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## PREFACE

## TO THE FIFTH EDITION.

Since the publication of the second edition of this work in 1865, several changes of expression and many corrections have been made, which it is impossible to enumerate in full. In preparing the fourth edition in 1870, and the fifth edition in 1873 , the work has been carefully revised; several sections and notes have been rewritten, and some notes have been added. The only changes which can affect references made to the earlier editions (besides those mentioned on page v.) will be found in § 10,1 , Remark ; § 11, Note 7 ; § 18, 1, Note; $\S 19$, Note $6 ; \S 66,2$, Note $3 ; \S 78$, Note ; and § 114,2 , Note: these have been added since the second edition was printed. Changes of expression and additions will be found in the Remark before $\S 12 ; \S 18,1 ; \S 23,2$, Note $3 ; \S 37$, $1 ; \S 45$, Note $7(a) ; \S 69,1 ; \S 70,1 ; \S 86$, Note 1 (b); § 88, Remark; and § 89, 2, Note 1 and Remark 1 ; not to mention others of less importance. The most important change made in the fifth edition will be found in the statement of the classification of conditional sentences (\$ 48). This has been adopted to make clearer the position of the present and past "general suppositions" which have the subjunctive and optative in Greek ( $\$ 51$ ), as opposed to the present and past "particular suppositions" which have the simple indicative ( $\S 49,1$ ). This distinction of these two classes in protasis is a striking peculiarity of Greek syntax ; most languages having a single form of expression for both particular and general conditions here, as the Greek has in other kinds of conditions. I cannot state too distinctly, that the chief peculiarity of my classi-
fication of conditional sentences consists in treating present and past general conditions as closely allied to ordinary present and past conditions (being actually united with them in one class in most languages, and occasionally even in Greek), and as only remotely connected, at least in sense, with the externally similar forms of future conditions which have the subjunctive and optative. This relation is especially obvious when we see that $\notin a ̀ \nu$ moong as a general supposition is occasionally represented by $\epsilon i \boldsymbol{i} \pi o \iota \epsilon \overline{\text {, }}$, whereas $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \mathfrak{a} \nu \pi o \iota \hat{\eta}$ in a future condition is equivalent to $\epsilon i \pi o \circ \eta \sigma \epsilon$ in the indicative. I have explained this at greater length in the Philologus, Vol. XXVIII. pp. 741-745 (Göttingen, 1869), and in a paper read before the American Philological Association in July, 1873. The change in $\S 48$ has made necessary slight changes of expression in $\S 12 ; \S 13,1 ; \S 20 ; \S 21,1 ; \S 49,1 ; \S 51$; $\S 60 ; \S 61,1$; and $\S 62$. An index to the examples which have been added in the later editions is given on page 242.

Harvard College, September, 1873.

The last-mentioned paper, in which the change in the classification of conditional sentences made in the edition of 1873 is explained and the whole system is defended, may be found in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1873, and in the Journal of Philology, Vol. V., No. 10.

September, 1875.

## PREFACE

## TOTHESECOND EDITION.

In the first edition of the present work, published in 1860 , I dttempted to give a plain and practical statement of the principles which govern the relations of the Greek Moods and Tenses. Although many of these principles were established beyond dispute, there were others (and these often the most elementary) upon which scholars had long held the most opposite opinions. Upon many of these latter points I presented new views, which seemed to me to explain the phenomena of the language more satisfactorily than any that had been advanced. The favorable opinion of scholars has confirmed my belief, that some such attempt as I have made was demanded by the rising standard of classical scholarship in this country, and has given me reason to hope that my labor has not been entirely a thankless one.

The progress in grammatical science in this century has been made step by step, like that in every other science; and so it must long continue to be. He who imagines that every important principle of Greek and Latin syntax is as well understood and as clearly defined as the rules for addition and multiplication in Arithmetic, has not yet begun to learn. It is no disparagement of even the highest scholars, therefore, to say that they have left much of the most important work to be lone by their successors.

The vague notions so often expressed on the Greek Moods, even by scholars of otherwise high attainments, are in strange contrast with the accuracy demanded by scientific scholarship in other departments. If the study of language is to retain its present place (or indeed any prominent place) in the mental
discipline of youth, it must be conducted on strictly scientific principles, and above all with scientific accuracy. On no other ground can we defend the course of elementary grammatical training, which is the basis of all sound classical scholarship. An elementary grammar should be as short as the best scholar can make it, but it should be as accurate as a chapter in Geometry. To those who cannot appreciate the importance of accuracy in scholarship, or even distinguish it from pedantry, to those who cannot see the superiority of the Greek in this respect over Chinese or Choctaw, it is useless to speak; but surely no scholar can fail to see that an accurate knowledge of the uses of the Greek Verb, with its variety of forms, each expressing its peculiar shade of meaning, must be indispensable to one who would understand the marvellous power of the Greek language to express the nicest distinctions of thought.

One great cause of the obscurity which has prevailed on this subject is the tendency of so many scholars to treat Greek syntax metaphysically rather than by the light of common sense. Since Hermann's application of Kant's Categories of Modality to the Greek Moods, this metaphysical tendency has been conspicuous in German grammatical treatises, and has affected many of the grammars used in England and America more than is generally supposed. The result of this is seen not merely in the discovery of hidden meanings which no Greek writer ever dreamed of, but more especially in the invention of nice distinctions between similar or even precisely equivalent expressions. A new era was introduced by Madvig, who has earned the lasting gratitude of scholars by his efforts to restore Greek syntax to the dominion of common sense. Madvig is fully justified in boasting that he was the first to give full and correct statements on such elementary matters as the meaning of the Aorist Optative and Infinitive, and the construction of ört and $\omega$ in oratio obliqua; although Professor Sophocles distinctly recognized the same principles in his Grammar, published later in the same year with Madvig's (1847). I can hardly express my great indehtedness to Madvig's Syntax der griechischen Sprache, and to his Bemerkungen über einige Puncte der griechischen Wortfügungslehre (in a supplement to the Philoloaus, Vol. II.). 'The works of this eminent scholar have aided
me not only by the material whieh they have afforded as a basis for the present work, but also by the valuable suggestions with whieh they abound.

Next to Madvig, I must aeknowledge my obligations to Krüger's Griechische Sprachlehre, which has everywhere sup. plied me with important details and most excellent examples. I have been frequently indebted to the other grammarians, who need not be specially mentioned. Bäunlein's Untersuchungen über die griechischen Modi reacherl me after the printing of the first edition was begun. I have often been indebted to his valuable collection of examples, and have derived many hints from his speeial critieisms; I regret that I cannot agree with the general pris ciples to whieh he refers the uses of each mood, especially as his critieisms of the prevailing German theories on this subjeet are most satisfactory and instructive. I am indebted to the personal advice and suggestions of my learned colleague, Professor Sophocles, in the preparation of both editions, for information which no books could have supplied.

I must aeknowledge the following special obligations. The notes on the tenses of the Indicative in Chapter II. are based mainly ou Krüger, §53. The chapters on the Infinitive and Participle are derived chiefly from Madvig's Syntax (Chapters V. and VI.), and partly from Krüger, $\$ 55, \$ 56$. The note on the Future Optative after $\boldsymbol{o} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{s}$, $\mathbb{\&} \mathrm{e}$. ( $\$ 26$, Note 1) contains the substance of Madvig's Bemerkungen, pp. 27-29; and the account of the various constructions that follow verbs of hindrance and prevention (§ 95, 2 and 3) is based on the same work, pp. 47-66. The statement of the principles of indireet diseourse (Chapter IV. Section IV.) was written in nearly its present form before Madvig's Syntax reached me; and I was strongly confirmed in the views there expressed, by finding that they agreed almost exactly with those of Madvig. I was anticipated by him in my statement of the occasional use of the Present Optative to represent the Imperfect, and in my quotation of Des. in Onet. I. 869, 12 to illustrate it. I am entirely indebted to him, however, for the statement of the important principle explained in § 74, 2.

It remains to state what new material the present work professes to offer to scholars. The most important and most
radical innovation upon the ordinary system will be found in the classification of conditional sentences (§48), with its development in the rules that follow. I have explained the grounds of this classification at some length in the Proceedings of the American Academy, Vol. VI. p. 363, and will therefore merely allude to them here. The great difficulty (or rather the impossibility) of defining the force of the Subjunctive in protasis as distinguished from the Present Indicative, has arisen from neglect of the distinction between particular and general suppositions. When this is recognized, the distinction between the Subjunctive and the Present Indicative is seen to be entirely one of time; whercas all the common distinctions based on possibility, certainty, \&c. will apply only to select examples, which of course are easily found to illustrate them. In the first edition, I could not persuade myself to abandon the old doctrines so completely as to exclude the common distinction between the Subjunctive and the Optative in protasis, - that the former implies a "prospect of decision," while the latter does not. Subsequent experience has convinced me that there
 than between the English if he shall do this and if he should do this; and I think every one must see that here there is no distinction but that of greater or less vividness of expression. The simple fact that both could be expressed by the Latin si hoc faciat is a strong support of this view.

The principles of conditional sentences being first settled, I have attempted to carry out the analogy between these and conditional relative sentences more completely. It seems to me that it is only by adopting the classification of conditional sentences which I have given, that the true nature of the analogous relative sentences can be made clear. (See § 60, § 61, § 62.) Upon a right classification of conditional sentences depends also the right understanding of the forms used to express a wish (§ $82, \$ 83$ ).

The frequent u-e of the Subjunctive with iva, ö $\pi \omega s, \& c$., after past tenses, instead of the Optative, of which I had never seen a satisfactory explanation, is here explained on the principle of oratio obliqua. (Sce § 44, 2; § 77, 2.) The ronstruction of the Infinitive with verls like $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \nu$ and $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota$, forming
an apodosis, is explained in the present edition on a new principle, which (it is hoped) will remove many of the difficulties which the old explanation did not reach. (See § 49, 2, Note 3 and Remarks.) In the first edition, the usual distinction between the constructions that follow ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$ was adopted with hesitation, including Elmsley's punctuation, by which the second person of the Future in prohibitions with ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$ is marle interrogative. In this edition both constructions are explained more satisfactorily upon the same principle. (See § 89,1 and 2 . with Notes and Remarks.) It is hoped that the new statement of the force of the Perfect Infinitive; in § 18, 3, (a) and (b) of this edition, will meet the difficulties which that tense presents. The statement in the former edition was very defective.

It may seem strange to some that no general definitions of the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative are attempted in the first chapter. I have rather taken warning from the numerous unsuccessful attempts that liave been made to include all the uses of these moods in comprehensive definitions, and have preferred merely to illustrate their various uses by simple ex amples at the outset, leaving the explanations to their proper place in the book. For one, I am not ashamed to admit that 1 cannot propose a definition comprehensive enough to include all the examples in $\S 1, \S 2$, or $\S 3$, which shall still be limited enough to be called a definition.

Besides the special changes already mentioned, the work has been subjected to a thorough revision, so that in many parts the new edition might claim to be an entirely new work.*

[^0]Especially, the collection of examples has been revised and greatly enlarged, with the object of illustrating every variety of each construction from as wide a range of classic authors as possible. An judex to these examples (more than 2,300 in number) is added to this edition. This index includes those which are merely cited, as well as those actually quoted, many of the former being quite as important as the latter. In the new edition, the matter printed in the two larger types has been reduced, and made as concise as was consistent with accuracy, while that printed in the smallest type has been greatly increased. It should be understood that only the firstmentioned portion of the work is intended for use as a grammatical text-book, while the notes and remarks in the smallest type are intended only for reference: with this view, the latter are often extended to a greater length than would otherwise be justifiable.

The Dramatists are cited by Dindorf's lines, except the fragments, which follow the numbers in Nauck's edition; Plato, by the pages of Stephanus; and Demosthenes, by Reiske's pages and lines. In the Index to the Examples, nowever, the sections of Bekker's German editions of Demosthenes have been added in each case, to facilitate reference. Other citations will be easily understood.

[^1]
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## CHAPTER I.

## GENERAL VIEW OF THE MOODS.

8 4. The Greek verb has five Moods, the Indicative, Subjunctive, Optative, Imperative, and Infiuitive. The first four, as opposed to the Infinitive, are called finite moods.
§ $\boldsymbol{2}$. The Indicative is used in simple, absolute assertions; as $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \epsilon \iota$, he writes; ${ }^{\text {є́ }} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rho a \psi \epsilon \nu$, he wrote; $\gamma \rho a ́ \psi \epsilon \iota$, he will write; $\gamma \epsilon \prime \gamma \rho a \phi \epsilon \nu$, he has written.

The Indicative is used also to express various other relations, which the following examples will illus-trate:-
 $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \circ \nu$ äv, if he had written, I should have come. Ei roũто $\pi$ о $\iota \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \iota$,




 $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \xi \in \iota$, he said that he would do this. 'E $\rho \omega \tau \hat{a}$ rí $\hat{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \psi a \mu \epsilon \nu$, he asks what we wrote.
These constructions will be explained in Chapter IV. They are sufficient to show the impossibility of including all the uses of the Indicative in one definition. Any definition which is to include these must be comprehensive enough to incluile even the Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive in Latin; for $\epsilon i$ é $\gamma \rho a \psi \epsilon \nu, j \hat{j} \lambda \not a o \nu a y$ is equivalent to si scripsisset, venissem. It would be equally impossible to give a single definition sufficiently precise to be of any use in practice, including all the uses of the Subjunctive or Optative.
§3. The various uses of the Subjunctive - in clauses denoting a purpose or object, after ${ }^{\imath} \nu a, \mu \eta^{\prime}, \& c$.; in conditional, relative, and temporai sentences; and
in certain independent sentences－may be seen by the following examples：－

队ov́ $\eta \tau a \iota$ ，ठvvŋ́бєтat，if he shall wish to do this，he will be able．


 тоtєí，whatever he wishes（at any time）to do he（always）does．＂Otav

 do anything，he（always）does it．${ }^{*} \mathrm{I} \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，let us go．M $\grave{\eta} \theta a v \mu a ́ \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon$ ， do not wonder． $\mathrm{O} \dot{v} \mu \grave{\eta} \tau о \hat{\tau} \tau o \gamma^{\prime} \nu \eta \tau a \iota$ ，this will（surely）not happen． Тi $\epsilon i \pi \omega$ ；what shall I say？
§ 4．The various uses of the Optative－in clauses denoting a purpose or object after＂$\nu \nu a, \mu \prime \prime, \& e$. ；in con－ ditional，relative，and temporal sentences；in indirect quotations and questions；and in independent sentences （in apodosis with $\stackrel{y}{a} \nu$ ，or in expressions of a wish）－ may be seen by the following examples：－
 тоиิтo $\gamma$＇́voıтo，he feared lest this might happen．Ei toùto понєì


 （ever）wished to do anything，he（always）did it．＂O $\tau \iota$ toutiv
 did．＂Ote toùto moוєì $\beta$ ои́入oıto，סúvaıт＇äv，whenever he should
 whenever he wished to do anything，he（always）did it．Eîmev örı тoûro


 asked what he was lloing（had done，or would do）．
 $\pi a ́ \sigma \chi o \iota \in \nu, O$ that they may not suffer these things！＇A $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ó入oıтo， may he perish！Mウ̀ тойтo $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu o u \tau o$ ，may this not happen！

Note．For a discussion of the relation of the Optative to the Subjunctive，see Appendix．
§ 5．The Imperative is used to express a command， exhortation，entreaty，or prohibition．
§ 6．The Infinitive expresses the simple idea of the
verb without restriction of person or number, and may be considered as a verbal noun with many attributes of a verb.
§ 7. To the Moods may be added the Participle, and the Verbal in - $\tau$ '́os or - $\tau \epsilon \in \boldsymbol{\prime}$. Both are verbal adjectives.

## CHAPTER II.

## USE OF THE TENSES.

§ 8. 1. There are seven Tenses, - the Present, Imperfect, Perfect, Pluperfect, Aorist, Future, and Future Perfect. The Imperfect and Pluperfect occur only in the Indicative ; the Futures are wanting in the Subjunctive and Imperative.
2. These tenses are divided into primary and secondary; the primary tenses being those which refer to present or future time, and the secondary being those which refer to past time.

The primary tenses of the Indicative are the Present, Perfect, Future, and Future Perfect. The secondary tenses are the Imperfect, Pluperfect, and Aorist.
Note. This distinction will be more fully explained at the end of this chapter, $\S \S 31-35$.
§ 9. In speaking of the time denoted by any verb, we must distinguish between time which is present, past, or future with reference to the time of the speaker or writer (that is, time absolutely present, \&c.), and time which is present, past, or future with reference to the time of some other verb with which the verb in question 13 connected (that is, time relatively pres-
 ioriv denotes time present with reference to the time of speak-

 "this is true"), we use the Present tense; but this tense here denotes time present with reference to the time of the leading verb, ${ }_{\epsilon} \lambda_{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon$, or time absolutely past and only relatively present. The same distinction is seen between the Future in touto
 $\gamma \in \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \epsilon \tau a \iota$ ( $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma o \iota \tau o$ ), he said thai this would happen; where the Future in the first case denotes time absolutely future, in the other cases time only relatively future, which may even be


 denotes time past with reference to the time of $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \xi \in \nu$, which makes it doubly past.

It is to be noticed as a special distinction between the Greek and English idioms, that the Greek oftener uses its tenses to denote merely relative time. Thus, in the examples given above, we translate the Greek Presents civai and $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i$ after ${ }_{\epsilon}^{*} \lambda \epsilon \xi \epsilon$ by our Imperfect was; the Futures $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ and $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta^{\prime}-$ $\sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ by would happen ; and the Aorists $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \in є \tau о$ by had happened. This principle is especially observed in the Indicative, Optative, and Infinitive in indirect quotations; in final and object clauses after $i z a, ~ o ̈ \pi \omega s, \& c$.; and usually in the Participle.

## Present and Imperfect.

## A. In the Indicative.

§ 10. 1. The Present Indicative represents an action as going on now ; as $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \omega, I$ write, or $I$ am writing.

Remark. A single important exception occurs when the Present Indicative in indirect diseourse denotes time present relatively to the leading verb. See above, § 9 ; and § 70, 2.

Note 1. As the limits of such an action on either side of the present moment are not defined, the Present may express a customary or repeated action, or a general truth. E. g.

П入oîo єis $\Delta \dot{\eta} \lambda o \nu$＇ $\mathrm{A} \theta \eta \nu \mathrm{aio} \mathrm{\iota} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi$ o v $\sigma \iota \nu$ ，the Athenians send a ship to Delos（every year）．Рlat．Phaed． 58 A．Tiктєı тоt кópos $\boldsymbol{v} \beta \rho \iota \nu$ ，




Note 2．The Present denotes merely the continuance of an action，without reference to its completion：sometimes，how－ ever，it is directly implied by the context that the action is not to be completed，so that the Present denotes an attempted ac－ tion．Especially，$\delta i \delta \omega \mu$ ，in the sense I offer，and rei $\theta \omega$ ，I try to persuade，are used in this sense．E．g．

Nū̀ $\delta^{\prime}$ äpa $\tau^{\prime}$ aùrika mod入à $\delta \iota \delta$ ồ，he offers many things．II．IX，
 $\sigma \theta a u$ ，they are trying to persuade you to vote contrary both to the laws and to justice．Isae．de Cleon．Hered．§ 26.

This signification is much more common in the Imperfect．See § 11，N．2，and the examples．

Note 3．The Present is often used with expressions denot－ ing past time，especially $\pi a ́ \lambda a t$ ，in the sense of a Perfect and Present combined．E．g．

 civar；i．e．have I not long ago told you，（and do I not still repeat，） that I call it the same thing？Plat．Gorg． 489 C．So Ho入̀̀v хfóvov тои̃то $\pi \circ$ っ七

So in Latin，Jam dudum loquor．
Note 4．The Presents $\ddot{\eta} \kappa \omega, I$ am come，and oizo $\alpha a \iota, I$ am gone，are used in the sense of the Perfect．An approach to the signification of the Perfect is sometimes found in such Presents as $\phi \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega$ ，in the sense $I$ am banished，á入iбкодaı，I am

 ixávo in Homer，with ö̀ $\lambda \lambda \nu \mu a \iota$ and similar verbs and sometimes rikto in the Tragedians．E．g．

 223．＇I $\lambda$ iov dìєбконє́vov，Ilium having been captured．Thuc．VI， 2.



 woman is thy mother．EUR．Ion． 1560.

Note 5. The Greek, like other languages, often allows the use of the Present of such verbs as I hear, I learn, I say, ezen when their action is strictly finished before the moment at which they are used. E. g.




Note 6. The Present $\epsilon i \mu \ell$, I am going, through all its moods, is used like a Future. Its compounds are sometimes used in the same sense. (The Poets, especially Homer, sometimes use $\epsilon i \mu \iota$ as a Present.) E. g.


 каі кєіขа $\psi \nu \lambda \dot{a} \xi \omega \nu$. Od. XVII, 593.
 as a star moves, \&c. Il. XXII, 317.

Note 7. In animated language the Present often refers to the future, to express likelihood, intention, or danger. E. g.


 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \delta \circ \kappa \bar{\omega} \mu \in \nu$; art thou he that should come, or do we look for another? Matti. Evang. XI, 3. 'A $\pi$ ó $\lambda \lambda v \mu a \iota, I$ shall perish. (See § 17, N. 6.)
2. The Present is often used in narration for the Aorist, to give a more lively statement of a past event. This is called the Historic Present. E. g.
 plan to prevent the Athenians from collecting. НDT. I, 63. $K \in \lambda \in \mathcal{v} \in!$

 $\pi a i ̂ \epsilon s$ रi $\gamma \nu 0 \nu \tau a \iota$ dúo. Xen. An. I, 1, 1.

Note. The Historic Present is not found in Homer.
§11. The Imperfect represents an action as going on in past time ; as ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \gamma \rho a \phi o \nu, I$ was writing.

Note 1. The Imperfect is thus a Present transferred to the past, and it retains all the peculiarities of the Present
which are not inconsistent with the change to past time. Thus the Imperfect denotes customary or repeated action, as opposed to the Aorist, which denotes the simple occurrence of an action. (See § 19, N. 2.) E. g.


 $\xi \nu \nu \omega \in \kappa \iota \sigma \epsilon$ тávas. Thuc. II, 15. (Here the Imperfects refer to the state of the country or the customs, the Aorists to single actions; ${ }^{2} \beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \cup \sigma \epsilon$, became king, $\xi v \nu \notin \kappa \iota \sigma \epsilon$, collected into one state.)

Notr 2. The Imperfect, like the Present (§ 10, N. 2), sometimes denotes attempted action, being in this case strictly


 Tウ̀ $\nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$, each one tried to persuade him to undertake the command.
 and was about to overpower the son of Peleus. Il. XXI, 327. ' ${ }^{\prime}$ e $\mu$ c-




 happen. Tiluc. VI, 74. So $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau i \theta \epsilon \iota$, she wanted to add. Arist. Nub. 63.

Note 3. When the Present has the force of the Perfect (§ $10,1, \mathrm{~N} .4$ ), the Imperfect has regularly the force of a Pluperfect. (See § 17, N. 3). E. g.

 Pylos. Od. XVI, 24.

Note 4. The Imperfect sometimes denotes likelihood, intention, or danger in past time. (See § 10, 1, N. 7.) E. g.
' $\mathrm{E} \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \psi \psi \in \dot{\delta} \delta \sigma \theta \theta a \iota \dot{a} \pi \dot{\omega} \lambda \lambda v \tau 0$, when ne was on the point of ruin through his deceit. Antiphon. de Caed. Herod. § 37. Kai tä $\mu$ ' $\ddot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \in \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu \nu^{\prime}, \dot{a} \pi \omega \lambda \lambda v^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$, and my children were about to die, and I was about to perish. Eur. Herc. F. 538.

Note 5. The Imperfect is sometimes found in simple narration, where the Aorist would be expected, especially in Homer. The meaning of the verb often makes it indifferent which of the two is used. Thus $\beta$ aîvoy and $\beta \hat{\eta}$ are used without any perceptible difference in II. I, 437, 439; so $\beta a ̈ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau о$ and $\beta a ́ \lambda \epsilon \tau о, ~ I I, ~ 43, ~ 45 ; ~ \theta \bar{\eta} к є \nu$ and $\tau i \theta_{\epsilon \iota}$, XXIII, 653,$656 ; \delta \bar{\omega} \kappa є$ and $\delta i \delta o v$, VII, 303,$305 ; \nexists \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$ and $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon$, II, 106, 107; compare also $\mu i \sigma \tau \cup \lambda \lambda o \nu$ and $\omega^{\omega} \pi \tau \eta \sigma a \nu$, I, 465, 466.


Note 6. The Imperfect sometimes expresses a fact, which is either the result of a previous diseussion, or one that is just recognizer as a fact by the speaker or writer, having previously beon denied, overlooked, or misunderstood. In the latter ease, the particle äpa is often joined to the verb. E. g.
 тopes $\grave{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \in \dot{\delta} \delta o \nu \tau \epsilon s$, i. e. they are not, as I once imagined. Od. XIW,
 is not after all merely one race of discords, but there are two on earth.

 you not then the only epops (as I thought)? Arist. Av. 280. ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H} \nu \dot{r}$
 proved) corresponds to gymnastics. PLAT. Rep. VII, 522 A. $\Delta$ -
 $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\omega} \lambda \lambda \nu \tau o$, we shall ilestroy that which (as we proved) becomes better by justice and is ruined by injustice. Plat. Crit. 47 D . "Ap' où tód́e
 which you were bringing us? Plat. Phaedr. 230 A.

Note 7. The Greek sometimes uses an idiom like the English he was the one who did it for he is the one who did it: as 弦 $\dot{o} \boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\eta} \nu$



## B. The Present in the Dependent Moods.

Remari. The distinction of time which marks the Present and Aorist in the Indicative is retained in the Optative and Infinitive of indirect discourse, and usually in the Participles.

But in all other constructions, this distinction of time disappears in the dependent moods, and the Present and Aorist differ only in this, that the Present denotes a continued or repeated action, while the Aorist denotes the simple occurrence of an action, the time being determined by the construction. In these cases the Present and Aorist are the tenses chiefly used; the Perfect is seldom required ( $\$ 18,1, N$.), and the Future is exceptional ( $\$ 27$, Note:). It must be remembered that the Greek distiuction between the Present and Aorist in the Suljunctive and $O_{p}$ tative is one which the Latin could not express; the Present, for example, being the only form found in the Latin Subjunctive to express a condition which the Greek can express by the Present or Aorist Optative, and sometimes by the Present or Aorist Subjunctive, each with some
peculiar meaning. Thus $\epsilon i$ rov̂to $\pi$ оьо í , if he should do this (habitually), $\epsilon i \pi \circ \iota \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota \epsilon$, (simply) if he should do this, and sometimes $\mathfrak{\epsilon}$ à $\nu$ тoùтo $\pi n \iota \bar{\eta}$ (or $\pi o \iota \eta \sigma \eta$ ), if he (ever) does this, may each be translated by si hoc faciat.

This distinction, although in general strictly observed, was sometimes neglected even by the best authors: we occasionally find, for example, the Present Subjunctive where the Aorist would have expressed the idea more exactly, and vice versa. In other examples the two seem to be u-ed in nearly the same sense. (See Xen. Cyr. V, 5, 13.) These are to be considered merely as exceptions ; when, however, the Aorist is wanting, as in $\epsilon i \mu i$, the Present regularly takes the place of both.
§12. The Present Subjunctive denotes a continued or repeated action, the time of which is determined as follows: -
(a.) In clauses denoting a purpose after ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu a,{ }_{\circ}^{\circ} \pi \omega \varsigma$, $\& c$., or the object of fear after $\mu \eta^{\prime}$, it refers to time $f u$ ture relatively to that of the leading verb.
(b.) In conditional sentences, - in ordinary protasis (§ 50,1 ), the Subjunctive refers simply to the future : if the supposition is general (depending on a verb of present time which expresses a repeated action or a general truth), the Subjunctive is indefinite in its time, but is expressed in English by the Present. This applies also to all conditional relative and temporal sentences.
(c.) In independent sentences (in exhortations, prohibitions, questions of doubt, \&c.) the Subjunctive refers to the future. E. g.
 $\tau \eta \gamma \hat{\eta}, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{a} \pi n \rho \epsilon v \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ ö $\pi \eta$ à $\nu$ rin $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota a ̂ a ~ \sigma v \mu \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta$, it seems good to me to burn the wagons, that our beasts of burden may not be zur generals, and that we may go on whithersocver it may be best for

 $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega \sigma \iota$. Xen. Mem. III, 2, 3.
 ore shall stand opposed to us, we will try to subdue him. Xen An.
 $\sigma 0 \hat{v} \tau \epsilon$ sai $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \boldsymbol{\sigma} \hat{\nu}$ à $\phi \epsilon \xi \bar{\mu} \mu \theta a$, and if there shall be war, so long as we
 ata $\epsilon \in \hat{\omega}$, but I will speak as I shall think best. Triuc. VI, 9 . Ô̂s ầ
 $\gamma^{\prime} \in \lambda \lambda$ дov $\boldsymbol{\tau} a s$, whomsoever you shall wish, \&c. Isoc. Demon. p. 9 C. § 33. *A speech, if (wherever) devds are wanting, appears vain and useless. Dem.
 $\pi a \rho \epsilon \sigma \kappa є v a \sigma \mu$ 'vous, all are willing to be allied to those whom they see prepared. Id. Phil. I, 42, 1.
(c.) $\Pi \epsilon \iota \theta \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ $\pi a ́ v \tau \epsilon s^{*} \phi \in \dot{v} \gamma \omega \mu \in \nu \sigma \dot{v} \nu \nu \eta \nu \sigma \grave{i} \phi i \lambda \eta \nu$ '̇s $\pi a \tau \rho i \delta a$ raîav, let us all be persuaded; let us fly, \&c. II. II, 139. Tí ф̂̀; ri $\delta \rho \hat{\omega}$; what shall $I$ say? what shall $I$ do? Пิ̂s oủv $\pi \in \rho \grave{i}$ тov́t $\pi \circ \iota \omega \mu \in \nu$; how then shall we act about this? Plat. Phileb. 63 A.

See other examples under the rules in Chapter IV.
§ 13. 1. The Present Optative, when it is not in indirect discourse, denotes a continued or repeated action, the time of which is determined as follows: -
(a.) In clauses denoting a purpose after ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu a$, ó $\pi \omega \omega$, \&c., or the object of fear after $\mu \eta$, it refers to time future relatively to that of the leading verb.
(b.) In conditional sentences, - in ordinary protasis ( $\S 50,2$ ), the Optative refers to the future (only more vaguely than the Subjunctive); if the supposition is general (depending on a verb of past time which expresses a repeated action or general truth), the Optative refers to indefinite past time. This applies also to all conditional relative and temporal sentences.
(c.) In independent sentences (that is, in expressions of a wish, and in Apodosis with $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} \nu$ ) the Optative refers to the future. E. g.




 Xex. An. II, 6, 21. (Here the Aorist Optative would have referred to single acts of receiving, getting gain, and suffering punishment, while the present refers to a succession of cases, and to a whole course of conduct.)
 for he would not praise me, if I should banish my benefactors. Xer.
 not be enduralle, if you should be in prosperity (at any time). Aesch.
 for how could any one be wise in that which he did not munderstand?

 always exhnrted us to bring it. Eur. Alc. 755. Oìк à $\pi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \tau о$ étь
 necessity for it. Xen. Mem. IV, 2, 40. 'Oדótє Ěayópà ó $\rho \hat{\varphi} \epsilon \nu$, i'申oßouvro, whenever they saw Evagoras, they were afraid. Isoc. Evag. 193 D. § 24.
 тaìтa $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi o \iota \in \nu$, may they not suffer these things (habit cally). But $\epsilon \ddot{\epsilon} \theta \epsilon \mu \bar{\eta}$ mádocev, may tury not suffer (in a single case). Sie examples of Apodosis with ä̀ above, under (b).

See other examples under the rules in Chapter IV.
2. In indirect quotations and questions, each tense of the Optative denotes the same time, relatively to the leading verb, which the tense (of any mood) which it represents denoted in the direct discourse. (See $\S 69,1$. )
(a.) If therefore the Present Optative represents a Present Indicative of the direct discourse, it denotes a continued or repeated action, contemporary with that of the leading verb (that is, relatively present). E. g.
 nounced that Archidamus was his friend (i. e. he said छ'єvos $\mu \circ i ́ \epsilon \in \tau \iota \nu$ ).
 fear was groundless (i. e. they learned kevós éqтiv). Xen. An. Ш, 2,
 inhabited (i. e. he asked the question, Is the country inhabited?). Xer. Cyr. IV, 4, 4.
(b.) But if it represents a Present Subjunctive of the direct discourse, it denotes a continued or repeated action, which is future with reference to the leading verb. E. g.
 chus was deliberating whether they should send a fev, or should al! go. Xex. An. I. 10, 5. (The question was, $\pi \hat{\epsilon} u \pi \omega \mu \hat{\mu}^{\prime} \nu \tau \nu \mathrm{vas} \dot{\eta}$ $\pi$ ràtes $i \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$; shall we send a few, or shall we all §o? See § §8.)

Remark. Examples of the Present Optative representing the

Present Indicative or Subjunctive in a dependent clause of the direct discouse, to which the same principles apply, may be found under § 74,1 .

Note 1. It will be seen, by a comparison of the examples under (a) and (b), that an ambiguity may sometimes arise from uncertainty whether the Optative stands for the Present Indicative or for the Present Subjunctive in a question of doubt (§ 88). Thus クु $\gamma \mathrm{o}$ óvy ö $\tau \ell$ nooív might mean they knew not what they were doing (the Optative representing ri $\pi o \iota o u ̄ \mu \in \nu$; what are we doing?) or they linew not what to do (the Optative representing $\tau i \operatorname{\pi o\iota } \bar{\omega} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$; what shall we do?). The context must decide in each case. See § 71.

Note 2. In the few instances in which the Present Optative in indirect quotations represents the Imperfect of the direct discourse, it of course denotes time past relatively to the leading verb. See § 70, 2, N. 1 (b).
§ 14. The Present Imperative refers to a continued or repeated action in future time; as $\phi \in \hat{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon$, begone; $\chi a \iota \rho o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$, let them rejoice; $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu о \mu ' \zeta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, do not believe.
§ 15. The Present Infinitive has three distinct uses:-

1. First, in its ordinary use (either with or without the article), whenever it is not in indirect discourse, it denotes a continued or repeated action without regard to time, unless its time is specially defined by the context. E. g.
 be possible to do this. $\Delta \in ́ \rho \mu a \iota ~ v \mu \omega ิ \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \in \iota \nu, I$ beg you to remain. Tí
 to prevent him from going whither he pleases? Dem. Ol. I, 12, 22. 'Екє́ $\lambda \epsilon v \sigma a$ aùrùv тоѝтo $\pi$ o七є $\mathfrak{\imath} \nu, I$ commanded him to do this. 'Eßoú-




 ov $\mu$ ßovinov, some one may say that finding fault is easy, but that showing what ought to be done is the duty of an adviser. Dem. Ol. I,
 this rule; civa in both cases belongs rader § 15, 2.) Oi $\pi \lambda \epsilon \sigma$
 $\mathfrak{a} \xi$ côv, he did this not from love of gain, but because of the Thetans making juster demands than you. Dra. Phil. II, 69, 6. 'Eterxíat
 prevent pirates from ravaging Euboea. Tiuc. II, 32.

Remark. The Infinitive in this its ordinary use has usually no more reference to time than any verbal nom, and the distinction of tense therefore disappears, the Present differing from the Aorist only by expressing a continued or repeated action. An Infinitive which in itself has no reference to time may, however, be referred to some particular time, like any other verbal noun, by the verb on which it depends, by some particle like $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ or $\pi \rho^{\prime} \nu$, or by some other word in the sentence. Thus $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \pi \sigma$ denoting a parpose refers the Infinitive to the future: the Infinitive without $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ expressing a purpose is likewise future. After a large class of verbs, as those of commanding, advising, desiring, asking, \&c., whose signification points to the future, the Infinitive necessarily denotes relative future time. (For an irregular use of the Future Infinitive after such verbs, see § 27, N. 2.) The time denoted by the Infinitive in any of these constructions must be carefully distinguished from that which it denotes in indirect discourse ( $\$ 15,2$ ), where its tense is fully preserved.

Note 1. For a discussion of the Infinitive with the article and a subject, with reference to its time, see Appendix, II.

Note 2. X $\rho a ́ \omega$, à $\left.\nu a \iota \rho \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \omega, \theta \epsilon \sigma \pi i\right\} \omega$, and other verbs signifying to give an oracular response, are sometimes followed by the Present (as well as the Aorist) Infinitive, where we might expect the Future on the principle of indireet discourse ( $\$ 15,2$, N. 1). These verbs here take the ordinary construction of verbs of commanding, advising, and warning. E. g.
 it is said that A pollo gave a response to Alcmaeon that he should inhabit this land. Tuuc. II, 102. The Future is sometimes found. For the Aorist, see $\S 23,1$, N. 2.
2. Secondly, the Present Infinitive in indirect discourse is used to represent a Present Indicative of the direct discourse, and therefore denotes a continued or repeated action, which is contemporary with that of the leading verb, that is, relatively present. E. g.
 that he was writing (i. e. he said "I am writing"); фं $\sigma \epsilon \iota \gamma \rho$ á $\phi \in \iota \nu$, he will say that he is (then) uriting. 'A $\rho \rho \omega \sigma \tau \epsilon i \nu \pi \rho о ф а \sigma i \zeta \epsilon \tau a t$, he pretends that he is sick. 'Е $\xi \dot{\omega} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu}$ a $\rho \rho \omega \sigma \tau \in \hat{\imath} \nu$ тovtovi, he took his oath that this man was sich. Dem. F. L. 379, 15 and 17. Oن́к ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \eta$ aíròs à $\lambda \lambda$ ' Є̇кєivo $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \in i ̀ \nu$, he saia that not he himself, but Nicias,
 Thuc. IV, 28. For the Present Infinitive with äy (not included here), see § 41.

Note 1. The Infinitive is said to stand in indirect discourse, witr its tenses thus corresponding to the same tenses of the Indieativ: only when it depends upon verbs implying thought or the expression of thought (verba sentiendi et declarandi), and when also the thought, as originally eonceived, would have been expressed by some tense of the Indicative, which the corresponding tense of the Infinitive ean represent. Thus verbs of commanding, wishing, and others enumerated in $\S 92,1$, although they may imply thought, yet never introduce an indirect quotation in the sense here intended, as an Infinitive after them never stands for an Indicative, but is merel) the ordinary Infinitive used as a verbal noun, without any definite time. See $\S 73,1$, Remark; where the prineiple is stated in full, so as to include all the tenses and the Infinitive with äv.

Note 2. Verbs and expressions signifying to hope, to expect, to promise, and the like, after which the Future Infinitive stands regularly in indirect discourse (as representing a Future Indicative of the direct discourse), sometimes take the Present or the Aorist Infinitive. E.g.
 to us (the laws). Plat. Crit. 52 C . Zvvé
 securities that he would go. Xen. Cyr. VI, 2, 39. 'Eגדi乡єi òvvatò's єijatäpXect, he hopes to be able to rule. Plat. Rep. IX, 573 C. (But in Hdt. I, 30 , $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega \nu$ є $\hat{i} \nu a \iota ~ o ̉ \lambda \beta \iota \dot{\tau} \tau a \tau o s ~ \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \dot{\rho} \tau a$, means, he asked, trusting that he was, civaı being a regular Present Infinitive of
 $\sigma \theta a t$.

In these cases the Infinitive seems to be used nearly as in § 15, 1, withont regard to time. The Greek makes no more distinetion than the English between $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \zeta \epsilon \iota$ тои̃тo moteiv, he hopes to do this, and $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \zeta \epsilon \iota$ тойто $\pi о \iota \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$, he hopes that he shall do this. Compare
 $\gamma \eta \kappa \in ́ v a l \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \in \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. Plat. Crit. 51 E and 52 D . The Future, however, is the regular form (§ 27, N. 3). For the Aorist, see § 23, 2, N. 2.

Note 3. Even verbs of saying and thinking, - as $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega$, when it signifies to command, and סokeí, it seems good, - may be followed by the ordinary Infinitive of $\S 15,1$, referring to the future. Eitov is very seldom followed by the Infinitive, exeept when it signifies to command. (See §92, 2, N. 1.) The context must distinguish these sases from indireet quotations. E. g.
 (Toúvous ${ }^{\kappa} \lambda \epsilon \gamma 0 \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon i ้ \nu$ would mean $I$ said that they were sailing.)

one should pass into the citadel. Xen. Hell. V, 2, 29. $\Delta$ океi j $\eta$ ì toûto
 means it seems to me that you are doing this, by § 15, 2.) "Eסoks in the sense it was resolved, introducing a resolution or enactment, is followed by the Present or Aorist (not Future) Infinitive.
3. Thirdly, the Present Infinitive belongs also to the Imperfect, and is used in indirect discourse io represent an Imperfect Indicative of the direct discourse. It here denotes continued or repeated action which is past with reference to the leading verb, thus supplying the want of an Imperfect Infinitive. E. g.
 §ev; what prayers then do you suppose Philip made when he was pouring the libations? Dem. F. L. 381, 10. (Here the temporal clause

 you think that the superiority of the Phocians over the Thebans, or that of Philip over you, was the greater in the war (the war being then past)? Dem. F. L. 387, 6. (Here the direet discourse would be




 do you think the Olynthians used to hear it, if any one said anything against Philip in those times when he was celling Anthemus to then, \&e.? Do you think they were expecting to suffer such things? Do you think that the Thessalians, when he was expelling the despots, were expecting, \&c.? Dem. Phil. II, p. 70, 25 to p. 71, 12. (The direct

 $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota, I$ hear that they used to follow this custom. Den. Ol. III,
 סокеi), in the times before Hellen this name does not appear to have even existed. Thuc. I, 3. Again, in the same sentence of Thucydi-





 for he said that he had met (Aor.) Atrestidas coming from Philip, and that there were walking with him, \&c. Dem. F. L. 439, 3. Toûr' $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \phi \eta \mu \iota \delta \in \hat{\imath} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\epsilon} \mu \dot{n} \lambda a \theta \in i \nu, I$ say that this ought not to have escapea my notice. Dem. Cor. 291, 27. (The dirent discourse here 'vas roût'
$\ddot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \iota \epsilon \mathfrak{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\eta} \lambda \alpha \theta \epsilon i \nu . \quad § 49,2, \mathrm{~N} .3$.

For the Imperfect Partieiple, see § 16, 2.
Remark 1. This use of the Present of the Infinitive as an Imperfect cannot be too earefully distinguished from its ordinary use after past tenses, where we translate it by the Imperfect, as in én $\lambda \boldsymbol{\text { fe }}$ тò $\sigma \tau \rho a ́ \tau \epsilon v \mu a \mu \dot{\chi} \epsilon \sigma \theta a u$, he said that the army was fighting. But here $\mu \alpha_{\chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a u r}$ refers to time present, relatively to " ${ }_{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon$; whereas, if it had been used as an Imperfect, it would have referred to time past
 he said that the army had been fighting on the day before. In the former case the direct discourse was $\mu$ áє $\epsilon a l$, in the latter it was є́ці́хєто. Such an Imperfect Infinitive differs from the Aorist in the same construction only by expressing a continued or repeated action (as in the Indieative): it gives, in fact, the only means of representing in the Infinitive what is usually expressed by $\lambda$ é $\gamma \epsilon t$ ört
 says that he did. (For the rare use of the Present Optative to represent the Imperfect in the same way, see § 70,2, N. 1, (b).) It must be observed, that this construction is never used unless the context makes it certain that the Infinitive represents an Imperfect and not a Present, so that no ambiguity can arise. See the examples.
Remark 2. This important distinetion between the ordinary Present Infinitive referring to the past (when it takes its time from a past tense on which it depends), and the same tense used as an Imperfect and referring to the past by its own signification, seems to be overlooked by those who would eall the former also a case of Imperfect Infinitive. But in the former case $\begin{gathered}\epsilon\end{gathered} \eta$ тойтo motiiv is translated he said that he was doing this merely to suit the English idiom, whereas the Greeks used the Present because the time was to be present (relatively to ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \eta$ ), the dircet discourse
 $\pi \rho o \tau \epsilon \rho a i a$, he said that he had been doing this the day before, the Greeks used $\pi o t \in \hat{L} \dot{\nu}$ as a regular Imperfeet (relatively to ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \eta$ ), the direct discourse being roùto є̇поoouv. So in Latin (Crc. Phil. VIII, 10), Q. Scaevolam memoria teneo bello Marsico, eum esset summa senectute, quotidie facere omnibus conveniendi potestatem sui. So (Crc. de Off. I, 30), Q. Maximum aceepimus faeile celare, tace - e, dissimnlare, insidiari, praeripere hostium eonsilia.

The frequeney of such construetions and their prineiple have been often overlooked, from the faet that they occur only when t.ee context prevents all possible ambiguity.

## 16. 1. The Present Participle regularly refers to a

 continued or repeated action, which is contemporary with that of the leading verb. E. g.Тойто поьоิбเข роцiگovтєs к. т. $\lambda$., they do this because they think, \&c. 'Enoiouv עŋpi广ovets, they were doing it in the thought, \&c. 'Enoínoav vouiگovtes, they did it lecause they thought, \&e. IIotn-

 general. Isoc. Evag. p. 200 C. §56. (乏тparך $\quad$ oûvos is present relatively to '่̇ $\pi \rho a ́ \chi \theta \eta$.) Kaì тoıû̀ta $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu \tau i ́ \epsilon ̇ \pi o i ́ \epsilon t ;$ and in doing such things what was he doing? Dem. Phil. III, 114, 20.

Note. When the Present Participle is used like an ordinary Adjective or Substantive (as in § 108), it occasionally refers to time absolutely present, even when the leading verb is not present. This must always be denoted by an adverb like $\nu \hat{v} \nu$, or by something else in the context. E. g.
$\mathrm{T} \dot{\eta} \nu \nu \bar{\nu} \nu$ Boเ $\omega \tau i a \nu \kappa a \lambda o v \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \nu \ddot{\omega} \kappa \eta \sigma a \nu$, they settled in the country


 ning, when Diopeithes was not yet general, and when the soldiers who are now in the Chersonese had not yet been sent out, seized upon Serrium and Doriscus. Dem. Phil. III, 114, 15. (Here $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta-$ roùvtos is present to the time of $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \dot{a} \mu \beta a \nu \epsilon$, while óo $\nu \tau \omega \nu$ is present to the time of speaking.)
2. The Present Participle is also used as an Imperfect, like the Present Infinitive. With the Participle this use is not confined (as it is with the Infinitive) to indirect discourse. E. g.
 who were his colleagues on the embassy and who were present will testify. Dem. F. L. 381, 5. (Here the embassy is referred to as a


 following things are evident, ' $\mathrm{E} \lambda \lambda$ às où $\pi$ ádaı $\beta є \beta a i \omega s$ @'кєiто, à $\lambda \lambda \grave{a}$


 Xen. Mem. I, 2, 18. (The direct discourse here was édeík


The principles stated in § 15, 3, with Remarks (cf. § 73, 1) in regard to the Present Infinitive used as an Imperfect apply equally to the Participle.

Remark. The rules for the time of the Infinitive and Participle given in this chapter do not include the Infinitive and Participle with $\not{ }^{\prime} v . \quad$ For these see Chapter III. § 41.

## Perfect and Pluperfect.

## A. In the Indicative.

§ 17.1. The Perfect represents an action as already finished at the present time; as $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma \boldsymbol{\rho} \phi a$, I have written (that is, my writing is now finished).
2. The Pluperfect represents an action as already finished at some specified past time; as $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \nu, I$ had written (that is, my writing was finished at some specified past time).

Note 1. The consideration that the Perfect, although it implies the performance of the action in past time, yet states only that it stands completed at the present time, will explain why the Perfect is classed with the Present and Future among the primary tenses, that is, the tenses of present or future time.

Note 2. The Perfect Indicative and the Pluperfect may be expressed by the Perfect Participle with the Present or Imperfect of $\varepsilon i \mu i$. Here, however, each part of the compound generally retains its own signification, so that this form expresses more fully the continuance of the result of the action down to the present time (in the case of the Ferfect), and down to the past time referred to (in the case of the Pluperfect), E. g.
 done, -he has done (or had done). ' $\mathrm{E} \mu \mathrm{v}$ oi vó $\mu \boldsymbol{\sim}$ oủ $\mu o ́ \nu o \nu$ à $\pi \epsilon \gamma \nu \omega$ -
 $\lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v e t \nu$, it is the laves which have not only acquitted me of injustice, but have commanded me to inflict this punishment. Lys. de Morte
 heaven has been formed (and still exists), and will still continue. Plat. Tim. 31 B.

Remark. The latter part of Note 2 of course does not apply to cases where the compound form is the only one in use, as in the third person plural of the Perfect and Pluperfect Passive and Middle of mute and liquid verbs.

On the other hand, the simple form very often implies the continuance of the result of the action down to the present time, or down to a specified past time; but not so distinctly as the compound form, and not necessarily. (See the last two examples.) E. g.
 Gods have carefully provided what men need. Xen. Mem. IV, 3, 3.



 tune has taken back what she has lent you. Menand. Frag. Incert. No. 41.

Note 3. The Perfect of many verbs has the signification of a Present, which is usually explained by the peculiar meaning of these verbs. Thus $\theta \nu \eta \eta_{\kappa \kappa є \nu, ~ t o ~ d i e, ~ \tau є \theta \nu \eta \kappa є ́ \nu a \iota, ~ t o ~ b e ~ d e a d ; ~}^{\text {, }}$ $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon i \nu$, to call, $\kappa \in \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$, to be called or named; $\gamma i \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, to become, $\gamma \in \gamma о \downarrow \in ́ \nu a \iota$, to be; $\mu \iota \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \kappa є \iota \nu$, to remind, $\mu є \mu \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$, to remember ; oida (novi), Iknow; \&c.

The Pluperfect of such verbs has the signification of the


Note 4. In Homer and Herodotus the Pluperfect is sometimes found in nearly the same sense as the Aorist. E. g.
 follow, referring to the same time as $\beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota$.) Taû̃a $\dot{\omega}$ s $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\prime} \dot{\theta} \theta_{0}$.) $\dot{\omega} \rho \mu \dot{\epsilon} a \tau \circ$ в
 VIII, 35.

Note 5. In epistles, the Perfect and Aorist are sometimes used where we might expect the Present, the writer transferring himself to the time of the reader. E.g.

 (Here $\hat{o} \nu \ddot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \mu \psi a$ refers to the man who was to carry the letter.) So scripsi in Latin.

Note 6. The perfect sometimes refers to the future, to denote the certainty or likelihood that an action will immediately take place, in a sense similar to that of the Present ( $\S 10, N .7$ ), but with more emphasis, as the change in time is greater. E. g.

 Xen. An. I, 8, 12. So perii in Latin.

The Pluperfect can express the same certainty or likelihood transferred to the past.

## B. Perfect in the Dependent Moods.

§ 18. As the Perfect Indicative represents an act as finished at the present time, so the Perfect of any of the dependent moods represents an act as finished at the time (present, past, or future) at which the Present of that mood would represent it as going on.

1．The Perfect Subjunctive and Optative are very often expressed in the active，and almost always in the passive and middle，by the Perfect Participle with $\dot{\hat{\omega}}$ and $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \eta \nu$ ；and can always be resolved into these． Their time，therefore，in each case，can be seen by applying the principles stated in $\S \S 12$ and 13 to the $\dot{\omega}$ or $\epsilon i \eta \nu \nu$ ．Where the Present would denote future time，the Perfect denotes future－perfect time．E．g．
 I fear lest the fact that a long time has passed may（when you come to decide the case）prove to have caused in you some forgetfulness DEM．F．L．342， 10 ．（Mウ mot $\hat{\eta}$ would mean lest it may cause，the time being the same as before．）X Xì aủvà［â $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau a$ ékáтєроע
 $\mu \in \nu a$ ，we must hear what awaits each of them after death，that（when we have finished）each may have fully received his deserts．Plat．Rep．X，
 $\dot{\delta} \rho \hat{\omega} \pi \rho о т \epsilon \iota \nu о \mu \epsilon \operatorname{\nu ous}$, I see that other men，even if they have already given their accounts，－i．e．even if they are（in the state of）persons who have given their accounts，－always offer a perpetual reckoning．Dexr． F．L．341，14．＇А $\nu \delta \rho \in$ ©ó $\nu \gamma \epsilon \pi a ́ \nu v \nu о \mu i \zeta о \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，ôs ả̀ $\nu \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \gamma \eta \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$ ， we always consider one who has beaten his father very manly．Arist．
 $\pi \rho o ́ т \epsilon \rho o s \beta \epsilon \beta \circ \eta \theta \eta \kappa \dot{\omega} s$ v $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu \hat{\eta}$ ，i．e．to assist no one who shall not pre－ viously have assisted you．Dex．F．L．345，28．（ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Os}$ ä $\nu \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o s$ ßon日ŋn would mean who shall not previously assist you．The Aorist $\beta o \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta$ would differ very little from the Perfect．See § 20，N．2．）
 might prove to have fallen upon us．Xen．An．V，7，26．（M̀̀＇̇ $\mu \pi i \pi \tau$ т would mean lest it might fall upon us．）$\Pi \omega \bar{s}$ oủk ầ oìктоóтata
 should I not have suffered the most pitiable of all things，if they should vote me to be an alien？Dem．Eubul．1312，17．（This could have been expressed，with a very slight difference in meaning，$\pi \hat{\omega} s$ ou

 oủ кǔ ả $\mu \phi$ о́тєpo九 ầ тоиิто $\pi \epsilon \pi$ ó $\nu \theta$ o七 $\mu \epsilon \nu$ ；if each of $u$ s should have suffered anything whatsoever，would not both of us have suffered it？
 this，at least，cannot be the reason why they did not pay it at once；i．e． they would not（on inquiry）prove to have not paid it on this account．




 （Here the direct discourse was $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau а к o ́ \sigma \iota o i ́ ~ \epsilon i \sigma \iota \nu \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon к а \sigma \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \iota$.

Note. The Perfect Subjunctive in protasis ( $\$ 50,1$ ) corresponds exactly to the Latin Future Perfect Indicative; but the Greek seldom uses this cumbrous Perfect, preferring the less precise Aorist ( $\$ 20$, N. 2). The Perfect Optative, in both protasis and apodosis, corresponds to the Latin Perfect Subjunetive, but is seldon used.

The Perfeet Optative can seldom be aceurately expressel in English. For when we use the English forms rould have suffered and should have suffered to translate the Perfect Optative, these are merely vaguer expressions for will and shall have suffered. (See the examples above.) I should have suffered is commonly past in English, being equivalent to $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi a \theta_{0 \nu} \neq \mu \nu$; but here it is future, and is therefore liable to be misunderstood. There is no more reference to past time, however, in the Perfect Optative with äy, than there is in the Future Perfect Indieative in sueh expressions as $\mu$ ár $\eta \nu$ द́ $\mu o \grave{\imath}$ $\kappa \in \kappa \lambda a v \in \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota, I$ shall have had my whipping for nothing (reterring to one received in his boyhood); Arist. Nub 1436.
2. The Perfect Imperative may express a command that something just done or about to be done shall be decisive and final. It is thus equivalent to the Perfect Participle with the Imperative of $\epsilon i \mu i$. E. g.
 let what has been thus said be sufficient. Plat. Crat. 401 D. But ${ }_{0}^{\prime \prime} \mu \omega s \delta_{\grave{\epsilon}} \epsilon i \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \omega$ ö $\tau \iota, \kappa . \tau . \lambda$., still let as much as this (which follows) be said (once for all), that, \&e. Plat. Rep. X, 607 C. Пєpì tŵ̀ iठí $\omega \nu$ roû̃á $\mu \circ \iota \pi \rho \circ є \iota \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \omega$, let this have been said (once for all) by way of introduction. Isoc. Paneg. p. 43 D. §14. Tẫтa $\pi \epsilon \pi a i \sigma \theta \omega$ $\tau \in \dot{v} \mu \bar{\nu}$, каi $\not \approx \sigma \omega s$ ikanws ${ }^{\prime} \chi \in \iota$, let this be the end of the play, \&c. Plat.
 let such a man remain where we have placed him, \&c. Plat. Rep. VIII, 561 E . 'A $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \gamma$ á $\sigma \omega$ $\theta \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath}$ aürŋ $\dot{\eta} \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a$, let now this be a sufficient description of this form of government. Id. 553 A. Méर $^{\prime}$ $\tau 0 \hat{\delta} \delta \epsilon \dot{\omega} \rho i \sigma \theta \omega \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta}$ Bpaঠvíns, at this point let the limit of your sluggishncss be fixed. Thuc. I, 71.

This use seems to be confined to the third person singular of the passive and middle. The third person plural in the same sense could be expressed by the Perfect Participle with the Imperative of
 ש̈ot $\omega \nu$, grant then that these have been persuaded of this.

Note 1. On this principle the Perfect Imperative is used in mathematical language, to imply that something is to be considered as proved or assumed once for all, or that lines drawn or points fixed are to remain as data for a following demonstration. E. g.
 r̂̀s $\mathrm{Ar} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{A} \Delta \ddot{\imath} \sigma \eta \dot{\eta} \mathrm{AE}$, let any point $\Delta$ be (assumed as) taken in the line AB , and AE equal to $\mathrm{A} \Delta$ as cut off from Ar Eucl. $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ Pr. 9.

Nore 2. The Perfect Imperative of the second person is rare; when it is used, it scems to be a little more emphatic than the Present or Aorist. E.g.

 us (immediately and once for all) solemn pledges and give the right hand. Xen. Cyr. IV, 2, 7. חé̃avao, stop! not another word! Dem. Timoc. 721, 6.

Note 3. In verbs whose Perfect has the force of a Present $(\S 17, N .3)$ the Perfect Imperative is the ordinary form, as $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \sigma o$,
 seems to have been used only in such verbs. Occasionally we find the periphrastic form with the Participle and $\epsilon i \mu i$, as ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \sigma \tau \omega \bar{\xi} v \mu \beta \epsilon-$ ß $\ddagger$ кuî́a. Plat. Leg. V, 736 B.
3. (a.) The Perfect Infinitive in indirect discourse represents a Perfect Indicative of the direct discourse, and therefore denotes an action which is finished at the time of the leading verb. E. g.

 $\pi \rho a \chi \epsilon \nu a \iota$, he will say that he has done this (the direct discourse in
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \kappa \epsilon \kappa \eta \rho \cup \chi \in \dot{\nu}$ aı, he said that the Thebans had offered a reward for his seizure. Dem. F. L. 347, 26. In Arist. Nub. 1277, $\pi \rho o \sigma-$ $\kappa \in \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a i \quad \mu o \ell$ бокєis (according to Mss. Rav. \& Ven.), you seem to me to be sure to be summoned to court (to be as good as already summoned), the Infinitive represents a Perfect Indicative referring to the future (§ 17, N. 6). So $\kappa \in \kappa \omega \lambda \hat{\nu} \sigma \theta a \iota$ є̇óóкєı. Thuc. II, 8.
(b.) In other constructions the Perfect Infinitive represents an act as finished at the time at which the Present in the same construction would represent it as going on ( $\$ 15,1$ ). E. g.

 be deliberating, but (it is time) to have finished deliberating; for all this must be done (and finished) within the coming night. Plat. Crit.
 and it is his duty to have attended (during his absence) to the business about which you gave him instructions. Dem. F. L. 342, 28. (This refers to an ambassador presenting his accounts on his return.)

 $\xi v \nu \eta \rho \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$, it often befell them to have made an attack on one side and (at the same time) to have been attacked themselves on the

 that the most important subjects have been used up, and that only unimportant ones have been left. Isoc. Pan. p. 55 D § 74 . Oík $\eta^{\prime} \theta \in \lambda o \nu$
 embark on account of having been terrified by the defeat. Tinc. VII,



 things during the war any one might justly charge upon our neglect; but our never having suffered this before and the fact that an alliance has now appeared to us to make up for these losses I should consider a benefaction, \&c. Dem. Ol. I, 12, 3. (Compare $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta_{\sigma} \theta a t$ in the


 own wall beyond that of the Athenians, so as no longer to be themselves interfered with ly them, and so as to have effectually prevented them,



 $\lambda \in \lambda \epsilon i \phi \theta a \iota$, they made such and so great acquisitions as to have no possibility of surpassing them left to any one who should come after.
 we allow them to have cut us up for nothing (i. e. we make no account of their having done so). Arist. Nub. 1426.

Note. The Perfect Infinitive is sometines used like the Perfect Imperative ( $\$ 18,2$ ), signifying that the action is to be decisive and permanent, and sometimes it seems to be merely more emphatic than the Present or Aorist Infinitive. E. g.

Eîmov tìv $\theta$ ט́pà $\kappa \in \kappa \lambda \in \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \iota$, they ordered that the door should be shut and remain so. Xen. IIell. V, 4, 7. Bov入ó $\mu$ ยуos à $\gamma \omega \bar{\omega}$ каі̀
 $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \kappa \pi a t$, i. e. wishing to have it definitely and once for all settled in your minds. Dem. F. L. 410, 28. Өє入ov́бas $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi u ́ \lambda a t s ~ \pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega-$ K'́vat, eager to fall before the gates. Aesch. Sept. 462. *Hגavyєv
 ${ }^{\circ} \pi \lambda a$, he marched against the soldiers of Menon, so that they were (once for all) thoroughly frightened and ran to arms. Xev. An. I, 5, 13. (Here $\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \chi \theta a \iota$ is merely more emphatic than the Present would have been.)

Remark. The Perfect Infinitive belongs also to the Pluperfect, and is oceasionally used to represent that tense in indirece discourse. This occurs ehiefly (perhaps only) when the Infinitive is modified by ăv. See the first example under $\S 41,2$.
4. The Perfect Participle in all its uses refers to an
action as already finished at the time of the leading verb. E g.
'Enaıvoval toìs єipךкótas, they praise those who have spoken. 'Eng̀vєaav тoùs єip $\quad$ ко́тas, they praised those who had spoken. 'Eтatעє́gova тoùs єipŋкóтas, they will praise those who have (then)
 that Aeschines had announced nothing that was true (i. e. I showed,


## AORIST.

## A. In the Indicative.

§ 19. The Aorist Indicative expresses the simple momentary occurrence of an action in past time; as ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \gamma \rho a \Psi a, I$ wrote.

This fundamental idea of simple occurrence remains the essential characteristic of the Aorist through all the dependent moods, however indefinite they may be in regard to time.

Note 1. The Aorist of verbs which denote a state or condition generally expresses the entrance into that state or condition. E. g.


 Тццокра́тоия ѐкєіขш $\sigma \nu \nu \underset{\kappa}{\kappa} \eta \sigma \epsilon$, she was his wife in good faith, and has not even yet been divorced; . . . . . but she went to live with him, \&e. Dem. Onet. I, 873, 8.

Note 2. The Aorist differs from the Imperfect by denoting the momentary occurrence of an action or state, while the Imperfect denotes a continuance or repetition of the same action or state. This is especially obvious in the verbs mentioned in Note 1, as
 especially the last example under N. 1.) The Aorist is therefore the tense most eommon in narration, the Imperfect in description. The Aorist may sometimes refer to a series of repetitions; but it refers to them collectively, as a single whole, while the Imperfect refers to them separately, as individuals. So the Aorist may even refer to a contimued action, if (as a whole) it is viewed as a single event in past time. E. g.
 (Veni, vidi, vici) Apr. Bell. Civ. II, 91. So $\epsilon \beta \beta a i \lambda \in v \sigma \epsilon$ ס́́ka
E. $\eta$ may be used to mean he had a reign of ten years (which is now
 mean he continued to reign ten years.

Noтe 3. The distinction between the Imperfect and Aorist was sometimes neglected, especially by the older writers. See § 11, Note 5.

Note 4. (a.) The Aorist is sometimes found where we should expect the Perfeet or the Pluperfect; the action being simply referred to the past, without the more exact specification afforded by the Perfect and Pluperfect. E. g.

 yovio, they turned towards Panormus, whence they had set sail.

 An. I, $1,2$.
(b.) Especially the Aorist is generally used, even where we thould expect the Pluperfect, after particles of time like $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$,

 tad died and Artaxerxes had become established. Xen. An. I, 1, 3.


 when they had entered. II. I, 432. So in Latin, postquam venit, after ke had come.

Note 5. The Aorist is sometimes used in colloquial language oy the poets (especially the dramatists), when a momentary action, which is just taking place, is to be expressed as if it had already happened. E. g.

 amused by your threats, I cannot help laughing, \&c. Arist. Eq. 696.

Note 6. Tbe Aorist sometimes refers vividly to the future, like the Present or Perfect ( $\$ 10, N .7 ; \$ 17, N .6$ ) ; as $\dot{a} \pi \omega \lambda \dot{\phi} \mu \eta \nu \epsilon i$ $\mu \in \lambda \in i \psi \in \epsilon s$, I perish if you leave me, Eur. Alc. 386.

So in questions with $\tau i$ ov expressing surprise that something is not already done, and implying an exhortation to do it; as $\tau i$ o ${ }^{3} \nu$ ov $\delta \iota \eta \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$; why then do you not tell us the story? Plat. Prot. 310 A . See also $\tau i$ oủv oủk $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa a \lambda \epsilon \in \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$; Prot. 317 D .

## B. Aorist in the Dependent Moods.

Remark. The Aorist of the dependent moods differs from the Present as is explained in the Remark before $\S 12$.
§ 20. The Aorist Subjunctive denotes a single or momentary action, the time of which is determined by the rules that appiy to the time of the Present Subjunctive, § 12 : -

That is, in clauses denoting a purpose or objert, after ${ }_{i v}^{\prime \prime} a, \mu \dot{\eta}$, \&e., it refers to time future relatively to the leading verb; in conditional sentences (including conditional relative and temporal sentences), - in ordinary protasis ( $\S 50,1$ ), the Subjunctive refers to the future; in general suppositions after verbs of present time (§51), it refers to indefinite time represented as present. In independent sentences it refers to the future. E. g.

 $\dot{\omega} \mu \dot{\eta} \delta \iota a \beta \bar{\eta} \tau \in \dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ a $\pi \quad$ о $\lambda \eta \phi \theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, he intends to destroy the bridge, that you may not pass over but be caught. Id. II, 4, 17. * $\mathrm{H} \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ cipip $\eta \eta \nu$
 shall make the peace, \&c. Isoc. Pac. p. $163 \mathrm{~A} . \S 20$. ' $\Omega s a y \in i \pi n \omega$

 death comes near), no one wants to die. Eur. Alc. 671. ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu{ }^{2}$ à $\nu$
 $\dot{a} \sigma \pi a ́ \zeta \epsilon t a l$, i. e. whomsoever the dog sees (at amy time). Plat. Rep. II, 376 A . 'А $\nu a \lambda o \gamma \iota \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ тà $\dot{\omega} \mu о \lambda о \gamma \eta \mu \epsilon ́ v a ~ \grave{\eta} \mu і ̈ \nu$, let us enumerate the points which have been conceded by us. Plat. Prot. 332 D. M $\eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \phi o \beta \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$, fear not (in this case). (But $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu \phi \circ \beta o \hat{\nu}$, be not timid.) Ti $\pi o \iota \eta \sigma \omega$; what shall I do (in a single case)? (But $\tau i$
 not say this. Ov $\mu \dot{\eta} \gamma^{\prime} \nu \eta \tau a \iota$, it will not happen. So in the Homeric ovió " $\begin{gathered}\delta \omega \mu a \iota \\ \text {, nor shall I ever see. }\end{gathered}$

See other examples under the rules in Chapter IV.
Note 1. When the Aorist Subjunctive depends on érer Báv ( $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a ́ \nu, ~ \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\eta} \nu)$, after that, it is referred by the meaning of the particle to a moment of time that precedes the action of the
 $I$ shall leave seen this, I will come; and ím $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \dot{\nu} \nu$ тоíro $\grave{i} \omega$, àтє́p $о \mu a \iota$, after $I$ have seen this, $I$ (always) depart. In such cases it is to be translated by our Future $P_{e}$ f $f e c t$, when the leading verb is future; and by our Perfect, when the leading verb denotes a general truth and is translated by the Present. As the Subjunctive in this construction can never depend
upon a verb expressing simply present time, it is obvious that it can never refer to time absolutely past: we use the Perfect Indicative in translating such Aorists after verbs expressing general truths, merely because we use the Present in translat. ing the leading verb, although that is properly not merely present, but general in its time.

In like manner, after $\bar{\epsilon} \omega s, \pi \rho_{i} \nu$, and other particles signifying until, before that, and even after the relative pronoun or ċáv, the Aorist Subjunctive may be translated by our Future Perfeet or Perfect, when the context shows that it refers to a moment of time preceding that of the leading verb. E. g.

 laws, you must look to see of what hind they are; but afier you have enacted them, you must guard and use them. Dem. Mid. 525, 1i. (Here the Present $\tau \iota \theta \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ after ö ơva, urhile, refers to an action continuing through the time of the leading verb; but $\theta_{\eta} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ after $\epsilon \pi \in i \dot{\delta} \dot{D}$, , after linat, refers to time past relatively to the leading verb.)
 $\epsilon \rho \bar{\omega}$, when 1 shall have spokien about my birth, then, if your desire to hear, I will speak of these things. Dem. Eubul. 1303, 25. (Here the Aorist $\epsilon^{i \pi} \omega$, , though absolutely future, denotes time past with refer-
 have accomplished what I desire, I will come. XEN. An. II, 3, 29.



 it remains in safety (Present); -but the moment that the sea has over-
 ' 'x' 'èmioia, until you have learnt fully, have hope. Sopin. O. T. 834 .
 à aipecov, and one bier is always carrierl empty, in honor of the missing, whose bodies have not been found. Thuc. II, 34. Tis סiavoeitau,
 thinks of having an equal share in those things which others by their

 thungs which are (or huve been) abandoned when peace is made are always lost to those who abandoned them. Den. F. L. 388, 9. "H $\nu \delta^{\prime}$
 xpeiav, if they have been disappointed in anything, they alucuys supply the deficiency, \&c. Thuc. I, $\mathbf{7 0}$. (See § 30, 1.) Oíxi $\pi$ aívo $\mu \iota$,
 hav. (shall have) madt $\mathfrak{\xi}$ フu master of your children. SopII. O. C
 Sorif. Plil. 917.

Note 2. The use of the Aorist Subjunctive mentioned in Note 1 sometimes seems to approach very near to that of the Perfect Subjunctive ( $\S 18,1$ ) ; and we often translate both by the same tense in English. But with the Perfect, the idea of an action completed at the time referred to is expressed by the tense of the verb, without aid from any particle or from the context; with the Aorist, the idea of relative past time can come only from the particle or the context. (See § 18, 1, Note.) E. g.

 whomsoever he sees whon he knows, he fawns upon, even if he has hitherto received no kindness from him. Plat. Rep. II, 376 A. Com-
 happens to receive any kindness from any one, he always fawns upon
 any kindness, he always fawns upon him. See examples under § 18,1 .
§ 21. 1. The Aorist Optative, when it is not in indirect discourse, denotes a single or momentary action, the time of which is determined by the rules that apply to the time of the Present Optative, § 13, 1:-

That is, in clauses denoting a purpose or object, after ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu a$, ó $\quad \pi \omega s, \mu \prime$, \&ce., it refers to time future relatively to the leading verb; in conditional sentences (including conditional relative and temporal sentences), - in ordinary protasis ( $\S 50,2$ ), the Optative refers to the future (only more raguely than the Subjunctive); in general suppositions after verbs of past time ( $\$ 51$ ), it refers to indefinite past time. In independent sentences it refers to the future. E. g.
 in fear lest the control of affairs might escape him. Dem. Cor. 236, 19.
 $\pi \dot{i} \nu \theta^{\prime}$ €ंळpa, if ever (whenever) he went, he (always) saw all. Oid'
 $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu i o u s$, not even if all the Persians should come, should we sur-

 $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \iota \pi o \nu$, but when they were come out of danger and it was in their power (Present) to go to other commanders, (in all such cases) many


 one could make of them. Xen. An. III, 1, 40. Eï $\theta \in \sigma i$ тotoĩtus $\dot{\omega} \nu$ фìos $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ र́voco, may you become a friend to us. Xen. Hell. IV, 1, 35. Mя $\gamma \in \nu$ оьто, may it not happen.

See other examples under the rules in Chapter IV.
Note. When the Aorist Optative depends upon $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta}$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \dot{\prime}$, after that, it is referred by the meaning of the particle to a moment of time preceding that of the leading verb, like the Aorist Sub-
 had seen, he (always) went away. This gives the Aorist in translation the force of a Pluperfect. So after $\tilde{\epsilon} \omega s$, until, and in the other cases mentioned in § 20, N. 1. E. g.
 $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon$, he asked any whom he saw marching in good order, who they were; and after he had ascertained, he praised them. Хen. Cyr. V,

 morning untit the prison was opened (or had been opened); and after it was opened, we went in to Socrates. Plat. Phaed. 59 D. Oida$\mu o ́ \theta \in \nu$ à $\phi i \in \sigma a \nu, \pi \rho i ̀ \nu \pi a \rho a \theta \in \hat{i} \in \nu$ aùroîs äpıбтov, before they hait placed breakfast before them. Xev. An. IV, 5, 30.
2. From the general rule for indirect discourse ( $\$ 69$, 1) we derive the following special rules:-
(a.) First, if the Aorist Optative in indirect discourse represents an Aorist Indicative of the direct discourse, it denotes a momentary or single action which is past with reference to the leading verb. E. g.
${ }^{*} \mathrm{E} \lambda \epsilon \xi a \nu$ ör $\tau \iota \epsilon \epsilon \mu \psi \epsilon \iota \epsilon \sigma \phi \hat{s} \quad \delta$ ßaoı $\lambda \epsilon$ ús, they said that the king had sent them (i. e. they said $\begin{array}{c}\epsilon \\ \pi \\ \hline\end{array} \psi \in \nu \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ ó $\beta$ ßaci $\left.\lambda \epsilon u ́ s\right)$. Xen. Cyr. II,
 then it became known that the barbarians had sent the man. Xex. An.
 say that they had taken much of my property. Dem. Aph. I, 828, 25. 'Н $\rho \omega \dot{\tau} \tau \omega$ aùrò $\epsilon i$ à $\nu a \pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota \epsilon \nu, I$ asked him whether he had set sail (i. e. I asked him the question, àvé $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma a s ;$ ). Dem. Polycl. 1223, 21. 'Елєєрш́та тiva $\imath \delta o \imath$, he asked whom he had seen (i. e. tiva
 $\lambda a ́ \beta o t$.
(b.) But if it represents an Aorist Subjunctive of the direct discourse, it denotes a momentary or single action which is future with reference to the leading verb. E. g.
 adincy, they asked whether they shonld deliver up their city to the Corinthions (i. e. they asked the question, $\pi$ a $\rho a \delta \bar{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\prime} \iota \nu$; shall
 '́v'́ $\gamma к$ кı $\mu$ ' aùтóv, I looled to se: how I could best endure him (i. e. I ashed, tês द́v'́ $\gamma \kappa \omega$ aitóv; how can I endure him?). Eur. Hipp. 393. $\Delta \iota \epsilon \sigma \iota \omega ் \eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma к о \pi \bar{\omega} \nu$ ö ть àтокріраıто, he continued silent, thinking what he should answer (i. e. thinking, тi ãокрivшرaı;). Xen. Mem. IV, 2, 10.

Remark. Examples of the Aorist Optative representing the Aorist Subjunctive in a dependent lause of the direct discourse, to which the same principles apply, may be found under $\S 74,1$. The Aorist Indicative is, however, generally retained in dependent clauses of indirect quotations : see $\S 74,2$, with N. 1 .

Note 1. It will be seen by a comparison of the examples under $(a)$ and $(b)$, as in $\S 13,2$, Note 1 , that an ambiguity may sometimes arise from uncertainty whether the Aorist Optative stands for the Aorist Indicative, or for the Aorist Subjunctive in a question of doubt. Thus, $\eta \gamma \nu o ́ o v \nu ~ o ̈ ~ \pi \iota ~ \pi о \iota \eta$ $\sigma \in \iota a \nu$ might mean, they knew not what they had done (the Optative representing $\tau \dot{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \sigma \circ \dot{\eta} \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$; what did we do?), or they knew not what they should do (the Optative representing $\boldsymbol{T} i$ $\pi о i \eta \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$; what shall we do?). The context must decide in each case ; but in most cases the latter construction is intendes. (For the manner of avoiding a similar ambiguity, see § 74, 2, N. 1.)
§ ฉ2. The Aorist Imperative refers to a momentary or single action in future time; as eimé $\mu o \iota$, tell me; סóтe $\mu$ о тойто, give me this.
§ ロ3. The Aorist Infinitive has two distinet uses, corresponding to the first two uses of the Present Infinitive (§ 15) : -

1. First, in its ordinary use (either with or without the article), whenever it is not in indirect diseourse, it denotes a momentary or single action without regard to time, unless its time is especially defined by the context. E. g.




 as it is preferable for honorable men to due (Aor.) nobly rather than to continue living (Pres.) in disgrace, so also they thought that it was better (Pres.) for the pre-eminent among states to be (at once) made th disappear from the earth, than to be (once) seen to have fallen int.


 кaтa入रणac, asking them not to.allow them to be destroycd, but to bring about a reconciliation . . . . and to put an end to the war. Thuec.
 to acquire hnowledlge. Plat. Theaet. 209 E. Пáytes tò xata $\lambda_{\imath \pi \epsilon}$ ív
 them behind. Xen. Mem. II, 2, 3. Où $\gamma$ à $\rho$ tò $\mu \grave{\eta} \lambda a \beta \in i ̃ \nu$ tảqä̀̀
 Cyr. VII, 5, 82. Toû $\pi \iota \in \hat{\imath} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu i ́ a$, the desire of obtaining drink.

 $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, he will command him to go. Прòs $\tau \bar{\varphi} \mu \eta \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \bar{\eta} s \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon i a s$
 the embassy, he ransomed the captives. Dem. F. L. 412, 21. Ei $\pi p$ ò
 struction of the Phocians you should vote to go to their assistance.
 тотє $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi$ ӧтои тобойтоs $\pi \dot{\prime} \lambda є \mu$ оs катє́бтп, that no one may ever ask the reason, why, \&c. Thuc. I, 23. Cf. Dem. Cor. 295, 13 ; Eur. Orest. 1529.

Remark. The Remark which follows § 15, 1 applies also to the Aorist Infinitive.

Note 1. For a discussion of the time denoted by the Infinitive when it has the article and also a subject, sce Appendix, II.
 give an oracular response, are sometimes followed by the Aorist (as well as by the Present) Infinitive, which expresses the command, advice, or warning given by the oracle. These verbs here simply take the ordinary construction of verbs of commanding and advising. E. g.




 'E $\theta \epsilon \in \sigma \pi \imath \sigma \epsilon к о \mu i \sigma a \iota . .$. . каi єi $\sigma \iota \delta \epsilon i \nu$. Eur. Iph. Taur. 1014.


panful disease at home, or perish at the hands of the Trojans. I XIİ, 667. So aftor रeqбuós, Plat. Rep. III, 415 C.

For the Present see $\S 15,1$. N. 2.
Note 3. The Present of ailtós ciuc, I am the cause, is often used with reference to the past, where logically a past tense should be
 of aitıos $\bar{\eta} \nu$ тоút $\varphi$ gaveiv, he was the cause of his death. This often gives an ordinary Aorist Infinitive after this form the appearance of a verb of past time, like the Aorist Infinitive in indirect discourse. This will be explained in each case by mentally substituting a past tense for the present. E. g.
 $\gamma^{\epsilon}$ тиvas à $\pi o \lambda \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$, they are the cause why you were deceived and some even perished (i. e. they cansed you to be deceived and some even to perish). Lys. de Arist. Bon. 156 , 28. § 51 . Te



For the construction of the Infinitive see $\S 92,1$, Note 2 (end).
2. Secondly, the Aorist Infinitive in indirect discourse is used to represent an Aorist Indicative of the direct discourse, and therefore denotes a momentary or single action, which is past relatively to the leading verb. E. g.



 Kapßiogen, Cyrus is said to have been the son of Cambyses. Xen. Cyr.

 aùroîs $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \theta \dot{v} \mu \omega \mathrm{~s} \sigma \phi i \sigma \iota \pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \psi a \iota$ à $\nLeftarrow \pi \epsilon \mu \psi a \nu$, they were suspected of not having sent them with alacrity what they did send. Thuc. VI, 75.

Note 1. The principle stated in $\S 15,2$, N. 1, will decide in doubtful cases whether the Infinitive stands in indirect discourse or in the construction of $\S 23,1$.

Note 2. Verbs and expressions signifying to hope, to expect, to promise, and the like, after which the Infinitive in indirect discourse would naturally be in the Future (§ 27, N. 3), as representing a Future Indicative of the direct discourse, sometimes take the Aorist (as well as the Present) Infinitive (See § 15,2, N. 2.) E. g.


 $\chi \in \iota \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$, they hoped to subdue Phegium. Tnuc. IV, 24 . Oio'
 their becoming better. Dem. Phil. I, 40, 18. 'Ек $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ той какю̂s поáт-

 Licurg. in Leocr. p. 155, 30. § 60. (Cf. below, è $\lambda \pi$ is ék toû какюs
 aùtò̀s katayáyot oıkaסє, having promised not to stop until he had re-

 тй oikiạ. Xen. Hell. V, 4, 7.

Note 3. In all the cases which belong under Note 2, the leading verb by its own signification refers to the future, so that the expression is seldom ambiguous: thus int́ $\sigma \chi \in \tau o$ пoıî̃aı ean never mean anything but he promised to do, although the Aorist Infinitive apiears to represent a Futmre Indicative of the direct discourse, contrary to $\S 15,2$, N. 1. The case is different, however, when the Aorist Infinitive follows verbs whose signification has no reference to the future, hike $\nu o \mu i \zeta \omega$, olo $\mu a$, , or even $\phi \eta \mu i$, and still appears to represent a Future Indicative; e. g. where in Arist. Nub. 1141* SikávaбAai фaбi $\mu$ ol is said to mean, they say they will bring on
 $\mu o t$ means, they say they will deposit the Prytaneia. Still, unless we deeide to correct a large number of passages, against the anthority of the Mss. (which is actually done by many crities, espeeially Madvig), we must admit even this anomalous construction; although it is to be considered strictly exceptional, and is, moreover, very rare in comparison with the regular one with the Future or the Aorist with äv. E. g.

Фáтo $\gamma$ à $\tau i \sigma a \sigma \theta$ at àdeitas, for he said that he should punish the offenders. Od. XX, 121. (In II. III, 28, we have in most Miss. and editions фáтo $\gamma \dot{a} \rho \tau i \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ả $\lambda \epsilon i \tau \eta \nu$, in precisely the same sense.

 that Apries should not blame him; for he would not only be present himself, but would bring others. Ньт. II, 162. (Notiee the strance transition from the Aorist (?) to the two Futures.) $\Phi \eta \sigma i \nu$ ovió rì $\nu$

 462. (Here Hermann reads iкєтєúбєı, by conjecture.) 'Evó $\mu \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$


 बvyरє́vouto, and he thinks that this would be most likely to happen to him if he should join himself with your. Plat. Prot. 316 C. (ILere we should expect $\gamma \in \nu^{\prime} \epsilon \in \theta a \iota ~ a ̈ \nu$, to correspond to $\epsilon i \sigma v \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\nu}$ oito.)

[^2] (1872.)

Note 4．Verbs like $\lambda \epsilon \operatorname{\gamma } \boldsymbol{\omega}$ or $\epsilon i \pi o \nu$ ，when they signify to com． mand，can be followed by the Aorist（as well as the Present）Infin－ tive in its ordinary sense，referring to the future ；as has been stated in § 15,2, N．3．E．g．
 áкovtioat，now I would command you to join me in hurling，\＆c． Od．XXII，262．Пapaסoìvat $\lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota$ ，he tells us to give her up． Arist．Av． 1679.
§ $\boldsymbol{2}$ ．The Aorist Participle regularly refers to a momentary or single action，which is past with refer－ ence to the time of its leading verb．E．g．
 wish to go away．Taùta єinóvtes àmj̀ $\theta$ ov，having said this，they went away．Où mo入入oi фaivovtal $\xi v \nu \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\sigma} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ，not many appear

 from Arue settled Boeotia．Thuc．I，12．＇Aфiкєтo $\delta \epsilon i \rho o ~ t o ̀ ~ \pi \lambda о i ́ o \nu, ~$
 the Cephallenians having determined to sail in，although this man op－ posed it．Dem．in Zenoth．886，1．（Here $\gamma v o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ denotes time past
 $\gamma \nu o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ ，which is its leading verb．See § 16， 1.

Note 1．When the Aorist Participle is used to contain the leading idea of the expression，with $\lambda a \nu \theta a \nu \omega$ ，to escape the notice of，$\tau v \gamma \chi^{a} \nu \omega$ ，to happen，and $\phi \theta a ́ v \omega$ ，to get the slart of （ $\$ 112,2$ ），it does not denote time past with reference to the

 er were they gone；＇$\epsilon \tau v \chi o \nu ~ \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta o ́ v \tau \epsilon s$, they came in by chance，or they happened to come in．E．g．


 she knew it．Thuc．IV，133．＂ $\mathrm{E} \phi \theta \eta$ ó $\rho \in \xi \operatorname{a} \mu \in \nu$ os，he aimed a blow
 $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \chi \epsilon i \rho \eta \sigma a \nu$, for no sooner did this misfortune come upon me，than they
 ＇I $\kappa \theta \mu_{0} \hat{v}$ a a $\rho \in \lambda \theta$ o $\hat{v} \sigma a$ ，an army of no great size had by chance
 тоũ кalpoù $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ ，and he happened to come just at that nick of tine．
 $\dot{\eta} \gamma \mathrm{ov} \nu \mathrm{ral})$ ，they think they have chanced to accomplish only a lith：in comparison with their explectations．Id．I， 70.
 without his knowing it. Xen. An. I, 3, 17. Tois à $\nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi$ ous $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \in \nu$

 $\tau \in s$, lest, having become wiser than is proper, you shall become corrupted before you know it. Plat. Gorg. 487 D. (Here $\gamma \in \nu$ ó $\mu \in \nu 0$ is an ordinary Aorist, past with reference to the phrase $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon \hat{\delta} \iota a \phi \theta a-$
 shall first hit, \&e. II. XXIII, 805.

The last four examples show that this use of the Participle was allowed even when the whole expression referred to the future.
Note 2. A use of the Aorist Participle similar to that
 and éreciòav) to allow, and occasionally after other verbs which take the Participle in the sense of the Infinitive ( $\S 112,1$ ). In this construction the Aorist Participle seems to express merely a momentary action, the time being the same that the Aorist Infinitive would denote if it were u-ed in its place ( $\$ 23,1$ ). E. g.
 $\tau \mu \eta \theta \epsilon i ̂ \sigma a \nu$, àveiर $\bar{\nu}$, expecting that they would be unwilling to allow their land to be ravaged, \&e. Tiuc. II, 18. But in II, 20, we find the Aorist Infinitive, $\eta_{\eta} \lambda \pi \iota \zeta \epsilon \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu, \gamma \tilde{\eta} \nu$ oủk å̀ $\pi \epsilon \rho u \delta \epsilon \grave{\nu} \tau \mu \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$, refer-
 tas, do not allow us to be destroyed. Ньт. IV, 118. Ov́ $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon ่ \gamma \grave{\omega}$ тєpióqoual àmє $\lambda \theta \dot{o} \nu \tau a, I$ will by no means let you go. Arist.

 $\pi a \tau \rho i \delta a \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ aú $\bar{\omega} \nu \gamma \iota \gamma \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a \nu$. Isoc. Pan. p. 60 D. § 96 . (Here the Aorist Participle denotes the laying waste of the city (as a single act), while the Presents denote the continuous rayaying of the country, and the gradual coming on of a state of war. This is precisely the difference that there would be between the Present and Aorist Infinitive in a similar construction. See note on the passage, added to Felton's 3d ed. p. 99.) So $\pi \rho$ a $\theta$ '́ $\nu \tau$ a $\tau \lambda \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota$, endured to be sold. Aesch. Agam. 1041 ; and $\sigma \pi \epsilon$ ípas ${ }_{\epsilon} \tau \lambda a$. Sept. 754.

Instances occur of the Aorist Participle in this sense even with other verbs, denoting that in which the action of the verb consists; as єv̉ $\gamma^{\prime}$ '̇oingas áva $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a s \mu \epsilon$, you did well in reminding me. Plat. Phaed. 60 C. So ката $\psi \eta \phi \iota \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota, ~ A p o l . ~ 30 ~ D . ~$

Remark. If a reference to the past is required in the Participle with the verbs mentioned in Notes 1 and 2, the Perfect is used. The Present can of course be used to denote a continued action or state. E. g.

iust received their authority. Thuc. VI, 96. 'Eáv $\tau .5 \grave{\eta} \delta \iota \times \eta \kappa$ ©́s $\tau$



 Thuc. I, 108, the Aorist Participle is used in its ordinary sense, being past with reference to the time of the beginning of the peace to which $\omega \mu \circ \lambda o \gamma \eta \sigma a \nu$ refers. The meaning is, they obtained terms of peace, on condtion that they should first (i. e. before the peace began) tear down their walls, \&e. (Such passages are Tinuc. I, 101, $108,115,117$. See Krügeris Note on I, 108, and Madvig's Bemerkungen, p. 46.)

Note 4. For the use of the Aorist Infinitive and Participle with ${ }_{u}^{*} \nu$, see $\S 41,3$. For the Aorist Participle with ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \omega$, as a circumlocution for the Perfect, as Oaváaas $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \chi \omega$, see § 112, N. 7. For the rare use of the Aorist Participle with ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \sigma о \mu a \iota$ as a circumlocution for the Future Perfect, see § 29, N. 4.

## Future.

§ 25. 1. The Future denotes that an action will take place in time to come ; as $\gamma \rho a ́ \psi \omega, I$ shall write, or I shall be writing.

Note 1. The action of the Future is sometimes continued, and sometimes momentary: thus $\tilde{\epsilon} \xi \omega$ may mean either I shall have, or $I$ shall obtain; äp $\xi \omega$, I shall rule, or $I$ shall obtain power. E.g.

 äpgoviaı, we must distinguish between those who are to rule and those who are to be ruled. Plat. Rep. III, 412 B.

Note 2. The Future is sometimes used in a gnomic sense, to denote that something will always happen when an occasion offers. E. g.
'A $\downarrow \grave{\eta} \rho$ ó $\phi \epsilon \dot{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu$ кaì $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu \mu a \chi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$. Menand. Monost. 45.
Note 3. The Future is sometimes used to express what will hereafter be proved or recognized as a truth. This is analogous to the use of the Imperfect, $\S 11$, N. 6. E. g.
 will prove to be a philosopher. Plat. Rep. II, 376 C. See Od. II. 270,

Note 4. The Future is sometimes used in puestic $1 s$ of doubh where the Subjuactive is more common (§88). E. g.
 we kill our mother? Eur. El. 967. Пô tıs $\tau \rho \epsilon \mathcal{\psi} \in \tau a \iota$; whither shall one turn? $\Delta \epsilon \xi \in \sigma \theta \epsilon, \hat{\eta} \dot{a} \pi i \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$; will you receive lime, or shall we go away? Plat. Symp. 212 E. Eit' ${ }^{\prime \prime} \gamma \dot{\prime}$ oov $\phi$ єíoo $\mu a \iota$; Arist.
 tov́rous $\pi a \rho a \delta \epsilon \xi$ ó $\mu \epsilon \theta a$; what then shall we do? Are we to receive all these into the state? Plat. Rep. III, 397 D.

Note 5. (a.) The second person of the Future may express a concession, permission, or obligation, and is often a mild form of imperative. E. g.

 this. Arist. Nub. 1352. So in the common imprecations, àmo $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{i}} \boldsymbol{i} \theta \in$,
 Med. 1320.
(b.) A few instances occur in which the Future Indicative with u $\eta$ expresses a prohibition, like the Imperative or Subjunctive with $u \eta$ ( $\$ 86$ ). E. g.

 faith, and do not wish to know, \&e. Dem. Aristoe. 659, 15. 'Eày סè
 ädeıaע $\delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. Lys. Phil. § 13 . (In the preceding examples


 397. So perhaps $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \in \epsilon$ ís кađà $\pi \tau o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$. Aesch. Supt. 250.

These examples are sometimes explained by supposing an ellipsis
 бко́тєє). See § 45, N. 7.

Remark. The use of the Future stated in Note 5 gives the most satisfactory explanation of the Future with ov $\mu \dot{\eta}^{\prime}$ in prohibitions, especially in such expressions as oú $\mu \dot{\eta} \lambda a \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} к о \lambda o u-$
 $\mu \dot{\eta} \delta^{\circ}$ á $\psi \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon^{\prime} \pi \lambda \omega \nu$, do not bring your hand near me, nor touch m! garments. See § 89,2 , with Notes.

Note 6. The Future sometimes denotes a present intention, expectation, or necessity that something shall be done, in which sense the periphrastic form with $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ is more common. E. g.

 they are to endure hunger and thirst, \&e. Xen. Mem. II, 1, 17. (Here $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \lambda o v \sigma \iota \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \bar{\eta} \nu$ кai $\delta \iota \psi \hat{\eta} \nu$, \&c. would be more common, as in the last example under § 25,2 .) A $\bar{i} \rho \epsilon \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \kappa \tau \rho o \nu, \epsilon i \quad \mu \propto \chi \in \hat{i}$, raise your spur, if you are going to fight. Arist. Av. 759. The impor
tance of this distinction will be seen when we come to conditional sentences. (See § 49, 1, N. 3.)

A still more emphatic reference to a present intention is found in the question $\tau \boldsymbol{i} \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \xi \in \iota s$; what dost thou mean to say? often found
 1124.

Note 7. For the Future Indirative and Infinitive with $a v$, see $\S 37,2$, and $\S 41,4$. For the Future Indicative in protasis, see $\S 50,1, \mathrm{~N} .1$; in relative clauses expressing a purpose, \&c., see $\S 65,1$ and 2 ; with $\circ \dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta}$, sce § 89.
2. A periphrastic Future is formed by $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$ and the Present or Future (seldom the Aorist) Infinitive. This form sometimes denotes mere futurity, and sometimes intention, expectation, or necessity. E. g.
 intends to do this. So in Latin, facturus est for faciet. M $\epsilon \in \lambda \omega \hat{i} \mu a ̂ s$

 if the constitution is to be preserved. Plat. Rep. IL, 412 A.

Note 1. The Future Infinitive after $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ forms the only regular exception to the general principle of the use of that tense. (See $\S 27$, N. 1.) The Future and the Present seem to be used indiscriminately.

Note 2. The Imperfect (seldom the Aorist) of $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$ is used to express a past intention or expectation. E. g.
 $\sigma \pi \bar{\eta} \iota ~ \gamma \lambda a \phi \cup \rho \hat{\varrho}$, you surely were not intending to eat, \&c. Od. IX, 475
 Arist. Nub. 1301. Sce Il. II. 36.
§ $\mathbf{Z 6}$. The Future Optative in classic Greek is used unly in indirect discourse after secondary tenses, to represent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse. Even here the Future Indicative is very often retained in the indirect discourse. (See §69.) E. g.
 as to what remained, that he would himself attend to the affairs there,
 direct discourse, which miglit have been expressed by $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \in t$ in the indirect quotation. See in the same chapter of Thucydides,






 purpose of making a code of laws, ly which they were to govern. Xen. Hell. II, 3,11 . (IIere we have an indirect expression of the idea of the persons who chose them, of which the direct form is found


Remari. The term indirect discourse here, as elsewhere, must be understood to include, not only all cases of ordinary indirect quotation, introduced by ört or $\dot{\omega}$ s or by the Accusative and the Infinitive, after verbs of saying and thinking, but also all dependent clauses, in any sentence, which indirectly express the thoughts of any other person than the writer or speaker, or even former thoughts of the speaker himself. (Sce § 68.)

Note 1. The Future Optative is sometimes used in final and object clauses after secondary tenses; but regularly only with $\delta_{\pi} \pi \omega$ or $\bar{\sigma} \pi \omega s \mu^{\prime}$ after verbs of striving, \&c., occasionally with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ (or $\overline{0} \pi \omega s \mu^{\prime}$ ) after verbs of fearing, and very rarely (if ever) in pure final clauses. As these clauses express the purpose or fear of some person, they are in indirect discourse according to the Remark above. (See § 44, 2.)
(a.) The most common case of the Future Optative in sen-
 tenses of verbs signifying to strive, to take care, and the like; the Future Indicative in this case being the most common form in the construction after primary tenses, which here corresponds to the direct discourse. Thus, if any one ever said or thought, $\sigma к о \pi \bar{\omega}$ б̈п由s тоиิто $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \tau a \iota$, I am taking care that this shall happen, we can now say, referring to that thought,
 should happen, changing the Future Indicative to the Future Optative (§ 77). E.g.




 should know, \&c., but that all should think, \&c. Plat. Tim. 18 C (Here the second verb, $\nu c \mu \iota o v a r$, is retained in the Future Indica
tive, while the other, $\gamma \nu^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \tau a t$, is changed to the Optative.) See


 43. Other examples are Plat. Apol. 36 C ; Xen. Cyr. VIII, 1, 10, Hell. VIf, 5, 3 ; Isae. de Philoct. Hered. p. 59, $41 . \S 35$.

In this construction the Future Indicative is generally retained, even after secondary tenses. See $\S 45$.
(b.) The Future Optative is seldom found with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ or $\delta \pi \pi \omega$ $\mu \eta$ after secondary tenses of verbs of fearing, as here the Future Indicative is not common after primary tenses. E. g.

 Isoc. Trapez. p. 363 B. $\$ 22$. (Here the fear was expressed origi-



 15 D.

Here the Present or Aorist Optative, corresponding to the same tenses of the Subjunctive after primary tenses, is generally used. See § 46.
(c.) In pure Final clauses $(\$ 44,1)$ it would be difficult to find an example of ö̃os with the Future Optative, in which the weight of Mss. authority did not favor some other reading. Such is the case in Xen. Cyr. V, 4, 17, and in Dem. Phaenipp. 1040, 20. Still, there can be little doubt of the propriety of such a construction, as the Future Indicative with ö $\pi \omega s$ was in use (though rare) after primary tenses. ( $\$ 44,1, N .1$.)

The single example cited for the use of the simple $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ with the Future Optative in a pure final clause is Plat. Rep. III, 393 E :

 (Here there is another reading, $\epsilon \pi a \rho \kappa \epsilon \in \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, of inferior authority, which is adopted by Bekker.) If the reading є̇ єаркє́ $\sigma o \iota$ is retained (as it is by most editors), it can be explained only by assuming that
 We must remember that Plato is here paraphrasing Homer (II. I, $25-28$ ), and by no means literally. The Homeric line is M $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \dot{v}$


The other final partieles, iva and $\dot{\omega}$, which seem never to take the Future Indicative, of course do not allow the Future Optative. (See §44, 1, N 1.)

Note 2. Many authors, especially Thucydides, show a decided preference for the Future Indicative, even where the Future Optative might be used. As the tense was restricted to indirect diso
course, it was a less common form than the Present and Aorist, and for that reason often avoided even when it was allowed.
§ 27. The Future Infinitive denotes an action which is future with reference to the leading verb. E. g.
${ }^{*} \mathrm{E} \sigma \in \sigma \theta a i \quad \phi \eta \sigma \iota$, he says that he will be ; ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \in \sigma \theta a t}{ }^{\epsilon} \phi \eta$, he said that he would be ; Є$\epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \quad \phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$, he will say that he will be. Ho入入oús $\gamma \in$
 who would be willing. Xen. Cyr. III, 2, 26.

Note 1. The most common use of the Future Infinitive is in indirect discourse, after verbs of saying, thinking, \&c., to represent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse. (See the examples abore.) In other constructions, the Present and Aorist Infinitive, being indefinite in their time, can always refer to the future if the context requires it ( $\$ \S 15,1 ; 23,1$ ); so that it is seldom necessary to use the Future, unless emphasis is particularly required.

Therefore, after verbs and expressions whose signification refers a dependent Infinitive to the future, but which yet do not introduce indirect discourse, as verbs of commanding, wishing, \&c. (§ 15, 2, N. 1), the Present or Aorist Infinitive (not the Future) is regularly used. Thus the Greek would express they wish to do this not by ßov̀ovtaı тov̂тo $\pi \circ \iota \eta(\sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$,
 under $\S \S 15,1$ and 23,1 . So, when the Infinitive follows $\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ and other particles which refer it to the future, or is used to denote a purpose without any particle (§97), - and when it is used as a noun with the article, even if it refers to future time, - it is generally in the Present or Aorist, unless it is intended to make the reference to the future especially emphatic. See examples in Chapter V.

A single regular exception to this principle is found in the Future Infinitive after $\mu^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega(\S 25,2)$.

Note 2. On the other hand, when it was desired to make the reference to the future especially prominent, the Future Infinitive could be used in the cases mentioned in Note 1, contrary to the general principle.
(a.) Thus we sometimes find the Future Infinitive after
take 42 th present oise or THE TESSES. Than 11 3- (ken
 verbs and expressions signifying to wish, to be unwilling, to $\in 4$ (1) intend, to ask, to be able, and the like, where we should expect the Present or Aorist. This was particularly a favorite construetion with Thucydides. E. g.
 Tiluc. I, 27. 'Eßoúخoขто $\pi \rho$ оотı $\mu \omega \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \sigma \theta a \iota$. Id. VI, $57 . \mathrm{T} \dot{q}$


 Tout $\tau a i ̂ s ~ \nu a v \sigma \grave{\imath} \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{a} \dot{a} v \mu \epsilon i \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \in \iota \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$, to prevent them from being without spirit to attack them in ships. Id. VII, 21. Oür' á $\pi о к \omega \lambda \dot{v}-$
 $\sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ тà ס́o้vтa, if any one postpones doing his duty as far as this Dem. OI. III, 31, 1. (The ordinary construction would be àvaßád





 he might (if possible) find himself by some chance in Egypt, rather than wish to juilge unfairly. (Here roxєiv üע is used in nearly the same sense as the Future in the second example. In this example and some others here given there seems to be an approach to the construetion of indirect discourse.)

See also Thuc. IV, 115 and 121 ; V, 35 ; VII, 11 ; VIII, 55 and 74. In several of these passages the Mss. vary between the Future and Aorist, although the weight of authority is for the Future. See Kruger's Note on Tint. I, 27, where the passages of Thucydides are collected.
(b.) In like manner, the Future Infinitive is occasionally used for the Present or Aorist, after $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ and in the other constructions mentioned in Note 1, to make the idea of futurity more prominent. E. g.

 world in that case restore him. 'Thur. 111, 34. Taus of
 put them to death. 'Tnèc. VI, 61. So $\pi \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a u$, III, 26. 'E $\lambda \pi i \delta t$
 what was uncertain in the prospect of success. Thuc. II, 42. (Here кaтop $\theta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \nu$ is more explicit than the Present cato $\theta$ out would be rò d́фavès rove кatop日ov̀v would mean simply what was uncertain in
 $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v \omega$, I have courage and great confidence as to my convicting him. Dem. F. L. 342, 2. (Here most of the ordinary Mss. read $\epsilon^{\prime} \xi \in \lambda \epsilon \prime \gamma \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$.)

Note 3. The Future Infinitive is the regular form after verbs of hoping, expecting, promising, \&c., since it stands here in indirect discourse ( $\$ 15,2, N .1$ ). E. g.










Yet all of these verbs can take the Aorist or Present Infinitive without apparent change of meaning. They form an intermediate class between verbs which take the Infinitive in indirect discourse and those which do not. For examples of the Present and Aorist, see § 15,2, N. 2 ; and § 23,2, N. 2.
§28. The Future Participle denotes an action which is future with reference to the leading verb. E. g.

 I know that he will do this: oìòa тồto $\pi$ o $\frac{\dot{\eta}}{} \sigma \omega \nu$, I know that I shall
 this.

Note. For the various uses of the Future Participle, and examples, see Cbapter VI.

## Future Perfect.

§ 29. The Future Perfect denotes that an action will br already finished at some future time. It is thus a Perfect transferred to the future. E. g.
 $\gamma^{\prime} \notin \eta s \quad \pi a \rho ’ \dot{\epsilon} \mu о \grave{c}$ à $\nu a \gamma \in \gamma \rho a ́ \psi \in \iota$, you will have been enrolled as the

 had my uhipping for nothing, and you will have died. Arist. Nub. 1435
Note 1 The Future Perfect often denotes the contir
uance of an action，or the permanence of its results，in futurt time．E．g．
 $\psi \in \tau a \iota$ ，the memory of our power will be left to our posterity forever． Thuc．II，64．（Compare § 18，2．）

Note 2．The Future Perfect sometimes denotes the cer－ tainty or likelihood that an action will immediately take place， which idea is still more vividly expressed by the Perfect（§ 17， Note 6）．E．g．
 $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ ，all the present fear will be at once dispelled．Demr． Symmor．178，17．（Here the inferior Mss．have $\lambda$ é $\lambda v \tau a \ell$ ，which would have the same force，like ${ }^{\circ} \lambda \omega \lambda a$ quoted in $\S 17, \mathrm{~N} .6$ ．） Фрá乡є，каì $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a ́ \xi \in \tau a \iota$ ，speak，and it shall be no sooner said than
 $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ov̇ठ́єis $\lambda \in \lambda \in i \psi \in \tau a \iota$ ．Xen．An．II，4， 5.

Note 3．The Future Perfect can be expressed by the Perfect Participle and ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ ．In the active voice this com－ pound form is the only one in use，except in a few verbs E．g．
 $\mu a r a i \omega \nu \dot{a} \pi \eta \lambda \lambda a \gamma \mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{c}^{\prime}$ o七，we shall have already resolved to do our duty and shall have been freed from vain reports．Dem．Phil．I，54， 22．（See § 17，N．2）．

Note 4．A circumlocution with the Aorist Participle and所ода is sometimes found，especially in the poets．E．g．
 C． 816 ．

Note 5．（a．）When the Perfect is used in the sense of a Present （ $\$ 17$, N．3），the Future Perfect is the regular Future of that tense． E．g．

Kєк $\lambda_{\eta} \sigma о \mu \iota \iota, \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a \iota, \dot{a} \phi \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\xi} \omega_{\omega} I$ shall be named，I shall re－ ruember，I shall withdraw，\＆e．
（b．）With many other verbs，the Future Perfect differs very slightly，if at all，from an ordinary Future．Thus，$\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \sigma_{\sigma o \mu a t ~ i s ~ t h e ~}^{\text {a }}$ regular Future Passive of $\pi \iota \pi \rho a \dot{\sigma} \kappa \omega$ ．Still，where there is another form，the Futwre Perfect is generally more emphatic，and may be explained by Note 1 or Note 2.

Note 6．The Future Perfect of the dependent moods is rare， except in the verbs referred to in Note 5 ．When it occurs，it presents no peculiarity，as it bears the same relation to the Indicative which the corresponding forms of the Future would bear．E．g．
 these things will have been accomplished within two or three days. Dem. F. I. 364, 18. (Here the direct discourse was $\pi \epsilon \pi \beta a \dot{\xi} \epsilon \tau a l$.)

Remark. It must be remembered that, in most cases in whicls the Latin or the English would use a Future Perfect, the Greeks use an Aorist or even Perfect Subjunctive. (See § 18, 1, and § 20, N. 1, with the examples.)

## Gnomic and Iterative Tenses.

§ 30. 1. The Aorist and sometimes the Perfect Indicative are used in animated language to express general truths. These are called the gnomic Aorist and the gnomic Perfect, and are usually to be translated by our Present.

These tenses give a more vivid statement of general truths, by employing a distinct case or several distinct cases in past time to represent (as it were) all possible cases, and implying that what has occurred will occur again under similar circumstances. E. g.

 $\nu i k \eta \nu$, who terrifies, and snatches away. II. XVII, 177. (See Note 2.)






 $\rho \omega \sigma a \nu \tau \eta \nu \nu \rho \epsilon \in i a \nu$, they supply the deficiency (as ofien as one occurs).
 $\theta \in \sigma u \nu$, i. e. they impose a penalty upon exery one who transgresses.


 $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon i p \epsilon \iota \tau \in \pi \sigma \lambda \lambda \grave{a}$ каì $\eta \delta \grave{\delta} \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$. PLat. Symp. 188 A. "Oтav




 Perfect and Aorist are used together, in nearly the same sense, he

$\sigma \iota \nu$, i. e. many always have suffered, and many do suffer. Xen
 $\mu \eta \tau a \iota$. Thuc. II, 45.

Remark. The gnomic Perfect is not found in Homer.
Note 1. The sense, as well as the origin of the constravtion, is often made clearer by the addition of such words as тод入áкıs, $\eta \not \partial \eta$, or oű $\pi \omega$. Such examples as these form a simple transition from the common to the gnomic use of these tenses: -
 have already arisen, implying, it often happens. Thuc. II, 89. Mé $\lambda$ -


 in which such a man has become rich the next day, \&c. Pirilem. Fr.

 6. (Krüger, $\S 53,10$, A. 2.)

Note 2. General truths are more commonly expressed in Greek, as in English, by the Present. (See § 10, N. 1.) Examples of the Present and Aorist, used in nearly the same zense in the same sentence, are given under $\S 30,1$. The gnomic Aorist is, however, commonly distinguished from the Present, either by being more vivid, or by referring to an aetion which is (by its own nature) momentary or sudden, while the Present (as usual) implies duration. See the second and sixth examples under $\S 30,1$.

Note 3. An Aorist resembling the gnomic Aorist is very common in Homer, in similes depending on past tenses, where it seems to stand by assimilation to the leading verb. It is usually to be translated by the Present. E. g.
${ }^{*} \mathrm{H} \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \delta{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \omega \mathrm{s}$ ö $\tau \epsilon \tau \iota s \delta \rho \hat{s}{ }^{\eta} \eta \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$, and he fell, as when an oak falls (literally, as when an oak once fell). Il. XVI, 389.

Note 4. It is very doubtful whether the Imperfect was ever used in a gnomie sense, so as to be translated by the Present.

Note 5. An instance of the gnomic Aorist in the Infinitive 19 found in SoriI. Aj. 1082:-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ' } \mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\xi} \text { oùpi } \omega \nu \text { रि }
\end{aligned}
$$

 being, believe that that city must at some time fall. (See Schneidewin's note.) So probably in Plat. Phaedr. 232 B : $\dot{\eta} \gamma o \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \varphi, ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~$


Even the Aorist Participle seems to be occasionally used in the


 although in their oun lifetimes they are offensive, yet often leave to some who come after them a desire to claim connexion with them, even where there is no ground for it.

Note 6. The gnomic Perfect is found in the Infinitive in Dem.

 aside, and is of no account.
2. The Imperfect and Aorist are sometimes used with the particle ${ }^{\circ} \nu \quad$ to denote a customary action, being equivalent to our phrase in narration, "he would often do this," or "he used to do it." E. g.
$\Delta \iota \eta \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \omega \nu \dot{a} \nu$ aùroùs $\tau i ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma o t \epsilon \nu, I$ used to ask them ( $I$ would ask them) what they said. Plat. Apol. 22 B. Eit tues "óaév ty tois
 friends in any way victorious, they would be encouraged (i. e. they were)

 aften to hear you, \&c. Arist. Lysist. 511. Eit ris autâ $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ tov
 пávтa tò̀ $\lambda$ óyov, he always brought the whole discussion back to the

 |ä $\lambda \lambda o t s \mathfrak{a}^{\nu} \nu \ddot{\epsilon} \lambda \in \xi \in \nu$. Xen. Cyr. VII, 1, 10.

This construction must be carefully distinguished from that with $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ in ordinary apodosis (§ 49,2$)$. For the iterative Imperfect transferred to the Infinitive, sce § 41, N. 3.

Note 1. (a.) The Ionic iterative Aorist in $-\sigma \kappa о \nu$ and - $\sigma \kappa о ́ \mu \eta \nu$ expresses the repetition of a momentary action; the Imperfect with the same endings expresses the repetition of a continued action. E. g.



(b.) In Homer, however, the iterative forms are someumes used in nearly or quite the same sense as the ordinary forms;


 $\nabla \lambda \eta \sigma i o \nu i \grave{j} \epsilon, \mu a ̈ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a \delta_{\epsilon} \mu \iota \nu \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \sigma \kappa \in \nu$. Od. VII, 171.

Note 2. Herodotus sometimes uses the iterative forms in -बков and $-\sigma \kappa \delta \not \mu \eta \nu$ vith $\not{\alpha} \nu$, in the construction of $\S 30,2$. (He uses the i.erative $A(r i s t$ in only two passages, in both with $a \nu \nu$.) E. g.





## I)ependence of Moods and Tenses.

§ 31. 1. In dependent sentences, where the conetruction allows either a Subjunctive or an Optative, the subjunctive is used if the leading verb is primary, and the Optative if it is secondary. (See § 8, 2.) E. g.

Прáттоvб८v â à $\boldsymbol{\beta o v} \lambda \omega \nu \tau a \iota$, they do whatever they please: but ётлаттоу â $\beta$ ои́ $\lambda$ оьขто, they did whatever they pleased.
2. In like manner, where the construction allows sither an Indicative or an Optative, the Indicative follows primary, and the Optative follows secondary tonses. E. g.



Note 1. To these fundamental rules we find one special exception:-

In indirect discourse of all kinds (including sentences denoting a purpose or object after ïva, $\mu \dot{\eta}$, \&c.), either an Indicative or a Subjunctive may depend upon a secondary ten ee, lu order that the mood and tense actually used by the speaker may be retained in the indirect discourse. (See § 69.) E. g.


 thought, фоßой $\mu \iota \iota \grave{\eta} \gamma^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\nu} \eta \tau=1$ ). (See § 44, 2.)

Note. 2. An only apparent exception to these rules occurs when either an apodosis with ${ }^{\prime 2} \nu$, or a verb expressing a wish, stands in a dependeni sentence. In both these cases the form which would
have been required in the apodosis or in the wish, if it had been independent, is retained without regard to the leading verb. It will be obvious from the principles of such sentences (Chapter IV), that a change of mood would in most cases change the whole nature of the apodosis or wish. E. g.
 know how any one could show this more clearly. Dex. Aph. I, 828 ,


 $\tilde{\epsilon} \xi \in \iota \nu$; Dem. Aph. II, 842, 14.

The learner needs only to be warned not to attempt to apply the rules § $31,1,2$ to such eases as these. See $\S 44,1$, N. 3 (3).

Note 3. A few other unimportant exceptions will be noticed as they occur. See, for example, § 44, 2, Note 2.

Remark. It is therefore of the highest importance to ascertain which tenses (in all the mools) are to be considered primary, and which secondary; that is, which are to be followed, in dependent sentences, by the Indicative or Subjunctive, and which by the Optative, where the rules of $\S 31$ are applied. The general principle, stated in §8, 2, applies ehiefly to the Indicative, and even there not without some important modifications.
§ 32. 1. In the Indicative the general rule holds, that the Present, Perfect, Future, and Future Perfect are primary tenses, and the Imperfect, Pluperfect, and Aorist are secondary tenses.
2. But the historical Present is a secondary tense, as it refers to the past; and the gnomic Aorist is a primary tense, as it refers to the present.

See the first example under $\S 10,2$, where an historical Present is followed by the Optative; and the sixth, seventh, and eighth examples under $\S 30$, 1 , where gnomic Aorists are followed by the Subjunctive.
3. (a.) The Imperfect Indicative in protasis or apodosis denoting the non-fulfilment of a condition (§ 49, 2), wheu it refers to present time, is a primary tense. E. g.
 in my letter how great services I would render you, if I knew, \&c. Dem. F. L. 353, 24. Пávv à $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \phi o \beta o u ́ \mu \eta \nu, \mu \grave{\eta}$ à $\pi o \rho \eta \eta^{\eta} \sigma \omega \sigma \iota ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu$.
 к. $\tau$. $\lambda$., I should be very much afraid to speak, lest I should seem, \&c.
 Dem. Aristocr. 623, 11.
(b.) On the other hand, the Aorist Indicative in the same sense in protasis and apodosis, and also the Imperfect when it refers to the past, are secondary tenses. E. g.



 (Here the Suljunctive $\delta \dot{v} \nu \eta \tau a \iota$ will be explained by $\S 44,2$, but the Optative shows that the leading verb is secondary.)*
§33. All the tenses of the Subjunctive and Imperative are primary, as they refer to present or future time. E. g.
 the way. Thuc. II, 11.
§31. As the Optative refers sometimes to the future and sometimes to the past, it exerts upon a dependent verb sometimes the force of a primary, and sometimes that of a secondary tense.

When it refers to the past, as in general suppositions after $\epsilon i$ and relatives, depending on past tenses ( $\$ \S 51$ and 62 ), it is of course secondary, like any other form which refers to past time.

When it refers to the future, it is properly to be considered primary. In many cases, however, a double construction is allowed: on the principle of assimilation the Greeks preferred the Optative to the Subjunctive in certain clauses depending

[^3]on an Optative, the dependen! verb referring to the future like the leading verb, and differing little from a Subjunctive in such a position. This assimilation takes place regularly in protasis and conditional relative clauses depending on an Optative; but seldom in final and object clauses after ìva, ö $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$, $\mu \dot{\eta}$, \&c., and very rarely in indirect quotations or questions.

The three classes of sentences which may depend on an Optative referring to the future are treated separately : -

1. (a.) In protasis and in conditional relative sentences depending upon an Optative which refers to the fiture, the Optative is regularly used to express a future condition, rather than the Subjunctive. E. g.
 able, if you should ever prosper. Aescu. Prom. 979. 'А $\nu \delta \rho i \quad \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ к'

 ooфòs єï; for how should any one be wise in those things which he did






 these! Minn. Fr. I, 2. (Here öтaע $\mu \eta к є \dot{\tau} \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta$ might be used without ehange of meaning. But ö $\tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota$, found in the passage as quoted by Plutarch, would refer to the present in classic Greek.)
(b.) On the other hand, the dependent verb is sometimes in the Subjunetive (or Future Indicative with $\epsilon$ ), on the ground that it follows a tense of future time. This happens especially after the Optative with äv used in its sense approaching that of the Future Indicative ( $\S 52,2, \mathrm{~N} ; \S 54,1, b$.) E. g.
 (shall) learn this for me, I would not pay, \&e. Arist. Nub. 116. "H $\nu$


 this peace, as long as a single Athenian shall be left. Den. F. L. 345,

 as each one of you would be ashamed to leave the post at which he might be placed in war. Aeschis. Cor. § 7. (Here $\hat{\eta} \nu \tau a \chi \theta \varepsilon i \eta$ would he
 $\delta \nu v \eta \theta \epsilon i s \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \xi \epsilon \iota$ Dem. Ol. I, 16, 25 . Many such examples may be explained equally well by § 54, 1 (a).

Note. It will be understood that no assimilation to the Optative can take place when the protasis (after $\epsilon i$ or a relative) eonsists of a present or past tense of the indieative, as in this ease a change to the Optative would involve a change of time. See § 64, Rem 2.
2. In final and object clauses after $\imath \nu a, ~ o ̈ \pi \omega s, \mu \dot{\eta}, \& \mathrm{c}$., the Subjunctive (or Future Indicative) is generally used when the leading verb is an Optative referring to the future; the Optative, however, sometimes occurs. The preference for the Subjunctive here can be explained on the general principle (§ 31, Note 1, and § 44, 2). E. g.



 रoì каì 入oxayoì à $\tau \tau \times a \tau a \sigma \tau a \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$. Xen. An. III, $1,38$.


 Oecon. VII, 39. Other examples of the Optative are Aesch.
 $\pi о \mu \epsilon \nu)$; Soph. Phil. 325 ; Eur. Hec. 839 ; Den. Cyr. I, 6, 22.

Note. In relative sentences expressing a purpose the Future Indicative is regularly retained, even after past tenses of the Indicative. For exceptional cases of the Optative in this construction, depending on the Optative with $a \partial \nu$, see $\S 65,1$, Notes 1 and 3.
3. In indirect quotations and questions. depending upon an Optative which refers to the future, the Indicative is the only form regularly used to represent an Indicative of the direct discourse. But in indirect questions the Optative is sometimes tound representing a dubitative Subjunctive of the direct question (§ 88). E. g.



 you urould not know what to do with yourself. Plat. Crit. 45 B. Oús
 õ $\tau \iota \in \ddot{i} \pi o \iota s$. Id. Gorg. 486 B . The direct questions here were $\tau t$
 be retained in this construction, even after past tenses. See $\S 71$.

Note. In Dem. Megal. 203,12, we find a case of the Optative in


no other readings: and it is doubtful whether we must consider it as an exceptional case of assimilation (we could not say this, that we wished, \&c.), or emend it, either by reading $\beta$ ow $\lambda \rho_{\mu} \epsilon \theta a$ (as proposed by Madvig, Bemerk. p. 21), or by inserting ar $\nu$, which may easily have
 In Plat. Rep. VII, 515 D, we find in the best Mss T Ti av oíct aùtòv
 $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi$ ot, what do you think he would say, if any one should tell him. that all that time he had been seeing foolish phantoms, but that now he sees more correctly? Some Mss. read $\beta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota$.
 dive in the indirect question represents $\mu$ '́ $\tau \in \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, but oủk ${ }^{\text {ap }} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma \nu 0 i \eta s$ here refers to the past, meaning you would not have known. (See § 49, 2, N. 6.)
§35. 1. The Present, Perfect, and the Futures in the Infinitive and Participle regularly denote time which is merely relative to that of the leading verb of the sentence. They are therefore primary when that is primary, and secondary when that is secondary. E. g.

Boú入єтає $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ ai тoîtó '̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$, he wishes to tell what this is.


 $\beta o v ं \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$, he says he will do whatever you shall wish. "E $\bar{\eta} \eta \pi o \iota \eta-$ $\sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ on $\tau \ell \beta$ ovi入oı $\sigma \theta \epsilon$, he said he would do whatever you should wish.
 тí єïך. Мє́ข


Note. When the Present Infinitive and Participle represent the Imperfect (without ${ }^{a} \nu$ ) they are secondary without regard to the leading verb. E. g.
 ingly do you think they heard it, when any one said anything? See this and the other examples under § 15,3 , and $\S 73,2$.
2. When the Aorist Infinitive in itself does not refer to any definite time, it takes its time from the leading verb (like the Present), and may be either primary or secondary. But when it refers to time absolutely past, it is always a secondary tense. E. g.

Boúnєтat $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \nu a \iota ~ \tau i ́ ~ \tau o u ̂ \tau o ́ ~ ' ̇ \sigma \tau \iota \nu, ~ h e ~ w i s h e s ~ t o ~ l e a r n ~ w h a t ~ t h i s ~ i s . ~ . ~$
 (§ 23,1 .)

But $\phi \eta \sigma i \quad \gamma \nu \omega \overline{\nu a \iota} \tau i$ roìto $\epsilon i \not \eta$, he says that he learned what this
 what thes was. (Гvêvat has the force of a primary tense in the first example, that of a secondary tense in the others.)
3. The Aorist Participle refers to time past relatively to the leading verb. It is therefore secondary when the leading verb is past or present and the Participle refers to time absolutely past; but it may be primary when the leading verb is future, if the Participle refers to time absolutely future. E. g.





4. The tenses of the Infinitive and Participle with ä̉v are followed, in dependent clauses, by those constructions that would have followed the finite moods which they represent, in the same position. See § $41, \S 32,3$, and § 34 .

## CHAPTER III.

## THE PARTICLE *AN.

§ 36. The adverb ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$ (Epic $\kappa \epsilon \in$, Doric $\kappa \alpha ́$ ) has two uses, which must be carefully distinguished.

1. In one use, it denotes that the action of the verb to which it is joined is dependent upon some condition, expressed or implied. This is its force with the secondary tenses of the Indicative, and with the Optative, Infinitive, and Participle: with these it forms an apodosis, and belongs strictly to the verb.
2. In its other use, it is joined regularly to $\epsilon i, i f$, and io all relatives and temporal particles, (and occasionally to the fimal particles $\dot{\omega}$, ó ${ }^{\prime} \pi \omega \varsigma$ and ${ }^{\circ} \phi \rho \rho a$,) when these
words are followed by the Subjunctive. Here it seems to belong entirely to the relative or particle, with which it often coalesces, as in $\frac{\epsilon}{} a ́ \nu$, ó óta $\nu, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta a ́ \nu$.
Remark 1. The rules, $\S 36,1,2$, include only the constructions which are in grod use in Attic Greek. For the Epic use of äv with the Subjunctive in apodosis, see § 38, 2 ; for ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$ with the Future Indicative, see § $37,2$.
Remark 2. There is no word or expression in English which can be used to translate äv. In its first use ( $\$ 36,1$ ) we express it by the mood of the verb which we use; as 及où outo äy, he would wish̆. Iu its sccond use, with the Subjunctive, it has no force that can be made perceptible in English. Its peculiar use can be understood only by a study of the various constructions in which it occurs. These are enumerated below, with references (when it is necessary) to the more full explanation of cach in Chapter IV.

## § 37. 1. The Present and Perfect Indicative are

 never used with ${ }^{\circ} \nu \nu$.When this seems to occur. there is always a mixture of construc-


 was substituted: the meaning is. if I should suddenly be asked, I

 (it would seem to follow that) they all have, \&e. Examples like the last are very conmon in Aristotle, who seems to use kàp $\epsilon i$ almost like кai $\epsilon i$, without regard to the mood of the leading verb.
Remark. Constructions like those mentioned in § 42. 2. Note, must not be referred to this head. For oỉk ä้ $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \delta$ оккí civat is never it would not seem to me to be; but always, it dues not seem to me that it would le; äy belonging to civau.
2. The Future Indicative is often used with ${ }_{a}^{\prime \prime}$ or $\kappa \epsilon$ ' by the early poets, especially Homer. The addition of $\stackrel{y}{a} \nu$ makes the Future more contingent than that tense naturally is, giving it a force approaching that of the Optative with ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\prime 2} \nu$ in apodosis (§ 39). E. g.






oova ८, i. e. who will honor me when occasion offers. II. I, 174. E.
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ orí $\epsilon \tau a \iota \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$. Od. XVII, 539 . (In this passage the Future with к' is used nearly in the sense of the Optative, corresponding to the Optatives in the Protasis. 'Amoziogtal may also be Aorist Sub-

 Mss.)

Note 1. The use of áv with the Future Indicative in Attic Greek is absolutely denied by many critics, and the number of the examples cited in support of it have been greatly diminished by the more careful revision of the texts of the Attic writers. Still several passages remain, even in the best prose, where we must either emend the text against the authority of the Mss., or admit the construction as a rare exception to the general rule. E. g.


 і́ $\mu і \nu \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu \pi \rho о \sigma \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$. Thuc. I, 140. (Here most editors read

 likely to come hither. Plat. Rep. X, 615 D . (Here the only other reading is $\vec{\eta} \xi o \iota$, which is of course corrupt.) "E ${ }^{\text {" }} \boldsymbol{\eta} \ldots . . . \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$
 $\pi а \nu$ та́табъ $\delta \iota a \phi \theta a \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma о \nu \tau a \iota$. Id. Apol. 29 C.

The construction is perhaps less suspicious in the dramatic chorus, which belongs to lyric poetry. See the last example under $\S 37,2$.

Sce $\S 41,4$, on the Future Infinitive and Participle with $a \not a \nu$.
Note 2. The form $k \epsilon$ is much more common with the Future in Homer than the form ${ }^{\prime a} \nu$.
3. The most common use of $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} \nu$ with the Indicative is with the secondary tenses, generally the Imperfect and Aorist, in apodosis. It here denotes that the condition upon which the action of the verb depends is not or was not fulfilled. Sce § 49, 2.

Note. The Imperfect and Aorist are sometimes used with ãy in an iterative sense; which construction must not be confounded with that just mentioned. See § 30, 2.
§3S. 1. In Attic Greek the Subjunctive is used with $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu$ only in the cases mentioned in § 36,2 ; never in independent sentences. See $\S 47,2, \S 501 \S 51$,
and $\S 60,3$. For the occasional use of ${ }^{2} \nu$ in final clauses, see § 44,1 , Note 2.
2. In Epic poctry, when the Subjunctive is used nearly in the sense of the Future Indicative (§ 87), it sometimes takes $\kappa \prime$ or ${ }^{\prime} \nu{ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$. The combination forms an apodosis, with a protasis expressed or understood, and is nearly or quite equivalent to the Future Indicative with $\stackrel{y}{\nu} \nu$. E. g.
 give her up, I will take her myself. II. I, 137. (Cf. Il. I, 324.)

See § 50, 1, Note 2 (a).
Note. This Epic use of $\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ or $\not \approx \boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ with the Subjunctive must nut be confounded with the ordinary construction of § $38,1$. In the latter the äy is closely connected with the particle or relative, while in the former it is joined with the verb, as it is with the Indicative or Optative. It in fact bears more resemblance to the ordinary Optative with $\not \approx \nu$ in apodosis in Attic Greek, than to any other Attic construction.
§ 39. The Optative with $\stackrel{y}{\prime} \nu$ always forms an apodosis, to which a protasis must be eitloer expressed or implied. It denotes what would happen, if the condition (expressed or implied) upon which the action of the verb depends should ever be fulfilled. See § 50 , 2 , and $\S 52,2$.

Remark. Such constructions as are explained in §44, 1, N. 3, $a$, and $\S 74,1, N .2$, are no exception to this rule, as there $\nRightarrow \nu$ does not belong to the verb.

Note. The Future Optative is not used with ẫv. See § 26.
§40. The Imperative is never used with $\stackrel{y}{\nu} \nu$.
Nóte. All passages formerly cited for ${ }_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{a} \nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ with the Imperative are now emended on Mss. authority, or otherwise satisfactorily explained. See Passow, or Liddell and Scott, s. v. "Av.
§41. The Infinitive and Participle can be used with $\stackrel{y}{a} \nu$ in all cases in which a finite verb, if it stood in their place, would be accompanied with $\stackrel{a}{ } \nu$. This com
bination always forms an apodosis (except in its itera. tive sense, Note 3): it can never form a protasis, as the finite verb never has $\stackrel{\not \partial}{\nu} \nu$ joined to itself in protasis. (Sec § 36, 2.)

Each tense of the Infinitive and Partieiple with ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$ furms the same kind of apodosis which the correspondiny tense of the Indicative or Optative would form in its place. The context must decide whether the Indicative or the Optative is represented in each case.

1. The Present Infinitive and Participle (which represent also the Imperfect, by $\S 15,3$, and $\S 16,2$ ), when they are used with $a \sim \nu$, may be equivalent either to the Imperfect Indicative with ă $\nu$ or to the Present Optative with ẳv. They can represent no other form, as no other form of the Presunt is used with ${ }^{a r \nu}$ in apodosis in the finite moods. E. g.
 they would (now) be free, if they had done this ( $\epsilon^{3} \nu \mathrm{vat} a \vec{\nu} \nu$ representing
 mpágєua, he says that they would (hereafter) be free, if they should do

 think he would not have taken care and have received the pay? Dem. Timoth. 1194, 20. (Here the direct discourse would be


 $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota \eta \dot{\eta} \dot{i} \kappa 0 \cup \nu$ ois $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\eta} \epsilon \sigma a \nu$, that they would not join in experditions, unless those against whom they were marching had wronged them. Tuuc. III, 11. (Here $\xi v \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon \cup ́ \epsilon \iota \nu$ ă $\nu$ represents $\xi v \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \rho a ́ \tau \epsilon v o \nu a ̆ \nu$.




 (i. e. ${ }_{\boldsymbol{j}} \mu \in \nu \vec{\prime} \boldsymbol{a}$ ), whereas we should justly be among those who inflict

 uould have been unable to bring aid (sc. if he had done it). Thuc. I
 might be able (if I should wish) to say many other things about it, -
 $\mu \eta \chi \dot{a} \eta \eta a \operatorname{\pi otki\lambda o\nu }$ (i. e ôs ì ф'́puts), thou who wouldst derive, \&e Solif. O. C. 761.
2. The Perfect Infinitive and Participle (which represent also the Pluperfect, by $\S 18,3$, Rem.), when they are used with $a \not a$, may be equivalent either to the Pluperfect Indicative with ăv or to the Perfect Optative with äv. E. g.

 (sc. $\phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ä̀ $\boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathrm{s})$, if those at Marathon and Salamis had not exhibited those deeds of valor in their behalf, any one would say that all these would have been captured by the barbarians. Den. F. L. 441,


 suffered sufficicht punislment, if you after hearing them should condemn them. Lys. XXVII, § 9 . (Here the protasis in the Optative
 if the protasis lad been $\epsilon i$ кaтє $\psi \eta \phi i \sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon$, if you had condemnert them,





These constructions are of course rare, as the forms of the finite moods here represented themselves seldom occur.
3. The Aorist Infinitive and Participle with äy may be equivalent either to the Aorist Indicative with äy or to the Aorist Optative with äp. E. g.



 $\xi v v \epsilon \in \beta$ ), but unless there had been an earthquake, it does not seem to me that such a thing could have by any chance happened. Thuc. III,




 $\lambda є \tau о$ àmotaveiv, whereas he might easily have been acquitted, \&c. Xen.


 $a ̈ \nu)$, 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

 surò $\lambda \eta \phi \theta \epsilon$ in $)$, seeing that it would easily be taken, \&c. Id. IU. 42
 are not real, and which never could happen (i. e. ov̉к å̀ $\gamma$ ধ́vo七тo). Id. VI, 38.
4. The Future Infinitive and Participle with $a \not v y$ would bo equivalent to the Homeric construction of ${ }_{a} \nu \nu$ with the Future Indicative (§37, 2). As, however, äy is not found in Homer with either the Future Infinitive or the Future Participle (see below, Note 2), this construction rests chiefly on the authority of passages in Attic writers, and is subject to the same doubt and suspicion as that of the Future Indicative with äy in those writers. (See §37, 2, Note 1.) In the following passages it is still retained in the best editions, with strong support from Mss.
 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \chi \omega \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$. THOc. II, 80. (Here the direct discourse would regularly have beer either in the Fut. Ind. without ${ }_{a} \nu$, or in the Aor. Opt. with ${ }^{a} \nu$. .) The same may be said of Thuc. V, 82, $\nu o \mu i \zeta \omega \nu \mu^{\prime} \gamma \iota \sigma \tau o \nu \hat{a} \nu \sigma \phi \bar{s} \dot{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$. (Here one Ms. reads by correction $\omega \phi \epsilon \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a l$.) See also Tnuc. VI, 66 ; VIII, 25 and 71.




 тоเทŋбаутаs.)

Note 1. As the Future Optative is never used with äy (§ 39 , Note), this can never be represented by the Future Infinitive or Participle with $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu$.

Note 2. The Participle with $\xi_{2}$ or $\kappa^{\prime}$ is not found in Homer or Pindar. The Infinitive with ${ }^{\prime} \nu$ occurs in these poets very seldom, and only in indirect discourse. E. g.
 (The direct discourse is given in the words of Achilles in vs. 417. каі̀ $\delta^{\prime}$ àv . . . $\left.\pi а р а \mu \nu \theta \eta \sigma а і \mu \eta \nu.\right) ~$

Note 3. The Infinitive with ${ }^{\prime} \nu$ sometimes represents an iterative Imperfect or Aorist Indicative with ${ }_{a}^{\prime} \nu(\S 30,2)$. This must bo earefully distinguished from an apodosis. E. g.

[^4]Note 4 The Infinitive with ây commonly stands in indirect discourse after a verb of saying or thinking, as in most of the examples given above. Oecasionally, however, it is found in other constructions, where the simple Present or Aorist Infinitive is regularly used. E. g.
 avitous $\dot{\rho} i \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, so that they would most gladly have thrown themselves into cold water. Tu"c. II, 49. (" $\Omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ pítтє $\epsilon$ would be the ordinary expression here: with $\not \partial \nu$ it represents an Imperfect Indicative,

 them in, even if they should be victorious. Id. VII, 6 . See § 27 , N. 2 (a), for an example of $\beta$ oữopat and the Infinitive with äd. We have given examples of verbs of hoping, \&e. with the Present, Aorist, and Future Infinitive; they sometimes take the Infinitive with äv, as a slight change from the Future; as in Thuc. VII, 61 :
 E $\lambda \pi i \zeta \omega$ is found also with $\dot{\omega}_{s}$ and the Future Optative in Thuc. VI, 30 ; and with $\dot{\omega}$ and the Aorist Optative with äv in V, 9 .
Note 5. The Partieiple with äv ean never represent a protasis, because there is no form of protasis in the finite moods in which äd is joined with the verb itself. For examples of apparent violations of this principle, incorrectly explained by Mattliae and others as cases of the Partieiple with $\nsim \nu \nu$ in protasis, see $\S 42,3$, Note 1.
§42. 1. When äy is used with the Subjunctive, if it does not coalesce with the relative or particle into one word (as in cáv, ötav), it is separated from it only by such words as $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu, \delta^{\prime}$, t', خáp, \&c. See examples under § 62.
2. When ä stands in apodosis with any verbal form, it may be either placed near the verb, or attached to some more emphatic word in the sentence.

Particularly, it is very often placed directly after interrogatives, negatives, adverbs of time, place, \&c., and other words which especially affect the sense of the sentence. E. g.





 Thuc. ل, 63.

Note. For the sake of emphasis, ä $\nu$ is often separated riom its verb by such words as ồo $\mu a$, , $\delta o \kappa \epsilon \in \omega, \phi \eta \mu i$, oì $\delta$, , \&c. In
such cases care must be taken to connect the $a \not v \nu$ with the verb to which it really belongs. E. g.
 should gladly take part (ả̀ belonging to кoı $\nu \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ ). Xen. Cyr.
 would you (I am sure) have ceased fighting. Dem. Phil. II, 72,

 $\epsilon i$, followed by an Optative to which the $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ belongs; as ouk oio à a $\nu$ $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i \sigma a \iota \mu \iota, I$ do not know whether I could persuade him (sc. if I should try). Eur. Med. 941. The more regular form would be aủk oỉ̀a $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i ́ \sigma a \iota \mu \iota a ̈ ้ \nu$. See Elmsley ad loc. (vs. 911).
3. "A $\nu$ 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 connection is broken by intermediate clauses. It may also be done in order to emphasize particular words with which it is joined, and to make them prominent as being affected by the contingency. E. g.





 $\mu \epsilon ́ \tau a$. Sopil. Ant. 69. $\Lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega$ ка $\theta^{\prime \prime}$ є́кабто⿱



 à̀ $\notin \xi a \sigma \theta a \iota$. Xen. An. I, 3, 6. (Here ä $\nu$ is used three times, belonging to tival.)

Note 1. This principle, taken in connection with that stated in § 42, 2, by showing that äv can be joined to any word in the sentence which it is important to emphasize, as well as to its own verb, and even to both, explains many cases in which ${ }_{a}^{\boldsymbol{a}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ and a Participle appear to form a protasis (See § 41, Note 5.) If a Participle takes the place of a protasis, it is of course one of the most important words in the sentence, and one to which the particle ${ }_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{a}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is especially sikely to be attached. The äv, however, does not qualify such a Participle, any more than it does a negative or in-
terrogative with which it is connected for the same purpose; but it always belongs to the principal verb of the apodosis. E. g.

 uni:ed, would be especially strong. Tinvc. VI, 18. (IIere $\xi$ vүкра日'̀ alone (not with $\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{a}}$ ) is equivalent to $\epsilon i \xi v \gamma \kappa \rho a t \in i \eta(\$ 52,1)$, and the $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu$ is placed before it merely to emphasize it, as containing the protasis to the verb i $\sigma \chi \dot{u} \epsilon i \nu$, to which this $\ddot{a} \nu$, as well as the other,
 éxá seems to me, said he, father, that if any one should proclaim contests, \&e., he would cause, \&c. Xen. Cyr. I, 6, 18. (Here the protasis implied in the Participles is merely emphasized by ${ }^{a} \nu$, which be-
 тis $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon v \sigma a \nu$ alv;) do you think they would have believed it, if any one hat told them? Den. Phil. II, 71, 4. (Here too the
 its own verb $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$ is the apodosis.)

In these eases, the protasis expressed by the Participle is affected by the $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu$, only as the ordinary protasis with $\epsilon i$ is affected in the example from Soph. El. 333, quoted above, under § 42, 3.

Note 2. "A $\nu$ is sometimes used elliptically without a verb, when one can be supplied from the context. E. g.
 are snoring; but they would n't have done so once. Anist. Nub. 5.

 could it? $\pi \hat{\omega}$ s oùk ä $\nu$; and similar phrases; especially $\omega^{\prime} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{a} \nu \epsilon i$ (also written as one word, $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho a \nu \epsilon i$ ), in which the ä $\nu$ belongs to

 $\dot{\eta} \nu$ ). Plat. Gorg. 479 A. (See § 53, N. 3.)

In like manner ${ }^{2} \nu$ may be used with $\epsilon i$ in protasis, or with a conditional relative, the verb being understood; as in Xfr. An. I, 3,
 (That is, ö $\pi \eta$ à $\nu$ каì $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon i s ~ i \eta \tau \epsilon$.)

Note 3. Repetition of $k \epsilon$ is rare; yet it sometimes occurs E. g.


On the other hand, Homer sometimes joins ${ }^{\prime} \nu \nu$ and $\kappa \epsilon$ in th. same sentence for emphasis. E. g.
4. When an anodosis consists of several co-ordinate clauses
with the same mood, ${ }_{a}^{z} \nu$ is generally used only in the first, and understood in the others; unless it is repeated for emphasis, or for some otlier special reason. E.g.






 ample illustrates also the principle of $\S 42,3$, кäy belonging to the Infinitives.) See also Xen. An. II, 5, 14. Пávza ク̆pei ó Фìtttmos,



 àтєфaь̀ó $\mu \eta \nu$ implied, as I should have declared it, if I had been speaking to inform my colleagues; in the following clause the same tense (esioaoкov) is inplied, and $a \partial \nu$ is not repeated; in the third clause, on the contrary, an Optative is implied, $\dot{\omega} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} \nu \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma o \neq \mu$, and therefore the äv again appears.) In Plat. Rep. III, 898 A, we find ä้ $\nu$ used with two eo-ordinate Optatives, understood with a third, and repeated again with a fourth to avoid confusion with a dependent Optative. "A $\nu$ may be understood with an Optative even in a separate sentence, if the construction is continued from a sentence in whieh äd is used with the Optative; as in Plat. Rep. I, 352



Note. The Adverb ráza, in the sense of perhaps, is often joined with äv, in which case the phrase rá $\chi^{\prime} \not a^{a} \nu$ is nearly equivalent to " $\sigma \omega \omega$ s. This, however, cannot be used unless the $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu$ would form an apodosis with the verb of the sentence, if the rá $\chi^{a}$ were not joined with it. Thus rá又' ầ $\gamma^{\prime} v o u \tau o$ means it

 verhaps it happened.

## CHAPTER IV.

## USE OF THE MOODS.

Tris chapter includes all those constructions which require any other form of the finite verb than the simple Indicative expressing an absolute assertion (§ 2). The Infinitive and Participle are included here only so far as they are used in indirect discourse, or in Protasis and Apodosis.

These constructions are divided into the following classes: -
I. Final and Object Clauses after ${ }^{i} \nu a, \dot{\omega} \varsigma$, o̊ ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \omega \varsigma$, oै $\phi \rho a$, and $\mu \dot{\eta}$.
II. Conditional Sentences.
III. Rclative and Temporal sentences.
IV. Indirect Discourse, including Indirect Quotations and Questions.
V. Causal Sentences.
VI. Expressions of a Wish.
VII. Imperative and Subjunctive in Commands, Exhortations, and Prohibitions.
VIII. Subjunctive (like the Future Indicative) in Independent Sentences. - Interrogative Subjunctive. - $O v^{\prime} \mu \eta^{\prime}$ with the Subjunctive or Future Indicative.

## SECTION I.

 and M $\eta$.
§43. The clauses which depend upon the so called final particles, ìva, $\dot{\omega}$, ò' $\overline{\prime \prime} \omega \varsigma$, öфоa, that, is
order that, and $\mu \dot{\eta}$, lest, that not, may be divided into three classes:-
A. Pure final clauses, in which the end, purpose, or motive of the action of any verb may be expressed, after any one of the final particles; as ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota{ }_{\text {ì }}^{\prime \prime}$ a тойто "ठ $\eta$, he is coming that he may see this; ámép $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{-}$ таı $\mu \eta$ тойто "' $\delta \eta$, he is departing that he may not see this.
B. Object clauses with ${ }^{\circ \prime} \pi \omega \varsigma$ or ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \omega \varsigma{ }^{\circ} \mu \eta$ after verbs of striving, \&c.; as $\sigma \kappa о ́ \pi \epsilon \iota ~ o ́ \pi \omega \varsigma ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$, see that it happens; $\sigma \kappa о ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \stackrel{ }{\circ} \pi \omega \varsigma \mu_{\eta}^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$, see that it does not happen. These clauses express the direct object of the verb of striving, \&c., so that they may stand in apposition to an object accusative like тồтo; as $\sigma \kappa o ́ \pi \epsilon \iota$
 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. Object clauses with $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ after verbs of fearing, \&c.; as фоßoì $\mu a \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \gamma^{\prime} \varphi \eta \eta \tau a \iota$, I fear lest it may happen;
 These express simply the object of fear, without even implying any purpose to prevent that object from being realized. Thus if we say $\phi о \beta о \hat{v} \mu a \iota ~ \tau о \hat{\tau} \tau о, \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa а \kappa \bar{\omega}$ s $\pi \rho a \xi^{\prime} \xi, I$ fear this, lest I may fall into misfortune, the clause with $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ merely explains $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau o$, the direct object of $\phi \circ \beta o \hat{\nu} \mu a \iota$.

Remark. Although the object clauses of the class B partake slightly of the nature of final clauses, so that they sometimes allow the same construction (the Subjunctive for the Future Indicative, § 45), still the distinction between these two classes is very strongly marked. An object clause, as we have seen, can stand in apposition to a preceding roìro; whereas a fiual clause could stand in apposition to roúrov
 purpose, viz., that he may assist us. The two can be combined
 $\epsilon \mathcal{̉} \pi o(\hat{\imath}$, 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, when its subject is attracted by the leading verb; as
 $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \mathrm{\tau} \alpha$, , to see that the city is saved.

Note 1. *Oф 0 is found only in Epic and Lyric poetry.

Note 2. The regular negative adverb after ${ }_{\imath}^{2} \nu a, \dot{\omega} s$, ö $\pi \omega s$, and ö $\phi \rho a$ is $\mu \eta^{\prime}$; but after $\mu \eta^{\prime}$. lest, oủ is used. E. g.
 this. Фоßєítal $\mu \dot{\eta}$ où roûтo $\gamma \dot{\jmath} \nu \eta \tau a t$, he is afraid lest this may not happen. This use of ov as the negative after $\mu \dot{\eta}$ seems to have no other object than to avoid repetition of $\mu \dot{\eta}$. Where, however, the sentence is so long that this repetition would not be noticed, we find

 $\mu \grave{\eta} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \epsilon \gamma^{i} \sigma \tau \eta \nu \chi$ व́pıv $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \circ \circ$.

## A. Pure Final Clauses.

§44. 1. In pure final clauses the Subjunctive is regularly used, if the leading verb is primary; and the Optative, if the leading verb is secondary. E. g.e








 21.




 $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\text {Хоб. Xen. An. 1, } 9,21 .}$


 III, 1, 8. Парака入єís latpoùs, ö $\pi \omega$ s $\mu \grave{\eta}$ à $\pi$ o $\theta$ áv $\eta$. Xen. Mem. II.





 $\pi ө \lambda \epsilon \mu \epsilon i v$. Thuc. I, 126.










 фоıто. Xen. Cyr. I, 4, 25.

Note 1. The Future Indicative sometimes (though rarely) takes the place of the Subjunctive in pure final clauses, after
 very seldom after the simple $\mu \eta^{\prime}$. ( $M \eta$ with the Future is commonly found only after verbs of the next two classes; §§ 45, 46.) Here, as well as after verbs of striving and of fearing, the Future differs from the Subjunctive only by being a more vivid form of statement. E. g.



 toùs ä $\nu \delta \rho a s$ ätavtas. Andoc. de Myster. I, p. 6, 38. § 43. 'Er'
 $\mu \epsilon ́ \rho o s ~ \pi \rho \omega ́ \tau \iota \sigma \tau o \nu \beta a \sigma a \nu \iota \omega$. Arist. Ran. 1120. In Nub. 1466, $0 \pi \omega 1$
 7. Өáporv

 $\kappa \in \chi o \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \ell, \mathrm{Il} . \mathbf{X X}, 301$. This construction is very rare in Attic prose.

Note 2. The Particle ä̆ $\boldsymbol{\nu}\left(\kappa^{\prime}\right)$ is sometimes joined witb
$\dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}}, \boldsymbol{z} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, and öфрa, before the Subjunctive in final clauses; especially with $\omega s$ and $\begin{gathered} \\ o\end{gathered} \phi \rho a$ in Homer. The äv here is always join'd to the particle, and (as in protasis) it adds nothing to the sense which can be made perceptible in English. E. g.
 mayest gain for me great honor and glory. 11. XVI, 84. (Here ís àv äp $\quad$ qau seems to be merely a weaker form of expression than $\dot{\omega}$










 Plat. Rep. VIII, 567 A . ' $\Omega_{s} \hat{a} \nu \mu \dot{a} \theta \eta \mathrm{~s}$, àvááovgov. Xen. An. II, 5, 16. See also An. VII, 4, 2 ; Aesch. Prom. 10 ( $\dot{\omega}$ sảv), 824

Note 3. (a.) Homer and Herolotus sometimes use äv or $\boldsymbol{k} \boldsymbol{k}$ in final clauses with the same partieles before the Optative, with no apparent effect upon the verb. E. g.







 order that his campanions might not be offended by seeing him and plot against him, but that he might appear to them to be of another nature by their not seeing him. Id. I, 99.
(b.) Apart from this use, however, the Optative can be regularly joined with ä in any final clause, if it forms an apodosis with the verb, to which there is a protasis expressed or distinctly understood. Such Optative with äd can follow primary as well as secondary tenses. (§ 31, N. 2.) E. g.
 let him lead offf the dance, so that any one who should hear without would say there was a marriage. Od. XXIII, 134. ' $\Omega s$ s' $\delta^{\prime} \nu$
 each one musi acquire these things for himself, to cause that they would appear most agreeable (if any one should experience them). Xen Cyr.


 the navy should be manned, stands as a protasis to the Optative тробঠ̀є́оито äv.)

 by which you could prevent hum from tloing these things, you are wholly inactive, are not final clanses, but relative sentences with an antecedent implied. See §65, 1, N. 4.

Remark. M $\dot{\eta}$, lest, can be followed by a verb with äp only in a regular apodosis after verbs of fearing, \&c. (See §46, N. 3.) ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{I} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { I }} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { \nu }} \mathrm{a}$ is never used with ${ }^{\alpha} \nu$, except when it means where. A single case

 $\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho a$. $\phi \dot{v} \gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$. But here the $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \epsilon$ belongs not to $\grave{\imath \nu} a$, but to the Subjunctives: sec $\S 87$, Note.

Note 4. A purpose can be expressed by a relative and the Future Indicative ( $\$ 65,1$ ), or by the Future Participle ( $(109,5$ ). For the use of $\omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ to express a purpose, see $\S 98,2$.
2. As all final clauses express the purpose or motive of some person, they admit of the double construction of indirect discourse ( $\$ 77,2$ ); so that, instead of the Optative after secondary tenses, we can have the mood and tense which the person himself might have used when he conceived the purpose in his own mind. That is, we can say either $\hat{j}^{\hat{\eta}} \lambda \theta \in \nu$ ìva ${ }^{\prime} \delta o c$, he came that he might see (by $\S 44,1$ ) ; or $\mathfrak{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ '"va $\langle\delta \eta$, because the person himself would have said ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \chi o \mu a t$ "iva " $\bar{\delta} \omega \omega$, I come that I may see.

Hence the Subjunctive in final clauses after secondary tenses is nearly as common as the more regular Optative. E. g.

[^5]

 pose was conceived in the form, ìva $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau a \dot{u} \tau \dot{a} \pi \dot{a} \theta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$.)

Remark. This principle applies equally well to the clauses which follow $\delta \pi \omega s$ and $\delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta$ atter verbs of striving ( $\$ 45$ ), and $\mu \eta$ after verbs of fearing, \&c. (\$ 46).

This is a favorite construction with certain authors, as Thucydides; who also, on the same principle, prefer the Indieative to the Optative in ordinary indirect quotations after secondary tenses. See § 70, 2, Remark 2.*

Note 1. This use of the Subjunctive instead of the Optative makes the language more vivid, by introducing as nearly as possible the exact words or thoughts of the person whose purpose is thus stated.

As the two forms are equally correct (the only difference being that just stated), we find them both in the same sentence, as we find the Indicative and Optative interchanged in indirect quotations. (See § 70, 2, Remark I.) E. g.

 they selected them, that they might be guards of Epipolae, and that they might be on hand if they should be needed for anything else. Tiuc.
 $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ кaì $\mu \dot{\eta} \beta o \eta \theta_{0} \hat{i} \in \nu$, 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. Thuc. III, 22.

The ordinary interpretation of the latter and similar passages, proposed by Arnold, viz. "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," manifestly cannot apply to the first example.

Note 2. (a.) 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. It occurs chiefly in Homer. E. g.



[^6](b.) Sometimes the Optative is used because the leading verk implies a reference to the past as well as the present. E. g.

 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, \&e.)
3. The secondary tenses of the Indicative are uned in final clauses after ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu a$, sometimes after $\omega^{\prime}$ s or ${ }^{\circ} \pi \pi \omega \varsigma$, to denote that the end or object is dependent upon some unfulfilled condition, and therefore is not or was not attained. This construction is peculiar to Attic Greek.

These tenses of the Indicative have here the same difference in meaning as in conditional sentences (§ 49, 2), the Imperfect referring to present time or to continued or repeated action in past time, the Aorist and Pluperfect to past time. Thus iva тov̂ro ë́npatтєy 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
 (but he did not) ; ǐva тойто '่ $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho$ á $\chi \in \iota$ means that he might have done this (but he has not). E. g.
 case I should not have forborne (to destroy my hearing), so that I should be both blind and devoid of hearing (implying that really he is

 facts have no voice for men, so that words of eloquence might be as


 II, 837, 11. (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.)
 they ought to have made an investigation, in order that we might have been alreatly freed from this demagogue (but we have not been freed





 under the earth, so that neither any God nor any one else should have rejoiced at these things (as they have done). Aescir. Prom. 152. (If we read $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \gamma \dot{\eta} A_{\epsilon} l$, we must translate, might be rejoicing, as they
 $\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \pi o ́ \nu \omega \nu \dot{a} \pi \eta \lambda \lambda a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$; why diul I not throw myself from this rock, that I might have been freed from all my toils? Id. 747.

Remark. This construction is especially common when a final clause depends cither upon an apodosis which contains a secondary tense of the Indicative ( $\$ 49,2$ ) implying the non-fulfilment of the condition, as is the case in examples $1,3,4$, and 5 , above, or upon a verb expressing an unfulfilled wish, as in examples 2 and 7 . In these cases the Indicative seems to be used by a sort of assimilation.

Note 1. The particle ${ }_{c}{ }^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is very rarely joined with the secomlary tenses of the Indicative in final clauses. When it is used, it denotes that the sentence is an apodosis (as well as a final clause), with a protasis expressed or understood. E. g.

 i. e. that he might be exempt from punishment after death (as he would be, if he had so lived). Plat. Leg. XII, 959 B.

Note 2. The Indicative can never be used in this construction, unless it is distinctly implied that the result is not (or was not) attained, that is, unless the final clause refers cither to the present or to the past (as in the examples given above): if it refers to the future, it must be expressed in the ordinary way by the Subjunctive or Optative, even although it depends on one of the class of verbs mentioned above (Remark). Both constructions may oceur in the same sentence. E.g.


 (in that case) in the Acropolis, that no one might corrupt them (as: they are now corrupted), and that when (in the future) they should become of age they might become useful to their states. Plat. Men. 89
 should (if that were so) be now undertaking to say this to you, that you might (hereafter) know, \&c. Dem. Aristocr. 623, 11. See also the examples under § 32,3 (b.).
B. Object Clauses with "O $0 \pi \omega$ and " $\mathrm{O} \pi \omega \mathrm{s} \mu \eta$ after Verbs of Striving, \&c.
§45. After verbs signifying to strive, to take care, to effect, and the like, the Future Indicative is regularly used with ${ }^{\circ \prime} \pi \omega s$ and ${ }^{\circ \prime} \pi \omega s \mu \eta$, if the leading verb is primary. The Subjunctive also occurs, but mnch less frequently than the Future.

If the leading verb is secondary, the Future Optative may be used, to correspond to the Future Indicative after primary tenses; but generally the Future Indicative is employ d here also, on the principle of $\$ 44,2$. The other tenses of the Optative are sometimes used, to correspond to the same tenses of the Subjunctive after primary tenses; or the Subjunctive itself may be employed (§ 44, 2). E. g.
 that it may (or may not) happen. 'Е $\mathrm{E} \pi \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon і \tau о$ ö $\boldsymbol{\pi} \omega \mathrm{s} \quad \gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota, \gamma \epsilon \nu_{\eta}^{-}$
















 VIII, 564 C. (For the force of the Future Perfect, see $\S 29$, N. 1.)
 $\dot{\oplus} \mu \epsilon \nu$; Plat. Gorg. 515 B. Пぃца

 (Subj. and Fut. combined.) Xrin Symp. VIII, 25.

 Oecon. VII, 5 . (Here the construction atter a primary tense would

 amples of the Future Optative inder § 26, Note 1 (a).
(Fnt. Ind. after Secondary Tenses.) "E ${ }^{*} \rho a \sigma \sigma o \nu ~ o ̈ \pi \omega s ~ \tau \iota s ~ \beta o \eta ́ \theta \in \iota a$



 парєбкєи́a $\sigma \epsilon \nu$. Dem. F. L. 419, 28.

$\tau \epsilon \lambda o i ̂ \varepsilon \nu . ~ X e n . ~ C y t . ~ V I I I, ~ 1, ~ 44 . ~ ' A \pi \epsilon к р i v a t o, ~ o ̈ \tau \iota ~ a u ̉ t \hat{̣}$ رí入o




 סovias, he bribed them to effect that we should not leave Macedonia Dem. Cor. 236, 12. (Subj. after Historie Present.)

It will thus be seen that the Future Indicative is the mos. common construction in these sentences, after both primary and secondary tenses; the Future Optative, which is theoretically the regular form after secondary tenses, being rarely used, for the reason stated in § 26 , Note 2 .

For the distinction between these object clauses and fina. clauses, see § 43, Remark.

Remark. ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{s}$ (like $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s}$ ) is originally a relative adverb, mean-
 Then it is nsed in indireet questions, in the sense of ö $\tau \omega$ т $\tau о \dot{\sigma} \pi \varphi, h o w$, in what way, and is followed by the Future Indicative; as $\sigma к о \pi \epsilon i \nu$ ö $\pi \omega s \dot{\eta} \pi o \dot{\lambda} \lambda s \sigma \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \tau a \iota$, to see how the city shall be saved. So

 Dem. Timoc. 733, 20. (See below, Note ${ }^{2} 2$.) Then, by a slight modification in sense, it may denote also the object to which the striving, \&e., is directed; so that $\sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu\left(\right.$ or $\sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ roùto) $\begin{array}{c}\text { ö } \pi \omega s ~ \\ \eta\end{array}$ $\pi \sigma^{\prime} \iota_{\iota} \sigma \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon a \iota$ 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 $\delta \pi \omega$ s is lost sight of, and its force as a final particle, meaning in order that, begins to appear. E. g.
 deny what you now say. Plat. Euthyd. 283 C. $\Sigma_{\kappa \epsilon \pi \tau \epsilon ́ o \nu ~}^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$
 $\dot{a} \nu \delta \rho \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi o \beta \dot{a} \lambda \omega \mu \in \nu$, we must see that we receive as few wounds as possible, and that we lose as few men's lives as possible. Xen. An. IV, 6, 10.*

From this it becomes established as a final particle, and denotes the purpose in ordinary final clauses. From the original foree of ${ }^{\delta} \pi \omega \omega$ as a relative, used in indireet questions in the sense of how, we

[^7]must explain its oceasional use in indireet quotations in the sense of $\dot{\omega}$ or ö $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \iota(\S 78)$. See also $\S 65,1$, Rem.

Note 1. "O $0 \pi \omega$ in this construction sometimes (though rarely) takes the particle $\not \partial \nu$ when it is followed by the Subjunctive; never, when it is followed by the Future Indicative. Its use is the same as in ordinary final elauses ( $\$ 44,1$, N. 2).

When ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$ is used with the Optative after a verb of striving, it denotes an ordinary apodosis, as in $\S 44,1$, N. 3 (b), and $\begin{gathered} \\ \pi\end{gathered} \omega$ s is simply interrogative. E. g.
 ${ }^{\prime} \chi \chi \omega \sigma \iota \tau a ̉ \lambda \lambda o ́ \tau \rho \iota a \mu \eta \tau \epsilon \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ aú $\bar{\omega} \nu \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu \tau a \iota$; Plat. Rep. IV, 433

 каі éXovтє́s тє öкаסє $\mathfrak{a} \phi i к \omega \nu \tau a \iota$. Xen. An. VI, 1, 17. (Here $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota a$ or some such word is understood as the subjeet of $\epsilon i \sigma \eta \in \iota$.)
 $\nu \circ$ i $\mu \in \theta$ a $\theta \in \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu o c$ aùroús, I try to see how they might (if they should choose) live the easiest lives, \&e. Xen. Symp. VII, 2. So $\epsilon \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta$ $\theta \hat{\nu} \nu a \iota$ ö $\pi \omega$ sả̀ $\gamma^{\prime} \epsilon$ vo七тo, Id. Cyr. I, 6, 7.

Note 2. (a.) The Homeric construction which most resembles that of $\S 45$ is found after such verbs as фрá̧ouat, $\beta o u \lambda \in \dot{v} \omega, \lambda \in \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega$, or $\mu \epsilon \rho \mu \eta \rho i \zeta \omega$, to consider, and $\pi \in \iota \rho a ́ \omega$, to try. Here $\begin{gathered} \\ \pi\end{gathered} \omega s$ or $\dot{\omega}$ is used with the Subjunctive (sometimes with $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \epsilon$ ) after primary tenses, and with the Optative after secondary tenses. E. g.
 consider how the very best things may be done. Od. XIII, 365. Фpa-






 $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta$ (or $\tau \iota \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota^{\prime}$ ), i. e. how he might honor Achilles. II. II, 3.
 $\delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \grave{\eta} \nu \pi a r p i o a ~ \gamma a i ̂ a \nu ~ i ̌ v \eta a \imath, ~ i . ~ e . ~ t r y ~ t o ~ f i n d ~ m e a n s ~ b y ~ w h i c h ~ y o u ~$
 $\lambda \omega \nu \tau a \iota$. Il. XXI, 459.

In some of these examples $\begin{gathered}\circ \\ \pi\end{gathered} \omega$ s or $\omega$ s seems to be used as an interrogative, meaning how, the Subjumetive of the direet question being the common IIomeric form explained in §87. (For the Subjunctive with $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}$, see $\$ 87$, Note.) But in other examples, especially those with $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a, \omega$, there is a nearer approaeh to the construction of § 45. The two following examples will further illustrate the

 ll. V, 411. See also Od. VI. 113.
(b.) In Homer ${ }^{\prime} \pi \omega s$ takes the Future Indicative chiefly when it is used merely as an indirect interrogative, with no reference to a
 "p $p$ a, we do not yet even know certainly how these thangs are to be; or
 consider how you will lay hands on the shameless suitors. It may take the Future (as well as other tenses) when it is used as a simple rela-
 (Sce Remark, above.) Occasionally also we find the Future after $\ddot{\circ} \pi \omega \sin$ final clauses ( $\$ 44,1, N .1$ ).

Note 3. As many verbs of this class imply caution, they may be followed by the simple $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ (without ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega s$ ), like verbs of caution and fearing ( $\$ 46$ ), See especially $\dot{\rho} \rho \hat{\omega}$ and $\sigma \kappa о \pi \omega$. Here, as elsewhere, $\mu \eta$ takes the Subjunctive more frequently than the Future Indicative. E. g.




 Phil. 519.
(See the corresponding use of $\not \approx \pi \omega s ~ \mu \eta$, instead of $\mu \dot{\eta}$, after verbs of fearing, \&c., §46, Note 2. It is often difficult to draw the line between the two constructions of $\S 45$ and $\S 46$.)

Note 4. ' $\Omega s$ is sometimes, though rarely, used instead of ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ after verbs of striving. Here the Subjunctive is more common than the Future Indicative. E. g.


 ä $\rho \xi \in \iota \epsilon \nu \theta_{\epsilon} \omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$. Aescif. Prom. 203. Occasionally we find the Sub-

 таüта $\pi \epsilon \rho a i \nu \eta \tau a \iota$. Xen. Hipparch. IX, 2. (See above, N. 1.)

Note 5. Some verbs which are regularly followed by an Infinitive of the object occasionally take an object clause with ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{s}$ (rarely with other particles), in nearly or quite the same sense: -
(a.) Verbs of exhorting, entreating, and commanding are sometimes followed by ö̃ $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$, and those of forbidding by ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{s}$ $\mu \dot{\eta}$, after the analogy of verbs of striving. E. g.
 thyself to speak the truth. Od. III, 19. (Compare the regular con



 $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ пálvas toùs roloútous. Plat. Rep. VIII, 549 E. So


 to say a word of what he believes. Id. I, 337 E. See Sopir. Trach. 604.
 $\dot{a} \gamma \in i \rho o \iota$, where the $\ddot{a} \nu$ is used with the particle as in the examples under §44, 1, N. 3 (a).
(b.) "I $\nu a$ is used in the same sense in a single passage of the Odyssey, III, $327:$ and implore him yourself to speak the truth.

This use of iva is not found in Attic Greek, but it reappears in the later language. E. g.
 mandment I give unto you, that ye love one another. Jon. Evang.
 rogat ut liceat.
(c.) A case of $\omega s$ and the Subjunctive (instead of an object Infinitive) after a verb implying a promise is found in 11. I, 558:-

 Achilles, \&c.

Note 6. (a.) On the other hand, some verbs which regularly take ön $\pi \omega$ s are oceasionally found with an Infinitive of the object, sometimes with the article. (See § 46, N. 8.) E. g.
 took care that one of their own number should be in the offices (where

 Xev. Mem. IV, 2, 4. So the Infinitive with tó, Mem. IV, 3, 1.
(b.) Verbs of this class ean be followed by an indirect question introduced by $\epsilon i$, whether. E. g.
 $m e$, \&c. Sophi. Ant. 41. (See § 46, Note 6, c.)

Note 7. (a.) Both ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega \omega$ and ${ }^{\circ} \pi \pi \omega s ~ \mu \eta$ ' are sometimes used elliptically with the Future Indicative in exhortations and prohibitions, depending on some Imperative like $\sigma \kappa o ́ \pi \epsilon \iota$, take care, understood. "O 0 ons $\mu$ ' allows also the Subjunctive. E. g.




 $\tau a \iota$, toútovs $\epsilon ่ \pi a \iota \nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ каі $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ каі $\sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \in \tau \epsilon$,

 see therefore that you say nothing about the war. Id. 370, 22. "Onws $\gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \xi a \pi a \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \dot{\eta} \mu a \hat{\varrho}$. Plat. Prot. 313 C . (See §46, N. 4.)
(b.) We occasionally find the Future Indicative with $\mu \eta$ in an independent sentence, expressing a prohibition. This may be explained by supposing an ellipsis of ${ }^{\circ \prime} \pi \omega$ s from the construction just
 seems more natural to consider it as an independent construction. See § 25,1, N, 5 (b), and the examples.

Remark. The construction of Note 7 (a) is confined almost exelusively to the second person of the verb; yet the first and third persons are sometimes found. E. g.

 $\epsilon \not \epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \tau a \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i o \nu$ к $a \theta \epsilon \delta$ о $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon \theta a$. Arist. Eecles. 297.

Note 8. When an Aorist Subjunctive active or middle was to
 Aorist was preferred to the first, if both forms were in use. This arose from the great similarity in form between these first Aorists and the Future Indicative (as $\beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \eta$ and $\beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota, \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta \tau a \iota$ and $\beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \tau a i)$ : this made it natural for a writer, if he intended to use the Subjunctive at all, to avoid those forms of it which were nearly identical with the more regular Future Indicative. This of course did not apply to the first Aorist Subjunctive passive, which has no resemblance to the Future Indicative. The same remark applies to the Subjunctive after ov $\mu$ ' , in the construction described in § 89. In both constructions the Subjunctive differs from the Future only by being a less vivid form of expression.*

[^8]
## C. Object Clauses with $\mu \dot{\prime}$ after Verbs of Fearing, \&c.

§46. After verbs and phrases which express or imply fear, caution, or danger, $\mu \eta^{\prime}$, lest or that, is used with the Subjunctive if the leading verb is primary, and with the Optative if the leading verb is secondary. By the principle of $\$ 44,2$, the Subjunctive can also follow secondary tenses, in order that the mood in which the object of the fear originally occurred to the mind may be retained.
$M \eta^{\prime}$ (like the Latin ne) denotes fear that something may happen which is not desired; $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ov' ( $u t=$ ne non) denotes fear that something may not happen which is desired. E. g.
 pen: $\phi \circ \beta o u ̄ \mu a \iota \mu \grave{\eta}$ où $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \eta \tau a \iota$ (vereor ut accidat), I fear that it may








Dawes is now generally abandoned; but most editors still hold to it (at least in practice) so far as to exclude the prohibited forms with ö $\bar{\pi} \omega \mathrm{s}$ when it follows verbs of striving, \&c., and with ov $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$. Even here, however, the rule is maintained only by changing many passages against Mss. authority. Thus in Dem. OI. I, p. 9, 17, all Miss. except one read
 while nearly all editions have ßon日ウَ $\sigma \epsilon \tau$. In the Third Philippie of Demosthenes two similar examples oceur: p. 128, 25 , $\hat{0} \pi \omega s$ $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon$ is

 $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\nu \quad \pi \rho a ́ \pi \tau o \nu \tau \epsilon s$, where the weight of Mss. authority deeidedly favors


Whatever view is taken of these last examples, there eertainly seems to be no reason for extending the rule of Dawes to ötows in pure final clauses, ${ }^{\text {as }}$ in these the Future is used only hy exception ( $\$ 44,1, \mathrm{~N} .1$ ). There


 Thic. II. 60. So with ö̃ In elliptical prohibitions with ö $\pi \omega \boldsymbol{s} \mu \eta^{\prime}(\$ 45$, N. 7$)$ the Subjunctive seems to be allowed from the analogy of ordinary prohibitions (\$86).
àmı
 Phaed. 70 A . Oủkoùv vìv каì тoи̃тo кívôvvos, $\mu \grave{\eta} \lambda$ á $\beta \omega \sigma \iota \pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau a ́ t a s$ aùt $\hat{\nu}$ tuvas $\tau 0 \dot{\tau} \tau \nu$, there is danger of this, that they may take, \&ic.





 $\pi \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$. Plat. Theaet. 183 E.







 daughter. Xen. Cyr. V, 2, $9 .{ }^{3} \mathrm{H} \theta \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \sigma a ́ \nu ~ \tau \iota \nu \epsilon s, ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu \nu o o u ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o l ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \tau \grave{a}$

 бォоито. Id. IV, $1,6$.


 $\gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{o} \mu \epsilon \nu o s \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ ai $\nu \bar{\eta} \epsilon s$. Thuc. III, 80. "E $\delta \epsilon \iota \sigma a \mu \dot{\eta}$


 4, 2.

It will be seen by the examples that the construction with $\mu \eta$ is very often used when the leading verb only implies the fear, caution, or danger, as after $\dot{v} \pi o \pi \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ and $\dot{\jmath} \kappa \nu \omega \bar{\omega}$. On this principle we

 against their deciding to fight during the night,-implying we fear lest they may.

Remark. These clauses with $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$, when they follow verbs of
 final clauses to the same extent with the construction of § 45 , since they imply the end or purpose of the caution. (See § 43, Remark.) On the other hand, when they follow $\phi o \beta o v \mu a t$ and other verbs expressing fear or danger, no purpose is expressed or implied, but there is merely an apprehension that something will happen, or, in some cases, that something is now taking place or has already happened. We should hence expect that these verbs would follow the analngy of verbs of thinking, \&c., and take either the Indicative with $\dot{\omega}$ s or the Infinitive, to denote the object of the fear. (Tlis

 below, Note 6.) Still, verbs of feuring, when the object of the fear is future, as it commonly is, are closely connected in sense with those like $\phi$ идcirтouuc; as they imply at least a desire (though not a purpose) to prevent the result. The Greeks generally apply to both the same construction, and as they say
 the object of the fear is already past or actually present, so that no desire of preventing a result can be implied, verbs of fearing are still followed by $\mu \dot{\eta}$ as before; but now all analogy to final clauses disappears, and the dependent verb is put in the proper tense of the Indicative, as in ordinary cbject elauses after órı and $\dot{\omega}$. (See below, Note 5.)

Note 1. Sometimes, though seldom. $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ takes the Future Indicative after verbs of fearing, \&c. E. g.

 Rep. V, 451 A .

The Future seems to differ from the Subjunctive in these cases, as in final clanses, only by expressing the result more vividly and marking its futurity more strongly. Thus фоßoì $\mu a \iota \mu \dot{\eta}$ єǘp $\omega \mu \in \nu$ would not differ from $\phi o \beta o v ̂ \mu a \iota ~ \mu \dot{\eta} \epsilon \dot{v} \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma$ o $\epsilon \epsilon \nu$ (fuoted above, except in the manner of expression; just as $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \in \tilde{v} \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ would differ from $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \epsilon \dot{i} \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \epsilon \nu$. (See $\S 44,1$, N. 1.) For the rare use of the Future Optative after verbs of fearing, \&c., see $\S 26$, Note 1 (b).

Note 2. Verbs denoting fear and caution are sometimes followed by ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega s \mu \dot{\eta}$, with the Future Indicative or the Subjunctive after primary tenses and the Optative after secondary tenses, like verbs of striving, \&c. Many verbs (like ópô and $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \kappa \pi \bar{\omega}$ ) belong equally well to both classes (§§ 45,46 ). It will be noticed, that $\% \pi \omega s \mu$ ' here is exactly equivalent to $\mu \dot{\eta}$,
 that it will happen (not, I fear that it will not happen). (See Note 6, a.) E. g.
 112. Eù入aßoúpevo九 ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega$ s s $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oix $\dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu a l$. Plat. Phaed. 91 C. $\Delta \epsilon \cdot$






Noze 3. The particle ä $\nu$ is never used with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ and the Sur
junctive．It is sometimes joined with an Optative depending upon $\mu \dot{\eta}$ after verbs of fearing，in which case it always forms an apodoss with the Optative．Such an Optative with $a^{\prime} \nu$ can of course follow primary as well as secondary tenses，by § 31，Note 2．（See § 44，1， N．3，Rem．）E．g．
 you miyht tell（ $i^{+}$you should have an opportunity）．Soph．Trach． 631.

 $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon i \eta \nu$ ，lest（in that case）I should be very soon brought to my senses．Xen．An．VI，1， 28.

Note 4．m $\dot{\eta}$ with the Subjunctive，and $\bar{\pi} \pi \omega s ~ \mu \dot{\eta}$ with the Future Indicative（seldom the Subjunctive），are sometimes used elliptically，depeuding upon some verb of fear or caution understood．（See § 45，N．7，a．）This expresses an appre－ hension or anxiety，sometimes a mere suspicion．It is espe－ cially common in Plato．E．g．
 may not be the difficult thing，to avoid death．Plat．Apol． 39 A．Mì
 speak the truth．Plat．Gorg． 462 E ．＇A入入à $\mu \dot{\eta}$ où ${ }^{\prime}$ oũr $\omega \mathrm{s}$ є＇$\chi \eta$ ，à $\lambda \lambda$

 （This example belongs equally well under § $45, \mathrm{~N} .7, a$ ．）＂Otws



 ठıкаıобívŋs $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \eta \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ ；（do you fear）I am not able to explain，\＆c．？ the Present Indicative belongs under Note 5 （a．）

Note 5．Verbs of fearing may refer to objects of fear which are past or immediately present；so that no desire or even possibility of preventing the result can be implied．（See Rem．before Note 1．）Here，therefore，all analogy to final clauses disappears，and $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ is followed by the present and past tenses of the Indicative，as öt or $\dot{\omega}$ s would be in indirect quotations．The following cases occur：－
（a．）M $\eta$ with the Present Indicative expresses a fear that something is now going on．E．g．
 is thinking that he says something．Plat．Lach． 196 C．（Here tho Subjunctive ö̈rat would have meant lest Nicias may think，refer．

 Bi $\omega$, you are afrail lest I am now in a more peevish state of minl，\＆c， （where the Suljunetive would have referred to the future，lest I

 Soúd $\varphi$ 廿ózos．Eur．Phoen．92．（Here $\mu \dot{\eta}$ фadạ̧́єtat means lest any one is now to be seen；and $\mu \eta{ }_{\eta}{ }_{\epsilon} \lambda \theta_{\eta}$ ，lest any report may come here－
 ßoudeút má̀al．Sopir．Ant．278．（The idea is，my mind has long been anxious，lesi this is the work of the Gods，éotiv being understood

 סó $\mu$ оиs тарабтєіхо⿱亠䒑єs．Soph．Ant．1253．（The idea is，we shall learn the result of our anxiety lest she is concealing，\＆c．$\dagger$ ）
（b．）M $\eta$ with the Perfect Indicative expresses a fear lest something has already lappened．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．（See examples，$\S 18,1$.$) E．g．$
 fear lest we have missed both at once．Tuuc．II，53．（The Perfect Subjunctive here would strictly have meant lest it may hereafter prove that we have misserl．）$\Delta \epsilon ́ \delta o c k a ~ \mu \dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta a \mu \epsilon \nu[\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \in i \rho \eta \eta \nu \eta \nu]$
 peace borrowerl at high interest．Dem．F．L．372，1．Фoßoùmà $\mu \dot{\eta}$


[^9](c.) Mry can be used with the Inuperfect or the Aorist Indicative, to express fear le.t something happened in past time. This can be expressed ouly in this way, as the Subjunctive and Optative would refer to (relatively) future time. E. g.
 Goddess said was true, $\mathrm{Od} . \mathrm{V}, 300$. 'А $\lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ö $\rho a \operatorname{\mu \grave {\eta }} \pi \operatorname{\pi ai} \zeta \omega \nu$ є̈ $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu$, but be very careful lest he was speaking in jest. Plat. Theaet. 145 B. (This implies a fear that he was speaking in jest.)

Note 6. (a.) As verbs of fearing, \&c., imply thought, they sometimes take the construction of ordinary indirect discourse. Here $\dot{\omega}$ (and even ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega \omega$ ), that, may be used to introluce the object of the fear, thus taking the place of $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ in the common construction. ("O $\tau \iota$ seems to be used only in the case mentioned in Note 7.) E. g.

Avóoòs $\mu \dot{\eta} \phi o \beta o \hat{u} \dot{\omega} s \dot{a} \pi$ o $\rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon i s$ dáiov, do not fear that you will be at a loss. Xen. Cyr. V, 2, 12. (Here the direet discourse would be $\dot{\pi} \pi \circ \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, I$ shall be at a loss.) Mì $\delta \epsilon i \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon \dot{\omega}$ s o $\dot{\chi} \chi \dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{s}$ к $\alpha \theta \in v$ $\delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, do not fear that you will not sleep sweetly. Id. VI, 2, 30. (Here $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oủ would be the ordinary expression.) Mì $\tau \rho \epsilon \in \sigma \eta s, o ̊ \pi \omega s$ $\sigma \epsilon ́$ tis $\dot{a} \pi o \sigma \pi a ́ \sigma \in \iota$ Bía, lest any one shall tear you away by force.

 B $\lambda$ áßos, do not fear either that I am saying this to try you ( $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s} \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ ), or lest any harm shall come ( $\mu \dot{\eta} \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \eta \tau a \iota$ ). HDt. I, 9. (Here the two constructions after $\phi \circ \beta \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ make the principle especially clear.)

In all these cases $\mu{ }^{\prime}$ or ö ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega s \mu^{\prime} \eta$ would have been more regular, and exactly equivalent to $\dot{\omega}$ s and $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \pi \omega$ s here. (See Note 2.)
(b.) We also find the Future Infinitive after veros of fearing, standing in indirect discourse to represent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse. (See § 73, 1, Rem.) E. g.
$0 \dot{v}$ фоßоú $\mu \theta a \dot{\epsilon} \lambda a \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma} \dot{\omega} \sigma \in \sigma \theta a \iota$, we are not afraid that we shall be defeated. Tiruc. V, 105. (Here $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ with the Subjunctive or the Future Indicative would have been more regular.)
(c.) Verbs of fearing may also be followed by an indirect question introduced by $\epsilon i$, whether, or by some other interrogative particle. "Otws used interrogatively in such sentences is not to be confoun ded with ${ }^{\circ} \pi \pi \omega$ in its use explained above (a). E. g.


whether Phitip is alive; but I have fear (about this), whether the custom of the city to hate and punish evil-doer: is extinct. Dem. F. L.

 through fear whether any one will perceive it (where $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ai $\sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ or ä̈ $\sigma$ \#qrat might have been used, meaning lest any one shall perccive
 à $\quad$ סpòs dívauts. Xen. Hell. VI, 1, 14. (The direct question would
 (about the question) how I shall escape the Goddess. Eur. Iph. T 995. (The direct question was $\pi \hat{\omega} s \lambda a ́ \theta \omega$; § 88.)

Note 7. Verbs of fearing may be followed by ôte, because, and an ordinary causal sentence with the Indicative (§ 81). E. g.
 גávovaı̀ övess, to fear them, because they happen to be many.
 $\chi \omega \rho i o \nu \epsilon^{\prime} \pi v \nu \theta{ }^{\prime} \nu \in \tau v \quad \nu o \sigma \bar{\omega} \delta \epsilon \in$ єival. Isoc. Acgin. p. 388 D. § 22.
 Oappeite, do not be afraid because they rule many, \&c. Xen. Hell. III, 5, 10. (м̀̀ ä $\rho \chi$ оvaı фоßєíбAaı would mean to fear lest they
 them, on the ground that they are painful. Plat. Gorg. 479 A. (But for the analogy of the preceding examples, we might be inclined to translate this fearing that they are painful, like $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ả $\lambda \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ сvóv.) 'Eфo-
 was afraid, because he was about to be seen beginning to build the palace. Xen. Cyr. III, 1, 1.

Note 8. (a.) Verbs of fearing may be followed by an Infinitive (without $\mu$ '), which is sometimes preceded by the article. Such an Infinitive denotes the direct object of the fear, as in English, I fear to go. E. g.
 refute you, lest you may suspect, \&c. Plat. Gorg. 457 E . (Here both constructions occur.) $\Phi \circ \beta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota ~ a ̀ \delta \iota \epsilon \bar{i} \nu$, he will be afraid to

 кatápas, $I$ shudder at the idea of the Fury fulfilling the curses. Aesch. Sept. 720. (But in 790, тр'́ $\omega \mu \eta{ }_{\tau} \tau \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \epsilon \sigma$ means I tremble lest she may fulfil them.) See also Xen. An. I, 3, 17. Tò à $\pi$ o $\theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \in \iota$ oùdeis фoßeítal, tò dè à $\delta \iota$ кєìv фoßєítal. Plat. Gorg. 522 E.

See § 92, 1, Remark 2, and Note 3.
(b.) Verbs of caution may be followed by an Infinitive (with or without $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ), which is sometimes preceded by the article; the Infinitive having the same meaning as a clause with $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ and the Subjunctive or Optative. E. g.

ought he not to guard against becoming such a man himself? Xen. Menı I, 5, 3. (Here $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a t$ is equivalent to $\mu \grave{\eta} \gamma_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \eta \eta_{\tau u}$ ) $\Phi \nu \lambda a \tau$ тópevos $\tau \dot{\partial} \lambda v \pi \bar{\eta} \sigma a i$ тıva, taking care to offend no one. Dras. Cor.

 773, 1. (For $\mu \dot{\eta}^{\prime}$ see \& 95,2, N. 1.) In Thuc. VII, 77, 5 , we find the Infinitive with $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ after $\phi \nu \lambda \dot{\text { ávoco }}$.
(c.) Kívòvoós $̇$ '̇̃t, the prineipal expression denoting danger which takes $\mu^{\prime}$ ind a finite verb, is quite as regularly followed by the Infinitive (without $\mu$ ' ). E. g.
 of their being deceived. Plat. Crat. 436 R.
Kıvơvév́v is regularly followed by the lnfinitive, by § $92,1$.
Remarif. All the Infinitives referred to in Note 8 belong regularly under the rule, $\S 92,1$. For the article before such Infinitives see § 92,1, Note 3.

## SECTION II.

## Conditional Sentences.

§47. 1. In conditional sentences the clause containing the condition is called the protasis, and that containing the conciusion is called the apodosis. The protasis is regularly introduced by the particle $\epsilon i, i f$, negatively $\epsilon i \mu \eta^{\prime}$.

Note. ai is the Doric form for $\epsilon$. It is sometimes used also in Epic poetry, but only when $\kappa \epsilon^{\prime}$ immediately follows.
2. The adverb ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$ (Epic $\kappa \epsilon \in$ or $\kappa \epsilon \in \nu$, Doric $\kappa \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ ) is regularly joined with $\epsilon i$ in the protasis, when the verb is in the Subjunctive ( $\$ 50,1$ ) ; $\epsilon i$ with $\stackrel{\prime \prime}{\nu} \nu(\breve{a})$ forming the compound $\epsilon \frac{\epsilon}{a} \nu, \stackrel{\not 2}{a} \nu(\bar{a})$, or $\stackrel{\eta}{\eta} \nu$. See $\S 38,1$.) The simple $\epsilon i$ is used in the protasis with the Indicative and the Optative.

The same adverb $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu$ is regularly ased in the apodosis with the Optative ( $\$ 50,2$ ), and also with tle secondary
tenses of the Indicative in the construction explained in $\S 49,2$. (See § 37, 3, and § 39.)
3. The negative particle of the protasis is regularly $\mu \eta^{\prime}$, that of the apodosis is ov.

Note. When the last rule is violated, and ò is found in a protasis, it is always closely connected with a particular word (generally the rerb), with which it forms a single negative. expression ; so that its negative force does not (like that of $\mu \eta^{\prime}$; affect the protasis as a whole。 E. g.
 $\phi \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, if you deny it, as well as if you admit it. Plat. Apol. 25 B. (Here ęà $\mu \grave{\eta} \phi \bar{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ would mean unless you almit it.) Eì $\mu \hat{e} \nu$ où
 $a$ few, \&c. Lys. Agorat. p. $135 ; \S 62$. Cf. p. 137; § 76. (Here

 rat, 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.

The following example makes the difference between ò and $\mu$ ' particularly clear, ov affecting merely the verb, and $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ affecting
 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \dot{\omega} \theta \theta_{\eta} \sigma a \nu$ äv, if it had not been that they dill not receive Proxenus, they would have been saved. Dem. F. L. 364, 11.

When several clauses, introduced by $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ and $\delta \dot{\delta}$, depend upon a single $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i}$ which precedes them all, ovi is used even more frequently than $\mu \dot{\eta}$; as such clauses have their own construction independently of the $e i$, which merely introduces each of them as a whole, not affecting the construction of particular words. E. g.

 бopev, it would be a hard thing, if (it is a fact that) their allies will not refiuse, \&.e., while we will not contribute. Truc. I, 121. Eit' ouv

 is true, that) the Argive people did not fear, \&c. Dem. Rhod. 197, 9.

## Classification of Conditional Sentences.

§4. The supposition contained in a protasis may be either particuiar or general. A particular supposi-
tion refers to a definite act or a defmite series of acts. A general supposition relers to amy one of a class of acts, which may occur (or may have occurred) on any one of a series of possible occasions, - if having the force of if ever or whenever.

The following examples contain particular suppoitions:-
If he is (now) able to din this, he is doing it, єi toìto moteiv סúvatau, пnпєî. If' he was able to do this. he did it, єi тоїто тоtiv '̇iv̀aato, ėmoís. If he (shall) be able to do this, he will do it,
 he would do it, єi тоїтo поוєì div̀.lto, пошoì äv.

The following contain general suppo-itious: -
If he is (ever) able to do this, he (alewys) dops it. є̣à toìto тоєє̂̀ dúvitat, тоєє̂. If any one (ever) wishes to go, it is (always)

 one (ever) wished to go, it was (ahways) premitted, eil tos ßní-

 one should (ever) wish to go, it would (always) be permitted, ei


Although this distinction can logically apply to all suppositions (present, past, and future), yet the Greek distinguishes the two classes in construction only in present and pust conditions, even here excepting those which imply non-fulfilment of the condition. Thercfore all the classes under I., except A. 1, inelude both particular and general suppositions.
I. Excluding from A. 1 the past and present general suppoitions, which have a peculiar construction, we have fimer forms of ordinary conditional sentences:-
A. If the protasis refers to the present or the past, the question as to the fulfilment of the condition which it expresses has been already decidel (in point of fact) either affirmatively or negatively; the speaker. however, either may or may not wi.h to imply by his form of statement how that question has been decided. He will, therefore, state such a condition in one of two ways:-

1. If he refers to a present or past condition, expressing no opinion as to its fulfilment, he may say if he is doing this, $\epsilon i$

 done it, $\epsilon i$ ėлєтра́хєь. The apodosis, expressing the result of the fulfilment of such a condition, may refer to the present, the past, or the future. Thus we may say,



 is (was or will be) well; and so with the other tenses in the protasis. (See § 49, 1.)

So in Latin, Si hoc facit, bene est; Si hoc fecit, bene erit.
2. If, on the other hand, he refers to a present or past condition, wishing to imply that it is not or was not fulfilled, he
 had done this (although he did not do it), $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon_{\pi}^{\prime} \rho a \xi \in \nu$. The apodosis here denotes what would be or would have been the result, if the false supposition in the protasis were a valid one. The apodosis here contains the adverb äv, which distinguishes it from those forms of apodosis belonging under 1 in which past tenses are used. Thus we may say,

 had been doing this, it would have been well.
 it would have been well (or it would now be weill). On the other
 did this, it was well. (See $\S 49,2$.

In Latin: Si hoc faceret, bene esset; Si hoc fecisset, bene fuisset.
Remark 1. The Greek has thus a special form (A, 2) implying that a condition is not or was not fulfilled, and another (A, 1) implying nothing whatever as to its fulfilment. There is no special form implying that the condition is or was fulfilled, - a force often erroneously assigned to the form $\mathrm{A}, 1$. If this is to be expressed at all, it must be done by the context, not by the form of the verb.
B. If the protasis refers to the future, the question as to the fulfilment of the condition is, of course, at present undecided, and a speaker may state such a condition in either of two ways ( 1,1 and 2 ), which differ more in the form of statement than in thei) meaning: -

 tion of a future case. The natural apodosis to such a protaris expresses what will be the result, if the condition shall be fulfilled. We may therefore say,

 1.) In Latin: Si hoc faciet (more frequently si hoc feccrit), bene erit ; rarely si hoc faciat, bene erit.
2. He may also say, if he should do this, ei mpá still supposing a case in the future, but less distinctly and vividly than before. The natural apodosis to such a protasis is a similar indefinite expression, it would be. We can therefore say,
 well. (See § 50, 2.) ln Latin : Si hoc faciat, bene sit.

Remari 2. The two forms of protasis which the Greek expresses by the Subjunctive ( $\grave{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu \pi \rho \bar{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \eta$ тоїтo) and the Optative ( $\epsilon i$ apá $\sigma \sigma o l$ тoùro) have only one equivalent form in Latin; si hoc faciat meaning if he shall do thiss ( $\epsilon$ 'à тoìтo $\pi \rho$ р́ $\sigma \sigma \eta$ ), as well as if he should do this' ( $\epsilon \mathrm{i}$ тойтo $\pi \rho$ а́ $\sigma \sigma o t$ ). (See § 50,2, Rem. $b$ ) But in the former sense the Latin conmonly employs the Future Inlicative, si hoc faciet (corresponding to $\epsilon i$ тoùto $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \epsilon \epsilon$, if he shall do this), or the Future Perfect, si hoc fecerit, leaving the form si hoc faciat to represent the Greek $\epsilon i$ тоѝтo $\pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma o \iota$, if he should do this.
II. In general suppositions the two following classes are distinguished in construction from the corresponding particular suppositions (I. A, 1).
A. First, when the apodosis contains a verb of present time, expressing a customary or repeated action or a general truth, and the protasis refers to indefinite time represented in English as present. We may then say,

 (ever) able to this, he (in all such cases) does it. 'Eáv tis toútou $\pi!l$, $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \theta_{\imath} \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$, if any one (ever) drinks of this, he dies.
13. Secondly, when the apodosis expresses a customary or repeated action or a general truth in past time, and the protasis refers to indefinite past time. We may then say,
 (in all such cascs) well. Ei toũto тoutiv סúvaıto, є̇поít, if he was (ever) able to do this, he (always) did it. Eil tıs тoútov miou, àmétro $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$, if any one (ever) drank of this, he died.

Remark 1. General suppositions referring to the future (see p. 89), as well as those referring to the present or past with nonfulfilment of the condition implied, not being distinguished by their form from partieular suppositions, are included under the rules of § 49, 2 and $\S 50,1$ and 2.

Remark 2. Although the Latin occasionally agrees with the Greek in the construction of general conditional sentences, - using si faciat and si faceret like $\grave{\epsilon}$ à $\nu \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \eta$ and $\epsilon i \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma o t ~ a b o v e,-$ - it commonly agrees with the English in not distinguishing this class from I, A, 1 .

## I. Four Forms of Ordinary Conditional Sentences.

## A. Present and Pust Conditions.

§ 45. 1. (Particular Suppositions.) When the protasis in a particular supposition simply. states a present or a past condition, implying nothing as to the truth of the supposition, the verb is in one of the presput or past tenses of the Indicative, after $\epsilon$ i. Any tense of the Indicative may be used in the apodosis, to express the result of the fulfilment of the condition. E. g.
 does not imply that the speaker has any knowledge or opinion on the question whether it actually thundered.) Ei $\delta^{\prime}$ oũt $\boldsymbol{\text { on }}$ тoũto



 тои́т $\omega$, if I do not know Phaedrus, I have forgotten myself; but neither of these is the case. Plat. Phaedr. 228 A. (See § 48, I, A,




Note 1. The Imperative, the Subjunctive in exhortations or prohibitions, or the Optative in wishes, may stand in the apodosis. E. g.
'A $\lambda \lambda$ ' $\epsilon i \delta о к \in \hat{\imath} \sigma \sigma$, , $\sigma \epsilon \epsilon \bar{i} \epsilon$, if thou art resolved, go. Soph. Ant. 98. (Here $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \quad \delta o k \hat{\eta}$ would refer to the future, while $\epsilon i$ $\delta o к є \hat{\imath}$ is strictly present in its time. Cf. Antig. 76.) ' $\Lambda \lambda \lambda$ ' $\epsilon i \delta$ окє $\hat{\imath}, \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon-$ $\mu \in \nu, \dot{o} \rho \mu a ́ \sigma \theta \omega$ тaxús. Sopir. Phil. 526. 'A $\lambda \lambda$ ' єĭ $\pi о v \pi \tau \omega \chi \bar{\omega} \nu \gamma \epsilon$

 ráXos, lut if this pleases you, let some one quickly loose the shoes, \&c.
 Arist. Ran. 579. In the last three examples the Optative expresses a wish (§ 82), and must not be confounded with the Optative with äv in apodosis (§50,2).

Remark. A protasis of this class may also be followed by an
 $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \theta o \iota \mu t$, if this is true, I should be glad to depart. But such an apodosis always implies a protasis with an Optative, which is independent of the one expressed; so that these examples belong under the mixed constructions of § 54. Sec § 54, 1 (a).

Note 2. Under this head belong all cases of particular suppositions referring to the present or the past in which the non-fulfilment of the condition is not implied. We must be careful not to include in this class the general suppositions explained in $\$ 51$; which require a Subjunctive or Optative in the protasis, although we commonly translate them in English by the simple Indicative.

Note 3. The condition may still be present, even when the Future Indicative stands in the protasis, if that tense expresses merely a present intention or necessity that something shall happen hereafter; as when $\boldsymbol{\epsilon i}$ тои̂то $\pi о \iota \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$ means if he is (now) about to do this, and not (as it does in an ordinary future condition) if he shall do this. E. g.

Aip $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \kappa \tau \rho o \nu, \epsilon i{ }^{\prime} a_{\chi} \in \hat{\imath}$, raise your spur, if you are going to fight. Arist. Av. 761. (Ei $\mu a \chi \in i$ in protasis commonly means $i f$ you shall



 \&e., if they are to suffer humyer, thirst, \&c. (i. e. if it is necessary that


 єi $\delta t a \beta \lambda \eta \theta_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma o \mu a l$, Eur. Hec. 863.

This use of the Future must be carefully distinguished from that found in future conditions, where it is equivalent to the Subiunctive. ( $\$ 50,1$, Note 1). The periphrastic form of the Future with $\mu \mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ and the Infinitive (§ 25,2 ) is more common in this construction.
 noon $\sigma o v \sigma \nu \nu)$ shows that the condition is really present and not future So with the Latin periphrastic Future, si hoc facturus est.
2. In sentences containing present or past conditions, when it is implied that the condition of the protasis is not or was not fulfilled, and when the apodosis expresses
what would be (or would have been) the result if that condition were (or had been) fulfilled, the secondury tenses of the Indicative are used in both protasis and apodosis. The apodosis regularly contains the adverb $a \nu$.

The Imperfect here refers to present time or to a continued or repeated action in past time, the Aorist to an action simply occurring in past time, and the (rare) Pluperfect to an action completed in past or present time. E. g.
 it ,ould be well (implying that he is not doing it). This may also mean if he had been ioing this, it would have been well (implying that he was not doing it). The context must decide, in each case, to
 $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \in \nu$, if he hal done this, it would have been well (implying that he
 finished doing this (now, or at any past time), it would be well (implying either he has not, or he had not finished it).
 they would not be able to do this, if they did not lead an abstemious
 it would be much more wonderful, if they were honored. Рlat. Rep. VI,

 $I$ not see (as I do), \&c. Isoc. Archid. p. 134 A. § 87. Á́ $\gamma 0 v \sigma t$
 $\dot{a} \nu$ oioi $\tau^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu$ тoùto moin $\sigma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu}$, they tell everything as it is: and yet if knowledge did not chance to be in them, they could not to this. Plat.



 IIdt. I, 187 . (This implies $\ddot{a} \pi \lambda r$ rotos $\epsilon \bar{l}$, thou art insatiable, and àv'̣ $\varphi \in \varsigma$, thou didst open.)
 have been master of the islands, if he had not had also some naval for:e

 $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \in v \in \nu \dot{d} \lambda \eta \theta \in \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \omega$, he would not have declared these things (referring to several), had he not becn confulent that he should speak
 oủk ä้ $\pi$ отє $\tau a \bar{\tau} \tau a \ddot{\epsilon} \pi a \sigma \chi$ оу, if they had been good men, as you say, they would never have suffered these things (referring to several cases) Plat. Gorg. 516 E.

 more, had not Hector perceived him. II. V. 679. Kaí vú кєy ïla nàva







 סúvauıv. Dem. Phil. I, 41, 18. (Sce below, Remark b; and § 42, 4.)
 not come, we should (now) be on our way to the King. (Aor. and Im-

 if they had given the necessary atrice in time past, there would now be no need of your deliberating. Dem. Phil. I, 40, 9. Toûto $\epsilon i$ à $\pi \epsilon-$
 answered this, I should have already learned, \&c. (implying $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' ov $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{a} \theta \eta \kappa a$, but now I have not learned). Plat. Euthyph. 14 C.



 Cor. 251, 28.

Different tenses can of course be used in the protasis and apodosis, if the sense requires it. See especially the example quoted above from Dem. Phil. I, p. 40, 9, and the preceding one.

This construction is the exact equivalent of the Latin Inperfect 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; while the Latin Pluperfect Subjunctive represents the Greek Aorist and Pluperfect Indicative, and also the Imperfect referring to past time.

Remark. (a.) It will be seen by the examples, that this construction usually implies, 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,
 been saved, implies not merely that he did not do this, but also that he was not saved. The denial of the apodosis is not, however, inferred as a necessary consequence from the denial of the protasis, which would often be an illogical inference; for (in the example ahove) the person might have been saved in some
other way, even if he did not do the thing referred to. Indeed, where it is not implied that the action of the apodosis depends as a result upon that of the protasis as its condition, the action of the apodosis is not denied: this happens when the protasis expresses a concession, introduced by каì ci, even if, although,
 had done this, he would have been saved, where it may be implied that he was saver.
(b.) In this form of conditional sentence, therefore, the verb of the protasis always (and the verb of the apodosis generally) implies its opposite ; the Imperfect always implying a Present or Imperfect, the Aorist an Aorist, and the Pluperfect usualiy a Perfect or Pluperfect. Thus $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \sigma \sigma \epsilon$, when it means if he were doing, implies à $\lambda^{\prime}$ ò $\pi$ áá⿱㇒日ध $t$, but really he is not doing;
 but really he was not doing: $\epsilon i \mu \grave{\eta} \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \xi \in \nu$, if he had not done,
 he had already done this, implies either a $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { ' ò } \\ \pi \epsilon \pi o i \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu, \text { but }\end{gathered}$
 not done $i t$, according to the context. This principle will show which tense of the Indicative is to be used in any given case, in writing Greek.

The Aorist, however, is very often used here, as elsewhere, where the Pluperfect would express the time inteuded more exactly (§ 19, N. 4) ; as in the sentence above quoted, ouvièv ${ }_{a} \nu \AA \nu \nu v \nu i$ that the Pluperfeet might have been used for $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \xi \in \nu$.

Note 1. In Homer, the Imperfect in this construction refers to past time, and is to be trauslated by our Pluperfect. E. g.
 $\pi a \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ à $\nu \delta \rho \omega \bar{\nu} \tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon$, then there would have been, \&c. II. VIII,



Note 2. Sometimes äv is omitted in the apodosis, although the non-fulfilment of the condition is still implied. This merely gives a more emphatic expression, as when we say it had been for it would huve been. The äy can be omitted only when the
context shows conclusively that the construction is not that of § 49, 1. E. g.
 $\tau \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$, yes, by Zeus, I were indeed ashamed, if I had been deceived,
 $\theta \rho \omega \pi$ os ${ }^{\text {ékeivos, }}$, it had been good for that man, if he had not becn born. Matth. Evang. XXVI, 24.

Compare Verg. Aen. XI, 115: Aequius huic Turnum fuerat se opponere morti, it had been more just, \&c., where fuisset would have been the regular form

Note 3. (a.) An apodosis without äv, but implying the non-fulfilment of a condition, is often formed by an Infinitive depending on the Imperfect of a verb denoting necessity, obligation, propriety, possibility, or the like. This combination merely expresses in other words what might have been expressed by the verb of the Infinitive in a past tense of the
 to love him (or ought to have loved him), 一 implying, but you do not love him (or did not love him), 一 and is equivalent to
 would have loved him), if you did (or had done) what you
 have done this (but you did not), being equivalent to cikótos


This construction occurs chiefly after the impersonal Imper-
 (decebat), $\eta_{\nu}$ or $\dot{i} \pi \eta \rho \chi \in \nu\left(i t\right.$ was possible), and $\tilde{\eta}_{\nu}$ with nouns and adjectives expressing necessity, propriety, \&c. So when ${ }_{j} \nu$ is
 tive). When the Present Infinitive is used, the construction refers to present time or to continued or repeated action in past time ; when the Aorist Infinitive is used, it refers to a single or romentary action in past time. E. g.


 against us alone, he ought, letting alone all others, to be marching directly into our country; and then he woulld show that he wras marehing against Scythians. Нрт. IV, 118. Here $\chi$ р $\hat{\eta} \nu$ lévaı means he would be marching into our country (like $\eta_{\| \in \nu} \ddot{\Delta} \nu$ ), if he were lloing what would be expected under such circumstances,- -implying that this
condition is not fultilled. (See below, Rem. 1.) ' $\mathrm{E}_{\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu} \mu \dot{\iota} \nu$ oủ

 $\tau \in s$ ékeivo moooûrıv, к.т. 入., i. e. those who think they ought to reccive the crown would (if they did what is right and just) be showing that they deserve it themselves, and not be abusing me; but since now they have neglected the former and do the latter, \&c. Dem. Cor. Trier. 1228,

 a tooth, then you would have to do as you now do. HDt. I, 39. (See

 to say a word out of regard either to enmity or to favor (and yet they

 ap $\quad$ ip ; i. e. ought she to have helped Philip acquire his dominion over the Greeks (sc. as she would have done by your policy)? Dem. Cor.

 have given satisfaction by a pricate suit (as if he had said $\pi \rho o \sigma \eta \kappa o ́ v \tau \omega s$
 $\tau^{\prime} \ddot{\omega} \nu \sigma \epsilon \sigma \dot{\omega} \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon i \vec{\eta} \theta \epsilon \lambda o \nu \dot{a} \nu a \lambda i \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu \chi \rho \eta \mu u \tau a, \dot{a} \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$, i. e. whereas I might have saved you, if I hal been willing to spend money, \&c
 $\Phi \iota \lambda i \pi \pi \omega$, for Philip could not have remained, unless you had been deceived (implying he did remain). Dem. F. L. 379, 2. (Sce § 52,
 $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \nu \bar{\nu} \nu, \xi v \mu \mu a \chi \epsilon i \nu$. Thuc. VI, 78 . (The orator adds, ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda$


 patris loco, si ulla in te pietas esset, colere debebas. Cic. Phil. II, 38.
(b.) The Aorist and Imperfect of $\dot{o} \phi \epsilon i \lambda \omega$ ( $\dot{o}^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ ) are sometimes used with the Infinitive like $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \nu, \not{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \iota$, \&c.; as in Il,

 me honor; but now he has not honored me even a little. From this comes the common use of this form in expressions of a wish; as $\ddot{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \mathrm{K} \hat{\nu} \rho o s \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$, would that Cyrus were living (lit. Cyrus ought to be living). This is an apodosis, implying as a protasis if it were possible, or something similar. See § 83, 2.
(c.) Similar to this is the occasional use of $\epsilon \beta$ oudó $\mu \eta \nu$ (without ${ }^{\circ} \nu$ ) to express what some one wishes were now true (but which is not true). E. g.

 and t.e assemblies were rightly managen, and that the laus were in


 oủk '́ $\rho \bar{i} \zeta \in \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta$ á $\delta \epsilon$, would that I were not contending here (as I am). Arist. Ran. s66. See below, Rem. 2.
(d.) Kııסvvevic is used with the Infinitive, as a periphrasis for the verb of the Infinitive with ${ }^{\circ} \nu \nu$. E. g.
 $\nu \in \tau 0$, the city was in danger of being utterly destroyed, if a wind had
 $\sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi o \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, if we had not escaped to Delphi, we were in danger of perishing (or there was danger that we should perish) Aeschin. Cor. § 123. (If the meaning had been that there would have been danger, we should have had $\left.\epsilon^{\epsilon} \kappa \iota \nu \delta \nu \nu \epsilon \dot{\prime} \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu a ̈ \nu.\right)$
(e.) The Imperfect of $\mu^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ with the Infinitive may express a past intention or expectation which was not realized, and so take the place of the verb of the Infinitive with ${ }_{c} \nu \nu$. E. g.
 $\mu \grave{\eta} . . .{ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon$, i. e. I should have perished like A. (lit. I was to have perished), if thou hadst not spoken. Od. XIII, 383. M $\operatorname{\epsilon } \lambda \lambda \in \nu \mu^{\mu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$
 $\theta \epsilon o i$. Od. I, 232. Ov $\sigma v \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \nu \notin \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, they would not hare joined him (in that ease). Dem. F. L. 391, 11. So in Latin: Hoc facturi erant, nisi venisset, they were to have done this, had he not come.

 should have done so) had Zeus granted us a return.

Remark 1. It will be seen that in the construction of Note 3 a

 would have lored him. if you had done what you ought, or simply you should have loved him. (See § 52, 1.) This form therefore commonly stands as an apodosis with no other protasis expressed; and even if another is added (as in the first example under $a$ ), the implied protasis always remains the prominent one. Especially, this implied protasis expresses the condition. the non-fulfilment of which prevents the action of the apodosis from taking place. The whole expression X $\rho \bar{\eta} \nu$ тoûto $\pi$ oteì, \&c. thus becomes the aporlosis to the expressed protasis, if one is added. In the third example under $a$ (Hot. I, 39), the real apodosis may be you would then do from necessity what you now do (implying that now you do not do it from necessity) ; or we may perhaps explain $\chi \rho \eta \bar{\eta}$ better by Note 2.

In this construction the Infinitive (of course modified by the leading verb, as shown above) contains the main idea of the apodosis.

When the main idea is contained in the verb of necessity, \&c., so that the non-fulfilment of the condition of the protasis affects this
 forming an ordinary apodosis (§ 49,2). Thus $\epsilon i$ tad $\grave{\text { ócovia oṽto }}$
 given the necessary advice, there would now be no need of your deliberrating, implies but now there is need of your deliberating. Occasionally both constructions can be used to express essentially the same apodosis: thus in Lys. in Frat. § 32, we find, $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \in, \epsilon \nexists \pi \epsilon \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a$
 you had been an honest man, you ought to have become an informer in behalf of those who were about to suffer death unjustly (implying but you did not do so, ov่к द' $\gamma^{\prime} \nu 0 u \mu \eta \nu \tau \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} s$ ); but in § 48, referring to the

 if he had been a good man, it would have been his duty, \&e. (implying oik єंХ $\rho \bar{\eta} \nu)$. The latter construction, however, is very rare where the former would be admissible.
 $\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon i ̄ \nu$ would be expressed in Latin by te oportebat hunc aware and te oporteret hunc amaze.

Remark 2. The greatest difficulty in understanding the forms explained in Note 3 is caused by the defect in the English verb ought, which makes it impossible to translate them accurately.
 te hoc facers, you ought not to have done this, expressing the past time by the tense of the Infinitive, which we should express by the past tense of ought if there were one. (You oughted not to do this would represent the Greek and Latin idiom. The vulgar expression you had n't ought comes very near it.)

A further trouble appears when such phrases as ova $\neq \delta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \tau$ rove $о$ moteiv refer to present time, meaning you ought not to be doing this (as you are). The Imperfect here refers to present time, as it does in the ordinary construction of $\S 49,2$. The Latin has the same idiom, non oportebat te hoc facere. But in English, owing to the defect in the verb ought, we are obliged to use the simple present; so that we cannot distinguish in translation between " $\delta \delta \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota}$, oportebat te mare, and $\delta \in \hat{i} \sigma \epsilon \phi_{i \lambda \epsilon i v, ~ o p o r t e t ~ t e ~ a m a r e, ~-~ b o t h ~ b e-~}^{\text {b }}$ ing expressed by you ought to love, although the former implies but you do not love, while the latter implies no condition.

It needs perhaps to be added, that the tenses of the infinitive here express no time of themselves, but are used in the ordinary constructions of $\S 15,1$, and $\S 23,1$. The equivalent Latin forms (facere representing both $\pi n \iota \epsilon \bar{\nu}$ and $\pi o \iota \bar{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ ) will make this clear.

## Remark 3. It must not be understood that the Imperfects éxpŋ̄̀

 $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \iota, \& c$. with the Infinitive are always used in the construction of but he wis obliged to remain (and did remain).

Note 4. (a.) In II. XXIIf, 526 к' is uset with a secondary tense of the Indicative in protasis, apparently addug nothing to the sense. (See § 50, 2. N. 2, b.)


(b.) When $\not \approx \nu$ stands in the protasis with a secondary tense of the Indicative in Attic Greek, the expression is so obviously an apodesis at the same time, as to present no difficulty. "A $\nu$ can never coalesce with $\epsilon i$ to form cáv in these sentences, as it always belongs to the verb. E. g.
 pıov, к. т. ., If then this would have been a strong proof for him (sc. had he had it to bring forward), so let it be also a proof for me, \&c. Dear. Timoth. 1201, 19. (This sentence properly belongs to the class of $\S 49,1$; for the protasis really is if it is true that this would have been a proof, to which the apodosis in the Imperative corresponds.) In

 if we retain the final $\boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ (which is strongly supported by Mss. authority), we must translate $\epsilon i \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \chi \epsilon i \rho \eta \sigma^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$ if it is true that I would (under any circumstances) have undertaken, \&c., and not simply if $I$ had undertaken ( $\epsilon i$ є̇ $\pi \epsilon \chi \epsilon i p \eta \sigma a$ ). See § 50,2 , Note $2, a$; and § 63, 2.

Note 5. In some cases the Aorist is found in the apodosis referring to present time, after a protasis in the Imperfect; it always denotes, however, a momentary or sudden occurrence, or some other idea which the Imperfect would not express so well. E. g.
 you were asking me any one of the questions before us, I should (at

 $\kappa \rho i \nu \omega$; if you desired this kind of wisdom, and I happened to be asking you, \&c., what should you reply? [Plat.] Theag. 123 B. See also Plat. Prot. 313 A; Gorg. 447 D ; Symp. 199 D.

Note 6. (a.) In a very few passages in Homer we find the Optative with $\kappa \epsilon^{\prime}$ in the apodosis referring to the past, where we should expect a secondary tense of the Indicative. E. g.
 $\Delta$ còs $\theta u$ रár $\eta \rho$ 'Aфpodít $\eta$, A eneas would have perished, had not Aphrodile quickly perceived him. Il. V, 311. Kaí עú $\kappa \in \nu$ évé àmó入oıтo"Apクs
 both these cases $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon \tau \sigma$ would be the regular form, in Honeric as


 army he belonged: for the dependent Optative, see § 31, 3, Note.
(b.) The Imperfeet Indicative is not used in Homer in the construction of § 49,2 referring to present time. (See Note 1.) In a few cases where the Attic Greek would use that form, we find the present Optative in Homer. E. g.
 кaì $\nu \circ \sigma \phi \iota \zeta \zeta o i \mu \epsilon \theta a \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$, i. e. if any other one had told it, we should call it a falschood, and should rather turn away from it. II. II, 80. In Il. XXIII, 274, we find the Optative in both protasis and apodosis, where the Attie Greek would use the Imperfect Indica-
 $\kappa \lambda \iota \sigma i \eta \nu \delta \epsilon \phi \in \rho$ oi $\mu \eta \nu$, i. e. if we were now contending in honor of another (than Patroclus), I should take the first prize and bear it to my tent. The present Optative in Homer is used also in its regular sense, referring to the Future (See § 50, 2.) The constructions included in this note seem to be a relie of an ancient use of the Optative in conditional sentences like that of the secondary tenses of the Latin Subjunctive. (See Appendix I.) For the similar Homeric use of the Present Optative in expressions of a wish, see § 82, Rem. 2.

## B. Future Conditions.

§ 50. 1. When a supposed future case is stated distinctly and vividly (as in English, if I shall go), the protasis takes the Subjunctive with $\epsilon^{\prime} \dot{a}^{\nu} \nu$, ${ }^{\prime \prime \nu} \nu(\bar{a})$, or ${ }_{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \nu$ (Epic $\epsilon \ddot{l} \kappa \epsilon$ or $a \grave{l} \kappa \epsilon$ ).

The apodosis denotes what will be the result, if the condition of the Protasis shall be fulfilled. It therefore takes the Future Indicative, or some other future form, like the Imperative. E. g.

[^10]- 's $\mu \in \theta$ a $\chi \in \iota \rho$ ồ $9 a \iota$, if any one shall stand opposed to $u s$, we will try

 shall not new be willing to fight him there, we shall perlaps be forceat to do so here. Dem. Phil. I, 54, 20. Here vùv refers to time immediately following the present: if Dem. had meant if we are not nom willing, he would have said $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \bar{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda o \mu \in \nu(\S 49,1)$. ${ }^{*} \mathrm{H} \nu$

 каì тoooúrous $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s ~ a u ̀ \tau c u ̀ s ~ \pi a \rho a ́ ~ \sigma \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, \mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda \eta ̄ s ~ a ̉ \sigma \phi a \lambda \epsilon i a s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$

 them, if there shall be any need. lb. V, 4, 30. * $\mathrm{H} \nu \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu о \nu$





 be understood as referring to the future, like $\delta \mu o \lambda o \gamma \eta \sigma \in \epsilon s . ~ § 10,1$,

 philcsophers shall become kings or the kings philosophers, there is no escape from troubles for states. Plat. Rep. V, 473 D . $\Delta i \delta i \omega \sigma{ }^{\prime}$ éxìn

 shall not have assisted us, there is no need of our assisting them. ${ }^{*} \mathrm{H} \nu$
 may I perish, if I ever take them auay. Arıst. Ran. 586. (Sce §34, 1.)

Remark 1. It will be seen that the apodosis in this construction may take any form of the verb that refers to the future, - the Future Indicative, the Imperative, the Subjunctive in exhortations and prohibitions, the Infinitive in any future sense, or the Optative in wishes. It may also contain a Present Indicative including a reference to the future (like $\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$ or $\delta \epsilon i$ ) or a Present merely used emphatically for the Future, like $\dot{\rho} \mu о \lambda о \gamma \hat{\omega}$ above quoted from Xex


Remark 2. The English (especially the colloquial language) seldom expresses the important distinction between this form of protasis and that of $\S 49,1$. Thus modern usage allows us to use the inexact expression if he wishes, not merely for $\epsilon i$ קoúגєтat (if he now wishes), but alse for $\mathfrak{\epsilon a ̀} \nu \beta$ oúd $\eta \tau a \iota$ (if he shall wish). The sense, however, generally makes the distinction clear.

Note 1. The Future Indicative with ci is very often used in the protasis in the same sense as the Subjunctive with éá, , sometimes alternating with it in the same sentence. This is
nerely a more vivid form of expression than the Subjunctive, both corresponding to the English if I shall do this, \&e. E. g.
 тобшкєа Пŋлєíшva, if A chulles shall fighte, \&c. Il. XX, 26. Eì סє $\sigma v^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime}$






 Dem. Aph. II, 842, 15. (Referring to the same thing, p. 834, 24,


 $\chi$ às катабтŋ́боцєข víâs aủtoús. Isoc. Archid. p. 138 A. § 107.

This use of the Future must not be confounded with its less common use in present conditions, $\S 49,1, N .3$, where it is not equivalent to the Subjunctive.
Note 2. In the Homeric language the following peculiarities appear in this construction:-
(a.) The Subjunctive with $\kappa^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ is sometimes used in the apodosis instead of the Future Indicative, thus making the apodosis correspond in form to the protasis. E. g.
 give her up, I will take her myself. II. I, 324. (Compare I, 137.) This gives a form of sentence analogous to that in which the Optative is used in both protasis and apolosis. See § 87, Note. (For the use of $\delta \epsilon$ in apodosis, see below, § 57.)
(b.) ${ }^{*} \mathrm{H} \nu$ is the only contraction of $\epsilon i \not a \nu$ found in Homer. The most common Homeric form is, however, $\epsilon i \neq \kappa \in$ (sometimes $\left.\epsilon i \delta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \kappa \epsilon\right)$. Eì ${ }^{\prime} \nu$ is rarely found, as Il. III, 288.
(c.) $\mathrm{E} i \hbar \kappa \epsilon$ or $a i k \epsilon$ is sometimes found even with the Future Indicative in Homer. E. g.



For $\kappa \in \in\left(\right.$ and even $\left.\not{ }^{\prime} \nu\right)$ with the Future in apodosis, see § 37, 2.
(d.) The simple $\epsilon i$ (without ä̆ or $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ) is often used with the Subjunctive in Homer, apparently in the same sense as $\epsilon i k \in$ or the Attic éáv. E. g.




Note 3. (a.) The Homeric use of the simple $\epsilon i$ with the Subjunctive continues in lyric poetry, and is found in the chorus of the Attic drama, and even in some passages of tho ordinary dialogue. E. g.




(b.) In Attic prose, this construction is extremely rare, and its existence is denied by many high authorities; if we follow the Mos., however, we must admit it in a few passages, as Thuc. VI, 21: 0

 worst Mss. read $\eta^{\eta} \nu$ for $\epsilon i$.)

Note 4. For the change from the Subjunctive to the Optativn after secondary tenses in indirect discourse, seo § 74, 1.
2. When a supposed future case is stated less distinctly and vividly than it would be stated by the Subjunctive (as in English, if I should go), the protasis takes the Optative with ei.

The apodosis here denotes what would be the result if the condition of the protasis should be fulfilled, and takes the Optative with ${ }^{2} \nu v$. E. g.




 царуанє́voи








 $\lambda_{\text {oi }} \mu \in \theta^{\prime}$ ầ $\nu$ toùs mo入 $\epsilon \mu$ ious. Xen. Cyr. II, 1, 8 . Oй $\pi o \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta}$ ầ



 suffered (lit. be in the condition of having suffered) the most pitiable of all things, if they should vote me a foreigner? Dem. Eubul. 1812, 17. (See $\S 18,1$, and examples of the Perfeet Optative there quoted.)

Remark. (a.) This form of the conditional sentence must be especially distinguished from that of §49, 2; the more so, as we often
 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.
(b.) On the other hand, the distinction beween this form and that of $\$ 50,1$ is less marked, and it is often of slight importance which of the two is used in a particular case. Thus 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; in Greek, the former
 Є̈Хоь. (See § 48, I, B, Rem. 2.) In writing Greek, this distinetion ean generally be made, by first observing the form of the apodosis in English; if that is expressed by would, it should be translated by the Greek Optative with $\not \approx \nu$; if it is expressed by will, it should be translated by the Future Indicative. (Other forms of the apodosis, as the Imperative, will present no difficulty.) The form to be used in the protasis will then appear from the rules for dependence of Moods (\$ 32 and § 34); the Optative will require another Optative with $\epsilon i$ in the dependent protasis (i. e. the form of $\S 50,2, \epsilon i \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \lambda \theta 0<-$
 primary form will require a Subjunctive with $\mathfrak{\epsilon c} \dot{\alpha}$, or a Future Indi-
 or $\epsilon \mathfrak{l} \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a, \kappa a \lambda \hat{\omega} \varsigma \tilde{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \iota)$.

In indirect discourse we often find an Optative in protasis, whieh merely represents the same tense of the Subjunctive or Indicative in the direct diseourse. See § 69, $1 ; \S 74,1$; and § 77 .

Note 1. Cases of the omission of $\not \approx \nu$ in an apodosis of this class are rare; they oecur chiefly in Homer, less frequently in the Attie pocts (even then chiefly in questions, and after such expressions as ouk $\left.{ }^{\prime} \sigma \theta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \omega \omega\right)$, and seldom or never in Attic prose where the text is beyond suspicion on other grounds. E. g.
 $\phi \in \rho a \iota \in \nu$, which two men could not lift (if they should try). Il. V,





 as one might say. Eur. Andr. 929. ${ }^{\circ} \Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \in \ddot{i} \pi$ o८ tis tótos, as one would say тónos. (?) Arist. Av. 180.


Note 2. (a.) The adverb ${ }^{a} \nu$ is sometimes used with the Optafive in the protasis, but only when the protasis is itself at the same time an apodosis, with another protasis expressed or imphed. This is, of course, no exception to the general rule ( $\S 39$ ); and it is to be noticed that the ${ }^{\alpha} \nu$ in this case always belongs strictly to the verb, and never joins the $\epsilon i$ to form ćáv. E. g.
 $\epsilon \sigma \pi \iota \nu$, it is not wholly to be despised, even if you would not do this (if an opportunity should occur). Dear. Phil. I, 44, $\overline{30}$. Kali єं $\gamma \dot{\omega}, \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho$
 any other man (if he shout.' give me his word), I trust you. Plat.

 even a slave who was intemperate (sc. if one should be offered), \&e. Sen. Mem. I, 5, 3. (Such conditional sentences as the three areceding belong properly under $\S 49,1$. Compare the last example under § 54, Rem.) See § 49,2, N. $4, b$.

So occasionally in Homer ; as Il. V, 273, ai то⿱́тн $\kappa \in \lambda a ́ \beta o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$,

 we would escape death (where $\epsilon i$ tai azov ф' should ever escape death).
(b.) Commonly, however, when $\epsilon \ddot{\imath} \kappa \epsilon$ occurs in Homer, $\kappa \epsilon$ belongs to the $\epsilon i$, and no force of an apodosis is perceptible. Here, as in final clauses $(\S 44,1$, N. $3, a)$, the $\kappa \kappa^{\prime}$ adds nothing to the sense that can be expressed in English. E. g.


 'Ахаьิ̀. Il. VI, 49.
But if the $\kappa \epsilon$ is separated from the $\epsilon i$ (except by $\mu \epsilon \in, \delta \epsilon^{\prime}, \tau \epsilon \in, \gamma a ́ \rho$, \&e.), or if the sense shows clearly that it belongs to the verb, it is the sign of an apodosis, as in the Homeric examples under (a). Sec § 49, 2, N. 4, a.

Note 3. It follows from $\S 26$, that the Future Optative cannot be used in protasis or apodosis, except in indirect discourse to rep--sent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse.

Note 4. For a rare Homeric use of the Optative for the Imperfeet or Aorist Indicative, see $\S 49,2$, N. 6.

## II. Present and Past General Suppositions.

§ 51. A present or past supposition is said to be general, when the protasis refers indefinitely to any one oi f a series or class of acts, and not to a definite act or

a definite series of acts. The apodosis must express a customary or repeated action or a general truth.

Here the protasis takes the Subjunctive with éáv after primary tenses, and the Optative with $\epsilon i$ after secondary tenses. The apodosis may take the Present or Imperfect Indicative, or any other form which implies repetition. E. g.
 ever a division comes, your prize is always much greater. Il. I, 166.
 cones near, no one is (ever) willing to die. Eur. Alc. 671. "Atas
 if deeds are wanting, appears mere emptiness and vanity. Den. Ol.

 one wrongs him, but if he ever suspects that any one is better than him-
 beware of slanders, even when they are false. Isoc. Demon. p. 5 C. § 17.
 ヘатабßєข disturbance, he always tried, \&c. Xen. Cyr. V, 3, 55. Oủk àme入єí-
 was some necessity for it. Xen. Mem. PV, 2, 40. Eî tis à $\nu \tau \epsilon i \pi a .$, $\epsilon \dot{v} \hat{v}^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \kappa \in \iota$, ifं any one refused, he was immediately put to death.





 in the habit of killing any others whom they took. Lys. Agor. p. 137, § 78.

The Optative in these exanules, referring to past time, must be espectally distinguished from the Optative in ordinary protasis $(\$ 50,2)$, referring to the future. Ei and $\epsilon^{\prime} a \dot{\nu}$ in this construction are almost equivalent to öтє or ötay (which are the more common expressions), and the protasis has precisely the same construction as the relative sentences of $\S 62$.

The Present and Aorist Subjunctive and Optative here do not differ except as explained in Remark before § 12.

Remark. The gnomic Aorist, and the other gnomic and iterative tenses of $\S 30$, can be used in the apodosis of these general propositions. The gnomic Aorist, as usual, is considered a primary tense ( $\S 32,2)$. E. g.
 if they fail, they aiways supply the deficiency, \&e. Tinuc. I, $70 .{ }^{*} \mathrm{H} \nu$
 (always) impose a penalty upon every one who transgresses. Xex.
 à $\nu \in \theta \dot{a} \rho \sigma \eta \sigma a \nu$ ä $\nu$, whenever any saw their friends in any ưay victorious, they would be encouragen (i. e. they were encouraged in all such cases). Thuc. VII, 71. (See § 30, 2, and Xen. Mem. IV, 6, 13 , there quoted.)

Note 1. The Optative in this construction is not found in Homer, although it is very common in the equivalent relative sentences (§ 62).

Note 2. Here, as in ordinary protasis, the poets sometines use the simple $\epsilon i$ with the Subjunctive instead of $\epsilon$ 'áv. (See § $50,1, N$ 3.) E. g.







## 


Note 3. The Indicative is sometimes found in the place of the Subjunctive or Optative in a general protasis of this kind. Here the speaker merely refers to one of the many cases in which the event may occur, as if it were the only case, - that is, he states the supposition as if it were particular, and not general. E. g.
 any one counts upon two or even more days, he is a fool. Soprs. Trach.
 $\delta \rho a ̣, \epsilon^{\prime} \chi$ оעtєs, i. e. not (having a habit of) being angry with our neighbor, if he acts in any case as he pleases. Thuc. II, 37. (Here the Indicative $\delta \rho a \hat{a}$ is used as if some particular act of some one neighbor, and not any act of any neighbor, were in the speaker's mind.) $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{t}}$ тis $\tau \iota \dot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \rho \dot{\omega} \tau a, \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \kappa$ ivovto, if any one asked anything, they replied, (to

 XI, 3. (Here, without any apparent reason, the writer changes from the Indicative to the Optative.) See $\$ 62 . \mathrm{N} .1$.

This use of the Indicative is exceptional in Greek, bat it is the regular construction in Latin and English. See § 48, II Rem. 2.

## Ellipsis and Substitution in Protasis or Apodosis.

§ 52. 1. Very often the protasis is not expressed in its regular form with $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon}$ or $\epsilon^{\prime} a ́ v$, but is either implied in something that precedes or follows, or expressed in a participle, a preposition with its case, an adverb like ovit $\omega$ s, or some other part of the sentence.

When a participle takes the place of a protasis, it is always in the same tense in which the finite verb which it represents would itself have stood after $\epsilon \grave{c}$ or $\notin a ́ a$, , in the Indicative, Subjunctive, or Optative. (See § 109, 6.) The Present participle stands for both Present and Imperfect, and the Perfect for both Perfect and Pluperfect. (See § 16, 2 ; § 18, 3, Rem.) E. g.

 not eat more than they can bear, for (if they should) they would burst,

 selves where the others went; but the animals could not go otherwise than as they did. Xen. An. IV, 2, 10. So 齐 $\gamma$ à $\rho \hat{a} \nu \lambda \omega \beta \dot{\eta} \sigma a \iota o$, II. I, 232.

 (i. e. $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \pi \circ \iota \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ ), if they shall (once) do this, they will prosper.

 (i. e. єi $\pi o(\eta \sigma a \iota \in \nu$ ), if they should (once) do this, they would prosper.
 this (or if they had been doing this), they would be in prosperity. Toûto
 they would be in prosperity.
 i. e. how is it that Zeus has not been destroyed, if Justice exists? Arist.

 shall know, if we shall cnter the house. Soph. Ant. 1255. £ì $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda$ úw
 Arist. Av. 1375. So $\mu \dot{\eta} \mu a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$, unless I learn, for $\mathfrak{\epsilon}$ à $\nu \mu \grave{\eta} \mu a ́ \theta \omega$,
 this I should like to obtain, if Zeus would only give it. Od. I, 390.
 èzous (i. e. fi ovvoaious), such things would you suffer, if you should


 (oípat), but if the Athenians should ever suffer this ( $\pi$ aOóvt $\omega \nu=\epsilon$ $\pi \dot{\theta} \theta o t(\nu)$, I think it would be inferred that their power was twice as great. Tiruc. I, 10. (Here nothing but the context shows that $\pi a \theta$ óvt $\omega \nu$ does not represent $\epsilon i \neq \prime \pi a \theta o \nu$, if they had ever suffered.)
 asked for something to eat. I used to come bringing you breaid. Arist. Nub. 1383. (Here airívavtos represents $\epsilon i$ airj́vєtas in a general supposition, § 51. For $\hat{\eta} k o \nu$ ä $\nu$ see § 30, 2, and § 42, 3.) חpiv
 pened, any one would have disbelieved such a thing, if he had heard it.

 change your minds, if such were not the prevailing opinion (i. e. ci $\mu \dot{\eta}$


 $\lambda a \chi \circ \hat{v} \sigma a$ (i. e. $\epsilon i \pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \eta{ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \lambda a \chi \in \nu$ ), it (the soui) would have done the same. even if it had had the first choice by the lot. Plat. Rep. X, 620 D So Thuc. VII, 13, 1.
 him, they often would have been disbanded. Isoc. Pan. p. 70 B. § 142.
 selves, you uould long ago have been ruined. Dem. Cor. 242, 10. (So
 for, if decrees were of any avail, he would long ago have sutfiered punishment. Dear. Oil. III, 32, 16. (IIere the protasis is implied in
 $\kappa a \kappa \omega ิ$, for in that case we should no longer suffier. Dem. Phil. I, 44.



In these cases the form of the apodosis will generally show what form of protasis is implied. When the aporlosis is itself expressed by an Infinitive or Participle ( $\$ 53$ ), as in Tincc. I, 10, the form of the protasis is shown only by the general sense of the passage.

Remark. The Future participle is not used in protasis to represent the Future Indieative, as it would denote time future relatively to the time of the apodosis (§ 28), which the Future Indicative in protasis does not do. The Present and Aorist participles, representing the Present and Aorist Subjunctive, express future conditions, thus making the Future participle innecessary. The Aorist participle in protasis can always represent an Aorist Subjune tive in the sense explained $\S 20, \mathrm{~N} .1$.

Note 1. An ellipsis of the verb of the protasis takes $p^{1}$ ace in the Homeric $\epsilon i \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} a \gamma \epsilon$, for $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$, ä $\gamma \epsilon$. and in such expressions as $\epsilon i \mu$ ì $\delta \iota a ̀$ тoùto, had it not been for this. E. g.


 the Prytanis, he would have been thrown in. Plat. Gorg. 516 E.



 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 sared.
 up, \&c. Arist. Nub. 229. So in alternatives: see Note 2. (Cf. $\S 53$, Note 1.)

Note 2. In alternatives, $\epsilon i \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta^{\prime}$, otherwise, regularly introduces the latter clause, even when the former clause is negative. Ei $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\eta}$ is much more common than $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \dot{\eta}$, even when $\dot{\epsilon} a, \nu$ $\mu \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \nu$ with the Subjunctive precedes. E. g.
 not beat me; but if you do, you will have yourself to blame for it.

 that otherwise ( $\epsilon i$ í $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ) they should be obligen, \&c. Thuc. I, 28.
 ミmaptátas $\pi$ paayapєv́єь, they ordered him not to be left behind by the herald: and if he should be ( $\epsilon i$ ì $\mu \eta$ ), (they told him) that the Spartans


 $\epsilon i \frac{\delta \grave{\epsilon}}{\mu \grave{\eta}, \kappa . \tau . \lambda \text {. }}$
2. The protasis is often altogether suppressed, leaving only an Optative with $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu$ or an Indicative with $\stackrel{y}{a} \nu$ as an apodosis. Here some indefinite or general protasis is always implied; as if he plcased, if he could, if an opportunity should offer, if it were necessary, if it were true, if we should consider, if what is natural should happen, \&c. E. g.

[^11]able to say this (if he should try), nor would you believe it. DEM.
 gladly ask Leptines (if an opportunity should offer). Id. Lept. 496, 8.
 him show that they would not now gladly become free (if they could).
 $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \theta a \iota \in \check{Z} \eta$, so that it might be strong enough to fight from (if it should be necessary). Xen. Cyr. III, 1, 1.

 $\vec{\eta} \pi o ́ \nu \omega \nu \dot{\eta}$ кıvסiv $\nu \omega \nu$ à $\pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \eta \sigma a \nu$; and from what acts, $\S c$. , would they have shrunk (i. e. if they had been required)? Isoc. Pan. p. 57 C.
 were true). Рlat. Rep. II, 374 D. So ßovגoí $\eta \nu$ ä̀ (velim), I
 now wish (on a certain condition, not fulfilled).

Note. The Optative with ${ }_{a}^{a} \nu$, used in this way, often has the force of a mild command or exhortation, and sometimes a sense approaching that of the Future Indicative. E. g.
^'́'yous ä้, you may speak (lit. you could speak, if you should desire
 may take yourself off whither you please. Soph. Antig. 444. (This


 ढ̈ть; in what other direction then, said 1, shall we turn (lit. should we turn, if we should wish)? Plat. Euthyd. 290 A. Oỉk å $\nu \mu \in \theta \in i \mu \eta \nu$ tov̂ $\theta$ póvov, I will not give up the throne. Arist. Ran. 830.

Remark. In such examples as Hdt. I, 2, 'E入入ívov tıvás фaбt
 tional use of the Optative with $\neq \nu$ referring to the past; but the meaning is these would prove to be Cretans (if we should examine the
 investigation) to have been many. Tıuc. I, 9.
§ 53. The apodosis may be expressed by an Infinitive or Participle, where the construction of the sentence requires it; each tense of the Infinitive or Participle representing its own tenses of the Indicative or Optative. (The Present includes also the Imperfect, and the Perfect also the Pluperfect.)

If a innite verb in the apodosis would have taken $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu$, that particle is joined with the Infinitive or Participle. The Present Infiuitive or Participle with $\ddot{a}^{\boldsymbol{a}} \nu$ represents
either an Imperfect Indicative with ${ }_{a}^{\prime \prime} \nu$, or a Present Optative with $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\nu} \nu$; the Perfect, either a Pluperfect Indicative or a Perfect Optative; and the Aorist, either an Aorist Indicative or an Aorist Optative. (See §41.) The context must decide in each case, whether an Infinitive or Participle with $\stackrel{y}{\nu} \nu$ represents the Indicative or the Optative. E. g.




 $\dot{a} \nu \not{ }^{\epsilon} \chi \in \iota \nu$, I believe that, if you had done this, all would (now) be well.

 $\beta \iota \omega \sigma \kappa \circ \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu \gamma^{\prime}$ à $\nu, \epsilon i$ oìoi $\tau \epsilon \bar{\eta} \sigma a \nu$, considerations for those who readily put men to death, and who would bring them to life again too, if they could. Plat. Crit. 48 C. ('A $\nu a ३ \iota \omega \sigma \kappa о \mu \in ́ v \omega \nu a ̈ \nu=a ̀ \nu \in \beta \iota \omega \sigma \kappa o \nu t o$ $\stackrel{a}{\nu} \nu$.) See the examples of each tense of the Infinitive and Participle with äv, under § 41 and § 73.
 Фi $\lambda i \pi \pi \pi o u$ кат' '́кєivous toùs xpóvous; how unwillingly do you think they heard it, if any one said anything against Philip in those times? Dem. Phil. II, 70, 25. (Here áкovéd represents the Imperfect
 representing the Pluperfect, see § 41, 2.
Note 1. The apodosis is sometimes omitted for effect, when some such expression as it is well can be supplied, or some other apodosis at once occurs to the reader. E.g.

 Il. I. 135. (Here we must understand $\epsilon \dot{\in} \tilde{\epsilon} \xi \in ⿺$, it will be well, or

 I, 580 . (Here we must understand he can do it after the protasis. The following $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ refers to this suppressed apodosis.) Eij $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$
 $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \gamma \epsilon \notin \nu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ рavӨávєтє. Xen. Cyr. VIII, 7, 23. Compare Aesch. Prom 835.

Note 2. Very often the apodosis is not directly expressed by the verb on which the protasis depends, but is merely $i m$ plied in the context. Here the form of the protasis is determined hy the implied apodosis. In such sentences ei or éáv
may generally be translated by supposing that, or in case that. E. g.
 ö $\lambda \in \theta \rho \circ \nu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \pi \epsilon \hat{L}$, , therefore $I$ am now come to your hnees, in case you shall be willing to tell me of his sad death (i. e. that you may tell me, in case you shall be willing). Od. III, 92. See Od. I, 94. (Here iкámo$\mu a \iota$ does not contain the apodosis to al $\kappa^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \eta \sigma \theta a$, which is rather implied in what follows.) T $\hat{\omega} \nu \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \mu \iota \nu \mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma a \sigma a \quad \pi a \rho \epsilon ́ \zeta \epsilon о$ каі̆ $\lambda a \beta \grave{\epsilon}$
 in case he shall be willing to assist the Trojans (i. c. that you may cau: $\epsilon$ him to assist them, if he shall be willing). Il. I, 408. So aï $\operatorname{ké}^{\nu} \pi \omega s$ ßoúnєтat (often explained as an indireet question), Il. I, 66. Oи̇кои̃̀
 this then still left to us, - in case we shall persuade you that you must let us go (sc. to have you do this)? i. e. to have you let us go, if we shall persuade you that you must? Plat. Rep. I, 327 C. *Aкovgov кai
 you, i. e. that then you may assent to it. Ib. II. 358 B. ${ }^{*}$ Етı kai $\nu \bar{\nu} \nu$ ajòs $\pi \frac{1}{}$ they invole curses, if there is any one who sends heralds to the Persians.

 in case you should tell us of some fleecy city (implying thinking that ue might go and live in such a city, if you should tell us of one). Arist. Av. 120. Oi $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \kappa \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu, ~ \epsilon i ́ a ̀ \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \sigma o \iota \nu \tau o$, and others pitied them, in case they should be captured (i. e. thinking what they would suffer if they should be captured). Xen. An. 1, 4. 7. Mpòs rìv mó入ıv, $\in i$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta \circ \eta \theta \circ \hat{\imath} \in \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \chi \dot{\omega} \rho o u v$, they marched towards the city, in cave they (the citizens) should rush out (i. e. that they might meet them, if they

 Tǹ $\pi$ ónct, 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. Eem. Cor. 276, 1. See Soph. O. C. 1770 ; Plat. R p. IV, 434 A.

In the examples from Homer and Plato the protasis belongs under $\S 50,1$, the implied apodosis referring to the future; in the example from Isocrates the protasis belongs under $\S 49,1 ;$ in that from Aristophanes, under $\S 50$, 2, the implied apodosis being in the Optative with äy or some equivalent form; while in the next three the protasis has been ehanged (on the principle of indirect discourse) from $\epsilon \dot{i} \dot{a} \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma o \nu \tau a \iota, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta o \eta \theta \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \mu \bar{\eta} \pi o i \eta \eta \sigma \omega$ of tho direct diseourse, on account of the past tense of the leading verb. For a further explanation of this construction, and other examples, see $\S 77,1 . c$. Sce also § 71, N. 1, and the examples, which are to be explained on the principle of this note.

Note 3. Sometimes the adverb ä $\nu$ stands alone to represent the apodosis, when the verb to which it belongs can be easily supplied from the context. In like manner $\epsilon i$ alone may represent the pro
tasis. The expression $\bar{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \stackrel{\star}{a} \nu \epsilon \boldsymbol{i}$ (sometimes written as one word, $\dot{\omega} \pi \pi \epsilon \rho a v \epsilon i$, quasi) ineludes both cases. See § $42,3, N .2$, with the examples.
${ }^{0} \Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ with the participle ( $\$ 109, \mathrm{~N} .9$ ) generally belongs to an apodosis understood. So in such expressions as $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ єi $\lambda \epsilon$ 'yots, as (it would be) if you should say.

Note 4. When $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \epsilon i$ is used for $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta}$, unless, there is an ellipsis of an apodosis after $\pi \lambda \eta_{\eta} \nu$. E. g.

 possible) in case one happens to be a comedian. Plat. Apol. 18 C.

Remark. Expressions of a wish like $\boldsymbol{\epsilon i}$ jà $\rho$ févoito, $O$ that it might be, and єi $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \tau о, O$ that it had been, are protases with the apodosis suppressed. See Rem. at the end of Sect. VI.

## Mixed Constructions. - Irregularities in Protasis or Apodosis.

§ 54. The regular forms of protasis and apodosis explained above ( $\S \$ 49,50,51$ ) 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. These admit of varions explana-tions:-

1. (a.) When an Indicative in the protasis (in either of the constructions of $\S 49,1$ or 2 ) is followed by an Optative with $\ddot{a} \nu$ in the apodosis, the latter properly belongs to an implied protasis in the Optative (on the principle of §52, 2). Thus, in
 is so, he would not justly be punished, ко入á̧o七то ä̀ belongs to a protasis in the Optative, if justice should be done, implied in
 to the expressed apodosis with its implied protasis. The sense therefore is, if this is so, (the result is that) he would not be punished if justice should be done. The same principle applies to a primary tense of the Indicative in protasis, followed by a secondary tense with äı, in apodosis.

This is sometimes the meaning, when a Subjunctive or Future Indicative (§50, 1) is in the protasis, with an Optative with ăv in the apodosis. (See the last two examples.) E.g.

 come from heaven, I would not fight against the Gods of hearen. Il. VI, 128. (Here the prineipal protasis to $\mu a \chi o i \mu \eta \nu$ ä $\nu$ is implied, if 1

 there would (naturally) be great happiness, \&c. Plat. Apol. 25 B.

 you were persuaded to make war by thinking, f.c., I should not now justly be charged with injustice. Thuc. II, 60. (Here a protasis
 $\sigma a \nu$, ن́u $\mu \hat{i s} \vec{a} \nu$ oủ $\chi \rho \epsilon \dot{\omega} \nu \vec{a} \rho \chi$ оıтє, for if these had a right to secerle, it would follow that your dominion is unjust. Id. III, 40. Ei vùv yє
 now we are unfortunate, how should we not be safe if we should do the opposite? Arist. Ran. 1449. (Here $\pi \rho$ á $\tau \tau о \nu \tau \epsilon=\epsilon i \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau о \iota \epsilon \nu$ is the principal protasis to which the optative refers.) Ei $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau^{\prime} \in \pi \epsilon$ -
 I were undertaking to say this $(\$ 49,2)$, every one would censure me
 many Mss., and Dion. Hal. p. 1054, read $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau i \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon$, the ordinary
 $\dot{o} \rho \gamma^{i} \zeta 0 \iota \sigma \theta \in$ à̇ois. Lys. Alcib. II, § 8.

 against me, he would then have prosecuted Hypereides with much more reason than this man. Dem. Cor. 302, 24. (Here $\epsilon^{\prime 2} \delta i \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu$ ä $\nu$ refers chiefly to the implied protasis, if he had done what was more reasonable.) Such examples seldom occur.
 $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i s \sigma \omega \theta \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$. Xen. An. II, 4, 19. (Here the implied protasis is if we should wish to escape.) See An. V, 1, 9.

 fort, they might (under favorable circumstances) injure some part of our land; but it will not be sufficient to prevent us, \&e. THuc. I, 142.
(b.) A Subjunctive or Future Indicative in the protasis sometimes depends on an Optative with $\begin{gathered}a \\ \nu\end{gathered}$ in the apodosis, when no other protasis can readily be supplied. This expresses the protasis more vividly than the regular Optative. (See $\S 50,2$, Rem. $b$, and $\S 34,1, b$.) It must be remembered also that the Optative with ä้ is sometimes merely a softened expression for the Future Indicative ( $\$ 52$, Note). E. g.
 (Here the irregularity is the same in English as in Greek: the regu



 Lys. Agor. p. 139, 6. § 94. (Here we should expect $\epsilon i$ ү́́voıvтo.)


 if you shall learn this for me, I will not (or I would not) pay even an obol to any one. Arist. Nub. 116. (This and many other examples might be explained equally well on either principle, $a$ or $b$.)
2. (a.) An Optative in the protasis sometimes depends upon a primary tense of the Indicative or an Imperative in the apodosis. This arises from the slight distinction between the
 which the Latin has but one form, si habeat. (See § 48, I, B, Rem. 2.) In fact, the irregularity in єí тои̂тo $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ о८то, пávтa $\kappa а \lambda \hat{\omega} s \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \xi \in \iota$, is precisely the same as in the English if this should happen, all will be well, where the more regular apodosis would


 $\tau \mathfrak{a} \varsigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu, \epsilon \dot{v} \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \epsilon \nu$, к.т. $\lambda$. Isoc. ad Nicocl. p. 23 D.
 In such cases the Optative is a less animated form of expression than the regular Subjunctive.
(b.) The Optative sometimes stands in the protasis, when the apodosis contains a primary tense of a verb denoting necessity, obligation, propriety, possibility, \&c., with an Infinitive, the two forming an expression that is nearly equivalent in sense to an Optative with äv, E. g.
 $\psi \eta \phi i \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$, for if there should be two laws opposed to each other, you could not surely vote for both. Dem. Timocr. 711, 8. (See § 63, 4, b.) This is analogous to the use of the Imperfect of the same verbs, explained in $\S 49,2$, Note 3 . There, for example, $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \hat{\eta} \nu$ a $\dot{\jmath} \tau \hat{\omega}$ ${ }_{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \theta \in \hat{c} \nu$, he could have gone, is nearly equivalent to $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \hat{a}{ }^{\prime} \nu$, and here

3. A few irregular constructions remain, which can be explained only as cases of anacoluthon, in which the speaker adapts lis apodosis to a form of protasis different from that which he has actually used. E. g.

 if I were able, had preceded. We should expect $\pi ⿰ 丿 o t i \mu \eta \nu$ at $\nu$, which
 $\mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu$, ơvok $\lambda \epsilon \grave{\eta} s$ ầ $\bar{\eta} \nu \nu$ фóvos. Eur. Orest. 1132. (Here we should expect $\epsilon \ddot{\prime \prime} \eta$.)

Remark. The same apodosis, in either the Indicative or Optative, may take one protasis in the Indicative referring to present or rast time, and another in the Optative referring to a supposed future case. E. g.

 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. Apol. 28 E. (Here the combination of the two acts is the future condition on which the

 i e. if I should speak the truth and did speak it then, \&e. Dem. Cor.

 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 (which was not done)? Ib. 291, 28. (See §50, 2, N. 2, and §49, 2, N. 3.)
§ 55. 1. Two or more protases, not co-ordinate, may belong to one apodosis. E. g.






2. It sometimes happens, that the apodosis is itself in a dependent sentence (as in a final clanse), which determines its mood without reference to the preceding rules. In this case, if the leading verb is in a secondary tense, so that the apodosis takes the Optative, the protasis also takes the Optative by the general rule ( $\S 31,1$ ), even if it would otherwise have the Subjunctive. E. g.

 aùròs $\epsilon i ̈ \pi \circ\llcorner$, and he said this, in order that, if on the one hand 1 should still expect him to tell it, I should waste time about it in my defence; but if on the other hand I should omit it. he might now iell it
himself．Dem．Aph．I，830，8．（If a primary tense stood for $\begin{gathered}\text { itrev，we }\end{gathered}$


Remark．For the forms assumed by such sentences when con－ structed on the principle of indirect discourse，see § 77， 1.
§ 56．After many verbs expressing wonder，delight， sontentment，indignation，disappointment，and similar ideas，a protasis with $\epsilon i$ may be used where a causal sentence would seem more natural．Such verbs are especially $\theta a \nu \mu a ́ \zeta \omega, ~ a i \sigma \chi v ́ v o \mu a \iota, ~ a ̉ \gamma a \pi a ́ \omega, ~ a n d ~ a ̀ \gamma a v a-~$ $\kappa \tau \epsilon \omega$ ．E．g．
 боळ̄，к．т．入．，I wonder that no one of you is either concerned or angry， when he sees，\＆c．（lit．if no one is either concerned or angry，I wonder）．

 єiซф＇єєєь，but I wonder at this，that you once opposed the Lacedaemo－ nians，but now are unwilling，\＆c．Id．Ol．II，25， 2. （The literal meaning is，if（it is true that）you once opposed，foc．，then I wonder．）
 фava日ウбєтаи à yavakтєí，he is not content if he was not punished；but if he is not also to be crowned with a golden crown，he is indignant． Aeschin．Cor．§ 147．（Here the former protasis belongs under $\S 49,1$ ，and the latter under § $49,1, \mathrm{~N} .3$ ．）
 I am indignant that（or if）I am not able，\＆e．Plat．Lach． 194 A．

 no wonder that he gets the advantage of you，\＆c．Dem．Ol．II，24， 23.

 Cyraeans have now wilhlrawn．Xev．An．III，2， 17.

These verbs may also be followed by ört and a causal sentence，
 construction with $\epsilon i$ gives a milder or more polite form of expression， putting the object of the wonder，\＆c．into the form of a supposition， instead of stating it as a fact，as we should do in English．The forms of protasis quoted above belong under $\S 49,1$ ．For the form some－ times assumed by these sentences on the principle of indirect dis course，see § 77，1，c．

Remark．This construction must not be mistaken for that in which $\epsilon i$ is used in the sense of whether，to introduce an indirect question；as，є̇ $\pi \dot{v} \theta_{\epsilon}$ ro $\epsilon i$ ì̀̀ $\pi a \rho \epsilon i \eta s$, he asked whether you were present For this see $\S 68,3$ ，and $\S 70$ ．
§ 57．The apodosis is sometimes introduced by the con－ junction $\delta \dot{\delta}$ ，as if the apodosis formed a sentence co－ordinate with the protasis，instead of being（ $a *$ it is）the leading sen－ tence．This is especially common in Homer and Herodotus， and rare in Attic prose．It occurs when the apodosis is to be emphatically opposed to the protasis．Instead of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ we some－ times find à $\lambda \lambda a ́$ or aùzáp．E．g．
 it up，then I will take it myself．Il．I，137．＇A入入a＇is found in II．I，





 Xen．Cyr．V，5， 21.

This $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ in apodosis cannot be expressed in English；as our ad－ verbs then，yet，still，\＆c．，necessarily fail to give the force of the Greek $\delta \varepsilon$ ，which is always a conjunction．

Remark．$\Delta \dot{\epsilon}$ may be used in the same way tr introduce the sentence upon which a relative clause depends．wee Remark be fore § 65 ．

## SECTION III．

Relative and Temporal Sentences．
§58．1．Relative sentences may be introduced not only by relative pronouns and pronominal adjectives， but also by relative adverbs of time，place，or manner． They include therefore all temporal clauses，except those introduced by $\pi \rho i \nu$ and other particles meaning until，which are treated separately（ $\S 66$ and $\S 67$ ）．

2．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，\＆c．

Secondly, those in which the antecedent is indefinite, that is, in which no such definite persons, things, times, or places are referred to.

Both the definite and the indefinite antecelent maly be either expressed or understood. E. g.
(Definite Antecedents). Taûta â è̉ $\chi \omega$ ópậs, you see these things
 wish:d, he came.
(Indefinite Antecedents.) חávta â ầ $\beta$ núd $\omega \nu \tau a \mathfrak{c} \xi \mathfrak{\xi} o v \sigma \iota \nu$, they
 they will have whatever they may want. "Отє $\beta$ ои́лоьто $\bar{\eta} \rho \chi є \tau о$, whenever he wished, he came.
3. When the antecedent is indefinite, the negative particle of the relative clause is $\mu^{\prime}$; when the antecedent is definite, ov is regularly used, unless the general construction requires $\mu \dot{\eta}$, as in prohibitions, wishes, \&c. (See §59, Note 1.)

## A. Relative with a Definite Antecedent.

§ 59. When the relative refers to a definite antecedent, expressed or understood, it has no effect upon the mood of the following verb; and it therefore takes the Indicative, unless the general sense of the passage requires some other construction. E. g.

 Boindovat), they are doing what they please. (On the other hand,
 whatever they please; the antecedent being indefinite.) $\Lambda$ ' $\gamma \omega$ â oùk àvō, I am saying that of which I am not ignorant.


 $\dot{\tau} \omega \nu \pi \rho а \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, i. e. now, while there is an opportunity, \&c. Dem. Ol. I, 15, 6 (If the exhortation had been general, he might have said $\dot{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{a} \hat{\nu} \nu \bar{j}$ Katoós, (on all occasions) so long as there is an opportunity,




who are to bear the greater part of the blame, \&c. Tircc. $\mathbf{\Sigma}, 83$. ${ }^{\circ} \supset \theta_{\epsilon} y$

 a particular point, at which he intends to begin.) Compare the

 be sad work, when you shall impel me, \&c. II. I, 518. (Here ötє refers to some time conceived as definite by the speaker; whereas öt ${ }^{\prime}$ at $\epsilon^{\prime} \rho \in \theta_{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \sigma \nu$, whenever she shall provoke me, is indefinite, and belongs



Note 1. When the sense requires it, these clauses admit all the constructions allowed in independent sentences. E. g.
 $\dot{a} \nu \delta \iota \delta a ́ \xi a \iota \mu \iota$. Dem. Aph. III, 846, 15. (Here the relative clanse contains an apodosis with ${ }^{\prime} \nu$, with a protasis $\epsilon \dot{i} \dot{a} \rho \xi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{i} \mu \eta \nu$ implied. This must not be confounded with the use of the Optative without ä $\nu$, in the other class of relative sentences. Sce § 61, 4.)
 not do this, in which he would have honored the people (if he had done
 $\mu \epsilon \tau a \delta \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \bar{\eta} s \zeta \eta \tau \eta \in \sigma \omega s$. Plat. Men. 89 E. (Subjunctive in

 ả $\lambda \eta$ oùs $\nu$ o $\mu$ íatтє. Lys. de Bon. Arist. p. 157, §61. (Here the Imperative vouiбatя is used in a sort of exclamation after $\tilde{o} \nu$, where


 a day will come when sacred Ilium will fall. Il. VI, 448. (Here $\vec{\Delta} \lambda \omega \lambda_{\eta} \eta \vec{a} \nu$ is used like a Future Indicative, $\S 87$, Note; and the anteeedent of ö $\tau \epsilon$ is definite. If ${ }_{a} \nu$ belonged to $\begin{gathered}\text { or } \tau, \text {, the clause would be }\end{gathered}$ a protasis, meaning when Ilium shall fall, a day will come.)

Note 2. The relative may be used to express a purpose ( $\$ 65,1$ ), or in a causal sense (§65,4). The antecedent may then be either definite or indefinite.

## B. Relative with an Indefinite Antecedent.

§ 60. 1. When the relative refers to an indefinite antecedent, expressed or understood, the action of its verb is not stated absolutely as a definite fact, but conditionally as a supposed case; and such a relative sentence has many of the essential qualities of a conditionel sentence.

 thought，the actions of vopi $\xi_{\epsilon \iota}$ and $\dot{\epsilon} v \dot{\prime} \mu \iota \zeta \epsilon$ are stated as actual facts，occurring at definite times；but when we say à à $\nu \nu \mu i \zeta \eta$ （тaìta）$\lambda \epsilon \in \xi \epsilon$ ，he（rlways）says whatever he thinks，or a rouiSou （rav̂ra）${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu$ ，he（always）said whutever he happened to be thimk．
 rather what some one may think（or may have thought）on any occasion on whick he is（or was）in the habit of speaking．So， when we say $\hat{a}$ vorítct tav̂ta $\lambda \epsilon \hat{\xi} \epsilon$, ，he will say what he（now）
 he will say whatever he happens to be（then）thinking，ронiלn denotes merely a case supposed in the future．Again，－to take the case in which the distinction is most liable to be
 $I$ do not know，I do not think that I know，oùk oìza，as before， denotes a simple fact，and its object，$a$ ，has a definite antece－
 meaning is if there are any things which I do not know，I do $r, t$ even think that I know them．In sentences like this，unless a uegative is used（ $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ being the sign of an indefinite，ov of a definite antecedent），it is often difficult to decide whether the
 may mean either what I（actually）know，I think that I know， or if there is anything which I know，I think that I know it．

The analogy of these indefinite relative clauses to conditional sentences will be seen at once．The following examples will make this clearer：－
${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \tau \iota \beta$ ои́ $\epsilon \tau \pi \iota \delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$ ，I will give him whatever he（now）wishes．




 thing had nut happened，I should not have told it．（§ 49，2．）
${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \tau \iota \dot{a} \nu \beta \emptyset \dot{\nu} \lambda \eta \tau a \iota, \delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$, I will give him whatever he shall wish． ＇Eáv т九 $\beta$ оu入ŋта九，$\delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$ ，if he shall wish anything，I will give it． （ $\$ 50,1$.

 give it．（§50，2．）

 $\tau \iota \beta o u ́ \lambda \eta \tau a \iota, \delta i \delta \omega \mu \iota$, if he ever wishes anything, I (always) give it.
 (§51.)
2. The relative with an indefinite antecedent may therefore be called the conditional relative, and the clause in which it stands may be called the protasis (like clauses with $\epsilon \mathfrak{l}$ or $\epsilon^{\epsilon} a^{\prime} \nu$ ), and the antecedent clause may be called the apodosis.
3. The particle $\stackrel{\text { al }}{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ (Epic $\kappa \epsilon$ ) is regularly joined with all relative words, when they are followed by the Subjunctive. The particle here (as always in protasis) is joined to the relative, never to the verb. (See § 38,1 , and $\S 47,2$.)


 where in Attic we have ötav, \&c. 'E $\pi \dot{\eta} \nu$, however, oceurs often in Homer.

Remark. The elassification of common conditional sentences, given in $\S 48$, applies equally to conditional relative sentences. The distinetion between those containing general suppositions ( $\$ 62$ ) and the corresponding forms containing particular suppositions ( $(61,1$ ) is especially important.
\$61. We have four forms of the conditional relative sentence which correspond to the four forms of ordinary protasis ( $\S 49,1,2$, and $\S 50,1,2$ ) : -

1. When the relative clause refers to a definite act in the present or the past, and no opinion of the speaker is implied as to the truth of the supposition, the verb is put in one of the present or past tenses of the Indicative. (§ 49, 1.)

The antecedent clause can have any form allowed in an apodosis ( $\S 49,1$, Note 1 ). E. $g$.

 deal with me as they please (i. e. $\epsilon \ddot{i}$ т $\tau$ ßoúdovtat). Arist. Nub. 439.
 see anything which I ought to see, and not to see anything which I ought not. Eur. Inc F'r. 417. ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{A} \delta \in \hat{\imath}$ is nearly equivalent to eil $\tau \iota v a \dot{\delta} \epsilon \hat{\imath}$,

 i. e. they raised a cenotaph for any of them whom they did not find




 $\mu \eta \delta a \mu a \hat{v} \xi v \mu \mu a \chi \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, Thuc. I, 35. "A tis $\mu \eta$ ो $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \delta o ́ \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$,
 what we did not expect (like $\epsilon$ " $\tau \tau \nu a \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \delta \dot{\sigma} \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon \in \tau t s)$. Antiphon.

 $\bar{j} \nu \bar{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon(\nu)$, i. e. any of it which they did not need. Xen. An. V, 3, 1.

 to the high land, so many the sea destroyed. Thuc. III, 89. Oís $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$
 àvaүкаiov $\dot{j}^{2}$, к.т. $\lambda .$, 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.

 $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \grave{\eta} \kappa \in \nu$ aủt $\hat{\omega}$, nor going anywhere at all where it was not law-



 رé $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota)$, may any plan prevail which will benefit you all. Dem. Phil. I, 55. 7. So Soph. Ant. 375, ôs тáơ ' $\epsilon \rho \delta \epsilon \iota$.

Note. Care must be taken here (as in conditional sentences, $\S 49,1$, Note 2), not to include under this elass the general suppositions of $\S 62$, which require the Subjunctive or Optative. On the other hand, the examples falling under $\S 62$, Note 1 , in which the Indicative is allowed, might properly be placed here, as they state a general supposition for emphasis as if it were a particular one ( $\$ 5^{\circ}$ Note 3). See also $\S 61,3$, Note.
2. When a relative clause, referring to the present or the past, implies that the condition which it expresses is not or was not fulfilled (like a protasis of the form $\S 49,2$ ), its verb is put in a secondary tense of the In dicative.

The ancecedent clause also contains a secondary tense of the Indicative, implying the non-fulfilment of a con dition, which may be in an apodosis with ${ }_{a} \nu \nu$ or a protasis (§ 49, 2), or in all expression of a wish (§83). E. g.




 $\mu \eta \nu \in i \chi o \nu$, for (if that were so) we should not be undertaking (as we are) to do things which we did not understand, nor should we pernit 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 knowl-
 $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \theta a$, if there were any things which we did not know,- $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu\end{gathered}$

 here supposed ever actually arose, as the whole passage refers to an unfulfilled condition expressed in the preceding sentence.) Ei $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$

 would ruin any who were especially friendly, Sc. Xen. Rep. Athen.
 the apodosis $a \pi \dot{\omega} \lambda \grave{\lambda} v \sigma a \nu \ddot{\alpha} \nu \nu$. See § $55,1$. )

 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

 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). Od. I, 217.
So when the relative sentence depends on an indicative in a final

 dixaa, 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

Remark. All examples of this form fall equally well under the general rule for assimilation, § 64, 2.
3. When the relative clause refers distinctly and vividly to the future (like a protasis of the form §50, 1),
and the verb of the antecedent clause also refers to the future, the relative is joined with $\stackrel{y}{\boldsymbol{a}} \nu$ (or $\kappa \bar{\epsilon}$ ) and followed by the Subjunctive. E. g.
 $\lambda \omega \mu \mathrm{c})$, whomsoever of these I may wish I shall make my wife. Il. IX,
 кaì $\bar{\eta} s i \mu \in i \rho \in \tau a \iota$ aỉ $\eta$, i. e. vengeance will come from Orestes, $u$ hen


 obey as I may direct, i. e. if I give any direction ( $\epsilon \mathfrak{a} \dot{\nu} \pi \omega \mathrm{s} \epsilon \mathrm{l} \pi \mathrm{\omega}$ ), let us


 $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu \grave{\eta} \sigma \theta \in ́ \nu \omega, \pi \epsilon \pi a v \dot{v} \sigma \mu a \iota$, therefore, when I shall have no more
 $\epsilon \ddot{i} \pi \omega, \dot{\epsilon} \rho \hat{\omega}, I$ will speak of this, when I shall have spoken about my birth. Dem. Eubul. 1303, 25. (See § 20, Note 1.) ${ }^{\text {' }}$ E $\pi \epsilon \iota \delta$ à $\nu$ ס $\iota a-$

 do you think she will have, when (or if at any time) she shall see me,

 age it shall seem good to you to take them (i. e. if from any particular

 whatever shall seem good to them shall be done. Ib. 51, 19. Ov̈ $\mu \mathrm{o}$
 $\sigma \theta o s$, so long as he shall kindle fire, \&c. Aesch. Agam. 1435.

Note. The Future Indieative is rarely, if ever, used in conditional relative clauses, as in common protasis ( $\$ 50,1$, Note 1 ), in the place of the Subjunctive; as it would generally be ambiguous,
 Thuc. I, 22, is perhaps to be explained in this way. See Xen.
 less he was to be present himself, the Future is used as it is in the form of protasis explained $\S 49,1$, N. 3.
4. When the relative clause refers to the future less distinctly and vividly (like a protasis of the form $\S 50$, 2), and the antecedent clause contains an Optative referring to the future, the relative is followed by the Optative (without äv).

The Optative in the antecedent clause may be in an
apodosis with ${ }^{2} \nu \nu$ or a protasis $(\$ 50,2)$, in an expression of a wish (\$82), or in a final clause. E. g.

 uho should then rejoice would be very stout-hearted. Il. XIII, 343 So II. VI, 329 and 521 ; XIV, 247 : Ärist. Nub. 1250. Oük àv oủz

 be both willing and able, \&c.? Xen. Mem. II, 9, 2. Пєєขต̂v фáyou à о́тóтє $\beta$ ои́ voıтo, when he is hungry, he would eat whenever he might wish (like єĭ тотє ßov́nouro). Ib. II, 1, 18 . So Mem. I, 5, 4; I, 7,

 which you had no experience at all? Plat. Men. 92 C. 'A $\rho$ ' ì

 $\mu \grave{\eta}$ каi í $\phi^{\prime}$ aírov̀ $\pi$ á $\theta o \iota$; what could he suffier, unless he should suffer it also from himself? (i. e. $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \pi u ́ \theta o c$ ). Plat. Lys. 214 E. ©O oè

 $\dot{a} \nu(\chi \rho \eta$ gata), the older he should grow, the more he would always cling
 Plat. Rep. VIII, 549 B So III, 412 D ; VIII, 557 B . Ф $\eta \sigma \sigma \mu \in \nu$
 éautê, so long as it should remam equal to itself. Plat. Theaet.





 $\gamma \epsilon \dot{\rho} \in \dot{S} 0_{1}$, O that any other man might likewise perish who should do

 óä $\rho \chi \omega \nu \pi \rho$ о $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau о \iota . ~ X e n . ~ C y t . ~ I I, ~ I, ~ 31 . ~ . ~$

Remark. All these examples fall also under the general rule for assimilation, § 64, 1 .
§ 62. A conditional relative sentence (like a protasis, § 51) may express a general supposition. This happens when the verb of the antecedent clause denotes a customary or repeated action or a general truth, whils the relative clause refers indefinitely to any one of a series or class of acts, and not to a definite act or a definite series of acts.

Here the Subjunctive with ôs $\stackrel{\circ}{a} \nu$, ò ö $\tau a \nu$, \&e. is used after primary tenses, and the Optative (without ăv) after secondary tenses. E. g.

 like the very gates of Hades, who conceals one thing in his mind and speaks another. Il. IX, 312. N $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a i ̂ \gamma \epsilon \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ oì $\bar{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \lambda \alpha i \epsilon \iota \nu$ ös ке
 weeping for any mortal who may die, \&c. Od. IV, 195. Kai $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \sigma \nu \mu-$
 all men a-e (always) willing to be allies to those whom they see prepared.

 consider the present war the greatest, solong as they are engaged in it.








 $\chi \in \iota$. Thuc. II, 62. (Here the ó refers to all that precedes, as a definite antecedent.)

 lives.) (Өєous) $\pi a \rho a \tau \rho \omega \pi \bar{\omega} \sigma$ ’ ä $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi о \iota \lambda_{\iota \sigma \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota, ~ o ̈ \tau \epsilon ~ к \epsilon ́ v ~ \tau \iota s ~}^{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$ -










 Phil. III, 128, 22. So $\epsilon \sigma \tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \nu \delta \epsilon i \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$, Xen. Mem. III, 5, 6.
 ; тis $\sigma \phi$ दаs єi $\sigma$ афікоıто, i. с. they were never in the habit of honor-






savy continued to increase from the money which these contributerl, and they, whenever they revolt:i, always found themselves unpropared and ivexperienced for war. Tiuc. I, 99.





 each morning, when the prison was opened, \&c. Plat. Phaed. 59 D.
 left him, when they were out of danger. Xivn. An. II, 6, 12. (If $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\epsilon}$ уогто had been used, the whole sentence would refer to a particular case in which many leit him.)

Remark. The gnomic Aorist, and the other gnomic and iterative tenses of $\S 30$, can be used in the antecedent clause of these general propositions. The gnomic Aorist, as usual, is a primary tense. (See § 32, 2.) E. g.
 the Gods, to him they are ready to listen. Il. I, 218. ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \tau a \nu \tau i s ~ \tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$




 other occasions preferred to say anything in order to please, unless I have been convinced that it would also be for your adcantage. Dem. Phil. I, 54, 27. (Here $\epsilon i \lambda o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ is used in a sense approaching that of the gnomic Aorist, so as to be followed by a Subjunctive. See $\S 30,1, N .1$.

Note 1. The Indicative is sometimes used instead of the Subjunctive and Optative in relative sentences of this class. (See § 51, N. 3.) Here the speaker refers to one of the cases in which the event in question is liable to occur, as if it were the only case, instead of referring indefinitely to all possible cases alike (as when the Subjunctive or Optative is used). This use of the Indicative occurs especially after the indefinite relative $\delta \sigma \pi \iota s$; as the idea of indefiniteness, which is usually expressed by the Subjunctive or Optative, is here sufficiently' expressed by the relative itself. E. g.


compare this with the first example (II. IX, 312) under § 62
 ós $\dot{a} \nu \nu o \mu i\langle\eta$, without any essential difference in meaning.)



 tinued to bury in the same way as many as the army took up. Xen.



 Ib. I, 9, 27. (In the last two examples there is some Ms. authority for the more regular á申ıкдoíto and óv́vaito.) See also An. I, 9, 13.

All these examples fall under the first class of conditional relative sentences, § 61, 1. So in common protasis, § 51, N. 3.

Note 2. The Greek generally uses the Indicative in relative clauses clepending on general negative sentences, where in Latin a Subjunctive is more common. E. g.
 i e. no one who is not alle (no one unless he is able), nemo qui non pussit. Xen. Hell. VI, 1. 5. These sentences are regular protases. and belong under the rule of $\S 61,1$. (See Note 1.)

Note 3. (a.) In Homer, similes and comparisons are often expressed by the Subjunctive after $\dot{\omega}$, $\ddot{\omega}_{s} \tau \epsilon$, $\dot{\omega}$ ö $\boldsymbol{\tau} \tau$, $\dot{\omega}_{s}$ ös (seldom, $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s} a ̈ \nu, \& c$. ), where we should expect the Present Indicative, which sometimes occurs. Besides the singular use of the Suljunctive in these expressions, the omission of $\nexists \nu$ or $\kappa \epsilon$ is especially to be noticed. (See §63, l.) E. g.



Ulysses went as a wife weeps, \&c. Od. VIII, 523-531.






 also Il. XII, 167-17シ.
(b.) In many cases the Subjunctive or the Present Indicative is followed by the gnomic Aorist in the same simile, the Aorist being merely a more vivid form of expression than the others. (See § 30, 1, Notes 2 and 3.) E. g.











Aías $\delta \iota o \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta$ 's. Il. IV, 482.
§ 63. 1. (a.) In Homer, the relatives (like $\epsilon i$ ) often take the Subjunctive without ád or $\kappa$ ', the sense being apparently the same as when ${ }_{a} \nu, \nu$ is used. ( $(50,1, N .2$ ) E. g.








so long as the Gods shall supply valor, \&c. Od. X VIII, 132.
(b.) The same omission of ${ }_{a} \nu$ is not uncommon in the Attic poets; and even in prose a few exceptional cases occur, if we follow the Mss. (§ 50,1, N. 3). E. g.




 not to use many words where few suffice. THuc. IV, 17, (Yet the

2. The adverb ${ }_{a}^{\prime} \nu$ is sometimes used with the Optative or Iudicative in conditional relative clauses, when the relative
clause is itself an apodosis, with a protasis expressed or implied. In Homer $\kappa \epsilon$ with the Optative sometimes occurs where there is no apodosis, as in common protasis (See §50, 2, N. 2, a, b.) E. g.
 ( $\epsilon \phi \eta$ ), he saitl that they would form their opinion upon any slanders which any good speaker might (if he pleased) chance to utter. Thuc.



 $\lambda \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$, which is a regular example illustrating § 62. "Ovzu' an.

 pointed (if you hat chosen) to this post would have been the cause of as great calamities as this man has been. Dem. F. L. 350, 3. (Without the $\ddot{a} \nu$ after $\boldsymbol{0} \nu \tau \tau \nu a$, this would have been a regular example
 катєбт $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \pi \epsilon$, if you had appointed any one else (which you did not do). With the $\ddot{a} \nu$, it is itself an apodosis with a suppressed protasis; unless we can suppose that the ${ }_{a}^{\prime \prime} \nu$ was used, like $\kappa \in$ in the Homeric example, without affecting the sense. Sce § 49, 2, N. 4.)
3. A conditional relative clause, like a common protasis, may depend upon an Infinitive or Participle (with or withoû̂ $\stackrel{a}{a} \nu)$, or upon a final clause. See the last three examples under § 61, 3. (Compare § 53 ; §55, 2.)
4. The conditional relative clause may have a form different from that of its apodosis. This happens under the same circumstances as in common protasis. (See § 54.)
(a.) An Indicative or Subjunctive in the relative clause may depend upon an Optative with $\not \boldsymbol{a} \nu$ in the apodosis, either when the expressed apodosis belongs to an implied protasis ( $\$ 54,1, a$ ), or when the Optative with ä $\nu$ is considered a primary tense, from its resemblance in sense to the Future Indicative (54, 1, b). See also $\S 34,1, b$. E. g.

 they would be good things (if we should accept your doctrine). Xew. Mem. IV, 2. 32. So Mem. II, 2, 3 ; and Plat. Rep. II, 379 B.

 city to make this peace, so long as a single Athemian shall be left. Dem. F. L. 345, 14. (Here $\bar{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{s}$ גєinotro, so long as one should be left, wonld be more regular.) So Arist. Nub. 1151 ; Soph. El. 697.
(b.) The Optative (without ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$ ) in the relative clause occasıonally depends npon a primary tense in the apodosis. This may arise from the slight distinction between the Subjunctive and Optative in such

 be a hard task for him, unless the son of hronos should hurl, \&c. (More regularly, öтє кє $\mu \bar{\eta} \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \beta{ }^{\prime} \lambda \eta$, unless he shall hurl, \&c.)

The Optative in the Relative clause sometimes depends on a verb of necessity, obligation, propriety, possibility, \&c. with an Infinitire, the two forming an expression that is nearly equivalent in sense to an Optative with $\stackrel{a}{\Delta} \nu$, which would be expected in their place ( $\$ 54,2, b$ ). E. g.
 whom the state appoints (if the state should appoint any one, we ought to obey him). Soph. Ant. 666. (X $\rho \dot{\eta}$ кג $\dot{v} \epsilon t \nu$ is followed by the Optative from its resemblance in sense to $\delta \iota \kappa a i \omega s$ à $\nu$ k $\lambda$ vol ris.)
 ought to abstain, \&c.; like фєíoıto äv tıs. Xen. Cyr. I, 6, 19. Oûs




5. The Indicative is generally used in Greek (as in Latin) in parenthetical relative clauses, like ő $\tau \imath \pi o \tau^{\prime}$ є́ $\sigma \tau i v$, whatever it is (quidquid est), ö ö
 $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \omega$, Zeus, whoever he may be, \&c. Aesch. Agam. 160.


The Subjunctive, however, sometimes occurs; in which case the expression belongs under $\S 62$ or $\S 61,3:$ as in Aeschin. Tim. § 127,
 So Dem. Phil. I, 47, 24.

## Assimilation in Dependent ReIative Clauses.

§ 64. 1. 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. Such a leading verb may be in protasis or apodosis, in another conditional relative clause, in the expression of a wish (§ 82 ), or in a final clause. E. g.



 able would do this. (Here the principle of assimilation makes oi ठívaivto after an Optative preferable to oit à $\nu \delta \dot{v} \nu \omega \nu \tau a \iota$, which would express the same idea.) So in Latin: Si absurde canat is qui se haberi velit musicum, turpior sit. - Sic injurias fortunae quas ferre nequeas defugiendo relinquas.

For examples see § 61, 3 and 4.
2. When a conditional relative clause depends on a secondary tense of the Indicative implying the non-fulfilment of a condition, it regularly takes a secondary tense of the Indicative by assimilution. The leading Indicative may be in protasis or apodosis ( $\$ 49,2$ ), in another conditional relative clause ( $\S 61,2$ ), in an expression of a wish (§83), or in a final clause ( $\{44,3$ ). E. g.

 $\nu a \nu \tau 0$ тoĩ̃o $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \xi a \nu, O$ 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.

Remark 1. It will be seen that this principle of assimilation accounts for the Indieative and Optative in a conditional relative sentence, which have been already explained by the analogy of the ordinary forms of protasis. (See $\$ 61,2$ and 4.) In fact, wherever this assimilation occurs, the relative clause stands as a protasis to its antecedent clause, although the latter may be itself a protasis to another apodosis. (See § 34 .) Occasionally this principle is dis. regarded, so that a Subjunctive depends on an Optative. (See the examples under § $34,1, b$, and $\S 63,4, a$.)

Remark 2. The Indicative in the construction of $\S 61,1$, referring simply to the present or past, cannot be affected by assimilation, as that would change its time. E.g.



Note 1. The principle of $\S 64$ applies only to conditional rela tive clauses. If the relative refers to a definite antecedent, so that its verb denotes a fact and not a supposition, the principle of assimilation does not apply, and the Indicative (or any other construction required by the sense, $\S 59, \mathrm{~N} .1$ ) is used. E. g.


 do as much as thou art eager to do. Eur. Heracl. 731. (If the Imperfect had been used by assimilation, the meaning would be as much as thou wert (or mightest be) eager to do.)

Note 2. Conditional relative clauses depending on a Subjunctive or Optative in a general supposition (§ $51, \S 62$ ) are generally assimilated to the Subjnnctive or Optative; but sometimes they take the Indicative on the principle of $\S 62$, Note 1. E. g.








 Boùдoוтo for $\dot{\epsilon}$ ßoúdєтo would have corresponded to d'́outo in the second example quoted.)

Remari. The conjunction $\delta \dot{c}$ is occasionally used to introduce the clause on which a relative depends. Its force here is the same as in apodosis. (See § 57.) E. g.

 when the war broke out, (then) he appears, \&c. Tuuc. H, 6j. Méरot
 $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ duveíixov, so long as their archers both had their urrows and were able to use them, they held out. Id. III, 98. " $\Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ oi іплітаद, oüтш ס́è kaì oi mètagtaí. Xen. Cyr. Vili, 5, 12. So фaivoutai óf, Thuc. I, 11; and éríyvouto dé, Aeschis. Cor. § 69.

## Relative Clauses expressing a Purpose, Result, \&c.

§ 65. 1. The relative is used with the Future Indicative to denote a purpose or object. E. g.
 $\gamma \mu a \sigma \iota \nu$, and to send an embassy to say these things, and to be present $a$ :




 have no money to pay the firse with. Plat. Apml. 37 C.

The antecedent of the relative, in this case, may be either definite or indefinite ; but the negative particle is regularly $\mu \eta^{\prime}$, as in final clauses (§ $43, \mathrm{~N} .2$ ).
Remark. "Onws as a relative is sometimes used in this construction in a way which illustrates its use as a final particle. (See § 45, Rem.) E. g.
 shall be nothing wanting on your part; lit. act in that way by which,

 i. e. in such a way that they shall have, \&c. Xex. Cyr. I, 6, 7. So Cyr. II, 4, 31.

Note. 1. (a.) The Future Indicative is the only form regularly used in prose after the relative in this sense. It is retained even after secondary tenses, seldom being changed to the Future Optative, which would here be expected by § 31, 2, and by the analogy of clauses with $0 \pi \omega s$ (§ 45). The Future Optative, however, is
 and probably in Plat. Rep. III, 416 C , фaì ầ tes $\delta \epsilon i \downarrow \nu$ kaì tàs oikí-

 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \rho o i ̂ ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ rov̀s ädдous $\pi$ o入ítas.
(b.) When, however, this Future is quoted indirectly after a past tense, or depends upon a clause expressing a pust purpose (which is equivalent to standing in indirect discourse, § 26, N. 1), it is sometimes changed to the Future Optative, like any other Future Indicative. E.g.


 been chosen with the condition that they should compile the laws by which they were to govern. Xen. Hell. II, 3, 11. (This is a sort of indirect quotation of the sentence which appears in its direct form in Hell. II, 3,2 , the example under § 65, 1.)

Note 2. In Homer, the Future Indicative is sometimes used
 $\sigma \iota \nu$. Sometimes the Optative with $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}$, as an apodosis, takes the place of the Future; as in Od. IV, 167, ầ $\lambda \lambda$ oo oì кev à̀àдкоєєv. The more common Epic construction is, however, the Subjunctive (generally with $\kappa$ к ${ }^{\prime}$ joined to the relative) after primary tenses, and the Optative (Present or Aorist, never Future), without $\kappa^{\epsilon}$, after secondary tenses. E. g.










Remark. It will be noticed that the earlier Greek here agrees with the Latin (in using the Subjunctive and Optative), while the Attic Greek differs from the Latin by using the more vivid Future Indieative.

Note 3. (a.) The Attic Greek allows the Subjunctive in surh phrases as ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \in \iota$ ö́ $\tau \iota \in \ddot{\prime \prime} \pi \eta$, he has something to say; where the irregularity seems to be caused by the analogy of the common expression
 not what he shall say, which contains an indirect question (§ 71). E. g.
 $\mu \eta \theta \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$, that both may have things in which they may glory. Isoc. Pan. p. 49 C. §44. (Here there is no indirect question, for the meaning is not that they may know in what they are to glory. See



 on $\tau \iota \lambda \epsilon \gamma_{n}$ s in the same sentence, Plat. Ion. 535 B.)
(b.) The Present or Aorist Optative very rarely oecurs in Attic Greek after a past tense, but more frequently after another Optative. E.g.

 me, \&c. Soph. Phil. 281. Ги́vı
 Arist. Ran. 96. (Yet in vs. 98 we have the regular ö $\sigma \tau \iota s \phi \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon$ $\tau a \iota$, depending on the same oùk à $\nu \in \ddot{v} \rho o u s$.) So in Plat. Rep. III,


 woull be persuaded by it to sacrifice any of the Gireeks to him. Dem. Phil. II, 67, 20.

Note 4. ' $\Omega s$ as a relative, in the sense of by which (with an antecedent like anything understood), is sometimes followed by an Optative with ä้ in apodosis, expressing a purpose or object. E. g.


 which you could make just speeches, \&c., you are better prepared than Philip; but as to anything by which you could prevent him from doing what he is now about, you are wholly inactive. Dem. Phil. II, 66, 15 . So at the end of the same oration, $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s} \delta^{\prime} \dot{a} \nu \epsilon^{\prime} \xi \in \tau a \sigma \theta \in i \quad \mu \dot{a} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau^{\prime}$
 of what I say would be thoroughly tested.

Note 5. The relative with any tense of the Indicative, on even with the Optative and $\begin{gathered}a \\ \nu\end{gathered}$, can be used to denote a result, where $\begin{aligned} & \text { б̈ } \\ & \text { at } \\ & \text { might have been expected. ( } \$ 65,3 \text { ). This }\end{aligned}$ occurs chiefly after negatives, or interrogatives implying a negative. E. g.
 $\delta \epsilon \overline{p o} a \eta \xi=\nu \tau a, \hat{a} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$; i. e. Who of you is so simple as not to know, \&c.? Dem. Ol. I, 13, 16. (Here $\begin{aligned} & \text { afte à àoeì might have }\end{aligned}$




 come so adamantine that he would remain firm in justice. Plat. Rep. II, 369 B. hwo ated that his anseculive relatir
 followed by the Infinitive (§ 99 ), sometimes takes the Future Indicative. E.g.
 ä $\rho \xi \circ \mu a \imath, I$ withdraw upon this condition, that I shall be ruled, \&c.




 I, 103 .
It will be noticed here (as in Note 1) that the Future Indieative generally remains unehanged even after a secondary tense.
3. " $\Omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ (sometimes $\dot{\omega}$ ), so that, so as, is usually followed by the Infinitive. (See § 98.) But when the action of the verb expressing the result after $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ is viewed chiefly as an independent fact, and not merely as a result, the Indicative can be used.

The Infinitive is sometimes used even hore, when the Indic-
alive would seem more natural ; and it often makes quite as little difference which of the two is used, as it does in English whether we say some are so strange as not to be ashamed (oütws
 strange that they are not ashamed ( $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ oik ain $\chi \dot{v} v o \nu \tau a)$ ). Here, although both expressions lave the same general meaning, the former expresses the result merely as a result, while the latter expresses it also (and more distinctly) as an independent fact. E. g.
 к.т. $\lambda$. are you so senseless that you expect, \&c. Dem. OI. II, 25, 19. (Here $\begin{gathered}\text { art } \\ \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \xi \epsilon \iota \nu \text {, so senseless as to expect, would merely make }\end{gathered}$








 Greeks came to know well the name of Rhodopis. Hd. II, 135.
Note. As $\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\text { in }}$ this construction has no effect whatever upon the mood of the verb, it may be followed by any construction that would be allowed in an independent sentence. (See § 59, N. 1.) It may thus take an Optative or Indicative in apodosis with adv, or even an Imperative. E. g.


 $\sigma \tau \notin \nu \epsilon$. Id. El. 1172. So with oz $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ and the Subjunctive ( 89,1 );
 Phaedra. 227 D.
4. The relative has sometimes a causal signification, being equivalent to ört, because, and a personal pronoun or demonstrative word. The verb is in the Indicative, as in ordinary causal sentences (§ 81, 1). E. g.
Өavpactà̀ $\pi$ octets, âs j juiv oùdè̀ $\delta i \delta \omega \mathrm{~s}$, you do a strange thing in giving us nothing (like oft oc où ờèv dion ass). Xes. Mem. II, 7, 13.



 nobly ( $\grave{\prime}$ b being equivalent to ätı oüтws). Plat. Plied. 58 E .

 have no ancestral Gods, \&c. Plat. Euthyd. 302 B. (See Remark.)

 Apat. 903, 22. So Arist. Ran. 1459.

Remark. The ordinary negative particle of a causal relative sentence is ov, as in the first example above. (See § 81.) But if a conditional force is combined with the causal, $\mu \dot{\eta}$ can be used. Thus
 (besides its causal force) implies if, as it appears, you are without ancestral Gods; and $\hat{\Phi} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, if, as it appears, I have no contract. The same combination of a causal and a conditional force is seen in the Latin siquidem.

## Temporal Particles signifying Until and Before that.


§66. 1. When ${ }^{\epsilon} \epsilon \varsigma, \not{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon, \stackrel{\circ}{a} \chi \rho \iota, \mu \epsilon \in \chi \rho \iota$, and $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \phi \rho a$, until, refer to a definite point of past time, at which the action of the verb actually took place, they take the Indicative. E. g.


 ধ́ '́є́vouto. Xen. Cyr. ViI, 5, 6. (So An. III, 4, 49.) Kaì taìta





Note 1. "A $\chi \rho \iota$ o $\hat{v}$ and $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota$ of are used in the same sense as ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \rho \iota$ and $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota$. E.g.




 Indicative. E.g.
 dùtús. НDt. II, 143. 'Es oû ムíxŋs àveîpє. I, 67.
2. When thase particles refer to the future, they are
joined with $\stackrel{y}{a} \nu$ or $\kappa \epsilon$ ' and take the Subjunctive, if tho leading verb is primary. (See §61,3.) But if such clauses depend upon an Optative in protasis or apodosis, or in a wish, they usually take the Optative (without ä̀) by assimilation. (See § 61, 4.) E. g.
 come to an end of the war. Il. III, 291. "E $\omega$ s $\delta^{\prime}$ àv ouv $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o v ̀ ~ \pi a p o ́ v-~$
 $\tau$ à $\lambda o \iota \pi a ̀ ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \mu a d \theta s$, wait until you shall learn, \&c. AEsCH. Prom.

 shall bring, \&c. Il. VI, 258 . So ő $\phi \rho^{\prime}$ à $\nu \tau i \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$, II. I, 509.



 tell him this, until I put him to torture. Xen. Cyr. I, 3, 11.

Note 1. It will be seen by the examples, that the clause after $\tilde{\epsilon} \omega$ s and other particles signifying until sometimes implies a future purpose or object, the attainment of which is desired. When such a sentence, implying a purpose or object which would have been originally expressed by a Subjunctive, depends upon a past tense, it generally takes the Optative ( $\S 31,1$ ); but the Subjunctive also may be used, in order to retain the mood in which the purpose would have been originally conceived (as in final clauses, $\S 44,2$ ). For the general principle, see § 77. E. g.
 mova, they made a truce, (to continue) until what had been said should




Note 2. Homer uses $\epsilon$ is ö ${ }^{\circ}$ кє (or cioóke), until, with the Subjunctive, as Herodotus uses $\epsilon$ 's of with the Indicative ( $\$ 66.1, \mathrm{~N} .2$ );
 $\kappa \in$ may take the Optative, retaining $\kappa$ ' ; as in II. XV, 70.

Note 3. "A $\nu$ is sometimes omitted after $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ s. \&c. (including $\pi \rho i \nu$, $\S 67,1)$ when they take the Subjuctive, as in common protasis ant in relative sentences ( $\$ 50.1$, N. $3 ; \S 63.1$ ) ; after $\mu$ 白 $\chi \rho$ and

 Aescinns. Cor. § 60.
3. When the clause introduced by $\neq \omega s$, \&c., until, refers to a result which was not attained in past time in consequence of the non-fulfilment of a condition, it takes a secondary tense of the Indicative. (See §63,2.) E.g.

 with him, until I had given him, \&c. Plat. Gorg. 506 B. Oủk â"


 lar speakers had declared their opinion, \&c. Dem. Phil. I, § 1. (For $a_{a} \nu$ here, see $\S 42,3$. )

The leading verb must be an Indicative implying the non-fulfilment of a condition.
4. When the clause introduced by ${ }^{\prime \prime} \omega \varsigma \varsigma$, \&c., until, depends upon a verb denoting a customary action or a general truth, and refers indefinitely to any one of a series of occasions, it takes $\stackrel{\beta}{a} \nu$ and the Subjunctive after primary tenses, and the simple Optative after secondary tenses. (See § 62.) E. g.
 $\chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu \lambda a \xi!$, they must always make trouble, until they are put in


 every day, util the prison was opened. Plat. Phaed. 59 D. (This may mean until the prison should be opened; § $66,2, \mathrm{~N} 1$.)

Note. "A $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is sometimes omitted after $\tilde{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{s}$, \&e. and $\pi \rho^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\nu}$. when they take the Subjunctive in this sense, as well as in the other con-




Remark. When $\epsilon \omega s$ and ö $\phi \rho a$ mean so long as, they are relatives, and are included under $\$ \$ 58-64$. *O 0 ona in all its senses is confined to Epic and Lyric poetry. (See § 43, N. 1.)

## B. Ifiv, Until, Before that.

§ 67. חpiv, before, before that, until, besides taking the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative, on the same principles with éms, \&c. (§ 66), may also take the Infinitive (§ 106). The question of choice between the Infinitive and the finite moods generally depends on the nature of the leading clause.

חpiv regularly takes the Subjunctive and Optative (when they are allowed) only if the leading clause is negative or
interrogative with a negative implied; very seldom if that is affirmative. It takes the Indicative after both negative and affirmative clauses, but chiefly after negatives.

In Homer the Infinitive is the mood regularly used with $\pi \rho^{i} \nu$, after both affirmative and negative clauses; in Attic Greek it is regularly used after affirmatives, and seldom after negatives.

1. The Indicative, Subjunetive, and Optative after
 E. g.

 until I showed them, \&c. Aesch. Prom. 481. Há入ı̀ toìto $\tau \epsilon \mu \nu \omega \mathrm{m}$




 $\delta \rho \bar{a}$. Eur. Med. 1173.









 be satisfied. Xen. Cyr. I, 4, 14. (§ 66, 2, N. 1.)

 ¿סida $\xi a \nu$, they ought not to have given advice, $\S c$., until they had instructed us, \&c. Isoc. Paneg. p. 44 C. § 19.




 gtov, before they had placed before them. Xen. An. IV, 5,30 .
 Phil. 917. So Od. X, 175 ; Hdt. I, 136; 1'lat. Phaed. 62 C.
2. For $\pi \rho i \nu$ with the Infinitive, see $\S 106$.

Note 1. In Homer, $\pi \rho^{\prime} \boldsymbol{i}^{2}$ is not found with the Indicativ $\rho, \pi \rho i \boldsymbol{r}$ $\gamma^{\prime}$ äre taking its place; a few cases oceur of the Subjunctive (with out äv) and the Optative ; but the most common Homerie construc. tion, in sentences of all kinds, is that with the Infinitive (§ 106). E. g.
 viòs à à̀ $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\text { ápaıo кá } \lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma \epsilon \nu \text {, i. e. before the time when, \&c. Od. XXIII, }}$


 $\gamma^{\prime}$ ô $\tau^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu$ with the Subjunctive is found in Od. II, 374, and IV, 477.

Note 2. Mpì with the Infinitive after negative sentences is most common in Homer (Note 1), rare in the Attic poets, and again more frequent in Attic prose. (See Krüger, Vol. II, p. 258.) For examples see § 106 .

Examples of the Subjunctive or Optative with $\pi \rho^{\prime} \nu$ after affirmative sentences are very rare. One oceurs in Isco. Paneg. p. 44 A,


 used in the same constructions as $\pi \rho i \nu$. חpiv $\eta \eta$ is especially common in Herodotus. E. g.







 before they would give up their arns. Xen. An. II, 1, 10. (See § 66, 2.)

For examples of the Infinitive after all these expressions, see § 106. Even $\tilde{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \eta$ 频 found with the Infinitive.

Note 4. Прív or $\pi \rho i \nu \vec{\eta}$ is very often preceded by $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho a \nu$, $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \in \nu, \pi a ́ \rho a s$, or another $\pi \rho i \nu$ (used as an adverb), in the leading clause. E.g.





For examples with the Infinitive, see § 106.
Note 5. When $\pi \rho i v$ appears to be followed by a primary tense of the Indicative, it is an adverb qualifying the verb. E. g.
 shall old aye come upon her. II. I. 29.

## SECTION IV.

## Lndirect Discourse, including Indirect Quotations and Questions.

§ 68. 1. 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 indireet quotation is one in which the words of the original speaker conform to the construction of the sentence in which they are quoted. Thus the expression тầza ßoúnouaı may be quoted either directly, as $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \tau \iota \varsigma$ " "тaûтa ßoú $\frac{1}{} \mu a \iota$," or indirectly, as $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \tau \iota s$
 one says that he wishes for these.
2. Indirect quotations may be introduced by öt or $\omega s$ (negatively ò'т oú, $\omega \varsigma$ oú) or by the Infinitive, as in the example given above ; sometimes also by the Participle (§ 73,2 ).
3. Indirect questions follow the same rules as indirect quotations, in regard to their moods and tenses. (For examples see § 70.)

Note. The term indirect discourse must be understood to apply to all clauses which express indirectly the words or thoughts of any person (those of the speaker himself as well as those of another), after verbs which imply thought or the expression of thought (verba sentiendi et declarandi), and even

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 clauses are not in indirect discourse. (See § 77.j

## General Principles of Indirect Discourse.

Remark. The following are the general principles of indirect discourse, the application of which to particular cases is shown in §§ 70-77.
§ 69. 1. In indirect quotations after öт८ or $\dot{\omega} s$ and in indirect questions, after primary tenses, each rerb retains both the mood and the tense of the direct discourse, no change being made except (when necessary) in the person of the verb.

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, haring no tenses in the Optative, are regularly retained in the Indicative. (See, however, $\S 70$, Note $1, b$.) The Aorist Indicative remains unchanged when it belongs to a dependent clause of the direct discomrse ( $\$ 7,2$ ) ; but it may be changed to the Optative, like the primary tenses, when it belongs to the leading clause ( $\S 70,2$ ). The Indicative with ${ }^{a} \nu$ belongs under $\S 69,2$.
2. All secondary tenses of the Indicative implying non-fulfilment of a condition ( $\$ 49,2$ ), and all Optatives (with or without $\stackrel{y}{ } \nu$ ), are retained without change in either mood or tense, after both primary and secondary teuses.
3. When, however, the verb on which the quotation depends is followed by 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 (ay $\boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ being retained when there is one), and the dependent verbs follow the preceding rules. (See § 73.)
4. The adverb $\stackrel{\not 2}{\boldsymbol{a}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is never joined with a verb in indirect discourse, unless it stood also in the drect form : on the other hand, ${ }_{a}^{\prime \prime \nu} \nu$ is never omitted with a verb in indirect discourse, if it was used in the direct form. When $\stackrel{\ddot{a} \nu}{\nu}$ is joined to a relative word or particle before a Subjunctive in the direct discourse, it is regularly dropped when the Subjunctive is changed to the Optative in indirect discourse. (See, however, § 74, 1, N. 2.)
5. The indirect discourse regularly retains the same negative particle which would be used in the direct form. But the Infinitive and Participle occasionally take $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ in indirect quotation, where ov would be used in direct discourse. See examples under § 73.

Simple Sentences in Indirect Quotations after öt $\iota$ or $\dot{\omega} \varsigma$ and in Indirect Questions.
§ 70. When the direct discourse is a simple sentence, the verb of which stands in any tense of the Indicative (without $\stackrel{\prime}{a} \nu$ ), the principle of $\S 69,1$, gives the following rules for indirect quotations after ot ó $\iota$ or $\dot{\omega}$ and for indirect questions:-

1. After primary tenses the verb stands in the Indicative, in the tense used in the direct discourse. E. g.
 he says that he was writing; $\lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon$ ört $\gamma \epsilon \in \rho a \phi \epsilon \nu$, he says that he has written; $\lambda \epsilon \in \notin \iota$ ö́ть є́ $\gamma \in \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \in \iota$, he says that he had written; $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$
 he shall write.





 $\mu a t$, I will bring witnesses to show that, \&c. Dem. Eubul. 1303, 2.






Remark. It is to be noticed that indirect questions after primary tenses take the Indicative in Greek, and not the Subjunctive as in Latin. Thus, nescio quis sit, I know not who he is, in Greek is simply à $\gamma \nu 0 \hat{\omega}$ тis $\bar{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$. This does not apply to indirect questions which would require the Subjunctive in the direct form (§ 71).
2. After secondary tenses the verb may be eithor changed to the Optative or retained in the Indicative. The Optative is the more common form. In both Indicative and Optative, the tense used in the direct discourse must be retained. E. g.


 $\gamma \rho a ́ \psi o \iota$ (or ôtı $\gamma \rho a \dot{\psi} \epsilon_{\imath}$ ), he said that he should write; i. e. he said
 written; i. e. he said ' $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} a \psi a$.



 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota$, каi $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu а т а . .$. . ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \in \iota:$ these Indicatives might have been used

 Ib. VII, 1, $3 \overline{0}$. (He said $\boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \tau \eta \nu \tau a \iota$, which might have been
 $\pi \rho a \dot{\xi} \circ \iota, \ddot{\psi} \chi \epsilon \tau \circ$, having hinted that he would himself attend to the alfairs there. Thuc. I, 90. (He said тákєí $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \omega$, and $\pi \rho a ́ \xi є \iota$
 $\sigma \iota y$, from the same chapter, quoted below.) For the Future Op-


 that the hing of the Indians had sent them, commanding them to ask on what account there was war. Ib. II, 4, 7. (They said $\neq \pi \epsilon \mu$ -




 voıro, $k=$ menounced that $A$. was his friend, but that he had not been male his ciend to the injury of the state. Tuuc. II, 13. (IIe said $\xi^{\prime} \in \operatorname{los}$



 Apol. 21 C.

 (They said $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \zeta \circ \mu \epsilon \nu$, which might have been ehanged to $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \zeta \circ \epsilon \epsilon \nu$.)
 some one had come with the report that Elatea had been taken. Den. Cor. 284, 21. (Here the Perf. Opt. might have been used.) $\Delta \in t-$


 Andr. 593, 14. Фаעєр $\omega$ s $\epsilon i \pi \pi \epsilon \nu$ ö $\tau \iota \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\eta} \nu$ mó̀ıs $\sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \in \tau \in i \chi \iota \sigma \tau a \iota$ $\ddot{\eta} \delta \eta$, he said that their city had already been forttied. Thuc. I, 91.
 90. (Cf. öть $\pi \rho a \dot{\xi} o \iota$, quoted above from the same chapter.)


 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i k \nmid \nu \delta i ́ v o o s . ~ I d . ~ A n d r . ~ 611, ~ 10 . ~$

 aủrò $\nu i \pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \eta \kappa \grave{\omega} s \in i ̈ \eta$ (or $\tau i \pi \epsilon \pi o i \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ ), he asked him what he
 (or $\tau^{i} \pi o(\eta \sigma \in \iota$ ), he asked him what he should do; i. e. he asked $+i$
 asked him what he had done; i. e. he asked ri Ł̇ $\pi$ oingas;
 wiser than I. Plat. Apol. 21 A. (The direct question was $\begin{gathered}\text { Ëovi }\end{gathered}$
 indicate what he would do. Xen. An. II, 1, 23. (The direet question
 asked whom he harl seen who came next to him. Hdt. I, 31. (The
 asked whence he had received the boy. Id. I, 116. 'Н $\rho \omega \dot{\tau} \omega \nu$ aùtòv $\epsilon i$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \pi \lambda \in \dot{v} \in \epsilon \in \in \nu, I$ asked him whether he had set sail. Dem. Polycl. i223, 20. (The direct question was àvé $\pi \lambda \epsilon \cup \sigma a s ;$ )
'Hmópouv тí motє $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \in \iota$, I was uncertain what he meant. Plat. Apol. 21 B. (Here $\lambda \epsilon$ ќoo might have been used.). ' $\mathrm{E} \beta$ ountion $\theta^{\prime}$




Remari 1. After secondary tenses the Indicative and

Optative are equally classic; the Optative being used when the writer wishes to incorporate the quotation entirely into his own sentence, and the Indicative, when he wishes to quote it in the original words as far as the construction of his own sentence allows. The Indicative here, like the Subjunctive in final and object clauses after secondary tenses ( $\$ 44,2$ ), is merely a more vivid form of expression than the Optative. We even find both moods in the same sentence, sometimes when one verb is to be especially emphasized, and sometimes when there is no apparent reason for the change. E.g.

 $\tau \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ contains the most important part of the message.) 'Eк $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$






Remark 2. The Perfect and Future were less familiar forms than the other tenses of the Optative; so that they were frequently retained in the Indicative after secondary tenses, even when the Present or the Aorist was changed to the Optative. (See the last two examples under Rem. 1.) In indirect questions the Aorist Indicative was generally retained, for a reason explained in § 21,2 , N. 1. Some writers, like Thucydides, preferred the moods and tenses of the direct form, in all indirect discourse. (See $\S 44,2$, Rem.)

Note 1. (a.) An Imperfect or Pluperfect of the direct discourse is regularly retained in the Indicative, after both primary and secondary tenses, for want of an Imperfect or Pluperfect Optative. E. g.
 saying that he had heard, \&c.; i. c. he said ク̈кovov. Xen. An. I, 2.
 є̈ $\rho$ yov aìrois $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho \circ i \eta$, he said that they had accused him rightly, and that the fact itself bore witness to them; i. e. he said $\dot{\partial} \rho \theta \bar{\omega} \mathrm{s} \dot{\eta} \tau \iota \hat{a}$








Onetor and Timocrates, whether there were any witnesses before whom they had paid the dowry; and Aphobus, whether there had been amy present when he reccived it. Dem. Onet. I, 8n0. 10. (The two

(b.) In a few cases the Present Optative is used after secoadary tenses to represent the Imperfect Indicative. The Present may thus supply the want of an Imperfect Optative, as the Present Infinitive and Participle supply the want of Imperfects (§ 15, 3 and § 16,2 ). This can be done only when the context makes it perfectly clear that the Optative represents an Imperfect, and not a Present. E. g.

 Hell. VII, 1, 38. (The words of Leon were aüvє $\sigma v \sigma \kappa \eta \nu o u ̂ \nu \eta \ddot{\eta} \theta \in \lambda \epsilon$





 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. Onet. I, 869, 12. (The direct discourse was oú8eis $\mu$ áptus
 tains the answer to the question $\epsilon \ddot{\iota}$ rıves $\pi a \rho \eta \bar{\eta} \sigma \nu$ in the preceding sentence, which is quoted as the last example under a. The Imperfect in the question prevents the Optatives used in the reply from being ambiguous.) So Plat. Rep. IV, 439 E.

Note 2. In indirect discourse after secondary tenses, each tense of the Indicative or Optative is to be translated by $i t s$ own past tense, to suit the English idiom. Thus einev ö ö
 $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rho a \phi \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\eta} \eta$ (or $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rho a \phi \in \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ) is he said that he had written.

In a few cases the Greek uses the same idiom as the Encrlish, and allows the Imperfect or Pluperfect to stand irregularly with öt or $\dot{\text { os after a secondary tense, where regularly }}$ the Present or Perfect (Optative or Indicative) would be required. In such cases the context must make it clear that the tense represented is not an Imperfect or Pluperfect (Note 1, a). E. g.



INDIRECT DISCOURSE.


 $\sigma \dot{\prime} \mu \mu a \chi o \nu$ е́ ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ discourse would be in the Present or Perfect Indicative.) $\Lambda$ '́ $\gamma \in \mathrm{q}$ at
 coming. Thus. I, 134 . (Here $\chi \omega \rho$ in or $\chi \omega \rho \in i$ would be the regular


 283. (Here $\epsilon i \mu i$ is changed to $\dot{\eta} \nu$, and not to $\epsilon i \eta: ~ к a \tau \epsilon i \pi o \nu ~ c o u l d ~$ have been changed only to катєinou.)

In these examples the principle usually observed in indirect discourse, - that the tenses employed in the quotation denote relative not absolute time ( $\S 9$ ), -is given up, and the Imperfect and Fluperfect denote absolute time, as in causal sentences ( $(81,1)$. See § 81, 2, Rem.

Note 3. (a.) An indirect quotation, with its verb in the Optalive after öt or $\dot{\omega} s$, is sometimes followed by an independent sentence with an Optative, which continues the quotation as if it were itself dependent on the $\begin{gathered}\text { oft } \\ \iota\end{gathered}$ or $\dot{\omega}$. Such sentences are generally introduced by $\gamma$ áp. E. g.

 סcookeìv, for (as they said) they must administer, \&c. Dear. OI. I, 15 ,


 єít, к. $\tau$. $\lambda$. Xes. An. VII, 3, 13.
(b.) Such independent sentences with the Optative are sometimes found even when no Optative precedes, in which case the context always contains some allusion to another's thought or expression. E. g.





 to the theory) it lives in misery, \&.c., and finally perishes in what is called death. Plat. Phaed. 95 D . (Plato is here merely stating the views of others. For the Imperfects in the first sentence, see § 11 , Note 6.)
§71. When a question in the direct form would be expressed by an interrogative Subjunctive (\$88), indirect
add ap ain - Ken: Gyron: vi.
questions after primary tenses retain the Subjunctive; after secondary tenses the Subjunctive may be either changed to the same tense of the Optative or retained in its original form. E. g.
 סıoıк, I am at a loss on both questions, how I shall give her a dowry ( $\pi \hat{\omega s} \tau \operatorname{\tau au} \tau \eta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \hat{\omega} ;$ ), and whence I shall pay other expenses ( $\pi o ́ \theta \epsilon \nu$
 $\dot{\mathbf{a}} \pi$ o $\delta \rho \hat{\omega}$, I am trying to think how I shall escape you ( $\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s} \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{d} \pi \sigma \delta \rho \hat{\omega}_{;}$). Xes. Cyt. I, 4, 13. Oủk ${ }^{\prime} \chi \omega$ ti $\lambda \in \notin \gamma \omega, I$ know not what I shall say. Dem. Phil. III, 124, 24. So in Latin, non habeo quid dicam. In
 explained on this principle as interrogative; or by $\$ 65,1, \mathrm{~N} .3$, as
 є inns. for it is not surely through inexperience that you will declare that you know not what to say (i. e. ri cilia;). Dram. F. L. 378, 4.
 ai X $\rho$ vodava taúte $\delta \hat{\omega}, I$ do not know whether Is hall give them, \&c. Id. Gym. V $\mathrm{H}, 4,16$.




 decide which should first throw his spear, the question being mótepos
 $\pi$ ádı, they asked whether they should give up their city, the question being $\pi a \rho a \hat{\delta} \omega \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \hat{\lambda} \lambda \iota \nu$; Thuc. I, 25. 'Eßoviєviovta ai rà

 үuatı, he was at a loss how to act in the matter, i. e. Ti $\chi \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \omega \mu a t$;
 $\pi \rho a ́ \xi a \iota \mu \in \nu$, for we could not see how we should fare well, if we did it. Soph. Ant. 272.



 $t$ at, whether they should burn them as they were, or deal with them in some other way. Id. II, 4. 'A $\Pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \nu \bar{\eta} \sigma \sigma \nu \stackrel{\prime}{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma a \nu$. Id. IV, 13.

Remark 1. The context must decide whether the Optative in indirect questions represents a Subjunctive ( $\left(7_{1}\right.$ ) or an Indicative (§ 70,2). The distinction is especially important when the Aorist Optative is used (§21, 2, N. 1). See also § 74, 2, N. 1.

Remark 2. When the leading verb is in the Optative with av, fun $\times$ Kites 1.53. FrETANART0.. FAx El cot ar .. A 5 T $x$ TE
the Optative may be used in indirect questions of this class. See e examples in § 34, 3.

Note 1. The particle commonly used in the sense of whether in indirect questions is $\epsilon i$, which can introduce a Subjunctive, as well as an Indicative or Optative. (See Sen. Cyr. VIII, 4, 16, quoted above.) "Eáv cannot mean whether; and when this introduces a clause resembling an indirect question, the expression is really a protasis, with an apodosis suppressed or implied (§ 53, N. 2). E. g.

 here is, but if that does not please you, examine, in case this shall suit you better (that then you may adopt it); and not, look to see whether this suits you better. If 'adv áp'́ $\sigma \kappa \eta$ is an indirect question, it can represent no form of direct question which includes the äv. Even ápé $\sigma \kappa n$ alone could not be explained as an interrogative Subjunctive, by § 88.) 'Eà $\boldsymbol{a}$ ar $\rho \epsilon \in \sigma \kappa \eta$ in the passage just quoted is similar to $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu$


 who makes such objections to follow us, in case we can in any way show him that, \&c.? See Xes. An. II, 1, 8; and Arist. Nub. 535.
 (Such sentences belong under § 53, N. 2. See also § 77, 1, c.)

Note 2. Eisk with the Subjunctive in Homer sometimes forms an indirect question, representing the Epic Subjunctive with $\kappa$ cf in the direct question. (See § 87, Note.) E. g.
 waiting that you may see whether the son of Kronos will hold his hand to protect you? Il. IV, 249 . (The direct question would be $\boldsymbol{i} \pi \epsilon \rho$ $\boldsymbol{\pi} \chi \underline{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \chi \epsilon i \rho a ;$ ). Here the $\kappa \epsilon$ always belongs to the verb, so that this Epic construction is no authority for the supposed Attic use of ea and the Subjunctive in the same sense. See Note 1.
§ 72. When the verb of the direct discourse stands with $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} \nu$ in the Indicative or Optative (forming an apodosis), the same mood and tense are retained in indirect quotations with ${ }^{\circ \prime} \tau \iota$ and $\dot{\omega} s$ and in indirect questions, after both primary and secondary tenses. (See $\S 69,2$. ) E. g.


 this man would justly be put to death.


hecome famons himself if he had been a Seriphian, nor would the other f he had beet: an Athenian. Plat. Rep. I, 330 A. 'Edvocite, öt،








Note. The same rule applies when a secondary tense of the Indicative in apodosis with äp omitted ( $\S 49,2, N .2$ ) is quoted. E. g.
 were better for him to die at once. Lys. X, p. 117, § 25 . (The direct discourse was apeitto $\bar{\eta}^{\eta} \nu \mu \circ$.)
§ 73. 1. When the Infinitive is used in the indirect quotation of a simple sentence, which had its verb in the Indicative (with or without $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\alpha} \nu$ ) or the Optative (with $\stackrel{\text { al }}{\nu} \nu$ ), the verb is changed in the quotation to the same tense of the Infinitive, after both primary and secondary tenses. If $\stackrel{\partial}{\partial} \nu$ was used in the direct discourse, it must be retained with the Infinitive.

The Present and Perfect Infinitive here represent the Imperfect and Pluperfect (as well as the Present and Perfect) Indicative. (§ 15,$3 ; \S 18,3$, Rem.) E. g.
 he was writing; $\phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon t$ रpá $\phi \epsilon \iota$, he will say that he is (then) writing. (The direct discourse is here $\gamma \rho \dot{\phi} \phi \omega$.) $\Phi \eta \sigma \grave{\imath}(\ddot{\epsilon} \phi \eta) \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \nu \stackrel{a}{d}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ciòvaro, he says (or said) that he should now be writing, if he were
 he says (or said) that he should write, if he should (ever) be able. (He says $\gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi o \iota \mu \iota a ̈ \nu$.
 written; $\phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ रpá廿at, he will say that he wrote. (He says $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \rho a \psi a$.
 that he should have written, if he had been able. (He says ${ }_{\mathrm{\epsilon}}^{\mathrm{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathrm{pa} \mathrm{\psi}$ a
 should write, if he should (ever) be able. (He says $\gamma \rho$ á $\psi$ aı $\mu \iota$ äv.)
 є́ $\phi \eta \gamma_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rho a \phi \dot{v} \mathrm{va}$, he said that he had written. (He says $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma \rho a \phi a$.) For the Perfect with ${ }^{a} \nu$, see below.
$\Phi \eta \sigma i(\phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon t) \quad \gamma \rho a \dot{\psi} \epsilon \iota \nu$, he says (or will say) that he will write ; $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ ท $\rho$ '́ $\psi \in \iota$, he said that he would write. (He says $\gamma \rho \dot{a} \psi \omega$.)
(Present.) 'А $\rho \rho \omega \sigma \tau \in i \nu \pi \rho \circ \phi a \sigma i \zeta \epsilon \tau a t$, he pretents that he ws sick ' $\mathbf{F}, \dot{\xi} \dot{\omega} \mu \sigma \sigma \epsilon \boldsymbol{a} \rho \rho \omega \sigma \tau \in \hat{i} \nu$ routoví, he took his oath that this man wus
 бт $\rho a \tau \eta \gamma \epsilon i \nu$, he said that not he himself, but Nicias, was generat; i. e. he saill, oùk द̀ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ aìitòs à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ '́кєivos $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \epsilon i$. Thuc. IV, 28.
 what prayers do you suppose Philip made, \&c.? Dem. F. L. 381, 10. (Ev̌ $\chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ here represents $\eta \ddot{v} \chi \in \tau o$ : for other examples of the Im-



 not have taken care and have received the pay, \&c.? i. e. oùk â $\nu$
 § 41, 1.)
(Aorist.) Kava $\mathrm{K} \chi \in i \hat{\imath} \nu \phi \eta \sigma \iota$ тoúrovs, he says that he detained them.
 that he did not even think of ransoming the prisoners. Dem. F. L. 353,



 the Alhenians would perhaps march out, and not allow their land to

 $\kappa \omega \lambda \bar{v} \sigma a \iota \tau \dot{\jmath} \nu \tau \epsilon \iota \chi \iota \sigma \mu \dot{\nu} \nu$. Id. VI, 102. (Here oìk $\ddot{a} \nu \gamma \epsilon \nu o i \mu \epsilon \theta a$ would be the direct form. (See § 69,5.) So I, 139. Oủk äv $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \bar{i} \sigma \theta$ aủròv $\kappa \vec{a} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \delta \rho a \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, do you not believe that (in that cuse) he would have run thither? i. e. oùk ầ $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon \delta \rho a \mu \in \nu$; Dem. Aph. I, 831, 12. (See § 41, 3.)

 $\lambda \eta \psi o ̛ ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o ́ v ~ \tau \iota ~ \pi \rho о є \lambda \eta \lambda a к$ ќvaı. Xen. An. I, 10, 16. (Their

 that the Thebans had offered a reuard for him. Dem. F. L. 347, 26. For examples of the Perfect Infinitive with a $\quad \nu$, representing the Pluperfect Indicative and the Perfect Optative, see § 41, 2.
(Future.). 'Епа

 he said that within twenty days he would either bring them alive or kill them where they were. Thuc. IV, 28. (Cleon said ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ ä $\xi \omega \ldots$... ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$
 he says that this will have been accomplished within two or three days. Dem. F. L. 364, 18. (See § 29, Note 6.) For the rare Future Infinitive with ăv, see $\S 41,4$.

Remarik. For the meaning of each tense of the Intinitive in indirect discourse, see $\S 15,2 ; \S 18,3 ; \S 23,2$; and $\S 27$. It will
bo seen that these tenses (especially the Aorist) in this nse differ essentially from the same tenses in other constructions; it is therefore important to ascertain in each case to which class the Infinitive oelongs. This must be decided by the context; but in general it may be stated that an Infinitive stands in indirect discourse, when it depends upon a verb implying thought or the expression of thought, and when also the thought, as originally conceived, would have been expressed by some tense of the Indicative (with or without äv) or of the Optative (with äv), which can be transferred without change of tense to the Infinitive. (Sce $\$ 15,2, N .1$, which applies only to
 he came; but $\beta$ oú $\lambda \epsilon \tau a \iota ~ \epsilon \in \lambda \theta \epsilon i \nu$ means he wishes to come, where $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \theta$ eiv is merely an ordinary Infinitive, belonging under $\S 23,1$. In the former case $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \epsilon \bar{i} \nu$ represents $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$, but in the latter case it represents no form of the Aorist Indicative or Optative, and is therefore not in indireet discourse. So with the Infinitive after all verbs of commanding, advising, wishing, and others enumerated in § $92,1$.
2. When the Participle with the sense of the Infinitive (§ 113) is used in the indirect quotation of a simple sentence, it follows the rules already given for the Infinitive ( $\$ 73,1$ ), in regard to its tense and the use of $\stackrel{\text { a }}{ }{ }^{2}$. E. g.


 тoúrous '่̇ $\lambda \theta$ óvias, he announces that they came; $\eta_{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ тoútous e $\lambda \theta$ óvias, he announced that they hat come. (The announcement
 are come; ${ }^{\prime \prime} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$ тovitous $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda v \theta$ ótas, he announcerl that they were
 roùto $\gamma \in \nu \eta \sigma$ ó $\mu \in \nu$ o , he announces (or announced) that this is (or


 and that the solfiers were distressed; i. e. they saw, ov кaто $\theta \theta \circ \hat{v} \mu \in \nu$.


 ธo七 $\omega \nu \epsilon \dot{\xi} \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \epsilon \gamma \kappa \tau a \iota$, he has been proved to be doing everything for his swn interest. Dem. Ol. II, 20, 12. Aùṭ̂ Kūpod $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon \dot{v} o \nu \tau a$ $\pi \rho \omega \bar{\tau} \frac{s}{\eta} \eta \gamma \not \epsilon i \lambda a, I$ first announced to him that Cyrus was marching against him. Xen. An. II, 3, 19. See Sopif. O. 'T. 395.


 Thuc. I, 69. (The direct diseourse would be ó ßápßapos . . .


 not know that he was dead (i. e. rét $\eta \eta \kappa \in \nu)$. Xen. An. I, 10, 16.
 shown that he has reported nothing that is true, and that he deceived you. (Perf. and Aor.) Dem. F. L. 396, 30.

Eỉ $\epsilon \bar{v} \tilde{\eta} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ каì $\bar{\eta} \nu \quad \sigma v \mu \mu a x i a \nu \mu o t \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma$ о $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \nu$, if I were sure that I should obtain an alliance also (i. e. $\sigma \nu \mu \mu(\chi i a \mu$ оь $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ ). Ib. 353,



 тоьойдтає ó $о$ доуíà. Id. LII, 28. (The direct discourse would be



 à $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \chi \in \mathfrak{i} \rho \eta \sigma a, \S 69,5$; and $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ represents $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \tau a L$.)
 I found that I could accomplish this ( ( $\mathrm{ta} \mathrm{\pi} \rho a \xi a i \mu \eta \nu$ äv) in no other way. Id. Antid. p. 311 C. § 7.
 $\theta$ ávoltas ípâs mo入入às какоирүías, do you not know that you learned, \&c. Xen. Cyr. I, 6, 28. (Here the Optative $\delta \dot{v} v a \imath \sigma \theta$, as well as the whole context, shows that $\mu a v \theta a ́ v o \nu \tau a s ~ r e p r e s e n t s ~ \epsilon ' ~ \mu a \nu \theta a ́ \nu \in \tau \epsilon, ~$
 remember that you were with this Critias. Plat. Charm. 156 A.


## Indirect Quotation of Compound Sentences.

§ 74. When a compound sentence is to be indirectly quoted, its leading verb is expressed according to the rules given for simple sentences ( $\$ 70-73$ ).

1. If the quotation depends on a primary tense, all the dependent verbs of the original sentence retain the moods and tenses of the direct discourse.

If the quotation depends on a secondary tense, all dependent verbs of the original sentence which in the direct discourse stood in the Present, Perfect, or Future Indicative, or in any tense of the Subjunctive, may (at the pleasure of the writer) either be changed to the
same tenses of the Optative, or retain both the moods and tenses of the direct discourse. The Optative is the more common form. E. g.








 275 E. See Dem. Mid. 536, 1, where two such conditional ser-


 ä̀ $\dot{a} \phi \iota \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \tau a \iota, ~ \theta a \nu a ́ \tau \varphi \zeta \eta \mu \iota \omega \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \nu$. Tuvc. III, 40. Seє § 73, 2.
 he said that he was bringing a man whom it was necessary to confine

 replied, $\mu$ av $\begin{aligned} & \text { ávouvı â oủk èmiotavtaı. Plat. Euthyd. } 276 \text { E. (Here }\end{aligned}$ $\boldsymbol{a}$ has a definite antecedent, $\S 59$, and is not conditional ; it takes the Optative only because it is in indirect discourse. So with öv in the



 бoito. Id. Cyr. III. 1, 3. (This is a quotation of a conditionat












 $\mathrm{V}, 1,1$. (The dependent clause is found in the direct discourse in III




$r \in \lambda \epsilon v \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota a \nu \tau \grave{\partial} \nu \beta i o \nu, \tau a \phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. Lys. Agor. p. 133. § 45.






 they said they knew that they were envious if any good came to them, but pleased if any calamity befell then. Ib. V, 2, 2. ( $\Phi \theta$ 㕸 $i \tau \epsilon$

 $\ddot{\eta} \xi 0 v \sigma a, ~ \epsilon \ddot{i} \tau \iota \pi a ́ \theta o \iota \mathrm{X} a \rho i \delta \eta \mu o s . ~ D e m . ~ A r i s t o c . ~ 624, ~ 20 . ~$ ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{H} \xi \in \iota, \dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \pi \dot{\alpha} \dot{a}_{l l}$ Xapió $\left.\eta \mu o s.\right)$ See § 73, 2.

 Opamovs, then said that there was a height, \&c. Xen. An. V, 2, 17 (Here $\epsilon \bar{i} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ and $\pi$ aiotev might have been used.)
 $\lambda \dot{a} \theta \omega, \sigma \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \circ \mu a \iota$, к. т. $\lambda$. Lys. Erat. p. 121, § 15 . (Here $\epsilon i$入á $\theta o r \mu \iota, \sigma \omega \theta \eta \sigma o i \mu \eta \nu$ might have been used.) $\Phi a ́ \sigma \kappa \omega \nu \tau \epsilon, \vec{\eta} \nu \sigma \omega \theta \hat{\eta}$







 An. I, 4, 12 and 13. ${ }^{*} E \phi \eta \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota, \ldots$ ồ ầ $\dot{\in} \lambda \in \gamma \chi \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota$ dıaßá $\lambda-$








 already manifest that this would be so, unless you should prevent it (i. e.
 used ; and $\kappa \omega \lambda \dot{v} \sigma a \iota \tau \epsilon$, representing $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \kappa \omega \lambda \dot{v} \eta \eta \tau \epsilon$, is found in one Ms. and many editions.) See § 73, 2.

Note 1. The dependent verbs in indirect discourse may be changed to the Optative, even when the leading verb retains the Indicative; and sometimes (though rarely) a dependent verb retains the Subjunctive or Indicative, when the
leadi.g verb is changed to the Optative. This often gives rise to a great variety of constructions in the same sentence. E. g.














 к.т. $\lambda$. Xex. Ages. II, 31.





 in the direct discourse wonld belong under § 51, N. 3, the Futures


 XV, 2.
In Dem. Cor. 276, 23, we have both the constructions of § 74, 1


 $\gamma \bar{\eta} \tau a$, , corresponding to $\grave{\text { èv } \nu} \bar{\eta}$.)

Note 2. According to the general rule ( $\$ 69,4$ ), all relatives and particles which take $\not{a} \nu$ and the Subjunctive lose the $a_{a} \nu$ when such Subjunctives are changed to the Optative in indireet discourse attel secondary tenses. In a few cases, however, the ${ }^{a} \nu \nu$ is irregularly retained, even after the verb has been changed to the Optative. This must not be confounded with ä $\nu$ belonging to the Optative itself, making an apodosis. E. g.

 S65, 24. (The direct diseourse was $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i \delta \dot{\delta} \nu \bar{\delta} \delta \kappa \kappa \mu a \sigma \theta \hat{\eta}$, and the
 $\delta o \kappa \iota \mu a \sigma \theta \bar{\omega}$. Here the verb is changed, while the original particle

2. The Imperfect and Pluperfect remain in the Indicative unchanged, even after secondary tenses, in the dependent (as well as in the leading) clanses of indirect discourse, from the want of those tenses in the Optative. (§ 70,2 , Note $1, a$.)

The Aorist Indicative also regularly remains unchanged after secondary tenses, when it stood in a dependent clause of the direct discourse; not being changed to the Aorist Optative (as it may be when it stood in the leading clause, § 70,2 ). E. g.

 they blamed them for what they had done before; i. e. $ఓ \nu \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \in ע$

 ànavтívєб日aı, they hoped that the Sikels whom they had sent for




 Dem. Onet. I, 869, 9.

Note 1. The Aorist Indicative is not changed to the Aorist Optative in the case just mentioned, as the latter tense in such dependent clauses generally represents the Aorist Subjunctive of the direct discourse, so that confusion might arise. Thus $\bar{\epsilon} \phi \eta \dot{a} \in \tilde{v} \rho a$ a ठ'बढty means he said that he would give whatever he might find (á
 $\hat{\mathbf{a}} \epsilon \mathcal{y} \rho o \nu$, it might also mean he said that he would give what he actually had found. In the leading clause the ambiguity is confined to indirect questions; and in these the Aorist Indicative is generally retained for the same reason. (See § 70, 2, Rem. 2.)

When no ambiguity can arise from the change of an Aorist Inarcative to the Optative, this tense may follow the general principle $(\S 69,1)$, even in dependent clauses of a quotation. This occurs chiefly in causal sentences after öть, \&c., because (§ 81, 2), in which the Subjunctive can never be used. E.g.

 $\sigma \in \iota a \nu$ aùtò̀ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ Aù $i \delta \partial \iota$. Xen. Hell. VII, 1.34. (The direct discourse





II, 121. (Неıе ӧть ката入и́бєєє represents ôтı катє́入vба, because I took down; öтє äтот́ápo ( во the Mss.) may also be understood in a causal sense, since he had cut off. Madvig, however, reads öть in both clauses.) See also § 77, $1, e$, and examples.

Note 2. The Imperfect or Pluperfect sometimes stands irregularly in a dependent (as well as in the leading) clause, 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 really abandon the construction of indirect discourse. (See § 70, 2, N. 2; § 77, 1, N. 2.) E. g.






 would give back what he had taken from the city; i. e. $\hat{a} \in \tilde{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \phi \in \nu$ à $\pi о \delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon$. Id. F. L. 388, 17.
§ 75. When a dependent clause of the original sentence contains a secondary tense of the Indicative implying the non-fulfilment of a condition, the same mood and tense are retained in the indirect discourse, after both primary and secondary tenses. E. g.
 $\pi{ }^{\prime} \mathbf{o}_{\iota \nu}$. Thuc. VI, 61. (If $\neq \phi \theta a \sigma a \nu$ had been changed to the Optative, the construction would have become that of § 76.) $\mathrm{O}_{i \epsilon \sigma \sigma \epsilon}^{\prime \prime}$ тò





 1227, 2.
§76. An Optative in a dependent clause of the original sentence (as in the leading clause) is retained without change of mood or tense in all indirect discourse. E. g.







Remark. Sentences which belong under § 76 are often translated like those which in the direet discourse were expressed by a Future and a dependent Subjunetive, and whieh belong under § 74,


 would come if this should happen; although in the first two sentences

 $I$ will come if this shall happen.

## Single Dependent Clauses in Indirect Discourse.

§77. The principles which apply to dependent clauses of indirect discourse ( $\$ 74,1$ and 2 ) apply also to any dependent clause in a sentence of any kind (even when what precedes is not in indirect discourse), if such a clause expresses indirectly the thought of any other person than the speaker, or even a former thought of the speaker himself.

After primary tenses this never affects the construction; but after secondary tenses such a clause may either take the Optative, in the tense in which the thought would have been originally conceived, or retain both the mood and the tense of the direct discourse. Here, as in § 74, 2, the Imperfect, Pluperfect, and Aorist Indicative are retained unchanged.

1. This applies especially ( $a$ ) to clauses depending on the lnfinitive which follows verbs of commanding, advising, wishing, \&e; these verbs implying thought or the expression of thought, although the Infinitive after them is not in indirect discourse. (See § 73, 1, Rem.) It applies also (b) to the Optative (though not to the Indicative) in causal sentences in which the speaker states the cause as one assigned by others $(81,2) ;-(c)$ to clauses containing a protasis with the apodosis implied in the context ( $\$ 53$, Note 2 ), or with the apodo-
sis expressed in a verb like $\theta a \nu \mu i \zeta \omega, \mathcal{E} c .(\$ 50) ;-(d)$ to temporal sentences expressing a past intention or expectution, especially those introduced by $\bar{\epsilon} \omega s$ and $\pi p i v$, until, after past tenses (§ 66, 2, Note 1); - and sometimes (e) even to ordinary relative sentences, which would otherwise take the Indicative. E. g.
 should happen. (Here ċà qойтo $\gamma \epsilon \bar{\varphi} \eta \tau a \iota$ might be used, as the form in whieh the wish would originally be conceived.) Гaסórav 8 è








 $\chi \omega \rho \hat{\eta}$.



 An. III, 5, 18. ('Е $\pi \epsilon t \delta \dot{a} \nu \delta \epsilon \iota \pi \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon$, and $\dot{\eta} \nu i{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ ä $\tau \tau s \pi a \rho a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \bar{\prime} \lambda \eta$.)
 $\kappa о \mu \iota \sigma \theta \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$. 'Thuc. I, 91. (Прі̀ кодьбөєієь might have been

 Id. I, 91. (Eỉ $\beta$ aac $\theta \epsilon i \epsilon \nu$ might have been usel.) 'H ${ }^{\prime} i o v \nu$ aùroùs
 ld. I, 95. (Eül $\pi$ ov $\beta \iota a ́ \zeta o \iota \tau o ~ m i g h t ~ h a v e ~ b e e n ~ u s e d.) ~ ' A \phi ı к \nu o u ̂ \nu-~$

 aùzoû. Isoc. Trapez. 361 E. § 16 . (This example might be placed also under c.) Eỉmov $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu a \operatorname{\tau } \omega \nu \nu$ ö $\pi \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \kappa \iota \nu \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \imath, \pi \rho i \nu$ ầ ó $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\eta} \tau a \ell, I$ commanded that no one, \&e. Xen. Cyr. II, 2, 8.



 written. Xen. Cyr. II, 2, 9. ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{H} \nu$ ypá ${ }^{2} a \iota \iota$ would mean whatever
 Thuc. Vil, 27.
 because he did not lead them out (as they said). 'Tiuc. II, 21.

See other examples under § 81, 2. See also § 81, 2, Rem.

should be captured: the idea in full is, they pitied them, thinking of what would befall them if they should be captured. Xen. An. I, 4, 7.

 he would go away. Id. Ages. IV, 6. ('Eàv à $\pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\theta}_{\eta}$ might have been
 $\tau \iota \phi a \nu \in i \eta \quad \theta \eta \rho i \omega \nu$, and (to be ready) in case any wild beasts shoula appear; his thought being éád $\tau \iota \phi a \nu \bar{\eta}$. Id. Cyr. I, 4, 7. See other examples of the Optative under § $53, \mathrm{~N} .2$.

 move, or put to vote a motion, to divert this money to any other purpose. Thuc. II, 24. (Ei єï $\pi$ оו ${ }_{\eta}^{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \psi \eta \phi i \sigma \epsilon \iota \epsilon \nu$ might have been used.)
 they made their other preparations, (to be ready) in case the Athenians should dare, \&e. Id. VII, 59. (Their thought was, we will be ready,
 $\lambda o \iota \pi \grave{̀} \nu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu \tilde{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \epsilon \nu, \epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \nu a \nu \kappa \rho a \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma o v \sigma \iota \nu$, they were not likely to have them (provisions) for the future (as they thought), unless they should hold the sea. Id. VII, 60. See Lys. Agor. p. 131, § 15.
 he wondered that any demanded money, \&c. Xen. Mem. I, 2, 7.

 joiced, being content if any one would let it pass. Plat. Rep. V, 450
 that he was bringing such a calamity on any one. Dem. Mid. 548, 24.
 $\nu$ vueiv Té $\sigma \iota \omega \pi \bar{\eta} \sigma a t$, it seemed hard, if he was to appear to be impli cated, \&e.; he thought, $\delta \in \iota \nu o ́ \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \tau \nu, \epsilon i \delta^{\circ} \dot{\xi} \omega(\$ 49,1, N .3)$. Id. F. L. 351, 18. (Here dógoc might have been used, like éávol above.)

 him, if he really had this art (as he thought). Plat. Apol. 20 B

 Aакє $\delta a i \mu о \nu a$, they made a truce, (to continue) until what had been said
 might have been retained. Xen. Hell. III, 2, 20. ' $\Omega \rho \sigma \epsilon$, $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i$
 $\mu \iota \gamma \epsilon i \eta$, until Ulysses.s should be among the Phaeacians; i. e. $\tilde{\omega} \omega \mathrm{s}$ à

 be satisfied. XEN. Cyr. I, 4, 14. (His words were $\pi \rho i \nu \downarrow$ à $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu$ -

 ing for the time when, \&c. Il IV, 335. (Here óтóтà ó $\rho \mu \eta \bar{\eta} \eta$, \&c.

 should see them, \&e. Xen. Cyr. I, 4, 21.
 aür立 $\Lambda \iota \beta u ̛ \eta \nu . ~ H \mathrm{pm}$ IV，156．（＇Алікоиขтo might be used．）oi
 ठıєортát由бıv．Thuc．VIII， 9.
 $\phi$＇́poıto，he asked to see the token，which（he said）he was bringing from Proetus，i．e．he said ф＇́ронає．Il．VI，177．Катәүóрєоу т $\omega \nu$
 them for what（as they said）they had done．Hdt．VI，49．So tà

 （as she said）he had perished himself，and had left her the mother，＊c． Sopr．O．T．1245．（If the relative clause contained merely the idea of the speaker，${ }^{\prime} \theta a v \epsilon$ and ${ }^{\mu} \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon$ would be used．Here no an－ biguity can arise from the use of the Aorist Optative．See § 74，2， N．1．）

Note 1．Causal sentences are usually constructed without re－ ference to this principle．See § 81，with Rem．

Note 2．The Imperfect and Pluperfect occasionally represent the Present and Perfect Indicative in this construction，as in § 74，2， N．2．Such clauses are simply not included in the indirect discourse． E．g．
日ei $\eta$ ，ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \iota$ ，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．
 sents $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\boldsymbol{a}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ à $\pi o \lambda \nu \theta \hat{\omega}$ ．）

Note 3．＊A $\nu$ 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 § 74， 1，Note 2．E．g．

 rò $\nu \mu \sigma \theta \dot{\circ} \nu$ ，because they were obliged（as he said）to converse with those from whom they received the pay．Xen．Mem．I，2，6．（Here $\hat{\dot{\omega} \nu} \mathbf{u} \boldsymbol{u}$

 Sopr．Trach．687．（Sce Schneidewin＇s note．）＇H ̧̧iovv aùroùs $\mu a-$


 have examinted，\＆c．Platt．Phaed． 101 D．（The direct thought of the person addressed would be，$\tilde{\epsilon} \omega \varsigma \not{ }^{2} \nu \sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \psi \omega \mu a \iota$ ．）See § 34， 1.

It is doubtful whether $\epsilon a \dot{\nu}$ was ever used with the Optative in thes way

2．Upon this principle（§77）final and object clauses with

so
oun．
The
iva, ö $\pi \omega \boldsymbol{s}, \mu \dot{\eta}, \& c$.. after secoudary tenses, admit the double construction of indirect discourse. This appears in the frequent use of the Subjunctive or the Future Indicative instead of the Optative in these sentences, after secondary tenses, when either of these is the form in which the purpose would have been originally conceived. Thus we may say either $\bar{j} \lambda \theta \in \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\text { Iva }}$
 being allowed because the person referred to would himself
 the examples.
Note. The principles of § 74 and $\S 77$ apply to clauses which depend upon final and object clauses, as these too are considered as standing in indirect discourse. E. g.






 the Peloponnesians as they sailed by, even if under the circumstances they had not been thinking of remaining, might destroy the cities. Id. Ш, 33. (Here $\delta \iota \epsilon \nu 0 o \hat{\nu} \tau o$ is retained by $\S 74,2$.)

## ${ }^{\prime \prime} O \pi \omega s$ and " $O$ in Indirect Quotations.

§78. 1. In a few cases ö $\pi \omega$ s is used in indirect quotations where we should expect $\dot{\omega}$ s or öть. This occurs chiefly in poetry. E. g.



 émiotaual, Plat. Euthyd. 296 E .
2. In a few passages in Homer we find $\begin{gathered}o \\ \text { (the neuter }\end{gathered}$ of ös) used for öт८. E. g.



 So Od. XII, 295.

Note. 'öoúvєкa and oũveкa in the tragedians, and oüveка in Homer, are sometimes used like ö́t or $\dot{\omega}$, that ; as ä $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \dot{\text { ó }} \boldsymbol{\theta}$ oúvєка
 Id. Phil. 232. See Soph. El. 1478 , Tra-h. 934 (oṽvєкa with Opt.); and II. XI, 21 ; Odyss. V, 216 ; XIII, 309.

## " $O_{\tau} \iota$ before Direct Quotations.

§ 79. Even direct quotations are sometimes introduced by öть, without further change in the construction. "Õь thus used cannot be expressed in English. E. g.
 סógaı $\mu$." Xen. An. I, 6, 8. 'А



 II, 115.

## SECTION V.

## Cadsal Sentences.

§ 80. Causal sentences express the cause or reason of something stated in the leading sentence. They

 о́тóтє, єن่̉ $\tau \epsilon$, and sometimes ö ótov, since, seeing that.

Remark. "Ote and $\omega$ s in this causal sense must not be confounded with ${ }_{o}^{\circ} \tau \iota$ and $\dot{\omega}$, that, in indirect quotations; and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime}$,
 ¢les in temporal sentences.
§ 81. 1. Causal sentences regularly take the Indicative, after both primary and secondary tenses; past eauses being expressed by the past tenses of the Indicative. The negative particle is ou. E. g.


















 Dem. Ol. I, 9, 3. For $\epsilon$ ย̇te, since, see Soph. Aj. 715, O. C. 84 ; for дтои, see Нdт. I, 68.
2. When, however, it is implied that the cause is assigned by some other person than the speaker, the principle of indirect discourse ( $\S 77,1$ ) applies to causal sentences.

This has no effect upon the form after primary tenses ; but after secondary tenses it allows the verb to stand in the Optative, in the tense originally used by the person who assigned the cause. E. g.
 Pericles, because being general he did not lead them out. Thuc. II, 21. (This states the reason assigned by the Athenians for reproaching Pericles: if Thucydides had wished to assign the cause merely




 king. Id. Symp. IV, 6. So $\dot{\omega} \in \dot{v} \rho \dot{\eta}$ кос, because (as he said) he had found, Нрт. I, 44.

Remark. We should suppose that in causal sentences of the second elass $(\$ 81,2)$ the moorl and tense by which the eause would have been originally stated might also be retained, as in ordinary indirect diseourse; so that in the first example above (Thuc. II. 21)


Ex $\epsilon \xi{ }_{\xi} \gamma_{0} .$. This, however, seems to have been avoidel, to prevent the ambiguity which would arise from the three forms, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \xi \eta \eta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \xi \dot{\alpha} \gamma o l$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \xi \dot{\xi} \gamma \in \iota$. It will be remembered that the first form, which is the regular one in causal sentences of the first class ( $\S 81,1$ ), is allowed only by exception in indirect quotations ( $\$ 70,2$, N. 2 ) ; for in indirect discourse the tenses of the Indicative regularly denote time present, past, or future relatively to the leading verb; while in causal sentences (as in most other constructions) they regularly denote time absolutely present, past, or future. (See § 9.)

Note 1. The Optative in causal sentences appears to have been


Note 2. If a cause is to be expressed by an apodosis in which the Indicative or Optative with $\underset{\Delta}{d} \nu$ is required, those forms can of course follow the causal particles. E. g.
 oac $\mu \iota \hat{\eta} \sigma o \hat{v}$, I beg you then to remain with us; as there is not one whom $I$ should hear more gladly than you. Plat. Prot. 335 D. Nîv o




Note 3. For relative causal sentences, see § 65, 4. For the causal use of the Participle, see § 109, 4.

## SECTION VI.

## Expression of a Wish.

Remark. The Greek has one form to express a wish referring to a future object, and another to express one 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! -O that this may happen! - Utinam veniat; to the latter, such as $O$ that this had happened! - O that this were true! - Utinam hoc factum esset, - Utinam hoc verum esset.
§ 82. If the wish refers to the future, the Optative is used after the particles of wishing $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \theta \epsilon$ or $\epsilon \grave{\jmath} \gamma^{\prime} \rho$ (nega-
tively, $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \theta \epsilon \mu \eta^{\prime}, \epsilon i \quad \gamma \dot{a} \rho \mu \eta^{\prime}$, or simply $\left.\mu \eta^{\prime}\right)$, $O$ that, $O$ if, would that ( $O$ that not, \&ic.). Eí $\theta \epsilon$ and $\epsilon \grave{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \rho$ may, however, be omitted ; and thus the Optative often stands alone to express a wish.

The Present Optative refers to a continued or repeated action or state in the future; the Aorist (which is the most common) refers to a momentary or single act in the future. E. g.
 would clothe me with so much strength! Od. III, 205. Ait oũros,




 $\chi \in \rho \sigma \grave{\iota}$ ë $\chi \epsilon \stackrel{s}{ }$, may you for the present continue to do what you now have

 $\mu_{\epsilon} \lambda^{\prime} \lambda_{\epsilon \iota} \sigma v \operatorname{loi}^{\sigma} \epsilon \iota$, and may that opinion prevail, \&c. Dem. Phil. I,


 є' $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ каi $\nu \circ \mu \iota \zeta \circ i \mu \eta \nu \sigma o \phi o ́ s$, on this condition may I gain the prize (in this case) and be (always) considered wise. Arist. Nub. 520.
 1,38. Eì $\gamma \mathfrak{a} \rho \gamma \in \nu o i \mu \eta \nu$, téкvov, àvì $\sigma o \hat{u}$ veкоós. Eur. Hippol.

 $\theta \epsilon i \eta s$, may you only be willing! Plat. Euthyd. 296 D. So $\epsilon i \epsilon \nu$, be it so,-well.

 remain on his shoulders, and no longer may Ibe called the father of Telemachus. II. I, 259. (See Rem. 1.)

From its use in wishes the Optative Mood ( $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \lambda \iota \sigma \iota s \epsilon \boldsymbol{v} \kappa \boldsymbol{\tau} \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ ) received its name.

Remark 1. The Future Optative was not used in wishes in classic Greek. The Perfect was probably not used except in the signification of the Present (§17, N. 3), as in the last example. If such a phrase as $\epsilon \ddot{\ell} \theta \in \nu \in \nu \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \kappa \circ$ c were used, it would mean $O$ that it may prove (hereafter) that he has been victorious! See § 18, 1.

Remari 2. In Homer we occasionally find the Present Optative in a wish referring to present time, where later writers would have used the Imperfect Lndicative. E. g.




$O$ that I were the son of Zeus, and that Hera were my mother, and that I were honored as Athene and Apollo are honored, \&c. II. XIII, 825. (Here тє́коє is nearly equivalent to $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \eta \rho$ є $\iota \eta$ : cf. $\dot{\omega} \tau \epsilon \kappa \boldsymbol{\imath} \sigma a, O$ mother. quoted under § 83, 1.)




The idea is, $O$ that thy knees equalled thy heart in strength, \&c. Il. IV, 313. At the end we have the more regular form, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \nu$ tis



$O$ that I were again so young, \&c. Il. VII, 157. See VII, 133.
For a similar exceptional use in Homer of the Present Optative in protasis, see $\S 49,2$, N. $6(b)$. The optatives in the examples quoted above may perhaps be explained as referring to the future, and translated, $O$ that I might be, \&c.

Note 1. In the poets, especially Homer, the Optative without є $\mathfrak{\imath} \theta \epsilon$ or $\boldsymbol{\epsilon i} \gamma \dot{\gamma} \rho$ sometimes expresses a concession or permission; and sometimes an exhortation, in a sense approaching that of the Imperative. E. g.

 рофóvтך̀, either die, or kill Bellerophontes. Il. VI, 164. 'A $\lambda \lambda$ á $\tau \iota s$
 Aesch. Prom. 1049 and 1051.

Note 2. The poets sometimes use the simple $\epsilon i$ (without $-\theta \in$ or ráp) with the Optative in wishes. E. g.


Note 3. The poets, especially Homer, sometimes use $\dot{\omega} s$ before the Optative in wishes. This $\dot{\omega}$ cannot be expressed in English; and it is not to be translated so (as if it were written $\boldsymbol{\omega} s$ ), or confounded with oũ̃ $\omega$ s used as in Note 4. E. g.
 may perish, \&̌c. Od. I, 47. See Od. XXI, 201. ' $\Omega$ s ó тáde $\pi$ порஸ̀y


Note 4. Ouftas, thus, on this condition, may be prefixed to the Optative in protestations, where a wish is expressed upon some condition ; which conditicn is usually added in another clause. E.g.
 condition, - do not neglect me. Dem. Aph. II, 842, 9 .

Note 5. The Optative in wishes belonging under this head never takes the particle $a \not v$. If' a wish is expressed in the form of an ordinary apodosis, as $\pi \omega^{\omega} s$ à $\nu$ ò $\lambda o i \mu \eta \nu$, how gladly $I$ would perish (i. e. if $I$ could), it does not belong here, but under $\S 52,2$.
§ 83. 1. If the wish refers to the present or the past, and it is implied that its object is not or was not attained, the secondary tenses of the Indicative are used. The particles of wishing here cannot be omitted.

The distinction between the Imperfect and Aorist Indicative is the same as in protasis ( $\$ 49,2)$; the Imperfect referring to present time or to a continued or repeated action in past time, and the Aorist to a momentary or single action in past time. E. g.


 would that it had not happened.
 mother, hadst a better understanding. Eur. El. 1061. Ei $\gamma$ à qoaaú$\pi \eta \nu$ סívaцı $\in i^{Z} \chi \circ \nu$, would that I had so great power. Id. Alc. 1072.

 die in a foreign land. Soph. O. C. 1713.

Remark. The Indicative cannot be used in wishes without e"de or $\epsilon i \gamma \alpha \rho$, as it would occasion ambiguity ; this cannot arise in the case of the Optative, which is not regularly used in independent sentences without $a v$, except in wishes. The last example quoted above shows that the Indicative with $\mu \eta$ alone can be used in negative wishes. (This passage is often emended; see, however, Hermann's note on the passage, and on Eur. Iph. Aul. 575.)
2. The Aorist $\ddot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda o \nu$ and sometimes the Imperfect $\ddot{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu$ of $\dot{o} \phi \epsilon i \lambda \omega$, debeo, may be used with the Influitive in wishes of this class, with the same meaning as the secondary tenses of the Indicative. 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.
" $\Omega \phi \in \lambda o \nu$ or $\omega \bar{\omega} \phi \in \lambda \lambda o \nu$ may be preceded by the particles of wishing, єi" $\theta \epsilon$, єi $\gamma$ á $^{\prime} \rho$, or $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ (not ov ). E. g.
 ought to be doing it), or would that he had (habitually) done this (lit. he ought to have done this). " $\Omega \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$ тоѝто $\pi \circ \stackrel{\iota}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} a \iota$, would that he had done this.

 third part, \&c., and that those men were safe who then perished. ()d.
 victorious in such a contest. Od. XI, 548. See Il. XVIII, 86, ai


 perished on that day. Soph. O. T. 1157. E'it' $\ddot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda$ ' 'Aproùs $\mu$ ’

 ' $\xi \in \rho \gamma \dot{\prime} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a i, O$ that the multitude were able, \&c. Plat. Crit. 44 D

 $\nu \eta v \sigma i ̀ \pi \in \phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$, would that ye all had been slain instead of Hector.

 a better man, who knew, \&c. Il. VI, 350. (For $\tilde{n} \delta \eta$, see § 64, 2.)

For the origin of this construction, see § 49, 2, N. 3 (b) and (c).
Note 1. The secondary tenses of the Indicative are not used in Homer to express wishes $; \stackrel{ }{\omega} \phi \in \lambda$ o with the Infinitive being generally used when it is implied that the wish is not or was not fulfilled. (See §82, Rem. 2.) The latter construction is used chiefly by the poets.

Note 2. Neither the secondary tenses of the Indicative nor the form with |  |
| :---: |
| $\phi \in \lambda o \nu$ |
| in wishes can (like the Optative) be preceded by | the simple $\epsilon i$ (without $-\theta \epsilon$ or $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ ).

' $\Omega_{\mathrm{s}}$, used as in $\S 82$, N. 3, often precedes $\omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda o \nu$, \&c. in Homer, and rarely in the Attic poets. E. g.




Remark. Expressions of a wish with the Optative or Indicative after $\epsilon \theta \epsilon \epsilon$, $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i}$ дáp, \&c. were originally protases with the apodosis suppressed. Thus, $\epsilon i$ yà $\rho \gamma^{\prime}$ vouto, $O$ that it may happen (lit. if it would only happen), implies an apodosis like ev̉rvx̀̀s an
 that it had happened, implies one like $\epsilon \dot{u} \tau \cup \chi \grave{\eta} s \stackrel{a}{ } \nu{ }_{\eta} \nu($ if it had only happened, I should have been fortunate). It will be seen that the use of the moods and tenses is precisely the same as in the corresponding classes of protasis $(\S 50,2 ; \S 49,2)$. The analogy with the Latin is the same as in protasis:- $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \gamma \dot{\mathrm{a}} \beta$ тоиิто $\pi$ oooin (or пою $\eta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \in \nu$ ), O si hoc faciat, $O$ that he may do this; ci $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ тоѝтo $\grave{\epsilon} \pi o i \epsilon \iota, O$ si hoc faceret, $O$ that he were doing this;
 $\epsilon i \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau$, utinam ne factum esset, $O$ that it had not happened.

The form with ${ }^{\approx} \phi \epsilon \lambda_{o \nu}$ and the Infinitive, on the other hand, is an apodosis with a protasis implied. See $\S 49,2$, N. 3, b.

## SECTION VII.

## lmperative and Subjunctive in Commands, Exhorta tions, and Prohibitions.

§ 84. The Imperative is used to express a command, an exhortation, or an entreaty. E. g.

R'́ $\gamma \epsilon$, speak thou. $\Phi \in \hat{\imath} \gamma \epsilon$, begone! 'E $\lambda \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \tau \omega$, let him come. Xat-
 П. I, 322. Z $\epsilon \hat{v}, \quad Z \epsilon \hat{v}, \theta \epsilon \omega \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu \delta \epsilon ~ \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ t \omega \nu ~ \gamma \in \nu o v ̂ . ~ A e s c h . ~$ Choeph. 246.

Note 1. The Imperative is often emphasized by ä $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ (or
 gular when the Imperative is in the plural, and in the second person when the Imperative is in the third. E. g.


 Xen. Apol. § 14. "A $\gamma \in \tau \in \delta \epsilon \iota \pi \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma a \tau \epsilon$. Xen. Hell. V, 1, 18. $\Phi \in \frac{1}{} \rho$ '


 tıs каї $\pi$ ûo dóro. Ib. 871.

Remark. Фépe is not used in this way in Homer.
Note 2. The poets sometimes use the second person of the Imperative with $\pi$ âs in hasty commands. E. g.




Note 3. The Imperative is sometimes used in relative clauses depending on an interrogative (usually oi $\sigma \theta a$ ), where we should expect the relative clause to be completed by $\delta \epsilon i$ with an Infinitive, and the Imperative to stand by itself. E. g.
 what to do? strike the rock with your leg! Arist. Av. 54. (We
 -vhat to do? if so, do it : viz. strike the rock, \&c.) Oī $\sigma \theta^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime \prime} \mu o t \sigma \dot{v} \mu-$ $\pi \rho a \xi o \nu$, do you know what you must do for me? if so, do it. Eur.
 do you know what must be done for me (â $\delta \in i \quad \mu o \iota \gamma \in \nu \in \in \sigma \theta a)$ ? let it he done then ( $\left.\gamma \in \boldsymbol{\nu}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \boldsymbol{\theta}\right)$, viz. put chains on the strangers. Id. Iph. 'Taur.
 Cycl. 131, oí $\theta^{\prime}$ oừ ó $\delta \rho \dot{a} \sigma \in \iota s$; dost thou know what thou art to do?)

Note 4. The Imperative sometimes denotes a mere concession, and sometimes a supposition (where something is supposed to be true for argument's sake). E. g.


 the private man address, \&c. Xen. Hier. VIII, 3.
§ 85. The first person of the Subjunctive (usually in the plural) is used in exhortations, supplying the want of a first person to the Imperative. "A $A \in$ ( $\left.{ }^{\prime \prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \tau \epsilon\right)$ or $\phi^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon$, come, often precedes. E. g.
 $\mu \epsilon e a$, тóv $\delta \epsilon \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$, let us sail homeward with our ships, and leave










Note 1. The first person singular of the Subjunctive, when it is nsed in this way, almost always takes ä $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ (ä $\gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ) or $\phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon$, unlesя some other Imperative precedes. E. g.


 quickly as possible ; let me pass the gates of Hades. I1. XXIII, 71.


 157 C .

Note 2. The second and third persons of the Subjunctive are not regularly used in affirmative exhortations, the Imperative being the regular form in these persons. (For the Aorist Subjunctive with $\mu_{i}^{\prime}$ in prohibitions, see § 86.)
In some cases the Optative in wishes, in the second and third persons, has almost the force of an exhortation. (\$82, N. 1.)
In a few exceptional cases, we find even the second person of the Subjunctive in exhortations, like the first person, but always accompanied by $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon$. E.g.

For the Future Indicative used elliptically in exhortations after ${ }_{0} \pi \omega \omega \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, see § 45 , Note 7.

Remark. The preceding rules apply only to affirmative exhortations: these should be carefully distinguished from prohibitions with $\mu^{\prime}$ ( (\$6). The use of the Imperative in prohibitions is generally confined to the Present tense.
§ 86. In prohibitions, in the second and third persons, the Present Imperative or the Aorist Subjunctive is used after $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ and its compounds. The former expresses a continued or repeated, the latter a single or momentary prohibition.

In the first person (where the Imperative is wanting) the Present Subjunetive is allowed. E. g.


 404. 'А $\rho \gamma \epsilon \bar{\iota} \iota \iota, \mu \dot{\eta} \pi \dot{\omega} \tau \iota \mu \in \theta i \epsilon \tau \in$ oov́pıòos $\dot{a} \lambda \kappa \bar{\eta} s$. Il. IV, 234. Eine






 $\theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ would not be allowed by $\S 86$; although $\lambda \dot{v} \sigma a \tau \epsilon$, in a mere exhortation, is regular, by §84.) Mウ̀ кaтà тoùs עópous $\delta \iota \kappa a ́ \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon^{\circ}$


 $\mu^{\prime}$ á $\gamma \nu 0 \in i \downarrow . ~ I d . ~ P a n e g . ~ p . ~ 55 ~ C . ~ § ~ 73 . ~$

Note 1. (a.) With the exception of the first person (§ 86), the Present Subjunctive is not used in prohibitions.

An elliptical use of the Subjunctive (sometimes the Present) after $\mu \dot{\eta}$ or ö ö $\omega \boldsymbol{s} \mu^{\prime}$, with a verb of fearing understood, must not be confounded with this. (See §46, N. 4.)
(b.) The second person of the Aorist Imperative is very aeldom found in prohibitions; the third person is less rare. E. g.
 $\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \sigma a ́ \tau \omega$. Aesch. Prom. 332. So Prom. 1004. Kaì $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \epsilon$ í $\dot{v} \mu \bar{\nu} \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \delta o \kappa \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega$ s. Plat. Apol. 17 C.

Note 2. The first person singular even of the Aorist Subjunctive in prohibitions is rare, and is found only in the poets. E. g.

 Tr. 801. ' $\Omega \xi \epsilon \in \mathcal{\nu} 0 \iota, \mu \dot{\eta} \delta \bar{\eta} \tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \delta \iota \kappa \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$. Id. O. C. 174. (This may be explained also by $\S 46, N .4$.)

## SECTION VIII.

Subjunctive (like Future Indicative) in Independent Sentences. - Interrogative Subjunctive.-Ó $\mu \dot{\prime}$ with Subjunctive and Future Indicative.
§ S7. In the Homeric language the Subjunctive is sometimes used in independent sentences, with the force of a weak Future Indicative. E. g.
 nor shall I (or can I) ever see such men. I1. I, 262. ' $\mathrm{Y} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ €̀ $\nu \pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \sigma \cdot$

 Hades，and shine among the dead（said by the Sun）．Od．XII， 383. （Here the Future divoouat and the Subjunctive native hardly differ in their force．）Ki $\pi ⿰ 丿 ㇄$ say．Il．VI，459．（In vs．462，referring to the same thing，we have


 not forget the far－shooting A mola．Hymn．in Apoll． 1.

Remark．The Aorist is the tense usually found in this construe－ ton．The first person singular is the most common，and instances of the second person are very rare．

Note．This Homeric Subjunctive，like the Future Indicia－ live，is sometimes joined with $a \nexists \nu$ or $\kappa^{\prime} \epsilon$ to form an apodosis． ＇This enabled the earlier language to express an apodosis with a sense between that of the Optative with an $\nu$ and that of the simple Future Indicative，which the Attic was unable to do． （See § 38，2．）E．g．
 give her up，I will take her myself．II．I，324．（Here ধ̈̀nomaぇ кєу has a shade of meaning between ex $\lambda \frac{i}{\mu \eta \nu} \kappa \epsilon \nu, I$ would take，and aipク́бo－ $\mu a \varepsilon, I$ will take，which neither the Attic Greek nor the English can

 31, －both referring to the same thing．See also II．III， 54 ；and VI， 448 ，the last example under $\S 59$, N． 1.
§ 88．The first person of the Subjunctive is used in questions of doubt，where the speaker asks himself or another what he is to do．The negative particle is $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ ． In Attic Greek this Subjunctive is often introduced by $\beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$ or $\beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$（poetic $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ or $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ）．E．g．
 that I should say this？M $\dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau}$
 me to say？For the Future in such questions，see $\S 25,1$, N． 4.

 whither shall I ga？to whose house shall I come？\＆c．Od．XV， 50 ．＇${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$

 $\pi \hat{a} \beta \hat{\omega} ; \pi \hat{a} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} ; \pi \hat{a} \kappa \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \sigma \omega$ ；Eur．Dec．1056．Пồ $\tau \rho a ́ \pi \omega \mu a \iota$



 ciồ; and may I not ansiver, \&e. Sen. Mem. I. 2, 36. Mitt $\omega \sigma \dot{\omega}-$

 receive him, or shall we go away? Id. Symp. 212 E. "A $\rho$ a $\mu \dot{\eta}$ a io $\chi$ v $\nu$ -
 to imitate the king of the Persians? Xes. Oecon. IV, 4.
 sit down and read? Plat. Phaedr. 228 E. (So 263 E.) Boúdei
 Boúdєь $\lambda a ́ \beta \omega \mu a \iota ~ \delta \grave{\eta} \tau a$ каì $\partial i \gamma \omega$ ti $\sigma o v$; Soph. Phil. 761. Boú$\lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta^{\prime}$ є̀ $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \omega \mu \nu$; Eur. Dec. 1042. A'́ $\lambda \epsilon \iota s \mu \epsilon i \nu \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ aùroû



 command me to speak, \&c.? Dem. Phil. III, 123, 1.

In Plat. Rep. II, 372 E, we find $\beta o v i \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ and a Subjunctive with

 (§ 49,1 .)

Remark. In this construction there is an implied appeal to some person (sometimes to the speaker himself), so that $\beta$ aud $\lambda \epsilon \iota$ or some similar word can always be understood, even if it is not expressed. Homeric examples in which this is not the case fall naturally under § 87.

In the later Greek the classic form $\theta_{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in$ e ina ; was developrell into $\theta \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon$ iva (or öt $\pi \omega s$ ) єitmo; - from which comes the modern Greek $\theta_{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu$ ai єї $\pi \omega$; or $\nu$ à til $\pi \omega$; will you have me speak?

Note 1. The third person of the Subjunctive is sometimes used in questions, but less frequently than the first. This happens chiefly when a speaker refers to himself by fris. Exsamples of the second person are very rare. E. g.
 shall we call you the city's enemy, or mine? Dem. Cor. 268, 28. Eîta

 \&c.; and are they to assume, \&e. Id. Androt. 613, 3. Ti cis kiva

 ä $\rho \xi \eta r a \iota \mu a ́ \chi \eta s ; ~ P l a t . ~ P h i l . ~ 15 ~ D . ~ M \omega ̂ s ~ \tau ı s ~ \pi є i \theta \eta t a \imath ; ~ I l . ~ I, ~$
 1417.) See Kruger, Vol. I, §54, 2 ; Notes 4 and 5.

Note 2. The Subjunctive is often used in the question Qrgeas 449 - oíkovs kail фw~er
rí $\pi \dot{a} \theta \omega$; what will become of me? or what harm will it do me. literally, what shall I undergo? E. g.

 1057. Tí $\pi \dot{\alpha}^{\theta} \omega \omega \tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$; Id. Pers. 912; Arist. Plut. 603. Tí
 $\pi \epsilon i \sigma o \mu a \iota^{\circ} \tau i \gamma a ̀ \rho \pi a ́ \theta \omega$; I shall suffer what is to come, if it must be; for what harm can it do me? Eur. Phoen. 895. (The difference between this and the ordinary meaning of $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \omega$ is here seen.) ' $\Omega \mu$ òó $\gamma \eta \kappa a \cdot \tau i \quad \gamma a ̀ \rho \pi a ́ \theta \omega$; Plat. Euthyd. 302 D. So in the
 $\rho^{\prime} \in \in \nu$;
§ 89. The double negative ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$ is sometimes used with the Subjunctive and the Future Indicative in independent sentences, being equivalent to a strong single negative. The compounds of both ov and $\mu \eta$ can be used here as well as the simple forms.

1. The Subjunctive (sometimes the Future Indicative) with ov $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ may have the force of an emphatic
 ou $\mu \dot{\eta}$ тоиิто $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ ) means this surely will not happen, being a little more emphatic than oú $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta^{-}$ $\sigma \in \tau a \iota$. E. g.
(Aor. Subj.) $O \dot{u} \mu \grave{\eta} \pi i \theta \eta \tau a \iota$, he will not obey. Sopr. Phil. 103.
 for there is not, nor has there been, nor will there ever be, \&c. Plat. Rep. VI, 492 E . (Here où $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\eta} \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \eta \tau a=$ is merely more emphatic








 Phil. III, 130, 11.



 but you will not be alle. Plat. Rep. I, 341 B.






 (See § 70, 2 ; and below, Note 1.)

The Aorist Subjunctive is the most common form in this construction.

Note 1. Oú $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with the Future Optative, representing a Future Indicative of the direct discourse, occurs in an inlirect quotation


 the last example under $\S 89,1$, the Future Indicative is retained in the same construction. The Future Infinitive can be used in the
 củ $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \in \iota \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu . ~ E u r$. Phoen. 1590.
$\mathbf{O} \dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta}$ with the Subjunctive occurs in a causal sentence after $\dot{\omega} s$, in
 $\pi а \rho a \beta \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$.

Note 2. This construction is often explained by supposing an ellipsis of $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ or фóßos $\bar{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ between the ou and the $\mu \dot{\eta}$ : this is based on such passages as Xen. Mem. II, 1, 20̃, oủ фópus $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\sigma € \mathfrak{a} \gamma \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega$, there is no fear lest I may lead you, which with the фókos omitted would be oú $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \dot{d} \gamma \dot{\gamma} \dot{\gamma} \omega$. This theory, however, leaves the following construction ( $\$ 89,2$ ) entirely unexplained; and the supposed ellipsis fails to account for the meaning in many cases, as in the first example under $\S 89,1$.

## 2. The second person of the Future Indicative (some-

 times the Subjunctive) with ov' $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ may express a strong prohibition. Thus ov' $\mu \dot{\eta} \lambda a \lambda \eta \sigma \sigma \iota s$ means you shall not prate (or do not prate), being more emphatic than $\mu \eta$ $\lambda \alpha ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$. E. g. your nonsense! Arist. Nub. 367. ${ }^{5} \Omega \pi a i ̂, ~ \tau i ́ ~ \theta \rho o \in i ́ s ; ~ o u ̀ ~ \mu \grave{\eta}$ map' $\delta^{\prime} \chi \lambda \omega$ тádє $\gamma \eta \rho v \dot{\sigma} \sigma \in$, do not (I beg you) speak out in this way before

 तóyov, do not adopt the cowardly language of women. Eur. Andr.

 978. Tí $\pi o \iota \epsilon i s ; ~ o v ̀ ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa a \tau a \beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$, don't come down. Arist. Vesp 397.

For the use of the future，see $\S 25,1$. N．5．For the Subjunctive in this construction，see below，Rem． 2.

Note 1．A prohibition thus begun by oú $\mu \eta$ may be con－ tinued by $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon^{\prime}$ with another Future（or Subjunctive）．An affirmative command may be added by another Future or an Imperative，after ả入入á or $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ．E．g．
 not call to me，I implore you，nor speak my name．Arist．Ran． 29 ．
 hand near me nor touch my garments．Eur．Hippol．606．O $\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta}$

 do not wipe off your folly on me．Id．Bacch． 343.
 prate，but follow me．Arist．Nub．505．Où $\mu \grave{\eta}$ Sıatpi千єıs，à入入à



 $\tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \in i$ тaт $o ́ s$, be not inimical to friends，but cease your rage，\＆c．
 $\mu o v e s$ oìvol，à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\iota} \phi \dot{\eta} \mu \in \iota$ ，do not scoff，nor do what these wretches do；but keep silence！Arist．Nub．296．（Here the Imperative is used preciscly like the Future with $\bar{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ or $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ in the preceding ex－ amples．）

The Future in the clauses with ${ }^{a} \lambda \lambda a a^{\prime}$ or $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ will be explained by $\S 25,1, \mathrm{~N} .5(a)$ ；in the clauses with $\mu \eta \delta \delta^{\prime}$ it may be explained by $\S 25,1, \mathrm{~N} .5$（b），or we may consider the construction a continua－ tion of that with ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ，the $\mu \dot{\eta}$ being repeated without the ov．

Note 2．In a few cases ou with the Future is used interroga． tively expressing an exhortation，followed by another Future with $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ or $\kappa a i \mu_{\eta}^{\prime}$ expressing a prohibition．E．g．

Óv $\sigma i \gamma^{\prime}$ à $\nu \epsilon ́ \xi \in \iota, \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \iota \lambda i ́ a \nu$ à $\rho \in i(s)$ ，keep silence（lit．will you not keep silence？）and do not become a coward．Soph．Aj．75．（Here
 See Rem．1．But the first clause，although strictly interrogative，is really an exhortation，and was so considered in the construction of the following clause，where the Future is to be explained on the principle of $\S 25,1$, N． 5 （b）．Compare the examples under Note
 hand，and do not distrust me．Id．Trach．1183．Oủk $\in i$ íví $\tau^{\prime}$ oükous，
 O．T． 637.

Remark 1．The examples under $\S 89,2$ and the notes are usu－ ally printed as interrogative，in accordance with the doctrine of Elmsley，stated in his note to Eurip．Med． 1120 （1151）and in the
 as meaning will you not stop prating? lit. will you not not prate? and when a second clause in the Future with $\mu \eta \delta \hat{\epsilon}$ or à $\lambda \lambda a$ follows, he considers the interrogative force of ou to extend also to this. But this explanation requires an entirely different theory to account for the construction of $\$ 89,1$; whereas the rules given above consider the Subjunctive there a relic of the common Homeric Subjunctive ( $\S 87$ ), and explain the Future in $\S 89,2$ by the principle stated in $\S 25,1, \mathrm{~N} .5,-$ où $\mu \eta$ having the same force of a strong single negative in both constructions. As to the examples in N. 1, the last one (where the Imperative instead of the Future follows $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda a^{\prime}$ ) seems to be decisive against the interrogative force commonly ascribed to the Future in the others. The examples in N. 2 are the strongest support of Elmsley's theory, where the first clause is clearly interrogative, at least originally; but the force of the question as an exhortation seems to have guided the construction of the sentence, which is finished after the analogy of the examples in N. 1. The explanation given above (N. 2) is supported by Aesch. Sept. 250, oi oiza;
 $\xi \in i$;) say nothing of this kind through the city.

We may explain the examples in N. 2 as interrogative, by considering the first clause a question with ou (implying an affirmative answer) equivalent to an exhortation, and the second a question with $\mu \eta$ (implying a negative answer) equivalent to
 will you not keep silence? and you will not become a coward, will you?

Remark 2. In modern editions of the classics the Subjunctive is not found in the construction of $\S 89,2$. But in many of the examples quoted there and in the notes the first Aorist Subjnnctive in $-\sigma \eta s$ has been emended to the Future, against the authority of the Mss., in conformity to Dawes's rule. (See § 45, N. 8, with footnote.) Thus, in the three examples from the Clouds, the Mss. have the Subjunctive; and in the last (vs. 296) oú $\mu \eta \grave{\eta}^{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \dot{\omega} \psi \eta s$ could not be changed to ov $\mu \grave{\eta} \sigma \kappa \dot{\omega} \psi \in \iota s$, as the Future of $\sigma \kappa \omega \dot{\sigma} \tau \omega$ is $\sigma \kappa \omega \dot{\psi} \boldsymbol{\sigma} a t$. Elmsley's emendation $\sigma \kappa \dot{\omega} \psi \in i$ is therefore adopted by most editors. But this seems too violent a change to allow in the text, merely to sustain an arbitrary rule, which at best has nothing hut accident to rest on. If both constructions ( $\$ 89,1$ and 2) are explained on the same principle, there is no longer any reason for objecting to the Subjunctive with ou $\mu \eta$ in prohibitions; and it seems most probable that both the Future and the Subjunctive were allowed in both constructions, but that the Subjunctive was more common in that of $\S 89,1$, and the Future in that of $\S 89,2$.

## CHAPTER $V$.

## THE INFINITIVE.

§ 90. The Infinitive mood expresses the simple idea of the verb, without limitation of number or person. It has the force of a neuter verbal noun, and as such it may take the neuter of the article in all its cases.

It has at the same time the attributes of a verb, so that (even when it takes the article) it may have a subject, object, and other adjuncts; and, further, it is qualified not by adjectives, but by adverbs.
§ 91. The Infinitive may as nominative be the subject of a finite verb, or as accusative be the subject of another Infinitive. The Infinitive is especially common as the subject of an impersonal verb, or of $\epsilon \sigma \tau i$. It may also be a predicate nominative, or it may stand in apposition with a substantive.

Such Infinitives stand regularly without the article; but if they are to be especially prominent as containing the leading idea of the sentence, the article may be used. . E. g.


 thing to be a king. Od. I, 392. Eîs oìuvòs ăpı

 $\sigma \theta$ aı $\pi a ́ \nu \tau a \pi \epsilon ́ \phi u к \epsilon \nu$. Dem. Ol.' II, 25, 24. (Compare Ol. I, 16, 3 :



 (Here $\pi o \iota \hat{\eta} \sigma a t$ as accus. is the subject of $\delta_{\epsilon} i \nu$ : for $\delta \epsilon i \nu$, see $\S 92,2$.)


 the subject Infinitive has the article to emphasize it, while the pre-

 pare the two examples above from Demosthenes.) Toùtó éoti tò



 29 A.
§92. The Infinitive without the article may be the object of a verb. It stands generally as an object accusative, sometimes as an object genitive, and sometimes as an accusative of kindred signification. The classes of verbs after which the Infinitive is thus used must be learned by practice; but the Infinitive without a subject follows in general the same classes of verbs in Greek as in English. The following, however, may be specially mentioned : -

1. In general, any verb whose action directly implies another action or state as its object, if such action or state is to be expressed by a verb and not by a noun, takes the Infinitive. Such are verbs signifying to teach, to learn, to accustom, to desire, to ask, to advise, to entreat, to exhort, to command, to persuade, to urge, to propose, to compel, to need, to cause, to intend, to begin, to attempt, to permit, to decide, to dare, to prefer, to choose, to pretend; those expressing fear, unwillingness, eagerness, caution, neglect, danger, postponement, forbidding, hindrance, escape, \&c.; and all implying ability, fitness, desert, qualification, sufficiency, or their opposites. E. g.








 $\lambda_{\epsilon \tau a \iota}$ тойто тоьєiv, he postpones doing this.

This use of the Infinitive is too common to need illustration by more particular examples.

Remark 1. The Infinitive in this construction is generally equiv alent to the English Infinitive after the same class of verbs; and it refers to indefinite or to future time. (See § 15, 1.) The Present and Aorist are the tenses usually found, with the distinction stated in the Remark before § $12:$ for the Perfect, see § 18, 3 (b); and for the occasional use of the Future Infinitive (or even the Infinitive with äv) after some of these verbs, see § 27, N. 2.

Remark 2. Verbs of fearing and caution are included in the list given above, although they are generally followed by $\mu \dot{\eta}$, lest, and the Subjunctive or Optative. (See §46.) The Infinitive, however, sometimes occurs; and, when it is used, it belongs regularly under the rule, $\S 92,1$. (See $\S 46$, N. $8, a$ and $b$.)

Verbs expressing danger take the Infinitive more frequently than $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with the Subjunctive or Optative. (See $\S 46, N .8, c$.)

Note 1. Some verbs which do not regularly take an Infinitive may be used in unusual significations, so as to allow an Infinitive by § 92, 1. E. g.
 they made an agreement with the Plataeans to surrender, \&c. Thuc.
 to whom would any one sooner dare to commit money? Xen. Mem. IV, 4, 17. 'Oóv́povtat oíkávóє $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ ' $\epsilon \sigma \theta a 九$, they mourn to go home. Il.


Note 2. When a noun and a verb (especially écri) together form an expression equivalent to any of the verbs of § 92,1 , they may take the Infinitive without the article. Some other expressions with a similar force take the same construction. E. g.


 prevented them from shutting the gates. Thuc. IV, 67. So èmeүéveto


 $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \nu a \iota, I$ am not enough of a prophet to clecide, \&c. Eur. Hippe!. 346. (Here the idea of ability is implied in $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \iota s ~ \epsilon i \mu i$. ) Tò à $\sigma \phi$ алѐs


being tamed ( $=\pi \epsilon$ фикóta $\pi \iota \theta a \sigma \epsilon$ v́є $\sigma \theta a l$ ). Plat. Politic. 264 A. Tís



 it is time to go away (like xp̀̀ àmífva, we must go away). Plat.
 бai), he hopes to do this. But $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i$ is tồ $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, Tuuc. II, 56. Oi $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \zeta \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ aitco $\theta a \nu \in i \nu$, and the living are those who caused then to die. Soph. Ant. 1173. We might also have aítoo roû toútou's
 like $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda o \hat{v}$ (or $\mu \iota \kappa \rho \circ \hat{v}$ ) $\delta \dot{\delta} \omega$ aot $\epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \tau, I$ want much (or little) of doing anything; $\pi$ ajà $\mu \iota \kappa \rho \grave{\nu} \nu \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$ тotєì $\tau \iota$, they came within a little of doing anything; where the idea of ability, inability, or sufficiency

 prevents him from going; where tov̀ $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu$ may be used. (See § 94, and \$ 95,1 and 2.)

The Infinitive depending on a noun is generally an adnominal genitive with the article rov̂. See § 94 and $\S 95,1$.

Note 3. Although the Infinitive depending on the verbs included in § 92, 1 regularly stands without the artiele, yet tó is sometimes prefixed to give the Infinitive still more the charaeter of a noun in the accusative. The Infinitive is sometimes placed for emphasis apart from the main construetion, like a synecdocbical aecusative. E. g.

 àv $\gamma v v \grave{j}$ divauto; i. e. as to living with her, what woman could do it ? Soph. Tr. 545. Tò $8 \rho \hat{a} \nu$ oủk $\dot{\eta}^{\prime} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma a \nu$. Id. O. C. 442.
 not to go. Arist. Ran. 68. (For $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ov̀, see § 95, 2, N. 1, b.) So
 $\pi \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \tau \grave{o} \mu \eta \grave{\eta}$ ктєival), Aesch. Prom. 865. Compare Soph. Phil. 1253, oúdé тoı $\sigma \hat{n} \chi \in \rho_{\grave{\prime}} \pi \epsilon i \theta_{0} \mu a \iota \tau$ ò $\delta \rho \hat{\alpha} \nu$, i. e. I do not trust your
 this.)

Note 4. Other aetive verbs than those included in § 92,1 may take the Infinitive like an ordinary noun, as an object aceusative. Here, however, the Infinitive takes the article tó. E. g.
 death to all. Isoc. Demon. p. 11 C. § 43.

Note 5. A few of the verbs ineluded in § 92 , 1 , which govern the genitive of a noun, allow also the genitive of the Infintive with rov̂, as well as the simple Infinitive. (See § 95, 1.) This appliea chiefly to $\mathfrak{a} \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \mu a t$, and to the verbs of hindrance, \&c ivo cluded in § 95, 2. E. g.
 $\lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma_{\epsilon L \nu}$, Plat. Phaed. 98 D.). Most verbs of desiring and neglecting
 $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{s}$ with the Future Indicative ( $\$ 45$ ), allows also the simple Infinitive (Thuc. VI, 54), and the Infinitive with tov̀ (Xen. Mem. III, 3,11 ). See § 45, N. $6, a$.

Remark. For the use of the Infinitive without $\boldsymbol{\text { ro after verbs as }}$ an accusative by synecdoche (usually found only after adjectives), see § 93,2 , Note 3 .
2. Another case in which the Infinitive appears as the object of a verb occurs in indirect discourse, after verbs implying thought or the expression of thought (verba sentiendi et declarandi) or equivalent expressions. Here each tense of the Infinitive, instead of referring indefinitely to the future (as in the former construction, $\S 92$, 1 ), represents the corresponding tense of the Indicative or Optative

Remark. For this construction see $\S 73,1$; where also examples of the Infinitive with äv in indirect discourse are given. For the distinction between the Infinitive in this construction and the ordinary Infinitive (92, 1), see $\S 73,1$, Remark. For the Infinitive, not in indirect discourse, after some verbs which usually belong to this class, see $\S 15,2$, Notes 2 and 3 ; see also $\S 23,2$, Notes 2 and 3.

Note 1. Of the three common verbs signifying to say, $\phi \eta \mu^{i}$ is regularly followed only by the Infinitive in indirect discourse, $\begin{gathered}\boldsymbol{i} \pi \pi \\ \text { a }\end{gathered}$ only by ö $\boldsymbol{\tau} \iota$ or $\dot{\omega}$ s and the Indicative or Optative, while $\lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ allows either construction. A singular exception in regard to eimov is found in Eur. Phoen. 1590, quoted § 89, 1, N. 1. (See § 15, 2, N. 3.)

Note 2. After many verbs of this class in the passive both a personal and an impersonal construction are allowed: thus, we can

 I seem (videor) usually has the personal construction, as in Englisli; as oviros $\delta$ oкє $\hat{i} \in \hat{i}$ val, he seems to be. When an Infinitive with ä̀ follows ( $\$ 73,1$ ), it must be translated by an impersonal construction, to suit the English idiom : thus, סoxєî $\tau \iota s$ à $\nu \bar{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ must be translated it seems that some one would have, although $\tau$ is is the subject of $\delta$ oкє $\boldsymbol{i}$; is we cannot use would with our Infinitive, to translate é $\boldsymbol{\chi} \boldsymbol{\in L \nu}$ äm (See § 42, 2, Note.)

Note 3. (a.) When an indirect quotation has been introduced by an Infinitive, a dependent relative or temporal clause in the quotation sometimes takes the Infinitive by assimilation, where we should expect an Indicative or Optative. The temporal particles $\dot{\omega} s, \begin{gathered}\tau \\ \tau \\ \\ \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \\ \epsilon \\ \pi \epsilon \boldsymbol{i}, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \text {, as well as the relative pro- }\end{gathered}$ nouns, are used in this construction. Herodotus also uses ci, $i f$, and even $\delta$ óct, because, in the same way. E. g.
 when it did not cease, they say that they sought for remedies. HDt. I,
 rov̀s mapóvtas, Gópußov $\gamma \in \nu^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ( $\phi a \sigma i v$ ), they say that, when those present heard it, there was a tumult. Dem. F. L. 402, 8. 'Eтєьסों ס'̀




 Id. I, 91. (Here $\epsilon^{\beta} \beta$ ov $\lambda \epsilon$ úouto would be the common form.) 'Hyov-

 Rep. VI, 490 C.

 $\delta \epsilon ́ a c$ or $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon i$ would be the ordinary expression.) So Нdt. III, 105 and 108; doubtful, II, 64 and 172 . See Kruiger's note on I, 129.


(b.) 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.
 it is allowed to kill. Dem. Lept. 505, 19. Kai ס̀à taûta, ä̀ tıs ảmo-
 and he did not enact what should be done if he should be convicted. Dem. Aristocr. 629, 2. (Here tival is the reading of the Cod. $\Sigma$, amply defended by the preceding example, in which all editors


§93. The Infinitive without the article may limit the meaning of certain adjectives and adverbs.

1. Such are particularly adjectives denoting ability, fitness, desert, qualification, sufficiency, readiness, and
their opposites; and, in general, those denoting the same relations as the verbs which govern the Infinitive ( $\$ 92,1$ ). E. g.




 danger.

 people said that he was a suitable person to suffer this. Dem. Phil. III,

 gave it (the Areopagus) power to superintend good order. Isoc. Areop.
 138. Madaкoì к $\alpha \rho \tau \in \rho \in i \nu$, too effeminate to endure. Plat. Rep.
 minds are too dejected to persevere, \&c. Tuuc. II, 61. (In the last two examples $\mu \mathrm{\mu} \lambda a \kappa o i$ and $\tau a \pi \epsilon \omega \dot{\eta}$ govern the Infinitive by the idea






For examples of nouns followed by the Infinitive, see § $92,1, \mathrm{~N} .2$.
Note 1. The use of the Infinitive after oios in the sense of appropriate, likely, capable, and äбos in that of sufficient, with or without their antecedents, is to be referred to this head. (Oîós rє, able, like סvvarós, regularly takes the Infinitive.) E. g.
 for irrigating the land. Xen. An. II, 3, 13. Touaútas oilas $\chi \in \notin \bar{\mu} \nu$ ós $^{\prime}$

 ö oov $\mathfrak{a} \pi 0 \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$, cullivating their own land to an extent sufficient to ive
 rò $\pi \in \delta i o v$, there was left enough of the night for crossing the plain in the dâk. Xen. An. IV, 1, 5. "EфӨaनє togoùtov ö́od חáxףtr
 ship), that l'aches hall already real the decree. Thuc. III, 49. (See $\S 18,3, b$.) Examples like the last strongly resemble those under $\$ 98,1$ in which $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ has toqoùzos for its antecedent.

Other pronominal adjectives (as toíos, тoเó $\delta \ell \in, \tau \eta \iota o ̂ \tau o s, ~ \tau \eta \lambda i ́ k o s$, noios) sometines take an Infinitive in the same way.

Note 2. (a.) Certain impersonal $\mathbf{v} \in$ rbs (like $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \in \sigma \tau!, \pi \rho \in ́ \pi \in t$,

( $\$ 91$ ), are sometimes used in the Participle in a personal sense, in which case they may be followed by the Infinitive, the Participle having the force of one of the adjectives of $\S 93,1$. Thus $\tau \mathfrak{a} \grave{\epsilon} \dot{\text { evóvra }}$

 to be said, as if $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \eta$ nкє $\iota$ were a personal verb, and as if we could say raùra $\pi \rho o \sigma \eta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \epsilon$, these things are becoming. E. g.

 she is calling on the God who ought not to be present at lamentations. Aesch. Agam. 1079. ( $\Pi \rho \sigma \sigma \eta$ $к o \nu \tau a$ is used like adjectives meaning


 Plat. Tim. 90 E.
(b.) In the same way certain adjectives, like $\delta i \times a \iota o s, \dot{\xi} \pi \iota \kappa a i-$ pıos, $e^{\prime} \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \in i o s, \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \delta o \xi o s$, may be used personally with the Infinitive; as סikatós écru тoùro noctiv, it is right for hiin to do this

 $\chi^{d} \nu \in \iota \nu$, i. e. that it is right for me to receiee, \&c. Dem. Cor. 243, 6.
 venient persons to be disposed of. Thuc. Vill, 70. Өєpatevé $\sigma \theta a \downarrow$ ėmıкаipiot, important persons to be taken care of. Xen. Cyr. VIII, 2,

 $\pi \in \epsilon \in \in \sigma \theta a$, , it is to be expected that many will suffer this same thing, Id. VI, 12, is an example of the Future Infinitive, § 27, N. 2. So in English, many are likely to suffer.)

These examples resemble those under § $93,2$.
Note 3. Rarely the Infinitive with $\boldsymbol{\tau o}$ is used after adjectives of this class. (Compare § 92, 1, N. 3.) E. g.

2. Any adjective may take the Infinitive without the article as an accusative by synecdoche, showing in what respect the adjective is applicable to its noun ; as $\theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} a \mu a$ aio $\chi$ pòv ó $\rho \hat{\nu} \nu$, a sight disgraceful to look upon.

The Infinitive is here regularly active or middle, seldom passive, even when the latter would seem more natural ; as $\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \grave{\nu}$ тоьє $\hat{\iota} \nu$, hard to do, seldom $\chi^{a \lambda \epsilon-}$ $\pi \grave{\nu} \pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota$, hard to be done. E. g.

ful for them to hear. II. II, 119. So II. I, 107 and 589. Toìs $\gamma$ àp

 most useful for you to hear. Dem. Mid. 522, 18. Фoßєpòs $\pi \rho o \sigma \pi$ o$\lambda \in \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma a t$, a terrible man to fight against. Id. Ol. II, 24, 12. Oixia
 III, 8, 8. Tà $\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega \dot{\omega} \tau a \tau a \in \dot{v} \rho \in i ̄ y$, the things hardest to find: Tà $\dot{\rho} \mathfrak{a} \sigma \tau a \mathfrak{e} \nu \tau v \gamma \chi a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$, the things easiest to obtain. Ib. I, 6, 9. Полıтєía $\chi^{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \pi \bar{\eta} \sigma \nu \zeta \bar{\eta} \nu$, a form of government hard to live under: ävouos $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$


 $\sigma \sigma_{\sigma} a_{\iota}$, the time is too short for narrating it properly. Id. Menex.
 convenient both for speaking and for hearing. Id. Symp. 173 B.
 colder for bathing? Xen. Mem. III, 13, 3.
(Passive.) Kîves aì $\alpha \rho a i ̀ \dot{i} \rho \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ (instead of ópâv). Xen.
 à $\sigma \dot{\sim} \mu$ фopos. Isoc. Antid. p. 70, § 115.

Note 1. The Infinitive may be used after adverbs which correspond to the adjectives just mentioned ( $\S 93,2$ ). E. g.

 to behold, and most terrible for the ill-disposed. Xen. Cyr. VIII, 3, 5.

Note 2. Certain nouns, which are equivalent in meaning to the ncuter of any of the adjectives which take the Infinitive, may themselves have the same construction. E. g.

Өav̂رa iठ́є $\sigma \theta a \iota$, a wonderful thing to behold (like $\theta a v \mu a \sigma \tau o ̀ v ~ i \delta e ́ s-~$ $\sigma \theta a l)$.

Note 3. (a.) In Homer verbs expressing excellence or fitness sometimes take the Infinitive (as an accusative by synecdoche), like the adjectives of $\S 93,2$. E. g.


 $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \beta$ ou $\bar{\lambda} \dot{\eta} \nu \Delta a \nu a \bar{\omega} \nu, \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\delta} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \grave{\epsilon} \mu \dot{a} \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$, ye who excel the Danai in counsel and excel them in battle. II. I, 258. (Here $\beta$ ou $\lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ and $\mu \dot{\chi} \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ are alike in the accusative by synecdoche after $\pi \epsilon \rho \stackrel{\iota}{\ldots}$ ${ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \in$.)
(b.) Even in Attic Greek the Infinitive is sometimes used after verbs as a synecdochical accusative. The Infinitives áкоv́єıv, áкои̃баи, in sound, and $\dot{\delta} \bar{\alpha} \nu$, $i \delta \in i v$, in appearance, especially, are used in this way. E. g.

they differ at all in appearance from a brazier? Plat. Rep. VI, 495


 avout tending. Xen. Cyr. IV, 5, 46.

Note 4. The Homeric use of $\dot{\delta} \mu$ ios, equal, like, with the Infinitive is to be referred to the same principle. E. g.
 snow, and like the winds in swiftness. 1l. X, 437. Ò̀ $\gamma$ áp oí tıs

§94. The Infinitive as genitive, dative, or accusative is very often governed by prepositions, or by adverbs used as prepositions. In this case it always takes the article $\tau \hat{v}, \tau \hat{\omega}$, or тó. E. g.
 मévous, for I see that the speec.ues are made about punishing Philip. Dem. Ol. III, 28, 5. Прò тoù toùs ôpкous à $\pi$ o óoûvaı, before taking the oaths. Id. Cor. 234, 6. 'Eк тov̀ moòs $\chi$ ápıv $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma \circ \rho \in i ̀ \nu$
 besides receiving nothing for the embassy. Id. F. L. 412, 21. 'E $\nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$



 áठıк $\theta \dot{\eta} \nu a l$, on account of being a stranger. Ib. II, 1, 15. חáve $\omega$
 є̃кабта $\pi$ o८єìv. Id. Cyr. I, 3, 1.
§95. 1. The genitive and dative of the Infinitive, with the article, may stand in most of the constructions belonging to those cases; as in that of the adnominal genitive, the genitive after comparatives, the genitive after verbs and adjectives, the dative of manner, means, $\& c$. , the dative after such verbs as $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v^{\prime} \omega$ and after adjectives denoting resemblance, \&c., and sometimes in that of the genitive of cause or motive. E. g.







 Plat. Phaed. 117 E. (See below, § 95, 2.) Kai $\gamma$ à $\rho$ àj $\theta$ cıs $\tau$ oi катакои́єıу тוvós єiotv, for they are unused to obeying any one. Dem. Ol. I, 15, 28.
 roîs $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \sigma \iota ~ \gamma i \gamma \nu \in \sigma \theta a \iota$. Id. Chers. 92, 21. 'A $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ à $\tau$ ф фavepòs

 in an orderly life. Isoc. Antid. p. 315 A. § $24 .{ }^{4} \mathrm{I} \sigma o \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\varrho} \pi \rho o-$
 є́ $\gamma \rho \eta \gamma \circ \rho \epsilon \in \nu a \iota$ tò ка $\theta \epsilon \dot{\prime} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$. Plat. Phaed. 71 C .
 in order that greater revenues might come in. Thuc. I, 4.

Note. It will be seen that the nominative and accusative of the Infinitive (except the accusative after prepositions) regularly stand without the article ; the genitive and dative regularly with the article. The Infinitive after the verbs included in $\S 92,1$, however, generally stands without the article, whatever case it represents; and further, whenever any word which might govern a genitive or dative of the Infinitive forms a part of an expression which is equivalent to any of the verbs of $\S 92,1$, the simple Infinitive may be used. (See § 92, 1, Note 2.)
2. After verbs and expressions which denote hindrance or freedom from anything, two constructions are allowed, - that of the simple Infinitive (§ 92, 1), and that of the genitive of the Infinitive with $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ (§ 95,1 ).
 $\boldsymbol{\sigma \epsilon}$ тồ roûto moteiv (both with the same meaning), he prevents you from doing this. As the Infinitive after such verbs can take the negative $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ without affecting the sense, we have a third and a fourth form, still with the same meaning:-
 noteiv, he prevents you from doing this. For a fifth form with the same meaning, see $\S 95,3$. (For the negative $\mu \dot{\eta}$, see Note 1, a.)

If the leading verb is itself negative (or interrogative with a negative implied), the double negative $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ov is generally used instead of $\mu \dot{\prime}$ in the form (c) with the simple Infinitive, but seldom (or never) in the form ( $d$ ) with the genitive of the


§ 95, 2.] infinitive after verbs of hindrance. 199
ven' you from doing this; selaom (or never) $\tau$ ô $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oú roûto noriv. See also § 95, 3. (For the double negative, see Note 1, b.) E. g.

 hesitation prevents you from doing this. Plat. Soph. 242 A. "A $\lambda \lambda \omega$ s






(b.) Tồ $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \delta \rho a \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu o i ̂ s ~ a ̀ \pi \epsilon i \rho \gamma o v \sigma \iota ; ~ X e n . ~ M e m . ~ I I, ~$




(c.) Eîp $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\eta} \beta \lambda a \sigma \tau a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$. Platt. Phaedr. 251 B. ${ }^{*} \mathrm{O} \pi \epsilon \rho$
 ravaging the Peloponnesus. Thuc. I, 73. Dtєк $\dot{\omega} \lambda v \sigma \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta} \delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon i-$


 Soph. O. C. 667.






 |) $\mu \dot{\eta}$ o $\dot{\nu} \chi^{i} \pi \alpha_{\alpha} \mu \pi a \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \delta a i \mu \omega \nu \epsilon i \nu a \imath$; what would hinder you from being perfectly happy? Id. Hell. IV, 1, 36. So Arist. Ran. 695.
 will heep two men from sinking. Xen. An. III, 5, 11. ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \nu$ ovióeis $\pi \omega$


 raîs $\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \chi a ́ t a \iota s ~ \sigma v \mu \phi o p a i ̂ s ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i ̀ \nu$. Isoc. Antid. p. 73, § 122.

 $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \alpha \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu . \mathrm{Ib}$. III, 3, 31. (See Tinuc. VI, 18, quoted § 92 ,
 you were entirely free from fear of suffering harm. Dem. F. L. 387,
 $\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \mu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}$, there being no longer any escape from the conclusion that you have taken bribes. Id. Timoc. 702, 26. with the genitive of the Infinitive, even after nouns implying hindance or freedom. In the two following the addition of $\mu \eta$ is more peculiar:-

 unwillingness to sail, caused by distrust. Id. III, 75.

Note 1. (a.) The use of $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ with the Infinitive in the forms $c$ and $d$ 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, \&c.) can always take the negative $\mu \eta^{\prime}$, to strengthen the negation implied in the leading verb. Thus we say àpveitaı $\mu \dot{\eta}$ dud $\eta \theta \hat{\epsilon} s$
 лоєiv, he forbade any one to do this. This negative may, however, be omitted without affecting the sense.
(b.) An Infinitive which for any reason would regularly take $\mu \dot{\eta}$ (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 $\mu \grave{\eta}$ oi, if the verb on which it depends is itself negative. Thus the example given above, àpveitat $\mu \dot{\eta}$ à $\lambda \eta \theta$ ès siva toûro, becomes, if
 rov̂ro, he does not deny that this is true. So, when the original
 àpiévau, it is just not to acquit him, -if we negative the leading
 not just not to acquit him. See Plat. Rep. IV, 427 E , iss
 the Infinitive with oo $^{(\$ 95} 9$ ).
$\mathrm{M} \dot{\eta}$ oi is occasionally used before participles, and even before nouns, on the same principle, to express an exception to a statement

 if the negatives (oik and oops $\nu$ ) were removed from the leading
 1 which would be the ordinary form with the participle, even after a
 Dem. F. L. 379, 7 , we find ait $\tau \epsilon \pi \dot{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon s$ mo $\lambda \lambda a i$ каі $\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi a i ̀ ~ \lambda a \beta \epsilon i \nu$,
 easy) to capture, except by lon siege.




Remark. Mì out is very rarely found where the leading verb does not at least imply a negative. In Yen. An. II, 3, 11, $\omega_{\sigma \tau \tau}$ пẫıv ai $\sigma \chi \dot{v} \eta \nu$ єivat $\mu \grave{\eta}$ o vi $\sigma \nu \sigma \pi o v \delta a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota$, so that all were ashamed not to join heartily in the work, the double negative may be explained by the negative idea of unwillingness implied in ai $\chi \dot{\chi} \nu \eta \nu$. See also the last example under N. 1.

 Id. Track. 226. (Mì oui here is a conjecture.)
3. The Infinitive preceded by $\tau \grave{\prime} \mu \eta^{\prime}$ is sometimes used after verbs and expressions denoting hindrance, and also after all expressions which even imply proven ion, omission, or denial.

This Infinitive with to is less closely connected than the simple Infinitive with the leading verb, and often denotes merely the result of the prevention or omission of anything : it may generally be explained as an accusative by synecdoche, or sometimes as an object accusative (as after verbs of denial). Here, as before ( $(95,2$ ), if the leading verb is itself negative, or interrogative with a negative implied, $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oi is generally used instead of $\mu \dot{\eta}$. E. g.


 $\pi o \iota \epsilon i \nu$, to the four already given ( $\S 95,2$ ) as equivalents of the


Note 2. When the leading verb expressing hindrance, \&c. is
itself negative, the form $c, \mu \dot{\eta}$ oi with the Infinitive, is the most common. The form $a$, the Infinitive alone, is allowed after negative (as well as affirmative) verbs, as in Dem. Pac. 62, 10, quoted above under $a$. The form $b$, fou with the Infinitive (without $\mu \eta$ ), is not used after negative verbs, according to Madvig.
Even in the form $c$, we sometimes find the single negative $\mu$ ' (for $\mu \dot{\eta}$ out), even when the leading verb is negative. E. g.






 votes to escape the punishment of death. Dem. Aristocr. 688, 27

 three votes prevented you from condemning him to deuth (lit. made the

 by to prevent my closing my eues, \&c. Aescif. Agam. 15.






 to die with thee, \&c. Id. Ant. 544. (Cf. Ant. 22, and Oed. Col. 49.)
 ф'vót kevidacmova, i. e. not grudging the city its right to be great, \&c.



 $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \nu$, it is not even possible for them to deny that they did these things


 no one is able to prevent people from knowing that he would gladly even eat some of them raw. Xen. Hell. III, 3, 6.

For $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ov̀, see § 95,2 , Note 1, (b.).
Note. The simple negative form $\tau \grave{o} \mu \dot{\eta}$ is sometimes found even when the leading verb is negative, where regularly $\tau \dot{o} \mu \dot{\eta}$ ovं would be used. This is more common here than in the corresponding case, $\S 95,2$, Note 2. E. g.





 392,13 , quoted above.

Remark. Tò $\mu \dot{\eta}$ and $\tau o v \mu^{\prime}$ can of course be used with the Infinitive as ordinary negatives. See examples, § 92,1, N. 3. So

§96. The Infinitive with its subject, object, or other ndjuncts (sometimes ineluding dependent verbs) may be preceded by the article to, the whole sentence stand. ing as a single noun, either as the subject or object of a
rerb，as the object of a preposition，or in apposition with a pronoun like тov̂to．E．g．



 I，12， 3.
§97．The Infinitive without the article often ex－ presses a purpose．E．g．
 choose every man of the Trojans to be our cupbearer．II．II，127．So II．I，338，סàs ar $\gamma \in \iota \nu$ ，and II，107，108．Tiv é＇̇＇Apciov $\pi a ́ \gamma o v ~ \beta o v \lambda \eta ̀ \nu$
 guarding good order．Isoc．Areop．p． 147 B．§ 37．Oi äp $\chi^{o \nu \tau \epsilon s, ~ o u ̂ s ~}$


 them to sail and examine，and to proclaim，\＆e．Tinuc．VI，50．Tais


 pleased．Id．II，4．（For $\pi$ apáoouvaı see § 92，1，N．1．）Vi ßoùai－
 к．т．$\lambda$ ．，if we should wish to intrust to any one either children to instruct or money to keep，\＆c．Den．Mem．I，5，2．Ai $\gamma$ vpaikes $\pi \iota \in i d$ ф＇́pou－ oat，the women bringing them（something）to drink．Xes．Hell．VII，
 delivered the city and the citadel to them to guard．Ib．IV，4，15．＂Os
 363， 25.


 $\gamma$ グбa日aı，i．e．a day to defend himself in．Id．Hell．I，7，28．＇Euav－

 тр $\eta$ өŋ．Tнис．II， 44.

Here，as in $\S 93,2$ ，the Infinitive is generally active or mild le， even where the passive would seem more natural；as $k \tau a \nu \in i \imath \epsilon \mu o i$ $\nu \ell \nu$ édoanav，they gave her to me to be killed．Eur．Trad． 874.

Note 1．The Infinitive is thus used in prose chiefly after verbs signifying to choose or appoint，to give or take（the Infinitive dent－ ing the purpose for which anything is given or taken），and also after those signifying to send or bring．（See the examples．）With the last class the Future Participle is more common．A final clause after iva，\＆c．may also be used in the same sense．

In poetry the same construction sometimes occurs after verbs of motion, like $\epsilon \hat{i} \mu \iota, \vec{\eta} \kappa \omega$, and $\beta a i \nu \omega$; and also aftel $\epsilon i \mu i,{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \mu \iota$, and $\pi a ́ \rho \in \iota \mu c$ (to be, to be at hand), expressed or understood. E.g
 some one go to tell Agamemnon. Od. XIV, 496. (See Passow, s.v.
 $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ảpìv кaì $\lambda$ otyòv à $\mu \hat{v} \nu a \iota$, nor is there any one to keep off curse
 $\kappa \in$ ס̂́vpat, i. e. for you to slay whomsoever you can. 11. VI, 229. Ov̀


 wreathe. Eur. Iph. Aul. 1478.

Even in prose, the Infintive occasionally occurs after $\epsilon i \mu i$ in this
 there is grass to sit upon. See also Xen. An. II, 1, 6, mo入入aì סè кai
 carried away (for fuel). See the last examples under § 97.

Note 2. As $\tilde{\omega} \sigma t \epsilon$ is seldom used in Homer in its sense of so as (§ $98, \mathrm{~N} .3$ ), the simple Infinitive may there express a result as well as a purpose. It thus follows many expressions which would not allow it in Attic Greek. E. g.

Tis $\tau^{\prime}$ ä $\rho \sigma \phi \omega \epsilon \theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ द̈ $\rho \iota \delta \iota \iota \xi \nu \nu \in ́ \eta \kappa \epsilon \mu a ́ \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$; i. e. who brought them into conflict, so as to contend? Il. I, 8. So I, 151; and '́pıć' $\mu \epsilon-$
 now their ship was loaded, so as (to be ready) to start. Od. XV,
 $\sigma \theta a \iota$, i. e. for washing. Od. I, $138^{\circ}$.

Note 3. In Homer and Herodotus we often find civa introduced to denote a purpose, where in Attic Greck a simple noun, as a predicate accusative or nominative, connected directly with the leading verb, would be sufficient. E. g.


 which they had placed (to be) as a boundary. Il. XXI, 405. Dapcios

 єiva، ímтархоs. Нрт. VII, 154.

Even in Attic prose this use of eival sometimes occurs; as in Dem.
 тórє, they remember his having been then manumitted so as to be a free-


Note 4. The use of the Infinitive after the comparative and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{1}$ than, is to be referred to this principle. E. g.
 human nature is too weak to acquire the art of thove things of which it has no experience. Plat. Theaet. 149 C. Tò $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \nu o ́ \sigma \eta \mu a \mu \varepsilon i \zeta o \nu \eta$ $\phi \epsilon \in \in \iota \nu$, i. e. too great to bear. Soph. O. T. 1293.
${ }^{\circ} \Omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ is sometimes expressed before this Infinitive; as in $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{en}}$.
 $\phi i ́ \lambda o u s \dot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda \epsilon i \nu$.

So, rarely, $\omega_{s}$ in the sense of $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ( $\$ 98$, Note i) ; as in Cyr. VI,

§98. 1. The Infinitive is used after $\omega_{\sigma} \tau \epsilon$, so that, so as, to express a result. E. g.
 モ̌ $\chi \in \iota \nu$ àpкоиิva, he had been educated so as very easily to have enough, although he possessed very little. Xen. Mem. I, 2, 1. Фûvat $\delta \stackrel{\text { c }}{\text { ó }}$


 so that we should have no difference with him. Dем. Aph. I, 815, 4.








 Eió́val, so that not a single one of the things we wish to know should have escaped you. Xen. Cyr. VI, 1, 40. (Nee § 18, 3, b.) $\Delta v \sigma-$





See § 93,1 , Note 1 , last example.
Remark. When the result is to be stated as an independent fact, rather than merely as a result, the Indicative is used after $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$. See $\S 65,3$.
2. The Infinitive after $\stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \sigma \tau$ sometimes denotes a condition, being equivalent to the Infinitive after ' $\epsilon \phi^{\prime} \dot{\omega}$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \phi^{\circ} \dot{\oplus} \tau \epsilon ;$ and sometimes it denotes a purpose, like a final cause. E. g.

$\lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma a \iota \pi \epsilon \rho_{1} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Muti $\lambda \eta \nu a i \omega \nu$, they make a treaty with Paches, to the effect that the Athenians shall be permitted, \&c. Thuc. III, 28. (See

 aỉrovis $\dot{\delta} \pi a \kappa o v \in \iota \nu$ ßaбı $\lambda \epsilon i$, it being in their power to rule the rest of the Greeks, on condition that they should themselves serve the King.
 do everything, so that they may not suffer punishment. Plat. Gorg. 479 C . (Here iva $\mu$ ' witl the Subjunctive might have been used.)

 $\phi \epsilon \dot{v} \gamma \in \iota \nu$ Oávatov, there are many devices for escaping death. Plat. Apol. 39 A. (See § 92, 1, N. 2.)

Note 1. ' $\Omega$ s is sometimes used with the Infinitive instead of $\check{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$; generally, however, to express a result, seldom to express a purpose. E. g.

 possible to see its summits. Нdт. IV, 184. Nav








Note 2. The Infinitive with $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ or $\dot{\omega}$ is sometimes used where we should expect a simple Infinitive, either after the adjectives and adverbs included in $\S 93$, or after the verbs and expressions which take the Infinitive of the object ( $\S 92,1$, and N. 2) ; and rarely after those which regularly take an Infinitive as the subject (§91). E. g.
 ${ }^{a} v \delta \rho \in s$; i. e. are they wiser than men in learning, \&c.? XEN. Cyr.
 (Cf. ỏ̉izat $\dot{\alpha}^{\mu} \nu \nu \in \iota \nu$, too few to make a defence. Thuc. I, 50.)


 $\pi \rho \omega \bar{\omega} о \iota \tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \pi a ́ \sigma \eta \pi \rho \circ \theta v \mu \dot{a}$ à $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \in \iota \nu$, having voted to defend then,


 $\pi \epsilon i \theta_{0} v \sigma \iota \nu \tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a} \sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \nu " A \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota \notin \pi \iota \chi \in \iota \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$. Thuc. III, 102.


Mívl $\mu \circ \iota \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \mathfrak{i} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \iota$, it concerned me very much to

 Mem. I, 3, 6.

Note 3. In Homer $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ is generally used like $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, in the sense of as. It occurs with the Infinitive, in the sense of so as, only twice: II. IX, 42 ; Od. XVII, 21. ' $\Omega \Omega$, so as, so that, is not found in Homer, who generally uses the simple Infinitive where later writers would insert $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ or $\dot{\omega}$. (See § 97, N. 2.)
 form an apodosis, whenever an Indicative or Optative, if used in the place of the Infinitive, would have required an ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$. (See § 65, 3, Note.) The Infinitive with $\neq \nu$ here, as in indirect quotations, fol lows the general rule stated in § 41. (See example in §41, N. 4 ; and the last examples under $\S 98,1$ and $\S 98,2, N .1$.)

Note 5. It will be seen that the Present and Aorist are the tenses of the Infinitive regularly used after $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$. For the perfect see § 18, 3, and Note; and for the Future, § 27, N. 2 (b).
§ 99. The Infinitive is used after ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi^{\prime} \mathscr{\varphi}^{\circ}$ and ${ }^{\prime} \phi^{\prime} \dot{\varphi} \tau \epsilon$, on condition that, for the purpose of. E. g.





 бolvto Xen. Hell. II, 3, 11. (For $\pi$ ohitev́aolvto. see §§ 65, 1, N.

 Herodotus and Thucydides, see $\S 65,2$.
§ 100. The Infinitive may stand absolutely in parenthetical phrases, sometimes alone, but generally preceded by $\dot{\omega}$ or ốcov. E. g.
 reф $\eta$ vós, i. e. recently, so to speak. Нdт. П, 15. (This expression

 member, \&c. Id. II, 125. ' $\Omega s \mu_{\epsilon ́ \nu} \nu v \nu$ év $\overline{\text { é } \lambda a \chi i \sigma \tau \varphi ~} \delta \eta \lambda \bar{\omega} \sigma a \iota, \pi a ̂ \nu$


 Gorg. 450 D . ' $\Omega \mathrm{s} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ' $\sigma v \nu \tau o ́ \mu \omega s \in i \pi \epsilon i \nu$, to speak concisely. Xen

 $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i \nu$. Thuc. I, 138. (So VI, 82, ès тò àkpıßès єimєì.) ' $\Omega_{s}$
 Eur. Alc. 801. ' $\Omega s$ mpàs $\dot{\mu} \mu a ̂ s ~ \epsilon i \rho \eta ̄ \sigma \theta a \iota$, i. e. between us. Plat.

 1 know. Id. Theaet. 145 A.
 to me; ỏdijou $\delta \epsilon i \nu$, to want little, i. e. almost. (See N. 1.)

Remark. The force of $\omega$ s in this construction can hardly be expressed in English, although it resembles that of $\dot{\omega}$ used for $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ in § 98, 2, Note 1. That it is not a demonstrative, as might be supposed from the translation of $\dot{\omega}$ cimeiv, so to speak, is plain from such expressions as $\omega \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \nu \nu \tau \dot{\mu} \omega \mathrm{s}$ єimeiv, to speak concisely.

Note 1. In the phrase ojiyov $\delta \in i \nu$ (lit. to want little), little short of, almost, 8єiv is often omitted, so that the genitive ${ }^{\circ} \lambda i \gamma o v$ stands alone in the sense of almost. E. g.
 The full form is found at the beginning of Dem. Phil. III, - Пoג-
 almost every meeting.

Note 2. In the phrase $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{i} \nu a \iota$ (sometimes tò $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu$ civat), willing or willingly, civat appears to be superfluous: the phrase is used chiefly in negative seutences. Eivat appears superfluous also in such expressions as $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ̀̀ $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ cival, at present, $\boldsymbol{\tau} \mathbf{\delta}$
 on them. E. g.






 396 E. Kazà тойто єï̀at, in this respect. Id. Prot. 317 A.

Similar is the expression $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \eta \nu \in i \nu a \iota$ (for $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \eta \nu$ ), at first, in Нрт. I, 153. So $\dot{\omega}$ s $\pi$ ádaıa єivat, considering their antiquity. Thuc. I, 21.
§101. The Infinitive is sometimes used in the sense of the Imperative, especially in Homer. E. g.




 кaì $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, and do you, having opened the gates, rush out and press on. Thuc. V, 9.

Remark. It will be noticed that, when the Infinitive stands for the Imperative, its subject is in the nominative, but in the four constructions that follow ( $\$ \S 102-105$ ) its subject is in the accusative.
§ 102. The Infinitive is sometimes used for the Optative in the expression of a wish referring to the future. This occurs chiefly in poetry. E. g.

Zє̂ $\pi a ́ \tau \epsilon \rho, \hat{\eta}$ Alavta $\lambda$ a $\chi \in \hat{i} \nu \hat{\eta}$ Tvó́óos vióv, Father Zeus, may the lot fall on Ajax or on the son of Tydeus. Il. VII, 179. 'Еериâ' $\mu \pi$ т-
 $O$ that $I$ could sell my wife and my mother at this rate! Arist.
 253.
§ 103. In laws, treaties, proclamations, and formal commands, the Infinitive is often used in the leading sentences, depending on some word like $\epsilon^{\star} \delta o \xi \epsilon$ or $\delta_{\epsilon}^{\prime}-$ סоктal, be it enacted, or кєлєvєтal, it is commanded; which may be either understood, or expressed in a preceding sentence. E. g.

 каӨа́лєє $\dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$ є่ $\gamma \dot{\gamma} \gamma \nu \epsilon \tau о$, and (be it enacted) that treasurers of the sacred funds be chosen, \&c. Plat. Leg. 759 E. So in most of the laws (genuine or spurious) standing as quotations in the text of the Orators, as in Dem. Aristocr. 627, 21: $\Delta \iota \kappa$ á $\zeta \in \iota \nu \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$




§ 104. The Infinitive, with or without $\tau 0$, is used in expressions of surprise or indignation. E. g.
 think that $I$, wretched fellow, should have come from home without even

 $\Delta i a ~ \nu о \mu i \grave{\zeta} \in i \nu$, övтa $\tau \eta \lambda \iota к о v \tau o v i ́, ~ w h a t ~ f o l l y!~ t o ~ b e l i e v e ~ i n ~ Z e u s, ~ n o w ~$ you are so big! Arist. Nub. 819.

Compare Verg. Aen. I, 37 : Mene incepto desistere victam.
§ 105. In narration the Infinitive often appears to stand for the Indicative. It depends, however, on some word like $\lambda_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \tau a l$, it is said, expressed (or at least implied) in something that precedes. E. g.
 tò фópтov, and (lhey say) that the Phoenicians, when now they were come to this Argos, were setting out their cargo for sale. Нdт. I, 1. (Here $\delta t a \tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ is an Imperfect Infinitive, § 15, 3.) "' $A \lambda \lambda$ ', ${ }_{\omega}$




 and 6. (Here all these Infinitives, and twelve others which follow, depend on $\lambda$ '́ $є є \tau a \iota$ in §4.) Kaì тòv $к \in \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$ סoûvat, and he commanded him to give it. Id. I, 3, 9. So in Hot. I, 24 the story of Arion and the dolphin is told in this construction, the Infinitives all depending on a single $\lambda$ érova، at the beginning. See § 101, Remark.
§106. חpiv, before, before that, until, besides taking the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative, like ${ }^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \omega \boldsymbol{s}$ (§66), is also followed by the Infinitive.

For the use of the finite moods after $\pi \rho i \nu$, see $\S 67$.

1. In Homer the Infinitive follows $\pi \rho^{i} \nu$ after both affirmative and negative sentences. E. g.







 Od. XVIII, 402. O



 II. $\mathrm{XX}, 198$.

See § 67, Note 1.

## 2. Writers later than Homer use the Infinitive after

 $\pi \rho i \nu$ chiefly when the leading sentence is affirmative. E. g. $\beta \omega \theta \ddot{\eta} \sigma a t$ 's $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ Boi $\omega$ tial, before he comes into Attica, \&c. Hdt. VIII,











 add a new calamily to the former one, before we shall have exhausted that. Eur. Med. 79. (See § 18, 3.)
Note 1. The Infinitive after $\pi \rho i \nu$ was probably not accompa nied by äv. (See Krïger's note on Нdт. I, 140.)

Note 2. $\Pi \rho i v$ with the Infinitive after negative sentences is rare in the Attic poets, but more frequent in the Attic prose. (See §67, Note 2.) E. g.

 Aesch. Sept. 1048, Agam. 1067; Arist. Av. 964. Kai סi' aùrò où



 Onet. I, 873, 10.
Note 3. $\Pi \rho i \nu \ddot{\eta}, \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \ddot{\eta}($ priusquam $), \pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \in \nu \ddot{\eta}$, and even $\tilde{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \tilde{\eta}$, like $\pi \rho i \nu$, may be followed by the Infinitive. (See § 67, Note 3.) E. g.


 before they perceived them. Truc. VI, 58. So I, 69. חipiv de à àa-
 T TES is $\Sigma \in \lambda$ ivoùvra, i. e. a hunired years after their own settlement. Id. VI, 4.

In Hot. VI, 108 we find the Infinitive depending on $\phi \theta a \dot{v} \omega \ddot{\eta}$, the
 rıva $\pi \nu \theta$ '́ध $\theta a \iota ~ \eta j \mu \epsilon \omega \nu$, you would be reduced to slavery before any of us would hear of it.

Note 4. $\Pi \rho i \nu$ or $\pi \rho i \nu \eta \eta^{\prime}$ is very often preceded by $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$, $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \in \nu, \pi \alpha^{\prime} \rho o s$, or another $\pi \rho i \nu$ (used as an adverb), qualifying the leading verb. (See § 67, Note 4.) E. g.






Note 5. חá oos, in the sense of $\pi \rho i \nu$, is used in Homer with the Infinitive, but never with the other moods. E. g.

 та. Od. XXIII, 309.

Remark. The rules for the tenses of the Infinitive are given in Chapter Second. It will be seen from a comparison of these, that the Present and Aorist are the only tenses ordinarily used in constructions in which the Infinitive in itself has no reference to time, that is, in all except indirect discourse. In indirect discourse each tense has its own force, as in the Indicative; but in other constructions the Perfect is used only in the cases mentioned in $\S 18,3, b$, and Note; and the Future only in the few cases mentioned in § 27, Note 2, a and b. (See § 27, Note 1.)

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE PARTICIPLE.

§107. The Participle has three distinct uses:first, it may express a simple attribute, like an ordinary adjective (§ 108) ; secondly, it may define the circumstances under which the action of the sentence takes place (§§ 109-111) ; thirdly, it may form part of the predicate with certain verbs, often having a force resembling that of the Infinitive ( $\$ \S 112,113$ ).
Remark. As the Infinitive may be considered as a verbal noun, so the Participle is always a verbal adjective; both alike retaining all the attributes of a verb which are consistent with their nature. See § 90 .
§ 108. 1. The Participle, like any other adjective, may qualify a noun.

In such expressions it must often be translated by a finite verb and a relative, especially when the Participle is preceded by the article. E. g.

Mó $\iota_{\iota s}$ кá $\lambda \lambda_{\epsilon \iota} \delta \iota a \phi \epsilon \in \rho о v \sigma a$, a city excelling in beauty. 'Avìp ка-

 sent from Philip. "Avסpes oi toùto $\pi o t \eta \sigma^{\prime} o \nu \tau \epsilon s$, men who will do this.

 they sail against the so-called Aeolian islands, lit. the islands called
 the natures a thich seem to be best. Xen. Mem. IV, 1, 3. Ai $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ t o u ̂ ~$
 кivôvvov $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi$ пó入ıv. DEM. Cor. 301, 28.
2. The Participle preceded by the article may be used substantively, like any other adjective. It is then equivalent to ć $\kappa \epsilon \hat{L} \nu o s$ ós (he who) and a finite verb in the tense of the Participle. E. g.


 wrong you all.

Пapà тoîs ápíctors $\delta$ o ко $\begin{gathered}\text { v. } \sigma \iota \nu \text { tival, among those who seem to be best }\end{gathered}$
 סoos, and Peisander was the one who gave this opinion. Thuc. VIlI,
 claimed to those of the Arcadians who were their allies. Id. V, 64.
 one who is to be able to be discreet. Xen. Symp. IV, 26.

Note 1. When the Participle, in either of these constructions, refers to a purpose or intention, it is generally Future, rarely Present. E. g.
 publicly enacted this law, which is to prevent these things. Dem. Mid. 530,10 . T $\hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \operatorname{a} \sigma$ o $\mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$ '̇vóvt $\omega \nu$, there being men in the country to cultivate it. Xen. An. $\Pi, 4,22$. (See § 110, 1.) 'O $\dot{\eta} \gamma \eta \sigma \sigma^{-}$ $\mu \epsilon \nu$ os oviסєis $\ddot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau a t ~ t h e r e ~ w i l l ~ b e ~ n o b o d y ~ w h o ~ w i l l ~ l e a d ~ u s . ~ I b . ~ I I, ~ 4, ~ 5 . ~$
 p. 186 D. § 139.

See the more common use of the Future Participle to express a purpose, § 109, 5.

Note 2. Participles, like adjectives, are occasionally used substantively even without the article, in an indefinite sense; but generally only in the plural. E. g.
 sailed with twelve triremes against men who had many ships. Xen.
 belligerents is taken. Id. Cyr. VII, 5, 73. Мєтà таи̃тa àфıкиoùvtai


 grieved and rejoicing! Plat. Gorr. 498 A.

Note 3. In the poets, the Participle with the article sometimes becomes so eompletely a substantive, that it is followed by an adnominal genitive rather than by the case which its verbal force would require. A few expressions like oi $\pi \rho о \sigma \dot{\eta} к о \nu \tau \epsilon s$, relatives, and
 way even in prose. E. g.
'O $\epsilon$ 'кєivou $\tau \epsilon \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu$, his father. Eur. El. 335. (We should expect

 taves. Tiuce. I, 128.

Note 4. (a.) In the poets and in Thucydides, the neuter singular of the Present Participle with the article is sometimes used in the sense of an abstract verbal noun, where we should expect the Infinitive with the article. E.g.
 $\& c$. Tifuc. 1, 142. (Here we should expect $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \mu \eta \eta_{\mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau a ̂ \nu .) ~}^{\text {. }}$

 fear, is used like tò $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \epsilon \in a t$, and tà $\theta a \rho \sigma o \hat{\nu} \nu$, courage, like tà $\theta a \rho \sigma \epsilon i ̀$



 196.

Compare the use of the neuter singular of an adjective for the corresponding abstract noun; as $\tau \grave{o}$ кад $\dot{\nu} \nu$, beauty, for $\tau \grave{̀}$ кá入入os.
(b.) A similar construction sometimes occurs when a Participle and a noun are used instead of an Infinitive and a noun, where in English we generally use a finite verb. E. g.






Remark. Such expressions as $\tau \grave{\partial}$ к $\rho a \tau o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \bar{\eta} s \pi \dot{o} \lambda \epsilon \omega s$, the ruling part of the state, $\tau \grave{o} \delta o \xi a \dot{a} \zeta o \nu ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi \dot{\chi} \chi \eta s, \& c$. must not be confounded with the examples belonging under Notes 3 and 4. They are merely cases of the partitive genitive after a participle used as a noun.

Note 5. Some Present Participles are occasionally used like predicate adjectives after $\epsilon i \mu i$ or $\gamma_{i}^{\prime} \gamma \nu o \mu a \iota$. Such are especially $\delta \iota a-$
 $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon ́ \rho o \nu$. E. g.
 from that one? Plat. Gorg. 500 C . $\sum v \mu \phi \epsilon \rho o \nu \bar{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$, it was advantageous to the state. Dem. F. L. 364, 25. So after ináp ${ }^{2} \omega$ in
 think you are aware of this, Cor. 257, 25.

Note 6. The poets sometimes use a Present or Aorist Participle with ci $\mu i$ as a periphrasis for the simple form of the verb In prose each part of such expressions has its ordinary meaning. E.g.
 always obtains from me. Soph. O. T. 580 . (Here $\eta^{3} \theta^{\prime} \hat{C}^{\prime} \lambda o v \sigma a$ is used



 Themistocles was one who manifested, \&c. Tuuc. I, 138.

For the use of the Perfect Participle in the same way, see §17, Note 2. For the Aorist Participle with $\epsilon^{\prime} \chi \omega$ as a periphrasis for the Perfect Indicative, see below, § 112, Note 7.
§ 109. The Participle is used to define the circumstances under which an action takes place. It may in this sense be connected with any substantive in the sentence, and agree with it in case.

The relations expressed by the participle in this use are the following : -

1. Time, the various tenses of the Participle denoting various points of time, which are of course all referred to that of the leading verb. E. g.


 while he was general. Taîta $\pi \rho \dot{\beta} \xi \in \tau \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$, he will do these



## 2. Means. E. g.

Аך८弓ó $\mu \in \nu$ oc $\zeta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota$, they live by plunder. Xen. Cyr. III, 2, 25.



 but domestic examples, \&c. Dem. Ol. III, 35, 1. (So often $\chi \rho \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ os with the dative.)
3. Manner, and similar relations, including manner of employment, \&c. E. g.
 $\zeta \eta \bar{\eta}$, he preferred to die ahiding by the laws, rather than to live disobey-
 $\sigma \theta a t$, to march having snatcherl up their arms (i. e. eagerly). Dem. Ol. III, 34, 8. Tồro є̇ $\pi$ oí $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \nu \lambda a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$, he did this secretly. (See below, N. 8.) 'А $\boldsymbol{\pi \epsilon} \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \iota \tau \rho \iota \eta \rho a \rho \chi \omega \nu$, he was absent on duty as trierarch.
4. Cause or ground of action. E. g.
 speak for this reason, because $I$ wish, \&e. Plat. Phaed. 102 D.


 object in view, \&e. (i. e. wishing what)? Plat. Phaed. 63 A. (Sce below, Note 7.)

For the Participle with $\dot{\omega}$, used to express a eause assigned by another, see below, Note 4.
5. Purpose, object, or intention, expressed by the Future Participle, rarely by the Present. E. g.
 I. 13. חapє $\lambda_{\eta} \lambda v \theta a \sigma v \mu \beta o v \lambda \in \dot{v} \sigma \omega \nu$, I have risen to give my advice.

 order to say this, and to ask for Lysander as admiral. Xen. Hell. II,

 wounded or to perish. Plat. Crit. 51 B.
 $\lambda$ ovaa! $\beta o \eta \theta \epsilon i v$, for some of the ships happened to be gone towards Caria, in order to give them notice to send aid. Thuc. I, 116. So ápví $\mu \in \nu 0$, II. I, 159. (The Present here seems to express an attendant circuinstance, rather than a mere purpose.)
6. Condition, the Participle standing for the protasis of a conditional sentence, and its tenses representing the various forms of protasis expressed by the Indicative, Subjunctive, or Optative ( $\$ 52,1$ ). E. g.

 $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, do you thinh that Alcestis would have died for Admetus, §'., if they had not believed, \&c. Plat. Symp. 208 D. (Here $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oioné-
 $i \pi \sigma \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ \nu o v \sigma \iota \nu$, for it would not have concerned them, unless they had had this idea. Dem. Phil. III, 122, 21. (Here $\mu \grave{\eta} \dot{v} \pi o \lambda a \mu-$

 - I should be able to do this ( $\epsilon i$ סvvaròs $\epsilon i \eta \nu)$. Eur. Phoen. 504.

See other examples under $\S 52,1$.
7. Opposition, or limitation, where the Participle is often to be translated by although. E. g.



 was summoned, and although he did go to the house, yet denies that he went in, §c., although he had previously gone in and arrorged every-

 are able to foresee few things, \&c. Xen. Cyr. III, 2, 15.

The Participle in this sense is very often accompanied by каiтєр and other particles. See below, Note 5.
8. Any attendant circumstance, the Participle being merely descriptive. E. g.
 having taken the Boeotians with them, they marched against Pharsalus.


 (See below, N. 8.)
 $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \tau a$, and $\sigma \tilde{v} \tau \omega s$ are often joined to the verb of the sentence in which the temporal Participle stands. E. g.
 manded that, after he had joined them in crossing, he should then retire



 of the Athenians. Id. VI, 104.
(b.) Eita, ${ }_{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \tau u$, and oũ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \omega$ s sometimes refer in the same way to a Participle expressing opposition or limitation; in which case they may be transliated by neicrtheless, after all. E. g.

 have destroyed so important a piece of cidence, they after all think,


 to Athens, you should after all be the only one to fail in obtaining this. Plat. Gorg. 461 E.
(c.) Oũ $\mathrm{T} \omega \mathrm{s}$, $\delta \grave{a}$ toûto, and $\delta \iota a ̀$ rav̂ta sometimes refer in the same way to a Participle denoting a cause. E. g.


 are often connected (in position and in sense) with the temporal Participle, although grammatically they qualify the verb of the sen. tence. E. g.
 pous motiv, as he advanced, he looked at the same time to see whether it was possible. \&c Xen. Cyr. V, 2, 22. "А $\mu$ а катадаßóvтєs $\pi \rho о \sigma є к \epsilon ́ a t o ́ ~$ $\sigma \phi$, as soon as they had overtaken them, they pressed hard upon them.
 $\gamma \in \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \in \nu o v$, Necho stopped while digying (the canal), \&c. Id. II, 158



 piveto énéкєьvто, the Corinthians presset upon the right wing, as soon
 beginning as soon as it (the war) broke out. Id. I, 1. $\Delta$ tóvvaov $\lambda \in ́ \gamma o v$.
 Dionysus that, as soon as he was born, Zeus sewed him into his thigh.
 viewing the soul of each one the moment that he is dead. Plat. Gorg. 523 E.

Note 3. (a.) ${ }^{\text {A }} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau}$, oiov, or oia, as, inasmuch as, are used to emphasize 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 N. 4.) E. g.
 oro $\hat{\eta}$, but Cyrus, inasmuch as he was a child, \&e. Xen. Cyr. I, 3, 3.

 inasmuch as they were departing by night, \&e. Xisw. Hell. VI, 4, 26.

In Herodotus $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma r \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is used in the same sense; as in I, 8 , $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ -aûta voui$\zeta \omega \nu$, inasmuch as he believed this. See Thuc. VII, 24.
(b.) " $\Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ with the Partieiple oceasionally seems to have the same force as ätc or oiod ; as in Eur. Hippol. 1307, $\delta \delta^{\prime} \ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ औौ


For the common use of $\varnothing \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ with the Participle, see Note 9.
Note 4. (a) ' $\Omega s$ may be prefixed to many of the Partiviples of § 109, especially those denoting a cause or a purpose. It shows that the Participle expresses the idea of the subject of the leading verb, or that of some other person prominently mentioned in the sentence; without implying that it is also the idea of the speaker or writer. E.g.

 Pericles, on the ground that he had persuaded them to engage in the war, asd that through him they had met with the calamities. Tinc. II. 59. (Here Thueydides himself is not responsible for the statements made by the Participles; as he would be if $\omega$ s wems nmitted.)
 indignant, because (as they allege) they have been deprived, \&e. Plat.
 aùrovouias ravirns, i. e. they thank lim because (as they belicve) they have obtained this independence through him. Isoc. Pan. p. 77 C .

 to thein, thinking that they were victorious over all; and the other side proceeding to piunder, thinking that they were all victorious. Xen. An.
 he made his pretence, (apparently) wishing to drive out the Pisidians.
 סtov, he said he took courage, on the ground that these matters were about to be settled, \&c. Ib. I, 3, 8. (See § $110,1, \mathrm{~N} .1$.) ' $\Omega \mathrm{s} \gamma \mathrm{a} \rho$ $\epsilon i \delta \delta^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\omega} \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \prime \mu \phi \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ àкои́єтє, for you hear them as men who (as you believe) know about what they were sent for. Dem. F. L. 342,
 prepared with the (avowed) intention of going to war. Thuc. II, 7.
 object of putting him to death. Xen. An. I, 1, 3.

It is a common mistake to suppose that $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ s 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.
(b.) ' $\Omega s$ may also be used before Participles with verbs of knowing, \&c., included in § 113 . (See § 113, N. 10.)

Note 5. (a.) The Partieiple expressing opposition or limitation is often strengthened by каiтє $\rho$ or каi (after a negative, by oú $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ or $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$, with or without $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ), кai $\tau a \bar{\tau} \tau a$, and that too. "O $\mu \omega \mathrm{s}$, nevertheless, may be connected with the Participle (like ä $\mu a$, \&c. N. 2), belonging, however, grammatically to the leading verb. E. g.

 my enemy. Sopir. Aj. 122. Oỉk àv $\pi \rho \circ \delta o i \eta \nu$, oí $\delta \epsilon \in \epsilon \rho \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$

 Aesch. Sept. 712. (Here $\quad \partial \mu \omega$ s qualifies $\pi \in i \theta_{o v}$; although, as usual,



(b.) In Homer, the two parts of kai . . $\pi \epsilon \rho$ are generally separ
rated by the Parti:iple, or by some emphatic word connected with it. Kai is here very often omitted, so that $\pi v^{\prime} \rho$ stands alone in the sense of althouyz.

Both of these uses are found also in the Atcic poets. E. g.






 $\mu a t$. Aesch. Sept. 1037.

Remark. Kaíto was very seldom used like кaitep with the Participle, its only regular use being with finite verbs. E. g.
 $\phi \omega t o ̀ s ~ \epsilon i p \eta \mu e ́ v o \nu . ~ S m m o n . ~ F r . ~ 5 ~(a p u d ~ P l a t . ~ P r o t . ~ 339 ~ C) . ~$.

Note 6. The Participle $\not \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ is someticas omitted after the particles mentioned in the last three notes, leaving an adjective or a noun standing by itself. E. g.


 is necessary, and not on the ground tha' $t$ is a good thing. Ib. II, 358
 Prom. 907.

Note 7. (a.) The Participle with any of the meanings included in § 109 may stand in relative or interrogative clauses. Such expressions can seldom be translated literally into English. E. g.
 that you are in such great haste? Xen. Hell. I, 7, 26. Tíà à timóv


 use in his intercourse with men. Plat. Gorg. 484 D.
(b.) Here belong $\tau i \mu a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$; and $\tau i \pi a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$; both of which hav the general force of wherefore? Ti $\mu a \theta \grave{\omega} \nu$ то^то $\pi о є \in \hat{i}$; however, usually signifies what put it into his head to do this? or with what idea does he do this? and $\boldsymbol{\tau} i \pi a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ тoûto $\pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\imath}$; wnat has happened to him that he does this? E. g.


 they resemble mortal women? Arist. Nub. 340.

These phrases may be used even in dependent sentences, ri becoming $\tilde{0} \boldsymbol{\tau}$, and the whole phrase meaning because. E. g.
门ुov; what do I deserve to suffer, §c. for not keeping quiet? i. c. for the idea which came into my heat, in consequence of which I did not keep quiet. Plat. Apol. 36 B. So Plat. Euthyd. 283 E, and 299 A. (See Matthiae, § 567.)

Note 8. Certain Participles, when they agree with the subject of a verb, have almost the force of adverbs. Such are $\mathfrak{a} \rho \chi \boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{o}}^{\boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{s},}$ at first ; $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, finally; $8 \iota a \lambda \iota \pi \dot{\omega} \nu$, after an interval; $\phi^{\prime} \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$; hastily; à v́vas, quickly; $\lambda a \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$, secretly; кататєìas, earnestly; ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \omega \nu$, continually; $\phi \theta$ á $\sigma a s$, quickly. (See Passow or Liddell and Scott, under a $\rho \chi \omega, \& c$.)
${ }^{*} \mathrm{E}_{\chi} \omega \nu$, ä $\gamma \omega \nu, \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu$, and $\lambda a \beta \dot{\omega} \nu$ may often be translated with. (See example under § 109, 8.)

Note 9. ${ }^{\quad} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ with the Participle generally belongs to an implied apodosis, to which the Participle forms the protasis (§ 109,6 ). Here $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ means simply $a s$, and the Participle is translated with an if prefixed. (See § $53, \mathrm{~N} .3$. ) E. g.
 to hear, as if you already knew well (i. e. as you would be if you knew). Isoc. Pac. p. 160 C. § 9. (Here єiסóтєs $=\epsilon i \not \eta \delta \epsilon \epsilon \tau \epsilon, ~ § 52$,
 $\psi v \chi a i ́ s \mu \epsilon ่ \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau \epsilon s$ кıขठvvєvєєv, as if they had been about to risk the
 § 86. So Ib. p. 78 C. § $179, \tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \pi \rho o ̀ s \tau o ̀ \nu \Delta i a \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu \nu \in \mu o ́-$
 (he would have done) if he had been dividing the country with Zeus, and not making a treaty with men.

That $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ means simply as (not $a s$ if) is seen when a verb with

 was as (it would be) if the whole land should be covered with fire.
§110. 1. If a Participle, denoting any of the relations included in § 109, belongs to a substantive which is not connected with the main construction of the sentence, both the substantive and the Participle are put in the genitive, called absolute. E. g.
 done when Conon was general. Isoc. Evag. p. 200 C. § 56. 'Афiкєтo
 rov, ...кататлєì, the Cephallenians having determined to sail in, althouyh this man opposed it. Dem. Zenoth. 886, 1. (For the tenses

 should ever suffer, \&e. Thuc. I, 10. (See § 52, 1.) ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \lambda \eta \mathrm{s} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathrm{a} \rho \mathrm{\tau} \bar{\eta}_{s}$

 Xen. Mem. III, 1, 3.

Note 1. The Participle in the genitive absolute may be accomfaried by all the particles mentioned in § 109 , Notes $1-9$, with the same force as in other constructions. It may also stand in the relative and interrogative sentences of $\S 109$, N. 7. E. g.
 vos, while he was saying this, \&c. Plat. Euthyd. 275 E. 'Ек $\delta \underset{\epsilon}{ }$
 $\tau \in \theta \nu \epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega} \tau \omega \nu$, because (as they said) the tyrants were dead. Xen.

 because they intended to be at war with the Greeks. Id. An. V, 6, 3.

 $\chi \in i p a s, \ldots$ diסarкє, since (as you may feel sure) I will not lay hands

 Нdt. I, 190. (See § 109, N. 3.) 'H $\nu$ रà $\rho$ d̀óv́vatos, ${ }^{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \sigma \eta \pi o-$

 been devastated (i. e. as they would have been, if it had been devastated). Isoc. Helen. p. 217 D. § 49.

For the genitive absolute after $\dot{\omega}$, in connection with verbs of knowing, \&c., see § 113, Note 10.

Note 2. 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 $\left.\dot{a}^{v} \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu, \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu\right)$ is understood. E.g.
 they (men lefore mentioned) came on, for a time kept quiet. Xen.
 т $\omega \nu$, єiкòs, к.т. $\lambda .$, and things being so (sc. $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu)$, \&c. Xen.

 úuâs єưvooav. Dem. Cor. 331, 30. (Here à $\nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu$ is understood with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda \lambda о \mu \dot{\epsilon} \varphi \nu \omega \nu$.)

So when the Participle denotes a state of the weather; as v̈ovios $\pi о \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$, when it was raining heavily. Xen. Hell. I, 1, 16. (In such cases the Participle is masculine, $\Delta$ ós being understood. Sce Arist.


Note 3. A passive Participle may stac 1 in the genitive absolute
with a clause introdnced by ${ }^{\circ} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau$. If the subject of such a clause is plural, the Participle is itself sometimes plural, by a kind of attraction. E.g.
 $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\epsilon} \nu \in \tau \boldsymbol{c}$, it having been clearly shown, that, \&c. Thuc. I, 74 . In I,
 $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \iota \nu$, it having be日n announced, that, \&c.

Note 4. The Participle ${ }_{\omega}^{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \nu$ is rarely omitted, leaving a noun and an adjective alone in the genitive absolute. E. g.

Note 5. The genitive absolute is regularly used only when a a 3 w subject is introduced into the sentence ( $\$ 110,1$ ), and not when the Participle can be joined with any substantive already belonging to the construction. Yet this rule is sometimes violated, in order to give greater prominence to a participial clause. E. g.
 кє. Thuc. I, 114.
2. The Participles of impersonal verbs stand in the accusative absolute, in the neuter singular, when other participles would stand in the genitive absolute. Such
 $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda o \nu$, ооко $\hat{\nu} \nu, \delta^{\prime} \xi a \nu$, and the like; also passive Participles used impersonally (as $\left.\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau a \chi \theta^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \nu, \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \eta \mu \in \epsilon^{\prime} \nu o \nu\right)$; and such expressions as ádúvatov ò $\nu$, it being impossible, composed of an adjective and $\stackrel{o}{\circ} \nu$. E. g.
 brought no aid when it was necessary escape safe and sound? Plat.




 Kvaǵápou Av єivaı ố $\tau \iota$ ầ $\tau \grave{2} \pi \lambda \bar{\eta} \theta_{0} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \xi \nu \mu \mu a ́ \chi \omega \nu \psi \eta \phi i \sigma \eta \tau a \iota$. Thuc. V, 20 . So





 (The genitive belongs under § 110,1 . See § 111 ) 'A $1 \tau \tau \pi a \rho e-$

would still be need of a battle. Ib. VI, 1, 26. (Sce Remark, below.)
 i. e. thinking that it was now in their power, \&e. 1d. Hell. 1I, 4, 1. 'H
 to the city. Soph. Ant. 44.

Remark. The accusative absolute may take the same particles as the genitive absolute ( $\S 110,1$, Note 1). It maty also omit the Participle ö $\partial$. (See the last two examples, above.)

Note 1. 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 $\dot{\omega}$ (used as in $\S 109$, Note 4), or bv $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, as $i f$. E. g.




 as if friends were made from fellow-citizens, and were not made from

 3. (See § 113, N. $10, c$.)

Note 2. The accusative absolute used personally without $\dot{\omega}$ or $\tilde{\omega}^{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ is very rare. It occurs chiefly with the neuter of Participles which are regularly impersonal. E. g.

 Нрт. II, 66. "H $\delta \eta$ à $\mu \phi о \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o t s ~ \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu ~ \delta о к о и ̆ \nu ~ a ̀ v a \chi \omega \rho \epsilon i ̂ \nu, ~ к v \rho \omega \theta \grave{\epsilon} \nu ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$


 in Plat. Prot. 314 C, where we may supply $\pi=\epsilon \epsilon$ iv.
§111. As the Participle in the genitive (or accusative) absolute denotes the same relations (time, cause, \&c.) as the Participle in its ordinary construction ( $\$ 109$ ), 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 those substantives in case, while those which refer to some new subject stand with that subject in the genitive absolute; any which are impersonal standing in the accusative absolute. E. g.
 10*
 riew to his (the King's) coming up and to receiving him. Xen. An. I,








 $\chi \omega \rho \in i ̂ ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ T \iota \sigma \sigma a \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \nu \eta \nu$. Id. VIII, 45.

See the examples collected by Krüger, Vol. I, §56, 14, 2; and his note to Thuc. IV, 5, 1.
§ 112. The Participle may be joined with certain verbs to restrict their meaning to particular actions, in a sense which often resembles that of the Infinitive ( 892,1 ). Such a Participle may agree in case with either the subject or the object of the verb.

1. The Participle is thus used especially with verbs signifying to begin, to continue, to endure, to persevere, to cease (or cause to cease), to repent, to be weary of, to be pleased, displeased, or ashamed, to represent (as in a poem), to find.

Further, after verbs signifying to overlook or to allow ( $\pi \in \rho \iota 0^{-}$
 Participle is used in the sense of the object Infinitive, the Present and Aorist Participles differing merely as the same tenses of the Infinitive would differ in similar constructions (§ 15, 1 ; § 23, 1). See § 24, Note 2. E. g.





 $\dot{\rho} a \chi^{a i f} \rho \nu \nu 0 \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau \iota$, they rejoiced in his return. Od. XIX, 463.
 that he was deprived of Aeolis. Xen. Hell. III, 2, 13. Aifxivopai



 $r \iota \mu \omega \rho o u \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu o u s$, he has represented those in Hades as suffering
 $\eta \nexists \mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \cap \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, she found lim sitting apart. II. I, 498. So I, 27.
 $\phi \rho \circ \nu \eta \theta \in i \quad \sigma a \nu$, let us not allow Lacedacmon to be insulted and despised.
 see me killed. Eur Orest. 746. T $\lambda \hat{\eta} v a i ́ \sigma \epsilon \delta \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma a \nu$, that thou shouldst take courage to do. Soph. El. 943. See examples in § 24, N. 2.

Remask. In Herodotus $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a ́ o \mu a t ~ i s ~ o f t e n ~ u s e d ~ w i t h ~ t h e ~ P a r t ı-~$ ciple in the same way; as oùk $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a ̂ \tau o ~ \epsilon ่ \pi \iota \grave{\omega} \nu \dot{o}$ Kùpos, Cyrus did not attempt to appr حach, I, 77. So I, 84; VI, 50.
'A ${ }^{\prime}$ the Participle as well as the Infinitive; as in Xen. Cyr. I, 6, 18, ä $\mu a$

 $\delta \epsilon i \xi \omega \sigma \epsilon, I$ will make you see. See these two verbs in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon.
2. The Participle used with the following verbs contains the leading idea of the expression: $\delta \iota a \tau \epsilon \boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \omega$, to continue, $\lambda a \nu \theta a \dot{\nu} \omega$, to escape the notice of, $\tau v \gamma \chi \dot{a} \nu \omega$, to happen, $\phi \theta a ́ \nu \omega$, to anticipate, to get the start of, oì $\chi \circ \mu a \iota$, to be gone, and $\theta a \mu i$ $\zeta \omega$, to be wont or to be frequent.

So in poetry with кupe $\omega$, to happen; and in Herodotus
 $\pi$ avroiss $\gamma i \gamma \nu o \mu a t$, to be urgent; and in Homer with $\beta \hat{\eta}$ for $\epsilon \beta \eta$. E. g.

 good will as I continually bear. Dem. Cor. § 1. "E $\lambda a \theta \in \nu$ (aùtク̀ $\nu$ )
 consumed lefore she knew it. Truc. IV, 133. (See § 24, Note 1.) Фovéa toù $\pi a \iota \delta o ̀ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \lambda ~ a ́ \nu \theta a \nu \in \beta o ́ \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$, he was unconsciously supporting the murderer of his son. Нdт. I, 44. (See Rem. below.) "Eтv才ov

 $\kappa a \theta \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu o s$ évtaù $\theta a$, I happened to be sitting there. Plat. Euthyd.
 they no sooner heard of the war than they came, \&c. Isoc. Paneg. 58
 àtкó $\mu \epsilon \nu$ о८, the Scythians came to the bridge much before the Per-
 will be the first to do this for themselves. Plat. Rep. II, 375 C. (See
 first to run to them. Aescinin. Cor. § 248. O"̌єтaı $\phi \in \dot{v} \gamma \omega \nu$, he has


Cyr. V, 1, 3. Ой $\tau \iota$ ко $\mu \iota \zeta$ о́ $\mu \in \nu$ д́s $\gamma \epsilon$ Gá $\mu \iota \zeta \epsilon$, he had not been used
 fis tò̀ חt $\rho$ palâ, you do not come down very often. Plat. Rep. I, 328 C.
Toùrov oì $\theta$ ' $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \zeta \bar{\omega} \nu$ кvp $\epsilon \hat{i}$; dost thou know whether he is perchance

 кєito $\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega \nu$ тoádé, and Gelon spoke urgently as follows. Id. VII,
 mópov, they begged them in every way (lit. they took every form in
 happened to be a quarrel. Id. I, 82. B $\bar{\eta} \phi \epsilon \dot{j} \gamma \omega \nu$, he took fight. Il. II, 665. (See § 97, N. 1.)

Remark. Aav $a^{a} v o$ being an active verb, meaning to escape the nutice of, must have an object expressed or understood. When no object is expressed, sometimes mívras is understood, and sometimes
 mean either he did this without any one's knowing it (sc. mávras), or he did this unconsciously (sc. éavtóv).

Note 1. 'Aрќє , to be suffcient, and ikavós, $\dot{\eta} \delta i \omega \nu$, кр $\epsilon i \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, or BeגTi $\omega$, єipi are sometimes used in a personal construction with the Participle (like $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda$ ós $\epsilon i \mu$, , \&c., § $113, \mathrm{~N} .1$ ), where we should expect an impersonal construction with the Infinitive. E. g.


 dкoúvautes. Dem. Aristoc. 641, 9.

Note 2. As à $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\prime} \chi \chi^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{al}$, to endure, may govern either the accusative or the genitive, it may take a Participle in either case agreeing with the object. Thus we may say either àvé $\chi \in \tau a i$
 ing.

Note 3. The phrase oủk à $\nu \phi \theta$ ávols (or oùk ả $\nu \phi \theta a ́ v o u r \epsilon)$, you could not be too soon, is used with the Participle as an exhortation, meaning the sooner the better. The third person, oùk $\mathfrak{a} \nu \phi \theta$ ávol, is sometimes used, meaning, it might as well happen now as ever (for it must happen). See Passow.

Note 4. The Participle $\omega \nu$ is sometimes omitted in the construo tions of § 112. E. g.

Note 5. Lav $\theta \dot{a} v \omega$ is sometimes followed by ö $\neq \iota$ and a finite verb, as in Xen. Mem. III, 5, 24. When it is used impersenally, it regu larly takes ö óc.

Note 6. Some verbs of this class are followed by the Infinitive as well as by the Participle; generally, however, with some differ.
ence in mesning. Thus ai $\sigma \chi^{\dot{v} v o \mu a \iota} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega \nu$ means $I$ am ashamed to say (but do say); ai $\sigma \chi \dot{v} \nu 0 \mu a \iota ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \in \iota \nu$ means $I$ am ashamed to say
 of doing this; but àтока́ $\mu \nu \omega$ тойтo $\pi$ о $\epsilon \in \hat{\imath} \nu, I$ cease to do this through weariness. (See Passow, or Liddell and Scott, under these words; and Passow under äрхонаи.) See $\pi \epsilon \rho и \delta \epsilon i \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \gamma \bar{\eta} \nu \tau \mu \eta \theta \eta \nu a \iota$, Thuc. II, 20 ; and $\pi \epsilon \rho u \delta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$ àj $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \mu \eta \theta \in \hat{\imath} \sigma a \nu$, II, 18 ; where it is difficult to detect any difference in meaning. See, however, Kriiger's note on I, 35 .

Note 7. The Aorist (seldom the Perfect) Participle may be joined with the subject of $\check{\epsilon} \chi \omega$, forming a periphrastic Pcrfect. This is especially common in Sophocles and Euripides. E. g.

 Xen. An. I, 3, 14.

For a similar periphrasis to express the Future Perfect, see § 29, Note 4; and § 108, Note 6.
 $\pi \rho o \sigma \delta \epsilon \chi \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon \nu \circ s$, and $\epsilon \lambda \pi \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon \nu o s$ sometimes agree in case with a dative, which depends on eipi or on a verb signifying to come or to happen; the whole forming a periphrasis for the verb of the Participle. E. g.

 I have been expecting the manifestations of your anger towards me. Thuc. II, 60.
§113. The Participle is used also with many verbs signifying to see, to perceive, to know, to hear or learn, to remember, to forget, to show, to appear, to prove, to acknowledge, and with $a^{\prime} \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$, to announce. The Participle here resembles the Infinitive in indirect discourse ( $\S 92,2$ ), each tense representing the corresponding tense of the Indicative or Optative.

The Participle may belong to either the subject or the object of these verbs, and agree with it in case. E. g.
 $\mu \dot{\mu} \mu \nu \eta \mu a \iota$ тоиิо $\pi \circ \iota \dot{\eta} \sigma a s, I$ remember that I did this. (In the first



shall prove that he is an enemy ; $\delta \in \iota \chi \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ oũtos $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho o ̀ s ~ \omega ँ \nu$, he wiu be proved to be an enemy.

For other examples see § 73, 2; where examples of the Participle with $\begin{aligned} & \text { al } \nu \text { after these verbs may be found. See also } \S 41 .\end{aligned}$

Note 1. The Participle is used in the same way with $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o ́ s ~ \epsilon i \mu \iota$ and фavepós єiرc. E.g.
 Xen. An. II, 5, 27. (This is equivalent to $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o \nu \dot{\eta} \nu \tilde{o}^{\sigma} \tau \iota$ oiocto.


 oủk idía $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu \circ \hat{v} \nu \tau \epsilon s$, they made it evident to all that they were nut fighting for themselves. I ycurg. Leocr. p. 154, § 50.

Note 2. When any 01 these verbs has for its object an accusative of the reflexive pronoun referring to its subject, the Participle agrees with the reflexive. Thus we may have $\delta \in i \xi \omega$ ' $\epsilon \mu a v \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ roû̃o $\pi \in \pi \circ \not \eta \kappa$ о́тa, I shall show that I have done this, for $\delta \in i \xi \omega$ тойтo $\pi \epsilon$ поı $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega}$.

Note 3. If the Participle of an impersonal verb is used in this construction, it must stand in the neuter singular (of course without a noun). The following example includes this and also the ordinary construction:-

 rights in the city, but also that I have suffered, \&c. Dem. Eubul. 1299
 aủrós.) See § 111.

Note 4. Some verbs which regularly take the Infinitive in indirect discourse ( $(92,2)$ occasionally take the Participle. E. g.
 death a good man. Xen. An. VI, 6, 24.

Note 5. The Participle $\not \omega \nu$ may be omitted here, as well as after the verbs of § 112 .

Note 6. When $\sigma \dot{v} \nu o \iota \delta a$ and $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \iota \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$ are followed by a dative of the reflexive pronoun referring to the subject of the verb, the Participle can stand either in the dative agreeing with the reflexive, or in the nominative agreeing with the sub-
 scious (to myself) that I have bren wronged.

Note ${ }^{7}$. The verbs included in $\S 113$ may also be followed by a clause with ö́tc, instead of the more regular Participle. When
 take a clanse with ö́rı. (See § 112, N. 5.)

Note 8. Most of these verbs are also found with the Infinitive. (See Passow, or Liddell and Scott.) But oida takes the Infinitive only when it means to know how. Thus oìa tov̂to $\pi$ octiv means I know how to do this, but oỉda roùto $\pi 0 \iota \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$ means I know that I am doing this.

Note 9. Verbs signifying to remember or to know may be followed by öre. (when) and the Indicative, if a particular occasion is referred to with emphasis. E. g.
 time) when I answered you, \&e. Plat. Men. 79 D. Oíat' öte


Note 10. (a.) ' $\Omega s$ is sometimes prefixed to the Participle in connection with the verbs of § 113. It implies that the Participle expresses the idea of the subject of the leading verb, or that of some other person prominently mentioned in the sentence. (See § 109, N. 4.) When this is also implied by the context (as it usually is in such sentences), the is merely adds emphasis to the expression. Thus
 oütos éxoura means know that you may assume this to be so. E. g.
 .ook upon) me as knowing nothing of what you seek. SopH. Phil.

 stand that you may assume these things to be going on, \&c. Ib. 567.
 buy me off from my determination. Soph. Ant. 1063. $\Delta \eta \lambda o i s \delta^{\circ}{ }^{\omega}$ ' s
 to disclose. Ib. 242. $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o s ~ \grave{j} \nu \mathrm{~K} \hat{\nu} \rho o s \dot{\omega} \varsigma \sigma \pi \epsilon \hat{\delta} \omega \omega$, it was evident (by the conduct of (yrus) that Cyrus was in haste. Xen. An. I, 5, 9.
 your father is no more. Sopu. O. T. 956 . (In vs. 959, the messenger


The force of $\dot{\omega}$ shere can seldom be expressed in English.
(b.) The Participle thus joined with $\dot{\text { os may stand with its sub- }}$ stantive in the genitive or accusative absolute. This sometimes happens even when the substantive would naturally be the object of the verb of knowing, \&c., so that if the $\dot{\omega}$ were omitted, the accusative would be used (as in $a$ ). E. g.

[^12] is so, you may learn it, i. e. you may learn that this is so. Aesch.
 nounce from you that there is war? lit. assuming that there is war, shall I announce it from you? Xen. An. II, 1, 21. ' $\Omega$ s $\pi$ ávv $\mu$ ot
 (as you must understand) this seems good to me, be sure of it. Id. Mem. IV, 2, 30.
(c.) We sometimer find the Participle with $\dot{\omega}$ even after verbs and expressions which do not regularly take the Participle by § 113. E. g.
 of this opinion, that I shall go, \&c. Xen. An. I, 3, 6. So Thuc. VII,
 they fancy themselves flying PLat. 'Theaet. 158 B . ' $\Omega \mathrm{s}$ toivod $\mu \dot{r}_{i}$
 shall not hear, lit. since then (as you must know) we shall not hear, so make up your minds. Plat Rep. I, 327C. ' $\Omega s \sigma t \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \boldsymbol{v} \tau a$

 кảкєiv $\omega \nu \sigma v \mu \beta \dot{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$, let us look at the case, assuming that both this and that might perhaps happen if chance should have it so. Dem. Aristoc. 638, 25. (Literally, since (as we may assume) 3oth this and that might perhaps happen if it should shance tv b, so, let us look at it in this light.) For ä $\nu$, see $\S 41,3$.

Remark. The examples included in Nate 10 (b) edl (a) bolcng properly under § 109, N. 4. (See also § 110,1 N. 1 ; rad the leat example under § 110,2, N. 1.)

## CHAPTER VII.

## VERBAL ADJECTIVES IN -тє́os.

§114. The verbal in $-\tau$ 'tos is used both in a personal and an impersonal construction.

1. In the personal construction the verbal is always passive in sense; expressing necessity (like the Latin Participle in -dus) and agreeing with its subject in case. F. g.

 $\pi \tau \epsilon \operatorname{as}$ єivai ( $\epsilon \phi \eta$ ), he said that others must be sent for. Thuc. VI, 25.




Note. The substantive denoting the agent is here in the dative, as in the impersonal construction.
2. In the impersonal construction (which is the most onmon) the verbal stands in the neuter of the nominative singular (sometimes plural) with $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i ́$ expressed or understood, and is regularly active in sense. The expression is equivalent to $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, it is necessary, with the Infinitive active or middle of the verb from which the verbal is derived.

Active verbals of this class may take 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.

 necessary to bear these things. Eur. Orest. 769. 'A $\mathrm{A} a \lambda \lambda a \kappa \tau \epsilon \in \nu$
 Plat. Phaed. 66 E. ( $\Delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mathfrak{a} \pi a \lambda \lambda a ́ a \tau \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota a u ̀ \tau o \hat{v}, ~ к a i ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \psi v \chi \hat{g}$
 $\gamma \mu a \sigma \iota v \dot{\jmath \mu i v}$, that you must give assistance in two ways. Dem. Ol. I, 14, 6 .




 $\gamma \mu a \tau \omega \nu \pi \lambda \in i \sigma^{\prime} \sigma \nu \hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \kappa \iota \sigma \chi \iota \lambda i o \iota s$. Id. VIII, 65 . (Here both the accusative and the dative of the agent are found.) See Rem. 2.



 it would be best for us to go and see her. Xen. Mem. III, 11, 1.


 Arist. Lys. 450. So Sopil. Ant. 678.

Note. A sentence sometimes begins with an impersonal verbal in $-\tau \epsilon \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ and is continued with an infinitive, the latter depending on $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ implied in the verbal. E. g.
 aù $\eta \dot{\eta} \nu$. Plat. Crit. 51 B .

Remark 1. The same impersonal construction is found in Latin, but very seldom with verbs which take an object accusative; as Eundum est tihi (iтє́à ধ́ $\sigma \tau i \operatorname{\sigma o\iota }$ ). - Moriendum est omnibus,
 employ war. See Madvig's Latin Grammar, § 421, $a$ and $b$ ).

Remark 2. The dative and the accusative of the agent are both
 lent construction of $\delta \in \hat{i}$ with the Infinitive the accusative is the only



## APPENDIX.

## I. On tae Relations of the Greek Optative to the Subjunctive and the Indicative.*

From the time of the Alexandrian grammarians a special mood called the Optative ( $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \lambda เ \sigma เ s \epsilon \dot{\jmath} \kappa \tau เ \kappa \eta$ ) has been recognized in Greek
 cient classification has been called in question in later times, and many grammarians of high authority have adopted or favored a union of the Subjunctive and Optative in one mood, to be called the Subjunctive or Conjunctive, in which the Subjunctive (commonly so called) is to supply the primary tenses, and the forms commonly assigned to the Optative the secondary tense. Thus the Present Optative would be called an Imperfect Subjunctive; $\pi$ oin and $\pi o \kappa i \mu$, for example, being supposed to bear the same relation to each other as faciam and facerem in Latin.

This was first reduced to a systematic form by Kühncr, who, mdeed discards the common names Suljunctive and Optative (except as explanatory terms), and adopts the cumbrous expressions "Conjunctive of the primary tenses" and "Conjunctive of the secondary tenses." Rost, in his Griechische Grammatik, § 118, says: "The socalled Optative is nothing but a peculiar form of the Suljunctive, and stands to the Greek Subjunctive in the same relation as in other languages the Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive to the Present and Perfect." Donaldson in his New Cratylus (p. 617, 2d ed.) says: "It has long been felt by scholars on syntactical grounds, that, considered in their relations to each other and to the other moods, they [the Subjunctive and Optative] must be regarded as differing in tense only." Again (p. 618) : "These moods have no right to a separate classification." Crosby, in his Grammar, § 591, says of this classification, that "it deserves the attention of the student, although it is questionable whether it is best to discard the old phraseology."

As the classification of Kühner has been introduced into many elementary grammars, so that many boys are now tanght to call the tenses commonly known as the Present and Perfect Optative by the strange names of Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive, the

[^13]question becomes not merely of theoretical, but eminently of practical importance. In fact it meets every student, and more especially every teacher of Greek grammar, the moment he reaches the paradigm of the regular verb. If it were merely a question of convenience, therefore, it would be highly important to have it settled, for the sake of uniformity.

The question What shall constitute a distinct mood in any langrage? must be settled to some extent arbitrarily. No precise rule will meet all cases; yet we may safely maintain that, when any series of verbal forms in which the chicf tenses are represented exhibits a closer connection in form and use among its members than it bears as a whole to any corresponding series, it is entitled to the rank of an independent mood. That this is true of the Latin Subjunctive is clear; and it is equally clear that the Imperfect and Pluperfect of that mood have sufficiently strong bonds of connection with the Present and Perfect to prevent them from being marked off as a distinct mood. A merely superficial view of the relation of the Greek Subjunctive and Optative might lead us to the idea that the two combined would form a mood similar to the Latin Subjunctive, thus simplifying the Greek conjugation and introducing a new analogy with the Latin. But it is this fatal error of carrying the analogy between the Greek and Latin further than the connection of the two languages warrants, which has thrown this whole subject into confusion. When the Latin was looked upon as an offspring of the Greek, as the result of a union of the Acolic dialect of Greece with barbarian languages in Italy, the presumption was decidedly in favor of such an analogy, and it would even have required strong proof to convince us of any radical difference in the modal systems of the two languages. But the more correct views now entertained of the origin of the Latin would rather lead us to believe that each language developed its syntax, and especially its modal system, independently. The modal system of the parent language of the Indo-Enropean group is of course hopelessly unknown; and yet the comparison of the Latin and Greek verb with the Sanskrit (as the oldest representative of the family) sometimes enables us to determine special points in regard to the primitive forms with an approach to certainty. Thus, to take the simplest case, when we find asti in Sanskrit meaning is, we may be sure that some similar form existed with that meaning in the parent language of the Sanskrit, the Greek, the Latin, the German, \&c., from which 'éctí, est, ist, \&c. were derived. So when we find a Potential mood in Sanskrit, which presents striking analogies both to the Greek Optative and to the Latin Subjunctive, and furthermore find the analogy extending even to the Gothic, we must conclude that the primitive language contained the elcments which the Greek developed into its Optative, and the Latin into its Subjunctive. (See Bopp's Vergleichende Grammatik, II. pp. 257-959.) Again, the absence in later Sanskrit of any form corresponding to the Greek Subjunctive might lead us to think that the Greek developed that mood by
itself; but in the Vedic dialect a few relics are found of a true Subjunctive, with a long connecting-vowel as its elaracteristic; for example, patāti, bearing the same relation to the Present Indicative patăti as $\beta$ ovi $\eta$ тaı to $\beta$ aúnєтaц. This seems to show that a similar mood existed in the parent language. If this testimony can be relied on, we must conclude, not only that the Latin and Greck derived the rudiments of their modal forms from a common ancestor, but that they inherited them from a period anterior to the separation of the Indian branch from the Indo-European family. We should therefore expect to find that the elements are generally the same in the two languages, but that the development is essentially different; and that the refinements in signification, for which the Greek modal forms are espeeially conspicuous, have been for the most part developed by each language within itself.

Let us now examine the forms themselves, to see how far a parallel can be drawn hetweeen the Greek and Latin moods. In clauses expressing a purpose or object after $\tilde{i \nu}$, ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega \omega$, \& k ., we certainly find the Subjunctive and Optative used like primary and secondary tenses of the same mood: thus where in Latin we have manet ut hoc

 blance there is no place for the Future Optative, which corresponds to the Future Indicative. Again, in clauses expressing general suppositions after $\epsilon \dot{a} \nu$ or $\epsilon \dot{l}$, or after relatives or temporal particles, depending on verbs which denote general truths or repeated actions, a correlation of the Subjunctive and Optative is found, analogous to that of the two divisions of the Latin Subjunctive; for example,
 are sometimes represented in Latin by such forms as si hoc faciat mirantur, and si hoc faceret mirabantur, although generally the Indicative is preferred. Here, however, the analogy ceases, if we except certain cases of indireet question hereafter to be noticed, and a Homeric construction in relative sentences expressing a purpose, which almost disappears from the more cultivated language.

Let us turn now to the Optative in wishes; for here, if anywhere, we may look for the primary meaning of this mood. From this use it derives its name; and especially this is its only regular use in independent sentences, except in apodosis with ${ }^{a} \nu v$. Here some have been so far misled by the supposed analogy of the Latin, as to translate the Present Optative by the Latin Imperfect Subjunctive: but a slight examination will show that the Present and Aorist Optative are here so far from being secondary tenses of the Subjunctive, that they are equivalent to the Present Subjunctive in Latin, and refer to the future, while the Greek Subjunctive cannot even regularly stand in sueh expressions. Thus $\epsilon^{\prime} \ell \theta \in \epsilon_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \eta \nu$ is utinam sim, $O$ that I may be; cilec $\gamma^{\prime}$ ยоито, utinam fiat, $O$ that it may happen; whereas utinam esset and utinam factom esset correspond to $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \theta \in \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$ and $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \theta_{0}$ є́ү́vévo.

In orainary protasis and apodosis the same relation is seen 'Ths
 $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in L \epsilon$, find in the Latin Subjunctive only one equivalent, si, faciat. (For the first two the Latin generally preferred the Future or Future Perfect Indicative.) Here therefore the absurdity of classifying the last two as secondary forms of the first $t w o$, in conformity to a Latin analogy, is especially clear. What the Latin analogy would lead us to expect as secondary forms, the equivalents of si faceret and si fecisset, can be expressed in Greek only by the Indicative. In apodosis the Optative with ${ }^{\prime} \nu$ is equivalent to the primary, not to the secondary, tenses of the Latin Subjunctive; thas, recthoat $\mu \iota \not \approx \nu$ is equivalent to faciam (not to fecissem, which would be
 Attic Greek. This analogy between the Optative and the primary tenses of the Latin Subjunctive might lead us even to the view that the latter ought rather to be called an Optative, for which view there are certainly much stronger reasons than for the opposite one which we are considering.

An Homeric exception to the principles of the last two paragraphs (explained in § 49, 2, Note 6, and § 82, Remark 2 of the present work) has little or no weight in this discussion; for, althongh we find examples in which the Optative in conditional sentences and wishes is used like the secondary tenses of the Latin Subjunctive, the ordinary use of the Optative referring to the future in those constrnctions is perfectly well established in the Homeric language. It would be a mere gratuitous assumption to maintain that the exceptions (like Il. V, 311 and 388) represent the original idiom of the language.
In indirect quotations and questions the Optative is used after past tenses, each tense of the Indicative or Subjunctive in the direct discourse being then ehanged to the corresponding tense of
 do what he could, implies that the direct discourse was $\hat{a} a \hat{a} \nu \dot{\delta} \dot{\nu} \omega-$ $\mu a \iota \pi o \imath^{\prime} \sigma \omega$, I shall do what I may be able. Here the first Optative is the orrelative of the Subjunctive; but it is quite as often the correlative of the Indicative, as when we say $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \nu$ ö $\tau \iota$ â $\delta \dot{\delta} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \iota \tau o$ mooin, he said that he was doing what he could, where the direct dis-
 of the Optative, the Future, can never represent a Subjanctive, as that mood has no corresponding tense; but it always represents a Future Indicative. Nothing more need be said to slow the absurdity of calling this tense a secondary tense of the Subjunctive. The three remaining tenses of the Optative can with no more propricty be called secondary tenses of the Subjunctive than of the Indicative, for they represent both on precisely the same principles. This is especially obvious in regard to the Aorist, which has two distinct meanings in indirect questions, - one when it represents an Aorist Indicative, and another when it represents an Aorist Subjunctive,

l:now not what he had done, or he knew not what he shou'd do; as the direct question may have been either ri ' $\operatorname{\epsilon } \pi o i \eta \sigma a$; what did I do? or тi $\pi o \neq \eta \sigma \omega$; (Aor. Sulj.), what shall I do? Strangely enough, this very class of sentences is supposed to furnish the most striking analogy between the Latin Subjunctive and the Greek Subjunctive and Optative combined. Non habet quo se vertat and non habebat quo se verteret are indeed equivalent to oủk ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \in \iota$ ö ö $\eta$ т $\rho$ án $\pi \eta \tau a \iota$ and oủk
 $\pi \lambda \in \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota \in, I$ asked him whether he had set sail (Dem. in Polyel. p. 1223, 21), in which àvandeúvetєy represents an Aorist Indicative (avé $\pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma a s ;$ ) shows that the argument proves too much. Indirect quotations and questions therefore afford us no more proof that the Optative is a secondary form of the Subjunctive, than that it is a secondary form of the Indicative.

Two tenses of the Indicative, the Imperfect and Pluperfect, have no corresponding tenses in the Optative, so that these are regularly
 xovto means he said that they hat been fighting, i. e. he said є́дáxоуто. A rare exception to the last principle shows conclusively the propriety of the names commonly given to the tenses of the Optative. The want of a tense in the Optative to represent the Imperfect Indicative in examples like the last was naturally felt as a defect; and in the Infinitive and the Participle this want was supplied by using the Present in a new sense to represent the Imperfect, the peculiar use being always denoted by something in the context. In a few instances we find the Present Optative used in the same way to supply the want of an Imperfect, the context making it clear that the tense is not used in its ordinary sense. Such an instance is found in Dem. Onet. I, 869, 12; àmєкрivavto ötт ov̇ס́єis páptus
 $\pi a \rho '$ aì $\omega \hat{\nu}$, they replied that no witness had been present, but that Aphobus had received the money from them, taking it in such sums as
 represents $\dot{\epsilon} к о \mu i \xi \in \tau о$, which would ordinarily be retained in such a sentence. See § 70, 2, Note $1(b)$ of the present work. If now the name of Imperfect be given to the Present Optative in its ordinary use, (when it represents a Present of the direct discourse, and is merely translated by an Imperfect to suit the English idiom,) what shall we call this true Imperfect Optative, which really represents an Imperfect Indicative, and stands where an Imperfeet Indicative is the regular form?

We see then that the Optative was used in the whole class of constructions krown as oratio obliqua, or indirect discourse, as the correlative not merely of the Subjunctive, but also of the Indicative, and that it possessed the power of expressing in an oblique form every tense of both those moods in a manner of which the Latin presents hardly a trace. In fact, this use of the Greek Optative presents one of the most striking examples of the versatility and flexibility of the language, and of its wonderful adaptation to the expression
of the nicest shades of thought of which the human mind is capable. This single use of the mood seems sufficient in itself to prevent us from assigning to it the subordinate rank of a secondary form attached to the Subjunctive.

## II On the Time denoted by the Tenses of the Infinitive when they are preceded by the Article and have a Subject expressed.

The able and instructive treatise of Madvig on the two uses of the Aorist Infinitive in Greek (in his Bemerkungen über einige Puncte der griechischen Wortfügungslehre, published as a supplement to his Syntax der griechischen Sprache) contains the earliest complete statement of the ordinary uses of that tense. The same principle, as far as it refers to indirect diseourse, is clearly stated in Sophocles's Greek Grammar (published in the same year, 1847). But with these exceptions, no distinct statement had been made, either in elementary grammars or in more elaborate treatises, of the simple principle which distinguishes the use of the Aorist Infinitive in Boú $\lambda \epsilon \tau a \downarrow{ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \theta_{\epsilon} i \nu$, he wishes to go, from that in $\phi \eta \sigma i \nu \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \epsilon i \nu$, he says that he went. According to Madvig, however, the use of the Aorist Infinitive as a past tense is not confined to indireet discourse, but extends also to cases in which the Infinitive "has a subject expressed and at the same time is preceded by the article." This principle was too hastily adopted, on Madvig's high authority, in the first edition of the present work ; and, as there seemed no good ground for distinguishing the Aorist from the Present Infinitive in similar construction, the general principle was stated, that any tense of the Infinitive could retain its designation of time (as in indirect discourse) when it had at the same time the article and a subject. The same class of sentences which seemed to confirm Madvig's view of the Aorist furnished also examples of the Present, and the use of this tense as an Imperfect made an exception here almost impossible.

A more careful review of all the examples quoted by Madvig, and of all that I have met with in reading since adopting his principle, has convinced me that the Aorist Infinitive here presents no peculiarity, and that it differs from the Present only in the ordinary way, by referring to a single or momentary act rather than to a repeated or continued act. The single example quoted by Madvig in his Syntax (§ 172) to support his principle is Dem. F. L. p. 360,

 that no one of the cities was taken by siege is the greatest proof that they
suffered these things, \&c. In the later treatise he adds Thuc. I.
 I, 2, 1, Cyr. II, 2, 3, IV, 5, 12,-Dem. Chers. p. 105, 28 ; § 65, and Arist. Nub. 268. It will be seen that all these examples can be explained by the ordinary principle of the Aorist Infinitive stated above; that is, the Infinitive is a mere verbal noun, designating no time of itself, and is referred to special time only by the context, which in these examples happens to refer it to the past. But when the Infinitive with $\boldsymbol{\tau} o \hat{v}$ expresses a purpose (where Madvig himself admits an exception), it is referred by the context or by the general meaning of the passage to the future: so in the following example from Dem. Cor. p. 236, 20, § 33, where on Madvig's prineiple the

 he was in fear lest, if before the Phocians should be destroyed you should vote to assist them, he might lose control of the business.

Other cases in which the Aorist Infinitive might seem to retain its force as a past tense are satisfactorily explained by Madvig. On the whole, it would be difficult to establish an exception to the general principle, that the Aorist Infinitive is a past tense only in indirect discourse, when it represents an Aorist Indicative after verbs of saying, thinking, \&c.
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| § 145 (153) . 149 | 697 - . 143 | 54 - - 179 |
| § 151 (160) . . 149 | 712. | 120 - - 115 |
| In Ctesiph.- | 747 - . 73 | 180 - - 106 |
| § $2 \cdot . \quad . \quad 99$ | 760 - . 232 | 280 448 - |
| § $7 . \quad . \quad 51$ | 786 - - 202 | 461 - - 209 |
| § 69 - . . 137 | $824 . \quad$ - 69 | 461 (761) - 180 |
| § 83 . . 7 | 835 . . 114 | 759 (761) - 37, 93 |
| § 90 . . . 162 | 865. . 191 | 964 - - 211 |
| § 110 . . 118 | 905 - . 157 | 1187 • • 179 |
| § $123.0 . \quad .99$ | $907.157,221$ | 1350 - - 20 |
| § 147 . . 120 | 918 . . 202 | 1375 - - 110 |
| §17\% . . . 185 | 930.43 | 1494 . - 83 |
| §248 . . 227 | 979 11, 51, 105 | 1608 - 69 |
| Aeschiylus. | 1004. - 181 | 1679 Eccles. 236 • . $\begin{array}{r}34 \\ 194\end{array}$ |
| Agam 15 . . 202 | 1051. . . 175 | 297 . . 79 |
| 37. . 105 | Sept. 38 . . 184 | 495 . 68 |
| 160 . . 135 | Sept. 195. | Equit. 112.082 |
| 253 . . 198 | $250 \cdot{ }^{\text {c }} 37,187$ | 696. . 25 |
| 340 - . 62 | 253 . . 209 | 698 . . 105 |
| 584. - 188 | 429 . . 33 | Lysistr. 450 . 234 |
| 620 . . 106 | 462 . . - 23 | 511. |
| 857 . . 5 | 712 . . 220 | Nubes, 5 . . 63 |
| 944 - 92, 93 | 720 . . 86 | 63 . ${ }^{7}$ |
| 1041 . . 35 | 754 . . 35 | 116 . . 51, 118 |
| 1067 . . 211 | 790 . . 86 | 125 . . 6 |
| 1079 . . 195 | 037 . . 221 | 229 - . 112 |
| 1170 . . 202 | 1048 . . 211 | 268 - . 209 |
| 1435 . 128 | 1057 . . 184 | 296 - 186, 187 |
| Cnoeph. 246 - . 178 | Suppl. $499 . \quad . \quad 45$ | $340 \quad \text {. } 221$ |
| ${ }^{594}$ - 106 | Andocides. | $\begin{aligned} & 367 \\ & 370 \end{aligned} \cdot \quad \begin{aligned} & 185 \\ & 293 \end{aligned}$ |
| Eum. 298 573 691. 69 | Myst. 1, 6, 38: § 4368 | 370 <br> 439 <br> - . <br> 126 |
| $691 . .201$ |  | 493 . . 83 |
| $800 . .181$ |  | $505 . .186$ |
| Pers. 912 . . 184 | De Caed. Herod. | 520 . . 174 |
| Prorn 10.69 | p. 131, 36. § 19 . 126 | 535 . . 156 |
| 152 . . 72 | 133, 40.§ 87.7 | 613 . . 181 |



1 p. $9,3, \$ 1$. 172

| 9, 17. § 2 | 80 | 67, 20. \$8 | 139 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10, 1. §2 | 137 | 68, 12. § 11 | 206 |
| 12, 3. § 10 | 23, 203 | 69, 6.§ 13 | 13 |
| 12, 22. § 12 | - 12 | 70, 25. § 20 | 114 |
| 13, 16. 15. | 140 | 70, 25. § 20 |  |
| 13, 25. § 15 | 191 | to 71,12 | 15, 53 |
| 13, 27. § 16. | 12 | 71, 4. § 20 | 63 |
| 14, 6. § 17 | 234 | 72, 25. § 29 | 62 |
| 15, 6. § 20 | 122 | 74, 24. § 37 | 140 |
| 15, 22. § 22 | 154 | III. p. 110, 1 ¢ 1 | 208 |

I. ․ 15, 28. § 23 . 198
$16,3 . \$ 23.188$
16, 25. § $26 \quad 51,118$
II. p. 20, 12. § $8 \quad 159$ 20,18 . § 8 113, 157 20, 27. § 9 45, 131 21, 1. § 10 - 45 21, 10. § 11137 21, 20. § $12 \quad 10,108$ 23,14 . § $18 \quad 47$ 23, 27. § 20 - 189 23, 29. § $20 \quad 194$ 24, 12. § 22 - 196 24, 23. § 23120 25, 2. § 24 - 120 25, 19.§ 26141 25, 24. § 26 - 188 III. p. 28, 5. § 1. 197 29, 18. § 3 • 197 30,10 § 671 31,1 § 9 - 42 31, 11. § $10 \quad 181$ 32, 16. § 14 - 111 34, 8. § $20 \quad 216$ 34,17 . § 21 - 15 $35,1 . \$ 23 \quad 216$ 35,18 . § 25 . 23 Philipp.
I. p. $40,1 . \$ 1$ - 144 40,9. 1 . 95 $40,18 . \$ 2$ - 83 41, 3. § 3 • 134
41, 18. §5 - 95
42, 1. § 6 . 10, 130
$43,12$. § 11 - 119
$44,12$. § 15.111
44,25 . 17 - 49
44,30 . 18 . 107
45, 27. § 21 • 128
47,24. § 27 . 135
51, 19. § 39 • 128
52, 17.§43. 120
53,4 . § 44 - 184
54, 18. §50 . 161
54, 20. §50 - 103
54, 22. §50. 44
54, 27. §51 • 131
$55,6 \& 7 . \S 51$ 126, 174
II, p. 66, 15. § 3 70, 140
67,20. § 8139
68, 12. § $11 \quad 206$
69,6. § $13 \quad 13$
70, 25. § $20 \quad 114$
$\left.\begin{array}{l}0,25 . \\ \text { to } 71,12\end{array}\right\} 15,53$
71, 4. §20 63
74, 24. 37140
III. p. 110, 1 § 1208

| III. p. 114, 15. § 15 | 17 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 114, 20.§ 15 | 17 |
| 122, 21. § 40 | 217 |
| 123, 1. § 46 | 183 |
| 123, 16. § 48 | 60 |
| 124, 25. \$ 54 | 84 |
| 124, 24. § 54 | 155 |
| 125, 10. § 56 | 80 |
| 126, 19. § 61 | 194 |
| 128, 22.§ 69 | 27, 130 |
| 128, 25.§ 69 | 80 |
| 129, 14. § 71 | 112 |
| 130, 11. § 75 | 184 |
| 130, 14.§ 75 | 82 |

## De Corona.

p. 225, 13. § 1 - 227

232, 20. § 22 . 221
234, 5. § 26 - 161
254, 6. § 26 - 197
234, 26. § 28 - 214
236, 12. § 32 - 75
236, 19. § 33 . 28
236, 20. § 33 . 31, 240
$\begin{array}{ll}236,28 . & 34 \\ 240,15 . & 43 \\ 241\end{array} \quad 113$
241, 15. § 47 - 187
242, 10. § 49 - 111
243, 6. 53 - 195
246, 1. §63 • 98
251, 28. § 79 - 95
257, 25. 95 - 215
$\begin{array}{lll}260,2 . \$ 101 \\ 268,23 . & 123 . \\ & 36\end{array}$
268, 28. 124 - 183
274, 28. 141. 119
276, 1. § 145 - 115
276, 23. § 148. 163
284, 21. § 169 • 151
291, 27. 190. 15

| 291, 28. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 295, 13. | 201. | 119 |

296, 24. § 206 - 117
301, 28. § 220. 213
302, 24. § 223 - 117
304, 1. \$228. 111
$\begin{aligned} & 313,4 . \$ 258 \\ & 313,6 . \$ 258 \\ & 32\end{aligned} \quad . \quad 58$
327, 1. § 303 - 5
331, 30.§322. 223
De Falsa Legatione.
p. 341, 12. § $1 \quad$ - 71

341, 14. §2 - 20
342, 2. § 3 - 42
$342,10 . ई 3$ - 20
342, $25 . \S 5$ - 22C
342, 28. § 6 • 22
345,14 . § 14 51, 134
345, 27. § 16 20,42
347, 26. § 2122,158

| p. 350, 3. § 29 - 134 | De Rhodiis. | I, p. 828, 25, 26. § 49 29, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 351, 4. ¢ 32 - 6 | p. 197, 9. § 23 . 88 | 152 |
| 351, 18. §33 - 168 | De Meralopol. | 829, 28. f 52 - 104 |
| 352, 26. §37 . 158 | p. 202, 24. 4 . 52 | 830, 8. § 53 - 120 |
| 353, 14 \& 18. § 39158 | $\begin{array}{rc}\text { p. 20, 24. } \\ \text { 203, } 2 . & 5 \\ 5\end{array}$ | 831, 5. § 56 - 165 |
| 353, 24. §40 49 | 207, 5. \$19 . 75 | 831, 10-12.§56 59, |
| 354, 8. § 411161 | 207, \% 19 * 10 | 62, 158 |
| 355, 17. § 45 - 79 | In Leptinem. | 833, 12-19. § 63 95 |
| 355, 29. § 47 . 197 | p. 495, 20. § 127 . 221 | 834, 18. § 66 . 155 |
| 356, 10. § 48 . 158 | 49t, 8. § 129 . 113 | 834, 24, 25.§67 104, |
| 356, 13. § 48 . 157 | 505, 9. §157 . 74 | 83,22, 123 |
| 357, 3. §51 - 64 | 505, 19. § 158.193 | II, p. 837, 10. § 5 . 218 |
| $360,10 . \$ 61$. 240 | In Midiam. | 837, 11. §5 72 |
| 364, 11 \& 12. § $74 \quad 88$, | $\text { p. 522, 18. §24 . } 196$ | 839, 29. § 14.218 |
| 364, 18.845 | p. 525, 3. § 33 • 98 | 842, 9. § 20 176 |
| 364, 18. § 7445 | 525, 11. § 34 - 27 | 842, 14, 15. § 21 49, |
| $364,25.875 .215$ | 530, 10. \$49 . 214 | 84, 104 |
| $369,12 . \$ 88$ - 183 | 535, 15. §64 . 126 | 842, 16. § 21.126 |
| 370, 22. § 94 - 79 | 536, 1. \$66 161 | III, p. 846, 15. § 5123 |
| 372, 1. §99 - 84 | 536, 25. § 69 - 123 | 849, 24. § 1772 |
| $378,4 . \% 120 . \quad 155$ | 548, 17. § 104. | 852, 12. § 25 204 |
| 378, 23. § 122 - 151 | 548,20 § 104 . 161 | In Onetorein I. |
| 379, 2. § 123 • $\begin{array}{r}\text { 379 } \\ 379\end{array}$ | $548,24 . \$ 105 . \quad 168$ | p. 865, 24. § 7 - 163 |
| $379,7 . \$ 123$ <br> $879,15 \& 17 . \$ 124$ <br> 13 | 563, 26. § 151 • 77 | p. $867,1$. § $10 . \quad 20$ |
| -79, 15 心17.§124 158 | 582, 2. \$209. 210 | 869, 9 \& 10. § 19 153, |
| 381, 5.§129 . 17 | 82, 15. §211 • 181 | 164 |
| 381, 10.§ 130 15, 158 | In Androtionem. | 869, 12. § 20 153, 239 |
| $387,6 . \$ 148$ - 15 | p. $593,14 . \$ 2$. 151 | 869, 18. § 20 - 50 |
| 387, 17.§149 . 199 | 596, 17. § 11 • 72 | $870,11 . \$ 23$ - 151 |
| 358, 4. § 150 . 14 | 598, 20. §17 - 113 | 870, 27. §25 - 161 |
| 388, 9. § 151 . 27 | $600,5 . \$ 22$ - 137 | 873, 8. § 33 - 24 |
| 388, 17. § 151 . 165 | 611, 10.§59 - 151 | 873, 10.§33 . 211 |
| 390, 5. § $156 . \quad 64$ | 613, 3. § 64 - 183 | In Zenothemin. |
| 392, 13. § 163 - 202 | In Aristocratem. | $\text { p. } 886,1 . \S 14 \quad .34,223$ |
| $396,30 . § 177 \quad 24,160$ | p. 623, 11. § 7 - 49, 73 | In Apaturium. |
| $402,8 . \$ 195$  <br> $409,25 . \$ 221 . ~$ 188 | p.624, 20. $12 \cdot 162$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In Apaturium. } \\ & \text { p. } 900,22 . \S 25 \end{aligned} 199$ |
| $409,25 . \$ 221 . ~$ <br> $410,18 . \$ 223$ <br> 199 | $\begin{array}{lll}627,21 . \\ 629,22 \\ \text { 2. } 26\end{array} \quad . \quad 193$ | p. 900, 22. $903,22 . § 34$ 34 • 142 |
| 410, 28. § 223 . 23 | $635,15 . \$ 48$. 127 | In Phaenippum. |
| 412, 21. § 229 31, 197 | 638, 25. §58 . 232 | p. 1040, 20.§5 . 40 |
| 416, 7. § 240 182, 183 | $640,10 . \$ 62$ - 74 |  |
| 416, 11. § 249 - 166 | 641, 9. \$64 - 228 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In Olympiodorum. } \\ & \text { p. } 1172, \text { 1. } \$ 16 \quad .165 \end{aligned}$ |
| 419, 28. \$250. 74 | $659,15 . \$ 117$. 37 | p. 1172, 1. § 16 • 165 <br> In Timotheum. |
| 434, 6. §289 - 86 | $676,12 . \$ 167$ - 202 | In Timotheum. ${ }_{\text {d }}$ |
| 439, 3. § 305 - 15 | 683, 22. § 188 - 197 | p. 1194, 13. § 35 - 165 |
| 439, 29. § 309 - 141 | 688,27.§205 . 201 | 1194, 20.§ $35 \quad 58,158$ |
| 441, 21. $4512 \cdot 59$ |  | 1201, 19. §58 - 101 |
| 450, 27. §342 - 60 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In Timocratem. } \\ & \text { p. } 702,26 . \$ 9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | In Polyclem. |
| De Pace. | ¢11, 8. §35 - 118 | p. 1210, 5. § 12 . 224 |
| F 62, 10.§ 20 199, 201 | 721, 6. §64 . 22 | 1223, 20,21. §55 29, |
| De Chersoneso. | 733, 20.§ 106.75 | $151,239$ |
| p 90, 1. § 1 - 98 | In Aristog. I. | 1227, 2. § 67 • 165 |
| 92, 21. § 11 - 198 | p. 773, 1. § 11 • 87 | De Coron. Trieraroh. $\text { p. } 1228,28 . § 3 \quad . \quad 98$ |
| $98,25 . \$ 35$ - 205 | In Aphobum. | p. 1228, 28.§ 3 - 98 |
| 89, 14. § 38 - 79 | I, p. 813, 4.§1 . 205 | In Enbu!idem. |
| De Symmoris. | I, 813, 20.§s 205 | p. 1299, 4. 1 . 230 |
| p 178, 17. § 2 - 44 | 814, 4. § 3 . 123 | 1300, 8. \$ . 58 |
| 182, 3. § 14. . 225 | 828, 23. § 48 49 | 1303, 2 § 14 - 150 |






| In Philocr. | Apol. 42 A . . 191 | rg. 479 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| p. 182, § 12 - . 20 | Charm. 156 A - 160 | 479 A . 86 |
| 182, § 13 - 37 |  | 479 C. 12, 206 |
| Meninder. | 171 E • 127 | 481 A 482 A . . ${ }^{76}$ 226 |
| Col. Fr. 6 . - 46 | Cratyl. 385 B . 178 | 483 C - 189 |
| Frag. Incert 41. 19 | 396 C - 144 | 484 D . . 221 |
| Dlonos. 45 , . 36 | 396 E - 208 | 486 B . 52 |
| 387 - • 197 | 401 D . 21 | 487 D . 35, 74 |
| 397 - . 37 | 430 E - 83 | 489 C - 5 |
|  | 436 B - 83 | 499 C . 208 |
| Mimnermus. | 436 B . 87 | 500 C . 215 |
| L, 2 . . 51, 174 | Crit. 43 B . . 70 | 502 B . . 223 |
| Nof. Testam. |  | 503 A - 74 |
| $\text { Matth. XI, } 3 \text {. . } 6$ | $\begin{array}{r}44 \mathrm{D} \\ 45 \mathrm{~B}\end{array} \cdot \quad . \quad 177$ | $506 \mathrm{~B} \cdot$ - 144 |
| NXVI, 24.097 | 45 B 46 A. 4 | 506 C <br> 515 B . . |
| Luc. IX, 40 • • 78 | 46 B . . 194 | 516 E . - 94 |
| Joh. XIII, 34 - 78 | 47 D . . 8 | 516 E . . 112 |
|  | 48 C - - 114 | 617 B - 208 |
| Frag. Incert. 2946 | 49 A <br> $49 \mathrm{~B} \cdot \quad$. <br> 534 | 522 E - - 86 |
| Pind | 50 A - . 159 | 525 E . . 227 |
| 01. XI( X), 34 . 67 | 50 B - . 171 | Hipp. Maj. |
| O1. XIII, 92 • 145 | 51 B - . 217 | - 301 A - 20 |
| XIV, 30. . 68 | $51 \mathrm{E} \cdot \mathrm{C} 14$ | Ion. 535 B . . 139 |
| Pyth. VII, 20 . 45 | $52 \mathrm{C} \cdot{ }^{52}$ - 14 | Lach. 194 A . 120 |
| IX, 196 - 211 | $52 \mathrm{D} \cdot$. 14 | 196 C - 83 |
| Nem. VII, 25 . 45 | 52 D • • 14 | Leg. IV, $712 \mathrm{E} \quad 55$ |
| VII, 68 . 56 | Critias, 108 C - 46 | V, 736 B - 22 |
| Isthm. IV, 16 - 105 | Euthydem. | VI, 759 E - 209 |
| Plato. | 272 E - - 227 | XI, $902 \mathrm{D} \cdot$ N |
| Alcib. I, 115 B . 224 | 275 E <br> 275 E . . ${ }^{161}$ | XIL, 959 B . 73 |
| Apol. 17 C . . 181 | $276 \mathrm{E}^{\text {- }}$ • 161 | Lys. 210 D . . 200 |
| 17 D . . 127 | 278 D . . 21 | 214 E - 129 |
| 18 C . . 116 | 283 C - 75 | 215 B • - 126 |
| 20 B . 168 | 283 E . . 222 | 215 B . 129 |
| 21 A - . 151 | 290 A - 113 | 218 D . . 84 |
| 21 B . 38 | 295 C . . 146 | Men. 74 B - . 119 |
| 21 B . . 151 | 296 D . 174 | 79 D . . 231 |
| 21 C . . 151 | 9296 E . 5170 | 89 B . . 73 |
| 21 D - 124, 125 |  | 89 E - . 123 |
| 22 B . . 47 | 302 A . 129 | 92 C . 129 |
| 25 B . . 88 | 302 B . 142 | Menex. 239 B . 196 |
| 25 B . 117 | 302 D . . 184 | 245 A - 142 |
| 28 E . . 119 | 305 D - 199 | Phaed. 58 A . . 5 |
| 28 E - 203 | Euthyphr. | 58 E . 141 |
| 29 A - - 189 | 4 E . . 82 | $59 \mathrm{D} . \quad 29,131$ |
| 29 C . - 56 | 12 D . 101 | 59 D . 144 |
| 29 C - . 207 | 13 D . . 61 | 60 A . . 171 |
| 80 C . - 60 | 14 A - 61 | 60 C . 35 |
| 32 D . 95 | 14 C . . 95 | 62 C . . 145 |
| $36 \mathrm{~B} . \quad . \quad 222$ | 15 D . 40,50 | 63 A . 217 |
| 36 C - . 40 | Gorg. 447 D . . 101 | 66 E . . 233 |
| 37 B . . 42 | 450 D . 207 | 68 B . 105 |
| 37 C . . 137 | 457 E . . 86 | 70 A . . 81 |
| 39 A . 83 | 461 E . 218 | 71 C . 198 |
| 39 A . . 206 | 462 E . . 83 | 72 C . . 51 |
| 40 B . . 219 | 476 D . 189 | 72 D . 191 |

$\begin{array}{rrrrr}\text { Phaed. } 73 \mathrm{~A} & & . & 94 \\ 84 \mathrm{E}\end{array}, \quad . \begin{array}{r}84 \\ 90 \mathrm{D}\end{array}$.
Phaedr. 227 D . 141 228 A - 92 228 E
$228 \mathrm{E} .{ }_{2}{ }_{2} 83$
203 229 A . 204 230 A
232 B $\quad \begin{array}{r}8 \\ 27\end{array}$ 232 E . 146 251 B . 199 257 C. 81 263 E - 183 266 A . 145 276 A . 194 279 C . 174

$\begin{array}{cc}\text { Phileb. } 13 \text { A. } \\ 15 \text { D } & 82 \\ & 183\end{array}$ | $15 \mathrm{D} . \quad 183$ |
| :--- |
| 39 C |

Politic. 264 A . 191
Protag. 313 A . 101 314 C . 225 316 C
$318 \mathrm{D} \cdot$
226 320 A - 211 328 B • 45 329 B
$332 \mathrm{D} . \quad 107$
3 335 C . 173 835 D . 173 338 C - 207 338 C . 221
De Republica. I, 327 C. . . 115 327 C . . 232 328 C . . 228
329 A . . 220
330 A . . 157
337 A . . 163
337 A . . 78
337 E - - 78
339 A . . 78
841 B . . 184
352 E . . 64
354 B . . 201
II, 358 B . . 115 858 C . . 221




| VI, $\begin{array}{r}18 \\ 18\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 63 \\ 190,199 \end{array}$ | VII, 70 • • . $\begin{array}{r}23 \\ 70 .\end{array}$ | I, 10,6 | $\begin{array}{r} 228 \\ -\quad 81 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | . 6 | $71 . .47,109$ | 10, 16 | 158 |
| 20 | 174 | 72. . . 23 | 10, 16 | - 160 |
| 21 | 105 | 77 . . 87 | 10, 17 | 155 |
| 25 | 233 | 80. . 164 | II, 1, 3 | - 152 |
| 29 | 169 | 84 - . 81, 197 | 1, 4 | 95 |
| 80 | 61 | $85 . . .219$ | 1,6 | - 204 |
| 31 | 7 | VIII, 9 - . 169 | 1,8 | 156 |
| 31 | 74 | $25 . . .600$ | 1, 10. | - 146,157 |
| 37 | 59 | 45. - 226 | 1,21 | . 232 |
| 38 | 60 | $55 . . .42$ | 1, 23 . | 151 |
| 50 | 203 | 65 - . 234 | 2,12 | - 184 |
| 50 | 234 | $66 . . .108$ | 2, 21 . | -11, 151 |
| 54 | 78, 192 | $68 \ldots$. 8,214 | 3, 6 | - 163 |
| 57 | 42 | $70 .$. | 3, 10 . | 206 |
| 58 | 211 | 71 - - 60 | 3,11 | 201 |
| 59 | 216 | 74. - 42 | 3,13. | - . 194 |
| 61 | - 34 | Tyrtaeus. | 3, 18 | . 58, 158 |
| 61 | 42 | XII 35 109 | 3, 19 . | . 159 |
| 61 | - 146 | XII, 35 . - . 109 | 3,20 | 33 |
| 61 | 165 | Xenophon. | 3,24. | - 143 |
| 66 | - - 60 | Anabasis. | 3,25 |  |
| 74 | - ${ }^{7}$ | I, 1, 1. . . 6 | 3, 29 . | - 27,128 |
| 75 | - • 32 | I, 1, $1,2 . . . \quad 25$ | 4,5 | - 44 |
| 77 | - $\quad 68$ | $1,3 . . . .25$ | 4,5 | - . 214 |
| 78 | - 98 | 1,3 . . 220 | 4,17 | . 26,67 |
| 82 | 208 | 1, 5 . . . 132 | 4, 19. | 117 |
| 88 | - 206 | $1,6 \times .$. | 4,22 | 29 |
| 96 | 36 | 1,10 . . . 111 | 4,22. | - . 214 |
| 96 | 71 | 2, 1 . . . 218 | 5, 13 | 56 |
| 100 | 115 | 2, 1. . . . 220 | 5,14. | 64 |
| 102 | 158 | 2,2 . . . ${ }^{2} \times$ | 5, 16 | 69 |
| F4, 1 | 111 | 2,21 . . . 152 | 5, 27 . | - 162 |
| 2 | 34 | 3,6 • . 62 | 5, 27 | - 230 |
| 5 | 87 | 3,6 . . 63,232 | 6,12. | - 28,131 |
| 6 | 23, 61 | 3,8 . . 220 | 6, 21 | - 10,67 |
| 10 | 109 | 3,14. . . 229 | III, 1, 2 | 154 |
| 11 | - 42 | 3,15 . . 232 | 1,13 | 199 |
| 13 | 111 | 3,17. . . 35 | 1,14 | 43 |
| 15 | - 232 | 3,17 . . 52, 86 | 1, 16 | - 146 |
| 17 | 87 | 4,7. 115,168 | 1,20 | . 199 |
| 21 | 42 | 4,12 \& 13 . 162 | 1,38 | 29 |
| 23 | 213 | 4,18 . . 70 | 1,38 | 52 |
| 24 | 219 | 4,18 . . 150 | 1,40 | 29 |
| 27 | 167 | 5,9 . . . 231 | 2, 9 | 161 |
| 28 | 111 | 5,13 . . 23 | 2, 10 | 223 |
| 34 | 206 | 6,2 . . . 199 | 2, 25 | 26 |
| 39 | 80 | 6,8 . . 171 | 2,27 | - 9,67 |
| 42 | 59 | 7,3 . . . 79 | 2, 29 | . 25 |
| 44 | - 224 | 7,3 . . 218 | 2, 36 | - 52 |
| 45 | 43 | 7,7. - . 155 | 3, 12 | - . 152 |
| 47 | 159 | 8,12 - . 19 | 4, 8 | - 142 |
| 48 | 134 | 8,13. . . 75 | 4,29 | - 81 |
| 50 | 211 | 9,10 . . 166 | 4,49 | 122, 142 |
| 56 | 42 | 9,13 . . . 132 | 5,3 | - 81 |
| 59 | 168 | 9,21 . . 67 | 5, 7 | 206 |
| 60 | 168 | 9,27 . . . 132 | 5, 11 | 199 |
| 61 | 61 | 10,4 . . 220 | 5, 13 | 152 |
| B7 | 75 | 10,5 . . 11, 155 | 5,18 | 167 |


| 1V, 1.5 , , $\begin{array}{r}194 \\ 1,61\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{I}, 4,23 \\ 4,25\end{aligned} . \quad . \quad . \quad 146$ | V, 2, 12 . . . $\begin{array}{r}82,85 \\ 2,22\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2,4 . . 142 | 5,12 . . . 197 | 3,13 . . . 51 |
| 2,10 . . 110 | 5,13 . . 128 | 3,27 . . 103 |
| 4,6 - . 207 | 5,14 • - 74 | 3,55. . 29, 130 |
| 5,13 . . 108 | 6,3 . . 129 | 3,55 . . 108 |
| 5,30 . . 29, 145 | 6,7 . . . 76 | 4, 17 . . . 40 |
| 6,10 • - 75 | 6,7 - . 138 | 4,30 . . 103 |
| 8,7 • - 157 | 6,10 - - 80 | 4,35. . . 108 |
| 8,14 - . 201 | 6,18 - . 63 | 5,13 . . 9, 103 |
| V, 1, 1 . . 161 | 6,18 - . 227 | 5,21. - . 121 |
| 1,9 - . 117 | 6,19 . . 135 | 5,34 - . 94 |
| 2,17 . . 162 | 6,22 . . . 52 | VI, 1, 21 . . 43 |
| 3,1 . - . 126 | 6,28 - 160 | 1,26 . . 225 |
| 4,16 - . 223 | 6,32 . . . 201 | 1,40 - . 20 E |
| 6,3 - . . 223 | II, 1, 8 . . 28, 105 | 2,30 - . 85 |
| 6,22 - . 79 | 1,9 . . . 119 | 2,39 . . 14 |
| 7,5. . . 145 | 1,21 . . 68 | 3,19 . . 207 |
| 7,26 . . 20,81 | 1,30 . . 137 | 4,17 - . 205 |
| VI, 1, 17 . - 76 | 1,31 • - 129 | VII, 1, 10 - . 47, 131 |
| 1,19 - . 7 | 2,3 - . - 88 | 2,19 - . 150 |
| 1,25 . . 163 | 2,8 . . 167 | 3,3 - . 171 |
| 1,26 . . 165 | 2,9 . . . 167 | 3,7 . . 167 |
| 1,28 . . 83 | 2,16 - . 220 | 3,13 . . 184 |
| 1,29 . . 157 | 2,20 . . 224 | 3,17 . . 77 |
| 4,9 . . . 126 | 3,5 . . 27 | 5,6 . . 142 |
| 5,6 • - 132 | 4,7. - 29, 150 | 5,73 - . 214 |
| 6,24 . . 230 | 4,10 . . 135 | 5,81 . . 69 |
| 6,25 . . 161 | 4,12. . . 68 | 5,82 . . 31 |
| VII, 1, 2 . . 218 | 4,17 . . 52 | 5,82 . . 80 |
| 1,7 - . 203 | 4,23 . - . 199 | VIII, 1, 5 - . 179 |
| 1,16 . . 162 | 4,31 . . 138 | 1,10 . 40 |
| 1,33 . . 39 | III, 1, $1 . \quad . \quad 86$ | 1,10 . . 161 |
| 3,11 . 9,103 | 1,1 • . 113 | 1,43 . 40, 74 |
| 3,13 - . 154 | 1,3 . . 39, 161 | 1,44 - 75, 144 |
| 3,43 . . 35 | 1,8 . . 68,171 | 2,21 . 110 |
| 4,2 . . 69 | 1,9 . . 199 | 2,25 . . 195 |
| 6,21 - . 97 | 2,1 • . 163 | 8, $5 . \quad$ - 196 |
| 7,11 . . 11, 105 | 2,8. - . 184 | 3,42 - 189 |
| 7,31 . - 81 | 2,12 • - 211 | 4,16 155, 156 |
| 7,65 . - 164 | 2, 13 • 77, 103 | 5,12 . - 137 |
| Cyropaedia. | 2,15 • - 218 | 5,28 - 224 |
| I, 1,2 . . . 130 | 2,25 • - 216 | 7,15 - - 86 |
| 2,1 . . 32, 158 | 2,26 • • 41 | 7,23 - 114 |
| 2,1 . . . 205 | 3, 31 - • 199 | 7,25 - - 62 |
| 2,2 . . 45,109 | 3,60 • - 211 | 7,27 - 206 |
| 2,8 . . . 145 | IV, 1, 1 . . 163 | Hellenica |
| 2,8 . . 206 | 1,18 • - 77 | $\mathrm{I}, 1,16$. . . 2 3 3 |
| 2,16 . . . 94 | 2,7 - . 22 | 6,7. . . 162 |
| 3,1 . 197218 | 3,10 • - 211 | 6,32 . . . 185 |
| 3,3 . . . 219 | 3,11 - . 206 | 7,5. . . 153 |
| $3,5 \& 6$ | 8,15 • - 33 | 7,26 . . . 221 |
| 3,9 . . . 210 | 4,4 - 11, 152 | 7,28 - . 203 |
| 3,11 . . 143 | 5,15 • - 206 | II, 1, 4 . . . 151 |
| 3,18 . . . 83 | 5,37 • - 144 | 1,6 • 217 |
| 4,2 . . 81 | 5,46 - . 197 | 3,2. 39, 137, 138 |
| 4,7 . . . 168 | V, 1, 3 - . 227, 228 | 3, 11 . 39, 188, 207 |
| 4,13 - . 155 | 1,25 . . 202 | 3,51 - - 130 |
| 4,14 - 145, 168 | 2,9 . . . 81 | 4, 1 . 225 |
| 4,21 - . 168 | 2,9 . . 212 | 4,8 . - . 206 |
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## N. B. The figures refer to Pages.

Absolute, Genitive, 222, 225, 232 ; Accusative, 224, 825.
Antecedent, defnite or indefinite, 121, 122, 123-125.
Aorist, Indicative, 24. Distinguished from Imperf., 7, 8, 21. Of verbs denoting a state or condition, 24. Used for Perf. or Pluperf., 25. Expressing a momentary action just taking place, 25. In epistles, 25. In Final clauses, 72. In Protasis and Apodosis (implying nonfulfilment of condition), 93-102; how distinguished from Imperf., 94,96 (b); how from Pluperf., 96 (b). With àv in Apod., 56, 93-96; rarely referring to present time, 101. Gnomic, 45 ; with $\pi$ od-入áкıs or $\ddot{\eta} \delta \eta, 46$; in Hom. similes, 46 ; a primary tense, 49 ; see Aor. Inf. Iterative, w. $\alpha \nu, 47$; iterative forms in $-\sigma \kappa \circ \nu$, $-\sigma \kappa o ́ \mu \eta \nu(w . a ̃ \nu$, in Hdt.), 47, 48.
——, in dependent moods, $25-36$. How distinguished from Present, 8 (R.). See Contents, Chap. If. ; and Subj., Opt., Imperat., and Infin.
--, Subjunctive, 26-28. As Fut. Perf., after è $\pi \epsilon \iota \delta a ́ v$, \&c., 26. How distinguished from Perf. Subj., 28. With $\mu \dot{\eta}$ in prohibitions, 180. With oú $\mu \dot{\eta}, 184$.
——, Optative, 28-30. After $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$, \&c., 29. In indirect quotations and questions, 29,30 ; ambiguity of, in indirect questions, 30.
——, Imperative, 30. Rarely used in prohibitions (for Aor. Subj.), 181.
—, Infinitive, with indef. time, 30-32. After $\chi \rho a ́ \omega, \theta \in \sigma \pi i \zeta \omega, \& c$., 31 ; see Present. After aitoós cipl, 32. In indirect quotation, referring to the past, 32, 33. Osed for the Futare: after verbs of hoping, promising, \&c., 32 ; after verbs of thinking, saying, \&c., 33. After $\lambda$ éq. and cirov, to command, 34. Primary or secondary tesse, 53. In a gnomic
sense, 46, 47. With $a v$ in a podosis, 60, 113, 114, 157 ; see "A $\nu$.
——, Participle, 34-36. With $\lambda a \nu \theta \dot{v} \nu \omega$, $\phi \theta a \dot{v} \omega, \& c$, coinciding with the verb in time, 34 ; with $\pi \epsilon \rho \frac{\rho \rho a ́ \omega, ~ \& c ., ~ 35 . ~ W i t h ~}{\text {. }}$
 tic Per., 223. With éбoнat, as periphr. Fut. Perf., 44. Primary or secondary tense, 54. As protasis, equiv. to Aor. Ind., Subj., or Opt., 110, 217. With à in apodosis (never in protasis), E3, 113, 114, 159 ; see "A $\nu$.
Apodosis, defined, 87, 125 ; see Protasis.
Assimilation in conditioual Relative clauses, 135, 136.

Causal sentences, 171-173; ses Contents, Chap. IV, Sect. V. Introduced by Relatives, 141; negative particle in, 142. Expressed by Participles, 216 ; by Part W. $\dot{\omega}, 219,220$.

Caution, verbs of ; sec Fear.
Conditional sentences, 110-121; see Contents, Chap. IV, Sect. II. Cond. Relative sentences, 125-137.

Danger, expressions of ; see Fear.
Dative after Verbals in -тéos, 233, 234.
Dependence of moods and tenses, 4854.

Direct Quotations, distinguished from Indirect, 147 ; introduced by öть, 171.

Exhortations, Imperative in, 178. Subj. in, 179. Opt. in (poet.), 175. Fut. Ind. in, ш. д̈т

Fear, caution, and danger, expressions of, $80-87$. Followed by $\mu \eta$ w. Subj. or Opt., 80, see Object clauses ; by $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ซ. Fut. Ind. (seldom), 82 ; by $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ w. Pres. and Past tenses of Indic., 83-85; by $\dot{\omega}$ or öm $\pi \omega$. lndic. (as in indir discourse),

85 ; by Fut. Inf., 85 ; by ei, whether, ö $\pi \omega \varsigma$, how, \&c., 85 ; by a causal sentence with äтL, 86 ; by Infin., 86, 87, 190
Final clauses (pure), after iva, is, $\quad \ddot{\pi} \omega \varsigma$, öфра, and $\mu \dot{\eta}, 67-73$; distinguished from object clauses, \&c., 66, 67. Subj. and Opt. in, 67. Fut. Ind. in, 68. Subj. in, after secondary tenses, 70. Secondary tenses of Indic. in, 72. 'Av or кé in : with Subj.. 69 ; w. Opt., 69, 70.
Final an'l Ubject clauses w. ö $\pi \omega$ s and $0 \pi \omega s$ $\mu \dot{\eta}_{\text {, }}$ after verbs of striving, effecting, \&c., 73-80. Fut. Ind. in, 73, 74. Subj. or Opt. in, 73, 74; Fut. Opt. 74, 39. ${ }^{\circ}$ О $\pi \omega s$ $\alpha_{\alpha} \nu$ w. Subj. in, 「6. Homeric construction $\ln , 76,77$. M $\eta$ ' (without öт $\omega$ s) in, 77. ' $\Omega$ s for $0 \pi \omega \mathrm{~s}$ in, 77. After verbs of exhorting, forbidding, \&c , 77, 78; rarely introduced by iva, 78 ; see iva. ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \pi \omega$ s or öпus $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ W. Fut. Ind., by ellipsis of the leading verb, 78 ( $\mathrm{N} .7, a$ ) ; $\mu \eta$ 'alone in prohibitions, 79 (N. 7,b). Second Aor. Subj. Act. and Mid. preferred in, 79 ; Dawes's Canon, 79, 80. See Object clauses after $\mu \eta^{\prime}$.
Finite moods, 1.
Future, Indicative, 36-38. In gnomic sense, 36. Expressing a general truth hereafter to be recognized, 36. Like mild imperative, 37. In prohibitions w. $\mu \dot{\eta}$, 37, 79. In Final clauses, w. ö $\pi \omega$, ó $\phi \rho \alpha$, $\mu \dot{\eta}, 68$. With $\ddot{\circ} \pi \omega$ s or $\ddot{\circ} \pi \omega \bar{s} \mu \dot{\eta}$, after verbs of striving, effecting, \&c. 73. With önws or ö $\pi \omega s \mu \dot{y}$, in exhortations and prohibitions (sc. $\sigma \kappa o ́ \pi \epsilon \iota$ ), 78. With $\mu \eta$, after verbs of fearing, 82. In Protasis w. $\epsilon i$ : expressing a future condition, 103 ; expr. a present intention, \&c., 93. In Rel. clanses expr. a purpose, 137. With ov $\mu \dot{\eta}, 184$ 157. With ăv: in Homer, 55 ; in Attic, 56. Periphrastic form of, w. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega, 38$.
, Optative, in indirect quotation, 38. After व̈лшь or ö $\pi \omega$ s $\mu \dot{\eta}, 39-41,73,74$.
——. Infinitive, 41-43. After verbs of sxying, thinking, \&e., in iudirect quotation, 41. For Pres. or Aor. Inf., after verbs of wishing, \&c., after $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$, and even in other constructions, 42. Regularly used after verbs of hoping, \&c., 43. With äv (rarely), 60. Primary or secondary tense, 53 .
——, Participle, 43. Expressing a purpose, 217, 214. With ä $\nu$ (rarely), 60. Irimary or secondary terse, 53 .
Future Perfect, 1ndicative, 42-45. Compound forms of: Perf. Part. w. є́бoual, 44 ; rarely Aor. Part. w. є̈ $\sigma \circ \mu \alpha, 44,215$.

Often nearly $=$ Fut., 44 In the depend ent moods, 44.

General and particular suppositions, how distinguished, 88, 89.
Genitive Absolute, 222, 225, 232.
Gnomic Aorist and Perf. See Aor. and 1'erf.

Hindrance, verbs implying, w. Infin., 198202. See Infuitive.

Hoping, promisiny, \&c., verbs of, w. Fnt Infin., 43 ; w. Pres. Infin., 14; w. Aco Inf., 32, 33.

Imperative, 2. Tenses of, see Present, Perfect, \&c. Not used w. ă $\nu, 57$. In commands, exhortations, \&c., 178 ; w. äyє, $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon, i \theta \ell, 178$; second person w. $\pi \hat{a} \varsigma, 179$. After oi $\sigma \theta^{\circ}$ ö, \&c., 179. In prohibitions W. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ (Present, rarely Aor.), 180, 181.

Imperfect, 6-8. Distinguished from Aor., 7, 8, 24. Denoting attempted action, 7 . In sense of Pluperf. (when Pres. $=$ Perf.), 7. Sometimes not distinguished from Aor., 7, 8. Expressing past likelihood, intention, or danger, 7. Expressing a fact just recognized, 8. In Fiual clauses, 72. In Protasis or Apodosis (implying non-fulfilment of condition), 93-102; how distinguished from Aor., $94,96(b)$; how from Pluperf., 96 (b) ; in Hom. usually past, 96 . With ${ }^{\circ} \nu$, in Apodosis, 56, 93-96. Itercitive, w. ă $\nu, 47$; iterative
 IIdt.), 47, 48. How expressed in Infin. and Part. (Imperf. Inf. and Part.), 15, 17. How expressed in Optative (Imperf. Opt.), 153.
Indicative, 1. Tenses of, see Present, \&c. Primary and secondary tenses of, 3,49 , 50. With $\tilde{\alpha} \nu$, see "Av. Fut., in Final and Object clauses after ö $\pi \omega$ s, \&c. ; see Future. Secondary tenses of, in Final clauses, 72. Present and past tenses of, after $\mu \dot{\eta}$, lest, $83-85$. Present and past tenses of, in Protasis, 92. Secondary tenses of, in both Protasis and Apodosis ( ${ }^{2} \nu$ in Apod.), 93-102; see "Av. Fut.: in Protasis, 103 ; in Apodosis, 102. For Subj. in general suppositions, 109. After Relative w. definite antecedent. 122. In causal Kel sentences, 141. In condi tional Rel. sentences: present and past tenses, 125 ; sccondary tenses (implying non-fulfilment of a condition). 126. Fon Subj. and Opt. in general suppositions
after Rel , 131. In Rel. sentences after a general negative, 132. Secondary tenses of, in cond. Rel. sentences, by assimilation, 136. Future after Rel., expressing 2 purpose, I37. Fut. after $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \dot{\varphi}$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \dot{\varphi} \dot{\omega} \epsilon$, I40. After $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon, 140$. After モढч, \&c., until, 142 ; second. tenses, referring to a result not attained, 143. After $\pi \rho i \nu, 145$; distinguished from Infin., 144, 145, 210. In indirect quotation after 0 ö $\iota$ and $\dot{\omega} \varsigma$, and in indir. questions, 149, I50; may be retained even after second. tenses, 151, 152; in dependent clauses of indir. quot., 160-165. In causal sentences, 171. Secondary tenses of, in wishes, 173, 176. Fature after oú $\mu \dot{\eta}, \mathbf{1 8 5}, 184$; see Future.
Iodirect Questions, I47 ; see Contents,Chap. IV, Sect. IV.
Indirect Quotation, 147-171; see Coatents, Chap. IV, Sect. IV. Moorls used in, see Indicative, \&c. Tenses used in, see Present, \&c. ; and Contents, Chap. II.
Iufinitive, 2, 188-212. Teuses of, 212; see Present, \&c., and Contents, Chap. II. With ${ }^{2} \nu$, sce 'Av. After verbs of fearing, $86,87,190$. In Apodosis, 113. In indirect quatations, 147, 148, 157 - 159. After $\ddot{\omega} \phi є \lambda o \nu$ in wishes, 176,177 . Fut. w. oú $\mu \dot{\eta}$, in indir. quot., IS5. See Contents, Chap. V.
Interrogative Suhj., 182-184. In indirect questions, 154 .
Iterative Imperfect and Aorist. See Imperfect and Aorist.

Moods, general view of, Chap. I. Use of, Chap. IV. Constructions enumerated, 65; see Indicative, \&c.

## Narration, Infin. in, 210.

Object clauses with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ after Verhs of fearing, \&c., 66, 80. Subj. and Opt. in, 80. Mí and $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oí in, 80,67 . How related to Final clauses, 66, 81 . Fut. Ind. in, 82. "O $\pi \omega \mathrm{s} \mu \dot{\eta}(=\mu \dot{\eta})$ in, $82 . \quad$ M $\grave{\eta} \check{\alpha} \nu$ w. Opt. (in Apod.) in, 82, 83. M M $\mathfrak{\text { aloue w. Subj., }}$ by ellipsis of the leading verb, 83. Mín w. present and past tenses of Indic. in, $83-85$, foot-note $\dagger$ to 84 . Other constructions allowed in, see F'tar, caution, ant danger.
Dptative, 2, 174. Its relations to the Indic. and Subjunctive., Appendix I. Tenses of, see Present, \&c. ; when primary and when arcondai'y,50-53. With iva, önws,
\&c., in pure Fin. clauses, 67. With $\overline{0} \pi \omega$ s and öт $\pi \varsigma \rho \dot{\eta}$, after verbs of striving, \&c., (seldom), 73, 74. With $\mu \dot{\eta}$, after verbs of feariny, \&c., 80. In I'rotasis w. ei, 91 : in particular suppositions, $10 \overline{3}$; in general suppos., 107, 108. In Apodosis w. $\check{a}^{\prime}$, , 57, 105, see 'dv: w. l'rotasis suppressed, Il2 ; as mild command or exhortation, or resembling Fut. Ind, 113. In conditional Rel. sentences: in particular suppositions, 128; in general suppos., 129 ; by assimilation, 135. In Rel. clauses expressing a purpose (Epic, rarely Attic), 138. After $\ddot{\omega}$ ¢, \&c., until, 142,143 ; implying a purpose, 143,166 . 168 (d). After $\pi \rho i v, 145$. In i.sdirect quotations and questions, 148 ; see Contents, Chap. IV, Sect. IV. In rausal sentences, 172 . In wishes, 173, I74; expressing concession or exhortation, 175. Future, $38-4 \mathrm{I}$; rarely w. ò $\mu \dot{\eta}$, after $\dot{\omega}$ s in indirect quotation, 185.

Participle, 3, 213-232. Tenses of, see Present, \&c. With $\dot{\alpha} \nu$, see ${ }^{*} \mathrm{~A} \nu$. Conditional (as Protasis) representing Indic., Subj., or Opt., 217, I10. As Apodosis (with or without $a \stackrel{y}{*}$ ), II3. In indirect quotation, 159, 229. See Contents, Chap. VI.

Particular and general suppositions, how distingui hed, 88, 89.
Perfect Indicative, I8, 19. Why primary, 18. Compound form of, 18. Of sertain verbs, in sense of Present, 19. In epis ties, 19. Referring to the future for emphasis (ö $\lambda \omega \lambda \alpha$ ), 19. Not used w. äv, $5 \overline{6}$. Goomic, 45 ; see Perf. Infin.
in depeudent moods, relations of to Pres. of those moods, 19. Subj. and Opt., 20. Imperat., 21: in ma.hematical language, 21 ; second person of (rare), 22 , in sense of Present, 22. Infin., 22: \%\%. $\check{\omega} \phi \in \lambda o v$ in wishes, 176, 177; primary or secondary tense, 53 ; w. är, 53 ; in a gnomic sense, 47 ; as Pluperf. Infin., 23 (Rcm.), 59. Partic, 23 ; primary or secondary, 53.
Pluperfect, I8, 19. Compound form of, 18. Of certain verbs, in sense of Imperf., 19. Sometimes nearly $=$ Aor. (Hom. and Mdt.), 19. Expressing past certainty, \&c., 19. In Final clauses, 72. In Protasis and Apodosis, how distinguished from Imperf. and Aor., 96 (b). With $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} \nu$, in Apod., 56, 93, 94. How expressed ir Infin. and Partic., 23 (Rem.).

Present. Indicative, 4. Expressing a general truth, 4,46 ; an attempted action, $\mathbf{5}$. With adverbs of past time (as mádac), 5 . Of certain verbs, in sense of Perf., 5. Of verbs signifying to hear, to learn, \&c., 6. Of $\epsilon^{i} \mu \mathrm{c}$, as Fut., sometimes as Pres., 6. Expressing likelihood, intention, or danger, 6. Not used w. àv, 55. Historic, 6 ; a secondary tease, 49.
——, in dependent moods, 8-17. How distinguished from the Aor., 8. See Conteats, Chap. II.; and Subj., Opt., Imperat., and Infin.

- , Subjunctive, 9,10. In first person, in prolibitions w. $\mu \dot{\eta}, 180$; see Aor. Subj. With o $\dot{0} \mu \dot{\eta}, 184$.
——, Optative, 10-12. In indirect quotations and questions, 11 ; ambiguity in indirect questions, 12.
——, Imperative, 12. In prohibitions w. $\mu \dot{\eta}, 180$. See Aor. Subj.

Infinitive, three uses of, 12. With indef. time, 12. After $\chi \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega, \theta \in \sigma \pi i \zeta \omega$, $\& c ., 13$. In indirect quotation, 13. For Fut., after verbs of hoping, \&c., 14. After $\lambda \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \omega$ and $\epsilon i \pi \% \nu$, to command, 14. As Imperfect Infin., 15, 16. With ä $\nu$ in Apodosis, 58, 113, 157 ; see "A $\nu$. With $\dot{\alpha} \nu$, representing iterative Imperf., 60. Primary or secondary tense, 53.

-     - Participle, 16, 17. As Imperf. Part., 17. Primary or secondary, 53. As Protasis ( $=$ Pres. Ind., Subj., or Opt.), 110, 21\%. With äv, in Apod. (never in Prot.), $58,113,159$; see 'A $\nu$.
Prevention, verbs implying, w. Inf., $198-$ 202 . See Infinitive.
Primary and Secondary tenses, 3, 48-54; see Tenses.
Prohibitions, Subj. and Imperat. in, 180 ; Aor. Imperat. rare in, 181. Fut. Ind. in, w. ӧтws $\mu \dot{\eta}$ or $\mu \dot{\eta}$ (sc. $\sigma \kappa о ́ \pi \epsilon \iota)$, 78. See o $\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta}$.
Promising, verbs of ; see Hoping.
Protasis and Apodosis, defined, 87. Moods and tenses in, see indic., \&c. ; Present, \&c. ; and Contents, Chap. IV., Sect. II.
Purpose, expressed by Final clause w. iva, \&c., 67 ; by Relat. w. Fut. Ind., 137 ; by Rel. w. Subj. and Opt. in Hom. (rarely in Attic), 138 ; by $\bar{\epsilon} \omega s$ W. Subj. and Opt., 143, 167, $168(d)$; by $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ W. Infin., 205 ; by Inf. alone, 203 ; by Fut. Part., 214, 217.

Questions, of doubt, w. first pers. of Subj. (sometimes w. ßoúd $\frac{1}{}$ or $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ ), 182 ; rarely $w$. third person of Subj, 183: see

Subjunctive. Indirect, 147 ; see Indireot quotation.
Quotation, see Direct and Indirect.
Relative and Temporal sentences, 121-146 see Contents, Chap. IV., Sect. III. Rela tive with Infinitive, 193.
Secondary, see Tenses.
Similes (Homeric): Gnomic Aor. in, 46, 133 ; Subj. (without $\alpha \nu$ ) and Pres. Indic. in, 133.
Subjunctive, 1. Its relations to the Opt., Appendix I. Tenses of ; see Pres., Perf., and Aor.; always primary, 50. With à $\nu$ or кє́, see "A $\nu$. With "עa, ö $\pi \omega \varsigma, \& \mathrm{c}$. in pure Final clauses, 67: after secondary tenses, 70. With ö $\pi \omega \varsigma$ and ö $\pi \omega \varsigma \mu \eta$ after verbs of striving, \&c. (seldom), 73. With $\mu \eta$ after verbs of fearing, \&c., 80. In Protasis w. $\begin{gathered}\text { á } \nu \\ \text { (ä } \nu, \tilde{\eta} \nu), 90,91 \text {; in }\end{gathered}$ particular suppositions, 102; in general suppos., 107, 108; w. єi (without $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ ), see 'A $\nu$. In Apodosis w. $\kappa \dot{\varepsilon}$ or $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ (Hom.), 67 , 182 ; see 'A $\nu$. In conditional Relat. sentences : in particular suppositions, 127; in general suppos., 129; by assimilation, 135. In Homeric similes after $\dot{\omega} \varsigma, \dot{\omega} \varsigma \ddot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon$, 132. In Rel. causes expressing a purpose (Epic), 138. After $\bar{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{s}$, \&c., until, 142, 143 ; implying a purpose, $143,167,168$ (d). After $\pi \rho i v, 145$. In indirect questions, representing Interrog. Subj., 154, 155. In indir. quotations, reprcs. de pendent Subj., 148, 160; may be changed to Opt. or retained, after second. tenses, $148,160,166$. First person of, in exhor tations, 179; see äyє, ф $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho$. Aor. in prohibitions w. $\mu \dot{\eta}, \mathbf{1 8 0}$; Pres. only in first person (rarely sing.), 180, 181. Inde pendent (like Fut. Ind.) in Hom., 181; w. ăv or $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}, 182$. Interrog. (in questions of doubt), 132. With ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$, as strong future, 184.
Temporal sentences, see Relative. With $\tilde{\epsilon} \omega \varsigma, \& c .$, until, 142-144. With mpiv, 144-147, 210.
Tenses, enumeration of, 3. Primary and secondary, 3, 48-54. Relative or absolute time denoted by, 3,4 . Gnomic and iterative, 45-48. Use of, see Contents Chap. II. See also Present, \&c.
Verbal in -téos, 3 ; see Contents, Chap. VII
Wish, expression of, 173-177 ; see Contents, Chap. IV., Sect. VI. Ind and Opt in, see Ind. and Opt. Latin and Greek expressions of, compared, 177. Infin in (poet.), 209.
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太уауакте் сi， 120.
Аүатá $\omega$ єi， 120.
A $\gamma \epsilon$ or $\tilde{a}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \tau \epsilon}$ W．Imperat．，178，179， 180.
＇Adıcéw as Perf．， 5.
Ai $\sigma \chi$ v́vopaє with Part．and Inf．，228．Ai－ $\sigma \chi$ v́yoцає єi， 120.
Aitiós eiцc，w．Inf．（sometimes w．tov̂ or то́），190， 191 ；w．Aor．Inf．， 32.
＇Axov́etv，áкovิбat，in sound， 196.
＇ANíконає as Perf．， 5.
 137 （Rem．）．
A $\mu$ а w．Partic．， 219.
A $\nu$（ $\breve{a}$ ），Adv．，two uses of，in Apodosis and in Protasis，54．Not used w．Pres．and Perf．Indic．，55．With Fut．Ind．：in early poets， 55,104 ；in Attic，56．With secondary tenses of Ind．in Apodosis，56， 87， $90,94,127$ ；omitted for emphasis， 96 ； regularly omitted in Apod．formed by
 Imperf．and Aor．Ind．in iterative sense， 47．With Subjunctive ：in Protasis（éáv， $\dot{a} \nu$ ，or $\tilde{\eta} \nu), 56,87,102,108$ ；in conditional Rel．and Temporal clauses， $56,125,128$ ， 130，143，144，145；often omitted in Hom． （rarely in Attic），104，105，109，133．In Final clauses after $\dot{\omega} s \ddot{\partial} \pi \omega s, \quad \ddot{\partial} \phi \rho \alpha$ ： w ． Subj．，68， 69 ；rarely w．Opt．69， 70. Omitted from éáv，ö $\tau \alpha \nu$, ô $\alpha$ ä ，\＆c．， when the Subj．is changed to Opt． after past tenses， 149 ；rarely retained， 163，169．Seldom w．$\dot{\omega} s$ and Subj． in Hom．similes，132．Epic use of，w． Subj．in Apodosis，57，104，182．With Optative，always forming Apodosis，67， 105，128，see Optative ；never w．Fut． Opt．， 57 ；rarely omitted， 100 ．With an Opt．Iu Protasis which is also an Apod．， 107，133．Eï $x \in$ W．Opt．in Hom．， 107. Never used w．Imperat．，57．With Infin． and Part．：in A podosis， $57-61,113,157$ ， 159，192， 232 ；never in Protasis， 62 ；use
of each tense with，see Present，\＆c．With Inf．for iterative Imperf，and Aor．w． $\tilde{a} \nu, 60$ ．Position of，61，62．Repetition of，62－6t．Without a verb，63．＇Táx＇ ä $\nu$, perhaps， 64.
＊Av（ $\bar{a})$ ，contracted for，èáv．See＇Eáv．
＇Avaıpéw，to give an oracular response， see $X \rho a ́ \omega$ ．
${ }^{\prime} А \nu \epsilon \in \chi \circ \mu a \iota$ W．Part．， 223.
＇Aпока́ $\mu \nu \omega$ W．Part．and Inf．， 228.
＇Аркє̇ш W．Part．， 228.
${ }^{*} \mathrm{~A} \tau \epsilon$, ä $\tau \in \delta \dot{\eta}, \mathrm{w}$. Part．， 219.
Aúтiка W．Part．， 219.
＂A $\chi \rho \iota$ ，see＂E $\omega s$ ．＂A $\chi \rho \iota$ oṽ， 142.
Beגtí $\omega \nu$ w．Part．， 228.
Boú $\lambda \epsilon \iota$ or $\beta$ oú $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta e$ W．Interrog．Snbj．， 182

「eqovéval，to be， 19.
$\Delta \epsilon ́$, in Apodosis，121．In antecedent clauses， 137.
$\Delta \in i к \nu \nu \mu$ W．Part．， 229.
$\Delta \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ v$ є̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ єi， 120.
$\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o ́ s$ єíцı W．Part．， 230.
$\Delta \iota a \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega$ W．Part．， 227 ；see $\Lambda a \nu \theta \alpha ́ \nu \omega$.
$\Delta i \delta \omega \mu t$ ，to offer，5．Imperf．of， 7.
вiкатоs w．Inf．， 195.
$\Delta ⿺ 𠃊 ́ \pi \epsilon \rho, 171$.
$\Delta t o ́ \tau \iota, 171$ ；w．Inf．（Hdt．）， 193.
＇Eáv（ei ä $\nu$ ），contracted $\tilde{\alpha} \nu(\bar{a})$ or $\ddot{\eta} \nu, 56,87$ 104；w．Subj．，102， 108.
 without $\alpha \stackrel{\alpha}{ } \nu, 98$.
＇E $\delta \in \iota, \dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$（ $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu), \dot{\epsilon} \xi \hat{\eta} \nu, \dot{e} \nu \hat{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu$ єiкòs $\eta^{\nu} \nu$ ท̈ $\rho \mu о \tau \tau \epsilon \nu$ ，$\grave{\nu} \nu$ or $\dot{v} \pi \hat{\eta} \rho \chi^{\epsilon} \nu$ ，with Infin．in Apodosis，without $\ddot{\alpha} \nu, 97-100$ ．
Ei，if，87，92，93，105， 108 ；see＂A ${ }^{\text {．}}$ ．Sup． posing that，115，168．After $\theta a v \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$, \＆c．，120．With Inf．（Hdt．），193．Ei $\gamma a ́ \rho$ ，or ei，in wishes，173－177．

Ei, whether, 120, 147, 151; after verbs of fearing 85.
Ei $\begin{array}{r}\text { áp in wishes, see } \\ E i .\end{array}$
Ei $\delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{2} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon, 111$.
Ei $\delta e ̀ \mu_{\eta} \dot{\eta}$ in alternatives, 112.
Eite in wishes, 173-177.

Expl to be going: as Future, 6; as Pres., 6; W. Inf., 204.
Eivat, expressing a purpose, 204.
Eitov, I commanded, W. Inf., 14, 34.
Eis ö (for ë $\omega \varsigma$ ) w. Indic. (Hdt.), 142.
Eicóке W. Subj. and Opt., 143; see"Ews.
'Екஸ̀̀ eíval, 208.
'Eveatı, Partic. of, used personally w. Inf., 194, 195.
'E $\nu \bar{\eta} \nu$ in Apodosis, see ${ }^{\text {E }} \mathrm{E} \delta \epsilon \iota$.

${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \xi \bar{\eta} \nu$ in Apodosis, see ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{E} \delta \epsilon \iota$.
'Enáv or è $\pi \dot{\eta}{ }^{\prime}$, see ${ }^{7}$ Otav.

'E $\pi \epsilon i$ or $\dot{e} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \eta^{\prime}$ (temporal); w. Aor. Indic. (not Pluperf.), 25 ; w. Aor. Opt., 29 ; w. Infin., 193. Causal, 171.
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta a \nu$, w. Aor. Subj. as Fut. Perf., 26. See ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Otav}$.
'Eniסogos w. Inf. 195.
'Eтєкаíplos w. Inf., 195.
 Fut. Ind., 73; w. Inf., or Inf. w. Tov̂, 192.

'Елıтрєт $\pi \omega$ W. Part., 226.
'E $\sigma \tau e$, until, see"Ews.
Eù̇ús w. Part., 219.
Eípiбкш w. Part., 226.
${ }^{-}$E $\phi \eta \nu$, in Ifomer, 99.
'E $\phi$ ' $\Phi$ or $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi$ ' $\dot{\omega} \tau \epsilon$, w. Fut. Ind., 140; w Inf., 207.


- E $\chi \omega$ w. Aor. or Perf. Part. as periphrastic Perf., 229.
 til, 142-144; expressing a purpose, 143, 167, 168.
'Ews, ö $\phi p a, s o$ long as, see Relative.

[^14]Өầ $\mu \alpha$ iठé $\sigma \theta a t, 196$.

©édets or $\theta$ ө́̀ $\lambda t e$ W. Interrog. Subjunctive (poet.), 182.

-I İeīv, òpâ $\nu$, in appearance, 196
'I $\theta$ c w. Imperat., 178.


- I $\kappa \omega$ or iкávo as Perf. (Hom.), $\overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$.
'Iva, in Final claases: w. Subj. and vpt., 67, 70 ; w. second. tenses of Indic 72. Not used with ${ }^{2} \downarrow, 70 ; 7 \nu \alpha \kappa \epsilon, 70$. In Object clauses after $\lambda i \sigma \sigma \sigma \mu a l$ (Hom.), 78; similar constr. in N. Test., 78.
——, where, with $\dot{\alpha} \nu, 70$ (R.).
Ká, Doric for кє́ ; see "Av.
Kai, каітєр (каі . . . $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ), w. Part., 220, 221.

Kaitot w. Part. (rare), 221.
Ké or кév, see'A $\nu$.
Kєк入च̈ $\sigma \theta a t$, to le called, 19.
Kıvסטvevíw W. Inf. in Apodosis, 99.
Kратé $\omega$, see Nıкá $\omega$.
Kрєíन $\omega \nu$ w. Part., 228.
K $\nu \rho \epsilon \in \omega$ W. Part. (poet.), 227.
 Part., 227 ; w. Aor. Part., 34.
Aé $\gamma \omega$, to command, w. Inf., 14, 34.
Mé $\lambda \lambda \omega$, ,w. Inf. as periphrastic Fut., 38 ; tense of Inf. with, 38. Imperf. of, w. Inf. : expressing past intention, \&c., 38, 99; forming A podosis (without $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ ), 99.
Ме́црицац, I remember, 19 ; w. Part., 229; พ. öтє, 231.
Mefagú w. Part., 219.

Mý, lest, in Final clauses : w. Subj. and Opt., 67, 70 ; rarely w. Fut Ind., 68. After verbs of stiviving, \&c. (for ö $\pi \omega \varsigma \mu \dot{\eta}$ ), 77. With Fut. Ind. in prohibitions, 37, 79, 187. After verbs of fearing, \&c.: w. Subj. and Opt., 80 ; w. Fut. Ind., 82. With Suhj. (by ellipsis of a verb of fear. ing), 83. With áv, 83. With present and past tenses of Indic., 83-85; never interrog., 84. With Fut. Opt. 39, 40.
——, not, w. iva, öт $\pi \omega$, \&cc., in Final and Olject clause, 67. In Protasis, 88 In Rel. clauses w. indef. anteced., 122, 124. In wishes (with and without ei), $17 \mathrm{i}, 176$. In prohibitions, 180. With interrog. Subj, 181. With 1nf., after verbs implying negation, 198, 200, 20 I.
Mì̀ oú (double neg.): w. Inf., 198, 200, 201. w. Part., 200 ; before Nouns, 200.

Neкá $\omega$ and кратé $\omega$, as Perf., 5.
No $\mu$ i $\zeta \omega$, oioual, and $\phi \eta \mu:$ :, w. Aorist. Inf referring to the future (?), 33.
＂O for ört（in ．＇．7om．）， 170.
Oísa（novi），I know， 19 ；see Oí $\sigma \theta a$ ．
Oiomal w．Aor．Int．for Fut．（？）， 33.
Oios w．Infin．，194．Oiov，oia，oia ס $\quad$ ，w． Part．， 219.

Oixонає as Perf．，5．Imperf．of， 7.
－＇0入iyou（ $\delta \in i \nu$ ），almost， 208.
－одлшцас as Perf．（Trag．）， 5.
－Oגшлa，I shall perish， 19.
＇O $\mu$ oías W．Infin．（Hom．）， 197.
＇Oто́та⿱亠䒑，seө Otav．
＇Ото́тє，when，see Relative．Since（causal）， 171.
＂Onws，originally Rel．Adv．，75；as indirect inter．og．，75，77，85，154．In order that， that，in Final clauses；W．Subj．and Opt．， 67， 70 ；w．$\dot{\alpha} \nu$ and Subj．，68， 69 ；w．Fut． Ind．， 68 ；w．second tenses of Indic．， 72. After verbs of striving，\＆c．：w．Fut． Ind．（sometimes Subj．and Opt．）， 73 ；w． àv and Subj．（rare），76．That（iike $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ）， after verbs of fearing，\＆c．，85．That （like $\dot{\omega}$ s or ö̃ı），in indirect quotations， 170.
 fearing，\＆c．， 82.
＇Opâv，iঠeiv，in appearance， 196.
－Ooov or $\omega$＇w．Absol．Infin． 207.
＂Ooos w．Infin． 294.

 єтte $\delta \dot{a} v, 55,125,127,123$ ；see＇Av．
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{O} \tau \epsilon$, when，see Relative．After $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \mu a$, 231．With Infin．， 193.
——，since（causal）， 171.
＇Otı，that，in indirect quotations，147．w． Ind．and Opt．，148，149， 150 ；w．Ind．or Opt．w．áv，156．Before direct quot．， 171.
－，because（causal），171－173，see Contents，Chap．1V．，Sect．V．；after verbs of fearing， 86 ．

O $\dot{v}$ ，after $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ，lest，67，80．In Apodosis，88； rarely in Protasis， 88 （N．）．In Rel． clanses w．def．anteced．，122．In causal Rel．clauses， 142 （R．）．In indirect dis－ course， 149.
Oòk àv фӨávots（ $\phi$ Oávout $), 228$.
Oùk oíßa äv $\epsilon i, 62$.
Oи̇ $\mu \dot{\eta}, 184-187$ ；see Contents，Chapter IV．，Section VILI．Dawes＇s Canon on， 79， 80.
Oӥvєка，because， 171.
Oitws，implying a Protasis，110．With Opt． in protestations，175．Referring to a Participle， 218

－Oфpa（Epic and Lyric），as tinal particle： w．Subj．and Opt．， 67 ；w．$\dot{\nu} \nu, 69$. With Fut．Ind．， 68.
－as temporal particle，until，142－ 144 ；see ẽّs．So long as，see Relative．

## Пádat w．Present， 5.

Havtoios $\gamma$ i $\gamma v 0 \mu$ at（Ion．）w．Participle， 227.
Пápos（like $\pi \rho i \nu$ ）w．Inf．（IIom．）， 212.
Hâs w．Imperat．（2d pers．）， 179.
Пav́ $\omega$ W．Part．， 226.
Шєiөw，to try to persuade，5．Imperfect of， 7.
Пєєра́оцає w．Part．（Пdt．）， 227.
Mєрьopám，w．Part．，226；w．Aor．Part．， 35.
IIt $\sigma \tau \in \dot{u} \omega$ w．Inf．and $\tau \hat{\varphi}, 197$.
 （Ion．）， 227.
חрєлєє，Partic．of，used personally w．In－ fin．，194， 195.
Hpiv，w．Ind．，Subj．，and Opt．，145， 146. With Infin．，210－212．As Adverb，soon－ er， 146 （N．5）．
Прiv $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime}$ öтє（ $\Pi$ от．）， 146.
Hрiv $\dot{\eta}, 146,211,212$.

Пробйкє ${ }^{\text {in }}$ A podosis，see＂E $\delta \epsilon \iota$ ．
Hробйкєь，Partic．of，used personally $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ． Infin．，194， 195.
Про́т $\theta \in \nu \dot{\eta}, 146,211$.
Про́тєроข $̆, 146,211$.

Súvot反a，$\sigma v \gamma \gamma \neq \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，w．Part．， 230
Táx ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\text {an }} \nu, 64$.
Te日 $\downarrow \eta \kappa \in ์ \nu a l$, to be dead， 19.
$-\tau \epsilon ́ o s$（ $\tau$ ćov，$-\tau \epsilon ́ a$ ），Verbal in，3，233，234；
see Contents，Chapter VII．
Ti $\lambda \in \dot{\xi} \epsilon \epsilon s ; 38$.
 222.

Tí $\pi \dot{a} \theta \omega ;$ 183， 184.
Tiктш（in tragedy）as Perf．， 5.
Tò $\nu \grave{v} \nu$ єival， 208.
Tvyđáv w．Part．， 227 ；see $\Lambda a v \theta a ́ v \omega . ~$

 w．Part．， 230.
$\Phi \dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\pi}$ ．Imperat．，178，179， 180.
$\Phi \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$ as Perf．， 5.
$\Phi \eta \mu i$ w．Aor．Inf．for Fut．（？）， 33.
Ф日áves w．Part．， 227 ；see $\Lambda a \nu \theta$ ív．Ф日áve $\grave{\eta}$ w．Infin．（Hdt．）， 212.
$X_{\rho \alpha ́ \omega}$, àvaı $\rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega, \theta \epsilon \sigma \pi i \zeta \omega$, w. Pres. or Aor Inf., 13, 31 ; sometimes w. Fut. Inf., 13.
' $\mathbf{D}_{5}$, originally Rel. Adv., 75 (R.). In order that, that, in Final clauses: w. Subj. and Opt., 67, 70 ; w. ăv and Subj., 68, 69; w. Fut. Ind., 68 ; w. second. tenses of Indic., 72. Sometimes (for öncs) after verbs of striving, \&c., 77 (N. 4); Homeric construction of, with Subj. or Opt., 76 (iv. 2.). Sometimes (for $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ) after verbs of fearing, 85. 193.
when, see Relative With Infln.,
, that, in indirect quotation (like ö $\tau \iota$ ), 147, 148, 149, 150. Once w. Subj. for Fut. Ind. (Hom.), 78, 171.
' $\Omega_{s}$, because, 171-173.
——, in wishes: w. Opt., 175; w. $\boldsymbol{\omega} \phi \in \lambda o \nu$ 177. With Inf., 206, 207, 203. With Partic., 219, 220, 225, 231, 232 ; w. Part. and $\check{\alpha} \nu 232$.
" $\Omega_{\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho}$ w. Partic., 219, 222, 225.
$\cdot \Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \ddot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon i(\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \alpha \nu \in i), 63,116$.
${ }^{-} \Omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$, so that, w. Indio., 140 With Inf., 205 ; after verbs and adject. which commonly take Inf. alone, 206 (N. 2.), 205. With Opt., Indic., or Inf. w. $\dot{\alpha} \nu, 141,207$. With Imperat., 141.

- , in Homer, $=\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, as if, 207. In Hdt., w. Partic., $=a ̈ \tau \epsilon, 219,223$.
 177.


## NEW BOOKS

AND

## NEW EDITIONS FOR 1879.

## LATIN.

> ABRIEF HISTORY OF ROMAN LITERATURE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. Translated and Edited from the German Edition of Bender by Professor E. P. Crowell and II. B. Richardson, A.M., Amherst College, Mass. (Rearly in August.)

$\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{E}}$E NATURA DEORUM. Translated and Edited from the German Edition of Schoeman by Professor Austin Stickney, formerly of Trinity College, Hartford. (Ready in Aufust.)

$\mathbf{R}^{\mathrm{E}}$EMNANTS OF EARLY LATIN, chiefly Inscriptions. Selected and Explained, for use in Colleges, by Frederick I. Allen, Professor of Latin in the University of Cincimnati. (Ready in June.)

Prepared to meet the need which many of our best teachers of Latin feel, of acquainting students with the earliest forms of Latin, as an aid to the better comprehension of the structure of the language. There is no such book in existence, the nearest thing to it being the large and extensive work of Wordsworth, which is not adapted to school use.
A CRITICAL HISTORY OF CICERO'S LETTERS. By R. F. Leighton, Ph.D., Principal of Brooklyn, N. Y., High School. The History of the Letters "ad Familiares" is nearly ready.

$\mathrm{A}^{\mathrm{N}}$N ELEMENTARY TREATISE ON LATIN ORTHOGRAPHY. Embracing the Latest Researches of Brambach, Ritschel, and others. With a Vocabulary of Words often Misspelled. By Ri. F. Jeighton, Ph.D., Principal of Brooklyn, N. Y., High School.
SELECTIONS FROM THE LESS-KNOWN LATIN POETS - viz., Catullus, Lucretius, the Elegiac Writers, Lucan and Martial. By E. P. Crowell, A.M., Professor of Latin, Amherst College.

## P

 ARALLEL SYNTAX OF THE MOODS IN GREEK AND LATIN. Prepared by R. P. Keep, Ph.D., Instructor in the Classical Department of Williston Seminary, at Easthampton, Mass. (Ready in Junr.)ANEW AND COMPLETE VIRGIL. This Edition will be printed from wholly new plates, and will be fully annotated by Professor J. B. Greenough, Harvard University. It will also have numerous illustrations from the antique.

GINN \& HEATH, Publishers, Boston, New York, and Chicago.

AREVISED EDITION OF ALLEN'S LATIN COMPOSITION. Simplified, carefully Graded, and Adapted to the New Allen \& Greenough's Latin Grammar. By W. F. Allen, Professor of Latin and History at University of Wisconsin and Leeturer at Johus Hopkins University. (Ready in September.)

THE AGRICOLA OF TACITUS. Edited for School and College Use by W. F. Allen, Professor of Latin in University of Wisconsin.

## GREEK.

THE PROMETHEUS OF AESCHYLUS. Edited, with Notes and Introduction, by Frederick D. Allen, Professor of Greek in the University of Cincimati.

SELECT ORATIONS OF DEMOSTHENES. Edited by Frank B. Tarbell, Yale College. This work will contain the three Philippics and the Oration On the Chersonese, from the Zuirich Edition of the Text, with an Extended Historical Introduction and Explanatory Notes.

THE PUBLIC HARANGUES OF DEMOSTHENES. Edited by Isaac Flagg, Ph. D., Professor of Greek in Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

This work has been undertaken in view of the fact that several speeches belouging to this head, of great merit and importance, have not as yet appeared in a form convenieut for college reading. The commentary, appended to a carefully edited text, will be adapted to the requirements of stủdents well advanced in Greek. Part First, forming a small volume by itself, will contain the three Hellenic Orations, Symmories, Megalopolitans, and Rhodians.

$\mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{E}}$ELECTIONS FROM THE GREEK LYRIC POETS, with an Historical Introduction and Explanatory Notes. By IIenry M. Tyler, Professor of Greek and Latin in Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (Ready in June.)

$\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{E}}$ELECTIONS FROM PINDAR AND THE BUCOLIC POETS, Containing six Odes of Pindar, four Idylls of Theocritus, a IIymn of Callimachus, a Hymn of Cleanthes, and one of the Homeric Hymns; in all thirteen hundred lines. Edited by Professor T. D. Seymour, Westeru Reserve College, Ohio. (Ready in January, 1880.)

THe First three books of homer's iliad. By Professor F. E. Anderson, of Harvarl University.

F
IIRST TWELVE BOOKS OF HOMER'S ODYSSEY. With Introduction, Notes, and Tables of Homeric Forms, for School Use. By W. W. Merry, A.M., Fellow and Lecturer of Lincoln College, Oxford, England.

GINN \& HEATH, Publishers, Boston, New York, and Chicago.

LEIGHTON'S NEW GREEK LESSONS. With notes, references, and full vocabulary; and references to Hadley's Greek Grammar, as well as to Goodwin's New Greek Grammar. The Lessons have been rewritten and arranged on the plan of the author's Latin Lessons, introducing the verb from the first.

About sixty easy and well graded lessons, both Greck and English (one term's work), introduces the pupil to the first book of Xenophon's Anabasis. Definite directions are given in regard to the amount of the Grammar to be learned. The pupil is given a clearidea of noun and verb stems, and also some insight into the formation of words from stems and roots by means of siguificant endings. Questions for Review and examination as in the first edition. The amount of matter to be translated into Greek is sufficient to prepare a student in Greek composition for any American college. In preparing these lessons, considerable use has been made of the excellent exercises used in most of the German Gymnasimms, prepared by Dr. Wasener to accompany Professor Curtius' Greek Grammar.

ANEW AND ENLARGED EDITION OF WHITON'S LYSIAS. Two new orations will be added to those which the book now contains. (Ready in September.)

## MATHEMATICS.

ASERIES OF ARITHMETICS, Consisting of two books, Primary and Written. By Dr. Thomas Hill, ex-President of Harvard College, and George A. Wentworth, Professor-of Mathematics in Plillips Exeter Academy.

ADIFFERENTIAL CALCULUS. With numerous Examples and Applications. Designed for use as a College Text-book. By W. E. Byerly, Ph.D., Harvard University. This book has been used two years in Harvard in manuscript form. (Ready in July.)

$\mathrm{A}^{\mathrm{N}}$N ELEMENTARY ALGEBRA. By George A. Wentworth, Professor of Mathematics in Phillips Exeter Academy.

AGEOMETRY FOR BEGINNERS. Adapted to Lower and Grammar School Work. By G. A. Hill, Harvard University. (Ready in September.)

The principles which underlie the method employed in this work are the following: -

1. Geometrical instruction for beginners should proceed from the concrete to the abstract.
2. It should seek to develop the intellectual powers, and especially the geometric imagination and the inventive faculty, by stimulating the selfactivity of the learner.

GINN \& HEATH, Publishers, Boston, New York, and Chicago.
3. It should be practical, - that is to say, it should seize every fitting opportunity to illustrate and explain the material uses of Geometry.

Agreeably to the first of these principles, in the beginning the distinction between a body, a surface, a line, and a point, is shown by the use of models, and later they are again emploved to give clear ideas respecting the regular solids. Many conceptions and sinı! e relations - such as occur, for instance, in the subject of parallels, of perpendiculars, of angles, of intersecting lines and planes, of equal figures, of similar figures, of polygons, \&c. - are illustrated by reference to well-known objects; and, a variety of questions are asked, which the learner can answer by reflecting upon what he has seen. Throughout the work, definitions are not stated in an abstract form until the ideas which they involve are already known.

In proving theorems, instead of the formal method which begins with the theorem and follows with the proof, unfolded step by step in syllogistic reasoning, the method here adopted begins with the study of a figure and the relations of its parts, and proceeds to the theorem, by the comparison and combination of ideas, much in the same way as the discoverer of the theorem might have done. Care has been taken to select theorems which are simple, and which at the same time form a basis for useful problems and applications. In a few cases, where a theorem was very desirable on account of its applications, while its rigorous proof was clearly beyond the capacity of those for whom the book is designed, the author has not hesitated to substitute a less rigorous proof, or probable reasons of a simple kind. Why it should be thought that, in Geometry, the choice must, in each case, lie between the most refined product of the human intellect and nothing at all, the author is unable to see.

The idea of ratio is made to arise naturally from that of addition; and that of units of measure from that of ratio.

Special stress has been laid upon the laws of the equality and of the similarity of triangles; because, apart from their simple character, they are the keys to nine-tenths at least of the rest of Geometry, both theoretical and practical.

Great pains have been taken to explain, by examples, how geometrical problems are to be attacked and solved; and numerous easy constructions are given, as exercises for the learner.

Exercises are appended to almost every section, and to the end of each chapter, and form one of the chief features of the book. They supply the means of real intellectual training, by throwing the learner on his own resources, and leading him to invent and to generalize for himself. They have been very carefully selected and graded, and, where necessary, hints for their solution have been added.

| PA | Goodwin, William Watson |
| :--- | :--- |
| 369 | Syntax of the moods and |
| G6 | tenses of the Greek verb. |
| 1879 | 7th ed., rev. |
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[^0]:    * Notwithstanding the changes in the second edition, very few alterations have been made in numbering the paragraphs or notes. The following are the only changes (except a few omissions) which can affect references already made to the first edition: - $\S 18,3$ is subdivided into ( $a$ ) and ( $b$ ); § 18 , 3, Rem. takes the place of $\$ 18,4$, Note; $\$ 24$, Notes 1 and 2 are rearranged; § 37 , Note 2 is omitted, and N. 3 is changed to N. $2 ; \S 45$, N. 2 is subdivided into (a) and (b); in $\oint 49,2, \mathrm{~N}$. 3, the present divisions (c), (d), and (e) were included in (b); $\S 64,1$ and 2 are rearranged; in $\$ 92,2$, Note 1 is changed to Remark; § 109, N. 9 was included in N. 3.
    The following additions have been made in the second edition: $-\$ 49,2$, N. 6 (b); § 50,1, Rem. 2; § 52,2, Rem. $;$ § 53, N. 4; § 64, Rem. 2; § 65,3 , N. $2 ; \S 65,4 ; \S 69,5 ; \S 71$, Rem. $2 ; \S 89,2$, Rem. 1 and $2 ; \S 92,2$, N. $1 ;$ § 95, 3, Rem.; § 108, N. 4 (b); § 112, 1, Rem.: § 112, 2, Rem.; § 113, Rem. after N. 1C. The following have been materially changed in snbject or in substance in the second edition: $-\$ 25,1$, N. 5 (b); § 41, N. $4 ; \S 43$, Rem. $;$ Remarks 1 and 2 after $\$ 49.2$, N. 3; §82, Rem. 2; $\$ 89,2$, Notes 1 and 2.

[^1]:    Cambridae, June, 1865.

[^2]:    * I find $\delta \iota \kappa$ á $\sigma \epsilon \theta \not a \iota$ here in Cod. Par. 2712 , and by correction in 2820 .

[^3]:    * It is difficult to determine the question whether the secondary tenses of the Indicative in this construction ( $\$ 32,3$ ) are primary or secondary in their effect on the dependent verb, as sentences of nearly every class depending upon them take by assimilation a secondary tense of the Indicative. (So in most final clauses, § 44,3 ; in protasis after $\epsilon i, \$ 49,2$; and after relatives, §64.) There remain only indirect quotations, and the few cases of final clauses that do not take the Indicative by assimilation, but both of these have the peculiarity of allowing the Indicative and Subjunctive, when the writer pleases, to stand as they were in the direct discourse, instead of being changed to the Optative. Madvig (Bemerkungen, p. 20) classes them all as primary forms, considering the two examples of the Optative after the Aorist, quoted above, § 32, 3(b), as exceptions. But these cannot be accounted for on the supposition that both Aorist and Imperfect are primary: they are, however, perfectly regular, if we consider the present forms primary and the past forms secondary (as in other cases) ; while the other examples in which the Indicative or Subjunctive follows the past forms may all be explained on the principle of $\$ 3 \mathbf{1}$, Note I.

[^4]:     $\dot{a} \nu a \chi \omega \rho \in \bar{i} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon^{\prime}$ oíkov $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu, I$ hear that the Lacedaemonians at that time, after invading and racaging the country, used to return home
    
    

[^5]:    
    
    
    
    
    
    
    
    
    

[^6]:    * Madvig remarks (Bemerkungen, p. 12) that he finds in the first two books of Thucydides no example of the Optative after ómos or $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ depending on a secondary tense of a verb of striving or fearing; although he cites fifteen examples of the Subjunctive from the same books. In pare final clauses after scoondiry tenses, the nsage in Thucydides is nearly equally divided between the Suljunctive and the Optative. Xenophon, tn the other hand, generally follows the rule, $\S 44,1$.

[^7]:     Govial (фìou), to see in what way they can be prevented from becoming
     was effecting that, \&e.; quoted by Madvig, Syntax, p. 125, whose views in the main are given in the text, above. See also Thuc. IV, 128, ${ }^{\epsilon} \pi \pi^{\prime} \rho a \sigma$ -
     таб.

[^8]:    * The general rule, first laid down by Dawes (Misc. Crit. pp. 222 and 228), which declared the first Aorist Subjunctive active and middle a solecism after ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{s} \mu^{\prime} \dot{\eta}$ and ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$, was extended by others so as to include $\overline{0} \pi \omega s$ ( withont $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ), and the Greek authors were emended to conform to it. As this rule has no other foundation than the accidental circumstance mentioned in Note 8, it uaturally fails in many eases, in some of which even emendation is impossible. Thus in the example, $\kappa \in \lambda \epsilon$ vourı $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau a-$
    
    
     $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \eta \boldsymbol{s}$, no emendation is possible. See also Plat. Rep. X, 609 B. ov $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{a} \pi \circ \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \eta$, where the Future would be $\dot{a} \pi \circ \boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$. The rule of

[^9]:    ＊That this is the correct explanation of the passage，Soph．Ant．278， and that we need not emend it with Nauck，so as to read roüpyov ró $\delta^{\prime} \eta$ ，
    
    
    
    $\dagger$ In this passage，if anywhere，it would seem necessary to admit the interroyative force usually ascribed to $\mu \eta$ ，which would make it equivalent to ei ov，whether not．But here，as in the other passages guoted，it is phain that the dependent clause after $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ expresses the object of an apprehension． ＇I＇o establish a purely interrogntive force in $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ，it would seem necessary to find examples in whicl $\mu \mu^{\prime}$ not only follows a verb like oỉda，but also is followed by a clause in which no olject of apprehension is contained （Such a sentence would be $\epsilon i \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \mu \dot{\eta}$ oi фìol $\zeta \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ ，we slall learn whether our friends are not living；but no such example can be found，as least in any classic writer．The Greeks would have said $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \boldsymbol{o}_{\mu} \mu \sigma \theta a \in i$ or $\zeta \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ or $\epsilon i \zeta \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ ．）The use of $\epsilon i$ ，whether，after verbs of fraring（Note 6， c），usually adduced as an argument to prove the interrogative force of $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ： rather scems to show that，when the Greeks wished to introduce an ind rect question after verbs of fearing，they had recourse to $\epsilon i$ ，as in othet cases．

[^10]:    'Eá̀ тt $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \omega, \delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega \sigma o \iota$, if I (shall) receive anything, I will give it to you. 'Eáv tı $\lambda$ áß $\quad$ ss, ,ós $\mu a \iota$, if you receive anything, give it to me. Ei $\delta$ dé
     какòs ös $\tau \epsilon$ ย $\lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} a \hat{\omega} \nu$, 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. (For $\epsilon^{\ddot{\prime}}$ кє see § 47, 2.) Aï к’ à̀rò̀
     ддá. Od. XVII, 549. So $\alpha i \not t \kappa \epsilon \delta \omega \sigma \iota$, II. I, 128. (See § 47, 1,
    
    
    
     $\nu \epsilon \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ (Subj. in exhortation), and àmoסồvaı (Infin. for Impera
    
    

[^11]:     might (if he pleased) find fault with what has been said. Isoc. Areop.
     therefore you should not take kings upon your tongue and talk (i. e jou would not, if you should do as you ought). Il. II, 250. Toìтo aür
    

[^12]:     that this is so. Soph. Aj. 281. Here the genitive absolute has at first the appearance of a dependent clause; but $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s}$ does not mean that, and the literal translation would be, this being so (as you may assume), you must understand it to be so. (See Schnveidewin's note

[^13]:    * Reprinted, with a few changes, from the Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and S'iences for Jan. 8, 1861: Vol. V. pp. 96-102.

[^14]:    ${ }^{*} H \kappa \omega$ as Perf., 5. Imperf. of, 7.
    ${ }^{-}$Hpuortel in A podosis, see 'E $\delta \epsilon$.
    'Htтáoual, as 1’erf., 5.

