

**THE SUPPLEMENTARY
PARTICIPLE
IN HERODOTUS**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649716401

The Supplementary Participle in Herodotus by Edward Joseph Filbey

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

EDWARD JOSEPH FILBEY

**THE SUPPLEMENTARY
PARTICIPLE
IN HERODOTUS**

The Supplementary Participle in Herodotus

by

EDWARD JOSEPH FILBEY

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of
the Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Wisconsin, 1908

URBANA, ILLINOIS
1917

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the treatment of the supplementary participle for Attic Greek by various grammarians the statements made relative to the use of this construction by Herodotus convey the impression that Herodotus uses the supplementary participle with considerably greater frequency and with more freedom than it is employed by Attic writers. The student of Herodotus also is likely to note the occasional occurrence of this construction after verbs usually followed by the infinitive in Attic Greek. He may observe, further, that in the construction of indirect discourse after certain verbs Herodotus seems to use either the participle or the infinitive, indifferently. The question quite naturally arises, therefore, To what extent does Herodotus' use of the supplementary participle differ from Attic usage? If Attic writers felt that a verb when followed by an infinitive had not the same meaning as when followed by a supplementary participle, did Herodotus fail to discriminate in his use of the two constructions?—To answer this general question, the investigation was begun, the results of which are recorded in the pages following.

It was first necessary to ascertain with what verbs Herodotus uses the supplementary participle. All passages were then collected in which these verbs are followed by either the supplementary participle, the infinitive, or a clause introduced by *ὅπως*, *ὅτι*, or *ὡς*. From a study of these passages the meaning of each verb with the different constructions was determined. For the principles underlying the distinctions of Attic usage the statements of Goodwin in his *Greek Moods and Tenses*, and of Kühner in his *Ausführliche Griechische Grammatik*, were relied upon. A comparison of the results obtained from the study of the passages in Herodotus, with the principles of Attic usage as stated by Goodwin and by Kühner, has furnished the answer here presented to the question proposed.

It will be recalled that the distinction between the three classes of participles,—attributive, circumstantial, and supplementary,—is not so clearly marked that a participle can always be placed definitely in one of three classes. The participles concerning which a record is presented in the pages following are those which, after some deliberation, are thought properly to be classed as supplementary. It may easily be that certain of these would better be classed as circumstantial. The inclusion of such will not however invalidate in any way the facts presented concerning the use of those participles which are plainly supplementary.

A problem that presented much difficulty was the determination of the exact meaning of the verb in each passage. Upon the accuracy with which this has been done depends in large measure the value of the whole investigation. The interpretation placed upon the various passages is in each case that which, from a study of the context, has seemed the most reasonable; but it is not asserted that this is in every instance correct.

In the case of each verb included in the discussion the following data are presented: The number of times the verb is followed by each of the three constructions—supplementary participle, infinitive, and finite clause—in Herodotus; a division of these constructions into those of indirect discourse and those not in indirect discourse; the list of all passages in which the verb occurs with any of the three constructions; the reference to Goodwin and to Kühner for the verb or for the general class in which the verb belongs; any facts of importance regarding the use of the verb by Herodotus; and, if his use of the word is at variance with Attic usage, a full statement of the principles underlying the latter, and of the particulars in which Herodotus' use of the verb differs from that of the Attic writers. It will be noted that much of this information is statistical. For this reason, figures have regularly been employed instead of words, to represent numbers. Also, such abbreviations have been employed as are used by Goodwin, Kühner, Brugmann, and other grammarians, in lieu of writing out certain words which recur from five to fifteen times on a single page.—A list of the abbreviations employed is appended.

Footnotes have been almost entirely dispensed with. If the information has been considered of sufficient value to warrant its inclusion in the discussion it has been inserted in its proper place in the text. It is believed that the continuity of thought is less interrupted by a parenthesis than by a reference to a distant portion of the page.

The Attic forms of the verbs have been used—except in quotations—instead of the Ionic forms employed by Herodotus, chiefly for the reason that the verbs are then, when catalogued alphabetically, in the order in which they occur in Liddell & Scott and other lexicons.

References to the passages are by book, chapter, and line. The lines are numbered as they are found in the text of Kallenberg. It will be found that the numbering holds also, with but slight variation, for Stein's annotated edition.

The large number of verbs dealt with—one hundred twenty-one—has restricted the quotation of illustrative passages to a greater extent than could be desired. Passages of particular importance are however cited in full.

CHAPTER II

HERODOTUS' USE OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY PARTICIPLE

ἀγγέλλω: Followed by a s. p. in 2 passages; by an inf. in 1; by a *ὄτι* clause in 2. All the constructions are in indirect discourse.

With s. p., 6.69.23; 7.37.5. With inf., 8.50.3. With *ὄτι* clause, 7.162.5; 9.69.2.—G M T. 904; 912; 914.3. Kühner, 482.2; 484.17; 550.

Goodwin suggests no difference in the meaning of *ἀγγέλλω* with the various constructions. Kühner proposes (484.17) the distinction that *ἀγγέλλω* with a participle means "announce as a fact"; with an inf., "announce as rumor."—An examination of the passages in which the verb occurs in Hdt. shows that *ἀγγέλλω* means "announce as a fact" in all except 9.69.2. In the last named passage, in which *ἀγγέλλω* is followed by a *ὄτι* clause, the announcement is made as "rumor."—The distinction suggested by K. does not hold true, therefore, for Hdt. With a s. p. *ἀγγέλλω* has the meaning which he suggests; but not so with an inf. Apparently Hdt. uses the different constructions with *ἀγγέλλω* without difference of meaning.

αἰσθάνομαι: Followed by a s. p. in 1 passage. The s. p. is in indirect discourse.

With s. p. 7.220.5.—G M T., 884; 904; 914.1. Kühner, 482.1; 484.4; 550.

Goodwin suggests no difference in the meaning of the different constructions of ind. disc. after this verb. Kühner says (484.4) that *αἰσθάνομαι* with the genitive of a ptc. means "perceive directly with one's senses"; w. the accusative of a ptc., "note mentally as a fact"; and with an inf., "believe or think."—Hdt. uses *αἰσθάνομαι* in 7.220.5 with the acc. of the s. p., with the meaning "note as a fact." This is therefore in accord with Kühner's statement.

αἰσχύνομαι: With infinitive in 1 passage. The inf. is not in indirect discourse.

With inf., 1.82.40. G M T., 881; 903.1. K., 482.3; 484.21; 550.

Both Goodwin (903.1) and Kühner state that *αἰσχύνομαι* with a s. p. means "be ashamed of doing (what one does)"; and with an inf., "be ashamed to do (something not yet done)".—The statement holds true for the one passage in which Hdt. uses this verb: Othryades was ashamed to return to Sparta, and did not return.

ἀκούω: With a s. p., 12 times; with an inf., 12; with a *ὅπως* or *ὡς* clause 3.

With s. p. not in ind. disc., 1.66.14; 1.85.9; 1.141.17; 1.158.5; 1.160.1; 4.77.1; 4.183.17; 5.89.14; 5.93.8; 7.169.10; (total, 10). With s. p. in ind. disc., 2.150.18; 7.10.θ.12. With inf. in ind. disc., 1.20.2; 2.2.30; 2.150.18; 4.76.23; 6.117.11; 7.55.13; 7.128.4; 8.109.7; 8.136.12; 9.84.3; 9.85.18; 9.115.3. With *ὅπως* or *ὡς* clause in ind. disc., 3.115.12; 5.89.16; 7.208.3.—G M T., 884; 886; 904; 914.1. K., 482.1; 484.1; 550.

G. states (886) that *ἀκούω* in Attic Greek regularly takes the genitive of the ptc. when the latter is not in ind. disc., and the accusative of the ptc. of ind. disc. Further (914.1), he suggests that little if any difference of meaning exists between the use of the inf. and that of the s. p. of ind. disc. after *ἀκούω*. K. suggests the distinction, that *ἀκούω* with the gen. of the ptc. is used of a direct, and with the acc. of the ptc. of an indirect, but certain perception; and that it is used with the inf. to indicate the receipt of information transmitted as mere rumor or hearsay.

In 1.85.9; 1.141.17; 5.93.8, *ἀκούω* with the gen. of the s. p. not in ind. disc. is used of a direct, certain perception. The rule of G. and that of K. both hold good for these three passages, therefore. But in 1.66.14; 1.158.5; 1.160.1; 4.77.1; 4.183.17; 5.89.14; 7.169.10, *ἀκούω* with the acc. of the s. p. not in ind. disc. is used also, of a direct certain perception. Neither the statement of G. nor that of K. holds, then, for these 7 passages. In 2.150.18 and in 7.10.θ.12 *ἀκούω* with the acc. of the s. p. in ind. disc. expresses the obtaining of information which rests upon hearsay. In the former passage the information is secured directly; in the latter, indirectly. For both these passages G.'s statement holds, but K.'s distinction is upheld fully in neither.—With the inf. in each of the 12 passages *ἀκούω* is used of the