

**THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN  
THE GENITIVE AND  
DATIVE USED WITH TO  
DENOTE SUPERPOSTION**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649740277

The Difference Between the Genitive and Dative Used with to Denote Superposition by Lewis Leaming Forman

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**LEWIS LEAMING FORMAN**

**THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN  
THE GENITIVE AND  
DATIVE USED WITH TO  
DENOTE SUPERPOSTION**



THE DIFFERENCE  
BETWEEN  
THE GENITIVE AND DATIVE  
USED WITH *ἐπί* TO  
DENOTE SUPERPOSITION

BY  
LEWIS LEAMING FORMAN, A. M.

A DISSERTATION ACCEPTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR  
OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS  
UNIVERSITY, FEBRUARY, 1894

---

BALTIMORE  
1894

PRESS OF  
THE FRIEDENWALD COMPANY  
BALTIMORE



"Vix quidquam tam lubricum est in syntaxi linguarum, quam hi loci, qui sunt de praepositionibus et de coniunctionibus." These words of G. Hermann,<sup>1</sup> though written many years ago (1831), must be recognized, however regretfully, as still true by any one who has attempted to answer even some less important question in prepositional usage. Classification he finds difficult, at times impossible, and the opinions of authorities widely divergent.

On the general theory of prepositions, it is true, Delbrück announced in 1879 the following consensus of judgment: "Ueber die ursprüngliche Anwendung dieser Präpositionen (*ἀνά, ἐπί, παρά, περί, πρός, πρό, ἐν, ἐκ, ξύν*) ist man jetzt zu einer übereinstimmenden Meinung gelangt. Man nimmt allgemein an, dass die Präpositionen ursprünglich wie alle Wörter *Freiwörter* (sog. Adverbia) waren, und dann *Begleitwörter* wurden, und zwar von Anfang an in grösster Ausdehnung verbale Begleitwörter, dagegen Anfangs seltener und erst im Laufe der Zeit häufiger werdend nominale Begleitwörter. In der ältesten Zeit war es die wesentliche Aufgabe der Präpositionen, die Richtung der im Verbum ausgedrückten Handlung näher zu bestimmen, die Beziehung der Handlung aber auf einen Gegenstand drückte der Casus allein aus, ohne Beihülfe der Präpositionen."<sup>2</sup> So essentially say Kühner,<sup>3</sup> Curtius,<sup>4</sup> Whitney<sup>5</sup> and others before this date, and so Paul,<sup>6</sup> Brugmann,<sup>7</sup> Vogrinz<sup>8</sup> and others since. But it is only upon this general theory that a consensus can be obtained—so general indeed that it must ignore the question of the ultimate origin of

<sup>1</sup> Opuscula, vol. V, p. 50, quoted by Sobolewski, *De Praepositionum Usu Aristophaneae*.

<sup>2</sup> *Syntaktische Forschungen*, IV 126.

<sup>3</sup> *Grammatik der griech. Sprache* (1870), II, §428, 3 and 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Erläuterungen* (1875), p. 176.

<sup>5</sup> *Language and the Study of Lang.* (1877), p. 276.

<sup>6</sup> *Principien der Sprachgeschichte* (1886), p. 316.

<sup>7</sup> *Griechische Grammatik* (Müller's Handbuch, II, 1890), §195.

<sup>8</sup> *Grammatik des homerischen Dialektes* (1889), p. 206.

prepositions,<sup>1</sup> *i. e.* whether or not they contain the stems of *Begriffswörter*; whereas, if one enters into particulars even so slightly as to ask for a definition of the difference between the true and the "improper" preps. or what preps., if any, go with the true gen. case, he will obtain a great diversity of answers. Curtius, for instance, finds that the gen. depends upon *ἀντί*, *πρό*, *διά*, *ὑπέρ* "und vielen andern—gerade in der Weise wie von unserm Angesichts, laut, kraß."<sup>2</sup> Delbrück takes issue with him, though admitting the Curtius-construction as a probability for *ἀντί* and a possibility for *διά*, because they may belong to the class of "unechten, d. h. aus Nominalstämmen gebildeten Präpositionen."<sup>3</sup> Vogrinz, *Gram. des homerischen Dialektes*, takes the gen. to be adnominal with *ἀντί* (p. 211), *διά* (p. 214), *κατά* sometimes (p. 215), *ὑπέρ* (p. 216), *παρά* "schwer zu entscheiden" (p. 222), *πρός* "allem Anschein nach" (p. 223). Delbrück now says: "Der echte Genitiv findet sich bei *ἀντί*, *ὑπέρ*, *διά*, *ἐπί*, *πρός*, *ἀνά*, *ἀμφί*, *περί*, *μετά*. Bei *ἀντί*, *ὑπέρ* und *διά* dürfte es der alte adnominale Genitiv sein, welcher uns bei den unechten Präp. begegnet."<sup>4</sup> It will be observed that as these lists are not co-extensive, the slipperiness of which Hermann complains is still present.

For the purposes of the present essay, however, these larger questions need not be taken up and the general theory as above presented may be subscribed to. We proceed therefore to the proper subject of the essay—the difference between the gen. and dat. used with *ἐπί* to express superposition, or, to take a concrete case,

What is the Attic Greek prose for 'with his hat on his head'? Is it *ἐπί τῆς κεφαλῆς*, or *ἐπί τῆ κεφαλῆ*? Or if either, is there any shade of difference in the meaning?

For the translation of so simple a phrase, one might expect

<sup>1</sup> See Grassmann, *Ursprung der Präpositionen*, Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, XXIII (1877), p. 559. He maintains (p. 563): "Keine ächte Präposition ist aus einem Begriffswort entsprungen," as also: "Keine ächte Präp. ist als Casus zu fassen." See on the contrary for *παρό*, Osthoff, *Morph. Unters.* IV 283, Anm., "der alte Instrumental," and for *πύρι* and *ἕνι*, Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*, §194 (locat.). So too *διά* (*διὰ*), *πρό*, and others have been reckoned among the preps. "in quibus terminatio alicuius nominis latet, ex quo genitivus pendeat," J. A. Heilmann, *De Genetivi Graeci maxima Homericu usu* (1873), p. 25, note 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Erläuterungen*, p. 177.

<sup>3</sup> *Synt. Forsch.* IV 134.

<sup>4</sup> *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen* (1893), p. 765.



clear rules and distinctions laid down even in the elementary books. The question is not one of origins. No matter what its derivation, affinities or ultimate meaning, *ἐπί* is certainly the proper preposition, while the case of the substantive should be settled by an examination of the remains of Greek literature; and, if both cases prove to be allowed, the difference between them, if worth anything, should appear at the same time. Only in this last matter need one feel drawn beyond the Greek in search of the Indo-Germanic basis of distinction.

Yet simple as the question seems, scholars are much at variance about it. Stated in general terms the question is:

1) Does Attic Greek prose employ *ἐπί* with both genitive and dative to express concrete superposition of one body upon another?

2) If so, what is the difference, if any, between the two forms of expression?

The answers of the following authorities I quote at some length, that their text may be at hand for reference.

1) Kühner, *Grammatik der griech. Sprache* (1870), II, §438: "*ἐπί* mit dem Dativ, 1) räumlich zur Angabe des Verweilens nicht nur, wie beim Gen., *auf*, sondern, und zwar häufiger, in erweiterter Bedeutung *an* od. *bei* einem Orte od. Gegenstande." He then quotes among other instances of *auf* Xen. An. VII 4, 4 οἱ Θρᾷκες τὰς ἀλωπεκίδας ἐπὶ ταῖς κεφαλαῖς φοροῦσι καὶ τοῖς ὤσι καὶ χεῖρας (Oberkleider) μέχρι τῶν ποδῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων ἔχοντες, remarking "*ἐπί* c. dat. rein räumlich, aber *ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων*, insofern die Pferde als thätig gedacht werden; so Plat. Conv. 212e ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ ἔχων τὰς ταυλάς, aber kurz vorher ταυλάς ἔχων ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς."

2) Krüger, *Griechische Grammatik* (1875), §68, 41, 1: "Bei *ἐπί* mit dem Gen. wird eine mehr zufällige, freiere Verbindung gedacht; bei *ἐπί* mit dem Dat. schwebt mehr der Begriff der Zugehörigkeit vor."

3) Rutherford, *Babrius* (1883), p. 7: "The correct Attic usage is very simple, the best writers of prose and comedy limiting *ἐπί* c. gen. to position or motion upon an object or surface, and *ἐπί* c. dat. to position or motion at or near. Thus a floating body is ἐπὶ ποταμοῦ, a city ἐπὶ ποταμοῦ. A wounded man may be carried home ἐπὶ θύρων, a beggar sits ἐπὶ θύραις. In tragedy this distinction is not observed, and *ἐπί* c. dat. is also used to convey the sense which prose writers confine to the genitive. In Thucydides the prose usage has not yet become absolute, and although several

deviations from the rule, such as *ἀετίων ἐπὶ ἀράξῃ κατακομάζειν* (4, 67), admit of easy correction, yet the undoubted dat. in 2, 80 *τοὺς ὀπίστας ἐπὶ ναοὶ πέμπουσι*, 4, *το ἐπὶ ταῖς νυκτὶ βήστοι εἰσὶν ἠμένεσθαι*, proves that such emendation is as uncalled for in the immature Attic of Thucydides as it would be in Herod. or Xen. The Ionic and poetic laxity also crops up in the Symposium, where Plato allows himself a poet's license, and in the same paragraph (212*ε*) are found the poetical *ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ ἔχων τὰς ταυρίας*, and the prosaic *ταυρίας ἔχοντα ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς*. In no writer, however, is the genuine prose signification of *ἐπὶ* c. dat. ever accredited to *ἐπὶ* c. gen.,<sup>1</sup> although the meaning 'in the direction of' sometimes brings *ἐπὶ* close to that of 'near.'

4) Sobolewski, *De Praepositionum Usu Aristophaneo* (Moscow, 1890), p. 161: "Sed omnino genetivum in multo usitatorem dativo in quotidiano Atticorum sermone fuisse vel inde clarissime apparet, quod Aristoph. hoc uso *ἐπὶ* iungit dativo in senariis 11-ies, in alio genere versuum 13-ies (quo annumeravi etiam Vesp. 1293, ubi Aristoph. tragicos imitatur), genetivo autem in senariis 48-ies, in aliis numeris 14-ies." In a footnote he adds: "Errat igitur Rutherfordius, qui hunc dativi usum a comicis omnino abiudicat (Babrius, p. 7)." On the difference between gen. and dat., p. 160: "Quaerenti mihi, quid inter utramque constructionem interesset, sensus quidem discrimen esse nullum visum est," citing Eq. 783 by the side of 754, and Vesp. 1040 as compared with Lys. 575, 732, Eccl. 909.

5) Gildersleeve, *American Journal of Philology*, XI, p. 372, reviewing Sobolewski's book: "Under *ἐπὶ* c. gen. Sobolewski rejects Krüger's distinction between *ἐπὶ* c. gen. and *ἐπὶ* c. dat. in a local sense, a distinction which, it is true, might well be reversed theoretically as well as practically, for we should expect the natural position to be expressed by *ἐπὶ* c. gen., the unnatural by the dat. Fixity of position is in fact often denoted by *ἐπὶ* c. gen. (see my Justin Martyr, Apol. I 26, 15), and it is not impossible that there may be some such feeling as we have in regard to *ἐπὶ* c. gen. and *ἐπὶ* c. dat. In refutation of Krüger, Sobolewski points triumphantly to Eq. 783 compared with 754, but he might have claimed here, not mere indifference, but, if one must refine, reversal. It would be easy to make Demos wriggle in the one

<sup>1</sup> See, however, to take the word Mr. Rutherford himself has chosen, Lycurg. *κατὰ Λευκράτους* §40 ὅραν ὃ' ἔν ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν θυμῶν γυναικῶν ἐλευθέρως περιφόβουσι κτλ.

passage and sit quiet in his 'fixed normal position' in the other. At any rate, the gen. is much more common in Attic daily speech than the dat., as Sobolewski shows, though, as he also notes, Rutherford is wrong in denying *ἐπί* c. dat. in this sense to Attic (Babrius, p. 7)."

6). Transferring the question to Homeric Greek (Monro, *Homeric Gram.*, §200): "The gen. with *ἐπί* is used in nearly the same sense as the dat., but usually with less definitely local force; in particular—1) with words expressing the great divisions of space, espec. when a contrast is involved (land and sea, etc.); as *ἐπί χέρσου*, *ἐπ' ἡπείρου*, *ἐπ' ἀγροῦ*; Od. 12, 27 ἡ ἄλος ἢ ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλγήσατε—2) where the local relation is a familiar one; as *ἐπὶ νηός*, *ἐπ' ἀπέτης*, *ἐφ' ἔππων*, *ἐπὶ θρόνου*, *ἐπ' οὐδοῦ*, *ἐπὶ πέργου*, *ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος*, *ἐπὶ μελῆς* (*ἐρεισθείς*). Thus *ἐπὶ νηαί* means *οὐ* or *beside* ships, *ἐπὶ νηῶν οὐ* *board* ships." (But for the Greeks before Troy was *ἐπὶ νηῶν* a more familiar location than *ἐπὶ νηαί*?)

Further quotation is needless to prove variety of opinion.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Rutherford is perhaps alone in denying to Attic Greek prose the use of the dat. in the sense of superposition. This point is naturally the first to be taken up, and could perhaps be determined by an appeal simply to Att. Greek prose. But it will be better to present at the same time and in historic order the whole material of the question.

The following lists

1) include only concrete substantial things, admitting abstractions, metaphors or other unrealities only when they vividly suggest their originals, *e. g.* Soph. Ant. 189-90 (speaking of the πόλις) ταύτης ἐπι πλείοντες; Ar. Av. 39-40 οἱ μὲν γὰρ οὖν τέττιγες . . . ἐ. τῶν κραδῶν ἤδουσι, Ἀθηναῖοι δ' αἰεὶ ἐ. τῶν δικῶν ἤδουσι; Xen. An. II 5, 23 of the wearing of the tiara ἐ. τῆ κεφαλῇ and also ἐ. τῆ καρδίᾳ.

2) exclude on the contrary concrete objects where evidently the meaning is not purely local, *e. g.* Z. 423-24 πάντας γὰρ κατέπεφνε . . . βουαὶ ἐπ' ἀλιπέδισσι (cf. vv. 209, 221); Xen. Cyr. V

<sup>1</sup> I may, however, quote Kuemmell, *De Praepositionis ἐπι Usu Thucydideo* (1875), p. 30: "Structuris Genetivi et Dativi collatis demonstrabo saepe fere nihil interesse Genetivus an Dativus sit usurpatus." He then compares I 13, 5 with I 56, 2, ἐ. τοῦ ἰσθμοῦ and ἐ. τῷ ἰσθμῷ; II 93, 4 with VIII 106, 4 ἀκρωτηρίων ἀπὸ -φ; IV 118, 4 with 105, 2 ἐ. τῆς αἰτίας μίμνεν and ἐ. τοῖς ἐαυτοῦ . . . μίμνεν; IV 100, 4 with VIII 69 1, ἐπ' αὐτοῦ (sc. τείχεσι) and ἐ. τείχεσι; III 102, 4 (and IV 101, 3) with II 80, 2 (and IV 10, 3) πῶν and ναυσί.