ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. II

INDEX

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE GENITIVE ABSOLUTE

Holger Thesleff

Since CLASSEN published his Beobachtungen über den homerischen Sprach-gebrauch (2nd edition, Frankfurt a.M. 1879) little advance has been made towards solving the problem of the origin of the Greek genitive absolute. CLASSEN maintained, contrary to his predecessors (except KRÜGER), that the GA could not have originated from a specific kind of genitive, such as the *»genitivus causae»* or the *»genitivus temporis»*, but that it reflects the manifold use of the Greek genitive as a whole and, therefore, seems to have a complex origin.[1] He referred [2] to the abundant passages in Homer where a substantive (or pronoun) in the genitive is qualified by a participle, but where the genitive is syntactically conditioned; i.e. cases such as the following (I take the examples quoted in SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER p. 398): Il. 8. 118 τοῦ δ᾽ ἰθὺς μεμαῶτος ἀ κ ό ν τ ι σ ε Τυδέος υἱός, 477 σέθεν δ᾽ ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀ λ ε γ ί ζ ω χωομένης, 9. 463 ἔνθ᾽ ἐμοὶ οὐκέτι πάμπαν ἐρητύετ᾽ ἐν φρεσὶ θυμὸς πατρὸς χωομένοιο κατὰ μ έ γ α ρ α στρωφᾶσθαι, 12. 392 Σαρπήδοντι δ᾽ ἄ χ ο ς γ έ ν ε τ ο Γλαύκου ἀπιόντος, Od. 8. 564 ἀλλὰ τόδ᾽ ὥς ποτε πατρὸς ἐγὼ εἰπόντος ἄ κ ο υ σ α. It is to be noted that frequently, at least from a logical point of view, no distinct boundary can be drawn between such constructions and real GA:s. SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER remark (*l.c.*): »Die genannten und ähnliche Bei-spiele konnten von einen jüngern Sprachgefühl aus auch als volle genitivi absoluti gefasst werden».

CLASSEN's view seems on the whole to have been accepted by modern scholars. Some have emphasized certain types of genitive as paving the way for the development, without, however, penetrating further into the question.[3] And the theories of EDWARD SPIEKER, On the so-called Genitive Absolute

---

[1] See CLASSEN Beob. p. 184 ff.

[2] P. 160 ff.

[3] E.g. WACKERNAGEL, Vorl. über Synt. I p. 292 f. stresses the importance of the temporal genitive (as in νυκτός »by night, in the night»), HUMBERT, Syntaxe p. 282 that of the ablatival (separative) genitive.

and its use especially in the Attic Orators (AJPh. 6, 1885, pp. 310—343), and KARL KUNST, Vom Wesen und Ursprung des absoluten Genetivs (Gl. 12, 1923, pp. 29—50),[1] have not met with general approval. SPIEKER makes some objections to CLASSEN's thesis, to which we shall return later. His own explanation that the GA is in origin exclusively a temporal genitive, is hardly better founded than earlier theories of the kind; but as it has been further developed and supported by more advanced linguistic arguments in KUNST's treatise we may conveniently deal with it in connection with the latter. KUNST (following certain remarks made by GILDERSLEEVE on SPIEKER's exposition) is inclined to draw a fundamental distinction between the GA with the present (or perfect) participle and the GA with the aorist participle. The former is, according to KUNST, originally a »genitive of the sphere», a possessive (pertinentive), or above all a partitive genitive, the durative participle preserving in principle a temporal notion (»while»); whereas the latter is in origin an ablatival genitive, the participle, with its reference to a single point of time, suggesting a causal sense (»because»).[2]

KUNST is certainly right in pointing out the possibility of interpreting most of the Homeric GA:s with an aorist participle as having a causal notion: e.g. Il. 8. 37 ὡς μὴ πάντες ὄλωνται ὀ δ υ σ σ α μ έ ν ο ι ο τ ε ο ῖ ο, 15. 328 ἔνθα δ᾿ ἀνὴρ ἕλεν ἄνδρα κ ε δ α σ θ ε ί σ η ς ὑ σ μ ί ν η ς. CLASSEN had made the same observation,[3] though he regarded the causal notion as a further development of the temporal which he considered primary. On the other hand KUNST's differentiation between temporal present participles and causal aorist participles in the GA:s is evidently too radical. Why, for instance, should Il. 17. 532 οἱ δ᾿ ἦλθον καθ᾿ ὅμιλον ἑ τ α ί ρ ο υ κ ι κ λ ή σ κ ο ν τ ο ς be considered as temporal, if Il. 10. 356 ἔλπετο γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀποστρέψοντας ἑταίρους ἐκ Τρώων ἰέναι πάλιν Ἕ κ τ ο ρ ο ς ὀ τ ρ ύ ν α ν τ ο ς is causal?[4] Or cf. Il. 22. 287 καί

---

[1] J. TEUTSCH, Der absolute Genetiv bei Homer, Progr. Rudolfswert 1882, has not been accessible to me; but it does not appear to have brought new aspects into the discussion. The dissertation of E. WENTZEL, De genetivis et dativis linguae Graecae quos absolutos vocant, appeared (Breslau) 1828: in CHANTRAINE, Gramm.Hom. II p. 324 note 1 there occurs the misprint 1928.

[2] KUNST p. 39.

[3] Beob. p. 180.

[4] In the former example, according to KUNST (p. 38), »empfand der griechische Sprachgebrauch das Rufen als so lange (in seiner Wirkung) andauernd, bis ihm durch das Herbeikommen Folge geleistet war . . . , so dass selbst da das ἐλθεῖν in die zeitlich ausgedehntere Sphäre des κικλήσκειν fällt». This explanation may possibly illuminate the u s e of the present participle in this and corresponding cases; but it does not exclude a causal touch of m e a n- i n g, quite natural with this particular verb in this particular context.

κεν ἐλαφρότερος πόλεμος Τρώεσσι γένοιτο σ ε ῖ ο κ α τ α φ θ ι μ έ ν ο ι ο with
24. 244 ῥηίτεροι γὰρ μᾶλλον Ἀχαιοῖσιν δὴ ἔσεσθε κ ε ί ν ο υ τ ε θ ν η ῶ τ ο ς.
It may seem inadvisable to make, on purely logical grounds, a fundamental
and genetic distinction between semantically related phrases. In fact, since
many GA:s with a present (or perfect) participle, as KUNST himself admits,
have an unmistakably causal tone (cf. further e.g. Il. 5. 865 οἴη δ᾽ ἐκ νεφέων
ἐρεβεννὴ φαίνεται ἀὴρ καύματος ἔξ ἀ ν έ μ ο ι ο δυσαέος ὀ ρ ν υ μ έ ν ο ι ο, 24.
248 οἱ δ᾽ ἴσαν ἔξω σ π ε ρ χ ο μ έ ν ο ι ο γ έ ρ ο ν τ ο ς), the argument loses
some of its force.

Let us, however, suppose that KUNST's differentiation contains some truth
and look at his derivation of the GA with the present (or perfect) participle.
For them KUNST assumes partly an adnominal (or similar) origin, partly,
and as it seems above all, a connection with the *genitivus temporis* — he is
somewhat obscure on this point.[1] KUNST, like SPIEKER (though the latter does
not say so explicitly), appears to regard the type Il. 2. 551 ἔνθα δέ μιν ταύροισι
καὶ ἀρνειοῖς ἱλάονται κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων π ε ρ ι τ ε λ λ ο μ έ ν ω ν ἐ ν ι α υ τ ῶ ν
which is supposed to be a »temporal genitive of the sphere» (for the term see
below p. 191), as in some way or other a model for the use of the present GA
in general, and in the first place for cases such as Il. 18. 10 καί μοι ἔειπεν
Μυρμιδόνων τὸν ἄριστον ἔτι ζ ώ ο ν τ ο ς ἐ μ ε ῖ ο . . . λείψειν φάος ἠελίοιο,
22. 432 τί νυ βείομαι αἰνὰ παθοῦσα σ ε ῦ ἀ π ο τ ε θ ν η ῶ τ ο ς; We have
therefore to inspect the former type somewhat more closely. First, we find
that the aorist cases cannot be fundamentally separated from the present
cases even here. The following instances of what could be conveniently called
»time-GA:s» are to be found in Homer:[2] In the plural like the above-men-
tioned Il. 2. 551, but with the aorist participle Od. 1. 16 ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ ἔτος
ἦλθε π ε ρ ι π λ ο μ έ ν ω ν ἐ ν ι α υ τ ῶ ν, with another present participle
Od. 10. 470 ὅτε δή ῥ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸς ἔην, περὶ δ᾽ ἔτραπον ὧραι μ η ν ῶ ν φ θ ι ν ό ν-
τ ω ν, Od. 19. 153 (= 24. 143) ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε τέτρατον ἦλθεν ἔτος καὶ ἐπήλυθον ὧραι

---

[1] It may be asked, for instance, why the common GA expressing the absence of somebody
(Il. 8. 522 λαῶν ἀπεόντων, Od. 14. 450 ἀποιχομένοιο ἄνακτος, etc.) is derived from the adnomi-
nal possessive genitive (cf. cases such as Od. 19. 19 τά μοι κατὰ ο ἶ κ ο ν ἀκηδέα καπνὸς
ἀμέρδει πατρὸς ἀποιχομένοιο KUNST p. 33 f.), whereas the type ἐμεῦ ζῶντος / τεθνηῶτος (Il.
18. 10, 22. 432, etc.) is put in direct connection with the temporal »genitive of the sphere»
(cf. Il. 2. 551 ἔνθα δέ μιν ταύροισι καὶ ἀρνειοῖς ἱλάονται κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων περιτελλομένων
ἐνιαυτῶν KUNST p. 38), in spite of the fact that similar apparently adnominal cases are to be
found with this type, e.g. Il. 13. 659 π ο ι ν ὴ δ᾽ οὔτις παιδὸς ἐγίγνετο τεθνηῶτος.

[2] Here and in the following I rely on the material collected by CLASSEN, and controlled
by KUNST.

μ η ν ῶ ν   φ ϑ ι ν ό ν τ ω ν. In the singular Od. 11. 295 (= 14. 294) ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ
μῆνές τε καὶ ἡμέραι ἐξετελεῦντο ἂψ π ε ρ ι τ ε λ λ ο μ έ ν ο υ   ἔ τ ε ο ς, with
aorist participle Od. 11. 248 χαῖρε, γύναι, φιλότητι· π ε ρ ι π λ ο μ έ ν ο υ   δ'
ἐ ν ι α υ τ ο ῦ τέξεαι ἀγλαὰ τέκνα, and with φθίνειν Od. 14. 163 (= 19. 307)
τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος ἐλεύσεται ἐνθάδ' Ὀδυσσεύς, τ ο ῦ μ ὲ ν   φ ϑ ί ν ο ν-
τ ο ς μ η ν ό ς, τ ο ῦ δ' ἱ σ τ α μ έ ν ο ι ο. Cf. further Il. 8. 538 κείσεται
οὐτηθείς, πολέες δ' ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἑταῖροι, ἠ ε λ ί ο υ   ἀ ν ι ό ν τ ο ς ἐς αὔριον
and Od. 19. 519 ὡς δ' ὅτε Πανδαρέου κούρη χλωρηὶς ἀηδὼν καλὸν ἀείδῃσιν
ἔ α ρ ο ς νέον ἱ σ τ α μ έ ν ο ι ο. For Od. 14. 475 see below p. 203.

This is a fairly distinct phraseology with reference to the succession of
years or months; the two last examples concern the change in the time of the
day and the season; and in all instances the substantive is naturally a word
for a t e m p o r a l   p e r i o d. As such the »time-GA:s» are not likely, as
far as I can see, to bear any particularly close relation to the type ἐμεῦ
ζῶντος / τεθνηῶτος where, it should be noted, t h e   s u b j e c t of the GA
i s   p e r s o n a l.

It is quite possible to reconstruct an origin for both the singular and the
plural time-GA:s independently of other GA:s. The last two examples suggest
a direct connection with the old (singular) so-called *genitivus temporis*[1] of the
type Il. 8. 470 ἠοῦς, 22. 27 ὀπώρης, h. Hom. 19. 17 ἔαρος: in this respect I
quite agree with WACKERNAGEL.[2] And in Od. 14. 163 (19. 307) we have a
qualified μηνός which naturally suggests the regular genitive of the type
ταύτης τῆς νυκτός, in fact represented in the preceding verse (τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ
λυκάβαντος). There is nothing to prevent us from understanding Od. 11.
248 in the same way, as it cannot be expected that KUNST's theory should
have absolute validity.[3] — In Od. 11, 295 (14. 294) we meet with a some-
what different problem: the relation of the genitive to the substantives μῆνες
and ἡμέραι. I am inclined to think that this genitive is, in principle, an ad-
nominal pertinentive[4], though there must have been associations with the

---

[1] This is widespread in IE. For the plural »*genitivus temporis*» cf. below p. 193 note 1.

[2] See above p. 187 note 3.

[3] The aorist participle gives KUNST (p. 46 f.) some trouble, as it cannot have a causal notion.
He supposes that it is used like a present participle and translates »im Verlauf des herumkrei-
senden Jahres» which, of course, is quite in accordance with all physiological rules known to
us. I do not think, however, that Homer was particular about such rules, especially as the
father *in spe* in this case was not a mortal, but Poseidon. Therefore a normal aorist sense seems
to me to be quite in order: »the year having gone round, when the year has passed». The same
in fact applies to Hes. Op. 386 and some other post-Homeric instances to which KUNST refers.

[4] I am using the term »pertinentive» with SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER for the possessive
and similar functions of the genitive proper.

independent temporal genitive.[1] My opinion arises from a consideration of the very similar cases with a plural participle which are all attached to substantives, except Il. 2. 551. Now, had this sole instance of a really absolute plural time-genitive (within the group of phrases here in question) not occurred in the *Κατάλογος τῶν νεῶν*, I would perhaps have hesitated about regarding it as secondary; but as the things are, I find it rather probable that it was modelled on the plural adnominal pertinentives of the same type, and made absolute b e c a u s e GA:s of other types already existed. In short, the time-GA:s can be easily explained, partly as *genitivi temporis*, partly, and in particular the plural cases, as adnominal pertinentives.

Though the time-GA:s may have had, to some extent, independent origins, it would be foolish to deny the possibility that they have been influenced by other GA:s.[2] The main thing to be noted in this connection, is that we have no reasons for supposing that they are, themselves, to any considerable extent more primary than other GA:s; on the contrary, the prevalence of instances in the Odyssey may suggest a comparatively late development.[3]

We have so far dealt with the theory of a relationship between the GA and the temporal genitive in a narrow sense of the term, i.e. the genitive of a substantive which denotes a temporal period; and we have not found a reasonable explanation of the GA as a whole. However, KUNST operates with a »temporal genitive of the sphere» in a larger sense which includes all kinds of substantives — even personal — provided that they have a (durative) present participle attached to them.[4] In this way he makes himself able to connect the GA in general with the *genitivus temporis*. He refers[5] to instances such as the following as more or less directly belonging to that genitive category: Il. 5. 501 *ὅτε τε ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ κρίνῃ ἐ π ε ι γ ο μ έ ν ω ν ἀ ν έ μ ω ν καρπόν τε καὶ ἄχνας*, 17. 393 *ἄφαρ δ᾽ ἐξ ἰκμὰς ἔβη, δύνει δέ τ᾽ ἀλοιφή, π ο λ λ ῶ ν ἑ λ κ ό ν τ ω ν* — with the result that the »temporal genitive of the sphere» is rather unavoidably made a principle of explaining the whole phenomenon of the GA. This is certainly what SPIEKER wants, though he does not use the term »genitive of the sphere»; and I believe this is also what KUNST has in

---

[1] In its ultimate origin the old *genitivus temporis*, whether pertinentive or partitive, may of course have been adnominal. And note the fact that a qualified temporal genitive can always be used adnominally, e.g. Hdt. 6. 106 *ἱσταμένου τοῦ μηνὸς εἰνάτῃ*.

[2] Cf. below p. 203.

[3] The time-GA:s are proportionally very frequent in Hesiod: see KUNST p. 47 f.

[4] This may be inferred above all from his remarks on p. 37.

[5] P. 38 f.

view, though his exposition is not altogether clear. In particular I am not quite sure what KUNST wants to do with the problematic parallels of the GA which have a clear syntactic reference. It would appear that he is trying to get rid of them when he states that the adnominal (pertinentive) genitive (as in δῶμα πατρός) is ultimately identical with the »genitive of the sphere» in a larger sense (the example ἅπτεσθαι πατρός is given).[1] If I understand him aright[2] he is of the opinion that the Greeks did not (or did not in pre-historic times) feel a difference in the sense of the genitive in two instances like, say, Od. 20. 216 κτήματα δάσσασθαι δὴν οἰχομένοιο ἄνακτος and 14. 450 ὅν ῥα συβώτης αὐτὸς κτήσατο μοῦνος ἀποιχομένοιο ἄνακτος. In the first case the genitive construction expresses the »sphere» of the κτήματα, in the second case the »sphere» of the κτήσασθαι, i.e. the sphere within which the κτήσατο happened. Apart from other considerations it is to be remarked, against this view, that the »sphere» of the κτήματα is the ἄναξ alone, the participle having nothing whatsoever to do with them; but that the »sphere» of the κτήσατο is constituted by the durative action (state) expressed by the present participle (or rather, by its suffix) — a completely different thing. Supposing that there really existed a general »genitive of the sphere», the Greeks must at any rate have been aware of the fact that the main idea in the first case is the substantive ἄνακτος, in the second case the participle ἀποιχομένοιο, and consequently that the relation expressed by the genitive in κτήματα οἰχομένοιο ἄνακτος is not identical with the one in κτήσατο ἀποιχομένοιο ἄνακτος. We have therefore, from a practical standpoint, to work with the category of adnominal and other (syntactically comparable) parallels of the GA, as a fact which cannot be easily explained away.

With KUNST's theory in view, it could perhaps be assumed that the genitive constructions with a syntactic reference reflect a parallel or secondary development, the original, or at least an equally old state, being the genitive of a present participle which actually constituted the »sphere» of the action of the

---

[1] P. 36 f.: »[The passage Il. 2. 551 περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν] zeigt uns den mit Partizip verbundenen Genetiv in seiner ursprünglichen echtgriechischen Funktion als Kasus zur Bezeichnung einer bestimmten Sphäre. In dieser Bedeutung liegt gleichermassen die Wurzel des adnominalen wie des adverbalen Genetivs und das die moderne Forschung ernsthaft beschäftigende Problem der Priorität des einen von beiden scheint aus einer falschen Fragestellung hervorgegangen; ist es doch im Wesen dieselbe Vorstellung, die den Anlass bietet, bei δῶμα πατρός und bei ἅπτεσθαι πατρός den Genetiv zu gebrauchen, da dieser Kasus jedesmal jene Person (oder Sache) bezeichnet, in deren Bereich dort der im Nomen ausgedrückte Gegenstand, hier die im Verbum liegende Handlung fällt.»

[2] Cf. KUNST p. 37.

main verb. But now it should be clearly pointed out that the specific kind of »genitive of the sphere» here in question is a p u r e l y h y p o t h e t i c r e c o n s t r u c t i o n made by KUNST in accordance with earlier (and more vague) temporal theories such as that of SPIEKER. The term »genitive of the sphere» was introduced by BRUGMANN and his contemporaries for the types of genitive for which SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER use the somewhat more definite terms »pertinentive» and »partitive». I cannot help feeling that KUNST's argumentation is an example of how delusive a term may be if it is not sufficiently well defined. In fact, the existence of a temporal »genitive of the sphere» outside the range of the *genitivus temporis* can reasonably be doubted. The *genitivus temporis* is restricted to temporal substantives; besides, it is preferably, and probably originally, singular.[1] Partitive genitives like Il. 5. 6 λελουμένος 'Ωκεανοῖο, to which KUNST refers[2], are not sufficiently common to afford a basis for explaining the whole phenomenon of the GA; in historical times they have on the whole an occasional character[3], and there is nothing to indicate that they were particularly widespread before Homer. Other types of genitive denoting the »sphere» within which a verbal action takes place, do not exist, and can probably not be proved to have ever existed.[4] Nor are there any signs, as far as I can see, of participles having ever been used with so predominant a notion of the temporal period during which the action (state) happens, that a combination like, say, ἄναξ ἀποιχόμενος could have really constituted the temporal »sphere» of the action of the main verb; as the adjectival character of the participles clearly indicates, the leading substantive of such a combination was at least originally the main idea: »the absent ἄναξ, the ἄναξ as being absent». I am prepared to admit that ἄναξ ἀποιχόμενος could secondarily mean something like »the situation of the ἄναξ being absent» — we shall have to work with this presumption below (p. 198). But this is not the same as »the time during which the ἄναξ is absent» which

---

[1] Il. 11. 691 ἐκάκωσε βίη Ἡρακληείη τῶν προτέρων ἐτέων is the only Homeric instance of what would appear to be a plural *genitivus temporis*. A plural genitive expressing »in so many years» etc. does not, as far as I know, occur before classical times, e.g. Pl. Symp. 172c οὐκ οἶσθ᾽ ὅτι πολλῶν ἐτῶν 'Αγάθων ἐνθάδε οὐκ ἐπιδεδήμηκεν.

[2] P. 37.

[3] The partitive genitive stands here for the accusative of time or space or the locative dative; cf. SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER p. 111 ff.

[4] The type ἅπτεσθαι πατρός to which KUNST also refers (cf. above p. 192) is a misleading example, as such genitives are not likely to have been ever felt as anything but partitive o b- j e c t s of the verb.

would be a necessary condition for an application of a temporal genitive.[1]

In my opinion the theory of SPIEKER, KUNST, and others that the temporal genitive to any considerable extent played a leading part in the development of the GA is extremely improbable and rather to be definitely abandoned. Let us also for the moment leave KUNST's hypothesis as to a specific origin of the aorist GA, retreat to the position of CLASSEN, and face the facts as he saw them: Homer uses a fully developed GA, but at the same time an abundance of, and in fact to some extent the same, participial constructions with a more or less clear syntactic reference. Here the adnominal (pertinentive) genitive is by far the most common, just as it is one of the most frequent uses of the genitive in general.

But I cannot help feeling that the easiest inference from these facts, *viz.* that the GA gradually developed out of such uses through being, simply, made independent of its original syntactic connections, is unsatisfactory. No explanation is given w h y this happened. I completely agree with SPIEKER [2] as he objects to CLASSEN that there is no obvious reason why the Greeks should have chosen to forget the exact construction of a normal and regular genitive.[3] With almost the same right, then, we should expect to find a corresponding nominative absolute, an accusative absolute, and a dative absolute. But nothing really like the GA is to be found with other cases.[4] And it is to be noted that participial constructions in the genitive with a syntactic reference also occur in later literature side by side with real GA:s, e.g. Ps.-Xen. Resp.Ath. 1. 18 καὶ εἰσιόντος τον ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς χειρός, Aristoph. Av. 1157 ὁ κτύπος αὐτῶν πελεκώντων, etc.; cf. in particular the very common type Aristoph. Ach. 303 σοῦ . . . λέγοντος οὐκ ἀκούσομαι. What was the reason for

---

[1] And if the combination could mean anything like that we should expect to find »absolute temporal accusatives» of the type *ἄνακτα ἀποιχόμενον (cf. below note 4), as the *accusativus temporis* is at least as common as the *genitivus temporis*.

[2] P. 312 ff.

[3] Note SPIEKER's simple argumentation p. 312: »That the dependent pure genitive is not the one to which we must refer this use [the GA] is made likely by the following fact: being an adnominal case, it was always felt as accompanying and depending upon another noun; this relation was distinctly felt, and it is far less probable that uncertainty as to the exact construction of such a genitive gradually gave rise to the absolute use than that this is due to some use not dependent on any noun in the sentence.

[4] The rare »nominative absolute» is always an occasional ancoluthon: exx. in SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER p. 403 f. The »accusative absolute» (mostly with ὡς) leads a disputable existence from the 5th century onwards: exx. in SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER p. 402 f. The type ἐξόν, δέον (*ibid.*) is wholly irrelevant. And a »dative absolute» is never manifest: see SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER p. 401.

a development of a specific, syntactically more independent genitive idiom at that particular pre-Homeric time, as the conditions would appear to be always approximately the same?

It is important to consider the fact that the roots of the GA reach very far back in time. This may be inferred, not only from the existence of a fully developed GA in Homer,[1] but from the character and distribution of the Homeric instances. They consist mainly of short formulae, simply subject and participle, of about half a line in length: ἐμεῦ ἀπομηνίσαντος, πολλῶν ἑλκόντων, κείνου τεθνηῶτος, δηίων ἀπονόσφιν ἐόντων, etc. The formulae have a rather general content of meaning; they are easily handled, and may have belonged to the stock phraseology of rhapsodes for centuries before Homer. It is further to be noted that the great majority of them are affective, expressive, or picturesque; and their concentrated, pregnant form suggests something like ancient sayings. More than the half of the instances occur in s p e e c h e s with a considerably emotional charge, e.g. Il. 1. 88 οὔ τις ἐμεῦ ζῶντος καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ δερκομένοιο σοὶ . . . βαρείας χεῖρας ἐποίσει, 14. 100, 22. 432, etc. Some other cases are also rather e x p r e s s i v e, e.g. Il. 11. 458 αἷμα δέ οἱ σπασθέντος (sc. ἔγχεος) ἀνέσσυτο, Il. 15. 328. Remarkably many instances are to be found in s i m i l e s: Il. 5. 499 ff. ὡς δ᾽ ἄνεμος ἄχνας φορέει . . . ὅτε τε ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ κρίνῃ ἐπειγομένων ἀνέμων καρπόν τε καὶ ἄχνας, 864 f., 15. 325, 17. 265, 393, 20. 405, 23. 521, Od. 19. 519, 20. 25: this fact may also suggest a very old phraseology. The rest of the cases consist of a few »absence»-formulae (Il. 15. 548 δηίων ἀπονόσφιν ἐόντων, Od. 14. 450, 17. 296 ἀποιχομένοιο ἄνακτος), some »time-GA:s» (Il. 2. 551, Od. 1. 16, 10. 470, 11. 295 = 14. 294, 19. 153 = 24. 143, most of them being rather adnominal; cf. above p. 190), and the phrase Il. 18. 605 f. (= Od. 4 18 f.) δοιὼ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε κατ᾽ αὐτοὺς μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντος ἐδίνευον κατὰ μέσσους.[2] Finally it may be observed that the GA is more often employed, and with more variety, in the Iliad than in the Odyssey. There are remarkably few aorist GA:s in the Odyssey: only 4 cases (the time-GA:s 1. 16 and 11. 428 of which the former is rather adnominal; 14. 475 which may be related to such GA:s, see below

---

[1] Pointed out by WACKERNAGEL Vorl. über Synt. I p. 292. SPIEKER p. 315 thinks that the Homeric GA:s reflect an early stage; but his opinion is probably only due to a comparison between Homer and classical prose in this respect.

[2] The phrase Od. 4. 717, 19. 195, 24. 272 πολλῶν κατὰ οἶκον ἐόντων, which CLASSEN (Beob. p. 183) records among real GA:s, was probably felt as a partitive genitive. The type is not uncommon later, cf. Eur. El. 649, Pl. Lach. 198a, etc.

p. 203; and 24. 535 πάντα δ' ἐπὶ χθονὶ πῖπτε θεᾶς ὄπα φωνησάσης); but in the Iliad some 15 cases (none of these a time-GA, and doublets not counted).[1] And proportionally many of the present GA:s in the Odyssey are formulae of the non-expressive kind (cf. above p. 195). — These facts seem to confirm one's impression that the GA is a very ancient phenomenon, not really productive at the beginning of the historical era of the Greek language.

The tendency in Homer to restrict the GA to certain types of formulae, already touched upon several times, is interesting. The following groups are easily discernible: The »life/death»-type; the »will and call»-type; the »presence/absence»-type [2] (the instances are recorded below p. 200 f.); and the »time-GA:s» (see above p. 189 f.). These cases make together more than the half of all Homeric instances of GA; and the types are also proportionally common in later literature.[3] It can hardly be proved that they constitute the original GA:s out of which the syntactic phenomenon in general was developed. But they seem to form — except possibly the last-mentioned type — an ancient class with a central position among the uses of the GA; and any theory as to the origin of the GA has therefore in the first place to be tested with them.

Looking for an explanation of the GA we have to keep in mind that the phenomenon is very old. This fact increases the difficulties of arriving at an exact and certain answer; but at the same time it allows us to work with the category of genitive within less narrow limits than the usage of historical Greek would postulate.

It is convenient to differentiate, with SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER (p. 89 ff.), between »pertinentive», »partitive», and »ablatival» genitive. Considering the prehistory of those genitive classes, it seems fairly obvious that the p e r- t i n e n t i v e is on the whole irrelevant for our purpose unless we accept CLASSEN's view and consequently assume an essentially adnominal origin

---

[1] CLASSEN Beob. p. 180 f. records 17 cases, among which 9. 426 and 19. 62 have the same GA-phrase. In 14. 521 f. I am inclined to regard the genitive as adnominal: see below p. 202. 22. 47 is probably partitive. On the other hand may 1. 47 f. ἔκλαγξαν δ' ἄρ' ὀιστοὶ ἐπ' ὤμων χωομένοιο / α ὐ τ ο ῦ κ ι ν η θ έ ν τ ο ς possibly be added to the list, as the last two words at least seem to be modelled on current GA:s.

[2] Though there is only one »presence»-case in Homer: cf. below p. 201.

[3] The »life/death»-type is extremely common in tragedy, e.g. Soph. Phil. 413, Eur. Or. 1070; further e.g. Ar. Pax 111, Pl. Crito 47d, 54a. For the »will and call»-type cf. e.g. Soph. OT. 288, Eur. Hel. 672, Ar. Lys. 874, Pl. Hp.Ma. 373c; with ἑκόντος and similar e.g. Soph. Ai. 455, Pl. Charm. 175b. The »presence / absence»-type is habitual in inscriptions, e.g. Lex Gort. 11. 49; in literature e.g. Pind. Nem. 6. 29, Soph. OC. 666, Ar. Lys. 1133, Pl. Euthyd. 280b. »Time-GA:s» (potentially adnominal) are often found in inscriptions together with the type τοῦ δεῖνος ἄρχοντος e.g. Inscr. Buck [2]. 43.

for the GA. The adverbal pertinentive is confined to certain types of verbs (see SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER p. 122 ff.), and has probably always been so; and in any case it would not afford a reasonable principle of explanation. The p a r t i t i v e genitive may have been used somewhat more freely instead of other cases before Homer; but this is equally irrelevant. I have stated my opinion (above p. 193 f.) that the temporal genitive, or any other »partitive» genitive, cannot explain the whole phenomenon of GA. The old (singular) type *νυκτός* can be connected with the time-GA:s only (and in the first place with the singular ones). On the other hand a plural partitive may be seen in the type Od. 4. 717 *οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' ἔτλη δ ί φ ρ ῳ* (sc. *ἐνί*) *ἐφέζεσθαι πολλῶν κατὰ οἶκον ἐόντων* (cf. above p. 195 note 2); but this is a category of its own, only having potential associations with real GA:s.

With the a b l a t i v a l genitive things are somewhat different. At an earlier stage the ablative seems to have been largely employed, without prepositions, in a separative sense: e.g. Il. 15. 655 *νεῶν . . . ἐχώρησαν*. It cannot be doubted that the ablative (whether formally identical with the pertinentive-partitive, or not) in Greek as in other IE. languages originally expressed the place which the subject leaves or comes from, and that the elucidation by means of prepositions is a comparatively late feature. Further, being a separative case, the ablative was also capable of denoting, in a more a b s t r a c t way, the point from which a thing is viewed or determined. In historical times this ablative is manifest above all as the genitive with comparatives (SCHWYZER and DEBRUNNER p. 98 ff.); cf. the use with secondary prepositions like *ἀντίον* (*ibid.* p. 97), and the type Hdt. 1. 110 *πρὸς βορέω ἀνέμου τ ῶ ν ᾿Α γ β α τ ά ν ω ν* (*ibid.* p. 96).[1] Finally, the genitive expressing the cause with verbs of emotion (*ibid.* p. 133 f.), and verbs like *περιδίδομαι, τίνω, τιμωρέω, αἰτιάομαι, ἀμφισβητεῖν*, etc. (*ibid.* p. 130 f.) may have something to do with the ablative. But it is important to note that the Greek ablative on the whole lacks a definite causal notion.[2] The ablatival genitive, whether adnominal or, and this is more frequent, adverbal, simply indicates t h e point of departure.

The scholars who, like HUMBERT[3], believe in a predominantly ablative

---

[1] Though not found in Homer, this is evidently an old use, as the IE. parallels show.

[2] The old explanations of BERNHARDY and ROST (see CLASSEN Beob. p. 185), according to whom the GA is originally a »causal genitive», are therefore quite improbable. KUNST's premises for the aorist GA:s are somewhat different; but he seems also to suppose a connection with a »causal genitive».

[3] See above p. 187 note 3.

origin of the GA in general have not taken the trouble of proving their hypo-
thesis. However, KUNST's argumentation for an ablative derivation of the
aorist GA:s seems to me to be a step in the right direction. It is certainly
worth while to consider the whole of the Homeric material from this stand-
point.

We notice, as a fact of some importance, the possibility of leaving the
subject of the GA unexpressed, whereas the participle is, as a rule, never
absent.[1] In the following passages in Homer the GA consists of a participle
alone: Il. 11. 458, 15. 191, 18. 606 (= Od. 4. 19), 22. 531.[2] This peculiarity
suggests that the GA does not convey a mere additional circumstance —
which could reasonably be expressed by a noun alone — but a more inde-
pendent statement, because of its semiverbal nature approximating to a full
sentence. As the relation of the participle to the subject of the GA is not
attributive, the GA may be said to convey the idea of a situation.

And it is to be noted that leaving out the subject of the GA does not on the
whole affect the clearness of the sentence, simply because the possibility of
referring the participle of the GA to the subject of the main verb is definitely
excluded. As regards Greek, there can hardly be any doubt on this point.
As such it is, of course, a fairly trivial fact that the subject of the GA is in
principle not identical with the subject of the main verb [3] — not even the
passive type *quo facto abiit*, where the main subject psychologically dominates
the whole clause, is at home in Greek;[4] in such cases the Greeks would use
a participle agreeing with the main subject (*participium coniunctum*). But it is
tempting to make a further inference from this regarding the nature of the
GA: the two subjects, that of the GA and that of the main verb, are in a way
opposed to each other, being always different. The main sentence expresses
a kind of a contrast to the GA. An inspection of the material below will
support this assumption.

I find it extremely important to observe that the Homeric GA:s do not on
the whole express secondary implications, or merely temporal relations[5], such
as might be expected had the construction originated in an attributive parti-
ciple depending on an adnominal or similar genitive. It is not a *genitivus*

---

[1] Exceptions such as Soph. OC 1588 ὑφηγητῆρος οὐδενὸς φιλῶν, which occur sometimes
in post-Homeric literature, are explained by the verbal nature of the predicative.

[2] For the instances in later literature, see KÜHNER and GERTH II p. 81.

[3] Exceptions rather remind one of anacoluthon: see KÜHNER and GERTH II p. 110 f.

[4] Cases such as Isae. 2. 28, Dem. 37. 6, 39. 3 are exceptional.

[5] Cf. the Sanskrit GA, below p. 206.

consequentiae in the sense of a »begleitender Umstand», as some scholars have been inclined to understand Priscian's remark on the GA (18. 14) but, as Priscian probably himself wanted the term to be understood, the idea of which the main action is the consequence.[1] This is the case with the present (and perfect) GA:s as well as with the aorist ones. Naturally the consequence implied is not temporal with the present GA:s, nor on the whole clearly causal. The GA usually expresses the actual basis or background for the action of the main verb, a necessary condition for it. A single example will illustrate what I mean. In Il. 17. 265 ἀμφὶ δέ τ᾽ ἄκραι ἠιόνες βοόωσιν ἐρευγομένης ἁλὸς ἔξω the expression ἐρευγομένης ἁλὸς ἔξω is no irrelevant addition, like an *epitheton ornans* only supplying an aesthetical background, nor does it denote just a temporal coincidence, or on the other hand explicitly state the reason why the ἠιόνες βοόωσιν (it could hardly be translated »because the sea outside is roaring»); it gives the condition on which the (ἀμφι)βοᾶν is dependent, the actual circumstances lying behind it: during the roaring of the sea, and as a consequence of it, the riverbanks βοόωσιν. Such a relation between the situation expressed by the GA and the main action may be observed in almost all Homeric instances.

These three observations regarding the Homeric GA, its forming a s i t u a-
t i o n of its own, its making a c o n t r a s t to the main sentence, and its character of a condition or b a c k g r o u n d for the main action, afford a suitable starting point for our investigation of its possible ablative origin.

It is easy to imagine that an ablative in prehistoric times could express such a relation between two ideas. Analyzing the pre-Homeric clause ἀμφὶ δὲ ἠιόνες βοῶσιν ἐρευγομένης ἁλὸς ἔξω into the basic ideas ἠιόνες βοῶσιν and ἐρεύγεται ἅλς, we find it quite natural that a language tending to synthetic expression (and lacking the appropriate conjunctions) [2] would choose to put the latter idea in the ablative, by making it nominal (ἐρευγομένη ἅλς) and so capable of taking an »ablative» form (ἐρευγομένης ἁλός), in order to indicate that the situation ἐρευγομένη ἅλς forms the background or p o i n t o f d e p a r t u r e for the ἠιόνες βοῶσιν, the circumstance from which the action (noise) arises. When the GA contains a present (or perfect) participle the action of the main verb may be said to depart from a (durative) state;

---

[1] See EDWIN FLINCK-LINKOMIES: De ablativo absoluto quaestiones (Ann.Ac.Scient.Fenn. B. 20, 1, Helsingforsiae 1929) p. 11.

[2] It is a well-known fact that temporal, causal, and conditional subordination received their conjunctional means of expression comparatively late.

but a (punctual) aorist participle rather makes an actual point of departure:
in e.g. Il. 22. 383 ἢ καταλείψουσιν πόλιν ἄκρην τοῦδε πεσόντος the τοῦδε πεσόντος
marks the point after which the καταλείπειν will happen, being at the same
time dependent on it. It is obvious that such a relation will often have a
causal character. But in principle the GA is not explicitly causal, temporal,
or conditional; those categories are inventions of theoretical logic, and should
not be introduced here.

Let us now consider the habitual types of GA to which reference was made
above (p. 196). Leaving for the moment the time-GA:s, we have:

The »life/death»-type. The aorist case Il. 22. 383 was touched upon above;
Il. 22. 288 is a similar one. The present (and perfect) formulae are interesting,
as almost all of them clearly imply the ideas of basis, point of departure, and
contrast: Il. 1. 88 *οὔ τις ἐμεῦ ζῶντος καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ δερκομένοιο
σοὶ . . . βαρείας χεῖρας ἐποίσει*, 18. 10 . . . *ἔειπεν Μυρμιδόνων τὸν ἄριστον ἔτι
ζώοντος ἐμεῖο . . . λείψειν φάος ἠελίοιο*, 19. 210 *πρὶν δ' οὔ πως ἂν ἔμοιγε
φίλον κατὰ λαιμὸν ἰείη οὐ πόσις οὐδὲ βρῶσις ἑταίρου τεθνηῶτος*, 22.
384 (following the above-mentioned aorist case) *ἠὲ μένειν μεμάασι καὶ Ἕκτο-
ρος οὐκέτ' ἐόντος*, 432 *τί νυ βείομαι αἰνὰ παθοῦσα σεῦ ἀποτε-
θνηῶτος*; 24. 244 *ῥηίτεροι γὰρ μᾶλλον Ἀχαιοῖσιν δὴ ἔσεσθε κείνου
τεθνηῶτος*, Od. 16. 373 *οὐ γὰρ ὀίω τούτου γε ζώοντος ἀνύσσεσθαι
τάδε ἔργα*, 439 *ὅς κεν Τηλεμάχῳ . . . χεῖρας ἐποίσει ζώοντός γ' ἐμέθεν
καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ δερκομένοιο*. Cf. Od. 1. 404 *μὴ γὰρ . . . ἔλθοι . . .
Ἰθάκης ἔτι ναιεταώσης*, 20. 218 *μάλα μὲν κακὸν υἷος ἐόντος
ἄλλων δῆμον ἱκέσθαι*. In several cases the contrast is strengthened by a ne-
gative in the main sentence. It may be noted that Od. 16. 439, where the
ablatival notion is perhaps not so manifest[1], is modelled on Il. 1. 88.

The »will and call»-type. Aorist: Il. 10. 356 *ἔλπετο . . . ἑταίρους . . . ἰέναι
πάλιν Ἕκτορος ὀτρύναντος*, 21. 290 *τοίω γάρ τοι νῶι θεῶν ἐπι-
ταρρόθω εἶμεν Ζηνὸς ἐπαινήσαντος*. Present: Il. 17. 532 *οἱ δ' ἦλθον
καθ' ὅμιλον ἑταίρου κικλήσκοντος*, 19. 273 *οὐδέ κε κούρην ἦγεν
ἐμεῦ ἀέκοντος ἀμήχανος* (or attribute?)[2], 24. 289 *ἐπεὶ ἄρ γέ σε θυμὸς
ὀτρύνει ἐπὶ νῆας ἐμεῖο μὲν οὐκ ἐθελούσης*. Cf. Od. 24. 535 *πάντα
δ' ἐπὶ χθονὶ πῖπτε θεᾶς ὄπα φωνησάσης*, and Il. 24. 248 *οἱ δ' ἴσαν*

---

[1] Unless the -θεν suffix was felt as ablative: on the whole -θεν seems to retain its ablatival
(separative) notion in Homer; see CHANTRAINE Gramm.Hom. I. p. 243 f.

[2] The reference of ἀέκοντος may be similarly disputed in Il. 1. 301, cf. Od. 10. 405, etc.
At any rate these constructions may be regarded as related to real GA:s.

ἔξω σ π ε ρ χ ο μ έ ν ο ι ο γ έ ρ ο ν τ ο ς, Od. 1. 390 καί κεν τοῦτ᾽ ἐθέλοιμι
Δ ι ό ς γ ε δ ι δ ό ν τ ο ς ἀρέσθαι. Though the last case may be a conventional
formula (cf. Aesch. Sept. 719, Ag. 678, Eur. Suppl. 1146, etc.), the action of
the main verb in all instances evidently departs from, and is based on, the
situation expressed by the GA.

The »presence/absence»-type. The cases in the Iliad imply a similar idea
of point of departure and, in fact, contrast: Il. 8. 522 μὴ λόχος εἰσέλθησι πόλιν
λ α ῶ ν ἀ π ε ό ν τ ω ν, 15. 325 ὥς τ᾽ . . . πῶυ μέγ᾽ οἰῶν θῆρε δύω κλονέωσι . . .
σ η μ ά ν τ ο ρ ο ς ο ὐ π α ρ ε ό ν τ ο ς, 548 ὁ δ᾽ ὄφρα μὲν . . . βοῦς βόσκ᾽ . . .
δ η ί ω ν ἀ π ο ν ό σ φ ι ν ἐ ό ν τ ω ν. In the Odyssey the type appears to
be more freely used in standard formulae: Od. 4. 393 ὅττι τοι ἐν μεγάροισι
κακόν τ᾽ ἀγαθόν τε τέτυκται ο ἰ χ ο μ έ ν ο ι ο σ έ θ ε ν (hardly attribute to
μεγάροισι; on the relevance of -θεν see above p. 200 note 1), 14. 450 ὅν ῥα
συβώτης αὐτὸς κτήσατο μοῦνος (or οἶος) ἀ π ο ι χ ο μ έ ν ο ι ο ἄ ν α κ τ ο ς,
17. 296 δὴ τότε κεῖτ᾽ ἀπόθεστος ἀ π ο ι χ ο μ έ ν ο ι ο ἄ ν α κ τ ο ς, 18. 268
μεμνῆσθαι πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος . . . ἐ μ ε ῦ ἀ π ο ν ό σ φ ι ν ἐ ό ν τ ο ς, 19. 19
ἔντεα πατρὸς καλά, τά μοι κατὰ οἶκον καπνὸς ἀμέρδει π α τ ρ ὸ ς ἀ π ο ι χ ο -
μ έ ν ο ι ο (note that the word πατρός is taken up again, which indicates that
the construction was not felt as an attribute), 20. 232 ἦ σ έ θ ε ν ἐ ν θ ά δ᾽
ἐ ό ν τ ο ς ἐλεύσεται οἴκαδ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς (-θεν again). Cf. Od. 5. 287 ἦ μάλα δὴ
μετεβούλευσαν θεοὶ ἄλλως . . . ἐ μ ε ῖ ο μ ε τ᾽ Α ἰ θ ι ό π ε σ σ ι ν ἐ ό ν τ ο ς.
I have used the label »presence/absence»-type because the »presence»-cases
are later at least as frequent as the »absence»-cases.[1] On the other hand the
(ἀπ)οιχομένοιο- phrases are rather stereotyped.

Things are not on the whole different with the other Homeric GA:s.

Aorist: Il. 8. 37 (= 468) ὡς μὴ πάντες ὄλωνται ὀ δ υ σ σ α μ έ ν ο ι ο
τ ε ο ῖ ο, cf. 10. 426, 19. 62. Il. 8. 164 οὐκ ε ἴ ξ α ν τ ο ς ἐ μ ε ῖ ο πύργων
ἡμετέρων ἐπιβήσεαι. 10. 246 τ ο ύ τ ο υ γ᾽ ἑ σ π ο μ έ ν ο ι ο καὶ ἐκ πυρὸς . . .
νοστήσαιμεν. 11. 458 αἷμα δέ οἱ σ π α σ θ έ ν τ ο ς (sc. ἔγχεος) ἀνέσσυτο.
11. 509 μή πώς μιν π ο λ έ μ ο ι ο μ ε τ α κ λ ι ν θ έ ν τ ο ς ἕλοιεν. 13. 409
καρφαλέον δέ οἱ ἀσπὶς ἐ π ι θ ρ έ ξ α ν τ ο ς ἄυσεν ἔγχεος (or going more
directly with ἄυσεν?). 15. 328 (= 16.306) ἔνθα δ᾽ ἀνὴρ ἕλεν ἄνδρα κ ε δ α σ -
θ ε ί σ η ς ὑ σ μ ί ν η ς. 19. 75 οἱ δ᾽ ἐχάρησαν ἐυκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ μ ῆ ν ι ν
ἀ π ε ι π ό ν τ ο ς μ ε γ α θ ύ μ ο υ Π η λ ε ί ω ν ο ς (or more directly with

---

[1] Cf. above p. 196 note 3. Looking at the Homeric material, however, one gets the impression that the »absence»-cases are the original. In fact this stresses the notion of contrast in the GA in question.

ἐχάρησαν?). 21. 437 Φοῖβε, τίη δὴ νῶι διέσταμεν; οὐδὲ ἔοικεν ἀ ρ ξ ά ν τ ω ν
ἑ τ έ ρ ω ν (probably an idiomatic phrase). For Od. 14. 475 see below p. 203.
I would add to these Il. 1. 47 ἔκλαγξαν δ' ἄρ' ὀιστοὶ ἐπ' ὤμων χωομένοιο
α ὐ τ ο ῦ κ ι ν η θ έ ν τ ο ς (cf. above p. 196 note 1). But I very much doubt the
relevance of the passage Il. 14. 522 οὐ γάρ οἵ τις ὁμοῖος ἐπισπέσθαι ποσὶν ἦεν
ἀνδρῶν τρεσσάντων, ὅτε τε Ζεὺς ἐν φόβον ὄρσῃ which Classen and Kunst
record among real GA:s. An ablative interpretation is, of course, possible,
though the connection with the main sentence is remarkably loose. Because
the ἀνδρῶν τρεσσάντων, not very happily, comes after an οὐ . . . τις to which
it would seem to belong as a partitive genitive — though this cannot be the
true sense — I am inclined to think that the line 522 is a comparatively late
interpolation.[1]

Present (and perfect): Il. 5. 203 μή μοι δενοίατο φορβῆς (sc. ἵπποι) ἀ ν δ ρ ῶ ν
ε ἱ λ ο μ έ ν ω ν. 5. 501 ὅτε τε ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ κρίνῃ ἐ π ε ι γ ο μ έ ν ω ν ἀ ν έ μ ω ν
καρπόν τε καὶ ἄχνας. 5. 865 οἵη . . . ἐρεβεννὴ φαίνεται ἀὴρ . . . ἀ ν έ μ ο ι ο
δ υ σ α έ ο ς ὀ ρ ν υ μ έ ν ο ι ο. 9. 574 τῶν δὲ τάχ' ἀμφὶ πύλας ὅμαδος καὶ
δοῦπος ὀρώρει π ύ ρ γ ω ν β α λ λ ο μ έ ν ω ν (or more directly with δοῦ-
πος?), cf. Od. 22. 309 (= 24. 185). 14. 96 ὃς κέλεαι π ο λ έ μ ο ι ο σ υ ν-
ε σ τ α ό τ ο ς κ α ὶ α ὐ τ ῆ ς νῆας . . . ἅλαδ' ἑλκέμεν. 14. 100 οὐ γὰρ 'Αχαιοὶ
σχήσουσιν πόλεμον ν η ῶ ν ἅ λ α δ' ἑ λ κ ο μ ε ν ά ω ν. 15. 191 ἦ τοι ἐγὼν
ἔλαχον . . . ἅλα ναιέμεν . . . π α λ λ ο μ έ ν ω ν (sc. ἡμῶν). 17. 265 ἀμφὶ
δέ τ' ἄκραι ἠιόνες βοόωσιν ἐ ρ ε υ γ ο μ έ ν η ς ἁ λ ὸ ς ἔ ξ ω. 17. 393 ἄφαρ
δέ τε (or δ' ἐξ) ἰκμὰς ἔβη (sc. ἐκ βοείης) . . . π ο λ λ ῶ ν ἑ λ κ ό ν τ ω ν. 18. 606
(= Od. 4. 19) δοιὼ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε κατ' αὐτοὺς μολπῆς ἐ ξ ά ρ χ ο ν τ ο ς (sc.
ἀοιδοῦ) ἐδίνευον κατὰ μέσσους. 20. 405 ὡς ὅτε ταῦρος ἤρυγεν ἑλκόμενος ʽΕλικώ-
νιον ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα κ ο ύ ρ ω ν ἑ λ κ ό ν τ ω ν. Od. 20. 25 ὡς ὅτε γαστέρ' ἀνὴρ
π ο λ έ ο ς π υ ρ ὸ ς α ἰ θ ο μ έ ν ο ι ο . . . ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα αἰόλλῃ. For the
prevalence of instances in the Iliad, see above p. 195 f. All these cases seem to
me to confirm the hypothesis as to an ablative origin of the GA: the action
of the main verb departs from, and at the same time depends on, the situation
constituted by the genitive expression. – The passage Il. 23. 52 ὁ δέ (sc. τροχός)
τ' ἄγχι μάλα τρέχει, οὐδέ τι πολλὴ χώρη μεσσηγύς, πολέος πεδίοιο θ έ ο ν τ ο ς
(sc. ἵππου) is probably to be counted with the rest. Kunst (p. 32) thinks that
θέοντος belongs with ἄγχι, but he does not consider the absolute character

---

[1] I also rather doubt the theoretically possible interpretation of taking ποσίν as the comitative
dative normally used with ἐφέπεσθαι, and regarding the genitive construction as a possessive
pertinentive belonging to ποσίν.

of the phrase ἄγχι μάλα. Od. 16. 275 σὸν δὲ φίλον κῆρ τετλάτω ἐν στήθεσσι κακῶς πάσχοντος ἐμεῖο and 20. 312 ἀλλ᾽ ἔμπης τάδε μὲν καὶ τέτλαμεν εἰσορόοντες, μήλων σφαζομένων οἴνοιό τε πινομένοιο are in my opinion rather more disputable. As the verb τλῆναι is nowhere else found with the genitive, KUNST (p. 46) regards these cases as real GA:s; I would, however, suppose some kind of connection with the genitive with verbs of emotion; ultimately, to be sure, the ablative comes in even here. On the other hand the genitive in Il. 23. 599 τοῖο δὲ θυμὸς ἰάνθη ὡς εἴ τε περὶ σταχύεσσιν ἐέρση ληΐου ἀλδήσκοντος which CLASSEN regards as GA, is as far as I can see obviously adnominal; a GA interpretation would not even make sense.

It was shown above (p. 190) that the time-GA:s may be divided into two classes, each having a discernible origin of its own. In fact, an ablative interpretation does not suit the plural type μηνῶν φθινόντων very well: there is no definite situation formed by the GA, no basis for the main action to depart from; as was said above, the type is probably originally adnominal. With the singular type περιπλομένου ἐνιαυτοῦ things are somewhat different. Here an ablative origin seems possible; and it becomes rather more plausible with the cases Il. 8. 538 ἠελίου ἀνιόντος ἐς αὔριον and Od. 19. 519 ἔαρος νέον ἱσταμένοιο. Are we to abandon the hypothesis positing a connection with the old *genitivus temporis*, in spite of the remarkable parallels ἠοῦς, ὀπώρης, ἔαρος (see above p. 190)? I do not think so. It is reasonable to suppose that these singular time-GA:s really derive from both sources, in other words, that their origin is complex. But in one passage, which is seemingly related to the time-GA:s, I would rather stress the ablative interpretation: Od. 14. 475 νὺξ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐπῆλθε κακὴ Β ο ρ έ α ο π ε σ ό ν τ ο ς (»as the Northwind came over us»). Admittedly there are temporal genitive parallels such as Il. 5. 523 νηνεμίης, Thuc. 3. 23. 5 ἀπηλιώτου: but the Βορέαο πεσόντος has a very strong notion of point of departure and condition for the νὺξ ἐπῆλθε κακή, thus clearly suggesting a close connection with the GA:s recorded above.

A further category of its own, only secondarily approximating to GA:s, is formed by the type Od. 4. 717 οὐδ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἔτλη δίφρῳ (sc. ἐνί) ἐφέζεσθαι π ο λ λ ῶ ν κ α τ ὰ ο ἶ κ ο ν ἐ ό ν τ ω ν, cf. 19. 195, 24, 272. I have already expressed my opinion (above p. 195 note 2) that this genitive is in principle partitive.

We have now examined the Homeric GA from the aspect of the ablatival genitive, and we have found, I believe, some indisputable facts in favour of

our hypothesis. In short, the arguments are as follows: The GA is a very ancient phenomenon, used with considerably more force and variation in the Iliad than in the Odyssey: we are therefore not bound to explain it merely by means of the use of the genitive attested in historical times. The GA resembles a sentence of its own, constituting a situation clearly differentiated from, often opposed to, the main action, but with a direct relevance for it. It forms a basis, a background, a condition, a kind of point of departure for the idea expressed by the main sentence. This principle is on the whole so manifest (even in the later language, as far as I can see) that it cannot be regarded as mere coincidence; in Homer the exceptions are few in number and easily explained.

This idea of basis and departure may quite naturally be connected with the notion of the ablatival genitive which was apparently widely used in prehistoric times and which, as above all the comparative genitive shows, was at an early date capable of expressing abstract relations.

It remains to make a new approach to the problem of the parallels of the GA which have an apparent syntactic reference.

To some extent the ablative seems to have been at a very early stage formally identical with the pertinentive-partitive genitive.[1] In prehistoric Greek the morphological identification became gradually almost complete. This could hardly have happened if the uses of the two (or three) kinds of »genitive» had not been to a great extent closely similar, and more similar than e.g. in Latin which preserves the formal difference between the ablative and the genitive proper. We may suppose — though this cannot be proved — t h a t t h e G A a r o s e a t a t i m e w h e n t h e a b l a t i v e c a s e s t i l l h a d f o r m s o f i t s o w n; it existed, then, during the period when the ablative began to be wholly identified with the genitive. Consequently it adopted throughout the case-endings of the genitive — the Homeric use of the non-possessive -ϑεν-forms in the GA[2] may possibly reflect a feeling of its ablative origin. And as another consequence, there occurred the situation which CLASSEN took as the starting point for the development: the GA, being formally a genitive (and the use of the specific ablatival genitive at the same time becoming gradually more limited), could be used precisely like any genitive proper; in other words, the G A w a s g i v e n s y n t a c t i c

---

[1] Except the o-stems, always so in singular; see BRUGMANN, Kurze vergl. Gramm., p 382.
[2] See above p. 200 note 1 and p. 201.

r e f e r e n c e in accordance with normal rules for the genitive, whenever the speaker wanted.[1] It should be noted that the possibilities of handling a genitive like, say, ἀποιχομένοιο ἄνακτος according to ordinary syntactic rules were much greater during the times here in question than in e.g. classical times; even such a detail as the absence of the article accounts for that. This, on the other hand, made the category of GA l e s s d e f i n i t e, stressed its seemingly anomalous character, and hence contributed towards its becoming somewhat obsolete. We have now arrived at the stage represented by the Homeric poems. With the tendency indicated the construction would probably have disappeared completely at a comparatively early date. But there arose some new factors which brought about the renaissance of the GA in 5th and 4th century literature and, probably to some extent, in the colloquial language. These factors demand an investigation of their own which cannot be entered on here; but it may be pointed out in this connection that the GA is never in classical times or later really at home in living speech.[2]

I have preferred this hypothetical explanation of the development of the GA met with in Homer, to the possibility of supposing that the GA arose at a date when the ablative function had already been completely taken over by the genitive. In that case we should have to face the difficulty of explaining how the principle of »point of departure» could be established at a time when the prevalent use of the same genitive forms was pertinentive-partitive. It cannot be doubted that the pertinentive-partitive notion of the genitive formation on the whole was stronger than the ablative, once the formal

---

[1] The continuing of the Aeolic epic tradition in an Ionic environment can be assumed to have been a contributory factor.

[2] SPIEKER (especially p. 340) seems to think that short GA:s were on the whole current in popular speech of classical times, whereas complex constructions were avoided. It is obvious that some short f o r m u l a e tended to be habitually used: a time-GA, for instance, as χειμῶνος ὄντος is found 5 times in Aristophanes (see SPIEKER *l.c.*); and the type ἐμοῦ ζῶντος which often approximates to an oath is quite frequent (cf. SPIEKER p. 339). But apart from such formulae, short GA:s seem to me to have been almost as rarely used in the colloquial language as more complex GA expressions. The g e n e r a l f r e q u e n c y of the GA in Aristophanes and Plato is extremely low, as SPIEKER's statistics (p. 322) indicate — KUNST's remark (p. 50), » . . . von den zahlreichen absoluten Genetiven der alten Komödie greife ich bloss Ar. Thesm. 540 f. heraus . . .», is misleading in this respect. And to a large extent the instances consist of formulae. The GA is considerably more common in Pindar and in tragedy (cf. GILDERS-LEEVE's notes, SPIEKER p. 318 and 319), though tragedy admittedly also employs several idiomatic formulae; and it is still more frequent, and used with much more variation, in the historians and, on the whole, in the orators (cf. SPIEKER p. 320 ff.). Note also the evidently non-colloquial use of time-GA:s *et sim.* in decrees (τοῦ δεῖνος ἄρχοντος, εἰπόντος, etc.).

identification had come about;[1] it is rather probable that, for the ablative, a loss of range of applicability accompanied the loss of specific forms. We should not expect a secondary function of the genitive to form the nucleus of a new usage. And the syntactically conditioned parallels of the GA would again come in as a disturbing problem.

It has been necessary to go far back in prehistoric times, though there is an evident risk of the hypothesis approximating to mere speculation. The facts attested in Greek itself do not help us any further. But what can comparative linguistics do for us?

Sanskrit has its »locative absolute» which is symptomatic of the old IE. tendency to synthetic expression, but which is wholly irrelevant for the Greek GA. In the later language there appears the rather more interesting phenomenon of a »genitive absolute». It is commonly regarded as independent of the Greek GA; in my opinion it is relevant for our purpose insofar as it shows what the Greek construction would be like had it developed out of a pertinentive-partitive genitive. The usage consists of cases such as the following: *divaṃ jagāma munīnām paçyatāṃ tadā* »he went then to heaven, the ascetics looking on»:[2] note the purely temporal relation; there is no actual dependency, no basis for the main action to depart from. In Sanskrit there seem to be no traces of an ablative absolute. — The Germanic and Balto-Slavic languages have only a »dative absolute».[3]

The Latin ablative absolute would at the first sight appear to be the evidence we are looking for. But a closer analysis of it, such as LINKOMIES[4] has made, shows that it may be explained out of conditions speculiar to Latin. LINKOMIES is certainly right in regarding the sociative ablative — i.e. a variant of the old instrumental — as the main idea underlying the ablative absolute such as it exists in historical Latin;[5] and he may also be right in doubting

---

[1] This is shown, for instance, by the fact that the ablative of historical times on the whole demands elucidation by means of prepositions. Note also the fact that the morphological process in question was not a fusion like that of old locative and dative (and probably also instrumental) forms, resulting in the Greek »dative», but a complete victory of the genitive forms over the ablative forms.

[2] See WHITNEY, Sanskrit Grammar, p. 100 f. The exact derivation of the construction is uncertain. At any rate it is probably to be connected with the tendency, in later Sanskrit, to extend the use of the genitive at the expense of other cases. The preference for GA constructions with the (active) present participle of the verb *paç-* »to see» is remarkable and stresses the difference from the Greek GA.

[3] Probably a *dativus commodi*; cf. BRUGMANN, Kurze vergl. Gramm., p. 610.

[4] See above p. 199 note 1.

[5] This had before been suggested, among others, by TAMMELIN (TAMMIO) and BRUGMANN: see LINKOMIES p. 24 ff.

the existence of a really absolute ablative construction in Oscan and Umbrian.[1] However, with the Homeric GA in mind it is tempting to suppose that in origin the Latin ablative absolute really was an ablative proper, and that the sociative associations came in with it later, just like the pertinentive-partitive associations coming in with the Greek GA: in the complex formation of the Latin »ablative» the instrumental notion is on the whole stronger than the ablative. An argument in favour of this hypothesis may be found by looking at the Old Latin use of appositional nouns in personal so-called ablative absolute, a phraseology which, contrary to many participial types of construction, may seem to be without Greek parallels.[2] In Plautus the following words occur in this usage:[3] *auctor* (*me auctore*, etc.), *arbiter, iudex, advocatus, adiutor, adiutrix, interpres, impulsor, lubens, invitus, vivus, praesens, absens*. Though *me auctore* and the like may be quite naturally taken as sociative ablatives, they form at the same time a condition, a background, a point of departure for the main action. It is remarkable that secondary circumstances, irrelevant for the main idea (e.g. * *me milite exercitus progressus est*), are not expressed by this type of ablative absolute, though they would appear to be quite normal with a sociative ablative (cf. the type *capillis dissolutis*). And is it mere coincidence, or due to secondary influence from Greek, that the »will and call»-type as well as the »life/death»-type and the »presence/absence»-type are represented in the above-mentioned group of words?

These problems, or apparent problems, cannot be solved here. I have only wanted to indicate some possible supports for the theory that the Greek GA, being originally ablative, reflects an old (Western?) IE. usage.

---

[1] P. 33 ff. Cases such as *toutad praesentid* may, at any rate, be due to Latin influence.

[2] It corresponds to the well-known tendency, in older Latin, to avoid present participles except in a purely nominal sense. Note the lack of a present participle for the verb *esse*.

[3] Cf. LINKOMIES p. 44 ff., esp. p. 72.