

GLOTTA

Zeitschrift für
griechische und lateinische Sprache

Herausgegeben von
Hartmut Erbse, Heinz Happ
und Hansjakob Seiler

LI. Band · 1. – 2. Heft · 1973

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT IN GÖTTINGEN

GLOTTA

Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache

Begründet von Paul Kretschmer und Franz Skutsch

Nach 1945 fortgesetzt von Paul Kretschmer und Bruno Snell

INHALT

G. Giangrande, Dorische Genitive bei Homer	1
H. Jones, Homeric Nouns in <i>-sis</i>	7
H. Koller, <i>Λυκάβας</i>	29
J. C. B. Lowe, <i>Γ'ἄρα, γ'ἄρα</i> and <i>τᾶρα</i>	34
R. F. Willetts, The Making of a Cretan Fixed Metaphor	64
W. J. Pepicello, On Argolic, <i>προτί</i>	67
S. N. Mouraviev, <i>Gnōmē</i>	69
J. Blomqvist, <i>οὔτος</i> = der oder der	79
C. Theodoridis, <i>Κροτήσατε</i>	91
R. Schmitt, Hesych K-3598 L.	94
H. Seiler, Methodologisches zu <i>κέρδιον, κέρδιστος</i>	96
J. Knobloch, Mohn und Minze	98
N. C. Conomis, Greek in Isodore's Origines	101
J. A. C. Greppin, The Sequence HRC- in Latin	112
J. N. Adams, The Substantival Present Participle in Latin	116
H. J. Hartung, Die Konstruktion eines Vergleichs mit „pro“	137
P. Colaclidès, Note sur un emploi de fortuna chez Virgile	140
H. Ruge, Imperfekt Passiv im Neugriechischen Ein Vergleich zwischen normativer Grammatik und Alltagssprache in Athen, Kavala und Istanbul	143

Manuskriptsendungen werden nach vorheriger Anfrage an folgende Anschriften erbeten: Prof. Dr. Hartmut Erbse, 53 Bonn, Bannauerstr. 52 / Doz. Dr. Heinz Happ, 74 Tübingen, Wilhelmstr. 36, Philolog. Sem. d. Univ. / Prof. Dr. Hansjakob Seiler, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Köln — Manuskripte müssen die deutlich lesbare Privatadresse des Verfassers tragen.

Preis des Bandes (2 Doppelhefte) 60,— DM, davon 3,13 DM MwSt.

Von dieser Zeitschrift sind auch noch ältere Jahrgänge lieferbar. Auf Anfrage unterbreiten wir Ihnen gern ein Angebot.

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft

Zur Beachtung: Rezensionen können nur in die Fachberichte über griechische bzw. lateinische Formenlehre und Syntax aufgenommen werden. Zusendungen von Rezensionsexemplaren an die Redaktion (nach vorheriger Anfrage) erbeten. Für Bücher, die ohne Anforderung der Redaktion bei Verlag oder Herausgebern einlaufen, wird keine Verantwortung übernommen.

Druck: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Feinberg hat V. 384–389 befriedigend ergänzt:

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμε]βρόμεν[ος προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς
 385 "Ἡέλ',]ῆ τοι μὲν σὸ μ[ετ' ἀθανάτοισι φάειω
 καὶ θ']νητοῖσι βροτοῖ[σιν ἐπὶ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν·
 τῶν]δε δ' ἐγὼ τάχα ν[ῆα θοὴν ἀργῆτι κεραυνῶ
 τυτ]θὰ διαραίσαιμι [μέσῳ ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ."
 ταῦ]τα δ' ἐγὼν ἤκου[σα Καλυψοῦς ἠϊκόμοιο·

Der Herausgeber hat die zwei neuen Varianten V. 387 und 388 richtig gewürdigt: er betont mit Recht, daß sie „are typical examples of those found in the so-called ‘eccentric’ texts“. Mit anderen Worten: der von dem Papyrus angebotene Text ist von Grammatikern umgearbeitet worden. Andererseits ist Feinberg der neuen Lesart *Ἐρμῆα* V. 390 nicht gerecht geworden: ich werde hier versuchen, zu beweisen, daß sie ein ebenso typisches Produkt der diaskeuastischen Textgestaltung wie die zwei übrigen Varianten ist.

Zuerst betrachten wir die Form *Ἐρμῆα* von dem morphologischen Gesichtspunkt aus. Sie ist ein tadelloser Dorismus, wie Feinberg anerkennt (a. a. O., S. 34): „as the genitive in -α, η for εἰ is also attested as Doric“, und „the genitive *Ἐρμῆα*“ ist in der Tat „attested by the grammarians“. Die Schreibung η statt εἰ ist bekanntlich ein dorischer Zug (vgl. Ahrens, *De gr. ling. Dial.* II, S. 153 ff. von Feinberg angeführt), aber hinsichtlich der geläufigen Verwechslung zwischen η und εἰ, die schon in Ptolemäischer Zeit gut belegt ist (zu den von Feinberg zitierten Angaben füge man Mayser-Schmoll, *Gramm. Pap.* I², 1, S. 49–51 hinzu) können wir nicht entscheiden, ob das η in dem *Ἐρμῆα* ein gewollter Dorismus oder ein Schreibfehler ist: letztes Endes tut dies nichts zur Sache. Dagegen ist die Endung auf -α bei dem Genitiv *Ἐρμῆα* ein unzweideutiger Dorismus und als solcher von großem Interesse. Die Lesart *Ἐρμῆα* ist nämlich nicht nur morphologisch einwandfrei, sondern auch zu dem epischen Kontext geeignet.

Ich habe schon hervorgehoben, daß die antiken Grammatiker einstimmig lehrten, Homer habe zahlreiche „Dorismen“ — darunter dorische Endungen — verwendet³⁾; insbesondere habe ich gezeigt, daß die dorischen, auf -α ausgehenden Genitivformen in der nachhomerischen Epik sicher belegt und zu zahlreich sind, als daß man sie ausmerzen könnte⁴⁾. So hat Panyassis *ἀργυροδίνα*

³⁾ *Hermes* 1970, S. 257 ff.

⁴⁾ *Hermes* 1970, S. 271 f.

(Powell, *Coll.*, S. 248, 5); Arcestratos hat *ἀλωπία* verwendet; Kallimachos weist *ἀσκάντρα* und *Γέλα* auf, während Apollonios Rhodios *Ἔλα* schrieb; Orph. *Arg.* 57 begegnet *Αἰσονίδα*. Wie sind solche Formen auf *-a* in die epische Gattung eingedrungen? Die Frage ist von v. Leeuwen⁵⁾ und von mir⁶⁾ beantwortet worden. Die Endung *-ao* wurde durch Elision vor anlautendem Vokal zu *-a'*: vgl. z. B. die Lesart *Μενουτιάδα' ἀποτίση* in Allens Apparat zu *Il.* XVIII, 93. Hinsichtlich der allgemein anerkannten Anwesenheit von „Dorismen“ bei Homer wurden aber die fraglichen Genitivformen von manchen nicht als elidiert, sondern als dorische Genitive auf *-a* aufgefaßt. So kommen z. B. die unelidierten Varianten *Αἰνεία ἔταρον Il.* V, 534 und *Βορέα Il.* XIV, 395 vor (vgl. Allens Apparat z. St.). Die Lesart *Ἐρμήα*, die in dem von Feinberg veröffentlichten Papyrus bezeugt ist, beweist, daß derartige dorische Genitivformen auf *-a* im Homertext schon in hellenistischer Zeit eingebürgert waren. Aus der Tatsache, daß Panyassis *ἀργυροδίνα* schreiben konnte, dürfen wir mit Glaubwürdigkeit erschließen, daß das Einschleichen solcher dorischen Genitive in den Text Homers in vorhellenistischer Zeit erfolgt war.

Die Frage ist nun: warum entstand die morphologisch richtige und zu dem epischen Zusammenhang passende Lesart *Ἐρμήα* in dem Vers? Das in den Handschriften an dieser Stelle belegte *Ἐρμείαιο* ist ja an sich nicht anstößig. Die korrekte Fassung des in Rede stehenden Verses, die uns in den Handschriften erhalten ist, lautet wie folgt:

ἦ δ' ἔφη Ἐρμείαιο διακτόρου αὐτῆ ἀκοῦσαι

In so einen Text eingeführt würde das an sich morphologisch und kontextuell unanfechtbare *Ἐρμήα* das Metrum verletzen: diese Feststellung verblüfft. Das *Ἐρμήα* kann schwerlich ein Schreibfehler sein, denn es ist an sich morphologisch und kontextuell perfekt, es ist, mit anderen Worten, ein in den Text absichtlich eingebrachter Dorismus: aber warum hätte irgend jemand durch die Ersetzung des metrisch befriedigenden *Ἐρμείαιο* den Vers hinkend machen wollen?

Feinberg hat die Lösung des Problems gewittert, obwohl er sie aus den Augen verloren hat. Er weiß (a. a. O., S. 34), daß der fragliche Vers zwei „corruptions“ erlitten hat, wie aus den Handschriften ersichtlich: neben den Lesarten *διακτόρου* und *αὐτῆ* sind

⁵⁾ *Encheir.*², S. 163f.

⁶⁾ *Hermes* 1970, S. 272.

auch *διάκτορος* und *αὐτοῦ* bezeugt⁷⁾. Er fragt sich zögernd (a. a. O.), ob vielleicht die erwähnten „corruptions“ irgendwie eine „confusion about the scansion“ dieses Verses mögen verursacht haben, welche „confusion“ das *Ἐρμῆα* ins Leben gerufen habe. Diese Annahme hat keine Stütze, weil die Lesarten *διάκτορος* und *αὐτοῦ* die „scansion“ des Verses überhaupt nicht beeinträchtigen und daher eine Änderung des *Ἐρμῆα* zur Wiederherstellung des Metrums nicht involvieren können.

Feinberg hat aber Recht, insofern das *Ἐρμῆα* durch die Lesart *διάκτορος* hervorgebracht worden ist: dies erfolgte nicht wegen einer angeblichen „confusion about the scansion“, sondern aus genauen interpretatorischen Gründen. Das *Ἐρμῆα* ist ein gewollter Eingriff seitens eines Grammatikers, ein Eingriff, der sich als typisch für die Arbeitsweise der hellenistischen Homerinterpreten erweist, wie sie uns bekannt ist. Die Lesart *Ἐρμῆα* kam zustande, weil Vers 390 in der Fassung

ἦ δ' ἔφη Ἐρμῆαο διάκτορος αὐτῆ ἀκοῦσαι

einem Kritiker vorlag. Homer hat wohl entweder *διάκτορος*, -ου oder *ἄκτωρ* (zum Eigennamen erstarrt, aber als Substantiv von den Grammatikern erkannt: vgl. Thes., s. v.; darüber mehr unten), nicht *διάκτωρ*, -ορος. Die letztere Form wurde aber von einigen Grammatikern geprägt (vgl. z. B. Thes., s. v.). Der Kritiker, dem wir das *Ἐρμῆα* verdanken, wollten den Genitiv *διάκτορος* aus dem ihm vorliegenden Homervers als unhomerisch beseitigen⁸⁾: statt das *διάκτορος* zu *διακτόρου* zu ändern, zog er die bei den hellenistischen Gelehrten besonders beliebte „Trennungsmethode“⁹⁾ vor, und las demgemäß *δι' ἄκτορος*, welches Verfahren die Einführung der dorischen Genitivendung auf -α in das dem getrennten *δι'*

⁷⁾ Vgl. am besten Ludwichts Apparat z. St.

⁸⁾ Zu solchen morphologischen Debatten vgl. z. B. Düntzer, *De Zenod. stud.*, S. 52 (über die Formen *μάγρυγοι* und *μάγρυρες*).

⁹⁾ Vgl. z. B. Düntzer, a. a. O., S. 69, mit Anm. 13 (*Il.* XI, 589: *Αἰαντος*, *Αἰαντ' ὄς*, *Αἰανθ' ὄς*); Wecklein, *Über Zenod. u. Arist. (Sitzungsber. Bayer. Akad., Philos.-philol. Kl., 1919, Abh. 7)* S. 45 (*Il.* VII, 127 *μείρομενος*, *μ' εἰρόμενος*, *Il.* XVI, 202 *μ' ἠτιάσθε*, *μητιάσθε*), S. 71 (*Il.* XXI, 323 schrieb Aristarch *τυμβοχοῆσ'*, d. h. elidiertes *τυμβοχοῆσαι*, während sein Gegner Krates *τυμβοχόης* las, vgl. Helck, *De Crat. Stud. ad Il. spect.*, S. 63f.); Helck, a. a. O., S. 31f. (*Il.* XV, 189: *πάντα*, *πάντ' ὄ*), S. 15ff. (*Il.* XI, 754: *διὰ σπιδέος*, *δι' ἀσπιδέος*), S. 40ff. (*Il.* XVIII, 489: *οἷη δ' ἄμμορος*, *οἱ ἦ δ' ἄμμορος*). Die Methode hieß *λόσις κατὰ λέξιν*, vgl. Helck, a. a. O., S. 44 und 32; zum voralexandrinischen Ursprung derselben vgl. Düntzer, a. a. O., S. 45f. („iam ante Zenodotum“).

ἄκτορος vorausgehende Wort zur Aufrechterhaltung des Metrums mit sich brachte¹⁰⁾:

ἦ δ' ἔφη Ἐρμῆα δι' ἄκτορος αὐτῆ ἀκούσαι

Die Arbeitsweise des Grammatikers läßt sich bis in die kleinsten Details verfolgen. Das Epitheton *δία* wird in der Odyssee gängig auf Kalypso bezogen (vgl. Krämer, *Zusammenst. Hom. Beiw.*, S. 17 f.): vgl. z. B. *Od.* V, 263, 321, 372. Der Grammatiker legt Homer *Od.* XII, 390 ἦ δὲ *δία* in den Mund, weil *Καλυψώ* im vorhergehenden Vers genannt ist (zum Typ vgl. *Od.* XI, 421 ff. *Κλυταιμνήστρη . . . ἦ δὲ κνωπίς*; Svensson, *Gebr. best. Artik.*, S. 22; der Typ gehört in die direkte Rede, vgl. *Od.* XI, 421 ἦκουσα = *Od.* XII, 389 ἦκουσα¹¹⁾). Elidiertes *δία* war ein den alten Textkritikern nicht unbekanntes

¹⁰⁾ Ein derartiges Verfahren, wobei die Endung des dem emendierten Text voraus- oder nachgehenden Wortes geändert wird, um die Emendation metrisch zu machen, ist bei den antiken Kritikern ganz üblich, vgl. z. B. Wecklein, a. a. O., S. 83 (zu *Il.* XI, 841); viel Material bei Düntzer, a. a. O. (z. B. S. 51, über die Art, wie Zenodot *Il.* XII, 365 und XIII, 203 das *Ο* änderte, um aus *Οἰλιάδης* das von ihm begünstigte *Ἰλιάδης* zu gewinnen und dieses in den Hexameter zu fügen; S. 90 f., zu *Il.* I, 567; S. 109, zu *Il.* XV, 86; S. 112, zu *Il.* V, 53; S. 123 f., zu *Il.* XI, 841, mit „*elisis pronominis*“; S. 124, zu *Il.* XIV, 37; S. 125, zu *Il.* XVI, 807). „Änderungen von Endungen“ (Wecklein, a. a. O., S. 82) aus metrischen Gründen wurden von den Alexandrinern sehr gerne vorgenommen. So ist z. B. die Lesart *προφανείσας* (mit der dorischen Endung auf -*ās*) *Il.* VIII, 378 zur Vermeidung des Hiats von Zenodot konjiziert (oder gebilligt) worden (vgl. Düntzer, a. a. O., S. 144, A. 2: zu den durch die Hiatusflucht hervorgebrachten Änderungen vgl. z. B. Wecklein, a. a. O., S. 59, 64, 79). Über die Frage, ob und inwieweit Zenodots Änderungen „statthaft“ und „der Überlieferung getreu“ waren, vgl. La Roche, *Hom. Textkr.*, S. 322 f., 387.

¹¹⁾ Man beobachte, wie gewissenhaft und genau der Grammatiker bei seinem Eingriff den homerischen *usus* reproduziert hat. Statt ἦ δὲ *δία* ohne Abstand (wie z. B. *Od.* XI, 424 ἦ δὲ κνωπίς) konnte er Homer ἦ δὲ . . . *δία* mit Abstand in den Mund legen, weil das ἦ durch δὲ eingeleitet wird, so daß Wörter (in diesem Falle ἔφη Ἐρμῆα) zwischen das ἦ δὲ und das *δία* einschlebungsfähig sind. Vgl. dazu Svensson, a. a. O., S. 141; auch Nägelsbach, *Exc. Il.* XIX, S. 328*: neben abstandslosem *ὁ γεραίς, ὁ γέρων* (zu diesem Typ vgl. Svensson, a. a. O., S. 77 ff., 132 ff.) begegnen bei Homer *ὁ . . . γεραίς, ὁ . . . γέρων* mit Abstand, wenn das *ὁ* durch δὲ oder αὐτὰρ eingeleitet wird (vgl. z. B. *Il.* XIV, 39 *ὁ δὲ ξύμβλητο γεραίς, Il.* XXIV, 162 *ὁ δ' ἐν μέσσοισι γεραίς, Od.* XXIV, 225 αὐτὰρ *ὁ τοῖσι γέρων*). Die Genauigkeit, mit welcher sich der Grammatiker an den *usus* Homers gehalten hat, ist um so beachtenswerter, als die antiken Kritiker öfters textliche Änderungen „*contra Homeri usum*“ vornahmen (vgl. Düntzer, a. a. O., S. 146–153, Wecklein, a. a. O., S. 72 ff.) und die Worte Homers willkürlich konstruierten (vgl. Carnuth, Nicanoris *Περὶ Ὀδυσσ. στιγμ. reliq.*, S. 16 ff.).

Hilfsmittel: vgl. *Il.* VI, 160, wo Herodian *δι' Ἄρτεια* las, obwohl andere *Διάρτεια* wollten (vgl. La Roches und Ludwicks Apparate, z. St.); Zenodot „*Od.* σ 190 pro *δία θεάων* emendavit *δι' Ἀφροδίτη*“ (Düntzer, a. a. O., S. 106). Wenn von Damen die Rede war — wie es ja *Od.* XII, 390 der Fall ist —, so war auch unelidiertes *δία* freilich eine naheliegende¹²⁾ Aushilfe: vgl. *Il.* VI, 343, wo das auf den ersten Blick verwirrende Epitheton *μειλιχίοισι*¹³⁾ dadurch aus dem Wege geräumt wurde, daß man zu *δία γυναικῶν* griff. Die Trennung ergab also *δία* (*δι'*) und *ἄκτωρ* (*ἄκτορος*): was diese letztere Form angeht, so ist das Substantiv *ἄκτωρ* nicht nur an sich ganz legitim (es wurde von Grammatikern als solches erkannt und von Schriftstellern wie Aischylos verwendet), sondern kontextuell völlig am Platze: das Paar *ἄκτωρ* (*Od.* XII, 390) *Ἄκτωρ* (*Il.* II, 513) ist ein bei Homer gewöhnlicher Typ¹⁴⁾.

Um zusammenzufassen: die Lesart *Ἐρμῆα*, die in dem von mir erörterten Papyrusfragment auftritt, ist nicht weniger charakteristisch für die hellenistischen Textgestaltungsmethoden als die zwei übrigen Lesarten, die Feinberg beleuchtet hat. Vorausgesetzt, daß wir mit den angedeuteten Methoden vertraut sind, so macht die überlieferte Lesart nicht die geringste Schwierigkeit. Umgekehrt: wenn wir die obige Erklärung der Lesart *Ἐρμῆα* nicht annehmen — eine Erklärung, die bis ins Kleinste genau auf den Methoden der hellenistischen Diaskenasten fußt — und glaubten, das *Ἐρμῆα* sei ein bloßer Schreibfehler, so müßten wir eine ganze Kette von Hypothesen verfechten, nämlich postulieren, daß der Zufall sogar dreimal genau wie ein hellenistischer Grammatiker operierte: wir müßten ja behaupten, (A) daß der Schreibfehler nicht ein Unwort, sondern durch Zufall einen morphologisch perfekten Dorismus ins Leben gerufen hat; (B) obendrein, daß die Anwesenheit dieses Dorismus in dem Verse Homers durch Zufall eben der Lehre jener hellenistischen Grammatiker entspricht, denen wir die zwei übrigen in dem fraglichen Passus befindlichen Lesarten verdanken; (C) daß die Lesart *Ἐρμῆα* einer metrischen Erklärung fähig ist, die durch Zufall eben der Methode der hellenistischen Grammatiker entspricht.

¹²⁾ Die antiken Kritiker benutzten bei ihren Emendationen gerne das „saepe obvium“, vgl. z. B. Düntzer, a. a. O., S. 144.

¹³⁾ Das *μειλιχίοισι* („sanft“) scheint mit dem selbstbescheltenden Ton des Verses 344 nicht zu kongruieren.

¹⁴⁾ Vgl. G. Dottin, *De eis in Iliade inclusis hominum nominibus quae non unice propria nomina sunt*, Diss. Paris 1896, S. 51 ff. (*ἄκτωρ* / *Ἄκτωρ*, *καλήτωρ* / *Καλήτωρ*, *ἀμύντωρ* / *Ἀμύντωρ*, *μήστωρ* / *Μήστωρ*, usw.).

Homeric Nouns in -sis

By HOWARD JONES, McMaster University Canada

The Indo-European suffix *-ti, productive in a number of languages of verbal abstract substantives, and to a lesser degree agent nouns, provided Greek with 5073 nouns in -sis or -tis; though in effect, since there are only 50 nouns in -tis, we have to do with 'a productive suffix -sis, forming verbal abstracts from every type of verb—from primary verbs and denominatives, from verbs ending in any vowel or in any consonant'¹). It is not the purpose of this paper to add anything to the scholarship concerning the morphological development of the system in Greek²); it is rather to present a fresh examination *in context* of those -sis nouns which make their first appearance in Homer, in an attempt to identify what may be termed the 'primary force' of the -sis suffix at this period.

The 36 -sis nouns which appear first in Homer will be divided into four groups; we shall examine the instances of each of the -sis nouns within each group in turn, commenting upon their common features; we shall then note the distinctions which separate the groups, in an attempt to establish an 'Homeric pattern' for -sis nouns and identify the 'primary force' of the -sis suffix itself at this period.

GROUP A

ἀμφίβασις

Iliad 5, 623:

δεῖσε δ' ὃ γ' ἀμφίβασιν κρατερὴν Τρώων ἀγερώχων,
οἱ πολλοὶ τε καὶ ἐσθλοὶ ἐφέστασαν ἔγχε' ἔχοντες,
οἱ ἔ μέγαν περ ἔόντα καὶ ἴφθιμον καὶ ἀγανὸν
ᾧσαν ἀπὸ σφείων· ὃ δὲ χασσάμενος πελεμίχθη.

¹) Vowles, G. R., "Words in -sis and -tis" *CP* 23 (1928) 37.

²) See the following: Holt, J., "Les noms d'action en -sis (-tis)" *Aarskrift for Aarhus Universitet* 13, I (Aarhus-Copenhagen 1941); Meillet, A., "Sur le rôle et l'origine des noms d'action indo-européennes en *-ti" *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris* 25 (1925) 123ff.; Benveniste, E., *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen* (Paris 1935); Chantraine, P., *La formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris 1933); Arend, E., "Die Verbalabstracta mit Stamm auf -t und Vokal, besonders -tis (-sis), im älteren Griechischen" *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 65 (1938) 214–246; Hoeg, C., "A propos d'un livre récent sur les noms verbaux en grec ancien". *Acta Linguistica* 11 (1941) 192–219 (a valuable review of Holt); Browning, R., "Greek abstract nouns in -sis" *Philologus* 102 (1958) 60–73.

Aias has fatally wounded Amphios and is about to strip his body; it is clear from the description of the scene that the verb *δείσε* does not describe any fear for the future on Aias' part—either the 'possibility' of resistance on the part of the Trojans, or their 'capacity' for resisting; what causes him alarm is what he sees actually happening—the defence which the Trojans are at that moment making around Amphios' body. The -sis noun names the action of its verb *in progress*.

ξύνεσις

Odyssey 10, 513:

*ἔνθα μὲν εἰς Ἀχέροντα Πυριφλεγέθων τε ῥέουσιν
Κώκυτός θ', ὅς δὲ Στυγὸς ὕδατος ἔστιν ἀπορρώξ,
πέτρῃ τε ξύνεσις τε δὺν ποταμῶν ἔριδούπων.*

The verbal abstract here does more than indicate the 'place of meeting' of the two rivers; the place, of course, is important: it is where Odysseus is to dig a trench to be filled with blood for the souls of the shades with whom he is to converse; but what is of no less importance to the poet is the atmosphere of this particular spot—the thunderous roar (*ἔριδούπων*) of the two rivers of the Underworld as they clash together (*ῥέουσιν*): sound and movement; *ξύνεσις* contributes to the vividness of the impression, focusing attention upon the continual 'coming together' of the waters, as it denotes the action of its verb *in progress*.

παλίωξις

Iliad 12, 71:

*εἰ δέ χ' ὑποστρέψωσι, παλίωξις δὲ γένηται
ἐκ νηῶν καὶ τάφρῳ ἐνπλήξωμεν ὀρυκτῆ...*

The verbal abstract here does not name an action which is at the moment taking place, and in this it differs from the examples above; but the aspect of the verbal action as conceived of by the speaker is the same: it is action *in progress*. This is a point of some importance, since it illustrates a fundamental weakness of Holt's conception of the force of the -sis suffix at this period. He maintains that since the -sis abstract is so often found in sentences where the main verb is in the future tense, or in the subjunctive, optative or imperative mood, or in sentences whose main verb has 'future' associations, the -sis suffix denotes verbal action which he terms

'non-realised', and expresses primarily the idea of 'possibility'. What he fails to recognise is that the actual occurrence of the action denoted by the -sis abstract may be projected into the future while the aspect of that action as conceived of by the speaker be action realised but not completed, i. e. action in progress³).

This instance of *παλίωξις* serves also to introduce an arrangement which Homer found particularly effective: that is, a periphrasis consisting of a -sis abstract as subject of a copula as a substitute for a finite form of the verb from which the -sis noun is derived. The effect of the arrangement—and it is the -sis suffix that produces it—is well described by Long, who notes that the periphrasis 'is more impersonal than the root-verb and concentrates attention on its process at the expense of the persons concerned'⁴).

In the present example the periphrasis with the -sis noun forms one of two protases of a conditional sentence; now the context is a discussion between Polydamas and Hector concerning the tactics to be employed by the Trojans as they face the ditch which guards the wall in front of the Achaean ships; what Polydamas is anxious to guard against, the flaw he sees in Hector's strategy of crossing the ditch in chariots, is the possibility of a sudden about-turn on the part of the Achaeans—a *παλίωξις*; the -sis abstract periphrasis, reinforcing the more conventional *εἰ δέ γ' ὑποστρέψωσι* serves to highlight the critical importance in the situation of exactly this eventuality.

In other examples of this type of periphrasis, the -sis noun appears in the apodosis of the conditional sentence, and it is noticeable that in these cases it is the result of the condition, or the certainty of the result, that is of prime interest: e. g.,

ἀνάβλησις

Iliad 2, 379:

*εἰ δέ ποτ' ἔς γε μίαν βουλεύσομεν, οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα
Τρωσὶν ἀνάβλησις κακοῦ ἔσσεται, οὐδ' ἠβαιόν.*

Agamemnon's remark here, addressed to the Achaeans when they are wavering between returning to Argos or continuing the struggle against Troy, is quite clearly designed to offer re-assurance; though conditional in form, it is rather a proclamation that there will be

³) Holt, *op. cit.*, p. 77. For a useful critique of Holt's other two categories — 'l'emploi gnomique' and 'l'emploi terminologique' see Hoeg, *op. cit.*

⁴) Long, A. A., *Language and Thought in Sophocles* (London 1968), p. 64.

no delay of evils for the Trojans; the -sis abstract periphrasis in the apodosis effectively underscores this aspect of the proposition.

In the other instance of *ἀνάβλησις* the effect is different: Achilles is cautioning Priam, who has come to ransom Hector's body, to take his sleep in the outer part of the hall, suggesting that if any of the Achaeans were to catch sight of him and report to Agamemnon there might result some delay in ransoming the body:

Iliad 24, 653:

τῶν εἴ τίς σε ἴδοιτο θοῆν διὰ νόκτα μέλαιναν,
 αὐτίκ' ἂν ἐξείποι Ἀγαμέμνονι ποιμένι λαῶν,
 καὶ κεν ἀνάβλησις λύσιος νεκροῦ γένηται.

The impersonal -sis abstract periphrasis adds a certain indefiniteness to the remark, suggesting that the thought is one that has suddenly occurred to Achilles only as a vague possibility whose details he has not worked out.

The following occurrences of -sis nouns offer further illustration of the effectiveness of this type of periphrastic arrangement in making various kinds of emphatic statements:

ὑπάλωξις: *Iliad* 22, 270⁵); *Odyssey* 23, 286.

τίσις: *Odyssey* 1, 40; 2, 76; 13, 144⁶).

ἄνυσις: *Iliad* 2, 347⁷).

Finally in the group of -sis nouns found in this type of periphrasis we may include *νέμεσις*. The word presents problems which are really of more concern to the etymologist, since as a -sis noun *νέμεσις* behaves in no way differently than the other abstracts in this

⁵) Long (*op. cit.*, p. 16) may be right in his remark that since the -sis noun names the action of its verb without reference to a particular subject the periphrasis here has the effect of suggesting that it is not just Hector who will be unable to escape Achilles in this situation, but that no one could have escaped.

⁶) On the other instance of *τίσις* (*Iliad* 22, 19), see my earlier remarks on *παλίωξις* concerning the projection of a particular occurrence into the future; the -sis noun still refers to action in progress.

⁷) See also *Odyssey* 4, 544, where *ἄνυσις* is employed in a different arrangement: *μηκέτι, Ατρεΐος υἱέ, πολὺν χρόνον ἀσκελές σῆτω / κλαῖ, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄνυσιν τινα δόμοιεν*. With *ἄνυσις* we may compare two instances in periphrasis of *πρήξις*: *Iliad* 24, 524 and *Odyssey* 10, 202 (cf. 10, 568). The *progress* aspect of verbal action is well illustrated in two further instances of *πρήξις* not in periphrasis: *Odyssey* 3, 72 — *ἦ τι κατὰ πρήξιν ἢ μαφιδίως ἀλλάγηθε* and 3, 82 — *πρήξις δ' ἦδ' ἰδίη, οὐ δῆμος, ἦν ἄγορεύω*.

group. The problem that faces the etymologist is how the verb *νέμω*, which in Homer means 'to apportion', gives rise to a verbal abstract which designates 'the action of feeling indignation'. For a -sis noun formed from *νέμω* with the strict connotation of that verb ('apportioning') we have to wait for *νέμησις* in Isaeus⁸). Benveniste offers an explanation which is quite convincing: he sees the shift in meaning from the idea of 'fair distribution' to 'indignation' as parallel to the change in *αἰδώς* from the idea of 'responsibility' to that of 'disgrace'; it is the *failure* to discharge responsibility which leads to 'disgrace' in the case of *αἰδώς*, and the *lack* of fair apportionment which leads to 'indignation' in the case of *νέμεσις*⁹).

What concerns us here is that as a -sis noun *νέμεσις* simply names this activity as a continuing process:

Odyssey 2, 136:

*νέμεσις δέ μοι ἐξ ἀνθρώπων
ἔσσεται.*—

'And there will be a feeling of indignation against me on the part of men'¹⁰).

The force of the -sis suffix is the same in the instances of the formula *οὐ νέμεσις* (*ἔστι*) with an infinitive:

Iliad 14, 80:

*οὐ γὰρ τις νέμεσις φηγέειν κακόν, οὐδ' ἀνὰ νύκτα*¹¹).

The other two instances of *παλίωξις* will serve to introduce a second type of periphrastic arrangement in which the -sis noun is found as the object of an auxiliary verb:

Iliad 15, 601:

*ἐκ γὰρ δὴ τοῦ ἔμελλε παλίωξιν παρὰ νηῶν
θησέμεναι Τρώων, Δαναοῖσι δὲ κῦδος ὀρέξειν*¹²).

⁸) Isaeus 9. 17.

⁹) Benveniste, *op. cit.*, p. 79. For other views on *νέμεσις* see Kretschmer, P., "Dyaus, Zeus, Diespiter und die Abstrakta im Indogermanischen" *Glotta* 13 (1924) 101; von Erffa, "Αἰδώς und verwandte Begriffe in ihrer Entwicklung von Homer bis Democrit" *Philologus Supplementband* 30 (1937) 1-206; Herter, H., *Pauly-Wissowa*, XVI 2, 2338.

¹⁰) Cf. *Odyssey* 22, 40; *Iliad* 6, 351; 13, 121.

¹¹) Cf. *Odyssey* 1, 350; 20, 330; *Iliad* 3, 156.

¹²) Cf. *Iliad* 15, 69: *ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἄν τοι ἔπειτα παλίωξιν παρὰ νηῶν / αἰὲν ἐγὼ τεύχοιμι διαμπερές, εἰς δ' κ' Ἀχαιοὶ / Ἴλιον αἰπὸν ἔλοιεν Ἀθηναίης διὰ βουλᾶς.*

It must be remarked, of course, that in the case of *παλιώξις* we are not surprised to find some kind of periphrasis; the root-verb is nowhere attested; there is also the consideration that the expression *παλιώξις παρὰ νηῶν* may have crystallised into a military technical term. With the following -sis nouns, however, we may detect a specific reason for their occurrence in this type of periphrasis, despite Long's assertion that when Homer uses this type of periphrasis 'the sense seems to be indistinguishable from the simple verb'¹³).

σκέδασις

Odyssey 20, 225:

ἀλλ' ἔτι τὸν δύστηνον δίομαι, εἴ ποθεν ἐλθὼν
ἀνδρῶν μνηστήρων σκέδασιν κατὰ δώματα θείη.

The effect of the -sis abstract here is to present the action of the root-verb, even though it is projected into the future, in a particularly vivid way; it suggests that his conversation with the disguised Odysseus has caused the swineherd to allow his imagination to run wild, and that he is for the moment actually living in his mind the scene which he so much desires to witness in reality.

ἔκκλησις

Odyssey 24, 482:

ἐπεὶ δὴ μνηστῆρας ἐτίσατο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,
ὄρκα πιστὰ ταμόντες ὃ μὲν βασιλευέτω αἰεὶ,
ἡμεῖς δ' ἀδ' παίδων τε κασιγνήτων τε φόνου
ἔκκλησιν θέωμεν· τοὶ δ' ἀλλήλους φιλέοντων
ὥς τὸ πάρος, πλοῦτος δὲ καὶ εἰρήνη ἄλις ἔστω.

To Athena's enquiries as to how the feud between Odysseus and the suitors is to be resolved, Zeus makes the pronouncement contained in the text: Odysseus is to be recognised as rightful king in Ithaca, and the suitors are to be made to forget that he has been the agent in the slaying of their sons and brothers. The important thing to recognise here is that these lines have very much the tone of an edict; the third person imperatives (*βασιλευέτω*, *φιλέοντων*, *ἔστω*) add a certain dignity to the pronouncement; the substitution of *ἔκκλησιν θέωμεν* for the more conventional *ἐκλάθωμεν* is in keeping with the effect of the whole. Further, the tense of the imperatives

¹³) Long, *op. cit.*, p. 81. See also Porzig, W., *Die Namen für Satzinhalte im Griechischen und im Indogermanischen* (Berlin 1942), pp. 28-31.

indicates that this is to be a lasting settlement; the -sis abstract serves to present the condition of 'forgetting' as a continuing one¹⁴).

It has been convenient to group together a number of -sis abstracts which occur in one or other of two types of periphrasis: either as subject of a copula or as object of an 'auxiliary' verb. The use of the -sis abstract periphrasis as a substitute for a finite form of the root-verb is uncommon enough at this period to justify our looking for some special effect, and in a number of cases this effect has been evident; it is significant perhaps that in every instance the periphrasis is part of direct speech¹⁵).

What is important for our purposes, however, apart from the special effects which these -sis abstracts create, is the fact that in all instances the -sis noun performs the function of naming the action of its verb *in progress or conceived of as in progress*, even where the actual occurrence (or non-occurrence) of the action is projected into the future.

It has been remarked above that the -sis abstract is more impersonal than the root-verb, and there is truth in Long's statement that 'the fact that -sis nouns are a way of making general statements in an impersonal manner is a major cause of their development in later Greek'¹⁶). The following three nouns will illustrate Homer's use of the -sis abstract in this manner, though we can best see the usage develop in an instance of one of the -sis nouns already discussed:

Odyssey 1,350: *τούτω δ' ὃ νέμεσις Δαναῶν κακὸν ὄϊτρον δεΐδεν.*

The reference here is quite specific; Telemachus is defending Phe-mius (τούτω) against Penelope's complaint that he is causing unnecessary discomfort by singing of the hardships suffered by the Achaeans on the return from Troy. In two other instances of the same formula the reference is also quite concrete (*Odyssey* 20,330;

¹⁴) As well as being content to note that *ἐκλησις* here occurs in a sentence where 'le verbe est au subjonctif ou à l'optatif designant une éventualité' and is accordingly to be classed as 'l'emploi de possibilité', Holt quite simply mistranslates: 'ne pensons plus au meurtre de nos fils et de nos frères' (*op. cit.*, p. 73).

¹⁵) The rarity of all abstracts in indirect compared with direct speech in Homer has been noted by P. Krarup, „Verwendung von Abstrakta in der direkten Rede bei Homer“ *Classica et Mediaevalia* 10 (1948) 1-17.

¹⁶) Long, *op. cit.*, p. 16. Holt goes further, establishing what he calls 'l'emploi gnominique' as one of the fundamental 'forces' ('valeur') of the -sis suffix in Homer (*op. cit.*, p. 77).

Iliad 3, 156). In the remaining example, however, we see a development:

Iliad 14, 75:

νῆες ὄσαι πρῶται εἰρύονται ἄγχι θαλάσσης,
 ἔλκωμεν, πάσας δὲ ἐρύσσομεν εἰς ἄλα δῖαν,
 ὕψι δ' ἐπ' ἐνδάων δρμίσσομεν, εἰς δ' κεν ἔλθῃ
 νῆξ ἀβρότη, ἣν καὶ τῆ ἀπόσχονται πολέμοιο
 Τρῶες· ἔπειτα δὲ κεν ἐρυσσάμεθα νῆας ἀπάσας.
 οὐ γάρ τις νέμεσις φηγέειν κακόν, οὐδ' ἀνά νύκτα.
 βέλτερον, ὅς φεύγων προφύγη κακὸν ἢ ἐάλῳη.

This is Agamemnon's recommendation when the Trojans are faring well against the Achaean ships drawn up against the beach, and his remark that 'there need be no feeling of indignation at fleeing disaster' is prompted by and refers to this particular situation. Yet it is evident that the impersonal -sis abstract has the effect of making the remark an aphoristic one that could be made to fit any number of like situations. The -sis nouns used by Homer in such general statements prompted by the immediate situation are the following:

ἀνάπνευσις: *Iliad* 11, 801; 16, 43; 18, 201¹⁷).

ἐπίσχεσις: *Odyssey* 17, 451¹⁸).

παράφασις: *Iliad* 11, 792; 15, 403¹⁹).

¹⁷) Long (*op. cit.*, p. 64) points out that in all three instances of ἀνάπνευσις the -sis noun serves to repeat in different form a verbal idea that has already been introduced by the root-verb; e. g. *Iliad* 11, 800: Τρῶες, ἀναπνεύσωσι δ' ἀρήιοι νῆες Ἀχαιῶν / τευράμενοι· ὀλίγη δὲ τ' ἀνάπνευσις πολέμοιο. — For a more involved word-play see *Odyssey* 13, 141— οὐ τί σ' ἀτιμάζουσι θεοί· χαλεπὸν δὲ κεν εἶη / πρῆσβύτατον καὶ ἄριστον ἀτιμίησιν ἰάλλειν. / ἀνδρῶν δ' εἴ πέρ τις σε βῆη καὶ κάρτει εἴκων / οὐ τι τίει, σοὶ δ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐξοπίσω τίσις αἰεὶ. See also Porzig, *op. cit.*, pp. 11–28.

¹⁸) ἐξείης πάντεσσι παρίστασαι· οἱ δὲ διδοῦσι / μαριδίως, ἐπεὶ οὐ τις ἐπίσχεσις οὐδ' ἔλεητύς / ἄλλοτριῶν χαρίσασθαι, ἐπεὶ πάρα πολλὰ ἐκάστω. Benveniste (*op. cit.*, p. 66) sees in this example a definite contrast between the -tus and the -sis noun—ἐλεητύς designating what he calls 'disposition subjective' and ἐπίσχεσις 'fait objectif'. It is the main conclusion of his study of -tus and -sis nouns that -tus nouns 'marquent la disposition et l'aptitude, l'exercice de la notion comme vocation et capacité de celui qui l'accomplit, en un mot la 'destination' subjective et en général la 'fonction' au sens propre, l'exercice de la notion étant considéré comme la 'fonction' de celui qui la pratique' (p. 74); while 'la signification générale des noms en -sis est la notion abstraite du procès conçu comme réalisation objective' (p. 80).

¹⁹) In the other instance of παράφασις (*Iliad* 14, 217) we are presented with a description of the girdle which Aphrodite gives to Hera, who is

It is important to recognise that it is not the -sis suffix *per se* that makes these sentences 'gnomic', nor is it the fact that they are 'gnomic' that accounts for the -sis noun. The function of the -sis abstract, here as in the examples already discussed, is to name the action of its verb as a continuing process. That the -sis noun is found useful for this type of utterance is due only to the fact that it can perform this function without personal reference.

It remains to consider the rest of the -sis nouns to be included in this group A.

λύσις

At *Iliad* 24, 655—*καὶ κεν ἀνάβλησις λύσιος νεκροῦ γένηται*—λύσις clearly designates 'the action of releasing': '... and there would be a delay in the action of releasing the body'. The other instance of λύσις is more difficult:

Odyssey 9, 420:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ βούλευον, ὅπως ὄχ' ἄριστα γένοιτο,
εἴ τιν' ἑταίροισιν θανάτου λύσιν ἦδ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῶ
εὐροίμην· πάντα δὲ δόλους καὶ μῆτιν ἕφαινον,
ὥς τε περὶ ψυχῆς· μέγα γὰρ κακὸν ἐγγύθεν ἦεν.
ἦδε δέ μοι κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνεται βουλή.

It is possible that λύσις here denotes the *completed* action of the verb in a passive sense; this is certainly the sense in Anacreon, *fr.* 42 (Diehl):

ἀπό μοι θανεῖν γένοιτ'· οὐ γὰρ ἄν ἄλλη
λύσις ἐκ πόνων γένοιτ' οὐδάμα τῶνδε.

It is clear from the context of our present example, however, that what is engaging Odysseus' attention is not the thought of 'having been delivered' from the predicament in which he and his companions find themselves; it is rather the very present problem of devising some means of escape—the 'process' of delivering his friends and himself from danger. The -sis abstract, by focusing

devising a scheme to take Zeus' attention away from the battle; represented on the girdle are various 'allurements' (*θελκτήρια*)—*ἐνθ' ἐνὶ μὲν φιλότης, ἐν δ' ἴμερος, ἐν δ' ἄριστος*—which the poet sums up in the expression—*πάρφασις, ἦ τ' ἔκλεψε νόον πύκα περ φρονοόντων*. The -sis abstract here has the effect of focusing upon these representations as part of the 'process of beguiling',—the process which Hera herself is engaged in.

upon the 'process', heightens the effect of Odysseus grappling with a problem which is by no means yet solved.

Similar considerations hold for *φύξις* at *Iliad* 10, 398²⁰); and *ἐκβασίς* at *Odyssey* 5, 410.

δμηῆσις

Iliad 17, 476:

Ἀλκίμεδον, τίς γάρ τοι Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ὁμοῖος
ἵππων ἀθανάτων ἐχέμεν δμηῆσιν τε μένος τε.

The -sis abstract (with *ἐχέμεν* by zeugma) simply names the action of its verb: 'Alcimedon, which of the Achaeans can match you in managing the taming of the immortal horses and handling their strength?'

Finally in Group A we consider a -sis abstract whose sole occurrence in Homer has naturally provoked much discussion, but for which there is an explanation that has the advantage of being at the same time simple and expected, given the force of the -sis suffix as illustrated in the nouns so far discussed.

φύσις (*φύομαι*)

Odyssey 10, 302:

ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας πόρε φάρμακον ἀργεῖφόντης
ἐκ γαίης ἐρύσας, καὶ μοι φύσιν αὐτοῦ ἔδειξε.
ῥίζην μὲν μέλαν ἔσκε, γάλακτι δὲ εἴκελον ἄνθος·
μῶλν δὲ μιν καλέουσι θεοί· χαλεπὸν δέ τ' ὀρύσσειν
ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι. θεοὶ δὲ τε πάντα δύνανται.

What Hermes actually points out to Odysseus is not the supernatural qualities of the plant, but the visible characteristics of it: the black root and white blossom; the name of the plant and its connection with the gods are added in the passage as a remark by Odysseus to his audience, and are thus only indirectly associated with the word *φύσις*. What Odysseus was actually shown was the way in which the plant was growing as manifested by its outward appearance: he was shown, in fact, the *process of growing*. We may contrast *φνή* at *Iliad* 22, 370:

ἄλλοι δὲ περιδραμον υἱες Ἀχαιῶν,
οἳ καὶ θηήσαντο φνήν καὶ εἶδος ἀγητὸν
Ἔκτορος·

²⁰) Cf. *Iliad* 10, 447. We may contrast *φνή* at *Odyssey* 10, 117 and 22, 306.

—where the emphasis is upon the stature of Hector,—what he has grown into—the *result of the process* rather than the process itself.

We have so far examined 19 of the Homeric nouns in -sis, and it has been demonstrated that we are presented with a formation which is extremely versatile: it can stand as subject or object of a verb in a variety of periphrastic expressions, and the fact that its use as an alternative to some form of the root-verb is at this stage not overworked makes its presence in such arrangements particularly effective; the fact that the -sis noun names the action of its verb without reference in itself to a particular subject makes it especially useful in the statement of general propositions. In whatever type of sentence it is employed, however, and whatever its syntactical role in the sentence, the -sis abstract so far performs the function of naming the action of its root-verb *in progress* or *conceived of as in progress*, and it is solely the -sis suffix that gives the noun this precise force.

Group B consists of 9 -sis nouns whose primary function is not to name the process of their respective root-verbs, but to designate something which is closely associated with this process. These nouns are to be further divided into two sub-groups according to the precise nature of this association.

GROUP B (a)

ἄροσις

There are two instances of ἄροσις in Homer, and in only one of these is it possible to regard the word as simply naming the action of its verb:

Odyssey 9, 131:

οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακή γε, φέροι δέ κεν ὄρια πάντα·
 ἐν μὲν γὰρ λειμῶνες ἀλός πολιοῖο παρ' ὄχθας
 ὑδρηλοὶ μαλακοί· μάλα κ' ἄφθιτοι ἄμπελοι εἶεν.
 ἐν δ' ἄροσις λείη.

A consideration of the second instance, however, suggests that such an interpretation is not warranted:

Iliad 9, 578:

ἐνθα μιν ἦρωγον τέμενος περικαλλὲς ἐλέσθαι
 πεντηκοντόγυον, τὸ μὲν ἦμισυ οἶνοπέδοιο,
 ἦμισυ δὲ ψιλῆν ἄροσιν πεδίλιο ταμέσθαι.

It is clear that in this instance *ἄροσις* refers to a 'piece of land'; but it is not a piece of 'ploughed land'; this can be seen from a consideration of *Odyssey* 9,122 ff., where the topography of the land of the Cyclopes is described:

οὐτ' ἄρα ποιμνησιν καταίσχεται οὐτ' ἀρότοισιν,
ἀλλ' ἢ γ' ἄσπαρτος καὶ ἀνήροτος ἤματα πάντα
ἀνδρῶν χηρεύει, βόσκει δέ τε μηκάδας αἴγας.

It is this same territory that is being discussed in our first example—*ἐν δ' ἄροσις λείη*: there is a definite contrast between *ἀρότοισιν* and *ἄροσις*, between land which *has been ploughed* and land which is *ploughable*.

In both instances of *ἄροσις*, then, the word is best regarded as referring to a tract of land, but land which is so termed only so long as it is considered in the context of the action of ploughing; it is its possible participation in the action of the verb which causes it to be referred to by a word which, because of the -sis suffix, signifies that activity.

βόσις

Iliad 19,268:

τὸν μὲν Ταλθύβιος πολιῆς ἀλὸς ἐς μέγα λαῖπμα
εἴψ' ἐπιδιήσας, βόσιν ἰχθόσων·

The actual material object of *ἐπιδιήσας* is contained in the pronoun *τὸν*, and can be qualified by the appositional *βόσιν* because of its participation as object in the action of the verb from which *βόσις* is formed. Just as with the -sis nouns in Group A, so with *βόσις* here, and *ἄροσις* in the above examples, the verbal aspect involved is that of process.

βρωσις/πόσις

These may be taken together, since they appear most often as a pair. It is clear from *Iliad* 19,209 that they refer to something material:

πρὶν δ' οὐ πως ἂν ἐμοί γε φίλον κατὰ λαιμὸν ἰεῖη
οὐ πόσις οὐδὲ βρωσις, ἐταίρον τεθνηῶτος,

Yet it is not to any particular item of food or drink, but to 'something' to eat and 'something' to drink. As -sis nouns they designate

the class to which all particular items of food or drink belong by reason of their common participation as object in the action of the verbs from which these abstracts are derived²¹).

δόσις

This final -sis noun to be considered in this sub-group presents problems whose examination will prove instructive. The question is whether *δόσις* denotes the 'action of giving' and is thus to be classed in Group A, or refers to a 'material gift'—that which participates as object in the act of giving—and thus belongs in the present group. Four instances will serve to illustrate:

(a) *Iliad* 10, 212:

μέγα κέν οἱ ὑπουράνιον κλέος εἶη
πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους· καί οἱ δόσις ἔσσειται ἐσθλή·
δοσοὶ γὰρ νήεσσιν ἐπικρατέουσιν ἄριστοι,
τῶν πάντων οἱ ἕκαστος δῖν δώσουσι μέλαιναν.

We have already noted that the -sis abstract is frequently used in periphrasis as a substitute for a form of the root-verb and remarked upon instances where the periphrasis is closely followed by the root-verb itself expressing the same idea²²). It is this arrangement that we meet here, where *δόσις ἔσσειται* ('there will be a giving') is made more explicit in *ἕκαστος δῖν δώσουσι μέλαιναν*.

(b) *Odyssey* 14, 58:

πρὸς γὰρ Διὸς εἰσιν ἅπαντες
ξεῖνοί τε πτωχοί τε· δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε
γίγνεται ἡμετέρη.

We have seen that Homer found the -sis abstract useful in making general statements and Eumaeus' reference here to the popular notion that all beggars and strangers come from Zeus is certainly aphoristic; *δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε / γίγνεται ἡμετέρη* is best taken

²¹) Benveniste (*op. cit.*, p. 67), commenting upon the difference between *βρωτός* and *βρωσις*, states that 'le contraste est frappant entre le 'manger' comme disposition subjective (*βρωτός*) et le 'manger' comme réalité matérielle (*βρωσις*)'. He is right that *βρωσις* is material, but he does not explain how it is possible to have both a -sis noun and a -tus noun in the same expression, e. g. *Iliad* 19, 319—*αὐτὰρ ἐμὸν κῆρ / ἄκμηρον πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος, ἐνδον ἐόντων*.

²²) See note 17.

as a similar type of general proposition: 'the act of giving presents itself to the likes of us but seldom, but it is pleasant when it does'.

(c) *Odyssey* 4, 651:

αὐτὸς ἐκὼν οἱ δῶκα· τί κεν ῥέξειε καὶ ἄλλος,
ὄπιστ' ἀνὴρ τοιοῦτος, ἔχων μελεδήματα θυμῶ,
αἰτλίῃ; χαλεπὸν κεν ἀνήρασθαι δόσιν εἶη.

δόσις here may well mean 'gift' and refer to the *ῆα μέλαινα* of line 646. Similarly at (d) *Odyssey* 18, 286:

δῶρα μὲν ὅς κ' ἐθέλησιν Ἀχαιῶν ἐνθάδ' ἐνεῖκαι,
δέξασθ'· σὸ γὰρ καλὸν ἀνήρασθαι δόσιν ἐστίν.

In both (c) and (d), however, the -sis abstract may simply be an alternative for the infinitive of the root-verb; in (d), for example, we might translate 'it would not be proper to reject *an act of giving*'. If we are justified in interpreting δόσις in both instances of the expression ἀνήρασθαι δόσιν as denoting the action of its root-verb, then we are presented with an excellent illustration of the versatility of the -sis abstract: in (c) the subject of the infinitive is also the subject of the action named by the -sis abstract, while in (d) the subject of the infinitive is not the subject but the recipient of the action denoted by the -sis noun. It is not surprising that a formation which had the power to name a verbal process in this impersonal manner should have proved increasingly popular as succeeding writers and thinkers found themselves in need of the elements of an abstract vocabulary.

It would be wrong, however, to say categorically that δόσις is to be placed exclusively in one or other of the two groups. While there are indications in each of the four examples cited that the -sis noun performs the same function as the -sis nouns in Group A, we cannot dismiss the possibility that δόσις may in all these examples be quite concrete in reference. It is safer to say that in the case of δόσις we are presented with a -sis abstract which may in one instance name the action of its verb and in another designate the material object involved in this action²³).

²³) Something of the same is true also of πόσις, and perhaps βρώσις. While we can be certain that both nouns are used to refer to material items, at *Iliad* 1, 469 πόσις may well name the action of its verb: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἐντο. The following may be considered as a possible instance of both nouns performing this function: *Odyssey* 12, 320—ἐν γὰρ νηὶ θοῆ βρώσις τε πόσις τε | ἔστιν—'eating and drinking is possible on the ship'.

GROUP B (b)

The following four -sis nouns are to be distinguished from those in sub-division (a) because their association with the action of their verbs is basically different.

χύσις

Odyssey 5, 483:

ἄφαρ δ' ἐννήν ἐπαμήσατο χερσὶ φίλησιν
 εὐρεῖαν φύλλον γὰρ ἔην χύσις ἤλιθα πολλή,
 ὄσσον τ' ἠὲ δύω ἠὲ τρεῖς ἄνδρας ἔρυσθαι²⁴).

The -sis noun here names a material entity—a 'pile'—and not the action of its root-verb; further, it does not designate the precise material nature of this entity (in this case it is a 'pile of leaves', but it could be a pile of anything). In both these respects *χύσις* behaves in exactly the same manner as the -sis nouns in sub-division (a). What distinguishes it from those abstracts is the fact that while they designate that which is involved in the verbal process as it is taking place, *χύσις* names that which *results* from the process after its completion.

δνησις

Odyssey 21, 402:

αἶ γὰρ δὴ τοσσοῦτον δνήσιος ἀντιάσειεν
 ὧς οὐτός ποτε τοῦτο δνησεται ἐντανύσασθαι.

The same problem presents itself here as with some of the -sis nouns in sub-division (a):—it is possible to regard *δνήσιος* as denoting the action of its verb *δνήμι*, and the expression *αἶ . . . δνήσιος ἀντιάσειεν* as a periphrasis for an optative form of this verb. What is required, however, is strictly a future-perfect aspect of this verbal idea, since the 'profit' is to accrue to Odysseus as a *result* of his stringing the bow. We shall therefore class *δνησις* with *χύσις* as naming that which results from the verbal process.

ὑπόσχεσις

Iliad 2, 286:

οὐδέ τοι ἐκτελέουσι ὑπόσχεσιν, ἦν περ ὑπέσταν
 ἐνθάδ' ἔτι στείχοντες ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἱποβότοιο.

²⁴) Cf. *Odyssey* 19, 443.

It is clear that the -sis noun here denotes that which results from the action of its root-verb, and again in a general way²⁵). At *Iliad* 13,369, however, *ὑποσχέσεισι* may well refer to the 'action of promising'—

ὁ δὲ μάραθ' ὑποσχέσεισι πιδήσας·

—the plural indicating that the action took place on a number of occasions. We may conclude, then, that in *ὑπόσχεσις* we have a -sis noun that in some instances designates that which results from the action of its verb, and in one instance may simply name this action.

ῥήσις

Odyssey 21, 291:

ὄκ ἀγαπᾶς ὃ ἔκηλος ὑπερφιάλοισι μεθ' ἡμῶν
δαίνουσαι οὐδέ τι δαιτὸς ἀμέρδει, αὐτὰρ ἀκούεις
μύθων ἡμετέρων καὶ ῥήσιος;

The -sis noun here compliments *μύθων* and must be taken as referring to the result of the verbal activity—'what is said'. In the context, however, what is meant by *μύθων . . . καὶ ῥήσιος* is not an isolated statement, but a continuing conversation at a banquet table, an activity taking place over a period of time; this may be an added reason for the choice of *ῥήσις* here, because of the association of the -sis suffix with continuing activity.

In Group B we are presented with 9 -sis nouns which add a new dimension to the force of the -sis suffix. The *sole* function of the 19 -sis nouns in Group A was to name the action of the root-verb in progress or conceived of as in progress. The -sis suffix enables the poet to focus upon the verbal process divorced from the particulars (persons, objects, etc.) involved in it; it presents him with a method of abstraction. With the -sis nouns in Group B the movement is in the opposite direction; each of these nouns designates a material particular involved in the activity of the root-verb: the participating or resulting object of the verbal process. As Webster well expresses it, 'we have a range in the reverse direction from abstract process to concrete substratum in which the process has been or can be fulfilled'²⁶).

²⁵) Cf. *Odyssey* 10, 483; *Iliad* 2, 349.

²⁶) *Manchester Literary and Philological Society, Memoirs and Proceedings* 94 (1952/53) 27.

GROUP C

This group consists of two -sis nouns which are generic in character, naming the class to which any number of particulars may belong by reason of their common participation in the process of the root-verb.

κτῆσις

Odyssey 7, 224:

ιδόντα με καὶ λίποι αἰὼν
κτῆσιν ἐμὴν, δμῶάς τε καὶ ὑπερεφές μέγα δῶμα.

κτῆσις here is a 'concrete' substantive, though 'concrete' in a special sense; just as in the last group the noun *χρύσις* was further identified by the word *φύλλων*, so κτῆσις here is further defined in *δμῶάς τε καὶ ὑπερεφές μέγα δῶμα*²⁷). The -sis noun does not itself designate a particular possession; it names the class to which all 'possessions' belong. It is because it is a generic term that κτῆσις is found only in the singular, while κτήμα appears in the plural in all instances but one, and is used when reference is to particular possessions; moreover, κτήμα is never further defined²⁸). κτῆσις, then, names a group of objects by applying to them as a class the name of the verbal activity in which they collectively participate as object.

πρόβασις

Odyssey 2, 75:

ἐμοὶ δέ κε κέρδιον εἶη
ὑμέας ἐσθήμεναι κειμήλιά τε πρόβασίν τε.

We cannot be sure that πρόβασις is formed from the verb *προβαίνω*; it would be a linguistically correct formation—in Pindar we have βάσις from *βαίνω*, and in later Greek the word πρόβασις is certainly derived from *προβαίνω*: it is used in Iamblichus (*V. P.* 26.120) of

²⁷) Of the eleven instances of κτῆσις, it is further particularised in four: *Odyssey* 7, 225; 14, 62; 19, 526; *Iliad* 19, 333. The other instances of κτῆσις are *Odyssey* 14, 687; 19, 534; *Iliad* 5, 158; 14, 491; 18, 512; 22, 121; 15, 633.

²⁸) Holt (*op. cit.*, p. 82) makes a further distinction between κτῆσις and κτήμα, on the grounds that when these nouns are involved in the process of 'partager', the main verb is always a compound in the case of κτῆσις, and a simple in the case of κτήμα. His first example, however, is not convincing, since κτήματα may well be the object there of a compound verb—*μή τοι κατὰ πάντα φάγωσιν | κτήματα δασσάμενοι* (*Odyssey* 3, 315). What significance such a distinction would have he does not say.

the 'progression' of musical sounds, and by Soranus Medicus (1.110) of the 'progression' of time. The later word may, however, be a homonym, and the Homeric *πρόβασις* not be derived from *προβαίνω* at all; it is certainly difficult to suggest a convincing association between the 'action of going before' and what *πρόβασις* evidently means—'cattle, sheep'; one could suggest that what is peculiar to sheep among domestic animals is a tendency to rely for direction upon an individual member of the flock, who could be described as 'going before'; but this is hardly more convincing than the opposite suggestion that the word was originally used of small animals which, in primitive mixed herds, 'went before' the larger ones²⁹).

Now it is noticeable that *πρόβατα* is used in Homer in much the same way as *κτήματα*; at *Iliad* 14,124 *πρόβατα* appears in a fairly detailed list of possessions and the emphasis is upon the number of individual animals rather than the class; similarly at *Iliad* 23,550. In the sole instance of *πρόβασις*, however, Telemachus is speaking of his animal holdings in the most general way, and the -sis noun certainly refers to the class. Since we know from the instances of *κῆσις* that the -sis suffix does possess the force of forming 'collectives', it is reasonable to suggest that *πρόβασις* is formed from *πρόβατα* by analogy.

Whatever the etymological derivation of *πρόβασις*, it is clear that in this word, as in *κῆσις*, the -sis suffix performs the function of designating the class to which particulars belong, by applying to them the name of the verbal process in which they participate.

GROUP D

It is proposed to place the remaining 6 -sis nouns in this final group, even though there is no single significance attached to all of them in common, as is the case with the -sis nouns within each of the first three groups. None of these nouns names the process of its root-verb; on the other hand, each has an association with this process which accounts for its formation in -sis³⁰).

²⁹) LSJ, s. v. *πρόβατον*. See also Hofmann, J. B., *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen* (Munich 1950), s. v. *πρόβατον*—'eigentlich das Vorwärtsgehende (von den beweglichen Gütern, opp. *κειμήλια*)'.

³⁰) We cannot be certain that *ἄσις* (*Iliad* 21,321) is a -sis termination noun. Chantraine (*op. cit.*, p. 282) argues that it is formed with the -sis suffix from the zero grade of the verb *ἄω* (epic infinitive—*ἄμεναι*; future—*ἄσω*). Though not entirely convinced, Holt lists it among the Homeric -sis

Two nouns in the group receive their designation from the name of the action with which they are particularly associated; in the case of ἔπαλιξις—'battlement'—it is 'the action of warding off' (ἐπαλέξω)³¹; in the case of προτόμησις—'navel'—it is 'the action of cutting off in front' (προτέμνω)³².

γένεσις

In each instance in Homer γένεσις is found in apposition to Oceanus: e. g. *Iliad* 14, 201—'Ὠκεανόν τε, θεῶν γένεσιν, καὶ μητέρα Τηθῶν. Now since γένεσις is derived from a verb which is intransitive, θεῶν here must be a subjective genitive: the gods participate as subject in the process of coming-to-be. Subject participation is conveyed in the following instance by the dative (again of the gods):

Iliad 14, 246:

καὶ ἄν ποταμοῖο ῥέεθρα
'Ὠκεανοῦ, ὅς περ γένεσις πάντεσσι τέτυκται·

In both instances, then, we have the idea of a process in which the gods are involved as subject; yet the -sis noun does not name the process itself³³; it is predicated of Oceanus, the *source* of the process³⁴).

ὄψις

At *Iliad* 20, 203ff., where there is a distinction between hearing reports about someone and actually seeing them for oneself, ὄψις is used along with the verb 'to see' to form an effective pleonastic expression 'to see *through seeing*', 'to see face to face':

ἴδμεν δ' ἀλλήλων γενεήν, ἴδμεν δὲ τοκῆας,
πρόκλυτ' ἀκούοντες ἔπεα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων·
ὄψει δ' οὔτ' ἄρ πω σὺ ἐμὸς ἴδες οὔτ' ἄρ' ἐγὼ σούς.

nouns and classifies it with χάσις, 'comme indiquant une action dont on ne peut pas apercevoir l'achèvement' (*op. cit.*, p. 86). If Chantraine is correct in his derivation from ἄω (to fill) there is some connection with the meaning of the noun—'slime, silt'—which could account for its formation in -sis; in view of the uncertainty in derivation, however, it has been decided to leave ἄσις out of account for the purposes of this study.

³¹) See *Iliad* 12, 397; 12, 258; 12, 263; 12, 308; 12, 375; 12, 406; 22, 3.

³²) *Iliad* 11, 424.

³³) It does perform this function later; see, for example, Parmenides, *fr.* 8, 21 (DK); Plato, *Philebus* 55a5.

³⁴) We may note that agent nouns from γίγνεσθαι—γενετήρ and γενέτωρ—are later than Homer.

Similarly at *Odyssey* 23, 94, where Penelope is presented as staring constantly at Odysseus, still not sure whether or not it is he. In both instances the -sis noun serves to focus upon the actual 'process of seeing'.

At *Iliad* 24, 632 *ὄψις* is again used in conjunction with a verb of 'seeing', but here the abstract designates that which in a sense 'completes' the action of seeing—the 'appearance' that presents itself to the eye:

αὐτὰρ ὁ Δαρδανίδην Πριάμον θαύμαζεν Ἀχιλλεύς,
εἰσορόων ὄψιν τ' ἀγαθὴν καὶ μῦθον ἀκούων³⁵).

ἐπίκλησις

ἐπίκλησις is placed in this final group because of its restricted usage in Homer; it is found only as an accusative of respect—five times in the expression *ἐπίκλησιν καλέειν*—'to call someone something with respect to naming him (as a name)'; e. g. *Iliad* 22, 506:

νῦν δ' ἂν πολλὰ πάθησι, φίλον ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἁμαρτῶν,
Ἄστυναξ, ὃν Τρῶες ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν³⁶).

πρόφασις

πρόφασις is likewise used only absolutely in the accusative—'with respect to putting forward as a reason, ostensibly'; e. g., *Iliad* 19, 301:

ὧς ἔφατο κλαίονσ', ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες,
Πάτροκλον πρόφασιν, σφῶν δ' αὐτῶν κήδε' ἐκάστη³⁷).

In the case of both -sis nouns the basic association with the action of the root-verb is clear.

It is clear that in Homer we have to do with a suffix which does not form nouns of only one type. It is true that Group A is by far the largest group, and it would be correct to say that it is the primary force of the -sis suffix to form nouns of this type,—verbal abstracts whose *sole* function is to name the action of the root-verb in progress or conceived of as in progress. The fact that the -sis

³⁵) Cf. *Iliad* 6, 468.

³⁶) Cf. *Iliad* 7, 138; 18, 487; 22, 29; *Odyssey* 5, 273; *Iliad* 16, 177.

³⁷) Cf. *Iliad* 19, 262. Holt (*op. cit.*, p. 44) argues that *πρόφασις* is derived from *προφαίνω* by analogy with *βάσις* from *βαίνω*; Benveniste (*op. cit.*, p. 78) reserves judgement between *προφαίνω* and *πρόφημι*. The fact that we have *πάρφασις* from *παράφημι* in Homer would seem to me to support *πρόφημι*.

noun does this in an impersonal manner makes it extremely versatile: it provides the poet with a method of abstraction whereby he can focus upon the activity itself, divorced from an immediate context; the -sis noun can stand as subject or as object of a verb and is thus available for use, with effect, in a variety of periphrastic arrangements; it is useful too in the statement of general propositions.

Group B, however, presents us with a smaller number of -sis nouns which add another dimension to the force of the suffix, since in this group are included nouns which in some instances perform the same function as those in Group A, while in others designate not the process of the root-verb, but the object of the process; in this group too are included a number of nouns which represent a further development, in that their *sole* function is to name the object of the process. This fluidity in the force of the suffix manifests itself further in Groups C + D, where the range of association with the verbal process is widened to include -sis nouns whose connection with the verbal action is less close.

A review of the 35 -sis nouns which make their first appearance during the period between Homer and the Ionian prose writers indicates that, while there are certain morphological developments in the system³⁸), the *force* of the -sis suffix underwent no significant change: all the new -sis nouns conform to the 'Homeric' pattern³⁹).

³⁸) See Holt, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

³⁹) Here is a list of the new -sis nouns and their instances, arranged according to the 'Homeric' groups: 'Homeric' Group A—24 -sis nouns: *τέργις* (Hesiod, Th. 206; 917; Sc. 273; Pindar, P. 9.19; O. 12.11; N. 8.43; fr. 126.1); *ἔνοσις* (Hesiod, Th. 681; 849; 706); *στάσις* (Pindar, O. 12.16; N. 9.13; Pa.4.53; Pa. 9.15; Dith. 3.3; fr. 109.3; Theognis, 51; 781; 1082; Alcaeus, G 2, 26; Z 2, 1; Solon, 3.19; Xenophanes, 1.23; Bacchylides, fr. 24.3); *κρίσις* (Pindar, O. 7.80; O. 3.21; P. 4.253; N. 10.23; fr. 131b.4; Bacchylides, 3.26); *ἀλρεσις* (Pindar N. 10.82); *ἀνάπασις* (Pindar, N. 7.52; Mimnermus, 10.2; Bacchylides, 19.36); *ἄλωσις* (Pindar, O. 10.42; Pa. 6.81); *κυβέργνασις* (Pindar, P. 10.72); *δύνασις* (Pindar, P. 4.238; P. 5.117; P. 9.30; Bacchylides, 10.49); *μέθυσις* (Theognis, 838); *ἐπίμειξις* (Theognis, 297); *ὑπέρβασις* (Theognis, 1247); *μετάστασις* (Pindar, Dith. 4.40; Simonides, 521.4); *ὑπόκρισις* (Pindar, fr. 140b.15); *φθίσις* (Pindar, Pa. 9.14); *μάθησις* (Aleman, 125); *κενέωσις* (Pindar, Pa. 9.16); *χόρρευσις* (Pindar, Pa. 6.9); *μειξις* (Anacreon, 377.2); *ἐπόνασις* (Alcaeus, Z 45.2); *ἀπόκρισις* (Theognis, 1167); *κτίσις* (Pindar, O. 13.83); *ἄθυρσις* (Bacchylides, 13.93); *ἄμελξις* (Pindar, fr. 106.4). 'Homeric' Group B—7 -sis nouns: *σύνθεσις* (Pindar, P. 4.168; fr. 205.3); *βάξις* (Theognis, 1298; Mimnermus, 9.1; 9.2); *ἐπίρρησις* (Archilochus, 9.1); *κρᾶσις* (Sappho, 148.2); *θείσις*

Moreover, it is noticeable that -sis nouns of the Group A type account for an even greater proportion of the whole than in the Homeric period. We may take this as indication that the primary force of the -sis suffix, at this period as in the Homeric, is to form verbal abstracts which name the action of the root-verb in progress, and that -sis nouns of other types, while still produced, are to be regarded as secondary developments.

The purpose of this study has been to examine the instances of all 36 -sis termination nouns in the Homeric poems in an attempt to identify the force of the -sis suffix at this period. To make such an identification based upon a study of these abstracts in their context is important not only for a clearer understanding of the passages in question and a better appreciation of one aspect of the poet's technique, but also because the -sis suffix was to be most productive in later Greek, especially among the medical writers and the philosophers, and there has been a tendency among those commenting upon the vocabulary of these later writers to rely too readily upon conclusions concerning the nature of -sis nouns which cannot be said to be without error⁴⁰).

We must acknowledge, of course, that, since the -sis suffix continues to be productive in the language—-sis nouns are formed from an increasingly wider range of verb-stems—, the force of the suffix itself may undergo radical development; associations which in the early period appear secondary may assume a primary role; indeed, we must allow for the evolution of quite new associations.

(Pindar, O. 3.8; Alcaeus, K 1.6); *ἔκλυσις* (Theognis, 556; 590; 1178; Solon, 1.70); *ἐπίλασις* (Pindar, P. 1.46). 'Homeric' Group D—4 -sis nouns: *πρόσοψις* (Pindar, P. 4.29); *βάσις* (Pindar P. 1.2); *χρησις* (Pindar, O. 13.76; O. 11.2; N. 1.30); *προϊωξις* (Hesiod, Sc. 154).

⁴⁰) To take but two examples: E. A. Havelock (*Preface to Plato*, Oxford 1963, p. 212, n. 17), commenting upon *Republic* 518e2, offers a fifth-century history of *φρόνησις* which is wholly dependent upon Holt's study of the force of the -sis suffix,—a study in which we have detected significant weaknesses; G. S. Kirk (*Heraclitus: The Cosmic Fragments*, Cambridge 1954, p. 173), commenting upon the meaning of *συλλάψεις* in *fragment* 10 of Heraclitus, states that 'the only doubt is whether it means 'takings together' . . . or 'things taken together', the objects of such an activity. The use of the plural suggests that the latter is the correct meaning'. No documentation is offered for this statement, which is a crucial one in the context, since it is part of the larger question whether we are to read *συλλάψεις* here at all, or *συνάψεις*; yet it is a statement which is readily accepted by the latest commentator on Heraclitus, Marcovich, M., (*Heraclitus: Greek Text with a Short Commentary*, Merida 1967).

On the other hand, if a formation is taken over by a particular class of writers, in this case mainly (though not exclusively) the medical writers and the philosophers, and becomes associated with the performance of a specialised function, then it is not unlikely that its basic force will remain fairly stable. It thus becomes important to determine what were the primary associations of the formation at that time when this class first recognised it as useful for their purposes.

Λυκάβας

VON HERMANN KOLLER, Zürich

Mit einem feierlichen Schwur stellt der unerkannte Odysseus der Penelope τ 305 ff. die unmittelbar bevorstehende Rückkehr ihres Gatten in Aussicht:

*ἦ μὲν τοι τάδε πάντα τελείεται ὡς ἀγορεύω,
τοῦδ' αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος ἐλεύσεται ἐνθάδ' Ὀδυσσεύς,
τοῦ μὲν φθίνοντος μηνός, τοῦ δ' ἰσταμένοιο.*

„Noch im jetzigen *λυκάβας* wird Odysseus hieher kommen, wenn der eine Mond schwindet, der neue aber wächst.“

Penelope bezweifelt aber die ihr wie ein Orakel verkündete Botschaft:

309 *αἶ γὰρ τοῦτο, ξεῖνε, ἔπος τετελεσμένον εἶη,*

„möchte doch diese Aussage (oder dieses Orakel)¹⁾ in Erfüllung gehen!“

Der Zeitpunkt des Eintreffens von Odysseus wird mit dem Genetiv *τοῦδ' αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος* bezeichnet, mit einem Ausdruck, der nur noch einmal (§ 161 f.) im selben Verszusammenhang vorkommt. Offenbar wird dieses dunkle Wort durch den Genetivus absolutus

¹⁾ *Ἔπος* als „Voraussage“, „Orakel“ vgl. Verf., *Glotta* 50 (1972) 16—24.

On the other hand, if a formation is taken over by a particular class of writers, in this case mainly (though not exclusively) the medical writers and the philosophers, and becomes associated with the performance of a specialised function, then it is not unlikely that its basic force will remain fairly stable. It thus becomes important to determine what were the primary associations of the formation at that time when this class first recognised it as useful for their purposes.

Λυκάβας

VON HERMANN KOLLER, Zürich

Mit einem feierlichen Schwur stellt der unerkannte Odysseus der Penelope τ 305 ff. die unmittelbar bevorstehende Rückkehr ihres Gatten in Aussicht:

*ἦ μὲν τοι τάδε πάντα τελείεται ὡς ἀγορεύω,
τοῦδ' αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος ἐλεύσεται ἐνθάδ' Ὀδυσσεύς,
τοῦ μὲν φθίνοντος μηνός, τοῦ δ' ἰσταμένοιο.*

„Noch im jetzigen *λυκάβας* wird Odysseus hieher kommen, wenn der eine Mond schwindet, der neue aber wächst.“

Penelope bezweifelt aber die ihr wie ein Orakel verkündete Botschaft:

309 *αἶ γὰρ τοῦτο, ξεῖνε, ἔπος τετελεσμένον εἶη,*

„möchte doch diese Aussage (oder dieses Orakel)¹⁾ in Erfüllung gehen!“

Der Zeitpunkt des Eintreffens von Odysseus wird mit dem Genetiv *τοῦδ' αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος* bezeichnet, mit einem Ausdruck, der nur noch einmal (§ 161 f.) im selben Verszusammenhang vorkommt. Offenbar wird dieses dunkle Wort durch den Genetivus absolutus

¹⁾ *Ἔπος* als „Voraussage“, „Orakel“ vgl. Verf., *Glotta* 50 (1972) 16—24.

des Verses 307 erläutert. *Λυκάβας* ist also die *ἐτη καὶ νέα*, die *νομηνία*, zugleich aber auch der laufende Monat²⁾. Eine unbefangene Interpretation dieser Stelle führt für *λυκάβας* zur Bedeutung „Neumond“/„Monat“, denn der ganze Zusammenhang erfordert eine kurze Zeitspanne, wie wenig vorher, V. 301/302 gesagt wird: . . . *οὐδ' ἔτι τῆλε φίλων καὶ πατρίδος αἴης δῆρον ἀπεσσεῖται*.

Die später anzutreffende Bedeutung von *λυκάβας* „Jahr“ muß hier noch ferngehalten werden³⁾.

Im frühen Epos ist *λυκάβας* also ein *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, das in einem dem Orakel verwandten Zusammenhang auftritt und vom Dichter selbst als der Erklärung bedürftig betrachtet wird. Es wird erst wieder in der Dichtung des poeta doctus Apollonios Rhodios aufgegriffen, dann wieder häufig in den Dionysiaka des Spätlings Nonnos. Ferner ist es dreimal in arkadischen Inschriften anzutreffen und einmal in einem von Julianus XI 154b überlieferten Orakel unbekannter Herkunft. Das Wort findet sich ebenfalls im Kalchasorakel bei Quintus Smyrnaeus 6, 61f., in dem der Zeitpunkt des Unterganges von Troia genannt wird:

*ἤδη μὲν καὶ πρόσθ' ἐφάμην δεκάτω λυκάβαντι
πέρσειν Ἴλιον αἰνύ⁴⁾.*

Allen diesen späteren Verwendungen ist eine andere Bedeutung gemeinsam, denn unverkennbar ist da immer „Jahr“ gemeint. Auffällig ist auch, daß bis auf wenige Beispiele alle das Wort *λυκάβας* an derselben Versstelle aufweisen, wie das einzige homerische Vorkommen. Es umfaßt da immer die beiden Kürzen des zweiten, die Länge und die erste Kürze des dritten Daktylus. Weitaus am häufigsten ist es im Akkusativ *λυκάβαντα* anzutreffen.

Die Bedeutung „Jahr“ konnte nicht aus Odyssee τ 306 herausgelesen werden. Das läßt aber m. E. nur den Schluß zu, daß sowohl der Odysseedichter wie alle Späteren auf ein gemeinsames Vorbild zurückgehen, in dem dieses rätselhafte Wort an derselben Stelle gestanden hatte, durch die Versumgebung aber je nachdem „Neu-

²⁾ Häufig bezeichnet der Begrenzungspunkt auch das Begrenzte: *ἄροι*, fines „Gebiet“, „Knoten“ in der Nautik, „Grad“ usw.

³⁾ S. dazu S. 30f.

⁴⁾ IG V 2, 327 *ἑικοστὸν λυγ[άβαντα καὶ] ὄγδοον οὐκέτι πλήσας*; IG V 2, 325 am Versende *τριηκοστῶ λυκάβαντι*; IG V 2, 472, 5 *ἦνικα γὰρ λυκάβαντας . . . δεκαπέντε*. In allen diesen Fällen ist λ. als „Jahr“ zu verstehen. Die übrigen Stellen bei Quintus Smyrnaeus: 1, 87; 2, 599; sowie 3, 327ff., vgl. u. S. 33.

mond“, „Monat“ oder aber „Jahr“ heißen konnte. Die Beobachtung einiger späterer Stellen zeigt einen möglichen Weg:

Nonnos VI 243 *καὶ τελέων λυκάβαντα δυωδεκάμηνος ὀδίτης...*
 Nonnos XXXVIII 114 *Ἥλιος λυκάβαντα δυωδεκάμηνον ἔλισσων...*
 Nonnos XL 372 *ὕλα χρόνου λυκάβαντα δυωδεκάμηνον ἔλισσων.*

Aber auch im Orakel bei Julianus XI 154 b findet sich das Entsprechende:

(*διανύει ὁ θεὸς*)
ὀρχηθμῶ λυκάβαντα δυωδεκάμηνα κέλευθα.

Ein λ. *δυωδεκάμηνος* ist dann offensichtlich der „Neumond nach zwölf Monaten“, d. h. aber Ende und Anfang des Mondjahres oder einfach „Mondjahr“. Schon Apollonios Rhodios muß dieses Wort in dieser Bedeutung übernommen haben, denn sowohl I 197/198

... εἴ κ' ἔτι μῶνον
αἴθι μένων λυκάβαντα μετέτραφη Αἰτωλοῖσιν...

als auch I 609/610

ἔνθ' ἄμυδις πᾶς δῆμος ὑπερβασίησι γυναικῶν
ηγλειῶς δέδημητο παροιχομένῳ λυκάβαντι

wird sie vorausgesetzt, nicht erst geschaffen. *Λυκάβας* verdankt seine Bedeutung „Jahr“ also nicht einer antiken Etymologie des homerischen Wortes, wie etwa *ἀμολγός* in *νοκτὸς ἀμολγῶ* oder *μέρορες* „Sterbliche“ aus *Μερόπων ἀνθρώπων*⁵⁾.

Wie ist *λυκάβας* aber formal zu verstehen? Das Wort muß zusammengesetzt sein, doch widerspricht es allen Möglichkeiten griechischer Wortzusammensetzung: Eine Wortfuge mit kurzem α, ein Hinterglied *-βας* sind nicht denkbar, ob man nun das Vorderglied mit *λύκος* „Wolf“ oder **λύκ-* „Licht“ in Verbindung bringt oder in *-βας* ein Hinterglied zum Verb *βαίνω* sucht. Für das Vorderglied „Wolf“ käme nur *λυκο-* in Frage, für „Licht“ allenfalls noch *λυκη-*; zu *βαίνειν* könnte das Hinterglied nur *-βατης* heißen⁶⁾.

⁵⁾ Verf. Glotta XLVI (1968) 18–26 und Glotta XLVII (1969) 110–116.

⁶⁾ E. Mauss, IF 43 (1926) 259 ff. „Winter und Sommer“, S. 265: „*Λυκάβας* ist nicht Sonnenlauf, nicht Mondlauf . . ., sondern ursprünglich Wolf- oder Wölfe laufen“. . . Formale Gründe verbieten diese Deutung, wie Kretschmer, Glotta XVII 241 f. zeigt. Ebenso vernachlässigt C. Theander, Symb. Phil. O. A. Danielsson 1932, 349–351, die formalen Schwierigkeiten und erklärt das vorgriechische *Λυκαβηττός* mit dem ungedeuteten *λυκάβας*, vgl. M. Leumann, Homerische Wörter 212A4, wo für λ. „Neumond(?)“.

Eine ganz ähnliche Schwierigkeit ist beim möglicherweise verwandten *ἀμφιλύκη* anzutreffen, das bei Homer ebenfalls ein *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* ist:

H 433f. *ἦμος δ' οὐτ' ἄρ' πω ἠώς, ἔτι δ' ἀμφιλύκη νόξ,*
τῆμος ἄρ' ἀμφι πύρην κριτὸς ἤγρετο λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν,
 „Als noch nicht der Morgen erschien, nur grauende Dämmerung,
 Jetzt erhob um den Brand sich erlesenes Volk der Achäier“
 (Voß)

Die Bildungsweise eines Adjektivs *ἀμφιλυκος* „zweilichtig“ kann nicht erklärt werden. Bechtel nahm daher an, es sei aus *ἀμφι λύκη νόξ* zusammengewachsen⁷⁾. Tatsächlich wird später die ungefähre Zeit häufig mit *ἀμφι* + Substantiv angegeben: Aisch. Ag. 826 *ἀμφι Πλειάδων δόσιν*; Xenoph. Anab. 1, 10, 17 *ἀμφι δορπηστῶν*; *ibid.* 4, 4, 1 *ἀμφι μέσον ἡμέρας*; *ibid.* 6, 3, 25 *σχεδὸν ἀμφι τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον*; Xenoph. Cyr. 5, 4, 16 *ἐσώζοντο . . . ἀμφι δειλὴν οἱ πρῶτοι* u. a.

Ein Substantiv *λύκη* „Licht“ ist nun allerdings nicht bekannt und zudem sehr hypothetisch. Apollonios steht II 669ff. in derselben Tradition. Hier wird das verdunkelte Adjektiv in epischer Redundanz erklärt:

Ἥμος δ' οὐτ' ἄρ' πω φάος ἄμβροτον οὐτ' ἔτι λῆν
ὄρφνατὴ πέλεται λεπτὸν δ' ἐπιδέδρομε νυκτὶ
φέγγος, ὅτ' ἀμφιλύκην μιν ἀνεγρόμενοι καλέουσιν,
τῆμος . . .

In H 433 fällt aber auf, daß der mit *ἦμος* eingeleitete Nebensatz kein flektiertes Verb enthält, während alle übrigen *ἦμος*-Sätze der Ilias und Odyssee ein Verb umfassen⁸⁾. Demzufolge ist nicht mit Bechtel in *ἀμφι λύκη νόξ* aufzulösen, sondern in *ἀμφι λὸκ' ἦν νόξ*, d. h. im irregulär gebildeten Adjektiv steht das nur noch in wenigen

⁷⁾ M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, 53 zu *ἀμφιλύκη νόξ*: „Es sei daran erinnert, daß auch umgekehrt mit falschem einfachen statt doppeltem *ν* hinter langem Vokal gerechnet wurde. Für H 433 *ἀμφιλύκη νόξ* ‚morgengraue Nacht‘ schlägt Be. Lex. 41 *ἀμφι λύκη νόξ* ‚Nacht ums Hellwerden‘ vor: *λύκη* ist verwandt mit lat. *lux* ‚Licht‘.“ Das Wort *ἀμφιλύκη* wird hier aber nicht mit *λυκάβας* in Verbindung gebracht.

⁸⁾ José S. Lasso de la Vega, *La oración nominal en Homero*, Madrid 1955 konstatiert 106 lediglich „en H 433 sin verbo“ ohne diese Singularität zu erklären. Mit H 433 am ehesten zu vergleichen sind Ψ 226 *ἦμος ἐωσφόρος εἶσι φάος ἐρέων . . .* oder μ 312 *ἦμος δὲ τρίχα νυκτὸς ἔην . . .*, aber auch alle formelhaften mit *ἦμος* eingeleiteten Wendungen enthalten ein Verb.

Ähnliche Kasuserstarrungen finden sich in der Hexameterdichtung auch sonst noch, wenn sie hier auch nicht zu einem neuen Kompositum geführt haben: Die ursprünglichen Vokative auf $-τᾶ$, Typus *μητίετα Ζεύς*, sind in der Formelklammer aus metrischen Gründen nicht mehr flektierbar. Das Adjektiv *εὐρόοπα* ist aus einem *Κρόνον εὐρόοπα Ζεύς* (wie in *Ξ* 203) in der Endstellung auf Zeus bezogen und zu *εὐρόοπα Ζῆν*¹¹⁾ und schließlich zu *εὐρόοπα Ζεύς* und *εὐρόοπα Ζεῦ* abgewandelt worden¹¹⁾.

Γ'ᾶρα, γ'ᾶρα and τᾶρα

By J. C. B. Lowe, Bedford College (London)

The main object of this paper is to dispel a prejudice which exists in certain quarters against $γ' ᾶρα$ (and in verse $γ' ᾶρα$) and to show that this conjunction of particles is commoner than is generally allowed. In particular I shall attempt to distinguish its usage from that of $τᾶρα$ (i. e. $τοὶ ᾶρα$), with which it is sometimes confused in MSS and by which it is often replaced in modern texts. Certain aspects of the usage of $γὰρ$ are also involved.

It is not disputed that $ᾶρα$ is used in conjunction with various other particles e. g. *ἀλλά, δέ, δή, μέν, τοι* (cf. Denniston, *G. P.* 42f.). In no case do the particles form a combination of distinct meaning; we should rather speak of a collocation (cf. *G. P.* li), in which each

¹¹⁾ J. Wackernagel, *Sprachl. Unters.* 160 glaubt Elision am Versschluß erst als Praxis des 5. Jh.s annehmen zu dürfen, daher sieht er in diesem dreimaligen am Versschluß stehenden *Ζῆν* (vor Vokal des folgenden Verses) den alten Akkusativ von Zeus. K. Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache* 1921, 33 fügt sich zögernd, gibt aber doch zu bedenken, „daß Formen, die nur am Versende begegnen, mindestens ebensoviel Aussicht bieten, als Neubildungen erkannt zu werden, wie als wirkliche sprachliche Archaismen“. Heute herrscht aber die Auffassung vor, daß Elision am Versende in mündlich tradiertem Dichtung eher möglich ist als in der schriftlichen Dichtung. Freilich sind die Fälle auf *Ζῆν*' und $δῶ[μ']$ beschränkt. B. Snell, *Griech. Metrik* 3 „Aristarch nahm diese Freiheit auch für den homerischen Hexameter bei dem Akkusativ *Ζῆν*' (*Θ* 206, *Ξ* 265, *Ω* 331 an)“. Ähnlich wie Meister äußert sich neuerdings Kweku A. Garbrah, *Glotta* 47 (1969) 153A.23.

Auch wenn man als Ausgangsformel *εὐρόοπα Ζῆν* am Versende annimmt, ist aber *εὐρόοπα* im Nominativ resp. Vokativ nur durch den Formelzwang erklärbar.

Ähnliche Kasuserstarrungen finden sich in der Hexameterdichtung auch sonst noch, wenn sie hier auch nicht zu einem neuen Kompositum geführt haben: Die ursprünglichen Vokative auf $-τᾶ$, Typus *μητίετα Ζεύς*, sind in der Formelklammer aus metrischen Gründen nicht mehr flektierbar. Das Adjektiv *εὐρόοπα* ist aus einem *Κρόνον εὐρόοπα Ζεύς* (wie in *Ξ* 203) in der Endstellung auf Zeus bezogen und zu *εὐρόοπα Ζῆν* [?] und schließlich zu *εὐρόοπα Ζεύς* und *εὐρόοπα Ζεῦ* abgewandelt worden¹¹).

Γ'ᾶρα, γ'ᾶρα and τᾶρα

By J. C. B. Lowe, Bedford College (London)

The main object of this paper is to dispel a prejudice which exists in certain quarters against $γ' ᾶρα$ (and in verse $γ' ᾶρα$) and to show that this conjunction of particles is commoner than is generally allowed. In particular I shall attempt to distinguish its usage from that of $τᾶρα$ (i. e. *τοὶ ᾶρα*), with which it is sometimes confused in MSS and by which it is often replaced in modern texts. Certain aspects of the usage of $γὰρ$ are also involved.

It is not disputed that $ᾶρα$ is used in conjunction with various other particles e. g. *ἀλλά, δέ, δή, μέν, τοι* (cf. Denniston, *G. P.* 42f.). In no case do the particles form a combination of distinct meaning; we should rather speak of a collocation (cf. *G. P.* li), in which each

¹¹) J. Wackernagel, *Sprachl. Unters.* 160 glaubt Elision am Versschluß erst als Praxis des 5. Jh.s annehmen zu dürfen, daher sieht er in diesem dreimaligen am Versschluß stehenden *Ζῆν* (vor Vokal des folgenden Verses) den alten Akkusativ von Zeus. K. Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache* 1921, 33 fügt sich zögernd, gibt aber doch zu bedenken, „daß Formen, die nur am Versende begegnen, mindestens ebensoviel Aussicht bieten, als Neubildungen erkannt zu werden, wie als wirkliche sprachliche Archaismen“. Heute herrscht aber die Auffassung vor, daß Elision am Versende in mündlich tradiertem Dichtung eher möglich ist als in der schriftlichen Dichtung. Freilich sind die Fälle auf *Ζῆν* und $δῶ[μ']$ beschränkt. B. Snell, *Griech. Metrik* 3 „Aristarch nahm diese Freiheit auch für den homerischen Hexameter bei dem Akkusativ *Ζῆν*“ (*Θ* 206, *Ξ* 265, *Ω* 331 an)“. Ähnlich wie Meister äußert sich neuerdings Kweku A. Garbrah, *Glotta* 47 (1969) 153A.23.

Auch wenn man als Ausgangsformel *εὐρόοπα Ζῆν* am Versende annimmt, ist aber *εὐρόοπα* im Nominativ resp. Vokativ nur durch den Formelzwang erklärbar.

particle retains its separate force. Whether the particles are juxtaposed or separated by one or more words makes no difference to their meaning. In verse ἄρα is sometimes used *metri gratia* for ἄρα (*G. P.* 44—46), and may similarly occur in conjunction with other particles, either juxtaposed or separated (e. g. δ' ἄρα *Ar. Pax* 1240, δὲ... ἄρα *Eur. Andr.* 1114, μὲν ἄρα *Ar. Av.* 161).

From the point of view of sense, there is no reason why γε should not also be used in conjunction with ἄρα/ἄρα. The emphatic or limitative force of γε, concentrated on a particular word or phrase, is readily compatible with the various shades of meaning of ἄρα, which belongs to the whole sentence. In fact ἄρα... γε is well attested and not disputed. In Epic it is common (e. g. *H* 169 πάντες ἄρ' οἱ γ' ἔθελον πολεμίζεν Ἐκτορι δίῳ, *Π* 33 οὐκ ἄρα σοὶ γε πατήρ ἦν ἱππότα Πηλεΐς), not surprisingly since γε is very frequent with pronouns and ἄρα used with "almost reckless profusion" (*G. P.* 33). After Homer the collocation is not as rare as Neil stated (*The Knights of Aristophanes* 198). As in many of the Homeric examples, it occurs especially after a negative, when an emphatic word, debarred from the first place in the sentence, receives a compensatory emphasis from γε (cf. *G. P.* 151), e. g. *Ar. Nuβ.* 121 οὐκ ἄρα μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα τῶν γ' ἐμῶν ἔδει, "Then you shall not share my table", *Plat. Phaed.* 93a οὐκ ἄρα ἠγεῖσθαι γε προσήκει... ἀλλ' ἐπεσθαι (cf. 76c, *Phileb.* 35b, *Gorg.* 449e, *Lach.* 192d, *Resp.* 342c, e). *Οὐκ ἄρα... γε* is attested twice, *Soph. Phil.* 106, *O. C.* 408 (see below p. 55)¹⁾ Ἄρα... γε also occurs without a preceding negative, e. g. *Ar. Plut.* 705 λέγεις ἄγροικον ἄρα σὺ γ' εἶναι τὸν θεόν, *Plat. Resp.* 468d πεισόμεθα ἄρα, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ταῦτά γε Ὀμήρῳ (cf. *Theaet.* 188e, *Euthyd.* 302b, *Phaed.* 87c). In such cases the main emphasis is usually on the opening word or phrase, but γε marks a secondary emphasis later in the sentence; when γε accompanies a pronoun, as in several of these examples, its force may be very slight (*G. P.* 122f.)²⁾.

¹⁾ We are not here concerned with interrogative ἄρα (...) γε, which is common, usually, but not always, at the beginning of the sentence (cf. *G. P.* 50).

²⁾ *G. P.* 43 cites three examples of ἄρα γε, against the normal rule of precedence by which, except in δὲ γε, γε either precedes an accompanying connective particle or follows at an interval (*G. P.* lx). *Arist. Eth. Nic.* 1130a22 is, as Denniston indicates, very doubtful; see below p. 63). The other two examples, both in *Xen. Oec.* 1.8, are special cases, in which ἄρα occurs in conjunction with the regular combinations καὶ... γε and οὐδέ γε. In later Greek ἄρα γε was common, even opening the sentence; cf. *Blass-Debrunner, Neutest. Gramm.* § 451.2.

Γε is also very common however after the opening word or phrase (*G. P.* 126ff.; see below p. 43), and, if the writer wishes to employ *ἄρα* in the same sentence, *γ' ἄρα* (or *γ' ἄρα* if metre requires) will naturally result³). In fact it has MS authority in a number of places, but is often rejected by editors, especially editors of Aristophanes. Elmsley in his note on *Ach.* 323 proposed to read *τᾶρα* (i. e. *τᾶρα*)⁴) in this line and several others in which *γ' ἄρα* or *γ' ἄρα* had previously been read. His reason for so doing will be examined later, but here we may note that he did not impugn *γ' ἄρα/ἄρα* as such; whether in fact he objected to *γ' ἄρα* is not clear, but he certainly accepted the possibility of *γ' ἄρα*, since, following Brunck, he read it at *Ach.* 71 (see below p. 60). In any case Elmsley started a certain vogue for *τᾶρα*⁵); after him it appears with increasing frequency in texts of Aristophanes, whereas *γ' ἄρα* and *γ' ἄρα* are admitted rarely and by a number of editors (e. g. Dindorf, Bergk, Meineke, van Leeuwen) not at all.

No arguments have been produced to justify the complete rejection of *γ' ἄρα/ἄρα*. Wilamowitz (*Platon* II 351), rejecting *γε ἄρα* in Plat. *Theaet.* 171c posed the question "Kann denn das ein Grieche mit dem Ohr von *γάρα* unterscheiden?". In this case the following word begins with a vowel and the question is a valid one, though the answer is by no means as self-evident as Wilamowitz implies; to this question we shall have to return (see p. 64). There seems no reason however to suppose that *γ' ἄρα* before a consonant

³) For *γ' ἄρα* corresponding to *οὐκ ἄρα . . . γε* compare *γε μὴν* (*μέντοι, οὐν*, etc.) corresponding to *οὐ μὴν* (*μέντοι, οὐν*, etc.) . . . *γε* (cf. *G. P.* 152). That *ἄρα* should sometimes be postponed, giving *γε . . . ἄρα*, is no matter for surprise (cf. *G. P.* 41f.). In Homer the collocation occurs in the formula *ἦτοι ὃ γ' ὦς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο* (*A* 68, etc.; *ἐκαθέξετο* Zen.); in *κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο* (also *κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο* Ω 522, *κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο* κ 378) *ἄρ'* has perhaps replaced the lost initial consonant of *ἔξομαι* (< **sediomai*; cf. Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* I 336, Stanford on ξ 295), but its position with the main verb after a participial clause can be paralleled, (*A* 744, θ 458). In Alexis fr. 124, 19 Casaubon's correction seems certain, *πολλῶ γ' ἀμείνων, ὡς εἰκας, ἦσθ' ἄρα λογογράφος ἢ μάγειρος (πολλῶν τ' cod.)*; here the late position of *ἄρα* can be explained by its tendency to follow *ἦν, ἦσθα*, etc. (cf. Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1012 Addenda). Another example of *γε . . . ἄρα* is possibly to be found at Soph. *O. C.* 534 (see p. 59).

⁴) The accentuation *τᾶρα* is preferable; cf. L-S-J s. v. *ἄρα* C.

⁵) He wanted to introduce it into several passages of tragedy also; see below p. 55f. The statement of Ellendt-Genthe, *Lex. Soph.* 737 "(τᾶρα) . . . ab Anglis post Elmsleium ad Arist. Acharn. 323 aliquando iniuria poetis Atticis reddi solet" is incorrect only in singling out English editors.

or γ' ἄρ(α) in verse would not have been readily distinguishable in speech from γάρ. A more plausible reason for doubting the possibility of γ' ἄρα is that this collocation probably gave rise to the particle γάρ; this probably lay behind Wilamowitz's objection (cf. *op. cit.* II 347 "ἄρα in γάρ steckt"). However this development must have been early and it is doubtful if the Greeks were conscious of it. Already in Homer the causal sense of γάρ is fully developed and its use distinguished from that of γε in that it can directly follow ἦ, οὐ, καί. Moreover γάρ ἔα is found and γάρ ἄρα later⁶). The derivation of γάρ, even if it may perhaps provide the explanation of the undoubted avoidance of γε γάρ (*G. P.* liii), gives no grounds for presuming that the Greeks would necessarily have avoided γ' ἄρα. Whether or not they did so, in default of a positive statement by an ancient grammarian, can only be decided on the evidence of the texts.

⁶) This is well enough attested, despite the doubts of Wilamowitz, Platon II 346f. The inferential sense of ἄρα is incompatible with γάρ, but not its other uses. Thus ἄρα expresses "the surprise attendant upon disillusionment" (*G. P.* 35) in Plat. *Symp.* 205b ἀλλὰ μὴ θαύμας, ἔφη· ἀφελόντες γὰρ ἄρα τοῦ ἔρωτός τι εἶδος ὀνομάζομεν . . . ἔρωτα (ἄρα T Oxy om. BW, "it appears") and *Prot.* 315c ἐπεδήμει γὰρ ἄρα καὶ Πρῶδικος ("as it transpired", rather than introducing "something supposed to be known to the person addressed" [Adam] or "etwas Selbstverständliches" [Wilamowitz]). By an extension of this usage ἄρα disclaims responsibility for the accuracy of the statement of someone else (*G. P.* 38) in *Resp.* 438a μήτοι τις ἀσκέπτους ἡμᾶς ὄντας θορυβήσῃ, ὡς οὐδεὶς ποτοῦ ἐπιθυμεῖ ἀλλὰ χρηστοῦ ποτοῦ . . . πάντες γὰρ ἄρα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ("we shall be told") and *Leg.* 698d καὶ τινα λόγον . . . ἀφήκεν φοβερόν, ὡς οὐδεὶς Ἑρετριῶν αὐτὸν ἀποπεφηνῶς εἶη· συνάπαντες γὰρ ἄρα τὰς χεῖρας σαγηνεύσαιεν πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑρετρικὴν . . . ("we are told"). These examples are supported by similar uses of γάρ . . . ἄρα, e. g. Ar. *Pax* 22 οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔργον ἦν ἄρ' ἀθλιώτερον . . . (cf. 566, *Vesp.* 1299, *Nub.* 1359 [Meincke's ἀράττεσθαι for ἄρα τίπτεσθαι is unnecessary]), Plat. *Symp.* 199a ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐγὼ οὐκ ἤδη ἄρα τὸν τρόπον τοῦ ἐπαίνου (ἄρα T om. BW, "it appears"), *Resp.* 358c πολὺ γὰρ ἀμείνων ἄρα ὁ τοῦ ἀδίκου ἢ ὁ τοῦ δικαίου βίος, ὡς λέγουσιν (cf. Adam *ad loc.*), *Men.* 81d τὸ γὰρ ζητεῖν ἄρα καὶ τὸ μανθάνειν ἀνάμνησις ὄλον ἐστίν ("here ἄρα marks a fresh link in a chain of argument that all hangs from borrowed premises" Thompson *ad loc.*), *Phaedr.* 273e οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἄρα, ὦ Τεισία, φασὶν οἱ σοφώτεροι ἡμῶν, ὁμοδοῦλοις δεῖ χαρίζεσθαι μελετᾶν . . . Γὰρ ἄρα should probably also be accepted in *Gorg.* 469d Ὡ Πῶλε, ἐμοὶ δὴ δόξα τις καὶ τυραννὶς θανατοῦ ἄρτι προσγέγονεν· ἐὰν γὰρ ἄρα ἐμοὶ δόξη . . . τεθνήξει οὗτος (γὰρ BTW γε F). Dodds prefers γε merely on the ground that γὰρ ἄρα "is not free from suspicion", but γὰρ gives the required sense; ἄρα may express "the speaker's gratified surprise at the realization of his own power" (Dodds), but I think it rather indicates that he is using arguments borrowed from Polus (so Thompson on *Men.* 81d).

Now it is true that $\gamma' \check{\alpha}ρα/\check{\alpha}ρα$ could very easily be confused by copyists with other particles, particularly $\tau' \check{\alpha}ρα$, $\tau\check{\alpha}ρα$, $\check{\alpha}ρα$, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}ρ$, $\gamma\epsilon$ (cf. p. 48), and the MSS often offer one or more of these as variants. The decision as to the right reading in each case must therefore depend largely on which particle or particles are most appropriate to the context. Even those editors however who accept $\gamma' \check{\alpha}ρα/\check{\alpha}ρα$ in some places have too readily adopted Elmsley's $\tau\check{\alpha}ρα$ in others, where the claims of $\gamma\epsilon$ are at least as strong as those of $\tau\omicron\iota$. Denniston mostly follows the text of Aristophanes by Hall and Geldart, and seems not to have considered whether some of the passages which he lists under $\tau\check{\alpha}ρα$ (*G. P.* 555) do not rather belong under $\gamma' \check{\alpha}ρα/\check{\alpha}ρα$ (*G. P.* 43). $T\check{\alpha}ρα$ seems sometimes to have been thought of as a distinct combination, and statements have been made about its usage which ill accord with the normal usage of $\tau\omicron\iota$; thus Neil on *Ar. Eq.* 366 " $\tau\check{\alpha}ρα$ is generally ironical" and Kock on *Av.* 1446 " $\tau\check{\alpha}ρα$ in der verwunderten Folgerung". In fact in nearly every case where $\tau\check{\alpha}ρα$ is well attested it is possible to see a normal use of $\tau\omicron\iota$; where it is not, the reading must be regarded as suspect.

* * *

In Homer $\gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρ'$ is commonly read in six places in the formula $\acute{\alpha}λλ' \delta' \gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρ'$ (the following word always begins with a vowel). In each case $\gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρ'$ (or $\acute{\alpha}ρ$) is read by a number of MSS, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}ρ$ by others, usually the majority; but little, if any, weight can be attached to the word division and accentuation of the MSS. In favour of $\gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρ'$ is the fact that in all the passages the collocation $\acute{\alpha}λλ\acute{\alpha} . . . \acute{\alpha}ρα$ would be entirely appropriate. In five of the passages a negative clause precedes: *M* 305 $\omicron\check{\upsilon} \acute{\rho}\acute{\alpha} \tau' \acute{\alpha}π\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon \sigma\tau\alpha\theta\mu\omicron\iota\omicron \delta\iota\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota, \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \delta' \gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρ' \eta \eta\rho\pi\alpha\chi\epsilon \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma, \eta\grave{\epsilon} . . .$, *N* 523 $\omicron\delta' \acute{\alpha}ρα \pi\acute{\omega} \tau\iota \pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron . . .$ *\u0391*\u0399\u0399\u0399\u0399\u0399 . . ., $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \delta' \gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρ' \acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\omega \text{'}\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\mu\pi\omega . . . \eta\sigma\tau\omicron, \text{O} 586 *\u0391*\u0399\u0399\u0399\u0399\u0399 \delta' $\omicron\delta' \mu\epsilon\iota\nu\epsilon \theta\omicron\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \pi\epsilon\rho \acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu \pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma, \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \delta' \gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρ' \acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\epsilon\sigma\epsilon, \text{\u03a6} 581 $\omicron\delta\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu \phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu . . ., \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \delta' \gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρ' \acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta' \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron . . ., \xi 526 $\omicron\delta\delta\acute{\epsilon} \sigma\upsilon\beta\acute{\omega}\tau\eta \eta\rho\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu \acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\omicron}\theta\iota \kappa\omicron\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma . . ., \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \delta' \gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρ' \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega \iota\omega\nu \acute{\omicron}\pi\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron.$ These passages can hardly be separated from the Homeric examples of $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} (. . .) \acute{\alpha}ρα$, used especially after a negative clause with the sense "but on the contrary", "but in fact", "but after all", e. g. *N* 716 $\omicron\delta' \gamma\acute{\alpha}ρ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu \kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\nu\theta\alpha\varsigma . . ., \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \acute{\alpha}ρα \tau\acute{\omicron}\xi\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu . . . \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron \pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\theta\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, cf. *M* 320, *\u0399* 305, *\u0399* 699, *\delta* 718, *\chi* 237, *h. Ven.* 10. Especially significant are several passages in which $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \acute{\alpha}ρα$ is followed by a pronoun with $\gamma\epsilon$ (i. e. the same elements as in $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \delta' \gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρ'$ but in$$$

a different order): *T* 93 οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' οὐδὲ πύλαται, ἀλλ' ἄρα ἦ γε κατ' ἀνδρῶν κράατα βάλνει⁷⁾, *γ* 259 τῷ κέ οἱ οὐδὲ θανόντι χυτὴν ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἔχευαν, ἀλλ' ἄρα τόν γε κύνες . . . κατέδαπαν, *κ* 214 οὐδ' οἱ γ' ὀρμήθησαν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι, ἀλλ' ἄρα τρεῖς γε . . . περισσαινόντες ἀνέστησαν, *ω* 223 οὐδ' εὐδρεν Δολλῶν . . . , οὐδέ τινα δμῶων οὐδ' υἰῶν· ἀλλ' ἄρα τοί γε . . . οἴχοντ'. Again for ἀλλὰ . . . ἄρα in the sixth passage, *E* 434 γιγνώσκων δ' οἱ αὐτὸς ὑπέριεχε χεῖρας Ἀπόλλων· ἀλλ' ὁ γ' ἄρ' οὐδὲ θεὸν μέγαν ἄζετο ("but for all that"), a parallel is provided by *T* 96 Ζεὺς ἄσατο, τόν περ ἄριστον ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ θεῶν φασ' ἔμμεναι· ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ τὸν Ἥρη . . . ἀπάτησεν.

However the usage of ἀλλὰ(. . .)γὰρ shows several points of contact with that of ἀλλὰ(. . .)ἄρα. In *E* 434 ἀλλὰ . . . γὰρ, "but that made no difference, for", would give essentially the same sense, cf. *κ* 202 (= 568) κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως . . . ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ τις προῆξις ἐγγίγνετο μυρομένοισιν. The similarity of usage of the two collocations of particles can be observed by comparing *χ* 91 εἴροτο δὲ φάσγανον ὄξύ, εἰ πῶς οἱ εἴξειε θυράων. ἀλλ' ἄρα μιν φθῆ Τηλέμαχος κατόπισθε βαλὼν ("but in fact", cf. Hes. *Theog.* 899), with *λ* 393 κλαῖε δ' ὁ γε λιγέως . . . , ὀρέξασθαι μενεαίων· ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἔτ' ἦν ἰς ἔμπεδος ("but in vain, for"), and *τ* 283 καὶ κεν πάλοι ἐνθάδ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἦην· ἀλλ' ἄρα οἱ τό γε κέρδιον εἶσατο θυμῷ, χρήματ' ἀγροτάζειν with 591 εἴ κ' ἐθέλοις μοι, ξεῖνε, παρήμενος ἐν μεγάροισι τέρπειν, οὐ κέ μοι ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροισι χυθείη. ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ πῶς ἔστιν ἀπνους ἔμμεναι αἰὲν ἀνθρώπους ("but the fact is" marking the non-fulfilment of a condition, cf. *G. P.* 104). Again ἀλλὰ (. . .) γὰρ is used after a negative clause with much the same meaning as ἀλλὰ (. . .) ἄρα, "for, on the contrary" (*G. P.* 107) although there are no certain Homeric examples; in *O* 739 οὐ μὲν τι σχεδὸν ἔστι πόλις . . . ἀλλ' ἐν γὰρ Τρώων πεδίῳ . . . ἡμεθα . . . τῷ ἐν χερσὶ φόως and *Ψ* 607 οὐ γὰρ κέν με τάχ' ἄλλος ἀνήρ παραπέσειεν Ἀχαιῶν· ἀλλὰ σὺ γὰρ δὴ πόλλ' ἔπαθες . . . τῷ τοι λισσομένῳ ἐπιπέισμαι it is probably better to take γὰρ as anticipatory, picked up by the following τῷ (cf. *P* 338, *H* 242, *ξ* 355, *G. P.* 99).

It is impossible to derive all the uses of γὰρ from the causal; an asseverative sense must be recognized at least in combinations (e. g. καὶ γὰρ, τοιγὰρ, cf. *G. P.* 56f.). Although in "complex" ἀλλὰ (. . .) γὰρ (*G. P.* 98ff.) γὰρ is causal, it seems likely that in some at least of its "simple" uses (*G. P.* 100ff., especially 105—108) we

⁷⁾ In this passage Rhianus read ἄρα' for ἄρα, which avoids the dubious hiatus (cf. Pfeiffer, *Hist. Class. Scholarship* 149); but the formulaic character of the phrase may explain the metrical irregularity (cf. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* 41 n. 1.). For hiatus after ἄρα cf. West on Hes. *Theog.* 532.

should recognize survivals of uses of $\check{\alpha}ρα$, as perhaps in some other uses of $\gamma\grave{\alpha}ρ$, particularly in questions (cf. *G. P.* 85). In any case in view of the undoubted similarity of usage of $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ (. . .) $\gamma\grave{\alpha}ρ$ and $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ (. . .) $\check{\alpha}ρα$, whatever its explanation, considerations of sense hardly justify writing $\gamma' \check{\alpha}ρ'$ rather than $\gamma\grave{\alpha}ρ$ in *E* 434, *M* 305, *N* 523, *O* 586, Φ 581, ξ 526. The orthography $\gamma' \check{\alpha}ρ'$ cannot be justified simply as indicating the origin of the usage. It is justified only if in this formula, after the word $\gamma\grave{\alpha}ρ$ had come into existence, γ' and $\check{\alpha}ρ'$ were still felt to be two distinct particles. On this point we have no reliable evidence. The fact that some MSS read $\gamma' \check{\alpha}ρ'$ is unlikely to represent an authentic tradition; although in theory ancient texts could have used *scriptio plena* to distinguish $\gamma' \check{\alpha}ρ'$ (*ΓΕΑΡΑ*) from $\gamma\grave{\alpha}ρ$, the evidence of inscriptions and papyri does not suggest that they normally did so. More probably the reading is due to editorial activity on the part of ancient scholars who recognized the sense of $\check{\alpha}ρα$. *A priori* it seems unlikely that in an oral tradition a distinction could have been maintained which made no difference to the metre, or so far as one can see, to the sense. It is better therefore to write $\gamma\grave{\alpha}ρ$.

In Hes. *Theog.* 466 where the MSS have $\tau\bar{\omega} \delta \gamma\epsilon \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\kappa \acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\iota\eta\eta\rho \acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\nu$, $\gamma' \check{\alpha}ρ'$ was conjectured by Peppmüller to remove the hiatus; it has since turned up in a 5—6 century papyrus and is accepted by West. This may be right but cannot be regarded as certain. For in the first place the Homeric formula just discussed, even if $\gamma' \check{\alpha}ρ'$ be read there, is not really parallel. Secondly the authority of a single late papyrus is not overwhelming. Thirdly there are other ways of curing the hiatus if this is necessary (e. g. $\tau\bar{\omega} \langle\kappa\alpha\iota\rangle \delta \gamma'$ Hermann), and it is possible that a *στίχος λαγαρός* should be recognized here (cf. West, introd. p. 92). In *Theog.* 532 $\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau' \acute{\alpha}ρα \acute{\alpha}\zeta\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, where the hiatus is easier (cf. West *ad loc.*), there is even less reason for accepting Rzach's $\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha} \gamma' \check{\alpha}ρ'$, although Denniston did.

* * *

If early Greek provides no certain examples of $\gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρα/\check{\alpha}ρα$ the classical period is more fruitful. It is convenient to start with Ar. *Ach.* 323 and Elmsley's influential note *ad loc.* The MSS (RAG) read *XO. Οὐκ ἀκουσόμεσθα δῆτα. ΔΙ. δεινά γ' ἄρα πείσομαι*. The unmetrical $\gamma' \check{\alpha}ρα$ can be simply corrected to $\gamma' \acute{\alpha}ρα$ as was done by earlier editors. Elmsley however, on the grounds that "in hac loquendi formula solenne est *τοι'*", proposed $\tau\acute{\alpha}ρα$, and this (or $\tau\acute{\alpha}ρα$) has been adopted by all subsequent editors.

Elmsley clearly did not mean by "hac loquendi formula" the phrase *δεινὰ πάσχειν* in whatever context, but only when it forms the apodosis to a condition, either stated or implied⁸). On the other hand he apparently extended the "formula" to include other adjectives (*καλά, δίκαια, χαρίεντα*). Now the hypothesis that these particular uses constituted an idiom so stereotyped that it was invariably accompanied by *τοι*, rather than a variety of particles according to context, is in itself implausible. The very similar idiom *δεινὸν (ἂν εἶη) εἰ . . .*, for example, occurs with various particles or none, e. g. Thuc. I. 121.5 *ἢ δεινὸν ἂν εἶη εἰ . . .*, Dem. 39.33 *ἢ δεινὸν γ' ἂν εἶη, εἰ . . .* (cf. Ar. *Eq.* 609), Dem. 34.43 *δεινὸν γὰρ ἂν εἶη εἰ . . .* (cf. Ar. *Plut.* 329), Xen. *Cyr.* 4.2.46 *δεινὸν γὰρ τᾶν εἶη, εἰ . . .*, Lys. 6.39 *ἐπεὶ τοι δεινὸν ἂν εἶη, εἰ . . .*, Plat. *Ap.* 29a *δεινὸν τᾶν εἶη (τᾶν B ἂν Stobaeus μέντᾶν T fort. recte)*, Dem. 20.125 *δεινὸν οὖν, εἰ . . .* (in indirect speech, cf. 56.22). The phrase *δεινὰ (ἂν) πάσχειν εἰ . . .* is used in other contexts without *τοι*, in indirect speech e. g. Dem. 24.187 *ὅτι δεινότατ' ἂν πάθοι . . ., εἰ . . .* (cf. 20.48, *et saep.*), in *πῶς οὐ* questions equivalent to emphatic statements e. g. Dem. 20.87 *εἰ . . ., πῶς οὐ δεινὰ πάσχοουσιν;* (cf. 133), and in an effectively independent sentence introduced by *ὥστε* Dem. 44.53 *ὥστε πάντων ἂν δεινότατα πάθοιμεν, εἰ . . .*; it seems highly unlikely that when it is used in a simple statement it should automatically require *τοι*. In fact Elmsley's own examples prove not only that *τοι* is not necessary in expressions of this type, but that *γε* is at least as common.

He cites four alleged instances of *τοι* with different forms of *δεινὰ πάσχειν*. Three of the passages, Ar. *An.* 1225 *δεινότατα γὰρ τοι πεισόμεσθ'*, *ἔμοι δοκεῖ, εἰ . . .*, *Eccles.* 650 *δεινὸν μέντᾶν ἐπεπόνθειν*, and Plat. *Gorg.* 461e *δεινὰ μέντᾶν πάθοις, εἰ . . .*, do indeed, in some sense, contain *τοι*, and Elmsley could have added Dem. 34.45 *πάθοιμι μέντᾶν δεινότατα, εἰ . . .*; it is at least questionable however whether *μέντοι* ought to be reckoned together with simple *τοι*, as the usage of the compound (which Elmsley wrote *separatim*) differs considerably. In the fourth passage, Thuc. 3.13.6, the true reading is *πάθοιμέν τ' ἂν δεινότερα . . .*, *τε* being required as a connexion; this then already is an instance of the idiom without *τοι*. Moreover the passages in which Elmsley on the strength of this evidence proposes to read *τοι* include four, in addition to Ar. *Ach.* 323, in

⁸) For this inferential use of *ἄρα* ("in that case"), insufficiently illustrated by Denniston, *G. P.* 40f., cf. e. g. *Ach.* 325, 757, 901, *Nub.* 217, 1181, 1256, and *Hermes* 95 (1967) 66 with n. 3.

which γε (or γούν) is well attested. In *Ran.* 252 the MS evidence points, as the early editors recognized, to δεινά γ' ἄρα πεισόμεσθα (γ' ἄρα Φ Π γὰρ R τᾶρα V). In *Lys.* 1098 there is no reason to doubt the transmitted text δεινά γ' αὐ πεπόνθαμες, αἰκ . . . which caps αἰσχρά γ' ἐπάθομεν in the previous line (cf. Wilamowitz *ad loc.*). In *Eccles.* 95 οὐκοῦν καλὰ γ' ἂν πάθοιμεν, εἰ . . . and 794 χαρίεντα γούν πάθοιμ' ἂν, εἰ . . . the genuineness of γε and γούν is confirmed by the ironical tone of both passages; the ironical use of γε is common (cf. *G. P.* 128, 455 and especially *Eccles.* 190f. χαρίεντά γ' ἂν ἔδρασας, εἰ . . .), whereas τοι is never used ironically in Aristophanes at least. Elmsley would read τᾶν in *Lys.* 1098 and *Eccles.* 95, 794; but, apart from other objections, whereas μέντᾶν is common in Aristophanes as in prose (*G. P.* 402), τᾶν is "not very common in prose" (*G. P.* 544, cf. Dodds on Plat. *Gorg.* 452b2) and doubtful in Aristophanes (only ἦ τᾶν in *Ran.* 34 is certain)⁹. This tells against Elmsley's supplement in *Thesm.* 86 νῆ τὸν Ποσειδῶ καὶ δίκαι(ά τ)ᾶν πάθοις (δὲ καὶ R), where δίκαι(ά γ') ἂν (Grynaeus, Sca-

⁹ In *Ran.* 34 ἦ τᾶν σε κωκύνει ἂν ἐκέλευον μακρά, ἦ τᾶν appears to give the threat a mock-heroic tone, for ἦτοι (= ἦ τοι) is essentially an epic word (cf. *G. P.* 554 and below p. 53 n. 23). In any case the existence of ἦ τᾶν (or ἦτᾶν) does not guarantee the possibility of τᾶν. Nor would οὐ τᾶν (or οὐτᾶν) which some editors adopt in *Ran.* 488 after Elmsley, although it does not seem to have any clear advantage over οὐκ ἂν, the reading of V (οὐκοῦν RΦ). In *Eccles.* 648 οἰμῶζοι γ' ἂν καὶ κωκῖοι many editors read τᾶν after Bentley and Lenting but without justification; γε is excellent (cf. Rogers, *n. crit. ad loc.*). Chremes' remark (646f.) πολὺ μέντοι δεινότερον τούτου τοῦ πράγματός ἐστι . . . εἰ σε φιλήσειεν Ἀρίστουλλος φάσκων αὐτοῦ πατέρ' εἶναι provokes Bleepyrus' retort "Ha! he would *smart* for it". Γε is common after the first word of a response, usually an adjective or adverb but sometimes a verb (see below p. 43). A special case is when the speech of one character is completed by another (*G. P.* 137f.). *Eccles.* 648 may be regarded as an abnormal example of this type; Bleepyrus caps Chremylus' conditional clause with a fresh apodosis as if one had not already preceded. So in *Ach.* 91-93 ΠΡ. καὶ νῦν ἄγοντες ἤκομεν Ψευδαργάβαν, τὸν βασιλέως Ὀφθαλμόν. ΔΙ. ἐκκόψειε γε κόραξ πατάξας, τὸν τε σὸν τοῦ πρέσβεως Dicaeopolis takes the Ambassador's last words out of context and makes them the object of a new sentence (*G. P.* 138, cf. 144; τε [A] is less well attested than γε [RT] but gives a much more effective sense, and the repetition of γε seems intolerable here). The verbal similarity to *Ran.* 34 has no doubt seemed to favour τᾶν in *Eccles.* 648, but, apart from the absence of ἦ, there is an important difference in the context. Τοι is appropriate and common in threats and warnings when, as in *Ran.* 34 they concern the person addressed; it is by no means so appropriate in the case of Bleepyrus' threat, which is directed at a third person and not in any sense at Chremes (*Lys.* 435f. is different, in that the Probulus is closely concerned in the fate of his minion, cf. p. 57).

liger) has been generally and rightly preferred; another point against *τοι* here is that it is rarely accompanied by an oath (see below p. 43f), whereas *καὶ . . . γε* frequently is (cf. Vahlen, *Op. Acad.* I. 283, J. Werres, *Die Beteuerungsformeln in der attischen Komödie*, Diss. Bonn 1936, 33f.). Finally to the passages cited by Elmsley can be added Dem. 25.71 ἢ δεινά γ' ἂν πάθοιεν . . . , εἰ . . . and Lys. 20.19 ἢ δεινὰ γ' ἂν πάθοιμεν . . . , εἰ . . . (γ' ἂν Stephanus ἄγαν X ἂν C τᾶν Wilamowitz [presumably under the influence of Elmsley's doctrine]).

Thus Elmsley's case for reading τᾶρα in *Ach.* 323 and *Ran.* 252 falls to the ground. If one takes the two virtually identical passages together, as one must, γ' has decisive MS support, and against this the accentuation of ἄρα can carry no weight. Γ' ἄρα must therefore be regarded as the genuine reading, unless cogent arguments can be brought against it, and no such arguments have been adduced. In fact an unprejudiced consideration will show, I believe, that γε is not only unexceptionable, but preferable to *τοι* on grounds of sense.

Both γε and *τοι* can be used in dialogue at the beginning of a comment on the words of the last speaker; but they are not used indifferently. Γε is very common after an emphatic first word, and as Denniston notes, "often when following an adjective or adverb, less frequently after verbs and nouns, it has a force which may fairly be described as exclamatory" (*G. P.* 127). The primary function of *τοι* on the other hand is to bring home a point to the person addressed, and this idea runs through a variety of nuances (threatening, confidential, reassuring, sententious, etc.); only in certain combinations (*γάρ τοι, ἐπεὶ τοι, οὐτοι, ἦτοι*) does it tend to degenerate into a merely emphatic particle (*G. P.* 537). In brief γε focuses attention on the idea itself, *τοι* on the person to whom it is addressed. The tone of *τοι*, though firm, is more intimate, or at least more restrained, than that of exclamatory γε. With *τοι* the speaker, as it were, buttonholes the listener, with γε he flings his hands into the air. A few examples of the two particles in similar contexts will illustrate the difference. Aesch. *Pers.* 245 δεινά τοι λέγεις κώντων τοῖς τεκοῦσι φροντίσαι is a warning reminder ("You know") by the Persian queen to her subject of the grim implications of his allusion to Marathon¹⁰); but in Ar. *Lys.* 529 ὑμεῖς ἡμᾶς; δεινόν γε

¹⁰) So in Soph. *Trach.* 1131 τέρας τοι διὰ κακῶν ἐθέσπισας, "A strange story you hint at in words that bode ill!", Heracles' tone to his son is coldly deprecatory; only after he has learnt the whole truth of Deianira's suicide does he give vent to his anger (1133 οἴμοι).

λέγεις καὶ τλητὸν ἔμοιγε the Probulus reacts in horror to Lysistrata's suggestion that the women might put the men right¹¹). In *Pax* 934 εὖ τοι λέγεις Trygaeus condescendingly congratulates his slave ("A good idea, I grant you"), and in *Plut.* 198 εὖ τοι λέγειν ἔμοιγε φαίνεσθον πάνυ Plutus grudgingly accepts the arguments of Chremylus and Carion¹²); but a more excited tone is appropriate to the distracted Orestes and the impetuous Pentheus in Eur. *Or.* 386 εὖ γ' εἰπας ("Ha, well said!") and *Bacch.* 824 εὖ γ' εἰπας αὖ τόδ', and proved by the preceding oath in Ar. *Av.* 1370 νῆ τὸν Διώνυσον εὖ γέ μοι δοκεῖς λέγειν and *Eccles.* 189 νῆ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην εὖ γε ταυταγὶ λέγεις. An oath often accompanies exclamatory γε (*G. P.* 128). In view of Elmsley's failure to distinguish between τοι and μέντοι it is relevant to add that the latter is nearer γε in tone. It is significant that, like γε, it is frequently accompanied by an oath, e. g. Ar. *Lys.* 1095 νῆ τὸν Δί' εὖ μέντοι λέγεις (cf. *G. P.* 401). An oath is not usual however with simple τοι. The only examples in Aristophanes of an oath with τοι, except in the combinations μέντοι, γέ τοι, οὔτοι, are *Ach.* 752 ἀλλ' ἠδύ τοι νῆ τὸν Δί', ἦν ἀλόος παρῆ and *Pax* 1096 ἀλλ' ὁ σοφός τοι νῆ Δί' "Ὀμηρος δεξιὸν εἶπεν . . ., which also seem to be special cases; ἀλλὰ . . . νῆ (τὸν) Δία emphatically raises an objection (cf. *Av.* 81, *Eccles.* 1011) and τοι adds an extra nuance, in the first case consolatory, in the second minatory.

A closer examination of the passages cited above confirms that, as we should expect, with forms of δεινὰ πάσχειν too the different particles keep their proper sense. In *Av.* 1225 γάρ τοι is argumentative ("For, look here, . . ."). In *Eccles.* 650, *Plat. Gorg.* 461e and *Dem.* 34.45 however μέντοι expresses "lively surprise or indignation" (*G. P.* 402). In Ar. *Lys.* 1098, *Lys.* 20.19 and *Dem.* 25.71 γε is emphatic/exclamatory, and, with ironical overtones, in Ar. *Eccles.* 95, 794¹³). So in *Ach.* 323 and *Ran.* 252 exclamatory γε ("Ah! then I (we) shall be in terrible trouble") is as appropriate as τοι is inappropriate. In both passages the speakers are involved in a shouting match in which a "close rapport" (*G. P.* 537) between the

¹¹) Cf. *Soph. Aj.* 1127 κτείναντα; δεινὸν γ' εἰπας, where again, as often (cf. *infra* n. 13) the exclamation is introduced by a scornful repetition of the previous speaker's words, and *Phil.* 1225 δεινὸν γε φωνεῖς.

¹²) Cf. similarly grudging comments *Vesp.* 588 τουτὶ γάρ τοί σε μόνον τούτων δὲν εἰρηκας μακαρίζω, 784 ἀνά τοί με πείθεις.

¹³) In *Lys.* 1098 the accompanying apostrophe (ὦ πολυχαρεῖδα) and in *Eccles.* 93 the echo of the previous speaker's words (ἰδοῦ γε σέ ξαίνουσαν) are both characteristic of exclamations (cf. *G. P.* 128f., *Hermes* 95 [1967] 58f., and n. 11 above).

contestants is hardly possible; and a confidential aside to the world at large or the audience in particular, for which *τοι* is sometimes used (cf. *G. P.* 538), is equally out of place.

There are other cases where γ' ἄρα/ἄρα should be recognized in an exclamatory comment on something said by the previous speaker. A clear case is *Plut.* 920 where the Informer's boast εἰς ἔμ' ἦκει τῆς πόλεως τὰ πράγματα prompts the retort νῆ Δία πονηρόν γ' ἄρα προστάτην ἔχει (γ' ἄρα R¹ γ' ἄρα R²VΦ), "Ha! then the city has a bad patron indeed". Here Dindorf proposed τᾶρα and was followed by editors up to van Leeuwen, but γ' ἄρα has rightly been restored by Hall-Geldart and Coulon and explicitly defended by Holzinger ("Durch γ' wird πονηρόν hervorgehoben"); one can compare *Nub.* 102 αἰβοῖ, πονηροί γ', οἶδα, 1462 ὦμοι, πονηρά γ', *Plut.* 220 παπαῖ, πονηρός γ' εἰπας ἡμῖν ξυμμάχους. The oath confirms that the transmitted γ' is right. Another example of γ' ἄρα with an oath occurs in *Vesp.* 217 νῆ τὸν Δί' ὄψέ γ' ἄρ' ἀνεστήκασι νῦν (γ' ἄρ' Porson γὰρ RV γοῦν Triclinius)¹⁴, "Oh! then they have certainly got up very late today", i. e. if they are not here before daybreak (cf. *Eur. Or.* 99 ὄψέ γε φρονεῖς εὖ); γ' ἄρ', virtually the paradosis, is preferable from every point of view to Lenting's τᾶρ', let alone other emendations, and has rightly been adopted by Starkie (cf. *crit. appx.*) and Coulon. Again we find an oath with γ' ἄρα in *Eccles.* 558f. νῆ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην μακαρία γ' ἄρ' ἢ πόλις ἔσται τὸ λοιπόν (γ' ἄρ' R γὰρ ΓΒ), "Ah! then the city will indeed be happy in future" i. e. if it is to be ruled by the women (cf. *Plat. Menex.* 249d νῆ Δία, ὦ Σώκρατες, μακαρίαν γε λέγεις τὴν Ἀσπασίαν, εἰ . . .); in this case γ' ἄρ' has won a fair measure of acceptance (by Denniston as well as by Blaydes, Hall-Geldart, Rogers and Coulon, among more recent editors) although as usual others have emended to τᾶρ'.

In *Av.* 1358 however, a passage essentially similar except that it is ironical, γ' ἄρα is strangely friendless but certainly right. The would-be parricide, his misconceptions about the customs of the birds shattered by Peisetaerus, exclaims ἀπέλαυσά γ' ἄρα νῆ Δί' ἐλθὼν ἐνθαδί, εἶπερ γέ μοι καὶ τὸν πατέρα βοσκητέον (γ' ἄρα Dobree γὰρ ἄν RVUF γὰρ AM Triclinius)¹⁵, "Ha, then I have really done

¹⁴ For the readings of the Triclinian edition cf. N. G. Wilson, *C. Q. n. s.* XII (1962) 32ff.

¹⁵ The simplest correction of the paradosis would be γ' ἄρ' ἄν (Dobree again in his indecisive note, *Adv.* II 229), but ἄν is not wanted (cf. van Leeuwen *ad loc.*) and is easily explained by dittography of the following ν; cf. *Lys.* 1098f. δεινά γ' αὐτὸν πεπόνθαμεν, αἰκ . . .

well in coming here, if I must actually maintain my father!" Editors have adopted either Elmsley's τᾶρ' ἄν or Dobree's alternative suggestion τᾶρα, but the genuineness of γ' is doubly confirmed by the oath and by the ironical tone¹⁶). Very similar is *Eq.* 175 εὐδαιμονήσω γ' εἰ διαστραφήσομαι (γ' VΦ δ' R) which Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Ar.* 47f., rightly interprets as an ironical exclamation, defending the reading γ' against recent editors (with the honourable exception of Rogers). Even closer however is *Av.* 176f., especially if we supply what in the light of *Av.* 1358 is surely the right supplement for the syllable missing in the MSS, νῆ Δία ἀπολαύσομαι γ' <ᾶρ>, εἰ διαστραφήσομαι (γ' VΦ δ' R τί γ' Triclinius) "Ha, I shall really do well then, if I twist my neck!" Triclinius' <τι> has generally been adopted, although editors have differed on whether to read γ' or δ' and whether to punctuate as an exclamation or as a question. There can be no doubt that γ' is right and that the sentence, like *Av.* 1358 and *Eq.* 175, is an ironical exclamation; that it is not a question is proved by the oath, as van Leeuwen noted¹⁷). Triclinius' supplement however is open to

¹⁶) Cf. p. 43; the ironical use is only a special case of exclamatory γε.

¹⁷) Whereas the occasional use of an oath to emphasize a command or wish (cf. Werres, *Beteuerungsformeln* 39) is a natural development of its use to affirm the truth of a statement, its use in a question would be in complete contradiction of its original function and in fact seems never to occur. In *Ar. Plut.* 566 the MSS offer νῆ τὸν Δί', εἰ . . . , πῶς οὐχὶ κόσμιόν ἐστιν; (πῶς οὐχὶ RM om. V πῶς οὐ AUS) but the line, unmetrical and barely intelligible as it stands, has been deleted as spurious by most editors since Bentley; in any case a πῶς οὐ question is virtually an emphatic statement, to which an affirmative oath would not be inappropriate. In *Eq.* 1162f. Neil reads ἀλλ' ἢ μεγάλως εὐδαιμονήσω τήμερον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐραστῶν; νῆ Δί' ἢ ἴγώ θρόνομαι; He is right to divide this passage into two sentences; as a single sentence (ἢ . . . ἢ . . .) it presents a "sinnwidrige Disjunction" (Kock), and νῆ Δί' indicates a fresh start (cf. *Hermes* 95 [1967] 68-71). However although the first sentence must be a question (cf. *G. P.* 27f.), the second should be read as an assertion, "By Jove, I shall play the coquette"; cf. *Av.* 1397 νῆ τὸν Δί' ἢ ἴγώ σου καταπαύσω τὰς πνοάς. Werres (*loc. cit.*) cites a single example of an oath in a question, *Eubul.* 117, 7 K., which he regards as justified by the fact that it occurs in hypophora. Now it is conceivable that in the special case when νῆ Δία is used with ἀλλά to show that an objection is attributed to another person it might be used even when the imagined objection is in the form of a question, although "no certain and indisputable example of the construction is forthcoming" (Wyse on *Isaeus III.* 73.1; cf. Seymour, *C. R.* 15 [1901] 108). It is hard to see, however, how the hypophora could justify the use of ἀλλά νῆ Δία in a question here, since it introduces the speaker's own answer to his imaginary interlocutor. Nevertheless the passage is after all no real exception to the general rule. The speaker is trying to

objections. First, it introduces an object for ἀπολάσομαι which is unwanted; in the closely parallel passages *Av.* 1358 and fr. 569, 14 ἀπέλασαν ἄρα σέβοντες ὑμᾶς, ὡς σὸ φήης the verb is used absolutely and this looks like a regular idiom (τι has special point in *Eur. I. T.* 526 ἀπέλασα ἀγὰρ δὴ τι τῶν κείνης γάμων). Secondly it involves a questionable inversion of the natural word order ἀπολάσομαι γέ τι¹⁸). Fraenkel (*loc. cit.*) prefers <δέ> γε (Nisbet); but this passage cannot be classed with the “retorts and lively rejoinders” in which δέ γε is used (cf. *G. P.* 153). In such cases the second speaker caps a statement with another statement, e. g. *Eq.* 967, or a promise or declaration of intent with another, e. g. *Ach.* 203, a threat with a threat, e. g. *Eq.* 443, or a command with a command, e. g. *Av.* 55 τῷ σκέλει θένε τὴν πέτραν. — σὸ δὲ τῆ κεφαλῇ γ', 845, *Ach.* 1104, *Ran.* 570. In *Av.* 177 however the Hoopoe does not cap Peisetaerus' command περιάγε τὸν τράχηλον, but only remarks, ironically, on the likely consequences of complying with it. No adversative or continuative particle is wanted, but ἄρα, “in that case”, fits the context admirably; it is noteworthy that it occurs in both the very similar passages *Av.* 1358 and fr. 569, 14 (cf. *Ran.* 1195f. εὐδαίμων ἄρ' ἦν, εἰ . . ., *Plut.* 657f. νῆ Δί' εὐδαίμων ἄρ' ἦν ἀνὴρ γέρον ψυχρᾷ θαλάττῃ λούμενος). As in *Av.* 1358, and often, e. g. *Eq.* 366 and *Thesm.* 248, discussed below, the inferential particle is reinforced by a conditional clause which repeats the gist of the previous speaker's words. The corruption of γ' ἄρ' (ΓΑΡ) to γε and δέ would have been easy (cf. e. g. *Plat. Phileb.* 46a, *Eur. Hipp.* 701, *I. A.* 425, *Men. Dysc.* 79, Coulon, *Essai sur la Méthode de la Critique Conjecturale* 15).

prove that there are as many virtuous as wicked women; after matching Penelope with Medea and Alcestis with Clytemnestra he continues ἀλλ' ἴσως Φαίδραν ἐρεῖ κακῶς τις· ἀλλὰ νῆ Δία χρηστὴ — τίς ἦν μέντοι, τίς; οἴμοι δείλαιος, ταχέως γέ μ' αἱ χρησταὶ γυναῖκες ἐπέλιπον. Confidently starting to cite another virtuous woman to match Phaedra, he suddenly breaks off, unable to think of one; as μέντοι shows, the question τίς . . . τίς; is an afterthought and has no connexion with ἀλλὰ νῆ Δία (cf. *Plat. Phaedr.* 236d ὄμνημι γάρ σοι — τίνα μέντοι, τίνα θεῶν; *Ar. Nub.* 787f., *Thesm.* 630). *Men. Dysc.* 162f. παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν δδὸν γάρ, νῆ Δία, εἰώθα διατρέβειν is punctuated as a question by Lloyd-Jones and others, but rightly interpreted by Handley as ironical; νῆ Δία there underlines an ironical statement in hypophora, as it does in real dialogue in *Ar. Thesm.* 745, *Plut.* 657, *Men. Sam.* 442 Au., and often with γε (*G. P.* 128).

¹⁸) Van Leeuwen seems to have had doubts about τί γ', for he suggested deleting γ', a remedy which requires no comment. *G. P.* 150 cites as exceptional *Plat. Lys.* 214e καίτοι δυσχεραίνω τί γε (γέ τι H. Richards, cf. *Resp.* 407B γέ τι ADM τί γε F Galenus).

Another clear case of exclamatory γ' $\alpha\rho'$ is provided by *Lys.* 31, where Lysistrata's claim that the salvation of Greece depends on the women provokes Calonice's cynical comment *ἐν ταῖς γυναιξί; ἐπ' ὀλίγον γ' ἄρ' εἶχετο* "On the women? Ha! then it has poor support". Here γ' , well attested (γ' $\alpha\rho'$ Γ $\gamma\alpha\rho$ R) and confirmed by the echo of the previous speaker's words which is characteristic of exclamations (cf. p. 44 n. 13), is rightly accepted by Denniston; there is no justification for emending to $\tau\alpha\rho'$ as most modern editors have done, following Mehler. Again there is little doubt that γ' $\alpha\rho'$ should be restored in *Eq.* 366 *νῆ τὸν Ποσειδῶ κάμει γ' ἄρ', ἦνπερ γε τοῦτον ἔλκης (γᾶρ RV corr. Brunck)*, "Ha! then, I assure you, (you will have to drag) me too . . .", where Bothe's $\tau\alpha\rho'$ has been adopted by all subsequent editors; γ' is supported by the oath, as well as the MSS. It is true that *τοί* would suit the implicit threat, but *τοί* is of course not obligatory in threats (which are often, as here, also exclamatory); *οὐκ ἄρα . . . γε*, the negative counterpart of γ' $\alpha\rho\alpha$, occurs in a threat in *Nub.* 121 (cf. p. 35) and *οὐκ ἄρα . . . γε* in *Soph. O. C.* 408 (cf. p. 55). The pattern of dialogue in 364—366 *ἐγὼ δὲ κινήσω γε . . . — ἐγὼ δὲ γ' ἐξέλω . . . — νῆ τὸν Ποσειδῶ κάμει γ' ἄρ' . . .* is similar to that of 429—434 *ἐγὼ . . . παύσω . . . — | ἐγὼ δὲ . . . γε . . . ἀφήσω . . . — κἄγω γ' . . . φυλάξω*; it should be noted however that whereas in 434 *καὶ . . . γε* is connective, in 366 it has its rarer adverbial sense "also" (*G. P.* 158), the connexion being provided by $\alpha\rho\alpha$.

In *Thesm.* 248, where the *Ravennas* is corrupt, certainty is not possible, but Kuster's neglected conjecture γ' $\alpha\rho'$ suits the context admirably and is, I think, very probable. Euripides' Relation, who is being singed, cries out that his posterior is on fire (246); when Euripides tells him not to worry, because someone else will sponge it, he exclaims *οἰμώξετ(αι γ') ἄρ' εἰ τὸν ἐμὸν προκτὸν πλυνεῖ (οἰμώξετ' ἄρ' εἰς R)*, "Ha! woe betide him then, if he tries to wash my behind". From a palaeographical point of view this correction is virtually as easy as Hermann's *οἰμώξεται τᾶρ'*, which has been adopted by a number of editors, and *γε* seems preferable to *τοί* when the threat is aimed at a third person (cf. *Eccles.* 648 *οἰμώζοι γ' ἄν καὶ κωκῶι*, discussed above p. 42 n. 9). Of various other solutions proposed none is really convincing. Dindorf's *οἰμώξετᾶρ' εἴ τις (οἰμώξετ' ἄρ' εἴ τις Brunck)* has been most widely favoured, as accounting for the MS reading *εἰς* and, it seems, because the sentence has been felt to want a subject ("Indefinitum *τις* omnino requirit linguae ratio" Brunck); but the corruption of *εἰ τὸν . . .*

to εἰς τὸν . . . is a trivial one, and the subject is still the nameless ἔτερος¹⁹) of the preceding line.

In *Av.* 1542 ἅπαντά γ' ἄρ' αὐτῷ ταμειέει the MSS are unanimous in favour of γ' (γ' ἄρ' VΓUB γ' ἄρ' A γὰρ RM); but Elmsley emended to τᾶρ' (τᾶρ') and only Hall-Geldart and Denniston since have reverted to γ' ἄρ'. Prometheus has just urged Peisetaerus to demand Basileia as his bride, since she is the guardian on Zeus' behalf of the whole apparatus of government, from thunderbolt to jury pay (1536—1541). Peisetaerus' response is punctuated by some editors as a statement or exclamation, by others as a question. In the light of the examples of γ' ἄρα already discussed the former interpretation is attractive; Prometheus' catalogue would sound so true to life to an Athenian that it might well prompt an exclamation of agreement, "Ha! then she *does* manage everything for him". Nevertheless it is probably better to take Peisetaerus' words as an incredulous question, "You mean she manages *everything* for him?" In favour of this interpretation is Prometheus' reply φήμ' ἐγώ, "Yes, I assure you". This idiom is regularly used to answer a question (1446, *Thesm.* 1220, *Ran.* 632, *Eccles.* 457, 717, *Plut.* 96, 143, 214, also φημί alone *Nub.* 1325, *Eur. Phoen.* 603, *Men. Ep.* 185, *Sam.* 62, 689 Au.)²⁰). Usually it reaffirms something already stated or implied in the face of doubt or disbelief expressed by the questioner, and this is the situation here. The pattern of dialogue in 1538—1542 *ΠΡ.* . . . ταμειέει . . . ἀπαξᾶπαντα . . . *ΠΕ.* ἅπαντα . . . ταμειέει; *ΠΡ.* φήμ' ἐγώ is closely paralleled by 1438—1446 *ΠΕ.* . . . λόγοις ἀναπτροῦνται . . . *ΕΥ.* λόγοισι . . . καὶ πτροῦνται; *ΠΕ.* φήμ' ἐγώ and *Plut.* 133—143 *ΧΡ.* θύουσι δ' αὐτῷ διὰ τίν'; οὐ διὰ τουτονί; . . . *ΠΛ.* τί λέγεις; δι' ἐμὲ θύουσιν αὐτῷ; *ΧΡ.* φήμ' ἐγώ. The similarity between *Av.* 1542 and 1446, which has long been observed, extends also to the particles which introduce the question. In 1446 the MSS have τ' ἄρα (RΓ) or τ' ἄρα (VAMU), except B which has γ' ἄρα,

¹⁹) I presume an attendant (cf. 238) is meant. Coulon's Σάτυρος (ὁ θρασυ-κατός τε καὶ ἀναδέσκατος *Xen. Hell.* II. 3.54) is quite inappropriate. Euripides suggests a sponge to relieve the pain; his Relation inevitably misunderstands him and indignantly rejects the suggestion. The play on the double use of the sponge for therapeutic and for cleansing purposes recurs in *Ran.* 482—490 (cf. Radermacher *ad loc.*).

²⁰) In *Plat. Phaedr.* 270c φημί expresses agreement with a preceding statement. The possibility that Aristophanes could have used φήμ' ἐγώ similarly cannot be entirely ruled out, but the probabilities are against it in *Av.* 1542.

almost certainly a conjecture²¹). Now connective $\tau\epsilon$ at the opening of a speech is not impossible (cf. *G. P.* 534). Nor is the collocation τ' $\delta\rho\alpha$, although I know of no certain instance outside Epic; $\tau\epsilon$. . . $\delta\rho\alpha$ is possible in Soph. *O. C.* 534 (but see p. 59). In this context however a continuative particle is not wanted; the informer adds nothing new but repeats his previous question (1437—1439). Since Elmsley therefore $\tau\delta\rho\alpha$ (or $\tau\delta\rho\alpha$) has been universally read, and this line has seemed to provide confirmation of Elmsley's emendation in 1542.

In fact however $\tau\delta\rho\alpha$ is not appropriate in either place. For since the primary function of $\tau\omicron\iota$ is to bring home a fact to the listener, it does not naturally belong in questions. The few exceptions fall within the doubtful territory in which questions merge with statements (cf. *G. P.* 545), e. g. Plat. *Theaet.* 168e $\omicron\upsilon$ πολλῶν τοι Θεαίτητος . . . ἄμεινον ἂν ἐπακολονθήσειε λόγῳ . . . ; (a question in form only), Dem. 52.8 $\omicron\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\alpha}$ τοι δ τι ἔστιν . . . δ σε ἐρωτῶ; ("You know . . . , don't you?"—a statement to which the interrogative tone imparts an element of doubt). These cannot justify $\tau\omicron\iota$ in contexts such as *Av.* 1446, 1542, where the speaker is in no way stating anything but merely questioning the statement of another. There is no objection however to γ' $\delta\rho\alpha$ in a question; " $\gamma\epsilon$ can of course emphasize a word or phrase in a question, just as well as in a statement" (*G. P.* 125). In *Av.* 1542 therefore, where γ' $\delta\rho\alpha$ is well attested, there is no justification for emendation; $\gamma\epsilon$ emphasizes the word ($\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$, echoed from 1539 $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\zeta\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$) on which the speaker's doubts centre. It may be noted that $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$ $\delta\rho\alpha$. . . $\gamma\epsilon$, the negative counterpart of γ' $\delta\rho\alpha$, occurs in a question in Soph. *Phil.* 106 (see below p. 55). *Av.* 1446 however still requires correction. The solution is readily suggested by 1542, as it probably was to the anonymous scholar responsible for the reading of B: $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$ γ' $\delta\rho\alpha$ καὶ πτεροῦνται; Here too γ' emphasizes the word specially queried ($\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$ repeated from 1439). In view of the close parallel provided by 1542, as well as on palaeographical grounds, this is preferable to $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\omega$ $\delta\rho\alpha$ (Brunck), which is otherwise acceptable.

In Aesch. *Cho.* 224 Electra's speech is, I am convinced, a similarly incredulous question (cf. Tucker *ad loc.*). Bamberger's $\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho'$, adopted by several editors for the unmetrical $\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta'$ of the Mediceus, will

²¹) I rely on the collations of White and Cary, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology xxix (1918) 77—131.

therefore not do. Tucker's δῆτ' is possible, but the Aristophanic passages just discussed suggest another possibility, ὡς ὄντ' Ὀρέστην γ' ἄρ' ἐγὼ σε προδόνέπω; (γ' giving a pathetic emphasis to Ὀρέστην).

Whatever may be thought of the last suggestion, the existence of γ' ἄρα/ἄρα in classical Attic must be regarded as proven. The examples so far discussed have been either in statements of a more or less exclamatory character or in questions, but there seems no reason why the same collocation of particles should not be found in other contexts also.

* * *

At this point however it is necessary to consider the usage of τᾶρα before turning to other passages in which the choice between γε and τοι is not so easy. Moreover a distinction should be made between the conjunction of ἄρα with simple τοι and with the compounds μέντοι, ἤτοι, οὐτοι. Μέντοι is indisputably a true combination, which has acquired meanings different from those which its constituent parts can bear separately; in conjunction with ἄρα it naturally produces μέντᾶρα. To some extent at least the usage of οὐτοι and ἤτοι too differs from that of simple τοι (cf. above p. 43 and *G. P.* 553f.), and it is better to write οὐτᾶρα and ἤτᾶρα rather than οὐ τᾶρα and ἤ (or ἦ) τᾶρα. These orthographic distinctions are justified by differences of sense and usage, and need not imply a difference of pronunciation.

Μέντᾶρα occurs in Crates Com. fr. 8K. οὐκ ἀσκίω μέντᾶρ' ἐμορμολύττετο αὐτούς (μέντᾶρ' Hesych. γ' Proverb. Bodlei.), "Then it was indeed no empty threat . . .", where it is easy to recognize emphatic μέντοι in a comment, not very different from exclamatory γε, which indeed is the reading of one of our authorities for the quotation. Another example is probably to be found in Eur. *Med.* 703, σὺγγνωστὰ μέντᾶρ' ἦν σε λυπεῖσθαι (μέντᾶρ' Hermann μὲν γὰρ LP γὰρ AVB κάρατ' ἄρ' Kirchhoff ἄγαν ἄρ' Wecklein), "Then your annoyance was indeed pardonable". Recent editors print μὲν τᾶρ', which they inaccurately ascribe to Hermann, but μέντᾶρ' is preferable. Affirmative/assentient μέντοι gives at least as good sense as μὲν τοι *separatim*, which "seems to have been avoided in Attic" (*G. P.* 398); σὺγγνωστὰ μὲν, "pardonable at least (cf. *Bacch.* 1039, *Phoen.* 994, *Andr.* 955), seems rather grudging by comparison with Aegceus' generally sympathetic attitude, and τοι would have a condescending

tone ("You know") in such a comment, as in phrases which convey a criticism of the previous speaker's words (cf. above p. 43f. and *G. P.* 542). Γ' ἄρ' would be a palaeographically attractive correction of the unintelligible γὰρ of the MSS, and exclamatory γε not inappropriate; but, apart from the difficulty of μέν, μέν γε is "probably entirely absent from serious poetry" (*G. P.* 159).

**Ἡτᾶρα* occurs six times in Euripides. Usually editors take it as a compound of emphatic ἦτοι (cf. Valckenaer on *Hipp.* 480) and print ἦ τᾶρα, although disjunctive ἦτᾶρα (or ἦ τᾶρα) has sometimes been recognized (in only one case by Denniston, *G. P.* 555). The MSS indeed generally, it seems, though not always, have ἦ, but in such matters they count for little or nothing. In fact in every case a disjunctive sense is required. This is clearest in *Herac.* 650—652 οὐκ ἔστ' ἄγειν σε τούσδ' ἐμοῦ ζώσης ποτέ. ἦτᾶρ' ἐκείνου μὴ νομιζοίμην ἐγὼ μήτηρ ἔτ', "Else be I counted mother of Hercules no more" (Way); cf. Xen. *An.* 1.4.16 ὅπως δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπαινέσετε ἐμοὶ μελήσει, ἦ μηκέτι με Κῦρον νομίζετε cited by K.-G. II 297 with other examples of this idiomatic use of ἦ = *ei δὲ μή*, *alioquin* (and for ἦτοι in the same sense cf. K.-G. II 298, *G. P.* 553). If ἦτᾶρα is taken as emphatic an essential link in the connexion of thought is missing, which commentators are forced to supply, e. g. "If you do carry them off . . ." (Paley), without being able to explain how such an ellipse is possible. The next example occurs in a passage of Admetus' speech to Pheres which has been the target for much critical attack, *Alc.* 636ff. οὐκ ἦσθ' ἄρ' ὀρθῶς τοῦδε σώματος πατήρ, . . . ἦτᾶρα πάντων διαπρέπεις ἀνυχία, δς . . . οὐκ ἠθέλησας οὐδ' ἐτόλμησας θανεῖν τοῦ σοῦ πρό παιδός . . . In 636—641, on the obvious interpretation, Admetus states as a conclusion just arrived at (636 ἄρα) on the basis of Pheres' behaviour (cf. 640) his belief that he cannot be Pheres' natural son²²). Now it is objected that this is in flat contradiction with the rest of Admetus' speech, in which he takes it for granted that Pheres is his real father (cf. 645, 649, 655) even if he has forfeited all right to be treated as such (cf. 646f., 666—668). This difficulty however disappears once it is realized that Admetus is making two alternative charges linked by ἦτᾶρα (642), "or else" (*aut certe* Heath, *ou alors* Méridier): either Pheres is not really Admetus' father, or he is the greatest coward in the world. The first charge is hurled out with sarcastic exaggeration and is not

²²) To interpret 641 καὶ μ' οὐ νομίζω παῖδα σὸν πεφονέμην with Dale as referring merely to "spiritual" kinship seems, in the context, very forced.

intended to be taken seriously; it serves as a rhetorical introduction to the real charge of ἀπυργία, which is the only one considered in the rest of Admetus' speech and in Pheres' reply (cf. 696). Hence there is no need to be surprised that Admetus even imputes to himself a servile origin (638f.). Ἥτοι occurs in a similar context, allowing for the difference between tragic rhetoric and urbane conversation, in Plat. *Resp.* 344e ἡ σμικρὸν οἶε ἐπιχειρεῖν πρᾶγμα διορίζεσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐ βίον διαγωγὴν . . .; — Ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶμαι, ἔφη ὁ Θρασύμαχος, τουτὶ ἄλλως ἔχειν; — Ἐοικας, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἦτοι ἡμῶν γε οὐδὲν κήδεσθαι . . . (ἀλλ' οὐ ADM δλον F), "You seem to (think it a trifling matter), or else not to have any consideration for us." Socrates first puts forward the graver charge (of not taking the subject seriously), in the expectation that Thrasymachus will reject it; when Thrasymachus duly obliges, he is faced with the second charge as the inescapable alternative.

Like *Heraclid.* 650—652 are *Alc.* 731—733 δίκας δὲ δώσεις σοῖσι κηδεσταῖς ἔτι· ἦτᾶρ Ἄκαστος οὐκέτ' ἔστ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν, εἰ μὴ σ' ἀδελφῆς αἷμα τιμωρήσεται, *Hipp.* 479—481 φανήσεται τι τῆσδε φάρμακον νόσον· ἦτᾶρ ἂν ὄψέ γ' ἀνδρες ἐξεύροιεν ἂν, εἰ μὴ γυναῖκες μηχανὰς εὐρήσομεν (ἦ τᾶρ ἂν fort. H [coni. Brunck] ἦ τ' ἄρα [vel ἄρα] γ' BCDLH² ἦ γὰρ ἂν MOAVE), 1026—1031 δμνυμι τῶν σῶν μήποθ' ἄφασθαι γάμων . . . ἦτᾶρ δλοίμην . . ., εἰ κακὸς πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ. In confirmation of a preceding assertion ἦτᾶρα introduces the unthinkable alternative; cf. *Soph. El.* 495—503 πρὸ τῶνδὲ τοι θάρσος μήποτε . . . ἀπεγὲς πελᾶν τέρας . . . ἦτοι μαντεῖαι βροτῶν οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐν δεινοῖς ὀνειροῖς . . ., εἰ μὴ τόδε φάσμα νυκτὸς εὖ κατασχῆσει²³). Where an explanatory conditional clause follows, ἦ (the reading of the MSS in *Alc.* 732, cf. Σ ad *Hipp.* 1028 διαζευκτικὸς ὁ ἦ) is less obviously preferable to ἦ, but that ἦ is right in these cases also is confirmed by ἄρα. Ἥ ἄρα would imply that the second sentence followed from the first, which is the reverse of the truth; in fact it expresses the consequences predicted or desired in the event of the preceding assertion proving *false*, and ἦ ἄρα indicates this concisely, "or else, (if not that,) then . . ." In four of the above five cases (not *Alc.* 642) ἄρα carries the further nuance that the idea is contrary to what one would expect or even absurd, "after all", as in the ironic use of εἰ μὴ ἄρα = *nisi forte* (K.-G. II 325).

²³) The similarity of the examples of ἦτᾶρα under discussion confirms that in *Soph. El.* 498 ἦτοι should be taken as disjunctive (cf. *G. P.* 554). Affirmative ἦτοι then occurs in drama only in the formula ἦτᾶν (cf. p. 42 n. 9).

The last example of *ἤτᾶρα* occurs in Eur. fr. 645:

συγγνώμονάς τοι τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι δόκει²⁴)
 ὅταν τις δοκῶ θάνατον ἐκφυγεῖν θέλῃ
 ἢ δεσμὸν ἢ βίαια πολεμίων κακά,
 ἢ παισίν† αὐθένταισι κοινωνῆ δόμων.
 ἤτᾶρα θνητῶν εἰσιν ἀσυνετώτεροι
 ἢ τᾶπεικῆ πρόσθεν ἡγοῦνται δίκης.

Here *ἤτᾶρα* apparently introduces a disjunction, "Either then they are more foolish than mortal men, or they value fairness higher than strict justice". It is not however altogether easy to see the force of *ᾶρα*. Does it indicate that the generalization is an inference from the particular cases just quoted or can it merely denote the absurdity of the idea that the gods might be inferior to men ("after all")? In the absence of the original context certainty of interpretation is impossible and emendation hazardous, but there is something to be said for Usener's οἱ [sc. θνητοῖ] τᾶπεικῆ (Valckenaer's εἰ τᾶπεικῆ gives the wrong sense); this would bring the passage into line with the other instances of *ἤτᾶρα*, "Or else after all . . ."

Finally we may note that in all the examples of *ἤτᾶρα*, as probably always in *ἤτοι* in the fifth century (cf. *G. P.* 553), *τοι* does more than just emphasize *ἤ*. The speaker presses his point home to his listener, whether threatening (*Heraclid.* 651, *Alc.* 732), accusing (*Alc.* 642), rebutting an accusation (*Hipp.* 1028) or encouraging (*Hipp.* 480, ? fr. 645).

Οὐτᾶρα occurs in statements of various kinds, and if *τοι* serves to strengthen the negative (cf. *G. P.* 543f.) its original force can, as in *ἤτᾶρα*, still always be felt. In Eur. *Hipp.* 440—442 *κᾶπειτ' ἔρωτος οὐνεκα ψυχὴν ὀλεῖς; οὐτᾶρα λυεῖ τοῖς ἐρώσι τῶν πέλας, . . . εἰ θανεῖν αὐτοὺς χρεὼν (οὐκ ᾶρα MV)* the nurse's tone is persuasive, "Then it is indeed a bad bargain for those who fall in love . . ." *Τοι* is similarly expostulatory in *I. A.* 1188—1190 *ἀλλ' ἐμὲ δίκαιον ἀγαθὸν εὐχεσθαί τί σοι; οὐτᾶρα συνέτους τοὺς θεοὺς ἡγοίμεθ' ἄν, εἰ τοῖσιν αὐθένταισιν εὖ φρονήσομεν (οὐ τᾶρ' ἀσυνέτους LP corr. Wecklein)*, "Then truly we should be crediting the gods with no intelligence, if we are to be well disposed to murderers" (Clytemnestra to Agamemnon), and *Supp.* 494ff. *σὺ δ' ἄνδρας ἐχθροὺς καὶ θανόντας ὠφελεῖς θάπτων κομίζων θ' ὕβρις οὐδ' ἀπώλεσεν; οὐτᾶρ' ἔτ'*

²⁴) δόκει Stob. *Flor.* L -εἰ SM et *Ecl.* FP -εἰς *Flor.* A.

δοθῶς Καπανέως κεραύνιον δέμας καπνοῦται . . . (οὔτ' ἄν LP corr. Markland), "Then indeed there is no justice in Capaneus' heaven-sent punishment . . ." (Theban herald to Theseus). *I. A.* 1189f. and *Supp.* 496ff. are sometimes punctuated as questions, but wrongly (cf. *G. P.* 555 n. 1); not only is *τοι* against this, but both passages clearly belong, like *Hipp.* 441f., to a not uncommon pattern of speech, in which a suggestion in the form of a question is emphatically rejected by a statement of the absurd consequences of accepting it (cf. *Hipp.* 1010—1012, *El.* 374, *H. F.* 580—582, *Ar. Ach.* 555f., *Eccles.* 746f., *Cephisod.* 3, 5 K., *Dem.* 45. 70)²⁵).

Eur. Hel. 85 οὐτᾶρα σ' Ἑλένην εἰ στυγεῖς θαυμαστέον (οὐτᾶρα Hermann οὔτ' ἄρα LP οὐκ ἄρα Triclinius), "Then (if you are a Greek), believe me, it is no wonder if you hate Helen", expresses Helen's sympathy with the Greek stranger. The remaining cases of οὐτᾶρα display the familiar use of *τοι* in threats and warnings: *Soph. Trach.* 322f. οὐτᾶρα . . . δεήσει γλώσσαν, *Phil.* 1253 οὐτᾶρα Τρωσίν, ἀλλὰ σοὶ μαχόμεθα, *Eur. Io* 337 οὐτᾶρα πράξεις οὐδέν, *Ar. Vesp.* 299 μὰ Δί' οὐτᾶρα προπέμνω σε τὸ λοιπόν, and perhaps *Hdt.* VIII, 57, 2 οὐ τοι ἄρα . . . οὐδὲ περὶ μῆς ἔτι πατριδος ναυμαχῆσεις (οὐ τοι Bekker οὔτοι RSV οὔτ' ABCP [cf. Stein *ad loc.*] οὐκ Plut. *Mor.* 869).

Here may be mentioned several passages where οὐτᾶρα has been introduced by emendation but the right reading is in all probability οὐκ ἄρα. Elmsley (on *Eur. Heraclid.* 268) proposed to read οὐτᾶρα in *Soph. Phil.* 106 οὐκ ἄρ' ἐκείνω γ' οὐδὲ προσμεῖξαι θρασύ; 114 οὐκ ἄρ' ὁ πέρσων, ὡς ἐφάσκειτ', εἰμ' ἐγώ; *O. C.* 408 οὐκ ἄρ' ἐμοῦ γε μὴ κρατήσωσίν ποτε and *Eur. Heraclid.* 268 οὐκ ἄρ' ἐς Ἄργος ῥαδίως ἄπει πάλιν. These proposals have justly won little support. In *O. C.* 408 and *Heraclid.* 268, both threats of a kind, though in the first case the threat is not directed at the person addressed, *τοι* would indeed be appropriate enough; but it is certainly not indispensable. *Phil.* 106, 114 however, even if they are on the borderline between questions and statements (contrast ἄρ' οὐ questions), at least contain an interrogative note, "Then it is not . . ., eh?", expressing

²⁵) A closely related idiom is when the speaker wishes his own ruin in case the eventuality in question should ever prove to have come to pass, e. g. *Eubul.* 117, 2 K. νῆ Δί' ἀπολοίμην ἄρα, *Ar. Lys.* 531 μὴ νυν ζῶην (and for examples in other contexts cf. *Hermes* 95 [1967] 65). These forms of emphatic denial are the counterpart to the emphatic confirmation of a preceding assertion introduced by ἤ, e. g. *Eur. Hipp.* 1028 ἤτᾶρ' ὀλοίμην, *Ar. Eq.* 833 ἤ μὴ ζῶην, *Nub.* 1255 ἤ μηκέτι ζῶην ἐγώ, *Men. Sam.* 312 Au. ἤ μήποτ' ἄρ' . . .

the speaker's surprise, if not incredulity, at what he has just been told; and here *τοι* is not appropriate. Soph. *Aj.* 1238 *οὐκ ἄρ' Ἀχαιοὺς ἄνδρες εἰσι πλὴν ὄδε;* and Ar. *Av.* 91 *οὐκ ἄρ' ἀφῆμας; ὠγάθ' ὡς ἀνδρεῖος εἶ* are similar²⁶). In Eur. fr. 715 (*Telephus*) the absence of the original context makes certainty impossible but the most probable text is *οὐκ ἄρ' Ὀδυσσεύς ἐστιν αἰμόλος μόνος· χρεία διδάσκει, κἂν βραδύς τις ἦ, σοφόν (οὐκ ἄρ' Valckenaer *Diatrib.* p. 206, *οὐκ ἄρα* Plut. *vit. Lys.* 20, *οὐ γὰρ* Stob. III 29. 55). Porson proposed *οὐτᾶρ'* and this has been accepted by, amongst others, Nauck and Handley and Rea, *The Telephus of Euripides*, Univ. Lond. Inst. Class. Stud. Bull. Supp. 5, 1957, but it is hard to imagine a context for the fragment in which the conjunction of *τοι* and *ἄρα* would be appropriate. It seems most likely that in these lines someone (the leader of the chorus?) is expressing amazement at the rhetorical skill which the apparent beggar has just displayed (cf. Handley-Rea 34). Almost certainly *ἄρ'* denotes "the surprise occasioned by enlightenment" (*G.P.* 35); thus Plutarch applies the quotation to the moment when Lysander realizes that he has been outwitted. Those who would read *οὐτᾶρ'* must suggest a situation in which the speaker might wish to impress on someone else (*τοι*) a truth he has himself just realized²⁷). I find it easier to accept the reading of Plutarch. For the expression *οὐκ ἄρ' . . . ἐστιν . . . μόνος* one can compare Hes. *Op.* 11 *οὐκ ἄρα μῶνον ἔην Ἐρίδων γένος*, Timocr. fr. 3 (Page, *P. M. G.* 729) *οὐκ ἄρα Τιμοκρέων μόνος Μῆδοισιν ὀρκιατομεῖ (ἄρα, μόνος Ahrens ἄρα, μῶνος codd.)*, Ar. *Av.* 280 *οὐ σὺ μόνος ἄρ' ἦσθ' ἔποπ*, Plat. *Gorg.* 454a *οὐκ ἄρα ἐρητορικὴ μόνη πειθοῦς ἐστιν δημοουργός*. Finally *οὐτᾶρα* was proposed by Elmsley in Ar. *Av.* 1308 *οὐκ ἄρα μὰ Δι' ἡμῖν ἔτ' ἔργον ἐστάναι (ἄρα RVΦ corr. Kuster)*, and in this case his proposal has been widely adopted (e. g. by Meineke, Kock, van Leeuwen, Coulon). Now *τοι* ("listen") could be justified here, but it is not necessary (cf. *Lys.* 424, 614). On the other hand there*

²⁶) Cf. Ar. *Nub.* 1252 *οὐκ ἄρ' ἀποδώσεις;* *Av.* 284 *Καλλίας ἄρ' οὕτως οὔρις ἐστίν;* Ὡς περορορνεῖ. Whereas the other passages are generally punctuated as questions, in *Av.* 284 editors print a stop; but the tone is surely similar, "So this bird is Callias, eh?" (cf. *Eq.* 138, *Vesp.* 664) and for the pattern of question followed by exclamation cf. *Hermes* 95 (1967) 58. In any case punctuation inadequately reflects the variety of intonation possible in speech.

²⁷) Cf. Eur. *H. F.* 623 cited below p. 58. I have doubts about Hartung's supplement in *O. C.* 1697 *πόθος <τοι> καὶ κακῶν ἄρ' ἦν τις* which has been generally accepted, but there Antigone is in a position to inform the chorus of a truth learnt from her own emotional experience.

can be no objection to οὐκ ἄρα, virtually the paradosis, in a strong statement, any more than to οὐκ ἄρα (e. g., *Nub.* 121, also with an oath, cf. p. 35); Soph. *Phil.* 106, 114 are parallel.

Turning to τᾶρα we are faced with a difficulty which was not present in the case of ἤτᾶρα and οὐτᾶρα, that confusion with γ' ἄρα in ancient texts was exceedingly easy. In discussing γ' ἄρα/ἄρα we have already encountered cases where the MSS are divided between γ and τ, and we shall meet more. Even where the MSS are unanimous in favour of τ this is not necessarily conclusive (cf. Ar. *Av.* 1446 discussed above pp. 49f.). The only safe guide is the normal usage of τοι; and since even in ἤτᾶρα and οὐτᾶρα, where we might have expected it to be somewhat attenuated, the original force of τοι could always still be felt, there is the less reason to suppose that it should be otherwise with τᾶρα. The securest examples are the following. In a threat τᾶρα is certain in Ar. *Lys.* 435f. εἰ τᾶρα . . . τὴν χεῖρα . . . προσοίσει, . . . κλαύσεται (cf. p. 42 n. 9), 439f., 443f., 447f., and restored with much probability in fr. 585 ἐπι Παλλαδίῳ τᾶρ' ὃ πάτερ δώσεις δίκην (τᾶρ' ὃ Elmsley παρ' ᾧ *codd.*); there is no reason to doubt it in a warning in fr. 610 (= Aesch. fr. 363) δευγλύκειάν τᾶρα κοκκίεις ῥόαν. No sharp line can be drawn between threats and warnings and other statements of action willed or intended which concerns the listener: Aesch. *Cho.* 112 ἐμοί τε καὶ σοί τᾶρ' ἐπεύξομαι τάδε (not a question, as it has sometimes been taken; Electra reassures the leader of the chorus that she will be included among the εὐφρονες), Soph. *El.* 404 χωρήσομαι τᾶρ' οἴπερ ἐστάλην ὁδοῦ (Chrysothemis to Electra, an impatient "Then I'm off"), Eur. *Phoen.* 712 ἐξοιστέον τᾶρ' ὄπλα Καδμείων πόλει (Eteocles to Creon resolutely), Ar. *Av.* 895ff. εἴτ' ἀθις ἀδ' τᾶρα σοι δεῖ με δεύτερον μέλος χέρονιβι . . . ἐπιβοᾶν (ἀδ' τᾶρα [τᾶρα] Elmsley ἀτ' ἄρα RVΦ, Chorus to Peisetaerus), *Eccles.* 711 βαδιστέον τᾶρ' ἐστὶν εἰς ἀγορὰν ἐμοί (τ' ἄρ' R ἄρ' ΓΒ, Praxagora to Blepyrus and Chremes), *Ran.* 656 βαδιστέον τᾶρ' ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τονδί πάλων (τ' ἄρ' VU ἄρ' RM ἄρ' A,²⁸) Pluto's servant ["Aeacus"] to Dionysus and Xanthias). In other strong assertions too various senses of τοι (cf. *G. P.* 540ff.) can be recognized. Aesch. *Cho.* 221 αὐτὸς κατ' αὐτοῦ τᾶρα μηχανορραφῶ is expostulatory, an urgent denial in answer to a question like those introduced by οὐτᾶρα in Eur. *Hipp.* 441, *I. A.* 1189, *Supp.* 496 (cf. p. 54f.). Soph. *O. C.* 1442f.

²⁸) Coulon cites Suidas, but according to Adler's index the line does not occur there. For details of the MSS I have followed Velsen rather than Coulon.

δυστάλαινά τᾶρ' ἐγώ, εἴ σου στερηθῶ is pleading. Although here exclamatory γε would be quite possible, τοι is finer; Antigone makes a final plea to Polyneices ("remember"). Eur. *H. F.* 623f. καλλιόνες τᾶρ' εἴσοδοι τῶν ἐξόδων πάρεισιν ὑμῖν is soothing (Heracles to his children).

* * *

In the light of the examples of both γ' ἄρα/ἄρα and τᾶρα already discussed we may now consider further passages in which the choice between γε and τοι is less straightforward. First two passages of tragedy. In Eur. *El.* 374 (πῶς οὖν τις αὐτὰ . . . κρινεῖ;) πλοῦτω; πονηρῶ τᾶρα χρῆσεται κριτῆ (τᾶρα Π γ' ἄρα LP) both γε and τοι have MS authority and are appropriate to the context. For πονηρῶ γ' ἄρα we may compare Ar. *Plut.* 920 (cf. p. 45) and for τᾶρα in answer to a question Aesch. *Cho.* 221 (cf. p. 57). The difference is merely one of tone and it is hardly possible to decide with certainty which Euripides intended. All the examples so far cited of γ' ἄρα/ἄρα in exclamatory comments have been from comedy; but it is natural that this lively usage, often accompanied by an oath, should be more frequent in comedy. Exclamatory γε is not uncommon in tragedy and there is no *a priori* reason to suppose tragedy would have avoided γ' ἄρα/ἄρα. Since however there are no certain examples, in default of better arguments, I am inclined to prefer the quieter τᾶρα here²⁹). The case for τᾶρα is somewhat stronger in *Or.* 1335 ἐπ' ἀξίοισι τᾶρ' ἀνευφημεῖ δόμος (ἀξίοισι τ' ἄρ' A ἀξίοισιν ἄρ' LB² ἀξίοις τ' ἄρ' P ἀξίοισιν γὰρ MB). None of the MSS actually reads γ' ἄρ' although the diversity of their readings could have arisen as easily from this as from an original τᾶρ'. As to sense exclamatory γε in a comment would certainly be idiomatic, but sympathetic τοι (cf. *Hel.* 85) is perhaps more appropriate in the mouth of Hermione.

In Ar. *Nub.* 1154f. βοάσομαι τᾶρα τὰν ὑπέρτονον βοάν (τ' ἄρα τὰν R γὰρ ἄταν V γ' ἄρα τὰν Φ) warning τοι seems preferable to exclamatory γε, especially, perhaps, in a line borrowed from tragedy (= Soph. fr. 451 N. [491 P.] = Eur. fr. 623, cf. Dover *ad loc.*); it is doubtful if βοάσομαι is sufficiently emphatic to justify γε (cf.

²⁹) It has been supposed that some or all of 373-379 are interpolated, perhaps from the *Auge* to which 379 is attributed by Diogenes Laertius. The arguments for this are not conclusive (cf. Denniston *ad loc.*), but if 374 was originally written for a different context, this would complicate the decision between the particles.

G. P. 128 for examples after an initial verb). In *Vesp.* 1262f. the MSS point clearly to μαθητέον γ' ἄρ' ἐστὶ πολλοὺς τῶν λόγων, εἴτε ἀποτείσω μηδέν (γ' ἄρ' B Ald γ' ἄρα R γ' ἄρ' δ' Γ ἄρα V). Hermann proposed τᾶρ', which has been generally accepted, and at first sight it may seem to be supported by the examples of τᾶρα in statements of intention, particularly *Ran.* 656, *Eccles.* 711 and Eur. *Phoen.* 712 (cf. p. 57). The superficial formal resemblance of these passages should not however mislead; -τέον verbal adjectives can of course also be followed by γε, e. g. *Vesp.* 1514. In this context, although τοι could be defended, the transmitted γε gives at least as good sense and should be kept. Philocleon picks up Bdelycleon's words λόγον . . . ὧν ἔμαθες (1258—1260) and γε has assentient force, "Then I shall have to learn a lot of stories" (cf. *G. P.* 130f.). Philocleon is expressing ironical agreement with his son's bizarre scheme rather than any serious intention to comply with it. In *Av.* 1017 the MSS have ἐπάγοιμι γὰρ ἄν against sense and metre. Here there is no doubt about the seriousness of Meton's intention and Elmsley's generally accepted τᾶρ', "Then, I assure you . . ." is appropriate enough. I prefer however the even easier correction γ' ἄρ' (Dobree), "Then I will be off"; ἐπάγοιμι picks up Peisetaerus' ἐπαποκίνει (1011) and γε is again assentient.

Now some passages in which γ' ἄρα/ἄρα or τᾶρα have been wrongly read and some doubtful cases. In *Soph. Aj.* 1368 σὸν ἄρα τοῦργον, οὐκ ἐμὸν κεκλήσεται (ἄρα A ἄρα L γὰρ ἄρα rec.) both γ' ἄρα (Porson) and τᾶρα (Elmsley) have been proposed; either would be possible but neither has any advantages over ἄρα, which has better MS authority (cf. Jebb *ad loc.*). In *O. C.* 534 Dain follows Bothe in reading σαί τᾶρ' ἀπόγονοί τ' εἰσὶ καὶ—(τ' ἄρ' εἰσὶν [εἴσ' A] ἀπόγονοί τε *codd.*), but τᾶρ' was rightly rejected by Ellendt-Genthe, *Lex. Soph.* 737. Τοι is quite inappropriate; it would be ludicrous for the chorus to draw Oedipus' attention to the truth which he has just revealed to them. They express rather their shock and incredulity at the revelation (cf. p. 56 on *Aj.* 1238, *Phil.* 106, 114). Jebb's σαί τ' εἴσ' ἄρ' ἀπόγονοί τε καὶ—is the most plausible of the corrections which have been suggested to cure the metre, τ' continuing Oedipus' last sentence. The possibility of γε however might also be considered, either σαί γ' εἴσ' ἄρ' or σαί γ' ἄρ' ἀπόγονοι (cf. p. 50f. on *Aesch. Cho.* 224).

In *Ar. Lys.* 797f. the majority of editors since Brunck have printed ΓΕΡ. βούλομαι σε γραῖ κόσαι. ΓΡ. κρομμύων τᾶρ' οὐκ ἔδει (κρόμ- (μ)νον RΓS *corr.* Bentley [cf. Σ] τᾶρ' S^A γὰρ RS^G τ' ἄρ' ΓS^{rel.}) al-

though their interpretations have differed. Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Ar.* 105ff., has justly objected that τᾶρ' οὐ instead of the normal οὐτᾶρα is without parallel. Fraenkel seems right in taking the old woman's tone as friendly rather than threatening (so that no reference to tears is in place), and probably also in taking ἔδει as the future of ἐσθίειν rather than the imperfect of δεῖ. His solution however, to read κρομμύων γὰρ οὐκ ἔδει; ("Wirst du denn keine Zwiebeln essen?") is not convincing. Could Fraenkel's text be understood as he translates it, rather than as a *nonne* question? Bentley's ἄρ' gives good sense ("In that case you'll not eat onions"); but γ' ἄρ' would be closer to the paradosis, γε adding an extra emphasis which is not essential but not inappropriate (cf. *Nub.* 121 οὐκ ἄρα μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα τῶν γ' ἐμῶν ἔδει). The future has the force of an imperative (K.-G. I 176).

In *Thesm.* 887f. the transmitted text (R) is κακῶς τ' ἄρ' ἐξόλοι καξολεῖ γε τοι, ὅστις γε τολμᾶς σῆμα τὸν βωμὸν καλεῖν. It is hardly possible to accept τ', although a few editors have. No connective is wanted and there is nothing in the text (for καὶ . . . γε marks an afterthought) or readily imaginable with which a preparatory τε could correspond (cf. Denniston, C. R. 44 (1930) 215). Metre forbids τᾶρ' unless we rewrite the line, as Meineke does. The *editio princeps* deleted τ' and all editions up to the rediscovery of the Ravennas and some since have followed suit. The only fault of this solution is that it does not account for the reading of R, for ἄρα gives the right connexion, (cf. pp. 46f. for ἄρα reinforced by a clause referring back to the previous speaker's words). Denniston (*loc. cit.*) suggested γ' ἄρ', and this may be right although I do not feel certain of it. If so, in Eur. *Cycl.* 261, where the transmitted γὰρ has caused difficulty, we could perhaps write ἐγώ; κακῶς γ' ἄρ' ἐξόλοι' (παρὰ προσδοκίαν for ἐξόλοιμι, cf. p. 55 n. 25). Or should we read γὰρ in both passages and suppose a stereotyped use of the particle in a curse as in εἰ γὰρ wishes (cf. *G. P.* 94)?

In *Ach.* 71 (ἐτρνηχόμεσθα . . . μαλθακῶς κατακείμενοι, ἀπολλύμενοι.) ΔΙΚ. σφόδρα γὰρ ἐσφωζόμεν ἐγώ Brunck proposed γ' ἄρ' and Mehler τᾶρ' for γάρ. The latter is unsuitable in an ironical comment and the former has no advantage over γὰρ expressing ironical agreement (cf. *Eccles.* 773ff., *Soph. El.* 393, *G. P.* 76). In *Nub.* 1440 ΦΕ. σκέψαι δὲ χᾶτέραν ἔτι γνώμην. ΣΤ. ἀπὸ γὰρ ὀλοῦμαι Willems proposed τᾶρ' but γὰρ idiomatically expresses dissent, "No, for it will be the death of me" (*G. P.* 74). If change were needed γ' ἄρ' would, I think, be better than τᾶρ'.

In *Lys.* 20 the MSS (RΓ) give to Lysistrata, in answer to Calonice's list of the activities which may have delayed the other women, the words ἀλλ' ἕτερα γὰρ ἦν τῶνδε προνοημιάτερα αὐταῖς. For the unmetrical γὰρ Elmsley proposed τᾶρ' and this has been accepted by many editors, but wrongly. The interpretation of the line depends on the meaning of τῶνδε. Some take this to refer to Lysistrata's plans, ἕτερα being the activities mentioned by Calonice; thus Wilamowitz translates "Also geht für sie etwas anderes vor gegenüber dieser Sache". Now ἄρα would indeed appropriately introduce a bitter inference from Calonice's statement; but ἀλλά and τοι would not then be appropriate. Neither Wilamowitz's translation nor his note "ἀλλά . . . τοι ἄρα zeigt, daß sie bitter konstatiert" explains the function of these particles. If however we take τῶνδε to refer to the activities listed by Calonice the transmitted ἀλλά . . . γὰρ gives admirable sense, "But (they should not have been doing these things, for) there were other more important tasks for them", whereas ἄρα would be inappropriate. Van Leeuwen objected that this interpretation would require τούτων rather than τῶνδε, but the objection is not valid. The use of ὅδε and οὗτος is not completely differentiated (cf. Neil or *Eq.* 133) and ὅδε can refer to the previous speech, e. g. *Av.* 864 (θῦε . . .-) δράσω τὰδ' ~ *Lys.* 1030 (δείξον . . .-) ἀλλὰ δράσω ταῦτα (cf. Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Ar.* 77ff.) It is only necessary then to adopt van Leeuwen's transposition ἀλλ' ἦν γὰρ ἕτερα, though not his interpretation.

* * *

What evidence is there for γ' ἄρα or τᾶρα in prose? Here we suffer from the further disadvantage that we lack the guideline of metre. Denniston (*G. P.* 43) cites four examples of γ' ἄρα from Plato. In every case the MSS offer variants. In no case can it be said that both particles are indispensable. Wilamowitz (*Platon* II 351) explicitly rejected two of them and his objection in principle to γ' ἄρ' (cf. p. 36 above) would apply equally to a third, though not to the last in which the next word begins with a consonant. To his objection we shall return when we have completed our survey of the evidence. For the present we may say on the other side first that in general γ' ἄρ(α) is more likely to have been removed than introduced in transmission during the Byzantine period, and secondly that a distinction which depends on the use of lectional signs is much more likely to reflect a genuine difference in pronun-

ciation in the case of a fourth century writer than in the case of an epic formula (cf. p. 40). Other things being equal then it is reasonable to prefer γ' ἄρ(α) to more ordinary variants.

In *Phileb.* 46a Σύμμεικτον τοῦτό γ' ἄρ', ὃ Σώκρατες, ἔοικε γίνεσθαι τι κακόν (γ' ἄρ' B γε T), "It seems then that this at least . . .", γε serves to give τοῦτο an emphasis its position denies it and ἄρα marks enlightenment (as often with ὡς ἔοικε). In *Charm.* 159d Φαίνεται γ' ἄρα ἡμῖν, ἔφην ἐγώ, κατὰ γε τὸ σῶμα σὲ τὸ ἡσύχιον . . . κάλλιστον ὄν (γ' ἄρα B ἄρα T), "Yes, it does then appear that . . .", assentient γε, though not necessary, is appropriate with the repeated φαίνεται; Socrates restates the conclusion of his argument. In *Phileb.* 35b ὁ δ' ἐπιθυμῆι πληρώσεως.—Ναί.—Πληρώσεώς γ' ἄρα πῆ τι τῶν τοῦ διωπῶντος ἂν ἐφάπτοιο (γ' ἄρα B ἄρα T) γε does no more than give πληρώσεως an extra emphasis which is perhaps justified by the repetition of the word. In *Theaet.* 171c Ἀλλά τοι, ὦ φίλε, ἄδηλον εἰ καὶ παραθέομεν τὸ ὀρθόν. εἰκός γε ἄρα ἐκεῖνον πρᾶσβύτερον ὄντα σοφώτερον ἡμῶν εἶναι (γε ἄρα B γε ἄρ' T γὰρ W) εἰκός γε can be readily paralleled (e. g. 149e, 202d, 203c) and γε is in general very common in verbless sentences (cf. *G. P.* 127, Starkie on Ar. *Vesp.* 79). The force of ἄρα is not altogether clear but seems best taken as marking Socrates' disillusionment ("it appears"); it surely does not mark an inference from Theodorus' last remark (*Ἄρα, ὦ Σώκρατες, τὸν ἐταῖρόν μου καταθέομεν*) as Campbell takes it. Having shown that Protagoras' doctrine leads to absurd consequences Socrates ironically pretends to have realized that he may have misunderstood Protagoras (cf. Wilamowitz, *loc. cit.*). It must be admitted that γὰρ, which Wilamowitz supports, is easier, but I prefer, despite doubts, to keep the *lectio difficilior*. None of these examples of γ' ἄρ(α) is beyond doubt, and if cogent objections to the collocation of particles were forthcoming they could be emended away. In default of such objections however it seems rash to reject them all.

Denniston's last prose example of γ' ἄρα is Democr. fr. 191 where Diels emended γὰρ to γ' ἄρ', but Wilamowitz (*loc. cit.*) argued convincingly that γὰρ is right here. It is possible however that γ' ἄρα should be restored in other places. In Plat. *Soph.* 241c I would suggest Μικρὸν μέρος τοίνυν αὐτῶν διεληλύθαμεν, οὐσῶν ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ἀπεράντων.—Ἀδύνατόν γ' ἄρ', ὡς ἔοικεν, [εἶη] τὸν σοφιστὴν εἰλεῖν, εἰ ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει (γὰρ BT ἄρ' W γὰρ ἂν *dett.*). The best MSS omit the ἂν which εἶη requires. Rather than inserting ἂν with the inferior MSS and Burnet it is better to delete εἶη with Wilamowitz (*Platon* II 353). The context requires ἄρα not γὰρ and Wilamowitz

may be right simply to accept the reading of W. However γ' ἄρ' would account for the reading of BT, γε would be idiomatic in a verbless sentence and its exclamatory note preferable to Campbell's τᾶρ', for, as Wilamowitz notes, Theaetetus does not really believe the task impossible. Again in *Gorg.* 454d we should perhaps read Δῆλόν γ' ἄρα ὅτι οὐ ταύτόν ἐστιν (γὰρ αἶ BTWF ἄρα Olympiodorus). Olympiodorus' ἄρα, adopted by Wilamowitz and Dodds, gives the right sense, but γ' ἄρα has the advantage of accounting for the reading of the direct tradition. In Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1130a22 I suggest ἐστι γ' ἄρ' ἄλλη τις ἀδικία ὡς μέρος τῆς ὀλης (γὰρ K^b ἄρα γε L^b M^b). Γᾶρ gives the wrong sense and ἄρα γε presents abnormal word order (see above p. 35 n. 2). Bywater who reads ἄρ', argued that γε was meaningless (*Contributions* 43); but it can, I think, be justified as giving a confirmatory emphasis to ἐστι, repeated from a 16 σημείον δ' ὅτι ἐστιν (cf. Plat. *Phileb.* 35b discussed above).

There do not seem to be any examples of τᾶρα in Attic prose, although Campbell conjectured it in Plat. *Soph.* 241c and Cobet in *Charm.* 159d. It apparently occurs in Philol. fr. 2 ἐπεὶ τοίνυν φαίνεται . . . , δῆλόν τᾶρα ὅτι . . . (τ' ἄρα *codd.*). A doubtful case of οὐ τοι ἄρα in Herodotus has been already mentioned (p. 55).

* * *

Finally let us sum up the evidence for γ' ἄρα/ἄρα. We have seen that there is MS evidence in a number of places for γ' ἄρα, γ' ἄρ', γ' ἄρα and γ' ἄρ'. That the MSS often disagree on the division of words and accentuation or present other variants is no more than we should expect. In a group of Aristophanic passages sense confirms beyond doubt the conjunction of γε and ἄρα in some form. So far I have assumed that γ' ἄρ(α) should be written only when the metre requires it, γ' ἄρ(α) otherwise. This assumption must be questioned. The fact is that although the metre sometimes requires γ' ἄρ(α) there are no certain cases where γ' ἄρ(α) is required. Should we then recognize γ' ἄρ(α) but not γ' ἄρ(α) as Hermann did (on Orph. *Arg.* 1176)? This would meet Wilamowitz's objection (cf. p. 36). If so, should we suppose that in the spoken language ἄρα was used after γε to avoid confusion with γὰρ, although it is generally assumed that ἄρα (= ἄρα) belongs only to poetry (*G. P.* 44)? Or should we reject the few instances of γ' ἄρ(α) which are more or less well attested in prose and suppose that outside poetry this conjunction of particles was avoided altogether? I do not find

it easy to believe that γ' $\check{\alpha}qa$ would have been used if γ' $\check{\alpha}qa$ had not also been current, for even in verse $\check{\alpha}qa$ appears as the normal form, $\check{\alpha}qa$ as a relatively rare variant. It may be accidental that there are no certain cases where the metre requires γ' $\check{\alpha}q(a)$; Ar. *Thesm.* 887 is at least a possible case (cf. p. 60) and there are a number of cases where the metre allows a short syllable. The fact that some MSS of Homer read γ' $\check{\alpha}q'$ where a short syllable is required, though not good evidence for pronunciation in the archaic period (cf. p. 40), probably indicates that in the Hellenistic period the possibility of γ' $\check{\alpha}q(a)$ was recognized. Wilamowitz's objection to γ' $\check{\alpha}q'$, which in any case does not apply to γ' $\check{\alpha}qa$, can still be answered. A partial answer, as Professor K. J. Dover has pointed out to me, is that, unless the following word was enclitic, $\gamma\grave{\alpha}q$ would differ tonally from γ' $\check{\alpha}q'$. Moreover although we do not know how elided vowels were pronounced it is probable that at least in some cases they made their presence felt (cf. Schwyzer, *Gr. Gramm.* I 403). Particularly relevant is the fact that MSS give both γ' $\sigma\grave{\nu}$ and $\gamma\sigma\grave{\nu}$ but only δ' $\sigma\grave{\nu}$, never $\delta\sigma\grave{\nu}$ (*G. P.* 449f.). This difference cannot be accidental and presupposes that γ' $\sigma\grave{\nu}$ could be distinguished in speech from $\gamma\sigma\grave{\nu}$. There is therefore no reason to suppose that γ' $\check{\alpha}q'$ could not be distinguished from $\gamma\grave{\alpha}q$ in speech, although of course confusion was very likely in written texts.

The Making of a Cretan Fixed Metaphor

By R. F. WILLETTS, Birmingham

I have elsewhere¹⁾ argued that the so-called Song of Hybrias, quoted by Athenaios to conclude his collection of Attic *σκόλια*²⁾ but possibly regarded by Hesychios as a marching-song³⁾, seems to be a true reflection of Cretan life in the long heyday of the Cretan aristocracies, perhaps dating to the sixth century B. C., or even earlier, in some form. The scanty traces of Cretan dialect in the text are sufficient reminder that the poem suffered change in its transmission from its Cretan home to the common stock of Greek lyric, the older the poem the greater being the likely degree of

¹⁾ *Cretan Cults and Festivals*. Appendix pp. 317-323.

²⁾ *Scol.* 28, Ath. 15.695f., cf. Eust. 1574.7.

³⁾ S. v. *Ἰβικτῆρ*.

it easy to believe that γ' $\check{\alpha}qa$ would have been used if γ' $\check{\alpha}qa$ had not also been current, for even in verse $\check{\alpha}qa$ appears as the normal form, $\check{\alpha}qa$ as a relatively rare variant. It may be accidental that there are no certain cases where the metre requires γ' $\check{\alpha}q(a)$; Ar. *Thesm.* 887 is at least a possible case (cf. p. 60) and there are a number of cases where the metre allows a short syllable. The fact that some MSS of Homer read γ' $\check{\alpha}q'$ where a short syllable is required, though not good evidence for pronunciation in the archaic period (cf. p. 40), probably indicates that in the Hellenistic period the possibility of γ' $\check{\alpha}q(a)$ was recognized. Wilamowitz's objection to γ' $\check{\alpha}q'$, which in any case does not apply to γ' $\check{\alpha}qa$, can still be answered. A partial answer, as Professor K. J. Dover has pointed out to me, is that, unless the following word was enclitic, $\gamma\grave{\alpha}q$ would differ tonally from γ' $\check{\alpha}q'$. Moreover although we do not know how elided vowels were pronounced it is probable that at least in some cases they made their presence felt (cf. Schwyzer, *Gr. Gramm.* I 403). Particularly relevant is the fact that MSS give both γ' $\sigma\check{\nu}$ and $\gamma\sigma\check{\nu}$ but only δ' $\sigma\check{\nu}$, never $\delta\sigma\check{\nu}$ (*G. P.* 449f.). This difference cannot be accidental and presupposes that γ' $\sigma\check{\nu}$ could be distinguished in speech from $\gamma\sigma\check{\nu}$. There is therefore no reason to suppose that γ' $\check{\alpha}q'$ could not be distinguished from $\gamma\grave{\alpha}q$ in speech, although of course confusion was very likely in written texts.

The Making of a Cretan Fixed Metaphor

By R. F. WILLETTS, Birmingham

I have elsewhere¹⁾ argued that the so-called Song of Hybrias, quoted by Athenaios to conclude his collection of Attic *σκόλια*²⁾ but possibly regarded by Hesychios as a marching-song³⁾, seems to be a true reflection of Cretan life in the long heyday of the Cretan aristocracies, perhaps dating to the sixth century B. C., or even earlier, in some form. The scanty traces of Cretan dialect in the text are sufficient reminder that the poem suffered change in its transmission from its Cretan home to the common stock of Greek lyric, the older the poem the greater being the likely degree of

¹⁾ *Cretan Cults and Festivals*. Appendix pp. 317-323.

²⁾ *Scol.* 28, Ath. 15.695f., cf. Eust. 1574.7.

³⁾ S. v. *Ἰβικτῆρ*.

change. It is more than usually difficult to assess the degree of such change simply because the poem has no close parallel.

J. D. S. Pendlebury⁴⁾ compared the spirit of the words of the ancient Song with the words of what he regarded as a modern Cretan equivalent—the Pentozales dance:

*ὅποιος δὲν εἶνε μερακλῆς καὶ στ' ἄρματα τεχνίτης
πρέπει του νὰ μὴν τὰ πατεῖ τὰ χῶματα τῆς Κρήτης.
ὅποιος δὲν εἶνε μερακλῆς του πρέπει νὰ ποδάνη,
γιὰ τὶ στὸν κόσμον γιὰ νὰ ζῆ μόνο τὸ τόπο πιάνει;*

We may indeed recognize a fundamental likeness of temper in the modern parallel after the passage of two and a half millennia. For the comparison serves to emphasize the traditional, folk-song nature of the Song of Hybrias, which no doubt helped to facilitate its transmission from a local to a more general lyrical context in antiquity. This nature of the Song is also marked by the repetition of one of its verses⁵⁾, an arresting feature of this short poem, which begins:

*ἔστι μοι πλοῦτος μέγας δόρυ καὶ ξίφος
καὶ τὸ καλὸν λαισήϊον, πρόβλημα χρωτός·*

The second of these verses is repeated at line 7.

The *λαισήϊον*, as defensive armour, occurs in a twice-used formula of the *Iliad*⁶⁾:

*δήνον ἀλλήλων ἀμφὶ στήθεσσι βοείας,
ἀσπίδας εὐκύνκλους λαισήϊά τε πτερόεντα.*

Apart from Homeric scholia and lexica, the *λαισήϊον* is mentioned only by Hybrias and by Herodotos⁷⁾ who explains that it was a shield of raw ox-hide carried *ἀντ' ἀσπίδων* by Cilicians in Xerxes' army. For Hybrias no doubt it signified the shield of the ordinary hoplite and he adds to it the descriptive term *πρόβλημα χρωτός*. The word *πρόβλημα*, signifying anything thrown forward or projecting, is used of what is put out before one as defensive barrier by Herodotos⁸⁾, Plato⁹⁾, Euripides (of a wall)¹⁰⁾, Xenophon (of the brazen armour of horses)¹¹⁾ and by Aeschylus of a shield (*σάκει, κυκλωτῶ σώματος προβλήματι*)¹²⁾. The Aeschylean parallel is close to the Hybrias verse¹³⁾.

⁴⁾ *The Archaeology of Crete*. p. 329.

⁵⁾ Cf. the half-verse repetition in the Pentozales dance.

⁶⁾ 5.452/453, 12.425/426. ⁷⁾ 7.91. ⁸⁾ 7.70, cf. 4.175.¹

⁹⁾ *Plu.* 279d seq., cf. *Sph.* 261a. ¹⁰⁾ *Rh.* 213. ¹¹⁾ *Cyr.* 6.1.51. ¹²⁾ *Th.* 540.

¹³⁾ By coincidence *σάκος* is a Cretan word according to *AB* 1096.

By fortunate chance there has survived from the second century B. C. at Gortyn a short verse inscription, of little literary merit in itself, but not without value in providing some modest evidence of stylistic change in the transmission and modification of this descriptive term in Crete itself¹⁴).

A Cretan called Pyroos, perhaps a mercenary, dedicates arms in the temple¹⁵ of Isis and Sarapis—*ὁ Κρηὶς εἶδρε Πύροος κτλ.* (11. 1—2). The epigram continues (1. 3):

εἶδρε δ' ἄρα πρόβλημα χροός καὶ τεῦχος ἰοστῶν.

The poem is traditional in the sense that its verses generally have an epic tone¹⁶) and also in a specifically Cretan sense that this particular verse echoes the Song of Hybrias¹⁷).

Our concern is with the particular verse and two differences call for comment, one morphological and one stylistic, both illustrating the kind of modification that may occur in oral transmission of traditional material. Whether Pyroos himself or someone else on his behalf composed the verses is of less consequence than that it should have seemed natural for him to make a dedication in a form which shows familiarity with epic expression and with an old Cretan lyric.

The first difference is that the genitive *χροός* is used instead of *χρωτός*. Since τ-forms from *χρώς* (*χρωτός* *Iliad* 10. 575, *χρῶτ' Odyssey* 18. 172, 179, beside usual *χροός*, *χροά*) already occur in Homer as epic variants, the alternation *χρωτός/χροός* was already traditional. Of more interest is the absence of *λαισήϊον* or synonym¹⁸). *πρόβλημα χρωτός* is a metaphorical descriptive phrase. *πρόβλημα χροός* is pure metaphor, in the sense that its intended meaning would lapse outside its familiar context of usage, of the sort that Milman Parry defined as fixed metaphor¹⁹).

¹⁴) *Inscr. Cret.* 4. 243 with refs. *ad loc.* Cf. also *ib.* 244.

¹⁵) See further Willetts *op. cit.* pp. 292/293.

¹⁶) “— carmina epica resonantibus”, Guarducci *ad loc.*

¹⁷) Kirsten, *Die Insel Kreta im fünften und vierten Jahrhundert* p. 119 n. 131; cf. Guarducci *ad loc.*: “Hoc vero haud parvi momenti est carmen illud antiquum post haud exiguum temporis intervallum in epigrammate nostro resonare”.

¹⁸) Cf. the close Aeschylean parallel cited above.

¹⁹) *The Traditional Metaphor in Homer, Class. Phil.* 28 (1933), pp. 30—43, reprinted in *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry ed. Adam Parry* (1971), pp. 365—375.

On Argolic *πρωτί*

By W. J. PEPICELLO, Providence

The preposition *πρωτί* is said to occur once in the Argolic dialect, in an inscription from Tylissos (Schwyzer 84, Guarducci I. 307) in the line $\Phi[\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\sigma\theta\omicron \text{ } \eta\omicron\iota \text{ } \text{Κ}\nu\delta\eta\iota\omicron\iota \text{ } \pi\rho\acute{o}\tau' \text{ } \alpha\nu[\tau\acute{o}\varsigma]$. This form has been accepted, or at least has not been contested, by Hatzidakis, who first published the inscription in 1914 (EA 1914. 94–98), Kahrstedt (Klio 34. 84), Bechtel (II. 503–504), Thumb-Kieckers (I. 123), Buck (*Dialects*. 107), and as late as 1970 by Wyatt (TAPA 1970, 567). The existence of this one form in Argolic presents a problem if Argolic is to be classified as a Doric dialect, for it then becomes the only mainland Doric dialect to have a form of this preposition containing ρ prior to the intrusion of koine *πρός*. It is in fact the only Greek dialect having forms of the preposition both with and without ρ . Though both *πρωτί* and *ποτί* are found in Cretan, *πρωτί* is found in Central Cretan, while *ποτί* occurs in East Cretan, West Cretan, and at Malla, as pointed out by Günther (IF 20. 29–30) and Bechtel (768). Thus only in Argolic do we find forms of the preposition with and without ρ coexisting prior to koine influence.

A significant consideration at this point is the relationship of *πρωτί* to normal Argolic *ποτί/ποί*. Brugmann (*Grundriß* II, 2. 877), Coleman (TPS 1963, 90), and Risch (Gliederung, 95), among others, see both forms as inherited, pointing to Skt. *prati* as proof of the antiquity of the ρ -form. However, I am inclined to agree with Wyatt (567/568) that *ποτί* may well be the older form, while *πρωτί* is a later development, perhaps influenced by *πρό* and *πρόσθεν*. If this situation, or one similar to it, is the case, certainly the occurrence of *πρωτί* in Argolic could not be explained as an inherited survival.

But in fact no consideration such as the one just presented has been previously explored. Since Hatzidakis' publication of the inscription in 1914 (cf. above) the existence of the form has been generally accepted. It is only with the objections raised by W. Vollgraff in his monograph *Le Décret d'Argos relatif à un pacte entre Knossos et Tylissos* that the *raison d'être* of the Argolic form *πρωτί* comes to light. Vollgraff notes that the preposition *πρωτί* fits the sense of the line restored by Hatzidakis as $\Phi[\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\sigma\theta\omicron\nu \text{ } \omicron\iota \text{ } \text{Κ}\nu\delta\eta\iota\omicron\iota \text{ } \pi\rho\acute{o}\tau' \text{ } \alpha\nu\tau\acute{o}\varsigma]$. That this interpretation was then widely accepted is

hardly sufficient grounds to accept it now, in light of the problems noted in the first paragraph above. Yet it is the only support for this form of the preposition in Argolic¹).

Vollgraff prefers a different treatment of the line in question. The actual line from the inscription (as I read it from the photograph in Guarducci I. 307) contains the following sequence of letters: . . . *OHIOIHPOTAY*²). Vollgraff (17 ff.) restores the sense as Φ [ε-ρῶσθo *hoi Ky]θήιοι πρὸ Ταυ[ροφορίων?]. He states that Hatzidakis' reading requires the meaning "emporter chez soi", while *φερῶσθo* literally means "ils emporteraient pour eux". He argues further (17/18):*

Pour exprimer le sens d'"emporter chez soi" on eut pu dire, avec Homère, *οἰκονδε φέρεσθαι*, mais jamais *φέρεσθαι πρὸτ' αὐτόν*. L'usage, sous ce rapport, ne souffre pas d'exception.

Vollgraff ends his arguments by claiming that a reflexive construction such as the one proposed by Hatzidakis is usually in the genitive, giving the following examples from Herodotus: Herod. I. 108: *φέρων ἐς σεωντοῦ*; IV. 5: *κομίσαι ἐς ἑωντοῦ*.

These arguments, while they may not irrefutably prove that *πρωτί* cannot exist in this inscription, do illuminate a vital issue which has been largely ignored, namely that the form *πρωτί* need never have been assumed to exist here in the first place. There is no firm epigraphical evidence to support the word division of the line as proposed by Hatzidakis. I therefore submit that the problem should be examined in a different light, that of dialect geography. Only here is there any basis on which to judge the validity of Argolic *πρωτί*. As has been seen, the evidence presented by the Greek dialects does not support the existence of *πρωτί* in Argolic, since its existence there is inconsistent with the facts as they obtain

¹) Coleman p. 89 notes that Apollonius Dyscolus cites *πρωτί* as a Dorian form and takes this testimony as support for the existence of *πρωτί* in Argolic. However, if neither epigraphical nor dialectal evidence bears out this testimony we can only view it as a statement which is unconfirmed by the accessible data.

²) This sequence of letters appears in Vollgraff (7) as *OEIOIHPOTAY*, and is in error as it appears there. In Schwyzer 84 we read: Φ [ε-ρῶσθo *hoi Ky]θήιοι πρὸτ' αὐτόν* . . . with the omission of brackets indicating what has been restored. In doing this Schwyzer followed the original publication of Hatzidakis, who also omitted the brackets in this line. Guarducci, while accepting the reading with the word division proposed by Hatzidakis, supplies the brackets in IC I. 307.

both for Doric and for the Greek dialects in general. There is no evidence, then, either epigraphical or dialectal, which supports the word division of Hatzidakis. We should, I believe, in light of this, give up Hatzidakis' proposal and follow the word division of Vollgraff.

References

- Bechtel, Friedrich, *Die Griechischen Dialekte*, Zweiter Band, Die Westgriechischen Dialekte, Heidelberg 1923.
- Brugmann, Karl, *Grundriß der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, Zweiter Band, Straßburg 1906.
- Coleman, R., "The Dialect Geography of Ancient Greece", *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1963, pp. 58-126.
- Guarducci, M., *Inscriptiones Creticae*, Vol. I, Rome 1935.
- Günther, R., „Die Präpositionen in den griechischen Dialektinschriften“, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 20 (1906/1907), pp. 1-163.
- Hatzidakis, J., "Κνωσίων και Τυλισίων συνθήκη", *Ἐφεμερίς Αρχαιολογική*, 1914, pp. 94-98.
- Kahrstedt, U., „Zwei Urkunden zur Geschichte von Argos und Kreta in der Pentekontaëtie“, *Klio* 34 (1941), pp. 72-91.
- Risch, E., „Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht“, *Museum Helveticum* 12 (1955), pp. 61-76, reprinted in G. S. Kirk, *The Language and Background of Homer*, New York 1964, pp. 90-105.
- Schwyzler, E., *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Potiora*, Leipzig 1923.
- Thumb, A., *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, zweite erweiterte Auflage von E. Kieckers, Heidelberg 1932.
- Vollgraff, W., *Le Décret d'Argos relatif à un pacte entre Knossos et Tyliossos*, Amsterdam 1948.
- Wyatt, W. F. Jr., "The Prehistory of the Greek Dialects", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 1970, pp. 557-632.

Gnōmē

By SERGE N. MOURAVIEV, MOSCOW

Wishing to get a more clear knowledge of what γνώμη meant in the works of the Presocratic philosophers, especially in Heraclitus, I undertook an analysis of the occurrences of this word listed in the *Greek-English Lexicon* by Liddell-Scott-Jones-McKenzie (°1968) and in the *Wortindex* by Kranz (in Diels' *Die Fragmente*

both for Doric and for the Greek dialects in general. There is no evidence, then, either epigraphical or dialectal, which supports the word division of Hatzidakis. We should, I believe, in light of this, give up Hatzidakis' proposal and follow the word division of Vollgraff.

References

- Bechtel, Friedrich, *Die Griechischen Dialekte*, Zweiter Band, Die Westgriechischen Dialekte, Heidelberg 1923.
- Brugmann, Karl, *Grundriß der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, Zweiter Band, Straßburg 1906.
- Coleman, R., "The Dialect Geography of Ancient Greece", *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1963, pp. 58-126.
- Guarducci, M., *Inscriptiones Creticae*, Vol. I, Rome 1935.
- Günther, R., „Die Präpositionen in den griechischen Dialektinschriften“, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 20 (1906/1907), pp. 1-163.
- Hatzidakis, J., "Κνωσίων και Τυλισίων συνθήκη", *Ἐφεμερίς Αρχαιολογική*, 1914, pp. 94-98.
- Kahrstedt, U., „Zwei Urkunden zur Geschichte von Argos und Kreta in der Pentekontaëtie“, *Klio* 34 (1941), pp. 72-91.
- Risch, E., „Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht“, *Museum Helveticum* 12 (1955), pp. 61-76, reprinted in G. S. Kirk, *The Language and Background of Homer*, New York 1964, pp. 90-105.
- Schwyzler, E., *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Potiora*, Leipzig 1923.
- Thumb, A., *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, zweite erweiterte Auflage von E. Kieckers, Heidelberg 1932.
- Vollgraff, W., *Le Décret d'Argos relatif à un pacte entre Knossos et Tylissos*, Amsterdam 1948.
- Wyatt, W. F. Jr., "The Prehistory of the Greek Dialects", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 1970, pp. 557-632.

Gnōmē

By SERGE N. MOURAVIEV, MOSCOW

Wishing to get a more clear knowledge of what γνώμη meant in the works of the Presocratic philosophers, especially in Heraclitus, I undertook an analysis of the occurrences of this word listed in the *Greek-English Lexicon* by Liddell-Scott-Jones-McKenzie (©1968) and in the *Wortindex* by Kranz (in Diels' *Die Fragmente*

*der Vorsokratiker*⁵, III/1, s. v.). The confrontation of the current and philosophical uses of γνώμη helped me, I believe, to form a more accurate picture of what the semantic evolution of the word had been like up to the end of the classical age. In order to test my conclusions, I gave them the form of a LSJ entry. I am well aware that a full discussion of all the early occurrences of γνώμη, taking into account all that has already been written by scholars on the subject, would have been preferable and would have made my conclusions more accurate and convincing. But other matters have prevented me, and will still prevent me for a long time, from doing so. This is why I resolved to publish my results as they are, in the form of an entry followed by a short commentary, hoping that even such it will not be altogether devoid of interest.

With only a few exceptions, I departed practically nowhere from the usual (LSJ-) understanding of γνώμη. But in two respects the entry as given here differs much from that in LSJ. Firstly, I gave special attention in each case to the *basic meaning* of the word as distinguished from its *actual* (contextual) *signification* and/or its secondary *derivative meaning*; hence, in the translations, I have sometimes preferred rather awkward descriptions showing clearly what the basic meaning is to what would have been the best English equivalent if the basic meaning could have been hidden by it. Secondly, I have tried to reconstruct the 'genealogy' of the basic meanings of γνώμη, and this has compelled me to remould completely the structure of the LSJ entry; besides—this is particularly true for sections A and B—I had to include in the headings of the sections meanings which, though unattested, were obviously at the origin of the derivative meanings and actual significations listed in the section.

γνώμη, ἡ, initially 'knowledge-power', i. e. *power related to knowledge*, an undifferentiated meaning which, judging by its derivatives, was used in three main (contextual) significations: 'knowledge-power' of the object known, i. e. its *power to be known* (A), 'knowledge-power' of the knowing subject, i. e. the *power given to him by knowledge* (B. I) or his *power (ability) to know* (B. II). All the other meanings (C and D) derive from B.

A. 'knowledge-power' of the object known, i. e. its *power or means to be known, recognized or understood*, unattested in this initial meaning, but exemplified by the following instances where the

meaning is narrower: I. *mark, token, distinctive feature*, i. e. *what enables one to know, recognize or distinguish the object as such* 1. of a young horse, λέγουσι (sc. τὸν ἵππον) γνώμην ἔχειν, ὅταν ἄβολος ἦι the horse is said to 'have the *mark*' when it has not shed its foal-teeth Arist. HA 576^b 15 (cf. γνώμα and γνώμων II. 6) 2. of social categories, οὔτε κακῶν γνώμας εἰδότες οὔτ' ἀγαθῶν not knowing the *distinctive features* of (the means of recognizing) both the villains and the nobles Thgn. 60. [both sg. and pl.]

II. of utterances: *meaning, purport*, i. e. *what enables one to know or understand them*, οὐ γνώμαι διπλόαν θέτο βουλάν his *clear-cut* (i. e. not double in *meaning*) will Pi. N. 10. 89; ἡ ξύμπασα γνώμη τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων the general *meaning (content)* of what has been really said Th. 1. 22; cf. ἦν τοῦ τείχους ἡ γνώμη . . . , ἴνα . . . the *purport* of the wall (the reason for deciding to build it) was . . . to . . . Id. 8. 90. [only sg.]

B. *knowledge-power* of the knowing subject, i. e. either the *power given to him by knowledge* (I), or the *power or faculty to know* which he possesses (II): I. *power given by knowledge, knowledge as a power or means* to do smth (found mainly in philosophical contexts of the early period where it refers to the *divine power* of wisdom) . . . ἐν τῷ σοφόν· ἐπίστασθαι γνώμην, ὅτεμι (v. l.) κυβερνήσαι (codd.) πάντα διὰ πάντων the wise is one: to acquire the *knowledge* (i. e. the *power given by it*) with which (it is possible) to steer all things by means of all things Heraclit. 41; cf. imitation Ζεῦ . . . , ἀνθρώπους ῥόοι ἀπειροσύνης ἀπὸ λυγρῆς . . . , δὸς δὲ κυβῆσαι γνώμης, ἦι πίσυνος σὸ . . . πάντα κυβερνᾷς deliver them from heavy ignorance and let them grasp the *knowledge*, relying on which thou steerst all things Cleanth. HIon. 32ff.; and objection τὸ σοφόν ἐστὶν οὐ καθ' ἐν μόνον, ἀλλ' ὅσσα περ ζῆι, πάντα καὶ γνώμαν ἔχει the wise is not but one, but all living creatures possess the *power of (given by) knowledge* (follows the example of the hen knowing how to animate an inanimate egg) Epicharm. 4, 1f.; . . . τί κράτιστον; γνώμη what is the mightiest thing? —*knowledge* (i. e. its *power*) Pythagorica ap. Iamb. VP. 82; cf. perh. Anaxarch. 1 fin. [only sg.]

II. *power or faculty to know, mental (intellectual) power or strength*, γνώμη φρενῶν, opp. ὀργῆι, on account of the (*knowing*) *power* of the mind, opp. on account of anger S. OT. 524; διὰ δακτύλων μάστιγα . . . γνώμην (καὶ ῥώμην) having trained their *mental* (and bodily) *strength* Gorg. 6. 13, cf. τῶι φρονίμῳ τῆς γνώμης πάειν τὸ ἄφρον (τῆς ῥώμης) to temper the mindlessness (of bodily strength) with

the mindfulness of *mental strength* *ibid.*, cf. Th. 3. 11 (infra C. II. 1); *ὅποσα ἐπέκεινα τῆς ἡμετέρας γνώμης ἔστιν* things beyond (out of reach of) our *mental powers* Thrasym. 1; *ἡ γνώμη τῆς ψυχῆς* the (*mental*) *power* of the soul Pl. *Lg.* 672b. [only sg.]

C. Meanings derived from B. I. 1. from *knowledge as a power* (B. I) → *knowledge as such, understanding, comprehension, πάντων γνώμαν ἴσχειν* to *know* or *understand* (lit. have *knowledge* or *understanding* of) everything S. *Ph.* 837; *γνώμην περὶ παντός πᾶσαν ἴσχει* (sc. ὁ νοῦς) has every *knowledge* about all Anaxag. 12; *κατελέλοιπεν ἀῆρ ἐν τῷ ἐγκεφάλῳ . . . ὃ τι ἂν ἦι φρόνιμόν τε καὶ γνώμην ἔχον* the intelligent and the *knowing* in air Hp. *Morb. Sacr.* 16; *γνώμην ἔχειν* have *knowledge, understanding, know, understand, be clever* S. *El.* 214 (lyr.), Ar. *Ach.* 396; *ὧι δεῖ γινώσκειν καὶ ἐν ᾧ γνώμην φυλάσσειν* the means of knowing and the place for keeping *knowledge* Pythagorica ap. Iamb. *VP.* 163; *οὐκ ἀπὸ γνώμης λέγεις* not without *reason* (i. e. *knowledge* of what you say) S. *Tr.* 389; *ἄτερ γνώμης* A. *Pr.* 456, *ἄνευ γνώμης* S. *OC.* 594, without *knowledge* or *understanding, foolishly; ἄνευ γνώμης φιλονικεῖν* rival (i. e. argue) without *knowledge* (of the matter of the argument) Thrasym. 1; *παρὰ γνώμην κινδυνευταί* adventurous past *understanding.* Th. 1. 70, cf. 4. 19. [only sg.] 2. *piece* or *item* of *knowledge, what smbd knows for certain, thesis, ἦθος ἀνθρώπειον μὲν οὐκ ἔχει γνώμας, θεῖον δὲ ἔχει* the human abode (sc. of the soul), i. e. the human body, has no *items of knowledge* . . . Heraclit. 78; *ὡς μὴ ποτέ τις σε βροτῶν γνώμη παρελάσσει* so that no *thesis* of the mortals surpasses you Parm. 8. 61; *Πυθαγόρης . . . ὁ σοφὸς περὶ πάντων/ἀνθρώπων γνώμας εἶδε (v. l.) καὶ ἐξέμαθεν* the wise P. understood and learnt thoroughly the *things* men *knew* (sc. for certain, cf. Heraclit. 129) about everything Ion Philos. 4, 3f.; *αἱ τῶν σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν γνώμαι ἀρετῇ πλουτίζουσι τοὺς κεκτημένους* the *theses* of (the *things known* by) wise men enrich with virtue those who possess them X. *Mem.* 4. 2. 9, cf. S. *Aj.* 1091, Arist. *Rh.* 1394^a 22 (sg.), 1395^a 11 (pl.); hence titles: *Ἀξιοπλίστου γνώμαι* (IV B. C.) Ath. *Deipn.* 648d, *Δημοκρίτου γνώμαι* Cod. Par. Gr. 1168, *Theses* of . . . ; *γνώμαι Δημοκράτους· γνωμέων μεν τῶνδε εἴ τις ἐπαῖτοι ξὺν νόῳ . . .* *Theses* of D.: if smbd hearkens to my *theses* intelligently . . . ap. Democrit. 35. [mostly pl., the sg. being often undistbl. fr. I. 1] 3. *knowledge of what one does, consciousness, awareness, will, γνώμη, opp. τύχη, σωφροσύντες* sound, or moderate, *on purpose, knowingly, opp. by chance, fortuitously* Isoc. 3. 47; *γνώμη κολάζειν* chastize *on purpose* (namely, to frighten) X. *An.* 2. 6. 10; *τύχης ἀγρεύμασι,*

οὐ γνώμης βουλευμάσι (love comes upon men) by strokes of chance, not by decisions of *will* Gorg. 11. 19. [sg.]

II. from *mental power* (B. II) 1. → *mind, intellect, insight, wit(s), heed*, γνώμας κατέθεντο c. inf., they have made up their *minds* to . . . Parm. 8. 53; acc. abs.: γνώμην ἱκανός having enough *mind*, i. e. *sound* Hdt. 3. 4, cf. Critias 40; γνώμην ἀγαθός, κακός with good, bad *insight* S. OT. 687, Ph. 910; τοιάδε τὴν γνώμην of such *insight* Id. El. 1021; dat. instr. et modi: γνώμη μαθεῖν τι understand smth *with the mind* (here: *without effort*) Id. OC. 403; γνώμη κερήσας having grasped *with the mind* Id. OT. 398; ὧν ὄψει ὄραϊ . . . ὧν γνώμη γιγνώσκει the things he sees with his sight, the things he knows with his *mind* Antipho Philos. 1; cf. ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν καὶ γνώμη νοῆσαι Hp. de Arte. 2; ἀπαρασκεύωι γνώμη with an unprepared *mind* Antipho Philos. 3; μήτε ἂ τῶι ἄλλωι σώματι αἰσθάνεται, μηδὲ ἂ τῆι γνώμηι γιγνώσκει neither the things he perceives with the rest of the body, nor those he knows with the *mind* Critias 39; γιγνώσκουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι . . . τῆι γνώμηι men know by means of the *mind* ibid.; ὅστις γνώμηι μὴ καθαρεύει who has not a pure *mind*, i. e. *wicked-minded* Ar. Ra. 355; ταῖς γνώμαις καὶ τοῖς σώμασι σφάλλῃσθαι to stagger with (i. e. to loose control of) one's *wits* and bodies X. Cyr. 1. 3. 10, cf. Th. 1. 60; γνώμης ἀπτεσθαι affect the *mind*, of wine and fever Hp. Acut. 63, Fract. 11; γνώμης ἰδέαι kinds of *mind* Democr. 11, cf. Περὶ διαφορῆς γνώμης (title) On the difference (i. e. the different kinds) of *mind* Id. 111; γνώμης κακοθηγίη the obtuseness of *mind* Id. 223; γνώμης θάρσος the daring of the *mind* (i. e. *intellectual boldness*) Id. 215; γνώμης ξύνεσις the sagacity of the *mind* Th. 1. 75; γνώμης ἔφοδος, opp. ἰσχύος ἔφ., attack based on *intellect* (i. e. *intellectual superiority*), opp. on force (i. e. here, military superiority) Id. 3. 11; προσέχειν γνώμην turn one's *mind*, give *heed*, *attend*: δεῦρο τὴν γνώμην προσίσχετε turn your *attention* hither Eup. 37, but προσεῖχον τὴν γνώμην, ὡς οὐ περιωφόμενοι . . . they turned their *minds* (i. e. they saw) to it, that they do not overlook Th. 1. 95; ἐπὶ τοῖς δυνατοῖς ἔχειν τὴν γνώμην have the *mind* upon, pay *attention* (only) to possible things Democr. 191, but ταύτης ἔχεσθαι τῆς γνώμης to hold on by this *way of thinking* (lit. *kind of mind*) ibid., cf. Id. 11, 111 (supra); πρὸς ἑτέρωι γνώμην ἔχειν have one's *mind* elsewhere, *think* about smth else Aeschin. 3. 192; ἐξοίχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς γνώμης to have gone out of the *mind*, to be no longer of *concern* or *interest* Antipho Philos. 49; δηλοῦν τὴν γνώμην ἐν τινι to show one's *wit* in smth Th. 3. 39. [pl. only when the minds of many people are meant, sg. even when kinds of a single mind are meant; this meaning has dis-

appeared by the time of Galenus, who finds it necessary to point out that οἱ παλαιοὶ used γνώμη the way he uses νοῦς, διανοία, “if not ἐννόησις” Gal. in *Hp. Off.* 656.2] 2. with Adjs. of righteousness, correctness: (right) *mind*, (good) *conscience*, (right) *judgement*, ἀπὸ γνώμης φέρειν ψήφον δικαίως (v. l.) to give one’s vote with a just *mind* (i. e. with good *conscience*) A. *Eu.* 674; γνώμη τῆ ἀρίστη (sc. κρίνειν or δικάζειν) with the best *mind*, i. e. to the best of one’s *judgement*, in the discasts’ oath Arist. *Rh.* 1375^a 29; περὶ ὧν ἂν νόμοι μὴ ὄσι, γνώμη τῆ δικαιοτάτη κρίνειν to judge with the most righteous *mind*, i. e. according to *conscience* D. 20. 118, cf. 23. 96, 39. 40, Arist. *Pol.* 1287^a 26. b. with other Adjs, εὐσεβεῖ γνώμαι with a pious *mind*, *piously* Pi. *O.* 3. 41; πάσῃ τῆ γνώμη with all one’s *mind*, i. e. *zealously* Th. 6. 45; ἐκ μιᾶς γνώμης D. 10. 59, μιᾷ γνώμη Th. 1. 122, 6. 17 with one *mind*, of one *accord*, *unanimously*; διὰ μιᾶς γνώμης γίνεσθαι to happen according to unanimous *will* Isoc. 4. 139. [sg.]

D. Further derivations: I. 1. from *knowledge, understanding* (C. I), in contexts restricting their value or showing their subjectivity, → *kind of knowledge or understanding, judgement, opinion, view, ταῦτη* . . . τῆ γνώμη πλεῖστος εἰμι lit. I am more in favour of this *kind* or *way of understanding*, i. e. I incline mostly to this *view* Hdt. 7. 220 (s. v. l.); cf. ταῦτη πλεῖστος τὴν γνώμην εἰμί Id. 1. 120, ἡ πλείστη γνώμη ἐστὶ τινι Id. 5. 126, τὸ πλεῖστον τῆς γνώμης εἶχεν . . . προσμεῖξαι Th. 3. 31; κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμήν in my *judgement* or *opinion* (i. e. according to the way I *know* or *understand* it) Hdt. 2. 26, 5. 3; ellipt. κατὰ γε τὴν ἐμήν Ar. *V.* 983, *Pax* 232; παρὰ γνώμην τοῖς Ἑλλεσιν ἐγένετο it happened contrary to their *expectation* (to the *way in which they understood* it would happen) Th. 4. 40; οὕτως τὴν γνώμην ἔχειν (cf. supra C. I. 1) to be of such an *opinion* (lit. to have such *sort of understanding*) Id. 7. 15, cf. X. *Cyr.* 6. 2. 8, Ar. *Nu.* 157; εἴ τινι γνώμη τοιαύτη παρειστήκει περὶ ἐμοῦ if such an *opinion* about me is held by smbd . . . And. 1. 54; τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἔχειν to be of the same *opinion* Th. 2. 55, cf. 1. 113, 140, 3. 38. Hence: 2. *opinion delivered publicly, advice, proposition, suggestion, motion, γνώμην ἀποφαίνειν* Hdt. 1. 40, ἀποδείκνυσθαι ib. 207, ἐκφαίνειν Id. 5. 36. τίθεσθαι S. *Ph.* 1448 (anap.), Ar. *Ec.* 658, ἀποφαίνεσθαι E. *Supp.* 336, express, deliver an *opinion*; γνώμην ἐκφέρειν Hdt. 3. 80, 81; εἰπεῖν Th. 8. 63, submit, propose a *motion*, make a *suggestion*; Θεμιστοκλέους γνώμη on a *suggestion*, by the *advice* of . . . Th. 8. 68; γνώμην ποιῆσθαι c. inf *suggest* to do . . . Id. 1. 128, but cf. 3. 36 (infra);

γνώμαι τρεῖς προεκέατο three *motions* were set forth Hdt. 3.38; γνώμην νικᾶν have a *motion* through Ar. V. 594, Nu. 432; γνώμας ποιεῖσθαι περὶ τιῶν Th. 3.36, γνώμας προτίθεναι *ibid.* hold *opinions*, i. e. a *debate*. [sg. and pl.] 3. (*high*) *opinion*, *esteem*, *favour*, ἐν γνώμῃ γεγονέναι τίνι to enjoy smbd's *esteem*, *favour* Hdt. 6.37; τίνα αὐτοὺς οἰεσθε γνώμην ἔξειν περὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν you think that you will have a *high opinion* of yourselves And. 1.104; πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους μᾶλλον τὴν γνώμην εἶχον their *favour* went rather towards . . . (they were more *in favour* of . . .) Th. 5.44; φίλιαι γνώμαι friendly *favours*, i. e. *sentiments* Hdt. 9.4. [pl. rare]

II. from *mind* (C. II) → *one's mind*, *intention*, *wishes*, *purpose*, *resolve*, ἐμπιπλάναι τὴν γνώμην τινός satisfy his *mind*, i. e. his *wishes* X. An. 1.7.8, cf. HG. 6.1.15 (pl.); ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ γνώμης on his own *initiative* (lit. according to his own *mind*, i. e. *wish*) Th. 4.68; κατὰ γνώμην according to one's *mind* or *wishes*, ὅταν τάκει θῶ κατὰ γνώμην ἐμήν E. Andr. 737, ἄν τι μὴ κατὰ γνώμην ἐκβῆι D. 1.16; ἀπὸ τοιαύδε γνώμης with some such *idea* or *purpose* Th. 3.92; τίνα ἔχουσα γνώμην; with what *mind*, i. e. *intention*? what *for*? Hdt. 3.119; οἶδα δ' οὐ γνώμῃ τίνι; do I know with what *purpose*? S. OT. 527, cf. Aj. 448; κατὰ γνώμην (cf. supra) of *set purpose* D. H. 6.81 (so also γνώμης Lib. Or. 33.13, 50.12). [pl. rare]

III. from (right) *mind* (C. II.2) → *right judgement*, *decision*, *resolution*, *verdict*, (ἡ καλουμένη γνώμη τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς κρείσσις ὀρθή the so-called *γνώμη* is right judgement about what is most fair Arist. EN. 1143^a19), *resolution* IG. 1^a.118.28, etc.; γνώμη στρατηγῶν their *decision* *ib.* 2^a.27; γνώμη Κλεισόφου καὶ συμπρωτάνεων *ib.* 1; ἡ ἐκφερομένη γνώμη the resolution put forth *ib.* 1051^e26; ἡ τοῦ δικαστοῦ γνώμη his *verdict* *ib.* 4.364 (Corinth. IV A. D.); cf. 685.32 (pl. Cret. II B. C.).

Commentary

1. The reasons why I include the idea of *power* in the initial meaning of *γνώμη* are, very briefly, these. *γνώμη* is cognate to *γιγνώσκειν*, and it is obvious that the idea of 'knowledge (understanding, recognition)' was present in the initial meaning of the word. But two observations make it evident that 'knowledge' could not have been the sole element of the initial meaning. (i) All the meanings of *γνώμη* fall into two groups, one passive (A), the other active (B, C, D). The difference between them lies in the

fact that while in the latter *γνώμη* is attributed (is said to belong) to the subject of knowledge (to 'him whose is the knowledge'), in the former it is attributed to the object of knowledge (to 'that of what is the knowledge'). But knowledge as such can be attributed only to its subject, it never belongs to what is known. Hence the meaning of *γνώμη* must have included still another element which, unlike 'knowledge', could be attributed to the object of knowledge as well. (ii) The active meanings of *γνώμη* fall in their turn into two categories represented by two different lines of evolution, the one centered on the meaning of 'knowledge' (B. I → C. I → D. I), the other on that of 'mind', 'intellect' (B. II → C. II → D. II, III). No kind of normal sense-modification typical for *simple* meanings (metonymy, irradiation, concretization, abstraction, extension, restriction etc.) can explain how 'knowledge' could have come to mean 'mind' (or *vice versa*) or how both could have sprung from a common *simple* meaning. The conclusion is that the initial meaning must have been *complex*.

We can identify the second element thanks to the rather unusual meanings of *γνώμη* in sections B. I and B. II. In B. I *γνώμη* clearly means 'knowledge', but of a special kind, with an additional stress on the exceptional deeds it allows one to perform: 'allows' is the same as 'gives the power or the means to'. This suggests the interpretation of *γνώμη* B. I as 'power from knowledge' (a kind of Ancient 'know-how'). In B. II *γνώμη* does not yet denote (as in C. II) the mind itself (as a matter of fact it is sometimes attributed not to the person—subject of knowledge, but to its mind or soul—cf. *φρενῶν, τῆς ψυχῆς* in the examples—which are viewed as the real subjects) and its most suitable meaning appears to be 'intellectual (mental) strength'. 'Intellectual' is obviously an extension of 'related to knowledge', and 'strength' is only a variant of 'power'. Thus in B. I we have 'power *coming from* knowledge' and in B. II 'power *leading to* knowledge'. And if we apply this scheme to section A, we shall find out that the meanings there can be interpreted as derivatives of 'power (of the object) leading (the subject) to knowledge' (contrast B. II 'power [of the subject] leading [the subject] to knowledge'). [N. B.: in all the three cases 'power' is not a notion, even less a concept, but rather an *idea* connoting potentiality; in different environments it appears as 'might', 'strength', 'ability', 'faculty', 'means' and the like.]

Thus we are led to conclude that the initial, and probably undifferentiated in the minds of the speakers, meaning of *γνώμη* was

‘power related to knowledge’, and that it allowed three actual contextual significations depending on whether (i) ‘power’ was attributed to the subject or to the object of knowledge, and (ii) ‘related to’ was understood as ‘coming from’ or ‘leading to’. (This makes four combinations possible, but the fourth—‘power [of the object] coming from [the subject’s] knowledge [of it]’—describes an unreal situation). This conclusion is somewhat corroborated by the way γνώμη was formed (stem γνω plus suffix μᾶ): though the meaning of the suffix requires still a lot of research, the comparison of γνώμη with words like μνήμη, ἔδμη, ἔώμη, φήμη is instructive—in all these words μᾶ seems to denote the action of the corresponding verb as a *potentia* of the person or thing to which the noun is attributed.

The semantic evolution of γνώμη would have thus consisted: (a) of a separation of the three actual significations into three different meanings (A, B. I, B. II); (b) of a weakening and/or simplification of these meanings in A (‘power to be known’ becomes ‘means of being known’ [complex], hence, in A. I, ‘mark’, ‘distinctive feature’ [simple], and in A. II ‘the knowable (intelligible)’, ‘meaning’ [simple]; in B. I ‘power from knowledge’ weakens to ‘means given by knowledge’ [complex] and disappears altogether in C. I ‘knowledge’ [simple]; in B. II ‘leading to knowledge’ has already weakened to ‘mental (intellectual)’, and in C. II both elements merge to produce ‘mind’ [simple]); and (c) of ordinary sense-modifications of the now simple meanings ‘knowledge’ and ‘mind’ (‘mark’ and ‘meaning’ having disappeared) which produced respectively ‘opinion’ (which survives in Modern Greek) and ‘intention’.

2. (A. I. 1) The expression γνώμην ἔχειν reported by Aristotle is clearly an old *terminus technicus* of horse-breeding.

(A. I. 2) My interpretation of Theognis 60 differs only in form from that of LSJ (cited under the heading ‘means of knowing, hence mark, token’; cf. Bailly ‘*signe de reconnaissance*’). The idea of vv. 53 ff. is that the ‘bad’ (the villains) have usurped the place of the ‘good’ (the nobles), that, therefore, the citizens have lost hold of the distinction between the two and, consequently, between good and evil behaviour. Cf. 1109–1114 where, instead of γνώμας, we have μνήμην (‘means of remembering’ what they are).

(A. II) It has been objected that Thucydides 1.22 and 8.90 ought to be under D. II (*intension, purpose*). But there is a great difference between the *purpose* (active) of a man (who ‘made up his *mind*’ to

do smth) and the *purport* (passive) of speeches or of (the decision to build) a wall, neither of which can have a mind of its own to 'make it up'. And the Pindar instance shows clearly that *γνώμη* was used to denote the meaning of an utterance as smth different from the intention (*βουλή*) of the speaker.

(B. I) In Heraclitus fr. B 41 *δτεη* is Deichgräber's reading (who writes *ότέη*, following Diels' impossible nominative *ότέη*, but cf. *δτεω*), *κυβερνήσαι* is good as transmitted and is an ellipsis for *ἔσσι κυβερνήσαι*. The mss. give *δτεῆκυβερνήσαι*, *ότέηκυβερνήσαι*, *δτεῆκυβερνήσαι*. For other readings see Marcovich, *Heraclitus: Editio Maior* (Merida, 1967) 447. But whatever the reading, the idea of *γνώμη* as a force steering all things remains.

(B. II) The two additions in Gorgias 6.13 are respectively by Voss and Sauppe.

(C. I) Note that in Sophocles *Phil.* 837 (*καιρός τοι πάντων γνώμαν ἴσχων . . .*) *γνώμη* 'knowledge' is used with an objective genitive instead of *περί* (cf. Anaxagoras fr. B 12). This is a clear sign that passive uses of *γνώμη* (except of utterances A. II) had almost disappeared by this time.

(C. I.2) Parmenides fr. B. 8, 61 could be interpreted as belonging to D. I (*opinion*), but the pejorative shade is rather contextual here (*σε* is probably elliptical for *τάς γνώμας σου*). The earliest occurrences of *γνώμη* 'opinion' are to be found in Herodotus, who was about 30 years younger than Parmenides. But this is precisely the kind of context which later produced the meaning 'opinion'.

(C. II) For the plural in Parmenides fr. B. 8, 53, cf. at the end of this section. Here Parmenides seems really to be the first to have used *γνώμη* in the sense of 'mind', though 'intellectual faculty' is not altogether impossible.

For *γνώμης ιδέαι* and *διαφορή γνώμης* in Democritus fr. B. 11, see Luria, *Democritea* (Leninopoli, 1970) 435 (comm. ad n° 82).

(C. II.2) These instances differ from those in section D. III in that the special meaning of *γνώμη* is due here to the context (cf. C. II.2.b), whereas in D. III *γνώμη* is already a legal *terminus technicus*.

3. I shall welcome all remarks and suggestions (as well as printed matters) on the subject discussed.

Stellen, wo andere Demonstrativa als *οὔτος* (*τοιούτος* usw.) und *ὅδε* in der behandelten Funktion auftreten. Mehrere von diesen Stellen sind schon in der Literatur angeführt worden.

ἐκεῖ: Matthäusev. 17.20, Markusev. 13.21, Jakobusbrief 2.3.

ἐκεῖνος: Platon Parm. 160e3, 164a7, Aristoteles APo. 83a2, a24ff., Top. 134b9, PA 641a16, Rh. 1371b9, 1377a11, 1378b19, 1392b26f., 1407b23, [Arist.] Rh. Al. 1429b36, 1435a11, Jakobusbrief 4.15, Epiktetos 1.27.5, Marcus Aur. 4.23.3, 4.26.1, 4.48.2, 7.29.7, 7.31.4, Lukianos Somn. 11.

ἐκεῖνος: Epiktetos 2.23.15.

ἐνθάδε: Porphyrios in Cat. S. 104.17.

ἐνταῦθα: Aristoteles Rh. 1365a22.

ἐνθεν: [Arist.] Probl. 915a39ff., Matthäusev. 17.20.

νῦν: Platon Alk. I 108e7, [Arist.] Rh. Al. 1425a2, a11, a12, Marcus Aur. 3.11.3.

τοῖος: Platon Phaidros 271d, Epiktetos 3.16.11.

τοιούσδε: Platon Phaidros 271d, 273c1, Aristoteles APo. 76a40, 81b5, 87b29, 98b34, 99a10, Epiktetos 1.4.26, Marcus Aur. 8.14.2, 11.21.3, Porphyrios in Cat. S. 57.32.

τόσος: Isaios Fr. 23.2 Thalheim, Platon Phaidros 271d, Aelius Arist. 26.5, 28.17.

τοσούδε: Aristoteles Rh. 1417b25, [Arist.] Probl. 883b7, Epiktetos 4.4.17, Marcus Aur. 6.49.

τότε: Aristoteles Rh. 1365a23.

ὅδε: Platon Alk. I 109b4, Phaidros 272a2, Aristoteles SE 171a29, a36, 174b26, 177a29, 178b5, Rh. 1407b23, [Arist.] Probl. 956a35, Epikuros Brief 1.80, Markusev. 13.21, Jakobusbrief 2.3.

Κροτήσατε

VON CHRISTOS THEODORIDIS, Thessaloniki

Paul Maas hat aus dem Artikel der Lexikographen *κροτήσατε· ἐπαιέσατε ταῖς χερσίν* (= *Συναγωγή* Ba. 283, 27, Phot. Lex. 180, 15 Porson, Suid. κ 2479) das griechische Vorbild der Formel *plaudite* erschlossen und die Form *κροτήσατε* auf die Neue Komödie zurückgeführt¹⁾. Dieser Artikel geht aber nicht auf die *Néa*, sondern auf den Psalm 46,1 zurück: *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη κροτήσατε χεῖρας, ἀλάλαξάτε τῷ θεῷ ἐν φωνῇ ἀγαλλιάσεως*. Den Beweis dafür liefert das

¹⁾ P. Maas, *Κροτήσατε*, Glotta 35 (1956) 301 „Das griechische Vorbild der Formel *plaudite* scheint in den Fragmenten der *Néa* noch nicht vorzukommen. Doch darf man wohl den Artikel *Κροτήσατε· ἐπαιέσατε ταῖς χερσίν* der Lexikographen (Suda usw.) mit Zuversicht darauf zurückführen“.

Lexikon des Hesych, welches die vollständigere Form des Lemmas erhalten hat: κ 4211 Latte *κροτήσατε χειρας· ἐπαιέσατε ταῖς χερσίν*²⁾. Daß die Hesychios-Glosse identisch mit der Glosse der *Συναγωγή* bzw. des Photios und Suidas ist, wird angesichts der gleichen Erklärung wohl niemand bezweifeln. Eine und dieselbe Glosse wird in den griechischen Lexika beliebig verkürzt oder erweitert, wie ein Beispiel aus dem Kyrill-Lexikon und aus Hesychios sehr schön zeigt:

Cyrilli lex. θελ 24 (p. 93 Drachmann) Hesych. θ 220 Latte
θελκτηριοι λογοι (Eur. Hipp. 478). *θελκτήριοι*³⁾. *θεραπευτικοί,*
θεραπευτικοι αγωντες εις απατην. *ἄγοντες εἰς ἀπάτην.*

Der Artikel des Suidas-Lexikons sowie der *Συναγωγή* und des Photios stellt in bezug auf das Lemma eine verkürzte Form der Psalmen-Glosse dar⁴⁾ und kann infolgedessen nicht als das griechische Vorbild der Formel *plaudite* gelten.

Die Ergänzung im Supplement des GEL von LSJ in der Ausgabe von 1968, p. 89 s. v. *κροτέω* „after [Thphr.] ,Char. 11.3‘ insert, ‚cf. *κροτήσατε* Suid., = *plaudite*“ muß daher gestrichen werden.

Nach dieser Feststellung verliert die von P. Maas vorgeschlagene Ergänzung am Schluß der *Ἀποκλειομένη* des Poseidippos⁵⁾ ihre wichtigste Stütze:

ὅμεις δὲ] λοιπόν, ὃ ἄνδρες οἱ συνηγμένοι,
κροτήσα]θ' ἡμᾶς· ἡ δὲ φιλόγελως θεὰ
Νίκη με]θ' ἡμῶν εὐμενῆς ἔποιτ' ἀεὶ.

Die letzten Worte des Augustus bei Sueton 99,1 *ἐπεὶ δὲ . . . πάνυ καλῶς τὸ παίγνιον,| δότε κρότον καὶ πάντες ἡμᾶς μετὰ χαρᾶς προπέμψατε,* die P. Maas zur Bestätigung seiner Ergänzung angeführt hatte,

²⁾ Schon Alberti und M. Schmidt hatten die Glosse auf die Psalmen-Stelle bezogen. K. Latte gibt am Rand seiner Ausgabe als Quelle die Septuaginta an.

³⁾ K. Latte hat das Lemma aus Kyrill ergänzt. Es ist aber fraglich, ob dies Lemma jemals bei Hesych vollständig existiert hat. Ähnlich steht es mit Hesych α 1107 Latte *ἀδηφάγα* (ἄρματα)· *μεγάλα καὶ τέλεια* ~ *Lex. rhetor.* Bekker AG I 203,20 *ἀδηφάγα ἄρματα λέγουσι τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τέλεια.* Vgl. Phot. *Lex.* 30,3 Reitz. *ἀδηφάγον ἄρμα· τὸ τέλειον καὶ μέγα.*

⁴⁾ Die Glosse *κροτήσατε χειρας* steht nach Ausweis von K. Latte auch im cod. A und in Hss. der Familie v des Kyrill-Lexikons, das den Kern der *Συναγωγή* bildet, vgl. G. Wentzel, Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Lexikographen, SBak. Berlin 1895, S. 478 (= *Lexica Graeca minora*, Hildesheim 1965, S. 2). Aus der *Συναγωγή* haben die Lexika des Photios und des Suidas sie übernommen.

⁵⁾ E. Siegmann, Literarische griechische Texte der Heidelberger Papyrusammlung, Heidelberg 1956, S. 7 (P. Heid. 183).

gehören höchstwahrscheinlich dem Mimus, nicht der Neuen Komödie an, wie O. Crusius konstatiert hat⁶⁾: „Fragmentis comoediae inseruerunt Meineke (IV p. 694) et Kock (III p. 544). Non recte. Quippe imperator *mimum vitae* se commode transegisse dicit, atque *παίγνιον* consueta mimorum erat appellatio. Neque igitur mirer, si quis ad mimographum Augusti coaevum haec referat, Philistionem opinor“⁷⁾.

Zugunsten der Maas'schen Ergänzung scheinen jedoch noch zwei andere Zeugnisse zu sprechen:

1. Der Schluß der *Samia* (V. 733ff.), wo es heißt:

παῖδες καλοί,
μειράκια, γέροντες, ἄνδρες, πάντες εὐρώστως ἅμα
πέμψ[α]τ' εὐνοίας προφήτην Βακχίῳ φίλον κρότον·
ἢ δὲ καλλίστων ἀγώνων πάρεδρος ἄφθιτος θεὰ
εὐμε[ν]ῆς ἔποιτο Νίκη τοῖς ἑμοῖς ἀεὶ χοροῖς.

2. Das *ἐπικροτήσατε* des *Dyskolos* (v. 968), das E. Vogt herangezogen hat⁸⁾.

Da aber die Form *κροτήσατε* als Aufforderung an das Publikum, Beifall zu spenden, für die *Νέα* nicht bezeugt ist⁹⁾, läßt sich das lateinische *plaudite* noch nicht mit Bestimmtheit auf eine entsprechende griechische Formel zurückführen.

⁶⁾ Herondae Mimiambi, ed. O. Crusius, 5. Auflage, Leipzig 1914, S. 144. Den Hinweis auf O. Crusius und auf den Aufsatz von Monaco (s. Anm. 8) verdanke ich der Liebenswürdigkeit von Herrn Dr. V. Schmidt (Hamburg), dem ich auch an dieser Stelle dafür herzlich danke.

⁷⁾ G. Monaco, *Spectatores plaudite*, Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi sexagenario oblata, Rom 1970, S. 255ff. hält noch an der Zuweisung dieser Klausel an die Neue Komödie fest. Ein Indiz dafür sei das Wort *παίγνιον*, das bei Platon Leg. 816e *ἄσα μὲν ὄν περὶ γέλωτά ἐστιν παίγνια, ἃ δὴ κωμῳδίαν πάντες λέγομεν* und im fr. 7 des Ehippos (II p. 254 Kock) *κοινωνεῖ γάρ, ὃ μειράκιον, ἢ/ ἐν τοῖσιν ἀλοῖς μουσικῇ κἂν τῇ λύρα/ τοῖς ἡμετέροισι παίγνιοις* ausschließlich von der Komödie gesagt werde. Das Wort *παίγνιον* wird aber als *terminus technicus* auch zur Bezeichnung des Mimus gebraucht, s. O. Crusius, a. a. O. S. 146.

⁸⁾ Ein stereotyper Dramenschluß der *Νέα*, Rhein. Mus. 102 (1959) 192. Vgl. auch Menand. fr. 771 Körte *ἐξάραντες ἐπικροτήσατε*.

⁹⁾ Der Fall ist anders gelagert bei Diog. Laert. 7,173, worauf P. Maas hingewiesen hat: *Σωσιθέου τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἐν θεάτρῳ εἰπόντος πρὸς αὐτὸν παρόντα „ὄθς ἢ Κλεάνθους μωρία βοηλατεῖ“ (TrGF 99 F 4 Snell) ἔμεινεν ἐπὶ ταυτοῦ σχήματος· ἐφ' ὃ ἀγασθέντες οἱ ἀκροῦσται τὸν μὲν ἐκρότησαν (τῷ μὲν ἐπεκρότησαν cod. φ) τὸν δὲ Σωσιθέον ἐξέβαλον. Vgl. auch Ael. V. H. 2,13 *ἄκουσμα ἔδοξεν ἡδιστον αἶδε αἱ Νεφέλαι, καὶ ἐκρότουν τὸν ποιητὴν ὡς οὐ ποτε ἄλλοτε καὶ ἐβρόν νικᾶν, καὶ προσέταττον τοῖς κριταῖς ἄνωθεν Ἀριστοφάνην ἀλλὰ μὴ ἄλλον γράφειν*.*

Hesych K-3598 L.

Von RÜDIGER SCHMITT, Saarbrücken

In dem Lexikon des Hesychios (5. Jh. n. Chr.) wird folgende Glosse überliefert, die von den neuesten Herausgebern¹⁾ übereinstimmend getilgt wird: *κορδύς· πανούργος*²⁾. In den Adnotationes bemerken diese dazu folgendes: Latte, l. c. sieht darin eine „v[aria] l[ectio] gl[ossae] 2316“ *κερδώ· [κερδίστη]. ἀλώπηξ* und verweist — der Bedeutungsdifferenz im Interpretamentum wegen — auf K-2307/8 *κερδαλή· ἀλώπηξ* bzw. *κέρδεα· πανουργίας*; M. Schmidt, l. c. dagegen meinte: „Hoc nihil est. Lego *κέρδις(τος)· πανούργος* q. v.“, identifizierte die Glosse also — indem er ein paar Buchstaben ausgefallen sein ließ und großzügig die Divergenz im Steigerungsgrad übersah — mit K-2312 *κέρδιςτος· συνετώτατος. φρόνιμος. πανουργότατος* in ihrem letzten Teil. Beide Begründungen zeugen von dem Scharfsinn ihrer Autoren, die — wie so oft — auch hier mit Textänderungen rasch bei der Hand waren. Methodisch richtiger wäre es gewesen, die Form, so wie sie überliefert ist, philologisch-linguistisch zu rechtfertigen zu versuchen. Doch dazu wurde durch die rigorosen [. . .]-Klammern der Editoren ein für allemal der Weg verbaut: In keinem der geläufigen Handbücher zur griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre und der etymologischen Wörterbücher tritt dieses *κορδύς* in Erscheinung. Ganz neuerdings erst hat Edzard J. Furnée³⁾ diese Glosse wieder ans Licht gezogen, um sie dem vorgriechischen Substrat zuzuweisen: Dazu fühlte er sich allein deshalb berechtigt, weil er „die reduplizierte Form *κοκρῦδων· λησιῶν. κλεπιῶν*“ (Hesych K-3302 L. [so richtig!]) damit verglich. Mit Hilfe der von ihm angenommenen, aber ganz und gar nicht bewiesenen⁴⁾ vorgriechischen Charakteristika ‚Reduplikation‘ und

¹⁾ Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, recensuit et emendavit Kurt Latte. Volumen II: E–X [recte: E–O], Hauniae 1966, p. 511, nr. 3598; Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, post Ioannem Albertum recensuit Mauricius Schmidt. Volumen II: E–K, Jenae 1860 (Nachdruck Amsterdam 1965), p. 516, nr. 3598.

²⁾ So Latte; Schmidt akzentuiert *κόρδυς*.

³⁾ Edzard J. Furnée, Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen (= Janua Linguarum, series practica, 150), The Hague/Paris 1972, p. 95, 359, 362.

⁴⁾ Cf. meine sehr kritische Rezension von Furnée, l. c. Anm. 4 in: Gymnasium 80, 1973.

,Wechsel $o \sim v'$ sei es, so meint er, möglich, die Form „nach vorgriechischen Spielregeln sprachlich zu verteidigen“ (p. 95).

Bevor man zu solch einer ‚vorgriechischen Notlösung‘ greift, hätte man sich besser der ‚altgriechischen . . . Spielregeln‘ (ibid.) erinnern sollen. Ich glaube diese Form ganz einfach — ohne jeglichen Trick und Kunstgriff — rechtfertigen zu können, ja sogar als eine Form erweisen zu können, die die Lücke eines bisher lückenhaften Systems schließt: *κορδύς· πανοῦργος* ‚geschickt, verschlagen‘ ist der ganz reguläre (schwundstufige) Positiv zu den bereits seit Homer belegten (regelrecht vollstufigen) Steigerungsformen *κερδίων, κέρδιστος* ‚verschlagenster, (Hesych:) *πανουργότατος*“. Zur Erklärung dieser Bildungen hatte man bisher⁵⁾ recht komplizierte und letztlich sehr wenig befriedigende Konstruktionen aufstellen müssen, indem man etwa *τὸ κέρδος* ‚als eine Art Pos[itiv]‘ (Seiler, l. c.) auffaßte.

In Wirklichkeit aber steht, so scheint mir,

<i>κορδύς</i>	<i>κερδίων</i>	<i>κέρδιστος</i>
(urgriech. * <i>krd-ú-</i>	* <i>kérd-íios-</i>	* <i>kérd-isto-</i>)

auf einer Stufe mit etwa

<i>πολύς</i>	<i>πλείων</i>	<i>πλείστος</i>
(< idg. * <i>pl̥e₁-ú-⁶⁾</i>	* <i>pl̥e₁-íios-</i>	* <i>pl̥e₁-isto-</i>)

oder, um Beispiele aus einer verwandten Sprachgruppe zu wählen, wo dieses Ablautverhältnis relativ weniger durch Analogiewirkungen gestört worden ist, aus dem Arischen:

avest. <i>pa^{ou}ru-</i> ‚viel‘	<i>frāīīah-</i>	<i>fraēšta-</i>
ved. <i>pr̥thú-</i> ‚breit‘	<i>pr̥athīyas-</i>	<i>pr̥athīṣṭha-</i>
ved. <i>urú-</i> ‚weit‘	<i>várīyas-</i>	<i>vārīṣṭha-</i>

In dieses alte, ererbte System fügt sich *κορδύς* nahtlos ein, wenn man *ορ* als aiolische Vertretung von idg. **r* ansieht: Die Epiker- oder Lyrikerstelle, aus der die Hesychglosse zweifellos geschöpft ist, ist allerdings nicht erhalten geblieben. Ein definitiver ‚Beweis‘ läßt sich somit nicht erbringen.

⁵⁾ Hansjakob Seiler, Die primären griechischen Steigerungsformen (= Hamburger Arbeiten zur Altertumswissenschaft, 6). Hamburg 1950, p. 84.

⁶⁾ Cf. zuletzt insbesondere Klaus Strunk, Verkannte Spuren eines weiteren Tiefstufentyps im Griechischen, Glotta 47, 1969, 1–8.

Methodologisches zu κέρδιον, κέρδιστος

Von HANSJAKOB SEILER, Köln

Unter dem Titel „Hesych K-3598 L.“ handelt Rüdiger Schmitt in dieser Zeitschrift (ob. S. 94) von der Hesychglosse *κορδύς· πανούργος*, die sowohl von K. Latte wie auch von M. Schmidt emendiert bzw. getilgt wird, wofür diese vom Verfasser des erwähnten Aufsatzes getadelt werden: „Methodisch richtiger wäre es gewesen, die Form, so wie sie überliefert ist, philologisch-linguistisch zu rechtfertigen zu versuchen.“ In *κορδύς· πανούργος* sieht R. Schmitt den „ganz regulären (schwundstufigen) Positiv zu den bereits seit Homer belegten (regelrecht vollstufigen) Steigerungsformen *κερδίων, κέρδιστος*, verschlagenster, (Hesych:) *πανουργότατος*“, der sich „nahtlos in das alte, ererbte System“ (nämlich Positiv als Adjektiv auf *-u*, Komparativ Vollstufe + *-ίος-*, Superlativ auf *-ιστο-*) einfüge. Allerdings muß er dann mit *-ορ-* als äolischer Vertretung von idg. **r* rechnen, und der Schluß dieser Betrachtung zeigt den Verfasser sehr viel weniger selbstsicher als deren Anfang.

Auch der Verfasser dieser Zeilen wird getadelt: „Zur Erklärung dieser Bildungen [*κερδίων, κέρδιστος*] hatte man bisher [Verweis auf H. Seiler, Die primären griechischen Steigerungsformen, Hamburg 1950, S. 84] recht komplizierte und letztlich sehr wenig befriedigende Konstruktionen aufstellen müssen, indem man etwa *τὸ κέρδος* ‚als eine Art von Positiv‘ (Seiler, l. c.) auffaßte.“

Man wird als Methodiker zunächst fragen dürfen, was an diesem Komparativ und Superlativ nach des Verfassers Meinung eigentlich erklärt werden sollte; eine klare Antwort darauf läßt sich seinen Ausführungen nicht entnehmen.

Sodann wären einige Behauptungen richtigzustellen: „Das alte, ererbte System“ zeigte neben den Bildungen auf *-ίος-*, *-ιστο-* durchaus nicht nur Adjektive auf *-u-*, sondern auch solche auf *-ro-*, ferner Neutra auf *-es/-os* und sogar Verben. Diese elementare Tatsache läßt sich am Indo-Iranischen ebenso ablesen wie am Griechischen. Zu den griechischen primären Steigerungsformen gibt es nun meistens mehrere mögliche „Positive“, aber oft wurde einer von ihnen enger mit diesen Steigerungsformen assoziiert, was sich in günstigen Fällen aus der besonderen Beleglage ablesen läßt. Und in unserem Falle ist diese gewiß nicht ungünstig. Dabei gilt es aber zunächst wieder richtigzustellen, daß die von R. Schmitt als Zeugen angerufenen Homerstellen gar nicht *κερδίων* aufweisen,

sondern nur das Neutrum *κέρδιον*, und daß dieses nie den Sinn von ‚verschlagen, schlau(er)‘ annimmt, sondern immer nur ‚besser, vorteilhafter‘ heißt. Dagegen ist der Superlativ, wenigstens bei Homer, immer persönlich und heißt ‚der Schlaueste, Verschlagenste‘ und nicht ‚der Beste‘.

Nimmt man nun ein *κορδύς· πανούργος* als „ganz regulären Positiv“ an, so läßt sich die Bedeutungs-differenz zwischen einem solchen und dem Komparativ und von diesem wiederum zum Superlativ nicht erklären.

Demgegenüber gibt es Fakten, die für eine enge Assoziation zwischen dem Neutrum *τὸ κέρδος* und den Steigerungsformen, gerade im homerischen Griechisch, sehr deutlich sprechen: *τὸ κέρδος* bedeutet im Singular ‚Gewinn, Vorteil‘. Man vergleiche nun *π 311 οὐ τοι τόδε κέρδος ἐγὼν ἔσσεσθαι δῖω* ‚ich halte das nicht für vorteilhaft, für einen Vorteil‘ mit der ganz verwandten Wendung *ξ 23 et passim ὠδε δέ οἱ φρονέοντι δοάσσαντο κέρδιον εἶναι* ‚so schien es ihm vorteilhaft(er) zu sein‘. Der Plural *τὰ κέρδεα* aber bedeutet ‚Listen, Ränke‘. Auch hier gibt es wieder Formeln, die sich eng entsprechen. Man vergleiche *Z 153 Sisyphos ὃ κέρδιστος γένετ' ἀνδρῶν* mit *Ψ 217 Ὀδυσσεύς . . . κέρδεα εἰδώς*, vgl. *μήδεα, δήγεα εἰδώς*. Die Verteilung der beiden Bedeutungen von *κερδ-* auf das „Steigerungsparadigma“ wird also vom Neutrum und dessen syntaktischen Verwendungsweisen her voll und ganz verständlich: Dem unpersönlichen *κέρδος ἐστίν* ‚es ist ein Vorteil, vorteilhaft‘ entspricht das ebenfalls unpersönliche *κέρδιόν ἐστιν* ‚es ist vorteilhaft(er) [in bezug auf eine Norm]‘. Dagegen entspricht das persönliche *κέρδιστος* ‚listigst‘ der ebenfalls persönlichen Konstruktion *κέρδεα εἰδώς* ‚der Listen kennt‘.

Warum macht nun der Gedanke, daß ein Neutrum, oder sogar ein ganzer Prädikatsausdruck wie *κέρδος ἐστίν* oder *κέρδεα εἰδώς* ‚als eine Art Positiv“ (Seiler, l. c.) zu Steigerungsformen fungieren könne, auf einen Indogermanisten immer noch den Eindruck einer „recht komplizierten und letztlich sehr wenig befriedigenden Konstruktion“ (R. Schmitt, l. c.)?

Eine der Unzuträglichkeiten liegt in der unterschiedslosen Anwendung der Termini „Positiv“, „Komparativ“, „Steigerungsformen“ sowohl auf das *-ιος/-istos*-System wie auf das davon formal wie funktionell ganz und gar geschiedene *-τερος/-tatos*-System.

Man sollte für das primäre System andere Termini prägen. Dieses System ist in den indogermanischen Sprachen verankert bei den Antonymen vom Typ *groß—klein, gut—schlecht, dick—dünn*. An-

ders als bei Komplementärbegriffen (*männlich—weiblich, lebend—tot*) sind Antonyme immer bezogen auf eine Norm, sie setzen keine absoluten Qualitäten und sind dem Prinzip der absoluten Abstufung oder Gradierung eigentlich entgegengesetzt. Man vergleiche etwa E. Sapirs berühmtes Beispiel *A small elephant is a large animal*, wobei sich *small* auf eine Norm für Elefanten, *large* aber auf eine Norm für Tiere bezieht. In dieses System gehören *Vorteil—Nachteil* (also Nomina, vgl. τὸ κέρδος) ebenso wie *schlau—dumm* (also Adjektive, vgl. κέρδιστος). Durch E. Benveniste¹⁾ haben wir gelernt, in den Formen auf *-ῖος-* die Funktion der „évaluation dimensionnelle à partir d'une norme typique“ (S. 143) zu sehen, in den Formen auf *-tero-* dagegen die Funktion „qui opère séparation et qui dote l'adjectif d'une qualification extrinsèque“. Man sollte die ersteren Evaluative nennen.

Mohn und Minze

VON JOHANN KNOBLOCH, Bonn

Nach ungenügenden Versuchen einer Anknüpfung der Benennung für den Mohn an indogermanisches Wortmaterial steht es für Hj. Frisk, der sich dem zwingenden Argument der Ablautwirkungen nicht verschließen kann, fest, daß es sich um eine schon idg. Entlehnung eines Wanderworts handeln müsse, das aus dem Ursprungsland des Mohnes, dem Mittelmeergebiet, komme. V. Machek vertrat hingegen die Ansicht, es sei mit anderen slawischen Pflanzennamen durch Übernahme aus einem alteuropäischen Substrat zu erklären.

Die früheren idg. Deutungen waren lediglich Wurzeletymologien: A. Fick stellte *μήκων* zu *μάσσω* ‚quetsche‘, G. Curtius zu *μήκος* n. ‚Länge‘ („vielleicht der langen Stengel wegen benannt“), während W. Prellwitz es mit lett. *maks* ‚Tasche‘ verbinden wollte.

Man muß sich die Bildung genauer ansehen, um zu einer Entscheidung zu gelangen. Die Stammbetonung weist auf die deverbativen Nomina agentis und instrumenti hin, die auf intensiven Ableitungen zu einfacheren Verbalwurzeln aufbauen: *δρόμων* ‚schnellaufendes, leichtes Schiff; Läufer‘ (zu altind. *dandramyate* ‚laufen‘, gr. *δρομήσασα*), *καύσων* ‚heißer Wind; Fieber‘ (zu *καίω*

¹⁾ Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen, Paris 1948, S. 115 ff.

ders als bei Komplementärbegriffen (*männlich—weiblich, lebend—tot*) sind Antonyme immer bezogen auf eine Norm, sie setzen keine absoluten Qualitäten und sind dem Prinzip der absoluten Abstufung oder Gradierung eigentlich entgegengesetzt. Man vergleiche etwa E. Sapirs berühmtes Beispiel *A small elephant is a large animal*, wobei sich *small* auf eine Norm für Elefanten, *large* aber auf eine Norm für Tiere bezieht. In dieses System gehören *Vorteil—Nachteil* (also Nomina, vgl. τὸ κέρδος) ebenso wie *schlau—dumm* (also Adjektive, vgl. κέρδιστος). Durch E. Benveniste¹⁾ haben wir gelernt, in den Formen auf *-ῖος-* die Funktion der „évaluation dimensionnelle à partir d'une norme typique“ (S. 143) zu sehen, in den Formen auf *-tero-* dagegen die Funktion „qui opère séparation et qui dote l'adjectif d'une qualification extrinsèque“. Man sollte die ersteren Evaluative nennen.

Mohn und Minze

VON JOHANN KNOBLOCH, Bonn

Nach ungenügenden Versuchen einer Anknüpfung der Benennung für den Mohn an indogermanisches Wortmaterial steht es für Hj. Frisk, der sich dem zwingenden Argument der Ablautwirkungen nicht verschließen kann, fest, daß es sich um eine schon idg. Entlehnung eines Wanderworts handeln müsse, das aus dem Ursprungsland des Mohnes, dem Mittelmeergebiet, komme. V. Machek vertrat hingegen die Ansicht, es sei mit anderen slawischen Pflanzennamen durch Übernahme aus einem alteuropäischen Substrat zu erklären.

Die früheren idg. Deutungen waren lediglich Wurzeletymologien: A. Fick stellte *μήκων* zu *μάσσω* ‚quetsche‘, G. Curtius zu *μήκος* n. ‚Länge‘ („vielleicht der langen Stengel wegen benannt“), während W. Prellwitz es mit lett. *maks* ‚Tasche‘ verbinden wollte.

Man muß sich die Bildung genauer ansehen, um zu einer Entscheidung zu gelangen. Die Stammbetonung weist auf die deverbativen Nomina agentis und instrumenti hin, die auf intensiven Ableitungen zu einfacheren Verbalwurzeln aufbauen: *δρόμων* ‚schnellaufendes, leichtes Schiff; Läufer‘ (zu altind. *dandramyate* ‚laufen‘, gr. *δρομήσασα*), *καύσων* ‚heißer Wind; Fieber‘ (zu *καίω*

¹⁾ Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen, Paris 1948, S. 115 ff.

,senge, zünde an'), lat. *cnaso* ← **κνάσων* ‚Kratzer‘ (zu *κνάω*, vgl. M. Leumann, Die Sprache 1, 1949, 207 A. 13; dort noch *σεισών* ‚Rüttler‘ [ein Gefäß], zu *σειώ*), *κλόδων* ‚Brandung‘ (zu *κλόζω* ‚spülen, branden‘), *γράσων* ‚Bock(sgestank von sich gebend)‘, zu *γράω* ‚nage‘ (Leumann, a. a. O.), *ῥώθωνες* ‚Nasenlöcher‘, zu *ῥαδάμιγξ* ‚Tropfen‘ („also als die ‚Tropfenden‘“, Bechtel, Lexilogus 291). Diese Bildung ist schon indogermanisch.

Somit kann *μήκων* mit lett. *mākt* ‚befallen, bedrängen, drücken, plagen‘ (Alpdruck, Durst usw., wie mir Frau E. Sturms nachweist), verbunden werden. Die schlafbringende Wirkung des Mohnsaftes war schon im Altertum bekannt, ebenso mögliche Schädigungen.

Vielleicht führt diese Erkenntnis auch bei *βλήχων* ‚Minze‘ (dor. *γλάχων*) weiter. Es braucht sich auch hier nicht um eine einmorphologisierte Bezeichnung aus einer vorindogermanischen Mittelmeersprache zu handeln, wenn es gelingt, Bildung und Wurzelbedeutung in einen einsichtigen Zusammenhang zu bringen und die Einordnung in eine idg. Wortsippe ausreichend zu begründen. Dies soll hier versucht werden.

Man darf von dor. *γλάχων* f. als der noch undissimilierten Lautung ausgehen und gelangt so zu der Wurzel **glāgh-*, deren Langvokal sich zur Abtönung in gr. *γλώχες* ‚Grannen, Hacheln der Ähren‘ und zum Schwundstufenvokal *a* < *ə* in russ. *glog* ‚Hartriegel‘, ion. *γλάσσα* (< **glāgh-ia*) ‚Zunge‘ verhält, wie lat. *clam* (< *clām*) ‚heimlich‘ zu gr. *κλώδις* *κλέπτης* Hes. und zu anord. *hulda* (< *k̄l-tā*) ‚Schleier‘.

Wenn man sich bei der hier zusammengestellten Wortsippe mit einer Wurzelbedeutung **glōgh-* ‚Stachel, Spitze‘ begnügt, führt dies in eine Sackgasse. Die vagen Ansätze, die eine frühere lautbezogene Forschung als erwiesen ansah, haben ja zu dem Ergebnis geführt, daß es mindestens 14 synonyme Wurzeln für ‚spitz‘ gegeben haben soll. Hier müssen nun weitere, inhaltbezogene Untersuchungen zu neuen Erkenntnissen führen, die oft auf der Hand liegen.

Gr. *γλωχίς*, *-ίως* f. ist nicht einfach ‚Spitze‘, sondern ursprünglich die mit Widerhaken versehene, in der Wunde steckengebliebene Pfeilspitze, so wie der *δελφίς* *-ίως* das fischähnliche Tier mit der *δελφύς* ist. Die *γλώχες* sind also nicht bloß als spitze, sondern als spitze, haftende Teile der Ähre benannt. Auch die Zunge selbst ist offenbar nicht nach ihrer Spitze neubenannt worden, sondern das substantivierte Adjektiv zu dem in aind. *jihvā* bewahrten femininen Substantiv bezeichnete die rauhe Zunge der Spalthufer; die von J. Schmidt KZ 33 (1895) 453–455 ermittelte ablautende

Deklination *γλώσσα*: **γλάσσας* kehrt bei *γη* ‚Erde‘ in der Form **γᾶψja*: **γᾶψjās* wieder, bei dem Wort also, das gleichfalls als Epitheton zu dem alten Wort *χθών* ‚Erde‘ diese als die erquickende (zu *γάνος* n. ‚Erquickung‘, *γάνυμαι*, *γηθέω*, *gaudeo*) charakterisiert hat.

Was die Pflanzennamen betrifft, so wäre man mit einer Benennung nach der Blattform nicht weit gekommen: Eberesche, Weißdorn, Hagedorn, was alles mit slaw. **glogъ* benannt werden kann, führt vielmehr auf einen anderen Benennungsaspekt. Poln. *głóg* kann neben dem Gewächs auch die Frucht, und schon im Altpoln. auch die Frucht der Heckenrose bezeichnen. Wer solche Früchte genießt, bekommt ‚stumpfe Zähne‘, die Säure ‚zieht den Mund zusammen‘. Bei den Hagebutten kommt das Haften der Härchen, die die Fruchtkerne umgeben als Tastempfindung der Zunge hinzu. Das führt aber ganz in die Nähe der Empfindung, die man hat, wenn man ein Blatt der Minze kostend zerbeißt: **glāgh-ōn* verhält sich also zu **glāgho-s*, wie *τρήρων* ‚Beiwort der Taube‘ zu *τράρον*· *ταχύ* (Hes.). *Γλήχων* ist demnach die ‚Kratzbeere‘.

Während also die im ersten Teil besprochenen Bildungen auf Verbalstämmen aufbauen und Nomina agentis liefern, hat der Polei seinen Namen nach einer Eigenschaft bekommen, die eine Einreihung in eine größere Wortfamilie gestattet.

Ein stechend anhaftendes Tier ist die Bremse, die deswegen in ihrer altnordischen Benennung *kleggi* m. eher als **glāgh-īo-s* hier ihre Anknüpfung findet, denn bei der Wurzel **glei-* ‚kleben‘: es geht ja dort nicht um die bei dieser Wurzel unentbehrliche Grundanschauung einer klebrigen Feuchtigkeit (*γλοιός*). Daß ein Heuschober eine stechend anhaftende Masse zusammenhält, läßt sich durch Realprobe im Urlaubsort dartun: man kann seine altnord. Bezeichnung *kleggi* m. also ruhig hier anschließen. Ebenso gehört altnord. *klungr* ‚Dornbusch, Hundsrose‘ hierher als nasale Bildung und das Verbum altengl. *olingan* ‚sich anklammern‘. Ein altnord. *brynklungr* zeigt noch deutlich die beiden Komponenten der Bedeutung: es ist ein Hakengerät an einer mit Stacheln versehenen Eisenkette, womit man die Feinde am Fuße der Mauer einer belagerten Stadt faßte und emporzog. Erst im Nhd. geht die Konnotation ‚stechend‘ verloren und das Anhaften bzw. das Zusammengeballtsein ist der gemeinsame Bedeutungskern von *Klün gel*, sei es nun ein Kotklümpchen an der Schafwolle oder die verächtliche Bezeichnung für den Anhang, der sich bei bedeutenden Personen einfand und ihr Prestige und ihre Hilfsquellen auszunützen verstand (‚Clique‘).

20, 1, 3 Convivium apud Graecos a computatione, ἀπὸ τοῦ ποτοῦ.

(αποθουπουον C αποθουουον B αποθουουον K)

Read πότον¹³).

20, 4, 9 Discus antea seus ab specie scuti; unde et scutella. Postea discus vocatus quod det escas . . . sive ἀπὸ τοῦ δίσκιν, id est quod iaciant.

(2 αποφραισκιν BK αποφραισηιν N αποθουδισκειν C αποτουαισ T δισκειν Otto δικεῖν Arev.)

Otto's δισκειν should be accepted.

20, 10, 5 Funalia autem Graeci scolaces dicunt, quod sint scoliae, hoc est intorti.

(scolaces ex -cis K scolascēs C an σκόλακες? Lindsay)

As a translation of *funalia* one would expect, as occurs in glossaries, *λαμπάδια* or *δαλοὶ* or *ἐλλόχνια*. The nearest meaning of *σκόληξ* recorded in *LSJ* s. v. II is "thread twisted from the distaff" Epig. 7; *σκόλακες* seems impossible here. A corruption of *σκόλλνες*? For a semantic parallel but with the opposite development cf. *βύσσος* from Semitic *būšu* which is believed to be connected with *bušinnu* 'wick', see O. Szemerényi *Gnomon* 43, 1971, 661¹⁴).

The Sequence *HRC-* in Latin

By JOHN A. C. GREPPIN, Gainesville

The role of the laryngeal in initial position in Latin is said to be limited to the coloring of a following *e-* vowel. Examples are Lat. *odor*, Arm. *hot* 'odor', and Gk. *ὄζω* 'smell' (with the perfect *ὄδωδα* showing "Attic reduplication"), IE **Oed-*; Lat. *argentum*, Hitt. *harki-* 'white', IE **Aerǵ-*. Examples with an initial **E-* are more difficult to demonstrate, and such hypothesized examples as

¹³) Accent involved also in 19, 28, 5 *πορφύρα*.

¹⁴) I take this opportunity to record two minor rectifications to my paper *Graeco-Latina* in Charisius, *Glotta* 46, 1968, 156–184 which I owe to a suggestion of Prof. Ag. Tsopanakis: p. 164 under *Genialia tύχαια* the reference from Plut. Public. 13, 4 should read *κατὰ δὴ τι δαιμόνιον ἢ στοιχεῖον* cf. Paul. Fest. p. 95 *geniales deos dixerunt aquam, terram, ignem, aerem: ea enim sunt semina rerum, quae Graecorum alii στοιχεῖα, alii ἀτόμους vocant*; also CGL 2, 33. 2 = Gloss. Philox. 2, 160a 40 should read (σ) το (ι)χ(ε)ῖα: *genialia*. At p. 168 *nar ῥώθων ῥεῖθρον ῥῖν* read *nar ῥώθων ῥεῖθρον ῥῖν(ός)*.

Lat. *edo* 'eat' (IE **Eed*-) and *est* 'is' (IE **Ees*-) are unlikely since the Hittite cognates show no initial laryngeal reflex (Hitt. *ed*- and *es*-).

It is generally agreed that an initial laryngeal, not before a vowel, is dropped in Latin. Thus the initial sequence **HC*-, **HR*- and **HRC*- would become, in preLatin, simply **C*-, **R*- and **RC*-. Similarly in Greek, it has been assumed that the sequence **HRC*- passed to preGreek **a(R)C*-, with no conspicuous coloring by the laryngeal. H. Rix, in *MSS* 27, 1969, pp. 79–111, in an article entitled "Anlautende Laryngal vor Liquida oder Nasalis sonans im Griechischen" challenged this conventional point of view toward the Greek material. He attempted, in part, to fill one of the voids in Beekes' otherwise thorough monograph on the reflexes of the laryngeals in Greek¹). Rix has clearly shown that the sequence **HRC*- developed in Greek with definite laryngeal coloration. Hence such words as *ἄλλυμι* < **ḷ-vv-μi* are more likely derived from a proto-form of **Ol-n-ew*- with initial **O*- being reflected as Greek initial *o*-²).

Not all of Rix's examples are so convincing. He proposes **Orǵh*- rather than **orǵh*- for Gk. *ὄρχεις* 'testicles', Arm. *orjik* 'id', Lith. *eřžilas* 'stallion'. However, the Hittite evidence, not cited by Rix: *ark*- 'to mount (of rams)'³) shows no apparent laryngeal reflex. Hence the existence of **O*- rather than **o*- is unlikely. There are various other areas where one might take exception to Rix's work, but on the whole his point is clear and cogent, and adequate data have been presented to make his case convincing.

A question remains about the manner in which a sequence such as IE **ORC*- becomes Gk. *oRC*-. There are two possible paths. The

1) R. S. P. Beekes, *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*, The Hague 1969, spends only two pages (132–133) on the subject of *HRC*- sequences. Though he tends to favor the possibility that a laryngeal in a sequence **HRC*- does color the sonant resonant, his argument is not conclusive.

2) It is probably necessary to propose a laryngeal for *ἄλλυμι* since the phonemic sequence most likely reflects an original *CC-n-eC* in the proto-language. Witness the evidence of the Sanskrit 5th, 7th and 9th classes. Further, were there not an initial **O*-, the stem would be either **l-n-ew*-, which would produce Gk. ***ἄλλυμι*, or **ol-n-ew*-, which is unlikely because of its shape. However, the *-vv-* could be simply suffixed as in *δείκνυμι*, but this would seem less likely in a root of this shape with a bi-form of *ḷλέκω*.

3) *KBo* X 45 IV 30–32 UDU.A.LUM GIM-an UDU.SÍG+SAL *arki* [nu-za *armaḥ*]hi *kāšš-a-za* URU-aš *parnaš* UDU.A.LUM [DÛ-ru nu LÍL-ri GE₆]-in KI-an *argaru* 'even as the ram covers the ewe and she becomes pregnant, so too let this town (and) settlement become a ram and cover on the steppe the dark earth' (generously communicated by J. Puhvel).

simplest would seem to be that the initial laryngeal became vocalized before the sonant became vocalized, hence **ORC-* became immediately Gk. *oRC-*. An alternative would be that the sonant became vocalized, and then this vocalization was colored by the laryngeal; thus **ORC-* > **OaRC-* > *oRC-*. This latter seems unlikely for two reasons. Firstly, we would have to propose that an **H-* could color an *a* as well as an *e*. Such a contention would be met with reasonable resistance on the part of many scholars since there is no other evidence of **H* coloring an *a* vowel. Secondly, in sequences of the type **ONC-*, should the nasal vocalize before the laryngeal developed vocalic qualities, one would have the sequence **OaC-* (< **OmC-*) with the apparent loss of the nasal. Thus the Gk. *ὀμφαλός* from **Onbh-* would have become ***ὀφαλός* or ***ἀφαλός* (**Oabh-* < **Om̄bh-*)⁴).

It is necessary, then, to agree that the laryngeal in an initial sequence **HRC-* became vocalized before the Greek resonant became vocalized⁵).

The Latin problem, touched on in passing by Rix, is somewhat different. Rix gave three examples of **HNC-* sequences which seem to be reflected in Latin with the residual coloration of the original IE laryngeal.

1. *umbilicus* < **Onbh-*, Gk. *ὀμφαλός*, OIr. *imbliv*, Skt. *nabhi-*, OHG *naba* 'navel'.
2. *unguis* < **Onḡh-*, Gk. *ὄνυξ, -υχος*, OIr. *ingen*, OHG *nagal*, Lith. *nāgas* 'nail'.
3. *ambi* < **Amb̄hi*, Gk. *ἀμφί*, OIr. *imb-*, OHG *umbi*, Arm. *amb-*, Skt. *abhi-* 'around'.

All three examples show strong evidence for an original zero grade⁶). Particularly clear is the evidence of *ambi* since Old Irish, Old High German, and Sanskrit show clear evidence for an original zero grade (Armenian *amb-* is ambivalent). In all three cases the

⁴) A third possibility might exist; that the passage of **HR-* to *VR-* was a synchronous event: the combination of **ORC-* gave *oRC-*. This would seem, however, to be begging the question.

⁵) That there are two separate vocalization patterns for Greek and Latin [*HRC* (?) and *H̄RC* (?) respectively] is difficult to accept. Yet this unique treatment of the laryngeal, characteristic of Greek, is consistent with Greek's unique representation of the laryngeal in such instances as the "prothetic vowel".

⁶) Rix has discussed various other explanations for the phonological developments of the lexemes in his article. I see no reason to go into them again.

conventionally expected Latin reflexes would be lexemes with an initial *e*-: ***embilicus*, ***enguis* and ***embi*. That this initial ***e*- is not continued, but rather is replaced by a vowel which reflects the color of the proposed laryngeal, seems to be reasonable evidence that the sequence **HNC*- in preLatin does develop with laryngeal interference.

A careful culling of the Latin lexicon for roots which would require an initial laryngeal has produced no more **HNC*- sequences than those discussed by Rix. Moreover, there is no example in Latin of a sequence **HNC*- that does not show coloration by the particular posited laryngeal. IE **HNC*- is always reflected in Latin with laryngeal coloration.

There seem, at best, to be only two clear cut instances where a laryngeal precedes a preLatin sonant *r* or *l* in the sequence **HRC*-. Rix offered the example Lat. *ursus* 'bear', Gk. *ἄρκτος*, Arm. *arj*, Hitt. *hartagga*- 'bear'. In all likelihood, the proto-form is **Artk*-. But, the Latin does not show ***arsus* with laryngeal coloration as it does in *umbilicus*, *unguis* and *ambi*. Lat. *ulciscor* 'to take vengeance' poses ambivalent evidence. If *ulciscor* is to be compared with Gk. *ὀλέκω* and *ἄλλυμι* 'destroy', we may assume a preLatin form of **Olk-e-sko*- (since a zero grade root is most common with *-sko*- suffixes⁷⁾). However, were the proto-form either **olk*- or **Olk*-, the result in Latin would still be the same. Hence, the importance of the laryngeal is merely moot here⁸⁾.

The example of Lat. *arceo* 'shut in', Gk. *ἀρκέω* 'ward off', Arm. *argelum* 'hinder', Hitt. *hark*- 'have, hold' is not clear. Further, as Beekes points out⁹⁾, the connection of Hitt. *hark*- with *ἀρκέω*, *arceo* and *argelum* is semantically just as weak as the possible connection with Lith. *rãktas* 'key', OHG *rigil* 'bolt'. Hence, the existence of a protoform of either **Ark*- or **Aerk*- is equally likely.

Let us return to Lat. *ursus*, which is derived from an earlier **Artk*-. Should we agree that this reflects a preLatin **ArC*-, we must

⁷⁾ A zero-grade root with *-sk*- suffix seems to be the expected rule. However, exceptions do exist: cf. Gk. *γηράσκω* 'grow old', Lat. *hiscere* 'open', OP *xšnāsāhy* (2nd sg. subj.) 'know'. A full grade root seems more common when the root is *set* or disyllabic. Also, it is quite likely that *-sko*- can be secondary.

⁸⁾ Couvreur, in *L'Antiquité Classique* 12, 1943, p. 108, compares Hitt. *hullai*- 'smite'. This etymology has not been openly accepted by Keiler (*A Phonological Study of the Indo-European Laryngeals*, The Hague 1970, p. 23 n. 60, or Beekes (*Development* p. 236).

⁹⁾ *Development*, p. 34.

then agree that the vocalization of the resonant occurs in a sequence different from the Greek. In Greek it appears, based on the evidence of $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\acute{\iota}$, that the laryngeal became vocalized before the resonant, thus causing the resonant to be no longer sonant: **Amb̥hi* passed to **ambhi*. The Latin procedure must be different and we have to assume that the resonant became vocalized before the initial laryngeal was lost. In the case of Lat. *ambi*, then, we would have an original **Amb̥hi* passing to **Aemb̥hi*, and then to *ambi*. In the case of *ursus*, we must assume a preLatin form of **Ark̥t-* (with metathesis of **-tk̥-*) passing to **Aork̥t-*. In this instance, since the laryngeal **A-* precedes an *o* vowel, no coloration is possible¹⁰), and *ursus* results from the earlier **orsos* with initial **Ao-* passing to *o-* without laryngeal interference. It is for this reason that we have, in Latin, no evidence for a sequence of **ArC-* (or **AIC-*) passing to Lat. *arC-*. The initial laryngeal cannot color the Latin *o* derived from the vocalization of the resonant.

Thus it would appear that the laryngeal in Greek vocalized before the resonants vocalized, while in Latin, the resonants became vocalized before the loss of the laryngeal. Although it would appear, at first, that the role of the laryngeal in Latin phonology has been expanded, this is actually not the case. An initial laryngeal in Latin still serves only to color a following *e* vowel.

The Substantival Present Participle in Latin

By J. N. ADAMS, Cambridge

I.

That participles (and adjectives) were less readily used as substantives in Latin than in Greek was to some extent due to the absence of a definite article in Latin. Nevertheless, from the earliest

¹⁰) Kuryłowicz (*Études indo-européennes*, Cracow 1935, p. 28) surveyed the range of laryngeal coloration and noted as follows: "Toute voyelle longue originaire . . . est une contraction d'une voyelle brève avec un des trois éléments ϑ_1 , ϑ_2 , ϑ_3 : $e + \vartheta_1 > \bar{e}$, $e + \vartheta_2 > \bar{a}$, $e + \vartheta_3 > \bar{o}$; \bar{o} (provenant de *e* par apophonie qualitative) $+ \vartheta_1 > \bar{o}$ ".

Later, though, he postulated a fourth laryngeal, ϑ_4 , which does color a contiguous *o*. This fourth laryngeal has found slim acceptance, and the greater part of laryngeal theory is now based on a trinitarian outlook: *E, A, O*.

then agree that the vocalization of the resonant occurs in a sequence different from the Greek. In Greek it appears, based on the evidence of $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\acute{\iota}$, that the laryngeal became vocalized before the resonant, thus causing the resonant to be no longer sonant: **Amb̥hi* passed to **ambhi*. The Latin procedure must be different and we have to assume that the resonant became vocalized before the initial laryngeal was lost. In the case of Lat. *ambi*, then, we would have an original **Amb̥hi* passing to **Aemb̥hi*, and then to *ambi*. In the case of *ursus*, we must assume a preLatin form of **Ark̥t-* (with metathesis of **-tk̥-*) passing to **Aork̥t-*. In this instance, since the laryngeal **A-* precedes an *o* vowel, no coloration is possible¹⁰), and *ursus* results from the earlier **orsos* with initial **Ao-* passing to *o-* without laryngeal interference. It is for this reason that we have, in Latin, no evidence for a sequence of **ArC-* (or **AIC-*) passing to Lat. *arC-*. The initial laryngeal cannot color the Latin *o* derived from the vocalization of the resonant.

Thus it would appear that the laryngeal in Greek vocalized before the resonants vocalized, while in Latin, the resonants became vocalized before the loss of the laryngeal. Although it would appear, at first, that the role of the laryngeal in Latin phonology has been expanded, this is actually not the case. An initial laryngeal in Latin still serves only to color a following *e* vowel.

The Substantival Present Participle in Latin

By J. N. ADAMS, Cambridge

I.

That participles (and adjectives) were less readily used as substantives in Latin than in Greek was to some extent due to the absence of a definite article in Latin. Nevertheless, from the earliest

¹⁰) Kuryłowicz (*Études indo-européennes*, Cracow 1935, p. 28) surveyed the range of laryngeal coloration and noted as follows: "Toute voyelle longue originaire . . . est une contraction d'une voyelle brève avec un des trois éléments ϑ_1 , ϑ_2 , ϑ_3 : $e + \vartheta_1 > \bar{e}$, $e + \vartheta_2 > \bar{a}$, $e + \vartheta_3 > \bar{o}$; \bar{o} (provenant de *e* par apophonie qualitative) $+ \vartheta_1 > \bar{o}$ ".

Later, though, he postulated a fourth laryngeal, ϑ_4 , which does color a contiguous *o*. This fourth laryngeal has found slim acceptance, and the greater part of laryngeal theory is now based on a trinitarian outlook: *E, A, O*.

period onwards present participles sometimes proved a source of substantives, as is shown by the existence even in the early Republic of certain substantival participles which had completely or largely lost their verbal character (e. g. *amans*, *dens*, *adulescens*, *femina*¹), *parens*).

The processes by which a participle may develop into a substantive are the same as those by which adjectives are substantivized (not only in Latin, but in many languages)². Those which are relevant to our purposes are worthy of mention.

In the first place, participles (or adjectives) which are regularly linked as attributes to certain substantives may in the course of time be detached and used independently with substantival function³. It is in this way that most of the earliest fully substantival present participles emerged in Latin. Thus *serpens* developed from *serpens bestia*, as is clear from the practice of Plautus, who never uses *serpens* alone but writes *proserpens bestia* 4 times (*Asin.* 695, *Persa* 299, *Poen.* 1034, *Stich.* 724). Similarly Plautus and Lucilius do not use *infans* substantivally, but rather to qualify *puer* (Plaut. *Poen.* 28, Luc. 486, 566)⁴. *Adulescens* may have arisen from combinations such as *homo*, *puer* or *liberi* + *adulescens*⁵. *Oriens* and *occidens* undoubtedly developed from *sol oriens* and *sol occidens*, *torrens* from *fluvius torrens* (see Varro *Rust.* 1.12.4, Plin. *Nat.* 2.229) and *confluentes* (*confluens*) from *fluviū confluentes*. Finally, *femina* would originally have been applied to various animal terms

¹) On the form of *femina* (it is in origin a participle in *-meno-*) see, for example, A. Ernout-A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine*⁴ (Paris 1967), s. v.

²) See, in general, A. Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik*, II (Leipzig 1894), pp. 160ff.; cf. J. B. Hofmann-A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich 1965), pp. 152ff.

³) On the substantivization of adjectives in this way, see, in addition to the above works, E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica, Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*, II (Lund 1933), pp. 237ff.; J. Svennung, *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (Lund 1935), pp. 272ff.

⁴) See J. Köhm, *Allateinische Forschungen* (Leipzig 1905), p. 121. We may compare the later ellipse of *filius* and *puer* with *parvulus* (see Löfstedt, o. c., II, p. 242), which leaves a derivative in Romance with the meaning 'child': see W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*³ (Heidelberg 1935), s. v. (6262).

⁵) See *TLL* I. 794.83ff. for the various combinations in which *adulescens* is used adjectivally.

to denote an animal 'giving suck'⁶); thence emerged its independent use with the meaning 'female'⁷).

Secondly, when a participle (or adjective) denotes a quality which is predominantly or exclusively possessed by persons, or when it is clear that a quality can in a certain context only be possessed by persons, the participle (or adjective) can easily be used independently to designate the person or persons possessing the quality⁸).

By the classical period substantival present participles which owed their origin to the second process were a well established feature of the language in cases other than the nominative⁹). They were perhaps most frequently used to fill gaps in the language by providing a term with substantival force when no apposite noun

⁶) Cf. the use in later Latin of substantival *lactantes* = 'suckling' (Varro *Rust.* 2.4.16, 2.4.17, 2.5.16, 2.7.12). This emerged from participle + substantive combinations such as *porci lactantes* (Varro *Rust.* 2.4.21).

⁷) It is also worthy of note that *patens* goes into Logudorese with the meaning 'wood', 'forest' (Meyer-Lübke, o. c., 6288). This usage presumably arose from ellipse in an expression such as *silva patens*.

⁸) For some examples of adjectives substantivized in this way, see R. Kühner-C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*², II, 1 (Hannover 1912), pp. 22ff.; Svennung, o. c., pp. 271f.

⁹) Numerous examples are given by K. F. von Nägelsbach-I. Müller, *Lateinische Stilistik*⁹ (Nuremberg 1905), pp. 144ff. Cf. O. Riemann, *Etudes sur la Langue et la Grammaire de Tite-Live* (Paris 1885), pp. 85ff. (see p. 88 on the nominative singular use); E. Laughton, *The Participle in Cicero* (Oxford 1964), pp. 72ff. It is misleading to refer to *timens* at Sen. *de Ira* 1.4.1 *quo distet ira ab iracundia, apparet: quo ebrius ab ebrioso et timens a timido* as an example of a nominative singular substantival present participle (as is done, for example, by Hofmann-Szantyr, o. c., p. 156), for Seneca is not really describing a person (a *timens*) as the subject of a verb, but is virtually distinguishing the meaning of the word *timens* (most conveniently presented in the nominative form) from that of *timidus*. The restriction of the substantival present participle to the oblique cases, as well as its virtual inability to be qualified by adjectives (see below, p. 120), can be explained in the terminology of O. Jespersen (*The Philosophy of Grammar* [London 1924], chap. VII). Apparently a substantival participle was to some extent felt to be an adjunct or qualifying word (of secondary rank) whose normal function would be to qualify an expressed substantive (of primary rank) instead of an unexpressed idea. As such, it could not itself be qualified by another word of secondary rank (an adjective), but required a modifier of tertiary rank (an adverb). It is above all in the nominative case that a substantive has primary rank, for in the oblique cases it is often virtually an adjunct (see, e. g. Cic. *Div.* 2.69 *vox . . . monentis* — 'a voice warning them' [Laughton, o. c., p. 75]; cf. Jespersen, o. c., p. 107); hence the avoidance of the substantival participle in the nominative, and its use in other cases.

existed (e. g. *fugientes*). Sometimes, however, we find a writer employing a participle despite the existence of an apparently synonymous verbal substantive (often of the *-tor* formation)¹⁰. It is with the history of this phenomenon that I am exclusively concerned here. Under what conditions does a writer prefer a personal substantival present participle to an existing verbal substantive?

E. Laughton has formulated the following distinction between substantives in *-tor* and participles¹¹): ‘... substantival present participles differ from nouns formed with the suffix *-tor* and *-sor* in that the latter are used, as a rule, without reference to a particular occasion, and sometimes imply a permanent or habitual quality or function, whilst the participle is used of a quality shown, or a function exercised, in particular circumstances’. But this statement of the role of the suffix *-tor* is slightly misleading. E. Benveniste has shown that Latin substantives in *-tor* had assumed the functions of two distinct Indo-European suffixes, represented in Greek by *-τωρ* and *-τηρ*¹². The one designated the *author* of an act (one who in particular circumstances performed an act), the other the *agent* of an act (one whose *function* it was to perform the act, whether or not in the context in question he is seen as actually carrying it out)¹³. The former clearly had *verbal* emphasis, the latter *nominal*. To illustrate the way in which substantives in *-tor* could play the part of author-nouns Benveniste quotes Liv. 1.28.6 *Mettius ille est ductor itineris huius, Mettius idem huius machinator belli, Mettius foederis Romani Albanique raptor*¹⁴.

Thus substantives in *-tor* are capable of verbal emphasis just as are substantival present participles. Some (e. g. *sutor*, *tonsor*) are clearly nouns of agent, but many refer to acts performed in particular circumstances (e. g. *lector*, *emptor*, *auditor*, *conditor*)¹⁵.

¹⁰ See the examples collected by A. Önnersfors, *Pliniana, in Plinii Maioris Naturalem Historiam Studia Grammatica Semantica Critica* (Uppsala 1956), pp. 125f.

¹¹ O. c., pp. 73f.

¹² *Noms d'Agent et Noms d'Action en Indo-Européen* (Paris 1948), pp. 57f.

¹³ See o. c., pp. 11–12 for a precise statement of the distinction. Details are to be found in chaps. 1–4.

¹⁴ O. c., p. 57. A good example of a *-tor* substantive used in this function is found at *Per. Aeth.* 1.2 *commonuerunt deductores sancti illi* (= *illi sancti deducentes*).

¹⁵ In Cicero's translation of Plato's *Timaeus* substantives in *-tor* sometimes render participles: 6 *ille fabricator* (*ὁ τεκταινόμενος*); 26 *ille procreator mundi* (*τῷ συνιστάντι*).

The semantic overlapping of participles and verbal substantives is further increased by the tendency, apparent from the early Empire onwards, of participles to lose their role as author-nouns and to approach closely to nouns of agent (see below, III, and especially s. v. *coquens*, *medens*).

The distinction, if any, between a verbal author-noun and a substantival present participle is apparently one of degree. A participle, if it takes a qualifying word at all, takes not an adjective (in the classical and early Imperial periods; for later Latin, see below, IV, especially s. v. *serviens*) but an adverb. It would seem then that the verbal emphasis of a participle continued, for a while at least, to be somewhat more marked than that of a verbal substantive¹⁶).

But this distinction is so fine that for practical purposes it is constantly impossible, especially in Imperial literature, to distinguish semantically between an unqualified substantival present participle which a writer has employed and an alternative substantive of the same root which he might have employed.

II.

The use of a personal substantival present participle for an existing substantive is, then, often not semantically determined¹⁷). It is best seen as a stylistic phenomenon showing historical development.

In Cicero there is perhaps only one instance of the usage in the whole of the speeches, but there are various in the philosophical and rhetorical works: *Planc.* 80 *qui sancti, qui religionum colentes* (= *cultores*) . . .?¹⁸); cf. *audientis* (*Orat.* 55, 132), *audientium* (*Off.* 1.137, 2.66, *Brut.* 89, 279, *Tusc.* 2.3), *consolantium* (*Tusc.* 3.75), *consolantis* (*Tusc.* 3.76, *Att.* 11.17 a.1), *consulentibus* (*Leg.* 1.10, *Orat.* 143), *discentibus* (*Orat.* 143), *discentium* (*Off.* 1.132, *de Orat.* 1.16), *docenti* (*Off.* 1.13), *docentis* (*Rep.* 1.70), *existimantium* (*Brut.*

¹⁶) Note too that substantival participles occasionally take a direct object (see, e. g. below, III, s. v. *regens*).

¹⁷) Sometimes a verbal substantive undergoes specialisation, so that the verbal notion contained in the verb from which it is derived is supplemented. Hence an author who wishes to express in substantival form the verbal notion alone without accretions will have recourse to a substantival present participle. Participles of this kind will not be considered here.

¹⁸) See *TLL* III. 1690. 37ff.

92), *gubernantibus* (*Div.* 2.123), *praecipienti* (*Off.* 1.13), *praecipientis* (*Rep.* 1.70)¹⁹). The stylistic distinction between the speeches and the treatises which this list suggests is certainly genuine, for substantival synonyms of most of the participles concerned occur in the speeches.

Elsewhere in Republican literature the substantival participle is as unusual as in Cicero's speeches. There is no example of the kind in question in Plautus, and only one each in Varro (*Rust.* 1.4.3), Caesar (*Gall.* 7.86.5) and Sallust (*Iug.* 113.5).

Clearly it was not normal at the time to resort to a substantival present participle when a noun was available. Cicero was no doubt led to do so in the treatises in imitation of the Greek works which he used as models. *Audientes*, for example, may be compared with ἀκούοντες, *aegrotantes* with ἀσθενούντες, νοσοῦντες, or κάμνοντες and *discentes* with μαθηάροντες. But it is not necessary to suppose that Cicero always had specific Greek words in mind; he simply allowed himself more freedom than usual under the general influence of his sources. He became more willing to experiment in the later part of his career, for in the early *de Inventione* he uses *auditor* but not *audiens*, *discipulus* but not *discens* and *praeceptor* but not *praecipiens*.

But it is of note that even in the late treatises Cicero admits superfluous substantival participles only sparingly. During the Empire, however, a marked development occurs. Substantival present participles for existing nouns become frequent not only in technical prose (e. g. Seneca, Pliny the Elder, Quintilian)²⁰), on which we might expect to find Greek influence, but even in non-technical genres such as history.

Thus, while Cicero provides only about 8 instances of the device in his rhetorical treatises, Quintilian has it almost 40 times in the first two books of the *Inst. Orat.* alone. *Auditor*, for instance, predominates over *audiens* by about 26 : 4 in Cicero's rhetorical works and by 34 : 0 in the *Rhet. Her.*²¹), but in books 1, 2 and 12 Quin-

¹⁹) *Aegrotantes* (for the substantival use of *aegrotus*) should perhaps be added. It occurs at *Off.* 1.83, and then frequently under the Empire (*TLL* I. 955.4ff.). I have also omitted *amans*, which is found even in early Latin and is common at all periods (*TLL* I. 1957.79ff.).

²⁰) On Pliny, see Ötnerfors, 1.c.

²¹) I include only those instances of *auditor* for which *audiens* could have been substituted; the participle is avoided in the nominative singular, nor is it found with an attribute.

tilian prefers the participle by 12 : 0²²). Similarly, in the same books Quintilian prefers *docens* to *doctor* by 8 : 2²³), but Cicero employs *doctor* almost exclusively in all genres. Other substantival participles used frequently by Quintilian but rarely by Cicero are *discens*²⁴) and *praecipiens*²⁵).

Again, Tacitus has the usage over 40 times²⁶), as against Sallust's single example. The smaller volume of Sallust's work alone cannot account for the discrepancy. Livy and Curtius also adopt it frequently.

The spread of the substantival participle in technical prose should perhaps be seen as analogous to the proliferation of Greek borrowings in technical genres under the Empire. The author of the treatise *ad Herennium*, for instance, writing during the Republic, latinizes Greek rhetorical terms far more often than Quintilian²⁷). Our device cannot be explicitly labelled as a Grecism, for, as seen above, it was commonly used in Latin when no noun was available. But when used unnecessarily it does seem to have savoured of Greek licence, to judge by its distribution in Cicero. It is likely that as Grecizing studies spread and Greek words became increasingly frequent, so the superfluous substantival participle became more acceptable in the technical language.

The increase of the device in history is more difficult to explain. It is, however, possible that it was to some extent generalized in the literary language under the influence of the rhetorical schools, in which words such as *audiens*, *docens*, *discens* and *praecipiens* (see below, III) were undoubtedly in use. A writer could adopt others by analogy, whether for variation, to avoid concinnity, or to produce an unusual substitute for a well established noun.

²²) 1.2.27, 1.2.29, 1.10.25, 2.3.11, 2.4.29, 2.5.13, 2.10.10, 2.17.29, 12.2.11, 12.6.4, 12.9.10, 12.10.17.

²³) *Docens*: 1.1.17, 1.1.36, 1.2.25, 2.2.3, 2.5.5, 2.9.1, 2.10.3, 2.16.13; *doctor*: 2.2.2, 12.2.2.

²⁴) E. g. 1.1.17, 1.2.11, 1.2.27, 1.3.6, 1.3.14, 1.11.19, 1.12.13, 2.2.2, 2.3.7, 2.4.5, 2.5.1, 2.5.14, 2.8.8, 11.1.5, 12.2.12.

²⁵) E. g. 1.1.25, 1.3.12, 2.3.5, 2.6.1, 2.6.6.

²⁶) See A. Gerber-A. Greef, *Lexicon Taciteum*, s. v. *accuso*, *audio*, *crimino*, *defendo*, *disco*, *domino*, *emo*, *faveo*, *guberno*, *imperito*, *medeor*, *obsideo*, *oppugno*, *oro*, *possideo*, *praesideo*, *rapio*, *rego*, *remigo*, *saluto*, *specto*, *venor*. Many of the participles from these verbs are discussed below (III).

²⁷) See O. Weise, *Die griechischen Wörter im Latein* (Leipzig 1882), pp. 234f.; A. Ernout, *Aspects du Vocabulaire Latin* (Paris 1954), p. 81.

Önnerfors tentatively suggests that the influence of poetry may have been at work²⁸). But although the usage is found in Ennius (*Ann.* 427 *induperantum* = *imperatorum*) and Lucretius (see below, III, s. v. *canens, medens*) as well as later poets, it is scarcely frequent enough to be described as a stock poetic device. If the commonplace *amans* is excepted, in the whole of the *Aeneid* there are only 3 examples (9.551, 12.5 *venantum*, 5.148 *faventum*), and in the *Metamorphoses* only 7 (2.492 *venantum*, 7.451 *faventum*, 7.561, 15.629 *medentes*, 11.20 *canentis*, 12.440 *spoliantis*, 14.90 *habitantum*)²⁹). Moreover, many of the words concerned are technical and not of the kind found in poetry (III), and some of the writers who employ the device were not subject to poetic influence (e. g. Quintilian, Seneca the Elder, Celsus, Tacitus in the *Dialogus*). But it is conceivable that certain poeticizing authors occasionally recalled specific instances from poetry.

III.

The following list, though not exhaustive, includes many of the superfluous substantival present participles found under the Republic and early Empire. It will be seen that most make their first appearance during the Empire. Where possible the similarity of meaning between a participle and the corresponding noun has been illustrated.

accusans (cf. *accusator*): Imperial (Sen. *Contr.* 7.5.7, Tac. *Ann.* 2.71.4, 3.10.3, 12.54.4). At *Ann.* 3.10 *accusatores* is also used in reference to the same prosecutors.

adiuvans (cf. *adiutor*): Curtius, Suetonius (*Cal.* 41.1), Vulgate (O. T.) (*TLL* I. 721.12ff.).

agens (cf. *actor*): Imperial (*TLL* I. 1395.75ff.); it is especially frequent in Quintilian. See further below, IV.

assentans (cf. *assentator*): Curt. 8.8.21, Eutrop. 8.5.3.

²⁸) O. c., p. 125.

²⁹) We may omit the exclusively poetic description of animals by means of masculine substantival present participles which refer to a distinctive action of the animal in question: e. g. *latrans* = *canis* (Ovid *Met.* 8.344, 8.412), *mugiens* = *vacca, bos* (Hor. *Epod.* 2.11), *volans* = *avis* (Lucr. 2.1083, Virg. *Aen.* 6.239, 6.728), *balans* = *ovis* (Lucr. 6.1131, Virg. *Georg.* 1.272, 3.457), *hinniens* = *equus* (Laevius ap. Apul. *Mag.* p. 294).

aucupans (cf. *auceps*): while Varro (*Rust.* 3.3.4) writes *aucupes*, *venatores*, *piscatores*, Pliny the Elder can convert the three substantives into substantival present participles³⁰): *Nat.* 35.116 *piscentes*, *aucupantes aut venantes* (cf. Aug. *Gen. ad Litt.* 9.14, p. 285.5 *venantes vel aucupantes*). Also, at *Nat.* 10.102 *aucupans* immediately follows *auceps* without change of meaning: *cum sensit feminam aucupis accedentem ad marem, recanat revocetque et ultro praebeat se libidini. rabie quidem tanta feruntur, ut in capite aucupantium saepe caecae motu sedeant.*

audiens (cf. *auditor*): particularly common from the later part of Cicero's career onwards with a sense indistinguishable from that of *auditor* (*TLL* II. 1281.14ff.). Both words are frequent, for instance, in descriptions of the effect of a speaker on the minds of an audience (actual or hypothetical): e. g. Cic. *Inv.* 1.20 *exordium est oratio animum auditoris idonee comparans ad reliquam dictionem*; *Rhet. Her.* 1.9 *cum animus auditoris persuasus esse videtur ab iis qui ante contra dixerunt* (see also *Rhet. Her.* 1.4, Cic. *Inv.* 1.23); cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.3 *effectus eloquentiae est audientium adprobatio*; *Brut.* 89 *ad animos audientium permovendos*; ib. 279 *inflammare animos audientium*; Sen. *Dial.* 4.14.1 *si segnes audientium animi concitandi sunt* (see also Liv. 45.42.1, Quint. 2.17.29, 12.10.43, Plin. *Epist.* 1.20.18, Tac. *Ann.* 4.9.1). Again, with Cic. *Part. Or.* 72 *omnis ratio fere ad voluptatem auditoris . . . refertur* may be compared Quint. 2.10.10 *sane paulum aliquid inclinare ad voluptatem audientium debemus* and Tac. *Dial.* 30.5 *de omni quaestione pulchre et ornate et ad persuadendum apte dicere . . . cum voluptate audientium possit*. Observe too the alternation of the two words at Sen. *Contr.* 3 *praef.* 2 and Sen. *Epist.* 108.8, 108.12. Finally, in later Christian Latin both terms are used to denote a person learning doctrine before baptism (= *κατηχούμενος*) (*TLL* II. 1281.49ff.; 1295.48ff.).

calumnians (cf. *calumniator*): e. g. Petronius, Quintilian, Suetonius, Digest, Vulgate (*TLL* III. 192.72ff.).

canens (cf. *cantor*): Imperial in prose (e. g. Sen. *Epist.* 51.12, Col. 12.2.4 [twice], Aug. *Civ.* 16.2, Veg. *Mil.* 3.5), although there is also an example in Lucretius (4.585 *tibia quas fundit digitis pulsata canentum*). Note especially Sen. *Epist.* 84.10 *in commissionibus nostris plus cantorum est quam in theatris olim spectatorum fuit. cum omnes vias ordo canentium implevit et cavea aeneatoribus cincta*

³⁰) See Önnersfors, o. c., p. 125.

est . . . , where the word follows *cantor* and is in the proximity of other *-tor* substantives.

colens: see above p. 120 for the Ciceronian example of this word = *cultor*³¹). Varro uses it after *colonus* without any real change of sense: *Rust.* 1.4.3 *contra [quod] in pestilenti calamitas, quamvis in feraci agro, colonum ad fructus pervenire non patitur. etenim ubi ratio cum orco habetur, ibi non modo fructus est incertus, sed etiam colentium vita;* and Seneca employs *agrum colens* for *agricola*: *Epist.* 36.5 *ad illud aes alienum solvendum opus est negotianti navigatione prospera, agrum colenti ubertate eius quam colit terrae, caeli favore;* *ib.* 94.14 *alia enim dare debemus feneranti, alia colenti agrum, alia negotianti*³²). See further below, s. v. *incolens*.

comissans (cf. *comissator*): e. g. Livy, Curtius, Petronius, Quintilian, Suetonius (*TLL* III. 1790.47 ff.).

coquens (cf. *coquus*): first in Seneca the Younger, then in Pliny the Elder and the Vulgate (O. T.) (*TLL* IV. 929.16 ff.). At Seneca *Epist.* 90.19 *itaque hinc textorum, hinc fabrorum officinae sunt, hinc odores coquentium* the parallel terms *textorum* and *fabrorum* suggest that *coquentium* denotes professional cooks rather than those who happen to be cooking in particular circumstances. Cf. *ib.* *omnes istae artes quibus aut circitatur civitas aut strepit corpori negotium gerunt.*

consolans (cf. *consolator*): Cicero, Seneca (*Dial.* 11.6.1).

criminans (cf. *criminator*): Seneca, Curtius, Tacitus, Suetonius, Ammianus (*TLL* IV. 1199.19 ff.). For an attempt to distinguish between *criminans* and *criminator*, see Isid. *Diff.* 1.86.

curans: worthy of special note is the use of *curans*, found apparently only in Celsus, with a meaning similar to that of *medicus* (not mentioned by *TLL*): e. g. 2.16 *intemperantes homines apud nos ipsi tempora curantibus dant* (cf. *ib.* *rursus alii tempora medicis pro dono remittunt, sibi ipsis modum vindicant*); 3.8 *plurimique sub alterutro curantis errore subito moriuntur*; 4.2.1 *his veluti in conspectum quendam, quatenus scire curanti necessarium est, adductis* (cf. 5.26.1 *in his autem ante omnia scire medicus debet . . .*); 5.26.1 *ne . . . maius curantis neglegentia fiat*³³). This could be interpreted as a variant for *curator*, which can have a medical sense (*TLL* IV.

³¹) Cf. *TLL* III. 1690.37 ff.

³²) Cf. *TLL* III. 1690.22 ff. (omitting the Senecan passages).

³³) The usage is found 9 times in Celsus: see the *index verborum* in E. Milligan, *A. Corn. Celsi Medicinae Libri Octo*² (Edinburgh 1831), s. v.

1477.60ff.). But as the latter usage is late, it is more likely that Celsus had a Greek model in mind (cf., e. g. οἱ θεραπεύοντες at Philod. Philos. Ir. p. 29W., Hippocr. περὶ τέχνης 10, περὶ ἰητροῦ 2; *curo* is often employed to translate *θεραπεύω* in the Latin versions of the New Testament: *TLL* IV. 1504.26f.).

For a general use of *curans* = *curator*, see Tert. *Nat.* 2.2 *Platonici quidem deum asseverant curantem rerum et arbitrum et iudicem* (note that here the word has so far lost its verbal function that it can take a genitive). Cf. *curator* at Arnob. *Nat.* 4.9 *quis curatores obliquitatum Limos, quis Saturnum praesidem sationis esse credit?*

custodiens (cf. *custos*): Curt. 3.13.4 *ille, e manibus custodientium lapsus* (cf. Val. Max. 9.12. ext. 1 *inter ipsas custodum manus*). Cf. τηροῦντες.

declamans (cf. *declamator*): Seneca the Elder (*Contr.* 7.7.10), Seneca the Younger (*Epist.* 20.2), Quintilian, Suetonius (*Gramm.* 10). Particularly striking is the similarity between the following two passages: Quint. 11.1.55 *quod praecipue declamantibus custodiendum est*; id. 3.8.51 *quid praecipue declamatoribus considerandum sit*.

defendens (cf. *defensor*): Imperial (Sen. *Contr.* 7.5.7, Tac. *Ann.* 14.33.2).

discens (cf. *discipulus*): Cicero has only *discipulus* in the early *de Inventione*, but in the later treatises he occasionally allows *discens*. It is under the Empire, however, that the participle becomes particularly common, both in educated genres (e. g. Seneca the Younger, Celsus, Scribonius Largus, Columella, Pliny the Elder, Quintilian, Suetonius, Apuleius)³⁴) and in more vulgar Latin (see *TLL* V. 1.1335.50ff.).

The synonymy of the two words is especially clear from the Latin versions of the Bible, which employ both alike to render *μαθητής*. *Discens* is often used in the *Afra* where the *Itala* has *discipulus* (Matth. 8.21, 15.36, 24.3, Mark 2.15, 2.16, 3.7, 9.31, 11.1, 13.1, 14.13, 14.14)³⁵), a fact which suggests a regional variation in the date at which the participle gained currency in popular Latin.

In educated Latin both terms are sometimes used in the same passage with the same sense: e. g. Quint. 2.5.1 *moneam quantum*

³⁴) On Quintilian, see above, p. 122.

³⁵) For the various versions, see A. Jülicher, *Itala, das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung* (Berlin 1938-).

sit conlaturus ad profectum discentium rhetor si, quem ad modum a grammaticis exigitur poetarum enarratio, ita ipse quoque historiae atque etiam magis orationum lectione susceptos a se discipulos instruxerit (cf. Sen. *Epist.* 108.3, 108.5, Tac. *Dial.* 29.4, 30.1). Again, we find *discens* as well as *discipulus* opposed to *magister* (Cic. *Off.* 1.132, Col. 1. pr. 4; cf. *TLL* V. 1.1328.11 ff.), and both also opposed to *praeceptor* (Sen. *Clem.* 1.16.2; cf. Val. Max. 8.7. ext. 11, Quint. 8.2.18).

E. Löfstedt, who points out that *discens* is common in later vulgar Latin and that it leaves derivatives in the Romance languages, perhaps underestimates its frequency in the educated language³⁶). Like the other words discussed here, it seems first to have come into use in educated Latin (perhaps in the rhetorical schools). From there it must have spread to the lower strata of society (perhaps via slaves apprenticed in *artes illiberales*, who would sometimes have been described by their masters as *discentes*).

docens (cf. *doctor*): found first in Cicero, and then frequently under the Empire (e. g. Columella, Pliny the Elder, Quintilian, Pliny the Younger, Digest, Vegetius: *TLL* V. 1.1751.25 ff.). For alternation of *docens* and *doctor*, see Quint. 2.2.2—3.

dominans (cf. *dominus*): found first at *Bell. Alex.* 32.3, and then under the Empire (*TLL* V. 1.1906.47 ff.). Note especially Sen. *Epist.* 28.8 *quid interest quot domini sint? servitus una est; hanc qui contempsit in quantalibet turba dominantium liber est*, where it follows *dominus* and bears the same sense.

emens: Imperial (*TLL* V. 2.517.41 ff.). At *Benef.* 6.15.4 *primum quid interest, quanti sint, cum de pretio inter ementem vendentemque convenerit?* Seneca has *emens* and *vendens* (both with indefinite reference) in juxtaposition³⁷), just as earlier Cicero had often opposed *emptor* and *venditor* (e. g. *Off.* 3.51, 3.54, 3.67). Also worthy of comparison are Cic. *Caecin.* 16 *deterrentur emptores multi partim gratia Caesenniae, partim . . . pretio* and Col. 8.6.2 *quae res ementem deterret*. Finally, observe the use of both words in the following passage: *Dig.* 40.7.8.1 *si partes suas quisque heredum diversis ementibus vendiderit, quas portiones heredibus dare statuliber debuit, easdem dabit emptoribus*. Cf. ἀνούμενος (opp. ἀνητής).

favens (cf. *fautor*): Augustan and later (*TLL* VI. 1.377.63 ff.). Note that at *Hist.* 1.52.2 *et Vitellius ut apud severos humilis, ita*

³⁶) *Late Latin* (Oslo 1959), pp. 122f.

³⁷) Cf. *Dig.* 7.1.54 *quid inter ementem vendentemque convenerit*.

comitatem bonitatemque faventes vocabant Tacitus uses the word with a meaning ('political supporters') commonly possessed by *fautor* (see *TLL* VI. 1.389.80ff.).

fenerans (cf. *fenerator*): Senecan (*Epist.* 94.14: quoted above, s. v. *colens*).

grassans (cf. *grassator*): Petron. 117.3 *quicquid Lycurgi villa grassantibus praebuisset*; Paul. Sent. 5.3.4 *grassantium cupido*. For *grassator* in this sense (= *latro*, 'one engaged in brigandage'), see *TLL* VI. 2.2198.48ff.

gubernans (cf. *gubernator*): once in Cicero, and then occasionally under the Empire. Compare the use of *gubernans* and *gubernator* in the following passages: Tac. *Ann.* 14.56.2 *ac tamen spatium amplexus ad vim remigii, gubernantium artes, impetus navium et proelio solita*; *Hist.* 5.23.2 *Cerialis miraculo magis quam metu derexit classem numero impari, usu remigum, gubernatorum arte, navium magnitudine potiore*.

habitans (cf. *incola*, *habitor*): Imperial (*TLL* VI. 3.2475.40ff., 2479.7ff.). It can denote both dwellers (in houses) (cf. *habitor*, *TLL* VI. 3.2470.80ff.) and inhabitants of cities and lands (cf. *incola*). In the latter meaning it is common in Pomponius Mela (*TLL* VI. 3.2475.44ff.).

incolens (cf. *incola*): Livy, Seneca, Curtius, Tertullian, Ammianus, al. (*TLL* VII. 1.978.33ff.). At 8.10.19 Curtius employs *incolae* and *incolentes* in adjoining sentences with no distinction in meaning: *deseruerant incolae sedes, et in avios silvestresque montes confugerant. ergo Acidira transit, aequae usta et destituta incolentium fuga*. It is also clear at Liv. 42.67.9 *cum exercitus parte profectus in Achaiam Pthiotim Pteleum desertum fuga oppidanorum diruit a fundamentis, Antronas voluntate incolentium recepit* that the participle refers to permanent inhabitants as distinct from chance or temporary dwellers (cf. *oppidanorum*). But even more striking is the use made by Livy of both words in the same formula: 31.39.6 *Erigonum incolae vocant* (27.29.9, 29.31.7, 32.5.11, 38.4.2, 38.41.4); cf. 42.53.7 *Tripolim vocant incolentes*. Cf. ἐνοικοῦντες (opp. οἰκήτωρ, ἐνοικος, οἰκητής).

insidians (cf. *insidiator*): found twice in classical prose (*Gall.* 8.19.3, Sall. *Iug.* 113.5), and then in Livy (*TLL* VII. 1.1896.73ff.). Cf. Liv. 34.49.10 *discordiam et seditionem omnia opportuna insidiantibus facere*; 22.28.5 *ager . . . erat . . . inutilis insidiatori*. Cf. ἐπιβουλεύων (opp. ἐπιβουλευτής).

interpretans (cf. *interpres*): first in Seneca the Younger and then in Pliny the Younger (*TLL* VII. 1.2263.4).

iudicans (cf. *iudex*): Imperial (*TLL* VII. 2.618.54ff., 619.17ff.).

legens (cf. *lector*): Imperial (e. g. Liv. 1. praef. 4, Sen. *Epist.* 45.13, 86.15, Petron. 105.2, Quint. 3.1.2, 10.1.16). Compare the use which Cicero makes of *lector* and Seneca of *legens* in the following passages: Cic. *Tusc.* 1.6 *nec delectatione aliqua allicere lectorem*; *Fam.* 5.12.4 *nihil est enim aptius ad delectationem lectoris quam temporum varietates fortunaequae vicissitudines*; Sen. *Epist.* 86.15 *nec agricolae docere voluit sed legentes delectare*. It is also of note that Quintilian uses both words in similar antitheses with *audiens*: 4.2.45 *quod otiosum fortasse lectorem minus fallat, audientem transvolat*; 10.1.16 *alia vero audientis, alia legentis magis adiuvant*.

litigans (cf. *litigator*): Imperial (e. g. Sen. *Contr.* 10. praef. 2, Sen. *Epist.* 15.7, Petron. 70.4).

medens (cf. *medicus*): found first in Lucretius (1.936, 4.11), and then frequently in Imperial prose (*TLL* VIII. 524.13ff.). At Plin. *Nat.* 25.87 *invenit nuper et Servilius Democrates e primis medentium quam appellavit Hiberida* it is clearly an agent-noun: it refers not to those in the act of healing, but to professional physicians whose function it is to heal (cf. Greg. *Hist. Franc.* 7.25 *qui primus medicorum in domo Chilperici regis habitus fuerat*). The same is also true at Tac. *Dial.* 41.3 *quo modo tamen minimum usus minimumque profectus ars medentis habet in iis gentibus, . . . sic minor oratorum honor obscuriorque gloria est*³⁸) (cf. Cic. *Fin.* 1.42 *ut enim medicorum scientiam non ipsius artis, sed bonae valetudinis causa probamus, et gubernatoris ars, quod bene navigandi rationem habet . . .*). For alternation of *medens* and *medicus*, see Sen. *Dial.* 3.6.2—4.

mendicans (cf. *mendicus*): Imperial (Seneca the Elder, pseudo-Quintilian, al.: *TLL* VIII. 708.3ff.).

mercans (cf. *mercator*): Imperial (Columella, Suetonius, al.: *TLL* VIII. 801.21ff.; add Cassiod. *Var.* 3.19.2).

muniens (cf. *munitor*): found first in Livy (7 times), and then taken up by Curtius (*TLL* VIII. 1660.15ff.).

negotians (cf. *negotiator*): Imperial (see above, s. v. *colens*). Cf. Vitruv. 5.1.8, Suet. *Aug.* 42.3 (opposite *arator*). See further below, IV.

³⁸) The word also immediately follows *medicus* (*supervacuus esset inter innocentes orator sicut inter sanos medicus*) and, like *medicus*, it is contrasted with a noun of agent in *-tor* (*orator*).

obiurgans (cf. *obiurgator*): Imperial (*TLL* IX. 2.71.60; add Sen. *Dial.* 4.28.4). At August. *Serm.* 266.8 the participle follows a series of instances of the substantive in *-tor*: *si enim amas veridicum obiurgatorem, et caves fallacem adulatorem, potes dicere quod cantatum est, . . . sed cor sanum facit virga obiurgantis; grande caput facit oleum peccatoris, hoc est, assentatio adulatoris.*

obsidens (cf. *obsessor*): Imperial (Liv. 5.26.9, 6.33.9, Sen. *Dial.* 7.26.3, Tac. *Ann.* 1.57.3, 3.39.2). In the two Livian passages the word is opposed to *obsessi*; cf. *obsessor* at Tac. *Hist.* 3.73.1 *sed plus pavoris obsessis quam obsessoribus intulit*. Cf. *πολιοκοῦντες*.

oppugnans (cf. *oppugnator*): Imperial (Livy, Tacitus). At Tac. *Hist.* 4.22.3 the word stands opposite *obsessi*; cf. *oppugnator* at *Hist.* 2.21.1, 3.71.4. It is clear from the juxtaposition of *defensor* at *Hist.* 3.30.1 *quod defensoribus auxilium ob multitudinem, oppugnantibus incitamentum ob praedam erat* that the participle could have been replaced by *oppugnator*; it has been chosen not for a semantic reason but to avoid a balanced antithesis.

orans (cf. *orator*): at Tac. *Dial.* 6.5 *vulgata dicentium gaudia et imperitorum quoque oculis exposita percenseo: illa secretiora et tantum ipsis orantibus nota maiora sunt, orans* approaches closely to *orator* in meaning (cf. *ib.* 6.4 *coire populum et circumfundi coram et accipere adfectum quemcumque orator induerit!*), for Tacitus is contrasting the joys of speaking which are evident even to the uninitiated with those known only by actual speakers (by implication professional orators, *oratores*, as is obvious from the next sentence). The participle does emphasise that the hypothetical speakers in question are in the act of speaking, but in this context it could easily have been replaced by *orator*. Cf. *ῥητορεύοντες* (opp. *ῥήτωρ*).

piscans (cf. *piscator*): Imperial (see above, s. v. *aucupans*)³⁹).

possidens (cf. *possessor*): Imperial (Sen. *Epist.* 84.11, Tac. *Ann.* 2.33.3, *Cod. Iust.* 10.27.1). Cf. *ἔχων*.

praecipiens (cf. *praeceptor*): found twice in Cicero, and then often under the Empire (see above, p. 122 n. 25 for examples from Quintilian). Note the alternation at Sen. *Epist.* 108.23 *sed aliquid praecipientium vitio peccatur, qui nos docent disputare, non vivere, aliquid discentium, qui propositum adferunt ad praeceptores suos non animum excolendi sed ingenium* (see also Quint. 2.3.4—5).

³⁹) See Önnersfors, o. c., p. 125.

praedans (cf. *praedator*): Imperial (Liv. 2.50.4, 31.26.3, Curt. 3.13.11 [twice]).

praesidens (cf. *praeses*): Imperial (Tac. *Ann.* 3.40.3, Tert. *Cor.* 3.3, *Cod. Theod.* 8.7.13, Aurel. Viot. *Lib. de Caes.* 13.7). The Tacitean example has the meaning 'provincial governors'; for *praeses* in the same sense, see *Ann.* 12.45.4. Cf. *προστατῶν* and *προστάντες* (opp. *προστάτης*).

propugnans (cf. *propugnator*): found first in Caesar (*Gall.* 7.86.5), then in Livy (36.9.11) and Curtius (4.3.15, 8.2.22). Curtius uses both *propugnans* and *propugnator* in the same chapter with the same reference: 4.3.15 *inde missilia in propugnantes ingerebantur tuto, quia proris miles tegebatur*; cf. 4.3.25 *unci quoque et falces ex eisdem asseribus dependentes aut propugnatores aut ipsa navigia lacerabant*.

raapiens (cf. *raptor, direptor*): Imperial (Liv. 5.22.3, Tac. *Hist.* 3.33.1). In the latter passage (*vi manibusque rapientium divolsus ipsos postremo direptores in mutuam perniciem agebat*), observe the following *direptores*⁴⁰); compare (for meaning) the use of *raptor* at *Ann.* 1.58.2.

regens (cf. *rector*): Imperial (e. g. Liv. 5.28.4, Sen. *Epist.* 58.28, 59.7, *Clem.* 1.19.1, 1.22.3, Curt. 3.3.11, 8.14.25, Tac. *Dial.* 41.3, *Ann.* 12.54.2; see further L.-S., s. v. *rego*). At *Ann.* 12.54.2 Tacitus has the word in reference to provincial governors, a function in which he and others employ *rector* (see *Lex. Tac.* 1362b, L.-S., s. v.). Again, Seneca uses it of a commander in war (*Epist.* 59.7); for a comparable example of *rector*, see Liv. 37.51.9 (cf. L.-S., s. v.). Finally, in Curtius it is employed both of horsemen: 3.3.11 *aureae virgae et albae vestes regentes equos adornabant* (*regentes* is the object of *adornabant* and *equos* of *regentes*; Curtius could have written *rectores equorum*); and elephant drivers: 8.14.25 *ingentem hi vim telorum iniicere et elephantis et regentibus eos* (= *rectores eorum*). With both these meanings *rector* would have been possible (cf., e. g. Tac. *Agr.* 36.3, Liv. 44.5.2; Curtius himself has *rector* = 'elephant driver' in the same chapter as *regentes*: 8.14.9 *is, ut dissipatos tota acie currus vagari sine rectoribus vidit, proximis amicorum distribuit elephantos*).

salutans (cf. *saluator*): like *saluator*, this word is used during the Empire to denote those paying a morning call on someone (e. g. Sen. *Epist.* 19.11, 84.12, Tac. *Hist.* 2.92.1, Suet. *Galba* 17, *Vesp.* 12).

⁴⁰ At Sen. *Epist.* 74.7-9 *dirapiens* and *raptor* alternate. For *dirapiens* (also Imperial), see *TLL* V. 1.1261.78.

scribens (cf. *scriptor*): Imperial (e. g. Ovid *Trist.* 2.495, Liv. 1 pr. 5, 21.57.14, 22.7.4, Quint. 1.7.1, 1.2.12, 7.6.12, 8.3.44, 10.3.20, 10.3.22).

spectans (cf. *spectator*): Imperial and frequent (e. g. Liv. 1.25.4, 28.45.12, *CIL* IV. 7585, Sen. *Epist.* 110.16, Col. 1. pr. 15, 12.2.4, Tac. *Germ.* 24.1, *Ann.* 1.77.4, Suet. *Nero* 12.2, *Titus* 8.2, Aug. *Civ.* 22.24). Cf. *θεώμενοι* (opp. *θεατής*). It is used both of formal spectators (in the theatre, etc.) and chance onlookers; *spectator* is also found in both senses (L.-S.).

spolians (cf. *spoliator*): Imperial (Ovid *Met.* 12.440, Sen. *Contr.* 2.1.10, Curt. 8.14.40).

venans (cf. *venator*): Virgil, Ovid and Imperial prose⁴¹). Cf. *θηρώμενοι* (opp. *θηρευτής*).

vendens (cf. *venditor*): Imperial (see above, s. v. *emens*; cf. *Cod. Iust.* 4.40.3, Vulg. 2 Esdr. 13.20).

IV.

The superfluous substantival present participle began as a device of the educated language, and it continued as such at all periods; so far as we can judge, it had little place in popular Latin. It leaves only scant remains in the Romance languages, and is found only rarely in the *Historia Francorum* of Gregory of Tours and in the vast body of Merovingian and Carolingian *Diplomata*, *Formulae*, Epistles and other prose works (in which most instances are provided by certain recurring words)⁴². In the *Vetus Latina* it is, with a few exceptions, used only under the influence of the Greek original⁴³.

The following words had some currency in vulgar or late Latin, whether for a limited period or through to the emergence of the Romance languages.

⁴¹) See Öttenfors, o. c., p. 126. To his examples from Pliny add Curt. 8.1.12, Tac. *Ann.* 3.43.2.

⁴²) The Merovingian documents are of course closer to the popular spoken language than the Carolingian, but even the latter show constant vulgar influence.

⁴³) E. g. Gen. 4.20 *habitantium* (οικούντων), 19.25 *inhabitantes* (κατοικοῦντας), 36.20 *habitantes* (κατοικοῦντος), Matth. 5.44 *calumniantibus* (διωκόντων), 13.3 *seminans* (σπείρων), 21.12 *vendentes et ementes* (πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας), 21.42 *aedificantes* (οικοδομοῦντες), 25.9 *vendentes* (πωλοῦντας), Eph. 4.29 *audientibus* (ἀκούουσαν). When the device is used to translate a plain substantive, we can usually draw on other evidence to show that the influence of vulgar Latin was at work: see below on *negotians*.

agens: used frequently to denote an official or functionary, usually employed either by the Church or by a king: e. g. Greg. *Hist. Franc.* 7.42 *sed agens domus illius resistere fortiter coepit*; ib. *conversusque ad agentem voce flebili ait*; 9.35 *interea mandatum mittit agenti* (cf. ib. *mandans iterum actori*); *Marculfi Form.*⁴⁴ 1.2 *illi comite vel omnibus agentibus*; 1.11 *illi rex omnibus agentibus*; 2.6 *agentes ecclesiae* (cf. 2.4 *actores ecclesiae*); *Cartae Senonicae*⁴⁵ 36 *patribus, ducibus, comitibus, domesticis, vicariis, centenariis vel omnis agentes nostros*; *Form. Andecavenses*⁴⁶ 58 *agente sancti illius*; *S. Bonifatii et Lulli Epist.*⁴⁷ 22 *patribus episcopis, ducibus, comitibus, vicariis, domesticis vel omnibus agentibus iunioribus*. It was obviously a word of officialese (note the various formulae in which it occurs), and as such was no doubt a learned creation, adopted to meet new social conditions. It was perhaps felt to be preferable to *actor* (with which, however, it sometimes alternates) because the latter already had certain specific associations. It does not pass into the Romance languages, though it was later borrowed by French and Italian⁴⁸).

discens: see above, III, s. v.

manens: found occasionally in late Latin with the meaning 'inhabitant' (cf. Prov. *manen* = 'resident')⁴⁹). The frequent substantival use of the present participle of *οἰκέω* and its compounds may have exercised an influence on the popular language through Latin translations of Greek religious texts⁵⁰). *Habitans, inhabitans* and *morans* also turn up sporadically in late Latin with the same sense⁵¹), though none leaves derivatives in Romance. In the *Vetus*

⁴⁴) Ed. K. Zeumer, *MGH, Form. Merowingici et Karolini Aevi* (Hannover 1886).

⁴⁵) See n. 44. ⁴⁶) See n. 44.

⁴⁷) Ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH, Epist. Merowingici et Karolini Aevi*, I (Berlin 1892).

⁴⁸) See O. Bloch-W. von Wartburg, *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Française*⁵ (Paris 1968), s. v.

⁴⁹) See Löfstedt, *Late Latin*, pp. 123f. For the meaning 'live', 'dwell' which *maneo* and also *moror* and its compounds developed in late Latin, see id. *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Uppsala 1911), p. 81.

⁵⁰) See above, n. 43.

⁵¹) For some examples of *habitans, morans* and *remorans*, see N. P. Sacks, *The Latinity of Dated Documents in the Portuguese Territory* (Philadelphia 1941), p. 137. For *inhabitans*, see, e. g. *Diploma* no. 33 of Lothar I and no. 30 of Lothar II (ed. T. Schieffer, *MGH, Diplomata Karolinorum*, III [Berlin-Zürich 1966]).

Latina, beside direct renditions such as *habitans* for *οικῶν*, we find *commorantium* for *τῶν ἐγγωγίων* at Gen. 34.1 (cf. Vulg. *incolarum*).

negotians: used in the *Vetus Latina* at Gen. 23.16 (where Jerome has *negotiator*) to translate an ordinary substantive (*ἐπιπόροις*), a fact which suggests that it may have been in use in vulgar Latin. This possibility is confirmed by certain Christian inscriptions of obviously vulgar provenance: *Inscript. Lat. Christ. Vet.*⁵²) 677 *Ballicus negotias*; 681 *hic requiescit in pace Petrus Alexandrinus negotias linatarius*; 2375 *negotias coiugi suae*; 3387 *viae Appiae multorum annorum negotias*; 3755A *Severinus negotias emit sivi locu* (note the vulgar loss of the nasal before *s* in all these passages). The word also occurs frequently elsewhere in late and Medieval Latin, often of a vulgar kind: e. g. Greg. *Hist. Franc.* 6.32 *domusque negutiantum circumiens*; 8.33 *virum inluminatum, tenente manu caereum et domus negutiantum ex ordine succedentem*; Cassiod. *Var.* 8.33.1 *facultates negotiantium hostili direptione saepe laceratas*; *Form. Andecavenses* 51 *negociens*; *Cartae Senonicae* 9 *ipse negotiens*; Alcuin⁵³) *Epist.* 7 *ut utrimque navigatio interdicta negotiantibus cessat*; *MGH, Diplomata Karolinorum*⁵⁴), I, 6 *omnes necuciantes*; ib. 43 *ad ipsos necuciantes*. As a term designating a lower-class activity, it presumably spread from the educated classes to the lower levels of society in much the same way as *discens*.

serviens: of considerable importance in Romance: e. g. Fr. *sergeant*, Sp. *sargento*, Pg. *sargente*⁵⁵).

The first substantival example of the word is at Cic. *Phil.* 10.20 *ea (vita) nulla est omnino servienti*, where Cicero is dealing with the loss of *libertas* which the Roman people had suffered. *Serviens* is obviously intended to be more general than *servus*; it is capable of designating freemen subjected to a tyrant as distinct from those who are technically slaves. Its general reference and freedom from the narrow associations of *servus* were later to be exploited fully.

At the court of the Gothic kings in Italy we find *servientes* used both of the subjects of the king (Cassiod. *Var.* 4.38.1 *cum omnes rei publicae nostrae partes aequabiliter desideremus augeri, crementa tamen fiscalium tributorum iustissimo sunt pensanda iudicio, quia servientium imminutio est huius illationis accessio*) and of various

⁵²) Ed. E. Diehl, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1925-1931).

⁵³) Ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH, Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, II (Berlin 1895).

⁵⁴) Ed. E. Mühlbacher (Hannover 1906).

⁵⁵) See Meyer-Lübke, o. c., 7873.

(free) officials (e. g. Cassiod. *Var.* 1.4.3 *ut honore magni nominis declararentur merita servientis*; 1.36.1 *utilitas personarum bonorum debet successione renovari, ne defectu servientium patiatu aliquod res suspensa dispendium*; 4.3.1 *ad ornatum palatii credimus pertinere aptas dignitatibus personas eligere, quia de claritate servientium crescit fama dominorum*). Cf. 'civil servants' in English.

But the word is also used in the late period of genuine slaves: e. g. *Marculfi Form.* 1.3 *de ingenuis aut de servientibus*; 2.3 *nisi tantum si aliquis ex servientibus nostris a iugum servitutis pro commune mercede relaxare voluerimus*; 2.27 *licentiam habeatis sicut ceteros servientes vestros disciplinam corporalem imponere*; *Form. Salicae Merkelianae*⁵⁶) 13a *si aliquis ex servientibus nostris et cui a iugo servitutis absolvimus*; *MGH, Diplomata Karolinorum I*, 52 *de ingenuos aut servientibus publicis*. In this sense it is particularly common in reference to the slaves of the Church and monasteries. These slaves could be ordained⁵⁷), but they retained their servile status and in surviving documents are habitually distinguished from *ingenui*. If they fled a monastery to take up another life, they were liable to be returned to their former owner (*Novellae* 5.2.3). See e. g. *Form. Bituricensis*⁵⁸) 8 *convenit ut omnes servientes ecclesiae nostrae decimare deberemus; quod ita et fecimus. ideo servo ecclesiae nostrae, quem, ut ait, 'confracto' esse cognoscimus, nomen illo a diae praesente ingenuo relaxamus; in ea ratione, ut ab hac diae sibi vivat, sibi agat sibi que laboret, fiat bene ingenuus, tamquam si ab ingenuos parentibus fuisset natus vel procreatus* (this passage clearly shows the servile status of *servientes ecclesiae* in the early Middle Ages⁵⁹); *MGH, Diplomata Karolinorum I*, 5 *tam de ingenuis quam de servientibus* (= *serviens ecclesiae*: cf. ib. 59 *homines ipsius monasterii, tam ingenuos quam et servientes*); ib. 67 *tam ad ingenuos quam et ad servientes seu accolas ipsius monasterii*; *Greg. Hist. Franc.* 10.16 *ut servientes monasterii publice hoc usitarent* (cf. ib. *ad sepulchrum beatae Radegundis fugientem servum monasterii sui occiderent*).

⁵⁶) See n. 44.

⁵⁷) See, e. g. L. Schiaparelli (ed.) *Codice Diplomatico Longobardo I* (Rome 1929), p. 88 *damus tibi atque firmamus in ti basilica Beati Sancti Prosperii martheris . . . cum omnibus ribus vel officiis ad ipsam ecclesiam pertinentibus* (a concession made to a *serviens* to reward his loyalty).

⁵⁸) See n. 44.

⁵⁹) For slaves employed by the Church, see further *Leg. Alamannorum* 17.2 (ed. K. A. Eckhardt, *MGH, Legum Sectio I*, V [Hannover 1966]). Cf. P. Allard, *Les Esclaves Chrétiens* (Paris 1876).

We can guess why *serviens* came into use alongside *servus* in application to slaves. As a general term suggesting no more than that the subject, whatever his status, was engaged in some form of service, it was a useful euphemism in the hands of those who were uneasy about the institution of slavery or wished to lessen the taint that it carried⁶⁰).

Later *serviens* and its Romance derivatives were naturally applied to servants of free status. The military sense (cf. Fr. *sergeant*) arose from the use of the word in reference to the servant of a *miles*⁶¹).

A passage which deserves special mention is Cael. Aurel. *Acut.* 1.9.64 *delirationes vero aegrotantum usu dextero atque artificio servientes accipere et tolerare debebunt*, which occurs in a medical work translated from the Greek of Soranus. It is possible that Caelius is rendering either *δοῦλος* or the participle of *δουλεύω*, but the meaning would be better if the sick were being tended by *θεραπεύοντες*, for *θεραπεύω* can mean 'look after' in either a general sense or in a more specific medical sense. But the word also has another, slightly different, meaning, 'do service to', 'serve'. Perhaps Caelius has misleadingly translated as if the latter meaning were predominant⁶²). For the notion that a medical practitioner should be prepared to endure anything, including delirious abuse, from his patients (roughly the implication that the passage would have if Soranus wrote *θεραπεύοντες* in the former sense), see Sen. *Dial.* 2.13.2 *hunc affectum adversus omnis habet sapiens, quem adversus aegros suos medicus, quorum nec obscena, si remedio egent, contrectare nec reliquias et effusa intueri dedignatur, nec per furorem saevientium excipere convicia*.

vians: this word displaces *viator* in the Romance languages⁶³). See, e. g., *Inscript. Christ. Lat. Vet.* 35.6 *usui publico et securitate vianantium admiranda propitio deo felicitate restituit*; Cassiod. *Var.* 2.32.3 *quod erit cunctis viantribus profuturum*.

⁶⁰) On Christian discussions of the morality of slavery, see H. Wallon, *Histoire de l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité*², III (Paris 1879), pp. 296ff.

⁶¹) See D. du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, VII, s. v.

⁶²) *Servio* is found in the sense 'treat' in the medical work of Theodorus Priscianus: 1.23 *vulneribus sollemni diligentia serviemus* (cf. 1.26 *vulneribus medeberis*); 2.3 *tunc adiutoris cibi et potus competentius serviemus*. Theodorus also wrote in Greek (see 1.1), and his work is full of Grecisms. In these passages he was probably influenced by *θεραπεύω*.

⁶³) See Meyer-Lübke, o. c., 9296.

**„pro nativo muro“
(Caes. b. G. 6, 10, 5)**

Die Konstruktion eines Vergleichs mit „pro“

Von HANS-JOACHIM HARTUNG, Hamburg

Wieviel Schutz bietet die *Bacenis silva*? Darauf antwortet ein mit der Präposition *pro* angelegter „Vergleich“: Von ausgesandten ubischen Spionen erfährt Caesar, der sich zur Durchführung einer Vergeltungsaktion gegen die Sueben auf der rechten Rheinseite aufhält (9, 5 ff.), die folgende geographische und militärische Situation:

(§ 5) *silvam ibi esse infinita magnitudine, quae appelletur Bacenis; hanc longe introrsus pertinere et pro nativo muro obiectam Cheruscos ab Suebis Suebosque a Cheruscis iniuriis incursionibusque prohibere: ad eius silvae initium Suebos adventum Romanorum exspectare constituisse*¹⁾.

Der Friede zwischen den beiden germanischen Stämmen wird durch die zwischen ihren Territorien gelegene *Bacenis silva* garantiert. Über diese *silva* wird in dem eben zitierten — textkritisch nirgends beanstandeten²⁾ — Satz allein durch die Wortverbindung *pro nativo muro* zweierlei gesagt. Die Doppelaussage ist durch die Funktion der Präposition *pro* ermöglicht:

Selbstverständlich ist die Verwendung der Präposition *pro* zur Anfügung einer stellvertretenden Person oder Sache (dt. Übersetzung i. d. Regel „statt“ oder „für“³⁾). Einsichtig sind die Bezeichnungen für Vertretungen im Amt, die nicht selten zu Kompositionsbildung mit der Präposition führten (z. B. *proconsul*). Daneben ebenso Vertretungen von Sachen, wie z. B. Caes. b. G. 1, 26, 3: *pro vallo carros obiecerant*⁴⁾: „statt“ hinter einem üblichen Schutzwall (spezifischen Materials und normierter Konstruktion) verschanzten sich die Gallier hinter zusammengerückten Wagen.

Was jeweils die vom Prädikat des Satzes direkt prädierte Person oder Sache (hier *carrī*) mit dem Stellvertretenen (hier *vallum*)

¹⁾ Text nach O. Seel, *Caesar, bellum Gallicum*, Teubner 1961.

²⁾ Vgl. die Ausgaben von A. Klotz, Teubner 1957, und O. Seel, Teubner 1961.

³⁾ Vgl. Kühner-Stegmann *Ausf. Gramm. der lat. Sprache* 2, 515β (zit. K.-St.); Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lat. Gramm.* 2, 270 § 151 (zit. L.-H.-Sz.).

⁴⁾ *ad multam noctem etiam ad impedimenta pugnatum est, propterea quod pro vallo carros obiecerant . . .*

verbindet — das *tertium comparationis* —, ist die Identität der Funktion⁵⁾. Nur in dieser einen Hinsicht tritt die Wagenreihe an die Stelle der Schanzmauer: sie erfüllt deren Aufgabe, vor den Angreifern zu schützen.

Neben dieser findet sich eine weitere, verwandte Verwendungsweise der Präposition, die eingangs vorsichtig als Konstruktion eines „Vergleichs“ bezeichnet wurde. An Textstellen dieser Art tritt neben die uneingeschränkt weiterbestehende Identität der Funktion als Verbindung zwischen der geschilderten Sache (oder Person) und der stellvertretenden in der Rolle des *tertium comparationis* eine hypothetische Identität in der Substanz⁶⁾. Dieses logische Bindeglied wird als semantische Komponente in der Sprachverwendung dominierend, da die Substanz einer Sache jeweils eher Beachtung findet als ihre Funktion⁷⁾. Das rechtfertigt die in den Grammatiken begegnende illustrierende Gleichsetzung dieser *pro*-Konstruktion mit einem durch *quasi* eingeleiteten Vergleichssatz, dessen Prädikat jedoch nur von einer Form der Kopula gebildet sein darf⁸⁾. Entgegen Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr⁹⁾ ist diese Verwendung der Präposition seit Plautus gut belegt; ein Beispiel aus Terenz (Ad. 48):

eduvi a parvulo; habui amavi pro meo;

⁵⁾ Unter diesem Aspekt, und nur dieser scheint mir hier möglich, ist die oben genannte Caesar-Stelle (b. G. 1, 26, 3) bei K.-St. (vgl. Anm. 3) neben anderen falsch eingereiht. Vgl. Meusel, Komm. z. St.; Meusel unterscheidet zwischen den beiden Nuancon dieser Konstruktion durch unterschiedliche Substitution der dt. Äquivalente „als“ bzw. „wie“. Vgl. Komm. zu b. G. 5, 7, 7 und b. civ. 2, 8, 1.

⁶⁾ Der Begriff „Substanz“ darf hier in Abgrenzung gegen den Begriff der „Funktion“ neben dem Material auch diejenigen — jedoch wesentlichen—Eigenschaften einer Person oder Sache mitumfassen, die sich in „ist“-Ausagen von ihr abgeben lassen.

⁷⁾ Hier liegt der Grund für die irreführende Kategorisierung bei K.-St. (vgl. Anm. 3): „So auch von einer bloß angenommenen Stellvertretung (= als, wie), wenn gesagt wird, daß einer (etwas) eigentlich nicht der (das) *ist*, wofür er (es) angesehen werden will oder soll.“ Dieser Satz sollte durch die Sperrung des Prädikats *ist* (von mir betont) pointiert und um folgenden Zusatz erweitert werden: ‚wobei die Funktion der identifizierten Person oder Sache ohne Einschränkung ausgefüllt wird‘.

⁸⁾ Vgl. K.-St. (s. Anm. 3); hier wird an zwei zitierten Stellen so verfahren (zu Cic. Sest. 116 und Val. M. 2, 7, 10). Zu *quasi* in dieser speziellen Verwendung vgl. K.-St. 2, 453, 6 („Vergleichung als eine bloße Annahme“). Neben *quasi* finden sich natürlich auch *tamquam si* oder (*vel*-) *ut si*.

⁹⁾ Vgl. 2, 271 b).

Micio, selbst ehe- und kinderlos (vgl. V. 43 ff.), hatte den Aischinus, den älteren Sohn seines Bruders Demea, adoptiert. Als dieser eines Nachts unerwartet lange ausbleibt, stellt Micio u. a. die oben zitierte Überlegung an („Ich habe ihn vom Säuglingsalter an aufgezogen; ich habe ihn behandelt und geliebt, als sei er mein eigener“). Die Funktion eines Sohnes (wenn das einmal so gesagt werden darf) hat Aischinus ständig erfüllt; das steht in dem Vers! Darüber hinaus ist deutlich die „hypothetische Identifikation in der Substanz“ mit einem nicht vorhandenen eigenen Sohn erkennbar¹⁰).

Zurück zur *Bacenis silva*: Ohne das Attribut *nativo* wäre die übrigbleibende Verbindung *pro muro obiectam* zweifellos ausschließlich als Vertretung in der Funktion aufzufassen (vergleichbar b. G. 1, 26, 3¹¹); die Frage, wie weit *obici* von einer *silva* ausgesagt werden kann, bleibt dabei unberührt); denn vom Schutz beider Stämme vor ihren Nachbarn spricht der Gesamtzusammenhang des Paragraphen. Durch das hinzugesetzte Attribut wird in der *pro*-Konstruktion neben der Funktion (die ausschließlich von *murus* getragen werden kann) gleichzeitig das Wesen (die „Substanz“) der *Bacenis silva* ins Blickfeld gerückt. Es hat den Anschein (hypothetische Identität), als ließen sich von ihr alle die „ist“-Aussagen machen, die auf einen echten *murus nativus* zutreffen (versuchsweise: sie ist ebenso unverrückbar, sie ist ebenso schwer überwindbar o. ä.).

Was ist nun ein *murus nativus*?

Zwei Stellen, an denen in militärisch strategischem Zusammenhang zwei im Gegensatz zum *murus extractus*¹²) durch die je-

¹⁰) Illustrierend im Sinne der Grammatiken ließe sich für *pro meo* unter Verzicht auf den ersten Aspekt (Funktions-Identität) einsetzen: *quasi meus esset*. Falsch jedoch ist die Klammer-Parallele bei K.-St.: *ut meum*. Der hier brachylogische Vergleichssatz läßt sich nur zu *ut meum amavi/amo* ergänzen; das ist jedoch durch die im Text gesetzten Voraussetzungen ausgeschlossen.

Ein vielleicht noch plastischeres Beispiel ist Cic. Sest. 116: *Ipse ille maxime ludius, . . . qui omnia sororis embolia novit, qui in coetum mulierum pro psalteria adducitur, . . .* Der stadtbekannteste junge Mann (sc. Clodius) wußte sich Zutritt zu der Damengesellschaft zu verschaffen indem er eine Funktion übernahm (die Zither zu spielen). Er hätte sein Ziel jedoch schwerlich erreicht, wenn er sich nicht auch angestrengt hätte, die „Substanz“ der psalteria darzustellen — nämlich die Gestalt einer Frau.

¹¹) Vgl. auch Liv. 30, 10, 5: *onerariarum quadruplicem ordinem pro muro adversus hostem opposuit*; dazu von Weißenborn-Müller zitiert: Appian (*Αιβνηκή* c. 24 § 101): *τά πλοία τοῖς κέρασι συνδῆσαι, ἵνα ἀντι τείχους ἦ*.

¹²) Vgl. zu *nativus* als relativem Begriff Lewis-Short s. v. II B.

weilige *loci natura* gegebene Hindernisse metaphorisch als *muri* bezeichnet werden, helfen die hier — soweit ich sehe — erstmals belegte Verbindung des Adjektivs *nativus* mit *murus* inhaltlich zu fixieren: 1. b. G. 7, 8, 3 berichtet Caesar, daß sich die gallischen Arverner hinter den Cevennen wie hinter einer Mauer vor römischen Angriffen geschützt fühlen (*quod se Cebenna ut muro munitos existimant*). 2. Cic. Phil. 5, 37 schildert der Redner das gewaltige Ausmaß der Raserei des Antonius in den Worten gipfelnd: *ut eius furorem ne Alpium quidem muro cohibere possemus*. Die Beobachtung, daß dieser metaphorische Gebrauch des Substantivs *murus* zunächst auf Gebirge beschränkt bleibt¹³), erlaubt den Schluß, daß an unserer Stelle kaum etwas anderes als ein Gebirge in *nativus murus* zu sehen ist.

Diese Vorstellung also hat der Anblick der *Bacenis silva* bei den ubischen Spionen evoziert.

Note sur un emploi de *fortuna* chez Virgile

Par PIERRE COLACLIDÈS, University of California, Irvine

Le vers XII, 920 de l'*Enéide* contient un emploi bizarre du mot *fortuna* dans la phrase *sortitus fortunam oculis* que Servius interprète en ces termes: *hunc locum oculis ad feriendum elegit Aeneas, quem fortuna destinaverat vulneri*. L'interprétation de Servius a été acceptée par un grand nombre de commentateurs modernes, à commencer par Heyne. D'autre part, il y a un accord général pour rattacher la phrase précitée de Virgile au vers XXII, 321 de l'*Iliade*:

εἰσορόων χροά καλόν, ὅπη εἴξειε μάλιστα

“cherchant des yeux, sur sa belle chair, où elle offrira le moins de résistance” (trad. P. Mazon). La belle chair dont il s'agit est celle d'Hector et l'endroit vulnérable est décrit aux vers 324–325:

*φαίνετο δ' ἧ κληῖδες ἀπ' ὤμων ἀχέν' ἔχουσι,
λαυκανίην, ἵνα τε ψυχῆς ὤμιστος ὀλεθροσ*

“un seul point se laisse voir, celui où la clavicule sépare l'épaule du cou, de la gorge; c'est là que la vie se laisse détruire au plus vite”

¹³) Vgl. Thes. L. L. 8, 1936–1966, 1687, 60ff.

weilige *loci natura* gegebene Hindernisse metaphorisch als *muri* bezeichnet werden, helfen die hier — soweit ich sehe — erstmals belegte Verbindung des Adjektivs *nativus* mit *murus* inhaltlich zu fixieren: 1. b. G. 7, 8, 3 berichtet Caesar, daß sich die gallischen Arverner hinter den Cevennen wie hinter einer Mauer vor römischen Angriffen geschützt fühlen (*quod se Cebenna ut muro munitos existimant*). 2. Cic. Phil. 5, 37 schildert der Redner das gewaltige Ausmaß der Raserei des Antonius in den Worten gipfelnd: *ut eius furorem ne Alpium quidem muro cohibere possemus*. Die Beobachtung, daß dieser metaphorische Gebrauch des Substantivs *murus* zunächst auf Gebirge beschränkt bleibt¹³), erlaubt den Schluß, daß an unserer Stelle kaum etwas anderes als ein Gebirge in *nativus murus* zu sehen ist.

Diese Vorstellung also hat der Anblick der *Bacenis silva* bei den ubischen Spionen evoziert.

Note sur un emploi de *fortuna* chez Virgile

Par PIERRE COLACLIDÈS, University of California, Irvine

Le vers XII, 920 de l'*Enéide* contient un emploi bizarre du mot *fortuna* dans la phrase *sortitus fortunam oculis* que Servius interprète en ces termes: *hunc locum oculis ad feriendum elegit Aeneas, quem fortuna destinaverat vulneri*. L'interprétation de Servius a été acceptée par un grand nombre de commentateurs modernes, à commencer par Heyne. D'autre part, il y a un accord général pour rattacher la phrase précitée de Virgile au vers XXII, 321 de l'*Iliade*:

εἰσορόων χροά καλόν, ὅπη εἴξειε μάλιστα

“cherchant des yeux, sur sa belle chair, où elle offrira le moins de résistance” (trad. P. Mazon). La belle chair dont il s'agit est celle d'Hector et l'endroit vulnérable est décrit aux vers 324–325:

*φαίνεται δ' ἧ κληῖδες ἀπ' ὤμων ἀχέν' ἔχουσι,
λαυκανίην, ἵνα τε ψυχῆς ὤμιστος ὀλεθρος*

“un seul point se laisse voir, celui où la clavicule sépare l'épaule du cou, de la gorge; c'est là que la vie se laisse détruire au plus vite”

¹³) Vgl. Thes. L. L. 8, 1936–1966, 1687, 60ff.

(trad. P. Mazon). Le sens de *ὅπη εἴξειε μάλιστα* est précisé par *ἴνα τε ψυχῆς ὤκιστος ὄλεθρος*.

Dans un passage analogue de l'*Iliade*, il est fait mention du même endroit vulnérable sur la chair de Teucros (VIII, 325-326):

..... παρ' ὤμων, ὅθι κληῖς ἀποέργει
ἀσχεῖνα τε στῆθος τε, μάλιστα δὲ καιρίον ἐστι

“le long de l'épaule, à l'endroit où la clavicule sépare du col la poitrine, là où un coup porte le mieux (trad. P. Mazon). Mais cette fois, *μάλιστα δὲ καιρίον ἐστι* tient la place de *ὅπη εἴξειε μάλιστα*.

C'est de ce *καιρίον* qu'il faut, croyons-nous, partir pour comprendre l'emploi de *fortuna* chez Virgile. L'adjectif *καιρίος*, employé chez Homère au neutre seulement et rien que dans l'*Iliade*, a un sens local et désigne “l'emplacement approprié, le bon endroit du corps en tant que son point vital”. Le sens local apparaît aussi dans le substantif *καιρός* (cf. *οὐ γὰρ εἰς καιρὸν τυπτεῖς* dans Euripide, *Andr.* 1120, où *καιρός* équivaut à *καιρίον* chez Homère et signifie “l'endroit critique, le point vital du corps”). Wilamowitz, qui avait déjà consacré à *καιρός* un article notoire dans le vol. 15 de *Hermes*, observait dans son *Sappho und Simonides*, Berlin, 1913, p. 247, n. 1: “*καιρός* ist nicht bloß in der Zeit das *καιρίον*; oder was ist *καιροῦ πέρα*, *καιρίος πληγή*, *καιροῦ σὺν ἀτρεκεῖ* . . .?”.

Le *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* par P. Chantraine pose comme sens fondamental de *καιρός* “le point juste qui touche au but”; le sens temporel “bon moment, bonne saison” n'en serait qu'un des sens dérivés. Vue sous cet angle, l'équation sémantique *tempus* = *καιρός* proposée par É. Benveniste, “Latin *tempus*”, in *Mélanges Ernout*, Paris, 1940, pp. 11-16, n'est valable que pour les acceptions temporelles de *καιρός*. Pour toute autre acception, l'emploi de *tempus* ne serait pas de mise; Virgile ne pouvait pas s'en servir pour rendre le *καιρίον* homérique en tant que “*locus corporis opportunus ad mortem inferendam*” (cf. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, s. v. *καιρίος*). Il a dû recourir à *fortuna*, au sens de “*locus quem fortuna destinaverat vulnere*” que lui attribue Servius dans le cas en question, en face d'un terme grec désignant “ce qui est à propos, avantageux, opportun”. On pourrait y voir mis en œuvre le procédé stylistique décrit par J. Marouzeau, *Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire*, Paris 1949, p. 113, qui consiste “à suggérer par l'énoncé de la notion abstraite l'être ou l'objet auquel elle s'applique: dans la langue des comiques, *odium* désigne une personne antipathique, *senium* un personnage

sénile; dans la langue de la galanterie, chez Catulle ou chez Ovide, *amor* et *desiderium* s'appliquent à l'objet aimé . . .". En outre, il est à noter que *καιρός*, au sens d'"occasion", se trouve joint à *τύχη* chez Platon, *Lois*, IV 709 b: *ὡς θεός μὲν πάντα, καὶ μετὰ θεοῦ τύχη καὶ καιρός, τὰνθρώπινα διακυβερνῶσι σύμπαντα.*

Il est certain que le sens local de *fortuna* dans la phrase *sortitus fortunam oculis* de l'*Enéide* ressort de ce contexte immédiat. Il est moins défendable, bien que non à exclure, au vers X, 422:

*da nunc, Thybri pater, ferro, quod missile libro,
fortunam atque viam duri per pectus Halaesi.*

Le mot *via*, interprété dans cet emploi par Donat comme *aditus plagae*, fait penser à la formule homérique *ὅπη εἴξειε μάλιστα* (= *ὅπου χωρήσειεν ἢ αἰχμῆ*, selon le commentateur ancien).

Imperfekt Passiv im Neugriechischen

Ein Vergleich zwischen normativer Grammatik und Alltagssprache in Athen, Kavala und Istanbul

Von HANS RUGE, Stockholm

Die Formenlehre der neugriechischen Dimotikí hat bekanntlich noch nicht dieselbe Festigkeit wie etwa die der romanischen Sprachen erreicht. Besonders deutlich scheint dies der Fall auf dem Gebiet des Imperfekt Passivs zu sein. Während die Personalendungen der übrigen Präteritalformen, d. h. des Aor. Akt. und Pass. und des Imperf. Akt., festgelegt sind — mit einziger Ausnahme der 3. Pers. Plur., wo die Ausgänge *-αν* und *-ανε* (*ἔδεσαν* — *δέσανε*, *δέθηκαν* — *δεθήκανε*, *ἔδεναν* — *δένανε*, *ἀγαπούσαν* — *ἀγαπούσανε*) miteinander konkurrieren, weist das Imperf. Pass. einen wahrhaften Dschungel von Formen auf.

Zunächst einmal muß auf die *Konjugationszugehörigkeit* Rücksicht genommen werden. Diese spielt bei den übrigen Präteritalformen fast gar keine Rolle — nur das Element *-ουσ-* im Imperf. Akt.¹⁾ ist konjugationsbedingt. Wieviel Konjugationen hat eigent-

¹⁾ Statt *-ουσ-* auch *-αγ-* bei der sog. *-ᾶς-*Gruppe (siehe unten): *ἀγαπούσα* oder *ἀγάπαγα*. Diese Variante ist jedoch auf gewisse Gegenden beschränkt.

sénile; dans la langue de la galanterie, chez Catulle ou chez Ovide, *amor et desiderium* s'appliquent à l'objet aimé . . .". En outre, il est à noter que *καιρός*, au sens d'"occasion", se trouve joint à *τύχη* chez Platon, *Lois*, IV 709 b: *ὡς θεός μὲν πάντα, καὶ μετὰ θεοῦ τύχη καὶ καιρός, τὰνθρώπινα διακυβερνῶσι σύμπαντα.*

Il est certain que le sens local de *fortuna* dans la phrase *sortitus fortunam oculis* de l'*Enéide* ressort de ce contexte immédiat. Il est moins défendable, bien que non à exclure, au vers X, 422:

*da nunc, Thybri pater, ferro, quod missile libro,
fortunam atque viam duri per pectus Halaesi.*

Le mot *via*, interprété dans cet emploi par Donat comme *aditus plagae*, fait penser à la formule homérique *ὅπη εἴξειε μάλιστα* (= *ὅπου χωρήσειεν ἡ αἰχμή*, selon le commentateur ancien).

Imperfekt Passiv im Neugriechischen

Ein Vergleich zwischen normativer Grammatik und Alltagssprache in Athen, Kavala und Istanbul

Von HANS RUGE, Stockholm

Die Formenlehre der neugriechischen Dimotikí hat bekanntlich noch nicht dieselbe Festigkeit wie etwa die der romanischen Sprachen erreicht. Besonders deutlich scheint dies der Fall auf dem Gebiet des Imperfekt Passivs zu sein. Während die Personalendungen der übrigen Präteritalformen, d. h. des Aor. Akt. und Pass. und des Imperf. Akt., festgelegt sind — mit einziger Ausnahme der 3. Pers. Plur., wo die Ausgänge *-αν* und *-ανε* (*ἔδεσαν* — *δέσανε*, *δέθηκαν* — *δεθήκανε*, *ἔδεναν* — *δένανε*, *ἀγαπούσαν* — *ἀγαπούσανε*) miteinander konkurrieren, weist das Imperf. Pass. einen wahrhaften Dschungel von Formen auf.

Zunächst einmal muß auf die *Konjugationszugehörigkeit* Rücksicht genommen werden. Diese spielt bei den übrigen Präteritalformen fast gar keine Rolle — nur das Element *-ουσ-* im Imperf. Akt.¹⁾ ist konjugationsbedingt. Wieviel Konjugationen hat eigent-

¹⁾ Statt *-ουσ-* auch *-αγ-* bei der sog. *-ᾶς-*Gruppe (siehe unten): *ἀγαπούσα* oder *ἀγάπαγα*. Diese Variante ist jedoch auf gewisse Gegenden beschränkt.

lich das neugriechische Verb? *Triandafyllidis*²⁾ rechnet mit zwei: 1. *δένω* — *δένομαι* und 2. *ἀγαπῶ*, *λαλῶ* — *ἀγαπιέμαι*, *θυμοῦμαι*, welche letztere er in zwei Klassen (*τάξεις*) einteilt: 1. *ἀγαπῶ* — *ἀγαπιέμαι* und 2. *λαλῶ* — *θυμοῦμαι*. Schließlich hat er eine Sonderkonjugation (*ἀρχαϊκὴ κλίση παθητικῆς φωνῆς*)³⁾ *στεροῦμαι*. (Von den neugr. *Contracta* kann hier abgesehen werden, da sich die Kontraktion nur auf das Präs. Akt. bezieht.) Das fehlende Gleichgewicht in der *Triandafyllidischen* Einteilung hat *Tzermias*⁴⁾ korrigiert, indem er als Klasse 2 der Konjugation 2 *λαλῶ* — *θυμοῦμαι* gegen *θεωρῶ* — *θεωροῦμαι* (wie *Triandafyllidis'* *στεροῦμαι*) austauscht und *λποῦμαι* (wie *Triandafyllidis'* *θυμοῦμαι*) eine 3. Klasse der zweiten Konjugation bilden läßt⁵⁾. *Babiniotis-Kondos*⁶⁾ haben wiederum eingesehen, daß man nicht so unproblematisch, wie es *Tzermias* in der 2. Klasse der 2. Konj. tut, Aktiv und Passiv zusammenstellen kann: viele Aktiva nach dem Typ *θεωρῶ* haben im Passiv eine Entsprechung auf *-ιέμαι* (wie *ἀγαπιέμαι*), z. B. *στενοχωρῶ* — *στενοχωριέμαι*⁷⁾. Das Vernünftigste wäre hier, glaube ich, die passiven Konjugationstypen völlig getrennt von den aktiven zu betrachten. Dies kann auch damit begründet werden, daß die passive Konjugationsweise im Neugr. nicht so sehr für Passivtransformationen aktiver Sätze verwendet wird — in der gesprochenen Sprache werden solche Sätze vermieden; statt *ἀγαπιέται* sagt man lieber *τὸν (τὴν, τὸ) ἀγαποῦν(ε)*. Es gibt Fälle, wo es sogar unmöglich ist, die passive Form als aus einem Aktivsatz transformiert zu verwenden: *πῶς φέρθηκε στὸ νοσοκομεῖο*; bedeutet nicht etwa „wie wurde er ins Krankenhaus geführt?“ (das würde *πῶς τὸν ἔφεραν στ. ν.* heißen), sondern „wie benahm er sich im Krankenhaus?“⁸⁾.

²⁾ [*M. Τριανταφυλλίδης*,] *Νεοελληνικὴ Γραμματικὴ (τῆς Δημοτικῆς)*. Ἐν Ἀθῆναις 1941 (*Ὄργανισμὸς Ἐκδόσεως Σχολικῶν Βιβλίων*). Dies ist die normative Grammatik der Dimotikí.

³⁾ S. 342.

⁴⁾ P. Tzermias, *Neugriechische Grammatik*. Bern und München 1969. Dies ist praktisch eine deutsche Übersetzung der *Triandafyllidischen* Grammatik (vgl. meine Besprechung in *Phonetica* 23, 1971, 126–128).

⁵⁾ S. 202–204.

⁶⁾ Γ. Μπαμπινιώτης & Π. Κοντός, *Συγχρονικὴ γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς νέας ἑλληνικῆς*. Ἀθῆναι 1967. Diese Grammatik baut auf der Hypothese, daß Dimotikí und Katharévousa dabei seien, zusammenzuschmelzen (vgl. meine Besprechung im *Kratylos* 12, 1967, 172–176).

⁷⁾ S. 156, 158.

⁸⁾ Vgl. *Triandafyllidis* S. 306 (unten), *Tzermias* S. 125 und I. P. Warburton, *On the Verb in Modern Greek*. Bloomington & The Hague 1970 (*Indiana University Publications. Language Science Monographs, Vol. 4*), S. 79ff.

Schließlich, und das ist in diesem Zusammenhang eine sehr wichtige Tatsache, gibt es eine Menge Verben, die nur entweder im Akt. oder im Pass. vorkommen (*μπορῶ*, *αἰσθάνομαι*) oder einen passiven Präsensstamm und aktiven Aoriststamm haben (*ἔρχομαι* — *ἦρθα*). Gerade das häufige Vorkommen sog. Deponentia — seit alters her — erklärt wohl die Lebendigkeit der passiven Konjugationsweise. Man vergleiche das Fehlen eines „synthetischen“ Passivs in den romanischen Sprachen. Vielleicht sollte man für das Neugr. den Terminus „Passiv“ meiden und ihn durch „Mediopassiv“ oder einfach „Medium“ ersetzen⁹⁾.

Obwohl auch *Wendt*¹⁰⁾ die mediopassive Konjugationsweise von der aktiven aus begründet, bringt er jedoch nomenklatorisch eine fortschrittliche pädagogische Neuerung. Mit der Endung der 2. Pers. Sing. als Kriterium teilt er die 2. Konjugation im Aktiv in eine *as-Gruppe* und eine *is-Gruppe* ein. Die *as-Gruppe* läßt er hinsichtlich des Passivs (der Passivbildung) in eine *jesε-* und *ase-Untergruppe* zerfallen. Schließlich ist von einer *ise-* Untergruppe die Rede. (Leider gibt *Wendt* keine klare Auskunft darüber, wie diese letztere „Untergruppe“ ins System hineinzufügen ist. Nur eine Tabelle deutet an, daß die *ise-* Untergruppe offenbar das passive Gegenstück zur *is-Gruppe* sein soll. Aber wieso dann *Untergruppe*, wenn die *is-Gruppe* nur *eine* passive Entsprechung hat? Was in der *Wendtschen* Aufstellung eben fehlt, ist der deutliche Hinweis, daß die *is-Gruppe* auch in zwei Untergruppen zerfällt, nämlich *ise-* und *jesε-*, vgl. das schon oben erwähnte *στενοχωρῶ* — *στενοχωριέμαι*.)

In Anbetracht der Selbständigkeit der mediopassiven Konjugationsweise würde ich, anschließend an *Wendt*, folgende Systematisierung der neugr. Konjugationen vorschlagen: 1. Konjugation (wie *Triandafyllidis*): Enthält eine aktive und eine mediopassive Gruppe. 2. Konjugation: Enthält fünf Gruppen, wovon zwei aktive und drei mediopassive.

Aktiv		Mediopassiv		
-ᾶς-Gruppe	-εῖς-Gruppe	-ιέσαι-Gruppe	-ᾶσαι-Gruppe	-εῖσαι-Gruppe
<i>ἀγαπῶ</i>	<i>λαλῶ</i>	<i>ἀγαπιέμαι</i>	<i>θνυμῶμαι</i>	<i>στεροῦμαι</i>
<i>ἀγαπᾶς</i>	<i>λαλεῖς</i>	<i>ἀγαπιέσαι</i>	<i>θνυμᾶσαι</i>	<i>στερεῖσαι</i>
usw.	usw.	usw.	usw.	usw.

⁹⁾ Tzermias sagt „Reflexiv-passiv“, Mirambel (A. Mirambel, *La langue grecque moderne*, Paris 1959) „Médio-passif“.

¹⁰⁾ H. F. *Wendt*, *Langenscheidts Praktisches Lehrbuch Neugriechisch*. 2. Auflage. Berlin, München, Zürich 1969, S. 88 ff.

Das Imperfekt der vier mediopassiven Konjugationsgruppen hat bei Triandafyllidis folgende Paradigmen:

1. Konjugation	2. Konjugation		
	-ιέσαι-Gruppe	-ᾶσαι-Gruppe	-εῖσαι-Gruppe
<i>δενόμουν</i>	<i>ἀγαπιόμουν</i>	<i>θυμόμουν</i>	<i>στερούμουν</i>
<i>δενόσουν</i>	<i>ἀγαπιόσουν</i>	<i>θυμόσουν</i>	<i>στερούσουν</i>
<i>δενόταν</i>	<i>ἀγαπιόταν</i>	<i>θυμόταν</i>	<i>στεροῦνταν</i>
<i>δενόμαστε</i>	<i>ἀγαπιόμαστε</i>	<i>θυμόμαστε</i>	<i>στερούμαστε</i>
<i>δενόσαστε</i>	<i>ἀγαπίσαστε</i>	<i>θυμόσαστε</i>	<i>στερούσαστε</i>
<i>δένονταν</i>	<i>ἀγαπιόνταν</i>	<i>θυμόνταν</i>	<i>στεροῦνταν</i>

Dies ist also die von Triandafyllidis anbefohlene *Norm*. Triandafyllidis selbst erlaubt jedoch folgende Abweichungen von den obigen Paradigmen:

1. *-μασταν* und *-σασταν* statt *-μαστε* und *-σαστε* „um das Imperfekt besser vom Präsens zu unterscheiden“. Besonders *-μασταν* sei „immer brauchbar und unentbehrlich“ (sic! — dann hätte es ja ins Paradigma aufgenommen werden können). Diese Formen würden besonders in den nördlichen Teilen Griechenlands häufig verwendet¹¹⁾.

2. Die 3. Pers. Sing. und Plur. auch mit angehängtem *-ε*: *δενότανε*, *δενότανε*¹²⁾. Ich bemerke, daß in diesem Fall die *-ᾶσαι*-Gruppe wie die 1. Konjugation aussieht.

3. Die 1. und 2. Pers. Sing. auch mit angehängtem *-α*: *δενόμουνα*, *δενόσουνα*¹¹⁾.

4. Die 1. und 2. Pers. Sing. auch mit *-ου-* statt *-ο-* in der Pänultima, wobei die 1. Konj. den Ton auf die Antepänultima verschiebt: *δένουμουν*, *δένουσουν* aber *ἀγαπιούμουν*, *ἀγαπιούσουν* und *θυμούμουν*, *θυμούσουν*¹¹⁾. (Die *εῖσαι*-Gruppe hat das *-ου-* sowieso.)

5. Die 3. Pers. Plur. in der 2. Konj. auch mit dem Ausgang *-οῦνταν* statt *-όνταν*: *ἀγαπιοῦνταν*, *θυμοῦνταν*¹³⁾. (Die *εῖσαι*-Gruppe hat sowieso *-οῦνταν*.)

6. In der 3. Pers. Sing. *δένονταν*, *ἀγαπιοῦνταν*, *θυμοῦνταν*¹¹⁾. Das bedeutet formale Identität zwischen Sing. und Plur. in der 3. Pers. (*στεροῦνταν* ist sowieso Einheitsform für Sing. und Plur.)

¹¹⁾ S. 325.

¹²⁾ S. 324f.

¹³⁾ S. 339, 340.

Um die Triandafyllidischen Regeln mit der „Wirklichkeit“, d. h. der gesprochenen Alltagssprache zu konfrontieren, habe ich eine Anzahl Sprachinterviews in Athen (25 Personen), Kavala (50 Personen) und Istanbul (100 Personen)¹⁴⁾ gemacht. Jede Person wurde um 20 Verbformen befragt, wobei alle vier mediopassiven Imperfekttypen vertreten waren: *έρχομαι, χασμουριέμαι, στεροῶμαι* und *θυμοῶμαι*. Auf die 2. Pers. Sing. wurde verzichtet, weil sie aus der 1. Pers. ablesbar ist: ein *έρχόμουν* repräsentiert auch *έρχόσουν, έρχόμωνα έρχόσουνα, στεροῶμουν στεροῶσουν* usw.

Ehe ich das Ergebnis vortrage, möchte ich ausdrücklich bemerken, daß die meisten Personen, wenn nicht alle, mehrere Varianten verwenden, die ihnen gleich natürlich erscheinen. Ich habe jedoch immer nur diejenige Form verzeichnet, die ihnen jeweils zuerst eingefallen ist. Nur eine Lenkung habe ich unternommen: wenn mir mit Katharévousa-Formen geantwortet wurde (etwa *ήρχόμην*) habe ich die Untersuchungsperson gefragt, ob sie solche Formen wirklich auch zu Hause in der Familie verwende. In einigen wenigen Fällen wurde trotzdem auf der Katharévousa-Form beharrt.

Einige Informanten ließen sporadisch augmentierte Formen hören. Dies wurde in den Tabellen nicht berücksichtigt.

Die folgenden Tabellen zeigen in %, wie häufig die Norm in der Umgangssprache vertreten ist. Dabei wird berücksichtigt sowohl die enge — paradigmatische — Norm wie auch die *erweiterte Norm*, d. h. paradigmatische Norm + die oben erwähnten von Triandafyllidis erlaubten Abweichungen. Hierzu ist zu bemerken, daß ich annehme, daß Triandafyllidis stillschweigend auch gewisse Kombinationen von Abweichungen erlaubt, nämlich 3 + 4, 2 + 6 und 2 + 5. Alles was nicht in die erweiterte Norm hineinpaßt, wird — mit Ausnahme gewisser Formen der 3. Pers. Plur. — unspezifiziert als „übrige Formen“ bezeichnet. Da hinsichtlich der Abweichungen 5 und 6 oben nichts über Formen wie *ἀγαπιόνταν* und *θυμόνταν* als 3. Pers. Sing. gesagt wird, führe ich diese unter den „übrigen Formen“ auf. Ferner ist (ebenda) nicht die Rede davon, daß *-όνταν* auch in der 1. Konjugation vorkäme. So habe ich in der Tabelle über die 3. Pers. Plur. die Felder für „1. Konj. — Abw. 5“ und „1. Konj. — Abw. 2 + 5“ als leer bezeichnet. Aus demselben

¹⁴⁾ Die Istanbuler Untersuchung wurde 1970 durch ein Stipendium des Schwedischen Forschungsinstituts zu Istanbul (Svenska Forskningsinstitutet i Istanbul), die Untersuchung in Kavala 1971 durch ein Stipendium der Schwedischen Tabaksaktiengesellschaft (Svenska Tobaks Aktiebolaget) ermöglicht.

Grund werden in der Tabelle über die 3. Pers. Sing. *ἐρχονται* und *ἐρχόταντε* zu den „übrigen Formen“ geführt. Leere Felder erscheinen auch bei der *-εῖσαι*-Gruppe, wo „Abweichungen“ mit paradigmatischen Formen identisch sind (*στερούμουν*[α], *στερούταν* [*στερούταντε*]), also gar keine Abweichungen sind. Unten in jeder Tabelle steht das Totalergebnis für alle Konjugationstypen zusammengenommen, *ausschließlich* der *-εῖσαι*-Gruppe, weil diese von den anderen Typen stark divergierende Zahlen aufweist.

Für Istanbul habe ich eine Sondergruppe von 25 Jugendlichen (bis 25 Jahre) berücksichtigt. (Dieselben Personen sind auch in dem gesamten Istanbulmaterial vertreten.) Zweck dieser Aussonderung ist es, zu prüfen, ob die Sprache der Jugendlichen eventuell einen näheren Anschluß an die normative Grammatik aufweist. Diese Hypothese begründet sich auf der Tatsache, daß 1. der griechische Schulunterricht in Istanbul von aus Griechenland entsandten Lehrern betrieben wird, und 2. Jugendliche überhaupt durch den Schulunterricht in nähere Berührung mit der normativen Grammatik kommen. (Dieses letztere Argument verliert natürlich an Gewicht dadurch, daß — genau wie in Griechenland — nur die *Katharévousa* als offizielle Norm angesehen wird.) Die Sondergruppe wird in den Tabellen als *Istanbul J* bezeichnet.

1. Pers. Sing.

	parad. Form	Abw. 3 -α	Abw. 4 -ου-	Abw. 3+4 -οἶμουςα	„erweiterte Norm“ total	übrige Formen
1. Konj.						
Athen	56	44	0	0	100	0
Kavala	44	56	0	0	100	0
Istanbul	25	46	0	28	99	1
Istanbul J	28	28	0	44	100	0
2. Konj. <i>-εῖσαι</i> -Gruppe						
Athen	44	56	0	0	100	0
Kavala	30	58	4	4	96	4
Istanbul	31	30	3	35	99	1
Istanbul J	44	16	4	36	100	0
2. Konj. <i>-εῖσαι</i> -Gruppe						
Athen	8	4	—	—	12	88
Kavala	22	10	—	—	32	68
Istanbul	13	28	—	—	41	59
Istanbul J	8	36	—	—	44	56

	parad. Form	Abw. 3 -α	Abw. 4 -ου-	Abw. 3+4 -όμενα	„erweiterte Norm“ total	übrige Formen
2. Konj. -ᾶσαι-Gruppe						
Athen	56	44	0	0	100	0
Kavala	36	52	6	4	98	2
Istanbul	23	33	3	39	98	2
Istanbul J	32	28	4	36	100	0
Alle Konjugationstypen insgesamt ausschließlich -εῖσαι-Gruppe						
Athen	52	48	0	0	100	0
Kavala	36,7	55,3	3,3	2,7	98	2
Istanbul	26,3	36,3	2	34	98,7	1,3
Istanbul J	34,7	24	2,7	38,7	100	0

1. Pers. Plur.

	parad. Form	Abw. 1 ζμάρτα	„erweiterte Norm“ total	übrige Formen
1. Konj.				
Athen	84	16	100	0
Kavala	2	94	96	4
Istanbul	3	58	61	39
Istanbul J	4	48	52	48
2. Konj. -εῖσαι-Gruppe				
Athen	72	28	100	0
Kavala	4	86	90	10
Istanbul	0	52	52	48
Istanbul J	0	48	48	52
2. Konj. -εῖσαι-Gruppe				
Athen	24	4	28	72
Kavala	2	32	34	66
Istanbul	0	21	21	79
Istanbul J	0	24	24	76
2. Konj. -ᾶσαι-Gruppe				
Athen	80	20	100	0
Kavala	2	86	88	12
Istanbul	1	41	42	58
Istanbul J	4	40	44	56
Alle Konjugationstypen insgesamt ausschließlich -εῖσαι-Gruppe				
Athen	78,7	21,3	100	0
Kavala	2,7	88,7	91,3	8,7
Istanbul	1,3	50,3	51,7	48,3
Istanbul J	2,7	45,3	48	52

2. Pers. Plur.

	parad. Form	Abw. 1 ἴσαοις	„erweiterte Norm“ total	übrige Formen
1. Konj.				
Athen	88	12	100	0
Kavala	12	88	100	0
Istanbul	5	53	56	44
Istanbul J	0	52	52	48
2. Konj. -ιέσαι-Gruppe				
Athen	88	12	100	0
Kavala	8	82	90	10
Istanbul	5	47	52	48
Istanbul J	4	48	52	48
2. Konj. -είσαι-Gruppe				
Athen	12	4	16	84
Kavala	0	28	28	72
Istanbul	0	23	23	77
Istanbul J	0	20	20	80
2. Konj. -ᾶσαι-Gruppe				
Athen	88	12	100	0
Kavala	6	82	88	12
Istanbul	3	40	43	57
Istanbul J	4	40	44	56
Alle Konjugationstypen insgesamt ausschließlich -είσαι-Gruppe				
Athen	88	12	100	0
Kavala	8,7	84	92,7	7,3
Istanbul	4,3	46,7	51	49
Istanbul J	2,7	46,7	49,3	50,7

3. Pers. Sing.

	parad. Form	Abw. 2 -ς	Abw. 6	Abw. 2+6	„erweiterte Norm“ total	übrige Formen
1. Konj.						
Athen	48	48	0	0	96	4
Kavala	38	50	2	4	94	6
Istanbul	21	28	0	15	64	36
Istanbul J	40	16	0	0	56	44

	parad. Form	Abw. 2 -ε	Abw. 6	Abw. 2+6	„erweiterte Norm“ total	übrige Formen
2. Konj. -ίσαι-Gruppe						
Athen	36	64	0	0	100	0
Kavala	36	46	0	6	88	12
Istanbul	20	25	4	25	74	26
Istanbul J	44	20	4	20	88	12
2. Konj. -εῖσαι-Gruppe						
Athen	0	0	—	—	0	100
Kavala	6	6	—	—	12	88
Istanbul	5	9	—	—	14	86
Istanbul J	4	20	—	—	24	76
2. Konj. -ᾶσαι-Gruppe						
Athen	44	52	0	0	96	4
Kavala	34	50	2	4	90	10
Istanbul	13	19	3	34	69	31
Istanbul J	28	20	4	32	84	12
Alle Konjugationstypen insgesamt ausschließlich -εῖσαι-Gruppe						
Athen	42,7	54,7	0	0	97,3	2,7
Kavala	36	48,7	1,3	4,7	90,7	9,3
Istanbul	18	24	2,3	24,7	69	31
Istanbul J	37,3	18,7	2,7	17,3	76	24

3. Pers. Plur.

	parad. Form	Abw. 2 -ε	Abw. 5	Abw. 2+5	„erweiterte Norm“ total	nicht-normative Formen: ἐτρούσαν ἐτραν[ε] übrige		
1. Konj.								
Athen	28	0	—	—	28	48	16	8
Kavala	16	14	—	—	30	18	44	8
Istanbul	4	19	—	—	23	8	32	37
Istanbul J	0	8	—	—	8	4	48	40
2. Konj. -ίσαι-Gruppe								
Athen	16	4	0	0	20	60	8	12
Kavala	8	8	4	4	24	14	60	2
Istanbul	11	14	0	19	44	15	26	15
Istanbul J	8	4	0	12	24	8	48	20

	parad. Form.	Abw. 2 -ε	Abw. 5	Abw. 2+5	„erweiterte Norm“ total	nicht-normative Formen:		
						ἐτρούσαν	ἐτρα[ε]	übrige
2. Konj. -εῖσαι-Gruppe								
Athen	8	0	—	—	8	12	0	80
Kavala	16	6	—	—	22	18	36	48
Istanbul	9	11	—	—	20	6	13	61
Istanbul J	0	20	—	—	20	8	20	52
2. Konj. -ᾶσαι-Gruppe								
Athen	8	4	8	0	20	60	8	12
Kavala	6	4	6	14	30	16	50	4
Istanbul	6	18	2	27	53	12	17	18
Istanbul J	4	8	4	32	48	4	32	16
Alle Konjugationstypen insgesamt ausschließlich -εῖσαι-Gruppe								
Athen	17,3	2,7	2,7	0	22,7	56	10,7	10,7
Kavala	10	8,7	3,3	6	28	16	51,3	4,7
Istanbul	7	17	0,7	15,3	40	11,7	25	23,3
Istanbul J	4	6,7	1,3	14,7	26,7	5,3	42,7	25,3

Zunächst fällt auf, wie wenig die -εῖσαι-Gruppe der Norm folgt. Hier erreichen überall die nicht-normativen Formen die Mehrheit. Man kann dabei zwei Haupttendenzen beobachten: *entweder* wird das Imperfekt der -εῖσαι-Gruppe wie das der -ιέσαι- oder -ᾶσαι-Gruppe konjugiert (*στεριόμουν*[a] bzw. *στερόμουν*[a]) *oder* es wird als in der Dimotikí nicht ausdrückbar betrachtet. Im letzteren Fall wird wiederum entweder 1. mit richtigen oder vermeintlichen¹⁵⁾ Katharévoussa-Formen geantwortet, oder 2. die Auskunft wird einfach verweigert: die Vokabel oder das Tempus wird vermieden.

Von der -εῖσαι-Gruppe einmal abgesehen, kann festgestellt werden, daß die *paradigmatische* Norm überall, d. h. an allen Orten, in allen Personen und in allen Konjugationstypen, recht schwach vertreten ist. (Ausnahme: 1. und 2. Pers. Plur. in Athen.) Die *erweiterte* Norm dagegen kann sich meistens großer Übereinstimmung mit der „Wirklichkeit“ erfreuen. In der 1. Pers. Sing. — und somit

¹⁵⁾ Ein Kuriosum ist dabei die öfters gehörte Form [ε]στερεῖσθε (oder [ε]στερεῖστο) für die 2. Pers. Plur. (statt ἐστερεῖσθε). Ich erkläre sie als Analogiebildung zum ἐστερεῖτο der 3. Pers. Sing.:

	3. Pers. Sing.	2. Pers. Plur.
Präsens (-e)	steríte	steríste
Imperfekt (-o)	(e)steríto	(e)sterísto

wohl auch in der nicht untersuchten 2. Pers. Sing. — ist sie an allen Orten etwa 100%ig. Die Abw. 3, Anfügung eines *-a*, ist sehr häufig (48—70,3%).

In der 1. und 2. Pers. Plur. ist die Übereinstimmung mit der erweiterten Norm in Athen 100%ig, in Kavala über 90%ig, aber in Istanbul nur etwa 50%ig. Auf die Eigenart der Istanbulformen komme ich unten S. 157 zurück. Daß die Formen auf *ἔμασταν* bzw. *ἔσασταν* tatsächlich nordgriechisch sind, wird durch meine Untersuchung bestätigt. Diese Formen bieten den Vorteil einer klaren Differenzierung des Imperfekts gegenüber dem Präsens, weil ja *ἔρχόμαστε* usw. auch Präsensform ist, und *ἔρχόσαστε* usw. es auch sein kann. Hierzu zwei Bemerkungen: 1. Die „undeutlichen“ paradigmatischen Formen sind in Kavala und Istanbul seltener als die tempusdifferenzierenden in Athen. Vielleicht ist das ein Anzeichen dafür, daß sich diese ursprünglich nordgriechischen Formen einmal auf das ganze griechischsprachige Gebiet verbreiten werden¹⁶⁾. 2. Die Form auf *ἔμασταν* ist überall häufiger als die auf *ἔσασταν*. In der 1. Pers. ist eben das Differenzierungsbedürfnis stärker, weil die Präsensform *nur ἔρχόμαστε* usw. heißen kann.

In der 3. Pers. Sing. ist die Übereinstimmung mit der erweiterten Norm recht groß, von 69% in Istanbul bis 97,3% in Athen. Wie

¹⁶⁾ Diese Hoffnung spricht Triandafyllidis als Schlußwort in seinem Artikel über das Augment im Neugr. aus (Glotta 25, 1936, 238–248). — Einige Athener, u. a. ein Journalist, behaupteten, daß sie diese Formen verwendeten, um die Vergangenheit klar auszudrücken, vgl. oben S. 145 Triandafyllidis' Worte „immer brauchbar und unentbehrlich“. Hinsichtlich jener Sprecher, die im Imperfekt beide Varianten *ἔμασταν* und *ἔμαστε* verwenden, könnte hier der Begriff der *Markiertheit* (siehe unten S. 156f.) appliziert werden: *ἔμασταν* ist markiert und *ἔμαστε* unmarkiert. Das markierte Glied signalisiert positiv „Präteritum“. Das unmarkierte Glied signalisiert bei aktualisierter Opposition negativ „Nicht-Präteritum“, sonst hat es die neutrale Funktion einer „Nicht-Signalisierung des Präteritums“. In der 2. Pers. Plur. ist jedoch durch die drei Formen *ἔρχεστε* (nur Präsens), *ἔρχόσαστε* (Imperfekt oder Präsens) und *ἔρχόσασταν* (nur Imperfekt) die Lage eine andere. Hier kann nur per analogiam von Markiertheit die Rede sein. Man könnte sagen, daß eine Tendenz zu einem „Miniparadigma“ vorliegt:

	Präsens	Imperfekt
1. Pers.	<i>ἔρχόμαστε</i>	<i>ἔρχόμασταν</i>
2. Pers.	<i>ἔρχόσαστε</i>	<i>ἔρχόσασταν</i>

wodurch die Differenzierung der Personen auf die Opposition μ/σ reduziert wird (vgl. *ἔμεις/ἔσεεις*), und die (aktualisierte) Tempusopposition durch *-ε/-αν* ausgedrückt wird.

bei der 1. Pers. Sing. das angefügte *-α* ist hier das angefügte *-ε* häufig vertreten (etwa 50 %). Die Verwendung der Form der 3. Pers. Plur. auch im Singular¹⁷⁾, also Abw. 6 (mit und ohne Abw. 2), erreicht in Istanbul eine Häufigkeit von 27 %. Hier erscheint eine Tendenz, deren wirklicher Umfang durch die Tabelle leider nicht klar zum Ausdruck gebracht wird. Sie besteht darin, die Pluralform der 3. Pers. als Einheitsform für Sing. und Plur. zu verwenden. Charakteristisch für die Pluralform ist das Element *-ντ* gegenüber dem *-τ*- der Singularform. Um also den wahren Umfang dieser Einheitstendenz zu messen, bedarf es eines Vergleiches der Häufigkeit sämtlicher *-τ*- und *-ντ*-Formen im Singular (über den Plural siehe weiter unten) einschließlich der „übrigen Formen“. Man erhält dann folgendes Bild:

	<i>-τ</i> -	<i>-ντ</i> -
Athen	97,3 %	2,7 %
Kavala	85,3 %	14,7 %
Istanbul	46,7 %	53,3 %
Istanbul J	59 %	41 %

Waren bisher in allen Personen die Übereinstimmungen zwischen „erweiterter Norm“ und „Wirklichkeit“ groß, ist es um so auffallender, wie wenig das der Fall in der 3. Pers. Plur. ist. Warum wird hier die normative Form gemieden und was wird an ihrer Stelle verwendet? Die Antwort auf die erstere Frage ergibt sich, wie ich meine, aus der Antwort auf die letztere. Deshalb habe ich gleich in der Tabelle eine Einteilung der verschiedenen nicht-normativen Formen gemacht. Daraus geht hervor, daß in Athen hauptsächlich Formen auf *-ντουσας* (*έρχόντουσας*, *χασμουριόντουσας*, *θυμόντουσας*) verwendet werden, in Kavala dagegen die Form der 3. Pers. Sing. In Istanbul ist auch diese letztere häufiger als die erstere, jedoch gibt es dort viele andere nicht-normative Formen, die sich nicht in diese beiden Kategorien einordnen lassen, siehe weiter unten über die Eigenart der Istanbulformen.

¹⁷⁾ Nämlich *έρχονταν* [*έρχόντανε*], *χασμουριούνταν* [*χασμουριούντανε*] und *θυμόνταν* [*θυμόντανε*]. (In der *-είσαι*-Gruppe ist ja ohnehin die Form auf *-ούνταν* [*-ούντανε*] Einheitsform für Sing. und Plur.) Wie ich schon oben S. 145 angemerkt habe, wird in der Triandafyllidisschen Abweichung Nr. 6 das Verwenden der *paradigmatischen* Pluralformen der *-είσαι*- und *-ᾶσαι*-Gruppe (*ἀγαπιούνταν* und *θυμόνταν*) nicht erwähnt.

Das Verwenden der Singularform für den Plural ist Ausdruck derselben Einheitstendenz, die schon oben hinsichtlich der 3. Pers. Sing. erwähnt wurde, wo es umgekehrt um das Verwenden der Pluralform im Singular ging. Es besteht also im neugr. Imperfekt Mediopassiv eine *Tendenz zur Aufhebung der formalen Unterscheidung zwischen Singular und Plural in der 3. Pers.* Sie manifestiert sich dadurch, daß die Elemente *-τ-* und *-ντ-* in diesen Verbformen¹⁸⁾ nicht mehr¹⁹⁾ in Opposition zueinander stehen, sondern als fakultative Varianten auftreten. So sind es z. B. unter den 100 Istanbuler Informanten nur 3, die konsequent *-τ-* im Sing. und *-ντ-* im Plur. verwenden! Dieselbe Person gebraucht manchmal eine Einheitsform (etwa *ἐρχότανε*), manchmal differenzierende Formen (etwa *χασμουριότανε* — *χασμουριόντανε*). Es kommt auch vor, daß eine Person etwa *ἐρχούντανε* im *Sing.* und *ἐρχότανε* im *Plur.* verwendet.

Das Verwenden der Formen auf *ιντουσαν*²⁰⁾ ist dagegen Ausdruck einer *Verstärkung der formalen Unterscheidung zwischen Sing. und Plur. in der 3. Pers.* Durch das Element *-ουσαν* kommt eine klare Pluralsignalisierung zustande. So kann der Gebrauch dieser Form gewissermaßen als eine Reaktion verstanden werden: eine Wiederherstellung der ursprünglich durch *-τ-/ντ-* ausgedrückten Numerusopposition. Es ist bezeichnend, daß mehrere meiner Informanten behaupteten, die Form auf *ιντουσαν* sei Katharévousa!²¹⁾

Nun ist es m. E. nicht notwendig (und auch historisch nicht richtig²²⁾), die Existenz der Form auf *ιντουσαν* von der Existenz der Einheitsform abhängig zu machen. Sie lassen sich besser beide

¹⁸⁾ Nur hier. In der Tat scheint aber auch anderswo die Opposition zwischen [t] und [nd] (oder [nd] oder [d]) schwach zu sein. Vgl. zu diesem Problem M. Setatos, *Phonological Problems of Modern Greek Koine*, Thessalonike 1969, 36ff.

¹⁹⁾ Die Erscheinung ist alt, vgl. die Beispiele für *-ντ-* im Singular bei G. N. Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1892, 60f.

²⁰⁾ Entstanden über *ινησαν* (Anfügung des aoristischen *-ησαν* an das imperfektive *-ντ[ο]*). Vgl. Hatzidakis ebenda Fußnote und den Artikel von Φ. Κουκουλές in *Glotta* 25, 1936, 159f.

²¹⁾ Das ist wohl psychologisch so zu verstehen: Dadurch daß die Katharévousa die offizielle Sprache in Griechenland ist, entsteht bei vielen Sprechern der (subjektive) Eindruck, daß diese Sprache deutlicher und exakter als die Dimotikí sei. Nun ist die (dimotische) Form auf *ιντουσαν* in bezug auf den Numerus deutlich und exakt. Also glauben manche, sie sei eigentlich Katharévousa.

²²⁾ Über ihren Ursprung siehe die Hinweise oben in Fußnote 20.

als selbständige Reaktionen gegen die normativen Formen erklären. Diese sehen im Paradigma bei Triandafyllidis etwa so aus

Sing.	Plur.
ἐρχόταν	ἐρχόνταν

Oft wird aber, wie oben erwähnt, ein *-ε* angefügt (wodurch im Plur. der 1. Konj. der Akzent verschoben wird)

ἐρχότανε	ἐρχόντανε
----------	-----------

Viele Griechen sprechen *-ντ-* auch im Wortinneren als [d]

ερχότανε	ερχότανε
----------	----------

Die Ähnlichkeit ist nun so irritierend groß, daß sie eine Spannung erzeugt, denn eine Opposition kann in dieser Form nur mit Mühe aufrechterhalten werden. Etwas muß geschehen. In Anbetracht der Tatsache, daß das Neugr. bei allen anderen Verbformen Singular und Plural in der 3. Pers. formal unterscheidet, ist es natürlich, es auch beim Imperfekt Mediopassiv zu tun: so wird die Form auf *ἔπρουνσαν* zur Hilfe genommen. Andererseits legt die phonetische Ähnlichkeit ein Aufgeben der Opposition nahe, so daß entweder *ἐρχότανε* oder *ἐρχόντανε* in beiden Numeri verwendet wird oder auch beide als fakultative Varianten. Es ist aber keineswegs selbstverständlich, daß phonetische Ähnlichkeit allein einfach zum Aufgeben einer Opposition führt — die Form auf *ἔπρουνσαν* zeigt, wie sich die Sprache dagegen wehrt. Trotzdem gibt es gewisse Anzeichen dafür, daß dem Aufgeben der formalen Unterscheidung tatsächlich ein *Aufgeben der funktionellen Unterscheidung* entspricht. Die Numerusdifferenzierung in der 3. Pers. Sing. des Verbs ist eigentlich eine Redundanz, weil der Numerus schon im Subjekt, in der „Nominalphrase“, liegt. Ich verweise zu diesem Thema auf meinen demnächst erscheinenden Artikel „Person und Numerus“²³⁾.

Die Einheitsformen haben übrigens ein Vorbild im Neugr. beim Imperfekt des unregelmäßigen (und häufigen) Verb *εἶμαι*: *ἦταν* [*ἦτανε*]. Daß auch im normativen Paradigma der *-εἶσαι*-Gruppe *στεροῦνταν* als Einheitsform gegeben wird, kann hier notiert werden, fällt aber weniger ins Gewicht, da dieses Paradigma so wenig befolgt wird. Es kann die Tendenz nicht fördern, sondern nur Symptom der Tendenz sein.

Oben S. 153 hatte ich für die 3. Pers. Sing. einen Häufigkeitsvergleich zwischen *sämtlichen* *-τ-* und *-ντ-* Formen angestellt, um das

²³⁾ Nicht in dieser Zeitschrift.

Eindringen des *-ντ-* in den Sing. zu beleuchten. Hier folgt nun eine entsprechende Übersicht über das *-τ-* im Plur. verglichen mit *ἔρχοντοσαν* und *-ντ-* (ohne *-οισαν*). So ersieht man (aus beiden Tabellen), daß in Athen die Differenzierungstendenz am stärksten ist, in Kavala und Istanbul dagegen die Einheitstendenz. Und die häufigste Einheitsform ist in Kavala die auf *-τ-*, in Istanbul die auf *-ντ-*. Bei der Gruppe Istanbul J schließlich scheinen *-τ-* und *-ντ-* Formen gleich häufig als Einheitsformen zu sein.

	<i>-ντ-</i>	<i>-τ-</i>	<i>ἔρχοντοσαν</i>
Athen	33,3 %	10,7 %	56 %
Kavala	32 %	52 %	16 %
Istanbul	63,3 %	25 %	11,7 % ³¹⁾
Istanbul J	52 %	42,7 %	5,3 %

Gibt es eine Erklärung, warum die Einheitsform in Istanbul und Kavala viel beliebter ist als in Athen? Könnte man sie vielleicht in der sprachlichen Interferenz (mit dem Türkischen) finden? Was Kavala betrifft, müßte man dann annehmen, daß das Ergebnis der Interferenz, die ab 1913 langsam aufhörte²⁴⁾, bis heute immer noch anhält. Im Türkischen kann nämlich dieselbe Verbform im Sing. und Plur. verwendet werden²⁵⁾.

<i>çocuk geliyordu</i>	<i>çocuklar geliyordu</i>
<i>τό παιδί ἐρχό[ν]τανε</i>	<i>τά παιδιά ἐρχό[ν]τανε</i>

Ob hier wirklich eine Interferenz vorliegt, kann wohl nicht bewiesen werden. Aber dieser Parallelismus, mag er auch zufällig sein, geht noch weiter. Denn, will man unbedingt den Plural auch in der Verbform hervorheben, gibt es die türkische Form *geliyorlardı*, dessen Gegenstück im Neogr. das differenzierende *ἐρχόντοσαν* ist.

So könnte das Verhältnis zwischen einerseits *ἐρχό[ν]τανε* und *geliyordu* und andererseits *ἐρχόντοσαν* und *geliyorlardı* als eine Relation *unmarkiert:markiert* verstanden werden. Das markierte Glied signalisiert positiv „Plural“. Das unmarkierte signalisiert bei

²⁴⁾ 1913 kam Kavala nach Griechenland, aber der türkische Bevölkerungsanteil verschwand erst 1923 durch den Lausanner Vertrag. Durch denselben Vertrag kamen wiederum zweisprachige Griechen oder nur Türkisch sprechende griechisch-orthodoxe Christen nach Nordgriechenland. (Außerdem gibt es im angrenzenden Westthrazien immer noch eine türkische Minorität.)

²⁵⁾ Das gilt allerdings für alle Tempora.

aktualisierter Opposition negativ „Nicht-Plural“, sonst hat es die neutrale Funktion einer „Nicht-Signalisierung des Plurals“²⁶⁾.

Im Istanbulgriechisch²⁷⁾ findet man beim Imperfekt Mediopassiv häufig Formen mit besonderen Eigenschaften, denen durch die Tabellen oben S. 147 ff. nicht immer Rechnung getragen wird. Daher erscheinen für Istanbul so viele „übrige Formen“ in den Tabellen. Eine dieser Sondereigenschaften ist der Ersatz des *-o-* durch *-ov-* in *allen* Personen und Konjugationen: nicht nur *έρχόμωνα* (Abw. 3 + 4) oder *χασμουριόντανε* (Abw. 2 + 5 oder 2 + 6), sondern auch z. B. *έρχόμασταν*, *χασμουριούσσασταν*, *έρχόντανε*. Hier ist also eine freie Variation zwischen [o] und [u] konsequent durchgeführt, die durch die „Abweichungen“ nur teilweise erlaubt wird. Vgl. hierzu auch die sogar ins Paradigma aufgenommenen Variationen *δένομε* ~ *δένουμε*²⁸⁾ und die geduldeten Variationen *δένομαι* ~ *δένομαι* und *δένονται* ~ *δένοννται*²⁹⁾. Außerhalb der Verbformen findet man auch sonst im Gemeinneugriechischen Belege für sowohl die synchronische Variation *o* ~ *u* wie die diachronische Entwicklung *o* > *u*³⁰⁾.

Eine andere besondere Erscheinung unter den Istanbulformen ist, daß — wie in den übrigen Personen — häufig (um 30 %) auch in der 1. und 2. Pers. Plur. ein *-ε* angehängt³¹⁾ wird: z. B. *έρχόμαστανε*, *χασμουριούσσαστανε*. Dieser Verstoß gegen die gemeinneugriechischen Akzentregeln ist auch aus anderen Dialekten be-

²⁶⁾ Zum Begriff der Markiertheit verweise ich auf R. Jakobson, Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums (in *Charisteria Guilelmo Mathesio quinquagenario a discipulis et circuli linguistici Pragonsis sodalibus oblata*. Pragae 1932. S. 74–84).

²⁷⁾ Die griechische Minorität in Istanbul (Eigenbezeichnung: *Ρομιοί*) bestand zum Zeitpunkt der Untersuchung (Herbst 1970) nur noch aus etwa 18000 Personen. Aber da diese sich ihrer ethnischen Eigenart sehr bewußt sind und es ihnen immer noch möglich ist, eigene Schulen und Kirchen aufrechtzuerhalten, können sie als zuverlässige Informanten der neugr. Sprache gelten. Ihre Sprache ist nicht so sehr als regionaler Dialekt, sondern eher als eine Großstadt-Koine anzusehen, eine Erinnerung an die nicht allzu ferne Zeit, als Konstantinopel noch eins der wichtigsten Zentren der *ρωμοσύνη*, der Neogräzität, war (bis 1923). Der *Vorteil*, den die Istanbul-Griechen bei einer Sprachuntersuchung wie dieser bieten, besteht in ihrer Zweisprachigkeit: man kann ihnen türkische Sätze zur Direktübersetzung vorlegen und so in bequemer Weise erfahren, welche Formen ihnen zuerst einfallen. Vgl. oben S. 156 über das Verwenden mehrerer Varianten.

²⁸⁾ Triandafyllidis S. 326.

²⁹⁾ Triandafyllidis S. 337.

³⁰⁾ Synchronisch z. B. *άπάνω* ~ *άπάνον*. Diachronisch z. B. *πωλώ* > *πουλώ*.

³¹⁾ Nämlich an Formen auf *ιμασταν* und *ισασταν*. Die auf *ιμαστε* und *ισαστε* sind ja, wie gezeigt wurde, in Istanbul selten.

kannt³²⁾. Ferner erscheinen in der 3. Pers. Plur.³³⁾ Formen auf *ῥταναν* und *ῥτανανε* (2,7 bzw. 8,7%). Die erstere läßt sich als Analogiebildung nach *ῥμασταν* und *ῥσασταν* erklären, die letztere durch Fortsetzung der Analogie: *ῥμασταν[ε]*, *ῥσασταν[ε]*, *ῥταναν[ε]*.

Die oben S. 147 aufgestellte Hypothese hinsichtlich der Sondergruppe Istanbul J konnte nicht im positiven Sinne bestätigt werden. Die Übereinstimmung zwischen dieser und der Gesamtgruppe Istanbul ist, im Gegenteil, groß. Nur beim Gebrauch der „Einheitsform“ der 3. Pers. läßt sich bei den Jugendlichen eine größere Neigung zur *-τ*-Form beobachten, als es bei der Gesamtgruppe der Fall ist.

Zum Schluß werde ich zeigen, wie man aus dem gemachten Vergleich zwischen Alltagssprache und normativer Grammatik einige Richtlinien für eine Reduzierung des in der Einleitung erwähnten „Formendschungsels“ herausfinden kann.

Zunächst kann das Imperfektparadigma der *-εῖσαι*-Gruppe eliminiert werden. Wie oben S. 151 erwähnt, wird es sehr wenig befolgt, sondern häufig durch das der *-ιέσαι*- oder der *-ᾶσαι*-Gruppe ersetzt.

Ferner könnte das Paradigma der *-ᾶσαι*-Gruppe im Imperfekt ausscheiden, da es sich nur durch den Akzent in der 3. Pers. Plur. von dem Paradigma der 1. Konj. unterscheidet. Denn dieser Unterschied wird in der Praxis auf dreierlei Art beseitigt: durch Anhängen eines *-ε* an die normative Form, durch Verwendung der Singularform auf *-όταν[ε]* oder der Form auf *-ότρουσαν*. In Athen wird die normative Form auf diese Weise insgesamt zu 69,3% ersetzt, in Kavala zu 76%.

So blieben im Imperfekt Mediopassiv nur zwei Konjugationstypen, einer ohne und einer mit dem Element *-ι*. Man vergleiche das *-ουσ-* im aktiven Imperfekt. Dieses wird jedoch bei *allen* Verben der 2. Konj. eingeschoben. Ein noch wichtigerer Unterschied besteht darin, daß das *-ουσ-* nur im Imperfekt erscheint, also auch als Präteritummerkmale betrachtet werden kann, während das *-ι* schon im Präsens vorhanden ist³⁴⁾. Das *-ι* kann folglich als zum

³²⁾ Siehe z. B. Hatzidakis op. cit. 425.

³³⁾ Durch die oben S. 154 beschriebene Einheitstendenz auch im Sing.

³⁴⁾ Daß dies eigentlich nur für die *-ιέσαι*-Gruppe gilt, ändert nichts an der Behauptung. Insofern die Verben der *-εῖσαι*-Gruppe im Imperfekt dem Paradigma der *-ιέσαι*-Gruppe folgen, handelt es sich um eine Analogie, die durch ein „zugrundeliegendes“ Präsens auf *-ιέσαι* bewirkt wird. Man vergleiche: *ἀγνίσκω* ist das übliche Imperfekt von *ἀγνίσκειν*, das aber auch die heute noch nicht so übliche Nebenform *ἀγνίμηναι* hat.

Präsensstamm³⁵⁾ gehörig betrachtet werden. Hieraus ergibt sich nun, daß es in Wirklichkeit nur *einen einzigen Konjugationstyp* im Imperfekt Mediopassiv gibt:

Präsensstamm + *όμων*[*a*]
usw.

Innerhalb dieses einzigen Typs gibt es sodann folgende Variationen:

1. Die euphonische Anfügung eines Vokals (-*a* bzw. -*ε*) in allen Personen außer der 1. und der 2. Plur. (in Istanbul auch in diesen, entgegen den gemeinneugriechischen Akzentregeln). Dadurch wird der zwar erlaubte, aber nicht beliebte Wortausgang auf -*n* vermieden³⁶⁾.

2. Entweder Neutralisation oder Markierung der Numerusopposition in der 3. Pers. Dabei scheint die Neutralisation häufiger in Nordgriechenland zu sein, die Markierung dagegen in Athen.

3. Markierung der Tempusopposition (Präteritum/Nicht-Präteritum) auch in der 1. und 2. Pers. Plur. Dies ist allgemein üblich in Nordgriechenland und kann vielleicht das ganze neugriechische Sprachgebiet erobern.

³⁵⁾ Gegensatz: Aoriststamm.

³⁶⁾ Vgl. Mirambel op. cit. 54.

Klassische Altertumswissenschaft

RENATA VON SCHELIHA GEDENKBUCH

Mit Beiträgen von u.a.:

Momme Mommsen, Marianne von Heereman, Vera Lachmann, Erd Wallace, Marianne Stern, Wolfgang Frommel, Renata von Scheliha.

Renata von Scheliha (1901-1967), die 1939 Deutschland freiwillig verließ, ist durch wissenschaftliche Publikationen über Homer und Plato, mit denen sie zu Lebzeiten an die Öffentlichkeit trat, der internationalen Altertumswissenschaft wohl bekannt.

176 S. DM 30,—

Bereits erschienen:

Renata von Scheliha:

FREIHEIT UND FREUNDSCHAFT IN HELLAS

Sechs Basler Vorträge

Inhalt: Humanität - Politische Freiheit - Geistige Freiheit - Griechische Freundschaft - Interpretation der XIV. Olympischen Ode von Pindar - Interpretation von Pythia 1 von Pindar.

„Ein wohlthuend integriertes Buch, entstanden aus gründlicher Fachkenntnis bei hoher Einsicht in die politische wie private Gesinnung antiker Menschen.“

The Classical World

140 S. Büttenpappband. DM 22,50

Renata von Scheliha:

DER PHILOKTET DES SOPHOKLES

„Einer großen Frau, Renata von Scheliha, verdanken wir neue Einblicke in das Wesen der hellenischen Menschlichkeit.“

Hellenika

104 S. Büttenpappband. DM 22,50

Glotta 51, Heft 1/2

Thuri Lorenz:

LEBEN UND REGIERUNG TRAJANS AUF DEM BOGEN VON BENEVENT

Am Bogen des Trajan in Benevent läßt sich über die Aussage der einzelnen Reliefs hinaus ein politisches Programm feststellen. Biographischer Bericht und Regierungsprogramm wurden in der bisherigen Forschung gegeneinander gestellt; sie sind aber, da es sich hier um die Personalisierung politischer Zielsetzungen handelt, nicht zu trennen.

In der Vita eines Kaisers konnten politische Inhalte vermittelt werden: in der Darstellung eines öffentlichen Auftritts konnten Tendenzen thematisiert und Legendenbildung gesteuert werden.

Solche propagandistischen Mittel weist der Verfasser am Bogen von Benevent nach; er stützt sich dabei auf die für Trajan gehaltene Dankesrede des jüngeren Plinius und auf die Kaiserviten Suetons. So gelingt es ihm, einen zusammenhängenden Text sichtbar zu machen, der von unten nach oben und von außen nach innen zu lesen ist.

64 S. 14 Tafeln. DM 30,—

CASTRVM PEREGRINI  PRESSE

AMSTERDAM . POSTBOX 645

Carlo Tagliavini Einführung in die romanische Philologie

1973. 550 Seiten und 8 Kunstdrucktafeln. Leinen DM 84.-
Subskriptionspreis bis zum Erscheinen DM 75.-
(Handbücher für das Studium der Romanistik)

Carlo Tagliavinis Werk, in der Originalausgabe (Le origini delle lingue neolatine) bereits in sieben Auflagen und zahlreichen Neudrucken verbreitet, gehört zu den bedeutenden Lehr- und Handbüchern auf dem Gebiet der romanischen Philologie. Mit der vorliegenden Übersetzung wird das Buch auch dem deutschen Publikum zugänglich gemacht; ihr liegt die letzte Auflage (1972) zugrunde.

«Der derzeitige Stand der Forschung ist am umfassendsten und am eindrucksvollsten in dem Buch von Carlo Tagliavini (Le origini delle lingue neolatine) dargestellt: dieses Buch, das alle romanischen Sprachen (mit Einschluß der ältesten literarischen Texte) in der Vielheit und Sonderheit ihrer wichtigsten wissenschaftlichen Probleme in einer bewunderungswerten Vollständigkeit berücksichtigt, verbindet systematische Darstellung mit vorzüglicher bibliographischer Orientierung. In der Zuverlässigkeit der sorgfältig abgewogenen kritischen Urteile und in der hervorragenden methodischen und illustrativen Präsentation des behandelten Stoffes darf dieses Buch heute als die reichste und anregendste Einführung in die romanische Sprachwissenschaft bezeichnet werden.» *Gerhard Rohlf*s (über die italienische Ausgabe)

C.H.Beck

ADOLF GREIFENHAGEN

NEUE FRAGMENTE DES KLEOPHRADESMALERS

(Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften
Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 4. Abhandlung)

1972. 50 S. 32 Tafeln. DM 32.—

Aus Fragmenten, die im Kunsthandel bekannt wurden, lassen sich zwei Vasen des Kleophradesmalers wiedergewinnen; der obere Teil einer Spitzamphora und der mit vier figürlichen Friesen bemalte Hals eines Volutenkraters. Einem Überblick über die Frühwerke des Malers (um 500-490 v. Chr.) folgt die ausführliche Veröffentlichung der beiden neu gewonnenen Gefäße, wobei die Fragmente des Volutenkraters als *disiecta membra* mit Campana-Fragmenten im Louvre vereinigt werden. Die attischen Jünglinge beim Minotaurosabenteuer auf der Spitzamphora zeigen aufs trefflichste die „vornehme Erscheinung der Einzelfigur“ und „den Charakter einer einfachen Größe“, die dem Stil dieses Malers eigen sind. An den Bildfriesen des Kraters bemerkt man eine wohlüberlegte Dreiteilung der Komposition und die ungewöhnliche Zusammenstellung mehrerer Heraklestaten, dabei den Hesperidengarten mit Atlas.

Es folgt ein Hinweis auf die als Ostraka verwendeten Scherben von Gefäßen des Kleophradesmalers mit Namen historisch bekannter Persönlichkeiten (Megakles, Themistokles). Kurz behandelt werden einige Spätwerke des Kleophradesmalers, ein Glockenkrater in Basel mit Hermes und kelterndem Silen, sowie ein Stamnos der Sammlung Astarita, ergänzt durch ein Fragment aus Privatbesitz.

CARL WINTER · UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG · HEIDELBERG

Glotta 51, Hef. 1/2

ARCHAEOLOGIA HOMERICA

Die Denkmäler und das frühgriechische Epos. Im Auftrage des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Herausgegeben von Friedrich Matz und Hans-Günter Buchholz

Das Werk ist auf 3 Bände (22 Lieferungen) berechnet.

Inzwischen liegen folgende Lieferungen vor:

- A/B** SPYRIDON MARINATOS / KLEIDUNG (A)
HAAR- UND BARTTRACHT (B)
1967. Zus. 114 S. m. 27 Textabb. u. 12 Kunstdrucktaf. Subskr. 24,— DM, einz. kart. 27,— DM
- C** ERWIN BIELEFELD / SCHMUCK
1968. 70 S. m. 8 Textabb., 1 Farbtaf. u. 5 S. Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 15,— DM, einz. kart. 18,— DM
- F** JOSEPH WIESNER / FAHREN — REITEN
1968. 144 S. m. 25 Textabb. u. 6 S. Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 31,— DM, einz. kart. 35,— DM
- H** WILL RICHTER / DIE LANDWIRTSCHAFT
IM HOMERISCHEN ZEITALTER
Mit einem Beitrag: Landwirtschaftliche Geräte von Wolfgang Schiering
1968. 162 S. m. 9 Textabb. u. 4 S. Kunstdrucktaf. Subskr. 31,— DM, einz. kart. 35,— DM
- I** HANS-GÜNTER BUCHHOLZ — GERHARD JÖHRENS —
IRMGARD MAULL / JAGD UND FISCHFANG
Mit einem Anhang: Wild-Honiggewinnung. Erscheint Sommer 1973.
- K** ROBERT JAMES FORBES / BERGBAU, STEINBRUCHTÄTIGKEIT
UND HÜTTENWESEN
1967. 43 S. m. 16 Textabb., Subskr. 8,50 DM, einz. kart. 9,80 DM
- O** HEINRICH DRERUP / GRIECHISCHE BAUKUNST
IN GEOMETRISCHER ZEIT
1969. 136 S. m. 59 Textabb. u. 8 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 28,— DM, einz. kart. 32,— DM
- P** SIEGFRIED LASER / HAUSRAT
Mit Anhang I: Beleuchtungsgerät von Ulf Jantzen und Renate Tölle und Anhang II: Die Elfenbeinthrone von Salamis, Zypern von Vassos Karageorghis
1968. 106 S. m. 17 Textabb. u. 8 S. Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 22,— DM, einz. kart. 25,— DM
- Q** GERDA BRUNS / KÜCHENWESEN — MAHLZEITEN
1970. 69 S. m. 13 Textabb., 4 S. Titelei u. 8 Kunstdrucktaf. Subskr. 19,80 DM, einz. kart. 22,— DM
- U** MAX WEGNER / MUSIK UND TANZ
1968. 85 S. m. 4 Textabb. u. 6 S. Kunstdr., Subskr. 18,— DM, einz. kart. 21,— DM
- W** MANOLIS ANDRONIKOS / TOTENKULT
1968. 140 S. m. 11 Textabb. u. 12 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 28,— DM, einz. kart. 32,— DM

In Vorbereitung: G Dorothea Gray: Seewesen / V Emily Townsend-Vermeule: Götterkult

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen und Zürich
