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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,9 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.
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1. Généralités

Dans son ouvrage désormais classique sur le 'œ épique', C. I. Ruiggh 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 œuvres grecques des Ve-IVe s. avant J.-C. J'y explorerais principalement la question du rapport entre grec écrit et parlé. Ceci mettra en jeu des comparaisons entre textes dialogués ou non, ainsi qu'entre œuvres scéniques et non scéniques. Subsidiairement, 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,1 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:

9 Taken from 'Monosyllabism in English', the Biannual Lecture on English Philology, read before the British Academy, Nov. 6, 1928, printed in: Linguística, Copenhagen-London 1933, 384-408; the quotation at p. 404.

PARTICLES IN GREEK EPIGRAPHICAL TEXTS

The Case of Arcadian
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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 sont pas augmentées des nombreuses “combinations” que nous atteste 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 VIe siècle et la fin du Ve.’ 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 prescriptive 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 Archaic 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 άλλα, δρα, δρα, άταρ, άταρ, άδ, άδ, δ, δ, η, η, και, καίτοι, μάνιμη, μέν, μέντοι, ούν, περ, κε, τε, τοι, τοιγάρ, τοιγάρτοι, τοιγαρών, τοιγαρών. 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 άν, κε(ν), nor shall I deal with conjunctions like έι, έντει, έος, or prepositions like έντει, κατά, etc. However, I shall add to Humbert’s list the Homeric particles άδ, νε, ην, and keep in mind the existence of dialect-specific particles like the Cypriot πασί 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, δε and τε or τε ... καί can be said to occur reasonably frequently; for the rest αλλά, γάρ, μέν occur more than 8 times each, while eight other particles (άδει, άρτο, έτει, έτει, ηδέ, ηδέ, περ, πο) occur at best four times each but often once or twice each only.1 Obviously the absence of some particles may be due to chance. Thus Hansen has no examples of μέν, but an instance of the particle occurs in the elegiac district of the Sixth Century Polyandrion of Ambracia recently published: Καβέ μέν άραθόλων Καβέ Εδεσεν ιόπτε, πολιτητη, ιός μετά τόνδε άνδρον Καβέ Εκείνην θανάτον.2

1 Hansen lists 465 inscriptions in CIG I and another 32 early inscriptions in CIG 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: αλλά (A x 2; nA x 7), άδει (nA x 1), άταρ (A x 1; nA x 3), γάρ (A x 6; nA x 4), έτει (A x 1), άταρ (A x 1; nA x 2), δέ (A x 5; nA x 1), μέν (A x 11; nA x 2 or 3), περ (nA x 2), πο (nA x 1). I have not counted the particles which are entirely restored or doubtful.

2 For the text (five districts which belong to the sixth century B.C.) see Andreou (1986), Bouquet (1992), Cassio (1994); presumably in the name άραθόλων 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 μέν is entirely parallel to that of Homer, where it regularly occurs before vowel. On the other hand, as he points out, Homer has άδει μέν before vowel as well as ηδέ μέν before vowel, but never καί μέν, while καί 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 Taenuber (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 koine. 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: ἀλλὰ (2 or 3 times), δὲ (μηδὲν, οὐδὲν), ἢ, καὶ/καὶ, μὲν, τε (τε/τε/τει, μηδὲν, οὐδὲν), of which only δὲ, ἢ, καὶ/καὶ have any frequency. In addition oaths are introduced by τοι, equivalent to νοθ found elsewhere in Greek, and there is a very doubtful instance of ἀνθ (see below).

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 δὲ as such, though two occurrences of με-τε could be interpreted as including either δὲ or τε. The basic connective is καὶ (not καὶ as in the majority of the Arcadian inscriptions), which is clearly used where elsewhere we might expect δὲ. In addition Cypriot offers evidence for three apparently archaic particles: καὶ, ὅδε and ἀνθ; the first is Cypriot only, the second and third are also found in Homer and in the poetry in the epigraphic language but not elsewhere. 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 δὲ, if they had been in real use. The presence of καὶ and ἀνθ 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 Arcadians 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. ἀνθ, ἀλλὰ

We may now look more closely at the Arcadian list. The supposed ἀνθ occurs only once—and only if we accept a specific interpretation and reading of the text in question (IQ V 2 343, 50; cf. Dubois 1986: ii, 157f.). The most recent editors (Thür and Taenuber 1994: 133 at 14.47) do not and it may be wiser to suspend judgement.

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

Two particles only, καὶ/τε καὶ and δὲ, are reasonably frequent; the remaining ones, μὲν 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 labiowular form (τε) it is omnipresent in Mycenaean but in alphabetic Greek it is mostly replaced by καὶ (or καὶ in Cypriot and parts of Arcadian). This is interesting enough a panhellenic phenomenon and the history of τε everywhere, including Arcadian, cannot be wholly dissociated from that of καὶ/καὶ, largely because its scarcity of occurrence is deter-

---

3 For the sake of completeness, though it does not feature in Humbert's list, I add here the two examples of νοθ in two late Hellenistic defixiones sometimes attributed to Arcadia (Dubois 1986: ii, 319f.). 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 σι, σι, μοι identified by Dubois (1986: ii, 227f.), both because, as indicated above, I am not concerned with potential particles, and because I follow Ilodot (1990) in a different interpretation of the texts. Cf. also Dinkel (1990).

4 με-τε ... με-τε occur twice, in fourth-century Paphos: ICS 2-4, Manila-Milford 1986, no. 237; for Masson the correct interpretation is μηδὲν, but for Risch (1988: 73 note 22) it is μηδὲ. In addition an example of τε, which may be (but need not be) interpreted as τε or δὲ occurs in ICS 2-4, 406, and for metrical reasons Neumann (1975: 154 = 1994: 833) introduces a δὲ in the final line of ICS 2-4, 264.

5 For the references of the Cypriot lexicon by Hinte (1993) and Egothney (1992) s.vv. παρί, i-tε, as-tα-tα-tα-tα, τα. It is likely, but obviously not certain, that the Idalian inscription (ICS 2-4 217) has a preform of the Attic ὅτεν and conceivably an instance of τε; the νοθ particle seems to be attested as well. Also τε is found more than once, while a late verse inscription (ICS 2-4 265) contains a sequence τα-κα-κα-τα τα, where different exegetes have recognized the particle τα (Masson, ad loc) or the particles τα τα (Neumann, loc. cit. in note 4).

6 A clear-cut example of ἀλλὰ is found in Schwyz DGF 627, 27 (Dubois 1986: ii, 61f.); Tegela's decree about the return of the exiles after Alexander the Great; the other example (IQ V 2 5, 34, Dubois 1986: ii, 40), in a set of rules about working contracts also from Tegela, belongs to the notoriously difficult sequence ἄλλα τε, where it is not even certain that ἄλλα (rather than ἄλλα) is included (... μη δέναι τοιούτου μηδένα ἄλλα τε ἢ τε).
mined by the success of κας/και. In fact in Arcadian the best evidence for τε is in some forms of compounds: είτε, μήτε, ούτε 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 ... κατ constructions:

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

[κακβ]ζις ζ' έξολοτρυ κατ δεις τότε δεμιομοργή [δόφωσσα] ας ... ‘let him perish horribly and let whoever is then damnatus pax ...’

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

α τε θεος κας οί δικαιοσσα ‘the goddess and the judges’

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

τας τε ην Εμαιμον και τας ην Ερχομονοφ ‘those in Eumainon and those in Orchomenos’

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

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

... παρακάλεαν[ν] τας τε θεος καινανη και τον θηγον οι και τας εκεχειρις ζ τις ηρον ουλον ηνα ... ‘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 Arcadian in compound forms like είτε or μήτε/ούτε (ο-υqe is Mycenaean) but otherwise was reintroduced from outside as part of learned language. That είτε etc. belong to a continuous tradition is confirmed by IG V 2, 262 (Mantinea) where είτε (or rather είτε) is written with tae, 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 Mantinea 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 (7) inscription (1 above) where we find ... ζ' ... κατ (for τε ... κας) 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—for except for compounds and possibly for the sequence τε ... κας/και—the simple τε is no longer in real use.

3.3. κας/και, δε, μεν

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

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

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 και rather than κας of Mantinea and possibly of the rest of Arcadia is due to external influence.

7 The fullest discussion is still that by Löfvel (1981); cf. also the review by Ruijgh (1981).
8 Cypriot also provides good evidence for the deictic pronoun δε. If this derives from the *δο pronom and connective δε (see below p. 64), we have further evidence for the earlier use of δε in the ancestor of classical Cypriot.
3.4. ἰα: function and use

It is now time to concentrate on ἰα 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 ἰα 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 ἰα: one may consider what they ‘mean’, their semantic or propositional content, or one may consider what pragmatist 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 ἰα and very rarely ὅλος, γώρ, ὀὖν and ἥτοι mark what he calls a development unit and that καί and ἰα operate within that development unit. Bakker (1993) has contrasted the oral tradition, represented e.g. in epic poetry, where ἰα may mark a cognitive unit or the equivalent of an intonation unit, with the written tradition where ἰα 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 prooxyne decree which provides for the award of a prooxyne together with consequent honours and perquisites for the honoree. 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):


‘Εδοξῆτε τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ τῷ πόλιτοι τῶν Ὀρχομενίων Ἀρχηγοῦς Στιπάκου Τεγέαν προξένον ἥν[α] καὶ εὐεργετάν ... αὐτῶν καὶ ἑγγόνος ἥμα τι θεότατῳ γὰς ἱσταναν καὶ ἀτελέκειαν καὶ ἀπολύειαν ...’


‘Εδοξῆτε τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Ὀρχομενίων Πάννων Ἀρχηγοῦς προξένον ἥμα τι καὶ εὐεργετάν [αὐ]τῶν [καὶ γένος καὶ ἀπολύεια] ἥμεν [ἀπο]τελεῖαν καὶ γένεια ...

It was agreed by the city of Orchomenos that Pannis son of Aigipinos 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 ἰα clause in (5) and of a καί clause in (6). It is of course possible that in (6) the choice of καί rather than ἰα is determined by dialect difference, since (6) has a number of features which are not Arcadian (ἐλέμον/ἡμεν, -ου genitives, ἐκ, ἐκτ + genitive) and which have induced Dubois to state that the dialect is that of the honoree, i.e. Argolic, but this is far from certain. In a similar prooxyne formula from Argos (Schwyzer DGE 92, third century) we find a ἰα construction parallel to that of (5) (προξένον ἥμα τι καὶ εὐεργετάν ... αὐτῶν καὶ ἑγγόνος, ἥμεν δὲ σφυν ἀτελέκειαν καὶ ἀπολύειαν ...). Also in a Mantinea prooxyne decree for an Argive, once again not in Arcadian, we find the standard ἰα construction (IG V 2 263). On the other hand in an earlier prooxyne 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 δέ καὶ (ἡμα τι δέ καὶ ἀπολύειαν καὶ ἀτελέκαν).

Examples of this type could be multiplied, but we can also use (5) by itself, as well as the alternation between ἰα and καί in (5) and (6), to underline the point that in some Arcadian texts ἰα simply introduces a new point without any contraposition; in other words the correct English rendering is ‘and’ rather than ‘but’. In general if one looks at late Arcadian inscriptions this is the main function of ἰα. 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. ἰα in parallel texts

The last conclusion is expected. Yet if we contrast early and late texts we observe that initially ἰα 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

9 In (5) it would be possible to argue that the contraposition is between the title of proxenos and benefactor awarded to Larchippus and his descendants (ὁ τὸν καὶ ἑγγόνος) and the rights to inviolability etc. awarded to Larchippus only (ὁ τὸν): in fact the parallelism with formulae in which instead of a singular we find a plural pronoun (ὁ τὸν καὶ ἑγγόνος) or a reference to the ἑγγόνος, while still having ἰα 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 koia 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 τοῦ νομοῦ ‘from this’ is replaced by τοῦτο δέ ‘from this’ and ἀπὸ + name in the dative is replaced by ἄπο δέ + name in the genitive. In other words here each clause is introduced by δέ in contrast with the earlier text:


ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀρίου ... ἐπὶ τὸ Βοουφαγέαν μεσακότεθεν τοῖς κράναις ἀπὸ τοῖς ἐν τῷ Πορθείαν πρότερον ἀπὸ τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἄρμα τοῦ ἄρμα τοῦ ... ἐν τῷ Πορθείαν πρότερον ἀπὸ τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἄρμα τοῦ ... ἐν τῷ Πορθείαν πρότερον ἀπὸ τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἄρμα τοῦ τῆς Τιραντής ... ἐν τῷ Πορθείαν πρότερον ἀπὸ τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἄρμα τοῦ τῆς Τιραντής ... ἐν τῷ Πορθείαν πρότερον ἀπὸ τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἄρμα τοῦ τῆς Τιραντής ... ἐν τῷ Πορθείαν πρότερον ἀπὸ τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἄρμα τοῦ τῆς Τιραντής ...

(from the boundary ... τοῦ φιόρον (passing) in the middle of the springs; from this point to the beginning of the Porthia; from this point to the end (of the Porthia); from this point to the end of the orchard; ... from the Padoessa to the hill with two boundaries, and from this point to the Trianezia; from this point ...).

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

... τοῦτο δέ ἄρες ... ἀπὸ τοῦτο δέ ...

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. From this point of view the longer texts in Arcadian fall into two groups. The smaller group includes the Law of the cult of Demeter Thesmophoros (Pheneos?, ca. 500 B.C.),

11 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 ἐκαὶ in Arcadian) is different from mine and I hope to extend the material while looking at it from a somewhat different angle.

12 Dubois (1986: ii, 196, no. 1), Thir and Taeuber (1994: 269, no. 20; cf. (1)).

13 IG V 2 262, Schwyzar DGE 661, Dubois (1986: ii, 94), Thir and Taeuber (1994: 75 no. 8; cf. (2)).

the judgement about the murder in the temple of Alea (Mantinea, Fifth Century B.C.) and the regulations for the temple of Athena Alea (Tegae, end Fifth Century or beginning Fourth Century). The second group includes most of the remaining dialect inscriptions from Arcadia of suitable length. Prominent examples are the rules about building contracts from Tegae (Second half of the Fourth Century),

14 IG V 2 3; Schwyzar DGE 654, Dubois (1986: ii, 20), Thir and Taeuber (1994: 11 no. 2).

15 IG V 2 6; Schwyzar DGE 656, Dubois (1986: ii, 39), Thir and Taeuber (1994: 20, no. 3).

16 IG V 2 p. xxvii; Schwyzar DGE 657, Dubois (1986: ii, 61 no. 4), Thir and Taeuber (1994: 51 no. 5).


19 After the division sign the new paragraph at line 13 starts with ὧν δὲ ὄνομα ἐπέγραψεν ἴππον ἐπηγάληθον. ‘However many contracts the Helissawos had among themselves before they became Mantinans, will be valid ... ’. However many contracts the Helissawos had among themselves before they became Mantinans, will be valid ... ’. However many contracts the Helissawos had among themselves before they became Mantinans, will be valid ...

20 Notice the absence of δέ in lines 14, 18, 20. The only possible exception is in line 24 where the editors restore ἐξ οὗ δέ ἐπηγάληθον τῷ ἱππείρῳ, but it is difficult to build too much on a restoration.

In contrast, the rules about building contracts 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 Exeimion (Orchomenos, mid fourth century) and the synoikia between the Helissawoi and the Mantinians (Mantinea, date uncertain but at latest 350-40 and possibly earlier),

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 section 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 Helissawoi and the Mantinians) 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.

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: ἔν τινι δοῦναι 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 Mantinea a serious change of topic calls for the absence of initial δέ;²⁰ by contrast in the much later Tegae decree for the return of exiles δέ sentence follows δέ sentence so that, if the previous criterion were to be adopted,
most of the inscription would count as one immense paragraph. This may be indeed the correct interpretation if one thinks of the involved 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 ‘legalase’ 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

#Τά δὲ ἁγράντα μὲ νέμεν ἐν Ἀλέα πλῶς ὁμέρια καὶ νυκτὶς ... εἰ δὲ ἐν 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 ἱερόθετον νέμεν ἐν Ἀλέα πλῶς τὰ δὲ ἀνασκεθεὶ πλῆθεσι χαίροντε. 'Let the sacrificer pasture in Alea whatever is unblemished, but (δέ) for the animals which are not unblemished let there be inphorismos'

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

... διὰ τὸ τὸ δομοφοργὸν ἀφαίρεστα δομῆς τριάκοντα εἰ δὲ μὲν ἀφαίρετο ... '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. In the later texts the position is different; practically every new sentence is linked to the preceding one by δέ which has a continuous 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.

#δὲ μὴν πεντάς καὶ εἴκοσι δς νέμεν καὶ ξεύσος καὶ ἀγατ' εἰ δὲ ἐν καταλλάσσειν ἰνφορμηθεὶν ἐναι τὸν ἱερομνήμονα ἰνφορμῆν. εἰ δὲ ἐν λεūσι μὲν ἰνφορμῆν ἱεροτρόπων δορχμῶν ὁμῖλον ἐν δάμον καὶ κεφαραὶ ὁμῖλον ἱερατί."The priest may pasture twenty-five sheep, a yoke and a goat; but (δέ) if he goes beyond this, let there be inphorismos; let the hieromnemon practice the inphorismos. but (δέ) if, having seen it, he does not practice inphorismos let him owe one hundred drachmai to the people and (καὶ) be accused’

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

#Μὴ ἔκτασιν δὲ μὴ διὰ κοινήν γενέσθαι αἰλέουν ἢ δυο ἐπὶ μηδενί τῶν ἔργων εἰ δὲ μὴ, ὁφάλωσι ἐκαστὸς πεντήκοντα δορχμῶν ἐπελεσάσθων δὲ αἱ ἀκασταὶ ἰμοῖσθαι δὲ τῷ βολυμένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ ἱμίσσοι τὰς ζωίας ... '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 hellastai will impose (the fine); and (δέ) whoever wishes can denounce (them) for half of the fine’

---

21 I deliberately leave aside at this stage the μήν ... 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 δὲ.\(^{22}\)

In general, it all looks as if in Arcadian inscriptions the use of δὲ changed round the middle of the fourth century. At all periods the particle acts as a sentence connective,\(^{23}\) 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 δὲ 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 δὲ?

Obviously the contrast just identified may be 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 adversative meaning of δὲ 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 δὲ. 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 δὲ 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 δὲ than Homer and Herodotus, and perhaps even Mycenaean—which defies credibility. The last point must be explored further.

In Mycenaean δὲ 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-ke-ja inscription:

(14) PY An 607, 5ff.:  

---

\(^{22}\) In the second text I have always rendered δὲ 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.

\(^{23}\) This is the primary function, which explains, for instance, why δὲ only appears in the first component of a hypothetical sentence; a construction like έτι δὲ μὴ, δορψῆν ὅφλην is grammatical, but a construction like *δορψῆν ὅφλην, έτι δὲ μὴ is not.

---

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

(15) PY Ep 704, 5-6:  

ma-te-de di-wi-ja do-e-ra  
... do-e-ra ma-te  
pa-te-de ka-ke-ų

‘... 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 bronzenith’

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

(16) PY Ep 338, 1-2:  

e-ri-ta i-je-reja e-ke  
e-u-en-ge 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

‘F. the priestess has  
and (qē) solemnly affirms that she has the e-to-ni-jo for the god(dess)  
but (de) the danos says that she has an onato of ktoinai kek’

Yet not all Mycenaean instances are so clear-cut and, as Ruijgh (1967) has shown, some uses of δὲ in connection with to-so or in the particle sequence o-da-a2 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 οδοντοσ and δὲ, and the particle cannot easily be understood as ‘but’. Thus in the Pylos tablet about the wanakeron temenos the easiest interpretation is that indicated below:

(17) PY Er 312, 5-6:  

t-e-re-ta-o to-so pe-ma GRA 30  
to-so-de te-re-ta VIR 3  
So much (to\(λ\)ον) seed of the telestal 30 units  
and (de) so many (to\(λ\)ον) telestal 3 Men’

Similarly in:
(18) PY Jr 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 talansia ... and (de) the bronze (is) so much: ... and (de) so many bronzesmiths without talansia’

It is in fact this connective and transitive value of ἰε 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 ἰατρός or τοσοὸς. Risch (1969), who argued for a derivation of the ‘demonstrative’ ἰε of ἰατρός etc. from the connective particle, did not really ask how it would have been possible to move from a purely adverstive value to a demonstrative value; yet, if the question is asked, the answer must be that the development is possible if the adverstive value is not too clearly marked. If, as Risch argued, the shift is happening in Mycenaean itself, it then follows that at that stage ἰε could not be purely adverstive. Rather than rewriting the interpretation of Mycenaean sub specie Arcadiae, it would be easier to assume that the strong adverstive value of Arcadian ἰε is due to a post-Mycenaean delevelopment 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 καὶ and ἰε but there is rather a three-way contrast between καὶ, ἰε 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 ἰε operates defining further and smaller units. In its turn in early Arcadian καὶ operates within the scope of ἰε, so that there is a sort of hierarchy: asyndeton > ἰε > καὶ. 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 clause about the imposition of the fine by the local magistrate follows in asyndeton the previous hypothetical sentence.

Within the paragraph, then, ἰε, asyndeton and sometimes καὶ/καῖ are all possible. Of these καὶ/καῖ, 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 ἰε. On the assumption that the original state of affairs was similar to that of Mycenaean where ἰε has either transitive or adverstive value it is not too difficult to see why in the early Arcadian inscriptions, where ἰε contrasted with asyndeton, it acquired a more clearly polarized adverstive value, while asyndeton simply indicated the shift to another topic without any added semantic value.

5. The loss of τὲ and ἰε in Cypriot

That the interpretation proposed is preferable to the assumption that early Arcadian simply preserves the original meaning of ἰε24 is perhaps shown by an attempt to make sense of the history of Cypriot with its loss of both τὲ and ἰε. 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 καὶ, the basic connective. Yet the creation of καὶ καὶ in the function of connecter, or rather the attribution of connective functions to καὶ καὶ, which must be post-Mycenaean, will have altered the situation, particularly because καὶ καὶ, differently from καὶ καὶ, was not enclitic. It is generally assumed, and correctly so, that καὶ καὶ must have taken over the functions of καὶ καὶ largely because it was a ‘stronger’ and ‘more emphatic’ particle. This, joined with its initial quasi-adverbial and non-enclitic nature, naturally gave καὶ καὶ a role at the beginning of a sentence and brought it in some way in collision with ἰε. Let us assume—purely on a speculative basis—that this happened in an early post-Mycenaean period. A priori the conflict between καὶ καὶ on the one hand and ἰε 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 2, no. 217, 1ff.):

kas pai erwetasaus basileus kas a pitolis ... downenai ... ’(When the Medes ... besieged the city of Idalion, the king Stasikyros and [kais] the city invited Onasikyros ... to treat the men wounded in battle without fee). And (kas pai) the king and the city promised ... to give ...’

(20) ibid., 1off.

καὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐν Ονασίλου ἰς καὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵνα ἐκαὶ καὶ ἵ

24 Note that if the proposed derivation of ἰε from ἰε is correct (cf. e.g. Leumann 1949) this makes it likely that the original meaning of the particle was not adverstive.
"if anyone removes Onasilos and his brothers ... from this place ... (ide pai) he who removes them will pay ... And (kαί) to Onasilos alone without the other brothers the king and the city promised to give ..."

(21) ibid., 266ff.:

ide ta(n) dalton ta(n)de ... basileus kas a ptaolls katethian i(n) ta(n) thion tan Athenan ...

"(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 δὲ rather than the introductory κάς of the Cypriot text. In all likelihood a δὲ 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 δὲ in Cypriot; its appearance at the start of the apodosis in (20) is striking. In any case it is clearly not adversative. Ruigigh (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 κὰς/κοῖ and δὲ in the post-Mycenaean period was resolved by Cypriot with the disappearance of δὲ (except for the compound forms) and with the take over by κὰς of parts of its role—leaving aside δὲ because of our ignorance.²⁵ In Arcadian the reverse happened. At a local level (within the main sections of the text) κὰς/κοῖ and δὲ were contrasted while asyndeton had a role to play too. The end result was that κὰς/κοῖ was kept with an additive value and δὲ with a contrastive value, while the neutral transitive role was left to local asyndeton.

6. The development of δὲ 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 δὲ as a quasi-sentence marker and the loss of its adversative/contrastive value?²⁶ One possible development would of course be that in an increasingly literate society a higher level of sophistication leads to a different seg-

²⁵ It is not uninteresting that, if we accept Warren Cowgill’s (1964) interpretation of the two crucial passages of the idation inscription, two strongly adversative sentences start with ἐδουαν oin na ‘they gave ...’ and στῆκται oin na ‘he gave ...’ respectively. Here the role of highlighting the contraposition is left to word order (the initial position of the verb) and to the oieov particle, to which Denniston (1954: 416) attributes the initial role of stressing the idea of reality or essentiality.

²⁶ The phrase κατ’ εἶς τὸν ὀίνον which we find in Arcadian inscriptions (IG V 2 6, 1, 17, 27) obviously includes a δὲ which is not a connective. Dubois (1986: 1, 233) compares the Boeotian κατ’ ὀίνον with eis δὲ τὸν ὀίνον and implies that δὲ stands for δὲ. Whatever the explanation of the phrase its existence proves that δὲ 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 δὲ 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 start, 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 δὲ which we found in (5).²⁷ 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 δὲ 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 is not subject to external influence is easily counteracted for Arcadian: in the suonokla of Mantinea with the Hellaswasi (note 18), i.e. in the middle of a text (line 21) which is written in good dialect, we find a very non-Arcadian "Av δὲ, i.e. ἐὰν δὲ, for what in Arcadian would be ei δὲ.

7. μὲν ... δὲ

There is perhaps more. So far we have left aside μὲν and the μὲν ... δὲ construction. This is largely because μὲν is rare in Arcadian. If it occurs, it is only in standard text-book constructions of the μὲν ... δὲ type which appear somewhat stilted:

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

... τὸ μὲν μὲξον πρὸς τὸν διερμίαν ὄφλειάν, τὸ δὲ μὲξον ἵναιρθμεν

‘on the one hand (μὲν) for a bigger piece of cattle he will owe a drakhma, on the other hand (δὲ) for a smaller one there will be inphorisimos’

(23) ibid., l. 22

tὸ μὲν ἔμισυ τοῖς θεοῖς, τὸ δὲ ἔμισυ τοῖς ἱερομενάμονα ...
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 μην, which in its turn was the Ionic form of μέν. 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 μέν (μην) and μέν is on the whole remarkably close’ but also observed that, while, leaving Epic on the one side, ‘μην, μην, 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.

28 The sequence δ μέν ... 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.
and 'Acolic' 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 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 synonymous 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 μέν 'but', which replaces the old δόλαδο and to a certain extent δέ,29 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-
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