ταιρ■τιον, ■ς φ■λακα συμπ■μψας α■τ■ν ε■ρ■κοi πολεμι■τατον. HDT. i. 44. (Croesus would have said δι■τι ■λ■νθανον and ■ς ε■ρηκα.)

[*] 715. We should suppose that in causal sentences of the latter class (714) the mood and tense by which the cause would be originally stated might also be retained, as in ordinary indirect discourse; so that in THUC. ii. 21, above, for example, we might have ■τι ο■κ ■π εξ■γει in the same sense as ■τι ο■κ ■πεξ■γοi. This, however, seems to have been avoided, to prevent the ambiguity which might arise from the three forms, ■πεξ■γεν, ■πεξ■γοi, and ■πεξ■γει. It will be remembered that the form ■πεξ■γεν, which is the most common in the expression of a past cause, is also the original form for expressing the corresponding time in indirect discourse, although it became exceptional here in the later usage (671; 674). For causal relative sentences see 580. For the causal participle see 838.

[*] 716. The optative in causal sentences is not found in Homer.

[*] 717. A cause may be expressed by a potential indicative or optative with ■ν.

Δ■ομαι ο■ν σου παραμε■ναι ■μ■ν: ■ς ■γ■ ο■δ■ ■ν ■ν■ς ■διον ■κο■σαιμι ■ σο■, "I beg you then to remain with us; as there is not one whom I should hear more gladly than you." PLAT. Prot. 335D. Ν■ν δ■, ■πειδ■ ο■κ ■θ■λεις κα■ ■μο■ τις ■σχολ■α ■στ■ κα■ ο■κ ■ν ο■■ς τ■ ε■ηην σοi παραμε■ναι ■ποτε■νοντι μακρο■ς λ■γους, ■λθε■ν γ■ρ πο■ με δε■, ε■μi: ■πε■ κα■

τατν σωσ οκ ηδς σου κουον (for πε see 719, 2). Ib. 335C. τι τν δικημων
ν μμνητο τν ατο, ε τι περ μο γ γραφεν. DEM. xviii. 79; so xviii. 49.

[*] 718. A causal sentence may be interrogative, or its verb may express a wish or a command.
E.g. πε, φρ επ, πο σ μντις ε σαφς; “for—come tell me—where do you ever show
yourself a prophet?” SOPH. O.T. 390. πε δδαξον, μθ ξ μο, τ μοι κρδος γνοιτ
ν. Id. El. 352: so O. C. 969. See PLAT. Gorg. 474 B: πε σ δξα ν; πε θεος φιλος
τι πματον λομαν, “for—may I perish!” SOPH. O.T. 662.

[*] 719. 1. A causal sentence may give the cause of something that is implied, but not expressed,
in the leading sentence. Especially it may give the reason for making a statement, rather than for
the fact stated. In dialogues, a causal sentence may refer to an implied yes or no. E.g.

Ο νυ κα μν οκοι νεστι γος, τι μ λθετε κηδσοντες; have you now no mourning at
home, that you have come to distress me? (i.e. I ask this, because you have come). Il. xxiv. 239.
(If the two clauses were reversed—have you come because you have no mourning at home?—the
causal relation would be plainer.) Ο μ τ φσκεθ πτροπον οκαδ κσθαι, τι μοι
κατεκερετε οκον, i.e. you thought I should never return (as is plain), because you wasted my
house. Od. xxii. 35. See πε in Od. i. 231. “ς στιν νδρς τοδε τργα τατ σοι,” “yes
(answering the preceding question), for here you have the deeds of this man.” SOPH. Aj. 39 : so
Ph. 812.

2. By a natural ellipsis, πε sometimes has virtually the force of although or and yet. E.g.

Ασχνομην ν γωγε τοτο μολογεν, πε πολλο γ φασι τν νθρπων, I should be
ashamed for my part to admit this, and yet many men do say so (in full, I speak for myself alone,
since many say this). PLAT. Prot. 333 C. See ibid. 335 C (quoted in 717), where πε ν . . .
κουον refers to the implied idea I am sorry after all to go. In Hom. Od. i. 236, πε ο κε . . .
καχομην, and yet I should not be thus afflicted by his death, refers to what ιστον suggests, I
am especially grieved by his death in obscurity (cf. vss. 241, Hom. Od. 242).

Section X: Expression of a Wish.

[*] 720. Wishes may be divided into two classes: (a) those referring to a future object, and (b)
those referring to a present or past object which (it is implied) is not or was not attained. To the
former class belong such wishes as O that he may come! or O that this may happen!—Utinam
veniat, Utinam fiat; and to the latter, such as O that this had happened! or O that this were
true!—Utinam hoc factum esset, Utinam hoc verum esset. From its use in wishes the optative
mood (γκλις εκτικ) received its name.

Wishes Referring to the Future.

[*] 721. A wish referring to the future may be expressed in Greek in two ways:—

I. by the optative alone; as in γνοιτο τοτο, may this happen, μ γνοιτο τοτο, may this not
happen;

II. by the optative with εθε or ε γρ (Homeric also αθε or α γρ), sometimes by the simple
ε, negatively εθε μ, ε γρ μ, etc.; as in εθε γνοιτο τοτο, O that this may happen, ε

γρ μ γνοιτο, O that it may not happen.

[*] 722. I. The pure optative in a wish (with no introductory particle) is an independent verb. E.g. μν μν θεο δοεν λμπια δματ χοντες κπρσαι Πριμοιο πλιν ε δ οκαδ κσθαι, may the Gods grant you to destroy Priam's city, etc. Il. i. 18. Μ μν σπουδ γε κα κλεις πολομην, may I not perish, etc. Il. xxii. 304. Μηκτ πειτ δυστι κρη μοισιν πεη, μηδ τι Τηλεμχοιο πατρ κεκλημνος εην, then may the head of Ulysses no longer stand on his shoulders, and no longer may I be called the father of Telemachus. Il. ii. 259. Τεθναην τε μοι μηκτι τατα μλοι, "may I die when these are no longer my care." MIMN. i. 2. Τ μν νν τατα πρσοις τπερ νν χερσ χεις, "may you for the present continue to do what you now have in hand." HDT. vii. 5. "πα, γνοιτο πατρς ετυχστερος" SOPH. Aj. 550. "Οτω νικσαιμ τ γ κα νομιζομην σοφς," "on this condition may I gain the prize (in this contest) and be (always) considered wise." AR. Nub. 520. "Θσω πρυτανε, μηκτι ζην γ," "or may I no longer live." Ib. 1255. Ξυνενγκοι μν τατα ς βουλμεθα, "may this prosper as we desire." THUC. vi. 20. λλ βουληθεης, "but may you only be willing!" PLAT. Euthyd. 296 D. "Πλοσιον δ νομζομι τν σοφν." Id. Phaedr. 279 C. Νικηη δ τι πσιν μν μλλει συνοσειν, "and may that opinion prevail which is to benefit you all." DEM. iv. 51. τι δ μν δξειε, τοτ, πντες θεο, συνενγκοι (see 561). Id. ix. 76. So εν, well, be it so. For the relation of the optative in wishes to the optative in its most primitive meaning, see Appendix I.

[*] 723. II. The optative in a wish with εθε (αθε), ε γρ (α γρ), or ε is probably in its origin a protasis with the apodosis suppressed. E.g. Αθ οτως π πσι χλον τελσε γαμνων, "O if Agamemnon would thus fulfil his wrath upon all." Il. iv. 178. Αθ οτως, Εμαιε, φλον Δι πατρ γνοιτο ς μο, "mayest thou become in like manner a friend to father Zeus." Od. xiv. 440. Α γρ δ οτως εη, φλος Μενλαε, "O that this may be so." Il. iv. 189. Α γρ μο τοσσνδε θεο δναμιν περιθεεν, "O if the Gods would clothe me with so much strength!" Od. iii. 205. λλ ε μν εικισσαμεθ λντες, τεχεα τ μοιιν φελομεθα, κα τιν ταρων ατο μνομνων δαμασσαμεθα νηλι χαλκ, but if we could only take him and insult him, and strip him of his armour, and subdue, etc. Il. xvi. 559. 54 Εθε μποτε γοης ς ε, "may you never learn who you are." SOPH. O.T. 1068. "Εθ μιν μφον νος γνοιτο σωφρονεν" Id. Aj. 1264. "Εθε πας μς εθηρος εη" Bacch. 1252. Ε γρ γενομην, τκνον, ντ σο νεκρς. Id. Hipp. 1410. Εθ, λστε, σ τοιοτος ν φλος μν γνοιτο. XEN. Hell. iv. 1, 38. Ε γρ γνοιτο. Id. Cyr. vi. 1, Id. Cyr. 38. Ε γρ ν τοτ εη, "if it may only depend on this!" PLAT. Prot. 310D. "Εθε γρψειεν ς χρ, κ.τ.λ." Id. Phaedr. 227C. The simple ε (without -θε or γρ) with the optative in wishes is poetic. λλ ε τις κα τοσδε μετοιχμενος καλσειεν. Il. x. 111. See three other Homeric examples cited in the footnote.55 Ε μοι ξυνεη μορα. SOPH. O. T. 863. Ε μοι γνοιτο φθγγος ν βραχοσιν. EUR. Hec. 836. The future optative was not used in wishes. The perfect was probably not used, except in the signification of the present (see 48); as in Il. ii. 259, quoted in 722.

[*] 724. In Homer, as the examples show, both present and aorist optative are freely used in future wishes, as in the corresponding future conditions (455). But the present optative in Homer also expresses a present wish implying that it is not attained, as it may express a present unreal condition (438). For this use, see 739.

[*] 725. In the poets, especially Homer, the simple optative may express a command or exhortation, in a sense approaching that of the imperative. E.g. Τάτ' εἰποις χίλι, (you may) say this to Achilles. Il. xi. 791. Τέθναης, Πρωτ', κέκτανε Βελλεροφόντην, (you may) either die, or kill Bellerophon. Il. vi. 164. ἄλλ' τις Δόλιον κάλει, "let some one call Dolios." Od. iv. 735. So in prohibitions with μή: μηδ' ἴσσι πιδεσσιν ποστρηφειας λυμπον, Il. iii. 407 (between two pairs of imperatives). See also AESCH. Prom. 1049 and 1051. For Homeric optatives (without ν), which form a connecting link between the potential and the wishing optative (like Il. iv. 18, Il. 19), see 13 and 233.

[*] 726. The poets, especially Homer, sometimes use ζ before the optative in wishes. This ζ cannot be expressed in English, and it is probably exclamatory. It must not be confounded with οτως used as in 727. E.g. ζ πλοῖτο κάλλος τις τοιαύτ' γε ζοι, O that any other may likewise perish, etc. Od. i. 47. See Od. xxi. 201. ζ τδε πορν λοιτ', εμοι θμῖς τδ' αδ'ν. SOPH. El. 126. Compare "ut pereat telum," HOR. Sat. ii. 1. 43 .

[*] 727. Οτως, thus, on this condition, may be prefixed to the optative in protestations, where a wish is expressed upon some condition; the condition being usually added in another clause. E.g. Οτως ναισθε τοτων, μη περιδητ' με, may you enjoy these on this condition,—do not neglect me. DEM. xxviii. 20.

[*] 728. When the potential optative is used to express a wish, as in πς ν λομην, how gladly should I perish, EUR. Supp. 796, it does not belong here, as λομην ν and λομην are, in use, wholly different constructions. If ε γρ κεν μμνοις, Hom. Od. xv. 545, is a wish, ε κεν may be used as it often is in protasis in Homer (460) in the same sense as ε, or the optative may be potential in the sense O if you could remain. In Hom. Il. vi. 281, ζ κ ο' αθι γαα χνοι, if κ is correct, must mean O that the earth could gape for him at once (potential). But the exceptional character of these expressions makes both suspicious. Hermann and Bekker read ε γρ κα in Hom. Od. xv. 545; and Bekker reads ζ δ in Hom. Il. vi. 281.

[*] 729. The infinitive occurs twice in Homer in wishes with α γρ: see 786, and 739 (end). For the infinitive used like the simple optative in wishes, especially in poetry, see 785.

[*] 730. There are many passages in Homer in which it is open to doubt whether the poet intended to express a wish with some form of ε, followed by a potential optative in a new sentence, or to form a complete conditional sentence. Such are—

Ε γρ πρσιν τλος μετρσι γνοιτο: οκ ν τις τοτων γε θρονον κοιτο. Od. xvii. 496. Α γρ τοτο, ξενε, ποσ τετελεσμων εη: τ κε τχα γοης φιλτητ τε πολλ τε δρα ξ με. Od. xv. 536.

If we keep the colon after γνοιτο in the former passage, we may translate, O that fulfilment may be granted our prayers: not one of these would (then) see the fair-throned Dawn. With a comma after γνοιτο, we may translate, if fulfilment should be granted our prayers, not one of these would see the fair-throned Dawn. So in the second passage we may translate, according to the punctuation, O that this word may be accomplished: then would you quickly be made aware of kindness and many gifts from me;—or if this word should be accomplished, you would then quickly be made aware, etc. These are probably rightly punctuated above, especially the second; and the wish is on the verge of independent existence, being almost ready to dispense with the apodosis.

The half-independent half-dependent nature of such clauses is best seen in a case like the following, where εἴθελοι is first stated as an independent wish, and is afterwards repeated as the protasis of a regular apodosis:—

Εἴ γάρ σὺ εἴθελοι φιλεῖν γλαυκῆπις ἠθνήης τῆς τῆς δῖσσοσ περικλυδοῦ κυδαλλμοιο δῆμιον Τρωῶν, ἴθι πύσχομεν ἄλγῶ χαίω: . . . εἴ σὺ οὔτως ἠθλοῖ φιλεῖν κδοῖτῆ τε θυμῶ, τῶ κῆν τις κῆνων γε κῆ κλελλθοῖτο γῆμοιο. Od. iii. 217. The meaning is, if only Athena would love you as she then loved Ulysses; . . . if (I say) she would thus love you, then would many a one (of the suitors) cease to think of marriage. Here, instead of leaving a simple apodosis like the καλῆς ἴν χῶι of Aristarchus to be mentally supplied, or to be felt without being actually supplied, the protasis is repeated (as if by afterthought) and a more precise form of conclusion is then actually expressed.

Such examples as the first two are sometimes adduced as evidence that εἴ with the optative in protasis was originally a form of wish, to which an apodosis was afterwards appended. For a discussion of this view, see Appendix I.

Wishes (Not Attained) in Present or Past Time.

[*] 731. A wish referring to a present or past object, which (it is implied) is not or was not attained, may be expressed in Greek in two ways:—

I. by the past tenses of the indicative, used as in unreal conditions, with εἴθε or εἴ γάρ; or

II. by φελον, aorist of φελλω, owe, with the infinitive.

[*] 732. I. The past tenses of the indicative with εἴθε or εἴ γάρ, in present and past wishes, correspond to the optative with these particles in future wishes. The construction was originally a protasis with its apodosis suppressed, εἴ γάρ με εἴδες meaning, O if you had seen me! This form of wish is common in the Attic writers, but is unknown to Homer (735). The imperfect and aorist indicative are distinguished here as in the unreal condition (410). E.g. εἴ γάρ γῆ, εἴθε μῆ δῖξω, O Earth, Earth, would that thou hadst received me. AESCH. Ag. 1537. “Εἴ γάρ μῆ πῆ γῆν κῆν,” “O if he had sent me beneath the earth.” Id. Prom. 152. Εἴθε σε εἴθε σε μῆ ποτῆ εἴδῆμαν. SOPH. O.T. 1217. Εἴθε εἴρομῆν ζῆ, ἴδητε, μῆ λυποῆμενον. EUR. Alc. 536. Εἴθε σοι, ἴ Περῆ κλεις, τῆτε συνεγενῆμην, “would that I had met you then.” XEN. Mem. i. 2, 46. Εἴθε εἴχες, ἴ τεκοῆσα, βελτῆους φῆνας, O mother, would that you had a better understanding. EUR. El. 1061. Εἴ γάρ τοσαῆτην δῆναμιν εἴχον, “would that I had so great power.” Id. Alc. 1072. Εἴθε ἴσθα δυνατῆς δῆν ἴσον πῆθυμος εἴ. Id. Her. 731.

[*] 733. The indicative cannot be used in wishes without εἴθε or εἴ γάρ, as it would occasion ambiguity; this cannot arise in the case of the optative, which is not regularly used in independent sentences without ἴν, except in wishes. SOPH. OC 1713, εἴ, μῆ γῆς πῆ ξῆνας θανεῆν χῆρῆζες (so the MSS.) is often quoted to show that at least the indicative with μῆ alone can be used in negative wishes, with the translation, O that thou hadst not chosen to die in a foreign land. But the passage is probably corrupt, as the following words ἴλλῆ ἴρημος ἴθανες show. See, however, Hermann’s note on this passage, and on Aul. 575.

[*] 734. II. The aorist φελον, ought, and sometimes (in Homer) the imperfect φελλον, of φελλω (Epic φῆλλω), owe, debeo, may be used with the infinitive to express a present or past

unattained wish. The present infinitive is used when the wish refers to the present or to continued or repeated past action, and the aorist (rarely the perfect) when it refers to the past.

■φελον or ■φελλον may be preceded by the particles of wishing, ε■θε and ε■ γ■ρ, and in negative wishes by μ■ (not ο■). E.g. ■φελε το■το ποιε■ν, would that he were (now) doing this (lit. he ought to be doing it), or would that he had (habitually) done this (lit. he ought to have done this). ■φελε το■το ποι■σαι, would that he had done this.

■ν ■φελον τριτ■την περ ■χων ■ν δ■μασι μο■ραν να■ειν, ο■ δ■ ■νδρες σ■οι ■μμεναι ο■ τ■τ■ ■λοντο, O that I were living with even a third part, etc., and that those men were safe who then perished. Od. iv. 97. So Il. i. 415. ■νδρ■ς ■πειτ■ ■φελλον ■με■νονος ε■ναι ■κοιτις, ■ς ■δη ν■μεσ■ν τε κα■ α■σχεα π■λλ■ ■νθρ■πων, O that I were the wife of a better man, who knew, etc. Il. vi. 350. Τ■ν ■φελ■ ■ν ν■εσσι κατακτ■μεν ■ρτεμις ■■, O that Artemis had slain her, etc. Il. xix. 59. Α■θ■ ■φελλες στρατο■ ■λλου σημα■νειν. Il. xiv. 84. Α■θ■ ■μα π■ντες ■κτορος ■φ■λετ■ ■ντ■θο■ς ■π■ νηυσ■ πεφ■σθαι, "would that ye all had been slain instead of Hector." Il. xxiv. 253. Μηδ■ ■φελες λ■σσεσθαι ■μ■μονα Πηλε■ωνα, "would that you had not besought the son of Peleus." Il. ix. 698. (See 736, below.) So xviii. 86; Od. viii. 312. Μηκ■τ■ ■πειτ■ ■φειλον (?) ■γ■ π■μπτοισι μετε■ναι ■νδρ■σιν, ■λλ■ ■πρ■σθε θανε■ν ■ ■πειτα γεν■σθαι, would that I were no longer living with this fifth race of men, but had either died before it or been born after it. HES. Op. 174. ■λ■σθαι ■φελον τ■δ■ ■μ■ρ■, "O that I had perished on that day." SOPH. O.T. 1157. Μ■ ποτ■ ■φελον λιπε■ν τ■ν Σκ■ρον, "O that I never had left Scyros." Id. Ph. 969. See Id. El. 1021. Ε■θ■ ■φελ■ ργο■ς μ■ διαπτ■σθαι σκ■φος Κ■λχων ■ς α■αν κυαν■ας Συμπληγ■δας. EUR. Med. 1. Ε■ γ■ρ ■φελον ο■ο■ τε ε■ναι ο■ πολλο■ τ■ μ■γιστα κακ■ ■ξεργ■ζεσθαι, O that the multitude were able, etc. PLAT. Crit. 44D. Ε■ γ■ρ ■φελον (sc. κατιδε■ν). Rep. 432C. Παθ■ντων ■ μ■ ποτ■ ■φελον (sc. παθε■ν), when they suffered what would they had never suffered. DEM. xviii. 288; so 320. So ■ς μ■ποτε ■φελεν, XEN. Cyr. iv. 6, 3 (see 737).

[*] 735. This form with ■φελον or ■φελλον is the only expression known to Homer for past wishes, the secondary tenses of the indicative being not yet used in this construction, although they were already in good use in past (though not in present) conditions (435). In present wishes, Homer has the present optative (739) as well as the construction with ■φελον. (See 438.)

[*] 736. For an explanation of the origin of the use of ■φελον in wishes, see 424. It is there seen to be analogous to ■δει and χρ■ν with the infinitive, implying that what ought to be or to have been does not or did not happen. Only after its original meaning was obscured by familiar use could ε■θε or ε■ γ■ρ have been prefixed to it. Μ■ ■φελον may be explained in the same way; or we may suppose that μ■ originally belonged to the infinitive, and afterwards came to negative the whole expression. See the examples in 734.

[*] 737. ■ς, used as in 726, often precedes ■φελον etc. in Homer, and rarely in the Attic poets. E.g. ■λυθες ■κ πολ■μου; ■ς ■φελες α■τ■θ■ ■λ■σθαι, "would you had perished there." Il. iii. 428. ■ς δ■ μ■ ■φελον νικ■ν τοι■δ■ π■ ■θλ■, "O that I had not been victorious in such a contest." Od. xi. 548. ■ς ■φελλ■ ■λ■νης ■π■ φ■λον ■λ■σθαι. Od. xiv. 68. So Il. iii. 173, Il. xxii. 481. ■ς πρ■ν διδ■ξαι γ■ ■φελες μ■σος διαρραγ■ναι, "would that you had split in two before you ever taught it." AR. Ran. 955.

[*] 738. Neither the secondary tenses of the indicative nor the form with **φελον** in wishes can (like the optative) be preceded by the simple **ε** (without **-θε** or **γρ**).

[*] 739. **Present Wishes in Homer.**) In Homer a present unattained wish may be expressed by the present optative, like a present unfulfilled condition (438). Here **εθε** or **ε γρ** generally introduces the wish. E.g.

ε γρ γν οτω γε Δις π τις αγιχοιο εην ματα πντα, τκοι δ με πνια ρη, τιομην δ τ τετ θηναη κα πλλων, ς νν μμρη δε κακν φρει ργεοισιν,

O that I were the son of Zeus, and that Hera were my mother, and that I were honoured as Athena and Apollo are honoured, etc. Il. xiii. 825. (Here **τκοι** is nearly equivalent to **μτηρ εη**: cf. **τεκοσα**, O mother, quoted under 732.) Almost the same wish occurs in Il. viii. 538.

γρον, εθ ς θυμ ς νν σθεσσι φλοισιν ς τοι γοναθ ποιτο, βη δ τοι μπεδος εη: λλ σε γρας τερει μοιον: ς φελν τις νδρν λλος χειν, σ δ κουροισι μετεναι, would that, even as thy spirit is in thy breast, so thy knees obeyed and thy strength were firm. Il. iv. 313. At the end we have the more common form of a present wish, **φελν τις λλος χειν**, would that some other man had it (**γρας**).

εθ ς ββοιμι, βη δ μοι μπεδος εη: τ κε τχ ντσειε μχης κορυθαολος κτωρ,

O that I were again so young, and my strength were firm, etc. Il. vii. 157. The same wish, in precisely the same words, occurs also in Il. xi. 670, Il. xxiii. 629, and Od. xiv. 468; also in Il. vii. 132 in the form **α γρ, Ζε τε πτερ, . . . βμ ς τ . . . μχοντο**. See Od. xiv. 503, **ς νν ββοιμι**, repeating the idea of vs. 468. In Od. xviii. 79 we have **νν μν μτ εης, βουγιε, μτε γνοιο**, better that thou wert not now, thou braggart, and hadst never been born, where **γνοιο** looks like a past wish; but not having been born may be included in the present wish of **εης**: compare **τκοι** in Il. xiii. 826 (above). For **α γρ λασαατο**, Il. x. 536, see 93 (end). For the infinitive with **γρ** in a past unattained wish in Homer, see 786.

[*] 740. It has been seen that the use of the moods and tenses in both classes of wishes with **ε γρ** and **εθε** is precisely the same as in the corresponding forms of protasis (455; 410). The analogy with the Latin is also the same as in protasis:— **ε γρ τοτο ποιοη** (or **ποισειεν**), O si hoc faciat, O that he may do this; **ε γρ τοτο ποει**, O si hoc faceret, O that he were doing this; **ε γρ τοτο ποησεν**, O si hoc fecisset, O that he had done this; **ε γρ μ γνετο**, utinam ne factum esset, O that it had not happened.

It must be remembered that it is the futurity of the object of a wish, and not its probability or possibility, that requires the optative. No amount of absurdity or extravagance in a future wish can make anything but the optative proper in expressing it. As Aristotle says (Eth. iii. 2, Eth. 7), **βολησις δ στ τν δυντων, οον θανασας**, wish may refer to impossibilities, as that we may live for ever; but this very wish would require the optative. So no amount of reasonableness in a present or past wish can make the imperfect or aorist indicative improper; for we may wish that the most reasonable thing were or had been ours, only such wishing implies that we do not or did not have it.

1 When the idea of ability, possibility, or necessity is the chief element in the expression, and is not (as above) merely auxiliary, it is expressed by a special verb like δ[ι]ναμαι, δε[ο], or χρ[ε]. Especially, the idea of obligation is generally expressed by δε[ο] or χρ[ε] with the infinitive; as “το[υ]δε[ο] χρ[ε] κλ[ε]ιν,” “him we must obey,” SOPH. Ant. 666.

2 We are probably justified in assuming that the past meaning which here appears in crederes, etc. is the original meaning of the Latin imperfect subjunctive in this use, as it certainly is that of the Greek imperfect indicative with [ι]ν. See 435.

3 See Postgate in Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society, III. 1, pp. 50-55.

4 Other examples in Plato are Phaed. 67B, Phaed. 69A; Theaet. 188D; Crat. 429C, Crat. 432A, Crat. 432B, Crat. 435C, Crat. 438C, Crat. 440C; Men. 89C, Men. 94B; Lys. 209A, Lys. 219D, Lys. 220A; Symp. 214C; Parm. 130D, Parm. 132B, Parm. 134E, Parm. 136D; Leg. 635; Theag. 122B; Amat. 137 See Weber B. (pp. 191, 192), who gives these examples in Plato, with HDT. v. 79 and DEM. i. 26, as the only cases of independent μ[ε] or μ[ε] ο[υ] in this peculiar sense before Aristotle.

5 See Weber, pp. 85, 95, 113, 124, for the history of this usage. Weber cites 41 examples from Aristophanes, besides Ach. 343; 13 from Plato, whose extraordinary use of the independent sentence with μ[ε] has been noticed; 7 from Xenophon, 9 from Demosthenes, 2 from Lysias, and one from Isaeus.

6 See Brugmann, Griechische Grammatik, p. 122.

7 See Gildersleeve in Jour. Phil. iv. p. 422.

8 Weber (p. 174) quotes two passages of Demosthenes as examples of final [ς] with the future indicative, a construction otherwise unknown in Attic prose: [ς] δ[ε] σαφ[ε]ς γν[ω]σεσθε [τι] [ληθ] [λ] [γω], [γ] [μ] [ν] [ρ], xxiv. 146; and [ς] δ[ε] καταφαν[ς] [ς] [σται] [τι] πρ[ο]τερον [ναισχυντο] [ντες] περιεγ[νοντο], [ναγ] [γνωσκε] τ[ς] μαρτυρ[ας], xliii. 42. But compare the common formula of the orators [ς] (or [τι]) [ληθ] [λ] [γω], λαβ[ε] τ[ν] μαρτυρ[αν] (or κ[λει] το[ς] μ[ρτυρας]), e.g. in DEM. xxvii. 28, with the occasional full form, [να] ε[δ] [τε] τα[τα] [τι] [ληθ] [λ] [γω], λαβ[ε] τ[ν] μαρτυρ[αν], DEM. xlv. 19; so xviii. 305. See also [ς] ε[κ] [τα] ποιο[μεν], κα[τ] [δ] [ννο] [σατε] (sc. [να] ε[δ] [τε]), XEN. Hell. ii. 3, 33. This common ellipsis shows that in DEM. xliii. 42 we can easily supply a final clause like [να] ε[δ] [τε] before [ς] καταφαν[ς] [ς] [σται], that you may know how it is to be established, etc. In xxiv. 146 there is no need even of an ellipsis, as we can translate how you are to know that I speak the truth, I will explain to you.

9 See Delbrück, Conj.u. Opt.p. 61.

10 See Madvig's Syntax, § 123.

11 In Homer, Hesiod, and the lyric poets we find 131 cases of simple μ[ε] and 50 of the final particles with μ[ε]; in tragedy the proportion is 76 : 59; in Aristophanes it is 8 : 55; in Herodotus, 8 : 53. In Attic prose (except in Plato and Xenophon) the simple μ[ε] in final clauses almost vanishes. Thucydides has only 4 or 5 cases; the ten orators only 4 (Demosthenes 2, Isocrates 1, Isaeus 1); Plato 24; and Xenophon 12.

12 Weber, p. 243, gives a comparison of the usage of various writers, showing that the proportion of subjunctives to optatives after past tenses in pure final clauses and after verbs of fearing is as follows:—in Homer 35 : 156, Pindar 2 : 10, Aeschylus 2 : 9, Sophocles 2 : 23, Euripides 31 : 65, Aristophanes 13 : 37, Herodotus 86 : 47, Thucydides 168 : 60, Lysias 22 : 19, Isocrates 21 : 17, Isaeus 8 : 17, Demosthenes 40 : 40, Aeschines 13 : 7, Plato 22 : 79, Xenophon 45 : 265. In all writers before Aristotle 528 : 894. In the Attic writers and Herodotus, excluding Xenophon, the two are just equal, Isaeus 441.

13 Weber cites the following cases, in addition to those given above. For πώς: AESCH. Cho. 265, Suppl. 449; SOPH. Aj. 698 (?); EUR. El. 835; AR. Vesp. 528, Pac. 309, Pac. 431, Lys. 1093, Thesm. 431, Lys. 653, Lys. 285 (?), Eccl. 783, Eccl. 997; ANDOC. i. 89; Hipp. i. 18, Mem. ii. 1, Mem. 1 (παίδειν πώς σται?). In XEN. Cyr. ii. 1, 4 and 21 the MSS. vary: in Cyr. iii. 3, Cyr. 42 πώς is probably independent. For φρα: Il. viii. 110; Od. iv. 163, Od. xvii. 6. For ς: Bacch. 784. For μ: Od. xxiv. 544; THEOG. 1307; AR. Eccl. 488. Only four undoubted examples occur in prose.

14 In the single case of κ with να, Od. xii. 156, “λλ ρω μν γν, να εδτες κε θνωμεν, κεν λευμενοι θνατον κα κρα φγωμεν”, να κε is not used like ς κε, etc., above, but να is followed by a potential subjunctive with κ (285). The repetition of κ removes the case from the class under consideration. να in its sense of where may have ν (see SOPH. OC 405). M, lest, may have ν with the optative after verbs of fearing (368).

15 It must be confessed that there are some difficult questions concerning these optatives with κ or ν in final clauses after past tenses. It may perhaps be thought that the subjunctive after ς κε, κως ν, etc., has been changed to the optative after a past tense retaining κ or ν without effect on the verb. Compare ως ν with the optative (613, 4; 702). Would κως ν in HDT. i. 22 (quoted in 328) have changed its nature if γγελλ had been changed to γγελετε? On the other hand, can we separate the optatives in HDT. i. 75 and 99 (in b) from the optative in i. 110 (in a)? The potential view seems, on the whole, much the more natural; but the potential force can be expressed in English only with great difficulty, owing to the ambiguity of our auxiliaries might, would, should, etc.

16 In this passage and the following, if anywhere, it would seem necessary to admit the interrogative force often ascribed to μ. But here, as elsewhere, it is plain that the dependent clause with μ expresses the object of an apprehension. To establish μ as an interrogative, meaning whether, μ should not only follow a verb like οδα, but also be followed by a clause expressing no object of apprehension, like εσμεσθα μ ο φλοι ζσιν, we shall learn whether our friends are now living; but no such example can be found in classic Greek. The use of ε, whether, after verbs of fearing (376) shows how the Greeks expressed an indirect question in such cases.

17 That this is the correct explanation, and that we need not emend the passage so as to read τοργον τδ, ξννοια βουλεει πλαι, is suggested by the scholion: σννοια μοι βουλεεται κα οεται μ κα θελατν στι τ προγμα. So perhaps we should read φοβεσθαι μ τι δαιμνιον τ προγματα λανει (vulg. λαν) in DEM. ix. 54 (with Cod. A). But the subjunctive in both passages might be explained on the principle of 92.

18 A■ for ε■ is usually left in Homer by editors as the Mss. give it. But Bekker (Homerische Blätter, pp. 61, 62) quotes Heyne with approval, who says that no human being can tell why we have α■ in one place and ε■ in another. Bekker cites, to illustrate this, α■θ■ ο■τως χ■λον τελ■σε■ ■γαμ■μων, Il. iv. 178, and ε■θ■ ■ς τοι γο■ναθ■ ■ποιτο, Il. iv. 313; also α■ κε θε■ς ■κηται, Il. v. 129, followed immediately by ■τρ ε■ κε ■φοδ■τη ■λθ■σ■ ■ς π■λεμον. Bekker in his last edition of Homer (1858) gives only ε■, ε■θε, and ε■ γ■ρ, without regard to the Mss.; and he is followed by Delbrück.

19 See Delbrück, Conj. und Opt., pp. 70, 71, who terms this a wahrscheinliche positive Vermuthung.

20 As I do not profess to have any distinct theory of the origin or the original meaning of either κ■ or ■v, I have not attempted to define their force, except so far as they emphasise what we see by usage may be implied by the sentence without their aid.

21 Monro (Gr. Hom. p. 263) thinks “the primary use of ■v or κ■v is to show that the speaker is thinking of particular instances or occasions.” If this is so, we should expect these particles to be first used in future conditions, while the later general conditions would first take the simple ε■, as is here supposed.

22 See Jour. Phil. iii. pp. 441, 442, where Gildersleeve refers to the use of ε■, ■τε, etc. with the optative in oratio obliqua, representing ■■v, ■ταν, etc. with the subjunctive in the direct form, as evidence of an old use of ε■, ■τε, etc. with the subjunctive.

23 See Jour. Phil. iii. p. 438.

24 See ISOC. v. 34.

25 ISAE. ii. 15; ARISTOT. Eth. x. 9, Eth. 18 (p. 1181 a, Eth. 4).

26 DEM. xx. 23.

27 ISOC. xx. 14.

28 DEM. xviii. 248.

29 LYS. vii. 24.

30 ANT. v. 13.

31 ARISTOT. Eth. x. 9, Eth. 19 (p. 1181 a, Eth. 6).

32 LYS. xiii. 28.

33 DEM. lix. 112. The imperfects not included in these references will be found among the examples in 419-422. The above list could doubtless be greatly extended.

34 This use of ■μελλον with the infinitive corresponds precisely to the Sanskrit use of the past future tense in the sense of the Greek aorist indicative with ■v. Thus “if he had said (avaksyat) this, he would have slain (ahaniSyat) Indra” (zat. Brahm. i. 6, THUC. 3^{10}), where the two verbs are augmented past futures, meaning literally he was going to say and he was going to slay. See Whitney’s Sanskrit Grammar, § 950.

35 Mr. Monro (Gr. Hom. p. 236) doubts this statement, and refers to Hom. Od. iv. 178, κα■ κε θ■μ■ ■νθ■δ■ ■■ντες ■μισγ■μεθ■, ο■δ■ κεν ■μ■ας ■λλ■ δι■κρινεν, as a case in which “the imperfect ■μισγ■μεθα takes in the present time, we should (from that time till now) have been meeting.” It seems to me that, according to the Homeric usage, we can find no more in θ■μ■ ■μισγ■μεθ■ κε than we should have had frequent meetings, and the rest comes from the context. In any case, this use is far removed from the Attic ■πορευ■μεθα ■ν ■π■ βασιλ■α, we should (now) be on our way to the King (410). A nearer approach to the later use perhaps appears in Hom. Il. xxiv. 220, ε■ μ■ν γ■ρ τις μ■ ■λλος ■κελευεν, if any other (had?) commanded me. But see Hom. Il. ii. 80.

36 In “minatory and monitory conditions”: see Gildersleeve in Trans. of Assoc. Phil. for 1876, p. 13. This article contains an enumeration of all the cases of ■■ν with the subjunctive in future conditions and of ε■ with the future indicative in the three tragedians. It appears that in Aeschylus there are 22 cases of the future and only 8 of the subjunctive; in Sophocles 67 futures and 55 subjunctives; in Euripides 131 futures and 177 subjunctives. If we omit the futures which are equivalent to μ■λλω with an infinitive, for which the subjunctive could not be substituted (see 407), we have in Aeschylus 15 futures in future conditions and 8 subjunctives; in Sophocles 46 and 55; in Euripides 98 and 177. In Attic prose Thucydides and Lysias have the largest proportion of futures; but in prose, as in Aristophanes, the subjunctives always preponderate.

37 See the examples in Lange, Partikel EI, pp. 185, 186. There are twenty-six cases of ε■ κε with the optative in Homer, and one of ε■ περ ■ν (Il. ii. 597); besides Il. v. 273 (= viii. 196) and Od. xvii. 223, mentioned in the text (461).

38 Jour. Phil. iii. p. 443. The examples are Ol. vi. 11; Pyth. iv. 266, 273 (perhaps also 263); Nem. vii. 11, Nem. ix. 46; Isth. iii. 58, Nem. iv. 12; Frag. 171 (Böckh), 5. The references to the other poets in 470 and 471 do not profess to be complete.

39 See Lange, Partikel EI, p. 234. Lange is at great pains to show that there is no ellipsis here, or indeed in any cases of ε■ without a verb like ε■ περ ■ν■γκη, if necessary. By “ellipsis” we often mean merely what one language finds it necessary to supply to translate an idiom of another. There are few ellipses of which a speaker is really conscious when he uses them. In this sense, it seems to me that, whenever we use if without a verb, there is at least a suppression (if not an ellipsis) of a verb.

40 The English translation of certain conditional clauses in the New Testament which have this peculiar construction preserves the sense of purpose or desire with the original form of protasis. Thus, that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him, Acts xvii. 27; and he came (to the fig tree), if haply he might find anything thereon, MARK xi. 13.

41 For the cases in Pindar here and in 500 and 501, see Jour. Phil. iii. p. 444.

42 Delbrück, Conj.u. Opt.pp. 161, Opt. 162, cites 63 cases of this construction (49 in the Iliad, Opt. 14 in the Odyssey), of which 35 have ■ς ■τε, Opt. 10 ■ς ■τ■ ■ν, Opt. 3 ■ς ■π■τε, Opt. 8 ■ς, and 7 ■ς τε.

43 See Gildersleeve in Jour. Phil. vii. pp. 161-175; and Seume, De Sententiis Consecutivis Graecis, Göttingen, Phil. 1883.

44 Shilleto (in the Appendix to his edition of Demosthenes de Falsa Legatione) thus illustrates the distinction between $\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \omicron\kappa\ \beta\omicron\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ and $\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \mu\ \beta\omicron\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. "The difference seems simply to be this: $\omicron\tau\omega\varsigma\ \phi\omicron\rho\omega\nu\ \nu\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\ \omicron\kappa\ \beta\omicron\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$, he was so foolish that he did not wish (expressive of the real result or consequence); $\omicron\tau\omega\varsigma\ \phi\omicron\rho\omega\nu\ \nu\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\ \mu\ \beta\omicron\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, he was so foolish as not to wish (expressive of the natural consequence). . . . Now it is obvious that an energetic speaker, wishing to express that the result (was not only of a nature to follow, but) actually did follow, would employ the indicative: whereas in ordinary and unimpassioned language the infinitive would imply all that was necessary, the natural consequence supposing the real."

45 The explanation of $\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \omicron$ with the infinitive on the ground of oratio obliqua was first made, I believe, by Shilleto in the Appendix to his Demosthenes de Falsa Legatione (1844). It is also given by Madvig (Synt.§ 205, Anm. 3), who confines $\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \omicron$ to clauses depending on the infinitive of oratio obliqua after verbs like $\phi\eta\mu$, $\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, etc. (i.e. like the examples in 594). Shilleto's faith in his own explanation was somewhat shaken by finding that four of the passages quoted in 598 could not be brought under his canon. Under the influence of Shilleto's essay, I originally suggested the mixture of two equivalent constructions given above, as applicable to all cases of $\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \omicron$, not appreciating the wide influence of the principle of oratio obliqua upon the construction.

46 In Homer, where the form $\omega\varsigma$ would seldom suit the verse, $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ or $\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ is commonly written.

47 "He shall conceal it whiles (= until) you are willing it shall come to note." Shakespeare. Twelfth Night, iv. 3.

48 Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Constructionen mit $\Pi\rho\nu$, von Josef Sturm: Heft 3 of Schanz's Beiträge.

49 See Sturm, pp. 239, Od. 261-263, who calls attention to the decrease of the double $\pi\rho\nu$ in the Odyssey. Of 43 cases of $\pi\rho\nu$ with the infinitive in the Iliad, Od. 20 have a preceding $\pi\rho\nu$ or other adverb; of 30 cases in the Odyssey, only 10 have such an adverb. Besides $\pi\rho\nu$ or $\tau\ \pi\rho\nu$ in the leading clause in Homer, $\pi\rho\varsigma$ occurs three times, and $\pi\rho\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$ and $\pi\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$ each once. Before $\pi\rho\nu$ with the subjunctive in Homer such an adverb is always found, $\pi\rho\nu$ twice, $\omicron\pi\omega$ or $\mu\pi\omega$ three times, and $\pi\rho\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$ once.

50 See Schmitt, Ueber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen, in Schanz's Beiträge, Heft 8.

51 See Schmitt, Ursprung des Substantivsatzes, p. 70. The following statistics are based on Schmitt's collection of Homeric examples. Homer has 40 cases of $\tau\iota$, $\tau\iota\nu$, or τ with the indicative after verbs of knowing, hearing, perceiving, or remembering (23 of τ , 17 of $\tau\iota$ or $\tau\iota\nu$); and 4 after verbs of saying (3 of $\tau\iota$, 1 of τ). 18 of ς after verbs of knowing, etc.; 8 after verbs of saying. 5 of τ (for $\tau\epsilon=\tau$) after $\gamma\gamma\nu\sigma\kappa\omega$, $\epsilon\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, and $\delta\lambda\omicron\nu$. 2 of $\omicron\nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ after verbs of knowing, etc.; 4 after verbs of saying (omitting Od. vii. 299 as causal). Only 3 of the 16 cases of these particles after verbs of saying are in the Iliad; while of the 65 cases after verbs of knowing, etc., 42 are in the Iliad (29 with $\tau\iota$, etc., Od. 9 with ς , Od. 3 with τ , Od. 1 with $\omicron\nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha$).

52 See Liddell and Scott, ed. 7, under μ , B. 5, C; also Gildersleeve in Jour. Phil. i. p. 51.

53 See Spieker in Jour. Phil. v. pp. 221-227, who has traced the history of this construction and collected examples, especially those in the Orators.

54 On this passage we have the note of Aristarchus in the Scholia : ■ διπλ■, ■τι ■ξωθεν προσυπακουστ■ον τ■ καλ■ς ■ν ■χοι: ε■ α■τ■ν ■νελ■ντες ■εικισσα■μεθα, καλ■ς ■ν ■χοι. Schol. A. It does not follow necessarily from this that Aristarchus explained all optatives with forms of ε■ in wishes by supplying καλ■ς ■ν ■χοι as an apodosis (see Lange, p. 6, note 15); but if he explained this passage as an elliptical protasis, he can hardly have objected to the same explanation of other similar passages. It is surely no more necessary or logical to insist on explaining both forms of wishes alike, than it would be in English to insist that may I see him again and O if I might see him again are originally of the same construction.

55 The Homeric examples of the optative with various forms of ε■ or α■ are of the highest importance for the understanding of the construction generally. The following is a list of the passages (according to Lange, Partikel EI, pp. 19-40):— Simple ε■ with optative: Il. x. 111, Il. xv. 571, Il. xvi. 559, Il. xxiv. 74. (4.) Α■ γ■ρ or ε■ γ■ρ with optative: Il. iv. 189, Il. x. 536, Il. xvi. 97, Il. xviii. 272, Il. 464, Il. xxii. 346, Il. 454; Od. iii. 205, Od. iv. 697, Od. vi. 244, Od. viii. 339, Od. ix. 523, Od. xv. 156, Od. xvii. 251, Od. 513, Od. xviii. 235, Od. 366, Od. xix. 22, Od. xx. 169, Od. xxi. 402. (20.) Α■θε or ε■θε with optative: Il. iv. 178; Od. ii. 33, Od. xiv. 440, Od. xv. 341, Od. xvii. 494, Od. xviii. 202, Od. xx. 61. (7.) Eight examples (five with ε■θε, two with ε■ γ■ρ, one with α■ γ■ρ), in which the present optative expresses an unattained present wish, are omitted here and will be found under 739. The cases discussed in 730 are not included here. For the use of α■θε, α■ γ■ρ, and α■ (for ε■θε, etc.) in Homer, see footnote to 379.

5. The Infinitive.

Chapter V The Infinitive.

[*] 741. The infinitive is originally a verbal noun, expressing the simple idea of the verb. As a verb, it has voices and tenses; it has a subject (expressed or understood), which may define its number and person; it may have an object and other adjuncts, and, further, it is qualified by adverbs, and not by adjectives. It may have ■v in a potential sense. It thus expresses the verbal idea with much greater definiteness than the corresponding substantives; compare, for example, πρ■ττειν and πρ■ξαι with πρ■ξις, as expressions of the idea of doing.

[*] 742. The origin of the infinitive in a verbal noun is beyond question. In the oldest Sanskrit certain verbal nouns in the dative express purpose, that is, the object to or for which something is done, and are almost identical in form with the equivalent infinitives in the older Greek. Thus vidma/ne, dative of vidman, knowledge (from root vid), may mean for knowing or in order to know (old English for to know); and in Homer we have ■■δμεναι (= Attic ■δε■v) from the same root ■ιδ. So Sanskrit dAva/ne, dative of dAvan, giving (from root da), is represented in Greek by the Cyprian δ■■εναι (= Attic δο■vαι) from root δο.¹ It is safe to assume, therefore, that the Greek infinitive was originally developed in a similar way, chiefly from the dative of a primitive verbal noun; that in the growth of the language this case-form became obscured, its origin as a dative was forgotten, and it came to be used for other cases of the verbal noun, especially the accusative; that it was allowed to take an object, like the corresponding verb, and afterwards a subject (in the accusative) to make the agent more distinct; that in course of time, as its relation to the verb became closer, it developed tenses like those of the verb, so as to appear as a regular mood of the verb. The final step, taken when the use of the definite article was established, was to allow the half-noun and half-verb to have the article and so be declined like a noun in four cases, while it still retained its character as a verb. This last step was taken after Homer; but the earlier stages were already passed, more or less decidedly, before the Homeric period, so that they cannot be traced historically. Thus, although the infinitive in Homer retained some of its uses as a dative more distinctly than the later infinitive, it is hardly possible that those who used the Homeric language retained any consciousness of the original dative; for the infinitive was already established as an accusative and a nominative, it had formed its various tenses to express present, past, and future time, and it could even be used with ■v (683). Indeed, the condition in which the infinitive appears in indirect discourse in Homer seems utterly inconsistent with any conscious survival of its force as a dative (see examples in 683).

[*] 743. The later addition of the article enlarged the uses of the infinitive and extended it to new constructions, especially to the use with prepositions. It thus gained a new power of taking adjuncts, not merely single words, but whole dependent clauses. (See examples in 806.) In all the constructions which were developed before the article came into use with the infinitive, as when it is the subject or the object of a verb, or follows adjectives or nouns, the infinitive continued to be used regularly without the article, although even in these constructions the article might be added

to emphasise the infinitive more especially as a noun, or to enable it to carry adjuncts which would otherwise be cumbrous; in other words, all constructions in which the original force of the noun had become obscured or forgotten before the article began to be used generally remained in their original form. On the other hand, newer expressions, in which the infinitive was distinctly felt as a noun in the structure of the sentence, generally added the article to designate the case.

[*] 744. The subject of the infinitive, if expressed, is in the accusative. The most indefinite infinitive, so far as it is a verb, must at least have a subject implied; but as the infinitive has no person or number in itself, its subject can remain more obscure than that of a finite verb. Thus καλ■ν ■στιν ■ποθανε■ν, it is glorious to die, may imply a subject in any number or person, according to the context, while ■ποθν■σκεις or ■π■θανε is restricted to thou or he as its subject. Still, in the former case, ■ποθανε■ν must have an implied subject in the accusative; and if this is not pointed out by the context, we can supply τιν■ or τιν■ς, as sometimes appears when a predicate word agrees with the omitted subject, as in φιλ■νθρωπον ε■ναι δε■ (sc. τιν■), one must be humane, ISOC. ii. 15, and δρ■ντας ■διον θανε■ν (sc. τιν■ς), it is sweeter to die acting, EUR. Hel. 814. The infinitive of indirect discourse, which seems to have been developed originally by the Greek language, must always refer to a definite subject, as it represents a finite verb in a definite mood, tense, number, and person. Other infinitives, both with and without the article, may have a subject whenever the sense demands it, although sometimes the meaning of the leading verb makes it impossible to express an independent subject, as in περι■ται μανθ■νειν, he tries to learn. In general, when the subject of the infinitive is the same as the subject or object of the leading verb, or when it has been clearly expressed elsewhere in the sentence, it is not repeated with the infinitive.² Infinitive without the Article: Infinitive as Subject, Predicate, or Appositive.

[*] 745. The infinitive may be the subject nominative of a finite verb, or the subject accusative of another infinitive. It is especially common as subject of an impersonal verb or of ■στ■. It may also be a predicate nominative or accusative, and it may stand in apposition to a noun in the nominative or accusative. E.g. Συν■βη α■τ■ ■λθε■ν, it happened to him to go. Ο■κ ■νεστι το■το ποι■σαι, it is not possible to do this. ■δ■νατ■ν ■στι το■το ποι■σαι. ■ξ■ν α■τ■ μ■νειν, he might have remained (i.e. to remain was possible for him). Δε■ μ■νειν. Ο■ μ■ν γ■ρ τι κακ■ν βασιλευ■μεν, for it is no bad thing to be a king. Od. i. 392. ■ε■ γ■ρ ■β■ το■ς γ■ρουσιν ε■μαθε■ν. AESCH. Ag. 584. Πολ■ γ■ρ ■■ον ■χοντας φυλ■ττειν ■ κτ■σασθαι π■ντα π■φυκεν. DEM. ii. 26. (Compare i. 23, quoted in 790.) ■δ■ πολλο■ς ■χθρο■ς ■χειν; Id. xix. 221. Δοκε■ ο■κον■μου ■γαθο■ ε■ναι ε■ ο■κε■ν τ■ν ■αυτο■ ο■κον. XEN. Oec. i. 2. Φησ■ δε■ν το■το ποι■σαι, he says that it is necessary to do this. (Here ποι■σαι as accusative is subject of δε■ν.) Τ■ γν■ναι ■πιστ■μην που λαβε■ν ■στιν, to learn is to acquire knowledge (pred. nom.). PLAT. Theaet. 209E. Ξυν■βη το■ς ■θηνα■ους θορυβηθ■ναι, "it chanced that the Athenians fell into confusion." THUC. v. 10. Ο■ φ■σκων ■νεκτον ε■ναι ξυγκε■σθαι κρατε■ν βασιλ■α τ■ν π■λεων. Id. viii. 52. (Here κρατε■ν βασιλ■α τ■ν π■λεων is subject of ξυγκε■σθαι, which is subject of ε■ναι, the whole being object of φ■σκων.) Ε■ς ο■ων■ς ■ριστος, ■μ■νεσθαι περι■τρης, one omen is best, to fight for our country. II. xii. 243. For the subject infinitive in indirect discourse, see 751.

Infinitive as Object.

[*] 746. The infinitive may be the object of a verb, generally appearing as the accusative of the direct object, sometimes as the accusative of kindred meaning. Here belong (1) the infinitive after verbs of wishing, commanding, and the like (not in indirect discourse), and (2) the infinitive in indirect discourse as the object of verbs of saying and thinking. For the infinitive in indirect discourse, see 751.

Object Infinitive not in Indirect Discourse.

[*] 747. The verbs which take the ordinary object infinitive are in general the same in Greek as in English. Any verb whose action directly implies another action or state as its object, if this object is to be expressed by a verb and not by a noun, may take the infinitive.

Such are verbs signifying to wish, ask, advise, entreat, exhort, command, persuade, compel, teach, learn, accustom, cause, intend, begin, attempt, effect, permit, decide, dare, prefer, choose; those expressing willingness, unwillingness, eagerness, caution, neglect, danger, postponement, forbidding, hindrance, escape, etc.; and all implying ability, fitness, desert, qualification, sufficiency, necessity, or their opposites. E.g.

Διδέσκουσιν αὐτὸν βλάθειν, they teach him to shoot. μαθὼν τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, they learned to do this. Βολεύεται λθεῖν. Παραίνουμί σοι πεθεσθαι. Ἀρόνται πολεμεῖν. Πῆλις κινδυνεύει διαφθαρεῖν, the city is in danger of being destroyed. Δύναται πελθεῖν. Τοῖς ξυμμάχοις φράζονταί τις τὸν Ἰσθμὸν, “they told the allies to go to the Isthmus.” THUC. iii. 15. Δέομαι μὲν συγγήμην μοι ἕχειν. Ἐπέστρατηγός τις λῆσθαι, he proposed to choose generals. Παγορεύουσιν αὐτοῖς μὲν τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, they forbid them to do this (815, THUC. 1). Τί κωλύσει αὐτὸν βαδίζειν ποῦ βούλεται; what will prevent him from marching whither he pleases? Ἔξι λαμβάνειν τοῦτο, I claim the right to take this. Ἔξιόταί θανεῖν, he is thought to deserve death. Οὐκ ἐφύκε δουλεύειν, he is not born to be a slave. Ἐναβλάεται τοῦτο ποιῆν, he postpones doing this.

Λαοὺς δὲ ἄτρεθης πολυμάθεσθαι ἠώγειν, “and the son of Atreus ordered the hosts to purify themselves.” Il. i. 313. Βούλομαι γὰρ λαὸν σῶον ἔμμεναι ἢ πολέσθαι, I wish that the people may be safe, rather than that they perish. Il. i. 117. Πειθὲν αὐτὸν πορεύεσθαι. XEN. An. vi. 2, 13. Ἔδοξε πλεῖν τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην, “it was decided that Alcibiades should sail.” THUC. vi. 29. Φυλακὴν ἔχε μὲν τὸ κλεῖν μηδὲνα μὲν τὸ σπλεῖν, he kept guard against any one’s sailing out or in (815, THUC. 1). Id. ii. 69. “Τί δέτα μῆλλεις μὲν οὐ γέγωνσκεῖν τὸ πῆν;” “why do you hesitate to speak out the whole?” AESCH. Prom. 627. This use of the infinitive is too familiar to need more illustration. The tenses commonly used are the present and aorist (87), for examples of which see 96; for the perfect see 109 and 110; for the exceptional future see 113; and for the infinitive with ῖν (seldom used in this construction) see 211. For μὲν and μὲν οὐ with the infinitive (as used above) see 815-817.

[*] 748. The poets, especially Homer, allow an infinitive after many verbs which commonly do not take this construction. The meaning of the verb, however, makes the sense clear. E.g. Ἰδύρονται οὐκ ἔνδε νῆεσθαι, they mourn (i.e. long) to go home. Il. ii. 290. Πευφύμησαν χαίον ἀδεσθαι ἔρφα, the Achaeans shouted with applause, (commanding) that they should reverence the priest. Il. i. 22. Φρα τίς ἄρρηγῶσι κακὸν ἔξει, that one may shudder (dread) to do evil. Il. iii. 353. Ἐκτορα μέναι μοῖρα πῆδησεν, Fate bound (fettered) Hector to remain. Il. xxii.

5. For the infinitive of direct object after verbs of fearing and caution, see 373. For the infinitive (not in indirect discourse) after χρῶ and other verbs meaning to give an oracle, see 98.

[*] 749. When a noun and a verb (especially στή) form an expression which is equivalent to any of the verbs above mentioned (747), they may take the infinitive. Some other expressions with a similar force may have the infinitive. E.g. ἐν γῆ στή πῆντας πέλθειν. Κύνδυνος ἐν ἀτὶ παθεῖν τι. ἄκνος στή μοι τότο ποιῆσαι. Φόβος στήν ἀτὶ ἄλθειν. Ὁ μῆντις ἐμὲ τῶφαν γνῆναι, I am not enough of a prophet to decide, etc. EUR. Hipp. 346. (Here ability is implied in μῆντις ἐμὲ.) ἄμαξα ἐν ἀτάξῃ ἐν, κῆλυμα ὄσα (τῆς πῆλας προσθεῖναι, a wagon, which prevented them from shutting the gates. THUC. iv. 67. So πηγῆνετο δὲ ἄλλοις τε ἄλλοι κωλύματα μὲ ἀξῆθῆναι, "obstacles to their increase." Id. i. 16. (See 815, Id. 1.) Τόσ στρατιῶταις ἄρμῃ ἐνπέσε κτειχῆσαι τὴ χωρῶν. Id. iv. 4. Τὴ σφάλας καὲ μενεῖν καὲ πέλθειν ἀνῆς παρῆξουσιν, "safety both to remain and to depart." Id. vi. 18. ἄχοντα τιθασεῖσθαι φῆσιν, capable by nature of being tamed (=πεφυκῆτα τιθασεῖσθαι). PLAT. Polit. 264A. Τῆς μηχανῆς μὲ ὄχῃ πῆντα καταναλωθῆναι ἐξ τῆ τεθῆναι; i.e. how can it be effected that all things shall not be destroyed in death? Plat. Phaed. 72D. (See 815, 2) Δῶδικα μὲ πολλῆ καὲ χαλεπῆ ἐξ ἐν γῆν ἄλθωμεν ποιῆν, "lest we may come to the necessity of doing." DEM. i. 15. ἄρα πῆναι, it is time to go away (like χρῆ πῆναι, we must go away). PLAT. Ap. 42A. ἄλπιδας ἄχει τότο ποιῆσαι (=ἄλπίζει τότο ποιῆσαι), he hopes to do this. But ἄλπῆς τότῆ ἄλθειν, THUC. ii. 56(798). Ὁ δὲ ζῆντες ἀτῆτοι θανεῖν, "and the living are those who caused them to die." SOPH. Ant. 1173. We might also have ἀτῆτοι τότῆ τοῦτους θανεῖν or ἀτῆτοι τῆ τοῦτους θανεῖν. (See 101.) So in phrases like πολλοῦ (or μικροῦ) δῶω ποιῆν τι, I want much (or little) of doing anything; παρῆ μικρῆν ἄλθον ποιῆν τι, they came within a little of doing anything; where the idea of ability, inability, or sufficiency appears: so in THUC. vii. 70, βραχῆ γῆρ πῆλιπον διακῆσαι γενῆσθαι. So ἄμποδῆν τότῆ στήν ἄλθειν (=κωλύει τότον ἄλθειν), it prevents him from going; where τότῆ ἄλθειν may be used (807). The infinitive depending on a noun is generally an adnominal genitive with the article τότῆ. See the examples above, and 798.

[*] 750. In laws, treaties, proclamations, and formal commands, the infinitive is often used in the leading sentences, depending on some word like ἄδοξε, it is enacted, or κελεῖται, it is commanded; which may be either expressed in a preceding sentence or understood. E.g. Ταμῆας δὲ τῆν ἄερῆν χρημῆτων ἄρεῖσθαι μῆν ἄκ τῆν μεγῆτων τιμημῆτων: τῆν δὲ ἄρεσιν τότων καὲ τῆν δοκιμασῆαν γῆγενεσθαι καθῆπερ ἄ τῆν στρατηγῆν ἄγῆγετο, and (it is enacted) that treasurers of the sacred funds be chosen, etc. Leg. 759E. So in most of the laws (genuine or spurious) standing as quotations in the text of the orators, as in DEM. xxiii. 22: δικῆζειν δὲ τῆν ἐν ἄρεῖ πῆγῆ φῆνου καὲ τραμῆματος ἄκ προνοῆας, κ.τ.λ. See AR. Av. 1661. ἄτη δὲ ἐῆναι τῆς σπονδῆς πεντῆκοντα, "and that the treaty shall continue fifty years." THUC. v. 18. ἄκοῖετε λεῖ: τότῆς πῆλῆτας νυνμενῆ ἄνελομῆνους θῆπῆ πῆναι πῆλιν ὄκαδε. AR. Av. 448.

Infinitive in Indirect Discourse.

[*] 751. The infinitive in indirect discourse is generally the object of a verb of saying or thinking or some equivalent expression. It may also be the subject of a passive verb of this class (as λῆγεται), or of such a verb as φαῖνεται, it appears, or δοκεῖ, it seems (see 754). Here each

tense of the infinitive represents the corresponding tense of the indicative (with or without **■v**) or the optative (with **■v**). (See 664, 2.) For examples see 683 and 689. For the various tenses of the infinitive with **■v**, representing the indicative or optative with **■v**, see 204-210.

[*] 752. Verbs of hoping, expecting, promising, swearing, and a few others of like meaning, form an intermediate class between this construction and that of 747. For examples of the infinitive (in both constructions) after these verbs, see 136.

[*] 753. 1. Of the three common verbs signifying to say, **φημ■** is regularly followed by the infinitive in indirect discourse, **ε■πov** by **■τι** or **■ς** and the indicative or optative, while **λ■γω** allows either construction. The active voice of **λ■γω**, however, generally has **■τι** or **■ς**.

2. Exceptional cases of **■τι** or **■ς** after **φημ■** are very rare and strange: one occurs in LYS. vii. 19, **■ς φησιν ■ς ■γ■ μ■ν παρειστ■κειν ο■ δ■ ο■κ■ται ■ξ■τεμνον τ■ πρ■μνα**. See also XEN. Hell. vi. 3, 7, and PLAT. Gorg. 487 D (where a clause with **■τι** precedes **φ■ς**).

3. Cases of **ε■πov** with the infinitive of indirect discourse are less rare, but always exceptional. See II. xxiv. 113, II. xviii. 9, quoted in 683; HDT. ii. 30; THUC. vii. 35; PLAT. Gorg. 473 A, **ε■πov τ■ ■δικε■ν το■ ■δικε■σθαι κ■κιον ε■ναι**. A remarkable case of **ο■ μ■** with the infinitive after **ε■πε** occurs in EUR. Phoen. 1590 (quoted in 296). **Ε■πov** and the active voice of **λ■γω** take the infinitive chiefly as verbs of commanding (747).

[*] 754. After many verbs of this class in the passive both a personal and an impersonal construction are allowed: thus, we can say **λ■γεται ■ Κ■ρος ■λθε■ν**, Cyrus is said to have gone, or **λ■γεται τ■ν Κ■ρον ■λθε■ν**, it is said that Cyrus went. **δοκ■ω** in the meaning I seem (videor■ usually has the personal construction, as in English; as **ο■τος δοκε■ ε■ναι**, he seems to be. When an infinitive with **■v** follows a personal verb like **δοκε■ω**, this must be translated by an impersonal construction, to suit the English idiom: thus, **δοκε■ τις ■ν ■χειν το■το** must be translated it seems that some one would have this, although **τις** is the subject of **δοκε■**, since we cannot use **would** with our infinitive to translate **■χειν ■v**.

[*] 755. When an indirect quotation has been introduced by an infinitive, a dependent relative or temporal clause sometimes takes the infinitive by assimilation, where we should expect an indicative or optative. The temporal particles **■ς**, **■τε**, **■πε■**, **■πειδ■**, as well as the relative pronouns, are used in this construction. Herodotus uses even **ε■**, if, and **δι■τι**, because, in the same way. E.g. **Μετ■ δ■, ■ς ο■ πα■εσθαι, ■κεα δ■ζησθαι (λ■γουσι)**, and afterwards, when it did not cease, they say that they sought for remedies. HDT. i. 94. (Here we should expect **■ς ο■κ■ πα■ετο**.) **■ς δ■ ■κο■σαι το■ς παρ■ντας, θ■ρυβον γεν■σθαι (φασ■ν)**, they say that, when those present heard it, there was a tumult. DEM. xix. 195. **■πειδ■ δ■ γεν■σθαι ■π■ τ■ ο■κ■τ■ τ■ ■γ■θωνος, (■φη) ■νε■γμ■νην καταλαμβ■νειν τ■ν θ■ραν**. Symp. 174D. **■φη δ■, ■πειδ■ ο■ ■κβ■ναι τ■ν ψυχ■ν, πορε■εσθαι**. Rep. 614 B. So **■ς φα■νεσθαι**, as it appeared, 359 D. **Λ■γεται ■λκμα■ωνι, ■τε δ■ ■λ■σθαι α■τ■ν, τ■ν ■π■λλω τα■την τ■ν γ■ν χρ■σαι ο■κε■ν**. THUC. ii. 102. **Κα■σα α■ μετ■ ■κε■νων βουλε■εσθαι, ο■δεν■ς ■στερον γν■μ■ φαν■ναι (■φασαν)**. Id. i. 91. (Here **■βουλε■οντο** would be the common form.) **■γουμ■νης δ■ ■ληθε■ας ο■κ■ ■ν ποτε φα■μεν α■τ■ χορ■ν κακ■ν ■κολουθ■σαι, ■λλ■ ■γι■ς τε κα■ δ■καιον ■θος, ■κα■ σωφροσ■νην ■πεσθαι**. PLAT. Rep. 490 C.

Ε■ γ■ρ δ■ δε■ν π■ντως περιθε■ναι ■λλ■ τ■ τ■ν βασιλη■ην, (■φη) δικαι■τερον ε■ναι Μ■δων τ■ περιβαλε■ν το■το, for if he was bound (= ε■ ■δει) to give the kingdom to any other, etc. HDT. i. 129. Ε■ ■ν ε■ναι τ■ θε■ το■το μ■ φ■λον, if this were (= ε■ ■ν) not pleasing to God. Id. ii. 64. So iii. 108 (ε■ μ■ γ■νεσθαι = ε■ μ■ ■γ■νετο, had there not occurred); vii. 229 (ε■ ■πονοστ■σαι, if he had returned); ii. 172 (ε■ ε■ναι, if he was); iii. 105 (ε■ μ■ προλαμβ■νειν = ε■ μ■ προλαμβ■νοιμεν). Τιμ■ν δ■ Σαμ■ους ■φη, δι■τι ταφ■να■ ο■ τ■ν π■ππον δημοσ■ ■π■ Σαμ■ων. Id. iii. 55.

[*] 756. In some cases, particularly when the provisions of a law are quoted, a relative is used with the infinitive, even when no infinitive precedes. E.g. ■θηκεν ■φ■ ο■ς ■ξε■ναι ■ποκτιν■ναι, “he enacted on what conditions it is allowed to kill.” DEM. xx. 158. Κα■ δι■ τα■τα, ■ν τις ■ποκτε■ν■ τιν■, τ■ν βουλ■ν δικ■ζειν ■γραψε, κα■ ο■χ ■περ, ■ν ■λλ■, ε■ναι, “and he did not enact what should be done if he should be convicted.” Id. xxiii. 26. (Here ε■ναι, the reading of Cod. Σ, is amply defended by the preceding example, in which all allow ■ξε■ναι.) Δ■κα γ■ρ ■νδρας προσε■λοντο α■τ■ ξυμβο■λους, ■νευ ■ν μ■ κ■ριον ε■ναι ■π■γειν στρατι■ν ■κ τ■ς π■λεως. THUC. v. 63.

[*] 757. In narration, the infinitive often appears to stand for the indicative. It depends, however, on some word like λ■γεται, it is said, expressed (or at least implied) in something that precedes. E.g. ■πικομ■νους δ■ το■ς Φο■νικας ■ς δ■ τ■ ■ργος το■το, διατ■θεσθαι τ■ν φ■ρτον, and (they say) that the Phoenicians, when now they had come to this Argos, were setting out their cargo for sale. HDT. i. 1. (Here διατ■θεσθαι is imperfect.) “■λλ■, ■ πα■,” φ■ναι τ■ν ■στυ■γην, “ο■κ ■χθ■μενοι τα■τα περιπλαν■μεθα.” “■λλ■ κα■ σ■,” φ■ναι τ■ν Κ■ρον, “■ρ■,” κ.τ.λ. Κα■ τ■ν ■στυ■γην ■περ■σθαι, “κα■ τ■νι δ■ σ■ τεκμαιρ■μενος λ■γεις;” “■τι σ■,” φ■ναι, “■ρ■,” κ.τ.λ. Πρ■ς τα■τα δ■ τ■ν ■στυ■γην ε■πε■ν, κ.τ.λ. Κα■ τ■ν Κ■ρον ε■πε■ν, κ.τ.λ. XEN. Cyr. i. 3, 5 and 6. (Here all these infinitives, and twelve others which follow, depend on λ■γεται in § 4.) Κα■ τ■ν κελε■σαι δο■ναι, “and he commanded him to give it.” Id. Cyr. i. 3, Id. Cyr. 9. So in HDT. i. 24 the story of Arion and the dolphin is told in this construction, the infinitives all depending on λ■γουσι at the beginning.

Infinitive after Adjectives, Adverbs, and Nouns.

[*] 758. The infinitive may depend on adjectives denoting ability, fitness, desert, qualification, sufficiency, readiness, and their opposites; and, in general, those expressing the same relations as the verbs which govern the infinitive (747). The omitted subject of the infinitive is the same as the substantive to which the adjective belongs. E.g. Δυνατ■ς ποιε■ν, able to do. Δειν■ς λ■γειν, skilled in speaking. ■ξι■ς ■στι τα■τα λαβε■ν, he deserves to receive this. ■ξιος τιμ■σθαι, worthy to be honoured. Ο■χ ο■■ς τε ■ν το■το ■δε■ν, he was not able to see this. Πρ■θυμος λ■γειν, eager to speak. ■τοιμος κ■νδυνον ■πομ■νειν, ready to endure danger.

Θεμιστοκλ■α, ■καν■τατον ε■πε■ν κα■ γν■ναι κα■ πρ■ξαι. LYS. ii. 42. Α■ γ■ρ ε■πραξ■αι δεινα■ συγκρ■ψαι τ■ τοια■τα ■νε■δη. DEM. ii. 20. Κυρ■αν ■πο■ησαν ■πιμελε■σθαι τ■ς ε■ταξ■ας, they gave it (the Areopagus) power to superintend good order. ISOC. vii. 39. Β■ην δ■ ■δ■νατοι ■σαν προσφ■ρειν. HDT. iii. 138. Μαλακο■ καρτερε■ν, “too effeminate to endure.” PLAT. Rep. 556B. Ταπειν■ ■μ■ν ■ δι■νοια ■γκαρτερε■ν ■ ■γνωτε, your minds are too dejected to persevere, etc. THUC. ii. 61. (In the last two examples, μαλακο■ and ταπειν■ govern the infinitive by the idea of inability implied in them.) Χρ■ματα πορ■ζειν ε■πορ■τατον γυν■. AR.

Eccl. 236. Σοφότεροι δὲ συμφορῆς τῆς τῶν πλάσας πόντες διαθρεῖν ἢ τῆς χάσας τῆς οἰκοθεν.
EUR. Fr. 103. “πιστῶν λῆγειν τε καὶ σιγῶν.” PLAT. Phaedr. 276 A. “Τέλλα ἐρῶσεις
πούργειν ἄντας ἴμῃς οὐ κακοῖς.” AR. Pax 430. For examples of nouns followed by the
infinitive in a similar sense, see 749. (See also 766.)

[*] 759. The infinitive after τοιοῦτος οἶος and τοσοῦτος ἴσος depends on the idea of ability,
fitness, or sufficiency which is expressed in these combinations. The antecedent may be omitted,
leaving οἶος with the infinitive in the sense of able, fit, likely, and ἴσος in that of sufficient. E.g.

Τοιοῦτοι οἶοι πονηροῦ τινος ἔργου φέσθαι, “capable of aiming at any vicious act.” XEN. Cyr.
i. 2, 3. Τοιαύτας οἶας χειμῶν ἄς τε σταγειν καὶ θύρους ἴκανῶς εἶναι. PLAT. Rep. 415E.
ἴφθασε τοσοῦτον ἴσον Πίχητα νενγκῶναι τῷ ψῶφισμα, it came enough in advance (of the
other ship) for Paches to have already read the decree (the fact that he had read it is inferred, but
not expressed: see 584). THUC. iii. 49.

Εἶπεν ἴς ἴγῃ εἶμι οἶος εἶμι ποτε μεταβῆλλεσθαι, that I am (such) a man (as) to be always
changing. XEN. Hell. ii. 3, 45. Οἶ γῶρ ἴν ἴρα οἶα τῷ πεδῶν ἴρδειν, “for it was not the proper
season to irrigate the land.” Id. An. ii. 3, Id. An. 13. Νεμῶμενοι τῷ αἴτῶν ἴκαστοι ἴσον ἴποζῶν,
each cultivating their own land enough (to an extent sufficient) to live upon it. THUC. i. 2.
ἴλεῖπετο τῆς νυκτῆς ἴσον σκοταῖους διελθεῖν τῷ πεδῶν, “there was left enough of the night
for crossing the plain in the dark.” XEN. An. iv. 1, 5. This construction suggests at once the
analogous use of οἴτως ἴστε or ἴστε alone, in the sense of so as, with the infinitive (see 593).
Here, as with ἴστε, the subject of the infinitive is not restricted as it is in 758.

[*] 760. In Homer, the pronominal adjectives τοῖος, τοῖσδε, τοιοῦτος, τῆσος, τῆλκος, and
ποῖος, without a relative, sometimes take an infinitive in the same way (759); as ἴμεῖς δὲ οἶο ἴν
τι τοῖοι ἴμυνῶμεν, but we are not able to keep it off, Od. ii. 60; ποῖοι κῆ εἴτῃ ἴδυσσῶι
ἴμυνῶμεν; Od. xxi. 195. See also Il. vi. 463; Od. iii. 205, Od. vii. 309, Od. xvii. 20.

[*] 761. Certain impersonal verbs (like ἴνεστι, πῶπει, πῶσκει), which regularly take an
infinitive as their subject (745), are used in the participle in a personal sense with the infinitive, the
participle having the force of one of the adjectives of 758. Thus τῷ ἴνῶντα εἴπεῖν is equivalent
to ἴνεστι εἴπεῖν, what it is permitted to say; τῷ πῶσκοντα ἴηθῶναι is equivalent to ἴ
πῶσκει ἴηθῶναι, what is proper to be said, as if it represented a personal construction like
ταῦτα πῶσκει ἴηθῶναι, these things are becoming to be said. E.g.

Κατιδῶν τῷ πῶθος τῶν ἴνῶντων εἴπεῖν, “seeing the number of things that may be said.”
ISOC. v. 110. Τῶν θεῶν καλεῖ οἶδῶν πῶσκοντῷ ἴν γῶις παραστατεῖν, “she is calling on
the God who ought not to be present at lamentations.” AESCH. Ag. 1079. (Πῶσκοντα is used
like adjectives meaning fit, proper.) Φῶζ, ἴπεῖ πῶπῶν ἴφυς πῶ τῶνδε φῶνεῖν. SOPH. O.T.
9. So τῷ ἴμῶν παραγγεῖλῶντα διεξελθεῖν (= ἴ παρηγγῶλθη ἴμῶν διεξελθεῖν). PLAT. Tim. 90
E.

[*] 762. In the same way (761) certain adjectives, like δῶκαιος, ἴπικαῖριος, ἴπιτῶδειος,
ἴπῶδοξος, may be used personally with the infinitive; as δῶκαίς ἴστι τοῦτο ποιεῖν, it is right
for him to do this (equivalent to δῶκαίῶν ἴστιν αἴτῶν τοῦτο ποιεῖν). E.g. Φῶμῷ πῶλλῷ
μειζῶν ἴτι τοῦτων δῶρεῖν δῶκαιος εἶναι τυγχῶνεῖν, “I say that I have a right to receive even
far greater rewards than these.” DEM. xviii. 53. ἴδῶκῶν ἴπιτῶδῶιοι εἶναι ἴπεξαιρεθῶναι, “they

seemed to be convenient persons to be disposed of.” THUC. viii. 70. Θεραπευέσθαι πικαίριοι, “important persons to be taken care of.” XEN. Cyr. viii. 2, 25. Τῷδε τοῖς αὐτῶν πειδοξά γενέσθαι, “it is to be expected that this will result from it.” HDT. i. 89. Πολλοὶ πειδοξοῖσι τὸ αὐτὸ πεσεσθαι ἐσσι, “it is to be expected that many will suffer this same thing.” Id. vi. 12 (for the future infinitive see 113).

[*] 763. Any adjective may take an infinitive to limit its meaning to a particular action; as ἀσχηρῶς ἰδεῖν, disgraceful to look upon. The infinitive is here regularly active or middle, even when the passive would seem more natural. The omitted subject of the infinitive (except when it is passive) is distinct from that of the adjective. E.g. Ἀσχηρῶς γὰρ τῷδε γὰρ ἔσται καὶ ἴσσομνοι σὺν πυθέσθαι, “for this is disgraceful even for future men to hear.” Il. ii. 119. So Il. i. 107 and 589. Τοῦ γὰρ πῶς τῶν λόγων μοῦ μὲν ἀναγκαιοτέρους προειπεῖν ἔγωμαι, μὲν δὲ χρησιμωτέρους σοῦ εἶναι, i.e. most necessary for me to speak, and most useful for you to hear. DEM. xxi. 24. Φοβερὴν προσπολεμῆσαι, “a terrible man to fight against.” Id. ii. 22. (Ὀκία) δὲσθη ἡδαιτῆσαι, “a house most pleasant to live in.” XEN. Mem. iii. 8, 8. Χαλεπῆτατα εἶρεν, hardest to find: ἁπλοῦστα ἡντυγγῆναι, “easiest to obtain.” Ib. i. 6, Ib. 9. (Πολιτεῖα) χαλεπῆ συζῆν, a form of government hard to live under: ἁνομος δὲ (μοναρχία) χαλεπῆ καὶ βαρύτερη ξυνοικῆσαι. PLAT. Polit. 302B and E. Ἀγὸς δυνατῆς κατανοῆσαι, a speech capable of being understood (which it is possible to understand). Plat. Phaed. 90D. ἁ χρόνος βραχὺς ἁξίως διηγήσασθαι, “the time is too short for narrating it properly.” Menex. 239B. ἁ δὲσθη ἁπιτηδεῖα πορευομνοι καὶ λῆγειν καὶ ἁκοῦειν, “convenient both for speaking and for hearing.” Symp. 173B. Πῶς τερὸν δὲ λῶσασθαι ψυχρῶς; which of the two (waters) is colder for bathing? XEN. Mem. iii. 13, 3.

(Passive.) (Κίνεσ) ἀσχηρῶς ἰδεῖσθαι (instead of ἰδεῖν). Cyn. iii. 3. ἁσθη δὲ ἁ λῶγος φιλαπεχθῶν μὲν, ἁηθῆναι δὲ ὁκ ἁσῆμφορος. ISOC. xv. 115. The infinitive with adjectives (here and in 758) shows distinct traces of its origin as a dative, though this origin was already forgotten. See 742 (end) and 767.

[*] 764. ἁa) The infinitive after the comparative with ἁ depends on the idea of ability or inability implied in the expression. E.g. Τῷ γὰρ νῆσημα μεζζον ἁ φέρειν, “for the disease is too heavy to bear.” SOPH.O.T. 1293. (See 763, above.) ἁ ἁνθρωπῆ φῆσις ἁσθενεστῆρα ἁ λαβεῖν τῆχνην ἁ ἁ πειρος, “human nature is too weak to acquire the art of those things of which it has no experience.” PLAT. Theaet. 149 C. (See 758.)

ἁb) ἁστε or ἁς is sometimes expressed before this infinitive; as in XEN. Hell. iv. 8, 23, ἁσθοντο αὐτῶν ἁλῆτω ἁχοντα δῆναμιν ἁ ἁστε τοῦς φῆλους ἁφέλεν, and Cyr. vi. 4, Cyr. 17, τῆς ἁσπῆδας μεζζους ἁχουσιν ἁ ἁς ποιεῖν τι καὶ ἁρῶν. (See 588.)

[*] 765. The infinitive may be used after adverbs which correspond to the adjectives of 763. E.g. Συμβουλεῖτο αὐτῷ πῶς ἁν τοῦς μὲν εἶνοις κῆλλιστα ἁδεν ποιῶτο τῶν ἁξῆλασιν, τοῦς δὲ δυσμενῆσι φοβερῆτατα, he took counsel with him how he might proceed forth in a manner most splendid for the friendly to behold, and most terrible for the indisposed. XEN. Cyr. viii. 3, 5.

[*] 766. Certain nouns, which correspond in meaning to adjectives which take the infinitive as in 763, may themselves have the same construction. E.g. Θαῦμα δῆσθαι, a wonderful thing to behold (like θαυμαστῶν δῆσθαι). Od. viii. 366. See the examples under 749.

[*] 767. In Homer, verbs expressing excellence or fitness sometimes take a limiting infinitive, like adjectives of similar meaning. E.g. ἠκτορος ἔδε γυναικός, ἡς ἄριστεσσέσκε μὲν χεσθαι, this is the wife of Hector, who was the first (= ἄριστος ἦν) in fighting. Il. vi. 460. μῆλικὴν κικαστο ἄρνιθα γυναικὰ ἄνασσιμα μῦθασσασθαι, “he excelled all of his age in knowledge of birds and in declaring fate.” Od. ii. 158. Οἱ περὶ μὲν βουλῆν Δαναῶν, περὶ δὲ ἔστω μὲν χεσθαι, “ye who excel the Danaï in counsel and excel them in battle.” Il. i. 258. (Here βουλῆν shows that μὲν χεσθαι was already felt as a limiting accusative, notwithstanding its primitive force as a dative. See 763, and 742, end.)

[*] 768. Even in Attic Greek a limiting infinitive, like the Homeric infinitive just mentioned (767), is sometimes found. Especially ἴκοσθαι, ἴκοσθαι, in sound, and ἴρῆν, ἴδῆν, in appearance, are used in this way. E.g. Δοκεῖς οὐ τι διαφέρειν ἀπὸς ἴδῆν χαλκῶς φάλακρον καὶ σμικρον; “do you think that they differ at all in appearance from a bald little tinker?” PLAT. Rep. 495E. ἴκοσθαι παγκάλως ἴχει, “it is very fine to hear.” DEM. xix. 47. Πρῆγματὰ παρῆξουσιν (οἱ ἴπποι) ἴπιμῆσθαι, “the horses will be troublesome to tend.” XEN. Cyr. iv. 5. 46.

[*] 769. The Homeric use of ἴμοσθαι, equal, like, with the infinitive belongs here. E.g. Λευκῆτεροι χιῆνος, θεῖν δὲ ἴνμοισιν ἴμοσθαι, (horses whiter than snow, and like the winds in swiftness (lit. to run). Il. x. 437. Οὐ γὰρ οὐ τις ἴμοσθαι ἴπισπῆσθαι ποσσὶν ἴεν, ἴνδρῶν τρεσσῆντων, “for none was like him for following with his feet when men fled.” Il. xiv. 521.

Infinitive of Purpose.

[*] 770. The infinitive may express a purpose. E.g.

Τρῶων ἴνδρα ἴκαστον (εἴ μὲν ἴλομῆθα οἴνοχοεῖν, “if we should choose every man of the Trojans to be our cup-bearers.” Il. ii. 127. Χῆρνιβα δὲ ἴμφῆπολος προχῆσθαι ἴπῆγευε φῆρουσα, ἴψασθαι, i.e. brought and poured water for washing. Od. i. 136. So Il. i. 338, δὲ ἴγειν, and Il. 107, Il. 108. Τῆν ἴξ ἴρεσθαι πῆγου βουλῆν ἴπῆστησαν ἴπιμῆσθαι τῆς εἴκοσμῆς, i.e. to guard good order. ISOC. vii. 37. Οἱ ἴρχοντες, οἱς ἴμῆς εἴλεσθε ἴρχειν μου, the rulers, whom you chose to rule me. PLAT. Ap. 28E. Δῆκα δὲ τῆν νεῖν προῆπεμψαν ἴς τῆν μῆγαν λιμῆνα πῆσα ἴτε καὶ κατασκῆψασθαι, καὶ κῆρῆξαι, κ.τ.λ., i.e. they sent them to sail and examine, and to proclaim, etc. THUC. vi. 50. Τοῖς ἴπῆσθαι παρῆχοντο Πελοποννησῆσις ἴστρατεῖν. Id. ii. 12. ἴνβῆσαν τοῖς ἴλαταισῆσι παρῆδοῖναι σῆς ἀπὸς καὶ τῆ ἴπλα, ἴρῆσασθαι ἴτι ἴν βῆλῶνται, i.e. to do with them whatever they pleased. Id. ii. 4. Εἴ βουλομῆσθαι τῆ ἴπιτρῆψαι ἴπαῆδασ παῆδεσσαι ἴχρῆματα διασῆσαι, “if we should wish to entrust to any one either children to instruct or money to keep.” XEN. Mem. i. 5, 2. Θεῆσασθαι παρῆν τῆς γυνῆσθαι πῆσθαι φεροσθαι, women bringing (something) to drink. Id. Hell. vii. 2. 9. Τῆν πῆλιν καὶ τῆν ἴκραν φυλῆττειν ἀπὸς παρῆδοσαν, “they delivered the city and the citadel to them to guard.” Ib. iv. 4. 15. ἴς γὰρ ἴν ἴμῆς λῆσθαι, τοῖτον ἴφῆετε τοῖς θεοῖς κολῆζειν. DEM. xix. 71.

“ἴ θῆρα ἴ μῆ ἴνῆκτο εἴσῆναι τῆ δεομῆν τῆ ἴμοσθαι.” XEN. Hell. v. 1, 14 “Οἱκ εἴχον ἴργῆριον ἴπισιτῆζεσθαι,” “they had no money to buy provisions.” Id. An. vii. 1, 7 “ἴριστῆρχῆ ἴδοτε ἴμῆραν ἴπολογῆσασθαι,” “i.e., a day to defend himself in.” Id. Hell. i. 7, 28 “ἴμαυτῆν σοι ἴμμελετῆν παρῆχειν οἱ πῆνυ δῆδοκται,” “i.e. to practise on.” PLAT. Phaedrus 228 E. “Οἱς ἴνευδαῖμονσθαι τε ἴ βῆος ἴμοσθαι καὶ ἴντελευτῆσαι ἴνεμετρῆσθαι,” “for enjoyment as well as for death.” THUC. ii. 44.

[*] 771. Here, as in 763, the infinitive is generally active or middle, even where the passive would seem more natural; as κτανεῖν μοῖνιν δοσαν, “they gave her to me to be killed.” EUR. Tro. 874.

[*] 772. a) The infinitive is thus used in prose chiefly after verbs signifying to choose or appoint, to give or take, to express the purpose for which anything is given or taken; and also after those signifying to send or bring. (See examples in 770.) With the last class the future participle is still more common (840). A final clause after να etc. may also be used in the same sense.

b) In poetry, the same construction occurs after verbs of motion, like εἶμι, κω, and βαίνω; and also after εἶμι, πειμι, and πρειμι (to be, to be at hand), expressed or understood. E.g. ἄλλοις εἴη εἶπεν τρεῖς γαμῖνονι, ποιμνὶ λαῖν, “but let some one go to tell Agamemnon.” Od. xiv. 496. Β δὲ θεῖν, “and he started to run.” Il. ii. 183. Οὐδὲ τις στὶν ῥῖν καὶ λοῖγῖν μῖναι, “nor is there any one to keep off curse and ruin.” Il. xxiv. 489. Πολλοὶ δὲ ἀσοῖο χαῖο ἵνα ῖμεν ἵν κε δῖνηαι, i.e. for you to slay whomsoever you can. Il. vi. 229. Ο γῖρ πῖ ἵν ῖρ οῖος δῖσσεῖς σκεν, ῖρ πῖ οῖκου μῖναι. Od. ii. 59. “Μανθῖνεῖν γῖρ ῖκομεν,” “for we are come to learn.” SOPH. O.C. 12.

c) Even in prose, the infinitive occasionally occurs after εἶμι in this sense, as in PLAT. Phaedr. 229A, “κεῖ σκί τῖ στῖ, καὶ πῖα καθῖζεσθαι ἵν βουλιμεθα κατακλιθῖναι”, there is grass to sit upon, etc. See also XEN. An. ii. 1, 6, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ πῖλται καὶ μαζαῖ ἵσαν φῖρεσθαι ῖρημοι, i.e. they were left to be carried away.

[*] 773. In Homer and Herodotus εἶναι is often introduced to denote a purpose, where in Attic Greek a simple noun, connected directly with the leading verb, would be sufficient. E.g. Θῖρηκα, τῖν ποτῖ οῖ Κινῖρης δῖκε ξεινῖον εἶναι, i.e. which they gave him as a present (lit. to be a present). Il. xi. 20. Ἄθον εἶλετο χειρῖ παχεῖ, τῖν ϖῖ ἵνδρες πῖτεροι θῖσαν ῖμμεναι οῖρον ῖροῖρης, which former men had placed (to be) as a boundary of the land. Il. xxi. 405. Δαρεῖος καταστῖσας ῖρταφῖρνεα ῖπαρχον εἶναι Σαρδῖων. HDT. v. 25. So in the passive construction: Γῖλων ῖπεδῖχθη πῖσης τῖς ῖππου εἶναι ῖπαρχος. Id. vii. 154.

[*] 774. Even in Attic prose, this use of εἶναι (773) sometimes occurs; as in DEM. xxix. 25, μνημονεῖουσιν φεθῖντα τοῖτον ῖλεῖθερον εἶναι τῖτε, they remember his having been then manumitted (so as) to be a freeman. So φῖησιν ἀτῖ δῖμῖσια εἶναι, he gives them up to be public property, THUC. ii. 13.

[*] 775. The simple infinitive in Homer may express a result as well as a purpose, as ῖστε is seldom used there in the sense of so as (589). It thus follows many expressions which would not allow it in Attic Greek. E.g. Τῖς τῖ ῖρ σφωε θεῖν ῖριδι ξυνῖηκε μῖχεσθαι; i.e. who brought them into conflict, so as to contend? Il. i. 8. So i. 151; and ῖριζῖμεναι, Il. ii. 214. ἄλλοι τε δῖ κοῖλη νηῖς ῖχθετο τοῖσι νῖεσθαι, when now their ship was loaded, so as (to be ready) to sail. Od. xv. 457. For the infinitive in consecutive sentences with ῖστε or ῖς, and φῖ or φῖτε, see 582-600; 608-610. For the infinitive with πῖν, see 626-631.

Absolute Infinitive.

Absolute Infinitive.3

[*] 776. The infinitive may stand absolutely in certain parenthetical phrases, expressing a limitation or qualification of some word or of the whole sentence.

[*] 777. 1. Most frequent are the simple εἰπεῖν and εἰπεῖν, so to speak; and εἰπεῖν or εἰπεῖν with an adverb or other adjunct, sometimes with an object. E.g. Καὶ ἔργου, εἰς ἅπος εἰπεῖν, οὐδενὲς προσδιδόνται βραχέως πῖνυ, and of action, so to speak, they need either none or very little. PLAT. Gorg. 450D. Plato uses εἰς ἅπος εἰπεῖν 77 times. εἰπεῖν ἅπος, “so to speak.” AESCH. Pers. 714: so EUR. Hipp. 1162, EUR. Her. 167 (see EUR. Or. 1). εἰς δὲ συντομῶς εἰπεῖν, “to speak concisely.” ISOC. vii. 26: so PLAT. Tim. 25E. εἰς συνελθόντι εἰπεῖν. XEN. Mem. iii. 8, 10. εἰπεῖν. PLAT. Phaedr. 258E : so PLAT. Rep. 619D. εἰς πλῆθὲς εἰπεῖν, “to speak simply.” ISOC. iv. 154. εἰς κεφάλαιον εἰπεῖν. Symp. 186C. εἰς τὸ ἅλῳν εἰπεῖν γένος. Crat. 192C. εἰς πᾶσι πῖνυ εἰπεῖν. Leg. 667D. So εἰς περὶ ἅλης εἰπεῖν ψυχῆς, Rep. 577E. εἰς γὰρ τὸ δικαιοτάτον εἰπεῖν. Leg. 624A. εἰς πᾶσιν εἰπεῖν, “speaking of a state.” Rep. 577C. Without εἰς: τὸ σμικρὸν εἰπεῖν, HDT. ii. 91; THUC. i. 138, THUC. vii. 49. εἰς τὸ κριβεῖν εἰπεῖν. Id. vi. 82. Σὺν θεῷ εἰπεῖν. PLAT. Prot. 317B. Τὸ δὲ ῥθῶν εἰπεῖν, ἅπνευσα, SOPH. O.T. 1220.

2. Other verbs of saying are used in the same way with εἰς. E.g. εἰς τορῆς φροῦσαι. AESCH. Ag. 1584. εἰς κτὸ παραχρῆμα λῆγειν. PLAT. Crat. 399D. εἰς γὰρ τὸ νῦν παρῶντι λῆγειν. Leg. 857C. εἰς ἅν φροῦζειν. Id. Polit. 282B εἰς πρὸς ἑμῶς εἰρῆσθαι, i.e. between ourselves. Rep. 595B. εἰς γὰρ πρὸς σὺ εἰρῆσθαι τλήθῃ. Prot. 339E. εἰς τὸ πᾶσι, μὲν δὲ κριβεῖσθαι, εἰρῆσθαι. Rep. 414A. For εἰς λῆγειν εἰπεῖν in Herodotus, see 782.

[*] 778. ἡμῶς δοκεῖν or (less frequently) εἰς ἡμῶς δοκεῖν means in my opinion, it seems to me. Other similar expressions are (εἰς) ἐκκῆσαι, to make a guess; (εἰς) συμβῆλλειν, to compare, if we may compare; (εἰς) ἀκοῆσαι, to the ear; εἰς δεῖν or ἅσον δεῖν, to the eye, in appearance; ἅσον μὲν εἰδῆναι, so far as my knowledge goes; εἰς τεκμῆρασθαι, so far as one can judge. E.g.

ἅλλῃ ἡμῶς δοκεῖν, τῆχῃ εἴσει, but, methinks, you will soon know. AESCH. Pers. 246: so SOPH. El. 410. ἅτῃχθονες δοκεῖν ἡμῶς εἴσει. HDT. i. 172. ἅπεπῆμπετο στρατιῆς, εἰς ἡμῶς δοκεῖν, ἅπῃ Διβῆνης καταστροφῆ. Id. iv. 167. Δοκεῖν δὲ ἡμῶς. THUC. viii. 64: so vii. 87. ἅληθῆ, ἅμοιγε δοκεῖν. PLAT. Men. 81 A. See Rep. 432 B, “εἰς γὰρ ὁ τῶς δῆξαι” .

“ἅπρος δὲ ῥῆς, εἰς ἅπικῆσαι” SOPH. O.C. 16. “εἰς θῆραθεν ἐκῆσαι” EUR. H.F. 713. See HDT. i. 34. εἰς μικρὸν μεγῆλῃ ἐκῆσαι. THUC. iv. 36. Once ἐκῆσαι alone: SOPH. O.T. 82. ἅδωρ γὰρ ἅν πρὸς ἅν συμβῆλλειν, i.e. to compare the waters one with the other. HDT. iv. 50 (cf. ἅν πρὸς ἅν, THUC. ii. 97). ἅστι δὲ τὸ τὸ ὁ τῶς μὲν ἀκοῆσαι λῆγον τινῆ ἅχον, i.e. on first hearing it. DEM. xx. 18. ἅτοπα, εἰς ὁ τῶ γὰρ ἀκοῆσαι. PLAT. Euthyph. 3 B. εἰς γὰρ ἅντεθεν δεῖν, “as it looks from this point.” Rep. 430 E. ἅσσον δῆν. Fr. 101. ἅσα γὰρ δὲ δεῖν. Pac. 856. “Ὀχῆ, ἅσον γὰρ μὲν εἰδῆναι,” “no, as far as I know.” Aristoph. Nub. 1252. See also Aristoph. Eccl. 350, ἅ τι κῆμῃ εἰδῆναι, and Thesm. 34, ἅστε (εἰς τε) κῆμῃ γὰρ εἰδῆναι, in the same sense. “εἰς γὰρ τὸ ποδῆ τεκμῆρασθαι.” PLAT. Phaedr. 230 B.

See also εἰς γὰρ ἡμῶς χρῆσθαι κριτῆ, EUR. Alc. 801; εἰς γὰρ κατὰ τὸν μὲν δῆξαν ἅποφῆνασθαι, PLAT. Polit. 272 D. See further, for Herodotus, 782.

[*] 779. a) Here belong λήγου δεῖν and μικροῦ δεῖν, wanting little, almost, and the rare πολλοῦ δεῖν, far from. E.g.

Πολλῶν λήγων γιγνομένων λήγου δεῖν καθ' ἕκαστην ἐκκλησίαν, “when many speeches are made almost in every assembly.” DEM. ix. 1. Μικροῦ δεῖν μοι ἐστὶ τὸ νειδίζειν. Id. xviii. 269; so ISOC. iv. 144, ISOC. viii. 44, ISOC. 89. νῦν ἐδιδτε πολλοῦ δεῖν ξίον ντα, that you may know that he is far from deserving, etc. DEM. xxiii. 7 (the only case of πολλοῦ δεῖν).

b) Here δεῖν is often omitted, leaving λήγου or μικροῦ in the sense of almost. E.g.

“λήγου φροδοῦς γεγνημαι,” “I am almost gone myself,” AR. Nub. 722, and μικροῦ κατηκντισαν παντας, “they came near shooting them all.” DEM. xviii. 151.

[*] 780. In many expressions εἶναι is used absolutely, and it often seems to us superfluous. The most common case is that of κεν εἶναι, so far as being willing goes, or willingly, used almost exclusively in negative sentences. E.g. Οὔτε αὐτὸς φη κεν εἶναι δουλεῖσθαι. HDT. viii. 116. See THUC. ii. 89, THUC. vi. 14. κεν γὰρ εἶναι οὐδὲν ψεῦσομαι, “willingly I will tell no falsehood.” Symp. 215A Οὐκ μὴν γε κατὰ ἄρχους πῶσο κεντος εἶναι ἕξαπατηθῆσθαι. Gorg. 499C. (νῦν γὰρ χεῖν τὸν ψευδεῖαν κατὰ κεντας εἶναι μηδαμῶς προσδχεσθαι τὸ ψεῦδος. Id. Rep. 485C: see 336 E. One positive sentence occurs, HDT. vii. 164.

[*] 781. Other cases of absolute εἶναι are τὸ πῶσφ (πῶσφ κενοῖς, πῶσφ τοῖς, κατὰ τὸν) εἶναι, so far as they were concerned, etc. THUC. iv. 28, THUC. viii. 48; XEN. An. i. 6, 9, XEN. Hell. iii. 5, 9;—κατὰ (εἰς δὲ ναμιν εἶναι, ISAE. ii. 32; PLAT. Polit. 300C;—κατὰ τὸ εἶναι, “so far as concerns this.” Id. Prot. 317A;—τὸν πρῶτην εἶναι, at first, HDT. i. 153. So especially τὸ νῦν εἶναι, at present (τὸν belonging to νῦν): see ISOC. xv. 270; PLAT. Lach. 201 C, PLAT. Rep. 506 E; XEN Cyr. v. 3, Cyr. 42; also τὸ τῆμερον εἶναι, to-day, PLAT. Crat. 396 E. In Aristotle's τὸ τὸν εἶναι, the εἶναι is probably absolute, and τὸν may be a “philosophic” imperfect (40), the expression meaning the original essence (the “what was it?”).

Two expressions have εἰς: εἰς πῶλαια εἶναι, considering their antiquity, THUC. i. 21; and εἰς γε διακνους εἶναι πῶλεως, considering that they were servants of a state, i.e. for servants, PLAT. Gorg. 517 B.

[*] 782. Herodotus has a remarkable variety of expressions of this kind. Besides those already quoted, see the following:—

Τὸ Δῶλτα ἐστὶ κατὰ ῥρυτὸν τε καὶ νεωστῶ, εἰς λήγῃ εἰπεῖν, νῦναπεφηνῆς, and recently, so to speak, has appeared above water. ii. 15. (εἰς λήγῃ εἰπεῖν is peculiar to Herodotus.) Καὶ εἰς μὲν εἰ μεμνῆσθαι τὸν ῥμηνεῖς μοι φη, so far as I remember rightly what the interpreter told me, etc. ii. 125. εἰς μὲν κατανοεῖν, as I understand it. ii. 28. εἰς μὲν νῦν νῦν ἕλαχῆσθαι δηλῆσαι, πῶν εἰρηται: εἰς δὲ νῦν πῶνι λήγῃ δηλῆσαι, ἔδε χεῖ. ii. 24 and 25. Μετὰ δὲ, οὐ πολλῶ λήγῃ εἰπεῖν, χρῆνος διφῶ. i. 61. εἰς μὲν συμβαλλόμενον εἰρῶσκειν, so far as I find by conjecture. vii. 24. εἰς μὲν δοκῆν συμβαλλόμενον. iv. 87. εἰς εἶναι τὰτα μικρῶ μεγῶλοισι συμβῆλλειν, so far as I may (εἶναι) compare these small things with great ones. iv. 99: see ii. 10. εἰς Σκῆθας εἶναι, for Scythians, considering that they are Scythians. iv. 81. εἰς εἶναι Ἀγῆπτου, for Egypt, i.e. for a land like Egypt. ii. 8. Μεγῶλα κτῶσατο χρῶματα εἰς νῦν

εἶναι οὐδ' ἔστιν, she gained great sums of money for a Rhodopis. ii. 135. (The force of εἶναι is very doubtful here; and οὐδ' ἔστιν is often emended to οὐδ' ἔστις or οὐδ' ἔστι, neither of which is satisfactory.)

[*] 783. The absolute infinitive was probably felt as a limiting accusative; and in Pac. 232, ἔστιν ἄνθρωπον μὴ μὲν μὴ λλει, we might substitute μοῖ δοκεῖν for ἄνθρωπον μὴ μὲν.4 εἶναι as used here can hardly be expressed in English; but it resembles some uses of εἶναι and εἶναι with the infinitive after adjectives in 588. It cannot be demonstrative, as might be supposed from our inadequate translation of εἶναι, so to speak.

Infinitive in Commands and Prohibitions for the Imperative. Infinitive in Wishes and Exclamations.

[*] 784. 1. The infinitive is sometimes used in the sense of the second person of the imperative, especially in Homer. E.g. Τὸ νῦν μὴ ποτε καὶ σὺ γυναικὶ περὶ ἑπιπέσειν: μὴ οὐ μὴθον ἄπαντα πιφασκόμεν, ἔν κ' ἔτι εἰδός, ἄλλ' τὸ μὴν φέσθαι, τὸ δὲ καὶ κεκρυμμένον εἶναι, now therefore be thou never indulgent to thy wife, etc. Od. xi. 441. So Il. i. 20, Il. 582, Il. ii. 10, Il. xvii. 501; Od. x. 297, Od. xi. 72, Od. xvii. 278, Od. xviii. 106, Od. xxii. 287. “Ὀὐ μὴ πελίζειν,” “do not approach these (= μὴ πηλαζε).” AESCH. Prom. 712. Πρὸν δὲ ἔν τελευτῆσθαι, ἄπισχεῖν μὴ δὲ καλεῖν κωλύβιον, wait, and do not yet call him happy. HDT. i. 32. Σὺ δὲ τὸς πηλασάμενος ἄνοιξας ἄπεθεῖν καὶ ἄπεγέσθαι, and do you open the gates, and rush out and press on. THUC. v. 9. ἔν οὐοὶ τε γενόμεθα ἔρεθον, φέσθαι ἄμεις ἄξευρηκέναι, “say that we have found it.” PLAT. Rep. 473 A. Τοῦτο παρὰ ἄμιν ἄτολμας βεβαίως γέναι, “understand this in your own minds.” DEM. viii. 39.

2. In the cases of the second person just given (1), the subject is in the nominative. But when the infinitive is equivalent to the third person of the imperative, its subject is in the accusative, as if some word like δός, grant, were understood. E.g. Εὐ μὲν κεν Μενέλαον ἄλκιξανδρος κακαπύφον, ἄτ' ἔτι ἄλκην ἄχέτω: εὐ δὲ κ' ἄλκιξανδρον κτενέμεν Μενέλαος, Τρῶας ἄπειθῶ ἄλκην ἄποδοῦναι, i.e. let him keep Helen himself,—and let the Trojans surrender Helen. Il. iii. 281-285. Τελέχεα σὺλμασας φέρτω, σέμα δὲ οὐκαδὲ ἄμιν δόμεναι πῆλιν (sc. ἄτ' ἔν). Il. vii. 78.

These examples follow the construction of the infinitive in wishes (785).

[*] 785. The infinitive with a subject accusative is sometimes used for the optative in the expression of a wish referring to the future. This occurs chiefly in poetry. E.g. Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἄ ἄπαντα λαχέμεν ἄ Τυδέος υἱόν, Father Zeus, may the lot fall on Ajax or on the son of Tydeus (= ἄσας ἄχοι). Il. vii. 179. Ζεῦ ἄνα, Τηλέμαχον μοι ἄν ἄνδρῶσιν ἄλβιον εἶναι, καὶ οὐ πῆντα γένοιθ' ἄσσα φρεσῶν ἄσι μενοινέμεν (εἶναι = εἶναι is followed by γένοιτο). Od. xvii. 354. Μὴ πρὸν ἄπ' ἄλλιον δέμεναι καὶ ἄπ' ἄκνέφας ἄλθεμεν. Il. ii. 413. ἄε δὲ τοιαῦταν ἄσαν διακρῖναι ἄτυμον ἄγον ἄνθρῶπων. PIND. Py. i. 67. Θεοὶ πολέται, μὴ με δουλέμασας τυχεμεν (= μὴ τῆχοιμι). Sept. 253. ἄμμητερ, εἰδαίμονεμεν με Θησῆα τε παδὲ ἄμιν. EUR. Supp. 3. ἄρμ' ἄπολαέ, τῶν γυνάκα τῶν ἄμιν οἴτω μὴ ἄποδῆσθαι τῶν τῶν ἄμαντομάτ' ἄρα, “O that I could sell my wife and my mother at this rate!” AR. Ach. 816. ἄ Ζεῦ, ἄκγενέσθαι μοι ἄθηναίους τῆσασθαι, “may it be permitted me to punish the Athenians.” HDT. v. 105. ἄκτεροι δὲ ἄν ἄμῶν νικέσωσι, τοῦτους τῶν ἄπαντι στρατοπέδῳ νικέμεν, i.e. let their victory count for the whole army. Id. ix. 48. This construction, like the preceding (784, 2), is often explained by an

ellipsis of $\delta\mu\varsigma$, grant; see ll. iii. 351, $\delta\mu\varsigma$ τ $\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. Aristarchus supplied $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\iota\tau\omicron$ or $\epsilon\eta$.

[*] 786. In two passages of the Odyssey, we find the infinitive in a wish introduced by $\alpha\gamma\upsilon\rho$, once in the sense of the optative and once in that of a past tense of the indicative, with the subject (understood) in the nominative:—

$A\gamma\upsilon\rho$, το σ ς $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$ ν ο $\mu\mu\varsigma$ $\sigma\sigma\iota$, . . . πα $\delta\delta$ τ $\mu\mu$ ν $\chi\mu\mu\epsilon\nu$ κα $\mu\mu$ ς γαμβρ $\mu\mu$ ς καλ $\mu\mu$ εσθαι, O that, being such as you now are, you might have (= $\chi\omicron\iota\varsigma$) my daughter and be called my son-in-law. Od. vii. 311. $A\gamma\upsilon\rho$, ο σ ς Ν $\rho\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$ ε $\lambda\omicron\nu$, . . . το σ ς $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$ ν τοι χθιζ $\mu\mu$ ς $\phi\epsilon\sigma\tau\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ κα $\mu\mu$ ν $\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\nu\delta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ μνηστ $\mu\mu$ ρας: τ μ κε σφ $\mu\mu$ ων γο $\nu\alpha\tau\mu\mu$ $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\alpha$, “O that I had stood by you yesterday and had punished the suitors; then would I have loosened their knees.” Od. xxiv. 376. So also AESCH. Cho. 362-366, and 368.

These passages agree in construction with the second person of the infinitive in commands (784, 1).

[*] 787. The infinitive, with its subject accusative, may be used in exclamations of surprise or indignation. E.g. $\mu\mu$ παθε ν τ $\mu\mu$ δε, $\phi\epsilon\mu$, $\mu\mu$ παλαι $\phi\omicron\rho\nu\omicron\nu\alpha$, κατ μ τε γ ν ν ο $\mu\mu$ κε ν , $\tau\mu\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu$, $\phi\epsilon\mu$, $\mu\mu\sigma\omicron\varsigma$, that I should suffer this, alas! I, with my thoughts of old; and that I should dwell in this land, alas! an unhonoured plague! AESCH. Eum. 837. $\lambda\mu$ το $\sigma\delta\mu$ $\mu\mu\omicron$ ματα $\mu\mu$ αν γλ $\mu\mu$ σσαν $\delta\mu$ $\mu\mu$ πανθ $\mu\mu$ σαι κ $\mu\mu$ κβαλε ν $\mu\mu$ πη τοια $\mu\mu$ τα, that these should thus cast at me the flowers of their idle tongues, etc. Id. Ag. 1662. “ $\mu\mu$ δυστ $\mu\mu$ λαινα, τοι $\mu\mu$ δ μ $\nu\delta\rho\alpha$ χρησι $\mu\mu$ ν $\phi\omega\nu\epsilon\mu\mu$ ν” SOPH. Aj. 410. “Τοιουτο $\mu\mu$ τρ $\mu\mu$ φειν κ $\mu\mu$ να,” “to keep a dog like that!” AR. Vesp. 835. Το $\mu\mu$ τον δ μ $\mu\mu$ βρ $\mu\mu$ ζειν: $\nu\alpha\pi\nu\epsilon\mu\mu$ ν $\delta\mu$, and that he should be thus insulting, and should draw his breath! DEM. xxi. 209.

Compare “Mene incepto desistere victam!” VERG. Aen. i. 37. This infinitive often has the article τ μ (805).

Infinitive with the Article.

Infinitive with the Article.5

[*] 788. It has been seen that the infinitive without the article was already established in the Homeric language, in nearly all the constructions in which it was most frequently used in later times. In this simple form it developed its various tenses, and their uses became fixed, especially in indirect discourse; so that the infinitive gradually came to be more of a verb and less of a noun. When the definite article had become common with nouns, it was soon prefixed to the infinitive, which thus, with all its attributes as a verb unimpaired, was restored to new life as a neuter verbal noun.⁶ As a nominative and accusative, it could be used with τ μ in all the constructions in which the simple infinitive was already familiar as subject or object, although here the older form was preferred except when it was desired to emphasise the infinitive especially as a nominative or accusative. But in other constructions (especially in the genitive, dative, and accusative with prepositions), and in its wonderful capacity for carrying dependent clauses and adjuncts of every kind, the articular infinitive appears as a new power in the language, of which the older simple infinitive gave hardly an intimation. As might be expected, the articular infinitive found its chief use in the rhetorical language, as in Demosthenes and in the speeches of Thucydides. It appears first in Pindar (for τ μ in Od. xx. 52 and Frag. HES. clxxi. can hardly be the article), but always as a subject nominative, with one doubtful exception. In the dramatists and Herodotus it is not

uncommon, being generally a nominative or accusative with τ, although it occurs also as a genitive or dative with το or τ; and it is found even with prepositions. In Thucydides (especially in the speeches), we find the nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative all used with the greatest freedom (in 135 cases), besides the accusative, genitive, and dative with prepositions (in 163 cases). Its fully developed power of taking dependent clauses must be seen in the Orators, especially in Demosthenes.⁷ Articular Infinitive as Subject or Object.

[*] 789. Although the infinitive, as subject or object of a verb, generally stands without the article, the article may be prefixed to make the infinitive more prominent as a noun in the structure of the sentence.

[*] 790. The infinitive with τ may stand as a subject, especially of σ. E.g. Τ γναι πιστμην που λαβε στιν, “to learn is to acquire knowledge.” PLAT. Theaet. 209 E. Τ δκην διδναι πτερον πσχειν τ στιν ποιεν; Gorg. 476 D. (In the last two examples the subject infinitive has the article to emphasise it, while the predicate infinitive stands alone.) Τ δ παθε εν πρτον θλων. PIND. Py. i. 99. Οτοι δ στι τ χειν χρματα οτως εν νιαρ τ ποβλλειν. XEN. Cyr. viii. 3, 42. Πολλκις δοκε τ φυλξαι τγαθ το κτσασθαι χαλεπτερον εναι, “to keep advantages often seems to be harder than gaining them.” DEM. i. 23 (cf. ii. 26, quoted in 745, for both construction and sense). Τοτ στι τ δικεν, τ πλον τν λλων ζητεν χειν. PLAT. Gorg. 483 C. λλλ ομαι, νν μν πισκοτε τοτοις τ κατορθον. DEM. ii. 20. Τ γρ θνατον δεδιναι οδν λλο στν δοκεν σοφν εναι μ ντα: δοκεν γρ εδναι στν οκ οδεν. PLAT. Ap. 29 A. See also 29 C.

It will be seen by comparison that most of these examples would admit the construction without the article by making the infinitive less prominent as a subject nominative. Compare οτε κλαεν οτ δρεσθαι ππει, AESCH Sept. 656, with τος δ λβοις γε κα τ νικσθαι ππει, Ag. 941.

[*] 791. The infinitive with τ can stand as an accusative of the direct object, sometimes as an accusative of kindred meaning. The relation of such an infinitive with τ to the verb is often less close than that of the simple infinitive in a similar case (see 811). E.g. Τλσομαι τ καθανεν, “I shall dare to die.” AESCH. Ag. 1290. στιν τις, στιν, εν σε κωλσει τ δρν, “who will prevent you from acting.” SOPH. Ph. 1241. So πισπεδεν τ δρν, SOPH. El. 467. Τ σπεδεν δ σοι παραιν. Id. Ph. 620. “Τ δρν οκ θλλησαν,” “they were unwilling to act (would not act).” Id. O.C. 442. Τ δ α ξυνοικεν τδ μο τς ν γυν δναιτο, what woman would be able to live with her? (to live with her—what woman could do it?). Id. Tr. 545. Τ π ονου μ σφλλεσθαι πιμελεσθαι, “to take care not to be upset by wine.” Lac. v. 7. Ασχνονται τ τολμν. PLAT. Soph. 247 C. Συνεθξεσθαι τας ψυχας τ τν πατρδα φιλεν. LYCURG. 100. Κα πς δ τ ρχιχος εναι νθρπων παιδεεις; XEN. Oec. xiii. 4: see also ix. 12. (So παιδεω τιν τι.) πσχον τ εθως τος θηναοις πιχειρεν. THUC. vii. 33 (cf. τοτο πσχον, THUC. ii. 76). Οδ τοι τ χειρ πεθομαι τ δρν, nor am I persuaded by your violence to act (as you bid me). SOPH. Ph. 1253 (cf. ο πεθομα σοι τατα). Καρδας ξσταμαι τ δρν, I withdraw from my resolution (i.e. I consent) to do it. Id. Ant. 1105: cf. φρονεν μετγνω, i.e. changed his purpose (and resolved) to contemplate, AESCH. Ag. 221. For τ μ ο with the infinitive after negated verbs in this construction (e.g. AR. Ran. 68), see 815,

2, and 814.

[*] 792. The infinitive with τ as an object accusative may follow verbs which would not allow the simple infinitive in its place. E.g. Τ τελευτσαι πντων πεπρωμνη κατκρινε, τ δ καλς ποθανεν διον τος σπουδαοις πνειμεν, “Fate condemned all mankind to death; but a glorious death she reserved for the virtuous.” ISOC. i. 43. Μνον ρν τ παειν τν λισκμενον, “seeing only the beating of the captive.” XEN. Cyr. i. 4, 21. Τ μν ενοειν τε κα προορν γαμα σευ. HDT. ix. 79. The double character of the articular infinitive, as noun and verb, permits it to stand as an object wherever the object accusative of a noun would be allowed.

[*] 793. A few of the verbs included in 747, which govern the genitive of a noun, allow also the genitive of the infinitive with το (798), as well as the simple infinitive. This applies chiefly to μελω, πιμελομαι, and to the verbs of hindrance etc. included in 807. E.g. μελσας το ργζεσθαι. XEN. Mem. ii. 3, 9. (But μελσας λγειν, PLAT. Phaed. 98 D.) Most verbs of desiring and neglecting take only the simple infinitive. πιμελομαι, which usually takes πως with the future indicative (339), allows also the simple infinitive (THUC. vi. 54), the infinitive with τ (Lac. v. 7), and the infinitive with το (Id. Mem. iii. 3, Id. Mem. 11). (See 361, Id. Mem. 791, and 798.)

[*] 794. The infinitive of indirect discourse after verbs of saying and thinking sometimes takes τ. Here each tense of the infinitive preserves its time, and even the infinitive with ν occurs. E.g. μεν δ τομοι θεος ρκωμοτεν τ μετε δρσαι μετε τ ξυνειδναι τ προγμα βουλεσαντι, to swear that we neither had done it (δρσαμεν) nor were in the secret (ξνισμεν) of any one who had plotted the deed. SOPH. Ant. 264. ξομε τ μ εδναι; “will you swear that you have no knowledge?” Ib. 535. “Κα τ προειδναι γε τν θεν τ μλλον κα τ προσημανειν βολεται, τοτο πντες κα λγουσι κα νομζουσιν.” XEN. Ar. 13. See also XEN. Hell. v. 2, 36 (814).

(With ν.) Τς λπδος γρ ρχομαι δεδραγμνος, τ μ παθεν ν λλο πλν τ μρσιμον, “for I come clinging to the hope that I could suffer nothing except what is fated.” SOPH. Ant. 235. For the articular infinitive with ν in other constructions, see 212.

Infinitive with τ, after Adjectives and Nouns.

[*] 795. In some constructions in which the simple infinitive appears to preserve most distinct traces of its origin as a dative, especially after adjectives or nouns (758; 763; 766), the articular infinitive takes τ as an accusative. E.g. Τ δ β πολιτην δρν φυν μχανος, “but I am helpless to act in defiance of the citizens.” SOPH. Ant. 79. Μακρς τ κρναι τατα χ λοιπς χρνος, “a long time to settle this.” Id. El. 1030 (cf. χρνος βραχς διηγσασθαι, a time short for narrating, under 763). Τ μ βλππειν τομα, “ready to cease beholding the light.” Ib. 1079 (see 758). Τ προσταλαπωρεν οδες προθυμος ν. THUC. ii. 53. Τ μν ς τν γν μν σβλλειν, κν μ κπλεσωμεν, THUC. i κανο εσι. Id. vi. 17. ς δον προεσθ δε Κρων τ προσειν κα τ βουλεειν, “he is here at the right moment to act and advise.” SOPH. O.T. 1416. Ατιος τ σ ποκρνεσθαι μ τοτο. PLAT. Lach. 190 E. (This is rare, but see DEM. viii. 56, DEM. ix. 63. Ατιος generally has the infinitive with το, DEM. 798, or the simple infinitive, DEM. 749.)

■ ναυμαχία ο■χ■ δικά■αν ■χει τ■κμαρσιν τ■ ■κφοβ■σαι, “the seafight offers no just ground for alarm.” THUC. ii. 87. “Ο■δ■ το■ξανιστ■ναι ■στ■ θ■ρσος,” “nor have I courage to remove you.” SOPH. O.C. 47. The exact force given to these accusatives by those who used them is not always clear; but they come nearest to the accusative of respect or limitation (as ε■δος κ■λλιστος, most beautiful in form). Sometimes the infinitive with τ■ has this force, where the simple infinitive could not be used; as in LYCURG. 91, ■πε■ γε τ■ ■λθε■ν το■τον, ο■μαι θε■ν τινα α■τ■ν ■π■ α■τ■ν ■γαγε■ν τ■ν τιμωρ■αν, for, as to his departure, I think that some God led him directly to punishment.

[*] 796. We occasionally find τ■ with the infinitive in the Mss. in a similar loose construction, where we should expect the infinitive with το■ or τ■ in apposition with a preceding genitive or dative. See THUC. vii. 36, τ■ πρ■τερον ■μαθ■ δοκο■σ■ ε■ναι, τ■ ■ντ■πρ■ρον ζυγκρο■σαι, and viii. 87, καταβο■ς ■νεκα τ■ς ■ς Λακεδα■μονα, τ■ λ■γεσθαι ■ς ο■κ ■δικε■, where most editors now read τ■ and το■ against the Mss. But Birklein defends the Mss. readings by HYPER. Epitaph. 2, ■ξιον δ■ ■στιν ■παινε■ν τ■ν μ■ν π■λιν ■μ■ν τ■ς προαιρ■σεως ■νεκεν, τ■ προελ■σθαι ■μοια, . . . το■ς δ■ τετελευτηκ■τας τ■ς ■νδρε■ας, τ■ μ■ καταισχ■ναι τ■ς τ■ν προγ■νων ■ρετ■ς, where the two infinitives with τ■ explain προαιρ■σεως and ■νδρε■ας. (See 804.)

[*] 797. The infinitive with τ■ appears in its greatest variety of meanings in the construction of τ■ μ■ or τ■ μ■ ο■ after verbs implying a negative (811). See also 813 and 814.

Infinitive with το■, τ■, and τ■, as a Noun, in various Constructions.

[*] 798. The infinitive with το■ appears as an adnominal genitive, a genitive after verbs and adjectives and with comparatives, a partitive genitive, a genitive absolute, and a genitive expressing cause, purpose, or motive. E.g. Το■ πιε■ν ■πιθυμ■α, “the desire to drink.” THUC. vii. 84. Π■νους δ■ το■ ζ■ν ■δ■ως ■γεμ■νας νομ■ζετε. XEN. Cyr. i. 5, 12. Πρ■ς τ■ν π■λιν προσβαλ■ντες ■ς ■λπ■δα ■λθον το■ ■λε■ν, i.e. hope of taking the city. THUC. ii. 56 (see 749). Τ■ γ■ρ ε■ πρ■ττειν παρ■ τ■ν ■ξ■αν ■φορμ■ το■ κακ■ς φρονε■ν το■ς ■νο■τοις γ■γεται, “for doing well beyond their deserts sets fools to thinking ill.” DEM. i. 23. ■ δ■ διαγ■μη α■τη τ■ς ■κκλησ■ας το■ τ■ς σπονδ■ς λελ■σθαι, “this vote of the assembly that the treaty had been broken.” THUC. i. 87. See XEN. Cyr. i. 4, 4.

Δ■ξετε α■τιοι ε■ναι, ■ρξαντες το■ διαβα■νειν, “by having begun the passage of the river.” XEN. An. i. 4, 15. ■ρεγ■μενοι το■ πρ■τος ■καστος γ■γεσθαι, “being eager each to be first.” THUC. ii. 65. Παρεκ■λει ■πιμελε■σθαι το■ ■ς φρονιμ■τατον ε■ναι. XEN. Mem. i. 2, 55 ; so iii. 3, XEN. Mem. 11. (See 793.) ■π■σχομεν το■ δακρ■ειν, “we ceased to weep.” PLAT. Phaed. 117 E. (See below, E. 807.) Κα■ γ■ρ ■■θεις το■ κατακο■ειν τιν■ς ε■σιν, “for they are unused to obeying any one.” DEM. i. 23. See xxix. 17. ■ξιος α■το■ς ■δ■κεις ε■ναι το■ τοια■τ■ ■κο■ειν. Id. xxi. 134. Το■ς καρπο■ς, ο■ το■ μ■ θηριωδ■ς ζ■ν ■μ■ς α■τιοι γεγ■νασι, the fruits of the earth, which are the cause of our not living like beasts. ISOC. iv. 28. Κατηρ■σατο τ■ α■τ■ το■ μ■ π■λαι ■ποδεδ■σθαι τ■ν μισθ■ν, “he cursed him who was responsible for the wages not having been paid long before.” XEN. An. vii. 7, 48. (Α■τιος may take the simple infinitive and even the infinitive with τ■. See 749 and 795.) Πολλ■κισ δοκε■ τ■ φυλ■ξαι τ■γαθ■ το■ κτ■σασθαι χαλεπ■τερον ε■ναι. DEM. i. 23. So XEN. Cyr. i. 5, 13. Ν■οις τ■ σιγ■ν κρε■τ■ν ■στι το■ λαλε■ν. MEN. Mon. 387. Το■ θαρσε■ν τ■ πλε■στον ε■ληφ■τες, i.e. having become most emboldened. THUC. iv. 34. Ο■δ■ν ο■τε ■ναιδε■ας ο■τε το■ ψε■δεσθαι παραλε■ψει. DEM.

xxxvii. 45. Ες το τ λλλυθε το νομζειν. Id. xxii. 16. Τ μεγαλου ργου ντος το αυτ τ δοντα παρασκευζειν μ ρκεν το το. XEN. Mem. ii. 1, 8 (see 806).

Ζηλ σε μλλον μ το μηδν φρονεν, for want of knowledge. I. A. 677. (Μνωσ) τ λστικν καθρει, το τς προσδους μλλον ναι ατ, "in order that revenues might come in to him more abundantly." THUC. i. 4. So ii. 22, THUC. 32, THUC. 75, THUC. 93; XEN. Cyr. i. 3, 9. Το μ τ δκαια ποιεν, "to escape doing what was just." DEM. xviii. 107. Πρς τ πργμα φιλονεικοντα λγειν το καταφανς γενσθαι. PLAT. Gorg. 457 E. This final use appears first and chiefly in Thucydides.

[*] 799. The infinitive with τ may express cause, manner, or means; or it may follow verbs, adjectives, and adverbs which take the dative. E.g. Οδ τ δνασθαι κα εωθναι λγειν παρθες. LYS. xxxi. 2. Οδεν τν πντων πλον κεκρητηκε Φλιππος τ πρτερος πρς τος πργμασι γγεσθαι. DEM. viii. 11. See xxiii. 9, τ μν κοσαι, τ δ ργ. λλλ τ φανερς εναι τοιοτος ν, "by making it plain that he was such a man." XEN. Mem. i. 2, 3. So Cyr. iv. 5, Cyr. 9. Ο γρ δ τ γε κοσμως ζν ξιον πιστεειν, "to trust in an orderly life." ISOC. xv. 24. "να πιστσει τ μ τετιμσθαι π δαιμνων," "that they may distrust my having been honoured by divine powers." XEN. Ap. 14. Μεζον μρος νμοντες τ μ βολεσθαι ληθ εναι. THUC. iii. 3. σον δ τ προστνειν. AESCH. Ag. 253. Τ ζν στι τι ναντον, σπερ τ γρηγορναι τ καθεδειν. PLAT. Phaed. 71 C. μοιν στι τ νειδζειν. DEM. xviii. 269. Τ πλουτεν πκοα, "obedient to wealth." AR. Pl. 146. μα τ τιμσθαι. PLAT. Rep. 468 D; so μα τ τιμν, 468 E

[*] 800. The infinitive with the article, as genitive, dative, or accusative, very often follows prepositions, or adverbs used as prepositions. E.g. Τος γρ λγους περ το τιμωρσασθαι Φλιππον ρ γιγομνους, "for I see that the speeches are made about punishing Philip." DEM. iii. 1. Πρ το τος ρκους ποδοναι, "before taking the oaths." Id. xviii. 26. κ το πρς χριν δημηγορεν νους. Id. iii. 3. ντ το πλις εναι φοριον κατστη. THUC. vii. 28; so i. 69. π το περαν διδος ζυνετς φανεσθαι. Id. i. 138. νεκα το πλεω ποισαι τν πρχουσαν οσαν. ISOC. i. 19. Πρς τ μηδν κ τς πρεσβεας λαβεν, "besides receiving nothing from the embassy." DEM. xix. 229. ν τ πολτην ποιεσθαι (Χαρδημον), in making Charidemus a citizen. Id. xxiii. 188. θαυμζετο π τ εθμωσ ζν. XEN. Mem. iv. 8, 2. μωσ δι τ ζνος εναι οκ ν οει δικηθναι, "on account of being a stranger." Ib. ii. 1, Ib. 15. Πντων διαφρων φανετο κα ες τ ταχμανθνεν δοι κα ες τ καλς καστα ποιεν. Id. Cyr. i. 3, Id. Cyr. 1. Πρς τ μετρων δεσθαι πεπαιδευμνος. Id. Mem. i. 2, Id. Mem. 1; so DEM. i. 4. Παρ τ ασχρν τι πομεναι. PLAT. Ap. 28 C.

[*] 801. The infinitive is not found with ν in any case, with μφ in accusative or dative, with κατ in genitive, with παρ in genitive or dative, with περ in dative, with πρς in genitive, with πρ in accusative, or with π in accusative or dative.

[*] 802. The genitive of the infinitive with πρ is often equivalent to a final clause. E.g. Τς δεσεις ας κχρηντα τινες πρ το τ μτρια κα τ συνθη μ γγεσθαι ν τ πλει (= να μ γγνηται), the solicitations which some have employed in order that moderate counsels and the ordinary principles may not prevail in the state. AESCHIN. iii. 1. Ες τς τριρεις μβντες πρ το μ τ κελυμενον ποισαι (= να μ ποισωσιν), embarking on shipboard that they might avoid doing what was bid. DEM. xviii. 204.

[*] 803. The article cannot ordinarily be omitted when the infinitive follows a preposition.

a) A singular exception occurs in a few cases of **ντ** with the simple infinitive in Herodotus. See **ς ντ μν δολων ποησας λευθρους Πρσας εναι, ντ δ ρχεσθαι πλλων ρχειν πντων**, i. 210, where the antithesis of **ντ μν δολων** makes **ντ δ ρχεσθαι** more natural; also vi. 32 (with no antithesis). So vii. 170 (but with a various reading **ντ το**).

b) **Πλν**, except, as an adverb, may have the simple infinitive; as **τλλο πλν ψευδ λγειν**, SOPH. Ph. 100. So **πλν γμου τυχεν**, AESCH. Eum. 737.

[*] 804. An infinitive, with the article in any case, may stand in apposition to a noun in the same case. E.g. **τν παδων ρχ, τ μν λευθρους εναι, ως, κ.τ.λ.**, the government of children,—not permitting them to be free, until, etc. PLAT. Rep. 590 E. **τοτ στι τ δικεν, τ πλον τν λλων ζητεν χειν**. Gorg. 483 C. **τοτο προσμοιον χουσι τος τυρννοις, τ πολλν ρχειν**. Id. Rep. 578 D. **τοτου μακαριτερον, το γ μιχθναι**; XEN. Cyr. viii. 7, 25. **δοκε τοτ διαφρειν νρ τν λλων ζων, τ τιμς ργεσθαι**. Id. Hier. vii. 3; so Id. Oec. xiv. 10. For a few doubtful cases of the infinitive with **τ**, in apparent apposition with a genitive or dative, see 796.

[*] 805. The infinitive with **τ** is used in exclamations of surprise or indignation. E.g. “**Τ δ μηδ κυνν οκοθεν λθεν μ τν κακοδαμον χοντα**,” “but to think that I, wretched fellow, should come from home without even my cap!” AR. Nub. 268. “**Τς μωρας: τ Δα νομζειν, ντα τηλικουτον**,” “what folly! to believe in Zeus, now you are so big!” Ib. 819. For the simple infinitive in these exclamations, see 787.

[*] 806. The infinitive with its subject, object, or other adjuncts (sometimes including dependent clauses) may be preceded by the article **τ**, the whole sentence standing as a single noun, either as the subject or object of a verb, as the object of a preposition, or in apposition with a pronoun like **τοτο**. E.g. **Τ μν γρ πολλ πολωλεκναι κατ τν πλεμον τς μετρας -μελεας ν τις θεη δικαως: τ δ μτε πλαι τοτο πεπονθναι, πεφηνναι τ τινα μν συμμαχαν τοτων ντρροπον, ν βουλμεθα χρσθαι, τς παρ κενων εννοιας εεργτημν ν γωγε θεην**. DEM. i. 10. **Τ γρ πρς νδρα θνητν κα δι καιρος τινας σχοντα γρφοντας ερνην θνατον συνθσθαι τν κατ τς πλεως ασχνην, κα ποστερσαι μ μνον τν λλων λλ κα τν παρ τς τχης εεργεσιν τν πλιν, κα τσατ περιουσ χρσθαι πονηρας στε μ μνον τος ντας θηναους λλ κα τος στερν ποτε μλλοντας σεσθαι πντας δικηκναι, πς οχ πνδεινον στν**; Id. xix. 55.

Simple Infinitive and Infinitive with **το**, after Verbs of Hindrance, etc.

Simple Infinitive and Infinitive with **το**, after Verbs of Hindrance, etc.8

[*] 807. After verbs and other expressions which denote hindrance or freedom from anything, two forms are allowed, the simple infinitive, and the genitive of the infinitive with **το**.

Thus we can say (a) **εργει σε τοτο ποιεν** (747) and (b) **εργει σε το τοτο ποιεν** (798), both with the same meaning, he prevents you from doing this. As the infinitive, after verbs implying a negation, can take **μ** to strengthen the previous negation without otherwise affecting the sense

(815, 1), we have a third and a fourth form, still with the same meaning: (c) εργει σε μ το το ποιεν, and (d) εργει σε το μ το το ποιεν, he prevents you from doing this. (For a fifth form, εργει σε τ μ το το ποιεν, with the same meaning, see 811.)

If the leading verb is itself negated (or is interrogative with a negative implied), the double negative μ ο is generally used instead of μ in the form (c) with the simple infinitive, but probably never in the form (d) with the genitive of the infinitive; as οκ εργει σε μ ο το το ποιεν, he does not prevent you from doing this (815, 2), but not το μ ο το το ποιεν. (See also 811, for τ μ ο.) E.g.

a) Κακν δ ποον εργε τοτ ξειδναι; SOPH. O.T. 129. Παιδς Φρητος, ν θανεν ρρυσμην. EUR. Alc. 11. π λνθου ποπμπουσιν, πως εργωσι τος κεθεν πιβοηθεν. THUC. i. 62. λλως δ πως πορζεσθαι τ πιτδεια ρκους δη κατχοντας μς (δειν). XEN. An. iii. 1, 20. Εδοκιμεν μποδν σφσιν εναι. PLAT. Euthyd. 305 D. Ε τοτ τις εργει δρν κνος, “if any hesitation prevents you from doing this.” Soph. 242 A. Τν δαν τς γς οδν με κωλει λγειν. Plat. Phaed. 108 D. Τν Φλιππον παρελθεν οκ δναντο κωλσαι. DEM. v. 20.

b) Το δ δραπετεειν δεσμος περγουσι; XEN. Mem. ii. 1, 16. Τ γρ ψευδμενον φανεσθαι κα το συγγμης τινς τυγγνεν μποδν μλιστα νθρποις γγεται. Id. Cyr. iii. 1, Id. Cyr. 9. Επεν τι κωλσειε (ν) το κειν πιντας. Id. An. i. 6, Id. An. 2. πσχομεν το δακρειν. PLAT. Phaed. 117 E (cf. 117 C, quoted in 811). πεσχμην το λαβεν το δικου νεκα. DEM. xix. 223.

c) “Θνητος γ παυσα μ προσδρκεσθαι μρον” AESCH. Prom. 248. “Τομν φυλξει σ νομα μ πσχειν κακς” SOPH. O.C. 667. περ σχε μ τν Πελοπννησον πορθεν, “which prevented him from ravaging the Peloponnesus.” THUC. i. 73. Διεκλυσε μ διαφθεραι. Id. iii. 49. πεγνετο κωλματα μ αξηθναι. Id. i. 16. Πμπουσι κρυκα, ποδεξμενοι σχσειν τν Σπαρτιτην μ ξινα. HDT. ix. 12. “Εργε μ βλαστνεν.” PLAT. Phaedr. 251 B.

Ο γρ στι λλησι οδεμια κδυσις μ ο δντας λγον εναι σος δολους. HDT. viii. 100. (See 815, HDT. 2; 816.) Ο δυνατο ατν σχειν εσ εργεοι μ οκ ξινα. Id. ix. 12. “στε ξνον γ ν οδν νθ, σπερ σ νν, πεκτραπομην μ ο συνεκσζειν.” SOPH. O.C. 565. Τ μποδν μ οχ μβριζομνους ποθανεν; XEN. An. iii. 1, 13. (Τ μποδν implies οδν μποδν.) Τνος ν δοιο μ οχ πμπαν εδαμων εναι; “what would hinder you from being perfectly happy?” Id. Hell. iv. 1, Id. Hell. 36.

d) Πς γρ σκς δο νδρας ξει το μ καταδναι, i.e. will keep two men from sinking. XEN. An. iii. 5, 11. ν οδες πω προθες το μ πλον χειν πετρπετο. THUC. i. 76. Ε δ ρ μποδν τι ατ γνετο το μ εθς τε δικσασθαι. DEM. xxxiii. 25. πστατο τν πλιν μικρν πολιποσαν το μ τας σχταις συμφορας περιπεσεν. ISOC. xv. 122. ποσοβοντες ν μποδν γγνοιτο το μ ρν ατος τ λλον στρτευμα. XEN. Cyr. ii. 4, 23. Εδτες τι ν σφαλε εσι το μηδν παθεν. Ib. iii. 3, Ib. 31 (cf. THUC. vi. 18, quoted in 749). Το δ μ (κακς) πσχειν ατο πσαν δειαν γετε, “you were entirely free from fear of suffering harm.” DEM. xix. 149. νοσης οδεμις τ μ ποστροφς το μ τ χρματ χειν μς, there being no longer any escape from the conclusion that you have

taken bribes (from your having bribes). Id. xxiv. 9. The last two examples show that the genitive of the infinitive can take μ, even after nouns implying hindrance or freedom. In the two following, the addition of μ is more peculiar:—

■ πορ■α το■ μ■ ■συχ■ζειν, “the inability to rest.” THUC. ii. 49. Τ■ το■ μ■ ξυμπλε■ν ■πιστ■, through distrust of sailing with them; i.e. through unwillingness to sail, caused by distrust. Id. iii. 75.

[*] 808. The infinitive with το■ μ■ can be used as a genitive in its ordinary negative sense; as ο■τε ■στιν ο■δεμ■α πρ■φασις ■μ■ν το■ μ■ δρ■ν τα■τα, “no ground for not doing this.” PLAT. Tim. 20 C. See also examples in 798.

[*] 809. Although μ■ ο■ is more common than μ■ after negatives in the form (c), the simple μ■ sometimes occurs. E.g. Ο■ πολ■ν χρ■νον μ■ ■π■σχον μ■ με ναυστολε■ν ταχ■. SOPH. Ph. 349. Ο■δ■ μ■ ■μματος φρουρ■ν παρ■λθε, τ■νδε μ■ λε■σσειν στ■λον. Id. Tr. 226.

[*] 810. The infinitive in the forms (a), (c), and (d), (but, according to Madvig, not in the form (b), with το■ without μ■) may follow negatives in the construction of 807. See the examples.

Infinitive with τ■ μ■, or τ■ μ■ ο■.

[*] 811. The infinitive with τ■ μ■ is used after many verbs and expressions which denote or even imply hindrance, prevention, omission, or denial, the μ■ merely strengthening the negative idea of the leading verb. If the leading verb is itself negated, or is interrogative with a negative implied, τ■ μ■ ο■ is generally used with the infinitive instead of τ■ μ■ (compare 807). This infinitive with τ■ μ■ or τ■ μ■ ο■ is often less closely connected with the leading verb than the simple infinitive (see 791), and it sometimes denotes merely the result of a prevention or omission. It is sometimes an object accusative, as after expressions of denial; but it oftener resembles the accusative of respect or limitation. It adds a fifth expression, ε■ργει σε τ■ μ■ το■το ποιε■ν, to the four already given in 807 as equivalents of he prevents you from doing this; and a corresponding form, ο■κ ε■ργει σε τ■ μ■ ο■ το■το ποιε■ν, for he does not prevent you from doing this. E.g.

Τ■ν πλε■στον ■μιλον ε■ργον τ■ μ■ προεξι■ντας τ■ν ■πλων τ■ ■γγ■ς τ■ς π■λεως κακουργε■ν, they prevented them from injuring, etc. THUC.iii. 1. Τ■ δ■ μ■ λεηλατ■σαι ■λ■ντας σφ■ας τ■ν π■λιν ■σχε τ■δε, “this prevented them from plundering the city.” HDT. v. 101. Ο■ο■ τε ■σαν κατ■χειν τ■ μ■ δακρ■ειν, “to restrain their tears.” PLAT. Phaed. 117 C (cf. 117 E, quoted in 807). Φ■βος τε ξυγγεν■ς τ■ μ■ ■δικε■ν σχ■σει, “will check injustice.” AESCH. Eum. 691. Ο■το■ ε■σιν μ■νοι ■τι ■μ■ν ■μποδ■ν τ■ μ■ ■δη ε■ναι ■νθα π■λαι ■σπε■δομεν. XEN. An. iv. 8, 14. Κ■μωνα παρ■ τρε■ς ■φε■σαν ψ■φους τ■ μ■ θαν■τ■ ζημι■σαι, i.e. by three votes they allowed Cimon to escape the punishment of death. DEM. xxiii. 205. Τρε■ς δ■ μ■ναι ψ■φοι δι■νεγκαν τ■ μ■ θαν■του τιμ■σαι, and only three votes prevented you from condemning him to death (lit. made the difference about condemning, etc.). Ib. 167. See XEN. Cyr. v. 1, 25, and Ag. v. 4. Φ■βος γ■ρ ■νθ■ ■πνου παραστατε■ τ■ μ■ βεβα■ως βλ■φαρα συμβαλε■ν ■πν■, i.e. stands by to prevent my closing my eyes in sleep. AESCH. Ag. 15.

“Ο■κ ■ναντι■σομαι τ■ μ■ ο■ γεγωνε■ν π■ν ■σον προσχρ■ζετε” Prom. 786. “Ο■δ■ν γ■ρ α■τ■ τα■τ■ ■παρκ■σει τ■ μ■ ο■ πεσε■ν ■τ■μωζ πτ■ματ■ ο■κ ■νασχετ■,” “this will not suffice to prevent him from falling, etc.” Ib. 918. Λε■πει μ■ν ο■δ■ ■ πρ■σθεν ■δεμεν τ■ μ■ ο■

βαρυστον εἶναι, “they have no lack of being heavily grievous.” SOPH. O.T. 1232. Μοι τοι, κασιγνήτη, μή τιμωσῆς τμή οὐ θανεῖν τε σὺν σοῦ τὴν θανόντα θεοῖσιν, do not think me too unworthy to die with thee, etc. Id. Ant. 544. (Compare Ant. 22, and O. C. 49.) Οὐκ ἔπεσχμην τμή οὐκ ἔπει τοῦτο ἔλθεῖν, “I did not refrain from proceeding to this subject.” PLAT. Rep. 354 B; see Crit. 43 C. Οὐκ ἔπασχοντο οὐδὲ πᾶσι τὴν φύλων τμή οὐχὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ἀτὴν πειρῆσθαι. XEN. Cyr. i. 6, 32. Ἀτὴν μὲν οὐ μισοῦντο κενήν τὴν πόλιν τμή οὐ μέγλην εἶναι κεδάμονα, not grudging that city its right to be great, etc. AR. Av. 36. (Compare μῆσησὺν μιν κυσσῆ κῆρμα γενῆσθαι, Il. xvii. 272.) Οὐδεὶς ἐντιλήγει τμή οὐ λῆξιν τι κᾶστος ἔγεται πλεῆστου ἔξιον ἔπστασθαι, no one objects to saying, etc. Symp. iii. 3. Μὴ παρῆς τμή οὐ φρῆσαι, “do not omit to speak of it.” SOPH. O.T. 283. Οὐδὲνα δὲνασθαι κρῆπτειν τμή οὐχὶ ἔδῶς ἔν καμῆν ἔσθειν ἀτὴν, “that no one is able to prevent people from knowing that he would gladly even eat some of them raw.” XEN. Hell. iii. 3, 6.

[*] 812. The form τμή is more common here when the leading verb is negative, where regularly τμή οὐ would be used, than μὴ for μὴ οὐ in the corresponding case (809). E.g. Οὐκ ἔσχμην τμή ἔποκλῆσαι τομῆν ἔθλιον δῆμας. SOPH. O.T. 1387. Τῆς σοῦ ἔπελεφθη τμή σοι ἔκολουθεῖν; i.e. who failed to follow you? XEN. Cyr. v. 1, 25. ἔκος δὲ οὐδὲν ἔπρκεσαν τμή πᾶσιν μὲν ἔσπερ οὐν ἔχει παθεῖν. AESCH. Ag. 1170. Καμῆ φημῆ δρῆσαι κοκῆ παρνομῆαι τμή. SOPH. Ant. 443. Οὐδὲ ἔρνησις ἔστιν ἀτοῆς τμή τᾶθῆ ἔπρ Φιλῆππου πρῆττειν, “it is not even possible for them to deny that they did these things in the interest of Philip.” DEM. xix. 163; so xx. 135. So perhaps we may explain τμή ἔπιβουλεῖν in HDT. i. 209 (see § 814).

[*] 813. Although the infinitive with τμή is most frequently used (as in 811) after verbs containing a negative idea, it can also have a negative sense as the object of other verbs or with adjectives. See τμή σφῆλλεσθαι ἔπιμελεσθαι (quoted in 791), and τμή βλῆπειν ἔτομῆα (quoted in 795), in both of which the infinitive is really negated by μὴ. We must distinguish also the use of τομῆ with the infinitive as an ordinary negative expression (see examples in 798) from that which is explained in 807. Compare, likewise, τμή οὐ with the infinitive in 814 and in 811. The nature of the leading verb will always make the force of the negative plain. We have the same distinction, with the simple infinitive, between ἔναγκῆζει σε μὴ ἔλθεῖν, he compels you not to go (747), and ἔρχει σε μὴ ἔλθεῖν, he prevents you from going (807).

[*] 814. The infinitive with τμή οὐ may be used in a negative sense in various constructions with verbs and expressions which do not have a negative meaning, provided these are themselves negated or are interrogative implying a negative. Though τμή οὐ is more common here, τμή is also allowed. E.g. “Κουδεὶς γῆ μὲν ἔπεισει ἐνθρῆπων τμή οὐκ ἔλθεῖν ἔπει ἀτὴν,” “and no man can persuade me not to go after him.” AR. Ran. 68. Οὐ μῆντοι ἔπειθῆ γῆ τμή οὐ μεγαλοπρῆγμων τε καμῆ κακοπρῆγμων εἶναι, “but he did not persuade them that he was not full of great and evil undertakings.” XEN. Hell. v. 2, 36. (For similar expressions with μὴ οὐ without τμή, see 749 and 815, 2) Τοῆς θεοῆς οὐδὲν ἔν ἔχοιμεν μῆμψασθαι τμή οὐχὶ πᾶντα πεπραχῆναι, we cannot blame the Gods for not having done everything. Id. Cyr. vii. 5. 42 (cf. “τᾶτῆ οὐν ἔμῆν μῆμφομαι,” AR. Nub. 525). Οὐδὲ ἔσιον ἔμοιγε εἶναι φᾶνεται τμή οὐ βοήθεῖν τοῆτοις τοῆς λῆγοις πᾶντα ἔνδρα. Leg. 891 A. ἔλογον τμή οὐ τῆμναι. Soph. 219 E (see 817). Τοῆς δὲ οὐδὲ λῆγος ἔεπεται τμή οὐ πονηροῆς εἶναι. DEM. xxiv. 69.9

οκων στ μηχαν οδεμα τ μ κενον πιβουλεειν μο, “there is then no way by which I can believe that he is not plotting against me.” HDT. i. 209 (cf. PLAT. Phaed. 72 D). “ξει τνα γμην λγειν τ μ ερπρωκτος εναι;” AR. Nub. 1084. φη οχ οεν τε εναι τ μ ποκτενα με, “he said it was not possible not to condemn me to death.” PLAT. Ap. 29 C.

μ ο with Infinitive and Participle, and (Rarely) with Nouns.

[*] 815. 1. The use of μ with the infinitive in the forms (c) and (d) in 807 is to be referred to the general principle, by which the infinitive after all verbs expressing a negative idea (as those of denying, distrusting, concealing, forbidding, preventing, etc.) can always take μ, to strengthen the negation implied in the leading verb. Thus we say ρνεται μ ληθς εναι τοτο, he denies that this is true; πηγρευε μηδνα τοτο ποιεν, he forbade any one to do this. This μ can, however, be omitted without affecting the sense.

2. An infinitive which for any reason would take μ (either affecting the infinitive itself, as an ordinary negative, or strengthening a preceding negation, as in the case just mentioned) generally takes the double negative μ ο, if the verb on which it depends is itself negated or is interrogative with a negation implied. Thus the example given above, ρνεται μ ληθς εναι τοτο, if we negative the leading verb, generally becomes οκ ρνεται μ οκ ληθς εναι τοτο, he does not deny that this is true. So, when the original μ really negatives the infinitive, as in δκαιν στι μ τοτον φιναι, it is just not to acquit him, if we negative the leading verb, we commonly have ο δκαιν στι μ ο τοτον φιναι, it is not just not to acquit him. E.g.

ς οχ σιν σοι ν μ ο βοηθεν δικαιοσεν, because (you said) it would be impious for you not to bring aid to Justice. PLAT. Rep. 427 E. Οκ ν πιθομην μ ο τδ κμαθην σαφς, “I cannot consent not to learn the whole.” SOPH. O.T. 1065. νδρα δ οκ στι μ ο κακν μμεναι, “it is not possible for a man not to be base.” SIMON. v. 10. See also PLAT. Phaed. 72 D (in 749). For examples in which μ ο strengthens the negation of the leading verb, see 807. This applies also to the infinitive with τ μ. See 811 and 814.

[*] 816. When μ or μ ο with the infinitive follows a verb of hindrance, etc. (807), neither μ nor μ ο can be translated. When μ really negatives the infinitive (as in the examples last given), μ ο must be translated by one negative. In PLAT. Rep. 368 B, the passage quoted in 427 E (815, 2, above), Socrates had said δδοικα μ οδ σιον . . . παγορεειν κα μ βοηθεν, being prevented from saying μ ο βοηθεν by the previous μ οδ. In XEN. Ap. 34 we have οτε μ μεμνσθαι δναμαι ατο οτε μεμνημνος μ οκ παινεν.

[*] 817. Verbs and expressions which contain such negative ideas as impossibility, difficulty, unwillingness, or impropriety sometimes take μ ο (instead of the simple μ with the infinitive, to express a real negation, even when the leading verb is not negated. E.g. Δμου ρχοντος δνατα μ ο κακτητα γγνεσθαι, it is impossible that vice should not come in (as if it were ο δυνατ). HDT. iii. 82. Δεινν δκεε εναι μ ο λαβεεν ατ. Id. i. 187. στε πσιν ασχνην εναι μ ο συσπουδζειν, “so that all were ashamed not to join heartily in the work.” XEN. An. ii. 3, 11. So σχνετο μ ο φανεσθαι, Cyr. viii. 4, Cyr. 5. Ασχρν στι μ οχ φναι. PLAT. Prot. 352 D. Πολλ νοια μ οχ γεσθαι. Symp. 210B. So after νητον, ib. 218 C; after λογον, id. Soph. 219E (see 814). For χαλεπς followed by μ ο, see example under 819.

[*] 818. **ο** is occasionally used with participles in negative sentences, in place of the simple **μ**, to express a negative condition. The following cases are quoted:—

Οκων δεικναι (Δαρεον νδριντα) σταναι μ οκ περιβαλλμενον τοσι ργοισι, i.e. he said that Darius had no right to set up his statue (in front of that of Sesostri), unless he surpassed him in his exploits (= ε μ περιβλλεται). HDT. ii. 110. Καταρρηδησαν μ ο . . . τν Μλητον οο τε ωσι ξελεν μ ο ντες ναυκροτες, they feared that they might not be able to capture Miletus without being masters of the sea (their thought was ε μ ναυκροτος σμεν). Id. vi. 9. Ενντ δ οκ ξελεσεσθαι φασαν μ ο πλορεος ντος το κκλου, they refused to march out on the ninth of the month (and thereafter) until the moon should be full (ν μ πλορης). Id. vi. 106. Δυσλγητος γρ ν εην τοινδε μ ο κατοικτερων δραν, for I should be hard of heart (817) should I feel no pity for such a band of suppliants (ε μ κατοικτεροιμι). SOPH. O.T. 12. Ο γρ ν μακρν χνευον ατς, μ οκ χων τι σμβολον, for I should not have traced it far, if I had attempted it by myself without any clue. Ib. 220. (For the force of the subordinate condition of μ οκ χων in its relation to the real protasis in ατς, see 511.) “κεις γρ ο κεν γε, τοτ γ σαφς ξιδα, μ οχ δεμ μο φρουσ τι,” “i.e. you have not come empty-handed, — (not at least) without bringing me some cause for alarm” (i.e. οκ ε μ φρεις). Id. O.C. 359. (Μ οχ φρουσα adds a condition as a qualification to κεν.) Οκ ρα στ φιλν τ φιλοντι οδν μ οκ ντιφιλον, “unless it loves in return.” Lys. 212 D. (Cf. φλοι δ γε οκ ν εν μ περι πολλο ποιομενοι αυτος, D. 215B.) Τς γρ ν βουληθη μικρ κερδναι, κ.τ.λ.; οδ ν ες μ ο συνειδς αυτ συκοφαντοντι, not a man (would have wished for this) if he had not been conscious that he was a sycophant (=ε μ συνδει). DEM. Iviii. 13. Οτε γρ ναυαγς, ν μ γς λβηται φερμενος, οποτ ν σσειεν ατν: οτ νρ πνης γεγς μ ο τχνην μαθν δναιτ ν σφαλς ζν τν βον (i.e. ε μ μθοι, corresponding to ν μ λβηται). Fr. 213.

[*] 819. **ο** occasionally occurs with nouns, in the same general sense as with participles, to express a negative condition to a negative statement. E.g. Α τε πλεις πολλα κα χαλεπα λαβεν, μ ο χρν κα πολιορκ, the cities were many, and difficult (=not easy, 817) to capture except by time and siege. DEM. xix. 123. Τοιατης δ τιμς τυχεν οχ ον τε μ ο τν πολ τ γνμ διαφροντα, “to attain such honour is not possible except for one who is of far transcendent wisdom.” ISOC. x. 47. (If τν is omitted, διαφροντα as a participle belongs under 818.) [*] 820. It may be noted that **μ** **ο** in poetry always forms one syllable.

1 Whitney (Sanskrit Grammar, p. 314) says of these primitive Sanskrit datives: “It is impossible to draw any fixed line between the uses classed as infinitive and the ordinary case-uses.” See Delbrück, Forsch. Synt. iv. p. 121; and Monro, Gr. Hom. p. 163.

2 A few exceptional cases are quoted by Birklein (p. 93) in which the infinitive with the article appears to have a subjective genitive, like an ordinary verbal noun, instead of a subject accusative. These are γγνσκω τς τοτων πειλς οχ ττον σωφρονζουσας λλων τδη κολζειν, XEN. An. vii. 7, 24 ; τ ε φρονεν ατν μιμεσθε, DEM. xix. 269; and ε τς πλεως τθηκε τ τος δικοντας μισεν, Ib. 289. In the first case the parallelism between τοτων and λλων caused the anomaly; in the second, ατν has a partitive force, as if it were τοτο ατν μιμεσθε; and in the third, πλεως is separated from the infinitive by the verb, and

the idea is whether the hatred of evil-doers has died out (i.e. disappeared from) the state. In none of these cases would a subject accusative be the exact equivalent of the genitive. For undoubted examples in later Greek, see *Trans. of Assoc. Phil. for 1877*, p. 7.

3 See Grünwald, *Der freie formelhafte Infinitiv der Limitation im Griechischen*, in *Schanz's Beiträge*, Heft 6.

4 See Grünwald, page 17.

5 See Gildersleeve, *Contributions to the History of the Articular Infinitive*, in *Trans. of Assoc. Phil. for 1878*, pp. 5-19; and *The Articular Infinitive in Xenophon and Plato*, in *Jour. Phil.* iii. pp. 193-202; Birklein, *Entwicklungsgeschichte des substantivirten Infinitivs*, in *Schanz's Beiträge*, Heft 7.

6 "By the substantial loss of its dative force the infinitive became verbalized; by the assumption of the article it was substantivized again with a decided increment of its power." *Jour. Phil.* iii. p. 195.

7 See the statistics given by Gildersleeve in the *Jour. Phil.* viii. p. 332. It appears that the average number of articular infinitives in a Teubner page of Demosthenes is 1.25; of the speeches of Thucydides, 1.00; of Xenophon (whole), 1.02; of Isocrates, .60; of Antiphon, .50; of Aeschines, .30; of Andocides, .20; of Isaeus, .25; of Lysias, .12. Hypereides even exceeds Demosthenes. For the actual number of articular infinitives in each author before Aristotle, see Birklein's table, p. 91.

8 See Madvig's *Bemerkungen über einige Punkte der griechischen Wortfügungslehre*, pp. 47-66.

9 This is cited by Birklein (p. 67) as the only case of the article with $\mu\sigma$ in the Orators; and no case occurs in either Herodotus or Thucydides.

6. The Participle.

Chapter VI The Participle.

[*] 821. As the infinitive is a verbal noun, so the participle is a verbal adjective; both retaining all the attributes of a verb which are consistent with their nature.

[*] 822. The participle has three uses:—first, it may express an attribute, qualifying a noun like an ordinary adjective (824-831); secondly, it may define the circumstances under which the action of the sentence takes place (832-876); thirdly, it may be joined to a verb to supplement its meaning, often having a force resembling that of the infinitive (877-919).

[*] 823. The distinction between the second and third of these classes is less clearly marked than that between the first and the two others: thus in **δεται τιμμενος**, he delights in being honoured, the participle is generally classed as supplementary (881), although it expresses cause (838). Even an attributive participle may also be circumstantial; as **μ δαρεις νθρωπος**, the unflogged man (824), involves a condition. The three classes are, nevertheless, sufficiently distinct for convenience, though the lines (like many others in syntax) must not be drawn so strictly as to defeat their object.

Attributive Participle.

[*] 824. The participle may qualify a noun, like an attributive adjective. Here it may often be translated by a finite verb and a relative, especially when it is preceded by the article. E.g.

Πλις κλλει διαφρουσα, a city excelling in beauty.

νρ καλς παιδευμνος, a man (who has been) well educated.

Ορσβεις ορπρ Φιλππου πεμφθντες, the ambassadors (who had been) sent from Philip.

νδρες οτο ποισοντες, men who will do this.

ν τρ Μεσσην ποτ οσ γ, “in the land which was once Messenia.” THUC. iv. 3.

Στρατεουσιν πρ τς Αλλου νσους καλουμνας, “they sail against the so-called Aeolian islands, lit. the islands called those of Aeolus.” Id. iii. 88.

Αρρισται δοκοσαι εναι φσεις, “the natures which seem to be best.” XEN. Mem. iv. 1, 3.

Αρπρ τορσματος νες ναυμαχοσαι THUC. vii. 23.

πεπεσμην μγαν εναι τν κατειληφτα κνδυνον τν πλιν, “the danger which had overtaken the city.” DEM. xviii. 220.

μ δαρεις νθρωπος ο παιδεεται MEN. Mon. 422.

[*] 825. The participle with the article may be used substantively, like any adjective. Here it may generally be translated by a finite verb and a relative, the verb expressing the tense of the participle. E.g. Ο κρατοῦντες, the conquerors. Ο πεπεισμένοι, those who have been convinced. Ο τὸς ἵστι τοῦτο ποίησας, this is the one who did it. Ο τὸ ἐσὶν οὐ μὲς πάντας δίκσοντες, these are the men who will wrong you all. Πῖντες οὐ παρῖντες τοῦτο ἄρων, all who were present saw this. Τ κρατοῦν τῆς πλεως, the ruling part of the state.

μ λαβῖν κα διαφθαρεῖς νενῖκηκε τῖν νοῖμενον, he who did not take (the bribe) and become corrupt has defeated the one who would buy him. DEM. xviii. 247 (see 841). Τῖν ῖργασοῖνων ῖνῖντων, there being in the country those who would cultivate it (i.e. men to cultivate it). XEN. An. ii. 4, 22. (See 826 and 840.) Παρ τοῖς ῖρῖστοις δοκοῖσιν εῖναι, “among those who seem to be best.” Id. Mem. iv. 2, Id. Mem. 6. ῖν δῖ μῖν τῖν γνῖμην ταῖτην εῖπῖν Πεῖσανδρος, “and Peisander was the one who gave this opinion.” THUC. viii. 68. Τοῖς ῖρκῖδων σφετῖροις οῖσι ξυμῖχοις προεῖπον, “they proclaimed to those of the Arcadians who were their allies.” Id. v. 64. ῖφεκτῖον ῖγῖ φημι εῖναι τῖ σωφρονεῖν δυνησοῖν, i.e. one who is to be able to be discreet. XEN. Symp. iv. 26.

[*] 826. When the participle, in either of these constructions, refers to a purpose, intention, or expectation, it is generally future, though sometimes present. E.g. Νῖμον δημοσῖ τῖν ταῖτα κωλῖσοντα τῖθεινται τουτονῖ, they have publicly enacted this law, which is to prevent these things. DEM. xxi. 49. See XEN. An. ii. 4, 22 in 825. ῖ γησοῖμενος οῖδεῖς ῖσται, “there will be nobody who will lead us.” Ib. ii. 4, Ib. 5. Πολλοῖς ῖξομεν τοῖς ῖτοῖμως συναγωνιζοῖνους μῖν. ISOC. viii. 139.

See the more common use of the circumstantial future participle to express a purpose, in 840.

[*] 827. a) Participles, like adjectives, are occasionally used substantively even without the article, in an indefinite sense; generally in the plural. E.g. ῖπλει δῖδεκα τριῖρεις ῖχων ῖπῖ πολλῖς ναῖς κεκτηῖνους, “he sailed with twelve triremes against men who had many ships.” XEN. Hell. v. 1, 19. ῖταν πολεμοῖντων πῖλις ῖλ, “whenever a city of belligerents is taken.” Id. Cyr. vii. 5, Id. Cyr. 73. Μετῖ ταῖτα ῖφικνοῖνταῖ μοι ῖπαγγῖλλοντες ῖτι ῖ πατῖρ ῖφεῖται, there come messengers announcing, etc. ISOC. xvii. 11. Δῖναιτῖ ῖν οῖδῖ ῖν ῖσχῖων φυγεῖν, “not even a strong man could escape.” SOPH. El. 697. “Οῖκ ῖστι φιλοῖντα ῖα λοῖεῖ μῖντιφιλεῖσθαι;” Lys. 212

b) This use in the singular appears especially in θνητῖν ῖντα, one who is a mortal. This indefinite expression, though masculine, may refer to both sexes. E.g. ῖν ποικῖλοις δῖ θνητῖν ῖντα κῖλλεσιν βαῖνειν ῖμοῖ μῖν οῖδαμῖς ῖνευ φῖβου, i.e. for a mortal (like myself) to walk on these rich embroideries, etc. AESCH. Ag. 923. Κοῖφος φῖρειν χρῖ θνητῖν ῖντα συμφορῖς, (one who is) a mortal (like yourself) must bear calamities lightly (addressed to Medea). EUR. Med. 1018. So in SOPH. Ant. 455 θνητῖν ῖνθῖ means a mortal (like myself), and refers to Antigone, not to Creon; she means that Creon’s proclamations could not justify her in violating the edicts of the Gods.

[*] 828. In the poets, the participle with the article sometimes becomes so completely a substantive, that it takes an adnominal genitive rather than the case which its verbal force would require. A few expressions like οῖ προσῖκοντες, relatives, τῖ συμφῖρον or τῖ συμφῖροντα,

gain, advantage, τὰ πύρχοντα, resources, are thus used even in prose. E.g. πατρὸς τεκνίου, his father (for πατρὸς τεκνίου). EUR. El. 335. Τὰ μικρὰ συμφέροντα τῆς πύλεως, “the small advantages of the state.” DEM. xviii. 28. Βασιλικῶς προσκόντες τινες, “certain relatives of the king.” THUC. i. 128.

[*] 829. a) The neuter singular of the present participle with the article is sometimes used as an abstract noun, where we should expect the infinitive with the article. This occurs chiefly in Thucydides and in the poets. E.g. ἐν τῷ μὲν μελετῶντι ἔξυνεττεροι ἴσονται, “in the want of practice they will be less skilful.” THUC. i. 142. (Here we should expect ἐν τῷ μὲν μελετῆν.) Ἐν τῷ μὲν δεδιῆς ἀτόμως ἵκνῃσθαι τοὺς ἄλλους μύλλον φοβῶσθαι, τὸ δὲ θάρσος ἴσχυρον ἴσχυρον. Id. i. 36. (Here τὸ δεδιῆς, fear, is used like τὸ δεδιῆναι, and τὸ θάρσος, courage, like τὸ θάρσεναι or τὸ θάρσος.) Μετὰ τὸ δρῶντος, with action (like μετὰ τὸ δρῆσθαι). Id. v. 102. Τοῦ παπιῆναι πύλον τὸ μύνοντος τῶν διύνοιαν ἴχουσιν (infin. and partic. combined). Id. v. 9. Καὶ σὺ γὰρ ἐσῆξω: τὸ γὰρ νοσοῦν ποθεῖ σε ζύμπαρραστῆν λαβεῖν. SOPH. Ph. 674 (τὸ νοσοῦν = τὸ νύσος). Τὸ γὰρ ποθοῦν ἴκαστος ἴκμαθεῖν θύλων ούκ ἴκ μεθεῖτο, πρῶν καθῆδον κλύειν. Id. Tr. 196. This is really the same use of the neuter singular of an adjective for the corresponding abstract noun, which is common in ordinary adjectives; as τὸ κάλυ, beauty, for τὸ κύλλος; τὸ δύκαιον and τὸ δύδικον for τὸ δύκαιος and τὸ δύδικός.

b) A similar construction sometimes occurs when a participle and a noun are used like an articular infinitive with its subject, where in English we generally use a finite verb. E.g. Μετὰ δὲ Σύλων ούχόμενον ἴλαβε νύμεσις μεγάλη Κροῦσον, i.e. after Solon was gone (like μετὰ τὸ Σύλων ούχεσθαι). HDT. i. 34. Πύ τοῦ τυραννεύοντος, “in his reign.” Id. i. 15: so viii. 44. ἴκει πύμπτ μετὰ Συρακοῦσας ούκισθεῖσας, “in the fifth year after the foundation of Syracuse.” THUC. vi. 3. Compare post urbem conditam in Latin. Μετὰ κάλυ ούτω κάλυ παντοδύπν λύγον ἴθηντα (like μετὰ τὸ . . . ἴθηναι). Symp. 198B. Τὸ πύλει ούτε πολύμου κάλυς σύμβύτος ούτε σῆσεως πύποτε ἀύτιος ἴγνέτο, i.e. the cause of a disastrous result of any war (like τὸ πύλεμν τινά κάλυς σύμβύναι). XEN. Mem. i. 2, 63.

c) The same construction occurs in Homer; as ἴς ἴλλιον κάταδύντα, to the going down of the sun, Il. i. 601; ἴμ ἴο φάινόμενύφιν, Il. ix. 682. For the peculiar use of the aorist participle here, see 149.

[*] 830. The participle is sometimes used like a predicate adjective, with ἐύμ or γύγνομαι. E.g. Τὸ ποτὸ ἴστν ούτος ἴκένου διάφύρων; in what is this man different from that one (another form for διάφύρει)? PLAT. Gorg. 500 C. Σύμφύρον ἴν τὸ πύλει, it was advantageous to the state (= συνύφεν). DEM. xix. 75. Ούτε γὰρ θράσῆς ούτ ἴν προδεῖσας ἐύμ τὸ γε νύν λύγ. SOPH. O.T. 90. Πάρνεύμενῆς ἴστι (= Πάρνεύεται). HDT. iii. 99. ἴ δὲ ἴστ δύκα σταδύους πύχουσα, and it (the island) is ten stades distant. Id. ix. 51.

ἴν ἴ θύλουσα, πύντ ἴμοῦ κόμύζεται, whatever she wants, she always obtains from me (for ἴν ἴλλ). SOPH. O.T. 580. ἴν γὰρ ἴ Θεμύστοκλύς βεβαύτατα δύ φύσεως ἴσχῆν δηλύσας, κά ἴξιος θάυμύσαι, Themistocles was one who manifested, etc. THUC. i. 138. Τοῦτο ούκ ἴστι γύγνόμενον πύρ ἴμν; “is not this something that goes on in our minds?” Phil. 39C. Τοῦτο κινδύνει πύπον τινῆ γύγνόμενον ἴ δύκαιος ἴνη ἴναι, justice seems somehow to be proving to be (lit. becoming) this. Rep. 433 B. So with πύρχω and the poetic πύλλομαι; as τὸτο

■π■ρχειν ■μ■ς ε■δ■τας ■γο■μαι, I think you may be presumed to know this, DEM. xviii. 95; ■με■ο λελασ■νος ■πλευ, II. xxiii. 69.

[*] 831. On the same principle, the participle is used in all periphrastic forms with ε■μ■ and ■χω for the perfect, pluperfect, and future perfect. In the future perfect active, the periphrastic form is generally the only one in use; in the third person plural of the perfect and pluperfect middle and passive of most verbs, it is the only form possible. Examples of the perfect participle with ε■μ■ or ■ν as peculiar forms of the perfect and pluperfect, in other persons, are given in 45; of ■χω and ε■χον with the aorist and perfect participle for the perfect and pluperfect, in 47 and 48; of ■σομαι with the perfect and aorist participle for the future perfect, in 80 and 81.

Circumstantial Participle.

[*] 832. The participle may define the circumstances under which an action takes place, agreeing with the noun or pronoun to which it relates. The negative of such a participle is ο■, unless it has a conditional force. The relations expressed by the participle in this use are the following:—

[*] 833. I. Time, the tenses of the participle denoting various points of time, which is relative to that of the leading verb. E.g. Τα■τα ε■π■ν ■π■ει, when he had said this, he departed. ■π■ντησα Φιλ■ππ■ ■πι■ντι, I met Philip as he was departing. Το■το πεποιηκ■τες χαϊρ■σουσιν. Τα■τα ■πραττε στρατηγ■ν, he did these things while he was general. Τα■τα πρ■ξει στρατηγ■ν, he will do these things when he is general. Τυραννε■σας δ■ ■τη τρ■α ■ππ■ας ■χ■ρει ■π■σπονδος ■ς Σ■γειον, “after a rule of three years.” THUC. vi. 59. Ν■ν μ■ν δειπνε■τε: δειπν■σαντες δ■ ■πελα■νετε, i.e. after supping. XEN. Cyr. iii. 1, 37. So vii. 5, XEN. Cyr. 78; XEN. An. vii. 1, 13.

[*] 834. Certain temporal participles, agreeing with the subject of a sentence, have almost the force of adverbs. Such are ■ρχ■μενος, at first; τελευτ■ν, at last, finally; διαλιπ■ν (or ■πισχ■ν) χρ■νον, after a while, or διαλε■πων χρ■νον, at intervals; χρον■ζων, for a long time. E.g.

■περ κα■ ■ρχ■μενος ε■πον, “as I said also at first.” THUC. iv. 64. Τελευτ■ν ο■ν ■π■ το■ς χειροτ■χνας ■α, “finally then I went to the artisans.” PLAT. Ap. 22 C. ■λ■γον χρ■νον διαλιπ■ν ■κιν■θη, “after a little while he moved.” Id. Phaed. 118. Ο■ πολ■ν χρ■νον ■πισχ■ν ■κε, after (waiting) no long time he came. Ib. 59 E Διαλε■πουσαν χρ■νον, at intervals (of Clotho’s regular movements). Rep. 617 C. Οπως χρον■ζον ε■ μενε■ βουλευτ■ον. AESCH. Ag. 847: cf. χρονισθε■ς, Ib. 727.

[*] 835. II. Means. E.g.

Λ■ζ■μενοι ζ■σιν, “they live by plunder.” XEN. Cyr. iii. 2, 25. Το■ς ■λληνας ■δ■δαξαν, ■ν τρ■πον διοικο■ντες τ■ς α■τ■ν πατρ■δας κα■ πρ■ς ο■ς πολεμο■ντες μεγ■λην ■ν τ■ν ■λλ■δα ποι■σειαν. ISOC. xii. 44. Ο■ γ■ρ ■λλοτρ■οις ■μ■ν χρωμ■νοις παραδε■γμασιν ■λλ■ ο■κε■οις, ε■δα■μοσιν ■ξεστι γεν■σθαι, “for it is by using not foreign but domestic examples that you can become prosperous.” DEM. iii. 23. Τ■ν ν■μων ■πειροι γ■γονται κα■ τ■ν λ■γων, ο■ς δε■ χρ■μενον ■μιλε■ν το■ς ■νθρ■ποις, which we (τιν■) must use in our intercourse with men. PLAT. Gorg. 484 D. So often χρ■μενος in the sense of with (cf. 843).

[*] 836. III. Manner and similar relations, including manner of employment, etc. E.g. Προε■λετο μ■λλον το■ς ν■μοις ■μμ■νων ■ποθανε■ν ■παρανομ■ν ζ■ν, he preferred to die abiding by the laws, rather than to live disobeying them. XEN. Mem. iv. 4, 4. Προαιρο■νται μ■λλον ο■τω

κερδαίνειν πῶς ἑλλήλων συνωφελόντες αἰτοῦσθαι, they prefer to get gain by this means from each other, rather than by uniting to aid themselves. Ib. iii. 5, lb. 16. Καὶ ἔγελσασα φη, “and she said with a laugh.” Symp. 202B. ῥησαντας τὰ πλά πορεύεσθαι, to march having snatched up their arms (i.e. eagerly). DEM. iii. 20: cf. ὄνον ἔψαντας τὰ μῦτια, PLAT. Rep. 474 A.

[*] 837. The following participles of manner are used in peculiar senses: φέρων, hastily; φερόμενος, with a rush; ἔνσας, quickly; κατατείννας, earnestly; διατεινόμενος and διατεταμμένος, with all one’s might; φθίσσας, before (anticipating); λαθῶν, secretly; ἄχων, continually; κλάων, to one’s sorrow; χαίρων, with impunity (to one’s joy). E.g. Ἐξ τοῦτο φέρων περιήστησε τὰ πράγματα, “he rapidly brought things to such a pass.” AESCHIN. iii. 82. ἔσπεσον φερόμενοι ἐς τοὺς ἑλληνας οἱ Μῆδοι, “when the Persians fell upon the Greeks with a rush.” HDT. vii. 210. So ὀχύεσθαι φερομένην κατ’ ὄον, PLAT. Rep. 492 C. “ἔνοιγόν ἔνσας τὸ φροντιστήριον,” “make haste and open the thinking-shop.” AR. Nub. 181. Κατατείννας ῥῆ τὸν ἄδικον βίον παινῶν, “I will speak earnestly in praise of the unjust life.” PLAT. Rep. 358 D: so 367 B. See Rep. 474 A, and XEN. Mem. iv. 2, 23. Ἐτὸν ἔνσας με φθίσσας, then you opened it (the door) before I could knock. Plut. 1102: so ἐξ μὲν βάλει φθόμενος, Il. v. 119; but in such expressions ἔφθη βάλων etc. (887) is more common. Πτεχεὸς ἔλτο λαθῶν, “he leaped from the wall secretly.” Il. xii. 390: cf. λήθουσ μὲν ἔξπινες, SOPH. Ant. 532; here again ἔλαθον with the participle is more common (see 893). “Τὸ κυπτίζεις ἄχων;” “why do you keep poking about?” AR. Nub. 509. Κλάων ἔψει τῶνδε, “you will lay hands on them to your sorrow.” EUR. Her. 270: so SOPH. Ant. 754. Οὐ τι χαίρων ῥεῖς, “you shall not speak with impunity.” Id. O.T. 363; so Ant. 759. Τοῦτον ὀδέεις χαίρων ἔδικσει. PLAT. Gorg. 510 D. Compare ταξάμενους, according to agreement, Id. Rep. 416 E.

[*] 838. IV. Cause or ground of action. E.g.

Ἄγω δὲ τοῦδ’ ἕνεκα, βουλόμενος δεῖξαι σοῦ περ ἴμο, and I speak for this reason, because I wish, etc. PLAT. Phaed. 102 D. πέχοντο κερδῶν, ἀσχροῦ νομίζοντες εἶναι, “because they believed them to be base.” XEN. Mem. i. 2, 22. Τὸ γὰρ ἔν βουλόμενοι ἔνδρες σοφοὶ ἐξ ἄληθῆς δεσπότητας μένους ἀτῶν φεγοίεν, with what object in view, etc. (i.e. wishing what)? PLAT. Phaed. 63 A. Τὸ γὰρ δεδιότες σφῆδρα ὀτῶς πέγεσθε; what do you fear, that you are in such great haste? XEN. Hell. i. 7, 26. For the participle with ἐξ, used to express a cause assigned by the subject of the sentence, see 864.

[*] 839. a) Here belong τὸ μαθῶν; and τὸ παθῶν; both of which have the general force of wherefore? Τὸ μαθῶν τοῦτο ποιεῖ; however, properly means what put it into his head to do this? or with what idea does he do this? and τὸ παθῶν τοῦτο ποιεῖ; means what has happened to him that he does this? E.g.

Τὸ τοῦτο μαθῶν προσήγαγεν; “with what idea did he add this to the law?” DEM. xx. 127. “Τὸ παθοῦσαι, ἔπερ Νεφέλαι γὰρ ἐσῶν ἄληθῆς, θνητάς ἐξάσι γυναῖξιν;” “what has happened to them that they resemble mortal women?” AR. Nub. 340.

b) These phrases may be used even in dependent sentences, τὸ becoming ἵτι, and the whole phrase meaning because. E.g.

Τι ξίς εμι παθεῖν ποτῶσαι, τι μαθῶν τ β οχ συχῶν ἄγον; what do I deserve to suffer or pay because I did not keep quiet? i.e. for taking it into my head not to keep quiet? PLAT. Ap. 36 B. μως ν κακ ν, τι μθοντα χαρειν ποιει κα πον; “would they still be evil because they give us joy in any conceivable manner?” Prot. 353 D. (In cases like this, the original meaning of the participle is forgotten.) So Euthyd. 283 E and 299 A.

[*] 840. V. Purpose, object, or intention, expressed by the future participle, rarely by the present. E.g. ἔλθε λυσόμενος θγατρα, “he came to ransom his daughter.” Il. i. 13. Παρελλυθα συμβουλεῶν, “I have risen to give my advice.” ISOC. vi. 1. βουλεῶσαντο πμπειν ἄς Λακεδαμόνα πρβεις τατ τε ροντας κα Λσανδρον ατσοντας π τς νας, in order to say this, and to ask for Lysander as admiral. XEN. Hell. ii. 1, 6. ν ες πλεμον (πατρς) γ τρωθησμενον ποθανομενον, ποιητον τατα, “even if it lead any one into war to be wounded or to perish.” PLAT. Crit. 51 B. Αθις δε γησμενος οδες σται, there will be nobody to lead us (=ς γσεται). XEN. An. ii. 4, 5. (This participle is also attributive: see 826.) Προσβολς παρεσκευζοντο τε χει ποιησμενοι, they prepared (themselves) to make attacks on the wall. THUC. ii. 18.

τυχον γρ (νς) οχμεναι, περιαγγλλουσαι βοηθεῖν, for some ships happened to be gone, to give notice to send aid. Id. i. 116. So ρνμενοι, Il. i. 159. The present here expresses an attendant circumstance (843) as well as a purpose. See also φθεροντε, AESCH. Ag. 652.

[*] 841. VI. Condition, the participle standing for a protasis, and its tenses representing the various forms of condition expressed by the indicative, subjunctive, or optative (472). E.g. Οει σ λκηστιν πρ δμτου ποθανεῖν ν, χιλλα Πατρκλ παποθανεῖν, μ οομνους θνατον μμην ρετς πρι αυτν σεσθαι, do you think that Alcestis would have died for Admetus, etc., if they had not believed, etc. Symp. 208D. (Here μ οομνους is equivalent to ε μ οοντο.) Ο γρ ν ατος μελεν μ τοθ πολαμβνουςιν, for it would not have concerned them, unless they had had this idea. DEM. ix. 45. (Μ πολαμβνουςιν = ε μ τοτο πελμβανον.) στρων ν λθοιμ λου πρς ντολς κα γς νερθε, δυνατς ν ρσαι τδε, if I should be able to do this (ε δυνατς εην). EUR. Ph. 504. So the attributive participles μ δαρες (824) and μ λαβν (825). In SOPH. OT 289, πλαι δ μ παρν θανμζεται, the construction represents θανμζομεν ε μ πρεστιν, we wonder that he is not here (494). For μ ο with the participle in negative conditions, where μ is more common, see 818.

See other examples under 472.

[*] 842. VII. Opposition, limitation, or concession, where the participle may often be translated by although. E.g.

Οτος δε κα μεταπεμφθναι φσκων π το πατρς, κα λθν ες τν οκῶν, εσελθεῖν μν ο φησιν, Δημοφντος δε κοσαι γραμματεον ναγιγσκοντος, κα προεισηλυθς κα παντα διωμολογημνος πρς τν πατρα, and this man, although he admits that he was summoned, and although he did go to the house, yet denies that he went in, etc., although he had previously gone in and arranged everything with my father. DEM. xxviii. 14. λγα δυνμενοι προορν περ το μλλοντος πολλ πχειρομεν πττειν, although we are able to foresee few things, etc. XEN. Cyr. iii. 2, 15. λν κα δυνηθες ν ατς χειν,

παρδωκε, i.e. when he had captured it (Olynthus) and might have kept it himself, he surrendered it. DEM. xxiii. 107. The participle in this sense is very often accompanied by καπερ and other particles. (See 859.) This construction is the most common equivalent of a clause with although.

[*] 843. VIII. Any attendant circumstance, the participle being merely descriptive. E.g.

Παραλαβντες Βοιωτους κα Φωκας στρευσαν π Φρσαλον, "they took Boeotians and Phocians with them and marched against Pharsalus." THUC. i. 111. Παραγγλλει τ Κλερχ λαβντι κειν σον ν ατ στρευμα, "he sends orders to Cl. to come with all the army that he has." XEN. An. i. 2, 1. ρχεται Μανδνη τ ν Κρον τ ν υν χουσα, "Mandane comes with her son Cyrus." Id. Cyr. i. 3, Id. Cyr. 1. Καταδιξαντες κα νας δεκα λαβντες τους τε νδρας νελμενοι ππλεον, κα τρπαιον σσαντες νεχρησαν. THUC. ii. 84. Μα ς Πελοπνησον χετο πρσβεις γουσα, one (ship) was gone to Peloponnesus with ambassadors. Id. vii. 25. Δς τ ξεν τατα φρων, "take these and give them to the stranger." Hom. Od. xvii. 345. Βο χρμενοι, "with a shout." THUC. ii. 84.

[*] 844. The participles χων, γων, λαβν, φρων, and χρμενος may often be translated by with: see examples in 843. (For another use of φρων see 837.) [*] 845. IX. That in which the action of the verb consists. E.g.

Τδ επε φωνν, "thus he spake saying." AESCH. Ag. 205. σ μς γαθ δδρακας ερνην ποισας, "what blessings you have done us in making peace!" Pac. 1199. Ε γ ποησας ναμνσας με, "you did well in reminding me." PLAT. Phaed. 60 C.

See other examples under 150, where the peculiar force of the aorist participle in such cases, denoting the same time with the verb, is illustrated.

[*] 846. The examples show that no exact distinctions of all circumstantial participles are possible, as many express various relations at the same time. See 823.

Genitive Absolute.

[*] 847. When a circumstantial participle (832-846) belongs to a substantive which is not grammatically connected with the main construction of the sentence, both the substantive and the participle generally stand in the genitive, in the construction called the genitive absolute. E.g.

"Ο τις με ζντος σο βαρεας χερας ποσει," "no one while I live shall lay heavy hands upon you." Il. i. 88.

"Τατ πρχθη Κωνωνος μν στρατηγοντος, Εαγορου δ τοτο παρασχντος κα τς δυνμεως τν πλεστην παρασκευσαντος" "these were accomplished while Conon was general, and after Evagoras had thus supplied him, etc." ISOC. ix. 56.

"Φοβομαι μ, προσδεξαμνων τν νν νθεστηκτων ατ κα μι γμ πντων φιλιππισντων, ες τν ττικν λθωσιν μφτεροι" DEM. xviii. 176 : see xix. 50 (present and perfect).

"φκετο δερο τ πλοον, γντων τν Κεφαλλνων ντιπρττοντος του . . . καταπλεν" "the Cephallenians having determined to sail in, although this man opposed it." Id. xxxii. 14.

“ἄθηναίων δ’ ἂν αὐτὸ τοῦτο παθόντων, διπλάσσαν ἢ τὴν δόναμιν ἐκκίξεσθαι ὀμῶμαι,” “i.e. if the Athenians should ever suffer this same thing, etc.” THUC. i. 10.

“ἄλλης γὰρ τῆς πύλεως πειρεπομένης τῆς στρατηγῆς, μέγιστα τῆς τε ἡγαθῆς κατορθόντος ἀπὸ καὶ τῆς κακῆς διαμαρτόντος ἐκκίξῃ γίγνεσθαι” XEN. Mem. iii. 1, 3. The genitive absolute was probably used at first to express time (present or past according to the tense), and afterwards the other circumstantial relations, cause, condition, concession, etc. The construction is most fully developed in Attic prose, especially in the Orators.¹

[*] 848. A participle sometimes stands alone in the genitive absolute, when a noun or pronoun can easily be supplied from the context, or when some general word like ἄνθρωπων or πραγμάτων is understood. E.g. Οὐ δὲ πολῆμοι, προσίντων, τῶς μὲν ἑσχαζόν, but the enemy, as they (men before mentioned) came on, for a time kept quiet. XEN. An. v. 4, 16. So παγομένων ἀπὸ τῆς, when they were called in (when people called them in), THUC. i. 3. Οὐτω δὲ ἄχόντων, ἐκκίξῃ, κ.τ.λ., and things being so (sc. πραγμάτων), etc. XEN. An. iii. 2. 10. Οὐκ ἔξαιτομένος, οὐκ ἄμφικτυονικῆς δίκας παγόντων, οὐκ ἄπαγγελλομένων, οὐδαμῆς ἄγ’ προδιδώκα τὴν ἐμὴν ἐνοίαν. DEM. xviii. 322. (Here the vague idea they is understood with παγόντων and ἀπαγγελλομένων.) So πολέμοντων, PLAT. Rep. 557 E. So when the participle denotes a state of the weather; as ὄντος πολλῆς, when it was raining heavily, XEN. Hell. i. 1, 16. In such cases the participle is masculine, Διῆς being understood. See AR. Nub. 370, “ὄντα”; and II. xii. 25, ἔδρα Ζεῦς.

[*] 849. A passive participle may stand in the genitive absolute with a clause introduced by ἵτι. If the subject of such a clause is plural, or if there are several subjects, the participle itself may be plural, by a kind of attraction. E.g. Σαφῆς δηλωθέντος ἵτι ἢν ταῖς ναυσὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν προγμῶν ἄγνετο, it having been clearly shown, that, etc. THUC. i. 74. ἑσαγγεληθέντων ἵτι Φοῖνισσαι νῆες ἄπὸ τῆς πλῆουσιν, it having been announced, that, etc. Id. i. 116. So XEN. Cyr. i. 4, 18; vi. 2, XEN. Cyr. 19.

[*] 850. The genitive absolute is regularly used only when a new subject is introduced into the sentence (847) and not when the participle can be joined with any substantive already belonging to the construction. Yet this principle is sometimes violated, in order to make the participial clause more prominent and to express its relation (time, cause, etc.) with greater emphasis. E.g. Διαβηκῆτος ἄδη Περικλέους, ἄγγελη ἄπὸ τῆς ἵτι Μῆγαρα ἄφστηκε, when Pericles had already crossed over, it was announced to him that Megara had revolted. THUC. i. 114. So sometimes in Latin, but generally with difference in meaning: as “Galliam Italiamque tentari se absente nolebat,” CAES. Bell. Civ. i. 29.

Accusative Absolute.

[*] 851. The participle of an impersonal verb stands in the accusative absolute, in the neuter singular, with or without an infinitive, when other participles with their subjects would stand in the genitive absolute.

Such are ἔξῃν, δόν, παρῃν, προσκόν, πρῆπον, παρῆχον, μῆλον, μεταμῆλον, δοκόν, δῆξαν, and the like; also passive participles used impersonally (as προσταχθῆν, ἐρημῆνον, δεδογῆνον); and such expressions as δόνατον ἢν, it being impossible, composed of an adjective and ἢν; also τυχῆν, perchance. E.g.

ο δ ο βοηθσαντες δον γιες πλλθον; “ and did those who brought no aid when it was necessary escape safe and sound?” PLAT. Alcib. i. 115B. πλς δ λπας ξν (sc. φρειν), οκ οσω διπλς. I. T. EUR. 688. Παρχον δ τς σσης πσης ρχειν επετω, λλο τι αρσεθε; HDT. v. 49. Ε δ παρασχν, “and when an opportunity offers.” THUC. i. 120. Ο προσκον, “improperly.” Id. iv. 95. Συνδξαν τ πατρ κα τ μητρ, γαμε τν Κυαξρου θυγατρα. XEN. Cyr. viii. 5, 28. Ερημνον κριον εναι τι ν τ πλθος τν ξυμχων ψηφσηται. THUC. v. 30. So δεδομνον, id. i. 125; γεγραμμνον, THUC. v. 56; and προστεταμνον, Leg. 902 D. Κα νθνδε πλιν, προσταχθν μοι π το δμου Μωννα γειν ες λλλσποντον, χμην. L. DEM. 12. Παρεκελεοντ τε, δνατον ν ν νυκτ λλ τ σημναι. THUC. vii. 44. γωγ, φη Κρος, ομαι, μα μν συναγορευντων μν, μα δ κα ασχρν ν τ ντιλγειν, κ.τ.λ. XEN. Cyr. ii. 2, 20. (See 876.) ντιπαρεσκευζετο ρρωμνωσ, ς μχης τι δεσον, “on the ground that there would still be need of a battle.” Ib. vi. 1, lb. 26. Ο δ τρικοντα, ς ξν δη ατος τυραννεν δες, προεπον, κ.τ.λ., i.e. thinking that it was now in their power, etc. Id. Hell. ii. 4, Id. Hell. 1.

[*] 852. Rarely the infinitive in the accusative absolute has τ; as ασχρν ν τ ντιλγειν, XEN. Cyr. ii. 2, 20 (above): so v. 1, XEN. Cyr. 13; PLAT. Rep. 521 A, PLAT. Rep. 604 C.

[*] 853. Even the participles of personal verbs sometimes stand with their nouns in the accusative absolute, in all genders and numbers, if they are preceded by ς or σπερ (864; 867). E.g. Δι κα τος υες ο πατρες π τν πονηρν νθρπων εργουσιν, ς τν μν τν χρηστν μιλαν σκησιν οσαν τς ρετς, τν δ τν πονηρν καταλυσιν (sc. οσαν). XEN. Mem. i. 2, 20. Φλους κνται ς βοηθν δεμνοι, τν δ δελφν μελοσιν, σπερ κ πολιτν μν γινομνους φλους, ξ δελφν δ ο γινομνους, as if friends were made from fellow-citizens, and were not made from brothers. Ib. ii. 3, lb. 3. ς τος Βοιωτος τν τν νομτων σνθεσιν τν Δημοσθνους γαπσοντας. AESCHIN. iii. 142. σπερ μς γνοοντας. Ib. 189. Μγιστον οτω διακεσθαι τς γμμας μν, ς καστον κντα προθμωσ τι ν δ ποισοντα. DEM. xiv. 14.

[*] 854. The accusative absolute used personally without ς or σπερ is very rare. It occurs chiefly with neuter participles which are regularly impersonal. E.g. Προσκον ατ το κλρου μρος σον περ μο. ISAE. v. 12. Τατα δ γινμενα, πνθεα μεγαλα τος Αγυπτους καταλαμβνει. HDT. ii. 66. δη μφοτροις μν δοκον ναχωρεν, κυρωθν δ οδν, νυκτς τε πιγενομνης, ο μν Μακεδνες χρουν π οκου. THUC. iv. 125. Δξαντα δ τατα κα περανθντα τ στρα- τεματα πλθε. XEN. Hell. iii. 2, 19. Δξαν μν τατα occurs in PLAT. Prot. 314 C, where we may supply ποιεν, or δξαν τατα may represent δοξε τατα. So XEN. An. iv. 1, 13.

Adverbs connected with the Circumstantial Participle.

[*] 855. The adverbs τε, δη (τε δη), νταθα, ετα, πειτα, and οτως are often joined to the verb of the sentence in which the temporal participle stands, to give greater emphasis to the temporal relation. E.g. κλευεν ατν συνδιαβντα, πειτα οτως παλλττεσθαι, he commanded that, after he had joined them in crossing, he should then retire as he proposed XEN. An. vii. 1, 4. Πειθομνων δ τν Σαμων κα σχντων τν Ζγκλην, νθατα ο Ζαγκλαοι βοθεον ατ. HDT. vi. 23. ποφυγν δε κα τοτους, στρατηγς οτω θηναων πεδχθη, and having escaped these also, he was then (under these circumstances) chosen

general of the Athenians. Id. vi. 104.

[*] 856. Εἴτα, πείτα, and ὁτιως sometimes refer in the same way to a participle expressing opposition or limitation; in which case they may be translated by nevertheless, after all. E.g.

Πόντων δὲ τοπίατιν ἔστι, τηλικατήν νελντας μαρτυραν ὁτιως ὁεσθαι δεῖν ἐκκίπιστεῖσθαι παρμῖν, it is most absurd of all that, although they have destroyed so important a piece of evidence, they should after all think, etc. DEM. xxviii. 5. Δεινμῖν πῆθοις, ἐθῆναζε φικμενος, ὁ τῆς ἄλλοδος πλεστη στήν ξουστῶα τοῦ λῆγειν, πείτα σῆνταθα τοῦ μῖνος τυχῶσας, if, although you are come to Athens, you should after all be the only one to fail in obtaining this. PLAT. Gorg. 461 E.

[*] 857. Ὀτιως, δι τοτο, and δι τατα sometimes refer in the same way to a participle denoting a cause. E.g. Νομζων μενονας κα κρεττους πολλν βαρβρων μῆς εἶναι, δι τοτο προσλαβον, because I believed, etc. XEN. An. i. 7, 3. μῆς δὲ μεῆς ἠησμενοι κκανοῆς γνῆναι, ὁτω παρελβόμεν. PLAT. Lach. 178 B.

[*] 858. The adverbs ἄμα, μεταξ, ἐθῆς (Ionic ἔθως), ἀτκα, ῥτι, and ἕξαφνης are often connected (in position and in sense) with the temporal participle, although grammatically they qualify the verb of the sentence. E.g. ἄμα προῖν πεσκοπετο εἰ τι δυνατῖν εἴη τοῆς πολεμῶους σθενεστῶρους ποιῆν, as he advanced, he looked at the same time to see whether it was possible, etc. XEN. Cyr. v. 2, 22. ἄμα καταλαβντες προσεκῶατ σφι, as soon as they had overtaken them, they pressed hard upon them. HDT. ix. 57. Νεκῆς μεταξ ῥσσων πασατο, μαντηῶου μποδῶου γενομῖνου, Necho stopped while digging (the canal), etc. Id. ii. 158. Πολλαχοῦ δὲ με πσχε λῆγοντα μεταξ, it often checked me while speaking. PLAT. Ap. 40 B. ππῖν σκῶσει ἐθῆς νῶι ντες τῶ νδρεῶον μετῶρχονται, by toilsome discipline, even while they are still young, etc. THUC. ii. 39. Τῶ δεξιῶ κῶρ εἰθῆς ποβεβηκῶτι ὁ Κορῖνθοι πκῶιντο, the Corinthians pressed upon the right wing, as soon as it was disembarked. Id. iv. 43. ῥξῖμενος ἐθῆς καθισταμῖνου, beginning as soon as it (the war) broke out. Id. i. 1. Διῖνυσον λῆγουσι ῆς ἀτκα γενῖμενον ῆς τῖν μηρῖν νερρῶψατο Ζεῆς, they say of Dionysus that, as soon as he was born, Zeus sewed him into his thigh. HDT. ii. 146. Τῖν ψυχῖν θεωρῶντα ἕξαφνης ποθανῖντος κῶστου, "viewing the soul of each one the moment that he is dead." PLAT. Gorg. 523 E. Καῶ αῶτο μεταξ τατα λῆγοντος Κλεινῶας τυχεν ποκρινῖμενος. Id. Euthyd. 275 E.

[*] 859. The participle expressing opposition, limitation, or concession is often strengthened by καπερ or κα (after a negative, by ὁδῶ or μηδῶ, with or without πῶρ), or by κα τατα, and that too. ἄμως, nevertheless, may be connected with the participle (like ἄμα, etc. in 858), belonging, however, grammatically to the leading verb. E.g. κτορα κα μεματα μῆχης σχῶσεσθαι ἄω. II. ix. 655. "ποικτεῶρω δῶ νιν δῶστηνον μπας, καπερ ῖντα δυσμενῶ," "although he is my enemy." SOPH. Aj. 122. Ὀκ ῖν προδοῶην, ὁδῶ περ πῶσσων κακῆς. EUR. Ph. 1624. Γυναικῶ πεῶθου μηδῶ τῶληθῶ κῶων (= μηδῶ ῖν τῶληθῶ κῶων). Id. Fr. 443. Πεῶθου γυναιξῶ, καπερ ὁ σῶργων ἄμως, "although you are not fond of them." Sept. 712. (Here ἄμως, qualifies πεῶθου; although, as usual, it is joined with the participle for emphasis.) ἄδικῆς ῶτι ῖνδρα μῖν τῖν σπουδαῖατον διαφθεῶρεις γελῖν ῖναπεῶθων, κα τατα ὁτω πολῖμιον ῖντα τῶ γῶλωτι. XEN. Cyr. ii. 2, 16.

[*] 860. In Homer, the two parts of κα . . . περ are generally separated by the participle, or by some emphatic word connected with it. Κα is here very often omitted, so that π stands alone in the sense of although. Both of these uses are found also in tragedy. E.g. Τ μ πειτ ε ασε, κα χν μεν περ τ αρου, κε σθαι. Il. viii. 125. Κα κρατερ περ ν, μεν τω τριτ τ ν μο ρ. Il. xv. 195. Τ τλαθι, μ τερ μ, κα ν σχεο κηδομ νη περ, μ σε φ λην περ ο σαν ν φθαλμο σιν δωμαι θεινομ νην: τ τε δ ο τι δυν σομαι χν μεν περ χραισμε ν. Il. i. 586.

“Κ γ σ κνο μαι, κα γυν περ ο σ μως” EUR. Or. 680. “Τ φον γ ρ α τ κα κατασκαφ ε γ, γυν περ ο σα, τ δε μηχαν σομαι” Sept. 1037. So π alone in Herodotus, as “σκευ περ ν,” iii. 131 .

[*] 861. Κα τοι was very seldom used like κα περ with the participle, its only regular use being with finite verbs. E.g. Ο δ μοι μμελ ως τ Πιττ κειον ν μεται, κα τοι σοφο παρ φωτ ε ρημ νον. Fr. 5, Fr. 8 (ap. PLAT. Prot. 339 C). καν μοι νομ ζω ε ρ σθαι, κα τοι πολλ γε παραλιπ ν. LYS. xxxi. 34.

[*] 862. τε, and ο α or ο ν, as, inasmuch as, are used to emphasise a participle denoting the cause or ground of an action. Here the cause assigned is stated merely on the authority of the speaker or writer. (See 864.) E.g. δ Κ ρος, τε πα ε ν κα φιλ καλος κα φιλ τιμος, δετο τ στολ, but Cyrus, inasmuch as he was a child (as being a child), etc. XEN. Cyr. i. 3, 3. τε χρ νου γγνομ νου συχνο, “as a long time intervened.” HDT. i. 190: in the same chapter, ο α δ ε ξεπιστ μενοι. So τε ληφ θ ντων, THUC. vii. 85. Μ λα δ χαλεπ ε πορευ μενοι, ο α δ ν νυκτ τε κα φ β π νντες, ε ε Α γ σθενα φικνο νται, inasmuch as they were departing by night, etc. XEN. Hell. vi. 4, 26. Ο ν δ δι χρ νου φιγμ νος, σμ νως α π τ ε συν θεις διατριβ ε. PLAT. Charm. 153 A.

[*] 863. In Herodotus, στε is used in the sense of τε; as in i. 8, στε τα τα νομ ζων, inasmuch as he believed this. So vi. 136, ν γ ρ δ ν ατος, στε σηπομ νου το μηρο. In THUC. vii. 24, στε (so the MSS.) γ ρ ταμει χρωμ νων τ ν θηνα ων το ε τε χεσιν, Bekker wrote τε for στε, and Stahl reads σπερ.

[*] 864. ε may be prefixed to participles denoting a cause or ground or a purpose, sometimes to other circumstantial participles. It shows that what is stated in the participle is stated as the thought or assertion of the subject of the leading verb, or as that of some other person prominent in the sentence, without implying that it is also the thought of the speaker or writer. E.g. Ο μ ν δι κοντες το ε καθ α το ε ε π ντας νικ ντες, ο δ ρπ ζοντες ε εδη π ντες νικ ντες, one side pursuing those opposed to them, thinking that they were victorious over all; and the other side proceeding to plunder, thinking that they were all victorious. XEN. An. i. 10, 4. Τ ν π ρ φασιν ποιε το ε Πισ δας βουλ μενος κβαλε ν, “he made his pretence as if he wished to drive out the Pisidians.” lb. i. 2, lb. 1. Συλλαμβ νει Κ ρον ε ε ποκτεν ν, he seizes Cyrus with the (avowed) object of putting him to death. lb. i. 1, lb. 3. Διαβα νει ε μ σων τ ν σ τον. HDT. vi. 28. Ο θηνα οι παρεσκευ ζοντο ε πολεμ σοντες, the Athenians prepared with the (avowed) intention of going to war. THUC. ii. 7. Τ ν Περικλ α ν α τ ε ε χον ε πε σαντα σφ ε πολεμε ν κα δ κε νον τα ε ζυμφορα ε περιπεπτωκ ετες, they found fault with Pericles, on the ground that he had persuaded them to engage in the war, and that through him they had become involved in the calamities. Id. ii. 59. (Here Thucydides himself is not

responsible for the statements in the participles, as he would be if **■** were omitted.) **■**γανακτο**■**σιν **■**ς μεγ**■**λων τιν**■**ν **■**πεστερημ**■**νοι, they are indignant, because (as they allege) they have been deprived, etc. PLAT. Rep. 329 A. Βασιλε**■** χ**■**ριν **■**σασιν, **■**ς δ**■** **■**κε**■**νον τυχο**■**σαι τ**■**ς α**■**τονομ**■**ας τα**■**της, i.e. they thank him because (they believe) they have obtained this independence through him. ISOC. iv. 175. **■**ς γ**■**ρ ε**■**δ**■**των περ**■** **■**ν **■**π**■**μφθησαν **■**κο**■**ετε, for you hear them as men who (you believe) know about what they were sent for. DEM. xix. 5.

■λεγε θαρρε**■**ν **■**ς καταστησομ**■**νων το**■**των ε**■**ς τ**■** δ**■**ον, he bade them take courage, on the ground that these matters were about to be settled as they should be. XEN. An. i. 3, 8. **■**κ δ**■** το**■**των ε**■**θ**■**ς **■**κ**■**ρυττον **■**ξι**■**ναι π**■**ντας Θηβα**■**ους, **■**ς τ**■**ν τυρ**■**νων τεθνε**■**των, because (as they said) the tyrants were dead. Id. Hell. v. 4, Id. Hell. 9. **■**πελογ**■**σατο **■**τι ο**■**χ **■**ς το**■**ς **■**λλησι πολεμησ**■**ντων σφ**■**ν ε**■**ποι, that he said what he did, not because they intended to be at war with the Greeks. Id. An. v. 6, Id. An. 3. So **■**ς **■**πιβουλε**■**οντος Τισσαφ**■**ρνους τα**■**ς π**■**λεσι, on the ground that T. was plotting, ib. i. 1, Id. An. 6. **■**ς ο**■** προσο**■**σοντος (sc. **■**μο**■**) τ**■**ς χε**■**ρας, . . . δ**■**δασκε, since (as you may feel sure) I will not lay hands on you, teach me. Id. Mem. ii. 6, Id. Mem. 32. **■**ς **■**ναμενο**■**ντος κα**■** ο**■**κ **■**ποθανουμ**■**νου (sc. **■**μο**■**), ο**■**τω παρασκευ**■**ζου, “make your preparations in the idea that I shall remain and shall not die.” Id. Cyr. viii. 4, Id. Cyr. 27. Ν**■**ν δ**■**, **■**ς ο**■**τω **■**χ**■**ντων, στρατι**■**ν **■**ς τ**■**χιστα **■**κπ**■**μπετε. HDT. viii. 144. So **■**ς β**■**βαιον **■**ν, THUC. i. 2; DEM. xviii. 207.

[*] 865. It is a mistake to suppose that **■**ς implies that the participle does not express the idea of the speaker or writer. It implies nothing whatever on this point, which is determined (if at all) by the context. The question whether the clause with **■**ς gives the real or the pretended opinion of the leading subject is also determined (if at all) by the context.

[*] 866. **■**ς may also be used before participles standing in indirect discourse with verbs of knowing, etc. (see 916).

[*] 867. **■**σπερ, as, as it were, with the participle denotes a comparison of the action of the verb with an assumed case. The expression may generally be translated by as if with a verb; but the participle is not felt to be conditional in Greek, as is shown by the negative ο**■** (not μ**■**). E.g. **■**ρχο**■**ντο **■**σπερ **■**λλοις **■**πιδεικν**■**μενοι, they danced as if they were showing off to others (i.e. they danced, not really but in appearance showing off). XEN. An. v. 4, 34. Τ**■** **■**μο**■** το**■**το λ**■**γεις, **■**σπερ ο**■**κ **■**π**■** σο**■** **■**ν **■** τι **■**ν βο**■**λ**■** περ**■** **■**μο**■** λ**■**γειν; why do you say this to me, as if it were not in your power to say what you please about me? Id. Mem. ii. 6, Id. Mem. 36. In both these cases, there is a comparison between the action stated in the verb and dancing or speaking under circumstances stated in the participial clause. The if in our translation is a makeshift, which we find convenient in expressing the supposed case in a conditional form, which, however, is not the Greek form. The construction is the same as when **■**σπερ takes a noun, as τ**■**ν κ**■**νδυνον παρελθε**■**ν **■**πο**■**ησεν **■**σπερ ν**■**φος, it caused the danger to pass by like a cloud, DEM. xviii. 188; only we can translate **■**σπερ ν**■**φος, but we could not translate **■**σπερ ν**■**φος **■**ντα.

■σπερ **■**δη σαφ**■**ς ε**■**δ**■**τες **■** πρακτ**■**ον **■**στ**■**ν, ο**■**κ **■**θ**■**λετ**■** **■**κο**■**ειν, you are unwilling to hear, as if you already knew well what should be done. ISOC. viii. 9. **■**π**■**ντων **■**λ**■**γοι πρ**■**ς πολλ**■**ς μυρι**■**δας, **■**σπερ **■**ν **■**λλοτρ**■**αις ψυχα**■**ς μ**■**λλοντες κινδυνε**■**σειν, “as if they had been about to incur the risk with others’ lives.” Id. iv. 86. Τ**■**ν **■**μ**■**σειαν ε**■**ληφεν, **■**σπερ πρ**■**ς

τὴν Δία τὴν χθρὸν νεμμενος, ἄλλ' οὐ πρὸς τοὺς ἄνθρωπους τὴς συνθήκας ποιούμενος, he has taken half (of the land) as if he were dividing the country with Zeus, and not making a treaty with men. Ib. 179. Πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλοις, ὅσπερ ἀπὸ τῆς πλῆθους καὶ μετ' ἐπινοίας πέντας ἐρηκίης τοὺς λήγους, φυλᾷ ττειν μὲν κλέυεν, as if he had himself spoken, etc. DEM. xviii. 276. Οὐ ἄλληνες οὕτως γὰν κτησαν, ὅσπερ ἄλης τῆς ἄλλοδος πεπορθημῆς, “as if the whole of Greece had been laid waste.” ISOC. x. 49. See Id. iv. 53, ὅσπερ οὐ τοὺς λήγους ντας, and XEN. An. iii. 1, 14, XEN. An. v. 7, 24; Mem. ii. 3, Mem. 3; Oec. ii. 7. In PLAT. Ap. 35 A, we have ὅσπερ θαντων σομνων ἐν μεζ ἀτομ μὲν ποκτενητε, i.e. as if they will be (like men who will be) immortal if you do not put them to death, where the future participle indicates that there is no condition (473). The participle with ὅσπερ generally denotes attendant circumstances (843), sometimes manner (836).

[*] 868. ὅσπερ, like any particle meaning as, can be followed by εἰ and an actual condition, the apodosis of which it represents; as in ὅσπερ εἰ παρεστῆς, as (you would do) if you had lived near by, AESCH. Ag. 1201. A participle with ὅσπερ εἰ seems to have hardly more conditional force than one with the simple ὅσπερ; as μὲν γου καταλιποσ ὅσπερ ἐπροκεμενον, you went off and left me as if I had been laid out, AR. Eccl. 537. See ὅσπερ εἰ νομζων, DEM. xxx. 7. When a real condition is expressed, we generally have ὅσπερ ἐν εἰ, as in ὅσπερ ἐν εἰ τις ἀτιτο, DEM. xviii. 194. But when ὅσπερ ἐν εἰ (or ὅσπερανε) is followed by a participle or a noun without a verb, it is hardly possible that either of the verbs which were originally understood with ἐν and εἰ (227) was felt as implied in the language as we find it: indeed, it would seldom be possible to supply an actual verb. Thus in ἡμῶς διεπορεθησαν ὅσπερανε προπεμμενοι, they proceeded as if they were under escort, ISOC. iv. 148, and in ὅσπερανε γομενοι, as if they believed, DEM. xviii. 214, ὅσπερ alone would have given essentially the same sense. So in φοβθη ὅσπερανε πας, PLAT. Gorg. 479 A, ὅσπερ πας, like a child, would probably have expressed the whole idea with less emphasis.

Remarks on ὅσπερ and ὅς with the Participle.

[*] 869. 1. In Homer ὅς τε, ὅς εἰ, and ὅς εἰ τε are used in a sense approaching that of ὅσπερ in Attic Greek. ὅς here always expresses a comparison, and when εἰ is added the form must originally have included a condition; but, even in Homer, the force of εἰ had become so weakened that it is hardly possible that any actual verb was felt to be implied in the expression. E.g. χαίῃν οὐτον εἰδεις, ὅς τῆ που ἀπὸ τῆς παρεῖν ἄλλου κοσας, “you sing as if you had been present yourself or had heard from another.” Od. viii. 490. Κρκ πῆξα ὅς τε κτμεναι μεναῖων, “I rushed upon Circe as if I were eager to kill her.” Od. x. 322: so x. 295. Τῆν δὲ γῆρων ἄτρεφεν, ἡμφαγαπζομενος ὅς εἰ θῆ ἐν υἱν ντα, welcoming him as (if he had been) his own son. Il. xvi. 191. Πῆλλ ἡλοφυρμενοι ὅς εἰ θανατνδε κντα, as (if he were) going to death. Il. xxiv. 327. Τῆς ν σε τοιδ ἡρεξεν, ὅς εἰ τι κακῆν ζουσαν νωπ, “as if you were doing any evil openly.” Il. v. 373. Καπνὸς γῆγεται ἕξ ἀπὸ τῆς, ὅς εἰ πυρὸς ἀθομνοιο, as (if) when a fire is burning. Il. xxii. 149; so Od. xix. 39.

2. In Homer ὅς εἰ may have a noun without a participle. Here the comparative force is specially clear, as the difficulty of supplying a verb with εἰ is specially great: see μὲν σφηλον ἡρεξεν ὅς εἰ τιν τμητον μετανστην, he made me of no account, like some dishonoured stranger, Il. ix. 648, Il. xvi. 59. So ὅς εἰ τε κατῆον, as if down stream, Od. xiv. 254; ὅς τε περ ψυχῆς, as

it were for my life, Od. ix. 423.2

[*] 870. The weak conditional force that appears in the Homeric εἰ with a participle or a noun (869) helps to explain the perhaps still weaker condition of σπερ εἰ or σπερ ν εἰ in Attic Greek (868).

[*] 871. The very few cases of εἰ with the participle in Homer do not indicate that εἰ had yet begun to develop its later force (864). See Od. xvi. 21, πντα κσεν περιφς, εἰ κ θαντοιο φυντα, he kissed him all over, like one escaped from death, though we might translate since he felt that T. had escaped from death. No such force is possible, however, in Il. xxiii. 430, εἰ οκ οντι οικς, appearing like one who heard not.

[*] 872. Herodotus uses στε with the participle in the sense of τε, although he has εἰ with the participle in the Attic sense (864). See examples under 863.

[*] 873. εἰ (or σε) and εἰ τε appear occasionally in Attic poetry with nouns or adjectives in their Homeric sense. So ματρ σε τις πιστ, like some faithful mother, SOPH. El. 234; πτσας σε τε δυσμεν, spurning her as an enemy, Ant. 653.

[*] 874. σπερ with the participle occasionally seems to have the same force as τε or οον; as in EUR. Hipp. 1307, δ σπερ ν δκαιος οκ φσπετο λγοις, inasmuch as he was just, etc. Or is the meaning here he, like a just man? In PLAT. Rep. 330 E, τοι π τς το γρωσ σθενεας κα σπερ δη γγυτρω ν τν κε μλλν τι καθορ ατ, the same force is generally given to σπερ. But it may have the comparative force: either because of the feebleness of old age, or perhaps (feeling) like one who is nearer the other world, he takes a more careful view of it,—a genitive of cause with π and a participle of circumstance being united under τοι and .

Omission of ν.

[*] 875. The participle ν is sometimes omitted, leaving a predicate adjective or noun standing by itself.

1. This occurs chiefly after τε, οα, εἰ, or καπερ, and much more frequently with predicate adjectives than with nouns. E.g. λλ γινσκω σαφς, καπερ σκοτεινς (sc. ν), τν γε σν αδν μως, “although my sight is darkened.” SOPH. O.T. 1325. φη κηρξειν μηδεμν πλιν δχεσθαι ατος, εἰ πολεμους (sc. ντας), that no city should receive them, on the ground that they were enemies. XEN. An. vi. 6, 9. So εἰ φλους δη, Cyr. iii. 2, Cyr. 25. Ατ πιτηδεουσιν εἰ νναγκαον λλ οχ εἰ γαθν (sc. ν), they practise it on the ground that it is necessary, and not on the ground that it is good. PLAT. Rep. 358 C. “μν τι Ζες, καπερ αθδης σξ. ν φρενν, σται ταπεινς” AESCH. Prom. 907. So in the genitive and accusative absolute. εἰ τομων δ χρημτων (sc. ντων). XEN. An. vii. 8, 11. “εἰ μο μνης πλας” (sc. οσης), “since I alone am near you.” SOPH. O.C. 83. εἰ καλν (sc. ν) γορεεσθαι ατν, on the ground that it is good for it (the speech) to be spoken. THUC. ii. 35. Σ πρτος, εἰ οκ νναγκαον (sc. ν) τ κλπτειν, ατι τν κλπτοντα. XEN. Cyr. v. 1, 13. εἰ ρα παντ δλον (sc. ν) τι κοιν τ φλων σται. PLAT. Rep. 449 C.

(With nouns.) Εθς, οα δ πας (sc. ν) φσει φιλστοργος, σπζετο ατν, “as he was by nature an affectionate child.” XEN. Cyr. i. 3, 2. Ατος ες τν πολιτεαν ο παραδεξμεθα,

■τε τυρανν■δος ■μνητ■ς (sc. ■ντας), since they sing the praises of tyranny. PLAT. Rep. 568 B.

2. Without the above mentioned particles (875, 1), ■ν is rarely omitted, and probably only in poetry. E.g. Το■ς ■ρνις, ■ν ■φηγητ■ν (sc. ■ντων) ■γ■ κτανε■ν ■μελλον πατ■ρα τ■ν ■μ■ν, the birds, by whose guidance, etc. SOPH. O.T. 966. So 1260, and O. C. 1588. Νοε■ς θ■πτειν σφ■, ■π■ρρητον π■λει (sc. ■ν); do you think of burying him, when it is forbidden to the city? Id. Ant. 44.

3. The adjectives ■κ■ν, willing, and ■κων, unwilling, omit ■ν like participles. E.g. “■μο■ μ■ν ο■χ ■κ■ντος,” “against my will.” SOPH. Aj. 455. ■■κοντος ■με■ο. II. i. 301. Νικ■αν κα■ Δημοσθ■νην ■κοντος το■ Γυλ■ππου ■π■σφαξαν. THUC. vii. 86. So AESCH. Prom. 771. Παρ■ το■των ο■κ ■ν ποτε λ■βοις λ■γον ο■τε ■κ■ντων ο■τε ■κ■ντων. PLAT. Theaet. 180 C.

4. A predicate adjective or noun sometimes stands without ■ν, when it is connected by a conjunction to a participle in the same construction. E.g. Τ■ με ο■κ ■λομ■ναν ■βρ■ζεις, ■λλ■ ■π■φαντον; why do you insult me when I am not yet dead, but am before your eyes? SOPH. Ant. 839. Λ■γοις δ■ συμβ■ς κα■ θε■ν ■ν■μοτος. EUR. Med. 737: so EUR. Or. 457. Λ■τρα φ■ρων κα■ ■κ■της (sc. ■ν) τ■ν ■χαι■ν. PLAT. Rep. 393 D. So HDT. i. 60 (■πολε■πουσα . . . κα■ ε■ειδ■ς), and 65 (■δελφιδ■ου μ■ν . . . βασιλε■οντος δ■); THUC. iii. 82 (ο■κ ■ν ■χ■ντων πρ■φασιν ο■δ■ ■το■μων). See other examples in Kühner, vol. ii. § 491.

Combinations of Circumstantial Participles.

[*] 876. As the participle in the genitive or accusative absolute denotes the same relations (time, cause, etc.) as the circumstantial participle in its ordinary construction (833-845), both may be used in the same sentence and be connected by conjunctions. When several participles denoting these relations occur in any sentence, those which belong to substantives already connected with the main construction agree with these in case, while those which refer to some new subjects stand with these in the genitive absolute; any which are impersonal standing in the accusative absolute. E.g. Ο■ μ■ν ■λληνες στραφ■ντες παρεσκευ■ζοντο ■ς τα■τ■ προσι■ντος (sc. το■ βασιλ■ως) κα■ δεξ■μενοι, they prepared themselves with a view to his (the King’s) coming up and to receiving him. XEN. An. i. 10, 6. Κα■ π■ντα διαπραξ■μενος ■ν τ■ ■κκλησ■ (Κλ■ων), κα■ ψηφισαμ■νων ■θηνα■ων α■τ■ τ■ν πλο■ν, τ■ν τε ■ν Π■λλ■ στρατηγ■ν ■να προσελ■μενος, τ■ν ■ναγωγ■ν δι■ τ■χους ■ποιε■το. THUC. iv. 29. ■λκιβι■δης το■ς Πελοποννησ■οις ■ποπτος ■ν, κα■ ■π■ α■τ■ν ■φικομ■νης ■πιστολ■ς ■στ■ ■ποκτε■ναι, ■ποχωρε■ παρ■ Τισσαφ■ρνην. Id. viii. 45. Τ■ς γ■ρ ■μπορ■ας ο■κ ο■σης ο■δ■ ■πιμιν■ντες ■δε■ς ■λλ■λοις ο■τε κατ■ γ■ν ο■τε δι■ θαλασσης, νεμ■μενο■ τε τ■ ■αυτ■ν ■καστοι ■σον ■ποζ■ν κα■ περιουσ■αν χρημ■των ο■κ ■χοντες ο■δ■ γ■ν φυτε■οντες, ■δηλ■ν ■ν ■π■τε τις ■πελθ■ν κα■ ■τειχ■στων ■μα ■ντων ■λλος ■φαιρ■σεται, τ■ς τε καθ■ ■μ■ραν ■ναγκα■ου τροφ■ς πανταχο■ ■ν ■γο■μενοι ■πικρατε■ν, ο■ χαλεπ■ς ■παν■σταντο. Id. i. 2. Here ο■σης and ■πιμιν■ντες belong to the leading clause; νεμ■μενοι, ■χοντες, and φυτε■οντες—corresponding to ■γο■μενοι—are in the second line; ■δηλον ■ν depends on νεμ■μενοι, etc., and introduces the indirect question ■π■τε . . . ■φαιρ■σεται, which contains ■πελθ■ν and ■τειχ■στων ■ντων as circumstantial participles.

Supplementary Participle.

[*] 877. The supplementary participle completes the idea expressed by a verb, by stating that to which its action relates. It often approaches very near the use of the object infinitive. It may belong to either the subject or the object of the verb and agree with it in case. E.g. Παύομαι σε λαλόντα, we stop you from speaking; παύμεθα λαλόντες, we cease speaking.

[*] 878. The supplementary participle has two uses. In one of these it corresponds to the infinitive in indirect discourse, with its tenses representing the same tenses of the direct form; and in the other it corresponds to the object infinitive in other constructions, so far as it approaches the infinitive at all in meaning. (See 746.)

Compare παύομαι σε λαλόντα, we stop you from speaking, with δεκνύσθαι σε λαλόντα τλήθθαι, he shows that you speak the truth; and compare both with κωλύομαι σε λαλῆναι, we prevent you from speaking, and φησὶ σε λαλῆναι τλήθθαι, he says that you speak the truth.

I. Not in Indirect Discourse.

[*] 879. I. The participle may be used with verbs signifying to begin, to continue, to endure, to persevere, to cease, to stop (i.e. cause to cease), and to permit or put up with. E.g.

ἔγὼ δὲ πρῶτον χαλεπαίνων, "and I was the first to be angry." Il. ii. 378. ἄρξομαι πρὸ τῆς ἰατρικῆς λαλῶν, "I will begin my speech with the art of medicine." Symp. 186B. Ἄτις ἡ οὐκ ἡ διατελεῖ μόνη λευθέρη οἴσα Περσῶν, "this house continues to be the only free one among the Persians." HDT. iii. 83. So XEN. An. iv. 3, 2; DEM. xviii. 1. Οὐκ ἐνδοξομαι ζῆσα, "I shall not endure life." EUR. Hipp. 354. ἐνχεσθαί τινων τὰς ἐκκλησίας λεγόντων, "to endure certain men saying." DEM. ix. 6. So ἐνδοξομαι λαλόντος μοι περὶ τοῦτων; "will you allow me to say?" PLAT. Rep. 613 C. With the accusative: καὶ τὰ τέκνων παύδης ἐξανξεται πύχοντα; "and will Jason endure to have his children suffer this?" EUR. Med. 74. Λιπαρῆτε μόνοντες, "persevere and hold your ground." HDT. ix. 45. Οὐ δὲ καρτέρουν πρὸς κίμα λακτίζοντες. I. T. EUR. 1395. Τρῶας δὲ οὐκ ἐλξω ἐναρξίζων, "I will not stop slaying Trojans." Il. xxi. 224. Παύσαι λαλῶσα, "stop talking." EUR. Hipp. 706; so 474. Τὴν φιλοσοφίαν παύσον τὰτα λαλῶσαν, "stop Philosophy from talking in this style." PLAT. Gorg. 482 A. α. ἐκέννοισι τὰτα ποιεῖσι οὐκ ἐπιτρέπτῃα ἴσθαι, "we must not allow them to act in this way." HDT. ix. 58. Πύλις ἀτόκος οὐκ ἐπιτρέψει παραβάνουσι τὴν νόμον, "the city will not put up with their transgression of the law." ISOC. xii. 170.

[*] 880. The poets sometimes have the participle with τολμῶ and τλῶ, to endure, to have courage, and with μῶν, to await, which usually take the infinitive. E.g. ἐτλμα βαλλόμενος. Od. xxiv. 162. Τλμα δὲ ἔρσα, "have the courage to love." EUR. Hipp. 476. Τλνα σε δρσαν ἐν γὰρ παραινῶ, "that you take courage to do what I shall advise." SOPH. El. 943. So παθῶντα τλναι, endured to be sold, AESCH. Ag. 1041; σπερσας ἔτλα, was bold enough to plant, Sept. 754. ἴφρα μῶνιεν νοστῶσαντα ἐνακτα, "that they might await the king's return." Il. xiii. 38 (compare iv. 247, μῶντε Τρῶας ἐλθόμεν;). For the aorist participle in the last three examples, see 148.

[*] 881. II. The participle may be used with many verbs which denote a state of the feelings, as those signifying to repent, to be weary, to be pleased, displeased, satisfied, angry, troubled, or ashamed. E.g.

Μεταμελλονται τας σπονδας ο δεξιμενοι, “they repented that they had not accepted the peace.” THUC. iv. 27. Τοις δεσμοτας μεταμελλοντο ποδεδωκτες, “they repented of having returned the prisoners.” Id. v. 35. Εμεταμλησ ο τιν λλλσποντον μαστιγσαντι, “whether he repented that he had scourged the Hellespont.” HDT. vii. 54. τιν τις μ ποκμν ζιτην, “provided one is not weary of seeking.” PLAT. Men. 81 D. Τι μν α χαρον νοστσαντι, “they rejoiced in his return.” Hom. Od. xix. 463: so Hom. Il. xviii. 259. Τιμμενοι χαρουσιν, “they delight to be honoured.” EUR. Hipp. 8. Χαρουσιν ξεταζομνοις τοις οομνοις μν εναι σοφος οσι δ ο, i.e. they delight in having them examined. PLAT. Ap. 33 C. In poetry χαρω may have the accusative: τοις γρ εσεβες θεο θνσκοντας ο χαρουσι, “for the Gods do not rejoice in the death of the pious.” EUR. Hipp. 1340. “Σ μν ε προσοντ πιχαρω” SOPH. Aj. 136. Φιλω with nominative: φιλες δ δρσ ατ σφδρα, “and you are very fond of doing it.” AR. Pl. 645. Ο γρ τς τοι νιται παρεντι. Hom. Od. xv. 335. Τις Αολδος χαλεπς φερεν πεστερημνος, “he took it hard that he was deprived of Aeolis.” XEN. Hell. iii. 2, 13. πσ μικροτρων τιμμενοι γαπσιν, “they are content to be honoured by smaller men.” PLAT. Rep. 475 B. λεγγμενοι χθοντο, “they were vexed at being exposed.” XEN. Mem. i. 2, 47. Τοις φρονμους γανακτεν ποθνσκοντας πρει, “it is right to be indignant when the wise die.” PLAT. Phaed. 62 E. ς μισ σ χων. EUR. Supp. 1108. Ο νεμεσ γαμμνονι τρνοντι μχεσθαι χαιος. Il. iv. 413. δικομενοι μλλον ργζονται βιαζμενοι. THUC. i. 77. Τοτο οκ ασχνομαι λγων, I say this without shame (see 903, THUC. 1). XEN. Cyr. v. 1, 21. “Αδεσαι πατρα προλεπων” SOPH. Aj. 506. Νικμενος λγοισιν οκ νανομαι, I am not sorry (non piget) to be overcome by your words. AESCH. Ag. 583. “Εδρσας δ σ οκ νανομαι,” “I do not regret that I helped you.” EUR. H.F. 1235. Θανοσα οκ νανομαι, I do not regret my death (about to come). I. A. 1503. “νανομαι τ γρας μν εσορν,” “I am troubled at the sight, etc.” Bacch. 251. (νανομαι, refuse, takes the infinitive: see AESCH. Ag. 1652.)

[*] 882. Most of the participles of 881 denote a cause or ground of action, and might be placed under 838. (See 823.)

[*] 883. III. The participle with verbs signifying to find, to detect, or to represent, denotes an act or state in which a person or thing is found, detected, or represented. E.g. Ερεν δ εροπα Κρονδην τερ μμενον λλων, “she found the son of Kronos sitting apart.” Il. i. 498. So i. 27. δ κρυξ φικιμενος ερε τοις νδρας διεφθαρμνους, the herald, when he came, found the men already put to death. THUC. ii. 6. ν γρ ερεθ λγων σο τατ, γωγ ν κπεφυγοην πθος, if he shall be found to tell the same story as you, etc. SOPH. O.T. 839. Καταλαμβνονουσι τιν Ποτδαιαν κα τλλα φεστηκτα, “they find Potidaea and the other towns in revolt.” THUC. i. 59. Κακς γ ν ς φλους λσκεται, “he is detected in baseness.” EUR. Med. 84. ν λς τι τοτο πρτων, ποθανε, if you are ever caught doing this again, you shall die. PLAT. Ap. 29 C. So PLAT. Rep. 389 D. Βασιλας πεποηκε τοις ν ιδου τιν ε χρνον τιμωρουμνους, “he has represented kings in Hades as suffering punishment without ceasing.” Gorg. 525 D. κλητον ποησεν (μηρος) λθοντα τιν Μενλεων π τιν θονην. Symp. 174C.

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish this use of the participle from that of indirect discourse, especially with ερσκω. (See 904.)

[*] 884. IV. The participle (not in indirect discourse) with verbs signifying to hear, learn (hear of), see, or perceive denotes the act which is perceived or heard of (not, as in indirect discourse, the fact that the act occurs). Here the participle approaches very nearly the ordinary object infinitive in its use, and the tenses of the participle differ only as the same tenses of the infinitive differ in such constructions, the aorist not denoting past time (148). E.g. Βαρ■ δ■ στεν■χοντος ■κουσεν, “and he heard him groaning heavily.” Od. viii. 95. Ε■ δ■ φθεγ■ξαμ■νου τευ ■ α■δ■σαντος ■κουσεν, “but if he had heard any one call or speak.” Od. ix. 497. (The aorist participles denote the occurrence of the act, as the present denotes its progress.) ■κουσα δ■ ποτε α■το■ κα■ περ■ φ■λων διαλεγομ■νου, I once heard him discourse, etc. (see 886). XEN. Mem. ii. 4, 1. “Τοσα■τα φων■σαντος ■σξ. α■το■ε■σηκο■σαμεν,” “so much we heard him say.” SOPH. O.C. 1645. ■δη π■ποτ■ του ■κουσας α■τ■ν λ■γον διδ■ντος ο■ καταγ■λαστον; PLAT. Rep. 493 D. Μεγ■λ■ κλυεν α■δ■σαντος. Hom. Od. iv. 505. Ο■ πω πεπ■σθην Πατρ■κλοιο θαν■ντος, “they had not yet heard of the death of Patroclus.” Hom. Il. xvii. 377; so 427. ■ς ■π■θοντο τ■ς Π■λου κατειλημμ■νης, “when they heard of the capture of Pylus.” THUC. iv. 6. (But with the accusative, in ■τι π■θοιτο τ■ Πλημμ■ριον ■αλωκ■ς, that he had heard that P. was captured, THUC. vii. 31, as indirect discourse. See Classen’s note on iv. 6.) Ο■ το■τους ■ρ■ντες π■σχοντας, “those who see these suffer.” PLAT. Gorg. 525 C. Μ■ σε ■δωμαι θεινομ■νην. Il. i. 587. So Od. x. 99. Τ■ κ■ μ■ ■δοις πρ■τοισιν ■ν■ προμ■χοισιν μιγ■ντα, “then would you see me mingle with the foremost champions.” Od. xviii. 379; so 176, ■ν ■ρ■ γενει■σαντα ■δ■σθαι, to see with a beard. “Τ■ π■ποτ■ ε■δες ■δη ■γαθ■ν τι γεν■μενον;” “to whom did you ever yet see any good come?” AR. Nub. 1061. ■ταν α■τ■ν ■δ■ ■ξα■φνης πτα■σαντα πρ■ς τ■ π■λει κα■ ■κχ■αντα τ■ τε α■το■ κα■ ■αυτ■ν, “when he sees him suddenly come into collision with the state and fall overboard with all his belongings.” PLAT. Rep. 553 A. Ε■ μ■ ■φθησαν ■λθ■ντες. THUC. iv. 73. (The aorist participle with a verb of seeing is not common in prose.) Α■σθ■μενος Λαμπροκλ■α πρ■ς τ■ν μητ■ρα χαλεπα■νοντα, “perceiving Lamprocles angry with his mother.” XEN. Mem. ii. 2, 1. Ο■δεμ■αν π■ποτε ■γ■λην ■σθ■μεθα συστ■σαν ■π■ τ■ν νομ■α. Id. Cyr. i. 1, Id. Cyr. 2. So also α■σθ■νομαι with the genitive: ■σθησα■ μου ■ ψευδομαρτυρο■ντος ■συκοφαντο■ντος; Id. Mem. iv. 4, Id. Mem. 11. Ο■μα■ σε ο■κ ■ν φ■ναι γενομ■νου ποτ■ ■ν σαυτ■ το■ τοιο■του α■σθ■σθαι, “I think you would not say that you ever knew such a thing to happen within yourself.” PLAT. Rep. 440 B. Τ■ν δ■ ν■ησεν ■στε■τ■, “and he perceived him standing.” Il. iv. 200.

[*] 885. The participle may be used in a similar way, having the same distinction of present and aorist (884), with περιορ■ (περιε■δον), and sometimes with ■φορ■, ε■σορ■ (■πε■δον, ε■σε■δον), and even the simple ■ρ■ (ε■δον), in the sense of overlook, allow, or not to prevent. E.g.

Το■ς ξυμ■χους ο■ περιορ■μεθα ■δικουμ■νους, “we shall not let our allies be wronged.” THUC. i. 86. Με■ζω γιν■μενον τ■ν ■νθρωπον περιορ■μεν, “we allow the man to grow greater.” DEM. ix. 29. ■μ■ν ■πισκ■πτω . . . μ■ περιυδε■ν τ■ν ■γεμον■ην α■τις ■ς Μ■δους περιελθο■σαν, “I adjure you not to see the leadership come round again into the hands of the Medes.” HDT. iii. 65. Μ■ περι■δωμεν ■βρισθε■σαν τ■ν Λακεδα■μονα κα■ καταφρονηθε■σαν, “let us not allow Lacedaemon to be insulted and despised.” ISOC. vi. 108. Περιε■δε τ■ν α■το■ πατ■ρα κα■ ζ■ντα τ■ν ■ναγκα■λων σπαν■ζοντα κα■ τελευτ■σαντα ο■ τυχ■ντα τ■ν νομ■μων, he allowed his own father to remain in want (pres.) of the necessaries of life while he

lived, and not to receive (aor.) a decent burial when he died. DIN. ii. 8. Κάμμημρημον κπεσοσαν εσδς, “do not see me driven out without a friend.” EUR. Med. 712. “Μμηδεν θαννθππστν,” “not to see me killed by citizens.” Id. Or. 746. See other examples of the aorist participle with these verbs in 148. For the infinitive, often in nearly the same sense, see 903, 6.

[*] 886. The verbs of perception included in 884 may take the participle also in indirect discourse, with the natural force of each tense preserved (see 904). With some of these verbs, the construction of the participle is generally shown by its case: thus κοω and πυνθνομαι in Attic Greek regularly take the genitive in the construction of 884, and the accusative in indirect discourse. See Ellendt, Sophocl. Lex.s.v. κοω, who does not allow an exception in SOPH. Ph. 615. For the less fixed usage of Homer with κοω and πεθομαι, see Schmitt in Schanz’s Beiträge, p. 9. Other verbs, as ρ, have the accusative regularly in both constructions, but the context generally makes the meaning plain: see, however, EUR. Hec. 342. Ασθνομαι sometimes has the genitive, as in some examples in 884, but not in indirect discourse.

[*] 887. V. With λανθνω, to escape the notice of, τυγχνω, to happen, and φθνω, to anticipate or get the start of, the participle contains the leading idea of the expression and is usually translated by a verb in English. Here the aorist participle does not denote time past relatively to the leading verb (unless the latter is a present or imperfect), but coincides with it in time (144). Other tenses of the participle express their usual relations of time to the verb (147). E.g. Φονα το παιδς λνθανε βσκων, “he was unconsciously supporting the slayer of his son.” HDT. i. 44. σε λανθνει προς τους φλους στεχοντα τν χθρν κακ; “are you unaware that our enemies’ evils are advancing upon our friends?” SOPH. Ant. 9. Τος δ λαθ εσελθν Πραμος, “and Priam entered unnoticed by them.” Il. xxiv. 477; so xvii. 1. Μ σε λθησιν κεσ ξορμσασα, “lest the ship be driven thither before you know it.” Od. xii. 220. Φλασσε δ γε ες νιαυτν, μη λθοι παριν. Od. iv. 526. τον λαθον σελθντες, “they entered more easily without being noticed.” THUC. ii. 2. λθομεν μις ατος παδων οδν διαφροντες; “did we never find out that all the time we were no better than children?” PLAT. Crit. 49 B. (See 147, 2.)

ρχδαμος ατ ξνος ν τγγανε. THUC. ii. 13. γεμν τγγανε τεθνηκς, it happened that the guide had died (was dead). Id. iii. 98. τυχον φοροι τεροι ρχοντες δη, “there happened to be other Ephors already in office.” Id. v. 36. τυχεν μν φυλ πρυτανεουσα, “our tribe happened to hold the prytany.” PLAT. Ap. 32 B. τυχον καθμενος νταθα. Euthyd. 272 E. ν τ σκτ γρ τοτ τυχον νδον λαβν. AR. Eccl. 375. τυχον παραγενμενος ππον χων, I came, as it happened, with a horse. Symp. 221A. Ναπακτον, ν τυχον ρηκτες νεωστ, in Naupactus, which it happened they had lately captured. THUC. i. 103. (See 147, THUC. 1.) ν μη τις ατ βοηθσας θεν τχ, “unless some God by chance comes to its aid.” PLAT. Rep. 492 A; so 495 B. Κν εν τχοιεν ν τ παραχρμα κυκενα πιντες, even if they should happen to drink a κυκεν, “on the spot.” Ib. 408 B.

Φθνουσιν π ατ καταφεγοντες, “they are the first to run to them.” AESCHIN. iii. 248. Ατο φθσονται τοτο δρσαντες, “they will do this for themselves first.” PLAT. Rep. 375 C. φθησαν πολλ τος Πρσας πικμενοι, “they arrived long before the Persians.” HDT. iv. 136.

Βουλ■μενοι φθ■ναι το■ς ■θηνα■ους ■πικ■μενοι ■ς τ■ ■στν. Id. vi. 115. Φθ■νει π■σαν ■π■
α■αν βλ■πτουσ■ ■νθρ■πους, i.e. she (Ate) harms men over the whole earth before Prayers can
avail. Il. ix. 506. ■φθη ■ρεξ■μενος, “he hit him first.” Il. xvi. 322. ■ππ■τερ■ς κε φθ■σιν
■ρεξ■μενος χρ■α καλ■ν, “whichever shall first hit.” Il. xxiii. 805. ■■κ ■φθασαν πυθ■μενοι τ■ν
π■λεμον κα■ ■κον, “no sooner did they hear of the war than they came.” ISOC. iv. 86.
Φθ■νουσιν (hist. pres.) ■π■ τ■ ■κρ■ γεν■μενοι το■ς πολεμ■ους. XEN. An. iii. 4, 49.

[*] 888. So sometimes with διαλανθ■νω and the poetic λ■θω. E.g. Τοια■της πολιτε■ας
μετ■χειν, ■ν ■μ■ διαλ■σει χρηστ■ς ■ν. ISOC. iii. 16. Ο■δ■ σε λ■θω κιν■μενος, “nor do I ever
move without your knowledge.” Il. x. 279.

[*] 889. Κυρ■ω in poetry takes the participle like τυγγ■νω. E.g. Το■τον ο■σθ■ ε■ ζ■ν κυρε■; “
do you know whether perchance he is alive?” SOPH. Ph. 444. Σεσωσμ■νος κυρε■. AESCH. Pers.
503. “Τα■τ■ ε■ρηκ■ς κυρε■;” Soph. O.C.414. “■χθρ■ς ■ν κυρε■” EUR. Alc. 954. So
συγκυρ■ω in HDT. viii. 87, with the aorist participle (144): ε■ συνεκ■ρησε ■ τ■ν Καλυνδ■ων
παραπεσο■σα νη■ς.

[*] 890. Συμπ■πτω (chiefly in Herodotus) and συμβα■νω may take the participle like τυγγ■νω.
E.g. Κα■ τ■δε ■τερον συν■πεσε γεν■μενον, and this other event occurred, as it chanced. HDT.
ix. 101. Συνεπεπ■κεε ■ρις ■ο■σα, “it had happened that there was a quarrel.” Id. i. 82. Ο■τω
γ■ρ συμβα■νει ■μα κα■ ■ τ■νδε ε■γ■νεια κοσμουμ■νη. PLAT. Menex. 237 C. Π■ντα
ξυμβα■νει γην■μενα. Phil. 42C. ■που ■ν ξυμπ■πτ■ ■ν τ■ ψυχ■ καλ■ ■θη ■ν■ντα. Id. Rep.
402 D.

[*] 891. Θαμ■ζω, to be wont or frequent, may take the participle. E.g. Ο■ τι κοιμ■ζ■μεν■ς γε
θ■μιζεν, “he was not used to being thus cared for.” Od. viii. 451. Ο■ θαμ■ζεις καταβα■νων ε■ς
τ■ν Πειραι■, “you do not come down to the Piraeus very often.” PLAT. Rep. 328 C. For examples
of the aorist participle with the present or imperfect of some of the above verbs (887-890),
retaining its own reference to past time, see 146.

[*] 892. As λανθ■νω is active and means to escape the notice of, it must have an object
expressed or understood. When none is expressed, sometimes π■ντας is understood, and
sometimes a reflexive referring to the subject. Thus ■λαθε πο■το ποι■σας may mean either he
did this without any one’s knowing it (sc. π■ντας), or he did this unconsciously (sc. ■αυτ■ν).

[*] 893. The usual construction of λανθ■νω and φθ■νω (and rarely that of τυγγ■νω and κυρ■ω)
with the participle may be reversed, these verbs appearing in the participle, and what is generally
the participle becoming the verb. E.g. ■ψ ■π■ τε■χεος ■λτο λαθ■ν, back from the wall he leaped
secretly (for ■λαθεν ■λμενος). Il. xii. 390. ■πως μ■ ποι■νται ■κπλους α■τ■θεν λανθ■νοντες.
THUC. iii. 51. ■ς μ■ ■βαλε φθ■μενος, “who took advantage of me and hit me.” Il. v. 119.
Φθ■νοντες ■δη δ■ο■μεν τ■ν ■κε■νων γ■ν. XEN. Cyr. iii. 3, 18. Τ■ν ■σβολ■ν φθ■σαντες
προκατ■λαβον. THUC. iv. 127; so ii. 52. ■λ■γ■ ■ληθ■ πολλ■ δ■ ψευδ■ λ■γει τυχ■ν, i.e.
speaks at random. I. A. 957. Πλησ■ον γ■ρ ■ν κυρ■ν, “for he happened to be near.” SOPH. Ph.
371. See AESCH. Supp. 805.

[*] 894. The phrase ο■κ ■ν φθ■νοις (or ο■κ ■ν φθ■νοιτε), you could not be too soon, is used
with the participle as an exhortation, meaning the sooner the better. The first and third persons are
less common in this sense. E.g. ■ποτρ■χων ο■κ ■ν φθ■νοις, “the sooner you run off the better.”

AR. Pl. 1133. So HDT. vii. 162; XEN. Mem. iii. 11, 1. ὄκ ν φθνοῖς λγων, "the sooner you speak the better." Symp. 185E. ὄκ ν φθνοῖμι (λγων), I might as well speak at once. Ib. 214E. Ε μ τιμωρσεσθε τοτους, οκ ν φθνοῖ τ πλθος τοτοις τος θηροῖς δουλεον, "the people might as well be slaves to these beasts at once." DEM. xxiv. 143.

[*] 895. VI. The participle, with many verbs signifying to come or to go, contains the leading idea of the expression. Such verbs are ὀχομαι, to be gone, κω, to have come, ρχομαι, εμι, with the Homeric β, and βαν or βν, from βανω. Some of these uses are very peculiar. E.g. ιχετ ποπτμενος, "it flew away and was gone." Il. ii. 71. ὀχεται φεγων ν εχες μρτυρα, "the witness whom you had has run away." AR. Pl. 933. "νν εδς ος φρων κω λγους," "that you may know the words I bring with me." EUR. Or. 1628. ρχομαι πιχειρν σοι πιδεξασθαι τς ατας τ εδος, "I am going to undertake to show you the nature of the cause." PLAT. Phaed. 100 B. ὄκ ρχομαι ρων ς οτω κ λλωσ πως τατα γνεντο, I am not going to say that these things occurred so, or in some other way (cf. French je vais dire). HDT. i. 5. ιε τατην ανων δι παντς, he always praised her (he went on praising her, French il allait la louant toujours: see Baehr's note). Id. i. 122. Κα γ μν α τς φεξς ρν, "and I was going to speak of them in order." PLAT. Rep. 449 A; so 562 C. Β φεγων, "he took flight." Il. ii. 665; so β ξασα, Il. ii. 167. ὄς μ κρες βαν θαντοιο φρουσαι, Il. ii. 302; so xix. 279.

[*] 896. VII. Herodotus uses the participle with πειρμαι, to try, and with πολλς εμι or γνομαι, πολλς γκειμαι, and παντοος γνομαι, to be urgent; rarely with πεγομαι, to press on. E.g.

ὄκ πειρτο πν Κρος, Cyrus did not attempt to approach. i. 77; so i. 84, vi. 50, vii. 9. Πολλς ν λισσμενος ξενος, the stranger entreated urgently. ix. 91. Γλων δ πολλς νκειτο λγων τοιδε, and Gelon spoke urgently as follows. vii. 158. Ττε παντοοι γνοντο Σκθα δεμενοι νων λσαι τν προν, they begged them in every way (lit. they took every form in begging them), etc. vii. 10. ν μ πειχθς ναυμαχην ποιεμενος, if you do not press on and fight a naval battle. viii. 68 (but just below, ν πειχθς ναυμαχσαι).

[*] 897. The participle with πειρμαι, πολλς γκειμαι, and γκειμαι alone, occurs occasionally in Attic Greek. So also with πντα ποι and rarely with σπουδζω. E.g.

"ὄκ ρ σοι πρν ν πανταχ πειραθ σκοπν" PLAT. Theaet. 190 A. So ANT. Tetr. A. γ. 1.

"Πολς νκειτο λγων" THUC. iv. 22.

"νκειντο φεγοντες" Id. ii. 81.

"Πντα ποιοσι κα λγουσι φεγοντες τν δκην" PLAT. Euthyph. 8 C .

"Τ πλοτου κα δυνμεων διγματα τ κα τις ν ς ξια λγου σπουδζοι μεμφμενος;" "why should any one seriously censure them as if they were worth noticing?" Id. Polit. 310 B ; so XEN. Oec. ix. 1.

[*] 898. VIII. ποδεκνυμι, καθζω, and παρασκευζω, in the meaning to put into a certain condition, to render, may take the participle. E.g. μα κα τπιτδεια μλιστα χοντας ποδεξειν κα τ σματα ριστα χοντας παρασκευσειν, (I undertake to say) that he will at the same time make them (show them forth) best supplied with provisions, and cause them to have their bodies in the best condition. XEN. Cyr. i. 6, 18. Βλποντ ποδεξω σ ξτερον

το Λυγκως, "I will make you see sharper than Lynceus." AR. Pl. 210. κλαοντας ατοος καθω. Eur. Ion. 535 So Cyr. ii. 2, Cyr. 14. See these verbs in Liddell and Scott.

[*] 899. IX. ρκω (and λς εμ in poetry), to be sufficient, and κανς, δων, κρεσσων, μενων, or βελτων with εμ, are sometimes used in a personal construction with the participle (like δλς εμι, etc. 907), where we should expect an impersonal construction with the infinitive. E.g. ρκω θνσκουσγ, "it will be enough for me to die." SOPH. Ant. 547. (We might expect ρκσει μ θνσκειν.) So ρκετω δεδηλωμων, THUC. v. 9. κανς φη ατς τυχν ενα, "he said that it was enough for himself to be in misfortune." ISAE. ii. 7. Κρεσσων γρ σθα μηκτ ν ζν τυφλς. SOPH. O.T. 1368. δους σεσθε κοσαντες, "you will be more pleased to hear." DEM. xxiii. 64. So λς νοσοσγ (sc. εμ), it is enough for me to be afflicted. SOPH. O.T. 1061.

[*] 900. The X. participles βουλμενος, θλων (poetic), δμενος, σμενος, χθμενος, προσδεχμενος, λπμενος, λδμενος (Ionic), and occasionally others, may agree in case with a dative which depends on εμ, γγνομαι, or some verb signifying to come, to appear, or to happen. E.g.

ς ρα τ Τρεσσιν ελδμενοισι φαντην, "thus then did they appear to the delight of the Trojans." Il. vii. 7. μο δ κεν σμν εη, "and I should be pleased with it." Il. xiv. 108. δομνοισιν μν ο λγοι γεγνασι, "we are pleased with the proposals made to us." HDT. ix. 46. Θλοντι κμο τοτ ν. SOPH. O.T. 1356. Τ πλθει ο βουλομν ν, "it was not the wish of the majority." THUC. ii. 3; so vii. 35. Προσδεχομν μοι τ τς ργς μν ς μ γγνηται, "I have been expecting the manifestations of your wrath against me." Id. ii. 60; so vi. 46. τ μν μ χθομν εη. XEN. Cyr. iv. 5, 21. ν βουλομνοις κοειν τουτοισ, μνησσομαι, "if these shall want to hear it." DEM. xviii. 11. ρα, ε σοι βουλομν (sc. στν) λγω. PLAT. Rep. 358 D

See also ττων πεπειραμνοις ν τι γνοιτο κα μν, THUC. v. 111; and "σμν δ σοι ποικιλεμων νξ ποκρψει φος" "you will be glad when spangled-robed night shall hide the light," AESCH. Prom. 23.

Compare TAC. Agric. 18: "Quibus bellum volentibus erat."

[*] 901. XI. In a similar way, the dative of any participle may be used with certain impersonal expressions which take the dative, especially those signifying it is fitting, good, pleasant, profitable, or their opposites, and those implying fear or confidence. E.g.

Ε τδ ατ φλον κεκλημν (sc. στν), if it pleases him to be thus called. AESCH. Ag. 161. Οκ ξιον τοτοις πολλκικς χρσθαι συμβολοις, ος οδ παξ λυσιτλησε πειθομνοις (sc. μν), whom it did not profit you to obey even once. LYS. xxv. 27. Φρονεν ς δειν ν νθα μ τλη λ φρονοντι, "where it does not profit one to be wise." SOPH. O.T. 316. πρετο τν θεν ε λον κα μεινον εη τ Σπρτ πειθομν ος οτος θηκε νμοις, "whether it was better for Sparta to obey." Lac. viii. 5. ντιπαραβλλοντι (sc. μο) τ μαυτο πθη πρς τ κενων οκ ν ηδς εη, it would not be unpleasant for me to compare, etc. PLAT. Ap. 41 B. Α δοκοσι κλλισται τν πιστημν κα μο πποι ν μλιστα πιμελομν, those which seem to be the noblest of the sciences, and which it would be most fitting for me to study. XEN. Oec. iv. 1. Τοτο κα ππειν μο δοκε κα ξιον κινδυνεσαι

ομοῖν ὁτῶς χεῖν (i.e. πρῆπει μοι ὁμοῖν τοτο ὁτῶς χεῖν), it seems fitting and worth the risk for me to believe that this is so. PLAT. Phaed. 114 D. τί μῆ ἴστι δρῶντι τρῶβος, ὁκπὸς φοβεῖ, one who has no dread of a deed, a word does not frighten. SOPH. O.T. 296. So εἰ μοι ζυνεῆ φῶροντι μοῖρα τῶν εἰσεπτον γνεῖαν, may it continue to be my fate to bear, etc. Id. 863. With the expressions of 901 the infinitive is more common (903, 7).

Omission of ν.

[*] 902. Occasionally the participle ν is omitted in the constructions of the supplementary participle that have been enumerated (879-901). E.g.

“Καταλαμβνόμεν Φιλῆππου παρῆντας πρῶβεις, κατὸς μῆν μετῶρους φῶλους ν φῶβῶσξ. ῆντας τὸς δῶ κενου θρασεῖς” DEM. xviii. 211.

“λλῶ οῦ περιψετα μῆ θεῶος ῆνιππον” (sc. ῆντα), “but my uncle will not let me go without a horse.” AR. Nub. 124.

“Εἰ δῆ τι τυγχῆναι ῆδῶς” (sc. ῆν). PLAT. Gorg. 502 B.

“Τυγχῆναι μῆν καστός ὁκ ἀτρῆκης” 3 Id. Rep. 369 B.

Infinitive with Verbs which may also have the Supplementary Participle.

[*] 903. Some verbs which take the supplementary participle allow also the infinitive in a similar construction, but with some difference in the meaning or at least in the point of view.

1. Ἀσχῆνομαι and ἀδοῖμαι with the participle (881) mean I am ashamed of doing (something which I am doing or have done); with the infinitive, I am ashamed to do (something which I have not yet done). E.g. Τοτο μῆν ὁκ ἀσχῆνομαι λῆγων: τῶ δῶ “ῆν μῆνῆτε παρῶ μοῖ ποδῶσῶ” ἀσχῆνομῆν ν λῆγειν, this (something just said) I am not ashamed of saying; but I should be ashamed to say the following, etc. XEN. Cyr. v. 1, 21. Ἀσχῆνομαι μῆν εἰπεῖν τῆλῆθῶ, I am ashamed to tell you the truth (but still I must tell it). PLAT. Ap. 22 B. Ἀδοῖνται τὸς παρῆντας πολεπεῖν, i.e. they are ashamed to leave them (and do not). XEN. Symp. viii. 35. But “ἀδεσαι πατῶρα προλεπεῖν,” “be ashamed of leaving your father (as you threaten to do),” SOPH. Aj. 506. A comparison of the last example with PLAT. Ap. 22 B (above) shows that the choice of the infinitive or participle may depend on the point of view of the speaker in a special case. In Aj. 506, the threat is viewed as the inception of the act.

2. ῆνχομαι, πομῆνω, τῶ, and τολμῶ with the participle (879; 880) mean to endure something now going on or already done; with the infinitive, to have the courage or to venture to do something not yet done. E.g. Καταμεῆναντες ῆνσχοντο τῶν πῆντα πῶ τῶν χῆρην δῆξασθαῖ, “they remained and had the courage to receive the invader of their country.” HDT. vii. 139. (Cf. ὁκ ῆνξομαι ζῶσα under 879.) So πομεῆναντα τῶ πῆντα πῶσχειν, “taking courage to suffer everything.” Leg. 869 C. (Cf. μῆ πομῆνειν Ξῶρξην πῆντα, not to await the coming of Xerxes, i.e. not to wait to see his coming, HDT. vii. 120.) “τῶ οῶρῆνιον φῶς ῆλλῶξαι” SOPH. Ant. 944. “Τῶλῆσῶν ποτε ῶρθῶς φρονεῖν” AESCH. Prom. 999.

ῆνχομαι with the infinitive, and τῶ and τολμῶ with the participle, are rare.

3. **ποκμνω τοτο ποι** (881) is I am weary of doing this; **ποκμνω τοτο ποιε** is I cease to do this through weariness. E.g.

Μτε τατα φοβομενος ποκμς σαυτν σσαι, do not, through fear of this, despair of saving yourself. PLAT. Crit. 45 B. (Cf. **οκ ποκμνεις μηχανμενος**, you are not tired of contriving, XEN. Mem. ii. 6, 35.)

4. **ρχομαι** (Homeric **ρχω**) with the participle (879) means to be first in something, to begin with something, or to be at the beginning (not at the end); with the infinitive, to begin to do something. E.g.

ρξαντο τ μακρ τεχη θηναοι οκοδομεν, “the Athenians began to build the long walls.” THUC. i. 107. **Δε μ μ πιδεικνναι**, **ς οτ ρξατο λγειν τ βλιιστα οτε νν διατελε πρτων τ συμφροντα τ δμ**. AESCHIN. iii. 50.

5. **Παω** with the participle (879) means to stop what is going on; with the infinitive, to prevent a future act. E.g. **μ παυσας μχεσθαι**, “you prevented me from fighting.” Il. xi. 442. (But **μ παυσας μαχμενον** would be you stopped me while fighting.) **Παψδος παυσε γωνζεσθαι**. HDT. v. 67.

6. **Περιορ** and the other verbs signifying to overlook or see (in the sense of permit) with the participle (885) mean to see an act done without interfering to stop it; with the less frequent infinitive, to permit an act to be done without interfering to prevent it. Strictly speaking, the infinitive here expresses time future to that of the verb, while the time of the participle coincides with that of the verb. Still, both forms may sometimes be used to express practically the same sense, and may even refer to the same event, though the point of view is different. E.g. **Περιδεν ατν ν τ σκευ πσ εσαι**, “to let him sing in full dress.” HDT. i. 24. **Θλασσαν πνεματ φασι ο περιψεσθαι φσι τ ωυτς χρσθαι**, “they say that the winds will not permit the sea to follow its own nature.” Id. vii. 16. **Τος γρ θηναους λπιζεν σως ν πεξελθεν κα τν γν οκ ν περιδεν τμηθναι**, “for he hoped that the Athenians would perhaps come forth and not let their land be ravaged.” THUC. ii. 20. But in ii. 18 he has said, **προσδχομενος τος θηναους τς γς τι κεραου οσης νδσειν τι κα κατοκνσειν περιδεν ατν τμηθεσαν, νεχεν**, that they would be unwilling to see it (the land) ravaged (referring to the same thing with **περιδεν τμηθναι**, to let it be ravaged, in 20); and again in 20, **ο χαρνς ο περιψεσθαι δκουν τ σφτερα διαφθαρντα**, it did not seem likely that the Acharnians would see their property destroyed.

7. The impersonal expressions of 901 take the infinitive more frequently than the participle, the distinction being similar to that in the last case (6). E.g. **Ο τοτο πρτον ρτα πτερον λον εη ατ πορεεσθαι μνεν**, “whether it was better for him to go or stay.” XEN. An. iii. 1, 7. But in XEN. Vect. vi. 2 we have **περσθαι τος θεος ε λον κα μεινον εη ν τ πλει οτω κατασκευαζομν**, whether it would be better for the state, supposing it to be thus constituted; the difference between this and better for the state to be thus constituted (**οτω κατασκευζεσθαι**) being practically very slight.

8. It is more than doubtful whether **λανθνω**, **τυγχνω**, and **φθνω** (887) ever have the infinitive in classic Greek. The passages formerly cited for this are now generally emended, or the readings are doubted: thus, in PLAT. Rep. 333 E, **λαθεν μποισαι** must be for **λαθεν μποισας**

(Schneider), and in AR. Eq. 935, φθαίης λθείν, and AR. Nub. 1384, “οκ φθης φρσαι”, Meineke reads λθν and φρσας. See Classen on THUC. iii. 82, φθσας θαρσσαι (?).

II. Participle in Indirect Discourse.

[*] 904. The participle is used with verbs signifying to see, to hear or learn, to perceive, to know, to be ignorant of, to remember, to forget, to show, to appear, to prove, to acknowledge, and with γγλλω, to announce, in a sense approaching that of the infinitive in indirect discourse. Here each tense of the participle represents the corresponding tense of the indicative or optative. (See 687.) The participle may belong to either the subject or the object of these verbs, and agree with it in case. E.g.

Μμνημαι ατν τοτο ποισαντα, I remember that he did this (ποησεν);

μμνημαι τοτο ποισας, I remember that I did this (ποησα).

Οδε τοτους επρξοντας, he knows that they will prosper;

οδε ατς επρξων, he knows that he himself will prosper.

“Εκ ατν γνω νημερτα πντ νποντα,” “if I shall find that he tells all without fault.” Od. xvii. 549.

“ρ δ μργον δειν ξειργασμνην,” “and I see that I have done a terrible deed.” SOPH. Tr. 706.

“μες δνατοι ρμεν ντες τ οκε μνον δυνμει περιγενσθαι,” “we see that we are unable, etc. (δνατο σμεν).” THUC. i. 32.

“κουσε Κρον ν Κιλικ ντα,” “he heard that Cyrus was in Cilicia.” XEN. An. i. 4, 5.

Περ τς χρας, τι κουον δουμνην, “because they heard that it was suffering from ravages.” Ib. v. 5, lb. 7. ταν κλ τινς ξοντ ρστην, “when she hears from any one that Orestes is coming.” SOPH. El. 293. Πυθμεινοι ρταξρξην νεωστ τεθνηκτα, “learning that Artaxerxes had recently died.” THUC. iv. 50; so HDT. vi. 23. πε πρς νδρς σθετ δικημνη. EUR. Med. 26. ισθοντο τος μετ ριστως πιπαριντας. THUC. i. 61. Δι τν λου λωσιν ερσκουσι οσαν τν ρχν τς χθρης (see 883). HDT. i. 5. πειδν γσιν πιστομεινοι, “when they find out that they are distrusted.” XEN. Cyr. vii. 2, 17. ιδεσαν Σωκρτην αταρκστατα ζντα. Id. Mem. i. 2, Id. Mem. 14. ν πολυτρποις γρ ξυμφορας πστανται τραφντες. THUC. ii. 44. Διαβεβλημνος ο μανθνεις. HDT. iii. 1. ννοομαι φαλος οσα. EUR. Hipp. 435. ννοσας γνος πιεικς θλως διατιθμενον. PLAT. Crit. 121 B. Τς οτως εθης στν μν στις γγοε τν κεθεν πλεμον δερο ξοντα; DEM. i. 15. Μμνημαι Κριτ τδε ξυνντα σε (i.e. ξυνσθα). PLAT. Charm. 156 A. Μεμμεθς κνδνον λθνντες μγαν (i.e. λθομεν). EUR. Hec. 244. “πιλελσμεθ δως γροντες ντες” Bacch. 188. πιδεξω δ τοτον ο μνον μολογηκτα ενα τν Μιλαν λεθερον (with six other participles, perfect, aorist, and present). DEM. xxix. 5. πλεμος οτος δηλσει μεζων γεγενημνος ατν (i.e. μεζων γενηται). THUC. i. 21. Εφανσεται ταθ μολογηκς, παρ τε το Δημοφντος τς τιμς εληφς, ατς τε . . . πογρψας, οκν τε τν οκαν, κ.τ.λ. DEM. xxvii. 16. Εθς λεγθσεται γελοος ν.

XEN. Mem. i. 7, 2. Ὅτως μολογουμένη ὁσα δόλη καὶ πάντα τὸν χρόνον ἀσχρῆς βίῃσα, “when it was thus admitted that she was a slave and was all the time living a life of disgrace.” ISAE. vi. 49. Ἐμὲ μὲν ἔγγειλε προσιῖν τὸ στρεψύμα, “had he not reported that the enemy was advancing.” XEN. Hell. vii. 5, 10. Πηγγύθη Φίλιππος μὲν ῥαῖον τεῖχος πολιορκῶν, it was reported to you that he was besieging, etc. DEM. iii. 4.

Compare the examples of ῥῶ, κοῶ, and similar verbs here given with those of the same verbs under 884, in which the participle is not in indirect discourse.

See other examples of the participle in indirect discourse under 687, where examples of the participle with ῖν may be found (see also 213-216).

[*] 905. When one of these verbs has for its object an accusative of the reflexive pronoun referring to its subject, the participle generally agrees with the reflexive. Thus we may have either δεῖξω ἑμαυτῶν τὸ το πεποιηκῆτα, I shall show that I have done this, or δεῖξω τὸ το πεποιηκῆς.

[*] 906. The participle of an impersonal verb in this construction stands alone in the neuter singular. The following includes both the personal and the impersonal construction:—

“Πείσομαι δεῖξαι καὶ μετῖν τῆς πᾶλεως μὲν καὶ πεπονθῆτα ἑμαυτῶν ὀχῶ προσκοντα,” “I shall try to show not only that we have rights in the city, but also that I have suffered, etc.” DEM. lvii. 1. (The direct discourse is μᾶτεστι τῆς πᾶλεως μὲν, καὶ πᾶπονθα ἄτῆς. Compare 876.)

[*] 907. The participle is used in the same way in a personal construction with δῶλῆς εἰμι and φανερῆς εἰμι, in preference to an impersonal expression. So with πιστος γίνομαι in Herodotus. E.g.

“Δῶλῆς τῶν ὀμμενος, κ.τ.λ.,” “it was evident that he thought, etc.” XEN. An. ii. 5, 27. (This is equivalent to δῶλον ἦν ἴτι οἶτο. See 899; 912.)

“πιστῆμενοι μὲν φανεροῦ εἰσι ῆς ἄσιν πᾶλιν,” “it is evident that they came to the city Oasis.” HDT. iii. 26.

“ῆς πιστος γίνετο τὸ το ῥγασμῆνος,” “when it became known (heard of) that he had done this.” Id. ii. 119.

Similar is the participle with φανερῶν ποιῶ, as “φανερῶν πᾶσιν ᾤποῆσαν ὀκ ἄδῶ πολεμοῦντες,” “they made it evident to all that they were not fighting for themselves.” LYCURG. 50.

[*] 908. When σῶνιδα and συγγινῶσκω have a dative of the reflexive referring to the subject, a participle may stand either in the dative agreeing with the reflexive, or in the nominative agreeing with the subject; as σῶνιδα ἑμαυτῶν δίκημῶν (or δίκημῆνος), I am conscious to myself that I have been wronged. E.g.

“γῶ ὀτε μεγὰ ὀτε μικρῶν ξῶνιδα ἑμαυτῶν σοφῆς ἦν” PLAT. Ap. 21 B.

“ἑμαυτῶν ξυνῶδιν ὀδῶν πισταμῶν” Ib. 22B.

[*] 909. When the participle of indirect discourse belongs to an infinitive depending on a verb with an object dative to which the participle refers, the participle stands in the dative. E.g. “Συμβήκε τοις προεσθηκῶσι καὶ τῶν πλὴν αὐτοῦ οἰομένοις πῶλεν πρώτους αὐτοῦς πεπρακῶσιν ἀσθῆσθαι” “it has been the lot of those who were in authority and who thought they were selling everything except themselves, to find that they have sold themselves first.” DEM. xviii. 46.

[*] 910. Some verbs which regularly have the infinitive or τι and ς in indirect discourse occasionally take the participle. E.g.

“Νομίζε νδρα γαθὸν ποκτείνων,” “think that you are putting to death a good man.” XEN. An. vi. 6, 24.

“νεβῆσέτο ρεοῖσα φίλον πῶσιν νδον ντα” Hom. Od. xxiii. 1.

“Θανντῶ ρῶστην νν τε καὶ πῶλαι λῶ” SOPH. El. 676. See O. C. 1579; EUR. Hel. 1076.

Οὐ Τρῶς γυνῆ τεκοῖσα κομπῶσειεν νν ποτε, i.e. none could boast that she was the mother (of such children), τεκον being the direct form. EUR. Tro. 477.

“Μετῶν νν ποτε λῶγοιτο” Phil. 22

“Σμῶρδιν μηκῶτι μῶν ντα λογῶζεσθε” HDT. iii. 65.

“Οὐ γῶρ εἰτυχῶν ῶρνωσομαι,” “for I will not deny that I am happy.” EUR. Alc. 1158. So “ῶρνε κατακῶς;” Id. Or. 1581.

[*] 911. The participle νν is sometimes omitted in indirect discourse. E.g.

“Σῶ δῶ σῶς σῶθι” (sc. νν), “but know that you are safe.” SOPH. O.C. 1210.

“Εἰδῶς εἰτρεπεῶς μῶς σῶξ. νταξῶ.” DEM. iv. 18 ; so iv. 41.

“ῶγγελλε πασῶν ῶθλιωτῶτην μῶ σῶξ. οῶσανῶ.” EUR. Hec. 423.

[*] 912. The verbs included in 904 may also be followed by a clause with τι or ς in indirect discourse. When δῶλῶν ῶστιν and φανερῶν ῶστιν are used impersonally, they regularly take τι or ς. E.g.

“ῶισθετο τι τῶ Μῶνωνος στρῶτευμα ῶδη νν Κιλικῶν” XEN. An. i. 2, 21.

“Αῶσθῶνεσθε ς ῶθῶμωσ ῶλθον” Ib. iii. 1. 40

“ῶκοῶοντες τι οῶτος πολῶζει τῶ χωρῶον” Ib. vi. 6. 4

“Τοσοτῶν γῶ οῶδα κῶμαυτῶν, τι ῶλγῶ” SOPH. El. 332.

“Ταῶτα ῶσασιν τι φῶσει τε καὶ τῶχῶ γῶγενεται” PLAT. Prot. 323 D.

“Δῶλον σῶξ. ῶστῶν τι οῶτως ῶχει” XEN. An. i. 3, 9.

“Φανερῶν δῶ τι οῶτῶν νν Θρῶξῶν οῶτε Σκῶθαισ ῶθῶλοιεν νν διαγωνῶζεσθαι” Id. Mem. iii. 9. 2

“Το το φανερν, ς . . . λγομεν” PLAT. Soph. 237 D.

[*] 913. Verbs signifying to remember or to know may have τε, when, and the indicative, to emphasise the temporal relation. E.g.

“Ε γρ μμνησαι τ γ σοι πεκρινμην,” “for if you remember (the time) when I answered you, etc.” PLAT. Men. 79 D.

“Οσθ τε χρυσοις φνη σν πλοις” EUR. Hec. 112. So II. xv. 18. (See 519, end.) Infinitive with the Verbs of § 904.

[*] 914. Many of the verbs which regularly have the participle in indirect discourse (904) may also take the infinitive in nearly or quite the same sense.

1. κοω, πυνθνομαι, and ασθνομαι, which have the participle both in indirect discourse (904) and in the other construction (884-886), sometimes take the infinitive in indirect discourse, in a sense differing little, if at all, from that of the participle. E.g.

“κοω δ κα λλα θνη πολλοια εναι,” “I hear that there are also many other such nations.” XEN. An. ii. 5, 13. (Πολλοια εναι would apparently mean the same.) So Mem. iv. 2. 4.

“κοω ατν ρεν,” “I hear that he will say.” DEM. xix. 202. (Compare SOPH. El. 293, under 904.)

“Πυνθανμενος τν Θουκυδδην κσν τε χειν κα π ατο δνασθαι ν τος πρτοις” THUC. iv. 105. So DEM. xix. 201.

“Ασθανμενος ατος μγα παρ βασιλε Δαρε δνασθαι” THUC. vi. 59.

2. ρ has the participle in both constructions (904; 886), but the infinitive (of indirect discourse) only in THUC. viii. 60 (according to Kühner, § 484. 2): ρων οκτι νευ ναυμαχας ον τε εναι ς τν Χον βοηθσαι, where Krü ger brackets εναι.

3. γγλλω may have the infinitive in indirect discourse, in place of the regular participle (904). E.g. “σςριος ες τν χραν ατο μβαλεν γγλλεται,” “is reported to have invaded his country.” XEN. Cyr. v. 3, 30.

4. μολογ, to admit or grant, is but rarely followed by the participle (904), and generally takes the infinitive of indirect discourse. E.g. “μολογεται πρς πντων κρτιστος δ γενσθαι θεραπειεν τος φλους.” XEN. An. i. 9, 20. (See 136.)

5. Φανομαι, to appear, which generally takes the participle in indirect discourse (904), sometimes has the infinitive. The distinction generally holds that φανεται σοφς ν means he is manifestly wise, while φανεται σοφς εναι means he seems to be wise; but in some cases the two constructions cannot be distinguished in sense. E.g.

“Τ φων σαφς κλαειν φανετο,” “by his voice he seemed plainly to be weeping (but he really was not).” XEN. Symp. i. 15.

Compare “κα■ σφι ε■νοος ■φά■νετο ■■ν,” “and he was plainly well disposed towards them” HDT. vii. 173. But see also AESCH. Ag. 593, “πλαγκτ■ς ο■σ■ ■φαιν■μην” , I appeared to be crazed, said by Clytemnestra of herself, after she was shown to have been right.

“Το■τ■ μοι θει■τατον φα■νεται γεν■σθαι,” “this seems to me to have been a most wonderful event.” HDT. vii. 137.

[*] 915. Other verbs of this class (904) may be used in a peculiar sense, in which they have the infinitive not in indirect discourse. Others, again, allow both constructions of the infinitive; while γγν■σκω and ε■ρ■σκω have the infinitive in three different senses.

1. Μανθ■νω, μ■μνημαι, and ■πιλ■νθανομαι, in the sense of learn, remember, and forget to do anything, take the ordinary object infinitive. E.g.

“πε■ μ■θον ■μμεναι ■σθλ■ς α■ε■ κα■ πρ■τοισι μετ■ Τρ■εσσι μ■χεσθαι,” “since I learned to be brave, etc.” Il. vi. 444.

“Το■ς προδ■τας γ■ρ μισε■ν ■μαθον” AESCH. Prom. 1068. So XEN. An. iii. 2, 25.

“Μεμν■σθω ■ν■ρ ■γαθ■ς ε■ναι,” “let him remember to be a brave man.” Ib. iii. 2. 29 (with ■ν it would mean let him remember that he is a brave man).

“Μεμν■σονται δε■ρο ■ποπ■μπειν” Id. Cyr. viii. 6. 6

“πελαθ■μην το■ς καδ■σκους ■κφ■ρειν,” “I forgot to bring out the urns.” AR. Vesp. 853.

“λ■γου ■πελαθ■μεθ■ ε■πε■ν” PLAT. Rep. 563 B.

2. (a) Ο■δα and ■π■σταμαι, which regularly have the participle in indirect discourse, take the ordinary infinitive in the sense of know how to do anything. E.g.

“Μ■ ψε■δε■, ■πιστ■μενος σ■φα ε■πε■ν,” “do not be false, when you know how to speak truly.” Il. iv. 404.

“Ο■δ■ ■π■ δεξι■, ο■δ■ ■π■ ■ριστερ■ νωμ■σαι β■ν” Il. vii. 238.

“Προβ■λλεσθαι δ■ ■ βλ■πειν ■ναντ■ον ο■τ■ ο■δεν ο■τ■ ■θ■λει” DEM. iv. 40. So EUR. Hipp. 729, EUR. Med. 664.

“Ε■κειν δ■ ο■κ ■π■σταται κακο■ς,” “she knows not how to yield to troubles.” SOPH. Ant. 472 ; so SOPH. Aj. 666; EUR. Hipp. 996.

(b) But these verbs in the sense to know or to believe sometimes take the infinitive (like the participle) in indirect discourse. This is rare in prose, except with ■π■σταμαι, to believe, in Herodotus. E.g.

“σθι τ■ σκλ■ρ■ ■γαν φρον■ματα π■πτειν μ■λιστα,” “know that too stubborn spirits are most apt to fall (like π■πτοντα■.” SOPH. Ant. 473. (Ο■δα with the participle follows in 477.)

“Ε■ ν■ν ■π■στω τ■νδ■ μ■ α■σχ■νην ■χειν” Id. El. 616 ; so O. T. 690, Ant. 1092; AESCH. Pers. 337.

“Ε■ ■σθι το■τον ■σχυρ■ς ■νι■σθαι” XEN. Cyr. viii. 3, 44 ; so viii. 7.12

“πιστευόμενοι τε τελευτῆσαι,” “believing that he (Cyrus) had then perished.” HDT. i. 122 ; so iii. 66, 134, and 140, HDT. vii. 172.

See “σθι μπότ ν τυχεν,” SOPH. Ph. 1329 ; and “τδ σθι, μ γμαι,” EUR. Med. 593 ; cf. I. A.1005.

3. Γινσκω, besides its construction with the participle in indirect discourse (904), has three uses with the infinitive:—

(a) In the meaning to decide or judge, with the infinitive in indirect discourse; as “τ δ σον νταπδοτε, γνντες τοτον ενοι τν καιρν” “making up your minds that this is that time, etc.,” THUC. i. 43 ; so HDT. ix. 71; XEN. An. i. 9, 17.

(b) In the meaning to determine or resolve, with the ordinary object infinitive; as “λυττα αγνωσαν δονοι τν θυγατρα στυγε” “they decided that Alyattes should give his daughter to Astyages,” HDT. i. 74 ; so XEN. Hell. iv. 6, 9 , γνω δικειν, and XEN. Hell. iii. 1. 12; ISOC. xvii. 16.

(c) Occasionally in the meaning to learn (γνω), with the object infinitive, like μανθνω and μμνημαι (1); as “να γν τρφειν τν γλσσαν συχωτραν” “that he may learn to keep his tongue more quiet” SOPH. Ant. 1089.

4. Δεκνυμι and other verbs signifying to show, besides the participle in indirect discourse (904), may take an object infinitive in the sense to show how to do anything. E.g.

“πδειξαν ο γεμνες λαμβνειν τ πιδεια,” “the guides instructed them to take provisions.” XEN. An. ii. 3, 14.

“Διαιτητρια τος νθρποις πεδεκνυον το μν θρους χειν ψυχειν, το δ χειμνος λεειν,” “I taught the men to keep their dwellings cool in summer and warm in winter.” Id. Oec. ix. 4.

5. Δηλ sometimes has the infinitive (like the regular participle, 904) in indirect discourse; and sometimes in the sense of command (make known) it has the ordinary object infinitive. E.g.

“Δηλος γρ ατν σωρν κειν χρημτων χοντα,” “for you indicate that he has come with a heap of money.” AR. Pl. 269.

“Δηλοντες προσεσθαι τ κεκηρυγμνα,” “showing that they accepted the terms which were announced.” THUC. iv. 38.

“Κηργματι δλου τος λευθερας δεομνους ς πρς σμμαχον ατν παρεναι,” “he proclaimed that those who wanted freedom should come to him as to an ally.” Xen. Ag. i. 33.

6. (a) Ερσκω, which has two constructions with the participle (883; 904), occasionally has the infinitive in indirect discourse. E.g. “Ερισκε πργμ ο ενοι λαννειν πτ τς Σρδεις” “he found that he must πργμ μοι στι, mihi opus est march to Sardes.” HDT. i. 79 : so i. 125, HDT. vii. 12. See PLAT. Leg. 699 B.

(b) The middle may take the ordinary object infinitive in the sense of discover how to do anything. E.g. “Οδε ς λπας ερετο παειν,” “no one ever found out how to stop pains.” EUR. Med. 195.

(c) The middle may also have the infinitive in the sense of procure by asking. E.g.

“Παρ■ δ■ σφ■σι ε■ροντο παρ■ Πausαν■εω ■στ■ναι Ποτιδαιητ■ων το■ς παρ■οντας” “they gained (the favour) from Pausanias that those who were present from Potidaea should stand next to themselves.” HDT. ix. 28.

■ς with the Participle in Indirect Discourse.

[*] 916. The participle in indirect discourse may be preceded by ■ς, which implies that the thought of the participle is expressed as that of the leading subject, or as that of some person prominent in the sentence. (See 864.) When this is already implied in the context, as it often is, ■ς adds only emphasis to the expression. Thus ■σθι τα■τα ο■τω■ς ■χοντα means know that this is so; but ■σθι ■ς τα■τα ■χοντα means know that (as you may assume) this is so, i.e. be assured that this is so. E.g.

“■ς μηδ■ν ε■δ■τ■ ■σθι μ■ ■ν ■νιστορε■ς” “understand (that you must look upon) me as knowing nothing of what you seek.” SOPH. Ph. 253.

“■ς μηκ■τ■ ■ντα κε■νον ■ν φ■ει ν■ει,” “think of him as no longer living.” Ib. 415.

“■ς τα■τ■ ■π■στω δρ■μεν■, ο■ μ■λλοντ■ ■τι” “understand that (as you may assume) these things are going on, etc.” Ib. 567.

“Τα■τα γ■ τ■δ■ ■ς τελ■ν ■φα■νετο” Id. O.C. 630.

“Κα■ το■το ■πιστ■σθω Κρο■σος, ■ς ■στερον ■λο■ς τ■ς πεπρωμ■νης” “and let Croesus understand this, that he was captured later than it was fated for him to be.” HDT. i. 91.

“■ς μ■ ■μπολ■σων ■σθι τ■ν ■μ■ν φρ■να,” “be assured that you will not buy me off from my determination.” SOPH. Ant. 1063.

“Δηλο■ς δ■ ■ς τι σημαν■ν ν■ον,” “you show that you have something new in your mind to disclose.” Ib. 242.

“Δ■λλ■ς ■στιν ■ς τι δρασε■ων κακ■ν,” “it is very plain that he wishes to do some harm.” Id. Aj. 326.

“Δ■λος ■ν Κ■ρος ■ς σπε■δων,” “Cyrus showed that he was in haste.” XEN. An. i. 5, 9.

“Δ■λοι ■σεσθε ■ς ■ργιζ■μενοι το■ς πεπραγμ■νοις,” “you will show that you are angry.” LYS. xii. 90.

“Πατ■ρα τ■ν σ■ν ■γγελ■ν ■ς ο■κ ■τ■ ■ντα” “(he comes) to announce that your father is no more.” SOPH. O.T. 956. (In vs. 959, the messenger himself says ε■ ■σθ■ ■κε■νον θαν■σιμον βεβ■κοτα.) The force of ■ς here can seldom be well expressed in English.

[*] 917. In place of the participle with ■ς in indirect discourse, we may have a circumstantial participle with ■ς in the genitive or accusative absolute, followed by a verb to which the participle would naturally be the object. E.g.

“■ς ■δ■ ■χ■ντων τ■νδ■ ■π■στασθα■ σε χρ■” “you must understand that this is so; lit. believing this to be so, you must understand (it is so).” SOPH. Aj. 281 ; see Schneidewin’s note.

By an entirely different construction this comes practically to the same meaning as ἴσχυοντα τῷ δὲ πῶστασθα σε χρῆ.

“ἴσχυ τοῦνυν ἴντων τῷ δὲ σοι μαθεῖν πῶρα” “in the belief that this is so, you may learn it, i.e. you may learn that this is so.” AESCH. Prom. 760.

“ἴσχυ πολῷμου ἴντος παρῷ μῖν παγγελά;” “shall I announce from you that there is war? lit. shall I make a report from you on the assumption that there is war?” XEN. An. ii. 1, 21.

“ἴσχυ πῶνυ μοι δοκοῖν, οἴτως ἴσθι” “know that I think so very decidedly; lit. in the belief that this seems so to me, understand accordingly.” Id. Mem. iv. 2. 30

“ἴσχυ ἴμο ἴγωνιουμῖνου, οἴτως γῶγωσκε,” “know that I shall contend.” Id. Cyr. ii. 3. 15

[*] 918. ἴσχυ with the participle in the genitive or accusative absolute, used as in 917, may depend on verbs or expressions which do not take the participle without ἴσχυ in indirect discourse. E.g.

“ἴσχυ οἴκτῶ ἴντων τῶν τῶκνων φῶντιζε δὲ” “think of it, that your children are no longer living, lit. knowing that your children are no longer living, think of it.” EUR. Med. 1311.

“ἴσχυ κατῶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν κατῶ τῶν ἴγεμῖνων μῖν μῖ μεμπτῶν γεγενημῖνων, οἴτω τῶν γῶμην ἴχετε” “be of this mind, that both your soldiers and their leaders have been free from blame.” THUC. vii. 15.

“ἴσχυ ἴμο οἴν ἴντος ἴπῶ ἴν κατῶ ἴμεῖς, οἴτω τῶν γῶμην ἴχετε” “be of this opinion, that I shall go wherever you do.” XEN. An. i. 3, 6.

“ἴσχυ τοῦνυν μῖ ἴκουσομῖνων, οἴτως διανοεῖσθε” “make up your minds then that we shall not hear; lit. knowing then that we shall not hear, so make up your minds.” PLAT. Rep. 327 C .

“ἴν τοῖτοις μῖν ἴς διδακτοῖ οἴσης τῶς ἴρετῶς λῶγει,” “here he speaks of virtue as a thing that can be taught.” Id. Men. 95 E.

“ἴποθῶμενοι ἴς τοῖτου οἴτως ἴχοντος, πῶωμεν” “having premised that this is so, let us proceed.” Rep. 437 A.

“Διανοηθῶντες ἴς ἴντων ἴπῶντων ἴε κατῶ ἴεντων,” “thinking of all things as moving and in flux.” Crat. 439 C.

“Οἴτω σκοπῶμεν, ἴς τῶχῶ ἴν, εἴ τῶχοι, κατῶ τοῖτων κῶκεῖνων συμβῶντων” “let us look at the case, feeling that both this and that might perhaps happen if it should so chance; lit. with the idea that both this and that might perhaps happen if it should so chance, let us look at it in this light.” DEM. xxiii. 58.

“ἴς δῶον ἀτῶν τεθῶναι” Id. xxi. 70.

[*] 919. Verbs of saying and thinking which do not take the participle in indirect discourse sometimes have the participle (in the accusative or nominative) with ἴσχυ, which in some cases approaches very near indirect discourse, and in others is more like a circumstantial participle. E.g.

“Φροντῶζεθῶ ἴς τοῖτοις τε κατῶ σοφωτῶροις ἴλλοισι τοῖτων πλεῶσιν μαχοῶμενοι” “consider that you will have to fight with these, etc.” SOPH. El. 1370 (cf. EUR. Med. 1311, quoted in 918).

“Λήγουσιν ἡμῶς ὡς λωλῆτας,” “they speak of us as lost.” AESCH. Ag. 672.

“ὅς οἱ κῆπεξῶν οὐδὲ πιστεῶν λήγεις;” “do you speak with a resolution not to yield or to believe?” SOPH. O.T. 625.

“Καμβήσης ἰωνας μὲν καὶ Αἰολῆας ἴσδοιλους πατρῶους ἕντας ἐνμίξει,” “he thought of Ionians and Aeolians as his father’s slaves.” HDT. ii. 1.

“ὅς στρατηγῶσόντα ἡμῶς μηδεὶς λέγῃτω,” “let no one speak of me as the one who is to be general.” XEN. An. i. 3, 15.

“ὁδὲ κει πολλὰ ἤδη ἠληθεῖσαι τοιαῦτα, τῶντα τε ἴσντα καὶ τῶ μὲν ἴσντα ὅς οἱ κῆντα” “he was thought to have already reported truly many such occurrences, (reporting) what was real as real, and what was unreal as unreal.” Ib. iv. 4. 15

“ἴταν ἴς πετῶμενοι ἐν τῶ πνῶ διανοῦνται,” “when in their sleep they fancy themselves flying.” PLAT. Theaet. 158 B 1 See Spiker in Jour. Phil. vi. pp. 310-343, on The Genitive Absolute in the Attic Orators.

2 See Lange, Partikel Ei, pp. 235-243. I cannot follow Lange (p. 241), in making the Attic ἴς with the participle the natural successor of the Homeric ἴς εἶ with the participle.

3 (sc. ἴν).

7. Verbal Adjectives in -τῶς and -τῶν

Chapter VII Verbal Adjectives in -τῶς and -τῶν

[*] 920. The verbal in -τῶς is used in both a personal and an impersonal construction.

[*] 921. In the personal construction, the verbal is always passive in sense. It expresses necessity (like the Latin participle in -dus and agrees with its subject in case. This construction is, of course, restricted to transitive verbs. E.g.

“φελητῶσσι πῶλις στῶ,” “the city must be benefited by you.” XEN. Mem. iii. 6, 3

“λλας νῶς κτῶν ξυμμῶνων μεταπεμπῶσεναι φῶ,” “he said that others must be sent for.” THUC. vi. 25

“Ο γῶρ πρῶ τῶς ληθεῶσ τιμητῶς νῶρ” “a man must not be honoured before the truth” PLAT. Rep. 595C.

“μῶσ φησῶν πῶσασεναι κῶ τιμητῶς χῶ σου” lb. 561C.

“Φρῶζοντες ῶσ σφι περὶ πῶη στῶ ῶ λλῶς πολλυμῶνη.” HDT. vii.168.

[*] 922. The substantive denoting the agent is here in the dative. εῶμ is often omitted.

[*] 923. In the impersonal construction (which is the more common), the verbal is in the neuter of the nominative singular (sometimes plural), with στῶ expressed or understood. The expression is equivalent to δεῶ, (one) must, with the infinitive active or middle of the verb to which the verbal belongs. This construction is practically active in sense, and allows transitive verbals to have an object in the same case which would follow their verbs. The agent is generally expressed by the dative, sometimes by the accusative. E.g.

Τῶτα μῶν ῶρ μῶς ποιητῶν στῶ, we must do this, equivalent to τῶτα μῶς δεῶ ποιῶσαι.

“Ο στῶντῶ δε” “we must bear these things” EUR. Or. 769

“Πειστῶντῶ δε ῶξ. σοῶ,” “you must obey in this (=dei= pei/qesqai).” SOPH. Ph. 994

“παλλακτῶνα τῶ τῶ σῶματος, καῶ αῶτῶ τῶ ψυχῶ θεατῶνα τῶ τῶ πρῶγματα ῶ δεῶ παλλῶττεσθαια τῶ, καῶ τῶ ψυχῶ θεῶσθαι τῶ πρῶγματα,” “we must free ourselves from it (the body), and with the soul itself we must contemplate things themselves.” PLAT. Phaed. 66 E.

“Φημῶ δῶ διχῶ βοηθητῶνε ναι τοῶς πρῶγμασι νῶ μῶν,” “I say that you must give assistance in two ways.” DEM. i.17.

“Τῶ νῶτῶ ποιητῶνε ῶη;” “what would he be obliged to do?” XEN. Mem. 1.7,2

“ἠψηφίσαντο πολεμητέοναί τε δεῖν πολεμεῖν,” “they voted that they must go to war” THUC. i. 88.

“Τὸν χόρον, ἕξ ἄτοκος ῥωμῶνις πολεμητέονα.” Id. vi. 50.

“Ὁ τεμισθοφορητὸν ἄλλους τοῖς στρατευομένοις, οἱ τε μεθεκτόν τινπραγμάτων πλεοσιν πεντακισχιλίοις.” Id. viii. 65 (Here both the accusative and the dative of the agent are found: see 926.)

“μὲν δὲ ξίμαχοι γαθοί, οἷο παραδοτέοις Ἀθηναίοις στέν, οἷο δὲ δίκαια καὶ λῆγοις διακριτάμ λῆγ καὶ μὲς ἄτοκος βλαπτομένων, ἄλλ τιμωρητέονα ντῆχεικα παντὶ σθνεῖ οἷο δεῖ μὲς παραδοῖναλ, κ. τ. λ.” Id. i. 86

“Ἴτεον νεῖο ἠθεασομένοις σξ. μὲς,” “it would be best for us to go and see her.” XEN. Mem. iii. 11,1

“Ἄδεν τρπ φάμν κένταξ δίκη τεονεῖναί.” PLAT. Crit. 49 A.

“τὸρο ἵυναικνοδποτὸ σθ ττητῆα μν οἷο ἵυναικνδε ττῆσθαι,” “but we must never be beaten by women.” AR. Lys. 450 So SOPH. Ant. 678 It will be seen that this construction admits verbals of both transitive and intransitive verbs.

[*] 924. The Latin participle in -dus is used in the same personal construction as the Greek verbal in -τός; as *epistula scribenda est*, πιστλήγραπτέονα στέν, a letter must be written. The impersonal construction is found in Latin, but generally only with verbs which do not take an object accusative, as *Eundum est tibi* (τέον στέσοι), — *Moriendum est omnibus*. — *Bello utendum est nobis* (τὸ πολμ χρηστὸν στέν μν), we must employ war See Madvig's Latin Grammar, § 421.

Occasionally the earlier Latin uses even the object accusative, like the Greek, as “*Aeternas quoniam poenas in morte timendum est*,” LUCR. i.112

[*] 925. A sentence sometimes begins with an impersonal verbal in -τέον and is continued with an infinitive, the latter depending on δεῖ implied in the verbal. E.g.

“Πανταχο ποιητέον νκελεῖ πλιςκα πατρς, πεθεινάτεν.” PLAT. Crit. 51 B.

[*] 926. The dative and the accusative of the agent are both allowed with the verbal in -τέον (or -τέα), although the equivalent δεῖ with the infinitive has only the accusative. Thus we can say *τοῦτο μν ποιητέον* or *τοῦτο μς ποιητέον*, but only *τοῦτο μς δεῖ ποιεῖν*.

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
 - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net