Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Ἀνφιῦνεία ἁ στάλα τοῦφρόνετος (Schw. 605). Attic-Ionic and Doric used the genitive of possession.

Whether or not certain Mycenaean forms in -ιος (e.g. *di-ko-na-ro a-da-ra-ti-jo = Δικόναρος Ἀδράστιος*) are in fact patronymics is still a matter of doubt[1]). If they are (as seems probable) they should possibly be regarded as an isolated phenomenon, unless they are to be connected with Homeric proper names in -ιος such as Μελάνθιος, Ταλθύβιος; certainly they should not be linked with the freakish Homeric Τελαμώνιος Αἴας, or the later Aeolic patronymics in -ιος.

'Doric' features in the language of Hesiod*

By ANNA MORPURGO DAVIES, Oxford

1. We owe to a paper published by Heinrich Ludolf Ahrens in 1853 the first survey of Hesiod's language and of its relation to the various Greek dialects[2]). Apart from the obvious similarities with Homer, Ahrens found in Hesiod some features which he defined as Doric (i.e. Doric and/or North-West Greek) and some others which he considered Aeolic (i.e. belonging to the Aeolic dialects spoken in Asia Minor). In an attempt to establish the origin of the 'Doric' features, Ahrens suggested that they might be due to the influence of the Delphic oracle, acting both on the language and on the content of the Hesiodic poems. More than forty years later the suggestion was taken over, in a very spectacular way, by August Fick who in 1887 gave to the scholarly world a 'Delphic' edition of the Theogony, in which all the lines considered authentic were translated into an 'archaic Delphic dialect'[3]). Such a rash attempt was

---

[1]) See p. 132 footnote 3.

*) This paper was first read to the Mycenaean Seminar of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London (see the Minutes of 13 May 1964) and I greatly profited from the discussion which followed. For useful suggestions and criticism I am also indebted to Professors H. Lloyd-Jones, L. R. Palmer and B. Snell, and to Dr. M. L. West.

[2]) H. L. Ahrens, 'Über die Mischung der Dialekte in der griechischen Lyrik', Verhandl. der Gött. Philologenversamml., 1853, p. 73 f. (= Kleine Schriften I [1891], p. 174 f.).

[3]) A. Fick, Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen fassung und sprachform wiederhergestellt, Göttingen 1887. The edition of the Theogony was

bound to have a somewhat cold reception, but the list of non-Homeric features drawn by Ahrens seems to have been more successful. With few modifications it was accepted in what is still the only full study of Hesiod's language, a dissertation by Rzach published in 1876[1]), and from there has found its way into the prefaces or the commentaries of the most important editions of Hesiod; as late as 1963, reference to Doric elements in Hesiod and to their supposed lateness was made by a German scholar in order to decide a question about the relative chronology of a Hesiodic and a Homeric formula[2]).

However, after the full study made by Rzach, as far as I know there has been no new examination of the evidence listed by Ahrens — and this in spite of the progress made both by Comparative Philology and by Greek Dialectology in this century[3]). The purpose of this paper is therefore to check Ahrens' and Rzach's interpretation of the evidence both in detail and as a whole.

I do not propose to discuss the Aeolic features: it is probably true that such forms as τριηκόντων (Gen. plur. of the word for 'thirty') or κανάξαις (with apocope of the preposition and preservation of ϝ as second element of diphthong) belong only to the Aeolic group of dialects and more precisely seem to point towards Asia Minor. Moreover, as Hesiod's father is known to have come from Aeolic Cumae, they do not seem to cause great difficulty. However, the Aeolic features should be the object of an independent investigation and here I shall limit myself to enumerating the Doric elements in the language of Hesiod and commenting on them.

Ahrens' list included:

1. the form ἦν (Th. 321 and 825) for the 3rd person plural Attic ἦσαν.

---

followed by an edition of the Erga in 'archaic Aeolic', the supposed dialect of Hesiod's father: „es ist ja auch nur natürlich daß Hesiod mit seinem bruder in der mundart des vaters, des hauses, der alten heimat spricht" (op. cit. p. 43f.).

[1]) A. Rzach, 'Der Dialekt des Hesiodos', Jahrbüch. für class. Phil., Supplementbd. VIII (Leipzig 1875—76), pp. 355—466.

[2]) F. Krafft, Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod, Göttingen 1963, p. 134f.

[3]) A dissertation on the language of Hesiod (Hans Troxler, Sprache und Wortschatz des Hesiods, Zürcher Diss.) is announced by E. Risch in Mus. Helv. 21 (1964), p. 10 n. 34, but has not yet been published. A short survey of Hesiod's language has also been published by C. Gallavotti and A. Ronconi as an appendix to La lingua omerica, Bari 1948.

10*

2. the form ἔδον (Th. 30) for ἔδοσαν (paralleled perhaps by the conjecture ἔθεν for ἔθεσαν in fr. 76 Rzach).

3. the verbs περίαχε, περοίχεται (Th. 678, 733) with the short form περ of the preposition περί.

4. the form τέτορ(α) (Erga 698) for the Homeric τέσσαρες or πίσυρες.

5. the accusative plurals of the first declension ending in -ᾰς: of these 5 or 6 are found in the Theogony, 3 in the Erga, 1 in fr. 55 Rzach (=Merkelbach K 2 15); a parallel is provided by the accusative plural in -ος of the second declension found in the Aspis (line 302).

Ahrens also added two items which may be considered either Aeolic or Doric:

6. The genitive plurals θεᾶν and μελιᾶν of Th. 41 and Erga 145.

7. ἐν used instead of ἐς (or εἰς) in the formula ἑὴν ἐγκάτθετο νηδύν (Th. 487, 890, 899).

No substantial additions to this list were made by Rzach, as the form ἔδιδον of Erga 139 belongs to No. 2. However, in view both of his study and of later discoveries in the field of Greek dialects, we may feel tempted to include in the list of Doricisms also the forms:

8. (ἔ)γεντο (Th. 199, 283, 705) for the Homeric (ἐ)γένετο.

9. καλυψαμένω (dual fem.) of Erga 198[1]).

---

[1]) We might also add the infinitive ἀποδρέπεν of Erga 611, which has been accepted in their editions by Rzach, Wilamowitz, Sinclair, Mazon and, more recently, by Colonna (with reserve: see below). The Mss. have ἀποδρέπειν which is unmetrical, or ἀπόδρεπε, which seems to cause difficulty because it is the only imperative in a series of infinitives. The reading ἀποδρέπεν is found in two manuscripts and according to Rzach (Wiener Studien, V [1883], p. 193) provides useful evidence for the infinitive required by the context. But I see no difficulty in the imperative: Chantraine, Grammaire Homérique, II, p. 316 gives a list of examples in which an imperative is followed by one ore more infinitives with imperatival functions. As for ἀποδρέπεν the ν may well have been added to fill the apparent hiatus caused by the disappearance of the ϝ in οἴκαδε. In short, I subscribe to the note of Colonna (Hesiodi Opera et Dies, rec. A. Colonna, Milano 1959, ad v. 611): „ἀπόδρεπε D, recc. nonnulli (quod servare libenter possis)". It may be added that this is almost the only point on which I do not agree with Hoekstra's conclusions (see Mnemosyne IV [1957], p. 206 f.).

A few other non-Homeric forms might be understood as dialect features (εἰ γάρ τίς κ(ε) of Erga 280 [but cf. λ 218], ἀμάειν of Erga 392 and μέζε(α) of Erga 512), but all of them present some obscure point and it is extremely unlikely that they may point to one dialect more than to another.

2. It might be as well to notice immediately that the chief problem is presented by the short forms of the accusative (No. 5). I shall therefore deal with these last, since the results obtained from the study of the other items may have some hearing on the problem of their origins.

ἦν, third person plural, is taken by Friedrich Schwenn as the only linguistic element capable of throwing light on the nationality of the supposed Bearbeiter of Hesiod's works[1]). As the form is found in West Locris, Phocis, Corinth and Laconia (on the evidence of Aristophanes' Lysistrata) it seems obvious — in Schwenn's opinion — to think of a connection with West Locris, made probable by the statement of Paus. IX 38, 3 that Hesiod's tomb was near Naupactus. However, from a linguistic point of view the problem is not so simple. The Ionic-Attic ἦν is now generally considered an original 3rd plural which fulfils the functions of 3rd singular; ἦσαν is no doubt an innovation and we must postulate for an early stage a system in which ἦς is the 3rd person singular and ἦεν or ἦν the 3rd plural[2]). The Ionic-Attic innovation is possibly due to the lack of clarity of ἦς which could easily be confused with a second person; whatever its origins are, this change must have happened at an early stage because Homer has already a 3rd singular ἦεν/ἦν (which in many cases could conceal ἦς) and a third plural ἦσαν or ἔσαν. In Greek literature in general the history of ἦν 3rd plural is fairly complicated: as we have seen it is used by Hesiod, who knows also ἦσαν, in Th. 321 τῆς δ' ἦν τρεῖς κεφαλαί and in Th. 825 ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ ὄφιος. In the past century this was often considered an instance of schema Pindaricum, i.e. of a singular verb with a plural subject, and examples of such a syntactic abnormality in which ἦν was involved were quoted from Simonides, Sophocles (lyric), Euripides (iambic), Epicharmos, Lucian and from an Attic epigram cited by Aeschines[3]). Whatever one may think of this —

---

[1]) See F. Schwenn, Die Theogonie des Hesiodos, Heidelberg 1934, p. 142, who follows F. Solmsen, Rhein. Mus. LXVI [1911], p. 144 n. 4 in spite of the objections put forward by Jacoby in his edition of the Theogony (Hesiodi Carmina rec. F. Jacoby, I, Berlin 1930, p. 20 with n. 2).

[2]) Bibliography in Schwyzer, Gr. Gr., I p. 677; cf. Chantraine, Morphologie², p. 206f. and for the Homeric forms Chantraine, Gramm. Hom., I, p. 473. See also G. Mahlow, Neue Wege durch die griech. Sprache und Dichtung, Berlin u. Leipzig 1926, p. 63f.

[3]) For a discussion of all the instances of schema Pindaricum see R.S. Haydon, AJPh, XI [1890], p. 182ff. It is obvious that if Th. 321 and 825

real schema Pindaricum, Hesiod's influence on other authors,
Doric influence found first in the lyric parts of tragedy etc. — the
evidence seems more definite for the non-literary dialects. No
dialect other than Ionic-Attic uses ἦν as third singular: evidence
for ἦς is found in various NWG and Doric dialects, in Boeotian,
in the Lesbian poets, in Arcadian and perhaps in Cyprian[1]). The
obvious conclusion is that the original form ἦς was also preserved
in those dialects for which there is no direct evidence[2]). If that is so,
one of the reasons (or of the concomitant causes) for the change in the
syntactic functions of the original 3rd plural ἦν is missing in these
dialects. We have evidence for ἦν 3rd plural in the dialects of La-
conia, Epidamnos, Sicily, Delphi and perhaps Locris[3]). Arcado-
Cyprian does not seem to offer any example of a 3rd plural imper-
fect of εἰμί. The position is slightly different for Lesbian: no examples
are found in Alcaeus, and Sappho has ἦσαν only once, in one of the

---

are instances of schema Pindaricum the whole problem of the 'Doric' ἦν
ceases to exist. However, for ἦν 3rd plural see also O. Wilpert, De schemate
Pindarico et Alcmanio, Breslau 1878, pp. 35—46 and Das schema Pin-
daricum und ähnliche grammatische Konstruktionen, Progr. Oppeln 1900,
p. 1f.

   [1]) For ἦς in NWG and Doric dialects see Thumb-Kieckers, Handbuch
der griech. Dial., I, Heidelberg 1932, pp. 88 (Laconia, but only on the evi-
dence of Alcman), 122 (Argolis), 132 (Corcyra), 164 (Olus), 181 (Cyrene),
214 (Sicily, on the evidence of Epicharmus), 272 (Delphi), 311 (Acarnania);
for Boeotian and Arcadian see Thumb-Scherer, Handbuch der griech. Dial.,
II, pp. 40 and 132. In Cyprian ἦς is perhaps found in the inscriptions 89,
327 and 398 Masson (see O. Masson, Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques,
Paris 1961, pp. 325 and 365). The occurrences of the word in Sappho and
Alcaeus are listed and discussed in E. M. Hamm, Grammatik zu Sappho
und Alkaios, Berlin 1957, p. 163; see also Thumb-Scherer p. 101. For Locrian,
see below, no. 3.

   [2]) See for instance C. D. Buck, Greek Dialects, Chicago 1955, p. 128:
"Third singular imperfect, ἦς . . . is probably the form in all dialects . . . ex-
cept Attic-Ionic, where it was replaced by ἦν".

   [3]) See Thumb-Kieckers pp. 88 (Laconia, but only on the evidence of
Aristophanes Lys. 1260), 132 (Epidamnos), 214 (Sicily, on the evidence of
Epicharmus), 272 (Delphi). In Locrian ἦν is found in the inscription Schwyzer
DGE 362₉ (Fifth Century): ℎόπō Ϝέϰαστος ἔν, where obviously the verb is
plural and we must recognize a typical instance of constructio ad sensum
(see e. g. W. Schulze, KZ 57 [1930] p. 297 = Kleine Schriften, p. 221f.). The
whole question of the Locrian forms of εἰμί is complicated by the presence
in the inscription quoted above (l. 36) of an apparent 3rd plural ἐς, which
is more likely to be due to an error of the scribe (bibliography in Solmsen-
Fraenkel, Inscriptiones Graecae ad inlustrandas dialectos selectae, Leipzig
1930, p. 83f., but see also Buck, Greek Dialects, pp. 251 and 253).

poems which Lobel regards as abnormal[1]). If we then consider ἦοαν as a borrowing from the epic language, we are left with no evidence from early Aeolic: only in an inscription of the beginning of the Third Century B. C. from the region of the Aeolic Aigai[2]) we find the plural ἔον[3]). We might consider this sufficient evidence for accepting a similar form also for the Seventh or Sixth Century Aeolic dialect, but in my opinion we should also take into account the possibility that Alcaeus and Sappho knew a form ἦεν (or ἦν) of third plural[4]). An indication pointing to the existence of this form in later Aeolic as well may come perhaps from the following consideration. In an article published in 1921 Wackernagel[5]) proved that the use of the form ἐντί both as third singular and as third plural of the present tense in the language of Archimedes and of some contemporary inscriptions is due to the entrance of the koine into the epichoric dialect of Syracuse, etc. In the language of the koine ἦν has the functions of a third singular, while in the epichoric dialect ἦν means 'they were' third plural, and it must have happened that the spoken language accepted the new use while re-

---

¹) Lobel-Page 142; see also D. Page, Sappho and Alcaeus, Oxford 1955, p. 65ff., and the observations of G. P. Shipp, Studies in the language of Homer, Cambridge 1953, p. 86f.

²) According to L. Robert, Hellenica, X (Paris 1955), p. 178ff. (in particular p. 184) the site is that of the ancient Olympos (or Olympe), the town mentioned in the inscriptions.

³) Schwyzer DGE 644. The first editor, S. Reinach, REG IV [1891] p. 269ff., dated the inscription to the end of the Fourth Century „vers l'époque d'Alexandre le Grand ou un peu après", but in the new and improved edition published by J. Keil and A. von Premerstein (Bericht über eine Reise in Lydien, I, 1909, p. 97f. No. 203) the inscription was considered „sicher später" and in PWRE XVIII 1 (1939) s.v. Olympos 18 Keil considered it to be „aus dem ausgehenden 4. oder beginnenden 3. Jh. v. Chr.". For the whole question see L. Robert, loc. cit. (with bibliography). The dialect of the inscription shows certain traces of Ionic influence: see W. Vollgraff, Mnemosyne, XLVII [1919], p. 68ff. (against Bechtel, Aeolica, Halle 1909, p. 44f.). Although probable, it is not certain that ἔον is third plural and not third singular as the subject (a neuter plural) would allow both interpretations. The same form ἔον with the functions of first person singular is found in Homer and in Alcaeus. It would be possible to assume an original 3rd plural *es-ont > ἔον (as *ēs-ent > ἦεν) later used as singular, were it not for the fact that this form may easily be explained as created on the analogy of other imperfects and on the model of e.g. the subjunctive.

⁴) See also E. M. Hamm op. cit. p. 163.

⁵) IF 39 [1921] p. 221ff. = Kleine Schriften, I, p. 510ff. See also Bechtel, Griech. Dial., II, p. 275.

taining the old one. On the analogy of this new identity of forms for
the third singular and the third plural of the imperfect, the dialect
extended the functions of the third plural present $\dot{\varepsilon}\nu\tau\iota$ so that it
came to be used as a singular. In this case then the presence of $\dot{\varepsilon}\nu\tau\iota$
used as singular and as plural implies the existence of $\mathring{\eta}\nu$ third
plural imperfect in the local dialect, a fact which is confirmed by
the inscriptions. I believe that a parallel phenomenon can be found
in Aeolic inscriptions: in IG XII 2 526a$_{39}$[1]) from Eresos and be-
longing to the last years of the Fourth Century and in IG XII
Suppl. 3$_{17}$ from Mytilene of the beginning of the Second Century[2])
$\dot{\varepsilon}\sigma\tau\iota$ is used twice instead of the plural $\varepsilon\dot{\iota}\sigma\iota$. The inscriptions fit
within the limits of time in which we can observe the influence of
the koine as well as the presence of a still vigorous epichoric dialect.
We could then recognize here a fact of verbal syncretism parallel to,
but inverse to the one described by Wackernagel: in both cases
we have instances of a confusion of 3rd singular and 3rd plural in
the present. In the dialect of Archimedes this is due to a parallel
confusion in the imperfect; the same might be true for the Aeolic
inscriptions. But if so, here again a third plural $\mathring{\eta}\nu$ should be pre-
supposed[3]).

Inscriptions and literary texts of the Aeolic dialect spoken on
mainland Greece are not very helpful: instances of the form $\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}a\nu$
(with the regular Boeotian treatment $\varepsilon\iota$ of $\bar{e}$) are found in Boeotian
inscriptions which cannot be older than the second part of the
Third Century[4]). Here again $\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}a\nu$ should be considered an innova-
tion of which the date cannot be established.

To sum up this fairly long discussion: if Th. 321 and 825 are not
instances of schema Pindaricum, they present a third person plural

---

[1]) = Schwyzer GDE 632 and Tod GHI 191 (with bibliography). The Ionic
influence on the dialect of the inscription is evident.

[2]) The inscription is dated by L. Robert BCH XLIX [1925] p. 237f. to
a date soon after 196, and this date is accepted in IG; an earlier date (ca.
230?) is suggested by M. Segre, Riv. Fil. XII [1934] p. 196. For $\dot{\varepsilon}\sigma\tau\iota$ used as
third plural see also Bechtel, Aeolica p. 8.

[3]) The necessity for making a distinction may also have caused the use of
$\dot{\varepsilon}o\nu$ (1st singular in Alcaeus) as third plural, an obvious parallel being pro-
vided by imperfects such as $\ddot{\varepsilon}\lambda\nu o\nu$ in which the forms of the 1st person singu-
lar and of the 3rd plural are identical.

[4]) See Thumb-Scherer p. 40. The form is obviously due to the same type
of innovation which has created third plurals such as $\ddot{\varepsilon}\vartheta\varepsilon a\nu$ (for the Attic
$\ddot{\varepsilon}\vartheta\varepsilon\sigma a\nu$) etc. (see below p. 144ff.), but owing to the scarcity of our evidence a
definite chronology is impossible. As far as I can see, the theory that forms
such as $\ddot{\varepsilon}\vartheta\varepsilon a\nu$ etc. are modelled on $*\mathring{\eta}a\nu$ does not rely on any solid evidence.

ἦν. This form is no doubt to be considered archaic when compared with the Ionic-Attic innovation ἦσαν. It has certainly been preserved in some Doric and NWG dialects, but we have no evidence to prove that the form is not also Arcadian or Cyprian or early Aeolic. For Boeotian in particular we are not in a position to say what was the form used at the time of Hesiod. As far as our poet is concerned then, ἦν may be either an archaism preserved in the formulaic diction or an element of his everyday language, or one of the Aeolic features of his poetry, or a Doric or NWG feature. None of these suggestions can be proved and none of them seems more probable than the other: the only sure conclusion is that ἦν is no evidence for a Locrian-speaking or a Delphic-speaking Hesiod.

3. The next item in our list is perhaps easier to deal with. In Th. 30 we find a form of aorist 3rd plural ἔδον, and in Erga 139 an imperfect ἔδιδον. The latter is followed by a word beginning with a consonant and the MSS. agree in giving ἐδίδων or ἐδίδουν, i.e. the form of the koine. The correction to ἔδιδον proposed by Ahrens seems quite simple, while to restore the Homeric form δίδοσαν is metrically possible, but absurd from any other point of view[1]). As for the former a group of MSS. has ἔδων and another one ἔδον (confirmed by P. Oxy. 2090): here again there seem to be no doubts about the reading to be preferred. A parallel to ἔδον and ἔδιδον is perhaps provided by ἔθεν, read by Boeckh (and Rzach) in fr. 76 Rzach[2]). All these forms present instead of the Attic-Ionic ending -σαν, which is undoubtedly an innovation, the old IE athematic ending *-nt with the regular dropping of the final dental. The same ending is found in Hesiod's aorists ἀπέσσυθεν (Th. 183), κατέσταθεν (Th. 674), and τράφεν (Th. 142b) which must also be taken into consideration[3]).

The dialect distribution of these endings is simple enough: Ionic and Attic agree in creating a new ending -σαν for the third person plural of the athematic aorist and of the imperfect. Forms with the original ending are found scattered through all the Peloponnese and the NWG dialects, from the earlier inscriptions onwards. Ar-

---

[1]) While ἐδίδουν does not seem probable, a case might be made for ἐδίδων comparing the few Homeric forms with long ending such as μιάνθην (or even ἔφῦν), but see Chantraine, Gramm. Hom., I, p. 471f. (cf. also Schwyzer Gr. Gr. I p. 687).

[2]) The Mss. have ἴστια θέσσαν νεώς which is impossible and ἴστι' ἔθεν νηός seems the easiest correction (see Rzach, Wiener Studien, V [1883], p. 201f.), but it is far from being certain.

[3]) See Rzach, Der Dialekt des Hesiodos, p. 439.

cadia presents in Orchomenos (first half of the Fourth Century) and
in Mantinea (Fourth Century) the forms συνέθεαν and ἀνέθεαν, but
elsewhere, and in particular in Tegea, ἀνέθεν is the only form
found[1]). The new ending -αν has a parallel in the Cyprian κατέθιjαν
(217 Masson), but it is likely that the form κατέθισαν (94 Masson)
of another Cyprian inscription is again an innovation based on
κατέθιjαν. The example is interesting, as it proves that parallel
innovations may have occurred in a completely independent way[2]).
Were it not for the quality of the vowel which precedes the ending,
we would have no reason for suspecting that κατέθισαν was not an
instance of an Attic-Ionic-Cyprian isogloss. The Lesbian evidence
is not too clear: both the inscriptions and the poets have forms like
ἔθηκαν, ἔδωκαν which are found also in Homer. Aorist passives
ending in -θεν are also found in inscriptions, while Sappho has the
Homeric forms in -σαν. Boeotian shows from an early date an ending
-αν added to the stem (ἀνέθεαν) as well as the forms in -θεν of the
aorist passive. Corinna has a form ὦρθεν[3]). Thessalian does not
behave very differently: an ending -ιεν or -εν/-ιν is added to the stem
(ἐτάξαιν; cf. also ἐνεφανίσσοεν) or to forms in -κα- (ἐδούκαεμ, ἐδώκαιεν)[4]).
In conclusion, it seems as if in dialects other than Ionic-Attic various
innovations occurred, probably in different periods and indepen-

---

[1]) See Thumb-Scherer p. 134. It is possible that the participle ἀπυδόας
of the inscription Schwyzer DGE 656₁₃ (from Tegea: Fourth Century)
presupposes a form of 3rd plural *ἔδοαν.

[2]) The date of the Cyprian inscription is not known, but it seems unlikely
that the -σαν of κατέθισαν is due to the influence of the koine.

[3]) ἀνέθεαν is found for instance in the Ptoion dedication published by
P. Guillon, Les Trépieds du Ptoion, I, Paris 1943, p. 54 No. 1. The in-
scription is dated by Guillon op. cit. II p. 68 to the middle of the Sixth
Century; a lower date (ca. 525—500?) is suggested by L. H. Jeffery, Local
Scripts of archaic Greece, Oxford 1961, p. 95, but see also P. Guillon, BCH,
LXXXVII [1963], pp. 26—28 n. 4. For epigraphical instances of the aorist
passives in -θεν/-εν see Thumb-Scherer p. 42; for Corinna, D. L. Page, Corinna,
London 1953, p. 56. The form ἀνέθεαν found in an East Locrian inscription
(Schwyzer DGE 359: Fifth Century) may be due to Boeotian influence.

[4]) For the Thessalian forms (ἐτάξαιν etc. alternates with ἐδούκαεμ; see
also ἐνεφανίσσοεν etc.) see Bechtel, Griech. Dial., I, p. 192; R. van der Velde,
Thess. Dialectgeographie, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1924, p. 106f.; Thumb-Scherer
p. 68 (with bibliography); the earliest instances of the forms in -εν do not
seem to be older than the Fourth Century, while ἔδōκαν is found in the
famous inscription of Sotairos of the Fifth Century (SchwyzerDGE 557)
and [ἐ]δό[κ]αιεν in an archaic inscription of Pherai (Béquignon, BCH
LXXXVIII [1964] p. 403 No. 3: see also No. 8 and W. Peek, Ath. Mitt. 59
[1934] p. 57 No. 15).

dently one from the other; the termination -θεν of the aorist passive
seems more stable than the forms like ἔθεν etc. It is only in Arca-
dian that the original form (ἀνέθεν) and the new one are found.
In the light of the available evidence we might feel inclined to
ascribe the ἔδον and ἔδιδον of Hesiod to NWG or Doric, as, apart
from Arcadian, we have no evidence that in other dialects the -ν
ending was preserved as such even in historical times: the matter is
obviously different for the -θεν aorists and also for τράφεν which may
belong to any dialect.

However, if we assume that the replacement of the IE *-nt with
another ending in dialects other than Doric or NWG occurred in a
prehistoric phase, we should expect to find only the 'new' ending
in Homer. That this is not so appears evident from a simple glance
at any Homeric dictionary or grammar. As Chantraine puts it:
,,La vieille désinence en -ντ est chez Homère plus fréquente que la
désinence ionienne en -σαν, qui, d'ailleurs, est bien attestée"[1]).
τράφεν is found in A 251 etc. and forms in -θεν are very frequent
with any kind of verb. It is true that neither ἔδον nor ἔδιδον are
Homeric, but in view of the presence in Homer of such third person
aorists as ἔβαν (A 391 etc.), ἔσταν (A 533 etc.), ἔφυν (ε 481 etc.),
we may safely say that such aorists as ἔδον and ἔθεν are not in-
consistent with the Homeric morphological system. The position is
not different for the imperfect ἔδιδον: Homer has only δίδοσαν, but
a form parallel to ἔδιδον is found in ἵεν, third person plural of the
imperfect of ἵημι (A 273 etc.). Moreover, for τίθημι the reading of
Aristarchus in α 112 seems to presuppose ἐτίθεν. ἔδιδον itself is
found in Hymn. Dem. 327 (and perhaps 437) where the form does
not need to be a borrowing from Hesiod. In conclusion, the Home-
ric evidence helps to give these forms the right place in the picture:
they are archaisms, common to all Greek dialects, which at diffe-
rent dates, but well within the historical period, have been replaced
by means of various innovations. If we want to understand the
Hesiodic ἔδον or ἔδιδον as Doricisms the same explanation must be
applied to the Homeric ἔσταν or ἵεν: that this cannot be done does
not require any demonstration.

4. The Delphic theory of Ahrens was based essentially on the
short form περ of περί before a vowel found in Th. 678 περίαχε and
in Th. 733 περοίχεται. The parallel quoted was the Delphic πέροδος
for περίοδος from the inscription of the early Fourth Century

---

[1]) Gramm. Hom. I p. 472.

Schwyzer DGE 325₁₆. Against this Rzach (Der Dialekt des He-
siodos, p. 465f.) argued that in both cases the preposition was
found before a verb originally beginning with ϝ, and that conse-
quently this was an instance of apocope and not of elision. As it is
possible to object a) that the etymology of οἴχομαι is not certain
and that we do not have any evidence for an initial ϝ, b) that if
the ϝ had been there the syllable περ- should have been metrically
long, we shall have to take into consideration the elided forms of
περί¹). However, their dialect distribution seems different from what
Ahrens suspected. True, Delphic has πέροδος (but in the same in-
scription l. 18: περιεῖεν), but Cyprian has περ' 'Εδάλιον (217 Masson)
and Sappho probably has περεθήκαο (94,14 Lobel-Page), which is
not likely to be due to metrical shortening of περρ-. Attic has
probably περέβαλον in Aesch. Ag. 1147 and περεσκήνωσεν in Eum.
634 as well as the usual form περιών²). What is even more to the
point, Corinna, as we now know from the papyri, has π[ε]ράγεις³),
which might point to a similar form in Boeotian, Hesiod's dialect.
Unfortunately the Pindaric πέροδος (Nem. 11,40, but see also fr.
314 Snell³) is not sufficient evidence to confirm this hypothesis. It
would be useless to pursue the argument any further, if it were not
for the fact that it may also be asked whether the evidence of
Hesiod's text is fully reliable on this point. We shall take first the
second passage quoted: here the standard editions have τεῖχος δὲ
περοίχεται ἀμφοτέρωθεν, but the text is not without difficulty. First,
περοίχεται is a hapax (even if we look for the supposed standard
form περιοίχομαι), secondly one does not see why the verb οἴχομαι
or a compound of it should be used in referring to a wall, as such a
usage is, to my knowledge, unprecedented in the whole of Greek
literature. Thirdly — and perhaps more important — a large group
of MSS has περίκειται against the metre, while the reading περοίχεται
is based only on a few texts⁴). As things stand, it seems as if the

---

¹) It is of course true that if Hesiod had known such a form as *περϝίαχε he
could have felt entitled to omit the ϝ according to the laws of epic language.
However, as the possibility is fairly remote, we prefer to discuss the form
actually written in our text. For the etymology of οἴχομαι see Boisacq s.v.,
Frisk s.v.

²) The form περ of the preposition is used in preconsonantal position both
by Sappho and Alcaeus. See also Mahlow, op. cit., pp. 319. 375, 412. For the
Attic forms see E. Fraenkel, Agamemnon, III [1950], p. 525 n. 1.

³) Fr. 1 III 47 Page; see also Page, Corinna, p. 53.

⁴) The Mss. tradition is discussed by Rzach in Wiener Studien XIX
[1897] p. 25.

safest conclusion consists in considering this passage of the Theo-
gony as a crux (this is Paley's suggestion) and therefore in not
giving too much importance to the supposed περ/περί.

As for περίαχε of Th. 678, it will be sufficient to refer to Schulze's
article in KZ 1888[1]), where by means of a conclusive argument, now
fully accepted in Chantraine's Grammaire Homérique, he proved
that in Homer such a form as ἴαχε with ῑ and no trace of initial Ϝ
is simply a mis-writing for an aorist ϜϜάχε, obviously without re-
duplication and with a double Ϝ representing the treatment of
initial *sw-. The forms with ῑ are obviously due to a false division of
such compounds as ἐπίϜϜαχε etc. If we wanted to restore the pri-
mitive formula in our passage we should probably write περίϜϜαχε;
that an aorist fits the context better than an imperfect is likely in
view of the following ἐσμαράγησεν[2]).

5. About the form τέτορ(α) found in Erga 698 a few observations
can be made. It seems undeniable that τέτορες is a West Greek form
opposed to the Ionic τέσσερες, the Attic τέτταρες, the Boeotian and
Thessalian πέτταρες etc. Homer has both τέσσαρες, perhaps an
Atticism for τέσσερες, and πίσυρες, an Aeolic form metrically more
convenient than the Ionic one. The West Greek τέτορες, which the
Armenian parallel seems to prove to be very ancient[3]), is general
in all dialects other than Ionic-Attic and Aeolic; we do not know
the Arcado-Cyprian form, and in view of the ordinal τέτορτος one
might perhaps wonder if the cardinal is τέτορες[4]). However, as all

---

[1]) W. Schulze, 'Zwei verkannte Aoriste', KZ 29 [1888] p. 230ff.
(= Kleine Schriften p. 330ff.). The Hesiodic form is discussed in Kleine
Schriften pp. 331 and 341; see also Chantraine, Gramm. Hom., I, p. 139f.
It may be noticed that in Th. 69 περὶ δ' ἴαχε is metrically equivalent to περὶ δὲ
ϜϜάχε.

[2]) It must be added that in Th. 370 Triclinius probably read περναιετάωσιν
against the different lectiones preserved in other Mss., but the reading
(accepted only by Mazon) is far too doubtful to be of any use for our pur-
poses. However, if περναιετάωσιν were the right form, this would give us an
instance of περ in preconsonantal position.

[3]) See for instance O. Szemerényi, Studies in the IE system of numerals,
Heidelberg 1960, p. 20. According to Schwyzer Gr. Gr. I p. 589 and Buck
Greek Dialects p. 95 Arcadian should have a form τέσσερες. But IG V 2 offers
only τεσσεράκοντ' in 473₈, metrical inscription of the Third Century A. D.,
and τεσαρακοστοῦ in 264₆-₇ of the First Century B.C. or A.D. Thumb-Scherer
p. 138 rightly omit the mention of τέσσερες in Arcadian.

[4]) Szemerényi op. cit. p. 20 argues that "the loss of -w- in all-Greek
τέτρατος is due to the cluster -τϜρ- from -twr- while τέταρτος is assimilated to
τέτταρες". If this may be accepted it seems as if the condition for such an

evidence in favour of this hypothesis is lacking, we are reduced to
accept τέτορ(α) as a West Greek form in Hesiod: its metrical con-
venience is obvious and may account for its presence in the Theo-
gony in the same way in which metrical convenience accounts for
the preservation (if it is preservation) of πίσυρες in Homer[1]).

Whatever we are to infer from this 'Doricism' in Hesiod, it
should be clear: a) that it does not point to any Doric or NWG dia-
lect in particular as the form seems common to all West Greek;
b) that its importance cannot be great, as single lexical borrowings
from one dialect to another are frequent, especially when it is a
poetic dialect that is in question.

6. Of the elements which we added to Ahrens' list, the first one,
γέντο aorist of γίγνομαι, is of obscure origin in spite of Wackernagel's
having assumed a metathesis of consonant and vowel in the root
γνη- found e.g. in κασίγνητος[2]). It is epigraphically documented in
an inscription of Mycenae (Schwyzer DGE 97) of the Sixth Century
and only there; otherwise it is found in Parmenides, Empedocles,
Theognis, Alcman, Pindar etc. and in the Hellenistic poets. What
is more important, it is used by Sappho, which seems to exclude the
possibility of a 'Doric' (or only 'Doric') interpretation. In view
of its extensive use in poetry it might be possible to take it as due to

---

assimilation should be a similarity between the cardinal and the corres-
ponding ordinal. In the case of the Arcadian τέτορτος it is difficult to assume
that *tetrotos (see also Myc. qe-to-ro-, i.e. kʷetro-, in qe-to-ro-po-pi etc.) chang-
ed into τέτορτος on the analogy of a supposed τέσσερες, while the reason of the
change would be obvious if the Arcadian cardinal had been τέτορες. See also
Mahlow op. cit. p. 324 ff.

[1]) I cannot help believing that the metrical equivalence of πίσυρες and
τέτορες is not due to pure chance.

[2]) See Wackernagel, Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer, Göttingen
1916, p. 173 ff. (against his previous conclusions of KZ 33 [1895] p. 50 =
Kleine Schriften I 729). The question has also been discussed at length by
H. Jacobsohn, Philologus, 67 [1908], p. 325 ff., but still cannot be regarded
as resolved. The basic difficulty consists in the fact that no satisfactory
linguistic explanation of γέντο has been found and that if the form is under-
stood as due to a misunderstanding of the epic γέντο 'he grasped', it is not
clear what is the cause of its presence in the inscription of Mycenae. If we
wanted to follow Wackernagel in regarding γέντο as an archaism, we might
postulate a root aorist formed on the root *gen-, which has not received the
suffix -(e)H₁- (to use Benveniste's terminology). Alternatively it is possible
to think of an artificial form created on the analogy of the real root aorists.
Mycenaean does not help, because it seems to have the regular form (ἐ)γένετο
(PY Ad 686 marg.: pa-ro-ke-ne-[to]).

a misunderstanding of the Homeric γέντο 'he grasped': it is towards this suggestion that Chantraine (Morphologie² p. 165) and Risch in his study on the language of Alcman seem to incline[1]).

The dual feminine καλυψαμένω preserved by the MSS. in Erga 198 and wrongly corrected by Rzach on the evidence of an inscription of the Second Century B.C.[2]), till a short while ago was paralleled only by the masculine τὸ̄ καταστάτō of an archaic Elean inscription (Sixth or Fifth Century)[3]) and, of course, by the Attic article τώ. However, the new Mycenaean evidence allows us to take this form not as an Atticism or a Doricism, but simply as an archaic feature preserved in poetic language[4]). This fact may have some interest as a proof of the possibility of finding in Hesiod some archaisms not preserved in Homer.

We shall not discuss the elements which Ahrens considered either Aeolic or Doric. It is not clear how much we can rely on the manuscript tradition for the genitives μελιᾶν and θεᾶν, which of course are metrically equivalent to μελιῶν and θεῶν, and as for ἐν instead of ἐς/εἰς, this is common enough in Greece, and what is more important, is also Boeotian and Thessalian. As εἰς or the parallel forms are innovations we might also suppose that Boeotian and Thessalian preserve the original Aeolic feature. However, here again the tradition is not sure and some of the MSS. have ἐς which is now accepted in the editions of Rzach, Jacoby, and Mazon.

To sum up: of all the features in the language of Hesiod which we have examined only one seems to be definitely West Greek: the number τέτορ(α) found once in the Erga. Of all the others there is none which we may safely call Doric, without first excluding the possibility that it is Aeolic (and we have seen that this cannot be done). The only peculiarity which all these elements have in common (with the possible exception of γέντο) is a character of linguistic archaism: as, at least in one case (καλυψαμένω), the preservation of a non-Homeric archaism in Hesiod seems to be proved,

---

[1]) Mus. Helv. XI [1954] p. 30 n. 46 (but see also Schwyzer Gr. Gr. I p. 678f.).

[2]) But see Wackernagel Sprachl. Unters. p. 219 n. 2.

[3]) Schwyzer DGE 418₁₃.

[4]) With the exception of a few words, for which various explanations can be produced, the Mycenaean Nom.-Acc. dual of the feminines of the -α declension seems to end in -ō both in Pylos and in Knossos (for instance to-pe-zo, i.e. torpezō, is the dual of the word for 'table'). It is obvious that we have here a Greek innovation which goes back to a very early date.

we may wonder if the same explanation might not be true for all
the supposed Doricisms.

7. We could wish that the problem represented by No. 5 in our
list were as straightforward as the ones which we have been dis-
cussing, but the question seems more complicated. The Theogony
has 5 instances of accusatives of the -a declension ending in -ᾰς
(κουρας 60, Ἁρπυιας 267, μεταναιετας 401, βουλάς 534 and 653).
A sixth possible instance is found in Th. 804, but the tradition is
not certain and a synizesis or a form εἶρας with a long a might be
assumed[1]). The Erga have the forms δεινάς (675) and τροπάς (564
and 663). Besides we might also notice that the Aspis has a short
form of accusative of the thematic declension, λαγός (302), and
that the form Σκύθας is found in fr. 55 Rzach and confirmed by
a papyrus (Merkelbach K 2 15)[2]). In view of the linguistic affinities
between the poet of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes and Hesiod we
can also consider the form ἀθρόας of Hymn. Hermes 106[3]). Both

---

[1]) The Mss. have εἰρέας ἀθανάτων, which may be corrected to εἰρᾶς ἐς
ἀθανάτων; alternatively we could accept a construction without the ἐς and
εἶρᾶς would be metrically correct. The reading of the Mss. εἰρέας is difficult
anyhow because we do not know such a word elsewhere. However, if it
belongs to the -a declension and if it is retained, it should be scanned εἰρέᾰς.

[2]) Moreover in Th. 521 Herodian, Choeroboscus etc. read δησᾰς against
the δῆσε δ' of the Mss. and of the EGen. δῆσε δ' fits the context admirably
and is accepted by all the editors. The origin of the varia lectio is obscure in
spite of all the hypotheses advanced (see e.g. Jacoby ad loc.).

[3]) The occurrence of the short accusatives is not limited to Hesiod and to
the author of the Hymn to Hermes: instances may be quoted from Epichar-
mus (-ᾰς in fr. 9, 90, 124 Kaibel; τᾰς in fr. 42.10; τός in fr. 170.13), Tyr-
taeus (see below p. 157 n. 1), Alcman (τροπᾰς [?] in fr. 17 Page: cf. Αἴας in fr. 68
Page), one of the Carmina Popularia (2 Page), the Rhodian chelidonismos (καλᾰς
ὥρας), and perhaps from Stesichorus (παγᾰς in fr. 7 Page). A large number
of accusatives in -ος and -ᾰς are found in the works of Theocritus. The in-
stances found in Pindar are doubtful: the Mss. have forms in -ος as variae
lectiones in Ol. 1.53, 2.71, Nem. 3.29 (where they are metrically possible,
but not satisfactory) and in Nem. 1.24, 3.24 where they are unmetrical.
The form ἥμενος of Nem. 10.62 is considered ʻperhaps rightʼ by Page. The
evidence is listed and discussed by D.L. Page (Alcman, The Partheneion,
by D.L. Page, Oxford 1951, p. 132f.), who rightly regards the source of the
Hesiodic forms as obscure. Also relevant is fr. 115.6 Diels of Empedocles,
which presents the forms μυριᾶς ὥρᾶς, now confirmed by P. Ibscher 2 (see
M. L. West, CR 76 [1962] p. 120). Together with the evidence listed above
we should consider the problem presented by the fr. 116 Diehl of Archilochus,
where the acc. plural δυσπαιπάλους presents a long syllable at the end of a
dactylic dimeter in which we should expect a short syllable. The reading
δυσπαιπαλός is possible, but the problem is essentially metrical and it may

the ancient tradition of the Hesiodic and Homeric scholia and modern scholars seem to agree in considering these forms of accusative as typical of Doric and NWG dialects. Since the attempt of Ahrens and Fick to consider them Delphic, and the generic label of Doric or NWG applied to them by Rzach and by the various editors and commentators of the Theogony and of the Erga, the only serious discussions of the problem have come from G. Mahlow in 1926 and from A. von Blumenthal in 1942[1]). However, before going into the details of their thesis, it may be convenient to examine the basis of the Doric theory.

The origins of these short accusatives are well known: in an early phase of Greek, which seems to have been common to all dialects, the forms of accusative plural ending in -ons, -ans ($<$ *-āns) were bound to lose the nasal in preconsonantal position, i.e. in front of a word beginning with a consonant, while the cluster -ns was preserved in prevocalic position[2]). As two forms fulfilling the same syntactic function are not easily tolerated in a single dialect, at a later date each linguistic group generalized either the short forms in -ος, -ᾰς or the long endings -ονς, -ανς both in the prevocalic and preconsonantal environment. The normal evolution of the language also caused the simplification of the forms in -ονς, -ανς which in their turn lost the nasal, but this time with some kind of compensatory lengthening. The result of this somewhat complicated process is the picture presented by the Greek dialects in historical times: on one side the dialects which have generalized and preserved the short accusatives, on the other side the dialects which have generalized the long forms and have then lost the nasal with lengthening or diphthongization of the preceding vowel. Few dialects, like Cretan and Argolic, still preserve both the long and the short forms. Insofar as our evidence allows us, it is possible to assume that a dialect has accusatives ending in -ᾰς, when the presence of short accusatives in -ος in that dialect is proved, but it is also obvious that, apart from the extremely rare metrical inscriptions, we are in a position to distinguish the accusatives ending in -ὄς from those

---

be advisable to admit an abnormal alcmanius in Archilochus (and consequently in Alcman). The whole question is discussed at length (with bibliography) in V. Marino, Archilochea, Roma 1957 (Ed. Gopa), p. 6ff.; see also P. Maas, Greek Metre, Oxford 1962, p. 29.

[1]) G. Mahlow op. cit. p. 244ff. and 478ff.; A. von Blumenthal, Hermes, 77 [1942], p. 103f.

[2]) See Schwyzer Gr.Gr. I p. 336f.; Lejeune, Phonétique, p. 112f.

ending in long -ōς only when the alphabet of the local inscriptions indicates the quantity of the vowels[1]).

We may now return to our Hesiodic forms. Ahrens' Delphic theory was based essentially on two points: 1. Most of the short accusatives are found in the Theogony which, because of its subject matter, seems to be connected with the sanctuary of Delphi much more closely than the Erga. 2. In a Delphic inscription of the first part of the Fourth Century (Schwyzer DGE 325) there are some examples of short accusatives in -oς. It is not difficult to prove that both these points are not well founded. As for the Delphic inscription, Ahrens knew only Boeckh's edition and did not rightly interpret the fact that while the alphabet indicates with ω the original long o, the secondary long o, due to compensatory lengthening or to contraction, is very often indicated with the simple o and only rarely with ov. This is true not only for the accusatives of the thematic declension, but also for the contracted genitive singular of the same declension, which is not suspect[2]). All modern editors now agree in regarding the accusative plurals as long, however they are spelled. As for the 'Doric' or 'Delphic' aspect of the Theogony on which both Ahrens and Rzach have insisted, we may say at least that this is not proved by our accusatives. True, the Theogony has 5 or perhaps 6 short accusatives in its 1022 lines, while only 3 short accusatives are found in 828 lines of the Erga[3]). But then what is the total number of accusative plurals of the -a declension in the Theogony as opposed to the total number found in the Erga? If my calculations are correct, the Theogony has 59 accusatives in -aς (-a declension), of which only 12 occupy such a position in the line that we can establish the quantity of the last vowels: of these 12, 7 are long (-$\bar{a}$ς) and 5 short (-$\breve{a}$ς); we are not clear about the sixth (see above p. 153). If we now turn to the Erga, we see that the poem offers only 31 forms of accusative in -aς vs. the 59 of the Theogony. Of these 31, only 5 are such that we can know their quantity and of these 5, 2 are long and 3 short[4]). In other words, as far as we

[1]) This considerably limits our evidence, as most of the Greek dialects did not adopt the Ionic alphabet before the Fourth Century.

[2]) e.g. τô Πvθίô (l. 11). It does not seem consistent to invoke the mistakes of the Attic stone-cutter, as Ahrens does in his De Graecae linguae dialectis, II (1843), p. 484ff.

[3]) These figures refer to all the known lines of the Theogony and of the Erga, leaving aside any question of authenticity.

[4]) The 'long' accusatives of the Theogony are found at ll. 53, 220, 502, 631, 663, 675, 712; those of the Erga at ll. 645 and 828.

know, in the Theogony the long accusatives are in a slight majority:
7 vs. 5 or 6; in the Erga in a slight minority: 2 vs. 3. Ahrens' con-
clusion is reversed, but it is obvious that, since the figures involved
are so small, we cannot rely too much on these ratios. At least we
may say that the proportions of long and short accusatives in the
Theogony and in the Erga do not differ considerably.

If then the short accusatives may not be considered Delphic
simply because our evidence points to long and not to short accu-
satives in Delphian, we may wonder which other Doric or NWG
dialect may be proved to be source of the Hesiodic forms. If we
hope to find a dialect near enough to Boeotia to have directly
influenced Hesiod's own dialect, we are going to be disappointed.
We have no evidence whatsoever which suggests the presence of
short accusatives in any NWG dialect of mainland Greece. Short
accusatives are the rule only in Thessalian, i.e. in a dialect be-
longing to the Aeolic group. In Peloponnese, there is some evidence
for the short accusatives in Argolis (where the forms in -νς are still
preserved) and perhaps — but the possibility is somewhat remote —
in Elis (where they are supposed to alternate with forms in -οις)[1]).
Arcadian has only short accusatives, but here again we have to
deal with a non-Doric dialect. In the Islands and in Africa there is
some evidence coming from the Doric dialects of Crete, Thera,
Cyrene, Cos, and perhaps Rhodes[2]). None of the dialects which we
have listed seems likely to have had a direct influence on Hesiod's
own dialect, especially since the exchange of morphological ele-
ments among dialects is necessarily much less common that the
simple borrowing of elements of the vocabulary. In conclusion,
if we insist in maintaining that our accusatives point towards a
definite dialect, we are also obliged to recognise that Doric, Ar-

---

[1]) For the Argolic forms see Thumb-Kieckers p. 117. In Elis the earliest
inscriptions show accusatives ending in -ος and in -ας, as well as forms in -αις.
The ending -οις is found only in the later inscriptions. There is no agreement
on the interpretation of the forms in -ος, as it is possible to understand them
as ending either in -ōς or in -ος (see Buck, Greek Dialects, p. 68, Thumb-
Kieckers p. 240).

[2]) See Thumb-Kieckers p. 56 (Crete), 175 (Thera and Cyrene), 199 (Cos
and other islands of the Aegean). The only evidence for Rhodes (where most
of the inscriptions are late) is offered by the Rhodian *chelidonismos* (see
above p. 152 n. 3), which can hardly be used to prove the presence of
short accusative in the epichoric dialect. The isolated Messenian instance
(see Thumb-Kieckers p. 105) is too doubtful to be worth considering.

11*

cadian and Thessalian are all equally probable or equally improbable
candidates. But are these the only conclusions we can reach?

8. I have already mentioned Mahlow's and von Blumenthal's
works on the subject. The solution proposed by Mahlow is quite
simple, but must be seen in the light of his thesis that Hesiod's
first language was neither Boeotian nor Aeolic of Asia, but Ionic[1]).
If this is accepted then any connection with Doric becomes even
more surprising; consistently Mahlow maintains that the short
accusatives are only archaic features, common to all Greek archaic
poets, including Homer. The only evidence adduced in support of
this last statement is given by the Homeric form $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\varkappa\check{\alpha}\varsigma$ 'into' or
'in the arms' which was considered a 'Doric' accusative as early as
by Eustathius (e. g. Eust. 558.17). If we could really assume that
the short forms are found in Homer, Mahlow's point would be
proved, but the evidence does not seem very encouraging. $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\varkappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ is
much more likely to be, as maintained by Risch and Chantraine,
a dative plural of $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\varkappa\acute{\omega}\nu$, i.e. $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\varkappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ with elision of the ι before a
word beginning with a vowel[2]); there is only one instance (Ψ 711)
in which it appears before consonant, but this seems to be late and
is probably due to a misunderstanding of the prevocalic use of the
word. As for the forms $\pi\varrho o\varphi\alpha\nu\varepsilon\iota\sigma\check{\alpha}\varsigma$ and $\vartheta\eta\lambda\varepsilon(\iota)\check{\alpha}\varsigma$ recorded by the
scholiasts as possible readings in Θ 378 and E 269, there is very little
doubt that in both cases we have to deal only with lectiones faciliores
for the $\pi\varrho o\varphi\alpha\nu\acute{\varepsilon}\nu\tau\varepsilon$ and $\vartheta\acute{\eta}\lambda\varepsilon\alpha\varsigma$ of Aristarchus[3]).

Thus the supposed Homeric evidence seems to disappear: to
Mahlow we can object that, although it is certainly true that Ionic
in an early phase of its history knew the short accusatives in a

---

[1]) Mahlow op. cit. p. 254ff.

[2]) See Risch in Lexicon des frühgriech. Epos 1 (1955) s.v. $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\varkappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma$' (with a
large bibliography, but the quotation of Mahlow should be added); Chan-
traine, Gramm. Hom., I, p. 251.

[3]) I am indebted for the information about the variae lectiones
$\pi\varrho o\varphi\alpha\nu\varepsilon\iota\sigma\check{\alpha}\varsigma$ and $\vartheta\eta\lambda\varepsilon(\iota)\check{\alpha}\varsigma$ both to Dr. M. L. West and to a note written by
Wackernagel (?) in the margin of his copy of Ahrens' De Graecae linguae
dialectis, II, p. 172 (now belonging to the library of the Ashmolean Museum
[Oxford]). For $\vartheta\acute{\eta}\lambda\varepsilon\alpha\varsigma$ see Chantraine, Gramm. Hom., I, 252 (and G. P.
Shipp, Studies in the language of Homer, p. 34). I confess that I do not
understand why Shipp wants to read $\vartheta\eta\lambda\acute{\varepsilon}\check{\alpha}\varsigma$ (acc. plur. of the -α declension
with reduction of $\varepsilon\iota$ to ε) instead of $\vartheta\acute{\eta}\lambda\varepsilon\alpha\varsigma$, acc. plur. of the 3rd declension,
used both as a feminine and as a masculine. The second form seems much more
likely to have been misunderstood by the scribes who were accustomed to
a feminine plural of the kind $\vartheta\eta\lambda\varepsilon\acute{\iota}\bar{\alpha}\varsigma$.

preconsonantal position, there is no evidence suggesting that their use was ever extended to a prevocalic position.

In 1942 von Blumenthal did not seem to be aware of Mahlow's attempt to solve the problem of the Doric accusatives; his main concern is undoubtely with the number of these forms found in Hesiod and in Tyrtaeus[1]). Having established that Hesiod has almost as many short accusatives as long accusatives (in the -a declension), that Tyrtaeus has only three forms of accusative of the -a declension in prevocalic position and that all of them are short, von Blumenthal arrives at the conclusion that both the poets felt these accusatives as short, perhaps on the analogy of the athematic declension, and that Hesiod considered the long forms as due to metrical lengthening. The objections are obvious: 1. If Hesiod thought that the ending -ας was short and could be lengthened for metrical reasons, why does the same not apply to the accusatives of the athematic declension? To my knowledge, neither the Theogony nor the Erga (nor Tyrtaeus' poems) present any instance of such a phenomenon. 2. I do not think that we can avoid taking into consideration the λαγός of the Aspis. The poet of the Aspis must have felt that this form was allowed by the linguistic rules of Hesiod (or of epic poetry), and if this is so, we cannot dissociate the accusatives of the -a declension from those of the thematic declension[2]). It follows that in order to accept von Blumenthal's explanation we have to assume a very complicated process by which on the analogy of the athematic declension the short accusatives of the -a declension were created and on the analogy of these were created the accusatives of the thematic declension. At least, the hypothesis does not seem economical[3]).

---

[1]) The forms χαιτᾱς, δημοτᾱς, δεσπότᾱς of Tyrtaeus are found in fr. 1.39, 3a.5, 5.4 Diehl. Apart from the article quoted above (p. 153 n. 1), see also von Blumenthal, Tyrtaios, in PWRE VII A (1948) col. 1954.

[2]) Even within these limits, this is a major problem and it is not easy to see why Hesiod and Tyrtaeus should have short forms in -ᾰς for the -a declension, but only long forms in -ους for the thematic declension (there are 12 instances of accusative in -ους in prevocalic position in the Theogony, 6 in the Erga, and 3 in Tyrtaeus). In some cases this may be due to the alterations occurred in the manuscript tradition: a short accusative in -ᾰς was prosodically odd, but graphically correct, while a short accusative in -ος was likely to be automatically corrected either into the equivalent long form in -ους or into a singular in -ον.

[3]) It may be added that it seems useless to invent a new ad hoc explanation in order to account for a morpheme which has already a philological justification.

9. It is possible that this series of negative conclusions might help us to find a new starting point. In my opinion it is very difficult to accept any hypothesis based on the possibility that the short accusatives belong to the spoken language of Hesiod. On one side all the available evidence seems to suggest that Boeotian generalized at a fairly early stage the long form of accusative[1]), on the other side the linguistic features of the Hesiodic language are such that the influence of the spoken language is nowhere evident. Boeotian preserved the *F* both in initial and in post-consonantal position, but Hesiod's use of *F* is much more sporadic than Homer's; the old genitives in -$\bar{a}o$, -$\bar{a}\omega\nu$ are preserved in Boeotian up to the beginning of the koine, but Hesiod's percentage of such genitives is very low if compared with the Homeric data[2]). These observations, together with the fact that more than 4/5 of the Hesiodic vocabulary consists of Homeric words[3]), should be enough to prove that Hesiod's works must be taken as a document of a literary[4]) language and are not likely to provide us with any information on the spoken language of the poet.

Recently A. Hoekstra and James Notopoulos[5]), following in the steps of Milman Parry, have insisted on the formulaic aspect of the Hesiodic works and on their character as oral poetry. If that

---

[1]) For those who accept an early date for Corinna, the fact that Corinna's accusatives end in -$\omega\varsigma$ may be significant.

[2]) According to A. Hoekstra, Mnemosyne, IV ser., X [1957], p. 202, the ratio of -$\bar{a}o$ to -$\varepsilon\omega$ in the Iliad is 4,5 to 1, in the Odyssey 2,8 to 1 and in Hesiod (Th. and Erga) 1 to 1; as for -$\dot{a}\omega\nu$ and -$\dot{\varepsilon}\omega\nu$ the ratio is 8,7 to 1 in the Iliad, 6,5 to 1 in the Odyssey, and 3 to 1 in Hesiod. For the *F* in Hesiod and in Homer see F. Devantier, Die Spuren des anlautenden Digamma bei Hesiod, I (1878), II (1894), and Hoekstra op. cit. p. 205ff. A comparison of the linguistic features of Homer and Hesiod will be found also in T.B.L. Webster, 'Early and late in Homeric diction', Eranos LIV [1956] p. 34ff.

[3]) The exact figures are given in J. A. Scott, A comparative study of Hesiod and Pindar, Diss. Johns Hopkins Univ., Chicago 1898. See also E. Kausch, Quatenus Hesiodi elocutio ab exemplo Homeri pendeat, Progr. Elbing 1878.

[4]) If the word 'literary' may be applied to oral poetry.

[5]) A. Hoekstra, 'Hésiode, Les Travaux et les Jours 405—407; 317—319; 21—24. L'élément proverbiel et son adaptation', Mnemosyne, IV Ser, III [1950] p. 89ff.; 'Une formule para-homérique', ibid. VII [1954], p. 297ff.; 'Hésiode et la tradition orale. Contribution à l'étude du style formulaire', ibid. X [1957], p. 193ff. J. A. Notopoulos, 'Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean Heritage of Oral Poetry', Hesperia, XXIX [1960], p. 177ff. (with large bibliography). The pioniering work in the study of Hesiodic formulae was done by P. Kretschmer, De iteratis Hesiodeis, Breslau 1913.

is so, then Hesiod ceases to be a late imitator of Homer, and be-
comes an author in his own right who draws from the inherited
stock of formulae of the professional poet and who may happen
to preserve some formulae or formulaic features which chance or
some other reason have prevented from occurring in Homer. In
this light it becomes exceedingly easy to account for the isolated
archaisms which we have been finding in the Theogony and in the
Erga, and we do not need any more to look round for a mysterious
'Doric' or 'Aeolic' influence. Moreover, if we felt inclined to follow
James Notopoulos in the most advanced part of his theory, which
assumes the existence of a continuous stream of oral poetry in
Mainland Greece from Mycenaean times up to the Eighth or Seventh
Century, we might also wonder if our accusatives could not be a
relic of that very early 'Achaean' phase of epic poetry which a few
recent works have tried to define[1]). In favour of this suggestion is
of course the fact that the Arcadian accusatives have the short
endings -ος, -ἄς, but against it is the more serious objection that
it is not easy to believe that Homer and his followers have not
preserved any trace of a morphological feature which would both
bear the mark of considerable antiquity and at the same time
would provide a very useful metrical device. Moreover, if we main-
tained that the earliest phase of epic poetry knew only short accu-
satives, we would arrive at the paradoxical conclusion that the long
accusatives, i.e. the only forms found in Homer, belong to the
late phases of the epics, and, to give a concrete example, that such
well established formulae as διὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας represent a late
development. But if this hypothesis, which at first sight seemed
almost plausible, leads to such a paradoxical conclusion, there must
be some wrong postulate which we have unconsciously assumed to
be true. In view of the most recent research it seems very difficult
to contest the existence of an 'Achaean' phase of epic poetry; the
'wrong step' will have to be found rather in the assumption that
this Achaean phase had the same short accusatives which we find
in Arcadian. That this is a mistake is quite likely, because we
know that the first stage in the evolution of the original forms
-ονς, -ανς is the loss of the nasal in preconsonantal position, and that
the extension of the short forms so created to the prevocalic position,
wherever this occurred, must have happened only in a second stage.

---

[1]) Most recently C. J. Ruijgh, L'élément achéen dans la langue épique,
Assen 1957.

It is not possible to give a date for the period in which Arcadian replaced the double form of accusative with the short forms -ος, -ἄς[1]), but, in view of a series of arguments based on linguistic probability and on comparison with other dialects, we may feel inclined to suggest a relatively late date, i.e. a period well after the Mycenaean age. If that is so, then we cannot escape the conclusion that the early epic formulae must have been created in a language in which the accusatives of the two first declensions still had the endings -ονς, -ανς in prevocalic position and -ος, -ἄς in preconsonantal position. This does not create any difficulty from the point of view of the actual texts as the metrical value of the formula was bound to remain constant in spite of the linguistic change: *διὰ κρατερὰνς ὑσμίνα(ν)ς is prosodically equivalent to διὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας and *τὸς δέ is as good an opening for a hexameter as the later τοὺς δὲ.

But when did the change actually occur? The same question of course may be asked for any Greek dialect, but is is most likely that it will remain unanswered because of the inadequacy of the available evidence. However, at least in the case of Ionic-Attic, a relative chronology may be suggested, provided that we can previously answer the question whether the generalization of the -ονς, -ανς forms is to be considered earlier or later than the simplification of the cluster -νς. I would not like to rule out the possibility that the long forms -ονς and -ανς may have been used as such in preconsonantal position, but I do not believe that the process of elimination of the short endings -ος, -ἄς could have been fully achieved before the dropping of the nasal in the cluster -νς. In the early Attic inscriptions we find sequences like ἐστέλει in which the ν of the preposition dropped because of its position in the syntagma; parallel evidence may be quoted for Ionic[2]). If this still happens in a much later period we have no reason to suppose that the cluster -ns + C[onsonant] was more easily tolerated a few centuries before, and it is therefore likely that in preconsonantal position the short

---

[1]) The Arcadian inscriptions do not have any trace of the -ονς, -ανς forms and the first forms with long ο are due to the influence of the koine.

[2]) For Attic the examples are listed in Meisterhans-Schwyzer, Gramm. att. Inschr., Berlin 1900[3], p. 111. For Ionic I can quote at least the archaic inscription of the VI Century (perhaps from the Granicus region) published by L. Robert in Hellenica, IX [1950], p. 78ff., where the text has τὴστέγην. For examples of the same phenomenon in other dialects see Thumb-Kieckers, p. 241.

accusatives would have been continuously recreated. It follows that the full disappearance of the accusatives ending in -$o\varsigma$, -$\breve{a}\varsigma$ must be later than the simplification of the consonantic group -ns. A chronological delimitation of this last phenomenon is given by the Attic-Ionic shift of long a to long open e (η). The presence of $\bar{a}$ and not of η in the ending -$\bar{a}\varsigma$ of the accusative plural of the -a declension is sufficient to prove that the loss of the nasal in the original ending -$a\nu\varsigma$ ($<$ *-$\bar{a}ns$) and the following lengthening of the vowel happened later than the passage of [$\bar{a}$] to [$\bar{\rho}$]. The dates proposed for this passage vary, but modern scholars seem inclined to put it in the First and not in the Second Millennium B.C.; quite recently Risch has suggested the Tenth or the Ninth Centuries as possible dates[1]. It might then be possible that the simplification of the endings -$o\nu\varsigma$, -$a\nu\varsigma$ happened after and not before the Ionic Migration, but this suggestion is not capable of any definite proof[2].

10. It must be emphasized that the conclusions we have reached are valid for Attic-Ionic only, but there is no reason for supposing that the evolution of the corresponding forms of accusative in, say, Boeotian or Lesbian was very different. As far as epic poetry is concerned, I think that it might be assumed that some of the formulae did preserve, for a period which may have covered some centuries, the old distinction between prevocalic and preconsonantal accusatives, i.e. between long and short endings.

A careful consideration of this period may offer a solution for the problem of the Hesiodic accusatives, provided that we accept the idea that Hesiod is not a late imitator of Homer, but a poet expert in the art of using the stock of formulae common to the aoidoi of his time. For many years or perhaps centuries the aoidoi in the continent used formulae in which the preconsonantal short accusatives in -$o\varsigma$, -$\breve{a}\varsigma$ alternated with the prevocalic accusatives in -$o\nu\varsigma$, -$a\nu\varsigma$. We may also suppose that during the same years or centuries they were busy creating new formulae and enriching or altering the

---

[1] Mus. Helv. XII [1955] p. 65.

[2] It may be wondered whether the name $M\acute{\eta}\delta o\iota$ on which the whole dating of the shift $\bar{a} > \eta$ is based (see Risch loc. cit.) is sufficient evidence. Recently L. R. Palmer (in The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts, Oxford 1963, p. 64) has pointed out that the form of the name with its η indicates only that the Persian $\bar{a}$ was assimilated to the Ionic η (which then was probably [$\ddot{a}$]) for lack of an [$\bar{a}$] in the dialect. But even in this case, the shift -$a\nu\varsigma > $ -$\bar{a}\varsigma$ must be later than the introduction of the name $M\acute{\eta}\delta o\iota$ in Ionia.

pre-existing ones by means of analogy or various modifications.
Both Parry and Leumann have shown how many elements in the
epic texts are due to the changes which occurred in the old formulae
during the uninterrupted use made of them by oral poets through the
centuries: often we have to deal with misunderstandings, more often
with perfectly legitimate modifications or alterations. It might then
come about that, when a formula which included a short accusative
in a preconsonantal position was split up, the same form came to be
used in a different position[1]), for instance before a caesura. Perhaps
it is not only by chance that of the five certain instances of short
accusatives found in the Theogony four occur just before the fe-
minine caesura. The metrical utility of such a device is quite ob-
vious, and there is no reason for surprise if later on it came to be
used wherever it was necessary, either for words which otherwise
could not have fitted in the hexameter or for the analogical creation
of formulae in a different case from the one of the original model.
The fifth instance of short accusative in the Theogony (l. 401)
belongs to a word μεταναιετᾰς, which is metrically possible only in
the Nom. plur. and before a word beginning with a vowel. As for
the Erga, the formula μετὰ τροπὰς ἠελίοιο of ll. 564 and 663 cor-
responds to the Homeric ὅθι τροπαὶ ἠελίοιο (ο 404), which again is
possible only in the Nom. plural[2]), while Νότοιό τε δεινὰς ἀήτας
of Erga 675 matches the Homeric ἀνέμοιο δὲ δεινὸς ἀήτη (Ο 626),
for which all the forms of the plural are unmetrical[3]).

Tyrtaeus has three instances of short accusatives: two of them
are words which otherwise would be possible only in the Nom.
plural and before a vowel (δημοτᾰς, δεσποτᾰς).

11. Even if some of the advantages of our suggestion are obvious,
it might be objected that it is built on a number of suppositions
which are not supported by adequate evidence. From a more
linguistic point of view it might also be contested that the speaker,
whether he was or was not a poet, may have not been conscious of
the different pronounciation of the two forms of accusative, no

---

[1]) A hint in this sense can be found in A. Hoekstra, Mnemosyne, IV Ser.,
X [1957], p. 217. The original meaning of the formula is discussed by I.
Sellschopp, Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod, Diss. Hamburg 1934,
p. 70 and by F. Krafft loc. cit. (see p. 139 n. 2).

[2]) See A. Hoekstra loc. cit.

[3]) For the supposed difference of gender and the supposed masculine
ἀήτης (still accepted in LSJ s.v.) see E. Fraenkel, Geschichte der griech.
Nomina agentis, Strassburg 1910—12, II, p. 134f., n. 1.

differently from any speaker who does not realize the distinction
between two allomorphs or two allophones. It would follow that
any conscious exploitation of such a distinction for metrical pur-
poses would be impossibile.

I believe that these objections may be met through the study of
a parallel case for which we have more abundant evidence. The
Ionic-Attic preposition εἰς is extensively used in epic poetry: its
origins are well known and the reconstructed form ἐνς accounts
both for εἰς with [ẹ̄] and for ἐς with [e][1]). The phonetic development
is parallel to the one of the accusatives which we have been dis-
cussing. As far as we can judge from the tradition, epic poetry
tends to use the short form ἐς in front of words beginning with a
consonant and the long form εἰς in front of words beginning with a
vowel, but the rule is not without exceptions. Before a word be-
ginning with a vowel Homer sometimes used the short form, which
is metrically convenient, but linguistically not justified: in his
Lexicon Homericum s.v. εἰς Ebeling lists almost 60 instances of
ἐς before vowel — and this figure does not include verbal com-
pounds of the kind ἐσαγείρομαι etc. In Hesiod I have counted 5
examples of the prevocalic ἐς in the Theogony and 5 in the Erga[2]).
The long form occurs in prevocalic position 6 times in the Theogony
and 10 times in the Erga[3]). It may be suggested that the distinction
is due to an overlapping of two different dialect strata in the for-
mation of the epic language. But as far as we know, among the
dialects which may have taken part in the formation of epics, εἰς is
found only in Ionic-Attic and in Lesbian; Arcadian, Boeotian and
Thessalian use ἐν both with the Dative and with the Accusative.
It is possible that the presence of εἰς (probably *[eis]*) in Lesbian
is due to Ionic influence, but for our purpose it is important to
note that early Lesbian seems to know in prevocalic position only
the long form of the preposition, while the later inscriptions have
generalized εἰς both in prevocalic and in preconsonantal position[4]).

---

[1]) See for instance W. Schulze, Quaestiones epicae, Gütersloh 1892,
p. 219f.

[2]) Th. 85, 285, 404, 596, 873; Erga 153, 290, 351, 620, 651.

[3]) Th. 292, 515, 740, 791, 795, 799; Erga 24, 44, 62, 84, 291, 534, 561, 562,
613, 630. The examples quoted in this and in the preceding note do not
include those cases in which the preposition is found before a word be-
ginning with a ϝ.

[4]) In Sappho and Alcaeus εἰς is regularly found before consonant and
before vowel. The only exceptions are the Sapphic ἐς ᾿Ιλιο[ν and ἐς αἴθ[ερα
in the 'abnormal' poem 44 Lobel-Page, where they are clearly due to epic

As for Ionic, the only valuable evidence comes from non-metrical inscriptions and they seem to agree in presenting εἰς before vowel and ἐς before consonant as late as the Fourth Century[1]). The prevocalic use of ἐς seems limited to literature and poetry, just as in the case of our short accusatives. Here again we must accept the same explanation. In the process of alteration of an old formula or of creation of a new formula, the short form previously used in preconsonantal position, may have proved to be a useful replacement for the long form εἰς which perhaps was metrically difficult. The procedure must have been common to all the Ionic aoidoi and the prevocalic ἐς became a stable part of the epic language. The aoidoi of the Greek mainland went a step further and applied the same procedure to the short accusatives of the first and possibly of the second declension. Hesiod and Tyrtaeus are probably not the creators, but the imitators of this device, first put to use by some unknown aoidos and successively exploited by his followers. It is not surprising that the short accusatives have left few traces in our tradition. After its great period oral poetry was bound to be replaced by a more sophisticated kind of literature: a linguistic feature which was not found in Homer and which did not have any basis in the spoken language could hardly survive for a long while. When the late grammarians spoke of the Doric accusatives of Hesiod, they were giving the only explanation which was possible within the limits of the evidence then available. It is also likely that Theocritus, the only late poet who made a considerable use of the accusatives in -ος, -ᾰς, was indebted for them much more to some Doric dialect with which he came in contact than to the old

---

influence. See E. M. Hamm, op. cit., p. 41 and D. L. Page, Sappho and Alcaeus, Oxford 1955, p. 67. The inscriptions seem to have fully generalized the form εἰς both in prevocalic and in preconsonantal position. The only exception quoted ἐσ[εν]ίκη of IG XII 2 645 b_{43} (from the island of Nesos) belongs to an inscription of the end of the Fourth Century, in which the influence of the koine is evident. See Thumb-Scherer p. 108.

[1]) It has been maintained that the Ionic form of the preposition was originally ἐς both in prevocalic and in preconsonantal position: see e.g. Bechtel Griech. Dial. III p. 140 and Buck, Greek Dialects, p. 69 ("Ion. mostly ἐς, Att. mostly εἰς"). However, Scherer has pointed out that the original distinction between preconsonantal ἐς and prevocalic εἰς is still preserved in the Fourth Century inscriptions and that the earlier evidence of metrical inscriptions is obviously of no use for the spoken language. See A. Scherer, Zur Laut- und Formenlehre der milesischen Inschriften, München 1934, p. 22f. and especially Thumb-Scherer p. 283.

epic tradition[1]): the whole conception of oral poetry had long since ceased to have any meaning.

If these conclusions can be accepted, then the last 'Doric' element of the morphology of Hesiod disappears, and there is no reason for regretting it. Whatever date we accept for the lifetime of Hesiod, it seems difficult to assume for that period a poetry composed in a different language from the one which we know through the Homeric epics, and in the great development of the epic tradition there is no place for Doric influence.

Dorisches und Hyperdorisches

Von KLAUS STRUNK, Köln

Bei Pindar, Ol. 13, 67 und Ne. 10, 76 bieten alle Hss. die Verbal-form φώνασε. Dieser scheinbar hyperdorischen Bildung entspricht bei Theokrit 2, 108 ein φωνᾶσαι. Auch hier steht die gesamte Text-überlieferung einschließlich des Antinoe Papyrus[2]), der als früher und eigenständiger Überlieferungsträger Gewicht hat, hinter der -ᾱ-Form. Dagegen ist φωνῆσαι für diese Stelle nur als Zweitversion in *H* bezeugt. Überlieferungswert hat die letztere Form in dem Theokritvers also kaum.

Die an den genannten Pindarstellen und im Grunde auch bei Theokrit einhellig bezeugten -ᾱ-Formen neben φωνέω geben zu denken. Instruktiv ist eine Gegenprobe mit der Überlieferung ent-sprechender Tempusstämme zu φιλέω. Bei Pindar sind alle in

---

[1]) The only hope of solving the question of Theocritus' short accusatives will be to consider it within the framework of the dialect (or dialects) used by him. It is obvious that the explanation suggested above for the Hesiodic accusatives cannot be accepted for the parallel forms in Theocritus. More-over, it is likely (and almost certain) that Theocritus regarded them as Doric. However, this does not account for their origin: Theocritus may have known the 'Doric theory' and may have felt that in using the -ος, -ᾰς forms he was imitating Hesiod, Tyrtaeus etc. or alternatively may have taken these forms from some spoken dialect with which he came in contact. It should also be noticed that these two hypotheses are not mutually exclusive.

[2]) Bei Hunt-Johnson, Two Theocritus Papyri (London 1930) 19 ff. Dieser Papyrus erscheint hier im folgenden als Pap. Ant. oder unter Gows Sigle P₃. Auch die Hss. werden unter Gows Siglen, die größtenteils mit denen von Wilamowitz und Gallavotti übereinstimmen, genannt. Eine Pindarhand-schrift erscheint in der Sigle Snells.