

The interchange of δ and ζ in early Greek epic

By SHANE HAWKINS, Chapel Hill

Summary: There are a few words in early Greek epic that are often regarded as showing an interchange of δ and ζ. Discussions of this interchange have usually explained it as a reflection of a dialectal variation that was utilized by the epic poets and incorporated into their verse as occasion warranted. This paper reexamines that possibility, along with other scenarios that have been put forth, and concludes that a dialectal explanation for the δ/ζ interchange is unfeasible. Instead, it is argued, the forms in question ought to be explained as products of the epic *Kunstsprache*, words shaped by the forces of analogy and metrical necessity.

1. δαφεινός

When placed alongside φοινός (*Il.* 16.159), φοινήεις (*Il.* 12.202, 220), and φοίνιος (*Od.* 18.97), all of which mean ‘red,’ δαφεινός (δαφεινός) is clearly analyzable as a compound form comprised of the intensifier δα- plus -φοινός ‘red.’ This word occurs four times in Homer, where the etymological meaning ‘very red’ is appropriate in two instances, once when it is used to describe clothing made red with blood (*Il.* 18.538 εἶμα δ’ ἔχ’ ἄμφ’ ὥμοισι δαφεινὸν αἵματι φωτῶν) and once in reference to the color of a serpent’s back (*Il.* 2.308 δράκων ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφεινός).¹

The other two Homeric attestations depart from this meaning. At *Il.* 10.23 δαφεινός is used to describe the color of a lion skin, and the meaning must be something like ‘tawny’: ἄμφ’ δ’ ἔπειτα

I would like to thank Michael Weiss and Martin Peters for their help in writing this article and William Race for commenting on a draft.

¹ All citations of the *Iliad* are taken from West’s 1998-2000 edition. It is possible that 18.538 is a late interpolation taken from the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield*; see Edwards 1991: 220-1 with bib. For 2.308 cf. Hesiod fr. 204.136 M-W δεινός ὄφις κατὰ νῶτα δαφεινός.

δαφαινὸν ἐέσσατο δέρμα λέοντος / αἶθωνος μέγαλοιο
ποδηγεκές, εἶλετο δ' ἔγχος. At *Il.* 11.473-4 it refers to θῶες:
ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' αὐτόν / Τρῶες ἔπονθ', ὥς εἴ τε δαφαινοὶ θῶες
ὄρεσφιν / ἄμφ' ἔλαφον κεραδὸν βεβλημένον. Dürbeck 1971 has
explained these examples as extensions of the word's original
and expected semantic range and as the subsequent development
of two notoriously late contexts (10.23 *Doloneia*, 11.474
simile), based ultimately on a misunderstanding of an earlier
context and the original meaning of the word.² This is a

² It will suffice to summarize here his explanation while omitting many of the details. The ill-fitting δαφαινός of 10.23 is brought into relief when placed alongside the similar but unproblematic lines from elsewhere in the *Doloneia*: 10.23 ἀμφὶ δ' ἔπειτα δαφαινὸν || ἐέσσατο δέρμα λέοντος / αἶθωνος μέγαλοιο ποδηγεκές, εἶλετο δ' ἔγχος. 10.177-8 ὥς φάθ'· ὃ δ' ἄμφ' ὥμοισιν || ἐέσσατο δέρμα λέοντος / αἶθωνος μέγαλοιο ποδηγεκές, εἶλετο δ' ἔγχος. The shared line and a half, identical after the caesura, suggests a background with exemplars in epic, and since this background is not to be found in the *Iliad*, Dürbeck reasoned, it must lie somewhere else. Neither Agamemnon (subject of 10.23) nor Diomedes (11.474) were known traditionally as wearers of a lion skin, but of course the prototypical lion-slayer and skin-wearer was Heracles, killer of the Nemean lion. A lion skin described as 'very red' would make the best sense in the context of its death in battle and after or during the removal of its skin (cf. *Il.* 18.538) and, assuming that our lines rely closely on their model and continue its original word order, Dürbeck reasoned that the confusion in 10.23 could be explained if one assumed that the verb ἐέσσατο, shaped - - - -, was a substitution for another verb of the same shape that somehow led to the ensuing confusion. Such ambiguity is present in the verb ἐρύω, which can mean either 'to drag or pull off' but also 'to draw' something on oneself (*Lfgre*, s.v.; cf. *Od.* 8.84-5 μέγα φᾶρος ... κακὸν κεφαλῆς εἵρυσσε). If we assume that the lines on Heracles meant 'he tore off the red skin' (δαφαινὸν ἐρύσσατο δέρμα), but that the *Doloneia* poet understood rather 'he drew on the red skin,' we can account for the confusion that led to 10.23 and understand how by replacing ἐρύσσατο with ἐέσσατο he created a phrase in which δαφαινόν no longer retained its original meaning. Corroborating evidence for supposing that the passage originally contained the verb ἐρύομαι appears at Theocritus 25.272-3 where, in fact, the missing verb is used to describe the skinning of the Nemean lion by Hercules: βύρσαν / θηρὸς τεθνευῶτος ἀπὸ μελέων ἐρυσάμην (Gow 1952: 441-2, 463). I would add that although the source(s) of *Idyll* 25 are unknown to us, Dürbeck's sce-

conclusion that, whatever one thinks of the details provided by Dürbeck, could be reasonably surmised solely on the evidence of the appearance of these unetymological meanings in their notoriously late passages.

As to the constituent parts of δαφινός, the ancient etymological tradition associated φοινός with φόνος 'murder.'³ This, however, is soundly quashed by the evidence of Mycenaean *po-ni-ki-ja* (φοινικία), written without use of the q-series, which

nario supposes that some extra-Homeric epic tradition on the subject was known to the author of *Idyll* 25 (the authorship is disputed; Gow 1952: 439-41). It is worth noting that Panyassis, the fifth century epic poet from Halicarnassus, wrote a *Heraclea* surviving in about sixty hexameters. According to Gow, mention of the city Bembina, Βεμβιναίους, at line 202 of *Idyll* 25 may have been borrowed from him. Steph. Byz., s.v. βέμβινα, cites from the *Heraclea* of Panyassis the line δέρμα τε θήρειον Βεμβινήταο λέοντος and καὶ Βεμβινήταο πελώρου δέρμα λέοντος, which, in turn, call to mind the line-final phrase δέρμα λέοντος from the passages of the *Doloneia* quoted above. This suggests the possibility not only that Panyassis' *Heraclea* served as a model for *Idyll* 25, but that in the phrase δέρμα λέοντος Panyassis shared with the author of the *Doloneia* a formular relic of the tradition surrounding Heracles and the Nemean lion; see further Matthews 1974: 43-5. It is clear too that, whatever δαφινός means in 11.474 ('red-brown-gray,' 'yellowish,' 'bloody,' even 'murderous') it is difficult to square with the first two examples where it means 'very red.' The passage is a simile that shows other linguistically abnormal features (Shipp 1972: 275) and Dürbeck noted that its status as a late addition is supported on formal grounds. That is, the beginning of 474 and 483, the lines which frame the simile, are easily combinable into a single verse:

11.473 ἦῤρον ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆα δίφιλον· ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' αὐτόν

11.474 Τρῶες ἔπονθ', ὡς εἴ τε δαφινοὶ θῶες ὄρεσφιν

11.483 Τρῶες ἔπον πολλοὶ τε καὶ ἄλκιμοι, αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἦρος

³ Nicander *Alexiph.* 187 with φοινός for φόνος, see Von der Mühl 1956; Orion 162.24 (Sturz 1820) Φοινός, παρὰ τὸ φόνον. φονός ἐστι ὀξύτωνος, καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ι, φοινός; Eustath. 228.20 Δαφινός . . . παρὰ τὸ δα ἐπιτατικὸν καὶ τὸν φόνον. Cf. 899.59, 1051.61 (where instead τὸ δὲ φοινὸν πρωτότυπὸν ἐστὶ τοῦ δαφινόν), and 1052.8; see below n. 8.

shows that this family of words did not begin with a labiovelar and therefore cannot, in fact, be connected with φόνος < *g^{uh}en-.⁴

According to the standard etymology the word is a derivative in *-iǵo- built on the o-grade of the root *b^hen- 'to strike' and assumes a progression in which *b^hon-iǵo-s > after syncope *p^honǵos > φοινός.⁵ Semantically, this is less than convincing since the gap between φοινός, which in epic literature always means 'red,' and the various reflexes of *b^hen-, which mean 'to strike' or 'beat to death' or, as a development of the latter, 'death, murder' (OE *bana*, ModEng *bane*, OHG *bano*, ON *bani*), is too large to admit of a ready explanation. But what really tells against this explanation is the implausibility of the phonology it assumes: the sequence -nǵ- could not have arisen by a *dialectal* syncope rule early enough to undergo the proto-Greek metathesis allegedly involved.⁶

If one looks elsewhere among the cognate languages for words meaning 'red,' one finds Old English *basu* 'scarlet' < *b^hh₂-s-ǵo- and Old Irish *basc* 'red' < *b^hh₂-s-ko-⁷, which point to an alternative explanation in which our word is derived from the root *b^heh₂- 'shining.' Here, φοινός could be readily explained as a -nó- derivative formed to an (acrostatic) i-stem, *b^hoh₂-i-nó-, for which one may compare a form like Sanskrit *dakṣiṇá* 'right' < *deḱs-i-nó-.

δα- is traditionally glossed as 'very' and compared with ζα- (DELG, s.v. δα-). This comparison is probably ancient since it is found in Eustathius and the *Etymologicum Magnum*, where

⁴ See DELG, s.v. φοινός, ". . . φοινίκιος . . . est constamment écrit *ponikija* (fém.) en mycénien, ce qui écarte une labio-vélaire initiale."

⁵ So DELG and Frisk, s.v. φοινός.

⁶ For such syncope note Myc. *ka-za* 'bronze' = χαλκέα and Cyprian κορζιά 'heart' = καρδία.

⁷ See Vendryes 1959-, s.v. 2 *basc*. However, the word only appears in glosses and may (according to DIL, s.v. *basc* 3) be a misinterpretation of *basc* 'necklace.'

ζαφοινός is given as an alternate form of δαφοινός.⁸ ζα- itself is regularly explained as the product of δια- after the consonantalization of /i/, i.e., *dia- > *dja- > ζα-⁹ and is normally understood to be an Aeolic feature of the epic dialect (so *DELG*, s.v. ζά). It could, however, be explicable in “Achaean” terms (cf. Hsch. κορζιᾶ· καρδίᾳ Paphus, Cyprus), if such a dialect stratum did in fact play a role in the formation of the epic *Kunstsprache*.

Assuming this analysis is correct, the question becomes one of accounting for the appearance of δα- in place of the expected ζα-. Shipp approached this problem by pointing to dialect areas where initial ζ- appears to have assimilated to *δδ- and simplified to δ-, with the result that δ appears for ζ in initial position.¹⁰ The use of δ for ζ is found essentially in either West Greek (Cretan, Laconian, Elean) or dialects with West Greek influence (Boeotian and Thessaliotis).¹¹ But while it is no longer possible to deny that West Greek played some part in the formation of epic language,¹² there are a couple of reasons for thinking that West Greek influence is rather unlikely in this case. First, if the source of δα- were West Greek, one would have to assume that δια- and δα- were available as variations in the source dialect. They were not, however, and δια- alone (διε- in Thess.) appears

⁸ Eustath. 228.20 quoted above in n. 3. *EM* 250.24 ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ ζα, ζαφοινός, καὶ δαφοινός ἐν τροπῇ, ὁ φόνιος ἄγαν.

⁹ Hodot 1990: 42-6, 84-6; Chantraine 1973: 168-9. Compare Hipponax 42.2W ἰθὺ δῖᾶ, scanned - - - .

¹⁰ Shipp 1972: 123-5. Shipp's view is similar to that of Sjölund 1938: 20-6, 76, who thought it necessary that ζ have the value of a single consonant and invoked examples of Elean ζ for δ.

¹¹ See most recently Méndez Dosuna 1991-3 and Teodorsson 1993. For a characterization of Thessaliotis see Buck 1965: 151.

¹² Recent discussions of West Greek forms in epic can be found in Matthews 1996: 189-90, 273, 334-5, Peters 1987: 236, 239 n. 6 with more bibliography, West 1988: 167-8, Shipp 1972: 5, 80, 274 n. 1; on the acceptance of Doric forms among grammarians and Hellenistic poets see Giangrande 1970 and 1973 (but on the explanation of the Doric gen. sg. as a reinterpretation of an elided -αο see rather West 1966: 400 and Matthews 1974: 133-4).

in this group. Cretan: διακρ[ι]νὸν[τ]αι Buck 117.II 46, Laconian: διακάτται Buck 70.1, διαγνόμεν Buck 70.7, Elean: no examples, Boeotian: δ[ι]εσσέλθει Buck 42.26 (ca. 230 BCE), διαγράψασθαι Buck 43.23 (between 222-220 BCE), Thessalian: διά Buck 32.5ff. (ca. 214 BCE), διακούσω 32.38. As it is there is no compelling reason to explain why δα- should be found only in this word and not elsewhere in Homer, where there are only compounds in δια- and ζα-.

A different approach to this problem has been taken by Steriade who, in a discussion of the outcome of stop + yod clusters, has argued for a scenario like this: **komid-ĵō* > **komidzō* > κομίζω, phonetically realized as either [komizzō] or [komizdō].¹³ That is to say, in outcomes of stop + yod clusters, ζ represents a sequence in which both members are [-son, +cor] but the first is [+cont] while the second is unspecified for continuancy (either [d] or [z]). This account eliminates the need to posit a continuancy metathesis rule, **[dz] > [zd]*, which has been assumed for some dialects. Her arguments are two-fold: If the <z> of Mycenaean words like *me-ze* = *mezōn* μέζων, *to-pe-za* = *torpeza* τράπεζα and *wo-ze* ≈ *ērdō* represent /zd/, then the spelling of these words violates the usual practice in Linear B of writing the coda of one syllable, /z/, and omitting the onset, /d/, of the following syllable. Therefore, it is unlikely that <z> represents /zd/ and one must assume that no metathesis has occurred in these words. A second piece of evidence is sought in the word *ērdō*, which Steriade derives along the following lines: **uerĝ-ĵō* > **uerd-ĵō* > **erdzō* > **erzzō* > with geminate simplification after a consonant *erzō* ≈ Myc. *wo-ze*. The attested form *ērdō*, which, under this scheme, must represent [erzō], is explained with the reasoning that since there is no sign in Greek for simple non-geminate /z/, the sign for the other voiced coronal obstruent in the inventory, <δ>, was used to represent phonetic [z]. Her explanation of *δαφαινός* follows directly from this: **dia-* > **dja-* > **dza-* > *zza-*, <ζα> when the

¹³ Steriade 1982: 261-9.

geminate is maintained, but <δα-> when the geminate is simplified.

Neither of these arguments can stand close scrutiny. The exact phonetic nature of the Linear B signs under discussion (the so-called z series 17 za, 74 ze, 20 zo) are still a subject of contention and therefore can not offer clear evidence for either the presence or absence of continuancy metathesis.¹⁴ But even if her explanation were valid for the Mycenaean forms, there is no reason to suppose that such an explanation is valid for other dialects, as if all subsequent Greek first passed through Mycenaean. As for ἐρδω, if one can resist the temptation to reject the explanation *ab initio* for the fact that it would represent a striking departure from the relative precision of Attic orthography, it should be pointed out that there is good evidence for the existence of the continuancy metathesis in Attic words like σύζυγος and σαλπίζω where a nasal is lost before a sibilant + stop sequence (i.e. *salping-ĵō > *indzō > *-inzdō > *-izdō). Therefore, there is no reason to discard the derivation of ἐρδω through a well-known sound change in which [s] or its allophone [z] is lost in a similar environment: *xerg-ĵō > *xerdzō > *xerzdō > ἐρδω. Such a process is evident in forms of the middle infinitive like ἔσπαρθαι < *espar-sl^hai, γέγραπθαι < *gegrap^h-sl^hai, λέλεχθαι < *lelek-sl^hai, etc. There is nothing here to support her analysis and the claim that the zza- from δια- was simplified to z- and written <δ> only in δαφονός and nowhere else (or even that it survives only in δαφονός) is unpersuasive.¹⁵

¹⁴ Crespo 1985 provides a useful rehearsal of the prevalent views while he himself takes the position that the z-series represents palatal stops.

¹⁵ I add here the view of Ruijgh 1986: 387, who wants δαφονός to be a Lesbian form. This is quite improbable since in Lesbian the outcome of δια- before a consonant is ζα- or δια-, and δι- before a vowel. There are no Lesbian forms in δα- < δια-, to my knowledge. There is no reason to accept the arbitrary and unique development suggested by Méndez Dosuna 1991-3: 85 n. 6 "Hom. δάφονος [sic] where <Δ> indicates consonantalization of ι without lengthening of the preceding syllable, i.e. without gemination of /d/."

Setting these approaches aside we might consider a factor that played a large role in shaping epic verse: meter. In seeking a metrical explanation for the facts we might start with the observation that, while all other Homeric forms in ζα- produce acceptable metrical sequences, either a molossus --- (ζᾱής, ζαχρηής) or a dactyl --- (ζᾱθεος, ζᾱκοτος, ζατρεφής, ζαφλεγής), the form *ζαφονός produces an irresolvable cretic --- and is therefore metrically illicit. For the poet who insisted on including this word in his repertoire, the task was the familiar one of adapting the shape of a word to the necessities of the meter.

The groundwork for a solution was laid by Felix Solmsen in a discussion of certain cases of a short final syllable in thesis that remain short before words with an initial σκ-, στ-, or ζ.¹⁶ As all such words have a metrical shape beginning ~-, Solmsen argued that this manner of scansion must be a metrical license employed to accommodate these words (Σκάμανδρος, σκέπαρ-
νον, Ζάκυνθος, Ζέλεια, and perhaps σταθμός¹⁷) to the shape of the verse.¹⁸

¹⁶ Solmsen 1905.

¹⁷ *Od.* 7.89 ἀργύρεοι δὲ σταῖθμοι is difficult. Although the surrounding verses echo the phrasing and thus, one might argue, support the reading (88 χρύσειαι δὲ θύραι ..., 90 ἀργύρεον δ' ἐφ' ὑπερθύριον, χρυσή δὲ κορώνη, 91 χρύσειοι δ' ἐκάτερθε, see Strunk 1961: 165-6), West 1966: 98 calls it "a monstrosity in which I cannot bring myself to believe" and has recently written (1998: 101) that the line "stands in one of the parts of the *Odyssey* that has most obviously been subject to reworking by a secondary hand, so that we need not judge it against the standards of the main poet." It has also been suggested that this kind of metrical license is due to imitation of a foreign sound or a special phonetic development within Greek. These ideas are well discussed by Szemerényi 1987: 343-7 who rejects them and concludes that examples of such license are "not due to linguistic peculiarities but simply to the structural requirements of the Homeric hexameter."

¹⁸ This is also the view of Debrunner 1927: 183-5, who takes these as examples of metrical license similar to light syllables before *muta cum liquida* sequences. Magnien 1922: 135 speaks improbably of "disparition phonétique d'une des deux consonnes de Ζάκυνθος, Ζέλεια, Σκάμανδρον,

This view was put forth against earlier scholarship that sought to solve the problem by emending such words to Κάμανδρος, κέπαρνον, Δάκυνθος, and Δέλεια. Encouragement for this solution was found in the fact that Κάμανδρος was attested in a few MSS and subsequently these forms were taken as relics rather than aberrations. In fact the sigma-less reading is quite wide-spread, according to Allen's apparatus, and found in some of the best minuscules from the tenth to the sixteenth centuries.¹⁹ Nevertheless, it seems likely that this reading must be traced back to ancient scholarly work on the text rather than any practice on the part of the Homeric poets. This is true because i) the reading with sigma is found in at least one papyrus at *Il.* 21.305, P. Heid. 1262a (P¹², third cent. BCE)²⁰, and ii) the A scholium to *Il.* 1.1 attributes the sigma-less spelling to Alexander of Cotiaeum: ὁ Κοτιαεὺς "Ἀχιλλῆος," διὰ τὸ μέτρον ἐν λ γρ(άφει)· καὶ γὰρ τὸ Κάμανδρος ἀντὶ τοῦ Σκάμανδρος γρ(άφεσθαι).²¹ Alexander's death in the second century CE provides a *terminus ante quem* for this reading, but it is hard not

σκέπαρνον, comme dans σκίδνασθαι, κίδνασθαι." In a similar vein Strunk 1961 explained Ζάκυνθος, Ζέλεια, Σκάμανδρος, σκέπαρνον, and σταθμός as mirages whose initial σ- is a later written disguise of the fact that in all these words σ- has actually assimilated to the following stop, forming a geminate that then simplified. As he thought this process of assimilation was Mycenaean (incorrectly, since (-)s- before a stop is ignored only in the writing but was likely spoken; so, e.g., *pa-i-to* = Φαιστός), he claimed (p. 167) that these words "der ältesten poetischen Sprachschicht zuzurechnen sind, die bis ins Mykenische hinabreicht." He explains δαφονός in the same way, but does not address the failure here to disguise δ with ζ.

¹⁹ See Allen's text at *Il.* 2.465, 467, 5.36, 49, 77, 774, 6.4, 402, 7.329, 11.499, 12.21, 20.74, 21.124, 223, 305, 603 and 22.148. West does not print these in his new text: "Nec tamen adducor ut Κάμ- pro vero habeam," p. xxxv.

²⁰ S. West 1967: 138. To judge by Vergil's imitation of *Od.* 9.24 ὕληεσσα Ζάκυνθος with *Aen.* 3.270 *nemorosa Zacynthos*, which also features a short scansion before *Zacynthos*, his text of Homer also read Ζάκυνθος.

²¹ See Dyck 1991: 322-4, and now West 1998-2000: xv and 2001: 153, 191.

to believe Erbse when he says that “Allerdings wurde diese Besonderheit schwerlich erst von Alexander entdeckt.”²² Dyck must be correct when he states that this fragment “represents a stage in the efforts of ancient grammarians to bring the spelling and prosody of Homeric proper names under a common denominator.”²³ Since we know that the text was sometimes altered by later critics in order to regularize spelling and to accommodate even erroneous metrical theories, there is no difficulty in believing that such was the case with Σκάμανδρος.²⁴

Solmsen himself thought that Κάμανδρος was the product of an even earlier time when the metrical license that allowed Σκάμανδρος to stand in the text was no longer understood and that its alteration represented the attempt of a redactor to correct the text. Likewise, δαφινός for *ζαφινός was created at this time, which he suggests was as early as the “Schlussredaktion der grossen Epen.” However, the concern over Σκάμανδρος seems not to have come so early while, on the other hand, δαφινός need not be taken as the result of editorial manipulation. It seems unlikely that δαφινός should be the product of a redaction so successful that it left no trace of Homeric *ζαφινός, while so many of our sources attest at the same time Σκάμανδρος, σκέπαρνον and the like. If the epics had been edited in this way, and σκέπαρνον was left in the text, one

²² Erbse 1960: 96.

²³ Dyck 1991: 323. The sigma-less forms were perhaps suggested by the existence of proper names such as Κάμανδρος or Καμμῦς, or that of Sappho's father, who was reported by the Suida (s.v. Σαπφώ) as having the full name Σκαμανδρόνυμος and the hypocoristic Κάμων. See further Sjölund 1938: 22-3, Strunk 1961: 164 and West 1966: 98-9.

²⁴ For example, according to van der Valk 1949: 38-9, the phrase καλέοι τρύξοντα ἔ αὐτόν at *Od.* 17.387 was altered in MSS adef to καλέοιτο τρύξοντα and in h to καλέοι τρύξοντα simply to adhere to Choeroboscus Canon 29, which stated that ι and υ were never long before ξ. S. West 1967: 17, “Orthographic systematization is normally one of the results of a scholarly edition.”

expects that *ζαφινός also would have stood the test. That we have no such Homeric word suggests that there was no *ζαφινός to pass inspection in the first place. In other words, we should attribute δαφινός to the work of the poet(s) rather than to any editors and suppose that while σκ- and στ- were allowed in exceptional cases like metrically untractable proper names or similar words in later developments (σκέπαρνον only at *Od.* 5.237 and 9.391, σκίη, Hes. *W&D* 589, σκοτεινόν Pindar *N.* 7.61, etc.), ζ did not generally fit into this class.

In support of this view one may cite other parallels for the loss of a consonant at the beginning of a word in Homer. For one, there is the inherited example of *s-mobile* in the words σκεδάννυμι *Il.* 19.171, κεδάννυμι *Il.* 2.398 and σκίδναμαι *Il.* 1.487, κίδνημι *Il.* 8.1. Or again, Strömberg and Haslam have shown that Homeric εἴβω is a decapitated form of λείβω, a result of the interplay between formula and metrical necessity that forced upon the poet the ungainly verse-final phrase *δάκρυον λείβω, “until it underwent metrical normalization and gave birth to εἴβω.”²⁵ Consonants may also be lost for metrical reasons in places other than word-initially. For example, ἀμφιβρότη (*Il.* 2.389, 12.402, 20.281, 11.32) for the expected *ἀμφιμβρότη and

²⁵ Haslam 1976: 207, with an elaborated version of the idea first presented in Strömberg 1960. In his article Haslam also argued that αἶα relates to γαῖα just as εἴβω does to λείβω. In particular, that αἶα was a product of the verse final phrase πατρίδος γαῖης from which αἶης was made *metri gratia*. But Peters 1994 points out that there is independent evidence for αἶα in the γλώσσαι κατὰ πόλεις (see Bowra 1960) where one finds Μαγνητῶν. αἶα· γῆ. Furthermore he adduces an etymology for αἶα, which derives it from a verbal adjective of the type Skt. *pakvá* ‘cooked, ripe’ built to the root *(s)h₂aj- (perhaps also in αἶμα ‘blood’) with the meaning ‘moistened, bedewed.’ He finds similar semantics in γατα ‘die mit (heller) Flüssigkeit (Versehene)’ < *gah-ja-, with *gah- < *gh₂ns-, a “Reflex eines (doppelt) schwundstufigen Allomorphs von γάνος [‘Glanz’].” According to this explanation, both of these words stem from the view of Heaven (οὐρανός < *uorsanó- ‘der mit der Befeuchtung, Befeuchter’) and Earth as a cosmic couple (for αἶα see esp. 206 n. 9 and 210 n. 27). All this makes the view that αἶα is a product of the Homeric verse unlikely.

ἀβρότη (*Il.* 14.78) for ἄμβρότη (or ἄμβροστή) are clearly adjustments made to accommodate words that were otherwise metrically prohibited.²⁶ There is, then, precedent for the idea that the metrical difficulty presented by *ζαφινός was settled by the poets themselves with the elimination of the [z] in ζ. Once a solution like (σ)κεδάννυμι was hit upon, it was possible to create δαφινός on a straightforward proportional model /sT/:/T/:/zd/:X, where X = /d/. No doubt Ζάκυνθος and Ζέλεια were spared this treatment simply because they were well-established place names.

One might have expected the poets to have made use of *διαφινός, since that is a metrically acceptable alternative to *ζαφινός. But we ought to take into account the facts that i) Homeric nominal compounds with an intensive sense only appear with ζα-, to the exclusion of any in δια- and ii) when color terms compounded in δια- do occur, they are not only attested much later but they usually have a mitigating rather than an intensive sense.²⁷ The reason for the absence of *διαφινός, therefore, is the fact that no such Ionic form was available to the poets as a substitute in the first place.

I might add at this point that there is no compelling reason to think that the pronunciation of ζ in ζα- compounds by Homeric poets was any different from other Homeric *zetas*, whatever exactly that may have been. It is possible that there were two different pronunciations of *zeta* in Lesbian since MSS of the

²⁶ Shipp 1972: 284; Steriade 1982: 379.

²⁷ See *LSJ*, s.v. διά D.VI.; Demosthenes 21.22 διάχρυσος 'interwoven with gold'; Aristotle *Problemata* 894a39 διάλευκος, of leprosy, and at 932a29 of the color of lake water; Philo Byzantius, *de Septem Miraculis* 2.3 διάχλωρος 'of translucent green'; Xenocrates 15 διάπυρρος 'bright red'; Dioscorides, *de Materia Medica* 1.11 διαπόρφυρος 'shot with purple' and at 3.9 διέρυθρος 'shot with red'; Plutarch, *de Daedalis Plataeensibus* 4 διαθολόω 'darken,' *Flamininus* 4 διαμελαίνω 'darken,' said of smoke darkening the air, intransitively at 2.921f. 'to be or become dark'; Babrius 85.15 διάργemos 'flecked with white'; Philostratus Junior, *Imagines* 12 διαλευκαίνω 'whiten.'

Lesbian poets (although not early inscriptions) show initial ζ- (= [dz]?, position-making) for διά and Διόνυσος, but usually medial -σδ- ([zd]). There is no such evidence for Homeric ζ, but given words like ἴζω (< *sisdō), ὄζος (< *osdos), θύραζε and πλάζω (< *planzdō < *plangiō) and the fact that ζ normally closes a syllable, a sure indication that it was treated metrically as a double consonant, one may presume that ζ is analyzable as underlying /sd/.²⁸

2. δάσκιος

If the δα- of δάσκιος ‘thickly shaded’ (*Il.* 15.273, *Od.* 5.470) is from ζα-, it would create a serious problem for the metrical theory just outlined since a metrical motivation for δα- is completely lacking in this word. But the assumption of a dissimilation of ζα- (σδα- < δια-) before -σκίος is, in the face of words like ζέσις, ζεστός, ζωστήρ, etc., quite improbable.²⁹ More

²⁸ Homeric examples like Ἀἰδόσδε, Θήβασδε, τοιόσδε, τοσ(σ)όσδε, and τέλοσδε are presumably analogical/etymological spellings. The earliest first-hand description of the sound seems to be as late as Aristotle *Metaph.* 993a4 οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ζα ἐκ τοῦ σ καὶ δ καὶ α φασὶν εἶναι, οἱ δὲ τινες ἕτερον φθόγγον φασὶν εἶναι, καὶ οὐθένα τῶν γνωρίμων. “For some say ζα is from σ and δ and α, while others say it is another sound, and not one of the familiar sounds.” The latter sound is probably an indication of the change to a pronunciation [z] in the 4th century (so Allen 1994: 58).

²⁹ Dissimilation is an idea found as early as Kühner-Blass 1892: 325. Solmsen 1905: 500 cites three examples in support of it: πασπάλη for *σπασπάλη, κασκάνδιξ for *σκαस्कάνδιξ, and κοσκυλμάτια for *σκοσκυλμάτια. But these examples are not worth much: πασπάλη is a “Volkstümliches Wort unklarer Bildung” and dissimilation “ist ganz hypothetisch” (Frisk, s.v.), κασκάνδιξ may be valid but the etymology of σκάνδιξ is unknown, and κοσκυλμάτια is a *hapax* (*Ar. Eq.* 49) showing “Volkstümliche Reduplikationsbildung” (Frisk, s.v.). For arguments on the phonetic improbability of aspirate dissimilation see Ohala 1993: 251-5. Lejeune 1972: 114 n. §105-1 also lists δασπλήτις, but the etymology of this word is unclear. See also Schwyzler 1939: 330 “δάσκιος nicht für *σδασκ- aus *δja-, da σδ für ζα- aus δja- u.ä. nicht bezeugt ist.” Lejeune’s explanation is repeated at Ruijgh

likely is a connection with the root **dps-* (δασύς, Lat. *dēnsus*). The ancients explained the word as a haplologized form of **dasu-skios* (which is not phonetically unreasonable, cf. κελαινεφής < **kelaino-nep^hēs*) and the result is semantically plausible (*Od.* 14.49 ῥῶπας . . . δασείας ‘brushwood thick with leaves’; δάσος ‘thicket, copse’).³⁰ Alternatively, one could explain it as if it were from **das-skios*, if Hsch. δάς· ἐπὶ τοῦ πολλοῦ καὶ μεγάλου and δασπέταλον· πολύφυλλον are really evidence of a form δάς. Either way, there is nothing to recommend δάσκιος as another example of δα- for ζα-.

3. ἀρίζηλος

Ἀρίζηλος ‘very clear, conspicuous’ is usually explained as a compound of the prefix ἀρι- and δῆλος ‘clear’ < **deǵh₂-lo-s* (cf. δέατο *Od.* 6.242).³¹ Schulze wanted to explain

1967: 256 n. 111; I find the alternative explanation given there, that an original **ζάσκιος* was contaminated by the δασ- of δασπλήτις, untenable.

³⁰ Eustath. 1015.55 δάσκιος ὕλη ἢ πολύσκιος ἢ κατὰ συγκοπὴν ἢ δασύσκιος; sch. D at *Il.* 15.273 δάσκιος· ὕλη· πολύσκιος. λίαν πυκνή, sch. Barn. 470 δάσκιον· δασύσκιον, similarly sch. at Aesch. *Pers.* 316 and Apoll. Rhod. II. 1283, denied however in response to the latter at *EM* 248.51-53.

³¹ *LIV*, s.v. **deǵh₂-*; *DELG* and Frisk, s.v. ἀρίζηλος. The value of the hapax δέελος (*Il.* 10.466) is suspect since it appears in a passage of the *Doloneia* that is “virtually unintelligible” and perhaps “the victim of deep and very early corruption” (Hainsworth 1993: 199; see Leaf 1900-2 *ad loc.*). If it is real it may be an uncontracted form of δῆλον (mistakenly for **δέαλος*, cf. sch. A) or a word for ‘bundle’ (Hsch. δέελος· δεσμός, ἄμμα). The etymology of εὐδέελος = Myc. *E-u-de-we-ro* (“ein Wort der Umgangssprache” according to Klaffenbach 1970) is unclear but is probably not to be connected with δῆλος. Neither δέελος ‘eventide’ nor δελή ‘afternoon’ have certain etymologies: Solmsen 1901: 87-90 suggested **deus-*, i.e., **δεύσελος* > **δέελος* > δέελος by metrical lengthening and δελή by contraction (cf. Skt. *doṣá* ‘evening’); Peters 1997 [2002]: 106-9 has scenarios for **ehu-deǵh₂elo-*, from which he also derives εὐδειλος (Alcaeus 129 L-P) < **-deǵh₂lo-* <

the appearance of ζ by deriving -ζηλος from **-d̥eh₂-los*, envisioning a root alternation *deh₂-/d̥eh₂-* with the development of *-d̥-* to ζ. But the *ad hoc* supposition of a *Schwebeablaut* form **d̥eh₂-*, for which there is no evidence, has not found support.³²

Instead, we might consider the fact that the necessary preform, **αριδεαλ-* with a series of four short syllables, would have been ill-suited for the meter so that, if such a word were to be included in hexameter, it must have been subject to some kind of reshaping. Of the likely ways that this might have been done, metrical lengthenings of the sort **ἀριδέαλος* or **ἀριδεαλος*, are neither attested nor are there any clear analogies on which they could be created. Another possibility would have been a contraction of *-εα-* to *-η-* in *ἀρίδηλος*. This form is metrically feasible and actually occurs in later literature, but since it is not what we find here, we should assume that such a contraction was either not possible at an early stage (all

-deǵuelo-* (otherwise Gentili 1950 takes εὔδειλος as a possessive compound of δελιη 'dal bel tramonto'; the *-ει-* can not be a contraction of *-εε-* if the word is Lesbian); García-Ramón 1998-9 (with bibliography) argues for **esudēu-elo-* (deuh₁-* 'sink') 'having nice late afternoons' (cf. Εὐεσπερίς), also with metrical lengthening, and δελιη as the regular phonetic outcome of **deu-élā-*. The reading δελιη, only at *Il.* 21.111, is uncertain and perhaps should be corrected to δειέλιη after Meyer 1858: 209 (so Solmsen 1901: 89-90, Wackernagel 1916: 166 and now West in his text and 2001: 257). Finally, Hsch. records δίαλον· φανερόν and διάλας· τὰς δῆλας καὶ φανεράς, which, rather than evidence for a zero grade of the root (*pace* Lasso de la Vega 1955: 104-9), are probably dialect forms equivalent to **δεάλον* and **δεάλας* (so Schmidt 1863: 221, suggesting Cretan or Boeotian, followed by, e.g., *DELG* and Frisk, s.v.). For ἀρι-/ἐρι- see Peters 1986: 368-82 and Willi 1999.

³² Schulze 1892: 244 n. 1. His idea is not well received by Chantraine 1973: 169 or Shipp 1972: 124, n. 1. Coleman's explanation (1991: 18-9) relies on this hypothetical *Schwebeablaut* form (and is therefore out of the question) and proposes an inexplicable form with vocalic *-i-*: **d̥i-eǵ₂-* reflected in ἀρίζηλος, **d̥i-eǵ₂-* in ἀρίδηλος, presumably with dissimilatory loss of *-i-*. A similar idea was put forth by Curtius in his *Grundzüge* (1886: 618-9).

examples of ἀρίζηλος can, in fact, be resolved to *ἀριζέαλος) or that it was simply not a form that was useful to the poet(s).

The following considerations can, I think, show that ἀρίδηλος was not a required form and may also indicate how the form ἀρίζηλος came about. The root **dejh₂-* seems to have meant originally 'to appear' in a strictly visual sense.³³ Of the examples of ἀρίζηλος in Homer, there are only three that preserve the original semantic notion 'clear' in the sense of 'clearly visible.' Two of these are found in the formulaic phrases ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαί: once describing the gleam of Zeus's thunder-bolt (*Il.* 13.244 δεικνὺς σῆμα βροτοῖσιν, ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαί) and again the bright rays of a star (*Il.* 22.27 ὅς ῥά τ' ὀπώρης εἴσιν, ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαί). The third example is in the description of Achilles' shield, when Ares and Athena are said to stand out in contrast to the mortals around them: ἀμφὶς ἀριζήλω· λαοὶ δ' ὑπ' ὀλίζονες ἦσαν (*Il.* 18.519). The other examples, describing sounds, are found in similes. One describes the blast of a trumpet (*Il.* 18.219 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀριζήλη φωνή, ὅτε τ' ἴαχε σάλπιγξ), the other the war-cry of Achilles (*Il.* 18.221 ὡς τότε ἀριζήλη φωνή γένετ' Αἰακίδαο). Finally, the word is also used adverbially, of a tale 'plainly' told (*Od.* 12.453 αὐτίς ἀριζήλως εἰρημένα μυθολογεῦειν).

The simplest explanation of these facts is that the meaning 'clearly visible' is older and that the other meanings are subsequent developments in which the semantic content of the word ἀρίζηλος had expanded to include the area of sound as well as sight. One can even make a distinction among the three examples where ἀρίζηλος refers to visibility since the two examples of ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαί are formulaic and the shield scene is clearly late.³⁴ That the examples of ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαί are the oldest examples is so not simply because they reside in a for-

³³ See *LIV*, s.v. **dejh₂-* 'aufleuchten' and cognate Vedic forms of the root *dī-* 'to shine (forth), be bright.'

³⁴ See Shipp 1972: 298, "There is no doubt about the linguistic lateness of the description of the shield and its manufacture."

mula, but because they also represent the older semantic content of the word from which the other examples developed.

Now, if one were to substitute the reconstructed form *ἀρίδεαλοι in the formulaic phrase ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαί, it is clear that the result of a contraction producing the phrase ἀρίδηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαί would have been unmetrical and would not have solved the problem of fitting this phrase into the end of the line. On the other hand, ἀρίζηλοι (or ἀριζέαλοι) δέ οἱ αὐγαί solves the problem neatly. I would argue then, that the ζ here is yet another product of metrical compulsion and that it is not the result of any phonological process.

Finally, it is possible to think of this ζ as a representation of -σδ-, that is, as if σ were inserted into the form ἀρίδηλοι. Such a process, involving the addition of a σ at the end of the first member of the compound, seems to have been one method of reshaping a series of three short syllables. This occurs in examples like μογοστόκοι for expected *μογοτόκοι (*Il.* 11.270), θεόσδοτος for θεόδοτος (Hesiod *W&D* 320), φερέσβιος for *φερέβιος (Hesiod *Th.* 693, *Hom. h. Ap.* 341), and δικασπόλος for *δικαπόλος (*Il.* 1.238, *Od.* 11.186). That all of these words close the bucolic diaeresis is probably significant.³⁵ If we look

³⁵ This phenomenon, which appears in other examples not listed here, and the fact that it seems to be limited to the bucolic diaeresis, has not, to my knowledge, been investigated. There is a brief mention in Chantraine 1973: 95; on θεόσδοτος (and διόσδοτος) see Jamison 1979: 141-3, esp. 142 n. 26; Moorhouse 1952: 301 “φερέσβιος (model φερεσσακής?)”; the first members of μογοστόκος and δικασπόλος are taken to be accusative plural case forms by Risch 1974: 220. An analysis of ἀρίζηλος similar to that proposed here was given long ago by Immanuel Bekker 1863: 291, who suggested that ἀρίζηλος should be divided ἀρί-σ-δηλος, supposing *ἀρισ- as a by-form of ἀρι-, and comparing examples like ἀμφί/ἀμφίς and ἰθύ/ἰθύς; this may be correct but the mechanism by which these forms with σ were created seems to have been correctly explained by Brugmann, Wackernagel and Solmsen, who analyzed these φερέσβιος types as the result of a spread of -s- to non-s-stems in compounds after -s-stems themselves could be reanalyzed as vowel-stems and the -s- could be dissociated from the stems (τελεσφόρος vs. Τελέφορος). See Miller 1982: 78-9 for bibliography. See also *EM* 142.22, s.v.

again at the examples of ἀρίζηλος, the two that end at the bucolic diaeresis occur in the formulaic phrase ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαί, and this, again, is the place where the word retains its etymological meaning ‘clearly visible.’ It seems likely then, that in this particular formulaic phrase we find the origin of the ζ. Once this form was created, the word’s semantic range expanded so that it was subsequently understood as simply ‘clear,’ was freely applied to sounds, and was then also free to move from its position at the bucolic diaeresis.

4. αἰζήλος

Il. 2.318 τὸν μὲν αἰζήλον θῆκεν θεός, ὃς περ ἔφηνεν is a well-known textual crux. The word in question refers to the snake Zeus sent to devour nine young sparrows, a portent for the Greeks that they should fight for nine years before Troy and conquer in the tenth. The medieval MSS read almost unanimously ἀρίζηλον ‘conspicuous,’ while ἀρίδηλον was attributed to Zenodotus by Aristonicus, who considered it incorrect and further suggested that the following line, 319, was interpolated by Zenodotus. According to the usual explanation, Aristarchus read instead αἰζήλον ‘invisible’ (followed by the 11th cent. codex Ambrosianus, an exception among the MSS) and athetized 319. Some scholars have found αἰζήλον appealing, mostly because, as Kirk 1985: 149 sums up, “it makes a significant contrast with ὃς περ ἔφηνε, which is otherwise rather pointless.” As a result, modern editions are divided between the reading of Aristarchus (αἰζήλον in the editions of Leaf and West) and that of the MSS (ἀρίζηλον in Allen and Van Thiel).³⁶ As it turns out,

Αρίζηλος where, among various options, one reads πλεονασμῷ τοῦ σ, γίνεται ἀρίσδηλος· καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ ζ ἐκ τοῦ σ καὶ δ σύγκειται, τρέπεται τὸ σ καὶ δ εἰς τὸ ζ, καὶ γίνεται ἀρίζηλος, ὁ ἄγαν ἐκδηλος.

³⁶ Spooner 2002: 87-115 has published two papyri fragments of scholia minora from the third and second centuries, P.Oxy. LXVII 4633 and 4634 re-

a decision on the text is unnecessary for the task at hand since on the one hand, no problem arises for the issue of δ/ζ if we adopt the reading ἀρίζηλον and, on the other hand, αἰζήλον also proves unproblematic.³⁷ All seem agreed that αἰδηλος ‘invisible’ is to be analyzed as *ἄ-φιδ-ηλος and Philipp has suggested, rightly I think, that on the model of ἀρδηλος : ἀρίζηλος, an αἰζήλος was created from αἰδηλος for metrical considerations.³⁸ This explanation for the ζ of αἰζήλον happily agrees with other analyses of δ/ζ interchanges advanced in this paper.

5. Post-Homeric Extensions of ζα- for δα-

Once the δα- of δαφονός was created, ζα- was free to be used as a metrically convenient by-form. Risch (1946) has discussed ζακρυόεις ‘tearful,’ for δακρυόεις at Alcaeus 34.8 L-P. He notes that epic had the forms κρυόεις ‘dreadful’ and δακρυόεις ‘tearful.’ On the model of φοινήεις and δαφονός, the δα- of δακρυόεις was reanalyzed as a strengthened form of κρυόεις. Although etymologically unrelated they became semantically confused and, since the more common form of the intensive was ζα-, Alcaeus was able to form the nonce word ζακρυόεις.

This use extends to two examples of ζα- for δα- < *dḡ-. ζάπεδον for δάπεδον < *dḡ-ped- appears at Stesichorus fr.

spectively. The former preserves the reading ἀρείζηλον ἀγαν φανερον, the latter αἰζηλον ἀδηλον ἀφανη.

³⁷ The issues surrounding the correct reading of lines 318-9 are complex. I hope to address the problem at length elsewhere.

³⁸ Philipp (*Lfgre*, s.v. αἰδηλος), “αἰζήλον für αἰδηλον mit einer durch das Metrum begünstigten hyperarchaischen Schreibung nach Analogie von ἀρδηλον.” I see no reason, however, to regard this as a hyperarchaism. See also van der Valk 1964: 147 n. 291. Hinrichs (at Leaf 1900-2 with note to 2.318) suggested αἰδηλος ‘ever visible’ with Aeolic αἰ- = ἀεί-, but this would be a completely isolated example in Homer, where otherwise there is only αἰεί, ἀεί, αἰέν and ἀενάων ‘everflowing’ *Od.* 13.109).

515.17, Xenophanes fr. 81.1, and *IG* 12(5).215, a metrical inscription from Paros dated to ca. 500 BCE.³⁹ Likewise, Solmsen 1912-3: 453-65 analyzed the first element of ζάκορος 'temple attendant' as *dḡ-, a view that was later strikingly confirmed with the decipherment of Linear B and the discovery of Mycenaean *da-ko-ro*.

6. μέζεα

The μέζεα of Hesiod *W&D* 512 is usually connected to μήδεα 'genitalia' (*Theog.* 180, 188, *Od.* 6.129, 18.67, 87, 22.476) and taken as an example of δ/ζ interchange.⁴⁰ Troxler's explanation for the word is that "in einem Gebiet, in dem ζ zu δ geworden ist [he names Laconian, Boeotian and Thessaliotis], kann nun in einem Wort mit altem δ also umgekehrte Schreibung auch ζ auftreten."⁴¹ It is instructive to compare this with West's analysis, which starts from the assumption that the two words are identical: "μέζεα ... is surprising, since in the *Theogony* Hesiod uses the Homeric form of the same word, μήδεα," but given that "ζ for δ ... is a phenomenon that appears in early records of certain West Greek dialects," one might conclude that "it may be that [Hesiod] knew μήδεα as the epic word for a man's genitals ... and learned μέζεα as a vernacular term for the place where miserable animals tuck their tails, not realizing that the two words were really the same."⁴² For Troxler, the explanation of μέζεα begins in a dialect that shows the change of ζ to δ, and in which μέζεα has been created by inverse spelling. For West, on the other hand, μέζεα comes from a dialect that shows the opposite change of δ to ζ. If either of these scenarios is cor-

³⁹ Less likely, I think, is Thumb-Scherer's view (1959: 229) that ζάπεδον came from *διάπεδον, a folk-etymological re-formation of δάπεδον.

⁴⁰ West 1966: 85-6, Edwards 1971: 111.

⁴¹ Troxler 1964: 49. This is also the view of Strunk 1961, who also attempted to explain ζάπεδον and ἀρίζηλος by this method.

⁴² West 1966: 85-6.

rect, then μέζεα would be the first example we have seen where a dialect form is responsible for a δ/ζ interchange.⁴³ As such, however, it would not present an objection to the metrical solution to the Homeric problem outlined above.

In fact, neither of these explanations is very likely. Of those dialects that show δ for ζ, Boeotian and Thessalian (Thessaliotis) have initial δ, but medially, like Laconian, they show <δδ>. Elean shows intervocalic <δ>, but a consensus of scholars interpret this as a transcription of /dd/.⁴⁴ There is no dialect in which ζ becomes δ, with or without instances of inverse spelling, from which Hesiod could easily have taken a form μέζεα. As for the other scenario, of those dialects that show ζ for δ or ζ from *d, only Elean and Cretan are contenders.⁴⁵ The idea

⁴³ Edwards 1971: 111 has not provided cogent counterarguments against West's theory. He attempts to show that the ζ/δ interchange could have originated elsewhere or by other means, but none of his proposals convince. For example, he mentions epic δηλήμων 'baneful' and ζηλήμων 'jealous,' but these are not examples of ζ/δ confusion, they are merely similar (but separate) words. Lesbian and Cyprian do of course show examples of ζ- for δ-, but it would be rather surprising to find Hesiod quoting either Lesbian or Cyprian dialect forms. How it is, as he says, that "μέζεα may be connected more loosely with the assimilation ... of ζ to δ or δδ," I do not know. Finally, he invokes Morpurgo Davies' comment (1964: 140 n. 1) that "it is extremely unlikely that [μέζεα, among other non-Homeric forms in Hesiod,] may point to one dialect more than to another." However, this presumably does not exclude the possibility of placing it within a larger *group* of dialects, of which West Greek is, at least, a possible candidate and I fail to see therefore how West Greek is "too definite an ascription" for μέζεα.

⁴⁴ Méndez Dosuna 1991-3: 86.

⁴⁵ We can eliminate other possibilities quickly. Rhodian τοζ' (= τοδ') is scanned short and therefore has some value other than [zd] or [dz], i.e., it cannot represent the same sound attested in μέζεα. Some readings are uncertain: ζεκ[α] for δέκα from Phleious, but Jeffery 1990: 147 reads δεκατας; Ϝισζειε from Argos, if an accurate reading (see Méndez Dosuna 1991-3: 85 with ref.), may be "an analogically induced reshaping of regularly expected *Ϝιζη" < *uid-jeh₁-t and thus irrelevant (so Martin Peters at Méndez Dosuna, *op. cit.*); for Phocaeen Ζιονύ(σιος) see Hodot 1990: 44 n. 19 with doubts on the reading and provenance. Lesbian ζ- for *d_h- is restricted to ζά- (< διά-)

that Hesiod stuck a piece of Elean or Cretan vernacular in his poem, unparalleled as it would be, simply lacks conviction and reads like a *faute de mieux*.⁴⁶

Additionally, neither of these solutions offers an explanation for the difference in vowel quantities in μέζεα and μήδεα. Nor, I think, can we simply assume, with Troxler and West, that the two words necessarily indicate precisely the same thing. Certainly μήδεα refers to the genitalia of Ouranos (*Theog.* 188), but μέζεα, a place where frightened animals put their tails, could refer to any number of appropriate concepts (crotch, haunches, belly, seat, bottom, hunkers or hams, etc.) and so, despite the resemblances between them, they could plausibly represent two different words.⁴⁷ If Wackernagel is correct when he suggests that Homeric μήδεα is a demure replacement for the coarser μέζεα, then we are free of the complications created by assuming they are identical words.⁴⁸

and Ζόννυσσον. The old reading δυγῶι in the Delphic inscription (*DGE* 317) must be rejected, see Buck 1965: 238-9, who reads δυιόι. Dates and references for these inscriptions can be found in Méndez Dosuna 1991-3 and Teodorsson 1993.

⁴⁶ I briefly mention here Chantraine's implausible suggestion (*DELG*, s.v. μήδεα) that the ζ of μέζεα represents a gemination of δ with a fricative pronunciation.

⁴⁷ Vergil may have understood the word as *uterus*, if *Aen.* 11.812-3 is an imitation of Hesiod: *caudamque remulcens / subiecit pauitanti utero siluasque petiuit*. The ancients had various explanations for the word: *EM* 575.10 μέζεα: τὰ αἰδοῖα, ὅτι μέσα εἰσὶ τῆς οὐρᾶς, μέσσεα ὄντα· Σικελοὶ δὲ καὶ Ταραντῖνοι μέσα αὐτὰ ἀποκαλοῦσιν. Ἡσίοδος, καὶ ὑπὸ μέζε' ἔθεντο. Ἡ κατὰ μετάθεσιν τοῦ Δ εἰς Ζ, μέδεα. Eustath. 234.32 Ἡσίοδος δέ φησιν αὐτοὺς μήδεα ἐν Θεογονίᾳ, ἐτέρωθι δὲ μέζεα, φυλάξας μὲν τὸ ε τοῦ μέδειν, τρέψας δὲ δ εἰς ζ κατὰ ἀκολουθίαν τὴν πολλαχοῦ δηλουμένην, καθ' ἣν καὶ τὸ ἐριδαίνομεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐρίζειν. Related perhaps is Hsch. εὔμαξέος (εὔμεζέος Meineke)· εὐφυεῖς (εὐφυοῦς Latte, εὐφυῆς Musurus) τοῖς αἰδοίοις.

⁴⁸ Wackernagel 1916: 227 n. 1. Later μέζεα sometimes came to be used as μήδεα; Lyc. 762 (of Cronus' genitalia) and Nic. *Th.* 722 (= αἰδοῖα). As for the Archilochian μέδεα, West 1974: 136 argues that is a *vox nihili* and does not print it at Archilochus 222W.

Conclusion

The foregoing analysis of the variation between ζ and δ in early Greek Epic has shown that for δαφονός, ἀρζηλος and ἀρζηλον such interchanges do not have a dialectal origin but they are in fact products of metrical compulsion, further instances in fact of Witte's famous dictum that "... die Sprache der homerischen Gedichte [ist] ein Gebilde des epischen Verses..."⁴⁹ In turn, these words served as models that gave rise to forms like ζακρυόεις, ζάπεδον and ζάκορος. On the other hand, for the words δάσκιος and μέζεα, which have occasionally been grouped with δαφονός and the like, there are no grounds to assume that they show this interchange between δ and ζ.

Bibliography

- Allen, W. S. (1987): *Vox Graeca*. 3rd ed. Cambridge.
- Bekker, I. (1863): *Homerische blätter. Beilage zu dessen Carmina Homerica, Bonn 1858*. Vol. 1. Bonn.
- Bowra, C. M. (1960): "Γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις." *Glotta* 38: 43-60.
- Buck, C. D. (1965): *The Greek Dialects*. 3rd corrected ed. Chicago.
- Chantraine, P. (1973): *Grammaire homérique*. 5th ed. revised and corrected. Vol. 1. Paris.
- Coleman, R. (1991): "Etymologica." In *Palaeograeca et Mycenaea: Antonino Bartoněk quinque et sexagenario oblata*. Brunae. 17-23.
- Crespo, E. (1985): "Palatal stops in Greek: reconstruction or Mycenaean evidence?" *Minos* 19: 91-104.
- Curtius, G. (1886): *Principles of Greek Etymology*. 5th ed. Trans. A. S. Wilkins and E. B. England. Vol. 2. London.
- Debrunner, A. (1927): "Alte Probleme der homerischen Sprache." *IF* 45: 173-190.
- DELG = Chantraine, P. (1968-80): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. New ed. with suppl. 1999. Paris.
- DIL = Royal Irish Academy (1990): *Dictionary of the Irish Language*. Compact ed. Dublin.

⁴⁹ *RE* XVI, col. 2214.

- Dürbeck, H. (1971): "δαφονός und δαφονεός." *MSS* 29: 9-26.
- Dyck, A. R. (1991): "The fragments of Alexander of Cotiaeum." *ICS* 16: 307-335.
- Edwards, G. P. (1971): *The language of Hesiod in its traditional context*. Oxford.
- Edwards, M. W. (1991): *The Iliad, a commentary*. Vol. 5: Books 17-20. Cambridge.
- Erbse, H. (1960): *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien*. München.
- Frisk, H. (1970-79): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
- García-Ramón, J. L. (1998-9): "Mycenaean *e-u-de-we-ro* /*E^hu-dewelo*/' Having nice late afternoons', Homeric εὔδειελος and Cyrenaean Εὐεσπερῖδες." *Minos* 33-34: 135-147.
- Gentili, B. (1950): "Note ad Alceo." *Maia* 3: 255-260.
- Giangrande, G. (1970): "Der stilistische Gebrauch der Dorismen im Epos." *Hermes* 98: 257-277.
- (1973): "Dorische Genitive bei Homer." *Glotta* 51: 1-6.
- Gow, A. S. F. (1952): *Theocritus*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Cambridge.
- Hainsworth, B. (1993): *The Iliad, a commentary*. Vol. 3: Books 9-12. Cambridge.
- Haslam, M. W. (1976): "Homeric words and Homeric metre: two doublets examined (λεῖβω/εῖβω, γαῖα/αἶα)." *Glotta* 54: 201-211.
- Hodot, R. (1990): *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie: la langue des inscriptions VIIe s. a.C.-IVe s. p.C.* Paris.
- Jamison, S. W. (1979): "The case of agent in Indo-European." *Die Sprache* 25: 129-143.
- Jeffery, L. H. (1990): *The local scripts of archaic Greece*. Rev. ed. with suppl. by A. W. Johnston. Oxford.
- Kirk, G. S. (1985): *The Iliad, a commentary*. Vol. 1: Books 1-4. Cambridge.
- Klaffenbach, G. (1970): "εὔδειελος." *Glotta* 48: 204-205.
- Kühner, R. / Blass F. (1892): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Vol. 2. 3rd ed. Hannover.
- Lasso de la Vega, J. S. (1955): "Glosas de Hesiquio." *Emerita* 23: 96-121.
- Leaf, W. (1900-02): *The Iliad. Edited with apparatus criticus, prolegomena, notes, and appendices*. 2nd ed. London.
- Lejeune, M. (1972): *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- LfgRE* = Bruno, S. (ed. 1955-): *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen.
- LIV* = Rix, H. (ed. 2001): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.
- Magnien, V. (1922): "L'alternance rythmique chez Homère." *MSL* 22: 113-139.

- Matthews, V. J. (1974): *Panyassis of Halikarnassos: text and commentary*. Leiden.
- (1996): *Antimachus of Colophon: text and commentary*. Leiden.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. (1991-3): "On <Z> for <Δ> in Greek dialectal inscriptions." *Die Sprache* 35: 82-114.
- Meyer, L. (1858): "Die homerischen anlautsgruppen δϜ und κϜ." *KZ* 7: 194-221.
- Miller, D. G. (1982): *Homer and the Ionian epic tradition: some phonic and phonological evidence against an Aeolic "phase"*. Innsbruck.
- Moorhouse, A. C. (1952): "Derivation in -τερος from Greek t-stems." *AJPh* 73: 298-301.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1964): "'Doric' features in the language of Hesiod." *Glotta* 42: 138-165.
- Ohalá, J. (1993): "The phonetics of sound change." In Charles Jones, ed., *Historical linguistics: problems and perspectives*. London - New York. 237-278.
- Peters, M. (1986): "Probleme mit anlautenden Laryngalen." *Die Sprache* 32: 365-383.
- (1987): "Indogermanische Chronik 33." *Die Sprache* 33: 125-488.
- (1994): "Griech. γῆ, γαῖα, armen. *erkir* 'Erde'." In Petr Vavroušek, ed., *Iranian and Indo-European studies: memorial volume of Otakar Klima*. Praha. 203-213.
- (1997 [2002]): "Chronicalia Indoeuropaea 39." [= "Indogermanische Chronik 35, III"] *Die Sprache* 39: 94-129.
- Risch, E. (1946): "Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Alkaios." *MH* 3: 253-256.
- (1974): *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. Berlin - New York.
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1967): *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam.
- (1986): "Observations sur κορέσαι, κορέω, myc. da-ko-ro δακόρος etc." In Etter, A., ed., *O-o-pe-ro-si, Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*. Berlin - New York. 376-392. = Ruijgh, C. J. (1996): *Scripta minora ad linguam graecam pertinentia*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam. 106-122.
- Schmidt, M. (1863): Review of Voretzsch, H. B. *De inscriptione Cretensi qua continetur Lyttiorum et Boloentiorum foedus*. In *ZVS* 12: 212-222.
- Schulze, W. (1892): *Quaestiones epicae*. Gütersloh.
- Schwyzer, E. (1939): *Griechische Grammatik, auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. Vol. 1. München.
- Shipp, G. P. (1972): *Studies in the language of Homer*. Cambridge.
- Sjölund, R. (1938): *Metrische Kürzung im Griechischen*. Uppsala.
- Solmsen, F. (1901): *Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre*. Strassburg.

- (1905): "Die metrischen Wirkungen anlautender Consonantengruppen bei Homer und Hesiod." *RhM* 60: 492-504.
- (1912-3): "Zur griechischen Wortforschung." *IF* 31: 448-506.
- Spooner, J. (2002): *Nine Homeric papyri from Oxyrhynchus*. Florence.
- Steriade, D. (1982): *Greek prosodies and the nature of syllabification*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Strömberg, R. (1960): "ΕΙΒΩ und ΑΕΙΒΩ bei Homer." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 21: 15-17.
- Strunk, K. (1961): "Sprachliches und Prosodisches zur mykenischen Orthographie." *IF* 66: 155-170.
- Sturzius, F. W. (1820): *Orionis Thebani Etymologicon. Ex museo Friderici Augusti Wolfii primum edidit ...* Leipzig. Reprint, Hildesheim - New York, 1973.
- Szemerényi, O. J. L. (1987): "Graeca Anatolica." In P. Hr. Ilievski and L. Crepajac, eds., *Tractata Mycenaea, proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, held in Ohrid, 15-20 September 1985*. Skopje. 343-356.
- Teodorsson, S.-T. (1993): "The pronunciation of zeta in different Greek dialects." In E. Crespo, J.L. García Ramón, A. Striano, eds., *Dialectologica Graeca: actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Dialectología Griega (Miraflores de la Sierra, (Madrid), 19-21 de junio de 1991)*. Madrid. 305-321.
- Thumb, A. / Scherer, A. (1959): *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. 2nd ed. Heidelberg.
- Troxler, H. (1964): *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*. Zürich.
- van der Valk, M. H. A. L. H. (1949): *Textual criticism of the Odyssey*. Leiden.
- (1964): *Researches on the text and scholia of the Iliad*. Part two. Leiden.
- Vendryes, J. (1959-): *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien*. Paris.
- Von der Mühl, P. (1956): "Ein eigentümlicher Fall metrischer Dehnung im pseudohesiodischen Scutum (212)." *MH* 13: 193-194.
- Wackernagel, J. (1916): *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen.
- West, M. L. (1966): *Theogony*. Oxford.
- (1988): "The rise of Greek epic." *JHS* 108: 151-172.
- (1998-2000): *Homeri Ilias*. 2 vols. Stuttgart - Leipzig.
- (1998): "The textual criticism and editing of Homer." In G. W. Most, ed., *Editing texts = Texte edieren*. Göttingen. 94-110.
- (2001): *Studies in the text and transmission of the Iliad*. München.
- West, S. (1967): *The Ptolemaic papyri of Homer*. Köln - Opladen.
- Willi, A. (1999): "Zur Verwendung und Etymologie von griechisch ἐπῑ-." *HS* 112: 86-100.