0. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to try to elucidate the correct reading of three passages of Herodotus in which the construction ἀντί + infinitive appears. For two of the passages, some editors propose introducing the article τοῦ between the preposition and the verb. On the basis of a linguistic study of ἀντί and of the constructions with infinitives I will try to demonstrate that it is possible to leave those passages without an article.

In the following sections, I will show first, the problematic passages and the reason for the problem. Second, I will provide some data about ἀντί + genitive and subordinated structures with the infinitive. Finally, I will present my conclusions.

1. The Problem

The problematic passages are the following:

(1) δς ἀντὶ μὲν δόυλων ἐποίησας ἐλευθέρους Πέρσας εἶναι, ἀντὶ δὲ ἀρχεσθαι ὑπ᾿ ἄλλων ἀρχεῖν ἀπάντων (Hdt. 1.210.2) “You have made the Persians free men instead of slaves, and they rule over all instead of being ruled by others”.

1 This work has been possible thanks to the support of the project HUM2005-06622-C04-01/FILO and of the grant PNFPU AP2003-4893. I thank Jesús de la Villa for his suggestions.

2 Most of the English translations of the Greek texts are taken or adapted from the Loeb Classical Library.

(2) ὡς γὰρ δὴ ἐπεκράτησαν τῶν πολίων, παῖδάς τε τοὺς ευειδεστάτους ἐκλεγόμενοι ἐξέσωμον καὶ ἐποίειν ἀντὶ εἰναὶ ἐνορχέας εὐνούχους, καὶ παρθένους τὰς καλλιστευούσας ἀνασπάσται παρὰ βασιλέα (Hdt. 6.32.1) “For when they had gained mastery over the cities, they chose the most beautiful boys and castrated them, making them eunuchs instead of men, and they carried the fairest maidens away to the king”.

(3) συναραχθέντων δὲ τῶν πλοίων (οὐδεμίαν γάρ σφι ἐτι κομιδήν ἔτι Κρήτην φαίνεσθαι) ἐνθαῦτα ᾿Υρίην πόλιν κτίσαντας καταμεῖναί τε καὶ μεταβαλόντας ἀντὶ μὲν Κρητῶν γενέσθαι Ἰήπυγας Μεσσαπίους, ἀντὶ δὲ εἶναι νησιώτας ἠπειρώτας (Hdt. 7.170.2) “And their ships being wrecked, and no way left to return to Crete, they founded there the town of Hyria, and abode in it, changing from Cretans to Messapians of Iapigia and to dwellers of the mainland instead of being islanders”.

The problem is that whenever a preposition is followed by an infinitive, there is an article between them, as in the following examples:

(4) ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ προσαγορεύειν ἀλλήλους φιλέουσι τοῖσι στόμασι (Hdt. 1.134.2) “For, instead of greeting, they kiss each other on the lips”.

(5) ἀντὶ τοῦ προσαγορεύειν ἀλλήλους ἐν τῆι ὁδοῖσι προσκυνέουσι κατιέντες μέχρι τοῦ γούνατος τὴν χεῖρα (Hdt. 2.80.5) “Passers-by salute by lowering the hand to the knee, instead of greeting each other”.

Cf. R. Kühner - B. Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Hannover 1904, II, II, 45. Πλήν (‘except’) is another thing. Although it seems that in the older phases of the language it functions as a preposition + genitive, it can be followed by very different syntactic structures from the classical times onwards: nominal phrases in any case, subordinated clauses… and infinitives without article. Moreover, its syntactic status is not clear at all, cf. J. Blomqvist, Greek Particles in hellenistic Prose, Lund 1969, 75-77.
As can be seen, Herodotus uses these two constructions: ἀντὶ τοῦ + infinitive and ἀντί + infinitive. The first construction has three occurrences and the second two. From a typologic point of view, Kortmann\(^4\) classifies them as adverbial subordinated clauses of substitution, that is, «of two alternative possible events/activities \(p\) and \(q\), \(q\) happens or is performed although \(p\) was rather to be expected».

However, some modern editions have proposed different solutions. I have used the editions of Hude, Legrand, Rosén, Nenci, and Asheri\(^5\).

About (1), these editors do not modify the structure ἀντί + infinitive, and the critical apparatus does not indicate that some manuscripts had the reading ἀντὶ τοῦ + infinitive nor is there any conjecture that they might have.

About (2), in the critical apparatus these editors present the conjecture of Valckenaer ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶναι. Only Legrand and Nenci accept it in their texts.

About (3), the critical apparatus of these editions reveals that the aldine edition had the reading ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶναι. Rosén says that this reading belongs to the manuscripts \(T\) (Laurentianus plur. LXX 6) and \(M\) (Mutinensis Estensis 221), that, according to Rosén, were used in the making of the aldine edition of 1502. Nevertheless, only Legrand accepts this reading in his text.

With this data, which is the right reading of these three passages? Should τοῦ be present in all the three passages? In some cases yes and in others no? As manuscripts do not offer another reading for (1) and (2), it seems possible to speculate that the article is not necessary in these three cases. But a linguistic study of ἀντί and structures of the type preposition + article + infinitive will provide more arguments that support this hypothesis.


2. Syntax

2.1. Ἀντί + genitive

Ἀντί is a preposition that governs genitive case. It is combined with nouns (6), pronouns (7), adjectives (8), numerals (9), infinitives (10), relatives (11), and, at least in one case, a subordinated clause (12) introduced by ὅτι:

(6) καὶ τούτων χίλιοι μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖσι δόρασι ἀντὶ τῶν σαυρωτήρων ροιὰς εἶχον χρυσέας (Hdt. 7.41.8) “One thousand of these latter bore golden pomegranates on their spear-shafts in place of the spike”.

(7) ἐκ γάρ οἱ τῆς ὄψιος τῶν μάχων οἱ ὀνειροπόλοι ἐσήμαινον ὅτι μέλλοι ὁ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ γόνος βασιλεύσειν ἀντὶ ἑκείνου (Hdt. 1.108.9) “For the interpreters declared that the meaning of this dream was that his daughter’s offspring should rule in his place”.

(8) τὰς τότε ὁ Πέρσης νησιώτιδαις ἀντὶ ἠπειρωτίδων ὥρμητο ποιέειν (Hdt. 7.22.16) “It was now the Persians’ intent to make (these cities) islands instead of mainland towns”.

(9) καὶ δύο τε ἀντὶ ἑνὸς νηὸς τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ οἰκοδόμησε ὁ Ἀλυάττης ἐν τῇ Ἀσσησῷ (Hdt. 1.22.13) “And Alyattes built two temples for Athene instead of one at Assesos”.

(10) ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ προσαγορεύειν ἀλλήλους φιλέουσι τοῖσι στόμασι (Hdt. 1.134.2) “For, instead of greeting, they kiss each other on the lips”.

(11) ἓν δὲ δῶρων ἄπειμι ἐχὼν παρὰ σοῦ ἀνθ’ οὗ οὐδ’ ἄν τὰ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι, [εἰ εκεῖ πλείστα ἐστιν,] οὐδὲ τὰ πανταχόν [ἀντὶ τούτου οὐ σὺ μοι δεδώρησαι] ἥδιον ἐν ἐχὼν ἀπελθοῦμι (X. Cyr. 5.2.8) “But one gift of yours will I take as I leave you, in place of which not even all the wealth of Babylon (and that is enormous)—no, not even all the wealth of all the
The following table shows the number of occurrences of ἀντί + noun with and without an article in Herodotus and Thucydides:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without article</th>
<th>With article</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. ἀντί + noun in Herodotus and Thucydides

As can be seen, there are more occurrences without article than with it. Let’s look at the following table, which shows the number of occurrences of the structure ἀντί + noun expressing substitution (‘instead of’), that is, the semantics of ἀντί in (1), (2) and (3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without article</th>
<th>With article</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. ἀντί + noun expressing substitution (‘instead of’) in Herodotus and Thucydides

6 I did not find the combination ἀντί + relative pronoun in Herodotus.
7 I did not find ἀντί τοῦ ὅτι expressing substitution.
As can be seen, there are more occurrences without an article than with it. Therefore, it can be concluded that the presence of the article is not completely indispensable when ἀντί combines with nouns. But the data about subordinated constructions with an infinitive seem to be more conclusive.

2.2. Structures with Infinitive

The constructions of the type ἀντί + infinitive, with and without an article, are testified for the first time in Herodotus. At this moment, the 5th century B.C., the greek language was undergoing a linguistic renewal. New subordinated constructions arose, such as the following:

i. subordinator + infinitive without article: the temporal πρίν + infinitive (13), the conditional ἐφ᾿ ᾧ + infinitive (14) or ὥστε + infinitive (15) expressing result.

---

8 Aesop, theoretically before Herodotus, uses ἀντί τοῦ + infinitive twice (Aesop. 139 and 142, cf. A. Hausrath – H. Hunger, Corpus Fabularum aesopicarum, Leipzig 1957, I). But Aesop’s fables belong to different times, and according to A. Schwyzzer - E. Debrunner, Griechische Grammatik, München 1950, 368-369 and E. Crespo et alii, Sintaxis del Griego clásico, Madrid 2003, 303, the combination preposition + article + infinitive begins in the classical times with Sophocles (5th B.C.). Therefore, it is not clear at all if Aesop is the first to use this construction.


ii. Article (genitive) + infinitive expressing purpose

(13) οὗτοι δὲ οὐ πρὶν πολιορκεῖν τὸ χωρίον, ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ ἤγισαντο ἡμᾶς οὐ περιόψεσθαι, τότε καὶ τὸ εὔπρεπὲς τῆς δίκης παρέσχοντο (Th. 1.39.2) “These men, however, bring forward their specious offer of a court of arbitration, not before laying siege to the place, but only after they had concluded that we would not permit it”.

(14) ἀναστήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς οἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιτετραμμένοι τὴν φυλακήν, ὡς ἐώρων ἀποθνῄσκοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐφ’ ὧν μηδὲν κακὸν ποιήσουσιν, ἀπαγαγόντες ἀπέκτειναν (Th. 1.126.11) “And the Athenians who had been charged with guarding them, when they saw them dying in the temple, caused them to arise under the condition of doing them no harm, and, leading them away, put them to death”.

(15) βοηθησάντων δὲ Ἀργείων τῇ σφετέρῃ ἀποταμνομένῃ, ἐνθαῦτα συνέβησαν ὡστε τριηκοσίους ἑκατέρων μαχέσασθαι (Hdt. 1.82.10) “The Argives came out to save their territory from being cut off; then, after debate, the two armies agreed that three hundred of each side would fight”.

(16) ἀγγελίαν ἔπεμπον ἐπὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ Μιλήτῳ ναύς τοῦ ἐξυμπαρακομισθῆναι (Th. 8.39.4) “They sent a message to the ships at Miletus with a view to being brought along the coast”.

In all these constructions, the infinitive expresses virtuality, that is, not factuality, as in the examples (1), (2) and (3) with the structure ἀντί + infinitive. Therefore, it is a phenomenon with which the Greek literary prose looks for a way of expressing virtuality in the subordination and does it through

\[11\] These clauses are testified from Thucydides, cf. Crespo et alii, Sintaxis del Griego, 419.
the development of subordinated constructions with the verb in the infinitive. This is so because the infinitive is the verbal form compatible with any modal content, as its modal contents are neutralized. Thus, the infinitive is the typical way of expressing non factuality\textsuperscript{12}.

My proposal is that the use of the preposition with an infinitive without an article is probably the result of an attempt of Herodotus to introduce subordinated clauses of substitution with virtual content similar to the subordinated constructions of the type subordinator + infinitive without article, as in the examples (13), (14), and (15)\textsuperscript{13}. But this innovation of Herodotus would have been abandoned because of the higher presence of τοῦ in these constructions. In fact, the structure that became completely grammaticalized in the language from the 5th century B.C. onwards is the one of the type ἀντὶ τοῦ + infinitive, as in the examples (4) and (5)\textsuperscript{14}. In some cases, its structure is more similar to the structure of a clause having its own subject in accusative, as in (17) and (18):

\( (17) \) οἷσι δὲ ἐν τοιουτοτρόπῳ πυρετῷ κεφαλήν ἀλγέουσιν ἀντὶ μὲν τοῦ ὀρφνῶδές τι πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν φαίνεσθαι, ἀμβλυωγμὸς γίγνεται... (Hp. Prog. 24.38) “Those who have headaches in this way, see worse instead of seeing something dark in front of their eyes”.


\textsuperscript{13} This does not mean that in the other construction of the type ἀντὶ τοῦ + infinitive, the infinitive does not have a virtual value. Herodotus would attempt to use this construction, with the same virtual value but without an article.

\textsuperscript{14} This structure is used frequently in the later literature: Andocides: 1x; Thucydides: 4x; Hippocrates: 4x; Plato: 2x; Lysias: 5x; Isocrates: 9x; Xenophon: 23x; Aeschines: 1x; Demosthenes 29x; Aristotle: 3x; Theophrastus: 1x; Hyperides: 1x; Dinarchus: 1x; Diodorus Siculus: 1x; Strabo: 11x; Philo: 7x; Dionysius of Halicarnassus: 7x; Apollonius Citensis: 1x; Plutarch: 4x; New Testament: 1x; Josephus: 2x; Dio Chrysostom: 6x; Arrian: 1x.
(18) καὶ ἀντί τοῦ τοσαῦτα εἶναι τὰ ἐσιόντα [...]. πολλῷ πλέω εἰσέρχεται (Hp. Oct. 12.3.) “Instead of being so many the things that enter […] many more enter”.

On the other hand, the fact that ἀντί as a preposition was used more commonly without an article could be an important support to its use as semi-conjunctonal with infinitive without article.

To sum up, from a syntactic point of view, it is not impossible that in Herodotus the construction ἀντί + infinitive would exist.

3. Conclusion

Although it is a seldom-used structure, it is possible to admit the existence in the Greek language of a construction of the type ἀντί + infinitive, without an article. The high frequency of the ἀντί + nominal phrase without an article, as seen in Herodotus and Thucydides, and the development similar to other constructions of the type subordinator + virtual infinitive (without article), support this hypothesis. It explains the unanimity of the manuscripts transmitting the contraction without an article in (1) and (2).

Therefore, it seems to be reasonable not to introduce any conjectures nor to introduce the readings of the manuscripts T and M, and leave in (1), (2) and (3) ἀντί + infinitive.
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