worden waren (V. 169): die Achill ehrende Aussendung der beiden Geronten im I steht im Kontrast zu der Achill beleidigenden Mission der beiden Herolde im A. Beide Gründe aber sind schließlich nicht unabhängig voneinander: Wenn der Erzähler *für den Hörer erkennbar* die Gesandtschaftsszene des I formal als Parallele, inhaltlich als radikale Umkehrung der Gesandtschaft des A darstellen wollte, dann mußte ihn, beim sorgenvollen Gang der Abgesandten ebenso wie bei ihrer Begrüßung durch Achill, die Figur des Phoinix (und auch die beiden Herolde Odios und Eurybates) stören, weil sie die ‚leitmotivischen' Entsprechungen zwischen den beiden Szenen beeinträchtigt hätte. Die Beteiligung des Phoinix an der Verhandlung mit Achill mußte nach den Gesetzen des Epos angekündigt werden [20]), die bemerkenswert knappe Einführung aber, die seine Identität zunächst im unklaren läßt, bis er sie durch seine ausführliche Selbstdarstellung in Achills Zelt selber aufdeckt (V. 437 ff.), ermöglicht zusammen mit der herausragenden Stellung des Gerontenpaares Odysseus/Aias seine zeitweilige Nichtberücksichtigung in der Dualpartie. Vielleicht könnte man auf das Verhältnis von Nestors Ankündigung zur Durchführung der Bittgesandtschaft das horazische Urteil über Homers Prooimientechnik anwenden (A.P. 143): ‚ex fumo dare lucem cogitat' [21]). ‚Nestors Strategie' (V. 179–81) enthüllt sich erst in Achills Zelt.

More on Nasal Dissimilation: ᾿Εϱϱάδαται, *etc.*

By Edwin D. Floyd, Pittsburgh

Direct evidence for the /d/ which the author had previously hypothesized in **πέφαδμαι*, etc. is to be found in the Homeric third plural forms *ἐϱϱάδαται* and *ἐϱϱάδατο*. The apparent 'endings' *-δαται* and *-δατο* are not from the analogy of verbs such as *ἐϱηϱέδαται*, but rather result from nasal dissimilation. The sequence of events was as follows: development of **-ṇ-* to **-ṇn-* in certain environments including the present stem of *ῥαίνω*, etc., spread of the new stem in **-ṇn-* to the perfect system, dissimilation of **-ṇnṇtoi*, etc. to **-ṇdṇtoi*, etc., and finally unconditioned development of **-ṇ-* to *-a-*.

In 1975 in *Journal of Indo-European Studies* (3.283–288), I argued for a basically phonological explanation of the /s/ which

---

[20]) Vgl. ‚Rolle des Phoinix' 27.

[21]) Genaugenommen zeigen alle drei Protagonisten in der Gesandtschaft erst durch ihre Reden vor Achill (V. 222 ff.), unter welchem Gesichtspunkt jeder von ihnen für die schwierige Aufgabe der Versöhnung Achills ausgewählt worden ist.

occurs in certain Greek mediopassive forms from /n/ stems, e.g., first singular πέφασμαι, participle πεφασμένο-, etc. My contention was that /s/ in these forms arose from dissimilation of the first nasal in forms such as *pephanmai, *pephanmeno-, etc., rather than (as commonly supposed) from the analogy of other verb forms such as τετέλεσμαι, πέπεισμαι, etc. The overall patterning clearly supports this explanation: /s/ replaces /n/ in *all* the forms of /n/ stem verbs in which the ending begins with /m/, and in *no* others (3rd sing. πέφανται, inf. πεφάνθαι, etc.), while the supposed analogical sources show no such variation. A slight difficulty with my explanation is the fact that dissimilation of /n/ to the phonetically quite distinct spirant /s/ (or [z], with which we may have to deal in this environment) seems to be otherwise unattested in the world's languages. Consequently, it seemed desirable to introduce intermediate forms *pephadmai, etc., from which the attested forms could then be derived by the well-known Greek change of -dm- to -sm-. Both the dissimilation to /d/ and the subsequent change to /s/ are reasonable in themselves, but the presence of a more or less ad hoc *pephadmai does introduce an additional stage into the process and may therefore make the entire explanation less plausible. In the present article, I wish to consider several peculiar Greek third plural perfect and pluperfect forms in /d/ which have previously resisted satisfactory explanation. Although analogy plays some role in the development, the initial impetus for these forms in /d/ was, I think, nasal dissimilation. Consequently, they constitute direct evidence for the existence of a transitional stage between /n/ and /s/ in the perfect middle paradigm.

Most important are two forms from ῥαίνω 'sprinkle' in Homer, viz., 3rd pl. perf. ἐρράδαται in *Od.* 20.354 and 3rd pl. plupf. ἐρράδατ(ο) in *Il.* 12.431; for other such forms, see note 3 below. Previous attempts at explaining these forms have centered around a somewhat vague invocation of the 'analogy' of other perfects in /d/, such as ἐρηρέδαται, from ἐρείδω 'prop'[1]). This is, I think, clearly

[1]) For discussion of forms such as ἐρράδαται, see Kühner-Blass 1890–92: II.75–76, Schwyzer 1939–53: I.672, Buck 1933: 288, Chantraine 1961: 196, Rix 1976: 258; cf. Frisk 1960–72: II. 639, s.v. ῥαίνω. Except for Kühner-Blass, who speak in terms of an intrusive -δ-, all of these explicitly explain the formation as analogical. Kühner-Blass, Buck, Schwyzer, and Chantraine all mention ἐρηρέδαται (which occurs in *Il.* 23.284 and 329; cf. ἐρηρέδατ(ο) in *Od.* 7.95); Schwyzer and Chantraine also mention various other forms which are found in Herodotus, such as ἐσκευάδαται (4.58), as sources for the development.

16   Edwin D. Floyd

untenable. No satisfactory connection—phonological, paradigmatic, or semantic—seems to exist between /d/ stem verbs and ῥαίνω etc., to support the analogical proportion. Nor do the few /d/ stem verbs seem to be sufficiently prominent to have imposed themselves on the paradigm of other verbs. (In fact, the supposed analogical source is attested in Homer for only one verb, viz., ἐρείδω, although additional formations, such as ἐσκευάδαται, do occur in Herodotus.) In lieu of some positive connection between the verbs in which /d/ is original and those in which it is intrusive, one might think of this as simply a hiatus-breaker in the latter; cf. /t/ in French *bijoutier*, /n/ in English *tobacconist*, etc.[2]). But, although it would work for, e.g., ἀκηχέδαται in *Il.* 17.637 (cf. the variant reading ἀκηχέαται, without -δ-), this explanation does not seem satisfactory for ἐρράδαται and ἐρράδατο: we do not need any hiatus-breaker here, since *ἐρράναται and *ἐρράνατο would be perfectly good forms (perfect stem ἐρραν-, with third plural endings). Significantly, though, ῥαίνω is the one verb for which the attestation of anomalous perfect forms in /d/ is most extensive, earliest, and least subject to manuscript or editorial variation[3]). Consequently, it would seem to be the verb (or to represent the type of verb) which gave rise to this anomalous pattern, rather than a formation to which the ending spread secondarily from somewhere else.

---

[2]) For general discussion of this phenomenon, cf. Schwyzer 1939–53: I. 288–289.

[3]) There appear to be only eight forms in all, including several which are quite doubtful. At least, the standard reference works (cf. note 1 above) list no more, and I have been unable to find any additional citations in commentaries on these various occurrences. Four such forms are printed in the Oxford or other standard edition of the authors in question, viz., ἐρράδατ' in *Il.* 12.431 (no ms. variants listed by Monro and Allen), ἀκηχέδατ' in *Il.* 17.637 (Monro and Allen list a ms. variant ἀκηχέατ', and Schwyzer prefers this form), ἐρράδαται in *Od.* 20.354 (ms. variants ἐρρέδαται and ἐρρέδεται), and διακεκρίδαται in Dio Cassius 42.5.7 (no ms. variants listed in Boissevain's edition). There are also one or two other likely examples. Various forms in -δ-, e.g., ἐληλέδατ' and ἐληλάδατ', appear in *Od.* 7.86 in most manuscripts; Allen, however, prints the variant ἐληλέατ', but Kühner-Blass, Buck, and Chantraine all cite ἐληλάδατ' as an example of the formation in question, and it may well be correct in this passage. In *Od.* 7.95, some manuscripts again have ἐληλέδατ', but Allen prints the better attested ἐρηρέδατ' (from ἐρείδω), and this is almost certainly correct here. In Herodotus 2.75.2, the manuscripts vary between κατακεχύαται and κατακεχύδαται; although Hude prints the form without -δ-, both Chantraine and Rix cite this as an example of the -δαται formation. Finally, in Herodotus 7.90, the manuscripts have ἐσταλάδατο or ἐστελάδατο, but Hude prints Dobree's emendation ἐστάλατο, which seems to be quite generally accepted.

Actually, it seems to me that positing the 'expected' Ionic forms *ἐρράναται and *ἐρράνατο immediately suggests the true explanation for the forms in /d/; we have to deal with dissimilation of /n/ to /d/ and must therefore go back to a period when these third plural forms contained another nasal sound, viz., in the endings *[-ṇtoi] and *[-ṇto]. Aside from ἐρράδαται and ἐρράδατο there does not seem to be any direct evidence for dissimilation in the third plural forms; however, some definite avoidance of the expected phonological development may be suggested by the fact that no third plurals in *-ναται or *-νατο seem to be attested; i.e., *no* forms such as *ἐρράναται, *πεφάναται, *μεμιάναται, *ἤσχύναται, etc., appear to occur[4]).

With ῥαίνω, as with many other Greek verbs, there is no vowel-gradation between the different tenses, aspects, etc. Though secondary, this phenomenon is widespread in Greek, and for some verbs must be reconstructed for an early stage in the development of the language; e.g., the pan-Hellenic occurrence of this phenomenon

---

[4]) It is difficult to be sure in such matters, but I have been unable to find any perfect or pluperfect forms in *-αναι, *-ανατο, *-νναται or *-νατο after some search: no such forms appear to be cited in LSJ for any of the 21 verbs in -αίνω and -ύνω listed by Kühner-Blass 1890–92: II.168. The periphrastic formation (πεφασμένοι εἰσί, etc.) is of course the normal Attic type, but in addition to the -άδαται/ο formation from ῥαίνω, there are two or three possible occurrences of another alternative, viz., -ανται, with coalescence of the nasals of the stem and ending. The best example is κεχείμανται in Pindar, *Pythian* 9.32. This has sometimes been explained as a singular, but it is probably a plural form (so Kühner-Blass 1890–92: II.75, Schroeder 1923: 249, and Farnell 1932: 203; cf. both LSJ 1940: 1982 and Slater 1969: 544, s.v. χειμαίνω, where this interpretation is implied, though not stated). Georgacas in his index to Schwyzer 1939–53: III.144 cites κεχείμανται as „3. pl.", but Schwyzer and Schwyzer-Debrunner appear to take it at I.672 and II.608 as a singular verb, used in the *schema Pindaricum* (which is actually extremely rare in Pindar, except probably in the dithyrambs). Of course, emendation in the Pindar passage can either produce an unexceptionable plural verb (Mommsen's οὐκ ἐχείμανθεν) or eliminate the plural subject (Bergk's φρένας), but neither of these seems indicated. Another probable instance of this type of formation is μεμίαντο, a metrically necessary restoration for μίαντο in a hexameter line quoted by the Suda, s.v. ψαφαρῇ (1928–38: IV.841). In Euripides, *Hippolytus* 1255, most manuscripts have κέκρανται συμφοραί, but probably the singular συμφορά is correct here, thus giving the expected *singular* verb form; cf. Barrett 1964: 390 and 436–437. (Two other forms which LSJ list as plurals, viz., ἐπέφαντο in Hesiod, *Scutum* 166 and μεμίανται in Phalaris, *Ep.* 121.2, are actually singulars, inasmuch as they have *neuter* plural subjects; cf. Birdsall 1974: 187 for discussion of the Phalaris passage.)

18   Edwin D. Floyd

in the case of φαίνω is attested by forms such as Doric ἐκπεφάναντι (Sophron 83). In the case of ῥαίνω (likewise φαίνω, etc.), we must start from a present formation in *-ṇyō, viz., *wrṇyō or *srṇyō (likewise *phṇyō, etc.). Eventually, *-ṇ- developed to *-an- before /y/, and from this new stem in -an-, we get the entire attested paradigm and its various derivatives (e.g., aor. pass. ἐρράνϑην nominal derivatives such as ῥανίς, περιρραντήριον, etc.)[5]).

The chronology and origin of the differing developments of *[ṇ] and *[ṃ], viz., to /an/ and /am/ before [y] and in some other environments, to /a/ (or /o/) elsewhere, is a matter of considerable complexity and ramification, but for our purposes it is sufficient to work with just two successive stages[6]). The environments for the change to /an/ and /am/ are before vowel, semivowel, and prevocalic laryngeal (see the formulation by Rix 1976: 66). Since one of the conditioning factors is [+lar], we must place this change of the vocalic nasals very early in the history of Greek, before any differentiation among the dialects[7]). On the other hand, the develop-

---

[5]) For the overall development and connection of the present and perfect systems of verbs such as φαίνω, etc., cf. Schwyzer 1939–53: I.770–771 and Rix 1976: 201; see also Frisk 1960–72: II.639–640 and 982–984 for the specific cases of ῥαίνω and φαίνω. In the case of ῥαίνω, a certain complication is provided by the aorist active imperative form ῥάσσατε, in *Od.* 20.150. This has been variously explained. Sometimes, it is taken with the perfect forms in -δ- as evidence for a stem ῥαδ- (so Kühner-Blass 1890–92: II.76 and Boisacq 1938: 833; cf. Chantraine 1958: 410 and 435). Probably, though, it is better to analyze it with Frisk (p. 639) as developing from the analogy of aorists such as κεδάσσαι 'spread' and κεράσσαι 'mix', both of which have some semantic similarity to ῥαίνω 'sprinkle'.

[6]) For the different developments of *[ṇ] and *[ṃ] (without, however, any explicit discussion of chronologically distinct stages), see Buck 1933: 104–105, Schwyzer 1939–53: I.342–345, and Rix 1976: 66, 74. Another important development is of course in the position before *preconsonantal* laryngeal (formerly analyzed as Indo-European 'long vocalic nasal'), but this does not directly concern us.

[7]) For the pre-dialectal elimination of the laryngeals as separate phonemes in Greek, see Rix's review (1969: 183–184) of Beekes 1969, along with Beekes 1973: 387. Strictly speaking, my argument applies only to the change of *[N] in a *laryngeal* environment, but in view of the identical development before vowel or semivowel, it is most economical to combine all three environments in a single statement, as in rule (1) below. Furthermore, at least some instances of Greek /aN/ which have traditionally been analyzed as deriving from prevocalic *[N] are actually likely to involve a laryngeal (cf. Lindeman 1970: 43–45). An example is the frequently cited correlation of Greek ἄνυδρος with Sanskrit *anudras*; for the probability that the word for 'water' began with *$/h_1/$, see Beekes 1969: 67.

ment of *[n̥] and *[m̥] to a simple vowel (only /a/ in Attic-Ionic, but /o/ in at least some instances in some dialects) must be placed later, after the individual dialects had begun to diverge from each other [8]).

The developments described in the preceding paragraph could be expressed directly in rules of the form "some N̥ → aN; N̥ → a"; however, it seems more economical to write the two rules as follows, with the development of a specific vocalism from *[N̥] coming only in the second stage:

(1) N̥ → N̥N/___ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} ([+\text{lar}]) \, [+\text{voc}] \\[2pt] \begin{bmatrix} -\text{voc} \\ -\text{cons} \end{bmatrix} \end{array} \right\}$ (pan-Hellenic)

(2) N̥ → a   (Attic-Ionic and West Greek; the development in Mycenaean, Arcado-Cypriote, and Aeolic is generally the same, but also involves N̥ → o under certain conditions)

Stated in this form, rule (1) involves a kind of gemination in environments in which the vocalic nasal might otherwise be subject to reanalysis as a single *consonantal* element (e.g., *[pʰn̥yō] would otherwise have a tendency to be pronounced *[pʰniō]). Then, rule (2) simplifies all vocalic nasals by removing the element of nasality from them [9]).

---

[8]) Development of dialectal o-vocalism is far more extensive in the case of *[r̥] and *[l̥], but some examples of /o/ for Attic-Ionic /a/ involve original *[n̥] or *[m̥], e. g., Arcadian and Lesbian δέκοτος, Mycenaean *pe-mo* (along with *pe-ma*; both forms seem to represent classical σπέϱμα), etc. Cf. Rix's formulation (1976: 66): "idg. /n̥/ : gr. /a/ a, äol. /o/" and "idg. /m̥/ : gr. /a/ a, äol. /o/". This is somewhat oversimplified, inasmuch as Rix omits Mycenaean, etc., and ignores the fact that the development N̥ → a is frequent (if not indeed usual), even in Aeolic; nevertheless, it is on the right track, and contrasts significantly with Rix's reference to the development to /an, am/, for which he (correctly, in my opinion) lists no dialectal variation. Of course, the /a ∼ o/ variation goes quite far back in the history of Greek, as is shown by its appearance within Mycenaean (cf. Risch 1966: 152–153, 156–157); but it must nevertheless represent a later stage than the development to /an, am/, which is partially conditioned by the presence of an original laryngeal.

[9]) Another reason for setting up rule (1) as stated here, rather than as N̥ → aN, is provided by Lesbian τομίαις (Alcaeus 317 Lobel-Page; cf.

20   Edwin D. Floyd

With an early change of *-$ny\bar{o}$ to *-$nny\bar{o}$ in the present system
of verbs such as ῥαίνω, the subsequent generalization of the new
present stem throughout the paradigm can then have taken place
before rule (2), so as to give us third plural forms in *-$nntoi$ and
*-$nnto$. In these, the clustering of nasal sounds (cf. also the situa-
tion in the participle in *-$nnmeno$-) would readily result in dissimi-
lation of /n/ to /d/, and will thus ultimately produce forms such as
ἐρράδαται, etc.[10]).

From nasal verbs such as ἐρράδαται, (unattested) *πεφάδαται, etc.,
in which /d/ had phonologically replaced /n/, the resulting -δαται
and -δατο can then have spread to other verbs, in which the perfect
did not contain any direct phonological basis for the development,
such as ἄχνυμαι, ἐλαύνω, κρίνω, στέλλω and χέω. In some of these
instances, the spread of intrusive -d- may be only a scribal vagary;
cf. note 3 above. In any event, my explanation of ἀκηχέδαται, etc.,
must be basically in terms of analogical spread, just as in the gener-
ally accepted account of these forms. There is, however, now a much
clearer motivation for the spread of -δαται. A form such as ἐρρά-
δαται, though it historically had a good phonological motivation,
was nevertheless anomalous. It would be particularly isolated in
the paradigm after the change to /s/ of the other instances of /d/,
since all the other forms then had either /n/ or /s/. It would there-
fore be readily subject to a diachronically erroneous analysis as
ἐρρά-δαται. On the other hand, in a form such as ἐρηρέδαται (which
has traditionally been cited as a source for the development), -d-
is clearly part of the stem, and correspondingly hard to detach
from it.

References

Barrett, W. S.: 1964 Euripides Hippolytos. Oxford.
Beekes, R. S. P.: 1969 The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryn-
    geals in Greek. The Hague: Mouton.
Beekes, R. S. P.: 1973 "ΠΡΟΤΙ ΙΛΙΟΝ ΙΡΗΝ", *Mnemosyne* 26: 387–390.

Schwyzer 1939–53: I. 344). Rules (1) and (2) will readily provide for the
development of -ομ- in this form, while the alternative formulation cannot
do so; however, the evidence of τομίαις is too tenuous for any particular
stress to be laid on it.

[10]) I am indebted to correspondence with Prof. Dr. Klaus Strunk for
clarifying my thinking with regard to the importance of *-$nntoi$ and *-$nnto$
in the development of these forms. Another possible solution to the awkward
collocation of nasal sounds would be to eliminate one of them (*-$nntoi$→
*-$nntoi$), thus eventually producing forms such as κεχείμανται (cf. note 4
above).

Birdsall, J. N.: 1974 "MEMIANTAI in Two Hellenistic Sources", *Classical Review* 24: 187.

Boisacq, É.: 1938 Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Heidelberg and Paris: Winter and Klincksieck.

Buck, C. D.: 1933 Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin. Chicago.

Chantraine, P.: 1958 Grammaire homérique, vol. 1. Paris: Klincksieck.

Chantraine, P.: 1961 Morphologie historique du grec. Paris: Klincksieck.

Farnell, L. R.: 1932 Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar. London: Macmillan (= 1961 Amsterdam: Hakkert).

Frisk, H.: 1960–72 Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg: Winter.

Kühner, R., and Blass, F.: 1890–92 Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Hannover und Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung (= 1966 Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung).

Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., and Jones, H. S.: 1940 Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford.

Lindeman, F. O.: 1970 Einführung in die Laryngaltheorie. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Risch, E.: 1966 "Les différences dialectales dans le mycénien", pp. 150–157 in L. R. Palmer and J. Chadwick, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies.* Cambridge.

Rix, H.: 1969 Review of Beekes 1969, *Kratylos* 14: 176–187.

Rix, H.: 1976 Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schroeder, O.: 1923 Pindari Carmina. Leipzig: Teubner.

Schwyzer, E., Debrunner, A., and Georgacas, D. J.: 1939–53 Griechische Grammatik. München: Beck.

Slater, W. J.: 1969 Lexicon to Pindar. Berlin: de Gruyter.

The Suda: 1928–38 Suidae Lexicon, ed. A. Adler. Leipzig: Teubner.

A Note on Nomer's Use of ἴα

By M. D. Northrup, Seattle (Washington)

The presence of the word ἴα in the *Iliad* cannot be satisfactorily explained either as an archaism or as a dialect form borrowed for metrical reasons. Distribution of the word suggests that Homer employed it in order to create a deliberate stylistic effect.

Aeolisms in the language of Homer are normally explained in one of the following ways: 1. such forms are not really Aeolisms at all but are merely archaisms, i.e., words reflecting characteristics of Mycenaean Greek which had been preserved in the epic poems but which in the spoken Greek of the post-Mycenaean period had disappeared everywhere but in the Aeolic dialect[1]; 2. such forms

---

[1] Cf. P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* I (Paris, 1958), pp. 496ff. and K. Strunk, *Die sogenannten Aeolismen der homerischen Sprache* (Köln, 1957).

22   M. D. Northrup

were borrowed from Aeolic by the Ionic epic poets because they were metrically useful[2]). Will either one of these explanations permit us to account for the presence of the word *ἴα* in the *Iliad*?[3])

Although *ἴα* has been declared an archaism by some[4]), this view is not completely convincing. If Homer's *ἴα* were an archaism coming originally from an old deictic/pronominal adjective *ἰός*, *ἴα*, *ἰόν*[5]), we would expect it always to be used demonstratively—or at least non-numerically—like its counterparts in Cretan and Messenian[6]). But Homer uses *ἴα* in precisely the same way that he uses *μία*, viz., to express the meaning "one"[7]). Since the use of *ἴα* as a numeral appears to be an exclusively Aeolic characteristic, it is preferable to conclude that Homer's *ἴα* was not an archaism but was borrowed from an Aeolic dialect.

If, however, Homer borrowed *ἴα* from Aeolic, there must have been some specific reason for his doing so. Since *ἴα* could be useful

---

[2]) *Πίσυρες*, e.g., is placed in this category by T. B. L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* (London, 1958), p. 161. On datives plural in *-εσσι*, see W. F. Wyatt, Jr., "Homer's Linguistic Ancestors" *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΕΙΟΝ ΠΑΝ-ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟΝ ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΕΤΗΤΡΙΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΚΗΣ ΣΧΟΛΗΣ* 14 (Thessaloniki, 1975), pp. 144ff. For the view that Aeolisms in Homer are relatively late additions to an epic tradition which was always Ionic see Wyatt, *ibid.*, pp. 133ff.; cf. also D. B. Monro, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect* (Oxford, 1891), pp. 386ff.; V. Pisani, *Enciclopedia classica* Sec. II Vol. V Pt. 1 (Torino, 1960), pp. 25ff.

[3]) Both of these explanations seem preferable to a third theory: the epic poems, at one time Aeolic, were subsequently translated into Ionic; this process of translation, however, left a residue of Aeolic forms in the now predominantly Ionic texts. Cf., e.g., the recent work of P. Wathelet (*Les traits éoliens dans la langue de l'épopée grecque* [Rome, 1970]), in which (p. 66) the author speaks of "le début de la phase ionienne de la composition ..." The objections to this view are twofold: 1) there is no hard external evidence for the existence of an Aeolic epic; 2) the ancient Greeks, as far as we know, did not translate from one dialect to another.

[4]) Cf. Wyatt, *TAPA* 101 (1970), p. 616.

[5]) Cf. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris, 1968), p. 466, *s.v.* "*ἰός*".

[6]) See E. Schwyzer, *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Potiora* (Leipzig, 1923), 74.126, 179.VII.23, 179.VIII.8; cf. also C. D. Buck, *CP* 1 (1906), pp. 409ff. Homer's *ἰῷ* is particularly problematic because it is *hapax* in his works (*Il.* 6.422). J. Schmidt (*KZ* 36 [1900], p. 394) suggests that the form is "eine neubildung zu *ἰῇ*".

[7]) For *ἴα* as "one" see 11.174, 16.173, 21.569. Wyatt (*op. cit.* [n. 2], p. 140 n.) has suggested that *ἴα* in Homer has the primary meaning "same" rather than "one". It is true that *ἴα* can frequently be rendered into English by the word "same" but this says nothing against the synonymy of *ἴα/μία*, since *μία* also shares this semantic property (cf., e.g., 15.416, 24.66, 24.396).

as a substitute for the Ionic μία when Homer wanted to avoid making a preceding syllable long by position, we might logically assume that the Aeolic adjective had been borrowed to provide additional metrical flexibility. But it cannot have been for this reason alone that Homer employed the Aeolic form, because he sometimes uses ἴα in places where he could just as easily have used its Ionic equivalent (cf. I 1. 9.319, 21.569).

The presence of ἴα in the *Iliad* cannot, it would seem, be satisfactorily explained by either of these means. This being the case, I would like to suggest a new reason for Homer's use of the form. First, however, consider the following facts: 1) in the eighth century B.C., when the poet of our *Iliad* was probably casting his work into something fairly close to its final form, the Aeolic dialect was being spoken (among other places) in Thessaly and in the area around Troy; 2) the only characters who use ἴα in their speeches in the *Iliad* are the Thessalian Achilles (9.319) and the Trojans Agenor (21.569), Andromache (6.422, 22.477), and Priam (24.496); 3) of the five occurrences of ἴα in the narrative portions of the text, three (4.437, 16.173, 18.251), and perhaps a fourth (11.174), appear in passages which deal specifically with either Thessalians or Trojans[8]); 4) the various case forms of μία occur seven times in the speeches of the *Iliad*, but Homer's use of this word is limited either to the speeches of the gods (Hera 14.267, Hypnos 14.275, Zeus 24.66, Hermes 24.396) or, with one exception[9]), to those of the Peloponnesian Greeks (Agamemnon 2.379, Helen 3.238); 5) μία appears four times in narrative portions of the poem (12.456, 15.416, 18.565, 20.272), but none of these passages is exclusively concerned with either the Trojans or with Achilles' Thessalians.

---

[8]) At 11.174, we read in a simile that Agamemnon is like a lion who appears as sudden destruction to one member of a herd of cattle: τῇ δέ τ'ἰῇ ἀναφαίνεται αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος. The ἰῇ of the simile, in other words, might be taken as the analogue of an anonymous Trojan warrior who is doomed in battle.

The only occurrence of ἴα in a completely non-Aeolic context comes at 13.354, where we are told that Zeus and Poseidon are of the same parentage (ἴα πάτρη). It appears that the presence of ἴα here is due solely to metrical convenience.

[9]) The one occurrence of μία in an ostensibly Aeolic context is at 19.293, where Briseis says "τρεῖς τε κασιγνήτους, τούς μοι μία γείνατο μήτηρ." Although we might have expected a native of the Troad (Lyrnessos) to use ἴα, we should reflect: 1) that Homer is here using a stock formula (cf. 3.238) which he might well have been reluctant to alter; and 2) that Briseis herself has been associated with the Greeks—not the Trojans—since the first book of the poem.

This information leads to the conclusion that Homer employed ἴα and μία in a way which was deliberately intended to reflect the contemporary dialect geography of Greece[10]). His use of the Aeolic ἴα, in other words, seems to have been motivated primarily by considerations of style. Of the 21 occurrences of ἴα/μία in the poem, at least 18—and possibly 20 (if we include the ambiguous 11.174 and 19.293)—are consistent with this observation. This percentage, I believe, is too high to be attributable to chance.

The usefulness of such an arrangement is not far to seek. On the one hand, the complementary distribution of ἴα/μία would have made good geographical sense to Homer's audience; on the other, such a distribution would have highlighted two of the fundamental tensions of the epic, for by this single device the Trojans become linguistically distinguishable from their Peloponnesian Greek foes while the conflict between Achilles and his antagonist Agamemnon is also subtly emphasized. Nor is it particularly surprising that Homer should have thought to employ a dialect form in his work for the purpose of creating an artistic effect. Indeed, the obvious similarities between ἴα and μία in both meaning and metrical shape might easily have suggested the idea to any Greek poet. There can also be little doubt that such a use of ἴα—especially when it occurred in a speech—would have been appreciated by Homer's audience. The Greeks seem always to have been quite sensitive to differences in pronunciation. Solon, for example, remarks that Athenian expatriates lost their Attic accents; and the use of dialects and dialect forms to enhance characterization becomes a commonplace in later comic writers[11]).

There is, however, one obvious argument which might be made against this interpretation of Homer's employment of ἴα: such a use of a dialect form appears to have no parallel elsewhere in the poem. This objection is of course justifiable, but in the case of the *Iliad* it is not so serious as it might initially seem. It is a corollary of the interpretation offered here that the present distribution of ἴα/μία in the poem is the work of a single person. Furthermore, it is likely that this one person (who has here been assumed, *faute de*

---

[10]) As additional support for this view, it should be noted that in the *Odyssey*, a work from which Trojans and Thessalians are almost completely absent, ἴα occurs only once (14.435)—quite a contrast to the ten examples in the *Iliad*.

[11]) Solon, frg. 24.12f. (Diehl); cf. also V. Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes* (Oxford, 1951), p. 289.

mieux, to have been Homer himself) first introduced ἴα into the poem. But it is extremely unlikely that this same poet was responsible for inserting *all* the instances of Aeolisms which we now find in the work. Many of these—one thinks, in particular, of the well-scattered and well-embedded datives plural in -εσσι—were probably present in the oral tradition which he took over from his predecessors. Under such circumstances, it would have been quite impractical (if not impossible) for a poet working near the end of the period of oral transmission to have revised the whole of the inherited epic in such a way that one set of linguistic forms was restricted to one group of characters.

If viewed in the manner suggested here, Homer's stylistically motivated use of the dialect form ἴα emerges as a subtle finishing stroke. It was a finishing stroke, however, whose underlying rationale could not easily have been (and therefore was not) applied on a wider scale.

Noch einmal Πεῖραρ/Πείρατα bei Homer[1])

Von WILHELM NOTHDURFT, Buntenbock

Herkunft und Wesen des Wortes

Die seit Beginn der Homererklärung unternommenen Versuche, der Mehrdeutigkeit des Wortes mit der Annahme von zwei etymologisch zu trennenden Homonymen „Ende" wie πέρας, τέλος, und „Seil" wie δεσμός beizukommen, konnten das Problem nicht lösen, weil sich, wie sich zwingend nachweisen läßt, bei dem nachgeordneten Versuch, jedes in den Textstellen auftretende Muster nun eindeutig einer dieser beiden Ausgangsbedeutungen zuzuordnen, grund-

---

[1]) Dieser Aufsatz bringt in der gebotenen Kürze die Ergebnisse einer breit angelegten Untersuchung zu Herkunft und Wesen des Wortes und zu seinem sprachlichen und inhaltlichen Umfeld. Nach Durchsicht der Erstfassung des Manuskriptes hat B. Snell mich zur Veröffentlichung ermuntert, K. Strunk hat mich dankenswerterweise auf den neuesten Stand der Erörterungen hingewiesen: Alfred Heubeck, Nochmal zur „innerhomerischen Chronologie", Glotta 50, 1972, S. 139–143. Zur Bezugnahme auf seine Ergebnisse habe ich Teile der Erstfassung nachträglich umgearbeitet. Bei einigen Übereinstimmungen haben meine Untersuchungen zu bedeutsamen abweichenden Ergebnissen vor allem in den Fragen nach der ursprünglichen Bedeutung des Wortes und der Phasenabfolge in seinem Wandlungsprozeß geführt.