XXVI. Preferential Treatment of Words in the Greek Clause

PAUL MORIN

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

In his recent book Greek Word Order, 1 K. J. Dover gives statistics for certain categories of words which receive preferential treatment in the clause from the point of view of position, based upon analysis of three texts: Herodotus III.61–87, Lysias XII, and Plato, Laches. 2 In Dover's system of symbols Greek words are designated as either p, q, or M. Prepositives (p) do not appear at the end of a clause except in certain specifiable instances; postpositives (q) never begin a clause; mobile words (M) may appear anywhere in the clause. Words receiving preferential treatment (symbol M^a , all others being M^b) are those which appear with disproportionate frequency as the first M of the clause. 3

Dover's material is of such interest as to merit amplification and detailed examination. The purpose of this paper is as follows:

- 1. To try out Dover's statistics on a larger portion of the text of Herodotus. The text examined will be specified in each instance in Table 1. This will be all of Herodotus in the case of the words which appear with only moderate frequency, or, in the case of the more common words, every occurrence in a portion of the text specified and beginning with 1, proemium.
- 2. To give statistics for each word contained in Dover's categories. Dover's statistics give an over-all view of the position of words which are logically or etymologically related. It may be of interest to see whether the words of such categories do in fact enjoy uniform treatment from the point of view of word order.
 - 3. To show statistically how some other semantic or syntactical

¹ K. J. Dover, *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge 1960), hereafter referred to as *GWO*. I am obliged to Professor Dover for reading this paper and for making some suggestions. Of course the opinions given are my responsibility.

² GWO 19 f.

⁸ GWO 12 f.

determinants affect the position of the Ma. Since any consideration of word order must involve at least two words standing in some relationship to each other, it is useful to specify under which circumstances, and how often, a particular word takes or yields the first position. Determinants of word order are numerous, as Dover has well pointed out,4 but for the following table I select several of a syntactical or semantic order. statistics will be entered under such of the following subdivisions as may be appropriate: nominative or oblique cases; pronominal or adjectival usage; other appropriate refinement in the case of uninflected words.

4. To add the M^a noted below (a-j) to Dover's list. are more M^a to be found, but this paper considers only Dover's and my additions.

Dover's categories of M^a are:

```
i. Interrogatives.
                                                                   xi. ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖσε, ἐκεῖθεν.
   ii. Negatives.
                                                                  xii. νῦν (νυνί, νυνδή).
  iii. The demonstrative Pro-
                                                                 xiii. \tau \acute{o} \tau \epsilon.
         noun စ်.
  iv. Words relating successive
         clauses as a whole one to
         another, e.g. \pi\rho\hat{\omega}\tau o\nu, \tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota-
         \tau \alpha, \epsilon i \tau \alpha, \delta \mu \omega \varsigma.
                                                               χνίιι. ἀμφότεροι.
   V. \epsilon \gamma \omega, \epsilon \mu \epsilon, \epsilon \mu o \hat{v}, \epsilon \mu o i.
  vi. \sigma \dot{v}, \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{\iota} s, \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \hat{\iota} s in the
        nominative.
                                                                 xxi. \epsilon i \varsigma.
 vii. οὖτος, τοσοῦτος, τοιοῦτος,
         τηλικοῦτος.
viii. o\tilde{v}\tau\omega(s) (o\tilde{v}\tau\omega\sigma i).
  ix. ἐκεῖνος.
  x. δεῦρο, ἐνταῦθα, ἐνταυθοῖ,
```

xiv. αὐτός ("self"). χν. δ αὐτός. χνί. ἄλλος. χνίι. ἔτερος.

xix. πολύς, πλείων, πλείστος. χχ. πολλάκις.

xxii. $\delta\delta\epsilon$, $\tau\hat{\eta}\delta\epsilon$, $\delta\delta\epsilon$, $\tau o i \delta\sigma\delta\epsilon$, τοσόσδε.

xxiii. $\pi \hat{\alpha}s$, and adverbs from the stem $\pi \alpha \nu \tau$ -.

I add the following for which I shall give statistics in Table I.

```
a. \tau \in \omega_S.
                                                     d. ἐναλλάξ.
                                                                                                                 g. \sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \delta \nu.
b. πάγχυ.
                                                     e. πάλιν.
                                                                                                                 h. κάρτα.
c. \pi \rho \acute{o} \kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon.
                                                     f. μόγις.

 αὐτίκα.
```

In general Table 1 (below) is modeled after Dover's, with the modifications noted. Under **Column I** is entered the occurrence

⁴ GWO 3-4.

of the M^a concerned as the leading M of the clause which contains either two or more M^a or the M^a followed by M^b ; ⁵ **Column II**: M^a preceded only by another M^a and followed by at least one other M^a or M^b or both; ⁶ **Column III**: the M^a concerned is the only M of the clause or is the last of a series of M^a not followed by M^b ; **Column IV**: doubtful cases because of the presence before the word concerned of any form of $\epsilon l \nu \alpha l$, copulative $\gamma l \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha l$, the oblique cases of $\sigma l \nu l$, $\dot{l} \mu \epsilon l s$; ⁷ **Column V**: M^a preceded by M^b ; **Column V**: M^a is the last word of a clause which contains at least one M^b . ⁸

In dividing the text into clauses I follow Dover's methods,9 which rest upon the fact that clauses are "main," "subordinate," "participial," or "infinitive." Special cases:

- b. If a noun or pronoun is subject of δοκεῖν, λέγεσθαι, φαίνεσθαι, and of an infinitive or a participle, it is considered subject of the infinitive or participle. Thus at 2.58: αί μὲν γὰρ
- ⁵ At GWO 21 Dover writes: "Column I lists the occurrences of the word concerned as the leading M of a clause which contains at least one M^b ." On the same page, however, he distributes Herodotus 3.65.1, τότε μèν τοσαῦτα, in Columns I (τότε) and III. According to the rule, τότε does not belong in Column I, since the clause contains no M^b . See below, note 8, for examples of the types to be listed in Columns I-VI.
- ⁶ Under Dover's system, to appear in Column II a word must be preceded only by M^a and must be followed by M^b . But if it is significant that M^a take precedence over M^b , it is a fortiori more significant that M^a take precedence over M^a . Hence only the last of an uninterrupted series of M^a could not be listed appropriately under Columns I or II.
 - 7 GWO 13-14.
- 8 I have added this column, which does not appear in Dover's table. The following are examples of the distribution of words into the six columns of Table 1: Col. 1: ἐγώ, 1.5.3. ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτων οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἐρέων . . .; Col. II: ἐμέ, 3.3.2. τοιῶνδε μέντοι ἐμὲ παίδων μητέρα . . .; Col. III: ἐκεῖσε, 2.29.7. στρατεύονται δὲ ἐπεὰν . . . κελεύη . . . καὶ τῆ ἄν κελεύη, ἐκεῖσε; Col. IV: σύ, 1.45.2. εἶς δὲ οὐ σύ μοι τοῦδε τοῦ κακοῦ αἴτιος . . .; Col. v: ἐγώ 1.9.1. ἀρχὴν γὰρ ἐγὼ μηχανήσομαι . . .; Col. vI: ἐγώ, 1.110.3. ἐπορᾶν δὲ ἐκκείμενον τέταγμαι ἐγώ . . .
 - 9 GWO 19-20.
 - 10 In this paper all references to Greek texts are for Herodotus.

φαίνονται ἐκ πολλοῦ τευ χρόνου ποιεύμεναι . . . The main clause is φαίνονται; αὶ μὲν . . . ποιεύμεναι is a participal clause.

- c. Oaths and vocatives are ignored.
- d. Prepositives and postpositives are ignored.¹¹

I add the following to cover situations presumably not encountered by Dover in his texts:

- f. The subject of both a finite verb and of an infinitive is associated with the infinitive. E.g. at 1.11.4: αἰρέεται αὐτὸς περιμεῖναι, the main clause is αἰρέεται, and αὐτός is entered in Column 1.12
- g. The subject of both a participle and of an infinitive is associated with the infinitive. E.g. 7.32: τούτους πάγχυ ἐδόκεε τότε δείσαντας δώσειν. I dismember as follows: τότε δείσαντας, participial; πάγχυ ἐδόκεε, main; τούτους δώσειν, infinitive. τούτους, τότε, πάγχυ are entered in Column I.

TABLE I 13

	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
ν. ἐγώ (Ι)	37	2	1	3	4	2
$\dot{\epsilon}\mu\dot{\epsilon}'$ (I–III)	19	6	0	0	11	9
$\epsilon \mu \epsilon o (-\epsilon \hat{v}) (in toto)$	16	6	1	0	23	11
<i>ἐμοί</i> (I−ΙΙΙ)	41	7	0	0	7	7
vi. σύ (I–III)	42	2	2	1	1	0
ύμεῖς (in toto)	27	4	1	0	1	3
ήμεῖς ,,	85	6	0	0	6	2

¹¹ See GWO 12 f.

¹² This is a working rule suggested by the method of handling nouns or pronouns subjects of participles and of other verbs, as cited in a above. Admittedly such a system leads to a certain artificial view of the language in some rare cases, as at 3.142.5: $d\lambda\lambda$ ovd $d\xi$ os els of γe $\eta \mu \ell \omega \nu$ draw draw. Where of must be divorced from els, and where $\eta \mu \ell \omega \nu$ draw plays the same role after $d\xi$ os as e.g. $d\pi \alpha l \nu \omega \nu$. On the other hand, the rare and momentary discomfiture which such a dismemberment causes is more than counterbalanced by the objectivity afforded in dismembering the bulk of the complexes of this type.

¹³ The references within parentheses after the entries in this table refer to the portion of the text of Herodotus examined in each instance.

	I	II	III	IV	v	vı
vii. ovros						
pronominal (1.1–52)	10	0	^	0	10	^
nom. obl.	13 45	2 3	0 1	2 0	10 13	0 13
adjectival (1.1–100)	43	3	1	U	13	13
nom.	8	0	0	0	6	3
obl.	15	1	ő	3	30	7
τοσοῦτος		•	·	·	•	•
pron. or pred. (I–IV)						
nom.	4	1	0	0	7	3
obl.	6	9	2	0	2	11
adjectival (I–IV)						
nom,	2	0	0	0	1	1
obl.	3	0	0	0	7	6
τοιοῦτος						
pron. or pred. (1–rv)						
nom.	5	0	0	11	4	1
obl.	8	14	1	2	6	10
adjectival (1–1V)						
nom.	1	0	0	1	2	0
obl.	13	1	0	0	22	8
τηλικοῦτος (in toto)	0	0	0	0	0	0
νίιί. οὖτως						
ref. back, used alone (I-II)	25	5	0	4	17	3
,, with adj. (in toto)	3	Õ	Õ	Ō	2	0
" with adv. "	3	0	0	0	3	0
looking forward (in toto)	8	0	0	0	5	5
, ,						
deictic, alone (in toto)	7	4	0	2	4 5	1 0
,, with adj. ,,	1	0	0	2	3	
,, with adv. ,,	2	1	0	0	3	0
resumptive after clauses:	14	0	0	0	1	0
temporal (I-IV)	13	0	0	0	0	Ö
participial (I–II) gen. abs. (in toto)	13	0	0	0	1	0
		-				
with asyndeton (I–II)	17	0	0	0	0	0
ίχ. ἐκεῖνος						
pronominal (1–11)						
nom.	16	1	0	0	0	1
obl.	18	5	0	1	13	16
adjectival (in toto)						
nom.	2	1	0	1	1	0
obl.	10	3	0	0	17	1
v. Selico (in tota)	0	0	0	0	0	0
x. δεῦρο (in toto) ἐνθαυτοῦ ,,	ő	0	ő	ő	ŏ	ő
ενυαυτοι ,, ενθεῦτεν (I–IV)	3	Ū	•	,	v	•
place	21	0	1	0	3	1
time	7	0	0	0	0	0

	τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν (Ι–ΙΥ)	1 11	11 0	111 0	ıv 1	v 4	vi 1
	<i>ἐνθαῦτα</i> (I–IV)						
	place	12	1	0	1	3	2
	time	39	1	0	0	1	1
xi.	ἐκεῖ (in toto, throughout)	0	1	0	0	0	2
	έκεῖσε	1	0	1	0	1	0
	<i>ἐκειθί</i>	2	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>ἐκεῖθεν</i>	1	1	0	0	1	0
xii.	v _{เป็น}						
	"now" (I-II)	34	6	1	1	18	2
	$v\hat{v}v \delta \epsilon (in toto)$	24	0	0	0	0	0
	in direct speech, followed by $\delta \nu$, $\delta \epsilon$, $\tau \epsilon$ (I–IV)	31	1	0	0	0	0
xiii.	τότε						
	antec. to ἐπεάν, ὅτε, ἥν (I–IV)	11	1	0	0	0	5
	used independently (I-IV)	20	4	1	1	12	1
viv	αὖτός ¹⁴ (I, throughout)						
AIV.	pronominal						
	nom.	32	6	1	0	16	5
	obl.	7	2	Õ	Ō	2	1
	adjectival	•	_	•	-	_	_
	nom.	11	1	0	0	4	0
	obl.	10	2	1	0	14	0
xv.	δ αὐτός (1–11, throughout)						
	prominal						
	nom.	0	0	1	1	2	1
	obl.	11	1	0	1	20	4
	adjectival						
	nom.	1	0	0	0	1	0
	obl.	14	2	0	1	21	0
xvi.	ἄλλος (I, throughout)						
	pronominal						
	nom.	7	2	0	0	5	1
	obl.	27	7	5	1	15	5
	adjectival						
	nom.	11	1	0	3	13	0
	obl.	28	3	1	2	22	1
xvii.	έτερος (I-IV, throughout)						
	pronominal		_	_			_
	nom.	11	2	2	4	4	0
	obl.	19	7	1	1	14	12
	adjectival	_	_			~	_
	nom.	3	0	0	1	2	0
	obl.	9	2	0	0	15	0

¹⁴ Not included in the statistics are usages with the oblique cases of personal pronouns.

xviii	. ἀμφότεροι (in toto, throughout) pronominal	I	11	Ш	IV	v	VI
	nom.	2	3	0	٥	5	9
	obl.	13	3 7	1	0 5	14	9
	adjectival	13	,	1	3	14	9
	nom.	0	0	0	0	3	0
	obl.	2	0	0	1	10	0
	061.	4	U	U		10	U
	N/ /N						
XIX.	πολλός (Ι)		_			_	_
	nom.	11	2	0	1	7	7
	obl.	18	6	0	1	35	14
	πλέων (Ι–ΙΙ)			_		_	
	nom.	4	1	0	0	6	1
	obl.	13	5	2	0	10	4
	$\pi\lambda\epsilon\hat{\iota}\sigma au\sigmas$ (in toto)		_	_		_	
	nom.	3	3	0	1	. 7	1
	obl.	13	4	1	2	14	5
xx.	πολλάκις (in toto)	14	1	0	0	4	3
xxi.	€ts (i−ii)						
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	nom.	10	2	0	0	6	1
	obl.	12	3	ĭ	ŏ	28	3
				•	v	20	9
::	$0 \sim 15$						
XXII.							
	pron. or pred. (1.1–100) nom.	1	^	^	,	0	0
	obl.	1 4	0 1	0	1	2 8	2 28
	adjectival	4	1	U	U	8	28
	nom.	1	0	0	^	10	9
	obl.	4	1	0	0 1	13 26	3 8
		_					
	$\hat{\omega}\delta\epsilon$ (I–IV)	11	5	0	4	21	29
	$\tau \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon \ (in \ toto)$	4	0	0	0	7	5
	τοιόσδε						
	pron. or pred. (1–1V)						
	nom.	0	0	1	1	2	1
	obl.	4	1	1	1	4	42
	adjectival (1–111)						
	nom.	1	1	0	0	0	4
	obl.	2	1	0	0	20	22
	τοσόσδε (in toto, throughout)						
	pron. or pred.						
	nom.	1	0	0	1	0	1
	obl.	8	Ŏ	Ŏ	ō	2	2
	adjectival	-					
	nom.	0	1	0	0	1	1
	obl.	2	0	0	0	3	1

¹⁵ δδε and πα̂s appear much more frequently as the leading M in Plato and in Lysias. For the statistics see GWO 23.

	I	II	111	IV	v	VI
xxiii. πᾶς						
pronominal (1)	_		_		_	_
nom.	7	4	0	1	8	2
obl.	7	8	2	1	25	16
adjectival (1.1–100)		_	_	_		_
nom.	1	0	0	2	4	1
obl.	1	3	0	1	34	6
adverbs from $\pi\alpha\nu\tau$ - (in toto, throughout)						
παντάπασιν	0	0	0	0	0	1
πανταχη̂	2	0	0	1	2	1
πανταχόθεν	0	0	0	0	0	2
παντελέως	3	0	0	0	3	0
πάντη	3	0	1	0	3	5
πάντοθεν	0	0	0	0	2	5
παντοίως	1	0	0	0	0	0
πάντως	12	7	0	0	5	9
a. τέως (in toto)						
"thitherto"	5	0	0	0	1	0
"for a time"	2	1	0	0	3	0
b. πάγχυ (in toto)	11	0	0	0	1	2
c. πρόκατε ,,	4	0	0	0	0	0
d. ἐναλλάξ ,,	1	2	0	0	0	0
e. πάλιν ,,	4	2	0	0	1	0
f. μόγις ,,	6	1	0	0	2	1
g. σχεδόν ,,						
"almost"	2	1	0	0	0	0
"nearly"	6	1	0	0	6	0
"near to"	1	0	0	0	0	0
h. κάρτα (in toto)						
with adjective	19	5	0	0	20	5
with adverb	7	0	0	0	4	0
with verb	18	4	0	1	6	3
j. αὐτίκα (in toto)						
"forthwith"	28	9	0	0	6	4
with κατ' ἀρχάς, ὅτε, τότε, μάλα	1	1	0	0	7	0
"as soon as" with temporal ἐπείτε, ώς, or gen.						
abs.	27	5	0	1	4	1
with μετά	11	3	0	0	4	1

Table I shows how often the M^a take precedence over M^b : i.e. how often they fall in Columns 1 and 11 as against Columns v and vi. The totals are:

	I—II	V-VI
$inflected^{16}$	952	999
uninflected	597	297
TOTAL	1,549	1.296

¹⁶ The totals include all occurrences of the inflected words, both in the nominative and in the oblique cases.

Expressed in other terms, M^a take precedence over M^b 55% of the time, overall. On the other hand, there is obviously a considerable difference between the performance of the inflected and the uninflected words: ¹⁷ whereas the former M^a take precedence only 49% of the time, the latter do so 67% of the time. I cite these averages as mathematical facts of perhaps momentary interest. As averages they necessarily conceal the significant differences. It will be more useful to interpret Table 1 by using a "precedence-percentage" for each category as a whole, as well as for each word individually, as in Tables 11 and 111 below.

TABLE II

Table II expresses, in percentage, how often the categories of M^a as a whole, as arranged by Dover, take precedence in the clause. The percentages in Column I are calculated from Table I, above, those of Column II are derived from Dover's statistics (GWO 22-23).

,		I	II			I	II
v.	$\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omega}$	64%	75%	xv.	ό αὐτός	37%	80%
vi.	σύ	93	86	xvi.	ἄλλος	58	77
vii.	οὖτος	47	45	xvii.	ἔ τερος	53	75
viii.	οὔτως	70	75	xviii.	ἀμφότεροι	35	50
ix.	ἐκεῖνος	53	88	xix.	πολλός	43	60
x.	δεῦρο	85	83	xx.	πολλάκις	68	100
xi.	<i>ἐκε</i> ῖ	60	50	xxi.	$\epsilon \hat{t}_S$	42	50
xii.	νῦν	83	86	xxii.	$\delta\delta\epsilon$	14	15
xiii.	$\tau \acute{o} \tau \epsilon$	67	67	xxiii.	$\pi \hat{lpha}_{S}$	24	28
xiv.	αὐτός	63	84		$\pi \alpha \nu \tau$ -	42	100

First I invite attention to the fact that, although by definition M^a are the most stable of mobile words, Table II shows that predictability of their position in the clause ranges from 15% to 100%, according to Dover's statistics, and from 14% to 93% according to the statistics of Table I. Secondly, increasing the amount of text to be examined has altered significantly, in several instances, the picture given by Dover's statistics. These fluctuations demonstrate again that the Greek author retains much freedom in the ordering of words, even M^a , and that he may not be consistent with himself in his work as a whole or in some parts of his work. In the case of $\sigma \dot{v}$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{v}$, my percentages are slightly higher than Dover's. $o \hat{v} \tau \sigma s$, $\delta \epsilon \hat{v} \rho \sigma$, $\tau \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon$ and $\ddot{o} \delta \epsilon$ claim

¹⁷ I.e. categories v-vII, IX, XIV-XIX, XXI, XXII (excluding adverbs), XXIII for the inflected, and VIII, X-XIII, XX, XXIII (adverbs), a-j for the uninflected.

the maximum stability over a great portion, or all, of the text. On the other hand, the fluctuation is most pronounced in the case of εκείνος, αὐτός, ὁ αὐτός, ετερος, ἀμφότεροι, πολλάκις and adverbs from the stem $\pi\alpha\nu\tau$.

TABLE III

In this table, entered under the appropriate headings, the percentage of occurrence in Columns 1 and 11 of Table 1 is given for every word considered in this paper.

		prono	oun obl.	adjed	ctive obl.	other
			obi.	nom.	obi.	
v.	ἐγώ	87%		_		
	$\epsilon \mu \epsilon$		56		—	
	<i>ἐμοῦ</i>	_	39	_		-
	ἐμοί	_	77	_	_	
V1.	σύ	98	—	_		
	ήμ€ι̂ς	92	_	_	_	-
	ύμε ῖς	89		_	_	
vii.	οὖτος	60	65	47	30	
	τοσοῦτος	33	54	50	19	
	τοιοῦτος	50	58	33	32	
	τηλικοῦτος	_	_	_	_	
viii.	οὖτως	-	_		_	ref. back, alone: 60
	,,	—		_		,, ,, with adj.: 60
	,,	_		_	_	,, ,, with adv.: 50
	,,	_	_	_	_	look. fwd.: 44
	,,	-		_		deictic, alone: 69
	,,	_	—		_	,, with adj.: 17
	,,	_	—	_		,, with adv.: 50
	,,			_	_	resumpt. after temp.: 93
	,,		—	_	—	,, with part.: 100
	,,			_		,, after gen. abs.: 93
	,,	_	_	—		with asyndeton: 100
ix.	ἐκεῖνος	94	44	75	42	
x.	δεῦρο	_				
	<i>ἐνθαυτο</i> î	_	_	—		
	ἐ νθεῦτεν	_	_	_	_	place: 84
						time: 100
	τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν			_		69
	ἐ νθαῦτα		—		_	place: 72
						time: 95
xi.	ἐ κεῖ		_			33
	ἐκεῖσε	_		_		50
	<i>ἐκειθί</i>		_	—		100
	ἐ κεῖθεν			_		67
xii.	νῦν	_				"now": 67
	,,					νῦν δέ: 100
	,,	-				dir. sp.: 100
xiii.	τότε					antec. to ἐπεάν etc.: 71
	,,			_	_	indep.: 65
xiv.	αὐτός	64	75	75	46	-

		prono	oun	adjec	tive	other
		nom.	obl.	nom.	obl.	
xv.	ό αὐτός	00	33	50	43	-
	άλλος	60	63	48	57	
	ἔ τερος	76	50	60	42	
	ἀμφότεροι	26	47	00	17	
	πολλός		_	48	32	-
	πλέων			42	56	
	πλεῖστος			43	47	
xx.	πολλάκις			_		68
xxi.			******	63	33	
xxii.	őδε	20	12	6	13	
	$\delta\delta\epsilon$					24
	$\tau \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon$					25
	τοιόσδε	00	10	33	7	
	τοσόσδε	50	67	33	33	_
xxiii.	πᾶς	52	27	17	9	
	παντάπασιν					00
	πανταχῆ		_		_	40
	πανταχόθεν					00
	παντελέως			******	—	50
	πάντη	_				27
	πάντοθεν				_	00
	παντοίως					100
	πάντως			_		58
	α. τέως					"thitherto": 83
						"for a time": 50
	b. πάγχυ	_		*******		79
	c. πρόκατ€		_		_	100
	d. ἐναλλάξ		_			100
	e. πάλιν		_	_	_	86
	f. μόγις		_			70
	g. σχεδόν					"almost": 100
						"nearly": 54
						"near to": 100
	h. κάρτα					with adj.: 49
						with adv.: 64
						with verb: 71
	j. αὐτίκα			-		"forthwith": 79
						with κατ' ἀρχάς etc.: 22
						with temp. ἐπείτε etc.: 86
						with μετά: 74

Table III ¹⁸ is of interest as showing that category vi, $\sigma \dot{v}$, is the only one in which all the words making up the category enjoy a high and nearly uniform degree of stability. On the other hand,

¹⁸ It is to be noted that the percentages of Table III have been computed upon the total number of occurrences, as entered in Table I, less the occurrences of Columns III and IV. The entries under III and IV cannot figure in any of the statistical operations of this paper since they represent cases where the word has been disqualified because (a) it is the only M of the clause, or (b) its situation is uncertain because of the presence of some word of uncertain character in the clause. See GWO 13–14.

examination of categories vii, viii, x, xii, xix, xxii, xxii (adverbs), g, h, and j, will reveal that one or more members of these categories deviates sharply, in a given circumstance, from what appears to be the norm for the majority of the group. E.g. in the $ov{v}$ group (vii), v or $ov{v}$ varies considerably as a pronoun in the nominative from $ov{v}$ and v or $ov{v}$ as pronouns in the nominative. The table shows, then, that words which are closely related logically or etymologically do not generally receive uniform treatment from the point of view of word order. Further, by reading the entries for each word horizontally, it will be seen that very few, if any, M^a can be said to enjoy a nearly uniform degree of predictability in all the syntactical situations in which they are found. The significant variations are too numerous to record, and I refer the reader to the table.

It can also be seen from Table III that the pronouns are more stable than the adjectives. As a group, including both nominative and oblique occurrences, the pronouns take precedence 52% of the time, whereas the percentage for the adjectives is 38. The average for the pronouns is raised by the fact that subject-pronouns, being almost always antithetical (either implicitly or explicitly), seldom have a postpositive form. On the other hand, pronouns in the oblique cases have both an M^a form and an M^b form, and the M^a form tends to encroach upon the territory of the postpositive form.

There remains to glance at Table 1 again and at Column VI, under which were listed occurrences of the M^a as the last word of The following M^a appeared last in their clause at the clause. least 20 % of the time. Those underlined actually appear as often or more frequently as the last word of the clause than they do as the first: $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \hat{v}$ (.20); $\epsilon \mu \epsilon (.20)$; $\tau o \sigma o \hat{v} \tau o s$ (pr. nom.: .20; pr. obl.: .39; adj. nom.: .25; adj. obl.: .38); τοιοῦτος (pr. obl.: .27); οὕτως (look. fwd.: .28); ἐκεῖνος (pr. obl.: .31); ἐκεῖ (.67); τότε (antec. etc.: .29); δ αὐτός (pr. nom.: .33); ἔτερος (pr. obl.: .23); ἀμφότεροι (pr. nom.: $\overline{.47}$; pr. obl.: .21); πολλός (nom.: .26); ὅδε (pr. nom.: .40; pr. obl.: .68; adj. obl.: .21); ὧδε (.44); τῆδε (.31); τοιόσδε (pr. nom.: .33; pr. obl.: .82; adj. nom.: .67; adj. obl.: .49); τοσόσδε (pr. nom.: .50; adj. nom.: .33); πᾶς (pr. obl.: .29); παντάπασιν (100); πανταχ $\hat{\eta}$ (.20); πανταχόθεν (100); πάντη (.45); πάντοθεν (.71); πάντως (.27).

The salient features of the list are (1) that it is dominated by pronouns and (2) that, including adverbs, all the words, with the exception of $\pi \hat{\alpha}s$, $\pi o \lambda \lambda \delta s$, and $\pi \acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega s$, are demonstratives or have affinities with the demonstratives. As a group, then, but in varying degrees, these words receive preferential treatment in the sense understood in this paper, but also by being relegated to the last position with considerable frequency.

It is plain that not all of the M^a discussed in this paper are of equal significance as manifestations of the phenomenon that certain Greek words receive preferential treatment in the clause. Dover has pointed out in another context ¹⁹ that, if statistics show that x phenomenon is observable 90% of the time, it is very likely that a primary determinant of word has been discovered. If, on the other hand, the statistics yield 60% or less, then the phenomenon is likely to be one of secondary importance. With these norms, the following M^a are found to be primary determinants: $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omega}$, $\sigma\dot{\nu}$, $\dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\hat{\iota}s$, $\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\hat{\iota}s$, $\sigma\ddot{\nu}\tau\omega s$ (resumpt. and with asyndeton), $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu\sigma s$ (pr. nom.), $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\theta\epsilon\hat{\nu}\tau\epsilon\nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\theta\alpha\hat{\nu}\tau\alpha$ (time), $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\theta\dot{\iota}$, $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$ $\delta\dot{\epsilon}$, $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$ $\dot{\omega}\nu$, etc., $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\sigma\dot{\iota}\omega s$, $\pi\rho\delta\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\lambda\lambda\dot{\alpha}\dot{\xi}$, $\pi\dot{\alpha}\lambda\nu$, $\sigma\chi\epsilon\delta\dot{\sigma}\nu$ ("almost," "near to"), $\alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\kappa}\alpha$ (with temp. cl.). Of these $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\sigma\dot{\iota}\omega s$, $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\theta\dot{\iota}$, and $\sigma\chi\epsilon\delta\dot{\sigma}\nu$ ("near to") should be disqualified as appearing so rarely that a valid statistic is not available.

One might properly ask whether the statistics given in this paper also demonstrate that the M^a which do not qualify as primary nevertheless appear as the first M of the clause with any more regularity than ordinary mobile words. An indication, if nothing more, is provided by these final statistics for six M, two adverbs, adjectives, and nouns, picked at random in Herodotus. The data are disposed according to the scheme of Table I.

	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
νεωστί (in toto)	5	2	0	0	5	0
τὸ παράπαν ,,	5	0	0	1	8	5
<i>ὶσχυρός</i> ,,						
nom.	0	1	0	0	6	2
obl.	4	1	0	0	7	5
μέγας (1.1–100)						
nom.	0	1	0	3	5	3
obl.	3	1	0	0	16	6
κεφαλή (Ι–ΙΙ)						
nom.	0	0	0	0	0	0
obl.	7	1	3	0	10	15

¹⁹ GWO 5.

Vol. xcii]	Words in the Greek Clause						
*	I	11	III	, IV	v	VI	
$i_{\pi\pi\circ s}$ (I–III) nom.	5	0	0	0	3	2	
obl.	4	1	1	0	10	22	

1

It happens that $\nu\epsilon\omega\sigma\tau'$ might have been included in the list of M^a , since its rate of occurrence in Columns 1 and 11 is relatively high (58%). But for the group as a whole the average percent of occurrence in Columns 1 and 11 is 26.66, 20 as compared with an average percent of 48.04 for the M^a not qualifying as primary determinants. So far as it goes, the comparison indicates that the M^a in question do receive preferential treatment, but the phenomenon is plainly of only secondary importance.

²⁰ I.e. the average of the percentages for the six words including the subdivisions, in this case "nominative" and "oblique."