

ΑΑΑΤΟΣ AND SOME OTHER NEGATIVE COMPOUNDS

THE uncertainty of the current explanation of ἀάατος is not difficult to demonstrate. The word occurs only in four passages of Epic, of which three are Homeric, and it will be convenient to start by listing them.

- (1) Hom. *Il.* 14. 271:
 ἄγρει νῦν μοι ὁμοσσον ἀάατον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ.
- (2) Hom. *Od.* 21. 89-91:
 ἀλλ' ἀκέων δαίνυσθε καθήμενοι, ἧὲ θύραζε
 κλαίετον ἐξελθόντε, κατ' αὐτόθι τόξα λιπόντε,
 μνηστήρεσσιν ἄεθλον ἀάατον.
- (3) Ibid. 22. 5:
 οὔτος μὲν δὴ ἄεθλος ἀάατος ἐκτετέλεσται.
- (4) Ap. Rhod. 2. 76-77:
 ἀπηνέα δ' αἰψα νοήσας
 πυγμαχίην, ἧ κάρτος ἀάατος, ἧ τε χερείων.

It will be seen that ἀάατος has twofold prosodic value: in passage (1) it equals ∪-∪-∪, but in the others ∪-∪∪.

It is usual to connect the word with ἄτη (*ἄφᾶτη; Alc., Pind. *αὔατα* i.e. *ἄφάτα: Lejeune, *Traité de phon. grecque*, p. 155 note), ἀάω-ομαι, thus following a lead given by Hesychius (ἀάβακτοι· ἀβλαβεῖς). This is indeed the only suggestion advanced in the respective etymological dictionaries of Boisacq, Hofmann, and Frisk, and by Seiler (*Lex. frühgriech. Epos*); though all but Seiler express more or less of doubt, particularly on the ground of meaning. The etymology of ἀάω: ἄτη is not certain, but, not to go outside Greek, the stems ἄφᾶ, ἄφᾶ can be identified. If initial ἀ- in ἀάατος is taken to be the negative prefix, we are left with the stem -άατος. This would primarily be taken as -ᾗατος or -ᾗατος (cf. aor. ᾗσα), thus leaving the quantities actually found in Epic ἀάατος (∪-∪∪) to be explained as secondary developments.¹

The main point of phonological difficulty (and it is a serious one, which has not been sufficiently stressed) is the form of the negative prefix, ἀ- in place of the expected ἀν- (ἀν-άατος); and ἀνάατος does indeed occur, on inscriptions of the fourth and third centuries B.C. (Elean and Arcadian). Seiler suggests that ἀ- was used to avoid the form ἀν-α-. He compares ἀάσχετος, made (as he proposes) from ᾗσχετος with reduplication of the negative prefix ἀ- to avoid similarity with the positive adjective ἀνσχετός from ἀνέχω: negative *ἀνάσχετος would have been open to the same objection. So far as ἀάσχετος is concerned, this account is satisfactory. In the case of ἀάατος we should be required to analyse as ἀα- (neg. prefix) + -ᾗατος (contracted as in ἄτη). But the analogy of ἀάσχετος is not really helpful here. In what way was the form ἀνάατος (which, moreover, did exist, at any rate in the post-Epic language) undesirable? ἀάω made no compound with ἀνα-, comparable to ἀνέχω; on the other hand, there

¹ Seiler, l.c., explains the regular long quantity of the second *a* in ἀάατος as probably metrical. I shall return below to this question.

was an Epic negative compound *ἄατος* 'insatiate, -able', **ἄ-σα-τος*: *ἄω*, and the similarity of *ἄατος* to this would (on the supposition of its derivation from *ἄάω*) have the effect of making *ἄνατος* actually desirable. This is to say nothing of the extreme phonetic awkwardness of *ἄάτος*, which *ἄν-* would have greatly relieved. Thus the essential part of Seiler's thesis remains unexplained and, I think, inexplicable.

We therefore must return to a simple negative prefix *ἄ-*. In later Greek it is possible to find on the one hand fluctuation between *ἄ-* and *ἀν-* before the same stem (as *ἄ-* and *ἀν-οπλος*); and on the other hand *ἄ-* before vowels where there was never *-υ-* or *-h-* to follow and justify it (as *ἄζος*, *ἄσμος*, *ἄορνος*).¹ But at the Epic stage this point of development does not seem to have been reached. In Homer there are only two apparent examples of the negative prefix *ἄ-* before vowels, if we omit cases where it is clear that the *simplex* began with *υ-* or *h-*:² and these are none other than *ἄάτος* and *ἄάσχετος*. Of other possible cases we must leave out of reckoning *ἀήσυλος* and *ἄωρος* (*Od.* 12. 89 *πόδες . . . ἄωροι*, of Scylla), since their derivation is unknown. *ἄοντος* probably has *-f-*. The source of *ἄαπτος* is disputed. It has been explained as in error for *ἄεπτος*, which would be derived from (f) *εἰπεῖν*: **ἄξεπτος* > *ἄεπτος* > **ἄπτος* > *ἄαπτος* (by *δέκτασις*).³ But this has been criticized by H. Vos,⁴ principally on the ground of meaning; and Frisk (*Et. Wb.*) also has serious doubts on this score. If we start from a sense 'unspeakable', passing to 'unspeakably large, strong', and so to the senses actually proposed (*Lex. frühgriech. Epos*) 'irresistible, hard to conquer, fearful, mighty', it is extraordinary that the range of the word is limited to use in the single phrase *χεῖρες ἄαπτοι*, which is paralleled by the occurrence of *χειρῶν ἄπτεισθαι* in the *Iliad*. It seems more satisfactory to follow Vos in returning to the interpretation *ἄ- + -απτος*: *ἄπτω*, 'not to be touched, unapproachable'. *ἄ-* is then explained by Vos as designed to avoid the confusing form *ἀναπτος*, which could be taken as from *ἀν-άπτω*. But whichever explanation of *ἄαπτος* is accepted, we have either *-f-* or *-h-* after the negative prefix.⁵

So, as stated, we are left with only *ἄάτος* and *ἄάσχετος*; and the latter can be satisfactorily accounted for, as we have seen, by Seiler's explanation.

¹ See my *Studies in the Greek Negatives*, pp. 47-48; M. Lejeune, 'Observations sur les composés privatifs', *Rev. Phil.* xxxii (1958), 198-205. The evidence of Mycenaean, with which Lejeune mainly deals, is unfortunately not clear on the questions whether it consistently had (1) *a-* before *h* plus vowel, and (2) *an-* before vowel without *h*. The most difficult forms are three with *an-* where *h* is postulated, contrasted with seven showing *a-* without *h* (including such clear forms as *a-na-hu-ke* and *a-no-we*, *a-no-wo-to*): they are *a-na-mo-to*, *a-no-pa₂-si-ja*, *a-no-po*. Of these the first is probably the most securely established, as either *ἀνάρμωστο-* (Ventris-Chadwick, etc.) or *ἀνάρμωστο-* (*ἄρμα*: Palmer). But even here the truth is tantalizingly fugitive, since the base of both *ἀρμόζω* and *ἄρμα* is **ar-* (*ἀραρίσκω*) and the aspirate is not original, although regularly appearing in these derived forms. So for *ἀρμόζω* Lejeune suggests the possibility of a Mycenaean form in

**ār-m-*, opposed to the Classical **ār-σμ-*, *ār-m-*. However, the point in doubt for Mycenaean is purely concerned with psilosis, with the question of the form of prefix before stems which originally had *h*. There is no sure example quoted from it of *a-* before a vowel in stems which never had *h*: the single case of *a-e-ti-to* (?*ἐρτίς*) is insecure evidence, as Lejeune grants. To this extent, therefore, there is agreement with Homer, and that is what is relevant to the present discussion.

² There are two examples of the negative prefix before *h* in Homer, apart from *ἄαπτος* (see above). *ἄατος* 'insatiable' < **ἄ-σα-τος*; and *ἄυπνος* < **h₁- + -supno-*, weak grade of **syē/ōrno-*.

³ So in *Lex. frühgriech. Epos* (Erbse and Lasser), following Wackernagel and Bechtel.

⁴ *Glotta* xxxiv (1955), 292-4.

⁵ The etymology of *ἄπτω* is not certain. Hofmann, *Et. Wb.*, connects with Skt. *yabhati*, so giving *i* as the source of Greek *h*.

Alternatively Wackernagel takes ἀάσχετος as a false form, replacing an original negative *ἀνάσχετος (which was glossed by ἄσχετος, and then this form was altered to repair the metre).¹ ἀάατος is now seen to be in fact isolated, and this, even if there were no other doubts, should have produced more scepticism regarding the alleged derivation from ἀάω. There for the present I leave its phonology.

It is time that we should turn to consider the meaning of ἀάατος, in relation to the derivation from ἀάω: ἄτη. The meanings of this verb and noun have, of course, been much discussed, but I think it is possible to summarize briefly the essential points. Here I have found most useful the work of Professor Dodds (*The Greeks and the Irrational*, pp. 2 ff., 38 ff.) and of Seiler (*Lex. frühgriech. Epos*, s.v. ἀάω; cf. also *Festschrift Debrunner*, pp. 409 ff.). The oldest sense (*Iliad*) of the noun is to denote temporary mental insanity or blindness, due to external 'daemonic' agency; also, actions committed under such influence. Later developments are those of 'harm, ruin, disaster' (transition to this already in *Od.*); 'instrument, or embodiment, of divine anger'; 'legal penalty, fine' (epigraphic). For the verb Seiler argues that the aorist middle ἀάσατο shows the meaning most clearly: *handelte in der Verblendung, Verirrung* (with the added note, *Verirrung liegt auf geistiger Ebene*). Note also L.S.J., s.v. ἀάω: 'hurt, damage, always in reference to the mind, mislead, infatuate'.

On this basis, what meanings should we expect to find for ἀάατος, if derived from the same source? The primary one would be, with either active or passive sense, 'not causing, or not suffering, infatuation'; then further (and later) in place of 'infatuation' we should expect 'hurt' or 'legal penalty'. The attested meanings of post-Epic ἄνατος fall with no trouble within these limits: so we find in L.S.J. (1) (passive) 'unharmful'; 'immune from punishment';² (2) (active) 'not harming, harmless'.³ So does ἀνάατος 'immune from punishment'. So far there is no difficulty. But let us now turn to Epic ἀάατος. For *Il.* 14. 271, to describe the water of the Styx, an active 'harmless' can be readily ruled out. Another active sense is given by Schrader, 'infallible, free from error' (quoted by Boisacq: this sense is proposed also for the two passages in the *Odyssey*);

¹ See my *Studies* . . . , pp. 49–50.

² The latter sense wrongly listed as active in L.S.J.

³ Fraenkel, *ad* Aesch. *Ag.* 1211, remarks that it is inappropriate in the case of ἄνατος (as in that of ἀναυδος) to speak of an active or passive force, since the word means 'devoid of hurt'. This disagrees with his own note on v. 238 (discussing ἀναυδος), where he grants that of course active and passive force are common in verbal adjectives in -τος, and quotes ἄνατος as one such, taking v. 1211 as showing the passive sense (vol. ii, p. 137, fn. 1). The confusion arises from doubt whether ἄνατος is nominally derived (possessive compound) or verbally: it may be either. The further question arises, whether the distinction is worth retaining, that we should speak of active and passive force only for adjectives of verbal derivation. For this presupposes that active or passive sense is formally ex-

pressed if we have a verbal adjective in -τος: yet that is not the case. The formation is an adjective, not a participle integrated in the conjugational system; what is expressed is no more than association with the idea contained in the verb (see Wackernagel, *Syntax*, i. 136). Hence if we have a nominal derivative such as ἀναυδος, where the original noun describes an action or the product of an action, it seems proper to establish the same categories of meaning lexically as for a verbal derivative. So ἀναυδῆτος and ἀναυδος may be described in parallel: both have (a) active sense, 'not speaking' (which meaning is shared by English 'speechless'); (b) passive sense, 'not to be spoken (of)'. In short, *active* and *passive* are here categories established by the lexicographer for our convenience of understanding: they are logically, not formally based.

similarly Seiler (*Lex. frühgriech. Epos*) 'in which there is no delusion or deception', which is amplified by the remark that it is probably the water of Styx itself which does not delude. This is objectionable for the *Iliad* on the ground that it gives poor sense. It is hard to see how the Styx itself can be called infallible, or said not to delude; though that would not be impossible as a description of an oath taken by it. Furthermore, and more generally, it seems to me that if one were looking for a word 'infallible, not deceiving' in such a context, one would not choose the stem of ἄτη at all: the early sense is a special kind of mental misleading, associated with awful consequences, and one too of a temporary nature. These features make the stem unsuitable to provide a word 'infallible' as an epithet either of an oath taken by the Styx, or a contest (as in the *Odyssey*).

A passive notion is adopted for the *Iliad* by L.S.J., 'not to be injured, inviolable'; Frisk, *Et. Wb.*, 'inviolable?'. The plain notion of 'injury, harm' is not found in the *Iliad* for the stem of ἄτη, so that this is an initial objection to this meaning at such an early stage. Even in post-Epic Greek there is no evidence for the use of ἄαω: ἄτη in the sense of 'injury to, violation of, an oath'. Also, it requires that the injury arising from perjury would apply not to the oath itself, but to the object on which the oath is taken. The nearest semantic parallel that I have found is in Aristotle, fr. 148 ἐβλάψαν τοὺς ὄρκους, but there it is the oath which is 'damaged'.

For the two passages in the *Odyssey*, where ἄατος is an attribute of ἄελλος, L.S.J. gives (though adding 'probably') 'unimpeachable, i.e. decisive': so also Monro. This brings us a long way from the original sense of 'infatuation'; but even if we start from a simple sense 'injure' as a base, it is still very hard to reach the notion of 'protest about, object to (the result of a contest)'. Frisk offers 'infallible?', with which I have dealt above. Seiler's method is ingenious, since he separates the two occurrences. He takes *Od.* 21. 91 as 'infallible', but at 22. 5, because the contest which has just taken place has been inconclusive for the suitors, he proposes either that we have a formulaic repetition of 21. 91, or that ἄατος means 'in which no damage, hurt, wrong occurred; harmless, innocuous'. This second explanation, however, is very unlikely (despite the fact that this sense of the word would be acceptable, and indeed the only one acceptable of all discussed until now, if only we could take the occurrence of ἄατος at *Od.* 22. 5 in isolation). If we are first told that there is to be an ἄελλος ἄατος (as at 21. 91), and then told that there has been one (as at 22. 5), it would argue an un-Homeric sophistication to suppose that the repeated phrase was used with two such dissimilar senses.

Finally there is the passage in Ap. Rhod. Frisk suggests 'invincible?'; so also L.S.J. (but without the saving question-mark) and Mooney ('resistless'). But ἄαω: ἄτη nowhere offer a sense of 'conquer', which these views would require. We must not, of course, overlook the lateness of Apollonius, and the possibility that he used a word or phrase without properly understanding it, because he was borrowing it. But his use of ἄατος is not in fact copied from Homer's use of that form; though I shall hope to show that it does have very close Epic analogies.

We thus reach the conclusion that the semantics of ἄατος are as unsatisfactory as its phonology, if it is sought to connect the word with ἄαω: ἄτη.

The possibility of finding an adequate explanation of ἄατος has only lately been opened up by the work of Professor Palmer on Mycen. *a-se-so-si*, showing

its connexion with $\acute{\alpha}\omega$ 'sate', $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta$ 'satiety, surfeit'.¹ He has shown that the base of these words is in Greek $\alpha\sigma\alpha$ ($as\alpha$), $\sigma\acute{\alpha}$, $\sigma\alpha$ ($s\alpha$); and behind these are the forms with laryngeals $*H_2e\text{-}H_2$, $*H_2s\text{-}eH_2$, $*H_2s\text{-}H_2$.² The original meaning on this explanation would show on the one hand a special connexion with satiating with drink, and on the other a general sense 'sate'. It is the general sense which is seen in $\acute{\alpha}\omega$; so in Homer the verb is used of having (giving) one's fill of blood, of flesh, and of lament.

$\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ can then be analysed as $*\eta\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, showing $\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ with loss of $-\sigma$ - but without contraction. We may obtain from it by contraction $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$:³ compare the contraction of $*\eta\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma > \acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, which left these two forms side by side ($\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in Homer, $\acute{\alpha}\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in Hesiod, Ap. Rhod.).

The negative prefix in $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ has just the form that we expect, that is, $\acute{\alpha}$ - in Epic before $h < \sigma$: $*\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\text{-} > *haa\text{-}$ with transfer of the aspirate to initial position (as would occur in the positive adjective).⁴ This is the first considerable gain achieved by derivation from $\acute{\alpha}\omega$.

The form of the stem $-\alpha\sigma\alpha\text{-}$ in $*\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\alpha\sigma\alpha\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is worth a fuller note.⁵ The grade corresponds to $-\epsilon\chi\text{-}$ in $\acute{\alpha}\nu\text{-}\epsilon\kappa\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (with positive $\acute{\alpha}\nu(a)\text{-}$): starting from a dissyllabic $*segha\text{-}$ we have (1) $*segh\text{-}$ (normal plus zero grades), $-\epsilon\kappa\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$; (2) $*sgh\text{-}$ (zero plus reduced grades), $-\sigma\chi\epsilon\text{-}$ in $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\sigma\chi\epsilon\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$.⁶ In $-\alpha\sigma\alpha\text{-}$ the second syllable represents the zero grade, with vocalization of the laryngeal.

There are notable parallels for two alternative forms of the adjective in $-\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (especially in negative compounds), in cases where the stem includes a sonant.⁷ (1) $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$: $\delta\mu\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$. $\acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ occurs in Tragedy but was metrically impossible in Epic, where it was replaced by $\acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ with $-\sigma\text{-}$ from forms such as aor. pass. $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$.⁸ The objection to such forms as $\acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ was not only metrical, but also a rhythmical feature of Greek, which disliked the succession of three or more short syllables. Compare the lengthening of comparative forms in $\sigma\phi\acute{\omega}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ ($-\omega\text{-}$ for $-\sigma\text{-}$) and $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ (addition of medial $-\sigma\text{-}$).⁹ The compounds in $-\tau\omicron\varsigma$ show both lengthening by addition of $-\sigma\text{-}$ and also vowel lengthening in $\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (for $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}$), $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (for $-\kappa\epsilon\rho\text{-}$). (2) $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$: $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\mu\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\mu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$; $\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$: $\theta\eta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$. The forms $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ have it in common that they are often explained as nominal, i.e. possessive compounds based on $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$.¹⁰ It is, however, surprising that a nominal compound should make the contrast with the verbal derivative $\theta\eta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$.¹¹ By the side of $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ there is $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\text{-}$, at least equally old (occurring as a personal name, as well as an adjective, in Homer: with it cf. $\acute{\alpha}\delta\mu\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$), which must be verbally derived. It must be noted that it is only to this pair of words (and possibly $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$)

¹ 'Methodology in Linear B interpretations', *Die Sprache* v (1959), 131-6.

² The laryngeal evidence is supplied by H. Hitt. *hasas* 'satiety', Palaic *has(i)* 'drink one's fill'.

³ Palmer, op. cit., p. 136, n. 21, would take $\acute{\alpha}\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ directly from $*\eta\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, with the verb stem showing zero plus normal grades.

⁴ Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*, § 75.

⁵ For $\alpha\sigma\alpha$ in other forms of the verb, see Palmer, op. cit., pp. 135-6.

⁶ So Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, p. 17; cf. Hirt, *Handbuch der gr. Laut- und Formenlehre*, p. 97.

⁷ The ablaut is not of course confined to

such verbal adjectives: see Schwyzler, *Gr. Gr.* i. 359 ff. for examples and discussion.

⁸ Risch, *Wortbildung*, p. 18; Schwyzler, *Gr. Gr.* i. 503.

⁹ I have discussed these in *A.J.P.* lxx (1949), 159 ff., and lxxiii (1952), 298 ff. See further F. Specht, *K.Z.* lxxiii (1936), 207 ff., 'Zur Vermeidung von Wörtern mit drei kurzen Silben'.

¹⁰ So Risch, *Wortbildung*, p. 22, n. 1 (with modification *wohl*).

¹¹ So Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, ii. 1157, n. 1, while accepting $\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu$. as nominal, is puzzled that a verbal $*\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ was not used instead.

among those here under discussion, that the suggestion of nominal derivation can apply. (3) ἀκήρατος (-σιος), ἀκέραστος: ἀκράτος. ἀκήρατος is probably to be taken as for *ἀκέρᾱτος, on metrical grounds. See Frisk (*Et. Wb.*, s.v. ἀκήρατος 2): he distinguishes ἀκήρατος 'unmixed, pure' from ἀκ. 'undamaged', while admitting that the latter too may show lengthening of the same *ἀ-κέρα-τος, influenced by κήρ. ἀ-κέρα-ιος also has -ε- in the dissyllabic grade, with change of suffix, and shares the division of meaning. ἀκέραστος was made like ἀδάμαστος (cf. ἐκεράσθην). (4) ἀγέραστος (Hom., etc.), ἀγείρατος (test. Hdn.): (γρηῦς). ἀγέραστος may owe its -σ- to the noun γέρας;¹ but ἀγείρατος suggests that for both forms the source was *ἀγέρατος, which was lengthened in one way or the other. (5) On the analogy of the previous cases we might suspect another example to underlie ἀπέλαστος: ἀπλᾱτος (for -σ-, cf. ἐπελάσθην, πέλας).

The difference in gradation between ἀδάματος: δμητός, ἀθάνατος: θνητός, etc., has long been a topic for discussion, and it is not to my purpose to add to that here. The interesting suggestion has recently been made by Lehmann² that the accent of the negative compound was a vital factor. He takes the underlying bases to contain laryngeals. Both -ανα- and -νᾱ- in ἀθάνατος, θνᾱτός would derive from the same reduced grade -η- plus laryngeal. If the syllable following the sonant was not accented (as in the negative compound, originally *ἄθανα-τος), a secondary vowel was developed, giving -αν-α; but if the following syllable was accented (as in θνᾱτός) this vowel was lost (or did not develop?) and the result was -νᾱ-. Similarly for -αμα-: -μᾱ- in ἀδάματος: δμητός. He then takes θάνατος, δάμασις, with accent on the root, to be made on the analogy of the compounds *ἄθανα-, *ἄδαμα-. This seems a more satisfactory account than, for example, that of Hirt.³ It has the special merit of providing an account of the co-existence of distinct grades in compounds made with -τος.

The prosodic value of ἀάατος calls now for mention. As previously stated, it is found scanned either as ◡-◡-◡, or as ◡-◡◡. Obviously vowel-lengthening was a necessary expedient if the word was to be used in Epic at all. The forms *ἄἄἄτος and (with contraction) ἄἄτος made the starting-points: the former needed lengthening, and so perhaps first assumed the initial value of the latter, ἄἄ-. This would give ἄἄἄτος, which is what we find in the *Odyssey* and Ap. Rhod. The single occurrence in the *Iliad* shows a further long, in the third syllable, and this is surprising since it was not unavoidable. Was there influence from a negative compound made from ἀάω: ἄτη (not, of course, attested in Homer if the suggested derivation of ἀάατος is correct!)? As indicated at the start of this article, we should expect from that stem -ἄἄτος or

¹ Risch, *Wortbildung*, p. 18, Chantraine, *Formation des noms*, p. 305. But Buck-Petersen, *Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*, p. 470, regard derivation in -τος from nouns as post-Homeric.

² W. P. Lehmann, *Proto-Indo-European Phonology* (1955), pp. 88 ff.

³ In *Handbuch* . . . , pp. 82, 95 ff. Specht, *K. Z.* lix (1932), 89-119, has a useful collection of material, without himself giving a convincing solution. In Latin it does not seem always possible to start from a reduced, monosyllabic form of the stem in cognate words. (*in*)domitus shows the same grade as

the present stem of *domo*, while there is no trace here of the reduced *dmā-; cf. Skt. *damita-*, *dāmīta-*. In *genitus*, opposed to *gnātus*, there is again a strong form of the stem (i.e. normal plus reduced grades), with cognates in O. *Genetai* and in Celtic. Walde-Hofmann, *Lat. Et. Wb.*, s.vv. *domo*, *gigno*, regard the strong forms as secondary; similarly Ernout-Meillet, *Dict. Étym.*, s.v. *domo*. But Kent, *Forms of Latin*, §420. 1, regards this as a regular Latin process, comparing *lautus* from **laus-tos*, and so in the second conj. *tacitus* from *tacē-re*, etc.

-*ᾱ*τος. We may also note that even the metrically suitable *ᾱ*τος (**n-sa-tos*), with initial short in Hesiod, was lengthened in Ap. Rhod. (*ᾱ*τος).

Lastly we turn to the meaning of *ᾱ*ατος (and also *ᾱ*ητος) in the light of the new derivation. In the first passage (*Il.* 14. 271) *ᾱ*ατος is the epithet of the water of the Styx, and means 'unlimited, ever-flowing': cf. Hes. *Theog.* 805 *Στυγὸς ἄφθιτον ὕδωρ*, which provides an alternative tautologous formula, of different metrical value, in the established Epic manner.¹ The sense derives from 'fill, give one's fill of'; a source which cannot be filled is one of immeasurable capacity. Compare *ἄπλετος* (*πίμπλημι*: **pēlē-*, **plā-*, with the same treatment of -*a*- as in **dhē-*, **dhā-*, *θετός*):² L.S.J. quotes Arist. *Meteor.* 355^b 23 *ποταμοὶ ἄπλετοι τὸ μέγεθος*, also Hdt. 8. 12. 1 *ὕδωρ ἄπλετον* (of rain).

There is another but, I think, less likely possibility; 'insatiable, with appetite unrestrained'. We find *ἄπλήρωτος* used with this sense as an epithet of *ΐδης*, *I.G.* 14. 1754; and *ἄπλήρωτος* is attested as a meaning of *ᾱ*ατος by a gloss of Cyrillus (Hesych., ed. Latte, s.v.). This sense would require a transfer from Hades to the waters of the Styx. The nearest early parallel is in *H. Dem.* 259 *ἀμείλικτον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ* ('cruel, implacable'), but this is perhaps not early enough.

In the *Odyssey* (21. 91, 22. 5) *ᾱ*ατος is the epithet of *ἄεθλος*, the crucial contest and trial of skill with the bow between Odysseus and the Suitors which heralds the climax of the poem, the revenge of Odysseus. An impressive word is clearly wanted, and 'insatiable' in the sense of 'making extreme demands, most exacting' will fit here. It is proper to remember that *ἄεθλος* implies something more than a mere game; underlying it are the notions of strain and suffering which are explicit in *ἀθλεύω*, -έω, *ἄθλιος*. Thus Laser (*Lex. frühgriech. Epos*) on the meaning of *ἄεθλος*: 'Mühsal, Anstrengung, die, im Gegensatz zu *πόνος*, Leiden und Gefahr in sich begreift. Die Bedeutung *Wettkampf* wahrscheinlich sekundär.'

In Ap. Rhod. 2. 77 *κάρτος ᾱ*ατος the meaning is 'boundless, immeasurable'; the epithet is transferred from the quality (of *κάρτος*) to the person possessing it. The phrase must be compared with those showing the contracted form *ᾱ*ατος (*ᾱ*η-): *Il.* 21. 395 *θάρσος ᾱ*ητον, Q.S. 1. 217 θ. *ᾱ*ατον (with the epithet applied to the quality). Courage and strength are active, expansive qualities, demanding tasks on which to work and satisfy themselves.³

We find some ancient support for these interpretations. Hesychius has *ᾱ*ητοι-

¹ In Homer and Hesiod there are four formulae, differing in metrical value. (1) *Il.* 14. 271 *ᾱ*ᾱατον *Στυγὸς ὕδωρ*; (2) *ibid.* 8. 369 *Στυγὸς ὕδατος αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα*; (3) *ibid.* 15. 37 (= *Od.* 5. 185, *H. Ap.* 85) *τὸ κατειβόμενον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ* (not equivalent to (2): it is used at the start of the line, with caesura after *κατειβ.*); (4) *Theog.* 805 *Στυγὸς ἄφθιτον ὕδωρ*. In the *Hymns* two of these are duplicated: (5) *H. Herm.* 519 *Στυγὸς ὄβριμον ὕδωρ* (= (4)); (6) *H. Dem.* 259 *ἀμείλικτον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ* (= (1)).

² Cf. Lehmann, *op. cit.*, p. 15 for the phonology.

³ See the account of *ᾱ*ητος by Risch (*Lex. frühgriech. Epos*): he lists the many explana-

tions offered in antiquity, but finds none very satisfying. Of these he prefers connexion with *ᾱ*ημι (cf. *Il.* 21. 386 *θυμὸς ᾱ*ητο), as does Verdenius, *Mnemos.*, 1957, p. 248. But in *θυμὸς ᾱ*ητο the sense of the verb is 'waver' (in doubt and fear): this is not a very promising parallel for *θάρσος ᾱ*ητον.

αἶητος (*Il.* 18. 410 *πέλωρ αἶητον*, of Hephaestus) does not fit into the picture as a compound of *ᾱ*ω, either for form (because of -ι-) or sense. It is attractive to follow the suggestion of Palmer (*Minos* v [1957], 61) to connect it with Mycen. *a-ja-me-no* and a verb 'do, make', used in the special sense of craftsmanship.

ἀκόρεστοι, ἀπληστοι; and ἀήτους· μεγάλας (in Aesch.). Herodian has ἀητος· ὁ ἀκατάπαυστος: the sense of 'unrestrained' would suit in contexts where it was united with words such as ὀργή, λύπη. For ἀάατος, as already mentioned, the gloss of Cyrillus offers ἀπλήρωτος.

ADDENDUM

It seems likely that ἀπλητος derives from **pelē-* (πίμπλημι) and not from **pelā-* (πελάζω, ἀπλάτος) as in L.S.J., also in Boisacq and Hofmann. ἀπλητος would then stand alongside the reduced grade ἀπλετος, and show the same formation as ἄδμητος, ἄκρατος. It is first found in *H. Dem.* 83 οὐδέ τι σέ χρῆ | μὰψ αὐτως ἀπλητον ἔχειν χόλον, where it means 'insatiable' (anger), and not 'unapproachable'. For the latter meaning in the context—an appeal to Demeter, lamenting her daughter's loss—there is no need; while to say that her anger can find no satisfaction is plainly to the point. The next passage is *Semon.* 7. 32 ff.

τὴν δ' [sc. ἡμέρην] οὐκ ἀνεκτὸς οὐδ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν
οὔτ' ἄσσον ἐλθεῖν, ἀλλὰ μαίνεται τότε
ἀπλητον ὥσπερ ἀμφὶ τέκνοισιν κύων . . .

This describes the woman who is like the sea, with two characters, one good, one bad. The meaning 'rages so as not to be approached' for μαίνεται ἀπλητον would be very suitable if the same thought had not been just expressed (οὔτ' ἄσσον ἐλθεῖν); we avoid such flatness by again translating 'insatiably'. The other, much later uses of the word are granted by L.S.J. to show the same sense as ἀπλετος, i.e. 'great, abundant': so as epithet of χεύματα (*Orph. Argon.*), and of αἰθήρ and δῶρα (*Q.S.*). Hence it is nowhere necessary to use the meaning 'unapproachable'.¹

Oxford

A. C. MOORHOUSE

¹ I am obliged to Mr. J. Chadwick for criticism, especially on some Mycenaean aspects in this article; it is of course not implied that he agrees with my remarks thereon.