

Tp 491p/33



THE BRITISH ACADEMY

On Ancient Greek Accentuation

By

J. P. Postgate

Fellow of the Academy

[*From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XI*]

1925

London

Published for the British Academy
By Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press
Amen House, E.C.

Price Five Shillings net

491p/33
Tp





ON ANCIENT GREEK ACCENTUATION

By J. P. POSTGATE

FELLOW OF THE ACADEMY

Communicated January 28, 1925

My principal aim in the following pages is to maintain, develop, and elucidate the views upon the principles and details of Greek Accentuation which have been put before the public in my *Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek*, published at the end of 1924 by the University Press of Liverpool, but which the scope and size of that work made it impossible to treat there with the fullness that the importance of their subject required. I have prefaced what I have to say upon them by some general observations which in the present conditions of the study appeared to be both necessary and opportune. With the view of abbreviating what in any case must be a lengthy disquisition, I have observed the following rules. I have not repeated anything in the *Guide* except where clearness in exposition or some need for amplification demanded such repetition. The appearance of the second edition of E. BOISACQ'S *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (with its supplement of additions and corrections), 1923, has freed me from the necessity of loading my pages with references to etymological discussions in learned periodicals, full references to which may there be found. A considerable part of this paper is taken up with the examination of theories set out in two important and much discussed monographs, BENJAMIN I. WHEELER'S *Der griechische Nominalaccent*, 1885, and WALTER PETERSEN'S *Greek Diminutives in -ων, a Study in Semantics*, 1910. In the case of both these works I have left to the reader the task of determining the exact amounts of truth and error which they severally hold in solution. Such an analysis would have added much to the length of my investigation and have obscured the presentation of its results. It would have had this effect in particular where Mr. Petersen's work was being considered, and to avoid this I have given copious and in general continuous extracts from his text, only using spaced type

to signalize anything to which for any reason I thought attention should be drawn.

A difficulty with which a writer on the accents of Ancient Greek has inevitably to contend is the existence of a genuine and widespread, though often unacknowledged, distaste for the subject. This distaste, which must always spring up in matters where, as in the pronunciation of Greek accents in Europe, theory is divorced from practice, has found a natural vent in a scepticism, again not always avowed, as to the value and certainty of what is included in the traditional system. The culmination of this scepticism appears in a paper, fitly emanating from St. Petersburg, by K. LUGEBIL, who died from a 'Gehirnschlag' before the publication of its second instalment, which was admitted into the *Rheinisches Museum*, vol. 43, pp. 1-20 and 220-35. The aim of this iconoclast was to prepare a way for the total supersession of the established system of Greek accentuation by sapping the foundations upon which its credit rested. The direct effect of Lugebil's treatment of the subject, loosely conceived and weakly argued as it was,¹ upon those whose judgements mattered may seem to have been negligible; but indirectly the propositions which it maintained that we have no right 'to count on the correct and accurate determination of the position and character of the accent in Greek' (p. 1), that 'the Alexandrine scholars could not' (note the choice of expression) 'escape gross errors and misapprehensions in the observation and determination of the accent of the living language' (p. 18), that 'the testimonies of Aristarchus should be subjected to severe revision' (p. 14 and note), that corroborations of the traditional Greek accent by other Indo-European languages (admitted by Lugebil in the case of *ἴππος*) 'hold good only for single words or, with less probability, for groups of words' (p. 20), that 'in order to escape the charge of false pretence to knowledge we should disregard the marking of the accent in Greek' (p. 235), are so much in consonance with the discontent of which I have spoken and make such an appeal to the modern conceit of superiority where ancient witnesses² are concerned, that I should not be justified in ignoring them altogether at the outset of this inquiry.

Our knowledge of the accents of Greek reposes on a triple foundation, the direct statements of the ancient authorities, for the most part professional exponents, the markings in Greek manuscripts, including

¹ The frequency in his exposition of expressions like 'might' and 'could not but —', 'nicht umhin konnte zu' (pp. 221, 222 (*bis*) and elsewhere), is noticeable and significant.

² On which see my paper, 'Flaws in Classical Research', in the *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1907-8), pp. 186 sqq. and elsewhere.

papyri, and the pronunciation of speakers and readers of Greek who utter the accent according to an oral tradition going back in the main, as it would appear, to Byzantine times. These are the primary sources of our knowledge. They are supplemented to a certain extent from the results of the scientific investigation of the phenomena in the language itself and in its relations to other members of the Indo-European family. Inasmuch as we can have no security that we have reached the truth, or such part of it as is now discoverable, until the evidence under all these heads has been gathered and its trustworthiness ascertained, a survey of the whole field is needed to show us how far this has been at present achieved.

In the collection of the ancient evidence there seems little still to be done. The works of CHANDLER, VENDRYES, and EHRLICH, supplemented by numerous articles in foreign, chiefly French and German, periodicals, provide or at least indicate the materials which an inquirer will need. The appraisal of the evidence has not advanced as far; there are still not a few doubts to be cleared up and contradictions to be removed or explained.

The ascertainment of the evidence of the manuscripts leaves more to be desired. In the interests of Greek accentuation Greek codices have still to be subjected to a scrutiny such as Lachmann and his successors have applied to Latin codices in the interests of Roman spelling. Those who turn the pages of Chandler's *Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation* in search for precise information about a given accent will find themselves too often put off with phrases. 'The books', we are told, disagree among themselves, or their testimony differs from that of the grammarians; but hardly a word is said about the age or character of the witnesses, without which attempts to estimate their evidence are but gropings in the dark. To take a couple of instances, are the anomalous accents of *πόλιος* adj. Oppian, *Cyneg.* 3. 310 and of *νυμφίον* (*ἕμνον*) Nonnus 47. 464 (below, pp. 24, 25) to be regarded as real exceptions or simple errors of copyists? Without inquiring into the fidelity of the manuscripts of these authors, who can tell?

The necessity of such inquiries is recognized by J. WACKERNAGEL in part iii of his series of *Akzentstudien* (see below, p. 6, n. 2), 1914, pp. 124 sqq.; the question between *ἄσσον* and *ἄσσον* in Herodotus cannot be satisfactorily settled until the relative *fides* of the two classes of MSS. denoted by *a* and *β* respectively has been ascertained.

While however we insist on the need for a more methodical treatment of details and the abandonment of the haphazard pro-

cedure that has hitherto prevailed, we must not leave it to be supposed that the imperfections of our investigations and the conflicts or deficiencies in the evidence affect the certainty of Greek Accentuation in general. About the accents of the mass of individual Greek words there is no dispute. The vast majority of the discrepancies in 'the books' are unimportant and disappear on examination. Forty-four years before Lugebil's assault upon tradition G. J. PENNINGTON, once a Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, showed this excellently in a particular case. Pages 93 to 98 of his *Essay on the Pronunciation of the Greek Language* contain an analysis of the discrepancies of three manuscripts in the Burney Collection of the British Museum in the first twenty verses of St. Luke's Gospel. 248 accent marks come there into the reckoning. On 237 of these the manuscripts are agreed. Of the 11 discrepancies only one affects the place of the accent, one manuscript having the manifestly false accent *δικαίωμασι*, due merely to ignorance or oversight. Pennington, with justice, concludes that the discrepancies show that the writers of the MSS. were all guided by the same system and that the mistakes are not sufficient to throw any doubt upon that system.

The evidential value of the correspondences under the third head cannot of course be demonstrated to those who are determined to gainsay it; and it is perfectly true that in some respects the accentuation of the spoken language, which we call Modern Greek, has changed from that of the ancient form. But that does not prove that the accents of the ancient form have not been in general retained. An exactly parallel case is the preservation of the classical accentuation of Latin in the liturgy of the Catholic Church even in countries where the Neo-Latin speech exhibits deviations therefrom.

Importance is not unnaturally attached to the cases where the current and recorded accent agrees with what might be expected or deduced from the general conditions of the Greek language itself, or what is attested by other Indo-European tongues. Lugebil himself, as we have seen, was fain to ascribe some weight to such agreements in a particular instance, but declined, irrationally, to let them count towards a general confirmation of the credibility of the established system.

No investigation of the accent of Ancient Greek can be anything but fruitless which does not follow through all its ramifications and consequences the dependence of that accent on Quantity and the Distribution of Quantity. For a statement so obvious,

and for other elementary observations which in the interests of clearness I shall be obliged to insert in this paper, I should offer an apology, were it not that of the confusions which the unapprehending fidelity of the later Greek grammarians could not always escape a number still persist. On paper, if not in speech, we do sufficiently discriminate between accents that are marked by different signs. But can the same be said of the four different 'acutes' of λέγε, λέγω, λέξω, and λήγω, merged under a single symbol and the common title of paroxytone? I address myself therefore first to questions of nomenclature and classification.

For the purposes of description as distinct from scientific classification I have, in the second chapter of my *Short Guide*, divided the accents of Ancient Greek into Recessive and Non-Recessive. The definition of Recessive Accents there given may be restated here as follows. Recessive Accents are those which, for any reason whatever, are at the maximum distance from the end of a word permitted by the laws of quantity in their application to accentuation, all other accents being Non-Recessive.

Under Recessive accents are accordingly comprised:

1. Original Unshifted accents, as δώδεκα = Sanskrit dvādaśa.
2. Unoriginal accents, the products of enclisis, as in (πάλιν)φερόμεθα from *πάλιν-φερομεθα.
3. Shifted accents which under the stress of the laws of quantity have moved Forward, but still remain at a maximum distance from the end of the word, as ἠδίων = Sanskrit svādīyān.
4. Shifted accents which have moved Backward till they are at a maximum distance from the end of the word, as ἔρημος, Attic for ἐρήμος.

This dichotomy is an empirical one and devised for practical convenience. It takes no account of origins; and while the title 'Non-Recessive' is exact, that of 'Recessive' is exposed to the objection that in one only of the four classes that are included under it has the accent actually 'receded'.¹ Its merit is that it brings together on the one hand all the words that conform or have been made to conform to a mode of accentuation which was undoubtedly the predominant one in all the dialects of Greek, Doric excepted,² and which in Aeolic was erected into a principle; and on the other hand all those which either wholly or in part have resisted the

¹ 'Recessive' then will be used in default of a better term; but 'receding' and 'recession' will be avoided, 'retracted' and 'retraction' being employed instead.

² That is, Doric *so far as we know it*.

influence and maintained their independence. *Similia similibus comparantur*; and the perception that a large majority of the forms of Greek words were accented on a given plan must have had a sensible effect upon the Greek linguistic consciousness, as we can see for example from the Attic 'retractions' in ἔρημος, τραγῳδίαι, and the like. Compare the list in B. I. Wheeler, *Der griechische Nominalaccent*, pp. 113 sqq.

Under Non-Recessive Accents are included not only such accents as have resisted the tendency to 'Retraction' and remain in their original position, but also those which from special causes as the influence of analogy ('similium cum similibus comparatio'), as I have already said, or the desire for Differentiation (διαστολή) have shifted in the reverse direction.¹ Thus of the abstracts in -της discussed by J. Wackernagel,² δημοτής (Homer) and κουφοτής 'Attic', instead of -ότης, seem to be due to the analogy of -υτής in βραδυτής, βαρυτής (Wackernagel), while χιλῶν, elliptical in the sense of χιλίων δραχμῶν, is thus accented to avoid confusion with the masculine (*Guide*, p. 93).

It would be a curious, though perhaps unprofitable, speculation to consider to what extent the 'Sprachgefühl' of the Greeks was affected by the coincidence of shifted and unshifted accents, for example, whether the associations in λογίων from λόγιον and in πεδίων from πεδίον were precisely the same. It might however be worth while to examine to what extent in various writings Recessive accents outnumber Non-Recessive. In two small extracts of verse and prose, Sophocles, *Oed. Tyr.* 1-30, and Demosthenes, *Leptines*, one page from the beginning of Blass's Teubner text, I found that omitting short monosyllables and enclitics the figures were: *O. T.* Recessive 82, Non-Recessive 49; *Leptines*, Recessive 112, Non-Recessive 47.

To the perception of the Greeks the distance of an accent from a given point, say the end of the last sound of a word, was measured in two ways not always discriminated enough in modern disquisitions, by syllables and by Units of Quantity (*Guide*, §§ 52 sqq.). By Quantity is meant duration or amount of time occupied in the utterance of the sounds constituting a syllable so far as this was recognized for the purposes of metre or of

¹ These are sometimes called Progressive Accents, as by Hirt, though they are hardly numerous or important enough to need a separate denotation.

² *Nachrichten v. d. Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Classe*, 1909, *Akzentstudien*, i. pp. 58 sqq.; ib. 1914, *Akzentstudien*, ii, pp. 33 sq.

accentuation (*Guide*, l. c.). The received name for a unit of quantity, taken by a convention as the quantity of a syllable ending in a short vowel, was called a 'time' by Greek grammarians, χρόνος, and by Latin 'tempus'; but by modern scholars a 'mora'.¹ A long syllable by a corresponding convention was taken to be one containing two χρόνοι or moras. But evidence is not lacking that more exact measurements were known to the ancients as may be seen from the remark of the commentator on the Manual of Hephaestion (p. 93, Westphal), that while οἱ μετρικοί, that is, οἱ γραμματικοί, did not recognize long syllables of more than 2 χρόνοι, the ῥυθμικοί (or μουσικοί) took account of syllables of $2\frac{1}{2}$ (as in ὦς) and even more χρόνοι.

For a due appreciation of the facts and problems of Greek accentuation regard must be had in the first instance to Moras, but on this a consideration of Syllables must be superposed. So far as units of quantity are concerned the accents of ὀ-δ and οὐ = ὄδ are the same; but it would be a neglect of the 'break', of whatever character this is, which demarcates the syllables, to treat them as identical. In a pair of words, e. g. ἤλιε and Φοῖβε, the distance of the accent from the end of the word may be the same in moras but different in syllables, or as in μεσόνουξ and κήρουξ it may be the same in syllables but different in moras. Or again the two words may contain the same number both of moras and of syllables, but their accents may differ, as in ἔλαμπε and ἀνέμων, through a different distribution of the moras among the syllables. Furthermore, the particular constitution of a syllable is not without its effect upon the accentuation. For the purposes of prosody a short vowel followed in the same syllable by a consonant, and a long vowel or diphthong, are equivalents, but *not* for the purposes of accentuation. For a syllable containing the first can only be accented on the first of its moras, but one containing the second on either of them (compare *Guide*, § 69).

The differences which spring from these facts, and which are imperfectly represented in the current accentuation of Greek words, render it advisable to repeat from *Guide*, § 67, a table showing the

¹ Hermann, *de emendanda ratione Graecae grammaticae* (1808), p. 63, says 'Ea res omnis hac continetur regula ut morae quae vocantur a grammaticis, i. e. brevium syllabarum pondera, omnis accentuum doctrinae fundamentum habeantur'. I do not know who these grammatici are. The words of (Sergius) in *explanationes* of Donatus, Keil, iv, p. 533 (the locus classicus on the Greek accent) 'Concessum est eam moram quae brevis syllaba dicatur unum et breuissimum tempus uocari' lend no support to this use. So it may be an error of Hermann's.

actual varieties of the Greek accent in its relation to moras and syllables, enlarged by the addition of examples of accents upon syllables containing more than two moras including the ἀντανακλωμένη or sixth accent (third circumflex) of Glaucus of Samos.

Word.	Number of Syllables in word.	Number of Moras in word.	Distance of accent from end of word in Moras.
μά	1	1	1
χρή	1	2	1
νοῦ	1	2	2
ἴνα	2	2	2
δίκη	2	3	3
{ ἔνθα	2	3	3
{ δῶρα	2	3	3
μνήμη	2	4	3
ἄλλη	2	4	4
ἔλαβε	3	3	3
βέβαια	3	4	4
εὐβουλα	3	5	4
δύστηνα	3	5	5

(Accented syllable containing $2\frac{1}{2}$ or 3 Moras)

γραῦ	1	3	3
νήττα	2	4	4

As I have discussed the character, marking, and naming of the accents of Glaucus on two occasions already, in the *Classical Review*, 13, pp. 364 sqq., and *Guide*, pp. 12 sqq., I only add that my view agrees in substance with F. SCHOELL'S 'De accentu linguae latinae' in *Acta societatis philologiae Lipsiensis*, 6, p. 81. But for the name of Glaucus' second circumflex, missing in the MSS., I now take ἀνακεκλασμένη instead of ἀνακλωμένη (Schoell), for the reasons given in *Guide*, pp. 12 n. 2, 14. νήτη, which Lentz, *Herodian*, i, p. xlii, has taken from Wilmanns, and ἴση Weil are ruled out of court by the expressions of Sergius in the immediate context 'cuius ex ipsis nominibus intellectu proclive est tres primas esse simplices et non alias quam βαρείαν μέσην ὀξεΐαν, postremas autem tres duplices et quasi species unius flexae quae est genere una'. Wilmanns himself says 're vera flexa erat'. The tense of Keil's περικεκλασμένη is right; but the preposition most suitable is ἀνα-. The signs of the 3 circumflexes are Λ, V, W; see *Guide*, § 35.

Of the two last words in the table γραῦ has the ἀντανακλωμένη and νήττα a κεκλασμένη (περισπωμένη) followed by one βαρεία or (the same thing) an ὀξεΐα followed by two βαρεία. That in a number of Greek

words chiefly of nominal formation the Recessive accent of classical times is due to Retraction is now an accepted doctrine of the textbooks. Let it be enough to refer to Wheeler, *Nominalaccent*, p. 115, and H. Hirt, *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, pp. 274 sqq. The normal amount of retraction as there set forth (Hirt, op. cit., § 272 init. with note 6; compare ib., d 2 (β) fn.) is One Mora, and the instances in which this amount has been exceeded, as in Attic $\xi\gamma\omega\gamma\epsilon$ from $*\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\gamma\epsilon$ (*Guide*, p. 92), require special explanations.

In two classes of cases it has hitherto been customary to connect Retraction of the accent with specific combinations of quantity, that is, particular metrical feet. The feet thus selected are the Trochee and the Dactyl.

Of these the former need not detain us long. The law of the Trochee ('Hemagesetz', as the Germans call it) prescribes that in disyllabic words of the form $- \cup$ the accent shall be on the third mora from the end. It applies equally to words which owe their long syllable to the length of the vowel, as $\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$, and to those where the length is produced by the conjunction of short vowel and consonant, as $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\lambda\alpha$. The quantitative equivalence of these two forms is shown by their similar accentuation when preceding enclitics such as $\tau\epsilon$, e. g. $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\epsilon$, $\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\epsilon$; and by their similar treatment in the scores of the Delphic musical inscriptions (*Guide*, § 273). For some interesting examples see E. HERMANN'S *Silbenbildung im Griechischen &c.*, 1923, § 120. But the resemblance ends there. From the first trochaic words like $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\lambda\alpha$ were, and (see p. 7, above) could only be, accented on the first mora of the closed syllable. But words like $\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ could be and were accented on the second mora of the open syllable. And that accentuation is preserved in Doric, e. g. in $\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$. This retraction of one mora, in so far as it has any relation to the metrical form of the word, will have been due to the influence of the trochaic words with *closed* first syllable; $\phi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ and $\delta\omega\rho\alpha$ were recognized as 'similia', both being of the form $- \cup$. The accent of $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\lambda\alpha$ could not be accommodated to the accent of $*\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$. But the converse accommodation was in accordance with the general trend of Greek speech, and with the retraction of the accent to $\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ the sense of disparity disappeared. Retraction of the accent to the third mora ($\cup \cup \cup$ to $\cup \cup \cup$) is seen also in words which end in a Tribach; compare p. 22 below. But there the working of our tendency was restrained by the fact that the retraction had to overleap the bar of the syllable. Bearing this in mind, we shall conclude that in the change of $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\acute{\omicron}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ to $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ the

stages were not *ἑσταότος*, *ἑστάοτος*, *ἑστῶτος*, but *ἑσταότος*, *ἑστῶτος*, *ἑστῶτος*.

Compare the enclitic forms of the personal pronouns *ἡμιν*, *ὑμιν* from *ἡμῖν*, *ὑμῖν*, below, p. 39.

The second attempt to associate a position of the acute accent with a metrical form is known as WHEELER'S LAW. Its distinguished author, unfortunately withdrawn too soon from philological researches by the ties of academic administration, propounded it among the theses of his treatise on the Nominal Accent in Greek, pp. 89 sqq., in the following terms: Oxytone words ending in a dactyl become Paroxytone ('Daktylisch ausgehende Oxytona werden zu Paroxytona'). The 'Law' won wide acceptance in Continental circles. Among its adherents were K. BRUGMANN in his *Grundriss* and *Griechische Grammatik*, and J. Vendryes in his *Traité d'accentuation grecque*, 1904, pp. 148 sqq. Soon after its appearance it had been subjected to a detailed examination by F. G. ALLINSON in the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. 12 (1891), pp. 49 sqq. But Allinson's criticisms, partly perhaps through ineffective presentation, failed to dislodge it from its position, as may be seen from the substantial if not complete acceptance of it by W. Petersen in the valuable monograph already cited, H. HIRT in his *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (ed. 2, 1912),¹ A. Thumb in the fifth edition of Brugmann's *Gr. Grammatik*, 1913, J. Wackernagel in his *Akzentstudien*, ii (1914), p. 27, and E. Hermann (1923) in the work already cited.

Wheeler's Law seems to have owed its vogue in large measure to its attractive compactness as a formula. In one short sentence it combined, as may be readily seen from its author's treatment of details, two entirely different propositions, one that Greek hyperdisyllabic stems with paroxytone accent showed a preponderance of dactylic terminations, and the other that oxytone words which were dactylic in Indo-European changed to paroxytone in Greek. But the first proposition was obviously of no use for the establishment of the second until it was shown (*a*) that the Greek dactylic paroxytones were *not* Indo-European paroxytones which had remained paroxytone in Greek, nor again until it was shown (*b*) that in the linguistic consciousness of the Greek there was some subtle association between dactylic form and paroxytone accent, so that in words which originally had dactylic form but oxytone

¹ The work of Allinson, whose name I regret to say was misprinted in the *Guide* as 'Atkinson', is not fairly judged by Hirt, *op. cit.*

accent the accent was accommodated to the form. For neither (a) nor (b) did Wheeler furnish proofs.

For a refutation of the presumption that there was in Greek any such association between form and accent as Wheeler has imagined, it is enough to refer to the collections of Allinson. Some striking instances, however, may be cited, mostly from Wheeler himself; Sanskrit gives ' *विष्कति*, but Greek *εἰκοσι*, Sanskrit *subhāra* and similar compounds, but Greek *εὐφορος* and the like (Wheeler, p. 88). The adjectival termination *-λεος* is neither proparoxytone, as on Wheeler's scheme might have been expected, nor oxytone, but paroxytone as *θαρσαλέος*, *λευγαλέος*,¹ with one exception the dactylic *ἡλεός*. Hirt, whose adhesion to Wheeler I have some difficulty in understanding, has a deadly paragraph, op. cit. § 271 (f) 'exceptions are not rare. Words which show a definite suffix, such as those in *-ικος*, may be disregarded here, since in them we may be dealing with the effects of "systematic" assimilation (Systemzwang). Of more importance are isolated words like *ὀμφαλός*, *μυελός*, *ὄρφανός*, *ἀδελφεός*, of which no explanation has as yet been given.' Not less significant is the circumstance that Hirt omits from his account of the 'Law' all reference to the 'diminutives' in *-ιον*, even carrying silence to the extent of leaving this suffix without any indications of its accent, §§ 324, 325, while in § 272 he applies his own law that, 'if the accent is on the penultimate mora of a word, it is retracted one mora', to dactylic words like *ἐλθετε* from **ἐλθέτε*, *ἐνέγκου* for *ἐνέγκεο* from **ἐνεγκέο*.

So much in general estimate of the Law. Its validity, or invalidity, cannot be adequately tested without examining in detail some of its particular applications, and the one that offers itself as most instructive for this purpose is the one which Hirt has omitted and to which Petersen has given his special attention.

The most convenient procedure will be to quote from the latter his account as far as possible in full in the manner indicated above, p. 1, premising only that his interest in the subject is, as the title of the dissertation implies, primarily in the development of the meaning of these formations and only secondarily in their accentuation.

He says, op. cit., p. 10:

§ 21. The generally accepted rule, both by ancient grammarians and modern authorities, is that polysyllabic diminutives follow the analogy of other polysyllables and retract their accent: cf. *βίλασμον*, *δικαστήριον*, *ἡρμίθιον*, *σπαθάιον*, &c. But dactylic trisyllabic diminutives, whether the first syllable is long by nature

¹ See Herodian, i. 114. 15 sqq. (Lentz), with the note. The proparoxytones *δαιδάλεος*, *κομισάλεος*, *αιθάλεος* (also *-λέος*) are formed from stems in *-αλο*.

or position, accent the *ι* of the suffix as παιδίον, τυμβίον, or ψωμίον, while tribrach diminutives accent the first syllable as θρόνιον, λίθιον or πτύχιον. So for instance it is stated in the Scholia to Dionysius Thrax AB. 856 τὰ γὰρ εἰς τὸν ὑποκοριστικά, τρισύλλαβα, ἀρχόμενα ἀπὸ βραχείας (προπαρ)οξύνεται, σπόλιον, πόδιον, χέριον, σάκιον ὅτε δι' ἐνὸς κίππα' ὅτε δὲ διὰ δύο, παραξύνονον, σακκίον. κορρίον διὰ δύο βῆ παρα Ἀττικοῖς, κόριον δὲ διὰ ἐνὸς βῆ παρὰ τῷ Θεοκρίτῳ. Cf. also Chandler, *Gr. Acc.*², p. 101; Janson, op. cit. 4. This canon for the accentuation of diminutives is in contrast with that of adjectives in *-ιος*, which, with very few exceptions, retract their accent as far as possible: ἀγώνιος, ἄλιος, ἴδιος. Cf. Chandler, op. cit., p. 115 f. Nouns which but recently were substantivized from adjectives of course retain their recessive accent: ἰσθμιον, δέσμιον, &c. Other exceptions are explained on the ground of contraction, dactylic words having arisen out of original tetrasyllables, e. g. βοῖδιον < βοῖδιον, γῆδιον < γηῖδιον, νοῖδιον < νοῖδιον.

§ 22. If we state the rule as above, as applying to diminutives, it is too narrow; for there are a large number of words which never had any diminutive meaning, old and common words too, which follow the rule. I may mention ἀμνιον, βιβλίον, ἰσχίον, ἦνια, ἦριον, εἰρίον (later for εἴριον), ἰστίον, κηρίον, μηρίον, θηρίον, ἰνίον, ὀλκίον, πηνίον, σχοινίον, τειχίον, φορτίον, φυκίον, χωρίον. For other examples cf. Chandler, op. cit., p. 105 f. All of these here mentioned except βιβλίον, ὀλκίον, εἰρίον, σχοινίον, χωρίον, possibly ἀμνιον occur as here accented in Homer, Hesiod, or Archilochus, before the diminutive meaning of *-ιον* had ever been developed. We cannot therefore satisfy ourselves with Janson (l. c.) that these have followed the analogy of the diminutives.

After some criticism of the views of Chandler and Allinson (who also have found the term 'diminutive' unsatisfactory, below, p. 18), which it is unnecessary to quote, the writer continues:

We must therefore state our rule in a different way: 'Trisyllabic substantives in *-ιον*, if all connection with the adjectival types from which they are derived has faded from the mind, have a tendency to accent the penult if they are dactylic, but the antepenult if they are tribrachs.'

§ 23. I have said 'have a tendency', for, if it is stated as a rule, there are numerous exceptions even as it is here formulated. Chandler, p. 106 f. gives a long list of 'Diminutives in Form and Signification, but not in Accent', i. e. dactylic words accenting the first syllable, so e. g. ἄσκιον, γάνδιον, δένδριον, ζῶνιον, λίθιον, λύχνιον, νήπτιον, ὄσπριον, τρύβλιον, ὄμιον. Altogether there are fifty-seven mentioned exclusive of compounds, some of which are found with both accentuations, but most are always accented on the antepenult. We even find κάδδιον contrasted to καδίον. Cf. also Janson, op. cit. 20 f. On the other hand, there is a number of tribrach diminutives which accent the penult. Cf. Janson, 21 f.; Chandler, 104 f.; Allinson, *A. J. of Ph.* 12. 55. Chandler¹ quotes some thirty different tribrach words which accent the penult according to some authorities. Most of these are also found with the accent on the antepenult, and so may be false forms, though it is at least equally probable that

¹ It must be observed here that the two lists in Chandler referred to in this passage, §§ 347, 350, stand much in need of revision.

the accent varied in actual speech. Such words are *θυρίον*, *κτενίον*, *πτυχίον*, *ράκιον*, *σφυρίον*. Others may be due to an interchange of *-ιον* with *-ειον* as *πυρίον* for *πυρείον*. But two, namely *σκαφίον* and *πεδίον*, are attested by a large number of passages. The former, however, may have gotten its accent by analogy to *κυρβίον* or by influence of *σκαφείον*, but the one word *πεδίον*, which is as old as Homer and practically free from analogical influences, is enough to show that the accent on the penult was not in every case due to the dactylic form of a word. For that *πεδίον* should have been accented in this manner simply to distinguish it from *πέδιον*, diminutive of *πέδη* (Janson, *op. cit.* 10), is utterly incredible and not warranted by the passage cited (*Etym. Mag.* 658. 24 ff.).

In § 25, p. 13, he says that 'the wavering of the *-ιον* forms'

has often been attributed to the working of Wheeler's 'dactylic law', the law that dactylic endings with the accent on the ultima become paroxytone, which, in spite of the uncertainty of the precise conditions under which the change occurred, we may accept as a fact. . . . Just as **παχυλός* (*παχυλῶς*) is contrasted with *δριμύλος* < **δριμυλός*, so we get *σφηκίον* from **σφηκιδόν*. Although there is no example of a neuter in *-ιδόν*, we do find traces of the law in masculine in *-ιος*, and in adjectives in *-ιος*, *-ια*, *-ιον*. Thus *γομφίος*, *κωβίος*, *νυμφίος*, and *σκορπίος* are opposed to *βομβυλῖος*, *μητρυῖος*, *πατριῖος*, or among adjectives *βαλιῖος*, *λαλιῖος*, *πελιῖος*, *σκολιῖος* are opposed to *άντιος*, *μῦριος*, *πλησιος*. It is, then, beyond doubt that the law must have had its influence on the neuter substantives also, so as to diminish the number of oxytones and increase the number of paroxytones and thus pave the way for the complete disappearance of the former.

In § 26 he proceeds :

It would, however, be a mistake to conclude that the original form was in every case an oxytone or a paroxytone. The three different types represented by *ζώνιον*, *πεδίον*, and *σφηκίον* < **σφηκιδόν* or the adjectives *ἄλιος*, *άντιος*, *σκολιῖος* are all inherited from the Iudo-European mother-tongue, as is shown by the corresponding variety of accent of the Sanskrit words in *-(i)ya*.¹

In §§ 27 and 28 he states his conclusions :

The distinction of accent between adjectives, which usually have recessive accents, masculine substantives, which mostly accent the ultima (Chandler, 67 f.), and neuter substantives or 'diminutives' which have a tendency to accent the penult when dactylic, otherwise to have recessive accent, is altogether secondary ; for a few adjectives have kept the old accent (see § 25), while on the other hand a number of substantives with no adjective connections retract their accent although dactyls. And to the rule that non-dactylic substantives have recessive accent we have the one certain exception *πεδίον* which can only be explained by assuming that it inherited the old accent. . . . It follows from this that the accent will be of no help whatever in discerning the different strata of *-ιον* substantives in their gradual separation from the adjectives.

¹ Then follow examples and a reference to Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*. See p. 25, below.

And he departs from the inquiry under the shelter of a plea which might have been put forward by a Lugebil: ¹

Adding to this the fact that all our knowledge of accent comes from the Alexandrian grammarians and their successors, and that we never can be quite sure how old their accentuation is, I may well be justified in omitting all reference to accent in my treatment of the semantic development of the *-ιον* diminutives.

Mr. Petersen's attitude to this question was a very natural one. As already said, his interest was in the signification of the words whose history he was tracing, and the complications of their accents he felt were here an embarrassment. But such an attitude is not the best for the pursuit of a delicate and intricate inquiry. His object was to bring all of the neuter substantives in *-ιον* into a single fold. Certain formations, 'diminutives' so called, were however recalcitrant; and these had to be coerced. They were coerced by the assumption of a chaos in Indo-European times: Oxytones, Paroxytones, and Proparoxytones in *-ιον*, *ὁμοῦ ἦν πάντα*. This hypothesis ensured that the variation in the accents should be meaningless. But to allay the suspicion that there might after all be something at the bottom of this variation, Wheeler's Law, with its purely mechanical explanation, was adopted as an auxiliary assumption.

A stricter application of the historical method should lead however to a very different result.

The Homeric neuters in *-ιον* (*-ια*) are distributed as follows:

QUADRESYLLABLES:

ἀκόνητιον Hymn to Hermes 460, *ἀράχνια*, *αἰπόλιον*, all Proparoxytone.²

TRISYLLABLES:

Dactylic:

Proparoxytone: *αἴλιον*, *δέμνια*, *ἔκρια*, *ἔχνια*, *μείλια*, *ᾔρκια* (once *Il.* 4. 158 *ᾔρκιον*), [*ρύσια*], *ἦια*, *λήιον*, *νήιον*, *ὄγκιον* (*ὄγκιον*).

Paroxytone: *ἐρκιον*, *ἦνια*, *ἦριον*, *θηριον*, *ινιον*, *ισχιον*, *κηριον*, *κρανιον*, *μηρια*, *οικία*, *πηνιον*, *τειχιον*. *φορτιον* Hesiod may be added.

Oxytone: *None*.

Tribrach:

Proparoxytone: [*κλίσιον*].

Paroxytone: *πεδιον*.

Oxytone: *None*.

¹ Above, p. 2.

² These Polysyllables are given here simply for the sake of completeness, Wheeler's Law not applying to them. The accent of all such, whatever the reason, is without exception Recessive. This applies also to Polysyllables which have become Trisyllables by contraction, as *βοιδιον* for *βοιδιον*, *καδιον*.

From this list must be omitted *ῥύσια* and *κλίσιον*. These are not formations in *-ιον* but derivatives from nouns in *-τι (-σι)* (*ῥύσι-ς, κλίσι-ς*), plus the suffix *-ον*. The latter word was used by the grammarians as a convenient example of the accents' variation with the metrical form (υ υ υ and - υ υ) of trisyllables, *κλίσιον* being proparoxytone and Attic *κλίσιον* (from *κλεισιόν*) being paroxytone. See Ebeling's *Homeric Lexicon*, s. u. *κλίσιον*.

The disappearance of *κλίσιον* from the formations in *-ιον* opens the way for the tribrach *πεδίον* to join its dactylic relatives. For *πεδίον* is to *πέδον* as *θηρίον* to *θήρ* or *τειχίον* to *τείχος*. I need add nothing to what I have quoted from Petersen, and may conclude at once that in the time of Homer the accent of all trisyllables in *-ιον* for which it is attested was paroxytone, and that the contention that it was ever oxytone is no better than a chimaera.

The list thus revised contains 10 (or including *φορτίον*, 11) paroxytone trisyllables which may be referred to extant nouns, and 3, *ἡρίον*, 'mound', 'barrow', *Iliad* 23. 126, *ἡνία* connected with *ἡνιά* which Herodian (i. 543. 3, Lentz) derives from *ἦσω*, and *ισχύον*, whose immediate congeners are unknown or uncertain.

The grammarians distinguish this class from the proparoxytones, which are sometimes called *ῥηματικά* as formed from verbs to mark them off from the *ὑποκοριστικά* or diminutives, which are offsprings from substantives: Herodian, ii. 97. 2, Lentz (Schol. A on *Iliad* 15. 676) *Ἰκρια*¹ ὡς δέμνια ἔστι γὰρ ῥηματικόν: id. i. 356. 20 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ Ἰχνιον οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ὑποκοριστικόν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ ῥήματος ἐσχημάτισται. Sometimes they are called 'possessives': id. i. 358. 6 sq. τὸ μέντοι ὄρκιον προπαροξυνόμενον κτητικῶδ' τύπου ἔχεται ἔπει δὲ ταυτοσημόν ἐστι τῷ ὄρκῳ παρωνύμφῳ εἶδει ὑποπεπτωκέσθαι φημέν ὡς τὸ Αἰτώλιος κάπριος αἰζήσιος. On this word compare Ebeling's view, s. u. 'non diminutivum voc. ὄρκιος . . . sed neutrum adiectivi ὄρκιος, i. e. quod ad iusurandum spectat', with which Petersen's agrees, op. cit. pp. 57 sq.

μείλια (which Petersen does not mention) in *Iliad* 9. 147 (289) ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ μείλια δώσω seems also to be the neuter of an adjective **μείλιος* (cf. *μείλιχος*) and to mean 'soothing gifts' (*douceurs*). Aristarchus read *ἐπιμείλια*, which would take it out of this class. Compare Apollonius, *Lex. Hom.* 110. 19 *μείλια*· *μειλίγματα οἷς ἀπομειλίσσονται*.

Ἰχνιον, with its obvious kinship to *ἴχνος* (which occurs only once in Homer, *Odyssey* 17. 317), the grammarians must have found the most puzzling of these proparoxytones. Herodian (ii. 458. 24 sq., Lentz), giving rules for the writing of *-ιον* or *-ον* in neuters of

¹ The origin of *Ἰκρια* is unknown. For possible cognates see Boisacq s. u.

disyllabic adjectives in -os, mentions *ἰχνίου* (sic) as an exception, *χωρὶς τοῦ ἰχνος ἰχνίου*.¹ But as it has a wider sense than *ἰχνος* ('τὰ ἰχνια was "everything connected with the walking", not only the foot-prints,' as Petersen says, p. 56) there seems to be no objection to regarding it as the neuter of a derivative adjective.

αὔλιον, which in Herodian, i. 360. 28, is explained as *ἡ ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς οἴκησις*, occurs first in the late Hymn to Hermes, l. 103, and elsewhere. This sense is consistent with a derivation from the neuter of *αὔλιος*, 'relating to a court or courtyard' (*αὐλή*), but not consistent with the supposition that it was itself a modification of *αὐλή*, for which, as we shall see later on, the accent *αὐλίον* was to be expected.

δέμνια, the name of a light framework of pieces of wood (whence the plural), used instead of laying the bedding on the bare ground, *Odyssey*, 19. 599 *ἡ χαμάδις στορέσας ἢ τοι κατὰ δέμνια θέντων*, is connected with no known substantive. Ancient grammarians explained it as a derivative from a verb (*ῥηματικόν*), connecting it with *δέμω*. Pedersen, however, *Kelt. Spr.* 1. 167, attaches it, with *κρήδεμνον* (= *κεφαλοδέσμιον*), to the root of *δέω*, 'bind'.

ῆια, in which apparently three different words have been fused in one (see Boisacq, s. u.), is another *ῥηματικόν*. In the sense of 'provisions' it corresponds exactly to the Latin *viatica*. What are the verbal roots for the other senses is uncertain.

Another similar formation is *λήιον*, 'standing corn', *seges*, also of uncertain origin.

νήιον again is the neuter of the adj. *νήιος*, *δόρυ* probably being understood. Compare *Iliad*, 3. 62 and 13. 391. So Apollonius, *Lex. Hom.* 116. 20 *ναυπηγήσιμον ξύλον*.

We now come to *ὄγκιον* or *ὄγκιον*, a large hamper or chest. *Odyssey*, 21. 61 *ἀμφίπολοι φέρου ὄγκιον ἐνθα σίδηρος | κείτο πολὺς καὶ χαλκός* where Schol. B has *προπαροξυτόνως τὸ ὄγκιον*, Herodian (Lentz), ii. 163. 27, but ib. i. 361. 3 it is accented *ὄγκιον* and so in ii. 458. 1. Apollonius, however, *Lex. Hom.* 118. 20, has *ὄγκιον ἄγγειον ἐν ᾧ οἱ πελέκεις κείνται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐγκεῖσθαι ἢ παρὰ τὸ ὄγκῶδη εἶναι*. *ὄγκιον* is the accentuation of Hesychius whose gloss is illuminating, *ἀγγεῖον ἐν ᾧ αἱ ἀκίδες*. *ἡ πλέγμα κιτσοειδές, ἐν ᾧ ἀπέκειντο οἱ π(ε)λέκε(ι)ς*. *εἴρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄγκου*. This is a compound of an interpretation, correct enough, of the passage (quoted above) of Homer, where alone the word is found, and of an etymology. The etymology that *ὄγκιον* was a substantive derived from *ὄγκος* (= Latin *uncus*) would account for

¹ The paroxytone accentuation of this word as of *ἰκρίον* (Chandler, § 349) seems to have been an error due to confusion. In Homer both would of course be dactylic and could not therefore come into comparison with *κλίσιον*.

the accent adopted by Hesychius; but its merit ends there. ἀκίς, 'point', is not the same as ὄγκος, 'bulk',¹ πῶγων (so Apollonius, ὄγκους· τοὺς πῶγωνας τῶν βελῶν τῶν τοξικῶν), nor is it credible that a receptacle large enough to carry the axe-heads should have been named from a small projection in an arrow-head. Accordingly this derivation has been rightly rejected, and the word connected with ὄγκος, 'bulk' or 'mass'. It would thus be the neuter² of a 'possessive' adjective *ὄγκιος, formed like ὄλβιος from ὄλβος, and Apollonius' ὄγκώδης, 'bulky', would be a proper equivalent.

We may now proceed to consider the meaning of the suffix.

The credit of discerning that the name 'hypocoristic' or diminutive (ὑποκοριστικὸν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ μείωσιν τοῦ πρωτότυπου ἀσυγκρίτως δηλοῦν οἶον ἀνθρωπίσκος λίθαξ μειρακύλλιον, Dionysius Thrax, *Ars Grammatica*, § 12 (14). 5, p. 28 Uhlig) did not apply to every neuter in -ιον belongs to an unknown ancient grammarian, whose comments on this text are preserved in the Scholia, edited by Hilgard *Grammatici Graeci*, Pars Tertia, in three versions, Scholia Vaticana, pp. 226 sq., Scholia Marciana, pp. 374 sq., and Scholia Londinensia (the fullest), pp. 538 sqq. Part of one of these, already published by Bekker in *Anecdota Graeca*, has been quoted from Petersen's book, p. 12 above. But it is worth while giving the discussion from the Scholia Vaticana in full, and noting some variations in the other versions: ὁ ὑποκορισμὸς ὀνομά ἐστι μικρότητος ἐμφαντικόν [Schol. Lond. explains that ὑποκοριστικά differ from συγκριτικά by being 'absolute', ἀπολελυμένα καὶ ἀόριστα, not 'comparative'] (κόροις) καὶ κόραις ἐοικός· λαμβάνεται δὲ ἔνεκεν τοῦ πρόποντος ὡς παρ' Ἀλκμᾶνι· κόραι γὰρ αἱ λέγουσαι [something is lost here; Schol. Lond. gives the sense ὡς παρ' Ἀλκμᾶνι εὐρομεν τὰς παρθένους ὑποκοριστικοῖς χρωμένας· πρέπει γὰρ τοῦτο παρθένους] ἢ τοῦ χρεώδους (ὡς τὸ) "ἰπάριον μοι χάρισαι", μειῶ γὰρ τὸ ζητούμενον ἵνα ἐτοιμότερον πρὸς τὸ δοῦναι ποιήσω τὸν ἔχοντα· ἢ τοῦ γελοίου χάριν ὡς τὸ Πριαμύλλιον ὁ Πρίαμος [Πριαμιλλύδριον Schol. Marc., a remarkable specimen for additions to Mr. Petersen's collection of the diminutives in -ύδριον, op. cit., p. 247]. παρὰ δὲ τῷ ποιητῇ οὐκ ἂν εὐμεθεῖη ὑποκοριστικόν· ἥρωικὰ γὰρ τὰ παρ' αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπηρμένα. τὸ τειχίου δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐρκίου οὐχ ὑποκοριστικά· διάφορον γὰρ τὸ δηλούμενον, τείχος καὶ ἔρκος ἐπὶ πόλεων, τειχίου καὶ ἔρκιον ἐπὶ ἐπαύλεων. πῶς δὲ μείωσις ὅπου τὸ μέγα; παρ' ἐκ μέγα τειχίου αὐλῆς [*Odyssey*, 16. 165]· οὕτω καὶ τὸ θηρίον· μάλα γὰρ μέγα θηρίον ἦεν [*Odyssey*, 10. 171]· καὶ τὸ

¹ By which Liddell and Scott mistranslate it at Plut. *Demetr.* 20.

² Or possibly a masculine with the ellipse of a noun. For there is nothing in the verse of the *Odyssey* to fix its gender.

μηρῶν διάφορον· μηρία γὰρ τὰ ἐναγιζόμενα τοῖς θεοῖς, μηροὶ δὲ τὰ μὴ οὕτως ἔχοντα· οὐδὲ τὸ ὄγκιον· οὐ γὰρ τοῦ ὄγκος μείωσις· οὐδὲ τὸ ἰχνιον· ἰχνια γὰρ μετόπισθε ποδῶν ἢ δὲ κνημάτων [*Iliad*, 13. 71]. καὶ (γὰρ) περὶ αὐτοῦ φησι τρεῖς μὲν ὀρέξαν' ἰών, τὸ δὲ τέτρατον ἔκετο τέκμων [*Iliad*, 13. 20]. μάχεται καὶ ὁ τόνος· τὰ γὰρ εἰς ἰὼν ὑποκοριστικὰ τρισύλλαβα ἀρχόμενα ἀπὸ βραχείας (προπαροξύνεται, ἀπὸ δὲ μακρᾶς παροξύνεται) στόλιον πόδιον χέριον, σάκιον ὅτε δι' ἐνὸς κ' ὅτε δὲ διὰ δύο, παροξύτουον σακκίον· κορρίον διὰ δύο, παρ' Ἀττικοῖς, κόριον δὲ δι' ἐνὸς ῥ παρὰ τῷ Θεοκρίτῳ [11. 60]. ἐχρῆν ἄρα ἰχνιον· ἔστι δὲ ῥηματικόν· ὥσπερ οὖν τὸ δέμω δέμνιον καὶ ἀράσ(σ)ω ἀράχνιον [Schol. Lond. adds καὶ παίξω παλγνιον] οὕτως ἔκω ἰχνιον, ὑπερθέσει τοῦ πνεύματος. καὶ τὸ νήιον πῶς ὑποκοριστικὸν ἐπὶ τῆς Ὀδυσσεύως νεώς [*Odyssey*, 9. 498 νῆια δοῦρα], ἐφ' ἧς ὁ ποιητῆς τὸ μεγακῆτέϊ [*Iliad* 8. 222, 11. 5] φησίν·

The opposite view was long the received one. Chandler indeed, *Gr. Accentuation*, § 348, and Mr. Allinson, l. c., p. 55, had observed that it was unsatisfactory, but it was reserved for Mr. Petersen to produce a mass of evidence, the simple inspection of which shows that, though a number of the nouns in question have a 'diminutive' sense, 'diminutiveness' is not a mark of the class as a whole.

The absence of diminutives from the Homeric poems was noted in antiquity, as by the scholiast on Dionysius Thrax just quoted. Compare Petersen, op. cit., § 273. ἀκόντιον in a late Hymn (Hermes 460) might be understood as a javelin of smaller size than an ἄκων, but with writers for whom ἄκων had become obsolete it carried no suggestion of smallness as the Didot Stephanus observes; and φορτίον in Hesiod is clearly no diminutive either.

It seems impossible to fix the time when this sense attached itself to neuters in -ιον. According to Petersen (§ 276), who rejects the idea of ἀκόντιον being a diminutive in the Hymn, the earliest example is πόδιον, 'a little foot', in the Ἦρας γάμος of Epicharmos, and the development 'must probably have taken place' in the interval between the fifth century B. C. and the age of the lyric poets who use diminutives in -ίσκος and -ίσκη.

If rid of the 'diminutive' fancy we pass in review the neuter nouns in -ιον and consider their relation to their primitives, we shall find, I think, that the proper function of this suffix is to distinguish, that the derivative noun thus formed marks some special appurtenance or special form of the primitive. Thus in Hymns, vii. 32, ἰστόν τε καὶ ἰστίον is 'the mast and the mast's characteristic appurtenance', viz. the sail. On the other hand, ἐρκίον is a special modification of ἔρκος, τευχίον a peculiar τεῖχος. So too with θηρίον, for whose uses Petersen, pp. 79 sq., gives a large collection of

examples. It occurs first in the *Odyssey* (l. c., on p. 17), where it is said of a stag, μάλα γὰρ μέγα θηρίον ἦεν, which Classen quoted by Petersen mistranslates 'Es war ein grosses Untier'. For this would be θήρ, of which θηρίον was a modification, introduced because a new word was wanted to include beasts as a class distinct from wild beasts.

οἰκία again (the singular does not occur till long after Homer, in a fragment of Callimachus (198 Schneider), and *Anth. Pal.* 6. 203. 7) is a differentiation of οἶκος, 'home', 'house'. Mr. Petersen, who devotes two whole sections (88, 89) to the word, says "τὰ οἰκία, "everything belonging to the house", "the whole household"; cp. τὰ οἰκεία and the original collective ἡ οἰκία'. With this meaning we should expect a Recessive Accent, οἰκία, as in his οἰκεία which comes from οἰκία. Ebeling's Latin translation 'domicilium' (compare the use of οἰκησις in Greek) seems to agree better with the usage of the word in Homer, e. g. οἰκία ναίειν, *Iliad*, 7. 221, of a shoemaker, σκυτοτόμων ὄχ' ἄριστος "Ἔλη ἐν οἰκία ναίων, that is, 'domiciled in Hyle'. The plural, with which Petersen compares the German 'Gehöft' of a large estate, is natural in this connexion, as in the English 'your quarters', 'my lodgings'.

Somewhat analogous is κηρίον, 'waxen cells', 'honeycomb', modified from κηρός, 'wax', and κρανίου, the upper part of the head from κράνα (= κεφαλή, Hesychius). The differentiation and its motive are very clear in the case of μηρία from μηρός of which Apollonius, *Lex. Hom.* (112. 27), says τὰ μηρία οὐχ ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν ἐξαιρούμενα καὶ ἱεροθυτούμενα. The plural thus expresses the parts of the thighs cut up and burned in sacrifice, whether of one animal or several. There is the same distributive force in the Hesiodic φορτία, 'wares', by the side of φόρτος, ονις, 'cargo'. Compare *Opera*, 643 sq. νῆ' ὀλίγην αἰνεῖν μεγάλη δ' ἐνὶ φορτία θέσθαι | μείζων μὲν φόρτος, μείζον δ' ἐπὶ κέρδει κέρδος, 672 φόρτον δ' ἐν πάντα τίθεσθαι. In ἰνίου, apparently a medical term (see the passages quoted in the Didot Stephanus), the sense of ἴς, ἴνες, 'sinews', has been specialized to mean the sinewy back of the neck, Apollonius, *Lex. Hom.* 91. 15 sq. ἰνίου] τὸ ὀπισθεν τοῦ τραχήλου νεῦρον. ἴνες] τὰ διατεταμένα νεῦρα τοῦ σώματος. πηνίου shows a specialization like that of ἰστίον from ἰστός: for it is the 'bobbin' that carries the 'yarn of the woof', πῆνος, Latin *pānis*.

These developments of the -ιον suffix did not disappear in post-Homeric times, and they account for the seeming anomalies which put the 'diminutive' theory out of court. βυβλίον (βιβλίον) is no more a diminutive of βύβλος than English '(news)paper' is of *paper*. χρυσίον is a special object made of χρυσός, e. g. a gold piece, a gold

coin, as *aera* and English 'coppers' are copper coins. From *χώρα*, 'room' or 'space', has come with restricted meaning *χωρίον*, a 'place' or 'spot', much as from *πέδον*, 'ground', came *πεδίον*, 'a stretch of ground', *campus*. The relation of *στρία* to *στῖρος* is the same as that of *φορτία* to *φόρτος*: *στρίων* singular is rare.

If the diminutive sense was no part of the original meaning of our suffix, how did it become a part of it and one so prominent as to throw other senses into the shade? The answer is not far to seek. The primary function of the suffix was to single out some variety, aspect, or concomitant of an object as specially noteworthy. This would usually be a material object of some kind or other. Mr. Petersen well says, § 203, 'The Greeks did not, at least in the classical times, form diminutives of abstract nouns unless they were distinctly sensualized. There is no counterpart to the Latin *animula*, "a little courage", as found in Cicero, *ad Att.* 9. 7. 1 "attulit uberrimas tuas litteras; quae mihi quiddam quasi *animulae* instillarunt". To which we may add that the Latin habit of qualifying the properties of persons or things as conveyed in adjectives by means of diminutive suffixes (e. g. *-ulus*) is wholly foreign to Greek. Now in the region of the concrete it is differences of magnitude that are most generally observed.¹ The observation is for the most part made from above, and the individual picked out for notice is under the average, not over it. The use of modifying suffixes to indicate unusual size seems to be quite exceptional in language.

The 'deteriorative' or depreciating use, which Mr. Petersen insists has nothing to do with the 'diminutive', may easily have developed independently.

Paroxytone accentuation of hyperdisyllables with short finals is admittedly rare in Greek. It was not unnatural therefore to bring the 'diminutives' in *-ιον* into connexion with the diminutives in *-ίσκος*, in which, as Hatzidakis (*Glotta*, i, p. 124) has well observed, neither the quantity of the last syllable nor the ending *-σκος* (cf. *βουσκός*, *ἀσκός*, *φωνασκός*, *ἄρεσκος*, &c.) require the paroxytone accent. It was natural too in Mr. Petersen, when he had shown that the diminutive sense was not the original one of *-ιον*, to reject this connexion; but not altogether logical. For if the same element was present in the two suffixes, its sense in both might have been developed in the same direction, though at different times. That the diminutive signification has been more deeply impressed upon this

¹ Mr. Petersen, in §§ 181 sqq., has suggestive sections on the perception and representation in speech of differences in magnitude.

formation is clear. Out of some 84 common names in *-ίσκος* (*-ίσκη*, *-ίσκον*, on which see also Petersen, § 344, and note), including those quoted by Petersen, § 276, from the melic poets, I find that after discarding 3 names of fishes that cannot be identified, *γλαυκίσκος*, *λευκίσκος*, and *λυχνίσκος*, 81 have a sense distinctly diminutive, whether literal, the sense attaching to the object itself as *τραγίσκος* from *τράγος*, *πασσαλίσκος* from *πάσσαλος*, or to something compared to it, as *μηνίσκος*, 'crescent', from *μήνη*, 'moon', of an ornament or of a military formation; or again metaphorical, *ἀνθρωπίσκος* = *homuncio*, *homullus*, *οἰνίσκος*, 'poor wine', as we say 'small beer'. In 3 only, *σφηκίσκος* from *σφήξ*, *σφηνίσκος*, and *λημνίσκος*, is a diminutive signification undiscoverable and a specializing of the original meaning alone apparent. It is of course by no means inconceivable that in these words an original diminutive sense has faded away. This process may be seen in *ὀβελίσκος* for *ὀβελός* in the sense of 'spit-shaped pillar', 'obelisk', and its beginnings in *ὀ σμικροῖσι αὐλίσκοις*, Soph. *Fragm.* 701 (768 Pearson), where the epithet reinforces, so to speak, the suffix of the substantive.¹ It seems possible that the special determination of this suffix is due in part to its second element which may well be related to the inceptive *-σκ-* of verbs.

In both *-ίον* and *-ίσκος* the *ι* receives the accent, and the same is the case in the feminine formations in *-ίς*, stem *-ίδ-*, which are occasionally diminutive, as *βατραχίς*, *κεφαλίς*, *κιονίς*, *πυλίς*. It is tempting moreover to compare the similar feminine patronymics as *Πριαμίς*. From these can hardly be separated the masculines, as *Πριαμίδης*, in which also the *ι* is accented. Here however this cannot be pressed as an argument, as the paroxytone may be secondary and due to the quantity of the final.² These appellations for children or other descendants need not be supposed to have had diminutive signification, although age and stature are naturally associated (as in *μέγας*; *maguus*, *maior*; *paruus*, *minor*). This accented *ί* is most naturally connected with the demonstrative *ι-* of the pronominal stem in *i-s*, Greek *ι-ν*, Sanskrit *i-dam*, 'hoc', whence the deictic *ι* of *ούτοσι*, *ἐνθαδὶ*, &c. Its original function would then be similar, e. g. to that of French *-ci*, Latin *ecc(e)-hic*, a sort of N.B. (*nota bene*); the particular point to which attention was drawn and the consequent modification of the idea of the primitive would depend upon circumstances.

¹ On faded diminutives see Petersen, §§ 217 sqq. It seems to me that he underestimates their frequency. They are a regular feature of popular speech.

² The same may be said of the diminutives in *-ίον* as *Ἀττικίων*, *μαλακίον*, though here the paroxytone is much more likely to have been primary.

The problem of the discrepant accents of dactylic and tribrach trisyllables in *-ιον* has not indeed yet been solved; but in the course of the inquiry it has become more soluble.

We need no longer assume an unattested accent which in dactylic words was shifted to a position which was rare in Greek and in tribrachs took a leap backwards over two moras and the same number of syllables without discoverable reason. It is no longer necessary to account for the place of the accent in *θηρίον*: it is where it always was and where the accent of *πεδίον* has remained. The retention of its ancient accent by *πεδίον* need not disturb us; it was 'too old to change'. It stood apart, and its isolation protected it from the infection of neuters of a similar scansion. That in these the accent was retracted by just a single mora is no violent assumption; it is in accordance with a tendency so common in Greek as almost to deserve the title which Wheeler's 'Law' must surrender. All we need ask is, why did this tendency leave the dactylic *-ιον*'s unaffected? and to this there seems to be a simple reply. To move the accent back in these words would have produced a disharmony. A one-mora shift was possible with *ἰ-μιον*, making it [*ἰμιον*] with accent on the third mora from the end. It was not possible with *ἰσ-χίον* as the accent could not fall on the consonant (above, p. 7). Otherwise, as the sole result of a quite abnormal retraction, words similar in kind and in formation and alike in metrical form would have been accented, some on the third mora from the end and others on the fourth. How far this divergence of accent in the two groups, dactylic and tribrach, is obscured in the accentuation of their several constituents, that is, to what extent the accent of the dactylic *-ιον*'s has been conformed to the proparoxytone of the neuter adjectives, is a matter that calls with some urgency for investigation, in view of the disorderly and inadequate treatment of Chandler §§ 347 sqq., which Mr. Petersen has done nothing to improve. Discriminative review of the manuscript and other evidence (above, p. 3) is here especially required. It does not seem unduly rash to prognosticate that on its completion the number of exceptions will be substantially reduced, and of the remainder no inconsiderable fraction will be explicable by causes that are known to be operative in language, such as the influence of analogy which may be conjectured in *ποσθιον* (the MSS. of Aristophanes) from *πρόσθιον* (adj.) and *ζώνιον* from *ζώνιον*.

An interesting parallel to the phenomena that we have had before us is the behaviour of Disyllabic Prepositions with short final vowels in respect to Anastrophe. As we know from the grammarians, those

containing two moras, as *παρά, περί, &c.* (*Guide*, §§ 294 sqq.), are enclitic when they follow their cases, their accent being retracted by a single mora, as *πάρα, &c.*; but *ἀντί* and *ἀμφί*¹ are not, as they contain three moras (*τριχρονούσαι ἢ ἀντί καὶ ἢ ἀμφὶ οὐκ ἀναστρέφονται* Iohannes Alexandrinus, *τονικὰ παραγγέλματα*, 27. 29), and Anastrophe would have involved a shift of two moras, the nasal consonant of the first syllable being incapable of receiving the accent.

La Roche, *Hom. Untersuchungen*, i, p. 120, observes that *ἀντί* is never elided in Homer and that when it appears to be elided *ἄντ(α)* is intended as in *Odyssey*, 4. 115 and 154 *χλαῖναν πορφυρέην ἄντ' ὀφθαλμοῖν ἀνασχών*. The editors of Sophocles would have found it useful to remember this at *Oed. Col.* 1650 sq. where exception has been taken to *ἀντέχοντα*, and we should read *ἄνακτα δ' αὐτὸν ὀμμάτων ἐπίσκιον | χεῖρ' ἄντ' ἔχοντα κρατός*, and still more so at *Philoct.* 830 *ὄμμασι δ' ἄντ' ἴσχοις τάνδ' αἴγλαν ἃ τέταται τὰ νῦν* where sense obviously demands 'keep this light before his eyes', *τέταται αἴγλα* as *τέτατο φάος* in *Antigone* 600.

The one-mora limitation is also strictly observed in the enclitic forms, Ionic and Attic, of *ἡμεῖς* and *ὑμεῖς*. Thus *ἦμας* from *ἡμᾶς*, *ἦμων* from *ἡμῶν*, *ἦμῖν* from *ἡμῖν*, the trochaic forms showing a further shift of one mora, as *ἦμας*, *ἦμῖν*, above, p. 10. Compare *Guide*, § 278, and see also pp. 39 sq. below.²

Apropos of the enclisis of Personal Pronouns, I may add here that the cause of the peculiar accentuation of those beginning with *σφ*- which in *Guide*, § 277, I have said was 'obscure', seems to have been sheer necessity. Had they, like the First or Second Pronouns, been accented on their first syllables, e. g. as *ὄτε σφέας, τόξου σφέων*, their enclitic and orthotone forms would have been indistinguishable. Hence the accentuations *ὄτέ σφεας, τόξού σφεων*.

The original and stable accentuation of *ἀντί* and *ἀμφί* will account for that of their adjectival derivatives *ἀντίος* (*ἐναντίος*), which Wheeler places in his subdivision J, p. 95, and **ἀμφίος* in *ἀμφίου*, 'a wrap', *ἀμφίεσμα*, as A. Bezzenberger explains in *Zeitschrift f. vergleich. Sprachforschung*, 42, p. 62.

Of the remaining dactylic words cited as examples of the Law, *νυμφίος* is distinguished from *νύμφιος* by Herodian as follows: *τὸ γὰρ νυμφίος ὁ γαμέτης παροξύνεται, τὸ δὲ κτητικὸν ὁ νύμφιος οἶκος προ-παροξύνεται*, ii. 441. 6 sqq. Lentz; cf. i. 125. 12 sq. The collocation

¹ The accentuation *ἄμφι* in the texts of *Bacchylides* 17 (18). 53 (Kenyon, Jebb, Blass, Smyth, &c.) is devoid of authority.

² *ἡμμι(ν)*, *ἡμμι(ν)* of course only show the barytonesis of Aeolic.

νύμφιος οἶκος, seemingly from some dactylic poet, appears to be the only extant instance where the accent of the adjective, for which νυμφίδιος (cf. κουρίδιος, μοιχίδιος, also μόλιος) or νυμφικός would be more usual, can be tested. Pindar's νυμφία τράπεζα and the νυμφια λεκτρα of an inscription, Kaibel, *Epigr.* 373, prove nothing, and the νυμφίος ὕμνος of Nonnus is, as Lobeck says, *Paralipomena*, 355 n. 64, 'contra regulam scriptum'; compare p. 3 above. The -ίος of the substantive has its proper determinant force, and in its function resembles the Teutonic suffix of German *bräutigam* and English *bridegroom*.

γομφίος has a determinant paroxytone when it is a substantive and differentiated from γόμφος, which last with dialectic variants is attested by Hesychius, s. uu. γόμφος, κόμβος, κόμπος, with the same meaning as γομφίος; whereas γόμφιος the adjective (α κτητικόν) has a proparoxytone in Aristotle, as an adjective corresponding to πρόσθιος, and as a substantive in *Hist. An.* ii. 501 b 24 (Bekker) where P (Vaticanus 1339) gives γομφίος. The proparoxytone in the substantive was no doubt due to the ellipse γόμφιοι (δδόντες).

In σκορπίος also the suffix is determinant. Pape, *Lexicon of Proper Names*, appears to be right in connecting it with Scorpius (Σκόρπος), the name of the famous chariot-driver whom Martial celebrates, x. 50 and 53; 74. 5. The general meaning of the root, for which see Boisacq, s. u., is 'cutting', 'piercing', a sense suitable enough in reference to the 'ictus scorpionum'. For the connected use of 'quick', 'rapid', we may compare the double meaning of the English 'sharp' and the Greek θοός. In all these words the form of the first syllable with its final consonant made retraction inadmissible. In the next following it was otherwise.

The accent of κωβίος (Latin *gobius* or *cobius*) needs to be further investigated. In Aristotle, who has it several times, the MSS. accent it κωβιός, a fact not mentioned by Wheeler. If this is its later accent, it would be a curious renegade from the Law; but probably the paroxytone of the grammarians is right. The etymology of the word is obscure. An adjective κωβός is noted by the grammarians; but its meaning is unknown. A derivative of this may be κωβήλη, one of whose meanings is βελόνη, 'needle', whence comes κωβηλήνη or rather κωβηλίνη, 'seamstress', ἡπήτρια, Hesychius. This suggests the conjecture that κωβίος, as the name of a fish, might be compared with βελόνη or ραφίς and Latin *acus* (gen. *aci*), *aculeatus*.

πλησίος, adverb πλησίον, both in Homer, appears to be derived from *πλητί, *πλατί in Doric (cp. πλατίον, Theocritus), with the accent of adverbs in -ί or -ί (-εί), as ἀμαχητί, νεωστί; see Kühner-

Blass, *Gr. Gramm.* i, § 336 (β). Compare πλήγης· πλησιαστής, Hesychius.¹

In *μυρίοι* the suffix with its accented *-ί-* signalizes a noteworthy modification of the root idea. This appears to be 'streaming', as seen in *μύρεσθαι*, 'weeping', 'crying' (conjoined as in Latin *flere*), and in *μορμύρειν* of a river in spate, ἀφρῶ *μορμύρουσα*, 'surging'.² For 'roaring' was associated as naturally with 'surges' as 'crying' with 'tears'. The metaphor by which 'streaming' was applied to an indefinite multitude or crowd (*ἀόριστον πλήθος*) seems common enough. I may instance the use of *ἐπιρρέω* in Homer, Plato, Theocritus, and *ῥυάχετος*, a word of the Lacedaemonians, which they applied to the popular assembly at Athens. By a *διαστολή* or differentiation the accent shifted back a mora, when the word was used as a numeral (10,000), and conformed to that of *χίλιοι* (*Guide*, § 212).

The shortcomings of the Wheelerian theory as applied to Neuter Substantives and Masculine Nouns (whether Adjective or Substantive) respectively may now be conveniently summarized in parallel statements. The factors with which it operates are three in number: (a) Proparoxytone Tribrauchs with Shifted accent, (b) Paroxytone Dactyls with Shifted accent, (c) Oxytones with Original accent. For the Neuters no evidence is presented under (c), and even if the supports under (a) and (b) were sound, the tripod of his argument is short of a leg. For the Masculines, (c)'s are forthcoming, e. g. *βαλιός*, *πολιός*, *σκολιός*: the missing leg is (a). *σκόλιον* (substantive), 'a catch', with its differentiating shift of the accent, is no evidence for an adjective [*σκόλιος*]. *πόλιος* in the text of Oppian, *Cyng.* 3. 310, has been rightly questioned by Lobbeck, *Paralipomena*, p. 355. In his note on p. 340 the same scholar quotes an instructive scholium on Nicander, *Ther.* 64 *τοουῦται καὶ πόλιον καὶ πολίων· ἄμεινον δὲ τὸ πόλιον ἵνα μὴ ἦ ὡς ἐπίθετον*.

A dispassionate survey of the Greek stems in *-ιο-* supports the conclusion of Mr. Petersen (p. 13 above) that their triple accentuation is an original trait. We find it in the Sanskrit derivatives in *-ya*. Of those without initial *vṛddhi*-strengthening, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, ed. 2 (1889),³ § 1212, says that they are usually adjectives, much less often (neuter or in *-yā* feminine) abstract nouns,

¹ The fancy of Cramer, *A. O.* i. 345. 8 'fictum uideri possit propter Homericum *τειχεσιπλήγης*', which Schmidt, s. u., very properly rejects, is a good example of modern arbitrariness in dealing with ancient witnesses.

² This is Doederlein's derivation and the only plausible one.

³ The third edition is not accessible to me, but I am given to understand that it does not differ from the second.



and are made from every variety of primitive and very numerous, being in Vedic Sanskrit three or four times as many as those that show the *vṛddhi*-strengthening. Besides those (1) which retain the accent of these primitives unaltered, e. g. *áryya* (ἄριος), we have (2) words with retracted accent, e. g. *pítṛya-* (πάτριος), (3) words with acute accent *-yá* (*-iá*), *divyá*, 'heavenly', and (4) words with circumflexed *-yâ* (that is *-iâ*), e. g. *nāvya*, 'navigable'. The derivatives in (4), to which correspond the Greek paroxytones, are exceedingly numerous in the earlier language and, as metre proves, almost always disyllabic, *-iâ* : in the Rig-Veda always so after a 'heavy' syllable (that is, one with long vowel, or with a short vowel followed by a consonant in the same syllable), a dactylic ending in Greek, and even after a 'light' one in more than three-quarters of the examples. We may add, from § 1210, 'The value *iâ* is more frequent after a heavy syllable: thus in R.-V. there are 188 examples of *iâ* and 27 of *ya* after such a syllable, and 78 of *iâ* and 96 of *ya* after a "light" syllable, the circumflexed *yâ*—that is to say *iâ*—being, as is pointed out below, more liable to the resolution than *ya* or *yá*.' The prima facie resemblance between what is presented in Sanskrit and what we have been studying in Greek is unmistakable. Unfortunately however, as Whitney points out, the whole subject of the derivatives in *-ya* is obscure and difficult. In his own words they exhibit 'a perplexing variety of form, connexion, and application'. With our present knowledge it would therefore be futile to attempt a comprehensive explanation; but it may nevertheless be useful to put forward a tentative hypothesis that seems consistent with the facts now at our disposal. The three variant accents of the suffix *-io-* correspond to a triple variety in Indo-European, reflected also in Sanskrit. There was a small class of oxytones with the suffix accented *-ió*, Sanskrit *-yá*. There was a larger class of paroxytones *-ío*, Sanskrit *-iâ* (*-yâ*), in which the suffix had a 'determinant' force. There was likewise a third class with proparoxytone accent or Recessive Accent which originally comprised derivatives, that retained the accent of their primitives to which they were consciously referred and to which they were regarded as conceptually belonging. Between these derivatives and the paroxytones which can be traced in the Greek neuters, there was an innate difference, the *-ío-* which carried an accent being, so to say, more self-assertive than the *-io-* which had none. The proparoxytones grew at the expense of the paroxytones; but these did not grow at the expense of the oxytones.

A significant *-í-* may be traced also in the adverbs in *-íka* of Wheeler's subdivision E, p. 94, *αὐτίκα*, *ἡνίκα*, *τηνίκα*, *πηνίκα*, *ὀπηνίκα*.

These words are correctly explained in Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gramm.*, p. 296, except that no account is taken of the paroxytone accent: 'αῦτι auf der Stelle', 'dort' (von der Gramm. als hom. überliefert, daneben αῦθι), ist formal identisch mit*αῦτι in ion. αῦτι-s, gort. αῦτι-ν: vgl. lat. *au-t'*, &c. 'Von αῦτι ist αὔτ-κα . . . abgeleitet.' αὔτ-ί-κα may be compared to ἐνθαδ-ί as meaning 'on the spot', 'sur le champ'. πηνίκα again, as Cobet, *Variarum Lectiones*, p. 314, showed long ago, is not a mere synonym of πότε; or *quando*? but much more distinctive: *quota hora*? For the final suffix -κα see Brugmann, l. c.

The pronominals in -λίκος, ἡλίκος, τηλίκος, πηλίκος, ὀπηλίκος, of Wheeler's subdivision G, p. 94, cannot be analysed with certainty, but may most probably be divided τηλί-κο-s, &c., and connected with Old Slavonic tolikŭ, tantus, kolikŭ, quantus, and Latin tāli-s, quāli-s (Boisacq after Joh. Schmidt and Wheeler).¹ The accent of the ί, whether original or analogical, is doubtless significant. ἡλίξ, 'age-mate, contemporary', is, as F. Solmsen, *Untersuchungen*, 195, has shown, to be separated from the relative ἡ-λίκος (yā-líko-s) so far as its first syllable is concerned and is to be analysed συā-lik-s (Boisacq, s. u.). But its second syllable contains the same element -λίκος as the rest. Accentually it is related to *συā-lik-os as μέγας to *μεγάλος.

Hatzidakis' argument on -ίσκος, above, p. 20, may be applied to the paroxytone adverbs in -ίδα and -ίδην collected by Fröhwein in Curtius, *Studien*, i, pp. 127 sqq., and most recently considered in Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gramm.*, § 296. 2, with note, where they are said to be 'obscure'. They are most simply analysed -ί-δα and -ί-δην, the accent of -ί-δα showing that the same accent in -ί-δην, which cannot be separated from it, is not merely secondary. The specifying force of this is appropriate in designations of sports, which is the prevailing use of the -ίδα formation.

This -ί- with its accent may be traced again in the stems in -ίλο-, which must accordingly be separated from those in -ύλο-, with which Wheeler associated them, subdivision A, pp. 61 sqq. They include both Dactyls, with open and closed first syllables, and Tribachs. Differentiation is clearest in the derivative names of animals: τροχίλος, the 'runner bird', from τροχός, πομπίλος, a fish that follows ships, from πομπός, ὄρχιλος, the 'dancing' bird, also accented ὄρχιλος (so κόρθιλος, Hesychius, a name of the [crested] wren), φρυγίλος, Aristophanes, *Aves*, 763, where it is associated with Φρύξ. ναυτίλος, substantive in

¹ F. A. Wood, *Zeitschrift f. vergleich. Sprachforschung*, 45, p. 65, prefers to connect them with 'lett. laiks, Zeit, Weile, lit. laikas, Tageszeit, Jahreszeit'.

Herodotus, 2. 43, and adjective in the poets, from *ναύτης*, has a similar application, as also *ποντίλος* from *πόντος* and *κουτίλος* from *κουτός*, *εἶδος ὀρνέου ἢ ὄρνυξ, ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὄφεις*, Hesychius (the reading of Eupolis, *Fragment*. 334 K., is uncertain). *ὀπίλος*, Doric for *ὀφθαλμός*, preserves the ancient accent and dental explosive of **ὀπίς* = *ὄψις*. *κωτίλος* is an adjective, so are *ὀργίλος* and *κορυπίλος*, both associated with verbs, *ὀργίζω, κορύπτω*. *ποικίλος* is perhaps the oldest member of the group. It is no doubt connected with the Sanskrit *पेक्ष-ाली-*, 'ornamented'; but the difference of their second vowels is worthy of the same attention as the difference of their accents. For a real parallel to the Sanskrit adjective we must go to the oxytone *ὀμφαλός*. Wheeler (p. 64) has given good reasons for thinking that the older form of *κοῖλος* was **κωφίλος* rather than **κοφίλος*, and so it would be accented *κωφίλος*. The subsequent stages would then be *κοῖλος* (so accented by Ioh. Alexandrinus, *τον. παρ.* 6. 23, cited by Wheeler), *κοῖλος, κοῖλος, ποτ κοῖλος, κοῖλος*. Compare pp. 9, 10 above.

The suffix is not uncommon in Proper Names as *Τρωῖλος, Ζωῖλος, Μυρτίλος, Χοιρίλος*, all of obvious derivation.

The -υλος formations. Substantives are Proparoxytone and Adjectives Paroxytone, almost invariably.

Thus *βαίτυλος, βάκχυλος, γόγγυλος* (= *κόνδυλος*), *δάκτυλος, κόνδυλος, σκόρδυλ[ος]* *θαλάσσιος ἰχθύς*, Hesychius, *σφόνδυλος στέμφυλα (-ον)*.

But *ἀγκύλος, αἰμύλος, γογγύλος, δριμύλος, εἰδύλος, καμπύλος, μικκύλος, ὀγκύλος, ὀσμύλος, στρογγύλος, στωμύλος*.

Of the remainder *αἴσυλος* Homeric adj. is etymologically obscure. Perhaps its accent is Aeolic; see below, p. 34.

ἴτυλος· μόνος, ὀρφανός, νέος, ἀπαλός, Hesychius, may be made up from glosses on *ἴτυλον* in *Odyssey*, 19. 522. On the other hand *κηρύλος*, a bird, and *βηθύλος· εἶδος ὀρνέου*, Suidas (which for accentuation may be compared with *ὀρχίλος* and so forth, just treated of), have the accent of adjectives. So has the name of one object, *κρωβύλος*, and two appellations, half adjective, of persons *ἔρωτύλος* and *λαμβύλος*, 'a lampooner'. The accent of the nominative of *κωθύλους· ὄνους*, Hesychius, is unknown.

There is one oxytone adjective *παχυλός*, inferred from the adverb *παχυλῶς*, an obvious derivative from *παχύς*, on whose correspondence to the Sanskrit *bahulá*—from *bahú*—a good deal has been built.

The class includes several Proper Names, as *Αἰσχύλος, Δημύλος, Ἰδύλος, Φειδύλος*. These, as Brugmann, *Grundriss*, ii. 1², p. 44, has noted, are allied to those in *-ύλλος* as *Βαθύλλος, Θρασύλλος*. Their sense is undoubtedly a diminutive one; it reappears in the derived suffix *-ύλλιον*, as in *μειρακύλλιον*. Several of the Greek adjectives in

-ύλος show it likewise as *μικκύλος*, *δριμύλος*: also *ἔρωτύλος* and *λαμβύλος*, which are distinctly slighting. In Latin it is the ordinary *-ulus*.

αἰόλος, classed with *-ύλος* formations by Wheeler, is an isolated word (for *αἰπόλος* is a compound), and its history is unknown.

Two substantives in *-νος* of obscure formation or origin, *καρκίνος* and *παρθένος*, with unusual accent are adduced under Wheeler's subdivision L. A third is quoted in a note *στεργάνος κόπρων* (? *κοπρών*), Hesychius. No reason is given why in these words the paroxytone should *not* be the original accent. If it were, the constitution of the first syllable shows at once why it resisted retraction. On the awkward fact that *οὐρανός* is a dactyl, and yet oxytone, all that Wheeler can say is '*οὐρανός* scheint dagegen seine alte adjectivische Betonung beibehalten zu haben'. *Why* was it so obstinate?

Perhaps the most paradoxical use of the dactylic principle is its application to the Perfect Participles in *-μένος*, subdivision B in Wheeler, pp. 66 sqq. The inconsistency involved will again be best shown by a parallel statement. Hypertrissyllables in *-ιον* with dactylic ending are Proparoxytone as *λεβήτιον*: if Perfect Participles in *-μενος*, they are Paroxytone as *πεφυγμένος*. With tribrach ending hypertrissyllables in *-ιον* are Proparoxytone as *κεράτιον*: but Perfect Participles in *-μενος* are Paroxytone as *τεταμένος*. Dactylic Trissyllables in *-ιον* however are for the most part Paroxytone; but the Participles in *-μενος* are Proparoxytone as *ἄρχμενος*, *ἄλμενος*, *ἄσμενος* (originally a participle), *δέγμενος*, *ἡμενος*, *ἴκμενος*, *κείμενος*, the sole exception in participles of this form being the *Perfect Participle* *εἰμένος*. The proparoxytone accent of *ἡμενος* and *κείμενος* is all the more noteworthy as they frequently have a perfect sense, *ἡμενος*, 'seated', serving as a perfect participle to *ἕζομαι* (Kühner-Blass, *Gr. Gr.* i. 2, § 301), and *κείμενος* as the perfect participle to the present passive *τίθεμαι*, *ib.*, § 234. So little regard had these participles for the Law of the Dactyl! Seeing that the *-μένος* of the perfect participle has a different accentuation from the *-μενος* of the participles of every other tense, is it not perverse to maintain that the difference in form had nothing whatever to do with the difference in meaning? Is it not more reasonable to hold with M. BLOOMFIELD, *Transactions of the American Philological Society*, 28, p. 55, that the accent of the perfect participle was not the mechanical consequence of a metrical form, but a real differentiation, whether derived from Indo-European or developed in Greek itself? The use made of the exceptional accents of *Ὀρχομενός*, *Σωζομενός*, *Στησαμενός*, *Τισαμενός*, *Φαμενός*,

δεξαμενή, εισμενή is more remarkable still, if they are adduced to show that the Perfect participles were originally accented on the last. What they show, if they show anything, is that the Other participles were so accented. I see no good reason for denying that these accents of Proper Names and of δεξαμενή, and may be ειαμενή, are διαστολῆς ἕνεκα rather than, as Boisacq, repeating Wheeler, says of the two latter words, 'avec maintien du ton primitif'. And I do not understand Hirt's refusal, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 16, p. 84, to accept the commonly received account that Greek φερόμενος is from *φέρομενος, Sanskr. bhāramānas, through the operation of the trisyllabic rule.

When Wheeler in support of his thesis dwells upon the much greater frequency of participles with final dactyls, as ειλημένος, κεκορηθμένος, &c., than participles with final tribrachs, as λελυμένος, τεταῖμένος, he should not have omitted to add that these latter were unavailable in Dactylic metres. Homer no doubt used these participles in his daily conversation, but in his verse he is limited to λέλυται, τεταται, and the like.

Verbals in -τέος and -τέον. Wheeler, who gives a separate section (H) to ὄστέον, to be dealt with presently, has not a word about these which accent Dactyls and Tribrachs alike: ἰστέον, ῥήτέον, ἰτητέον, ἄρμωστέον. ἰτέον, θετέον, μωυ-τέον; for μωυητέον is an inferior form, Lobeck, *Phrynichus*, p. 446.

Numeral Adverbs in -άκι (-άκισ). On the inefficacy of this subdivision of Wheeler's argument (F, p. 94), Allinson, l. c., p. 58, has justly commented. It is enough to give in parallel enumeration A the Dactylic Adverbs and B the Tribrach that are found in classical times. J. Baunack, *Zeitschrift f. vergleichende Sprachf.* 25 (1881), pp. 225 sqq., provides the material.

A. *Homeric.* τετράκισ, εἰνάκισ, ὄσσάκισ, τοσσάκισ, πολλάκισ (-κισ).

Post-Homeric. δισσάκισ, τρισσάκισ, ἑξάκισ, ἑπτάκισ, ὀκτάκισ, τριακοντάκισ, and similar adverbs from 40 to 90, ἑκατοντάκισ. ἑκαστάκισ, τοσαντάκισ, παυράκισ, πλειστάκισ, ἀπειράκισ.

B. *Homeric.* δεκάκισ, εἰκοσάκισ.

Post-Homeric. ἁμάκισ, δνάκισ, τριάκισ, ἑβδομάκισ, ἑννεάκισ (ἐνάκισ), ἑνδεκάκισ, δωδεκάκισ, compounds of δεκάκισ from 13 to 19, εἰκοσάκισ, διακοσιάκισ, χιλιάκισ, μυριάκισ, ἑκατεράκισ, ποσάκισ, ὀποσάκισ, ἀμφοτεράκισ, θαμάκισ, θαμινάκισ, πυκνάκισ, ὀλιγάκισ, πλεονάκισ, ἑλαττονάκισ, ἰσάκισ, ἀρτιάκισ.

Wheeler regards B as derived from A by Systemzwang. Why not A from B by the same? Or, better still, why not say that -άκι(s) was the accent of the suffix employed for both Dactylic and Tribach endings alike?

One of the slightest of Wheeler's arguments, from the accentuation of certain trisyllabic cases of nouns, subdivision N, p. 98, is based on a suggestion of Brugmann. But ποδός from πούς (accent on the last mora) proves nothing about ὄφρυος from ὄφρυς (accent on the penultimate mora); ἀστέρι shows nothing when confronted with πατέρι. Nor is there anything in the accentuation of πατράσι, μητράσι = Sanskr. *pitṛ̥si*, *mātṛ̥si*, (which also is presumably Indo-European), that is in disaccord with that of τρι-σί, γυναιξ-ί, and so forth. We have merely to observe that the vowel of the suffix which is accented is the vowel of the syllable containing the ρ, whether this represents a consonant or a sonant (χ).

The most interesting section of our inquiry is that which deals with the Nominal Compounds with a Verbal second member in -ος, collected in Chandler, §§ 426-528, and (apart from dactylic prepossessions) excellently handled by Wheeler, pp. 70 sqq. His presentation proves how deeply rooted was the union of oxytone accent and active signification in these verbals of early Greek. I have little to add to his examples.¹ But it may be noted here that the verbal substantives in -ός have to a large extent been displaced by cognates in -εύς, as φονός by φουεύς, these finding their way even into compounds, as πατρο-φουεύς. I have touched on this in *Mnemotzyne*, 52 (1924), pp. 13 sqq., where in Soph. *O. T.* 450 I restore φονόν for φόνον, citing κλοπός, κλυπεύς, and comparing Wackernagel's similar restoration, accepted by Gildersleeve and now by Schroeder (1914), in Pindar, *Pyth.* 4. 250 τῶν Πελῖαιο φονόν. For other examples, as ἀγωγός, ἀγωγεύς, see Lobeck's instructive dissertation, *Phrygischus*, pp. 314 sqq. Oxytones with Passive sense seem to be exceedingly rare. λοιπός, *reliquus*, is not necessarily an exception, as instead of passive 'left' it might be intransitive 'failing', 'deficient' (a known sense of λείπω), and hence 'failing to appear', 'remaining behind'. Compare English *rest, remainder*. νεογνός and νεογιλλός = νεογλαγής remain obscure in spite of the efforts of Brugmann and Bechtel, for which see Boisacq, s. uu. Why δορός, 'leather bag'

¹ To the simples may be added ἄλος· δλέθριος, and to the compounds ἀρτοκόπος (ἀρτοπόπος Phrygischus), seemingly from ἄρτο- and *κόπος identical with Lat. *cymos* (*quomos*). Compare Boisacq, s. u.

(which should mean 'slaying' as in the compound adjective *βου-δόμος*), has the accent of *δορά* I cannot tell any more than Wheeler. But *θαμβός* = *ἐκπλαγείς*, Eustathius 906. 53, is in order as an intransitive; cf. Hom. *στῆ δὲ ταφών*.

When these verbals appear as second members of compounds whose first members are nominal, their accent is paroxytone if their first syllable is short; they remain oxytone if that syllable is long. Thus *βουφόνος*, *ἀνδροφόμος*, *ἀνδροκτόνος*: but *ἱππαγωγός*, *πορνοβοσκός*. To meet this discrepancy Wheeler summons the Law, maintaining that the accent of the first class is that of the dactylics and that it has spread to the tribrachs by analogy. Allinson, l. c., p. 57, meets this by observing that of 516 active compounds 232 are dactylic, while 284 only are tribrach. From the first group he deducts 134, the dactylics of 24 categories, i. e. *-ηγόρος*, *-δρομος*, *-κλοπος*, *-κτονος*, *-πλοκος*, and so forth, leaving 94 to compare with 284. But of his 24 categories 6, those in *-δρομος*, *-κλοπος*, *-πλοκος*, *-τροπος*, *-τροφος*, *-γραφος*, are not necessarily dactylic outside of Homer (*Guide*, §§ 60 sqq.), and in common speech would have a short antepenult. These whatever their number—Mr. Allinson does not say in what way he has arrived at his statistics, which do not seem to be based on the lists in Chandler—must not only be deducted from the dactylics, but added to the tribrachs, leaving the first in a still more woeful minority.¹ Here, too, it seems that the simple and obvious course is to own that active compounds, whether dactylic or tribrach, have the Same Accent because they have the Same Function.

These active verbals, oxytone if uncompounded, paroxytone in composition, do not stand alone. Side by side with them are passive verbals, paroxytone if uncompounded, proparoxytone in composition, as *ὄρνυθόγονος* by *θηλυγόνος*, *πυρίγονος* by *πυριγόνος*, *νεόκτονος* by *μητροκτόνος*. We have then two questions to answer. What was the ground of the original difference in the accents? and what was the cause of their shifting? The first question has never given trouble. The difference between **πατρο-κτονός* and **πατρου-κτόνος* is the difference in the place of what we may call the centre of gravity of compounds—the difference between 'father-slaying' and 'father-slain'. It needs no proof that an action expressed by the passive is emphasized less, and is felt to be more subordinate, than one expressed by the active. In these passive compounds then the force of the verbal is weakened, and in the conflict of the accents of the two members, though the second was not wholly bereft of accent, what remained to it was a

¹ This matter is however really non-essential as will be seen below.

Quasi-enclitic Accent as near to the first member as possible.¹ This modification accords with what we know of the developments of Greek accentuation elsewhere.

Nor is the second question much more difficult to answer. The change of oxytone to paroxytone and of paroxytone to proparoxytone, so that the accents differentiated as active and passive did not lose their distinctiveness but kept their distances as before, was an effect of that tendency to retract the accent by one mora which we have noted more than once already. Still some one who remembers what I have urged above, p. 9, in a different connexion, may perchance object that in compounds like νεόκτονος, 'newly slain', the accent will thus be moved by two moras, not as in ὄρνιθόγονος by one. The objection is naught. For the purposes of metrical scansion the κ belongs to the third syllable from the end, but for the purposes of accentuation to the second. The κτ of νεό-κτονος is on a level with the κτ of κτείνω, and the similarity of their treatment strikingly agrees with the practice of Sanskrit in which for the purposes of Sandhi the constituents of compounds are treated as separate words, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, ii, § 262 (d), &c.; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, § 67 a, 'External Sandhi is on the whole followed in the formation of Compounds'.

One group of adjectives in this class calls for particular mention, *Guide*, § 192. The compounds ending in -οχος, -ουχος (Chandler, § 415) with active sense are not paroxytone, as they should be if they are derived from ὄχος, -vāhās in Sanskrit compounds. The proparoxytonic -ούχος which in many instances (Chandler, l. c.) is purely analogical would be explicable if it stood by itself. For κληρο-οχος would have become *κληροόχος, *κληρούχος, and finally by the Rule of the Trochee κληρούχος: compare above, p. 28. But we have also to reckon with the proparoxytones δρούχος, αλίοχος, γαιίοχος, ἡνίοχος, ἀστύοχος ('Ἀστύοχος), λιμενήοχος, the first four of which are Homeric and the last two belong to the Epic tradition. The last occurs in Apollonius Rhodius, 2. 965, where (as Wackernagel says in a supplement to the section 'Aeolisms in Homer' of his *Akzentstudien* iii, p. 128 sq.), the Guelferbytanus MS. has λιμενήοχον ἄκραν, but the Laurentianus λιμενήοχον ἄκραν. The Scholiast knew both readings and faces the discrepancy with the following solution, ἐὰν μὲν τὴν συνεχομένην προπαροξυτόνως· ἐὰν δὲ τὴν συνέχουσιν τὸν λιμένα, παροξυτόνως. λιμενήοχος has obviously been made on the pattern of

¹ I have purposely put it thus, as there is no sufficient evidence that the Greek verbal adjectives which we are considering ever had on their first syllable an accent expressive of a passive signification.

γαιήοχος, which, whatever its precise interpretation, is indubitably active; Euripides, *Troades*, 884 sq. ὦ γῆς ὄχημα κατὰ γῆς ἔχων ἔδραν | ὅστις ποτ' εἶ σύ, δυστόπαστος εἰδέναι | Ζεὺς, with unmistakable allusion to the γαίδοχε παγκρατὲς Ζεῦ of Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 816, and this would dispose us to understand it as λιμένα ἔχουσαν, that is 'not ἀλίμενον'. But we cannot leave out of the account two passages where λιμῆν and ὄχος (with two different accents) are in close connexion, Orph. *Arg.* 1200 (1205) λιμῆν νηῶν ὄχος oxytone, and *Odyssey*, 5. 404 λιμένες νηῶν ὄχοι paroxytone in the MSS. In this latter passage I proposed to restore ὄχοί (accepted by Mr. T. W. Allen in his latest text) not knowing then that the reading was as old as Eustathius. The word in both places must be an adjective with active verbal sense, 'carrying', 'upholding', and, if so, we have to choose between altering the text of Homer and postulating an active verbal adjective ὄχος. Now a clearly passive use of -οχος is discernible in only one of its compounds, and this from a verb compounded with a preposition (and such compounds are of course not subject to the same rules as those whose first member is nominal) κάτοχος, 'possessed' (also active). Thus we see that there was not in these -οχος compounds the same contrast of active and passive which subsisted in other compounds. Furthermore the proparoxytone compounds, as αἰγίοχος, if they are to be explained by the normal shift of one mora, presuppose an accentuation ὄχος for their simple. So now I incline to the opinion that the ὄχος of the MSS. of the *Odyssey* is right, and that it should be added to the Aeolisms which Wackernagel has discussed, l. c., above.

The compounds of παν-, this first element in which is often rather adverbial than nominal, are, notwithstanding Chandler's observations, §§ 465, 469, 473, 491, 509, 519, 525, likewise proparoxytone: πάναιθος, πάμβοτος, πύμβοτος, πάνδοκος, πάμμαχος, πάμφορος, πάνσκοπος, πάντροφος. The sole exception παμφάγος took the accent of the paroxytone compounds, such as ζωοφάγος, with which it was associated as in Aristotle, *Politics*, i. 8. 5. 1256 a 25.

We pass now to compounds with Long Penultimate. Of these we have the following, with examples as early as Homer: 1. -ᾶγος (-ηγος), 2. -πηγος, 3. -αιδός, 4. -λοιγος, 5. -εργος (-ουργος, -ωργος), 6. -μολγος, 7. -φορβος: and of these nos. 1, 3, and 5 are numerous in later Greek. These compounds have two features in common with the remaining 18 to which Chandler's list, §§ 430-59, may for the purposes of this argument be reduced. They include no compounds whose first member is nominal and second member really passive in relation to the first; for ναυηγός, *naufragus*, 'shipwrecked', does not

really mean 'broken by a ship', nor any seemingly passive except those whose first member is indeclinable, as παράγωγος, καλλίεργος: compare ὠκύπομπος, &c., for which see below. In other words the psychological contrast and external differentiation which is characteristic of the first group is not present in this. Secondly, the retraction of the accent by a single mora, which is all but invariable in the first group, is altogether absent from this. These phenomena are not independent and they arise out of the conditions affecting the second member. A retraction of the accents in, say ὄχετηγος, and an assumed αἰγοβοσκος, whether for the differentiation of active and passive or for any other reason, would have involved the abnormal shift of two moras.

The numerous compounds in -εργος, rarely -οργος (-ωργος, -ουργος), require special notice. In the first place their verbal member should show the ο grade of the root (compare στέργω, στοργή), and there are actually two isolated examples of this, -οργός in ὑποοργός (also ὑποεργός) and λαοοργός, Hesychius; compare λεωοργός which presupposes a *ληοργός. This ο form appears in cognates; ὄργανον, ὄργια, ὄργεών, 'priest', compare the sacrificial sense of ῥέζειν, Latin *facere*; ὄργάζω, 'knead', Eng. 'work up', used of dough. But in the sense of 'working' it seems to have withered away and the verbal adjectives to have been refashioned with the vowel of ἔργον. Wackernagel, op. cit., p. 130, may be right in his suggestion that the properispomenon in the contract κακοῦργος, and πανοῦργος which has been modelled upon it, has come from κακοεργός through the vocative accent *κακόεργε. But it is also possible that it is a simple contraction of κακόεργος, a compound from ἔργον, with the normal accent.

The poetical compounds of -πομπος and ταχυν-, ὠκυν-, with adverbial first member, which approximate to passive adjectives, are proparoxytone: ταχυνόμποισι διωγμοῖς, Aesch. *Suppl.* 1057, 'in swiftly sped pursuit', Headlam (tr.), ναὸς ὠκυνόμπου, Euripides, *Iph. Taur.* 1136, but oxytone of the oars that propel the ship, ὠκυνομπούς . . . πλάτας, v. 1427 of the same play. In ναυσίπομπος αὔρα, Euripides, *Phoen.* 1712, which cannot mean 'naues uehens', the relation of the dative to the rest of the compound must be the same as in ναυσίπορος, 'nauibus peruius', 'nauigabilis', so that the sense is that the breeze is 'escorting', 'an escort', for ships.

αὐτόποιος in Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus*, 698 φύτευμ' ἀχείρωτον αὐτόποιον, said of the sacred olive plant which according to the legend sprouted again after being destroyed in the burning of Athens (Herodotus, 8. 55, Pausanias, i. 27. 2), has been altered by Blaydes,

followed by several editors, to an oxytone; but it is not clear that they are right in regarding *αὐτο-* as an *object* to the verbal. Furthermore the verb *ποιεῖν* itself is not at all suitable to a plant's spontaneous growth. Possibly *αὐτόποιος* is a compound of *ποίη*, 'foliage', applied by Pindar to the leaves of the bay-tree, *Pyth.* 8. 20 *ποίη Παρνασίδι*, compare 4. 240 *στεφάνοισι . . . ποίας. αὐτοφορβος* too is variously accented. In Hesychius we have *αὐτόφορβος* *αὐτοφάγος*, Aeschylus, *fragm.* 114 Nauck. But according to Arcadius, 88. 4, it was accented as an oxytone.

Adverbs in -μα (or rather in -α).

Two compounds of quite another type constitute Wheeler's subdivision M (pp. 96 sqq.) *ἡρέμα* and *ἀτρέμα*. For the purposes of metre they are both dactylics, so far at least as Homeric prosody is concerned, but for the purposes of accentuation *ἀ-τρέμα* (or *ἀ-τρέμας*, with the *ς* added so often in adverbial formations) counts as a tribrach. Both belong to a class of formations that is tolerably numerous in Greek in which there is a single vowel prefixed and the accent of the primitive retained. As illustrations I may quote with *έ-*, *έ-κείνος*, &c., *κείνος*, &c.; *έ-χθές*, *χθές*; *έ-κατόν*, Sanskr. *catám*; with *δ-*, *δ-βολός* from **βολός*, verbal adj. (*δ-βελός*-s has taken the vowel of *βέλος*), *δ-δόντ-*, Sanskr. *dánt-*, Lat. *dent-* (*έ-δοντες* Aeolic, with dialectic retraction and the *ε* of *έδ-*), *δ-δάξ*, **δάξ*, cf. *λάξ*, *δ-κλάξ*;¹ with *ι-*, *ι-δέ*, *δέ*; with *ἦ-*, *ἦ-δέ*; *ἦ-βαιο*, *βαιο*; and with *ά-*, *ά-βληχρός*, *βληχρός*; *ά-λαός*, **λαός*, 'seeing', *ά-πρίζ*; add *ά-νά*, *Guide*, § 299.

ἡρέμα from root *rem* for whose cognates in Sanskrit, Zend, Lithuanian, &c. see Boisacq, s. u., and *ἀτρέμα* from root *τρεμ*, show the same adverbial formations as *δχα*, *λγα*, *σάφα*, *ἔμα*.

δλίγος may be considered here. It is a congener of *λοιγός*, Lith. *ligà*, 'illness', &c. (Boisacq, s. u. *λοιγός*). Its paroxytone appears to be primitive, as is indicated by its correlative **μεγάλος* which supplies the feminine singular and the whole of the plural of *μέγας*. The association of ideas by contrast of meaning is an obvious one; compare *Odyssey*, 10. 94 *οὔτε μέγ' οὔτ' δλίγον*, and the Attic *δλείζων*, refashioned from *δλίζων*, on the pattern of *μείζων*.

There are three substantives in *-ύς* (which is the accentuation attested by Herodian, i. 238. 8, Lentz, and elsewhere) that have been expanded from monosyllables; cf. Boisacq, s. u., for their cognates, also *Guide*, §§ 168, 169, addendum. Their genitives are *ι-χθύος*,

¹ I see no sufficient reason for Boisacq's statement, s. u. *δκλάξω*, that the derivation of *δ-κλάξω* is 'unknown'. What is the objection to connecting it with *κλάω*, the proper meaning of which is to bend something till it breaks?

ὀ-σφύος, ὀ-φρύος, all of which might have been cited (as ὀφρύος was, Wheeler, Subdivision N, p. 98) in support of the Law, though these three syllables do not make dactyls for the purposes of accentuation any more than the last three syllables of πατρο-κτόνος (above, p. 33). It might be urged that if we accept either Kretschmer's derivation of ὀσφῦς from ὀστ- + φῦ-, or Persson's of the same from ὀστ- + σφύς, this word must be divided ὀσ-φῦς with gen. ὀσ-φύος, a real dactyl. If necessary, it might be replied that, when the sense of this origin of ὀσ- was lost, it would be treated exactly as if it consisted of ὀ-, the usual prefix, + σ the initial consonant of the next syllable; compare ὀστέον below. The paroxytone of these three words, though not due to dactylic influence, may still be due to retraction. For *φρύος may have been the genitive of *φρύς as *bhruvé* is the dative of Sanskrit *bhrúś*, 'brow', and the assimilating force of the disyllables in -ύς upon these disyllabic compounds may have operated first in the oblique cases.

ὀστέον, as Wheeler says, Subdivision M, p. 95, is a unique paroxytone neuter in -έον. Why not likewise say 'a unique paroxytone neuter in -στέον'? But here it has plenty of company, as *ιστέον*, *ἄρμωστέον*, *δεσποστέον*. Are these similarities to count for nothing? The formation of the word is obscure; and the accent of the dual, ὀστώ, *παγ* mean that it was oxytone once. By origin the σ belongs to the ὀ, but in the popular consciousness it would be divided ὀ-στέον, like ὀ-σφῦς.

Two Monosyllabic Adjectives of similar form, in their nominatives, to monosyllabic participles of verbs in -μι, show a retraction of one mora which has exercised the minds of philologists. Of these εἰς may be satisfactorily explained as an assimilation to the Recessive accentuation of the series of numerals from 2 to 5 and especially (M. Bloomfield, *American Journal of Philology*, 9, p. 50) to that of *τρῆς*.

The accent of *πᾶς*, stem *παντ-*, contrasts sharply with that of *βάς*, stem *βαντ-*; and I see nothing better than the first of the suggestions in the *Guide*, § 183 fin., that it has been conformed to *πᾶσο*, which has the regular trochaic accent. The neuter *πᾶν* is still more anomalous, showing changes both of quantity and accent. The locus classicus about it is Herodian, i. 533. 29 sqq. Lentz *πᾶν εἰς ἀν λῆγου οὐδέτερον τὸν χρόνου ἔχει τοῦ α τοῦ κατὰ τὴν γενικὴν τοῦ ἀρσενικοῦ. τάλαος τάλαν μέλαος μέλαν, στάντος στάν, βάντος βάν ποιητικῶς γὰρ ἐκτέτατο "ἵνα μὴ τὸ γῆρας ἐπαναβᾶν αὐτὸν λάθῃ". ἐπεὶ οὖν "παντός" φάμεν κατὰ συστολήν (i. e. with ᾗ) καὶ "πᾶν" ὑφείλομεν λέγειν κατὰ*

συστολήν, ὡσπερ Αἰολεῖς καὶ Δωριεῖς ἀποφαίνονται. ἡ μέντοι παρ' ἡμῖν (i. e. in the Κοινῇ dialect) ἕκτασις τοῦ α καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἰωσιν ἀφορμὴν ἔχει τὸν τόνον. διὰ γὰρ τὸ δέξασθαι τὴν περισπωμένην τοῦ πᾶς ἀρσενικοῦ ἐκτείνει τὸ α· ὅταν μέντοι τὸ παν δισυλλάβως λέγῃται τότε ἔξει τὸ α συνεσταλμένον σύμπαν, ἄπαν. ἄπαν εὔρηται παρ' Ἀθηναίους ἐκτείνον τὸ ᾱ. This is confirmed by our texts; compare O. Schroeder, *Pindar* (1908), Prolegomena, 71, p. 34. But the explanation seemingly inverts the facts. The lengthening in Ionic and Attic came first, and it was followed by the retraction of the accent, then only possible. The change of πάν, now an isolated neuter, to πᾶν was in part no doubt due to the assimilating influence of other neuters, in which a Recessive accent is normal, producing Retraction in this monosyllable as in σκῶρ, but Doric σκῶρ.

About, or not long after, the time for which a long vowel in πάν is first attested, in Parmenides, *fragm.* (Diels) B. 8. 22, 24, 47 ἐπεὶ παν ἐστὶν ἄστυλον, and Aeschylus, *Agam.* 686 τίς ποτ' ὀνόμαζεν ᾧδ' ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἐτητύμως; μή τις ὄντιν' οὐχ ὀρώμεν;¹ and other places in that play and elsewhere, the worship of the Arcadian God, Πάν, began to spread over the rest of Greece. For Attica we have the well-known passage of Herodotus, 6. 105, 106, which records the establishment of the cult there in 490 or shortly afterwards. Now between πᾶς, παντ-, παν there was a constant association in the minds of the ancient Greeks. It is enough to quote the Hymn to Pan, 45 sqq., πάντες δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἔτερψθεν | ἀθάνατοι περιάλλα δ' ὁ Βακχείος Διόνυσος· | Πᾶνα δέ μιν καλέεσκον ὅτι φρένα πᾶσιν ἔτερψε, the date of which, though uncertain, may well be early fifth century, and Plato's *Cratylus* 408 B sq. ΣΩ. καὶ τό γε τὸν Πᾶνα τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ εἶναι νιδὸν διφυῆ ἔχει τὸ εἰκός, ᾧ ἔταίρε. EPM. πῶς δὴ; ΣΩ. Οἶσθα ὅτι ὁ λόγος τὸ πᾶν σημαίνει καὶ κυκλεί καὶ πολεὶ ἀεὶ καὶ ἐστι διπλοῦς, ἀληθὴς τε καὶ ψευδής; EPM. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς αὐτοῦ λείον καὶ θείον καὶ ἄνω οἰκοῦν ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς, τὸ δὲ ψεῦδος κάτω ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τραχὺ καὶ τραγικόν· ἐνταῦθα γὰρ πλείστοι οἱ μῦθοι τε καὶ τὰ ψεῦδη ἐστί, περὶ τὸν τραγικὸν βίον. EPM. Πάνυ γε. ΣΩ. Ὅρθῶς ἄρ' (ἂν) ὁ πᾶν μηνύων καὶ ἀεὶ πολλῶν Πάν αἰπόλος εἶη κ.τ.ε. In the Orphic Hymn to Pan, H. xi. 1 Πᾶνα καλῶ κρατερόν, νόμιον, κόσμοιο τὸ σύμπαν, the Great God Πάν and (τὸ) πᾶν are clearly identified.

It seems therefore legitimate to conjecture that a contributory reason for the Ionic and Attic retraction of the accent in πάν was a desire to restore the outward distinction between the god and the

¹ Other expressions here recall the diction of Parmenides, l. c. 18 (ὀδὸν) ἐτήτυμον (cf. Xenophanes B. 35 ταῦτα δεδοξάσθω μὲν εἰκότα τοῖς ἐτύμοισι, B. 8. 4 λέγειν ἐτύμως), l. c. 62 ὀνόμασται.

neuter adjective which had been effaced by the alteration of quantity.¹

The long quantity of $\pi\bar{\alpha}\nu$ ultimately worked its way into the compound $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu$, compare the last sentence of the extract quoted above, but not till the age of Alexander, so that the $\acute{\alpha}\pi\bar{\alpha}\nu$ read in some MSS. and by certain scholars at Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 598, is a false quantity. There are two verses of the later Attic drama where $\acute{\alpha}\pi\bar{\alpha}\nu$ is attested: Menander's in Athenaeus, 4. 146 f. $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ · οἱ δὲ τὴν ὀσφῦν ἄκραν, and one which Stobaeus, Meineke, ii. 311. 23, quotes from Metrodorus τὸ νέον $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu$ ὑψηλόν ἐστι καὶ θρασύ.

The unique lengthening in $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu$ may very well belong to the same age.

The question of the changes in the quantity and accent of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ cannot be separated from that of similar changes in the dative of $\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ and $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. These have been examined by F. Sommer in Part III of an elaborate article in *Glotta*, i. 219 sqq., entitled ' $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ and $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ '. He has shown there that there is no evidence for $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ and $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ before their appearance in the Attic Greek of Aeschylus, and that the forms in $-i\nu$, orthotone $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$, and enclitic $\acute{\eta}\mu\iota\nu$, $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\iota\nu$, were current, at least for poetical speech, as late as Sophocles, who employs them frequently. He is right also in maintaining that the difference in quantity has nothing to do with the different accentuation of the orthotone and the enclitic forms as $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ and $\acute{\eta}\mu\iota\nu$, and in explaining the circumflex in the orthotone datives as due to the analogy of the other cases $\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$. But in certain other respects his views stand in need of amendment. In the first place he assumes, it would appear, that quantity and accent changed simultaneously, i. e. that $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ passed at once to $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$: ' $\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ haben die circumflektierte Länge auch auf den Dat. übergehen lassen', p. 232. This may be so; but it cannot be proved, and we are not entitled to presume it. Having regard to what we have learned about $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu$, it seems at least as likely that the quantity changed first and the accent second. The contrast between the usage of the two forms with short and long vowel respectively in the two tragedians, Aeschylus and Sophocles, is not quite as Sommer presents it. Aeschylus has two examples of the lengthening, *Prom.* 640 οὐκ οἶδ' ὕπως ὑμῖν ἀπιστῆσαι με χροί, *Eum.* 98 αἰσχρῶς δ' ἀλώμαι. προϋννέπω δ' ὑμῖν

¹ If this is not unreasonable, the view of Aristarchus that the difference of accent in $\Delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ and $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ was *διαστολῆς ἕνεκα* (*Guide*, § 293) is not so absurd as it has sometimes appeared to the modern intelligence.

ᾄτι . . . In all the other passages, 36 in number, the quantity cannot be determined.¹ In *Suppl.* 970 ξυθ' ὑμῖν ἐστὶν εὐτόκους ναλεῖν δόμους, ξυθ' ὑμῖν is an emendation, though a generally accepted emendation, of Kirchhoff for the corruption εὐθυμείν. In *Prom.* 847 λέγ'· εἰ δὲ πάντ' εἴρηκας, ἡμῖν αὐτὸ χάρις | δὸς κ.τ.ε., S. does not decide between ἡμῖν and ἡμῖν. His conclusion (p. 231) is that 'Aeschylus tells us in general nothing (überhaupt nichts) on the use or the non-use of ἡμῖν by ἡμῖν.' This is pushing nescience too far. The better conclusion is that Aeschylus in general avoided placing ἡμῖν and ὑμῖν in places in the verse where the quantity of the vowel determined the quantity of the syllable, and that he did this because the new pronunciation had not yet established itself. In his latest works, the *Eumenides*, 453, and the *Prometheus*, which according to the view that now recommends itself to scholars belongs to the last period of his activities, he had definitely decided to adopt it. There seems no reason why in the *Supplices*, a play probably fifteen to twenty years older than the *Eumenides*, the poet should not have given ὑμῖν its original quantity. If so, our lengthening might be referred to the period between 470 and 453.

Sophocles, on the other hand, keeps closer to the ancient epic tradition. There is a striking parallel to this in their attitudes towards the Homeric treatment of the quantity of syllables when a short vowel is followed in the same word by a mute and a liquid. Aeschylus adheres on the whole to the 'correptio Attica'; but Sophocles lavishly employs the epic lengthening. The facts are notorious and can be examined conveniently in Professor Tucker's article in the *Classical Review*, 6, pp. 342 sqq., 'On a point of metre in Greek Tragedy'. To take a single group of words, in those beginning with πατρ- (πατρ-ός, -ι, πατρ-ίς, &c.) Aeschylus has 4 examples of the epic scansion, Sophocles 56.

The Accentuation of Dimoric Prepositions.

In §§ 294-9 of the *Guide* I have briefly set out the main facts that bear on this much debated question. Its settlement hinges on the proper correlation and co-ordination of the data furnished by the direct testimonies of the grammarians and others, the cognate prepositions in Sanskrit, and the 'apocopated' forms of the prepositions in Greek. These forms have been discussed with profitable results by Hugo Ehrlich in his *Untersuchungen über die Natur der*

¹ Sommer's words (p. 230) are 'Von den 19 + 19, in Summa 38 Beispielen für ἡμῖν and ὑμῖν zeigen bei letzterem nur die zwei oben geauanteu (*Prom.* 640, *Eum.* 98) die Länge bei ἡμῖν — überhaupt keines!'

griechischen Betonung, 1912. He shows in detail, pp. 1 sqq., that the motive power by which these disyllables *ἀνά, κατά, παρά,* &c., are reduced to monosyllables *ἄν, κάτ, πάρ* in Homer, is the desire to get rid of a succession of three short syllables, incompatible with the laws of the Homeric hexameter, and that originally it did not operate elsewhere. Thus *κάλλιπον* for *κατάλιπον*, but *καταλείπω*. These abbreviations are not confined to the Homeric poems, but ramify through the dialects;¹ and Ehrlich regards Apocope as a special manifestation of the prehistoric tendency of speech, which was put forward by F. de Saussure as 'Une loi rythmique de la langue grecque', *Mélanges Graux*, pp. 737-48, but rejected by Wackernagel in his treatise '*Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Composita*', Basel, 1889. Ehrlich's explanation of Apocope is in the main unassailable, but it requires some supplementing. It does not show how the shortening produced words apparently incongruous with Greek habits of speech, such as *κάτ, κάδ, κάγ, κάδ δ' ἔπεισον, κάπ φάλαρ', κάγ γόνυ*, nor how we are to deal with the objection which P. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, i, p. 35, brings against another explanation, 'We cannot understand why in the same dialects we have *ἄν τὸν . . . πάρ τὸν . . .* but never **ἄπ τοῦ . . . *ὑπ τῶ.*' The answer to this latter objection is simple. In *κατά, ἀνά, παρά* the vowels of the two syllables are one and the same, in *ἀπό* and *ὑπό* they are different. That there should be corresponding discrepancy in their treatment need surprise no one who recollects the Greek dislike of sameness in successive sounds. Instances of loss resulting therefrom (haplology) are *ἔγεντο, γέντο* from *ἐγένετο, γένετο, ἔθρισεν* for *ἐθέρισεν, ἔσ(ε)ται*. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, l. c., p. 36, brings other examples in support of his rule, 'Von zwei gleichen Vokalen in Nachbarsilben wird der eine unbetonte in der Nähe von Liquiden und Nasalen unterdrückt'.²

To return to *κάτ* and its variants, Kretschmer observes, l. c., p. 38, that the loss of the final vowel in *κατά* and *ποτί* is on a different footing from that in *ἀνά, παρά,* and *περί,* being dependent on the character of the initial sound (consonantal) of the following word. Following Ahrens and Schulze he remarks that *πότ* and *κάτ* appear in Doric only before dental explosives. There are two forms (1) as in

¹ For the evidence it is enough to refer to Ehrlich's collections or to those in Kühner-Blass, *Gr. Gramm.* i, pp. 176 sqq. Ehrlich's statistics and conclusions have been examined and to some extent modified by E. Hermann, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 34, pp. 338 sqq.

² Kretschmer (l. c., p. 38) in order to explain the *περ* which arises from *περί* in certain W. Grecian dialects assumes an intermediate stage **περε*. His rule, as stated above, would not apply to *κατά*; but it has been too narrowly drawn.

πόττον, καττόν, (2) as in ποτόν, κατόν, where the whole last syllable of the prepositions is lost. For (2) he adopts the view of Schulze, that dissimilation has caused the loss of one of two adjacent syllables, κατόν having come from κατὰ τόν as ἡμέδιμνον from ἡμιμέδιμνον: 'κάτ, πότ', he says, 'it is clear came from a dissimilation' (sic) 'before τ, θ, δ' (p. 40), but in support of the double τ he can find nothing better than a derivation of φιλοττάριον, an uncertain ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in Aristophanes, *Eccles.* 896, which he would have us believe is from *φιλοττάριον, a diminutive of φιλότης, 'darling'. His explanation of the shorter forms is no doubt a possible one; but, as he himself admits, it does not account for 'κάπετον, ∪ ∪ ∞, cod. BC κάππετον, Pind. *Ol.* 8. 38', or 'καβαίνω, *Alk. fr.* 38'. All this might have been saved if he had not followed Schmidt in precipitately rejecting what might well be thought the simple and obvious explanation: 'Mit Recht verwirft er [Johannes Schmidt] die Annahme, dass die verkürzten Formen eigentlich die antevokalischen seien, die ihren Vokal durch Elision verloren haben (ἀν', παρ' usw.) und auch in die Stellung vor konsonantischem Anlaut übertragen wurden', with the bare unproven assertion (which begs the whole question) that 'such transferences of forms with elided vowel are elsewhere unknown to Greek'.¹ The explanation thus rejected is accepted in part at least by R. Günther, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 20. 52 sqq., who compares the use of ἐξ before consonants in Cyprian and Pamphylian, and similarly of ἐξ and εἰς in Attic, and by E. Hermann, l. c., p. 352.

It is a matter of common knowledge that in the distribution of consonants between syllables the practice of the Homeric age differed notably from that in later Greek. And this not only in the middle of words, as in collocations such as τρ, κρ, where the Homeric division was usually 'after the consonant' as in English, *Guide*, § 60 (a division utilized by later poets for the purposes of their verse (ib. § 62) as in κείται δὲ νεκρός περὶ νε-κρῶ, Sophocles, *Antigone*, 1240), but also, again agreeing with English, where a single consonant stood, or was allowed to stand, at the end of the last syllable of a word. Hence are explained the bulk of the Homeric lengthenings for which it is enough to refer to La Roche, *Homericische Untersuchungen*, i, pp. 1 sqq., or to Kühner-Blass, *Gr. Gram.* i, § 75. ἀγέ-τρεις means ἀγε-ρεις, οἱ τε Κάρυστον ἐχ-ὄν- ἦδ' contrasts with the later division ἐχῶ-νηδ', τέρ-ᾱs- ἦέ with τέ-ρᾱ-σηέ; compare *Guide*, §§ 63 sqq. That the ancient division of syllables was already beginning to disappear in Homer is obvious to any one who considers

¹ Then follows a second reason, sound in itself but inapplicable here, which I have already quoted on p. 41 in a different connexion.

the treatment of naturally short final vowels in the weak position, Kühner-Blass, *Gr. Gramm.* i, pp. 303 sqq. But Greek had a long way to go before reaching the stage at which Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *de Compositione*, ch. 22, found the *iuncturae* of words in Thucydides, where a final consonant was followed by an initial consonant, and thus the last syllable of the first was necessarily closed, 'rough and austere'.¹

In accordance then with the foregoing considerations a preposition *κατα-* might, as in *κατα-βαίνω*, *κατ-έχω*, *κα-τέχω*, be perceived in the three forms *κατα*, *κατ*, *κα*. These three forms appear on inscriptions, sometimes side by side, thus giving clear testimony that transference has been at work, as in *I. G.* vii. 524, a Tanagra inscription, *καγ γᾶν* (*καγατ*, the stone) *κῆ κατὰ θάλατταν* (*θαλατατ*, the stone), but *I. G.* vii. 4260. *Θ κατὰ γᾶν κῆ κατ θάλατταν*.² It would appear from the evidence adduced by Kretschmer, l. c. p. 39, that the *κα-* form is later; which is what we should expect.³ Its absence from Homer need not anyhow surprise us; it offered no such metrical convenience as *κατ*. The greater frequency of *κατ* and *πότ* before dental explosives, especially when the next word was the article as noted by Ahrens and Schulze (Kretschmer, p. 38), was the direct result of an easier and more stable combination. That *δρ* and *πάρ* are more common than *κάτ* in post-Homeric writings is not less natural. For *-ν* and *-ρ* were recognized endings for Greek words; the final consonants of most forms of *κάτ*, as *κάδ*, *κάκ*, were not. How sensitive were the later Greeks to this consideration may be gathered from their attitude to *οὐκ* which for them is a *voix nihili*. 'The negative *οὐ*' is, in spite of the hiatus, *ἡ οὐ ἀπόφασις* (cf. e. g. Herodian, ii. 23. 29 Lentz, Johannes Alexandrinus, 40. 30), *not ἡ οὐκ ἀπόφασις*, and *ἡ οὐκ ἀπόφασις* or rather *ἡ οὐ κ-ἀπόφασις* is 'the non-denial'.⁴

The accentuation of these apocoped forms when separated from verb or case remains to be considered. It is tempting to assume that in, e. g. *καδ δ' ἔπεισον*, *παρ δ' ἴσαν*, the prepositions should be accented

¹ This passage deserves a more careful study from writers on the pronunciation of ancient Greek than, so far as I know, it has as yet received.

² E. Nachmanson in *Gkotta*, ii, pp. 146 sqq.

³ E. Hermann, l. c., p. 354, comments on the appearance of *κα-* as against *κατ-* in Arcadian and *πε-* for *πεδα-*, and compares *με* for *μετά* and *κα* for *κατά* in Modern Greek (Thumb, *Neogr. Volkspr.* (ed. 2) 97. 100), without perceiving that these are simply the results of a later division of the syllable.

⁴ The much debated question of the relation of *πρῶτι* and *πρὸς* does not immediately concern us here, for there never was a form *πρῶτ-*, but I may say that I have seen no refutation of the suggestion that *πρῶ-τι* (compare *δν-τι*) and *πρῶ-ς* (with suffixed *-ς*) are distinct words. Compare the coalescence of *πρῶ* (= *πρῶ*) and *πρῶν* (*πρῶ* in Latin). [For *οὐ* see *Guide* § 244.]

(κάδ, πάρ) as shortenings of κάτα, πάρα : and we bethink ourselves of the accentuation of prepositions in principal sentences in Vedic Sanskrit which, detached and usually preceding their verbs, take an accent on their first syllable.

Ehrlich, indeed, op. cit., p. 26, says outright, 'κάτ ist also bei Homer ein Äolismus', which appears also to be the view of Günther, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 20, p. 37 sqq., and of E. Hermann, ib. 34, p. 350. It may well be one, and the same may be said of πάρ. As to ἄν, a paroxytone accent is directly attested for ἄνά in the imperatival use only. And it might be urged that in its case an Aeolic barytonesis is doubly improbable, inasmuch as not only does ἄνά belong to the class which are said by the grammarians to be oxytone even in Aeolic, but it is given on similar authority as exempt from Anastrophe. I have shown however elsewhere that the oxytonesis of prepositions is by no means inconsistent with the Aeolic habitude if the statement of the grammarians be properly interpreted, *Guide*, Appendix, p. 94,¹ and the difference between the imperatival ἄνα = ἀνάσθηθι as ἀλλ' ἄνα μηδ' ἔτι κείσο, *Iliad*, 18. 178, and the indicatival ἄν in *Iliad*, 23. 859 sq. ὦς ἔφαρ', ὦρτο δ' ἔπειτα βίη Τεύκροιο ἄνακτος | ἄν δ' ἄρα Μηριόνης is a difference of mood only. It seems therefore proper to conclude that ἄν is a shortening of ἄνα with recessive accent, not of ἄνά with ordinary accent, since this satisfies best the phonetic conditions.

The Attic Retraction, it is generally recognized, was subject to limitations by syllabic quantity ; but the rule which is thus stated in Vendryes' *Traité d'accentuation grecque*, p. 263, *Tout périspomène à antépénultième brève devient en attique proparoxyton*, may be restated more illuminatingly as follows : 'In the Attic change of a perispomenon to a proparoxytone the retraction must not exceed One Mora.' Thus ἐ-ρήμος may shift to ἔ-ρημος, γε-λοῖος to γέ-λοῖος, ἀ-γροῖκος to ἄ-γροικος : but ἄν-ταῖος cannot shift to [ἄν-ταιος] for a reason now familiar to my readers. ὦραῖος and so forth having a long open antepenultimate might conceivably have retracted ; but they were kept in order by Systemzwang. This -αῖος, which seems to have come in the first instance from oxytone nouns in -ᾱ (-η), as ἀγοραῖος from ἀγορά, and to have extended itself gradually, dominated the formations and ruled out disharmonious accentuations like [ὦραιος]

¹ The similar accentuation of certain Conjunctions in Aeolic (see Ahrens, *Dial.* i, p. 11, n. 1, and the authorities there quoted) is to be explained in the same way. The Conjunction was run on to the following word, and the two words accented recessively as one. Thus ἀλλάφουγε but ἀλλαφεύγω.

no less than abnormal ones like [ἀνάγ-καιος]. δίκαιος, βίαιος, μάταιος, δείλαιος (from *δέιλη, an abstract from δειλός, cf. Vendryes, op. cit., § 198, *Guide*, § 144), seem to have maintained the accentuation of δίκη, βία, &c.;¹ anyhow, they belong to a different period in the language. τρόπαιον from τροπαῖον is an isolated neuter. For more on the words included in this class see Wheeler, pp. 119 sqq., Vendryes, *Traité*, § 207, Wackernagel, *Akzentstudien*, iii, pp. 50 sqq., with whose discrediting of the later grammarians' statements on the date of the change of τροπαῖον to τρόπαιον I find myself unable to agree.

The accentuation of compound adjectives in -γηρως has been most recently discussed by Wackernagel, *Akzentstudien*, iii, p. 125 n. He is clearly right in rejecting ὑπέργηρως which would bring the κύριος τόπος on to the sixth mora from the end, a wholly unexampled position, and one discountenanced by direct MS. testimony (see below), and the indirect evidence of the verse of Babrius in which it ends a scazon; cf. *Guide*, § 278. But there is less certainty about ἀγηρως, ἐύγηρως, and βαθύγηρως. The Homeric accentuation of the first word was no doubt ἀγήρως: but that is not conclusive for the later Attic. ἄγηρως, according to the Didot Stephanus, is sometimes found in MSS., and that the MS. evidence is not decisive may be seen from Wackernagel's own statement: 'Die handschriftliche Überlieferung schwankt, scheint aber, wenn den kritischen Apparaten zu trauen ist, mehr für die Paroxytonese zu sprechen. Bei Homer ist ἀγήρως -ων -ω überliefert, bei Aeschyl. Ag. 79 in ὑπεργήρως . . ., der Codex Pal. der Anthologie schwankt zwischen ἐύγήρως vii. 728. 6 und βαθύγηρως vi. 247. 7 usw.' It is true that Choeroboscus on the Canons of Theodosius, i. 347. 33, ii. 312. 34, pronounces against εὔγηρως on the ground of its derivation from ἐύγήραος. But this implies that the proparoxytone accentuation was actually current. With it the accent would not move farther back than the first mora of the antepenultimate, and εὔγηρων would thus be related to εὔκερων, Soph. *Αἰ.* 64, exactly as ἀνωθεν is related to ἀνεμον.

For a proper comprehension of the phenomena of Greek accentuation there is no part of its study more important, as indeed may have been gathered from the foregoing pages, than that which is concerned with the delimitation of the syllables of Greek words, initial, medial, or final, particularly in their bearing upon quantity.

Final Syllables. The ancient grammarians were well aware that the division of syllables into Longs and Shorts was a division for

¹ The formation of βέβαιος is obscure. γίνομαι may very well have been affected by the vocative γίναι.

practical convenience merely; but they agreed to consider a syllable ending in a long vowel or diphthong as the normal Long and one ending in a short vowel as the normal Short. Between them lay the final syllables of words which, when detached, had a short vowel followed by a single consonant as ἵπνος. When in these the consonant was pronounced in the same syllable with the vowel the exact measurement was taken to be one and a half χρόνοι, *tempora*, or 'moras'; but for practical purposes such a syllable was counted as long. Before a following vowel, whether in the same word or in a next following one, the consonant was pronounced with the following vowel and so had no effect on the quantity. Thus we have δν|των: δν|τῶν but δ|νον, δ|ν οὐ, as said in *Guide*, §§ 63 sqq.

That syllables in which the consonant was pronounced with the preceding vowel were ever short, whether in the middle of a word, in the middle of a sentence, or at the end of a sentence or verse, there is nothing to prove. But in the last position it was only too natural to describe them as such, as they occupied the place of the *syllaba anceps* and there was there no sound immediately succeeding to fix their prosodiocal value. This explains why Hephaestion, taking the first two lines of the *Second Iliad*¹ to illustrate the *syllaba anceps*, says that in line 1 the last syllable of ἵπποκορυσταί was 'Long', and in line 2 the last syllable of ἵπνος was 'Short', when it would have been more strictly accurate to say that it was 'shorter' (*Guide*, § 65). So slight a misdescription, excusable enough in a grammarian who had not had the benefit of 'a training in modern phonetics', should not have misled the philologists who have been more fortunate, and yet have adopted an error just because it had the countenance of their own habits of speech; compare what is said below, p. 48.

The treatment of a conjunction of consonants, final and initial, betwixt the last vowel of one word and the first vowel of the next, does not in general differ from that of a medial conjunction. But final -ξ and -ψ call for some attention. The circumflex accent of ἀλλάξ, διῶρυξ, λαίλαψ, κατῶβλεψ, and so forth in which the vowel of the stem is short, and of φοῖνιξ, κῆρυξ (to which we must add βόμβυξ, Herodian, i. 44. 20, Lentz) in which it has been shortened, has long been thought anomalous. Clearly the accent here overleaps the boundary of the three-mora rule in a disyllable. Strictly taken a κῆρυξ might be thought a justification for a [κῆρους]; but the moment we realize that the accent is not a mere appanage of the metrical quantity, the anomaly disappears. Metrically κῆρυξ and κηρυξ-, in,

¹ Why the beginning of the *First Iliad* was not taken a simple inspection of it will show.

say, κηρύξας are equivalents; but accentually they are not. For the first is κῆρυ-ξ with a final combination which in the Greek linguistic consciousness was compared to, say, πῆχυ-s, and the second is κηρυκ-σας with a different partition of the sounds. I have used this difference in the syllable division to explain the accentuation of these words before certain enclitics (*Guide*, § 277, cf. 78). Thus we have κῆρυξ ἐστίν by the side of οἰκός ἐστίν because the syllable division of the two groups allowed the final consonant of οἰκός to attach itself to the initial vowel of the next syllable, οἰκό-s ἐστίν, the syllable κῶ remaining short, but did not allow this in the case of -ξ as the division here was between the parts of the conjunct consonant, κηρυκ-σεστίω, as in the middle of a word, and the second syllable of the noun was accordingly long and, if accented, would have had the accent a mora farther back than in the contrasting collocation.¹

Since the revised views of Eduard Sievers' *Phonetik* (fifth edition, 1901, unfortunately now out of print) have percolated into the discussions of Indo-European philologists, not a little attention has been given to the syllabation of the Classical languages with especial reference to Quantity and the treatment of Quantity in the ancient forms of verse. I may instance here the articles of F. Sommer published in *Glotta*, 1909, and the treatise of E. Hermann, 1923, already cited. In this difficult branch of inquiry it is of fundamental importance to observe first that what we have to deal with is the syllable as it presented itself to the perception of ancient speakers and hearers, psychically that is, not physically. Modern instruments, such as the kymograph, if of the requisite delicacy and if manipulated by trained and intelligent experimenters, may indeed tell us something of the details of modern articulation and may help us to infer something about modern syllabation in so far, but in so far only, as this carries a perception of its physical basis; but for the purposes of determining firstly the physical basis and secondly the perceptual basis of the syllable in an ancient tongue they are ludicrously inappropriate. The sole foundation for such determinations is the testimony of the ancient witnesses and the evidence of the phenomena of the ancient language, critically scrutinized and interpreted. Furthermore, a modern is handicapped, and will not cease to be until he has recognized this handicap, by the fact that in

¹ The different values of medial and initial ξ and ψ have been recognized by F. Sommer in the article already cited, p. 39. It is apparent in such spellings as δοξῆαζειν found in inscriptions. E. Hermann, *Silbenbildung*, p. 87, § 113, cites Bekker, *Anecd.* 11. 33, Arcadius 91. 26 to show that βούκλεψ was the primitive accent. If so, βούκλεψ and the like would be extensions of the Rule of the Trochee.

the application of the notions of 'Schallfülle' and 'Schallgrenzen' to syllables in the ancient language of Greece he is dealing with a linguistic form, a main feature whereof, the musical accent, which must have profoundly affected the Greek's perception of speech, is one with whose actual influence upon spoken language he has no immediate acquaintance. Again, it can be shown that to the perception of the ancient Greeks it was the vowel of the syllable, upon which alone the tone was recognized as falling, that was the centre of the syllable, the measurement of the syllable being taken from vowel to vowel, and the consonants preceding the vowel in that syllable not being reckoned in for its quantity. The open syllable therefore was, for the Greek of the Classical Period, the norm; and the closed more or less of an exception as we may see from a careful reading of the passage of Dionysius which has already been cited, p. 43.

But this is not the case with a number of modern languages, and those who speak them are only too prone to force upon the ancient language the habits of their own native speech. How blinding such modern prepossessions may be can be seen from the dicta of Mr. G. M. Bolling, who, in his 'Study of Homeric Metre', vol. 34 (1913), of the *American Journal of Philology*, p. 160, writes of a Greek hexameter composed by himself, Πάτροκλον κλαίωμεν. | τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανάτων, 'Both punctuation and caesura combine to leave the final syllable with the quantity which it would have at the end of the line' [this means 'short' and begs a question] 'and we might theoretically expect to find it employed as a short syllable, irrespective of whether the following word begins with vowel or consonant. That this expectation is not fulfilled is well known. I should therefore recognize in the avoidance of such lines an artificiality of the Homeric verse technique; meaning that the poet has subjected himself to limitations stricter than those demanded by the nature of the sounds', and in a note, 'Similarly we might expect but do not find in the bucolic diaeresis something like παρέσταςαν | λαὸν ἄγροσαι'.

Illusions about the effect of Punctuation in Classical verse are not confined to Mr. Bolling. Elision not so rarely coincides with a stop or change of speaker; and then the modern scholar does his best to wriggle out of acknowledging that *for an ancient a verse was* in all circumstances *a whole*; see Chandler (§ 977) on Euripides, *Orestes*, 1345, 'where Hermione speaks one half and Electra the other', and the *praefatio* to the third volume of the Oxford text of Euripides, p. v, where *Orest.* 1605, and *Phoen.* 606, 623, are referred to. The truth is seen by J. W. White, 'The Metre of Greek Comedy', § 141; but he does not conceal his dislike of it, calling

it 'a curious phenomenon from the point of view of both rhythm and thought'. There is the same reluctance to admit the corresponding facts in Latin verse. I may refer to what I have written in the *Classical Review*, 38 (1924), p. 47.

With the written accents of Greek this article is not concerned except just so far as they throw light on the spoken. And in the interpretation of the much debated change of final acute to grave at the end of words, it cannot add anything to what has already been given in the *Guide*, §§ 249 sqq. But a hope may be expressed that some further research will be devoted to clearing up the relations between the two different uses of the grave mark which seem to belong to different systems, *Guide*, §§ 44, 45; and to draw attention to the singular agreement in principle between what is presumably the older of the two methods employed in the papyri and that which is used in the MSS. of the Rig-Veda, the most striking peculiarity in which I quote from Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 87, 'The acute syllable is left unmarked; the circumflex, whether independent or enclitic, has a short perpendicular stroke above, and the grave next preceding an acute or (independent) circumflex has a short horizontal stroke below' (the italics are mine). Compare in Greek papyri ἀφνειού meaning ἀφνειοῦ, ἐλών meaning ἐλών, *Guide*, § 45. Unfortunately the Indian climate has left us nothing but late MSS. of the Vedas, and it is impossible to arrive at any conclusion as to the date when the MSS. of the sacred books were first written with the traditional accents. But it seems not unreasonable to assume that the Indian grammarians, whose extant works show how much care and pains they spent on the spoken accents of their language, had some system of representing them in the written language; nor again is it unreasonable to suppose that of all the methods employed in the existing MSS., of which there are several, that one is the oldest which is used for the most ancient books. It is therefore quite possible that the system in the Rig-Veda was the system of the great grammarian Pāṇini. Pāṇini's date cannot be fixed with certainty, but he is generally assigned to the third or fourth century B. C.; he was a predecessor of Kātyāyana, 'who seems to have lived in the third century B. C.', see Wackernagel, *Altind. Gr.* i, pp. lix sqq. There would therefore be no chronological obstacle to supposing that the mode of accentuation which first appears in Greek papyri of the first century B. C., as in the Bacchylides papyrus, Kenyon, *Bacchylides*, Introduction, p. xx, *Palaeography of Greek Papyri*, p. 28, may have been derived, directly or mediately, from the celebrated school of Indian grammarians.

INDEX

- Accent and quantity, their relations in ancient Greek 4, 7 sq., 83
- Accents, Greek, different kinds of 5, 8; places of 8
- Accentuation of ancient Greek: general certainty of 4 need for further investigation of 3 sources of our knowledge of 2, 3 unpopularity of subject of 2
- Acute accents, four different 5
- Aeolic accentuation of conjunctions and prepositions 44 and n.
- Aeolisms in Homer 28, 33, 34, 44
- Aeschylus and Sophocles, differences in prosody of 40
- Age and stature associated 27
- Anastrophe 22 sq.
- Apocope of prepositions 40 sqq.
- Attic Retraction 6, 9, 44 sq.
- Attica Corruptio 40
- Circumflex accents of Glaucus: *ἀνακεκλωσμένη* 8 *ἀντανακλωμένη* 8
- Closed and Open syllables differently accented 7, 9, 22
- Compound Verbal Adjectives: with first element adverbial (indeclinable) 34, 35 with first element nominal 31 sqq.
- Consonants, distribution of, between syllables 33, 42
- 'Dactylic' words 9, 10 sqq., 22, 23 sqq., 27 sq.
- 'Deteriorative' sense 20
- Differentiation of words by accent 6, 25, 30, 39 n.
- 'Diminutive' sense: development of 20 fading of 21 in *-lov* not original 12, 17 sq.
- 'Diminutives' 11 sqq. not in Homer 18
- Dimoric Prepositions 40 sq.
- Disharmony or disparity in accents avoided 9, 22, 23, 44
- Distribution of consonants between syllables 42, 46 sq.
- Doric 5, 9
- Elision before stop or change of speaker 48 sq.
- Enclitic forms of plural personal pronouns 10, 23
- Enclitics 9
- Final syllables ending in single consonants 46
- Final syllables ending in *-ξ* and *-ψ* 46 sq.
- Glaucus of Samos, the accents of 8
- Haplology 47
- 'Hemagesetz' 9
- Homeric division of syllables 42 sq. language affected by metro 30
- Indo-European suffix in *-jo*, triple accentuation of 13, 26
- 'Mora', meaning of 7 and n.
- Moras and syllables 7
- Non-Recessive accents 6
- Numeral Adverbs in *-ἀκι(ς)* 30
- Oxytone verbals with passive sense 31
- Pāṇini 49
- Papyri, accentuation in Greek 49
- Paroxytone hyperdisyllables with short final 20
- Paroxytones, four different 5, 8 (table)
- Participles in *-μένος* and *-μενος* 29
- 'Possessives' 15
- Prepositions 40 sqq.
- 'Progressive' accents 6, n. 1
- Quantity and Distribution of Quantity in relation to accent 4, 7 Unit of 7
- Recessive accents 5 outnumber Non-Recessive 6
- Retraction 6, 9, 11, 44 sq. exceptional 9 normal, one mora 9, 22, 23, 33, 34, 44
- Sanskrit 5, 21, 31, 33 derivative stems in *-ya* 25 sq. method of accenting in Rig-Veda 49
- Secondary proxytones 21
- Shifted accents 5, 25
- Single vowel prefix without effect on accent 36
- Sophocles closer to Epic tradition than Aeschylus 40
- Special appurtenance or form expressed by *-lov* 20
- Syllaba anceps* 46
- Syllable delimitation 47 sq. Homeric 42 sq. in compounds 33, 37
- 'Systemzwang' 11, 31, 34, 44
- Tribrach endings in relation to quantity and accent 45, 52
- Trochee, 'law' of the 9 sq.
- Verbal adjectives in *-ος* 31 rarely passive 31 compounds with nouns 32 sqq. with long penultimate 34-6 with short penultimate 32-4
- Wheeler's Law 10 sq., 22 sqq.

SUFFIXES, ETC.

- ι (declitic) 21
- ιδ- (-is) 21
- ιδης 20
- ίκα 26 sq.
- ίλος 27 sq.
- ίμβα, -ίβην 27
- ιον 11-20, 21, 22
- ιος 21-3
- ίσκος 20-1
- ίων 21 n. 2
- λέος 11
- λικός 27
- ύλος 28 sq.
- ύλλος, -ύλλον 28
- μένος 29
- τέος, (-ον) 30
- α 36
- άκι, -άκις 30
- εργος, -ιργος, -ουρ-
γος 35
- οχος, -ουχος 33 sq.
- ομπος 35
- Adverbs in -α 36
- Compounds in -γ-
ρας 45
- Substantivus (ab-
stract) in -της 6
- Verbs in -ος re-
placed by -εύς 31
- κτητικά 15
- ρηματικά 15, 17
- συγκριτικά 17
- υποκοριστικά 15, 17
- SUBSTANTIVES in -ιον
- ἀκόντιον 14, 18
- ἀράχνια 14
- αὔλιον 16
- βυβλίον (βιβλ.) 19
- δέμια 16
- ζώνιον 13
- ἦμα 16
- ἡ ἰα 15

- ἡρίον 15
- ἰόνιον 19
- ἰστίον 18
- ἰχτιον (ἰχθύν) 15 sq.
- κηρίον 19
- κλισίον 15
- κλιτίον 15
- κρανίον 19
- λήιον 16
- μέλια 15
- μηρία 19
- νήιον 16
- ὄγκιον (ὄγκιον) 16
- οικία (-ον) 19
- πέδιον 18, 15
- πηρίον 19
- πίδιον 18
- πόλιον 22
- πόσθιον 25
- σκύλιον 25
- χρυσίον 19
- ἀγήρωσ, ἀγηρωσ 45
- αιθάλειος (αιθάλιος)
11 n.
- αἰόλος 29
- αἰυλος 28
- ἀλαός 36
- ἀμφί 23
- ἀμφίος 23
- ἀνά 36
- ἄνα, ἄν 44
- ἄντα 23
- ἀντί 23
- ἀντίος, ἐναντίος 23
- ἄπᾶν 37
- ἀπρίξ 36
- ἀρτοκόπος 31 n.
- ἄσμενος 29
- ἄσσειν, ἄσσειον 3
- ἀστέρι 31
- ἀτρέμα, -ας 36
- αὐτίπειος 35
- αὐτοφορβος 36
- βαθυγηρωσ 45
- Βύμβυξ 46

- γαίηοχος 34
- γομφίος 24
- γόμφος 24
- γύναιος 45 n.
- δαιδάλειος, &c. 11 n.
- δείλαιος, δικαίος, &c.
45
- *δείλη 45
- δέξαμενή 30
- δορός 31
- ελαμενή 30
- εἶς 37
- ἐκεῖνος 36
- ἐπαναβάν 37, 39
- εὐγηρωσ 45
- ἠβαιοός 36
- ἠδέ 36
- ἠλέος 11
- ἠλικός, &c. 27
- ἠλιξ 27
- ἦμενος 29
- ἦμίν, ἦμίν, ἦμιν 10,
23, 39
- ἠρέμα 36
- θαμβός 32
- ἰδῆ 36
- ἰτυλος (?) 28
- ἰχθύς 36
- καρκίνος 29
- κατά, κάτ, κα 41
- κάτοχος 34
- κεῖμενος 29
- κῆρυξ 46
- κωβίος (κωβίος) 24
- λαοργός 35
- λιμενήοχος 33
- λοιπός 21
- μέγας, *μεγάλος 27
- μητράσι, πατράσι 31
- μυρίοι 25
- μύριοι 25
- ναυηγός 34
- ναυσίπομος 35
- ναυτίλος 37
- νυμφίος (subst.) 23
- νύμφιος (adj.) 23

- ὀβελίσκος 21
- ὀβολός. ὀβελός 36
- ὄγκος 16
- ὀδάξ 36
- οἰνίσκος 21
- ὀκαξ 36
- ὀλίγος 36
- ὀλλός 31
- ὀπτίλος 28
- *ὀπτίς 28
- ὀστέον 37
- ὀσφύς 36
- οὐ 43 and n.
- ὀφρὺς 36
- ὄχος, ὄχος 34
- παμφάγος 34
- πάν, πάν 27, 39
- Πάν 38
- Πανοῦργος 35
- παρί, πάρ 41
- παρθέλιος 29
- πᾶς 37
- πατροφονεύς 31
- παχυλῶς 28
- πλησίος 24 sq.
- ποιία 36
- ποικίλος 28
- πόλιος (?) 25
- ποτί, πύτ 41, 43
- Πραμιλλύδριον 17
- προτί, πρύς 43 n. 4
- σκύλιον 26
- σκορπίος 24
- ταχύομπος 35
- τρόπαιον 45
- ὑμίν, ὑμίν, ὑμιν 10,
23, 39
- ὑπεργήρωσ 45
- ὑποργός 35
- φλοστάρων 42
- φουίξ 46
- φονός and φονεύς 31
- ἠκυπομπός, ἠκυπομ-
πος 35
- antimūia 20

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 636, 38
 „ *Supplices* 816, 34
 Apollonius Rhodius 2. 965, 33
 Bacchylides 17 (18). 53, 23 n. 1
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *de composi-
tione* 22, 43, 48
 Dionysius Thrax and Scholia on 17 sq.
 Euripides, *Troades* 884 sqq., 34
 Hephaestion 46
 Scholiast on 7
 Homer, *Odyssey* 5. 404, 34
 „ *Hymn to Pan* 45 sqq., 38

Nonnus 47. 464, 3, 24
 Oppian, *Cynegetica* 3. 810, 3, 25
 'Orpheus', *Argonautica* 1200 (1205), 34
 „ *Hymn to Pan* (xi). 1, 38
 Parmenides, *fragm.* B. 8, &c., 38
 Pindar, *Pythia* 4. 250, 31
 Plato, *Cratylus* 408 B sq., 38
 Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus* 690, 35
 „ „ „ 1650 sq., 23
 „ *Oedipus Tyrannus* 450, 31
 „ *Philoctetes* 830, 23
 „ *Fragm.* 701 (768), 21



- Allinson, F. G. 10, 32
 Bezenberger, A. 23
 Bloomfield, M. 29, 37
 Bolling, G. M. 48
 Brugmann, K. 10, 28, 81
 Chandler, H. W. 3, 12 n., 18, 49
 Ehrlich, H. 40, 41, 44
 Günther, R. 42, 44
 Hatzidakis, G. N. 20
 Hermann, E. 9, 42, 43 n. 3, 44
 Hermann, G. 7 n.
 Hirt, H. 9, 11
 Kretschmer, P. 41, 42, 43
 La Roche, J. 23
 Lohock, C. A. 24, 25, 30
 Lugebil, K. 2
 Pennington, G. J. 4
 Peterson, W. I. 11 sqq.
 de Saussure, F. 41, 52
 Schoell, F. 8
 Sievers, E. 47
 Solmsen, F. 27
 Sommer, F. 39, 47 n.
 Vendryes, J. 3, 44
 Wackernagel, J. 3, 6, 33, 35, 45
 Wheeler, B. I. 1, 9, 10 sqq., 24 sqq.
 White, J. W. 49
 Whitney, W. D. 25 sqq.

ADDENDUM TO PAGE 22

In *Guide* § 80 it was suggested that the preponderance of the accentuation — ◡ ◡ which was the basis of 'Wheeler's Law' was in part only accidental and due to the avoidance of an accentuation ◡ ◡ ◡. This suggestion, which has an affinity to de Saussure's 'rhythmic law' (*supra*, p. 41), was intended to apply in the first instance to tribrach neuters in -*iov* whose retracted accent, as in *πόδιον*, it would well explain.

Oxford

Printed by Frederick Hall, at the University Press