

EY OIDA AND OYAE EIS: CASES OF HIATUS

I

THERE are in iambic trimeters a number of examples of hiatus where εἶ is followed by forms of οἶδα, mainly in Comedy but also (very rarely) in Tragedy. These are notable because they fall outside the usual range of hiatus in drama, which covers passages with interrogative τί (probably the most common) and ὅτι, περί, invocatory ὦ, exclamations such as φεῦ, αἰαῖ, and interjections. The use seems to deserve closer attention.

In Aristophanes there are nine cases: *Lys.* 154, 764, *Pax* 373, 1296, *Pl.* 72, 183, 838, *Thes.* 12, fr. 152. 2.¹ The forms of the verb found in these nine cases are οἶδα and ἴσθι, and are always followed by ὅτι (though ὅτι does not always follow in other metres of the poet). The phrases occur always at the end of the line (εἶ οἶδ' ὅτι, εἶ ἴσθ' ὅτι, where ὅτι provides a convenient termination) with the exception of *Pl.* 838 where it ends the speech but not the line; and in four positions in the sentence. These are as follows. (i) Initial, with a subordinate clause following. *Pl.* 72-73 . . . , εἶ οἶδ' ὅτι | κακόν τί μ' ἐργάσασθε. (ii) Medial, with a part of the subordinate preceding and a part following. *Pax* 1296-7 σὺ γὰρ εἶ οἶδ' ὅτι | οὐ πράγματ' ἄσει. Also *Lys.* 764, fr. 152. 2. (iii) Final, after the subordinate. *Lys.* 154 σπόνδας ποιήσαντ' ἂν ταχέως, εἶ οἶδ' ὅτι. Also *Pl.* 183, 838. (iv) By itself constituting the whole remark. *Pax* 373 εἶ ἴσθ' ὅτι. Also *Thes.* 12. The use of ὅτι in type (iv), where there can be no question of a subordinate clause, shows that this is a stereotyped phrase which is functionally equivalent to an adverb such as σαφῶς 'certainly, undoubtedly'. The same is probably true of type (iii); though I have referred here to a subordinate clause, it is in fact very doubtful whether the listener, or speaker, had any sense of subordination. Contrast the type of sentence introduced by λέγω ὅτι, which has subordination: with this we would not have the order σπόνδας ποιήσαντ' ἂν ταχέως λέγω ὅτι. If we use further the technique of substitution, we find that an adverb or adverbial phrase can replace εἶ οἶδ' (ἴσθ') ὅτι in the sentences of types (iii) and (iv). I shall mention later another feature of word order pointing to equivalence of a εἶ ἴσθι phrase to an adverb (on Soph. *O.T.* 1438).² In view of this we may feel doubt whether even in types (i) and (ii) there is any real subordination, though that cannot be proved.

In Attic Old Comedy apart from Aristophanes I have noted only one example: Phryn. 59. 1 ἦν γὰρ πολίτης ἀγαθός, ὥς εἶ οἶδ' ἐγώ. In Middle and New Comedy there are the following: Alex. 251. 2 ἀλλ' εἶ οἶδ' ὅτι | κυμνοπρίστων ὁ πρόπος ἐστί σου πάλαι. Philem. 152. 1 οὐ μάτην εἶ ἴσθ' ὅτι | τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο δόξαν ἐν Δελφοῖς ἔχει (οὐ μάτην of course with τὸ ῥῆμα . . . ἔχει). Hipparch. 1. 2 οὐδαμόθεν, εἶ οἶδ' ἐγώ, | ἀλλ' ἢ Diox. 4. 2 εἶ οἶδα (start of line, makes whole remark). Anon. *ap. Page, Lit. Pap.*, p. 274 (60. 10) ὦν εἶ οἶδ' ὅτι | οὐδείς με]μάθηκεν οὐθέν. Anon., *ibid.* p. 306 (65. 78) εἶ ἴσθι, βουλοίμην ἂν (start of line).

¹ A tenth example might be in fr. 186. 1, where εἶ ἴσθι is conjectured by Meineke for ἐνίστε at the start of the line. This would make the only example in Aristophanes of the phrase at the start of an iambic line. The passage is from the *Daedalus* and could be by

Plato and not Aristophanes.

² There is similar use of οἶδ', ἴσθ' ὅτι without εἶ. A parallel use of ὅτι without a subordinate clause is seen in δηλον ὅτι: here the equivalence to an adverb is especially marked in the form δηλονότι. Cf. Dale on E. *Alc.* 48.

Menander has eight occurrences (also a possible ninth, *Epit.* 552, where *οἶδα* is restored): *Dysc.* 13, 819; *Her.* fr. 5; *Epit.* 199, 770; *Phasm.* 43; fr. 334. 7, 532. 3. All have either *οἶδα* or *ἴσθι*. Only one of these is followed by *οὔτι* and a subordinate clause (*Epit.* 770). In the majority (six) *εἰ οἶδα* (*ἴσθι*) is in parenthesis; once it makes the whole remark (fr. 334. 7). Five times it is initial in the line, twice medial, once final.

To sum up the evidence of these examples from Comedy, the principal features are these. The forms of the verb used are either *οἶδα* or *ἴσθι*. The phrase is either employed with *οὔτι* (in which case, where another clause accompanies it, there is doubt as to its subordinate status), or without *οὔτι*, in parenthesis or independently. No effort seems to have been made to avoid the hiatus, which was not found embarrassing. Unfortunately it is not possible to infer the metrical value of the syllable *εἰ*, since it is always in the first part of the iambic foot; but that is not so serious since there are two cases in Old Comedy of *εἰ* before forms of *οἶδα* in trochaic metre, where *εἰ* shows a long quantity. These are Telecl. 41. 4 *ὦν δ' ἑκατι τοῦτ' ἔδωκε, καίπερ εἰ εἰδὼς ἐγώ*; and Ar. *Vesp.* 425 *ὡς ἂν εἰ εἰδῇ τὸ λοιπὸν . . .* It seems reasonable to suppose that *εἰ* before *οἶδα* and *ἴσθι* in iambs would be similarly scanned as long.¹

We turn now to Tragedy, where we find that Aeschylus does not use *εἰ οἶδα*, *εἰ ἴσθι*.² It may be thought that he even deliberately avoided their use, for in *Persae* there are several phrases which show only slight variation from them: vv. 173 *εἰ τόδ' ἴσθι*, 211 *εἰ γὰρ ἴστε*, 431 *εἰ γὰρ τόδ' ἴσθι*, 435 *εἰ νυν τόδ' ἴσθι*, 784 *εἰ γὰρ σαφῶς τόδ' ἴστε*.³ Elsewhere he does not use the collocation of *εἰ* and *οἶδα*, apart from the participial *εἰδὼς γ' εἰ*, *Ag.* 934, *Sept.* 375 (without *γ*), which has Epic association. There is the more dignified equivalent *εἰ γὰρ ἐξέπισταμαι*, *Ag.* 838: this also has a form of repetition, since the preverb *ἐξ-* is broadly expressing the same idea as *εἰ*. But it has not the tautology of *εἰ . . . σαφῶς*, with repetition of the same part of speech.

Sophocles has one example with hiatus, *O.T.* 959 *εἰ ἴσθ' ἐκείνον θανάσιμον βεβηκότα* (spoken, be it noted, by a messenger). Here *εἰ ἴσθι* governs a subordinate clause with the accusative. In other examples of *εἰ* with *οἶδα* (*O.T.* 59, 1133, *Ant.* 1043) or *ἴσθι* (*O.T.* 1438, *El.* 605), *ἴστε* (*Tr.* 1107), hiatus is avoided by interposing particles, or demonstratives, or both. Where *οὔτι* is found (*O.T.* 59, 1133, *Ant.* 1043) the phrase is initial, and followed by a subordinate clause. Sophocles has no example of *εἰ οἶδ' οὔτι* in isolation. But the equivalence of *εἰ τοῦτ' ἴσθι* to an adverb meaning 'certainly' rather than the parenthetic use seems clearly marked by *O.T.* 1438 *ἔδρασ' ἂν εἰ τοῦτ' ἴσθ' ἂν, εἰ μὴ . . .* Here we cannot separate *εἰ τοῦτ' ἴσθι* by punctuation to make a parenthesis, as may elsewhere be done; *ἔδρασ' ἂν, εἰ τοῦτ' ἴσθ', ἂν, εἰ μὴ . . .* would leave the second *ἂν* in unsupported isolation, which does not look possible. The material for discussion of the place of *ἂν*, and its repetition, was collected by Wackernagel

¹ The point is of some value in considering the pronunciation of *εἰ οἶδα*, to which we shall come below. It may be noted on the other hand that *αἰ* appears shortened in hiatus in Pl. Com. 153. 3 *οἱ δ' αἰ ἐκείθεν* (anapaestic) and Archestr. ap. Ath. 6. 300 c *οὔτος γὰρ αἰ ἐστὶν ἐκείθεν* (hexam.).

² Fr. 199 (326 Mette), quoted by Jebb *ad*

Soph. *O.T.* 959, has *σάφ' οἶδα* and not *εἰ* in the citations of both Dion. Hal. 1. 41. 3 and Strab. 4. 1. 7.

³ The expressive redundancy seen at v. 784 in *εἰ . . . σαφῶς* recurs in Ar. *Pax* 1302 *εἰ γὰρ οἶδ' ἐγὼ σαφῶς* and is surely a reflex of current speech. So too Broadhead, *ad loc.*

(*I.F.* i (1892), 387 ff.), whose treatment is still fundamental. He explains cases of repetition as due to contamination, a combination of the use of inherited second position with that of other, later positions which were adopted in the classical period, both in prose and in verse. This is far more likely than to see nuances of emphasis, as do Smyth (*Greek Grammar*, § 1765) and L.S.J. (s.v. *ἄν*, D II). Smyth quotes Soph. fr. 673 *πῶς ἄν οὐκ ἄν ἐν δίκη θάνοιμ' ἄν*; but this involves him in an absurd position. If *ἄν* gives emphasis, we should have as many as three points of emphasis in this short sentence and yet would leave out *ἐν δίκη*, which has at least as good a claim to be emphasized as the other parts.

On Soph. *O.T.* 1438 Wackernagel (p. 393) divides as *ἔδρασ' ἄν* (*εὖ τόδ' [sic] ἴσθ'*) *ἄν*; here he somewhat obscurely explains the placing of the *second* *ἄν* as due to the initial placing of the verb. But he also quotes examples with initial verb and a single *ἄν* following, as Dem. 20. 61 *μάθοιτε δὲ τοῦτο μάλιστ' ἄν*. It is of course obvious that, where the verb is initial, *ἄν* will come somewhere after; but it does not seem established that an initial verb necessarily requires *ἄν* in a particular position, nor that it should be repeated. Wackernagel returns to *O.T.* 1438 on p. 396, where *ἄν* is listed as an instance of repetition after a parenthesis or other intervening clause. However, all his other examples show *ἄν* in this use in association with another word, as indeed we expect to find it (e.g. Soph. *El.* 333 *ᾧστ' ἄν, εἰ σθένος λάβοιμι, δηλώσαιμ' ἄν*; Ar. *Ran.* 585 *κᾶν, εἴ με τύπτοις, οὐκ ἄν ἀντίποιμί σοι*). *O.T.* 1438 would be alone in having its *ἄν* isolated. Wackernagel indeed appears to propose an isolated *ἄν* after a parenthesis in one other example (p. 396: I copy his punctuation): Pl. *Phaed.* 102 *α σὺ δ'—οἶμαι, ἄν, ὥς ἐγὼ λέγω, ποιήης*. But there is no reason to separate *οἶμαι* from *ἄν*. Burnet's text runs: *σὺ δ', εἴπερ εἰ τῶν φιλοσόφων, οἶμαι ἄν ὥς ἐγὼ λέγω ποιοῖς. οἶμαι* is integrated in the sentence in parataxis, and *ἄν* follows it as second word after the inserted conditional clause. Cf. Xen. *Hell.* 6. 1. 9 *οἶμαι ἄν, αὐτῶν εἰ καλῶς τις ἐπιμελοῖτο, οὐκ εἶναι ἔθνος . . .*; Aeschin. 1. 122 *οἶμαι δ' ἄν, εἰ . . ., ταῖς ὑμετέραις μαρτυρίαις ῥαδίως ἄν ἀπολύσασθαι τοὺς τοῦ κατηγοροῦ λόγους* (both with object clause after *οἶμαι*, but that makes no difference to the present argument). I therefore take *εὖ τοῦτ' ἴσθι* in *O.T.* 1438 as an adverbial equivalent, and not parenthetical; it is not then unnatural to find *ἄν* repeated after this phrase as it might be in, say, *ἔδρασ' ἄν ἀσφαλέστατ' ἄν*. The placing of *ἄν* after adverbs is too familiar to need illustration.

The possibility should also be mentioned (but, I think, rejected) that *ἄν* is itself attached to a parenthetical *εὖ τοῦτ' ἴσθι*: thus L.S.J. (*ἄν*, D II), punctuating *ἔδρασ' ἄν, εὖ τοῦτ' ἴσθ' ἄν, εἰ . . .*. There are several different positions found for *ἄν* in a sentence including a parenthesis (in which *ἄν* may syntactically belong either to the principal clause, or to the parenthesis itself). First *ἄν* occurs at the head of a parenthesis of which it is syntactically a member (Dem. 1. 14 *τί οὖν, ἄν τις εἴποι, ταῦτα λέγεις*); here it has been attracted to the second place in the sentence as a whole, following the initial phrase. A parenthesis can separate *ἄν* (in second place in the sentence) from the rest of the clause to which it belongs (Ar. *Ran.* 1222 *οὐδ' ἄν, μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα, φροντίσαιμ' γε*); or *ἄν* may follow the parenthesis (Ar. *Pax* 137 *ἀλλ', ὦ μέλ', ἄν μοι σιτίων διπλῶν ἔδει*: compare the position of indefinite *τις* in Pl. *Rep.* 337 *ε πῶς γὰρ ἄν, ἔφην ἐγὼ, ὦ βέλτιστε, τις ἀποκρίναιτο . . .*). But we must notice that in none of these cases is *ἄν* isolated *both before and behind* from the clause to which it belongs syntactically. It is that isolation which I find unnatural in

the proposal to take $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau'$ $\iota\sigma\theta\iota$ as a parenthesis in *O.T.* 1438, whether $\alpha\upsilon$ is attached to that parenthesis or separated from it. The passage then should simply be written as $\epsilon\delta\rho\alpha\sigma'$ $\alpha\upsilon$ $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau'$ $\iota\sigma\theta'$ $\alpha\upsilon$, $\epsilon\iota$. . .

I return now to the listing of passages with $\epsilon\upsilon\ \omicron\iota\delta\alpha$. Euripides has one example: fr. 946 $\epsilon\upsilon\ \iota\sigma\theta'$, $\delta\tau\alpha\nu$ $\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\omega\nu$ $\theta\eta\eta$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$. Elsewhere $\epsilon\upsilon$ is separated from the imperative by a particle (δ' *Andr.* 368, *Hipp.* 656), or particle (or adverb) plus $\tau\omicron\delta\epsilon$ ($\nu\upsilon\nu$ $\tau\omicron\delta\epsilon'$, *Med.* 593; $\nu\upsilon\nu$ $\tau\omicron\delta\epsilon'$, *Rhes.* 816; $\gamma\alpha\rho$ $\tau\omicron\delta\epsilon'$, fr. 1033. 1).

There are no examples in any of the other Tragic fragments in Nauck.

From this pattern of use we can infer that $\epsilon\upsilon\ \omicron\iota\delta\alpha$, $\epsilon\upsilon\ \iota\sigma\theta\iota$ ($\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon$), with or without $\delta\tau\iota$, and in just these particular forms of person, tense, and mood,¹ are formulaic phrases from everyday speech, where they acquired their set character from frequency of employment. It was therefore in error that Jebb explained the hiatus at *O.T.* 959 ($\epsilon\upsilon\ \iota\sigma\theta'$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\nu$ $\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\mu\omicron\nu$ $\beta\epsilon\beta\eta\kappa\acute{o}\tau\alpha$) by referring to a literary and archaic precedent, the Epic use of *Il.* 1. 385 $\epsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\delta\omega\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon$ (to which other Epic passages can be added): not only because the digamma accounts for the Epic hiatus, but also because Epic has a participial phrase, specially associated with a context of prophecy in a number of passages (as also in Aesch. *Ag.* 934), while the passages of Comedy and Tragedy that we are considering do not have the participle (apart from the exception in Telecleides just mentioned) nor the special sense.

The colloquial character of our phrase was used by L. Radermacher² to account for the hiatus. He took it as one of several phrases or words which were adopted by literature from ordinary speech, in which usage hiatus would have been allowable. Another case would be $\tau\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$; (frequent in Comedy, but also found in Tragedy). It is relevant to add that $\epsilon\upsilon$ is not used in hiatus in iambic trimeters before words other than forms of $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$. Thus, to take just one example, Aristophanes wrote at *Vesp.* 859 $\epsilon\upsilon\ \gamma'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$. Of course $\epsilon\upsilon\ \gamma(\epsilon)$ is a very frequent combination, used where there is no question of metrical convenience. None the less I think it was found serviceable here metrically, and that Aristophanes would not have been able to write $\epsilon\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ if only because this adverb and this verb made a combination only rarely in use and so with no degree of fixity.

It remains to consider a little more closely the phonetic situation postulated by Radermacher's hypothesis. He proposed that (a) hiatus was regular in the spoken language, and that (b) when words or phrases were taken over from it for literary use, the freedom to allow hiatus remained. In addition to the two examples already quoted, he so explained $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ (Epidaurus, *I.G.* iv. 1.² 129. 11) and Soph. *Tr.* 222 $\iota\delta\epsilon$ $\iota\delta'$ $\tilde{\omega}$ $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$ $\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$. With regard to the latter the first $\iota\delta\epsilon$ in the phrase $\iota\delta\epsilon$ $\iota\delta\epsilon$ would be left unelided but the second would suffer elision, since he also proposed that this could occur at the end of the set phrase. There is, however, a difficulty here, since in the former example we should not expect $\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ to figure in everyday speech, so that it would only be $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ itself which would be colloquial; and, if that is correct, elision could occur at the end of this single word.

¹ The range of forms is very restricted, as is clear from the examples. Exceptionally, there is the single use of a subjunctive form, $\epsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\delta\eta$, in Ar. *Vesp.* 425 (trochaic), and of the participle, $\epsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\delta\omega\varsigma$, in Telecl. 41. 4 (also trochaic), due to analogical extension. It is

not difficult to accept that the three meanings 'I am sure', and 'You may be sure' (imperative, singular and plural) would be much the most common uses.

² *Anzeiger der Akad. der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-hist. Kl.* lxxi (1934), 135-8.

In the main I would accept Radermacher's explanation of the phrases $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ οἶδα and $\tau\acute{\iota}$ ἔστιν; but with this modification, that through frequent colloquial use the two words of each phrase made a stable combination, and that within this combination the rules of internal hiatus (*Binnenhiat*) were applied.¹ In other words the phrase was treated as a single unit. For $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ in such a situation there is ample analogy in the many compound words beginning with $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ - ($\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ αγάης, $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ ελπίς, etc.; before -οι-, $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ οικος, $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ οινος).

The pronunciation of the diphthong $\epsilon\upsilon$ itself remained unchanged in such hiatus, but after it a glide sound μ (or w) may well have developed, for which there is direct evidence in spellings such as Cor. $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\phi\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\varsigma$, Lac. $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\phi\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$, Cypr. $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\kappa\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma\epsilon = \epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$.² For $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ οἶδα we should then have a pronunciation $\epsilon\upsilon\mu\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$, as for $\tau\acute{\iota}$ ἔστιν, $tij\acute{e}stin$. Schwyzler indeed (*Griech. Gramm.* i. 197) gives $\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$, because he regards $\epsilon\upsilon$ as the regular pronunciation of the classical diphthong $\epsilon\upsilon$ (so that it would not be a true diphthong, but the second element would be consonantal). However, the isolated case of $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ οἶδα with hiatus is not good evidence for this, as he supposes; for if $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ was universally spoken as $\epsilon\upsilon$ (as well as $\epsilon\upsilon$ occurring as a syllable in other words), why then should $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ not have been used in hiatus before any other word beginning with a vowel? Why only before certain forms of οἶδα itself? Why should the pattern of use of $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}$ οἶδα so strongly suggest that it belonged to a particular part of the literary language, that based on colloquial speech? Schwyzler further quotes the spellings Cor. $\epsilon\phi\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, Cret. $\acute{\alpha}\phi\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, Locr. $\acute{\alpha}\phi\pi\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$, but these seem to be equally incapable of proving a pronunciation $\epsilon\upsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon$, in which w had a consonantal, unsyllabic role.³ We cannot have a syllabic division of $\acute{\alpha}\phi\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ into $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, or of $\epsilon\phi\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ into $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$: the division must be after $\alpha\phi$ -, $\epsilon\phi$ -.⁴ We may concede that the occasional use of ϕ instead of υ , and of special signs in Pamphylian and Acarnanian, to denote the second member of $\epsilon\upsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon$ diphthongs, may (but not necessarily) indicate a slight modification in their pronunciation, but not that they had ceased to be diphthongs.

The spellings with both ϕ and υ simultaneously (Att. $\acute{\alpha}\phi\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$, Ion. (Naxos) $\acute{\alpha}\phi\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}$, Cret. $\acute{\alpha}\phi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\phi\upsilon\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$) give further indication of a diphthongal value, in which the vocalic u is evident. ϕ here stands for the glide between the two members of the diphthong.⁵ This seems more likely than to deny that ϕ has any sound value here, as Scherer does:⁶ the fact (to which he refers) that inherited

¹ I use the term 'combination' (like Bloomfield's 'phrasal combination') of a close association of words which has not the complete fixity of the compound. Similarly I have written elsewhere of the negative combination seen in such groups as $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$ ἔδω, $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$ ἔθελω (*Studies in the Greek Negatives*, pp. 28 ff.). Denniston (*Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 'Hiatus') also writes of hiatus in drama 'within a more or less closely unified word-group', and this is the essential point which Radermacher did not bring out.

² Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*, § 239.

³ Note that Schwyzler's text (p. 197, l. 10) has *silbisches u*, but this is a mistake for *unsilbisches* which is put right in his *Corrections*.

⁴ We may have w as first sound in a syl-

lable where it is followed by a vowel or diphthong, or by a liquid, but not by a consonantal stop. The pre-liquid position can be seen in El. $\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\alpha$, Lesb. * $\phi\rho\acute{\omicron}\delta\omicron\nu$ as shown by $\beta\rho\acute{\omicron}\delta\omicron\nu$; also Cypr. $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\phi\rho\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\tau\upsilon/\acute{\epsilon}\phi\rho\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\tau\upsilon$, where the second of the alternative forms preserves the original $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\rho\epsilon\tau$ -. In $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\phi\rho\epsilon\tau$ - the sound of the semi-vowel ϕ (w) has been anticipated, changing the initial vowel into a diphthong. This change, seen also in some other forms (e.g. Lesb. $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta$, Hom. $\tau\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\rho\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$: Buck, *Greek Dialects*, p. 51), is the opposite of that postulated by Schwyzler ($\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma > \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$).

⁵ Lejeune, op. cit., pp. 141 (with fn. 2), 151.

⁶ Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch der griech. Dialekte*, ii. 292-3.

f had been lost very early intervocalically is no argument against the use of the letter as symbol of a transitional glide, which was no doubt in more widespread use than the epigraphic record suggests, but for which there is in fact evidence from as many as eight dialects, including Ionic. We are not, of course, dealing with an inherited sound.¹

It should be added that to take *f* in *afv* as a glide need in no way imply acceptance of the view that *ἄφντάρ*, *ἄφντῶ* were trisyllabic, with *a* and *v* pronounced with distinction. The evidence for that is lacking both on phonological and on metrical grounds. Webster, *Glotta* xxxviii (1960), 253, 260, has lately supported trisyllabic value for *ἄφντάρ* on the Attic verse-inscription (Schwyzer, *Del. App.* I, 2; Peek, *Griech. Versinschr.* i, no. 155: the second line runs *καλὸν ἰδέν· ἄφντάρ Φαίδιμος ἐργάσατο*).² He suggests that *f* is omitted from *ἰδέν*, where it would not scan, but written in *ἄφντάρ*, where it can make a trisyllable. But it is clear that the sculptor Phaidimos, who made the inscription, had no choice whether or not to write *φιδέν*: that form did not exist in Attic, nor did any other form with inherited *f*. It would have been astonishing if we had found *φιδέν* in the inscription. As for *ἄφντάρ*, there is no difficulty in scanning it as a spondee. The other inscription with which he deals has *ἄφντῶ* (*αὐτοῦ*): Schwyzer, *Del.* 760 τ]ῶ *ἄφντῶ λίθο ἐμὶ ἀνδρίας καὶ τὸ σφέλας*. This too has been much discussed. If it is verse at all, an iambic scansion is as good as any, perhaps better, giving *τῶ ἄφντῶ* as the first foot (so again, a spondee). It may, however, be prose. Webster writes: 'Either it is prose (and the *f* militates against this) or it is a dactylo-epitrite line' (with suggestion then of alternative forms of scansion). But one can hardly use the presence of *f* as a sign that the inscription is not prose. The argument, if I am not doing it injustice, could be put as follows. *ἄφντῶ* is to be taken as a trisyllable, and is used in that form (rather than as disyllabic *αὐτῶ*) because it suits the metre. But how do we know that it is metre here? Because we have *ἄφντῶ*! One might add that, if trisyllabic value were genuine, we might expect to find other evidence of it with so common a word as *αὐτός*. But I know of none.

I have referred earlier to the long metrical value of *εῦ* before forms of *οἶδα* in two trochaic passages of Old Comedy (Telecl. 41. 4, Ar. *Vesp.* 425). This implies a diphthongal value for *εῦ*, and argues against the pronunciation *evoida*.

Finally, there is other evidence that *av*, *ev* kept their diphthongal value into the post-classical period, especially that of Latin and Indian transcriptions, and of the musical extension of syllables found in the Delphic hymns; but this need not be repeated here.³

¹ Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*², p. 53, would also take *afv* as showing a contamination of the two spellings *av* and *af*, so that this would be a purely graphic phenomenon and *f* and *v* would represent a single sound. I find it difficult to agree with his refusal to accept the possibility of a glide sound *w* between *a* and *v*, which he claims, in criticism of Buck, would not be natural in the position preceding the *u*-sound, but only following it (op. cit., pp. 53-54 fn.).

The glide may facilitate transition to the *u*-sound, as well as from it.

² The form *ἄφντάρ* may also occur in Attic on a fragmentary stone from the Acropolis, illustrated in Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, Plate II. 7, where *afvτ* is found: the inscription is too fragmentary to show whether it is metrical.

³ Cf. Sturtevant, op. cit., pp. 53-54; Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* i. 197.

II

If the explanation offered for εὖ οἶδα is correct, that it made a stable combination in which internal hiatus was permitted, a parallel to it can be seen in οὐδὲ (and μηδὲ) εἰς.¹ This stronger form of οὐδεῖς (μηδεῖς) reasserted the value of the negative element, as English *not one* is more emphatic than *none*, and is found both in prose and in verse.² Elision was regularly avoided: so Hdt. 3. 125. 2 and five other times (though usually he prefers οὐδεῖς: cf. Powell, *Lexicon to Herodotus*, s.v.). Tab. Heracl. i. 136–7 οὐδὲ ἦς οὐδὲ ἔν; 157 μηδὲ ἔνα. Buck, *Greek Dialects*, 115. 49 (Cyrene) οὐδὲ [ἦς ο]ὐδὲ ἔν. Cf. *ibid.* 26. 12 (Lesb.) μηδεῖα (but 16, 24 μηδέν). Where a particle or preposition intervenes, οὐδέ may be elided: so especially with ἄν in οὐδ' ἄν εἰς. Ar. *Pl.* 137 f. οὐδ' ἄν εἰς θύσειεν ἀνθρώπων ἔτι | οὐ βοῦν ἄν, οὐχὶ ψαιστόν, οὐκ ἄλλ' οὐδὲ ἔν. Plat. *Gorg.* 512 e τὴν εἰμαρμένην οὐδ' ἄν εἰς ἐκφύγοι. Xen. *Hell.* 5. 4. 1 οὐδ' ὅφ' ἐνός. In such cases εἰς stands in sufficient distinction, however οὐδέ is treated.

One may in passing raise here the question, what value is to be assigned to the orthographic distinction made in some texts of Lesbian verse between οὐδ' εἰς and οὐδεῖς, μηδ' εἰς and μηδεῖς? In Lobel–Page (*Poet. Lesb. Frag.*) I find the following. (a) Sappho. (i) Book-texts (i.e. from papyri): forms of οὐδεῖς 67 (a) 7, 95. 10, 96. 35; forms of μηδεῖς 63. 6, 82 (b) 2; μηδ' εἰς 5. 8. (ii) Quotations: οὐδένα 56. 2; οὐδ' ἔν 31. 8, 11. In total, six undivided, three divided. (b) Alcaeus. (i) Book-texts: forms of οὐδεῖς 37. 3, 73. 5, 119. 5, 296. 6 (with *ou* restored); οὐδ' ἔν 69. 5 (with *de* restored); μηδ' ἔνα 129. 16. (ii) Quotations: οὐδέν 320, 335. 2; οὐδ' εἰς 360. 2; forms of μηδ' εἰς 342, 349 (a) 1. In total, six undivided, five divided. In the first place it must be recognized that the difference in pronunciation between οὐδεῖς and οὐδ' εἰς is minimal: hence, even if the poets wished to indicate distinction of meaning by use of the two forms (though I cannot see that any is intended in the passages under discussion), it would be difficult for an audience to appreciate the fact. Next, the evidence of the papyrus book-texts (which should be our best guide) does not seem to support the use of the two forms, to judge from the plates and diplomatic transcripts. There are three passages from these texts in which Lobel–Page use division. For Sappho 5. 8 the plate of the papyrus (*P. Oxy.* 1. 7) shows no apostrophe to mark elision, and Grenfell and Hunt (following Blass) read μ[ῆ]δεῖς.³ At Alc.

¹ As already mentioned, I see examples of negative combination where οὐ is used in close association with certain words (e.g. οὐκ ἑάω). With οὐ hiatus would not arise, as the alternative forms οὐκ, οὐχ are regularly used before vowels. But note the use of μή with hiatus in the phrases μή ὥρασι, μή ὥρας (Aristophanes, Alexis, Menander: μή is required here because of the underlying wish).

² Not that the negative element οὐδέ in οὐδεῖς was not appreciated as such: that seems hardly credible. Meillet (*Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*^s, p. 263), referring to the back-formation δέν (Alcaeus, Democritus) remarked that this showed that *on ne sentait pas οὐδέ*. But this is to read too much in the evidence of this plainly artificial form, which is due to a sophisticated rather than

an ignorant division into οὐ-δέν. I have dealt further with δέν on pp. 235 ff.

To return to the sense of the negative element in οὐδεῖς, a valuable indication is given by the form οὐθείς which in Attic and elsewhere displaced οὐδεῖς in popular favour for a period from the start of the fourth century B.C.; for οὐθείς owed its -θ- to the influence of the aspirate on the final of οὐδ-, and so shows consciousness of a division οὐδ-θείς.

With regard to the aspirate in οὐδέ εἰς it may also be remarked that there seems no reason to suppose that this feature made the hiatus easier (as suggested by Jebb *ad* Bacchyl. 15. 5 ἀνθεμόεντι Ἑβρω). Cf. Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*, p. 287.

³ So too Lobel, *C.Q.* xv (1921), 163.

69. 5 (*P. Oxy.* 1234, fr. 1. 11) Lobel-Page have οὐ[δ' εἰ]ν: naturally we could also write this as οὐ[δέ]ν, as did Grenfell and Hunt, and this would agree with οὐδέν at fr. 3. 5 of the same papyrus (= Alc. 73. 5). The third example of division is that of *μηδ' εἶνα* (Alc. 129. 16, *P. Oxy.* 2165, fr. 1. 16): here too *μηδένα* in the first edition of the papyrus. So there seems to be no evidence in the papyri to make us read sometimes οὐδέεις and sometimes οὐδ' εἶς; and, so far as we can be guided here by palaeographic evidence, it would appear that on the ground of consistency οὐδ' εἶς and *μηδ' εἶς* should be replaced by the undivided forms in our texts of the Lesbian poets. I would, of course, include in the change the texts derived from quotations, for which too there seems no reason to postulate alternative forms. Whether we will then have restored the original form cannot, unfortunately, be claimed as certain, because the palaeographic evidence is not in itself conclusive. The scribes were not consistent in using the apostrophe generally, any more than with other *Lesezeichen*; and they were writing long after the date of composition of the texts. However, we should expect use of the apostrophe the more if we were to suppose that they sometimes intended division of οὐδέεις, and sometimes not: it would be a serviceable means of distinction. Further, we can add to their evidence, negative as it is, the text Alc. 320 L.-P. *καί κ' οὐδέν ἐκ δεινὸς γένοιτο*,¹ in which the unified form οὐδέν is guaranteed by the antithesis with δεινός. The form δέν is only possible when so opposed to οὐδέν (or to *μηδέν*, as in Democr. 156 *μη μάλλον τὸ δέν ἢ τὸ *μηδέν* εἶναι*),² and the use of οὐδ' εἶν would hopelessly obscure the contrast.

Examples of οὐδὲ (and *μηδὲ*) εἶς together, and unelided, occur in Comedy, both Old and (more frequently) Middle and New. The following are some examples (but the list is by no means exhaustive): Ar. *Lys.* 1044, *Pl.* 37, 138, 1115, 1182, *Ran.* 927. Aristophon 9. 5, 10. 1. Philem. 11. 3. Alex. 27. 1, 3; 125-6. 11. Men. *Dysc.* 252 and six other times in this play (cf. Lloyd-Jones's index); twenty-seven times in the other plays and fragments (cf. Koerte's index). To these iambic examples may be added, in other writing that drew on popular sources, οὐδὲ εἶς in Epicharmus 245. 2, 283, 285. 3 (Kaibel: all trochaic); *μηδὲ εἶς* in Hipponax 62 (Diehl: scazon). But in Tragedy the use is almost wholly absent. There is no example in the three major tragedians. The nearest that we come to it in these authors is in the form with *ἀν*, οὐδ' *ἀν* εἶς: Soph. *Ant.* 884, *O.T.* 281, *O.C.* 1656, *Tr.* 1072, fr. 619. 1. Eur. fr. 1064. 6. In Nauck, *Trag. Graec. Frag.*, I have found two cases of οὐδὲ εἶς itself. Dionys. 7. 2 (p. 795) *τοῖς οὐδὲν οὖσιν οὐδὲ εἶς ὅλως φθονεῖ*. Fr. adesp. 477 (p. 933) *ἄνευ θεοῦ γὰρ οὐδὲ εἶς ἀνὴρ σθένει*.³ The distribution of οὐδὲ εἶς as between Comedy and Tragedy is remarkably similar to that of εἶν *οἶδα*.

III

Finally, another and a different type of support for the use of εἶν in combination is to be found, in such phrases as *ἀντ' εἶν ποιεῖν, πᾶσχειν*. Dem. 20. 64 *ὅσους εἶν ποιήσαντας ἢ πόλιν ἀντ' εἶν πεποίηκεν* (*ἀντευπεποίηκεν*, FA). Ibid. 124

¹ Even here Lobel (*Δ.μ.* 84) read *καί κ' οὐδ' εἶν* . . . , but, as noted, in *Poet. Lesb. Frag.* return is made to the form οὐδέν.

² I amplify this point in considering separately the use of δέν (pp. 235 ff.).

³ Meineke would remove both of these,

assigning the first to the comic poet of the same name, and proposing emendations to displace οὐδὲ εἶς in the second. But such a very rare appearance of the use in Tragedy is not to be ruled out in principle.

ἀντ' εὖ ποιήσωμεν (again written unseparated, FA). Plat. *Gorg.* 520 ε τὸν εὖ παθόντα ἐπιθυμεῖν ποιεῖ ἀντ' εὖ ποιεῖν (separated, B; unseparated, TWF). Ibid. εὖ ποιήσας ταύτην τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἀντ' εὖ πείσεται. Further ἀντ' εὖ ποιεῖν (or ἀντευποιεῖν) at Ar. *Pl.* 1029, Xen. *Anab.* 5. 5. 21, Arist. *E.N.* 1179^a28, *Rh.* 1374^a24. Also with κακῶς: Thuc. 3. 13. 1 μὴ ξὺν κακῶς ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς . . . ἀλλὰ ξυνελευθεροῦν. This last example is especially valuable because it gives the decisive answer to the problem posed by the unusual position of the preverb, in apparent isolation from its verb. Kühner-Gerth (*Griech. Gramm.* i. 538) look at it from an incorrect aspect, seeking to explain the insertion (*die Dazwischenstellung*) of the adverb (εὖ, κακῶς) which divides the compound verb, and so coupling their discussion of it with that of cases of tmesis. That course might not seem impossible for ἀντ' εὖ ποιεῖν, e.g. in Dem. 20. 64 (the first example quoted above). One would start from ἀντιποιῶ, to which would be added εὖ which produces a separation of ἀντι- from -ποιῶ. This is, however, open to the objection that ἀντ' εὖ πεποίηκεν is contrasted, in the passage under discussion, with εὖ ποιήσαντας: the antithesis is effected by adding, in the second phrase, ἀντί to the earlier εὖ ποιῶ. This suggests that the constitution of the phrase is that of (i) ἀντί + (ii) εὖ ποιῶ. There is a similar basis of antithesis in the other passages with ἀντ' εὖ ποιῶ and πάσχω. Still more convincing is the use of ξὺν κακῶς ποιεῖν in Thuc. 3. 13. 1, for here it is quite out of the question to start with ξυν-ποιεῖν (συμποιεῖν): we are not asked to contemplate an act consisting of τὸ συμποιεῖν, to which a modifying κακῶς is added. Again, the antithesis with ξυνελευθεροῦν shows that ξύν is added to κακῶς ποιεῖν: to the idea of 'doing an injury' is added 'in company with others'.

The problem of the proper graphic, and accentual, convention for these phrases (whether ἀντ' εὖ ποιεῖν, or ἀντευποιεῖν) still remains. This might only be solved by finding direct evidence for the orthography used by, say, Thucydides or Demosthenes; but possibly, not even then. In other words, we cannot expect to solve it. But that is a matter of small account. Linguistically it seems plain that we have examples of combination in εὖ ποιεῖν, εὖ πάσχειν, and κακῶς ποιεῖν; that it is this association which allows the phrases to be preceded by the prefixes ἀντί (or ἀντι-), σύν (or συν-), as if a simple verb followed; and that the association is parallel to that seen in εὖ οἶδα.¹

University College, Swansea

A. C. MOORHOUSE

¹ I am glad to acknowledge assistance given me by Mr. P. J. Parsons.