Aristotle, Homer owed his popularity to the fact that he, by his brilliant use of metaphors, could speak about inanimate things as if they were alive, thus creating an actuality (ἐνέργεια, *Rhetoric* 1411 b31–1412a10).

For Aristotle, metaphor can only function in the context of linguistic interaction: metaphors which are not understood are not functional (*Rhetoric* 1405a34–37, 1406b5–19), whereas the functioning metaphor conveys knowledge and (its own) truth (*Rhetoric* 1410b13–15, 26–27; 1412a19–22).

In this article, I have tried to avoid any overhasty characterisation of Aristotle's theory of metaphor; rather, I have tried to analyse how Aristotle describes the functioning of metaphorical speech. To some scholars, Aristotle's theory of metaphor may seem too less formalised, or incomplete, but one must take into account that it was Aristotle's intention to understand metaphorical communication within its broader cognitive and even ontological context. Within such a view, metaphor cannot be reduced to an algebraic formula, or to a mere substitution of terms; rather, Aristotle has attempted to put before our eyes how he *saw* metaphor and its relation to dianoetic (re)cognition.

Ionic ὀνονημένα

By Donald A. Ringe, Jr., Annandale-on-Hudson (USA)

In 1924 Albert Rehm unearthed on Samos an inscription recording a dedication made at the Samian Heraion by two Perinthian colonists; in 1953 this was finally published by Günther Klaffenbach ("Archaische Weihinschrift aus Samos", *Deutsche Mitteilungen* 6, pp. 15–20). It appears in *SEG* XII (1955) as no. 391. Klaffenbach's text reads as follows:

[. .]νίσκος Ξ[εν|ο]δόκο, Δῆμι[ς|Π]υθοκλέος ο|[ἱ]κήι{ηι}οι (?) Περ[ί]||⁵ν-
θιοι τῆι Ἥρ|ηι ἀνέθεσαν| δεκάτην ἔρ|δοντες γορ|γύρην χρυσῆ||¹⁰ν,
σερῆνα ἀργ|ύρεον, φιάλη|ν ἀργυρῆν, λυ|χνίην χαλκῆ|ν ὀνονημένα ||¹⁵
σύνπαντα δ|[ι]ηκοσίων δυ|ωδέκων στατ|ήρων Σαμίω|ν σὺν τῶι λίθω[ι].

quand ils signifient les choses en acte", and by J.H. Freese, *Aristotle: The "Art" of Rhetoric* (Cambridge-London 1975) 405: "I mean that things are set before the eyes by words that signify actuality".

46   Donald A. Ringe

Lilian Jeffery tentatively dates this inscription to about 525
B.C. (*Local Scripts*, p. 371, no. 35).[1])

There has been considerable discussion of the reading and
meaning of ο|[ἴ]κή{ηι}οι (ll. 3–4);[2]) surprisingly, ὀνονημένα (l. 14)
has been little discussed. Evidently this participle means 'bought'
(Klaffenbach, op. cit. p. 20), as the last phrases of the dedication
can only mean 'all together bought for two hundred twelve Samian
staters, including the stone'; presumably it is a perfect passive par-
ticiple to ὠνέομαι 'buy'.[3]) But in that case ὀνονημένα exhibits two
unexpected formal peculiarities: the reduplication is not of the
type expected for this verb, and we find ο's instead of the ω that
we expect to find in the root. I will first discuss the root vowel,
then deal with the reduplication.

To begin with, Klaffenbach's readings appear to be correct. The
inscription is cut in typical Samian letters (Jeffery, op. cit. p. 365);
ο and ω are easily distinguishable from one another, and the ex-
cellent photograph (Plate 3) that accompanies Klaffenbach's
article shows clearly that ὀνονημένα contains two ο's and no ω.
Moreover, ο is not likely to be a possible alternative spelling for
the vowel usually spelled ω; the uses of the two symbols had
become fixed in Asiatic Ionic writing early in the sixth century
B. C. (Jeffery, op. cit. p. 38), and this text uses ω for [ọ̄] consist-
ently (there are several examples in the last four lines). The drafter
or stonecutter might have made a mistake (as suggested by Klaffen-
bach, op. cit. p. 20), but the assumption of an error should be the
hypothesis of last resort; it seems less risky to accept the ο's as
real and try to explain them.

---

[1]) This paper is a revised and expanded version of pages 81–5 of my Yale
Ph. D. dissertation, *The Perfect Tenses in Greek Inscriptions* (1984); I am
grateful to Warren Cowgill for much helpful criticism and comment on the
early drafts of it. An intermediate version constituted the bulk of a thirty-
minute paper, "Two Unusual Reduplications", presented at the 115th
Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association (Cincinnati,
December 30, 1983); for enlightening discussion of that paper I am indebted
to Calvert Watkins, Alan Nussbaum, Gregory Nagy, and Warren Cowgill.
All remaining errors and infelicities are of course my own.

[2]) See Guarducci, "Un' antica offerta alla Era di Samo", *Studi Calderini
e Paribeni*, Vol. I, pp. 23–7; Jeffery, *Local Scripts*, p. 365, fn. 4; Graham,
"*ΟΙΚΗΙΟΙ ΠΕΡΙΝΘΙΟΙ*", *JHS* 84 (1964), pp. 73–5.

[3]) A perfect passive participle to ὀνίνημι 'benefit', though formally less
difficult, is semantically out of the question. Note that a perfect to ὀνίνημι
is nowhere attested.

Klaffenbach's own explanation (loc. cit.) can be rejected at once.
He suggests that if the second *o* is not merely an error it is the
result of assimilation to the first; that is, an original *ὀνωνημένα
(with Attic reduplication) has become ὀνῶνημένα by the raising of
*ω to ō under the influence of the preceding ŏ. Such an assimi-
lation of a long vowel to a non-adjacent short vowel is unparalleled
elsewhere in Greek; in addition, the occurrence of ω in the other
tenses of ὠνέομαι should have prevented the change by para-
digmatic analogy.

Eduard Schwyzer suggests that ὀνονημένα is an Aiolism in
Perinthian Ionic (*Griechische Grammatik*, Vol. I, p. 86), citing it in
connection with Lesbian Aiolic ὄννα 'contract' (op. cit. p. 283; the
Aiolic form occurs twice in a treaty, *IG* XII *Supplementum* 136.b.17,
21; see also Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte*, Vol. I, pp. 37, 59,
who mistranslates 'Verkauf'). Anton Scherer (in Thumb-Scherer,
Handbuch, Vol. II, p. 280) gives the same explanation more fully:
the form should be interpreted as ὀνον(ν)ημένα, the perfect passive
participle of a verb *ὀννέομαι or the like; this verb, with -νν- as in
ὄννα, reflects Aiolic influence on Perinthian Ionic. Initially this
seems attractive, especially since the genitive plural ending of
δυ|ωδέκων (ll. 16–7) is an obvious Aiolism. On the other hand, all
the certain Aiolisms in Ionic dialect inscriptions are either in-
flectional endings or proper nouns (Thumb-Scherer, op. cit. pp. 263,
282–3), which can easily be borrowed from one dialect into another.
That Aiolic influence could have changed the shape of a basic
Ionic verb is much less credible.

A better explanation will depend on an investigation of the
etymology of these words. Since Attic-Ionic ω is not the usual
result of the compensatory lengthening of Proto-Greek *o, it appears
that ὠνέομαι 'buy', ὦνος 'price', ὠνή 'sale, contract', etc. reflect a
preform *wōsn-. But long vowels are not shortened before the
-νν- that results from pre-Greek *-sn- and *-ns- in Aiolic (cf. μῆννος
'of a month' < *mēnsós), so that a preform *wōsná could only
give Lesbian Aiolic *ὦννα. Conversely, the preform *wosn- that
ὄννα apparently reflects should give *ὄν-, not ὦν-, in Attic-Ionic
(cf. ε̄ in Homeric φαεινός 'shining' < *phawesnós and ō in Attic
οὐρά 'tail' < *orsá). Thus the forms of the two dialects do not
seem to permit a unitary Proto-Greek reconstruction.[4])

---

[4]) Either preform will account for the Cretan cognates, e.g. Gortyn Laws
V. 47 ὀνῆν, VI. 4 ὀνἔθθαι, IX. 7 ὀνάν, since all long o-vowels fell together in
Cretan.

48   Donald A. Ringe

A straightforward phonological solution to this problem was
first suggested by Paul Kretschmer ("Zur griechischen Wortkunde",
Wiener Eranos, pp. 123–4), argued for by Eduard Hermann (*Silben-
bildung*, pp. 48–9), and accepted by Émile Boisacq (*Dictionnaire
étymologique*, s. vv. ὦμος and ὦνος), Carl D. Buck (*The Greek Dialects*,
p. 30), and Hjalmar Frisk (*Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*,
Lieferung 22 (1970), s. vv. ὦμος and ὦνος). These scholars maintain
that while the usual Attic-Ionic result of the compensatory lengthen-
ing of Proto-Greek *o was ō, in the sequences *osn and *oms (and
presumably *ons and *osm, though clear examples are lacking)
*o was lengthened to ω when the consonant cluster was reduced
to a simple nasal. The arguments in favor of this view are the
following:

1. there are three apparently good examples of the proposed sound
   change, namely ὠνή 'sale, contract' and its kin (cf. Lesbian
   Aiolic ὄννα < *wosnā), ὦμος 'shoulder' (cf. Sanskrit áṃsas, etc.),
   and Homeric Διώνυσος (cf. Lesbian Ζόννυσος, plausibly from
   *ΔιϜόσ-νυσος 'X of Zeus');

2. there are no clear counterexamples;

3. this is by far the easiest solution that will account for the relevant
   Attic-Ionic and Aiolic forms.

The value of the latter two arguments is of course only relative;
they can be used to support the first only if it is independently
valid. Unfortunately none of the examples of the putative sound
change is secure, as I shall briefly demonstrate.

The weakest case is that of Διώνυσος. This divine name appears
in the following shapes:

Homeric Διώνυσος (Iliad 3 ×; Odyssey 1 ×, ω 74; Hymns 2 ×;
    also in later poetry);

Ionic Δεύνυσος (Anakreon 12.11 and 20.2 Page, emended to Δεό-
    νυσος in both passages by Page);

Amorgian Ionic Διενύσω⟨ι⟩ (*IG* XII–7.78.1, from Arkesine; first half
    of the fifth century B.C., Jeffery, *Local Scripts*, p.304, no.22);

Lesbian Aiolic Ζόννυσσον (Alkaios G 1.9 Lobel and Page) and Ζοννύσω
    IG XII–2.69 and 70, 3 × altogether; all from Mytilene, second
    century A.D.);

Pelasgiote Thessalian *Διόννυσος, inferrable from the derivative
    human name Διοννύσοι, i.e. Διοννσίου (*IG* IX–2.1228.74, Pha-
    lanna, third century B.C.);

Boiotian Διών(ο)υσος (more than half a dozen times in *IG* VII);

Διόννσος, the usual form in Attic-Ionic (Odyssey 1 ×, λ 325; Hymns 4 ×, etc.);

late koine Διννσῳ (*IG* XII *Supplementum* 32.3–4, Mytilene, second or third century A. D.).

The last form listed probably exhibits the late Greek change of *ιο* to *ι*; the Aiolic forms (including the Boiotian) do seem to reflect an earlier *Διόννσος, with -νν- possibly (though not certainly) from *-sn-. But the variations in the form of the name within Attic-Ionic are not the result of sound changes; it appears that this word has undergone deformation repeatedly. Consequently we cannot be certain whether Homeric Διώννσος and Aiolic *Διόννσος are related by regular sound changes or not. Moreover, it is very probable that Dionysos' name is not Greek, in which case a form *ΔιϜόσ-ννσος, if it ever existed, is the result of a folk etymology which might have occurred only in Aiolic.

The case for ὦμος < *ómsos is also relatively weak. Whether Armenian *us* 'shoulder' reflects Proto-Indo-European *ómsos or *ṓmsos cannot be determined; the short vowels of Gothic acc.pl. *amsans*, Umbrian loc. sg. *onse* (if the vowel is short), and Latin *umerus* (if the second vowel is epenthetic, as seems likely; see Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* s.v. ὦμος) can have been shortened by Osthoff's Law, and are thus equally indeterminate. Sanskrit *áṃsas* does seem to reflect *ómsos, since Osthoff's Law did not operate in Indo-Iranian;[5]) but Tocharian B *āntse*, A *es* (Proto-Tocharian *ánse) can only reflect *ṓmsos, since *ómsos would give *entse in Tocharian B.[6]) Aiolic ἐπομμαδίαις 'on

---

[5]) The fate of *Ns clusters in Indo-Iranian—or indeed in late Proto-Indo-European—is still poorly understood. The only clearly relevant parallel to the word for 'shoulder' is *mēmsóm 'flesh, meat', which underwent Osthoff's Law in Germanic (cf. Gothic *mimz*) but not in Indo-Iranian (cf. Sanskrit *māṃsám*). It seems possible that both words had long vowels before the cluster in Proto-Indo-European, but that one long vowel was the result of ablaut and the other the result of contraction (after the loss of intervocalic laryngeals); this could account for their divergent development in Indo-Iranian. However, I know of no evidence that would support such a hypothesis.

[6]) For the sound laws involved see Penney, "The Treatment of Indo-European Vovels in Tocharian", *TPS* 1976–7, p. 69; Normier, "Tocharisch *ñkät/ñakte* 'Gott'", *KZ* 94 (1980), pp. 253–4; Winter, "Tocharian B *weñ-*, A *weñ*-'Say'", *JIES* 5 (1977), pp. 149–51 with bibliography.

50   Donald A. Ringe

the shoulders' (Theokritos 29.29), cited by Kretschmer (*Wiener
Eranos*, p. 124, fn. 1) and Frisk (loc. cit.) as evidence for a reflex
of *ómsos in Greek, is a conjectural emendation of a corrupt
variant reading in a text that contains hyperaiolisms in any case
(e.g. ἄμισυ for ἥμισυ in l. 5); such a form can hardly be used as
evidence for any etymology. In sum, the only two solid pieces of
evidence, the Sanskrit and Tocharian forms, reflect different
quantities for the initial vowel of the Proto-Indo-European word;
consequently we cannot assert that ὦμος is from *ómsos rather
than *ōmsos.[7])

ὠνέομαι and its Attic-Ionic kin are of course the third example
of the proposed sound change. Evidence that they do not directly
reflect *-osn- will emerge from the discussion below. But in addition
there is a weighty theoretical argument against the suggestion that
pre-Greek *osn could result in Attic-Ionic ων. In every other en-
vironment the compensatory lengthening of a Proto-Greek mid
vowel gives an Attic-Ionic higher mid vowel $\bar{e}$ or $\bar{o}$, not a lower
mid vowel η or ω; note especially that *esn, *ems, etc. give ἕν,
ἕμ, etc., not *ην, *ημ, and the like (cf. φαεινός, ἔνειμα, and so on).
Since it is usually phonologically definable classes of phonemes that
are affected by specific sound changes, it would be rash to posit a
lack of parallelism between the development of *osn, *oms and
that of *esn, *ems, etc. without much clearer evidence. Kretschmer
is aware of this problem; he attempts to sidestep it by citing as a
similar case the lack of parallelism in the development of e- and
o-vowels in late koine Greek (in a review of Gustaf Sandsjoe's *Die
Adjektiva auf -αιος*, in *Glotta* 11, pp. 241–2). But the structure of
the late koine vowel system differs greatly from that of the vowel
system of archaic Attic-Ionic dialects, and one can hardly use
developments in one to shed any light on developments in the
other. Thus the strongest argument against the phonological
solution to the problem stands unanswered, and it is preferable
to find a solution against which such an argument cannot be
made.

A second solution recognizes different ablaut grades of the root
in different words of this family: Lesbian ὄννα is indeed from
*wosnā, an o-grade form, but Attic-Ionic ὦνος, etc. are from
*wōsn-, a form with a lengthened o-grade root; forms with both

---

[7]) For attempts to resolve this puzzle see Schulze, "Griech. ὦμος", *KZ* 63
(1936), p. 28; Beekes, "H₂O", *Die Sprache* 18 (1972), p. 127 with bibliography.

grades coexisted in Proto-Greek. This hypothesis was first proposed
by Felix Solmsen ("Sigma in Verbindung mit Nasalen und Liquiden
im Griechischen", *KZ* 29 (1888), pp. 62–3); it has been adopted by
Michel Lejeune (*Phonétique historique*, p. 123) and was at first
accepted by Pierre Chantraine (in a review of Buck's *Greek Dialects*,
in *Revue de Philologie* 31 (1957), p. 98). According to this view
ὦμος 'shoulder' can only reflect Proto-Indo-European *ŏmsos, the
preform indicated by the Tocharian reflexes (Lejeune, op. cit. p. 128;
Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, s.v. ὦμος). This solution is
particularly attractive because the cognates of ὦνος, etc. in other
Indo-European languages exhibit considerable variation in the
ablaut grade of the root: cf. Sanskrit *vasnám* 'price' (*e or *o),
Latin *vēnum* 'sale' (*e or *ē), Armenian *gin* 'price' (apparently *ē;
see Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, Part I, p. 434).[8])

On the other hand, the pattern in which the ablaut variants
appear in this family of words is somewhat surprising. Lengthened-
grade formations in *-no- and *-nā- are rare in Greek and in Indo-
European in general (compare the examples of words with these
suffixes in Chantraine, *La Formation des noms*, pp. 191–6; Schwyzer,
Griechische Grammatik, Vol. I, pp. 488–9; Brugmann, *Grundriss*,
Vol. II, Part 1, pp. 255–64). Moreover, the Armenian evidence for
a lengthened-grade root in this family is shaky. *wēsno- is posited
as the preform of *gin* because the sequence *-esn- seems to have
given *-en-* in *z-genum* 'I put (clothing) on' (*wes-nu-; Hübschmann,
loc. cit.); but Holger Pedersen ("Armenisch und die Nachbar-
sprachen", *KZ* 39 (1904), pp. 414–5) calls this assumption into
question, and it seems possible to attribute the *e* of *z-genum* to the
analogy of its aorist *z-geçeay* (cf. *en* 'they are' for expected *in* on
the analogy of *es* 'you are', etc., as noted by Pedersen, loc. cit.).
Thus *gin* could be the regular outcome of *wesno-. Finally, it is
surprising to find two ablaut grades of the same root with the same
suffix in a single daughter language (Greek), especially as there
is no functional or semantic difference between the two forms. For
all these reasons it seems preferable not to posit a preform *wōsn-;
we should explain the difference in vocalism between ὄννα and
ὦνος, etc. within Greek instead of projecting it back into Proto-
Indo-European.

---

[8]) The Hittite verbs cannot be used as evidence for the ablaut grade of
this noun, since they are not morphologically comparable; Old Church
Slavonic *věno* 'dowry' is probably related not to this family but to Greek
ἔδνον 'brideprice' (Brugmann, *Grundriss*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 261).

4*

So far as I can determine, the only scholar who has looked for
further solutions to this problem is Pierre Chantraine. In his
Dictionnaire étymologique (s. v. ὠνέομαι; Fascicle 4, Part 2, published
posthumously 1980) it is suggested that ὠνέομαι is an iterative de-
verbative with a lengthened o-grade root, like πωλέομαι 'frequent',
and that ὦνος and ὠνή "seraient alors secondaires et de date
grecque". That the vocalism of the two nouns has been altered
to conform to that of the verb is plausible, but it seems unlikely
that either noun is actually derived from ὠνέομαι; from an ε-
contract verb one expects deverbative nouns formed to a base in
-η-, e.g. ὤνημα, ὤνησις, and ὠνητής (all of which occur). It is likeliest
that the basic word is really ὦνος 'price', and that both ὠνή 'sale,
contract' and ὠνέομαι 'buy' are derived from it (so Boisacq, *Dic-
tionnaire étymologique*, s.v. ὦνος; Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches
Wörterbuch*, s.v. ὦνος); this is especially likely because all the
cognate words in other Indo-European languages are o-stem nouns.
But if ὠνέομαι is a denominative verb it cannot also be an iterative
with root-ablaut, as the latter are formed only to basic verb roots.

Chantraine himself proposes another solution in his article "À pro-
pos de grec ΩΝΕΟΜΑΙ" (*Scritti Bonfante*, Vol. I, p. 152): he suggests
that ὠνέομαι owes its ω to the influence of its antonym πωλέω 'sell',
and that the ω spread from the verb to the nouns. Against this
hypothesis I can find no objections; though Chantraine does not
claim that it is superior to other suggestions, it must be correct.
The development of this family of words in Attic-Ionic must
therefore have been as follows. Originally there was a basic noun
*ŏνος 'price' (< *wósnos) with a derivative *ŏνή 'sale, contract'
(*wosná) and a denominative verb *ŏνέομαι 'buy' (*wosnéye/o-). In
the verb the initial *ŏ was replaced by ω under the influence of
πωλέω; this ω then spread to the nouns as well. Lesbian Aiolic did
not participate in this series of analogical changes, since in that
dialect *ŏννημαι 'buy', if it existed at all, did not have a long vowel
in the initial syllable and was therefore much less like *πώλημι
than Attic-Ionic *ŏνέομαι was like πωλέω.

ὀνονημένα, then, is the Perinthian perfect passive participle of
the original Attic-Ionic verb *ŏνέομαι, unaffected by the analogical
spread of the ω. It shows that the regular outcome of pre-Greek
*osn in Attic-Ionic is indeed ŏν, and it is the best material evidence
that the developments just outlined actually occurred. That a
form of this verb with ŏ should occur in late sixth-century Perinthian
is only mildly surprising, in spite of the fact that ὦνος, ὠνή are

attested in Homer and ὠνέομαι in Hesiod. The replacement of ŏ by ω is most likely to have occurred in one subdialect of Attic-Ionic and then to have spread to others; there is nothing to indicate that it occurred particularly early. Evidently the subdialect of Samos had not adopted the change by about 600 B.C., when Perinthos was founded, nor had Perinthos itself some seventy-five years later.

ὀνονημένα clearly exhibits some sort of reduplication appropriate to vowel-initial verbs, though the root originally began with *w. This poses no great problems; *w was lost very early throughout Attic-Ionic, and before o-vowels (except the diphthong οι) the loss was so early that the *w left no traces even in the Homeric poems (Lejeune, *Phonétique historique*, p. 176).[9]) The early loss of *w enabled this verb to be reinterpreted as vowel-initial in Perinthian Ionic (though not in Attic; cf. ἐώνημαι < *we-w-).

One of the o's of ὀνονημένα must be long, but it is impossible to tell which one it is. It is likelier that the second o is long, the stem exhibiting Attic reduplication (ὀνōνημένα). This type of reduplication is not normal for verbs beginning with vowels other than short a, ε, and o, but there is an approximate parallel in Herodotos' ἀναραιρηκότα (5.102.3), ἀραίρητο (1.191.6), etc. to (-)αἱρέω 'take'.[10]) On the other hand, an internally reduplicated ὀνονημένα is not out of the question; a parallel for this exists in fourth-century Thasian

---

[9]) Compare the loss of *w before o-vowels in Cretan, which usually preserves initial Ϝ (Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, p. 48); words of this family are of course noteworthy examples. On this sound change see Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, Vol. I, p. 225 with fn. 4, and especially Klaus Strunk in *Glotta* 56 (1978), pp. 208–10. (I am grateful to Prof. Strunk for the latter reference.) Mycenaean *o-no*, etc. are of course not related to ὦνος, etc.; see Lejeune, "Sur quelques termes du vocabulaire économique mycénien" (1961), *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne, deuxième série*, pp. 285–312.

[10]) Mid-fourth-century Koan ⟦ον⟧ὠνημένα (Herzog, "Heilige Gesetze von Kos", *APAW* 1928, No. 6, p. 10: inscr. no. 2, l. 6) is not a secure parallel. The preceding word is ἐλάσσονος; the letters ον at the beginning of the participle have been (insufficiently) chiselled out by the stonecutter. The two letters could be an erroneous repetition of the third syllable of ἐλάσσονος, or an error for ὦν-, or the beginning of a real Koan form ὀνωνημένα which the stonecutter tried to koinize. Whether *osn would give ων in Koan by regular sound change is not clear; see Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, p. 29; Thumb-Kieckers, *Handbuch*, Vol. I, pp. 197–8. In any case, all the examples of ὦν- in this family of words that I have been able to find in West Greek dialects that distinguish secondary ŏ from Proto-Greek *ŏ (e.g. Delphian) are late enough to be the result of Attic koine influence.

---

54   Donald A. Ringe

Ionic ἀναιρερημένος (3 × in *IG* XII-8.265; see also *IG* XII *Supplementum*). In any case, ὀνονημένα belongs to a small class of Ionic perfects made to verbs beginning with long vowels or diphthongs and reduplicated in innovative ways.

Bibliography

Bechtel, Friedrich. *Die griechischen Dialekte*, Vol. I. Berlin 1921: Weidmann.

Beekes, R.S.P. "H₂O." *Die Sprache* 18 (1972), pp. 117–31.

Boisacq, Émile. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Heidelberg 1916: Winter.

Brugmann, Karl. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 2nd. ed., Vol. II, Part 1. Strassburg 1906: Trübner.

Buck, Carl Darling. *The Greek Dialects*. Chicago 1955: University of Chicago Press. Reprinted with corrections 1968.

Chantraine, Pierre. "A propos de grec ΩΝΕΟΜΑΙ." *Scritti in onore di Giuliano Bonfante*, Vol. I, pp. 147–54. Brescia 1976: Paideia.

—. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris 1968–80: Klincksieck.

—. *La Formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris 1933: Champion.

—. Review of Buck, C.D., *The Greek Dialects*. In *Revue de Philologie* 31 (1957), pp. 98–100.

Frisk, Hjalmar. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg 1960–70: Winter.

Gehring, August. *Index Homericus*. Revised by Ulrich Fleischer. Hildesheim 1970: Olms.

—. —. *Appendix Hymnorum Vocabula Continens*. Revised by Ulrich Fleischer. Hildesheim 1970: Olms. (Published in one volume with the *Index*.)

Gow, A.S.F., ed. *Bucolici Graeci*. Oxford 1952: Clarendon Press.

Graham, A.J. "ΟΙΚΗΙΟΙ ΠΕΡΙΝΘΙΟΙ." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 84 (1964), pp. 73–5.

Guarducci, Margherita. "Un' antica offerta alla Era di Samo." *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni*, Vol. I, pp. 23–7. Milan 1956: Ceschina.

Hermann, Eduard. *Silbenbildung im Griechischen und in den andern indogermanischen Sprachen*. (= *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, Ergänzungsheft 2.) Göttingen 1923: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Herzog, Rudolf. "Heilige Gesetze von Kos." *Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1928, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, No. 6.

Hübschmann, H. *Armenische Grammatik*, Part I. Leipzig 1897: Breitkopf & Härtel.

Inscriptiones Graecae. Vol. VII: *Inscriptiones Graecae Megaridis Oropiae Boeotiae*. Ed. Wilhelm Dittenberger. Berlin 1892: Reimer.

—. Vol IX: *Inscriptiones Graeciae Septentrionalis Voluminibus VII et VIII Non Comprehensae*. Part 2: *Inscriptiones Thessaliae*. Ed. Otto Kern. Berlin 1908: Reimer.

—. Vol. XII: *Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum Maris Aegaei Praeter Delum.* Fasc. 2: *Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum Lesbi Nesi Tenedi.* Ed. William R. Paton. Berlin 1899: Reimer.

—. —. Fasc. 7: *Inscriptiones Amorgi et Insularum Vicinarum.* Ed. Julius Delamarre. Berlin 1908: Reimer.

—. —. Fasc. 8: *Inscriptiones Insularum Maris Thracici.* Ed. Carl Fredrich. Berlin 1909: Reimer.

—. —. *Supplementum.* Ed. Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen. Berlin 1939: de Gruyter.

Jeffery, Lilian Hamilton. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece.* Oxford 1961: Clarendon Press.

Klaffenbach, Günther. "Archaische Weihinschrift aus Samos." *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 6 (1953), pp. 15–20.

Kretschmer, Paul. "Zur griechischen Wortkunde." *Wiener Eranos zur fünfzigsten Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner,* pp. 118–24. Vienna 1909: Hölder.

—. Review of Sandsjoe, Gustaf, *Die Adjektiva auf -αιος.* In *Glotta* 11 (1921), pp. 241–2.

Lejeune, Michel. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien.* Paris 1972: Klincksieck.

—. "Sur quelques termes du vocabulaire économique mycénien." *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne, deuxième série (1958–1963) (= Incunabula Graeca,* Vol. XLII), pp. 285–312, Rome 1971: Ateneo.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon,* 9th ed. Revised by Sir Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford 1940: Clarendon Press.

—. —. *Supplement.* Ed. E. A. Barber. Oxford 1968: Clarendon Press.

Lobel, Edgar, and Denys L. Page, edd. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta,* 2nd ed. Oxford 1963: Clarendon Press.

Normier, Rudolf. "Tocharisch *ñkät/ñakte* 'Gott'." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94 (1980), pp. 251–81.

Page, Denys L., ed. *Poetae Melici Graeci.* Oxford 1962: Clarendon Press.

Pedersen, Holger. "Armenisch und die Nachbarsprachen." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 39 (1904), pp. 334–485.

Penney, John H. W. "The Treatment of Indo-European Vowels in Tocharian." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1976–7, pp. 66–91.

Pokorny, Julius. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Bern 1959: Francke.

Schulze, Wilhelm. "Griech. *ὄμος.*" *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 63 (1936), p. 28.

Schwyzer, Eduard. *Griechische Grammatik,* 3rd ed., Vol. I. Munich 1939: Beck.

Solmsen, Felix. "Sigma in Verbindung mit Nasalen und Liquiden im Griechischen." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 29 (1888), pp. 59–124, 329–58.

Strunk, Klaus. „Umstrittenes *ΤΑΣΑΝΟΔΕΑΣΑΣ* im arkadischen Urteil von Mantinea (IG V 2, 262, 17)." *Glotta* 56 (1978), pp. 206–12.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, Vol. XII. Edd. A. G. Woodhead et al. Leiden 1955: Sijthoff.

Thumb, Albert, and Ernst Kieckers. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, 2nd ed., Vol. I. Heidelberg 1932: Winter.

Thumb, Albert, and Anton Scherer. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, 2nd ed., Vol. II. Heidelberg 1959: Winter.

Winter, Werner. "Internal Structure and External Relationship of Two Verbal Paradigms: Tocharian B *weñ-*, A *weñ-* 'Say'." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 5 (1977), pp. 133–59.

The Etymology of Greek μασχάλη 'Armpit' with Notes on μάλη

By Douglas Q. Adams, Moscow (Idaho)

Μασχάλη is "dunkel" according to Frisk (1970: 183–184) or of "etymologie ignorée" according to Chantraine (1968–1980: 671). Certainly, as it stands, it is not the obvious phonological equivalent of anything else in some other Indo-European group but, since words rarely come into being *e nihilo* and "since in principle we always look for linguistic continuity unless we have powerful evidence to the contrary" (Hamp, 1980: 40), it is worthwhile to see if a little ingenuity cannot recover a bit of history for us in this instance.

The ingenuity proposed here consists, in firstly of ignoring the initial consonant (to whose origin we will return later). The *-ασχάλη* that remains matches the PIE *akslā* that lies behind Latin *āla* 'wing, shoulder-joint, armpit' almost exactly in kind if not so precisely in order. If in pre-Greek we had *-aksalā*, a simple metathesis would produce *-askhalā*. This kind of metathesis is not unknown, particularly in popular words (cf. Schwyzer, 1953: 266), in Greek. It should also be noted that "deformations" of one sort or another are fairly common in words referring to the armpit. Witness for instance Scots Gaelic *achlais* but Welsh *cesail*, both, through borrowing, from Latin *axilla* or, on the other side of the Indo-European world, the various unexpected phonetic developments of the descendants of Sanskrit *kakṣa-* (Fussmann, 1972: 52).[1]

---

[1] Compare the similar unexpected *initials* in modern Greek dialects of southern Italy: *paskáli* (beside the expected *maskáli*) in Calabria but *vaskáli* in the Terra d'Otranto (Rohlfs, 1964: 319).