20   Richard Janko

position auch als Nicht-*s*-Stamm verwendet wurde. Diese doppelte Erscheinung von φάος als *s*- bzw. als *o*-Stamm läßt sich sehr gut veranschaulichen durch die Dublette a) φαοσ-φόρος (Lyr. Adesp. in PLit. Lond. 51.5) bzw. φαεσ-φόρος (Call. Dian. 204) und b) φανο-φόροι· Αἰολεῖς ἱέρειαι Hsch. mit Umdeutung zum *o*-Stamm wie in ἀπο-φώ-λιος[34]).

Korr.-Zusatz: Nachträglich werde ich aufmerksam auf folgende Verse von Philetas (fr. 10, Coll. Alex. ed Powell, Oxford 1925, p. 92):

> Οὔ μέ τις ἐξ ὀρέων ἀποφώλιος ἀγροιώτης
> αἱρήσει κλήθρην, αἱρόμενος μακέλην·
> ἀλλ' ἐπέων εἰδὼς κόσμον καὶ πολλὰ μογήσας
> μύθων παντοίων οἶμον ἐπιστάμενος.

Hier könnte man zwar die Paraphrase ἀπαίδευτος, ἀδίδακτος (Ableitung von φωλεός) einsetzen. Ein Vergleich mit ξ 212 und der Stelle aus Nikander führt aber zu dem Schluß, daß Philetas ἀποφώλιος ebenfalls von φάος abgeleitet haben dürfte. ἀποφώλιος ἀγροιώτης sollte etwa mit 'unerleuchteter Bauerntölpel' wiedergegeben werden (zur Form ἀπόφωλος neben ἀποφώλιος vgl. Man. 4.316).

The Etymology of σχερός and ἐπισχερώ: a Homeric Misunderstanding

By Richard Janko, Trinity College Cambridge

The words σχερός and ἐπισχερώ have never been brought into connexion with each other, and at first sight there is no obvious link: semantically they are very different, and both are usually thought to have reasonable etymologies. Firstly, σχερός is attested in the Hesychian gloss σχερός· ἀκτή, αἰγιαλός (cf. σχερόν· κῦμα ἕτοιμον, ibid., which I do not understand), the varia lectio σχεράς 'shingle' at Φ 319, and the compound πολυσχεράς 'shingly' in Euphorion, fr. 25.

The consensus of scholarly opinion, represented by Frisk[1]) and Chantraine[2]), is to accept Hiersche's derivation of this by a second-

---

[34]) Diesen Hinweis verdanke ich Herrn Prof. Strunk.

[1]) H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1960–70, s.v.

[2]) P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1968–, s.v.

ary aspiration from *σχερός, cf. OE *score*, MHG *schore* from the root *(s)ker- in κείρω. The secondary aspiration is very difficult to explain. Hiersche suggests that the original form is seen with metathesis in ξερόν at ε 402:

ῥόχϑει γὰρ μέγα κῦμα ποτὶ ξερὸν ἠπείροιο [3]).

This is certainly a far better link than that with ξηρός, by "metrical shortening" the like of which is unparalleled [4]). However, if σχερός is original, the aspiration would disappear in metathesis to produce the same result ξερός, cf. ἔξω beside ἔχω. It might therefore be better to jettison the link with OE *score*. It is tempting instead to suggest a connexion (somehow!) with ἡ χέρσος 'dry land', which is cognate with Sanskrit *hárṣate* 'become stiff, bristle', Latin *horreō*, Avestan *zarštva* 'stone': but in this case we must suppose the existence of an otherwise unattested prothetic *s* in this root, and that the *s* at the end of the root did not always belong to it as firmly as appears from the new 'cognates'. This etymology raises as many problems as Hiersche's.

What has all this to do with ἐπισχερώ, 'in turn'? Apart from the three examples in the Iliad to be scrutinised shortly, the form is attested in Simonides (fr. 155.5), Theocritus (*Id.* 14.69) and Apollonius of Rhodes (I 528, IV 451). There is also ἐνσχερώ (Ap. Rhod. I 912) and ἐν σχερῶι in Pindar, *Nem.* I 69, XI 39, *Is.* VI 62. None of these instances has any connexion with 'shore'. Lastly, there is the gloss ἰσχερώ· ἑξῆς in Hesychius. Chantraine [5]), following Schwyzer [6]), sees this as Cypriot from *ἰνσχερώ: if correct, this will prove the antiquity of the form. However, a more likely if more prosaic explanation is that it is derived from ἐπισχερώ by false division: indeed ἐπ' ἰσχερώ is given in some Homeric mss.

The etymology of ἐπισχερώ is thought to be — *seĝʰ-, with the zero grade of the root seen in ἔσχον and a suffix in -ερός. Thus Schwyzer [7]) deems it the instrumental of a lost noun *σχερόν

---

[3]) *Zeitschr. für Phon. Sprachw. und Kommunikationsforschung* 17 (1964) 515 ff.

[4]) Pace Chantraine op. cit. s.v. It is certain that the long vowel in ξηρός was original, cf. Skt. *kṣārá-*, *kṣáyati* 'burns'. For ξερός a better cognate is Latin *serescunt* 'dry' (Lucil. I 306), cf. *serēnus*, OHG *serawēn*, MHG *serben* 'dry' < *ksero- or kʰsero-, perhaps — *gʰsero- by assimilation Pokorny, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* p. 625).

[5]) s.v. σχερός.

[6]) *Griechische Grammatik* II 469.

[7]) loc. cit.

22   Richard Janko

'continuum'. Chantraine[8]) compares ἑξῆς, ἐφεξῆς and Doric ἕξαν and ἐπεχές. The suffix is harder to parallel: the accentuation is against an analogy with comparative adverbs, such as ἑκαστέρω, as well as the sense.

However, the Homeric use of the word suggests new lines of enquiry. The remakable fact is that in two cases ἐπισχερώ is juxtaposed with ἀκτή, and the only other case is highly ambiguous:

Σ 68–9   ἀκτὴν εἰσανέβαινον ἐπισχερώ, ἔνθα θαμειαὶ
         Μυρμιδόνων εἴρυντο νέες ταχὺν ἀμφ᾽ Ἀχιλῆα

Ψ 125–6 κὰδ᾽ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀκτῆς (sc. φιτρούς) βάλλον ἐπισχερώ, ἔνθ᾽ ἄρ᾽
             Ἀχιλλεὺς
         φράσσατο Πατρόκλωι μέγα ἠρίον ἠδέ οἱ αὐτῶι.

Λ 666–8 ... εἰς ὅ κε δὴ νῆες θοαὶ ἄγχι θαλάσσης
         Ἀργείων ἀέκητι πυρὸς δηΐοιο θέρωνται,
         αὐτοί τε κτεινώμεθ᾽ ἐπισχερώ· οὐ γὰρ ἐμὴ ἴς ...

The association with ἀκτή in the first two cases suggests that there was some relationship between ἐπισχερώ and σχερός. In all three contexts ἐπὶ σχερῶι 'on the shore' would give excellent sense: although in the first two it might be thought somewhat pleonastic, it is syntactically acceptable. It looks very much as if one of the words we have been examining is derived, by a misunderstanding of these or similar passages, from the other. The question is, which? And when?

On the evidence available a certain conclusion seems out of reach. If σχερός was original, we can argue that at some stage in the tradition a dative σχερῶι has been corrupted to the accepted reading, and this is supported by Pindar's ἐν σχερῶι. But it is equally likely that at some stage the texts read ΕΠΙΣΧΕΡΟ, where O could represent either -οῦ or -ώ; for this compare βῶν at H 238 for βοῦν and Chantraine's discussion of Homeric orthography[9]). To me a genitive seems more probable at Ψ 125; ἐπὶ χέρσου occurs once in the Iliad, seven times in the Odyssey, mostly in formulae. Σ 68 is the most difficult case of the three for this view, as the common use of ἐπί with the genitive in the sense of 'onto' appears with verbs of motion in the simplex, rather than with a compound as here. Thus I suspect that here ἐπισχερώ did mean 'in turn', at least in this passage if not elsewhere in the mind of the poet: but the two

―――――――――
[8]) loc. cit.
[9]) *Grammaire homérique*, 2nd. ed. Paris 1973, Ch. 1.

collocations with ἀκτή suggest that the misunderstanding did not predate the constitution of our present text by very much.

I find this a more satisfying derivation than the reverse, but on no very strong grounds; perhaps it is of significance that no alternative meaning 'on the shore' is ever offered by the scholiasts, and that is such an obscure word: had the development been from ἐπισχερώ to σχερός, we might have expected to find the latter form somewhere in the considerable bulk of learned Hellenistic poetry, apart from a single derivative in Euphorion.

Another argument may be drawn from the likelihood that σχερός is attested very early, while ἐπισχερώ and ἐν σχερῶι are not found with certainty until Simonides and Pindar. This too is an *argumentum ex silentio* and thus doubtful. There is a place-name at Pylos *o-pi-ke-ri-jo*, *o-pi-ke-ri-jo-de* (An 615.8, 724.3) which has been interpreted by Chadwick[10]) as /Opiskerion/. The context is eminently appropriate to a coastal town at An 724.3–4:

o-pi-ke-ri-jo-de ki-ti-ta o-pe-ro-ta e-re-e VIR 1

(At An 615.8 the context is lost, but may also be a list of rowers.) For the formation compare /opihala/ 'coastal regions' (An 657.1) and τὰ ἐπιθαλάσσια: and also perhaps Homer's Σχερίη. It is even possible that a compound *ἐπισχερός underlies ἐπισχερώ in Homer, although one would expect it to have had a suffix in -ιος as in Mycenaean. A further weak indication of the antiquity of σχερός may be the form ξερόν in the Odyssey, discussed above.

While these arguments are not conclusive, they do suggest that the adverb originated by a misunderstanding in the early epic tradition, particularly if the form ἐπεχές along with ἴσχω was known to the poet. On balance this seems more plausible than the reverse process.

---

[10]) M. Ventris and J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2nd. ed. Cambridge 1973, pp. 187–188 and glossary s. v. I am indebted to Dr. Chadwick for drawing my attention to these forms. I now find that the link between σχερός and ἐπισχερώ was first made in the last century by Doederlin (cf. Mooney on Ap. Rhod. I 220).