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Attic-Ionic and Doric used the genitive of possession.

Whether or not certain Mycenaean forms in -ιος (e.g. δι-κό-να-ρος α-δα-ρα-λι-κός = Διονύσας 'Αδράστος) are in fact patronymics is still a matter of doubt. 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, Ταληδέριος; certainly they should not be linked with the freakish Homeric Τελαμώνιος Αίας, 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.* 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'*. 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.

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

*) A. Fick, Hesiod's Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen fassung und sprachform wiederhergestellt, Göttingen 1887. The edition of the Theogony was
'Doric' features in the language of Hesiod

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\(^3\).

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 τωρεάστων (Gen. plur. of the word for 'thirty') or καπίτας (with apocope of the preposition and preservation of \(\eta\) 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 \(\eta \nu\) (Th. 321 and 825) for the 3rd person plural Attic \(\eta \sigma \nu\).

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 der Vatere, 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.

\(^3\) 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 Hesiod, 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 umerica, Bari 1948.
2. the form ἔδον (Th. 30) for ἔδοσαν (paralleled perhaps by the conjecture ἔδων for ἔδεσαν in fr. 76 Rzach).

3. the verbs περιάχε, περιώσεται (Th. 678, 733) with the short form περ of the preposition περι.

4. the form τίτος (a) (Erga 698) for the Homeric τίσαρες or πισμικές.

5. the accusative plurals of the first declension ending in -άς: 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 θεῖν and μελιάν of Th. 41 and Erga 145.

7. ἐν used instead of ἐς (or εἰς) in the formula ἔν ἐγκάθητο πηνόν (Th. 487, 890, 899).

No substantial additions to this list were made by Rzach, as the form ἔδοσαν 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. ἦγεντο (Th. 199, 283, 705) for the Homeric ἦγεντο.


1) We might also add the infinitive ἀποδέξεν 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 ἀποδέξεν which is unmetrical, or ἀπόδεξε, which seems to cause difficulty because it is the only imperative in a series of infinitives. The reading ἀποδέξεν is found in two manuscripts and according to Rzach (Wiener Studien, V [1883], p. 193) provides useful evidence for the imperative 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 or more infinitives with imperative functions. As for ἀποδέξεν the ν may well have been added to fill the apparent hiatus caused by the disappearance of the F in ὀξάδε. In short, I subscribe to the note of Colonna (Hesiodi Opera et Dies, rec. A. Colonna, Milano 1959, ad v. 611): „ἀπόδεξεν D, rec. 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 [1967], p. 206f.).

A few other non-Homeric forms might be understood as dialect features (εἰ γὰρ τίς κ(ε) of Erga 280 [but cf. ἔ 218], ἄδεξαν of Erga 392 and μέξες(α) of Erga 612), 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.

ἡν, 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 works1). As the form is found in West Locris, Phocis, Corinth and Lacouia (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; ἠσαν is no doubt an innovation and we must postulate for an early stage a system in which ἦς is the 3rd person singular and ἦσεν or ἦν the 3rd plural2). 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 ἦσεν/ ἦν (which in many cases could conceal ἦς) and a third plural ἠσάν or ἠσαν. 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 ἠσάν, in Th. 321 τῆς δ’ ἦν τρεῖς κεφαλαί and in Th. 825 ἦν ἑκατὼν κεφαλαί δόρως. 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), Epicharmus, Lucian and from an Attic epigram cited by Aeschines3). Whatever one may think of this —

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 ἰ conductivity third singular: evidence for ἰ conductivity 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 ἰ conductivity 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 ἰ conductivity is missing in these dialects. We have evidence for ἰ conductivity 3rd plural in the dialects of Laconia, Epidamnos, Sicily, Delphi and perhaps Locri 3). Arcado-Cyprian does not seem to offer any example of a 3rd plural imperfect of ἵππ. The position is slightly different for Lesbian: no examples are found in Alcaeus, and Sappho has ἰσὼν only once, in one of the

are instances of schema Pindaricum the whole problem of the 'Doric' ἰ conductivity ceases to exist. However, for ἰ conductivity 3rd plural see also O. Wilpert, Der schematische Pindarico et Alcmanico, Breslau 1878, pp. 35—40 and Das schema Pindaricum und ähnliche grammatische Konstruktionen, Progr. Oppeln 1900, p. 1 f.

1) For ἰ conductivity in NWG and Doric dialects see Thumb-Kieckers, Handbuch der griech. Dial., I, Heidelberg 1932, pp. 88 (Laconia, but only on the evidence of Alcman), 122 (Argolis), 132 (Corcyra), 164 (Olus), 181 (Cypria), 214 (Sicily, on the evidence of Epicnarmus), 272 (Delphi), 311 (Arcarnania); for Boeotian and Arcadian see Thumb-Scherer, Handbuch der griech. Dial., II, pp. 40 and 132. In Cyprian ἰ conductivity 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 Alkaeus, Berlin 1951, 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, ἰ conductivity . . . is probably the form in all dialects . . . except Attic-Ionic, where it was replaced by ἰ conductivity."  

3) See Thumb-Kieckers pp. 88 (Laconia, but only on the evidence of Aristophanes Lys. 1260), 132 (Epidamnos), 214 (Sicily, on the evidence of Epicnarmus), 272 (Delphi). In Locrian ἰ conductivity is found in the inscription Schwyzer DGE 362, (Fifth Century): ὕππ ρμώς τον ἰ conductivity, 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. 221 f.). The whole question of the Locrian forms of ἵππl is complicated by the presence in the inscription quoted above (I.36) of an apparent 3rd plural ἰ conductivity, 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. 83 f., but see also Buck, Greek Dialects, pp. 251 and 253).
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poems which Lobel regards as abnormal¹). If we then consider ëov 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 Aigai²) we find the plural ëov⁵). 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 ëov (or ëp) of third plural⁴). 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 Wackernagel⁶) proved that the use of the form ëov 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 epicpheric dialect of Syracuse, etc. In the language of the koine ëp has the functions of a third singular, while in the epicpheric dialect ëp means 'they were' third plural, and it must have happened that the spoken language accepted the new use while re-


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.

⁵) Schwyzler DGE 644. The first editor, S. Reinach, REG IV (1891) p. 209ff., 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. 97ff. No. 203) the inscription was considered „sicher später“ and in PWRE XVIII 1 (1939) s. v. Olympos 18 Keil considered it to be „aus den 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, XI/VII (1919), p. 68ff. (against Bechtel, Aeolica, Halle 1909, p. 44 ff.). Although probable, it is not certain that ëov is third plural and not third singular as the subject (a neuter plural) would allow both interpretations. The same form ëov 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-ent > ëov (as *es-ent > ëov) 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.

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 ἔστι so that it came to be used as a singular. In this case then the presence of ἔστι used as singular and as plural implies the existence of ἄν 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 526a29) from Eresos and belonging to the last years of the Fourth Century and in IG XII Suppl. 3,7 from Mytilene of the beginning of the Second Century2) ἔστι is used twice instead of the plural εἰσὶ. 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 ἄν should be presumed3).

Inscriptions and literary texts of the Aeolic dialect spoken on mainland Greece are not very helpful: instances of the form ἕλω (with the regular Boeotian treatment εἰ of ε) are found in Boeotian inscriptions which cannot be older than the second part of the Third Century4). Here again ἕλω should be considered an innovation 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) = Schwzyer 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 ἔστι used as third plural see also Bechtel, Aelica p. 8.

3) The necessity for making a distinction may also have caused the use of ἕλω (1st singular in Aelaeus) as third plural, an obvious parallel being provided by imperfects such as ἑλὼν in which the forms of the 1st person singular 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 ἑδίκων (for the Attic ἑδίκων) etc. (see below p. 144f.), 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 ἑδίκων etc. are modelled on ἄν does not rely on any solid evidence.
This form is no doubt to be considered archaic when compared with the Ionic-Attic innovation ἤσαν. 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, ἤν 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 ἤν 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 ἑδον, and in Erga 139 an imperfect ἑδιδον. The latter is followed by a word beginning with a consonant and the MSS. agree in giving ἐδίδον or ἐδίδων, i.e. the form of the koine. The correction to ἐδοον proposed by Ahrens seems quite simple, while to restore the Homeric form ἑδόον is metrically possible, but absurd from any other point of view1). As for the former a group of MSS. has ἑδον and another one ἑδων (confirmed by P. Oxy. 2090): here again there seem to be no doubts about the reading to be preferred. A parallel to ἑδον and ἑδων is perhaps provided by ἐδεσ, read by Boeckh (and Rzach) in fr. 76 Rzach2). 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 ἐκέσασθέν (Th. 183), κατέσταθέν (Th. 674), and τράφεν (Th. 142b) which must also be taken into consideration3).

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 Peloponnesian and the NWG dialects, from the earlier inscriptions onwards. Ar-

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

2) The Mss. have ἵσια θέσσαν νεός which is impossible and ἵσι: ἐθέν νηός seems the easiest correction (see Rzach, Wiener Studien, V [1883], p. 201 f.), 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 σαιεθαν and ἀνέθαν, but elsewhere, and in particular in Tegea, ἀνέθαν is the only form found1. The new ending -αν has a parallel in the Cyprian κατεθιμα (217 Masson), but it is likely that the form κατέθανα (94 Masson) of another Cyprian inscription is again an innovation based on κατεθιμα. The example is interesting, as it proves that parallel innovations may have occurred in a completely independent way2). Were it not for the quality of the vowel which precedes the ending, we would have no reason for suspecting that κατεθιμα 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 ἐθηκαν, ἐσωκαν which are found also in Homer. Aorist passives ending in -θαν 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 (ἀνέθαν) as well as the forms in -θαν of the aorist passive. Corinna has a form ἔθοντα. Thessalian does not behave very differently: an ending -εν or -εν-αν is added to the stem (ἐδάξαν; cf. also ἐνεφαλάσσαν) or to forms in -αν (ἐδῶκαν, ἐδῶκαν)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 ἰπεθαν of the inscription Schwyzer DGR 856, (from Tegea: Fourth Century) presupposes a form of 3rd plural *ἐσωκαν.

2) The date of the Cyprian inscription is not known, but it seems unlikely that the -αν of κατεθιμα is due to the influence of the koine.

3) ἀνέθαν is found for instance in the Ptoion dedication published by P. Guillon, Les Trépieds du Ptoion, I. Paris 1943, p. 54 No. 1. The inscription 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 -θαν see Thumb-Scherer p. 42; for Corinna, D. L. Page, Corinna, London 1953, p. 56. The form ἀνέθαν is found in an East Locrinean inscription (Schwyzer DGE 359: Fifth Century) may be due to Boeotian influence.

4) For the Thessalian forms (ἐτάξαν etc. alternates with ἐδῶκαν; see also ἐνεφαλάσσαν etc.) see Bochtel, Griech. Dial., I, p. 192; R. van der Velde, Thess. Dialektgeographie, 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 ἐδῶκαν is found in the famous inscription of Sotaiose of the Fifth Century (SchwyzerDGE 557) and [ἐ]δῶκαν in an archaic inscription of Phraia (Bóquignon, BCH LXXXVIII (1964) p. 403 No. 3; see also No. 8 and W. Peek, Ath. Mitt. 59 [1934] p. 57 No. 15).
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Dently one from the other; the termination -δέν of the aorist passive seems more stable than the forms like ἐδέν etc. It is only in Arcadian 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 ἐδὼν and ἐδίδον 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 -θέν aorists and also for τυάρεν 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). τυάρεν is found in Λ 251 etc. and forms in -θέν are very frequent with any kind of verb. It is true that neither ἐδὼν nor ἐδίδον are Homeric, but in view of the presence in Homer of such third person aorists as ἐδάν (Λ 391 etc.), ἔσταν (Λ 533 etc.), ἔφεν (ἐ 481 etc.), we may safely say that such aorists as ἐδὼν and ἐθεν are not inconsistent with the Homeric morphological system. The position is not different for the imperfect ἐδίδον: Homer has only δίδοσαν, but a form parallel to ἐδίδον is found in ἤδον, third person plural of the imperfect of ἔημι (Λ 273 etc.). Moreover, for τίμημι the reading of Aristarchus in a 112 seems to presuppose ἔτιδον. ἐδίδον 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 Homeric evidence helps to give these forms the right place in the picture: they are archaisms, common to all Greek dialects, which at different dates, but well within the historical period, have been replaced by means of various innovations. If we want to understand the Hesiodic ἐδὼν or ἐδίδον as Doricisms the same explanation must be applied to the Homeric ἔσταν or ἤδον: that this cannot be done does not require any demonstration.

4. The Delphic theory of Ahrens was based essentially on the short form πεό of πειλ before a vowel found in Th. 678 πειλαχε and in Th. 733 πειοίχεται. The parallel quoted was the Delphic πέροδος for πειλόδος from the inscription of the early Fourth Century

Schwyzer DGE 325,4. Against this Rzach (Der Dialekt des Hesiodos, p. 465f.) argued that in both cases the preposition was found before a verb originally beginning with Ρ, and that consequently this was an instance of apocope and not of elision. As it is possible to object a) that the etymology of οἶχομαι is not certain and that we do not have any evidence for an initial Ρ but that if the Ρ had been there the syllable περ- should have been metrically long, we shall have to take into consideration the elided forms of περ(ο-)4). However, their dialect distribution seems different from what Ahrens suspected. True, Delphic has πέροδος (but in the same inscription 1.18: περιμεῖνη), but Cyprian has περ' Ἐδάλρον (217 Masson) and Sappho probably has περιεθήκα, (94, 14 Lobel-Page), which is not likely to be due to metrical shortening of περ- Attic has probably περιβάλλων in Λεσχ. Αγ. 1147 and περεπαικῶντεν in Ευμ. 634 as well as the usual form περιμόνας2). What is even more to the point, Corinna, as we now know from the papyri, has περίστας Ἰάγελς4), which might point to a similar form in Boeotian, Hesiod's dialect. Unfortunately the Pindaric πέροδος (Nem. 11, 40, but see also fr. 314 Snell4) 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 τείχος δὲ περιθεταὶ ἀμφότεροισθεν, but the text is not without difficulty. First, περιθεται is a hapax (even if we look for the supposed standard form περιόθεται), secondly one does not see why the verb οἶχομαι 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 περίκεται against the metre, while the reading περιθεται 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 *περοῖάσθε he could have felt entitled to omit the Ρ 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 οἶχομαι see Boissacq 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. Praenkel, Agamemnon, 111 [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.
safeest conclusion consists in considering this passage of the Theogony as a crux (this is Paley's suggestion) and therefore in not giving too much importance to the supposed περι/περί.

As for περιάξε of Th. 678, it will be sufficient to refer to Schulze's article in KZ 1888¹), where by means of a conclusive argument, now fully accepted in Chantraine's Grammaire Homérique, he proved that in Homer such a form as ἰαξε with ἰ and no trace of initial Ἰ is simply a mis-writing for an aorist Ἰάξε, obviously without re-duplication and with a double Ἰ representing the treatment of initial *sw-. The forms with ἰ are obviously due to a false division of such compounds as ἐπί/ἲαξε etc. If we wanted to restore the primitive formula in our passage we should probably write περί/Ἱάξε; that an aorist fits the context better than an imperfect is likely in view of the following ἔρμαρψήμενοι²).

5. About the form τέτορ(α) found in Erga 698 a few observations can be made. It seems undeniable that τέτορις is a West Greek form opposed to the Ionic τέσσαρες, the Attic τέταρτες, the Boeotian and Thessalian τέταρτες etc. Homer has both τέσσαρες, perhaps an Atticism for τέσσαρες, and πλουρες, an Aeolic form metrically more convenient than the Ionic one. The West Greek τέτορες, which the Armenian parallel seems to prove to be very ancient³), 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 τέτορες⁴). However, as all

¹) W. Schulze, 'Zweiverkannte 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 περί Ἰαξε is metrically equivalent to περί δέ Ἰάξε.

²) It must be added that in Th. 370 Trielinius probably read περιοιτάδων 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 purposes. However, if περιοιτάδων were the right form, this would give us an instance of περί in preconsonantal position.

³) See for instance O. Szemerényi, Studies in the IE system of numerals, Heidelberg 1900, p. 20. According to Schwyzer Gr. Gr. I. p. 589 and Buck Greek Dialects p. 95 Arcadian should have a form τέσσαρες. But IG V 2 offers only τεσσαράδων in 473¹, metrical inscription of the Third Century A.D., and τεσσαράδων in 264⁴, of the First Century B.C. or A.D. Thumb-Scherer p. 138 rightly omit the mention of τέσσαρες in Arcadian.

⁴) Szemerényi op. cit. p. 20 argues that "the loss of -ω- in all-Greek τετάρτος is due to the cluster -τγ- from -τετ- while τετάρτος is assimilated to τέταρτος". 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 têtop(a) as a West Greek form in Hesiod: its metrical convenience is obvious and may account for its presence in the Theogony in the same way in which metrical convenience accounts for the preservation (if it is preservation) of πίσως in Homer¹.

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 dialect 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 γίνομαι, is of obscure origin in spite of Wackernagel’s having assumed a metathesis of consonant and vowel in the root γη- found e.g. in κασίγηντος²). 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, Alman, 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 corresponding ordinal. In the case of the Arcadian τέτραγως it is difficult to assume that *tetraus (see also Myc. ge-to-to-, i.e. ke-tro-, in ge-to-to-pa-pi etc.) changed into τέτραγως on the analogy of a supposed τέσσαρες, while the reason of the change would be obvious if the Arcadian cardinal had been τέτραγως. See also Mahlow op. cit. p. 324ff.

¹) I cannot help believing that the metrical equivalence of πίσως and τέτραγως is not due to pure chance.

²) See Wackernagel, Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer, Göttingen 1916, p. 173ff. (against his previous conclusions of KZ 33 [1905] p. 50 = Kleine Schriften 1 729). The question has also been discussed at length by H. Jacobsohn, Philologus, 67 [1908], p. 325ff., 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 understood as due to a misunderstanding of the epic γένος ‘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 (e)γέντο (PY Ad 686 marg.: pa-ro-ke-ne-[to]).
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a misunderstanding of the Homeric ψέντο 'he grasped': it is towards this suggestion that Chantraine (Morphologie⁶ p. 165) and Risch in his study on the language of Åleman seem to incline¹).

The dual feminine καλυφαμένω preserved by the MSS. in Erga 198 and wrongly corrected by Rzach on the evidence of an inscription of the Second Century B.C.*), till a short while ago was paralleled only by the masculine τὸ καταστάτῳ of an archaic Elean inscription (Sixth or Fifth Century)²) and, of course, by the Attic article τῶ. 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 language⁴). 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 μελιών and θεῖων, which of course are metrically equivalent to μελιών and θεῖων, and as for ἑν instead of ἐξ/εξ, this is common enough in Greece, and what is more important, is also Boeotian and Thessalian. As είς 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 ἐξ 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 τὸτάο(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 ψέντο) is a character of linguistic archaism: as, at least in one case (καλυφαμένω), 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 Schwzyzer Gr. Gr. I p. 678f.).
²) But see Wackernagel Sprachl. Unters. p. 219 n. 2.
³) Schwzyzer DGE 4184.
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 -ό both in Pylos and in Knossos (for instance λο-τόζο, i.e. τορζό, 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 discussing, but the question seems more complicated. The Theogony has 5 instances of accusatives of the -α declension ending in -άς (καυρας 60, Ἀρτινας 267, μετανιματας 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 εἰράς with a long a might be assumed1). The Erga have the forms δεινας (675) and τροπας (564 and 663). Besides we might also notice that the Aspis has a short form of accusative of the thematic declension, λαγις (302), and that the form Συβός 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 ἄθρας of Hymn. Hermes 106)3). Both

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

2) Moreover in Th. 521 Herodian, Choroeboscus etc. read δήσα against the δῆσα of the Mss. and of the EGen. δήσα δῆσα 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 Epicharmus (άς fr. 9, 90, 124 Kaidel; τάς fr. 42.10; τάς fr. 170.13), Tyrtaeus (see below p. 157 n. 1), Alcman (τροπάς [?] in fr. 17 Page: cf. Αλας in fr. 68 Page), one of the Carmina Popularia (2 Page), the Rhodian chelidonismos (ταλός ἄρας), and perhaps from Stesichorus (παγάς in fr. 7 Page). A large number of accusatives in -ας and -ας are found in the works of Theocritus. The instances found in Pindar are doubtful: the Mss. have forms in -ας 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, 2.24 where they are unmetreical. The form ἡμερας of Nem. 10.62 is considered 'perhaps right' 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. 110.6 Diels of Empedocles, which presents the forms μυράς ἀμάς, now confirmed by P. Ithacher 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 δοσαπαλδος presents a long syllable at the end of a dactylic dimeter in which we should expect a short syllable. The reading δοσαπαλδος is possible, but the problem is essentially metrical and it may
'Doric' features in the language of Hesiod

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. 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 (< *-ans) 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. 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, -άς 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 -άς, 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 -άς from those

be advisable to admit an abnormal alemanius in Archilochus (and consequently in Alcman). The whole question is discussed at length (with bibliography) in V. Marino, Archilochea, Roma 1957 (Ed. Copa), p. 6ff.; see also P. Maas, Greek Metre, Oxford 1962, p. 29.
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ending in long -āç 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 -oç. 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 \(\alpha\) 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 \(ou\). 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 -oç (-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 (-āç) and 5 short (-āç); 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 -oç 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. τo Ἰενθία (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.
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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’ conclusion 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 accusatives 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 belonging to the Aeolic group. In Peloponnese, there is some evidence for the short accusatives in Argolis (where the forms in -vç are still preserved) and perhaps — but the possibility is somewhat remote — in Elis (where they are supposed to alternate with forms in -oç)\(^1\). 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 elements 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 -oç and in -vç, as well as forms in -oç. The ending -oç is found only in the later inscriptions. There is no agreement on the interpretation of the forms in -vç. as it is possible to understand them as ending either in -vç or in -oç (see Buck, Greek Dialects, p. 68, Thumb-Kieckers p. 240).

\(^2\) See Thumb-Kieckers p. 86 (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. 9), 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.
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 Ionie¹.

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 ἄγνάς ‘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. ἄγνάς is much more likely to be, as maintained by Risch and Chantraine, a dative plural of ἄγων, i.e. ἄγνασι with elision of the i before a word beginning with a vowel²); there is only one instance ( frags. 711) in which it appears before consonant, but this seems to be late and is probably due to misunderstanding of the prevocalic use of the word. As for the forms προφανεσάς and θηλέ(ι)άς recorded by the scholiasts as possible readings in Ὅ 378 and Ἕ 269, there is very little doubt that in both cases we have to deal only with lectiones faciliiores for the προφανέσταται and θηλεάς of Aristarchus³).

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. ἄγνασ (with a large bibliography, ‘the quotation of Mahlow should be added); Chantraine, Gramm. Hom., I, p. 251.
³) I am indebted for the information about the variae lectiones προφανεσάς and θηλε(ι)άς both to Dr. M. L. West and to a note written by Wackernagel (1) in the margin of his copy of Ahrens’ De Graecae linguæ dialectis, II, p. 172 (now belonging to the library of the Ashmolean Museum [Oxford]). For θηλεάς 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 θηλεάς (acc. plur. of the -a declension with reduction of ei to e) instead of θηλεάς, 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 θηλεάς.
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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 undoubtedly with the number of these forms found in Hesiod and in Tyrtæus\(^1\). Having established that Hesiod has almost as many short accusatives as long accusatives (in the -\(\alpha\) declension), that Tyrtæus has only three forms of accusative of the -\(\alpha\) 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 -\(\alpha\) 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 Tyrtæus' poems) present any instance of such a phenomenon. 2. I do not think that we can avoid taking into consideration the \(\lambda\gamma\rho\zeta\) 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 -\(\alpha\) 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 -\(\alpha\) 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 χαυτάς, δῆμοτάς, δέσποτάς of Tyrtæus 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, Tyrtæios, 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 Tyrtæus should have short forms in -\(\alpha\) for the -\(\alpha\) declension, but only long forms in -\(\omega\zeta\) for the thematic declension (there are 12 instances of accusative in -\(\omega\zeta\) in prevocalic position in the Theogony, 6 in the Erga, and 3 in Tyrtæus). In some cases this may be due to the alterations occurred in the manuscript tradition: a short accusative in -\(\alpha\) was prosodically odd, but graphically correct, while a short accusative in -\(\omega\zeta\) was likely to be automatically corrected either into the equivalent long form in -\(\omega\zeta\) or into a singular in -\(\omega\).

\(^3\) 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 \( \acute{a} \) both in initial and in post-consonantal position, but Hesiod’s use of \( \acute{a} \) is much more sporadic than Homer’s; the old genitives in \(-\dollar{\acute{a}o}, -\dollar{\acute{a}ov}\) 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 \( -\dollar{o} \) may be significant.

\(^2\) According to A. Hoekstra, Mnemosyne, IV ser., X [1957], p. 202, the ratio of \( -\dollar{\acute{a}o} \) to \( -\dollar{\dollar{\acute{a}o}} \) 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 \( -\dollar{\acute{a}ov} \) and \( -\dollar{\dollar{\acute{a}ov}} \) 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 \( \acute{a} \) in Hesiod and in Homer see F. Devantier, Die Spuren des anlautenden Digamma bei Hesiod, I (1878), II (1894), and Hoekstra op. cit. p. 308ff. 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’, Erans 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.

is so, then Hesiod ceases to be a late imitator of Homer, and becomes 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 define¹). In favour of this suggestion is of course the fact that the Arcadian accusatives have the short endings -ος, -ας, 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 maintained that the earliest phase of epic poetry knew only short accusatives, 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 κριτερίων ἓκληματος 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 -ος, -ας 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. Ruljgh, 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, -άς\(^1\)), 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, -ας in prevocalic position and -ος, -άς 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: *διά κράτεράς ύσμίνα(ν)ς is prosodically equivalent to διά κράτερας ύσμίνας and *τὰς δὲ is as good an opening for a hexameter as the later τοις δὲ.

But when did the change actually occur? The same question of course may be asked for any Greek dialect, but 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, -ας 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 -ας may have been used as such in preconsonantal position, but I do not believe that the process of elimination of the short endings -ος, -άς could have been fully achieved before the dropping of the nasal in the cluster -νς. In the early Attic inscriptions we find sequences like ἐστέλλει 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 -νς + Κ[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, -ας 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. Inscrh., Berlin 1900, 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 τηλετέγγην. 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 -öç, -åç must be later than the simplification of the consonantic group -ne. 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 å and not of η in the ending -åç of the accusative plural of the -a declension is sufficient to prove that the loss of the nasal in the original ending -avç (< *-ãns) and the following lengthening of the vowel happened later than the passage of [å] to [ŋ]. 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 dates1). It might then be possible that the simplification of the endings -avç, -avç happened after and not before the Ionic Migration, but this suggestion is not capable of any definite proof2).

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, Bocotian 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 -öç, -åç alternated with the prevocalic accusatives in -avç, -avç. We may also suppose that during the same years or centuries they were busy creating new formulae and enriching or altering the

---

2) It may be wondered whether the name Μήδος on which the whole dating of the shift å > η 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 å was assimilated to the Ionic η (which then was probably [å]) for lack of an [ä] in the dialect. But even in this case, the shift -avç > -åç must be later than the introduction of the name Μήδος 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 position¹), 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 feminine caesura. The metrical utility of such a device is quite obvious, 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 (1.401) belongs to a word μετάναστάς, which is metrically possible only in the Nom. plur. and before a word beginning with a vowel. As for the Erga, the formula μετά τροπάς ἤλλου of ll. 564 and 663 corresponds to the Homeric ὅθε τροπαὶ ἤλλου (o 404), which again is possible only in the Nom. plural²), while Νότοιῷ τε δεινῷ ἅγίας of Erga 675 matches the Homeric ἀνέμου δὲ δεινὸς ἅγη (O 626), for which all the forms of the plural are unmetrical³).

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 (δημοτάς, δεσποτάς).

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 pronunciation 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 L. Sellbach, 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.
'Doric' features in the language of Hesiod

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 purposes would be impossible.

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 *ei* is extensively used in epic poetry: its origins are well known and the reconstructed form *ei* accounts both for *ei* with [i] and for *ei* with [e]. The phonetic development is parallel to the one of the accusatives which we have been discussing. As far as we can judge from the tradition, epic poetry tends to use the short form *ei* in front of words beginning with a consonant and the long form *ei* in front of words beginning with a vowel, but the rule is not without exceptions. Before a word beginning with a vowel Homer sometimes used the short form, which is metrically convenient, but linguistically not justified: in his Lexicon Homericum s.v. *ei* Ebeling lists almost 60 instances of *ei* before vowel — and this figure does not include verbal compounds of the kind *εκαγείνομαι* etc. In Hesiod I have counted 5 examples of the prevocalic *ei* in the Theogony and 5 in the Erga. The long form occurs in prevocalic position 6 times in the Theogony and 10 times in the Erga. It may be suggested that the distinction is due to an overlapping of two different dialect strata in the formation of the epic language. But as far as we know, among the dialects which may have taken part in the formation of epics, *ei* is found only in Ionic-Attic and in Lesbian; Aedrian, Boeotian and Thessalian use *ei* both with the Dative and with the Accusative. It is possible that the presence of *ei* (probably *[ei]/) 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 *ei* both in prevocalic and in preconsonantal position.

1) See for instance W. Schulze, Quaestiones epicae, Gütersloth 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 beginning with a *f*.

4) In Sappho and Alcaeus *ei* is regularly found before consonant and before vowel. The only exceptions are the Sapphic *ei* "Ταίοντας" and *ei* of *equiv* in the 'abnormal' poem 44 Lohel-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 eiç before vowel and eiç before consonant as late as the Fourth Century\(^1\). The prevocalic use of eiç 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 eiç which perhaps was metrically difficult. The procedure must have been common to all the Ionic aoidoi and the prevocalic eiç 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, -ας, was indebted for them much more to some Doric dialect with which he came in contact than to the old

\(^1\) It has been maintained that the Ionic form of the preposition was originally eiç both in prevocalic and in preconsonantal position: see e.g. Bechtel Griech. Dial. III p. 149 and Buck, Greek Dialects, p. 69 ("Ion. mostly eiç, Att. mostly eiç"). However, Scherer has pointed out that the original distinction between preconsonantal eiç and prevocalic eiç 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 mittleischen Inschriften, München 1934, p. 22f. and especially Thumb-Scherer p. 283.
epic tradition): 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 Verbalform φώσις. Dieser scheinbar hyperdorischen Bildung entspricht bei Theokrit 2,108 ein φωσάω. Auch hier steht die gesamte Textüberlieferung einschließlich des Antinoc Papyrus), der als früher und eigenständiger Überlieferungsträger Gewicht hat, hinter der -ά-Form. Dagegen ist φωσησίω 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 -ά-Formen neben φωσίω geben zu denken. Instruktiv ist eine Gegenprobe mit der Überlieferung entsprechender 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 Ieisiod accusatives cannot be accepted for the parallel forms in Theocritus. Moreover, 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, -ές 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.