

# GLOTTA

Zeitschrift für  
griechische und lateinische Sprache

Herausgegeben von  
Klaus Nickau und Klaus Strunk

LXX. Band · 1.–2. Heft · 1992

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

M. Meier-Brügger, Mykenisch <i>te-u-to</i> = <i>Stéutōr</i> ? . . . . .	1
J. Chadwick, The Thessalian Accent . . . . .	2
A. Lillo, Zu griechisch <i>τίπτε</i> . . . . .	15
W. F. Wyatt, Homeric Hiatus . . . . .	20
J. Cotter, The Etymology and Earliest Significance of <i>εῖπων</i> . . .	31
M. W. Haslam, On <i>ἄλθος</i> etc. . . . .	35
I. Sluiter, Causal <i>ἵνα</i> – Sound Greek . . . . .	39
R. Führer, Archilochos fr. 5,3 W. . . . .	54
A. Mojena, The Behavior of Prespositives in Theocritus' Hexameter	55
R. Führer, Pseudo -Phokylides Vers 127 . . . . .	61
R. J. Durling, The Language of Galenic Pharmacy . . . . .	62
E. Livrea, Esichio e la Visione di Dorotheos . . . . .	71
E. P. Hamp, focus . . . . .	82
R. Heine, Vorfahren und Nachkommen . . . . .	83
H. Beikircher, Zur Etymologie und Bedeutungsentwicklung von <i>praestare</i> . . . . .	88
J.-P. Wild, Colorator . . . . .	96
M. R. Mezzabotta, The meaning of <i>spica</i> in Cato Agr. 70,1 . . . . .	100
U. Dubielzig Monacensis Segimero Doepp et Andreae Patzer suis quondam praeceptoribus s.p.d. . . . .	106
Th. Lindner, Vlat. <i>dolus</i> ‚Leid‘ und das Konzept der Gelenkheteroklistie . . . . .	108

---

Manuskriptsendungen werden nur nach vorheriger Anfrage mit kurzer Zusammenfassung des Inhalts an folgende Anschriften erbeten: Prof. Dr. Klaus Nickau, Seminar f. Klass. Philologie, Humboldtallee 19, 3400 Göttingen / Prof. Dr. Klaus Strunk, Institut für Allgemeine u. Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft der Univ. München, Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1, 8000 München 22. Die Zusammenfassungen werden mit den Beiträgen veröffentlicht und sollten nicht mehr als etwa 75–100 Wörter umfassen. Manuskripte müssen die deutlich lesbare Privatadresse des Verfassers tragen.

---

Diese Zeitschrift und alle in ihr enthaltenen einzelnen Beiträge und Abbildungen sind urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes bedarf der Zustimmung des Verlages. Abbestellungen können nur berücksichtigt werden, wenn sie innerhalb 8 Wochen nach Ausgabe des Schlußheftes eines Bandes beim Verlag vorliegen.

Verlag: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, 3400 Göttingen. Zweigstelle Schweiz: Steinacker Str. 11, CH-8302 Kloten/ZH. – Druckerei: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

---

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft

ISSN 0017–1298

## Mykenisch *te-u-to* = *Stéytōr*?

Von MICHAEL MEIER-BRÜGGER, Hamburg

Episch-poetisches *στεῦτο/στεῦται* (u. a. Homer, Aischylos, Apollonios Rhodios) „feierlich verkünden, versprechen, drohen“ ist längst als uraltes Erbwort erkannt und mit indoiran. *stay-* „preisen“ (rigved. *stáve* u. a. m., avest. *staota* u. a. m.) zusammengestellt, vgl. die Angaben bei P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque II* (1977) p. 1054 und bei M. Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen III* (1976) p. 519 ff. Das fragliche Verbum ist innerhalb des alphabetisch belegten Griechisch des 1. Jt. v. isoliert. Es fragt sich daher, ob die myken. Texte des 2. Jt. v. nicht weitere verbale oder nominale Belege enthalten. Ich vermute einen solchen im Personennamen *te-u-to* (PY Jn 601.3 und 693.6 zusammen mit weiteren Namen, unsicher KN Xd 292 *te-u-to-ri-\**65[]). O. Landau erwähnt in seinem Buch von 1958 über die myken.-griech. Personennamen p. 136 als mögliche Verknüpfungen von *te-u-to* späteres *Teur-* (bei Homer *Teυταμίδης* „Sohn des *Teύταμος*, vgl. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire II* p. 1111), *teūthos* „Tintenfischart“ (Chantraine a. O. p. 1110 s. v. *teυθίς*) und *στεῦτο*. Die myken. Schreibregeln lassen eine Interpretation sowohl als *Téyτος*, als *Téy<sup>h</sup>tos*, als auch als *Stéytōr* zu. Landau entscheidet sich a. O. für *Téyτος* („illyrisierend“ auch P. H. Ilievski in *ZAnt* 25, 1975, p. 416 f.), O. Masson für *Téy<sup>h</sup>tos* (*Minos* 12, 1972, p. 290 f.). Vom uridg. Standpunkt aus muß aber auch die Interpretation als *Stéytōr* geprüft werden, zumal da der (allerdings unklare) Beleg aus KN auf eine Ableitung von einem *-r*-Stamm hinzuweisen scheint. Ein Personennamen *Stéytōr* im Sinn von „Verkünder“ paßt zum Bild der bis jetzt bekannten Namen auf *-τωρ*, vgl. E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (1974) § 13 b, und denselben in *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie, Kolloquium der Idg. Gesellschaft in Basel 1988*, edd. H. Eichner und H. Rix, Wiesbaden 1990, p. 238 f. (zu myk. *Aléktōr* und *Héktōr*). Ein allfälliger komponierter Name mit gleichem Vorderglied und dem Hinterglied *-ánōr/ándrā* müßte *\*Steysánōr* bzw. *\*Steysándrā* gelautet haben. Unser *Stéytōr* kann mit dem indoiran. Nomen agentis *staytár-* „Lobsänger“ (rigved. *stotár-*, avest. *staotar-*) verglichen werden. Endgültige Sicherheit in etymologischen Fragen ist bei Personennamen nicht zu gewinnen, ein *Stéytōr* verdient aber ernsthafte Beachtung.

## The Thessalian Accent

By JOHN CHADWICK, Cambridge

The dialect of ancient Thessaly is one of the least well known. Before the third century BC there are only two inscriptions of any length, so that most of the material belongs to the period when the Hellenistic *κοινή* was setting a standard, and dialect forms may thus have been influenced by it. An excellent study by J. L. García-Ramón<sup>1</sup>) has shown that the fifth century Sotairos inscription from Thetionion is far from typical of this dialect and cannot be used as the basis for a dialectal division of the area. I think it is likely that we are misled by the paucity of early inscriptions, and more evidence might reveal even wider divergence at that date; a Thessalian *κοινή* may only have developed in the third century. This is certainly what happened in Crete. So it is perhaps wise to begin by saying that these remarks are based mainly upon material of Hellenistic date, though this does not mean that the feature to be studied arose only at that time.

No one who has studied an important new text, the convention of the Basaidai from Matropolis in Western Thessaly, dating from the end of the 3rd century,<sup>2</sup>) can have failed to be impressed by the vowel changes in final syllables more reminiscent of Latin than Greek phonology. The thought must inevitably occur that the cause of these phenomena might be the same, the existence of a stress accent. This is accepted by García-Ramón<sup>3</sup>) and A. Morpurgo Davies.<sup>4</sup>) But there does not seem to have been any detailed discussion of the accent and its position. It is worth remarking at the outset that the ancient grammarians prescribed for "the Aeolians" a special kind of accentuation which they called *βαρυτόνησις*, the use of the grave accent. But in the light of their examples this has been interpreted as meaning a rule of recessive accentuation, but still subject to the law of the three morae (e.g. *βασιλεύς* becomes *βασίλευς*). It must be admitted at once that the grammarians knew little about Thessalian, and their expression, *οἱ Αἰολεῖς*, normally refers to Lesbian poetry. However, it is now accepted that an early form of Thessalian was the main component of

---

<sup>1</sup>) *Verbum* 10 (1987), 101–153.

<sup>2</sup>) *BCH* 90 (1970), 161–2; *SEG* 36.548.

<sup>3</sup>) *l.c.* 128.

<sup>4</sup>) *Studies ... offered to Leonard R. Palmer*, 191, n. 31.

the later Lesbian dialect, so that a feature found there may also have existed in the parent Thessalian. It might therefore be interesting to see whether *βαρυτόνησις* was not more properly a cancellation of the inherited tonic accent, accompanied no doubt by other prosodic features.

While it is generally agreed that the Hellenistic *κοινή* and thus 4th century Attic had an accent which was primarily one of pitch, it is also accepted that pitch and stress are often present simultaneously. On the other hand a stress accent may be accompanied by a flattening of the pitch, which is presumably what *βαρυτόνησις* implies. What I wish to explore in this paper is the possibility that Thessalian reveals not only a stress accent, but one which is independent of the length and prosodic structure of the word, probably, but perhaps not exclusively, confined to the initial syllable. Heterodox as such a suggestion must seem, it is here accepted as a working hypothesis, and the material is reviewed from this point of view.

The most obvious effect of a strong stress is to cause the weakening and possibly loss of unaccented syllables. Both English and Modern Greek offer many examples of this process. If the accent falls upon another syllable, and especially on the second, initial vowels are frequently lost (e.g. Modern Greek *λέπτερος* < *ἐλεύθερος*). It is the absence of such aphaeresis which suggests that the Thessalian accent may have fallen normally on the initial syllable; contrast Pamphylian, where a few such examples are recorded.<sup>5)</sup> But negative evidence is of little value where the dialect is so poorly known. What is certain, and will be demonstrated shortly, is that syllables which in standard Greek carried the accent were liable to suffer syncope and vowel-change. It follows that the rules for the position of the accent must have been different in Thessalian from those of standard Greek.

Examples of actual syncope are few but significant. The best known is in the name of Apollo, for which we have Plato's statement<sup>6)</sup> that *ΑΠΛΟΥΝ* is used by all Thessalians. This is amply confirmed by the inscriptions. Since original long *δ* is written in later Thessalian spelling as *ΟΥ*, the obvious inference is that either *Ἀπόλλων* or its West Greek variant *Ἀπέλλων* was reduced by syncope to *Ἀπλουν*. But it has been asserted<sup>7)</sup> that these forms exhibit the normal Indo-European ablaut series. Yet if so, the etymology of the name remains unexplained, and

<sup>5)</sup> C. Brixhe, *Le dialecte grecque de Pamphylie*, 27.

<sup>6)</sup> *Crat.* 405 c.

<sup>7)</sup> E.g. by C.D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects*<sup>3</sup>, 46.

the variants are more likely to have arisen by interference in a borrowed name. Ἀπέλλων may have been influenced by West Greek ἀπελλα. If syncope is the explanation of the Thessalian form, it must be noticed that the syllable lost is the one which carries the normal accent.

In the decree about citizenship at Larisa<sup>8)</sup> the name of the people is given as ΛΑΣΑΙΟΙΣ. This was at first regarded as an engraver's error for Λα<ρι>σαίοις, but a further example<sup>9)</sup> confirms it as a genuine form. It also agrees with the Hesychian gloss Λᾶσα· Λάρισα. In such cases the local pronunciation is often out of step with traditional spelling. The syllable -ρι- would be unaccented in either form. The parallel of ΠΕΣΤΑΝΤΑΣ<sup>10)</sup> = περίσταντας is probably not exact, since Thessalian employs apocopated ΠΕΡ for περί, but this confirms the loss of ρ before στ.

The identical syllable is involved in another case. As M. Leumann pointed out long ago,<sup>11)</sup> there are numerous personal names in Thessalian with the first element ΑΣΤΟ- (sometimes ΑΣΣΤΟ-) which cannot represent ἄστν or ἀστός. Syncope of Ἄριστο- is the obvious explanation. In all cases the normal accent would fall later than the first two syllables, but the syncope may already have taken place in the uncompounded ἄριστος.<sup>12)</sup>

All these examples are in proper names, but the new Matropolis inscription<sup>13)</sup> adds one in a common noun. ΞΕΝΔΟΚΟΙ (nominative plural) must stand for ξενόδοκοι, since there is no trace of ξένος as anything but an o-stem. My impression is that this would occur more naturally if the stress fell on the initial rather than the penultimate syllable. It should be observed that the application of the grammarians' rule would have yielded "Aeolic" ξενόδοκοι, in which case we should again have the loss of an accented syllable.

Another effect of stress to be expected is the loss of final short vowels. The apocope of prepositions is so widespread, especially in West Greek, that its presence in Thessalian would not be worth mentioning, if it were not that this dialect takes the process further than any other. ΠΕΡ for περί is shared with Cypriot, but exclusively Thes-

<sup>8)</sup> E. Schwyzer, *DGE* 590.19, 3rd cent. BC.

<sup>9)</sup> *BCH* 59.40.

<sup>10)</sup> *BCH* 59.37.10.

<sup>11)</sup> *Glotta* 18 (1930), 65-66.

<sup>12)</sup> The last two examples are mentioned by O. Szemerényi, *Syncope* 97-98, but without reference to ΑΠΛΟΥΝ.

<sup>13)</sup> See note 2; line 19.

salian are *ΑΠ* (in the sandhi form *ΑΤ ΤΑΣ*), *ΕΠ* (in *ΕΤ ΤΟΙ, ΠΤ > ΤΤ* being a regular sound change of the dialect), *ΥΠ* (in the compound *ΥΠΠΡΟ*).<sup>14)</sup>

More significant are the inflexional forms which show the same development. The genitive singular of o-stems appears to have been at an early date in *-ΟΙΟ*, and is recorded as late as the 3rd century at Larisa (*ΠΟΛΕΜΟΙΟ*).<sup>15)</sup> The more common reflex is *-ΟΙ*, which must be due to apocope of *Ο*.

The same is true of long diphthongs, where the dative singular of a-stems is regularly *-Α < -ᾶι*, and of o-stems *-ΟΥ < -ωι*. This feature appears to be documented as early as the fifth century by the (aberrant) Sotairos inscription,<sup>16)</sup> which contains the phrase *ΚΕΝ ΤΑΓΑ ΚΕΝ ΑΤΑΓΙΑΙ* with the diphthong maintained in one case but not the other. By the 3rd century these spellings are regular, e.g. *ΤΑ ΕΚΤΑ* (= *τῆ ἕκτῃ*); *ΕΚΑΣΤΟΥ* (= *ἐκάστῳ*).<sup>17)</sup> Similarly *ΕΙ* (noting long *ē*) appears for *ηι* in the subjunctive *ΔΟΘΕΙ*.<sup>18)</sup> Since this is a common feature of other dialects and later Hellenistic Greek, its presence in Thessalian is not surprising, though it does appear remarkably early.

There may be a rather different case where the vowel is followed by a consonant, if *ΔΟΙΝ* in the Matropolis inscription (line 7) is for *δοῖεν*. But the interpretation of this clause is uncertain and other explanations have been attempted. Syncope has at least the merit of simplicity.

Another case however is more doubtful. It is well known that Thessalian tends to show reduction and sometimes loss of the vowel *ι* when followed by another vowel. It would seem likely that in this case the vowel was reduced to a semi-vowel, which might or might not then be omitted following a consonant. This occurs usually with *ρ, λ, ν* or *σ*, which is then sometimes geminated; but there is at least one possible example with a stop: *ΚΑΘ ΙΑΔΙΑΝ*.<sup>19)</sup> Typical examples of the loss of *ι* are *ΚΥΡΡΟΝ, ΚΥΡΟΝ* (both = *κύριον*),<sup>20)</sup> *ΔΙΟΝΝΥΣΟΙ* (= *Διονυσίου*), *ΓΥΜΝΑΣΣΑΡΧΕΙΣΑΝΤΑ*.<sup>21)</sup> It is clear that in all cases

<sup>14)</sup> *DGE* 590.43.

<sup>15)</sup> *DGE* 588.

<sup>16)</sup> *DGE* 557.

<sup>17)</sup> *DGE* 590.10, 20.

<sup>18)</sup> *DGE* 590.15

<sup>19)</sup> *DGE* 578. B 13.

<sup>20)</sup> *DGE* 590.20, 46; *BCH* 59.55, n. 2.32.

<sup>21)</sup> *DGE* 612.74; *IG IX*, 2.620.3.

but one the omission of *I* does not occur in initial syllables, hence we have *ΔΙΕ*- from *δια*-, not *ΖΑ*- as in Lesbian. The exception is *ΤΡΑ* = *τρία* and its derivatives such as *ΤΡΑΚΑΔΙ*.<sup>22</sup>) In view of this it must remain doubtful whether or not this tendency is associated with an initial accent. Modern Greek also tends to shift the accent in similar words, such as *μιά* < *μία*.

It has long been known that although final *-α* is maintained normally, the preposition *διά*, both alone and in compounds, becomes *ΔΙΕ* (*ΔΙΕ ΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ*; *ΔΙΕΚΙ*; *ΔΙΕΤΕΛΕΙ* [present]).<sup>23</sup>) The restriction is probably due to frequency of usage, since phonetic changes are often observed in commonly used words before extending more widely. This change would be remarkable if the second vowel were stressed, but if the stress were on the first syllable, a weakening of the *-α* towards an obscure vowel or schwa would be natural.

The same explanation seems to be inevitable for a feature of the new Matropolis inscription,<sup>24</sup>) which regularly reduces final *-ον*, *-ος* to *-ΕΝ*, *-ΕΣ*: *ΤΕΝ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΧΡΟΝΕΝ* (where *τὸν* would normally carry a barytone accent), *ΕΚΑΤΟΜΒΙΕΝ* (epithet of Apollo), *ΚΑΙ-ΑΝΔΡΕΣ* (= *Κλέανδρος*, [*ΑΣ*]ΤΟΚΡΑΤΕΙΕΣ = (*-κράτειος*), *ΜΕ-ΝΟΥΝΕΣ* = *Μένωνος*. But even here not all examples of final *-ος* are modified: *ΑΠΟΛΑΟΣ*, [*Α*]ΣΤΟΛΑΟΣ = *Ἀριστόλαος*, ...*ΑΡΧΟΣ* (proper name). The diphthong *ΟΙ* is similarly modified to *ΕΙ* in the dative plural termination of *ο*-stems: *ΑΥΤΕΙΣ* (= *αὐτοῖς*), *ΤΥΤΕΙΣ* (= *τούτοις*). The first of these shows reduction of what in normal Greek would be the accented syllable. The *ΟΙ* of the nominative plural remains intact in *ΞΕΝΔΟΚΟΙ*.

Now in the formation of the patronymic adjective the Thessalian rule is that names in *-ΑΣ* form adjectives in *-ΑΙΟΣ*, names in *-ΕΙΣ* (= *ης*), *-ΟΣ* or consonant stems have adjectives in *-ΕΙΟΣ*.<sup>25</sup>) Since this rule is regularly observed it follows that *ΑΙ* and *ΕΙ* were not pronounced alike. But since the graph *ΕΙ* covers the original diphthong, the *ει* arising by contraction or compensatory lengthening and original long *ē*, it follows that this must have been a monophthong, as in the *κοινή*, but there of course *ΕΙ* and *Η* are kept distinct. But it does not follow that *ΑΙ* remained a diphthong; it may have become another

<sup>22</sup>) *SEG* 13.394, 395, al.

<sup>23</sup>) *DGE* 590.12; *ibid.* 11; 578. A4.

<sup>24</sup>) See note 2.

<sup>25</sup>) A. Morpurgo Davies, *Thessalian Patronymic Adjectives*, *Glotta* 46 (1968), 79-106, esp. p. 92.



long vowel positioned between *EI* and *A*. But in certain forms *AI* was replaced by *EI*, sometimes followed by an analogical *-N*. This occurs in the 3rd person termination of the middle indicative, where we have a few times *-TEI* for *-ται*: *ΕΨΑΦΙΣΤΕΙ* (= *ἐψήφισται*), *ΒΕΛΛΕΙΤΕΙ* (= *βούληται*), *ΓΙΝΥΕΙΤΕΙ* (= *γίγνηται*.<sup>26</sup>) The same termination appears in the plural spelled *-EIN*: *ΒΕΛΛΟΥΝΘΕΙΝ* (= *βούλωνται*), *ΕΦΑΝΓΡΕΝΘΕΙΝ* (= *ἐφαιροῦνται*.<sup>27</sup>) The plural forms appear to be a recharacterisation of the form as 3rd person plural.

The change of *-AI* to *-EIN* occurs equally in the medio-passive infinitive, where *-ΣΘΕΙΝ* or *-ΣΤΕΙΝ* is written for *-ΣΘΑΙ*: *ΕΛΕΣΤΕΙΝ* (= *ἐλέσθαι*); *ΠΕΠΕΙΣΤΕΙΝ*; *ΕΣΣΕΣΘΕΙΝ*; *ΔΕΔΟΣΘΕΙΝ*.<sup>28</sup>) Also the aorist infinitive active in one instance is remodelled in the same way: *ΟΝΓΡΑΨΕΙΝ* (= *ἀναγράψαι*.<sup>29</sup>) In this case the analogy of the second aorist infinitives in *-EIN* can have provided a starting point, though I know of no examples in Thessalian. But the analogy of the thematic present in *-EIN* is far-fetched for medio-passive forms, since this same inscription has regularly *-EMEN* in this form (e.g. *ΥΠΑΡΧΕΜΕΝ*). It is still true that active infinitives end in *-N*, but there may be a further reason for this change.

It would appear that in final position, at least in these terminations, the diphthong *AI* was reduced to a vowel of the same quality as *E*, the familiar development of later Greek. But as demonstrated above, the distinction of *AI* and *EI* was maintained in medial syllables. There is one rather more difficult case where the patronymic adjective derived from *Αἴμων* is written *EIMOYNEIO[Σ]*, cf. *ΑΝΔΡΕΙΜΟΥΝ* (= *Ἀνδραίμων*).<sup>30</sup>) Here we might expect the original diphthong to be maintained. But proper names are frequently subject to personal choice, and *AI* appears medially in other names in this list (e.g. *ΔΙΚΑΙΟΚΡΑΤΕΙΣ*; *ΑΡΧΑΙΟΚΡΑΤΕΙΣ*). Likewise names in both *ΑΡΙΣΤΟ-* and *ΑΣΤΟ-* figure in this list. Final *-AI* is maintained in the nominative plural of *a*-stems, no doubt by the analogy of the alpha in other forms (*ΔΙΚΑΣΤΑΙ*)<sup>31</sup>) The examples of *-TAI* maintained in verbal endings will either be earlier than the weakening of vowels in medial syllables (e.g. *ΦΑΛΙΣΣΚΕΤΑΙ*),<sup>32</sup>) or, if late, due to *κοινή*

<sup>26</sup>) DGE 590.17, 20, 23; 3rd century.

<sup>27</sup>) DGE 589.7–8; 590.41.

<sup>28</sup>) DGE 589.7; 590.16, 17.

<sup>29</sup>) DGE 590.21.

<sup>30</sup>) DGE 590.54, 64.

<sup>31</sup>) DGE 555.3; ca 200 BC.

<sup>32</sup>) DGE 608; Phalanna, 5th century.

influence. The other strange form of this type from the Matropolis inscription is ΠΟΔΕΞΑΣΤΑ = προσδέξασθαι.<sup>33)</sup> This is hard to regard as anything but an error, though if original -AN can be written -AEN in final position (see below), this is merely the reverse. It is at least further evidence for the reduction of diphthongs to simple vowels in final position.

Another phenomenon of Thessalian which may be relevant to this enquiry has been exhaustively discussed by A. Morpurgo Davies.<sup>34)</sup> It concerns the form of the third person plural termination of the 1st aorist active, where -αν is replaced by a variety of spellings: -AEN, -AIEN, -AIN. It has generally been assumed that -AEN represents two syllables, and that the -α is regarded as part of the stem of the aorist (changed only in the 3rd person singular to -ε), to which a new 3rd person plural ending -εν is added. The basic question to be answered is: why did Thessalian reject, e.g. ὄνεθειαν (from ἀνατίθημι) and substitute ONEΘEIKAEN?<sup>35)</sup> One answer is that the analogical pressure of the inflexion, which has a monosyllabic termination in the singular, but a disyllabic one in the 1st and 2nd persons plural, produced a similarly lengthened form for the 3rd plural. If so, this would be exactly parallel to the *danunt* phenomenon in Latin, where new 3rd plural forms were created in early Latin for the same reason, but were later dropped.<sup>36)</sup>

An alternative answer might be that the initial stress of such words led to the reduction of the a-vowel to a schwa, written as we have seen -E, so that the termination \*-EN would become confused with the singular -E, especially for speakers familiar with the κοινή sandhi variant -εν. There is no reason why AE must denote two syllables. The same digraph appears regularly in Boeotian, where it is quite clear that -AI becomes -AE and finally -H (e.g. ΤΑΕ ΔΑΜΑΤΡΙ; ΕΠΙ ΔΑΜΑΕΝΕΤΟΕ.<sup>37)</sup> There is thus no reason why -AEN in Thessalian too cannot stand for a diphthong or even a single vowel intermediate in quality between α and ε (i.e. [æ]). Even -AIEN may represent a single diphthong, granted that AI is now established as denoting [e:]. The proof seems to lie in the isolated form ΕΤΑΞΑΙΝ,<sup>38)</sup> which can

<sup>33)</sup> See note 2; lines 5-6.

<sup>34)</sup> *Glotta* 43, 235-251.

<sup>35)</sup> *DGE* 566, 2.

<sup>36)</sup> J. Chadwick, Latin *danunt* and related forms, *Studii si cercetari linguistice*, 26, 343-5.

<sup>37)</sup> *DGE* 475; 476, 1.

<sup>38)</sup> *IG IX*, 2.1229.19.

hardly represent anything but [eːtakːse:n], and under the influence of the stress accent the last syllable might have been shortened.

The same argument applies to the isolated example of final *-OEN* as the termination of the 3rd person plural of the thematic imperfect: *ENEΦΑΝΙΣΣΟΕΝ* (= *ἐνεφάνιζον*).<sup>39)</sup> It has too readily been assumed that the spelling implies a disyllabic ending, and while this is not impossible on the analogy of the 1st and 2nd persons (*-ομεν, -ετε*, leading to *-οἶν*), it is not unknown for *OE* to represent a diphthong, at least in Boeotian. If quantity is not significant, the spelling may be an attempt to represent a vowel which is neither *O* nor *E*, but somewhere between them.

I turn now to the effects of stress on the stressed syllable itself. It is well known that a stressed short vowel tends to become lengthened, a feature prominent in Modern Greek where, e. g., *ἡμέρᾱ* has become [ˈme:ra]. We should therefore expect to find cases where Thessalian showed lengthening of initial short vowels. Obviously there can be no direct evidence for *A* and *I* and possibly *Y*, since the short and long variants share the same graph. Only in the cases of *E/EI* and *O/OY* is the quantity marked by the spelling. One example occurs in the Matropolis inscription and has given rise to lengthy debate.<sup>40)</sup> This is the form *EINTEΣΣI*,<sup>41)</sup> which must be the dative plural masculine of the participle of the verb 'to be' (= Attic *οὔσι*). The e-grade vocalism is unusual, but not unparalleled. What creates a problem is the initial long vowel, which must of course be secondary, since original long vowels are shortened in this position in all dialects. The first observation I should like to make is that because of initial stress the vowel would tend to be lengthened in pronunciation. In fact accented *E* and accented *EI* were probably pronounced very much alike, so that *E* and *EI* were in this position graphic variants. This will then go some way towards explaining the other case of unexpected *EI* in line 2 of the same inscription: *KOINANEINTOYN* stands for the expected *-εν-τουv* of the athematic participle. Secondly, there is another example of lengthened *ε* known in Thessalian; the long decree of Larisa on citizenship has *ΠΡΕΙΣΒΕΙΑΣ*<sup>42)</sup> answering to *πρεσβείας* in Philip's letter. Here too complicated explanations have been offered, and in any case this may be an artificial form adapted from the *κοινῆ*; but

<sup>39)</sup> *DGE* 590.12.

<sup>40)</sup> A. Morpurgo Davies, *Étrennes de Septantaine* (Festschrift Lejeune), 157-166.

<sup>41)</sup> See note 2; line 2.

<sup>42)</sup> *DGE* 590.12.

the parallel with *EINTEΣΣI* offers a simpler solution. It would be equally to be expected that the reverse of this might occur, the spelling of long  $\bar{e}$  in initial position as *E* instead of *EI*. This happens in a 2nd century inscription from Cierium: *ΕΡΑΚΛΙΟΣ* (= *Ἡρακλέους*); contrast *E[I]ΠΑΚΛΕI*.<sup>43)</sup>

Just as *EI* is used for all long vowels of *e* quality, so *OY* is used after the introduction of the standard alphabet for original *ou*, original  $\omega$  and the lengthened  $\bar{o}$ . The phonetic realisation of this graph is uncertain, because in the pronunciation of the *κοινή* the closing of original [u] to [y] allowed the long close  $\bar{o}$  to move in the direction of [u:]. Dialects which maintained the original value of *Y* then had a choice: to continue its use with the value [u], or to replace it, even when short, with the digraph *OY*. Boeotian regularly chooses the second option, e.g. *ΤΟΥΧΑ* = *τύχη*. Thessalian generally prefers to retain *Y* for short *υ* (e.g. *ΟΝΥΜΑΤΑ*),<sup>44)</sup> and I know of only one possible case of *OY* = *υ*. Dr. A. Thompson called my attention to *ΚΑΡΟΥ[Σ]ΑΝΤΕΣ*<sup>45)</sup> where an easier restoration would be *ΚΑΡΟΥ[Ε]ΑΝΤΕΣ* = *κηρύξαντες*.

The reverse of this would be of course the writing of *Y* to represent long [u:], and this occurs several times. In the Matropolis inscription we have *ΤΥΤΕΙΣ* (= *τούτοις*) where *ou* is an original diphthong, and *ΤΥΤΟΥΝ*<sup>46)</sup> where we have the same sound written in two different ways in the same word, perhaps because only accented *Y* would equal *OY*. In another inscription we have the man's name *ΒΥΛΙΠΠΟΣ ΒΥΛΙ-ΑΔΔΑΙΟΙ*,<sup>47)</sup> which probably represents *Βουλ-*, though other explanations may be possible. The name *ΣΠΥΡΑΓΟΣ* also appears as *ΣΠΟΥΡΑΓΟΥ* in the Matropolis inscription.<sup>48)</sup> In this case there is some doubt whether it is derived from *σφυρόν* or *σφύρα* or even *πυρός*. At all events there is a recorded alternation. It is perhaps significant that *Y* for *OY* seems to be confined to initial syllables, where on the theory of a stress accent the opposition of long and short vowels would tend to be neutralised.

Now if the effect of the initial stress was to lengthen short vowels in initial syllables, this will allow a new solution to a long-standing

<sup>43)</sup> *DGE* 558.11; 586.

<sup>44)</sup> *DGE* 590.21.

<sup>45)</sup> *DGE* 614.25.

<sup>46)</sup> See note 2; lines 8, 5, 19.

<sup>47)</sup> *DGE* 584, 11. But Dr. A. Thompson doubts this explanation of the name and suggests that it might be related to *Γύλιππος*.

<sup>48)</sup> *DGE* 567.33; Matropolis line 17.

puzzle, the etymology of the name of the senior Thessalian magistrate, *ταγός*. It has usually been assumed to belong to the root of *ταγή*, *τάσσω* (probably a replacement of \**τάζω*), but there has not been any convincing explanation for the long *ā*. In fact the existence of *τάγός* with a short vowel is assumed by Aristarchus' reading of Ψ 160: *παρὰ δ' οἱ ταγοὶ ἄμμι μερόντων*, a line which significantly employs the Aeolic *ἄμμι*. Others in antiquity and most modern editors have preferred to read *οἱ τ' ἀγοί*, no doubt because they knew *τᾶγός* from Attic tragedy as having a long vowel. But although the Attic evidence is clear, there is no direct evidence for quantity in any inscription. It follows therefore that the short vowel in stressed position might be heard by other Greeks as long, and thus the loan-word would be taken over with a long vowel. The accent would, however, not be felt as justifying \**τᾶγός* and the analogy of *λοχᾶγός*, *στρατηγός*, etc. would support an oxytone.

This then will help with a problem which I attempted to solve long ago.<sup>49)</sup> The Sotairos inscription contains the phrase already mentioned above, *KEN TΑΓΑ KEN ΑΤΑΓΙΑΙ*,<sup>50)</sup> and parallels both from later Thessaly and elsewhere make it clear that its effective sense must be 'both in war and in peace' (*καὶ ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ*). It was therefore interpreted as the dative of a noun *τᾶγά* = 'the office of *ταγίας*' and a corresponding negative *ἀτᾶγία* = 'the absence of a *ταγός*'. I pointed out that an abstract noun of this type cannot be created by substituting *-α* for *-ος*; and that there is a well known word *τᾶγά* (*ταγή*) to which *ἀτᾶγία* would form the negative, like *δίκη*: *ἀδικία*. I was able to demonstrate that *τᾶγή* already had a sense very close to that required, since it means something like 'military service' in a passage of Aristophanes put into the mouth of a Laconian<sup>51)</sup>. To extend the sense to mean 'time of military service' would be no obstacle. I therefore proposed exorcising the alleged *τᾶγά* as a ghost-word, and adding a slightly extended sense to the inventory of *τᾶγή*.

However the ghost of *τᾶγά* was resurrected by B. Helly,<sup>52)</sup> no doubt in ignorance of my article. He assumed that in the new Matropolis text *ταγά* again bears the sense 'the office of *ταγός*'. But the general sense of 'military command' inherent in the root is perfectly good sense. In *ΤΑΣ ΤΑΓΑΣ ΚΟΙΝΑΝΕΙΝΤΟΥΝ* it will mean 'clans which

<sup>49)</sup> J. Chadwick, *Studi linguistici in onore di V. Pisani*, 1969, 231-4.

<sup>50)</sup> *DGE* 557.6.

<sup>51)</sup> *Lys.* 105.

<sup>52)</sup> *BCH* 1970, 161-2.

share in the military command' and *ΜΑΔΕ ΤΑΓΑΝ ΔΟΙΝ* will mean 'and not give the command (outside the clan system).' Although the meaning 'the office of *ταγός*' would also be acceptable, this is an unnecessary step, and since it involves creating a new word, should be avoided unless it becomes essential.

But once *τάγος* and *τάγη* have been restored to their natural relationship, it becomes clear that *τάγά* would to a Thessalian imply the existence of the military commander *ταγός*. So the original interpretation is not wrong; what is wrong is the way in which the word is alleged to have been formed. I hope that ghost is at last truly laid.

As I remarked above, we have very little evidence for the Thessalian dialect before the 3rd century BC, but this interpretation of the Sotairos inscription requires us to believe that the initial stress accent was already in existence in the 5th century, and there is, I believe, another inscription of that date which can be interpreted as confirming it. This is a verse epitaph from Cierium which reads:<sup>53</sup>)

*MNAM EMI ΠΥΡΙΑΔΑ ΗΟΣ ΟΥΚ ΕΠΙΣΤΑΤΟ ΦΕΥΓΕΝ  
ΑΛ ΑΥΘΕ ΠΕΡ ΓΑΣ ΤΑΣΔΕ ΠΟΛΟΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΥΟΝ ΕΘΑΝΕ*

The versification leaves much to be desired, but it is interesting that there do not appear to be any spelling mistakes, allowing for the fact that geminate consonants are written as single. *ΑΥΘΕ* might be an error for *αύθι* (= *αυτόθι*), but could be a dialect form. Nor is there any doubt about the meaning: 'This is the monument of Pyrrhiadas, who did not know how to run away, but died on the spot performing many deeds of valour in defence of this land.'

But when we examine the metre, we may as well admit the case is hopeless; what is interesting is the nature of the mistakes. The first line is plainly meant to be a hexameter, but it has three faults: *EMI* should in Thessalian be *έμμί*, not *ειμί*, but it has to scan as two light syllables. There is a hiatus after *ΠΥΡΙΑΔΑ* - unless this is an epic genitive in *-αο* elided. *ΗΟΣ* is treated as heavy before a vowel. But the next line is worse. A hexameter cannot end in *εθάνε*, but a pentameter can. Yet the line has sixteen syllables, and fourteen is the maximum permissible in a pentameter. It follows therefore that the line is hypermetric, so we must exclude the first three syllables; I suspect the author thought that *άλ(λ)' αυθε* could scan as a dactyl. Anyway, we then have *περ γας τασδε*, a correct beginning for a line. But *πολ(λ)όν* has to scan as an iambus; the geminate consonant is

<sup>53</sup>) *DGE* 561; Cierium, 5th century.

again neglected and a light syllable is treated as heavy before the caesura. This leaves *APISTEYON* to fill the first foot and a half of the second part of the line. I cannot persuade myself that he could say *ἀριστεῦδον*, but we do know that later Thessalian pronounced *APIST-* as *AET-*. So *ἄσπεῦδον* gives an inadmissible spondee for dactyl, but the line now falls into some sort of shape. This proves that the writer had no feel for which are heavy and light syllables (*ἔμμι, πῶλλῶν, ἠὸς*), and he must surely have pronounced *αριστ-* as *αστ-*. All these errors will be explained if we suppose that he used an initial stress accent.

One consequence of this theory is so remote that I mention it only as a mere speculation. It is well established that the epic tradition contains, or is based upon, earlier epics in an Aeolic dialect. This is certainly not the Lesbian of Alcaeus and Sappho, and there are Homeric forms which must go back to some other Aeolic source. For instance, the infinitive of the verb 'to be' is, among other things, in Homer both *ἔμμεν* and *ἔμμεναι*. The latter is certainly Lesbian, the former is known elsewhere only in Thessalian. It would therefore not be unreasonable to suppose that an early form of Aeolic, which was ancestral to classical Thessalian, had influenced the epic tradition.

Now one of the basic peculiarities of Homeric scansion is the so-called metrical lengthening which enables words of unmetrical shape to be used in the verse. Obviously the cretic pattern must be eliminated, and if the final heavy syllable cannot be lightened, the medial light syllable must become heavy. But the tribrach pattern, where three or more short syllables come together in a word, is equally impossible. In theory a word such as *ἀκάματος* allows three possible treatments. Lengthening might be applied to any of the first three vowels. But in practice only one such lengthening is known; it is always the first syllable of the word which is so treated. So we find *ἄκάματος, εἰνάλιος*, etc., even if some words such as *ἄθάνατος* may have been justified by an earlier digamma. It is at least a strange coincidence that the lengthened syllable is always that which on the view proposed of the Thessalian accent would carry the stress.

We might also notice an interesting case of lengthening which is not strictly necessary. *Ἀπόλλωνα* or the other oblique cases can be fitted into the verse either by eliding the final vowel or placing before a double consonant. It is therefore all the more remarkable that Homer prefers to scan *ἄπολλωνα, -νος, -νι*. Now this is precisely the name which suffers syncope in Thessalian *ἄπλων*, and we have already predicted a long alpha for this. Again, a curious coincidence?

Another name behaves rather similarly: *Ὀλυμπος*. Forms such as

*Ούλύμποιο* or *Οὔλυμπόνδε* share the same problem as *Ἀπόλλωνα*, but it is harder to see why *Ούλύμπου* and *Ούλύμπω* should have been necessary.<sup>54</sup>) Is it an accident that *Ἄλυμπος* is in Thessaly?

Other words of this type are the name *Εἰλείθια* and the participle *εἰληλουθῶς* (together with the indicative *εἰλήλουθα*), *εἰοικῦται* (Σ 418). These are perhaps less remarkable, but show this same tendency to lengthen initial vowels.

It would be normal for *ἄνερα* to appear as *ᾗνερα* (so also *ᾗνέρες*); but is the explanation of *ᾗνήρ* as due merely to this analogy really acceptable? At least the theory of the lengthening of the first syllable of disyllabic words would account for *ᾗνήρ* on the same principle as *τᾗγός*.

To sum up, there is no ancient evidence for the pronunciation of the Thessalian dialect; the grammarians' statements about Aeolic may be irrelevant and they do not disprove the existence of a stress accent. It is not impossible that elements of stress occurred also in Lesbian and Boeotian, but it would seem to be much harder here to demonstrate it.

The positive evidence takes the form of syncope of medial and apocope of final short vowels, coupled with other examples where the vowel of the final syllable is not lost but appears to have changed quality. These phenomena are most easily accounted for by the existence of a stress accent. The lack of clear cases where the initial syllable is affected suggests that the accent may have been uniformly located on the initial syllable. A few cases of what are at first sight erroneous spellings may be explained by a tendency to lengthen the vowel of the initial syllable. This would allow Attic *τᾗγός* to be derived from Thessalian *τᾗγός*, and the relation of this to *τᾗγά* would thus become normal. The tendency of iota + vowel following certain consonants to become a semi-vowel may possibly be due to the same feature, but this is rather less certain.

<sup>54</sup>) *E* 298 = 309, *Π* 374, *Σ* 616, *Φ* 389, *λ* 315.



## Zu griechisch τίπτε \*)

Von ANTONIO LILLO, Murcia

Die epische Form τίπτε hat bis heute zwei verschiedene Erklärungen gefunden:

a) Die erste von Brugmann<sup>1)</sup> verteidigte und im Jahre 1884 von Saussure<sup>2)</sup> formulierte Deutung sieht die Form als Zusammensetzung aus dem interrogativen Pronomen τί und der synkopierten Form des Zeitadverbs ποτε, -πτε. Diese Erklärung wurde sowohl von Kretschmer<sup>3)</sup> als auch von Szemerényi<sup>4)</sup> aufrechterhalten und wird ferner im Wörterbuch von Liddell-Scott-Jones<sup>5)</sup> erwähnt.

b) Die zweite Erklärung wurde von Schwyzer<sup>6)</sup> vorgeschlagen und geht von einer zusammengesetzten Form \*τιδ-πε > \*τιτ-πε aus, die zu dem lateinischen *quippe* < \**quid-pe* in Bezug stehe, bei ihr sei eine Metathese der Sequenz von -τιπ- zu -πτ- entstanden, parallel zu der der Sequenz -τικ-, die zu -κτ- wird (\*τικω > τίκτω).

Diese von Schwyzer gegebene Erklärung wurde allein von Monteil<sup>7)</sup> aufrechterhalten, der sie auf eine etwas unvorsichtigere Weise entwickelt: die in *quippe*, *nempe*, *prope* vorkommende lateinische Partikel -pe leitet sich nach Monteils Meinung von \**k<sup>w</sup>e* ab; diese Entwicklung des Labiovelars zu *p* sei mundartlich. Monteil hebt die Entwicklung von \**k<sup>w</sup>* zu *p* bei gleichzeitigem Erhalt von *qu-* hervor. Diese dialekt-

---

\*) Mein Dank gilt Prof. Strunk für seine Ratschläge, die er mir nach dem Lesen dieses Artikels gegeben hat, Frau Trumpp für die deutsche Übersetzung und Dr. Mumm für seine Durchsicht. Diese Arbeit verfaßte ich während meiner Zeit als Stipendiat der spanischen DGICYT in München.

<sup>1)</sup> K. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik* <sup>3</sup>, München 1900, S. 546; K. Brugmann-A. Thumb, *Griechische Grammatik*, München 1913, S. 629.

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. *Recueil des publications scientifiques de Ferdinand de Saussure*, Genève 1970 (Reprint from the edition of 1922 by Slatkine Reprints), S. 473.

<sup>3)</sup> P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 21 (1933), 172.

<sup>4)</sup> O. Szemerényi, *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the nature of Indo-European accent*, Naples 1964, S. 218-9.

<sup>5)</sup> Liddell-Scott-Jones, *An English-Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1940, s. v.

<sup>6)</sup> E. Schwyzer, „Griechische Interjektionen und griechische Buchstabennamen auf -α“, *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 58 (1931), 184; *Griechische Grammatik I*, München 1939, p. 266 und E. Schwyzer-A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik II*, München 1950, S. 572-3.

<sup>7)</sup> P. Monteil, *Éléments de phonétique et de morphologie du latin*, Paris 1970, S. 56 und 227.

tale Mischung bei *quippe* hätte nach Monteils Meinung als Parallele die griechische Form *τίπτε* (< \**τίδ-πε* < \**k<sup>w</sup>id-k<sup>w</sup>e*), wo die ionische Entwicklung des Labiovelars zu *τ* gemeinsam mit der „äolischen“ zum *-π-* vorliegen soll. Offensichtlich wurde aber hier die vorab zu stellende und wichtigste Frage nicht berücksichtigt, ob *-πε* bei *quippe* von \**k<sup>w</sup>e* abgeleitet ist oder ob es sich bei \**pe* um eine ursprüngliche Partikel handelt. Ernout-Meillet denken an Verwandtschaft von *-πε* mit dem *-p* des litauischen *kaip<sup>8</sup>*), obwohl sie die Möglichkeit nicht ausschließen, daß es sich um eine oskisch-umbrische Entwicklung von \**k<sup>w</sup>e* handeln könne. Vom methodologischen Standpunkt aus erscheint uns der Vergleich von *quippe* mit dem litauischen *kaip* als vertretbar, während die Erklärung, daß es sich um eine mundartliche Vermischung handele, *ad hoc* erscheint, da es ihr an zuverlässigen Grundlagen mangelt.

Setzen wir uns nun genauer mit den beiden vorgenannten Erklärungen auseinander!

Der erste Einwand gegen die Überlegung, daß *-πε* von einer Synkope von *ποτε* nach einem interrogativen Pronomen abstammt, ergibt sich daraus, daß sie unzureichend fundiert ist; *τίς ποτε* und *τί ποτε* sind attisch bezeugte Verbindungen, jedoch nicht homerisch. Gewiß, *τί ποτε* paßt nur bedingt für den Hexameter<sup>9)</sup>, *τίς ποτε* jedoch – nie mit interrogativer, zweimal mit indefiniter Bedeutung in *Odysee* 3, 120 und 18, 141 – ohne weiteres. Zudem erscheint es erstaunlich, daß in Kontexten gleicher Art wie bei *τίπτε* vom Genus commune des interrogativen Pronomens nur *τίς*<sup>10)</sup> oder *τίς τ(ε)*<sup>11)</sup> bei Homer erscheinen, jedoch nie *τίς ποτε*. Außerdem ist *τίπτε* von *τί* nicht besonders verschieden, wie dies aus *τί* und *τίπτε* in identischen Verwendungen zu ersehen ist, z. B. *Ilias* 10, 85, *τίπτε δέ σε χρεώ*; und 11, 606, *τί δέ σε χρεώ ἐμείο*. Kurzum, wir glauben, daß die Erklärung von *-πε* als synkopierte Form von *ποτε* schwer zu akzeptieren ist. Andere Formen auf *-πε* fehlen, die ein darin steckendes Adverb *ποτε* semantisch eindeutiger aufzeigen könnten, und auch eine interrogative Sequenz *τίς ποτε* fehlt.

Schwyzers Erklärung weist ähnliche Schwierigkeiten wie die vorste-

<sup>8)</sup> A. Ernout-A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris 1967, s. v. *nempe*. Cf. J. Endzelins, *Comparative Phonology and Morphology of the Baltic Languages*, The Hague 1971, S. 262 (englische Übersetzung).

<sup>9)</sup> Nur wenn auf *τί ποτε* ein Wort folgt, das mit zwei Konsonanten beginnt; aber eine solche Sequenz erscheint bei Homer nie.

<sup>10)</sup> Z. B.: *Ilias* 6, 123: *τίς δέ σύ ἐσσι, φέριστε, κατανηπιῶν ἀνθρώπων*;

<sup>11)</sup> Cf. *Ilias* 1, 8; 2, 761; 3, 226.

hende Erklärung auf. Sie greift zirkulär auf eine Partikel \*-pe zurück, die nur im Griechischen so auftaucht<sup>12)</sup>. Wir glauben allerdings nicht, daß der von Kretschmer<sup>13)</sup> Schwyzers Erklärung<sup>14)</sup> gegenüber vorgebrachte Einwand verfängt, da bei ὄππως nicht der gleiche ursprüngliche phonetische Zusammenhang wie bei τίπε besteht: auf jeden Fall wäre bei τίπε von einer Sequenz -δπ- (< \*k<sup>w</sup>id-pe) auszugehen, will man der Erklärung Schwyzers folgen, während bei ὄππως die ursprüngliche Sequenz \*-dk<sup>w</sup>- ist.

Unserer Meinung nach bietet es sich am ehesten an, die Form τίπε aus (\*k<sup>w</sup>is /) \*k<sup>w</sup>id k<sup>w</sup>e herzuleiten. Diese pronominale Sequenz liegt auch der epischen Form τίς / τί τε zugrunde. Sowohl die Sequenz τίς τε, bei der τίς ein unbestimmtes Pronomen ist, als auch die homonyme Fügung τίς τε, in der τίς interrogativ ist, sind im homerischen corpus belegt. Die interrogative Sequenz zeigt sich in drei Fällen, alle drei in der *Ilias*.

- 1, 8            Τίς τ' ἄρ' σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;  
 2, 761        Τίς τ' ἄρ' τῶν ὄχ' ἄριστος ἔην, σύ μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα,  
 3, 226        Τίς τ' ἄρ' ὄδ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιοὺς ἀνήρ ἠΰς τε μέγας τε.

Bezogen auf diese drei Belege zweifelt Ruijgh<sup>15)</sup> nicht daran, daß ihr τε das sogenannte ‚epische‘ ist, obwohl er in der Kasuistik seines Buches den Gebrauch dieser Partikel nicht als „digressif-permanent“ einstuft.

Vier Fälle mit τί τε (Neutrum) sind

- Ilias* 12, 409    ὦ Λύκιοι, τί τ' ἄρ' ὄδε μεθίετε θούριδος ἀλκῆς;  
*Ilias* 18, 6      ὦ μοι ἐγώ, τί τ' ἄρ' αὐτε κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ  
                   νηυσὶν ἐπι κλονέονται ἀτυζόμενοι πεδίοιο;  
*Odyssee* 1, 346    μῆτερ ἐμή, τί τ' ἄρα φθονέεις ἐρήηρον αἰοιδὸν  
                   τέρπειν ὄππη οἱ νόος ὄρνυται;  
*Odyssee* 23, 264    δαιμονίη, τί τ' ἄρ' αὖ με μάλ' ὀτρύνουσα κελεύεις  
                   εἰπέμεν;

Ruijgh hält es für schwierig, den syntaktischen Wert dieses τε zu bestimmen; er analysiert den Text von *Ilias* 12, 409<sup>16)</sup> und setzt den Wert dieses τε etwa als koordinierend an.

<sup>12)</sup> Cf. Szemerényi, *op. cit.*, S.219.

<sup>13)</sup> *Glotta* 21 (1933), 172, der Szemerényi, *op. cit.* folgt.

<sup>14)</sup> Nach Kretschmers Auffassung hätte sich τίπε (< \*τιτ-πε < \*τιδ-πε) zu \*τιππε entwickeln müssen, so, wie es bei \*ὄδ-πως zu ὄππως der Fall ist.

<sup>15)</sup> C.J. Ruijgh, *Autour de ‚τε épique‘*, Amsterdam 1971, S.804–6.

<sup>16)</sup> *Op. cit.*, S.805: „Noter qu'en français, il est possible de rendre τε par ‚et‘.

Andererseits unterscheiden sich mit *τίπτε* eingeleitete Sätze kaum von solchen mit *τί τ'(ε)*, sondern erscheinen in den gleichen Zusammenhängen, wie die folgenden Beispiele zeigen:

- Ilias* 15, 90      *Ἥρη, τίπτε βέβηκας; ἀτυζομένη δὲ ἔοικας·*  
*Ilias* 16, 721      *Ἔκτορ, τίπτε μάχης ἀποπαύεαι; οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ.*  
*Odyssee* 9, 494      *Σχέτλιε, τίπτ' ἐθέλεις ἐρεδιζέμεν ἄγριον ἄνδρα;*

Die einzige hervorzuhebende Tatsache ist die größere Häufigkeit von *τίπτε* im Vergleich mit *τί τ'(ε)*<sup>17)</sup>, was jedoch kein Hindernis für unseren Vorschlag sein kann. Die Identität der Kontexte und der Verwendungsweise von *τίπτε* und *τίς / τί τ'(ε)* reicht unseres Erachtens aus, um beide Konstruktionen miteinander in Verbindung zu bringen. Lautlich kann *\*k<sup>w</sup>id-k<sup>w</sup>e*, die rekonstruierte Form von *τί τ'(ε)*, ebenfalls als Grundlage für *τίπτε* angesehen werden: *\*k<sup>w</sup>id-k<sup>w</sup>e* > *\*k<sup>w</sup>it-k<sup>w</sup>e* ⇒ *\*k<sup>w</sup>ik-<sup>w</sup>te* > *τίπτε*. Die Desonorisierung von *-d-* zu *-t-* vor *\*k<sup>w</sup>* entspricht einer allgemeinen phonetischen Tatsache, die jeden weiteren Kommentar erübrigt. Der nächste Schritt, die Metathese einer Sequenz *\*-tk<sup>w</sup>-* zu *\*k<sup>w</sup>t-*, erscheint ebenfalls nicht ungewöhnlich, da das Griechische auch die Lautfolge *\*-tk-* nicht zuläßt<sup>18)</sup>, während andererseits die Gruppe *\*-k<sup>w</sup>t-* im Mykenischen in der Form *ke-ni-ge-te-we*<sup>19)</sup> bestätigt wird. Abschließend ist der Schritt von *\*k<sup>w</sup>* zu *π* die normale Entwicklung des stimmlosen Labiovelars vor einem anderen Konsonanten, bei Formen wie *πρίασθαι, χερνίπτομαι*, usw.<sup>20)</sup>.

So stehen wir also vor einer Doublette *τίπτε* (ungestört entwickelt) / *τί τε* (reanalysiert aus *τί τε*). Auf den ersten Blick könnte sie mit der Doublette *ὄττι / ὄτι* vergleichbar erscheinen. Bei näherem Hinsehen ergibt sich hier jedoch die Frage, warum im zweiten Falle *\*γod-k<sup>w</sup>id* nicht die gleiche Entwicklung (über Desonorisierung und Metathese zu *\*γot-k<sup>w</sup>id* \* *\*γok<sup>w</sup>tid*) erkennen läßt, wie sie soeben für *τίπτε* postuliert wurde, also kein *\*ὄπτι* (~ *τίπτε*) ergeben bzw. hinterlassen hat. Die Antwort mag darin zu suchen sein, daß normal entwickeltes *τίπτε* neben neu zusammengesetztem *τί τε* erhalten blieb, während

... *Il est difficile de déterminer avec certitude le statut syntaxique de τε dans cette construction.*"

<sup>17)</sup> In 43 Fällen erscheint *τίπτε*. Bei einem dieser Fälle ist die Sequenz *τίπτε τ' ἄρ'*, aber es kann sich hier um eine Übercharakterisierung handeln.

<sup>18)</sup> Cf. M. Lejeune, *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*, Paris 1972, S. 69–70, bezüglich, e. g., *τίκτω* von *\*τί-τκ-ω*.

<sup>19)</sup> Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, S. 52.

<sup>20)</sup> Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, S. 52.

\*ὄπι durch ὄτι / ὅτι total verdrängt wurde, weil beim verallgemeinernden Relativpronomen ein zu ὅς τις, ἥ τις usw. zur Verdeutlichung neu geschaffenes ὄτι / ὅτι (mit rezenterer Vereinfachung der Geminata), gestützt durch das normale Relativum ὅς, ἥ, ὅ, übermächtig war und sich schließlich allein durchgesetzt hat.

## Homeric Hiatus

By WILLIAM F. WYATT, Providence

Hiatus in Homer has of course been much discussed, most recently by P. Fortassier,<sup>1)</sup> to which work I refer the reader for a recapitulation of earlier views. In general it is believed that Homer avoided hiatus, save at certain points in the line or at the junctions of formulas. It is also held that he avoided hiatus of final *-ι* and *-υ*. In this note I wish to explore briefly some of the hiatuses in Homer in order to develop a clearer idea of the poet's attitude towards vowels in contact.

Be it noted first that Homer does not in fact avoid vowels in contact. There are many words in which vowels come together without elision or contraction, such as *Ἄτρείδης* or *ῥέεθρα*; and that between words vowels come into contact after the elision of a final vowel, as in the case of *ἄλλγε' ἔθηκε*. Furthermore and most strikingly, hiatus resulting from the loss of *ϝ* as in *τε ἄναξ* (*Iliad*. I.7) was familiar and studied: certain words habitually allowed preceding short vowels to remain unelided.<sup>2)</sup> Vowels in contact, therefore, were not objectionable to epic poets, and it might be well therefore to rephrase final elision of vowels in terms of sentence sandhi, and to hold that words ending in a vowel lose one mora of length when followed by a word beginning with a vowel. Phrased in this way we can incorporate under the same heading both elision and shortening of final long vowels (and diphthongs).<sup>3)</sup>

Furthermore not all words will fall under this rubric. Words such as *σύ* do not lose a mora (though *σέ* does), and *ό* is never lost through elision. *Πρό* is not elided either, and either is maintained as such or experiences crasis. Monosyllables, therefore, are exempt from the rule as stated above, which must now be rephrased: polysyllabic words with a final vowel lose one mora of length before a word beginning with a vowel. Because, however, we regularly find *μ'* for *μέ* and *σ'* for

---

<sup>1)</sup> P. Fortassier, *L'hiatus expressif dans l'Iliade et dans l'Odyssee*, (Louvain, 1989). I have a review of this work to appear in *Phoenix*.

<sup>2)</sup> On the pronunciation of such hiatuses cf. my article in *Studies in Greek Linguistics, Proceedings of the 11th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessalonike 26-28, April, 1990* (Thessalonike, 1991) 13-21.

<sup>3)</sup> And we get around W.S.Allen's objection to the shortening of diphthongs, an objection based on phonetic rather than prosodic criteria, in *Vox Graeca* 2nd Ed. (Cambridge, 1974) 90-92.

σέ, we must add the specification that even in monosyllables one mora is lost when the final vowel is /e/.<sup>4)</sup>

It would take me beyond the scope of this note to render the above rule precise in all its details and to account for all cases. Suffice it to say that *ó*, particularly in the phrase *αὐτὰρ *ó*, τί, σύ* and the like is never elided.<sup>5)</sup> *Προ* is rare unelided (cf. IV. 398 *προέηκε*) but numerous cases of *πρου* (*προὔτυψαν* XIII. 136, *προὔχοντα* XXIII. 325) occur throughout the poems, with crasis. Crasis also occurs with *ó*, as in XI. 288 (*ᾠριστος*) and elsewhere. Crasis is of course the rule later on and we find therefore in Attic *ἀνήρ* (with long initial *α*, a development peculiar to crasis) and Ionic *ᾠνήρ* with the result expected from contraction. Crasis is that development in external sandhi affecting non-elided final vowels before vocalic onset of a following word. It of course applies to those words (plus a few others) which are monosyllabic and hence unaffected by the mora-loss rule stated above.

Homer is, therefore, not at all out of the mainstream either of epic poetry or of the Greek language in his treatment of monosyllables, and nothing whatsoever is to be made of his not allowing elision in the words I have cited.<sup>6)</sup> He is completely in line with later practice also in his use of the reflexive pronoun without hiatus, as in 8.396: *Εὐρύαλος δέ *ε* αὐτόν*, in which a final short *ε* is not elided.<sup>7)</sup> Mora loss is, however, also not the case in two other categories of word, and here things are more problematical.

There are numerous cases of hiatus in vocatives, as in the well-known phrase (*Iliad* I. 74): *ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ κέλευί με δίφιλε*. Clearly here the monosyllabic rule is operative, but in others it is not, as in the

<sup>4)</sup> The rule as given is incomplete and fails to account for the non-elision of *περί*, which can be explained by the desire to avoid homonymy with the etymologically related *περ*. A formulation of this rule is to be found in Monro's *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect* 2nd Ed. (Oxford, 1891) 349-350.

<sup>5)</sup> An exception is the compound form *ὄ τι* which occasionally appears with the final vowel elided, thus implying that it is regarded prosodically as a single word.

<sup>6)</sup> Fortassier (n. 1) is of the opinion that all cases of hiatus have the meaning or significance of separation and are therefore consciously and significantly chosen by the poet. This is of course impossible.

<sup>7)</sup> It may be that the rule will need restating to include non-elision of final short vowels in the reflexive pronoun of the second and third persons. This makes things too complicated, however, and it is as likely if not more so that reflexive combinations are remade with a clear morphological boundary which prevents elision. That is, (Attic) *σαντοῦ αὐτόν* are the phonologically regular continuations of earlier complexes, while forms without elision are later compounds created in the interests of clarity.

equally well-known (*Iliad* II. 8): *βάσκι' ἴθι, οὐλέ' Ὀνειρε*, in which hiatus is twice allowed, once between imperative and vocative, and once within the vocative phrase itself. There is no excuse for either hiatus in terms of earlier forms of the word with initial consonant, now lost. Rather the function of the word is what is at issue: vocatives allow hiatus – or may allow hiatus – because they stand outside the construction of the sentence and hence outside the metrical constraints of verse. Or, put another way, they are separated from the remainder of the sentence by a pause (or something) which can function as a consonant. This explains the hiatus after *ἴθι*.

I give here exempli gratia other cases of hiatus after vocatives: *ἔγνωσ, Ἐννοσίγαιε ἐμήν ...* (XX. 20), ... *Ὀλύμπιε; οὐ νύ τ' Ὀδυσσεύς* (1.60), ... *ξεῖνε, δάω πειρήσασθαι* (19.215). before vocatives: XV. 365 *ᾧς ῥα σύ, ἦιε Φοῖβε*, where the poet addresses Apollo, can be explained by the fact that *σύ* is never elided; XX. 152 *ἀμφὶ σέ, ἦιε Φοῖβε* cannot be so explained, and either is a case of hiatus before a vocative, or is by analogy with the allowed hiatus of XV. 365.<sup>8)</sup> In general, though, it would appear that hiatus is more common after than before a vocative: this may be due to the fact that vocatives frequently appear initially in the line or after the particle *ἦ*.<sup>9)</sup>

Preservation of quantity is seen also in vocatives ending in a long vowel or diphthong. The most striking and perhaps best known case is that of I. 39: *Σμινθεῦ, εἴ ποτέ τοι ...* One may cite, more dubiously, VIII. 209: *Ἥρη ἀπτοεπές* and XIX. 56: *Ἀτρεΐδῃ ἦ ἄρ τι ...* Finally, and most interestingly, we have the case of a final syllable lengthened in thesis, in XXIII. 493 *Αἴαν Ἰδομενεῦ τε*. In all these cases the vocative behaves as if before another consonant: pause functions as a consonant, for these expressions are free-standing and not part of the prosodic flow of the hexametric line any more than they are of colloquial speech, in which vocatives are always separated by pause or

<sup>8)</sup> The *ἐξέφθιτο ἦια* of 12.329 would seem to be by analogy with the phrase just cited and be a misunderstanding, or rather misuse, of the phrase. And this in turn would argue for uncertainty, and hence discussion, of the meaning of the vocative *ἦιε*, which occurs also in the Hymn to Apollo. I suspect that in fact it is not a vocative at all, but is rather an imperative from the verb *άίω* < \**awsio*: “to hear”), and thus means “hear me, Apollo.” The phrase later came to be abstracted from its context and developed an adjectival use. Perhaps a similar development took place with the phrase *φῆλαι Ἀθήνη*, though here the development may be rather from vocative to imperative. Cf. my *Metrical Lengthening in Homer (Incunabula Graeca* 35, Rome, 1969) 212–214.

<sup>9)</sup> Hiatus is not obligatory with *ἦ*, as with. *Ἦρίγωντε σὺβάτω* /17.375).



other mark of syntactic function.<sup>10)</sup> Pause has the function of either a single or a double consonant, for we find final short vowels occupying a heavy syllable in the two phrases *έσσι φίλε έκυρέ* (III. 172), though here the following *δεινός* (< \*dweinos) may be considered to account for the length; and *φίλε κασίγνητε θάνατον* (IV. 155), *φίλε κασίγνητε κόμισαι* (V. 359).<sup>11)</sup> One will compare as well XVI. 555: *Αΐαντε νῦν*, XVIII. 385 *Τίπτε, Θέτι τανύπεπλε*, XIX. 400 *Ξάνθε τε και Βαλίε*, XXIII. 602 *Άντίλοχε νῦν ...*

Imperatives function in the same way as vocatives do, and for the same reason: they are outside the construction of the sentence. Thus we find *τέττα, σιώπη ήσο έμῶ δ' έπιπείθεο μύθω* (IV. 412), *ζώγρει, Άτρεός νιέ* (VI. 46), *άλλ' έρχευ· έμέ* (17.22), plus the more dubious *άνθρώπους τίνυσθε* (or *τίνυσθον* - III. 279), and other cases in which variant readings possibly obscure earlier cases of hiatus.

Hiatus is never obligatory, and one finds elision of vocatives often enough, as in *Άντίλοχ'* (XVII. 685), *Αΐαντ'* (XVII. 508, 669), *Εύρύμαχ'* (21.364). Cf. *Ξείν'* e.g. 18.357. \**Μενέλα'*, however, does not occur, and *Πάτροκλ'* only once.<sup>12)</sup> One wonders whether hiatus is even allowed *within* vocative expressions. We have the evidence of (*Iliad* I. 131): *θεοείκελ' Άχιλλεῦ* that hiatus is not the rule within vocative expressions: one would expect them to behave prosodically just as any other phrase would since a break cannot be assumed within such phrases. And this renders problematic the hiatus in *ούλε Όνειρε*. I suggest that in this case the *ούλε* is in fact (felt to be) an imperative and hence also stands outside the ordinary construction of the verse. If this is correct, it will of course somehow be or be taken to be the greeting *ούλε*, "health to thee."<sup>13)</sup> The vocative phrase *πότνια Όρη /*

<sup>10)</sup> Cf. Monro (n. 4) 360-361, who cites W. v. Hartel, *Homerische Studien*, I. 64 (2nd Ed., Berlin, 1873) for the view that the vocative is an "interruption in the natural flow of a sentence."

<sup>11)</sup> The same phrase occurs in XXI. 308 but before *σθένος* where there is no question of irregular lengthening.

<sup>12)</sup> In XVI. 830, where Hector contemptuously and boastfully addresses the dying Patroclus. The form seems chosen especially to denote Hector's contempt, and we are probably meant to feel horror at the truncated form of the name, a hapax.

<sup>13)</sup> Whatever the case, this word seems to have been felt by the poets to allow hiatus, perhaps precisely as a result of cases like II. 8, as we see from XXI. 536: *Δείδια γάρ μη ούλος άνήρ ...* In this a prosodic rule has been extended from its proper environment to another, as in the case of (e.g.) *αΐθοπα οίνον*, in which hiatus is correct before the word once beginning with *ϝ*, but not correct in phrases like (XXIV. 641): *πασάμην και αΐθοπα οίνον* (cf. also 2.57) in which hiatus has been incorrectly - if one judges etymologically - allowed also before *αΐθοπα*. Poets

*Ἥβη* remains unexplained, but explanation lies rather in the words than in the syntactic function of the words.<sup>14)</sup>

The word *φίλος* has appeared in our discussion, and must appear again. For we find *φίλος* used where it is metrically necessary – or so it would seem – but where syntax would require *φίλε*. I think of cases like IV. 189: *φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε*, IX. 601 *ἐνταῦθα τρέψειε, φίλος· κάκιον*, XXI. 106 *ἀλλά, φίλος, θάνε*, XXIII. 313 *ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ σὺ, φίλος, μῆτιν*, 343 *ἀλλά, φίλος, φρονέων*, 627 *οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἔμπεδα γυῖα, φίλος, πόδες*. In all these cases the nominative stands for the vocative, and scholars accept that such is normal and correct. And so it must be because the text stands as is. The suspicion arises, however, that the vocative *φίλε* may have stood in some at least of these phrases earlier on, or at least have been allowable metrically. Particularly does this seem to me to be the case in XXI. 106.

A third category of hiatus is found in compound verbs such as *ἐπιόσομαι ἀποαίρεο*. Fortassier (*op. cit.* 322–325) discusses cases of this sort. He finds that there is a total of 149 hiatuses, in two categories: 1 (117 examples) in verbs with which the poet uses only hiatus forms; 2 (32 examples) in verbs with which the poet uses forms with hiatus beside forms without (e. g., *ἀποαίρεο ἀφαιρείσθαι*). Clearly 117 cases must be discarded immediately since the poet had no other form at his disposal.<sup>15)</sup> Some of the verbs that Fortassier assigns to the second category in fact belong with the first (*περίστατο προ-, ἐπιόσομαι*). The remaining instances are (24 in number):

<i>ἀποαίρεισθαι</i>	<i>Δῶρ' ἀποαίρεισθαι ὅς τις σέθεν ἀντίον εἶπη</i> (I. 230)
<i>ἀποαίρεο</i>	<i>Μῆτε σὺ τόνδ' ἀγαθός περ ἑών ἄ. κοῦρην</i> (I. 275)
<i>ἀποαίνυμαι</i>	<i>δούρατα / Τρώια, τὰ κταμένων ἄ.</i> (XIII. 262)
<i>ἀποαίνυτο</i>	<i>θεὸς δ' ἄ. νόστον</i> (12.419 = 14.309)

knew of a set of words which allowed hiatus, and I would assume that each poet had his own set, though there would no doubt have been overlap. Many such words once began with *f*, a fact of which poets were ignorant. Poets' habits were lexical in these cases, prosodic or syntactic in others: I am primarily concerned here with the syntactic.

<sup>14)</sup> C. J. Ruijgh, *Linear B: A 1984 Survey* (Louvain-a-Neuve-, 1985) 154–156 argues that the initial [h] (< [s]) of *Ἥβη* prevented elision in this phrase which he considers – and partly for the reason of the hiatus – to be of Mycenaean origin.

<sup>15)</sup> 104 cases of *προ-* compounds are included in this number, and we have seen that *προ* never experiences elision. *προτί* likewise is never elided (*προτιόσσομαι προτιάπτω* – and cf. my article in *SMEA* 19 [1978] 89–123), nor is *περί* (*περισταθ' περίεμι*). *Ἐπί* does experience elision frequently, but not in *ἐπιορκέω ἐπίορκος*, and *ἐπιόσομαι* is formed after the same verb prefixed with *προτι*.

<i>ἀποαίνονται</i>	<i>ἤμισυ γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς ἄ. εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς (17.322)</i>
<i>ἐπιάλμενον</i>	<i>βάλε / Δεξιάδην, ἵππων ἔ. ὠκειάων (VII. 15)</i>
<i>ἐπιάλμενος</i>	<i>κύσσε δέ μιν περιφύς ἔ. ἠδὲ προσηύδα (24.320)</i>
<i>καταειβόμενον</i>	<i>καταειβόμενον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ (XIV. 279 A, XV. 37, 5.185)<sup>16)</sup></i>
<i>ἐπιείσομαι</i>	<i>νῦν αὖ τοὺς ἄλλους ἔ., ὄν κε κικεῖω (XI. 367)<sup>17)</sup></i>
<i>ἐπεισαμένη</i>	<i>Καὶ ῥ' ἔ. πρὸς στήθεα χειρὶ παχείῃ (XXI. 424)</i>
<i>καταείσατο</i>	<i>Τῆλε διὰ προμάχων, ὅθι οἱ κ. γαίης (XI. 358)</i>
<i>ἀμφίεπον</i>	<i>Ὡς οἱ γ' ἄ. τάφον Ἔκτορος ἵποδάμοιο (XXIV. 804)</i>
<i>ἀμφιέποντες</i>	<i>Σπυδόντων· τοῖον γὰρ ἔχον πόνον ἄ. (V. 667)<sup>18)</sup></i>
	<i>Ἴππους δ' Αὐτομέδων τε καὶ Ἄλκιμος ἄ. (XIX. 392)</i>
	<i>Εἰνάετες γάρ σφιν κακὰ ῥάπτομεν ἄ. (3.118)</i>
	<i>Οἱ μὲν Φωκῆων στίχας ἴστασαν ἄ. (II. 525)</i>
<i>ἀναερχομένω</i>	<i>ἄψ ἄ. πυκινὸν λόχον εἶσαν ἄγοντες (IV. 392)</i>
	<i>τῷ δ' ἄ. πυκινὸν δόλον ἄλλον ὕφαινε (VI. 187)</i>
<i>καταίσχεται</i>	<i>οὐτ' ἄρα ποιμήνησιν καταίσχεται οὐτ' ἀρότοισιν (9.122)</i>

The explanation of these hiatuses is fairly simple, and indeed has been provided by Fortassier (*op. cit.* 323) who refers to tmesis and "l'indépendance du préverbe dans les verbes composés donnait toute latitude à l'utilisation de l'hiatus." Tmesis<sup>19)</sup> is, literally taken, the "cutting" of the preposition from its verb, as in III. 34 *ὑπὸ τε τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα* for prose *ὑπέλαβε*. The origin of the device, already by Homer's time a literary mannerism, lies back in the history of Greek to a period in which the adverb had not yet been completely attached to the verb which it (often) modified. In those days the expression "seized" of III. 34 could have been expressed in three ways:

- 1) *ὑπὸ τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα*
- 2) *τρόμος ἔλλαβε ὑπο γυῖα* (cf. VII. 425)
- 3 a) *τρόμος ὑπὸ ἔλλαβε γυῖα >*
- 3 b) *τρόμος ὑπέλλαβε γυῖα*

<sup>16)</sup> Cf. XVI. 11 *κατὰ δάκρυον εἴβεις* in words of the poet addressed to Patroclus. But cf. *δάκρυα λείβων* (XVIII. 32).

<sup>17)</sup> And XX. 454 (with *ἄλλους Τρώων*) and 15.504: *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἀγρούς ἔ. ἠδὲ βοτήρας.*

<sup>18)</sup> Cf. XVI. 28 *τοὺς μὲν τ' ἱητροὶ πολυφάρμακοι ἀμφιπέπονται*, XIX. 278 *δῶρα δὲ Μυρμιδόνες μεγαλήτορες ἀμφεπέποντο*. The two words are in complementary distribution, and form a single paradigm. See below.

<sup>19)</sup> On tmesis cf. E. Schwyzer – A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik* II. 425–428 (Munich, 1950), Kühner-Gerth I. 530–538 (Hannover and Leipzig, 1898, repr. Darmstadt, 1963).

In this last case preposition and verb are unified, while in the first two they are not; in the second the adverb (preposition), postponed, is in anaphora marked by recessive accent. Stage 3) had been reached already by Mycenaean times, so that Homer, in utilizing 1) and 2) was indulging in an archaism of considerable antiquity, an archaism which may have been progressively restricted to elevated utterance such as that of epic.<sup>20)</sup>

Epic poets were forced by the nature of their craft to analyze their utterances and build new ones out of what were (supposed to be) the rules of the genre. In addition to tmesis in the poems Homer encountered (learned, created) forms like *ὑποείξομαι* (XXIII. 602) beside *ὑπέιξομαι* (I. 294), these with one-time digamma, not to mention forms always with hiatus like *ἀποέργω*, *ἀποεῖπον*. Forms with hiatus are doubtless archaisms preserved by the tradition, while those with elision stem from the current language of the poets. But poets could reverse this process, and make of words with elision words which showed hiatus, the more so if those same words also occurred within the poems *in tmesi*. Verbs with internal hiatus are therefore as it were forms with tmesis of the 3 a) type, in which – from the poets' point of view – the preverb is separated from its verb though appearing directly before it.

We can now test this hypothesis against the evidence of the text. *ἀποαιρείσθαι* (I. 230) and *ἀποαίρεο* (I. 275) appear in *Iliad* I, where also occur *ἀφαιρείσθαι* (I. 182), *ἀφαιρησέσθαι* (I. 161), *ἀφέλεσθε* (I. 299). Forms with tmesis do not occur in I, but do occur often elsewhere: *ἀπὸ γὰρ μένος εἶλετο χαλκός* (III. 94), *οὓς ποτ' ἀπ' Αἰνείαν ἐλόμην* (VIII. 108). Furthermore, also in Book I, we find this verb's semantic opposite (cf. I. 299 *ἀφέλεσθέ γε δόντες*) twice, once with (I. 198: *ἀπὸ πατρὶ φίλω δόμεναι*), once without tmesis (I. 134: *τήνδ' ἀποδοῦναι*). I suggest that tmesis misunderstood explains the hiatus: the poet utilized tmesis, perhaps to underline the meaning of the preverb,<sup>21)</sup> but placed the preverb immediately before the verb with which it forms a semantic unity. The resultant forms are irregular, but are not to be interpreted as archaisms of great antiquity.

<sup>20)</sup> On Mycenaean, cf. A. Morpurgo Davies, *Linear B: A 1984 Survey*, A. Morpurgo Davies & Y. Duhoux, Ed., (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1985) 86–89.

<sup>21)</sup> One will note that here the meaning is in fact that of separation, which would accord with Fortassier's hypothesis, as is the case also with the next example.

*ἀποαίνυμαι* (XIII. 262) and *ἀποαίνυτο* (12.419 = 14.309) have beside them contracted forms *ἀπαινύμενον* XI. 581, XVII. 85, *ἀπαινυτο* XV. 595), and also forms with tmesis: *καὶ αἴνυτο τεύχε' ἀπ' ὤμων* (XI. 579, XIII. 550). The *Iliad* example is isolated, but may well be generated by the appearance of pairs such as that seen in XI. 579, 581: again the preverb immediately precedes the verb. The *Odyssey* example seems clearer, and may indeed be derived from phrases like that seen in XVI. 82: *φίλον δ' ἀπὸ νόστον ἔλωνται*. In fact the two verbs are so similar semantically that the one may well have worked on the other. I would guess that the rarer verb will have influenced the more common.

*ἐπιάλμενον* of VII. 15 is clearly not an archaism, and is clearly also semantically different from more usual *ἐπάλμενος* which means 'leap or spring at or upon a foe',<sup>22</sup>) whereas in VII. 15 it means to 'mount'. In this meaning it fits in rather with the formula *καθ' ἀφ' ἵππων ἄλλο* (with tmesis) of V. 111, XVI. 733, 755, in which again the adverbial notion is stressed. *ἐπιάλμενος* (24.320) is strange, and has been commented upon. The word occurs in the scene of Laertes' recognition of Odysseus, a scene which is itself problematic.<sup>23</sup>) It is clear enough at least that Odysseus is not attacking Laertes, and that therefore the meaning usual with the elided form is inappropriate. Otherwise I have nothing to add.

*καταειβόμενον* in the stock phrase *καταειβόμενον Στυγὸς ὕδαρ* (XIV. 279 A, XV. 37, 5.185) should not be included because the word in fact does not occur anywhere, and is a restoration of Fortassier's (*op. cit.* 165–166) for the attested *καὶ τὸ καταειβόμενον* of the manuscripts. He is of course correct that the use of the article in the phrase is odd, but is not justified in jettisoning the readings of manuscripts.

*ἐπιείσομαι* (XI. 367, XX. 454, 15.504) appears to be a formulaic line, and therefore has perhaps some claims to antiquity. Neither *ἐπεισαμένη* (XXI. 424) nor *καταείσατο* (XI. 358) has any such claim. Indeed were it not for *μετεισάμενος* (XIII. 90, XVII. 285), one would simply assume that the former presence of *digamma*<sup>24</sup>) prevented eli-

<sup>22</sup>) R.J. Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* (London, 1924, repr. Norman, 1963) *s. v.*

<sup>23</sup>) Cf. A. Heubeck in *Omero Odissea* VI.377 (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1986).

<sup>24</sup>) Cf. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris, 1970) 327, H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1960) I. 472.

sion of the preverb. And that must be the proper explanation. Identification of the verb with εἶμι, seen already in XXIV.462-3:

ἀλλ' ἦτοι μὲν ἐγὼ πάλιν εἶσομαι, οὐδ' Ἀχιλλῆος  
ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶσειμι·

explains the absence of hiatus. False tmesis is therefore here a case of tmesis introduced by loss of *digamma* and false etymological speculation.

The hiatus in this word may, however, have contributed to the hiatus in ἀναερχομένῳ (IV.392, VI.187). Because the word πυκινὸν occurs in both lines, it would appear that the one supports the other and is probably derived from it. The reading seems assured in IV.392. And here it seems clear that we are dealing with a reformation, with quasi-tmesis, of the compound. The compound verb without hiatus means 'go up' or 'shoot up' (of plants) whereas the form with tmesis has a more etymological meaning of 'come back, return'. The tmesis form stresses the meaning of 'back' in ἀνά and the analysis of the compound into its two etymological elements. I find few instances of tmesis with ἔρχομαι, but there are many with ἀνά: it would appear that this adverb is peculiarly susceptible to being separated from its verb.

ἀμφιέποντες occurs four times, always at the end of the line, as one would expect. Elided forms of the same compound occur (ἄμφεπε XVI.124, XVIII.348, 15.437, ἄμφεπον XVIII.559, XXIII.167, XXIV.622). Tmesis forms also occur: ἀμφί θ' ἔπον (VII.316), ἀμφ' Ὀδυσσῆα ... Τρῶες ἔπον (XI.482). The verb generally means 'attend to', and as such is a near synonym of ἀμφιπένομαι, which likewise appears at the end of the line (usually). Once (V.667) ἀμφιέποντες appears in fact with the noun πόνον. It would seem that ἀμφιέποντες is a tmesis form created precisely to provide a participial replacement for ἀμφιπένομαι at the end of a line. The two words are, as it were, in complementary distribution, and form part of a single paradigm.<sup>25</sup>).

καταίσχεται (9.122) occurs but once, and at that in what appears a non-formulaic use: it occurs three other times elided, never in the sense of 'be covered by, occupied' which is required in 9.122. The simplex ἴσχω does not readily lend itself to this meaning, nor does it

<sup>25</sup>) For the rhythm and position in the line, cf. also XVIII.186 ἀθανάτων, οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἀγάννιφον ἀμφινέπονται.

occur with tmesis. A clue to the origin of this form is to be found in 9.143–5:

*οὐδὲ προουφαίνεται' ιδέσθαι·  
ἀήρ γὰρ περὶ νηυσὶ βαθεῖ' ἦν, οὐδὲ σελήνη  
οὐρανόθεν προύφαινε, κατείχετο δὲ νεφέεσσιν.*

It would appear that *καταίσχεται* is semantically the same as *κατείχετο*, though of course it is metrically different; and shares the same compounding habits as that verb. Tmesis is relatively frequent with *κατά*, and occurs with forms of *ἔχω* often enough, e. g., (II. 560) *βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπον ἔχουσας* – this more or less in the desired sense – and 24.530: *κατὰ δ' ἔσχεθε λαόν*. Here connection with verbs displaying tmesis is weaker, but it is there: I hold that the form in question appears as it does because both *κατέχεται* and *\*καταέχεται* are metrically excluded. *\*καταείχετο* is excluded because a present tense is wanted.

In all of the above instances there is a case to be made for tmesis in the sense I have utilized that term. One will note also that in all cases we are dealing with polysyllables, and that extension of the words was in all cases necessary. Formulaic variation played a role in some cases, in others a desire to reinforce the meaning of the preverb. Beside them all, in varying degrees, there stand in the Homeric poems cases in which the preverb is in fact separated from the verb. I hold that it is this latter fact which caused the poet to think of separating the prefix from the verb (by means of hiatus) even though he does not separate them physically.

And that brings us to the question of how hiatus was realized phonetically. I hold that there was no glottal catch in Greek, and that therefore the transition was smooth. *ἀποαίρεο*, (e. g.), was pronounced exactly as spelled; or as [apowaireo] with a slight lip-rounding; and not [apo?aireo] where ? denotes a glottal catch such as seen in German, for instance, or in English \*[a?elm] for *a elm*, were we to use that form of the article instead of regular *an elm*. Hiatus did not involve the introduction of a glottal catch, and ancient objections to it were based therefore not on the need for the glottal catch but on the fact that word boundaries were obscured when hiatus was allowed.

Hiatus seems to have been desired by Homer, at least in the above cases; or he at least preferred hiatus to whatever his other choices were: e. g., metrical deficiency. Did he ever seek hiatus, either for its own sake or because it contributed to the meaning he wished to convey? I would answer the question in the affirmative, and would instance two examples which it seems to me can be explained in no

other way. They are rare, but then all literary devices if they are not to become caricatures or banalities are rare. II. 87:

*ἤύτε ἔθνεα εἶσι μελισσάων ἀδινάων*

Here I see no justification for the hiatus save perhaps a desire to create a sonorous line (at least vaguely) suggestive of the flight of bees: a glottal catch would destroy that effect. And XXIII. 224:

*ὧς Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐτάροιο ὀδύρετο ὀστέα καίων*

in which the [o]'s in hiatus convey the idea of lamentation. In neither of these cases can active choice of hiatus be proved, but in both it seems highly likely.



# The Etymology and Earliest Significance of *εἴρων*

*In memoriam David R. Lachterman*

By JOSEPH COTTER, University Park

Efforts to derive *εἴρων* from either *εἴρομαι* (ask) or *εἴρω* (say) suffer from both semantic and morphological weaknesses (cf. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque* [Paris 1970] II, 326). This paper argues that the word derives from the Spartan *ἰρήν* (= Attic *εἴρην*, cf. K. Forbes, *Glotta* [1958] 252–3) with the stem-ending replaced by the colloquial nominalizing suffix *-ων* (cf. Schwyzer-Debrunner [1939] I, 285 and 487); this assumption better explains not only the morphological and semantic aspects of the word but also the contexts of its earliest use in Greek literature.

The traditional etymology assumes that *εἴρων* derives from the rare verb *εἴρω* and meant originally “one who says something (but without thinking it!)” – a *lucus a non lucendo* guess. The derivation from *εἴρομαι* “I ask” – though it has resurfaced in M. Gourinat’s paper, “Socrate était-il un ironiste” (*RMM* 91 [1986] 339–353) – has only the suggestive connection with the Socratic method of question and answer to recommend it.

*Εἴρων* first appears in Aristophanes’ *Clouds* (449) together with its ethical opposite *ἀλαζών*, a word convincingly derived from the name of a people in Thrace (cf. G. Bonfante *BSL* 37 [1936] 77–78). An important and productive role of the suffix *-ων* in ancient Greek was to create epithets and nicknames from adjectives and nouns; I suggest that the nominal stem in *εἴρην* served as the basis of *εἴρων* – the meaning would be “having the qualities of an *εἴρην*”. At Sparta, *εἴρην* meant a young soldier whose initiation into military life had been characterized by the systematic use of deception in paramilitary exercises; we would then have in *εἴρων* a word meaning “one with the deceitful cunning of an *εἴρην*.” Examples of such morphological opposition are *ἀττάγων* = *gallina rustica*<sup>1</sup>) < *ἀτταγήν* = francolin; *φάγων* = glutton < *φαγών*, *-όνοσ* = jaw; the numerous masculine

---

<sup>1</sup>) For the difficulty in identifying the *gallina rustica*, cf. D’Arcy W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford 1936) 40. It is, however, certainly not the same as the francolin and so there is no reason to emend *ἀττάγων* in the Philoxenus glossary (*Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* vol. 2, 32, 11).

names with Attic *-ων* and non-Attic *-ήν<sup>2</sup>*) such as Πύθων < Πυθήν, Λύκων < Λυκήν; γάστρων = Pot-belly < γαστήρ = belly; γλύκων = Sweety < γλυκύς = sweet; and - at Sparta - μόθων = a Helot child, a brat or “scrapper” in Attic comedy < μόθος = fight or battle-racket. A similar pejorative semantic development turned OE *cnafa* into *knave*.

The renown enjoyed by the Spartan *eirenes* in fifth century Greece is clear from a passage in Herodotus (9.85), where we read that after the victory at Plataea the Lacedaimonians made three graves; ἔνθα μὲν τοὺς ἱρένας ἔθαψαν, τῶν καὶ Ποσειδώνιος καὶ Ἀμομφάρετος ἦσαν καὶ Φιλοκῶν τε καὶ Καλλικράτης. ἐν μὲν δὴ ἐνὶ τῶν τάφων ἦσαν οἱ ἱρένες. Although the manuscripts read *ιρέας* and *ιρέες* here, Valckenaer's emendation is quite certain and the definitions (1) *εἴρην*, ‘aged between thirteen and nineteen, teenager’ and (2) *μελλείρην* ‘boy about to become an *εἴρην*, in sixth year of public education, i. e. in thirteenth of his age<sup>3</sup>) cannot be correct.<sup>4</sup>) The *eirenes* would include all those in the first ten-year class of soldiers – aged twenty to thirty.<sup>5</sup>)

The word *εἴρων* appears in the *Clouds* in an anti-Socratic context and the Socratics were notorious for their pro-Spartan tendencies; in Athens during the late 420s BC both the presence of the Spartan prisoners from Pylos and the continuance of the Peloponnesian War would have contributed to a general interest in aspects of the Spartan military training.

Ribbeck (*RhM* [1876] 381–400) correctly stressed the pejorative qualities of “irony” in Old Comedy; I would call attention to the tricky activities (not merely verbal deceptions) that are described as “ironic.” Thus at *Birds* 1211–2:

Ἰρ. οὐκ οἶδα μὰ Δί' ἔγωγε κατὰ ποίας πύλας.  
 Πι. ἤκουσας αὐτῆς οἷον εἴρωνεύεται;  
 πρὸς τοὺς κολοιάρχας προσῆλθες; οὐ λέγεις;  
 σφραγιδ' ἔχεις παρὰ τῶν πελαργῶν;

<sup>2</sup>) Cf. F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen der Griechen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle 1917) and *Die griechischen Dialekte* (Berlin 1921–4) II, 246; and P. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris 1933) 158–168.

<sup>3</sup>) Cf. *LSJ Supplement* (Oxford 1968) 48 and 98.

<sup>4</sup>) The best discussion is in C. M. Tazelaar, “ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΦΗΒΟΙ: Notes on the Spartan Stages of Youth,” *Mnemosyne* 20 (1967) 127–153. Cf. H. Stein, *Herodot.* (Berlin 1893), V, 196; F. Solmsen, *IF* 7 (1897) 41–43; and J. F. Lazenby, *The Spartan Army* (Warminster 1985) 48–50.

<sup>5</sup>) Cf. G. Gilbert, *Handbuch der Griechischen Staatsalterthümer* (Leipzig 1893) I, 70.

Iris's ignorance as to which gate she had used to enter illegally Cloud-Cuckoo-Land is viewed by Pisthetaerus as a deliberate attempt to deceive and to spy on the new state. At *Wasps* 174 ff., Philokleon's "ironic" attempt to escape from his son by clinging to the undersides of an ass is modelled on the greatest of all trickster's – Odysseus's – escape from Polyphemus; Philokleon's scheme involves action as well as words:

Σω. οἶαν πρόφασιν καθήκεν, ὡς εἴρωνικῶς,  
 ἔν' αὐτὸν ἐκπέμψειας. Βδ. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔσπασεν  
 ταύτη γ'· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἠσθόμην τεχνωμένου.

In his discussion of the Constitution of the Lacedaimonians, Xenophon stressed three aspects of Lycurgus's educational system: (1) the boys were given over to the control of a *paidonomos* chosen from the highest social class rather than to mere *paidagogoi* as in other states; (2) the boys were subject to strict discipline – they were shoeless, were given a single cloak for the entire year, and were given little to eat; (3) they were encouraged to steal and were punished for stealing badly – i. e. for getting caught. Plutarch (*Lyc.* 17) gives us further information on the relationship between *παῖδες*, *μελλείρενες*, and *εἴρενες*. We learn that the boys were grouped into gangs ruled directly by a bright, reliable, and aggressive 20-year old – the *εἴρην*; those under him were called *melleirenes*, i. e. "want-to-be-eirenes."

The boys took their stealing so seriously, Plutarch writes, that one of them while carrying a little fox under his cloak allowed the animal to dig into his belly with its teeth and nails and so died rather than have his theft detected (*Lyc.* 18.1). After their frugal suppers the *eiren* would have the boys either sing or give brief, thoughtful answers to value-oriented, political questions such as: *ὅστις ἄριστος ἐν τοῖς ἀνδράσιν*; "Who is the best man?" The second example preserved by Plutarch is equally telling: *ποία τις ἢ τοῦδε πράξις*; "What is the nature of this man's action?" If a boy were to give a clumsy answer, the *eiren* would punish him by biting the lad's thumb!

In the *Clouds*, Socrates is said to have stolen a cloak (179, cf. 497–8 and 856–9), the 'Spartan' diet of the Thinkery is remarked on (416–7), Socrates does a question and answer routine with Strepsiades (478–480, 636 ff.), and Pheidippides calls attention to the shoelessness of Socrates's students (103). The Socrates persona of the *Clouds* brings together the comic poet's observations of natural philosophers, sophists, and ambitious politicians as well as of Socrates himself (cf. K. Dover, *Aristophanes: Clouds* [Oxford 1968] xxxii–lvii). I would ex-

plain the asceticism, the thievery, and the notion of an institution into which the young are initiated (this allows for the jokes on a religious initiation) as directly related to the Spartan connection.

The direct ancestor of *εἰρην* (= young man) was the proper term for the male vs female gender distinction in Greek *ἄρσην* / *ἔρσην* with Atticisation of the expected Lac. *\*ἦρην* (cf. F. Solmsen, *IF* 7 [1897] 44-45; E. Benveniste, *BSL* 45 [1949] 100-103; and K. Forbes, *Glotta* 36 [1958] 252-253). The aggressiveness of the young male was naturally linked to preeminence in battle (cf. Herodotus 9.12 for the role of *ἡ νεότης* and 9.85 for the honored burial of the *ἱρένες* at Plataea). Though ancient Greek culture tended to glorify male beauty and aggressiveness within agonistic contexts, the creation of the pejorative family of "ironic" words made possible second thoughts in the same way that an English speaker's use of "macho" and "machismo" does.

## On ἄλθος etc.

By MICHAEL W. HASLAM, Los Angeles

There are words, known to readers of this journal, which exist only in dictionaries. For ἄλθος (-εος, τό), LSJ offers nothing but two lexicographical references, *EM* 63.10 and Hsch. In the former we find *καὶ ἄλθος φάρμακον* appended to an entry on ἄλλετο (*Il.* 5.417), in the latter we find ἄλθαίνει glossed *αὔξει, θεραπεύει, ὑγιαίνει· φάρμακον γὰρ ἄλθος*.<sup>1</sup>) These unimpressive credentials are only slightly improved by LSJ Suppl., which adduces a couple of doubtfully recognized literary attestations: a conjecture in a Sophoclean fragment and a v.l. in Nicander. At Soph. fr. 172 Radt, *πόθεν ποτ' ἄλυπον ὄδε ἤϋρον ἄνθος ἀνίας;* (satyrs, on first tasting wine), Tucker's ἄλθος for ἄνθος is still resisted, but resistance is pointless. The text as it stands is nonsense, and ἄλθος gives exactly the desiderated sense with truly minimal change.<sup>2</sup>) At Nicander *Alex.* 423, *τῷ δ' ὅτε μὲν καθαρὴν γλάγεος πόσιν ἄλθεα* (*Π: ἤλιθα recs.*) *πίσαις* (Gow: *πώμοις Π, πίνειν recs.*), the correctness of the cod. vet.'s ἄλθεα is even less open to question.<sup>3</sup>) And it may be that another occurrence of the word is to be recovered in P. Oxy. LVI 3830, which is a remnant of the collection of *ἱστορίαι* whose compiler modern scholarship has dubbed the 'mythographus Homericus'.<sup>4</sup>) The papyrus' version of the story of Phoenix includes

---

<sup>1</sup>) Hesychius also has an entry ἄλθα· *θερμασία. ἢ θεραπεία.* The alternative implies connexion with ἄλθος, but *θερμασία* implies that ἄλθα originated as a misreading of *αλεα*.

<sup>2</sup>) The transmitted text is defended by R. Renehan (*Glotta* 50 [1972] 41), who takes *ἀνίας* as dependent on ἄλυπον and says that ἄνθος can mean the "bouquet" of a wine – but it cannot: the two alleged occurrences of this meaning (*Glotta* 47 [1969] 222) are Alcman's (*οἶνον*) *ἄνθος ὄσδοντα* and Xenophanes' *οἶνος ... ἄνθος ὀζόμενος*; that wine can be said to smell of flower – to have a floral bouquet – does not make "flower" mean "bouquet." Other conjectures are legion, whether for ἄνθος or ἀνίας or both, but ἄλθος makes them redundant. The line is adduced as the origin of the proverb ἄλυπον ἄνθος (ἄλθος?) ἀνίας, applied *ἐπί τινος πράγματος ὃ λύπης ἀπαλλάττει*.

<sup>3</sup>) The citation of the line in its corrupt form in LSJ s.v. ἤλιθα is a hangover that should simply be deleted. Cf. A. S. F. Gow, *Class. Quart.* 45 (1951) 95 f., 116. For a different view see H. White, *Studies in the poetry of Nicander*, 95–7.

<sup>4</sup>) No fewer than eight ancient manuscripts of it have been published and recognized (six Iliadic, two Odyssean); listed at P. Hamb. III 199 and at *Atti XVII Congr. Int. Pap.* ii (Naples 1984) 241 f., qq. v. for bibliography. It became a

a line beginning *αχθος παραγίνεται* (fr. 3 ii 17; *-γίνεται* = *-γίνεται*); the context is Phoenix' going to Peleus after being cursed with childlessness by his father. But *ἄχθος* is not easy to accommodate to this context, besides being a rather unexpected word to encounter in this kind of text, and if we read *ἄλλθος* instead (restoring e.g. *ὁ [δὲ φυγῶν καὶ βουλόμενος εὐρεῖν] ἄλλθος παραγίνεται[ι Πηλεΐ, ὃς διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν αὐ] τὸν ἀσμένως ἐδέχ[ετο κτλ]*), we have the motif of a cure that we find in other versions of the Phoenix story.<sup>5)</sup>

That *ἄλλθος* deserves more recognition than it currently receives is in keeping with the constellation of cognates to which it belongs.<sup>6)</sup> Homer offers *ἄλθετο χεῖρ* and *ἔλκε' ἀπαλθήσεσθον*, and also *Ἄλθαίη*. This last, *ἄλθαία*, is a pharmacologically favored plant (or plants), named, according to Dioscorides, *διὰ τὸ πολυαλθές*. And *-αλθής* compounds, to confine ourselves to this the commonest formation, are part of the standard medical vocabulary: *ἀναλθής*, *δυσαλθής*, *εὐαλθής* make a handy classification system, exuberantly expanded in pharmacological epic.<sup>7)</sup> The jargon spills over into non-technical prose: we encounter *δυσαλθής* in the Lucianic and Platonic corpora, in Sextus Empiricus, in Gregory of Nyssa and Eusebius. There was less occasion to use the noun, but *ἄλλθος* has no serious competition.<sup>8)</sup> Whatever the

---

constituent of the so-called D(idymus) scholia to Homer. An edition of it is needed.

<sup>5)</sup> Apollod. 3.13.8, schol. Pl. *Legg.* 931b, Tzetz. schol. Lyc. 421, Propert. 2.1.60. In these versions blindness replaces childlessness; the healer is Chiron, to whom Peleus takes him. (In the photograph of the papyrus, P. Oxy. LVI pl. II, it looks as if *αλθος* is in fact what was written, but Dr. R.A. Coles has been kind enough to check the original and confirms *αχθ-*.) – For an attempted reconstruction of the *ἱστορία* in the papyrus see *Bull. Am. Soc. Pap.* 27 (1990).

<sup>6)</sup> Some are given in Frisk's entry in *ἄλθαίνω* (or in Chantraine's, which is nearly identical). I am grateful to Prof. Theodore Brunner for running a TLG search for me, from which some of the following information is drawn.

<sup>7)</sup> In addition to *ἀν-*, *δυσ-* and *εὐ-* (the first already in the epic *Iliupersis*, *ἀναλθέα ἴησασθαι*, F 1.6 Davies, of Podaleirios), Nicander offers *παν-*, *γυ-*, *ἐπ-* and *έν-*. Hesychius' *ῶμαλθές ἔλκος*, a wound that has closed up prematurely, reads as if it comes from tragedy. Formations in *-άλθητος* (*ἀν-*, *δυσ-*) occur in later epic. *διαλθέστερα* at Cass. i 144.19 Ideler I take to be in error for *δυσ-*.

<sup>8)</sup> There is the rather odd *ἄλθεξις*, a clinical term confined to a few medical texts (Hippocratic corpus, Aretaeus, Galen); did it originate under influence of *μάλθαξις*? (It apparently spawned the even odder *ἀλθέζομαι* – present, not future as the lexica and etymological dictionaries have it – which occurs a couple of times in Aretaeus: fake ionic?) Nicander's *ἐναλθη* is glossed as *τὸν χηρῶντα ἀλθήσεως* (not in LSJ or Suppl.). Hesychius glosses *ῥυκάνη* by *ἀλθητήριον* (not in LSJ or Suppl., but I see little reason to think it corrupt). Nicander coins *ἀλθεστήριον*.

provenance of Hesychius' ἀλθέυς = ἰατρός, this is the milieu of Chiron, folk-healer, as evidenced by Pind. *Pyth.* 3 and the names of a host of plants.<sup>9)</sup> The writer of the papyrus' story of Phoenix could have used *θεραπεία*, but evidently preferred the more specific word – which happens also to be the *mot juste*: *δυσσαλθῆ* wounds or diseases, like the plants that healed them, were known as Chironic, *Χειρώνεια*, and it was Chiron who healed Phoenix.<sup>10)</sup>

We have seen ἄλθος mistaken for ἄνθος and for ἄχθος, and the plural ἄλθεα displaced by ἤλιθα. No doubt the word is lying under cover in other places too, awaiting the exposure that may or may not come.

Something of the same sort may be true of ἄλθω. This is a verb not registered by LSJ at all, but in antiquity Homer's ἄλθετο was (not unreasonably) taken as implying it,<sup>11)</sup> and Herodian recognized it as an exception to the rule that verbs in -θω, apart from those in -ερθω, are perispomena (1.441.19). That it was not merely a grammarian's construct is shown by poetic usage such as ῥέα δ' ἄλθεται ὕδατι νοῦσος (Heliod. ap. Stob. 4.36.9).<sup>12)</sup> It may even be that ἀλθαίνα, LSJ's primary entry, is a fictive form by contamination with ἀλδαίνα; its earliest attestation is Timaeus' etymology of the River Ἄλθαινος (FGH 566 F 56 a & b). Whatever the truth of that, I think we may be able to identify at least one place in mainstream literature where there seems a good chance that an ἀλθ- verb has been effaced. At Pl.

<sup>9)</sup> Cf. e.g. Suda in *Χείρων*: *πρῶτος εὗρεν ἰατρικὴν διὰ βοτανῶν*. The plant-names include centaury, of course; cf. Nic. *Ther.* 500 f.

<sup>10)</sup> Eustath. 463.33 f. *Χείρων δὲ εὗρετὴς ἰατρικῆς, ... ἐξ οὗ Χειρώνεια ἔληκται τὰ δυσσαλθῆ, ἃ δηλαδὴ Χείρων κατέδειξε θεραπεύεσθαι, 45.42 τραύματα ... Χειρώνεια, ὅσα δυσσαλθῆ ὄντα δέονται ἄν ἰατροῦ τοῦ Χείρωνος*. Cf. Zenob. 6.46. Even doctors used the term: Galen several times has the collocation *χειρώνεια καὶ δυσσαλθῆ* (as well as *χρόνια καὶ δυσσαλθῆ*, which raises the possibility of textual or semantic fusion). For Cheiron's healing of Phoenix see n.5 above.

<sup>11)</sup> E.g. schol. T *Il.* 5.417, *ἄλθετο παρὰ τὸ ἄλθω*. ... τὸ δὲ ἄλθετο ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑγιάζετο; Erotian glosses ἄλθεσθαι with ὑγιάζεσθαι; ἀλθαίνα, δυσσαλθές etc. were routinely derived from ἄλθω. The other Homeric form, ἀπαλήθεσθον (*Il.* 8.405=419), justified fut. and aor. in -ησ-, and grammarians inevitably back-formed ἀλθέω (EM in ἀπαλήθεσθον is illustrative, cf. ἀλθείσθαι Eustath. 720.20, Hippocr. ap. Erotian *φλαύρωξ ξυναλθέεται*). – The inconsistency of LSJ's various lexeis reflects the confused state of affairs: ἀλθαίνω and ἀπαλθαίνομαι, no ἄλθω or ἄλθομαι or ἀλθέω (a gloss ἀλθεῖν ὑγιάζειν is cited s.v. ἀλθαίνω but unwarrantably labelled aor., as also by Schwyzler, *Gr. Gr.* I 703), but ἐπαλθέω (only Nicander, only fut. & aor.) and συνάλθομαι (on the basis of Hippocratic ξυναλθεσθῆναι).

<sup>12)</sup> Cf. Q.S. 9.475 ἢ δ' ἀλθομένη ἀνέμοισι, unless that is to be emended to ἀλδομένη. Cf. Veitch s.v. (Ἄλθω).

*Rep.* 333e the paradosis (ignoring punctuation) is Ἄρ' οὖν καὶ νόσον ὅστις δεινὸς φυλάσασθαι καὶ λαθεῖν οὗτος δεινότατος ἐμποιῆσαι; If λαθεῖν meant "to heal" or "to cure" there would be no difficulty; as it is, the passage is recognized as corrupt.<sup>13)</sup> The usual remedy, to change ἐμποιῆσαι to ἐμποιήσας and to assign καὶ λαθεῖν to the οὗτος clause (comma after φυλάσασθαι), is far from ideal both in structure and in meaning.<sup>14)</sup> No such problems arise if we simply suppose that λαθ should be αλθ.<sup>15)</sup>

<sup>13)</sup> It is defended however by A. Prandtl, *Analecta Critica ad Platonis de republica libros* (Munich 1904), p. 6, who interprets ἄσπον λαθεῖν tamquam hostem agredientem.

<sup>14)</sup> As to structure, cf. the preceding Ἄρ' οὐχ ὁ πατάξαι δεινότατος ..., οὗτος καὶ φυλάσασθαι;, which makes it all the harder to accept an emendation that does not allow οὗτος to signal the exit from the relative clause; Plato's prose articulates itself without the artificial aid of punctuation. As to meaning, emphasis on inducing sickness *without the victim's noticing* is jarringly out of place, even if it is taken as sneakily paving the way for the argument's conclusion that the just man is a thief (so e.g. D. J. Allan, accepting without query the text as conventionally emended); 'no reason has been given why either the onset or the defence should be *stealthy*' (Allan).

<sup>15)</sup> ἀλθεῖν was proposed by Salvini, according to Tucker (*The Proem to the Ideal Commonwealth of Plato* [1900], crit. n. ad loc.). Tucker half-heartedly commended it (obelizing λαθεῖν in his text, and proffering further suggestions in his commentary), and aptly compared Plato's use of the medical word ἐξάντης at *Phdr.* 244e, but Adam turned his back on it and the modern *textus receptus* remains Schneider's (cf. S. R. Slings, *Mnemos.* 41 [1988] 283 f., who sees the choice as being between ἐμποιήσας and λαθών, and is obviously right to prefer the former). Whether ἀλθεῖν is to be taken as present or aorist is a secondary question. It is securely attested only as present (whether ἄλθειν or ἀλθεῖν: see n. 11 above), but ἀλθίσκω (Hippocr.?) perhaps makes ἀλθεῖν aor. acceptable (cf. εὐρίσκω), and Homer's ἄλθεο likewise (if taken as aor.), cf. ἀλδών ("pot. qu. ἄλδων vel ἀλδῶν" Radt after Lobel) at Aesch. *Dict.* (*TrGF* F 47 a) 815 Radt (but Nic. *Alex.* 532 ἐναλδόμενον I take to be pres.).



# Causal *iva* – Sound Greek<sup>1)</sup>

By INEKE SLUITER, Amsterdam

Summary: Apollonius Dyscolus (s. II A. D.) has always given philologists a hard time by his description of the so-called “causal” use of the conjunction *iva*. To all appearances causal *iva* was a ghost-construction, unknown from any extant Greek text. Grammars of New-Testament Greek every now and then revived the concept in order to explain some problematic instances of the conjunction. However, their alleged examples of causal *iva* did not conform to the conditions that Apollonius had set for its use. This article reports 11 instances of causal *iva* from the 4th and 5th cent. A. D., all in accordance with Apollonian precepts, and showing a very regular semantic pattern. Attention is paid to the stylistic level where the construction is found. The “causal” use of *iva* is thus definitively established as “sound Greek.”

## 1. *The problem*

Scholarly grammars are not in the habit of devoting much attention to the problem of the so-called “causal use” of the Greek conjunction *iva*. Kühner-Gerth does not even mention the phenomenon and in Schwyzer-Debrunner it is only briefly referred to in an *Anmerkung* (II 674). Grammars of later Greek, especially those concerned with the New Testament, have more to offer.<sup>2)</sup> They discuss a number of passages where a causal interpretation of the conjunction might have its theological attractions (cf. *AGC* 157 ff.). However, in none of these passages does a causal interpretation of *iva* impose itself.

Now, the reason why the possibility of such an interpretation is entertained at all, is the authority of the famous Greek grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus (s. II A. D.), who mentions the existence of “causal *iva*”. I studied his and other ancient theories on the topic on an earlier occasion.<sup>3)</sup> Apart from these theories and a discussion of the origin of

---

<sup>1)</sup> I wish to thank Prof. Dr. D.M. Schenkeveld for his critical remarks on an earlier draft of this paper.

<sup>2)</sup> Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 456 Anm. 2 (discussing *Apocal.* 22:14; 16:15; *Marc.* 4:12; *1 Petr.* 4:6); Moulton-Turner III 102. Cf. further Jannaris § 1741; Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr II 647 (causal *ut*).

<sup>3)</sup> See Sluiter, I., *Ancient Grammar in Context. Contributions to the Study of Ancient Linguistic Thought*. Amsterdam (VU University Press) 1990, isbn 90-6256-912-9 (henceforth *AGC*).

the grammatical terminology for the *σύνδεσμοι αίτιολογικοί*, I also presented as a kind of *πάρεργον* a few instances of an actual causal use of *ἵνα* and I gave a tentative explanation of the semantic development leading to this use. Since then, I have found several new instances shedding new light on the material available so far. They justify the conclusion that a “causal” use of *ἵνα* may be considered good Greek (no need for emendation) and they prove Apollonius Dyscolus to have been an acute observer of linguistic fact once again. The presentation of this new material is the objective of this paper.

## 2. *Status quaestionis*

The results of AGC were the following: Apollonius Dyscolus discussed the causal use of *ἵνα* at several points in his work (*coni.* 243, 11 ff., *esp.* 244, 24 ff.; *synt.* 381, 10 ff. and 388, 9 ff.). The upshot of his remarks is that *ἵνα* functions either as an adverb of place, or as a conjunction. When it is a conjunction, it either has final or causal meaning. In accordance with Apollonius’ view on other causal conjunctions, *ἵνα* allegedly has a preference for past-tense constructions, probably on the ground that it is easiest to call something the cause of something else, when both cause and effect have already taken place. However, there is a slight complication in that, unlike other causal conjunctions, *ἵνα* takes the subjunctive instead of the indicative mood. This is said to be caused by analogy from the homophonous *final* conjunction, which is likewise construed with that mood. Although all examples provided by Apollonius feature a subjunctive of the aorist, *ἵνα* is an exception not only with regard to the following mood, but also because of the tense: An aorist subjunctive does not have past-tense value.<sup>4)</sup>

Apollonius’ examples of causal *ἵνα* are somewhat disappointing: He does not quote any literary examples at all, but only gives some phrases coined for schoolroom use, such as: *ἵνα ἀναγνώ, ἐτιμήθην, ἵνα λοιδορήσω ἐπεπλήχθην* (*coni.* 243, 21) (‘because I had read, I was honoured; because I had used foul language, I was rebuked.’).

To sum up the characteristics of Apollonian causal *ἵνα*: that conjunction is always followed by an aorist subjunctive, the main sentence has a past tense, and, finally, in all examples the *ἵνα*-clause precedes the main clause.

<sup>4)</sup> Apollonius himself gets quite confused over this point, cf. *coni.* 244, 24 ff.; AGC 145 ff.; 151 f.

One of the questions I tackled in my thesis was: Where did the theory about causal *ἵνα* originate? I argued that the whole concept of causal *ἵνα* rested mainly on a terminological confusion. From the Peripatos the grammarians had taken over some ideas about causation in general, including the distinction between final and effective causes. However, in this respect as in others they were terminologically dependent on the Stoics, who held a more monolithic view on causation. The consequence was that the one term *αἰτιολογικός* covered both final and effective causes. Thus, *ἵνα* would be classified as *αἰτιολογικός*, in its normal, final interpretation.

Some grammarians, however, began to distinguish the *σύνδεσμοι ἀποτελεσ(μα)τικοί* (final conjunctions) as a separate group within the category of the *αἰτιολογικοί*. Remarks on a causal use of *ἵνα* are found only in these grammarians, maybe because they took the term *ἵνα αἰτιολογικός* not in its wide, but in its strict sense, i.e. as truly “causal” *ἵνα*.

I found some evidence that *ἵνα* was sometimes taken as a causal conjunction by ancient interpreters (examples from Andreas of Caesarea<sup>5</sup>) and the *Lexicon Vindobonense*, AGC 158 ff.) and I suspected that there could also have been a real, if rare and marginal, use of *ἵνα* in a causal sense to support the grammarians’ interpretations. I tentatively suggested several examples of such a use. These, however, laboured from various problems, the most conspicuous being that they did not all of them concur with Apollonian criteria for the causal use of *ἵνα*, as I remarked at the time (AGC 164). In this respect, I did no better than the New Testament Grammars, which never bother about the Apollonian conditions for the use of causal *ἵνα* (cf. AGC 157 ff.).

In AGC, I tentatively regarded this use of *ἵνα* as an Alexandrian colloquialism.

### 3. Method; anticipation of conclusions

As I said, I have found several more instances since then. The problem with looking for a specific use of *ἵνα* is, that the word is so frequent. Even when one has the benefit of access to the *Ibycus* computer and the *TLG* material (as I do), a random search for *ἵνα* is

<sup>5</sup>) PG 106, 449. Andreas paraphrases *ἵνα* (*Apocal.* 22:14) by means of *γάρ*. At the time I checked ancient commentaries on the Bible-passages which were considered likely candidates for causal *ἵνα* by the New Testament Grammars. *A posteriori* that was not the most likely way to find “truly” causal *ἵνα*.

useless and frustrating. I was very glad therefore, when I found that a pattern emerged with the first new cases to crop up.<sup>6</sup>) However, a hermeneutic circle immediately was imminent: I could look for more examples by making use of the once-discovered pattern (and, indeed, not without success), but this was bound to be a self-confirmatory search. All new cases necessarily conformed to the established pattern, otherwise they would have gone undetected. Therefore, I cannot claim to have found the type of context in which a causal use of *ἵνα* may feel at home *par excellence*. I trust that others will supply my material with *Lesefrüchte* of their own.

In anticipation of my results the pattern which established itself may be described as follows: Causal *ἵνα* is mostly followed by an aorist subjunctive, the *ἵνα*-clause preceding the main clause. The main verb is in the past tense. All this is in accordance with Apollonian theory. The *ἵνα*-clause contains a condition (which in my examples is virtually always explicitly marked as a slight one).<sup>7</sup>) It is clear that the condition must have been fulfilled, because its consequent is presented as having taken place already (hence the past tense). It is this past tense which forces us to interpret *ἵνα* causally.

I shall now first present my material, starting with a brief mention of the examples from my thesis which fit the new pattern, then presenting the new material in full. Then, I shall give a brief general discussion, summing up what results from my material. After a note on the semantic development which led to our construction (more specifically the relationship with *ἐάν*), I shall end with some remarks on the stylistic level on which causal *ἵνα* seems to occur.

---

<sup>6</sup>) I owe many thanks to dr. J.M. Tevel, who has showed himself an almost more fervent hunter for examples than myself. He found the pseudo-Chrysostomic text (ex. [4]) which proved the key to at least one set of problems.

<sup>7</sup>) The one possible exception is *Anth. Pal.* IX 169, 5 (Palladas) which I had (accidentally) found already; see, however, section 5. The rest of the new examples was found precisely by looking for a combination of *ἵνα* plus a disparaging word like *βραχ(ός)*, *μόν(ον)*, *εἷς*, *μία*, *ἐν*, *μικρ(ός)*, *τοσοῦτ(ος)*, etc. Alternatively, I looked up the names of either very good people who were severely punished for one small (?) error (e.g. Moses, Miriam, the boys who laughed at Elisa), or of very "bad" people who were saved by one small (?) good deed (like Mary Magdalen, the robber on the cross, Paul). In all these cases, a phrase like "only because" is apt. I searched in all Christian writers available in the *TLG* material and further in Anon. Med.; *Anth. Graeca*; Chariton; Diog. Laertius; Dioscurides; Epict.; Eratosthenes; Euclides; Galenus; Heliodorus; Liban.; Porph.; Sextus Empiricus; Themist.; Vettius Valens; Xenophon Eph.

4. *The material*

(1) *Anth. Pal.* IX 169 (discussed in *AGC* 161 f.):

*Μῆνις Ἀχιλλῆος καὶ ἐμοὶ πρόφασις γεγένηται  
οὐλομένης πενίης γραμματικευσαμένῳ.  
εἶθε δὲ σὺν Δαναοῖς με κατέκτανε μῆνις ἐκείνη,  
πρὶν χαλεπὸς λιμὸς γραμματικῆς ὀλέσει.  
ἀλλ' ἴν' ἀφαρπάξῃ Βρισηίδα πρὶν Ἀγαμέμνων  
τὴν Ἑλένην δ' ὁ Πάρις, πτωχὸς ἐγὼ γενόμεν.*

“The wrath of Achilles was the cause of pernicious poverty to me too, since I adopted the profession of a grammarian. Would that the ‘wrath’ had killed me with all the Greeks, before the bitter hunger of grammar had put an end to me. But all because in former times Agamemnon raped Briseis, and Paris Helen, I have become a beggar.”<sup>8)</sup>

The *ἵνα*-clause precedes the main clause, *ἵνα* is followed by an aorist subjunctive and the main verb is an imperfect. A final use of *ἵνα* seems excluded here.

(2) Johannes Chrysostomus, *de Sacerdotio*, SC 272 (ed. Malingrey) I 4.33 ff. (discussed *AGC* 160):

*ὅσοι δὲ εἰσὶν ἀφειδέστεροι τῶν αἰτιωμένων ταυτὰ τε ἡμῖν ἀμφοτέρα  
ἐγκαλοῦσιν ὁμοῦ καὶ προσιθέασι τὴν εἰς τοὺς τετιμηκότας ὕβριν, δίκαια  
πεπονθέναι λέγοντες αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰ μείζονα τούτων ἀτιμασθέντες ἔτυχον  
παρ' ἡμῶν ὅτι τοσοῦτους καὶ τηλικούτους ἀφέντες ἄνδρας, μεράκια χθὲς  
καὶ πρῶην ἔτι ταῖς τοῦ βίου μερίμναις ἐγκαλινδούμενα, ἵνα χρόνον*

<sup>8)</sup> Transl. adapted from Paton (Loeb), see *AGC* 161 note 55: Paton translates: “But all to let A. run away with B., and P. with H., I have become poor.” Notice that he is obliged to ignore *πρὶν* in his translation in order to give *ἵνα* its ordinary final interpretation. Soury (Budé) translates: “Mais pour qu’Agamemnon enlevât autrefois Briseis, et Pâris Hélène, je suis devenu mendiant” – this is incomprehensible. Beckby (Tusculum) notices the difficulty and comes up with: “Nein, da mußte zuvor Agamemnon Briseis und Paris/Helena rauben, damit ich als ein Bettler erstand.” The drift of the epigram is that “there is a chain of causation which runs from the rape of Helen and that of Briseis via the *μῆνις* of Achilles to the poverty of the grammarian. The first two distichs call attention to the link between *μῆνις* and poverty, the last between the raped ladies and poverty – it does not make sense to take *ἵνα* as final in this connection. Moreover, ... *πρὶν* (vs.5) would put an unpleasant and unnecessary emphasis on the inversion of cause and effect in the case of a final interpretation of *ἵνα*, whereas in a causal interpretation *πρὶν* has the function of stressing the anteriority of *ἀφαρπάξῃ* to *γενόμεν*” (*AGC* 161).

βραχὺν τὰς ὀφρῦς συναγάγωσι καὶ φαιὰ περιβάλλονται καὶ κατήφειαν ὑποκρίνονται, ἐξαίφνης εἰς τοσαύτην ἡγαγον τιμὴν ὅσην οὐδὲ ὄναρ λήψεσθαι προσεδόκησαν.

“And all those detractors who are even less sparing in their accusations, accuse us of both these things at the same time and they add our insolent behaviour towards those who have honoured us, saying that they suffered what they deserved, even if they had received a still more ignominious treatment on our hands, because they had dismissed such formidable men and of such an honourable age, in order all of a sudden to promote youths who only a short time ago were completely involved in all the antics of the worldly life, *because* they frowned for a short time and dressed in grey and feigned a sombre and serious attitude, to such an honour as they would not even in their dreams have expected to receive.” (See *AGC* 159 f.)<sup>9</sup>)

The *ἵνα*-clause precedes the main clause, *ἵνα* is followed by an aorist subjunctive and two subjunctives of the present stem (or should we read *περιβάλλονται*, as does *PG*? *ὑποκρίνονται* is ambiguous, of course). The main verb is an aorist indicative. The point is that in the eyes of his detractors a brief exertion on the part of the “youths” had sufficed to promote them to their present high position. The connection is clearly causal in nature.

(3) Basilius of Caesarea, *Regulae brevius tractatae*, *PG* 31, 1237–40: Question 233:

“Ἐκ πάντων τῶν κατορθωμάτων εἴαν ἐν λείπῃ τινί, εἰ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ σφύζεται”. ΑΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ Πολλῶν ὄντων ἐν τῇ τε Παλαιᾷ καὶ ἐν τῇ Καινῇ Διαθήκῃ τῶν δυναμένων περὶ τούτου πληροφοροῦσαι ἡμᾶς, ἀρκεῖν ἡγοῦμαι τῷ πιστῷ καὶ μόνον τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ κρῖμα· ὅς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτοις καὶ τηλικούτοις κατορθώμασι, καὶ τοιούτοις τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου μακαρισμοῖς καὶ ἐπαίνοις, ἵνα ἐν ἐνὶ μόνῳ δόξῃ παρακούειν, καὶ τοῦτο οὔτε διὰ ὄκνον, οὔτε διὰ καταφρόνησιν, ἀλλὰ δι’ εὐλάβειαν καὶ τιμὴν τὴν περὶ τὸν Κύριον, ἐπὶ τούτῳ μόνῳ ἀκούει· Ἐὰν μὴ νίψω σε, οὐκ ἔχεις μέρος μετ’ ἐμοῦ [*Joh.* 13:8].

“If from all virtuous deeds one is lacking, whether for that reason a person will not be saved.’ ANSWER Although there are many examples from both the Old and the New Testament that can inform us on this point, I think it will be sufficient for the believer to look only at the decision taken in the case of Peter. After all his great and

<sup>9</sup>) Malingrey translates “*rouvrir que ceux-ci froncent les sourcils depuis quelque temps ...*”, instinctively noticing the relationship with *εἴαν* (see below, section 6).

wonderful virtuous deeds, after so many blessings and praise from the Lord, he heard, *because* he seemed to be disobedient in one instance only, and that not even on account of laziness or arrogance, but out of respectful honour for the Lord – for that reason only he heard: ‘If I do not wash you, you have no part in me.’<sup>10)</sup>

The *ἵνα*-clause precedes the main clause. It contains an aorist subjunctive. The main verb is in the present indicative, which may be interpreted as a *praesens historicum*. A causal interpretation is supported by the fact that the *ἵνα*-clause is taken up by the phrase *ἐπὶ τούτῳ μόνῳ*.

(4) Pseudo-Johannes Chrysostomus, *Oratio catechetica in dictum evangelii: simile est regnum caelorum homini patrifamilias, qui exiit primo mane conducere operarios in vineam suam* [Matth.20:1], PG 59, 582:

Οὗτοι οἱ ἔσχατοι μίαν ὥραν ἐποίησαν· Ἴνα μίαν ὥραν ἐγγός σου κλαύση γυνὴ πόρνη, καὶ λύση τὰς τρίχας ..., καὶ φιλήσῃ τοὺς ἀχράντους σου πόδας σώφροσι χεῖλεσι, καὶ προσενέγκῃ σοι τῷ οὐρανίῳ μύρον [Savil. Μύρω] ἐπίγειον, ἔδωκας αὐτῇ πρέσβεια [l. πρεσβεῖα αὐτ πρέσβειαν I. S.] θυγατρὸς καὶ παρθένου. Ἴνα μίαν ὥραν ἐσταυρωμένος ληστής ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ σοι προσφύγῃ καὶ βοήσῃ Μνήσθητί μου, Κύριε, ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου, ὑπὲρ μόνης τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης ἀνέφξας αὐτῷ τὸν παράδεισον. Ἴνα μίαν ὥραν μετανοήσῃ Παῦλος ὁ διώκτης, ὁ πολέμιος, Εὐαγγελιστὴς ἀναδέδεικται.

“*Because* a prostitute has cried but for one hour next to you and because she untied her hair ... and kissed your immaculate feet with demure lips, and because she has offered to you, the heavenly one, earthly unguents, you gave her the privilege (or: the dignity) of a daughter and virgin. *Because* a robber, crucified on the cross, fled but for one hour for refuge to you and cried out ‘Remember me when you come in your high power’ [Luke 23:42], you opened paradise to him on account of that word only. *Because* Paul the persecutor, the enemy, repented but for one hour, he was made a preacher of the gospel.”<sup>11)</sup>

In each of these three examples of causal *ἵνα*, the *ἵνα*-clause precedes the main clause. Each *ἵνα*-clause contains an aorist subjunctive. The main clause twice features an aorist indicative and once a perfect indicative (*ἀναδέδεικται*). A causal interpretation is explicitly supported by the words *ὑπὲρ μόνης τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης*. The context

<sup>10)</sup> PG translates “*ubi ... visus est*”.

<sup>11)</sup> PG translates *ut* + present subjunctive.

excludes a final interpretation. This is a sermon on “the workers in the vineyard” and in this section examples are presented of “last who will be first.” Like the “last” from the gospel, who worked *μίαν ὥραν*, each of the persons here quoted (Mary Magdalen, the robber on the cross, Paul) were saved, after having functioned “properly” (in whichever way) *μίαν ὥραν*. The rhetorical repetition of this phrase is significant.

(5) Pseudo-Johannes Chrysostomus, *de Sacerdotio* l. VII, PG 48, 1069f.:

Γνωθι τοίνυν ὁ πεπόνθασιν οἱ τάλανες ἐκεῖνοι, οἱ τῷ Μωσεῖ καὶ Ἀαρὼν ἀντιστάντες ποτὲ καὶ προπετευσάμενοι ἀναιδῶς καὶ ἀυθαδῶς θυμιάσαι τῷ Θεῷ· οὐχὶ πῦρ κατέφαγεν ἅπαντας ἀνθ' ὧν κατετόλμησαν εἰς βαθμὸν οὗ οὐκ ἦσαν ἄξιοι; Πάλιν δὲ καὶ Μαριάμ ἡ προφῆτις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα βραχύν τινα λόγον τῷ Μωσῆ ὄνειδίσῃ περὶ ἱερωσύνης, τοιοῦτον αὐτῇ μῶμον ὤρισεν ὁ Ὑψιστος, ἵνα λεπρωθεῖσα ἐπτά ἡμέρας ἀφορισθῇ ἕξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς.

“Think of what those wretched men suffered, who once opposed Moses and Aaron and had the rashness to burn incense for God in a shameless and wilful way. Did not fire consume them all for their rash pretention to the rank of which they were unworthy? And, again, Miriam the prophetess of God: *because* she made Moses some brief reproach over the priesthood, the Highest brought such disgrace down on her that she was banned from the camp for seven days, suffering from an attack of leprosy.”<sup>12)</sup>

The ἵνα-clause precedes the main clause and it has an aorist subjunctive. The main clause contains an aorist indicative. An explicit indication for a causal interpretation is the use of ἀνθ' ὧν in the preceding sentence (cf. SD 661). In both sentences the topic is divine retribution, in the first this is caused by the rashness of the pretenders to the priesthood (ἀνθ' ὧν κατετόλμησαν), in the second, it is the behaviour of Miriam.

(6) Johannes Chrysostomus, *de poenitentia hom.* VIII, PG 49, 339:

(God does not only refrain from punishment in the case of a penitant person, he even justifies). ... “Δίκαιον αὐτὸν ποιῶ.” Καὶ ποῦ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν; Ἐπὶ τοῦ ληστοῦ, ἵνα εἶπῃ μόνον ἐκεῖνο, “Οὐδὲ φοβῆ σὺ τὸν Θεόν;”, τῷ ἐταίρῳ αὐτοῦ. “Καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως· ἄξια γὰρ ὧν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν.” Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Σωτὴρ· “Σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ

<sup>12)</sup> PG translates “*quod ... exprobrasset*”!



ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.” Οὐκ εἶπεν, “Ἀπαλλάττω σε κολάσεως καὶ τιμωρίας,” ἀλλ’ εἰς τὸν παράδεισον εἰσάγει αὐτὸν δίκαιον.<sup>13)</sup>

“I justify him.’ And in which case did he do that? In the case of the robber, because he had said only this: ‘Do you not fear God?’, to his companion, ‘And we indeed justly; for we are receiving the due reward of our deeds’. The Saviour says to him: ‘Today you will be with me in Paradise’. [*Luc.* 23:40–3] He did not say: ‘I deliver you from punishment and retribution’, but he leads him into Paradise as a just man.”<sup>14)</sup>

In this case the main clause lacks a verb and we have to supply *ἐποίησεν τοῦτο*. The rhetorical structure of the passage accounts for the differences with the preceding passages. Theoretically, it seems possible to regard *λέγει* as the main verb (by change of punctuation), but this is not attractive. However the sentence is construed, I find the asyndeton rather harsh. The *ἵνα*-clause contains an aorist subjunctive. The main verb (to be supplied) is an aorist indicative (*ἐποίησεν*) (alternatively, it is a present indicative (*λέγει*)). A causal interpretation seems inevitable and it is supported by the parallel passage from Johannes Chrysostomus, *de Cruce et Latrone homil. II*, PG 49, 410. There the causal relationship between the penitence of the robber and his reward is unmistakable. The words of the robber are there called *τὰ βραχέα ἐκεῖνα ῥήματα*, which stresses the fact that his is a simple accomplishment that leads to a disproportionate remuneration.

(7) Johannes Chrysostomus, *de Virginitate*, SC 125 (ed. Musurillo), 22, 1:

Καὶ τί λέγω Μαριάμ; Οἱ γὰρ παῖδες ἐκεῖνοι οἱ περὶ τὴν Βηθλεὲμ παίζοντες ἵνα πρὸς τὸν Ἐλισσαῖον τοῦτο μόνον εἴπωσιν· “Ἀνάβαινε, φαλακρέ”, οὕτω παρώξυναν τὸν Θεὸν ὡς ἅμα τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἄρκους αὐτῶν ἐπαφεῖναι τῷ πλήθει.

“And why am I talking about Miriam? For those children who were playing near Beth-el – *because* they said to Elisa only this: ‘Go up, you baldhead!’, they so angered God that as soon as they had spoken these words, he sent bears to attack their group” (cf. 2 Kings 2:23–4).<sup>15)</sup>

<sup>13)</sup> This text is also found as Johannes Chrysostomus, *Ecloga de poenit. homil. xxxv*, PG 63, 836 (which in fact contains excerpts from our passage). The text there runs thus: *Δίκαιον αὐτὸν ποιεῖ. Καὶ ποῦ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν; Ἐπὶ τοῦ ληστοῦ ἵνα εἴποι μόνον ἐκεῖνος· κτλ.*

<sup>14)</sup> PG translates “*ut ... diceret*”, ignoring the problem.

<sup>15)</sup> Grillet (SC) rightly translates “pour avoir dit”.

The *ἵνα*-clause precedes the main clause. It contains an aorist subjunctive. The main verb is in the aorist indicative. Again the topic is severe retribution for (seemingly) small offences. This brings about a causal interpretation.

(8) Johannes Chrysostomus, in *Acta Apostol. homil. III*, PG 60, 40.

*Ἐνόησον, ὅσα ὑπέμεινεν, ὅσα ἐφιλοσόφησεν ὁ Μωϋσῆς, ὅσα ἐπεδείξατο ἀγαθά· καὶ ἵνα ἐν ἀμαρτη ἀμαρτημα μόνον, ἐκολάζετο πικρῶς.*

“Think how much Moses endured, how much he taught, how many good deeds he did. And just *because* he committed one single sin, he was punished relentlessly.”<sup>16)</sup>

The *ἵνα*-clause precedes the main clause, it contains an aorist subjunctive and the main verb is an imperfect. This text should be connected with the next one, which I discussed in AGC 162. There, the context is virtually identical and, moreover, it contains (like ex. (5) above) an explicit support for a causal interpretation, namely the phrase *ἀνθ’ ὧν*:

(9) Severianus of Gabala, *homil. In qua potestate*, PG 56, 419 (cf. CPG 4193) (discussed in AGC 162):

*Μωϋσῆς ὁ τοσοῦτος καὶ τηλικούτος ἀνὴρ ..., ᾧ διηρέθη θάλασσα ... οὗτος, ἵν’ ἐν τι τῶν ὑπὸ Θεοῦ κελευσθέντων τολμήσῃ (M; τολμήσας cet. Migne) ἀνθρωπίνῳ λογισμῷ μετρήσαι, καὶ μὴ τῇ θεῖα δυνάμει παραχωρήσαι, ἀπαιραίτητον ὑπέσχε την δίκην. ὡς γὰρ ἔφθασεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, λέγει πρὸς τὸν λαόν· “ὦ λαὸς σκληρὸς καὶ ἀπειθής, μὴ ἐκ τῆς πέτρας ταύτης δυνήσομαι ὑμῖν δοῦναι ὕδωρ;” καὶ τί πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός; “ἀνθ’ ὧν οὐκ ἐδόξασάς με ἐνώπιον τῆς συναγωγῆς οὐκ εἰσελεύσει εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ὠμοσα.”*

“Moses, that great and honourable man ... for whom the sea parted ... he inescapably underwent his punishment *because* he had ventured to measure one of God’s commandments with human reason. For when he came at the rock he said to the people: ‘Hard and disobedient people, shall I not be able to give you water from this rock?’ And what did God say to him? ‘Because you have not glorified me in front of the assembly, you shall not enter the land that I promised.’” (cf. *Num.* 20:2–13).<sup>17)</sup>

The parallels with the passage from Chrysostom leap to the eye. Again the *ἵνα*-clause precedes the main clause. It contains an aorist subjunctive, the main verb is an aorist indicative.

<sup>16)</sup> PG translates “*et tamen quod unum peccatum admiserit*”.

<sup>17)</sup> PG (reading *τολμήσας*, which cannot be construed) translates: “*hic ubi unum ex Dei jussis ausus est humana ratione metiri*”.

## 5. Discussion

The nine passages quoted above contain eleven instances of *ἵνα* eliciting a causal interpretation. In all examples *ἵνα* is followed by an aorist subjunctive. In one instance (ex. [2]) *ἵνα* is followed by an aorist subjunctive which is coordinated with a present subjunctive and then another aorist subjunctive. However, the coordination is suspect (maybe a simple typesetting error?). I propose to read an aorist subjunctive in this case, too.

In ten out of eleven cases, the *ἵνα*-clause precedes the main clause. The one exception is ex. (6), where the structure of the sentence is to blame, there being no main verb explicitly present. The verb has to be supplied from the preceding question. Alternatively, the punctuation could be changed so as to make *λέγει* the principal verb, but on balance this is not attractive.

In eight out of eleven instances the main verb is in the past tense, either an aorist indicative (six cases) or an imperfect (two cases). The three remaining ones have either a present indicative (ex. [3], *praesens historicum*; possibly (see above) ex. (6), in that case another *praesens historicum*) or a perfect indicative (ex. [4]). The latter is the third of a series of three instances of causal *ἵνα* in one context. Since the preceding two have an aorist indicative as main verb, it is likely that the perfect was also felt as a past tense here.

The Apollonian conditions for a causal interpretation of *ἵνα* seem, therefore, to be generally valid. Several times there are overt signs in the context leading to a causal interpretation. In all contexts a final interpretation is excluded by the temporal sequence of the actions described in the *ἵνα*-clause and the main clause respectively. It is virtually impossible to read a teleological innuendo into any of these passages.<sup>18)</sup>

All examples share the characteristic that the action expressed by the main verb is presented as resulting from the fulfilment of a certain condition. The causal interpretation is due to the fact that evidently both the fulfilment of the condition and the result are already effectuated. Mostly, stress is put on the discrepancy between the slightness of the condition and the seriousness of the ensuing results. In practice, this is done by underscoring the discrepancy lexically:

<sup>18)</sup> As may easily be done in the New Testament passages mentioned e.g. in note 2.

ex. (2) *ἵνα χρόνον βραχύν τὰς ὀφρῦς συναγαγῶσι ... ἐξαίφνης εἰς τοσαύτην ἤγαγον τιμὴν*

ex. (3) *ἵνα ἐν ἐνὶ μόνῳ δόξῃ παρακούειν* (cf. in the preceding lines:) *ἐπὶ τοσοῦτοις καὶ τηλικούτοις κατορθώμασι*

ex. (4) *ἵνα μίαν ὥραν ... κλαύσῃ ... ἵνα μίαν ὥραν ... προσφύγῃ ... ὑπὲρ μόνῃς τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης ... ἵνα μίαν ὥραν ...*

ex. (5) *ἵνα βραχύν τινα λόγον ... ὄνειδίσῃ ... τοιοῦτον ... μῶμον ὤρισεν*

ex. (6) *ἵνα εἴπῃ μόνον ἐκεῖνο*

ex. (7) *ἵνα ... τοῦτο μόνον εἴπωσιν ... οὕτω παρῶξυναν*

ex. (8) *ἐννόησον ὅσα ... ὅσα ... ὅσα ... καὶ ἵνα ἐν ἀμάρτῃ ἀμάρτημα μόνον*

ex. (9) *τοσοῦτος ... τηλικούτος ... ἵνα ἐν τι ... τολμήσῃ ... μετρηῆσαι*

However, as I explained above, such a disproportionate relationship between cause and effect cannot be posited as a prerequisite for the causal interpretation of *ἵνα*: The preponderance of this type would in any case result from my methods of research. Typically, an example which I had already found accidentally, does not seem to conform to this pattern (ex. [1]). On the other hand, it must be remarked that this case, too, could be interpreted accordingly if one be prepared to consider the rape of Helen of minor importance in confrontation with the poverty of the complaining grammarian – one might even argue that the epigram gains additional force from such a supposition, ludicrous as it may be, but made by the *persona* of the grammarian! Nevertheless, I do not think that we can as yet posit the discrepancy of cause and effect as one of the semantic factors inducing the causal interpretation of *ἵνα*. For in that case, all the examples quoted by Apollonius Dyscolus would fall outside the general semantic environment of our construction. It is hardly conceivable that a schoolteacher would find a compliment an excessive reward for proper reading, or a rebuke an excessive punishment for using foul language. From a didactic point of view Apollonius' examples would in that case be an extremely bad choice. Since Apollonius thus far proved a reliable witness, I hesitate to introduce elements which not only are not mentioned by him, but even seem to clash with his evidence.

#### 6. Semantic development – relationship with *εἰάν*

In AGC 164 ff. I discussed the semantic developments which may have led to the possibility of a causal interpretation of *ἵνα*. I refer to that passage for a full discussion, but would like to add one detail

here. The fact that our *ἵνα*-clauses may be described in terms of “conditions”, inevitably calls to mind the relationship between *εἰάν* and *ἵνα*, which was established in ancient grammatical sources (AGC 155, n. 37).<sup>19</sup>) Such a link is also suggested by the formulation of ex. (3): The question there is “ἐκ πάντων τῶν κατορθωμάτων εἰάν ἐν λείπῃ τινι, εἰ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ σφύζεται”. The expression that comes nearest to a direct answer to this question is the phrase: “ἵνα ἐν ἐνὶ μόνῳ δόξῃ παρακούειν ... ἀκούει”.

Now, I do not for a moment mean to suggest that *ἵνα* is in any straightforward sense equivalent to *εἰάν*. For one thing, it is impossible to replace the “causal” instances of *ἵνα* by *εἰάν*, if only precisely because the whole period is generally past tense. But one wonders whether *εἰάν* may not have had a kind of intermediary function, if one calls to mind that *εἰάν*-sentences can state the “cause” with many verbs of emotion. The “cause” is in those cases presented as a mere supposition rather than as a matter of fact (cf. Smyth, *Gr. Grammar* 2247; KG II 370, 8 d). An example is Isocr. *ep.* 6.7: μὴ θαναμάζετε δ’ ἂν τι φαίνωμαι λέγων. The point is, of course, that *ἵνα* comes to be used in very much the same contexts in later Greeks (i.e. replacing *οἷτι*-clauses), cf. AGC 166 f.

### 7. Stylistic level

In AGC (e.g. 143) I suggested that the so-called causal use of *ἵνα* may have been either colloquial, or typical of the dialect of Alexandria, or both. In view of the authors who use *ἵνα* with a causal connotation, it is no longer necessary to regard it as a typically Alexandrian phenomenon. However, the likelihood of a “colloquial” flavour seems confirmed by the new material.

In general the following may be remarked on the “social environment” of causal *ἵνα*: Apart from the testimony of Apollonius Dys-

<sup>19</sup>) For “ἵνα ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰάν” add Sch. Hom. *H* 353 (according to Aristonicus [see also Friedländer 133] this substitution is not done ‘Ομηρικῶς – this evokes the question where it is usual. Cf. Eustath. *a. l.*). Another instance is provided by the Scholiast on Epictetus I 29.16. For a final *ἵνα*-clause that comes very close to a statement of a proviso or condition, see e.g. Joh. Chrysost. *Fragm. in Iob*, PG 64, 596 πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἔοικεν αὐθημερινῶ μισθωτῶ, ὃς δι’ ὅλης ἡμέρας κάμνει ἵνα μικρόν τι κομίσηται. In this case, too, the presence of *μικρόν τι* induces semantic overtones that are not quite straightforwardly final: it rarely is anyone’s professed purpose to earn “a little”.

colus, all “literary” instances of the causal use of *ἴνα* date from the fourth and fifth centuries. The stylistic level of *Anth. Pal.* IX 169 (ex. [1]) is discussed in *AGC* 161 f. Several other examples stem from homilies, which are characterized in general by frequent colloquialisms (exx. [4], [6], [8], [9]). Note that I do not use “colloquialism” in any pejorative sense, i.e. as a “vulgar” element. All authors are educated persons, and there is no reason whatsoever for disparaging their Greek, but they do apply elements of a sub-literary level of style in the texts under discussion here. Such a sub-literary level of style may also be posited for the remainder of the passages containing causal *ἴνα*: *De Sacerdotio* (ex. [2]; cf. ex. [7]) is a dialogue, containing many elements of (educated) spoken Greek (cf. Malingrey, *introd.* 22 ff.).<sup>20</sup> Basilus’ *Regulae* (ex. [3]) are “based on notes of pastoral conversations between Basil and members of his monasteries, as they were written down by tachygraphs”.<sup>21</sup> – Incidentally, most homilies have come down to us by a like procedure. And, finally, Chrysostom’s *de Virginitate* (ex. [7]), although it is a treatise and not a homily, is very similar in stylistic level to the homiletic genre, and shows many affinities with the diatribe in this respect (cf. Musurillo, *introd.* 38 ff.).

I have entertained the possibility that causal *ἴνα* might belong to the stylistic level of the “Fachprosaschriftsteller”.<sup>22</sup> This would imply that it belongs to the stylistic level of sub-literary, written, educated Greek. However, there are two considerations that make me look upon causal *ἴνα* as a phenomenon that primarily belongs in (educated) *spoken* language. In the first place, the more technical writers I investigated (e.g. Vettius Valens, various medical writers, Euclides, Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry etc.) simply did not yield any instances of causal *ἴνα*. And secondly, the specific group of examples that I did find, struck me by the rhetorical impact of the construction, which seemed to fit a context of direct contact between speaker and addressee. The fact that Apollonius Dyscolus does not quote any literary examples (as he is wont to do) is also telling. The reason to regard “causal *ἴνα*” as “correct” Greek (instead of a vulgarism), is the character of the au-

<sup>20</sup>) I have not been able to consult W.A. Maat, *A Rhetorical Study of J. Chrysostom’s De Sacerdotio*, Washington 1944 (= *Patr. Studies* vol. LXXI).

<sup>21</sup>) J. Quasten, *Patrology* III 212.

<sup>22</sup>) Cf. L. Rydbeck, *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament. Zur Beurteilung der sprachlichen Niveauunterschiede im nachklassischen Griechisch*. Uppsala 1967.

thors involved, and especially the fact that at least Apollonius Dyscolus cannot have considered the construction to be vulgar, or he would have excluded it from his teaching.

### 8. *Conclusion*

The causal interpretation of the conjunction *ἵνα* is now definitively vindicated as sound Greek, and as such it deserves a place in the scholarly grammars.

It occurs under the circumstances that were described by Apollonius Dyscolus. The *ἵνα*-clause precedes the main clause, *ἵνα* is construed with an aorist subjunctive and the main verb is past tense.

This usage of *ἵνα* belongs to the sub-literary, colloquial language of the educated Greek, at least from the second century A. D. onwards. All literary attestations date from the fourth and early fifth centuries A. D.

## Archilochos fr. 5,3 W.

Von RUDOLF FÜHRER, Hamburg

Daß die richtige Textvariante nicht *αὐτὸς δ' ἐξέφυγον θανάτου τέλοσ<sup>1)</sup>*, sondern *αὐτὸν<sup>2)</sup> δ' ἐξεσάωσα. τί μοι μέλει<sup>3)</sup>* ist, zeigen nicht zuletzt die – zum Teil (chiastisch) 'respondierenden'<sup>4)</sup> – Klangwiederholungen<sup>5)</sup> gegenüber v. 1 *ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαίων τις ἀγάλλεται*:

1	<i>ca</i>	<i>ῆ</i>	<i>ω</i>	<i>τι</i>		<i>ca</i>
	∪	∪	<u>3</u>	∪		∪
~ 3		<i>κά</i>	<i>ω</i>	<i>ca</i>		<i>τι</i>

<sup>1)</sup> So Bergk (fr. <sup>15=</sup>46), Diehl (fr. <sup>16=</sup>26b), Tarditi (fr. 8), Snell (Die Entdeckung des Geistes <sup>4301</sup> Anm. 10, vgl. Entretiens Hardt 10, 1963, 116).

<sup>2)</sup> *ψυχὴν* (Ar. Pax 1301) Nauck (Philologus 5, 1850, 555), Weber (Philologus 74, 1917, 94 ff.), Perrotta (= Gentili, Polinnia <sup>270</sup>), Treu; dagegen Dover, CR 74 = n. s. 10, 1960, 11.

<sup>3)</sup> So Diehl (fr. <sup>26 a=</sup>36) mit "suggestion of a pun between *Σαίων* and *ἐξεσάωσα*" (Adkins, Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists, Chicago 1985, 216 Anm. 65), West (Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus, Berlin / New York 1974, 118).

<sup>4)</sup> Vgl. noch v. 2 *κ' οὐκ ὦ*  
                   |— ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ —||  
                   ~ 4 *κ' οὐκ ὦ*

sowie (bei beiden Varianten) *ἐξ-* [2] v. 3 ~ 4, ferner ZPE 57, 1984, 41 Anm. 2.

<sup>5)</sup> Vgl. außer "1 -άλλ-, 2 -άλλ-, 3 αὐτ-, 4 -αῦτ-" (GGA 229, 1977, 44 Anm. 461) noch (bei beiden Varianten) 2 -έλ-, 3 -έλ-, ferner ZPE 29, 1978, 40.



# The Behaviour of Prepositives in Theocritus' Hexameter\*)

By ASUNCIÓN MOJENA, Barcelona

It is well known that ancient metrics and a great deal of modern metrical studies have only taken syllables into account. Word-ends were first paid attention to in the early 19th century, and it was only in 1926 that Hermann Fränkel<sup>1)</sup> put forward his interpretation of the caesurae and bridges of the hexameter within the frame of a theory of its structure.

On reviewing the various theories of the structure of Greek hexameter from Fränkel onwards, it can be seen that they are determined by the way word-ends are taken into account and particularly by the treatment of appositives, a term which includes all unstressed words (both proclitics and enclitics) as well as those stressed ones that must be preceded by others (postpositive such as μέν, δέ etc.).

The problems arising when scholars try to determine word-ends are due to differences in the treatment of appositives. The first question to be considered is whether naïvely to follow the tradition of written text, placing word-end where the blank space is found, or else to assume that the object of metrics is not the written text itself but its phonic reality. If the latter assumption is right, both proclitics and enclitics should not be taken apart from the following or preceding word respectively. From this point of view the current situation is extremely confusing as shown by a survey of recent studies.

The present paper is an attempt to clarify the present state of affairs. To this end we have studied the behaviour of appositives applying strictly linguistic and statistical criteria. It should be remarked that the hexameters under scrutiny are those of Theocritus' *Idylls*<sup>2)</sup> (2614 lines), whether or not of dubious authorship (epigrams are not taken

---

\*) I wish to state here my thanks to Professor Martín S. Ruipérez who has been of great help to me. Professors Klaus Strunk and Klaus Nickau have made valuable suggestions to improve the contents of this paper.

<sup>1)</sup> H. Fränkel, "Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter", *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, München, 1955, pp. 100-156, first published in *Nachrichten d. Göttinger Gel. Gesellsch.*, 1926, pp. 197-229.

<sup>2)</sup> A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus*, Cambridge 1950, vol. I & II.

into account).<sup>3)</sup> The reason for this choice is our belief that Theocritus' *corpus* is large enough to draw conclusions and can be approached as a whole. Therefore our conclusions apply primarily to his verses although we feel confident that they may be extended safely to other hexametric texts as well. Nevertheless, in the discussion of the appositives treatment made by other authors, the occurrences are necessarily homeric and to this effect they will be argued in this paper.

\* \* \*

H. Fränkel, in his *Wortbild* appendix, classified the words in two types; full or phonetically independent words (*Vollwörter*) and, on the other hand, appositives or phonetically dependent. He does not say anywhere, as might be expected, that the phonetic dependence of appositives prevents the occurrence of caesura. In fact, Fränkel assumes that such a difference between these two word-types is neither absolute nor constant. According to him, such factors as expressivity or louder phonic volume of the word-group (factors which are very difficult and subjective indeed to grasp) are determinant. Thus, word-ends are established arbitrarily and one and the same preposition is handled in two opposite ways: for instance *Iliad* 1.53 ἐννήμαρ-μὲν (!) ἀνὰ-στρατὸν ἄχετο is taken as two words whereas *Iliad* 1.10 νοῦσον/ἀνὰ-στρατὸν ἄρσε makes up a single word.

E. O'Neill<sup>4)</sup> in his study on "metrical word-types," deals with appositives as if they were independent words: according to him, "that an accented word and its enclitic did not constitute a single and indivisible metrical unit appears to be the inevitable conclusion from the existence of such lines as the following: *Iliad* 1.179. οἴκαδ' ἰὼν σὺν νηυσὶ τε σῆς καὶ σοῖς (...) because there is no known verse, in the whole history of the Greek hexameter down to Byzantine times, in which the third foot is so filled by an indisputable single word."<sup>5)</sup> However, such a word as analysed by O'Neill, is disputable indeed.

<sup>3)</sup> Our choice does not imply to assume that there are no differences among the hexameters we have scrutinized (i.e. Theocritean *versus* non-Theocritean poems, urban mimoi *versus* pastoral idylls). But we have given up operating with such a distinction on two grounds: first we try to grasp the behaviour of prepositives in our *corpus* as a whole. Secondly, when dealing with statistics the higher are the figures the sounder are the conclusions we draw.

<sup>4)</sup> E. O'Neill, "The Localization of Metrical Word-types in the Greek Hexameter," *Yale Classical Studies* 8, 1942, pp. 105-178.

<sup>5)</sup> E. O'Neill, *op. cit.* p. 109.

Bearing in mind that *σύν* is a proclitic, the word is actually *σύν-νησι-τε* and fills a segment longer than the third foot. A similar criticism may be made on the six remaining lines he adduces.

H. N. Porter<sup>6)</sup> is the only author who does not think that caesura must necessarily coincide with word-end. In his opinion a word is a semantic unit, which is defined neither phonetically nor morphologically. Thus, in such a line as *Odyssey* 5.481 *ἀλλήλοισιν ἔφον ἐπαμοιβαδῖς· οὐς ὑπ' Ὀδυσσεύς* without caesura A (in Fränkel's own terms) he assumes the trithemimeres caesura, as he takes only the first three syllables as making up the first word of the line. He explicitly states that the dative - ι (*ν*) ending, which undergoes elision in so many cases, is not essential to the meaning of the word and can be treated freely.

Not only has the evidence been arbitrarily handled, which contributes to bewilder scholars, but also such procedures have been even justified, as has been done by A. M. Devine and L. Stephens.<sup>7)</sup> In their opinion, the dependence or independence of appositives is to be compared to the syllabification of *muta cum liquida* clusters after short vowel, allowing in classical Greek poetry either a closed, long syllable (*πατ'ρός*) or an open, short one (*πα'τρός*). In my view, the availability of the *muta cum liquida* freedom cannot be invoked arbitrarily to postulate word-ends after proclitics or before enclitics, since the syllabification of the consonantal cluster of *muta cum liquida* resulted from the mixing (in the course of epic tradition) of two different trends of syllabification (first *πατ'ρός* and then *πα'τρός*). On the other hand, linguistics has never traced any such changes in the behaviour of proclitics and enclitics, which were always melted together with the following or preceding word throughout the prehistory and history of Greek.

In the case of Ancient Greek, the only evidence that facilitates access to the phonic reality of versification are written texts. Obviously enough, it is necessary to apply linguistic knowledge and criteria in dealing with this evidence. Prosody is just the application of linguistics, more precisely phonology, to the study of versification. From this

<sup>6)</sup> H. N. Porter, "The Early Greek Hexameter," *Yale Classical Studies* 12, 1951, pp. 3-63.

<sup>7)</sup> A. M. Devine & L. Stephens, "The Greek Appositives: toward a Linguistically Adequate Definition of Caesura and Bridge," *Classical Philology* 73, 1978, pp. 314-328.

point of view, P. Maas' observation in his "Prosody"<sup>8</sup>) is most accurate. He states that in metrics "a 'word' is not every part of a sentence that according to our system of writing Greek is written separately, but the whole group formed by an important part of the sentence (i. e. noun, verb, & c.) together with any prepositives (i. e. article, prepositions, monosyllabic conjunctions, and pronouns, & c.) and postpositives (i. e. monosyllabic enclitics, conjunctions, & c.) that go with it."

Precisely, there is a perfectly elaborated linguistic theory of word-ends, which classifies the words in accented and unaccented, and the latter ones subsequently into enclitics and proclitics. One should not consider that there is a word-end in the boundary between a proclitic and an accented word or between an accented word and an enclitic. The accented or unaccented nature of a given word is a structural feature, not an utterance variant.

If our view is right, we should expect that the boundary after proclitics and before enclitics will have a different prosodic behaviour from the full word-end and coincide with the word-internal sequences where there is no word boundary.

The *muta cum liquida* (i. e. a consonantal cluster where a stop is followed either by a vibrant, a liquid or a nasal) is the only prosodic phenomenon that allows us to compare appositive boundaries (as *Idyll* 1.41 *ὁ π'ρέσβυς*) with both word-internal sequences (*Idyll* 1.40 *λεπ'ράς*) and full word-ends (*Idyll* 17.11 *τί π'ρῶτον*), since elision (*Idyll* 1.133 *ἐπ' ἀρκεύθοισι*) and epic correption (*Idyll* 1.33 *καὶ ἄμ-πυμι*) do not occur in word-internal sequences (they are phenomena which appear only in *sandhi*).

Owing to the fact that enclitics beginning with *muta cum liquida* do not exist in Greek, only the behaviour of proclitics can be tested.

*A priori*, it may be expected that, in full-word boundary, short vowels act as short syllables before *muta cum liquida* more frequently than as long ones because in the phonic *continuum* word-end favours *muta cum liquida* to belong as a whole to the following word. On the contrary it may be expected that lengthening of short vowels before a *muta cum liquida* cluster in word-internal sequences are more frequent.<sup>9</sup>) The computerized analysis of these consonantal groups in Theocritus' work has lead to the following statistical results:

<sup>8</sup>) P. Maas, "Prosody," *Greek Meter*, translated by H. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford, 1962, pp. 84-89, first published in Leipzig, 1923.

<sup>9</sup>) M. West, (*Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982, p. 26) draws attention to the important fact that "prepositives before a word with initial plosive + liquid are counted with

General behaviour of *muta cum liquida* (1138 instances)

## Word-internal sequences (794 out of 1138)

Lengthening of syllable (621 out of 794)	78%
------------------------------------------	-----

*Idyll* 2.143 ἐπ' ῥάχθη

Not lengthening of syllable (173 out of 794)	22%
----------------------------------------------	-----

*Idyll* 18.51 ἀ'πρίξ

In *sandhi* (344 out of 1138)

## Proclitic boundary (97 out of 344)

Lengthening of syllable (73 out of 97)	75%
----------------------------------------	-----

*Idyll* 5.95 ἀπὸ π'ρίνοιο

Not lengthening of syllable (24 out of 97)	25%
--------------------------------------------	-----

*Idyll* 1.81 ὁ'Πρίηπος

## Full-word boundary (247 out of 344)

Lengthening of syllable (97 out of 247)	39%
-----------------------------------------	-----

*Idyll* 15.141 ἔτι π'ρότεροι

Not lengthening of syllable (150 out of 247)	61%
----------------------------------------------	-----

*Idyll* 4.60 δειλαίε· 'πρόαν

To assess those figures we applied the statistic  $\chi^2$  test.<sup>10)</sup> The degree of reliability of this test depends on the signification threshold we establish. In our study we assumed that  $\chi^2$  should be higher or equal to 6.635 (which means an error probability lower than 1/100).

First, on applying the  $\chi^2$  test to the distribution of absolute frequencies of word-internal sequences (621 out of 794 of lengthening of syllable and 173 out of 794 of not lengthening of syllable) and proclitic boundaries (73 out of 97 of lengthening of syllable and 24 out of 97 of not lengthening of syllable), we obtained  $\chi^2 = 0.282$ , which is lower than the threshold 6.635. From this we can infer that there is no significant difference between these two distributions.

Secondly, on applying the  $\chi^2$  test to the distribution of absolute

---

it for prosodic purposes in epic and elegy but not in Attic tragedy, so that, for example, τὰ πρίν (first syllable long) is normal in the former, but avoided in the latter (though perhaps not totally excluded...).” Such a behaviour must be obviously related to the *correptio attica*.

<sup>10)</sup> This test allows to compare two different distributions of the same phenomenon and ascertain whether differences are significant or due to hazard. It has the advantage of operating with absolute frequencies and avoiding the confusion that may occur when percentages based on very low absolute figures are used (see F. Clegg, *Simple Statistics. A Course Book for the Social Sciences*, Cambridge, 1982). In this paper, we have used the  $\chi^2$  test within an error margin lower than 1/100, which means a value for  $\chi^2$  equal or higher than 6.635 when two distributions are significantly different (see Powell's table of  $\chi^2$  critical values, quoted by F. Clegg).

frequencies of full-word boundaries (97 out of 247 of lengthening of syllable and 150 out of 247 of not lengthening of syllable) and proclitic boundaries (73 out of 97 of lengthening of syllable and 24 out of 97 of not lengthening of syllable), we obtained  $\chi^2 = 34.76$ , which is higher than the threshold 6.635. From this we can infer that there is a significant difference between these two distributions.

To sum up, *muta cum liquida* clusters after proclitic boundaries behave in the same way as in word-internal sequences and in the opposite way when they occur in full word boundaries. From this we may conclude that proclitic boundary is neither a full word-end nor a caesura. Hence, those metrical studies that take word-end where the blank space is found should be considered wrong.

From the behaviour of proclitics we are led to the conclusion that there is no phonic word-end and therefore a caesura cannot possibly be assumed in that position.

## Pseudo-Phokylides Vers 127

Von RUDOLF FÜHRER, Hamburg

ὄπλον ἐκάστῳ νείμε θεός, φύσιν ἠερόφοιτον  
ὄρνιασιν, πάλοις ταχυτήτ', ἀλκὴν τε λέουσιν,  
127 ταύροις δ' αὐτοφύτως<sup>1)</sup> κερατίσσαι<sup>2)</sup>, κέντρα μελίσσαις  
ἔμφυτον ἄλλακ' ἔδωκε, λόγον δ' ἔρυμ' ἀνθρώποισιν.

---

<sup>1)</sup> Bernays : αὐτοχύτως, -οις.

<sup>2)</sup> coniecti : κεράεσσιν, „une infraction à la loi de Wernicke“, wie in Derrens Edition (Paris 1986) p.LXIX n.2 vermerkt. Das Verbum ist in der Septuaginta und bei Philon belegt, „un aoriste épique avec redoublement du σ“ findet sich v. 17. 58 (Derron p.LXXIII), ähnlich auch v. 11 (δικάσσει neben δικάσης), zum Versbau vgl. v. 45 (γενέσθαι ∪  $\frac{4}{-}$  - | ), zum Infinitiv im Wechsel mit Akkusativobjekten vgl. Anacreont. 24, 6 W., zitiert in van der Horsts Kommentar (Leiden 1978) p. 201 zur Stelle, zur Klangwiederholung κερ-ίσσαι κε-ρα --ίσσαι- vgl. v. 17 (-ὄς -ος ὄσ-ς ο-όσ-). 42 (je 2× -ημ-, -ητ-, -τη-). 162 (2× -νευ-). 164 (2× μῦ-). 173 (2× -δο-). 172. 174 (jeweils -τηη-, -δο-). 211 (2× κορῦ-). 216 (2× ἰμων).

# The Language of Galenic Pharmacy

By RICHARD J. DURLING, Kiel

When Galen came to write his influential treatise *De simplicium medicamentorum facultatibus*, he included a list of no less than 66 different types of medicines, according to their various properties or effects.<sup>1)</sup> It is the object of this present paper to analyse, clarify, and if necessary, supplement his account.

Galen's list is the most complete in ancient pharmacy: it recognizes such important classes of drugs as anodynes, discutients, emetics, emmenagogues and so on. By definition, all drugs act more upon the body than they are acted upon, in contradistinction to foodstuffs.<sup>2)</sup> But some foodstuffs do not fall short of drugs,<sup>3)</sup> and some are both foodstuffs and drugs.<sup>4)</sup> Each drug possesses a *faculty* or *power*, e. g. to open up the pores, promote the discharge of phlegm, bring to suppuration or temper the humours.

Some drugs are known to all (but not their effects), e. g. *ἐλλέβορον*, *ἐλατήριον*, *σακκαμωνία*, *ἐπίθυμον*, *ἴρις*, *ἐλένιον*.<sup>5)</sup> Others are known to professionals only. All simples are discovered by *πείρα*: compounds by *λόγος*, confirmed by *πείρα*.<sup>6)</sup> But all simples turn out on closer inspection to be composite (*σύνθετα*) and have contradictory properties.<sup>7)</sup> The properties of some drugs are well-known: everyone knows for instance that scammony is a purgative.<sup>8)</sup> There is by general consent a purgative *dynamis* in purgatives and an emetic *dynamis* in emetics, and so on. But what, Galen asks, is the *essence* of this *dynamis*? The sceptics and empirics say it is unknowable: others who claim it is knowable refer the *dynamis* to molecules and pores; others to the four qualities, heat, cold, dryness and wetness. Three senses distinguish these things: taste, sight, and smell.<sup>9)</sup> One must train one's organ

<sup>1)</sup> XI 710-711.

<sup>2)</sup> *Temp.* iii 4 (107.11-13 H.).

<sup>3)</sup> CMG V 4, 2 438.3-11.

<sup>4)</sup> *Temp.* iii.2 (93.1-2 H.); cf. *Elem.* 45.3, 16-17, 46.5 H.; CMG V 9, 1 159, 26-33.

<sup>5)</sup> *Elem.* 33.24 H.

<sup>6)</sup> *SM* III 9.14-17.

<sup>7)</sup> XI 574.3-10.

<sup>8)</sup> IV 760.12-13.

<sup>9)</sup> XI 390.6-7.



of taste: it is crucial. The tongue, which is extremely sensitive (it is provided with six nerves)<sup>10</sup>) distinguishes not only hot, cold, dry and wet but also what is proper and alien to the taster. Smell distinguishes vapours:<sup>11</sup>) it is located in the cerebral ventricles.<sup>12</sup>) Smell is not an adequate guide to the *κράσις τῶν αἰσθητῶν*<sup>13</sup>) or to the faculties of medicines.<sup>14</sup>) Medicines act by heating, chilling, drying, and moistening – or by paired qualities.<sup>15</sup>) It is better to describe medicines in terms of qualities (heat, cold, and so on) than by their complex effects.<sup>16</sup>)

Nevertheless, Galen lists 66 such effects at XI 710–711, largely in paired opposites (e.g. *μαλακτικός, σκληρυντικός*). Herewith an alphabetical re-working of his list, with a few examples of Galen's own usage: *ἀναστομωτικός, ἢ, ὄν proper for opening up* (e.g. the pores) XI 710.17, cf. 749.9, 15–16, 750.4, also Dsc. I.4.2.17.2, 40.2, al. – *ἀνώδυνος, ὄν allaying pain*, (opp. *ὀδυνηρός*), XI 710.18, cf. 712.4, 7, 764.12, 13–14, 16, 765.4, al.; XIII 268.12 (Sup.); cf. *Hp. Aph.* 5.22; Dsc. 4.68 (Comp.), al. – *ἀποκρουστικός, ἢ, ὄν repellent* (opp. *έλκτικός*), XI 710.16, cf. 759.5, 7 ff., 842.3, al.; Dsc. I.116.1, III 114. – *ἀποφλεγματικός, ἢ, ὄν promoting the discharge of phlegm or mucus*, XI 711.7, cf. 769.5. – *ἀραιωτικός, ἢ, ὄν of or for rarefying*, XI 710.12, 14, cf. 574.7, 619.7, 749.9, 14–15 (def.), 750.3. al. cf. Dsc. I 62. – *ἀρθριτικός, ἢ, ὄν for the joints*, XI 710.12, cf. X 805.17; XIII 361.6. – *βηχικός, ἢ, ὄν good for coughs*, XI 711.12, cf. 769.13; X 801.3; XVIII (2) 908.9. – *γάλακτος γεννητικός, ἢ, ὄν productive of milk*, XI 711.8–9, cf. 821.6, 857.9–10, 876.13; XII 67.17. – *διαβρωτικός, ἢ, ὄν corrosive*, XI 711.2, cf. 684.9; XII 1002.14; XIII 141.8, al. – *διαλυητικός, ἢ, ὄν promoting suppuration*, XI 712.3, cf. 766.8; XIII 496.7. al. – *διαφορητικός, ἢ, ὄν discutient*, XI 710.18, cf. 261.17–262.1, 712.4, al.; cf. Dsc. I 30.2 (comp.). – *ἐκπηητικός, ἢ, ὄν bringing to suppuration*, XI 710.18, cf. XIII 771.8, al.; cf. *Hp. Aph.* 5.22. – *ἐκστατικός, ἢ, ὄν causing mental derangement*, XI 711.1; cf. *Thphr.* HP 9.13.4 (LSJ<sup>9</sup>); *ἐκστατικὸν ... τὸ πάθος* CMG V 9.2 71.5–6. – *ἐκφρακτικός, ἢ, ὄν for cleansing obstructions*, XI 711.4, cf. 743.5, 825.14 (comp.); VIII 375.8, X 763.12, al. – *έλκτικός, ἢ, ὄν opp.*

<sup>10</sup>) XI 669.6–11.

<sup>11</sup>) XI 696.18 ff.

<sup>12</sup>) XI 698.8–9.

<sup>13</sup>) XI 700.4–9.

<sup>14</sup>) XI 702.14.

<sup>15</sup>) XI 705.13–14.

<sup>16</sup>) XI 711.18–713.5.

ἀποκρουστικός *attractive*, XI 710.16, cf. 759.4, 6, 15; 760.18 (comp.); XIII 923.18–924.2, al. – έμετικός, ή, όν *vomitive*, XI 711.6, cf. 829.14; XVII (2) 672.9, 678.14; II 112.1, 173.3, al. – έμμήνων άγωγοί *emmenagogues*, XI 711.7–8, cf. 769.14; XII 40.18, al. – έμπλαστικός, ή, όν opp. ρυπτικός, *causing to adhere*, XI 710.15, cf. 729.9, 735.16, 742.7, 9–10 (def.); XVIII (1) 47.5, al.; Dsc. I 102. – έμφρακτικός, ή, όν opp. έκ- *likely to obstruct*, XI 711.4, cf. 743.7, 784.6; XII 700.6–7, al.; Hp. *Acut.* (Sp. 9). – έπιπεραστικός, ή, όν *tempering the humours*, XI 711.3, cf. XII 361.16; CMG V 4, 2 280.24; CMG V 9, 1 355.25 (τό έ.). – έπισχετικός, ή, όν *checking, stopping*, XI 711.8, 9, cf. 776.8–9, al. – έπουλωτικός, ή, όν *promoting cicatrization*, XI 711.15, cf. XIII 380.11 (comp.); *Glotta* 57 (1979) 223 (R.J. Durling). – έρρινος, η, ον *sternutatory*, XI 711.7, cf. 769.2; XII 30.9, al.; *Glotta* 57 (1979) 223 (R.J. D.). – έσχαρωτικός, ή, όν *caustic, tending to form an eschar* XI 711.2, cf. 684.9, 755.5; XII 246.6; X 324.17–18, 325.4; Dsc. II 73.1, 175.2, al. – ήπατικός, ή, όν *for liver-complaints*, XI 711.10, cf. XII 152.11; XIII 202.6, al. – θρυπτικός, ή, όν *able to break or crush, λίθων* XI 711.13, cf. XII 33.10–11, 89.16, al.; Dsc. I 121. – ιδρωτικός, ή, όν *sudorific*, XI 711.1, cf. 684.16; Hp. *Vict.* 3.72; Dsc. III 56, 74.3. – ισχιαδικός, ή, όν *good for sciatica*, XI 711.11; cf. XIII 339.9, 340.2, al.; Dsc. I 174 (as v.l.). – καθαιρετικός, ή, όν *reducing, cathartic*, of mild caustics, XI 711.16, cf. XII 123.12, 218.7, 223.8, al. – καθαρτικός, ή, όν *purgative*, XI 711.3, cf. 768.13, 770.3; CMG V 9, 1 175.17–18, al.; Dsc. V 66 (comp.). – κακοχυμός, όν *inducing ill humours*, XI 711.3, al.; cf. Dsc. II 88, 123, 148. – καρωτικός, ή, όν *stupefying, soporific*, XI 711.1, cf. XII 147.16; XIII 266.16, al.; Dsc. I 58.2, 64.3, al. – καυστικός, ή, όν *caustic*, XI 711.2, cf. 833.14; XII 30.17, al. Dsc. II 4.1, 4.2, 80.4. – κολλητικός, ή, όν *glutinous, agglutinating*, XI 711.15, cf. 821.2, al. – λαπακτικός, ή, όν (λαπάσσω), *laxative*, XI 711.7, cf. CMG V 4, 2 304.3, al. – λεαίνων, -ούσα, ον *soften down*, XI 711.4; cf. έκλεαίνω, λεαντικός, ή, όν (XIII 374.5). – λεπυντικός, ή, όν *attenuating*, XI 710.18, cf. 286.15–16, 745.19–20, 805.15; XI 746.4 (comp.), al.; Dsc. III 31.1 al. – μαλακτικός, ή, όν (opp. σκληρυντικός), *emollient*, XI 710.12. 14, cf. 727.11, 737.3, 4, 10; XIII 946.2 ff., al.; Hp. *Vict.* 2.66. – ναρκωτικός, ή, όν *narcotic*, XI 711.1, cf. 752.2; XII 613.3–4, 617.3–4, 618.4; XIII 89.9; XVIII (1) 47.9, 15, 17, al. – νεφρικός, ή, όν *good for the kidneys*, XI 711.11; XII 321.3, 322.14, 326.9. – όδοντικός, ή, όν *good for the teeth*, XI 711.11, cf. XII 864.18–865.1. – όδυνηρός, ά, όν *painful*, XI 710.18 and *passim*. – ούρητικός, ή, όν *diuretic*, XI 711.6, cf. 769.13, 771.2, 775.6, 876.15 (comp.) al.; Dsc. I 7.3, 10.2, 13.3;

II 86.1 (comp.); IV 22.2 (sup.), al. – *ὀφθαλμικός, ἡ, ὄν for the eyes*, XI 711.11, cf. 867.18; XII 61.17, 127.8, 192.16–17, al.; Dsc. V 74.2. – *παρηγορικός, ἡ, ὄν soothing*, XI 712.4, cf. 764.12; XII 480.16 (comp.), 635.4 (sup.), al.; cf. Hp. *Acut.* (Sp.) 53, *Aph.* 5.22. – *παχυντικός, ἡ, ὄν* (opp. *λεπτυντικός*), *fattening*, XI 710.17, cf. 574.6, and XIII 374.5, 764.8. – *πεπτικός, ἡ, ὄν promoting digestion*, XI 710.18, cf. 828.17 (comp.), 832.6–7; XIII 881.16 (sup.), al. – *πιλητικός, ἡ, ὄν contractive*, XI 711.3, cf. 845.6. – *πλευριτικός, ἡ, ὄν good for pleurisy*, XI 711.12, cf. 780.16. – *ποδαγρικός, ἡ, ὄν good for gout*, XI 711.12, cf. XI 432.16; cf. Dsc. V 128.2. – *προκλητικός, ἡ, ὄν stimulating, productive of* (opp. *ἐπισχετικός*), XI 711.9, cf. CMG V 9, 1 349.19, al.; cf. Dsc. I. 115.4 (οὔρων). – *πυκνωτικός, ἡ, ὄν* (opp. *ἀραιωτικός*), *servicing to close the pores*, XI 710.12, cf. 749.17 (def.), 750.6, 751.12, 18, al.; cf. Dsc. 3.22, al. – *ῥυπτικός, ἡ, ὄν* (opp. *ἐμπλαστικός*), *cleansing, detergent*, XI 710.15, cf. 743.12, 14, 835.5 (comp.); XII 35.4 (sup.) al.; Dsc. II 135.2. – *σαρκωτικός, ἡ, ὄν making flesh grow*, XI 711.14–15, cf. X 167.16–17, 177.6; XII 1007.3–4; XIII 74.10–11, al.; cf. Dsc. V 85.2, al. – *σπέρματος ... σβεστικός, ἡ, ὄν extinguishing sperm*, XI 711.8–9, cf. 776.7–8 ff., 861.11; Dsc. I. 128. – *σηπτικός, ἡ, ὄν septic*, XI 711.2, cf. 755.7, 8, 17, 756.6, al.; Dsc. I. 77.1; II 61.2. – *σκληρυντικός, ἡ, ὄν* (opp. *μαλακτικός*), *hardening*, XI 710.12, 15, cf. 740.13; Dsc. I 39. – *σπληνικός, ἡ, ὄν good for the spleen*, XI 711.10, cf. 780.16 (this sense not recognised by LSJ<sup>9</sup>). – *σταλτικός, ἡ, ὄν astringent*, XI 711.4, cf. 781.8; XII 200.13–14, 713.5–6, al.; Dsc. I 30.1, 121 (comp.), al. – *συνακτικός, ἡ, ὄν* (opp. *ἐλκτικός*) *constrictive* XI 710.17, cf. 748.2, 845.6; XII 11.4, 64.8, 80.4, 134.2, al. – *συντατικός, ἡ, ὄν astringent*, XI 710.11, 17, cf. 825.4, 853.15, al. – *τραχύων, -οὔσα, ὄν roughening*, XI 711.4, cf. XII 712.4–6; CMG V 9, 1 136.7, 12, 233.14. – *ὑπακτικός, ἡ, ὄν aperient, evacuant*, XI 711.7, cf. XII 361.17, CMG V 4,2 201.5, 259.2 (comp.), al. – *ὑπνωτικός, ἡ, ὄν narcotic, soporific*, XI 711.1, cf. 766.12; XII 145.13, 18, 146.1; XIII 21.8, al.; Dsc. I. 54.2, 123.1, al. – *χαλαστικός, ἡ, ὄν laxative*, XI 710.11, 16, cf. 712.4, 742.15, al. cf. Dsc. I 30.1 (Wellmann). – *χυτικός, ἡ, ὄν having a dissolvent power*, XI 711.2 (a hapax in Galen; cf. with LSJ<sup>9</sup> Arist. Pr. 863<sup>a</sup> 6). – *ὠτικός, ἡ, ὄν (οὔς) good for the ears*, XI 711.11, cf., XII 606.3, 643.6; XIII 633.2, al.; Dsc. I. 26.

Galen's list above is illustrative, not comprehensive: it omits a number of terms describing drug action which are duly listed by LSJ<sup>9</sup>. Herewith a complete list of pertinent addenda, again in alphabetical order: *ἄδηκτος, ὄν* (δάκνω: opp. *δακνώδης*) *not biting or pungent*, XII 467.7, 810.6, cf. 817.1 (comp.); X 199.17, al.; Hp. *Mul.* 1.11; Dsc.

I. 30 al. – ἄκοπον (sc. φάρμακον) τό *application for relief of pain*, etc. XIII 100.3–5; ἄκοπα χρίσματα XIII 622.17; 1039.14 (sup.). – ἀμβλωθρίδιος, ὄν *causing abortion*, XII 130.1, cf. Aret. CA 2.11. – ἀμβλωτικός, ἦ, ὄν *producing abortion*, φάρμακα CMG V 10 2, 2 7.2–3. – ἀνακολλητικός, ἦ, ὄν *of or for glueing*, Dsc. II. 135.2; cf. Heras ap. Gal. XIII 782.3 (of a plaster). – ἀναπληρωτικός, ἦ, ὄν *filling up*, δύναμις Dsc. V 75; φάρμακα (Gal.) XIV 763.17. – ἀνετικός, ἦ, ὄν *relaxing*, Antyll. ap. Orib. 6.21.30; cf. Crito ap. Gal. XIII 1041.1; Dsc. I. 57. – ἀποτηκτικός, ἦ, ὄν *melting away*, XII 123.12 (not in LSJ<sup>9</sup>) cf. ἀκοπήκω, XII 349.2. – ἀπουλωτικός, ἦ, ὄν *causing to scar over, healing*, IV 770.2; cf. Dsc. II. 4.1, al.; c. gen. ἐλκῶν Id. V. 84. – ἀρρευμάτιστος, ὄν *arresting discharge, astringent, styptic*, Androm. Jun. ap. Gal. XIII 77.4. – ἀτόκιον, τό (sc. φάρμακον), *a medicine for causing barrenness*, Hp. *Mul.* I 76; Dsc. I 77; Gal. XI 876.4; XII 18.3. – ἀφλέγμαντος, ὄν *relieving or checking inflammation*, XI 814.12, 967.15; XII 57.12, 841.7; ἀ φάρμακα Ascl. Pharm. ap. Gal. XIII 675.16 (= 744.4). – ἄφυσος, ὄν *causing no flatulence*, IV 520.18; VI 266.17 (sup.); XI 808.9, al.; cf. Dsc. II. 70.3 (comp.). – γαγγραινικός, ἦ, ὄν *fit for gangrene*, XIII 739.13. – δακνώδης, ες (opp. ἄδηκτος), *biting, pungent*, VII 551.16, 552.4, *passim*. – δηκτικός, ἦ, ὄν (opp. ἄδηκτος), *pungent*, X 813.18; XIII 688.17 (comp.), al.; Dsc. I. 105. – διαχωρητικός, ἦ, ὄν *laxative*, Hp. *Aer.* 7; Gal. CMG V 9, 1 234.12. – διαχυτικός, ἦ, ὄν *able to dissolve*, XII 127.18; cf. Dsc. I. 71.2, 72.5; V 109.2. – διουρητικός, ἦ, ὄν *diuretic*, XI 39.13, 145.12, 684.16, al.; Dsc. I. 4, 2, 9.3, 12.2; II 124.2, al. – ἐδρικός, ἦ, ὄν *for the anus*, XIII 307.18, 448.18; Androm. Jun. ap. Gal. XIII 307.18, al. – ἐκκοπρωτικός, ἦ, ὄν *promoting passage of faeces*, φάρμακα XI 822.4–5; cf. XIII 19.11; CMG V 9, 1 366.16. – ἐκκριτικός, ἦ, ὄν *tending to remove*, XI 374.6; Dsc. II 152, al. – ἐλκωτικός, ἦ, ὄν *ulcerating*, XI, 684.15. – ἐμετήριος, ὄν = ἐμετικός : ἐ φάρμακον *an emetic*, Hp. *Loc. Hom.* 33; pl. Dsc. I. 56.4; Aret. CD I.3 cf. Gal. XI 845.10; XVII (2) 464.9, 656.11–12, 671.17, al. – ἔναιμος, ὄν *medicament for staunching blood*, XII 376.14; X 257.17, 307.2, 397.13ff., 418.18, 441.4; cf. Hp. *Art.* 63; sg., *Fract.* 24, al. – ἐντατικός, ἦ, ὄν (αἰδοίων), *aphrodisiac*, VIII 449.17, cf. XII 341.8. – ἐξιπωτικός, ἦ, ὄν *fit for squeezing out, expressive*, XIII 504.18, 993.2, al. – ἐπικρατητικός, ἦ, ὄν *astringent*, CMG V 9, 1 355.28. – ἐπισπαστικός, ἦ, ὄν *drawing in*, XI 705.16, 761.4, 831.12, 876.18; cf. Dsc. II 85, 109, al. – εὐκόιλιος, ὄν *easing the bowels*, Diocl. Fr. 126; Dsc. I. 30.2, 120.1; II 70.1 (sup.), al. – ἐφεκτικός, ἦ, ὄν *able to check or stop*, γαστρός IV 760.13; XII 72.4–5; τῶν ῥοωδῶν παθῶν XII 90.15–16. – ἡμικρανικός, ἦ, ὄν *remedies for ημικ-*

ρανία XII 592.16, 593.5, 11. – *ικτερικός*, ἢ, ὄν for *jaundice*, φάρμακον XIII 229.7, 230.3, 9–10, 231.15–16; cf. Ruf. ap. Orib. 7.26.142. – *ἴσχαμος*, ὄν (ἴσχω, αἷμα), *staunching blood*, XII 25.4, 64.15; cf. X 318.18, 333.4; Dsc. IV 43, al. – *καταγματικός*, ἢ, ὄν for *fractures*, ἔμπλαστρος Ascl. Pharm. ap. Gal. XIII 536.7; Gal. XIII 534.9. – *κατακεραστικός*, ἢ, ὄν *restoring normal* κρᾶσις VIII 41.7; X 486.2. – *κατασταλτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *fitted for checking* (opp. *ἐγερτικός*), φάρμακα (Gal.) XIV 763.17. – *κατουλωτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *causing cicatrization*, Heras ap. Gal. XIII 432.8, cf. Dsc. V 88.6, 108.2, 115.2. – *κατωτερικός*, ἢ, ὄν *purgative*, Hp. *Epid.* 5.20, Gal. X 527.13, 921.17; CMG V 10, 2, 2 100.21; CMG Suppl. III 32.9–10. – *κενωτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *purgative*, X 641.2, 10, 14, al. – *κεφαλικός*, ἢ, ὄν for *the head*, X 164.5, 337.16, 445.17; XI 138.5; ἔμπλαστροι XIII 534.8–9, 16, 541.16, al.; τροχίσκος Heras ap. Gal. XIII 544.17. – *κρατυντικός*, ἢ, ὄν = *κρατυντήριος*, κ. φάρμακα *making firm*, of lower teeth, Archig. ap. Gal. XII 873.5, v.l. in Dsc. II 30, prob. 1. in Antyll. ap. Orib. 6.34.3. – *κωλικός*, ἢ, ὄν κ. φάρμακα *remedies for colic*, XIII 266.9; sc. *ἀντίδοτος* Androm. Jun. ap. Gal. XIII 276.7, al. – *λειχηνικός*, ἢ, ὄν for *eruptions*, τροχίσκος Crito ap. Gal. XII 832.5; – *κῆ* (sc. ἔμπλαστρος) ib. 835.1; – *κόν* (sc. φάρμακον) Orib. *Fr.* 78, *Aet.* 8.16, etc. – *λεπρικός*, ἢ, ὄν *good for leprosy*, XII 365.2–3, cf. Dsc. II 62, III 88, *P Oxy.* 1088, 14 (i A. D.). – *ληξιπύρετος*, ὄν (ληξις B), *allaying fever*, Ascl. Pharm. ap. Gal. XIV 136.3, also *ληξο* – Gal. XIII 68.9, 1013.9. – *λυτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *laxative*, φάρμακα Arist. *Pr.* 949<sup>a</sup>5; φάρμακον φλεγμονῆς λ. *dispersive of inflammation*, Gal. XI 751.10, cf. X 637.1, al. – *μαλθακώδης*, ες *emollient*, VIII 709.3–7, 721.5, 724.5, al. cf. Hp. *Ulc.* 2, 21. – *μαλθώδης*, ες (μάλθα) = *μαλακτικός ἢ κηρώδης* Hp. ap. Gal. XIX 120.1, hence conjectured by Daremberg for *μαλθακώδης* in Hp. *Ulc.* 2, 21. Gal. ap. Orib. 51.36.25. – *μανωτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *loosening*, ἀλείμματα X 760.5, 13. – *μετασυγκριτικός*, ἢ, ὄν t. t. of the Methodists but not peculiar to them, XI 781.11 (criticized), 792.1; XII 348.2, al.; cf. Dsc. I 38; IV 153.3; Soran. ap. Gal. XII 415.14. – *μωλωπικός*, ἢ, ὄν (μῶλωψ), *suitable for weals*, XIX 139.13. – *νεκρωτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *causing mortification*, δύναμις XI 752.3. – *νυγματικός*, ἢ, ὄν *suitable for νύγματα*, ἔμπλαστρος Androm. Jun. ap. Gal. XIII 650.14 (= 907.5), cf. 651.4, 906.9. – *ὀμαλυντικός*, ἢ, ὄν *emollient*, δύναμις CMG V 4, 2 228.9. – *ὀξυδερκής*, ες *promoting quickness of sight*, XII 263.3, cf. 9.3 (χυλός), 279.6 & Diocl. *Fr.* 128; Dsc. V 5. – *ὀξυδορκικός*, ἢ, ὄν = *-δερκικός* XI 778.18, 780.1. – *ὀξυπόριος*, ὄν (sc. φάρμακον) *a captinative medicine* (Gal.) XIX 717.10, *Aet.* 5.68; τροφή Philum. ap. eund. 9.23; also – *πορος*, ὄν (Gal.) XIV 751.15, Orib. *Fr.* 46, al. –

παρμικός, ἡ, ὄν *causing to sneeze*, X 931.15; XI 849.13, XII 571.2; XVII (2) 842.2, al.; cf. Dsc. II 24.1; IV 146, 148.2, al. – πυητικός, ἡ, ὄν *of suppuration*, X 887.17. – πυοποιός, ὄν *making pus*, XI 832.8–9; XIII 700.1, 771.5 (λιβανωτός); cf. Dsc. I 54.2, 72.5, II 72.2, 86.3. – σηπτός, ἡ, ὄν = σηπτικός *septic*, φάρμακα XI 755.16; XII 17.6–7; δυνάμεις XII 223.3, 365.2; τῶν σηπτῶν ὀνομαζομένων XIII 369.4; cf. Dsc. II 62, al. – σκορπιστικός, ἡ, ὄν *dissipative*, φυμάτων (Gal.) XIV 242.1–2. – σμηκτικός, ἡ, ὄν *purgative*, CMG V 9, 1 232.7.17, 258.18; cf. Diphil. Med. ap. Ath. 2.55 b, 646; *detersive*, ὀδόντων σ. δύναμις Dsc. II 4.1. – σμωδικός, ἡ, ὄν *belonging to weals or bruises*, φάρμακον a plaster for them, XIX 139.12. – στατικός, ἡ, ὄν *astringent*, τῆς κοιλίας XII 45.9; cf. Dsc. IV 17, V 53.1, al. – στεγνωτικός, ἡ, ὄν *making costive, astringent*, X 317.17; XI 753.10; XII 78.16–17, 82.9–10; τῆς γαστρῶς XII 88.3; cf. Dsc. I 115.4, al. – στοματικός, ἡ, ὄν *good for the mouth*, X 357.6, 906.7, 927.4; XI 928.14 ff. (def.); XII 889.15–16, al.; cf. Dsc. III 5.2. – στομαχικός, ἡ, ὄν *good for the stomach*, XI 780.16; XII 152.1; CMG V 4, 2 198.1; cf. Ruf. ap. Orib. 8.47.11. – συγκριτικός, ἡ, ὄν = μετασυγκριτικός, φάρμακα, ὀpp. χαλαστικά II 343.16–18; τὰ σ – title of work by Thessalus X 7.16. – συμπεπτικός, ἡ, ὄν *promoting digestion, digestive*, XII 28.14, 101.15; *dissolving*, οἰδημάτων Dsc. II 86.2. – συμφυτικός, ἡ, ὄν *causing to unite*, φάρμακον X 347.11; *tending to close up*, of a wound, Arist. Pr. 863<sup>a</sup>15. – συνουλωτικός, ἡ, ὄν *promoting cicatrization*, X 199.7, 888.16; XII 246.7; XIII 375.3–4, 522.2. – συντηκτικός, ἡ, ὄν *liquefactive*, φάρμακα XI 754.3, 757.7. – τηκτικός, ἡ, ὄν (τήκω), *suitable for reducing*, XII 218.7–8 (σκληρᾶς σαρκῶς); cf. Dsc. IV 183.2 (σπληνός). – τμητικός, ἡ, ὄν *solvent*, XI 799.12, 814.2, 888.17, al.; cf. Dsc. V 17.2. – τονωτικός, ἡ, ὄν *bracing, strengthening*, X 941.2 (φάρμακα); c. gen., Antyll. ap. Orib. 6.32.10, 6.35.1. – τραυματικός, ἡ, ὄν *for wounds*, XII 984.4; – ας = κολλητικός (sc. ἐμπλάστρους), XIII 551.13–14; cf. Dsc. I 99, III.3 (ἀντίδοτος), al.; τὰ τ. (i.e. φάρμακα) Id., I 72.5, al. – τραχυντικός, ἡ, ὄν *making rough*, XIII 619.1 (τὰ μεταλλικά), 688.17 (φάρμακον); CMG V 10, 2.2 62.21, al. – τραχωματικός, ἡ, ὄν *for trachoma*, X 1018.17; XII 775.6. – ὑδραγωγός, ὄν *purgative producing watery motions*, ὕ. δύναμις Dsc. IV 173.2; – ἄ φάρμακα Gal. XI 325.16, 348.13; CMG V 8, 1 116.3; CMG V 9, 1 39.3–4, al. – ὑδροφοβικός, ἡ, ὄν *curing hydrophobia*, XIV 208.3 (καταπότιον). – ὑπλάτος, ὄν (ἐλαύνω) *carrying off downwards*, φάρμακα purging medicines, Hp. Acut. 23, Morb. 4.56; Gal. X 527.13, 969.8–9; XI 37.13, 41.4, 172.17, al. – ὑπνοποιός, ὄν *causing sleep, soporific*, X 372.12; XIII 144.8; Temp. 48.20 (Helmreich), al. – φθόριος, ὄν: φ· φάρμακον

*abortefacient*, XII 58.18; cf. Hp. *Jusj.*; Dsc. V 67; Soran. I. 60. – *χολαγωγός*, *όν carrying off bile*, *φάρμακα* VIII 975.6; XI 325.15; XVII (2) 658.14, al. – *ψιλωτικός*, *ή, όν stripping, making hairless*, *φάρμακα* XII 456.9.

The list contains a few synonyms, for example *άμβλωθρίδιος*, *άμβλωτικός* and *φθόριος*: all describe abortefacients. *διαχωρητικός* and *λυτικός* both mean laxative, and there are several words for purgatives, for example, *κατωτερικός*, *κενωτικός*, *σημητικός*, *ύπήλατος*.

A third list contains the remaining words for drug action listed by LSJ<sup>9</sup> which are not attested for Galen. They are partly used by earlier authors, partly by later authors, for example, the Byzantine compilers Oribasius, Aetius of Amida, Paul of Aegina and so on. A few are only found in the lexicographers, for example Hesychius, or in papyri. Again, the list is alphabetical: *άκάθαρτος*, *ον Act. not fit for cleansing*, *έλκείων* Aret. CD I.8. – *άκεσώδυνος*, *ον allaying pain*, Paetus ap. Hp. *Ep.* 2. – *άκητήριον*, *τό drug to prevent conception*, Hsch. – *άμυκτηικός*, *ή, όν of remedies, irritant*, Soran. 2.12, al. Dsc. II 174 (sup.). – *άναβρωτικός*, *ή, όν corrosive*, Alex. Aphr. Pr. I 92. – *άνάγω*: *φάρμακα άνάγοντα*, *expectorants*, Hp. *Morb.* 3.15. – *άνακαθαριστικός*, *ή, όν promoting vomiting*, Dsc. I 68.8, 71.2, al. – *άναχαλαστικός*, *ή, όν relaxing*, *ύστέρας* Dsc. I 128.3. – *άπεσχαρωτικός*, *ή, όν removing scabs*, Paul. Aeg. 4.34.6.66. – *άποκαθαριστικός*, *ή, όν cleansing*, Dsc. II 151.1; III 23.3, al. – *άποψητικός*, *ή, όν suppurative*, Hp. *Coac.* 282, *Epid.* 2.3.6. – *άσύλληπτος*, *ον preventing conception*, *φάρμακον* Aet. 16.17. – *άφαιρετικός*, *ή, όν τō ά. τών βοηθημάτων evacuant remedies*, prob. 1. in *Rh. Mus.* 58.87. – *δακτυλικός*, *ή, όν for the anus*, *έμπλαστρος* Orib. *Fr.* 83, Cass. *Fel.* 74. – *διαπνευστικός*, *ή, όν promoting exhalation*, Aret. *CA.* 1.1. – *διασκεδαστικός*, *ή, όν fitted for dispersing or digesting* Dsc. 3.80, 5.115. – *διασκορπιστικός*, *ή, όν dissipative (of waste products)* Antyll. ap. Orib. 6.21.30. – *έκτυλωτικός*, *ή, όν removing callosities*, Antyll. ap. Orib. 44.23, 29; Paul. Aeg. 4.49. – *έλατήριος*, *ον έ. φάρμακα purgatives*, Hp. *Acut.* 2; cf. *Epid.* 1.5.7, *Erot.* – *έμετοποιός*, *όν emetic*, Dsc. II 9.1. – *έμπυητικός*, *ή, όν causing suppurative*, Hp. *Acut.* 22. – *έξοδος*, *ον (B) promoting the passage*, *λίθων* Aret. CD 2.3. – *έρευκτικός*, *ή, όν (έρεύγομαι A) promoting eructation*, Dsc. I 70.3; II 182.1; III 68.2, 80.1. – *εύκάρδιος*, *ον good for the stomach*, Diocl. *Fr.* 120 (comp. Ruf. ap. Orib. 5.11.3 (sup.); Xenocr. 8.2.2; *good for the heart*, cordial, Hp. *Aff.* 41, 54; Alex. Trall. *Febr.* 4). – *εύφιμος*, *ον astringent, styptic*, Nic. *Al.* 275. – *έφελκτικός*, *ή, όν attractive*, *φάρμακον* Hippiatr. 20. – *ίδρωτοποιός*, *όν sudorific*, Dsc. III 68.2; Philum. ap. Aet. 9.12. – *ίσητήριος*, *α, ον (ίσχω), astringent*, Hp. *Loc. Hom.* 20, cf. *Erot.* –

καρώδης, ες *causing stupor*, Hp. *Art.* 31; *soporific*, Aret. *CA* 2.1. – *καταρρηκτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *promoting discharge*, φουσέων Hp. *Acut.* 23 (comp.); οὔρων Aret. *CA* 1.2; abs. *purgative*, Hp. *Acut.* 51. – *κατασπασμικός*, ἢ, ὄν *curing κατασπασμός*, *P Oxy.* 1088, 68 (i A.D.). – *κατατιτώσκω* *open an abscess*, ἔμπλαστρος – σκουσα Aet. 15.17. – *κοιλιολυτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *laxative*, *Gr.* 10.51 tit. – *κνητήριος*, α, ὄν *aiding conception*, πρόσθετον κ. Hp. *Nat. Mul.* 109. – *λευκωματικός*, ἢ, ὄν *good for leucoma*, κολλούρια Paul. Aeg. 3.22. – *μαλθακτικός*, ἢ, ὄν = *μαλακτικός*, πνεύμονος Hp. *Acut.* 53; Aret. *CD* 1.3. – *μινυτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *reducing*, *μαλάγματα* Cael. Aur. *TP* I.39. – *ὄξυωπής*, ες *sharpening the sight*, Dsc. III. 45. – *οὔραγωγός*, ὄν (οὔρον [A], ἄγω), *promoting urine*, πότισμα Soran. I.71. – *παρεμπλαστικός*, ἢ, ὄν *for stopping the pores*, δύναμις Dsc. I 109. 3, al. cf. Aet. 9.42; Alex. Trall. 5.5 (comp.). – *παραλεαντικός*, ἢ, ὄν *emollient, lenitive*, Diph. Siph. ap. Ath. 2.62 c. – *πολυανώδυνος*, ὄν *with much anodyne power*, = κώνειον Ps. Dsc. 4.78. – *προσταλτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *reducing*, π. τῶν ὄγκων φάρμακα Aet. 12.43. – *πωρολυτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *softening callosities*, Paul. Aeg. 6.109. – *σπλαγχνικός*, ἢ, ὄν *for the bowels*, φάρμακα Dsc. I 68.3. – *συλληπτικός*, ἢ, ὄν *promoting conception*, Aet. ap. Phot. *Bibl.* p.180 B. – *συνουσιαστικός*, ἢ, ὄν *promoting sexual intercourse, aphrodisiac*. Paul. Aeg. I.79. – *ὕδροκηλικός*, ἢ, ὄν *for curing hydrocele*, Paul. Aeg. 6.62. – *ὕπεκχωρητικός*, ἢ, ὄν *purgative*, τὰ – κά Hp. *Loc. Hom.* 41. – *ὕποβιαστικός*, ἢ, ὄν *purgative*, Dsc. IV 1.3; Antyll. ap. Orib. 6.34.3. – *ὕποχωρητικός*, ἢ, ὄν *relaxing, evacuating* Hp. *Loc. Hom.* 13, al. – *χοληγός*, ὄν *carrying off bile*, φάρμακον Hp. *Loc. Hom.* 27, 28. – *ὠκυτόκιος*, ὄν *promoting a quick birth*, Dsc. IV 14; V 154; cf. Plu. *Mor.* 964 C.

Here again we note the presence of synonyms: for *suppurative*, we find both *ἀποπυητικός* and *ἐμπυητικός*; for *preventing conception* *ἀκνητήριος* and *ἀσύλληπτος*; finally, for *purgative*, we find *ὕπεκχωρητικός* and *ὕποβιαστικός*.

Note, finally, the prevalence of topical remedies (τὰ τοπικά βοηθήματα VIII 148.1, cf. X 938.7–8, 971.16, al.) One school of thought denied their existence or their efficacy (XIII 363.9–364.8). Galen argued that local remedies were real and effective.



## Esichio e la Visione di Dorotheos

Di ENRICO LIVREA, Università di Firenze

Un aspetto non secondario delle multiformi, talora sorprendenti novità linguistiche disvelateci dalla Visione di Dorotheos contenuta in P. Bodmer XXIX<sup>1</sup>) è rappresentato dai molteplici rapporti fra il lessico di questo poeta cristiano-gnosticizzante del IV sec. (forse da identificare con un Dorotheos vescovo di Tiro morto ad Edessa sotto Giuliano) e le tradizioni lessicografiche confluite in Esichio.<sup>2</sup>) Anche se il nostro poemetto non può certo esser annoverato fra le fonti esichiane, appare sicuro che il Lessico di Cirillo contenesse molte glosse desunte da testi cristiani periti paragonabili alla Visione di Dorotheos. In effetti, nei 343 esametri talora assai mutili almeno una dozzina di oscurità lessicali si risolve grazie al confronto con Esichio, che a sua volta ne guadagna consistenti apporti critico-testuali, in quanto per la

<sup>1</sup>) Sono citate in forma abbreviata le seguenti opere: Agosti = G. Agosti, *Lingua, stile e metrica nella Visio Dorothei* (P. Bodmer XXIX), Diss. Firenze 1990 (in corso di stampa); Agosti<sup>2</sup> = G. Agosti, *Alcuni omerismi nella Visio Dorothei* (P. Bodmer XXIX), *Orpheus* 10, 1989, p. 101-16; HRR = *Papyrus Bodmer XXIX: Vision de Dorotheos*. Edité avec une introduction, une traduction et des notes par A. Hurst, O. Reverdin, J. Rudhardt..., Cologny-Geneve 1984; KH = *The Vision of Dorotheus* (Pap. Bodmer 29) edited with introduction, translation and notes by A. H. M. Kessels and P. W. van der Horst, *VCh* 41, 1987, p. 313-59; Livrea = E. Livrea, *Censura editionis principis*, *Gnomon* 58, 1986, p. 687-711; Livrea<sup>2</sup> = E. Livrea, *Ancora sulla "Visione" di Doroteo*, *EIKΑΣΜΟΣ* 1, 1990, p. 183-90; Vian = F. Vian, *A propos de la "Vision de Dorotheos"*, *ZPE* 60, 1985, p. 45-9.

<sup>2</sup>) Non trattiamo qui i lessemi doroteani per l'illustrazione dei quali Esichio fornisce solo materiale d'appoggio, come 257 *ὑπεκτροπαλίζω*, ἄ. λ. assoluto modellato su Y 190 *οὔτι μετατροπαλίζω φεύγων*, cf. Hesych. μ 1047 *μετατροπαλίζω ἐπιστρέφω*, τ 1489 *τροπαλίζει· στρέφει*, ma anche Plat. Phaed. 108b *ταύτην μὲν ἅπας φεύγει τε καὶ ὑπεκτρέπεται*. Sull'equazione \*τροπαλίζω: τρέπω = στροφαλίζω (Hom.): στρέφω si innesta la predilezione di Dorotheos per il preverbo *ὑπεκ-*, cf. 317 *ὑπεκφαίνω* (solo Philostr. Im. 1.24) e 336 *ὑπεξάιφνης* (ἄ. λ.). Al v. 119, è troppo forte il sospetto che *στίχοντα* (ῖ!) sia una scrittura itacistica per invocare Hesych. σ 1882 *στίχουσι· βαδίζουσι*, glossa espunta a torto da Schmidt, vd. F. Létoublon, *Les variantes στείχ-/στίχ-et l'existence du présent στίχω en grec*, *RPh* 53, 1979, p. 92-7. Che infine la glossa η 872 *ἤρωσ ποικίλος· ἐπὶ τῶν μεμαστιγομένων ἢ ὄφεις* <...?> serva per chiarire il significato della categoria degli *ἤρωες* nel paradiso doroteano (Livrea, p. 700 e n. 35), appare un'infelice ipotesi di HRR, p. 92, vd. Agosti, p. 229-32.

prima volta siamo in grado di considerare autentiche ed integre parecchie glosse racchiuse dagli editori fra croci, e di saggiare la validità di glossemi privi finora di ogni materiale documentario. Qui abbiamo raccolto il materiale doroteano in ordine alfabetico (1. *άλέα*; 2. *ἀλεύρης*; 3. *ἀλιτάων*; 4. *ἄμαργος*; 5. *έαλά*; 6. *έσορεύων*; 7. *κατήφησης*), lasciando per ultima una glossa (8. [*βα*]θάλης) che forse potrebbe illuminarci sulla provenienza di tutto questo materiale oscuro e problematico.

1. Nel descrivere (150-2) la flagellazione catartica cui viene sottoposto da due file di angeli punitori

μάστι[ξαν δ'έτέρω]σε, πέλεν δέ μοι αίματόεις χρώς,  
 σάρκε[ς δέ φθινύθ]εσκον έερ<γ>μέναι, όστέα δ'όϊα  
 φαίνο[ντο προπάρ]οιθε, λύθεν δέ μοι άλέα πάντα.

Dorotheos adatta l'enoplio omerico *λύθεν δέ οι ἄψα πάντα* (δ 794 = σ 189, dell'abbandono del sonno), riusato anche da Quinto Smirneo e 'declinato' da Nicandro e Gregorio di Nazianzo<sup>3</sup>). La sostituzione del termine per 'membra'<sup>4</sup>) con l'enigmatico *άλέα* crea difficoltà, che sarebbe inopportuno eliminare banalizzando *ex silentio*, con KH, attraverso la reintroduzione del termine omerico nel verso doroteano, anche perché un altro carme ancora inedito di P. Bodmer XXIX reca identica formula con *αλεα*<sup>5</sup>). Intendendo "et tout mon organisme se défaisait" gli editori svizzeri leggono *ἄλεα*, 'condensato', rinviando a Thes. s.v. *ἀλής*, *quod ad rem non facit*: occorrerebbe almeno scrivere *ἀλής* (unde *άλέα* D.), una parola che è propria del lessico ipocratico<sup>6</sup>), ove designa una certa quantità di cibo e di liquido, e dello ionico di Erodoto, ove designa una massa o affollamento di persone (\**ση-*

<sup>3</sup>) Cf. per *ἄψα πάντα* Q.S. 1.252, 637, 4.121, 5.30, 9.472, 11.84, 14.350, ma ciò che scompagina gli *ἄψα* può esser la morte (1.252, 11.84), la fatica (1.637), la vecchiaia (4.121), perfino la trasformazione in pietra (Ecuba, 14.350): mentre in 11.472 con *ἀέξετο ἄψα πάντα* Quinto capovolge la formula omerica, in 5.30 presenta tre creature guerresche *αἶματι λευγαλέω πεπαλαγμένοι ἄψ. π.* La somiglianza con la scena doroteana va ascritta al comune patrimonio di codice epico. Più vicini, ma solo formalmente, ad Omero Nic. *Al.* 541 *ἄψα λύει* e Greg. Naz. Carm. 1.2.38.157 *Χριστός ἐμὴν ψυχὴν τε καὶ ἄψα πάνθ' ὑπέδεκτο.*

<sup>4</sup>) Vd. Lfgre s.v. *ἄψα*, c.1786-7.

<sup>5</sup>) HRR, p.94 ed in app.: la primizia è passata inosservata per KH, che reintrodotta l'omerismo traducono a p.331 "and my total constitution collapsed".

<sup>6</sup>) Documentazione completa in J.H.Kühn - U.Fleischer, *Index Hippocraticus*, Göttingen 1986, I p.21.

*φαλής*, cf. *ἀολλής* etc.), come ionica è la ripresa callimachea nel I Giambo, fr. 191.9 Pfeiffer con  $\bar{a}$ <sup>7</sup>). Se è pertanto impossibile che Dorotheos abbia inteso "si sciolsero tutte le parti condensate (o ammassate)", la sua formula potrà spiegarsi soltanto col confronto con una costellazione di glosse esichiane i cui glossemi fanno tutti riferimento a fenomeni termici:  $\alpha$  2811 *ἀλέα· θέρημ. θάλπος*,  $\alpha$  2812 *ἀλεάζειν· θερμαίνεσθαι*,  $\alpha$  2881 *ἀλεόν· θερμόν ἢ χλιαρόν*,  $\alpha$  2822 *ἀλεός· διάπυρος*. Il dissolvimento del calore vitale come effetto dell'aspra flagellazione prefigura la 'morte' simbolica dell'iniziato, cioè lo scioglimento della sua compagine illica in una mistica comunione col divino. I modelli dai quali Dorotheos si sente autorizzato a modificare la formula omerica saranno pertanto l'  $\alpha$ . l. odissiaco *ἀλέη* ( $\rho$  23 *αὐτίκ' ἐπεὶ κε πυρὸς θερέω ἀλέη τε γένηται*, ubi schol. *Ο θερμασία, κυρίως ἢ τοῦ ἡλίου*, cf. Ap. Soph. 21.19) e soprattutto l'esiodico *ἐπαλέα λέσχην* (Op. 493), dove fin dall'antichità si contrapponeva all'interpretazione 'portico dove ci si riunisce in massa'<sup>8</sup>) una lettura in chiave termica 'esposto al sole, riscaldato'<sup>9</sup>).

2. Il *nomen agentis* *ἀλεύρης* attestato chiaramente dal mutilo v.288 (*αὐτόθι γυῖα διασκεδάσειας ἀλεύρης*) consente di dichiarare perfettamente sana la glossa di Esichio  $\alpha$  2905 *ἀλεύρειν· ἀφεστάναι*, che Latte mette tra croci e già Schmidt aveva considerato corrotta adducendo in app. la 'correzione' *ἀλεύειν* di Stephanus ed *ἀλεωρεῖν* di Ruhnken, ai quali va se non altro il merito di aver riconosciuto la rad. \**αλεφ-* di *ἀλεωρή*, *ἀλέομαι* (-έφ.), *ἀλεύω* etc. Nel Lessico di Cirillo fonte di Esichio *ἀλεύρειν* deve esser entrato come termine tecnico per indicare l'apostasia (per *ἀπίστημι* vd. Lampe s.v. 2), ed 'apostata' vale il suo *nomen agentis* *ἀλεύρης* in Dorotheos. Né deve sfuggire la rilevanza autobiografica del sostantivo, con cui Dorotheos richiama alla memoria la propria vicenda di *lapsus* sopravvissuto alla persecuzione diocle-

<sup>7</sup>) Si può dubitare della validità della forma con spirito aspro accolta da Pfeiffer, e non discussa da R. Schmitt, *Die Nominalbildung in den Dichtungen des Kallimachos von Kyrene*, Wiesbaden 1970, p. 121: cf. però Chantraine, DELG, p. 60.

<sup>8</sup>) Vd. Irigoin, LfgrE, c. 479-80; Chantraine, DELG, p. 59, 356.

<sup>9</sup>) 'Warm' intende West ad loc., p. 282, il quale non menziona una *varia lectio* *ἐπ' ἀλέα λέσχην* forse presente a Dorotheos: cf. l'apparato dell'editio maior di Rzach, p. 216. Questa forma *ἀλέα* poi ricongetturata da Goettling vorrebbe accogliere nel testo Bechtel, *Lexilogus*, p. 129; contra vd. H. Troxler, *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*, Zürich 1964, p. 141 (\**ἐπαλε-έα*;  $\bar{a}$  si spiegherebbe come 'Adaptationsform', ma è possibile anche 'Kompositionsdehnung').

ziana grazie alla familiarità con l'imperatore e grazie alla dutilità che consentì agli gnostici di godere di una certa immunità durante le persecuzioni<sup>10</sup>). Qualcosa di simile affiora nella *μετάνοια* del battesimo iniziatico di 226 (*ἐκπάγλω[ς δ'] ἀπέειπον, ὅπερ θέλον*<sup>11</sup>) e traluce nel simbolismo delle colpe di cui si macchia Dorotheos (82 ss.), oltre che nel ripetuto abbandono della postazione della porta.

3. Il testo dell'editio princeps di 147 *ἐξήμειβον ἀλι τάων*, oltre ad essere ametrico ed a correggere *εξημοιβον Π*<sup>12</sup>), non offre senso alcuno, malgrado la nota sull'uso del sale nella tortura<sup>13</sup>): "et les éloignai-ent d'elles (?) par le sel" non ha bisogno di refutazione nella sua absurdità, né suona d'altronde più persuasivo *ἐξήμειβον ἀλιτάων* "as a requital for my sins" di KH, p.353, costretti a postulare due forme inesistenti, *ἐξήμειβος* 'ricompensa' (sic!) e *ἀλίτη* 'peccato' (sic!). Per evitare la difficoltà prosodica di *ἀλιτάων* suggerito da Vian, p.48, occorrerà ritoccare l'itacismo restaurando *ἀλ<e>ιτάων* con sinizesi, cf. s.s. Γ 28, υ 121, Ap. Rh. 1.1338. Comunque chi è pronto ad ammettere *ἀλιτάων* secondo il noto trattamento 'libero' delle *δίχρονοι*<sup>14</sup>) potrà conservare il testo del papiro, confrontando per *ἀλίτης* = 'peccatore' Hesych. α 3066 *ἀλίτης· ἁμαρτωλός, ξένος, Etym. M. 62.1 Gaisford ἀλίτης διὰ τοῦ ι γραφόμενον εἶρον ἐγὼ σημαίνον τὸν ἁμαρτωλόν*, Lex. De spir. p.209 Valckenaer *ἀλίτης· ὁ ἁμαρτωλός, καὶ ἀλιτρός*, Orion Etym. 32. 10 Sturz *ἀλίτης καὶ παρώνυμον ἀλιτήρ*. Adirittura Apollonio Sofista scriveva *ἀλίτην* in Γ 28<sup>15</sup>), ove Zenodoto proponeva *ἀλείτας* considerandolo equivalente di *ἁμαρτίας*, un'opinione non condivisa da Apollonio Rodio. Non occorre pensare con Latte che la glossa esichiana confonda fra *ἀλείτης* ed *ἀλήτης*, anzi il senso di 'peccatore' si sarà stabilizzato per *ἀλίτης* grazie all'omofonia itaci-

<sup>10</sup>) Vd. Livrea, p.691 e soprattutto n.11.

<sup>11</sup>) HRR non si accorgono che questa frase costituisce un inciso parentetico, "orrendamente avevo rinnegato ciò che volevo", che Livrea, p.705 considera "riferimento di D. alla sua esperienza terrena di peccatore, forse carica di allusioni a deviazioni di eretico e di apostata". Curiosamente KH, p.336 escludono dall'inciso *ὅπερ θέλον*, privando del suo necessario oggetto *ἀπέειπον*, sul cui valore di 'rinnegare' vd. Livrea a Nonn. Par. Σ 129, p.172.

<sup>12</sup>) Difeso a buon diritto da Agosti<sup>2</sup>, p.115-6.

<sup>13</sup>) La tacita quanto arbitraria correzione di HRR non tiene conto di Hesych. ε 3857 *ἐξημοιβαί· ἔτεραι*, né - per il senso complessivo dell'espressione - di versi come Hes. Op. 334 *ἔργων ἀντ' ἀδικῶν χαλεπήν ἐπέθηκεν ἀμοιβήν*.

<sup>14</sup>) Si potrebbero addurre 86 *δομestικόιο*, 112 *λιπών*, 191 *λιταίνουσι* (?), 262 *τριηκοσίους*, 332 *ὠράριον*: vd. Agosti, p.106, ed infra, n.19.

<sup>15</sup>) Ap. Soph. 22.28: vd. schol. A ad Γ 28, I p.361.5-6 Erbse; Micknat, LfgrE s.v. *ἀλείτης*, c.466; Ardizzoni ad Ap.Rh. 1.1338.

stica con ἀλήτης 'errante', che in Nonno designa ormai stabilmente i non credenti<sup>16</sup>), cf. Par. Θ 38 ὑμεῖς δ'ἀφραδέεσσιν ἐν ἤθεσι πάντες ἀλήται = Jo. 8.21 ἐν τῇ ἀμαρτία ὑμῶν. Sulla cittadinanza di ἀλίτης nella poesia cristiana conferma Eud. Cyrp. 1.92 ἀπάλακ' ἀλίτην (= il diavolo!), 2.217 ἀλίτης κρατέει ἐπὶ γαῖαν, cf. anche P. Cairo Maspero 67097.77 (VIP) ἀλίταις<sup>17</sup>). Per Dorotheos un'interferenza fra i campi semantici di ἀλιταίνω 'peccare' (ricorrente al v. 194) ed ἀλάομαι 'errare' appare altamente probabile, così come degna d'interesse si rivela la compresenza dell'ἄ. λ. omerico ἐξημοιβόν (θ 249 εἵματά τ'ἐξημοιβὰ λοετρά τε θερμὰ καὶ εὐναί), che se riferito al ricambio o all'alternativa potrebbe alludere alla τάξις dei peccatori durante le punizioni inflitte dagli ἄγγελοι κολασταί, oppure al ricambio dell'involucro corporeo adombrato nei vv. 151-2, necessario all'iniziazione celeste ed anticipatore della scena di vestizione di 329 ss.

4. La risposta di Cristo al giuramento iniziatico di Dorotheos dà luogo ad un testo enigmatico, 218-9

ὄ]ς δ' ἄρα [μ]ειδιῶν προσεφώνεε· ημαμαργος  
ὄ]φρα [μοι ἔ]σποιο πᾶσιν ἐπ' ἤμασι ποιμανέων με.

La lez. papiracea ημ' αμαργος (una macchiolina sul primo α potrebbe essere un segno di elisione) è stata variamente corretta sia per ristabilire la sintassi (ἦν ἄμαργος Livrea, p.704-5) collocando un tempo storico nella principale, sia al fine di postulare la caduta di una sillaba nel comune nesso ἦ μάλα (ἦ μά<λα> μάργος HRR: ἦ μά<λᾶ>μαργος KH). La prima esigenza si può soddisfare con una diversa interpunzione, che renda ἦν ἄμαργος un inciso parentetico, oppure appellandosi a rari casi epici di ottativo in dipendenza da un tempo principale, quali Ap. Rh. 4.399 μεμάασιν ἀμυνέμεν, ὄφρα ... ἄγοιτο, Q.S. 2.314 χάζεο μὴ σε βάλοιμι<sup>18</sup>). La seconda non lascia spazio per il verbo principale, da cui dipenderebbe ὄφρα con pesante

<sup>16</sup>) Vd. Livrea a Nonn. Par. Σ 3, p.110, ed inoltre A 32, Z 198 ma soprattutto A 166 dove νεκρὸν ἀλήτην (= Lazzaro) allude alla resurrezione come liberazione dal peccato, secondo l'esegesi evangelica cirilliana mutuata da Nonno.

<sup>17</sup>) Vd. H. Zilliacus, Zur Abundanz der spätgriechischen Gebrauchssprache, Helsinki 1967, p.75.

<sup>18</sup>) Addotti per quest'anomalia da HRR, p.95. Si aggiungano gli esempi nonniani raccolti da R. Keydell, Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiaca, Prol. p.75-6. Proponendo di chiudere fra parentesi tonde ἦν ἄμαργος, intenderei "e quegli mi rivolse la parola (era inesorabile) allo scopo di seguirmi per sempre etc."

ellissi cui non rende giustizia un'interpretazione quale "surely, very eager is he"<sup>19</sup>). Ma forse ci si può risparmiare la mia correzione ἦν attenendosi al papiro, ove chi rifiuta ημ' = ἡμῶν (cf. 7 bis, edito ma non tradotto da HRR) può appellarsi ad una forma elisa di ἡμε = εἶμαι, attestata in epigrafi e papiri<sup>20</sup>) e forse confermata da un ulteriore esempio doroteano di coniugazione deponente di εἶμί, 199 ἡμην<sup>21</sup>). Né appare del resto da escludere che ημ' sia scrittura itacistica di εἶμί, cf. per l'elisione di ι in Dorotheos 19 ἐῶ πατέρ' ἐσθλῶ. Risulta comunque intangibile l'ἄ.λ. ἄμαργος, cf. Hesych. α 82 ἄβαρτος· ἄπληστος. οἱ δὲ ἄμαργος, α 83 ἀβαρτία· ἀπληστία, ove è assai verisimile che ἄμαργος ed ἄβαρτος siano lo sdoppiamento di un'unica glossa, anche se appare difficile spiegare la *conflatio* di un errore di minuscola (μ ~ β) e di uno di maiuscola (Γ ~ Τ). In Dorotheos ἄμαργος andrà inteso come 'inesorabile, terribile' piuttosto che 'insaziabile', secondo la nota confusione semantica fra ἄπληστος ed ἄπλητος<sup>22</sup>): l'epiteto si adatta perfettamente al carattere minaccioso di un angelo punitore quale Gabriele, e riprende assai a tono ἐαλά, su cui *infra*. Né manca, per -μαργος in clausola, l'influsso omerico di σ 2.

5. In un verso fra i più misteriosi del poemetto (217 ἦ] τοι ἐγὼ πατέρα κλυτόν, ἦ τεά, Γαβριήλ, ἐαλά) resta incerto se computare Γᾱβροῖηλ con consonantizzazione di ι ed abbreviamento (così HRR, p. 40) oppure Γᾱβριῆηλ con sinizesi come al v. 50: in questo caso opererebbe sinizesi anche in ἐαλά. Questo 'Ghostword' era finora attestato solo in Hesych. ε 17 ἐαλόν· λυπηρόν. λυτήριον, dove Latte appone la *crux* alla glossa - che ritiene derivata da ἐάνόν ε 24 - ed espunge il primo glossema, mentre Schmidt aveva postulato una corruzione da AIANON > EANON ed aveva preferito espungere il secondo glossema, "nihil est nisi varietas antecedentis λυπηρόν". La ricorrenza doroteana, mentre conferma definitivamente la sanità della glossa di Esichio, non

<sup>19</sup>) KH, p. 335. Per *ā* (tutt'altro che "metrically incorrect") vd. Agosti, p. 106.

<sup>20</sup>) Part. un'iscrizione frigia dell'inizio del IV sec. (J. H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, I. Prolegomena, Edinburgh 1908, p. 56) e P. Ross. Georg. III. 10.22 (IV-V sec.), vd. B. Mandilaras, The Verb in the Greek non-Literary Papyri, Athens 1973, p. 76.

<sup>21</sup>) ησμην Π era stato corretto ἡσμην da HR, ma poiché "j'avais crié" non dà senso, Vian, p. 48 aveva proposto ἡμην < ἡμῶν, cl. 4, 7, 17. La retta soluzione sembra intravista da KH, p. 355, che rinviano a F. T. Gignac, A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, II, Milano 1981, p. 402.

<sup>22</sup>) Vd. Richardson a H. Hom. Cer. 83, p. 175.

si presta affatto a decidere quale dei due glossemi sia errore di maiuscola per l'altro, anzi poiché tanto 'doloroso' quanto 'espiatorio' offrono ottimo senso nel contesto di cruenta punizione che le potenze celesti impongono al penitente, la duplicità semantica segnalata da Esichio potrebbe esser originaria, riflettendo un testo (forse cristiano?) simile a quello di Dorotheos, che dunque indurrebbe ad escludere il sospetto di autoschediasmi grammaticali. Nell'impossibilità di discernere l'etimologia del termine<sup>23</sup>), non mi sentirei né di relegarlo *faute de mieux* fra le glosse macedoni di cui *infra*, né di ascriverlo ad un'arbitraria catacresi di passi omerici come Y 278 *Αἰνεΐας δ'ἔαλλη καὶ ὑπὸ ἔθεν ἀσπίδ' ἀνέσχε*, ove il *punctum leumannianum* sarebbe l'aor. pass. di *εἴλω* frainteso come sostantivo coordinato ad *ἀσπίδα*. Piuttosto importa qui sottolineare che il significato del v. 217 appare ancora recuperabile se, invece di renderlo con l'oscurissimo "by the renowned Father, or by your deliverance" con KH, si tengano presenti i due versi precedenti. Alla domanda di Gabriele 215-6

*εὐδρ]αγίη[ν] χαρίεσσαν ἐέλδεται ἀμφελέεσθαι  
πρ]ᾶξιν <θ> ἡρώων τῶν ῥ' ἐσταότων πρὸ δόμοιο;*<sup>24</sup>)

"Desideri assumere la prestanza piena di grazia e la funzione degli eroi in guardia davanti al palazzo?" Dorotheos risponde "Sì, [desidero assumerla, sc. *ἐέλδομαι ἀμφελέεσθαι*) nel nome del padre glorioso, oppure, o Gabriele, [desidero assumere] le tue dolorose punizioni". Non appare pertanto per nulla necessario postulare la caduta di uno o più versi prima di 217, con HRR<sup>25</sup>).

<sup>23</sup>) Non saprei quanto rilevante sia Hesych. ε 18 *ἑαλός· τεθραυσμένος*, dove la corr. *ἑαγός* (-ώς) sembrerebbe imporsi, vd. l'app. di Schmidt, e che non saprei riferire con Agosti, p. 224 ai colpi che Dorotheos subirebbe in caso di rottura del giuramento iniziatico.

<sup>24</sup>) I versi da me ricostruiti (Livrea, p. 704) sfruttano Hesych. ε 6768 *εὐδράνεια· ἰσχύς*, cf. Sap. Sal. 13.19 *τὸ ἀδρανέστατον ταῖς χερσὶν εὐδράνεια αἰτεῖται*. Il sost. *εὐδρανίη*, se non è coniato da Dorotheos, poteva esser nella sua fonte una formazione analogica su *ἀδρανίη* Call. fr. 730 Pfeiffer (Hecale?), Ap. Rh. 2.200, Leon. Tar. A. P. 6. 296. 6 = L. 2276 Gow-Page, Hermes. fr. 7. 43 Powell, Nic. Ther. 248, 745, Opp. Hal. 1.371, 2.72, Man. 2.421, Q. S. 9.456, 472, Nonn. Dion. 21.245, 24.171, 30.282, Maced. A. P. 6.73.8, Jul. Aeg. A. P. 6. 29. 2, 7.598.2. Per la poesia cristiana cf. Apollin. Ps. 9.25, 15.6, 24.37, 26.4, 30.15, 54.14, 118.91, 141.5, Eud. Cypr. 2.308 e vd. J. Golega, Der homerische Psalter, Ettal 1960, p. 37.

<sup>25</sup>) Per l'enigmatico *ἀμφελέεσθαι*, che sembra fondere *ἐλέσθαι* frequente clausola omerica con o 66 *ἐέλδεται οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι*, δ 162 *ἐέλδετο γάρ σε ιδέσθαι*, non sono purtroppo in grado di progredire su HRR, p. 37, che per

6. Rimproverando a Dorotheos la sua mancanza, Cristo lo accusa di aver trascurato la turpitudine e la vergogna di cui si macchiava abbandonando la porta, "mentre doveva montar la guardia per noi", 133 οὐδ' [ἄλεγεν] λώβης τε καὶ αἴσχεος ἅμμ' ἐσορεύων. Quest' ἄ. λ. si spiega facilmente sulla base di un abbondante materiale esichiano, o 1167 ὀρεύειν· φυλάσσειν, o 1133 ὄρει· φυλάσσει, a cui si possono aggiungere ω 334 ὠρήσαντα· φυλάσσουντα, ω 318 ὠρειν· φυλάττειν. ὄθεν καὶ ὁ θυρωρός, ω 335 ὠρήσονται· φυλάσσουνται, ω 317 ὠρεία· φυλακτῆρια, ω 374 ὠρου· ὠρια, φύλακες. Di particolare rilevanza appare poi ε 6474 ἐσωρηαὶ ὑπουργῆσαι τοὺς αὐτούς ..., che Latte considera plausibilmente lacone a causa di ἐσ- e dell'aspirazione prodotta dalla caduta del σ (ἐσωρη<σ>αι impropriamente LSJ), e che si accosterà a ω 326 ὠρεύειν τὸ τῶν ἀγρίων νομῶν καὶ ἐθνῶν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι. Normalmente la radice, che è in sostanza la stessa di ὀράω<sup>26</sup>) ed in tutta la costellazione assume il significato di 'sorvegliare, custodire, occuparsi di', appare nella forma οὐ- (Hom. οὐρος 'guardiano', ούρεύς A 50, K 84, ed i denominativi ούρεύω 'far la guardia' SIG 522.127 - Creta, III a. C. -, ούρέω 'sorvegliare' schol. Ap. Rh. 4.1614, dove vd. Wendel, p. 323), oppure nella forma ὠ- che potrebbe esser un dorismo<sup>27</sup>), non però presso Hes. Theog. 903 (le Ore) αἱ τ' ἔργ' ὠρεύουσι καταθητοῖσι βροτοῖσι<sup>28</sup>), Cornut. De nat. deor. 1 ἔνιοι δέ φασιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὠρεῖν ἢ ὠρεύειν τὰ ὄντα, ὃ ἐστὶ φυλάττειν, οὐρανὸν κεκλήσθαι, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ὁ θυρωρός ἀνομάσθη, 29 ἐκ Θεμίδος λέγεται ὁ Ζεὺς γεννησάμενος τὰς Ὠρέας, ὑφ' ὧν τὰ ἀγαθὰ πάντα καθ' ἡμᾶς ὠρεύεται καὶ φυλάττεται. La nuova testimonianza doroteana dimostra che Latte aveva torto nel sospettare le due glosse esichiane con ὀ- (per o 1167 egli proponeva di correggere ὀρεύειν in ὠρεύειν, mentre per 1133 decretava addirittura l'espun-

---

ἀμφαιρέω adducono Thes. s.v. "ἀμφαιρήσεται Hesych. affert pro περισχισθήσεται ab ἀμφαιρέω posito pro ἀμφαιρέω". Nemmeno a me è riuscito di ritrovare la glossa esichiana, ove il glossema περισχισθήσεται sembrerebbe comunque riferirsi ad un ἀφαιρήσεται. Per λανθανόνων 94, che fornirebbe un analogo esempio di falsa 'distrazione' omerica esemplata su βάλλειν etc., avevo già rinviato (Livrea, p. 709) ad ἀνδανείεις di Gregorio di Nazianzo, su cui vd. A. Knecht, Gegen die Putzsucht der Frauen, Heidelberg 1972, p. 79.

<sup>26</sup>) Chantraine, DELG s.v. ὀράω, p. 814; Frisk, p. 448.

<sup>27</sup>) Cf. Hippocr. ap. Gal. 19.157 ὠρέοντων· φροντίζόντων, schol. ad μ 89, Ammon. 226, p. 60.1-2 Nickau τὸ δὲ θεωρεῖν, φησὶν, οὐκ ἄλλο τι ἢ τὸ τῶν θεῶν ὠρεῖν, τοῦτο δὲ τὸ φροντίζειν, Etym. M. 60.44, 74.29, 209.43, 457.52, 742.23, 686.54.

<sup>28</sup>) West ad loc., p. 407-8 ritiene che il vb. possa esser stato fogggiato ad hoc, in un Wortspiel che si propone l'etimologia delle Ore.



zione), mentre conferma la loro difesa operata da Schulze<sup>29</sup>) e fornisce un impressionante parallelo a Hesych. ε 6474.

7. In un inno cletico di forte coloritura gnostica, l'arcangelo Gabriele è lodato come 'angelo della gioia'<sup>30</sup>), οὗτι κατηφηςας τὸν ἐμόν νόον. Questo δις λεγόμενον omerico (X 293 στῆ δὲ κατηφήςσας s. s., π 342), dalle ricorrenze piuttosto rare<sup>31</sup>), viene normalmente impiegato con valore intransitivo, 'sum vultu demisso' Thes. s. v. Sembrava isolata l'attestazione di un uso transitivo presso Hesych. κ 1793 κατήφηςσας· κατηνίασας, tanto che Stephanus poteva annotare "signi. transitivae, quam huic verbo tribuere videtur grammaticus, exx. desideramus". Ora la ricorrenza doroteana conferma in pieno la glossa di Esichio, che potrebbe anche esser utile – pur se non deriva dall'Ὁρασις – a ristabilire nel testo papiraceo l'ind. κατήφηςσας a preferenza del part. κατηφήσας (HRR, KH).

8. Nel battesimo iniziatico che trasforma Dorotheos in Andrea<sup>32</sup>), l'acqua di vita viene riversata dal Cristo sul miste, 231 χεῦεν ἐλὼν [βα]θάλης ὕδωρ ἄμβροτον ὑψίστοιο. L'insolita integrazione di HRR potrebbe suscitare qualche dubbio, ed invero, se si integrasse – come suggerisce Agosti, p. 227 – con l'onvio [φι]άλης si avrebbe un significativo parallelo con la visione di Perpetua nell'omonima Passio, 8 *video ... Dinocraten ... et piscinam ... et aqua de ea proflebat sine cessatione; et super marginem fia la aurea plena aqua; et accessit Dinocrates, et de ea bibere coepit; quae fiala non deficiebat*<sup>33</sup>). Purtroppo però questo paragone fra i due battesimi iniziatici non si può spingere fino

<sup>29</sup>) W. Schulze, *Quaestiones Epicae*, Gütersloh 1892, p. 17<sup>3</sup> riconduce all'omerico ὄροντο (γ 411, ξ 104).

<sup>30</sup>) Vd. Kropp, *Koptische Zaubertexte* 1.80, 2.250; Ps. Cael. Hom. in Archang. Gabr. (ap. Worrell, *Coptic Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, New York 1923), 7 (p. 331), 11 (p. 333). Cf. anche Livrea<sup>2</sup>, p. 186–7. Del resto la tristitia è il quinto fra gli otto vizi stigmatizzati da Cass. Inst. 5.1, vd. Festugière ad Hist. Mon. in Aeg., Paris 1964, p. 11<sup>34</sup> e cf. ex. gr. Mani 40.1 (il σύζυγος a Mani) και πάλιν, εἰ ποτ' ἂν θλιβῆς, ἐπικαλέση με, ἐγὼ πλησίον σου εὐρηθήσομαι ἐσῶς, ὑπερασπιστῆς σου ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει κτλ., Ev. Phil. 116 beato il servo che non ha rattristato il loro animo. Questi è Gesù Cristo, 118 non si deve rattristare nessuno, sia grande che piccolo, sia infedele che fedele.

<sup>31</sup>) Eur. Med. 1008, Arist. H.A. 604 b 12, Call. Ep. 20.5 Pfeiffer, Ap. Rh. 2.443, 888, Jo. Chrys. Hom. 9.5 in Hebr. (PG 12.100b), Bas. Sel. Or. 18.2 (PG 85.232 b).

<sup>32</sup>) Vd. Livrea, p. 696<sup>25</sup>. Qui si tratta naturalmente di "pneumatisches Heilwasser" (Henrichs-Koenen, ZPE 5, 1970, p. 137), in opposizione alla normale acqua corrente maldestramente usata da Dorotheos (213–4).

<sup>33</sup>) Su questi rapporti strutturali fra la Visione di Dorotheos e la Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis vd. Livrea, p. 696<sup>26</sup>.

alla restituzione di [φι]άλης in P. Bodmer XXIX, cui ostano 1) le tracce discernibili prima di α, incompatibili con ι ed appartenenti invece alla parte destra di una lettera tondeggiante in mezzo al rigo; 2) il computo dello spazio, che richiede almeno due lettere nella lacuna prima di θ. Già l'editio princeps<sup>34)</sup> richiama la glossa esichiana β 47 βαθάλη· κρήνη· Ἀμερίας, ora studiata da E. Degani, il quale riprende l'opinione di O. Hoffmann secondo cui si tratterebbe di un nome proprio (Suid. β 25 Adler Βαθάλη· ὄνομα κύριον)<sup>35)</sup>, un'ipotesi ora smentita da Dorotheos. La correzione di Herwerden, *Lex.*<sup>2</sup> 258 βαδάλη poggia sul fatto che i Macedoni non pronunciavano le aspirate θφχ, e consente forse di istituire un parallelo col misterioso βέδν di Orph. fr. 219 Kern

*καὶ βέδν Νυμφάων καταλείβεται ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ.*

Clemente Alessandrino, che cita probabilmente da Didimo questa glossa 'frigia'<sup>36)</sup>, prosegue con altre preziose osservazioni, Strom. 5. 8, II p. 357 Stählin, che non possono non evocare la scena battesimale della Visione doroteana: ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ θύτης Δίων ὁμοίως φαίνεται γράφων· 'καὶ βέδν λαβὼν κατὰ χειρῶν καταχέου καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἱεροσκοπίην τρέπου' ... συνομολόγος τῆς τοιαύτης δόξης καὶ ὁ Κυζικηνὸς Νεάνθης (= 84 F 36 Jacoby) γράφων τοὺς Μακεδόνων ἱερεῖς ἐν ταῖς κατευχαῖς βέδν κατακαλεῖν ... ὅπερ ἐρμηνεύουσιν ἀέρα. Che 'aria' e non 'acqua' il termine valesse presso il comico Filillio (fr. 20 = I p. 787 Kock) sembra confermato e dal contesto autoscolastico del frammento citato da Clemente<sup>37)</sup>

<sup>34)</sup> HRR, p. 39, 95; a p. 87 trad. "prise à la source"; KH, p. 337 "from a well". Per la restituzione dell'inizio del verso vd. Vian, p. 49 e Livrea, p. 705.

<sup>35)</sup> E. Degani, Macedonian Glosses in Hesychius' Lexicon, *Hellenika* 35, 1984, p. 13-4, con una preziosa raccolta delle glosse di Ameria, che per βαθάλη non progredisce su O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum*, Göttingen 1906, p. 13. La relazione con βαθός forse è inesistente, ed anche sul rapporto con ὄνομα κύριον attestato da Suida già Schmidt si pronunciava assai dubitativamente, "quae mihi tamen equidem huc pertinere non videntur".

<sup>36)</sup> Vd. M. West, *The Orphic Poems*, Oxford 1983, p. 267. Su elementi frigi nella lingua dei Macedoni cf. N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia I*, Oxford 1972, p. 407-14.

<sup>37)</sup> Che non occorre normalizzare con D. Detscheff, *Glotta* 16, 1928, p. 281, il quale dopo aver inteso il fr. orfico "und die Quelle der Nymphen giesst glänzendes Wasser herunter" propone di correggere in Filillio τὸν ἀέρ' in τὸ νεαρόν. Nemmeno appar necessario il passaggio "acqua del cielo ~ pioggia" escogitato da Sturtevant, *Philologus* 21, 1926, p. 241.

ἔλκειν τὸ βέδν σωτήριον προσεύχομαι,  
ὄπερ μέγιστόν ἐστιν ὑγιείας μέρος,  
τὸ τὸν ἀέρ' ἔλκων καθαρὸν, οὐ τεθλωμένον

e dall'evidente rapporto con la rad. \**ve-/vē-*, cf. *vātas*, ἄ-*φή-της*, *ventus*, *vinda-*, *wéjas* etc. Tuttavia questa forte oscillazione semantica, piuttosto che rinviare con Wilamowitz a "sinnlos gewordene karische Worte"<sup>38)</sup>, conferma il carattere simbolico e cabalistico del termine, impiegato nel vocabolario rituale dello gnosticismo, come già intuirono Lobeck e Lagarde<sup>39)</sup>. Qualunque sia il rapporto con *βέδν*<sup>40)</sup>, l'origine della glossa *βαθάλη* appare indiscutibilmente macedone, come macedone è l'altra glossa Hesych. ε 446 Ἐδεσσαῖος· ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἐν Ἐδέσσει, legata al più importante culto locale macedone fiorente ad *Αἰγαί* = Edessa, prima capitale degli Argeadi o Eraclidi e luogo di riposo dei defunti re epicorici<sup>41)</sup>. Secondo una diffusa tradizione<sup>42)</sup>, Edessa nell'Osroene avrebbe mutuato il nome dalla capitale macedone per la sua abbondanza di acque (*βέδν!*): ora, sarà un caso che proprio ad Edessa si può fissare il martirio, in età giuliana, di Dorotheos<sup>43)</sup> già vescovo di Tiro al quale vorremmo assegnare la paternità della Visione?

<sup>38)</sup> Glaube der Hellenen I, p. 80.

<sup>39)</sup> F.A.Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* I, p. 883; P. de Lagarde, *Ges. Abhandlungen* 1886, p. 285.

<sup>40)</sup> Vd. Walde-Pokorny, LEW s.v. *unda*; ad una rad. \**ved-* riconduce *βέδνς*, *Βεδύσιος*, Ἐδέσσα W. Tomaszek, *Das alte Thrakien*, Wien 1893-4, 2.1 p. 5. Il più equilibrato e dotto status quaestionis si legge in J.N. Kalléris, *Les anciens Macédoniens. Etude linguistique et historique*, Athènes 1954, I p. 118-30. Su Ἐδέσσα = 'water-place' vd. ora N.G.L. Hammond, *The Macedonian State*, Oxford 1989, p. 4.

<sup>41)</sup> Vd. Hoffmann, p. 32<sup>120</sup>; Kalléris, p. 169. Per *Αἰγαί*, toponimo che potrebbe esser collegato allo stesso radicale di *αἰγίς*, *καταιγίς* etc. (vd. Frisk, p. 32), cf. Diod. 19.52.5, 22, fr. 23, Plut. *Pyrrh.* 26, Just. 7.1.9, Plin. N.H. 4.33.

<sup>42)</sup> Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἐδέσσα· πόλις Συρίας, διὰ τὴν τῶν ὑδάτων ῥύμην οὕτω κληθεῖσα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ.

<sup>43)</sup> Cf. l'ep. 115 di Giuliano da me evocata (Livrea, p. 692). Nella ricca fioritura di movimenti ereticali nella città siriana fra il 360 ed il 370 si colloca la comunità ariana (J.B. Segal, *Edessa, 'the Blessed City'*, Oxford 1970, p. 91), né forse è del tutto privo di significato il fatto che la chiesa che accolse nel 372 la visita dell'ariano Valente e nel 373 l'esilio del vescovo Barsai fosse intitolata a S. Tommaso, una figura capitale per gli Gnostici, vd. H.-Ch. Puech, *Sulle tracce della Gnosi*, Milano 1985, p. 329 ss. Sulla biografia di Dorotheos vd. ora anche Livrea<sup>2</sup>, p. 185 ss.

## focus

By ERIC P. HAMP

The noun *focus*, of uncertain origin, appears to form a diminutive *foculus* 'brazier, etc.', while another noun *fōculum* exists, apparently derived from *foueō*. Since *foculus* is associated with sacrifices, it may well have an ancient pedigree as part of a traditional semantic sphere. Because *fo-c-us* would violate the morpheme structure constraints that dominate Indo-European it seems plausible that *focus* might be a back-formation from the ancestor of *foculus* once *ātrium* had shifted from the simple semantic range of 'hearth' (*Glotta* 69, 1991, 191).

At that time *\*fuekos* might well have been fashioned from *\*fuek-lo-m* < *\*f<sup>w</sup>e-klo-m* < *\*x<sup>w</sup>e-klom* < *\*g<sup>w</sup>h-e-tlo-m*, a formation originally derived in exactly the same way as Gk. ἐφέ-τλη = Welsh *haeddel* f. 'plough handle' < (*\*sag(h)ed(h)lā* <) *\*sghetlā* (*ZCP* 37, 1979, 168-9), with zero grade of the base.

It would be perfectly regular for *\*dg<sup>w</sup>h-e-tlo-* to have simplified its initial cluster just as *humus* and *homō* < *\*dghm-* did (*ZCP* 44, 1991, 76-8; *KZ* 103, 1990, 289). We would therefore have a nomen instrumenti formed from the base *\*dheg<sup>w</sup>h-* found also in *foueō* < *\*dhog<sup>w</sup>h-éi<sup>e</sup>/o-*.

## Vorfahren und Nachkommen

Von ROLF HEINE, Göttingen

*Progenies*<sup>1</sup> bedeutet gewöhnlich ‚Nachkommenschaft‘, und so findet sich denn als Übersetzung von Apul. met. 11, 5, 1 *saeculorum progenies initialis* bei z. B.

Rode/Burck	(1783/1961):	„erstgeborenes Kind der Zeit“
Helm	( <sup>4</sup> 1959)	: „Ursproß der Jahrhunderte“
Gwyn Griffiths	(1975)	: „the first offspring of time“
Hanson	(1989)	: „the first offspring of the ages“.

Andererseits übersetzen

Valette	( <sup>2</sup> 1956)	: „origine et principe des siècles“
Brandt/Ehlers	( <sup>3</sup> 1980)	: „Keimzelle der Geschlechter“,

nachdem bereits Forcellini die Stelle als ‚Translate‘ unter ‚genus, familia‘ zwar nicht eindeutig erklärt, aber doch deutlich abgehoben hatte von ‚II ... ipsi filii, proles, suboles‘. Also *progenies* auch das Gegenteil, die ‚Vorfahren‘, hier speziell die ‚Schöpferin, Ahnherrin, Ursprung‘?

Argumente aus fünf Bereichen sprechen für diese Deutung und dagegen, daß Isis sich in ihrer Selbstprädikation mit der gewöhnlichen Bedeutung von *progenies* als das erste Geschöpf der *saecula* bezeichnet:

1. Aus dem Kontext: Isis nennt sich die „Mutter“ der Schöpfung, die „Herrin“ der Elemente, die „Höchste“ der Götter, die „Königin“ der Manen und die „Erste“ der Himmlischen. Es wäre sehr erstaunlich, wenn sie sich innerhalb dieser ganz auf Dominanz und Priorität ausgerichteten Reihe mit der untergeordneten Rolle eines, wenn auch erstgeborenen, Geschöpfes, eines Nachkommen begnüge.

2. Aus dem apuleianischen Sprachgebrauch: Das ziemlich seltene Wort *initialis*<sup>2</sup>) kommt bei ihm noch zweimal vor, einmal met. 4, 30, 1 in wenn auch kürzerer, so doch durchaus vergleichbarer Selbstprädikation der Venus (*elementorum origo initialis*)<sup>3</sup>), das andere Mal apol. 64, 7 vom platonischen (epist. 2, 312 E) πάντων βασιλεύς als *totius re-*

<sup>1</sup>) Weitere Verbalabstrakta dieses Bildungstyps bei Leumann, Gramm. 285.

<sup>2</sup>) Der Thes. artikel ohne Stern (VII 1, 1648, 31 ff.) bringt 26 Belege (ohne Adv.).

<sup>3</sup>) Vgl. Gwyn Griffiths in: Hijmans/van der Paardt (edd.), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*, 1978, 151.

*rum naturae causa et ratio et origo initialis*, in beiden Fällen also die nahezu tautologische Unterstreichung einer absoluten Priorität, nicht einer relativen, wie es bei Rodes „erstgeborenem Kind der Zeit“ wäre.

3. Aus der Religionsgeschichte: Während Isis etwa in einer Versinschrift aus dem bithynischen Cius als Tochter des Uranos<sup>4)</sup> oder, nach Diodor 1, 27, 4, auf einer Stele in Nysa als Tochter des Kronos<sup>5)</sup> genealogisch der Zeit ein- und untergeordnet ist, kommt es allmählich zu einer Ausweitung ihrer Macht, die Gwyn Griffiths, unter Verweis auf Norden<sup>6)</sup>, beschreibt als: „Eventually Isis became the essence of nature, the creator of the world and of time.“<sup>7)</sup> Auch im Kommentar zu 11, 5, 1 ist von ihrer „sovereignty over time“ (S. 141) die Rede, und so fragt man sich, ob es nicht vor allem die gewöhnliche Bedeutung von *progenies* war, die die Konsequenz dieser Feststellungen in der Übersetzung verhindert hat.

4. Aus dem sonstigen *progenies*-Gebrauch: Daß Apuleius bei nicht wenigen sprachlichen Raritäten überraschende Berührungspunkte mit der *Vetus Latina* hat, ist bekannt; hier sei nur auf einige Beispiele aus dem Bereich der Wortwahl verwiesen:

	Apul.	Vet. Lat.
<i>victimare</i>	met. 7, 11, 1. 22, 2	- Sirach 34, 24 <sup>8)</sup>
<i>inalbare</i>	met. 9, 24, 2. 10, 20, 3	- Is. 1, 18 (Optat. 5, 4). Dan. 12, 10 (Iren. 1, 19, 2) <sup>9)</sup>
<i>ineffugibilis</i>	mund. 38 p. 372	- sap. 17, 16 <sup>10)</sup>
<i>exobruere</i>	met. 9, 6, 3	- prov. 29, 22 (Ps. Aug. spec. 49) <sup>11)</sup>
<i>impaenitendus</i>	met. 6, 13, 1. 11, 28, 4	- II Cor. 7, 10 (Aug. serm. coll. Morin p. 681) <sup>12)</sup>

4) L. Vidman, *Sylogae inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae*, 1969, Nr. 325 (= Kaibel, *Epigr. Gr.* 1029): ἦν τέκεν Οὐρανὸς Εὐφρονίδης ἐπὶ κύμασι πόντου μαρμαρέοις.

5) ἐγὼ εἶμι ἡ τοῦ νεωτάτου Κρόνου θεοῦ θυγάτηρ πρεσβυτάτη.

6) Die Geburt des Kindes, 1931, 30: Isis als „uranfängliche Erzeugerin der Weltzeiten“.

7) Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*, 1970, 284 (Sperrung von mir).

8) Ph. Thielmann, *ALL* 8, 1893, 506 (ebd. wenige spätere Belege).

9) M. Bernhard, *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura*, 1927, 120.

10) H. Koziol, *Der Stil des L. Apuleius*, 1872, 274. Außerdem noch ein späterer Beleg im *Op. imperf.* in *Matth.* (ThLL s. v.).

11) Bernhard a. a. O., 121. Außerdem noch zwei spätere Belege in den *Antidotaria Brux.* und bei *Cassiod.* (ThLL s. v.).

12) Gwyn Griffiths, *Isis - Book 58*. Außerdem noch drei/vier weitere Belege bei *Aug.* und *Cassiod.* (ThLL s. v.).

In diesen Rahmen paßt es, daß die zeitlich wohl nächste Parallele auch bei *progenies* Sirach 8, 5 ist: *ne male de progenie tua loquatur*<sup>13</sup>). Dies aber als möglicherweise von der Lautform der Vorlage (8, 4 *ἵνα μὴ ἀτιμάζωνται οἱ πρόγονοί σου*) beeinflusste<sup>14</sup>) Übersetzerfahleistung anzusehen und so als Stütze für Apul. met. 11, 5, 1 zu entwerfen, verbietet sich angesichts einiger altlateinischer Belege:

Pacuv. praetext. 1 *pater supreme nostrae progenii patris* kann ebenso wie Acc. trag. 50 *tu tuam progeniem ex (et trad., profer Ribbeck) ordine* trotz Textunsicherheit wohl auf die Geschlechterfolge aus dem Blickwinkel des Späteren bezogen werden, sicher ist die Bedeutung ‚Stammbaum‘ (Dziatzko/Hauler) und damit ‚Vorfahren‘ bei Ter. Phorm. 395 *progeniem vestram usque ab avo atque atavo proferens*. Was dagegen von den Wörterbüchern, bes. Forcellini und dem OLD, an Belegen für die Bedeutung ‚Stammbaum, Vorfahren‘ aus Cic. und Späteren gebracht wird, ist teils widersprüchlich, teils ambivalent, so z. B. Cic. Tusc. 1, 26, wo es von der alten Zeit heißt: *quo propius aberat ab ortu et divina progenie, hoc melius ea fortasse, quae erant vera, cernebat*. Die modernen Übersetzungen beziehen dies auf die menschlichen Vorfahren, so Humbert (<sup>2</sup>1960: „de notre origine divine“), Gigon (<sup>2</sup>1970: „den göttlichen Ahnen“) oder Douglas (1985: „divine descent“); näher an der Wahrheit dürften jedoch die alten Kommentatoren sein, die den Ausdruck auf die göttlichen Nachkommen beziehen, so Kühner (1853: „eos significari, qui ab ipsis dis nati sint“), Hasper (1883: „Die Heroen“) oder Tischer/Sorof (<sup>9</sup>1899: „der Götter Sprösslingen“). Ähnlich Cic. rep. 2, 24<sup>15</sup>) u. ö.

Man sieht: *progenies* könnte ursprünglich eine Geschlechterfolge bezeichnet haben, von der nur Blickwinkel bzw. Kontext bestimmten, ob die Ahnen oder die Nachkommen gemeint waren. Erst die Klassik scheint, möglicherweise beeinflusst durch *progignere* (und *progenerare?* *progenitor?*) und nach dem Typus *effingere: effigies, facere: superficies*<sup>16</sup>), den Gebrauch durch Beschränkung auf den einen Aspekt

<sup>13</sup>) Als ‚Vorfahren‘ verstanden z. B. von Hrabanus Maurus in seiner allegorischen Deutung PL 109, 814 C: *Iste enim de progenie nostra male loquitur, quando blasphematur Christianam religionem et catholicam fidem* (frdl. Hinweis W. Thiele).

<sup>14</sup>) Ph. Thielmann, ALL 1, 1884, 81.

<sup>15</sup>) Ziegler übersetzt *regalem ... progeniem* mit „der königlichen Herkunft“; ebenso möglich ist ‚Sproß aus königlichem Geschlecht‘ (vgl. nicht nur Hor. carm. 3, 29, 1 *Tyrrhena regum progenies*, sondern vor allem Cic. a. a. O. *Herculi stirpe generatus*).

<sup>16</sup>) Vgl. Walde-Hofmann I 439.

‚Nachkommenschaft‘ normalisiert zu haben; der andere, ‚Vorfahren‘, tritt erst mit Apul. und der Vet. Lat. wieder deutlich ans Licht der literarischen Bezeugung – eine Verteilung der Belegstellen, die ja auch sonst nicht selten ist<sup>17)</sup>, vgl. etwa *condecet*: Plaut., Turpil., Pompon. Atell., dann Apul., Tert., Vet. Lat. u. ö.

5. Aus dem semantischen Umfeld: Außer acht bleiben mag hier *stirps*, da das Wort, obwohl Parallelen für einerseits ‚Vorfahren‘, andererseits ‚Nachkommen‘ bietend<sup>18)</sup>, als Übertragung aus dem Pflanzenreich einem Verbalabstraktum nur bedingt vergleichbar ist; Berücksichtigung dagegen verdient *origo*, da es, bei gleichsam umgekehrter Semantik, eine interessante Parallele aufweist:

Apoc. 22 lautet in der Vulg. *ego sum radix et genus David*, in einigen Versionen der Vet. Lat. aber *radix et origo David*, und man tut sich zunächst etwas schwer, zu glauben, daß *origo* hier bedeuten kann, was es nach Christusgenealogie und Thes. IX 2, 990, 62 ff. bedeuten muß, eben ‚Nachkomme‘ statt ‚Vorfahr‘, sondern würde lieber an einen Folgefehler nach falsch verstandener *ρίζα/radix* denken: Was die LXX mit *ρίζα*<sup>19)</sup> wiedergibt, bezeichnet im Hebr. nicht nur ‚Wurzel, Grundlage, Ursprung‘, sondern auch das Reis aus der Wurzel, also gerade umgekehrt ‚Sproß, Nachkommenschaft‘<sup>20)</sup>, so etwa I Makk. 1, 10 *ρίζα ἀμαρτωλός*, vor allem aber Is. 11, 10, wo *ἡ ρίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαί* im Grunde dasselbe besagt wie ebda. 11, 1 *ράβδος ἐκ τῆς ρίζης*.

Die Kenntnis dieser Sonderbedeutung von *ρίζα* aber den Übersetzern der Vetus Latina abzusprechen und dadurch für *origo* die Normalbedeutung zu postulieren, scheitert an den weiteren Belegen, die der Thes. für den ‚usus novatus‘ bringt, und zwar nicht so sehr an ihrer Zahl als vielmehr an ihrer Streubreite: Es kommen Dichter und Prosaiker vor, unter den Dichtungen christliche (Hil. hymn.) und nichtchristliche (Drac. Romul.), unter den Prosawerken juristische (Cod. Theod.) und historiographische (Cassiod. Ios. antiq.), philologische (Claud. Don. Aen., Schol. Iuv.) und liturgische (Sac. Leon.) – kurzum: die semantische Umkehrung bei *origo* von ‚Vorfahren‘ zu

<sup>17)</sup> Ph. Thielmann, ALL 8, 1893, 241 ff. und 510 ff.

<sup>18)</sup> Z. B. Apul. met. 1, 23, 3 *generosa stirpe proditum*. 8, 20, 4 *puerum ... illum novissimum successionis meae atque unicam stirpem*.

<sup>19)</sup> Das Folgende im wesentlichen nach Maurer bei Kittel, ThWNT 6, 985 ff.

<sup>20)</sup> Versuche, diese Bedeutung schon für das profane Grch. zu vindizieren, so etwa für Soph. Ant. 600 oder Diodor 26, 15, 2 (bei Bauer, WbNT s. v.), sind nicht überzeugend, vgl. Maurer a. a. O., 985, 11 f.



‚Nachkommen‘ ist an keinen spezifischen Sprachbereich gebunden, sondern ab dem Ende des 2. Jh.s<sup>21)</sup> überall und jederzeit möglich.

Wenn aber dieser Prozeß bei *origo* möglich war, obwohl der semantisch-etymologische Zusammenhang mit *oriri* selbst mittelmäßigen Geistern nicht verborgen geblieben war<sup>22)</sup>, um wieviel leichter muß dann die Annahme fallen, daß bei *progenies*, trotz schwächerer Bezeugung, mit dem Ende des 2. Jh.s die semantische Umkehrung wieder möglich wird, die im Altlatein schon einmal möglich gewesen war – oder vielleicht richtiger: daß die semantische Ambivalenz immer vorhanden war und nur für uns durch sublitterarische Existenz über drei Jahrhunderte verdeckt ist.

---

<sup>21)</sup> Aus früherer Zeit bringt der Thes. a. a. O. nur Lucr. 4, 1232, wo man aber auch mit der Normalbedeutung auskommen kann.

<sup>22)</sup> Nep. Cato 3, 3 ... *unde quaeque civitas orta sit Italica; ob quam rem omnes (sc. libros) Origines videtur appellasse.*

## Zur Etymologie und Bedeutungsentwicklung von *praestare*\*

Von HUGO BEIKIRCHER, München

In der Beurteilung des Verbums *praestare* herrscht zwischen den etymologischen Wörterbüchern und den übrigen Lexika eine grundlegende Verschiedenheit; diese, z. B. Forcellini, Klotz, Georges und Oxford Latin Dictionary, setzen in Weiterführung einer lexikographischen Tradition, die auf die antike Grammatik zurückgeht<sup>1)</sup>, ein einheitliches, von *prae* und *stare* gebildetes Lemma an; da aber nicht näher erklärt wird, wie das Nebeneinander der sehr divergierenden Bedeutungen entstanden sein könnte<sup>2)</sup>, waren wohl die Sprachforscher veranlaßt, ihrerseits nach verschiedenen Ausgangspunkten zu suchen. Natürlich führen auch sie die Bedeutung ‚voranstellen, übertreffen‘ auf ein Kompositum aus *prae* und *stare* zurück, aber für die Bedeutungsfelder ‚geben, leisten‘ bzw. ‚verbürgen, garantieren‘ werden verschiedene Lösungen vorgeschlagen.

Ernout-Meillet<sup>3)</sup> denken an eine Ableitung aus dem Adverb *praesto*: statt der ungebräuchlichen Fügung *praesto facere*<sup>4)</sup> sei das Verbum *praestare* gebildet worden, dessen ursprünglicher Sinn also ‚gegenwärtig machen, zur Verfügung stellen‘ sei, woraus sich die anderen Bedeutungen entwickelt hätten. Natürlich wäre dann für das Perfekt nicht *praestiti*, sondern die Normalform *praestavi* zu erwarten, die aber erst spät und vereinzelt auftaucht<sup>5)</sup>. Freilich kann man diesbe-

---

\*) Für viele förderliche Hinweise danke ich meinen Kollegen am Thesaurus, vor allem P. Flury, C. G. van Leijenhorst, J. Ramming, H. Wieland.

<sup>1)</sup> Z. B. Non. p. 371, 3, der als Bedeutungen *facere, beneficium dare, exhibere, antecellere* und – für das unpersönliche *praestat – utile est* angibt.

<sup>2)</sup> Nur Georges verweist für seine Gruppe II auf die gleich zu erwähnende Etymologie von F. Bücheler.

<sup>3)</sup> Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine, 1979, s. v. p. 532; ebenso etwa E. Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, 1969, I p. 196.

<sup>4)</sup> Das adv. *praesto* kommt ganz überwiegend nur in der Junktur *praesto esse (adesse)* vor, vgl. den entsprechenden Artikel im Thesaurus; mit *facere* verbunden begegnet es nur bei Claud. Don. Aen. 4, 290 p. 392, 28 Greg. M. in Ezech. 1, 5, 10 Gloss.<sup>L</sup> V Aa P 1106.

<sup>5)</sup> Dreimal in den Digesten, nämlich Ulp. dig. 22, 1, 37 Paul. dig. 3, 5, 18, 4. 5, 3, 36, 1 (bei über 130 Belegen für die korrekte Perfektform), fünfmal im Codex Iustinianus (-*stit*- über 50mal), zweimal bei Irenaeus (vgl.

züglich an eine Übernahme der Formen des aus *prae* und *stare* gebildeten Homonyms denken; was aber schwerer wiegt, ist die Tatsache, daß die postulierte Grundbedeutung nicht besonders gut zu den Hauptgebrauchsweisen des Verbums zu passen scheint, weil es sich bei den hinzutretenden Objekten in der Regel nicht um Dinge handelt, die man ‚bereitstellt, zur Verfügung stellt‘<sup>6)</sup>. Auch läßt sich von diesem Ausgangspunkt die Bedeutung ‚garantieren‘ nicht so ohne weiteres ableiten und bedürfte jedenfalls einer näheren Erklärung.

Im Walde-Hofmann<sup>7)</sup> wird die Etymologie Büchellers<sup>8)</sup> aufgegriffen, der für ‚garantieren‘ unter Berufung auf die Formulierung der LEX Tarent. (CIL I<sup>2</sup>590) 1, 9 *quei pro se praes stat* eine Zusammenrückung von *praes* und *sto* annimmt<sup>9)</sup>. Diese These wirkt wohl etwas künstlich und kühn, ist aber nicht von vornherein auszuschließen, wenn man etwa an die Bildungen *possum* (*potis sum*) oder *animadverto* (*animus adverto*) denkt. Für die Bedeutung ‚vor jemanden hin, zur Verfügung stellen‘, wie sie Bücheler definiert<sup>10)</sup>, wird wieder *prae* und *stare* herangezogen, dieses allerdings transitiv im Sinne von *sistere* genommen, worauf gleich einzugehen sein wird.

Der eben erschienene Thesaurusartikel<sup>11)</sup> nimmt eine gewisse Zwischenstellung ein: er setzt zwar zwei Lemmata an, nimmt aber in der von B. Forssman verfaßten Etymologie für beide dieselben Elemente *prae* und *stare* zur Grundlage, nur sind sie im Falle von 2. *praesto* mit anderer Funktion und Bedeutung angenommen; anders als bei 1. *praesto* soll *prae* hier nicht die Lage, sondern die Richtung ‚vorne hin‘ bezeichnen, und *stare* bedeute nicht ‚stehen‘, sondern sei transitiv im Sinne von ‚stellen‘ gebraucht (vgl. *sistere*). Die Grundbedeutung von 2. *praesto* wird demnach mit ‚hinstellen‘ angesetzt. Für den Übergang zur Bedeutung ‚verbürgen‘ wird entsprechend einer Fahnenbemerkung

---

dazu Lundström, Neue Studien zur lat. Irenaeusübersetzung, Lund 1948, 41) und hin und wieder anderswo.

<sup>6)</sup> Dazu unten Näheres.

<sup>7)</sup> Lat. etym. Wörterbuch von A. Walde, 3., neubearbeitete Aufl. von J. B. Hofmann, II, Heidelberg 1954, S. 355.

<sup>8)</sup> Rhein. Museum 52, 1897, 396 ff. = Kl. Schriften III 248 ff.

<sup>9)</sup> Ohne Kenntnis der erst 1894 entdeckten Inschrift hatte dies bereits H. Kothe, Arch. Lat. Lex. 7, 1892, 114 vorgeschlagen.

<sup>10)</sup> A. a. O., 396, bzw. 248.

<sup>11)</sup> Wie immer ist er – was hier einmal deutlicher als sonst erkennbar bleibt – das Ergebnis einer Zusammenarbeit, an der außer Verfasser (J. Ramminger) und Redaktor (Beikircher) auch der Etymologe (B. Forssman) und die Fahnenleser (hier speziell R. Wittmann) entsprechenden Anteil haben.

von R. Wittmann auf die Verbindungen *praestare fideiussores*<sup>12)</sup> und *praestare cautiones*<sup>13)</sup> verwiesen, die als Bindeglied zwischen beiden Bedeutungen zu betrachten seien: man stellt Bürgen und Sicherheiten zur Verfügung, um eine Obligation abzusichern; diese Bürgen und Sicherheiten seien bei zwei älteren nur mit dem Dativ gebildeten Formeln, nämlich *noxis ... praestari* bei Varro<sup>14)</sup> und *rebus recte praestari* bei Probus und Ulpian<sup>15)</sup> als nicht genannte Objekte mitzuhören; aus einem solchen ursprünglichen ‚(Bürgen) stellen für eine Sache‘ sei dann in einem Konstruktionswechsel die Sache selber zum direkten Objekt geworden: ‚die Sache (be)stellen (nämlich sicherstellen durch Bürgen)‘.

Obwohl ich als Redaktor des betreffenden Thesaurusbandes an der so veröffentlichten Aufteilung in 1. und 2. *praesto* maßgeblichen Anteil hatte, sind mir nachträglich doch Zweifel an der Richtigkeit dieses Verfahrens gekommen. Zwei Punkte bleiben bei der vorgeschlagenen Lösung problematisch: einmal entspricht ein *prae*, das die Richtung ‚auf jemand (etwas) hin‘ bezeichnet, nicht der ursprünglichen Bedeutung dieses Praeverbs; man könnte freilich dafür auf *praebere*<sup>16)</sup> hinweisen, trotzdem bleibt es merkwürdig, daß *prae* bei den übrigen Komposita ganz klar die relative Position angibt (‚vorne‘ oder ‚vor etwas‘), aber nicht die Richtung (‚vor hin‘)<sup>17)</sup>. So heißt *praeponere* – um ein der postulierten Bedeutung ähnliches Beispiel zu wählen – eben nicht ‚jemandem etwas hinstellen‘, sondern ‚voranstellen‘, also so stellen, daß es vor jemandem steht.

Noch gravierender aber ist der schon oben kurz erwähnte Einwand, daß eine Grundbedeutung ‚hinstellen‘ zur Masse der Belege nicht recht paßt, denn es ist keine Frage, daß konkrete Dinge, die man hinstellen, darreichen könnte, keineswegs die für *praestare* typischen Objekte

<sup>12)</sup> Proc. dig. 45, 1, 113, 1 Ulp. dig. 19, 5, 19, 1 u. a.

<sup>13)</sup> Maecian. dig. 36, 1, 67, 1 Papin. dig. 33, 4, 7, 4. u. a.

<sup>14)</sup> rust. 2, 4, 5 *illasce sues sanas esse habereque recte licere noxisque praestari ... spondesne?* Wäre das *noxisque praestari* dieser Kaufformel nicht noch zweimal bei Varro ebenso überliefert (nämlich 2, 5, 10 und 11 für *boves* bzw. *iuuencos*), dann könnte man wohl zweifeln, ob der Text nicht so zu verbessern wäre: *noxisque <solutas> praestari*, entsprechend dem Wortlaut, den wir z. B. aus Tab. cer. Herculan. 60, 6 und Julian. dig. 50, 16, 200 kennen.

<sup>15)</sup> Prob. litt. sing. gramm. 6, 58 Ulp. dig. 6, 1, 19 (e Labeone). 21, 1, 21, 2. 50, 16, 71, 1.

<sup>16)</sup> Aber die Grundbedeutung des Wortes ist m. E. mit dem bloßen Hinweis auf gr. *παρέχειν* noch nicht genügend erklärt (so im Gefolge von J. Wackernagel, Kl. Schriften III 1668, auch der Thesaurus, vol. X 2, 381, 70).

<sup>17)</sup> Das hat u. a. E. Benveniste, *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, Paris 1966, 132 ff. gut herausgestellt.

bilden. Ein Blick in den Thesaurusartikel zeigt dies sofort. Dabei müssen die zahlreichen privat- und staatsrechtlichen Stellen zunächst außer Betracht bleiben, weil es dort ja um die Leistung einer geschuldeten Sache geht, – eine Bedeutung, die von dem postulierten ‚hinstellen‘ ja schon weiter entfernt liegt<sup>18</sup>). Im außerrechtlichen Bereich zeigt sich folgende Situation: die ganz erdrückende Mehrzahl der Belege von Anfang an bietet unkörperliche Objekte wie *honorem, pietatem, officium, curam* usw., wobei auffällt, daß es in der Regel etwas ist, was von einem erwartet wird, was sich gebührt<sup>19</sup>), ein Aspekt, der z. B. Cic. Phil. 9, 12 eigens betont wird<sup>20</sup>). Demgegenüber treten als früheste Belege für konkrete Dinge folgende Stellen auf: Pomona läßt dem Pflanzfreis Säfte zuteil werden (Ov. met. 14, 631 *sucos alieno praestat alumno*), Aristipp versorgt seine Begleiter mit Kleidern und Lebensmitteln (Vitr. 6 praef. 1), ein Stiefsohn gewährt dem Stiefvater Unterhalt (*alimenta*, Sen. contr. 1, 1, 18), einem Kranken wird Wasser gegeben (Cels. 3, 7, 2<sup>c</sup>), ein Palmzweig bietet Verhüllung und zugleich ein glückliches Vorzeichen (Sen. Ag. 939) u. a. Man sieht, den Hintergrund bildet auch hier weitgehend die Erfüllung einer Aufgabe, die jemandem zukommt. So hat also Doederleins Feststellung, *praestare* bezeichne gegenüber *praebere* und anderen ähnlichen Verben „einen unfreiwilligen Act des Gebenden, welcher nur eine Pflicht erfüllt, wie leisten“<sup>21</sup>), durchaus ihre Berechtigung, wenn die Formulierung auch zu sehr von dem Mißvergnügen diktiert erscheint, das man dem hohen Anspruch kantischer Ethik schuldig zu sein glaubte. Vermutlich erhält eine Stelle, die sonst ziemlich aus dem Rahmen fällt (Mart. 10, 11, 3 *si tu Pyladi praestare matellam dignus es*), gerade von daher ihren Witz, daß das Verbum, das mit Verantwortung und Pflichtgefühl assoziiert wird, zu diesem allerniedrigsten Dienst einen komischen Kontrast bildet.

<sup>18</sup>) Trotzdem verdient festgehalten zu werden, daß in diesem Bereich die vorherrschenden Objekte Abstrakta sind; an Konkreta kann man als früheste Belege anführen: *frumentum* bei Liv. 30, 37, 5, *nummos* bei Labeo dig. 19, 2, 58, 2, *thus et vinum* in der *Lex arae Aug. Narb.* (CIL XII 4333) 1, 20, *vehicula* in einem Edikt aus der Zeit des Tiberius (Année Épigr. 1976 n. 653, 13) u. a.

<sup>19</sup>) So auch die selten vorkommenden „negativen“ Dinge wie Tod für den Gatten (Sen. contr. 2, 5, 8) oder Trauer um einen Verstorbenen (Sen. contr. 10, 3, 1 Sen. dial. 11, 5, 1).

<sup>20</sup>) *ut videatur honorem debitum patri praestitisse*. Ähnlich auch dom. 17 und ad Brut. 1, 2.

<sup>21</sup>) Handbuch der lat. Synonymik, Leipzig <sup>2</sup>1849, 182.

Diese ins Rechtliche führende Sphäre des Wortes scheint mir nun bei erneuter Beschäftigung mit diesem Problem doch die Möglichkeit zu bieten, den beiden von Forssman in der Etymologie angenommenen Elementen *prae* und *stare* auch für 2. *praesto* ihre übliche Bedeutung zu belassen und damit eine einzige Grundbedeutung zu gewinnen, von der aus alle anderen als Ausdifferenzierungen im Rahmen einer normalen Bedeutungsentwicklung verständlich werden.

Auszugehen ist – entsprechend der Chronologie der Belege – von der Grundbedeutung ‚vor etwas stehen‘. Im eigentlich lokalen Sinn gibt es dafür, von zwei ganz späten Stellen abgesehen, zwar nur einen Beleg aus dem älteren Cato in der Etymologie des Ortsnamens *Praeneste*<sup>22)</sup>, es bedarf aber keiner weiteren Erläuterung, daß der schon im Altlatein (seit Plautus) breit belegte Gebrauch im Sinne von ‚dem Wert nach voranstehen‘ (intransitiv mit dem Dativ des weniger Geschätzten) oder ‚dem Wert nach übertreffen‘ (in der üblichen vom Praeverb geleisteten Transitivierung<sup>23)</sup> mit dem Objektsakkusativ des Übertroffenen) als ganz normale Übertragung dieses lokalen Gebrauchs anzusehen ist, wie er etwa auch in *praecedo*, *praemineo*, *praepono* u. a. vorliegt.

Nun scheint es mir nicht schwierig, daneben noch eine etwas andere Art von Übertragung anzunehmen, in der man sich als vor einer Sache stehend betrachtet, wenn man sich für deren Ausführung oder Schutz als verantwortlich ansieht: man steht vor etwas, für etwas ein, für etwas gerade u. ä. Dieser Übertragungstypus ist für *prae* legitim und kommt auch bei anderen Komposita vor, die einerseits auf Führung, Vorsitz zielen, wie *praesum*, *praeficio*, *praesideo*, andererseits auf Schutz wie *praetendo*, *praesidium*. Im Falle von *praestare* kommt als weitere Stütze einer solchen Auffassung dazu, daß schon das Simplex *stare* vor allem von den Juristen durchaus in diesem Sinne verwendet wird und zwar in Verbindung mit einem Dativ<sup>24)</sup>. Die beiden oben

<sup>22)</sup> Cato orig. 60 *quia is locus montibus praestet*.

<sup>23)</sup> Generell dazu Hofmann-Szantyr 33, wo *prae* nicht eigens erwähnt wird. Die Komposita von *stare* zeigen im übrigen keine große Tendenz zur Transitivierung, vgl. aber z. B. *supersto* und vor allem *insto*, mit seinem im Altlatein schon gut bezeugten, wenn auch im ganzen nicht häufigen transitiven Gebrauch.

<sup>24)</sup> Z. B. – um nur auf syntaktisch eindeutige Fälle zu verweisen – Afric. dig. 2, 1, 18 *conventioni stare*. Scaev. dig. 26, 8, 20 *standum esse divisioni* (die vorher vereinbart worden). Ulp. dig. 12, 2, 3, 3 (e Marcello) *iuri iurando*; vgl. die Stellensammlung im *Vocabularium iurisprudentiae Romanae*, vol. V, 1939, S. 694, 21 ff. Doppeldeutige Formen, von denen es schon bei Cic. meh-

erwähnten Kaufformeln *noxis praestari* und *his rebus recte praestari* stimmen mit diesem *stare alicui rei* gut zusammen und fügen nur zusätzlich das verdeutlichende Praeverb *prae* an. *Noxis praestari* wäre also ganz wörtlich so zu verstehen ‚es wird vorgestanden vor etwaigen Schadensansprüchen‘, das heißt es wird dafür gutgestanden, ganz so, wie es die sachliche Erklärung meint, die Ulpian für die andere Formel bietet: *haec verba ‚his rebus recte praestari‘ hoc significant, ne quid periculum vel damnum ex ea re stipulator sentiret* (dig. 50, 16, 71, 1).

Der primäre Aspekt dieser übertragenen Verwendung von *praestare* ist also das Gutstehen für, das Verantwortlichsein, das Haften, und daraus ergibt sich dann je nach Zusammenhang die Vielfalt der sekundären Bedeutungen. Wenn z. B. Cicero im Hinblick auf den Verkauf eines Sklaven sagt *qui ... scire debuit de sanitate, de fuga, de furtis (sc. servi), praestat edicto aedilium* (off. 3, 71), so heißt dies zunächst, daß der Verkäufer, der die erwähnten Mängel kennen mußte, dafür nach dem Edikt der Aedilen auch haftet; in der Situation des Vertragsabschlusses ergibt sich daraus eine Garantie, ein Versprechen, den etwaigen Schaden zu übernehmen; im Falle der berechtigten Reklamation erfolgt aus dieser Haftung natürlich die entsprechende Leistung des Schadenersatzes. In ähnlicher Weise kann im Deutschen z. B. die Feststellung „Herr X ist für die Betreuung verantwortlich“ ebenso als Verpflichtung für die Zukunft aufgefaßt werden („er wird die Betreuung übernehmen, dafür sorgen, daß sie geschieht“), wie als Aussage über eine bereits erfüllte Aufgabe („er hat sie geleistet, durchgeführt“).

Diese sekundären Bedeutungen werden natürlich dann deutlicher ausgeprägt, wenn durch die Transitivity entsprechende Objekte dazutreten, was ja bei der großen Masse unserer Belege auch der Fall ist. Es kommen alle denkbaren Objekttypen vor: einmal die Sache oder Person, die man in seine Verantwortung übernimmt, wofür man ‚Gewähr bietet‘, oder auch das zukünftige Ereignis, das man absichert<sup>25</sup>), dann die Abmachung selbst (also das, womit man sicherstellt), die man

---

rere Beispiele gibt (off. 1, 32 *promissis*. 3, 95 *conventis*. fam. 16, 12, 4 *condicionibus*. u. a.) können natürlich auch als Ablative aufgefaßt werden, die die Grundlage angeben, worauf man fußt (Instrumental, nicht Lokativ, vgl. Hofmann-Szantyr S. 120 f.), so etwa – als Pendant zur eben zitierten Ulpianstelle, *iure iurando stare* bei Ulp. dig. 12, 2, 5, 1.

<sup>25</sup>) Z. B. Labeo dig. 18, 1, 78, 3 *frumenta, quae in herbis erant ... te, si quid ... tempestate factum esset, praestaturum*. Cic. Verr. II 2, 28 *nostros comites praestare debemus* (cf. 2, 29 *de illorum factis rationem esse reddendam*). Cic. off. 3, 66 *emptori damnum praestari oportere*.

also ‚eingeht, abschließt‘ (als inneres Objekt) oder auch ‚einhält, erfüllt‘<sup>26)</sup>, und endlich die Sache oder Leistung, die man durch Absicherung ‚verspricht‘ oder auf Grund der Absicherung ‚erbringt‘<sup>27)</sup>. Dabei gibt es immer wieder Stellen, deren Einordnung in eine dieser Kategorien nicht eindeutig möglich ist<sup>28)</sup>, aber diese eigentümliche semantische Unschärfe etwa zwischen „versprechen“ und „erbringen“ findet ja genau in der eben skizzierten Herleitung ihre ganz natürliche Erklärung.

Ebenso scheint man von diesem Ausgangspunkt her den ursprünglichen Sinn einer weiteren, bisher außer Betracht gebliebenen Gebrauchsweise – der mit dem doppelten Akkusativ – besser zu treffen. Wenn z. B. Cicero von Befehlshabern spricht, *qui cum praedonem nullum cepissent, mare tamen tutum praestiterunt* (Flacc. 31), so kann man sicherlich verstehen, ‚haben das Meer sicher gemacht‘, aber dahinter steht – und wurde wohl auch noch so gefühlt –, daß sie für die Sicherheit des Meeres ‚standen‘, sie gewährleistet haben, nicht anders als im rechtlichen Bereich ein Grundstück als von Lasten frei garantiert wird<sup>29)</sup>. Eine spezielle Spielart dieser Konstruktion, nämlich der reflexive Gebrauch, den man gemeinhin mit ‚sich zeigen (erweisen) als‘ wiedergibt, verweist in ähnlicher Weise meist auf ein Eintreten für eine moralische oder staatsbürgerliche Verpflichtung, auf die Erfüllung einer diesbezüglichen Erwartung, auf die Bewahrung einer entsprechenden persönlichen Eigenschaft<sup>30)</sup>. Gut paßt dazu die Tatsache, daß es sich bei den dazutretenden Prädikatsnomina – ob reflexiv oder nicht – fast ausschließlich nur um positive Begriffe handelt<sup>31)</sup>.

<sup>26)</sup> Z. B. Maecian. dig. 36, 1, 67, 1 *cautione praestita*. Vlp. dig. 21, 1, 19, 3 *quaecumque (dicta vel promissa) sic dicuntur, ut praestentur, non ut iacentur*. Cic. off. 3, 55 (*in venditione*) *sin ... dictum non omne praestandum est, quod dictum non est, id praestandum putas?* Sall. hist. frg. inc. 24 *quae pacta in conventionem non praestitissent*.

<sup>27)</sup> Z. B. Labeo dig. 19, 2, 60, 9 *rerum custodiam, quam horrearius conductoribus praestare deberet*. 19, 2, 28, 2 *pretium conductionis*. Mit Verbalstruktur als Objekt: Labeo dig. 19, 2, 60, 7 *non ultra me tibi praestaturum, quam dolum malum et culpam meam abesse*.

<sup>28)</sup> Vgl. Bücheler, a. a. O. 396 (= 248): „wenn ich auch bei mancher Stelle gerade der besten Literatur in Verlegenheit komme, unter welcher Rubrik ich sie einordnen soll“.

<sup>29)</sup> Z. B. Proc. dig. 50, 16, 126 (*fundum*) *liberum praestare*.

<sup>30)</sup> Z. B. Cic. Flacc. 101 *se tribunum militum ... imperatoribus ... dignum suis maioribus praestitit*. Lael. 64 *qui ... stabilem se in amicitia praestiterit*.

<sup>31)</sup> An negativen nennt der Thesaurusartikel aus „guter“ Zeit nur Sen. dial. 6, 5, 1 *difficilem* und – mit Adverb statt Prädikativ – Ov. Pont. 1, 6, 53 *male*;



Natürlich soll nicht in Abrede gestellt werden, daß Stellen vorkommen, wo von einer irgendwie gearteten Verantwortung, Verpflichtung kaum mehr etwas zu spüren ist, sondern nur mehr ‚geben, zur Verfügung stellen‘ gemeint ist. Diese stehen aber nicht am Anfang der Wortgeschichte, sondern an deren Ende, und sind als abgeblaßte Verwendung eines zunächst ganz sinnerfüllten ‚Gewährens‘ aufzufassen. Ein umgekehrter Schritt der Bedeutungsentwicklung, vom ‚Geben‘ zum ‚Garantieren‘, wäre logisch nicht so glatt nachvollziehbar und setzt vor allem eine Grundbedeutung voraus, die aus den oben erwähnten Gründen nicht befriedigen kann.

Nicht ganz überflüssig ist vielleicht noch die Bemerkung, daß durch diese Überlegungen die Brauchbarkeit der beiden Thesaurusartikel natürlich nicht beeinträchtigt ist; betroffen ist ja nicht die detaillierte Darstellung der überaus vielfältigen Bedeutungen und Gebrauchsweisen von *praestare*, sondern unsere Vorstellung von der Grundidee<sup>32)</sup> dieses Wortes. Man sollte diesen Versuch einer veränderten Sehweise, gerade weil er vom beteiligten Redaktor stammt, als Beleg dafür nehmen, daß der Thesaurus nicht beanspruchen will, in jedem Fall die endgültige und einzig richtige Lösung gegeben zu haben, wohl aber die Grundlage bieten möchte, auf der jede weiterführende Diskussion aufbauen muß.

---

beide Stellen sind aber verkappt positiv und meinen eigentlich die Erfüllung der Freundespflicht (Ovid im Zusammenhang eines Adynatons, Seneca durch eine Art Litotes).

<sup>32)</sup> Wollte man sie im Aufbau des Lexikonartikels verwirklichen, dann genügte es, die jetzt unter 1. *praesto* gesammelten Stellen als Caput prius des einheitlichen Lemmas einem von dem jetzigen 2. *praesto* gebildeten Caput alterum gegenüberzustellen; in diesem Caput alterum wäre dann noch durch eine Vertauschung der Gruppen I und II der rechtliche Gebrauch an den Beginn des Artikels zu rücken.

# Colorator

By JOHN-PETER WILD, Manchester

Summary: *colorator* has been translated 'dyer' or 'colourer'. The Edict of Diocletian, however, shows the craftsman handling complete garments; but only raw fibres or occasionally spun yarn were dyed in classical antiquity. The evidence suggests rather that the *colorator* acted as a dry cleaner or valet, refurbishing soiled clothing.

The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (fasc. 2, 356 s.v. *colorator*) offers the translation 'colourer (? house-painter)'. There is evidence to show that this is incorrect.<sup>1)</sup>

The material on which interpretation and translation of the term can be based is admittedly meagre. The *columbarium* of the house-slaves of Livia on the Via Appia held the ashes of *Anteros Liviae colorator* (*CIL* VI, 3953); among the domestic slaves of the Statilii Tauri in the first century A.D. was Licinus *colorator* (*CIL* VI, 6251); and the enterprising freedman Amaranthus had probably served that family in the same capacity (*CIL* VI, 6217, 6250). Two more *liberti* practising as *coloratores* are recorded in the first century: C. Caninius Philogenes at Interamna Lirenas in Latium (*CIL* X, 5352) and M. Tullius Famulus at Zola Predosa near Bologna (*Ann. Ep.* 1976, no. 210). The art or craft was obviously a familiar one; for *Colorator* was the title of a mime by the Republican mimographer Laberius (Gellius VI [VII], 9, 4). Evidently, where a household was not large enough to warrant its own *colorator*, his professional services might be hired in some of the larger towns of Italy.

After a gap of two centuries in the documentary record the term crops up again in A.D. 301 in the Edict of Diocletian (ed. S. Lauffer, 1971; M. Giacchero, 1974), which is much more informative. In Cap. VII, 54 [*color*]atorum is restored to the Latin text on the strength of the Argive and Megarian Greek versions which read *κοροράτορι*.<sup>2)</sup> Hugo Blümner was the first to propose the restoration and his per-

---

<sup>1)</sup> I am grateful to Miss H. Granger Taylor for alerting me to the problems surrounding the work of the *colorator*.

<sup>2)</sup> Latin fragments from Stratonicea and Aezani: S. Lauffer, *Diokletians Preisedikt*, 1971, 122; M. Giacchero, *Edictum Diocletiani et collegarum de pretiis rerum venalium*, 1974, 152-3; *ZPE* 26, 1977, 129, 139.

ipient comment on the significance of the term comes close to our own view.<sup>3)</sup>

The Edict (VII, 54–63) specifies the maximum fee to be paid to a *colorator* for his work on an ordinary woman's tunic (*tunica*), a man's long-sleeved shirt (*strictoria*), a child's shirt, a blanket (*sagum sive rachana*) and a rug (*tapete*), either an article fresh from the loom or one already worn. Evidently the *colorator* was concerned with textile finishing, but for a limited range of everyday body-garments and household bedding: outer wear is not mentioned. The rug – which probably had a pile or long nap – required the most expensive treatment: 24d against 16d for the blanket and the woman's tunic. The rug and blanket were certainly of wool (cf. XIX, 4–7; 28–35) and the shirts probably also of wool (cf. XX, 12–13; XIX, 2–3; XXII, 2–3).

The problem of identifying the colorator's precise function remains. Lauffer (ad loc.) translates: 'Färber, Weissfärber, Reiniger, Polierer'. On the face of it 'dyer' is an attractive translation; for no other craftsmen named in the Edict can be construed as dyemen, and 'dyer' is the normal translation of *colorator* in Medieval Latin.<sup>4)</sup> Nevertheless, *pace* Moeller and Kolendo,<sup>5)</sup> we cannot accept 'dyer'; for piece-dyeing and the dyeing of finished garments is very rarely attested in classical antiquity. Standard practice in fact was to dye the raw fibres or, less commonly, the spun yarn.<sup>6)</sup> The entries in Cap. XXIV of the Edict confirm this as do the dyer's handbooks like the *Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis* (ed. Lagercrantz, 1913). The rarity of piece-dyeing marks a fundamental difference between ancient dyeing procedures and our own.

The enquiry into the role of the *colorator* as cloth finisher can be narrowed by eliminating some of the other types of textile operative listed in the Edict (VII, XX). The *colorator* is neither tailor nor cutter (*bracarius*) (VII, 42–47) nor does he hem, seam or repair garments (*sarcinator*) or decorate them with tapestry inserts (*plumarius*) (XX, 1–4). Yet he is not a fuller (*fullo*) in the specific sense of one who washes and shrinks cloth (XXII). In fact the fuller's fee for work on

<sup>3)</sup> Der Maximaltarif des Diocletian, Berlin 1893 [1958 reprint] 115, note 1.

<sup>4)</sup> R.E.Latham, Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources, 1965, s.v.; J.W.Fuchs et al., Lexicon Latinitatis Nederlandicae Medii Aevi II, 1981, s.v.; Philologus 130, 1986, 258 (AD 1170–90).

<sup>5)</sup> W.O.Moeller, The Wool Trade of Ancient Pompeii, 1976, 14; Kolendo: Archaeologia (Poland) XXXVII, 1986, 38 notes 57–59.

<sup>6)</sup> J.P.Wild, Textile Manufacture in the Northern Roman Provinces, 1970, 79–82; E. Wipszycka, L'industrie textile dans l'Égypte romaine, 1965, 145.

a new blanket (*rachana*) (30 d: XXII, 4) can be compared directly with the colorator's fee for his work on the same item (16 d: VII, 60). Nor is the *colorator* likely to have been a bleacher; for wool cloth straight from the loom is unlikely to have become yellow and discoloured. The modest nature of the textiles entrusted to the *colorator*, coupled with the low fees charged for his services (his fee for treating a child's worn shirt is the same as the barber's fee for a shave and a haircut: VII, 23) suggest that neither the skill nor the labour involved in his work was out of the ordinary.

The garbled transliteration of *colorator* offered to the masons cutting the Greek text of the Edict suggests that there was no corresponding term in the Greek-speaking world and that no such independent craft was recognized there. *Colorator* is glossed as *σπιλωτής* in the Corpus (ed. Goetz, 1888, II, 103, 21), but the latter term does not appear in the papyri as one might have expected if it had been in current usage.

The reliability of the gloss cannot be tested; but in view of *σπιλωτής* it is attractive to think that the idea of 'brightness' or 'polish', figurative or literal, lies behind *colorator*, rather than colour itself. Cicero for instance (*ad Quintum fratrem* II, 11, 3, ed. Shackleton-Bailey, 1988) refers to the 'polishing' (*interpolare*) of a *toga praetexta*.

Was the colorator's role then to restore brightness and 'polish' to clothing, and can it be further defined?

There are several possibilities. A soft finish could be attained for garments of wool worn next to the skin by raising the nap on the cloth (*vestis pexa*).<sup>7)</sup> A well-known wall-painting from Pompeii demonstrates the procedure: a fuller's assistant is seen working over a tunic with a card-like *aena* to give it a soft handle.<sup>8)</sup> That might be part of the colorator's function, although the Edict (XXII, 6, 7) implies that at least when it was fresh from the loom *vestis pexa* was treated in a fuller's workshop, not by an independent *colorator*.

The garments and bedding entrusted to the *colorator* were those most likely to be soiled through intimate contact with the human body, and they were probably all of wool. The ancients had several methods of removing or disguising grease and stains on clothing which did not involve immersion in water. One technique for restoring brightness – literally – to wool fabrics was to sprinkle them with a

<sup>7)</sup> CQ NS XVII, 1967, 133–5.

<sup>8)</sup> Museum Helveticum 25, 1968, 139–142.

patent powder which left a white coating on the surface and absorbed some of the grease. The residue, and some of the dirt, could then be brushed off. Theophrastus (whose father was a fuller) cites the use of Cimolian earth (calcium montmorillonite), Samian earth (a kaolin) and Tymphaic earth (gypsum) in this context.<sup>9)</sup> Pliny (*NH XXXV*, 196) adds further circumstantial detail, and there are frequent comments in European handbooks of the pre- and early industrial revolution on the efficacy of fuller's earth as a cleansing agent, applied dry.<sup>10)</sup>

That the *colorator* played the part of a valet seems probable; we cannot identify his working methods more precisely at present.

---

<sup>9)</sup> De lapidibus 62, 64, 67; E. R. Caley, J. C. Richards, *Theophrastus On Stones*, 1956, 209, 213, 218 f.; cf. R. H. S. Robertson, *Fuller's Earth: A History of Calcium Montmorillonite*, 1986, 34-5.

<sup>10)</sup> Robertson, *op. cit.*, 162-170.

## The meaning of *spica* in Cato Agr. 70, 1

By M. R. MEZZABOTTA, University of Cape Town

Cato lists *ulpici spicas III, alii spicas III*<sup>1)</sup> as two of the twelve ingredients<sup>2)</sup> of a prophylactic treatment for cattle which he prescribes in Agr. 70. 1. Anglophone translators of these phrases incorrectly render *spica* as "spike" instead of "clove", an error of interpretation which is not committed by translators into Italian or French. In botanical English, "spike" means "a form of inflorescence consisting of sessile flowers borne on an elongated single axis",<sup>3)</sup> whereas the part of the above-mentioned plants to be used in Cato's prescription is the clove, "one of the small bulbs which make up the compound bulb of garlic, shallot, etc."<sup>4)</sup> It should be observed at the outset that "spike" is not a synonym for "clove".

Brehaut,<sup>5)</sup> Hooper<sup>6)</sup> and Phillips<sup>7)</sup> all translate *spicas* in Cato Agr. 70.1 as "spikes". This gives the false impression that the top of the plant,<sup>8)</sup> rather than its base, is to be employed. The evidence shows

---

<sup>1)</sup> *Allium* is ordinary garlic, or *allium sativum* L. (J. André, *Les Noms de Plantes dans la Rome Antique* [Paris 1985] 10). The identification of *ulpicum*, a plant resembling garlic in structure and cultivation but distinct from it (cf. Col. 11. 3. 20-21, Plin. *N. H.* 19. 112), is more problematic (cf. J. André, *Lexique des Termes de Botanique en Latin* [Paris 1956] 334). Though the translators named in notes 5-7 below translate *ulpicum* in Cato Agr. 70.1 as "leek", it is clearly not a leek. I intend elsewhere to argue that *ulpicum* should be identified with *allium ampeloprasum* L., popularly known as Levant garlic, but for this paper I retain the original Latin nomenclature.

<sup>2)</sup> The ten remaining substances are salt, bay leaves, leek leaves, grains of incense, savin plants, rue leaves, white bryony stalks, white beans, charcoal and wine. I intend elsewhere to examine the healing properties, magical aspects and likely efficacy of this prescription, as part of a study of Cato's veterinary remedies conducted in the light of current approaches to ethnoveterinary research. (See C. M. McCorkle, "An introduction to ethnoveterinary research and development", *Journal of Ethnobiology* 6 [1986] 129-149).

<sup>3)</sup> OED (= *Oxford English Dictionary*) s.v. spike, 1.2.

<sup>4)</sup> OED s.v. clove, 1.

<sup>5)</sup> E. Brehaut, *Cato the Censor, On Farming* (New York 1933) 87.

<sup>6)</sup> W. D. Hooper, *Marcus Porcius Cato, On Agriculture*, revised by H. B. Ash (London and Cambridge, Mass. 1934) 79.

<sup>7)</sup> J. H. Phillips, "Cato on the prevention and treatment of animal disease", *Historia Medicinae Veterinariae* 6 (1981) 58.

<sup>8)</sup> In the interests of accuracy it should be noted that the inflorescence of the

overwhelmingly that in antiquity the bulb of the garlic plant was favoured for medicinal purposes over its other parts (e.g. Scrib. *Larg. Comp.* 231 *alii candidi spicae capitis tritae*; Cels. *Med.* 4.10.3 *aut cum spica alii contriti duos vini cyathos*; Pelag. *Ars Vet.* 162 *vel e bitumine collyrium insere naturalibus locis vel alii spicam*; Apic. 9.443 *unam spicam alei purgatam teres*<sup>9)</sup>; Dsc. 1.152.3 notes the emmenagogic properties of the foliage). This is also the case today.<sup>10)</sup> The unwary English-speaking reader whose knowledge of Latin vocabulary is drawn more from readings of Caesar and Cicero, than from the agricultural and medical writers, will probably seek guidance from a translation, as will the wholly Latinless reader with an interest in Roman veterinary remedies; both will receive a distorted understanding of Cato's prescription.<sup>11)</sup>

Selected passages from Columella clearly show that the term *spica*, when applied to garlic or to *ulpicum*, denotes one of the bulbets of the plant's compound bulb, i.e. a clove, not the flower.

Col. 10. 112: *alliaque infractis spicis* ("garlic with detachable cloves")

Col. 11. 3. 20: [Ulpicum] *habet enim velut alium plures cohaerentes spicas* ("like garlic, *ulpicum* has several cloves sticking together")

Col. 11. 3. 21: *per summam partem eius, id est in dorso inter palmaria spatia spicae ulpici vel allii ... disponendae sunt* ("the cloves of *ulpicum* or garlic must be set out along the top of it, that is on the back [of the ridge] at intervals of a palm's breadth from one another").

---

garlic plant, being an umbel ("a mass of inflorescence borne upon pedicels of nearly equal length springing from a common centre", *OED* s.v. umbel), cannot properly be termed a spike. The flower-head, stalk, leaves, bulb and cloves of garlic are clearly illustrated in B.E. Nicholson, S.G. Harrison *et al.*, *The Oxford Book of Food Plants* (Oxford 1969) 169.

<sup>9)</sup> This culinary recipe serves also as a medicinal remedy to soothe a troubled stomach and to promote digestion.

<sup>10)</sup> Cf. R. Chiej, *The Macdonald Encyclopaedia of Medicinal Plants* (London 1984, English translation of 1982 Italian edition) No. 18. Sometimes the leaves may be used as well as the bulb, cf. G. Dragendorff, *Die Heilpflanzen der verschiedenen Völker und Zeiten* (Stuttgart 1898) 119, J. de Bairacli Levy, *The Complete Herbal Handbook for Farm and Stable* (London 1952, revised 1984) 77.

<sup>11)</sup> The errors of the translations may be perpetuated by being quoted in later discussions, e.g. W.H.S. Jones, "Ancient Roman folk medicine" *Journal of the History of Medicine* 12 (1957) 463-4, J. Scarborough *Roman Medicine* (London 1969) 20.

These examples from Columella could be multiplied and further supported by passages from other Latin writers, but they suffice to demonstrate the point.

The mistranslation may be due, at least in part, to the imprecision of the entry s. v. *spica* in Lewis and Short. After giving “a point; hence, in partic[ular], of grain, an ear, spike (syn[onym] arista)”, as possible meanings, supported by references to passages where the word denotes an ear of corn, the entry continues:

-II. Transf[erred], of things of a similar shape. A. *A top, tuft, head* of other plants, Cato, R.R. 70, 1; Col. 8, 5, 21; Plin. 21, 8, 23, § 47; 22, 25, 79, § 161; Prop. 4 (5), 6, 74; Ov. F. 1, 76.

But close examination of these citations shows that further clarity of definition is required. Setting aside Cato *Agr.* 70, 1 (in which, as has been demonstrated, *spicas* means “cloves”), we move on to Col. 8. 5. 21. Presumably the compilers of Lewis and Short read *sunt qui spicas alii tepido madefaciunt oleo et faucibus inferant* (“some people moisten cloves of garlic in warm olive-oil and insert them into their [i. e. chickens’] throats”), rather than *micas alii* (“morsels of garlic”).<sup>12</sup> Yet whether *spicas* or *micas* is read, it is evident that parts of the garlic bulb, not of the inflorescence, are to be administered. Both passages from Pliny’s *Natural History* indicate that *spica* denotes the flower- or seed-bearing top of the plant mentioned:

Plin. *N.H.* 21. 47: [Amarantus] est ... spica purpurea verius quam flos aliquis (“[Amaranthus] is more exactly a purple ear than a flower”).<sup>13</sup>

Plin. *N.H.* 22. 161: Bromos semen est spicam ferentis herbae (“Bromos is the seed of an ear-bearing plant”).

The final two passages adduced by Lewis and Short belong to a completely different category:

Prop. 4. 6. 74: perque lavet nostras spica Cilissa comas (“and let saffron drench our hair”).

<sup>12</sup> Richter’s text (*Lucius Iunius Moderatus Columella, Zwölf Bücher über Landwirtschaft*, ed. W. Richter, [München und Zürich 1983]) prints *micas alii*, a reading which is defended by M. Nyman, “Semantic selection properties and etymology: Latin *mica*”, *Glotta* 65 (1987) 232.

<sup>13</sup> J. André (*Les Noms de Plantes dans la Rome Antique* [Paris 1985] 13) identifies this plant as *amarantus caudatus* L., which is popularly known in French as “queue-de-renard” and in English as “love-lies-bleeding”. It is illustrated in L. H. Bailey, *Standard Cyclopaedia of Horticulture* (London 1914) Vol. 1, 270.



Ov. *Fast.* 1.76: et sonet accensis spica Cilissa focus ("and [do you see how] saffron crackles in the blazing hearth").

In these examples *spica*, when qualified by the proper adjective *Cilissa*,<sup>14)</sup> denotes the pistil of the flower *crocus sativus* L., from which saffron was obtained.

The extracts from Pliny, Propertius and Ovid all provide examples of *spica* referring to the top of the plant, while those from Cato and Columella, extrapolated from discussions of garlic, show *spica* referring to the base. All demonstrate that the transferred meanings "top, tuft, head", suggested by Lewis and Short, inadequately convey the full range of connotation inherent in the word. Subdivision into separate categories and additional definition are needed.

In the Lewis and Short entry, "head" is given after "top, tuft". The ambiguity of the term "head" requires some comment. Both English "head" and Latin *caput* may signify the upper extremity of a plant (by virtue of its position) or its bulb (by virtue of its shape).<sup>15)</sup> Since the compilers do not alert the reader to the ambiguity, the listing of "head" after "top, tuft" strongly suggests that the term applies to the upper part of a plant.

To what may the unsatisfactory aspects of the entry be attributed? It is possible that the explanation lies in cultural factors. I suggest that because of the general prejudice against the culinary use of garlic which prevailed in their American, English-speaking culture, the nineteenth-century compilers of Lewis and Short were unacquainted with garlic as a foodstuff and ignorant of its appearance. This lack of familiarity prevented them from going far enough in suggesting meanings to be assigned to *spica*.

It is likely that a similar ignorance affected the translators whose versions I have criticised. These scholars failed to perceive intuitively that *spica*, in the context of garlic, meant "clove", and consultation of the Lewis and Short entry would not have enlightened them.

It is noteworthy that Italian and French translators, in whose national cuisines garlic is a familiar ingredient, unanimously and cor-

<sup>14)</sup> The best saffron reputedly came from Mt. Corycus in Cilicia, cf. Plin. *N.H.* 21.31.

<sup>15)</sup> *OED* s.v. head, II. 9.a; *TLL* III. 414.18-73; M.G. Bruno, *Il Lessico Agricolo Latino* (Amsterdam 1969) 63, no.269. For *caput* as "top" see Liv. 1.54.6; Plin. *N.H.* 19.60. For *caput* as "bulb", see Col.11.3.21; Plin. *N.H.* 19.102; 19.114.

rectly understand that *spicas* in Cato *Agr.* 70.1 signifies "cloves". The Italians Curcio<sup>16</sup>) and Marmorale<sup>17</sup>) render *spicas* as "spicchi" ("cloves"); Goujard,<sup>18</sup>) the editor and translator of the French Budé text, translates as "gousses" ("cloves"). André,<sup>19</sup>) too, gives "gousse" as a meaning for *spica*.<sup>20</sup>

Fascicle 8 (Sopor-Zythum) of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* was published only in 1982, too late to have been consulted by Brehaut, Hooper or Phillips. Although the explanation of the transferred sense of the term *spica* is an improvement on what is offered in Lewis and Short (reference to *spica nardi* is introduced, and *spica Cilissa* is separated from the other citations), the entry lacks clear definition in the context of garlic. The *OLD* entry s.v. *spica*, 4, begins, "(applied to other growths arranged around an axis) A spike, head, etc.; *nardi* ~ *a*, also ~ *a* alone, spikenard." Cato *Agr.* 70.1, Cels. 4.10.3, Plin. *N.H.* 21.47, Cels. 3.21.8, Scrib. Larg. 113, 271, *CIL* 6.13528 are cited by way of illustration, but the entry does not differentiate between axillary growths occurring at the top of the plant (e.g. Plin. *N.H.* 21.47) and those sprouting at its base (e.g. Cato *Agr.* 70.1).

If the *OLD* were to be revised, I suggest that part 4 of the entry s.v. *spica* should be expanded and rewritten as follows:

4 (applied to other growths arranged around an axis, whether at the upper or lower extremity) A spike; *nardi* ~ *a*, also ~ *a* alone, spikenard. b (of garlic) a clove. c ~ *a* *Cilissa*, saffron.

(amarantus) est .. ~ purpurea verius quam flos aliquis PLIN. *Nat.* 21.47; - rosae folia vel nardi ~ a temptanda est CELS. 3.21.8; nardi ~ ae Syriacae, aloes, singulorum p ✕ II LARG. 113; 271; - vitrum candidum .. diligenter tritum admixta ~ a 60; *CIL* 6.13528. b ulpici ~ as III, alii ~ as III CATO *Agr.* 70.1; alii candidi ~ ae capitis tritae LARG. 231; cum ~ a alii contriti CELS. 4.10.3; (ulpicum) habet ..

<sup>16</sup>) G. Curcio, *La primitiva civiltà latina e il libro dell'agricoltura di M. Porcio Catone* (Firenze 1929) 172.

<sup>17</sup>) E.V. Marmorale, *Cato Maior* (Bari 1949<sup>2</sup>) 194.

<sup>18</sup>) R. Goujard, *Caton, De L'Agriculture* (Paris 1975) 59.

<sup>19</sup>) J. André, *Lexique des Termes de Botanique en Latin* (Paris 1956) 299.

<sup>20</sup>) In the case of German-language translations, it is less easy to ascribe success or failure in translating *spica* to dietary and cultural factors. P. Thielscher (*Des Marcus Cato Belehrung über die Landwirtschaft* [Berlin 1963] 99) erroneously translates *spicas* as "Ähren" ("spikes"), whereas W. Hausmann, "Die Tierheilkunde bei Cato", *Tierärztliche Praxis* 13 (1985) 274, while wrongly identifying *ulpicum* with the leek, nevertheless shows by his translation "3 Lauchknollen, 3 Knoblauchzehen" ("3 leek bulbs, 3 cloves of garlic") that he has understood that the *spicae* occur at the base of the above-mentioned plants.

velut alium plures cohaerentes ~ as COL. 11.3.20; 11.3.21. c ter ..  
lavet nostras ~ a Cilissa comas PROP. 4.6.74; Ov. *Fast.* 1.76.

The subsequent increase in clarity achieved by this revision would obviate the errors in interpretation and translation liable to be made by English-speakers.

## Uvius Dubielzig Monacensis Segimero Doepp et Andreae Patzer suis quondam praeceptoribus s. p. d.

Veniam mihi date, viri doctissimi, ut tertius veniam ad id colloquium, quod aliquot annis ante in his commentariis publici iuris fecistis<sup>1</sup>). Neque enim est dubium, quin optime demonstraveritis Quintiliano illo loco *inst. orat.* 12. 10. 21: *nam quis erit hic Atticus? Sit Lysias; hunc enim amplectuntur amatores istius nominis modum* ultimum vocabulum, id quod est *modum*, nullo pacto posse defendi. Sed ut de *διαγνώσει* vestra idem sensi ac vos, ita *θεραπείαν* nimis acrem ad eum locum sanandum adhibuisse mihi visi estis, cum totum illud vocabulum radicatus exsecuistis; neque enim facile mihi persuasi eo loco partem *γλώσσης* e margine paginae in contextum irrepsisse. Ut vero equidem rem sese habere suspicer, paucis mihi exponere propositum est.

M. igitur Fabius toto illo loco eos obiurgat rhetoras, qui re ipsa, Attica dicendi arte, parum perspecta nihil profitentur nihilve prae se ferunt nisi nomen inane, Atticum dico; id quod et ex eis verbis, quae modo attuli, satis comparet et ex eis, quibus oratores vere Atticos recensendi paulo post finem facit, *ibid.* 12. 10. 26: *melius de hoc nomine sentiant credantque Attice dicere esse optime dicere*. Priore ergo loco intelligendum est eos a Quintiliano significari, qui Atticorum gaudent (ut verbis Horati utar, *serm.* 1. 9. 3:) *nomine tantum* sive (ut propius accedam ad Quintiliani dictionem restituendam), qui sunt *amatores istius nominis modo*; unde efficitur, ut non omnino tollendum censeam illud *modum*, sed potius adverbio *modo* commutandum.

Nam et idem ille Quintilianus eo adverbio *modo* saepius ita usus est, velut *ibid.* 1. 4. 18: *verba modo et nomina et convinciones* eqs., et apud alios scriptores neque eos contemnendos eandem hic illic reperietis iuncturam verborum. Proinde conferte *Caes. bell. civ.* 3. 32. 2: *cuius modo rei nomen reperiri poterat, hoc satis esse ad cogendas pecunias videbatur*; *Sallust. epist. Pomp.* 4: *nomine modo imperi a vobis accepto diebus quadraginta exercitum paravi*; *Plin. nat. hist.* 23. 33: *eo venere mores, ut nomina modo cellarum veneant*. Nescio vero, an non huc spectet *Curt. hist. Alex.* 4. 14. 3: *nomina modo vana gentium ignotarum ne extimescerent*, nam dubito, utrum *modo* (ut in *ThLL* vol. 8.

---

<sup>1</sup>) S. Döpp, Kann *modus* ‚personales Vorbild‘ bedeuten? Zu *QUINT. inst.* 12, 10, 21, *CIC. dom.* 65 und *FILASTR.* 132, 2, in: *Glotta* 61, 1983, 228–233; A. Patzer, Ad v. c. Segimerum Doepp de loco quondam Quintiliano epistula, *ibid.* 62, 1984, 251–252.

p. 1298. ll. 44 sq. contenditur<sup>2)</sup> pro *tantum* an (ut placuit Iohanni Siebelis interpreti Curti) pro *agedum* positum sit. Maioris autem momenti puto omnibus locis ad id allatis cum vocabulo *nomen* praeter ipsam particulam *modo* alia quoque verba esse coniuncta; quae res alio quodam loco Sallustiano amplius potest illustrari, *bell. Iug.* 78. 4: *eius civitatis lingua modo convorsa conubio Numidarum, legum cultusque pleraque Sidonica*. Addite porro Suet. *Ner.* 17. 1: *cautum, ut testamentis primae duae cerae testatorum modo nomine inscripto vacuae signaturis ostenderentur*, quo loco, sicut in Quintiliani sententia emendata, vocabulum *modo* cum genitivo q.v. attributivo iunctum est. At quaerere tantum e vobis ausim, nonne Plaut. *rud.* 1076: *verbo illo modo ille vicit* eodem sensu possit intelligi.

Restat, ut brevissime commemorem primum vocabulum *modo* facillime in illud *modum* potuisse depravari – vel consulto, cum qui scriba primum illius sententiae verbum, id quod est *hunc*, cum aliquo nomine appellativo vellet coniungere, vel casu, cum ultima littera perperam pro compendio haberetur –, tum nihil obstare, quominus adverbium *modo* in fine *κόμματος* vel *κώλου* vel etiam *περιόδου* ponatur – conferte, ne plura, Quintil. *declam. min.* 297. 4: *atque id tamen praetenditur modo, indices* –, post numeros clausulae mea quidem coniectura omnino non affici.

Ea demum, viri doctissimi, vobiscum communicare in animo habui de illo loco Quintiliano non sine aliqua *εἰρωνεία* enuntiato: Quales enim fingetis illos rhetoras amatorum more amplexos ne rem quidem ullam, sed vanum atque inane nomen modo? Valet!

D. a. d. V. Kal. Apr. a. MCMXCI. Monaco Bavariorum.

---

<sup>2)</sup> Quo loco haud ita idoneo nihilo minus magnas ago gratias Gabrielae Thome philologiae doctissimae aliisque Thesauri q.d. Linguae Latinae Monacensis sociis, quod me comiter exceperunt, benigne adiuverunt, liberaliter docuerunt.

# Vlat. *dolus* ‚Leid‘ und das Konzept der Gelenkheteroklisie\*)

Von THOMAS LINDNER, Salzburg

## 0. Einleitung

0.1. In den folgenden Ausführungen soll zu einem Problem der historischen romanischen Lexik bzw. auch Grammatik Stellung genommen werden, für das m.E. in den gängigen Handbüchern und Etymologika noch keine wirklich befriedigende Lösung gefunden worden ist. Es handelt sich um das in den romanischen Sprachen allenthalben anzutreffende Wort *dolus* (REW 2727), nicht aber mit der aus dem klassischen Latein erwartbaren Bedeutung ‚List‘, sondern, und das ist das Erstaunliche, mit der Bedeutung ‚Leid, Schmerz‘. Eine Erklärung dieses Phänomens wird hier eine wie immer geartete Vermengung mit dem eigentlichen klassisch-lateinischen Wort für ‚Leid‘, *dolor*, ins Kalkül ziehen müssen, die sich, wie wir des weiteren sehen werden, bereits in spätlateinischer Zeit abgespielt hat.

Diese prekäre Situation erinnert mich zumindest, nebenbei bemerkt, an den gymnasialen Lateinunterricht, wo es schon so manchesmal zu einer fatalen Verwechslung der beiden Lemmata kommen konnte. Daß sich diese notorische Ambivalenz nun auch in Texten aus spätrömischer Zeit widerspiegelt, sich diese ‚externe‘ Evidenz nun auch am geschichtlichen Material bestätigt, scheint mir nicht von ungefähr zu kommen; es wird sich im Laufe dieses Beitrags herausstellen, daß hier wohlbekannte sprachgeschichtliche Vorgänge die in der normierten Sprachebene verständlicherweise streng komplementäre Verteilung von *dolus* und *dolor* ins Wanken gebracht und eine eher psychologisch denn logisch begründbare Vermischung zweier ähnlich gelagerter Wörter ausgelöst haben.

0.2. Um damit bereits das Wesentliche dieses Aufsatzes vorwegzunehmen: Ich möchte diesem exemplarischen Problem ein sprachwis-

---

\*) Der vorliegende Artikel basiert auf einem Vortrag, den ich am 9.12.1989 anlässlich der 17. Österreichischen Linguistentagung in Wien gehalten habe. Daher entschloß ich mich, auch die das Auditorium miteinbeziehende Diktion des Vortragsmanuskriptes weitgehend beizubehalten. Für hilfreiche Kommentare und Hinweise möchte ich mich bei den Herren Univ.-Prof. Dr. Oswald Panagl (Salzburg) und Univ.-Prof. Dr. Max Pfister (Saarbrücken) sehr herzlich bedanken.

senschaftliches Konzept zugrunde legen, mit Hilfe dessen die *communis opinio* der üblichen Handbücher, es handle sich bei diesem Wort um eine sekundäre, im Vulgärlatein erfolgte (Verbal-)ableitung von *dolere* (Genauerer dazu s. unten), hinsichtlich ihrer Erklärungsadäquatheit, so wage ich zu hoffen, relativiert werden soll.

### 1. Das Konzept der Gelenk(s)heteroklisie

1.1. Diesen Hintergrund, auf dem die Einzelwortanalyse aufbaut, stellt ein bekannter Terminus vorwiegend aus der nominalen Morphologie dar, nämlich die Heteroklisie.

Bereits im Altertum erkannten die griechischen Grammatiker (in deren Nachfolge freilich auch die römischen) Unregelmäßigkeiten im nominalen Flexionsparadigma (so z. B. Stamm-, Deklinationsklassenwechsel, analoge Umgestaltungen nach bekannten, oft gebrauchten Vorbildern, Dubletten etc.) und nannten sie *ἐτερόκλιτα*, d. h. Formen, die einem anderen Paradigma folgen als dem angestammten bzw. von der synchron-normativen Grammatik anerkannten. Aus diesem Grund galten solche heteroklitischen Formen als abnorm (Ausnahmen, poetische Lizenzen, Vulgarismen)<sup>1)</sup> und wurden, wo möglich, in literarischer Diktion tunlichst vermieden. Betrachtet man diese Anomalien jedoch aus der Blickrichtung der diachronen Grammatik, so wird man in ihnen (a) Reliktformen aus älteren Sprachzuständen (vgl. die archaische idg. *r/n*-Flexion)<sup>2)</sup> oder (b) erst einzelsprachlich erfolgte, sekundäre Umbildungen (bzw. auch Kontaminationen) nach dominanten Vorbildern erkennen können.

1.2. Es ist hier nicht der Raum, eine vollständige Systematik aller Ausprägungen der Heteroklisie zu geben (siehe dazu Leumann 1977: 448 ff. fürs Lateinische). Besondere Beachtung freilich verdient hinsichtlich unserer Fragestellung ein Subtyp des Problemkomplexes, nämlich die Gelenkheteroklisie, die von J. Egli (1954:18 ff.) ausführlich erläutert wird und für viele von ihm behandelte innergriechische Heteroklisien einen adäquaten Erklärungsmodus bietet. Es handelt sich

<sup>1)</sup> Man vergleiche damit den tendenziösen Titel von Consentius' grammatikpuristischem Traktat *De barbarismis et metaplasmis* aus dem 5. nachchristlichen Jahrhundert (Ed. H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, Bd. 5).

<sup>2)</sup> Wie schwer sich die lat. Schriftsteller mit diesen Paradigmen taten, zeigt die Mannigfaltigkeit der in verschiedene Richtungen gehenden Ausgleichsformen (besonders augenfällig *iecur* und seine Sippe, vgl. H. Rix 1965:79 ff.).

hierbei um eine Neuinterpretation einer morphologisch doppeldeutigen Kasusform, welche den Flexionswechsel gleichsam als Gelenk ermöglicht und aus verschiedenen, v. a. psychologisch motivierbaren Gründen begünstigt.

Das soll zunächst an einem klassischen indogermanistischen Beispiel veranschaulicht werden (vgl. dazu Egli 1954:20): Das idg. Wurzelnom. *\*ped-/pod-* ‚Fuß‘ läßt sich im Altindischen seit dem Rg-Veda als *a*-Stamm (d. h. idg. *o*-Stamm) belegen. Auf den ersten Blick scheint es – und das war Lehrmeinung bis etwa 1890<sup>3)</sup>, als ob hier das alte Wurzelnom. um ein *o*-Suffix erweitert worden wäre (schon idg. Thematisierung des Wurzelnomens) und ein alter, ererbter Dualismus bestanden hätte. Eine ökonomischere und plausiblere Lösung ist hingegen zu erzielen, wenn man auf diese Dublette das Konzept der Gelenkheteroklisie anwendet: Da im Altindischen der Akk. Sg. der Konsonantenstämme *-am* (< idg. *\*-m*) durch besondere Lautentwicklungen mit dem der *a*-Stämme (*-am* < idg. *\*-o-m*) zusammenfiel, bildete eine Form *pādam* (zu strukturieren in *pād-am*) durch eine virtuelle Restrukturierung in *pāda-m* das ideale Gelenk für eine Proportion *devam* : *devaḥ* = *pādam* : X, X = *pādaḥ*. Damit war der Vorgang der Heteroklisie vollzogen, und die Auffüllung zum vollständigen thematischen Paradigma war, wie Egli sagt (S. 20), nur mehr „eine Frage der Zeit und der Gebrauchsgelegenheit“.

Lassen wir nun Egli selbst zum theoretischen Konzept und vor allem zu den Ursachen der Gelenkheteroklisie zu Wort kommen (S. 21):

„Man kann daher diesen bei weitem interessantesten Typus unter allen Erscheinungen des weitverzweigten Problemkomplexes (*scil.* der Heteroklisie, Anm. Th. L.) zutreffend als „Gelenkheteroklisie“ bezeichnen. Dieser Name bezieht sich freilich mehr auf den mechanischen Ablauf des Paradigmawechsels. Im Zentrum steht eigentlich ein psychologischer Vorgang: es werden ganz einfach sich entsprechende Kasusformen, die verschiedenen Systemen angehören, sich aber lautlich decken, im Sprachgefühl einander gleichgesetzt, wobei die Formen des schwächeren Typus eine Umdeutung nach denen des stärkeren erfahren und auf Grund dieser Neuorientierung die Angleichung auch der übrigen, noch dem alten System verhafteten Kasusformen veranlassen. *Umdeutung* mit den daraus sich ergebenden formalen Konsequenzen ist das Wesen der Gelenkheteroklisie.“

Die Ambivalenz einer Kasusform hinsichtlich zweier verschiedener Flexionsschemata ist hier somit ausschlaggebend, ein formales Kriterium also; wenn dazu noch semantische Assoziationen den primär

<sup>3)</sup> Vgl. Egli 1954:20, der dies allerdings zitatlos in den Raum stellt; als Beispiel dafür, soweit ich sehe, H. Möller 1879:520.



formal motivierten Übertritt begünstigen, wie wir im folgenden an unserem Beispiel zu demonstrieren versuchen, scheint ein höchst stringent und empirisch gut abgesichertes Erklärungsmodell vorzuliegen.

## 2. Vlat. *dolus* ‚Leid‘

2.1. In den meisten romanischen Sprachen findet man als Lexeme mit der Bedeutung ‚Leid, Schmerz‘ neben den lautgesetzlichen Kontinuanten von lat. *dolore(m)* ebenfalls genuine Erbwörter: it. *duolo*, sard. log. *dolu*, afz. *duel*, nfz. *deuil*, aprov. *dols*, kat. *dol* und einige andere mehr (REW 2727). Ohne zunächst das (vulgär)lateinische Material als positive oder negative Evidenz zu beanspruchen, muß man wohl als rekonstruierte protoromanische Grundform für die eben aufgelisteten Lemmata eine *o*-stämmige Basis *\*dolu* ansetzen neben dem erwartbaren lat. Lexem *dolore(m)*. Diese rekonstruktive Analyse scheint sich auf der Grundlage des vulgärlateinischen Korpus zu bestätigen. Für die weitere Argumentation sind offenkundig folgende Grabinschriften von besonderem Aufschlußwert:

- (1) CIL X 1760, 5 ff. = D<sup>1</sup> 1520 (Puteoli, 3. Jh. n. Chr.):  
 ... *sed is mihi debuit facere, quam senectae meae dolum relinquere.*

Es handelt sich beim Sprechenden um einen Vater, der seinen Sohn bestatten mußte: ‚Aber eigentlich hätte er es (*scil.* das Grabmal) mir errichten müssen, anstatt meinem Alter *dolus*, d. h. ‚Leid, Trauer‘ zu hinterlassen‘.

- (2) CIL III 1903, 3; 8 = D<sup>1</sup> 1521 (Baska Voda, Dalmatien):  
 (3 ff.) *cum dolum tantum haberent de Valerio delicato ...*, (8 f.)  
*dunc dolum haberit ...*

In der Übersetzung: ‚... als sie so großen Schmerz um den lieben Valerius empfanden ... als sie Schmerz empfand ...‘.

In der Folge häufen sich inschriftliche Belege solcher Art<sup>4</sup>); aber auch im literarischen bzw. quasiliterarischen Latein (d. h. in der stilisierten Umgangssprache vor allem der Kirchenschriftsteller und späte-

<sup>4</sup>) Es sei hier eine Auflistung aller übrigen (vorsichtig formuliert: mir zugänglichen) inschriftlichen Belege angeführt: CIL V 1638, 2 ff. (Aquileia, christ.): ... *filiae suae titulum dolo pleni fecerunt ...* ‚sie haben ihrer Tochter voll Schmerz den Grabstein errichtet‘. – CIL X 4510, 5 ff. (Capua, christ., 563 n. Chr.): ... *quius rememoratio dolum parentibus demisit ...* ‚dessen Angedenken den Eltern Schmerz bereitete‘. – CIL XI 3054, 4 (Polimartium, 359 n. Chr.): *in hoc dolo ...* ‚in diesem

ren Historiographen) begegnen wir den zur Diskussion stehenden Formen, z. B. bei Gregor von Tours, dessen merovingisches Latein ja verbürgertermaßen die, wenn auch literarisierte, Umgangssprache seiner Zeit, des 6. Jhs., repräsentiert. Zwei Stellen zur Bekräftigung:

- (3) Greg. Tur. Franc. 5, 35 (MG SS. rer. Mer. I. 1 [21951], edd. B. Krusch/W. Levison)  
 ... *sit unus dolus nostris pariter ac eorum amicis.*

Schmerz'. – CIL XII 2033, 1 ff. (Ste. Colombe, viell. christ., 4./5. Jh. n. Chr.): *Ego pater Vitalinus et mater Martina scripsimus non grandem gloriam, sed dolum filiorum* ... , wir, Vater Vitalinus und Mutter Martina, haben nicht einen großen Triumph zu verzeichnen, sondern den Schmerz um unsere Söhne'. Zu dieser Inschrift bemerkt Schuchardt (1868:9), daß ihm an dieser Stelle die Gleichsetzung *dolum* = *dolorem* zweifelhaft sei, „denn der Tod eines Kindes wurde nicht selten als von diesem an den Eltern verübter Betrug aufgefaßt“. Doch scheinen mir der Mikrokontext (*gloria* ≙ ‚Freude‘, *dolus* ≙ Antonym, d. h. ‚Leid‘) wie auch der Makrokontext (das übrige eindeutige inschriftliche Material wie auch die angebrachte Pietät gegenüber dem Verstorbenen, vgl. *de mortuis nil nisi bene* bzw. Pirson 1901:241: „... que l'idée de douleur convient mieux à une épitaphe que l'idée de ruse ...“) doch der hier vertretenen Lesart den Ausschlag zu geben. – CIL XII 2093, 1 ff. (Vienne, christ., 573 n. Chr.): ...] *bus* (viell. *reliquit parentibus*, so ergänzt in D<sup>2</sup> 2905) *dolum quae vixit annus septem* ... , (sie hinterließ den Eltern) Leid, welche sieben Jahre lebte'. – CIL XIV 3896, 1 ff. (Tibur, 400 n. Chr.): *parentis posuerunt petulum* (verschrieben oder alliterierend für *tetulum* = *titulum*, oder aber Eigenname, vgl. D<sup>2</sup> 4181, 2, Komm. *ad loc.*) *contra vo. tu et dolo suo* ... , die Eltern haben das Grab errichtet gegen ihren Wunsch und schmerzerfüllt'. – D<sup>2</sup> 4837, 7 f. (Carthago, metr.): *sed hanc dira dolum rapiens commune parentum / tradidit et miseris tristia corda dedit* , aber der grausame Tod (*dira*, scil. *mors*) raubte sie (die Tochter), bewirkte das gemeinsame Leid der Eltern und ließ den Unglücklichen traurige Herzen zurück'. Auch hier entscheidet der Kontext: *dolum tradidit et tristia corda dedit* ist fast eine *variatio* ein und derselben Aussage. Hier könnte sich außerdem ein Neutrum 'dolum' ‚Leid‘ verbergen (vgl. *dolum commune*), doch scheint mir *commune* = *communem* mit notorischer Schwäche des auslautenden *m* v. a. im Vulgärlatein plausibler. Interessant auch, daß in der 2. Zeile dieser Versinschrift (*non minor hic dolor est*) die ursprüngliche Form des Wortes für ‚Leid‘ zu stehen kommt, wogegen in der 7. Zeile schon diskutiertes *dolum* begegnet. Dieser Wechsel mag metrisch begründet sein (zunächst „korrektes“ *dolor*, dann aber, *metri causa*, ein Akk. *dolum* anstelle von unpassendem *dolorem*). – D<sup>2</sup> 2138 B, 6 (Rom, metr.): *filiis tuis demisisti dolum, uxori dolorem* , deinen Söhnen, deiner Gattin hast du Leid hinterlassen'. Wiederum eine bemerkenswerte, emphatische Variation (möglicherweise, abgesehen von metrischem Zwang, nach dem Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder bzw. nach dem Suffix von *uxori* motiviert: zunächst zweisilbiges *dolum*, dann dreisilbiges *dolorem*). An eine Bedeutungstrennung mag ich hier nicht denken, zumal solche emphatischen Doppelungen öfters begegnen. – D<sup>2</sup> 3650, 1 ff. (Rom, 368 n. Chr.): *merentes parentes fecerunt, quod ipse debuit facere; infelices parentes dolo debere (= debuere) et hunc tumulum fecerunt* ... , die traurigen

In der Übersetzung: ‚Ein Schmerz soll den unsern gleich wie ihren Freunden sein‘.

(4) *Id.* 6, 23:

... *magnum ... dolum hic intulit infans.*

Aus dem Kontext geht die Semantik von *dolus* an dieser Stelle klar hervor: ‚Großes Leid fügte hier das Kind zu‘.

Ebenso bei Comodian, dessen literarische Verbundenheit mit der Volkssprache ja auch seine rhythmischen (d. h. erstmals akzentuierend gebauten) Hexameter demonstrieren:

(5) *Comm. instr.* 1, 26, 19 (CSEL 15 [1887], ed. B. Dombart):

*Sed in futuro tibi spes est sine dolo vivendi.*

Auch hier: ‚Aber in Zukunft besteht für dich die Hoffnung, ohne Leid zu leben‘.

---

Eltern machten, was er selbst machen hätte sollen; die unglücklichen Eltern mußten es aus Schmerz und errichteten dieses Grabmal‘. Die bei Diehl angeführte Konjektur (*decepti* für *debere et*, vgl. auch Silvagni 1922:56 f. [ICUR 479]) scheint mir nicht nötig. – Unsicher bleibt wegen der verwitterten Buchstabenformen die in ThLL V.1, Sp.1837, 45 f. unter CIL X als *dub.* 2074 zitierte Inschrift: *hic iacet libertus dulcis sine dol(o) suo*. Es handelt sich in Wirklichkeit, wie ich durch eine Recherche im Thesaurus-Archiv in München feststellen konnte, um CIL XI 2074, 4 f. (Perugia). – Nachfolgend seien noch Inschriften angeführt, die aufgrund ihres fragmentarischen Zustands nicht eindeutig interpretierbar sind: CIL V 1732, 2 (Fiumicelli, christ.): *dulcissimae maritus dolis ficet dolis f*[... (*dolis* entweder Abl., d. h. ‘unter Schmerzen machte er ...’, oder, so ThLL V.1, Sp.1820, 11 f., mit einem Fragezeichen für *doliens*). – CIL V 6271 a, 4 f. (Mailand): ... *ocsor sua dolis [contra votu]m posuit Martina*. Dies klingt an CIL XIV 3896 *contra votu et dolo suo* an. Auch ein epigraphisch desperates *dolin(s)* kommt vor, CIL V 8610, 1 f. (resp. 2 f.; Aquileia): [*mari]tus suus dolin[s* (evt. *dolis*) *contra*] *votum pos(uit)*. Möglicherweise können andere Inschriften mit epigraphisch deutlichem *doliens* [z. B. CIL VI 16483, 1 (Rom); XII 2863, 7 (Barron, Gall. Narb.); der Übergang in die vierte Konjugationsklasse aufgrund des Zusammenspiels von phonetischem Wandel und morphologischer Reinterpretation ist bei diesem Verb epigraphisch gut bezeugt, vgl. CIL XI 932, 4 (Modena): *dolio*, CIL V 1706, 7 (Aquileia): *doleunt*] die partizipiale Lesart dieser Fragmente bestätigen. – Die von Muratori(us) (L. A. Muratori. *Novus Thesaurus Veterum Inscriptionum*, Tomus III. Mediolani: Ex Aedibus Palatinis MDCCXXI) S. 1439, Nr. 7, Z. 5 f. gegebene Inschrift ... *fecit Fortunatus alonnus ipseius ex dolo ipseius fecit* ..., die Muratori selbst (noch skeptisch: „num EX DOLO pro EX DOLORE?“), sodann Schuchardt 1866:35 und, auf ihn verweisend, Roensch 1887:27 f. für *dolus* = *dolor* geltend machen wollten, wird heutzutage nach CIL III 2240, 6 (Salona) ... *ex boto* (= *ex voto*) ... gelesen und ist somit für unsere Argumentation hinfällig.

Es läßt sich unser Wort also in seiner veränderten Bedeutung in erklecklicher Anzahl feststellen<sup>5</sup>). Ein Testimonium aus jener Zeit

<sup>5</sup>) Als weitere literarische Belege für die Zeit des Spät- und frühen Mittellateins sind zu nennen: Ambr. epist. 31,11 (Migne, PL 16, Sp.1113) = epist. XIII,11 (CSEL 82.1 [1968], S.106, ed. O.Faller): ... *et novacula non satis acuta, ne faciat dolum*, ... und mit einem nicht allzu scharfen Messer, damit es nicht Schmerz verursache. Man vergleiche damit Psalm 51,4 in der Vulgata-Version (edd. R. Weber et al., Stuttgart 31984): ... *sicut novacula acuta fecisti dolum*, wie ein scharfes Messer hast du *dolus* verursacht. Gerade dieses letzte Beispiel führt die semantische Ambivalenz von ‚List‘ und ‚Leid‘ in besonderen Junktoren wie hier deutlich vor Augen, da *facere dolum* als ‚Leid zufügen‘ ebensogut wie als ‚List ersinnen‘ aufgefaßt werden kann; dies scheint auch Ambrosius bei der Interpretation dieses Psalmenverses vorgeschwebt zu sein. Als eine indirekte Bestätigung für die semantischen Übergänge fasse ich auch Alc. Avit. carm. 2,32 (ed. R.Peiper, MG AA VI.1 [1883]) auf: *frans, dolor atque dolus, maeror, discordia, livor*. Obwohl bedeutungsmäßig nach klassischem Vorbild geschieden, zeigt das Syntagma doch ein ‚Zusammengehörigkeitsgefühl‘ von seiten des Dichters auf. Unsicher erweist sich noch die Stelle bei Ausonius 210,13 (ed. R.Peiper, Leipzig: Teubner 1886): ... *procul ira dolorque* ... Eine Handschrift bricht bei *dol[\*\*\*]* ab, was Peiper zu dieser Konjekturen veranlaßt haben mag. Andere Ausgaben, z.B. Schenkl (MG AA V.2 [1883]) bzw. Prete (Leipzig: Teubner 1978) entscheiden sich mit anderen Handschriften für ... *procul ira dolusque*. – Comm. instr. 2,32,1 (CSEL 15 [1887], ed. B.Dombart; CC Lat. 128 [1960], ed. J.Martin): *Filiorum casus licet et dolum cordis relinquat*, mag der Tod der Söhne auch Herzeleid zurücklassen. In vorwissenschaftlichen Ausgaben liest man an dieser Stelle immer wieder *dolium* (vgl. Anm. 17), doch muß hier *dolum* aufgrund der eindeutigen handschriftlichen Belege als die einzig mögliche Lesart geltend gemacht werden (vgl. dazu die eingehende Diskussion von Dombart 1884:786 ff.). – Anon. Vales. 15,92 (ca. 6. Jh., in: MG AA IX.1 [1892], ed. Th.Mommsen, S.328 f. = J.Moreau/V.Velkow 1968, Leipzig: Teubner, § 92): ... *metuens vero rex ne dolore (dolo codd.) generi aliquid adversus regnum eius tractaret, obiecto crimine iussit interfici*, der König aber ließ ihn wegen Hochverrats töten, aus Furcht, er unternehme etwas gegen das Reich aus Schmerz um den Schwiegersohn. Die in den Text aufgenommene Konjekturen vom Erstherausgeber Valesius (17. Jh.) erübrigt sich, da beide erhaltenen Kodizes eindeutiges *dolo* aufweisen (vgl. Adams 1976:25: „Clearly the vulgarism is right here, especially in view of the agreement between the MSS.“). Allerdings wollten die frühen Editoren, auch in Ermangelung des inschriftlichen Materials, eine solche „Entgleisung“ vom normativen Standpunkt aus nicht wahrhaben (vgl. auch unten). – Pelagon. 224 (ed. K.-D. Fischer, Leipzig: Teubner 1980): *hoc frequenter renovabis, utilissimum est et dolori (dolo cod.) et tumori*, du sollst ihn (*scil.* den Verband) häufig erneuern, er ist sehr nützlich gegen Schmerz und Schwellung. Die Konjekturen des frühen Herausgebers Sarchianus, die bis in die kritische Ausgabe von 1980, der ersten Teubneriana von M. Ihm (Leipzig 1892, vgl. S.168) entsprechend, Eingang gefunden hat, ist angesichts der handschriftlichen Überlieferung *dolo* wiederum aufzugeben; doch scheint hier Vorsicht angebracht: So steht im unmittelbar folgenden Kontext die „korrekte“ Form *dolorem* (Pelagon. 225: *item ad dolorem coxae*) – jedoch zeigt auch D<sup>2</sup> 4837 Variation von *dolor* und *dolus* mit derselben

(4.Jh.) darf nicht vorenthalten werden, weil es fast als Grammatikerzitat zu werten ist und an die schulmeisterlichen Zurechtweisungen der

Semantik –, und, wie Fischer im Kommentar ausführt (S. 117), „*dolum pro dolore homines vergentis antiquitatis dixisse non ignoravit Ihm, sed Pelagonio tribuere ausus non est ... -re- syllabam a scribis omitti docet Svennung ...*“. In Anbetracht von *tumori* ist meiner Meinung nach die Annahme einer graphischen Silbenverkürzung nicht unbedingt zwingend, so daß jedenfalls *dolo* als *lectio difficilior* geltend gemacht werden kann. – Fredeg. chron. cont. 53 (MG SS. rer. Mer. II [1888], ed. B. Krusch, S. 193, Z. 2f.): *His gestis rex Pippinus post paucos dies, ut dolus est ad dicendum, ultimum diem et vitam simul caruit*. ‚Hierauf starb König Pippin nach wenigen Tagen, wie es schmerzlich zu berichten ist.‘ – Zweifelhaft ist Expos. mundi 12, p. 107 (4.Jh.; ed. A. Riese, Geogr. lat. min., 1878 = <sup>2</sup>1964): *inter eos ... neque rixa neque cupiditas neque dolum (dolor, dolus Mai) vel aliquid mali est*, unter ihnen ... besteht weder Streit noch Verlangen noch Leid (oder doch: List) noch irgend eine Schlechtigkeit. Hier kann m. E. auch der Kontext nicht eindeutigen Aufschluß geben. Das von Th. Sinko im textkritischen Apparat seiner Ausgabe angeführte Argument (1904:546) „*dolum i. q. dolus, synonymum mali. de animi enim agitur affectibus, non de doloribus corporis*“ überzeugt nicht, da *dolor* ebensogut ein *animi affectus* sein kann. Die französische Ausgabe von J. Rougé entscheidet sich in der Übersetzung für ‚tromperie‘ (1966:151), obwohl in der Parallelüberlieferung (zweiten Fassung) *dolor* aufscheint, was ich nicht als Hyperkorrektismus für *dolus* ‚List‘ auffassen möchte. Die bevorzugte handschriftliche Lesung legt hier jedenfalls ein eindeutig neutrales *dolum* (Nom. Sg.) nahe. Noch prekärer wird die Lage bei Kap. 63: ... *est autem in ipsa civitate statua, quam omnes Colossum nominant, novum visum magnitudinis; dolus enim in ipsa fuit, secundum prophetiam praedictae Sibyllae ...* ‚in der Stadt selbst aber gibt es eine Statue, die alle Kolosß nennen, ein Wunder an Größe; doch ihr haftet *dolus* an, gemäß der Prophezeiung der schon erwähnten Sibylla.‘ Rougé bleibt mit seiner etwas unscharfen Interpretation ‚impiété‘ (S. 207) offenbar bei der ursprünglichen Bedeutung von *dolus*, weist aber im Kommentarteil (S. 331) auf die Gleichstellung *dolus* = *dolor* des früheren Herausgebers Lumbroso (Rom 1903) „Lumbroso comprend *dolus* comme équivalent de *dolor*“ hin. Diese Auffassungsunterschiede machen wieder einmal deutlich, wie sehr die Bedeutungen ‚List‘ und ‚Leid‘ kontextuell changieren können. – Ein Lexikoneintrag für *dolus* ‚Leid‘, der bei Georges 1951: Sp. 2277 aufscheint, ist allerdings zu tilgen, nämlich Symm. Orat. 2, 17 (MG AA VI. 1 [1883], ed. O. Seeck, S. 326): ... *dolus circumcisi tergoris auxit dedecus emptionis ...* ‚die List der ringsum zerschnittenen Tierhaut mehrte die Schmach des Kaufes‘ (vgl. dazu ThL V. 1, Sp. 1859, Z. 4f. [s. v. *dolus* ‚List‘]). – Älteres, großteils Überholtes findet sich dazu noch bei Pirson 1901:241 sowie bei Schuchardt 1868:9f. (Savaron-Zitat, vgl. Io. Savaro Claromontensis: *Caii Sollii Apollinaris Sidonii Arvernorum Episcopi opera*, II. Editio, Parisii: Ex officina Plantiniana MDCIX, S. 321f.). So kann hier die für die Cassiod. var. 2, 39, 4 zitierte Lesart *balnea contra diversos dolos corporis attributa* ‚Bäder gegen verschiedene Körperleiden‘ nicht aufrechterhalten werden (vgl. Migne, PL 69, Sp. 569 *doloris* mit dem Vermerk auf Savarons Lesung [„ex fide veter. cod.“] und MG AA XII [1894], ed. Th. Mommsen, S. 68 ausschließlich *dolores* ohne jede Variante.) – Veraltet ist auch die Lesung von Arator, act. 2, 994f. bei Migne, PL 68, Sp. 229 ... *fugiamus ab ista / parte dolos ...* mit der Bemerkung, hier habe sich *dolus* mit

*Appendix Probi* gemahnt<sup>6</sup>). Noch dazu rechtfertigt es metasprachlich die bisherige Bedeutungshypothese für das Vulgärlateinische, die freilich aus dem Kontext des behandelten Materials schon eindeutig herleitbar ist. Augustinus äußert sich einmal in seinem Kommentar zum Johannesevangelium (*in evang. Ioh.* 7, 18; Migne, PL 35, Sp. 1446 = CC Lat. 36 (1954), S. 77 [ed. D. R. Willems]) folgendermaßen (vgl. Regnier 1886:VII):

- (6) *Non dolus dolor est; propterea dico, quia multi fratres imperitiores Latinitatis loquuntur sic, ut dicant ‚dolus illum torquet‘, pro eo quod est ‚dolor‘. ‚Dolus ist nicht gleichzusetzen mit dolor. Ich sage das deshalb, weil viele Mitbrüder, die des Lateinischen nicht so mächtig sind (scil. des klassischen Idioms!), anstelle von ‚dolor illum torquet‘ eben ‚dolus illum torquet‘ sagen‘.*

Ein weiteres Zeugnis soll an diesem Punkt angeführt werden, durch welches die „Vorherrschaft“ unseres betreffenden Wortes augenfällig wird:

- (7) CIL XII 1939, 1 ff. = D<sup>1</sup> 1522 (Vienne):  
*... filia, cuius suprema ... composui dolose,*

d. h. ‚die Tochter, deren Überreste ich trauernd (im Sinn von *dolorose*, *dolenter*) bestattete‘.

Man kann daraus ersehen, daß *dolus* in seiner neuen Bedeutung

---

*dolor* vermischt („permutantur“, s. Index, s. v. *dolus*). A. P. McKinlay gibt dafür in seiner textkritischen Ausgabe (CSEL 72 [1951]) ... *Fugiamus ab ista / parte, dolor*, ... und interpretiert *dolor* als Vokativ (vgl. Index, s. v. *dolor*).

<sup>6</sup>) Antike metasprachliche Zeugnisse, die direkt oder indirekt *dolus* = *dolor* erweisen (Grammatiker, Glossen u. ä.) sind, abgesehen vom schon behandelten Augustinus-Zitat, ebenfalls in einiger Anzahl vorhanden: (a) CGL II, 54, 37 (vgl. VI, 363; edd. G. Götz et al. GL II, Philox. Gloss., Do, 24, 24 a (edd. W. Lindsay et al.): ‚dolus: δόλος, ἄλγος (-ως), ἄλγυμα (-ημα).‘ – (b) Isid. diff. 1, 173 (Migne, PL 83): ‚Inter *dolum* et *dolorem*: *Dolus* tergiversatio, *dolor* vero corporis inquietudo.‘ – (c) *Id.* 1, 142: ‚Inter *dolum* et *dolorem*. *Dolor* est corporis incommoditas, sive molestia. *Dolus* vero occulta malitia, blandis sermonibus adornata.‘ – (d) Prob. app. gramm. IV, 201, 23 f. (ed. H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, Bd. 4): ‚inter *dolum* et *dolorem* hoc interest, quod *dolum* tergiversationem significat, *dolorem* vero corporis inquietudinem esse demonstrat.‘ – (e) J. W. Beck, *De differentiarum scriptoribus Latinis*, Groningen: Noordhoff 1883, D 37 (S. 53): Inter *dolum* et *dolorem*: *dolus* fraudem significat, *dolor* vero incommodum corporis demonstrat. – Diese *grammaticorum differentiae* zeigen mit ihrer schulmeisterlichen semantischen Zurechtweisung indirekt, daß hier ‚Verwechslungen‘ stattgefunden haben (vgl. ThIL V. 1, Sp. 1837, 30 f.: „confusionem declinationum testantur etiam grammaticorum differentiae“).

bereits ins Ableitungsparadigma Eingang gefunden hat. Ob es sich nun um eine Neuableitung oder aber um eine konsequente Umdeutung eines ja bereits vorhandenen *dolosus* ‚listenreich‘ auf der Folie des bedeutungserneuerten *dolus* handelt, möge dahingestellt bleiben.

Besonderen Aufschlußwert möchte ich noch den am Material nachweisbaren hyperkorrekten Formulierungen zubilligen. Wenn nämlich ein *dolor* in der Bedeutung ‚List‘ verwendet wird, scheint sich mir hier der Zusammenhang der beiden Paradigmen geradezu aufzudrängen:

( 8) Itala Psalm. 23, 4 (Veron.): *nec iuravit in dolore*.

Man vergleiche damit die griechische Vorlage: LXX *loc. cit. και ουκ ὤμοσεν ἐπὶ δόλῳ* ‚und er schwor nicht mit einer List im Hinterkopf‘ und die bereinigte Vulgata-Version: *nec iuravit in dolo*. Ich glaube, die beiden letzteren Zitate sprechen hier für sich und bringen die Übersetzung in eine eindeutige Richtung<sup>7)</sup>.

2.2. Aus dem eben dargestellten Material ist ersichtlich, daß zumindest seit dem 3. nachchristlichen Jahrhundert (dem ersten datierbaren Beleg) das Lexem *dolus* sich mit der Bedeutung ‚Leid, Schmerz‘ in den niedrigen Stilschichten der lateinischen Sprache durchgesetzt hat. Es erscheint mir wichtig, als gemeinsamen Nenner der noch zu besprechenden morphologischen Komplikationen auch einen semantischen Zusammenhang zu orten: klat. *dolus* ‚List‘ und vlat. ‚Leid‘ sind miteinander durch implikativen Bezug (implikativen Bedeutungswandel) verbunden; eine mögliche Implikation wäre: „Wenn sich jemand einer List bedient, kann er dadurch Leid verursachen.“<sup>8)</sup>

<sup>7)</sup> Ein weiteres Zeugnis läßt sich aus dem Spätlateinischen dafür noch beibringen: Lucif. non conv. 6, p. 14, 30 (CSEL 14 [1886], ed. W. Hartel) = Itala prov. 24, 2: *falsa ... meditatatur cor ... et dolores* (gr. Vorlage: *πόνους*, Vulg. *fraudes*) *labia eorum locuntur* ‚Falsches ersinnt das Herz und Listen sprechen ihre Lippen‘. – Die von Brewer 1906:336 f. für diese hyperkorrekte Verwendung von *dolor* = *dolus* ‚List‘ zitierten Stellen Phoebad. c. Arrian. 8, 4; 6 (Migne, PL 20, Sp. 18 = CC Lat. 64 [1985], S. 31, ed. R. Demeulenaere) haben im Gegenteil sehr wohl ursprüngliches *dolor* (vgl. Index von Demeulenaere, S. 431, *ad loc.*: *dolor* = *offensio, displicentia*). – Eine Kuriosität sei hier noch erwähnt: Auch in einer schon vollkommen ausgeprägten romanischen Einzelsprache, im Altkatalanischen, macht sich singular eine solche Verwechslung bemerkbar, unabhängig, wie ich meine, von den vulgärlateinischen Hyperurbanismen (vgl. DECLC III, 167, Anm. 4: *la dolor* ‚List, Betrug‘). Corominas spricht hier (*loc. cit.*) von „un calc o una transfusió semàntica del ll. DOLUS a DOLOR“, sodann von einer „contaminació semàntica“. Ein eindrucksvolles Beispiel also für die von mir festgestellte semantische Ambivalenz von ‚List‘ und ‚Leid‘.

<sup>8)</sup> Zur theoretischen Basis mit weiterführender Literatur vgl. Panagl 1980:323.

2.3. Im folgenden soll nun genauer auf die morphologischen Vorgänge eingegangen werden. Lassen wir dazu zunächst die bisherige Literatur Revue passieren, um damit auch den forschungsgeschichtlichen Aspekten des betreffenden Problems Rechnung zu tragen.

Am Anfang dieses Überblicks steht, wie bei vielen anderen vulgärlateinischen Fragestellungen auch, Schuchardt mit seinem als Materialsammlung auch heute noch sehr brauchbaren ‚Vulgärlateinischen Vokalismus‘ (1866:35)<sup>9)</sup>. In dieser frühen Phase der wissenschaftlichen vulgärlateinischen Forschung wurde freilich die Ansicht vertreten, daß *dolus* ‚Leid‘ aus Nom. Sg. *dolor* aufgrund eines *r*-Schwundes hervorgegangen sei, daß also ein daraus resultierendes *dolo* als Nom./Obl. Sg. in das Paradigma der *o*-Stämme eingegliedert wurde. Obwohl hier zumindest ein organischer Zusammenhang von *dolus* ‚Leid‘ mit *dolor* auszumachen ist, wurde diese Erklärung, nachdem noch einmal Schuchardt (1874:175; v. a. 179), sodann Sittl (1882:76, 1885:576), Mohl (1899:201) und Pirson (1901:240) für sie eingetreten waren, alsbald zugunsten der Rückableitungsthese aufgegeben, wohl wegen der epigraphisch nur unzulänglich abzustützenden Annahme eines *r*-Schwundes<sup>10)</sup>. Gustav Gröber und vor allem Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke waren nun, soweit ich sehe, die ersten, die für eine retrograde Ableitung von *dolere* plädierten<sup>11)</sup>. Dieser Lehrmeinung schlossen sich in der Folge fast alle maßgeblichen, vor allem romanistisch orientierten Abhand-

<sup>9)</sup> Noch ältere Ansichten (die schon zitierte Bemerkung Savarons) werden von Schuchardt 1868:9f. referiert.

<sup>10)</sup> Ein später Nachfahre ist Pisani 1960:158, der da schreibt: „la declinazione è fatta dal nom. che, caduta l’-r di *dolor*, è stato inteso come nom. di II. decl. in cui pure l’-s era caduto ...“. – Es hat freilich auch „neutrale“ Positionen gegeben, die sich nicht eindeutig festgelegt haben: So Bonnet 1890:367 (Übergang von der 3. in die 2. Deklination) und Wackernagel 1890:300 (durch Assoziation bewirkte Bedeutungsverschiebung) und 1895:55 (Bedeutungsverschiebung aufgrund der Verwitterung der Kasusendungen bzw. infolge des Anklangs an andere unverwandte Wörter). Densusianu (1901:134; 138) vermerkt allgemein eine „passage à la II<sup>e</sup> déclinaison“, obgleich er sich auf S.140 durch den Verweis auf Mohl 1899:201 offenbar der Schuchardtschen These anschließt. Im übrigen ist der auf S.138 für *dolus* = *dolor* reklamierte Beleg CIL XIII 905 infolge des eindeutigen Kontextes *dolus malus* als der bekannte Rechtsterminus aufzufassen und nicht als ein weiteres Beispiel für *dolus* ‚Leid‘ zu werten.

<sup>11)</sup> Gröber *en passant* 1885:102 (allerdings ohne Verweis auf vlat. *dolus*, sondern nur aufgrund der romanischen Fortsetzer), Meyer-Lübke zunächst (1890:176) noch vorsichtig „Verwechslung von *dolor* mit *dolus* [Verweis auf Schuchardt 1866:35] oder postverbal zu *dolere*“, sodann eindeutig Rückableitung in 1894:443, weiters 1903:99 und Grundriß<sup>2</sup> (1904–6):486.



lungen und etymologischen Wörterbücher an<sup>12)</sup>, wovon ich nur eine, aber sehr gewichtige Aussage zitieren möchte. Walther von Wartburg schreibt in seinem umfangreichen Etymologikum (FEW III, S. 121) lapidar: „DOLUS ist erst seit dem 3. Jh. nach Chr. bezeugt. Es ist eher eine verbalabl. von DOLERE, als eine Umbildung von DOLOR.“ Dagegen nahm Manu Leumann in der ersten Auflage seiner Laut- und Formenlehre (Umarbeitung der Stolz[-Schmalz]-schen Grammatik, 1926–28; unveränd. Nachdruck 1963:195) eine Kontamination an, welche in der endgültigen Fassung von 1977 nicht mehr aufscheint<sup>13)</sup>:

(9) *dolor* ‚Schmerz‘ + *dolus* ‚List‘ → *dolus* ‚Schmerz‘,

wobei zu bemerken ist, daß er hier eher formale denn funktionale Assoziationen konstatiert. Auch Einar Löfstedt bekannte sich für *dolus* in seinen *Vermischten Studien* (1936:96 f.; 100) zu einer wie immer gearteten Umbildung oder Umdeutung von *dolor*, die er in *Late Latin* (1959:160 f.) ebenfalls nicht näher ausführt<sup>14)</sup>. Doch damit ist bereits eine Weiche zu einer anderen Sicht gestellt, die, wie ganz zu Beginn,

<sup>12)</sup> Vgl. Herzog 1904:139 (postverbal zu *dolere*), Puşcariu 542 (postverb. Subst. von DOLĒRE), Körting 1907: Sp. 361 (Nr. 3065: Verbalsubstantiv), Brender 1920:40 f. (*dolus* Postverbale von *dolire* [!], danach Hofmann, LEW I, S. 364 und 1952:275), Wiese 1928:68 (postverbale Ableitung), Grandgent 1934:12 f. (postverbal *dolus* < *dolere*), Rohlf's 1949:29 (Verweis auf FEW), Cioranescu 3024 (Verweis auf Puşcariu 542, REW 2727, sowie auf weitere, mir nicht zugängliche Literatur, die sich offenbar auf die innerrumänische Ableitung von rum. *dor* bezieht), Maurer 1959:251; 292 (*dolus* deverbal de *dolere*, derivação regressiva), Väänänen 1963:95 f. (dérivation rétrograde), Tekavčić 1972:226 (estratto dal verbo DOLERE); REW 2727, EWFS, s.v. *deuil* (aus vlat. *dolus*, d.i. postverbal. Subst. von *dolere*), DEI II, S. 1402 (da *dolerē* [sic!]), schon vorsichtiger DELI II, S. 367 (prob[abilmente] ricavato da *dolere*) usw. – Gegen diese Auffassung spricht m. E. a) das sehr frühe Auftreten (3. Jh. n. Chr.) von *dolus* ‚Leid‘ bei noch vorhandenem *dolus* ‚List‘ und b) die Singularität dieses Ableitungstypus (zu einem *e*-Verbum wäre auch in späterer Zeit eine Ableitung auf *-ium* zu erwarten, vgl. *dolium*, *lugium*, Anm. 17; vermutlich deswegen geht Brender *loc. cit.* von einem *i*-Verbum aus, was die Ableitungsthese trotzdem nicht viel plausibler erscheinen läßt). Richtig produktiv war die Rückableitung im Lateinischen eigentlich nur bei *a*-Verben (dazu Leumann 1977:268). Im Romanischen freilich werden die Postverbalia Legion, doch kann dieses Argument aufgrund der frühen, jedenfalls vorprotoromanischen Beleglage für unser *dolus* nicht vorgebracht werden.

<sup>13)</sup> Eine verwirrende Angabe findet sich im Index, s.v. *dolus* ‚dolor‘ (1977:645): Der Verweis auf Löfstedts Kommentar führt ins Leere.

<sup>14)</sup> Löfstedts Bemerkung (1959:161). „Cf. Span. *duelo*, It. *duolo*, O. Fr. *duel*, Mod. Fr. *deuil*, etc., which cannot be derived from *dolor*“ möchte ich dahingehend verstehen, daß die romanischen Fortsetzer nicht unmittelbar auf *dolor* zurückzuführen sind, sondern daß eben eine ja auch vorkommende Zwischenstufe *dolus* anzu-

wiederum einen organischen Zusammenhang für *dolus* = *dolor* anzusetzen versucht, allerdings in davon deutlich unterschiedener Art und Weise.

In der vierten Auflage des lateinischen Etymologikums von Ernout/Meillet (1959:181, s.v. *doleō*), noch nicht in der ersten, wird bereits andeutungsweise diejenige Richtung eingeschlagen, zu der auch ich mich bekennen möchte und die ich eben mit Hilfe des vorgestellten theoretischen Konzepts zu stützen versuche: „En bas latin, à côté de *dolor* apparaît une forme *dolus* (refaite sur le génitif pluriel *dolōrum* commun à *dolor* et à *dolus*?), qui est demeurée dans les langues romanes, à côté de *dolor*“. Der entscheidende Punkt ist freilich mit einem schüchternen Fragezeichen versehen<sup>15</sup>). Desgleichen schrieb schon Hey, der in dieser Hinsicht die Priorität haben dürfte, um 1930 in seinem Thesaurus-Artikel *dolor* (ThL V. 1 [1909-34], Sp. 1837, 24 ff.): „*dolus*, -i (declinatione nata fortasse ex gen. plur. utique communi, sed ...)“ (es folgt ein Verweis auf Meyer-Lübke und Brender, s. o.). Auch hier steht die vorgeschlagene Lösung ohne zusätzliche Argumente und wird durch ein ‚fortasse‘ eingeschränkt.

2.4. So weit die bibliographische Bestandsaufnahme zu unserem Problem. Alle vorherigen Erklärungen, mit Ausnahme der beiden letzteren, scheinen mir nicht recht glücklich zu sein. Ich glaube, hier einen heteroklitischen Vorgang beobachten zu können, der über eine Gelenkform *dolōrum* (Gen. Pl.) verläuft, dadurch bestärkt, daß die ‚Zielform‘ bereits vorhanden ist und zwischen den beiden Etyma, wie oben gezeigt, auch ein semantischer Konnex besteht. Die morphologisch zweideutige Gestalt des Gen. Pl., *dolōrum*, ermöglichte in einer Zeit, in der der Genitiv noch existent oder zumindest noch durchschaubar war, den Übertritt des konsonantischen Stammes *dolor* in die Kategorie der im Vulgärlateinischen frequenzmäßig dominanten *o*-Stämme<sup>16</sup>):

---

nehmen ist. Ich glaube nicht, daß dadurch *a priori* jeglicher (auch indirekter) Zusammenhang mit *dolor* ausgeschlossen wird. – Romanische Etymologika, die auch auf Löfstedts Umdeutung verweisen, sind z. B. DES, s.v. *dolu* und Machado, s.v. *dó* (Piel-Zitat).

<sup>15</sup>) Erst nach der Abfassung des Haupttextes wurde mir bekannt, daß J. Picoche (1971:221) diese These offenbar von Ernout/Meillet übernommen hat, allerdings ohne Fragezeichen: „Bas lat. *dolus*, ..., sans doute [!] analogique de *dolōrum*, génitif pluriel de *dolor*, qui a éliminé son homonyme *dolus* ‚ruse‘ et concurrencé *dolor*.“ Freilich bleibt das „analogique“ ebenso vage wie das „refaite sur le génitif pluriel“ Ernout/Meillet (loc. cit.). Desgleichen ohne eingehendere Argumentation Gómez de Silva (1985:175) mit „Late latin *dolus* ‚grief, pain‘ (influenced by Latin *dolus* ‚deceit, fraud‘), from Latin *dolor* ‚grief, pain“.

<sup>16</sup>) Gerade der Genitiv Plural mit seiner „schweren“ Endung *-ōrum* kommt

- (10) *dolor* ‚Leid‘ über Gen.Pl. *dolorum* ‚Leid; u.U. List‘ → vlat. *dolus* ‚Leid‘<sup>17)</sup>.

2.5. Eine solche Gelenkform könnte sich eventuell an folgender Stautius-Stelle verbergen (besonders der Hexameterschluß bietet sich für oblique Kasus von *dolor*, zudem auch für den Gen. Pl. von *dolus* geradezu an). Selbstverständlich darf dieser Beleg nicht absolut gesetzt werden, sondern ist nur als mögliche Schablone aufzufassen.

- (11) St. Theb. 5, 117 ff. (ed. H. W. Garrod, Oxford 1962 = <sup>1</sup>1906):  
 ... *potuitne ultricia Graius*  
*virginibus dare tela pater laetusque dolorum*  
*sanguine securos iuvenum perfundere somnos ...*

Zur Interpretation dieses Beleges ist folgendes anzumerken: Kann der grausame Vater, nämlich Danaos, der den sorglosen Schlaf der jungen Leute mit Blut befleckt (v. 119), nicht auch über die Leiden, die darob entstehen, sich hämisch freuen, als bloß reich an Listen zu sein? Die Übersetzungen entscheiden sich wohl zu Recht für letzteres, das wird

---

inschriftlich bei Konsonantenstämmen relativ häufig vor, wobei zumeist ein organischer Zusammenhang zwischen den Flexionsklassen konstatiert werden kann, vgl. Leumann 1977: 451 f. Besonders aufschlußreich ist CIL IV 5213, 3 (Pompeii) *mulierorum*, wodurch der Einfluß einer vorschwebenden Gelenkform *virorum* und die Dominanz der *o*-Flexion sichtbar werden. Diese kumulative Evidenz von Gen.-Pl.-Formen *o*-stämmiger Herkunft bei nicht-thematischen Nomina scheint auf eine gewisse Beliebtheit derselben hinzuweisen (vgl. Gaeng 1990:119 f., 124) und den von mir angenommenen heteroklitischen Prozeß über einen Gen. Pl. zu erhärten.

<sup>17)</sup> Romanische Fortsetzer (it. *doglia* ‚Leid‘, aspan. *dolioso* ‚schmerzvoll‘, danach auch *dolorioso* ‚ds.‘ u. a.) lassen auf ein weiteres vlat. Lemma für ‚Leid‘ schließen, das tatsächlich inschriftlich belegt ist, wodurch übrigens Gröbers Argumentation in 1885:102 f. hinfällig wird: *dolium* (vgl. CIL V 1729, 7 ff. (Aquilaia, christ.) = D<sup>2</sup> 4185: ... *doliū fecit parentibus* ... ‚(sie) bereitete den Eltern Schmerz‘). Es scheint dies der einzige sichere vlat. Beleg zu sein, da man für die Comodian-Stellen (vgl. Anm. 5) besser die entsprechenden Formen von *dolus* liest. M. E. handelt es sich bei *dolium* um eine sekundäre Extrahierung aus *cordolium* ‚Herzeleid‘ (seit Plautus belegt, v. a. alat.; solche Prozesse begegnen im späteren Latein häufig, vgl. *nocentia* aus *innocentia*, *crurum fragium* aus *crurifragium* etc. [Leumann 1977:267 f.]), doch könnte man hier auch an eine späte Ableitung von *dolere* nach der antonymischen Proportion *gaudere* : *gaudium* = *dolere* : X, X = *dolium* denken. Jedenfalls ist das von Comodian geprägte Hapax *lugium* (Comm. instr. 1, 29, 18: *lugia sunt semper*) zweifellos auf diese Weise entstanden. – Ein bei Georges 1951: Sp. 2275 verbuchtes Substantiv *dolies* f. ‚Schmerz, Betrübnis‘ erweist sich als eine *vox nihili*, da der inschriftliche Beleg (CIL VI 29947, 2 [Rom]) als *n*-loses Präsenspartizip *dolies* = *doliens* (vgl. Anm. 4, Schluß) zu deuten ist (vgl. ThlL V. 1, Sp. 1820, 11).

auch die Intention des Dichters gewesen sein. Ich darf trotzdem auf die, wohlgermerkt, rezeptive, d. h. sekundäre Ambiguität der Stelle hinweisen, die aus dem Kontext vom Leser nicht eindeutig aufgelöst werden kann, und somit das Syntagma *laetusque dolorum* als virtuelle Folie für die angenommene Umdeutung beanspruchen.

3. Zusammenfassend möchte ich festhalten: es scheint plausibler, daß beide Paradigmen voneinander ableitbar sind im Sinne des zugrunde gelegten Konzeptes der Gelenkheteroklisie, als daß vlat. *dolus* ‚Leid‘ unter Ausschluß von *dolor* ‚ds.‘, so die Handbuchmeinungen, eine neuerliche Verbalableitung von *dolere* darstellt<sup>18</sup>).

### Bibliographie

Vorbemerkung: Nicht berücksichtigt sind die in den Haupt- bzw. Anmerkungstext eingearbeiteten Ausgaben der Quellentexte. Als Abkürzungen dienen: CC Lat. = Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina; CGL = Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum; CIL = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum; CSEL = Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum; GL = Glossaria Latina; MG = Monumenta Germaniae Historica; AA = Auctores Antiquissimi, SS rer. Germ. = Scriptorum rerum Germanicarum; PL = Patrologia Latina; ThL = Thesaurus Linguae Latinae; weitere s. u.

- J. N. Adams (1976): *The Text and Language of a Vulgar Latin Chronicle (Anonymus Valesianus II)*. London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies, Bull. Suppl. 36.
- C. Battisti/G. Alessio (1950–57): *Dizionario etimologico italiano* [DEI]. 5 vol. Firenze: Barbèra.
- M. Bonnet (1890): *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*. Paris (Nd. 1968, Hildesheim: Olms).
- F. Brender (1920): *Die rückläufige Ableitung im Lateinischen* [Diss. Basel]. Lausanne: La Concorde.
- H. Brewer (1906): *Kommodian von Gaza. Ein Arelatensischer Laiendichter aus der Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- G. Calboli (éd.) (1990): *Latin vulgaire - latin tardif II. Actes du I<sup>er</sup> Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Bologne 1988)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- A. Cioranescu (1958–66): *Diccionario etimológico rumano*. Tenerife: Biblioteca filológica, Universidad de La Laguna.
- J. Coromines (1982): *Diccionari etimològic i complementari de la llengua catalana* [DECLC]. Vol. III. Barcelona: Curial Edicions Catalanes.
- M. Cortelazzo/P. Zolli (1979–88): *Dizionario etimologico della lingua italiana* [DELI]. 5 vol. Bologna: Zanichelli.

<sup>18</sup>) Das klat. Wort für ‚List‘, *dolus*, wurde durch diesen Umwandlungsprozeß bis auf periphere Reste (vgl. REW 2728) aufgrund von Homonymenflucht verdrängt, so daß in der Romania neue Etyma zum Tragen gekommen sind (z. B. frz. *ruse*, span. *astucia*, it. *astuzia* usw.). It. *dolo*, frz. *dol* ‚List‘ u. ä. sind späte Buchwörter.

- O. Densusianu (1901): *Histoire de la langue roumaine*. Tome 1<sup>er</sup>: *Les Origines*. Paris: Leroux.
- E. Diehl (1910): *Vulgärlateinische Inschriften* [D<sup>1</sup>]: Kleine Texte (Lietzmann), Nr. 62. Bonn: Marcus & Weber.
- (1961): *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres* [D<sup>2</sup>]. 3 Vol. Berlin: Weidmann.
- B. Dombart (1884): Commodian-Studien, in: *SBer. phil-hist. Kais. Akad. Wiss.*, Bd. 107, Wien, S. 713–802.
- J. Egli (1954): *Heteroklisie im Griechischen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Fälle von Gelenkheteroklisie*. Zürich: Juris.
- A. Ernout/A. Meillet (1959): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- P. A. Gaeng (1990): La flexion nominale à l'époque du latin tardif: essai de reconstruction, in: Calboli 1990, S. 111–128.
- E. Gamillscheg (1969): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache* [EWFS]. Heidelberg: Winter.
- K. E. Georges/H. Georges (1951): *Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch*. Bd. 1. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt (= Nd. von 1912/18).
- G. Gómez de Silva (1985): *Elsevier's concise Spanish etymological dictionary*. Amsterdam [etc.]: Elsevier.
- C. H. Grandgent (1934): *An introduction to Vulgar Latin*. New York: Hafner (= Nd. 1962).
- G. Gröber (1885): Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter (Forts.). *ALL* 2, 100–115.
- (1904–1906) (Hrsg.): *Grundriß der Romanischen Philologie*, Bd. 1, Straßburg: Trübner.
- E. Herzog (1904) (Rez.): O. Densusianu. *Histoire de la Langue Roumaine* (Paris 1901). *ALL* 13, 139f.
- J. B. Hofmann (1952): Zur Wortschöpfung im Lateinischen. *IF* 60, 273–276.
- G. Körting (1907): *Lateinisch-Romanisches Wörterbuch (Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Romanischen Hauptsprachen)*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- M. Leumann (1963): *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*: HdA 2.2.1. München: Beck (= Nd. von 1926–1928).
- (1977): *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Bd. 1 der *Lateinischen Grammatik* von Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr; HdA 2.2.1. München: Beck (vollständig überarbeitete Neuauflage von 1963).
- E. Löfstedt (1936): *Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax*. Lund: Gleerup.
- (1959): *Late Latin*. Oslo: Aschehoug & Co.
- J. P. Machado (1977): *Dicionário etimológico da língua portuguesa*. 5 vol. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte.
- Th. H. Maurer Jr. (1959): *Gramática do latim vulgar*. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria Acadêmica.
- W. Meyer-Lübke (1890): *Italienische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Reisland.
- (1894): *Romanische Formenlehre*, Bd. 2 der *Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen*. Leipzig: Reisland.
- (1903): Zu den lateinischen Glossen. *WSt* 25, 90–109.
- (1904): Die lateinische Sprache in den romanischen Ländern, in: G. Gröber (Hrsg.) 1904–1906, S. 451–497.
- (1935): *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [REW]. Heidelberg: Winter.

- F. G. Mohl (1899): *Introduction à la chronologie du latin vulgaire. Étude de philologie historique*. Paris: Bouillon.
- H. Möller (1879): Epenthese vor *k*-lauten im germanischen als wirkung des velaren oder palatalen charakters des wurzelauslauts [Habil. Kiel]. *KZ* 24, 427–522.
- O. Panagl (1980): Zur Problematik semantischer Rekonstruktion in der Etymologie. In: *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der 6. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (Wien 1978)*. Hg. von M. Mayrhofer, M. Peters und O. Pfeiffer. Wiesbaden: Reichert. S. 317–327.
- J. Picoche (1971): *Nouveau dictionnaire étymologique du français*. Paris: Hachette-Tchou.
- J. Pirson (1901): *La langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule*. Bruxelles: Office de Publicité/Société Belge de Libraire.
- V. Pisani (<sup>2</sup>1960): *Testi latini arcaici e volgari con commento glottologico (= Manuale storico della lingua latina. Vol. III)*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- S. Puşcariu (1905): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der rumänischen Sprache. I. Lateinische Element*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- A. Regnier (1886): *De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin*. Paris: Hachette.
- H. Rix (1965): Lat. *iecur, iocineris*. *MSS* 18, 79–92 (= FS W. Wissmann zum 65. Geburtstag. III. Teil).
- H. Roensch (1887): *Semasiologische Beiträge zum lateinischen Wörterbuch. I. Heft: Substantiva*. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag (R. Reisland).
- G. Rohlf's (1949): *Historische Grammatik der Italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten. Bd. 2: Formenlehre und Syntax*. Bern: Francke.
- J. Rougé (1966): *Expositio totius mundi et gentium. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et commentaire: Sources Chrétiennes 124*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- H. Schuchardt (1866–1868): *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*. 3 Bde: I. 1866, II. 1867, III. 1868. Leipzig: Teubner.
- (1874): Zur romanischen sprachwissenschaft. Lateinische und romanische deklination. *KZ* 22, 153–190.
- A. Silvagni (1922): *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae [ICUR]*. Vol. I. Rom: Befani.
- Th. Sinko (1904): Die Descriptio orbis terrae, eine Handelsgeographie aus dem 4. Jahrhundert. *ALL* 13, 531–571.
- K. Sittl (1882): *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des afrikanischen Lateins*. Erlangen (Nd. 1972, Hildesheim: Gerstenberg).
- (1885): Zur Beurteilung des sogenannten Mittellateins. *ALL* 2, 551–580.
- P. Tekavčić (1972): *Grammatica storica dell'italiano*. Vol. III: *Lessico*. Bologna: Mulino.
- V. Väänänen (1963): *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- J. Wackernagel (1890): Miscellen zur griechischen grammatik. *KZ* 30, 293–316.
- (1895): Miscellen zur griechischen grammatik. *KZ* 33, 1–62.
- M. L. Wagner (1960–64): *Dizionario etimologico sardo [DES]*. 3 vol. Heidelberg: Winter.
- A. Walde/J. B. Hofmann (<sup>2</sup>1982): *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch [LEW]*. 3 Bde. Heidelberg: Winter (Nd. von <sup>3</sup>1938–54).
- W. v. Wartburg (1949): *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch [FEW]*. Bd. 3. Tübingen: Mohr (= Nd. von <sup>1</sup>1934).
- B. Wiese (1928): *Altitalienisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.