

- Sommerstein, A.H. (1973) *The Sound Pattern of Ancient Greek*. Publications of the Philological Society XXIII. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thumb, A and Kieckers, E. (1932) *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. Vol. I. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Thumb, A. and Scherer, A. (1959) *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. Vol. 2. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Vennemann, T. and Ladefoged, P. (1973) "Phonetic features and phonological features". *Lingua* 32, 61–74.
- Wang, W. (1968) "Vowel features, paired variables and the English vowel shift". *Language* 44.
- Wheeler, M.W. (1972) "Distinctive features and natural classes in phonological theory". *Journal of Linguistics* 8, 87–102.
- Zwicky, A.M. (1972) "Note on a phonological hierarchy in English". In *Linguistic Change and Generative Theory*, ed. by R.P. Stockwell and R.K.S. Macaulay, 275–301. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

**Homeric Words and Homeric Metre:
two doublets examined (*λείβω/εἰβω, γαῖα/αἶα*)**

By M. W. HASLAM, Los Angeles

Verse is the fit between language and metre. A convenient if rather lopsided view of the relationship is to regard the language as being superimposed on a particular metrical pattern, i.e. as having to meet certain rhythmical conditions; and the concern of metrics may then be said to be the definition and understanding of those conditions. Considerations of, say, word order or word choice are often put under the wider head of stylistics. But in Homer as in no other poet, it has been becoming increasingly apparent over the years, *no* aspect of the language can properly be considered without reference to the metre; this goes for vocabulary, diction, syntax, even morphology. When dealing with Homer, to treat of philological matters in isolation from metrics is absurd: one might as well discuss breathing without mentioning air.

As for the rhythmical conditions obtaining in the hexameter: the metrical scheme to which the language has to be accommodated is $_ \sim _ \sim _ \sim _ \sim _ _$. (I say nothing here of the structure that the pattern acquires in actualization: caesurae, etc., the so-called inner metric.) Here there is a binary opposition between longum and biceps, and the biceps can take monosyllabic or disyllabic form. In this abstract schema every longum is equal in

duration to every other longum, every biceps to every other biceps, every breve to every other breve.¹⁾ Realization of the scheme, however, does not entail such isochrony. For, as has long been known, acoustically irregular intervals are liable to perceptual regularization, in conformity with the conceptual pattern to which in acoustic terms they approximate. Temporal discrepancies are up to a point tolerated, perceptually eliminated, so as to give an illusion of isochrony. Thus the scheme tends to have perceptual as well as conceptual stability, but not acoustic. The limits of tolerance in the Homeric hexameter—for the longum, the breve, and the monosyllabic biceps—are expressed in the prosodial make-up of the verses themselves, and they are fairly well defined. In order to be kept within those limits, the language was subject to various kinds of modification. Chantraine's chapter on the accommodation of words to metre²⁾ (to take a standard treatment of the topic) shows just the tip of the iceberg, surface manifestations of the metrical conditioning that informs the Homeric language in its entirety. In the odd cases where the language is not brought within the normal limits of prosodic tolerance, we are accustomed to talk of 'metrical licence'. 'Linguistic licence', so to term it, is the other side of the same coin, and though the limits are less sharply definable a no more improper concept. Where metrical vs. linguistic conflict is not resolved, the result may be a metrical abnormality or a linguistic abnormality. Whatever form it takes, such a misfit may throw light on the vast, complex and fascinating subject of Homeric versification. Nothing here of Homeric poetry; but verse is its material.

These preliminary remarks may serve as context for the focal arguments of this paper, namely that the words $\epsilon\lambda\beta\omega$ and $\alpha\iota\alpha$ are mutations of $\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\beta\omega$ and $\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha$. Without such a context, the arguments would lose both validity and interest.

*

Leumann, in his *Homerische Wörter*, showed in effect that certain words owe their being to the oral conditions of Homeric performance. Lexical sequences originally understood in one way came to be understood in another, or not to be understood at all, and new

¹⁾ The breve has half the value of the monosyllabic biceps. There is both internal and external evidence that the biceps had a greater value than the longum. (Controversion, to appear in *Class.Phil.* 1976, is promised by A. M. Devine and L. Stephens, *GRBS* 16, 1975, 201 n. 13.)

²⁾ P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*, c. 7.

formations resulted.³⁾ The etymology of such formations is therefore to be sought exclusively within Homer. Oral conditions can of course give rise to new formations in prose as well as in verse, by way of misdivision: Eng. *adder*, E.Gaelic *grá*,⁴⁾ Lat. *ubi*, perhaps Attic-Ionic *ἄν*,⁵⁾ etc. etc. *εἴβω* and *αἶα*, however, I propose were motivated not only under oral conditions but specifically under the conditions of the dactylic hexameter, an ultimate product of what Parry termed 'la puissance créatrice du mètre'. Their etymologies have generally been sought *outside* Homer; and if such searches have failed, that may be because the philological approach has been wrong. If the context is disregarded, there is a danger of losing the baby along with the bathwater.

*

In Homer *εἴβω* means the same as *λείβω*, only is more constricted in function and in position. R. Strömberg, in *Classica et Mediaevalia* 21, 1960, 15–17, suggested that *εἴβω* is nothing but a decapitated *λείβω*. His suggestion was founded on the facts of Homeric usage. This is of more than ordinary philological interest; it is material to the workings of Homeric versification. The presentation I give here was worked out before I knew of Strömberg's article, but effectively it is little more than a reworking of his observations.

λείβω has cognates and an etymology. *εἴβω* is another matter: 'Reimwort zu *λείβω*, sonst dunkel', is Frisk's crisp appraisal. There have been put forward various proposals for the etymology of *εἴβω* which give it either total or partial independence from *λείβω*, but none has won acceptance.⁶⁾ There is in fact no need to look

³⁾ The Alexandrians continued the process, but deliberately. Theocritus' *στήτα* = 'woman', for example, manufactured from a rearticulation of *ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε* (II. 1.6), is pure *παιδιά*.

⁴⁾ *ag ràdh* to *a gràdh*; G. MacLennan, *Celtica* 6, 1963, 250–52.

⁵⁾ Misdivided *οὐ καν* (*οὐ κεν*): K. Forbes, *Glotta* 37, 1958, 179–82 (and independently L. R. Palmer, 'The Language of Homer', in Wace and Stubbings, *Companion to Homer*, 90f.); opposed by D. J. N. Lee, *AJP* 88, 1967, 45–56. I have not seen adduced in support the consideration that a collocation *οὐ + κV* would be exceptionally *liable* to boundary redistribution, since *οὐκ + V* overwhelmingly predominates over *οὐ + κV*. (In the Prendergast-Marzullo *Iliad* concordance I find only five instances of *οὐ + κV*, as against the hundreds of *οὐκ + V*.)

⁶⁾ Proposals which assign the *β* to contamination from *λείβω* construct (1) **εἴκω* from *ικμάς* (on which Chantraine makes the restrained comment,

beyond *λείβω*, in its epic context: the formation of *εἶβω* is sufficiently motivated within Homer.

*λείβω*⁷⁾ is found in several positions in the Homeric hexameter.⁸⁾ More often than not it occupies the final foot, and in this position it is always preceded immediately by *δάκρυα*. *εἶβω* is confined to the final foot;⁹⁾ and it is always preceded immediately by *δάκρυον*. Not all inflexions are available for use, of course: some are metrically excluded. We find *δάκρυα λείβω* and *δάκρυον εἶβω* in the present, in the imperfect (*δάκρυα λείβον/δάκρυον εἶβον* etc.), and in the first pers.sing.masc. present participle. (*εἶβω* exists only in the present paradigm; *λείβω* has aorist too, in non-final positions.) The most serious deficiencies of this formula system, so to call it, are met by a complementary system based on *δάκρυ χέουσα/χέοντα*, which allows feminine and non-first-pers.-sing. masculine participles. Now, a fundamental feature of Homeric composition is its systematic deployment of lexical or semantic equivalents which are metrically differentiated. The coexistence in Homeric verse of *ὑμεῖς* and *ὑμεις*, or of *τοι* and non-copulative *τε*, or of *ἔλαβεν* and *ἔλλαβε* and *ἔλλαβ'* and *λάβεν* and *λάβε* and *ἔλαβ'* and *λάβ'* and *γέντο*, is to be accounted for in functional terms. Expressions which are both metrically and semantically identical tend not to coexist. *δάκρυα λείβω* and *δάκρυον εἶβω* constitute a prima facie violation of this principle, the principle of economy. Each of them both means the

'indémontrable, et pas très probable') or (2) **εἶπω* (Frisk s.v. *τρύγοιπος*). Bourgeaud, *IF* 74, 1969, 139–46, refers *εἶβω* to *ὑγρός*; he does not mention *λείβω*.

It has been suggested to me that I ought to evaluate all previous work done on *εἶβω* and *αἶα* before making the attempt to move on. But I am not 'moving on': I am starting from a different point and going in a different direction.

⁷⁾ From here on I use the word as comprehending its inflexions; so too with *εἶβω*.

⁸⁾ The pres. paradigm forms, six positions: ft. 1, -- and - ∘; ft. 3/4; ft. 4 --; ft. 5 - ∘; ft. 6. *λείψαι* in ft. 3 - ∘, *λείψαντε* ft. 4/5.

⁹⁾ This is not true of *εἶβω*'s one and only compound, *κατείβομαι*, but that is clearly a secondary development. *μυρόμενοι, θαλερόν δὲ κατείβετο δάκρυ παρειῶν* (Il. 24.794; originally one foot further forward, without *παρειῶν*?) is evidently formed on *θαλερόν κατὰ δάκρυον εἶβον*; there are three other occurrences in the same position (*ἄ δειλώ, τί νυ δάκρυ κατείβετον ἠδὲ γυναικί* Od. 21.86, *δακρνώφιν τέρσοντο, κατείβετο δὲ γλυκὺς αἰὼν* Od. 5.152, and . . . *ὀχλειῦνται, τὸ δὲ τ' ὄκα κατειβόμενον κελαρύζει* in a simile at Il. 21.261). Otherwise only in the line *καὶ τὸ κατειβόμενον Στυγὸς ὕδαρ, ὅς τε μέγιστος* (Il. 15.37, Od. 5.185; also H.Ap. 85). Hesiod uses uncompounded *εἶβετο* mid-line (4th ft., *ἔρος εἶβετο*) at *Theog.* 910.

same and scans the same: so how come both of them are in use? The following table at once directs us towards the answer.¹⁰⁾

	Il.	Od.
δάκρυα λειβ-	2 ×	5 × ¹¹⁾
ὑπ' ὀφρύσι ,, ,,	1 ×	1 ×
τέρειν κατὰ δάκρυον εἰβ-	2 ×	1 ×
θαλερόν ,, ,, ,,	1 ×	1 ×
πυκνὸν ὑπ' ὀφρύσι ,, ,,	—	1 ×
ἐλεεινὸν ,, ,, ,, ,,	—	2 ×

στάς ἄρ' ὑπὸ βλωθρῆν ὄγγην κατὰ δάκρυον εἴβεν Od. 24.234

τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἔπειτα πατήρ κατὰ δάκρυον εἴβων Od. 24.280

The singular, *δάκρυον* not *δάκρυα*, which in turn entails *εἴβω* not *λείβω*, is enforced by an adjective at an earlier point in the line. Here we have confirmation, if any were needed, that *δάκρυον εἴβω* is the secondary formation. (There is further confirmation in *δάκρυον*, which is recognized as being a back-formation from *δάκρυα* plural of *δάκρυ*. Was *δάκρυον* born in this very phrase?) Where the choice between *δάκρυα λειβω* and *δάκρυον εἴβω* is not predetermined by a preceding adjective, we have *δάκρυα λειβω*. The two exceptions, it is satisfying to note, both come from the 24th book of the *Odyssey*, a book which is generally agreed to have been composed under different conditions from the bulk of the poem. As well as prettily exemplifying something of the resources of oral composition, the above table might be said in fact to suffice to show the origin of the word *εἴβω*. The poet, once committed by the adjective, found himself confronted by the conflicting claims of language and metre. And metre won out.

If suppression of an initial /l/ is not a familiar linguistic phenomenon, we should view the metre as a factor which changes the rules. It is inevitable that the epic language will behave in radically different sorts of way from a spoken language operating largely without the metrical factor. Nonetheless, it is surely remarkable that a bard should have felt at liberty to treat the language so. In a sense, he here moves outside the language with which and grammatical formations as *δάκρυον* or such prosodical formations as *δέ νέφος*. Such formations are analogical, they work by simple

¹⁰⁾ Here, for comparison, is the complementary system: simple *δάκρυ χέουσα/χέοντα* etc. 10 × Il., 2 × Od.; simple *κατὰ δ.χ.* 2 × Il., not Od.; *τέρειν κατὰ δ.χ.* 1 × Il., not Od.; *θαλερόν κατὰ δ.χ.* 1 × Il., 8 × Od.

¹¹⁾ The figures are exclusive: those given for *δάκρυα λειβ-* do not include those for *ὑπ' ὀφρύσι δάκρυα λειβ-*.

extension: it is not by analogy that we shall motivate *εἶβω*. To indulge in a little fanciful historical reconstruction, let us imagine within which he works. *λείβω* > *εἶβω* is not on a par with such a bard in a world without *εἶβω*. He begins a line, let us say, *κλαῖε δ' ὁ γε λιγέως, θαλερόν κατὰ δάκρυ*—and finds that he cannot avail himself of the *δάκρυ χέουσα/χέοντα* system because he needs a masculine nominative for the participle, and cannot say *δάκρυα λείβων* because he has committed himself to a singular tear. I am not meaning to imply this degree of consciousness, but am tentatively identifying the respective roles played by the two systems available for 'crying', *δάκρυα λείβων* and *δάκρυ χέουσα/χέοντα*, which between them lulled the bard into a false sense of security. The existence of the latter may be seen as responsible for his not being deterred from the singular adjective.

The result in phonetic terms of the singularising of *δάκρυα λείβων* is beyond my competence to specify, but I fancy *δάκρυν λείβων* would come closer to representing it than *δάκρυν εἶβων*. To hypothesise instant decapitation of *λείβω* is to attribute to the executioner an extraordinary degree of independence from his language (vernacular and poetic alike); moreover, if that is what happened, we should expect him to take pains not to get into such a situation again, whereas the fact that *δάκρυν εἶβω* established formulaic status for itself shows that it was not an isolated aberration, like say *μέροπες ἄνθρωποι* or *Ὀδυσσεῦς* genitive, but that no great exception was taken to it. For although *δάκρυα λείβω* is always preferred when the choice is open (Od. 24 apart), there is no aversion to *δάκρυν εἶβω* when it serves. It seems likely to me that *δάκρυν εἶβω* started life as **δάκρυν λείβω* and only later (I do not propose to say absolutely when, but relatively early) had its prosody ironed out by the only expedient available. Support for the notion that *δάκρυν λείβω* may not have been felt originally as an unduly serious perturbation of the rhythm is perhaps to be found in *ἀνδροτήτα*, where too a short vowel before nasal + liquid (the *δ* being a glide) is allowed to occupy a short element.¹²) The prosody of *ἀνδροτήτα*

¹²) *δν πότμον γούωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτήτα καὶ ἦβην* 2 × Π., and *Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτήτά τε καὶ μένος ἦύ* 1 × Π. The possibility of vocalic *r* (**anr̥tata*: H. Mühlestein, *Athen. N.S.* 36, 1958, 361–65) does not explain why *ἀνδρ-* is tolerated only with *ἀνδροτήτα* and (probably) *ἀνδριφόντη*; nothing but metrical necessity will account for this. Similarly *νῶξ ἀ(μ)βρότη* (but this a nonce displacement), *ἀ(μ)βροτάξομεν*. In all these cases, however, (i) there is no word juncture, and (ii) /l/ is not /r/. I do not adduce *Ἀχιλλεύς* > *Ἀχιλεῦς* because that may be by analogy with *ἔλαβε/ἔλλαβε*-type variability.

is abnormal: the first syllable of *ἄνδρες*, in all cases, is without exception long; *ἄνδροτῆτα* is in the hexameter only on sufferance, but it *is* in the hexameter: the prosody was not sufficiently abnormal to exclude it. So it was, I suggest, with *δάκρυον λείβω*, until it underwent metrical normalization and gave birth to *εἴβω*. The metre must prevail, even when it wreaks philological havoc.

*

A pair of words remarkably comparable to *λείβω* and *εἴβω* is *γαῖα* and *αἶα*. *αἶα* behaves in relation to *γαῖα* in just the same way that *εἴβω* behaves in relation to *λείβω*, and its genesis may be similarly accounted for. *αἶα* has no cognates, no derivatives; and there is no evidence for its existence prior to Homer. *γαῖα* has multitudinous cognates, and some of its compounds may well be older than Homer. The antiquity of *ἐννοσίγαιος*, of *γαιήοχος* and of *Γαῖήϊος* was recognized even before the decipherment of Linear B. Attempts have been made, predictably enough, to make *γαῖα* a conflation of *γῆ* and *αἶα*, even though such a derivation means reversing the apparent historical priority of *γαῖα* over both *γῆ* and *αἶα*.¹³) In his *Dictionnaire Etymologique* s.v. *αἶα* Chantraine, after rejecting the alternative etymologies, is attracted by the proposed connexion of *αἶα* with *γαῖα*—but feels obliged to discard the idea that *αἶα* might be an ‘artificial form’: ‘Enfin le fait que le mot s’emploie chez Homère dans certaines conditions métriques doit prouver qu’il est un archaïsme (plutôt qu’une forme artificielle). Ces données ne permettent pas d’établir l’étymologie.’ Now this argument exemplifies the ‘operational principle’ recently enunciated by Householder and Nagy, ‘the narrower the range of positional variation . . ., the greater the archaism involved’.¹⁴) The principle is valid, but not in such wide terms. No word has a narrower range

¹³) Cf. Chantraine, *Dict. Etym.* s.v. *γῆ*, ‘On a supposé que *γαῖα* était une contamination de *γῆ* avec *αἶα* et *μαῖα*’. Mette in *Lex. d. frühgr. Epos* s.v. *αἶα* reports Walde-Pokorny, ‘vielleicht die ‘Urmutter’ (Erde), verselbstständigt aus *γῆ* **ǵfja*, das in historischer Zeit nur noch als *γαῖα* begegnet’; on this Risch had commented, ‘Dafür, daß gr. *αἶα* ‘Erde’ auf *ǵfja* zurückgeht und ursprünglich ‘Großmutter’ bedeutet, fehlt jeder Beweis’ (*Mus. Helv.* 1, 1944, 120 n. 10). V. T. Georgiev, *Philol.* 118, 1974, 272, refers *αἶα* to **sawsyā*; he ignores the collocational facts of Homeric usage. On *γῆ* and *γαῖα* see B. Čop, *KZ* 85, 1971, 23f.: he proposes a common derivation for them, and rejects cross-influence of *αἶα* on *γαῖα*.

¹⁴) F. W. Householder and G. Nagy, *Greek, A Survey of Recent Work* (1972), 45.

of positional variation than, say, *προσώπατα*. We must distinguish between frozen archaisms on the one hand, and on the other, innovations which do not stray beyond the bounds of the particular circumstances that engendered them. Usually this is not difficult to do, and there seems little room for reasonable doubt that *αἶα*, no less than *εἶβω*, belongs in the latter category.

The following table may be the best way of setting out the more salient details of the distributional and collocational evidence regarding *γαῖα* and *αἶα* in Homer.

		Non-final	Final
<i>γαῖα</i> (nom.)	Il.	16	4
	Od.	11	0
		<u>27</u>	<u>4</u>
		(5 positns.)	
<i>γαῖαν</i>	Il.	19	25, of which 16 <i>πατρίδα γαῖαν</i>
	Od.	56	55, ,, ,, 43 ,, ,,
		<u>75</u>	<u>80</u> <u>59</u>
		(5 positns.) ¹⁵⁾	
<i>γαίης</i>	Il.	12	10
	Od.	31	18
		<u>43</u>	<u>28</u>
		(5 positns.)	
<i>γαίηι</i>	Il.	9	18, of which 3 <i>πατρίδι γαίηι</i>
	Od.	9	11, ,, ,, 4 ,, ,,
		<u>18</u>	<u>29</u> <u>7</u>
		(7 positns.)	
<i>γαῖάων</i>	Il.	0	0
	Od.	3	0
Total no. of occurrences:		307	Total no. of positions: 11
<i>αἶα</i> (nom.)	Il.	0	1
	Od.	0	1
<i>αἶαν</i>	Il.	0	7, of which 5 <i>πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν</i>
	Od.	0	1, <i>πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν</i>

¹⁵⁾ It has nothing to do with my argument, but is it noteworthy that eighteen instances of *γαῖαν* in the *Odyssey* (nearly a third of the *Odyssey* non-final occurrences) are in the third foot, *none* in the *Iliad*.

Two doublets examined (*λείβω/εἴβω, γαῖα/αῖα*)

209

<i>αῖης</i>	Π.	0	7, of which	6	<i>πατρίδος αῖης</i>
	Od.	0	13, ,, ,,	11	,, ,,
			<u>20</u>	<u>17</u>	

[*αῖη* void]

Total no. of occurrences: 30

Total no. of positions: 1

αῖα,¹⁶) like *εἴβω*, is confined to the final foot: this in strong contrast to *γαῖα*, which has a mobility surpassed by few nouns in Homer.¹⁷) Where *γαῖα* and *αῖα* are metrically indifferent, *γαῖα* is invariably preferred. As well as the absolute inhibition against moving *αῖα*, there is a fairly powerful one against employing it in other than the set phrases *πατρίδος αῖης* and *πᾶσαν ἐπ' αῖαν*. *πατρίδος αῖης* accounts for over half the occurrences of the word.¹⁸)

Far and away the most frequent collocation involving *γαῖα* is *πατρίδα γαῖαν*, and far and away the most frequent place for this collocation is at line end. *πατρίδα γαῖαν* is the accusative member of a group of formulae with the shape - υυ - υ and the meaning 'homeland'. The nominative, rather than the spondaic *πατρίς γαῖα*, becomes *πατρίς ἄρουρα*; the dative presents no problem, *πατρίδι γαίη*;—but the genitive? Did the poet really have recourse to a pre-existent word *αῖα*, which conveniently happened to have the same meaning as *γαῖα*? It seems intrinsically unlikely, and if it is true, why did he not avail himself of it in other places, where it would undeniably have come in useful? It seems to me an incom-

¹⁶) I use *αῖα* as comprehending its inflexions; so too with *γαῖα*.

¹⁷) The final foot is by far the most favoured single position for *γαῖα*, but non-final occurrences outnumber final.

¹⁸) The two nominatives occur in the phrase *φυσίζοος αῖα* (held to be a secondary formation by G. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer*², 190). Of the two accusatives not in the collocation *πᾶσαν ἐπ' αῖαν*, one, *ἕδωρ ἐπικίδναται αῖαν* (Π. 2.850, *αῖη*, *αῖης* clearly inferior vv. ll.), is apparently based on the formulaic 'sun-rise' line, *Ἥως μὲν/δὲ κροκόπεπλος ἐκίδνατο πᾶσαν ἐπ' αῖαν*, the other is *νόσφιν ἐφ' ἱπποπόλων Θρηγκῶν καθορώμενος αῖαν* (Π. 13.4, in the *Διὸς ἀπατή*). There remain three genitives: one in a suspect line at the beginning of the *Odyssey*, *δαιμόν' ἄν ἠβήσῃ καὶ* (v.l. *τε καὶ*) *ἧς ἰμείρεται* (v.l. *ἐπιβήσεται*) *αῖης* (Od. 1.41), one in the last line (a late addition?) of a speech, *Ἰθάκης γε καὶ ἐς Τροίην ὄνομ' ἵκει, | τὴν περ τηλοῦ φασιν Ἀχαιῖδος ἐμμέναι αῖης* (Od. 13.249), and the third at Π. 23.327, *ὄσον τ' ὄργυι' ὑπὲρ αῖης* with a v.l. *ἐνὶ γαίη*. Hesiodic usage too confines *αῖα* to line-end (assuming Lehrs' alteration of *εἰς αῖαν* to *ἐς γαῖαν* in fr. 151 M-W to be correct), but *πατρίδος αῖης* does not have the same predominance. *πατρίδος αῖης* once or twice (fr. 89.3 M-W, fr. 244.3 M-W), *ἐπ' αῖαν Op.* 125 = 255, *ἐν Ἀσ[ί]δι ἔτραφεν αῖη* fr. 165. 11 M-W; *μελαίνη πόθεται αῖη Scut.* 153. In the *Cypria*, *βαθυστέρνου πλάτος αῖης* (F 1.2 p. 20 Kinkel).

parably more plausible hypothesis that the normal prosodical requirements yielded a little under pressure from the model *πατρίδα γαίαν*, so as to allow *πατρίδος γαίης*. The epic verse is not generally so tolerant, and I cannot adduce parallels less dubious than \sim *Σκάμανδρος* and \sim *σκέπαρον* (though with these cords too it is a matter of sufferance: with normal prosody, they could not be admitted); but the formulaic pressure would be unusually intense. It would be outrageous to derive *αἶα* from *γαῖα tout court*;¹⁹⁾ but in deriving *πατρίδος αἶης* from *πατρίδα γαῖαν* I am merely following the indications of the Homeric evidence. Once *πατρίδος αἶης* had come into existence, *αἶα* was then a word in its own right—with nothing like the freedom of *γαῖα*, to be sure, but with sufficient autonomy to admit the formation of the unimpeachably formulaic *πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν*.²⁰⁾

*

The hypothesis of **δάκρον λείβω* and of **πατρίδος γαίης* involves exceptional metrical tolerance,²¹⁾ and the hypothesis of the reduction of *λείβω* to *εἶβω* and of *γαῖα* to *αἶα* involves exceptional linguistic tolerance. In explanation we can and indeed must point to the exceptional circumstances obtaining. Such things could happen only under heavily formulaic conditions. *εἶβω* would never have been perpetrated if it had not been for *δάκρονα λείβων* and *δάκρον χέοντα*, *αἶα* would never have been perpetrated if it had not been for *πατρίδα γαῖαν*.²²⁾ What is in evidence here is the generative

¹⁹⁾ *αἶα ἢ γῆ, παρὰ τὸ γαῖα, ἀποβολῆ τοῦ γ̄*: Et.Gen. 13 = Et.Mag. 27.8 = Et.Sym. a 226. Where I hope to have improved on the philological respectability of this 'etymology' is in motivating the *ἀποβολή*. (From a phonological point of view, *πατρίδο γαίης* would have been an easier modification; but retention of the /s/ was evidently essential as a determinant of the inflexion) Similarly with *δάκρον εἶβω* × *δάκρον λείβω*.

²⁰⁾ Though it is perhaps more than merely curious that *πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν* does not come in the *Odyssey*, except once in bk. 24. The *Odyssey* (apart from that instance) has *αἶα* only after sigma.

²¹⁾ If the hypothesis is accepted, it may have implications for such developments as *μελιθέα οἶνον* → *μελιθέος οἶνον*. It is always assumed (reasonably enough, it must be admitted) that the latter phrase was formed only after the digamma was lost from pronunciation.

²²⁾ It is notable that it is the 'adonic' section of the line that is involved in both cases, and the same point in it. It is many years since Witte elaborated the significance of this part of the line: he drew especial attention to its proneness to 'Neubildungen und ungewöhnlichen Wendungen', and specifically noted the secondary character of *πατρίδος αἶης* in relation to *πατρίδα γαῖαν* (*Glotta* 3, 1912, 110–17, cf. *Glotta* 4, 1913, 5, and *RE* VIII 2244f.).

potency of the formulaic diction operating under the conditions of the epic hexameter. The dynamics are formula and metre in interplay.²³⁾

Ἀργεῖφόντης

VON HERMANN KOLLER, Zürich

Das Beiwort des Gottes Hermes, ἀργεῖφόντης, ist nur am Ende von Formelversen bei Homer anzutreffen¹⁾. Es wird als „Argostöter“ gedeutet, offenbar weil -φόνος im Hinterglied anklingt. Im Mythos findet diese Deutung jedoch keinen Rückhalt. Zudem lassen weder die Form des Vordergliedes noch die Gestalt des Hintergliedes diese Deutung zu. Sollte es sich nämlich um ein Nomen agentis auf -της handeln, so müßte es -θέν-της heißen²⁾. Das Vorderglied aber kann wohl nur als Dativ des os-Neutrums *ἄργος/-ες aufgefaßt werden. Im Vorderglied eines echten Kompositums aber ist ein Dativ undenkbar. Sofern ἀργεῖφόντης eine griechische Bildung ist, kann es folglich 1. kein Nomen agentis, 2. kein echtes Kompositum sein.

Bei Homer finden sich drei Eigennamen, die ebenfalls auf -φόντης ausgehen, deren Vorderglied aber den Kompositionsregeln des Griechischen entspricht:

1. Λυκοφόντης, Θ 275: Δαίτορά τε Χρόμιόν τε καὶ ἀντίθεον Λυκοφόντην;
2. Πολυφόντης, Δ 395: υἱός τ' Ἀδοφόνιοι μινεπτόλεμος Πολυφόντης;
3. Βελλεροφόντης, siebenmal im Z in der bekannten Proitosepisode, davon sechsmal am Versende, einmal, Z 220, am Versanfang. Dieser Name kann ebenfalls nicht recht gedeutet werden, denn daß Βελλεροφόντης einen Belleros getötet hätte, wird nur aus dem Namen herausgelesen, ist aber aus dem Mythos nicht bekannt.

Außerhalb des Epos sind Namen auf -φόντης nicht gebräuchlich. Es lassen sich nur drei solche Namen nennen, Κρεσφόντης, Ἀριστοφόντης und Κλεοφόντης³⁾, wobei der erste einen Heroen bezeichnet, der zweite nur bei Plautus, Captivi, passim erwähnt wird und Κλεοφόντης nur im Etymologicum Magnum vorkommt⁴⁾. Ἀριστοφόντης und Κλεοφόντης erscheinen aber normalerweise in der Form

²³⁾ I am very grateful to Mr J. T. Hooker and Mr P. Considine for subjecting this paper to a philological scrutiny more rigorous than I am capable of. They are not responsible for any remaining inanities.

¹⁾ Abgesehen von einer Stelle im jungen homerischen Hymnus 29, 7.

²⁾ Vgl. L. fg. E. Mader, s. v. ἄ. ³⁾ Tragödientitel bei Euripides.

⁴⁾ Es ist natürlich auch denkbar, daß Eigennamen auf -φόντης schon mykenisch wären. Nach Ventris-Chadwick, Documents 94f. und Heubeck,