DISSERTATION

ON

INDIRECT DISCOURSE

IN

ANTIPHON, ANDOCIDES, AND LYSIAS.

Presented to the Faculty and Board of Visitors of the University of
Virginia for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,

BY

J. H. MOSS.

U Va

**U. Va. Doctoral
Dissertation**

18

PREFACE.

This work was begun as a treatise on Indirect Discourse in Antiphon and Andocides; Lysias and Xenophon's Anabasis were added for comparison. The lists of verbs and the statistics for ὅτι and ὡς clauses and Indirect Questions are exhaustive.

The remaining treatment is so nearly complete in the orators that we trust the few omissions will not vitiate any of the conclusions drawn. It has not been deemed necessary to note facts that present no peculiarity, such as the usual phenomena after primary tenses, and the retention of the Optative and Indicative with ἄν after secondary tenses. The Historical Present is treated as primary or secondary, at the option of the writer.

Covallin's work on O. O. in Xenophon and other books ordered were not procured in time for consultation. Goodwin's Moods and Tenses, Madvig's Syntax, and Schanz's Beiträge have given valuable aid.

Since the completion of this treatise an article has appeared in the *Classical Review*, Vol. XIV., Nos. 5 and 7, by H. Darnley Naylor, Ormund College, Melbourne University, entitled "On the Optative and Graphic Constructions in Greek Subordinate Clauses." The interesting statement is made that interrogative sentences dependent on a verb of knowing or perceiving are not introduced by the simple interrogative pronoun τίς.

INTRODUCTION.

The parallel use of the Infinitive, the Participle, ὅτι and ὡς with a finite verb in O. O., and the freedom with which the Greek mind construed subordinate clauses from the time of *speaker* or *narrator* gave vivacity to Greek style and a wide range of phenomena to O. O.

O. O. may be divided according to the character of the leading verb into *three* classes : 1) Pure; 2) Partial; 3) Subjective.

1) PURE O. O.—The governing verb is one expressing *thought* or *utterance.*

2) PARTIAL O. O.—The governing verb states a fact *involving* or *implying thought* or *utterance.*

3) SUBJECTIVE O. O.—The governing verb does not imply or state thought or utterance. The O. O. is shown by the contexts, or by the mood of the dependent verb.

Again, O. O. may be divided without serious cross division upon the principle of *vividness* into *a*) vivid; *b*) less vivid; *c*) remote.

a) VIVID O. O.—Mood and tense are unchanged except where the Infinitive is required. The exact words of the *speaker* are quoted with slight variation.

b) LESS VIVID O. O.—Tense is unchanged. The mood is changed to Optative or Infinitive when required, according to well-known rules. *The O. O. is modeled after a possible direct form.*

c) REMOTE O. O.—The mood is unchanged. The O. O. is stated from the time of the narrator, or without reference to a direct form.

The Imperfect and Pluperfect sometimes represent the Present and Perfect of a possible direct form. This occurs both in leading and subordinate O. O. verbs. It is quite common in leading clause after verbs of *knowing* and *perceiving*; rare after verbs of *saying.* Ar. Vesp. 283.

An Aorist Indicative may be retained according to the principle of *vividness* or *remoteness*, since the view of the speaker and of the narrator coincide with reference to the indefinite past.

The frequent failure to note the following fundamental principle of Greek syntax has caused some error in the treatment of O. O.

As in Latin an ideal condition in a past connection takes the Imperfect, so in Greek an anticipatory condition becomes Optative. The principle may be stated generally thus: *A future temporal or conditional relation dependent on and taking its time from a past situation is written in the Optative.* This includes the well-known phenomenon of past general conditions; but past situations may be particular as well as general.

This principle and that of O. O. often coincide. In fact it seems to be the more general, the genus to which O. O. may be referred as a species. To attempt to read O. O. into sentences where it prevails is often successful, though frequently unnecessary, and, sometimes, fraught with calamity. See Lys. [3, 7], Dem. [18, 32; 18, 145]. Dem. [18, 145] is treated by Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, §696.

" Οὐδ' ἦν ἀπαλλαγὴ φιλίππῳ εἰ μὴ Θηβαί ους . . . . ἐχθροὺς ποιήσειε τῇ πόλει;

Philip *saw that* he could neither end nor escape the war unless, etc."

Ποιήσειε is the mood and tense required by the narrative and is absolutely independent of what Philip saw.

This distinction between O. O. and the more general principle will be useful in discussing partial O. O. where the Imperfect and Pluperfect occur side by side with the Optative in what seems a perfectly normal construction. See Thuc., 6, 29.

" ' Ετοῖμος ἦν, εἰ μὲν τούτων τι εἴργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, ἄρχειν."   —Moods and Tenses, § 701.

This form of O. O. is not *quotation*, but *representation*. It allows the subordinate clauses to be retained in the same mood and tense, or to be stated in the past by the narrator. There is no need to treat one conditional clause differently from another in the example quoted; both are objective.

A Present or Perfect Indicative in such a connection is regularly retained or changed to Imperfect or Pluperfect respectively. It may be questioned whether we ever have the Indicative changed to Optative in such a connection. We find that relative sentences, because of their *declarative nature*, readily adapt themselves to the narrator's view and change the Present and Perfect Indicative to Imperfect and Pluperfect, instead of changing to Optative. This occurs not infrequently after verbs of saying in pure O. O., and seems to be the rule in partial O. O. There is quite a difference between a relative clause in the Imperfect *representing* part of what was said and a simple explanatory relative clause introduced by the narrator. Subordinate clauses in O. O. changed to Imperfect or Pluperfect, other than relative clauses, are comparatively rare. We find one in continued O. O., Xen. Anab., 5, 7, 34; one after the objective verb συνειδέναι, Xen. Anab., 1, 5, 9; and Goodwin quotes two, M. and T., §691, with pure verbs of saying.

The two examples from the Anabasis need no explanation. The shift from speaker to narrator is natural and easy to feel. The examples quoted by Goodwin are seemingly quite irregular, and it seems scarcely sufficient to say that they are thrown out of O. O.

Customary action in Greek has a strong tendency to remain in the Indicative, and it is doubtless due to this fact that the clauses quoted by Goodwin are represented by the narrator instead of following the rule of O. O. It is our opinion that clauses so represented *still form a part* of O. O. They are not quotations, but statements by the narrator of the substance of what was said. This is the regular construction in English. There is a striking difference between representing a clause from the time of the narrator, and treating it as entirely independent of O. O. Thus in Xenophon's Anabasis, 1, 5, 9, εἴ τις διὰ ταχέων τὸν πόλεμον ἐποιεῖτο is represented by the narrator as a sort of afterthought. If it be thrown out of O. O. it becomes a protasis to ἦν and makes nonsense. "It was possible," says Xenophon, "for the man who paid attention to observe that the king's empire was weak, if anyone made war quickly." The statement of Xenophon is unconditional. The condition forms part of the observation. So much for the general subject.

I.—Ὅτι and ὡς Clauses.

§1. Antiphon.

1. *Verbs with ὅτι.*

ἄδηλον εἶναι	ἐνθυμεῖσθαι	πιστεύειν
ἀντιλογίζεσθαι	ἐπαγγέλλειν	προλέγειν
αἰσθάνεσθαι	ἐπίστασθαι	
ἀποφαίνειν	λέγειν	σκόπειν
γιγνώσκειν	μανθάνειν	τεκμήριον εἶναι
εἰδέναι	μεμνῆσθαι	φανερὸν εἶναι.

2. *Verbs with ὡς.*

ἀποδεικνύναι	διδάσκειν	ἐρεῖν
αἰτιᾶσθαι	ἐπιδεικνύναι	καταμαρτυρεῖν
δηλοῦν	εἰπεῖν	λέγειν

3. *ὅτι Clauses after Secondary Tenses.*

13 Cases:
Optative, 9; Indicative, 4.

a. Optative.—
  Present, 3: 1, 11; 1, 15; 6, 38.
  Future, 2: Γβ, 4; 5, 50.
  Aorist, 4: 5, 33; 5, 39 bis; 6, 21.

b. Indicative Unchanged.—*Pf.:* 5, 54.

c. Indicative Changed from *Pres.* to *Imp.,* 3: 1, 8; 1, 15; 6, 32.
  Examples 1, 8; 1, 15, will be noted under the full treatment of verbs of *Knowing,* etc.

  6, 32—μάρτυρες ἐγένοντο ὅτι οὐδὲν δίκαιον . . . . ᾐτιῶντο—demands some notice. ᾐτιῶντο may be regarded as an original Imperfect, but this seems a somewhat forced explanation. The *O. O.* is only partial. The ὅτι clause is stated as a fact. μάρτυρες ἐγένοντο implies ἐμαρτύρησαν but is not equivalent to it. The ὅτι clause takes its mood and tense from the narrator, and does not fall under the regular rule for *O. O.*

4. ὡς Clauses after Secondary Tenses.
5 Cases:
Indicative, 4 : Optative, 1.

a. Optative—*Aorist*: 5, 53.

b. Indicative—*Present*, 2: β γ, 9; Γ γ, 4.

         Aorist, 2: Α γ, 1; Γ γ, 2.

Note that Β γ, 9, is a general truth and Γ γ, 4, is alleged to be.

In Γ γ, 2, εἶπε . . . εἰ ἐκ τῶν πληγῶν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀνήρ, ὡς οὐκ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν the ὡς clause is not a bare statement depending on εἶπε, but is represented as following logically from the reason stated in the protasis.

We call attention to the two examples (5, 15 ; 6, 24), with ἄν and the Indicative after εἰδέναι. Here the Potential Indicative seems to represent a Potential Optative transferred to the past. See M. and T., §243; cf. Lys., 3, 29 (εἰδώς).

§2. Andocides.
1. Verbs with ὅτι.

ἀγγέλλειν	ἐνθυμεῖσθαι	λόγον διδόναι
αἰσθάνεσθαι	εἰδέναι	μανθάνειν
ἀκούειν	ἐπίστασθαι	ὁρᾶν
ἀπαγγέλλειν	εἰπεῖν	σημεῖον εἶναι
ἀποκρίνεσθαι	ἐλέγχειν	σκοπεῖν
ἀναμνησθῆναι	κληδὼν κατέχειν	τεκμηρίῳ χρῆσθαι
γιγνώσκειν	λέγειν	ψεύδεσθαι

2. Verbs with ὡς.

ἀνακράζειν	γνώμην περι ιστάναι	ἐλέγχειν
ἀντιλέγειν	διδάσκειν	συνειδέναι
ἀπολογεῖσθαι	ἐπίστασθαι	φανερὸν ποιεῖν
ἀποδεικνύναι	ἐρεῖν	

3. ὅτι Clauses after Secondary Tenses.
26 Cases:
Indicative, 10; Optative, 16.

a. Optative.—

    Present, 8: 1, 4; 1, 12; 1, 61; 1, 64; 1, 39; 1, 115 bis;
        1, 118.

    Aorist, 7: 1, 40; 1, 61; 1, 113; 1, 116; 1, 115 ter.

    Perfect, 1: 1, 39.

b. Indicative Unchanged.—

  Present, 2: 1, 30 ; 2, 20.
  Future, 1: 1, 135 quinquies.
  Aorist, 2: 1, 61 bis.

c. Indicative Changed to Secondary.—

  Imperfect, 2: 1, 52 bis.
  Pluperfect, 2: 1, 52 bis.

In 1, 61 the ὅτι clause, ἐξήλεγξα τὰ γενόμενα ὅτι εἰς ἡγήσατο μὲν πινόντων ἡμῶν ταύτην τὴν βουλὴν Εὐφίλητος ἀντεῖπον δ' ἐγώ, καὶ τότε μὲν οὐ γένοιτο δι' ἐμέ, presents a striking change of mood. The whole clause is an explication of τὰ γενόμενα and soon drifts into O. R.

The introduction of the negative has some influence upon the thought. It is merely suggested that the statement made in γένοιτο is incapable of proof, that it was necessarily a mere assertion of opinion, and consequently felt the force of O. O. more than those statements which were verified and might be set down as facts.

In 1, 52 we have an interesting example of an entire clause after ἐνεθυμήθην καὶ ἐλογιζόμην viewed not as a quotation, but taking its mood and tense from the standpoint of the reporter, as if it were independent.

1, 135, is properly O. R.

In 1, 130 ; 2, 20, in which the Indicative Present is retained, the former (1, 130) seems to be a pithy saying, a popular saw applied to such cases. The latter (2, 20) retains μέλλει and extends to the realm of the present.

4. ὡς *after Secondary Tenses.*

· 17 Cases :

Optative, 11 ; Indicative, 6.

a. Optative.—

  Present, 4: 1, 36 ; 1, 40 ; 1, 122 ; 1, 110.
  Aorist, 7: 1, 19 ; 1, 22 ; 137 ter.; 1, 40 ; 1, 110.

b. Indicative.—

  Present, 1, 43.
  Imperfect, 1, 64.
  Future, 1, 43.
  Aorist, 3 : 1, 54 ; 1, 58 ; 3, 10.

§3. Lysias.

1. Verbs taking ὅτι.

ἀγνοεῖν

ἀναμιμνῄσκειν

ἀποκρίνεσθαι ·

γιγνώσκειν

δῆλον εἶναι

δηλοῦν

δῆλον γίγνεσθαι

διαβάλλειν

διισχυρίζεσθαι

εἰδέναι

ἐννοῦν γίγνεσθαι

ἐπίστασθαι

μανθάνειν

μεμνῆσθαι

μηνύτης γίγνεσθαι

ὁρᾶν

προειδέναι

πυνθάνεσθαι ·

πρόφασιν

σκοπεῖν

συνειδέναι

ὑπολαμβάνειν

τεκμήριον γίγνεσθαι

τεκμήριον νομίζειν

φανερὸν εἶναι

φανερὸν ποιεῖν

φράζειν

2. Verbs taking ὡς.

ἀπαγγέλλειν

ἀποφαίνειν

ἀντειπεῖν

ἀπολογίαν ποιεῖσθαι

διομνύναι

δόξαν περιιστάναι

ἐλπίδα παρέχειν

ἐρεῖν

λόγους ἔχειν

μάρτυρας εἶναι

ὁμολογεῖν

πείθειν

μάρτυρας καλεῖν

πιστὸν εἶναι

πιστὸν δοκεῖν

φάναι

3. Verbs taking ὅτι and ὡς.

ἀκούειν

αἰσθάνεσθαι

ἀποδεικνύναι

ἀπολογεῖσθαι

ἐνθυμεῖσθαι

ἐπιδεικνύναι

εὔγνωστον εἶναι

εἰπεῖν

κατηγορεῖν

λέγειν

τάρτυρεῖν

μεκμήριον εἶναι

τεκμηρίῳ χρῆσθαι

μάρτυρας παρέχειν

Combinations of ὅτι and ὡς (17, 2 ; 17, 4 ; 19, 41 ; 19, 55) are worthy of note.

4. ὅτι Clauses after Secondary Tenses.

74 Cases:

Indicative, 47 ; Optative, 27.

a. Optative.—

Present, 20 : 1, 19 ; 8, 12 ; 9, 5 ; 12, 9 ; 12, 15 ; 12, 48 ; 12, 74 bis ; 12, 77 ; 13, 9 ; 13, 78 ; 19, 51 ; 22, 2 ; 23, 2 ; 23, 3 ; 23, 6 bis.; 23, 9 ; 23, 10 ; 32, 25.

Future, 2 : 1, 22 ; 19, 16.

Aorist, 3 : 12, 16 ; 12, 77 ; 32, 9.

Perfect, 2 : 1, 18 ; 10, 25.

b. Indicative.—

  Present, 15: 2, 41; 6, 19; 7, 34 bis.; 8, 8; 9, 1; 9, 9
   bis.; 10, 30; 12, 9; 12, 48; 12, 69; 13, 17; 13, 77;
   16, 14.

  Future, 11: 2, 33; 12, 15; 12, 45 bis.; 12, 58; 12, 70;
   12, 74; 13, 25; 16, 15; 27. 1; 32, 11.

  Imperfect retained, 7: 1, 17; 2, 58; 12, 56 bis.; 13, 41;
   19, 39; 19, 52.

  Imperfect from Present, 5: 3, 6; 7, 16; 12, 57; 12, 73;
   18, 11.

  Aorist, 9: 2, 65; 3, 29; 8, 13; 9, 9: 12, 40; 12, 57;
   12, 69; 13, 42; 19, 25.

5. ὡς *after Secondary Tenses.*

29 Cases:
Optative, 15; Indicative, 14.

a. Optative.—

  Present, 10: 8, 10; 8, 12; 9, 5; 9, 6; 9, 7; 13, 8;
   19, 50; 1, 20; 1, 20; 12, 6.

  Aorist, 4: 1, 20; 1, 20; 8, 12; 22, 8.

  Perfect, 1: 29, 12.

b. Indicative.—

  Present, 3; 11, 11; 12, 70; 28, 5.

  Imperfect retained 4: 1, 20; 7, 42; 19, 7; 22, 3.

  Future, 2: 2, 22; 13, 61.

  Aorist, 4: 1, 17; 3, 22; 10, 12; 32, 15.

  Perfect, 1; 12, 7.

§4. Xenophon's Anabasis.

1. ὅτι *after Secondary Tenses.*

a. Optative.—

Present	75
Future	14
Aorist	7
Perfect	8

b. Indicative.—

Present	23
Future	17
Imperfect retained	4

Imperfect from Present, 11: 1, 2, 21; 2, 2, 15; 2, 3, 6;
  3, 1, 2 sexies; 5, 6, 29; 5, 8, 10.
Perfect... 1
Pluperfect from Perfect, 2: 3, 1, 2 bis.

2. ὡς *after Secondary Tenses.*

a. Optative.—
  Present, 22.
  Future, 1: 5, 6. 3.
  Aorist, 1.
  Perfect, 1: 7, 6, 44.

b. Indicative.—
  Present, 3: 2, 6, 2; 5, 6, 31; 6, 4, 14.
  Future, 1: 7, 5, 8.
  Perfect, 1: 6, 4, 14.

In 2 *a*) the first Present Indicative [2, 6, 2] expresses habitual action; 5, 6, 31, retains χρή; 6, 4, 14 depends upon a preceding Perfect Indicative retained.

§5. *Remarks upon* ὅτι *and* ὡς *Clauses.*

1. For the origin of ὅτι and ὡς clauses see Goodwin's Moods and Tenses, §663, and Schanz's Beiträge, Heft 8. Goodwin considers ὅτι an *accusative of respect,* and thus an outer object. Schmitt regards ὅτι as the inner or cognate object (p. 19), which seems to be the correct view.

Goodwin's view of the development of ὡς in O. O. from the interrogative seems correct, while Schmitt has apparently overlooked the fact that pure relatives are used as interrogatives after verbs of asking (pp. 14 and 52). This use has been noted by Dinwiddie in his dissertation on O. O. in Thucydides. See See *Revue de Philologie,* xiv., pp. 57 ff.

2. In reference to the distinction between ὅτι and ὡς, it is a mistake to state that always, or even generally, ὡς carries the idea of doubt or uncertainty, without any discrimination in the verbs that take ὡς.

ὡς introduces a *theory, opinion* or *allegation.* It is used regularly with διδάσκειν because, perhaps, the true idea of teaching is to teach theories. It is used with ἀποδεικνύναι to introduce a theory professed to be proven from *facts stated,* and takes the Indicative *Ant* [Δγ 1], also with εἰπεῖν in this sense *Ant* [Γγ 2].

ὡς with λέγειν, εἰπεῖν, κατηγορεῖν introduces an allegation generally intimated to be untrue, but not always so. See Lysias, 1, 20, for true accusation; and 1, 37 ; 7, 20 for false.

The examples of ὡς cited from Andocides and Lysias with the Optative imply falsity except Lysias [1, 4; 22, 8]; to these add Andocides [1, 4], Lysias [28, 5] where ὡς is construed with Indicative.

In Lysias [22, 8] the force of ὡς may be brought out by translating " ἔλεγεν ὡς "—*he explained that.*

ὡς in the Anabasis is comparatively rare with the Indicative, and is used not infrequently with the Optative without implying doubt or uncertainty. Anab., 1, 9, 11; 5, 1, 3.

Madvig points out that ὡς is usual when the leading verb is negative or when the ὡς clause is negatived. The clause is thus marked as a mere allegation. Xen. Anab., 2, 4,19; 2, 3, 25; 7, 5, 8.

ὅτι also occurs after a negative verb. Thuc., 2, 6, 2.

ὅτι and ὡς clauses take the Present Indicative after a secondary tense when they purport to express:

1. A general truth.
   { Antiphon: β γ, 9 ; Γ, γ, 4.
   { Lysias; 2, 41 ; 10, 30 ; 12, 69.
   { Anabasis : 6, 1, 21.

2. A common report.   Andocides : 1, 130.

3. A present fact.
   { Androcides : 2, 20.
   { Lysias : 6, 19 ; 9, 1.
   { Anabasis : 2, 4, 21; 5, 5, 24 ; 6, 1, 31 ;
   { 6, 4, 18.

4. Continued or habitual action.   { Lysias : 28, 5.
   (usually)   { Anabasis : 2, 6, 2; 4, 5, 10;
   { 6, 1, 19 ; 6, 6, 4.

5. Necessity with χρή.   { Lysias : 12, 70 ; 16, 14.
   (usually)   { Anabasis : 5, 6, 31.

To these may be added Anabasis, 6, 3, 11; 7, 2, 16, where the presence of νῦν makes the vivid construction preferable; Anabasis, 4, 1, 3 ; 4, 5, 28, where the Present is retained for the Future on account of the vivid meaning of the verb ἰέναι ; and Anabasis, 1, 10, 5, where the perfect meaning of οἴχονται may influence its retention.

χρή is retained after past tenses in Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias, Thucydides, Xenophon's Anabasis. χρείη occurs in Xenophon's Hellenics, 2, 4, 23, with ὡς in a negative sentence.

II.—῞Οτι and ὡς Clauses—*continued.*

We note the fact that the retention of the Indicative in a
ὅτι or ὡς clause after a *past finite tense of a pure verb of saying*
is quite rare except in those cases where it is required to EXPRESS
A GENERAL TRUTH, PRESENT FACT, OR WHERE χρή IS RETAINED·

The only cases noted are Andocides, 1, 4; 1, 43; Lysias, 12, 74;
28, 5.

Andocides (1, 43) retains the Present with ὡς after ἀνέκραγεν.
Cf. Anabasis (51, 14), ἀνέκραγον ὡς οὐ δέοι.

Andocides (1, 4) retains the Future with ὡς after λέγοιεν in the
second clause.

Lysias (12, 74) retains the Future with ὅτι after εἶπε in the
second clause.

Lysias .(28, 5) retains the Present with ὡς after ἔλεγεν. ἔλεγεν
ὡς ἤδη συκοφαντεῖτε. The force of ἤδη would be to retain the
Indicative.

With these compare:

Andocides 1, 54: γνώμη παρειστήκει ὡς, with Present Indica-
tive.

Lysias 9, 9: μάρτυρας παρεσχόμην ὅτι; 8, 13: ἤδη ὅτι; 12, 40:
ἐδήλωσαν ὅτι, with Aorist Indicative.

Lysias, 12, 45: ἠπίσταντο ὅτι, with Future Indicative).

Lysias, 2, 65: ἀπελογήσαντο ὅτι, with Future Indicative, where
the apology is made by deeds not words.

Lysias, 10, 12: διωμόσατο ὡς, with Aorist Indicative, quoting
words of a legal document.

Where the verb that governs O. O. is an Infinitive or Participle
the construction is somewhat freer.

The following are the examples noted in Antiphon, Andocides
and Lysias, omitting those cases in which the Infinitive repre-
sents a past tense of the Indicative and where the Imperfect
Indicative occurs in ὅτι or ὡς clauses.

§1. Indicative retained after ὅτι or·ὡς.

a. Present.—Lysias: 7, 34; 8, 8; 12, 69; 13, 17; 9, 1; 13, 77.
b. Future.—Lysias: 2, 32; 12, 15; 12, 58; 12, 70; 13, 25;
13, 61; 16, 15; 27, 1; 32, 11.

c. Aorist.—Lysias: 1, 17; 3, 22; 3, 29; 19, 25; 12, 75, 32, 15.
Andocides: 1, 58; 3, 10.
d. Perfect.—Antiphon: 5, 54.

§2. Indicative changed to Optative.

a. Present.—Lysias: 8, 10; 9, 5; 9, 7; 12, 48; 13, 78; 19, 51.
b. Future.—Lysias: 1, 22; 19, 16.

In Lysias, 12, 48, an interesting change from Optative to Indicative occurs. Some of the examples with Indicative retained have been explained on other grounds. Omitting these the retention of the Indicative is more frequent than the change to Optative.

In most cases cited with the Optative depending upon a Participle, the Participle can be resolved into a finite verb expressing a co-ordinate idea or a temporal or causal relation. The same can sometimes be done when the Indicative is retained, but the Participle is usually more closely connected with the governing verb, continuing its thoughts or descriptive of its action.

The following is added for comparison:

ὅτι and ὡς clauses depending upon the Infinitive or Participle.

1. With the Indicative retained.

Xenophon's Anabasis, 16 : 2, 1, 14; 2, 1, 20; 2, 2, 20; 2, 5, 2;
2, 6, 2; 4, 5, 19; 4, 5, 28; 5, 1, 14; 5, 5, 24; 5, 6, 31;
6, 1, 25, 6, 1, 31, 6, 4, 14; 6, 4, 15; 6, 6, 4; 7, 1, 11.

2. With change to Optative.

Xenophon's Anabasis, 22 : 1, 2, 21; 1, 3, 16: 1, 6, 10; 1, 9, 23;
2, 2, 15; 2, 3, 25; 2, 6, 10; 3, 2, 4; 3, 2, 10; 3, 3, 14;
4, 5, 28; 5, 6, 34; 5, 7, 18; 6, 1, 2; 6, 1, 30; 6, 2, 13;
6, 6, 3; 6, 6, 6; 7, 1, 39; 7, 2, 31; 7, 5, 11; 7, 8, 21.

All the examples with the Optative might have been omitted except 1, 2, 21; 2, 2, 15; 3, 3, 4; 5, 6, 34; the Participle or Infintive so clearly representing a Past Indicative Tense. Compare ἧκε λέγων, *he came and said,* (1, 2, 21), with ἔπεισε λέγων, *he persuaded (by) saying,* (5, 1, 14).

In 5, 6, 34, ἐπέχει λέγειν is equivalent to a conative Imperfect of the verb of saying.

An examination of ὅτι clauses depending on an Infinitive or Participle consecutively in something over two books of the Hellenica and five books of Thucydides shows, without discrimination, a proportion of 10 to 10 in the Hellenica, and 20 to 8 in favor of the Indicative in Thucydides.

Typical examples with the Indicative in the Hellenica are: ·

> 1, 5, 4.—ἐκέλευον διδάσκοντες.
> 1, 6, 36.—πλεῖν βοῶντας.
> 2, 1, 4.—ἐκέλευον παραγγέλλειν.

III.—Indirect Questions.

§1. Antiphon.

1. *Introductory Particles.*

εἰ, εἰ . . . ἤ, τίς, ὅστις, ὅς πότερος, ὁπότερος, ὅσος, οἷος, ὡς, ὅπως.

2. *Indirect Questions after Past Tenses.*

7 Examples:
Indicative, 6 ; Optative, 1.

a. Optative (1, 17).

b. Indicative.
> *Present,* 2: 6, 7 ; 6, 49.
> *Future* : 1, 16.
> *Imperfect retained* : 4, γ, 8.
> *Imperfect from Present* : 6, 26.
> *Pluperfect retained* : 5, 70.

§2. Andocides.

1. *Introductory Particles.*

εἰ, εἰ . . . εἰ, πότερον . . . ἤ . . . ἤ . . . εἴτε, εἴτε . . . εἴτε τίς, ὅστις, ὁπότερος, πόθεν, ὡς, πῶς, ὅσος, οἷος, ἐάν.

2. *Indirect Questions after Past Tenses.*

6 Examples:
Optative, 4 ; Indicative, 2.

a. Optative.—
Present, 3 : 1, 62 ; 1, 126 ; 3, 30.
Aorist, 1 : 1, 112.

b. Indicative.
Aorist, 1 : 1, 29 ; 1, 116.
Pluperfect, 1 : 2, 14.
Future : 1, 23.

§3. Lysias.

1. *Introductory Particles.*

εἰ, εἰ . . . ἤ, πότερον . . . ἤ, πότερα . . . ἤ, εἴτε . . . εἴτε
τίς, ὅστις, ὅς, πότερος, ὁπότερος, ποῖος, ὁποῖος, πόθεν, ὁπόθεν, ὅπου
ὅπως, ὡς, ὅσος, οἷος, ὁσάκις, ἐάν.

2. *Indirect Questions after Past Tenses.*

35 Examples:
Optative, 16 ; Indicative, 19.

a. Optative.—
Present, 12.
Future, 2.
Aorist, 1.
Perfect, 1.

b. Indicative.—
Present, 7.
Future, 6.
Imperfect from Present, 3 : 1, 42 ; 7, 12 ; 11, 12.
Aorist, 2.
Pluperfect from Perfect, 2 : 9, 7 ; 32, 18.

§4. Xenophon's Anabasis.

1. *Indirect Questions after Past Tenses.*

80 Examples:
Optative, 59 ; Indicative, 21.

a. Optative.—

> *Present*, 53.
> *Future*, 3.
> *Aorist*, 3.

b. Indicative.—

> *Present*, 5.
> *Future*, 4.
> *Imperfect retained*, 2 : 7, 2, 25 ; 7, 7, 43.
> *Imperfect from Present*, 7 : 2, 3, 11 ; 2, 5, 33 ; 3, 5, 17 ;
>   4, 7, 11 ; 5, 5, 25 ; 6, 1, 13 ; 6, 4, 23.
> *Aorist*, 2.
> *Pluperfect from Perfect*, 1 : 4, 5. 29.

§5. *Remarks upon Indirect Questions.*

1. An important distinction may be drawn between Indirect Questions and Indirect Exclamations. The simple relative pronominal adjectives ὅσος, οἶος, etc., introduce only the latter, while the pronominal adverbs ὡς, ᾗ, etc., introduce either.

This distinction has been noted by Dinwiddie in his dissertation on O. O. in Thucydides (page 13):

> For ὡς see Andocides, 1, 33 ; Lysias, 21, 13.
> For ὅσος see Andocides, 1, 47 ; Lysias, 6, 47.
> For ὅιος see Andocides, 2, 8 ; Lysias, 9, 7.

It has not been considered necessary to divide the statistics of Indirect Questions upon this principle.

2. It is often difficult to distinguish ὡς relative, ὡς interrogative and ὡς conjunctive introducing O. O. These uses mark stages in the development of ὡς, and it is not always possible to determine the conception of the writer.

3. In Greek as in Latin, interrogative and relative sentences shade into each other.

4. Notable is the use of ἐάν, meaning *whether*.

> Andocides, 1, 37 : ἀναμιμνήσκεσθαι ἐάν.
> Lysias, 15, 5 : σκέψασθε ἐάν.
> cf. Demosthenes, 19 : συνδιαμνημονεύειν ἐάν.

It may be noted that σκέψασθε ἐάν ἀληθῆ λέγω does not mean "Consider whether I am telling the truth," but "Consider whether what I shall say is true."

5. Vivid Constructions in Indirect Questions.—As in ὅτι and ὡς clauses it will be found that the statistics do not show the range of freedom in the use of Indicative and Optative; but in many cases the Indicative is retained because the sense of the sentence demands it. In Antiphon 6, 7, (ἐλέγξαντες) εἴ τι ἀδικῶ is in the sphere of the present, meaning *whether I am an evildoer*.

It may be noted that the Greek uses the Aorist Participle, when the leading verb is primary, as the equivalent of the English Perfect Participle. From the frequent retention of the original mood and tense in such cases it seems highly probable that the Participle was felt to be primary.

The Imperfect in Antiphon (6, 26) may be explained in two ways; ἠδικοῦντο may represent an original Present stated from the standpoint of the narrator, or it may be explained as a simple conditional not in O. O. Antiphon (6, 49) retains χρή.

There are two examples of the Indicative retained in Andocides—Aorist (1, 29), Pluperfect (2, 14). Both approach relative sentences. It may be worthy of note that in 1, 29 the O. O. clause recounts well-known facts. In (2, 14) τὸ ρρᾶγμα πᾶν διηγεῖτο ὡς ἐπέπρακτο the ὡς clause is in opposition to πρᾶγμα and may be considered as a pure relative, or taking πρᾶγμα as proliptic the ὡς clause may be in O. O., from standpoint of narrator. From the time of the speaker ἐπέπρακτο would be Perfect. The conception varies somewhat as the Latin *dixit modum quo; dixit quo modo.*

In Lysias six Present Indicatives are retained. Of these one (1, 25) might have been put in the Optative. 2, 21; 30, 32 retain χρή. 1, 33; 32, 18 belong to the universal present.

In (10, 4) τί ἐστιν ὀλιγαρχία ἠπιστάμην the subordinate clause involves a bit of *general information* properly retained in the Indicative. Thus we say in English "I knew that two and two *make* four." Compare (11, 2) ὅτι ὀλιγαρχία ἦν ᾔδειν.

Lysias 1, 25 is the only Indirect Question in Lysias with past tense of a verb of *asking* that retains the Indicative except 30, 32 in which χρή occurs. Even here it is quite probable that the Indicative is not retained merely for vividness, but is used to express habitual action.

The three Imperfects and two Pluperfects in Lysias depend upon the verbs εἰδέναι, σκοπεῖν, ἐννοεῖν, ὁρᾶν.

The two Aorist Indicatives are after ὡς in *indirect exclamation*. The clauses are not far removed from relative clauses, are not at all contingent, and naturally prefer the Indicative.

In Xenophon's Anabasis there are five Indicative Presents after past tenses. 6, 2, 4 and 7, 5, 9 retain χρή; the three others seem to be retained for vividness. In 4, 1, 26 and 6, 2, 5 the verb upon which the question depends is an Infinitive standing for a Present of a finite mood. 5, 7, 23—ἠρώτων ὅτι ἐστὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα *is one of the few examples of the Present Indicative retained for vividness after a finite mood.* Perhaps the familiarity of the phrase caused it to resist the influence of O. O.

Of the four Future Indicatives, 6, 1, 21 forms part of a general truth and is regularly retained. The three others are vivid.

Of the seven Imperfects from the Present in the Anabasis 6, 1, 13 (ἤροντο εἰ καὶ γυναῖκες συνεμάχοντο αὐτοῖς) deserves special mention. The Imperfect expresses *customary action which the Optative seems unable to express.* Συμμάχοιντο might mean: (if they) *ever fought in company with* (them). It cannot mean: (if they) *were in the habit of fighting.* The Present Indicative might be used here.

The Indicative in 2, 5, 33 probably expresses *attempted action*: ὅτι ἐποίουν, what they were trying to do.

3, 5, 17 has ἔμελλον. It has been noted that μέλλω does not conform to the rules of O. O. Ἔμελλον with the Infinitive to express a Future from the past, or the Future of an unreal relation, is not uncommon.

The remaining Imperfects (2, 3, 11; 5, 5, 25; 6, 4, 23) occur in clauses not far removed from true relative clauses and seem to be construed as such.

Χρείη occurs once in Lysias (12, 44) in an indefinite relative sentence having the force of an indirect question. See Schmitt on such sentences (Schanz's Beiträge, Heft 8, p. 14). The sentence reads: οὕστινας χρείη ἄρχειν παρήγγελλον. The governing verb expresses past customary action. The vivid form of the subordinate clause would be οὕστινας ἂν χρῇ; though χρή is not

absolutely excluded on account of the force of the indefinite
relative pronoun. This does not seem to be a fair exception to
the rule that χρή is retained in indirect questions.

VERBS OF KNOWING AND PERCEIVING.

Verbs of *knowing* and *perceiving*, on account of their objective
character, allow two classes of constructions. As knowledge
must depend for its accuracy upon true perception and reason-
ing, and as wrong impressions are quite common, whatever is
dependent upon the observation of one man or a class of men
is somewhat contingent. When the narrator represents the
knowledge as entirely due to the thought or perception of the
subject of the subordinate clause, this clause may follow the
regular rules of O. O. This is especially true when the narrator
quotes his past knowledge.

But it may be stated that a manifest fact was *observed* or
meditated upon. Logically the clause is in O. O., because it
expresses thought. Grammatically it is construed as the state-
ment of the narrator without reference to a direct form. The
Aorist Indicative is retained. The Present and Imperfect of a
possible direct form become Imperfect and Pluperfect.

The most common verbs of this class are:

εἰδέναι	ἐνθυμεῖσθαι	δῆλον εἶναι
ἐπίστασθαι	ἀγνοεῖν	ὁρᾶν
γιγνώσκειν	ἀναμιμνήσκειν	σκοπεῖν
αἰσθάνεσθαι	καταμανθάνειν	ἐννοεῖν
πυνθάνεσθαι		

Statistics for Verbs of *Knowing*, etc.

1. *With ὅτι and ὡς in Antiphon, Andocides, and Lysias.*

a. Indicative.—

Present, 7—Lysias: 9, 1; 10, 30; 11, 11; 12, 69; 12, 70;
13, 17; 13, 77.

Future, 5—Lysias: 2, 32; 12, 15; 12, 45; 12, 70; 16, 15.

Imperfect retained, 1—Lysias: 1, 17.

Imperfect from Present, 9 $\begin{cases} \text{Antiphon: 1, 8; 1, 15.} \\ \text{Andocides: 1, 52; 1, 52.} \\ \text{Lysias: 3, 6; 7, 16; 12, 57;} \\ \qquad \text{12, 73; 18, 11.} \end{cases}$

Aorist, 4—Lysias: 3, 29; 8, 13; 12, 75; 1, 17.

Pluperfect, 2—Andocides: 1, 52; 1, 52.

Lysias: 10, 30; 11, 11; 12, 69 are general truths; 12, 10 retains χρή; 9, 1 belongs to the sphere of the present. In 13, 17; 13, 77 the context does not make it quite clear whether the Indicative is retained for vividness or whether the time of the subordinate clause extends to the present.

b. Optative.—

Present, 4— $\begin{cases} \text{Andocides: 1, 39.} \\ \text{Lysias: 9, 5; 12, 15; 23, 3.} \end{cases}$

Future, 3— $\begin{cases} \text{Antiphon: 5, 50.} \\ \text{Lysias: 1, 22; 19, 16.} \end{cases}$

Perfect, 1—Lysias: 23, 3.

The Present Optative from Andocides (1, 39) depends on γνῶναι, which is itself in O. O., from ἔφην, and is hardly a fair example.

The two examples from Lysias (23, 3) depend on πυθόμενος. The context shows that the information was in answer to questions. πυθόμενος is equivalent to a passive of a verb of *saying*. The same might be said of ἐπυθόμην in 9, 5. In Lysias, (3, 6) πυθόμενος is used as a verb of *perception*. The result is stated but the process is ignored.

It may be noted that in the two first examples speaker and narrator are the same. In the last they are different. In the orators examined the *use of these verbs with the Optative is rare.*

2. *With ὅτι and ὡς in Xenophon's Anabasis.*

a. Indicative.—

 Present, 1.

 Future, 2.

 Imperfect retained, 1: 6, 3, 23.

 Imperfect from Present, 6: 1, 2, 21; 2, 2, 15; 2, 3, 6;

           3, 1, 3; 5, 6, 29; 5, 8, 10.

b. Optative.—

>   *Present,* 11.
>   *Aorist,* 2.
>   *Perfect,* 1.

The Present Indicative (6, 1, 31) is required. It can be seen that the Present Optative is used freely with these verbs, and the Imperfect Indicative quite often.

3.   *With Indirect Questions in Antiphon, Andocides and Lysias.*

a. Indicative.—

>   *Present,* 3—Lysias: 1, 33; 10, 4; 32, 18.
>   *Future,* 4—Lysias: 1, 41; 2, 13; 4, 7; 14, 17.
>   *Aorist,* 1—Lysias: 32, 18.
>   *Imperfect retained,* 1—Antiphon: 2, *γ*, 8.
>   *Imperfect from Present,* 3—Lysias: 1, 42; 7, 12; 11, 12.
>   *Pluperfect from Perfect,* 2—Lysias: 9, 7; 32, 18.

b. Optative.—

>   *Present,* 2— $\begin{cases} \text{Andocides: 1, 62.} \\ \text{Lysias: 1, 15.} \end{cases}$
>   *Future,* 2—Lysias: 23, 9; 23, 10.
>   *Aorist,* 1—Lysias: 3, 10.

The Indicative is more frequent than the Optative.

4.   *With Indirect Questions in Xenophon's Anabasis.*

a. Indicative.—

>   *Present,* 1.
>   *Future,* 3.
>   *Imperfect retained,* 1 : 7, 7, 43.
>   *Imperfect from Present,* 4 : 2, 5, 33; 4, 7, 11; 5, 5, 25;
>   6, 4, 23.

b. Optative.—

>   *Present,* 13.

Note that the Present Optative is more frequent and that the one Present Indicative retained (6, 2, 5) occurs after the Infinitive εἰδέναι representing the Imperative in continued O. O.

IV.—The Infinitive.

The Infinitive has by nature no declarative force. It expresses in O. O. the subject of thought or speech. The realization, in fact, is deduced from the context.

A ὅτι clause assumes the reality of the matter *stated* or *thought upon.* A ὡς clause is intermediate and often approaches closely the use of the Accusative and Infinitive.

With εἰπεῖν and λέγειν an *opinion* or *conclusion* is maintained by the Infinitive.

> Antiphon: Α γ, 4; Α δ, 11.
> Lysias: 8, 15.
> Anabasis: 5, 4, 34.

When words are the subject of discussion εἰπεῖν and φάναι seem to be used indiscriminately.

> Lysias: 10, 9; 11, 3; 11, 5.
> Cf. Lysias (10, 8) with ὡς.

In Lysias, 11, 5, εἴπῃ ἀποβεβληκέναι seems to be the exact equivalent of φῇ ῥῖψαι.

The Infinitive occurs as the object of that large class of verbs *asking, exhorting, commanding*, etc., expressing shades of meaning from a mild wish to a strong command. The Infinitive is the *outer object* denoting the thing *commanded*, etc.

In the development of the O. O. construction in certain cases the Infinitive lost its objective character and became the *cognate object*, expressing the content of the governing verb. Then it is the true representative of the Imperative in O. O.

The Present Infinitive occurs rarely with φάναι referring to the Future in O. O. ἔφη μηνύειν, *he said* he was going to inform (Lysias, 29, 6).

Cf. the regular use of ἰέναι. Anabasis, 1, 3, 1: οὐκ ἔφασαν ἰέναι.

The Aorist Infinitive occurs in Lysias, 13, 15 and 13, 47, with φάναι referring to the Future. (Moods and Tenses, §127).

Perhaps the best explanation of this phenomenon is to consider the Infinitives as simple object Infinitives. φάναι coalesces with a preceding negative and is felt to be the equivalent of a verb of *refusing*.

Εἰπεῖν in Anabasis, 7, 8, 2, with ἐπομόσας, and followed by an Infinitive with ἦμήν, is construed as a verb of *swearing*.

Γνῶναι with the Infinitive (Lysias, 16, 36; Andocides, 2, 10; Anabasis, 1, 9, 17) may be translated "*to decide.*" Moods and Tenses, §915, 3 (a).

Πυνθάνεσθαι occurs (Lysias, 6, 37; Anabasis, 7, 6, 11) with the Infinitive with meaning very near to that of ἀκούειν. Ἀκούειν is used with the Infinitive with the meaning "*to be told.*" Lysias, 13, 77; 25, 21; 26, 3; Anabasis, 4, 6, 14; 4, 6, 16; 4, 5, 35.

Ἀκούειν with the Participle indicates that the hearing is from someone who professes to have definite information. Xenophon's Anabasis, 1, 4, 5; Sophocles' Electra, 293. (Moods and Tenses, §914). The thing heard is not necessarily a fact.

The Infinitives after αἰτίαν ἔχειν λόγον, ὑπολείπειν (Antiphon, 2, 10; Β β, 5) belong to the class of object Infinitives not in O. O. proper. Cf. Moods and Tenses, §749 and Andocides, 3, 26, οὐδὲ λόγος ὑπολείπεται μὴ οὐκ ἀδικεῖν.

In Antiphon, 5, 80, διδάσκειν takes an object Infinitive with the meaning *to teach how.*

1. Verbs taking the Infinitive in O. O. representing the Indicative or Optative.

§1. Antiphon.

ἀρνεῖσθαι	ἡγεῖσθαι	ὀμνύναι
διωμνύναι	κατηγορεῖν	προσδιαβάλλειν
δοκεῖν	καταδοκεῖν	πρόσποιεῖσθαι
ἐλέγχειν	λέγειν	ὑπολαμβάνειν
ἐλπίζειν	νομίζειν	φαίνεσθαι
ἐλπὶς εἶναι	οἴεσθαι	φάναι
ἐπικαλεῖν	ὁμολογεῖν	φάσκειν

§2. Andocides.

αἰτεῖν	ἐοικέναι	ὀμνύναι
ἀρᾶσθαι	ἐπαγγέλλειν	πιστεύειν
γιγνώσκειν (2, 10)	ἡγεῖσθαι	προειπεῖν (4, 17)
δοκεῖν	λέγειν	ὑπισχνεῖσθαι
διορίζεσθαι	νομίζειν	φάναι
ἐλπίζειν		

§3. Lysias.

αἰσθάνεσθαι	ἐπαγγέλλειν	ὁμολογεῖν
ἀπειλεῖν	ἐπικηρύττειν	ὀμνύναι
ἀκούειν	ἡγεῖσθαι	πυνθάνεσθαι
αἰτιᾶσθαι	λέγειν	ὑπισχνεῖσθαι
γιγνώσκειν	μηνύειν	ὑποπτεύειν
δοκεῖν	νομίζειν	φάναι
εἰπεῖν	οἴεσθαι	φάσκειν
ἐλπίζειν		

1. *The Infinitive in Continued Narrative.*

The Infinitive may continue a narrative:

1. When it is used in the first clause of O. O. (Andocides, 38, 42). This is an unusually long passage. Even here ἔφη is repeated three times.

2. After verbs which take ὅτι and ὡς. This is the rule when the continuation is introduced by γάρ. With γάρ: Antiphon, Γ γ, 2. Lysias, 10, 6; 13, 5; 14, 5; 14, 33; 22, 9; 25, 28. Anabasis, 6, 1, 23; 6, 2, 11; 7, 2, 31. Without γάρ: Andocides, 1, 12; 1, 36. Lysias, 19, 25. An independent Optative occurs with γάρ: Antiphon, 6, 22. Anabasis, 7, 3, 13.

3. After verbs which take a simple object Infinitive in partial O. O. Κελεύειν, etc., Lysias, 2, 45. Anabasis, 4, 5, 16; 7, 7, 19.

4. After a verb taking the Participle in O. O. Lysias, 32, 15.

5. After δοκεῖ with the Nominative and Infinitive O. O. may be continued by the Accusative and Infinitive. Xenophon's Anabasis, 1, 4, 18.

2. *The Infinitive as Imperative.*

It is impossible, as Goodwin says, (Moods and Tenses, §684) to tell exactly where a Greek would have drawn the line between

the Infinitive as a simple object and the Infinitive in O. O. It is, however, too narrow to limit the use of the Infinitive in O. O. to the representation of the Indicative and Optative. The Infinitive is used as Imperative.

1. In the indirect statement of laws. Antiphon, $\varGamma'\beta$, 5; 5, 10. Andocides, 1, 20; 1, 73; 1, 93; 1, 95; 1, 110, 1, 116; 3, 12. Lysias, 1, 32; 6, 52; 8, 10; 8, 12; 11, 5; 14, 5; 22, 6. Laws are frequently written in O. O. Lysias, 10; 16, 17, 18, 19.

2. In proclamations, decrees, etc. Andocides, 1, 111; 1, 145 bis; 1, 176; 1, 182; 2, 23. Lysias, 2, 1; 6, 24; 12, 70; 12, 76; 16, 6.

3. In simple propositions or commands with pure verbs of *saying*, as εἰπεῖν λέγειν, etc. Andocides, 1, 71; 1, 123; 1, 126; 4, 27. Lysias, 1, 23; 1, 30; 16, 13.

In Andocides, 1, 123, and Lysias, 16, 13, the Imperative idea is specifically plain. Cf. Anabasis, 1, 3, 14; 5, 7, 34.

When required for clearness or emphasis the Infinitive is strengthened by χρῆναι. Antiphon, φασὶ χρῆναι, 5, 84; 6, 28. Andocides, ἔλεγον . . . χρῆναι, 1, 36.

3. *Subject of the Infinitive.*

The subject of the Infinitive is usually omitted if it is the same as that of the governing verb expressed or implied in a phrase. When emphatic it is usually expressed by the accusative of the *reflexive* or by the Nominative of the *intensive* αὐτός.

When the subject of the Infinitive is different from that of the governing verb it is expressed in the Accusative unless mentioned before or clearly implied by the context. Andocides, 4, 38. Cf. Demosthenes, xx, 111.

The Accusative of αὐτός (Andocides, 1, 12; 1, 126), the Accusative of the personal pronoun (Antiphon, 6, 31), and the Nominative of the personal pronoun (Thucydides, 6, 34, 2) also occur.

V.—The Participle.

The Participle in O. O. is a development of the object Participle after verbs of sense and perception, and usually carries with it the definiteness and certainty of personal observation. The Infinitive (within our limits) is comparatively rare with verbs taking the Participle. When is does occur it expresses an opinion gathered from a process of reasoning. The distinction between a participle in O. O. and a clause with ὅτι or ὡς is often very slight. The Participle is more concrete and vivid, the ὅτι clause is abstract and didactic.

The following verbs are construed with the Participle:

Antiphon.

ἀποδεικνύναι	ἐπιδεικνύναι	ὁρᾶν
ἀποφαίνειν	ἐπίστασθαι	περιειδέναι
ἀπελέγχειν	εἰδέναι	συνειδέναι
γιγνώσκειν	κατάφανὴς γίγνεσθαι	φαίνεσθαι
δηλοῦν	μηνύειν	φανερός εἶναι
ἐλέγχειν		

Andocides.

ἀπο-δεικνύναι	δῆλον εἶναι	ἐλέγχειν
ἐπι-δεικνύναι	εἰδέναι	ὁρᾶν
ἐν-δεικνύναι	ἐνθυμεῖσθαι	πυνθάνεσθαι
γιγνώσκειν	εὑρίσκειν	φαίνεσθαι
δηλοῦν	λογίζεσθαι	

Lysias.

αἰσθάνεσθαι	συγγιγνώσκειν	ὁρᾶν
ἀπο-φαίνειν	δῆλον εἶναι	ἐν-ορᾶν
φαίνεσθαι	δοκεῖν	ἐφ-ορᾶν
ἀπο-δεικνύναι	ἐλέγχειν	περι-ορᾶν
ἐπι-δεικνύναι	ἐξ-ελέγχειν	πυνθάνεσθαι
δεικνύναι	εὑρίσκειν	φαίνεσθαι
γιγνώσκειν		

Subject of the Participle.

When the subject of the Participle is the same as that of the governing verb it is usually omitted and the Participle is expressed in the Nominative case.   Antiphon, *A β*, 6; *A β*, 9.

When emphatic the subject of the Participle is expressed by the Accusative of the reflexive.   Antiphon, *A δ*, 3

VI.—Secondary Dependencies.

§1.   *Conditional Sentences after Past Tenses.*

a. Subjunctive and Indicative changed to Optative.—
> Antiphon: 1, 15; 1, 19; *A α*, 8; 5, 50; 6, 12; 6, 13;
>> 6, 23; 6, 23; *Γ β*, 4.
> Andocides: 1, 20; 1, 90; 1, 115; 1, 122; 3, 30; 4, 15;
>> 4, 17.
> Lysias: 2, 21; 7, 34; 12, 9; 12, 15; 13, 25; 13, 53;
>> 13, 78; 19, 59; 26, 24; 28, 14; 23, 11;
>> 12, 74.

b. Indicative retained.—
> Andocides (1 Future): 1, 53.
> Lysias (11 Futures): 2, 32; 2, 45; 2, 45; 12, 11; 12, 70;
>> 13, 15; 13, 15; 21, 24; 26, 9; 27, 1.
>> (2 Presents): 2, 22; 22, 2.
>> (1 Perfect): 32, 11.

c. Subjunctive retained.—
> Andocides; 1, 41.
> Lysias: 12, 15; 12, 15; 32, 6.

We observe no Future Optatives in protases.   Protases in *ἐάν* are usually changed to Optative.   Lysias uses the "most vivid" Future condition more frequently than others examined and retains the Future Indicative in protases.

Xenophon quite frequently retains the Future Indicative in protases.   Cf. Anabasis, 5, 6, 34; 6, 6, 10; 7, 1, 40; 7, 4, 5.

In Andocides (1, 122) a Present Indicative is changed to Optative.

In the *Classical Review*, p. 320, July, 1890, Marchant raises an interesting question with reference to conditional sentences. Following Stahl, who says in substance (Quaest. Gram. ad Thuc., p. 8, ed. 1886) "Thucydides never changes the Indicative with εἰ to Optative in O. O. This rule is true for all writers, εἰ with the Future Optative excepted." Marchant adds: "I have never seen an example outside Xenophon which breaks Stahl's canon." In an example given by Goodwin, (§696 from Plato, Ap. 20 *b*), καὶ ἐγὼ τὸν Εὔηνον ἐμακάρισα εἰ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἔχει ταύτην τὴν τέχνην καὶ οὕτως ἐμμελῶς διδάσκει, he remarks that ἔχοι and διδάσκοι might be used. If Stahl is correct, is the Optative possible outside Xenophon in a single clause containing εἰ in O. O., unless εἰ with Optative, εἰ with Future Indicative, or ἐάν with the Subjunctive would be used in the recta?

In the *American Journal of Philology*, 1892, ("Brief Mention") Gildersleeve notes this view of Marchant, quoting among other references in refutation, Andocides, 1, 122 ; Thucydides, 6, 27, 5 ; 2, 92, 3.

The change of present protases in the Indicative to Optative is regular though rare. Marchant, however, may be right in his protest at Goodwin's treatment of the example quoted.

If Plato had written ἔφην εἶναι εὐδαίμονα instead of ἐμακάρισα the Optative would be allowable in the O. O. clause. It may be questioned whether this change, which is rare at best, would be allowed after such an objective verb as ἐμακάρισα.

§2. *Relative Sentences after Past Tenses.*

a. Subjunctive and Indicative changed to Optative.—

     Antiphon: 5, 50 ; 6, 22 ; 6, 23 ; 6, 45 ; 1, 10.

     Andocides; 1, 39 ; 2, 10.

     Lysias: 3, 5 ; 2, 24 ; 12, 74 ; 12, 76 ; 12, 84 ; 13, 7 ;
           19, 25 . 19, 35 ; 23, 2.

b. Indicative retained.—

     Present—Antiphon: *B β*, 3 ; 6, 27.

          Lysias: 1, 19 ; 7, 40 ; 27, 2 ; 6, 54 ; 22, 6.

     Future—Lysias: 13, 17 ; 13, 25.

Imperfect (contemporaneous)—

    Antiphon: 6, 23; 6, 38.
    Andocides: 1, 12; 1, 34; 1, 53.
    Lysias; 12, 73; 18, 11; 19, 50.
    Anabasis: 1, 2, 1 ter.; 1, 2, 2; 2, 1, 2; 4, 1, 12;
        4, 3, 29; 6, 5, 22; 7, 8, 2.

c. Subjunctive retained.—

  Lysias: 1, 6; 13, 25; 13, 86; 13, 92; 30, 28.

The statistics are sufficient to show that the retention of the Subjunctive with the relative is rare in the authors examined. Lysias, 1, 6, (οὕτω διεκείμην ὥστε μήτε λυπεῖν μήτε λίαν ἐπ' ἐκείνῃ ὅτι ἂν θέλῃ ποιεῖν) is a very unique example.

One theory of result clauses is that they look to the end *con-templated*, and the vivid construction would be explained by O. O. It is necessary, however, to consider that the time of the relative sentence is general. The Infinitive upon which it depends on account of the generality was not felt to be past, and takes the primary sequence.

Lysias, 13, 25, depends upon a preceding Indicative retained, and is regular.

Lysias, 13, 86, is O. R. It quotes the words of the legal document.

In Lysias, 30, 28, the time of the relative clause is general.

Lysias, 13, 92, is perhaps the only clear case of the retention of the Subjunctive for vividness. It is thoroughly incorporated in the subordinate clause and quotes the injunction.

§3. *Final Clauses.*

Final clauses are treated fully by Weber (Schanz's Beiträge, Heft. 5), and the statistics are taken from his treatment.

It is necessary to discriminate between Purpose clauses in O. O. and those depending on simple declarative verbs. Even here they allow Representation and may retain the Subjunctive. This, however, is much rarer than we would be led to believe by Moods and Tenses, §318 and §320. Weber's statistics quoted in confirmation of §320 are quite misleading.

Statistics for Final Clauses.

Antiphon (including Tetralogies).—

    Optative, 6: 1, 10; 5, 43; 5, 55; 6, 13; 6, 37; Γ α, 2.

    Subjunctive, 3; 1, 33; Α β, 6; Α γ, 2.

Andocides (including oration) 4.—

    Optative, 11: 1, 39; 1, 42; 1, 88; 1, 137; 1, 141; 1, 54;

                3, 3; 3, 39; 4, 15; 4, 29; 1, 99.

    Subjunctive, 7: 1, 12; 1, 40; 1, 86; 1, 113; 1, 133;

                3, 23; 3, 33.

Lysias (including orations 2, 6, 8, 13, 20).—

    Optative, 26.

    Subjunctive, 22: 1, 9; 1, 10; 1, 11; 1, 12 bis.; 1, 4;

               2, 9; 2, 33; 6, 11; 6, 54; 12, 7; 12, 12;

               12, 25; 16, 6; 16, 14; 28, 6; 30, 12;

               31, 30; 32, 22; 33, 2; 34, 11; 31, 3.

Weber says in reference to the examples from Andocides (Schanz's Beiträge, Heft. 5, p. 140): "Analysisen wir genauer . . . so müssen wir bei 1, 86; 1, 113; 3, 23 Fortdauer der Absicht in der Gegenwart annehmen."

1, 40, properly belongs to O. R. 1, 121, follows an Historical Present. 3, 33, and 1, 133 are in O. O.

In reference to Lysias, after discussing the change in 32, 22; Weber says: "An den übrigen Stellen, echten wie unechten, haben, wir an 8 Fortdauer der Absicht in der Gegenwart an-zunehmen."

We find that these are 2, 9; 6, 11: 6, 54; 16, 6; 16, 14; 30, 12; 31, 30; 33, 2. 28, 6, and (1, 12, Present Subjunctive) are O. R. 1, 12; 12, 7 and 12, 12 are in O. O.

In Antiphon, 1, 23 expresses purpose continued to the present. Α β, 6 is in O. O.

The remaining examples from Antiphon present peculiarities which may be felt. But, not to draw too nice a distinction, we may consider it established that :—

1. A positive Purpose Clause taking its time from a definite past action prefers the Optative.

2. When a Purpose Clause is *iterative* (1, 9; 1, 10) or in O. O.

or otherwise contingent by depending on an Infinitive or condition, it may lend itself readily to Representation.

3. When a Purpose Clause expresses a purpose that continues to the Present it regularly takes the Subjunctive.

§4. *Clauses of Fearing.*

These are few and give scarcely any basis for generalization.
Antiphon.—*Optative Aorist* (5, 58 ; *A γ*, 8).
    Indicative Aorist with ὡς (5, 69).
Andocides.—*Optative Aorist* (1, 36 ; 4, 15).
Lysias.—*Subjunctive Aorist* (12, 3 ; 12, 98 ; 1, 44).

In the examples from Lysias the Subjunctive is retained in 12, 3, on account of the continuance of the fear into the present, and perhaps in 12, 98, for the same reason.

It has not been thought necessary to give statistics for other secondary dependencies, nor to distinguish in this place between the kinds of O. O. We now examine the influence of the verb upon which these clauses depend. Some examples have been taken from Goodwin's Moods and Tenses, and other sources.

In ὅτι and ὡς clauses, when the leading verb is changed to Optative, secondary dependencies are usually changed also. (Moods and Tenses, §690).

We may expect exceptions :—

1. When the dependent O. O. clause expresses customary action. (Xenophon : Cyrus, 3, 2, 1).

2. When a general truth or present fact is stated. (Xenophon, Oec., 15, 2).

3. When relative clauses occur in the Present or Future Indicative. (Xenophon's Anabasis : 2, 3, 6 ; 3, 1, 7 ; 3, 1, 26 ; 7, 41. Thucydides, 2, 72, 2 ; 3, 33).

When an Infinitive intervenes between the leading O. O. verb and its dependencies. (Andocides, 1, 41).

When a primary tense of the Indicative is retained after a past governing verb in ὅτι or ὡς clauses secondary dependencies are usually retained in the original mood and tense.

Lysias : 2, 22 ; 2, 33,; 12, 15 bis.; 12, 70 ; 13, 61 ; 13, 17 ; 13, 25 ; 27, 1 ; 32, 11.

Exceptions—
     Lysias: 7, 34; 12, 74 bis.; 13, 25.

It may be noted that when an exception does occur to either of these rules it naturally carries with it its immediate dependencies. (Lysias, 12, 74; Xenophon's Anabasis, 2, 3, 6.)

When the verb that governs the O. O. is followed by the Infinitive representing a primary tense in O. R. there is much freedom.

Secondary dependencies seem to be retained or changed to Optative (where allowable) according as they are closely or loosely incorporated in O. O. Compare Lysias, 12, 9 and 12, 11. In the former case Lysias states the conditions of agreement; in the latter he quotes what was said.

It seems scarcely necessary to quote statistics already given with reference to this special case, since the construction depends largely upon the conception of the writer.

Purpose clauses retained in the Subjunctive through their close incorporation in O. O. have already been mentioned. All conditional sentences noted with Optative in Antiphon fall under this rule.

We have the original mood retained :
     Andocides: 1, 41.
     Lysias: 2, 45; 21, 24; 22, 2 ; 26, 9; 32, 6.

Changed to Optative :
     Andocides: 1, 20 ; 1, 90; 4, 17.
     Lysias: 2, 21; 12, 9; 12, 15; 13, 53 ; 23, 11.

There is quite a difference between a clause forming an integral part of the thought stated by the narrator and one which forms no part of O. O., even in thought. Thus the *narrator* may state a purpose or temporal relation which the speaker intentionally omitted.

We do not hold, however, that the original mood and tense is retained for the sole purpose of presenting vividly the words or thoughts of the *speaker*. In Demosthenes, xviii, 148, (Moods and Tenses, §690), for example, the skill of the orator is shown by the delicate turn of expression which allowed him to repre-

sent Philip's past thoughts as a matter present to his audience.

Few examples have been noted of secondary dependencies where the leading verb in O. O. is a Participle depending on a verb of *knowing*, etc.

Antiphon, 6, 48. Lysias, 17, 35.

Here the change to the Optative is what we would expect.

VII.---Partial O. O.

A full discussion of this interesting subject cannot be attempted. The construction has been noted in the Introduction and in the treatment of the Infinitive. The governing verb is not a pure verb of *saying* or *thinking*.

The dependencies *do not follow the strict rules of O. O., but take often the moods and tenses called for by the narrative regardless of the implied thought or utterance.* Representation is allowed.

The Imperfect Indicative is perfectly regular to represent a Present, certainly in relative clauses. Andocides, 1, 12; Lysias, 12, 73; Anabasis, 1, 2, 1 ter.; 1, 2, 2; 2, 2, 1; 4, 1, 12.

White, in his note on ἐϛρατεύετο, Anabasis, 1, 2, 2, allows the Optative Present as a possible form. This is exceedingly doubtful.

The Imperfects in Anabasis, 1, 2, 1, are so regular that they called forth no comment, though they are clearly exceptional according to Moods and Tenses, § 695.

A condition in the Imperfect or Pluperfect representing an original Present or Perfect is rare; but when it does occur in partial O. O., we see no reason for treating it as irregular.

We would not hesitate to write such a sentence as: *I claimed that if Cyrus were doing this he ought to be put to death:* ἠξίουν κῦρον ἀποθανεῖν εἰ τοῦτο $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ποιεῖ} \\ \text{ἐποίει} \end{array} \right\}$ not ποιοῖ.

VIII.—The Negative.

The negative has been so frequently discussed that it seems unnecessary to mention the few irregularities that occur when a full treatment is impossible. An interesting fact has been noted by Gildersleeve, that the change from positive to negative and vice versa seems to influence the mood. Andocides, 1, 4; 1, 61; Lysias, 12, 48; 12, 74; Anabasis, 4, 5, 10; 4, 5, 28; Thucydides, 2, 13, 1; 2, 80, 1; 4, 130, 3; 8, 86, 3.

The examples noted are scarcely sufficient to justify any generalization. It may be observed that the negative clause is usually the one construed with the Optative. In Lysias, 12, 48; 12, 74, the thought is the reverse of the form. However, we find the change of mood without the negative, and the negative without the change, so that other causes often appear. The negative *quantifies the predicate of a sentence, neutralizing the force of continued or habitual action,* and whether used with the governing or subordinate verb, *has a tendency to mark the O. O. as a mere allegation,* following the regular rule of O. O. rather than to be stated vividly.

Compare ἠγγέλθη, Thucydides, 1, 114, 1; 4, 93, 2, with Indicative, and οὐ γὰρ ἠγγέλθη, Thucydides, 2, 6, 2, with Perfect Optative.