

The phenomenon of diectasis may represent the kind of effect we are looking for. What is *δράαν* but the disyllable *δρᾶν* with the second syllable prolonged beyond the normal syllabic maximum μ — not necessarily to the face value of *ρᾶν* ($\cup \mu$), but say to $\cup \cup$? There is no need to treat such a prolongation as an artifice. It may reflect the ordinary pronunciation of a certain transitional period. The artifice consists in admitting the device of syncopated rhythm into the delivery, so that the super-longs produced by contraction can be accommodated in the positions formerly occupied by the ingredients as distinct syllables. Where the first syllable had been allowed to occupy the whole thesis by metrical lengthening, e.g. *ῆ]γά[εσθε (as *ὑπεροπ]λί[ησι*), the same licence is granted to the super-long, ῆγᾶσθε.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that what is sketched in the foregoing pages is not a 'theory' to be accepted or rejected, but a formula for classifying empirical data; it is no more conjectural than the Dewey system of classifying books, it is neither true nor false. It must be judged on its ability to match the complexity of the facts.

On Lesbian Accentuation

By M. L. WEST, Oxford

The statements of ancient grammarians on Aeolic accentuation, collected most fully by Ahrens¹⁾ and Meister²⁾, are now augmented by a considerable amount of papyrus evidence, which has been dealt with very thoroughly and well by E.-M. Hamm in her *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*, pp. 42–44. The papyri are remarkably (though not absolutely) consistent in the principles they follow. They are, no doubt, handing on the accentuation of an Alexandrian edition, perhaps Aristophanes'³⁾, made by, or with the assistance of,

¹⁾ *De Graecae linguae dialectis*, i. 10ff.

²⁾ *Die griech. Dialekte*, i. 32ff.

³⁾ It certainly will not go back to the time of Theocritus, and it is a question whether his Aeolic poems should be given the recessive accentuation of which there are distinct traces in the manuscript tradition. If all his knowledge of the dialect came from texts of Sappho and Alcaeus, and he was not familiar with the sound of spoken Lesbian, he must have been unaware of the

someone who had a detailed knowledge of the intonations of a contemporary 'Aeolic' dialect. We must hope it was Asiatic Aeolic; a tendency to recessive accents in modern Lesbos and nearby (Meister 38) is some encouragement. Wackernagel's arguments⁴⁾ for attributing Aeolic barytonesis to a number of words in the Homeric language, if accepted, would establish both the locality and the antiquity of the phenomenon; but they are severely criticized by Schwyzer, *Gramm.* 1.385⁵⁾.

As regards its antiquity, inferences can now be drawn from the papyrus evidence. The third person plural imperative is accented paroxytone although the last syllable is short: Alc. 5.10 (L.-P.) ζαλλευόντων, 30.3 ἀγόντων. The survival in the tradition of this and other exceptions to the general law of recession shows that the law was not mechanically generalized by scribes, and that the consistent barytonesis of genitive plurals of *a*-stems, παρθενίκαν, etc., is trustworthy. It follows that the recession of accent took place, or remained operative, after the contraction. But it ceased to be operative before the formation of the ending -όντων (whose origin has not been satisfactorily explained; cf. Hamm 169f.). Since the ending is metrically guaranteed in Alcaeus, it took place before him, and we are justified in accenting the Lesbian poets on the Alexandrian system, even if in practice those poets sacrificed the accents of speech to a recurring melody.

The same conclusion might be drawn from the accentuations οὐδάμα, μηδάμα, μηκέτι, μηδένα⁶⁾. Clearly they were fixed at a time when the elements were still felt as separate, when οὐδ' εἷς was 'not even one'. This time has passed when Sappho and Alcaeus write. The elements have lost their separate force, οὐδεῖς (better οὐδεῖς?) is simply 'none'.

A certain number of anomalies may be put down to scribal error. The conjunction ἀλλά is given a paroxytone accent in Alc. 38.7

accentual peculiarities. But to print the Lesbian accents may be thought of as a friendly gesture which would have pleased him greatly. ἡ μεγάλη χάρις δώρω σὸν ὀλίγω.

⁴⁾ NGG 1914, 97ff. = Kl. Schr. 1154ff. Cf. Bechtel, *Die griech. Dial.* i. 8, 67, 69.

⁵⁾ If I had been justified in finding "an occasional Aeolic barytonesis" in the Corinna papyri (C. Q. 20, 1970, 277 n. 4), the implications would be far-reaching. But κάθεκτος, as I noted, is an uncertain case; and in Melici 692 fr. 8.4 [α σόφων[there is nothing against reading ἀσόφων.

⁶⁾ Hamm says „für οὐδεῖς usw. kein Beispiel“: she has overlooked Alc. 129.16.

(overlooked by Hamm 112 n.249), contrary to the usual practice and to the statement of Choeroboscus about *σύνδεσμοι*. *οὐδ'* is doubtful in Alc. 130.3. I can only see arbitrariness in the difference between on the one hand *κᾶσλον* Alc. 48.14, *κᾶτι* 68.4 (unless it was *κᾶτιτον*), *κᾶμ'* 127.4, and on the other *τᾶσλα* 296.7, *πᾶσλον* 69.5, *τᾶπος* 66.4, *κᾶνδρι* Sa. 18.5, *κᾶλ.*[88.16. No sense can be made of]*όλβῶν* Alc. 121.3,]*ισιδώχροι* 132.5,]*νώᾶσεπ*[Sa. 25.3,]*ροτήννεμε*[65.4. *πολύλαιδος* in Alc. P. Colon. inv. 2021 i 9 (R. Merkelbach, *Zeitschr. f. Pap. u. Epigr.* 1, 1967, 83ff.) is incredible, since Aeolic is subject to the ordinary law of limitation: John of Alexandria p. 4 Dindorf (= Herodian i. 8.12 Lentz) cites only *Μήδεϊα* Sa. 186 as an exception to the universal law, justifying it on the ground of the resolved diphthong. (As *Μήδεϊα*, so scanned, cannot have belonged to the spoken language, the accent assigned to it is merely a grammarian's preference anyway.)

Nouns that are long monosyllables are said to be perispomena, and on general principles we might have expected this to be true of *χρη* Alc. 249.6, orthotone *σοι* 261 b i 5⁷), *μή* Sa. 22.6. In the case of *πάν* Sa. 18.1, 62.3 (as against masc. *παῖς*, 44.14), we have it on grammarians' authority that the vowel is short; cf. Hamm 155.

There are other obscurities connected with this root. In Sa. 65.9 *πάντᾱι* is written where we expect *πάντᾱι*. Perhaps the scribe momentarily mistook *πάν* for the neuter. Then in 60 we have]*θέλ'ώντᾱπίσᾱν*, and in 99 ii 13 *εκπᾱίσο*], with a point added above *ά* and *ι* above *ι*. The latter is perhaps to be interpreted as *ἐκ πᾱίσο*δ[λ- ('perish utterly'), the trema not having scansional significance but (as in *τύϊδε* and *δῶδα* to be discussed presently) serving to justify the odd accent—'the word is accented as if trisyllabic'. The incorrect long mark may have been added to counteract the trema—'scan it nevertheless as a disyllable'. That makes two apparent cases of *πᾱίσα*, against one of *παῖσα*, Alc. 357.2. Perhaps this *αι* was not a true diphthong, and the *ισ* in what was written as *παισα* retained the consonantal character of the *ντι* that generated it. If so, we should also write *βᾱίσα*, *δῶσαι*, *Μῶσαι*, etc.

There remain a number of other anomalous paroxytones. *γεγράφ* in Alc. 129.27 need not be counted as such, for it may have been a participle *γεγράφπεν*- like *ἀπαππένα* in the Cologne papyrus of the same poem (see Merkelbach's note, p. 87). *ῥήα* Alc. 34.7 is at best a

⁷) Cf. Ahrens p. 12: "Ceterum quod de nominibus praecipunt, etiam ad reliqua, quae non sunt particulae, extendendum videtur, nec dubitamus Aeoles inter alia *σοι* pronuntiasse, ut etiam vulgo est *οἱ*."

grammarian's decision, since the form is non-vernacular and based on epic *ῥεῖα* (< **ῥῆα* < **ῥᾶα*). The corresponding Aeolic form was *βῥᾶ*, and the accentuation *ῥήα*, if it is not merely scribal, may represent a compromise with the perispomenon.

In Sa. 26.12 the papyrus gives *σν]νόιδα*; Apollonius Dyscolus quotes the passage twice (not for this word), and in both places the manuscript gives *σννόιδα*. Cf. Alc. 75.9 *ἴνοῖδα*. Herodian π. μον. λέξ. 1.24 (ii. 930.18 L.) says that *οἱ περὶ Ἀλκαῖον* scanned *ῥῖδα* as a trisyllable (Alc. fr. 420), and elsewhere (ii. 313.23 = 777.15 = St.Byz. p. 359.9 Meineke) he says the Aeolians used it with the *ι* long. Elsewhere again (i. xviii, from Choer. ii. 110.31) he is reported as saying that they resolved *σννόιδα*; but this is part of an elaborate discussion—very inadequately reproduced in EM 617.52—of the *κοινή* accentuation *σύννοιδα*, the resolution of the simple verb is sufficient for his argument, and the compound may have intruded from the context. When he says that *σύννοιδα* is a pseudo-Aeolic accentuation he does not mean that the Aeolians do not accent it so (resolution ought not to prevent it, on the analogy of *Μήδεῖα*), but that the word is not of Aeolic origin and therefore an Aeolic-style proparoxytone is artificial. He also speaks of Aeolic resolution of *Προΐτου*.

οῖδα is certainly not trisyllabic in the fragments quoted or anywhere else in what survives of the Lesbians. Nor is such a scansion credible: *ῥῖδα* would be as outlandish as *λελόῖπε*. I suspect that Herodian was misled by seeing the word written *οῖδα*, almost exactly as *παῖος* is written *παῖος* in an extant papyrus. A similar trema is written on *τύιδε* at Alc. 142.3, Sa. 5.2, 17.7, 96.2, and the word is never a trisyllable. So it seems that *οῖδα* and *σννοῖδα* were both accented proparoxytone in Lesbian; to be more precise, with an acute on the *ο*, while the *ι* does not bear a falling tone (which would have turned the accent into a circumflex). Now even if the simple verb is *ῥῖδα*, one would still expect the compound to be *σύννοῖδα*. P. Colon. inv. 2021 i 15 gives *κατῆχε* (presumably for *κατῆχε*: a long mark is pointless on an eta), as if the accent did not go back to the prefix, at any rate over the augment; but the same papyrus has *ἐπητόν*, and in others we regularly have *ἐνωρσε*, *ὑπάγον*, etc. I suppose the grammarians who explained *ῥῖδα* as a kind of proparoxytone were thereby precluded from taking the accent further back in a compound; and I suppose they were wrong.

In the case of *τύιδε* one's first instinct is to account for the accent as that of enclitic *δε*, as in Attic *οἶδε*, *ἐνθάδε*, *Μεγαράδε*, *τοιόσδε*, etc. But in those forms the accent of the base-word is such as to allow

the acute to assert itself: *οἷ δε, ἔνθα δε, Μέγαρά δε, τοῖός δε*. When the base-word is perispomenon, the circumflex stands: *τῶνδε, τᾶσδε*. So too in Alcaeus (6.15, 21, 38.12, 70.9, 122.5, 129.11, 185.5). *τῶι* is oxytone in the manuscript of Hesychius, who gives it as Cretan, but in Lesbian it should have been perispomenon, if that was the general rule for long accented monosyllables, and *τῶιδε* should ensue.

Two other anomalous paroxytones must now be added to the list: *Λύδοι* (so written) Alc. 69.1, and *μύθον* 302 ii 15. If we look at the four unexplained cases together, *ῥίδα, τῶιδε, Λύδοι, μύθον*, we observe that they have nothing in common from the point of view of grammatical function, but they have two phonetic features in common. In each case the vowel that is accented acute is a rounded back vowel, and is followed by a dental consonant, with or without an intervening *ι*. Herodian's *Προῖτον* may imply *Πρόιτος* as a fifth case.

What we want to explain is why a high tone on a certain vowel is not sinking in the space that appears to be available. I have suggested that with *πάισα* this happens because the space apparently available is not really so; the *ι* is too mixed up with the *σ* to sound like a pitched vowel. I conjecture that the dentals in the other words have some similar effect, absorbing some of the length of the preceding syllable. The Aeolic tendency to geminate liquids and nasals (even without historical cause; cf. Hamm 36) may be relevant, for the effect is much as if *Λύδοι* had developed into *Λῦδδοι*. But that was not written, and cannot have been felt as the right way to transcribe the sound. In connexion with *ῥίδα* and *τῶιδε* it is also in place to recall the consonantalization of *ι* that takes place between *δ* and following vowel in *ζά, Ζόννυσσος*. The fact that the accented vowels are rounded back vowels in all five words may be fortuitous; but it would not be surprising if *ό* and *ύ* tended naturally to be pitched lower than *έ* or *ί*, with the consequence that a fall of pitch—especially onto an *ι*—might be less noticeable than in a word like *εἶδος*, and more effectively masked in the presence of counteracting factors⁸⁾.

⁸⁾ Cf. also Wackernagel, NGG 1909, 56ff. = Kl. Schr. 1114ff. on traces of a tendency for *ύ* to throw its accent forward.