1 D4769261 1 --1761 Ēm

Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2008 with funding from Microsoft Corporation

SYNTAX

OF

THE MOODS AND TENSES

OF

THE GREEK VERB.

BΥ

WILLIAM W. GOODWIN, PH. D.,

BLIOT PROFESSOR OF GREEK LITERATURE IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

SEVENTH EDITION, REVISED.



BOSTON: GINN AND HEATH. 1879.



Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1860, Br W. W. GOODWIN,

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

UNIVERSITY PRESS: JOHN WILSON & SON, CAMBRIDGE.

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; § 19, Note 6; § 66, 2, Note 3; § 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 § 12; § 18, 1; § 23, 2, Note 3; § 37, 1; § 45, Note 7 (a); § 69, 1; § 70, 1; § 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-

PREFACE.

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 $\dot{\epsilon}a\nu \pi \alpha i\hat{\eta}$ as a general supposition is occasionally represented by $\epsilon i \pi o \iota \epsilon i$, whereas $\epsilon a \mu \pi o \iota \eta$ in a future condition is equivalent to el mouno en 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 §48 has made necessary slight changes of expression in §12; §13, 1; §20; §21, 1; §49, 1; §51; $\S60$; $\S61$, 1; and $\S62$. 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

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

In the first edition of the present work, published in 1860, I attempted 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 ore and is 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 indebtedness to Madvig's Syntax der griechischen Sprache, and to his Bemerkungen über einige Puncte der griechischen Wortfügungslehre (in a supplement to the Philologus, Vol. II.). The works of this eminent scholar have aided

me not only by the material which they have afforded as a basis for the present work, but also by the valuable suggestions with which they abound.

Next to Madvig, I must acknowledge my obligations to Krüger's Griechische Sprachlehre, which has everywhere supplied me with important details and most excellent examples. I have been frequently indebted to the other grammarians, who need not be specially mentioned. Bäumlein's Untersuchungen über die griechischen Modi reached 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 special criticisms; I regret that I cannot agree with the general principles to which he refers the uses of each mood, especially as his criticisms of the prevailing German theories on this subject 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 acknowledge the following special obligations. The notes on the tenses of the Indicative in Chapter II. are based mainly on 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 $\delta\pi\omega s$, &c. (§ 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 indirect discourse (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 DEM. 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: whereas 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 is no more distinction between ¿du τοῦτο ποιή and εἰ τοῦτο ποιοίη 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 use of the Subjunctive with $i\nu a$, $\delta\pi\omega s$, &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*. (See § 44, 2; § 77, 2.) The construction of the Infinitive with verts like $\chi\rho\bar{\eta}\nu$ and $\xi\delta\epsilon_i$, forming

PREFACE.

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 $o\dot{\nu} \mu \dot{\eta}$ was adopted with hesitation, including Elmsley's punctuation, by which the second person of the Future in prohibitions with $o\dot{\nu} \mu \dot{\eta}$ is made 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 have 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 § 1, § 2, or § 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.*

The following additions have been made in the second edition: $-\frac{5}{4}$ 49, 2, N. 6 (b); § 50, 1, Rem. 2; § 52, 2, Rem.; § 53, N. 4; § 64, Rem. 2; § 65, 3, N. 2; § 65, 4; § 69, 5; § 71, Rem. 2; § 89, 2, Rem. 1 and 2; § 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 subject or in substance in the second edition: $-\frac{5}{2}$ 25, 1, N. 5 (b); § 41, N. 4; § 43, Rem.; Remarks 1 and 2 after § 49, 2, N. 3; § 82, Rem. 2; § 89, 2, Notes 1 and 2.

V

^{*} 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: --6 18, 8 is subdivided into (a) and (b); § 18, 8, 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; § 45, N. 2 is subdivided into (a) and (b); in § 49, 2, N. 3, the present divisions (c), (d), and (e) were included in (b); § 64, 1 and 2 are rearranged; in § 92, 2, Note 1 is changed to Remark; § 109, N. 9 was included in N. 3.

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 index 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.

CAMBRIDGE, June, 1865.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE MOODS.

| PAU | |
|--|---|
| § 1. The five Moods | 1 |
| | • |
| §§ 2-4. Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative 1, | 9 |
| 33 2-4. Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative | |
| §§ 5-7. Imperative, Infinitive, Participle, and Verbal in -reos 2, | • |
| 000-1. Inderadive, Infinitive, Largerone, and Verbal in "Troc 2. | |

CHAPTER II.

USE OF THE TENSES.

| ş | 8, 1. The seven Tenses | 8 |
|---|---|----|
| c | 2. Primary and Secondary Tenses | 3 |
| 3 | 9. Relative and absolute Time | 9 |
| | Present and Imperfect. | |
| | A. In the Indicative. | |
| ş | 10, 1. Present Indicative | 4 |
| Ī | 2. Historic Present | 6 |
| ş | 11. Imperfect | 6 |
| | B. Present in the Dependent Moods. | |
| | REM.—Distinction between Present and Aorist | 8 |
| 8 | 12. Present Subjunctive | ä |
| | 13, 1. Present Optative, not in indirect discourse | 10 |
| a | 2. Present Optative in indirect discourse : | 10 |
| | (a.) Representing a Present Indicative | 11 |
| | (b.) Representing Pres. Subj. (in questions of doubt) | 11 |
| 8 | 14. Present Imperative | 12 |
| | 15. Present Infinitive : | 12 |
| 3 | 1. In its ordinary use (indefinite in time) | 12 |
| | 2. In indirect discourse | 13 |
| | 3. As Imperfect Infinitive | 15 |
| 6 | 16. Present Participle : | 10 |
| 9 | 1. As Present | 16 |
| | 2. As Imperfect | 17 |
| | | |

Perfect and Pluperfect.

A. In the Indicative.

| § 17, 1 Perfect Indicative . 2. Pluperfect Indicative . N. 2. Compound forms (εἰμί and ἦν with Perf. Part.) | 18 . 18 18 |
|---|------------------|
| B. Perfect in the Dependent Moods. | |
| 8 18. Relations of the Perfect to the Present | . 19 |
| 1. Perfect Subjunctive and Optative | 20 |
| 9 Danfast Importive | . 21 |

 Perfect Imperative
 Perfect Infinitive
 Perfect Participle 22, 23

Aorist.

23

A. In the Indicative.

| \$ 19. | Aorist In | dicative | | | | • | • | • | | 24 |
|--------|-----------|-----------|---------|-------------------------|-----|--------|------|---|---|----|
| 9 | N. 2. Di | stinction | between | Aorist | and | Imperi | fect | • | • | 24 |

B. Aorist in the Dependent Moods.

| § 20. Aorist Subjunctive | | | 26 |
|--|------|-------|----|
| N. 1. Aorist Subjunctive as Future Perfect . | | 26, | 27 |
| § 21, 1. Aorist Optative not in indirect discourse | | • | 28 |
| 2. Aorist Optative in indirect discourse: — | - | | |
| (a.) Representing an Aorist Indicative | | | 29 |
| (1) Depresenting an Abrist Indicative | • | | 29 |
| (b.) Representing an interrogative Aor. Subj. | • | • | 30 |
| § 22. Aorist Imperative | | • | |
| § 23. Aorist Infinitive : | | | 30 |
| 1. In its ordinary use | • | • | |
| 2. In indirect discourse | • | • | 32 |
| N. 2. After verbs of hoping, promising, &c. | • | • | 32 |
| § 24. Aorist Participle | • | • | 34 |
| N. 1. With $\lambda a \nu \theta \dot{a} \nu \omega$, $\phi \theta \dot{a} \nu \omega$, &c | • | • | 34 |
| N. 2. With περιείδον, επείδον, &c | • | • | 35 |
| Future. | | | |
| § 25, 1. Future Indicative | | • | 36 |
| N. 5. Future with force of Imperative | | | 37 |
| N. 6. Future denoting present intention . | | • | 37 |
| 2. Periphrastic Future (with $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$) . | | | 38 |
| § 26. Future Optative | | | 38 |
| N. 1. After $\delta \pi \omega s$ and $\mu \eta$ | | | 39 |
| § 27. Future Infinitive \cdot \cdot \cdot | | | 41 |
| N. 1. Distinction between Future and Present | or A | orist | 41 |
| | | . 41, | |
| N. 2. Future used for Present or Aorist | • | • | 10 |

| | N. Z. Future used | | | | | | | • | | ., |
|--------|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|----|---|----|
| | N. 3. Future after | r ver | bs of | hopir | iq, p | romis | ing, 8 | кс | • | 43 |
| \$ 28. | Future Participle | | • | ··· . | 5/2 | | • | | | 43 |
| | Future Perfect | | | | | | | | | 43 |

| | N. 3. Expressed by Perfect Participle and $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha$ N. 6. In the dependent moods | • | | 44 44 |
|---|---|---|--------------------|----------------|
| | Gnomic and Iterative Tenses. | | | |
| 5 | 30, 1. Gnomic Aorist and Perfect N. 5. Gnomic Aorist in Infinitive and Participle N. 6. Gnomic Perfect in Infinitive | | • | 47 47 47 |
| | Dependence of Moods and Tenses. | | | |
| ş | 31, 1-2. General Rules . Distinction between Primary and Secondary Tenses:- | • | | 48 |
| Š | 32. In the Indicative | | 49, 50 – 53, | 50 |
| | CHAPTER III. | | | |

13

THE PARTICLE *AN.

| § 36, 1-2. Two uses of a_{ν} |
|--|
| § 37, 1. "Av not used with the Present and Perfect Indicative . 55 |
| 2. "Av with Future Indicative in early Poets 55 |
| N. 1. In Attic Greek (rare) |
| 3. "Av with Secondary Tenses of the Indicative 56 |
| § 38, 1. "Av with the Subjunctive in Protasis, &c |
| 2. "Av with the Subjunctive in Apodosis (Epic) 57 |
| § 39. $^{\prime}A_{\nu}$ with the Optative |
| § 40. "Av not used with the Imperative |
| § 41. "Av with the Infinitive and Participle 57-61 |
| 1. Present |
| 2. Perfect |
| 3. Aorist |
| 4. Future 60 |
| § 42, 1-4. Position and repetition of $d\nu$ |

CHAPTER IV.

USE OF THE MOODS.

SECTION I.

FINAL AND OBJECT CLAUSES AFTER "Ινα, 'Ως, "Οπως, "Οφρα, AND Μή.

| § 43. | Classification | | | • | • | .65-67 |
|-------|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|--------|
| - | N. 2. Negative Particle | | • | • | • | . 67 |

A. Pure Final Clauses.

| A. Fure Final Clauses. |
|--|
| § 44, 1. Subjunctive and Optative after <i>iva</i>, ώs, <i>öπωs</i>, μή, &c. 67 N. 1. Future Indicative after <i>öπωs</i>, &c |
| B. Clauses with "Oπωs and "Oπωs μή after Verbs of Striving, &c. |
| § 45. Future Indicative, &c. after ὅπως |
| C. Clauses with M _n after Verbs of Fearing, &c. |
| § 46. Subjunctive and Optative after μή N. 1. Future Indicative after μή 82 N. 2. Elliptical expressions 83 N. 5. Present and past tenses of the Indic. after μή 83-85 |
| SECTION II. |
| |
| CONDITIONAL SENTENCES. |
| § 47, 1. Protasis and Apodosis explained |
| I. Four Forms of Ordinary Conditional Sentences. |
| A. Present and Past Conditions. |
| 49, 1. Simple Indicative in Protasis and Apodosis |
| B. Future Conditions. |
| \$ 50, 1. Subjunctive with ἐάν in Protasis |

II. Present and Past General Suppositions.

| \$ 51. | Subjunc | tive and | Optativ | re in | Protasis | | | . 107, | 108 |
|--------|---------|-----------|----------|-------|----------|---|---|--------|-----|
| | N. 3. | Indicativ | ve after | εί τι | • • | • | • | | 109 |

Ellipsis and Substitution in Protasis or Apodosis.

| § 52, 1 | . Protasis implied in another clause, or expressed in a |
|---------|---|
| • | Participle or other word |
| | N. 1 and 2. Ellipsis of Verb of the Protasis . 111, 112 |
| 2 | Protasis suppressed |
| | N. Optative with av like Imperat. or Fut. Ind 113 |
| § 53. | Apodosis expressed in Infinitive or Participle 113 |
| - | NOTES.—Ellipsis of the Apodosis 114-116 |
| | |

Mixed Constructions. - Irregularities.

| § 54, 1-3. Protasis and Apodosis differing in form . | 116 - 119 |
|--|-----------|
| § 55, 1. Two or more Protases with the same Apodosis | 119 |
| 2. Apodosis in a dependent construction | . 119 |
| § 56. El after verbs expressing wonder, indignation, &c. | 120 |
| § 57. $\Delta \epsilon$ in Apodosis | . 121 |

SECTION III.

RELATIVE AND TEMPORAL SENTENCES.

| \$ | 58, | 1. Relative and Temporal Words |
|----|-----|---|
| | | A. Relative with a Definite Antecedent. |
| ş | 59. | Indicative after Relative with Definite Antecedent . 122 N. 1. Other constructions |
| | | B. Relative with an Indefinite Antecedent. |
| ş | 60, | 1, 2. Conditional Relative explained |
| § | 61 | Four forms of Conditional Relative clauses correspond- |
| | | ing to the four forms of ordinary protasis . 125-129 1. Simple Indicative (like § 49, 1) |
| | | 1. Simple Indicative (like $\S49, 1$) |
| | | 2. Secondary tenses of the Indicative (like § 49, 2) . 126 |
| | | 3. Subjunctive (like § 50, 1) |
| 8 | 69 | 4. Optative (like § 50, 2) |
| 3 | 04. | Subjunctive and Optative (like § 51) 129 |
| | | N. 1. Indicative in these sentences (after $\delta \sigma \tau \kappa$) . 131 |
| | | N. 3. Subjunctive in Homeric similes |
| S | 63, | 1. Relative without dy, with the Subjunctive |
| Ũ | | 2, 3, 4. Peculiarities in Cond. Relative clauses . 133-135 5. Parenthetical Relative clauses (ὄ τι ποτ' ἐστίν) . 135 |
| | | 5. Parenthetical Relative clauses ($\ddot{o} \tau \iota \pi \sigma \tau' \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$) . 135 |
| | | Assimilation in Conditional Relative Clauses. |
| ş | 64, | 1. Assimilation after Subjunctive or Optative. 1352. Assimilation after secondary tenses of Indicative. 136 |
| | F | elative Clauses expressing a Purpose or Result. |
| 6 | | 1. Future Indicative after Relatives |
| 3 | -0, | |

| N. 2. Subjunctive and Optative in Homer | | | 188 |
|--|---|---|-------|
| N. 5. Relative clauses expressing a result | | | . 140 |
| 2. Future Indicative after εφ' ω, εφ' ωτε . | | | 140 |
| 3. Indicative after $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$. | | | . 140 |
| 4. Causal Relative Sentences | • | • | 141 |

Temporal Particles signifying Until and Before that.

Α. "Εως, "Εστε, "Αχρι, Μέχρι, Εἰσόκε, "Οφρα, Until.

| y ou i has de trans tenes et materie | 142 |
|---|-----|
| 2. "Ews av, &c. with Subj. "Ews, &c. with Optative 142, | 143 |
| 3. "Ews, &c. with secondary tenses of Indicative | 143 |
| 4. "Ews, &c. with Subj. and Opt. after general statements | 144 |
| B. Πρίν. Until. Before that. | |

| § 67. Finite Moods and Infinitive after $\pi \rho i \nu$ | | . 144 |
|---|---|-------|
| 1. Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative after $\pi \rho i \nu$ | | 145 |
| 2. Infinitive after $\pi \rho i \nu$ (see § 106) | | . 145 |
| Ν. 3. Πριν ή, πρότερον ή, πρόσθεν ή | • | 146 |

SECTION IV.

INDIRECT DISCOURSE.

| § 68, 1. | Direct and Indirect Quotations distinguished | | | . 147 | ſ |
|----------|--|---|---|-------|---|
| | Manner of introducing Indirect Quotations | • | | . 147 | 1 |
| 3. | Indirect Questions | | • | . 147 | ! |

General Principles.

| § 69, 1. | Principles of Indirect Quotations after and of Indirect Questions | | | |
|----------|--|-----|----|-------|
| 2. | Secondary tenses of the Indicative . | • | • | . 148 |
| 3. | Infinitive and Participle | • . | ۰. | . 148 |
| 4. | "A ν in Indirect Discourse | | | . 149 |
| 5. | Negative particles in Indirect Discourse | • | • | . 149 |

Indirect Quotation of Simple Sentences.

| ş | 70. | Indicative and Optative after or us, and in Indirect | |
|---|-----|--|-----|
| | | Questions: — | |
| | | 1. Indicative after primary tenses | 149 |
| | | 2. Optative or Indicative after secondary tenses | 150 |
| | | REM. 1 and 2. Both Moods in the same quotation. 151, | 152 |
| | | N. 1. (a.) Imperfect and Pluperfect retained | 152 |
| | | (b.) Present Optative as Imperfect | 153 |
| | | N. 3. Independent Optative (often with $\gamma d\rho$) . | 154 |
| ş | 71. | Interrogative Subjunctive in Indirect Questions . 154, | |
| ŝ | 72. | Indicative or Optative with av in Indirect Discourse . | 156 |
| ŝ | 73, | 1. Infinitive, with or without a_{ν} , in Indirect Discourse . | 157 |
| ĺ | | 2. Participle, with or without av, in Indirect Discourse | 159 |

Indirect Quotation of Compound Sentences.

| § 74, 1. Quotation of dependent clauses with a Subjunctive, or |
|---|
| a Present, Perfect, or Future Indicative |
| N. 1. Mixed constructions |
| 2. Quotation of dependent clauses with Imperfect, Plu- |
| perfect, or Aorist Indicative |
| § 75. Dependent clauses with secondary tenses of Indicative 165 |
| § 76. Dependent clauses with Optative |
| g to. Dependent clauses with optative : |
| Single Dependent Clauses in Indirect Quotation. |
| § 77, 1. (a.) Clauses depending on an Infinitive after verbs of commanding, &c. — (b.) Causal sentences stating a cause assigned by others. — (c.) Clauses after \$\epsilon\$ io \$\epsilon\$ io |
| 2. Same principle applied to clauses after $i\nu a$, $\delta\pi\omega s$, &c. 169 |

"Onws and "O in Indirect Quotations.

| § 78, | 1. "Onws for $\delta \tau \iota$ or $\dot{\omega} s$. | 2. Homeric ő for őri | | | 170 |
|-------|--|----------------------|---|---|-----|
| - | NOTE 'Οθούνεκα and | οῦνεκα for ὅτι . | • | • | 171 |

SECTION V.

J

CAUSAL SENTENCES.

| | | | | partic | | | • | c | • | | • | | | 17 | 11 |
|---|-----|----|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|-------|----|----|
| ŝ | 81, | 1. | India | ative | in (| Causal | sente | nces. | | | | | | 17 | 11 |
| - | | 2. | Opta | ative | after | seco | udarv | tense | s. te | o exi | oress | a | cause | _ | - |
| | | | as | signed | lby | others | . ' | | | | | | | 17 | 12 |
| | | | N. 1. | Čaus | se ex | presse | ed by | an Aj | odo | sis | • | • | • | 17 | 13 |

SECTION VI.

EXPRESSION OF A WISH.

| REM. — Two classes of Wishes | | | • | | 173 |
|--|------------|-------|----|------|-----|
| § 82. Optative in Wishes. § 83, 1. Secondary tenses of Indicative | | | | 173. | 174 |
| § 83, 1. Secondary tenses of Indicative | in Wisł | nes | | . , | 175 |
| 2. " $\Omega \phi \epsilon \lambda o \nu$ with the Infinitive . | | • | | 176, | |
| REM Greek and Latin expre | essions co | ompar | ed | • | 177 |

SECTION VII.

IMPERATIVE AND SUBJUNCTIVE IN COMMANDS, EXHOR-TATIONS, AND FROHIBITIONS,

| § 84. | Imperative | . 1 | 178 |
|--------|---|-----|-----|
| \$ 85. | First person of Subjunctive in exhortations. | . 1 | 179 |
| | Pres. Imperat. or Aor. Subj. in prohibitions with $\mu\eta$ | . 1 | 180 |

SECTION VIII.

SUBJUNCTIVE (LIKE FUT. IND.) IN INDEPENDENT SENTENCES. — INTERROGATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE. — Où $\mu \dot{\eta}$ WITH SUBJUNC-TIVE AND FUTURE INDICATIVE.

| \$ 87. | Independent Subjunctive in Homer | 181 |
|--------|---|-----|
| · | NOTE. — With $d\nu$, in apodosis | 182 |
| § 88. | Interrogative Subjunctive (with or without $\beta o \hat{\nu} \lambda \epsilon \iota$) | 182 |
| \$ 89. | Double Negative, où $\mu \eta$: | |
| • | 1. With Subj. (rarely Fut. Ind.), as emphatic Future | 184 |
| | 2. With Future Indicative in prohibitions | 185 |

CHAPTER V.

THE INFINITIVE.

| § 90. Infinitive as a Verbal Noun |
|--|
| § 91. Infinitive as Subject |
| |
| § 92. Infinitive as Object: |
| |
| 2. In indirect discourse |
| N. 3. Infinitive after Relatives (by assimilation) . 193 |
| § 93, 1 and 2. Infin. after Adjectives and Adverbs 193-195 |
| § 94. Infinitive (with Article) after Prepositions 197 |
| § 95, 1. Infinitive as Genitive or Dative |
| 2. Two constructions after verbs of hindrance, &c 198 |
| N. 1. Negative particles. Double Negative, $\mu\eta$ où . 200 |
| 3. Infinitive with $\tau \delta \mu \eta$, after expressions implying pre- |
| vention, omission, or denial |
| § 96. Infinitive and its adjuncts preceded by τo 202 |
| § 97. Infinitive expressing a purpose |
| N. 4. Infin. after Comparative and <i>i</i> , than 204 |
| § 98, 1. Infinitive after ώστε (result) |
| 2. Infin. after $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ (condition or purpose) 205 |
| N. 1. Ω_s for $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$, with Infinitive 206 |
| § 99. Infinitive after ed o or ed or ed or ed or ed of or |
| § 100. Absolute Infinitive (generally with ώs or δσον) 207 |
| N. 1. 'Ohiyou ($\delta \epsilon i \nu$), almost, little short of 208 |
| Ν. 2. Έκων είναι, τὸ νῦν είναι, &c 208 |
| § 101. Infinitive used imperatively 208 |
| § 102. Infinitive in wishes (like the Optative) 209 |
| § 103. Infinitive in laws, treaties, proclamations, &c 209 |
| § 104. Infinitive expressing surprise or indignation 209 |
| § 105. Infinitive in narration |
| § 106 Infinitive after $\pi \rho i \nu$ |
| |
| |
| REM. — Tenses of the Infinitive |

CHAPTER VI.

THE PARTICIPLE.

| § 107. Three uses of the Participle . . |
|---|
| 1-4. Time, means, manner, cause, &c |
| 5 - 7. Purpose, condition, opposition, &c |
| 8. Attendant circumstances |
| Notes 1-5. Adverbs, &c. with Part. of § 109 . 218-221 |
| N. 7. (a.) Partic. in Rel. or Interrog. sentences . 221 |
| (b.) Τί μαθών; Τί παθών; wherefore? 221, 222 |
| § 110, 1. Genitive Absolute |
| 2. Accusative Absolute |
| § 111. Gen. or Accus. Absol. and ordinary Partic. combined 225 § 112. Participle with verbs (like Infinitive) : — |
| 1. With verbs signifying to begin, to cease, &c 226 |
| 2. With διατελέω, λανθάνω, τυγχάνω, φθάνω, &c 227 |
| § 113. Partic. in indirect discourse (after verbs signifying to see, |
| to perceive, to know, &c.) |
| N. 1. Participle with $\delta \eta \lambda \delta s$ ($\phi a \nu \epsilon \rho \delta s$) $\epsilon i \mu i$ |
| N. 6. Participle with σύνοιδα and σ υγγιγνώσκω 230 |
| N. 10. Ω_s with these Participles |

CHAPTER VII.

VERBAL ADJECTIVES IN -réos.

| § 114. Two constructions of t 1. Personal constructio 2. Impersonal construc | n | • | | . 233 233, 234 |
|--|---|---------|-----|-------------------|
| Appendix I | | | | |
| INDEX TO EXAMPLES . ENGLISH INDEX | • | ••• | • • | |
| GREEX INDEX | | | | |



CHAPTER I.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE MOODS.

§ 1. THE Greek verb has five Moods, the Indicative, Subjunctive, Optative, Imperative, and Infinitive. The first four, as opposed to the Infinitive, are called *finite* moods.

§ 2. The Indicative is used in simple, absolute assertions; as $\gamma \rho \dot{a} \phi \epsilon \iota$, he writes; $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \rho a \psi \epsilon \nu$, he wrote; $\gamma \rho \dot{a} \psi \epsilon \iota$, he will write; $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \rho a \phi \epsilon \nu$, he has written.

The Indicative is used also to express various other relations, which the following examples will illustrate:—

El τοῦτο ἀληθές ἐστι, χαίρω, if this is true, I rejoice. El ἔγραψεν, ηλθον ἄν, if he had written, I should have come. El τοῦτο ποιήσει, καλῶς ἕξει, if he shall do this, it will be well. Ἐπιμελείται ὅπως τοῦτο γενήσεται, he takes care that this shall happen. Eiθε με ἕκτεινας, ώς μήποτε τοῦτο ἐποίησα, O that thou hadst killed me, that I might never have done this! Είθε τοῦτο ἀληθές ην, O that this were true. Λέγει ὡς τοῦτο ἀληθές ἐστιν, he says that this is true. Eἶπεν ὅτι τοῦτο πράξει, he said that he would do this. Ἐρωτῆ τί ἐγράψαμεν, 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 include even the Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive in Latin; for $\epsilon i \ \epsilon \gamma \rho a \psi \epsilon \nu$, $\eta \lambda \theta o \nu \ a \nu$ is equivalent to si scripsuset, venissen. 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 $l\nu a$, $\mu \eta'$, &c.; in conditional, relative, and temporal sentences; and

1

in certain independent sentences — may be seen by the following examples: —

"Ερχεται ΐνα τοῦτο ἴδη, he is coming that he may see this. Φοβείται μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, he fears lest this may happen. Ἐἐν τοῦτο ποιεἶν βούληται, δυνήσεται, if he shall wish to do this, he will be able. "Οτι ΐν ποιεῖν βούληται δυνήσεται, whatever he shall wish to do he will be able (to do). Ἐέν τι ποιεῖν βούληται, τοῦτο ποιεῖ, if he (ever) wishes to do anything, he (aἰκαys) does it. "Ο τι ἀν ποιεῖν βούληται ποιεῖ, whatever he wishes (at any time) to do he (always) does. "Όταν τοῦτο ποιεῖν βούληται, δυνήσεται, when he shall wish to do this, he will be able. "Οταν ποιεῦν τι βούληται, ποιεῖ, whenever he wishes to do anything, he (always) does it. "Ιωμεν, let us go. Μὴ θαυμάσητε, do not wonder. Οὐ μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, this will (surely) not happen. Τί εἴπω; what shall I say?

§ 4. The various uses of the Optative — in clauses denoting a purpose or object after $i\nu a$, $\mu \eta$, &e.; in conditional, relative, and temporal sentences; in indirect quotations and questions; and in independent sentences (in apodosis with $a\nu$, or in expressions of a wish) may be seen by the following examples: —

^{*}H λ θεν ^τνα τοῦτο ^τδοι, he came that he might see this. ^{*}Eφοβεῖτο μη τοῦτο γένοιτο, he feared lest this might happen. El τοῦτο ποιεῖν βούλοιτο, δύναιτ^{*} ἄν, if he should wish to do this, he would be able. ^{*}Ο τι ποιεῖν βούλοιτο δύναιτ^{*} ἄν, whatever he should wish to do, he would be able (to do). El τι ποιεῖν βούλοιτο, τοῦτ^{*} ἐποίει, if he (ever) wished to do anything, he (always) did it. ^{*}Ο τι ποιεῖν βούλοιτο ἐποίει, whatever he wished (at any time) to do he (always) did. ^{*}Οτε τοῦτο ποιεῖν βούλοιτο, δύναιτ^{*} ἄν, whenever he should wish to do this, he would be able. ^{*}Οτε ποιεῖν τι βούλοιτο, ἐποίει, uchenever he wished to do anything, he (always) did it. Eἶπεν ὅτι τοῦτο ποιοίη, he said that he was doing this. Eἶπεν ὅτι τοῦτο ποιήσει, he said that he would do this. ^{*}Ηρώτων τί ποιοίη (ποιήσεις νη ποιήσει, he said that he would do this. ^{*}Ηρώτων τί ποιοίη (ποιήσεις νη τοῦτοτηότοι), they asked what he was doing (had done, or would do).

 $\Delta \psi \nu \alpha \iota \tau' \, \dot{a} \nu \tau \sigma \vartheta \tau \sigma \iota \epsilon \dot{\nu}$, he would be able to do this. Elle $\mu \eta \tau \alpha \vartheta \tau \alpha$ $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \sigma \iota \epsilon \nu$, O that they may not suffer these things ! `A $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \sigma \iota \tau \sigma$, may he perish ! M $\eta \tau \sigma \vartheta \tau \sigma \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \iota \tau \sigma$, 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 $-\tau \acute{\epsilon} os$ or $-\tau \acute{\epsilon} o\nu$. 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, \$ 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 is connected (that is, time *relatively* present, &c.). Thus, when we say rouro $d\lambda\eta\theta$ is irrue, this is true, ioriv denotes time present with reference to the time of speak.

ing: but when we say $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilon$ τοῦτο $d\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon$ s εἶναι, or $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilon\nu$ ὅπ τοῦτο $d\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon$ s ἐστιν (or εἴη), he said that this was true (1. e. he said "this is true"), we use the Present tense; but this tense here denotes time present with reference to the time of the leading verb, $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilon$, or time absolutely past and only relatively present. The same distinction is seen between the Future in τοῦτο γενήσεται, this will happen, and in $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilon$ τοῦτο γενήσεσθαι or ὅτι γενήσεται (γενήσοιτο), he said that 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 absolutely past. Again, in τοῦτο ἐγένετο, this happened, the Aorist is absolutely past; but in $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilon$ τοῦτο γενέσθαι, or $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilon\nu$ ὅτι τοῦτο ἐγένετο (or γένοιτο), he said that this had happened, it denotes time past with reference to the time of $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilon\nu$, 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 elvan and $e\sigma ri$ after $\ddot{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilon$ by our Imperfect was; the Futures $\gamma\epsilon\nu\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta a$ and $\gamma\epsilon\nu\dot{\eta}-\sigma\epsilon\tau a$ by would happen; and the Aorists $\gamma\epsilon\nu\dot{\sigma}\theta a$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{\epsilon}\tau$ by had happened. This principle is especially observed in the Indicative, Optative, and Infinitive in indirect quotations; in final and object clauses after $\ddot{\iota}\nu a$, $\ddot{\sigma}\pi\omega s$, &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 $\gamma \rho \dot{a} \phi \omega$, *I write*, or *I am writing*.

REMARK. A single important exception occurs when the Present Indicative in indirect discourse denotes time present relatively to the leading verb. See above, $\S 9$; and $\S 70$, 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. Πλοΐον εἰς Δήλου 'Αθηναΐοι π έμπουσιν, the Athenians send a ship to Delos (every year). PLAT. Phaed. 58 A. Τίκτει τοι κόρος ὕβριν, ὅταν κακῷ ὅλβος ἕπηται, satiety begets insolence, whenever prosperity follows the wicked. THEOGN. 153. Ἐν χρόνῷ ἀποφθίνει τὸ τάρβος ἀνθρώποισιν. AESCH. Agam. 857.

NOTE 2. The Present denotes merely the continuance of an action, without reference to its completion: sometimes, however, it is directly implied by the context that the action is not to be completed, so that the Present denotes an attempted action. Especially, $\delta(\delta\omega\mu\mu)$, in the sense I offer, and $\pi\epsilon(\partial\omega)$, I try to persuade, are used in this sense. E. g.

Nῦν δ' ẫμα τ' αὐτίκα πολλὰ διδοî, he offers many things. II. IX, 519. Πείθουσι ὑμῶς ἐναντία καὶ τοῦς νόμοις καὶ τῷ δικαίψ ψηφίσασθαι, 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 denoting past time, especially $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha_i$, in the sense of a Perfect and Present combined. E. g.

Κείνον ἰχνεύω πάλαι, I have been tracking him a long time (and still continue it). SOPH. Aj. 20. Οὐ πάλαι σοι λέγω ὅτι ταὐτόν φημι είναι; 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 Πολύν χρόνον τοῦτο ποιῶ.

So in Latin, Jam dudum loquor.

NOTE 4. The Presents $\eta \kappa \omega$, *I* am come, and $\delta n \chi \omega \mu \omega$, *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 $\phi \epsilon \nu \gamma \omega$, in the sense *I* am banished, $\delta \lambda i \sigma \kappa \omega \mu \omega$, *I* am captured, $\nu \kappa \kappa \omega$ and $\kappa \rho \alpha \tau \epsilon \omega$, *I* am victorious, $\eta \tau \tau \delta \omega \mu \omega$, *I* am conquered, $\delta \delta \kappa \epsilon \omega$, *I* have been unjust (*I* am $\delta \iota \kappa \sigma s$). So $\kappa \omega$ and $\kappa \alpha \mu \omega$ in Homer, with $\delta \lambda \lambda \nu \mu \omega$ and similar verbs and sometimes $\tau i \kappa \tau \omega$ in the Tragedians. E. g.

Θεμιστοκλής ήκω παρὰ σέ, I, Themistocles, am come to thee. THUC. I, 137. Οἶχεται εἰς äλa δίαν, he is gone to the divine sea. II. XV, 223. ἸΛίου ἀλισκομένου, Ilium having been captured. THUC. VI, 2. So HDT. I, 85. Εἰ πάντα ταῦτα ἐλυμαίνετο τοῖς ὅλοις, ἔως ἀνέτρεψε, τί Δημοσθένης ἀδικεῖ; DEM. Cor. 327, 1. Πύργων ὀλλυμένων ἐνἰ ναυσὶν ἔβαν, I embarked after the towers had been destroyed. EUR. Iph. T. 1108. So ἀνοιγομένης θύρης, HDT. I, 9. "Hδε τίκτει σε, this 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*, even when their action is strictly finished before the moment at which they are used. E. g.

Οί Σικελιώται στασιάζουσιν, ώς πυνθανόμεθα, the Sicilians are at discord, as we learn. Thuc. VI, 16. Ἐπὶ πόλεις, ὡς ἐγὼ ἀκοỹ αἰσθάνομαι, μέλλομεν ἰέναι μεγάλας. Thuc. VI, 20.

NOTE 6. The Present $\epsilon i \mu$, *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 $\epsilon i \mu$ as a Present.) E. g.

Σεῦ ὕστερος εἰμ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν, I shall go. Π. ΧΥΠΠ, 333. Εἰμι πάλιν ἐπ' ἐκεῖνα, I shall recur to that. ΡΙΑΤ. Phaed. 100 Β. 'Αλλ' εἴσειμι, σοῦ δ' οὐ φροντιῶ. ARIST. Nub. 125. 'Ω φίλ', ἐγὼ μὲν ἄπειμι, σύας καὶ κεῖνα ψυλάξων. Od. XVII, 593.

(As Present.) Olos δ' ἀστὴρ εἶσι μετ' ἀστράσι νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ, as a star moves, &c. II. XXII, 317.

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

Mένομεν ξως αν ξκαστοι κατὰ πόλεις ληφθῶμεν; shall we wait? THUC. VI. 77. Ei δέ φησιν οὗτος, δειξάτω, κἀγὼ καταβαίνω, and I will take any seat. DEM. F. L. 351, 4. Σὶ εἶ δ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἔτερου προσδοκῶμεν; art thou he that should come, or do we look for another? MATTH. Evang. XI, 3. ᾿Απόλλυμαι, 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.

Βουλήν έπιτεχναται ὅπως μή άλισθεῖεν Αθηναῖοι, he contrives a plan to prevent the Athenians from collecting. HDT. I, 63. Κελεύει πέμψαι ανδρας άποστέλλουσιν οὖν, καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν ὁ Θημιστοκλῆς κρύφα πέμπει. THUC. I, 91. Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος παίδες γίγνονται δύο. 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\gamma\rho a\phi o\nu$, I was writing.

NOTE 1. The Imperfect is thus a Present transferred to the past, and it retains all the peculiarities of the Present

IMPERFECT.

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.

Ἐπὶ Κέκροπος ἡ Αττικὴ κατὰ πόλεις ῷκεῖτο, καὶ οὐ ξυν ἡεσαν βουλευσόμενοι. ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ἕκαστοι ἐπολιτεύοντο καὶ ἐβουλεύοντο. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ Θησεὐς ἐβασίλευσεν, ἐς τὴν νῦν πόλιν οὖσαν ξυνῷκισε πάντας. ΤΗυς. Η, 15. (Here the Imperfects refer to the state of the country or the customs, the Aorists to single actions; ἐβασίλευσε, became king, ξυνῷκισε, collected into one state.)

NOTE 2. The Imperfect, like the Present (§ 10, N. 2), sometimes denotes attempted action, being in this case strictly an Imperfect tense. So especially $\partial \partial \partial vv$ and $\delta \pi \epsilon \iota \partial vv$. E. g.

Φίλιππος 'Αλόννησον ἐδίδου, Philip offered Halonnesus (lit. tried to give it). AESCH. Cor. § 83. Έκαστος ἔπειθεν αὐτὸν ὑποστῆναι τὴν ἀρχήν, each one tried to persuale him to undertake the command. XEN. An. VI, 1, 19. Κῦμα ἴστατ' ἀειρόμενον, κατὰ δ' ῆρεε Πηλείωνα, and was about to overpower the son of Peleus. II. XXI, 327. Έμισθοῦτο παρ' οὐκ ἐκδιδόντος τὴν αὐλήν, he tried to hire the yard of one who refused to let it. HDT. I, 68. Πέμψαντες ἐς Σάρδις χρυσὸν ἀνέοντο, they wanted to buy gold. HDT. I, 69. Ἐπεθύμησε τῆς χλανίδος, καὶ αὐτὴν προσελθῶν ἀν έετο, he tried to buy it. HDT. III, 139. [°]A ἐπράσσετο οὐκ ἐγένετο, what was attempted did not happen. THUC. VI, 74. So προσετίθει, she wanted to add. ARIST. Nub. 63.

NOTE 3. When the Present has the force of the Perfect (§ 10, 1, N. 4), the Imperfect has regularly the force of a Pluperfect. (See § 17, N. 3). E. g.

'Ο ὅχλος κατὰ θέαν ἡ κεν, the crowd were come to look on. Thuc. VI, 31. 'Επεὶ ῷ χεο νηὶ Πύλονδε, after thou wast gone by ship to Pylos. Od. XVI, 24.

NOTE 4. The Imperfect sometimes denotes likelihood, intention, or danger in past time. (See § 10, 1, N. 7.) E. g.

Έπειδη τῷ ψεύδεσθαι ἀπώλλυτο, when he was on the point of ruin through his deceit. ΑΝΤΙΡΗΟΝ. de Caed. Herod. § 37. Καὶ τẫμ έθνησκε τέκν', ἀπωλλύμην δ' ἐγώ, 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 $\beta a\hat{\nu} vor$ and $\beta \hat{\eta}$ are used without any perceptible difference in II. I. 437, 439; so $\beta a\lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau o$ and $\beta a\lambda \epsilon \tau o$. II. 43, 45; $\theta \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu$ and $\tau i \theta \epsilon_i$, XXIII, 653, 656; $\delta \hat{\omega} \kappa \epsilon$ and $\delta i \delta o v$, VII. 303, 305; $\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda \pi \epsilon \nu$ and $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon_i$ II, 106, 107; compare also $\mu i \sigma \tau v \lambda \lambda v$ and $\omega \pi \tau \eta \sigma a v$, I, 465, 466.

§ 11.]

[§ 11.

NOTE 6. The Imperfect sometimes expresses a *fact*, which is either the result of a previous discussion, or one that is just recognized as a fact by the speaker or writer, having previously been denied, overlooked, or misunderstood. In the latter case, the particle $a\rho a$ is often joined to the verb. E. g.

²Ω πόποι, οὐκ ἄρα πάντα νοήμονες οὐδὲ δίκαιοι η̈σαν Φαιήκων ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες, i. e. they are not, as I once imagined. Od. XIII, 209. Οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνου ἕην ἐρίδων γένος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν εἰσὶ δύω, there is not after all merely one race of discords, but there are two on earth. HES. Op. 1. ^{*}Oδ' η̈ν ἄρα ὁ ξυλλαβών με, this is then the one who seized me. SOPII. Phil. 978. Où σὺ μώνος ἄρ' η̈σθ' ἔποψ; are you not then the only epops (as I thought) ? ARIST. Av. 280. ^{*}Hν τ΄ μουσικὴ ἀντίστροφος τῆς γυμναστικῆς, εἰ μέμνησαι, music then (as we proved) corresponds to gymnastics. PLAT. Rep. VII, 522 A. Διαφθεροῦμεν ἐκείνο, ὃ τῷ μὲν δικαίφ βέλτιον ἐγίγνετο, τῷ δὲ ἀδίκφ ἀπ ὡ λ ντο, we shall destroy that which (as we proved) becomes better by justice and is ruined by injustice. PLAT. Crit. 47 D. ^{*}Aρ' οὐ τόδε η̈ν τὸ δένδρον, ἐφ' ὅπερ ຖ̂µes ἡμῶς; is not this after all the tree to which you were bringing us? PLAT. Phaedr. 230 Å.

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 $\frac{3}{7}\nu \circ \tau \eta \nu$ $\gamma \nu \dot{\rho} \mu \eta \nu \tau a \dot{\nu} \tau \eta \nu \epsilon l \pi \dot{\omega} \nu \Pi \epsilon i \sigma a \nu \delta \rho o \varsigma$, THUC. VIII, 68 ; $\tau i s \tilde{\eta} \nu \delta \beta o \eta \theta \eta \sigma a s$ $\tau o i s B \nu \zeta a \nu \tau i o s \kappa a \dot{\nu} \sigma \omega \sigma a s a \dot{\nu} \tau o \dot{\nu} s$; DEM. Cor. 255, 2. (See Note 6.)

B. The Present in the Dependent Moods.

REMARK. 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 chieffy used; the Perfect is seldom required (§ 18, 1, N.), and the Future is exceptional (§ 27, Notes). It must be remembered that the Greek distinction between the Present and Aorist in the Subjunctive and Optative 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 $\epsilon i \tau \circ \tilde{\tau} \circ \tau \circ \iota \circ (\eta, if he should do this$ $(habitually), <math>\epsilon i \pi \circ \iota \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota \epsilon$, (simply) if he should do this, and sometimes $\epsilon a \tau \circ \tau \circ \tau \circ \tau \circ \iota \eta$ (or $\pi \circ \iota \eta \sigma_{\eta}$), 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 used 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 $\epsilon l\mu i$, 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 $i_{\nu a}$, $\delta \pi \omega s$, &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, 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.

(a.) Δοκεί μοι κατακαῦσαι τὰς ἀμάξας, ἕνα μὴ τὰ ζεύγη ἡμῶν στρατηγŷ, ἀλλὰ πορευώμεθα ὅπῃ ἀν τŷ στρατιῷ συμφέρῃ, 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 whithersoever it may be best for the army. XEN. An. III, 2, 27. Καὶ γὰρ βασιλεὺς αἰρείται, οὐχ ἕνα ἑαυτοῦ καλῶς ἐπιμελῆται, ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ οἱ ἐλόμενοι δι' αὐτὸν εὖ πράττωσι. XEN. Mem. III, 2, 3.

(b.) ^{*}Aν δέ τις ἀνθιστῆται, πειρασόμεθα χειροῦσθαι, but if any one shall stand opposed to us, we will try to subdue him. XEN. An.

§ 12.]

VII, 3, 11. Kầv πόλεμος \vec{y} , \vec{e} ως $\hat{a}\nu$ $\hat{\epsilon}^*$ αλλον $\vec{\epsilon}\chi$ ωμεν στρατεύεσθαι, σοῦ τε καὶ τῶν σῶν ἀφεξόμεθα, and if there shall be war, so long as we shall be able. &c. Id. Hell. IV, 1, 38. 'λλλ' \hat{j} âν γιγνώσ κω βέλτιστα ἐρῶ, but I will speak as I shall think best. THUC. VI, 9. Oûş âν 80 υλη ποιήσασθαι φίλους, ἀγαθόν τι λέγε περὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοῦ ἀπαγγέλλοντας, whomsoever you shall wish, &c. ISOC. Demon. p. 9 C. § 33. 'Aπας λόγος, ầν ἀπῆ τὰ πράγματα, μάταιόν τι φαίνεται καὶ κενών, all speech, if (wherever) dɛsds are wanting, appears vain and useless. DEM. OI. II, 21, 20. Συμμαχεῖν τούτοις ἐθέλουσιν ἅπαντες, οὐς ầν ὅρῶσι παρεσκευασμένους, all are willing to be allied to those whom they see prepared. Id. Phil. I, 42, 1.

(c.) $\Pi \epsilon \iota \theta \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a \pi \dot{a} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \cdot \phi \epsilon \dot{v} \gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \dot{v} \nu \eta v \sigma \dot{v} \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\eta} a \tau \rho \dot{\delta} a \tau a \tau \rho \dot{\delta} a \tau a \tau \rho \dot{\delta} a \tau a \tau \rho \dot{\delta} c \dot{\delta} a \tau a \tau \rho \dot{\delta} c \dot{\delta$

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 $i\nu a$, $\delta\pi\omega s$, &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 $a\nu$) the Optative refers to the *future*. E. g.

(a.) Toύτου ἐπεθύμει, ΐνα εὖ πράττοι, he desired this in order that he might be in prosperity. Ἐφοβεῖτο μὴ τοῦτο ποιοῖεν, he feared lest they should do this (habitually). Δῆλος ἦν ἐπιθυμῶν ἄρχειν, ὅπως πλείω λαμβάνοι. ἐπιθυμῶν δὲ τιμῶσθαι, ΐνα πλείω κερδαίνοι 'φίλος τε ἐβούλετο εἶναι τοῦς μέγιστα δυναμένοις, ΐνα ἀδικῶν μὴ διδοίη δίκην. XEN. 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.) (b.) Où yàp åv è π aivoín $\mu\epsilon$, el è $\xi\epsilon \lambda a \acute{v} v \iota \mu i$ roùs e $\iota\epsilon p \gamma \acute{e} r as$, for he would not praise me, if I should banish my benefactors. XEN. An. VII, 7, 11. E'ns ϕ opnràs oùs åv, el $\pi \rho \acute{a} \sigma \sigma \iota s$ ka $\lambda \hat{s}$, you would not be endurable, if you should be in prosperity (at any time). AESCH. Prom. 979. Hâs yàp äv ris, ä $\gamma \epsilon \mu \eta$ è π i $\sigma \tau a \iota \tau \sigma$, ra $\iota \tau a \sigma \phi \diamond \delta s$ e'n; for how could any one be wise in that which he did not understand? (i. e. e'i $\tau \iota r a \mu \eta$ è π i $\sigma \tau a \iota \tau \sigma$. YAN' e'i $\tau \iota \mu \eta$ $\phi \acute{e} \rho \iota \mu \epsilon v$, ä $\tau \rho v \phi \acute{e} \rho \epsilon \iota v$, but if we neglected to bring anything, he always exhirted us to bring it. EUR. Alc. 755. Oùs à $\pi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \acute{i} \pi \epsilon \tau \sigma$ $\pi \iota a \dot{v} \sigma \ddot{v}$, e'i η , he never left him, unless there was some necessity for it. XEN. Mem. IV, 2, 40. ' $\sigma \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon$ E $\iota a \gamma \delta \rho \delta e \nu$, $\acute{e} \phi \delta \delta v ro$, whenever they saw Evagoras, they were afraid. Isoc. Evag. 193 D. § 24.

(c.) Eile $\tau \circ \tilde{\iota} \tau \circ \tilde{\iota} \eta$ (utinam sit), O that this may be. Eile $\mu \eta$ $\tau a \tilde{\iota} \tau a \pi \dot{a} \sigma \chi \circ \iota \epsilon \nu$, may they not suffer these things (habit tally). But $\epsilon \tilde{\iota} \partial \epsilon \mu \eta \pi \dot{a} \partial \circ \iota \epsilon \nu$, may they not suffer (in a single case). See examples of Apodosis with $\ddot{a}\nu$ 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 § 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.

Περικλης προηγόρευε, ὅτι 'Αρχίδαμός οἱ ξένος εἴη, Pericles announced that Archidamus was his friend (i. e. he said ξένος μοί ἐστιν). THUC. II, 13. "Εγνωσαν ὅτι κευὸς ὁ φόβος εἴη, they learned that their fear was groundless (i. e. they learned κενός ἐστιν). XEN. An. II, 2, 21. Ἐπυνθάνετο εἰ οἰκοῖτο ἡ χώρα, he asked whether the country was inhabited (i. e. he asked the question, Is the country inhabited?). XEN.

(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.

Kλέαρχος ἐβουλεύετο, εἰ πέμποιέν τινας ἢ πάντες ἴοιεν, Clearchus was deliberating whether they should send a few, or should all go. XEN. An. I. 10, 5. (The question was, πέμπωμέν τινας ἢ πάντες ἴωμεν; shall we send a few, or shall we all co? See § S8.)

REMARK. Examples of the Present Optative representing the

Present Indicative or Subjunctive in a dependent clause of the direct discourse, 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 $\eta\gamma\nu\delta\sigma\nu$ ö $\tau\iota$ ποιοΐεν might mean they knew not what they were doing (the Optative representing $\tau\iota$ ποιοΐμεν; what are we doing?) or they knew not what to do (the Optative representing $\tau\iota$ ποιῶμεν; 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 $\phi \epsilon \hat{\nu} \gamma \epsilon$, begone; $\chi \alpha i \rho \acute{\nu} \tau \omega \nu$, let them rejoice; $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu o \mu i \zeta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, 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.

"Εξεστι μένειν, it is possible to remain. 'Εξέσται τοῦτο ποιεῖν, it will be possible to do this. Δέομαι ὑμῶν μένειν, I beg you to remain. Τί τὸ κωλῦον ἔτ ἀὐτὸν ἔσται βαδίζειν ὅποι βούλεται, what will there be to prevent him from going whither he pleases? DEM. OI. I, 12, 22. 'Ἐκέλευσα ἀὐτὸν τοῦτο ποιεῖν, I commanded him to do this. 'Ἐβῶν λετο σοφὸς εἶναι, he wished to be wise. Δεινός ἐστι λέγειν, he is skilled in speaking. "Δρα βαδίζειν, it is time to be goirg. Πῶν ποιοῦσιν, ὥστε δίκην μὴ διδόναι, they do everything, so as to avoid being punished. PLAT. Gorg. 479 C. Τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐπιτιμῶν ἴσως φήσαι τις ῶν βάδιον εἶναι, τὸ δ' ὅτι δεῖ πράττειν ἀποφαίνεσθαι, τοῦτ ἐἶναι showing what ought to be done is the duty of an adviser. DEM. OI. I, 13, 27. (Here ἐπιτιμῶν, ἀποφαίνεσθαι, and πράττειν belong under this rule; είναι in both cases belongs ruder § 15, 2.) Οὐ πλεσ νεξίας ἕνεκεν ταῦτ' ἔπραξεν, ἀλλὰ τῷ δικαιότερα τοὺς Θηβαίοις ἡ ὑμας ἀξιοῦν, he did this not from love of gain, but because of the Thebans making juster demands than you. DEM. Phil. II, 69, 6. Ἐπειχίσθη δὲ ᾿Αταλάντη νῆσος, τοῦ μὴ ληστὰς κακουργεῖν τὴν Εὕβοιαν, in order to prevent birates from ravaging Euboea. Thuc. II, 32.

REMARK. The Infinitive in this its ordinary use has usually no more reference to *time* than any verbal noun, 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 $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ or $\pi \rho i \nu$, or by some other word in the sentence. Thus $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ denoting a *purpose* refers the Infinitive to the future: the Infinitive without $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ expressing a *purpose* is likewise future. After a large class of verbs, as hose 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. Xpáw, $d\nu a u \rho \epsilon \omega$, $\theta \epsilon \sigma \pi i \zeta \omega$, 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 indirect discourse (§ 15, 2, N. 1). These verbs here take the ordinary construction of verbs of commanding, advising, and warning. E. g.

Λέγεται δὲ 'Αλκμαίωνι τὸν 'Απόλλω ταύτην τὴν γῆν χρῆσαι οἰκεῖν, it is said that Apollo gave a response to Alemaeon that he should unhabit this land. THUC. II, 102. The Future is sometimes found. For the Aorist, see § 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.

Φησὶ γράφειν, he says that he is writing; ἔφη γράφειν, he said that he was writing (i. e. he said "I am writing"); φήσει γράφειν, he will say that he is (then) writing. 'Αρρωστεῖν προφασίζεται, he pretends that he is sick. 'Εξώμοσεν ἀρρωστεῖν τουτονί, he took his oath that this man was sick. DEM. F. L. 379, 15 and 17. Οὐκ ἔφη aἰτὸs ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον στρατηγεῖν, he said that not he himself, but Nicias, was genera', i.e. he said, oùr éyè aùròs dhà' éxêivos $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \epsilon \hat{i}$ THUC. IV, 28. For the Present Infinitive with $a\nu$ (not included here), see § 41.

NOTE 1. The Infinitive is said to stand in *indirect discourse*, with its tenses thus corresponding to the same tenses of the Indicative only when it depends upon verbs implying *thought* or the expression of thought (verba sentiendi et declarandi), and when also the thought, as originally conceived, would have been expressed by some tense of the Indicative, which the corresponding tense of the Infinitive can represent. Thus verbs of commanding, wishing, and others enumerated in § 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 merely the ordinary Infinitive used as a verbal noun, without any definite time. See § 73, 1, Remark; where the principle is stated in full, so as to include all the tenses and the Infinitive with $a\nu$.

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.

⁶ Ωμολόγεις καθ' ήμῶς πολιτεύεσθαι, you agreed to live according to us (the laws). PLAT. Crit. 52 C. Ξυνέθου πολιτεύεσθαι. Id. 52 D. Προσαγαγών ἐγγυητὰς ἦ μὴν πορεύεσθαι, having giving securities that he would go. XEN. Cyr. VI, 2, 39. 'Ελπίζει δυνατὸς εἶναι ἄρχειν, he hopes to be able to rule. PLAT. Rep. IX, 573 C. (But in HDT. I, 30, ἐλπίζων εἶναι ὀλβιώτατος ἐπειρώτα, means, he asked, trusting that he was, εἶναι being a regular Present Infinitive of indirect discourse. So I. 22, ἐλπίζων ... εἶναι καὶ τὸν λεών τετρύσθαι.)

In these cases the Infinitive seems to be used nearly as in § 15, 1, without regard to time. The Greek makes no more distinction than the English between $i\lambda\pi i\xi\epsilon\iota$ τοῦτο ποιέν, he hopes to do this, and $i\lambda\pi i\xi\epsilon\iota$ τοῦτο ποιήσειν, he hopes that he shall do this. Compare $\phi_{a\mu}\epsilon_{\nu}$ τοῦτον ὡμολογηκέναι ταῦτα ποιή σειν with φάσκοντές σε ὡμολογηκέναι πολιτε ὑεσθαι. 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 $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$, when it signifies to command, and $\delta \alpha \epsilon \tilde{i}$, it seems good, — may be followed by the ordinary Infinitive of § 15, 1, referring to the future. Elizov is very seldom followed by the Infinitive, except when it signifies to command. (See § 92, 2, N. 1.) The context must distinguish these cases from indirect quotations. E. g.

Τούτοις έλεγον πλείν, I told them to sail. DEM. F. L. 388, 4. (Τούτους έλεγον πλείν would mean I said that they were sailing.) Είπων μηδένα παριέναι είς την ακρόπολιν, having given orders that no

§ 15, 3.] PRESENT INFINITIVE AS IMPERFECT.

one should pass into the citadel. XEN. Hell. V, 2, 29. $\Delta \alpha \kappa \epsilon i \ \eta \mu \tilde{\nu} ro \tilde{\nu} ro \pi \sigma \iota \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, it pleases us to do this. (But $\delta \sigma \kappa \tilde{\epsilon} \mu \sigma \iota \tilde{\nu} \mu \tilde{\alpha} ro \tilde{\nu} \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \tilde{\iota} \tilde{\nu}$ means it seems to me that you are doing this, by § 15, 2.) "Edože 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 to 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.

Τίνας ούν εύχας ύπολαμβάνετ' εύχεσθαι των Φίλιππον ότ' έσπενdev; what prayers then do you suppose Philip made when he was pouring the libations? DEM. F. L. 381, 10. (Here the temporal clause ότ' έσπενδεν shows the past time denoted by ευχεσθαι.) Πότερ' οιεσθε πλέον Φωκέας Θηβαίων ή Φίλιππον ύμων κρατείν τώ πολέμω; do 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 direct discourse would be έκράτουν and έκράτει.) Πώς γὰρ οἶεσθε δυσχερώς ἀκούειν Ολυνθί-ους, εἶ τίς τι λέγρι κατὰ Φιλίππου κατ ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους, ὅτ ᾿Ανθεμοῦντα αὐτοῖς ἀφίει, κ. τ. λ.; . . . ἀρα προσδοκῶν αὐτοὺς τοιαῦτα πείσεσθαι (sc. οἴεσθε); ǚρ οἴεσθε, ὅτε τοὺς τυράννους έξέβαλλε, (του's Θετταλούς) προσδοκάν κ. τ. λ.; for how unwillingly do you think the Olynthians used to hear it, if any one said anything against Philip in those times when he was ceiling Anthemus to them, &c.? 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 discourse here was $\pi \hat{\omega} s \dots \hat{\eta} \kappa o v o v$, $\epsilon i \dots \lambda \epsilon \gamma o i$; and $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \delta \delta \kappa \omega v$;) Καὶ γὰρ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶν λέγοντας ἀκούω τούτω τῷ ἔθει $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a_i$, I hear that they used to follow this custom. DEM. OI. III, 34, 17. Tà μèν πρὸ "Ελληνος οἰδέ εἶναι ή ἐπίκλησις αῦτη (sc. δοκεῖ), in the times before Hellen this name does not appear to have even existed. THUC. I, 3. Again, in the same sentence of Thucydides, παρέχεσθαι, to have furnished. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἔφη σφᾶς μὲν δειπνεῖν, τὸν δὲ Σωκράτη οὐκ εἰσιέναι· τὸν οὖν ᾿Αγάθωνα πολλάκις κελεύειν μεταπέμψασθαι τον Σωκράτη, έ δε οὐκ εαν. ΡΙΑΤ. Symp. 175 C. (He said, $\epsilon \delta \epsilon i \pi \nu o \hat{\upsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \delta \epsilon \Sigma$. $o \hat{\upsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{\iota} \sigma \hat{\eta} \epsilon \hat{\iota} \cdot \delta o \hat{\upsilon} \nu A$. Φιλ(ππου πορευρμένο, καὶ μετ αὐτοῦ γύναια καὶ παιδάρια βαδίζειν,for he said that he had met (Aor.) Δυστυχείν γὰρ (ὅφη) Ατρεστίδα παρὰΦιλ(ππου πορευρμένο, καὶ μετ αὐτοῦ γύναια καὶ παιδάρια βαδίζειν,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. Toῦτέγώ φημι δε $\hat{\iota} \nu$ έμὲ μὴ λαθέ $\hat{\iota} \nu$, I say that this ought not to have escaped my notice. DEM. Cor. 291, 27. (The direct discourse here vas τοῦτ' ἔδει ἐμὲ μὴ λαθέ $\hat{\iota} \nu$. § 49, 2, N. 3.)

[§ 15, **3**.

For the Imperfect Participle, 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 $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon$ τό στράτευμα μάχεσθαι, he said that the army was fighting. But here $\mu \dot{\alpha} \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ refers to time *present*, relatively to $\ddot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon$; whereas, if it had been used as an Imperfect, it would have referred to time past relatively to έλεγε, as in έλεγε το στράτευμα τη προτεραία μάχεσθαι, he said that the army had been fighting on the day before. In the former case the direct discourse was µáxerai, in the latter it was Such an Imperfect Infinitive differs from the Aorist in έμάχετο. the same construction only by expressing a continued or repeated action (as in the Indicative): it gives, in fact, the only means of representing in the Infinitive what is usually expressed by *\langle \get \overlapsel to \text{if } i* enoie, he says that he was doing, differing from λέγει ὅτι ἐποίησεν, he 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 distinction 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 call the former also a case of Imperfect Infinitive. But in the former case 201 rouro *moleiv* 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\eta$), the direct discourse being τουτο ποιώ: in the other case, however, έφη τουτο ποιείν τη $\pi po\tau \epsilon pairs, he said that he had been doing this the day before, the Greeks$ used moleiv as a regular Imperfect (relatively to $\epsilon\phi\eta$), the direct discourse being rouro enolouv. So in Latin (CIC. Phil. VIII, 10), Q. Scaevolam memoria teneo bello Marsico, cum esset summa senectute, quotidie facere omnibus conveniendi potestatem sui. So (CIC. de Off. I, 30), Q. Maximum acceptions facile celare, tacere, dissimulare, insidiari, praeripere hostium consilia.

The frequency of such constructions and their principle have been often overlooked, from the fact that they occur only when the 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.

Τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν νομίζοντες κ. τ. λ., they do this because they think, &c. Ἐποίουν νομίζοντες, they were doing it in the thought, &c. Ἐποίησαν νομίζοντες, they did it lecause they thought, &c. Ποιήσουσιν νομίζοντες, they will do it in the thought, & ... Ταῦτ' ἐπράχθη Κόνωνος στρατηγοῦντος, these things were done when Conon was general. ISOC. Evag. p. 200 C. § 56. (Στρατηγοῦντος is present relatively to ἐπράχθη.) Kai τοιαῦτα πράττων τί ἐποίει; 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 $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$, or by something else in the context. E. g.

Tὴν νῦν Βοιωτίαν καλουμένην ὅκησαν, they settled in the country now called Boeotia. THUC. I, 12. Ὁ τοίνυν Φίλιππος ἐξ ἀρχῆς, οὕπω Διοπείθους στρατηγοῦντος, οὐδὲ τῶν ὅντων ἐν Χερρονήσω νῦν ἀπεσταλμένων, Σέρρειον καὶ Δορίσκον ἐλάμβανε, Philip then in the beginning, 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 στρατηγοῦντος is present to the time of ἐλάμβανε, while ὅντων 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.

Oi $\sigma \nu \mu \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon \acute{v} \circ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ kai $\pi a \rho \acute{v} \tau \epsilon s$ kataµap $\tau \nu p \acute{v} \sigma \circ \sigma \upsilon v$, those 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 well-known event in the past.) Φαίνεται γὰρ ἡ νῶν Ἑλλὰs καλουµένη οὐ πάλαι βεβαίως οἰκουµένη, ἀλλὰ µεταναστάσεις τε οὖ σαι τὰ πρότερα, καὶ ῥαδίως ἕκαστοι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀπολείποντες, ἱ. e. the following things are evident, Ἑλλὰs οὐ πάλαι βεβαίως ὀκεῖτο, ἀλλὰ µεταναστάσεις ἦσαν, καὶ ἕκαστοι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀπέλειπον. THUC. I, 2. Olda τὸν Σωκράτην δεικνύντα τοῦς ξυνοῦσιν ἑαυτὸν καλὸν κἀγαθὸν ὄντα. Olda δὲ κὰκείνω σωφρονοῦντε, ἔστε Σωκράτει συνήστην. XEN. Mem. I, 2, 18. (The direct discourse here was ἐδείκνυ and ἐσωφρονείτην.)

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 a. 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 $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a \phi a$, 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 $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \epsilon w$, *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 $\epsilon i \mu i$. 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 Perfect), and down to the *past* time referred to (in the case of the Pluperfect). E. g.

Πεποιηκώς ἐστιν (or ην), he is (or was) in the condition of having done, — he has done (or had done). Ἐμοῦ οἱ νόμοι οὐ μόνον ἀπεγνωκότες εἰσὶ μὴ ἀδικεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κεκελευκότες ταύτην τὴν δίκην λαμβάνειν, it is the laws which have not only acquitted me of injustice, but have commanded me to inflict this punishment. LYS. de Morte Erat. p. 95, 4. § 34. Οὐρανὸς γεγονώς ἐστί τε καὶ ἕτ' ἔσται, 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.

Ἐπιμελῶς οἱ θεοὶ ῶν οἱ ἄνθρωποι δέονται κατεσκευάκασιν, the Gods have carefully provided what men need. XEN. Mem. IV, 3, 3. Τῶν ποιητῶν τινες ὑποθήκας καταλελοίπασιν, some of the poets have left us maxims. Isoc. Nicocl. p. 15 B. § 3. ᾿Ακήκοα μὲν τοὕνομα, μνημονεύω δ' ού, I have heard the name, but I do not remember it. PLAT. Theaet. 144 B. ⁶Α σοι τύχη κέχρηκε, ταῦτ' ἀφείλετο, Fortune 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 $\theta \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$, to die, $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa \epsilon' \nu a\iota$, to be dead; $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \nu$, to call, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \theta a\iota$, to be called or named; $\gamma i \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a\iota$, to become, $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \circ \nu \epsilon' \nu a\iota$, to be; $\mu \iota \mu \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$, to remind, $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta a\iota$, to remember; olda (novi), I know; &c.

The Pluperfect of such verbs has the signification of the Imperfect; as olda, I know, $jj\delta_{\epsilon\nu\nu}$, I knew. (§ 29, N. 5.)

NOTE 4. In Homer and Herodotus the Pluperfect is sometimes found in nearly the same sense as the Aorist. E. g.

Βεβλήκει γλουτόν κατά δεξιόν. Π. V, 66. (Here two Aorists follow, referring to the same time as βεβλήκει.) Ταῦτα ὡs ἐπύθοντο, ὡρμέατο βοηθέε, when they heard this, they started to carry aid. Η DT. IX, 61. "Αλλοι δὲ ἡγεμόνας ἔχοντες ὡρμέατο ἐπὶ τὸ ἱρόν. Η DT 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.

'Απέσταλκά σοι τόνδε τὸν λόγον, I send you this speech. Isoc. Demon. § 2. Μετ' 'Αρταβάζου, ὅν σοι ἔπ εμψα, πράσσε. Thuc. I, 129. (Here ὃν ἔπεμψα 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 (§ 10, N. 7), but with more emphasis, as the change in time is greater. E. g.

^αΩστ' εί με τόξων έγκρατής αἰσθήσεται, ὅλωλα, I shall perish at once. Soph. Phil. 75. Κάν τοῦτο νικῶμεν, πάνθ ἡμῦν πεποίηται. 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 $\dot{\omega}$ and $\epsilon i \eta \nu$; and can always be resolved into these. Their time, therefore, in each case, can be seen by applying the principles stated in §§ 12 and 13 to the $\dot{\omega}$ or $\epsilon i \eta \nu$. Where the Present would denote future time, the Perfect denotes future-perfect time. E. g.

Τὸ χρόνον γεγενησθαι πολύν δέδοικα μή τινα λήθην ύμιν πεποιήκη, 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. (Mh noin would mean lest it may cause, the time being the same as before.) Χρή αὐτὰ [ά τελευτήσαντα έκάτερον περιμένει] ακούσαι, ίνα τελέως έκάτερος αὐτῶν ἀπειλήψη τὰ ἀφειλό- $\mu\epsilon\nu a$, 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, 614 Α. Τούς μέν άλλους, κών δεδωκότες ώσιν εύθύνας, την άειλογίαν όρῶ προτεινομένους, 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. DEM. F. L. 341, 14. 'Ανδρείόν γε πάνυ νομίζομεν, δς άν πεπλήγη πατέρα, we always consider one who has beaten his father very manly. ARIST. Av. 1350. Νόμον θήσειν μηδενί των Έλληνων ύμῶς βοηθείν ôs ἀν μη πρότερος $\beta \in \beta \circ \eta \theta \eta \kappa \omega$ ς ύμιν $\tilde{\eta}$, i. e. to assist no one who shall not previsusly have assisted you. DEM. F. L. 345, 28. (Os aν μη πρότεροs Bondy would mean who shall not previously assist you. The Aorist $\beta_{o\eta\theta\eta\sigma\eta}$ would differ very little from the Perfect. See § 20, N. 2.)

"Εδεισαν μή λύσσα ήμιν έμπεπτώκοι, they feared lest madness might prove to have fallen upon us. XEN. An. V, 7, 26. (Mn eunintou would mean lest it might fall upon us.) Πως οὐκ ἀν οἰκτρότατα πάντων ἐγῶ πεπονθως εἴην, εἰ ἐμὲ ψηφίσαιντο εἶναι ξένον; how 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, $\pi \hat{\omega} s \circ \hat{v}$ πεπονθώς έσομαι, Fut. Perf., έαν ψηφίσωνται; how shall I not have suffered, &c.) Εί ότιοῦν πεπονθώς εκάτερος ήμων είη, ού και ἀμφότεροι αν τοῦτο πεπόνθοιμεν; if each of us should have suffered anything whatsoever, would not both of us have suffered it? PLAT. Hipp. M. 301 A. Ούκ αν δια τοῦτό γ' εἶεν οὐκ εὐθὺς δεδωκότες, 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. DEM. Onet. I, 867, 1. Šo ŠOPH. Oed. T. 840. "Ελεγε σσα άγαθὰ Κῦρος Πέρσας πεποιήκοι, he told how many services Cyrus had done the Persians. HDT. III, 75. (Пепонукон here represents πεποίηκε of the direct discourse.) Ούτοι έλεγον ώς πεντακόσιοι αυτοίς είησαν έκ τοῦ Πειραιώς δεδεκασμένοι. Lys. in Philoer. p. 182, § 12. (Here the direct discourse was $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \kappa \delta \sigma \iota o \iota \epsilon \delta \epsilon \kappa a \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota$.)

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 Subjunctive, but is seldom used.

The Perfect Optative can seldom be accurately expressed in English. For when we use the English forms would 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi a \theta o v \, \tilde{a} v$; 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 $\tilde{a} v$, than there is in the Future Perfect Indicative in such expressions as $\mu \hat{\alpha} \tau \eta v \, \hat{e} \mu \hat{a}$ $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda a \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \tau a$. I shall have had my whipping for nothing (referring 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 $\epsilon_i^2 \mu_i^{\prime}$. E. g.

Taῦτa μèν δỳ τaῦτη εἰρήσθω, let so much have been thus said, i. e let what has been thus said be sufficient. PLAT. Crat. 401 D. But ὅμως δè εἰρήσθω ὅτι, κ. τ. λ., still let as much as this (which follows) be said (once for all), that, &c. PLAT. Rep. X, 607 C. Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων τοῦτά μοι προειρήσθω, let this have been said (once for all) by way of introduction. Isoc. Paneg. p. 43 D. § 14. Ταῦτα πεπαίσθω τε ὑμῦν, καὶ ἴσως ἰκανῶς ἔχει, let this be the end of the play, &c. PLAT. Euthyd. 278 D. Τετάχθω ἡμῦν κατὰ δημοκρατίαν ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνήρ, let such a man remain where we have placed him, &c. PLAT. Rep. VIII, 561 E. 'Απειργάσθω δὴ ἡμῦν αῦτη ἡ πολιτείa, let now this be a sufficient description of this form of government. Id. 553 A. Μέχρι τοῦδε ὡρίσθω ὑμῶν ἡ Βραδυτής, at this point let the limit of your sluggishness 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 $\epsilon i \mu i$, as in PLAT. Rep. VI, 502 A: $o \delta \tau o t \tau o \delta \tau o \tau \sigma \pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon t \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon$ for any 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.

Eì $\lambda \eta \phi \theta \omega \epsilon \pi i \tau \eta s$ AB $\tau v \chi \delta \nu \sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i \circ \nu \tau \delta \Delta$, kai $\dot{a} \phi \eta \rho \eta \sigma \theta \omega \dot{a} \pi \delta \tau \eta s$ AD $\tau \eta \eta \Delta i \sigma \eta \eta \delta AE$, let any point Δ be (assumed as) taken in the line AB, and AE equal to A Δ as cut off from AF EUCL. I, Pr. 9.

NOTE 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.

⁴Hè σừ τώνδε δέδεξο. II. V, 228. Mỳ πεφόβησθε. Thuc. VÌ, 17. Μόνον σừ ἡμῶν πιστὰ θεῶν πεποίησο καὶ δεξιὰν δός, only make us (inmediately and once for all) solemn pledges and give the right hand. XEN. Cyr. IV, 2, 7. Πέπαυσο, stop ! not another word ! DEM. Timoc. 721, 6.

NOTE 3. In verbs whose Perfect has the force of a Present (§ 17, N. 3) the Perfect Imperative is the ordinary form, as $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \sigma \sigma$, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \omega$, $\epsilon \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$, $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$, $\tau \sigma \omega$. The Perfect Imperative active seems to have been used only in such verbs. Occasionally we find the periphrastic form with the Participle and $\epsilon i \mu i$, as $\epsilon \sigma \tau \omega \xi \nu \mu \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa v a$. 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.

Φησὶ τοῦτο πεπραχέναι, he says that he has done this; ἔφη τοῦτο πεπραχέναι, he said that he had done this; φήσει τοῦτο πεπραχέναι, he will say that he has done this; ψήσει τοῦτο πεπραχέναι, he will say that he has done this (the direct discourse in each case being πέπραχα). "Εφη χρήμαθ ἐαυτῷ τοὺs Θηβαίους ἑπικεκη ρυχέναι, he said that the Thebans had offered a reward for his seizure. DEM. F. L. 347, 26. In ARIST. Nub. 1277, προσκεκλ ησθαί μοι δοκεῖς (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 κεκωλῦσθαι ἐδόκει. 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.

Où $\beta \circ v \lambda \epsilon \acute{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a i$ $\check{\epsilon} \tau i$ $\check{\omega} \rho a$, $d\lambda \lambda a \beta \epsilon \beta \circ v \lambda \epsilon \acute{v} \sigma \theta a i \cdot \tau \hat{\eta} s$ yàp $\check{\epsilon} \pi \iota \circ \delta \sigma s$ $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau a \tau a v \tau a \delta \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \chi \theta a i$, it is no longer time to be deliberating, but (it is time) to have finished deliberating; for all this must be done (and finished) within the coming night. PLAT. Crit. 46 A. Kai µµv $\pi \epsilon \rho i \delta v \gamma \epsilon \pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \tau \dot{\epsilon} a \tau \epsilon \dots \cdot \pi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon i \delta \iota \omega \kappa \eta \kappa \epsilon \dot{v} a \iota,$ 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.) $\Xi v \nu \epsilon \tau \delta \lambda a \dot{v} \sigma \delta v \dot{s} \tau \dot{\rho} \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \sigma \theta a \iota$, $\delta v \circ \tau \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\iota} \dot{\mu} s \epsilon \cdot \dots \epsilon$ $\xi v v \eta \rho \tau \eta \sigma \theta a \iota$, it often befell them to have made an attack on one side and (at the same time) to have been attacked themselves on the **9** 18, 4.]

other, &c. ΤΗυς. VII, 70. 'Ανάγκη γαρ τα μέν μέγιστ' αὐτῶν ήδη κατακεχρήσθαι μικρά δέ τινα παραλελειφθαι, for it must be that the most important subjects have been used up, and that only unimportant ones have been left. Isoc. Pan. p. 55 D § 74. Our ήθελον έμβαίνειν διά τὸ καταπεπληχθαι τη ήσση, they were unwilling to embark on account of having been terrified by the defeat. THUC. VII. 72. Το γάρ πολλά άπολωλεκέναι κατά τον πόλεμον της ήμετέρας άμελείας αν τις θείη δικαίως, το δε μήτε πάλαι τουτο πεπονθέναι πεφηνέναι τέ τινα ήμιν συμμαχίαν τούτων άντίρροπον, τής παρ εκείνων ευνοίas ευεργέτημ' αν έγωγε θείην, for our having lost many 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. OI. I, 12, 3. (Compare $\gamma_{\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota}$ in the first example under § 18, 1.) "Εφθασαν παροικοδομήσαντες, ώστε υηκέτι μήτε αυτοί κωλύεσθαι ύπ' αυτών, εκείνους τε και παντάπασιν άπεστερηκέναι σφάς ἀποτειχίσαι, i. e. they carried their own wall beyond that of the Athenians, so as no longer to be themselves interfered with by them, and so as to have effectually prevented them, &c. THUC. VII, 6. Ἐπεμελήθη καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, ῶστε τῶν παρόντων τοις άνθρώποις άγαθων μηδέν μέν άνευ της πόλεως είναι, τα δε πλείστα διὰ ταύτην γεγενησθαι. Isoc. Pan. p. 48 B. § 38. Τοιαῦτα καὶ τοσαύτα κατεσκεύασαν ήμιν, ώστε μηδενί των επιγιγνομένων ύπερβολήν $\lambda \in \lambda \in \hat{i} \oplus \theta a i$, they made such and so great acquisitions as to have no possibility of surpassing them left to any one who should come after. them. DEM. Ol. III, 35, 18. Δίδομεν αυτοίς προίκα συγκεκόφθαι, 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 sometimes 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.

EÎROV TÌV θύραν κεκλεῖσθαι, they ordered that the door should be shut and remain so. XEN. Hell. V, 4, 7. Βουλόμενος ἀγῶνι καὶ δικαστηρίφ μοι διωρίσθαι παρ' ὑμῦν ὅτι τἀναντία ἐμοὶ καὶ τούτοις πέπρακται, i. e. wishing to have it definitely and once for all settled in your minds. DEM. F. L. 410, 28. Θελούσας πρὸς πύλαις πεπτωκέναι, eager to fall before the gates. AESCH. Sept. 462. "Ηλαυνεν ἐπὶ τοὺς Μένωνος, ῶστ' ἐκείνους ἐκπεπλῆχθαι καὶ τρέχειν ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα, he marched against the soldiers of Menon, so that they were (once for all) thoroughly frightened and ran to arms. XEN. An. I, 5, 13. (Here ἐκπεπλῆχθαι is merely more emphatic than the Present would have been.)

REMARK. The Perfect Infinitive belongs also to the Pluperfect, and is occasionally used to represent that tense in indirect discourse. This occurs chiefly (perhaps only) when the Infinitive is modified by an See the first example under § 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.

Ἐπαινοῦοι τοὺς εἰρηκότας, they praise those who have spoken. Ἐπήνεσαν τοὺς εἰρηκότας, they praised those who had spoken. Ἐπαινέσουσι τοὺς εἰρηκότας, they will praise those who have (then) spoken. Ἐπέδειξα οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς ἀπηγγελκότα (Λἰσχίνην), I showed that Aeschines had announced nothing that was true (i.e. I showed, νὐδὲν ἀληθὲς ἀπήγγελκεν). DEM. F. L. 396, 30.

AORIST.

A. In the Indicative.

§ 19. The Aorist Indicative expresses the simple momentary occurrence of an action in past time; as $\ddot{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\psi\alpha$, 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.

Baσιλεύω, I am king, έβασίλευσα, I became king; ἄρχω, I hola office, ^hρξα, I obtained office; πλουτῶ, ἐπλούτησα, I became rich. Tỹ ἀληθεία συνώκει και οὐδέπω ἀπολέλοιπεν[•].... ἀλλὰ παρὰ ζῶντος Γιμοκράτους ἐκείνω συν ὡκησε, she was his wife in good faith, and has not even yet been divorced;.... but she went to live with him, &c. 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 $i\beta a \sigma i\lambda \epsilon vov$, $\bar{\eta} \rho \chi ov$, $\epsilon \pi \lambda o v \tau ov$, I was king, held office, was rich. (See especially the last example under N. 1.) The Aorist is therefore the tense most common in narration, the Imperfect in description. The Aorist may sometimes refer to a series of repetitions; but it refers to them *collectively*, as individuals. So the Aorist may even refer to a continued action, if (as a whole) it is viewed as a single event in past time. E. g.

Ἐγὼ δὲ ἦλθον, εἶδον, ἐνίκησα, Ι came, Ι saw, Ι conquered (Veni, vidi, viei) APP. Bell. Civ. II, 91. So ἐβασίλευσε δέκα $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\eta}$ may be used to mean he had a reign of ten years (which is now viewed as a single past event); whereas $\tilde{\epsilon}\beta a\sigma(\lambda\epsilon\nu\epsilon)\delta\epsilon\kappa a$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\eta$ would mean he continued to reign ten years.

Note 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 Perfect or the Pluperfect; the action being simply referred to the past, without the more exact specification afforded by the Perfect and Pluperfect. E. g.

Τών οἰκετών οὐδένα κατέλιπεν, ἀλλ απαντα πέπρακεν. ΑΕ-БСНІΝ. Timarch. § 99. Ἐτράποντο ἐς τὸν Πάνορμον, ὅθενπερ ἀνηγάγοντο, they turned towards Panormus, whence they had set sail. ΤΗUC. II, 92. Κῦρον δὲ μεταπέμπεται ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἧς αὐτὸν πατράπην ἐποίησεν, of which he had once made him satrap. XEN. An. I, 1, 2.

(b.) Especially the Aorist is generally used, even where we should expect the Pluperfect, after particles of time like $i\pi\epsilon i$, $i\pi\epsilon_i\delta_{\eta}$, δs (when), $\delta\tau\epsilon$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$, $\pi\rho i\nu$, &c. E. g.

Έπειδὴ ἐτελεύτησε Δαρεῖος καὶ κατέστη ᾿Αρταξέρξης, after Darius tad died and Artaxerxes had become established. XEN. An. I, 1, 3. Οὐ πρόσθεν ἐξενεγκεῖν ἐτόλμησαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς πόλεμον, πρὶν τοὺς ετρατηγοὺς ἡμῶν συνέλαβον, before they had seized our generals. XEN. An. III, 2, 29. Οἱ ὅ ὅτε δὴ λιμένος πολυβενθέος ἐντὸς ἰκοντο, chen 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 by 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.

Έπήνεσ' ἕργον καὶ πρόνοιαν ην ἕθου, I must approve your act. &c. SOPH. Aj. 536. "Ησθην ἀπειλαῖς, ἐγέλασα ψολοκομπίαις, I am amused by your threats, I cannot help laughing, &c. ARIST. Eq. 696.

NOTE 6. The Aorist sometimes refers vividly to the future, like the Present or Perfect (§ 10, N. 7; § 17, N. 6); as $\partial \pi \omega \lambda \delta \mu \eta \nu \epsilon i$ $\mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \psi \epsilon i s$, *I perish if you leave me*, EUR. Alc. 386.

So in questions with τi où expressing surprise that something is not already done, and implying an exhortation to do it; as τi où où $\delta i\eta \gamma \eta \sigma \omega$; why then do you not tell us the story? PLAT. Prot. 310 A. See also τi oùr oùk $\epsilon \kappa a \lambda \epsilon \sigma a \mu \epsilon r$; 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 § 12. § 20. The Aorist Subjunctive denotes a single or momentary action, the time of which is determined by the rules that apply to the time of the Present Subjunctive, \$ 12: -

That is, in clauses denoting a *purpose* or *object*, after *iva*, $\mu \eta'$, &c., it refers to time *future* relatively to the leading verb; in conditional sentences (including conditional relative and temporal sentences), — in ordinary protasis (§ 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.

Δέδοικα μὴ ἐπιλ αθώ μεθα τῆς οἴκαδε όδοῦ, I fear lest we may forget the road home. XEN. An. III, 2, 25. Διανοείται τὴν γέφυραν λῦσαι, ώς μὴ διαβῆτε ἀλλ ἀποληφθῆτε, he intends to destroy the bridge, that you may not pass over but be caught. Id. II, 4, 17. ^{*}Ην τὴν εἰρήτην ποιησώμεθα, μετὰ πολλῆς ἀσφαλείας τὴν πόλιν οἰκήσομεν, if we shall make the peace, &c. Isoc. Pac. p. 163 A. § 20. [°]Ως ἀν εἴπω πειθώμεθα, let us obey as I shall direct. II. IX, 704. ^{*}Ην ἐγγὺς ἕλθη θάνατος, οὐδεὶς βούλεται θνήσκειν, if death comes near (the moment that death comes near), no one wants to die. EUR. Alc. 671. [•]Ον μὲν ἂν ἴδη ἀγωῶτα (sc. ὁ κύων), χαλεπαίνει· ὃν δ' ἂν γνώριμον (sc. ἴδη, ἀσπάζεται, i. e. whomsoever the dog sees (at any time). PLAT. Rep. II, 376 A. [°]Αναλογισώμεθα τὰ ὑμολογημένα ἡμῶν, let us enumerate the points which have been conceded by us. PLAT. Prot. 332 D. Μηδὲν φοβηθῆς, fear not (in this case). (But μηδὲν φοβοῦ, be not timid.) Τί ποιήσω; what shall I do (in a single case)? (But τί ποιῶς what shall I do (generally)?) Οὐ μὴ τοῦτο εἴπῃς, you will not say this. Οὖ μὴ γένηται, it will not happen. Sò in the Homerie οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι, nor shall I ever see.

See other examples under the rules in Chapter IV.

NOTE 1. When the Aorist Subjunctive depends on $i\pi\epsilon\nu$. $\partial \delta \nu (i\pi \delta \nu, i\pi \eta \nu)$, after that, it is referred by the meaning of the particle to a moment of time that precedes the action of the leading verb, so that $i\pi\epsilon\iota \partial \delta \nu$ τοῦτο $i\delta \omega$, $i\lambda\epsilon i \sigma \sigma \mu a$ means after I shall have seen this, I will come; and $i\pi\epsilon\iota \partial \delta \nu$ τοῦτο $i\delta \omega$, $i\pi\epsilon\rho\chi o\mu a\iota$, after I have seen this, I (always) depart. In such cases it is to be translated by our Future Perfect, 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 translating the leading verb, although that is properly not merely *present*, but *general* in its time.

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

Χρή δέ, όταν μέν τιθήσθε τούς νόμους, όποιοί τινές είσιν σκοπείν, έπειδαν δε θησθε, φυλάττειν και χρησθαι, while you are enacting laws, you must look to see of what kind they are; but after you have enacted them, you must guard and use them. DEM. Mid. 525, 11. (Here the Present ridhode after oran, while, refers to an action continuing through the time of the leading verb; but $\theta \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$ after eπειδάν, after that, refers to time past relatively to the leading verb.) Taîra, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon_i \delta a \nu \pi \epsilon_i roi \gamma i vous \epsilon' i \pi \omega$, rore, $a \nu \beta o i \lambda_i \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon' a \kappa o i \epsilon_i \nu$, $\epsilon \rho \hat{\omega}$, when I shall have spoken about my birth, then, if you desire to hear, I will speak of these things. DEM. Eubul. 1303, 25. (Here the Aorist einw, though absolutely future, denotes time past with reference to έρω.) Ἐπειδὰν διαπράξωμαι å δέομαι, ήξω, when I shall have accomplished what I desire, I will come. XEN. An. II, 3, 29. Έπειδαν δε κρύψωσι γη, ανηρ ήρημένος ύπο της πόλεως λέγει έπ autois enauvor tor πρέποντα, when they have covered them with earth, &c. THUC. II, 34. "Έως αν σώζηται τὸ σκάφος, τότε χρη προθύμους είναι ἐπειδὰν δὲ ή θάλαττα ὑπέρσχη, μάταιος ή σπουδή, as long as it remains in safety (Present); - but the moment that the sea has overwhelmed it (Aorist). DEM. Phil. III, 128, 22. "Ews av expádys, ex' ελπίδα, until you have learnt fully, have hope. SOPH. O. T. 834. Mia δε κλίνη κενή φέρεται των άφανων, οι αν μή ευρεθωσιν ές avaipeous, and one bier is always carried empty, in honor of the missing, whose bodies have not been found. THUC. II, 34. Tis Slavoeira, ά άν άλλοι τη ἀρετή καταπράξωσι, τούτων ἀσομοιρείν; who ever thinks of having an equal share in those things which others by their valor have acquired? XEN. Cyr. II, 3, 5. Πάνθ' όσ' αν έκ πολέμου γιγνομένης εἰρήνης προεθή, ταῦτα τοῖς ἀμελήσασιν ἀπόλλυται, all things which are (or have been) abandoned when peace is made are always lost to those who abandoned them. DEM. F. L. 388, 9. "Hy δ " άρα καί του πείρα σφαλωσιν, άντελπίσαντες άλλα έπλήρωσαν την xpeiar, if they have been disappointed in anything, they always supply the deficiency, &c. Thuc. I, 70. (See § 30, 1.) Οὐχὶ παύσομαι, πρὶν ἄν σε τῶν σῶν κίωιον στήσω τέκνων, I will not cease before I hav. (shall have) made 3 να master of your children. SOFII. O. C.

1040. Mý στέναζε πρίν μάθης, do not groan until you have heard. SOPH. Phil. 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 (§ 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.

⁶ Ov µèv åv i dy dyvöra (ó κύων), χαλεπαίνει · ôv d' åv γνώριμον (idy), doπάζεται, κάν µηδèv πώποτε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ dyadòv πεπόνθη, whomsoever he sees whom he knows, he fawns upon, even if he has hitherto received no kindness from him. PLAT. Rep. II, 376 A. Compare this with êdu dyadóv τι πάθη ὑπό τινος, doπάζεται, if he ever happens to receive any kindness from any one, he always fawns upon him; and ἐπειδàν dyadóv τι πάθη, doπάζεται, after he has received 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 $i\nu a$, $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$, $\mu\eta$, &c., it refers to time future relatively to the leading verb; in conditional sentences (including conditional relative and temporal sentences),— in ordinary protasis (§ 50, 2), the Optative refers to the future (only more vaguely 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.

Φίλιππος ἐν φόβω ἦν μὴ ἐκφύγοι τὰ πράγματα αὐτόν, Philip was in fear lest the control of affairs might escape him. DEM. Cor. 236, 19. Ei ἕλθοι, πάντ ἀν ἕδοι, if he should go, he would see all. Ei ἕλθοι, πάνθ ἐώρα, if ever (whenever) he went, he (always) saw all. Οὐδ' εἰ πάντες ἕλθοιεν Πέρσαι, πλήθει γε οὐχ ὑπερβαλοίμεθ ἀν τοὺς πολεμίους, not even if all the Persians should come, should we surpass the enemy in numbers. XEN. Cyr. II, 1, 8. [°]Οτε ἔξω τοῦ δεινοῦ γένοιντο, καὶ ἐξείη πρὸς ἄλλους ἄρχοντας ἀπίναι, πολλοὶ αὐτὸν ἀπάλειπον, but when they were come oul of danger and it was in their power (Present) to go to other commanders, (in all such cases) many 'εft him. XEN. An. II, 6, 12. [°]Ανευ γὰρ ἀρχώντων ἐὐδὲr ῶν οῦτε καλὸν οῦτε ἀγαθὸν γενοιτο, nothing could be done, &c. XEN. An. III, 1 38. Οὐκ οἶδα ὅ τι ἄν τις χρήσαιτο αὐτοῖς, I do not know what use any one could make of them. XEN. An. III, 1, 40. Εἴθε σὺ τοιοῦτος ἀν φίλος ἡμῶν γένοιο, may you become a friend to us. XEN. Hell. IV, 1, 38. Μη γένοιτο, may it not happen.

See other examples under the rules in Chapter IV.

NOTE. When the Aorist Optative depends upon $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \eta$ or $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota$, 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 Subjunctive in § 20, N. 1, so that $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \eta$ i $\delta \iota \iota$, $d \pi \eta \rho \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma$ means after he had seen, he (always) went away. This gives the Aorist in translation the force of a Pluperfect. So after $\epsilon \omega s$, unid, and in the other cases mentioned in § 20, N. 1. E. g.

Oùs µèv loa cùráktws lovtas, tíves te elev ipóta, kal étel $\pi i \theta \circ i \tau o$, étfivei, he asked any whom he saw marching in good order, who they were; and after he had ascertained, he praised them. XEN. Cyr. V, 3, 55. Περιεμένομεν έκάστοτε έως ἀνοιχθείη τὸ δεσμωτήριον έπειδη δὲ ἀνοιχθείη, εἰσήειμεν παρὰ τὸν Σωκράτη, we waited each morning until the prison was opened (or had been opened); and after it was opened, we went in to Socrates. PLAT. Phaed. 59 D. Oùδaµόθεν ἀφίεσaν, πρὶν παραθεῖεν αὐτοῖς ἄριστον, before they had placed breakfast before them. XEN. An. IV, 5, 30.

From the general rule for indirect discourse (\$ 69,
 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.

Έλεξαν ὅτι π έμψειε σφᾶs ὁ βασιλεύs, they said that the king had sent them (i. e. they said ἕπεμψεν ήμᾶs ὁ βασιλεύs). XEN. Cyr. II, 4, 7. Τότε ἐγνώσθη ὅτι οἱ βάββαροι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑποπέμψαιεν, then it became known that the barbarians had sent the man. XEN. An. II, 4, 22. Ἐτόλμα λέγειν ὡς πολλὰ τῶν ἐμῶν λάβοιεν, he dored to say that they had taken much of my property. DEM. Aph. I, 828, 25. Ἐμρώτων αὐτὰν εἰ ἀναπλεύσειεν, I asked him whether he had set sail (i. e. I asked him the question, ἀνέπλευσας j). DEM. Polycl. 1223, 21. Ἐπειρώτα τίνα ἴδοι, he asked whom he had seen (i. e. τίνα είδες, whom did you see ?). HDT. I, 31. So I, 116: εἴρετο κόθεν λάβοι.

(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.

Oi 'Eπιδάμνιοι τον θεον ἐπήροντο εἰ παραδοῖεν Κορινθίοις τὴν εζλιν, they asked whether they should deliver up their city to the Corinthians (i. e. they asked the question, παραδωμεν τὴν πόλιν; shall we deliver up our city?). THUC. I, 25. 'Εσκόπουν ὅπως κάλλιστ' ενέγκαιμ' αὐτόν, I looked to see how I could best endure him (i. e. I asked, πῶς ἐνέγκω αὐτόν; how can I endure him?). EUR. Hipp. 393. Διεσιώπησε σκοπῶν ὅ τι ἀποκρίναιτο, he continued silent, thinking what he should answer (i. e. thinking, τί ἀποκρίνωμαι;). XEN. Mem. IV, 2, 10.

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

NOTE 1. It will be seen by a comparison of the examples under (a) and (b), as in § 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, $\dot{\eta}\gamma\nu\delta\sigma\nu\nu$ ö $\tau\iota$ $\pi\sigma\iota\dot{\eta}$ - $\sigma\epsilon\iota a\nu$ might mean, they knew not what they had done (the Optative representing τi $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\sigma\iota\dot{\eta}\sigma\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$; what did we do?), or they knew not what they should do (the Optative representing τi $\pi\sigma\iota\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$; what shall we do?). The context must decide in each case; but in most cases the latter construction is intended. (For the manner of avoiding a similar ambiguity, see § 74, 2, N. 1.)

§ 22. The Aorist Imperative refers to a momentary or single action in *future* time; as $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon' \mu o \iota$, tell me; $\delta \delta \tau \epsilon \mu o \iota \tau o \hat{\upsilon} \tau o$, give me this.

§ 23. The Aorist Infinitive has two distinct 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 discourse, it denotes a momentary or single action without regard to time, unless its time is especially defined by the context. E. g.

Πόλεώς έστι θάνατος ἀνάστατον γενέσθαι, it is death for a city to be laid waste. Lycung. in Leoer. p. 155, 35. § 61. $\Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ τών

άνδρών τοις καλοίς κάγαθοις αίρετώτερόν έστι καλώς άποθανειν ή ζήν αίσχρώς, ούτω και των πόλεων ταις ύπερεχούσαις λυσιτελείν (ήγούντο) έξ ανθρώπων άφανισθηναι μάλλον ή δούλαις όφθηναι γενομέναις, as it is preferable for honorable men to du (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 ty disappear from the earth, than to be (once) seen to have fallen int. slavery. Isoc. Paneg. p. 60 C. § 95. Πέμπουσιν ές την Κέρκυραν πρέσβεις, δεόμενοι μη σφάς περιοράν φθειρομένους, άλλα τούς τε Φεύγοντας ξυναλλέξαι σφίσι καὶ τὸν τῶν βαρβάρων πόλεμον καταλυσαι, asking them not to allow them to be destroyed, but to bring about a reconciliation and to put an end to the war. THUC. I, 24. Το γάρ γνωναι επιστήμην που λαβείν εστιν, to learn is to acquire knowledge. ΡΙΑΤ. Theaet. 209 Ε. Πάντες το καταλιπείν αὐτὰ πάντων μάλιστα φεύγομεν, we all try most of all to avoid leaving them behind. XEN. Mem. II, 2, 3. Ού γάρ τό μη λαβείν τάγαθά ούτω γε χαλεπόν ωσπερ τό λαβόντα στερηθηναι λυπηρόν. XEN. Cyr. VII, 5, 82. Toũ $\pi \iota \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \theta \iota \mu \iota a$, the desire of obtaining drink. THUC. VII, 84. Keleiei autov $\epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$, he commands him to go Ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἐλθεῖν, he commanded him to go. Κελεύσει αὐτὸν έλθειν, he will command him to go. Πρός τῷ μηδέν ἐκ τῆς πρεσβείας λαβείν, τους alxμaλώτους ελύσατο, besides receiving nothing from the embassy, he ransomed the captives. DEM. F. L. 412, 21. El προ τοῦ τοὺς Φωκέας ἀπολέσθαι ψηφίσαισθε βοηθεῖν, if before the destruction of the Phocians you should vote to go to their assistance. DEM. Cor. 236, 20. Tàs altías προύγραψα, του μή τινα ζητήσαί ποτε έξ ότου τοσούτος πόλεμος κατέστη, 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, see Appendix, II.

NOTE 2. $X\rho\dot{\omega}$, $dva\rho\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, $\theta\epsilon\sigma\pi\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, and other verbs signifying to 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.

Χρωμένω δε τῶ Κύλωνι ἀνεῖλεν ὁ θεός, ἐν τῆ τοῦ Διὸς τῆ μεγίστη έορτῆ καταλαβεῖν τὴν ᾿Αθηναίων ἀκρόπολιν, that he should seize. ΤΗ UC. Ι, 126. But we find ἀνεῖλεν ἔσεσθαι in ΤΗ UC. Ι, 118. Ἐκέχρητο γὰρ τοῖσι Σπαρτιήτησι, ἡ Λακεδαίμονα ἀνάστατον γενέσθαι, ἡ τὸν βασιλέα σφέων ἀπολέσθαι. Η DT. VII, 220. Ἐθέσπισε κομίσαι... καὶ εἰσιδεῖν. ΕUR. Iph. Taur. 1014. So Ἐειπε οἱ... νούσω ὑπ' ἀργαλέη φθίσθαι... ἡ ὑπὸ Τρώεσσι δαμῆναι, the diviner told him that he must either die by painful disease at home, or perish at the hands of the Trojans. I XIII, 667. So after $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \sigma s$, PLAT. Rep. III, 415 C.

For the Present see § 15, 1. N. 2.

NOTE 3. The Present of airto's $\epsilon^{i}\mu\iota$, I am the cause, is often used with reference to the past, where logically a past tense should be used; as airto's $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ rodr φ $\theta av\epsilon^{i}\nu$, he is the cause of his death, instead of airtos $\eta\nu$ rodr φ $\theta av\epsilon^{i}\nu$, he vas 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.

Αἴτιοι οὖν εἰσι καὶ ὑμῦν πολλῶν ἤδη ψευσθηναι καὶ δὴ ἀδίκως γέ τινσς ἀπολέσθαι, they are the cause why you were deceived and some even perished (i. e. they caused you to be deceived and some even to perish). LYS. de Arist. Bon. 156, 28. § 51. Τεθνᾶσιν οἱ δὲ ζῶντες αἴτιοι θανεῖν. SOPH. Ant. 1173. "Η μοι μητρὶ μὲν θανεῖν μόνη μεταίτιος. SOPH. Trach. 1233.

For the construction of the Infinitive see § 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.

Φησίν τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, he says that he did this (i. e. he says τοῦτο ἐποίησα). ^{*}Εφη τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, he said that he had done this (i. e. he said τοῦτο ἐποίησα). Φήσει τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, he will say that he did this (i. e. he will say τοῦτο ἐποίησα). ⁶Ο Κῦρος λέγεται γενέσ θαι Καμβύσεω, Cyrus is said to have been the son of Cambyses. XEN. Cyr. I, 2, 1. Παλαιότατοι λέγονται ἐν μέρει τινί τῆς χώρας Κύκλωπες οἰκῆσαι, they are said to have settled. ΤΗ UC. VI, 2. ^{*}Ησαν ὕποπτοι αὐτοῦς μὴ προθύμως σφίσι πέμψαι å ἔπεμψαν, they were suspected of not having sent them with alacrity what they did send. THUC. VI, 75.

NOTE 1. The principle stated in § 15, 2, N. 1, will decide in doubtful cases whether the Infinitive stands in indirect discourse or in the construction of § 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.

Ἐέλπετο κύδος ἀρέσθαι. he was hoping to obtain glory. Π. ΧΠ.

407. Πάλιν ἕμολ' å πάρος οῦποτε ἤλπισεν παθεῖν. EUR. Here. F. 746. Ei γὰρ κρατήσειαν τῷ ναυτικῷ, τὸ 'Ρήγιον ἤλπιζον ῥαδίως χειρώσασθαι, they hoped to subdue Ithegium. THUC. IV, 24. Οἰδ' ἂν ἐλπὶς ἦν αὐτὰ βελ τίω γενέσθαι, there would not be even a hope of their becoming better. DEM. Phil. I, 40, 18. 'Εκ μὲν τοῦ κακῶς πράττειν τὰς πόλεις μεταβολῆς τυ χεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον εἰκός ἐστιν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ παντάπασι γενέσθαι ἀνάστατον καὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἐλπίδων στερηθῆναι. LYCURG. in Leocr. p. 155, 30. § 60. (Cf. below, ἐλπὶς ἐκ τοῦ κακῶς πράξαι μεταπεσεῖ.) 'Υποσχόμενος μὴ πρόσθεν παύσασθαι, πρὶν αὐτοῦς καταγάγοι οἶκαδε, having promised not to stop until he had restored them to their homes. XEN. An. I, 2, 2. 'Υπέσχετό μοι βουλεύτῆ οἰκία. 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 ύπέσχετο ποιησαι ean never mean anything but he promised to do, although the Aorist Infinitive appears to represent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse, contrary to § 15, 2, N. 1. The case is different, however, when the Aorist Infinitive follows verbs whose signification has no reference to the future, like $vo\mu i\zeta \omega$, oioµai, or even $\phi \eta \mu i$, and still appears to represent a Future Indicative; c. g. where in ARIST. Nub. 1141* δικάσασθαί φασί μοι is said to mean, they say they will bring on action against me, while just below, vs. 1180, θήσειν τά πρυτανείά φασί µor means, they say they will deposit the Prytaneia. Still, unless we decide to correct a large number of passages, against the anthority of the Mss. (which is actually done by many critics, especially 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 av. E.g.

Φάτο γαρ τίσασθαι άλείτας, for he said that he should punish the offenders. Od. XX, 121. (In II. III, 28, we have in most Mss. and editions φάτο γαρ τίσεσθαι άλείτην, in precisely the same sense. Cf. Il. III, 366.) Καὶ αὐτῶ οὐ μέμψασθαι Ἀπρίην (sc. ἀπεκρίνατο). παρέσεσθαι γάρ και αυτός και άλλους άξειν, and (he answered) that Apries should not blame him; for he would not only be present himself, but would bring others. HDT. II, 162. (Notice the strange transition from the Aorist (?) to the two Futures.) $\Phi\eta\sigma i\nu$ oude the Διός "Εριν πέδω σκήψασαν έμποδών σχεθείν. AESCH. Sept. 429. Oipar yáp viv ikerevoar táde, I think of imploring. EUR. Iph. Aul. 462. (Here Hermann reads iκετεύσειν, by conjecture.) Ἐνόμισαν $\epsilon \pi i \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu o i \rho a \delta i \omega s \kappa \rho a \tau \eta \sigma a i, they thought they should gain the victory.$ Τιυς. ΙΙ, 3. Νομίζω, ην ίππευς γένωμαι, άνθρωπος πτηνός γενέσθαι. XEN. Cyr. IV, 3, 15. Τοῦτο δε οἴεταί οἱ μάλιστα γενέσθαι, εἰ σοὶ συγγένοιτο, and he thinks that this would be most likely to happen to him if he should join himself with you. PLAT. Prot. 316 C. (Here we should expect yever dat av, to correspond to ei ouyyevoiro.)

* I find $\delta\iota\kappa\dot{a}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota$ here in Cod. Par. 2712, and by correction in 2820. (1872.)

NOTE 4. Verbs like $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ or $\epsilon i \pi \sigma \nu$, when they signify to command, can be followed by the Aorist (as well as the Present) Infinitive in its ordinary sense, referring to the future; as has been stated in § 15, 2, N. 3. E. g.

⁸Ω φίλοι, ήδη μέν κεν έγων εποιμι και ἄμμιν μνηστήραν ές δμιλον άκοντίσαι, now I would command you to join me in hurling, &c. Od. XXII, 262. Παραδοῦναι λέγει, he tells us to give her up. ARIST. Av. 1679.

§ 24. The Aorist Participle regularly refers to a momentary or single action, which is *past* with reference to the time of its leading verb. E. g.

Ταῦτα ποιήσαντες ἀπελθεῖν βούλονται, having done this, they wish to go away. Ταῦτα εἰπόντες ἀπῆλθον, having said this, they went away. Où πολλοὶ φαίνονται ξυνελθόντες, not many appear to have joined in the expedition. Thuc. I, 10. Βοιωτοὶ οἱ ἐξ Ἄρσης ἀναστάντες τὴν Βοιωτίαν ῷκησαν, Boeotians who had been driven from Arne settled Boeotia. Thuc. I, 12. ᾿Αφίκετο δεῦρο τὸ πλοῖον, γνόντων τῶν Κεφαλλήνων, ἀντιπράττοντος τούτου, καταπλεῖν, the Cephallenians having determined to sail in, although this man opposed it. DEM. in Zenoth. 886, 1. (Here γνόντων denotes time past relatively to ἀφίκετο, and ἀντιπράττοντος time present relatively to γνόντων, 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 $\lambda a \nu \theta \dot{a} \nu \omega$, to escape the notice of, $\tau \nu \gamma \chi \dot{a} \nu \omega$, to happen, and $\phi \theta \dot{a} \nu \omega$, to get the slart of (§ 112, 2), it does not denote time past with reference to the verb, but coincides with it in time. Thus $\xi \lambda a \theta o \nu \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\delta} \nu \tau \epsilon s$, means they went away secretly; où $\kappa \check{\epsilon} \phi \theta \eta \sigma a \nu \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\delta} \nu \tau \epsilon s$, no soon er were they gone; $\check{\epsilon} \tau \nu \chi o \nu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\delta} \nu \tau \epsilon s$, they came in by chance, or they happened to come in. E. g.

Odo apa Kipkap ét dovres ét habeve, nor did we come without Circe's knowledge. Od. XII, 17. "Etadev [autip] á $\phi \theta e v \tau a$ mávra kai kara $\phi h e \chi \theta e v \tau a$, everything took fire and was consumed before she knew it. THUC. IV, 133. "Etd do for $e f a \mu e v os$, he aimed a blow first. II. XVI, 322. Od yàp étod poe f a $\mu v v \beta a \sigma a$ i at vy(a, kai émexeipnoav, for no sooner did this misfortune come upon me, than they undertook, &c. DEM. Eubul. 1319, 8. Stratia od motifier $\mu e \chi p \mu$ 'Indµoù mapet do v σa , an army of no great size had by chance marched as far as the Isthmus. THUC. VI, 61. "Etvyte de kata tovro to kaupoù ét $\theta o v$, and he happened to come just at that nick of time. Id. VII, 2. 'Otiya mpòs tà $\mu e \lambda hovta$ to $\chi e \mu \delta f a v t e s$ (8c. ignovina), they think they have chanced to accomplish only a littl: in comparison with their expectations. Id. I, 70. Bouloúµµv åv laθεîv aὐτὸν ἀπελθών, I shoula ike to get avay without his knowing it. XEN. An. I, 3, 17. Τοὺς ἀνθρώπους λήσοµεν ἐπιπεσόντες. Id. VII, 3, 43. Εὐλαβεῖσθαι παρακελεύσεσθε ἀλλήλοις, μὴ πέρα τοῦ δέοντος σσφώτεροι γενόµενοι λήσετε διαφθαρέντες, lest, having become wiser than is proper, you shall become corrupted before you know it. PLAT. Gorg. 487 D. (Here γενόµενοι is an ordinary Aorist, past with reference to the phrase λήσετε διαφθαρέντες.) Όππότερός κεφθῆσιν δρεξάµενος χρόα καλόν, whichever shall first hit, &c. 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 noticed in Note 1 is found after $\pi\epsilon\rho\rho\rho\rho\omega$ and $\epsilon\phi\rho\rho\omega$ ($\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\rho\delta\sigma\nu$) and $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\delta\sigma\nu$) to allow, and occasionally after other verbs which take the Participle in the sense of the Infinitive (§ 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.

Προσδεχόμενος τοὺς ᾿Αθηναίους κατοκνήσειν περιδεῖν αὐτὴν [τὴν γῆν] τμηθεῖσαν, ἀνεῖχεν, expecting that they would be unwilling to allow their land to be ravaged, &c. ΤΠΟC. Η, 18. But in Η, 20, we find the Aorist Infinitive, ἥλπιζεν τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἀν περιδοῖν τμηθῆναι, referring to precisely the same thing. Μὴ περιδητε ἡμέας διαΦθαρέντας, do not allow us to be destroyed. HDT. IV, 118. Οὐ μή σ' ἐγὼ τεριόψομαι ἀπελθόντα, Ι will by no means let you go. ARIST. Ran. 500. "Ετλησαν ἐπιδεῖν ... ἐρήμην μὲν τὴν πόλιν γενομένην, τὴν δὲ χώραν πορθουμένην, ... ἐμήμην μὲν τὴν πόλιν γενομένην, τὴν δὲ χώραν πορθουμένην, ... ἐπαντα δὲ τὸν πόλμον περὶ τὴν πατρίδα τὴν αὐτῶν γιγνόμενον. 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 ravaging 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 πραθέντα τλῆναι, endured to be sold. AESCH. Agam. 1041; and σπείρας ἔτρα ξάνα. 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 $\epsilon v \dot{\gamma} \epsilon \pi o i \eta \sigma as \dot{a} \kappa a \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma as \mu \epsilon$, you did well in reminding me. PLAT. Phaed. 60 C. So $\kappa a \tau a \psi \eta \phi_{1\sigma} a \dot{\mu} \epsilon \nu \sigma a$, Apol. 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.

Έτύγχανον άρτι παρειληφότες την άρχήν, they happened to have

iust received their authority. THUC. VI, 96. 'Εάν τ.ς ήδικηκώς τι τυγχώνη την πόλιν. DEM. Cor. 268, 23. 'Ελάθομεν ήμας αὐτοὺς παίδων οὐδεν διαφέροντες. PLAT. Crit. 49 B.

NOTE 3. In such passages as $\delta \mu o \lambda \delta \gamma \eta \sigma a \nu \tau o \hat{s}^* \lambda \theta \eta \nu a \hat{o} \hat{s} \tau \epsilon \eta \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \lambda \delta \nu \tau \epsilon s \kappa a \hat{\iota} \nu a \hat{v} s \pi a \rho a \delta \delta \nu \tau \epsilon s \phi \delta \rho o \nu \tau \epsilon \tau a \xi \dot{a} \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota,$ 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 $\delta \mu o \lambda \delta \gamma \eta \sigma a \nu$ refers. The meaning is, they obtained terms of peace, on condition that they should first (i. e. before the peace began) tear down their walls, &c. (Such passages are Thuc. I, 101, 108, 115, 117. See Krüger's Note on I, 108, and Madvig's Bemerkungen, p. 46.)

NOTE 4. For the use of the Aorist Infinitive and Participle with $\tilde{a}\nu$, see § 41, 3. For the Aorist Participle with $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$, as a circumlocution for the Perfect, as $\theta a \nu \mu \dot{a}\sigma as \tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$, see § 112, N. 7. For the rare use of the Aorist Participle with $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma \rho \mu a$ 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 $\gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \psi \omega$, I shall write, or I shall be writing.

NOTE 1. The action of the Future is sometimes continued, and sometimes momentary: thus $\xi \xi \omega$ may mean either *I* shall have, or *I* shall obtain; $\delta p \xi \omega$, *I* shall rule, or *I* shall obtain power. E. g.

Πραγματεύονται ὅπως ἄρξουσιν, they take trouble to gain power. XEN. Rep. Laced. XIV, 5. Διαιρετέον οι τινες ἄρξουσίν τε καὶ ἄρξονται, 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.

'Ανήρ ό φεύγων και πάλιν μαχήσεται. 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, § 11, N. 6. E. g.

Φιλόσοφος ήμιν έσται ό μέλλων καλός κάγαθός έσεσθαι φύλαξ, he will prove to be a philosopher. PLAT. Rep. II, 376 C. See Od. II. 270.

NOTE 4. The Future is sometimes used in *questic* is of doubt, where the Subjunctive is more common (§ 88). E. g.

I δητα δρω_μεν; μητέρ³ η φονεύσομεν; what can we do? shall we kill our mother? EUR. El. 967. Ποί τις τρέψεται; whither shall one turn? Δέξεσθε, η ἀπίωμεν; will you receive him, or shall we go away? PLAT. Symp. 212 E. Εἰτ ἐγώ σου φείσομαι; ARIST. Acharn. 312. Τί οἶν ποιήσομεν; πότερον εἰς τὴν πόλιν πάντας τούτους παραδεξόμεθα; 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.

Πρὸς ταῦτα πράξεις cỉον ἂν θέλης, you may act as you please. SOPH. O. C. 956. Πάντως δε τοῦτο δράσεις, but by all means do this. ARIST. Nub. 1352. So in the common imprecations, ἀπολεῖσθε, οἰμωξεσθε, may you perish, &c. Χειρὶ δ' οὐ ψαύσεις ποτέ. Ευκ. 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.

Ταύτην, αν μοι χρησθε συμβούλω, φυλάξετε την πίστιν, και μη βυλήσεσθε είδεναι, κ. τ. λ., if you follow my advice, keep this faith, and do not wish to know, &c. DEM. Aristoc. 659, 15. 'Eav δέ εὖ φρονητε, και νυνι τοῦτο φανερὸν ποιήσετε, και μηδεμίαν αὐτοῖς ἄδειαν δώσετε. LYS. Phil. § 13. (In the preceding examples φυλάξετε and ποιήσετε belong under a.) Και τἀμὰ τεύχη μήτ' ἀγωνάρχαι τινὲς θήσουσ' 'Αχαιοῖς, μήθ' ὁ λυμεὼν ἐμός. SOPII. Aj. 572. Ξένον ἀδικήσεις μηδέποτε καιρὸν λαβών. MENAN. Mon. 397. So perhaps μηδέν τῶνδ' ἐρεῖς κατὰ πτύλιν. AESCH. Sept. 250.

These examples are sometimes explained by supposing an ellipsis of $\ddot{\sigma}\pi\omega s$ from the common construction $\ddot{\sigma}\pi\omega s \ \mu\dot{\eta} \ \tau \sigma \dot{\upsilon}\tau \sigma \ \dot{\epsilon}\rho \hat{\epsilon}\hat{s}$ (se $\sigma\kappa \dot{\sigma}\pi \epsilon i$). See § 45, N. 7.

REMARK. The use of the Future stated in Note 5 gives the most satisfactory explanation of the Future with $o\dot{v} \ \mu\dot{\eta}$ in prohibitions, especially in such expressions as $o\dot{v} \ \mu\dot{\eta} \ \lambda a\lambda\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iotas$, $d\lambda\lambda' \ d\kappa o\lambda ov <math>\theta\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iotas \ \dot{\epsilon}\mu\dot{\epsilon}$, do not prate, but follow me, and $o\dot{v} \ \mu\dot{\eta} \ \pi\rho\sigma\sigmaoi\sigma\epsilon\iotas \ \chi\epsilon\bar{\iota}\rhoa$, $\mu\eta\delta' \ d\psi\epsilon\iota \ \pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\omega v$, do not bring your hand near me, nor touch mu 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 $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ is more common. E.g.

Tí διαφέρουσι τῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης κακοπαθούντων, «ἴ γε πεινήσουσι καὶ διψήσουσι καὶ ῥιγήσουσι καὶ ἀγρυπνήσουσι»; i. e. if they are to endure hunger and thirst, &e. XEN. Mem. II, 1, 17. (Here εἰ μέλλουσι πεινῆν καὶ διψῆν, &c. would be more common, as in the last example under § 25, 2.) Αἶρε πλῆκτρον, εἰ μαχεί, 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 $\tau i \lambda \epsilon \xi \epsilon \iota s$; what dost thou mean to say? often found in tragedy; as " $\Omega \mu o \iota$, $\tau i \lambda \epsilon \xi \epsilon \iota s$; $\eta \gamma a \rho \epsilon \gamma \gamma v s \epsilon \sigma \tau i \pi o v$; EUR. Elec. 1124.

NOTE 7. For the Future Indicative and Infinitive with $\tilde{a}\nu$, see § 37, 2, and § 41, 4. For the Future Indicative in protasis, see § 50, 1, N. 1; in relative clauses expressing a purpose, &c., see § 65, 1 and 2; with $o\dot{\nu} \mu \dot{\eta}$, see § 89.

2. A periphrastic Future is formed by $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ and the Present or Future (seldom the Aorist) Infinitive. This form sometimes denotes mere futurity, and sometimes intention, expectation, or necessity. E. g.

Μέλλει τοῦτο πράττειν (or πράξειν), he is about to do this, or he intends to do this. So in Latin, facturus est for faciet. Μέλλω ὑμâs διδάξειν, ὅθεν μοι ἡ διαβολὴ γέγονε. PLAT. Apol. 21 B. Δεήσει τοῦ τοιούτου τινὸς ἀεὶ ἐπιστάτου, εἰ μέλλει ἡ πολιτεία σώζεσθαι, if the constitution is to be preserved. PLAT. Rep. III, 412 A.

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

NOTE 2. The Imperfect (seldom the Aorist) of $\mu i \lambda \lambda \omega$ is used to express a *past* intention or expectation. E. g.

Κύκλωψ, οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες ἀνάλκιδος ἀνδρὸς ἐταίρους ἔδμεναι ἐν σπῆι γλαφυρῷ, you surely were not intending to eat, &c. Od. IX, 475 Ἐμελλόν σ' ἆρα κινήσειν ἐγώ, I thought I should start you off. ARIST. Nub. 1301. See II. II. 36.

§ 26. The Future Optative in classic Greek is used only 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.

'Υπειπών τάλλα ὅτι αὐτὸς τἀκεῖ πράξοι, ὅχετο, having suggested us to what remained, that he would himself attend to the affairs there, ke departed. Thuc. I, 90. (Here πράξοι represents πράξω of the direct discourse, which might have been expressed by πράξει in the indirect quotation. See in the same chapter of Thucydides, ἀποκρινάμενοι ὅτι πέμψουσιν, having τ plied that they would send, where $\pi\epsilon\mu\psi\omega\epsilon\nu$ might have been used.) Ei τινα φεύγοντα λήψοιτο, προηγόρευεν ότι ώς πολεμίφ χρήσοιτο. ΧΕΝ. Сут. III, 1, 3. (Here the announcement was εί τινα λήψομαι, ώς πολεμίφ χρήσομαι.) Έλεγεν ότι έτοιμος είη ήγεισθαι αὐτοίς εἰς τὸ Δέλτα, ἕνθα πολλά λήψοιντο. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VII, 1, 33. Αἰρεθέντες ἐφ΄ ὅτε ξυγγράψαι νόμους, καθ' οὕστινας πολιτεύσοιντο, having been chosen jor the purpose of making a code of laws, by which they were to govern. XΕΝ. Hell. II, 3, 11. (Here we have an indirect expression of the idea of the persons who chose them, of which the direct form is found just before (II, 3, 2), ἕδοξε τριάκοντα ἄνδρας ἐλέσθαι, οἱ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους ξυγγράψουσι, καθ' οῦς πολιτεύσουσι.)

REMARK. The term *indirect discourse* here, as elsewhere, must be understood to include, not only all cases of ordinary *indirect quotation*, introduced by $\delta \tau_i$ or δs 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. (See § 68.)

NOTE 1. The Future Optative is sometimes used in final and object clauses after secondary tenses; but regularly only with $\delta \pi \omega s$ or $\delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta$ after verbs of *striving*, &c., occasionally with $\mu \eta$ (or $\delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta$) 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 sentences of this class is with $\delta\pi\omega s$ or $\delta\pi\omega s \mu \eta$ after secondary 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, $\sigma\kappa\sigma\pi\omega$ $\delta\pi\omega s$ $\tau\omega\tau\sigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, I am taking care that this shall happen, we can now say, referring to that thought, $\epsilon\sigma\kappa\delta\pi\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\pi\omega s$ $\tau\omega\tau\sigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\sigma\sigma\iota\tau\sigma$, he was taking care that this should happen, changing the Future Indicative to the Future Optative (§ 77). E. g.

Ἐσκόπει ὁ Μενεκλῆς ὅπως μὴ ἔσοιτο ἄπαις, ἀλλ' ἔσοιτο αὐτῷ ὅστις ζῶντά τε γηροτροφήσοι καὶ τελευτήσαντα θάψοι αὐτὸν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον τὰ νομιζόμενα αὐτῷ ποιήσοι. ISAE. de Meneel. Hered. § 10 (11). Ἐμηχανώμεθα ὅπως μηδείς... γνώσοιτο, νομιοῦτ. δὲ πάντες, κ.τ. λ., we were striving that no one should know, &c., but that all should think, &c. PLAT. Tim. 18 C (Here the second verb, νεμιοῦσι, is retained in the Future Indica tive, while the other, $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\epsilon\tau a\iota$, is changed to the Optative.) See also PLAT. Tim. 18 E. Mydèv otou $\lambda \lambda o \mu \eta \chi a u \overline{a} \sigma d a\iota$, $\tilde{\eta} \delta \pi \omega s$... $\delta \epsilon \xi \sigma \iota \nu \tau \sigma$. PLAT. Rep. IV, 430 A. (See § 15, 3.) $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tilde{\iota} r \sigma \tilde{\iota} \delta \sigma \sigma \sigma \iota \nu \tau \sigma$. XEN. Cyr. VIII, 1, 43. Other examples are PLAT. Apol. 36 C; XEN. Cyr. VIII, 1, 10, Hell. VII, 5, 3; ISAE. de Philoct. Hered. p. 59, 41. § 35.

In this construction the Future Indicative is generally retained, even after secondary tenses. See § 45.

(b.) The Future Optative is seldom found with $\mu\eta$ or $\delta\pi\omega s$ $\mu\eta$ after secondary tenses of verbs of *fearing*, as here the Future Indicative is not common after primary tenses. E. g.

Οὐ μόνον περὶ τῆς βασάνου καὶ τῆς δίκης ἐδεδοίκει, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ γραμματείου, ὅπως μὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μενεξένου συλληφθήσοιτο. Isoc. Trapez. p. 363 B. § 22. (Here the fear was expressed originally by ὅπως μὴ συλληφθήσεται) Κατέβαλε τὸ Ἡρακλεωτῶν τείχος, οὐ τοῦτο φοβούμενος, μή τινες . . . πορεύσοιντο ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκείνου δύναμιν. ΧΕΝ. Hell. VI, 4, 27. ᾿Αλλὰ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀν ἔδεισας παρακινδυνεύειν, μὴ οὐκ ὀρθῶς αὐτὸ ποιήσοις. PLAT. Euthyphr. 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 $\delta \pi \omega s$ 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 $\delta \pi \omega s$ was in use (though rare) after primary tenses. (§ 44, 1, N. 1.)

The single example cited for the use of the simple μ_{η}' with the Future Optative in a pure final clause is PLAT. Rep. III, 393 E: Ayaµéµww $\eta_{\gamma\rho}$ fauver, $\epsilon v r \epsilon \lambda \delta \mu evos v v r \epsilon à π i eva a a d d is <math>\mu\eta$ $\epsilon \lambda \partial \epsilon v$, $\mu\eta$ a v $\tau \phi$ $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon \sigma \kappa \eta \pi \tau \rho \sigma v \kappa a i \tau a \tau \sigma v \theta \epsilon \sigma \sigma v \epsilon \delta \sigma a \rho \kappa \ell \sigma \sigma \iota$. (Here there is another reading, $\epsilon \pi a \rho \kappa \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$, of inferior authority, which is adopted by Bekker.) If the reading $\epsilon \pi a \rho \kappa \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ is retained (as it is by most editors), it can be explained only by assuming that Plato had in his mind as the direct discourse $\mu\eta$ où $\kappa \epsilon \pi a \rho \kappa \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \iota$. We must remember that Plato is here paraphrasing Homer (II. I, 25-28), and by no means literally. The Homeric line is $M\eta v v$ $\tau \sigma \iota o v \chi \rho a (\sigma \mu_{\eta} \sigma \kappa \eta \pi \rho ov \kappa a \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \mu a \theta e \delta o$.

The other final particles, $i\nu a$ and ωs , 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 discourse, 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.

^{*}Εσεσθαί φησι, he says that he will be ; εσεσθαι εφη, he said that he would be ; εσεσθαι φήσει, he will say that he will be. Πολλούς γε εσεσθαι ελεγον τους εθελήσοντας, they said that there would be many 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 above.) In other constructions, the Present and Aorist Infinitive, being indefinite in their time, can always refer to the future if the context requires it (§§ 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 $\beta o \delta o r a i \eta \sigma \epsilon i \nu$, but by $\beta o \delta \delta o r a i \epsilon i \nu$ (or $\pi o i \eta \sigma a i$). See examples under §§ 15, 1 and 23, 1. So, when the Infinitive follows $\delta \sigma r \epsilon$ 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 $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ (§ 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

§ 27.]

take 42 the present Obse OF THE TENSES. [\$ 27 V. 9 (KANGRAGRAG Bai) TT. 13 (CLAIR (KREN) IV. 27. GRIK verbs and expressions signifying to wish, to be unwilling, to to (1 intend, to ask, to be able, and the like, where we should expect the Present or Aorist. This was particularly a favorite construction with Thueydides. E. g.

'Εδεήθησαν δε και των Μεγαρέων ναυσι σφάς ξυμπροπέμψειν ΤΠUC. Ι, 27. Ἐβούλοντο προτιμωρήσεσθαι. Ιd. VI, 57. Tà στόμα αὐτοῦ διενοοῦντο κλήσειν. Id. VII, 56. Ἐφιέμενοι μέν τῆς ΤΑ πάσης ἄρξειν, βοηθείν δε άμα εὐπρεπῶς βουλόμενοι τοῖς έαυτῶν ξυγγενέσι και ξυμμάχοις. Id. VI, 6. (Here βοηθείν follows the rule.) Του ταίς ναυσί μή άθυμειν έπιχειρήσειν, to prevent them from being a without spirit to attack them in ships. Id. VII, 21. Our anorwhiσειν δύνατοι όντες. Id. III, 28. Ει τις είς τοῦτο ἀναβάλλεται ποιή- $\sigma \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \dot{a} \delta \epsilon_{0} \nu \tau a$, if any one postpones doing his duty as far as this DEM. Ol. III, 31, 1. (The ordinary construction would be avaBá) / λεται ποιείν or ποιήσαι.) Οὔτε των προγόνων μεμνήσθαι [δεί] οὔτε τών λεγόντων ανέχεσθαι, νόμον τε θήσειν και γραψειν, κ. τ. λ. DEM. F. L. 345, 27. (Here we have δεί θήσειν.) Πολλού δέω έμαυτόν γε άδικήσειν και κατ έμαυτοῦ έρειν αὐτός. PLAT. Apol. 37 B. In ARIST. Nub. 1130 we find, ισως βουλήσεται κάν έν Αἰγύπτω τυχείν ών μάλλον ή κρίναι κακώς, perhaps he will wish that he might (if possible) find himself by some chance in Equpt, rather than wish to judge unfairly. (Here roxeiv uv 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 construction of indirect discourse.)

See also THUC. IV, 115 and 121; V, 35; VII, 11; VIII, 55 and 4 74. In several of these passages the Mss. vary between the Future and Aorist, although the weight of authority is for the Future. See Krüger's Note on THUC. I, 27, where the passages of Thucydides are collected. 1 sait he

Soph: (b.) In like manner, the Future Infinitive is occasionally shelon used for the Present or Aorist, after worre and in the other 1482 constructions mentioned in Note 1, to make the idea of futurity V Spings more prominent. E. g. THIN

Προκαλεσάμενος ές λόγους Ίππίαν, ώστε ην μηδεν αρέσκον λέγη, πάλιν αὐτὸν καταστήσειν ἐς τὸ τείχος. on condition that he would in that case restore him. THUC. 111, 34. Tobs ouppour mapeδοσαν τῷ Αργείων δήμω διὰ ταῦτα διαχρήσεσθαι, that they might put them to death. Thuc. VI, 61. So πεύσεσθαι, III, 26. Ἐλπίδι το άφανές του κατορθώσειν επιτρέψαντες, having committed to hope what was uncertain in the prospect of success. THUC. II, 42. (Here κατορθώσειν is more explicit than the Present κατορθοῦν would be το άφανές τοῦ κατορθοῦν would mean simply what was uncertain in regard to success.) Το μέν ουν έξελέγξειν αυτόν θαρρώ και πάνυ πιστενω, I have courage and great confidence as to my convicting him. DEM. F. L. 342, 2. (Here most of the ordinary Mss. read ¿ξελέγχειν.)

o.

(1)

Ear

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.

Τρωσίν δ' έλπετο θυμός νηας ένιπρήσειν κτενέειν θ' ηρωας Αχαιούς. Π. XV, 701. 'Υπό τ' έσχετο καὶ κατένευσεν δωσέμεναι. Π. XIII, 368. Παίδαι τε σὸν προσδόκα τοι ἀπονοστήσειν. ΗDT. Ι, 42. Καὶ προσδοκάν χρὴ δεσπόσειν Ζηνός τινα; AESCH. Prom. 930. "Ηλπιζεν γὰρ μάχην ἔσεσθαι. ThUC. IV, 71. 'Εν ἐλπίδι ῶν τὰ τείχη αἰρήσειν. Ιd. VII, 46. Τὸν στρατηγὸν προσδοκῶ ταῦτα πράξειν. XEN. An. III, 1, 14. 'Εκ τούτου ὑπέσχετο μηχαυὴν παρέξειν. Id. Cyr. VI, 1, 21. Σὺ γὰρ ὑπέσχου ζητήσειν. PLAT. Rep. IV, 427 Ε. So διώμοτοι η μὴν ἅξειν, SOPH. Phil. 594.

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.

Τοῦτο ποιήσων ἔρχεται, ἦλθεν οι ἐλεύσεται, he comes, went, or will come, for the purpose of doing this. Οἶδα αὐτὸν τοῦτο ποιήσοντα, I know that he will do this: οἶδα τοῦτο ποιήσων, I know that I shall do this. So ἦδειν αὐτὸν τοῦτο ποιήσοντα, I knew that he would do this.

NOTE. For the various uses of the Future Participle, and examples, see Chapter VI.

FUTURE PERFECT.

§ 29. The Future Perfect denotes that an action will be *already finished* at some future time. It is thus a Perfect transferred to the future. E. g.

Kaí με ἐἀν ἐξελέγξης, οὐκ ἀχθεσθήσομαί σοι, ἀλλὰ μέγιστος εὐεργέτης παρ' ἐμοὶ ἀναγεγράψει, you will have been enrolled as the greatest benefactor. PLAT. Gorg. 506 C. [•]Ην δὲ μὴ γένηται, μάτην ἐμοὶ κεκλαύσεται, σὺ δ' ἐγχανὼν τεθνήξεις. I shall then have had my whipping for nothing, and you will have died. ARIST. Nub-1435

NOTE 1 The Future Perfect often denotes the contin-

uance of an action, or the permanence of its results, in future time. E. g.

Tŷs δυνάμεως ès dibiov τοîs ἐπιγιγνομένοις μνήμη καταλελεί $\psi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$, 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 certainty or likelihood that an action will *immediately* take place, which idea is still more vividly expressed by the Perfect (§ 17, Note 6). E. g.

El dè παρελθών εἶς όστισοῦν δύναιτο διδάξαι, πῶς ὁ παρῶν φόβος λελύσεται, all the present fear will be at once dispelled. DEM. Symmor. 178, 17. (Here the inferior Mss. have λέλυται, which would have the same force, like ὅλωλα quoted in § 17, N. 6.) Φράζε, καὶ πεπράξεται, speak, and it shall be no sooner said than done. ARIST. Plut. 1027. Εἰθος ᾿Αριαῖος ἀφεστήξει, ὥστε φίλος ἡμῖν οὐδεἰς λελείψεται. XEN. An. II, 4, 5.

NOTE 3. The Future Perfect can be expressed by the Perfect Participle and $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha a$. In the active voice this compound form is the only one in use, except in a few verbs E. g.

^Aν ταῦτ' ϵἰδῶμϵν, καὶ τὰ δέοντα ἐσ ὁμϵθα ἐγνωκότϵς καὶ λόγων ματαίων ἀπηλλ αγμένοι, 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ is sometimes found, especially in the poets. E. g.

Ού σιωπήσας έσει; SOPH. O. T. 1146. Λυπηθείς έσει. SOPH. O 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.

Κεκλήσομαι, μεμνήσομαι, ἀφεστή $\xi \omega_{\mathbf{w}} I$ shall be named, I shall renember, I shall withdraw, &c.

(b.) With many other verbs, the Future Perfect differs very slightly, if at all, from an ordinary Future. Thus, $\pi\epsilon\pi\rho\dot{a}\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ is the regular Future Passive of $\pi\iota\pi\rho\dot{a}\sigma\kappa\omega$. Still, where there is another form, the Future 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. L. g. **Ταῦτα (Φησί)** $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \acute{a} \xi \epsilon \sigma \theta aι$ δυοΐν η τριών ημερών, he says that these things will have been accomplished within two or three days. DEM. F. L. 364, 18. (Here the direct discourse was $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \acute{a} \acute{a} \epsilon \tau a$.)

REMARK. It must be remembered that, in most cases in which 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.

Κάτθαν' όμῶς ὅ τ' ἀεργὸς ἀνὴρ ὅ τε πολλὰ ἐοργώς, both alike must die. II. IX, 320. "Οστε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἄνδρα φοβεῖ καὶ ἀφείλετο νίκην, who terrifies, and snatches away. II. XVII, 177. (See Note 2.) Bia δὲ καὶ μεγάλαυχον ἔσφαλεν ἐν χρόνῷ. PIND. Pyth. VIII, 20. Σοφοὶ δὲ μέλλοντα τριταῖον ἄνεμον ἕμαθον, οἰδ' ὑπὸ κέρδει βλ άβεν. PIND. Nem. VII, 25. Καὶ δὴ φίλον τις ἔκταν' ἀγνοίας ὅπο. ΑΕSCH. Supp. 499. 'Αλλὰ τὰ τοιαῦτα εἰς μέν ἅπαξ καὶ βραχὺν χρόνον ἀντέχει, καὶ σφόδρα γε ἥνθησεν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐλπίσιν, ἂν τύχη, τῷ χρόνῷ δὲ φωρᾶται καὶ περὶ ἀὐτὰ καταρρεῖ. DEM. OI. II, 21, 1. (See Note 2.) 'Hν ἄρα... σφαλῶσιν, ἀντελπίσαντες ἅλλα ἐπλή ρωσαν τὴν χρείαν, they supply the deficiency (as often as one occurs). THUC. I, 70. 'Hν δέ τις τούτων τι παραβαίνη, ζημίαν αἰτοῖς ἐπτέθεσαν, i. e. they impose a penalty upon every one who transgresses. XEN. Cyr. I, 2, 2. Δεινῶν τ' ἅημα πνευμάτων ἐκοίμισε στένοντα πόντον. SOPH. Aj. 674. Μί ἡμέρα τὸν μὲν καθεῖλεν ὑψόθεν, τὸν δ' ἦρ' ἄνω. EUR. Ino. Fr. 424. "Οταν ὅ "Ερως ἐγκρατέστερος γένηται δια φθείρει τε πολλὰ κὴ ἡδίκησεν. PLAT. Symp. 188 A. "Οταν τις ὥσπερ οὖτος ἰσχύση, ἡ πρώτη πρόφασις κοὶ μικρὸν παῶσμα ἅπαυτα ἀνεχαίτισε καὶ διέλυσεν. DEM. OI. II, 20, 27. Επειδάν τις παρ' ἐμοῦ μάθη, ἐλθων εἰς ἰερὸν ὀμόσας, ὅσοι ῶν φῇ ἅξια εἶναι τὰ μαθήματα, τοσοῦτον κατέθη κεν. PLAT. Prot. 328 B. (Here the Perfect and Aorist are used together, in nearly the same sense, he pays.) Πολλοὶ διὰ δόξαν καὶ πολιτικὴν δύαμιν μεγάλα κακὰ πεπά ἡν θα σιν, i. e. many always have suffered, and many do suffer. ΧεΝ Mem. IV, 2, 35. Τὸ δὲ μὴ ἐμποδῶν ἀνανταγωνίστῷ εὐνοία τετί μηται. Thuc. II, 45.

REMARK. The gnomie Perfect is not found in Homer.

NOTE 1. The sense, as well as the origin of the construction, is often made clearer by the addition of such words as $\pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha \kappa s$, $\eta \delta \eta$, or $o \ddot{\upsilon} \pi \omega$. Such examples as these form a simplutransition from the common to the gnomic use of these tenses:—

Πολλὰ στρατόπεδα ἤδη ἕπεσεν ὑπ' ἐλασσόνων, i. e. many cases have already arisen, implying, it often happens. Thuc. II, 89. Μέλλων γ' ἰατρὸς, τῆ νόσω διδοὺς χρόνον, ἰ ἀσατ' ἤδη μᾶλλον ἢ τεμῶν χρόα. ΕUR. Frag. 1057. Πολλάκις ἔχων τις οὐδὲ τἀναγκαῖα νῦν αῦμου ἐπλούτησ', ὥστε χἀτέρους τρέφειν, i. e. cases have often occurred in which such a man has become rich the next day, &c. PHILEM. Fr. Inc. 29. 'Αθυμοῦντες ἀνδρες οὕπω τρόπαιον ἔστησαν. PLAT. Crit. 108 C. Οὐδεἰς ἐπλούτησεν ταχέως δἰκαιος ὥν. ΜΕΝΑΝD. Col. Fr. 6. (Krüger, § 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 sense in the same sentence, are given under § 30, 1. The gnomic Aorist is, however, commonly distinguished from the Present, either by being more vivid, or by referring to an action which is (by its own nature) momentary or sudden, while the Present (as usual) implies duration. See the second and sixth examples under § 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.

[#]Ηριπε δ' ώς ὅτε τις δρῦς ἤριπεν, and he fell, as when an oak falls (literally, as when an oak once fell). II. XVI, 389.

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

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

Οπου δ' ὑβρίζειν δραν θ', & βούλεται, παρη, Ταύτην νόμιζε τὴν πόλιν χρόνφ ποτὲ Ἐξ οὐρίων δραμοῦσαν ἐς βυθὸν πεσεῖν.

Here $\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\tilde{i}\nu$ represents $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$ in the direct discourse; the sense being, believe that that city must at some time fall. (See Schneidewin's note.) So probably in PLAT. Phaedr. 232 B: ήγουμένω διαφοράς γενομένης κοινήν άμφοτέροις καταστήναι την συμφοράν.

Even the Aorist Participle seems to be occasionally used in the same sense; as in THUC. VI, 16: οίδα τούς τοιούτους έν μέν τώ κατ' αύτούς βίω λυπηρούς όντας, των δε επειτα άνθρώπων προσποίησιν ξυγγενείας τισί και μή ούσαν καταλιπόντας, I know that such men. although in their own 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. Ol. II, 23, 14: είδέ τις σώφρων ή δίκαιος, παρεώσθαι καί έν οὐδενός είναι μέρει τὸν τοιοῦτον (Φησίν), such a man is always thrust aside, and is of no account.

2. The Imperfect and Aorist are sometimes used with the particle av 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.

 $\Delta \iota \eta \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \omega \nu \dot{a} \nu$ autoùs ti $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma o \iota \epsilon \nu$, I used to ask them (I would ask them) what they said. PLAT. Apol. 22 B. El TIVES Bout TO TOUS σφετέρους έπικρατούντας, άνεθάρσησαν άν, whenever any saw their friends in any way victorious, they would be encouraged (i. e. they were fill of the concouraged in all such cases). THUC VII, 71. Πολλάκις ηκούταμεν αν τι κακώς ύμας βουλευσάμενους μέγα πράγμα, we used very often to hear you, &c. ARIST. Lysist. 511. El ris auto περί του άντιλέγοι μηδέν έχων σαφές λέγειν, έπι την υπόθεσιν έπανηγεν αν of me πάντα τὸν λόγον, he always brought the whole discussion back to the main point. XEN. Mem. IV, 6, 13. 'Οπότε προσβλέψειέ τινας των έν ταις τάξεσι, τοτέ μεν είπεν αν, ω άνδρες, κ. τ. λ. . . . τοτε δ' αυ έν άλλοις αν έλεξεν. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VII, 1, 10.

This construction must be carefully distinguished from that with av in ordinary apodosis (§ 49, 2). For the iterative Imperfect Race JK transferred to the Infinitive, see § 41, N. 3.

(a.) The Ionic iterative Aorist in - okov and NOTE 1. -σκόμην expresses the repetition of a momentary action; the Imperfect with the same endings expresses the repetition of a $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}}}$ continued action. E. g.

Αλλους μέν γαρ παίδας έμους πόδας ωκύς Αχιλλεύς πέρνασχ', ου τιν' έλεσκε. Π. ΧΧΙΥ, 751. Οκως έλθοι ο Νείλος επί οκτώ πήχεας, ἄρδεσκε Αίγυπτον την ένερθε Μέμφιος. HDT. II, 13.

(b.) In Homer, however, the iterative forms are sometimes used in nearly or quite the same sense as the ordinary forms; thus fore in Homer does not differ from hv. E. g

ht.

Le corrup from

ant

0426

pinos

21(*00

8 dios

GV21

nas ×.

115 di

G hol

άv

10

Δαήρ αυτ' έμος έσκε κυνώπιδος, εί ποτ' έην γε. Π. ΠΙ, 180. "Os oi τλησίου ίζε, μάλιστα δέ μιν φιλέεσκεν. Od. VII, 171.

NOTE 2. Herodotus sometimes uses the iterative forms in $-\sigma \kappa \rho \nu$ and $-\sigma \kappa \delta \mu \eta \nu$ with $\delta \nu$, in the construction of § 30, 2. (He uses the kerative Arrist in only two passages, in both with $\delta \nu$.) E. g.

Φοιτέουσα κλαίεσκε ΐν καὶ όδυρέσκετο. ΗΔΤ. ΙΙΙ, 119. 'Es τούτους ὅκως ἔλθοι ὁ Σκύλης, τὴν μὲν στρατιὴν καταλείπεσκε ἐν τῷ εροαστείῳ, ، ὐτὸς δὲ ὅκως ἔλθοι ἐς τὸ τεῖχος ...λάβεσκε ἶν Ελληνίδα ἐσθῆτα. ΗΔΤ. ΙV, 78.

DEPENDENCE OF MOODS AND TENSES.

§ 31. 1. In dependent sentences, where the construction 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.

Πράττουσιν â âν βούλωνται, they do whatever they please: but $\tilde{\epsilon}$ πραττον â βούλοιντο, they did whatever they pleased.

2. In like manner, where the construction allows either an Indicative or an Optative, the Indicative follows *primary*, and the Optative follows *secondary* tenses. E. g.

Λέγουσιν ὅτι τοῦτο βούλονται, they say that they wish for this, $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\Lambda \epsilon} \xi_{\alpha \nu}$ ὅτι τοῦτο βούλοιντο, they said that they wished for this.

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 iva, $\mu \eta$, &c.), either an Indicative or a Subjunctive may depend upon a secondary ten-e, nu order that the mood and tense actually used by the speaker may be retained in the indirect discourse. (See § 69.) E. g.

Εἶπεν ὅτι βούλεται, for εἶπεν ὅτι βούλοιτο, he said that he wished (i. e. he said βούλομαι). Ἐφοβεῖτο μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, for ἐφοβεῖτο μὴ τοῦτο γένοιτο, he feared lest it should happen (i. e. he thought, φοβοῦμαι μὴ γένηται). (See § 44, 2.)

NOTE. 2. An only *apparent* exception to these rules occurs when either an apodosis with $\tilde{a}\nu$, or a verb expressing a wish, stands an a dependent 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.

Έγω οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἄν τις σαφέστερον ἐπιδείξειεν, Ι do not know how any one could show this more clearly. DEM. Aph. I, 828, 23. Δεῖ γὰρ ἐκείνῷ τοῦτο ἐν τῆ γνώμῃ παραστῆσαι, ὡς ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῆς ἀμελείας ταύτης . . . ἴσως ἂν ὁρμήσαιτε. DEM. Phil. I, 44, 25. Εἰ δ' ὑμεῖς ἄλλο τι γνώσεσθε, ὁ μὴ γένοιτο, τίνα οἴεσθε αὐτὴν ψυχὴν ἔξεω; DEM. Aph. II, 842, 14.

The learner needs only to be warned not to attempt to apply the rules \S 31, 1, 2 to such cases 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 moods) 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 § 31 are applied. The general principle, stated in § 8, 2, applies chiefly 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 § 10, 2, where an historical Present is followed by the Optative; and the sixth, seventh, and eighth examples under § 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), when it refers to *present* time, is a primary tense. E. g.

^{*}Εγραφον αν ήλίκα ύμας εἶ ποιήσω, εἰ εἶ ήδειν, I would tell you in my letter how great services I would render you, if I knew, &c DEM. F. L. 353, 24. Πάνυ αν ἐφοβούμην, μὴ ἀπορήσωσι λόγων. PLAT. Symp. 193 Ε. Ἐφοβούμην αν σφόδρα λέγειν, μὴ δύξω, κ. τ. λ., I should be very much afraid to speak, lest I should seem, &c. PLAT. Theaet. 143 Ε. Ταῦτ ἀν ήδη λέγειν ἐπεχείρουν, ὕν εἰδητε. DEM. Aristor. 623, 11.

3

(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.

'Αλλὰ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀν ἔδεισας παρακινδυνεύειν, μὴ οὐκ ὑρθῶς αὐτὸ ποιήσοις. ΓΊΑΤ. Euthyph. 15 D. 'Αλλ' οὐδὲ μετὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων ἀποδιδοὺς εἰκῆ τις ἀν ἐπίστευεν, ῦν' εἶ τις γίγνοιτο διαφορὰ, κομίσασθαι ῥαδίως παρ' ὑμῖν δύνηται. DEM. Onet. I, 869, 18. (Here the Subjunctive δύνηται will be explained by § 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.

^{*}Επεσθ' ὅπη αντις ήγηται, follow whithersoever any one leads the way. Thuc. II, 11.

§ 34. 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 ϵ and relatives, depending on past tenses (§§ 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

* 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 a, § 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 § 31, Note 1.

on an Optative, the dependent 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 $i_{\nu\alpha}$, $\delta\pi\omega_s$, $\mu\eta'$, &c., and *very rarely* in indirect quotations or questions.

1. (a.) In protasis and in conditional relative sentences depending upon an Optative which *refers to the future*, the Optative is regularly used to express a future condition, rather than the Subjunctive. E. g.

Eins φορητός οὐκ αν, εἰ πράσσοις καλῶς, you would be unendurable, if you should ever prosper. AESCH. Prom. 979. ᾿Ανδρὶ δέ κ' οὐκ εἶξειε μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αιας, ὃς θνητός τ' εἶη καὶ ἕδοι Δημήτερος ἀκτήν. II. XIII, 321. Πῶς γὰρ ἄν τις, ἅ γε μὴ ἐπίσταιτο, ταῦτα σοφὸς εἰη; for how should any one be wise in those things which he did not understand? XEN. Mem. IV, 6, 7. Δέοιτο αν αὐτοῦ μένειν, ἕστε σὺ ἀπέλθοις. XEN. Cyr. V, 3, 13. Εἰ ἀποθνήσκοι μὲν πάντα, ôσα τοῦ ζῆν μεταλάβοι, ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀποθάνοι, μένοι ἐν τούτα... ẵρ' οὐ πολλὴ ἀνάγκη τελευτῶντα πάντα τεθνάναι; PLAT. Phaed. 72 C. Ως ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἀλλος, ὅ τις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι, may any other man likewise perish, who shall do such things. Od. I, 47. Τεθναίην, ὅτε μοι μηκέτι ταῦτα μέλοι, may I die, when I (shall) no longer care for these! MIMN. Fr. I, 2. (Here ὅτε μηκέτι μέλη might be used without ehange of meaning. But ὅτε μέλει, 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 Subjunctive (or Future Indicative with ϵi), on the ground that it follows a tense of future time. This happens especially after the Optative with $a\nu$ used in its sense approaching that of the Future Indicative (§ 52, 2, N; § 54, 1, b.) E. g.

[•]Hν οἶν μάθης μοι τοῦτον, οἰκ ἀν ἀποδοίην, if then you should (shall) learn this for me, I would not pay, &c. ARIST. Nub. 116. [•]Hν σε ἀ φ ἐλ ω μαι, κάκιστ ἀπολοίμην. Id. Ran. 586. [•]Eγὼ δὲ ταύτην μὲν τὴν εἰρήνην, ἔως ἂν εἶς Ἀθηναίων λείπηται, οἰδέπστ ἀν συμβουλεύσαιμι ποιήσασθαι τῆ πόλει, I would never advise the city to make this peace, as long as a single Athenian shall be left. DEM. F. L. 345, 14. (Here ἕως λείποιτο would be the common form.) [•]Ωσπερ ἀν ὑμῶν ἕκαστος αἰσχυνθείη τὴν τάξιν λιπεῖν ἡν ἀν ταχθῆ ἐν τῷ πολέμω. as each one of you would be ashamed to leave the post at which he might be placed in war. AESCHIN. Cor. § 7. (Here ἡν ταχθείη would be the more common expression.) Τῶν ἀτοποτάτων ἀν εἴr, εἰ ταῦτα δυνηθεἰς μὴ πράξει DEM. OI. 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 ϵi or a relative) eonsists of a present or past tense of the indicative, as in this case a change to the Optative would involve a change of time. See § 64, Rem 2.

In final and object clauses after $i\nu a$, $\delta\pi\omega s$, $\mu\eta$, &c., the $\mathbf{2}$ 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.

(Subj.) 'Οκνοίην αν είς τα πλοία έμβαίνειν, μή καταδύση · φοβοίμην δ' αν τω ήγεμόνι επεσθαι, μή ήμας αγάγη οθεν ούχ οιόν τε έσται έξελθείν. ΧΕΝ. An. 1, 3, 17. Οιομαι αν ύμας μέγα όνησαι το στράτευμα, εί επιμεληθείητε όπως άντι των απολωλότων ώς τάχιστα στρατηγοί καὶ λοχαγοὶ ἀντικατασταθῶσιν. ΧΕΝ. An. III, 1, 38.

(Opt.) Πειρώμην αν μή πρόσω ύμων είναι, ίνα, εί που καιρός είη, έπιφανείην. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, 4, 17. Η φυλακή γελοία τις αν φαίνοιτο, εί μή σύγε επιμελοίο οπως έξωθεν τι είσφεροιτο. ΧΕΝ. Oecon. VII, 39. Other examples of the Optative are AESCH. Eumen. 298 (έλθοι, όπως γένοιτο); SOPH. Aj. 1221 (όπως προσείποιμεν); SOPH. Phil. 325; EUR. Hec. 839; XEN. 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 $a\nu$, see § 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.

Οὐδ' ἀν εἶς ἀντείποι ὡς οὐ συμφέρει τŷ πόλει. DEM. Megal. 202, 24. Εἰ οὖν νῦν ἀποδειχθείη τίνα χρή ἡγείσθαι, . . . οὐκ ἀν ὑπότε οἰ πολέμιοι ἕλθοιεν βουλεύεσθαι ἡμῶς δέοι. ΧΕΝ. ΑΠ. ΙΙΙ, 2, 36.

Oùκ ἀν ἔχοις ἐξελθών ὅ τι χρῶο σαυτῷ, if you should withdraw, you would not know what to do with yourself. PLAT. Crit. 45 B. Oùκ 1UMi αν έχοις ό τι χρήσαιο σαυτώ, άλλ' ίλιγγιώης αν και χασμώο ούκ έχων ο τι είποις. Id. Gorg. 486 B. The direct questions here were τι χρωμαι; — τί χρήσωμαι; — τί είπω; The Subjunctive can always be retained in this construction, even after past tenses. See § 71.

NOTE. In DEM. Megal. 203, 12, we find a case of the Optative in an indirect quotation : Ού γàρ ἐκεῖνό γ' αν εἴποιμεν, ὡς ἀνταλλάξασθαι βουλοίμεθ' αντιπάλους Λακεδαιμονίους αντί Θηβαίων There are

another milance is Plate Sutty demas

Х

§ 35, 2.] DEFENDENCE OF MOODS AND TENSES.

In II. V, 85, Tudeídhv our av yvolns ποτέροισι $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon i \eta$, the Optative in the indirect question represents $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota v$, but our av yvolns 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.

Boûleral légeur tí toũtó ẻ στιν, he wishes to tell what this is. EBoûlero légeur tí toũto $\epsilon_{1,\eta}^{i}$, he wished to tell what this was. Φησιν ἀκηκοέναι τί ἐστιν, he says he has heard what it is. "Εφη ἀκηκοέναι τί εἶη, he said he had heard what it was. Φησι ποιήσειν ὅ τι ἀν βούλησθε, he says he will do whatever you shall wish. "Εφη ποιήσειν ὅ τι βούλοισθε, he said he would do whatever you should wish.

Μένουσιν βουλόμενοι είδέναι τί έστι. "Εμενον βουλόμενοι είδέναι τί εἴη. Μένουσιν ἀκηκοότες τί ἐστιν. "Εμενον ἀκηκοότες τί εἴη. Μένουσιν ἀκουσόμενοι τί ἐστιν. "Εμενον ἀκουσόμενοι τί εἴη.

NOTE. When the Present Infinitive and Participle represent the Imperfect (without dv) they are secondary without regard to the leading verb. E. g.

Hûs yàp oi $\epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ $\delta v \sigma \chi \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} s$ $\dot{a} \kappa o \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu$, ϵi $\tau i s \tau \iota \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma o \iota$; how unwillingly do you think they heard it, when any one said anything? See this and the other examples under § 15, 3, and § 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.

Βούλεται γνώναι τί τοῦτό ἐστιν, he wishes to learn what this is. Ἐβούλετο γνώναι τί τοῦτο εἴη, he wished to learn what this was. (§ 23, 1.)

But phoi yvava ti roito ein, he says that he learned what this

anation of attraction to an adjoin a

was (§ 23, 2). "Eqn $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \nu a \iota \tau i \tau \hat{\upsilon} \hat{\upsilon} \tau o \tilde{\tau} \sigma \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \eta$, he saw that he had learned what this was. ($\Gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \nu a \iota$ 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.

"Ιστε ήμας ελθόντας ίνα τοῦτο ἴδοιμεν, you know that we came that we might see this. Ύπειπων τάλλα ὅτι αὐτὸς τἀκεῖ πράξοι, ὅχετο. ΤΗυς. Ι, 90. Τῆ μάστιγι τυπτέσθω πληγὰς ὑπὸ κήρυκος ἐν ἀγορậ, κηρύξαντος ῶν ἕνεκα μέλλει τύπτεσθαι. PLAT. Leg. XI, 917 Ε. Ψήφων δείσας μὴ δεηθείη...τρέφει. ARIST. Vesp. 109.

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

CHAPTER III.

THE PARTICLE "AN.

§ 36. The adverb $a\nu$ (Epic $\kappa\epsilon$, Doric κa) 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 ϵi , if, and to all relatives and temporal particles, (and occasionally to the final particles ω_s , $\delta \pi \omega_s$ and $\delta \phi \rho a$,) when these

§ 37, 2.]

words are followed by the *Subjunctive*. Here it seems to belong entirely to the relative or particle, with which it often coalesces, as in $\dot{\epsilon} \alpha \nu$, $\dot{\delta} \tau \alpha \nu$, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \nu$.

REMARK 1. The rules, § 36, 1, 2, include only the constructions which are in good use in Attic Greek. For the Epic use of $\tilde{a}\nu$ with the Subjunctive in apodosis, see § 38, 2; for $\tilde{a}\nu$ with the Future Indicative, see § 37, 2.

REMARK 2. There is no word or expression in English which can be used to translate $d\nu$. In its first use (§ 36, 1) we express it by the mood of the verb which we use; as $\beta \omega \lambda \alpha \tau \sigma \ d\nu$, he would wish. In its second 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 each in Chapter IV.

§ 37. 1. The Present and Perfect Indicative are never used with $a\nu$.

When this seems to occur, there is always a mixture of constructions. Thus in PLAT, Leg. IV, 712 E, $\dot{\epsilon}_Y \dot{\omega} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \, \delta \sigma \omega \, v \tilde{\nu} \epsilon \, \dot{\xi} a (\delta \rho \eta s \, \dot{a} v \, \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \, \delta \sigma \tau \omega \, v \tilde{\nu} \epsilon \, \dot{\xi} a (\delta \rho \eta s \, \dot{a} v \, \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \, \delta \sigma \tau \omega \, v \tilde{\nu} \epsilon \, \dot{\xi} a (\delta \eta \eta s \, \dot{a} v \, \dot{\epsilon} \, \dot{\epsilon} \, \delta \phi \, \dot{\epsilon} \, \dot{$

REMARK. Constructions like those mentioned in § 42. 2. Note, must not be referred to this head. For oik $a\nu$ µoi $\delta o \kappa \epsilon i \epsilon i vai$ is never it would not seem to me to be; but always, it does not seem to me that it would be; $a\nu$ belonging to $\epsilon i vai$.

2. The Future Indicative is often used with $a\nu$ or $\kappa\epsilon$ by the early poets, especially Homer. The addition of $a\nu$ makes the Future more contingent than that tense naturally is, giving it a force approaching that of the Optative with $a\nu$ in apodosis (§ 39). E. g.

'Αλλ' ίθ', έγω δέ κέ τοι Χαρίτων μίαν όπλοτεράων δώσω, όπυιέμεναι και σην κεκλήσθαι άκοιτιν. ΙΙ. ΧΙV, 267. Καί κέ τις ωδ' έρέει Τρώων ύπερηνορεόντων, perhaps some one will thus speak. ΙΙ. ΙV, 176. Ο δέ κεν κεχολώσεται, δν κεν ϊκωμαι, and he will perhaps be angry to whom I come. ΙΙ. Ι, 139. Είδ' άγε, τους αν έγων ἐπιόψομαι · οἰ δέ πιθέσθων. ΒΙΧ, 167. Παρ' ἔμοιγε και άλλοι, οι κέ με τιμήσουσι, i. e. who will honor me when occasion offers. II. I, 174. E. δ' 'Οδυσεὺς ἕλθοι καὶ ἴκοιτ' ἐς πατρίδα γαΐαν, αἶψά κε σὺν ῷ παιδὶ βίας ἀποτίσεται ἀνδρῶν. Od. XVII, 539. (In this passage the Future with κέ is used nearly in the sense of the Optative, corresponding to the Optatives in the Protasis. 'Αποτίσεται may also be Aorist Subjunctive, by § 38, 2.) Μαθῶν δέ τις ἂν ἐρεῖ. PIND. Nem. VII, 68. Kầν ἔτ' ἔτι φόνιον ὄψομαι αἶμα. EUR. Elect. 484. (So the Mss.)

NOTE 1. The use of $a\nu$ 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.

Αἰγυπτίους δὲ οὐχ ὁρῶ ποία δυνάμει συμμάχω χρησάμενοι μαλλον ἀν κολ άσεσ θε τῆς νὑν σὑν ἐμοὶ οὕσης. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙ, 5, 13. ᾿Απισχυρισάμενοι δὲ σαφὲς ἀν [καταστήσετε] αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴσου ὑμῶν μαλλον προσφέρεσθαι. ΤΗ UC. Ι, 140. (Here most editors read καταστήσαιτε, on the authority of inferior Mss.) "Εφη οὖν τὸν ἐρωτώμενον εἰπεῖν, οὐχ ῆκει, φάναι, οὐδ' ἀν ῆ ξει δεῦρο, nor will he be likely to come hither. PLAT. Rep. X, 615 D. (Here the only other reading is ῆξοι, which is of course corrupt.) "Εφη λέγων πρὸς ὑμῶς ὡς, εἰ διαφευξοίμην, ῆδη ἀν ὑμῶν οἱ υίεῖς πάντες παντάπασι διαφθαρήσονται. Id. Αροί. 29 C.

The construction is perhaps less suspicious in the dramatic chorus, which belongs to lyric poetry. See the last example under § 37, 2. See § 41, 4, on the Future Infinitive and Participle with *a.*

NOTE 2. The form $\kappa \epsilon$ is much more common with the Future in Homer than the form $d\nu$.

3. The most common use of $a\nu$ 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. See § 49, 2.

NOTE. The Imperfect and Aorist are sometimes used with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in an iterative sense; which construction must not be confounded with that just mentioned. See § 30, 2.

§ 38. 1. In Attic Greek the Subjunctive is used with $a\nu$ only in the cases mentioned in § 36, 2; never in independent sentences. See § 47, 2, § 50 1 § 51, and § 60, 3. For the occasional use of $d\nu$ in final clauses, see § 44, 1, Note 2.

2. In Epic poetry, when the Subjunctive is used nearly in the sense of the Future Indicative (§ 87), it sometimes takes $\kappa \acute{e}$ or $a\nu$. The combination forms an apodosis, with a protasis expressed or understood, and is nearly or quite equivalent to the Future Indicative with $a\nu$. E. g.

Ei dé $\kappa \epsilon \mu \eta$ déwour, éve dé $\kappa \epsilon \nu$ adrès $\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \mu \alpha \iota$, and if they do not give her up, I will take her myself. II. I, 137. (Cf. II. I, 324.) See § 50, 1, Note 2 (a).

Note. This Epic use of $\kappa \epsilon$ or $\delta \nu$ with the Subjunctive must not be confounded with the ordinary construction of § 38, 1. In the latter the $\delta \nu$ 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 $\delta \nu$ in apodosis in Attie Greek, than to any other Attic construction.

§ **39.** The Optative with $d\nu$ always forms an apodosis, to which a protasis must be either 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 § 52, 2.

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

NOTE. The Future Optative is not used with av. See § 26.

§ 40. The Imperative is never used with $a\nu$.

Note. All passages formerly cited for $\vec{a}\nu$ with the Imperative are now emended on Mss. authority, or otherwise satisfactorily explained. See Passow, or Liddell and Scott, s. v. "A ν .

§ 41. The Infinitive and Participle can be used with $a\nu$ in all cases in which a finite verb, if it stood in their place, would be accompanied with $a\nu$. This com

3*

bination always forms an *apodosis* (except in its iterative sense, Note 3): it can never form a *protasis*, as the finite verb never has $a\nu$ joined to itself in protasis. (See § 36, 2.)

Each tense of the Infinitive and Participle with $a\nu$ forms the same kind of apodosis which the corresponding 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 § 15, 3, and § 16, 2), when they are used with $\vec{a}\nu$, may be equivalent either to the Imperfect Indicative with $\vec{a}\nu$ or to the Present Optative with $\vec{a}\nu$. They can represent no other form, as no other form of the Present is used with $\vec{a}\nu$ in apodosis in the finite moods. E. g.

Φησίν αὐτοὺς ἐλευθέρους α̈ν εἶναι, εἰ τοῦτο ἔπραξαν, he says that they would (now) be free, if they had done this (εἰναι α̈ν representing η̈σαν α̈ν, § 37, 3). Φησίν αὐτοὺς ἐλευθέρους ἀν εἶναι, εἰ τοῦτο πράξειαν, he says that they would (hereafter) be free, if they should do this (εἶναι α̈ν representing εἰησαν α̈ν, § 39). Οἶεσθε γàρ τὸν πατέρα οὐκ α̈ν φυλάττειν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν λαμβάνειν τῶν ξύλων; do you think he would not have taken care and have received the pay? DEM. Timoth. 1194, 20. (Here the direct discourse would be ἐφύλαττεν α̈ν καὶ ἐλάμβανεν.) Οἶμαι γὰρ α̈ν οὐκ ἀχαρίστως μοι ἔχειν, for I think it would not be a thankless labor; i. e. οὐκ α̈ν έχαι. XEN. An. II, 3, 18. Μαρτυρίφ ἐχρῶντο, μὴ α̈ν ξυστρατεύειν, εἰ μή τι ἡδίκουν οἶs ἐπῆεσαν, that they would not join in expeditions, unless those against whom they were marching had wronged them. Thuc. III, 11. (Here ξυστρατεύειν α̈ν represents ξυνεστρατευσ α̈ν.)

Olda avrovs $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon \rho v \sigma s$, $\epsilon i rovro \epsilon \pi \rho a \xi av$, I know they would (now) be free, if they had done this. Olda avrovs $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon \rho ovs$ av $\delta r \sigma s$, ϵi rovro $\pi \rho a \xi \epsilon u av$, I know they would (hereafter) be free, if they should do this. (In the former $\delta v ras av$ represents $\eta \sigma av$ av, in the latter $\epsilon i \eta \sigma av av$.) Two $\lambda a \mu \beta av \delta v rav \delta v$ in the latter $\epsilon i \eta \sigma av av$. (i. e. $\eta \mu \epsilon v$ av), whereas we should justly be among those who inflict punishment. DEM. Eubul. 1300, 8. $\neg \sigma \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \chi \epsilon \mu \eta \ldots \tau \eta \nu$ I $\epsilon \lambda c$ $\pi \delta v \nu \eta \sigma \sigma \rho \epsilon \delta v$, $\delta v v \delta r \sigma v r \omega v$ ($\psi \mu \delta v$) $\epsilon \pi (\beta \sigma \eta \epsilon \delta v, when you$ would have been unable to bring aid (sc. if he had done it). THUC. I $73. <math>\Pi \delta \lambda \lambda^{2} av \epsilon \epsilon r \epsilon \rho^{2} \epsilon i \pi \epsilon v \pi \epsilon \rho i a v \tau \eta s m a c h \epsilon m s dhough$ might be able (if I should wish) to say many other things about it, $omit them. DEM. Cor. 313, 4 <math>\neg A \pi \delta \tau \pi av r \delta s v \phi \delta \epsilon \rho \omega v \lambda \delta \gamma ov \delta k a dor$ $<math>\mu \eta \chi a \sigma u \kappa \lambda h v \delta r$. 2. The Perfect Infinitive and Participle (which represent also the Pluperfect, by § 18, 3, Rem.), when they are used with \tilde{a}_{ν} , may be equivalent either to the Pluperfect Indicative with \tilde{a}_{ν} or to the Perfect Optative with \tilde{a}_{ν} . E. g.

El μη τàs ἀρετὰs ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐκείνας οἱ Μαραθῶνι καὶ Σαλαμῖνι παρέσχοντο, . . . πάντα ταῦθ ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ἂν ἑαλωκέναι (sc. φήσειεν ἂν τις), if those at Marathon and Salamis had not exbibited those deeds of valor in their behalf, any one would say that all these would have been captured by the barbarians. DEM. F. L. 441, 21. Here ἑαλωκέναι ἂν represents ἑαλώκεσαν ἂν, Plup. Ind.) `Αλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἡγοῦμαι αὐτοὺς δἰκην ἀξίαν δεδωκέναι, εἰ ἀκροασάμενοι αὐτῶν καταψηφίσαισθε, but I do not believe they would (then) have suffered sufficient punishment, if you after hearing them should comdemn them. LYS. XXVII, § 9. (Here the protasis in the Optativo shows that δεδωκέναι ἂν represents δεδωκότες ἂν είεν (§ 18, 1); but if the protasis had been εἰ κατεψηφίσασθε, if you had condemned them, δεδωκέναι ធν would have represented ἐδεδωκεσαν αν, they would have suffered.) See also, in § 8 of the same oration, οὐκ ἂν ἀπολωλέναι ἀλλὰ δεδωκέναι. `Ανδραποδώδεις ἂν δικαίως κεκλησθαι ήγείτο. XEN. Mem. I, 1, 16. (Here κεκλησθαι ἄν represents κεκλημένοι ἂν είεν.)

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 $\ddot{a}\nu$ may be equivalent either to the Aorist Indicative with $\ddot{a}\nu$ or to the Aorist Optative with $\ddot{a}\nu$. E. g.

Oùk ầv $\eta\gamma\epsilon i\sigma\theta'$ aðràv kầv $\epsilon \pi i \delta \rho a \mu \epsilon i v; do you not believe that (if$ this had been so) he would even have run thither ? i. e. oùk ầv eréδραμεν; DEM. Aph. I, 831, 10. "Ανευ δὲ σεισμοῦ οἰκ ẩν μοι δοκεί τοroιοῦr οξυμβηναι γενέσθαι (οὐκ ầν ξυμβηναι representing οἰκ ầνξυνέβη), but unless there had been an earthquake, it does not seem tome that such a thing could have by any chance happened. THUC. III,89. Toòs 'Aθηναίους ήλπιζεν ϊσως ầν ἐπεξελθείν καὶ τὴν γῆν οἰκầν περιιδείν τμηθηναι (i. e. ἴσως ầν ἐπεξέλθοιεν καὶ οὐκ ầν περιίδοιεν). Id. II, 20. Οὐδ' ἀν κρατησαι αὐτοὺς τῆς γῆς ἡγοῦμαι (i. e.κρατήσειαν ẩν). Id. VI, 37.

² Αλλà ἑράδίωs åν ἀφεθεὶs, εἰ καὶ μετρίωs τι τούτων ἐποίησε, προείλετο ἀποθανείν, whereas he might easily have been acquitted, &c. XEN. Mem. IV, 4, 4. Kaì εἰ ἀπήχθησθε ὥσπερ ἡμεῖs, εὖ ἴσμεν μὴ ầν ἡσσον ὑμᾶς λυπηροὺs γενομένους τοῖs ξυμμάχοιs, καὶ ἀναγκασθέντας ầν ἢ ἄρχειν, κ.τ.λ. (i. e. οὐκ ἂν ἐγένεσθε, καὶ ἠναγκάσθητε ἄν), if you had become odious as we have, we are sure that you would have been no less oppressive to your allies, and that you would have been forced, &c. THUC. I, 76. Όρῶν τὸ παρατείχισμα ἀπλοῦν ὑν, καὶ ἰ ἐπικρατήσειέ τις.... ἑραδίως ἂν αὐτὲ ληφθείη), seeing that it would easily be taken, &c. Id. VI, 42 O^vte ^o ^vte ^d ^v ^v ^e ^v ^o ^v ^v ^o ^v ^o ^v ^o ^v ^o ^v ^v

4. The Future Infinitive and Participle with a_{ν} would be equivalent to the Homeric construction of a_{ν} with the Future Indicative (§ 37, 2). As, however, a_{ν} 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 a_{ν} 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.

Noμίζοντες, εἰ ταύτην πρώτην λάβοιεν, ῥαδίως αν σφίσι τάλλα προσχωρήσειν. ΤΗ Σ. ΙΙ, 80. (Here the direct discourse would regularly have beer either in the Fut. Ind. without äν, or in the Aor. Opt. with αν.) The same may be said of THUC. V, 82, νομίζων μέγιστον αν σφῶς ὡφελήσειν. (Here one Ms. reads by correction ὡφελῆσαι.) See also THUC. VI, 66; VIII, 25 and 71. Σχολῆ ποθ' ῆξειν δεῦρ' αν ἐξηύχουν ἐγώ, I declared that I should be very slow to come hither ogain. SOPH. Ant. 390. 'Aφίετε ἡ μὴ ἀφίετε, ὡs ἐμοῦ οὐκ äν ποιήσοντος äλλa, οὐδ εἰ μέλλω πολλάκις τεθνάναι. Plat. Apol. 30 C. Τοὺς ὅτιοῦν ἂν ἐκείνω ποιήσοντας ἀνηρηκότες ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἕσεσθε. DEM. F. L. 450, 27. (Here Cod. A. reads ποιήσαντας.)

NOTE 1. As the Future Optative is never used with $d\nu$ (§ 39, Note), this can never be represented by the Future Infinitive or Participle with $d\nu$.

NOTE 2. The Participle with L or $\kappa \epsilon$ is not found in Homer or Pindar. The Infinitive with $\tilde{a}\nu$ occurs in these poets very seldom, and only in indirect discourse. E. g.

Kal δ' aν τοῖς ἄλλοισιν ἔφη παραμυθήσασθαι. II. IX, 684. (The direct discourse is given in the words of Achilles in vs. 417. καὶ δ' aν . . . παραμυθησαίμην.)

NOTE 3. The Infinitive with $\ddot{a}\nu$ sometimes represents an *iterative* Imperfect or Aorist Indicative with $\ddot{a}\nu$ (§ 30, 2). This must be carefully distinguished from an apodosis. E. g.

'Ακούω Λακεδαιμονίους τότε ἐμβαλόντας αν καὶ κακώσαντας τὴν χώραν ἀναχωρεῖν ἐπ' οἴκου πάλιν, I hear that the Lacedaemonians at that time, after invading and ravaging the country, used to return home again. DEM. Phil. III, 123, 16. (Here ἀναχωρεῖν ἄν represents ἀνεχώρουν ἅν in its iterative sense, they used to return) NOTE 4 The Infinitive with $\delta\nu$ commonly stands in indirect discourse after a verb of saying or thinking, as in most of the examples given above. Occasionally, however, it is found in other constructions, where the simple Present or Aorist Infinitive is regularly used. E. g.

Tà dè évròs ovros ékalero, sorre η diora $a\nu$ és vdop ψ uxpèv ordas avroùs $\beta i \pi \tau \epsilon_{i\nu}$, so that they would most gladly have thrown themselves into cold water. Thuc. II, 49. ("Qare $\beta i \pi \tau \epsilon_{i\nu}$ would be the ordinary expression here: with $a\nu$ it represents an Imperfect Indicative, $\epsilon\rho\mu\pi\sigma\nu a\nu$.) 'Ekcivous $a\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu a$, el kal $\kappa\rhoarole\nu$, $\mu\eta a\nu$ éri ordas $a\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon_{i}\chi (\sigma a_{i}, to have deprived them of the power of ever again walling$ them in, even if they should be victorious. Id. VII, 6. See § 27, N. 2 $(a), for an example of <math>\beta ovrous of hoping, &c.$ with the Present, Aorist, and Future Infinitive; they sometimes take the Infinitive with $a\nu$, as a slight change from the Future; as in Thuc. VII, 61. $\epsilon \delta \tau \eta s \tau \delta \eta \mu e \delta' \eta \mu \omega \epsilon \delta \pi i \sigma a n \tau \eta \nu a l.$ (See § 27, N. 3.) $\epsilon \lambda \pi i s$, is found also with ωs and the Future Optative in Thuc. VI, 30; and with ωs and the Aorist Optative with $a\nu$ in V, 9.

NOTE 5. The Participle with $a\nu$ can never represent a protosis, because there is no form of protasis in the finite moods in which $a\nu$ is joined with the verb itself. For examples of apparent violations of this principle, incorrectly explained by Matthiae and others as cases of the Participle with $a\nu$ in protasis, see § 42, 3, Note 1.

§ 42. 1. When $\vec{a}\nu$ is used with the Subjunctive, if it does not coalesce with the relative or particle into one word (as in $\vec{\epsilon} a\nu$, $\vec{\sigma} \tau a\nu$), it is separated from it only by such words as $\mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \epsilon$, $\tau \epsilon$, $\gamma \alpha \rho$, &c. See examples under § 62.

2. When $d\nu$ 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.

'Αλλά τίς δη θεῶν θεραπεία εἴη αν ή όσιότης; PLAT. Euthyph. 13 D. 'Αλλ' όμῶς τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτῶν ῥαδίως αν εἴποις. Ιd. 14 Α. Οὐκ αν δη τόνδ ἄνδρα μάχης ἐρύσαιο μετελθών, Τυδείδην, ὃς νῦν γε αν καὶ Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο. Π. V, 456. Πῶς αν τὸν αἰμυλώτατον, ἐχθρὸν ἄλημα, τούς τε δισσάρχας ὀλέσσας βασιλῆς, τέλος θάνοιμι καὐτός. SOPH. Aj. 889. Τάχιστ ἄν τε πόλιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἑτέρους πείσαντες ἀπολέσειαν. THUC. II, 63.

NOTE. For the sake of emphasis, $\vec{a}\nu$ is often separated from its verb by such words as $\vec{a}\nu_{\alpha}$, $\delta\sigma\kappa\epsilon\omega$, $\phi\eta\mu\epsilon$, $\vec{a}\partial\sigma$, &c. In .

such cases care must be taken to connect the $a\nu$ with the verb to which it really belongs. E. g.

Kai vôv hôtes ắv µoi dokê κοινωνĥσαι, and now I think I should gladly take part (ắv belonging to κοινωνĥσαι). XEN. Cyr. VIII, 7, 25. Oùð åv ὑµεis olð ὅτι ἐπαύσασθε πολεµοῦντες, nor would you (I am sure) have ceased fighting. DEM. Phil. II, 72, 25. Tí oðv åv, ἔφην, είη ὁ "Eµως; PLAT. Symp. 202 D. This is especially irregular in the expression oùk olda åv εἰ, or oùk åv olda εἰ, followed by an Optative to which the ἄν belongs; as oùk old åv εἰ πείσαιµι, I do not know whether I could persuade him (sc. if I should try). EUN. Med. 941. The more regular form would be οὐκ οlda εἰ πείσαιµι ἄν. See Elmsley ad loc. (vs. 911).

3. "A ν is sometimes used twice, or even three times, with the same verb. This may be done in a long sentence, to make the conditional force felt through the whole, especially when the 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.

[•]Ωστ' ^àν, εἰ σθένος λάβοιμι, δηλώσαιμ' ^àν οἶ' αὐτοῖς φρονῶ. SOPH. El. 333. Οὐκ ^àν ἡγεῖσθ' αὐτὸν κἂν ἐπιδραμεῖν. DEM. Aph. I, 831, 10. Οῦτ' ^àν ἐλόντες αὖls ἀνθαλοῖεν ^ăν. AESCH. Ag. 340. [•]Αλλους γ' ἀν οὖν οἰομεθα τὰ ἡμέτερα λαβόντας δείξαι ^àν μάλιστα εἰ τι μετριάζομεν. ΤΗ UC. I, 76. (See § 42, 2, N.) Οῦτ ^àν κελεύσαιμ', οὕτ ^àν, εἰ θέλοις ἔτι πράσσειν, ἐμοῦ γ' ἀν ἡδέως δρ ὡης μέτα. SOPH. Ant. 69. Λέγω καθ' ἕκαστον δοκείν ^ăν μοι τὸν αὐτὸν ^äνδρα παρ' ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πλεῖστ' ^àν εἴδη καὶ μετὰ χαρίτων μάλιστ' ^àν εὐτραπέλως τὸ σῶμα αῦταρκες παρ έχεσθαι. THUC. II, 41. (Here ^äν is used three times, belonging to παρέχεσθαι.) [•]Υμῶν δὲ ἕρημος ^ών οὐκ ^àν ἰκανὸς οἶμαι εἶναι οῦτ' ^àν ϕίλον ὡφελῆσαι οῦτ' ^àν ἐζθρὸν ἀλέξασθαι. XEN. An. I, 3, 6. (Here ^äν is used three times, belonging to εἶναι.)

NOTE 1. This principle, taken in connection with that stated in § 42, 2, by showing that $a\nu$ 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 $a\nu$ 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 $a\nu$ is especially ikely to be attached. The $a\nu$, however, does not qualify such a Participle, any more than it does a negative or interrogative with which it is connected for the same purpose; but it always belongs to the principal verb of the apodosis. E. g.

Naµíσaτε τό τε φαῦλον καὶ τὸ μέσον καὶ τὸ πάνυ ἀκριβἐς ἑν ξυγκριθἐν μάλιστ ἑν ἰσχύειν, believe that these, if they should be unved, would be especially strong. Thuc. VI, 18. (Here ξυγκραθέν alone (not with ἄν) is equivalent to εἰ ξυγκραθείη (§ 52, 1), and the ធ̃ν is placed before it merely to emphasize it, as containing the protasis to the verb ἰσχύειν, to which this ἄν, as well as the other, belongs.) ᾿Αγῶνας ἄν τίς μοι δοκεῖ, ἔφη, ὦ πάτερ, προειπὼν ἐκόστοις καὶ ἀθλα προτιθεἰς μάλιστ ἑν ποιεῖν εὖ ἀσκείσθαι, it seems to me, said he, father, that if any one should proclaim contests implied in the Participles is merely emphasized by ắν, which belongs to ποιεῖν.) Λέγοντος ἄν τινος πιστεῦσαι οἴεσθε; (i. e. εἴ τίς ἕλεγεν, ἐπίστενσαν ἅν;) do you think they would have believed it, if any one had told them? DEM. Phil. II, 71, 4. (Here too the ầν stands near λέγοντος only to point it out as the protasis, to which its own verb πιστεῦσαι is the apodosis.)

In these eases, the protasis expressed by the Participle is affected by the $a\nu$, only as the ordinary protasis with ϵi is affected in the example from SOPH. El. 333, quoted above, under § 42, 3.

NOTE 2. "Av is sometimes used elliptically without a verb, when one can be supplied from the context. E. g.

Oi oikétai béykovoiv $d\lambda\lambda$ oùk $a\nu$ mpò toũ (se. eppeykov), the slares are snoring; but they would n't have done so once. ARIST. Nub. 5. ' Ω s oữt $a\nu$ dotŵv tŵvô' $a\nu$ éξείποιμί t ω , oữt $a\nu$ tékvoioi tois èµoîs, στέργων ὅµωs. SOPII. O. C. 1528. So mŵs γàp $a\nu$ (se. e(n); how could it? mŵs oùk $a\nu$; and similar phrases; especially $@σπep a\nu$ ei (also written as one word, ωσπερανε(i), in which the $a\nu$ belongs to the verb that is understood after ei; as φοβούµενοs @σπεp aν ei maîs, fearing like a child (i. e. φοβούµενοs @σπεp $a\nu$ ei aν. PLAT. Gorg. 479 A. (See § 53, N. 3.)

In like manner $\tilde{a}\nu$ may be used with ϵi in protasis, or with a conditional relative, the verb being understood; as in XEN. An. I, 3, 6: ώς έμοῦ οἶν ἰόντος ὅπη αν καὶ ὑμεῖς, οὕτω τὴν γνώμην ἔχετε. (That is, ὅπη αν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἴητε.)

NOTE 3. Repetition of $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}$ is rare; yet it sometimes occurs E.g.

Τώ κε μάλ' ή κεν έμεινε και έσσύμενός περ όδοίο,

"Η κέ με τεθνηυίαν ένι μεγάροισιν έλειπεν. Od. IV, 733.

On the other hand, Homer sometimes joins $a\nu$ and $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}$ in the same sentence for emphasis. E. g.

Καρτεραί, α'ς οὕτ' α'ν κεν Άρης ἀνόσαιτο μετελθών, Οὕτε κ' Ἀθηναίη λαοσσόος. 11. XIII, 127.

4. When an anodosis consists of several co-ordinate clauses

with the same mood, $\vec{a}\nu$ is generally used only in the first, and understood in the others; unless it is repeated for emphasis, or for some other special reason. E. g.

Οὐδ' άν ἐμὲ, ἡνίκα δεῦρο ἀποπλεῖν ἐβουλόμην, κατεκώλυεν, οὐδὲ τοιαῦτα λέγειν τούτφ προσέταττεν, ἐξ ὡν ῆκισθ ὑμεῖς ἐμέλλετ ἐξιέναι. DEM. F. L. 357, 3. (Here äv is understood with προσέταττεν.) Ούτω δέ δρών οὐδέν αν διάφορον τοῦ έτέρου ποιοῖ, ἀλλ' έπι ταὐτὸν ἀμφότεροι ἴοιεν. ΡΙΑΤ. Rep. II, 360 C. Οὐκοῦν καν, εί πρός αὐτό τὸ φῶς ἀναγκάζοι αὐτὸν βλέπειν, ἀλγεῖν τε αν τὰ ὅμματα και φεύγειν αποστρεφόμενον (οιει); Id. VII, 515 E. (This example illustrates also the principle of § 42, 3, kav belonging to the Infinitives.) See also XEN. An. II, 5, 14. Πάντα ήρει ό Φίλιππος, πολλά λέγοντος έμου και θρυλούντος άει, το μέν πρώτον ώς αν είς κοινόν γνώμην ἀποφαινομένου, μετά ταῦτα δ' ὡς ἀγνοοῦντας διδάσκοντος, τελευτώντος δε ώς αν πρός πεπρακότας αύτούς και ανοσιωτάτους ανθρώπους ούδεν ύποστελλομένου. DEM. F. L. 390, 5. (The first av belongs to aπεφαινόμην implied, as I should have declared it, if I had been speaking to inform my colleagues; in the following clause the same tense (¿dídaσκον) is implied, and äν is not repeated; in the third clause, on the contrary, an Optative is implied, is $a\nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma o i \mu i$, and therefore the av again appears.) In PLAT. Rep. III, 398 A, we find av used with two co-ordinate Optatives, understood with a third, and repeated again with a fourth to avoid confusion with a dependent "Av may be understood with an Optative even in a Optative. separate sentence, if the construction is continued from a sentence in which av is used with the Optative; as in PLAT. Rep. I, 352 E: — "Εσθ' ὅτω αν άλλω ίδοις η ἀφθαλμοῖς; Οὐ δητα. Τί δέ; ακούσαις άλλω ή ώσιν; So with πράττοι, Id. IV, 439 B.

NOTE. The Adverb $\tau \dot{\alpha}\chi a$, in the sense of *perhaps*, is often joined with $\ddot{\alpha}\nu$, in which case the phrase $\tau \dot{\alpha}\chi'$ $\ddot{\alpha}\nu$ is nearly equivalent to $\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\omega s$. This, however, cannot be used unless the $\ddot{\alpha}\nu$ would form an apodosis with the verb of the sentence, if the $\tau \dot{\alpha}\chi a$ were not joined with it. Thus $\tau \dot{\alpha}\chi' \dot{\alpha}\nu' \gamma \dot{\epsilon}\nu o i \tau \sigma$ means it might perhaps happen. So $\tau \dot{\alpha}\chi' \dot{\alpha}\nu' \dot{\epsilon}\nu \dot{\epsilon}\nu \epsilon \tau \sigma$ means it would perhaps have happened; but it can never (like $\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\omega s \dot{\epsilon}\gamma \dot{\epsilon}\nu \epsilon \tau \sigma$) mean verhaps it happened.

CHAPTER IV.

USE OF THE MOODS.

THIS 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 : ---

- Final and Object Clauses after ίνα, ώς, ὅπως, ὅφρα, and μή.
- II. Conditional Sentences.
- III. Relative 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. — $O\dot{v} \ \mu \dot{\eta}$ with the Subjunctive or Future Indicative.

SECTION I.

FINAL AND OBJECT CLAUSES AFTER "I νa , ' Ωs , "O $\pi \omega s$, "O $\phi \rho a$, AND M η .

§ 43. The clauses which depend upon the so called final particles, *iva*, ωs , $\delta \pi \omega s$, $\delta \phi o a$, that, in

Е

order that, and $\mu \eta$, 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 $\epsilon p\chi \epsilon \tau a i \nu a$ $\tau o \nu \tau o \delta \eta$, he is coming that he may see this; $a \pi \epsilon p \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota \mu \eta$ $\tau o \nu \tau o \delta \eta$, he is departing that he may not see this.

B. Object clauses with $\[5pt] \pi \omega s$ or $\[5pt] \pi \omega s \mu \eta$ after verbs of striving, &c.; as $\[5pt] \pi \omega s \eta e \nu \eta \sigma e \tau a \iota$, see that it happens; $\[5pt] \pi \omega s \mu \eta$ $\[5pt] \gamma e \nu \eta \sigma e \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 $\[5pt] \pi \omega \tau \sigma$; as $\[5pt] \pi \omega \tau \sigma \iota$ $\[5pt] \tau \omega \tau \sigma \delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta' \sigma \epsilon \delta \psi \epsilon \tau a \iota$, see to this, viz., that he does not see you. They also imply the end or purpose of the action of the leading verb, and to this extent they partake of the nature of final clauses.

C. Object clauses with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ after verbs of fearing, &c.; as $\phi \circ \beta \circ \tilde{\nu} \mu a \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \tau a \iota$, I fear lest it may happen; $\phi \circ \beta \circ \tilde{\nu} \mu a \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \circ \tilde{\nu} \tau \circ \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \tau \circ$, I fear lest this happened. These express simply the object of fear, without even implying any purpose to prevent that object from being realized. Thus if we say $\phi \circ \beta \circ \tilde{\nu} \mu a \iota \tau \circ \tilde{\nu} \tau \circ$, $\mu \dot{\eta} \kappa a \kappa \hat{\omega} \varsigma$ $\pi \rho \dot{a} \xi \omega$, I fear this, lest I may fall into misfortune, the clause with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ merely explains $\tau \circ \tilde{\nu} \tau \circ$, the direct object of $\phi \circ \beta \circ \tilde{\nu} \mu a \iota$.

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 rouro; whereas a final clause could stand in apposition to rourow ένεκα, as έρχεται τούτου ένεκα. Για ήμῶν βοηθήση, he comes for this purpose, viz., that he may assist us. The two can be combined in one sentence; as σπουδάζει ὅπως πλουτήσει, Για τοὺς φίλους εῦ ποιῷ, 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 σκοπεῖν τὴν πόλιν ὅπως σωθήσεται for σκοπεῖν ὅπως ἡ πόλις σωθήσεται, to see that the city is saved.

NOTE 1. "Oppa is found only in Epic and Lyric poetry.

NOTE 2. The regular negative adverb after *iva*, δs , $\delta \pi \omega s$, and $\delta \phi \rho a$ is $\mu \eta$; but after $\mu \eta$. *lest*, $o \vartheta$ is used. E. g.

'Απέρχεται, ΐνα μη τοῦτο ẳδη, he is departing that he may not see this. Φοβείται μη οὐ τοῦτο γένηται, he is afraid lest this may not happen. This use of où as the negative after μη seems to have no other object than to avoid repetition of μη. Where, however, the sentence is so long that this repetition would not be noticed, we find μη repeated; as in XEN. Mem. I, 2, 7: ἐθαύμαζε δ' εἴ τις ... φοβοίτο μη ό γενόμενος καλός κάγαθδς τῷ τὰ μέγιστα εὐεργετήσαντι μη την μεγίστην χάριν ἔξοι.

A. Pure Final Clauses.

§ 41. 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.«

Νῦν δ' ἔρχεσθ' ἐπὶ δεῖπνον, ΐνα ξυνάγωμεν "Αρηα. ΙΙ. ΙΙ, 381. Σοὶ δ' ὅδε μνηστῆρες ὑποκρίνονται, Γν' εἰδῆς αὐτὸς σῷ θυμῷ, εἰ δῶσι δὲ πάντες Άχαιοί. Od. II, 111. Εἴπω τι δῆτα κἴλλ, Γν' ὀργίζη πλέον; SOPH. O. R. 364. Καὶ γὸρ βασιλεὺς αἰρεῖται, οὐχ Γνι ἐαντοῦ καλῶς ἐπιμελῆται, ἀλλ' Γνα καὶ οἱ ἐλόμενοι δι' αὐτὸν εἶ πράττωσι. XEN. Mem. ΙΙΙ, 2, 3. Δοκεῖ μοι κατακαῦσαι τὰς ἁμάξας, Γνα μὴ τὰ ζεὑγη ἡμῶν στρατηγῦ. XEN. An. ΙΙΙ, 2, 27. "Ωρνυθ', ΐν' ἀθανάτοισι ψώως φέροι ἡδὲ βροτοῖσιν. Od. V, 2. Φίλος ἐβούλετο εἶναι τοῖς μέγιστα δυναμένοις, Γνα ἀδικῶν μὴ διδοίη δίκην. XEN. An. II, 6, 21.

Βουλήν δ' 'Αργείοις ὑποθησόμεθ', η τις ἀνήσει, ώς μη πάντες ὅλωνται ἀδυσσαμένοιο τεοῖο. Π. VIII, 36. Διανοεῖται την γέφυραν λῦσαι, ὡς μη διαβητε, ἀλλ' ἐν μέσφ ἀποληφθητε. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙ, 4, 17. Πέφνε δ' Εὕρυτον, ὡς Αὐγέαν λάτριον μισθὸν πράσσοιτο. ΡΙΝΟ. ΟΙ. ΧΙ (Χ), 34. Τούτου ἕνεκα φίλων ῷετο δεῖσθαι, ὡς συνεργους ἔχοι. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Ι, 9, 21. Τὸν δὲ μνηστῆρες λοχῶσιν, ὅπως ἀπὸ φῦλον ὅληται ἐξ Ίθάκης. Od. XIV, 181. Μέθες τόδ' ἄγγος νῦν, ὅπως τὸ πῶν μάθης. Soph. El. 1205. Els καιρὸν ῆκεις, ὅπως τῆς δίκης ἀκούσης. XEN. Cyr III, 1, 8. Παρακαλεῖς ἱατροὺς, ὅπως μὴ ἀποθάνη. XEN. Mem. II. 10, 2. Οἶμαι δὲ ταῦτα γίγνεσθαι, οὐχ ὅπως τοὺς αὐτοὺς χοροὺς κρίνωσιν οἱ πολίται, οὐδ' ὅπως τοὺς ἀὐτως ἀλητὰς ἐπαινῶσιν, οὐδ ὅπως τοὺς αὐτοὺς ποιητὰς aἰρῶνται, οὐδ' ἶνα τοῦς αὐτοῖς ῆδωνται, ἀλλ' ἕνα τοῦς νόμοις πείθωνται. XEN. Mem. IV, 4, 16. Ἐν χείρεσ σιν ἔθηκεν, ὅπως ἔτι πῆμα φύγοιμι. Od. XIV, 312. Ἐπρεσβεύοντο ἐγκλήματα ποιούμενοι, ὅπως σφίσιν ὅτι μεγίστη πρόφασις εἴη τοῦ πολεμείν. Τηυτο. Ι, 126.

Κεφαλή κατανεύσομαι, ὄφρα πεποίθης. Π. Ι, 524. "Ορσεο δή νῦν, ξεῖνε, πόλινδ' ἴμεν ὄφρα σε πέμψω. Od. VI, 255. Δόμον Φερσεφόνας ἐλθὲ, ὄφρ' ἰδοίσ' υἰδν εἴπης. PIND. Ol. XIV, 30. Αὐτὰρ ἐμοι γέρας αὐτίχ' ἐτοιμάσατ', ὄφρα μὴ οἶος Ἀργείων ἀγέραστος ἔω. Π. Ι, 118. °Ως ὁ μὲν ἔνθα κατέσχετ ἐπειγόμενιός περ όδοῖο, ὅφρ' ἔταρον θάπτοι καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερίσειεν. Od. III, 284.

'Αλλά σύ μέν νῦν αὖτις ἀπόστιχε, μή τι νοή ση "Ηρη ἐμοὶ δέ κε ταῦτα μελήσεται, ὄφρα τελέσσω. Π. Ι, 522. Οὐ δῆτ' αὐτὸν ἄξεις δεῦρο, μή τις ἀναρπάση; Sopi, Aj. 986. Λυσιτελεί ἐἀσαι ἐν τῷ παρόντι, μή καὶ τοῦτον πολέμιον προσθώμεθα. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. Π, 4, 12. Λέγεται εἰπεῦν ὅτι ἀπιέναι βούλοιτο, μὴ ὁ πατήρ τι ἄχθοιτο καὶ ἡ πόλις μέμφοιτο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. Ι, 4, 25.

NOTE 1. The Future Indicative sometimes (though rarely) takes the place of the Subjunctive in *pure* final clauses, after $\ddot{o}\pi\omega s$ and $\ddot{o}\phi\rho a$ ($\ddot{o}\pi\omega s$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$, $\ddot{o}\phi\rho a$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$); — never after $\ddot{i}\nu a$ or $\dot{\omega}s$, and very seldom after the simple $\mu\dot{\eta}$. (M $\dot{\eta}$ 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.

Αἰεὶ δὲ μαλακοῖσι καὶ aἰμυλίοισι λόγοισι θέλγει, ὅπως Ἰθάκης ἐπιλήσεται. Od. I, 56. Οὐδὲ δι' ἐν ἄλλο τρέφονται ἢ ὅπως μαχοῦνται ὑπὲρ τῶν τρεφόντων. XEN. Cyr. II, 1, 21. Χρὴ ἀναβιβάζειν ἐπὶ τὸν τροχὸν τοὺς ἀναγραφέντας. ὅπως μὴ πρότερον νὺξ ἕσται πρὶν πυθέσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἅπαντας. ΑΝΟΟC. de Myster. I, p. 6, 38. § 43. Ἐπ΄ ἀντοὺς τοὺς προλόγους σου τρέψομαι, ὅπως τὸ πρῶτον τῆς τραγωδίας μέρος πρώτιστον βασανιῶ. ΑRIST. Ran. 1120. In Nub. 1466, ὅπωι ἀπολεῖς μετελθών (not μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔλθ') is to be explained by § 45, Ν. 7. Θάρσυνον δέ οἱ ἦτορ ἐνὶ φρεσὶν, ὅφρα καὶ Ἔκτωρ εἴσεται. II. XVI, 242. So Od. IV, 163. "Ωστ' εἰκὸς ἡμῶς μὴ βραδύνειν ἐστι. μὴ καί τις ὄψεται χὴμῶν ὕσως κατείπῃ. ARIST. Eccles. 495. So μὴ κεχολώσεται, II. XX, 301. This construction is very rare in Attic prose.

NOTE 2. The Particle $d\nu$ ($\kappa \epsilon$) is sometimes joined with

is, $\delta \pi \omega s$, and $\delta \phi \rho a$, before the Subjunctive in final clauses; especially with δs and $\delta \phi \rho a$ in Homer. The $\delta \nu$ here is always joined to the particle, and (as in protasis) it adds nothing to the sense which can be made perceptible in English. E. g.

Πείθεο, ώς αν μοι τιμήν μεγάλην και κύδος αρηαι, obey, that thou mayest gain for me great honor and glory. Il. XVI, 84. (Here ws av appar seems to be merely a weaker form of expression than ws άρηαι would have been.) 'Αλλ' "θι, μή μ' ερέθιζε, σαώτερος ως κε νέηαι, that thou mayest go the more safely. II. I, 32. 'Αλλ' ούτος μέν νυν σοί αμ' έψεται, όφρα κεν ευδη σοίσιν ένι μεγάροισιν. Od. III, 359. Προσδεόμεθα συμπέμψαι ήμιν, ως αν μιν εξέλωμεν έκ της χώρης. Η DT. I, 36. 'Αλλ' έάσωμεν, φίλοι, εκηλον αὐτὸν. ὡς άν είς ύπνον πέση. SOPH. Phil. 825. Τουτί λαβών μου το σκιάδειον ύπέρεχε ανωθεν, ώς αν μή μ' όρωσιν οι θεοί. ARIST. Av. 1508. Καί φατε αὐτὸν τοιοῦτον είναι, ὅπως άν φαίνηται ὡς κάλλιστος καὶ μριστος. ΡΙΑΤ. Symp. 199 Α. "Αν γέ τινας υποπτεύη ελεύθερα φρονήματα έχοντας μή επιτρέψειν αὐτῷ ἄρχειν, (πολέμους κινεί) ὅπως άν τούτους μετὰ προφάσεως ἀπολλύη, that he may destroy them. PLAT. Rep. VIII, 567 A. Ώς αν μάθης, ἀντάκουσον. ΧΕΝ. An. II, 5, 16. See also An. VII, 4, 2; AESCH. Prom. 10 (ws av), 824 $(\delta \pi \omega s \, d\nu)$, Eumen. 573 $(\delta \pi \omega s \, d\nu)$.

NOTE 3. (a.) Homer and Herodotus sometimes use $a\nu$ or $\kappa\epsilon$ in final clauses with the same particles before the Optative, with no apparent effect upon the verb. E. g.

Καί μιν μακρότερον καὶ πάσσονα θῆκεν ἰδέσθαι, ῶς κεν Φαικήκεσσι φίλος πάντεσσι γένοιτο. Od. VIII, 20. Ἐννῆμαρ δ' ἐς τείχος ἴει ρίον' ὖε δ' ὅρα Ζεὐς συνεχὲς, ὅ φρα κε θῶσσον ἀλίπλοα τείχεα θείπ. II. XII, 25. Σὐ δέ με προίεις ἐς πατέρα, ὅ φρ' ἀν ἐλοίμην ὅῶρ. Od. XXIV, 334. Διώρυχα (ὥρυσσεν), ὅκως ἀν τὸ στρατόπεδον ἰδρυμένον κατὰ νώτου λάβοι. Ποτ. Ι, 75. Ταῦτα δὲ περὶ ἑωυτὸν ἐσέμνυε τῶνδε εἶνεκεν, ὅκως ἀν μὴ ὁρέοντες οἱ ὁμήλικες λυπεοίατο καὶ ἐπιβουλεύοιεν, ἀλλ' ἐτεροϊός σφι δο κέοι εἶναιμὴ όρέωσι, in 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. 1, 99.

(b.) Apart from this use, however, the Optative can be regularly joined with $\tilde{\alpha}_{\nu}$ 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 $\tilde{\alpha}_{\nu}$ can follow primary as well as secondary tenses. (§ 31, N. 2.) E. g.

[']Ηγείσθω ὀρχηθμοῖο. ῶς κέν τις φαίη γάμον ἕμμεναι ἐκτὸς ἀκούων, let him lead off the dance, so that any one who should hear without would say there was a marriage. Od. XXIII, 134. 'Ως δ' ἀν [†]βίστα ταῦτα φαίνοιτο, αὐτός τις αὐτῷ τοῦτα παρασκευάσει, lit. bui each one must acquire these things for himself, to cause that they would appear most agreeable (if any one should experience them). XEN Cyr. VII, 5, 81. "Εδωκε χρήματα 'Ανταλκίδα, ὅπως αν, πληρωθέντος ναυτικοῦ ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων, οἱ 'Αθηναῖοι μᾶλλον τῆς εἰρήνης προσ δέοιντο. ΧεΝ. Hell. IV, 8, 16. (Here πληρωθέντος ναυτικοῦ, if the navy should be manued, stands as a protasis to the Optative προσδέοιντο αν.)

Such sentences as DEM. Phil. II, 66, 15, $\delta s \ \delta \epsilon \ \kappa \omega \lambda \ \delta \sigma \ a \iota \tau' \ \delta \nu \ \epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu \sigma \ m casures$ by which you could prevent him from doing these things, you are wholly inactive, are not final clauses, but relative sentences with an antecedent implied. See § 65, 1, N. 4.

REMARK. M' η , lest, can be followed by a verb with $\tilde{a}\nu$ only in a regular apodosis after verbs of *fearing*, &c. (See § 46, N. 3.) "Iva is never used with $\tilde{a}\nu$, except when it means where. A single case of $\tilde{i}\nu a$ with $\kappa \epsilon$ in a final clause occurs, Od. XII, $156:-\lambda \lambda \lambda^{2} \epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$ $\mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \psi \delta \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon$. But here the $\kappa \epsilon$ belongs not to $\tilde{i}\nu a$, but to the Subjunctives: see § 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 $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ to express a purpose, see § 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 $\hat{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ iva idou, he came that he might see (by § 44, 1); or $\hat{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ iva idou, he came that I may see.

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

'Επεκλώσαντο δ' όλεθρον ἀνθρώποις, ΐνα ἦσι καὶ ἐσσομένοισιν ἀοιδή. Od. VIII, 579. Καὶ ἐπίτηδές σε οὺκ ἥγειρον, ΐνα ὡς ἦδιστα διάγης. PLAT. Crit. 43 Β. Πλοΐα κατέκαυ σεν ΐνα μὴ Κῦρος διαβῆ. XEN. An. I, 4, 18. 'Αχλὺν δ' αὖ τοι ἀπ' ὀΦθαλμῶν ἕλον, ἡ πρὶν ἐπῆεν, ὄφρ' εὖ γιγνώσκης ἡμὲν θεὸν ἦδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα. II. V, 127. 'Αριστεὺς ξυνεβούλευεν ἐκπλεῦσαι, ὅπως ἐπὶ πλέου ὁ σῖτος ὰντίσχη. TIUC. I, 65. 'Ηλθον πρεσβευσίμενοι, ὅπως μὴ σφίσι τὸ 'Αττικὸν (ναυτικὸν) προσγενόμενου ἐμπόδιον γένηται. TIUC. I, Si. 'Εχώρουν ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν, ὅπως μὴ κατὰ φῶς προσφέρωνται καὶ σφίσιν ἐκ τοῦ ΐσου γίγνωνται, ἀλλ'..... ἦσσους ὦσι. THUC. II, 3. Ταύτας ΐνα κωλύηθ' οἱ νόμοι συνήγαγον ὑμᾶς, οὐχ ΐνα κυρίας τοῖς ἀδικοῦσι ποιῆτϵ. DEM. F. L. 341, 12. Καὶ πϵρὶ τούτων ἐμνήσθην, ΐνα μὴ ταὐτὰ πάθητϵ. DEM. Ol. III, 30, 10. (Here the pur pose was conceived in the form, ΐνα μὴ ταὐτὰ πάθωσιν.)

REMARK. This principle applies equally well to the clauses which follow $\ddot{o}\pi\omega s$ and $\ddot{o}\pi\omega s \mu \dot{\eta}$ after verbs of *striving* (§ 45), and $\mu \dot{\eta}$ after verbs of *fearing*, &c. (§ 46).

This is a favorite construction with certain authors, as Thucydides; who also, on the same principle, prefer the Indicative 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.

Έξακοσίους λογάδας έξέκριναν, ὅπως τῶν τε Ἐπιπολῶν εἴησαν φύλακες, καὶ ἢν ἐς ἄλλο τι δέῃ, ταχὺ ξυνεστῶτες παραγίγνωνται, 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. Thuc. VI, 96. Παρανίσχον δὲ φρυκτοὺς, ὅπως ἀσαφῆ τὰ σημεία τοῖς πολεμίοις ỹ καὶ μὴ βοηθοῖεν, 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 *remole* 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.

"Αξω τῆλ' Ἰθάκης, ΐνα μοι βίοτον πολύν ἄλφοι. Od. XVII, 250. So II. I, 344, ὅππως μαχέοιντο.

^{*} Madvig remarks (*Bemerkungen*, p. 12) that he finds in the first two books of Thucydides no example of the Optative after $\delta\pi\omega s$ or $\mu\dot{\eta}$ 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 pure final clauses after secondary tenses, the usage in Thucydides is nearly equally divided between the Subjunctive and the Optative. Xenophon, on the other hand, generally follows the rule, § 44, 1.

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

Τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον ὁ νόμος, Γνα μηδὲ πεισθηναι μηδ' ἐξαπατη θηναι γένοιτ' ἐπὶ τῷ δήμῳ. DEM. Androt. 596, 17. (Here ἔχει 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, &c.)

3. The secondary tenses of the Indicative are used in final clauses after $i\nu a$, sometimes after ωs or $\delta \pi \omega s$, 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 $\tauovro \ \tilde{\epsilon}\pi\rho a\tau\tau\epsilon v$ means in order that he might be doing this (but he is not doing it), or that he might have been doing this (but he was not); $iva \ \tauovro \ \tilde{\epsilon}\pi\rho a\xi\epsilon v$ means that he might have done this (but he did not); $iva \ \tauovro \ \tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\pi\rho a\xi\epsilon v$ means that he might have done this (but he has not). E. g.

Οὐκ αν ἐσχόμην, κ.τ.λ., ίν' η τυφλός τε και κλύων μηδέν, in that 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 not so). SOPII. O. T. 1387. Φέῦ, φεῦ, τὸ μὴ τὰ πράγματ ἀνθρώποις έχειν φωνήν, ίν' ήσαν μηδέν οι δεινοι λόγοι, Alas! alas! that the facts have no voice for men, so that words of eloquence might be as nothing. EUR. Hippol. Frag. 442. Έχρην είσκαλέσαντας μάρτυρας πολλούς παρασημήνασθαι κελεύσαι τας διαθήκας, ίν', εί τι εγίγνετο αμφισβητήσιμον, ην είς τα γράμματα ταυτ' έπανελθείν. DEM. Aph. 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.) Έχρην αύτούς ζητείν, ίνα απηλλάγμεθα τούτου του δημαγωγού, they ought to have made an investigation, in order that we might have been already freed from this demagogue (but we have not been freed from him). DINARCH. in Demosth. p. 91, 24. 'E(ήτησεν αν με τον ποίδα, ΐν' εἰ μή παρεδίδουν μηδέν δίκαιον λέγειν εδόκουν. DEM. Aph. III, 849, 24. Τί μ' οὐ λαβών ἕκτεινας εὐθύς, ὡς ἔδειξα μήποτε έμαυτον ανθρώποισιν ένθεν ή γεγώς; that I might never have shown as I have done. Sorn. O. T. 1391. Εί γάρ μ' ύπο γην ήκεν, ώς μήτε $\theta_{\epsilon i \circ s}$ $\mu \eta \tau \epsilon \tau \iota s \ a \lambda \lambda o s \tau o i \sigma \delta' \ \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \gamma \eta \theta \epsilon \iota$, would that he had sent me under the earth, so that neither any God nor any one else should have rejoiced at these things (as they have done). AESCH. Prom. 152. (If we read $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \gamma \eta \theta \epsilon \iota$, we must translate, might be rejoicing, as they are.) Tí $\delta \eta \tau^{\prime}$ oùk $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\rho\iota\psi^{\prime}$ $\epsilon\mu a v \tau \eta v$ $\tau \eta \sigma\delta^{\prime}$ and $\pi\epsilon \rho a s$, $\tilde{\sigma}\pi\omega s$ $\tau \tilde{\omega}\nu \pi \dot{a}\nu \tau \omega\nu \pi \dot{o}\nu \omega\nu \dot{a}\pi \eta \lambda \lambda \dot{a}\gamma \eta \nu$; why did 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 either upon an apodosis which contains a secondary tense of the Indicative (\S 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 $a\nu$ is very rarely joined with the secondary 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.

Ζώντι έδει βοηθείν, ὅπως ὅτι δικαιότατος ών καὶ όσιώτατος έζη τε ζών καὶ τελευτήσας ἀτιμώρητος ἀν κακῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐγίγνετο, 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 either 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 occur in the same sentence. E. g.

B. Object Clauses with "Οπως and "Οπως μή 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 $\delta\pi\omega$ s and $\delta\pi\omega$ s $\mu\eta$, if the leading verb is primary. The Subjunctive also occurs, but much less frequently than the Future.

4

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 employed 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.

Ἐπιμελείται ὅπως (or ὅπως μη) γενήσεται or γένηται, he takes care that it may (or may not) happen. Ἐπεμελείτο ὅπως γενήσεται, γενήσοιτο, or γένοιτο, he took care that it should happen.

(Fut.) "Ωσπερ τον ποιμένα δεί επιμελείσθαι όπως σώαι τε εσονται αί οίες και τα επιτήδεια εξουσιν, ούτω και τον στρατηγον επιμελείσθαι δεί ύπως σώοι τε οι στρατιώται έσονται και τα επιτήδεια έξουσι, καί, οδ ένεκα στρατεύονται, τοῦτο έσται. ΧεΝ. Mem. III, 2, 1. Καλόν τό παρασκευάζειν ὅπως ὡς βέλτισται ἔσονται τῶν πολιτών αί ψυχαί. PLAT. Gorg. 503 Α. Μίκραν πρόνοιαν έχειν δοκεί όπως όνόμος κύριος έσται και μήτε συγχυθήσεται μήτ' αν μεταποιηθήσεται; DEM. Aristocr. 640, 10. Καλώς δε δημαγωγήσεις, ήν σκοπής όπως οι βέλτιστοι μέν τας τιμας έξουσιν, οι δ' άλλοι μηδέν άδικήσονται. Isoc. Nicocl. p. 18 A. § 16. Όρα δκως μή άποστήσονται. ΗΔΤ. ΠΙ, 36. Σοι μελέτω όκως μή σε όψεται. ΗΔΤ. Ι, 9. Φρόντιζ' ὅπως μηδέν ἀνάξιον της τιμής ταύτης πράξεις. Isoc. Nieocl. p. 22 B. § 37. Τί μάλιστ' έν απασι διεσπούδασται τοις νόμοις; ὅπως μή γενήσονται οἱ περὶ ἀλλήλους φόνοι. DEM. Lept. 505, 9. Δεί ευλαβείσθαι, μάλιστα μέν δπως μή εγγενήσεσθον, αν δε εγγενησθον, όπως ότι τάχιστα εκτετμήσεσθον. ΡΙΑΤ. Rep. VIII, 564 C. (For the force of the Future Perfect, see § 29, N. 1.)

(Subj.) "Αλλου του ἐπιμελήσει. ή ὅπως ὅτι βέλτιστοι πολίται ³μεν; PLAT. Gorg. 515 Β. Παρασκευάζεσθαι ὅπως σὺν θεῷ ἀγωνιζώμεθα. XEN. Cyr. I, 5, 14. Οὐ γὰρ ὅπως πλείονος ἄξιος γένηται ἐπιμελείται, ἀλλ' ὅπως αὐτὸς ὅτι πλείστα ὡραῖα καρπώσεται. (Subj. and Fut. combined.) XEN Symp. VIII, 25.

(Fut. Opt.) "Εξη ὑπὸ πολλῆς ἐπιμελείας ὅπως ὡς ἐλάχιστα μὲν ὅψοιτο, ἐλάχιστα & ἀκούσοιτο, ἐλάχιστα & ἔροιτο. ΧΕΝ. Occon. VII, 5. (Here the construction after a primary tense would be, ὅπως ὄψεται... ἀκούσεται... ἔρηται.) Ἐπεμελεῖτο ὅπως μὴ ἄσιτοί ποτε ἐσοιντο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 1, 43. See the other examples of the Future Optative under § 26, Note 1 (a).

(Fut. Ind. after Secondary Tenses.) "Επρασσον δπως τις βοήθεια ήξει. Τιιυς. III, 4. Προθυμηθέντος ένδς έκάστου δπως ή ναῦς προέξει. Τιυς. VI, 31. Εἰλαβείσθαι παρεκελεύεσθε ἀλλήλοις, ὅπως μὴ λήσετε διαφθαρέντες. ΡΙΑΤ. Gorg. 487 D. Οὐδ ὅπως ὀρθὴ πλεύσεται προείδετο, ἀλλὰ καθ αὐτὸν ὅπως ἐπὶ τοῦς ἐχθροῖς ἔσται παρεσκεύασεν. DEM. F. L. 419, 28.

(Pres. or hor. Opt.) Ἐπεμέλετο αὐτῶν, ὅπως ἀεὶ ἀνδράποδα κια.

τελοίεν. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 1, 44. 'Απεκρίνατο, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλοι ὅπως καλῶς ἔχοι. ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. Ι, 8, 13. 'Εμεμελήκει δὲ αὐτοῦς ὅπως ὁ ἱππαγρέτης εἰδείη οῦς δέοι πέμπειν. ΧΕΝ. Hell. III, 3, 9. (Sulj. after Secondary Tenses.) "Επραστεν ὅπως πόλεμος γενη-

(Subj. after Secondary Tenses.) $\epsilon \pi \rho a \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \delta \pi \omega s \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \mu o s \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta - \tau a \iota$. THUC, I, 57. $\epsilon \pi \rho a \sigma \sigma \sigma \nu \delta \pi \omega s a \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \sigma \omega s \nu A \partial \eta \nu a (\omega \nu \tau \eta) \mu \pi \delta \lambda \nu$. Id. III, 70. $\Omega \nu \epsilon \tau a \tau a \rho^2 a \delta \tau \omega \nu \delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta^2 a \pi \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \kappa Make \delta \delta \sigma a s, he bribed them to effect that we should not leave Macedonia DEM. Cor. 236, 12. (Subj. after Historic Present.)$

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 final clauses, see § 43, Remark.

REMARK. "Onus (like ω_s) is originally a relative adverb, meaning as. See THUC. VII, 67, $\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omega_s$, $\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omega_s$, $\tilde{\delta}\upsilon\omega_s\tau a$, as they can. Then it is used in indirect questions, in the sense of $\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omega$ $\tau_0\tilde{\sigma}\tau_0$, how, in what way, and is followed by the Future Indicative; as $\sigma\kappa\sigma\pi\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\nu$ $\tilde{\upsilon}\pi\omega_s$ $\tilde{\eta}\pi\delta\lambda_s$, $\sigma\omega\theta\tilde{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau a$, to see how the city shall be saved. So $\tau\tilde{\upsilon}s$ $\tau\tilde{\upsilon}\eta\rho\tilde{\upsilon}s$, $\tilde{\delta}\pi\omega_s\mu\tilde{\eta}$, $\delta\omega\sigma\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota$, $\delta\tilde{\kappa}\nu_s$, $\delta\delta\tilde{\upsilon}v$, $\delta\epsilon$, hows them how they can avoid suffering punishment ($\tilde{\sigma}\tau\omega$ $\tau_0\tilde{\tau}\omega_s\mu\tilde{\eta}$, $\delta\omega\sigma\sigma\upsilon\tau\iota$). DEM. Timoc. 733, 20. (See below, Note 2.) Then, by a slight modification in sense, it may denote also the object to which the striving, &c., is directed; so that $\sigma\kappa\sigma\pi\epsilon\tilde{\nu}$ (or $\sigma\kappa\sigma\pi\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\tau\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\upsilon}\sigma)$, $\tilde{\sigma}\pi\omegas\tilde{\eta}$ $\pi\delta\lambda s \sigma\omega\theta\tilde{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau a$ 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 $\tilde{\sigma}\pi\omega s$ is lost sight of, and its force as a final particle, meaning *in order that*, begins to appear. E. g.

Σκόπει ὅπως μὴ ἔξαρνος ἔσει ἀ νῦν λέγεις, see that you do not deny what you now say. PLAT. Euthyd. 283 C. Σκεπτέον ἐστὶν ὅπως ἐλάχιστα μὲν τραύματα λάβωμεν, ὡς ἐλάχιστα δὲ σώματα ἀνδρῶν ἀποβάλωμεν, 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 force of $\delta\pi\omega s$ as a relative, used in indirect questions in the sense of *how*, we

* Compare DEM. Megal. 207, 5, $\sigma \kappa o \pi \epsilon i \nu \epsilon \xi$ őτου τρόπου μὴ γενήσονται (φίλοι), to see in what way they can be prevented from becoming friends; and THUC. I, 65, ἕπρασσεν ὅπῃ ὡφελία τις γενήσεται, he was effecting that, &c.; quoted by Madvig, Syntax, p. 125, whose views in the main are given in the text, above. See also THUC. IV, 128, ἕπρασσεν ὅτφ τρόιφ τάχιστα τοῦς μὲν ξυμβήσεται τῶν δὲ ἀπαλλάξεται. must explain its occasional use in indirect quotations in the sense of ω_s or $\delta \tau \iota$ (§ 78). See also § 65, 1, Rem.

NOTE 1. "O $\pi\omega s$ in this construction sometimes (though rarely) takes the particle $a\nu$ 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 clauses (§ 44, 1, N. 2).

When $d\nu$ is used with the Optative after a verb of *striving*, it denotes an ordinary apodosis, as in § 44, 1, N. 3 (b), and $\delta\pi\omega s$ is simply interrogative. E. g.

[•]Η ἄλλου ἐφιέμενοι δικάσουσιν ἢ τούτου, ὅπως ἀν ἕκαστοι μήτ ἕχωσι τὰλλότρια μήτε τῶν αὐτῶν στ ἑρωνται; PLAT. Rep. IV, 433 Ε. Ἐὰν ὅ ἔλθη, μηχανητέου, ὅπως ἀν διαφύγη καὶ μὴ δῷ δίκην ὅ ἐχθρός. Id. Gorg. 481 Α. Μαλλον ἢ πρόσθεν εἰσήει αὐτοὺς ὅπως ἀν καὶ ἔχοντές τι ὅἰκαδε ἀφίκωνται. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VI, 1, 17. (Here ἐπιμέλεια or some such word is understood as the subject of εἰσήει.) Σκοπῶ, ὅπως ἀν ὡς μῷστα διάγοιεν, ἡμεῖς δ' ἀν μάλιστα ἀν εὐφραινοίμε θα θεώμενοι αὐτούς, I try to see how they might (if they should choose) live the easiest lives, &c. XΕΝ. Symp. VII, 2. So ἐπιμεληθῆναι ὅπως ἀν γένοιτο, Id. Cyr. I, 6, 7.

NOTE 2. (a.) The Homeric construction which most resembles that of § 45 is found after such verbs as $\phi \rho a \zeta \rho \mu a \iota$, $\beta o \upsilon \lambda \epsilon \upsilon \sigma \sigma \omega$, or $\mu \epsilon \rho \mu \eta \rho \iota \zeta \omega$, to consider, and $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \omega$, to try. Here $\ddot{\sigma} \pi \omega s$ or $\dot{\omega} s$ is used with the Subjunctive (sometimes with $\kappa \epsilon$) after primary tenses, and with the Optative after secondary tenses. E. g.

Αὐτοὶ δὲ φραζώμεθ' ὅπως ὅχ' ἄριστα γένηται, let us ourselves consider how the very best things may be done. Od. XIII, 365. Φραζώμεθ' (imperf.) 'Αργείοισιν ὅπως ὅχ' ὕριστα γένοιτο. Od. II, 129. Φράζεσθαι ὅππως κε μνηστῆρας κτείνης. Od. I. 295. Περιφραζώμεθα πώντες νόστον, ὅπως ἕλθησιν, i. e. how he may come. Od. I, 76. Φράσσεται ὡς κε νέηται, ἐπεὶ πολυμήχανός ἐστιν. Od. I, 205. "Αμα πρόσσω καὶ ἀπίσσω λεύσσει, ὅπως ὅχ' ὕριστα γένηται, i. e. he looks to see how, &c. II. III, 110. Μερμήριζεν ὅπως ἀπολοίατο πᾶσαι νῆες. Od. IX, 554. Μερμήριζε κατὰ φρένα ὡς ᾿Αχιλῆα τιμήση (οτ τιμήσει'), i. e. how he might honor Achilles. II. II, 3. Βούλευον ὅπως ὅχ' ἅριστα γένοιτο. Od. IX. 420. Πείρα ὅπως κεν δὴ σὴν πατρίδα γαΐαν ἕνηαι, i. e. try to find means by which you may go, &c. Od. IV. 545. Πει,ῷ ὡς κε Τρῶες ὑπερφίαλοι ἀπόλωνται. II. XXI, 459.

In some of these examples $\delta\pi\omega_s$ or $\dot{\omega}_s$ seems to be used as an interrogative, meaning how, the Subjunctive of the direct question being the common Homeric form explained in § 87. (For the Subjunctive with $\kappa\epsilon$, see § 87, Note.) But in other examples, especially those with $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\dot{a}\omega$, there is a nearer approach to the construction of § 45. The two following examples will further illustrate the Homerie usage: $-\eta \delta\eta \gamma \alpha \rho \mu \omega \theta \nu \delta s \dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma \tau \tau a$, $\delta\phi\rho'$, $\dot{\epsilon}\phi a\mu\dot{\nu}\nu \omega$

Τρώεσσιν, Π. VI, 361; φραζέσθω μή τίς οἱ ἀμείνων σεῖο μάχηται, Π. V, 411. See also Od. VI. 113.

(b.) In Homer $\delta\pi\omega s$ takes the Future Indicative chiefly when it is used merely as an indirect interrogative, with no reference to a purpose, as in II. II, 252, oldé $\tau i \pi\omega$ order $\delta \mu ev$ $\delta \pi \omega s$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \tau a \iota \tau d\delta e$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \rho \gamma a$, we do not yet even know certainly how these things are to be; or in Od. XIII, 376, $\phi \mu d \xi ev \delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \rho \sigma \iota x$ sectors. It may take the Future (as well as other tenses) when it is used as a simple relative; as in II. I, 136, $\delta\pi\omega s \, dv \tau d \xi \iota \omega r \pi a \iota$, as shall be an equivalent. (See Remark, above.) Occasionally also we find the Future after $\delta\pi\omega s$ in final clauses (§ 44, 1, N. 1).

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

Σκοπεί δη μη τούτοις αύτον έξαιτήσηται και καταγελάση. DEM. Mid. 563, 26. 'Ορα ουν μή τι και νῦν ἐργάσηται. PLAT. Symp. 213 D. 'Όρα μη πολλῶν ἐκάστω ήμῶν χειρῶν δεήσει. XEN. Cyr. IV, 1, 18. Σκόπει, μή σοι πρόνοι ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ φυλακτέα. Soph. O. C. 1180. 'Όρα σὺ, μη νῦν μέν τις εὐχερης παρῆς. SOPH. Phil. 519.

(See the corresponding use of $\delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta$, instead of $\mu \eta$, after verbs of *fearing*, &c., § 46, Note 2. It is often difficult to draw the line between the two constructions of § 45 and § 46.)

NOTE 4. ' Ω s is sometimes, though rarely, used instead of $\delta \pi \omega s$ after verbs of *striving*. Here the Subjunctive is more common than the Future Indicative. E. g.

[']Επιμελοῦνται ὡς ἔχη οῦτως. XEN. Oecon. XX, 8. [']Ως δὲ καλῶς ἔξει τὰ ὑμέτερα, ἐμοὶ μελήσει. XEN. Cyr. III, 2, 13. [']Επεμελήθη ὡς τύχοιεν πάντων τῶν καλῶν. Id. VII, 3, 17. Σπεύδουτες ὡς Ζεὺς μήπσ' ἄρξειεν θεῶν. AESCH. Prom. 203. Occasionally we find the Subjunctive with ἄν: τὸ ὅσα ἀν γνῷ ἀγαθὰ εἶναι ἐπιμελεῖσθαι ὡς ἀν πραχθῆ[']... Οὐ φέρει καρπὸν, ἡν μή τις ἐπιμελῆται ὡς ἀν ταῦτα περαίνηται. 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 $\ddot{o}\pi\omega s$ (rarely with other particles), in nearly or quite the same sense: —

(a.) Verbs of exhorting, entreating, and commanding are sometimes followed by $\delta\pi\omega s$, and those of forbidding by $\delta\pi\omega s$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$, after the analogy of verbs of striving. E. g. Λίσσεσθαι δέ μι» αὐτ`s ὅπως νημερτέα εἴπη, and implore him thyself to speak the truth. Od. III, 19. (Compare the regular con struction, οὐδέ σε λίσσομαι μένειν, Π. Ι, 174.) Λίσσετο δ' aἰe 'Ηφαιστον κλυτοεργόν ὅπως λύσειεν "Αρηα, he implored him to liberate Ares. Od. VIII, 344. Κείνω τ' ἐμὴν ἀγγείλατ' ἐντολὴν, ὅπως τὸν παίδα δείξει. SOPH. Aj. 567. Διακελεύονται ὅπως τιμωρήσεται πάντας τοὺς τοιούτους. ΡΙΑΤ. Rep. VIII, 549 Ε. So παραγγέλλει ὅπως μὴ ἔσονται, Id. III, 415 Β. "Εμοιγε ἀπηγό ρευες ὅπως μὴ τοῦτο ἀποκρινοίμην. (Fut. Opt.) Id. I, 339 Δ. 'Απειρημένον αὐτῷ ὅπως μηδὲν ἐρεῖ ῶν ἡγεῖται, when he is forbilden to say a word of what he believes. Id. I, 337 Ε. See SOPH. Trach. 604.

In Od. XVII, 362, we find $\delta \tau \rho \nu \nu \epsilon \nu \delta s \delta \nu \pi \delta \rho \nu a \kappa a \tau \delta \mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \eta \rho a s \delta \rho \epsilon i \rho o \iota$, where the $\delta \nu$ is used with the particle as in the examples under § 44, 1, N. 3 (a).

(b.) "Iva is used in the same sense in a single passage of the Odyssey, III, $327 : - \Lambda i \sigma \sigma \epsilon \sigma \partial a \delta \epsilon \mu v a v \tau a v \tau \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \epsilon s \epsilon v i \sigma \pi \eta$, and implore him yourself to speak the truth.

This use of $l\nu a$ is not found in Attie Greek, but it reappears in the later language. E. g.

Έντολήν καινήν δίδωμι ύμιν, Ίνα άγαπ âτ ε ἀλλήλους, a new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another. JOH. Evang. XIII, 34. So ἐδεήθην Ίνα ἐκβάλλωσιν, LUC. IX, 40. So in Latin, rogat ut liceat.

(c.) A case of &s and the Subjunctive (instead of an object Infinitive) after a verb implying a *promise* is found in 11. I, 558:-

T_η σ' δίω κατανεῦσαι ἐτήτυμον, ὡs 'Αχιλη̂α τιμήσηs, ὀλέσηs δὲ πολέαs ἐπὶ νηυσὶν 'Αχαιῶν, that you promised by your nod to honor Achilles, &c.

NOTE 6. (a.) On the other hand, some verbs which regularly take $\delta\pi\omega s$ are occasionally found with an Infinitive of the object, sometimes with the article. (See § 46, N. 8.) E. g.

' Αεί τινα ἐπεμέλοντο σφών αὐτών ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς εἶναι, they always took care that one of their own number should be in the offices (where we should expect űπως τις ἐσται οι ἔσοιτο). ΤΗυς. VI, 54. Οὐδ' ἐπεμελήθην τοῦ διδασκαλών μοί τινα γενέσθαι τών ἐπισταμένων. XEN. Mem. IV, 2, 4. So the Infinitive with τό, Mem. IV, 3, 1.

(b.) Verbs of this class can be followed by an indirect question introduced by ϵi , whether. E. g.

El ξυμπονήσεις και ξυνεργάσει σκόπει, see whether thou wilt assist me, &c. SOPH. Ant. 41. (See § 46, Note 6, c.)

NOTE 7. (a.) Both $5\pi\omega s$ and $5\pi\omega s \mu \eta$ are sometimes used elliptically with the Future Indicative in *exhortations* and *prohibitions*, depending on some Imperative like $\sigma\kappa\delta\pi\epsilon\iota$, take care, understood. " $0\pi\omega s \mu \eta$ allows also the Subjunctive. E. g.

Οπως ανήρ έσει (se. σκύπει), prove thyself a man. Οπως μοι,

§ 45.] "Onws AFTER VERBS OF STRIVING.

δ ανθρωπε, μὴ ἐρεῖς ὅτι ἔστι τὰ δώδεκα δὶς ἕξ, see that you do not tell me that twice six are twelve. PLAT. Rep. I, 337 A. ⁶ Οπως οὖν ἕσεσθε ἄνδρες ἄξιοι τῆς ἐλευθερίας (sc. σκοπείτε), prove yourselves men worthy of freedom. XES. An. I, 7, 3. ⁶ Οπως γε, ἄν τι τούτων γίγνηται, τούτους ἐπαινέσεσθε καὶ τιμήσετε καὶ στεφανώσετε, ἐμὲ δὲ μή, καὶ μέντοι κῶν τι τῶν ἐναντίων, ὅπως τούτοις ὀργιείσθε. DEM. F. L. 355, 17. ⁶ Οπως τοίνυν περὶ τοῦ πολέμου μηδὲν ἐρείς, see therefore that you say nothing about the war. Id. 370, 22. ⁶ Οπως γε μὴ ἐξαπατήσῃ ἡμῶς. PLAT. Prot. 313 C. (See § 46, N. 4.)

(b.) We occasionally find the Future Indicative with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ in an independent sentence, expressing a *prohibition*. This may be explained by supposing an ellipsis of $\delta \pi \sigma \sigma$ from the construction just mentioned ($\delta \pi \sigma \sigma \mu \eta$ rovro $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} s$ becoming $\mu \eta$ rovro $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} s$); but it 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 exclusively to the second person of the verb; yet the first and third persons are sometimes found. E. g.

Καὶ ὅπως, ὥσπερ ἐρωτῶσι προθύμως, οῦτω καὶ ποιεῖν ἐθελήσουσιν. DEM. Chers. 99, 14. Ὅπως δὲ τὸ σύμβολον λαβόντες ἔπειτα πλησίον καθεδούμεθα. Arist. Eccles. 297.

NOTE 8. When an Aorist Subjunctive active or middle was to be used with $\delta\pi\omega s$ or $\delta\pi\omega s \mu\dot{\eta}$ after a verb of striving, the second 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 $\beta\omega\lambda\epsilon\dot{\omega}\sigma\eta$ and $\beta\omega\lambda\epsilon\dot{\omega}\sigma\epsilon, \beta\omega\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\sigma\eta\pi u$ and $\beta\omega\lambda\epsilon\dot{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\tau a$): 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 $o\dot{v} \mu\dot{\eta}$, in the construction described in § 89. In both constructions the Subjunctive differs from the Future only by being a less vivid form of expression.*

* 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 $\delta\pi\omega s$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ and $o\dot{v}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$, was extended by others so as to include $\delta\pi\omega s$ (without $\mu\dot{\eta}$), and the Greek authors were emended to conform to it. As this rule has no other foundation than the accidental circumstanee mentioned in Note 8, it naturally fails in many cases, in some of which even emendation is impossible. Thus in the example, $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\dot{v}ov\pi$ $\pi\rho\sigma\pia\tau\epsilon\dot{v}\sigma a$ for $\epsilon\kappa\pi\lambda\epsilon\dot{v}\sigma\eta$, $\dot{\eta}$ $\sigma\tau\rhoa\tau\iota\dot{a}$, XEN. An V, 6, 22, $\epsilon\kappa\pi\lambda\epsilon\dot{v}\sigma\eta$ cannot be a mistake for $\epsilon\kappa\pi\lambda\epsilon\dot{v}\sigma\epsilon$, as the Attic Future is $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\dot{v}\sigma\rho\nu$ in $\epsilon\kappa\pi\lambda\epsilon\dot{v}\sigma\eta$, no emendation is possible. See also PLAT. Rep. X, 609 B. $o\dot{v}\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{a}\pi\circ\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\eta$, where the Future would be $\dot{a}\pio\lambda\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}$. The rule of

C. Object Clauses with µn after Verbs of Fearing, &c.

§ 46. After verbs and phrases which express or imply *fear*, *caution*, or *danger*, $\mu \eta$, *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.

 $M\dot{\eta}$ (like the Latin *ne*) denotes fear that something may happen which is not desired; $\mu\dot{\eta}$ où (ut = ne non) denotes fear that something may not happen which is desired. E.g.

Φοβοῦμαι μὴ γένηται (vereor ne accidat), I fear that it may happen: Φοβοῦμαι μὴ οὐ γένηται (vereor ut accidat), I fear that it may not happen. Νῦν δ' aἰνῶς δείδοικα κατὰ Φρένα μή σε παρείπη. Π. Ι, 555. Δείδω μὴ θήρεσσιν ἕλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένωμαι. Od. V, 473. Οὐ Φοβῇ μή σ' ᾿Αργος ὥσπερ κἅμ' ἀποκτείναι θέλη. EUR. Or. 770. Ποῖον ἕθνος οὐ δοκεῖ Φοβούμενον μή τι πάθῃ; ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 6, 10. Φροντίζω μὴ κόάτιστον ἢ μοι σιγῶν. ΧΕΝ. Μεm. IV, 2, 39. Φυλαττόμενος μὴ δόξῃ μανθάνειν τι. Id. IV, 2, 3. Δέδοικα μὴ οὐδ ὅσιον ἡ ἀπαγορεύειν. PLAT. Rep. Π, 368 B. Τὰ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς πολλὴν

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 $\delta\pi\omega s$ when it follows verbs of striving, &c., and with $\delta \nu \mu h$. Even here, however, the rule is maintained only by changing many passages against Mss. authority. Thus in DEM. OI. I, p. 9, 17, all Mss. except one read $\pi a pa \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu a \sigma \sigma a$ in $\delta m \omega \epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \eta \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon$, $\kappa a \lambda \mu h \pi \delta \eta \tau \epsilon \tau a \nu \tau \delta \nu$, while nearly all editions have $\beta o \eta \theta \eta \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon$, $\kappa a \lambda \mu h \pi \delta \theta \eta \tau \epsilon \tau a \nu \tau \delta \nu$, while nearly all editions have $\beta o \eta \theta \eta \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon$, $\kappa a \lambda \mu h \pi \delta \theta \eta \tau \epsilon \tau a \nu \tau \delta \nu$, while nearly all editions have $\beta o \eta \theta \eta \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon$, so have $\delta \mu \eta \delta \delta \eta \tau \epsilon \tau a \nu \tau \delta \nu$, where sumples occur : p. 128, 25, $\delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta \delta \epsilon s \delta \nu a \tau p \epsilon \psi \epsilon \iota$, $\tau o \nu \sigma \sigma \sigma \kappa \sigma \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$, where all Mss. have $\delta u a \tau p \epsilon \psi q$, which Schaefer emended to $\delta u a \tau p \epsilon \psi \epsilon \iota$; and p. 125, 10, $\delta \pi \omega s \mu h \delta \sigma v \lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma \sigma \sigma \delta \sigma \nu \tau \mu \sigma \tau \tau \sigma \tau \epsilon s$, where the weight of Mss. authority decidedly favors $\delta o v \lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma \sigma \sigma \iota$. For $\delta \nu \mu \eta$, see § 89, 2, Rem. 2.

Whatever view is taken of these last examples, there certainly seems to be no reason for extending the rule of Dawes to $\delta \pi \omega \omega$ in pure final clauses, as in these the Future is used only by exception (§ 44, 1, N, 1). There is no objection, therefore, to such sentences as these: $-\delta \nu \ \tilde{\epsilon}\nu\kappa \alpha \ \tilde{\epsilon}\pi i r a - \theta \eta \nu \alpha , \delta \pi \omega s \ \tilde{\alpha}\pi \omega \lambda \alpha \delta \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \kappa \alpha i \ \delta \pi \omega s \ \gamma \epsilon \nu \omega \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$, XEN. Cyr VII, 5, 82; and $\hat{\epsilon}\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \delta \alpha \psi \epsilon \nu \kappa \alpha i \ \delta \pi \omega s \ \gamma \epsilon \nu \omega \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$, XEN. Cyr VII, 5, 82; and $\hat{\epsilon}\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \delta \alpha \psi \epsilon \nu \kappa \alpha i \ \delta \pi \omega s \ \delta \rho i \sigma \tau \sigma \omega \eta \sigma \omega \kappa \alpha i \ \mu \epsilon \mu \psi \omega \mu \alpha i$, Truce. II. 60. So with $\delta \pi \omega s \ \alpha \rho i \sigma \tau \sigma \omega \eta \sigma \omega \tau \alpha i$, Thuce, VII, 39. In elliptical prohibitions with $\delta \pi \omega s \ \mu \eta'$ (§ 45, N, 7) the Subjunctive seems to be allowed from the analogy of ordinary prohibitions (§ 86). άπιστίαν παρέχει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, μὴ ἐπειδὰν ἀπαλλαγῆ τοῦ σώματος οὐδιμοῦ ἔτι ἦ, ἀλλὰ διαφθείρηταί τε καὶ ἀπολλύηται. PLAT. Phaed. 70 A. Οὐκοῦν νῦν καὶ τοῦτο κίνδυνος, μὴ λάβωσι προστάτας αὐτῶν τινας τοῦτων, there is danger of this, that they may take, šcc. XEN. An. VII, 7, 31. Κίνδυνός ἐστι, μὴ μεταβάλωνται καὶ γ ένωνται μετὰ τῶν πολεμίων. Isoc. Plataic. p. 303 E. § 38. 'Οκνῶ uή μοι ὁ Λυσίας ταπεινὸς φανῆ. PLAT. Phaedr. 257 C. Εὐλαβοῦ δὲ μὴ φανῆς κακὸς γεγώς. SOPH. Trach. 1129. Οὐδὲν δεινοὶ ἔσοτται μὴ βοηθέωσι ταύτη. HDT. VII, 235. 'Υποπτεύομεν καὶ ὑμῶς μὴ οὐ κοινοὶ ἀποβῆτε. THUC. III, 53. Αἰσχυνόμενος μὴ φορτικῶς σκοπῶμεν. PLAT. Theaet. 183 E.

Δείσας μή πώς οἱ ἐρυσαίατο νεκρόν 'Αχαιοί. Π. V, 298. "Αζετο γὰρ μὴ Νυκτὶ θοῦ ἀποθύμια ἔρδοι. Π. ΧΙV, 261. 'Εγὼ γὰρ ἤμην ἐκπεπληγμένη φόβω, μή μοι τὸ κάλλος ἄλγος ἐξεύροι ποτέ. SOPI. Trach. 25. "Εδεισαν οἱ "Ελληνες μὴ προσάγοιεν πρὸς τὸ κέρας καὶ αὐτοὺς κατακόψειαν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Ι, 10, 9. Ουκέτι ἐπετίθεντο, δεδοικότες μὴ ἀποτμηθείησαν. Ιd. ΙΙΙ, 4, 29. "Εδεισαν μὴ λύττα τις ὥσπερ κυσὶν ἡμῖν ἐμπεπτώκοι. Ιd. V, 7, 26. 'Υποπτεύσας μὴ τὴν θυγατέρα λέγοι, ἤρετο, having suspected that he might mention his daughter. XΕΝ. Cyr. V, 2, 9. 'Ηθύμησάν τινες, ἐννοσύμενοι μὴ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια οὐκ ἕχοιεν ὅπόθεν λαμβάνοιεν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙΙ, 5, 3. Οὐδεἰς γὰρ κίνδυνος ἐδἰκει εἶναι, μή τις ἅνω πορευομένων ἐκ τοῦ ὅπισθεν ἐπί-

Οι Φωκαιέες τας νήσους οὐκ ἐβούλοντο πωλέειν, δειμαίνοντες μη ἐμπόριον γένωνται. Η DT. Ι, 165. Τῷ γὰρ δεδιέναι μη λόγοις ησσους ὦσι, τολμηρῶς προς τὰ ἔργα ἐχώρουν. ΤΗ UC. III, 88. Περιδεής γενόμενος μη ἐπιπλεύσωσιν αἰ νηες. ΤΗ UC. III, 80. "Εδεισα μη Τροίαν ἀθροίση καὶ ξυνοικίση πάλιν. ΕUR. Hec. 1138. Οἰ θεώμενοι ἐφοβοῦντο μή τι πάθη. XEN. Symp. II, 11. Δηλος ην πασιν (Κῦρος) ὅτι ὑπερεφοβείτο μή οἱ ὁ πάππος ἀποθάνη. XEN. Cyr. I, 4.2.

It will be seen by the examples that the construction with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ is very often used when the leading verb only *implies* the fear, caution, or danger, as after $i\pi\sigma\pi\tau\epsilon i\omega$ and $\delta\kappa\nu\delta$. On this principle we must explain passages like II. X, 100; $\dot{o}\dot{v}\dot{\delta}$ τ_1 $\ddot{v}\partial\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\pi\omega\varsigma$ $\kappa a\dot{v}\dot{\delta}\dot{u}\dot{v}$ $\nu\dot{\kappa}\tau a \mu\epsilon\nuo\iota\nu\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega\sigma\iota$, $\mu\dot{a}\chi\epsilon\sigma\partial a\iota$, where the idea is we know of no security against their deciding to fight during the night, — implying we fear lest they may.

REMARK. These clauses with μ'_1 , when they follow verbs of caution like $\phi v \lambda \dot{a} \tau \tau \rho \mu a$, $\epsilon \dot{v} \lambda a \beta o \tilde{v} \mu a$, &c., partake of the nature 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 $\phi o \beta o \tilde{\nu} \mu a$ 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 analogy of verbs of thinking, &c., and take either the Indicative with $\dot{\omega}$ or the Infinitive, to denote the object of the fear. (This

F

actually happens in a few cases; as où $\phi o\beta où \mu e \theta a i horo <math>\omega \sigma e \sigma \theta a_h$. Thuce, V, 105; $\mu \dot{\eta} \phi o\beta o \hat{\upsilon} \omega s a \pi o p \dot{\eta} \sigma e i s$, XEN. Cyr. V, 2, 12. See below, Note 6.) Still, verbs of *fearing*, when the object of the fear is *future*, as it commonly is, are closely connected in sense with those like $\phi \upsilon \lambda \dot{a} \tau \sigma \mu a_i$; 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 $\phi \upsilon \lambda \dot{a} \tau \sigma \mu a_i$, they say also $\phi o\beta o \tilde{\upsilon} \mu a \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\gamma} \epsilon \upsilon \eta \tau a$. When 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 object clauses after $\delta \tau \iota$ and $\dot{\omega} s$. (See below, Note 5.)

NOTE 1. Sometimes, though seldom. $\mu\eta'$ takes the Future Indicative after verbs of *fearing*, &c. E. g.

Φοβοῦμαι δὲ, μή τινας ἡδονἀς ἡδοναῖς εὐρήσομεν ἐναντίας. ΡΙΑΤ. Phil. 13 Α. Φοβερὸν καὶ σφαλερὸν, μὴ σφαλεὶς κείσομαι. ΡΙΑΤ. Rep. V. 451 Α.

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

NOTE 2. Verbs denoting *fear* and *caution* are sometimes followed by $\delta\pi\omega s \ \mu\dot{\eta}$, with the Future Indicative or the Subjunctive after primary tenses and the Optative after secondary tenses, like verbs of *striving*, &c. Many verbs (like $\delta\rho\dot{a}$ and $\sigma\kappa\sigma\pi\dot{a}$) belong equally well to both classes (§§ 45, 46). It will be noticed, that $\delta\pi\omega s \ \mu\dot{\eta}$ here is exactly equivalent to $\mu\dot{\eta}$, so that $\phi\rho\beta\sigma\dot{v}\mu a \ \delta\pi\omega s \ \mu\dot{\eta} \ \gamma\epsilon\nu\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau a (or \ \gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\tau a)$ means I fear that it will happen (not, I fear that it will not happen). (See Note 6, a.) E. g.

Τοῦ δαίμονος δέδοιχ' ὅπως μὴ τεύξομαι κακοδαίμονος. ARIST. Eq. 112. Εὐλαβούμενοι ὅπως μὴ οἰχήσομαι. PLAT. Phaed. 91 C. Δέδοικα ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκη γένηται, I fear that there may be a necessity. DEM. Phil. III, 130, 14. Οὐ φοιδεῖ, ὅπως μὴ ἀνόσιον πρᾶγμα τυγχάνης πράττων; PLAT. Euthyphr. 4 Ε. Φυλάττου, ὅπως μὴ εἰς roῦναντίον ἕλθης. XEN. Mem. III, 6, 16. 'Ηδέως ἂν (θρέψαιμι τὸν ἄνδρα), εἰ μὴ φοβοίμην ὅπως μὴ ἐπ' αὐτόν με τράποιτο. XEN. Mem. II, 9, 2.

NOTE 3. The particle $a\nu$ is never used with $\mu\eta$ and the Sub-

junctive. It is sometimes joined with an Optative depending upon $\mu\dot{\eta}$ after verbs of *fearing*, in which case it always forms an apodosis with the Optative. Such an Optative with $\ddot{\mu}\nu$ can of course follow primary as well as secondary tenses, by § 31, Note 2. (See § 44, 1, N. 3, Ren.) E. g.

Δέδοικα γὰρ μὴ πρῷ λέγοις ἂν τὸν πόθον τὸν ἐξ ἐμοῦ, I fear that you mɨght tell (i' you should have an opportunity). SOPH. Trach. 631. (Cf. Philoct. 493.) Οὕτε προσδοκία οὐδεμία ἦν μὴ ἄν ποτε οἱ πολέμια ἐπιπλεύσειαν. Τιμος. Η, 93. Ἐκεῖνο ἐννοῶ μὴ λίαν ἂν ταχὸ σωφρονισθείην, lest (in that case) I should be very soon brought to my senses. XEN. An. VI, 1, 28.

NOTE 4. M_{η}' with the Subjunctive, and $\delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta'$ with the Future Indicative (seldom the Subjunctive), are sometimes used elliptically, depending upon some verb of *fear* or *caution* understood. (See § 45, N. 7, *a*.) This expresses an apprehension or anxiety, sometimes a mere suspicion. It is especially common in Plato. E. g.

'Aλλà μὴ οὐ τοῦτ' ỹ χαλεπὸν, θάνατον φυγεῖν, but (I fear) lest this may not be the difficult thing, to avoid death. PLAT. Apol. 39 A. Mỳ ἀγροικότερον ỹ τὸ ἀληθές εἰπεῖν, (I fear) lest it may be too rude to speak the truth. PLAT. Gorg. 462 E. 'Aλλà μὴ οὐχ οῦτως ἔχῃ, ἀλλ ἀναγκαῖον ỹ εἰδότα τίθεσθαι τὸν τιθέμενον τὰ ὀνόματα. PLAT. Crat. 436 B. Οἴμοι τάλας, ὁ Zεὺς ὅπως μή μ' ὄψ εται. ARIST. Av. 1494. (This example belongs equally well under § 45, N. 7, α). "Όπως οὖν μὴ ἀπολεί μαστιγούμενος. XEN. Cyr. I, 3, 18. 'Aλλ' ὅπως μὴ ἐν τοῖς ζωγραφήμασιν ỹ τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ ὀρθῶς διανέμειν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν οῦ, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖον ỹ ἀὲ ὀρθῶς. PLAT. Crat. 430 E. In XEN. Mem. IV, 2, 12, μὴ οὖν, ἔφη, οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ τὰ τῆς

In XEN. Mem. IV, 2, 12, $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oùv, $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \eta$, où $\delta \dot{\nu} \nu a \mu a \iota \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \tau \dot{a} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ δικαιοσύνηs ἐξηγήσασθαι; (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 $\mu \dot{\eta}$ is followed by the present and past tenses of the Indicative, as $\delta \tau_1$ or $\dot{\omega}_5$ would be in indirect quotations. The following cases occur:—

(a.) M_1 with the Present Indicative expresses a fear that something is now going on. E. g.

⁶Ορῶμεν μὴ Νικίας οἴεται τι λέγειν, let us be cautious lest Nicias is thinking that he says something. PLAT. Lach. 196 C. (Here the Subjunctive οἴηται would have meant lest Nicias may think, referring to the future.) Δέδοικα μὴ πληγῶν δέει. ARIS⁷. Nub. 193 Φοβείσθε, μὴ δυσκολώτερόν τι νῦν διάκειμαι ἡ ἐν τῷ πρόσθε βίω, you are afraid lest I am now in a more peevish state of mind, &c. (where the Subjunctive would have referred to the future, lest I may be). PLAT. Phaed. 84 E. Ἐπίσχες, ὡς ἀν προιξερεννήσω στίβον μή τις πολιτῶν ἐν τρίβω Φαντάζεται, κὰμοὶ μὲν ἔλθη φαῦλος ὡς δούλω ψόγος. EUR. Phoen. 92. (Here μὴ φαντάζεται means lest any one is now to be seen; and μὴ ἕλθη, lest any report may come hereafter.) "Αναξ, ἐμοί τοι, μή τι καὶ θεήλατον τοὕργον τόδ', ἡ ξύννοια βουλεύει πάλαι. SOPII. Ant. 278. (The idea is, my mind has long been anxious, lest this is the work of the Gods, ἐστίν being understood after μ∱.*) "Ορα μὴ ἐκεῖνον κωλύει. PLAT. Charm. 163 A. 'Αλλ' εἰσύμεσθα, μή τι καὶ κατάσχετον κρυψῆ καλύπτει καρδία θυμουμένη, δόμους παραστείχοντες. SOPII. Ant. 1253. (The idea is, we shall learn the result of our anxiety lest she is concealing, &c.†)

(b.) M'_{η} with the Perfect Indicative expresses a fear lest something has already happened. The difference between this and the Perfect Subjunctive is often very slight, the latter expressing rather a fear that something may hereafter prove to have happened. (See examples, § 18, 1.) E. g.

* 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 $\tau \sigma \tilde{\nu} \rho \gamma \sigma \nu \tau \delta \delta' \tilde{J}$, $\xi \dot{\nu} \nu \nu \sigma i \alpha \beta \sigma \nu \lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \pi \alpha \dot{\lambda} \alpha i$, is evident from the Scholion on the passage : 'H $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \nu \sigma i \alpha \beta \sigma \nu \lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau \alpha i \alpha \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \tau \dot{\sigma} \pi \rho \tilde{\alpha} \gamma \mu \alpha$. So perhaps we should read $\mu \eta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\nu} \epsilon \epsilon i$ in DEM. Phil. III, 124, 25.

† In this passage, if anywhere, it would seem necessary to admit the *interrogative* force usually ascribed to $\mu\eta$, which would make it equivalent to $\epsilon i \ ov$, whether not. But here, as in the other passages quoted, it is plain that the dependent clause after $\mu\eta$ expresses the object of an apprehension. To establish a purely *interrogative* force in $\mu\eta$, it would seem necessary to find examples in which $\mu\eta$ not only follows a verb like olda, but also is followed by a clause in which no object of apprehension is contained (Such a sentence would be $\epsilon i\sigma\delta\mu\epsilon\sigma\thetaa \mu\eta$ of $\phi(\lambda) \zeta \delta\sigma \mu v$, we shall learn whether our friends are not living; but no such example can be found, at least in any classic writer. The Greeks would have said $\epsilon i\sigma\delta\mu\epsilon\sigma\thetaa \epsilon i$ or $\zeta \delta\sigma \mu v$ or $\epsilon i \ \zeta \delta\sigma \mu v$.) The use of ϵi , whether, after verbs of fraring (Note 6, c), usually adduced as an argument to prove the interrogative force of $\mu\eta$, rather seems to show that, when the Greeks wished to introduce an indirect question after verbs of fearing, they had recourse to ϵi , as in other **cases**.

(c.) M₁ can be used with the Imperfect or the Aorist Indicative, to express fear lest something happened in past time. This can be expressed only in this way, as the Subjunctive and Optative would refer to (relatively) future time. E. g.

 $\Delta\epsilon i \delta \omega \mu \eta$ $\delta \eta \pi a \nu \tau a \ \theta \epsilon \lambda \ m \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \epsilon a \ \epsilon \ \tilde{l} \pi \epsilon \nu$, I fear that all that the Goddess said was true. Od. V, 300. 'AAX' $\delta \rho a \ \mu \eta \ \pi a i \zeta \omega \nu \ \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu$, 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 δs (and even $\delta \pi \omega s$), that, may be used to introluce the object of the fear, thus taking the place of $\mu \dot{\eta}$ in the common construction. (" $\sigma \tau i$ seems to be used only in the case mentioned in Note 7.) E. g.

Avdpos $\mu\eta$ $\phi o\beta o\tilde{v}$ $\dot{w}s \dot{a}\pi op \dot{\eta}\sigma \epsilon \iota s \dot{d}\xi iov, do not fear that you will$ be at a loss. XEN. Cyr. V, 2, 12. (Here the direct discourse would $be <math>\dot{a}\pi op \dot{\eta}\sigma \omega$, I shall be at a loss.) M $\dot{\eta} \delta\epsilon i\sigma \eta \tau \epsilon \dot{w} s o\dot{v}_{\chi} \dot{\eta} \dot{\delta} \epsilon \dot{w} \kappa a \theta \epsilon \upsilon - \dot{\delta} \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, do not fear that you will not sleep sweetly. Id. VI, 2, 30 (Here $\mu\dot{\eta} o\dot{v}_{\chi}$ would be the ordinary expression.) M $\dot{\eta} \tau \rho \epsilon \sigma \eta s$, $\ddot{\sigma} \pi \omega s$ $\sigma \epsilon \tau \iota s \dot{a}\pi o\sigma \pi \dot{a} \sigma \epsilon \iota \beta \dot{a}_{\chi}$, lest any one shall tear you away by force. EUR. Herael. 248. M $\dot{\eta} \phi \sigma \beta \epsilon \tilde{v} \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{s}$, $\ddot{\omega} s \sigma \epsilon \sigma \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon v \nu \sigma i \kappa \dot{s} \tau \omega$ $\dot{\lambda} \dot{\sigma} \rho \sigma \tau \dot{\sigma} \dot{\sigma} \epsilon$, $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \gamma \nu \nu a \dot{\kappa} a \tau \dot{\eta} \dot{\tau} \dot{\mu} \dot{\eta} \tau i \tau \sigma \iota \dot{\epsilon} \xi a \dot{\tau} \eta s \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \tau a \iota \beta \dot{\delta} \delta s$, do not fear either that I am saying this to try you ($\dot{\omega} s \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$), or lest any harm shall come ($\mu\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \tau a$). Hort. I, 9. (Here the two constructions after $\phi \sigma \beta \epsilon \tilde{\nu}$ make the principle especially clear.)

In all these cases $\mu \dot{\eta}$ or $\delta \pi \omega s \mu \dot{\eta}$ would have been more regular, and exactly equivalent to $\dot{\omega}s$ and $\delta \pi \omega s$ 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.

Οὐ φοβούμεθα ἐλαστώσεσθαι, we are not afraid that we shall be defeated. Thuc. V, 105. (Here μή 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 ϵi , whether, or by some other interrogative particle. "Onws used interrogatively in such sentences is not to be confounded with $\ddot{o}\pi\omega s$ in its use explained above (a). E. g.

Οι δέδοικα εἰ Φίλιππος ζῆ, ἀλλ' εἰ τῆς πόλεως τέθνηκε τὸ τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας μισεῖν καὶ τιμωρείσθαι, Ι have no fear (on the question) whether Philip is alive; but I have fear (about this), whether the custom of the city to hate and punish evil-doers is extinct. DEM. F. L. 434, 6. $\Phi \delta \beta \delta s \epsilon^{i} \mu \omega \zeta \tilde{\phi} \sigma \iota v \delta s \epsilon' \gamma \tilde{\omega} \delta \epsilon \pi \sigma \tau \tilde{\phi} \delta \tau \tau 1.$ $\Phi \epsilon' \rho \upsilon \sigma \delta \sigma v \epsilon \sigma v \delta' \delta s \tilde{\eta} \delta \sigma \tau u \delta s \epsilon' \gamma \tilde{\omega} \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \tau \tilde{\omega} \delta \tau \tau 1.$ Heracl. 791. $\Phi \epsilon' \rho \upsilon \sigma \delta \sigma \sigma \tau \delta \sigma \delta \tau \tau 1.$ through fear whether any one will perceive it (where $\mu \eta$ alor $\theta \eta \sigma \tau \tau 1.$ through fear whether any one will perceive it (where $\mu \eta$ alor $\theta \eta \sigma \tau \tau 1.$ $\tau \delta \sigma \eta \tau 1.$ might have been used, meaning lest any one shall perceive it). EUR. Androm. 61. $\Phi \sigma \beta \sigma \tilde{\upsilon} \tau \sigma \sigma \tau \sigma \tau \epsilon \pi \rho \sigma \beta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau \tau 1.$ $\delta \tau \sigma \delta \delta \delta \delta \tau \sigma \mu s.$ XEN. Hell. VI, 1, 14. (The direct question would be $\pi \sigma \tilde{\iota} \pi \rho \sigma \beta \eta \sigma \tau \tau 1.$) $T \eta \nu \theta \epsilon \delta \nu \delta \tilde{\upsilon} \pi \sigma s \lambda \delta \theta \omega \delta \delta \delta \delta \kappa a, I am in fear$ (about the question) how I shall escape the Godless. EUR. Iph. T $955. (The direct question was <math>\pi \delta s \lambda \delta \theta \omega$; § 88.)

NOTE 7. Verbs of *fearing* may be followed by $\delta \tau \iota$, because, and an ordinary causal sentence with the Indicative (§ 81). E. g.

Où kắţiov dià τοῦτο Φοβεῖσθαι τοὺς πολεμίους, ὅτι πολλοὶ τυγχάνουσιν ὅντες, to fear them, because they happen to be many. Isoc. Archid. p. 128 C. § 60. Φοβουμένης τῆς μητρὸς, ὅτι τὸ χωρίον ἐπυνθάνετο νοσῶδες εἶναι. Isoc. Aegin. p. 388 D. § 22. Ότι δὲ πολλῶν ἅρχουσι, μὴ Φοβηθῆτε, ἀλλὰ πολὺ μᾶλλον διὰ τοῦτο δαρρεῖτε, do not be afraid because they rule many, &c. XEN. Hell. III, 5, 10. (Mỳ ἄρχουσιν Φοβεῖσθαι would mean to fear lest they rule.) Φοβούμενος τὸ κάεσθαι καὶ τὸ τέμνεσθαι, ὅτι ἀλγεινόν, fearing 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 μὴ ἀλγεινόν.) ἘΦοβεῖτο. ὅτι ὀΦήσεσθαι ἕμελλε τὰ βασίλεια οἰκοδομεῖν ἀρχόμενος, he was afraid, because he was about to be seen beginning to build the palace. XEN. Cyr. III, 1.

NOTE 8. (a.) Verbs of *fearing* may be followed by an Infinitive (without $\mu\eta$), 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.

Φοβοῦμαι οὖν διελέγχειν σε, μὴ ὑπολάβης, κ.τ.λ., I am afraid to refute you, lest you may suspect, &c. PLAT. Gorg. 457 E. (Here both constructions occur.) Φοβήσεται ἀδικεῖν, he will be afraid to do wrong. XEN. Cyr. VIII, 7, 15. (But φοβήσεται μὴ ἀδικῆ, he will fear that he may do wrong.) Πέφρικα Ἐρινὺν τελέσαι τὰς κατάρας, I shudder at the idea of the Fury fulfilling the curses. AESCH. Sept. 720. (But in 790, τρέω μὴ τελέση means I tremble lest she may fulfil them.) See also XEN. An. I, 3, 17. Τὸ ἀποθνήσκει» οὐδεὰ φοβεῖται, τὸ δὲ ἀδικεῖν φοβεῖται. 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 $\mu \eta$), which is sometimes preceded by the article; the Infinitive having the same meaning as a clause with $\mu \eta$ and the Subjunctive or Optative. E. g.

Πως ούκ άξιον αυτόν γε φυλάξασθαι τοιούτον γενέσθαι; why

86

ought he not to guard against becoming such a man himself? XEN. Mem I, 5, 3. (Here $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha$ is equivalent to $\mu\dot{\eta}\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\tau\alpha$) $\Phi\nu\lambda\alpha\tau$ - $\tau \acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\sigma\tau\dot{o}\lambda\nu\pi\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha i$ twa, taking care to offend no one. DEM. Cor. 313, 6. $\Phi\nu\lambda\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu\mu\dot{\eta}\delta\epsilon\mu\alpha\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\upsilon\dot{\nu}\sigma\alpha i$. Thuc. VII, 17. $\Phi\nu\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\dot{\sigma}$ - $\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu\kappa\dot{\alpha}\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\rho\dot{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu\mu\dot{\eta}\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\sigma\chi\dot{\nu}\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\dot{\sigma}\tau\mu\nu$. [DEM.] Aristog. I, 773, 1. (For $\mu\dot{\eta}\sec 95, 2, N. 1$.) In THUC. VII, 77, 5, we find the Infinitive with $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ after $\phi\nu\lambda\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$.

(c.) Kivouvós $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota$, the principal expression denoting *danger* which takes $\mu \dot{\eta}$ and a finite verb, is quite as regularly followed by the Infinitive (without $\mu \dot{\eta}$). E. g.

Οὐ σμικρὸς κίνδυνός ἐστιν ἐξαπατηθηναι, there is no little danger of their being deceived. PLAT. Crat. 436 B.

Kινδυνεύω is regularly followed by the Infinitive, by § 92, 1.

REMARK. All the Infinitives referred to in Note 8 belong regularly under the rule, § 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 conclusion is called the *apodosis*. The protasis is regularly introduced by the particle ϵi , if, negatively $\epsilon i \mu \eta'$.

NOTE. At is the Doric form for ϵl . It is sometimes used also in Epic poetry, but only when $\kappa \epsilon$ immediately follows.

2. The adverb $\ddot{a}\nu$ (Epic $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}$ or $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}\nu$, Doric $\kappa \dot{a}$) is regularly joined with $\epsilon \dot{\iota}$ in the *protasis*, when the verb is in the *Subjunctive* (§ 50, 1); $\epsilon \dot{\iota}$ with $\ddot{a}\nu$ (\ddot{a}) forming the compound $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a}\nu$, $\ddot{a}\nu$ (\bar{a}), or $\ddot{\eta}\nu$. See § 38, 1.) The simple $\epsilon \dot{\iota}$ is used in the protasis with the Indicative and the Optative.

The same adverb $a\nu$ is regularly used in the *apodosis* with the *Optative* (§ 50, 2), and also with the *secondary*

tenses of the Indicative in the construction explained in § 49, 2. (See § 37, 3, and § 39.)

3. The negative particle of the protasis is regularly $\mu \eta$, that of the apodosis is o v.

NOTE. When the last rule is violated, and $o\dot{v}$ is found in a protasis, it is always closely connected with a particular word (generally the verb), with which it forms a single negative expression; so that its negative force does not (like that of $\mu \eta$) affect the protasis as a whole. E. g.

Πάντως δήπου (οῦτως ἔχει), ἐάν τε σὺ καὶ "Ανυτος οὐ φῆτε ἐάν τε φῆτε, if you deny it, as well as if you admit it. PLAT. Apol. 25 B. (Here ἐὰν μὴ φῆτε would mean unless you admit it.) Ei μὲν οὐ πολλοὶ ἦσαν, καθ ἕκαστον ἂν περὶ τοῦτων ἦκοῦετε, if there were only a few, &c. LYS. Agorat. p. 135; § 62. Cf. p. 137; § 76. (Here οὐ πολλοί are used together in the sense of ὀλίγοι.) Τῶνδε μὲν οὐδὲν ἴσον ἐστὶν, εἴγε ἀφ ἡμῶν γε τῶν ἐν μέσω οὐδεἰς οὐδέποτε ἄρξεται, 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 où and $\mu \eta$ particularly clear, où affecting merely the verb, and $\mu \eta$ affecting the whole (including the où): ei $\mu \eta$ Πρόξενον où χ ὑπεδέξαντο, εσώθησαν äv, if it had not been that they did not receive Proxenus, they would have been saved. DEM. F. L. 364, 11.

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

Δεινόν αν είη, εἰ οἱ μὲν ἐκείνων ξύμμαχοι ἐπὶ δουλεία τῆ αὐτῶν φεροντες οὐκ ἀπεροῦσιν, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτοὶ σώζεσθαι οὐκ ἄρα δαπανήσομεν, ἰι would be a hard thing, if (ἰι is a fact that) their alies will not refuse, &c., while we will not contribute. THUC. I, 121. Εἰτ οὐκ αἰσχρὸν, εἰ τὸ μὲν ᾿Αργείων πλῆθος οὐκ ἐφοβήθη τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀρχὴν, ὑμεῖς δὲ βάρβαρου φοβήσεσθε; is it not then disgraceful, if (it is true, that) the Argive people did not fear, &c. DEM. Rhod. 197, 9.

Classification of Conditional Sentences.

§ 48. The supposition contained in a protasis may be either particular or general. A particular supposi-

§ 48.] CLASSIFICATION OF CONDITIONS.

tion refers to a definite act or a definite series of acts. A general supposition refers to any 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 suppositions : ---

If he is (now) able to do this, he is doing it, εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύναται, ποιεῖ. If he was able to do this, he did it, εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἐδύνατο, ἐποίει. If he (shall) be able to do this, he will do it, ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύνηται, ποιήσει. If he should be able to do this, he would do it, εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύνματο, ποιοίη ἅν.

The following contain general suppositions : --

If he is (ever) able to do this, he (always) does it. έὰν τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύνηται, ποιεῖ. If any one (ever) wishes to go, it is (always) permitted, ἐάν τις βούλητ.α ἰέναι. ἔξεστιν. If he was (ever) able to do this, he (always) did it. εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύναιτο, ἐποίει. If any one (ever) wished to go, it was (always) permitted, εἴ τις βούλοιτο ἰέναι, ἐξῆν. If any one shall (ever) wish to go, it will (always) be permitted, ἐάν τις ἰέναι βούληται, ἀεἰ ἐξέσται. If any one should (ever) wish to go, it would (always) be permitted, εἴ τις ἰέναι βούλοιτο, ἀεὶ ǜν ἐξείη.

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 past conditions, even here excepting those which imply non-fulfilment of the condition. Therefore all the classes under L, except A. 1, include both particular and general suppositions.

I. Excluding from A. 1 the past and present general suppositions, which have a peculiar construction, we have *four* 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 decided (*in point of fact*) either affirmatively or negatively; the speaker. however, either may or may not wish 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, ϵi rouro $\pi p \acute{a} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota$, — if he was doing it, $\epsilon i \ \breve{\epsilon} \pi p a \sigma \epsilon \upsilon$, — if he did it, $\epsilon i \ \breve{\epsilon} \pi p a \xi \epsilon \upsilon$, — if he has done it, $\epsilon i \ \pi \epsilon \pi p a \chi \epsilon \upsilon$, — if he had already done it, $\epsilon i \ \epsilon \pi \epsilon \pi p \acute{a} \chi \epsilon \upsilon$. 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,

El πράτσει τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔχει, if he is doing this, it is well.

El πράσσει τοῦτο, ἡμάρτηκεν, if he is doing this, he has erred.

El πράσσει τοῦτο, καλῶς έξει, if he is doing this, it will be well.

El $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\rho a\xi\epsilon$ τοῦτο, καλῶς $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ ($\tilde{\epsilon}l\chi\epsilon\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\epsilon\nu$, or $\tilde{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\iota$), if he did this, it 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 may say if he were now doing this, $\epsilon i \tau \sigma \tilde{\upsilon} \tau \sigma \tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \rho a \sigma \epsilon v$; or if he had done this (although he did not do it), $\epsilon i \tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \rho a \xi \epsilon v$. 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 av, which distinguishes it from those forms of apodosis belonging under 1 in which past tenses are used. Thus we may say,

El $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\rho$ aσσε τοῦτο, καλῶς ἂν εἶχεν, if he were (now) doing this, it would be well. El $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\rho$ aσσε τοῦτο, καλῶς ἂν εἶχεν may also mean if he had been doing this, it would have been well.

El $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\rho a\xi\epsilon$ τοῦτο, καλῶς ἀν $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\epsilon\nu$ (or ἀν $\epsilon\tilde{i}\chi\epsilon\nu$), if he had done this, it would have been well (or it would now be well). On the other hand, εἰ $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\rho a\xi\epsilon$ τοῦτο, καλῶς $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\epsilon\nu$ (without åν) would mean if he did this, it was well. (See § 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 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 (B, 1 and 2), which differ more in the form of statement than in their meaning: -

§ 48.]

1. He may say if he shall do this, $\epsilon \dot{a}\nu \pi\rho \dot{a}\sigma\sigma \eta \tau o (\sigma r, still more vividly, <math>\epsilon l \pi\rho \dot{a}\xi\epsilon\iota \tau \sigma \dot{\sigma}\tau \sigma$), making a distinct supposition of a future case. The natural apodosis to such a protasis expresses what will be the result, if the condition shall be fulfilled. We may therefore say,

² Eàν πράσση τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔξει, if he do this, it will be well; or εl πράξει τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔξει, if he shall do this, it will be well. (See § 50, 1.) In Latin: Si hoc faciet (more frequently si hoc fecerit), bene erit; rarely si hoc faciat, bene erit.

2. He may also say, if he should do this, $\epsilon i \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma$ $\tau \sigma \tilde{\nu} \tau \sigma$, 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,

El πράσσοι τοῦτο, καλῶs ἂν ἔχοι, if he should do this, it would be well. (See § 50, 2.) In Latin : Si hoc fuciat, bene sit.

REMARK 2. The two forms of protasis which the Greek expresses by the Subjunctive $(\epsilon u \pi \rho a \sigma \sigma \eta \tau o \tilde{\tau} \tau o)$ and the Optative $(\epsilon u \pi \rho a \sigma \sigma \sigma \tau o \tilde{\tau} \tau o)$ have only one equivalent form in Latin; si hoc faciat meaning if he shall do this $(\epsilon u \tau \sigma \tilde{\tau} \tau \sigma \tau \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \eta)$, as well as if he should do this $(\epsilon i \tau \sigma \tilde{\tau} \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma)$. (See § 50, 2, Rem. b) But in the former sense the Latin commonly employs the Future Indicative, si hoc faciet (corresponding to $\epsilon i \tau \sigma \tilde{\tau} \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \delta \epsilon \iota$, if he shall do this, or the Future Perfect, si hoc facerit, leaving the form si hoc faciat to represent the Greek $\epsilon i \tau \sigma \tilde{\tau} \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma i$, 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,

Ἐάν τις τοῦτο πράσση, καλῶς ἔχει, if any one (ever) does this, it is (ir. all such cases) well. Ἐάν τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύνηται, ποιεῖ, if he is (ever) able to this, he (in all such cases) does it. Ἐάν τις τούτου πιη, ἀποθνήσκει, if any one (ever) drinks of this, he dies.

B. 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,

Εἴ τις τοῦτο πράσσοι, καλῶς εἶχεν, if any one (ever) did this, it was (in all such cases) well. Εἰ τοῦτο ποιείν δύναιτο, ἐποίει, if he was (ever) able to do this, he (always) did it. Εἴ τις τούτου πίοι, ἀπέθνη σκεν, 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 non-fulfilment of the condition implied, not being distinguished by their form from particular suppositions, are included under the rules of \S 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 $\dot{\epsilon}a\nu \pi\rho\dot{a}\sigma\sigma\eta$ and $\epsilon t \pi\rho\dot{a}\sigma\sigma\sigma a$ above, — 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 Past Conditions.

§ 49. 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 present or past tenses of the Indicative, after ϵi . Any tense of the Indicative may be used in the apodosis, to express the result of the fulfilment of the condition. E. g.

El έβρόντησε, καὶ ἤστραψεν, if it thundered, it also lightened. (This does not imply that the speaker has any knowledge or opinion on the question whether it actually thundered.) El δ' ούτω τοῦτο έστὶν, ἐμοὶ μέλλει φίλον εἶναι. II. I, 564. See I, 178. El τότε κοῦρος ἕα, νῦν αὖτέ με γῆρας ὑπάζει. II. IV, 321. El δεοί τι δρῶσιν αἰσχρὸν, οἰκ εἰσιν θεοί. EUR. Beller. Fr. 294. El ἐγὼ Φαίδρον ἀγνοῶ, καὶ ἐμαυταῦ ἐπιλέλησμαι· ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐδέτερά ἐστι τοἱτων, 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, Rem. 1.) El μὲν (Ἀσκληπιδς) θεοῦ ἦν, οὐκ ἦν αἰσχροκερδὴς, οὐκ ἦν θεοῦ. PLAT. Rep. III, 408 C. Εἰμηδὲν τούτων πεποίηκας, τί φοβήση;

NOTE 1. The Imperative, the Subjunctive in *exhortations* or *prohibitions*, or the Optative in *wishes*, may stand in the apodosis. E. g.

AESCH. Agam. 944. Kákuơr' ả πολοίμην, Ξανθίαν εἰ μὴ ψιλώ. ARIST. Ran. 579. In the last three examples the Optative expresses a wish (§ 82), and must not be confounded with the Optative with $a\nu$ in apodosis (§ 50, 2).

REMARK. A protasis of this class may also be followed by an apolosis in the Optative with $a\nu$, as $\epsilon i \tau \sigma \tilde{\nu} \tau' d\lambda \eta \theta \epsilon s \epsilon \tilde{\sigma} \tau \iota \nu$, $\dot{\eta} \delta \epsilon \omega s \tilde{a} \nu \tilde{a} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \sigma \iota \mu \iota$, if this is true, I should be glad to depart. But such an apolosis 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. See § 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 $\epsilon i \tau o \tilde{\upsilon} \tau o \pi o u \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$ 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.

Aloe πληκτρον, εἰ μαχεῖ, raise your spur, if you are going to fight. ARIST. Av. 761. (Εἰ μαχεῖ in protasis commonly means if you shall fight, being equivalent to ἐἀν μάχη.) Oi εἰs τὴν βασιλικὴν τέχνην παιδευόμενοι... τί διαφέρουσι τῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης κακοπαθούντων, εἰ γε πεινήσουσι καὶ διψήσουσι καὶ ῥιγώσουσι καὶ ἀγρυπνή. σουσι καὶ τἄλλα πάντα μοχθήσουσι κ κάντες; how do they differ, &c., if they are to suffer hunger, thirst, &c. (i. e. if it is necessary that they should suffer)? XEN. Mem. II, 17. ^{*}Η νῦν ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἀνὴρ, αῦτη δ' ἀνὴο, εἰ ταῦτ' ἀνατεὶ τῆδε κείσεται κράτη, if this is to pass unpunished. SOPH. Ant. 484. So εἰ πόλεμος δαμậ, II, I, 61; and εἰ διαβληθήσομαι, EUR. Hec. 863.

This use of the Future must be carefully distinguished from that found in *future* conditions, where it is equivalent to the Subjunctive. (§ 50, 1, Note 1). The periphrastic form of the Future with $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$ and the Infinitive (§ 25, 2) is more common in this construction. Here the tense of $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$ (as in $\epsilon l \ \mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda ov \sigma t \ \tau \sigma \delta \tau \sigma \ \pi \epsilon i \ \sigma \delta \tau \sigma \ \pi \sigma \delta \tau \sigma$) shows that the condition is really present and not future So with the Latin periphrastic Future, si hoc factures 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 secondary 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.

El τοῦτο ἔπρασσε, καλῶς ἀν εἶχεν, if he were (now) doing this, it would be well (implying that he is not doing it). This may also mean if he had been doing this, it would have been well (implying that he was not doing it). The context must decide, in each case, to which time the Imperfect refers. El τοῦτο ἔπραξε, καλῶς ἀν ἔσχεν, if he had done this, it would have been well (implying that he did not do it.). El τοῦτο ἐπεπράχει, καλῶς ἀν εἶχεν, if he had finished doing this (now, or at any past time), it would be well (implying either he has not, or he had not finished it).

Taῦτa οὐκ ἀν ἐδύναντο ποιεῖν, εἰ μὴ καὶ διαίτη μετρία ἐχρῶντο, they would not be able to do this, if they did not lead an abstemious life. XEN. Cyr. I, 2, 16. Πολὺ ἀν θαυμαστότερον ἦν, εἰ ἐτιμῶντο, it would be much more wonderful, if they were honored. PLAT. Rep. VI, 489 B. Οὐχ οῦτω δ' ἀν προθύμως ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον ὑμῶς παρεκάλο ουν, εἰ μὴ τὴν εἰρὴνην ἑ ὡρ ων αἰσχρὰν ἐσομένην, I should not exhort you, did I not see (as I do), &c. Isoc. Archid. p. 134 A. § 87. Λέγουσι πάντα ἦ ἔχει· καί τοι εἰ μὴ ἐτύγχανεν αἰτοῖς ἐπιστήμη ἐνοῦσα, οἰκ ἀν οἰοί τ' ἦ σαν τοῦτο ποιήσειν, they tell everything as it is: and yei ϳ knowledge did not chance to be in them, they could not do this. PLAT. Phaed. 73 A. Εὖ ἴσθ' ὅτι εἴ τι ἐμοῦ ἐκ ἡ δου, οἰδενός ἀν οῦτω με ἀποστερεῖν ἐψυλάττου ὡς ἀξιώματος καὶ τιμῆς, if you cared for me at all, you would take care, &c. XEN. Cyr. V, 5, 34. Εἰ μὴ ἄπληστός τε ἕ as χρημάτων καὶ αἰσχροκερδὴς, οὐκ ἀν νεκρῶν θήκας ἀνέφγες. HDT. I, 187. (This implies ἅπληστος εἶ, thou art insatiable, and ἀνεώρχες, thou didst open.)

Où ầv νήσων ἐκράτει, εἰ μή τι καὶ ναυτικὸν εἶχεν, he would not have been master of the islands, if he had not had also some naval force (implying ναυτικὸν εἶχεν and νήσων ἐκράτει, he had a navy, and he was master of the islands). THUC, I, 9. (Taữa) οὐκ ἂν προέλ εγεν, εἰ μὴ ἐπίστευεν ἂληθεώσειν, he would not have declared these things (referring to several), had he not been confident that he should speak the truth. XEN, Mem. I, 1, 5. El ἦσαν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ, ὡς σὺ φῆς, οὐκ ἂν ποτε ταῦτα ἕπασχον, if they had been good men, as you say, they would never hare suffered these things (referring to several cases) PLAT. Gorg, 516 E.

§ 49, 2.] SECONDARY TENSES OF THE INDICATIVE.

Καί νύ κ' έτι πλέονας Λυκίων κτάνε δίος 'Οδυσσεὺς, εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ἀξὺ νόησε μέγας κορυθαίολος "Εκτωρ, i. e. Ulysses would have killed still more, had not Hector perceived him. H. V. 679. Καί ιύ κεν ἤια πάντα κατ έφθιτο καὶ μένε ἀνδρῶν. εἰ μή τίς με θεῶν ἀλοφύρατο καὶ μ ἐσ ἀ ωσ εν. Od. IV, 363. Καὶ ϊσως ἀν διὰ ταῦτ ἀ πέθανον, εἰ μὴ ἡ ἀρχὴ διὰ ταχέων και ελύθη. PLAT. Apol. 32 D. Τί ποτ' ἀν ἕπαθον ὑπ' αὐτῶν, εἰ πλείω χρόνον ἐπετροπεύθην; ... εἰ κατελείφθην μὲν ἐνιαύσιος, έξ ἔτη δὲ προσεπετροπεύθην ὑτ' αὐτῶν, οὐδ ἀν τὰ μικρὰ ταῦτα παρ' αὐτῶν ἀπέλαβον. DEM. Aph. I, 833, 12–19. Εἰ τοίνυν ὁ Φίλιππος τότε ταύτην ἔσχε τὴν γνώμην, οὐδὲν ἀν ῶν νυνὶ πεποίηκεν ἔπραξεν, οὐδὲ τοσαύτην ἐκτήσατο δύναμιν. DEM. Phil. I, 41, 18. (See below, Remark b; and § 42, 4.)

El μὴ ὑμεῖς ἤλθετε, ἐπορευόμεθα ἀν ἐπὶ βασιλέα, if you had not come, we should (now) be on our way to the King. (Aor. and Imperf.) XEN. An. II, 1, 4. El γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ παρεληλυθότος χρόνου τὰ δέοντα οὖτοι συνεβούλευσαν, οὐδὲν ἀν ὑμᾶς νῦν ἔδει βουλεύεσθαι, if they had given the necessary adrice in time past, there would now be no need of your deliberating. DEM. Phil. I, 40, 9. Τοῦτο εἰ ἀπεκρίνω, iκανῶς ἀν ἤδη παρὰ σοῦ τὴν ὁσιότητα ἐμεμαθήκη, if you had answered this, I should have already learned, &c. (implying ἀλλ' οὐ μεμάθηκα, but now I have not learned). PLAT. Euthyph. 14 C. Λοιπὸν ὅ ἀν ἦν ἡμῖν ἔτι περὶ τῆς πόλεως διαλεχθηναι τῆς ἡμετέρας, εἰ μὴ προτέρα πῶν ἄλλων τὴν εἰρήσην ἐπεποίητο. (This implies ἀλλὰ τὴν εἰρήσην προτέρα πεποίηται.) ISOC. Phil. P. 93 C. § 56. Τῶν ἀδικημάτων ἀν ἐμέμνητο τῶν αὐτοῦ, εἶτι περὶ ἐμοῦ γ'ἕγραφεν. DEM. 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 Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive in protasis and apodosis. With regard to the tenses, the Latin Imperfect Subjunctive represents the Greek Imperfect Indicative referring to present time; 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, el $\tau o \tilde{\tau} \tau \sigma \tilde{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \xi \epsilon \nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \omega \delta \eta$ äv, if he had done this, he would have 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 above) the person might have been saved in some

95

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 kal *el*, even *if*, although, or oùd' *el*, not even *if*; as kal *el* τούτο *äπpaξev*, *iσώθη äv*, even *if* he had done this, he would have been saved, where it may be implied that he was saved.

(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 usually a Perfect or Pluperfect. Thus $\epsilon i \, \epsilon \pi \rho a \sigma \sigma \epsilon$, when it means if he were doing, implies $d\lambda\lambda'$ où $\pi \rho a \sigma \sigma \epsilon$, but really he is not doing; when it means if he had been doing, it implies $d\lambda\lambda'$ où $\epsilon \pi \rho a \sigma \sigma \epsilon$, but really he was not doing: $\epsilon i \mu \eta \, \epsilon \pi \rho a \xi \epsilon \nu$, if he had not done, implies $d\lambda\lambda' \, \epsilon \pi \rho a \xi \epsilon \nu$, but really he did do: $\epsilon i \, \epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma o \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$, but really he has not done it, or $d\lambda\lambda'$ où $\kappa \, \epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma o \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$, but really he has not done it, or $d\lambda\lambda'$ où $\kappa \, \epsilon \pi \epsilon \pi o o \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$, but not done it, 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 intended more exactly (§ 19, N. 4); as in the sentence above quoted, $o\dot{v}\delta\dot{e}\nu$ $\ddot{a}\nu \ \delta\nu \ \nu\nu\nu\dot{v}$ $\pi\epsilon\pi oi\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu \ \epsilon\pi\rho a\xi\epsilon\nu$, where the Perfect $\pi\epsilon\pi oi\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$ shows that the Pluperfect might have been used for $\epsilon\pi\rho a\xi\epsilon\nu$.

NOTE 1. In Homer, the Imperfect in this construction refers to *past* time, and is to be translated by our Pluperfect. E. g.

^{*}Ενθα κε λοιγός έην καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα γένοντο, εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, then there would have been, &c. II. VIII, 130. Εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ τάδε ἦδε' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμησιν, οὐκ ἂν ὑπεξέφυγε Στυγὺς ὕδατος αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα, ἰf I had known, &c. Id. 366.

NOTE 2. Sometimes $a\nu$ 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 have been*. The $a\nu$ can be omitted only when the

\$ 49, 2.1

context shows conclusively that the construction is not that of \S 49, 1. E. g.

Naì μà Δία ήσχυνόμην μέντοι, εἰ ὑπὸ πολεμίου γε ὄντος έξηπατήθην, yes, by Zeus, I were indeed ashamed, if I had been deceived, &c. XEN. An. VII, 6, 21. Καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγευνήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, it had been good for that man, if he had not been born. ΜΑΤΤΗ. Evang. XXVI, 24.

Compare VERG. Aen. XI, 115: Acquius 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 $d\nu$, 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 Indicative with $d\nu$. Thus $\delta\epsilon_{i}$ of τ_{0} τ_{0} λ_{i} means you ought to love him (or ought to have loved him), — implying, but you do not love him (or did not love him), — and is equivalent to τ_{0} τ_{0} λ_{i} ϵ_{i} τ_{0} $\delta\epsilon_{0}$ τ_{0} ϵ_{1} ϵ_{0} ϵ_{i} , you would love him (or would have loved him), if you did (or had done) what you ought. So ϵ_{i} κ_{0} ϵ_{1} τ_{0} $\tau_$

This construction occurs chiefly after the impersonal Imperfects $\chi\rho\bar{\eta}\nu$ or $i\chi\rho\bar{\eta}\nu$, $i\delta\epsilon_i$, $i\xi\bar{\eta}\nu$, $i\nu\bar{\eta}\nu$, $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\bar{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\nu$, $\epsilon i\kappa\deltas\ \bar{\eta}\nu$, $\bar{\eta}\rho\mu\sigma\tau\tau\epsilon\nu$ (decebat), $\bar{\eta}\nu$ or $i\pi\bar{\eta}\rho\chi\epsilon\nu$ (it was possible), and $\bar{\eta}\nu$ with nouns and adjectives expressing necessity, propriety, &c. So when $\bar{\eta}\nu$ is used with the verbal in $-\tau\epsilon\sigma\nu$ (equivalent to $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota$ with the Infinitive). 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 **r** omentary action in past time. E. g.

El èn' ήμέας μούνους ἐστρατηλάτεε ὁ Πέρσης, $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} v$ αὐτὸν πάντων τῶν ἄλλων ἀπεχόμενον οὕτω ἰ έναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμετέρην καὶ ἂν ἐδήλου τᾶσι ὡς ἐπὶ Σκύθας ἐλαύνει, if the Persian were making his expedition against us alone, he ought, letting alone all others, to be marching directly into our country; and then he would show that he was marching against Scythians. HDT. IV, 118. Here $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} v$ lévai means he would be marching into our country (like ἤιεν α̈ν), if he were doing what would be expected under such circumstances, — implying that this

5

G

condition is not fulfilled. (See below, Rem. 1.) $E_{\chi\rho\hat{\eta}\nu} \mu \hat{\epsilon}\nu$ our και δίκαιον ήν τούς τον στέφανον οιομένους δειν λαβείν αι τούς άξίους έπιδεικνύναι τούτου, μή έμε κακώς λέγειν έπειδή δε τοῦτο παρέν-Tes έκεινο ποιούσιν, κ.τ. λ., i. e. those who think they ought to receive 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, 28. Εἰ γὰρ ὑπ' ἀδόντος τοι εἶπε τελευτήσειν με, χρην δή σε ποιέειν τὰ ποιέεις νῦν δὲ ὑπ' αἰχμης, if he had said that I was to be killed by a tooth, then you would have to do as you now do. HDT. I, 39. (See below, Rem. 1.) "Εδει μέν τούς λέγοντας απαντας μήτε πρός έχθραν n οιείσθαι λόγων μηδένα μήτε πρός χάριν, i. e. the speakers ought not to say a word out of regard either to enmity or to favor (and yet they do so). DEM. Chers. 90, 1. Πότερον αὐτὴν έχρην έν τη Θετταλών και Δολόπων τάξει συγκατακτασθαι Φιλίππω την των Έλλήνων $d\rho_{\chi}\eta_{\nu}$; 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. 246, 1. Ἐμε εἰ μεν εν άλλαις τισιν ήμεραις ήδίκησε τι τούτων ίδιώτην όντα, ίδία και δίκην προσήκεν αύτω διδόναι, i. e. he would properly have given satisfaction by a private suit (as if he had said $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\eta\kappa\delta\nu\tau\omega s$ ίδία δίκην αν εδίδου). ĎΕΜ. Mid. 525, 3. Και πολλοις δόξω, ώς οίος τ' ών σε σώζειν εί ήθελον αναλίσκειν χρήματα, αμελήσαι, i. e. whereas I might have saved you, if I had been willing to spend money, &c PLAT. Crit. 44 C. Ού γαρ ένην μη παρακρουσθέντων ύμων μείναι Φιλίππω, for Philip could not have remained, unless you had been deceived (implying he did remain). DEM. F. L. 379, 2. (See § 52, Καὶ μάλιστα εἰκὸς ἦν ὑμᾶς προορᾶσθαι αὐτὰ καὶ μὴ μαλακῶς, ὥσπερ νῦν, ξυμμαχεῖν. Τηυς. VI, 78. (The orator adds, ἀλλ οὕθ ὑμεῖς νῦν γέ πω οὕθ' οἱ ἄλλοι ἐπὶ ταῦτα ὅρμησθε.) Εἰ μὲν τοίνυν αίσχρών τι έμελλον έργάσεσθαι, θάνατον άντ' αὐτοῦ προαιρετέον ην (i. e. προαιρείσθαι έδει). XEN. Mem. II, 7, 10. So in Latin : Quem patris loco, si ulla in te pietas esset, colere debebas. CIC. Phil. II, 38.

(b.) The Aorist and Imperfect of $\partial \phi \epsilon i \lambda \omega$ ($\partial \phi \epsilon i \lambda \omega$) are sometimes used with the Infinitive like $\chi \rho \eta \nu$, $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota$, &c.; as in II. I, 353, $\tau \iota \mu \eta \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \iota \iota \delta \phi \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu$ 'Oλύμπιος $\epsilon \gamma \gamma \nu a \lambda i \xi a \iota Z \epsilon \delta s \delta \psi \iota \beta \rho \epsilon - \mu \epsilon \tau \eta \tau \delta \nu \delta \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \tau \tau \tau \sigma \epsilon \nu$, i. e. Zeus ought to have secured 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 $\omega \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \kappa \delta \rho o s \xi \eta \nu$, 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 $\partial \rho \partial \rho \eta \nu$ (without $\partial \nu$) to express what some one wishes were now true (but which is not true). E. g.

Έβουλόμην μέν σύν και την βουλήν και τας εκκλησίας όρθως

διοικείσθαι καὶ τοὺς νόμου, ἰσχύειν, would that both the Senate and t.e assemblies were rightly managed, and that the laws were in force (implying the opposite of ὀρθώς διοικείσθαι and ἰσχύειν). This is analogous to ὥφελεν είναι, would that it were, and ἔδει είναι, it ought to be (but is not). AESCHIN. Cor. § 2. Ἐβουλόμην μὲν οἰκ ἐρίζειν ἐνθάδε, would that I were not contending here (as I am). ARIST. Ran. 866. See below, Rem. 2.

(d.) Kuvouvevo is used with the Infinitive, as a periphrasis for the verb of the Infinitive with $\tilde{a}\nu$. E. g.

[']Η πόλις ἐκινδύνευσε πασα διαφθαρηναι, εἰ ἄνεμος ἐπεγενετο, the city was in danger of being utterly destroyed, if a wind had arisen. THUC. III, 74. Εἰ μη ἐξεφύγομεν εἰς Δελφούς, ἐκινδυνεύσαμεν ἀπολέσθαι, 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 ἐκινδυνεύσαμεν ἄν.)

(e.) The Imperfect of $\mu i \lambda \lambda \omega$ 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 $a\nu$. E. g.

²H µáλa δὴ 'Ayaµéµνονος $\phi \theta$ ίσεσθαι κακὸν οἶτον ἕµελλον, εἰ µὴ...ἔειπες, i. e. I should have perished like A. (lit. I was to have perished), if thou hadst not spoken. Od. XIII, 383. Μέλλεν µέν ποτε οἶκος ὅδ ἀφνειὸς καὶ ἀµµµων ἕµµεναι·νῦν δ ἑτέρως ἐβδλοντο θεοί. Od. I, 232. Οὐ συστρατεύσειν ἕµελλον, they would not have joined him (in that case). DEM. F. L. 391, 11. So in Latin: Hoe facturi erant, nisi venisset, they were to have done this, had he not come.

So $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\eta\nu$ in Od. IV, 171: $\kappa a(\mu\nu) \tilde{\epsilon}\phi\eta\nu \tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\delta\nu\tau a \phi\iota\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu \tilde{\epsilon}\xi_{0\chi0\nu}$ $\tilde{a}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$, $\epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu\delta\iota\nu \nu\delta\sigma\tau o\nu \tilde{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$ (Zeús), i. e. I intended to love him (and should have done so) had Zeus granted us a return.

REMARK 1. It will be seen that in the construction of Note 3 a protasis is implied with the apodosis; $\delta \delta e \sigma \epsilon \tau \delta \sigma \sigma \nu \phi \lambda \eta \sigma a$ being strictly equivalent to $\tau \delta \tau \sigma \nu \delta \nu \delta \phi \lambda \eta \sigma a$; $\delta \epsilon \delta \tau \sigma \delta \delta \sigma \tau a \delta \delta \sigma \tau \sigma \delta \tau \eta \sigma a$, you would have loved 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 expressed protasis, if one is added. In the third example under a (HDT. 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 $\chi \rho \eta \nu$ 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 rather than the infinitive, we have $\chi \rho \eta \nu$ and λ , $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota$ and $\pi \rho o \sigma \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ and $\lambda \kappa c.,$ forming an ordinary apodosis (§ 49, 2). Thus el tà déouta obtou συνεβούλευσαν, οὐδέν αν ύμας νῦν ἔδει βουλεύεσθαι, if these men haa given the necessary advice, there would now be no need of your deliberating, 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 Erat. § 32, we find, $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon$, $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a$ χρηστώς, τοις μέλλουσιν άδίκως αποθανείσθαι μηνυτήν γενέσθαι, if 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, oùk eyevou unvurns); but in § 48, referring to the same thing, the orator says, $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu d\nu \eta \rho d\gamma a \theta \delta s$, $\epsilon \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu d \nu \pi \rho \tilde{\omega} \tau o \nu$ μέν μή παρανόμως άρχειν, έπειτα τη βουλή μηνυτήν γενέσθαι, κ.τ.λ., if he had been a good man, it would have been his duty, &c. (implying où $\kappa \, \epsilon \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$). The latter construction, however, is very rare where the former would be admissible.

The distinction between $\delta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \tau \sigma \delta \tau \sigma \nu \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \tilde{\iota} v$ and $\delta \delta \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \delta \epsilon \tau \sigma \delta \tau \sigma \nu \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \tilde{\iota} v$ would be expressed in Latin by te oportebat hunc amare and te oporteret hunc amare.

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. Thus we translate obx $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota$ or $\tauo\bar{v}\tau\sigma$ $\pioi\sigma\sigma$ and $\sigma the is$, 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 our $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota$ or $\tau o \tilde{\iota} \tau \sigma$ $\pi o \iota \epsilon \tilde{\nu}$ 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 § 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota$ or $\epsilon \psi l \lambda \tilde{\epsilon} \tilde{\nu}$, oportebat te amare, and $\delta\epsilon \tilde{\epsilon}$ or $\epsilon \psi l \lambda \tilde{\epsilon} \tilde{\nu}$, oportet te amare, — both being 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 § 15, 1, and § 23, 1. The equivalent Latin forms (facere representing both $\pi ou \hat{\epsilon} v$ and $\pi ou \hat{\eta} \sigma ai$) will make this clear.

REMARK 3. It must not be understood that the Imperfects $\epsilon_{\chi\rho\eta\nu}$ $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota$, &c. with the Infinitive are always used in the construction of Note 3. Thus $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$, in DEM. F. L. 379, 14, means simply but he was obliged to remain (and did remain).

TE Piker mg = i'run yo dus - & love

1-1

Note 4. (a.) In Π . XXIII, 526 $\kappa \epsilon$ is used with a secondary tense of the Indicative in protasis, apparently adding nothing to the sense. (See § 50, 2. N. 2, b.)

El δέ κ' έτι προτέρω γ ένετο δρόμος ἀμφοτέροισιν, Τῷ κέν μιν παρέλασσ' οὐδ' ἀμφήριστον ἔθηκεν.

(b.) When $\vec{a}\nu$ stands in the protasis with a secondary tense of the Indicative in Attic Greek, the expression is so obviously an apodosis at the same time, as to present no difficulty. "A ν can never ccalesce with ϵi to form $\epsilon \vec{a}\nu$ in these sentences, as it always belongs to the verb. E. g.

El τοίνυν τοῦτο ἰσχυρὸν ἢν ἂν τούτῷ τεκμήριον, κἰμοὶ γενέσθῳ τεκμήρου, κ.τ.λ., 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. DEM. Timoth. 1201, 19. (This sentence properly belongs to the class of § 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 DEM. Cor. 260, 2, καὶ τίς οὐκ ἂν ἀπέκτεινέ με δικαίως, εἶ τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων τῆ πόλει καλῶν λόγω μόνον καταισχύνεων ἐπεχείρησ' ἄν; if we retain the final ἂν (which is strongly supported by Mss. anthority), we must translate εἰ ἐπεχείρησ' ἄν if it is true that I would (under any circumstances) have undertaken, &c., and not simply if I had undertaken (εἰ ἐπεχείρησα). 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.

El μèν οἶν σύ με ἡρώτας τι τῶν νῦν δὴ, εἶπ ον ἂν, κ.τ.λ., if then you were asking me any one of the questions before us, I should (at once) say, &c. PLAT. Euthyph. 12 D. El ἐπεθύμεις ταύτης (τῆς σοφίας), καὶ ἐγώ σε ἐτύγχανον ἀνερωτῶν, κ.τ.λ., τί ἄν μοι ἀπεκρίνω; 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. 318 A; Gorg. 447 D; Symp. 199 D.

NOTE 6. (a.) In a very few passages in Homer we find the Optative with $\kappa \epsilon$ in the apodosis referring to the past, where we should expect a secondary tense of the Indicative. E. g.

Kaí vů $\kappa \epsilon \nu \ \epsilon \nu \ \delta \nu \ \delta \alpha \ \delta \lambda o \iota \tau o \ \delta v a \ \delta \rho \ \delta \nu \ \lambda \delta \rho \ \delta \nu \ \lambda \delta \rho \ \delta \nu \ \delta \nu \ \delta \rho \ \delta \nu \ \delta \nu \ \delta \rho \ \delta \nu \ \delta \nu \ \delta \nu \ \delta \rho \ \delta \nu \$

(b.) The Imperfect Indicative is not used in Homer in the construction of \S 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.

Εἰ μέν τις τὸν ὄνειρον ᾿Αχαιῶν ἄλλος ἔνισπε, ψεῦδός κεν φαίμεν, καὶ νοσφιζοίμεθα μάλλον, i. e. if any other one had told it, we should call it a falsehood, 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 Indicative: εί νῦν ἐπὶ ἄλλω ἀθλεύοιμεν, ἦ τ' άν ἐγώ τὰ πρώτα λαβών κλισίηνδε φεροίμην, i. e. if we were now contending in honor of another (than Patroclus), I should take the first prize and bear it to my The present Optative in Homer is used also in its regular tent. 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 $\epsilon \dot{a}\nu$, $\ddot{a}\nu$ (\bar{a}), or $\eta\nu$ (Epic $\epsilon i \kappa \epsilon$ or $a i \kappa \epsilon$).

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.

'Εάν τι λάβω, δώσω σοι, if I (shall) receive anything, I will give it to you. 'Εάν τι λάβης, δός μοι, if you receive anything, give it to me. Ei δέ κεν δις έρξης καί τοι πείθωνται 'Αχαιοὶ, γνώση ἔπειθ' ὅς θ΄ ήγεμόνων κακὸς ὅς τέ νυ λαῶν, 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. II. II, 364. (For εĭ κε see § 47, 2.) Aĭ κ' αὐτὸν γνώω νημερτέα πάντ' ἐνέποντα, ἔσσω μιν χλαϊνάν τε χιτῶνά τε, εἶματα gλά. Od. XVII, 549. So aĭ κε δώσι, II. I, 128. (See § 47, 1, Νούκ.) Εἰ μέν κεν Μενέλαον 'Αλέξανδρος καταπέφνη, αὐτὸς ἔπειθ' Έλένην ἐχ έτω καὶ κτήματα πάντα, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν νήεσσι νεώμεθα ποντοπόροισιν· εἰ δέ κ' 'Αλέξανδρον κτείνη ξανθὸς Μενέλαος, Τρῶας ἔπειθ' Έλένην καὶ κτήματα πάντ' ἀποδοῦναι. II. ΗΙ, 128. Here ἐχέτω νεώμεθα (Subj. in exhortation), and ἀποδοῦναι (Infin. for Impera tive) aue iu the apodosis. Αἴ κα τῆνος ἕλ η κεραὸν τράγον, αἶγα το λαψỹ. THEOC. I, 4. *Αν δέ τις ἀνθιστῆται, σιν ὑμῦν πειρα-

50, 1.] SUBJUNCTIVE AND FUTURE INDICATIVE.

ο 5μεθα χειρούσθαι, if any one shall stand opposed to us, we will try to overcome him. XEN. An. VII, 3, 11. * Αν μή νυν έθέλωμεν έκεί πολεμείν αὐτῷ, ἐνθάδ' ἴσως ἀναγκασθησόμεθα τοῦτο ποιείν, if we shall not new be willing to fight him there, we shall perhaps be forced to do so here. DEM. Phil. I, 54, 20. Here vur refers to time immediately following the present: if Dem. had meant if we are not noto willing, he would have said $\epsilon i \mu \eta \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \hat{\epsilon} \theta \hat{\epsilon} \lambda o \mu \epsilon \nu$ (§ 49, 1). *H ν γὰρ ταῦτα καλῶς δρισώμεθα, ἄμεινον βουλευσόμεθα καὶ περὶ τῶν άλλων. Isoc. Pac. p. 162 D. § 18. *Ην δέ την εἰρήνην ποιησώμεθα, καὶ τοιούτους ἡμῶς αὐτοὺς παράσχωμεν, μετὰ πολλῆς ἀσφαλείας τὴν πόλιν οἰκήσομεν. Ib. p. 163 A. § 20. Ἐὰν οὖν ἔŋς νῦν, πότε ἔσει οἴκοι; XEN. Cyr. V, 3, 27. Καὶ χρῶ αὐτοῖς, ἐὰν δέŋ τι, and use them, if there shall be any need. Ib. V, 4, 30. Ἡν μὲν πόλεμον αίρησθε, μηκέτι ήκετε δεύρο άνευ υπλων, εί σωφρονείτε ήν δέ εἰρήνης δοκητε δείσθαι, άνευ ὅπλων ηκετε ώς δε καλώς έξει τά ύμέτερα, ήν φίλοι γένησθε, έμοι μελήσει. lb. III, 2, 13. 'Eav γάρ τί σε φανώ κακόν πεποιηκώς, όμολογώ άδικειν εάν μέντοι μηδέν φαίνωμαι κακόν πεποιηκώς μηδε βουληθείς, ού και σύ αδ όμολογησεις μηδέν ύπ' έμου άδικείσθαι; Ib. V, 5, 13. (Here όμολογώ must be understood as referring to the future, like δμολογήσεις. § 10, 1, Ν. 7.) Ἐἀν μή ή οἱ φιλόσοφοι βασιλεύσωσιν ή οἱ βασιλής φιλοσοφήσωσιν, ούκ έστι κακών παύλα ταις πόλεσιν, unless either the philosophers shall become kings or the kings philosophers, there is no escape from troubles for states. PLAT. Rep. V, 473 D. Δίδωσ' έκων κτείνειν έαυτον, ην τάδε ψευσθη λέγων. Sopn. Phil. 1342. 'Eàν μή ήμιν βεβοηθηκότες ώσιν, ου δεί ήμας αυτοίς βοηθείν, if they shall not have assisted us, there is no need of our assisting them. "Hu σε τοῦ λοιποῦ ποτ' ἀφέλωμαι χρόνου, κάκιστ' ἀπολοίμην, i. e. may I perish, if I ever take them away. ARIST. Ran. 586. (See §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 $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$) or a Present merely used emphatically for the Future, like $\dot{\delta}\mu \rho \lambda \rho \dot{\varphi}$ above quoted from XEN-Cyr. V, 5. 13, or $\pi a \hat{\upsilon} \lambda \dot{a} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau_i$ from PLAT. Rep. 473 D.

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

NOTE 1. The Future Indicative with ϵi is very often used in the *protasis* in the same sense as the Subjunctive with $\epsilon d\nu$, sometimes alternating with it in the same sentence. This is

103

n crely a more vivid form of expression than the Subjunctive, both corresponding to the English *if I shall do this*, &c. E. g.

Εἰ γὰρ 'Αχιλλεὺς οἶος ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι μαχεῖται, οὐδὲ μίνυνθ' ἔξουσι ποδώκεα Πηλείωνα. if Achilles shall fight, &c. II. XX, 26. Εἰ δὲ σύ γ' ἐς πόλεμον πωλήσεαι, ἤ τέ σ' όίω ῥιγήσειν πόλεμόν γε, καὶ εἴ χ' ἐτέρωθι πύθηαι. II. V, 350. Εἰ δὲ πρὸς τούτοισι ἔτι τελευτήσει τὸν βίον εὖ, οῦτος ἐκεῖνος τὸν σὺ ζητεῖς ὅλβιος κεκλῆσθαι ἄξιώς ἐστι. ΗDT. Ι, 32. (See Rem. 1.) Εἰ μὴ καθ έξεις γλῶσσαν, ἕσται σοι κακά. Ευπ. Aeg. Frag. 5. Εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτ' ἐπιδείξει, πῶς χρὴ ταύτῃ τῆ προκλήσει προσέχειν ὑμᾶς τὸν νοῦν; DEM. Aph. I. 829, 28. Εἰ δ' ὑμεἰς ἅλλο τι γνώσεσθε, ὅ μὴ γένοιτο, τίνα οἴεσθε αὐτὴν ψυχὴν ἕξειν; DEM. Aph. II, 842, 15. (Referring to the same thing, p. 834, 24, Demosthenes had said ἀν γὰρ ἀποφύγῃ με οὖτος, ὅ μὴ γένοιτο, τὴν εἰωβελίαν ὀφλήσω.) 'Ην ἐθείλωμεν ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπὲρ τῶν δικαίων, εὐδοκιμήσομεν' εἰ δὲ φοβησόμεθα τοὺς κινδύνους, εἰς πολλὰς ταραχὰς καταστήσομεν ὑμᾶς αὐτούς. Isoc. Archid. p. 138 A. § 107.

This use of the Future must not be confounded with its less common use in *present* conditions, § 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 $\kappa \epsilon$ is sometimes used in the *apodosis* instead of the Future Indicative, thus making the apodosis correspond in form to the protasis. E. g.

Eì dé $\kappa \epsilon \mu \eta$ dúngour, èvà dé $\kappa \epsilon \nu$ airòs $\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \mu a \iota$, and if he do not give her up, I will take her myself. Il. I, 324. (Compare I, 137.) This gives a form of sentence analogous to that in which the Optative is used in both protasis and apodosis. See § 87, Note. (For the use of dé in apodosis, see below, § 57.)

(b.) "H ν is the only contraction of $\epsilon i \, a\nu$ found in Homer. The most common Homeric form is, however, $\epsilon i \, \kappa \epsilon$ (sometimes $\epsilon i \, \delta \epsilon \, \kappa \epsilon$). El $a\nu$ is rarely found, as II. III, 288.

(c.) Et $\kappa\epsilon$ or at $\kappa\epsilon$ is sometimes found even with the Future Indicative in Homer. E. g.

Αἴ κεν ἄνευ ἐμέθεν . . . Ἐλίου πεφιδήσεται, οὐδ' ἐθελήσε εκπήρσαι, ἴστω τοῦτο. Π. ΧΥ, 213.

For $\kappa\epsilon$ (and even $d\nu$) with the Future in apodosis, see § 37, 2.

(d.) The simple ϵi (without $a\nu$ or $\kappa \epsilon$) is often used with the Subjunctive in Homer, apparently in the same sense as $\epsilon i \kappa \epsilon$ or the Attic $\epsilon a\nu$. E. g.

Εἰδ' αὖ τις ῥαίησι θεῶν ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντω, τλήσομαι ἐν στήθεσσι» ἔχων ταλαπενθέα θυμών. Od. V, 221. Οὐδὲ πόλινδε ἔρχομαι, εἰ μη πού τι περίφρων Πηνελόπεια ἐλθέμεν ὀτρύνησιν. Od. XIV, 372.

§ 50, 2.] OPTATIVE IN PROTASIS AND APODOSIS.

NOTE 3. (a.) The Homeric use of the simple ϵi with the Subjunctive continues in lyric poetry, and is found in the chorus of the Attic drama, and even in some passages of the ordinary dialogue. E. g.

Εἰ γὰρ θάνης καὶ τελευτήσας ἀφῆς. SOPH. Aj. 496. Δυστάλαινα τἅρ' ἐγὼ, εἴ σου στερηθῶ. SOPH. O. C. 1442. Εἰ μή σ' ἐκΦάγω ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς γῆς, οὐδέποτε βιώσομαι. ARIST. Eq. 698. Εἴ τις εὖ κάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούση. PIND. Isth. IV, 16.

(b.) In Attic prose, this construction is extremely rare, and its existence is denied by many high authorities; if we follow the Mss., however, we must admit it in a few passages, as THUC. VI, 21: Où vaurikîs στρατιâs μόνον δεί, ἀλλὰ καὶ πεζῶν πολὺν ξυμπλεῖν, ἄλλωs τε καὶ εἰ ξυστῶσιν αἱ πόλεις φοβηθεῖσαι. (Here only a few of the worst Mss. read ην for εἰ.)

NOTE 4. For the change from the Subjunctive to the Optative after secondary tenses in indirect discourse, see § 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 ϵi .

The *apodosis* here denotes what *would be* the result if the condition of the protasis should be fulfilled, and takes the Optative with $a\nu$. E. g.

Εἰ έλθοι, πάντ' ἀν ίδοι, if he should go, he would see all. Εί σ σὕτως ἐθέλοι φιλέειν κήδοιτό τε θυμῷ, τῷ κέν τις κείνων γε καὶ ἐκλελάθοιτο γάμοιο, if she should be willing thus to love y.u., &c Od. III, 223. 'Η κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παίδες. άλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυμῷ, εἰ σφῶιν τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο μαρυαμένοιυ. Π. Ι, 255. (See § 47, 2.) 'Αλλ' εί μοί τι πίθοιο, τό κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη. Π. VII, 28. Εἴης φορητὸς οὐκ ἀν, εἰ πράσσοις καλῶς. AESCH. Prom. 979. Εἰ δέ τις τοὺς κρατοῦντας τοῦ πλήθους ἐπ' ἀρετὴν προτρέψειεν, ἀμφοτέρους ἀν ὀνήσειε. Isoc. ad Nicocl. p. 16 C. § 8. Εἴης τών σοι συνόντων ἐπαρθείη ποιεία. α σὺ τυγχάνεις εὐλογῶν, πῶς οὐκ ἀν ἀθλιώτατος εἴη; Isoc. Busir. p. 230 C. § 47. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀν Μήδοκός με ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπαινοίη, εἰ ἐξελαύνοιμι τοὺς εὐεργέτας. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VII, 7, 11. Εἰ μὴ δυνατὸν ὑπ' ἀὐτῶν είη σωθῆναι, ἀποκτείναιμ' ἀν ἐμαυτόν. DEM. Eubul 1320, 25. Οὐδ' εἰ πάντες ἕλθοιεν Πέρσα, πλήθει γε οὐχ ὑπερβα: λοίμεθ' ἀν τοὺς πολεμίους. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. ΙΙ, 1, 8. Οὐ πολλή ἀ β ἀλογία εἴη, εἰ φοβοῖτο τὸν θάνατον ὁ τοιοῦτος; PLAT. Phaed. 68 Β. Οἰκος δ' αἰνδις οἰν οὐκ ἀν οἰκτρότατα πάντων ἐγὼ πεπουθὼι

5*

 $\epsilon I\eta \nu$, $\epsilon i \,\epsilon \mu \epsilon \, \psi \eta \phi \, i \sigma a \iota \nu \tau \sigma \, \epsilon i \nu a \iota \, \xi \epsilon \nu \sigma \nu$; how then should I not have suffered (lit. be in the condition of having suffered) the most pitiable of all things, if they should vote me a foreigner? DEM. Eubul. 1312, 17. (See § 18, 1, and examples of the Perfect 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 translate both $\epsilon i_{\eta} \ddot{a}_{\nu}$ and $\dot{\eta}_{\nu} \ddot{a}_{\nu}$ by the same English expression, \dot{u} 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 is ear expounder, radius efer, and the latter is ei exponer, radius ar έχοι. (See § 48, I, B, Rem. 2.) In writing Greek, this distinction can 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 $a\nu$; 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 ϵi in the dependent protasis (i. e. the form of § 50, 2, $\epsilon i \ \epsilon \lambda \theta o \iota$ - $\mu \in \nu$, $\kappa a \lambda \hat{\omega} s \hat{a} \nu \hat{\epsilon} \chi a \iota$; while the future Indicative or any other primary form will require a Subjunctive with eav, or a Future Indicative with ei (i. e. the form of § 50, 1, ear er, kalws efer, οι εί έλευσόμεθα, καλώς έξει).

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

NOTE 1. Cases of the omission of $d\nu$ in an apodosis of this class are rare; they occur chiefly in Homer, less frequently in the Attic poets (even then chiefly in questions, and after such expressions as $o\nu\kappa \ \delta\sigma\theta' \ \delta\pi\omega s$), and seldom or never in Attic prose where the text is beyond suspicion on other grounds. E. g.

'Ο δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χειρὶ Τυδείδης, μέγα ἔργον, ὁ οὐ δύο γ' ἄνδρε φέροιεν, which two men could not lift (if they should try). II. V, 303. (See § 52, 2.) Τέαν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἀνδρῶν ὑπερβασία κατά σχοι; SOPH. Ant. 605. 'Αλλ' ὑπέρτολμον ἀνδρὸς Φρόνημα τίς λέγοι; AESCH. Choeph. 594. "Εστ' οὖν ὅπως Άλκηστις ἐς γῆρας μόλοι; EUR. Alc. 52. Οὐκ ἔστ⁰ ὅπως λέξαιμι τὰ ψευδῆ καλά. AESCH. Ag. 620. Οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτω μείζονα μοῖραν νείμαιμ' ἡ σοί. AESCH. Prom. 292. Πῶς οὖν τάδ', ὡς εἰποι τις, ἐξημάρτανες; i. e. as one might say. EUR. Andr. 929. "Ωσπερ εἰποι τις τόπος, as one would say τόπος. (?) ARIST. Αν. 180.

= j) wid have gone .100 Napur \$ 51. AN IN PROTASIS. 107

0

61

=W.

61

= 5.

NOTE 2. (a.) The adverb $\tilde{a}\nu$ is sometimes used with the Optative in the *protasi*, but only when the protasis is itself at the same time an *apodosis*, with another protasis expressed or implied. This is, of course, no exception to the general rule (§ 39); and it is to be noticed that the $\tilde{a}\nu$ in this case always belongs strictly to the verb, and never joins the ϵi to form $\epsilon i \alpha_{\nu}$. E. g.

Οὕτοι παντελῶς, οὐδ' εἰ μὴ ποιήσαιτ' ἀν τοῦτο, εἰκαταΦρόνητόν εστιν, ἰt is not wholly to be despised, even if you would not do this (if an opportunity should occur). DEM. Phil. I, 44, 30. Kai ἐγὼ, εἴπεφ ἄλλφ τφ ἀνθρώπων πειθοίμην ἀν, καὶ σοὶ πείθομαι, if 1 would trust any other man (if he should give me his word), I trust you. PLAT. Prot. 329 B. Εἴ γε μηδὲ δυῦλον ἀκρατῆ δεξαίμεθ' ἀν, πῶς οἰκ ἄξιον αὐτών γε Φυλάξασθαι τοιοῦτον γενέσθαι; if we would not take even a slave who was intemperate (sc. if one should be offered), &c. XEN. Mem. I, 5, 3. (Such conditional sentences as the three preseding belong properly under § 49, 1. Compare the last example under § 54, Rem.) See § 49, 2, N. 4, b.

So occasionally in Homer; as II. V, 273, $\epsilon i \tau o \dot{\tau} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \lambda \dot{a} \beta o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\dot{a} \rho o \dot{\mu} \epsilon \theta \dot{a} \kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \dot{\epsilon} o s \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \lambda \dot{o} \nu$, if we could (in any case) obtain these, we should gain great glory; and II. I, 60, Ei κεν θ $\dot{a} \nu a \tau \dot{o} \nu \gamma \epsilon \phi \dot{v} \gamma o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$, if we would escape death (where $\epsilon i \theta \dot{a} \nu a \tau o \nu \phi \dot{v} \gamma o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ would mean if we should ever escape death).

(b.) Commonly, however, when $\epsilon i \kappa \epsilon$ occurs in Homer, $\kappa \epsilon$ belongs to the ϵi , and no force of an apodosis is perceptible. Here, as in final clauses (§ 44, 1, N. 3, a), the $\kappa \epsilon$ adds nothing to the sense that can be expressed in English. E. g.

Πως αν έγω δέοιμι μετ' άθανάτοισι θεοΐσιν, εί κεν "Αρης οι χοιτο χρέος και δεσμον αλύξας. Od. VIII, 352. Των κέν τοι χαρίσαιτο πατήρ απερείσι' αποινα, εί κεν έμε ζωον πεπύθοιτ' έπι νηυσιν 'Αχαιών. II. VI, 49.

But if the $\kappa \epsilon$ is separated from the ϵi (except by $\mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \epsilon$, $\tau \epsilon$, $\gamma \dot{a}\rho$, &c.), 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 § 26, that the *Future* Optative cannot be used in protasis or apodosis, except in indirect discourse to represent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse.

NOTE 4. For a rare Homeric use of the Optative for the Imperfect or Aorist Indicative, see § 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 of a series or class of acts, and not to a definite act or

And tig hartine 150g that such 16 Ito Such 1 . . .

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 $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{a}\nu$ after primary tenses, and the Optative with $\epsilon\dot{i}$ after secondary tenses. The *apodosis* may take the Present or Imperfect Indicative, or any other form which implies repetition. E. g.

"Hu more das ubs lkn t al, sol td yépas mold ueilou (sc. èstiv), if ever a division comes, your prize is always much greater. II. I, 166. "Hu èyyds $\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda \theta_{3}$ dávaros, oddels βούλεται θνήσκειν, if (or when) death comes near, no one is (ever) willing to die. EUR. Alc. 671. "Amas λάγος, âν à mỹ tà πράγματα, μάταιών τι φαίνεται καὶ κενών, all speech, if deeds are wanting, appears mere empliness and vanity. DEM. OI. II, 21, 20. Διατελεί μισων, οὐκ ἤν τίς τι αὐτὸν ἀδικỹ, ἀλλ' ἐἀν τινα ὑποπτεύση βελτίονα ἑαυτοῦ εἶναι, he continues to hate, not if any one wrongs him, but if he ever suspects that any one is better than himself. XEN. Cyr. V, 4, 35. Εὐλαβοῦ τὰς διαβολὰς, κῶν ψευδεῖς ὦσιν, beware of slanders, even when they are false. Isoc. Demon. p. 5 C. § 17.

Εἰ δέ τινας θορυβουμένους αἴσθοιτο, τὸ αἴτιον τούτου σκοπῶν κατασβεννύναι τὴν ταραχὴν ἐπειρᾶτο, whenever he saw any making a disturbance, he always tried, &c. XEN. Cyr. V, 3, 55. Οὐκ ἀπελείπετο ἔτι αἰτοῦ, εἰ μή τι ἀναγκαῖον εἴη, he never left him, unless there was some necessity for it. XEN. Mem. IV, 2, 40. Εἴ τις ἀντείπο., εἰθὺς τεθνήκει, if any one refused, he was immediately put to death. THUC. VIII, 66. ¹Ην τοῖς μὲν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐπικούρημα τῆς χιόνος, εἴ τις μέλαν τι ἔχων πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν πορεύαιτο, τῶν δὲ ποδῶν εἴ τις κινοῖτο. XEN. An. IV. 5, 13. ¹ΑΛΛ εἶ τι μὴ φέροιμεν, ὥτρυνεν φέρειν. ΕUR. Alc. 755. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἶδον αἰτον τάχιστα, σύλλαβότετς ἄγουσιν ἄντικρυς ὡς ἀποκτενοῦντες, οὖπερ καὶ τοὺς ἅλλους ἀπέσφαττον, εἰ τινα ληστὴν ἡ κακοῦργον συλλμβοιεν, i. e. where they had been in the habit of killing any others whom they took. LYS. Agor. p. 137, § 78.

The Optative in these examples, referring to past time, must be especially distinguished from the Optative in ordinary protasis (§ 50, 2), referring to the future. Et and $\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ in this construction are almost equivalent to $\ddot{\sigma}\tau\epsilon$ or $\ddot{\sigma}\tau\omega$ (which are the more common expressions), and the protasis has precisely the same construction as the relative sentences of § 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 § 30, can be used in the apodosis of these general propositions. The gnomic Aorist, as usual, is considered a *primary* tense (§ 32, 2). E. g.

10

*Hν σφαλῶσιν, ἀντελπίσαντες ἄλλα ἐπλήρωσαν τὴν χρείαν, if they fail, they aiways supply the deficiency, &c. Thuc. 1, 70. *Hν δέ τις τούτων τι παραβαίνη, ζημίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπέθεσαν, they (always) impose a penalty upon every one who transgresses. XEN. Cyr. 1, 2, 2. Εί τινες ἰδοιέν πη τοὺς σφετέρους ἐπικρατοῦντας, ἀνεθάρσησαν ἄν, whenever any saw their friends in any way victorious, they would be encouraged (i. e. they were encouraged in all such cases). THUC. VII, 71. (See § 30, 2, and XEN. Mcm. 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 scntences (§ 62).

NOTE 2. Here, as in ordinary protasis, the poets sometimes use the simple ϵi with the Subjunctive instead of $\epsilon d\nu$. (See § 50, 1, N 3.) E. g.

Είπερ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψη, ἀλλλά γε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον, ὄφρα τελέσση. Π. Ι, 81.

Εί δὲ φύγη μὲν κῆρα τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο,

Νικήσας δ' αίχμης άγλαὸν εὖχος έλη,

Πάντες μιν τιμώσιν όμως νέοι ήδε παλαιοί,

Πολλά δέ τερπνά παθών έρχεται είς 'Λίδην. ΤΥΠΤ. ΧΗ, 35.

'Αλλ' άνδρα, κεί τις η σοφός, το μανθάνειν

Πόλλ' αἰσχρον οὐδέν και τὸ μή τείνειν άγαν. SOPH. Ant. 710.

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.

Et ris δύο $\hat{\eta}$ καὶ πλέους ris $\hat{\eta}\mu \acute{e}\rho as <math>\lambda \circ \gamma \acute{l} \zeta \epsilon \tau a\iota$, $\mu \acute{a}\tau ai \acute{o}s \acute{e}\sigma \tau v$, if any one counts upon two or even more days, he is a fool. SOPH. Trach. 944. 'Ελευθέρως πολιτεύομεν, οὐ δἰ ởργῆς τὸν πέλας, εἰ καθ ἰβονήν τι $\delta \rho \tilde{a}$, ἔχοντες, 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 $\delta \rho \tilde{a}$ is used as if some particular act of some one neighbor, and not any act of any neighbor, were in the speaker's mind.) Et ris τι ἐπηρώτα, ἀπεκρίνοντο, if any one asked anything, they replied (to all such). THUC. VII, 10. 'Εμίσει οὐκ εἰ τις κακῶς πάσχων ἡμ ὑν ετο, ἀλλ' εἰ τις εὐεργετούμενος ἀχάριστος φαίνοιτο. XEN. Ages. XI, 3. (Here, without any apparent reason, the writer changes from the Indicative to the Optative.) See § 62. N. 1.

This use of the Indicative is exceptional in Greek, but 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 ϵi or $\epsilon a \nu$, but is either *implied* in something that precedes or follows, or *expressed* in a participle, a preposition with its case, an adverb like $o \upsilon \tau \omega s$, 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 ϵi or $\dot{\epsilon} a\nu$, 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.

Toῦτο ποιοῦντες εἶ πράξουσιν (i. e. ἐἰν ποιῶσιν), if they shall do this (habitually), they will prosper. Τοῦτο ποιήσαντες εἶ πράξουσιν (i. e. ἐἰν ποιήσωσιν), if they shall (once) do this, they will prosper. Τοῦτο ποιοῦντες εἶ ἀν πράττοιεν (i. e. εἰ ποιοῖεν), if they should do this (habitually), they would prosper. Τοῦτο ποιήσαντες εὖ ἀν πράττοιεν (i. e. εἰ ποιήσαιεν), if they should (once) do this, they would prosper. Τοῦτο ποιοῦντες εὖ ἀν ἔπραττον (i. e. εἰ ἐποίουν), if they were doing this (or if they had been doing this), they would be in prosperity. Τοῦτο ποιήσαντες εὖ ἀν ἔπραττον (i. e. εἰ ἐποίησαν), if they had done this, they would be in prosperity.

Îlŵs δητα δίκης ο ὕσης ό Ζεὐς οὐκ ἀπόλωλεν τὸν πατέρ' αὐτοῦ δήσας; i. e. how is it that Zeus has not been destroyed, if Justice exists? ARIST. Nub. 904. (Here δίκης οὕσης represents εἰ δίκη ἐστίν-) 'Aλλ' εἰσόμεσθα δόμους παραστείχοντες (i. e. ἐὰν παραστείχωμεν), but we shall know, if we shall enter the house. SOPH. Ant. 1255. Σὐ δὲ κλύων εἴσει τάχα (i. e. ἐὰν κλύης), but you will soon know, if you listen. ARIST. Av. 1375. So μὴ μαθών, unless I learn, for ἐὰν μὴ μάθω, Nub. 792. Kai κεν τοῦτ' ἐθέλοιμι Διός γε διδόντος ἀρέσθαι, and this I should like to obtain, if Zeus would only give it. Od. I, 390. (Here Διός διδόντος = εἰ Ζεὐς διδοίη.) Τοιαῦτά τἂν γυναιξὶ συνναίων ἕχοις (i. e. εἰ συναίοις), such things would you suffer, if you should

§ 52, 1.] ELLIPSIS OR SUBSTITUTION IN PROTASIS.

live with women. AESCH. Sept. 195. Οὐδ' αν σιωπήσαιμι την ατην όρων στείχουσαν αστοίς (i.e. εί όρωμι). SOPH. Ant. 185. 'Αθηναίων δέ το αύτο τοῦτο παθόντων, διπλασίαν αν την δύναμιν εἰκάζεσθαι (oiµaı), but if the Athenians should ever suffer this $(\pi\alpha\theta \delta\nu\tau\omega\nu = \epsilon i$ $\pi \dot{a} \theta_{0ie\nu}$, I think it would be inferred that their power was twice as great. THUC. I, 10. (Here nothing but the context shows that παθόντων does not represent εί επαθον, if they had ever suffered.) Μαμμάν δ' άν αιτήσαντος ήκών σοι φέρων άν άρτον. and if you ever asked for something to eat. I used to come bringing you bread. ARIST. Nub. 1383. (Here aitnoavros represents el aitnoeias in a general supposition, § 51. For hov av see § 30, 2, and § 42, 3.) Ipiv γενέσθαι ηπίστησεν αν τις ακούσας (i. e. ει ηκουσεν), before it happened, any one would have disbelieved such a thing, if he had heard it. ΤΠUC. VII, 28. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν μεταπείθειν ὑμῶς ἐζή-ει μὴ τοιαύτης ovons the inappoints inoly $\epsilon \omega s$, for he would not be seeking to change your minds, if such were not the prevailing opinion (i. e. ei µn) τοιαύτη ήν). DEM. Cor. 304, 1. Μή κατηγορήσαντος Αἰσχίνου μηδέν έξω της γραφής ούδ' αν έγω λόγον ουδένα εποιούμην έτερον (i. e. εί μή κατηγόρησεν). Ib. 236, 28. Τὰ αὐτὰ ἂν ἔπραξε καὶ πρώτη λαχοῦσα (i. e. εἰ πρώτη ἕλαχεν), it (the soul) 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.

Tò μèν ἐπ' ἐκείνω πολλάκις αν διελύθησαν, if it had depended on him, they often would have been disbanded. Isoc. Pan. p. 70 B. § 142. Διά γε ὑμᾶς aðroðs πάλαι αν ἀπολώλειτε, if it had depended on your selves, you would long ago have been ruined. DEM. Cor. 242, 10. (So καθ ὑμᾶς.) Πάλαι γὰρ ἂν ἕνεκά γε ψ η φισμάτων ἐδεδωκει δίκην, for, if decrees were of any avail, he would long ago have suffered punishment. DEM. OI. III, 32, 16. (Here the protasis is implied in ἕνεκῶ ψηφισμάτων.) Οὕτω γὰρ οὐκέιι τοῦ λοιποῦ πάσχοιμεν ἂν κακῶς, for in that case we should no longer suffer. DEM. Phil. I, 44. 12. So ὡς οῦτω περιγενόμενος αν, XEN. An. I, 1, 10. Οὐδ' ἂν δικαίως ἐς κακὸν πέσοιμίτι. SOPH. Ant. 240.

In these cases the form of the apodosis will generally show what form of protasis is implied. When the apodosis is itself expressed by an Infinitive or Participle (§ 53), as in Tnuc. 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 Indicative, 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 unnecessary. The Aorist participle in protasis can always represent an Aorist Subjunctive in the sense explained § 20, N. 1.

NOTE 1. An ellipsis of the verb of the protasis takes place in the Homeric $\epsilon i \ \delta' \ \tilde{a}\gamma\epsilon$, for $\epsilon i \ \delta \epsilon \ \beta o \upsilon \lambda \epsilon i$, $\tilde{a}\gamma\epsilon$, and in such expressions as $\epsilon i \mu \eta \delta \iota a \tau o \upsilon \tau o$, had it not been for this. E. g.

111

Eì ở ắyẽ, τοι κεφαλη κατανεύσομαι. Π. Ι, 524. Eì ở ắyẽ μην, πείρησαι, ΐνα γνώωσι και οῗδε, but if you wish, come now, try it. Π. Ι, 302. Kai ei μη διὰ τὸν πρύταυν, ἐνέπεσεν ἄν, and, had it not been for the Prytanis, he would have been thrown in. PLAT. Gorg. 516 E. (Compare διά γε ὑμᾶs, DEM. Cor. 242, 10, quoted § 52, 1.) Où γῶ ώς ei μη διὰ Λακεδαιμονίους, οἰδ' ῶς ei μη Πρόξειον οἰχ ὑπεδέξαντο, οἰδ' ῶς ei μη διὰ 'Υμήσιππον, οἰδ' ὡς ei μη διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸ, ἐσώθησαν ἂν οἱ Φωκεῖς, οἰχ οὕτω τότε ἀπήγγειλεν, for he did not then report that, if it had not been for the Lacedaemonians, — or if they had not refused to receive Proxenus, — or if it had not been for Hegesippus, -- or if it had not been for this and that, — the Phocians would have been sared. DEM. F. L. 364, 12. So ei μη κρεμάσας, had I not done it by hanging μη, &c. ARIST. Nub. 229. So in alternatives: see Note 2. (Ci. § 53, Note 1.)

NOTE 2. In alternatives, $\epsilon i \ \delta \epsilon \ \mu \eta$, otherwise, regularly introduces the latter clause, even when the former clause is negative. Ei $\delta \epsilon \ \mu \eta$ is much more common than $\epsilon a \nu \ \delta \epsilon \ \mu \eta$, even when $\epsilon a \nu \ \mu \epsilon \nu$ with the Subjunctive precedes. E. g.

Πρὸς ταῦτα μὴ τύπτ' εἰ δὲ μὴ, σαυτόν ποτ' aἰτιάσει, therefore do not beat me; but if you do, you will have yourself to blame for it. ARIST. Nub. 1433. Πόλεμον οὐκ εἴων ποιεῖν' εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ aἰτοὶ ἀναγκασθήσεσθαι ἐφασαν φίλους ποιεῖσθαι οῦς οὐ βούλονται, they said that otherwise (εἰ δὲ μἡ) they should be obliged, &c. ΤΗUC. Ι, 28. Εἶπον (Παυσανία) τοῦ κήρυκος μὴ λείπεσθαι εἰ δὲ μὴ, πόλεμον αὐτῷ Σπαρτιάτας προαγορεύειν, they ordered him not to be left behind by the herald: and if he should be (εἰ δὲ μἡ), (they told him) that the Spartans declared war against him. Id. Ι, 131. Ἐὰν μέν τι ὑμῦν δοκῶ λέγειν ἀληθὲς, ξυνομολογήσατε εἰ δὲ μὴ, παντὶ λόγῷ ἀντιτείνετε. ΡLAT. Phaed. 91 C. So in DEM. Phil. III, p. 129, 14, ἐὰν μὲν πείσητε, ... εἰ δὲ μὴ, κ.τ.λ.

2. The protasis is often altogether suppressed, leaving only an Optative with $a\nu$ or an Indicative with $a\nu$ 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.

^{*}Iσως [‡]ν οὖν τις ἐπιτιμήσειε τοῖς εἰρημένοις, perhaps some one might (if he pleased) find fault with what has been said. ISOC. Areop. p. 146 E. § 36. Τῷ οὐκ [‡]ν βασιλῆας ἀνὰ στόμ[‡] ἔχων ἀγορεύοις, therefore you should not take kings upon your tongue and talk (i. e. you would not, if you should do as you ought). II. II, 250. Τοῦτο οῦτ [†]ν οὖτος ἔχοι λέγειν οῦθ' ὑμεῖς πεισθείητε, neither would he be able to say this (if he should try), nor would you believe it. DEM. Andr. 598, 20. 'Hdéws d' âν ἕγωγ' ἐροίμην Λεπτίνην, but I would gladly ask Leptines (if an opportunity should offer). Id. Lept. 496, 8. Δειξάτω ώς οἱ Θετταλοὶ νῦν οἰκ ầν ἐλεύθεροι γένοιντο ἄσμενοι, let him show that they would not now gladly become free (if they could). Id. OI. II, 20, 18. Βασίλεια οἰκοδομεῖν ἥρχετο, ὡς ầν ἰκανὰ ἀπομάχεσθαι εἴη, so that it might be strong enough to fight from (if it should be necessary). XEN. Cyr. III, 1, 1.

Où yàp $\eta\nu$ δ $\tau\iota$ $\delta\nu$ $\epsilon\pi$ o $\iota\epsilon$ $i\tau\epsilon$, for there was nothing that you could have done (if you had tried). DEM. Cor. 240, 15. $\Pi o(\omega\nu \delta) \delta \nu \epsilon \rho\gamma \omega\nu$ η $\pi \delta\nu\omega\nu \eta$ $\kappa\iota\nu\delta\dot{\nu}\omega\nu$ $\delta\pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a\nu$; and from what acts, §c., would they have shrunk (i. e. if they had been required)? ISOC. Pan. p. 57 C. § 83. $\Pi o\lambda o\delta$ $\gamma a\rho \delta\nu \eta \nu$ $\delta\xi a$, for they would be worth much (if that were true). PLAT. Rep. II, 374 D. So $\beta o\nu\lambda o(\mu\eta\nu \ d\nu$ (velim), *I* could wish (in a certain future case); $\epsilon\beta ou\lambda o(\mu\eta\nu \ d\nu$ (velim), *I* should now wish (on a certain condition, not fulfilled).

Note. The Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$, 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.

Λέγοις αν, you may speak (lit. you could speak, if you should desire it), implying εἰ βούλοιο. Σὺ μὲν κομίζοις αν σεαυτὸν ỹ θέλεις, you may take yourself off whither you please. SOPH. Antig. 444. (This is merely a milder expression than κόμιζε.) Κλύοις αν ἤδη, Φοῖβε προστατήριε, i. e. hear now. Id. El. 637. Χωροῖς αν ἤδη, Φοῖβε προστατήριε, i. e. hear now. Id. El. 637. Χωροῖς αν ἤδη, Φοῖβε τι; in what other direction then, said I, shall we turn (lit. should we turn, if we should wish)? PLAT. Euthyd. 290 A. Οὐκ αν μεθείμην τοῦ θρόνου, I will not give up the throne. ARIST. Ran. 830.

REMARK. In such examples as HDT. I, 2, 'E $\lambda\lambda\eta'\omega\omega\nu \tau\iota\nu\dot{a}s \phi a\sigma\iota \dot{a}\rho\pi\dot{a}\sigma a\iota E\dot{\nu}\rho\dot{\omega}\pi\eta\nu \cdot \epsilon \ddot{l}\eta\sigma a\nu \delta' \dot{a}\nu o \dot{v}\tau o\iota K\rho\eta\tau\epsilons$, there is no exceptional use of the Optative with $\ddot{a}\nu$ referring to the past; but the meaning is these would prove to be Cretans (if we should examine the case). So avera $\delta\epsilon$ oùx $\dot{a}\nu$ mo $\lambda\lambda\dot{a}$ i ϵ l' $\eta\sigma a\nu$, these would not prove (on investigation) to have been many. THUC. 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 finite verb in the apodosis would have taken $a\nu$, that particle is joined with the Infinitive or Participle. The *Present* Infinitive or Participle with $a\nu$ represents

н

113

either an Imperfect Indicative with $a\nu$, or a Present Optative with $a\nu$; 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 $a\nu$ represents the Indicative or the Optative. E. g.

'Ηγοῦμαι, εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, πάντα καλῶς ἔχειν, I believe that, if you are doing this, all is well. 'Ηγοῦμαι, ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιῆτε, πάντα 'καλῶς ἕξειν, I believe that, if you (shall) do this, all will be well. 'Ηγοῦμαι, εἰ τοῦτο ποιοῖτε, πάντα καλῶς ἀν ἔχειν, I believe that, if you should do this, all would be well. 'Ηγοῦμαι, εἰ τοῦτο ἐποιήσατε, πάντα καλῶς ἀν ἕχειν, I believe that, if you had done this, all would (now) be well. Oἶδα ὑμῶς, ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιῆτε, εὖ πράξοντας, I know that, if you do this, you will prosper. Σκέμματα τῶν ῥαδίως ἀποκτιννύντων καὶ ἀναβιωσκομένων γ' ἂν, εἰ οἶοί τε ἦσαν, 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. (Ἀναβιωσκομένων ἄν=ἀνεβιώσκοντο ἄν.) See the examples of each tense of the Infinitive and Participle with ấν, under § 41 and § 73.

Πως γὰρ οἴεσθε δυσχερῶς ἀκούειν 'Ολυνθίους, εἴ τίς τι λέγοι κατὰ Φιλίππου κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους; how unwillingly do you think they heard it, if any one said anything against Philip in those times ? DEM. Phil. II, 70, 25. (Here ἀκούειν represents the Imperfect ἤκουον, § 15, 3.) For an example of the Perfect Infinitive with α̈ν, 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.

'AAÀ' eì μèv δώσουσι γέρας μεγάθυμοι 'Aχαιοὶ, ἄρσαντες κατὰ θυμὸν, öπως ἀντάξιον ἕσται, — eì δέ κε μὴ δώωσιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕλωμαι. II. I. 135. (Here we must understand eὖ ἕξει, it will be well, or something similar, after ἕσται.) Εἶ περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλησιν 'Ολύμπιος ἀσ εροπητὴς ἐξ ἐδέων στυφελίξαι — ό γὰρ πολὺ φέρτατός ἐστιν. II. I, 580. (Here we must understand he can do it after the protasis. The following γάρ refers to this suppressed apodosis.) Εἰ μèν ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἰκανῶς διἀακω οῖους δεῖ πρὸς ἀλλῆλους εἶναι · — εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ παρὰ τῶν προγεγευημένων μανθάνετε. 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 *implied* in the context. Here the form of the protasis is determined by the implied apodosis. In such sentences ϵi or $i d \mu$ § 53.] ELLIPSIS OR SUBSTITUTION IN APODOSIS.

may generally be translated by supposing that, or in case that. E. g.

115

Τούνεκα νων τά σά γούναθ ικάνομαι, αι κ' έθέλησθα κείνου λυγρών όλεθρον ένισπείν, therefore I am now come to your knees, 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 ikávo- $\mu a \iota$ does not contain the apodosis to $a \iota \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \partial \epsilon \lambda \eta \sigma \partial a$, which is rather implied in what follows.) Τών νῦν μιν μνήσασα παρέζεο και λαβέ γούνων, αί κεν πως έθέλησιν έπι Τρώεσσιν άρηξαι, grasp his knees, in case he shall be willing to assist the Trojans (i. c. that you may cause him to assist them, if he shall be willing). II. I, 408. So at Kev nus βούλεται (often explained as an indirect question), Il. I, 66. Οὐκοῦν έτι έλλείπεται το ην πείσωμεν υμας ώς χρη ήμας αφείναι; is not 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. "AKOUGOV Kal έμοῦ, ἐάν σοι ταὐτὰ δοκη, hear me also, in case the same shall please you, i. e. that then you may assent to it. Ib. II. 358 B. "Ert Kai you άρὰς ποιοῦνται, «ἴ τις ἐπικηρυκεύεται Πέρσαις, even to this day they invoke curses, if there is any one who sends heralds to the Persians. Isoc. Pan. p. 73 D. § 157. 'Ικέται πρός σε δευρ' αφίγμεθα, εί τινα πόλιν $\phi \rho \dot{a} \sigma \epsilon_i as \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{i} \nu \epsilon \dot{\nu} \epsilon \rho \rho \nu$, we are come hither as suppliants to you, in case you should tell us of some fleecy city (implying thinking that we might go and live in such a city, if you should tell us of one). ARIST. Av. 120. Oi δ' ακτειρον, εἰ άλωσοιντο, and others pitied them, in case they should be captured (i. c. thinking what they would suffer if they should be captured). XEN. An. I. 4. 7. Προς την πόλιν, εί επιβοηθοίεν, εχώρουν, they marched towards the city, in case they (the citizens) should rush out (i. e. that they might meet them, if they should rush out). THUC. VI, 100. Ous hv Tou Tokepou nepas ous άπαλλαγή Φιλίππω, εί μή Θηβαίους και Θετταλούς έχθμους ποιήσειε τη πόλει, 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. **Рем.** Сог. 276, 1. See Soph. O. C. 1770; Plat. Rep. IV, 434 Å.

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

NOTE 3. Sometimes the adverb $\tilde{a}\nu$ stands alone to represent the apodosis, when the verb to which it belongs can be easily supplied from the context. In like manner ϵi alone may represent the pro-

tasis. The expression $5\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho \, d\nu \, \epsilon i$ (sometimes written as one word, $5\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho a\nu\epsilon i$, quasi) includes both cases. See § 42, 3, N. 2, with the examples.

 $\Omega_{\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho}$ with the participle (§ 109, N. 9) generally belongs to an apodosis understood. So in such expressions as $\omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\epsilon i \lambda\epsilon\gamma \sigma is$, as (it would be) if you should say.

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

Oùdè tà ởνόματα οἶόν τε αὐτῶν εἰδέναι, πλ ην εἶ τις κωμωδοποιός τυγχάνει ῶν, it is not possible to know even their names, except (it is possible) in case one happens to be a comedian. PLAT. Apol. 18 C.

REMARK. Expressions of a wish like εἰ γàρ γένοιτο, O that it might be, and εἰ γàρ ἐγένετο, 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 (§§ 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 various explanations: —

1. (a.) When an Indicative in the protasis (in either of the constructions of § 49, 1 or 2) is followed by an Optative with $\vec{a}\nu$ in the apodosis, the latter properly belongs to an *implied* protasis in the Optative (on the principle of § 52, 2). Thus, in the sentence $\epsilon i \tau a \tilde{\nu} \tau a$ or $\tilde{\tau} \kappa \tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi} \epsilon_{\iota}$, $o \tilde{\nu} \kappa \tilde{a} \nu \delta i \kappa a \tilde{\omega} s \kappa \delta a \tilde{\zeta} o i \tau \sigma$, if this is so, he would not justly be punished, $\kappa \delta a \tilde{\zeta} o i \tau \sigma \tilde{a} \nu$ belongs to a protasis in the Optative, if justice should be done, implied in $\delta i \kappa a (\omega s; while the protasis \epsilon i \dots \tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi} \epsilon_{\iota}$ belongs as a condition 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 $\tilde{a}\nu$ in apodosis.

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

Εί δέ τις άθαιάτων γε κατ' οὐρανοῦ εἰλήλουθας, οὐκ αν ἔγωνε θεοίσιν επουρανίοισι μαχοίμην, but if thou art one of the immortals come from heaven, I would not fight against the Gods of heaven. II. VI, 128. (Here the principal protasis to µaχo(µην äv is implied, if 1 should have my choice.) Πολλή γαρ αν ευδαιμονία είη περί τους νέους, εί είς μεν μόνος αυτούς διαφθείρει, οι δ' άλλοι ώφελουσιν, for there would (naturally) be great happiness, &c. PLAT. Apol. 25 B. Ωστ' εί μοι και μέσως ήγούμενοι μάλλον έτέρων προσείναι αὐτὰ πολεμείν έπείσθητε, ούκ άν εικότως νύν του γε άδικειν αιτίαν φεροίμην, if you were persuaded to make war by thinking, Sc., I should not now justly be charged with injustice. THUC. II, 60. (Here a protasis to $\phi \epsilon \rho o(\mu \eta \nu \, d\nu \, is implied in \epsilon i \kappa \delta \tau \omega s.)$ El yap ovto do do s at $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta - \sigma a \nu$, une is a v ou xpew ap x oute, for if these had a right to secole, it would follow that your dominion is unjust. Id. III, 40. El vuv ye δυστυχούμεν, πώς τάναντι άν πράττοντες ού σωζοίμεθ' άν; if now we are unfortunate, how should we not be safe if we should do the opposite? ARIST. Ran. 1449. (Here $\pi p \acute{a} \tau \tau o \nu \tau \epsilon s = \epsilon i \pi p \acute{a} \tau \tau o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ is the principal protasis to which the optative refers.) El $\tau o \tilde{\tau} r \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ χείρουν λέγειν, ούκ έσθ' δστις ούκ αν εικότως επιτιμήσει έμοι, if I were undertaking to say this (§ 49, 2), every one would censure me with reason (i. e. $\epsilon i \ \tau \dot{a} \ \epsilon i \kappa \delta \tau a \ \pi o i \eta \sigma \epsilon i \epsilon v$). DEM. Cor. 296, 24. (Here many Mss., and Dion. Hal. p. 1054, read $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau i \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon$, the ordinary apodosis.) Εί μηδένα των άλλων ίππεύειν είασαν, ούκ άν δικαίως οργίζοισθε αυτοίς. Lys. Alcib. H, § 8.

kaiτοι τότε τὸν Υπερείδην, εἶπερ ἀληθη μου νῦν κατηγορεῖ, μαλλου αν εἰκότως ἡ τόνδ ἐδίωκεν, and yet, if he is now making true charges against me, he would then have prosecuted Hypereides with much more reason than this man. DEM. Cor. 302, 24. (Here ἐδίωκεν ἄν refers chiefly to the implied protasis, if he had done what was more reasonable.) Such examples seldom occur.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν πολλαὶ γέφυραι ὦσιν, ἔχοιμεν ἂν ὅποι φυγώντες ημεῖς σωθῶμεν. XEN. An. II, 4, 19. (Here the implied protasis is if we should wish to escape.) See An. V, 1, 9.

Φρούριον εἰ ποιήσονται, τῆς μὲν γῆς βλάπτοιεν ἄν τιμέρος, οὐ μέντοι ἰκανόν γε ἔσται κωλύειν ἡμᾶς, κ.τ.λ., if they shall build a fort, they might (under favorable circumstances) injure some part of our land; but it will not be sufficient to prevent us, &c. THUC. I, 142.

(b.) A Subjunctive or Future Indicative in the protasis sometimes depends on an Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in the apodosis, when no other protasis can readily be supplied. This expresses the protasis more vividly than the regular Optative. (See § 50, 2, Rem. b, and § 34, 1, b.) It must be remembered also that the Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ is sometimes merely a softened expression for the Future Indicative (§ 52, Note). E. g.

'Ear τοῦτο ποιήσω, καλῶς ἀν ἔχοι, if I do this, it would be well. (Here the irregularity is the same in English as in Greek: the regu lar form in both would be either èàv τοῦτο ποιήσω, καλῶς ἔξει, if I d. this, it will be well; or eì τοῦτο ποιήσαιμι, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι, if I should do this, it would be well.) Kai οῦτως ầν δεινότατα πάιτων πάθοιεν, ei οῦτοι ὁμόψηφοι κατ' ἐκείνων τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῖς τριάκοντα γενήσονται LYS. Agor. p. 139, 6. § 94. (Here we should expect eì γένοιντο.) Τῶν ἀτοποτάτων μέντ' ἂν eἴη, eì, â νῦν ἄνοιαν ὀφλισκάνων ὅμως ἐκλαλεῖ, ταῦτα δυνηθεὶς μὴ πράξει. DEM. Ol. I, 16, 25. ^{*}Ην οὖν μάθης μοι τὸν ἄδικον τοῦτον λόγον, οἰκ âν ἀποδοίην οἰδ ἂν ὀβολὸν οἰδενί, if you shall learn this for me, I will not (or I would not) pay even an obol to any one. Antsr. 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 Subjunctive and Optative in protasis, as $i \Delta \nu \, \tilde{\epsilon}_{X\Pi}$ and $i \, \tilde{\epsilon}_{X\Omega}$, for which the Latin has but one form, si habeat. (See § 48, I, B, Rem. 2.) In fact, the irregularity in $i \, \tau \, \sigma \tilde{\nu} \, \sigma \, \tau \, \sigma \, \gamma \, \epsilon \, \nu \, \sigma \, \tau \, \sigma \, \tau \, \alpha \, \lambda \, \delta s \, \tilde{\epsilon} \, \xi \, \epsilon_{1}$, is precisely the same as in the English *if this should* happen, all will be well, where the more regular apodosis would be all would be well, as in Greek, $\pi \, \delta \, \pi \, s \, \Delta \, \delta \, s \, \tilde{\epsilon} \, \chi \, \omega$. E. g.

'Αλλ' εί τίς μοι ἀνὴρ ἕμ' ἕποιτο καὶ ἄλλος, μῦλλον θαλπωρὴ καὶ θαρσαλεώτερον ἔσται. II. X, 222. Εἰ θέλοιμ γ σκοπεῖν τὰς φύσεις τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, εὐρή σομεν, κ.τ.λ. Isoc. ad Nicocl. p. 23 D. § 45. Εἰ τις τάδε παραβαίνοι, ἐναγὴς ἔστω. AESCHIN. Cor. § 110. 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 $a\nu$. E. g.

Eì yàp ϵ ĩη σαν δύο τινὲς ἐναντίοι νόμοι, οὐκ ἀμφοτέροις ἕνι δήπον ψηφίσασθαι, 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 § 49, 2, Note 3. There, for example, ἐνῆν αὐτῷ ἐλθεῖν, he could have gone, is nearly equivalent to ἦλθεν ẫν, and here ἔνεστιν αὐτῷ ἐλθεῖν, he could go, is nearly equivalent to ἕλθοι ἅν.

3. A few irregular constructions remain, which can be explained only as cases of *anacoluthon*, in which the speaker adapts his apodosis to a form of protasis different from that which he has actually used. E. g. Έγὼ μέν αν, εἰ ἔχοιμι, ὡς τάχιστα ὅπλα ἐποιούμην πῶσι Πέρσaıs. XEN. Cyr. II, 1, 9. (Here ἐποιούμην αν is used as if εἰ εἰχον, if I were able, had preceded. We should expect ποιοίμην αν, which is found in one Ms.) Εἰ μὲν γὰρ εἰς γυναῖκα σωφρονεστέραν ξίφος μεθεῖμεν, ὄυσκλεὴς αν ἢν φόνος. ΕUR. Orest. 1132. (Here we should expect εἴη.)

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

Έγω οἶν δεινὰ ἂν εἶην εἰργασμένος, εἰ, ὅτε μέν με οἱ ἄρχοντες ἔταττον, τότε μέν ἔμενον, τοῦ δὲ θεοῦ τάττοντος, λίποιμι τὴν τάξιν, I should therefore (prove to) have behaved outrageously, if when the state authorities stationed me I stood my ground, but if now when God stations me I should desert my post. PLAT. Apol. 28 E. (Here the combination of the two acts is the future condition on which the apodosis depends.) Ἐπεύχομαι πῶοι τούτοις, εἰ ἀληθῆ πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἴποιμι καὶ εἶπον καὶ τότ εὐθὺς ἐν τῷ δήμῷ, εὐτυχίαν μοι δοῦναι, i e. if I should speak the truth and did speak it then, &e. DEM. Cor. 274, 28. Eἰ δὲ μήτ ἕστι μήτε ἦν μήτ ἂν εἰπεῦν ἔχοι μηδεἰς μηδέπω καὶ τήμερον, τί τὸν σύμβουλον ἐχρῆν ποιεῖν; but if there neither is nor was (any such thing), and if no man yet even at this day could possibly tell of any, what ought the statesman to hare 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.

Καὶ γὰρ ἀν οὖτός τι πάθη, ταχέως ὑμεῖς ἔτερον Φίλιππον ποιήσετε, ἄνπερ οῦτω προσέχητε τοῖς πράγμασι τὸν νοῦν. DEM. Phil. I, 43, 12. El ở ἦμεν νέοι δὶς καὶ γέροντες, εἰ τις ἐξημάρτανε, διπλοῦ βίου λαχόντες ἐξωρθούμεθ ἄν. EUR. Suppl. 1084. Εἰ τίς σε ἀνέροιτο τοῦτο, τί ἐστι σχῆμα; εἰ αὐτῷ εἶπες ὅτι στρογγυλότης, εἴ σοι εἶπεν ἅπερ ἐγὼ, εἶπες δήπου ἀν ὅτι σχῆμά τι. PLAT. Men. 74 B.

2. It sometimes happens, that the apodosis is itself in a *dependent* sentence (as in a final clause), 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.

Taῦτa δ' εἶπεν, ĩν' εἰ μὲν καὶ νῦν προσδοκήσαιμι αὐτὸν ἐρεῖν, ἀπολογούμενος περὶ αὐτῶν διατρίβοιμι, εἰ δὲ παραλίποιμι, νῦν aὐτὸς εἴποι, and he said this, in order that, if on the one hand I 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 tell it himself. DEM. Aph. I, 830, 8. (If a primary tense stood for είπεν, we should have, e. g. ταῦτα λέγει, ὕν' ἐὰν μὲν προσδοκήσω αὐτὸν ἐρεῖν, διατρίβω, ἐὰν δὲ παραλίπω, νῦν εἴπη.)

REMARK. For the forms assumed by such sentences when constructed on the principle of indirect discourse, see § 77, 1.

§ 56. After many verbs expressing wonder, delight, contentment, indignation, disappointment, and similar ideas, a protasis with ϵi may be used where a causal sentence would seem more natural. Such verbs are especially $\theta a \nu \mu a \zeta \omega$, $a i \sigma \chi \nu \nu \rho \mu a \iota$, $a \gamma a \pi a \omega$, and $a \gamma a \nu a \kappa \tau \epsilon \omega$. E. g.

Θαυμάζω δ' ἔγωγε εἰ μηδεὶς ὑμῶν μήτ' ἐνθυμεῖται μήτ' ὀργίζεται, ὁρῶν, κ.τ.λ., 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). DEM. Phil. I, 52, 17. (See Rem. below.) 'Aλλ' ἐκεῖνο θαυμάζω, εἰ Λακεδαιμονίοις μέν ποτε ἀντήρατε, νυνὶ δ' ὀκεῖτε ἐξιέναι καὶ μέλλετε εἰσφέρειν, but I wonder at this, that you once opposed the Lacedaemonians, but now are unwilling, &c. Id. Ol. II, 25, 2. (The literal meaning is, if (it is true that) you once opposed, §c., then I wonder.) Οὐκ ἀγαπῷ εἰ μὴ δίκην ἔδωκεν, ἀλλ' εἰ μὴ καὶ χρυσῷ στεφάνῷ στεφανωθήσεται ἀγανακτεῖ, 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 § 49, 1, and the latter under § 49, 1, N. 3.)

Kaì ŵs dìnhôs dyavaktô, ϵ ì oùtwơi â voô µỳ olós t' tùi tât (or if) I am not able, &c. PLAT. Lach. 194 A. Où ôỳ havµaotáv toti, ϵ ì otpattuát voyavaktov kaì movôv theiros að A. Où ôỳ havµaotáv toti, ϵ ì otpattuát voyavaktov mepiylyvetai, il is no wonder that he gets the advantage of you, &c. DEM. Ol. II, 24, 23. Mydè µétroi toùto µéiov dógnte txeiv, ϵ ì où Kupeioi mpósotev oùv ýµîv tattáµevoi vîv à¢eotýkatv, i. e. do not be discontented, if (or that) the Cyracans have now withdrawn. XEN. An. III, 2, 17.

These verbs may also be followed by $\delta \tau \iota$ and a causal sentence, as in PLAT. Theaet. 142 A, $\partial d a \dot{\mu} a \zeta_{0\nu} \delta \tau \iota \delta \dot{\sigma} \tau \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \dot{\nu} \rho \epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu$. The construction with $\epsilon \dot{\iota}$ 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 § 49, 1. For the form sometimes 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 ϵi is used in the sense of whether, to introduce an indirect question; as, $\epsilon \pi i \theta \epsilon \tau o \epsilon i \sigma i \pi a \rho \epsilon i \eta s$, he asked whether you were present For this see § 68, 3, and § 70.

§ 58, 2.]

§ 57. The apodosis is sometimes introduced by the conjunction $\delta \epsilon$, as if the apodosis formed a sentence *co-ordinate* with the protasis, instead of being (as it is) the leading sentence. 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 $\delta \epsilon$ we sometimes find $d\lambda\lambda \delta$ or $a\partial \tau \delta \rho$. E. g.

Εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώωσιν, ἐγὼ δ έ κεν αὐτὸς ἕλωμαι, but if they do not give it up, then I will take it myself: II. I, 137. ᾿Αλλά is found in II. I, 82, quoted § 51, N. 2. Εἴ περ γάρ τ' ἄλλοι γε περικτεινώμεθα πάντες νηυσὶν ἐπ' ᾿Αργείων, σοὶ δ' οὐ δέος ἔστ' ἀπολέσθαι. II. XII, 245. Εἰ δὲ θανώντων περ καταλήθοντ' εἰν ᾿Λίδαο, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κεῖθι φίλου μεμνήσομ' ἐταίρου. II. XXII, 389. Εἰ ὑμῖν ἐστι τοῦτο μὴ δυνατὸν ποιῆσαι, ὑμέες δ ὲ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου ἡμῖν ἔζεσθε. HDT. VIII, 22. ᾿Αλλ' εἰ μηδὲ τοῦτο βούλει ἀποκρίνασθαι, σὺ δ ὲ τοὒντεῦθεν λέγε. XEN. Cyr. V, 5, 21.

This $\delta \epsilon$ in apodosis cannot be expressed in English; as our adverbs *then*, yet, still, &c., necessarily fail to give the force of the Greek $\delta \epsilon$, which is always a conjunction.

REMARK. $\Delta \dot{\epsilon}$ may be used in the same way to introduce the sentence upon which a relative clause depends. Lee 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 (§ 66 and § 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 antecedent may be either expressed or understood. E. g.

(Definite Antecedents). Taîra â $\xi_{\chi\omega}$ ópậs, you see these things which I have; or â $\xi_{\chi\omega}$ ópậs. "Οτε έβούλετο ηλθεν, (once) when he wished, he came.

(Indefinite Antecedents.) Πάντα ἁ ἂν βούλωνται ἕξουσιν, they will have everything which they may want; or ἁ ἂν βούλωνται ἕξουσιν, they will have whatever they may want. [«]Οτε βούλοιτο ἤρχετο, whenever he wished, he came.

3. When the antecedent is indefinite, the negative particle of the relative clause is $\mu \dot{\eta}$; when the antecedent is definite, $o\dot{v}$ 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.

Λέγω â οἶδα. Λέγω â ἤκουσα. Λέξω â ἀκήκοα. "Ελεξαν â ἤκουσαν. Πάντα λέγει â γενήσεται. Πράσσουσιν â βούλονται (οτ ώς βούλονται), they are doing what they please. (On the other hand, πράσσουσιν â ûν βούλωνται (οτ ώς âν βούλωνται,) they always do whatever they please; the antecedent being indefinite.) Λέγω â οὐκ àγνοῶ, I am saying that of which I am not ignorant. 'Αλλ' ὅτε δ'n ὅ' ἐκ τοῦο δυωδεκάτη γένετ' ἡώς, καὶ τότε δὴ πρòς

'Αλλ' ὅτε δή ὅ' ἐκ τοῖο δυωδεκάτη γένετ' ἡὼς, καὶ τότε δὴ πρὸς υλυμπον ὕσαν θεοὶ nἰὲν ἐόντες. Π. Ι, 493. Τίς ἕσθ' ὁ χῶρος δῆτ', ἐν ϣ βεβήκαμεν. SOPH. O. C. 52. "Εως ἐστὶ καιρὸς, ἀντιλάβεσθε τῶν πραγμάτων, i. e. now, while there is an opportunity, &c. DEM. Ol. Ι, 15, 6 (If the exhortation had been general, he might have said ἐως ἃν ἢ καιρός, (on all occasions) so long as there is an opportunity, § 62.) 'Ο δὲ ἀναβὰς, ἕως μὲν βάσιμα ἦν, ἐπὶ τοῦ ὅππου ῆγεν ἐπεὶ δὲ ὅβατα ἦν, καταλιπὼν τὸν ὅππον ἔσπευδε πεζῇ. XEN. An. ΠΙ, 4, 49. So II. 1, 193, ἕως ὥρμαινε. Οἵπερ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀποβαινόντων τὸ πλέον τῆς aἰτίας ἔξομεν, οῦτοι καὶ καθ ἡσυχίαν τι αὐτῶν προῖδωμ•ν, we who are to bear the greater part of the blame, &c. THUC. 1, 83. $\Im \partial \epsilon \nu$ 8 ov particle part of $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \delta \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho i$ adviou, $\epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \partial \delta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \partial \delta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \sigma \delta \epsilon$ $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \delta \sigma_{0} \iota a \partial \delta \delta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$. DEM. Aph. I, 814, 4. (Here $\epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \partial \epsilon \delta \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \delta \epsilon$ a particular point, at which he intends to begin.) Compare the first example under Note 1. 'H $\delta \eta$ $\lambda o i \gamma \iota a \epsilon \mu \gamma$, $\delta \tau \epsilon \mu' \epsilon \chi \partial \delta \sigma \pi \eta \sigma \iota a$ $\epsilon \phi \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ ''H $\rho \eta$, $\delta \tau' \delta \nu \mu' \epsilon \rho \epsilon \delta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, $\delta \tau \epsilon \mu' \epsilon \chi \partial \delta \sigma \pi \eta \sigma \iota a$ $\epsilon \phi \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ ''H $\rho \eta$, $\delta \tau' \delta \nu \mu' \epsilon \rho \epsilon \delta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, $\delta \tau \epsilon \sigma \delta \sigma \nu$, surely there will be sad work, when you shall impel me, &c. II. I, 518. (Here $\delta \tau \epsilon$ refers to some time conceived as definite by the speaker; whereas $\delta \tau' \delta \iota$ $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \delta \eta \sigma \iota \nu s \delta \epsilon \delta \sigma \delta \sigma \tau \sigma \nu \rho \epsilon \rho \delta \gamma \delta \nu \sigma \delta \lambda \sigma \delta \tau \eta \delta \rho \delta \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \tau \delta \rho \delta \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$ $\delta \lambda \rho \mu \epsilon \eta s \epsilon \mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon \delta \sigma \delta \sigma \sigma \sigma \eta \nu \rho a$. Od. XVIII, 272.

NOTE 1. When the sense requires it, these clauses admit all the constructions allowed in independent sentences. E. g.

"Αρξομαι δ' έντεῦθεν ἄθεν καὶ ὑμεῖς ῥậστ' ἀν μάθοιτ ε κἀγὼ τάχιστ' ἀν διδάξαιμι. DEM. Aph. III, 846, 15. (Here the relative clause contains an apodosis with $d\nu$, with a protasis $\epsilon i d\rho \xi a i \mu \eta \nu$ implied. This must not be confounded with the use of the Optative without av, in the other class of relative sentences. See § 61, 4.) Νύν δέ τούτο ούκ εποίησεν, εν ώ τών δημον ετίμησεν αν, but he did not do this, in which he would have honored the people (if he had done it). Id. Mid. 536, 25. Είς καλον ύμιν "Ανυτος όδε παρεκαθέζετο. ώ μεταδώμεν της ζητήσεως. PLAT. Men. 89 E. (Subjunctive in an exhortation.) Ούκουν άξιον τοις των κατηγόρων λόγοις πιστεύσαι μαλλον ή τοις έργοις και τῷ χρόνω, ον υμείς σαφέστατον έλεγχον του aληθούs νομίσατε. Lys. de Bon. Arist. p. 157, § 61. (Here the Imperative $\nu o \mu i \sigma a \tau \epsilon$ is used in a sort of exclamation after $\delta \nu$, where ordinarily δεί νομίσαι would be used.) *Αν γὰρ ἀποφύγη με σὖτος, ὃ μὴ γένοιτο, τὴν ἐπωβελίαν ὀφλήσω. DEM. Aph. I, 834, 25. (Optative in a wish.) "Εσσεται ἦμαρ ὅτ' ἅν ποτ' ὀλώλη "Ιλιος ἰρή, a day will come when sacred Ilium will fall. Il. VI, 448. (Here ολώλη äv is used like a Future Indicative, § 87, Note; and the anteeedent of $\tilde{o}\tau\epsilon$ is definite. If $\tilde{a}\nu$ belonged to $\tilde{o}\tau\epsilon$, the clause would be a protasis, meaning when Ilium shall fall, a day will come.)

NOTE 2. The relative may be used to express a purpose $(\S 65, 1)$, or in a causal sense $(\S 65, 4)$. 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 conditional sentence.

Thus, when we say a vouiger tauta Déver, he is saying what he (actually) thinks, or a evolute raira Exerce, he was saying what he thought, the actions of vouice and evolute are stated as actual facts, occurring at definite times; but when we say a av vouign (ταιτα) λέγει, he (always) says whatever he thinks, or & rouijou (ταῦτα) ἔλεγεν, he (always) said whatever he happened to be thinking, voui(n and voui(or do not state any such definite facts, but rather what some one may think (or may have thought) on any occasion on which he is (or was) in the habit of speaking. So, when we say à voriger tanta défer, he will say what he (now) thinks, vouige denotes a fact; but when we say a av vouign hige, he will say whatever he happens to be (then) thinking, vouign denotes merely a case supposed in the future. Again, - to take the case in which the distinction is most liable to be overlooked, - when we say a our oida our oiopar eidévar, what I do not know, I do not think that I know, our oida, as before, denotes a simple fact, and its object, a, has a definite antecedent; but when Socrates says à un oida oude oiouat eidévat, the meaning is if there are any things which I do not know, I do not even think that I know them. In sentences like this, unless a negative is used $(\mu \eta')$ being the sign of an indefinite, or of a definite antecedent), it is often difficult to decide whether the antecedent is definite or indefinite : thus à olda olopar eldévar 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:—

["]Ο τι βούλεται δώσω, I will give him whatever he (now) wishes. Εἴ τι βούλεται, δώσω, if he wishes anything, I will give it. (§ 49, 1.)

⁶Ο τι έβούλετο έδωκα ἄν, I should have given him whatever he haa wished. ⁶Ο τι μὴ ἐγένετο οὐκ ἂν εἶπον, I should not have told what had not happened. Εἴ τι ἐβούλετο, ἔδωκα ἄν, if he had wished anything, I should have given it. Εἴ τι μὴ ἐγένετο, οὖκ ἂν εἶπον, if anything had nut happened, I should not have told it. (§ 49, 2.)

⁶Ο τι αν βούληται, δώσω, I will give him whatever he shall wish. Έάντι βουληται, δώσω, if he shall wish anything, I will give it. (§ 50, 1.)

(§ 50, 1.) [°]Ο τι βούλοιτο δοίην αν, I should give him whatever he might wish. Εί τι βούλοιτο, δοίην αν, if he should wist anything, I should give it. (§ 50, 2.)

§ 61, 1.] CONDITIONAL RELATIVE SENTENCES.

Ο τι αν βούληται δίδωμι, I (always) give him whatever he wishes. [•] Ο τι βούλοιτο έδίδουν, I always gave him whatever he wished. Έμν τι βούληται, δίδωμι, if he ever wishes anything, I (always) give it. Εἴ τι βούλοιτο, έδίδουν, if he ever wished anything, I (always) gave ut. (§ 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 ϵi or $\epsilon a\nu$), and the antecedent clause may be called the *apodosis*.

3. The particle $d\nu$ (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 § 47, 2.)

NOTE. With $\delta \tau \epsilon$, $\delta \pi \delta \tau \epsilon$, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$, and $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \eta$, $\tilde{a}\nu$ coalesces, forming $\delta \tau a\nu$, $\delta \pi \delta \tau a\nu$, $\epsilon \pi a \nu$ or $\epsilon \pi \eta \nu$ (Ionic $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \nu$), and $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \delta \mu$. In Homer, where $\kappa \epsilon$ is generally used for $\tilde{a}\nu$, we have $\delta \tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon$, &c. (like $\epsilon i \kappa \epsilon$), where in Attic we have $\delta \tau a\nu$, &c. $E \pi \eta \nu$, however, occurs often in Homer.

REMARK. The elassification of common conditional sentences, given in § 48, applies equally to conditional relative sentences. The distinction 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.

Α μή οίδα, οὐδέ οισμαι εἰδέναι (like εί τινα μή οίδα). ΡΙΑΤ. Apol.

21 D. (See above, § 60, 1.) Χρήσθων ό τι βούλονται, let them deal with me as they please (i. e. ei τι βούλονται). ARIST. Nub. 439. 'Επίσταμαι όραν θ' ά δεί με, κούχ όραν ά μη πρέπει, I know how to see anything which I ought to see, and not to see anything which I ought not. EUR. Inc Fr. 417. ("A deî is nearly equivalent to el riva deî, and à μή πρέπει to εί τινα μή πρέπει.) Τους πλείστους ένθοπερ έπεσον έκάστους έθαψαν' ούς δε μή ευρισκον, κενοτάφιον αυτοίς εποίησαν, i. e. they raised a cenotaph for any of them whom they did not find (like εί τινας μή ευρισκον). XEN. An. VI, 4, 9. Τί γάρ; ὅστις δαπανηρός ῶν μή αὐτάρκης ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ τῶν πλησίον δείται, καὶ λαμβάνων μή δύναται αποδιδόναι, μή λαμβάνων δε τον μή διδόντα μισεί, ού δοκεί σοι και ούτος χαλεπώς φίλος είναι; (i. e. supposing a case, εί Id. Mem. II, 6, 2. τις μή αὐτάρκης ἐστίν, κ. τ. λ.). So nTIS μηδαμού ξυμμαχεί, ΤΗυς. Ι, 35. "Α τις μή προσεδόκησεν, οὐδὲ φυλάξασθαι έγχωρεῖ, there is no opportunity to guard against what we did not expect (like el TIVA µn προσεδόκησε TIS). ANTIPHON. p. 131, 36. § 19. Είς τὰ πλοία τούς τε ἀσθενοῦντας ἐνεβίβασαν καὶ τών σκευών όσα μή άνάγκη ήν έχειν (like εί τινα τών σκευών μή άνάγκη ην έχειν), i. e. any of it which they did not need. XEN. An. V, 3, 1. Ανθρώπους διέφθειρεν (ή θάλασσα) όσοι μη εδύναντο φθηναι πρός τα μετέωρα αναδραμόντες, i. e. if any were unable to escape soon enough to the high land, so many the sea destroyed. THUC. III, 89. Ois µèv αίρεσις γεγένηται τάλλα εύτυχούσι, πυλλή άνοια πολεμήσαι · εί δ' avaγκaiov ήν, κ.τ.λ., for any who have had the choice given them, while they are prosperous in other respects, it is great folly to go to war (i. e. ει τισιν αιρεσις γεγένηται). ΤΗυς. Π. 61. Πάντες ισμεν Χαβρίαν ούτε τύπτοντα ούθ' άρπάζοντα τον στέφανον ούθ' δλως προσιόνθ' όποι $\mu \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu$ avto, nor going anywhere at all where it was not lawful for him (i. e. εί ποι μή προσήκεν). DEM. Mid. 535, 15. Πως ούν οί άγαθοι τοις άγαθοις φίλοι έσονται, οι μήτε απόντες ποθεινοι άλλήλοις μήτε παρόντες χρείαν αυτών έχουσι; (i. e. εί μή ... έχουσι). ΡΙΑΤ. Lys. 215 B. Νικώη δ' ότι πάσιν υμίν μέλλει συνοίσειν (i. e. είτι $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota$), may any plan prevail which will benefit you all. DEM. Phil. I, 55. 7. So SOPH. Ant. 375, ôs τάδ' έρδει.

NOTE. Care must be taken here (as in conditional sentences, § 49, 1, Note 2), not to include under this class the general suppositions of § 62, which require the Subjunctive or Optative. On the other hand, the examples falling under § 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[•] Note 3). See also § 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.

§ 61, 3.] CONDISIONAL RELATIVE SENTENCES.

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

[•] A μη $\hat{\epsilon}\beta \circ \hat{\nu}\lambda \epsilon \tau \circ \delta \circ \hat{\nu} \nu a$, οὐκ åν έδωκεν, he would not have given what he had not wished to give (i. e. el τινα μή έβούλετο δούναι, ούκ άν έδωκεν). Ούτε γάρ αν αυτοί επεχειρουμεν πράττειν ά μή ήπιστάμεθα, ούτε τοις άλλοις επετρέπομεν, ων ήρχομεν, άλλο τι πράττειν ή η τι πράττοντες ορθώς έμελλον πράξειν τουτο δ' ήν άν, ου επιστή- $\mu\eta\nu \in i\chi \circ \nu$, for (if that were so) we should not be undertaking (as we are) to do things which we did not understand, nor should we permit any others whom we were ruling to do anything else than what they were likely to do properly; and this would be whatever they had knowledge of. PLAT. Charm. 171 E. (Here à $\mu\eta$ $\eta\pi\iota\sigma\tau\mu\epsilon\theta a = \epsilon i$ $\tau\iota\nu a$ μη ηπιστάμεθα, if there were any things which we did not know, $-\omega_{\nu}$ $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \mu \eta \nu \epsilon i \chi o \nu = \epsilon i \tau \iota \nu o s \epsilon i \chi o \nu$. It is implied that none of the cases here supposed ever actually arose, as the whole passage refers to an unfulfilled condition expressed in the preceding sentence.) Ei de οίκοι είχον εκαστοι τας δίκας, τούτους αν απώλλυσαν οίτινες φίλοι μάλιστα ήσαν 'Αθηναίων τῷ δήμω, if each had their trials at home, they would ruin any who were especially friendly, &c. XEN. Rep. Athen. 1, 16. (Here outrives $\eta \sigma a v$, = $\epsilon i \tau i v \epsilon s \eta \sigma a v$, forms a second protasis to the apodosis $d\pi\omega\lambda\lambda\nu\sigma\alpha\nu d\nu$. See § 55, 1.)

El Éévos étúyxavov δv , Évveyiyvástere δήπου äv μοι, el év ékeívy tỹ φωνῆ τε καὶ τῷ τρόπῷ ἕλεγον ἐν οἶσπερ ἐτεθράμμην, if I happened to be a foreigner, you would surely pardon me, if I were (now) addressing you in both the language and the manner in which I had been brought up. PLAT. Apol. 17 D Ωs δὴ ἔγωγ ὅφελον μάκαρόs νύ τευ ἕμμεναι viòs ἀνέροs, δν κτεάτεστιν έοῖs ἕπι γήραs ἔτετμεν, O that I were the son of some fortunate man, whom old age had found upon his oven estate (i. e. if old age had found any such man, would that I had been his son). Od. I, 217.

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 *viv-idly* 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 $\tilde{a}\nu$ (or $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}$) and followed by the Subjunctive. E. g.

128

Τάων ην κ' έθέλωμι φίλην ποιήσομ' άκοιτιν (like εί κέ τινα έθέ- $\lambda \omega \mu i$), whomsoever of these I may wish I shall make my wife. II. IX, 397. 'Έκ γὰρ 'Ορέσταο τίσις ἔσσεται 'Ατρείδαο, ὑππότ' ἀν ήβήση τε kai hs inciperal ains, i. e. vengeance will come from Orestes, when he shall grow up, &c. (like eav nore hBhoy). Od. I, 40. Tore & avre μαχήσεται, όππότε κέν μιν θυμός ένι στήθεσσιν άνώγη και θεός όρση. II. IX, 702. 'Αλλ' άγεθ', ώς αν έγων είπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες, let us obey as I may direct, i. e. if I give any direction ($\dot{\epsilon}\dot{a}\nu \pi\omega s \epsilon i\pi\omega$), let us obey it. II. II, 139. 'Ημείς αυτ' αλόχους τε φίλας και νήπια τέκνα αξομεν έν νήεσσιν, έπην πτολίεθρον έλωμεν, when we shall have taken the city. II. IV. 238. So εὐτ' ἀν πίπτωσιν, II. I, 242. Οὐκοῦν, ὅταν $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega$, $\pi \epsilon \pi a \dot{\nu} \sigma \rho \mu a \iota$, therefore, when I shall have no more strength, I will cease. SOPH. Ant. 91. Ταῦτα, ἐπειδὰν περὶ τοῦ γένους $\epsilon i \pi \omega$, $\epsilon \rho \hat{\omega}$, I will speak of this, when I shall have spoken about my birth. DEM. Eubul. 1303, 25. (See § 20, Note 1.) Ἐπειδάν διαπράξωμαι à δέομαι, ήξω. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Π, 3, 29. Τίνα οιεσθε αὐτὴν ψυχήν έξειν, όταν έμε ίδη των πατρώων απεστερημένον; what feelings do you think she will have, when (or if at any time) she shall see me, &c.? DEM. Aph. II, 842, 16. Τούτων δε 'Αθηναίους φημί δείν είναι πεντακοσίους, έξ ης αν τινος ύμιν ηλικίας καλώς έχειν δοκ η, from whatever age it shall seem good to you to take them (i. e. if from any particular age. &c.) Id. Phil. I, 45, 27. Των πραγμάτων τους βουλευομένους (ηγείσθαι δεί), ίνα ά αν εκείνοις δοκή ταυτα πράττηται, in order that whatever shall seem good to them shall be done. Ib. 51, 19. Ov you φόβου μέλαθρον έλπις έμπατειν, έως αν αιθη πυρ έφ' έστίας έμης Αίγιodos, so long as he shall kindle fire, &c. AESCH. Agam. 1435.

Note. The Future Indicative 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, appearing as if the antecedent were definite. "Oor $\beta_{OV}\lambda_{fOOTAI}$, THUC. I, 22, is perhaps to be explained in this way. See XEN. Cyr. I, 5, 13. In such examples as $\zeta_{\mu}\mu_{f}\tau_{IS}a\partial_{T}\delta_{T}\pi_{a}\rho_{f}\epsilon_{T}\tau_{a}$, unless he was to be present himself, the Future is used as it is in the form of protasis explained § 49, 1, N. 3.

4. When the relative clause refers to the future less distinctly and vividly (like a protasis of the form § 50, 2), and the antecedent clause contains an Optative referring to the future, the relative is followed by the Optative (without $\check{a}\nu$).

The Optative in the antecedent clause may be in an

apodosis with $a\nu$ or a protasis (§ 50, 2), in an expression of a wish (§ 82), or in a final clause. E. g.

Μάλα κεν θρασυκάρδιος είη, δς τότε γηθήσειεν ίδων πόνον ούδ άκάχοιτο (i. e. ει τις γηθήσειε, μάλα κεν θρασυκάρδιος είη), any one who should then rejoice would be very stout-hearted. Il. XIII, 343 So II. VI, 329 and 521; XIV, 247: ARIST. Nub. 1250. Our av our θρέψαις άνδρα, όστις έθελοι τε και δύναιτο σου απερύκειν τους έπιχειρούντας aδικείν σε; would you not support any man who shoula be both willing and able, &c.? XEN. Mem. 11, 9, 2. Πεινών φάγοι αν όπότε βούλοιτο, when he is hungry, he would eat whenever he might wish (like εί ποτε βούλοιτο). Ib. II, 1, 18. So Mem. I, 5, 4; I, 7, 3; IV, 2, 20. Πως ούν αν είδείης περί τούτου του πράγματος, ού παντάπασιν απειρος είης; how then could you know about that thing of which you had no experience at all? PLAT. Men. 92 C. 'Ap' aν ήγοιο ταύτα σὰ είναι, α σοι έξειη και αποδόσθαι και δούναι και θύσαι ότω βούλοιο θεών; Id. Euthyd. 302 A. Τί αν παθείν (δύναιτο), δ $\mu \dot{\eta}$ και ψφ' αυτού πάθοι; what could be suffer, unless he should suffer it also from himself? (i. e. εἰ μη πάθοι). PLAT. Lys. 214 E. O δέ μη άγαπώη, οὐδ' τω φιλοί (i. e. εί τι μη άγαπώη, οὐδ' τω φιλοί τοῦτο). Ib. 215 B. Οσω δε πρεσβύτερος γίγνοιτο, μαλλον del ασπάζοιτο δv ($\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau a$), the older he should grow, the more he would always cling lo il (i. e. εί τι πρεσβύτερος γίγνοιτο, τόσω μαλλου ασπάζοιτο αυ). PLAT. Rep. VIII, 549 B So III, 412 D; VIII, 557 B. Φήσομευ μηδέποτε μηδεν αν μείζον μηδε έλαττον γενέσθαι, εως ίσον είη αὐτὸ Eavro, so long as it should remain equal to itself. PLAT. Theaet. 155 A. So βουλοίμην κε. μη είη, Od. XI, 489.

Εἰ δὲ βούλοιο τῶν φίλων τινὰ προτρέψασθαι όπότε ἀποδημοίης ἐπιμελεῖωθαι τῶν σῶν, τί ἂν ποιοίης; ΧΕΝ. Μειπ. Π. 3, 12. Εἰκότως ἂν καὶ παρὰ θεῶν πρακτικώτερος εἶη, ὅστις μὴ όπότε ἐν ἀπόροις εἶη τότε κολακεύοι, ἀλλ' ὅτε τὰ ἄριστα πράττοι τότε μάλιστα τῶν θεῶν μεμνῷτο. Ιd. Cyr. I, 6, 3. 'Ως ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅ τις τοιατά γε ῥέζοι, O that any other man might likewise perish who should do the like (i. e. εἶ τις τοιαῦτα ῥέζοι). Od. Ι, 47. 'Εγίγνωσκε δεῖν τοὺς ὑπηρέτας τοῦτο ἀσκεῖν, ὡς πάντα νομίζοιεν πρέπειν αὐτοῖς πράττειν ὅσα ὁ ἄρχων προστάττοι. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, Ι, 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, while 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.

§ 62.]

Here the Subjunctive with $\delta s \, \ddot{a}\nu$, $\delta \tau a\nu$, &c. is used after primary tenses, and the Optative (without $\ddot{a}\nu$) after secondary tenses. E. g.

Έχθρός γάρ μοι κείνος όμως 'Αίδαο πύλησιν, δς χ' έτερον μεν κεύθη ένι φρεσιν, άλλο δε είπη, for that man (i e. any man) is hated by me like the very gates of Hades, who conceals one thing in his mind and speaks another. Il. IX, 312. Νεμεσσωμαί γε μέν οὐδέν κλαίειν ös κε θάνησι βροτών και ποτμον ενίσπη, I am never at all indignant at weeping for any mortal who may die, &c. Od. IV, 195. Kai yap oupμαχείν τούτοις εθέλουσιν απαντες, ούς αν όρωσι παρεσκευασμένους, for all men we (always) willing to be allies to those whom they see prepared. DEM. Phil. I, 42, 1. Καίπερ των ανθρώπων, έν ω μέν άν πολεμωσι, τον παρόντα (πόλεμον) αει μεγιστον κρινόντων, although men always consider the present war the greatest, so long as they are engaged in it. THUC. Ι, 21. Πορεύονταί τε γάρ αί ἀγέλαι ή αν αὐτὰς εἰ θύνωσιν οί νομεῖς, νέμονταί τε χωρία ἐφ' ὅποῖα ἀν αὐτὰς ἐφιῶσιν, ἀπέχονταί τε ών άν αύτὰς ἀπείργωσι καὶ τοῦς καρποῖς ἐῶσι τοὺς νομέας χρησθαι ούτως όπως άν αὐτοὶ βούλωνται άνθρωποι δὲ ἐπ' οὐδένας μάλλον συνίστανται ή επί τούτους ούς άν αισθωνται άρχειν αὐτῶν επιχειροῦντας. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 1, 2. Νομίζω προστάτου έργον είναι οίου δεί, ôs αν όρων τους φίλους έξαπατωμένους μη επιτρέπη, i.e. such as one ought always to be, who, &c. Id. Hell, II, 3, 51. Καταφρώνησις δέ (έγγίγνεται), ôs åν και γνώμη πιστεύη των εναντίων πρυεχειν, ô ήμιν υπάρ- $\chi_{\epsilon i}$. Thuc. II, 62. (Here the \ddot{o} refers to all that precedes, as a definite antecedent.)

Οὐ μὲν γὰρ μεῖζόν κλέος ἀνέρος, ὅφρα κ' ἔŋ σιν, ἡ ὅ τι ποσσίν τε ρέξη καὶ χερσίν. Od. VIII, 147. ("Οφρα κ' ἔŋσιν, so long as he lưes.) (Θεούς) παρατρωπῶσ ἄιθρωποι λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβήῃ καὶ ἀμάρτῃ. II. IX, 500. "Ημισυ γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς ἀποαίνυται εἰρύοπα Ζεὺς ἀνέρος, εἶτ' ἅν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἢμαρ ἕλῃσιν. Od. XVII, 322. Φιλέει δέ κως προσημαίνειν, εἶτ' ἂν μέλλῃ μεγάλα κακὰ ἢ πόλι ἡ ἔθνει ἔσεσθαι. ΗΔΤ. VI, 27. Φεύγουσι γάρ τοι χοὶ θρασεῖς, ὅταν πέλας ἦδη τὸν Ἅιδην εἰσορῶσι τοῦ βίου. SOPII. Ant. 580. Ηνίκ' ἀν δ' οίκοι γένωνται, δρῶσιν οἰκ ἀνασχετά. ARIST. Pac. 1179. Ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἡ ἐκφορὰ ἦ, λάρνακας ἅγουσιν ἕμαξαι. THUC II, 34. Ἐπειδὰν δὲ κρύψωσι γῆ, ἀνὴρ ἡρημένος ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως, δς ἁν γνώμῃ τε δοκῇ μὴ ἀξύνετος εἶναι, λεγει ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἕπαινον τὸν πρέποντα. Ibid. Ἔως ἀν σώζηται τὸ σκίφος, τότε χρὴ προθύμου είναι ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἡ ἀἀλαττα ὑπέρσχῃ, μάταιος ἡ σπουδή. DEM. Phil. III, 128, 22. So ἕστ ἀν δε ἐσωτιν, ΧΕΝ. Μετ. III, 5, 6.

Οὕ τινα γὰρ τίεσκον ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων, οὐ κακὸν οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλὸν, ἱ τίς σφεας εἰσα φίκοιτο, i. e. they were never in the habit of honoring any one who came to them. Od. XXII, 414. Kaì οῦς μὲν ἔδοι εὐτάκτως καὶ σιωπῃ ἰόττας, προσελαύνων αὐτοῖς τίνες τε εἶεν ἡρώτα, καὶ ἐπεὶ π ὑ θοιτο ἐπήνει. XEN. Cyr. V, 3. 55. (Here ἡρώτα and ἐπήνει denote the habit of Cyrus.) Καὶ τοῖς μὲν Ἀθηναίοις πὕξετο τὸ ναυτιῶν ἀπὸ τῆς δαπάνης ἡν ἐκείνοι ξυμφ έροιεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ, ὁπότε ἀ πο στ αῖεν, ἀπαράσκευοι καὶ ἄπειραι ἐς τὸν πόλεμον καθίσταντο, and the Athenian

62.1 CONDITIONAL RELATIVE SENTENCES.

navy continued to increase from the money which these contributed, and they, whenever they revolt it, always found themselves unprepared and inexperienced for war. THUC. I, 99.

Έπὶ Μοίριος βασιλέος, ὅκως ἕλθοι ὁ ποταμὸς ἐπ' ὀκτὼ πήχεας, ἄρδεσκε Αἴγυπτ... τὴν ἕνερθε Μέμφιος, i. e. whenever the river rose. Η DT. II, 13. Των δὲ χοῦν τὸν ἐκφορεόμενον, ὅκως γίνοιτο νὐξ, ἐς τὸν Τίγριν ἐξεφόρεον, i. e. they carried it away every night. Id. II, 150. Oi δε (Κάρες), ὅκως Μίνως δέοιτο, ἐπλήρουν οi τὰς νέας. Id. I, 171. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνοιχθείη, εἰσήειμεν παρὰ τὸν Σωκράτη, i. e. each morning, when the prison was opened, &c. PLAT. Phaed. 59 D. Οτε ἕξω τοῦ δεινοῦ γένοιντο, πολλοί ἀτὸν ἀπέλειπον, many (always) left him, when they were out of danger. XEN. An. II, 6, 12. (If ἐγένοντο had been used, the whole sentence would refer to a particular case in which many left him.)

REMARK. The gnomic Aorist, and the other *gnomic* and *iterative* tenses of § 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.

^OS κε θεοῖs ἐπιπείθηται, μίλα τ' ἕκλυον αὐτοῦ, whoever obeys the Gods, to him they are ready to listen. II. I, 218. ^OOTAV τις ὥσπερ οὐτος ἰσχύση, ἡ πρώτη πρόφασις ἅπαντα ἀνεχαίτισε καὶ διέλυσεν. DEM. OI. II, 20, 27. ^Oσάτε προσβλέψειἐ τινας τῶν ἐν ταῖs τάξεσι, εἶπεν ἀν, ὦ ἀνδρες, κ.τ.λ., i. e. he used to suy, &c. XEN. Cyr. VII, 1, 10. (See § 30, 2.) Οὕτ' ἄλλοτε πώποτε πρὸς χάριν εἰλόμην λέγειν, ὅ τι ἀν μὴ καὶ συνοίσειν πεπεισμένος ὦ, I have never on other occasions preferred to say anything in order to please, unless I have been convinced that it would also be for your advantage. DEM. Phil. I, 54, 27. (Here εἰλόμην is used in a sense approaching that of the gnomic Aorist, so as to be followed by a Subjunctive. Sea § 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 $\delta\sigma\tau s$; as the idea of indefiniteness, which is usually expressed by the Subjunctive or Optative, is here sufficiently expressed by the relative itself. E. g.

Έχθρος γάρ μοι κείνος όμως Αίδαο πύλησιν

Γίγνεται, ôs πενίη εἶκων ἀπατήλια βάζει. Od. XIV, 156. compare this with the first example (II. IX, 312) under § 6?

'Εμοί γὰρ ὅστις πᾶσαν εὐθύνων πόλιν Μὴ τῶν ἀρίστων ἅπτεται βουλευμίτων, 'Αλλ' ἐκ φόβου του γλῶσσαν ἐγκλείσας ἔχει, Κάκιστος εἶναι νῦν τε καὶ πάλαι δοκεί Καὶ μείζου ὅστις ἀντὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ πάτρας Φίλον κομίζει, τοῦτον οὐδαμοῦ λέγω. SOPH. Ant. 178.

(Here we might have had $\delta s \ \delta v \dots \mu \eta \ \delta \pi \tau \eta \tau \alpha t, \ \delta \lambda \lambda^2 \dots \xi \chi \eta$, and $\delta s \ \delta v \nu \rho \mu (\zeta \eta, without any essential difference in meaning.)$

Οίτινες πρός τὰς ξυμφορὰς γνώμη μὲν ῆκιστα λυποῦνται, ἔργῷ δὲ μάλιστα ἀντέχουσιν, οἶτοι καὶ πόλων καὶ ἰδιωτῶν κράτιστοι είσιν. Τιιυς. II, 64. So in the same chapter, ὅστις λαμβάνει. Έθαπτον τὸν ἀντὸν τρόπον ὁπόσους ἐπελάμβανεν ἡ στρατιά, they continued to bury in the same way as many as the army took up. XEN. An. VI, 5, 6. (Here ἐπιλαμβάνοι might have been used.) ¨Οστις δ' ἀφικνείτο τῶν παρὰ βασιλέως πρὸς αὐτὸν, πάντας ἀπεπέμπετο. Ib. I, 1, 5. ¨Οπου δὲ χιλὸς σπάνιος πάνυ είη, αὐτὸς δ' ἐδύνατο παρασκευάσασθαι, διαπέμπων ἐκόλευε τοὺς φίλους ἵπποις ἐμβάλλειν τοῦτον. Ib. I, 9, 27. (In the last two examples there is some Ms. authority for the more regular ἀφικνοῖτο and δύναιτο.) 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 depending on *general negative* sentences, where in Latin a Subjunctive is more common. E. g.

Παρ' έμοὶ δὲ οὐδεὶς μισθοφορεῖ, ὅστις μὴ ἱκανός ἐστιν ἶσα πονεῖν ἐμοἰ, ἱ e. no one who is not able (no one unless he is able), nemo qui non possit. XEN. Hell. VI, 1. 5. These sentences are regular protases, and belong under the rule of § 61, 1. (See Note 1.)

NOTE 3. (a.) In Homer, similes and comparisons are often expressed by the Subjunctive after δs , $\delta s \tau \epsilon$, $\delta s \ \delta \tau \epsilon$, $\delta s \ \delta s \ (seldom, \delta s \ \delta \nu, \& c.)$, where we should expect the Present Indicative, which sometimes occurs. Besides the singular use of the Subjunctive in these expressions, the omission of $\delta \nu$ or $\kappa \epsilon$ is especially to be noticed. (See § 63, 1.) E. g.

ως δε γυνή κλαίησι φίλον πόσιν αμφιπεσούσα,

Ος τε έης πρόσθεν πόλιος λαών τε πέσησιν,

'Ως 'Οδυσεύς έλεεινών ύπ' όφρύσι δάκρυον είβεν,

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

'Ως δ' ὅτ' ἀπωρινὸς Βορέης φορέησιν ἀκάνθας

Αμ πεδίον, πυκιναί δε πρός αλλήλησιν εχονται,

°Ως την αμ πέλαγος άνεμοι φέρον ένθα και ένθα. Od. V, 328.

'Ως δ' ὅτ' ἀν ἀστράπτη πύσις "Ηρης ἠυκόμοιο, ...

[•]Ως πυκίν έν στήθεσσιν ανεστενάχιζ 'Αγαμέμνων. Il. X, 5-9.

Οί δ', ως τ' αμητήρες εναντίοι αλλήλοισιν όγμον ελαύνωσιν, ως

§ 63, 2.] CONDITIONAL RELATIVE SENTENCES.

Τρῶες καὶ ᾿Αχαιοὶ ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι θορόντες δήσυν. Π. XI, 67-71. See also II. XII, 167-172.

(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.

'Ως δ' ὅτε καπνὸς ἰὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἵκηται "Αστεος αἰθομένοιο, θεῶν δέ ἐ μῆνις ἀνῆκεν, Πᾶσι δ' ἔθηκε πόνον, τολλοῖσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφῆκεν, °Ως Ἀχιλεὺς Τρώεσσι πόνον καὶ κήδε' ἔθηκεν. Π. XXI, 522.

Ο δ' έν κονίησι χαμαὶ πέσεν, αἶγειρος ὡς, "Η ῥά τ' ἐν εἰαμενῆ ἕλεος μεγάλοιο πεφύκη Λείη, ἀτάρ τέ οἱ ὄζοι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτη πεφύασιν· Τὴν μεν θ' ἀρματοπηγὸς ἀνῆρ αἴθωνι σιδήρω 'Εξέταμ', ὄφρα ἴτυν κάμψη περικαλλέι δἰφρω· 'Η μέν τ' ἀζομένη κείται ποταμοῦο παρ' ὅχθας· Τοίον ἄρ' Ανθεμίδην Σιμοείσιον ἐξενάριξεν Αἴας διογενής. Π. ΙV, 482.

§ 63. 1. (a.) In Homer, the relatives (like ϵi) often take the Subjunctive without $a\nu$ or $\kappa \epsilon$, the sense being apparently the same as when $a\nu$ is used. (§ 50, 1, N. 2.) E. g.

^{*}Οττι μάλ' οὐ δηναιὸς, ὃς ἀθανάτοισι μάχηται. Π. V, 407. ^{*}Ανθρώπους ἐφορῷ, καὶ τίνυται ὅς τις ἡμάρτη. Od. XIII, 214. Zεὺς δ' αὐτὸς νέμει ὅλβον 'Ολύμπιος ἀνθρώποισιν, ^{*}Ἐσθλοῖς ἡδὲ κακοῖσιν, ὅπως ἐ θέλησιν, ἐκάστω. Od. VI, 188. Οὐ μὴν σοι ποτε ἶσου ἔχω γέρας, ὅππότ 'Αχαιοὶ Τρώων ἐ κπέρσωσ' εὐναιόμενον πτολίεθρον. Π. Ι, 163. Οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτέ φησι κακὸν πείσεσθαι ἀπίσσω, ^{*}Οφρ' ἀρετὴν παρέχωσι θεοὶ καὶ γούνατ ὀ ρώρη, so long as the Gods shall supply valor, &c. Od. XVIII, 132.

(b.) The same omission of $\tilde{a}\nu$ 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.

Γέροντα δ' δρθοῦν Φλαῦρον, δς νέος πέση. SOPH. O. C. 395. Τών δὲ πημονῶν μάλιστα λυποῦσ' aỉ Φ aνῶσ' aὐθαίρετοι. Id. O. T. 1231. Τοῦσι γὰρ μήτε ἄστεα μήτε τείχεα ἦ ἐκτισμένα,....κῶς οὐ ἀν εἶησαν οὖτοι ἄμαχοι; ΗΡΤ. IV, 46. (See § 63, 4, a.) Ἐπιχώριον ὅν ἡμῖν οὖ μὲν βραχεῖς ἀρκῶσι μὴ πολλοῖς χρῆσθαι. ἰι being our national habit not to use many words where few suffice. T<u>ηυς. IV, 17.</u> (Yet the sentence continues, πλείοσι δὲ ἐν ῷ ἀν καιρὸς ἦ, κ.τ.λ.) See § 66,4, N.

2. The adverb $d\nu$ is sometimes used with the Optative or Indicative in conditional relative clauses, when the relative

ai . 1

Des Si

TS,

9 in

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.

 $(\check{\epsilon}\phi\eta)$, he said that they would form their opinion upon any slanders which any good speaker might (if he pleased) chance to uture the standard of the sta VII, 48. But in Od. II, 54, $\underline{\omega}_{\mathcal{S}} \kappa \epsilon \dots \delta_{0}$ for $\lambda \epsilon \ell \epsilon \lambda o_{\ell}$, that he might give her to any one he pleased, $\underline{\phi} \kappa \ell \delta \ell \lambda_{0\ell}$ does not differ from the ordinary $\hat{\omega}$ $\hat{\epsilon}\theta\hat{\epsilon}\lambda o\iota = \epsilon \tilde{i} \tau \iota \nu \epsilon \hat{\theta}\hat{\epsilon}\lambda o\iota$. In DEM. Phil. I, 41, 3, oiov aν βούλοισθε is merely a conjectural emendation for olov aν βού- $\lambda \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$, which is a regular example illustrating § 62. Over $\dot{\theta} v$ ύμεις είς ταύτην την τάξιν κατεστήσατε, ούτος των ισων αίτιος ην άν какат бошитер кal ouros, any one soever whom you might have appointed (if you had 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 $d\nu$ after $\delta\nu\tau\iota\nu a$, this would have been a regular example under § 61, 2, $\delta \nu \tau \iota \nu a$ κατεστήσατε being equivalent to εί τινα άλλον κατεστήσατε, if you had appointed any one else (which you did not do). With the $d\nu$, it is itself an apodosis with a suppressed protasis; unless we can suppose that the $d\nu$ was used, like $\kappa\epsilon$ 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 without $\tilde{a}\nu$), 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 $d\nu$ in the apodosis, either when the expressed apodosis belongs to an implied protasis (§ 54, 1, a), or when the Optative with av is considered a primary tense, from its resemblance in sense to the Future Indicative (54, 1, b). See also § 34, 1, b. E. g.

Ούκουν και το ύγιαίνειν και το νοσείν, όταν άγαθου τινος αίτια γίγνηται, ayaθà aν είη, i. e. when they prove to be the causes of any good, they would be good things (if we should accept your doctrine). XEN. Mem. IV, 2. 32. So Mem. II, 2, 3; and PLAT. Rep. II, 379 B. Έγω δε ταύτην μεν την ειρήνην, εως αν είς Αθηναίων λείπηται, οὐδεποτ' αν συμβουλεύσαιμι ποιήσασθαι τη πόλει. I would never advise the city to make this peace, so long as a single Athenian shall be left. DEM. F. L. 345, 14. (Here Ews heinouro, so long as one should be left, would be more regular.) So ARIST. Nub. 1151; SOPH. El. 697.

134

§ 64, 1.] CONDITIONAL RELATIVE SENTENCES.

(b.) The Optative (without $a\nu$) in the relative clause occasionally depends upon a primary tense in the apodosis. This may arise from the slight distinction between the Subjunctive and Optative in such sentences (§ 54, 2, a); as in 11 XIII, 317, $al\pi\nu$ of $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\tau a\nu\eta$ arise $\epsilon\mu\eta$ are the son of Kronos should harl, &c. (More regularly, $\delta\tau\epsilon \ \mu\eta \ \epsilon\mu\beta \ \delta\lambda \ \eta$, unless he shall harl, &c.)

The Optative in the Relative clause sometimes depends on a verb of *necessity, obligation, propriety, possibility,* &c. with an Infinitive, the two forming an expression that is nearly equivalent in sense to an Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$, which would be expected in their place (§ 54, 2, b). E. g.

'Aλλ' δν πόλις στήσειε, τοῦδε χρὴ κλύειν, we should obey any one whom the state appoints (if the state should appoint any one, we ought to obey him). SOPH. Ant. 666. (Xpὴ κλύειν is followed by the Optative from its resemblance in sense to δικαίως ầν κλύοι τις.) 'Aλλά τοῦ μὲν αἰτὸν λέγειν â μὴ σαφῶς εἰδείη φείδεσθαι δεῖ, i. e. we ought to abstain, &c.; like φείδοιτο ἄν τις. XEN. Cyr. I, 6, 19. Οὐς δὲ ποιήσασθαί τις βούλοιτο συνεργοὺς προθύμους, τωύτους ταντάπασιν ἕμοιγε δοκεῖ ἀγαθοῖς θηρατέον εἶναι. Ib. II, 4. 10. (Here θηρατέον είναι = θηρῶν δεῖν.) 'Υπερορῶν οὐ δυνατὸν ὑμῶν ἀνδρὶ δς εἰδείη κυρίους ὅντας ὅ τι βούλεσθε αὐτῷ χρῆσθαι. Id. Hell. VII, 3, 7.

5. The Indicative is generally used in Greek (as in Latin) in *parenthetical* relative clauses, like ὅ τι ποτ' ἐστίν, whatever it is (quidquid est), ὅστις ποτ' ἐστίν (or ἔσται), &c. E. g.

Ζεύς, ὅστις ποτ' ἐστὶν, εἰ τόδ' αὐτῷ φίλον κεκλημένω, τοῦτό νιν προσεννέπω, Zeus, whoever he may be, &c. AESCH. Agam. 160. Δουλεύομεν θεοῖς, ὅ τι ποτ' εἰσὶν θεοί. EUR. Orest. 418.

The Subjunctive, however, sometimes occurs; in which case the expression belongs under § 62 or § 61, 3: as in AESCHIN. Tim. § 127, $\dot{a}\lambda\lambda'$ ó προσαψάμενος αὐτῶν καὶ παρατυχῶν, ὅστις ἀν ἦ, λόγον παρέχει. So DEM. Phil. I, 47, 24.

Assimilation in Dependent Relative 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 (\S 82), or in a final clause. E. g.

Ἐάν τινες οἱ ἀν δύνωνται τοῦτο ποιῶσι, καλῶς ἔξει, if any who shall be able do this, it will be well. Εἴ τινες οἱ δύναιντο τοῦτο ποιοῖεν, καλῶς ἀν ἔχοι, if any who should be able should do this, i would be well. Ei $\theta \in \pi \dot{a} \forall \tau \epsilon s$ of $\delta \dot{v} \tau a \iota v \tau o \tau o \tilde{v} \tau \sigma v o \tilde{v} \tilde{\epsilon} v$, O that all who may be able would do this. (Here the principle of assimilation makes of $\delta \dot{v} a \iota v \tau \sigma$ after an Optative preferable to of $\dot{a} v \delta \dot{v} \omega v \tau a$, 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 *assimilation*. The leading Indicative may be in protasis or apodosis (\S 49, 2), in another conditional relative clause (\S 61, 2), in an expression of a wish (\S 83), or in a final clause (\S 44, 3). E. g.

Et tives oî $\epsilon \delta \psi \nu a \nu \tau o \tau o \tilde{\nu} \tau o ἕπραξαν, καλῶς ἂν ἕσχεν, if any who had$ been able had done this, it would have been well. Είθε πάντες oî εδύναντο τοῦτο ἔπραξαν, O that all who had been able had done this. Soin 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 Indicative 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 traantecedent clause, although the latter may be itself a protasis to another apodosis. (See § 34.) Occasionally this principle is disregarded, so that a Subjunctive depends on an Optative. (See the examples under § 34, 1, b, and § 63, 4, a.)

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

Μήτ' έμοι παρέστιος γένοιτο, μήτ' ίσον φρονών, ος τάδ' έρδει (i. e εί τις τάδ' έρδει). SOPH. Ant. 372.

NOTE 1. The principle of § 64 applies only to conditional relative 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, § 59, N. 1) is used. E. g.

El τῶν πολιτῶν οἶσι νῦν πιστεύομεν, τούτοις ἀπιστήσαιμεν, οἶs δ' οὐ χρώμεθα, τούτοισι χρησαίμεσθα, σωθείημεν ἀν. ARIST. Ran. 1446. Εἰθ ὅσθα δυνατὸς δρῶν ὅσον πρόθυμος εἰ, O that thou couldst 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.)

§ 65, 1.] ASSIMILATION. — $\Delta \dot{\epsilon}$ IN APODOSIS.

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

Οὐδ³, ἐπειδὰν ῶν ἂν πρίηται κύριος γένηται, τῷ προδότη συμβούλφ περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔτι χρῆται. DEM. Cor. 241, 15. See Plat. Rep. VI, 508 C and D; Charm. 164 B. 'Ο δὲ τότε μάλιστα ἔχαιρεν, ὁπότε τύχιστα τυχόντας ῶν δέοιντο ἀποπέμποι. XEN. Ages. IX, 2.

Αἰτία μὲν γάρ ἐστιν, ὅταν τις ψιλῷ χρησάμενος λόγῳ μὴ παράσχητας πίστιν ὧν λέγει, ἔλεγχος δὲ, ὅταν ὧν ἀν εἴπῃ τις καὶ τἀληθὲς ὁμοῦ δείξῃ. DEM. Androt. 600, 5. (Here ὧν λέγει and ὧν ἀν εἴπῃ are nearly equivalent.) Ἐκάλει δὲ καὶ ἐτίμα ὁπότε τινὰς ἴδοι τοιοῦτον ποιήσαντας ὁ πάντας ἐβούλετο ποιεῖν. XEN. Cyr. II, 1, 30. (Here βούλοιτο for ἐβούλετο would have corresponded to δέοιντο in the second example quoted.)

REMARK. The conjunction $\delta \epsilon$ 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.

Οίη περ φύλλων γενεὴ, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν. Π. VI, 146. Ἐπεί τε ὅ πόλεμος κατέστη, ὅ δὲ φαίνεται καὶ ἐν τούτῷ προγιοὺς τὴν δύναμιν, and when the war broke out, (then) he appears, &c. Τιιυς. Π, 65. Μέχρι μὲν οἶν οἱ τοξόται εἶχον τε τὰ βέλη αὐτοῖς καὶ οἶοἱ τε ἦσαν χρησθαι, οἱ δὲ ἀντείχον, so long as their archers both had their arrows and were able to use them, they held out. Id. III, 98. Ὅσπερ οἱ ὅπλῖται, οῦτω δὲ καὶ οἱ πελτασταί. XEN. Cyr. VIII, 5, 12. So φαίνονται δέ, ΤΗυς. I, 11; and ἐγίγνοντο δέ, AESCHIN. 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.

Πρεσβείαν δὲ πέμπειν, ῆτις ταῦτ' ἐρεῖ καὶ παρέσται τοῖς πράγμασιν, and to send an embassy to say these things, and to be present a? the transaction. DEM. OI. I, 10, 1. Φημὶ δὴ δεῖν ἡμῶς πρὸς Θεττα λοὺς πρεσβείαν πέμπειν, ἡ τοὺς μὲν διδάξει ταῦτα, τοὺς δὲ παρο ξυνεῖ. Ib. II, 21, 10. Ἐδοξε τῷ δήμῷ τριάκυντα ἄνδρας ελέσθαι, οἱ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους ξυγγράψουσι, καθ' οὺς πολιτεύσουσι. XEN. Hell. II, 3, 2. Οὐ γὰρ ἔστι μοι χρήματα, ὅπόθεν ἐκτίσω, for l have no money to pay the fine with. PLAT, Apol. 37 C.

The antecedent of the relative, in this case, may be either definite or indefinite; but the negative particle is regularly $\mu \eta$, as in final clauses (§ 43, N. 2).

REMARK. "O $\pi\omega s$ 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.

Ποίεε δὲ οῦτω ὅκως τῶν σῶν ἐνδεήσει μηδέν, and act so that there shall be nothing wanting on your part; lit. act in that way by which, &c. HDT. VII, 18. Τὸ οῦτως ἐπίστασθαι ἀνθρώπων ἄλλων προστατεύειν ὅπως ἔξουσι πάντα τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, ... τοῦτο θαυμαστὸν ἐφαίνετο, i. e. in such a way that they shall have, &c. XEN. Cyr. I, 6, 7. So Cyr. II, 4, 31.

(b.) When, however, this Future is quoted indirectly after a past tense, or depends upon a clause expressing a *past* 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.

²Εσκόπει ὅπως ἔσοιτο αὐτῷ ὅστις ζῶντά τε γηροτροφήσοι καὶ τελευτήσαντα θάψοι αὐτών. ISAE. de. Menecl. Her. § 10. Αἰρεθέντες ἐψ ῷ τε ξυγγράψαι νόμους, καθ οῦστινας πολιτε ὑσοιντο, having 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 in this sense; as in Od. XIV, 333, $\epsilon \pi a \rho \tau \epsilon a s$, of $\delta \eta \mu \nu \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \sigma \nu \sigma \iota \nu$. Sometimes the Optative with $\kappa \epsilon$, as an apodosis, takes the place of the Future; as in Od. IV, 167, $\hbar \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \delta \kappa \epsilon \nu \delta \lambda \lambda \kappa \sigma \epsilon \nu$. The more common Epic construction is, however, the Subjunctive (generally with $\kappa \epsilon$ joined to the relative) after primary tenses, and the Optative (Present or Aorist, never Future), without $\kappa \epsilon$, after secondary tenses. E. g.

Ελκος δ' ίητηρ επιμάσσεται, ηδ' επιθήσει

Φάρμαχ', α κεν παύσησι μελαινάων όδυνάων. Π. ΙV, 191.

Αλλ άγετε, κλητούς ότρύνομεν, οί κε τάχιστα
Έλθωσ' ές κλισίην Πηληκάδεω 'Αχιλησς. Π. ΙΧ, 165.
Έκδοτε, και τιμην αποτινέμεν ην τιν έοικεν,
"Η τε και έσσομένοισι μετ' άδανάτοισι π έληται. Π. Π. 459.
"Αγγελον ήκαν, δς άγγείλειε γυναικί. Od. XV, 458.
Πάπτηνεν δ' ανά πύργου 'Αχαιών, εί τιν' ίδοιτο
'Ηγεμόνων, δς τίς οι άρην έτάροισιν άμύναι. Π. ΧΙΙ, 332.

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 Indicative.

NOTE 3. (a.) The Attie Greek allows the Subjunctive in such phrases as $\xi_{\chi\epsilon\iota} \circ \tau\iota \epsilon^{i}\pi\eta$, he has something to say; where the irregularity seems to be caused by the analogy of the common expression oùk $\xi_{\chi\epsilon\iota} \circ \tau\iota (or \tau i) \epsilon^{i}\pi\eta$, equivalent to oùk $oi\delta\epsilon\nu \circ \tau\iota \epsilon^{i}\pi\eta$, he knows not what he shall say, which contains an indirect question (§ 71). E. g.

Toiovrov ë θ os map $\dot{\epsilon}$ δ orav, $\dot{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon \dots \dot{\epsilon}\kappaa\tau\dot{\epsilon}\rho$ ovs $\ddot{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\nu\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\phi}'$ o $\dot{i}s$ $\phi\iota\lambda\sigma\taui-\mu\eta\theta\dot{\omega}\sigma\iota\nu$, 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 note added to Felton's Isocrates, p. 135.) Ovdev $\ddot{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ bioire ι av $\dot{\tau}\sigma\rho$, $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{a}\nu\mu\dot{o}\nu\nu\dot{\epsilon}\chi\eta$ $\ddot{\sigma}\tau\phi$ $\delta\iotaa\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\eta\tau a\iota$, if only he shall have some one to tak with. PLAT. Symp. 194 D. To $\hat{s}\mu\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda ov\sigma\iota\nu$ $\ddot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\ddot{\sigma}$ $\tau\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\phi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\,\omega\sigma\iota\nu$. XEN. Oecon. VII, 20. (Compare $d\pi o\rho\epsilon is$ $\ddot{\sigma}\tau\iota\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\eta s$ and $\epsilon\dot{\nu}\tau\rho\mu\epsilon is$ $\ddot{\sigma}\tau\iota\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\eta s$ in the same sentence, PLAT. Ion. 535 B.)

(b.) The Present or Aorist Optative very rarely occurs in Attic Greek after a past tense, but more frequently after another Optative. E. g.

^{*}Ανδρα οὐδέν ἕντοπον (όρῶν), οὐχ ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν, οὐδ ὅστις νόσου κάμνοντι συλλάβοιτο, i. e. when I saw no one there to assist me, &c. SOPH. Phil. 281. Γώνιμον δὲ ποιητήν ῶν οὐχ εῦροις ἔτι ζητῶν ῶν, ὅστις ῥῆμα γεννῶιον λάκοι, i. e. a poet to speak a noble word. ARIST. Ran. 96. (Yet in vs. 98 we have the regular ὅστις φθέγξεται, depending on the same οὐκ ῶν εῦροις.) So in PLAT. Rep. III, 398 B, ôs μιμοῖτο καὶ λέγοι, depending on χρώμεθα ἄν. Τῇ ἡμετέρα πῶλει οὐδὲν ῶν ἐνδείξαιτο τοσοῦτον οὐδὲ ποιήσειεν. ὑψ' οῦ πεισθέντες τινὸs 'Ελλήνων ἐκείνω προεῖσθε, i. e. nothing so great, that you woul be persuaded by û to sacrifice any of the Greeks to him. DEM. Phil. II, 67, 20.

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

⁶Ως μέν αν είποιτε δικαίους λόγους και λέγοντος άλλου συνείητε, αμεινον Φιλίπτου παρεσκεύασθε, ώς δι κωλύσαιτ' αν έκεινον πρατ τειν ταῦτα ἐφ' ὧν ἐστι νῦν, παντελῶς ἀργῶς ἔχετε, ἱ. e. as to means by 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, ὡς δ' åν ἐξετασθείη μάλιστ' ἀκριβῶς, μη γένωτο, ἱ. e. may nothing come upon us by which the truth of vehal I say would be thoroughly tested.

NOTE 5. The relative with any tense of the Indicative, on even with the Optative and $a\nu$, can be used to denote a *result*, where $\delta\sigma\tau\epsilon$ might have been expected. (§ 65, 3). This occurs chiefly after negatives, or interrogatives implying a negative. E. g.

Τίς ούτως εἰήθης ἐστὶν ὑμῶν, ἄστις ἀγνοεῖ τὸν ἐκεῖθεν πόλεμον δεῦρο ῆξοντα, ἁν ἀμελήσωμεν; ἱ. e. Who of you is so simple as not to know, &c.? DEM. OI. I, 13, 16. (Here ὥστε ἀγνοεῖν might have been used.) Τίς οῦτω πόρρω τῶν πολιτικῶν ἦν πραγμάτων, ὅστις οὐκ ἐγγὺς ἡναγκάσθη γενέσθαι τῶν συμφορῶν; Isoc. Pan. p. 64 B. § 113. Τίς οῦτως ῥάθυμός ἐστιν, ὅστις οὐ μετασχεῖν βουλήσεται ταύτης τῆς στρατείας; Ib. p. 79 D. § 185. Οὐδεἰς ἀν γένοιτο οῦτως ἀδαμάντινος, ὡς ἀν μείνειεν ἐν τῆ δικαισύνη, no one would ever become so adamantine that he would remain firm in justice. PLAT. Rep. II, 360 B. hav A Kel Mar Miz Ga Se Whol Walth

2. E ϕ ϕ or $\epsilon \phi$ $\phi \tau \epsilon$, on condition that, which is commonly followed by the Infinitive (§ 99), sometimes takes the Future Indicative. E. g.

Ἐπὶ τούτῷ δὲ ὑπεξίσταμαι τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐφ' ῷτε ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ὑμέων ἄρξομαι, Ι withdraw upon this condition, that I shall be ruled, &c. HDT. III, 83. Τούτοισι δ' ῶν πίσυνος ἐῶν κατήγαγε, ἐπ' ῷτε οἱ ἀπόγονοι αὐτοῦ ἱροφάνται τῶν θεῶν ἕσονται. HDT. VII, 153. Καὶ τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἐξέλιπον ᾿Αθηναῖοι πᾶσαν, σπονδὰς ποιησάμενοι ἐφ' ῷ τοῦ ἄνδρας κομιοῦνται. ΤΙΙUC. Ι, 113. Ξυνέβησαν ἐφ' ῷτε ἐξίασιν ἐκ Πελατονήσου ὑπόσπονδοι καὶ μηδέποτε ἐπιβήσονται αὐτῆς. Id. Ι, 103.

It will be noticed here (as in Note 1) that the Future Indicative generally remains unchanged even after a secondary tense.

3. " $\Omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ (sometimes ωs), 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 here, when the Indic-

ative 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 (our si äronoi sore oix aioxiveobai, DEM. F. L. 439, 29), or some are so strange that they are not ashamed (sore oix aioxivvoral). Here, although both expressions have 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.

Οῦτως ἀγνωμόνως ἔχετε, ὥστε ἐλπίζετε αὐτὰ χρηστὰ γενήσεσθαι, κ.τ.λ. are you so senseless that you expect, &c. DEM. Ol. II, 25, 19. (Here ὥστε ἐλπίζειν, so senseless as to expect, would merely make the fact of their expecting less prominent.) Οῦτως ἡμῖν δοκεῖ παντὸς ἄξια εἶναι, ὥστε πἀντες τὸ καταλιπεῖν αὐτὰ μάλιστα φεύγαμεν, so that we all especially avoid, &c. XEN. Mem. II, 2, 3. Οὐχ ἡκεν. ὥσθ οἱ Ἐλληνες ἐφρόντιζον. Id. An. II, 3, 25. Εἰς τοῦτ ἀπληστίας ἡλθον, ὥστ οὐκ ἐξήρκεσεν αὐτοῖς ἔχειν τὴν κατὰ γῆν ἀρχὴν, ἀλλα καὶ τὴν κατὰ θάλατταν δύναμιν οῦτως ἐπεθύμησαν λαβεῖν, ὥστε τοὺς συμμάχους τοὺς ἡμετέρους ἀφίστασαν. Isoc. Panath. p. 254 A. § 103. So after ὡς, § 98, 2, N. 1: Οῦτω ὅή τι κλεινὴ ἐγένετο, ὡς καὶ πάντες οἱ ἕλληνες Ροδώπιος τοῦνομα ἐξέμαθον, i. e. so that all the Greeks came to know well the name of Kholopis. Hor. II, 135.

NOTE. As $\overleftarrow{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ 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 $\ddot{a}\nu$, or even an Imperative. E. g.

²Ωστ' οὐκ ἀν αὐτὸν γνωρίσαιμ' ἀν εἰσιδών. Ευκ. Or. 379. Παθών μὲν ἀντέδρων, ὥστ', εἰ φρονῶν ἔπρασσον, οὐδ' ἀν ὥδ' ἐγιγνόμην κακός. SOPH. O. C. 271. Θυητὸς δ' ᾿Ορέστης: ὥστε μὴ λίαν στένε. Id. El. 1172. So with οὐ μή and the Subjunctive (89, 1); οῦτως ἐπιτεθύμηκα ἀκοῦσαι, ὥστε...οὐ μή σου ἀπολειφθῶ. PLAT Phaedr. 227 D.

4. The relative has sometimes a *causal* signification, being equivalent to δn , *because*, and a personal pronoun or demonstrative word. The verb is in the Indicative, as in ordinary causal sentences (§ 81, 1). E. g.

Θαυμαστὸν ποιεῖς, δς ἡμῖν οὐδἐν δίδως, you do a strange thing in giving us nothing (like ὅτι σὺ οὐδἐν δίδως). XEN. Mem. II, 7, 13. Δόξας ἀμαθὴς εἶναι, ὅς ... ἐκ έλευε, having seemed to be unlearned, because he commanded, &c. HDT. I, 33. Τὴν μητέρα ἐμακάριζων, οἶων τέκνων ἐκύρησε (like ὅτι τοίων). Id. I, 31. Εὐδαίμων ἐφαίνετο, ὡς ἀδεῶς καὶ γενναίως ἐτελεύτα, i. e. because he died so fearlessly and nobly (ὡς being equivalent to ὅτι ὅτως). PLAT. Phaed. 58 E.

uting outris ayarakingen hafriker (4) filor

Taλaίπωρος εἶ, 🧔 μήτε θεοὶ πατρῶοί εἰσι μήθ' ἱερά, i. e. since you hare no ancestral Gods, &c. PLAT. Euthyd. 302 B. (See Remark.) Πῶς ἂν ὀρθῶς ἐμοῦ καταγιγνώσκοιτε, ῷ τὸ παράπαν πρὸς τουτανὶ μηδἐν συμβόλαιόν ἐστιν; i. e. since I have no contract at all, &c. DEM. Apat. 903, 22. So ARIST. Ran. 1459.

REMARK. The ordinary negative particle of a causal relative sentence is où, 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 in the last examples above, in which $\mu\dot{\eta}$ is used, $\ddot{\phi} \ \mu\dot{\eta} \ \thetaeol\ \epsilon low$ (besides its causal force) implies if, as it appears, you are without ancestral Gods; and $\ddot{\phi} \ \mu\eta\delta\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\nu$, 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.

Α. "Εως, "Εστε, "Αχρι, Μέχρι, Εἰσάκε, "Οφρα, Until.

§ 66. 1. When $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega_S$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon$, $\tilde{\alpha}\chi\rho\iota$, $\mu\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\iota$, and $\check{o}\phi\rho\alpha$, 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.

Νηχου πάλιυ, έως ἐπ ηλθου εἰς ποταμόυ, Ι swam on again, until I came to a river. Od. VII, 280. Πίνει, έως ἐθέρμηυ' αὐτὸν ἀμφιβῶσα φλὸξ αἴνου. EUR. Alc. 758. Ξυνεῖρου ἀπιόντες, ἔστε ἐπὶ ταῖς σκηναῖς ἐγένουτο. XEN. Cyr. VII, 5, 6. (So An. III, 4, 49.) Καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίουν μέχρι σκότος ἐγένετο. Id. An. IV, 2, 4. (So III, 4, 8.) [°]Ως μὲυ Θρήικας ἄνδρας ἐπψχετο Τυδέος υἰὸς, ἄφρα δυώδεκ' ἔπεφνεν. II. X, 488. [°]Ηρχ΄ ἴμεν, ὄφρ ἀφίκουτο κατὰ στρατὸν, ἢ μιν ἀνώγει. II. XIII, 329. [°]Ηιεν, ὄφρα μέγα σπέος ἴκετο. Οd. V, 57.

NOTE 1. "A $\chi \rho \iota$ où and $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota$ où are used in the same sense as $a \chi \rho \iota$ and $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota$. E.g.

Των δὲ ταῦτα πραξάντων ἄχρι οῦ ὅδε ὁ λόγος ἐγράφετο Τισίφονος πρεσβύτατος ῶν τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὴν ἀρχὴν εἶχε. ΧΕΝ. Hell. VI, 4, 87. Τοὺς "Ελληνας ἀπελύσατο δουλείας, ὥστ' ἐλευθέρους εἶναι μέχρι σῦ πάλιν αὐτιὶ αὐτοὺς κατεδοιλώσαντο. ΡΙΑΤ. Menex. 245 Α.

NOTE 2. Herodotus uses $\epsilon_s \delta$ or $\epsilon_s \delta$, until, like $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$, with the Indicative. E. g.

'Απεδείκνυσαν παίδα πατρός έκαστον έώντα, ές ο ἀπέδεξαν ἀπάσας αὐτάς. HDT. II, 143. 'Es οὐ Λίχης ἀνεῦρε. Ι, 67.

2. When these particles refer to the future, they are

§ 66, 3.] "Ews, ETC. WITH INDIC., SUBJ., AND OPTATIVE. 143

joined with $\tilde{a}\nu$ or $\kappa\epsilon$ and take the Subjunctive, if the 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 $\tilde{a}\nu$) by assimilation. (See § 61, 4.) E. g.

Maχήσομαι aðθι μένων, είως κε τέλος πολέμοιο κιχείω, until I shall come to an end of the war. II. III, 291. "Έως δ' αν ούν προς τοῦ παρόντος ἐκμάθῃς, ἔχ' ἐλπίδα. SOPH. O. T. 834. Ἐπίσχες, ἔστ' ἀν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ προσμάθῃς, wait until you shall learn, &c. AESCH. Prom. 697. Μέχρι δ' ἀν ἐγὼ ῆκω, αἰ σπονδαὶ μενόντων. XEN. An. II, 3, 24. `Αλλὰ μέν', ὅφρα κέ τοι μελιηδέα οἶνον ἐνείκω, hut wait, until I shall bring, &c. II. VI, 258. So ὅφρ' ἀν τίσωσιν, II. I, 509.

Καὶ τὸ μέν ἂν ἐξαλείφοιεν, τὸ δὲ πάλιν ἐγγράφοιεν, ἕως ὅ τι μάλιστα ἀνθρώπεια ἤθη θεοφιλῆ ποιήσειαν, until they should make, &c. PLAT. Rep. VI, 501 C. Εἰ δὲ πάνυ σπουδάζοι φαγείν, εἴποιμ' ἂν ὅτι παρὰ ταῖς γυναιξίν ἐστιν, ἕως παρατείναιμι τοῦτον, i. e. I would 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 (§ 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, § 44, 2). For the general principle, see § 77. E. g.

Σπονδàs ἐποιήσαντο, ἕως ἀπαγγελθείη τὰ λεχθέντα els Λακεδαίμονα, they made a truce, (to continue) until what had been said should be announced at Sparta. XEN. Hell. III, 2, 20. (Here ἕως ἂν ἀπαγγελθῆ might have been used; as in THUC. I, 90, ἐκέλευεν (τους πρέσβεις) ἐπισχείν, ἕως ἂν τὸ τείχος ἰκανὸν αἴρωσιν.) Sce § 77, 1, d.

NOTE 2. Homer uses $\epsilon i s$ ő $\kappa \epsilon$ (or $\epsilon i \sigma \delta \kappa \epsilon$), until, with the Subjunctive, as Herodotus uses ϵs ő with the Indicative (§ 66, 1, N. 2); as $\mu i \mu \nu \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, $\epsilon i s$ ő $\kappa \epsilon \nu$ ő $\sigma \tau \nu$ $\mu \epsilon \gamma a$ Πριάμοιο $\epsilon \lambda \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, II. II. 332. Els ő $\kappa \epsilon$ may take the Optative, retaining $\kappa \epsilon$; as in II. XV, 70.

Note 3. "Av is sometimes omitted after $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$. &c. (including $\pi\rho i\nu$, § 67, 1) when they take the Subjunctive, as in common protasis and in relative sentences (§ 50. 1, N. 3; § 63. 1); after $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \mu$ and $\pi\rho i \mu this occurs even in Attic prose. Thus <math>\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma r$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\gamma \omega \mu \delta \lambda \omega$, SOPH. Aj. 1183; $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho u \pi \lambda \sigma \tilde{\nu} s \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \tau a u$, Thuc. I, 137: see Thuc. IV. 16; AESCHIN. Cor. § 60.

3. When the clause introduced by $\xi \omega_S$, &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.

'Ηδέως αν τούτφ έτι διελεγόμην, έως αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ 'Αμφίονος ἀπ έδωκα ῥῆσιν ἀντὶ τῆς τοῦ Ζήθου, Ι should gladly have continued to talk with him, until I had given him, &c. PLAT. Gorg. 506 B. Οὐκ ἀν ἐπαυόμην, ἕως ἀπεπειρ ἀθην τῆς σοφίας ταυτησί. Id. Crat. 396 C 'Επισχῶν ἀν, ἔως οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν εἰωθότων γνώμην ἀπεφ ἡναντο, ἡσυχίαν ἀν ἦγον, i. e. I should have waited until most of the regular speakers had declared their opinion, &c. DEM. Phil. I, § 1. (For ἄν here, see § 42, 3.)

The leading verb must be an Indicative implying the non-fulfilment of a condition.

4. When the clause introduced by $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$, &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 $\tilde{a}\nu$ and the Subjunctive after primary tenses, and the simple Optative after secondary tenses. (See § 62.) E. g.

⁶ A δ åν dσύντακτα $\frac{1}{2}$, dνάγκη ταὺτα deì πράγματα παρέχειν, έως åν χώραν λάβη, they must always make trouble, until they are put in order. XEN. Cyr. IV, 5, 37. ⁶Οπότε ῶρα εἰη ἀρίστου, ἀνέμενεν αὐτοὺς ἔστε ἐμφάγοιέν τι, ὡς μὴ βουλιμιῷεν. Ib. VIII, 1, 44. Περιεμένομεν οὖν ἐκάστοτε, ἔως ἀνοιχθείη τὸ δεσμωτήριον. we wailed every day, until the prison was opened. PLAT. Phaed. 59 D. (This may mean until the prison should be opened; § 66, 2, N 1.)

Note. "Av is sometimes omitted after $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega_s$, &c. and $\pi\rho\dot{\nu}$, when they take the Subjunctive in this sense, as well as in the other construction (§ 66, 2, N. 3); as $\frac{d\nu}{2}\pi\dot{\varphi}$ $\phi\rho\sigma\nu\epsilon\dot{\nu}$ $\gamma\dot{\partial}\rho$ $\mu\eta\dot{\delta}\dot{\nu}$ $\eta\dot{\delta}\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma$ $\dot{\beta}\dot{\omega}s$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega_s \tau\dot{\sigma}$ $\chi\alpha\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\omega$ $\kappa\dot{\alpha}$ $\tau\dot{\sigma}$ $\lambda\omega\pi\epsilon\dot{\omega}\sigma\alpha\mu$, More $\lambda\dot{\sigma}\sigma\eta$, II. 1, 82; and $\dot{\epsilon}s$ $\delta\dot{\nu}$ $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\dot{\omega}\omega\sigma\sigma$, HDT. III, 31.

REMARK. When $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega_s$ and $\tilde{\delta}\phi\rho_a$ mean so long as, they are relatives, and are included under §§ 58-64. "Oppa in all its senses is confined to Epic and Lyric poetry. (See § 43, N. 1.)

B. *npiv*, Until, Before that.

§ 67. $\Pi \rho i \nu$, before, before that, until, besides taking the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative, on the same principles with $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$. &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.

 $\Pi_{\rho i\nu}$ 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, Subjunctive, and Optative after $\pi \rho i \nu$ follow the rules already given for $\tilde{\epsilon} \omega s$, &c. (§ 66). E. g.

(Indic. § 66, 1.) Οὐκ ἦν ἀλέξημ' οὐδὲν, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκων χρεία κατεσκέλλοντο, πρίν γ' ἐγώ σφισιν ἕδειξα κράσεις ἦπίων ἀκεσμάτων, until I showed them, &c. AESCH. Prom. 481. Πάλιν τοῦτο τέμνωπ οὐκ ἐπανῆκε, πρὶν ἐλοιδάρησε μάλ' ἐν δίκη. PLAT. Phaedr. 266 A. Οὐκ ἡξίωσαν νεώτερόν τι ποιεῖν ἐς αὐτὸν, πρίν γε δὴ αὐτοῖς ἀνὴρ ᾿Αργίλιος μηνυτὴς γίγνεται, until he becomes, &c. (Histor. Pres.) THUC. I, 132. Πολλὰ ἔπαθεν, πρίν γέ οἱ χρυσάμπυκα κούρα χαλινὸν Παλλὸς ἦνεγκεν. PIND. OI. XIII, 92. ᾿Ανωλόλυξε πρὶν ὅρậ. EUR. Med. 1173.

(Subj. and Opt. § 66, 2.) Oř κώ σε έγὼ λέγω (εἰδαίμονα), πρὶν $\mathring{a}\nu$ τελευτήσαντα καλῶς τὸν αἰῶνα πύθωμαι. HDT. I, 32. Oἰδὲ λήξει, πρὶν \mathring{n} κορέση κέαρ, \mathring{n} ... ελη τις ἀρχάν. AESCH. Prom. 165. Où χρή με ἐνθένδε ἀπελθεῖν, πρὶν $\mathring{a}ν$ δῶ δίκην. XEN. AN. V, 7, 5. 'Aλ' οὐπάτ' ἔγωγ' ἀν, πρὶν ἴδοιμ' ἀρθον ἔπος, μεμφομένων α̈ν καταφαίην. SOPH. O. T. 505. So THEOGN. 126, πρὶν πειρηθείηs. So πρὶν ἐξελκύσειεν, depending on a protasis (εἰ μὴ ἀνείη), PLAT. Rep. VII, 515 Ε. "Ολοιο μήπω, πρὶν μάθοιμ' εἰ καὶ πὰλιν γνώμην μετοίσεις. SOPH. Phil. 961. (Πρίν after Opt. in wish.) 'Απηγόρευε μηδένα βάλλειν, πρὶν Κῦρος ἐμπλησθείη θημῶν, unil Cyrus should be satisfied. XEN. Cyr. I, 4, 14. (§ 66, 2, N. 1.)

(Indic. § 66, 3.) Ἐχρῆν οὖν τοὺς ἄλλους μὴ πράτερον περὶ τῶν όμολογουμένων συμβουλεύειν, πρὶν περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων ἡμῶς ἐδίδαξαν, they ought not to have given advice, §c., until they had instructed us, &c. Isoc. Paneg. p. 44 C. § 19.

(Subj. and Opt. § 66, 4.) Ορώσι τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους οὐ πρώσθεν ἀπιώντας γαστρὰς ἕνεκα, πρὶν ἂν ἀφῶσιν οἱ ἄρχοντες. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 2, 8. Οὐ γὰρ πρότερον κατήγορος παρὰ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ἰσχύει, πρὶν ἂν ὁ Φεύγων ἀδυνατήση τὰς προειρημένας αἰτίας ἀπολίτασθαι. ΑΕΞ-CHIN. F. L. § 2. Οὐδαμόθεν ἀφίεσαν, πρὶν παραθεῖεν αὐταῖς ἅριστον, before they had placed before them. ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. IV, 5, 30.

(Subj. without aν. § 66, 2, N. 3.) Μή στέναζε, πριν μάθης. Sorn. Phil. 917. So Od. X, 175; HDT. I, 136; PLAT. Phaed. 62 C.

J

2. For $\pi \rho i \nu$ with the Infinitive, see § 106.

146

NOTE 1. In Homer, $\pi\rho i\nu$ is not found with the Indicative, $\pi\rho i\nu$ y' $\ddot{\sigma}\tau\epsilon$ taking its place; a few cases occur of the Subjunctive (with out $\ddot{a}\nu$) and the Optative; but the most common Homeric construction, in sentences of all kinds, is that with the Infinitive (§ 106). E. g.

^THμεθ' ἀτυζόμεναι, σανίδες δ' ἔχον εὐ ἀραρυῖαι, πρίν γ' ὅτε δή με σòς νίὰς ἀπὸ μεγάροιο κάλεσσεν, ἱ. e. before the time when, &c. Od. XXIII, 43. So II. IX, 588; XII, 437. [°]Ω φίλαι, οὐ γάρ πω καταδυσώμεθ' ἀχνύμενοί περ εἰς ᾿Λίδαο δόμους, πρὶν μόρσιμον ἦμαρ ἐπέλθη. Od. X, 175. Οἰκ ἔθελεν φείγειν πρὶν πειρήσαιτ' ᾿Αχιλῆος. II. XXI, 580. Πρίν γ' ὅτ' ἅν with the Subjunctive is found in Od. II, 374, and IV, 477.

NOTE 2. $\Pi \rho i \nu$ 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 πρίν after affirmative sentences are very rare. One occurs in ISGC. Paneg. p. 44 A, § 16; ὅστις οὖν οἴεται τοὺς ἄλλους κοινῆ τι πράξειν ³γαθὸν, πρὶν ἂν τοὺς προεστῶτας αὐτῶν διαλλάξῃ, λίαν ἁπλῶς ἔχει.

NOTE 3. $\Pi \rho [\nu \ \eta, \pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \nu \ \eta' (priusquam), and \pi \rho \delta \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \ \eta' may be used in the same constructions as <math>\pi \rho (\nu, \Pi \rho) \nu \ \eta'$ is especially common in Herodotus. E. g.

Οὐ γὰρ δỳ πρότερον ἀπανέστη, πρὶν ἤ σφεας ὑποχειρίους ἐποιήσατο. ΗΔΤ. VI, 45. So ThUC. VI, 61. ᾿Αδικέει ἀπατειθόμενος πρὶν ἢ ἀτρεκέως ἐκμάθῃ. ΗΔΤ. VII, 10. Εὕχετο μηδεμίαν οἱ συντυχίην τοιαύτην γενέσθαι, ἥ μιν παύσει καταστρέψασθαι τὴν Εὐρώπην, πρότερον ἢ ἐπὶ τέρμασι τοῖσι ἐκείνης γένηται. Ιd. VII, 54. Πρότερον ἢ ἐπὶ Τέρμασι τοῖσι ἐκείνης γένηται. Ιd. VII, 54. Πρότερον ἤ with Indic., PLAT. Phaedr. 232 Ε. Πρόσθεν ἢ σὺ ἐφαίνου, τοῖτ' ἐκηρύχθη. SOPH. O. T. 736. ᾿Απεκρίνατο ὅτι πρόσθεν ἂν ἀποθάνοιεν ἢ τὰ ὅπλα παραδοίησαν, that they would die before they would give up their arms. XEN. An. II, 1, 10. (See § 66, 2.)

For examples of the Infinitive after all these expressions, see § 106. Even $\tilde{v}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu$ if is found with the Infinitive.

NOTE 4. $\Pi \rho i \nu$ or $\pi \rho i \nu$ η is very often preceded by $\pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$, $\pi \rho \delta \sigma \delta \epsilon \nu$, $\pi a \rho o s$, or another $\pi \rho i \nu$ (used as an adverb), in the leading clause. E. g.

Οὐ πρότερον πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὸν πόλεμον ἐξέφηναν, πρὶν ἐνόμισαν, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. ΙΙΙ, 1, 16. Οὐ τοίνυν ἀποκρινοῦμαι πρότερον, πρὶν ἂν πύθωμαι. ΡΙΑΤ. Euthyd. 295 C. Καὶ οὐ πρόσθεν ἔστησαν, πρὶν ἢ πρὸς τοῖς πεζοῖς τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἐγένοντο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. Ι, 4, 23.

For examples with the Infinitive, see § 106.

NCTE 5. When $\pi\rho i\nu$ appears to be followed by a primary tense of the Indicative, it is an adverb qualifying the verb. E. g.

Thy δ' dyà où húgu $\pi \rho i \nu \mu \nu$ kai yhpas $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon_{i} \sigma_{i} \nu$, i. e. shoner shall old age come upon her. II. I. 29.

SECTION IV.

INDIRECT 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 indirect 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 $\tau a \tilde{\nu} \tau a \beta o \tilde{\lambda} o \mu a \iota$ may be quoted either directly, as $\lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \tau \iota \tau a \tilde{\nu} \tau a \beta o \tilde{\lambda} o \mu a \iota$," or indirectly, as $\lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \tau \iota \tau s$ őτι ταῦτα βούλεται or $\lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \tau \iota \tau a \tilde{\nu} \tau a \beta o \tilde{\nu} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, some one says that he wishes for these.

2. Indirect quotations may be introduced by $\delta \tau \iota$ or ω s (negatively $\delta \tau \iota o \dot{\upsilon}$, $\dot{\omega}_{s} o \dot{\upsilon}$) 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 \S 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 after such expressions as $\delta \eta \lambda \delta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \nu$, & c.

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.)

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 $\delta \tau \iota$ or δs and in indirect questions, after *primary* tenses, each verb retains both the mood and the tense of the direct discourse, no change being made except (when necessary) in the *person* of the verb.

After secondary tenses, each primary tense of the Indicative and each Subjunctive of the direct discourse may be either changed to the same tense of the Optative or retained in its original mood and tense. The Imperfect and Pluperfect, having no tenses in the Optative, are regularly retained in the Indicative. (See, however, § 70, Note 1, b.) The Aorist Indicative remains unchanged when it belongs to a dependent clause of the direct discourse (§ 74, 2); but it may be changed to the Optative, like the primary tenses, when it belongs to the leading clause (§ 70, 2). The Indicative with $\check{\alpha}\nu$ belongs under § 69, 2.

2. All secondary tenses of the Indicative implying non-fulfilment of a condition (§ 49, 2), and all Optatives (with or without $a\nu$), are retained without change in either mood or tense, after both primary and secondary tenses.

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 ($a\nu$ being retained when there is one), and the dependent verbs follow the preceding rules. (See § 73.)

4. The adverb $a\nu$ is never joined with a verb in indirect discourse, unless it stood also in the direct form: on the other hand, $a\nu$ is never omitted with a verb in indirect discourse, if it was used in the direct form. When $a\nu$ 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 $\mu\dot{\eta}$ in indirect quotation, where $o\dot{v}$ would be used in direct discourse. See examples under § 73.

Simple Sentences in Indirect Quotations after $\delta \tau \iota$ or $\omega \varsigma$ 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 $a\nu$), the principle of § 69, 1, gives the following rules for indirect quotations after $\delta\tau\iota$ or δs and for indirect questions : —

1. After *primary* tenses the verb stands in the *Indicative*, in the tense used in the direct discourse. E. g.

Λέγει ὅτι γράφει, he says that he is writing; λέγει ὅτι ἔγραφεν, he says that he was writing; λέγει ὅτι γέγραφεν, he says that he has written; λέγει ὅτι ἐγεγράφει, he says that he had written; λέγει ὅτι ἔγραψεν, he says that he wrote; λέγει ὅτι γράψει, he says that he shall write.

Λέγει γὰρ ὡς οὐδέν ἐστιν ἀδικώτερον φήμης. AESCHIN. Timarch. § 125. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν τοῦτό γ' εἴποις, ὡς ἔλαθεν. Id. F. L. § 151 (160). Εὐ δ' ἴστε, ὅτι πλείστον διαφέρει φήμη καὶ συκοφαντία. Ib. § 145 (153). 'Αλλ' ἐννοεῖν χρὴ τοῦτο μὲν, γυναῖχ' ὅτι ἔφυμεν. Soph. Ant. 61. Καὶ ταῦθ' ὡς ἀληθῦ λένω, καὶ ὅτι οῦτε ἐδόθη ἡ ψῆφος ἐν άπασι πλείους τ' εγενοντο των ψηφισαμένων, μάρτυρας ύμιν παιέξο μαι, I will bring witnesses to show that, &c. DEM. Eubul. 1303, 2.

Ἐρωτậ τί βούλονται, he asks what they want; ἐρωτậ τί ποιήσουσιν, he asks what they will do. Ἐρωτῶντες εἰ λησταί εἰσιν, asking whether they are pirates. ΤΗ UC. Ι, 5. Εὐβοιίς ῶν δ' ἔβλαστεν, οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν. SOPH. Trach. 401. Εἰ ξυμπονήσεις καὶ ξυ·εογάσει σκόπει. Id. Ant. 41. So EUR. Alc. 784

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 $dyvo\omega \tau is \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$. 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 either 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.

^{*} Ελεξεν ὅτι γράφοι (or ὅτι γράφει), he said that he was writing; i. e. he said γράφω. ^{*}Ελεξεν ὅτι γεγραφὼς εἶη (or ὅτι γέγραφεν), he said that he had written; i. e. he said γέγραφα. ^{*}Ελεξεν ὅτι γράψοι (or ὅτι γράψει), he said that he should write; i. e. he said γράψω. ^{*}Ελεξεν ὅτι γράψειν (or ὅτι ἔγραψεν), he said that he had written; i. e. he said ἔγραψα.

(Optative.) Ἐνέπλησε φρονήματος τοὺς ᾿Αρκάδας, λέγων ὡς μόνοις μέν αυτοίς πατρίς Πελοπόννησος είη, πλείστον δε των Ελληνικών φῦλον τὸ ᾿Αρκαδικὸν εἴη, καὶ σώματα ἐγκρατέστατα ἔχοι. ΧΕΝ. Hell. VII, 1, 23. (He said μόνοις μέν ύμιν.... έστι, πλειστον δέ έστι, και σώματα έχει: these Indicatives might have been used in the place of είη, είη, and έχοι.) "Ελεγε δε ό Πελοπίδας ὅτι Αργείοι και Άρκάδες μάχη ήττημένοι είεν ύπο Λακεδαιμονίων. Ib. VII, 1, 35. (He said ηττηνται, which might have been retained.) So HDT. I, 83. Υπειπών τάλλα ότι αὐτὸς τἀκεί πράξοι, $φ_{\chi}$ ετο, having hinted that he would himself attend to the affairs there. Thuc. I, 90. (He said τἀκεῖ πράξω, and πράξει might have been used for $\pi p a \xi o \iota$. Cf. $a \pi o \kappa \rho \iota v a \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota$ o $\tau \iota$ $\pi \epsilon \mu \psi o \upsilon$ - $\sigma_{i\nu}$, from the same chapter, quoted below.) For the Future Optative in general, see § 26. 'O de einev öri eooivro. XEN. Cyr. VII, 2, 19. (He said έσονται.) Ελέξαν ὅτι πέμψειε σφάς ό Ίνδῶν βασιλεὺς, κελεύων ἐρωτάν ἐξ ὅτου ὁ πόλεμος εἴη, they said that the king of the Indians had sent them, commanding them to ask on what account there was war. Ib. II, 4, 7. (They said eneu- $\psi \epsilon \nu \ \eta \mu \hat{a}s$, and the question to be asked was $\epsilon \kappa \tau i \nu os \ \epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu \ \delta \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon$ μος;) "Ελεγον ότι οὐπώποθ' οῦτος ὁ ποταμὸς διαβατὸς γένοιτο πεζη ei µn tore, they said that this river had never been (everero) fordable except then. Id. An. I, 4, 18. Περικλής προηγόρευε rois 'Aθηναίοις, ήτε

Αρχίδαιος μεν οί ξένος είη, οὐ μέντο ἐπὶ κακῷ γε τῆς πόλεως γένοιτο, λ. zmounced that A. was his friend, but that he had not been male his Giend to the injury of the state. THUC. II, 13. (He said ξένος μοί ἐστιν. οὐ μέντοι... ἐγένετο.) So HDT. I, 25. Έγνωσαν ὅτι κενός ὁ φοβος είη. ΧΕΝ. ΑΠ. Η, 2, 21. Προϊδόντες ὅτι ἕσοιτο ὁ πόλεμος, ἐβούλοντο τὴν Πλάταιαν προκαταλαβείν. THUC. II. 2. Ἐπειρώμην αὐτῷ δεικνύναι, ὅτι οἴοιτο μὲν εἶναι σοφὸς, είη δ' οῦ. PLAT. Αροl. 21 C.

(Indicative.) "Ελεγον ότι έλπίζουσιν σε και την πόλιν έξειν μοι χάριν, they said that they hoped, &c. Isoc. Phil. p. 87 A. § 23. (They said $\epsilon \lambda \pi i (o \mu \epsilon \nu)$, which might have been changed to $\epsilon \lambda \pi i (o \epsilon \nu)$) Ήκε δ' άγγέλλων τις ώς τους πρυτάνεις ώς 'Ελάτεια κατείληπται, some one had come with the report that Elatea had been taken. DEM. Cor. 284, 21. (Here the Perf. Opt. might have been used.) Decνούς λόγους έτόλμα περί έμοῦ λέγειν, ὡς ἐγὼ τὸ πρâγμ' εἰμὶ τοῦτο δεδρακώς. Id. Mid. 548, 17. Αιτιασάμενος γάρ με α και λέγειν αν όκνήσειέ τις, τον πατέρα ώς απέκτονα έγω τον έμαυτοῦ, κ.τ.λ. Id. Andr. 593, 14. Φανερώς είπεν ότι ή μέν πόλις σφών τετείχισται non, he said that their city had already been fortified. THUC. I, 91. Αποκρινάμενοι ότι πέμψουσιν πρέσβεις, εύθυς απήλλαξαν. Id. I, (Cf. $\delta \tau \iota \pi \rho \dot{a} \xi \sigma \iota$, quoted above from the same chapter.) 90. "Ηιδεσαν ότι τους απενεγκώντας οἰκέτας έξαιτήσομεν. DEM. Onet. I, 870, 11. (Ἐξαιτήσοιμεν might have been used.) Ἐτόλμα λέγειν ώς ύπερ ύμων έχθρους έφ' έαυτον είλκυσε και νύν έν τοις έσχάτοις έστι κινδύνοις. Id. Andr. 611, 10.

(Indirect Questions.) 'Ηρώτησεν αὐτὸν τί ποιοίη (οτ τί ποιεῖ), he asked him what he was doing; i. e. he asked τί ποιεῖς; 'Ηρώτησεν aὐτὸν τί πεποιηκώς εἴη (οτ τί πεποίηκεν), he asked him what he had done; i. e. he asked τί πεποίηκας; 'Ηρώτησεν αὐτὸν τί ποιήσοι (οτ τί ποιήσει), he asked him what he should do; i. e. he asked τί ποιήσεις; 'Ηρώτησεν αὐτὸν τί ποιήσειεν (οτ τί ἐποίησεν), he asked him what he had done; i. e. he asked τί ἐποίησας;

"Hpero, et ris èµoù et ŋ σοφώτερος, he asked whether any one was wiser than I. PLAT. Apol. 21 A. (The direct question was $\check{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota$ ris σοφώτερος;) "O τι δὲ ποιήσοι οὐ διεσήµηνε, but he dùl not indicate what he would do. XEN. An. II, 1, 23. (The direct question was τί ποιήσω;) 'Eπειρώτα, τίνα δεύτερον µε' ἐκείνον ἴδοι, he asked whom he had seen who came next to him. HDT. I, 31. (The direct question was τίνα είδες;) Εἶρετο κόθεν λάβοι τὸν maiδa, he asked whence he had received the boy. Id. I, 116. 'Ηρώτων αἰτὸν εἰ ἀναπλεύσειεν, I asked him whether he had set sail. DEM. Polycl. 1223, 20. (The direct question was ἀνέπλευσας;)

'Ηπόρουν τί ποτε λέγει, I was uncertain what he meant. PLAT. Apol. 21 B. (Here λέγοι might have been used.) 'Εβουλεύουθ' οῦτοι τίν' αὐτοῦ καταλείψουσιν, they were considering the question, whom they should leave here. DEM. F. L. 378, 23. 'Ερωτώντων τινῶν λιὰ τί ἀπέθανεν, παραγγέλλειν ἐκέλευεν, κ.τ.λ. XEN. Hell. II, 1, 4.

REMARK 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.

Οῦτοι ἕλεγον ὅτι Κῦρος μὲν τέθνηκεν, ᾿Αριαῖος δὲ πεφευγὼς ἐν τῷ σταθμῶ εἴη, καὶ λέγοι, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Η, 1, 3. (Here τέθνηκεν contains the most important part of the message.) Ἐκ δὲ τούτου ἐπυνθάνετο ἤδη αὐτῶν καὶ ὑπόσην ὁδὸν διήλασαν, καὶ εἰ οἰκοῖτο ἡ χώρα. Ιd. Cyr. IV, 4, 4. Ἐτόλμα λέγειν, ὡς χρέα τε πάμπολλα ἐκτέτικεν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ καὶ ὡς πολλὰ τῶν ἐμῶν λάβοιεν. DEM. Aph. I, 828, 26. (See Rem. 2.) Ὅμοιοι ἦσαν θαυμάζειν ὅποι ποτὲ τρ έψονται οἱ Ἔλληνες καὶ τί ἐν νῷ ἔχοιεν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΗΙ, 5, 13.

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 § 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.

⁶Ηκεν ἄγγελος λέγων ὅτι τριήρεις ἤκουε περιπλεούσας, he came saying that he had heard, &c.; i. c. he said ἤκουον. XEN. An. I, 2, 21. 'Ακούσας δὲ Ξενοφῶν ἔλεγεν ὅτι ὀρθῶς ἤτιῶντο καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῖς μαρτυροίη, he said that they had accused him rightly, and that the fact itself bore witness to them; i. e. he said ᠔ρθῶς ἤτιᾶ σθε καὶ τὸ ἔργου ὑμῖν μαρτυρεῖ. Ib. III, 3, 12. Εἰχε γὰρ λέγειν. καὶ ὅτι μόνοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων βασιλεῖ συνεμάχοντο ἐν Πλαταιαῖς, κοὶ ὅτι ὕστερον οὐδέποτε στρατεύσαιντο ἐπὶ βασιλέα (he saul μόνοι συνεμαχόμ.θα,...καὶ... οὐδέποτε ἐστρατευσάμεθα]. XEN. Hell. VII, 1, 34. Τούτων ἕκαστον ἤρώμην, Ἐνήταραμὲν καὶ Ἐινκράτηρε ἐν εἴ τινες παρῆσυν ὑτ΄ ἀπελάμβανεν, I usked cuch of these men,... Onetor and Timocrates, whether there were any witnesses before whom they had paid the dowry; and Aphobus, whether there had been any present when he received it. DEM. Onet. I, 850. 10. (The two questions were $\epsilon i \sigma i \mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho \epsilon s$; and $\pi a \rho \eta \sigma a \nu \tau \iota \nu \epsilon s$;)

(b.) In a few cases the Present Optative is used after secondary 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.

Τόν Τιμαγόραν απέκτειναν, κατηγορούντος του Λέοντος ώς ούτε συσκηνούν έθέλοι έαυτώ, μετά τε Πελοπίδου πάντα βουλεύοιτο. ΧΕΝ. Hell. VII, 1, 38. (The words of Leon were συσκηνοῦν ήθελέ μοι, μετά τε Πελ. πάντα έβουλεύετο.) Τα πεπραγμένα διηγούντο, ότι αὐτοὶ μέν ἐπὶ τοῖς πολεμίοις πλέοιεν, τὴν δὲ ἀναίρεσιν τῶν ναυαγῶν προστάξαι εν ἀνδράσιν ἰκανοῖς. Ib. I, 7, 5. (The direct discourse was αὐτοὶ μέν ἐπλέομεν, τὴν δὲ ἀναίρεσιν προσετάξαμεν.) Καί μοι πάντες άπεκρίναντο καθ' έκαστον, ότι ούδεις μάρτυς παρείη, κομίζοιτο δε λαμβάνων καθ' όποσονοῦν δέοιτο "Αφοβος παρ' αὐτῶν, they 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 οὐδεἰs μάρτυς παρη ν, ἐκομίζετο δὲ λαμβάνων καθ ὁποσονοῦν δέοιτο. Παρείη contains the answer to the question $\epsilon i \tau i \nu \epsilon s \pi a \rho \eta \sigma a \nu$ 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 its own past tense, to suit the English idiom. Thus $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \nu \ \delta \tau \iota$ $\gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \iota$ (or $\gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \epsilon \iota$) is he said that he was writing; $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \nu \ \delta \tau \iota$ $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\omega} s \ \epsilon i \eta$ (or $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \rho a \phi \epsilon \nu$) is he said that he had written.

In a few cases the Greek uses the same idiom as the English, and allows the Imperfect or Pluperfect to stand irregularly with δn or δs 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.

Εν πολλή απορία ήσαν οι "Ελληνες, εννοιούμενοι μεν ότι επί ταις βασιλέως θύραις ήσαν, κύκλω δε αυτοίς... πόλεις πολευκαι όσαν

bu

4

te

au

no

4 ch

pre

A

con

in

5.

dy 2

KJ/

n

10

11? not

Henry "

A Xen : 10 then take INDIRECT DISCOURSE. Xenv = Xenva [§ 70, 2

àγορàν δὲ οὐδεἰς ἔτι παρέξειν ἔμελλεν, ἀπεῖχον δὲ τῆς Ἑλλάδος οὐ μεῖον ἡ μύρια στάδια,...προὐδεδώκεσαν δὲ ιὐτοὺς καὶ ὁ βἀρβαροι, μώνοι δὲ καταλελειμμένοι ἦσαν οὐδὲ ἱππέα οὐδενα σύμμαχον ἔχοντες. ΧΕΝ. Αn. III, 1, 2. (In all these cases the direct discourse would be in the Present or Perfect Indicative.) Δέγεται δ' αὐτὸν γῶναι ἐψ' ῷ ἐ χώρει, it is said that he knew fir what he was coming. THUC. I, 134. (Here χωροίη or χωρεῖ would be the regular form) Διὰ τὸν χθιζινὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὅς ἡμᾶς διεδύετ, ἐξαπατῶν καὶ λεγον ὡς φιλαθήναιος ἦν καὶ τὰν Σάμῷ πρῶτος κατείποι, i.e. saying φιλαθήναιος εἰμμ καὶ τὰν Σúμῷ πρῶτος κατείπον. ARIST. Vesp 283. (Here εἰμί is changed to ἦν, and not tõ εἰη: κατείπον could have been changed only to κατείποι.)

In these examples the principle usually observed in indirect discourse, — that the tenses employed in the quotation denote *relative* not *absolute* time (§ 9), — is given up, and the Imperfect and Pluperfect denote *absolute* time, as in causal sentences (§ 81, 1). See § 81, 2, Rem.

NOTE 3. (a.) An indirect quotation, with its verb in the Optative after $\delta \tau_i$ or δs_i is sometimes followed by an *independent* syntence with an Optative, which continues the quotation as if it were itself dependent on the $\delta \tau_i$ or δs_i . Such sentences are generally introduced by $\gamma d\rho$. E. g.

⁴Ηκουον δ' έγωγέ τινων ώς οὐδὲ τοὺς λιμένας καὶ τὰς ἀγορὰς ἔτι δώσοιεν αὐτῷ καρποῦσθαι· τὰ γὰρ κοινὰ τὰ Θετταλῶν ἀπὸ τούτων δέοι διοικεῖν, for (as they said) they must administer, &c. DEM. OI. I, 15, 22. ᾿Απεκρίναντο αὐτῷ ὅτι ἀδύνατα σφίσιν εἴη ποιεῖν ἀ προκαλεῖται ἄνευ Ἀθηναίων· παῖδες γὰρ σφῶν καὶ γυναῖκες παρ' ἐκείνοις εἴησαν. (ΓΗUC. II, 72. ^{*}Ελεγου ὅτι παντὸς ἅξια λέγοι Σεύθης· χειμῶν γὰρ εἴη, κ.τ.λ. XEN. 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.

'Υπέσχετο τον ανδρ' 'Αχαιοῖς τόνδε δηλώσειν αγων οἴοιτο μέν μάλισθ' έκούσιον λαβών, εἰ μὴ θέλοι δ', ἄκοντα, i. e. he thought (as he said), &c. SOPH. Phil. 617. 'Αλλά γὰρ οὐδέν τι μαλλον ἦν ἀθάνατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἰς ἀνθρώπου σῶμα ἐλθείν ἀρχὴ ἦν αὐτῆ ὀλέθρου, ὅσπερ νόσος· καὶ ταλαιπωρουμένη τε δὴ τοῦτον τὸν βίον ζώη, καὶ τελευτῶσά γε ἐν τῷ καλουμένω θανάτω ἀπολλύοιτο, and (according 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, seø § 11, Note 6.)

§ 71. When a question in the direct form would be expressed by an *interrogative Subjunctive* (§ 88), indirect

add afam - Ken: Cyrop: VI.

\$ 71.7

M

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.

Πρὸς ἀμφότερα ἀπορῶ, ταὐτην θ ὅπως ἐκδῶ καὶ τάλλ' ὅπόθεν διοικῶ, Ι am at a loss on both questions, how I shall give her a dowry (πῶς ταὐτην ἐκδῶ;), and whence I shall pay other expenses (πόθεν τάλλα διοικῶ;). DEM. Aph. I, 834, 18. Βουλεύομαι ὅπως σε ἀποδρῶ, I am trying to think how I shall escape you (πῶς σε ἀποδρῶ;). XEN. Cyr. I, 4, 13. Οὐκ ἔχω τί λέγω, I know not what I shall say. DEM. Phil. III, 124, 24. So in Latin, non habeo quid dicam. In AESCH. Prom. 470, οὐκ ἔχω σάφισμ' ὅτω... ἀπαλλαγῶ may be explained on this principle as interrogative; or by § 65, 1, N. 3, as a relative elause. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ δι' ἀπειρίων γε οῦ ψήσεις ἔχειν ὅ τι εἴπης. for it is not surely through inexperience that you will declare that you know not what to say (i. e. τί εἴπω;). DEM. F. L. 378, 4. So ὅ τι δῶ and οἶς δῶ. XEN. An. I. 7, 7. <u>Τὰ δὲ ἐκπώματα οὐκ αἰδ'</u> el Χρυσάντα τούτῷ δῶ, I do not know whether I shall give them, &c...

[']Eν δε οί ήτορ μερμήριξεν, ή ὅ γε... τοις μὲν ἀναστήσειεν, δ δ' Ατρείδην ἐναρίζοι, ἡὲ χόλον παύσειεν, ἐρητύσειε τε θυμόν. Π. Ι, 191. (The direct questions were τοὺς μὲν ἀναστήσω, ᾿Ατρεί δην δ' ἐναρίζω; — ἡὲ παύσω, ἐρητύσω τε;) Κλήρους πάλλον, ὑπσότερος δὴ πρόσθεν ἀψείη χάλκεον ἕγχος, i. e. they shook the lots, to decide which should first throw his spear, the question being πότερος πρόσθεν ἀψŷ; Π. ΠΙ, 317. 'Επήροντο, εἰ παραδοῖεν Κομινθίοις τὴν πόλιν, they asked whether they should gire up their city, the question being παραδωμεν τὴν πόλιν; THUC. Ι, 25. 'Εβουλεύοντο εἰ τὰ σκευσφόρα ἐνταθα ἄγοιντο ἡ ἀπίοιεν ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον. XEN. An. Ι, 10, 17. (So An. Ι, 10, 5.) 'Ηπόρει ὅτι χρήσαιτο τῷ πράγματι, he was at a loss how to act in the matter, i. e. τί χρήσωμαι; Id. Hell. VII, 4, 39. Οὐ γὰρ εἴχομεν... ὅπως δρῶντες καλῶς πράξαιμεν, for we could not see how we should fare well, if we did ü. Sort. Ant. Α.

Απορέοντος δὲ βασιλέος ὅ τι χρήσηται τῷ παρεώντι πρήγματι, Επιάλτης ἦλθέ οἱ ἐς λόγους. ΗDT. VII, 213. Ήπόρησε μὲν ἀποτέρωσε διακινδυνεύση χωρήσας. THUC. Ι, 63. Οἱ Πλαταιῆς ἐβουλεύοντο εἶτε κατακαύσωσιν ῶσπερ ἔχουσιν, είτε τι ἄλλο χρήσωνται, whether they should burn them as they were, or deal with them in some other way. Id. II, 4. Απορήσαντες ὅπη καθορμίσωνται, ἐς Πρώτην τὴν νῆσου ἔπλευσαν. Id. IV, 13.

REMARK 1. The context must decide whether the Optative in indirect questions represents a Subjunctive (§ 71) 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.

× Udtus 1.53. Frettildeto. Ettelewith ... & STENTE

REMARK 2. When the leading verb is in the Optative with ar, the

the Optative may be used in indirect questions of this class. See examples in \S 34, 3.

NOTE 1. The particle commonly used in the sense of whether in indirect questions is ϵi , which can introduce a Subjunctive, as well as an Indicative or Optative. (See XEN. Cyr. VIII, 4, 16, quoted above.) 'Eáw 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.

El dé σοι μὴ δοκεῖ, σκέψαι ἐἀν τόδε σοι μᾶλλον ἀρέσκη· φημὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ τὸ νόμιμον δίκαιον εἶναι. XEN. Mem. IV, 4, 12. (The meaning 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 ἐἀν ἀρέσκη is an indirect question, it can represent no form of direct question which includes the ἄν. Even ἀρέσκη alone could not be explained as an interrogative Subjunctive, by § 88.) Ἐἐλν ἀρέσκη in the passage just quoted is similar to ἐἀν ἐνδειξώμεθα in PLAT. Rep. V, 455 B: Βούλει οὖν δεώμεθα τοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀντιλέγοντος ἀκολουθῆσαι ἡμῦν, ἐἀν πως ἡμεῖς ἐκείψα ἐνδει ξώμεθα, ὅτι οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐπιτήδευμα ἴδιον; shall we then ask the one who makes such objections to follow us, in case we can in any way show him that, &c.? See XEN. An. II, 1, 8; and ARIST. Nub. 535. (Such sentences belong under § 53, N. 2. See also § 77, 1, c.)

NOTE 2. E' $\kappa \epsilon$ with the Subjunctive in Homer sometimes forms an indirect question, representing the Epic Subjunctive with $\kappa \epsilon$ in the direct question. (See § 87, Note.) E. g.

Mένετε ὄφρα ἴδητ' αἴ κ' ὕμμιν ὑπέρσχη χεῖρα Κρονίων; are you waiting that you may see whether the son of Kronos will hold his hand to protect you? II. IV, 249. (The direct question would be ὑπέρσχη κε χεῖρα;) Here the κέ always belongs to the verb, so that this Epic construction is no authority for the supposed Attic use of ἐάν and the Subjunctive in the same sense. See Note 1.

§ 72. When the verb of the direct discourse stands with $a\nu$ in the Indicative or Optative (forming an apodosis), the same mood and tense are retained in indirect quotations with $\delta\tau\iota$ and $\delta\sigma$ s and in indirect questions, after both primary and secondary tenses. (See § 69, 2.) E. g.

Δέγει ὅτι τοῦτο ἀν ἐγένετο, he says that this would have happened: ἕλεγεν ὅτι τοῦτο ἀν ἐγένετο, he said that this would have happened. Δέγει (οr ἕλεγεν) ὅτι οὖτος δικαίως ἀν θάνοι, he says (or said) that this man would justly be put to death.

(Θεμιστοκλής) απεκρίνατο, ότι οῦτ' ἀν αὐτὸς Σερίφιος ῶν ὀνομαστὸς εγένετο οῦτ ἐκεῖνος ᾿Αθηναῖος, he replied that he should not have Alan

SKO7

8570

Car K. INFINITIVE.

become famous himself if he had been a Seriphian, nor would the other f he had been an Athenian. PLAT. Rep. I, 330 A. 'Εννοείτε, στι jττον αν στάσις είη ένδς άρχοντος ή πολλων. XEN. An. VI, 1, 29. Απεκρίνατο, στι πρόσθεν αν άποθάνοιεν ή τὰ ὅπλα παραδοίησαν. 'b. II, 1, 10. (The direct discourse was πρόσθεν αν ἀποθάνοιμεν.) Παρελθών τις δειξάτω, ώς οἱ Θετταλοὶ νῦν οὐκ αν ἐλεύθεροι γένοιντο ἄσμενοι DEM. OI. II, 20, 18. Οὐδ' εἰδέναι φησὶ τί ἀ νοιῶν ὑμῖν χαρίσαιτο. Id. F. L. 356, 13. Οὐκ ἔχω τίς ἀν γενοί γαν. AESCH. Prom. 905. So 907. 'Ηρώτων εἰ δοῖεν ἀν τούτωι τὰ πιστά. XEN. An. IV, 8, 7.

NOTE. The same rule applies when a secondary tense of the Indicative in apodosis with $\tilde{a}\nu$ omitted (§ 49, 2, N. 2) is quoted. E. g.

(*Ελεγεν) ὅτι κρείττον η ν αὐτῷ τότε ἀποθανεῖν, he said that it were better for him to die at once. Lys. X, p. 117, § 25. (The direct discourse was κρείττον η ν μοι.)

§ 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 $a\nu$) or the Optative (with $a\nu$), the verb is changed in the quotation to the same tense of the Infinitive, after both primary and secondary tenses. If $a\nu$ 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; § 18, 3, Rem.) E. g.

Φησὶ γράφειν, he says that he is writing; ἔφη γράφειν, he said that he was writing; φήσει γράφειν, he will say that he is (then) writing. (The direct discourse is here γράφω.) Φησὶ (ἔφη) γράφειν ἂν, εἰ ἐδύνατο, he says (or said) that he should now be writing, if he were able. (He says ἕγραφον ἄν.) Φησὶ (ἔφη) γράφειν ἂν, εἰ δύναιτο, he says (or said) that he should write, if he should (ever) be able. (He says γράφοιμι ἄν.)

Φησί γράψαι, he says that he wrote; ἔφη γράψαι, he said that he had written; φήσει γράψαι, he will say that he wrote. (He says ἔγραψα. See § 23, 2.) Φησί (ἔφη) γράψαι αν, εἰ ἐδυνήθη, he says (or said) that he should have written, if he had been able. (He says ἔγραψα ān.) Φησί (ἕφη) γράψαι αν, εἰ δυνηθείη, he says (or said) that he should write, if he should (ever) be able. (He says γράψαιμι ǎν.) Φησί (φήσει) γεγραφέναι, he says (or will say) that he has written;

Φησὶ (φήσει) γεγραφέναι, hé says (or will say) that he has written; ἔψη γεγραφέναι, he said that he had written. (He says γέγραφα.) For the Perfect with $a\nu$, see below.

Φησὶ (φήσει) γράψειν, he says (or will say) that he will write; έφη γράψειν, he said that he would write. (He says γράψω.)

(Present.) 'Appwortin propagiferal, he pretends that he is sick 'Effipiere àppwortin rourowi, he took his oath that this man was sick. DEM. F. L. 379, 15 and 17. Oùr éfiq adròs $d\lambda$ ' ékcîvow orparqyeîv, he said that not he himself, but Nicias, was general; i. e. he said, oùr éyà airòs $d\lambda$ ' ékcîvos orparqyeî. THUC. IV, 28. Tivas nor eduks divada dater e ex e o al ròv Quantov ör éonevdeu; what prayers do you suppose Philip made, &c.? DEM. F. L. 381, 10. (Educoda here represents quu yap åv oùr àxapíorus poi é xeiv, for I think it would not be a thankless labor; i. e. oùr åv $\xi_{\chi ol.}$ XEN. An. II, 3, 18. Oleofe yap ròv marépa... oùr åv $\psi du artev kai rip$ rupà have faken care and have received the pay, &c.? i. e. oùr åv $é <math>\psi du artev kai è \lambda a \mu Bavev; DEM. Timoth. 1194, 20. (See$ § 41, 1.)

(Aorist.) Kata a $\chi \in i \nu \phi \eta \sigma i \tau o \dot{\upsilon} \tau o \upsilon s$, he says that he detained them. Toùs & ai $\chi \mu a \lambda \dot{\omega} \tau o \upsilon s$ oùd ' $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \upsilon \mu \eta \theta \eta \nu a i \phi \eta \sigma i \lambda \dot{\upsilon} \sigma \sigma \theta a i$, but he says that he did not even think of ransoming the prisoners. DEM, F, L. 353, 14 and 18. (He says katé a v oùd oùd ' $\dot{\epsilon} \nu e \theta \upsilon \mu \eta \theta \eta \nu a i$ to have been the son of Cambyses. XEN. Cyr. 1, 2, 1. Toùs 'Ad quaison $\eta \lambda \pi i \xi \epsilon \nu$ i a say that the Athenians would perhaps march out, and not allow their land to be laid waste; i. e. $i \sigma \omega s$ a $\nu \epsilon \epsilon \xi \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon i \nu$ range a voui a voi a

(Perfect.) $\Phi\eta\sigma\dot{\nu}a\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\sigma}s$ arros $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\sigma\theta a\iota$, he says, arros $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta\mu a\iota$. DEM. F. L. 352, 26. Eikaζov η διώκοντα σίχεσθαι η καταληψόμενών τι προεληλακέναι. XEN. An. I, 10, 16. (Their thought was η διώκων σίχεται, η ...προελήλακεν. See § 10, N. 4.) "Εφη χρήμαθ' έαυτῷ τοὺs Θηβαίουs ἐπικεκηρυχέναι, he said that the Thebans had offered a reward for him. DEM. F. L. 347, 26. For examples of the Perfect Infinitive with $n\nu$, representing the Pluperfect Indicative and the Perfect Optative, see § 41, 2.

(Future.) 'Emayyéhlerai rà díkaia $\pi \circ i \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota v$, he promises to do what is right. DEM. F. L. 356, 10. So II. I, 161. "Ecpη ἐντὸς $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho \delta v$ ἐκοσιν η ἄξειν Λακεδαιμονίους ζώντας η αὐτοῦ ἀπο & τενεῖν, he said that wihin twenty days he would either bring them alive or kill them where they were. THUC. IV, 28. (Cleon said η ἄξω...η ἀποκτενῶ.) Ταῦτα (Φησὶ) πεπράξεσθαι δυοῦν η τριῶν ήμερῶν, 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 ¤ν, see § 41, 4.

REMARK. For the meaning of each tense of the Intinitive in indirect discourse, see § 15, 2; § 18, 3; § 23, 2; and § 27. It will

be seen that these tenses (especially the Aorist) in this use 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 $a\nu$) or of the Optative (with a_{ν}), which can be transferred without change of tense to the Infinitive. (See § 15, 2, N. 1, which applies only to the Infinitive without $a\nu$.) Thus $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega a\nu\tau\delta\nu \epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$ means I say that le came; but Bourtai erai valeiv means he wishes to come, where erdeiv is merely an ordinary Infinitive, belonging under § 23, 1. In the former case $\epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon i \nu$ represents $\eta \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$, but in the latter case it represents no form of the Aorist Indicative or Optative, and is therefore not in indirect 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 $a\nu$. E. g.

'Αγγέλλει τούτους ἐρχομένους, he announces that they are coming; ἤγγειλε τούτους ἐρχομένους, he announced that they were coming. (The announcement is οἶτοι ἔρχονται.) 'Αγγέλλει τούτους ἐλθόντας, he announces that they came; ἤγγειλε τούτους ἐλθόντας, he announced that they had come. (The announcement is ἦλθον.) 'Αγγέλλει τούτους ἐληλυθότας, he announces that they are come; ἤγγειλε τούτους ἐληλυθότας, he announces that they roro γενησόμενον, he announces (or announced) that this is (or was) about to happen. (He announces τοῦτο γενήσεται.) Τοῦ τε γὰρ ἐπιχειρήμασιν ἐώρων οὐ κατορθοῦντες καὶτοῦς στρα-

Toîs te yàp èmixeipíµasiv éŵpŵv où katop boùvtes kaltoùs stpatiátas à χ boµ évovs tỹ µovỹ, they saw that they were not succeeding, and that the soldiers were distressed; i. e. they saw, où katop boùµev kal oi stpatiânai ă χ bovtai. Thuc. VII, 47. 'Eµµévoµev dis ‰pokoyýsaµev dikaiois o voir; do we abide by what we acknowledged to be just (i. e. dikauá èstiv)? PLAT. Crit. 50 A. Hávô' ἕveka éautoù voi v éξeληλεγκτai, he has been proved to be doing everything for his swn interest. DEM. Ol. II, 20, 12. Aùtôp Kûpov stpatevovta mpôros ἤγγείλa, I first announced to him that Cyrus was marching against him. XEN. An. II, 3, 19. See SOPH. O. T. 395.

'Επιστάμενοι καὶ τὸν βάρβαρον αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῷ τὰ πλείω σφαλέντα, καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τοὺς 'Αθηναίους πολλὰ ἡμᾶς ὅὅη τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασιν αὐτῶν μᾶλλον ἡ τῆ ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν τιμωρία περιγεγενημένους ΠΗUC. Ι, 69. (The direct discourse would be ὁ βάρβαρος ... έσφαλη, καὶ ἡμεῖς ... περιγεγενήμεθα.) So in the same chapter. τον Μηδων αυτοί ἴσμεν ἐκ πειράτων γης ἐπὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἐλθόντα, i. e. ὁ Μηδος ἦλθεν. Οὐ γὰρ ἦδεσαν αὐτὸν τεθνηκότα, jor they did not know that he was dead (i. e. τέθνηκεν). XEN. An. I, 10, 16. Ἐπέδειξα οὐδεν ἀληθές ἀπηγγελκότα ἀλλὰ φενακίσανθ' ὑμᾶς, I have shown that he has reported nothing that is true, and that he deceived you. (Perf. and Aor.) DEM. F. L. 396, 30.

Ei ev for the set of the set of

Εῦ δ' ἴσθι μηδὲν ἄν με τούτων ἐπιχειρήσαντα σε πείθειν, εἰ δυναστείαν μόνον ἡ πλοῦτον ἐώρων ἐξ αὐτῶν γενησόμενον. Isoc. Phil. p. 109 B. § 133. (Here μηδὲν ἀν ἐπιχειρήσαντα represents οὐδὲν ἀν ἐπεχείρησα, § 69, 5; and γενησόμενον represents γενήσετα.) Σκοπούμενος οὖν εῦρισκον οὐδαμῶς ἀν ἅλλως τοῦτο διαπραξάμενος, I found that I could accomplish this (διαπραξαίμην ἅν) in no olker way. Id. Antid. p. 311 C. § 7.

⁶Onws dé ye toùs noleµious dúvaiche kakŵs noieîv, oùk oloha µ av- $\theta á vovtas$ úµâs nollás kakovpyias, do you not know that you learned, &c. XEN. Cyr. I, 6, 28. (Here the Optative dúvaiche, as well as the whole context, shows that µavθávovtas represents èµ µav $\theta á vete$, § 16, 2.) Méµvηµai dè ĕywye kai naĩs ŵv Kpitia tŵde £ vvóvta oe, I remember that you were with this Critias. PLAT. Charm. 156 A. (Ξυνόντα represents ξυνήσθα.) See § 16, 2, and the examples.

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

§ 74, 1.]

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.

(After primary tenses.) *Αν δ' ὑμεῖς λέγητε, ποιήσειν (Φησὶ) δ μήτ αἰσχύνην μήτ ἀδοξίαν αὐτῷ Φέρει. DEM. F. L. 354, 8. (Here no change is made, except from παιήσει to παιήσειν.) Νομίζω γὰρ, αν τοῦτ ἀκριβῶς μίθητε, μαλλαν ὑμᾶς τοὐτοις μὲν ἀπιστήσειν ἐμοὶ δὲ βοηθήσειν. Id. Onet. I, 870, 27. Ἐἐκεινο εἰδῶμεν, ὅτι ὅπαντα ὅσα πώποτ' ὴλπίσαμέν τινα πράξειν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καθ' ἡμῶν εὕρηται,...κὰν μὴ νῦν ἐθέλωμεν ἐκεῖ παλεμεῖν αὐτῷ, ἐνθάδ' ἴσως ἀναγκασθησόμεθα τοῦτο πωείν, κ. τ. λ. Id. Phil. I, 54, 18. Προλέγω ὅτι, ὑπότερ' ἀν ἀποκρίνηται, ἐξελεγχθήσεται. PLAT. Euthyd. 275 Ε. See DEM. Mid. 536, 1, where two such conditional sertences depend on εἰ πρίθηλον γένοιτο. (Sce § 34, 3.) [°]Ορῶ σοἰ τούτων δεῆσον, ὅταν ἐπιθυμήσης φιλίαν πρός τινα

Ορώ σοὶ τούτων δέῆσον, ὅταν ἐπιθυμήσῃς φιλίαν πρός τινα. ποιεῖσθαι. ΧΕΝ. Μεm. II, 6, 29. Παράδειγμα σαφὲς καταστήσατε, ὅι ἀν ἀφιστῆται, θανάτως ζημιωσόμενον. Τιιυς. III, 40. Set § 73, 2.

(Opt. after secondary tenses.) Eine öri ävdpa äyoi öv eipgai déoi he said that he was bringing a man whom it was necessary to confine i. e. he said ävdpa äyw öv eipgai dei. XEN. Hell. V, 4, 8. 'Arre kpivaro öri µavdávoiev oi µavdávorres à oùk èri or aivro, i. e. hi replied, µavdávoiev do vi eirorarrai. PLAT. Euthyd. 276 E. (Here ä has a definite antecedent, § 59, and is not conditional; it takes the Optative only because it is in indirect discourse. So with öv in the preceding example.) 'Ayŋoihaos ëheyev öri, ei Bhaßepà $\pi \in \pi p a \chi o;$ díxaiós $e i n (gnuoùodai, i. e. he said ei Bhaßepà <math>\pi \in \pi p a \chi o;$ díxaiós e o ri (gnuoùodai. XEN. Hell. V, 2, 32. So An. VI, 6, 25.

Εἰ δέ τινα φεύγοντα λήψοιτο, προηγόρευει ὅτι ὡς πολεμίω χρή σοιτο. Id. Cyr. III. 1, 3. (This is a quotation of a conditionan sentence belonging under § 50, 1, N. 1; εἶ τινα λήψομαι, ... χρήσο μαι.) Γνώντες δὲ ... ὅτι, εἰ δώσοιεν εὐθύνας, κινδυνεύσοιε ἀπολέσθαι, πέμπουσιν καὶ διδάσκουσιν τοὺς Θηβαίους ὡς, εἰ μὴ στρα τεύσοιεν, κινδυνεύσοιεν οἰ Ἀρκάδες πάλιν λακωνίσαι. Id. Heli VII, 4, 34. (See § 32, 2.) "Ηιδει γὰρ ὅτι, εἰ μάχης ποτὲ δ.ήσοι, ἐν τούτων αὐτῷ παραστάτας ληπτέον εἴη. Id. Cyr. VIII, 1, 10. (The direct discourse was εἴ τι δεήσει, ... ληπτέον ἐστίν.)

Έλογίζοντο ώς, εἰ μὴ μάχοιντο, ἀποστήσοιντο αἰ περιοικίδε· πόλεις. Id. Hell. VI, 4, 6. (Ελν μὴ μαχώμεθα, ἀποστήσοντα.) Χρήμαθ' ὑπισχνεῖτο δώσειν, εἰ τοῦ πράγματος αἰτιῷντο ἐμέ. DEM. Mid. 548, 20. (Δώσω, ἐἰν αἰτιᾶσθε.) 'Ηγεῖτο γὰρ ἅπαν ποιήσειν αὐτὸν, εἴ τις ἀργύριον διδοίη. LYS. in Erat. p. 121, § 14. Εὕζαντο σωτήρια θύσειν, ἕνθα πρῶτον εἰς φιλίαν γῆν ἀφίκοιντο. XEN. An. V, 1, 1. (The dependent clause is found in the direct discourse in III 2, 9: δοκεῖ μαι εὕξασθαι τῷ θεῷ τούτῷ θύσειν σωτήρια ὅποῦ ἀπ πρῶτν εἰς φιλίαν γῆν ἀφικώμεθα.) Τοῦτο ἐπραγματεύετο νομίζων, ὅσα τῆι πόλεως προλάβοι, πάντα ταῦτα βεβαίως ἔξειν. DEM. Cor. 234, 5 ("Οσ' ἀν προλάβω, βεβαίως ἔζω.) "Ηλπιζον ὑπὸ τῶι παίδων, ἐπειδλ

161

К

τελευτήσειαν τὸν βίον, ταφήσεσθαι. Lys. Agor. p. 133, § 45. (Ἐπειδὰν τελευτήσωμεν, ταφησόμεθα.) Κόνων ἐδίδασκεν ὡς οῦτω μὲν ποιοῦντι πῶσαι αὐτῷ ai πόλεις φιλίαι ἔσοιντο, εἰ δὲ δουλοῦσθαι βουλόμενος φανερὸς ἔσοιτο, ἔλεγεν ὡς μία ἐκάστη πολλὰ πράγματα ἰκανὴ εἴη παρέχειν, καὶ κίνδυνος εἴη μὴ καὶ οἱ ἕΕλληνες, εἰ ταῦτα αἴσθοιντο, συσταῖεν. XEN. Hell. IV, 8, 2.

⁴Ετι δὲ γιγνώσκειν ἔφασαν φθονοῦντας μὲν αὐτοὺς, εἶ τι σφίσιν ἀγαθὸν γίγνοιτο, ἐφηδομένους δ', εἴ τις συμφορὰ προσπίπτοι, they said they knew that they were envious if any good came to them, but pleased if any calamity bejell them. Th. V, 2, 2. (Φθονεῖτ ε μὲν, ἐἀν τι ἡμῖν ἀγαθὺν γίγνηται, ἐφήδεσθε δ', ἐἀν τις συμφορὰ προσπίπτη. See § 51.) Τὴν αἰτίαν, ἡ πρόδηλος ἦν ἐπ' ἐκείνους ἥξουσα, εἶ τι πάθοι Χαρίδημος.) See § 73, 2.

(Subj. and Indic. after secondary tenses.) "Eleyov öti äkpa té $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota v \epsilon v \delta o v kai o i πολ εμιοι πολλοί, ο παίου σι v τουs ενδον άν$ θρώπουs, then said that there was a height, &c. XEN. An. V, 2, 17(Here είεν and παίοιεν might have been used.)

'Εδόκει μοι ταύτη πειρασθαι σωθηναι, ενθυμουμένω ότι, εαν μεν λάθω, σωθήσομμι, κ.τ.λ. LYS. Erat. p. 121, § 15. (Here εἰ λάθοιμι, σωθησοίμην night have been used.) Φάσκων τε, ην σωθη οἴκαδε, κατά γε τὸ αὐτῷ δυνατὸν διαλλάξειν 'Αθηναίους καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους, ἀπέπλευσεν. XEN. Hell. Ι, 6, 7. (He said ην σωθῶ, which might have been changed to εἰ σωθείη.) 'Υπέσχοντο αὐτοῖς, ην ἐπὶ Ποτίδαιαν ἴωσιν 'Αθηναίοι, ἐς τὴν 'Αττικὴν ἐσβαλεῖν. THUC. Ι, 58. (^{*}Ην ἴωσιν, ἐσβαλοῦμεν.) So THUC. Ι, 137. Καὶ οὐκ ἔφασαν ἰέναι, ἐὰν μή τις αὐτοῖς χρήματα διδῷ... 'Ο δ' ὑπέσχετο ἀνδρὶ ἑκάστῷ δώ σειν πέντε μνας, ἐπὰν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ῆκωσι, καὶ τὸν μισθῶν ἐντελη, μέχρι ἀν καταστήση τοὺς ἕλληνας εἰς ἰωνίαν πάλιν. XEN. An. Ι, 4, 12 and 13. "Εψη χρηναι,... οἱ ἀν ἐλεγχθῶσι διαβάλλοντες τῶν Έλλήνων, ὡς προδότας ὅντας τιμωρηθήναι. Ib. II, 5, 27.

Eἰ δὲ μὴ, καἱ αὐτοὶ ἔφασαν αὐτῶν τοὺς ἀνδρας ἀποκτενεῖν οὑς ἔχονσι ζῶντας. THUC. II, 5. (Ἔχοιεν might have been used.) Kaτασχίσειν τὰς πύλας ἔφασαν, εἰ μὴ ἐκόντες ἀνοίξουσιν. XEN. An. VII, 1, 16. (Εἰ μὴ ἀνοίξοιεν might have been used.) Αὐτοῖς τοιαὐτη δόξα παρειστήκει, ὡς, εἰ μὲν πρότερον ἐπ' ἀλλην πόλιν ἴασιν, ἐκείνοις καὶ ᾿Αθναίοις πολεμήσουσιν· εἰ δ' ἐνθάδε πρῶτον ἀφίξονται, οὐδένας ἄλλους τολμήσειν, κ.τ.λ. LYS. Or. Fun. p. 192, § 22. (Τοῦτο) πρόδηλον ἦν ἐσόμενον, εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς κωλύσετε, ἰ was already manifest that this would be so, unless you should prevent it (i. e. ἔσται, εἰ μὴ κωλύσειτε, representing ἐἀν μὴ κωλύσητε, 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

§ 74, 1.]

leading verb is changed to the Optative. This often gives rise to a great variety of constructions in the same sentence. E. g.

Δηλώσας ὅτι ἔτοιμοί εἰσι μάχεσθαι, εἴ τις ἐξέρχοιτο. ΧΕΝ Cyr. IV, 1, 1. (ἕτοιμοί εἰσιν, ἐάν τις ἐξέρχηται.) Λύσανδρος εἶπε ότι παρασπόνδους ὑμᾶς ἔχοι, καὶ ὅτι οὐ περὶ πολιτείας ὑμῦν ἔσται ἀλλὰ περὶ σωτηρίας, εἰ μὴ ποιὑσαιθ ἂ Θηραμένης κελεύοι. LYS. in Erat. p. 127, § 74. (Έχω, καὶ οὐ... ἕσται, ἐἀν μὴ ποιἡσηθ ἂ Θ. κελεύει. There is no need of the emendations ποιήσετ and κελεύει.) Ἐδάκει δῆλον εἶναι ὅτι αἰρήσονται αὐτὸν, εἴ τις ἐπιψηφίζοι. ΧΕΝ. Αn. VI, 1, 25. Οὐκ ἡγνόει Εὐβουλίδης ὅτι, εἰ λόγος ἀποδοθήσοιτο, καὶ παραγένοιντό μοι πώντες οἱ δημόται, καὶ ἡ ψῆφοδικαίως δοθείη, οὐδαμοῦ γενήσονται οἱ μετὰ τούτου συνεστηκότες. DEM. Eubul. 1303, 22. (Εἰ ἀποδοθήσεται, καὶ ἐὰν παραγένωντα, καὶ ψῆφος δοθῆ, οὐδαμοῦ γενήσονται.) 'Αγησίλαος γνοὺς ὅτι, εἰ μὲν μηδετέρφ συλλήψοιτο, μισθὸν οὐδίτερος τ΄ ἀν κρατήση, οῦτος ἐχθρὸς ἕσται· εἰ δὲ τῷ ἐτέφ συλλήψοιτο, οῦτός γε φίλος ἔσοιτο, κ.τ.λ. XEN. Αχος. II, 31.

Έλεγον ὅτι εἰκότα δοκοῖεν λέγειν βασιλεῖ, καὶ ῆκοιεν ἡγημόνας ἔχοντες, οἱ αὐτοὺς, ἐὰν σπονδαὶ γένωνται, ἄξουσιν ἕνθεν ἔξουσι τὰ ἐπιτήδεια. ΧΕΝ. ΑΠ. ΙΙ, 3, 6. Ἐπηρώτα, ποῖα εἴη τῶν ὀρέων ὑπόθεν οἱ Χαλδαίοι καταθέοντες ληίζονται. Ιd. Cyr. ΙΙΙ, 2. 1. Τούτοις προῦλεγον, ὅτι εἰρωνεύσοιο καὶ πάντα μαλλον ποιήσοις ἡ ἀποκρινοῖο, εἴ τίς τί σε ἐρωτᾶ. ΡLΑΤ. Rep. Ι, 337 Α. (Ἐρωτᾶ in the direct discontrse would belong under § 51, Ν. 3, the Futures denoting a habit.) Ἔλεξας ὅτι μέγιστον εἴη μαθεῖν ὅπως δεῖ ἐξεργάζεσθαι ἕκαστα· εἰ δὲ μὴ, οὐδὲ τῆς ἐπιμελείως ἔφησθα ὄφελος οὐδὲν γίγνεσθαι, εἰ μή τις ἐπίσταιτο ἁ δεῖ καὶ ὡς δεῖ ποιείν. ΧΕΝ. Oecon. XV, 2.

In DEM. Cor. 276, 23, we have both the constructions of § 74, 1 in the same sentence: $\epsilon i \, \mu \epsilon \nu$ τοῦτο τῶν ἐκείνου συμμάχων εἰση γοῦτό τις, ὑπόψεσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐνόμιζε πάντας, ἁν δ' Ἀθηναῖος ἦ ὁ τοῦτο ποιῶν, εὐπόρως λήσειν. (Here εἰ εἰσηγοῖτο represents ἐἀν εἰσηγῆται, corresponding to ἐἀν ἦ.)

NOTE 2. According to the general rule (§ 69, 4), all relatives and particles which take \tilde{a}_{ν} and the Subjunctive lose the \tilde{a}_{ν} when such Subjunctives are changed to the Optative in indirect discourse attent secondary tenses. In a few cases, however, the \tilde{a}_{ν} is irregularly retained, even after the verb has been changed to the Optative. This must not be confounded with \tilde{a}_{ν} belonging to the Optative itself, making an apodosis. E. g.

Oùk ểơở ổơτιs oùy ἡγεῖτο τῶν εἰδότων δίκην με λἡψεσθαι παρ' αὐτῶν, ἐπειδὰν τάχιστα ἀνὴρ εἶναι δοκιμασθείην. DEM. Onet. I, 865, 24. (The direct discourse was ἐπειδὰν δοκιμασθῆ, and the regular indirect form would be either ἐπειδὴ δοκιμασθείην or ἐπειδὰν δοκιμασθῶ. Here the verb is changed, while the original particle ἐπειδάν is retained.) See also § 77, 1, Note 3. 2. The Imperfect and Pluperfect remain in the Indicative unchanged, even after secondary tenses, in the dependent (as well as in the leading) clauses 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.

²Επιστείλαι δὲ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἐφάρους (ἔφασαν) εἰπεῖν, ὡς ῶν μὲν πρόσθεν ἐποίουν μέμφοιντο αὐτοῖς, that they sent them to say that they blamed them for what they had done before; i. e. ῶν πρόσθεν ἐποιεῖτε μεμφόμεθα ὑμῖν. XEN. Hell. III, 2, 6.

(Aorist Ind.) "Ηλπίζον τοὺς Σικελοὺς ταὐτη, οῦς μετ έπ εμψαν, ἀπαντήσεσθαι, they hoped that the Sikels whom they had sent for would meet them here. THUC. VII, 80. 'Αντέλεγον... λέγοντες μὴ ἀπηγγέλθαι πω τὰς σπουδὰς, ὅτ' ἐσ έπ εμψαν τοὺς ὅπλίτας. Id. V, 49. (§ 69, 5.) Ελεγον ὡς Ξενοφῶν οἴχοιτο ὡς Σεύθην αἰκήσων καὶ ἀ ὑπ έσ χετο αὐτῷ ἀποληψόμενος. XEN. An. VII, 7, 55. Έκαστον ηράμην, εἶ τινες εἶεν μάρτυρες ὡν ἐναντίον τὴν προῖκ' ἀπ έδοσαν. 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 $\epsilon\phi\eta \,\hat{a} \,\epsilon\,\tilde{v}\rho\,a$ $\delta\phi\sigma\epsilon v$ means he said that he would give whatever he might find (\hat{a} $\epsilon\,\tilde{v}\rho\sigma v$, 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 In-

When no ambiguity can arise from the change of an Aorist Indicative to the Optative, this tense may follow the general principle (§ 69, 1), even in dependent clauses of a quotation. This occurs chiefly in causal sentences after $\delta \tau_i$, &c., because (§ 81, 2), in which the Subjunctive can never be used. E. g.

Είχε γὰρ λέγειν ὡς Λακεδαιμόνιοι διὰ τοῦτο πολεμήσειαν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι οὐκ ἐθελήσαιεν μετ' ᾿Αγησιλάου ἐλθεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν οὐδὲ θῦσαι ἐάσειαν αὐτὸν ἐν Αὐλίδι. XΕΝ. Hell. VII, 1. 34. (The direct discourse was ἐπολέμησαν ἡμῖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἡ θελήσαμεν... οὐδὲ θῦσαι εἰάσα μεν.) ἘΑπηγήσασθαί (φασι) ὡς ἀνοσιώτατον μὲν εἶη εἰργασμένος ὅτε ποῦ ἀδελφεοῦ ἀποτάμοι τὴν κεφαλὴν, σοφώτατον δὲ ὅτι τοὺς φιλάκους κσταμεθύτας κα · αλύσειε τοῦ ἀδελφεοῦ κρεμάμευον τὸν νέκυν ΗDT II, 121. (Here $\delta \tau \iota$ καταλύσειε represents $\delta \tau \iota$ κατέλυσα, because I took down; $\delta \tau \epsilon$ ἀποτάμοι (so the Mss.) may also be understood in a causal sense, since he had cut off. Madvig, however, reads $\delta \tau \iota$ 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.

^{*}Ελεγον οὐ καλῶς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐλευθεροῦν αὐτὸν, εἰ ἄνδρας διέφθειρεν οῦτε χεῖρας ἀνταιρομένους οῦτε πολεμίους. ΤΗ UC. III, 32. (Οὐ καλῶς ἐλευθεροῖς, εἰ διαφθείρεις.) Οὕτε γὰρ τοῖς θεοῖς ἔφη καλῶς ἔχειν, εἰ ταῖς μεγάλαις θυσίαις μαλλον ἢ ταῖς μικραῖς ἔχαιρον. ΧΕΝ. Μεm. Ι, 3, 3. (Εἰ χαίρουσιν.) Καὶ ἔφη εἶναι παρ' ἐαυτῷ ἄσον μὴ ἦν ἀνηλωμένον. DEM. Olymp. 1172, 1. ([']Οσον μή ἐστιν ἀνηλωμένον.) ^{*}Α μὲν εἰλήφει τῆς πόλεως ἀποδώσειν (ἡγούμην), I thought that he would give back what he had taken from the city; i. e. ἁ εἴληφεν ἀποδώσει. 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.

Ἐδόκει, εἰ μὴ ἔ ϕ θασαν ξυλλαβόντες τοὺς ἄνδρας, προδοθῆναι ἀν τὴν πόλιν. ΤΗ UC. VI, 61. (Ι΄ ἔζθασαν had been changed to the Optative, the construction would have become that of § 76.) Οἴεσθε τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ Τιμοθέου ῆν τὰ ξύλα καὶ ἐδ εή θη οὖτος αὐτοῦ... παρασχεῖν τὸ ναῦλον, ἐἂσαι ἄν ποτε, κ.τ.λ., ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ϕυλάττειν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν λαμβάνειν, ἕως ἐκομίσατο τὰ ἑαυτοῦ. DEM. Timoth. 1194, 13. Τούτων εἶ τι ἦν ἀληθὲς, οἴεσθ' οὐκ ἂν αὐτὴν λαβεῖν; Ιd. Aph. I, 831, 5. 'Ηδέως ἂν ὑμῶν πυθοίμην, τίν' ἂν ποτε γνώμην περὶ ἐμοῦ εἴχετε, εἰ μὴ ἐπετριηράρχησα ἀλλὰ πλέων ῷχόμην. Id. Polycl. 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.

Είπεν ὅτι ἕλθοι ἀν εἰς λόγους, εἰ ὁμήρους λάβοι. ΧΕΝ. Hell. ΠΙ, 1, 20. Ἡττον ἀν διὰ τοῦτο τυγχάνειν (δοκεῖ μοι), εἴ τι δέοισθε παρ πὐτῶν. ΧΕΝ. ΑΠ. VΙ, 1, 26. Ἐλεγεν ὅτι οὐκ ἄν ποτε προοῖτο, ἐπεὶ ἅπαξ φίλος αὐτρῶς ἐγένετο, οὐδ εἰ ἔτι μὲν μείους γένοιντο ἔτι δὲ κάκιον πράξειαν. Ib. I, 9, 10. Δεινόν αντι παθείν σαυτόν ήλπιζες, εl πύθοινθ' ούτοι τά πεπραγμένα σοι. DEM. F. L. 416, 11.

REMARK. Sentences which belong under § 76 are often translated like those which in the direct discourse were expressed by a Future and a dependent Subjunctive, and which belong under § 74, 1. Thus $\xi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu$ ori $\xi\lambda\theta\alpha$ a, ϵi τοῦτο γένοιτο (or $\xi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu$ $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon u$ àν, ϵi τοῦτο γένοιτο), as well as $\xi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu$ ori $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon u$ σοῦτο, ϵi τοῦτο γένοιτο (or $\xi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\sigma\nu$ $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon u$ σοῦτο γένοιτο), may be translated he said that he would come if this should happen; although in the first two sentences the direct discourse was $\xi\lambda\theta oιμ$ aν, ϵi τοῦτο γένοιτο, I would come if this should happen; and in the last two, $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon u$ σοῦτο γένηται, 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 Infinitive which follows verbs of commanding, advising, wishing, &c.; 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 apodosis expressed in a verb like $\theta a \nu \mu i \zeta \omega$, &c. (§ 56); — (d) to temporal sentences expressing a past *intention* or *expectation*, especially those introduced by $\tilde{\epsilon} \omega s$ and $\pi \rho i \nu$, *until*, after past tenses (§ 66, 2, Note 1); — and sometimes (e) even to ordinary relative sentences, which would otherwise take the Indicative. E. g.

(a.) Έβούλοντο ἐλθεῖν, εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο, they wished to go, if this should happen. (Here ἐὰν τοῦτο γένηται might be used, as the form in which the wish would originally be conceived.) Γαδάταν δέ καὶ Γωβρύαν ἐκέλευσεν ὅ τι δύναιντο λαβώτας μεταδιώκειν καὶ ὅστις εἰχε τὰς ἐπομένας ἀγέλας, εἶπε τούτω καὶ ἅμα πρώβατα πολλὰ ἐλαύνειν, ὅπη ἀν αὐτὸν π υν θ ἀνηται ὅντα, ὡς ἐπισφαγείη. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VII, 3, 7. (Here ὅ τι δύναιντο represents ὅ τι ἀν δύνησθε in the direct command, while ὅπη ἀν πυνθάνηται represents ὅ τη ἀν δύνησθε in the direct command, while ὅπη ἀν πυνθάνηται represents ὅ τη ἀν δύνησθε in the direct command, while ὅπη ἀν πυνθάνηται represents ὅ τη ἀν δύνησθε in the direct command, while ὅπη ἀν πυνθάνηται represents ὅ τη ἀν δύνησθε 'n, ἡν ἄρα τύ χωσί τινες ἐζωγρημένοι. ΤΗ UC. II, 5. (⁺Ην λάβωμεν, and ἡν τύχωσι.) Οἱ δ ἀλλοι θηβαῖοι, οῦς ἔδει παραγενέσθαι, εἴ τι μὴ προχωροίη τοῖς ἐσεληλυθόσιν, ἐπεβοήθουν. Ibid. (⁻Εάν τι μὴ προ-

Προείπον αὐτοῖς μή ναυμαχείν Κορινθίοις, ην μή ἐπὶ Κέρκυραν πλέωσι και μέλλωσιν αποβαίνειν. Id. I, 45. (*Ην μή πλέητε και μέλλητε.) Καί παρήγγειλαν έπειδή δει πνήσειαν συνεσκευασμένους πάντας άναπαύεσθαι, και έπεσθαι ηνίκ άν τις παραγγέλλη. ΧΕΝ. An. III, 5, 18. (Ἐπειδὰν δειπνήσητε, and ἡνίκ' ἄν τις παραγγέλλη.) Περί αὐτῶν κρύφα πέμπει, κελεύων ... μη ἀφείναι πρίν αν αὐτοι πάλιν κομισθώσιν. Thuc. I, 91. (Πριν κομισθείεν might have been used.) Και πολλάκις τοις 'Αθηναίοις παρήνει, ην άρα ποτε κατά γην βιασθώσι, καταβάντας ές αὐτὸν ταῖς ναυσὶ πρὸς ἄπαντας ἀνθίστασθαι. Id. I, 91. (Εἰ βιασθείεν might have been used.) 'Ηξίουν αὐτοὺς ήγεμόνας σφών γενέσθαι και Παυσανία μή επιτρέπειν, ήν που βιάζηται. ld. I, 95. (E' που βιάζοιτο might have been used.) 'Αφικνούνται ώς Σιτάλκην, βουλόμενοι πείσαι αυτόν, εί δύναιντο, στρατεύσαι έπι την Ποτίδαιαν. Id. 11, 67. "Ετοιμος ην αποτίνειν, εί καταγνοίεν autov. Isoc. Trapez. 361 E. § 16. (This example might be placed also under c.) Είπον μηδένα των όπισθεν κινείσθαι, πριν αν ό πρόσθεν $\eta \gamma \eta \tau \alpha \iota$, I commanded that no one, &c. XEN. Cyr. II, 2, 8.

Παρηγγέλλετο γὰρ αὐτοῖς δέκα μὲν οῦς Θηραμένης ἀπ έδειξε χειροτονήσαι, δέκα δὲ οῦς οἱ ἔφοροι κελεύοιεν. Lys. in Erat. p. 127, § 76. (Οῦς ἀπέδειξε, and οῦς ἀν κελεύωσιν. See § 74, 2.) Ἐκέλευσέ με τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἡν ἔγ ραψα οἶκαδε δοῦναι, the letter which I had written. XEN. Cyr. II, 2, 9. ([°]Ην χράψαιμι would mean whatever letter I might write, representing ἡν ἀν γράψης.) So öθεν ἦ λθον, ΤΗUC. VII, 27.

(b.) Ἐκάκιζον ὅτι στρατηγὸς ῶν οἰκ ἐπεξάγοι, they abused him because he did not lead them out (as they said). ΤΗυς. II, 21.

See other examples under § 81, 2. See also § 81, 2, Rem.

(c) "Ωικτειρον, el άλώσοιντο, they pitied them, in case they

should be captured: the idea in full is, they pilied them, thinking of what would befall them if they should be captured. XEN. An. I, 4, 7. (El àλώσονται might have been used.) $\Delta i\delta \delta \nu \tau \sigma \delta^* a \delta \tau \tilde{\varphi} \pi a \mu \pi \sigma \lambda \lambda a$ $\delta \tilde{\omega} \rho a Ti \theta \rho a \dot{\sigma} \tau \sigma v$, $\epsilon l \ a \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \sigma \iota$, $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \rho i \nu a \tau \sigma$, offering him many gifts, if he would go away. Id. Ages. IV, 6. (Eav $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \eta$ might have been used.) $\Phi \dot{\nu} \lambda \kappa \alpha s \sigma \sigma \mu \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \iota$, $\tilde{\sigma} \pi \omega s \Phi \nu \lambda \tilde{\sigma} \tau \sigma \dot{\nu} \sigma \lambda \kappa a \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\iota} \tau \dot{\sigma} \dot{a} \gamma \rho i \omega \sigma \tau \iota$, $\theta a \nu \epsilon i \eta \ \theta \eta \rho i \omega \nu$, and (to be ready) in case any wild beasts should appear; his thought being $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \tau \tau \phi a \nu \tilde{\eta}$. Id. Cyr. I, 4, 7. See other examples of the Optative under § 53, N. 2.

^{*}Hv $\delta \epsilon \tau i s \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \pi \eta \tilde{\eta} \tilde{\epsilon} \pi i \psi \eta \phi i \sigma \eta \kappa i v \tilde{\epsilon} v \tau \lambda \chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau a \tau a \tilde{v} \tau a \tilde{\epsilon} s \tilde{a} \lambda \lambda \sigma \tau i,$ $\theta \delta \nu a \tau o v \zeta \eta \mu i a v \tilde{\epsilon} \tau \delta \epsilon v \tau o, they set death as the penalty, if any one should$ move, or put to vote a motion, to divert this money to any other purpose. $THUC. II, 24. (Ei ε ι π o <math>\tilde{\eta} \epsilon \pi i \psi \eta \phi i \sigma \epsilon i \epsilon v$ might have been used.) Tä $\lambda \lambda a, \tilde{\eta} v \tilde{\epsilon} \tau i v a \mu a \chi \epsilon \tilde{\iota} v o i \lambda \theta \eta v a \tilde{o} i \tau o \tau \lambda \eta i m \sigma \sigma \sigma \kappa \epsilon v \delta \sigma \sigma \tau o, i. e.$ they made their other preparations, (to be ready) in case the Athenians should dare, & c. Id. VII, 59. (Their thought was, we will be ready, in case they shall dare, $\tilde{\eta} v \tau o \lambda \mu \eta \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \iota v$, 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.

Έθαύμαζε δ' εί τις άρετην έπαγγελλόμενος άργύριον πράττοιτο, he wondered that any demanded money, &c. XEN. Mem. I, 2, 7. (But in I, 1, 13, we find ¿θαύμαζε δ' εί μή φανερών αὐτοῖs ἐστιν, he wondered that it was not plain.) "Εχαιρον ἀγαπῶν εί τις ἐάσοι, Ι rejoiced, being content if any one would let it pass. PLAT. Rep. V, 450 Οὐκ ήσχύνθη εἰ τοιοῦτο κακὸν ἐπάγει τω, he was not ashamed А. that he was bringing such a calamity on any one. DEM. Mid. 548, 24. Τῷ δὲ μηδὲν ξαυτῷ συνειδότι δεινὸν εἰσήει, εἰ πονηρῶν ἔργων δόξει κοινωνείν τῶ σιωπήσαι, it seemed hard, if he was to appear to be impli cated, &c.; he thought, $\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\delta\nu$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, $\epsilon\ell$ $\delta\delta\xi\omega$ (§ 49, 1, N. 3). Id. F. L. 351, 18. (Here δάξοι might have been used, like ἐάσοι above.) So AESCHIN. Cor. § 10. Καὶ ἐγώ τὸν Εὐηνὸν ἐμακάρισα, εἰ ὡς ἀληθῶς έχει ταύτην την τέχνην και ούτως έμμελως διδάσκει, I congratulated him, if he really had this art (as he thought). PLAT. Apol. 20 B (Here έχοι and διδάσκοι might have been used.)

(d.) Σπονδàs ἐποιήσαντο, ἕως ἀπαγγελθείη τὰ λεχθέντα εἰς Λακεδαίμονα, they made a truce, (to continue) until what had been said should be announced at Sparta; i. e. ἕως αν ἀπαγγελθῆ, which might have been retained. XEN. Hell. III, 2, 20. ⁹Ωρσε δ' ἐπὰ κραιπνὸν Βορέην, πρὸ δὲ κύματ ἕαξεν, ἕως ὅ γε Φαιήκεσσι Φιληρέτμοισι μιγείη, until Ulysses should be among the Phaeacians; i. e. ἕως αν μιγῆ, Od. V, 385. So είως θερμαίνοιτο, Od. IX, 376. ⁹Απηγόρενε μηδένα βάλλειν, πρὶν Κῦρος ἐμπλησθείη θηρῶν, until Cyrus should be satisfied. XEN. Cyr. I, 4, 14. (His words were πρὶν ἀν ἐμπλησθῆ.) Oi δὲ μένοντες ἕστασαν, ὅππότε πύργος ᾿Αχαιῶν ἀλλος ἐπελθῶν Τρώων ὅρμήσειε καὶ ἄρξειαν πολέμοιο, i. e. they stood waiting for the time when, &c. II IV, 335. (Here ὁπόταν ὁρμήσῃ, &c. might be used.) So II. II, 794. Προὐκίνησαν τὸ στίΦος, ὡς παυσομένους τοῦ διωγμοῦ, ἐπεὶ σφᾶς ἴδοιεν προορμήσαντας, when they should see them, &c. XEN. Cyr. I, 4, 21. \$ 77, 2.

Οι γὰρ δή σφεας ἀπίει ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀποικίης, πρὶν δὴ ἀπίκωνται ἐς αὐτὴν Λιβύην. ΗΡ IV, 156. (᾿Απίκοιντο might be used.) Οι δὲ Κορίνθιοι οὐ προεθ.μήθησαν ξυμπλεῖν, πρὶν τὰ ὅτσθμια, ἀ τότε ἦν, διεορτάτωσιν. Thuc. VIII, 9.

(e.) Kai $\frac{1}{7}\pi\epsilon\epsilon \sigma \eta \mu a i \delta\epsilon\sigma \theta a i, <math>\frac{3}{6} \tau \tau i$ $\frac{1}{6} a$ $\frac{1}{6} \gamma a \mu \beta \rho \delta \rho a \pi a$ $\Pi \rho \delta \tau \sigma a$ $\phi \epsilon \rho o i \tau o, he asked to see the token, which (he said) he was bringing$ $from Proetus, i. e. he said <math>\phi \epsilon \rho \rho a a$. I. VI, 177. Katypópeov $\tau \delta \nu$ Aiyum $\tau \epsilon \omega \tau a \tau \sigma o i \eta \kappa o i \epsilon \nu \pi \rho o \delta \delta \nu \tau \epsilon s \tau h^{\nu} E \lambda \lambda \delta a, i. e. they accused$ $them for what (as they said) they had done. HDT. VI, 49. So <math>\tau a$ $\pi \epsilon \pi o \nu \theta \delta s \epsilon i \eta, 1, 44.$ Ka $\lambda \epsilon i \tau \delta \nu$ A $\delta i o \nu, \mu \nu \eta \mu \eta \nu$ $\pi a \lambda a i \delta \nu$ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \chi o \nu \sigma', \dot{\nu} \phi' \delta \nu \theta \dot{a} \nu o i \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{a} \dot{\tau} \delta s, \tau \eta \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau i \kappa \tau o \nu \sigma a \nu \lambda (\pi o i, by which$ (as she said) he had perished himself, and had left her the mother, & c.SOPH. O. T. 1245. (If the relative clause contained merely the $idea of the speaker, <math>\tilde{\epsilon} \theta a \nu \epsilon$ and $\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda i \pi \epsilon$ would be used. Here no ambiguity can arise from the use of the Aorist Optative. See § 74, 2, N. 1.)

NOTE 1. Causal sentences are usually constructed without reference 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.

⁶Ετοΐμος ην, εἰ μὲν τούτων τι εἴργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, ἄρχειν, he was ready, if he had done any of these things, to be punished; but if he should be acquitted, to hold his command. THUC. VI, 29. (Εἴργαστο represents εἴργασμαι, while εἰ ἀπολυθείη represents ἐἀν ἀπολυθῶ.)

NOTE 3. "A ν is occasionally retained with relatives and temporal particles in sentences of this kind, even when the Subjunctive to which they belonged has been changed to the Optative. See § 74, 1, Note 2. E. g.

Toùs δè λαμβάνοντας τῆς ὁμιλίας μισθὸν ἀνδραποδιστὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀπετ cdλει, διὰ τὸ ἀναγκαίον αὐτοῖς εἶναι διαλέγεσθαι παρ' ῶν ἀν λάβοιεν ròv μισθών, because they were obliged (as he said) to converse with those from whom they received the pay. XEN. Mem. I, 2, 6. (Here ῶν ἀν λάβωειν represents ῶν ἁν λάβωσιν.) Καί μοι τάδ' ἢν πρόρρητα, ... τὸ ψάρμακον τοῦτο σώζειν ἐμὲ, ἕως ἁν ἀρτίχριστον ἀρμόσαιμί που. SOPH. Trach. 687. (See Schneidewin's note.) 'Ηξίουν αὐτοὐς μαστιγοῦν τὸν ἐκδοθέντα, ἕως ἀν τὰληθῆ δόξειεν αὐτοῖς λέγειν. Isoc. Trap. 361 D. § 15. Χαίρειν ἐψῆς ἀν καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρίναιο, ἕως ἀν τὰ ἀπ' ἐκείνης ὁρμηθέντα σκέψαιο, you would not answer, until you should have εχαπίπεσ, ξως Ρ. Τ.Τ. Phaed. 101 D. (The direct thought of the person addressed would be, ἕως ἅν σκέψωαι.) See § 34, 1.

It is doubtful whether $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{a}\nu$ was ever used with the Optative in this way

Ken: mem: 4. 1. 2. Elexpraigero Tas Syntods

2. Upon this principle (§ 77) final and object clauses with

50 1

sur.

me

, 1.

(AR)

is's

32

iva, $\delta\pi\omega_s$, $\mu\eta$, &c., after secondary 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 $\eta\lambda\thetae\nu$ iva idou or $\eta\lambda\thetae\nu$ iva $i\delta\eta$, he came that he might see; the latter being allowed because the person referred to would himself have said $\epsilon\rho\chi\rho\mua$ iva $i\delta\omega$. See § 44, 2, § 45, and § 46, with the examples.

NOTE. The principles of § 74 and § 77 apply to clauses which depend upon final and object clauses, as these too are considered as standing in indirect discourse. E. g.

²Ελθύντες ἐς Λακεδαίμονα (ἔπρασσον) ὅπως ἐτοιμάσαιντο τιμωρ ρίαν, ἡν δέη. ΤΗυΟ. Ι, 58. (Here εἰ δέοι might have been used. See § 55, 2.) ²Εφοβείτο γὰρ μὴ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι σφᾶς, ὅπότε σαφῶς ἀκούσειαν, οὐκετι ἀφῶσιν. Ιd. Ι, 91. (Here ὁπόταν ἀκούσωσιν is changed to ὑπότε ἀκούσειαν, although ἀφῶσιν is retained by § 77, 2.) Μέγα τὸ δέος ἐγένετο μὴ παραπλέοντες οἱ Πελοπουνήσιοι, εἰ καὶ ῶς μὴ διενοοῦντο μένειν, πορθῶσιν τὰς πόλεις, the fear was great lest the Peloponnesians as they sailed by, even if under the circumstances they had not been thinking of remaining, might destroy the cities. Id. Щ, 33. (Here διενοοῦντο is retained by § 74, 2.)

" $O\pi\omega_{S}$ and "O in Indirect Quotations.

§ 78. 1. In a few cases $\delta \pi \omega s$ is used in indirect quotations where we should expect ωs or $\delta \tau \iota$. This occurs chiefly in poetry. E. g.

Τοῦτ' αὐτὸ μή μοι φράζ', ὅπως οὐκ εἶ κακός. SOPH. O. T. 548. "Αναξ, ἐρῶ μὲν οὐχ ὅπως τάχους ῦπο δύσπνους ἰκάνω. Id. Ant. 223. So Ant. 685 : ὅπως σὺ μὴ λέγεις. 'Ανάπεισον ὅκως μοι ἀμείνω ἐστὶ ταῦτα οῦτω ποιεόμενα. Ηυτ. Ι. 37. So III, 115. So ὅπως πάντα ἐπίσταμαι, PLAT. Euthyd. 296 E.

2. In a few passages in Homer we find δ' (the neuter of δ' s) used for $\delta'\tau\iota$. E. g.

Γιγνώσκων ο οἱ αὐτὸς ὑπείρεχε χεῖρας ᾿Απόλλων, knowing that Apollo himself held over him his hands. II. V, 433. Εὖ νυ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ὅ τοι σθένος οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν. II. VIII, 32. Λεύσσετε γὰρ τό γε πάντες, ὅ μοι γέρας ἕρχεται ἄλλη, that my prize goes elsewhere. II. I, 120. So Od. XII, 295.

170

§ 81, 1.] "Or BEFORE DIRECT QUOTATIONS.

NOTE. 'Oboúveka and oũveka in the tragedians, and oũveka in Homer, are sometimes used like őrt or δs , that; as äγγελλε όθούνεκα τέθνηκ' 'Opéστηs, SOPH. El. 47; ἴσθι τοῦτο, οῦνεκα Ἐλληνές ἐσμεν, Id. Phil. 232. See SOPH. El. 1478, Trach. 934 (οῦνεκα with Opt.); and Il. XI, 21; Odyss. V, 216; XIII, 309.

" $O \tau \iota$ before Direct Quotations.

§ 79. Even direct quotations are sometimes introduced by $\ddot{\sigma} \tau \iota$, without further change in the construction. "O $\tau \iota$ thus used cannot be expressed in English. E. g.

Ο δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι "Οὐδ' εἰ γενοίμην, ὥ Κῦρε, σοί γ' ἄν ποτε ἔτι δόξαιμι." XEN. An. I, 6, 8. `Απεκρίνατο ὅτι "³Ω δέσποτα, οἰ ξῆ, κ.τ.λ." Id. Cyr. VII, 3, 3. Εἶπε δ' ὅτι "Εἰς καιρὸν ῆκεις," ἐψη, "ὅπως τῆς δίκης ἀκούσης." Ib. III, 1, 8. *Η ἐροῦμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ὅτι "Ἡδίκει γὰρ ἡμῶς ἡ πόλις, καὶ οὐκ ὀρθῶς τὴν δίκην ἔκρινε," — ταῦτα ἡ τἱ ἐροῦμεν; PLAT. Crit. 50 B. So Phaed. 60 A. See also HpT II, 115.

SECTION V.

CAUSAL SENTENCES.

§ **80.** Causal sentences express the cause or reason of something stated in the leading sentence. They may be introduced by $\delta\tau\iota$, $\delta\iota\delta\tau\iota$ or $\delta\iota\delta\pi\epsilon\rho$, $\delta\nu\epsilon\kappa a$ or $\delta\theta\delta\nu\nu\epsilon\kappa a$, and $\delta\sigma$, because; or by $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$, $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$, $\delta\tau\epsilon$, $\delta\pi\delta\tau\epsilon$, $\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon$, and sometimes $\delta\pi\sigma\nu$, since, seeing that.

REMARK. "Or and δs in this causal sense must not be confounded with $\delta \tau \iota$ and δs , that, in indirect quotations; and $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota$, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \eta$, $\delta \tau \epsilon$, and $\delta \pi \delta \tau \epsilon$ must not be confounded with the same particles in temporal sentences.

§ S1. 1. Causal sentences regularly take the Indicative, after both primary and secondary tenses; past causes being expressed by the past tenses of the Indicative. The negative particle is où. E. g.

Κήδετο γάρ Δαναών, ότι ρα θνήσκοντας δράτο. Π. Ι, 56. Χωόμε

νος, ὅτ' ἄμιστον 'Αχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἕτισας. Π. Ι, 244. Δημοβόρος βασιλεὺς, ἐπεὶ οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις. Π. Ι, 231. Μὴ ὅ οῦτως κλέπτε νόω, ἐπεὶ οὐ παρελεύσεαι οὐδέ με πείσεις. Π. Ι, 132. Νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὡρσε κακὴν, ὀκέκοντο δὲ λαοὶ, οῦνεκα τὸν Χρύσην ἡτίμησ ἀρητῆρα 'Ατρείδης. Π. Ι, 11. Καὶ τριήρης δέ τοι ἡ σεσαγμένη ἀνθρώπων διὰ τί ἄλο Φοβερόν ἐστι ἡ ὅτι ταχὺ πλεῖ; διὰ τί δὲ ἄλλο ἄλυποι ἀλλή λοις εἰσιν οἱ ἐμπλέοντες ἡ δίσι ἐν τάξει κάθηνται; ΧΕΝ. ΟΘε. VII, 8. Οἱ ἐμοὶ Φίλοι οῦτως ἔχοντες μερὶ ἐμοῦ διατελοῦσιν, οὐ διὰ τὸ Φιλεῖν ἐμὲ, ἀλλὰ διώπερ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἂν οἴονται βέλιστοι γίγνεσθαι. Ιd. Μεπ. IV, 8, 7. (See § 42, 2, Note.) Πρὸς ταῦτα κρύπτε μηδέν, ὡς ὁ πάνθ ὅρῶν καὶ πάντ' ἀκούων πάντ' ἀναπτύσσει χρόνος, ἱ. e. since time ἀνεθορs all things. SOPH. Hippon. Fr. 280. Μέγα δὲ τὸ ὁμοῦ τρα-Φῆναι, ἐπεἰ καὶ τοῦς θηρίοις πόθος τις ἐγγίγνεται τῶν συντρόφων. ΧΕΝ. Μεm. ΙΙ, 3, 4. "Οτ οὐν παραινοῦς οὐδὲν ἐς πλέον ποιῶ, ἰκέτις ἀφῖγμαι. SOPH. Ο. Τ. 918. 'Οπότε οὖν πόλις μὲν τὰ ἱδίας ξυμφορὰς οἱα τε φέοειν, εἶς δὲ ἕκαστος τὰς ἐκείνης ἀδύνατος (sc. ἐστὶ), πῶς οὐ χρὴ πάντας ἀμύνειν αὐτῆ; ΤΗυC. ΙΙ, 60. "Οτε τοίννν τοῦθ οῦτως ἔχει, προσήκει προθύμως ἐθέλειν ἀκούειν τῶν βουλομένων συμβουλεύειν. DEM. ΟΙ. Ι, 9, 3. For εὖτε, since, see SOPH. Aj. 715, Ο. C. 84; for ὅπου, see HDT. Ι, 68.

2. When, however, it is implied that the cause is assigned by some other person than the speaker, the principle of indirect discourse (§ 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.

Tèν Περικλέα ἐκάκιζον, ὅτι στρατηγès ῶν οὐκ ἐπεξάγοι, they abused 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 eause merely on his own authority, he would have used ὅτι οἰκ ἐπεξῆγεν.) Tois συνόντας ἐδόκει ποιείν ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἀνοσίων, ἐπείπερ ἡγήσαιντο μηδὲν ἅν ποτε ῶν πράττοιεν θεοὺς διαλαθεῖν. XEN. Mem. I, 4, 19. (See § 74, 2, N. 1.) Οἶσθα ἐπαινέσαντα αὐτὸν ([°]Ομηρον) τὸν ᾿Αγαμέμνονα, ὡς βασιλεὺς εἶη ἀγαθός, because (as he said) he was a good king. Id. Symp. IV, 6. So ὡς εὑρήκοι, because (as he said) he had found, HDT. I, 44.

REMARK. We should suppose that in causal sentences of the second class (§ 81, 2) the mood and tense by which the cause would have been originally stated might also be retained, as in ordinary indirect discourse; so that in the first example above (THUC. II. 21) or obx $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \xi \, a \gamma \epsilon$. might also be used, in the same sense as $\delta \tau \iota$ obx

i. $\epsilon \xi \dot{a} \gamma o$. This, however, seems to have been avoided, to prevent the ambiguity which would arise from the three forms, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\xi\bar{i}\gamma\epsilon\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\xi\bar{a}\gamma\epsilon\mu$, and $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\xi\bar{a}\gamma\epsilon\mu$. It will be remembered that the first form, which is the regular one in causal sentences of the first class (§ 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 used only after $\delta \tau_i$, δs , and $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$. It is not found in Homer.

NOTE 2. If a cause is to be expressed by an apodosis in which the Indicative or Optative with $d\nu$ is required, those forms can of course follow the causal particles. E. g.

Δέομαι οὖν σου παραμεῖναι ἡμῖν · ὡs ἐγὼ οὐδ' ἀν ἐνὸς ἡδιον ἀκο ὑσαιμι ἡ σοῦ, Ι beg you then to remain with us; as there is not one whom I should hear more gladly than you. PLAT. Prot. 335 D. Νῦν ὁ ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐθέλεις καὶ ἐμοί τις ἀσχολία ἐστὶ καὶ οὐκ ἀν οἶος τ «ἴην σοι παραμείναι ἀποτείνοντι μακροὺς λόγους — ἐλθεῖν γάρ ποί με δεῖ — εἰμι · ἐπεὶ καὶ ταῦτ' ἀν ἴσως οὐκ ἀηδῶς σου ἤκουον. Ιb. 335 C.

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 $\epsilon \ell \theta \epsilon$ or $\epsilon \ell \gamma \alpha \rho$ (nega-

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.

Aî yàp èµoì rossívõe θeoì δύναµıν παραθεῖεν, O that the Gods would clothe me with so much strength! Od. III, 205. Aĩ θ οῦτως, Eῦμαε, ϕίλον Διὶ πατρὶ γένοιο, mayest thou become in like manner a friend to father Zeus. Od. XIV, 440. 'Υµῦν µὲν θeoì δοῖεν 'Ολύμmia δώματ' ἔχοντες ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εἶ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι, may the Gods grant you, &c. Π. Ι, 18. Mỹ µàν ἀσπουδί γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίµην. II. XXII, 304. Tò μὲν νῦν ταῦτα πρήσσοις τάπερ ἐν χεροὶ ἔχεις, may you for the present continue to do what you now have in hand. HDt. VII, 5. Θήσω πρυτανεῖ, ἢ µηκέτι ζ ώŋν ἐγώ, or may I no longer live. ARIST. Nub. 1255. Νικώη δ' ὅτι πάσιν ὑµῦν μέλλει συνοίσειν, and may that opinion prevail, &c. DEM. Phil. I, 55, 6. Τεθναίην, ὅτε μοι µηκέτι ταῦτα μέλοι. ΜΙΜΝΕRΜ. Ι, 2. Πλούσιον δὲ νομίζοιμι τὸν σοφόν. PLAT. Phaedr. 279 C. [°]Ω παῖ, γένοιο πατρὸς εὐτυχέστερος. SOPH. A]. 550. Οὕτω νικήσαιμί τ΄ έγὼ καὶ νομιζοίµην σοφός, on this condition may I gain the prize (in this case) and be (always) considered wise. ARIST. Nub. 520. (See Note 4.) Εἴθ, ὦ λῷστε, ϕίλος ἡμῦν γένοιο. XEN. Hell. IV, 1, 38. Εἰ γὰρ γενοίµην, τέκνον, ἀντὶ σοῦ νεκρός. EUR. Hippol. 1410. Ξυνενέγκοι μὲν ταῦτα ὡς βουλόμεθα. THUC. VI, 20. Αὐτὸς ἐἰ ἐπιστήσει καὶ ἅπαντα, ἂν ἐγὼ βούλωμαι.— ᾿Αλλὰ βουληθείης, may you only be willing! PLAT. Euthyd. 296 D. So εἶεν, be it so, — well.

Μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' 'Οδυσῆι κάρη ὅμοισιν ἐπείη, μηδ' ἔτι Τηλεμάχοιο πατὴρ κεκλημένος εἶην, then may the head of Ulysses no longer remain on his shoulders, and no longer may I be called the father of Telemachus. II. II, 259. (See Rem. 1.)

From its use in wishes the Optative Mood ($\tilde{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iotas\ \epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\kappa\tau\iota\kappa\dot{\eta}$) 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 $\epsilon i \partial \epsilon \ \nu \epsilon \nu \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \kappa \circ \iota$ were used, it would mean O that it may prove (hereafter) that he has been victorious ! See § 18, 1.

REMARK 2. In Homer we occasionally find the Present Optative in a wish referring to present time, where later writers would have used the Imperfect Indicative. E. g. Εί γάρ έγών ούτω γε Διός παις αίγιόχοιο

Είην ήματα πάντα, τ έκοι δέ με πότνια "Ηρη, Τιοίμην δ' ώς τίετ' 'Αθηναίη και 'Απόλλων,

Ως νθν ήμέρη ήδε κακόν φέρει 'Αργείοισιν,

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 $\tau \epsilon \kappa o \iota$ is nearly equivalent to $\mu \eta \tau \eta \rho \epsilon \iota \eta$: cf. $\mathfrak{L} \tau \epsilon \kappa o \iota \sigma a$, O mother. quoted under § 83, 1.)

'Ω γέρον, είθ', ώς θυμός ένὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν

"Ως τοι γούναθ' έποιτο, βίη δέ τοι έμπεδος είη"

'Αλλά σε γήρας τείρει δμοίιον · ως ὄφελέν τις

'Ανδρών άλλος έχειν, σύ δε κουροτέροισι μετείναι.

The idea is, O that thy knees equalled thy heart in strength, &c. II. IV, 313. At the end we have the more regular form, $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu$ ris $\delta\lambda\lambda\sigma$ s $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\nu$, would that some other man had it ($\gamma\eta\rho\alpha$ s). § 83, 2, N. 1.

Είθ ώς ήβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι έμπεδος είη.

Τῷ κε τάχ' ἀντήσειε μάχης κορυθαίολος "Εκτωρ,

O that I were again so young, &c. II. VII, 157. See VII, 133.

For a similar exceptional use in Homer of the Present Optative in protasis, see § 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 $\epsilon i \partial \epsilon$ or $\epsilon i \gamma \delta \rho$ sometimes expresses a concession or permission; and sometimes an *exhortation*, in a sense approaching that of the Imperative. E. g.

Aštis 'Apyeinv 'Eλένην Μενέλαος άγοιτο, Menelaus may take back Argive Helen. II. IV, 19. Τεθναίης, δ Προίτ', η κάκτανε Βελλεροφόντην, either die, or kill Bellerophontes. II. VI, 164. 'Αλλά τις Δολίον καλέσειε, let some one call Dolios. Od. IV, 735. So AESCH. Prom. 1049 and 1051.'

NOTE 2. The poets sometimes use the simple ϵi (without $-\theta \epsilon$ or $\gamma i \rho$) with the Optative in wishes. E. g.

'Αλλ' εί τις και τούσδε μετοιχόμενος καλέσειεν. Π. Χ, 111. Εί μοι γένοιτο φθόγγος έν βραχίοσιν. Eur. Hec. 836.

NOTE 3. The poets, especially Homer, sometimes use ωs before the Optative in wishes. This ωs cannot be expressed in English; and it is not to be translated so (as if it were written ωs), or confounded with $o \tilde{v} \tau \omega s$ used as in Note 4. E.g.

⁽Ως ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι, O that any other also may perish, ἐc. Od. I, 47. See Od. XXI, 201. ⁽Ως ὁ τάδε πορὼν ὅλοιτ', εἴ μοι θέμις τάδ' αὐδῶν. SOPH. El. 126.

NOTE 4. Our s, thus, on this condition, may be prefixed to the Optative in protestations, where a wish is expressed upon some condition; which condition is usually added in another clause. E. g.

Ουτως δναισθε τούτων, μη περιίδητέ με, may you enjoy these on this condition, — do not neglect me. DEM. Aph. II, 842, 9.

Note 5. The Optative in wishes belonging under this head never takes the particle $\delta \nu$. If a wish is expressed in the form of an ordinary apodosis, as $\pi \delta s \ \delta \nu \ \delta \lambda o (\mu \eta \nu, how gladly I would perish (i. e. if I could), it does not belong here, but under § 52, 2.$

§ **S3.** 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.

Eiθε τοῦτο ἐποίει, would that he were now doing this, or would that he had been doing this; εἴθε τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, would that he had done this; εἴθε ἦν ἀληθές, would that it were true; εἴθε μὴ ἐγένετο, would that it had not happened.

Eil δ ei χες, δ τεκοῦσα, βελτίους φρένας, would that thou, O mother, hadst a better understanding. EUR. El. 1061. El γὰρ τοσαύτην δύναμιν εἶχον, would that I had so great power. Id. Alc. 1072. Eiθε σοι, δ Περίκλεις, τότε συνεγενόμην. XEN. Mem. I, 2, 46. ⁴ Lω, μὴ γῶς ἐπὶ ξένας θανεῖν ἔχρηζες, O that thou hadst not chosen to die in a foreign land. SOPH. O. C. 1713.

REMARK. The Indicative cannot be used in wishes without $\epsilon^{\prime\prime}\partial\epsilon$ or $\epsilon^{\prime}\gamma \dot{\alpha}\rho$, as it would occasion ambiguity; this cannot arise in the case of the Optative, which is not regularly used in independent sentences without $\ddot{\alpha}\nu$, except in wishes. The last example quoted above shows that the Indicative with $\mu\dot{\eta}$ 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 $\dot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\sigma\nu$ and sometimes the Imperfect $\dot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\sigma\nu$ of $\dot{o}\phi\epsilon\lambda\omega$, debeo, may be used with the Infinitive 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.

"Ωφελον or ώφελλον may be preceded by the particles of wishing, είθε, εί γάρ, or $\mu \dot{\eta}$ (not ov). E. g.

^{*} Ωφελε τοῦτο ποιεῖν, would that he were (now) doing this (lit. he ought to be doing it), or would that he had (habitually) done this (lit. he ought to have done this). ^{*} Ωφελε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, would that he had done this.

Ων όφελον τριτάτην περ έχων έν δώμασι μοίραν ναίειν, οι δ' άνδρες σόοι εμμεναι οι τότ' όλοντο, O that I were living with even a third part, &c., and that those men were safe who then perished. Od. IV, 97. Mή οφελον νικάν τοιώδ' έπ' ἀέθλω, O that I had not been victorious in such a contest. Od. XI, 548. See II. XVIII, 86, aï όφελες σύ μέν αδθι ναίειν, Πηλεύς δέ θνητήν άγαγέσθαι. Thu ὄφελ' έν νήεσσι κατακτάμεν "Αρτεμις ιω, O that Artemis had slain her, &c. II. XIX, 59. Olter dat $\ddot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda \circ v \tau \eta\delta$ ' $\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho q$, O that I had perished on that day. SOPH. O. T. 1157. Eld $\ddot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda$ ' Apyoùs $\mu\eta$ διαπτάσθαι σκάφος Κόλχων ές αίαν κυανέας Συμπληγάδας. Ευκ. Med. 1. Εί γαρ ώφελον οιοί τε είναι οι πολλοι τα μέγιστα κακά έξεργάζεσθαι, O that the multitude were able, &c. PLAT. Crit. 44 D Μή ποτ' ώφελον λιπείν την Σκύρον, O that I never had left Seyros SOPH. Phil. 969. All a mainters "Extopos $\dot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda \in \tau^*$ divides $\delta \eta = \eta v \eta v \sigma i \pi \epsilon \phi \dot{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$, would that ye all had been slain instead of Hector. II. XXIV, 253. 'Ανδρός έπειτ' ώφελλον αμείνονος είναι άκοιτις, δς ήδη νέμεσίν τε και αίσχεα πόλλ' ανθρώπων, O that I were the wife of a better man, who knew, &c. Il. VI, 350. (For ήδη, 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; $\omega \phi \epsilon \lambda o \nu$ 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 $\delta \phi \epsilon \lambda o \nu$ in wishes can (like the Optative) be preceded by the simple ϵi (without $-\theta \epsilon$ or $\gamma \delta \rho$).

 Ω_s , used as in § 82, N. 3, often precedes ώφελον, &c. in Homer, and rarely in the Attic poets. E. g.

"Ηλυθες έκ πολέμου; ώς ὤφελες αὐτόθ' ὀλέσθαι. Π. Π. 428.

'Ως ώφελλ' Έλένης ἀπὸ φῦλον ἀλέσθαι. Od. XIV, 68.

'Ως πρίν διδάξαι γ' ώφελες μέσος διαρραγήναι. ARIST. Ran. 955.

einv. I should be fortunate, or I should rejoice; ei yàp èyévero, O that it had happened, implies one like eὐrvχỳs ầv ŷr (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 (§ 50, 2; § 49, 2). The analogy with the Latin is the same as in protasis: — eì yàp roῦro ποιοίη (or ποιήσειεν), O si hoc faciat, O that he may do this; eì yàp roῦro ἐποίει, O si hoc faceret, O that he were doing this; eì yàp roῦro ἐποίησεν, O si hoc facest, O that he had done this; eì yàp μὴ èyévero, utinam ne factum esset, O that it had not happened.

The form with $\delta \phi \epsilon \lambda o \nu$ and the Infinitive, on the other hand, is an apodosis with a protasis implied. See § 49, 2, N. 3, b.

SECTION VII.

IMPERATIVE AND SUBJUNCTIVE IN COMMANDS, EXHORTA TIONS, AND PROHIBITIONS.

§ 84. The Imperative is used to express a command, an exhortation, or an entreaty. E. g.

 \hat{A} έγε, speak thou. Φεῦγε, begone! Ἐλθέτω, let him come. Xaiρόντων, let them rejoice. Ἐρχεσθον κλισίην Πηληιάδεω Ἀχιλῆοs. II. Ι, 322. Ζεῦ, Ζεῦ, θεωρὸς τῶνδε πραγμάτων γενοῦ. AESCH. Choeph. 246.

NOTE 1. The Imperative is often emphasized by $\ddot{a}\gamma\epsilon$ (or $\ddot{a}\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$), $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon$, or $\ddot{\iota}\theta\iota$, come. These words may be in the singular when the Imperative is in the plural, and in the second person when the Imperative is in the third. E. g.

Είπ³. άγε μοι καὶ τόνδε, φίλον τέκος, ὅστις ὅδ' ἐστίν. Π. ΗΙ, 192. 'Αλλ' ἅγε μίμνετε πάντες, ἐυκνήμιδες 'Αχαιοί. Π. Η, 331. Βάσκ' ἴθι, οῦλε ὅνειρε, θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας 'Αχαιῶν. Π. Η, 8. "Αγε δὴ ἀκούσατε. XΕΝ. Αροl. § 14. "Αγετε δειπνήσατε. ΧΕΝ. Hell. V, 1, 18. Φέρ' εἰπὲ δή μοι. SOPH. Ant. 534. Φέρε δή μοι τόδε εἰπέ. PLAT. Crat. 385 Β. "Ιθι δὴ λέξον ἡμῦν πρῶτον τοῦτο. ΧΕΝ. Mein. ΗΙ, 3, 3. "Ιθι νυν παρίστασθον. ARIST. Ran. 1378. "Ιθι νυν λιβανωτὸν δεῦρό τις καὶ πῦρ δότω. Ib. 371. **REMARK.** $\Phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon$ is not used in this way in Homer.

NOTE 2. The poets sometimes use the second person of the Imperative with $\pi \hat{a} \hat{s}$ in hasty commands. E. g.

"Ακουε πâs, hear, every one! ARIST. Thesm. 372. Χώρει δευρο πâs ὑπηρέτης τόξευε, παῖε σφενδόνην τίς μοι δότω. Id. Av. 1187. "Αγε δὴ σιώπα πâs ἀνήρ. Id. Ran. 1125.

NOTE 3. The Imperative is sometimes used in relative clauses depending on an interrogative (usually $olar \theta a$), where we should expect the relative clause to be completed by $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\epsilon}$ with an Infinitive, and the Imperative to stand by itself. E. g.

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.

Πλούτει τε γὰρ κατ' οἶκον · ἐὰν δ' ἀπῆ τούτων τὸ χαίρειν, τἶλλ' ἐγὼ καπνοῦ σκιᾶς οὐκ ἂν πριαίμην. SOPH. Aut. 1168. Προσειπάτω τινὰ φιλικῶς ὅ τε ἄρχων καὶ ὁ ἰδιώτης. suppose that both the ruler and 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. $A\gamma\epsilon$ $(a\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon)$ or $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon$, come, often precedes. E. g.

¹ωμεν, let us go. ¹Ιδωμεν, let us see. Οίκαδέ περ σὺν νηυσὶ νεώμεθα, τόνδε δ' ἐῶμεν, let us sail homeward with our ships, and leave 'him. II. II, 236. 'Αλλ' εἰ δοκεί, πλέωμεν, όρμάσθω ταχύς SOPH. Phil. 526. 'Επίσχετον, μάθωμεν. Ib. 539. 'Επίσχες, ἐμβάλωμεν εἰς ἄλλον λόγου. ΕUR. ΕΙ. 962. Παρῶμέν τε οὖν ὥσπερ Κῦρος κελεύει, ἀσκῶμέν τε δι' ῶν μάλιστα δυνησόμεθα κατέχειν ἀ δεῖ, παρέχωμέν τε ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, I, 5. 'Αλλ' ἄγεθ', ὡς ἂν ἐγὼν εἴπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες. II. II, 139. 'Αλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ νῶι μεδώμεθα θούριδος ἀλκῆς. II. IV, 418. Φέρε δὴ διαπεράνωμεν λόγους. ΕUR. Androm. 333. Δεῦτε φίλοι τὸν ξείνον ἐρώμεθα. Od. VIII, 133.

\$ 85.7

NOTE 1. The first person singular of the Subjunctive, when it is used in this way, almost always takes $a\gamma\epsilon$ ($a\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$) or $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon$, unless some other Imperative precedes. E. g.

'Αλλ' ἄγε δὴ τὰ χρήματ' ἀριθμήσω καὶ ἴδωμαι. Od. XIII, 215. 'Αλλ' ἄγεθ' ὑμῖν τεὑχε' ἐνείκω θωρηχθῆναι. Od. XXII, 139. Θάπτε με ὅττι τάχιστα, πύλας 'Αίδαο περήσω, bury me as quickly as possible; let me pass the gates of Hades. II. XXIII, 71. Φέρ ἀκοίσω, come, let me hear. HDT. I, 11. Σῖγα, πνοὰς μάθω φέρε πρὸς οὖς βάλω. EUR. Herc. F. 1059. Ἐπίσχετ' αὐδὴν των ἔσωθεν ἐκμάθω. Id. Hippol. 567. Λέγε δὴ, ἕδω. PLAT. Rep. V, 377 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 μ_{ij} 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 $\phi \,\epsilon \rho \,\epsilon$. E.g.

Φέρ', ω τέκνον, νυν και το της νήσου μάθης. Soph. Phil. 300.

For the Future Indicative used elliptically in exhortations after $\delta \pi \omega s$, see § 45, Note 7.

REMARK. The preceding rules apply only to affirmative exhortations: these should be carefully distinguished from *prohibitions* with $\mu \eta$ (§ 86). The use of the Imperative in prohibitions is generally confined to the Present tense.

§ **S6.** In prohibitions, in the second and third persons, the *Present Imperative* or the *Aorist Subjunctive* is used after $\mu \dot{\eta}$ 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 Subjunctive is allowed. E. g.

Mỳ ποίει τοῦτο, do not do this (habitually); μỳ ποιήσης τοῦτο, do not do this (single act). Ἐξαῦδα, μỳ κεῦθε νόω, ἶνα εἶδομεν ἄμφω. Π. Ι, 363. ᾿Ατρείδη, μỳ ψεύδε' ἐπιστάμενος σάφα εἰπεῖν. Π. ΙV, 404. ᾿Αργεῖοι, μή πώ τι μεθίετ ε θούριδος ἀλκῆς. Π. ΙV, 234. Εἶπε μοι ειρομένω νημερτέα, μηδ' ἐπικεύσης. Od. XV, 263. ὅΗδη νου σῷ παιδὶ ἕπος φάο, μηδ' ἐπικεύθε. Od. XVI, 168. Μηκείτι νῦν δήθ αὐθι λεγ ώμεθα, μηδ ἔτι δηρὸν ἐμβαλλώμεθα ἔργον. Π. ΙΙ, 435 Υμεῖς δὲ τῆ γῦ τῆδε μỳ βαρὺν κύτον σκήψησθε, μὴ θυμοῦσθε μηδ' ἀκυρπίαν τ. ὑξητε. ΑΕSCH. Eumen. 800. Ον μήτ' ὀκνεῖτε, μήτ' ἀφῆτ' ἔπος κακόν. SOPH. O. C. 731. Μὴ θῆσθε νόμον μηδένα, ἀλλὰ τοὺς βλάπτοντας ὑμᾶς λύσατε. DEM. Ol. III, 31, 11. (Here θέσθε would not be allowed by § 86; although λύσατε, in a mere εκhortation, is regular, by § 84.) Μὴ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους δικάσητε μὴ βοηθήσητε τῷ πεπονθότι δεινά· μὴ εὐορκεῖτε. Id. Mid. 582, 15. Μὴ πρίη, παῖ, ὅξιδα. ΑΝΙ ST. Nub. 613. Καὶ μηδεἰς ὅι εσθω με βούλεσθαι λαθεῖν. Isoc. Phil. p. 101 A. § 93. Καὶ μηδεἰς οἰ έσθω μ' ἀγνοεῖν. Id. Paneg. 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 $\delta\pi\omega s \ \mu\dot{\eta}$, 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 seldom found in prohibitions; the third person is less rare. E. g.

Μηδ' ή βία σε μηδαμώς νικησάτω. SOPH. Aj. 1334. Μηδέ σοι μελησάτω. AESCH. Prom. 332. So Prom. 1004. Καὶ μηδεἰς ὑμῶν προσδοκησάτω ἄλλως. PLAT. Apol. 17 C.

Μή ψευσον, 3 Ζευ, της έπιούσης έλπίδος. ARIST. Thes. 870.

NOTE 2. The first person *singular* even of the Aorist Subjunctive in prohibitions is rare, and is found only in the poets. E. g.

Μή σε, γέρον, κοίλησιν ἐγὼ παρὰ νηυσὶ κιχείω. ΙΙ. Ι, 26. ᾿Αλλά μ' ἔκ γε τῆσδε γῆς πόρθμευσον ὡς τάχιστα, μήδ' αὐτοῦ θάνω. SOPH. Tr. 801. [°]Ω ξείνοι, μὴ δῆτ' ἀδικηθῶ. Id. O. C. 174. (This may be explained also by § 46, N. 4.)

SECTION VIII.

SUBJUNCTIVE (LIKE FUTURE INDICATIVE) IN INDEPENDENT SENTENCES. — INTERROGATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE. — $O\dot{\upsilon} \ \mu \dot{\eta}$ 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.

Où yáp πω τοίους ίδου ἀνέρας, οὐδὲ ἶδωμαι, for I never yet saw, nor shall I (or can I) ever see such men. II. I, 262. Υμίν ἐν πάντεστι περικλυτὰ δῶρ' ἐνομήνω, I will enumerate the gifts, &c. II. IX, 121. $\Delta \dot{v} \sigma \rho \mu a \dot{\epsilon} s' A \dot{\delta} a \sigma, \kappa a \dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu \epsilon \kappa \dot{\nu} \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota \phi a \epsilon \iota \nu \omega, I will descend to Hades, and shine among the dead (said by the Sun). Od. XII, 383. (Here the Future <math>\delta \dot{v} \sigma \rho \mu a$ and the Subjunctive $\phi a \epsilon \dot{\iota} \nu \omega$ hardly differ in their force.) Kai $\pi \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau s \epsilon \ddot{\iota} \pi \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, and some one will perhaps say. Il. VI, 459. (In vs. 462, referring to the same thing, we have $\dot{\omega} s \pi \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau s \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota$.) Où $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \sigma d^{2} \sigma \dot{\delta} \nu \dot{\rho}$, où $\dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau a$. où $\dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta - \tau a \iota$, $\dot{\delta} s \kappa \epsilon \tau T \eta \lambda \epsilon \mu \dot{\lambda} \chi \phi \sigma \phi$ viét $\chi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\sigma} \delta \sigma c \sigma d$. XVI, 437. $M \nu \dot{\eta} - \sigma \rho \mu a \iota \dot{\delta} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega \mu a \iota \dot{\lambda} \pi \delta \lambda \lambda \omega \sigma s \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \sigma o I. will remember and will not forget the far-shooting Apollo. Hymn. in Apoll. 1.$

REMARK. The Aorist is the tense usually found in this construction. The first person singular is the most common, and instances of the second person are very rare.

NOTE. This Homeric Subjunctive, like the Future Indicative, is sometimes joined with $d\nu$ or $\kappa\epsilon$ to form an apodosis. This enabled the earlier language to express an apodosis with a sense between that of the Optative with $d\nu$ and that of the simple Future Indicative, which the Attic was unable to do. (See § 38, 2.) E. g.

Eì dé $\kappa \epsilon \mu \eta$ dώŋσιν, èyà dé $\kappa \epsilon \nu$ airds ë $\lambda \omega \mu a\iota$, but if he does not give her up, I will take her myself. II. I, 324. (Here $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\mu a\iota \kappa\epsilon\nu$ has a shade of meaning between $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda oi\mu\eta\nu$ $\kappa\epsilon\nu$, I would take, and aipήσο- $\mu a\iota$, I will take, which neither the Attic Greek nor the English can express.) Compare $\tilde{\eta}\nu \chi' \dot{\eta}\mu\tilde{\nu}\sigma d\phi a \epsilon i \pi \omega$, öre πρότερόs $\gamma\epsilon$ πυθοίμην, Od. II, 43, with $\tilde{\eta}\nu \chi' \dot{\eta}\mu\tilde{\nu}\sigma d\phi a \epsilon i \pi o\iota$, öre πρότερόs $\gamma\epsilon$ πύθοιο, II, 31,— both referring to the same thing. See also II. III, 54; and VI, 448, the last example under § 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 $\mu \eta'$. In Attic Greek this Subjunctive is often introduced by $\beta o \nu \lambda \epsilon \iota$ or $\beta o \nu \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ (poetic $\theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota s$ or $\theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$). E. g.

Eⁱπω τοῦτο; shall I say this ? or βούλει εⁱπω τοῦτο; do you wish that I should say this ? Mὴ τοῦτο ποιῶμεν, shall we not do this ? Ti εⁱπω; or τί βούλεσθε εⁱπω; what shall I say ? or what do you want me to say ? For the Future in such questions, see § 25, 1, N. 4.

Πŷ γàρ ἐγὼ, φίλε τέκνον, ἴω; τεῦ δώμαθ ἴκωμαι ἀνδρῶν οἱ κραναὴν 'Ιθάκην κάτα κοιρανέουσιν; [°]Η ἰθὺς σῆς μητρὸς ἴω καὶ σοῖο δόμοιο; whither shall I go? to whose house shall I come? &c. Od. XV, 509. [°]H aὐτὸς κεύθω; φάσθαι δέ με θυμὸς ἀνώγει. Od. XXI, 194. [°]Ω Ζεῦ τί λέξω; ποῦ φρενῶν ἔλθω, πάτερ; SOPH. O. C. 310. [°]Ωμοι ἐγὼ, πῶ βῶ; πῶ στῶ; πῶ κέλσω; EUR. Hec. 1056. Ποῖ τράπωμαι ποῦ πορευθῶ; Ib. 1099. Εἴπω τι τῶν εἰωθότων, ὦ δέσποτα; ARIST. Ran. 1. Τίνα γὰρ μάρτυρα μείζω παράσχωμαι, DEM

* But the the examples at the to the 183 h

§ 88.]

F. L. 416 7. Μηδ', έάν τι ώνωμαι, ... έρωμαι όπόσου πωλεί; may I not ask, &c.? Μηδ άποκρίνωμαι ουν. αν τίς με έρωτα veos, έαν eido; and may I not answer, &c. XEN. Mem. I. 2, 36. $M_{i\sigma}\theta\omega\sigma\omega$ μεθα ούν κήρυκα, ή αὐτὸς ἀνείπω; PLAT. Rep. IX, 580 B. θύοντα άνδρα πάνυ σφόδρα δέξεσθε συμπότην, η άπίωμεν; will you receive him, or shall we go away? Id. Symp. 212 E. Apa un ai o xuvθώμεν τον Περσών βασιλέα μιμήσασθαι; shall we then be ashamed to imitale the king of the Persians? XEN. Oecon. IV, 4. nor

Ποῦ δή βούλει καθιζόμενοι ἀναγνῶμεν; where will thou that we sit down and read? PLAT. Phaedr. 228 E. (So 263 E.) Boulet ούν έπισκοπώμεν όπου ήδη το δυνατόν έστι; XEN Mem. III, 5, 1. Sund Βούλει λάβωμαι δήτα και θίγω τί σου; SOPH. Phil. 761. Βούλεσθ' έπεισπέσωμεν; EUR. Hec. 1042. Θέλεις μείνωμεν αύτου κάνακούσωμεν γόων; SOPH. El. 81. Τισοι θέλεις δητ'εικάθω; Id. O. T. 651. Θέλετε θηρασώμεθα Πενθέως 'Αγαυήν μητέρ' έκ βακχευμάτων, χάριν τ' άνακτι θωμεν; Eur. Bacch. 719. So with κελεύετε: 'Αλλά πώς; είπω κελεύετε και οὐκ ἀργιεῖσθε; do you command me to speak, &c.? DEM. Phil. HI, 123, 1.

In PLAT. Rep. II, 372 E, we find $\beta_{\sigma\nu}\lambda_{\epsilon\sigma}\theta_{\epsilon}$ and a Subjunctive with εί in protasis: εί δ' αν βούλεσθε και φλεγμαίνουσαν πόλιν θεωρήσωμεν, ούδεν αποκωλύει, i. e. if you will have us examine, &c. (§ 49, 1.)

REMARK. In this construction there is an implied appeal to some person (sometimes to the speaker himself), so that $\beta_{\alpha\nu\lambda\epsilon\iota}$ 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 $\theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon \epsilon \ddot{\iota} \pi \omega$; was developed into $\theta \in \lambda \in \epsilon \in i \nu a$ (or $\delta \pi \omega s$) $\epsilon = \pi \omega s$; — from which comes the modern Greek $\theta \in \lambda \in \tau \in va$ $\in i \pi \omega$; or $va \in i \pi \omega$; 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 τ is. Examples of the second person are very rare. E. g.

Πότερόν σέ τις, Αἰσχίνη, της πόλεως έχθρον η έμον είναι φη; i. e. shall we call you the city's enemy, or mine? DEM. Cor. 268, 28. Eira ταῦθ οῦτοι πεισθῶσιν ὑπέρ αὐτῶν σε ποιεῖν, καὶ τὰ τῆς σῆς πονηpias épya éd' éautoùs avadé & wvtai; i. e. are these men to believe, &c.; and are they to assume, &c. Id. Androt. 613, 3. Ti ris elvai τοῦτο $\phi \hat{\eta}$; Id. F. L. 369, 12. Θύγατερ, ποι τις φροντίδος έλθη; SOPH. Ο. C. 170. Ποι τις ούν φύγη; Id 1. 403. Πόθεν ουν τις ταύτης άρξηται μάχης; PLAT. Phil. 15 D. Πώς τις πείθηται; Π. Ι. 150. (Πώς ουν έτ' είπης ότι συνέσταλμαι κακοίς; EUR. Here. F. 1417.) See Krüger, Vol. I, § 54, 2; Notes 4 and 5.

NOTE 2. The Subjunctive is often used in the question

OUNOUN Kai que puer

m Sogias 449 A.

lul

ne

"Sha

we

and:

τί πάθω; what will become of me? or what harm will it do me. literally, what shall I undergo? E. g.

^{*}Ω μωι έγὼ, τί πάθω; τί νύ μοι μήκιστα γένηται; Od. V, 465. So fl. XI, 404. Τί πάθω; τί δὲ δρῶ; τί δὲ μήσωμαι; AESCH. Sept. 1057. Τἰ πάθω τλήμων; Id. Pers. 912; ARIST. Plut. 603. Τί πάθω; τί δὲ μήσομαι; οἴμοι. SOPH. Trach. 973. Τὸ μέλλον, εἰ χρῆ, πείσομαι· τί γὰρ πάθω; I shall suffer what is to com, if it must be; for what harm can it do me? EUR. Phoen. 895. (The difference between this and the ordinary meaning of πάσχω is here seen.) [']Ωμολόγηκα· τί γὰρ πάθω; PLAT. Euthyd. 302 D. So in the plural, HDT. IV, 118; Τί γὰρ πάθωμεν μὴ βουλομένων ὑμέων τιμωρέειν;

§ **S9.** The double negative $o\dot{v} \ \mu \dot{\eta}$ is sometimes used with the Subjunctive and the Future Indicative in independent sentences, being equivalent to a strong single negative. The compounds of both $o\dot{v}$ and $\mu \dot{\eta}$ can be used here as well as the simple forms.

1. The Subjunctive (sometimes the Future Indicative) with $o\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta}$ may have the force of an emphatic Future with $o\dot{v}$. Thus $o\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta} \tau o\hat{v} \tau o \gamma \epsilon v \eta \tau a \iota$ (sometimes $o\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta} \tau o\hat{v} \tau o \gamma \epsilon v \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$) means this surely will not happen, being a little more emphatic than $o\dot{v} \tau o\hat{v} \tau o \gamma \epsilon v \eta \cdot \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$. E. g.

(Pres. Subj.) Ην γαρ απαξ δύο ή τριών ήμερών όδαν ἀπόσχωμεν, οὐκέτι μὴ δύνηται βασιλεὺς ἡμᾶς καταλαβεῖν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Π, 2, 12. So οὐ μὴ δύνωνται, Id. Hier. XI, 15. Προς ταῦτα κακούργει καὶ συκοφάντει, εἶ τι δύνασαι · οὐδέν σου παρίεμαι · ἀλλ' οὐ μὴ οἶός τ' ής, but you will not be able. PLAT. Rep. I, 341 B. (Fut. Ind.) Οὕ σοι μὴ μεθέψομαί ποτε. SOPH. El. 1052. Τοὺς γὰρ πονηροὺς οὐ μή ποτε ποιήσετε βελτίους. AESCHIN. Cor. § 177. Οῦ τοι μήποτέ σ' ἐκ τῶν ἐδράνων, ὦ γέρον, ὕκουτά τις ἄξει. SOPH. O. C. 176. So οἰκ οὖν μὴ όδοιπορήσεις, O. C. 848; and HDT. III, 62. Μὰ τὸν ᾿Απόλλω οὐ μὴ σ' ἐγὼ περιόψομἀπελθόντ' (i. e. περιόψομαι ἀπελθόντα). ARIST. Ran. 508. Εἶπεν ὅτι ἡ Σπάρτη οὐδέν μὴ κάκιον οἰκιείται αὐτοῦ ἀποθανώντος. XEN. Hell. I, 6, 32. (See § 70, 2; and below, Note 1.)

The Aorist Subjunctive is the most common form in this construction.

NOTE 1. Où $\mu\eta$ with the Future Optative, representing a Future Indicative of the direct discourse, occurs in an indirect quotation after is: Tá $\dot{\tau}$ äλλa πάντ έθέσπισεν, καὶ τảπὶ Τροίας πέργαμ is où $\mu\dot{\eta}$ ποτε πέρσοιεν, εἰ μὴ τόνδε ἄγουντο. SOPH. Phil. 611. (The direct discourse was où μή ποτε πέρσετε, ἐἀν μὴ τόνδε ἄγησθε.) In the last example under § 89, 1, the Future Indicative is retained in the same construction. The Future Infinitive can be used in the same way; as, Εἶπε Τειρεσίας οἱ μή ποτε, σοῦ τήνδε γῆν οἰκοῦντος, εὖ πράξειν πόλιν. EUR. Phoen. 1590.

Oⁱ $\mu \eta$ with the Subjunctive occurs in a causal sentence after ωs , in ARIST. Av. 461: $\Lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon$ $\theta a \rho \rho \eta \sigma a s^{-} \omega s \tau a s \sigma \pi o \nu \delta a s o \vartheta \mu \eta \pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \pi a \rho a \beta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$.

NOTE 2. This construction is often explained by supposing an ellipsis of $\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\delta\nu$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ or $\phi\delta\beta\sigmas$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ between the où and the $\mu\eta$: this is based on such passages as XEN. Mem. II, 1, 25, où $\phi\delta\beta\sigmas$ $\mu\eta$ $\sigma\epsilon$ $d\gamma d\gamma\omega$, there is no fear lest I may lead you, which with the $\phi\delta\beta\sigmas$ omitted would be où $\mu\eta$ $\sigma\epsilon$ $d\gamma d\gamma\omega$. 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 § 89, 1.

2. The second person of the Future Indicative (sometimes the Subjunctive) with $o\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta}$ may express a strong prohibition. Thus $o\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta} \lambda a \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon_i s$ means you shall not prate (or do not prate), being more emphatic than $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\lambda \dot{a} \lambda \epsilon_i$. E. g.

Hoîos Zeύs; οὐ μὴ ληρήσεις (ληρήσης)· οἰδ ἔστι Ζεύς, i. e. stop your nonsense! ARIST. Nub. 367. ³Ω παῖ, τί θροεῖs; οὐ μὴ παρ' όχλφ τάδε γηρύσει, do not (I beg you) speak out in this way before the people. EUR. Hippol. 213. ³Ω θύγατερ, οὐ μὴ μῦθον ἐπὶ πολλούs έρεῖs. EUR. Supp. 1066. Οὐ μὴ γυναικῶν δειλον εἰσοίσεις λόγον, do not adopt the cowardly language of women. EUR. Andr. 757. Οὐ μὴ ἐξεγερεῖς τὸν ὕπνφ κάτοχον κἀκκινήσεις κἀναστήσεις φοιτάδα δεωὴν νόσον, ὦ τέκνον, do not wake him. SOPH. Trach. 978. Τί ποιεῖς; οὐ μὴ καταβήσει, don't come down. ARIST. Vesp 897. For the use of the future, see § 25, 1. N. 5. For the Subjunctive in this construction, see below, Rem. 2.

NOTE 1. A prohibition thus begun by $o\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta}$ may be continued by $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ with another Future (or Subjunctive). An affirmative command may be added by another Future or an Imperative, after $d\lambda\lambda \dot{a}$ or $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$. E. g.

Où μ à $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} s \mu'$, $\delta \nu \theta \rho \omega \phi'$, $i \kappa \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\omega}$, $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa a \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \hat{i} s \tau o \ddot{\nu} \nu \rho \mu a$, do not call to me, I implore you, nor speak my name. ARIST. Ran. 298. Où μ à $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma o \hat{i} \sigma \epsilon \iota s \chi \epsilon \hat{i} \rho a \mu \eta \delta' \ddot{a} \psi \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \omega \nu$, do not bring your hand near me nor touch my garments. EUR. Hippol. 606. Où μ à $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma o \hat{i} \sigma \epsilon \iota s \chi \epsilon \hat{i} \rho a \kappa \chi \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota s \delta' l \dot{\omega} \nu$, $\mu \eta \delta' \dot{\epsilon} \xi \rho \mu \delta \rho \xi \epsilon \iota \mu \omega \rho \hat{i} a \nu$ tà v σὴν ϵμοί, do not bring your hand near me; but go and rage, and do not wipe off your folly on me. Id. Bacch. 343.

Où μ ì $\lambda a \lambda$ í $\sigma \epsilon i s$ ($\lambda a \lambda i \sigma y s$), $d\lambda \lambda$ ' $d\kappa o \lambda o v \theta$ í $\sigma \epsilon i s$ $\epsilon \mu o i$, do not prate, but follow me. ARIST. Nub. 505. Où μ ì $\delta i a \tau \rho i \psi \epsilon i s$, $d\lambda \lambda i \gamma \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon i$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\theta v \rho a s$, do not delay, but knock at the door. Id. Ran. 462. Où μ ì $\phi \lambda v a \rho i \sigma \epsilon i s$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \chi \omega v$, $\tilde{\omega} \Xi a v \theta (a, d\lambda)$ ' $d\rho d\mu e vos o o i \sigma \epsilon i s$ $\pi d\lambda v \tau a \sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu a a$. Ib. 524. Où μ ì $\delta v \sigma \mu e v \eta s$ ' $\tilde{s} \sigma \epsilon i \phi i \lambda o s$; $\sigma \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon i \phi h \lambda v v \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \psi \epsilon i s \kappa a \rho a, \dots \delta \epsilon \xi \epsilon i \delta \epsilon \delta \delta \rho a \kappa a \pi a \rho a i <math>\tau i \sigma \epsilon i \pi a \tau \rho o s$, be not inimical to friends, but cease your rage, &c. EUR. Med. 1151. Où μ ì $\sigma \kappa \omega \psi \eta s \mu \eta \delta \epsilon n o i \eta \sigma y s a \pi \epsilon \rho o i <math>\tau \rho v \gamma \delta a i - \mu \delta v \kappa \delta \psi \eta s \mu \eta \delta \epsilon n o i \eta \sigma y s a \pi \epsilon \rho o i <math>\tau \rho v \gamma \delta a i - \mu \delta v \epsilon v \delta i \mu \epsilon i, do not scoff, nor do what these wretches$ do; but keep silence ! ARIST. Nub. 296. (Here the Imperative is $used precisely like the Future with <math>d\lambda \lambda d$ or $\delta \epsilon$ in the preceding examples.)

The Future in the clauses with $d\lambda\lambda d$ or $\delta\epsilon$ will be explained by § 25, 1, N. 5 (a); in the clauses with $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon$ it may be explained by § 25, 1, N. 5 (b), or we may consider the construction a continuation of that with $o\dot{v} \ \mu\dot{\eta}$, the $\mu\dot{\eta}$ being repeated without the $o\dot{v}$.

NOTE 2. In a few cases of with the Future is used interrogatively expressing an *exhortation*, followed by another Future with $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon$ or $\kappa a\lambda \mu\eta$ expressing a *prohibition*. E. g.

Où $\sigma_i \gamma' \dot{a} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon_1$, $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon_i \lambda i a \nu \dot{a} \rho \epsilon_i (s)$, keep silence (lit. will you not keep silence?) and do not become a coward. SOPH. Aj. 75. (Here perhaps we should punctuate où $\sigma_i \gamma' \dot{a} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon_i$; $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon_i \lambda i a \dot{a} \rho \epsilon_i$. 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 § 25, 1, N. 5 (b). Compare the examples under Note 1.) Où $\theta \tilde{a} \sigma \sigma \sigma$ o $(\sigma \epsilon_i s, \mu \eta \delta) \dot{a} \pi_i \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon_i s \dot{\epsilon} \mu o i$, i. e. extend your hand, and do not distrust me. Id. Trach. 1183. Où $\kappa \epsilon_i s \sigma \tau \dot{\tau} \dot{\sigma} \kappa \sigma s$, $\sigma \tau \tau \epsilon K \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega \kappa a \tau \dot{a} \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon} \gamma a s$, $\kappa a \dot{\mu} \dot{\eta} \tau \dot{o} \mu \eta \delta \dot{e} \dot{a} \lambda \gamma o s \dot{\epsilon} s \mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\sigma} (\sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. Id. O. T. 637.

REMARK 1. The examples under § 89, 2 and the notes are usually printed as interrogative, in accordance with the doctrine of Elmsley, stated in his note to Eurip. Med. 1120 (1151) and in the Quarterly Review for June, 1812. He explains ou un hadnoes; as meaning will you not stop prating ? lit. will you not not prate ? and when a second clause in the Future with $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon$ or $d\lambda\lambda a$ follows, he considers the interrogative force of où 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 (§ 87), and explain the Future in § 89, 2 by the principle stated in § 25, 1, N. 5, — où $\mu \dot{\eta}$ 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 $d\lambda\lambda d$) 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, où oîya; μηδέν τωνδ' έρεις κατά πτόλιν, will you not keep silence? (où σιγ' άνέ- $\xi \in i$;) 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 $o\dot{v}$ (implying an affirmative answer) equivalent to an exhortation, and the second a question with $\mu\dot{\eta}$ (implying a negative answer) equivalent to a prohibition. Où $\sigma_i\gamma'$ $d\nu \xi\epsilon_i$. $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon$ $\delta\epsilon_i\lambda(a\nu d\rho\epsilon_i)$; will thus mean, 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 § 89, 2. But in many of the examples quoted there and in the notes the first Aorist Subjunctive 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) of $\mu\eta$ $\sigma\kappa\omega\psi\eta s$ could not be changed to où $\mu\eta$ $\sigma\kappa\omega\psi\epsilon\iota s$, as the Future of $\sigma\kappa\omega\pi\tau\omega$ is σκώψομαι. Elmsley's emendation $\sigma \kappa \omega \psi \epsilon \iota$ 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 but 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 où $\mu\eta$ 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 § 89, 1, and the Future in that of § 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. \cdot E. g.

Συνέβη αὐτῷ ἐλθεῖν, it happened to him to go. Οὐκ ἔνεστι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. Ἀδύνατών ἐστι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. Ἐξῆν μένειν. Δεῖ αὐτὼν μένειν. Οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακὼν βασιλενέμεν, for it is no bad thing to be a king. Od. I, 392. Εἶs οἰωνὸs ἄριστος, ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης. II. XII, 243. Ἀκὶ γὰρ ἡβậ τοῖς γέρουσιε εὐ μαθεῖν. Ακεςιι. Αg. 584. Πολὺ γὰρ ῥῆον ἔχωντας ψυλάττειν ἡ κτήσασθαι πάντα πέψυκεν. DEM. Ol. II, 25, 24. (Compare Ol. I, 16, 3: Δοκεῖ τὸ ψυλάξαι τἀγαθὰ τοῦ κτήσασθαι χαλεπώτερον εἶναι.) 'Hồù πολλοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἔχειν; DEM. F. L. 409, 25. Δοκεῖ οἰκονόμου ἀγαθοῦ είναι εὖ οἰκεῖν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον. XEN. Oceon. I, 2. Φησὶ δεῖν τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, he says that it is necessary to Jo this. (Here ποιῆσαι as accus. is the subject of δεῖν: for δεῖν, see § 92, 2.) Τὸ γυῶναι ἐπιστήμην που λαβεῖν ἐστίν, to learn is to acquire knowledge. PLAT. Theact. 209 Ε. Τὸ δίκην διδόναι πότερον πάσχει τί ἐστιν ἢ ποιεῖν; PLAT. Gorg. 476 D. (In the last two examples the subject Infinitive has the article to emphasize it, while the predicate Infinitives stand alone.) Οὕτοι ἡδύ ἐστι τὸ ἔχειν χρήματα οῦτως ὡς ἀνιαρὸν τὸ ἀποβάλλειν. XEN. Cyr. VIII, 3, 42. (Compare the two examples above from Demosthenes.) Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἀδικεῖν, τὸ πλέον τῶν ἄλλων ζητεῖν ἔχειν. PLAT. Gorg. 483 C. 'Aλλ' οἰμαι, νῦν μὲν ἐπισκοτεῖ τούτοις τὸ κατορθοῦν. DEM. Ol. II, 23, 27. Τὸ γὰρ θάνατον δεδιέναι οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἢ δοκεῖν σοφὸν είναι μὴ ὅντα· δοκεῖν γὰρ εἰδέναι ἐστὶν ἇ οὐκ οἶδεν. PLAT. Apol. 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.

Διδάσκουσιν αὐτὸν βάλλειν, they teach him to shoot. "Εμαθον τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, they learned to do this. Βούλεται ἐλθεῖν. Παραινοῦμέν σοι πειθεσθαι. Φοβοῦμαι μένειν. Αἰροῦνται πολεμεῖν. Ἡ πόλις κινδυ νεύει διαφθαρῆναι. Δύναται ἀπελθεῖν. Ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν περιμεῖνατ με. Δέομαι ὑμῶν συγγνώμην μοι ἔχειν. Εἶπε στρατηγοὺς ἑλέσθαι, he proposed to choose generals. Ἀπαγορεύουσιν αὐτοῖς μὴ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. (See below, § 95, 2) Τί κωλύσει αὐτὸν βαδίζειν ὅποι βούλεται, what will prevent him from marching, §c.? ᾿Αξιῶ λαμβάνειν. ᾿Αξιοῦται θανείν. Οὐ πέφυκε δουλεύειν, he is not born to be a slave. 'Aνaβάλ. λεται τοῦτο ποιείν, 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 $\S 12$: for the Perfect, see $\S 18$, 3 (b); and for the occasional use of the Future Infinitive (or even the Infinitive with $a\nu$) 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 $\mu \eta$, lest, and the Subjunctive or Optative. (See § 46.) The Infinitive, however, sometimes occurs; and, when it is used, it belongs regularly under the rule, § 92, 1. (See § 46, N. 8, a and b.) Verbs expressing *danger* take the Infinitive more frequently than

 $\mu \eta$ with the Subjunctive or Optative. (See § 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.

Ξυνέβησαν τοις Πλαταιεύσι παραδούναι σφάς αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ ὅπλα, they made an agreement with the Plataeans to surrender, &c. THUC. ΙΙ, 4. Τίνι δ' άν τις μάλλον πιστεύσειε παρακαταθέσθαι χρήματα; to whom would any one sooner dare to commit money? XEN. Mem. IV, 4, 17. 'Οδύρονται οἶκόνδε νέεσθαι, they mourn to go home. Il. ΙΙ, 290. Ἐπευφήμησαν Ἀχαιοί αἰδείσθαι ίερηα. Π. Ι, 22.

NOTE 2. When a noun and a verb (especially $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\epsilon}$) 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.

'Ανάγκη έστι πάντας απελθειν. Κίνδυνος ην αυτώ παθειν τι. Οκνος έστί μοι τοῦτο ποιησαι. Φύβος ἐστὶν αὐτῷ ἐλθεῖν. "Αμαξα έν αὐταῖς ἦν, κώλυμα οὖσα (τὰς πύλας) προσθεῖναι, a wagon, which prevented them from shutting the gates. THUC. IV, 67. So energévero δε άλλοις τε άλλοθι κωλύματα μή αυξηθήναι, obstacles to their increase. Id. I, 16. (See § 95, 2, N. 1.) Τοῖς στρατιώταις δρμη ἐνέ-πεσε ἐκτειχίσαι τὸ χωρίον. Id. IV, 4. Οὐ μάντις εἰμι τάφανη yvŵvai, I am not enough of a prophet to decide, &c. EUR. Hippe'. 346. (Here the idea of ability is implied in µάντις εἰμί.) To ảσφαλές και μένειν και απελθείν αι νήες παρέξουσιν. Τιιυς. VI, 18. (See § 93, 1.) "Εχοντα τιθασεύεσθαι φύσιν, capable by nature of

being tamed (=πεφυκότα τιθασεύεσθαι). PLAT. Politic. 264 A. Tis μηχανή μή ούχι πάντα καταναλωθήναι είς το τεθνάναι; (i. e. τί κωλύσει μή ουχί πάντα καταναλωθήναι;) PLAT. Phaed. 72 D. Δέδοικα μή πολλά και χαλεπά είς ανάγκην έλθωμεν ποιείν, lest we may come to the necessity of doing. DEM. Ol. I, 13, 25. "Opa aniévai, it is time to go away (like xpn antivat, we must go away). PLAT. Apol. 42 A. Ἐλπίδας ἔχει τοῦτο ποιησαι (= ἐλπίζει τοῦτο ποιησaι), he hopes to do this. But έλπις τοῦ έλεῖν, THUC. II, 56. Oi de joures antion baveiv, and the living are those who caused them to die. SOPH. Ant. 1173. We might also have altrio tou toutous θανείν or σίτιοι το τούτους θανείν. (See § 23, 1, N. 3.) So in phrases like πολλού (or μικρού) δέω ποιείν τι, I want much (or little) of doing anything; $\pi a \rho \dot{a} \mu \kappa \rho \dot{o} \nu \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu \pi o \iota \hat{\epsilon} \iota \nu \tau \iota$, they came within a little of doing anything; where the idea of ability, inability, or sufficiency appears : so in THUC. VII, 70, βραχύ γάρ ἀπέλιπον διακόσιαι γενέ-So έμποδών τούτω έστιν έλθειν (=κωλύει τουτον έλθειν), it σθαι. prevents him from going ; where rov endeiv may be used. (See § 94, and § 95, 1 and 2.)

The Infinitive depending on a noun is generally an adnominal genitive with the article $\tau o \hat{v}$. See § 94 and § 95, 1.

NOTE 3. Although the Infinitive depending on the verbs included in § 92, 1 regularly stands without the article, yet $\tau \delta$ is sometimes prefixed to give the Infinitive still more the character of a noun in the accusative. The Infinitive is sometimes placed for emphasis apart from the main construction, like a synecdochieal accusative. E. g.

Καὶ πῶς δὴ τὸ ἀρχικοὺς εἶναι ἀνθρώπων παιδεύεις; ΧΕΝ. Oecon. XIII, 4. (So παιδεύω τινά τι.) Τὸ δ' αὖ ξυνοικεῖν τῆδ' ὁμοῦ τίς ἂν γυνὴ δύναιτο; i. e. as to living with her, what woman could do it ? SOPH. Tr. 545. Τὸ δρᾶν οὐκ ἡθέλησαν. Id. O. C. 442.

Oùdeis μ av $\pi \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon i \epsilon v \tau \delta \mu \eta$ oùk $\epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon i v$, no one could persuade me not to go. ARIST. Ran. 68. (For $\mu \eta$ où, see § 95, 2, N. 1, b.) So XEN. Hell. V, 2, 36. So $\theta \epsilon \lambda \xi \epsilon \iota \tau \delta \mu \eta$ $\kappa \tau \epsilon i v a \iota \sigma i v \epsilon v v v v$ (like $\pi \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \iota \tau \delta \mu \eta$ $\kappa \tau \epsilon i v a \iota$, AESCH. From. 865. Compare Soph. Phil. 1253, oùde τοι σ η χειρι $\pi \epsilon i \theta o \mu a \iota \tau \delta \delta \rho a v$, i. e. I do not trust your hand for action (like où $\pi \epsilon i \theta o \mu a \iota \sigma o \iota \tau a v \tau a$, I do not trust you in this.)

NOTE 4. Other active verbs than those included in § 92, 1 may take the Infinitive like an ordinary noun, as an object accusative. Here, however, the Infinitive takes the article $\tau \delta$. E. g.

Τὸ τελευτησαι πάντων ή πεπρωμένη κατέκρινεν, fate awarded death to all. Isoc. Demon. p. 11 C. § 43.

NOTE 5. A few of the verbs included in § 92, 1, which govern the genitive of a noun, allow also the genitive of the Infinitive with roû, as well as the simple Infinitive. (See § 95, 1.) This applies chiefly to $d\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega$, $\epsilon\pi\iota\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, and to the verbs of *hindrance*, &c included in § 95, 2. E. g. 'Αμελήσας τοῦ ὀργίζεσθαι. XEN. Mem. II, 3, 9. (But ἀμελήσας λέγειν, PLAT. Phaed. 98 D.) Most verbs of desiring and neglecting take only the simple Infinitive. Ἐπιμελέομαι, which usually takes ὅπως with the Future Indicative (§ 45), allows also the simple Infinitive (THUC. VI, 54), and the Infinitive with τοῦ (XEN. Mem. III, 3, 11). See § 45, N. 6, a.

REMARK. For the use of the Infinitive without τo 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, § 92, 1), represents the corresponding tense of the Indicative or Optative

REMARK. For this construction see § 73, 1; where also examples of the Infinitive with a_{ν} in indirect discourse are given. For the distinction between the Infinitive in this construction and the ordinary Infinitive (92, 1), see § 73, 1, Remark. For the Infinitive, not in indirect discourse, after some verbs which usually belong to this class, see § 15, 2, Notes 2 and 3; see also § 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, $\epsilon i \pi o \nu$ only by $\delta \tau \iota$ or δs and the Indicative or Optative, while $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ allows either construction. A singular exception in regard to $\epsilon i \pi \sigma \nu$ 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 say $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \tau a$ $\delta \ K \hat{v} \rho o \gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \delta a , Cyrus is said to have been, or <math>\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \tau a$ $\tau \dot{\nu} \kappa \ \tilde{v} \rho \sigma \nu \gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \delta a , it is said that Cyrus was. <math>\Delta \sigma \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ in the meaning, I seem (videor) usually has the personal construction, as in English; as obros $\delta \sigma \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \ \dot{\epsilon} \iota \nu a , he seems to be.$ When an Infinitive with $\dot{a} \nu$ follows (§ 73, 1), it must be translated by an impersonal construction, to suit the English idiom: thus, $\delta \sigma \kappa \hat{\epsilon} \tau \tau s \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ must be translated it seems that some one would have, although $\tau \iota s$ is the subject of $\delta \sigma \kappa \hat{\epsilon} i$; τs we cannot use would with our Infinitive, to translate $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \ d m$ (See § 42, 2, Note.)

§ 93, 1.] INFINITIVE AFTER RELATIVES, ETC.

NOTE 3. (a.) When an indirect quotation has been introduced by an Infinitive, a dependent relative or temporal clauso in the quotation sometimes takes the Infinitive by assimilation, where we should expect an Indicative or Optative. The temporal particles δs . $\delta r \epsilon$, $\delta \pi \epsilon i$, $\delta \pi \epsilon i \delta \eta$, as well as the relative pronouns, are used in this construction. Herodotus also uses ϵi , if, and even $\delta i \delta \tau i$, because, in the same way. E. g.

Merà dè, ώς οὐ παύ εσθαι, ἄκεα δίζησθαι (λέγουσι), and afterwards, when it did not cease, they say that they sought for remedies. HDT. I, 94. (Here we should expect ώς οὐκ ἐπαύετο.) 'Ως δ' ἀκοῦσαι τοὺς παρόντας, θόρυβου γενέσθαι (φασίν), they say that, when those present heard it, there was a tumult. DEM. F. L. 402, 8. 'Επειδή δὲ γενέσθαι ἐπί τῆ οἰκία τῆ 'Αγάθωνος, (ἔφη) ἀνεωγμένην καταλαμβάνειν τὴν θύραν. PLAT. Symp. 174 D. See Rep. X, 614 B. Λέγεται 'Αλκμαίωνι, ὅτε δὴ ἀλᾶσθαι αὐτὸν, τὸν 'Απόλλω ταύτην τὴν γῆν χρῆσαι οἰκεῖν. THUC. II, 102. (See § 15, 1, N. 2.) Καὶ ὅσα αὖ μετ' ἐκείνων βουλεύοεσθαι, οὐδενὸς ὕστερον γνώμη φαιῆναι (ἔφασαν). Id. I, 91. (Here ἐβουλεύοντο would be the common form.) 'Ηγουμένης δὴ ἀληθείας οὐκ ἅν ποτε φαῖμεν αὐτῆ χορὸν κακῶν ἀκολουθῆσαι, ἀλλ' ὑγίες τε καὶ δίκαιον ἦθος, ῷ καὶ σωφροσύνην ἔπεσθαι. PLAT. Rep. VI, 490 C.

Εἰ γὰρ δὴ δεῖν πάντως περιθεῖναι ἄλλῷ τέῷ τὴν βασιληίην, (ἐφη) δικαιότερον εἶναι Μήδων τέῷ περιβαλεῖν τοῦτο. ΗΔΤ. Ι, 129. (Here εἰ δέοι or εἰ δεῖ would be the ordinary expression.) So HDT. III, 105 and 108; doubtful, II, 64 and 172. See Krüger's note on I, 129. Γιμῶν δὲ Σαμίους ἔψη, διότι ταψῆναί οἱ τὸν πάππον δημοσίη ὑπὸ Σαμίων. HDT. III, 55.

(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.

^{*}Εθηκεν έφ' ois έξειναι ἀποκτιννύναι, he enacted on what conditions it is allowed to kill. DEM. Lept. 505, 19. Kai διὰ ταῦτα, ἄν τις ἀποκτείνη τινὰ, τὴν βουλὴν δικάζειν ἔγραψε, καὶ οὐχ ἅπερ, ἁν ἀλῷ, εἶναι, and he did not enact what should be done if he should be convicted. DEM. Aristocr. 629, 2. (Here είναι is the reading of the Cod. 2, amply defended by the preceding example, in which all editors allow ἐξείναι.) Δέκα γὰρ ἄνδρας προείλοντο αὐτῷ ξυμβούλους, ἄνευ ῶν μὴ κύριον εἶναι ἀπάγειν στρατιὰν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως. THUC. V, 63.

§ 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.

Δυνατὸς ποιεῖν, able to do. Δεινὸς λέγειν, skilled in speaking. ^{*}Αξιός ἐστι ταῦτα λαβεῖν, he deserves to receive this. 'Ανάξιος θαυμάζεσθαι, unworthy to be admired. ^{*}Αξιος τιμῶσθαι, worthy to be honored. Οὐχ οἶός τε ἦν τοῦτο ἰδεῖν, he was not able to see this. Πρόθυμος λέγειν, eager to speak. 'Ετοῖμος κίνδυνον ὑπομένειν, ready to endure danger.

Θεμιστοκλέα, ίκανώτατον είπειν και γνωναι και πράξαι. Lys. Or. Fun. p. 194, § 42. Τον δ' επιτήδειον ταῦτα παθεῖν έφη, the people said that he was a suitable person to suffer this. DEM. Phil. III, 126, 19. Αί γὰρ εὐπραξίαι δειναί συγκρύψαι τὰ τοιαῦτα ὀνείδη. Id. Ol. II, 23, 29. Κυρίαν ἐποίησαν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῆς εὐταξίας, they gave it (the Areopagus) power to superintend good order. Isoc. Areop. p. 147 D. § 39. Βίην δε αδύνατοι ήσαν προσφέρειν. Η DT. III, 138. Mahakoù Kaptepeiv, too effeminate to endure. PLAT. Rep. VIII, 556 B. Ταπεινή ύμων ή διάνοια έγκαρτερείν ά έγνωτε, your minds are too dejected to persevere, &c. THUC. II, 61. (In the last two examples $\mu a \lambda a \kappa o i$ and $\tau a \pi \epsilon i \nu \eta$ govern the Infinitive by the idea of inability implied in them.) Χρήματα πορίζειν εὐπορώτατον γυνή. ARIST. Eccles. 236. Σοφώτεροι δή συμφοράς τάς των πέλας πάντες διαιρείν ή τύχας τὰς οικοθεν. Ευκ. Alemen. Fr. 103. Ἐπιστήμων λέγειν τε και σιγάν. PLAT. Phaedr. 276 Α. Τάλλα ευρήσεις ύπουργείν όντας ήμας ου κακούς. ARIST. Pac. 430.

For examples of nouns followed by the Infinitive, see § 92, 1, N. 2.

NOTE 1. The use of the Infinitive after olds in the sense of appropriate, likely, capable, and $\sigma\sigma\sigma$ in that of sufficient, with or without their antecedents, is to be referred to this head. (Olds $\tau\epsilon$, able, like duratos, regularly takes the Infinitive.) E. g.

Où yàp ^hy ^wpa ola τò πεδίον ^ap $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu$, for it was not the proper season for irrigating the land. XEN. An. II, 3, 13. Totairas olas χειμώνός τε στέγειν καὶ θερους iκανὰς εἶναι. PLAT. Rep. III, 415 Ε. Τοτοῦ τος οἰος πείθεσθαι. Id. CTR. 46 Β. Νεμώμενοι τὰ ἀντῶν ἕκαστοι ὅσον ἀποζην, cultivating their own land to an extent sufficient to ùve upon it. THUC. I, 2. Ἐλείπετο τῆς νυκτός ὅσον σκοταίους διελθεῖν τὸ πεδίον, there was left enough of the night for crossing the plain in the dark. XEN. An. IV, 1, 5. ^{*}Εφθασε τοσοῦτον ὅσον Ηάχητ^π ἀνεγνωκέναι τὸ ψήφισμα, it came so much in advance (of the other ship), that Paches had already read the decree. THUC. III, 49. (See § 18, 3, b.) Examples like the last strongly resemble those under § 98, 1 in which ὥστε has τοσοῦτος for its antecedent.

Other pronominal adjectives (as $\tau o \hat{l} o s$, $\tau o \hat{l} o \sigma \delta \epsilon$, $\tau \eta i o \hat{v} \tau o s$, $\tau \eta \lambda i \kappa o s$, $\pi o \hat{l} o s$) sometimes take an Infinitive in the same way.

NOTE 2. (a.) Certain impersonal verbs (like $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota, \pi\rho\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$, **προσήκει**), which regularly take an Infinitive as their subject

11.166 Joyw. whis

§ 93, 2.] INFINITIVE AFTER ADJECTIVES, ETC.

(§ 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 § 93, 1. Thus τa ένόντα είπεῖν is equivalent to â ἕνεστι εἰπεῖν, what it is permitted to say; τa τροσήκειτα ἡηθηναι is equivalent to â προσήκει ἡηθηναι, what is proper to be said, as if προσήκει were a personal verb, and as if we could say τaῦτα προσήκει, these things are becoming. E. g.

Kaτιδών τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐνόντων εἰπεῖν. Isoc. Phil. p. 104 D. § 110. Τὸν θεὸν καλεῖ οὐδὲν προσήκοντ ἐν γόοις παραστατεῖν, she is calling on the God who ought not to be present at lumentations. AESCH. Agam. 1079. (Προσήκοντα is used like adjectives meaning fil, proper, as if we could say ôs οὐ προσήκει παραστατεῖν.) Φράζ, ἐπεὶ πρέπων ἔφυς πρὸ τῶνδε φωνεῖν. SOPH. O. T. 9. So τὰ ἡμῶν παραγγελθέντα διεξελθεῖν (= ἅ παρηγγέλθη ἡμῶν διεξελθεῖν). PLAT. Tim. 90 E.

(b.) In the same way certain adjectives, like $\delta(\kappa a \cos, \epsilon \pi \kappa a i - \rho \cos, \epsilon \pi i \tau \eta \delta \epsilon \cos, \epsilon \pi i \delta o \xi o s$, may be used personally with the Infinitive; as $\delta(\kappa a i \delta s \epsilon \sigma \tau i \tau o \tilde{v} \tau o n \sigma i \epsilon \tilde{v}, it is right for him to do this (equivalent to <math>\delta(\kappa a i \delta r \epsilon \sigma \tau v a v \tau \delta r \tau \sigma \sigma i \epsilon \tilde{v})$. E. g.

Φημὶ καὶ πολλῷ μειζόνων ἔτι τούτων δωρεῶν δίκαιος εἶναι τυγχάνειν, i. e. thai it is right for me to receive, &c. DEM. Cor. 243, 6. Έδόκουν ἐπιτήδειοι εἶναι ὑπεξαιρεθηναι, they seemed to be convenient persons to be disposed of. THUC. VIII, 70. Θεραπεύεσθαι ἐπικαίριοι, important persons to be taken care of. XEN. Cyr. VIII, 2, 25. Τάδε τοι ἐξ αὐτέων ἐπίδοξα γενέσθαι, it is to be expected that this will result from it. HDT. I, 89. (Πολλοὶ ἐπίδοξοι τωὐτὸ τοῦτο πείσεσθαι, 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 $\tau \delta$ is used after adjectives of this class. (Compare § 92, 1, N. 3.) E. g.

Τό προσταλαιπωρείν ούδεις πρόθυμος ήν. ΤΗυς. Π, 53.

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 $\theta \epsilon a \mu a$ aigxpov opav, 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 $\chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \delta \nu \pi \sigma \iota \epsilon i \nu$, hard to do, seldom $\chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon - \pi \delta \nu \pi \sigma \iota \epsilon i \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, hard to be done. E. g.

Λίσχρον γάρ τόδε γ' έστι και έσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι, i. e. disgrace-

195

ful for them to hear. II. II, 119. So II. I, 107 and 589. Tous yap ύπερ τούτων λόγους έμοι μεν άναγκαιοτάτους προειπείν ήγουμαι, ύμιν δέ χρησιμωτάτους άκοῦσαι, i. e. most necessary for me to say, and most useful for you to hear. DEM. Mid. 522, 18. DoBepos προσπο- $\lambda \in \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma a_i$, a terrible man to fight against. Id. Ol. II, 24, 12. Oikía ήδίστη ένδιαιτασθαι, a house most pleasant to live in. XEN. Mem. III, 8, 8. Tà γαλεπώτατα ευρείν, the things hardest to find: τà pagra evruy x averv, the things easiest to obtain. Ib. I, 6, 9. Πολιτεία χαλεπή συζην, a form of government hard to live under: ανομος δέ (μοναρχία) χαλεπή και βαρυτάτη ξυνοικήσαι. PLAT. Politic. 302 B and E. Adyos Suvatos Katavon o al, a speech which it is possible to understand. Id. Phaed. 90 D. 'O xpovos Bpaxies atios Sinyn- $\sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$, the time is too short for narrating it properly. Id. Menex. 239 Β. Η όδος επιτηδεία πορευομένοις και λέγειν και άκούειν, convenient both for speaking and for hearing. Id. Symp. 173 B. Πότερον δε λούσασθαι ψυχρότερον (τὸ ῦδωρ); is the water there colder for bathing? XEN. Mem. III, 13, 3.

(Passive.) Κύνες αἰσχραὶ ὁρᾶσθαι (instead of ὁρῶν). ΧΕΝ. Cyneg. III, 3. Ἐστι δ' ὁ λόγος φιλαπεχθήμων μὲν, ῥηθῆναι δ' οὐκ ἀσύμφορος. Isoc. Antid. p. 70, § 115.

NOTE 1. The Infinitive may be used after adverbs which correspond to the adjectives just mentioned (§ 93, 2). E. g.

Πώς ἂν τοῖς μὲν εὔνοις κάλλιστα ἰδεῖν ποιοῖτο τὴν ἐξέλασιν, τοῖς δὲ δυσμενέσι φοβερώτατα, in a manner most delightful for the friendly 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 neuter of any of the adjectives which take the Infinitive, may themselves have the same construction. E. g.

 $\Theta_{a\hat{\nu}\mu a}$ idé $\sigma \theta_{a\hat{\nu}}$, a wonderful thing to behold (like $\theta_{a\nu\mu a\sigma\tau d\nu}$ idé- $\sigma \theta_{a\hat{\nu}}$).

NOTE 3. (a.) In Homer verbs expressing excellence or fitness sometimes take the Infinitive (as an accusative by synecdoche), like the adjectives of § 93, 2. E. g.

^TΕκτορος ήδε γυνη, δς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι, this is the wife of Hector, who was the first in fighting. II. VI, 460. Όμηλικίην ἐκέκαστὸ ὅρνιθας γνῶναι καὶ ἀναίσιμα μυθήσασθαι. Od. II, 158. Οἱ περὶ μὲν βουλην Δαναῶν, περὶ δ' ἐστὲ μάχεσθαι, ye who excel the Danai in counsel and excel them in battle. II. I, 258. (Here βουλήν and μάχεσθαι are alike in the accusative by synecdoche after περὶ... ἐστέ.)

(b.) Even in Attic Greek the Infinitive is sometimes used after verbs as a synecdochical accusative. The Infinitives $\delta\kappa o \delta \epsilon u v$, $\delta\kappa o \delta \sigma a v$, in sound, and $\delta \rho \delta v$, $\delta \delta \epsilon \tilde{u} v$, in appearance, especially, are used in this way. E. g.

Δοκείς ούν τι διαφέρε autoùs ίδειν χάλκεως; do you think that

§ 95, 1.] INFINITIVE AS GENITIVE OR DATIVE.

they differ at all in appearance from a brazier? PLAT. Rep. VI, 495 E. Compare εὐρύτερος ἰδές θαι, II. III, 194. ᾿Ακοῦσαι παγκάλως ἔχει, it ω very fine in its sound. DEM. F. L. 355, 29. Πράγματα πορέξουσιν (οἱ ἶπποι) ἐπιμέλεσθαι, the horses will make trouble about tending. XEN. Cyr. IV, 5, 46.

NOTE 4. The Homeric use of $\delta \mu o \hat{l} o s$, equal, like, with the Infinitive is to be referred to the same principle. E. g.

Λευκότεροι χιόνος, $θ \epsilon i \epsilon \iota v \delta' dν \epsilon μοισιν όμοιοι, (horses) whiter than$ snow, and like the winds in swiftness. II. X, 437. Οὐ γάρ οι τιςόμοιος ἐπισπέσθαι ποσὶν ἦεν. II. XIV, 521.

§ 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 $\tau o \hat{v}, \tau \hat{\phi}$, or $\tau \acute{o}$. E. g.

Τοὺς γὰρ λόγους περὶ τοῦ τιμω, $q \sigma a \sigma \theta aι Φίλιππον ὁρῶ γιγνο$ μένους, for I see that the speeckes are made about punishing Philip.DEM. Ol. III, 28, 5. Πρὸ τοῦ τοὺς ὅρκους ἀποδοῦναι, before taking the oaths. Id. Cor. 234, 6. Ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς χάριν δημηγορεῖνἐνίους. Id. Ol. III, 29, 18. Πρὸς τῶ μηδὲν ἐκ τῆς πρεσβείας λαβεῖν,besides receiving nothing for the embassy. Id. F. L. 412, 21. Ἐν τῷπολίτην ποιεῖσθαι (Χαρίδημον), in making Charidemus a citizen.Id. Aristocr. 683, 22. Ἐνεκα τοῦ πλείω ποιῆσαι τὴν ὑπάρχουσανοὐσίαν. Isoc. Demon. p. 6 A. § 19. Ἐθαυμάζετο ἐπὶ τῷ εὐθύμωςζῆν. ΧΕΝ. Mem. IV, 8, 2. Ὅρως διὰ τὸ ξένος εἶναι οὐκ ἀν οἴειἀἰκηθῆναι, on account of being a stranger. Ib. II, 1, 15. Πάντωνδιαφέρων ἐφαίνετο, καὶ εἰς τὸ ταχὺ μανθάνειν ἀ δέοι καὶ εἰς τὸ καλῶςἕκαστα ποιεῖν. 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 $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega$ and after adjectives denoting resemblance, &c., and sometimes in that of the genitive of cause or motive. E. g.

Τοῦ πιεῖν ἐπιθυμία, the desire to drink. THUC. VII, 84. Πόνους δὲ τοῦ ζῆν ἡδέως ἡγεμόνας νομίζετε. XEN. Cyr. I, 5, 12. Εἰς ἐλπίδα ἦλθον τοῦ ἐλεῖν (τὴν πόλιν), i, e. hope of taking the city. THUC. II, 56. (See § 92, 1, N. 2.) Νέοις τὸ σιγῶν κρεῖττόν ἐστι τοῦ λαλεῖν ΜΕΝΑΝΟ. MONOS. 387. Παρεκάλει ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοῦ ώς φρονιμώτατων εἶναι. XEN. Mem. I, 2, 55. So III, 3, 11. Seg

197

§ 92, 1, N. 5. ('Eπιμελέομαι usually takes öπωs with the Future Indicative, by § 45.) 'Επέσχομεν τοῦ δακρύειν, we ceased to weep. PLAT. Phaed. 117 E. (See below, § 95, 2.) Kai γὰρ ἀήθειs τοῦ κατακούειν τινός εἰσιν, for they are unused to obeying any one. DEM. Ol. I, 15, 28.

Οὐδενὶ τῶν πάντων πλέον κεκράτηκε Φίλιππος ἢ τῷ πρότερος πρὸς τοῖς πράγμασι γίγνεσθαι. Id. Chers. 92, 21. ᾿Αλλὰ τῷ φανερὸς εἶναι τοιοῦτος ὥν, by making it plain that he was such a man. XEN. Mem. I, 2, 3. Où yὰp δὴ τῷ γε κοσμίως ζῆν ἄξιον πιστεύειν, to trust in an orderly life. Isoc. Antid. p. 315 A. § 24. ὅΙσον δὲ τῷ προστένειν. ΑΕSCH. Agam. 253. Τῷ ζῆν ἕστι τι ἐναντίον, ὥσπερ τῷ ἐγρηγορέναι τὸ καθεύδειν. ΡΙΔΤ. Phaed. 71 C.

Μίνως το ληστικον καθήρει, το \hat{v} το \hat{v} το \hat{v} το \hat{v} το \hat{v} το \hat{v} γ, the 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 § 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 § 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 $\tau o\hat{v}$ (§ 95, 1).

If the leading verb is itself negative (or interrogative with a negative implied), the double negative $\mu\dot{\eta}$ où is generally used instead of $\mu\dot{\eta}$ in the form (c) with the simple Infinitive, but seldom (or never) in the form (d) with the genitive of the Infinitive; as où $\kappa \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \rho \gamma \epsilon r \epsilon \mu \dot{n} a \dot{v} \tau o \tilde{v} \tau \sigma \sigma c \epsilon \tilde{u}$, he does not pre-

but for win in his soll man : 1 296 add

§ 95, 2.] INFINITIVE AFTER VERBS OF HINDRANCE. 199

ven' you from doing this; selaom (or never) $\tau \circ \hat{v} \mu \dot{\eta} \circ \dot{v} \tau \circ \hat{v} \tau \sigma \hat{v} \tau \circ \hat{v}$ $\pi \circ \iota \tau \hat{v}$. See also § 95, 3. (For the double negative, see Note 1, b.) E. g.

(a.) Ἐπὶ ἘΛίνθου ἀποπέμπουσιν, ὅπως ἐἴργωσι τοὺς ἐκείθεν ἐπιβοηθείν. ΤΗυC. Ι, 62. Εἰ τοῦτό τις εἴργει δρâν ὅκνος, if any hesitation prevents you from doing this. PLAT. Soph. 242 A. ¨Αλλως δέ πως πορίζεσθαι τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ὅρκους ἤδη ‹ατέχοντας ἡμῶς (ἦδειν). XEN. An. III, 1, 20. Κακὸν δὲ ποῖον εἰργε τοῦτ ἐξειδέναι; SOPH. O. T. 129. Εὐδοκιμεῖν ἐμποδὼν σφίσιν εἶναι. PLAT. Euthyd. 305 D. Παιδὸς Φέρητος, ὅν θανεῖν ἐρουσάμην. EUR. Alc. 11. Τον Φίλιππον παρελθεῖν οὐκ ἐδύναντο κωλῦσαι. DEM. Pac. 62, 10. Τὴν ἰδέαν τῆς γῆς οὐδέν με κωλύει λέγειν. PLAT. Phaed. 108 Ε.

(b.) Τοῦ δὲ δραπετεύειν δεσμοῖς ἀπείργουσι; ΧΕΝ. Μεm. ΙΙ, 1, 16. Τὸ γὰρ ψευδόμενον φαίνεσθαι καὶ τοῦ συγγνώμης τινὸς τυγχάνειν ἐμποδῶν μάλιστα ἀνθρώποις γίγνεται. Ιd. Cyr. ΙΙΙ, 1, 9. Εἶπεν ὅτι κωλύσειε (ἀν) τοῦ καίειν ἐπιόντας. Ιd. An. Ι, 6, 2. ³Απεσχόμην τοῦ λαβεῖν τοῦ δικαίου ἕνεκα. DEM. F. L. 410, 18.

(c.) $E_{i}^{2}\rho\gamma\epsilon \ \mu\dot{\eta}\ \beta\lambda a\sigma\tau \acute{a}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$. PLAT. Phaedr. 251 B. $^{o}O\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\epsilon \ \mu\dot{\eta}\ \tau\dot{\eta}\nu\ \Pi\epsilon\lambda\sigma\pi\acute{a}\nu\eta\sigma\sigma\nu\ \pi\sigma\rho\theta\epsilon\iota\nu,\ which\ prevented\ him\ from\ ravaging\ the\ Peloponnesus.\ THUC. I, 73. <math>\Delta\iota\epsilon\kappa\dot{\omega}\lambda\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\ \mu\dot{\eta}\ \delta\iotaa\phi\theta\epsilon\iota \rhoa\iota.\ Id.\ HI, 49.\ 'E\pi\epsilon\gamma\acute{e}\nu\epsilon\tau\sigma\ \kappa\omega\lambda\dot{\upsilon}\mua\taua\ \mu\dot{\eta}\ a\dot{\upsilon}\xi\eta\theta\ddot{\eta}\nu a\iota.\ Id.\ I, 16.\ (§ 92, 1, N. 2.)\ \Theta\eta\tau\sigma\dot{\upsilon}s\ \gamma'\ \check{\epsilon}\pi a\upsilon\sigmaa\ \mu\dot{\eta}\ \pi\rho\sigma\ \delta\epsilon\rho\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota\ \mu\dot{\rho}\rho\nu.$ AESCH. Prom. 248. Toùµàv φυλάξεισ' ὄνομα μ\mmod πάσχειν κακῶs. SOPH. O. C. 667.

Οὐ γὰρ ἔστι Ἐλλησι οὐδεμία ἔκδυσις μὴ οὐ δόντας λόγον εἶναι σοὺς δούλους. ΗΔΤ. VIII, 100. Πέμπουσι κήρυκα, ὑποδεξάμενοι σχήσειν τὸν Σπαρτιήτην μὴ ἐξιέναι....Οὐ δυνατοὶ αὐτὴν ὕσχειν εἰσὶ Ἀργεῖοι μὴ οὐκ ἐξιέναι. Ιd. ΙΧ, 12. Ὅστε ξένον γʾ ἀν οὐδέν' ὅνθ', ὥσπερ σὺ νῦν, ὑπεκτραποίμην μὴ οὐ συνεκσ ὡζειν. SOPH. O. C. 565. Τί ἐμποδών μὴ οὐχὶ ὑβριζομένους ἀπο θανεῖν; ΧΕΝ. An. III, 1, 13. (Τί ἐμποδών μὴ οὐχὶ ὑβριζομένους ἀπο θανεῖν; ΧΕΝ. An. μὴ οὐχὶ πάμπαν εὐδαίμων εἶναι; what would hinder you from being perfectly happy? Id. Hell. IV, 1, 36. So ARIST. Ran. 695.

(d.) Πῶς γὰρ ἀσκὸς δύο ἄνδρας ἕξει τοῦ μὴ καταδῦναι, i. e. will keep two men from sinking. XEN. An. III, 5, 11. ⁶Ον οἰδείς πω προθεὶς τοῦ μὴ πλέον ἔχειν ἀπετράπετο. ΤΙΙΟΟ. Ι, 76. Εἰ δ ἄρ' ἐμποδών τι αὐτῷ ἐγένετο τοῦ μὴ εὐθὺς τότε δικάσασθαι. DEM. Apatur. 900, 22. 'Ηπίστατο τὴν πόλιν μικρὸν ἀπολιποῦσαν τοῦ μὴ ταῖς ἐσχάταις συμφοραῖς περιπεσεῖν. ISOC. Antid. p. 73, § 122. 'Αποσοβοῦντες ἀν ἐμποδῶν γίγνοιντο τοῦ μὴ ὅρῶν αὐτοὺς τὸ ὅλον στράτευμα. XEN. Cyr. II, 4, 23. Εἰδότες ὅτι ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ εἰσι τοῦ μη δὲν παθεῖν. Ib. III, 3, 31. (See Thuc. VI, 18, quoted § 92, 1, N. 2.) Τοῦ δὲ μὴ (κακῶς) πάσχε ν αὐτοὶ πῶσαν ἄδειαν ἤγετε, you were entirely free from fear of suffiring harm. DEM. F. L. 387, 17. Ἐνούσης οὐδεμῶς ἔτ ἀποστροφῆς τοῦ μὴ τὰ χρήματ ἔχειν ὑμῶς, there being no longer any escape from the conclusion that you have taken bribes. Id. Timoc. 702, 26.

0 .

tion which it.

201 surpassed him in provers = finder - fit i THE INFINITIVE. Iwas not Jais to CORE REMARK. The last two examples show that $\mu\eta$ can be joined with the genitive of the Infinitive, even after nouns implying hindrance or freedom. In the two following the addition of $\mu\eta$ is more peculiar : ---

U

A

non

'Η ἀπορία τοῦ μη ήσυχάζειν, the inability to rest. THUC. II, 49. 'Η τοῦ μη ξυμπλειν ἀπιστία, the distrust of sailing with them; i. e. the unwillingness to sail, caused by distrust. Id. III, 75.

(a.) The use of $\mu\eta$ with the Infinitive in the NOTE 1. 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 $\mu\eta$, to strengthen the negation implied in the leading verb. Thus we say apreîrat un annoes είναι τοῦτο, he denies that this is true ; ἀπηγόρευε μηδένα τοῦτο moleiv, 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 µn où, if the verb on which it depends is itself negative. Thus the example given above, dpveîrat µ n din des eîvat rouro, becomes, if we negative the leading verb, où k àpveirai µì où k àdybès eivai τοῦτο, he does not deny that this is true. So, when the original μή really negatives the Infinitive, as in δίκαιόν έστι μή τοῦτον aduévas, it is just not to acquit him, - if we negative the leading verb, we shall have οὐ δίκαιόν ἐστι μη οὐ τοῦτον ἀφιέναι, it is not just not to acquit him. See PLAT. Rep. IV, 427 E, is ούχ όσιόν σοι όν μή ού βοηθείν δικαιοσύνη. This applies also to the Infinitive with $\tau o'$ (§ 95, 3).

 $M\dot{\eta}$ où is occasionally used before participles, and even before nouns, on the same principle, to express an exception to a statement · containing a negative; as in PLAT. Lys. 210 D, οὐκ ἄρα ἐστὶ φίλον A τῷ φιλοῦντι οὐδέν μή οὐκ ἀντιφιλοῦν, unless it loves in return. Here, s if the negatives (our and ouder) were removed from the leading verb, we should have simply un avrigidouv (with the same meaning), which would be the ordinary form with the participle, even after a negative. So μη οὐκ ἐόντες, unless they were. HDT. VI, 9. So in DEM. F. L. 379, 7, we find aι τε πόλεις πολλαί και χαλεπαι λαβείν, $\iint u\dot{\eta}$ ού χρόνω και πολιορκία, the cities were many and difficult (= not easy) to capture, except by lon7 siege. Jsmi +

two tor Ento 1. JA

Entration &XIII.

sinala Ederal. Hen the infunctive Election nil \$ 95, 3.] has to up with the infinitive. I come 201 duy (at the orates Ind fat's know: Out "was ashamed to damy" = could REMARK. My ou is very rarely found where the leading verb does not at least imply a negative. In XEN. An. II, 3, 11, worre πάσιν αἰσχύνην είναι μή οὐ συσπουδάζειν, so that all were ashamed not to join hearthy in the work, the double negative may be explained by the negative idea of unwillingness implied in alox vunv. See also the last example under N. 1.

plen

ie 1

12

her.

reit

der :. The

× Dr

neja

all

~(h

ms.

In

ler

Neu

450

war

"ta

inaj pin

heco My

regin

Ita

+ OV

was

asha

.

NOTE 2. When the leading verb expressing hindrance, &c. is itself negative, the form c, $\mu \dot{\eta}$ of 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, $\tau o \hat{v}$ 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 $\mu \eta$ (for $\mu \eta o \dot{v}$), even when the leading verb is negative. E. g.

Ού πολύν χρόνον μ' έπέσχον μή με ναυστολείν ταχύ. SOPH. Phil. Ούδε μ' όμματος φρουράν παρηλθε, τόνδε μη λεύσσειν στόλον. 349. Id. Trach. 226. (M) of here is a conjecture.) ashu

3. The Infinitive preceded by $\tau o \mu \eta$ is sometimes used after verbs and expressions denoting hindrance, and also after all expressions which even imply preven " hur tion, 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, (Hin h or interrogative with a negative implied, $\mu\dot{\eta}$ où is generally used instead of $\mu \eta$. E. g.

admit - I Τον πλείστον δμιλον είργον το μή προεξιόντας των δπλων τα έγγυς του της πόλεως κακουργείν, they prevented them from injuring, &c. (3.4 x THUC. III, 1. (This adds a fifth expression, είργει σε το μή τοῦτο moleiv, to the four already given (§ 95, 2) as equivalents of the English, he prevents you from doing this.) Το δέ μή λεηλατήσαι την πόλιν έσχε τόδε. Η DT. V, 101. Φόβος τε ξυγγενής το μη άδικείν σχήσει. AESCII. Eum. 691. Ουτοί είσιν μόνοι έτι ήμίν έμποδών το μή ήδη είναι ένθα πάλαι έσπεύδομεν. ΧΕΝ. An. IV, 8, 14. Ούκ άπεσχόμην τὸ μὴ οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐλθεῖν. PLAT. Rep. I, 354 B. Ούκ απέσχοντο ούδ' από των φίλων το μή ούχι πλεονεκτείν αύτων πειράσθαι. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 6, 32. Κίμωνα παρά τρείς ἀφείσαν ψήφους το μη θανάτω ζημιώσαι, i. e. they allowed Cimon by three votes to escape the punishment of death. DEM. Aristocr. 688, 27

Thug VII. 53. Fourthering This Ghork Ker To

the

ture

Γρείs δὲ μόναι ψῆφοι διήνεγκαν τὸ μὴ θανάτου τιμῆσαι, and on'ş three votes prevented you from condemning him to death (lit. made the difference as to condemning, &c.). Ib. 676, 12. Φόβος γὰρ ἀνθ' ὕπνου παραστατεῖ τὸ μὴ βεβαίως βλέφαρα συμβαλεῖν ὕπνω, i. e. stands by to prevent my closing my eves, &c. AESCH. Agam. 15.

Έπεὶ προθυμεῖσθ', οὐκ ἐναντιώσομαι τὸ μὴ οὐ γεγωνεῖν πῶν ὅσον προσχρήζετε. Id. Prom. 786. Οὐδεν γαρ αὐτῷ ταῦτ' ἐπαρκέσει τὸ μή ου πεσείν ατίμως πτώματ' ουκ ανασχετά, this will not suffice to prevent him from falling, &c. Ib. 918. Λείπει μεν ουδ' à πρόσθεν ήδεμεν το μή ου βαρύστον' είναι, they lack nothing of being heavily grievous. Soph. O. T. 1232. Μήτοι, κασιγνήτη, μ' άτιμάσης το μή ου θανείν τε σύν σοι, τον θανόντα θ' άγνίσαι, do not think me too mean to die with thee, &c. Id. Ant. 544. (Cf. Ant. 22, and Oed. Col. 49.) Αὐτὴν μὴν οὐ μισοῦντ' ἐκείνην τὴν πόλιν τὸ μὴ οὐ μεγάλην είναι φύσει κευδαιμονα, i. e. not grudging the city its right to be great, &c. ARIST. Av. 36. (Compare μίσησέν μιν κυσι κύρμα γενέσθαι, Il. XVII, 272) Οὐδεὶς ἀντιλέγει τὸ μὴ οὐ λέξειν ὅ τι ἕκαστος ἡγείται πλείστου άξι ν επίστασθαι, no one objects to saying, &c. XEN. Conv. ΙΠ. 3. Οὐδ ἄρνησις ἔστιν αὐτοῖς τὸ μὴ ταῦθ ὑπερ Φιλίππου πράττειν, it is not even possible for them to deny that they did these things in the interest of Philip. DEM. F. L. 392, 13. Mh πaphs το μη ου Φράσαι, do not omit to speak of it. SOPH. O. T. 283. Oudeva δύνασθαι κρύπτειν το μή ου χ ήδέως αν και ώμων έσθίειν αυτών, that no one is able to prevent people from knowing that he would gladly even eat some of them raw. XEN. Hell. III, 3, 6.

For $\mu \dot{\eta}$ où, see § 95, 2, Note 1, (b.).

NOTE. The simple negative form $\tau \partial \mu \dot{\eta}$ is sometimes found even when the leading verb is negative, where regularly $\tau \partial \mu \dot{\eta}$ où would be used. This is more common here than in the corresponding case, § 95, 2, Note 2. E. g.

Οὐκ ἀν ἐσχύμην τὸ μὴ ἀποκλῆσαι τοὐμὸν ἄθλιον δέμας. SOPH. O. T. 1387. Τίς σοῦ ἀπελείΦθη τὸ μή σοι ἀκολουθεῖν; XEN. Cyr. V, 1, 25. "Ακος δ' οὐδὲν ἐπήρκεσαν τὸ μὴ πόλιν μὲν ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχει παθεῖν. AESCH. Agam. 1170. Οὐκ ὦν ἔστι μηχανὴ οὐδεμία τὸ μὴ κείνον ἐπιβουλεύειν ἐμοί. HDT. Ι, 209. Καὶ Φημὶ δρᾶσαι, κοὺκ ἀπαρνοῦμαι τὸ μή. SOPH. Ant. 443. See also DEM. F. L. 392, 13, quoted above.

REMARK. Tò $\mu \dot{\eta}$ and $\tau o \hat{v} \mu \dot{\eta}$ can of course be used with the Infinitive as ordinary negatives. See examples, § 92, 1, N. 3. So $\epsilon \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota} \tau a \hat{\iota} \tau o \hat{v} \mu \dot{\eta} \delta (\epsilon \eta \nu \delta o \hat{v} \nu a \iota.$

§ 96. The Infinitive with its subject, object, or other adjuncts (sometimes including dependent verbs) may be preceded by the article $\tau \phi$, the whole sentence standing as a single noun, either as the subject or object of a

1 97.]

verb, as the object of a preposition, or in apposition with a pronoun like τουτο. E. g.

Τὸ μέν γὰρ πολλὰ ἀπολωλεκέναι κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τῆς ἡμετέρας άμελείας αν τις θείη δικαίως· το δε μήτε πάλαι τουτο πεπονθέναι πεφηνέναι τέ τινα ήμιν συμμαχίαν τούτων άντίρροπον, άν βουλώμεθα χρησθαι, της πειρ' έκείνων εύνοίας εύεργέτημ' αν έγωγε θείην. DEM. OL I, 12, 3.

§ 97. The Infinitive without the article often expresses a purpose. E. g.

Τρώων ανδρα εκαστον (εί) ελοίμεθα οίνοχοεύειν, if we should choose every man of the Trojans to be our cup-bearer. Il. II, 127. So II. I, 338, δλs άγειν, and II, 107, 108. Την έξ' Αρείου πάγου βουλήν επέστησαι επιμελείσθαι της εὐκοσμίας, i. e. for the purpose of guarding yood order. Isoc. Areop. p. 147 B. § 37. Oi apxovtes, ous ύμεις είλεσθε άρχειν μου, the rulers, whom you chose to rule me. PLAT. Apol. 28 E. Δέκα δέ των νεών προύπεμψαν ές τον μέγαν λιμένα πλεύσαί τε και κατασκέψασθαι, και κηρύξαι, κ.τ.λ., i. e. they sent them to sail and examine, and to proclaim, &c. THUC. VI, 50. Tows ίππέας παρείχοντο Πελοποννησίοις ξυστρατεύειν. Id. II, 12. Ξυνέβησαν τοις Πλαταιεύσι παραδούναι σφάς αύτους και τα όπλα, χρήσασθαι ő τι αν βούλωνται, i. e. to do with them whatever they pleased. Id. II, 4. (For παραδούναι see § 92, 1, N. 1.) Εί βουλοίμεθά τω έπιτρέψαι ή παίδας παιδεύσαι, ή χρήματα διασώσαι, $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$, if we should wish to intrust to any one either children to instruct or money to keep, &c. XEN. Mem. I, 5, 2. Ai yuvaikes TIEIV depouoa, the women bringing them (something) to drink. XEN. Hell. VII, 2, 9. Την πόλιν και την άκραν φυλάττειν αυτοίς παρέδωκαν, they delivered the city and the citadel to them to guard. Ib. IV, 4, 15. 'Os γάρ αν ύμας λάθη, τοῦτον ἀφίετε τοῖς θεοῖς κολάζειν. DEM. F. L. 363, 25.

Η θύρα ή έμη ανέφκτο είσιέναι τῷ δεομένω τι έμοῦ. ΧΕΝ. Hell. V, 1, 14. Our $\epsilon_{i\chi}$ or apyupion $\epsilon_{\pi i\sigma i\tau i\zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a i}$, they had no money to buy provisions. Id. An. VII, 1, 7. 'Αριστάρχω έδοτε ήμέραν ἀπολοyhoadar, i. e. a day to defend himself in. Id. Hell. I, 7, 28. 'Euavτόν σοι έμμελεταν παρέχειν ου πάνυ δέδοκται. PLAT. Phaedr. 228 E. Οίς ένευδαιμανήσαι τε ό βίος όμοίως καὶ ἐντελευτήσαι ξυνεμετρήθη. THUC. II, 44.

Here, as in § 93, 2, the Infinitive is generally active or middle, even where the passive would seem more natural; as KT aveiv eµoi viv čoorav, they gave her to me to be killed. EUR. Troad. 874.

The Infinitive is thus used in prose chiefly after verbs NOTE 1. signifying to choose or appoint, to give or take (the Infinitive denot 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. forral 6

Ć

the

ma

Jac

he :

Two To EO Two

[§ 97.

In poetry the same construction sometimes occurs after verbs of motion, like $\epsilon \,i \mu \iota$, $\eta \kappa \omega$, and $\beta a i \nu \omega$; and also after $\epsilon i \mu i$, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \mu \iota$, and $\pi a \rho \epsilon \iota \mu \iota$ (to be, to be at hand), expressed or understood. E. g

'Aλλά τις εἶη εἰπ εἶν 'Ατρείδη 'Αγαμέμνονι, ποιμένι λαῶν, but let some one go to tell Agamemnon. Od. XIV, 496. (See Passow, s. v. είμι.) Bỹ δὲ θέειν, and he started to run. II. II, 182. Οὐδέ τις ἔστιν ἀρὴν καὶ λοιγὸν ἀμῦναι, nor is there any one to keep off curse and ruin. II. XXIV, 489. Πολλοί δ' aǚ σοὶ 'Αχαιοὶ ἐναιρέμεν ὅν κε δύνηαι, i. e. for you to slay whomsoever you can. II. VI, 229. Οὐ γὰρ ἕπ' ἀνὴρ οἶος 'Οδυσσεὺς ἔσκεν, ἀρὴν ἀπὸ οἴκου ἀμῦναι. Od. II, 59. Μανθάνειν γὰρ ῆκομεν, for we are come to learn. SOPH. O C. 12. Πλόκαμος ὅδε καταστέψειν, here is my hair for you to wreathe. EUR. Iph. Aul. 1478.

Even in prose, the Infinitive occasionally occurs after $\epsilon i \mu i$ in this sense, as in PLAT. Phaedr. 229 A, $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \pi \delta a \kappa a \theta i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (sc. $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$), there is grass to sit upon. See also XEN. An. II, 1, 6, $\pi \circ \lambda a \iota \delta \epsilon \kappa a \iota$ $\pi \epsilon \lambda \tau a \iota \kappa a \iota a \mu a \xi a \iota a \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \epsilon \rho \eta \mu o \iota$, i. e. they were left to be carried away (for fuel). See the last examples under § 97.

NOTE 2. As $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ is seldom used in Homer in its sense of so as (§ 98, 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.

Tís τ' ẵρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι; i. e. who brought them into conflict, so as to contend? II. I, 8. So I, 151; and ἐριζέμεναι, II, 214. `Αλλ' ὅτε δὴ κοίλη νηῦς ἦχθετο τοῖσι νέεσθαι, when now their ship was loaded, so as (to be ready) to start. Od. XV, 457. Χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχάφ ἐπέχευε φέρουσα,....νίψασθαι, i. e. for washing. Od. I, 138.

NOTE 3. In Homer and Herodotus we often find *eivai* introduced to denote a *purpose*, where in Attic Greek a simple noun, as a predicate accusative or nominative, connected directly with the leading verb, would be sufficient. E. g.

Θώρηκα, τόν ποτέ οἱ Κινύρης δῶκε ξεινήιον εἶναι, i. e. which they gave him as a present (lit. to be a present). II. XI, 20. Λίθον είλετο χειρὶ παχείη, τόν β' ἄνδρες πρότεροι θέσαν ἕμμεναι οὖρον ἀρούρης, which they had placed (to be) as a boundary. II. XXI, 405. Δαρείος καταστήσας ᾿Αρταφέρνεα ὕπαρχον εἶναι Σαρδίων. ΗDT. V, 25.

So in the passive construction :— Γέλων ἀπεδέχθη πάσης της ἵππου είναι ὕππαρχος. Η DT. VII, 154.

Even in Attic prose this use of $\epsilon i \nu a \iota$ sometimes occurs; as in DEM. Aph. III, 852, 12, $M \nu \eta \mu o \nu \epsilon i v \sigma \iota v d \phi \epsilon \theta \epsilon v \tau a \tau o v \tau o \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon p o \nu \epsilon i \nu a \iota$ $\tau o \tau \epsilon, they remember his having been then manumitted so as to be a free$ $man. So <math>d \phi (\eta \sigma \iota \nu a \upsilon \tau a \delta \eta \mu \delta \sigma \iota a \epsilon i \nu a \iota, Thuc. II, 13.$

NOTE 4. The use of the Infinitive after the comparative and $\tilde{\eta}$, than, is to be referred to this principle. E. g.

§ 98, 2.]

[•]Η ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις ἀσθενεστέρα ἢ λαβεῖν τέχνην ῶν ἀν ἢ ἀπειρος, human nature is too weak to acquire the art of those things of which it has no experience. PLAT. Theaet. 149 C. Τὸ γὰρ νόσημα μείζον η̂ φέρειν, i. e. too great to bear. SOPH. O. T. 1293.

^αΩστε is sometimes expressed before this Infinitive; as in XEN. Hell. IV, 8, 23, ^{*}Ηισθοντο αὐτὸν ἐλάττω ἔχοντα δύναμιν η̈ ὥστε τοὺς φίλους ὡφελεῖν.

So, rarely, ώs in the sense of ώστε (§ 98, Note 1); as in Cyr. VI, 4, 17, Tàs ἀσπίδαs μείζους ἔχουσιν ἢ ὡς ποιεῖν τι κὰ ὁρῶν.

§ 98. 1. The Infinitive is used after $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$, so that, so as, to express a result. E. g.

⁹Ην πεπαιδευμένος ούτως ώστε πάνυ μικρά κεκτημένος πάνυ ραδίως έχειν ἀρκοῦντα, he had been educated so as very easily to have enough, although he possessed very little. XEN. Mem. I, 2, 1. Dîvai de d Κύρος λέγεται φιλοτιμότατος. ώστε πάντα μέν πόνον άνατληναι, πάντα δε κίνδυνον ύπομειναι. Id. Cyr. I, 2, 1. 'Απέχρη γαρ αν τοιs γνωσθείσιν έμμένειν, ωστε μηδεμίαν ήμιν είναι πρός τουτον διαφοράν, so that we should have no difference with him. DEM. Aph. I, 813, 4. Πολλάς έλπίδας έχω άρκούντως έρειν, ωστε ύμας μήτ' άπολειφθηναι των πραγμάτων μήτ' άγνοησαι, κ.τ.λ. Ib. 813, 20. Τοιούτον έθος ήμιν παρέδοσαν, ώστε... συνελθειν ές ταὐτόν. Isoc. Pan. p. 49 B. § 43. See Pan. § 45, τοσοῦτόν ἐστιν, ὥστε καὶ τοῦτο περιειληφθαι. Πείσομαι γὰρ οὐ τοσοῦτον οὐδὲν ὥστε μή οὐ καλῶς θανείν. Soph. Ant. 97. Σύ δέ σχολάζεις, ώστε θαυμάζειν έμέ. EUR. Hee. 730. Μηδ' ή βία σε μηδαμώς νικησάτω τοσόνδε μισείν ώστε την δίκην πατείν. SOPH. Aj. 1335. Λόγων και βουλευμάτων κοινωνόν αν σε ποιοίντο, ωστε μηδέ έν σε λεληθέναι ων βουλόμεθα eideval, so that not a single one of the things we wish to know should have escaped you. XEN. Cyr. VI, 1, 40. (See § 18, 3, b.) Δυσκολία και μανία πολλάκις είς την διάνοιαν εμπίπτωσιν ουτως ώστε και τάς επιστήμας εκβάλλειν. Id. Mem. III, 12, 6. 'Αποληφθέντος, ώστε μή αν δύνασθαι έπανελθειν οικαδε. DEM. Chers. 98, 25. (For δύνασθαι äv see N. 4.)

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 $\delta\sigma\tau\epsilon$. See § 65, 3.

2. The Infinitive after $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ sometimes denotes a condition, being equivalent to the Infinitive after $\dot{\epsilon} \phi' \phi$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \phi' \phi \tau \epsilon$; and sometimes it denotes a *purpose*, like a final cause. E. g.

Ποιούνται όμολογίαν πρός Πάχητα, ώστε 'Αθηνα οις έξείναι βου-

λεῦσοι περ. τῶν Μυτιληναίων, they make a treaty with Paches, to the effect that the Athenians shall be permitted, &c. THUC. III, 28. (See THUC. III, 114, ξυμμαχίαν ἐποιήσαντο ἐπὶ τοῖσδε, ὥστε...μ στρατεύειν.) Ἐξὸν αἰτοῖς τῶν λοιπῶν ἄρχειν Ἑλλήνων, ὥστ αὐτοὺς ὑπακούειν βασιλεῖ, it being in their power to rule the rest of the Greeks, on condition that they should themselves serve the King. DEM. Phil. II, 68, 12. Πῶν ποιοῦσιν, ὥστε δίκην μὴ διδόναι, they do everything, so that they may not suffer punishment. PLAT. Gorg. 479 C. (Here Ἐνα μἡ with the Subjunctive might have been used.) Ἐβουλήθησαν Ἐλευσῖνα ἐξιδιώσασθαι, ὥστε εἶναι σφίσι καταψνγὴν, εἰ δεήσειε. XEN. Hell. II, 4, 8. Μηχαναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν, ὥστε διαφεύγειν θάνατον, there are many devices for escaping death. PLAT. Apol. 39 A. (See § 92, 1, N. 2.)

NOTE 1. ' Ω_s is sometimes used with the Infinitive instead of $\omega_{\sigma\tau\epsilon}$; generally, however, to express a *result*, seldom to express a *purpose*. E. g.

Υψηλών δὲ οῦτω δή τι λέγεται, ὡς τὰς κορυφὰς αὐτοῦ οὐχ οἶά τε εἰναι ἰδέσθαι, and it (the mountain) is said to be so high, that it is not possible to see its summits. HDT. IV, 184. Ναυμαχήσαντες ἀντίπαλα μὲν καὶ ὡς αὐτοὺς ἑκατέρους ἀξιοῦν νικᾶν, and so that each thought themselves the victors. THUC. VII, 34. Βιασόμεθα, ὡς πλεονεκτοῦντες δίκην μὴ διδόναι. PLAT. Rep. II, 365 D. ⁶Ο ποταμὸς τσοῦτος τὸ βάθος, ὡς μηδὲ τὰ δόρατα ὑπερέχειν τοῦ βάθους. ΧΕΝ. ΑΠ. ΙΙΙ, 5, 7. So II, 3, 10. Φέρονται κώθωνα, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀρύσ ασθαι. Id. Cyr. I, 2, 8. Ἐν τῷ ἀσφαλεί ῆδη ἕσονται, ὡς μηδὲν ἂν ἕτι κακὸν παθείν. Ib. VIII, 7, 27. (For παθεῖν ἄν see N. 4.)

NOTE 2. The Infinitive with $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ or ωs is sometimes used where we should expect a simple Infinitive, either after the adjectives and adverbs included in § 93, or after the verbs and expressions which take the Infinitive of the object (§ 92, 1, and N. 2); and rarely after those which regularly take an Infinitive as the subject (§ 91). E. g.

Πότερα παιδές είσι φρονιμώτεροι ὥστε μαθεῖν τὰ φραζόμενα η ανδρες; i. e. are they wiser than men in learning, &c.? XEN. Cyr. IV, 3, 11. 'Ολίγοι ἐσμὲν ὡς ἐγκρατεῖς εἶναι ἀὐτῶν. Ib. IV, 5, 15. (Cf. ἀλίγαι ἀμὑνειν, too few to make a defence. THUC. I, 50.) Ψυχρίν (ἐστι τὸ ῦδωρ) ὡστε λούσασθαι, the water is cold for bathing. XEN. Mem. III, 13, 3. (Cf. λούσασθαι ψυχρότερον, and θερμότερον πιεῖν, in the same section.) Ψηφισάμενοι αὐτοἰ πρῶτοι ὡστε πάση προθυμία ἀμὑνειν, having voted to defend them, &c. THUC. VI, 88. Εἰς ἀνάγκην καθέσταμεν ὡστε κινδυνεύειν. Isoc. Archid. p. 126 C. § 51. (See § 92, 1, N. 2.) So δύναμν ὅστε ἐγγενέσθαι, PLAT. Rep. IV, 433 B. Ἐλθόντες πρὸς ἀὐτοὺς πείθουσιν ὡστε μετὰ σφῶν ᾿Αργει ἐπιχειρῆσαι. THUC. III, 102. (In the same chapter, πείθει ᾿Ακαρυῶνας βοηθῆσαι Ναυπάκτω.)

Πάνι μοι έμέλησεν ωστε είδεναι, it concerned me very much to

§ 100.] INFINITIVE AFTER 'Εφ' ώ AND 'Εφ' ώτε. 207

know. XEN. Cyr. VI, 3, 19. 'Αδύνατον ὑμῖν ὥστε Πρωταγόρου τοῦδε σοφώτερόν τινα ελεσθαι. PLAT. Prot. 338 C. So XEN. Mem. I, 3, 6.

NOTE 3. In Homer $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ is generally used like $\delta \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, in the sense of *as*. It occurs with the Infinitive, in the sense of *so as*, only twice: II. IX, 42; Od. XVII, 21. ' Ωs , *so as*, *so that*, is not found in Homer, who generally uses the simple Infinitive where later writers would insert $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ or δs . (See § 97, N. 2.)

NOTE 4. The Infinitive after $\delta\sigma\tau\epsilon$ may take the adverb $\delta\nu$ to form an apodosis, whenever an Indicative or Optative, if used in the place of the Infinitive, would have required an $\delta\nu$. (See § 65, 3, Note.) The Infinitive with $\delta\nu$ here, as in indirect quotations, fol lows the general rule stated in § 41. (See example in § 41, N. 4; and the last examples under § 98, 1 and § 98, 2, N. 1.)

NOTE 5. It will be seen that the Present and Aorist are the tenses of the Infinitive regularly used after $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$. For the perfect see § 18, 3, and Note; and for the Future, § 27, N. 2 (b).

§ 99. The Infinitive is used after $\dot{\epsilon}\phi'$, $\dot{\phi}$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\phi'$, $\dot{\phi}\tau\epsilon$, on condition that, for the purpose of. E. g.

Είπεν ὅτι σπείσασθαι βούλοιτο, ἐφ' ῷ μήτε αὐτὸς τοὺς Ἐλληνας ἀδικεῖν μήτε ἐκείνους καίειν τὰς οἰκίας, λαμβάνειν τε τἀπιτήδεια ὅσων δέοιντο. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙV, 4, 6. Πῶς ἀν οὖτος ἐθέλοι τὰ ἀλλότρια ἀποστερεῖν ἐφ' ῷ κακόδοξος εἶναι; Ιd. Ages. IV, 1. ᾿Αφίεμέν σε, ἐπὶ τοῦτῷ μέντοι, ἐφ' ῷ τε μηκέτι ψιλοσοφεῖν. ΡΙΑΤ. Αροl. 29 C. Αἰρεθέντες ἐφ' ῷ τε ξυγγράψαι νόμους, καθ οῦστινας πολιτεύσοιντο ΧΕΝ. Hell. II, 3, 11. (For πολιτεύσοιντο, see § 65, 1, Ν. 1) Ἐφ' ῷτε βοηθήσειν. ΑΕSCΗΙΝ. Cor. § 114 See § 27, Ν. 2 (b).

For the Future Indicative after $\dot{\epsilon}\phi$, $\dot{\phi}$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\phi$, $\dot{\phi}\tau\epsilon$, especially in Herodotus and Thucydides, see § 65, 2.

§ 100. The Infinitive may stand *absolutely* in parenthetical phrases, sometimes alone, but generally preceded by ω s or $\delta \sigma o \nu$. E. g.

Τὸ Δέλτα ἐστὶ κατάρρυτόν τε καὶ νεωστὶ, ὡς λόγῳ εἰπεῖν, ἀναπεφηνός, i. e. recently, so to speak. ΗΣΤ. Π, 15. (This expression ὡς λόγῳ εἰπεῖν is peculiar to Herodotus.) Καὶ ὡς ἐμὲ εὖ μεμνη̄σθαι, τὰ ὁ ἑρμηνεὐς μοι ἐπιλεγόμενος τὰ γράμματα ἔφη, αs l well remember, &c. Id. II, 125. ʿΩς μέν νυν ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ δηλῶσαι. πῶν εἴρηται ὡς δὲ ἐν πλέονι λόγῳ δηλῶσαι, ὡδε ἔχει. Id. Η, 25. Μετὰ δὲ, οὐ πολλῷ λόγῳ εἰπεῖν, χρόνος διέψυ. Id. Ι, 61. Καὶ ἔργου, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ἡ οὐδενὸς προσδέονται ἡ βραχέος πάνυ. ΡΙΑΤ. Gorg. 450 D. ʿΩς δὲ συντόμως εἰπεῖν. Id. Mem. III, 8, _0 Χώρος δ' δδ' ίρος, ώς άπεικάσαι. SOPH. O. C. 16. Και το ξύμπαν είπεῖν. Thuc. I, 138. (So VI, 82, ἐς τὸ ἀκριβές εἰπεῖν.) 'Ως μικρὸν μεγάλω εἰκάσαι. Id. IV, 36. "Ως γ' ἐμοὶ χρῆσθαι κριτῆ. Ευκ. Alc. 801. 'Ως πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰρῆσθαι, i. e. between us. PLAT. Rep. X, 595 B. Οὐδ' ἐγώ ψέγω τούτους, ὥς γε διακόνους εἶναι τόλεως. PLAT. Gorg. 517 B. "Οσον γέ με εἰδέναι, at least as far as I know. Id. Theaet. 145 A.

So ws épol do $\kappa \in i\nu$ or épol do $\kappa \in i\nu$, like ws épol do $\kappa \in i$, as it seems to me; $\partial \lambda i \gamma_{0\nu} \partial \in i\nu$, to want little, i. e. almost. (See N. 1.)

REMARK. The force of $\dot{\omega}s$ in this construction can hardly be expressed in English, although it resembles that of $\dot{\omega}s$ used for $\ddot{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ in § 98, 2, Note 1. That it is not a demonstrative, as might be supposed from the translation of $\dot{\omega}s \epsilon i\pi\epsilon i\nu$, so to speak, is plain from such expressions as $\dot{\omega}s \sigma \nu \nu \tau \dot{\sigma} \mu \omega s \epsilon i \pi\epsilon i \nu$, to speak concisely.

NOTE 1. In the phrase $\partial \lambda (\gamma ov \ \delta \epsilon \hat{i} v$ (lit. to want little), little short of, almost, $\delta \epsilon \hat{i} v$ is often omitted, so that the genitive $\partial \lambda (\gamma ov \ stands \ alone \ in the sense \ of \ almost.$ E. g.

'Ολίγου φροῦδος γεγένημαι, I am almost gone. ARIST. Nub. 722. The full form is found at the beginning of DEM. Phil. III, — Πολλῶν λόγων γιγνομένων ὀλίγου δεῖν καθ ἐκάστην ἐκκλησίαν, i. e. in almost every meeting.

NOTE 2. In the phrase $\epsilon \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu \epsilon i \nu a \iota$ (sometimes $\tau \dot{\delta} \epsilon \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu \epsilon i \nu a \iota$), willing or willingly, $\epsilon i \nu a \iota$ appears to be superfluous: the phrase is used chiefly in negative sentences. Eival appears superfluous also in such expressions as $\tau \dot{\delta} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \epsilon i \nu a \iota$, at present, $\tau \dot{\delta} \tau \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \sigma \nu \epsilon i \nu a \iota$, to-day, and $\tau \dot{\delta} \epsilon \pi' \epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu \sigma \iota$ s far as depends on them. E. g.

Έκών γὰρ εἶναι οὐδὲν ψεύσομαι, willingly I will tell no falsehood. PLAT. Symp. 215 A. Οὐκ ὤμην γε κατ' ἀρχὰς ὑπὸ σοῦ ἐκόντος εἶναι ἐξαπατηθήσεσθαι. Id. Gorg. 499 C. (Ἀνάγκη ἔχειν) τὴν ἀψεύδειαν και τὸ ἐκόντας εἶναι μηδαμῆ προσδέχεσθαι τὸ ψεῦδος. Id. Rep. VI, 485 C. ἘΑπόχρη μοι τὸ νῦν εἶναι ταῦτ' εἰρηκέναι. Isoc. Antid. p. 119, § 270. Τὸ ἐπ' ἐκείνοις εἶναι ἀπωλώλειτε. XEN. Hell. III, 5.9. Τὸ μὲν τήμερον εἶναι χρήσασθαι αὐτῆ, to use it to-day. PLAT. Crat 396 E. Κατὰ τοῦτο εἶναι, in this respect. Id. Prot. 317 A.

Similar is the expression $\tau h \nu \pi \rho \omega \tau \eta \nu \epsilon i \nu a \iota$ (for $\tau h \nu \pi \rho \omega \tau \eta \nu$), at first, in HDT. I, 153. So $\omega s \pi a \lambda a \iota a \epsilon i \nu a \iota$, considering their antiquity. THUC. I, 21.

§ 101. The Infinitive is sometimes used in the sense of the Imperative, especially in Homer. E. g.

Τῷ νῦν μή ποτε καὶ σὺ γυναικί περ ἤπιος εἶναι· μή οἱ μῦθον ἄπαντα πιφαυσκέμεν, ὅν κ' εὖ εἰδῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν φάσθαι, τὸ δὲ καὶ κεκρυμμένον είναι, now therefore be thou never indulgent to thy wife, &c. Od. XI, 441. So II. I, 20, 582; II, 10: HDT. I, 32 (ἐπισχέειν μηδὲ καλέειν): AESCH. Prom. 712. Σὺ δὲ τὰς πύλας ἀνοίξας ὑπεκθεῖν καὶ ἐπείγεσθαι, 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 (\$ 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.

Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἢ Αιαντα λαχεῖν ἢ Τυδέος υίόν, Father Zeus, may the lot fall on Ajax or on the son of Tydeus. II. VII, 179. Έρμα μπολαῖε, τὰν γυναῖκα τὰν ἐμὰν οῦτω μ' ἀ ποδόσθαι τάν τ' ἐμαυτοῦ ματέρα, O that I could sell my wife and my mother at this rate! ARIST. Acharn. 816. Θεοὶ πολῖται, μή με δουλείας τυχεῖν. AESCH. Sept. 253.

§ 103. In laws, treaties, proclamations, and formal commands, the Infinitive is often used in the leading sentences, depending on some word like $\delta\delta\delta\xi\epsilon$ or $\delta\epsilon-\delta\delta\kappa\tau a\iota$, be it enacted, or $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\dot{\nu}\epsilon\tau a\iota$, it is commanded; which may be either understood, or expressed in a preceding sentence. E. g.

Ταμίας δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων aἱρεῖσθaι μὲν ἐκ τῶν μεγίστων τιμημάτων · τὴν δὲ aἶρεσιν τούτων καὶ τὴν δοκιμασίαν γίγνεσθaι καθάπερ ἡ τῶν στρατηγῶν ἐγίγνετο, 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: Δικάζειν δὲ τὴν ἐν ᾿Αρείω πάγω Φόνου καὶ τραύματος ἐκ προνοίας, κ.τ.λ. Ἔτη δὲ εἶναι τὰς σπονδὰς πεντήκοντα, and that the treaty shall continue fifty years. THUC. V, 18. ᾿Ακούετε λεώ·τοῦς ὁπλίτας νυμενὶ ἀνελομένους θῶπλα ἀπιέναι πάλιν οἴκαδε. ARIST. Αν. 448.

§ 104. The Infinitive, with or without $\tau o'$, is used in expressions of *surprise* or *indignation*. E. g.

Tò dè $\mu\eta$ dè $\kappa v \eta v$ divodev $\epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon i v \epsilon \mu \epsilon$ to v kavodai $\mu o v$ i zovra, but to think that I, wretched fellow, should have come from home without even my cap ' ARIST. Nub. 268. Tourov de $\delta \beta \rho i \zeta \epsilon i v$; $\delta v a \pi v \epsilon i v d \epsilon$; δν εί τις έζ ζην, ἀγαπῶν ἔδει. DEM. Mid. 582, 2. Της μωρίας \cdot τδ Δία νομίζειν, ὅντα τηλικουτονί, what folly! to believe in Zeus, now 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 $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \tau a\iota$, it is said, expressed (or at least implied) in something that precedes. E. g.

'Απικομένους δὲ τοὺς Φοίνικας ἐς δὴ τὸ 'Αργος τοῦτο, διατίθεσθαι τὸν φόρτον, and (they say) that the Phoenicians, when now they were come to this Argos, were setting out their cargo for sale. HDT. I, 1. (Here διατίθεσθαι is an Imperfect Infinitive, § 15, 3.) ''Αλλ', παῖ,'' φάναι τὸν 'Αστυάγην, '' οὐκ ἀχθόμενοι ταῦτα περιπλανώμεθα.''''Αλλὰ καὶ σέ,'' φάναι τὸν Κῦρον, '' όρῶ,'' κ.τ.λ... Kaὶ τὸν 'Αστυάγην ἐσερέσθαι, ''καὶ τἱνι δὴ σὺ τεκμαιρόμενος λέγεις;'' '''Οτι σε,'' φάναι, '' όρῶ,'' κ.τ.λ... Πρὸς ταῦτα δὲ τὸν 'Αστυάγην εἰπεῖν, κ.τ.λ... Kaὶ τὸν Κῦρον εἰπεῖν, κ.τ.λ. XEN. Cyr. I, 3, 5 and 6. (Here all these Infinitives, and twelve others which follow, depend on λέγεται in § 4.) Καὶ τὸν κελεῦσαι δοῦναι, and he commanded him to give it. Id. I, 3, 9. So in HDT. I, 24 the story of Arion and the dolphin is told in this construction, the Infinitives all depending on a single λέγουσι at the beginning. See § 101, Remark.

§ 106. $\Pi \rho i \nu$, before, before that, until, besides taking the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative, like $\epsilon \omega s$ (§ 66), is also followed by the Infinitive.

For the use of the finite moods after $\pi \rho i \nu$, see § 67.

1. In Homer the Infinitive follows $\pi \rho i \nu$ after both affirmative and negative sentences. E. g.

Ναῖε δὲ Πήδαιον πρὶν ἐλθεῖν υἶας ᾿Αχαιῶν. Π. ΧΠΙ, 172. "Εφθη δρεξάμενος πρὶν ο ὐτάσαι, οὐδ' ἀφάμαρτεν. Π. ΧΝΙ, 322. Σφῶιν δὲ πρίν περ τρόμος ἔλλαβε φαίδιμα γυῖα, πρὶν πόλεμών τ' ἰδέειν πολέμοιό τε μέρμερα ἕργα, before they saw the war, &c. Π. VIII, 452. (See Note 4.) Φεύγει πρίν περ ὅμιλον ἀολλισθήμεναι ἀνδρῶν Π. ΧΥ, 588. "Η κ' ἕτι πολλοὶ γαῖαν δὰδ ἐἶλον πρὶν Γιλον εἰσαφικέσθαι. Π. ΧΧΙΙ, 17. 'Αλλά οἱ αὐτῷ Ζεὐς ὀλέσειε βίην πρὶν ἡμῶν πῆμα φυτεῦσαι. Od. IV, 668. Αἴθ' ὥφελλ'... ἄλλοθ' ὀλέσθαι πρὶν ἐλθεῦν. (J. XVIII, 402. Οὐ λήξω πρὶν Τρῶις ἄδην ἐλάσαι πρὶν ἐλθεῦν. (J. XVIII, 402. Οὐ λήξω πρὶν Τρῶις ἄδην ἐλάσαι πολέμοιο. Π. ΧΙΧ, 423. Οὐδέ τι θυμῷ τέρπετο πρὶν πολέμου στόμα δύμεταο. αἰματόεντος. Π. ΧΙΧ, 313. Οὐδ' ἀπολήγει πρὶν χροὸς ἀνδρεμέσο διελθεῖν. Π. ΧΧ, 100. Οῦ μ' ἀποτρέψεις πρὶν χαλκῷ μαχέσα. σθαι. Π. ΧΧ, 257. Μηδ' αντίος ΐστασ' ἐμεῖο πρίν τι κακόν παθέειν. Π. ΧΧ, 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.

Πρίν ών παρείναι έκεινον ές την Αττικήν, ύμέως καιρός έστι προβωθήσαι ές την Βοιωτίαν, before he comes into Attica, &c. HDT. VIII, 143. Οίον εύρεν τεσσαράκοντα και όκτω παρθένοισι, πριν μέσον άμαρ έλειν, ώκύτατον γάμον. PIND. Pyth. IX, 196. Πριν νυν τα πλείον ίστορείν, ἐκ τῆσδ' ἔδρας ἔξελθε, before seeking further, &c. SOPH. O. C. 36. Αποπέμπουσιν ούν αὐτὸν πρίν ἀκοῦσαι. Thuc. II, 12. So ΙΙ, 13, πρίν έσβαλείν είς την Αττικήν. Αφίεσαν τα βέλη πολύ πρίν έξικνείσθαι. ΧΕΝ. Суг. III, 3, 60. Πριν μεν ουν έχεσθαι τα άκρα οιδέν εδείσθε είρήνης. Ιb. III, 2, 12. Ημείς τοίνυν Μεσσήνην είλομεν πρίν Πέρσας λαβείν την βασιλείαν και κρατήσαι της ήπείρου, και πρίν οικισθηναί τινας των πόλεων των Έλληνίδων. Isoc. Archid. p. 121 A. § 26. Καὶ πρὶν έξ μῆνας γεγονέναι, ἀπέδωκε. PLAT. Prot. 320 A. 'Απωλόμεσθ' "μρ', εί κακών προσοίσομεν νέον παλαιώ, πριν τόδ' έξηντληκέναι, we are ruined then, if we shall add a new calamity 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 accompanied by $\tilde{a}\nu$. (See Krüger's note on HDT. I, 140.)

NOTE 2. $\Pi \rho i \nu$ 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.

Οὐκ ἀν μεθεῖτο, πρὶν καθ ἡδονὴν κλύειν. SOPH. Tr. 197. Πρὶν ἰδεῖν δ', οὐδεἰς μάντις τῶν μελλόντων, ὅ τι πράξει. Id. Aj. 1418. So AESCH. Sept. 1048, Agam. 1067; ARIST. Av. 964. Kai δι' αὐτὸ οὐ πρὶν πάσχειν, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῷ ἔργῷ ἐσμὲν, τοὺς ἑνμμάχους τούσδε παρεκαλέσατε. THUC. I, 68. So I, 39; V, 10; VII, 50. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τούτων πρὶν μεθεῖν οὐδεὶς ἠπίστατο. XEN. Cyr. IV, 3, 10. Αὕτη ἡ γυνὴ, πρὶν μεν ὡς ¾Φοβον ἐλθεῖν, μίαν ἡμέραν οὐκ ἐχήρευσεν. DEM. Onet. I, \$73, 10.

NOTE 3. $\Pi \rho i \nu \eta$, $\pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \nu \eta$ (*priusquam*), $\pi \rho \delta \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \eta$, and even $\vec{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \nu \eta$, like $\pi \rho i \nu$, may be followed by the Infinitive. (See § 67, Note 3.) E. g.

Οί δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι, πρὶν μὲν ἢ Ψαμμίτιχον σφέων βασιλεῦσαι, ἐνόμιζον ἑωυτοὺς πρώτους γενέσθαι πάντων ἀνθρώπων. HDT. II, 2. Ἐπὶ τοὺς πομπέας πρότερον ἢ αἰσθέσθαι αὐτοὺς εὐθὺς ἐχώρησεν, before they perceived them. THUC. VI, 58. So I, 69. Πρὶν δὲ ἀναστῖναι, ἔτεσιν ὕστερον ἑκατὸν ἢ αὐτοὺς οἰκῆσαι, Πάμμιλον πέμψαντες ἐς Σελινοῦντα, i. e. a hundred years after their own settlement. Id. VI, 4. In HDT. VI, 108 we find the Infinitive depending on $\phi\theta \acute{a}\nu\omega$ η , the verb implying $\pi\rho \acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho o\nu$ or $\pi\rho \acute{\nu} : -\phi\theta a i\eta \tau \epsilon a \dot{v} \acute{\xi}a v \delta \rho a \pi o \delta i \sigma \theta \acute{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon s \eta$ $\tau i \nu a \pi \upsilon \theta \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a i \dot{\eta} \iota \acute{\omega} \nu$, you would be reduced to slavery before any of us would hear of it.

NOTE 4. $\Pi \rho i \nu$ or $\pi \rho i \nu \eta$ is very often preceded by $\pi \rho i \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \nu$, $\pi \rho o \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$, $\pi a \rho \rho s$, or another $\pi \rho i \nu$ (used as an adverb), qualifying the leading verb. (See § 67, Note 4.) E. g.

'Αποθνήσκουσι πρότερον πρίν δηλοι γίγνεσθαι οἶοι ήσαν. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. V, 2, 9. Καὶ ὅμοσαν μὴ πρίν ἐς Φώκαιαν ήξειν πρίν ἡ τὸν μύ δρου τοῦτον ἀναπεφηνέναι. ΗDτ. Ι, 165. Πάρος δ' οὐκ ἔσσεται ἄλλως, πρίν γε...νω πειρηθηναι. Π. V, 220. Μὴ πρίν ταράξης, πρίν τόδ εῦ θέσθαι, τέκνον. Eur. Herc. F. 605.

NOTE 5. $\Pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \sigma s$, in the sense of $\pi \rho i \nu$, is used in Homer with the Infinitive, but never with the other moods. E. g.

Τέκνα ἀγρόται ἐξείλοντο πάρος πετεηνὰ γενέσθαι. Od. XVI, 218. Οὐδέ οἱ ὕπνος πῦπτεν ἐπὶ βλεφάροισι πάρος καταλέξαι ӓπαντα. 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 § 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 (§§ 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.

Πόλις κάλλει διαφέρουσα, a city excelling in beauty. 'Ανὴρ καλῶς πεπαιδευμένος, a man who has been well educated. Οἱ πρέσβεις οἱ παρὰ Φιλίππου πεμφθέντες, the ambassadors who had been sent from Philip. "Ανδρες οἱ τοῦτο ποιήσοντες, men who will do this.

Έν τῆ Μεσσηνία ποτὲ οὕση γῆ, in the lund which was once Messenia. See § 16, 2. Στρατεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὰς Alόλου νήσους καλουμ ἐνας, they sail against the so-called Aeolian islands, lit. the islands called those of Aeolus. THUC. III, 88. Ai ἄρισται δοκοῦσαι εἶναι φύσεις, the natures which seem to be best. XEN. Mem. IV, 1, 3. Ai πρὸ τοῦ στόματος νήε; ναυμαχοῦσαι. THUC. VII, 23. Τὸν κατειληφότα κίνδυνον τὴν πόλιν. DEM. Cor. 301, 28.

2. The Participle preceded by the article may be used substantively, like any other adjective. It is then equivalent to $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu o s$ (he who) and a finite verb in the tense of the Participle. E. g. Oi κρατοῦντες, the conquerors. Oi πεπεισμένοι, those who have beeconvinced. Οδτός έστι ό τοῦτο ποιήσας, this is the one who did it. Οῦτοί εἰσιν οἱ ὑμᾶς πάντας ἀδικήσοντες, these are the men who will wrong you all.

Παρὰ τοῖς ἀρίστοις δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, among those who seem to be best XEN. Mem. IV, 2, 6. ³Ην δὲ ὁ μὲν τὴν γνώμην ταύτην εἰπῶν Πείσανδρος, and Peisander was the one who gave this opinion. THUC. VIII, 68. Τοῖς ᾿Αρκάδων σφετέροις οὖσι ξυμμάχοις προεῖπον, they proclaimed to those of the Arcadians who were their allies. Id. V, 64. Αφεκτέον ἐγώ φημι εἶναι (τούτων) τῷ σωφρονεῖν ◊υνησομένῷ, for one who is to be able to be discrete. 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.

Νόμον δημοσία τὸν ταῦτα κωλύσοντα τέθεινται τουτονί, they have publicly enacted this law, which is to prevent these things. DEM. Mid. 530, 10. Τῶν ἐργασομένων ἐνόντων, there being men in the country to cultivate it. XEN. An. II, 4, 22. (See § 110, 1.) [']O ήγησόμενος οὐδεὶς ἔσται there will be nobody who will lead us. Ib. II, 4, 5. Πολλοὺς ἔξομεν τοὺς ἑτοίμως συναγωνιζομένους ἡμῖν. Isoc. Pac. 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.

^{*}Επλει δώδεκα τριήρεις έχων ἐπὶ πολλὰς ναῦς κεκτημένους, he sailed with twelve triremes against men who had many ships. XEN. Hell. V, 1, 19. ^{*}Όταν πολεμούντων πόλις άλῷ, whenever a city of belligerents is taken. Id. Cyr. VII, 5, 73. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀφικνοῦνταὶ μοι ἀπαγγέλλοντες ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ ἀφείται, there come messengers announcing, &c. Isoc. Trapez. p. 360 C. § 11. Εἶδες νοῦν ἔχοντα λυπούμενον καὶ χαίροντα; did you ever see a man of sense (sc. τινά) grieved and rejoicing? PLAT. Gorg. 498 A.

NOTE 3. In the poets, the Participle with the article sometimes becomes so completely 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 of $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\eta\kappa\rho\tau\epsilon$, relatives, and $\tau\delta \sigma\nu\mu\phi\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu$ or $\tau\delta \sigma\nu\mu\phi\epsilon\rho\sigma\taua$, gain, advantage, are used in the same way even in prose. E. g.

Ο ἐκείνου τεκών, his father. EUR. El. 335. (We should expect ό ἐκείνον τεκών.) Τὰ μικρὰ συμφέροντα τῆς πόλεως, the small advantages of the state. DEM. Cor. 234, 26. Βασιλέως προσήκοντέι τινες. Thuc. 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.

²Εν τῷ μὴ μελετῶντι ἀξυνετώτεροι ἔσονται, in the want of practice, &c. ΤΗ UC I, 142. (Here we should expect ἐν τῷ μὴ μελετῶν.) Γνώτω τὸ μὲν δεδιὸς aὐτοῦ τοὺς ἐναντίους μᾶλλον ϕοβῆσον, τὸ δέ βαρσο ῦν.... ἀδέστερον ἐσόμενον. Ιd. Ι, 36. (Here τὸ δεδιός, fear, is used like τὸ δεδιέναι, and τὸ θαρσοῦν, courage, like τὸ θαρσεῖν οr τὸ θάρσος.) Μετὰ τοῦ δρωμένου, with action. Id. V, 102. Kal σέ γ' εἰσάξω· τὸ γὰρ νοσοῦν ποθεῖ σε ξυμπαραστάτην λαβεῖν. SOPH. Phil. 674. (τὸ νοσοῦν = ἡ νόσος.) Τὸ γὰρ ποθοῦν ἕκαστος ἐκμαθεῖν θέλων οἰκ ἂν μεθεῖτο, πρὶν καθ ἡδονὴν κλύειν. SOPH. Trach. 196.

Compare the use of the neuter singular of an adjective for the corresponding abstract noun; as $\tau \delta$ καλών, beauty, for $\tau \delta$ κάλλος.

(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.

Μετὰ δὲ Σόλωνα οἰχόμενον ἕλαβε νέμεσις μεγάλη Κροῖσον, i. e. after Solon was gone. Η DT. I, 34. Τῆ πόλει οὕτε πολέμου κακῶς συμβάντος οὕτε στάσεως πώποτε aἴτιος ἐγένετο, i. e. the cause of a disastrous result of any war (like τοῦ πόλεμόν τινα κακῶς συμβῆναι). XEN. Mem. I, 2, 63. So ἐς ἡελιον καταδύντα, II. I, 601.

REMARK. Such expressions as $\tau \delta \kappa \rho a \tau o \tilde{\nu} \tau \eta s \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega s$, the ruling part of the state, $\tau \delta \delta \delta \xi \delta (\omega \tau \eta s \psi \delta \chi \eta s$, &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 $\gamma i\gamma \nu \nu \mu \mu a$. Such are especially $\delta i a - \phi \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \chi \omega \nu$ (with an adverb), $\pi \rho o \sigma \eta \kappa \omega \nu$, $\pi \rho \epsilon \pi \omega \nu$, $\delta \epsilon o \nu$, $\epsilon \xi o \nu$, and $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho o \nu$. E. g.

Tí ποτ' ἐστὶν οὗτος ἐκείνου διαφέρων; in what is this man different from that one? PLAT. Gorg. 500 C. Συμφέρον ἢν τῆ πόλει, it was advantageous to the state. DEM. F. L. 364, 25. So after ὑπάρχω in Demosthenes; as τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ὑπάρχειν ὑμῶς εἰδότας ἡγοῦμαι, for I think you are aware of this, Cor. 257, 25.

NOTE 6. The poets sometimes use a Present or Aorist Participle with $\epsilon l\mu i$ as a periphrasis for the simple form of the verb In prose each part of such expressions has its ordinary meaning. E. g.

[•] Αν j θέλουσα, πάντ' έμοῦ κομίζεται, whatever she wants, she always obtains from me. SOPH. O. T. 580. (Here j θέλουσα is used for θέλη.) Οἰκ εἰς ὅλεθρον, sử σιωπήσας ἔσει; Ib. 1146. [•]Π roῦτο οἰκ ἔστι γιγνόμενον παρ' ἡμῖν; or is not this something that happens among us? PLAT. Phileb. 39 C. ⁹Ην γὰρ δ Θεμιστοκλη̂s βεβαιότατα δη φύσεως ἰσχύν δηλώσας, καὶ ... ἄξιος θαυμάσαι, Themistocles was one who manifested, &c. ΤΗUC. I, 138.

For the use of the Perfect Participle in the same way, see § 17, Note 2. For the Aorist Participle with $\xi_{X\omega}$ as a periphrasis for the Perfect Indicative, see below, § 112, Note 7.

§ 109. The Participle is used to define the *circum*stances 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.

Ταῦτα εἰπ ὡν ἀπήει, when he had said this, he departed. ᾿Απήντησα Φιλίππῷ ἀπιόντι, I met Philip as he was departing. Τοῦτο πεποιηκότες ἀπελεώσονται. Ταῦτα ἔπραττε στρατηγῶν, he did these things while he was general. Ταῦτα πράξει στρατηγῶν, he will do these things when he is general. Τυραννεύσας δὲ ἔτη τρία Ἱππίας ἐχώρει ὑπόσπονδος ἐς Σίγειον. ΤΗUC. VI. 59.

2. Means. E. g.

Ληιζόμενοι ζώσιν, they live by plunder. XEN. Cyr. III, 2, 25. Toùs Ἐλληναs ἐδίδαξαν, δν τρόπον διοικοῦντες τὰς αὐτῶν πατρίδας καὶ πρὸς οὖς πολεμοῦντες μεγάλην ἀν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ποιήσειαν. Isoc. Panath. p. 241 D. § 44. Οὐ γὰρ ἀλλοτρίοις ὑμῶν χρωμένοις παραδείγμασιν ἀλλ' οἰκείοις, εὐδαίμοσιν ἔξεστι γενέσθαι, by using not foreign but domestic examples, &c. DEM. Ol. III, 35, 1. (So often χρώμενος with the dative.)

3. Manner, and similar relations, including manner of employment, &c. E. g.

Προείλετο μαλλον τοῖς νόμοις ἐμμένων ἀποθανεῖν ἡ παρανομῶν ζῆν, he preferred to die abiding by the laws, rather than to live disobeying them. XEN. Mem. IV, 4, 4. 'Αρπάσαντας τὰ ὅπλα πορεύεσθαι, to march having snatched up their arms (i. e. eagerly). DEM. OI. III, 34, 8. Τοῦτο ἐποίησεν λαθών, he did this secretly. (See below, N. 8.) 'Απεδήμει τριηραρχῶν, he was absent on duty as trierarch.

4. Cause or ground of action. E. g.

§ 109, 7.] PARTICIPLE EXPRESSING CAUSE, ETC.

Λέγω δὲ τοῦδ ἕνεκα, βουλόμενος δόξαι σοὶ ὅπερ ἐμοί, and Ispeak jor this reason, because I wish, &c. PLAT. Phaed. 102 D. Απείχοντο κερδών, alσχρὰ νομίζοντες εἶναι, because they believed them to be base. XEN. Mem. 1, 2, 22. Τί γὰρ ἁν βουλόμενοι ἄνδρες σοφοὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς δεσπότας ἀμείνους αὐτῶν φεύγοιεν, with what object in view, &c. (i. e. wishing what)? PLAT. Phaed. 63 A. (See below, Note 7.)

For the Participle with ωs , 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.

[•]H $\lambda \theta \in \lambda \upsilon \sigma \circ \omega \in v \circ s$ $\theta \circ v \gamma a \tau \rho a$, he came to ransom his daughter. II. I. 13. Παρελήλυθα $\sigma \upsilon \mu \beta \circ \upsilon \lambda \in \circ \sigma \omega v$, I have risen to give my advice. ISOC. Archid. § 1. 'Εβουλεύσαντο πέμπεω ès Λακεδαίμονα πρέσβεις ταῦτά τε έροῦντας καὶ Λύσανδρον aἰτήσοντας ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς, in order to say this, and to ask for Lysander as admiral. XEN. Hell. II, 1, 6. 'Eàv εἰς πόλεμον (ἡ πατρὶς) ἄγῃ τρωθησόμενον ἡ ἀποθανούμενον, ποιητέον ταῦτα, even if it lead any one into war to be wounded or to perish. PLAT. Crit. 51 B.

^{*} Ervχov γàρ ai μèν (νηε) ἐπὶ Kaplas οἰχόμεναι, ... περιαγγέλλουσαι βοηθεῖν, for some of the ships happened to be gone towards Caria, in order to give them notice to send aid. THUC, I, 116. So ἀρνύμενοι, Π. I, 159. (The Present here seems to express an attendant circumstance, 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.

Οἴει σὺ ^{*}Αλκηστιν ὑπὲρ 'Αδμήτου ἀποθανεῖν ἀν, ἡ 'Αχιλλέα Πατρόκλφ ἐπαποθανεῖν, μὴ οἰομένους ἀθάνατον μνήμην ἀρετῆς πέρι ἐαυτῶν ἔσεσθαι, do you think that Alcestis would have died for Admetus, §c., if they had not believed, &c. PLAT. Symp. 208 D. (Here μὴ οἰομένους is equivalent to εἰ μὴ ῷοντο.) Οὐ γὰρ ἀν αὐτοῖς ἔμελεν μὴ τοῦτο ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, for ἰι would not have concerned them, unless they had had this idea. DEM. Phil. III, 122, 21. (Here μὴ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν is equivalent to εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ὑπελάμβανον.) ^{*}Αστρων ἀν ἔλθοιμ' αἰθέρος πρὸς ἀντολὰς καὶ γῆς ἔνερθε, δυνατὸς ὡν δρῶσαι τάδε, if should be able to do this (εἰ δυνατὸς εἶην). EUR. Phoen. 504.

See other examples under § 52, 1.

7. Opposition, or limitation, where the Participle is often to be translated by although. E. g.

Ούτος δέ και μεταπεμφθήναι φάσκων ύπο του πατρύς, και έλθών

εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, εἰσελθεῖν μὲν οῦ φησιν, Δημοφῶντος δ' ἀκοῦσαι γραμματεῖον ἀναγιγνώσκοντος, καὶ προεισεληλυθὼς καὶ ὅπαντα διωμολογημένος πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, and this man. although he admits thai he was summoned, and although he did go to the house, yet denies that he went in, §c., although he had previously gone in and arranged everything with my father. DEM. Aμh. II, 839, 29. 'Ολίγα δυνάμενοι προορῶν περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος πολλὰ ἐπιχειροῦμεν πράττειν, although we are able to foresee few things, &c. XEN. Cyr. III, 2, 15.

The Participle in this sense is very often accompanied by $\kappa a i \pi \epsilon \rho$ and other particles. See below, Note 5.

8. Any attendant circumstance, the Participle being mercly descriptive. E. g.

Kaì $\pi a \rho a \lambda a \beta \delta \nu \tau \epsilon_{S}$ rovs Bolwrovs $\epsilon \sigma \tau \rho \delta \tau e \tau \sigma \lambda a \beta \delta \rho \sigma \sigma \lambda o \nu$, and having taken the Boeotians with them, they marched against Pharsalus. THUC. I, 111. Παραγγέλλει τῷ Κλεάρχῷ λαβόντι ῆκειν ὅσον ῆν αὐτῷ στράτευμα. XEN. An. I, 2, 1. "Ερχεται Μανδάνη τὸν Κῦρον τὸν υίον ἕχουσα, Mundane comes with her son Cyrus. Id. Cyr. I, 3, 1. (See below, N. 8.)

NOTE 1. (a.) The adverbs $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon$. $\eta \delta \eta$ ($\tau \delta \tau \epsilon \eta \delta \eta$), $\epsilon \nu \tau a \vartheta \theta a$, $\epsilon i \tau a$, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \tau a$, and $\sigma \vartheta \tau \omega s$ are often joined to the verb of the sentence in which the *temporal* Participle stands. E. g.

Έκέλευεν αὐτὸν συνδιαβάντα ἔπειτα οῦτως ἀπαλλάττεσθαι, he commanded that, after he had joined them in crossing, he should then retire as he proposed. XEN. An. VII, 1, 2. Πειθομένων δὲ τῶν Σαμίων καὶ σχόντων τὴν Ζάγκλην, ἐνθαῦτα οἱ Ζαγκλαῖοι ἐβοήθεον αὐτῆ. Ηστ. VI, 23. ᾿Αποφυγῶν δὲ καὶ τοὐτους, στρατηγὸς οῦτω ᾿Αθηναίων ἀπεδέχθη, and having escaped these also, he was then chosen general of the Athenians. Id. VI, 104.

(b.) Eira, $\xi \pi \epsilon_{i\tau t}$, and $o v \pi \omega s$ sometimes refer in the same way to a Participle expressing opposition or limitation; in which case they may be translated by nevertheless, after all. E. g.

Πάντων δ' ἀτοπώτατόν ἐστι, τηλικαύτην ἀνελόντας μαρτυρίαν οῦτως οἴεσθαι δεῖν εἰκῆ πιστεύεσθαι παρ' ὑμῖν, that, although they have destroyed so important a piece of evidence, they after all think; &c. DEM. Aph. II, 837, 10. Δεινὰ μέντ' ἂν πάθοις, εἰ ᾿Αθήναζε ἀφικόμενος, οῦ τῆς Ἐλλάδος πλείστη ἐστιν ἐξουσία τοῦ λέγειν, ἔπειτα σὺ ἐνταῦθα τοῦτου μόνος ἀτυχήσαις, if, although you are come to Athens, you should after all be the only one to fail in obtaining this. PLAT. Gorg. 461 E.

(c.) Ούτως, διà τοῦτο, and διà ταῦτα sometimes refer in the same way to a Participle denoting a cause. E. g.

Νομίζων ἀμείνονας καὶ κρείττους πολλῶν βαρβάρων ὑμῶς είνας διὰ τοῦτο προσέλαβον. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Ι, 7, 3. Note 2. The Adverbs $\tilde{a}\mu a$, $\mu\epsilon\tau a\xi \dot{v}$, $\epsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{v} s$, $a \dot{v} \tau i \kappa a$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \xi a i \phi \nu \eta$: are often connected (in position and in sense) with the *temporal* Participle, although grammatically they qualify the verb of the sentence. E. g.

Αμα προιών ἐπεσκοπείτο εἴ τι δυνατὸν εἴη τοὺς πολεμίους ἀσθενεστέpous more \hat{u} , as he advanced, he looked at the same time to see whether it was possible. & XEN. Cyr. V, 2, 22. "Αμα καταλαβόντες προσεκέατό $\sigma \phi_i$, as soon as they had overtaken them, they pressed hard upon them. ΗDT. IX, 57. Νεκώς μεταξύ δρύσσων επαύσατο, μαντή ν εμποδίου γενομένου, Necho stopped while digging (the canal), &c. Id. II, 158 Πολλαχοῦ δή με ἐπέσχε λέγοντα μεταξύ, it often checked me while speaking. PLAT. Apol. 40 B. Ἐπιπόνω ἀσκήσει εὐθὺς νέοι ὄντες τὸ άνδρείον μετέρχονται, by toilsome discipline, even while they are still young, &c. THUC. II, 39. Τῷ δεξιῷ κέρα εὐθὺς ἀποβεβηκότι οἱ Κορίνθιοι ἐπέκειντο, the Corinthians pressed upon the right wing, as soon as it was disembarked. Id. IV, 43. 'ApEauevos e u d vs καθισταμένου, beginning as soon as it (the war) broke out. Id. I. 1. Διόνυσον λέγου. σι ώς αὐτίκα γενόμενον ἐς τὸν μηρὸν ἐνερράψατο Ζεύς, they say of Dionysus that, as soon as he was born, Zeus sewed him into his thigh. Ηρτ. Π, 146. Την ψυχην θεωρών έξαίφνης αποθανόντος εκάστου, viewing the soul of each one the moment that he is dead. PLAT. Gorg. 523 E.

NOTE 3. (a.) " $\Lambda \tau \epsilon$, of $o\nu$, or of a, 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.

Ο δὲ Κῦρος, ἄτε παῖς ῶν καὶ φιλόκαλος καὶ φιλότιμος, ήδετο τῆ στολῆ, but Cyrus, inasmuch as he was a child, &c. XEN. Cyr. I, 3, 3. So äτε ληφθέντων, THUC. VII, 85. Μάλα δὲ χαλεπῶς πορενόμενοι, οἶα δὴ ἐν νυκτί τε καὶ φόβω ἀπιόντες, εἰς Λἰγόσθενα ἀφικνοῦνται, inasmuch as they were departing by night, &c. XEN. Hell. VI, 4, 26.

In Herodotus $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ is used in the same sense; as in I, 8, $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ a $\tilde{v} \tau a \nu o \mu i \zeta \omega \nu$, inasmuch as he believed this. See THUC. VII, 24.

(b.) " $\Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ with the Participle occasionally seems to have the same force as $\tilde{a}\tau\epsilon$ or olov; as in EUR. Hippol. 1307, $\delta \delta' \ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \ \dot{\omega}\nu$ δ . kalos oùk $\epsilon \dot{\phi} \epsilon \sigma \pi \epsilon \tau \sigma \lambda \dot{\sigma} \gamma \sigma \iota s$, inasmuch as he was just, &c.

For the common use of $\delta\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ with the Participle, see Note 9.

NOTE 4. (a) ' Ω_s may be prefixed to many of the Partisiples 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.

Τόν Περικλέα έν αίτια είχον ώς πείσαντα σφάι πολεμείν και δι εκείνον rais ξυμφοραίs περιπεπτωκότες, they found fault with Pericles, on the ground that he had persuaded them to engage in the war, and that through him they had met with the calamities. THUC. II. 59. (Here Thueydides himself is not responsible for the statements made by the Participles ; as he would be if is wer omitted.) See § 111. 'Αγανακτοῦσιν ώς μεγάλων τινῶν ἀπεστερημένο. they are indignant, because (as they allege) they have been deprived, &c. PLAT. Rep. I, 329 A. Βασιλεί χάριν ίσασιν, ώς δι εκείνον τυχούσαι τής aυτονομίas ταύτης, i. e. they thank him because (as they believe) they have obtained this independence through him. Isoc. Pan. p. 77 C. § 175. Οί μέν διώκοντες τούς καθ' αύτούς ώς πάντας νικώντες, οίδ' άρπάζοντες ώς ήδη πάντες νικώντες, one side pursuing those opposed to them, thinking that they were victorious over all; and the other side proceeding to plunder, thinking that they were all victorious. XEN. An. Ί, 10, 4. Την πρόφασιν εποιείτο ώς Πισίδας βουλόμενος εκβαλείν, he made his pretence, (apparently) wishing to drive out the Pisulians. Ib. I, 2, 1. "Ελεγε θαρρείν ώς καταστησομένων τούτων είς το Seov, he said he took courage, on the ground that these matters were about to be settled, &c. Ib. I, 3, 8. (See § 110, 1, N. 1.) ' Ω s yàp εἰδότων περὶ ῶν ἐπέμφθησαν ἀκούετε, jor you hear them as men who (as you believe) know about what they were sent for. DEM. F. L. 342, 25. Οι Αθηναίοι παρεσκευάζοντο ώς πολεμήσοντες, the Athenians prepared with the (avowed) intention of going to war. THUC. II, 7. Συλλαμβάνει Κυρον ωs αποκτενων, he seizes Cyrus with the (avowed) object of putting him to death. XEN. An. I, 1, 3.

It is a common mistake to suppose that &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.) ' Ω_s may also be used before Participles with verbs of knowing, &c., included in § 113. (See § 113, N. 10.)

NOTE 5. (a.) The Participle expressing opposition or limitation is often strengthened by $\kappa a i \pi \epsilon \rho$ or $\kappa a i$ (after a negative, by $o \delta \delta \epsilon$ or $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon$, with or without $\pi \epsilon \rho$), $\kappa a i \tau a \delta \tau a$, and that too. "Oµws, nevertheless, may be connected with the Participle (like $\tilde{a}\mu a$, &c. N. 2), belonging, however, grammatically to the leading verb. E. g.

^{*}Εκτορα καὶ μεμαῶτα μάχης σχήσεσθαι δίω. II. IX, 655. 'Εποικτείρω δέ νιν δύστηνον ἕμπας, καίπερ ὄντα δυσμενη, although he is my enemy. SOFII. Aj. 122. Οἶκ ἂν προδοίην, οὐδέ περ πράσσων κακῶς. ΕUR. Phoen. 1624. Γυναικὶ πείθου, μηδὲ τἀληθη κλύων. Id. Hipp. Fr. 443. Πείθου γυναιξὶ, καίπερ οὐ στέργων ὅμως. AESCH. Sept. 712. (Here ὅμως qualifies πείθου; although, as usual, it is joined with the Participle for emphasis.) 'Αδικεῖς ὅτι ἄνδρα μῶν τὸν σπουδαιότατον διαφθείρεις γελῶν ἀναπείθων, καὶ ταῦτα οῦτω πολέμον ὄντα τῷ γέλωτι. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, 2, 16.

(b.) In Homer, the two parts of $\kappa a i \dots \pi \epsilon \rho$ are generally sepa-

rated by the Participle, or by some emphatic word connected with it. Kai is here very often omitted, so that π'_{ρ} stands alone in the sense of *although*.

Both of these uses are found also in the Atcic poets. E.g.

Τον μέν ἕπειτ' εἶασε, καὶ ἀχνύμενώς περ ἐι ιίρου, κεῖσθαι. Π. VIII, 125. Καὶ κρατερός περ ἐὼν. μενέτω τριτάτη ἐνὶ μοίρη. Π. XV, 195. Τέτλαθι, μῆτερ ἐμὴ, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη ιιερ, μή σε φίλην περ ἐοῦσαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδωμαι θεινομένην· τότε δ' οῦ τι δυνήσομαι ἀχνύμενός περ χραισμεῖν. Π. Ι, 586.

Κάγώ σ' ίκνοῦμαι, καὶ γυνή περ οἶσ' ὅμως. Ευπ. Orest. 680. Τάφον γὰρ αὐτὴ καὶ κατασκαφὰς ἐγὼ, γυνή περ οἶσα, τῷδε μηχανήσομαι. AEsch. Sept. 1037.

REMARK. Kairou was very seldom used like $\kappa ai\pi\epsilon\rho$ with the Participle, its only regular use being with finite verbs. E. g.

Ούδέ μοι έμμελέως το Πιττάκειον νέμεται, καίτοι σοφού παρά φωτος είρημένον. SIMON. Fr. 5 (apud PLAT. Prot. 339 C).

NOTE 6. The Participle $\omega\nu$ is sometimes omitted after the particles mentioned in the last three notes, leaving an adjective or a noun standing by itself. E. g.

Aờroùs els rậv πολιτείαν οù παραδεξόμεθα, ατε τυραννίδος ὑμνητάς (sc. öντus). PLAT, Rep VIII, 568 B. Αὐτὸ ἐπιτηδεύουσιν ὡς ἀναγκαῖον ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἀγαθὰν (sc. ὄν), they practise it on the ground that it is necessary, and not on the ground that it is a good thing. Ib. II, 358 C. ⁷H μậν ἔτι Zeùs, καίπερ αὐθάδης φμενῶν, ἔσται ταπεινός. AESCH. 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 seklom be translated literally into English. E. g.

Tí δὲ καὶ δεδιότες σφόδρα οῦτως ἐπείγεσθε; what do you fear, that you are in such great haste? XEN. Hell. I, 7, 26. Tí ἂν εἰπών σέ τις δρθῶς προσείποι; what could one call you, so as to give you the right name? DEM. Cor. 232, 20. Τῶν νόμων ἄπειροι γίγνονται καὶ τῶν λόγων, oἶς δεῖ χρώμενον ὑμιλεῖν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, which one must use in his intercourse with men. PLAT. Gorg. 484 D.

(b.) Here belong $\tau i \ \mu a \theta \omega \nu$; and $\tau i \ \pi a \theta \omega \nu$; both of which have the general force of wherefore? $T i \ \mu a \theta \omega \nu \tau o^{2} \tau o \ models$, however, usually signifies what put it into his head to do this? or with what idea does he do this? and $\tau i \ \pi a \theta \omega \nu \tau o^{2} \tau o \ models$; what has happened to him that he does this? E. g.

Tί τοῦτο μαθών προσέγραψεν; with what idea did he add this to the law? DEM. Lept. 495, 20. Tí παθοῦσαι, εἴπερ Νεφέλαι γ' εἰσὶν ἀληθῶs, θνηταῖs εἴξασι γυναιξίν; what has happened to them that they resemble mortal women? ARIST. Nub. 340.

These phrases may be used even in dependent sentences, τi becoming $\delta \tau i$, and the whole phrase meaning because. E. g.

§ 109.]

Tí ἀξιός εἰμι παθεῖν ἢ ἀποτῖσαι, ὅ τι μαθων ἐν τῷ βίῳ οἰχ ἡσυχίαν ῆγου; what do I deserve to suffer, §c. for not keeping quiet? i. e. for the idea which came into my head, 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 $d\rho\chi\phi\mu\epsilon\nu\sigmas$, at first; $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu$, finally; $\delta\iotaa\lambda\iota\pi\omega\nu$, after an interval; $\phi\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$, hastily; $d\nu\nu\sigma as$, quickly; $\lambda a\theta\omega\nu$, secretly; $\kappa a\tau a\tau\epsilon\iota\nu as$, earnestly; $\xi\chi\omega\nu$, continually; $\phi\theta d\sigma as$, quickly. (See Passow or Liddell and Scott, under $d\rho\chi\omega$, &c.)

^{*} $\mathbf{E}\chi\omega\nu$, $\tilde{a}\gamma\omega\nu$, $\phi\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$, and $\lambda a\beta\omega\nu$ may often be translated with. (See example under § 109, 8.)

NOTE 9. $\Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ with the Participle generally belongs to an implied apodosis, to which the Participle forms the protasis (§ 109, 6). Here $\delta \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ means simply *as*, and the Participle is translated with an *if* prefixed. (See § 53, N. 3.) E. g.

⁶Ωσπερ ήδη σαφῶς εἰδότες, οὐκ ἐθέλετ ἀκούειν, you are unwilling to hear, as if you already knew well (i. e. as you would be if you knew). Isoc. Pac. p. 160 C. § 9. (Here εἰδότες = εἰ ἤδειτε, § 52, 1.) ³Απήντων ὀλίγοι πρὸς πολλὰς μυριάδας, ὅσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίαις ψυχαῖς μέλλοντες κινδυνεύειν, as if they had been about to risk the lives of others (i. e. ὅσπερ ἀπήντων ἀν, εἰ ἕμελλον). Id. Pan. p. 58 B. § 86. So Ib. p. 78 C. § 179, ὅσπερ πρὸς τὸν Δία τὴν χώραν νεμόμενος, ἀλλ οὐ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τὰς συνθήκας ποιούμενος, as (he would have done) if he had been dividing the country with Zeus, and not making a treaty with men.

That $\varpi\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ means simply as (not as if) is seen when a verb with ϵi follows; as in $\varpi\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ ϵi $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\sigma\sigmas$, as if you should say. See also II. II, 780, $i\sigma\sigma\nu$, $\delta s \epsilon i \tau \epsilon \pi v\rho i \chi \partial \delta v \pi a \sigma a v \epsilon \mu o v \sigma$, i. c. their march 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^s 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.

Ταῦτ' ἐπράχθη Κάνωνος στρατηγοῦντος, these things were done when Conon was general. Isoc. Evag. p. 200 C. § 56. 'Αφίκετο δεῦρο τὸ πλοῖου, γνόντων τῶν Κεφαλλήνων, ἀντιπράττοντος τού rov,... καταπλεῖν, the Cephallenians having determined to sail in, although this man opposed it. DEM. Zenoth. 886, 1. (For the tenses of the Participles, see § 24.) Αθηναίων δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο παθόντων, διπλασίαν ἀν τὴν δύναμιν εἰκάζεσθαι (οἶμαι), i. e. if the Athenians should ever suffer, &c. ΤΗ UC. Ι, 10. (See § 52, 1.) ^{\circ} Ολης γὰρ τῆς πόλεως ἐπιτρεπομένης τῷ στρατηγῷ, μεγάλα τά τε ἀγαθὰ κατορθοῦντος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ κακὰ διαμαρτάνοντος εἰκὸς γίγνεσθαι. ΧΕΝ. Mem. HI, 1, 3.

NOTE 1. The Participle in the genitive absolute may be accompanied 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 § 109, N. 7. E. g.

Kaì aờ τοῦ μετ aξỳ ταῦτα λέγθντος ὁ Κλεινίας ἔτυχεν ἀποκρινάμενος, while he was saying this, &c. PLAT. Euthyd. 275 E. Ἐκ δὲ τοῦτων εὐθὺς ἐκἡρυττον ἐξιέναι πάντας Θηβαίους, ὡς τῶν τυράνων τεθνεώτων, because (as they said) the tyrants were dead. XEN. Hell. V, 4, 9. (See § 109, Ň. 4.) ᾿Απελογήσατο ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ταῖς Ἐλλησι πολεμησόντων σφῶν εἶποι, that he said what he did, not because they intended to be at war with the Greeks. Id. An. V, 6, 3. So ὡς ἐπιβουλεύοντος Γισσαφέρνους ταῖς πόλεσι, on the ground that T. was plotting; An. I, 1, 6. ʿΩς οὐ προσοίσοντος (Sc. ἐμοῦ τᾶς χεῖρας,... δίδασκε, since (as you may feel sure) I will not lay hands ου you, teach me. Id. Mem. II, 6, 32. Κῦρος δὲ ἀπορίησι ἐνείχετο, ἄτ ε χρόνου ἐγγινομένου συχνοῦ, inasmuch as a long time intervened. HDT. I, 190. (See § 109, N. 3.) [°]Ην γὰρ ἀδύνατος, ὥστε σηπομένου τοῦ μηροῦ. Id. VI, 136. Οι ¨Ελληψες οῦτας ἡγανάκτησαν, ὥσπερ ὅλης τῆς Ἐλλάδος πεπορθημένης, as if the whole of Greece had 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 δs , 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 $d_{\nu}\theta\rho\dot{\omega}\pi\omega\nu$, $\pi\rho a\gamma\mu\dot{a}\tau\omega\nu$) is understood. E. g.

So when the Participle denotes a state of the weather; as $\tilde{v}ov\tau \sigma s$ $\pi o\lambda\lambda \hat{\varphi}$, when it was raining heavily. XEN. Hell. I, 1, 16. (In such cases the Participle is masculine, $\Delta \iota \delta s$ being understood. See ARIST. Nub. 370, $\tilde{v}ov\tau a$; and II. XII, 25, $\tilde{v} \in \delta$ äpa $Z \in \tilde{v}s$.)

NOTE 3. A passive Participle may star 1 in the genitive absolute

with a clause introduced by $5\tau\iota$. If the subject of such a clause is *plural*, the Participle is itself sometimes plural, by a kind of attraction. E. g.

Σαφῶς δηλωθέντος ὅτι ἐν ταῖς ναυσὶ τῶν Ἐλλήνων τὰ πράγματα ἐγένετο, it having been clearly shown, that, &c. THUC. I, 74. In I, 116 we find ἐσαγγελθέντων ὅτι Φοίνισσαι νῆες ἐπ' αὐτοὺς πλέουσιν, it having been announced, that, &c.

NOTE 4. The Participle $\delta \nu$ is rarely omitted, leaving a noun and an adjective alone in the genitive absolute. E. g.

ως έμοῦ μόνης πέλας (sc. οὕσης). SOPH. O. C. 83.

NOTE 5. The genitive absolute is regularly used only when a raw 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.

Διαβεβηκότος ήδη Περικλέους, ηγγέλθη αὐτῷ ὅτι Μέγαρα ἀφέστηκε. ΤΗυς. Ι, 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 are $\delta \acute{e} v$, $\acute{e} \acute{g} \acute{v}$, $\pi a \rho \acute{v}$, $\pi \rho \sigma \hat{\eta} \kappa o v$, $\pi a \rho \acute{e} \chi o v$, $\mu \acute{e} \lambda o v$, $\mu \acute{e} \tau a - \mu \acute{e} \lambda o v$, $\delta \sigma \kappa o \hat{v} v$, $\delta \acute{o} \acute{g} a v$, and the like; also passive Participles used impersonally (as $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \tau a \chi \theta \acute{e} v$, $\acute{e} i \rho \eta \mu \acute{e} v o v$); and such expressions as $a \delta \acute{v} \nu a \tau o v \check{o} v$, it being impossible, composed of an adjective and $\check{o} v$. E. g.

Οἱ δ' οὐ βοηθήσαντες, δέον, ὑγιεῖς ἀπῆλθον; and did those who brought no aid when it was necessary escape safe and sound? PLAT. Alcib. I, 115 B. 'Απλᾶς δὲ λύπας ἐξόν (sc. φέρειν), οὐκ οἴσω διπλᾶς. Ευπ. Ιph. Taur. 688. Παρέχον δὲ τῆς ᾿Ασίης πάσης ἄρχειν εὐπετέως, ἄλλο τι ιἰρήσεσθε; ΗDT. V, 49. Εὖ δὲ παρασχὸν, and when an opportunity offers. Thuc. I, 120. Οὐ προσῆκον, improperly. Id. IV, 95. Συνδόξαν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῆ μητρὶ, γαμεῖ τὴν Κυαξάρου θυγατέρα. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 5, 28. Εἰρημένον κἰ cuo είναι ὅ τι ἂν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ξυμμάχων ψηφίσηται. Thuc. V, 20. So δεδογμένον, Ι, 125; γεγραμμένον, V, 56; and προστεταγμένον, PLAT. Leg. X, 902 D. Καὶ ἐνθένδε πάλιν, προστ ταχ θέν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμοι Μένωνα ἄγειν εἰς Ἑλλήσποντον, ἀχόμην. DEM. Polycl. 1210, 5. Παρικελεύοντό τε, ἀδύνατον ὃν ἐν νυκτὶ ἄλλῷ τῷ σημῆναι. Thuc. VII, 44. "Εγωγ', ἔφη ὁ Κῦρος, οἶμαι, ἅμα μὲν συναγορευόταν ἡμῶν, ἅμα δὲ καὶ a ἰσχρὸν ὃν τὸ ἀντιλέγειν, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, 2, 20. (The genitive belongs under § 110, 1. See § 111) 'Διτιπαρεσκευάζετο ἐρρωμένως, ὡς μάχης ἔτι δεῆσον, on the ground that there would still be need of a battle. Ib. VI, 1, 26. (See Remark, below.) Of de $\tau \mu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha}$, we keep $\eta \dot{\delta} \eta$ advois $\tau \nu \rho a \nu \nu \epsilon \dot{\nu}$ dde $\hat{\omega} s$, $\pi \rho c \hat{\epsilon} \pi \sigma \sigma$, $\kappa \cdot \tau \cdot \lambda$., i. e. thinking that it was now in their power, &c. Id. Hell. II, 4, 1. ^{*}H yàp voe $\hat{s} d \dot{n} \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \sigma \dot{\phi}$, $\dot{a} \pi \delta \rho \rho \eta \tau \sigma \nu \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \iota$ (sc. $\delta \nu$), when it is forbidden to the city. SOPH. Ant. 44.

REMARK. The accusative absolute may take the same particles as the genitive absolute (§ 110, 1, Note 1). It may also omit the Participle $\delta\nu$. (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 ωs (used as in § 109, Note 4), or by $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, as if. E. g.

Δίο καὶ τοὺς υἱεῖς οἱ πατέρες ἀπὸ τῶν πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰργουσιν, ὡς τὴν μὲν τῶν χρηστῶν ὁμιλίαν ἄσκησιν οὖσαν τῆς ἀρετῆς, τὴν δὲ τῶν πονηρῶν κατάλυσιν (sc. οὖσαν). ΧΕΝ. Μεm. Ι, 2, 20. Φίλους κτῶνται ὡς βοηθῶν δεόμενοι, τῶν δ' ἀδελφῶν ἀμελοῦσιν, ὥσπερ ἐκ πολιτῶν μὲν γιγνομένους φίλους, ἐξ ἀδελφῶν ἀμελοῦσιν, ὥσπερ ἐκ πολιτῶν μὲν γιγνομένους φίλους, ἐξ ἀδελφῶν ἀμελοῦσιν, ὥσπερ ἐκ πολιτῶν μὲν γιγνομένους φίλους, ἐξ ἀδελφῶν ἀμελοῦσιν, ὥσπερ ἐκ sa if friends were made from fellow-citizens, and were not made from brothers. Ib. II, 3, 3. Μέγιστον οῦτω διακείσθαι τὰς γνώμας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἕκαστον ἑκόντα προθύμως ὅ τι ἀν δέῃ ποιήσοντα. DEM. Sym. 182, 3. (See § 113, N. 10, c.)

Note 2. The accusative absolute used personally without ωs or $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ is very rare. It occurs chiefly with the neuter of Participles which are regularly impersonal. E. g.

Προση κον αὐτῷ τοῦ κλήρου μέρος ὅσονπερ ἐμοί. ISAE. V, § 12. Ταῦτα δὲ γινόμενα, πένθεα μεγάλα τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους καταλαμβάνει. ΗDT. II, 66. "Ηδη ἀμφοτέροις μὲν δοκοῦν ἀναχωρεῖν, κυρωθέν δὲ οὐδἐν, νυκτός τε ἐπιγενομένης, οἱ μὲν Μακεδόνες... ἐχώρουν ἐπ' οἶκου ΤΗUC. IV, 125. Δόξαντα δὲ ταῦτα καὶ περανθέντα, τὰ στρατεύματα ἀπῆλθε. XEN. Hell. III, 2, 19. Δόξαν ἡμῖν ταῦτα occurs in PLAT. Prot. 314 C, where we may supply ποιείν.

§ 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.

Οί μέν "Ελληνες στραφέντες παρεσκευάζοντο ώς ταύτη προσιζντος 10* Ο (sc. τοῦ βασιλέως) καὶ δεξόμενοι, they prepared themselves with a view to his (the King's) coming up and to receiving him. XEN. An. I, 10, 6. Tậs yàp ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὕσης, οὐδ ἐπιμιγνύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις,...νεμόμενοί τε τὰ ἑαυτῶν,...ἀδηλὼν ὑν ὅπότε τις ἐπελθών καὶ ἀτειχίστων ἅμα ὄντων ἄλλος ἀφαιρήσεται, τῆς τε καθ ἡμέραν ἀναγκαίου τροφῆς πανταχοῦ ἀν ἡγούμενοι ἐπικρατείν, οὐ χαλεπῶς ἀπανίσταντο. THUC. I, 2. Καὶ πάντα διαπραξάμενος ἐν τῆ ἐκκλησία (Κλέων), καὶ ψηφισαμένων ᾿Αθηναίων αὐτῷ τὸν πλοῦν, τῶν τε ἐν Πύλω στρατηγῶν ἕνα προσελόμενος, τὴν ἀναγωγὴν διὰ τάχους ἐποιεῖτο. Id. IV, 29. ᾿Αλκιδόης τοῖς Πελοποννησίοις ὕποπτος ῶν, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀφικομένης ἐκιστολῆς ὥστ ἀποκτείναι, ὑποχωρεῖ παρὰ Τισσαφέρνην. 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 (§ 92, 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 ($\pi\epsilon\rho\iotao-\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$, $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\rho\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$, with $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\hat{\iota}\delta\sigma\nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\hat{\iota}\delta\sigma\nu$, sometimes $\epsilon\hat{\iota}\delta\sigma\nu$) the 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.

(a.) "Apţoµaı $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$, I will begin to speak. PLAT. Symp. 186 B. Haûσaı $\lambda \epsilon \gamma o \upsilon \sigma a$, cease speaking. EUR. Hippol. 706. (So ἀπειπείν $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$.) Οὐκ ἀνέξοµaι ζῶσα, I shall not endure to live. Ib. 355. Tὴν φιλοσοφίαν παῦσου ταῦτα λέγουσαν, cause philosophy to stop saying this. PLAT. Gorg. 482 A. Kai ἐγὼ τοῖs ἐρωτῶσι χαίρω ἀποκρινόμενος, I like to answer, &c. Id. Prot. 318 D. Τῷ μέν ῥα χαίρον νοστήσαντι, they rejoiced in his return. Od. XIX, 463. Tῆs Aioλίδos χαλεπῶs ἔφερεν ἀπεστερημένος, he took it hardly that he was deprived of Aeolis. XEN. Hell. III, 2, 13. Αἰσχύνομαι $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega ν$, I am ashamed to say. (For aἰσχύνομαι λέγειν, see below, N. 6.) 'Αποκάμνω τρέχων, I am weary of running. Toùs ἐκ τῆς νήσου δεσμώτας μετεμέλοντο ἀποδεδωκότες, they repented of having given them up. Thuc. V, 35. Πεποίηκε τοὺς ἐν "Auδou τὸν ἀεἰ χρόνον *ιμωρουμένους, he has represented those in Hades as suffering punishment. PLAT. Gorg. 525 E. Εὖρεν δ' εὐρύοπα Κρονίδιν ἄτερ ημενον άλλων, she found him sitting apart. II. I, 498. So I, 27.

(b.) Mỹ περιίδωμεν ὑβρισθεῖσαν τὴν Λακεδαίμονα καὶ καταφρονηθεῖσαν, let us not allow Lacedaemon to be insulted and despised. Isoc. Archid. 138 A. § 108. Mỹ μ' ἰδεῖν θανόνθ' ὑπ' ἀστῶν, not to see me killed. EUR Orest. 746. Τλῆναί σε δρῶσαν, that thou shouldst take courage to do. SOPH. El. 943. See examples in § 24, N. 2.

REMARK. In Herodotus πειράσμαι is often used with the Participle in the same way; as οἰκ ἐπειρῦτο ἐπιών ὁ Kῦρος, Cyrus did not attempt to approach, I, 77. So I, 84; VI, 50.

[']Αποδείκνυμι and παρασκευάζω, in the meaning to render, may take the Participle as well as the Infinitive; as in XEN. Cyr. I, 6, 18, äμα καὶ τἀπιτήδεια μάλιστα ἔχοντας ἀποδείξειν καὶ τὰ σώματα ἀριστα ἔχοντας παρασκευάσειν. So ARIST. Plut. 210, βλέποντ' ἀποδείξω σε, 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 : $\delta\iota a\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega$, to continue, $\lambda a\nu\theta \dot{a}\nu\omega$, to escape the notice of, $\tau\nu\gamma\chi\dot{a}\nu\omega$, to happen, $\phi\theta\dot{a}\nu\omega$, to anticipate, to get the start of, $\sigma'\chi\circ\mu\alpha\iota$, to be gone, and $\theta a\mu i$ - $\zeta\omega$, to be wont or to be frequent.

So in poetry with $\kappa v \rho \epsilon \omega$, to happen; and in Herodotus with $\sigma v \mu \pi i \pi \tau \omega$, to happen, and with $\pi o \lambda \lambda \delta s$ $\epsilon i \mu \iota$, $\pi o \lambda \lambda \delta \delta s$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \epsilon \iota \mu a \iota$, or $\pi a \sigma \tau c \delta s$ $\gamma i \gamma v o \mu a \iota$, to be urgent; and in Homer with $\beta \eta$ for $\tilde{\epsilon} \beta \eta$. E. g.

Διατελεῦσι τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ αἰεὶ ἐ όντες ἐλεύθεροι, they still remain free. HDT. VII, 111. "Οσην εύνοιαν έχων έγω διατελώ, as much good will as I continually bear. DEM. Cor. § 1. "Ελαθεν (αὐτὴν) άφθέντα πάντα και καταφλεχθέντα, everything took fire and was consumed before she knew it. THUC. IV, 133. (See § 24, Note 1.) Φονέα τοῦ παιδὸς ἐλάνθανε βόσκων, he was unconsciously supporting the murderer of his son. HDT. I, 44. (See Rem. below.) "ETUXOV έν τη άγορα όπλιται καθεύδοντες, soldiers happened to be sleeping in the market-place. THUC. IV, 113. Katà θεών γάρ τινα έτυχον καθήμενος ένταῦθα, I happened to be sitting there. PLAT. Euthyd. 272 Ε. Οίδ' οὐκ ἔφθασαν πυθόμενοι τὸν πόλεμον, καὶ ... ἡκον, they no sooner heard of the war than they came, &c. Isoc. Paneg. 58 B. § 86. "Εφθησαν πολλώ οι Σκύθαι τους Πέρους έπι την γέφυραν άτικόμενοι, the Scythians came to the bridge much before the Perstans. Η DT. IV, 136. Αὐτοὶ φθήσονται τοῦτο δράσαντες, they will be the first to do this for themselves. PLAT. Rep. II, 375 C. (See § 24, N. 1.) Φθάνουσι έπ' αὐτὰ καταφεύγοντες, they are the first to run to them. AESCHIN. Cor. § 248. O"ixeral \$\$\phi v v, he has taken flight. I pee Bevou wxero, he was gone on an embassy. XEN

Cyr. V, 1, 3. Oř τ_i κομιζόμενός γε θάμιζεν, he had not been used to being thus cared for. Od. VIII, 451. Où θαμίζεις καταβαίνων εἰς τὸν Πειραιâ, you do not come down very often. PLAT. Rep. I, 328 C.

Τοῦτον οἶσθ εἰ ζῶν κυρεῖ; dost thou know whether he is perchance living? SOFH. Phil. 444. Πολλὸς ἦν λισσόμενος ὁ ξεῖνος, the stranger entreated urgently. HDT. IX, 91. Γέλων δὲ πολλὸς ἐνέκειτο λέγων τοιάδε, and Gelon spoke urgently as follows. Id. VII, 158. Τότε παντοῖοι ἐγένοντο Σκύθαι δεόμενοι τῶν Ἰώνων λῦσαι τὸν πόρον, they begged them in every way (lit. they took every form in begging them). Id. VII, 10. Συνεπεπτώκεε ἔρις ἐοῦσα, there had happened to be a quarrel. Id. I, 82. Bỹ φεύγων, he took flight. II. II, 665. (See § 97, N. 1.)

REMARK. Aavdávo being an active verb, meaning to escape the notice of, must have an object expressed or understood. When no object is expressed, sometimes $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \sigma a$ is understood, and sometimes a reflexive referring to the subject. Thus $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda a \partial \epsilon \tau o \tilde{\tau} \sigma \sigma \sigma o i \eta \sigma a s may$ $mean either he did this without any one's knowing it (sc. <math>\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \sigma s$), or he did this unconsciously (sc. $\tilde{\epsilon} a \tau \sigma v$).

NOTE 1. 'Apréw, to be sufficient, and ikavós, $\eta \delta i \omega \nu$, $\kappa \rho \epsilon i \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, or $\beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i \omega \nu$ $\epsilon i \mu i$ are sometimes used in a personal construction with the Participle (like $\delta \eta \lambda \delta s \epsilon i \mu$, &c., § 113, N. 1), where we should expect an impersonal construction with the Infinitive. E. g.

'Αρκέσω θνήσκουσ' ἐγώ, it will be enough for me to die. SOPH. Ant. 547. (We should expect ἀρκέσει ἐμοὶ θνήσκειν.) Κρείσσων γὰρ ἦσθα μηκέτ' ῶν ἢ ζῶν τυφλός. Id. O. T. 1368. 'Ηδίους ἔσεσθε ἀκούσαντες. DEM. Aristoc. 641, 9.

NOTE 2. As $d\nu \epsilon \chi_0 \mu a\iota$, 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 $d\nu \epsilon \chi_{\epsilon\tau a\ell}$ two $\lambda \epsilon \gamma_0 \nu \tau a$, or $d\nu \epsilon \chi_{\epsilon\tau a\ell}$ twos $\lambda \epsilon \gamma_0 \nu \tau os$, he endures any one's saying.

NOTE 3. The phrase $o\dot{\nu}\kappa \,\dot{a}\nu \,\phi \,\theta \,\dot{a}\nu \,o \iota s$ (or $o\dot{\nu}\kappa \,\dot{a}\nu \,\phi \,\theta \dot{a}\nu o\iota \tau \epsilon$), you could not be too soon, is used with the Participle as an exhortation, meaning the sooner the better. The third person, $o\dot{\nu}\kappa \,\dot{a}\nu \,\phi \,\theta \dot{a}\nu o\iota$, 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 constructions of § 112. E. g.

El dé ti tuyxávei andés (sc. ov.) PLAT. Gorg. 502 B.

NOTE 5. $\Lambda a\nu\theta \dot{a}\nu\omega$ is sometimes followed by $\delta\tau\iota$ and a finite verb, as in XEN. Mem. III, 5, 24. When it is used *impersentally*, it regularly takes $\delta\tau\iota$.

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 meaning. Thus $al\sigma\chi'\nu o\mu a i \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$ means I am ashamed to say (but do say); $al\sigma\chi'\nu o\mu a i \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ means I am ashamed to say (and therefore do not say). So $d\pi o\kappa d\mu \nu \omega \tau \sigma \tilde{\nu} \tau \sigma \tau \sigma \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu$, I am weary of doing this; but $d\pi o\kappa d\mu \nu \omega \tau \sigma \tilde{\nu} \tau \sigma \tau \sigma \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu$, I cease to do this through wearness. (See Passow, or Liddell and Scott, under these words; and Passow under $d\pi \rho\chi o\mu a$.) See $\pi \epsilon \rho u \delta \epsilon \tilde{\nu} \tau \tau \nu \gamma \theta \tilde{\nu} \tau \mu \eta \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a \iota$, THUC. II, 20; and $\pi \epsilon \rho u \delta \epsilon \tilde{\nu} a v \tau \eta \eta \theta \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \sigma a \nu$, II, 18; where it is difficult to detect any difference in meaning. See, however, Krüger's note on I, 35.

NOTE 7. The Aorist (seldom the Perfect) Participle may be joined with the subject of $\tilde{\epsilon}_{X\omega}$, forming a periphrastic Perfect. This is especially common in Sophoeles and Euripides. E. g.

Τὸν μὲν προτίσας, τὸν δ' ἀτιμάσας ἔχει. SOPH. Ant. 22. So EUR. Med. 33 and 90. Πολλά χρήματα ἔχομεν ἀνηρπακότες. XEN. An. I, 3, 14.

For a similar periphrasis to express the Future Perfect, see § 29, Note 4; and § 108, Note 6.

Note 8. The Participles $\beta \sigma v \lambda \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon v \sigma s$, $\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega v$, $\dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon v \sigma s$, $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \delta \epsilon \chi \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon v \sigma s$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon v \sigma s$ sometimes agree in case with a dative, which depends on $\epsilon i \mu i$ or on a verb signifying to come or to happen; the whole forming a periphrasis for the verb of the Participle. E. g.

[#]Εστιν αὐτῷ βουλόμενῳ, it is to him wishing it, i. e. he wishes it. Kaì προσδεχομένῷ μοι τὰ τῆς ὀργῆς ὑμῶν ἐς ἐμὲ γεγένηται, i. e. 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 $\dot{a}\gamma\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$, to announce. The Participle here resembles the Infinitive in indirect discourse (§ 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.

Μέμνημαι τὐτὸν τοῦτο ποιήσαντα, I remember that he did this; μέμνημαι τοῦτο ποιήσας, I remember that I did this. (In the first case ἐποίησεν is represented; in the second, ἐποίησα.) Οἶδε τούτους εὖ πράξοντας, he knows that they will prosper; οἶδε ἀπτὸς εὖ πράξων, he knows that he himself will prosper. Δείξω τοῦτον ἐχθρὸν ὅντα, I shall prove that he is an enemy; $\delta \epsilon_i \chi \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau a_i$ où τos $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho \dot{o} s$ $\ddot{\omega} \nu$, he win be proved to be an enemy.

For other examples see § 73, 2; where examples of the Participle with $a\nu$ after these verbs may be found. See also § 41.

NOTE 1. The Participle is used in the same way with $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \delta s \epsilon i \mu \iota$ and $\phi a \nu \epsilon \rho \delta s \epsilon i \mu \iota$. E. g.

 $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \delta \hat{\tau} \hat{\eta} \nu o l \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \hat{s}, \kappa. \tau. \lambda., it was eviden: that he thought, &c. XEN. An. II, 5, 27. (This is equivalent to <math>\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu \hat{\eta} \nu \tilde{\sigma} \tau i o l o \tau o.$ See § 112, N. 1.) See below, Note 7. $A \pi \iota \kappa \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu \phi a \nu \epsilon \rho o i e l \sigma \iota \hat{s}^* O a \sigma \iota \nu \pi \delta \iota \nu, it is evident that they came to the city O asis. HDT. III, 26. So with <math>\phi a \nu \epsilon \rho \delta \nu \pi \sigma \iota \hat{\epsilon} \omega$: as $\phi a \nu \epsilon \rho \delta \nu \pi \sigma \delta \iota \nu \sigma \epsilon \tau$, they made it evident to all that they were not fighting for themselves. I YCURG. Leocr. p. 154, § 50.

NOTE 2. When any of 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 $\delta\epsilon i\xi\omega \ \epsilon\mu a \upsilon \tau \partial \upsilon \tau \sigma$ $\pi\epsilon \pi \sigma \omega \eta \kappa \delta \tau a$, I shall show that I have done this, for $\delta\epsilon i\xi\omega \ \tau \sigma \upsilon \tau \sigma \pi \epsilon - \pi \sigma \omega \eta \kappa \omega s$.

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: —

Πειράσομαι δείξαι καὶ μετὸν τῆς πόλεως ἡμῖν καὶ πεπονθότα ἐμαυτὸν οἰχὶ προσήκοντα, I shall try to show not only that we have rights in the city, but also that I have suffered, &c. DEM. Eubul. 1299 4. (The direct discourse is μέτεστι τῆς πόλεως ἡμῖν, καὶ πέπονθα αὐτός.) See § 111.

NOTE 4. Some verbs which regularly take the Infinitive in indirect discourse (§ 92, 2) occasionally take the Participle. E. g.

Νόμιζε ανδρα αγαθον αποκτείνων, think that you are putting to death a good man. XEN. An. VI, 6, 24.

NOTE 5. The Participle ω_{ν} may be omitted here, as well as after the verbs of § 112.

NOTE 6. When $\sigma i \nu \sigma i \delta a$ and $\sigma v \gamma \gamma i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$ 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 subject; as $\sigma i \nu \sigma i \delta i \kappa \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma$ (or $\eta \delta i \kappa \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$), I am conscious (to myself) that I have been wronged.

NOTE 7. The verbs included in § 113 may also be followed by a clause with $\delta \tau \iota$, instead of the more regular Participle. When

δηλόν έστιν and φανερόν έστιν are used impersonally, they regularly take a clause with őτι. (See § 112, N. 5.)

NOTE 8. Most of these verbs are also found with the Infinitive. (See Passow, or Liddell and Scott.) But olda takes the Infinitive only when it means to know how. Thus olda rouro $\pi o \iota \epsilon \iota \nu$ means I know how to do this, but olda rouro $\pi o \iota a \nu$ means I know that I am doing this.

NOTE 9. Verbs signifying to remember or to know may be followed by $\delta \tau \epsilon$ (when) and the Indicative, if a particular occasion is referred to with emphasis. E. g.

Εἰ γὰρ μέμνησαι ὅτ' ἐγώ σοι ἀπεκρινάμην, for if you remember (the time) when I answered you, &c. PLAT. Men. 79 D. Οἶσθ' ὅτε χρυσέοις ἐφάνη σὺν ὅπλοις. ΕUR. Hec. 112.

NOTE 10. (a.) ' Ω_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 ω_s merely adds emphasis to the expression. Thus iroth raira ourse ixvorta means know that this is so; but iroth ω_s raira ourse ixvorta means know that you may assume this to be so. E. g.

⁶Ω₅ μηδὲν εἰδότ⁷ ἴσθι μ' ὡν ἀνιστορεῖs, understand (that you must .ook upon) me as knowing nothing of what you seek. SOPH. Phil. 253. ⁶Ω₅ μηκέτ⁷ ὄντα κείνον ἐν φάει νόει, think of him as no longer living. Ib. 415. ⁶Ω₅ ταῦτ ἐπίστω δρώμεν, οὐ μέ λ λοντ ἔτι, understand that you may assume these things to be going on, &c. Ib. 567. Ω₅ μὴ μπολήσων ἴσθι τὴν ἐμὴν φρένα, be assured that you will not buy me off from my determination. SOPH. Ant. 1063. Δηλοῖs δ' ῶs τι σημανῶν νέον, you show that you have something new in your mind to disclose. Ib. 242. Δῆλος ἦν Κῦρος ὡς σπείδων, it was evident (by the conduct of Cyrus) that Cyrus was in haste. XEN. An. I, 5, 9. Πατέρα τὸν σὸν ἀγγελῶν ὡς sουκ ἕτ² ὅντα, (he comes) to announce that your father is no more. SOPH. O. T. 956. (In vs. 959, the messenger himself says εὖ ἴσθ' ἐκείνον θανάσιμον βεβήκοτα.)

The force of ωs here can seldom be expressed in English.

(b.) The Participle thus joined with &s may stand with its substantive 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 &s were omitted, the accusative would be used (as in a). E. g.

⁶Ωs δδ $\dot{\epsilon}\chi \acute{\rho}\tau \omega\nu \tau \widetilde{\omega}\nu \delta$ $\dot{\epsilon}\pi i\sigma\tau a\sigma\theta a i\sigma\epsilon \chi\rho \dot{\eta}$. you must understand that this is so. SOPH. Aj. 281. Here the genitive absolute has at first the appearance of a dependent clause; but is 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 Schneidewin's note

on the passage.) $\Omega s \tau o i \nu v \nu v \tau \hat{v} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma o i \mu a \theta \epsilon \hat{v} \pi d \rho a, since this is so, you may learn it, i. e. you may learn that this is so. AESCH.$ $Prom. 760. <math>\Omega s \pi o \lambda \epsilon \mu o v \sigma s \pi a \rho' v \mu \hat{v} \nu \delta \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{s}$; shall I announce from you that there is war? lit. assuming that there is war, shall I announce it from you? XEN. An. II, 1, 21. $\Omega s \pi a \nu v \mu \sigma \delta \sigma \kappa \sigma \hat{v} \nu, \ldots \sigma \tilde{v} \pi \delta \kappa i h, know that I think so very decidedly, lit. since (as you must understand) this seems good to me, be sure of it. Id. Mem. IV, 2, 30.$

(c.) We sometimer find the Participle with ω_s even after verbs and expressions which do not regularly take the Participle by § 113. E. g.

^{(Ω}S ἐμοῦ οὖν ἰόντος ὅπη αν καὶ ὑμcîs, οὖτω τὴν γνώμην ἔχετε, be of this opinion, that I shall go, &c. XEN. An. I, 3, 6. So THUC. VII, 15. ^{(Π}Oταν ὡς πετόμενοι ἐν τῷ ὕπνῷ διανοῶνται, when in their sleep they fancy themselves flying PLAT. Theaet. 158 B. ^{(Ω}S τοίννν μὴ ἀκουσομένων, οῦτως διονοεῖσθε, make up your minds then that we shall not hear, lit. since then (as you must know) we shall not hear, so make up your minds. PLAT Rep. I, 327 C. ^{(Ω}S στρατηγήσοντα ἐμὲ μηδεἰς λεγέτω, let no one speak of me as likely to be the general. XEN. An. I, 3, 15. Οῦτω σκοι:ῶμεν, ὡς τάχ ἀν, εἰ τύχοι, καὶ τούτων κἀκείνων συμβάντων, 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) both this and that might perhaps happen if it should chance to b. so, le' us look at it in this light.) For ἅν, see § 41, 3.

REMARK. The examples included in Note 16 (b) rd (c) belong properly under § 109, N. 4. (See also § 110, 1 N. 1; rd the last example under § 110, 2, N. 1.)

CHAPTER VII.

VERBAL ADJECTIVES IN -TEOS.

§ 114. The verbal in -téos 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. E. g.

² Ωφελητέα σοι ή πόλις ἐστί, the city must be benefited by you. XEN. Mem. III, 6, 3. ^{*}Αλλας (ναῦς) ἐκ τῶν ξυμμάχων μεταπεμπτέας εἶναι (ἔφη), he said that others must be sent for. Thuc. VI, 25. Où γὰρ πρὸ τῆς ἀληθείας τιμητέος ἀνὴρ, ἀλλ[°] δ λέγω ῥητέον. PLAT. Rep. X, 595 C. So VIII, 561 C. Φράζοντε ὡς οὕ σφι περιοπτέη ἐστὶ ή Ἑλλὰς ἀπολλυμένη. HDT. VII, 168.

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 common) the verbal stands in the neuter of the nominative singular (sometimes plural) with $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\iota}$ expressed or understood, and is regularly *active* in sense. The expression is equivalent to $\delta\epsilon\hat{\iota}$, *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.

Ταῦτα ἡμῖν (or ἡμᾶs) ποιητέον ἐστί, we must do this, equivalent to ταῦτα ἡμᾶs δέῖ ποιῆσαι. (See Rem. 2.) Οἰστέον τάδε, ἰt is necessary to bear these things. EUR. Orest. 769. ᾿Απαλλακτέον αὐτοῦ (τοῦ σώματος), καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ ψυχῇ θεατέον αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα. PLAT. Phaed. 66 E. (Δεῖ ἀπαλλάττεσθαι αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῇ ψυχỹ θεασθαι τὰ πράγματα.) Φημὶ δὴ διχῆ βοηθητέον είναι τοῖς πράyµaσıv ὑµîv, that you must give assistance in two ways. DEM. Ol. I, 14, 6. Ti aν aυτώ ποιητέον είη; what would he be obliged to do? XEN. Mem. I, 7, 2. Ἐψηφίσαντο πολεμητέα εἶναι (=δείν πολεμείν), they voted that they must go to war. THUC. I, 88. The xwpar, it is αὐτοῖς όρμωμενοις πολεμητέα ην. Id. VI, 50. Οὕτε μισθοφορητέον άλλους ή τούς στρατευομένους, οὕτε μεθεκτέον τῶν πραγματων πλείοσιν η πεντακισχιλίοις. Id. VIII, 65. (Here both the accusative and the dative of the agent are found.) See Rem. 2. Ημίν δε ξύμμαχοι άγαθοί, ούς ού παραδοτέα τοις Αθηναίοις εστίν, ούδε δίκαις και λόγοις διακριτέα μή λόγω και (ήμας) αύτους βλαπτομένους, άλλα τιμωρητέα έν τάχει και παντί σθένει (= ούς οὐ δεί ήμας παραδούναι, κ.τ.λ.). Id. I, 86. 'Ιτέον αν είη θεασομένους, it would be best for us to go and see her. XEN. Mem. III, 11, 1. ('Huas is understood.) Ούδενί τρόπω φαμέν έκόντας άδικητέον είναι. Άταρ ου γυναικών ουδέποτ έσθ' ήττητέα ήμιν PLAT. Crit. 49 A. $(= a\dot{v} \gamma v \nu a \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \hat{i} \eta \tau \tau \hat{a} \sigma \theta a i)$, but we must never be beaten by women. ARIST. Lys. 450. So Soph. Ant. 678.

NOTE. A sentence sometimes begins with an impersonal verbal in $-\tau \epsilon_{ov}$ and is continued with an infinitive, the latter depending on $\delta \epsilon i$ implied in the verbal. E. g.

Πανταχοῦ ποιητέον ἁ ἂν κελεύῃ ἡ πόλις καὶ ἡ πατρὶς, ἡ πείθειν αὐτήν. ΡΙΑΤ. Crit. 51 Β.

REMARK 1. The same impersonal construction is found in Latin, but very seldom with verbs which take an object accusative; as Eundum est tibi ($i\tau \acute{e}\sigma \imath \acute{e}\sigma \imath \acute{e}\sigma \imath$). — Moriendum est onnibus, — Bello utendum est nobis ($\tau \ddot{\varphi} \ \pi \circ \lambda \acute{e}\mu \varphi \ \chi \circ \rho \eta \sigma \acute{e}\sigma \imath \acute{e} \tau \imath \acute{e}\eta \acute{u} \vartheta$), we must employ war. See Madvig's Latin Grammar, § 421, a and b).

REMARK 2. The dative and the accusative of the *agent* are both allowed with the verbal in $-\tau \epsilon \omega$ (or $-\tau \epsilon a$); although in the equivalent construction of $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$ with the Infinitive the accusative is the only form regularly used. Thus we can say rouro $\eta \mu \hat{\iota} \nu \pi \omega \eta \tau \epsilon \omega \nu$ or rouro $\eta \mu \hat{a} s \pi \omega \eta \tau \epsilon \omega \nu$, but only rouro $\eta \mu \hat{a} s \delta \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$ mount out only rouro the second secon

APPENDIX.

I. ON THE RELATIONS OF THE GREEK OPTATIVE TO THE SUBJUNCTIVE AND THE INDICATIVE.*

FROM the time of the Alexandrian grammarians a special mood called the Optative ($\xi \gamma \kappa \lambda \iota \sigma \iota s \epsilon \iota \kappa \tau \iota \kappa \eta$) has been recognized in Greek as distinct from the Subjunctive ($\xi \gamma \kappa \lambda \iota \sigma \iota s \iota \tau \kappa \eta$). The ancient 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; $\pi o \iota \hat{\omega}$ and $\pi o \iota o \iota \mu$, 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 Kühner, who, indeed discards the common names Subjunctive 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 Grammalik, § 118, says : "The socalled Optative is nothing but a peculiar form of the Subjunctive, 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

^{*} 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.

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 chief 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-European 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 eori, 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 elements which the Greek developed into its Optative, and the Latin into its Subjunctive. (See Bopp's Vergleichende Grammatik, II. pp. 257-259.) 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 characteristic; for example, $pat\bar{a}ti$, bearing the same relation to the Present Indicative $pat\bar{a}ti$ as $\beta \omega \lambda \eta \tau at$ to $\beta \omega \lambda \epsilon \tau at$. 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 Greek 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 especially 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 betweeen the Greek and Latin moods. In clauses expressing a purpose or object after $l\nu a$, $\delta\pi\omega s$, &c., 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 faciat, and manebat ut hoc faceret, we have µένει ίνα τοῦτο ποιĝ, and έμενεν ίνα τοῦτο ποιοίη. But even in this case of strongest resemblance there is no place for the Future Optative, which corresponde to the Future Indicative. Again, in clauses expressing general suppositions after éau or ei, 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, in έαν τουτο ποιή θαυμάζουσιν, and εί τουτο ποιοίη έθαύμαζον, which 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 indirect 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 $a\nu$. 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 such expressions. Thus $\epsilon i\partial \epsilon \epsilon i n \mu$ is utinam sim, O that I may be; $\epsilon i \partial \epsilon \gamma \epsilon voiro, utinam fiat, O that it may happen; whereas$ $utinam esset and utinam factum esset correspond to <math>\epsilon i \partial \epsilon i \mu$ and $\epsilon i \partial \epsilon$ $\epsilon i \rho \epsilon n o$.

In ordinary protasis and apodosis the same relation is seen 'The four Greek forms, cav moin, cav moin on, el moioin, and el moin- $\sigma_{\epsilon,\epsilon}$, 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 two, 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 av is equivalent to the primary, not to the secondary, tenses of the Latin Subjunctive; thus, reinoau av is equivalent to faciam (not to fecissem, which would be $i\pi o i \eta \sigma a \, a \nu$). Here likewise the Subjunctive cannot be used in 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, although 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 constructions is perfectly well established in the Homeric language. It would be a mere gratuitous assumption to maintain that the exceptions (like II. 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 changed to the corresponding tense of the Optative. Thus, είπεν ὅτι å δύναιτο ποιήσοι, he said that he would do what he could, implies that the direct discourse was a av $\delta v v \omega$ - $\mu a \iota \pi o i \eta \sigma \omega$, 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 είπεν ότι à δύναιτο **\pio**toin, he said that he was doing what he could, where the direct discourse is a $\delta \dot{\nu} \nu a \mu a \iota \pi o \iota \hat{\omega}$, I am doing what I am able. One tense of the Optative, the Future, can never represent a Subjunctive, as that mood has no corresponding tense; but it always represents a Future Indicative. Nothing more need be said to show the absurdity of calling this tense a secondary tense of the Subjunctive. The three remaining tenses of the Optative can with no more propriety 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, the direct form. Thus, hyvoei ti πoin σειεν may mean either he

APPENDIX.

Incu not what he had done, or he knew not what he should do; as the direct question may have been either $\tau i \ \epsilon noinva;$ what did I do? or $\tau i \ noinva;$ (Aor. Subj.), 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 obx $\xi_{\xi\epsilon}$ is $\delta \eta \tau \rho i \eta \tau a and obx$ $<math>\epsilon l \chi ov \ \delta \eta \eta \tau \rho i \eta \sigma i \eta$, but a single example like $\eta \rho i \sigma w a \partial \tau \delta v \epsilon i \ dv a - \pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon i \epsilon v$, I asked him whether he had set sail (DEM. in Polyel, p. 1223, 21), in which $a v a \pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon i \epsilon v$ 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 retained in the Indicative in indirect discourse; thus εἰπεν ὅτι ἐμάχοντο means he said that they had been fighting, i. e. he said εμάχοντο. 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; ἀπεκρίναντο ὅτι οὐδεὶς μάρτυς παρείη, κομίζοιτο δε λαμβάνων καθ' όποσονοῦν δέοιτο "Αφοβος $\pi a\rho'$ avrav, they replied that no witness had been present, but that Aphobus had received the money from them, taking it in such sums as he happened to want. Here mapsin represents maphy, and κομίζοιτο represents exouigero, 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 Imperfect Indicative is the regular form?

We see then that the Optative was used in the whole class of constructions known 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

APPENDIX

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 IN-FINITIVE 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 discourse, is clearly stated in Sophoeles'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 Bourteral exterior, he wishes to go, from that in proir exterior, he says that he went. According to Madvig, however, the use of the Aorist Infinitive as a past tense is not confined to indirect 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 Madvio'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, $10, § 61: \tau \delta \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \mu a \kappa i \sigma \delta \kappa a \kappa i \delta \kappa a i \pi \alpha \delta \epsilon i \nu$, the fact 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. 41, τὸ δι' ήμῶς Πελοποννησίους αὐτοῖς μή βοηθήσαι, - XEN. Mem. 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 $\tau o \hat{v}$ 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 principle the Infinitive must refer to the past: y ev do Bu un, el mpo rov rovs Φωκέας απολέσθαι ψηφίσαισθε βοηθείν, εκφύγοι τα πράγματ' αὐτόν, 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.

ADDED IN THE THIRD AND FOURTH EDITIONS.

| Page AESCHINES. | Page HOMER. | Repub. IV, 434 A 115 |
|---|----------------------------------|--|
| In Ctes. § 10 168 § 114 . 207 | II. XI, 21 171 Odyss. II, 270 | V, 450 A 168 |
| | III, 92 . 115 IV, 167 . 138 | Sophocles. |
| ARISTOPHANES. Vesp. 109 54 | V, 216 . 171 VI, 113 . 77 | Elect. 47 171 948 227 |
| Vesp. 100 01 | XI, 489 . 129 XIII, 309 . 171 | 1478 171 |
| Demosthenes. | 2111,000 . 111 | Oed. Col. 1770 115 Philoct. 232 . 171 Trachin. 934 . 171 |
| De Falsa Legatione. p. 391, 11. § 159 99 | PLATO. | |
| 1 | Apol. 30 D | XENOPHON. |
| EURIPIDES. | Protag. 310 A . 25 313 C . 79 | Mem. IV, 3, 1 . 78 |
| Alcest. 386 25 | 317 A 208 317 D 25 | |

ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES (1873).

| | | | | | | | | | | | Page |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|----|------|---|---|---|---|---|------------|
| AESCHINES, in Ctes. § | 60 | | | | • | | | | | • | 143 |
| DEMOSTHENES, De Co | rona | , p. | 255, | 2, | § 88 | | • | • | | • | 8 |
| Herodotus, III, 31 | • | | • | | | • | | | • | • | 144 |
| Homer, H. I, 22 | | | | | | | • | • | | • | 190 |
| Plato, Men. 72 C | • | | | | • | • | | | • | • | 55 |
| " Crit. 51 B . | | | | | | | • | | | • | 234 |
| Sophocles, Aj. 1183 | | • | | | • | • | | | • | • | 143 |
| THUCYDIDES, IV, 16 | • | | • | • | • | | · | • | | • | 143 |

| ABSCHINES. In Timarch.— § 99 | | Page | 1 | | Page | 1 | Page |
|--|-------------|------------|----------------|---------|------|--------------------|-----------|
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | | | • | | | |
| | | | | • • | | Bell. Civ. II, 91. | 24 |
| | | | | • | | ARISTOPHANES. | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | • • | | | |
| | | 139 | | • | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 145 | | • • | | Aves, 36 | |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | | | • | | 54 | 179 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | • • | | | 115 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 110 | | | | | |
| | | 99 | | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | 786 | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | 824. | | 69 | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 7 | 835 | | 114 | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 162 | 865. | | | | |
| | §110 | 118 | | • • | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | § 123 | | | 157 | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | §147 | | | • • | | | |
| | § 177 | | | • | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | §248 | 227 | | 11, 51, | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | AESCHYLUS. | | | • | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Agam 15 | 202 | | • • | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 105 | | • | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 160 | 135 | 5ept. 30 | • • | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 253 | 198 | | . 37 | | | 25 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | • •••, | | 698 | 105 |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | · · . | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 2, 93 | | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | 754 | | 35 | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | 790 . | | 86 | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | 221 | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | | | |
| 594 106 Suppl. 495 43 367 185 Fun. 298 52 ANDOCIDES. 370 223 573 69 Myst. l, 6, 38i § 43 68 439 126 691 201 ANTIPHON. 493 53 83 800 181 De Caed. Herod. 505 186 520 174 Pers. 912 10 69 p. 131, 36. § 19 126 535 55 56 | | | | | | | |
| Eum. 298 . 52 ANDOCIDES. 370 . 223 573 . 69 Myst. 1, 6, 38i § 43 68 439 . 126 691 . 201 ANTIPHON. 505 . 186 Pers. 912 . 184 De Caed. Herod. 520 . 174 Prom. 10 . 69 p. 131, 36. § 19 . 126 535 . 156 | | | Suppl. 499. | • | 45 | | |
| 573 69 Myst. l, 6, 38, § 43 68 439 126 691 201 ANTIPHON. 493 83 800 181 De Caed. Herod. 505 186 Pers. 912 184 De Caed. Herod. 520 174 Prom. 10 69 p. 131, 36. § 19 126 535 555 | | | ANDOCI | IDES. | | | |
| | | | Myst. 1, 6, 38 | § 43 | 68 | | |
| 800 . 181 ANTIPHON. 505 . 186 Pers. 912 . 184 De Caed. Herod. 520 . 174 Prom. 10 . 69 p. 131, 36. § 19 . 126 535 . 156 | | | | - | | | |
| Pers. 912 . . 184 De Caed. Herod. 520 . 174 Prom. 10 131, 36. § 19 . 126 156 | | | | | ļ | | |
| Prom. 10. 69 p. 131, 36. § 19. 126 535. 156 | Pers. 912 . | | De Caed. | Herod. | 1 | 520 | 174 |
| | Prom. 10. | 69 | | | 126 | | |
| | 152 | 72 | i 133, 40. § 8 | 87. | 7 | 613 | 181 |

| Nubes, 723 208 | I. p. 15, 28. § 23 . 198 | III. p. 114, 15. § 15 17 |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| 792 110 | 16, 3. § 23 . 188 | |
| | | |
| 819 210 | 16, 25. § 26 51, 118 | 122, 21. § 45 217 |
| 904 110 | II. p. 20, 12. § 8 . 159 | 123, 1. § 46 183 |
| 1130 42 | 20, 18. § 8 113, 157 | 123, 16. § 48 60 |
| 1141 33 | 20, 27. § 9 45, 131 | 124, 25. § 54 84 |
| | | 104 04 154 155 |
| 1151 1 84 | 21, 1. § 10 . 45 | 124, 24. § 54 155 |
| 1250 129 | 21, 10. § 11 137 | 125, 10. § 56 80 |
| 1255 174 | 21, 20. § 12 10, 108 | 126, 19. § 61 194 |
| 1277 22 | 23, 14. § 18 47 | 128, 22. § 69 27, 130 |
| | | |
| 1301 38 | 23, 27. § 20 . 189 | 128, 25. § 69 80 |
| 1352 37 | $23, 29. \\ 0 194$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 1383 111 | 24, 12. § 22 . 196 | 130, 11. § 75 184 |
| 1426. 23 | 24, 23. § 23 120 | 130, 14. § 75 82 |
| | | |
| 1433 112 | 25, 2. § 24 . 120 | De Corona. |
| 1436 21, 43 | 25, 19. § 26 141 | p. 225, 13. § 1 . 227 |
| 1466 68 | 25, 24. § 26 . 188 | |
| Pac. 480 194 | III. p. 28, 5. § 1 . 197 | 232, 20. § 22 . 221 |
| | 0, 10, 10, 107 | 234, 5. § 26 . 161 |
| 1179 130 | 29, 18. § 3 . 197 | 234, 6. § 26 . 197 |
| Plut. 210 227 | 30, 10. § 6 71 | 234, 26, § 28 . 214 |
| 603 184 | 31, 1. § 9 . 42 | |
| 1027 44 | 31, 11. § 10 181 | 236, 12. § 32 . 75 |
| | | 236, 19. § 33 . 28 |
| Ran. 1 182 | $32, 16. \\ 14. 111$ | 236 20 5 33 . 31 240 |
| 68 191 | 34, 8. § 20 216 | 236, 28. § 34 . 111 |
| 96 & 98 139 | 34, 17. § 21 . 15 | |
| 298 186 | 35, 1. § 23 216 | 240, 15. § 43 . 113 |
| | | |
| 462 186 | | 242, 10. § 49 . 111 |
| 508, 509 . 35, 185 | Philipp. | 201 0 1 20 102 |
| 524 186 | I. p. 40, 1. § 1 . 144 | 243, 0. 0 33 . 193 |
| 579 93 | 1 | 246, 1. § 63 . 98 |
| | 40, 9. § 1 . 95 | 251, 28. § 79 . 95 |
| 586 51, 103 | 40, 18. § 2 . 33 | $257, 25. \\ 95 . 215$ |
| 695 199 | 41, 3. § 3 . 134 | |
| 830 113 | 41, 18. § 5 . 95 | |
| 866 99 | 49 1 4 6 10 120 | 268, 23. § 123. 36 |
| 871 178 | 42, 1. § 6 . 10, 130 | 268, 28. § 124 . 183 |
| | 43, 12. § 11 . 119 | 274, 28. § 141. 119 |
| 955 177 | 44, 12. § 15. 111 | 050 1 1 1/7 117 |
| 1120 68 | 44, 25. § 17 . 49 | |
| 1125 179 | 44, 30. § 18. 107 | 276, 23. § 148. 163 |
| 1378 178 | | 284, 21. § 169 . 151 291, 27. § 190 . 15 |
| | 45, 27. § 21 . 128 | 291, 27. § 190. 15 |
| 1446 136 | 47, 24. § 27. 135 | 291, 28. § 190 . 119 |
| 1449 117 | 51, 19. § 39 . 128 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 1459 142 | 52, 17. § 43 . 120 | 000 04 1000 117 |
| TLesm. 372 179 | | 296, 24. § 206 . 117 |
| 870 . 181 | | 301, 28. § 220. 213 |
| | 54, 18. § 50. 161 | 302, 24. § 223 . 117 |
| Vesp. 283 154 | 54, 20. § 50 . 103 | 304, 1. § 228 . 111 |
| 397 185 | 54, 22. § 50. 44 | 010 4 5 050 59 |
| r | 54, 27. § 51 . 131 | |
| DEMOSTHENES. | | 313, 6. § 258 . 87 |
| Olynth. | 55, 6 & 7. § 51 126, | 327, 1. § 303 . 5 |
| | 174 | 331, 30. § 322. 228 |
| l p. 9, 3, § 1 172 | II, p. 66, 15. § 3 70, 140 | |
| 9, 17. § 2 . 80 | 67, 20. § 8 139 | De Falsa Legatione. |
| 10, 1. § 2 . 137 | 68, 12. § 11 206 | p. 341, 12. § 1 . 71 |
| 12, 3. § 10 23, 203 | | |
| 10 00 110 40, 200 | | $341, 14. \S 2 \cdot 20$ |
| $12, 22. \\ 12$. 12 . 12 | 70, 25. § 20 114 | 342, 2. § 3. 42 |
| 13, 16. § 15. 140 | $\begin{array}{c} 70, 25. & 20 \\ 70, 25. & 20 \\ 15, 53 \\ to 71, 12 \end{array}$ | 342, 10. § 3 . 20 |
| 13, 25. § 15 . 191 | to 71, 12 | 342, 25. § 5 . 220 |
| 13, 27. § 16 . 12 | 71, 4. § 20 63 | |
| | 70 05 1 00 00 | |
| $14, 6. \\ 517 . 234$ | | 345, 14. § 14 51, 134 |
| 15, 6. § 20 . 122 | 74, 24. § 37 140 | 345, 27. § 16 20, 42 |
| 15, 22. § 22 . 154 | III. p. 110, 1 § 1 208 | 347, 26. 21 22, 158 |
| | • | |

| p. 350, 3. § 29 . 134 | | I, p. 828, 25, 26. § 49 29, |
|--|--|---|
| 351, 4. § 32 . 6 | p. 197, 9. § 23 . 8 | 152 |
| 351, 18. § 33 . 168 | | 829, 28. 52 . 104 |
| 351, 18. § 33 . 168 352, 26. § 37 . 158 | | |
| 002, 20, 901 . 100 | | $2 \begin{bmatrix} 830, 8. \\ 53 \end{bmatrix} = 120$ |
| 853, 14 & 18. § 39 158 | 203.12.55 | $\frac{1}{2}$ 831, 5. § 56 . 165 |
| 3 53, 24. § 40 49 | | 5 831, 10-12. § 56 59, |
| 354, 8. § 41 161 | 201, 0. 9 15 | 62, 158 |
| 354, 8. § 41 161 355, 17. § 45 . 79 | | 833, 12-19. § 63 95 |
| 255 20 4 47 107 | 107 00 5 107 00 | |
| 355, 29. § 47 . 197 | 100 0 1100 11 | |
| 356, 10. § 48 . 158 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | |
| 3 56, 13. § 48 . 157 | 505, 9. § 157 . 7 | 4 123 |
| 357, 3. § 51 . 64 | 505, 19. § 158. 19 | 3 II, p. 837, 10. § 5 . 218 |
| 360, 10. § 61 . 240 | | |
| | In Midiam. | |
| 864, 11 & 12. § 74 88, | p. 522, 18. § 24 . 19 | 6 839, 29. § 14 . 218 |
| 112 | 525, 3. § 33 9 | |
| 364, 18. § 74 45, 158 | | |
| 364, 25. § 75 . 215 | | 1 |
| | 530, 10. § 49 . 21 | 1 849 16 & 91 198 |
| | 535, 15. § 64 . 12 | 6 III - 042 15 (F 100 |
| 370, 22. § 94 . 79 | 536, 1. § 66 16 | 1 III, p. 846, 15. § 5 123 |
| 3 72, 1 . § 99 . 84 | 536, 25. § 69 . 12 | |
| 378, 4. § 120. 155 | 548, 17. § 104. 15 | |
| 378, 23. § 122 . 151 | 548, 17. § 104. 15 | |
| 379, 2. § 123 . 98 | 548, 20. § 104 . 16 | |
| 070, 7, 9120 . 90 | 548, 24. § 105. 16 | ⁸ p. 865, 24. § 7 . 163 |
| 379, 7. § 123 . 200 | 563, 26. § 151 . 7 | |
| 879, 15 & 17. § 124 13, | 582, 2. § 209 . 21 | |
| 158 | F00 15 1 011 10 | 1 000, 0 00 101, 100, |
| 381, 5. § 129 . 17 | 582, 15. § 211 . 18 | 101 |
| 381, 10. § 130 15, 158 | In Androtionem. | 869, 12. § 20 153, 239 |
| | p. 593, 14. § 2 . 15 | |
| 387, 6. § 148 . 15 | 506 17 4 11 | 870, 11. § 23 . 151 |
| 8 87, 17. § 149 . 199 | 596, 17. § 11 . 7 | |
| 3 88, 4 . § 150 . 14 | 598, 20. § 17 . 11 | 870, 27. § 25 . 161 |
| 8 88, 9. § 151 . 27 | 600, 5. § 22 . 13 | 873, 8. 533 . 24 |
| 388, 17. § 151 . 165 | 611, 10. § 59 . 15 | $[873, 10. \\ 33 . 211$ |
| 390, 5. § 156 . 64 | 613, 3. § 64 . 18 | T. Z |
| | | In Zenothemin. |
| 3 92, 1 3. § 1 63 . 202 | In Aristocratem. | p. 886, 1. § 14 . 34, 223 |
| 3 96, 30. § 177 24 , 160 | p. 623, 11. § 7 . 49, 7 | 317 |
| 402, 8. § 195 . 193 409, 25. § 221 . 188 | 624, 20. § 12 . 16 | in manufiante. |
| 409, 25. § 221. 188 | 627, 21. § 22 . 20 | |
| 410, 18. § 223 . 199 | 629, 2. § 26 . 19 | |
| 410 , 28. § 223. 23 | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| 410, 20, 9 225. 25 | $635, 15. \\ § 48 . 12$ | |
| 412, 21. § 229 31, 197 | 638, 25. § 58 . 23: | p. 1040, 20. § 5 . 40 |
| 416, 7. § 240 182, 183 | 640, 10. § 62 . 74 | The Olympic Learning |
| 416, 11. § 249 . 166 | 641, 9. § 64 . 22 | In Olympiodorum. |
| 419, 28. § 250 . 74 434, 6. § 289 . 86 | 659, 15. § 117 . 3 | |
| 434, 6. § 289 . 86 | | |
| 420 9 4 205 15 | 676, 12. § 167 . 20 | n 1104 19 6 95 165 |
| 439, 3 . § 305 . 15 | 683, 22. § 188 197 | p. 1194, 13. § 35 . 165 |
| 439, 29. § 309 . 141 | 688, 27. § 205 . 201 | 1194, 20. § 35 58, 158 |
| 441, 21. § 312. 5 9 | | 1201, 19. § 58 . 101 |
| 450, 27. § 342 . 60 | In Timocratem. | T D I I |
| | p.702,26.§9 . 199 | |
| De Pace. | 711, 8. § 35 . 118 | p. 1210, 5. § 12 . 224 |
| F 62, 10. § 20 199, 201 | | $1223, 20, 21. \\ 55$ 29, |
| | 733, 20. § 106. 76 | 151 000 |
| De Chersoneso. | , , | 1227, 2. § 67 . 165 |
| p. 90, 1. § 1 98 | In Aristog. I. | |
| 92, 21. § 11 . 198 | | De Coron. Trierarch. |
| 98, 25. § 35 . 205 | | p. 1228, 28. § 3 . 98 |
| 00 14 6 28 70 | In Aphobum. | |
| 99, 14. § 38 . 79 | I, p. 813, 4. § 1 . 205 | |
| De Symmoriis. | 813, 20. § 2 20. | |
| p 178, 17. § 2 . 44 | 814, 4. § 3 . 123 | 1300, 8. § 3 . 58 |
| 182, 3. § 14 225 | | |
| | | |

| p. 1303, 22. § 16 . 163 1303, 25. § 16 . 27, 128 1312, 17. § 44 20, 106 1319, 8. § 65 . 34 1320, 25. § 70 . 105 | Iph. Aul. 462 33 1478 204 Iph. Taur. 688 224 995 86 1014 31 | $\begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{I}, 36 & \cdot & \cdot & 69 \\ 37 & \cdot & \cdot & 107 \\ 39 & \cdot & \cdot & 98, 99 \\ 42 & \cdot & \cdot & 43 \\ 44 & \cdot & \cdot & 169 \end{vmatrix}$ |
|--|---|---|
| | 1108 . 5 | 44 172 |
| DINARCHUS. | 1203 . 179 | 44 |
| In Demosth. p. 91, 24 72 | Med. 1 177 | 61 207 |
| EUCLID. | 33 229 | 63 6 |
| 1, 9 21 | $79 \cdot 211$ | 67 142 |
| | 90229 | 68 7 |
| EURIPIDES. | 941 62 1151 (1120) 186, 187 | $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| Alcest. 11 199 | 1173 145 | 7569 |
| 52 106 | 1320 | 77 |
| 671 . 26, 108 | Orest. 379 141 | 82 |
| $755 \cdot 11, 108$ $758 \cdot 142$ | 418 135 | 88 150 |
| 784 150 | 680 221 | 84 |
| 801 208 | 746 227 | 85 5 |
| 1072 176 | 769 233 | 89 195 |
| Androm. 61 86 | | 94 193 |
| 333 . 179 | $1132 \cdot 119 \\ 1529 \cdot 31$ | 99 · · · 69 116 · · 29, 151 |
| 757 185 | Phoeniss. 92 . 84 | 129 |
| 929 . 106 | 504 217 | 136 145 |
| Bacch. 343 186 719 . 183 | 895 . 184 | 153 208 |
| 719 . 183 Cycl. 131 179 | 1590 . 185 | 165 81 |
| Elect. 126 175 | 1624 · 220 | 165 212 |
| 335 214 | Suppl. 1066 185 | 171 131 |
| 484 56 | 1084 . 119 | 187 94 |
| 962 179 | Troad. 874 203 | $190 \cdot \cdot \cdot 223$ |
| 967 37 | Aeg. Frag. 5 104 | 199 	 . 	 . 	 184 209 	 . 	 . 	 202 |
| 1 039 184 | Alcmen. Frag. 103 194 | II, 2 |
| $1061 \cdot 176$ | Beller. " 294 92 | 13 47, 131 |
| 1124 38 Hecub. 112 . 231 | Ino, " 417 126 | 15 207 |
| 730 205 | " 424 45 | 25 207 |
| 836 . 175 | Hippol. " 442 72 | 64 193 |
| 839 | 110 420 | $66 \cdot \cdot \cdot 225$ |
| 863 . 93 | Frag. Incert. 1057 46 | $115 \cdot \cdot \cdot 171$ $121 \cdot \cdot 164$ |
| 1042 183 | HERODOTUS. | 121 	 . 	 . 	 . 	 164 	 |
| 1056 . 182 | | 135 141 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | I, 1 | 143 142 |
| Heracl. 248 85 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 146 219 |
| 451 . 179 | 95 | 150 131 |
| 731 136 | 9 74 | 158 219 |
| 791 . 86 | 985 | $162 \cdot \cdot \cdot 33$ |
| Herc. Fur. 538 . 7 | 11 180 | 172 193 |
| 605 · 212 | $22 \cdot \cdot \cdot 14$ | III, 26 230 |
| | $\frac{24}{25}$ · · · 210 | $36 \cdot \cdot \cdot 74$ |
| $1059 \cdot 180$ $1417 \cdot 183$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $55 \cdot 193 \\ 62 \cdot 185$ |
| Hippol. 346 , 190 | 31 | 75 20 |
| 393 . 30 | 31 | 88 140 |
| 567 . 180 | 32 104 | 105 193 |
| 606 · . 186 | 32 145 | 108 193 |
| 1307 219 | 32 209 | 115 170 |
| 1410 · 174 | 33 141 | 119 48 |
| Ion. 1560 5 | 34 215 | 138 194 |

 $\mathbf{246}$

| III, 139 | 7 | I, 60 . | | . 10 | 7 II, 36 . | | . 38 |
|----------|-------------|----------|---------|---------------------|------------------|-----|-------------|
| JV, 46 | 133 | 61 . | | . 9 | 8 43, 45 | | . 7 |
| 78 . | 48 | 66 . | | . 1 | 5 80. | • | . 102 |
| 118 | 35 | 81 | • | . 10 | | • | . 8 |
| 118 | 97 | 82 . | • | 121, 14 | | • | 203 |
| 118 | 184 | 107 | • | | | • | |
| | | | • | . 19 | | • | . 196 |
| 136 | 227 | 118 | • | | 8 127. | • | 203 |
| 156 | 16 9 | 120 . | • | . 17 | 0 139 . | 10 |), 128, 179 |
| 184 | 206 | 128 . | • | . 10 | 2 182. | | 204 |
| V, 25 | 204 | 132 . | | . 17 | 2 214 . | | . 204 |
| 49 | 224 | 135 . | | . 11 | | | . 179 |
| 101 | 201 | 136 . | | | 7 250 . | • | . 112 |
| VI, 9 | 200 | 137 | . 65 | , 104, 15 | 1 252. | • | . 77 |
| 12 | 195 | 139 | | , 101, 10 | 5 259 | • | |
| 23 | 218 | 150 | • | | | • | . 174 |
| | | | • | . 18 | | • | . 190 |
| 27 | 130 | 151 . | • | . 20 | | • | . 143 |
| 45 | 146 | 159 . | • | . 21 | | • | . 178 |
| 49 | 169 | 161 . | • | . 15 | 8 364 . | • | . 102 |
| 50 | 227 | 163 . | | . 13 | 3 381 | | 67 |
| 104 | 218 | 166 . | | . 10 | 8 435 . | · . | . 180 |
| 108 | 212 | 174 . | | 56, 7 | 8 665. | . • | . 228 |
| 136 | 223 | 178 . | | c , c | 2 780 . | • | . 222 |
| | 174 | 191 . | • | . 15 | | • | |
| VII, 5 | 146 | 193 | • | | | • | . 168 |
| 10 | | | • | . 12 | , [···· , ··· · | • | . 33 |
| | 228 | 218 . | • | . 13 | al °* | • | . 182 |
| 18 | 138 | 281 . | • | . 17 | | • | . 76 |
| 53 | 184 | 232 . | • | . 11 | | • | . 48 |
| 54 | 146 | 242 . | • | • 12 | | • | . 178 |
| 111 | 227 | 244 . | • | . 17 | | | . 197 |
| 153 | 140 | 255 . | • | . 10 | | | . 102 |
| 154 | 204 | 258 . | • | . 19 | 6 288 | | . 104 |
| 158 | 228 | 262 . | • | . 18 | 1 291 . | | . 143 |
| 168 | 233 | 302 . | | . 11 | 2 317 | | . 155 |
| 213 | 155 | 322 . | | . 17 | 8 366 . | • | . 33 |
| 220 | 31 | 324 . | 57 | , 104, 18 | 2 428 | • | . 177 |
| 235 | 81 | 338 . | | 20 | | • | . 139 |
| ViII, 22 | 121 | 344 . | • | . 7 | 1 -00 - | • | |
| 35 | 19 | 355 . | • | . 9 | 0 1 1 13 | • | . 175 |
| 100. | 199 | 363 . | • | . 18 | 1 110 . | • | . 55 |
| 143 | 211 | 408 . | • | . 11 | z 191 | • | . 138 |
| IX, 12 | 199 | 482 . | • | . 2 | | • | . 180 |
| 14, 13 | | | • | | | • | . 128 |
| 91 | 228 | 437, 439 | • | | 249 . | | . 156 |
| 57 | 219 | 465 . | • | | 8 313 | | . 175 |
| 61 | 19 | 493 . | • | . 12 | | | . 92 |
| HESIOD. | | 498 . | • | • 22 | 335 | | . 168 |
| Op. 1 | 8 | 509 . | • | . 14 | 3 404 | · . | . 180 |
| op.1 | • | 518 . | • | . 12 | 3 418 | • | . 179 |
| Homer. | | 522 . | • | . 6 | 8 482 . | • | . 133 |
| Iliad. | | 524 . | | 68, 11 | 2 V, 66 | • | . 100 |
| | 004 | 555 , | | . 8 | 85 | • | |
| L, 8 | 204 | 558 . | | 7 | | • | 53, 101 |
| 11 | 172 | 564 . | | . 9 | al 127 | • | . 70 |
| 13 | 217 | 580 . | · . | · 11 | 4 230 . | • | . 212 |
| 18 | 174 | 582 . | | . 20 | 1 220 | • | . 22 |
| 20 | 209 | 586 . | • | . 22 | 1 410 . | • | . 107 |
| 26 | 181 | 589 . | • | . 19 | 290 | • | . 81 |
| 27 | 2 27 | | • | . 21 | . 200 - | • | . 106 |
| 28 | 40 | 601 . | • | | 1 011 | | . 101 |
| 29 | 146 | II, 3 . | | . 7 | | • | . 104 |
| 82 | 69 | 8. | | . 17 | 3 388 | | 101 |
| 56 | 171 | 10 . | | . 20 | | | . 133 |
| | | | · · · · | | • | | |

| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | T 000 |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 433 170 | 817 135 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 456 61 | 321 51 | 390 110 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 329 · 142 | 892 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | V1, 49 101 | | 40 100 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 164 175 | | 59 204 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 177 | XIV. 247 129 | 111 67 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 261 | 158 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | 111, 19 • • 15 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 350 177 | XV, 70 143 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 361 77 | 195 221 | 205 174 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 448 | 213 104 | 223 105 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | VU. 28 105 | XVI,84 69 | IV. 97 177 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 303.305 . 7 | 242 68 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 322 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | 1/1 • • • • • • • • • |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | • • |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | 363 . 95 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 36 67 | | 477 146 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 125 | XVIII. 86 177 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 333 . 6 | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | XIX 50 177 | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | ALA, 05 · · 111 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | 735 75 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | IX, 42 207 | 423 210 | V. 2 67 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 121 181 | XX, 26 104 | 57 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 100 210 | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | 3 85 168 |
| | 897 128 | XXI. 327 7 | 465 184 |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 500 | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 580 146 | VII, 171 48 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | XXII 317 6 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 702 128 | 280 191 | VIII. 20 69 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 704 | | 138 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 274 102 | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 526 101 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 659 656 7 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 222 118 | | 451 228 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 437 197 | | 523 - [11 . 132 |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 488 | XXIV, 253 177 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | AI, 20 204 | | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | Odyssey. | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | XII 25 69 223 | T 40 198 | 554 76 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 167 - 179 199 | 1, 10 120 | X. 175 . 145. 146 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 41 51, 129, 175 | XI 441 200 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 00 00 | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 332 139 | 94 115 | XII, 17 34 |
| 437 146 205 76 295 170 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | AUI, 12/ · · · 03 | 1 417 · · · 127 | . 154 |

 $\mathbf{248}$

| XIII, 209 | p. 311 C. § 7 . 160 | p. 60 C. § 95 . 31 |
|--|--|--|
| 214 13 | p. 311 C. § 7 . 160 315 A. § 24 . 198 | 60 D. § 96 . 35 |
| 215 18 | | 64 B. § 113 . 140 |
| 365 7 | | 70 B. § 142 . 111 |
| 376 7 | P.116 A. § 1 . 217 | 73 D. § 157 . 115 |
| XIV. 68 17 | 121 A. § 26 . 211 | 77 C. § 175 . 220 |
| XIV, 68 17 156 13 | 126 C. § 51 . 206 | 78 C. § 179 . 222 |
| 181 6 | 128 C. \$ 60 . 86 | 79 D. § 185 . 140 |
| 312 6 | 134 A. 987 . 94 | |
| 883 13 | | Philipp. |
| 372 104 | | p. 87 A. § 23 151 |
| 440 174 | | 93 C. § 56 . 95 |
| 496 204 | F8- | 101 A. § 93 181 |
| XV, 263 180 | [P. 1 0 1. 9 00 0 1. 1.1. | 104 D. § 110 . 195 |
| 457 204 | 1 11 D. VOI . 100 | 109 B. § 133 . 160 |
| 458 139 | | |
| 509 185 | | Plataic. |
| XVI. 24 | - 000 (1 / 47 107 | p. 303 E. § 38 . 81 |
| XVI, 24 | | Trapezit. |
| | Demon. | p. 360 C. § 11 . 214 |
| $ \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 0.0.1.0 | 361 D. § 15 . 169 |
| | | |
| XVII, 21 207 | 0 1 1 10 107 | 363 B. § 22 . 40 |
| 250 71 | 9 C. § 33 . 10 | |
| | 1 11 (2 & 49 101) | LYCURGUS. |
| 362 . 78 | 11 0. 9 10 1 1 101 | In Leocrat |
| 475 92 | Evag. | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 539 56 | p. 193 D. § 24 . 11 | p. 154, 9 50 260 |
| 549 102 | 200 C. § 56 . 17, 222 | |
| 593 | Helen. | 199,901 80 |
| XVIII, 132 . 133 | Ilelell. | LYSIAS. |
| 272 123 | | |
| 402 . 210 | Nicocl | III Aguiata |
| XIX, 463 226 | n 15 B & 3 18 | p. 131, § 15 168 |
| XX, 121 33 | 16 C Å 8 105 | 133, § 45 . 162 |
| XXI, 194 182 | 1 18 4 4 18 74 | 100, 904 |
| 201 175 | 92 B & 37 74 | 101.010 . 00 |
| XXII, 139 180 | | 137, § 78 108 |
| 262 34 | , n | 139, § 94 . 118 |
| 414 130 | Pac. | In Alcib. II. |
| XXIII, 43 146 | p. 160 C. § 9 . 222 | p. 145, § 8 117 |
| 134 69 | 162 D. § 18 . 103 | De Arist. Bon. |
| 309 212 | | p. 156, § 51 32 |
| XXIV, 334 69 | 186 D. § 139 . 214 | 157, § 61 . 123 |
| | Panathen. | In Eratosth. |
| Hymn. in Apoll. 1 182 | | |
| | p. 241 D. § 44 . 216 | 123, § 32 . 100 |
| ISAEUS. | 254 A. § 103 . 141 | 124, § 48 100 |
| Cleon. § 26 | Panegyr. | 127, § 74 . 163 |
| Dicaeog. § 12 . 22 | p. 43 D. § 14 21 | 127, § 76 167 |
| Menecl. § 10 . 39, 138 | | |
| Philoct. § 35 . 40 | | De Morte Eratosth. |
| | 110. 410 . 110 | p. 95, § 34 18 |
| IsocRATES. Aeginet. | 48 B. § 38 . 23 49 B. § 43 . 205 | Or. Funebr. |
| Agrinat | 49 B. § 43 . 205 49 C. § 44 . 139 | |
| Aeginet. p. 888 D. § 22 . 86 | 49 C. § 44 . 139 49 E. § 45 . 205 | p. 192, § 22 162 194, § 42 . 194 Or. X. |
| p. 888 D. § 22 . 80 | 49 E. § 45 . 205 55 C. § 73 . 181 | 194, § 42 . 194 |
| Antid. | 1 00 0. 9 / 0 . 101 | Or. X. |
| | 1 00 D. 0 /4 . 20 | - 117 1 05 157 |
| p. 70, § 115 19 | | Or. XXVIL |
| 78, 122 . 19 | 58 B. § 86 . 222 | |
| 119, \$ 270 . 20 | | p. 178, §§ 8, 9 59 |
| | 11 * | |

11 *

| In Philoer. | Apol. 42 A | . 191 | Gorg. 479 A 68 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------|----------------------------------|
| p. 182, § 12 20 | Charm. 156 A | . 160 | |
| 182, § 13 . 37 | 163 A | . 84 | |
| 101, 9 10 . 07 | 164 B | 137 | 481 A . 76 |
| MENANDER. | 171 E | . 127 | 482 A 226 |
| Col. Fr. 6 46 | | - 178 | |
| Frag. Incert 41. 19 | 396 C | . 144 | 484 D 221 |
| | | 208 | |
| Monos. 45 , 36 | | | 486 B . 52 |
| 387 197 | | • 21 | 487 D . 35, 74 |
| 397 37 | 430 E | 83 | 489 C . 5 |
| MIMNERMUS. | 436 B | . 83 | 499 C 208 |
| | 436 B . | 87 | 500 C . 215 |
| I , 2 51, 174 | Crit. 43 B . | • 70 | 502 B 228 |
| NOV. TESTAM. | 44 C | 98 | 503 A . 74 |
| | 44 D . | . 177 | 506 B 144 |
| Matth. XI, 3 6 | 45 B | 52 | 506 C . 43 |
| XXVI, 24 . 97 | 46 A . | . 22 | 515 B 74 |
| Luc. IX, 40 78 | 46 B | 194 | 516 E . 94 |
| Joh. XIII, 34 . 78 | 47 D , | . 8 | 516 E 112 |
| n í | 48 C | 114 | 517 B 208 |
| PHILEMON. | 49 A . | . 234 | 522 E 86 |
| Frag. Incert. 29 46 | 49 B | 36 | |
| | 50 A | | |
| PINDAR. | 50 B | . 159 | 525 E 227 |
| Ol. XI(X), 34 . 67 | | 171 | Hipp. Maj. |
| XIII, 92 . 145 | 51 B | . 217 | 301 A 20 |
| XIII, 92 . 145 XIV, 30 . 68 | 51 E | 14 | Ion. 535 B 139 |
| Pyth. VIII, 20 . 45 | 52 C . | . 14 | Lach. 194 A 120 |
| IX, 196 . 211 | 62 D | 14 | 196 C . 83 |
| | 52 D . | . 14 | Leg. IV, 712 E 55 |
| | Critias, 108 C . | 46 | V, 736 B . 22 |
| VII, 68 . 56 | Euthydem. | | V, 736 B . 22 VI, 759 E . 209 |
| Isthm. IV, 16 . 105 | 272 E . | . 227 | X. 902 D. 224 |
| Plato. | 275 E | 161 | XI, 917 E . 45 |
| | 275 E . | | XII, 959 B . 73 |
| | 276 E | • 223 | Lys. 210 D 200 |
| Apol. 17 C 181 | | 161 | 214 E . 129 |
| 17 D 127 | 278 D . | • 21 | 215 B 126 |
| 18 C 116 | 283 C . | 75 | 215 B 129 |
| 20 B 168 | 283 E . | · 222 | |
| 21 A 151 | 290 A . | 113 | |
| 21 B 38 | 295 C . | . 146 | Men. 74 B 119 |
| 21 B 151 | 296 D . | 174 | 79 D 231 |
| 21 C 151 | 97 296 E . | 170 | - 89 B 73 |
| 21 D . 124, 125 | 296 E . 5 | 2/222 | 89 E 123 |
| 22 B 47 | 802 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 |
| | Euthyphr. | | |
| 29 A 189 | 4 E . | . 82 | |
| 29 C. 56 | 12 D . | | |
| 29 C 207 | | 101 | 59 D . 144 |
| | 13 D . | . 61 | 60 A 171 |
| | 14 A . | 61 | 60 C . 35 |
| | 14 C . | . 95 | 62 C 145 |
| | 15 D . | 40, 50 | 63 A . 217 |
| $\frac{36}{27}$ R · · · 40 | Gorg. 447 D . | . 101 | 66 E 233 |
| 37 B 42 | 450 D . | 207 | 68 B . 105 |
| 87 C 137 | 457 E . | . 86 | 70 A 81 |
| 39 A 83 | 461 E . | 218 | 71 C . 198 |
| 89 A 206 | 462 E . | . 83 | 72 C 51 |
| 40 B 219 l | 476 D . | 189 | 72 D . 191 |
| | | | |

| Phaed. 73 A . | . 94 | II, 360 B . | . 140 | X, 609 B 79 |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 84 E . | 84 | 360 C . | . 64 | 614 A . 20 |
| 90 D . | . 196 | 365 D . | . 206 | 614 B 193 |
| 91 C . | 82 | 368 B . | . 80 | 615 D 56 |
| 91 C . | . 112 | 372 E . | . 183 | 620 D 111 |
| 95 D . | 154 | 374 D . | . 113 | Soph. 242 A . 199 |
| 98 D . | . 192 | 375 C . | . 227 | Symp. 173 B . 196 |
| 100 B . | 6 | 376 A . | . 26, 28 | 174 D . 193 |
| 101 D . | . 169 | 376 C . | . 36 | 175 C. 15 |
| 102 D . | 217 | 379 B . | . 134 | 186 B . 226 |
| 108 E . | . 199 | III, 393 E . | . 40 | 188 A . 45 |
| 117 E . | 198 | 397 D . | . 37 | 193 E . 49 |
| Phaedr. 227 D | . 141 | 398 A . | . 64 | 194 D . 139 |
| 228 A . | 92 | 398 B . | 139 | 199 A . 69 |
| 228 E | . 183 | 408 () . | . 92 | 199 D . 101 |
| 228 E . | 203 | 412 A . | . 38 | 202 D . 62 |
| 229 A | . 204 | 412 B . | . 36 | 208 D . 217 |
| 230 A . | | 412 D . | . 129 | 212 E . 37, 183 |
| 232 B | . 47 | 415 B . | 78 | 213 D . 77 |
| 232 E . | 146 | 415 C . | . 32 | 215 A . 208 |
| 251 B | . 199 | 415 E . | . 194 | Theaet. 142 A . 120 |
| 257 C. | 81 | 416 C . | . 134 | 143 E . 49 |
| | | | | 143 F . 45 |
| 263 E 266 A | . 183 145 | IV, 427 E . | · 43 · 200 | 145 A 208 |
| | | | | |
| 276 A | . 194 | 430 A . | · 40 | |
| 279 C . | 174 | 433 B . | | |
| Phileb. 13 A. | . 82 | 433 E • | . 76 | 155 A . 129 |
| 15 D . | 183 | 439 B . | . 64 | 158 B . 232 |
| 39 C . | . 216 | 439 E . | . 153 | 183 E . 8 |
| 63 A . | 10 | V, 451 A. | . 82 | 209 E 31, 1 88 |
| Politic. 264 A | . 191 | 455 B | . 156 | Theag. 123 B . 101 |
| 302 B . | 196 | 457 C . | . 180 | Tim. 18 C 39 |
| Protag. 313 A | . 101 | 473 D . | . 103 | 18 E 40 |
| 314 C . | 225 | VI, 485 C. | . 208 | 31 B 18 |
| 316 C | . 33 | 489 B . | . 94 | 90 E 195 |
| 318 D . | 226 | 490 C . | . 193 | SIMONIDES. |
| 320 A | . 211 | 492 E . | . 184 | |
| 328 B . | 45 | 495 E . | . 197 | Frag. 5 221 |
| 329 B | . 107 | 501 C . | · 143 | Sobular |
| 332 D . | 26 | 502 A . | . 21 | SOPHOCLES. |
| 835 C | . 173 | 508 C, D | . 137 | Aj. 20 5 |
| 835 D . | 173 | VII, 515 D. | • 53 | 75 , . 186 |
| 338 C | . 207 | 515 E . | • 64 | 122 220 |
| 839 C . | 221 | 515 E . | . 145 | 281 231 |
| | | 522 A . | . 8 | 389 61 |
| De Republic | | VIII, 549 B | . 129 | 403 183 |
| I, 827 C. | . 115 | 549 E | . 78 | 496 105 |
| 327 C | 232 | 553 A | . 21 | 536 25 |
| 828 C. | . 228 | 557 B . | . 129 | 550 174 |
| 329 A | 220 | 561 C | . 233 | 555 1 44 |
| 330 A . | . 157 | 561 E . | . 21 | 560 184 |
| 837 A | 163 | 564 C | . 74 | 567 78 |
| 337 A . | . 78 | 556 B . | . 194 | 572 |
| 837 E | 78 | 567 A | . 69 | 674 45 |
| 839 A . | . 78 | 568 B . | . 221 | 715 172 |
| 841 B | 184 | IX, 573 C . | . 14 | 986 68 |
| 352 E . | . 64 | 580 B . | • 183 | 1082 46 |
| 854 B | 201 | X, 595 B . | 208 | 1221 52 |
| 11, 358 B | . 115 | 595 C . | . 233 | 1334 181 |
| 858 C | 221 | 607 C . | . 21 | 1335 205 |

| Aj. 1418 . | 0 | 11 Oed. Col. 667 | 199 | Phil. 961 . 14 |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Antig. 22 . | 202, 2 | | | Phil. 961 . 147 969 . 173 |
| 41 . | 78, 1 | 50 761 | | 978 8 |
| 44 | | 25 816 | | 1253 191 |
| 61 . | . 1 | | | 1342 103 |
| 69 | | 52 956 | | |
| 76 . | | 1040 | | Trach. 25 81 |
| 91 . | . 19 | | | 196 215 |
| 97 . | . 20 | | | 197 	 . 	 . 	 211 	 226 	 . 	 . 	 201 |
| 98 . | | 1528 | | |
| 178 . | . 1 | | | 545 191 |
| 185 . | . 1 | | 195 | 604 |
| 228 | 12 | | 199 | 631 83 |
| 240 . | . 1 | | . 133 | 687 169 |
| 242 . | . 2 | | 67 | 801 181 |
| 272 . | . 1 | | . 159 | 944 109 |
| 278 . | | 505 | 145 | 973 184 |
| 872 . | . 1 | | . 179 | 978 185 |
| 375 . | . 12 | | 170 | 1129 81 |
| 390 . | | 580 | . 215 | 1183 186 |
| 443 . | . 20 | | 186 | 1233 |
| 444 . | . 1 | | . 183 | |
| 484 | | 3 736 | 146 | Hippon. Fr. 280 . 172 |
| 534 . | . 17 | | . 138 | Trene |
| 544 . | . 20 | | . 27, 143 | THEOCRITUS. |
| 547 . | . 29 | | . 21, 143 | Id. I, 4 102 |
| 580 . | . 18 | | 172 | Transastra |
| 605 . | . 10 | | | THEOGNIS. |
| 666 . | 1. 18 | | | Vs. 126 145 |
| 678 . | . 23 | | • 44, 215 • 177 | 153 5 |
| | | | | |
| 685 . | . 17 | | | THUCKDIDES |
| 685 · | . 17 | 1281 | 133 | THUCYDIDES. |
| 710 . | . 10 | | · · 133 · 202 | I, 1 219 |
| 710 . 1063 . | . 10 | $\begin{array}{cccc} 70 & & 1281 \\ 19 & & 1232 \\ 11 & & 1245 \end{array}$ | 133 . 202 169 | $\begin{smallmatrix} I, 1 & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . &$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . | . 10 . 23 . 17 | $\begin{array}{cccc} & & 110 \\ & & 1281 \\ 09 & & 1232 \\ 01 & & 1245 \\ 9 & & 1293 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133 \\ \cdot & 202 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 169 \\ \cdot & 205 \end{array}$ | $\begin{smallmatrix} I, 1 & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . &$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . | 10 23 11 32, 19 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 133 . 202 . 169 . 205 228 | $\begin{smallmatrix} I, 1 & . & . & . & 219 \\ 2 & . & . & . & 17 \\ 2 & . & . & . & 226 \\ 2 & . & . & . & . & 194 \end{smallmatrix}$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . | 10 23 17 32, 19 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 133 202 169 . 205 228 . 72, 202 | $\begin{matrix} \mathbf{I}, 1 & . & . & . & 219 \\ 2 & . & . & 17 \\ 2 & . & . & . & 226 \\ 2 & . & . & . & 194 \\ 3 & . & . & . & 15 \end{matrix}$ |
| $\begin{array}{cccc} 710 & . \\ 1063 & . \\ 1168 & . \\ 1173 & . \\ 1253 & . \\ 1255 & . \end{array}$ | 10 23 11 32, 19 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} & & 133 \\ & & 202 \\ & & 169 \\ & & 205 \\ & & 228 \\ & & 228 \\ & & 72, 202 \\ & & & 72 \end{array}$ | $\begin{matrix} I, 1 & . & . & . & . & 219 \\ 2 & . & . & . & 17 \\ 2 & . & . & . & 226 \\ 2 & . & . & . & 194 \\ 3 & . & . & . & . & 15 \\ 8 & . & . & . & . & 223 \end{matrix}$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . | 10 23 11 32, 19 . 2 32, 19 . 11 | 70 1281 19 1232 31 1245 79 1293 31 1368 34 1387 30 1391 33 Phil. 75 | 133 . 202 169 . 205 228 72, 202 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . | 10 23 32, 19 32, 19 . 11 . 11 . 11 | 1281 19 1232 19 1232 19 1293 11 1245 19 1293 11 1368 34 1387 10 1391 13 Phil. 75 35 103 | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133 \\ \cdot & 202 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 169 \\ \cdot & 205 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 72, 202 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & 19 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 184 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 333 . | . 10 . 22 . 17 . 32, 19 . 4 . 11 . 11 . 18 . 6 | | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133 \\ \cdot & 202 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 169 \\ \cdot & 205 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 72, 202 \\ \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & 19 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 184 \\ \cdot & 231 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 333 . 637 . | · 10 · 23 · 17 · 32, 19 · 4 · 11 · 11 · 11 · 12 · 6 · 11 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133 \\ \cdot & 202 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 169 \\ \cdot & 205 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 72, 202 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & & 72 \\ \cdot & & 184 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot & & 139 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 333 . 637 . | · 10 · 23 · 17 · 32, 19 · 8 · 11 · 11 · 18 · 6 · 11 · 15 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133 \\ \cdot & 202 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 169 \\ \cdot & 205 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 72, 202 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & 19 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 184 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot & 139 \\ \cdot & 189 \\ \cdot & 180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 333 . 637 . 697 . 1029 . | · 10 · 23 · 17 · 32, 19 · 8 · 11 · 11 · 18 · 6 · 11 · 18 · 6 · 11 · 18 · 6 · 11 · 18 · 6 · 11 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 637 . 697 . 1029 . | · 10 · 23 · 17 · 32, 19 · 4 · 11 · 11 · 11 · 12 · 12 · 12 · 12 · 12 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 169\\ \cdot & 205\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 72, 202\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 19\\ \cdot & 184\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 180\\ \cdot & 52\\ \cdot & 201\\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1252 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 637 . 697 . 1029 . 1052 . 1172 . | . 10 . 22 . 17 . 32, 19 . 8 . 10 . 11 . 12 . 14 . 14 . 14 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133 \\ \cdot & 202 \\ \cdot & 169 \\ \cdot & 205 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & 19 \\ \cdot & 184 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot & 139 \\ \cdot & 189 \\ \cdot & 52 \\ \cdot & 201 \\ \cdot & 79 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| $\begin{array}{cccc} 710 & \cdot \\ 1063 & \cdot \\ 1168 & \cdot \\ 1173 & \cdot \\ 1253 & \cdot \\ 1255 & \cdot \\ 1339 & \cdot \\ 1339 & \cdot \\ 1339 & \cdot \\ 1339 & \cdot \\ 1052 & \cdot \\ 1052 & \cdot \\ 1052 & \cdot \\ 1172 & \cdot \\ 1205 & \cdot \end{array}$ | 100 223 1732, 193 32, 193 101 111 111 112 112 113 114 113 114 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 169\\ \cdot & 205\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 19\\ \cdot & 184\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 189\\ \cdot & 180\\ \cdot & 52\\ \cdot & 201\\ \cdot & 79\\ \cdot & 231\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 637 . 637 . 637 . 1029 . 1052 . 1172 . 1205 . Oed. Col. 12 . | 100 220 170 32, 100 32, 100 100 110 1000 100 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133 \\ \cdot & 202 \\ \cdot & 169 \\ \cdot & 205 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 72, 202 \\ \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & 19 \\ \cdot & 184 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot & 139 \\ \cdot & 139 \\ \cdot & 139 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot &$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 637 . 697 . 1029 . 1029 . 1052 . 1172 . 1205 . 0ed. Col. 12 . 16 | 10 22 17 32, 18 32, 19 10 110 110 110 120 121 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 169\\ \cdot & 205\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 19\\ \cdot & 184\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 184\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 52\\ \cdot & 201\\ \cdot & 79\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 288\\ \cdot & 83\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 100 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 169\\ \cdot & 205\\ \cdot & 226\\ \cdot & 226\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 19\\ \cdot & 184\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 189\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 201\\ \cdot & 79\\ \cdot & 201\\ \cdot & 79\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 83\\ \cdot & 77\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 637 . 697 . 1052 . 1172 . 1205 . Oed. Col. 12 . 16 . 16 . 16 . 17 . 18 . 19 . 10 . | 100 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 169\\ \cdot & 205\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 72, 202\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 19\\ \cdot & 184\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 201\\ \cdot & 79\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 83\\ \cdot & 77\\ \cdot & 92, 179\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 10 22 12 32,16 8 11 11 12 14 20 20 20 21 21 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 333 . 637 . 637 . 1029 . 1052 . 1052 . 1052 . 1205 . Oed. Col. 12 . 166 . 49 . 52 . 83 | 100 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 169\\ \cdot & 205\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 19\\ \cdot & 184\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 184\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 52\\ \cdot & 201\\ \cdot & 79\\ \cdot & 201\\ \cdot & 79\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 83\\ \cdot & 77\\ \cdot & 92, 179\\ \cdot & 179\\ \cdot & 179\\ \cdot & 231\\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 333 . 637 . 697 . 1052 . 1172 . 1205 . 1205 . Oed. Col. 12 . 16 . 16 . 16 . 16 . 17 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 . 0 | 10 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 169\\ \cdot & 205\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 72, 202\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 19\\ \cdot & 184\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 231\\$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| $\begin{array}{ccccccc} 710 & & \\ 1063 & & \\ 1168 & & \\ 1173 & & \\ 1253 & & \\ 1255 & & \\ 1339 & & \\ Elect. 81 & & \\ 333 & & \\ 697 & & \\ 333 & & \\ 697 & & \\ 1029 & & \\ 1052 & & \\ 1172 & & \\ 1205 & & \\ 1172 & & \\ 1205 & & \\ 1172 & & \\ 1205 & & \\ 1172 & & \\ 1205 & & \\ 697 & & \\ 1029 & & \\ 697 & & \\ 1029 & & \\ 697 & & \\ 1029 & & \\ 697 & & \\ 1029 & & \\ 697 & & \\ 1029 & & \\ 697 & & \\ 1029 & & \\ 697 & & \\ 1029 & & \\ 697 & & \\ 1029 &$ | 10 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133 \\ \cdot & 202 \\ \cdot & 205 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & 72 \\ \cdot & 19 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot & 139 \\ \cdot & 184 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot & 139 \\ \cdot & 189 \\ \cdot & 52 \\ \cdot & 201 \\ \cdot & 79 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 83 \\ \cdot & 77 \\ \cdot & 92, 179 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot & 43 \\ \cdot & 43 \\ \cdot & 185 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 333 . 637 . 637 . 1029 . 1052 . 1052 . 1052 . 1052 . 0ed. Col. 12 . 166 . 49 . 52 . 83 . 84 . 170 . 174 . 174 . 174 . 106 . 106 . 107 . 1 | 10 23 17 32, 18 11 11 11 11 12 14 14 14 20 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 12 12 12 14 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 10 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 169\\ \cdot & 205\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 19\\ \cdot & 184\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 139\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 228\\ \cdot & 83\\ \cdot & 77\\ \cdot & 221\\ \cdot & 271\\ \cdot & 231\\ \cdot & 179\\ \cdot & 178\\ \cdot & 154\\ \cdot & 113\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 10 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133 \\ \cdot & 202 \\ \cdot & 205 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 201 \\ \cdot & 139 \\ \cdot & 184 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 201 \\ \cdot & 2$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 710 . 1063 . 1168 . 1173 . 1253 . 1255 . 1339 . Elect. 81 . 333 . 637 . 637 . 1029 . 1052 . 1052 . 1052 . 1052 . 1052 . 0ed. Col. 12 . 16 . 36 . 49 . 52 . 83 . 84 . 170 . 174 . 176 . 810 . 810 . 810 . 810 . 810 . 810 . 1063 . 1073 . 1074 . 810 . 1074 . 107 | 10 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 203\\ \cdot & 205\\ \cdot & 225\\ \cdot & 202\\ \cdot & 72\\ \cdot & 199\\ \cdot & 189\\ \cdot & 189\\ \cdot & 183\\ \cdot & 211\\ \cdot & 221\\ \cdot & 165\\ \cdot & 154\\ \cdot & 113\\ \cdot & 215\\ \cdot & 183\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 10 | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \cdot & \cdot & 133 \\ \cdot & 202 \\ \cdot & 205 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 201 \\ \cdot & 139 \\ \cdot & 184 \\ \cdot & 231 \\ \cdot & 228 \\ \cdot & 201 \\ \cdot & 2$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |

| $ \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 3 45 | | 107 | | |
|--|--------|---|-------------|---|-----------|
| | I, 45 | • | . 167 | II , 2 1 51 III , 33 . | . 170 |
| | | • | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | | |
| | | • | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 62 . | • | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | | |
| | | • | | | |
| | | • | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | 13 11, 151 88 | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | 13 204 89 . | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | 167 98 . | . 137 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | 18 35, 229 102 . | 206 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | 20 . 35, 59, 158, 229 114 . | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | 21 167, 172 IV, 4 . | 190 |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | 24 168 13 . | . 155 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | • | | | 133 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 83 . | | | 34 (2 examp.) 27, 130 24 . | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 86, 88 | • | | | . 14, 158 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 90 . | 5 | 88, 54, 150 | 39 219 28 . | 158 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 90 . | | | 40 160 29 | 226 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 90 . | | . 151 | 41 62 36 . | . 208 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 91 . | | . 6, 167 | | 168 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 91 . | | | | . 219 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 91 . | | . 170 | 46 | 190 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 91 . | | . 193 | | . 43 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 95 . | | . 167 | 49 | 224 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 101 . | | . 36 | 56 191, 197 115 | 42 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 103 . | | . 140 | 59 220 121 . | . 42 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 108 . | | . 36 | 60 80 125 | . 225 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 111 . | | | | . 75 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 113 . | | . 140 | 60 172 133 | 34, 227 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | . 224 | 60 229 V. 9 . | . 61 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 115 . | | . 36 | | . 209 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | . 217 | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 116 . | | · 224 | | . 209 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 117 . | | . 86 | 63 61 30 . | . 224 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 118 . | | . 31 | 64 | . 42 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | · 224 | 64 132 35 . | . 226 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 121 . | | . 88 | 65 137 49 | . 164 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | . 224 | | . 224 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 126 . | | . 81 | 72 154 63 | . 193 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | . 214 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 128 . | | . 214 | 89 46 82 | . 60 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | . 215 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | 82, 85 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | . 5 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | . 5 | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | 143, 162 | | . 42 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | |
| 142 117 28 42, 160 16 47 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | 32 165 17 | . 22 |

| 177 10 | | | | | 60 | |
|-----------|---|---|---|-----|------------|--|
| VI, 18 | ٠ | | ٠ | | 63 | VII, 70 23 I, 10, 6 226 |
| 18 | | ٠ | | 190 | , 199 | 70 191 10, 9 81 |
| 20 | | | | | 6 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| 20 | | | | | 174 | 72 23 10, 16 160 |
| 21 | | | | • | 105 | 77 87 10, 17 155 |
| | • | | • | • | | |
| 25 | | ٠ | | • | 233 | 80 164 II, 1, 3 152 |
| 29 | • | | ٠ | • | 169 | 84 81, 197 1, 4 95 |
| 80 | | | | • | 61 | 85 219 1, 6 204 |
| 31 | | | | | 7 | VIII, 9 169 1, 8 156 |
| 81 | • | | - | | 74 | |
| 87 | | • | | • | 59 | |
| | • | | • | • | | |
| 38 | | ٠ | | • | 60 | 5542 1, 23151 |
| 50 | ٠ | | ٠ | • | 203 | 65 234 2, 12 184 |
| 50 | | | | | 234 | |
| 54 | | | | 78 | , 192 | <u>68</u> . 8, 214 3, 6 163 |
| 57 | • | | | | 42 | 0,0 100 |
| 58 | | • | | • | 211 | |
| | • | | • | • | | |
| 59 | | ٠ | | • | 216 | 74 42 3,13 194 |
| 61 | • | | • | • | 34 | TYRTAEUS. 3, 18 58, 158 |
| 61 | | | | | 42 | 2 10 150 |
| 61 | | | | | 146 | XII, 35 109 $3, 20$ |
| 61 | • | | | • | 165 | 0,40 |
| | | • | | • | 60 | XENOPHON. 3,24 143 |
| 66 | • | | • | • | | Anabasis. 3,25 141 |
| 74 | | ٠ | | • | 7 | I, 1, 1 |
| 75 | • | | ٠ | • | 32 | 1, 2 |
| 77 | | | | • | 6 | |
| 78 | | | | | 98 | |
| 82 | | | | | 208 | |
| 88 | | • | | • | 206 | 1, 5 132 4, 19 |
| | • | | • | • | | 1, 6 |
| 96 | | • | | • | 36 | 1 10 111 4, 22 214 |
| 96 | ٠ | | ٠ | • | 71 | 2, 1 . 218 5, 13 56 |
| 100 | | • | | • | 115 | 2, 1 |
| 102 | | | | | 158 | |
| | | | | | | $egin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
| VI, 1 | | ٠ | | • | 111 | |
| 2 | • | | • | • | 34 | 3, 6 . 62 $0, 21$. 230 |
| 5 | | | | | 87 | |
| 6 | | | | 2 | 3, 61 | 3, 8 |
| 10 | | | - | | 109 | 8, 14 229 III, 1, 2 154 |
| 11 | | • | | • | 42 | |
| | • | | • | • | | 3, 15 . 232 1, 13 199 |
| 13 | | • | | • | 111 | 3, 17 |
| 15 | ٠ | | ٠ | • | 232 | 3, 17 52, 86 1, 16 146 |
| 17 | | ٠ | | • | 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 0 921 0 0 1c1 |
| | | • | | • | | 5, 9 231 2, 9 161 |
| 28 | ٠ | | ٠ | • | 111 | 5, 13 23 2, 10 223 |
| 34 | | ٠ | | • | 206 | 6, 2 199 2, 25 26 |
| 39 | | | • | • | 80 | 6,8.171 2,27.9,67 |
| 42 | | | | | 59 | 7,379 2,2925 |
| 44 | | | | | 224 | 7, 3 218 2, 36 52 |
| 46 | • | | • | • | 43 | 7, 7 |
| | | • | | • | | |
| 47 | ٠ | | • | • | 159 | 8, 12 |
| 48 | | ٠ | | • | 134 | 8, 13 75 4, 29 81 |
| 50 | • | | ٠ | • | 211 | 9, 10 166 4, 49 . 122, 142 |
| 56 | | • | | • | 42 | 9,13 132 5,8 81 |
| 59 | | | | | 168 | 9,21 67 5,7 206 |
| 60 | ÷ | | ŕ | | 168 | 9, 27 132 5, 11 199 |
| 61 | | • | | • | 61 | 10, 4 |
| | | | | • | | xv, ∓ • • ∴∴v 0,10 • • 104 |
| | • | | | | 75 | 10 8 11 128 2 10 10 |
| 67 | Ī | • | | • | 75 | 10,5 11, 155 5, 18 . 167 |

| 1V , 1, 5 , , 194 | I, 4, 23 . | | . 146 | V, 2, 12. | . 82, 8 | 85 |
|---|------------------------|-----|-------------------------|--|------------|---------|
| 1,6 81 | 4,25 | | . 68 | 2,22 | 2 | 19 |
| 2, 4 142 | 5, 12 . | | . 197 | 3, 13 . | | 51 |
| | 0,14. | • | | | • • • | 10 |
| 2, 10 110 | ə, 13 - i | • | 128 | 3,27 . | • 1 | 03 |
| 4,6.207 | 5, 13 5, 14 6, 3 | | . 74 | 3,55. | . 29, 1 | 30 |
| 5, 13 108 | 6.3. | | . 129 | 3,55 . | . 1 | 08 |
| 5, 30 29, 145 | 6,7. | | . 76 | 4, 17. | | 40 |
| 0,00 40,140 | | • | | | | |
| 6,10 75 | 6,7 | • | . 138 | 4,30 . | | 03 |
| 8,7 157 | 6, 10 | | . 80 | 4,35. | 1 | 08 |
| 8, 14 201 | 6,18 | | . 63 | 5,13 . | . 9, 1 | 03 |
| V, 1, 1 161 | 6,18 | | . 227 | 5.21. | | 21 |
| v , <u>1</u> , <u>1</u> | 0,10 . | • | | 0, 21. | | |
| 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 | . 2 | 25 |
| 4, 16 223 | 6,32 . | | . 201 | 1, 40 | 2 | 06 |
| | 11 1 2 | • | . 28, 105 | | | |
| | II, 1, 8 . | • | | 2,30 . | | 85 |
| 6, 22 79 | 1, 9 . | • | . 119 | 2, 39 | | 14 |
| 7, 5 145 | 1,21 . | | . 68 | 3, 19 . | . 2 | 07 |
| 7, 26 20, 81 | 1, 30 | | . 137 | 4, 17 | 2 | 05 |
| VI. 1. 17 | 1, 31 . | • | . 129 | VII, 1, 10 . | . 47, 1 | 01 |
| | 1, 01 4 | • | | vII, I, IU. | | |
| 1, 19 7 | 2,3. | • | . 88 | 2, 19 | 1 | 50 |
| 1, 25 163 | 2, 8 . | | . 167 | 3,3 . | . 1 | 71 |
| 1, 26 165 | 2, 9 2, 16 | | . 167 | 3, 7 | | 67 |
| 1, 28 | 2 16 | | . 220 | 3, 13 . | | 84 |
| 1,20 | 2,10 | • | | 0,10. | | |
| 1, 29 157 | 2, 20 | • | . 224 | 3, 17 | • • | 77 |
| 4,9 126 | 3,5. | • | . 27 | 5,6. | . 1 | 42 |
| 5, 6 132 | 4,7. | | 29, 150 | 5, 73 | 2 | 14 |
| 6, 24 | 4,10 | | . 135 | 5,81 . | | 69 |
| 0, 21 | 4, 12. | | . 68 | <i>z</i> 00 | • | 0.0 |
| 6, 25 161 | | • | | 5, 82 | • • • | 31 |
| ♥Π , 1 , 2 218 | 4,17 | • | . 52 | 5,82 . | • | 80 |
| 1, 7 203 | 4,23. | | . 199 | VIII, 1, 5 | 1 | 79 |
| 1, 16 162 | 4, 31 | | . 138 | 1, 10 | | 40 |
| 1, 33 | III, 1, 1. | | . 86 | 1, 10 | · 1 | 61 |
| 1,00 • • 09 | 111, 1, 1, 1 | • | | | • • • | 101 |
| 3, 11 . 9, 1 03 | 1, 1 | • | . 113 | 1, 43 | • 40, 1 | 14 |
| 3,13 154 | 1, 3 . | • | 39, 161 | 1, 44 | . 75, 1 | 44 |
| 8,43 35 | 1,8 . | , | . 68, 171 | $2, 21 \\ 2, 25$ | . 1 | 10 |
| 4, 2 69 | 1,9. | | . 199 | 2 25 | . 1 | 95 |
| | 2, 1 | • | . 163 | 2, 5 . | • • • | 96 |
| 6, 21 97 | 4,1 | • | | 0,0. | | |
| 7, 11 11, 105 | 2,8. | • | . 184 | 3, 42 | | 89 |
| 7,31 81 | 2,12 | | . 211 | 4, 16 | 155, 1 | 56 |
| 7,55 164 | 2, 13 | | 77, 103 | 5, 12 | 1 | 37 |
| | 2, 15 | _ | . 218 | 5, 28 | | 24 |
| Cyropaedia. | 2, 25 | • | . 216 | 7, 15 | | 86 |
| I, 1, 2 130 | 4, 40 | • | | | • • . | 14 |
| 2, 1 | 2, 26 | • | . 41 | 7, 23 | • 1 | 14 |
| 2, 1 205 | 3, 31 | • | . 199 | 7, 25 | ' | 62 |
| 2,1 • • • 203 | 3,60 | | . 211 | 7, 27 | . 2 | 06 |
| 2, 2 45, 109 | | - | | | | |
| 2,8145 | IV, 1, 1 | • | . 163 | Heller | | |
| 2, 8 206 2, 16 94 3, 1 . 197 218 | 1, 18 | • | . 77 | I, 1, 16 . | 2 | 23 |
| 2.16 | 2, 7 | | . 22 | 6,7 | . 1 | 62 |
| | 3, 10 | | . 211 | 6, 32 . | i î | 85 |
| 3, 1 . 197 218 | 0,10 | • | , 206 | | | |
| 8, 3 219 | 3, 11 | • | | 7,5 | | 63 |
| 3, 5 & 6 . 210 | 8, 15 | • | • 33 | 7,26 . | | 21 |
| 8,9,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | 4,4 | • | 11 , 152 | 7,28 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | 03 |
| 8, 11 143 | 5, 15 | | . 206 | II, 1, 4 . | | 51 |
| 9,11 • • 140 | 5, 37 | | . 144 | | 0 | 177 |
| 8, 18 83 | 2, 11 | • | | 1,6 . | 39, 137, 1 | 11 |
| 4, 2 81 | 5,46 | • | . 197 | 3,2. | 39, 137, 1 | చర |
| 4,7.168 | V, 1, 3 . | | 227, 228 | 8,11 . | 39, 188, 2 | 07 |
| 4,13 155 | 1, 25 | . ' | . 202 | 3,51. | 1 | 30 |
| 4, 14 . 145, 168 | 2, 20 | • | . 81 | 4,1. | | 25 |
| | 2,9. | • | | | | 06 |
| 4.21 . 168 | 2.9 | | . 212 | 4.8. | 2 | υØ |

| 111 | [1, 20 | | | | | 165 | ιI, | 2, 7 | | | | 6 | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------|---|---|---|----------|-------------|--------------|------------------|---|-----|-----------|--------------|--------------------|------|-----|-----|------------|
| | 2,6 | • | | • | | 164 | | 2, 7 | • | | • | | | • | ٠ | | 213 |
| | 2, 13 | | • | | • | 226 | | 2, 18 | | • | • | 16 | 2,3 | • | | ٠ | 80 |
| | 2, 19 | • | | • | | 225 | | 2, 10 | • | | • | 1 22 | | • | ٠ | | 78 |
| | 2, 20 | | • | | 149 | 168 | | 2, 22 | | • | • | 21 | | • | | ٠ | 214 |
| | 3, 6 | • | | | 1.10 | 202 | | 2, 22 2, 36 | • | | • | 18 | | • | ٠ | | 30 |
| | 8, 9 | | • | | • | 75 | | | | • | • | | | • | | ٠ | 83 |
| | 5,9 | • | | • | | 208 | | $2, 46 \\ 2, 55$ | • | | • | 176 | | • | ٠ | | 129 |
| | 5, 10 | | • | | • | - 86 | 1 | 2, 63 | | • | • | 197 218 | | • | | ٠ | 232 |
| 837 | | • | | • | | | | 3, 8 | • | | • | | | • | ٠ | | 134 |
| | , 1, 36 | | • | | ٠ | 199 | | 3,6 | | • | • | 160 207 | | • | | • | 46 |
| | 1, 38 | • | | • | • | 10 | | 4, 19 | • | | • | 172 | | • | ٠ | | 80 |
| | 1, 38 | | • | | 29 | , 174 | | 5, 10 | | • | • | 203 | | • | | п, | 108 |
| | 4, 15 | • | | • | | 203 | | 5,2 5,3 | • | | ° ., | | | • | • | | 18 |
| | 7, 3 | | • | | • | 160 | | 5, 4 | | • | 0 | 7,107 129 | | • | | • | 59 |
| | 8, 2 8, 16 | • | | • | | 162 70 | | 6.9 | • | | • | 196 | | • | • | | 216 |
| | | | • | | • | | 1 | 7, 2 | | • | • | 234 | | • | | • | 156 |
| | 8, 23 | • | | • | | 205 | | 7, 8 | • | | • | 129 | | • | ٠ | | 68 |
| v | 1, 14 | | ٠ | | ٠ | 203 | TT | | | • | • | | 1 1 2 | • | | • | 190 |
| | 1, 18 | ٠ | | ٠ | | 178 | II, | 1, 15 | ٠ | | • | 197 | | • | • | | 11 |
| | 1, 19 | | ٠ | | ٠ | 214 | | 1, 16 | | ٠ | • | 199 | | • | | 477 | 51 |
| | 2, 2 | • | | ٠ | | 162 | | 1, 17 | • | | • • | 37, 93 | | • | • ' | ±,, | 109 |
| | 2, 29 | | ٠ | | ٠ | 15 | | 1, 18 | | • | • | 129 | | • | | • | 197 172 |
| | 2, 32 | ٠ | | ٠ | | 161 | | 1, 25 | ٠ | | • • • | 185 | | • | • | | 1/2 |
| | 2, 86 | | ٠ | | • | 191 | | 2, 3 | | • | З. | l, 141 | | | | | |
| | 4, 7 4, 7 4, 8 | ٠ | | ٠ | | 23 | | 2, 3 3, 3 | • | | • | 134 | 1 | | | • | 168 |
| | 4,7 | | ٠ | | ٠ | 33 | | 3,3 | | • | • | 225 | 1 11, | 1 | • | | 207 |
| | 4,8 | ٠ | | ٠ | | 161 | | 3, 4 3, 9 | • | | • | 172 | 1 1, | 6. | | • | 168 |
| | 4, 9 | | ٠ | | • | 223 | i i | 3, 9 3, 12 | | • | • | 192 | 1.1. | 2 | • | | 137 |
| VI | , 1, 5 | • | | ٠ | | 132 | | 6, 12 | • | | • | 129 | 1 47.14 | | | • | 109 |
| | 1, 14 | | ٠ | | • | 86 | | 6, 29 | | • | • | 126 | Apol. § 14 | • | • | | 178 |
| | 4,6 | ٠ | | ٠ | | 161 | | 6, 32 | • | | • | 161 223 | Cyneg. III, | 8. | | • | 196 |
| | 4, 26 | | ٠ | | • | 219 | | 7, 10 | | • | • | 3 98 | Hier. VIII, | 8 | ٠ | | 179 |
| - | 4, 27 | ٠ | | • | | 40 | | 7, 13 | • | | • | 141 | XI, | 15 | | • | 184 |
| VI. | I, 1, 23 | | • | | • | 150 | [| 9,2 | | • | • | 82 | Hipp. IX, | 2 | • | | 77 |
| | 1, 34 | | | • | | 152 | | 9, 2 | • | | • | 129 | Oecon. I, | 2. | | • | 188 |
| | 1, 34 | | • | | • | 164 | | 10, 2 | | • | • | 68 | IV, | 4 | • | | 183 |
| | 1, 35 | ٠ | | • | | 150 | m | | • | | • | 223 | VII, | | | • | 74 |
| | 1, 38 | | ٠ | | • | 153 | , , , | 1, 3 | | • | • | | VII, | 20 | • | | 139 |
| | 2, 9 | ٠ | | ٠ | | 2 03 | | 2, 1 2, 3 | • | | • | 74 | VII, | 39 | | • | 52 |
| | 8, 7 | | ٠ | | • | 135 | | 2, 3 3, 3 | | • | | 9,67 | VIII, | 8 | • | | 172 |
| | 4, 84 | • | | ٠ | | 161 | | 3, 11 | • | | 100 | 178 | XII, | 19 | | • | 207 |
| | 4, 87 | | ٠ | | • | 142 | | 5, 1 | | • | 192 | , 197 183 | XIII, | 4 | • | | 191 |
| | 4, 39 | ٠ | | • | | 155 | | 5,6 | • | | • | 130 | XV, | 2. | | • | 163 |
| | 5, 3 | | ٠ | | • | 4 0 | | 5, 24 | | • | • | 228 | XX, Rep. Ath. I | °., | • | | 77 |
| Memorabilia. | | | | | | 6, 8 | • | | • | 233 | Pop Log V | 10 | e | • | 127 | | |
| T | 1, 5 | | | | | 94 | | 6, 16 | | • | • | 233 | Rep. Lac. X | | 0 | | 36 |
| - | 1, 13 | • | | - | | 168 | | 8, 8 | • | | • | 196 | Symp. II | , 11 | | • | 81 |
| | 1, 16 | | - | | - | 59 | | 8, 10 | | • | • | 207 | III IV | , 0 | • | | 202 |
| | 2, 1 | - | | - | | 205 | | 11, 1 | • | | • | 234 | 11 | , 26 | | | 172 |
| | 8,8 | | | | | 198 | | 12, 6 | | • | . • | 205 | VII VII | , 20 | • | | 214 |
| | 2, 6 | | | - | | 169 | | 13, 3 | • | | 196 | , 206 | viii viii | | | • | 76 74 |
| | | | | | ^ | | | , • | | • | | , | . 4111 | , 40 | • | | 13 |

ENGLISH INDEX.

N. B. The figures refer to Pages.

Absolute, Genitive, 222, 225, 232; Accusative, 224, 225.

Antecedent, definite or indefinite, 121, 122, 123 - 125.

Aorist, Indicative, 24. Distinguished from Imperf., 7, 8, 91. 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 av in Apod., 56, 93-96; rarely referring to present time, 101. Gnomic, 45; with $\pi o \lambda$ λάκις or ηδη, 46; in Hom. similes, 46; a primary tense, 49; see Aor. Inf. Iterative, w. av, 47 ; iterative forms in - σκον, -σκόμην (w. av, in Hdt.), 47, 48.

, in dependent moods, 25-36. How distinguished from Present, 8 (R.). See Contents, Chap. II.; and Subj., Opt., Imperat., and Infin.

—, Subjunctive, 26-28. As Fut. Perf., after ἐπειδάν, &c., 26. How distinguished from Perf. Subj., 28. With μή in prohibitions, 180. With σύ μή, 184.

Optative, 28 - 30. After ἐπειδή, &c.,
 29. In indirect quotations and questions,
 29, 30; ambiguity of, in indirect questions,
 30.

prohibitions (for Aor. Subj.), 181.

—, Infinitive, with indef. time, 30-32. After χράω, θεσπίζω, &c., 31; see Present. After airás είμι, 32. In indirect quotation, referring to the past, 82, 33. Used for the Future: after verbs of hoping, promising, &c., 32; after verbs of thinking, saying, &c., 33. After λέγω and eirov, to command, 34. Primary trans. 53. In a gnomic sense, 46, 47. With a n a podosis, 59, 113, 114, 157; see "Av.

- -----, Participle, 34 36. With $\lambda a\nu \delta^{\rho} \nu_{\nu}$, $\delta^{\rho} \delta^{\mu} \nu_{\nu} \lambda c$, coinciding with the verb in time, 34; with $\pi \epsilon \mu o \rho \delta \omega$, cc, 35. With $\delta \mu o \lambda o \gamma \epsilon \omega$, 36. With $\epsilon \tau \omega$, as periphrastic Per., 229. With $\epsilon \sigma o \mu a$, as periphr Fut. Per., 44. Primary or secondary tense, 64. As protasis, equiv. to Aor. Ind., Subj., or Opt., 110, 217. With $\delta \nu$ in apodosis (never in protasis), 59, 113, 114, 159; sec Av.
- Apodosis, defined, 87, 125; see Protasis.
- Assimilation in conditional Relative clauses, 135, 136.
- Causal sentences, 171 173; see 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; see 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 -réos, 233, 234.

Dependence of moods and tenses, 48-54.

- Direct Quotations, distinguished from indirect, 147; introduced by öτι, 171.
- Exhortations, Imperative in, 178. Subj. in, 179. Opt. in (poet.), 175. Fut. Ind. in, w. öπως (8C. σκόπει), 78, 79.
- Fear, caution, and danger, expressions of, 80-87. Followed by μj w. Subj. or Opt., 80, see Object clauses; by μj w. Fut. Ind. (seldom), 82; by μj w. Pres. and Past tenses of Indic., 83-85; by ωe or $\delta \pi \omega s$ w. Indic. (as in Indir discourse).

85; by Fut. Inf., 85; by ϵi , whether, $\ddot{\sigma}\pi\omega_5$, how, &c., 85; by a causal sentence with $\ddot{\sigma}\tau_i$, 86; by Infin., 86, 87, 190.

- Final clauses (*pure*), after *iva*, ω_5 , $\bar{\sigma} \omega_5$, $\bar{\sigma} \phi_{pa}$, and $\mu \dot{\eta}_5$, 67 - 73; distinguished from object clauses, &c., **66**, 67. Sulj, and Opt. in, 67. Fut. Ind. in, 68. Subj. in, after secondary tenses, 70. Secondary tenses of Indic. in, 72. 'Aν or $\kappa \epsilon$ in: with Subj. 69; w. Opt., 69, 70.
- Final and Object clauses w. $\delta\pi\omega_5$ and $\delta\pi\omega_5$ $\mu\eta_5$ after verbs of striving, effecting, &c., 73 - 80. Fut. Ind. in, 73, 74. Subj. or Opt. in, 73, 74 ; Fut. Opt. 74, 39. "Oras $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ w. Subj. in, 76. Homeric construction In, 76, 77. M η (without $\delta\pi\omega_5$) in, 77. ' Ω_5 for $\delta\pi\omega_5$ in, 77. After verbs of exhorting, forbidding, &c, 77, 78 ; rarely introduced by $\delta\nu_a$, 78 ; see $\delta\nu_a$. "Oras or $\delta\pi\omega_5 \mu\eta$ w. Fut. Ind., by ellipsis of the leading verb, 78 (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 $\mu\eta_-$

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. $\delta\pi\omega_S$, $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$, $\mu\dot{\eta}$, 68. With $\delta\pi\omega_S$ or $\delta\pi\omega_S$, $\mu\dot{\eta}$, after verbs of striving, effecting, &c. 73. With $\delta\pi\omega_S$ or $\sigma\sigma\omega_S$, $\mu\dot{\eta}$, in exhortations and prohibitions (sc. $\sigma\kappa\delta\pi\epsilon\epsilon$), 78. With $\mu\dot{\eta}$, after verbs of fearing, 82. In Protasis w. $\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}$: expressing a future condition, 103 ; expr. a present intention, &c., 93. In Rel. clauses expr. a purpose, 137. With $\delta\dot{\mu}\dot{\eta}$, 184 – 187. With $\delta\dot{\mu}$: in Homer, 55 ; in Attic, 56. Periphtrastic form of, w. $\mu\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega_3$, 38.
 - , Optative, in indirect quotation, 38. After $\ddot{\sigma}\pi\omega_5$ or $\ddot{\sigma}\pi\omega_5 \mu \eta$, 39 – 41, 73, 74.
- ——, Participle, 43. Expressing a purpose, 217, 214. With άν (rarely), 60. Primary or secondary terse, 53.
- Future Perfect, Indicative, 43-45. Compound forms of: Perf. Part. w. ἐσομαι, 44; rarely Aor. Part. w. ἐσομαι, 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 Perf.
- Hindrance, verbs implying, w. Infin., 198-202. See Infinitive.
- Hoping, promising, &c., verbs of, w. Fat. Infin., 43; w. Pres. Infin., 14; w. Acr Inf., 32, 33.
- Imperative, 2. Tenses of, see Present, Perfect, &c. Not used w. $\check{\alpha}\nu$, 57. In commands, exhortations, &c., 178; w. $\check{\alpha}\gamma$ e, $\phi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon$, $i\partial t$, 178; second person w. $\pi \tilde{\alpha}s$, 179. After ologo 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 Final 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 av, in Apodosis, 56, 93-96. Iterative, w. av. 47; iterative forms in - σκον and - σκόμην (w. av, in Hdt.), 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 av, see "Av. Fut., in Final and Object clauses after $\ddot{o}\pi\omega\varsigma$, &c.; see Future. Secondary tenses of, in Final clauses, 72. Present and past tenses of, after µή, lest, 83-85. Present and past tenses of, in Protasis, 92. Secondary tenses of, in both Protasis and Apodosis (av 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 Rel sentences, 141. In condi tional Rel. sentences : present and past tenses, 125 ; secondary tenses (implying non-fulfilment of a condition), 126. For 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 a purpose, 137. Fut. after έφ' μ and έφ' ώτε, 140. After ώστε, 140. After έως, &c., until, 142; second. tenses, referring to a result not attained, 143. After mpiv, 145; distinguished from Infin., 144, 145, 210. In indirect quotation after öre and ws, and in indir. questions, 149, 150; 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. Future after ov μή, 185, 184 ; see Future.

- Indirect Questions, 147; see Contents, Chap. IV, Sect. IV.
- Indirect Quotation, 147 171; see Coatents, Chap. IV, Sect. IV. Moods used in, see Indicative, &c. Tenses used in, see Present, &c.; and Contents, Chap. II.
- Infinitive, 2, 188-212. Tenses of, 212; see Present, &c., and Contents, Chap. II. With $\ddot{a}\nu$, see "A ν . After verbs of fearing, 86, 87, 190. In Apolosis, 113. In indirect quotations, 147, 148, 157-159. After $\ddot{a}\phi \epsilon \lambda \rho \nu$ in wishes, 176, 177. Fut. w. où $\mu \dot{\eta}$, in indir. quot., 185. See Contents, Chap. V.
- Interrogative Subj., 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 Verbs of fearing, &c., 66, 80. Subj. and Opt. in, 80. M $\dot{\eta}$ and $\mu\dot{\eta}$ ov in, 80, 67. How related to Final clauses, 66, 81. Fut. Ind. in, 82. "O $\pi ws \mu\dot{\eta}$ (= $\mu\dot{\eta}$) in, 82. M $\dot{\eta}$ air w. Opt. (in Apod.) in, 82, 83. M $\dot{\eta}$ alone w. Subj., by ellipsis of the leading verb, 83. M $\dot{\eta}$ w. present and past tenses of Indic. in, 83-85, foot-note $\dot{\dagger}$ to 54. Other constructions allowed in, see Fear, caution, and danger.
- Optative, 2, 174. Its relations to the Indic. and Subjunctive., Appendix I. Tenses of, see Present, &c.; when primary and when secon daw, 50-53. With iva, öπως,

&c., in pure Fin. clauses, 67. With öπως and önus µn, after verbs of striving. &c ... (seldom), 73, 74. With µý, after verbs of fearing, &c., 80. In Protasis w. ei, 91: in particular suppositions, 105; in general suppos., 107, 108. In Apodosis w. av, 57, 105, see 'Av : w. Protasis suppressed, 112; 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 Ews, &c., until, 142, 143; implying a purpose, 143, 166. 168 (d). After πρίν, 145. In indirect quotations and questions, 148; see Contents, Chap. IV, Sect. IV. In causal sentences, 172. In wishes, 173, 174; expressing concession or exhortation, 175. Future, 38 - 41; rarely w. ov µή, after ώs in indirect quotation, 185.

- Participle, 3, 213–232. Tenses of, see Present, &c. With $\tilde{a}\nu$, see 'Ar. Conditional (as Protasis) representing Indic., Subj., or Opt., 217, 110. As Apodosis (with or without $\tilde{a}\nu$), 113. In indirect quotation, 159, 229. See Contents, Chap. VI.
- Particular and general suppositions, how distingui-hed, 88, 89.
- Perfect Indicative, 18, 19. Why primary, 18. Compound form of, 18. Of certain verbs, in sense of Present, 19. In epis ties, 19. Referring to the future for emphasis ($\delta \lambda \omega \lambda \alpha$), 19. Not used w. $\dot{\alpha}\nu$, 56. Geomic, 45; see Perf. Infin.
- in dependent 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; v. ωφελον in wishes, 176, 177; primary or secondary tense, 53; w. ω, 59; in a gnomio sense, 47; as Pluperf. Infin., 23 (Rem.), 59. Partic., 23; primary or secondary, 53.
- Pluperf.et, 18, 19. Compound form of, 18. Of certain verbs, in sense of Imperf., 19. Sometimes usurly = Aor. (Hom. and Hdt.), 19. Expressing past certainty, &c., 19. In Final clauses, 72. In Protasis and Apodosis, how distinguished from Imperf. and Aor., 96 (b). With a_{ν} , in Apod., 56, 93, 94. How expressed in Infin. and Partic., 23 (Rem.)-

- Present, Indicative, 4. Expressing a general truth, 4, 46; an attempted action, 5. With adverbs of past time (as πάλαι), 5. Of certain verbs, in sense of Perf., 5. Of verbs signifying to hear, to learn, &c.,
 6. Of e*i*μι, as Fut., sometimes as Pres.,
 6. Expressing likelihood, intention, or danger, 6. Not used w. άν, 55. Historic,
 6; a secondary tense, 49.
- , in dependent moods, 8-17. How distinguished from the Aor., 8. See Contents, Chap. II.; and Subj., Opt., Imperat., and Infin.
- -----, Subjunctive, 9, 10. In first person, in prohibitions w. μή, 180; see Aor. Subj. With οὐ μή, 184.

....., Optative, 10 - 12. In indirect quotations and questions, 11; ambiguity in indirect questions, 12.

- μή, 180. See Aor. Subj.
- Infinitive, three uses of, 12. With indef. time, 12. After $\chi \rho \Delta \omega$, $\theta e \sigma \pi i \zeta \omega$, &c., 13. In indirect quotation, 13. For Fut., after verbs of hoping, &c., 14. After $\lambda \dot{e} \gamma \omega$ and $\epsilon \bar{i} \pi \sigma \nu$, to command, 14. As Imperfect Infin., 15, 16. With $\Delta \nu$ in Apodosis, 58, 113, 157; see 'A. With $\bar{a} \nu$, representing *iteratuve* 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,
 217. With *a*ν, in Apod. (never in Prot.),
 58, 113, 159; see 'Aν.
- 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. ὅπως μή οτ μή (sc. σκόπει), 78. See οὐ μή.

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. Sulj. and Opt. in Hom. (rarely in Attic), 138; by $\tilde{e}\omega\varsigma$ w. Subj. and Opt., 143, 167, 168 (d); by $\tilde{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ w. Infin., 206; by Inf. alone, 203; by Fut. Part., 214, 217.
- Questions, of doubt, w. first pers. of Subj. (sometimes w. βούλει or θέλεις), 182; rarely w. third person of Subj, 183: see

Subjunctive. Indirect, 147; see Indirect 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 άν) 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 άν or κέ, see 'Aν. With ϊνα, öπως, &c. in pure Final clauses, 67: after secondary tenses, 70. With $\ddot{o}\pi\omega\varsigma$ and $\ddot{o}\pi\omega\varsigma \mu\dot{\eta}$ after verbs of striving, &c. (seldom), 73. With µή after verbs of fearing, &c., 80. In Protasis w. eav (av, nv), 90, 91; in particular suppositions, 102; in general suppos., 107, 108; w. ei (without av), see "Av. In Apodosis w. ké or av (Hom.), 57, 182; see 'Av. In conditional Relat. sentences: in particular suppositions, 127; in general suppos., 129; by assimilation, 135. In Homeric similes after ώς, ώς ὅτε, 132. In Rel. causes expressing a purpose (Epic), 138. After eus, &c., until, 142, 143; implying a purpose, 143, 167, 168 (d). After $\pi \rho i \nu$, 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, 143, 160, 166. First person of, in exhor tations, 179; see aye, dépe. Aor. in prohibitions w. µή, 180; Pres. only in first person (rarely sing.), 180, 181. Inde pendent (like Fut. Ind.) in Hom., 181; w. av or ké, 182. Interrog. (in questions of doubt), 182. With ov µή, as strong future, 184.
- Temporal sentences, see Relative. With $\ddot{\epsilon}\omega_5$, &c., until, 142-144. With $\pi\rho'\nu$, 144-147, 210.
- Tenses, enumeration of, 3. Primary and secondary, 3, 45-54. 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 -réos, 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 ia (poet.), 209.

GREEK INDEX.

N. B. The figures refer to Pages.

| Ayavantéw ei, 120. | of each tense with, see Present, &c. With |
|---|--|
| Αγαπάω εί, 120. | Inf. for iterative Imperf. and Aor. w. |
| Aye or ayere w. Imperat., 178, 179, 180. | av, 60. Position of, 61, 62. Repetition |
| 'Αδικέω as Perf., 5. | of, 62-64. Without a verb, 63. Τάχ' |
| Aioxuvopar with Part. and Inf., 228. Ai- | äv, perhaps, 64. |
| σχύνομαι ei, 120. | 'Av (ā), contracted for, cáv. See 'Eáv. |
| Airios eiui, w. Inf. (sometimes w. rou or | 'Avaipéw, to give an oracular response, |
| τό), 190, 191 ; w. Aor. Inf., 32. | see Χράω. |
| 'Ακούειν, ἀκοῦσαι, in sound, 196. | 'Ανέχομαι w. Part., 228. |
| 'Αλίσκομαι as Perf., 5. | Αποκάμνω w. Part. and Inf., 228. |
| 'Αλλά or αὐτάρ (like $\delta \epsilon$) in Apodosis, 121, | 'Αρκέω W. Part., 228. |
| 137 (Rem.). | Aτe, äτe δή, w. Part., 219. |
| Aµa w. Partic., 219. | Αύτίκα W. Part., 219. |
| $A\nu$ (\check{a}), Adv., two uses of, in Apodosis and | "Αχρι, see Έως. "Αχρι ου, 142. |
| in Protasis, 54. Not used w. Pres. and | |
| Perf. Indic., 55. With Fut. Ind.: in | Βελτίων w. Part., 228. |
| early poets, 55, 104; in Attic, 56. With | Βούλει or βούλεσθε w. Interrog. Snbj., 182. |
| secondary tenses of Ind. in Apodosis, 56, | Βουλομένω μοι τοῦτό ἐστιν, 229. |
| 87, 90, 94, 127; omitted for emphasis, 96; | |
| regularly omitted in Apod. formed by | Γεγονέναι, to be, 19. |
| Infin. and έχρην, έδει, &c., 97 - 100. With | |
| Imperf. and Aor. Ind. in iterative sense, | $\Delta \epsilon$, in Apodosis, 121. In antecedent clauses, |
| With Subjunctive : in Protasis (ἐάν, | 137. |
| $\tilde{a}\nu$, or $\tilde{\eta}\nu$), 56, 87, 102, 108; in conditional | Δείκνυμι w. Part., 229. |
| Rel. and Temporal clauses, 56, 125, 128, | Δεινόν έστιν εί, 120. |
| 130, 143, 144, 145; often omitted in Hom. | Δηλός είμι w. Part., 230. |
| (rarely in Attic), 104, 105, 109, 133. In | Διατελέω W. Part., 227; see Λανθάνω. |
| Final clauses after ώς öπως, öφρα: w. | $\Delta i \delta \omega \mu \iota$, to offer, 5. Imperf. of, 7. |
| Subj., 68, 69; rarely w. Opt. 69, 70. | Δίκαιος w. Inf., 195. |
| Omitted from eav, örav, ös av, &c., | Διόπερ, 171. |
| when the Subj. is changed to Opt. | Διότι, 171; w. Inf. (Hdt.), 193. |
| after past tenses, 149; rarely retained, | |
| 163, 169. Seldom w. ώs and Subj. | 'Εάν (ei åν), contracted ãν (ā) or ην, 56, 87 |
| in Hom. similes, 132. Epic use of, w. | 104 ; w. Subj., 102, 108. |
| Subj. in Apodosis, 57, 104, 182. With | 'Εβουλόμην with Infinitive in Apodosis, |
| Optative, always forming Apodosis, 57, | without av, 98. |
| 105, 128, see Optative ; never w. Fut. | Έδει, έχρην (χρην), έξην, ένην προσήκεν |
| Opt., 57; rarely omitted, 100. With an | εικός ην ηρμοττεν, ην or υπηρχεν, with |
| Opt. lu Protasis which is also an Apod., | Infin. in Apodosis, without $a\nu$, 97 – 100. |
| 107, 133. Ei ke w. Opt. in Hom., 107. | Ei, if, 87, 92, 93, 105, 108; see 'Av. Sup- |
| Never used w. Imperat., 57. With Infin. | posing that, 115, 168. After θαυμάζω, |
| and Part.: in Apodosis, 57-61, 113, 157, | &c., 120. With Inf. (Hdt.), 193. Ei |
| 159, 192, 232; never in Protasis, 62; use | γάρ, cr el, in wishes, 173 - 177. |
| | |

GREEK INDEX.

Ei, whether, 120, 147, 151; after verbs of fearing 85. Ei yáp in wishes, see Ei. Εί δ' άγε, 111. Ei $\delta \epsilon \mu \eta$ in alternatives, 112. $Ei\theta\epsilon$ in wishes, 173-177. Eiκòς ην in Apodosis, see 'Εδει. Elui to be going : as Future, 6; as Pres., 6; w. Inf., 204. Elval, expressing a purpose, 204. Einov, I commanded, w. Inf., 14, 34. Eis ő (for ëws) w. Indic. (Hdt.), 142. Eirooke w. Subj. and Opt., 143; see 'Ews. 'Εκών είναι, 208. ^{*}Ενεστι, Partic. of, used personally w. Inf., 194, 195. $E \nu \hat{\eta} \nu$ in Apodosis, see $E \delta \epsilon \iota$. 'Εξαίφνης w. Part., 219. 'E $\xi \hat{\eta} \nu$ in Apodosis, see 'E $\delta \epsilon \iota$. 'Επάν or έπήν, see 'Οταν. 'Επεάν, Ionic for έπήν. 'Eπεί or επειδή (temporal); w. Aor. Indic. (not Pluperf.), 25; w. Aor. Opt., 29; w. Infin., 193. Causal, 171. 'Επειδάν, w. Aor. Subj. as Fut. Perf., 26. See "Otav. 'Επίδοξος w. Inf. 195. 'Επικαίριος w. Inf., 195. 'Επιμελέομαι (ἐπιμέλομαι), W. öπως and Fut. Ind., 73; w. Inf., or Inf. w. rov. 192. 'Επιτήδειος w. Inf., 195. Έπιτρέπω w. Part., 226. 'Eore, until, see "Ews. Eύθύς w. Part., 219. Ευρίσκω w. Part., 226. "Εφην, in Homer, 99. 'Εφ' ώ or έφ' ώτε, w. Fut. Ind., 140; w Inf., 207. 'Eχρην in Apodosis. See 'Eδει. " $E_{\chi\omega}$ w. Aor. or Perf. Part. as periphrastic Perf., 229. Έως, έστε, άχρι, μέχρι, εἰσόκε, ὄφρα, until, 142-144; expressing a purpose, 143, 167, 168. 'Eως, ὄφρα, so long as, see Relative. ^{*}Hκω as Perf., 5. Imperf. of, 7. "Homottev in Apodosis, see 'Eder. 'Ηττάομαι, as Perf., 5. Θαύμα ίδέσθαι, 196. Θαυμάζω εί, θαυμαστόν έστιν εί, 120. Θέλεις or θέλετε w. Interrog. Subjunctive (poet.), 182. Θεσπίζω, see Χράω.

| Ideiv, opav, in appearance, 196 'Iθι w. Imperat., 178. 'Ικανός w Part., 228. [•]Ικω or iκάνω as Perf. (Hom.), 5. "Iva, in Final clauses: w. Subj. and opt., 67, 70; w. second. tenses of Indic 72. Not used with av, 70; iva ke, 70. In Object clauses after λίσσομαι (Hom.), 78; similar constr. in N. Test., 78. -----, where, with av, 70 (R.). Ká, Doric for κέ; see 'Av. Καί, καίπερ (καί . . . περ), w. Part., 220, 221. Kairoi w. Part. (rare), 221. Ké or kév, see 'Av. Keκλησθαι, to be called, 19. Kινδυνεύω w. Inf. in Apodosis, 99. Κρατέω, see Νικάω. Κρείσσων w. Part., 228. Κυρέω w. Part. (poet.), 227. Λανθάνω, φθάνω, τυγχάνω, διατελέω, 🕷 Part., 227; w. Aor. Part., 34. Λέγω, to command, w. Inf., 14, 34. Méλλω, w. Inf. as periphrastic Fut., 38; tense of Inf. with, 38. Imperf. of, w. Inf. : expressing past intention, &c., 38, 99; forming Apodosis (without av), 99. Méµvηµaı, I remember, 19; w. Part., 229; W. öre, 231. Μεταξύ w. Part., 219. Μέχρι, see Ews. Μέχρι ού, 142. Mn, lest, in Final clauses : w. Subj. and Opt., 67, 70; rarely w. Fut Ind., 68. After verbs of striving, &c. (for $\ddot{o}\pi\omega_{S} \mu \dot{\eta}$), 77. With Fut. Ind. in prohibitions, 37, 79, 187. After verbs of fearing, &c. : w. Subj. and Opt., 80; w. Fut. Ind., 82. With Subj. (by ellipsis of a verb of fear. ing), 83. With av, 83. With present and past tenses of Indic., 83-85; never interrog., 84. With Fut. Opt. 39, 40.

- . nol, w. τνα, öπως, &c., in Final and Object clause, 67. In Protasis, 88 In Rel. clauses w. indef. anteced., 122, 124. In wishes (with and without εi), 174, 176. In prohibitions, 180. With interrog Subj., 181. With Inf., after verbs implying negation, 198, 200, 201.
- M'n où (double neg.): w. Inf., 198, 200, 201.
 w. Part., 200; before Nouns, 200.

Nekáw and kpatéw, as Perf., 5.

Noμίζω, οἰομαι, and φημ.', w. Aorist. Inf referring to the future (1), 33.

*O for öre (in Hom.), 170.

- Olδa (novi), I know, 19; see Olσθa.
- Oioµat w. Aor. Inf. for Fut. (?), 33.
- Olos w. Infin., 194. Οίον, οία, οία δή, w. Part., 219.
- Οίσθ' δ δράσον ; 179.
- Oiyonal as Perf., 5. Imperf. of, 7.
- 'Ολίγου (δείν), almost, 208.
- Ολλυμαι as Perf. (Trag.), 5.
- [°]Ολωλα, I shall perish, 19.
- 'Opoios w. Infin. (Hom.), 197.
- 'Οπόταν, see Οταν.
- 'Oπότε, when, see Relative. Since (causal), 171.
- ^o $\sigma w s$, 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. $\check{a}\nu$ 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. $\check{a}\nu$ and Subj. (rare), 76. That (like $\mu i j$), after verbs of fearing, &c., 85. That (like $\dot{\omega}_s$ or $\tilde{\sigma}\tau_i$), in indirect quotations, 170.
- ^{*}O $\pi\omega_s \mu \eta$ (for $\mu \eta$), lesl, that, after verbs of fearing, &c., 82.
- 'Opâv, ideiv, in appearance, 196.
- 'Oσον or ώς w. Absol. Infin. 207.
- "Ocos w. Infin. 294.
- "Οστις αν ή, "Οστις ποτ' έστίν, 134.
- Οταν, δπόταν, ἐπάν or ἐπήν (ἐπεάν), and ἐπειδάν, 55, 125, 127, 129; see 'Αν.
- Oτε, when, see Relative. After μέμνημαι, 231. With Infin., 193.
- _____, since (causal), 171.
- *Or., that, in indirect quotations, 147. w. Ind. and Opt., 143, 149, 150; w. Ind. or Opt. w. äv, 156. Before direct quot, 171. , because (causal), 171-173, see Contents, Chap. IV., Sect. V.; after verbs of fearing, 88.
- Ο τι ποτ' έστίν, "Οστις ποτ' έστίν, &c , 134.
- Ού, after μή, lest, 67, 80. In Apodosis, 88; rarely in Protasis, 88 (N.). In Rel. clauses w. def. anteced., 122. In causal Rel. clauses, 142 (R.). In indirect discourse, 149.
- Ούκ αν φθάνοις (φθάνοιτε), 228.

Ούκ οίδα άν εί, 62.

- Ού μή, 184-187; see Contents, Chapter IV., Section VIII. Dawes's Canon on, 79, 80.
- Oüvera, because, 171.
- Oύτως, implying a Protasis, 110. With Opt. in protestations, 175. Referring to a Participle, 218

- "Οφελον, see `Ωφελον.
- ^{*}Οφρα (Epic and Lyrie), as *final* particle: w. Subj. and Opt., 67; w. *aν*, 69. With Fut. Ind., 68.
 - , as temporal particle, until, 142-144; see εωs. So long as, see Relative.
- Πάλαι w. Present, 5.
- Παντοΐος γίγνομαι (Ion.) w. Participle, 227.
- Πάρος (like πρίν) w. Inf. (Ποm.), 212.
- Has w. Imperat. (2d pers.), 179.
- Παύω W. Part., 226.
- $\Pi \epsilon i \theta \omega$, to try to persuade, 5. Imperfect of, 7.
- Heipáomai w. Part. (Hdt.), 227.
- Περιοράω, w. Part., 226; w. Aor. Part., 35.
- Πιστεύω w. Inf. and τώ, 197.
- Πολλός είμι, πολλός έγκειμαι, w. Part. (Ion.), 227.
- Πρέπει, Partic. of, used personally w. Infin., 194, 195.
- Πρίν, w. Ind., Subj., and Opt., 145, 146. With Infin., 210-212. As Adverb, sooner, 146 (N. 5).
- Πρίν γ' ὅτε (Ποm.), 146.
- Πρίν ή, 146, 211, 212.
- Προσδεχομένω μοι τοῦτό ἐστιν, 229.
- Προσήκεν in Apodosis, see "Εδει.
- Προσήκει, Partic. of, used personally w. Infin., 194, 195.
- Πρόσθεν ή, 146, 211.
- Πρότερον ή, 146, 211.
- Πῶς γὰρ ἄν; Πῶς οὐκ ἄν; & 0., 63.

Σύνοιδα, συγγιγνώσκω, w. Part., 230

- Τάχ' άν, 64.
- Tebrykévai, to be dead, 19.
- -τέος (-τέον, -τέα), Verbal in, 3, 233, 234 ; see Contents, Chapter VII.
- Τί λέξεις ; 38.
- Τί μαθών; Τί παθών; wherefore? 221, 222.
- Τί πάθω; 183, 184.
- Τίκτω (in tragedy) as Perf., 5.

Τὸ νῦν εἶναι, 208.

Τυγχάνω w. Part., 227 ; see Λανθάνω.

^{*}Υστερον ή w. Infin., 211.

Φανερός είμι w. Part., 230. Φανερόν ποιείν w. Part., 230.

Φέρε w. Imperat., 178, 179, 180.

Φεύγω as Perf., 5.

- Φημί w. Aor. Inf. for Fut. (?), 33.
- Φθάνω w. Part., 227 ; see Δανθάνω. Φθάνω ή w. Infin. (Hdt.), 212.

- Χράω, ἀναιρέω, θεσπίζω, w. Pres. or Aor. Inf., 13, 31; sometimes w. Fut. Inf., 13.
- ¹ Ω_5 , originally Rel. Adv., 75 (R.). In order that, that, in Final clauses: w. Subj. and Opt., 67, 70; w. $\tilde{a}\nu$ and Subj., 68, 69; w. Fut. Ind., 63; w. second. tenses of Indic., 72. Sometimes (for $\delta\pi\omega_5$) after verbs of striving, &c., 77 (N. 4); Homeric construction of, with Subj. or Opt., 76 (N. 2.). Sometimes (for $\mu\dot{\eta}$) after verbs of fearing, 85.
 - ____, when, see Relative With Infin., 193.

| 'Ωs, because, 171-173.

- , in wishes: w. Opt., 175; w. Δφελον 177. With Inf., 206, 207, 208. With Partic., 219, 220, 225, 231, 232; w. Part. and δν 232.
- ^{*}Ωσπερ w. Partic., 219, 222, 225.
- *Ωσπερ αν εί (ώσπερανεί), 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. $\check{\alpha}\nu$, 141, 207. With Imperat., 141.
- , in Homer, = $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, as if, 207. In Hdt., w. Partic., = $\ddot{a} \tau \epsilon$, 219, 223.
- [•]Ωφελον or ωφελλον in wishes, 98, 176, 177.

THE END.

264

NEW BOOKS

AND

NEW EDITIONS FOR 1879.

LATIN.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF ROMAN LITERATURE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. Translated and Edited from the German Edition of Bender by Professor E. P. Crowell and H. B. Richardson, A.M., Amherst College, Mass. (*Ready in August.*)

D^E NATURA DEORUM. Translated and Edited from the German Edition of Schoeman by Professor Austin Stickney, formerly of Trinity College, Hartford. (*Ready in August.*)

R^{EMNANTS OF EARLY LATIN, chiefly Inscriptions. Selected and Explained, for use in Colleges, by Frederick D. Allen, Professor of Latin in the University of Cincinnati. (*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.

AN ELEMENTARY TREATISE ON LATIN ORTHOGRAPHY. Embracing the Latest Researches of Brambach, Ritschel, and others. With a Vocabulary of Words often Misspelled. By R. F. Leighton, 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.

PARALLEL 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 Jane.*)

A NEW 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.

A REVISED 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 Lecturer at Johns 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 Cincinnati.

S ELECT 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 Zürich 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 belonging to this head, of great merit and importance, have not as yet appeared in a form convenient for college reading. The commentary, appended to a carefully edited text, will be adapted to the requirements of students well advanced in Greek. Part First, forming a small volume by itself, will contain the three Hellenic Orations, Symmories, Megalopolitans, and Rhodians.

SELECTIONS FROM THE GREEK LYRIC POETS, with an Historical Introduction and Explanatory Notes. By Henry M. Tyler, Professor of Greek and Latin in Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (*Ready in* June.)

SELECTIONS FROM PINDAR AND THE BUCOLIC POETS, Containing six Odes of Pindar, four Idylls of Theocritus, a Hymn of Callimachus, a Hymn of Cleanthes, and one of the Homeric Hymns; in all thirteen hundred lines. Edited by Professor T. D. Seymour, Western Reserve College, Ohio. (*Ready in January*, 1880.)

THE FIRST THREE BOOKS OF HOMER'S ILIAD. By Professor F. E. Anderson, of Harvard University.

FIRST 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.

 $\mathbf{2}$

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 clear idea of noun and verb stens, and also some insight into the formation of words from stems and roots by means of significant 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 eollege. In preparing these lessons, considerable use has been made of the excellent exercises used in most of the German Gymnasiums, prepared by Dr. Wasener to accompany Professor Curtius' Greek Grammar.

A NEW AND ENLARGED EDITION OF WHITON'S LYSIAS. Two new orations will be added to those which the book now contains. (Ready in September.)

MATHEMATICS.

A SERIES 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 Phillips Exeter Academy.

A DIFFERENTIAL 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.*)

AN ELEMENTARY ALGEBRA. By George A. Wentworth, Professor of Mathematics in Phillips Exeter Academy.

A GEOMETRY FOR BEGINNERS. Adapted to Lower and Grammar School Work. By G. A. Hill, Harvard University. (*Ready in Sep*tember.)

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 self-activity 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 employed to give clear ideas respecting the regular solids. Many conceptions and simple 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.

2427

is

4







| PA | Goodwin, William Watson |
|------|---------------------------|
| 369 | Syntax of the moods and |
| G6 | tenses of the Greek verb. |
| 1879 | 7th ed., rev. |

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

