- 44
- (3) as an object of some activity of a verb where a person affects his own νόος. (Accusative after a verb; cf. one instance of the objective genitive: καρτερὸς νόου.)
- (4) as an entity qualified by certain characteristics. (Epithets with $\nu\delta\sigma$ especially with a copulative verb.)
- (5) as an active agent acting within the person. (Subjective genitive and nominative.)

As in Homer $v \acute{o} c c$ can act as a location, instrument, or accompaniment in, by, or with which a person acts. Here person and $v \acute{o} c c c$ cooperate in performing some activity; there is harmony between them. This relationship is more common in the lyric poets, especially in Pindar, than it was in Homer.

On other occasions $v \delta o \varsigma$ can act independently within a person but in Hesiod and the lyric poets a person's control over it appears increased. $N \delta o \varsigma$ does not seem to be a psychic organ that he addresses directly (evidence provides no instance of the vocative of $v \delta o \varsigma$) but he can direct the way $v \delta o \varsigma$ functions and the manner in which it manifests itself.

The epithets with $v\acute{o}o\varsigma$ both reveal its characteristics and its important role as a locus of a person's qualities. This role may in some degree explain the most common occurrence of $v\acute{o}o\varsigma$ in Hesiod and the lyric poets: as an object to be affected, grasped, or known. $N\acute{o}o\varsigma$ is a psychic organ accustomed to be hidden from others 30). Most information about a person is found if his $v\acute{o}o\varsigma$ is known; likewise, if $v\acute{o}o\varsigma$ is influenced, the person himself is also most keenly affected. Person and $v\acute{o}o\varsigma$ remain distinct but the importance of $v\acute{o}o\varsigma$ is recognised. This may account for the frequent outside influence upon $v\acute{o}o\varsigma$ and also the greater control a person exerts over $v\acute{o}o\varsigma$ in Hesiod and the lyric poets.

A Homeric Note

By SARA E. KIMBALL, Philadelphia

Iterative preterits are made by the addition of the thematic suffix $-\sigma\kappa\epsilon/o$ and secondary endings to full agrist or present verbal stems e.g. δό-σκον, ὤσα-σκε φύγε-σκον, φιλέε-σκον and ἰσχανάα-σκον. Iterative preterits derived from verbs in $-\epsilon\omega$ and $-\epsilon\omega$ take one of two shapes. After heavy

³⁰) See, e.g., Scol. 889, Theog. 121–128, 499–502, 897–900. See also Darcus (note 12).

stem syllables one finds -εσκ and -ασκ e.g. πωλέσκετο and νἴκάσκομεν. After light stem syllables one finds -εεσκ and -αασκ e.g. φιλέεσκε and ἰσχανάασκον. The origin of iterative preterits in -εσκ is not easily explainable. Forms such as καλέσκετο which are derived from verbs in -έω with stems that are thematized disyllabic roots (in this case, καλε-), may have provided one model for the development of iterative preterits in -εσκ. Another model may have been provided by iterative preterits in -ασκ.

In early Greek hexameter poetry¹), there is a group of verbs known as Ionic iterative preterits. They consist of a full verbal stem (present or aorist), plus the thematic suffix $-\sigma \varkappa \varepsilon/o$ plus secondary endings. The thematic vowel $-\varepsilon$ - is retained before the suffix in forms derived from thematic verbs. Forms such as the following are found:

ϊστασχ'	au 574	${ m ef.}$ ἵστη μ ι, ἱστ $ ilde{a}$ σι
φεύγεσκεν	P 461	${ m cf.}~~ oldsymbol{arphi} arepsilon arphi oldsymbol{\omega}$
δόσκον	I 331	cf. ἔδωκα, ἔδοσαν
φύγεσκε	ϱ 316	${ m cf.}$ ě $\phi v \gamma o v$
ὤσασκε	λ 599	${ m cf.}~~ar{\phi}\sigma a$

Iterative preterits derived from presents in $-\epsilon\omega$ may take one of two shapes. On the one hand, those derived from presents with "light" stem syllables²) have expected $-\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\varkappa$ - from *- $\epsilon\iota\epsilon\sigma\varkappa$. For example, one finds forms such as the following:

φιλέεσκε	Z 15	cf. φιλέω
φορέεσκε	N~372	cf. φορέω

Forms made from presents in $-\epsilon \omega$ with heavy stem syllables on the other hand, have $-\epsilon$ - before the suffix. For example:

πωλέσκετο	A 490	cf. πωλέομαι
ἀν tνεσκον	ρ 294	cf. ἀγινέω

¹⁾ This paper is a revision of a short section from my senior honors thesis. I would like to thank my advisor Jay Jasanoff, for his advice and encouragement. Responsibility for errors which may appear in this paper, or in my thesis is, of course, solely mine.

[&]quot;Early Greek hexameter poetry" refers to; the "Iliad" the "Odyssey", the poems of Hesiod, and the Homeric Hymns. The only other major source of iterative preterits is the prose of Herodotus.

²) A heavy syllable is one which contains a long vowel and one consonant (ie. $\overline{V}C$) or a short vowel and two consonants (ie. $\overline{V}CC$). A light syllable contains a short vowel and one consonant, (ie. $\overline{V}C$).

46

Similarly, iterative preterits derived from presents in $-\dot{\alpha}\omega$ with heavy stem syllables have $-\alpha$ - before the suffix. For example:

```
νικάσκομεν λ 512 cf. νικάω σύλασκε Hes. "Shield" 480 cf. συλάω
```

Forms from verbs in $-\dot{a}\omega$ with light stem syllables however, have -aa- before the suffix³). For example:

```
περάασκε ε 480 = \tau \, 442 cf. περάω \log \alpha ατάασκον O \, 723 cf. \log \alpha
```

The expected shape of all iterative preterits from presents in -άω is -ασκ however, from *-αεσκ (via contraction), ultimately from *-αεσκ.

The distribution of -εσμ and -ασμ after heavy syllables vs. -εεσμ and -αασμ after light syllables is the result of metrical conditioning 4). Forms of the shape $_{---}$ e.g. *πωλέξσμετο or *ν̄ιμάασκομεν, are impossible to use in hexameter. Confirmation that forms with -εσμ are poetic only and are not representative of Ionic speech may be found in Herodotus, who attests for example 5) ποιέεσκον (IV 78, I 36 cf. ποιέω. *Ποίεσμον would be the expected poetic form), and πωλέεσμον (I 196 cf. πωλέω and Hom. πωλέσμετο).

Forms in -αασκ such as ἰσχανάασκον may be explained as the results of "distraction" 6). Forms in -εεσκ such as φιλέεσκε are simply uncontracted 7). It is forms in -εσκ such as ἀγ ῖνέσκον which are not easily explainable.

A verb which belongs synchronically, if not diachronically with the iterative preterits derived from presents in $-\epsilon\omega$ is $\varkappa a\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \varepsilon \sigma \varkappa \varepsilon$ (Z 402, $\varkappa a\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \varepsilon \sigma \varkappa \varepsilon \sigma$, I 562) or, as it appears in O 338, $\varkappa a\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \varkappa \varepsilon \tau \sigma$. In this case, $\varkappa a\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \varkappa \varepsilon \tau \sigma$, with a single $-\varepsilon$ - before the suffix, is the expected form, since this verb is derived from $\varkappa a\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ which has a stem $\varkappa a\lambda \varepsilon$ -, a thematization of a "disyllabic" root, $\varkappa a\lambda \varepsilon$ -.

It is possible that forms such as $\varkappa \alpha \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \varkappa \epsilon \tau o$, which are the result of regular phonetic development, provided models for the analogical and poetic creation of iterative preterits in $-\epsilon \sigma \varkappa$, from verbs in $-\epsilon \omega$ with heavy stem syllables. The model of the iterative preterits in "undistracted" $-\alpha \sigma \varkappa$ probably also contributed to their formation.

³⁾ An exception is $\gamma \acute{o} \alpha \sigma \varkappa \varepsilon \nu$ "Hymn to Aphrodite" 209 and 216 (Θ 92 $\gamma o \acute{a} \alpha \sigma \varkappa \varepsilon \nu$).

⁴⁾ See Chantraine, Grammaire homérique p. 31

⁵) Herodotus attests no iterative preterits from verbs in $-\dot{\alpha}\omega$.

⁶⁾ See Chantraine, Grammaire homérique p. 356.

⁷⁾ See Chantraine, Grammaire homérique p. 39.