

SOME NOTES ON THE SYNTAX OF THE PROSE INSCRIPTIONS OF HELLENISTIC ATHENS¹

I. AGREEMENT

A. Agreement of Participle

(1) Masculine takes precedence over feminine: e.g.

- ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται διαφυλ|άττων
677. 7-8 (post 277)
- ὅπως ἂν οὖν καὶ ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται|ται τιμῶν τοὺς χρεῖας αὐτῶι
παρεχομένους S. xiv. 64. 19-20 (271/270)
- ὅπως οὖν καὶ ἡ βουλὴ κ[αὶ ὁ δῆμος φαί|][νω]νται τιμῶντες
992. 6-7 (s. ii)
- ἐνεῖσι προσευχόμενοι Καλλιστώ, Ἀφόβητος 1534. A. 87 (292/291)
- Ἀγάθων . . . καὶ Ζεύξ|ιον ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἡ ἰέρεια [κα]τ[α]σταθέντες
1316. 6-7 U (272/271).²

In the first two examples (for which see also II. A. 2 below) the participle may be conceived of as agreeing with the nearer of the two subjects, since it is expressed in the masculine singular. Likewise, αὐτῶι refers specifically to δῆμος. But the third example, in which the participle is in the masculine plural, clearly demonstrates the usual preference for masculine.

(2) Feminine takes precedence over neuter: e.g.

- ἐν αἷς αἱ δωρεαὶ ᾗσαν γεγ[ραμμένῃ]| αὶ καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα 448. 67-8 (318/317)

Here the word-order is significant, the verb coming immediately after the feminine plural subject and before the neuter singular subject has ever been mentioned.

(3) Masculine participle referring to a neuter noun:

- ὅπω[s] | ἂν οὖν καὶ τὰ γένη φαίνεται τιμῶντες 1235. 9-10. U (c. 248/247)

Here τὰ γένη is equivalent to οἱ γεννήται. (See also II. C below.)

¹ This is the *fourth* in a series of articles on the language of Attic prose inscriptions, and should have been published before the article which appears in *C.Q.* n.s. xix (1969) 289 ff., which is the *fifth* of the series. For sources used, *C.Q.* n.s. xiv (1964) 240, n. 2 and n. 5. Note that in the examples quoted all references are to *IG* ii², unless otherwise indicated. *S* prefixed to a reference refers to *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*; *H* to *Hesperia* (*H.S.* = *Hesperia Supplement*).

My purpose in the present article is to

present additional evidence which Meistershans (*Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³) does not offer, and in certain cases to modify, or contradict, statements of his.

² For the tripartite division of the evidence see *C.Q.* n.s. xvii (1967) 257, n. 2. 'State' inscriptions have no sign added to the numbering to denote them; 'sub-unit' inscriptions are denoted by 'U' written between the line number and the date; 'private' inscriptions by 'P' in the same position.

(4) Masculine pronoun referring to neuter noun:

ὅτι τὸ κοινὸν τοῖς φιλοτιμουμένοις εἰς αὐτοὺς . . . ἀποδίδωσιν
1262. 13-15. U (301/300)

Here τὸ κοινόν is the guild of the *θιασῶται*. (See also II. C below.)

B. Agreement of Relative Pronoun

In an inscription containing catalogues of the dedications in the temple of Asclepius (1534. A. 292/1)¹ there are several peculiarities of agreement of relative pronoun with antecedent in the expression 'which *ἀνέθηκεν* ὁ δέινα'. The neuters *ὃ* and *ᾧ* frequently displace the masculine, even when the antecedent is composed of two elements neither of which is neuter. The explanation is no doubt that in these cases the relative clause is conceived of as 'which dedication (*ἀνάθημα*) X. dedicated'. Nevertheless, it is perhaps worth while to examine the evidence in some detail.

(1) Relative agrees with the nearer antecedent:

τύπος ἄνδρος κ[αὶ γυν]αικὸς καὶ πρόσωπον, ὃ ἀνέθηκεν	ibid. 77
[τύπ]ος, [ἐν]ι προσευχόμενος, καὶ στόμα, ὃ	ibid. 79
τ[ύπος] κατάμακτος καὶ χεῖρ ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἐμ πιν[α]κίῳ, ἦν	ibid. 65
ὀφθαλμοὶ ἀργυροὶ δύο καὶ ὧτα ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, ᾧ	ibid. 117

(2) Relative is neuter singular:

(a) Referring to masculine singular antecedent:

στέ[φαν]ος χρυσοῦς, ὃ	ibid. 39
τύπος πρὸς πινακ[ί]ῳ, ὃ	ibid. 54
τύπος ἐν ᾧ κε[ράτ]ιον, ὃ	ibid. 55
τ[ύπος] πρὸς πινακίῳ, ἐν σῶμα γυναικός, ὃ	ibid. 58
τύ[πο]ς κατάμακτος πρὸς πινακίῳ, ἐν προσευχόμενος, ὃ	ibid. 63

(b) Referring to feminine singular antecedent:

σιαγὼν πρὸς πινακίῳ, ὃ	ibid. 53
------------------------	----------

(3) Relative is neuter plural *ᾧ*, referring to masculine singular and masculine plural antecedents:

τύπος ἐμ πινακίῳ, ἐν σῶμα ἄνδρος, ᾧ	ibid. 57
ἐν ἀριστερᾷς τύποι: : ᾧ	ibid. 93
τ[ύ]ποι ἀργυροί, ἐν προσευχομένη, καὶ ἔτεροι [. . .] : Δ : ᾧ	ibid. 42

(4) Relative is neuter plural *ᾧ*, referring to antecedent which is:

(a) Masculine plural + neuter singular:

τύπο[ι] δύ[ο], ἐν ὀφθαλμοί, χ[ρ]υσοῦς καὶ ἀργυροῦς, καὶ ὀφίδιον χρυσοῦν: ᾧ	ibid. 83
ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ α[ἰδοῖ]ον ᾧ	ibid. 108

(b) Neuter singular + masculine singular:

στόμα καὶ τύπος πρὸς πινακίῳ, ᾧ	ibid. 52
---------------------------------	----------

¹ Referred to by Meisterhans, p. 197, § 82. 5.

(c) Masculine singular + masculine plural:

τύπος ἀργυροῦς καὶ :††††[. . . ὀφ]θαλμοί, ἀ ibid. 68

(d) Masculine plural + feminine singular:

ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ῥίς, ἀ ibid. 120

There are, however, several examples of strict agreement, e.g. (cf. 2 a):

σιδηρο[ῦς] δακτύλιος, ὄν ibid. 40

τύπος κατά[μακ]τος, ἐν ᾧ ἐνι θεὸς καὶ προσευχόμενος, ὄν ibid. 62

(cf. 2 b):

φιάλη [λε]ία διάχρυσος ἦν ibid. 41

φιάλη διάχρυσος ἦν ibid. 47

(cf. 3):

ὦτα δύο καὶ ὀδόντες οὓς ibid. 55

τύ[ποι] ἐμ πινακίῳ τρεῖς, οὓς ibid. 72

II. NUMBER

A. Singular for Plural

(1) In the formulae:

εἶναι δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ ἐκγόνοις γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἔγκτησιν ἀπέχοντι κτλ. e.g. 373. 29–30 (322/321)

εἶναι Ἀθηναῖον αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκγόνους e.g. 448. 19–20 (318/317)

Here αὐτῶι and αὐτόν are the specific honorands of the decrees, and agreement is thus, naturally enough, made only with them.

(2) In the formulaic phrase ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος agreement is made sometimes in the singular, the two bodies being conceived of as a single entity, sometimes in the plural (cf. I. A. 1 above):

ὅσα αὐτοῖς ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος προσ|έταπτεν 500. 16–17 (302/301)

καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐπήνεσαν τε αὐτοὺς πολλάκις ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος| καὶ ἐστεφάνωσεν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ibid. 17–19

ὅτι ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ|[δ]ῆμος . . . ἐπίσταται 505. 41–2 (302/301)

ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δ[ῆμος] ἐσσεφέα|[ν]ωσαν 656. 8–9 (284/283)

ἡ τε βουλὴ καὶ | ὁ δῆμος ἐπευέκασιν 1163. 13–14. U (284/283)

ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται διαφυλ|άττων 677. 7–8 (post 277)

ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνε|ται τιμῶν τοὺς χρεῖας αὐτῶι παρεχομένους S. xiv. 64. 19–20 (271/270)

ἡ βουλὴ κ[αὶ ὁ δῆμος φαί]|([νω]νται τιμῶντες 992. 6–7 (s. ii)

(3) Two-part subject with singular verb:

ἡ τε φιλί[α κ]αὶ ἡ εἰρήνη διατηρῆ|ται 1304. 6–7. U (paullo post 211/210)

οἷ τε [στε] |φανοὶ καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ἀναγραφῆ|[σ] |εται 1262. 10–12. U (301/300)

Contrast:

ὦν αὐτῶι οἷ τ[ε] | νόμοι καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα προστάτ|τουσιν
1163. 10-12. U (284/283)
προσέταπτον οἷ τε νόμοι καὶ τὰ ψηφίσ[ματα]
1299. 61. U (paullo post 236/235)
προσέταπτον οἷ τε νόμοι καὶ τ[ὰ] | ψηφίσματα
H.S. i. 74. 29. 31-2 (228/227)

It is perhaps significant that in these latter three examples both *νόμοι* and *ψηφίσματα* are plural.

(4) For singular relative pronoun referring to plural antecedent, see I. B. 1 above.

B. *Plural for Singular*: for plural relative pronoun referring to singular antecedent, see I. B. 3 above.

C. *Neuter Plural Subject*: One example of a neuter plural subject with a singular verb and a masculine plural participle:

ὅπω[ς] | ἄν οὖν καὶ τὰ γένη φαίνεται τιμῶντες
1235. 9-10. U (c. 248/247)

Cf.

ὅτι τὸ κοινὸν τοῖς φιλοτιμουμ|ένοις εἰς αὐτοὺς . . | . ἀποδίδωσιν
1262. 13-15. U (301/300),

in which a neuter singular subject has a singular verb and is referred to by a masculine plural pronoun.

III. THE ARTICLE¹

A. *Personal Names*. Meisterhans's remarks on personal names² are in general sound as regards (1) the omission of the article in the official language of decrees—it is also omitted in sub-unit and private inscriptions, e.g.

Σωσίθε|ον τραγωιδόν, Σώφιλον ὠιδόν
1320. 6-7. U (fin. s. iii)
Κωτάλη.
11,934. P (s. iii/ii)

—and (2) the omission of 'der anaphorische Artikel bei Personennamen (vor dem Vaternamen)', except when the son's name is in the genitive case. But there are exceptions to both of these rules:

(1)
Εὐφρω|ν ὁ Ἀ[δ]έα τοῦ Σικυννίου
448. 40-1 (318/317)
πρὸς Ἀλέξανδ[ρ]ον τὸν Κρα[τεροῦ]
774. 15 (c. 250/249)

In the first of these there is the added abnormality that the ethnic qualifies the father and not the son, and in the second there may be a rhythmical significance in the sequence preposition-noun-article-noun.³ Note also that we find the normal omission of the article at line 7 (*Εὐφρων Ἀδέα Σικυνώνιος*) and line 12/13 (*Εὐφ[ρ] | ρονα Ἀδέα Σικυνώνιον*) of inscription 448.

¹ Cf. in general Meisterhans's account, pp. 222-34, § 86. In this section I present evidence only where Meisterhans's remarks require expansion or modification.

² p. 223, § 86. b.

³ For the rhythm of this pattern see sect. (iii) of my article on Final Clauses, *C.Q.* n.s. xvi (1966), 295-7.

(2)

ἐπὶ ἱερέως Πραξιτέλου | [Τ]ιμάρχου Εἰρεσίδου

4440. 2-3. ?P (med. s. iii)

In the examples of omission of the article in this case quoted by Meisterhans he suggests (following Kirchoff) that the article may have been mistakenly omitted, presumably by haplography (*Εὐφιλέτο Τιμοθέο* i². 328. 14). It seems more difficult, however, to explain away the omission in the example quoted above, although if, as seems likely, this is a private inscription, a simple error would not be unusual.

B. *Names of Peoples*. I have stated the evidence for the article with the names of peoples in my article on Final Clauses, sect. iii.,¹ and attempted to give some explanation of the cases where the article does appear.

C. *Names of Deities*²

(1) In the expression 'I swear by—' when *νή* is not expressed, the article is normally omitted. But contrast

ὁμνύω [τὸν Δ]ιὰ τὸν [Βασιλέ]||[α καὶ τὴν Ἥρα]ν καὶ τὸν Ποσειδῶ κα[ὶ
951. 10-11 (167/166)

But here—if the restoration is correct—Zeus is given a title, and it is the practice in decrees when a god is mentioned with his title to give both the god and the title the article. Then it is rhythmically desirable to continue the list of deities with the article, even although they are not also given titles.

(2) In decrees, as just stated, the article is always present with both the god's name and his title (if any). There are, however, several examples in which the god does not receive the article viz.

τῇ ἐν Διονύσου	H. vii. 100. 18. 19 (282/281)
ἐκκλησία ἐν Διονύσου	896. 5 and 31 (186/185)
ἐν το[ῖς πρ]ὸς Ἄγραν μυστηρ[ί]οις	661. 9-10 (267/266)
τῶν πρὸς Ἄγραν μυστηρίων	847. 22 (215/214)
ἐγ Μυσ[τηρίων τῶν μεγάλ]ω καὶ τῶν πρὸ[ς] Ἄγραν	1231. 10-12. U (fin. s. iv)
προσκατεσκεύασε ναὸν καὶ τέμενος Ἀσκληπι[οῦ]	1302. 7-8. U (220/219)

But note that all these have a strong formulaic flavour.

There is only one example in which the article is lacking with the title, viz.

τῆς Ἀφροδίτης Πανδήμου 659. 11 (283/228)

Contrast:

τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ τεὶ Πανδή|μωι ibid. 22-3

But, this being the sole example of omission of the article with the title, I am strongly inclined to restore *τῆς* before *Πανδήμου* and to assume a haplography.

D. *Βασιλεύς*. In a decree of οἱ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνῖται in honour of King Ariarathes V of Cappadocia and his wife Nysa there are three exceptions to

¹ Art. cit., pp. 295-7.

² Cf. Meisterhans, pp. 222-3.

Meisterhans's statement 'handelt es sich aber um andere kleinere Fürsten, so wird der Artikel zugesetzt':¹

καὶ Φιλοπάτορα βασιλέως Ἀριαράθου[	1330. 22. U (post 163)
καὶ βασιλέως Ἀριαράθου καὶ βασιλ[ίσσης Νύσης	ibid. 31
ἐπειδὴ βασίλισσα Νύσα βασιλέως[	ibid. 69

But contrast:

ὕπὲρ τοῦ βασ[ιλ]έως	ibid. 34
τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀριαράθου	ibid. 36

E. *Demes*. It is not true that the article is never found with names of demes (as Meisterhans suggests),² but the examples with the article do seem to be confined to the deme Πειραιεύς, e.g.

τοῦ Π[ε]ρ[αι]εύ[ς]	463. 2 (307/306)
καταπλεύσας εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ	844. 53-54 (193/192)

Cf.

εἰς Π[ε]ρ[αι]ᾶ πορεύεσθαι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ Πειραιέως· τ[οὺς δὲ εἰ] ν τῷ Πειραιεῖ ἐπιμελητὰς κτλ.	1283. 15-17. U (263/262)
---	--------------------------

F. *Tribes*. Meisterhans states 'die attischen Bezirksnamen, ursprünglich Adjektiva, haben keinen Artikel, wenn sie ohne Zusätze (φυλή, πρυτανεύουσα) sind'.³ A full analysis of the evidence shows this to be inexact:

(1) When φυλή is not added to the name of the tribe:

(a) The article is always added in the expression οἱ πρυτάνεις τῆς—e.g.

οἱ πρυτάνεις τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος	674. 5 (273/272)
οἱ πρυτάνεις τῆς Πανδιονίδος	790. 9 (235/4); ibid. 18, 24
οἱ πρυτάνεις τῆς Ἰπποθωντίδος	S. xvi. 95. 8 (164/163)

(b) The article is always omitted in the choregic monuments: e.g.

Ἐρεχθίδς ἀνδρῶν ἐνίκα.	3078. 3 (in. s. iii)
Λεωντίς [ἀ]νδρῶν ἐνίκα.	3079. 3 (282/281)
νικήσας χορηγῶν Κεκροπίδι παίδων	3055. 1. U (320/319)

(2) When φυλή is added:

(a) In decrees we find the article, e.g.

περὶ τὴν Ἐρ[ε]χθίδα φυλὴν	1165. 29-30. U (300-250)
---------------------------	--------------------------

(b) In the choregic monuments there is no article, e.g.

Οἰνίς φυλὴ παίδων [ν] ἐνίκα.	3054. 2. U (323/322)
χορηγῶν νικήσας ἀνδράσιν Ἰπποθωντίδι φυλῇ	3056. 2. U (320/319)

(c) In the victor lists there is no article, e.g.

Ἀλέξων Ἀπολλοφάνου Πανδιονίδος φυλ[ῆς]	
956. 47. (161/160); cf. 957 (157/156) and 958 (154/153) <i>passim</i>	
φυλὴ ἐν[ί]κα Ἀτ[τ]αλῆς	
956. 49 (161/160); cf. 957 (157/156) and 958 (154/153) <i>passim</i>	

¹ p. 230, § 86. q.

² p. 227, § 86. i.

³ p. 226, § 86. h.

G. *Months*. Again Meisterhans's remarks require further clarification.¹

(1) In the preamble to decrees the name of the month is generally given without the addition of *μήν* and without the article, e.g.

Θαργηλιῶνος δευτέραῖς ἵστα [μῆ]νου	373. 18-19 (322/321)
Θαργηλιῶνος·	1297. 2. U (237/236)

(2) In the text of decrees, when *μήν* is added, the article is also inserted, e.g.

ἐν τῷ[ι] Μεταγειτνιῶνι μηνὶ	507. 16-17 (c. 302/301)
τοῦ Μουνιχιῶνος μην [ὸς	663. 25-26 (c. 286/285)
τοῦ Γαμηλιῶνος μηνός	1168. 7. U (s. iii)

(3) Exceptions:

(a) Two examples of the article without *μήν*, viz.

ὁ ἐπὶ Ἑγεμάχου Μουνιχιῶν	1241. 30. U (300/299)
--------------------------	-----------------------

But here the article is necessary to specify the month in question.

τῇ θυσίαι τοῦ Μουνιχι ῶνος	1329. 26-7. U (175/174)
----------------------------	-------------------------

Note here the pattern article-noun-article-noun.

(b) Two examples of sub-unit preambles with *μήν* and without the article, viz.

μη[νὸς Σκ] ιρο[φο]ριῶνος.	1262. 1-2. U (301/300)
μηνὸς Πυαν οψιῶνος πέμπτει ἱσταμένου	1263. 1-2. U (300/299)

(4) In inscriptions recording leases the article appears to be inserted, usually without *μήν*, e.g.

ἀπὸ τῆς ἔκτης ἐπὶ δέκ α τοῦ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος	2498. 20-1. U (321/320)
τοῦ Βοηδρομιῶνος τῇ νομηνία	2499. 22. U (306/305)
τοῦ Ἑλα φηβολιῶνος τῇ νομηνία	ibid. 23-4
τοῦ Βο ηδρομιῶνος	ibid. 25-6

Cf. also:

τεῖ νομηνία τοῦ [Βοηδ]ρ[ομι]ῶνος μηνός	2501. 6. U (fin. s. iv)
--	-------------------------

Note again the word-patterns in these examples.

And contrast:

μηνὸς Βοηδρομιῶνος ἔνι	1241. 25. U (300/299)
μηνὸς Ἑλαφηβολιῶνος [ἔ] [ν]ηι	ibid. 26-7

H. *Ships*. In the naval records 1631 and 1632 (323/322) there are numerous names of ships. When the ship is named by itself without the addition of *τρύρης* or *τετρήρης*, the article is inserted, e.g.

ἀπὸ [τ]ῆς Δελφίδος	1631. 191-2
ἐ] πὶ τῇμ Πρόνοιαν	ibid. 578-9
ἐπὶ τὴν Θήραν	1632. 5
ἀπὸ τῆς Νίκης	ibid. 10-11

¹ p. 228, § 86. 1.

On the other hand, if *τριήρης* or *τετρήρης* also appears, the article is omitted, e.g.

τετρήρης Ἀχιλλεία 1631. 139

ἐπισκευ[ήν] τριήρους Φιλοτιμ[ίας] *ibid.* 483-4

ἐπισ[κευήν] τριήρους Ὡκε[ίας] *ibid.* 492-3

There is only one example of both the article and *τετρήρης*, viz.

[ἀπὸ τ]ῆς τετρήρους Ἀχιλλείας *ibid.* 165-6

IV. CO-ORDINATION

A. *τε* . . . *καί*. Apart from the normal use of this combination there is one example in which *τε* seems to connect the leading idea of the first member of the co-ordination with the second, although it does not appear in its logical position in the first member :

*ἐπειδὴ οἱ ταμί[αι] | [τῶ]ν τῆς θεοῦ οἱ ἐπὶ Ἑγεμά[χου] | [ἄρ]χοντος ἐπεμελή-
θησαν [ὑπέ][ρ τ]ῶν ἱππάρχων, ὅπως ἂν οἱ [ἱππ] | [εἰ]ς τὸν τε σίτον κομίσων[ται] |
[π]αρά τοῦ δήμου τὸν ὀφειλ[όμε]ν[ον] [νο]ν αὐτοῖ[ς] καὶ ἅλλα πάν[τα δ] | [ιατελ]οῦσιν
πράττοντες κτλ. 1264. 2 ff. U (300/299)*

For this phenomenon one might compare Thucydides 6. 7. 3: *καὶ ἐς Μεθώνων τὴν ὁμορον Μακεδονία ἱππείας κατὰ θάλασσαν κομίσαντες Ἀθηναῖοι σφῶν τε αὐτῶν καὶ Μακεδόνων τοὺς παρὰ σφίσι φυγάδας ἐκακούργουν τὴν Περδίκκου*. On the face of it Thucydides seems to be dividing the cavalry into two categories, and implies that the Macedonian exiles at Athens were all cavalry. But it is much better to consider *τε* as being deferred to a later position in order to bring out the essential feature of the co-ordination: thus

*ἱππείας | σφῶν τε αὐτῶν |
καὶ Μακεδόνων | τοὺς φυγάδας*

This supposedly 'misplaced' *τε* occurs in Thucydides vi also at 14; 15. 2; 18. 1; 24. 1; 63. 2; 94. 2.¹

B. *τε*. *τε* is also found as a conjunction by itself in two instances, viz.

*κομιεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ παράδ[ευγμα τ]οῦ ἐπικράνου | εἰς Ἀήλ[ον] . . . καὶ θήσει
καθάπερ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων γέ[γραπται], . . . τῶι τε [ὑ]παρχιτέκτονι συντελεῖ
κτλ. 1678. A. 11-13 (ante 315)*

*κατασταθεὶς δὲ καὶ γραμματεὺς ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ | Θευξένου ἄρχοντος οὐθὲν
ἐνλέλοιπεν φιλοτιμίας συναύξων τε διατετέλεκεν κτλ.*

1329. 4-7. U (175/174)

In one example *τε* means 'also', viz.²

*δεδόχθαι τῶι κοινῶι τῶν θι[ασω]τῶν ἐπεὶ τά τε ἄλλα πράττουσιν καλῶς |
[κ]αὶ εὐσεβῶς τὰ κατὰ τοὺς θεούς, ἀναθεῖναι | [α]ὐτοὺς καὶ στήλην ἐν τῶι
ἱερῶι τῆς Ἀρτέμι[δος]* 1298. 8-12. U (247/246)

Meisterhans is misleading in taking this as an unusual 'Verbindung von Haupt- und Nebensatz durch *τε*. . . *καί*'.³ *καί* in this case is simply adverbial.

¹ I am indebted to Prof. K. J. Dover for these references.

² For parallels see LSJ⁹ s.v. *τε*, C. 10. a.
³ p. 250, § 91. A. 2.

V. WORD ORDER

A. *Postpositives*

(1) *ἄν*. In a previous article¹ I presented the evidence for the position of *ἄν* in Final Clauses introduced by *ὅπως ἄν* in conjunction with *δέ* and *οὖν*. In the same article I also made an analysis of Indefinite Clauses with *ἄν* and *δέ*. Therefore all that remains to be added here is that in Indefinite Clauses *without* *δέ*, *ἄν* always comes second and, where *ὅτε* appears, always forms a single word with it, e.g.

τ[ρ]όπῳ ὅ τωι ἄν ἐπίστων[τα]ι.	380. 27-8 (320/319)
ὅπου ἄμ βούλῃ ται	450. b. 10-11 (314/313)
οὗς ἄν ἡ πόλις τιθεῖ.	500. 33 (302/301)
ὅταν καὶ ὥς πληρῶσιν δικαστήριον	850. 17-18 (197/196)

(2) Anaphoric *αὐτόν*. It will be seen from the examples which I quote that the oblique cases of *αὐτός* in the anaphoric sense tend to come early in their clause and never later than the position immediately after the governing verb.

I analyse the evidence under a few recognizable categories:

(a) Relative clauses:

(i) Relative + *αὐτ-* +, e.g.

ὅσα αὐτοῖς ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος προσ έταττεν	500. 16-17 (302/301)
ἐφ' ᾧ αὐτὸν κατέστησεν ὁ δῆμος	H. v. 422. 15. 12 (196/195)

(ii) Relative + verb + *αὐτ-* +, e.g.

ὅσ [α] προσέταξεν αὐτῷ ὁ δῆμος	373. 24-5 (322/321)
ὅσαι καθήκον αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυ τῷ	847. 13-14 (215/214)

(iii) Relative + subject + verb + *αὐτ-*: only one example, viz.

τὴν π[ολιτείαν] ἣν ὁ δῆμος ς ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κα[ὶ]	391. 8-9 (between 321/320 and 319/318)
--	--

(b) Genitive absolute: *αὐτ-* appears to come immediately after the participle, e.g.

[καὶ τι] μήσαντος αὐτὸν τοῦ δήμου	448. 56-7 (318/317)
καὶ ἐπὶ [Κοροΐβου ἄρχοντος] παρακαλέσαντος αὐτοῦς Ἑγη[σίῳ]	505. 30-1 (302/301)
προσαγαγόντων αὐτὸν τῶν στρατηγῶν	844. 55 (193/192)

(c) Imperative infinitives:

(i) *εἶναι* + *δέ* + *αὐτ-* + subject, e.g.

εἶναι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐγγόνο[ις γῆς καὶ] [οἰ]κίας ἔγκτησιν	373. 29-30 (322/321)
εἶναι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἀτελείαν	S. xv. 112. 26. U (225/224)

Cf.

ὑπάρχειν δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ἔγκ[τησιν]	835. 26 (paullo post 229)
δίδοσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πολιτείαν	850. 14-15 (197/196)

¹ Art. cit., pp. 293-5.

Cf.

δοῦναι δὲ αὐτοῖς | [τὸν ἐπ]ὶ τεῖ διοικήσει 488. 17–18 (304/303)

(ii) καὶ + εἶναι + αὐτ- + subject, e.g.

κ] | αἱ εἶναι αὐτοῖς πρόσδοον 448. 75–6 (318–317)

καὶ εἶναι αὐτῶι σίτησιν ἐν πυρτανείῳ 657. 64 (283/282)

There is one apparent exception to (i) and (ii), viz.

εἶναι δὲ | καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς τὰς ἐψηφισμένας τιμὰς αὐτῶι κυρίας
844. 42–3 (193/192)

But here αὐτῶι κυρίας, which go closely together, have been displaced by the adverbial καί-phrase. Cf. B. 2. b below.

(iii) Examples where αὐτ- is the subject of the imperatival infinitive:

τὰ λο[ι]πὰ χρέμ[ατα κατ]α[βὰ]λλειν αὐτοὺς πρὸς [το]ύς [ἀθ]λοθ[έτας]
380. 32–3 (320/319)

καὶ τὰ[ς εἰσφ] | [ορὰς] αὐτοὺς εἰσφέρειν μετ' Ἀθηναίων 505. 53–4 (302/301)

καὶ εἶναι αὐτὸν Ἀθ[ηνα] | [ῖον καὶ ἐκγό]νους αὐτοῦ 495. 22–3 (303/302)

εἶναι δ[ε] | αὐτὸν καὶ πρόξενον καὶ εὐ[εργέ]την
908. 14–15 (between 181 and 170)

εἶναι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ πρόξενον Ἀθηναίων 947. 3 (166/165)

(iv) Examples where αὐτ- is the object of the imperatival infinitive:

ἐπαιν[ε] | [σ]αι αὐτὸν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοία[ς] | 495. 17–18 (303/302)

καὶ στεφ] | ανῶσαι αὐτὸν χρυσῶι στεφάνῳι | 456. b. 8–9 (307/306)

καὶ καλέ] | σαι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ δεῖπνον ibid. 26–7

καλέσαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπὶ δεῖπνον H. iv. 525. 39. 44 (226/225)

καὶ στῆσαι αὐτὴν ἐν τῶι | τ[ε]μ[έ]νει
908. 19–20 (between 181 and 170)ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτ[ῶν] καὶ [τὴν β]ουλ[ὴν τῇ] | [ν] ἀεὶ βουλευούσαν καὶ τοὺς
στρατηγούς, 505. 56–7 (302/301)

Note that there are many variations on the στεφανῶσαι and στῆσαι themes, but all follow this basic pattern.

Cf. also

στῆσαι δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸν δῆμον καὶ | εἰκόνα 682. 80–1 (c. 256/255)

ἀναθεῖναι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα ἐμ πῖνακι ἐν τῶι | ναῶι
1327. 24–5. U (178/177)

In both of these αὐτοῦ is possessive and really belongs with εἰκόνα.

(v) Subject + δέ + infinitive + αὐτ- + object, e.g.

τὸν δ[ε] ἀρχιτέκτονα κατανέμειν αὐτοῖς | τὴν θέαν 500. 33–5 (302/301)

τοὺς δὲ θεσμοθέτας εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτ[ῶι] τὴν δοκιμασίαν
682. 96–7 (c. 256/255)

Cf. καὶ + subject + infinitive + αὐτ- + object, e.g.

καὶ τοὺς θεσμοθέτας [τ] | οὺς ἐπὶ Νικοκλέους ἀρχοντος προ[γ] | ράψαι αὐτῶι τὴν
δοκιμασίαν 507. 14–16 (c. 302/301)

(d) With other postpositives:

(i) With *ἄν* and *τις*: e.g.

καθότι ἄν αὐτῶι π[αραγγέλληται	503. 11 (302/301)
καθ' ὃ ἄν τις αὐτὸν παρακαλεῖ	1304. b. 7-8. U (269/268)
καθότι ἄν ἕκαστος αὐτὸν παρακαλεῖ	657. 30-1 (283/282) ¹
εἰάν τις εὖ ποιήσει αὐτὸν	448. 82 (318/317)
ὅταν δὲ ὁ χρόνος ἐξίημι αὐτῶι τῆς δεκαετίας	2499. 11-12. U (306/305)
ὅπως δ' ἄν καὶ ὑπόμνημα ὑπάρχει αὐτῶι περὶ κτλ.	908. 17 (between 181 and 170)

It seems clear that, except in comparative clauses, *αὐτ-* tends to come after the verb.

(ii) With *πώποτε*: only one example, viz.

ὅσα πώποτε αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου [προ]|[σ]ετάχθη 505. 39-40 (302/301)

(e) In clauses with prepositional phrases:

(i) *καὶ* + prep. phrase + *αὐτ-* + subject + verb, e.g.

[καὶ] διὰ ταῦτ' αὐτὸν οἶ	379. 5 (321/320 or 318/317)
καὶ διὰ τα [ῦτα] αὐτοὺς ἢ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δ[ῆμος] ἐστεφά [ν]ωσαν	656. 7-9 (284/283)
καὶ διὰ ταῦτα αὐτὸν καὶ πρότερον ὁ δῆμος ἐπήνεσεν	H. vii. 100. 18. 17-18 (282/281)

Cf.

καὶ δ[ι]ὰ ταῦ[τ]α π|άντα πολίτην αὐτ[ὸν] ὁ δ[ῆμος] ἐπόη[σε]
492. 16-17 (303/302)

where *αὐτόν* is displaced by *πολίτην*, presumably because there is a slight pause after *πάντα*, so that in a sense *αὐτόν* actually does occupy second place in its phrase.

(ii) *καὶ* + prep. phrase + verb + *αὐτ-* + subject, e.g.

καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐπήνεσαν τ ε αὐτοὺς πολλάκις ἢ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμ ος καὶ ἐστεφάνωσεν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν	500. 17-19 (302/301)
καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτων π[ά]ντων πολ λάκις μεμαρτύρηκεν αὐτῶι ὁ βασιλεὺς	657. 36-7 (283/282)

(f) There are two examples which do not fit in with the patterns illustrated above:

(i)

ἀναγορεύεσθαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς σ|τεφάνους αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸν ἔπαινον καθ' | ἐκάστην
τὴν θυσίαν 1277. 24-6. U (278/277)

This is an unusual formulation of a common formula, unusual in two respects: firstly, it has the present infinitive passive instead of the normal aorist infinitive active *ἀναγορεῦσαι* or *ἀνειπεῖν*;² secondly, it contains *αὐτοῖς*. But the stock formula *ἀναγορεῦσαι* / *ἀνειπεῖν τὸν στέφανον* may have exerted enough influence

¹ For the word-order *ἕκαστος αὐτόν* cf. be made on more than one occasion (καθ' B. 1. below. ἐκάστην τὴν θυσίαν).

² Present because the proclamation is to

on our present example to prevent αὐτοῖς intervening between the infinitive and τοὺς στεφάνους.

(ii)

ἀναθεῖναι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα ἐμ πίνακι ἐν τῷ | ναῶι καὶ στεφανοῦν καθ' ἐκάστην θυσίαν αὐτόν. 1327. 24-5. U (178/177)

This is a very peculiar example, and one feels tempted to suspect that the stone-cutter may have omitted αὐτόν by error after στεφανοῦν and then been unwilling to remedy his error. On the other hand it is perhaps just possible that there is some formulaic interaction between this example and those quoted in (e) above.

(3) τε. In the co-ordination τε . . . καί:

(a) Joining two nouns: τε stands between the article and the noun of the first member, unless the co-ordinated members are governed by a preposition, in which case τε comes immediately after the preposition, e.g.

ἐν ᾧ οἱ τε [στε] | φανοὶ καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ἀναγραφῇ[σ] | εταὶ 1262. 10-12. U (301/300)
 ἄθλα τῶν τε ἱππέων καὶ τῶν ἐπι[λέκτων] | 958. 10 (154/153)
 πρὸς τε τοὺς νῦν ἡδικηκότας καὶ παρεσπον|δηκότας 687. 32-3 (268/267)
 ἐν τε τῷ ἐπὶ Ἀπολλοδώρου καὶ | Προξενίδου ἐνιαυτῷ H. v. 422. 15. 14-15 (196/195)

(b) Joining two verbs with the same object: τε comes immediately after the first verb, e.g.

καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐπήνεσαν τ|ε αὐτοὺς πολλάκις ἢ βουλῇ καὶ ὁ δῆμ|ος καὶ ἑστεφάνωσεν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν | 500. 17-19 (302/301)

(c) Joining two verbs with different objects: τε comes between the article and noun of the first object, e.g.

τάς τε πατρίο[υς] | θυσίας ἐθύσεν τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῇ | [ν . . . ⁸ . . .]ν ἔδωκεν πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίοις 657. 40-2 (283/282)
 τάς τε θυσίας τὰς καθηκούσας [ἔθυσα] | ν καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἐπιμεμέλην[ται] 674. 11-12 (273/272)

(d) Joining two clauses, where the real co-ordination is between the subject of the first and the object of the second:

νῦν δὲ ἐπειδὴ ὁ τε δῆμος [κατελ] | ἦλυθε καὶ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἀ[πείλη] | φε 448. 62-4 (318/317)

Here the two facts co-ordinated are (i) the δῆμος has been restored; (ii) the laws and democracy have been recovered. But it is put in the form 'since the δῆμος has been restored and has recovered the laws and democracy'.

(e) Joining two adverbs: τε comes immediately after the first adverb, e.g.

ιδίαι | τε περὶ Ἀθηναίους τοὺς ἀφ|ικνουμένους εἰς τὴν χώρα|ν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ κοινῇ κτλ. 450. a. 13-16 (314/313)

(f) + τε καὶ + : only two examples, viz.

πρότε|ρόν τε καὶ νῦν 1191. 24-5. U (321/320)
 τιμῶντες τοὺς | ὄντας εὖνους τε καὶ ἀξίους ἑαυτῶν. 1235. 10-11. U (c. 248/247)

(4) *τις*.

(a) *τις* comes early in its clause, but never displaces *δέ*, e.g.

ἐὰν δέ *τις* εἰσφορά γ[ι]γνηται 2498. 7-8. U (321/320)

ἐ[ὰ]ν δέ *τι* πτωματίσει 463. 47 (306/7)

(b) *τις* always comes immediately after *ἄν* (disregarding *δέ*), and before anaphoric *αὐτόν*, e.g.

καὶ ἄν *τι* ἐγ|λείπει 2499. 16-17. U (306/305)

καθ' ὃ ἄν *τις* αὐτόν | παρακαλεῖ 1304. b. 7-8. U (269/268)

εἰς ὃ ἄν *τις* αὐτόν | παρακαλεῖ 1309. b. 12. U (c. fin. s. iii)

(c) *τις* comes after *που*: only one example, viz.

εἴ *πού* τί ἐστιν 2498. 16. U (321/320)

(5) *που*. There are four examples of *που*, in each of which it takes second position (disregarding *δέ*):

εἴ *πού* τί ἐστιν 2498. 16. U (321/320)

ἐὰν δέ *που* δείηται 463. 43 (307/306)

πλήν | εἴ *που* αὐτοῖς Πειραιεῦσιν νόμιμόν ἐστ|ιν εἰσέναι 1214. 15-17. U (300-250)

εἴ *που* λάφυρον ἀποδέδοται τοῖς καταπλέουσιν 844. 13 (193/192)

Cf. *πώποτε*:

ὅσα *πώποτε* αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου [προ]|[σ]ετάχθη 505. 39-40 (302/301)

(6) *δέ*.

For (a) *ὅπως δέ ἄν* / *ὅπως ἄν δέ* and (b) *δέ* and *ἄν* in Indefinite Clauses, see my article on Final Clauses.¹

(c) For *δέ* and *τις*, see (4) (a) above.

(d) *καὶ* + *δέ*. In this type of co-ordination *δέ* is the connective and *καὶ* is adverbial. Sometimes the whole adverbial *καὶ*-phrase comes before *δέ*, but sometimes *δέ* breaks up the adverbial *καὶ*-phrase, e.g.

καὶ τὰς ἄλ|λας δέ 682. 60-1 (c. 256/255)

καὶ εἰς τὸ λοι|πὸν δέ 909. 17-18 (c. 170)

καὶ | εἰς τὰς ἐπισκευὰς δέ προαναλίσκων 1327. 12-13. U (178/177)

καὶ ἄλλαις δέ πολλὰ|[ς] 457. b. 8-9 (307/306)

καὶ αὐ|τὸς δέ Φαῖδρος 682. 18-19 (c. 256/255)

In the latter two examples the position of *δέ* causes no disruption.

(e) In other cases *δέ* normally comes second, although in a few instances it is postponed, e.g.

ἐν ᾧστει μὲν . . . ἐ[ν] | 'Ηφαιστίαι δέ 1223. 10-11. U (post 167)

ἐμ μὲν τῷ ἐπ[ὶ] ἐ|[ν]ια]ντῷ . . | . . ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐπὶ 'Ιππᾶκου ἐνιαντῷ 903. 4-7 (c. 176/175)

In the first of these the prepositional phrases are short and do not postpone *δέ* to any great extent; but in the second the prepositional phrases are so long that it would be awkward to postpone *δέ*.

¹ Art. cit., pp. 293-5.

B. (1) ἑκαστος.

(a) ἑκαστος tends to come early in its clause, e.g.

οὐ ἑκαστοι ἡβ[ο]ύλοντο 657. 25 (283/282)

καθότι ἂν ἑκαστος αὐτὸν παρακαλε|ῖ ibid. 30-1

ὦν ἑ|καστοι ἰάσαντο 772. 12-13 (268/267)

These examples are too few for us to conclude that ἑκαστος has the 'postpositive tendency' to occupy second position if possible; but they do suggest that this is the case.

(b) ἑκαστος αὐτῶν. In the formula relating to the conferring of crowns the word order is almost invariably στεφανῶσαι ἑκαστον αὐτῶν κτλ. There are fifteen examples of this word order from 456. b. 25 (307/6) to H.S. i. 131. 71. 27 (169/8). The only exception is:

στε|φανῶ|σαι αὐτῶν ἑκαστ<ο>ν χρυσῶι στεφάνωι
S. xiv. 65. 38-9 (271/270)

But lines 38 and 39 of this inscription are carelessly written—witness ἐκάστων for ἑκαστον. It is, therefore, more than likely that the stone-cutter has written the phrase in the wrong order and not taken the trouble to correct his error.

With the normal formula cf. also

καὶ ἐστεφάνωσεν ἑκαστον αὐτῶν | [χ]ρυσῶι στεφάνωι
500. 19-20 (302/301)

ὀφειλέτω ἑκαστος | αὐτῶ<ν> : XXX : δραχμ : 1631. 392-3 (323/322)

Note too that in the very similar formulation στεφανῶσαι ἐκάτερον αὐτῶν there are four examples of the order ἐκάτερον αὐτῶν and no exceptions.

It is also interesting to note that quite the opposite order is found when τούτων appears instead of αὐτῶν:¹ there are two examples, viz.

στεφαν[ῶ]|σαι{σαι} τούτων ἑκαστον θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι
H.S. i. 120. 64. 39-40 (178/177)

στεφανῶσαι καὶ τούτων ἑκαστον θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι
1322. 24. U (fin. s. iii or in. s. ii)

(2) Adverbial καί-phrases. These tend to come as early as possible in the clause:

(a) Immediately after the conjunction, e.g.

ἐπειδὴ καὶ οἱ πα[τέρες αὐτῶν πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίοις δεδώκ]|ασιν πολιτείαν
566. 7-8 (fin. s. iv)

ἐπειδὴ καὶ [οἱ] νόμοι προ[ο]τάττουσ[ι]ν 832. 12 (229/228)

(b) Immediately after δέ, e.g.

ἐπειδὴ δέ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀστυνόμων ἐπιμέ|λεια 380. 17-18 (320/319)

προσαναγράψαι δέ καὶ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα 448. 71 (318/317)

ἐπ[α]|νγέλλεται δέ καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸ[ν] 654. 30-1 (285/284)

ὅπως ἂν δέ καὶ τὰ Χαλκεῖα θύσωσιν 674. 16 (273/272)

¹ Cf. K. J. Dover, *Greek Word Order*, pp. 26 ff.

(c) immediately after anaphoric αὐτόν: e.g.

ἐ[ξέε] | ναι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ εἰκόνα στ[ῆσαι] 450. b. 7-9 (314/313)
 εἶναι δ' | αὐτοῖς καὶ προεδρίαν 500. 31-2 (302/301)
 καὶ διὰ ταῦτα αὐτὸν καὶ πρότερον ὁ | δῆμος ἐπήνεσεν
 H. vii. 100. 18. 17-18 (282/281)

(d) Immediately after ἄν, e.g.

ὅπως δ' ἄν καὶ εἰς τὸ[ν] λο[ιπὸν] χρόνον 380. 34 (320/319)
 οὐδ' ἄν καὶ τοῖς στρατη[γ]οῖς κατανέμῃται 500. 35-6 (302/301)

Thus it is seen that adverbial καί-phrases come immediately after the postpositives at the beginning of the clause. But there are a few 'exceptions':

(i)

ὅπ[ω]ς ἄν τετιμμημένος ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου [π] | ράττει καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐππέων τῶν
 αἰ[χμαλώτων] ὡς ἄν ὑπὲρ πολιτῶν 558. 31-4 (c. 303/302)

But τετιμμημένος . . . δήμου would be awkward any later than where it is, and there is probably also a desire to combine as closely as possible the two ὑπέρ-phrases.

(ii)

ὅπως ἄ | ν ἀφελῶσιν καὶ ὅσοι τῶν πολιτῶν κατελήφθησαν ἐν | τῇ Ἀσίαι
 εἰργμένοι ὑπὸ Δημητρίου καὶ Ἄντ[ι]γόνο[υ], 657. 26-9 (283/282)

Here the verb ἀφελῶσιν has come first to avoid separating it too far from ὅπως ἄν.

(iii)

ὅπως ἄ | ν οὖν φαίνεται καὶ ὁ δῆμος τιμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς | ἄνδρας καὶ ἀξίους
 μνήμης, 683. 64-6 (c. 256/255)

This is the only example in a *state* decree in which the subject does not precede the verb in this type of expression. Cf., e.g.,

ὅπως ἄ | ν οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται τιμῶν 672. 10 (279/278)
 ὅπως ἄν οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆ | μος φαίνεται 844. 20-1 (193/192)
 ὅπ[ω]ς οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμο[ς] φαίνεται 945. 16 (168/167)

Cf. also, in sub-unit documents:

ὅπως ἄν οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες | φαίνονται 1324. 10-11. U (in s. ii?)
 ὅπ[ω]ς[ς] | ἄν οὖν καὶ τὰ γένη φαίνεται τιμῶντες 1235. 9-10. U (c. 248/247)

But we should be deterred from assuming that in the state decree in question the stone-cutter has made an error by the fact that there are three examples of the more 'irregular' order in *sub-unit* decrees, viz.

ὅπως ἄν οὖν φα | [ίν]ονται καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες 1283. 9-10. U (263/262)
 ἵνα οὐ[δ] | ν φαί | νονται καὶ οἱ τεταγμένοι τῶν πολιτῶν ἐν τοῖς φρουρίοις χάριτας
 ἀξίας [ἀπο] | [δι]δόντες 1299. 17-19. U (paullo post 236/235)
 ἵνα ο[ὐ] | ν φαίνονται οἱ τὴν σύνοδον φέροντ[ες] 1326. 23-4. U (176/175)

It seems, in fact, that what we are dealing with here is a double formulaic mould for the same type of expression, so that, when we find examples of adverbial καί not immediately after the postpositives, the explanation is that the formulaic interaction of one of the two moulds has proved stronger than the tendency of adverbial καί to occupy an early position in the clause.

(iv)

στήσαι δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸν δῆμον καὶ | εἰκόνα 682. 80-1 (c. 256/255)

This inscription is a resolution of the βουλή. Perhaps then τὸν δῆμον has been given prominence in the phrase—at the expense of the adverbial καί—to stress that the body to set up the εἰκόνα is the δῆμος, not the βουλή.

(v)

ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἐμ παντὶ καιρῷ τὰ φιλόανθρωπα πρὸς τοὺς ἀξίους | πράττηται καὶ
νῦν καθάπερ καὶ πρότερον, 844. 59-60 (193/192)

The reason here for the postponement of καὶ νῦν is so as not to interrupt the final clause with the καθάπερ-phrase with which καὶ νῦν goes very closely.

VI. FINAL CLAUSES

In my article¹ on 'Final Clauses in Hellenistic Attic Prose Inscriptions' I began by briefly stating the evidence for conjunctions introducing Final Clauses in the period before 323 B.C., this evidence being the result of a very cursory reading of the relevant inscriptions.² Mr. H. B. Mattingly has now very kindly brought to my attention five examples, which had escaped my eye, of Final Clauses introduced by conjunctions other than ὅπως ἂν. These I list below:

(i) Apart from *I.G.* i². 81. 12-13 (421/420) there are two other certain examples of ἵνα + subjunctive, viz. *A.T.L.* ii. Ag. 41 and 46 (425/424) (= *I.G.* i². 63+).

ἵνα μὲ αὐ[τοὶ ἄτακτοι ἴσιν

ἵνα εἰ [τοῖ δέμοι ἀργύριον ἡκανὸν ἐς τὸμ] πόλ[εμον.

(ii) Although noting the example of ἵνα in *I.G.* i². 81. 12-13 (421/420) I overlooked the rare variant ὥς ἂν³ (for normal ὅπως ἂν) at ll. 9-11: *hos ἄν τὰ*
ἡερὰ φέροσιν καὶ ἡέραι ἀ[σ]φαλέστατα.

(iii) There are two fifth-century examples of ὅπως + future indicative: *A.T.L.* ii. D8. 28-9 (426/425) (= *I.G.* i². 65 +), as improved by a new fragment (EM 13355):⁴ *[h]όπος δὲ ἄρι[στα καὶ ῥῥᾱ]στα οἴσοσι Ἀθελνα[[ιοι τ]ὸν πόλεμ[ον*

I.G. i². 126/ii². 1. 13-14 (405/404): *καὶ ὅπως ταῦτα ἔσται ὥς ἐπιτηδειό[τατα ἀμφοτέρους.*

University of New England, Australia

ALAN S. HENRY

¹ *C.Q.* N.S. xvi (1966), 291-7.

² Such evidence as I presented for the periods before 323 B.C. and after 146 B.C. was merely offered as a rough point of comparison for the evidence of the Hellenistic period.

³ Contrast Meisterhans, p. 255, § 91. 33: 'ὥς ἂν (mit Konjunktiv und Optativ) ist erst aus der Kaiserzeit zu belegen.'

⁴ See B. D. Meritt, *AJPh* lxxxviii. 1 (1967), 29-32.