

AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

ALBERT RIJKSBARON

IRENE J.F. DE JONG

HARM PINKSTER

VOLUME SEVEN

PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED

1. A. Rijksbaron, *Grammatical Observations on Euripides' Bacchae*. 1991.
2. R. Risselada, *Imperatives and other Directive Expressions in Latin. A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language*. 1993.
3. G. Wakker, *Conditions and Conditionals. An Investigation of Ancient Greek*. 1994.
4. C. Kroon, *Discourse Particles in Latin. A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. 1995.
5. H. Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek. A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus*. 1995.
6. J.E. v.d. Veen, *The Significant and the Insignificant. Five Studies in Herodotus' View of History*. 1996.

NEW APPROACHES TO  
GREEK PARTICLES

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COLLOQUIUM HELD IN  
AMSTERDAM, JANUARY 4-6, 1996,  
TO HONOUR C.J. RUIJGH  
ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

EDITED BY

ALBERT RIJKSBARON

J. C. GIEBEN, PUBLISHER  
AMSTERDAM 1997

of drying up ...' No doubt Denniston would have been amazed at the torrential effect on the field of the publication of his own work. There are clear signs, however, that the field is recovering, and the renewed interest in particles is a very welcome development. For, rather than as 'parapleromatic' embellishments, particles should be regarded as part and parcel of the Greek language. In the quotation used as a motto to this Introduction,<sup>9</sup> Jespersen compared the function of particles and other 'grammatical words' with that of policemen controlling the traffic, a daring but appropriate comparison. Without particles human communication would of course still be possible, but soon look like the traffic in Cairo at rush-hour.

## GREC ÉCRIT ET GREC PARLÉ

### *Une étude contrastive des particules aux Ve-IV<sup>e</sup> siècles*

YVES DUHOUX

Université de Louvain-la-Neuve

#### 1. Généralités

Dans son ouvrage désormais classique sur le 're épique', C. J. Ruijgh a pris la peine d'examiner en détail chacun des quelque huit cents passages homériques de cette particule, pensant, à juste titre, qu'il est préférable d'étudier l'intégralité d'un matériel plutôt qu'une sélection restreinte.

C'est en m'inspirant de son exemple que je voudrais présenter ici une étude mettant en jeu l'ensemble des particules de plusieurs oeuvres grecques des Ve-IV<sup>e</sup> s. avant J.-C. J'y explorerai principalement la question du rapport entre grec écrit et parlé. Ceci mettra en jeu des comparaisons entre textes dialogués ou non, ainsi qu'entre oeuvres scéniques et non scéniques. Subsidièrement, j'opérerai certaines confrontations d'auteur à auteur.

L'essentiel du corpus utilisé comportera cinq couples de textes totalisant 62.219 mots dont j'ai opéré un dépouillement personnel; l'étude portera sur 9.958 particules présentes dans cet ensemble. Accessoirement, je me référerai à d'autres relevés effectués par d'autres ou par moi-même.

L'ensemble du travail présente une méthode d'approche des particules qui pourrait se révéler féconde pour des recherches ultérieures.

#### 2. Particules étudiées

Tout travail sur les particules grecques devrait, théoriquement, en avoir donné au préalable une définition et déterminé la fonction. Ceci demanderait à soi seul une étude à part,<sup>1</sup> de sorte que je me limiterai ici à donner ma définition personnelle. J'entends par *particules* un ensemble hétérogène de mots invariables dont la fonction est de spécifier:

<sup>9</sup> Taken from 'Monosyllabism in English', the Biennial Lecture on English Philology, read before the British Academy, Nov. 6, 1928, printed in: *Linguistica*, Copenhagen-London 1933, 384-408; the quotation at p. 404.

<sup>1</sup> Sur cette question, voir par exemple F. R. Adrados, *Nueva Sintaxis del Griego Antiguo*, Madrid, 1992, 708-715; Blomqvist, 20-22; Denniston, xxxvii-lv; Fraenkel; Hellwig; Labéy, 1-3; J. Redondo, 'De nuevo sobre la cuestión de las partículas griegas', *Actas del VII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid, 1989, 261-266; Ruijgh, 99-102; Schwyzler, II, 553-556; Sicking.

- = : différence non significative d'après le test du  $\chi^2$   
 ≠ : différence significative d'après le test du  $\chi^2$   
 > : significativement plus grand que (d'après le test du  $\chi^2$ )  
 < : significativement plus petit que (d'après le test du  $\chi^2$ )  
 ~ : en regard de

### Abréviations bibliographiques

- Blomqvist, J.  
 1969 *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose*. Lund  
 Cauquil, G. - J.-Y. Guillaumin  
 1985 *Vocabulaire de base du grec*. Besançon  
 Denniston, J.D.  
 1954<sup>2</sup> *The Greek Particles*. Oxford  
 Dickey, E.  
 1995 'Forms of Address and Conversational Language in Aristophanes and Menander'. *Mnemosyne* 48, 257-271  
 Duhoux, Y.  
 1997 'Quelques idées reçues, et néanmoins fausses, sur les particules grecques'. *L'Antiquité Classique*  
 Fraenkel, J.J.  
 1947 'A Question in Connection with Greek Particles'. *Mnemosyne* 13, 183-201  
 Hellwig, A.  
 1974 'Zur Funktion und Bedeutung der griechischen Partikeln'. *Glotta* 52, 145-171  
 Labéy, D.  
 1950 *Manuel des particules grecques*. Paris  
 Meillet, A.  
 1965<sup>7</sup> *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*. Paris  
 Ruijgh, C.J.  
 1971 *Autour de « épique »*. *Études sur la syntaxe grecque*. Amsterdam  
 Schwyzer, E.  
 1939-71 *Griechische Grammatik*. Munich  
 Sicking, C.M.J.  
 1986 'Griekse partikels: definitie en classificatie'. *Lampas* 19, 125-141  
 Sicking, C.M.J. - J.M. Van Ophuijsen  
 1993 *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage. Lysias and Plato*. Leyde etc. *TLG: Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (Université de Californie à Irvine).  
 Trenkner, S.  
 1960 *Le style καί dans le récit attique oral*. Assen, 1960 [réimpression de l'édition de 1948]

## PARTICLES IN GREEK EPIGRAPHICAL TEXTS

### *The Case of Arcadian*

ANNA MORPURGO DAVIES  
 Somerville College, Oxford

### 1. Three preliminary points

Three points are relevant to most discussions of Greek particles. The first concerns the widespread belief that Greek is unbelievably rich in particles and combinations of particles. Admittedly it is normally assumed that this applied to Homeric and Classical Greek and it is accepted that the position changes when we reach the New Testament. Similarly it is taken for granted that different literary genres made different use of particles. Denniston ([1934] 1954) carefully distinguishes between poetry and prose. Yet we do not normally ask ourselves how rich in particles the dialects are, or, less optimistically, what we know about the use of particles in the dialects other than Attic and Ionic. Denniston's references to dialects concern literary dialects and mainly Ionic and Attic.

The second point concerns the development of particles and of the use of particles in Greek. The traditional but valuable *Syntaxe grecque* by Humbert (1954: 370), just to take an example, has a clear statement on the subject. The author justifies his decision to discuss the Attic use of particles in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. pointing out that it is far more developed and refined than anywhere else. 'Chez Homère, le clavier des particules est fort réduit, non seulement parce que les particules sont elles-mêmes peu nombreuses, mais surtout parce qu'elles ne sont que grossièrement différenciées et ne se sont pas augmentées des nombreuses "combinaisons" que nous attestent l'attique. Le développement des particules, l'affinement de ces instruments d'expression de plus en plus précis, est parallèle au développement, si rapide et si brillant, de l'esprit grec entre le VI<sup>e</sup> siècle et la fin du V<sup>e</sup>.' One may disagree with the general conclusion but the implication is that there is development and variety in the use of particles. Is this development typical of dialects too? What evidence do we have?

A third and more general point has to do with the grammatical status of particles. There is an unstated agreement that they belong to the systemic part of grammar; they are a closed rather than an open class. Hence they are less likely to be borrowed and

when due to innovations more likely to come into existence through the internal development of the language. In other words, we like to believe that particles may arise through complex processes of grammaticalization just as complementizers, auxiliary verbs or other morphological categories. This belief is widely shared. Even at the very beginning of the nineteenth century in the so-called prescientific linguistics John Jamieson, the author of *Hermes Scythicus or, The Radical Affinities of the Greek and Latin Languages to the Gothic* (Edinburgh 1814) argued that particles were the ideal ground on which to test the possible kinship of languages since they were likely to be inherited and not borrowed: 'The particles, or "winged words", as they have been nominated, are preferred in the proof of this affinity for several reasons. These are generally of the highest antiquity .... They are also more permanent than most other terms .... They are also least likely to be introduced into another language ...' (op. cit., ii: 2). Indeed, the view that borrowing is much more likely for open classes like lexical items than for closed classes has long been accepted (Haugen 1950). Should we then reckon that particles, which in all likelihood form a closed class, are not normally borrowed? And does this apply to particles as such (i.e. to the possibility of particles as loanwords) or to the way in which they are used (i.e. to the possibility of semantic loans)? The answer is important for the Greek dialects. If particles and particle use tend to be developed through internal mechanisms we might expect considerable divergences between the dialects. More exactly, we might expect such divergence, if a) the assumption just made about particles as belonging to a closed class is correct, b) borrowing processes between dialects in general or between the Greek dialects in particular are comparable to those between languages.

## 2. Particles in inscriptions

We may now turn from the general to the specific. First (§ 2.1) I shall make some general observations about the epigraphical use of particles; then I shall briefly discuss the data we have about particles in Arcadian and Cypriot (§ 2.2); this survey of the material will finally lead me to concentrate on Arcadian and on the use of connectives in Arcadian inscriptions (§ 3). Mycenaean will be used to provide some sort of background to our history. It is with some trepidation that I offer this paper to Kees Ruijgh, who has been both a friend and a model for thirty years and more, and who has never ceased to impress and astonish me with his complete mastery of all forms of Greek, early and late, literary and epigraphical.

### 2.1. Some general observations

That of particle is a vague concept and I cannot avoid any longer a statement about what is meant by particle in this paper. I shall not try to provide a definition but shall exploit a previously formulated list. For Attic Humbert (1954: 374ff.) mentions *ἀλλά, ἄρα, ἄρα, ἀτάρ, αὐτάρ, αὐ, αὐτε, αὐτις, γάρ, γε, δαί, δέ, δή, ἦ, ἦ, καί, καίτοι, μάν/μήν, μέν, μέντοι, οὖν, περ, που, τε, τοι, τοιγάρ, τοιγάρτοι,*

*τοιγαροῦν, τοίνυν.* I shall use this list as a starting point, accepting Humbert's exclusions, i.e. I shall not consider, for instance, the so called potential particles like *ἄν, κε(v)*, nor shall I deal with conjunctions like *εἰ, ἐπεὶ, ὥς*, or prepositions like *ἐπί, παρά*, etc. However, I shall add to Humbert's list the Homeric particles *ἰδέ, νο, θην*, and keep in mind the existence of dialect-specific particles like the Cypriot *παί* or the Thessalian *μα*, which corresponds in usage to *δέ*. What do we know about these particles outside literature?

The answer is that we know very little; outside literature most particles are not attested or are badly attested. Indeed the extent of this non-attestation must surprise and the point requires further illustration.

I start with a body of material which ought in theory to be rich in particles—that of Greek verse inscriptions. P.A. Hansen's edition of the *Carmina epigraphica graeca* I-II (1983-89), even if not completely up-to-date, offers sufficient evidence for the verse inscriptions written before 300 B.C. and I base my observations on it.

Particularly in the first volume (inscriptions dated before 400 B.C.) we find texts heavily influenced by the epic language and we might expect that on the one hand the desire to imitate epic poetry and on the other the need to fill slots in the metre may have led to large use of particles which offer convenient monosyllabic or disyllabic elements. A quick reading leads to different conclusions. Not even half of our list is represented in the verse inscriptions of the period before 400. If we consider Hansen's second volume which contains for the most part inscriptions of the fourth century the evidence increases but we still have considerable gaps. In any case the main point is the rarity of these particles in the early period at least. In ca. 500 verse inscriptions written before 400 only *καί, δέ* and *τε* or *τε ... καί* can be said to occur reasonably frequently; for the rest *ἀλλά, γάρ, μέν* occur more than 8 times each, while eight other particles (*αὐθε, αὐτάρ, εἴτε, εὔτε, ἦ, ἦδέ, περ, πω*) occur at best four times each but often once or twice each only.<sup>1</sup> Obviously the absence of some particles may be due to chance. Thus Hansen has no examples of *μάν*, but an instance of the particle occurs in the elegiac distichs of the Sixth Century Polyandron of Ambracia recently published: *Καἰ μάν Ἀραθθίωνα Καἰ Εὐξενον ἴστε, πολίταε, / ἠὲ μετὰ τῶνδ' ἀνδρῶν Καρ ἔκιχεν θανάτῳ.*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hansen lists 465 inscriptions in CEG I and another 32 early inscriptions in CEG II (cf. p. 299). The figures for the least frequent particles are given below distinguishing occurrences in Attic (A) and in non-Attic (nA) inscriptions: *ἀλλά* (A x 2; nA x 7), *αὐθε* (nA x 1), *αὐτάρ* (A x 1; nA x 3), *γάρ* (A x 6; nA x 4), *εἴτε* (A x 1), *εὔτε* (A x 1), *ἦ* (A x 1; nA x 2), *ἦδέ* (A x 3; nA x 1), *μέν* (A x 11; nA x 2 or 3), *περ* (nA x 2), *πω* (nA x 1). I have not counted the particles which are entirely restored or doubtful.

<sup>2</sup> For the text (five distichs which belong to the sixth century B.C.) see Andreou (1986), Bousquet (1992), Cassio (1994); presumably in the name *Ἀραθθίωνα* the first vowel is long and the *ι* is consonantal, so that we have three long syllables followed by a short one. I owe to Albio Cassio the observation that here the use of *μάν* is entirely parallel to that of Homer, where it regularly occurs before vowel. On the other hand, as he points out, Homer has *οὐ μάν* before vowel as well as *ἦ μάν* before vowel, but never *καὶ μάν*, while *καὶ μέν* occurs frequently before consonant and rarely before vowel.

Even if new discoveries bring new evidence the rarity of particles is not in question; the lesson to be learned at this stage is that even in poetry we need not expect the same richness in particles or combinations of particles that we find in Homer or in Attic literary prose. If that is so in verse inscriptions, we should not be surprised when we turn to prose inscriptions in a local non-literary dialect. I have chosen Arcadian as a test case on various grounds. First the available data are of a manageable proportion; secondly the dialect inscriptions have been recently edited by Dubois (1986) and even more recently most of them have been reconsidered by Thür and Taeuber (1994), so that one can use these texts with a few basic additions as an adequate representation of what we have for the dialect; thirdly we may legitimately compare Arcadian with Cypriot on the one hand and with Mycenaean on the other to extend our historical perspective.

## 2.2. Arcadia and Cyprus

Arcadia as all other Greek regions has yielded a number of dialect inscriptions and a greater number of inscriptions in koine; there are also a few instances of texts in koina. The dialect inscriptions which concern us start in the sixth century B.C. and continue down to the third century B.C. when the dialect is replaced by the koine. What follows concerns the dialect inscriptions only.

As we might have expected the Arcadian inscriptions are not rich in particles: a complete list (which again excludes modal particles and conjunctions) comprises: *ἀλλά* (2 or 3 times), *δέ* (*μηδέ*, *ουδέ*), *ἦ*, *κάς/καί*, *μέν*, *τε* (*ζ'*, *εἴτε/εἴη*, *μήτε*, *οὔτε*), of which only *δέ*, *ἦ*, *κάς/καί* have any frequency. In addition oaths are introduced by *ὄϊ*, equivalent to *ὄϊ* found elsewhere in Greek, and there is a very doubtful instance of *ἀτάρ* (see below).<sup>3</sup>

This paucity of particles is not, as I said, unexpected. It is striking, however, how Arcadian differs from Cypriot not in the number but in the types of particles. In Cypriot we do not seem to find either *τε* or *δέ* as such, though two occurrences of *me-te* could be interpreted as including either *δέ* or *τε*.<sup>4</sup> The basic connective is *κάς* (not *καί* as in the majority of the Arcadian inscriptions), which is clearly used where elsewhere we might expect *δέ*. In addition Cypriot offers evidence for three apparently archaic particles: *παί*, *ἰδέ* and *αὐτάρ*; the first is Cypriot only, the second and third are also found in Homer and in the poetry influenced by the epic language but

<sup>3</sup> For the sake of completeness, though it does not feature in Humbert's list, I add here the two examples of *ποτε* in two late Hellenistic defixiones sometimes attributed to Arcadia (Dubois 1986: ii, 319ff.). In fact, as pointed out by Dubois, there is no real evidence that the texts are Arcadian. On the other hand I have not considered the particles *δαν*, *καν*, *ναν* identified by Dubois (1986: i, 227ff.), both because, as indicated above, I am not concerned with potential particles, and because I follow Hodot (1990) in a different interpretation of the texts. Cf. also Dunkel (1990).

<sup>4</sup> *me-te* ... *me-te* occur twice, in fourth century Paphos: ICS<sup>2</sup> 8, Masson-Mitford 1986, no. 237; for Masson the correct interpretation is *μήτε*, but for Risch (1988: 73 note 22) it is *μηδέ*. In addition an example of *te*, which may (but need not) be interpreted as *τε* or *δέ* occurs in ICS<sup>2</sup>, 406, and for metrical reasons Neumann (1975: 154 = 1994: 533) introduces a *δέ* in the final line of ICS<sup>2</sup> 264.

not elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> Other absences are not significant given the limits of our evidence, but even in our scrappy texts we would have expected to find a reasonable number of occurrences of *τε* and *δέ*, if they had been in real use. The presence of *ἰδέ* and *αὐτάρ* is significant, since, as C.J. Ruijgh pointed out long ago (1967: 29-57), they must belong to an earlier 'Achaean' stratum. If so, it seems likely that Arcadian had them too at some stage but presumably lost them or used them at a stylistic level or a register which differs from that of our texts. Notice, however, that for Arcadian and Cypriot we assume an earlier unity at a post-Mycenaean period (Morpurgo Davies 1992). This means that the differences which we have observed in the particle lists must be due to developments which follow the period of unity. In other words as far as particles are concerned the patterns of development are relatively fast.

## 3. A closer look at Arcadian

### 3.1. *ἀτάρ*, *ἀλλά*

We may now look more closely at the Arcadian list. The supposed *ἀτάρ* occurs only once—and only if we accept a specific interpretation and reading of the text in question (IG V 2 343, 50; cf. Dubois 1986: ii, 157f.). The most recent editors (Thür and Taeuber 1994: 133 at l. 47) do not and it may be wiser to suspend judgement.

Of the other particles *ἀλλά* is very rare: one or two examples from the fourth century (in texts where outside influence cannot be excluded)<sup>6</sup> and one later example in a defixio which need not be Arcadian (Dubois 1986: ii, 320).

Two particles only, *κάς* or *καί* and *δέ*, are reasonably frequent; the remaining ones, *μέν* and *τε* are not. All of these require further discussion.

### 3.2. *τε*

I hardly need to rehearse the history of *τε*; in its inherited labiovelar form (*qe*) it is omnipresent in Mycenaean but in alphabetic Greek it is mostly replaced by *καί* (or *κάς* in Cypriot and parts of Arcadian). This is interestingly enough a panhellenic phenomenon and the history of *τε* everywhere, including Arcadian, cannot be wholly dissociated from that of *κάς/καί*, largely because its scarcity of occurrence is deter-

<sup>5</sup> For the references cf. the Cypriot lexica by Hintze (1993) and Egetmeyer (1992) s.vv. *pa-i*, *i-te*, *au-ta-ra-la-u-ta-ra*. It is likely, but obviously not certain, that the Idalion inscription (ICS<sup>2</sup> 217) has a preform of the Attic *οὐν* and conceivably an instance of *γε*; the *νυ* particle seems to be attested as well. Also *ἦ* is found more than once, while a late verse inscription (ICS<sup>2</sup> 264) contains a sequence *o-wo-ka-re-ti* where different exegeses have recognized the particle *γάρ* (Masson, ad loc.) or the particles *ἄρ* *ἔτι* (Neumann, loc. cit. in note 4).

<sup>6</sup> A clear-cut example of *ἀλλά* is found in Schwyzler DGE 627, 27 (Dubois 1986: ii, 61ff.; Tegea's decree about the return of the exiles after Alexander the Great); the other example (IG V 2 6, 34, Dubois 1986: ii, 40), in a set of rules about working contracts also from Tegea, belongs to the notoriously difficult sequence *ἀλλ' ἦ*, where it is not even certain that *ἀλλά* (rather than *ἄλλο*) is included (... *μή οἱ ἔστω ἰνδικον μηδέποθι ἀλλ' ἦ ἰν Τεγέαι*).

mined by the success of *κάς/καί*. In fact in Arcadian the best evidence for *τε* is in some forms of compounds: *εἴτε*, *μήτε*, *οὔτε* are all attested, even if very rarely, in Arcadian inscriptions. Yet these are fossilized forms; they are not sufficient to indicate that copulative *τε* as such is part of current usage.

On its own *τε* (or *ζ'*) occurs three times in dialect inscriptions, always in ... *τε* ... *καί* constructions:

(1) Dubois (1986: ii, 196, possibly from Pheneos, ca. 500):

[κακῶ]ς ζ' ἐξόλοιτν κα δζις τότε δαμιοφοργε [ἀφάε]σται ... 'let him perish horribly and let whoever is then *damiorgos* pay ....'

(2) IG V 2 262,19 (Mantineia, fifth century)

ἄ τε θεὸς κάς οἱ δικασσοταί 'the goddess and the judges'

(3) IG V 2 343, 49 (Orchomenos, fourth century)

τάς τε ἐν Ε[ὐ]αίμονι καὶ τὰς ἐν Ἐρχομίνῳ 'those in Euaimon and those in Orchomenos'

The particle is also found in an obscure and probably mistaken construction in the *Cos Asylieurkunden* where it is not clear whether we deal with an example of ... *τε* ... *καί* ... *καί* joining nouns or (more likely) with an example of *τε* ... *τε* joining clauses:

(4) Dubois (1986: ii, 230, dialect of Thelphousa, 242 B.C.)

... παρεκάλεα[ν] τὰς τε θυσίας κοινανῆν ... καὶ τοῦ ἀγῶνος καὶ τὰς ἐκεχηρίας τὸ τ[ε] ἱερὸν ἄσυλον ἦναι ... 'invited them to share in the sacrifice ... and in the agon and the truce, and to let the sanctuary be inviolable ...'

Given the absence of *τε* in Cyprus and the rarity of the Arcadian attestations we may feel tempted to assume that *τε* survived in Arcadia in compound forms like *εἴτε* or *μήτε/οὔτε* (*ο-υ-γε* is Mycenaean) but otherwise was reintroduced from outside as part of learned language. That *εἴτε* etc. belong to a continuous tradition is confirmed by IG V 2, 262 (Mantineia) where *εἴτε* (or rather *εἴτε*) is written with *tsade*, which is used in parts of Arcadia to indicate the continuation of a labiovelar, i.e. an intermediate stage between a voiceless labiovelar and [t]. This excludes the possibility of a borrowing. Yet in the same Mantineia inscription (line 19, see (2) above) we find *τε* written with tau, while we would expect *τε*. Could this be a sign that this use of *τε* is not pure Arcadian? A counterargument, however, is the Pheneos (?) inscription (1) above) where we find ... *ζ'* ... *κα* (for *τε* ... *κάς*) and *ζ'* represents again the treatment of a

labiovelar; here too a borrowing could not have happened in this form. Probably we cannot reach a firm conclusion, but at least it seems clear that in Arcadian—except for compounds and possibly for the sequence *τε* ... *κάς/καί*—the simple *τε* is no longer in real use.

### 3.3. *κάς/καί*, *δέ*, *μέν*

We are now left with three Arcadian particles which we ought to consider together: *κάς/καί*, *δέ*, and *μέν*. Of these *μέν* is rare while *κάς/καί* and *δέ* are not. The form *κάς*, as we have seen, is also Cypriot but in the connective function is not Mycenaean (as far as as we know); *καί* is panhellenic—with the exception of Cyprus—and is general in Arcadia except for the early inscriptions from Mantineia. By the mid-fourth century Mantineia too has *καί*. Nowhere do we find alternations between *κάς* and *καί* in the same text. This is not the place where to discuss again the etymology of *κάς/καί*,<sup>7</sup> but on any hypothesis we need to account a) for the contrast between Cyprus and Arcadia, b) for the contrast in Arcadia between Mantineia and the other cities, c) for the contrast between early and late Mantineia. It would be possible of course to assume that the whole of Arcadia had at some stage both *κάς* and *καί* and each city made its choice but even on this hypothesis we shall have to assume that Mantineia first selected *κάς* and then rejected that choice or rather replaced *κάς* with *καί*. The likelihood is that Mantineia was influenced in its later choice of *καί* by other dialects. In other words the *καί* of Mantineia is a borrowing, conceivably from other parts of Arcadia or from other parts of Greece. If so, however, one may well wonder if *καί* in the rest of Arcadia could not have the same explanation and whether we should not assume that in the whole of Arcadia the earlier form was *κάς* (cf. Ruijgh 1981).

As for *δέ* its absence from Cyprus can only be due to an independent development in that dialect, since *δέ* is well attested in Mycenaean and in Arcadian, Cyprus itself may preserve traces of *δέ* possibly in *me-te* and almost certainly in *ιδέ*, if that word is correctly etymologized as containing *δέ* (Ruijgh 1967: 57).<sup>8</sup>

Some basic points are now established: a) Arcadian—or at least the Arcadian of the inscriptions—has only a small number of particles, b) the quasi disappearance of *τε* must be due to a reasonably fast evolution in usage after the Mycenaean period, c) the form *καί* rather than *κάς* of Mantineia and possibly of the rest of Arcadia is due to external influence.

<sup>7</sup> The fullest discussion is still that by Lüttel (1981); cf. also the review by Ruijgh (1981).

<sup>8</sup> Cypriot also provides good evidence for the deictic pronoun *δε*. If this derives from the *\*so* pronoun and connective *δέ* (see below p. 64), we have further evidence for the earlier use of *δέ* in the ancestor of classical Cypriot.

### 3.4. δέ: function and use

It is time now to concentrate on δέ and to move from questions of form to questions of function and use.

In a paper read at a Dutch Colloquium on Greek particles it is not necessary to survey the various new approaches to the analysis of particles, since most of the work done arises in the Netherlands. It is sufficient to refer to the general discussion by Kroon (1995) about discourse particles in Latin and, more specifically, to Bakker's article (1993) on Greek δέ and the earlier monograph by Stephen Levinsohn on textual connections in *Acts* (1987). For epic use in general the most important contribution is Ruijgh (1971), which also summarizes the Mycenaean data discussed in Ruijgh (1967); for Arcadian the basic data are collected in Dubois (1986) and some very relevant observations appear in Hodot (1990).

There are at least two ways to discuss the use of connective particles like καί and δέ: one may consider what they 'mean', their semantic or propositional content, or one may consider what pragmatic function they have; there may of course be overlap between the two enterprises. In a discourse context it is also necessary to consider the unit to which the particles belong. Levinsohn (1987), for instance, discussing the use of the connective particles in the Acts of the Apostles observes that δέ and very rarely ἀλλά, γάρ, οὖν and τότε mark what he calls a development unit and that καί and τε operate within that development unit. Bakker (1993) has contrasted the oral tradition, represented e.g. in epic poetry, where δέ may mark a cognitive unit or the equivalent of an intonation unit, with the written tradition where δέ still marks a unit, but one which is more content oriented and more deliberate.

So much can be accepted but, when dealing not with literary material but with inscriptions written in formal style, there are or may be considerable difficulties in understanding what aims are fulfilled by the particles used. Consider for instance a straight formula such as that of a late proxeny decree which provides for the award of proxeny together with consequent honours and perquisites for the honorand. In the same Arcadian city (Orchomenos) and in the same century (third century B.C.) we find on the one hand the standard formula in (5) and on the other the formula in (6):

(5) Schwyzer DGE 667, Dubois (1986: ii, 175, no. 11), Thür and Taeuber (1994: 345, Orchomenos, third century):

Ἔδοξε τῷ βωλῶι καὶ τῷ πόλι τῶν Ὀρχομενίων Λάρχιππον Στιπάκω Τεγεάταν πρόξενον ἦν[α] καὶ εὐεργέταν ... αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγγόνος ἦναι δὲ αὐτῶι γὰρ ἴνπασιν καὶ ἀτέλειαν καὶ ἀσυλίαν ...

'It was agreed by the assembly and by the city of Orchomenos that Larchippos son of Stipakos from Tegea should become proxenos and benefactor ... he and his descendants, and (δέ) that he should have land property and freedom from taxes and inviolability ...'

(6) Dubois (1986: ii, 174, no. 10), Thür and Taeuber (1994: 345, Orchomenos, third century):

Ἔδοξε τῷ π[ό]λι τῶν Ὀρχομενέων Πάννιν Αἰγυπίου Ἀργεῖον πρόξενον εἶμεν καὶ εὐεργέτ[α]ν αὐτὸν [καὶ γένος καὶ ἀσυλ[λ]ίαν ἡμεν [αὐ]τῶι καὶ γένει ...

'It was agreed by the city of Orchomenos that Pannis son of Aigyrios from Argos should become proxenos and benefactor, he and his family, and (καί) that he and his family should have inviolability ...'

We have difficulties here in deciding what prompts the use of a δέ clause in (5) and of a καί clause in (6). It is of course possible that in (6) the choice of καί rather than δέ is determined by dialect difference, since (6) has a number of features which are not Arcadian (εἶμεν/ἡμεν, -ου genitives, ἐν, ἐπί + genitive) and which have induced Dubois to state that the dialect is that of the honorand, i.e. Argolic, but this is far from certain. In a similar proxeny formula from Argos (Schwyzer DGE 92, third century) we find a δέ construction parallel to that of (5) (πρόξενον ἡμεν καὶ εὐεργέταν ... αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγγόνος, ἡμεν δὲ σφιν ἀτέλειαν καὶ ἀσυλίαν ...). Also in a Mantinea proxeny decree for an Argive, once again not in Arcadian, we find the standard δέ construction (IG V 2 263). On the other hand in an earlier proxeny decree from Tegea possibly of the late fourth century (Dubois 1986: ii, 81, no. 8; Thür and Taeuber 1994: 342) the usual formula is introduced by δὲ καί (ἦναι δὲ καὶ [ἀσυλία]ν καὶ ἀτέλειαν).

Examples of this type could be multiplied, but we can also use (5) by itself, as well as the alternation between δέ and καί in (5) and (6), to underline the point that in some Arcadian texts δέ simply introduces a new point without any contraposition; in other words the correct English rendering is 'and' rather than 'but'.<sup>9</sup> In general if one looks at late Arcadian inscriptions this is the main function of δέ. At its simplest it marks a sectioning of the discourse indicating that a different piece of information is now introduced, in fact what Bakker calls a thematic break.

### 3.5. δέ in parallel texts

The last conclusion is expected. Yet if we contrast early and late texts we observe that initially δέ is used less frequently or more discriminately than later on. An objectively usable example, even if it raises the problem of different dialects, is that of two parallel texts which define boundaries. The first—from Fourth Century Orchomenos and

<sup>9</sup> In (5) it would be possible to argue that the contraposition is between the title of proxenos and benefactor awarded to Larchippos and his descendants (αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγγόνος) and the rights to inviolability etc. awarded to Larchippos only (αὐτῶ); in fact the parallelism with formulae in which instead of a singular we find a plural pronoun (αὐτοῖς) or a reference to the ἐγγόνους, while still having δέ as in (5), show that this is not the critical point (cf. e.g. IG V 2 10, *ibid.*, 17, *ibid.* 263, Dubois 1986: ii, 169, no. 6, *ibid.* p. 177, no. 13, IG V 2 389, *ibid.*, 510, etc.).

in Arcadian—has a standard pattern ‘from X to Y’ which is constantly repeated; no δέ appears. The second is in koina and from Phigalia more than one century later; it is broken but it is clear that the pattern is similar to that of Orchomenos, though ἀπὸ τῶινυ ‘from this’ is replaced by τούτω δέ ‘from this’ and ἀπό + name in the dative is replaced by ἀπὸ δέ + name in the genitive. In other words here each clause is introduced by δέ in contrast with the earlier text:

(7) Schwyzer, DGE 664, Dubois (1986: ii, 113, no. 1), Thür and Taeuber (1994: 124, no. 14, Orchomenos, first part of the Fourth Century; see Thür and Taeuber 1994: 125). Marking of boundaries:

ἀπὸ τῶι ὀρίῳ ... ἐπὶ τὸ Βουφαγέον μεσακόθεν τοῖς κράναινυ· ἀπὸ τῶινυ ἰν τὰν Πορθιέαν πρώταν· ἀπὸ τῶινυ ... ἰ νηάταν· ἀπὸ τῶινυ ἰν τὰν ἄλωνα νηάταν· ... ἀπὸ Παδοέσσα ἰν τὸν λόφον τὸν δίωρον· καὶ ἀπὸ τῶινυ ἰν τὰν Τριάγγκειαν· ἀπὸ τῶινυ ...  
 ‘from the boundary ... to the Bouphegeon (passing) in the middle of the springs; from this point to the beginning of the Porthiea; from this point to the end (of the Porthiea); from this point to the end of the orchard; ... from the Padoessa to the hill with two boundaries, and from this point to the Triankeia; from this point ...’.

(8) Dubois (1986: ii, 266, no. 3); Thür and Taeuber (1994: 301, no. 29, Phigalia, second part of the Third Century; in koina). Marking of boundaries (very fragmentary):

... τούτω δέ ἐ[π]ῖ [ ... ἀπὸ δ[έ] ... τούτω δέ ...<sup>10</sup>

In spite of the different dialect the chronological contrast is representative. More generally the contrast between early and late is a contrast between limited use of δέ and extensive use of δέ.

### 3.6. δέ in some longer Arcadian inscriptions

Some fifth and early fourth century inscriptions show subtler distinctions in the use of δέ.<sup>11</sup> From this point of view the longer texts in Arcadian fall into two groups. The smaller group includes the Law about the cult of Demetra Thesmophoros (Pheneos?, ca. 500 B.C.),<sup>12</sup> the judgement about the murder in the temple of Alea (Mantineia, Fifth Century B.C.)<sup>13</sup> and the regulations for the temple of Athena Alea

<sup>10</sup> For a similar set of formulae cf. Thür and Taeuber (1994: 306, no. 31, I A (IG V 2 p. xxvii)), a second century fragmentary inscription from Olympia with a boundary division with Megalopolis.

<sup>11</sup> Hodot (1990) offers some subtle analyses of the use of δέ in a few inscriptions. However, his aim (viz. to establish the existence or otherwise of the potential particles καὶ and δὲ in Arcadian) is different from mine and I hope to extend the material while looking at it from a somewhat different angle.

<sup>12</sup> Dubois (1986: ii, 196, no. 1), Thür and Taeuber (1994: 269, no. 20; cf. (1)).

<sup>13</sup> IG V 2 262, Schwyzer DGE 661, Dubois (1986: ii, 94), Thür and Taeuber (1994: 75 no. 8; cf. (2)).

(Tegea, end Fifth Century or beginning Fourth Century).<sup>14</sup> The second group includes most of the remaining dialect inscriptions from Arcadia of suitable length. Prominent examples are the rules about building contracts from Tegea (Second half of the Fourth Century),<sup>15</sup> the decree for the return of the exiles also from Tegea (324 B.C.),<sup>16</sup> the mid-fourth century boundary statement from Orchomenos mentioned above (in (7)), and the various proxeny decrees in dialect (see above). To this group may also belong the synoikia between Orchomenos and Euaimon (Orchomenos, mid fourth century)<sup>17</sup> and the synoikia between the Heliswasioi and the Mantineans (Mantineia, date uncertain but at latest 350-40 and possibly earlier),<sup>18</sup> though these two inscriptions and particularly the latter seem to have an intermediate position between the two groups. It is noticeable that the two groups also differ on chronological grounds, with the first group including all the early inscriptions.

Fundamentally δέ is a connective particle which links sentences rather than clauses. As such it normally takes second position in the first clause of the sentence after the first accented word. Because δέ is a connective we do not expect it to appear in the first sentence of a text and indeed it never does. More delicate is the question of the sections in which a text may be divided. The clearest instances are those of inscriptions where the division into paragraphs is graphically marked either by double punctuations (as in the regulations for the temple of Athena Alea) or by an horizontal line (as in the synoikia of the Heliswasioi and the Mantineans) or by a line and an empty letter space (as in the rules about building contracts). Noticeably in the earliest of these texts (the first) no paragraph has an initial δέ; the second text follows the same rule with one possible exception.<sup>19</sup> The third text, on the contrary, regularly breaks the rule while at the same time also breaking (once at least) the rule according to which δέ is inserted after the first word of the sentence (IG V 2 6, 21: Μῆ ἐξέστω δέ ...). If we look at other inscriptions where separate paragraphs or sections can only be identified on semantic bases we obtain similar results. In the fifth century murder judgement from Mantineia a serious change of topic calls for the absence of initial δέ;<sup>20</sup> by contrast in the much later Tegea decree for the return of exiles δέ sentence follows δέ sentence so that, if the previous criterion were to be adopted,

<sup>14</sup> IG V 2 3; Schwyzer DGE 654, Dubois (1986: ii, 20), Thür and Taeuber (1994: 11 no. 2).

<sup>15</sup> IG V 2 6; Schwyzer DGE 656, Dubois (1986: ii, 39), Thür and Taeuber (1994: 20, no. 3).

<sup>16</sup> IG V 2 p. xxxvi; Schwyzer DGE 657, Dubois (1986: ii, 61 no. 4), Thür and Taeuber (1994: 51 no. 5).

<sup>17</sup> IG V 2 343, Schwyzer DGE 665, Dubois (1986: ii, 146), Thür and Taeuber (1994: 130 no. 15).

<sup>18</sup> Te Riele (1987), Thür and Taeuber (1994: 98 no. 9).

<sup>19</sup> After the division sign the new paragraph at line 13 starts with Ὅσα δέ συνβόλ[α]τα ἐτύγγανον ἔχοντες οἱ Ἑλισφάσιοι αὐτοὶ πρὸ αὐτῶν πάρος Μαντινῆς ἐγένοντο ... 'However many contracts the Heliswasioi had among themselves before they became Mantineans, will be valid ...' The unique presence of δέ in this paragraph may raise the question whether we should not read Ὅσαδε, accepting the existence of a univerted ὁσόςδε parallel to τοσόςδε, which, as shown by Risch (1969), arose perhaps in the post-Mycenaean period, but panhellenically, from an earlier sequence τόςος δέ.

<sup>20</sup> Notice the absence of δέ in lines 14, 18, 30. The only possible exception is in line 24 where the editors restore Εὐχολὰ [δ'] ἄδε ἐσσοι τοῖ ἀλιτεροῖ, but it is difficult to build too much on a restoration.



most of the inscription would count as one immense paragraph. This may be indeed the correct interpretation if one thinks of the involuted legal style which prevails in later texts—but obviously there is a certain element of circularity in trying to argue that new paragraphs never start with δέ, while then arguing that in some inscriptions paragraphs are very long because most sentences start with δέ. Moreover the parallelism with the building inscription where paragraphs are graphically marked speaks for the introduction of δέ at the beginning of paragraphs. The truth is probably in the middle. With increased sophistication in 'legalese' it becomes more and more necessary to mark formally the links between the different parts of a text including parts which concern different subjects and which can consequently be marked as belonging to different paragraphs.

### 3.7. δέ in texts of different periods

Even on this simple test which concerns the presence or absence of δέ at the beginning of paragraphs the existence of a linguistic contrast between early and late inscriptions is confirmed, but the phenomenon is underlined if we actually look at the meaning of δέ in texts of different periods. In the *lex sacra* about the cult of Demetra Thesmophoros, in the judgement of Mantinea and in the dispositions for the temple of Athena Alea, δέ is regularly used to indicate a contrast with the previous sentence. In practically all instances the correct translation is 'but' rather than 'and'; that this is so is shown by the frequency of δέ clauses which negate the previous clause, often elliptically, but sometimes with an actual repetition of the verb:

#### (9) Regulations for the temple of Athena Alea (note 14), l. 15

#Τὰ ἱερά πρόβατα με νέμεν ἰν 'Αλέαι πλὸς ἀμέραυ καὶ νυκτός ...' εἰ δ' ἂν νέμε ...  
'The sacred cattle must not pasture in Alea more than a day a night ... but (δέ) if it pastures ...'

#### (10) *ibid.*, l. 5

Τὸν ἱεροθύταν νέμεν ἰν 'Αλέαι ὅ τι ἂν ἀσκεθὲς ἔ, τὰ δ' ἀνασκεθέα ἰνφορβίεν  
'Let the sacrificer pasture in Alea whatever is unblemished, but (δέ) for the animals which are not unblemished let there be *inphorbismos*'

#### (11) Law about the cult of Demetra Thesmophoros (note 12), l. 4

... ὅζις τότε δαμιοφοργῆ ἀφάεσται δαρχμάς τριάκοντα· εἰ δὲ μὲ ἀφάετοι...  
'whoever is then a magistrate will pay thirty drachmai, but (δέ) if he does not pay ...'

In these texts δέ does not simply section the discourse while highlighting its continuity but actually adds a semantic component.<sup>21</sup> In the later texts the position is different; practically every new sentence is linked to the preceding one by δέ which has a continuative rather than adversative value. The contrast is best illustrated by formulae with similar function which belong to the early and the later period respectively. Contrast once again the rules for the administration of the temple of Athena Alea and the somewhat later building text, also from Tegea:

#### (12) Regulations for the temple of Athena Alea (note 14) l. 1 ff.:

#τὸν ἱερεῖν πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι οἷς νέμεν καὶ ζεῦγος καὶ αἶγα·  
εἰ δ' ἂν καταλλάσσει  
ἰνφορβισμόν ἔναι·  
τὸν ἱερομνάμονα ἰνφορβίεν.  
εἰ δ' ἂν λεύτον μὲ ἰνφορβίῃ  
ἡκοτὸν δαρχμάς ὀφλέν ἰν δάμον  
καὶ κάταρφον ἔναι  
'The priest may pasture twentyfive sheep, a yoke and a goat;  
but (δέ) if he goes beyond this,  
let there be *inphorbismos*;  
let the hieromnamon practice the *inphorbismos*.  
but (δέ) if, having seen it, he does not practice *inphorbismos*  
let him owe one hundred drachmai to the people  
and (καί) be accursed'

#### (13) Rules about building contracts (note 15), l. 21 ff.

#Μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ μηδὲ κοινάνας γενέσθαι πλέον ἢ δύο ἐπὶ μηδένι τῶν ἔργων·  
εἰ δὲ μή,  
ὀφλέτω ἕκαστος πενήκοντα δαρχμάς·  
ἐπελασάσθων δὲ οἱ ἀλιασταί·  
ἰμφαίνεν δὲ τὸμ βολόμενον ἐπὶ τοῖ ἡμίσοι τὰς ζαμίαν ...  
'Let it not be allowed to have more than two partners for any work  
but (δέ) if not,  
each (of the partners) must pay fifty drachmai,  
and (δέ) the heliastai will impose (the fine);  
and (δέ) whoever wishes can denounce (them) for half of the fine'

<sup>21</sup> I deliberately leave aside at this stage the μὲν ... δέ constructions, which will be discussed later (§ 7).

In both texts the first hypothetical sentence is followed by a statement about the magistrates in charge of the imposition of the penalty; in the first text this is in asyndeton, in the second (and later texts) it is introduced by δέ.<sup>22</sup>

In general it all looks as if in Arcadian inscriptions the use of δέ changed round the middle of the fourth century. At all periods the particle acts as a sentence connective,<sup>23</sup> but at a later stage it can appear at the beginning of most sentences marking on the one hand the cohesion within a text, on the other thematic and grammatical shifts of all types. Previously this was not so and δέ required a more semantically based definition; it introduced a rebuttal of previous statements, i.e. was seriously adversative rather than merely continuative or transitive.

#### 4. From adversative to transitive δέ?

Obviously the contrast just identified may be the due to the limits of our evidence since in the early period this is exiguous. Yet the pattern that we have found is remarkably consistent and at present we must accept it as a significant. If so, and if there is a contrast between Arcadian and other forms of Greek as well as a development within Arcadian, we ought to try to understand how this came about. An obvious hypothesis is that the earliest texts represent the original adversative and quasi adverbial meaning of δέ which later on was weakened allowing a much wider range of uses. If so, this would provide much needed support for the first of the two contrasting views about the origin of δέ. Bakker (1993) has highlighted the contrast between those (like Kühner-Gerth 2, 261ff.) who believe that the original function of the particle is adversative ('but', 'however') and those, like C.J. Ruijgh (1971: 128ff.), who argue that the main purpose of the particle is to indicate transition from one point of the narrative to another. A transitive value, as we have seen, does not account for the use of δέ in early Arcadian, an adversative value does. For the followers of the Kühner-Gerth theory then Arcadian must be singularly archaic. Yet if we take this point seriously we must also argue that our inscriptions are more archaic in their use of δέ than Homer and Herodotus, and perhaps even Mycenaean—which defies credibility. The last point must be explored further.

In Mycenaean δέ is certainly used in contrapositions. It is enough to remember in the first instance the contrast between the different status of father and mother in the *do-qe-ja* inscription:

(14) PY An 607, 5ff.:

... *do-e-ro pa-te*

<sup>22</sup> In the second text I have always rendered δέ with either 'and' or 'but' to show that a 'but' meaning is not always appropriate or possible; obviously in a real translation other renderings might be more appropriate.

<sup>23</sup> This is the primary function, which explains, for instance, why δέ only appears in the first component of a hypothetical sentence; a construction like εἰ δὲ μή, ἀρχαῖαν ὄφλ' ἐν is grammatical, but a construction like \*ἀρχαῖαν ὄφλ' ἐν, εἰ δὲ μή is not.

*ma-te-de di-wi-ja do-e-ra*  
 ... *do-e-ra ma-te*  
*pa-te-de ka-ke-u*  
 '... the father (is) a slave, but (*de*) the mother (is) a slave of Diwia;  
 ... the mother (is) a slave, but (*de*) the father (is) a bronzesmith'

An equally clear example is the famous contest between the priestess and the community:

(15) PY Ep 704, 5-6:

*e-ri-ta i-je-reja e-ke*  
*e-u-ke-to-qe e-to-ni-jo e-ke-e te-o*  
*da-mo-de-mi pa-si ko-to-na-o ke-ke-me-na-o o-na-to e-ke-e*  
 'E. the priestess has  
 and (*qe*) solemnly affirms that she has the *e-to-ni-jo* for the god(dess)  
 but (*de*) the *damos* says that she has an *onato* of *ktoinai kek*'

A similar meaning is found in the text with which Ruijgh (1967: 337) starts his analysis of Mycenaean δέ:

(16) PY Eb 338, 1-2:

*ka-pa-ti-ja ... e-ke-qe ke-ke-me-no ko-to-[no] dwo*  
*o-pe-ro-sa-de wo-zo-e o-wo-ze*  
 K. ... has two *ktoinai kek*.  
 but (*de*) having to *worzeen* she does not *worzei*'

Yet not all Mycenaean instances are so clear-cut and, as Ruijgh (1967) has shown, some uses of *de* in connection with *to-so* or in the particle sequence *o-da-a<sub>2</sub>* speak for 'transitivity' in his sense rather than for an adversative function. In a number of clauses *to-so-de* is not as yet a demonstrative but a sequence of τός(σ)ος and δέ, and the particle cannot easily be understood as 'but'. Thus in the Pylos tablet about the *wanakteron temenos* the easiest interpretation is that indicated below:

(17) PY Er 312, 5-6:

*te-re-ta-o to-so pe-ma GRA 30*  
*to-so-de te-reta VIR 3*  
 So much (*tos(s)on*) seed of the *telestai* 30 units  
 and (*de*) so many (*tos(s)oi*) *telestai* 3 Men'

Similarly in:

(18) PY Jn 389 1, 9, 11:

*a-ka-si-jo-ne ka-ke-we ta-ra-si-ja e-ko-te*

.....

*to-so-de ka-ko* AES M 27

.....

*to-so-de a-ta-ra-si-jo ka-ke-we*

'In A. bronzesmiths who have *talansian* ....  
and (*de*) the bronze (is) so much: ...  
and (*de*) so many bronzesmiths without *talansia*'

It is in fact this connective and transitive value of δέ which offers the most plausible start for the processes of grammaticalization which led—during, or possibly after, the Mycenaean period—to the creation of forms like ὅδε or τοσόσδε. Risch (1969), who argued for a derivation of the 'demonstrative' δέ of ὅδε etc. from the connective particle, did not really ask how it would have been possible to move from a purely adversative value to a demonstrative value; yet, if the question is asked, the answer must be that the development is possible if the adversative value is not too clearly marked. If, as Risch argued, the shift is happening in Mycenaean itself, it then follows that at that stage δέ could not be purely adversative. Rather than rewriting the interpretation of Mycenaean *sub specie Arcadiae*, it would be easier to assume that the strong adversative value of Arcadian δέ is due to a post-Mycenaean delevopment and to try to understand how this came about. One starting point is that in our texts there is not a two-way contrast between καί and δέ but there is rather a three-way contrast between καί, δέ and asyndeton or pause. The last of these three has two roles. First it defines large development units, to use Levinsohn's terminology, including the whole text or a paragraph. These are the units within whose scope δέ operates defining further and smaller units. In its turn in early Arcadian καί operates within the scope of δέ, so that there is a sort of hierarchy: asyndeton > δέ > καί. Secondly, asyndeton can be used with purely local value within a unit (e.g. a paragraph) also marked by asyndeton; the local asyndeton still indicates a new theme but in a neutral fashion. This is what occurs in (12), where, as we have seen, the clausula about the imposition of the fine by the local magistrate follows in asyndeton the previous hypothetical sentence.

Within the paragraph, then, δέ, asyndeton and sometimes κόζ/καί are all possible. Of these κόζ/καί, which is the main and practically only particle which joins nouns and adjectives, in the Arcadian inscriptions is used less frequently to join clauses. When it is, it normally joins clauses which share the same subject and/or are closely linked from a semantic point of view. An example is provided by the last clause of (12). This means that any other sort of connection at the local level within the paragraph had to be indicated by either asyndeton or the use of δέ. On the

assumption that the original state of affairs was similar to that of Mycenaean where δέ has either transitive or adversative value it is not too difficult to see why in the early Arcadian inscriptions, where δέ contrasted with asyndeton, it acquired a more clearly polarized adversative value, while asyndeton simply indicated the shift to another topic without any added semantic value.

### 5. The loss of τε and δέ in Cypriot

That the interpretation proposed is preferable to the assumption that early Arcadian simply preserves the original meaning of δέ<sup>24</sup> is perhaps shown by an attempt to make sense of the history of Cypriot with its loss of both τε and δέ. If we assume that Myc. *de* had a transitive function, i.e. marked a thematic shift while also identifying a section of discourse, we probably want to attribute to *de* a broader scope than to *qe*, the basic connective. Yet the creation of κόζ/καί in the function of connector, or rather the attribution of connective functions to κόζ or καί, which must be post-Mycenaean, will have altered the situation, particularly because κόζ/καί, differently from *qe/τε*, was not enclitic. It is generally assumed, and correctly so, that κόζ/καί must have taken over the functions of *qe/τε* largely because it was a 'stronger' and 'more emphatic' particle. This, joined with its initial quasi-adverbial and non-enclitic nature, naturally gave κόζ/καί a role at the beginning of a sentence and brought it in some way in collision with δέ. Let us assume—purely on a speculative basis—that this happened in an early post-Mycenaean period. A priori the conflict between κόζ/καί on the one hand and δέ on the other could be resolved in one of two ways: either the role of both particles was further defined and perhaps polarized, or one of the two particles was given up while the other took over its functions. Consider now some of the constructions that we find in the Edalion inscription.

(19) Bronze Table of Idalion, Fifth Century (Masson, ICS<sup>2</sup>, no. 217, 1ff.):

*kas pai ewrētasatu basileus kas a ptolis ... dōwenai ...*

'(When the Medes ... besieged the city of Idalion, the king Stasikupros and [kas] the city invited Onasikupros ... to treat the men wounded in battle without fee). And (*kas pai*) the king and the city promised ... to give ...'

(20) *ibid.*, 10ff.:

*ē ke sis Onasilon ē tos kassignētos ... ex tōi khōrōi tōide ex oruxē, ide pai o ex oruxē peisei Onasilōi kas tois kassignētois ... Kas Onasilōi oiwōi aneu tō(n) kassignētōn tōn ailōn ewrētasatu basileus kas a ptolis ... dōwenai ...*

<sup>24</sup> Note that if the proposed derivation of δέ from δή is correct (cf. e.g. Leumann 1949) this makes it likely that the original meaning of the particle was not adversative.

'if anyone removes Onasilos and his brothers ... from this place ... (*ide pai*) he who removes them will pay ... And (*kas*) to Onasilos alone without the other brothers the king and the city promised to give ...'

(21) *ibid.*, 26ff.:

*ide ta(n) dalton ta(n)de .... basileus kas a ptolis katethijan i(n) ta(n) thion tan Athanan ...*

'(*ide*) the king and the city put this tablet ... in the temple (of) Athena ...'

In all Greek texts, including Arcadian, the second sentence of (20) would be likely to have a *δέ* rather than the introductory *κός* of the Cypriot text. In all likelihood a *δέ* would also appear in (19) and in (21) in most dialects, though early Arcadian would probably have an *asyndeton*. We do not have enough evidence to be certain about the role of *ιδέ* in Cypriot; its appearance at the start of the *apodosis* in (20) is striking. In any case it is clearly not adversative. Ruijgh (1967: 57), Gusmani (1967: 19-22) and Perpillou (1978: 179ff.) would all agree, even if in other respects they reach different conclusions.

From this evidence it is not too difficult to surmise that the conflict of *κός/καί* and *δέ* in the post-Mycenaean period was resolved by Cypriot with the disappearance of *ιδέ* (except for the compounded forms) and with the take over by *κός* of parts of its role—leaving aside *ιδέ* because of our ignorance.<sup>25</sup> In Arcadian the reverse happened. At a local level (within the main sections of the text) *κός/καί* and *δέ* were contrasted while *asyndeton* had a role to play too. The end result was that *κός/καί* was kept with an additive value and *δέ* with a contrastive value, while the neutral transitive role was left to local *asyndeton*.

## 6. The development of *δέ* in fourth century Arcadian

Clearly we have offered a speculative account but not an implausible one. The next question now concerns the further developments of fourth century Arcadian. How do we explain the new role of *δέ* as a quasi-sentence marker and the loss of its adversative/contrastive value?<sup>26</sup> One possible assumption would of course be that in an increasingly literate society a higher level of sophistication leads to a different seg-

<sup>25</sup> It is not uninteresting that, if we accept Warren Cowgill's (1964) interpretation of the two crucial passages of the Idalion inscription, two strongly adversative sentences start with *eduwān oin nu* 'they gave ...' and *edōk' oin nu* 'he gave ...' respectively. Here the role of highlighting the contraposition is left to word order (the initial position of the verb) and to the *oin/odn* particle, to which Denniston (1954: 416) attributes the initial role of stressing the idea of actuality or essentiality.

<sup>26</sup> The phrase *κατ' εἰ δέ τινα τρόπον* which we find in Arcadian inscriptions (IG V 2 6, 1, 17, 27) obviously includes a *δέ* which is not a connective. Dubois (1986: i, 233) compares the Boeotian *καθ' ὃν δέ τινα τρόπον* and implies that *δέ* stands for *δη*. Whatever the explanation of the phrase its existence proves that *δέ* was no longer felt as having an adversative value.

mentation of discourse so that the development units marked by *asyndeton* are increasingly coming to be identified with the whole text. The role of *δέ* then simply becomes that of guaranteeing the basic segmentation of the text (which happens to be into sentences) and the links between the various components. This is certainly correct but may not be whole truth. It is not certain in fact that the development can be wholly explained within the system. If we look again at (5) above, the proxeny decree from which we started, we must observe that the language and arrangement of these decrees, beyond the phonetic and lexical appearance of the local dialect, are remarkably similar in different regions. This cannot be due entirely to chance; the technical formulae which define the honours and privileges granted to a favourite foreigner are obviously borrowed from common sources. Thus we do not find it surprising if in places as diverse as Corcyra, Megara and Oropos, with dialects which range from Corinthian to West Ionic, we find the second clause of a proxeny decree starting with the same *δέ* which we found in (5).<sup>27</sup> Terminology and phraseology can be borrowed but constructions can be borrowed too. If so, though we cannot prove it, it is conceivable that the shift in the use of *δέ* which we find in fourth century Arcadian inscriptions was, in part at least, due to external influence. The objection that particles or use of particles are not subject to external influence is easily counteracted for Arcadian: in the *sunokia* of Mantinea with the Heliswasioi (note 18), i.e. in the middle of a text (line 21) which is written in good dialect, we find a very non-Arcadian *ἄν δέ*, i.e. *ἐάν δέ*, for what in Arcadian would be *εἰ δ' ἄν*.

## 7. *μέν ... δέ*

There is perhaps more. So far we have left aside *μέν* and the *μέν ... δέ* construction. This is largely because *μέν* is rare in Arcadian. If it occurs, it is only in standard textbook constructions of the *μέν ... δέ* type which appear somewhat stilted:

(22) Regulations for the temple of Athena Alea (note 14), l. 15:

... τὸ μὲν μέζον πρόβατον δαρχμῶν ὀφλέν, τὸ δὲ μείον ἰνφορβίεν  
'on the one hand (*μέν*) for a bigger piece of cattle he will owe a drakhma, on the other hand (*δέ*) for a smaller one there will be *inphorbismos*'

(23) *ibid.*, l. 22

τὸ μὲν ἔμισυ τῶν θεῶν, τὸ δὲ ἔμισυ τοῖς ἱερομνάμονσι ...

<sup>27</sup> The examples are chosen at random: Corcyra IG IX 1 682, Schwyzer DGE 136 (fourth century): *πρόξενον ποιῆι ἄ ἄλῖα ... δίδωσι δὲ καὶ γὰρ καὶ οἰκίας ἔμψασιν ...*, Megara IG VII 8, Schwyzer DGE 155 (early third century): *... πρόξενον αὐτὸν εἶμεν καὶ ἐκγόνους αὐτοῦ ... εἶμεν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἰκίας ἔμψασιν*, Oropos IG VII 4250, Schwyzer DGE 812 (fourth century): *... Ἀμύνταν Ἀντιόχου Μακεδόνα πρόξενον εἶν ... ἀτέλειαν δὲ εἶν καὶ ἀσυλίαν ...*

'... on the one hand (μέν) half to the goddess, on the other hand (δέ) half to the temple administrators ...'

(24) Rules about building contracts (note 15), l. 49:

... τὸν μὲν ἐργάταν ἐσδέλλοντες ..., τὸν δὲ ἐργῶναν ζαμιόντες...  
'(let them have power) on the one hand (μέν) to sack the workman, on the other hand (δέ) to fine the contractor ...'

(25) Synoikia between Orchomenos and Euaimon (note 17), l. 73 and l. 92:

... κεῦορκέντι μὲν τάγαθά, [ἐ]πιορκέντι δὲ ἐξο[λέ]σθαι αὐτοῦ καὶ γένος  
'... on the one hand (μέν) for whoever respects the oath all good things, on the other hand (δέ) for whoever breaks the oath let him die and his descendants'

(26) Decree for the return of exiles (note 16), l. 41ff.:

... εἰ μὲν ἂν φαίνηται ... εἰ δ' ἂν μὴ φαίνηται ...  
'(whoever holds the property) on the one hand (μέν) if he looks as (having paid the debt to the goddess ... let him give back to the returning exile half of the property), if on the other hand (δέ) he does not look as (having given back to the goddess) ...'<sup>28</sup>

In other texts and other dialects μέν is far more frequent and seems to be used with more freedom. Should we assume that we are dealing with an Arcadian inherited usage? About fifty years ago Manu Leumann (1949) argued with good evidence that μέν was simply a shortened form of μήν, which in its turn was the Ionic form of μάν. Denniston died in the same year in which Leumann's article appeared and consequently we do not know how he would have reacted; he did point out ([1934] 1954: 328) that 'the parallelism in the uses of μάν (μήν) and μέν is on the whole remarkably close' but also observed that, while, leaving Epic on the one side, 'μάν, μήν, μέν are confined respectively to Doric, Attic and Ionic', 'preparatory μέν is common to all three dialects'. However, if Leumann is right, it should follow that μέν must be Attic or Ionic since it presupposes a change α > η. Arcadian usage does not contradict this view: as pointed out above the only constructions attested are those with preparatory μέν and these show a lack of flexibility which is striking; if they were due to the imitation of an outside model the textbook feeling which I mentioned earlier would be understandable.

<sup>28</sup> The sequence δ μὲν ... δ δέ probably appears also in a very fragmentary text from Mantinea of the early fifth century (IG V 2 261) which seems to offer the first instance of μέν.

## 8. Some conclusions

I started in 1. with three questions or observations to which we now need to return.

Merely from the few examples adduced it is clear that the epigraphical texts which we have been looking at do not offer the same extensive use of particles which we find in Homer or Attic prose. Of course the very limited use of particles in Arcadian inscriptions does not prove that the spoken language was equally depleted of particles. [Ed. note: see for this issue also Duhoux' article in this volume]. But more work needs to be done to ascertain how far this apparent poverty is characteristic of specific dialects or specific periods or of epigraphical language in general. One thing, however, is certain: we cannot assume *a priori* that all Greek dialects shared the same particles and made the same extensive use of them.

The history of Arcadian on the one hand and that of Arcado-Cypriot and Mycenaean on the other make clear that developments in the use of particles, i.e. changes in the particle inventory as well as changes in the way in which the same particles are used and in the function that they fulfil, are characteristic not only of literary languages but also of the epigraphically attested dialects. The lesson to be learned is that we should be careful in attributing to the one or the other dialect a specific particle or particle use; it is conceivable that in each instance we are dealing with features which belong to a specific phase rather than to the whole history of the dialect. The important point is that even in our small world we have evidence not only for the loss of old particles but also for the appearance of new particles.

The way in which these changes occur partly contradicts the received opinion, but only partly. The processes which led to the disappearance of δέ in Cypriot and to the emphasizing of its adversative value in early Arcadian are likely to be internally led; it would be difficult to see how they could have been determined by external influences. On the other hand, we should not necessarily think in terms of purely systemic developments; it may well be that, as Bakker (1993) has suggested, the adversative value of δέ is connected with the development of a written content-biased tradition which replaces an old oral tradition. At the same time it would be foolish to exclude the importance of interdialectal contacts for the development of the particle system. The standard example has been available for a long time. We assume that the spread of καί and the quasi-disappearance of τε are post-Mycenaean; it follows that either they happened independently in all Greek dialects—which is hardly plausible—or that we must allow for influences and counterinfluences of various types. In the texts that we have studied the replacement of Mantinean κόζ with καί gives concrete evidence for a similar process, i.e. the introduction of a new form of a well known particle thanks to external influence. But do we have evidence for the wholesale borrowing not of a new form of particle but of a new particle and perhaps of new constructions? Above I have argued that both the most plausible etymology and the somewhat stilted, textbook-like, use of μέν in Arcadian speak for a borrowed particle. If this is correct, it also follows, as Leumann believed, that all instances of 'Doric'

and 'Aeolic' epigraphical μέν are due to borrowings and that these borrowings are reasonably early: just to give an example, μέν ... δέ are found in sixth century Cretan inscriptions and are omnipresent in the Gortyn code. Similarly I have also made a case for the possibility that the purely connective/transitive use of δέ which appears in the Arcadian inscriptions of mid and late fourth century may be influenced from outside Arcadia.

Do we then reject the view that particles belong to a closed class and are not prone to borrowing or do we take refuge in the observation that we are dealing with dialects and not with separate languages, which could explain why the developments which we have been describing may be externally determined? The general point remains unchallenged. The status of the Greek dialects as dialects or languages, if the distinction is meaningful, is of course in dispute, but there is little doubt that structural similarity and frequent contacts must have allowed a range of mutual influences which would not have been possible in different sociolinguistic situations. However, we ought at least to notice that the general principle itself has been powerfully challenged by evidence more compelling than that discussed above. In considering a series of claims about the plausibility or otherwise of grammatical borrowing Campbell (1993) concludes (p. 103f.) that 'none of them holds true in any absolute sense.' In particular he rejects the view that 'prepositions, conjunctions, and particles, to the extent that they are used grammatically, can be borrowed from one language to another only with great difficulty,' pointing to the counterevidence provided by 'the typical borrowing of conjunctions and other discourse particles from Spanish into a large variety of Indian languages of Latin America' (ibid., 100). In an earlier article Brody (1987) had analyzed the extensive borrowing from Spanish into the Mayan languages of particles used as discourse markers and pointed to various processes which led either to the joint use of isofunctional Spanish and Mayan particles or to the exclusive use of Spanish particles like *pero* 'but', *como* 'like', *pues* 'well', *y* 'and', *porque* 'because', *entonces* 'then', all of which can function as discourse markers in Mayan. Here are we dealing with unrelated and structurally different languages, one of which however is sociolinguistically dominant. On the other hand, at a more anecdotal level, it is not too difficult to find similar examples nearer home: it is generally assumed that the Modern Greek μά 'but', which replaces the old ἀλλά and to a certain extent δέ,<sup>29</sup> is a borrowing from Italian *ma* 'but', in its turn a replacement for Latin *sed* derived from Latin *magis* 'more, rather'.

The final conclusion is that we should not hesitate to assume that in the class of particles interdialectal borrowings are not only possible but likely. If so, however, much remains to be done to establish not only what particle forms were borrowed from one dialect into another but also how particle usage was in any specific case determined by external influences. If it is indeed the case, as for Mayan and Spanish, that the dominant language is more likely to influence the usage of the less important lan-

guage, studies of this kind may provide us with important insights about the sociolinguistic status of the Greek dialects.

## References

- Andreou, I.  
1986 'Τὰ ἐπιγράμματα τοῦ πολυανδρίου τῆς Αμβρακίας'. *Αρχ. Δελτ.* 41 α', *Μελέτες* 425-46, Πίν. 97-100
- Bakker, E.J.  
1993 'Boundaries, Topics and the Structure of Discourse. An Investigation of the Ancient Greek Particle *de*'. *Studies in Language* 17, 275-311
- Bousquet, J.  
1992 'Deux épigrammes grecques (Delphes, Ambracie)'. *BCH* 116, 585-606, at 596-606
- Brody, J.  
1987 'Particles Borrowed from Spanish as Discourse Markers in Mayan Languages'. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 29, 507-21
- Campbell, L.  
1993 'On Proposed Universals of Grammatical Borrowing'. In: H. Aertsen and R.J. Jeffers (eds), *Historical Linguistics 1989. Papers from the 9th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam, 91-109
- Cassio, A. C.  
1994 'I distici del *Polyandron* di Ambracia e l'"io anonimo" nell'epigramma greco'. *SMEA* 33, 101-117
- Cowgill, W.  
1964 'The Supposed Cypriot Optatives *duwánoi* and *dōkoi*. With Notes on the Greek Infinitive Formations'. *Language* 40, 344-65
- Denniston, J.D.  
1954 *The Greek Particles*. 2nd ed. Oxford (1st ed. 1934)
- DGE cf. Schwyzer
- Dubois, L.  
1986 *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*. 3 vols., Louvain-la-Neuve
- Dunkel, G.  
1990 'J. Wackernagel und die idg. Partikeln \*so, \*ke, \*kem und \*an'. In: E. Eichner und H. Rix (Hrsg.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*. Wiesbaden, 100-130
- Egetmeyer, M.  
1992 *Wörterbuch zu den Inschriften im kyprischen Syllabar*. Berlin.
- Gusmani, R.  
1967 'Zwei kyprische Konjunktionen'. *Glotta* 45, 19-25
- Hansen, P.A.

<sup>29</sup> Not to be confused with Thessalian μά, which in that dialect fulfils the functions of δέ.

- 1983-89 *Carmina epigraphica graeca*. 2 vols., Berlin-New York
- Haugen, E.  
1950 'The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing'. *Language* 26, 210-31
- Hintze, A.  
1993 *A Lexicon to the Cyprian Syllabic Inscriptions*. Hamburg
- Hodot, R.  
1990 'Organisation textuelle et particules modales dans des textes législatifs arcadiens (Ve-IVe S. a.C.)'. *Verbum* 13, 27-37
- Humbert, J.  
1954 *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris
- ICS cf. Masson 1983
- Jamieson, J.  
1814 *Hermes Scythicus or, The Radical Affinities of the Greek and Latin Languages to the Gothic*. Edinburgh
- Kroon, C.  
1995 *Discourse Particles in Latin*. Amsterdam
- Kühner, R. - B. Gerth  
1904 *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*. 2 vols. Hannover and Leipzig
- Leumann, M.  
1949 'μέν und μήν, δέ und δή'. *Museum Helveticum* 6, 85-89 (Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Zürich und Stuttgart 1959, 229-34)
- Levinsohn, S.  
1987 *Textual Connections in Acts*. Atlanta, Georgia
- Lüttel, V.  
1981 *Κάς und Καί. Dialektale und chronologische Probleme im Zusammenhang mit Dissimilation und Apokope*. Ergsh. zur KZ Nr 29, Göttingen
- Masson, O.  
1983 *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques* [ICS]. Réimpression augmentée. Paris
- Masson O. et T.B. Mitford  
1986 *Les inscriptions syllabiques de Kouklia-Paphos*. Konstanz
- Morpurgo Davies, A.  
1992 'Mycenaean, Arcadian, Cyprian and some Questions of Method in Dialectology'. In: J.P. Olivier (ed.), *Mykenaiika*. BCH Suppl. XXV, 415-31
- Neumann, G.  
1975 'Zu den Hexametern der kyprischen Inschrift ICS 264 (mit einem Beitrag von Klaus Stiewe)'. *Kadmos* 13, 146-55
- 1994 *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*. Innsbruck
- Perpillou, J.-L.  
1978 'Débuts de phrase en grec méridional archaïque'. In: *Etrennes de septantaine. Travaux de linguistique et de grammaire comparée offerts à Michel Lejeune*. Paris, 179-181

- Risch, E.  
1969 'Die verschiedenen Partikeln δε im Griechischen'. In: *Studi linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani*. Vol. 2, Brescia, 831-43 (Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Berlin-New York 1981, 486-98)
- 1988 'Le développement du chypriote dans le cadre des dialectes grecs anciens'. In: J. Karageorghis and O. Masson (eds), *The History of the Greek Language in Cyprus*. Nicosia, 67-77
- Ruijgh, C.J.  
1957 *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*. Assen
- 1967 *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam
- 1971 *Autour de τε épique. Études sur la syntaxe grecque*. Amsterdam
- 1981 Review of Lüttel 1981. *Kratylos* 26, 115-20
- Schwyzler, E.  
1923 *Dialectorum graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora* [DGE]. Leipzig
- Te Riele, G.-J.-M.-J.  
1987 'Hélios entre en sympolitie avec Mantinée: une nouvelle inscription d'Arcadie'. *BCH* 111, 167-88
- Thür, G. und H. Taeuber  
1994 *Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der griechischen Poleis*. Wien