88

Adherescent Negative Compounds with φημί and the Infinitive

By John R. Wilson, Edmonton (Canada)

Adherescent οὐ with φημί in the sense of "I say that ... not" is a familiar construction. Less familiar and indeed hardly recognized as such are the adherescent negative compounds οὐκέτι, οὔπω und οὔποτε in the same construction. And yet in Homer this is the norm. The adherescent occurrences of each compound are discussed in full, including οὔποτε at Pindar, *N.* 7.102.

In his study *Negation in English and other languages* (Copenhagen 1917), Otto Jespersen talks of "the strong tendency found in many languages to attract to the main verb a negative which should logically belong to the dependent nexus. In many cases *I don't think he has come* and similar sentences really mean 'I think he has not come'" (p.53). In Greek this tendency is associated with indirect speech in the infinitive introduced by verbs of saying, thinking and believing. Of this group, οὐ φημι has been studied in detail by A. C. Moorhouse (*Studies in the Greek negative,* Cardiff 1959), who comes to the conclusion that in infinitive constructions from Homer to Aristophanes (the limit of his investigation), οὐ before φημί is habitual and neutral, while οὐ following φημί usually produces some special emphasis or rhetorical effect (pp.131, 134, 137).

To be transferred in sense to the infinitive, the negative must be adjacent or virtually adjacent to φημί, i.e. it must be adherescent or virtually adherescent. Adherescent οὐ φημι forms a unit comparable to Latin *nego,*[1]) and in this adjacent position the negative is always carried over to the infinitive. In the classical period, the same applies to οὐ γάρ φημι (also οὐ γάρ δή φημι at Hdt.1.137.2) and to οὔτε φημί, in both of which cases οὐ can be considered virtually adherescent. But in Homer, as Jacob Wackernagel has demonstrated (*IF* 1 [1892] 333ff.), the tendency of numerous particles as well as enclitic pronouns to claim second place in a clause is overwhelming. This affects adherescent οὐ φημι, allowing more instances than in later Greek of virtual adherescence, i.e. οὐδέ τί φημι, οὐδέ μέ/σέ/ἕ φημι. More important, the flexibility of Homeric usage permits the employment of compound negatives in the same way, with both ele-

---

[1]) See, e.g., Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik,* II 593; Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar,* 610; J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax,* II 261ff.

ments of the negative being transferred in sense to the infinitive. These compounds are οὐκέτι, οὔπω and οὔποτε. Of the three, adherescent οὐκέτι is confined to Homer, while (virtually) adherescent οὔπω only occurs once and adherescent οὔποτε only three times outside of Homer. This is probably due to the fact that already in Herodotus the intrusive position of particles and enclitic pronouns has become somewhat weaker, discouraging the free use of adherescent compound negatives, with their built-in intrusive elements (-ετι, -πω, -ποτε).

1. οὐκέτι

Adherescent οὐκέτι φημί occurs eleven times in Homer. The transference in sense of the negative from the main verb to the infinitive is most obvious in the two instances with the present infinitive. At *Od.* 20.137 Eurycleia claims that the guest was well looked after by Penelope. He drank his fill and, in answer to her explicit inquiry, "said he was no longer hungry for food," σίτου δ' οὐκέτ' ἔφη πεινήμεναι. At *Od.* 1.189 Athena, disguised as Mentes, claims to be a guest friend of Laertes, τὸν οὐκέτι φασὶ πόλινδε/ἔρχεσθαι, "who, they say, no longer comes to the city."

The remaining instances of οὐκέτι φημί are all with the future infinitive and are confined to two subjects, holding the line of battle and coming home.

At *Od.* 2.238 = 24.460 we find the formula τὸν δ' οὐκέτι φασὶ νέεσθαι, "they say that he will not come back home."[2]) At *Od.* 11.176 this is adapted to the first person narrative with ἐμέ replacing τόν. At *Od.* 14.149 Odysseus says to a sceptical Eumaeus that, since he is so negative and said that his master wouldn't return, ἐπεὶ δὴ πάμπαν ἀναίνεαι, οὐδ' ἔτι [= καὶ οὐκέτι] φῇσθα/ κεῖνον ἐλεύσεσθαι, he will counter with a sworn statement. *Il.* 6.501 should also be included in this group: οὐ γάρ μιν ἔτ' ἔφαντο ὑπότροπον ἐκ πολέμοιο / ἵξεσθαι. In this example the -ετι element is separated from οὐ by γάρ μιν. As we have seen in our brief discussion of οὐ φημί, even in the classical period γάρ has a privileged position of second place after the negative and before φημί. In Homer, of course, μιν also has a privileged position which, as Wackernagel has

---

[2]) In this and other applications to homecoming, the -ετι element refers to the return leg of the journey. See my "Non-temporal οὐκέτι/μηκέτι," *Glotta* 65 (1987) 194–198.

90   John R. Wilson

shown (*IF* 1[1892] 336), is still evident in Herodotus. *Il.* 6.501, then,
is an instance of virtual adherescence.

Adherescent οὐκέτι φημί in the context of 'holding firm' occurs at
Il. 9.234; 12.106; 14.374; 17.637. A comparison between *Il.* 12.106
and 12.125 shows how οὐκέτι before φημί can be replaced by
οὐκέτι before the infinitive without any material change in sense:[3])

> βάν ῥ' ἰθὺς Δαναῶν λελιημένοι, οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔφαντο
> σχήσεσθ', ἀλλ' ἐν νηυσὶ μελαίνῃσιν πεσέεσθαι.
>
>   (*Il.* 12.106-7)

> τοὶ δ' ἄμ' ἕποντο
> ὀξέα κεκλήγοντες· ἔφαντο γὰρ οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοὺς
> σχήσεσθ', ἀλλ' ἐν νηυσὶ μελαίνῃσιν πεσέεσθαι.
>
>   (*Il.* 12.124-6)

It should be noted, however, that *Il.* 12.125 is the only example of
non-adherescent οὐκέτι with the infinitive in Homer.

The four instances of adherescent οὐκέτι in the context of 'hold-
ing firm' are very similar. Each is introduced in the second hemistich
by οὐδ' ἔτι φημί/φασί/φάντο. In three instances this is followed by a
line containing the infinitive (*Il.* 12.107 above = 9.235 = 17.236).

Adherescent οὐκέτι does not occur at all outside of Homer. A
good example of its avoidance is Hdt. 1.97.1, which employs simple
adherescent οὐ before φημί and postpones the -ετι element until
after the infinitive: οὔτ' ἔφη δικᾶν ἔτι (not οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔφη δικᾶν).

2. οὔπω

At *Od.* 9.455 the Cyclops talks of Οὖτις, ὃν οὔ πώ φημι πεφυγ-
μένον ἔμμεν ὄλεθρον. At *Od.* 16.143 the enclitic μιν takes its usual
pride of place, with οὔπω being virtually adherescent: οὔ πώ μίν
φασιν φαγέμεν καὶ πιέμεν αὔτως. The same applies to the indefinite
pronoun at *Od.* 19.380: ἀλλ' οὔ πώ τινά φημι ἐοικότα ὧδε ἰδέσθαι.

After Homer the priority of enclitic pronouns is much weakened.
Nevertheless, Euripides provides an instance of virtually adherescent
οὔπω at *Tr.* 938: οὔπω με φήσεις αὐτὰ τὰν ποσὶν λέγειν.

---

[3]) See Pierre Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique,* II 334-5.

3. οὔποτε

At *Od.* 23,71 Eurycleia reproaches a sceptical Penelope, ἦ πόσιν ἔνδον ἐόντα παρ' ἐσχάρῃ οὔ ποτ' ἔφησθα/ οἴκαδ' ἐλεύσεσθαι, "who said/thought that your husband, who is now inside by the hearth, would never come home." To this example should be added *Il.* 8.238 and *Od.* 18.132, where οὔποτε is virtually adherescent, being split by particles that in Homer have absolute priority of position. At *Il.* 8.238 Agamemnon claims that he has never disregarded Zeus' altar: οὐ μὲν δή ποτέ φημι τεὸν περικαλλέα βωμὸν/ ... παρελθέμεν. At *Od.* 18.132 the fortunate man is said to be overly confident: οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτέ φησι κακὸν πείσεσθαι ὀπίσσω,/ ὄφρ' ἀρετὴν παρέχωσι θεοὶ καὶ γούνατ' ὀρώρῃ.

Adherescent οὔποτε with φημί occurs three times outside of Homer. Of these occurrences, the clearest is Xenophanes 1.5 (West), where a personified wine states that it will never fail: ἄλλος δ' οἶνος ἑτοῖμος, ὃς οὔποτέ φησι προδώσειν. At Eur. *Alc.* 238 the chorus makes a confident statement: οὔποτε φήσω γάμον εὐφραίνειν/ πλέον ἢ λυπεῖν. Φήσω here is a so-called Pindaric future, conveniently spelt out for us by Bacchylides (1.159) in his φαμὶ καὶ φάσω, "I state and will continue to state" = "I strongly affirm." In Euripides the chorus is saying: "I assert that marriage never (in all its manifestations) gives more pleasure than pain." Similar is the much discussed conclusion to Pindar's *Nemean 7*: τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὔ ποτε φάσει κέαρ/ ἀτρόποισι Νεοπτόλεμον ἑλκύσαι/ ἔπεσι, "my heart strongly affirms that it has never ravaged Neoptolemus with harsh words." W. J. Slater (*CQ* 63 [1969] 92) appears to be the first to construe οὔποτε with the infinitive, provoking the following riposte from Professor Lloyd-Jones (*JHS* 93 [1973] 136): "οὔ ποτε goes with φάσει, not with ἑλκύσαι. Every translator has seen all this except Slater, who in his violent attempt to fit the text to the Procrustean bed of his dogma has done to Pindar's words just what Pindar is denying that he has done to Neoptolemus." However the weight of the evidence not only of οὔποτέ φημι but also of οὐκέτι, οὔπω and simple οὔ φημι suggests that in this adjacent position the negative should always be considered adherescent in constructions with the infinitive. In all these combinations adjacent or virtually adjacent negatives with φημί *must*, on occasion, be transferred to the infinitive to make sense and always *can* be so transferred with either a superior or at least not an inferior result. In the two instances from Pindar and Euri-

92   John R. Wilson

pides of *οὔποτέ φημι,* transference of the negative produces a slightly
superior sense to non-transference.[4])

---

[4]) In his *Commentary on five odes of Pindar* (New York 1981, 177–8) Christo-
pher Carey presents a more detailed attack on Slater's position. He admits that
"in negative statements with *φημί* the negative is usually attracted to the infini-
tive of the governing verb," but does not add the important proviso that, to be so
attracted, the negative must be adjacent or virtually adjacent to *φημί.* None of
the passages that Carey cites as exceptions are in fact adjacent or virtually adja-
cent, hence in none of them do we expect the negative to be carried over to the
infinitive. Carey also seems to consider the future tense significant, though there
is no cogent reason for thinking this to be the case. Even if one did not accept
the concept of Pindaric futures, the passage could still be satisfactorily inter-
preted "I will state that I have never ..."