

XIII.—Partitive Apposition in Homer and the Greek Accusative

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The present paper¹ is a sequel to one on "Vestiges of Partitive Apposition in Latin Syntax" (*TAPA* 84 [1953] 92–123), in which I touched very briefly (103, note 56) on the so-called "Greek accusative" or accusative of specification.² Since this construction is not

¹ Bibliographical references are to be interpreted as follows. Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* = Karl Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*⁴, rev. by Albert Thumb (Munich 1913). Brugmann, *Grund.* = Karl Brugmann and Berthold Delbrück, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*², 5 vols. (Strassburg 1893–1916). Brugmann, *KVG* = Karl Brugmann, *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, trans. into French as *Abrégé de grammaire comparée des langues indo-européennes*, by J. Bloch, A. Cuny, and A. Ernout (Paris 1905). Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* = Pierre Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, 2 vols. (Paris 1948–53). Delbrück, *Grund.*: see Brugmann, *Grund.* Friedrich, *El.* = Johannes Friedrich, *Hehitisches Elementarbuch*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg 1940–46). Friedrich, *Vert.* = Johannes Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1926–30). Gildersleeve and Lodge, *Lat. Gr.* = B. L. Gildersleeve and Gonzales Lodge, *Latin Grammar*³ (Boston 1894). Götz, *AM* = Albrecht Götz, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš* (Leipzig 1933). Hirt, *IG* = Hermann Hirt, *Indogermanische Grammatik*, 7 vols. (Heidelberg 1921–37). Hofmann, *Lat. Gr.* = Manu Leumann and Joh. Bapt. Hofmann, *Stolz-Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik*⁵ (Munich 1928). Humbert, *Synt. gr.* = Jean Humbert, *Syntaxe grecque* (Paris 1945). *IF* = *Indogermanische Forschungen*. Meillet, *Introduction* = A. Meillet, *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*⁷ (Paris 1934). Meillet and Vendryes, *Traité de gr. comp.* = A. Meillet and J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*² (Paris 1927). *Monro, Hom. Gr.* = D. B. Monro, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*² (Oxford 1891). *MSL* = *Mémoires de la société de linguistique de Paris*. Schwyzer-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* = Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, 2 vols., 2nd vol. compl. and ed. by Albert Debrunner (Munich 1939–50). Sturtevant, *Chr.* = Edgar H. Sturtevant and George Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy* (Philadelphia 1935). Whitney, *Skt. Gr.* = William Dwight Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, 2nd ed., 5th issue (Cambridge 1923). Zuntz, *Ortsadv.* = Leonie Zuntz, *Die hethitischen Ortsadverbien arha, parā, piran als selbständige Adverbien und in ihrer Verbindung mit Nomina und Verba*. — It does not seem necessary to supply data concerning well-known editions and translations of Homer.

² Obviously, I am referring to the type of accusative of specification sometimes termed, presumably because of its most common use with reference to parts of the body, the synecdochal accusative, of which the following may be cited as typical examples: Lucretius 1.13 *perculsae corda*, 3.489 *tremit artus*; Catullus 64.122 *devinctam lumina somno*; Vergil, *Aen.* 1.481 *tunsae pectora*, 1.320 *nuda genu*; Horace, *Carm.* 1.1.21–22 *membra stratus*, *Serm.* 2.7.57 *tremis ossa*; Ovid, *Met.* 9.307 *flava comas*; Livy 21.7.10 *femur ictus*; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.17 *oblitus faciem*. I am not referring to

really a directly inherited feature of Latin, but is strictly, as its name implies, a Greek development, which was borrowed for Latin by the Hellenizing poets and a few prose-writers³ of the Golden Age and thereafter, the subject did not seem to belong to an article on usages preserved by Latin from an earlier period, but needed to be postponed for separate treatment.

In this treatment I make no attempt to distinguish between the accusative of specification in general, and certain manifestations of it which some authorities class separately (though in my opinion unnecessarily) as the accusative used as direct object of the middle voice.⁴ Though not all "accusatives of specification" can be classed as "objects of the middle voice," all "objects of the

two other types which some scholars class as accusatives of specification, both of which are met in early Latin and are therefore surely to be viewed as native constructions. The first class, consisting of neuter accusatives used almost adverbially, may be classified rather as developments of the inner object, as Plautus, *Mil.* 1158 id venimus, *Amph.* 377 quid venisti? (a usage retained in the common employment of *quid* as 'why'), *Trin.* 287 haec doleo, *Rud.* 397 id maesta est, *Mil.* 927 quiescas cetera. Vergil, *Aen.* 4.558 omnia Mercurio similis may be a development of this — though I would rather view it as an extension of the synecdochal accusative, like *πᾶντ* in *Il.* 23.66, and exactly parallel to the body-part accusatives of *Aen.* 1.589 os umerosque deo similis; so too *Aen.* 3.594 cetera Graius. The second class, accusatives with verbs of donning and doffing, seem to me direct objects pure and simple (with a deponent or middle verb), as in Plautus, *Men.* 511–12 indutum pallam; the usage is surely Italic, for it is met in Umbrian (*Tab. Ig.* VI B 49) as well as in Latin. I have also suggested (*TAPA* 84.104) that the only two instances of the synecdochal accusative citable from early Latin (Ennius, *Ann.* 400 succincti corda machaeris, and Cato, *Orig.* 1.18 togae parte caput velati), in which the article donned appears in the ablative and the part of the body affected in the accusative, may be due to some sort of confused extension of the normal usage. Hofmann (*Lat. Gr.* 378) gives a similar explanation for the Vergilian examples *Ecl.* 7.32 suras evincta coturno and *Aen.* 4.518 exuta pedem vinclis; we may note as an especially close parallel to the Cato passage *Aen.* 3.545 capita Phrygio velamur amictu. However, here again Vergil's usage may be simply a Grecism (as may indeed be Ennius' too, but hardly Cato's). The normal native Latin construction (as seen in *Men.* 511–12, already quoted) is also preserved in a number of passages from the *Aeneid*, e.g. 7.640 lorica induitur. It is rather strange to find even so careful an editor as Knapp failing to distinguish between the two types; actually, 4.518 exuta pedem vinclis, with the accusative denoting a body-part and the ablative an article worn, is quite different from the passage with which he compares it (*ad loc.*), 2.275 exuvias indutus, with the accusative denoting the article worn and no word for a body-part — exactly as *Ann.* 400 succincti corda machaeris is different from *Aen.* 2.510–11 ferrum cingitur.

³ Never Caesar or Cicero (Hofmann, *Lat. Gr.* 379).

⁴ Of course the only possible explanation for the accusative with an adjective is that it is an accusative of specification; and yet I do not think it is desirable to separate the accusative used with an adjective from that used with a medio-passive participle, or the latter from that used with a medio-passive finite verb (examples of all these types are included in note 2). Compare Brugmann, *IF* 27.134: "Wie klein war aber der Schritt z. B. von *nudatus pedem* zu *nudus pedem*, von *vulneratus pectus* zu *saucius pectus*!"

middle voice" can be classed as "accusatives of specification." Both types as they are used by the poets of the Ciceronian and still more of the Augustan Age are clearly imitations of Greek; and in Greek both types seem to me indubitably developments from a single prototype, the accusative in partitive apposition.

In the earlier article already referred to, which treated Latin specifically, with occasional parallels from Hittite,⁵ I noted (100–106) that two particularly common types of partitive apposition are the combination of substantives denoting respectively a group and one or more⁶ of the units that make it up, and the combination of substantives denoting respectively an individual and a part or parts of his body.⁷ From the nature of the case, examples of partitive apposition of the first type are frequently, though by no means exclusively,⁸ in the nominative; and instances of partitive apposition in the nominative tend to be limited almost exclusively to examples of the first type.⁹ On the other hand, examples of partitive apposition of the second type may appear in the genitive, the dative, or the accusative, but I know of no Latin instance in the nominative.¹⁰

⁵ Partitive apposition of the usual type seems to be extremely rare in Sanskrit (cf. Brugmann, *Grund.* 2.2.633, and Delbrück, *ib.* 3.385). For a special variety of it there, involving verbal nouns, see Hahn, *Language* 29.246–51.

⁶ Or all. But I prefer to term this last type distributive rather than partitive apposition. Cf. *op. cit.* 101, note 41, and 102, note 52. A good example of distributive apposition is Plautus, *Aul.* 275 nunc nobis prope adest exitum, mihi atque erili filiae, which Hofmann (*IF* 42.84) lists as an instance of partitive apposition.

⁷ I also note (*ib.* 106) a third type, the combination of substantives denoting an individual and a quality belonging to him or an action performed by or upon him. This is very close to the second type.

⁸ The general type is common in Hittite, and instances may be cited from this language both for the nominative and for other cases as well. See *TAPA* 84.100, notes 36 and 38.

⁹ See especially *ib.* 100–101. Almost all the examples that Hofmann in his interesting treatment of partitive apposition in Latin (*IF* 42.75–87) offers for the nominative (85–86) fall into this category; they are instances of so-called synesis in which a plural verb accompanies a singular indefinite pronoun, and may be viewed as implying a plural subject (*nos, vos, ei*) with which the indefinite pronoun is in partitive apposition.

¹⁰ For one possible example in Greek, cf. below, note 15. Götze thinks we have an instance in Hittite, *KUB* 14.15.2.6 *na-aš gi-nu-uš-ši du-ud-du-wa-ri-eš-ta* 'and he the knee to him (i.e. his knee) gave way' (*AM* 214–15). This involves viewing *gi-nu-uš-ši* as a combination of a nominative singular *genuš* or *genu* (a *-u* stem) in apposition with *-aš*, and a dative of reference *-ši*. But I prefer the explanation given by Sturtevant (*JAOS* 54.401; cf. *Chr.* 171) that *gi-nu-uš-ši* is a dative sing. of an *-s* stem *genuš*; my reason for this preference I plan to give elsewhere. — The example for modern German given by Blümel (*IF* 34.294) from Freytag's *Soll und Haben*, "Er hat furchtbar gelitten, seine Seele wie sein Körper," is logically an instance of distributive rather than partitive apposition (cf. above, note 6).

Examples in the genitive¹¹ and the dative¹² are not certain, however, because it is almost always possible to explain them in a different way; the noun denoting the "whole," the owner of the part, may, if a genitive, be viewed as a genitive of possession, and may, if a dative, be viewed as a dative of reference. But when we come to the accusative, of which we find numerous examples in Hittite,¹³ and a few in early Latin,¹⁴ there can be no doubt that we have partitive apposition.

I. PARTITIVE APPPOSITION IN HOMER

An examination of Homer reveals a situation in early Greek very similar to that in early Latin, except that in Greek as in Hittite, partitive apposition is much commoner than in Latin.

A. *Nominatives*

Homeric¹⁵ examples of partitive apposition in the nominative¹⁶ are strictly limited to combinations of a group and a member or members of the group.

¹¹ Friedrich includes no example of the genitive in his lists of partitive apposition in Hittite (*Vert.* 1.44–45 and 2.24; also *El.* 1.69–70), and I know of none involving a part of the body. Hofmann explicitly denies the occurrence of the genitive in partitive apposition in Latin (*IF* 42.85), but I suggest two possible examples in *TAPA* 84.102, note 48.

¹² There are plenty of likely Hittite examples (see for one *TAPA* 84.102, note 49), but on their ambiguity see Friedrich, *Vert.* 1.45. For some probable Latin examples, see Hofmann, *IF* 42.84–85, and Hahn, *TAPA* 84.105–6.

¹³ Cf. Friedrich (*Vert.* 1.44): "Am reichlichsten ist der doppelte Akkusativ (der betroffenen Person und des betroffenen Gliedes) belegt."

¹⁴ Hofmann (83) cites *Cist.* 641 and *Rud.* 1345–46, which I would class as distributive rather than partitive (*TAPA* 84.102, note 52; also above, note 6). To these I would add *Men.* 858–59 and (with a clause following the body-part noun) *Rud.* 1008–9 (*ib.* 102–3).

¹⁵ A passage in Solon, 29.5–7 (Hiller-Crusius)

ἦθελον γάρ κεν . . .
ἀσκὸς ὕστερον δεδᾶρθαι κάπιτετρίφθαι γένος.

seems to me to illustrate a special variety (on which see below, note 233) of the scheme of whole and part, though so far as I know it has not been so explained. But of course it is too late to have a bearing on the history of the construction. However, the fact that it is evidently couched in somewhat colloquial language, representing as it does a scornful comment on Solon's altruism and apparently put into the mouth of one of the populace, may have significance; archaisms that have disappeared from literature sometimes live on in popular speech.

¹⁶ Note that I do not say "Examples with the subject." Blümel believes he has found one example of physical whole and part (*IF* 33.31), though he terms it a late and poor one (44.251). This is *Il.* 8.191–93

ὄφρα λάβωμεν
ἀσπίδα Νεστορέην, τῆς νῦν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει
πᾶσαν χρυσεῖην ἔμεναι, κανόνας τε καὶ αὐτήν.

There are instances of the use of a singular indefinite¹⁷ in combination with a plural substantive,¹⁸ whether a noun, as in *Il.* 2.775–77

ἵπποι δὲ παρ' ἄρμασιν οἷσιν ἕκαστος/ἔστασαν,

or a pronoun, as in *Il.* 1.606

οἱ μὲν κακκείοντες ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος,

7.175

οἱ δὲ κλῆρον ἐσημήναντο ἕκαστος,

9.656–57

οἱ δὲ ἕκαστος ἐλὼν δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον
σπείσαντες παρὰ νῆας ἴσαν πάλιν,

and 16.264–65

οἱ δ' ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἔχοντες
πρόσσω πᾶς πέτεται καὶ ἀμύνει οἷσι τέκεσσιν.

The last two examples are particularly interesting because of the effect of the partitive apposition on the rest of the sentence. In 9.956–57 each pronoun has its own concordant participle, a plural with the plural demonstrative and a singular with the singular indefinite. In 16.264–65 the verb agrees with the singular indefinite instead of with the plural demonstrative.¹⁹

The combination as appositives of a plural noun or pronoun and a singular indefinite is of course not confined to any given case.²⁰ But perforce restricted to the nominative is the similar

Blümel's thesis, which will be treated later (in II.A.3), is that when an accusative "part" noun appears where we would have expected a nominative, i.e. with an intransitive or passive verb form, it must be viewed as an accusative of specification and not a remnant of partitive apposition; and I should think this exceptional passage would be regarded by him as confirming rather than as challenging his view, since of course the only possible case in this instance, which he admits must exemplify partitive apposition and not specification, is the accusative.

¹⁷ The plural is naturally used when separate groups, not individuals, are involved, as in *Il.* 3.1.

¹⁸ See Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* 2.15.

¹⁹ Cf. the Hittite *Tel.* 1.9 *nu DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU ku-iš-ša pa-iz-zi* literally 'his sons each one goes,' i.e. in normal English, either 'his sons each go' or 'each of his sons goes.'

²⁰ Compare for the dative *Il.* 5.195 = 10.473

παρὰ δέ σφιν ἑκάστω

and 11.11–12

Ἀχαιοῖσιν δὲ μέγα σθένος ἐμβαλ' ἑκάστω/καρδίη,

and for the accusative 7.215 = 20.44

Τρῶας δὲ τρόμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἕκαστον.

usage of a singular indefinite pronoun with a plural verb which has no subject expressed, the ending of the verb sufficing alone to imply the plural substantive with which the singular indefinite is in apposition,²¹ as in *Il.* 5.878

δεδμήμεσθα ἕκαστος,

9.311

ὥς μή μοι τρύζητε παρήμενοι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος,

and *Od.* 1.424

δὴ τότε κακκείοντες ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος,

which may be compared with *Il.* 1.606 cited in the preceding paragraph. An intermediate stage between *Il.* 1.606 and *Od.* 1.424 is provided by *Od.* 10.397

ἐγνώσαν δέ μ' ἐκείνοι ἔφυν τ' ἐν χερσὶν ἕκαστος,

where we may say either that the demonstrative subject of the first verb serves for the second verb as well, or that the second verb has no expressed subject.

On the other hand when a dual or plural verb has two or more singular subjects which jointly constitute the entire group performing the action designated by the verb, we have distributive and not partitive apposition.²² In straightforward instances,²³ as *Od.* 6.183–84

ἦ ὄθ' ὁμοφρονέοντε νοήμασιν οἶκον ἔχητον
ἀνὴρ ἡδὲ γυνή

and *Il.* 5.907–8

αἱ δ' αὖτις πρὸς δῶμα Διὸς μέγαλοιο νέοντο,
"Ἡρη τ' Ἀργεῖη καὶ Ἀλαλκομενῆϊς Ἀθήνη,

the form of expression seems so natural that we may not recognize a case of apposition at all. But the distribution is more striking when the verb is followed by two separate members marked by some such forms as *ὁ μὲν* and *ὁ δέ*,²⁴ as in *Il.* 12.287–89

The last two examples also involve a body-part as well as an indefinite in partitive apposition, and will be cited below for this reason; see notes 40, 63, and 158. On the extra appositive, see notes 114, 116, 147, and 228.

²¹ Compare in Latin e.g. Plautus, *Ep.* 212 *filios suos quisque visunt*, *Poen.* 107 *omnes meretrices ubi quisque habitant invenit*. This is the type cited in note 9.

²² Cf. above, note 6.

²³ Examples are of course far too numerous to list, but I mention just a few: *Il.* 1.6–7, 2.864, 22.128; *Od.* 21.188–89.

²⁴ Once again it should be pointed out that the construction under consideration is by no means confined to the nominative. For instance, cf. the similarly used

ὥς τῶν ἀμφοτέρωσε λίθοι πωτῶντο θαμειαί,
αἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἐς Τρώας, αἱ δ' ἐκ Τρώων ἐς Ἀχαιοὺς,
βαλλομένων

and 4.536–38

ὥς τῷ γ' ἐν κονίησι παρ' ἀλλήλοισι τετάσθην,
ἦτοι ὁ μὲν Θρηκῶν, ὁ δ' Ἑπειῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,
ἡγεμόνες,

the latter a specially interesting passage because the two balanced singulars which serve as subjects for the preceding dual verb are then themselves jointly summed up by a second appositive in the plural. A more complicated passage is 7.8–12

ἐνθ' ἐλέτην ὁ μὲν υἱὸν Ἀρηιόβοιο ἄνακτος,
Ἄρην ναιετάοντα Μενέσθιον, ὃν κορυνήτης
γείνατ' Ἀρηίθοος καὶ Φυλομέδουσα βοῶπις·
Ἐκτωρ δ' Ἡιονῆα βάλλ' ἐγχεῖ ὀξυόεντι
αὐχέν' ὑπὸ στεφάνης ἐνχάalkου, λῦσε δὲ γυῖα.

Here the slight interruption occasioned by the details about Menesthus's dwelling place and ancestry serves to alter the construction, and instead of the logical ὁ δέ (Hector) balancing ὁ μὲν (Paris) as the second subject of the dual verb, we find a shift to Ἐκτωρ δ' with its own verb. Thus strictly speaking we have partitive apposition in 8–10, but the second member, which would have provided distributive apposition, is implied by the following 11–12.

In other instances the dual or plural verb has a subject expressed instead of one merely implied by its ending, and the following singular members are in apposition with that, as in 7.274–76

εἰ μὴ κήρυκες, Διὸς ἄγγελοι ἦδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν,
ἦλθον, ὁ μὲν Τρώων, ὁ δ' Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,
Ταλθύβιός τε καὶ Ἰδαῖος, πεπνυμένω ἄμφω.

Here again, as in 4.536–38 cited above, the two singular members are jointly summed up, this time by a dual.

Sometimes instead of a common dual or plural verb with two or more substantives in distributive apposition with its subject, we find a dual or plural noun or adjective followed by two or more

accusatives in *Il.* 5.27–28 and 12.128–30; and note too 5.144–47, in which the second accusative, by a sort of anacoluthon, has its own verb, to balance the participle used with the first one.

substantives each with its own verb.²⁵ A good example is *Il.* 12.14

πολλοὶ δ' Ἀργείων οἱ μὲν δάμεν, οἱ δὲ λίποντο.

This construction is particularly common in connection with a dual or plural noun or participle which very specifically refers to two units or groups²⁶ and which is followed by the designation of both parts or at least one of them. The first part is almost invariably²⁷ marked by the usual *ὁ μὲν* or *ἡ μὲν*, presupposing a balancing *ὁ δέ* or *ἡ δέ*, which is regularly implied even when, by a sort of anacoluthon, it is considerably delayed or possibly omitted altogether.²⁸ Hence here too, as in the case of the not dissimilar instances (cited just above) of two members serving jointly as subjects of common verbs, what we have is distributive rather than partitive apposition. But apposition it certainly is, and those who regard such passages as involving a “nominative absolute”²⁹ seem to me quite wrong; they would be justified only if they could cite a single instance of a nominative dual or plural followed by a singular in some case other than the nominative.³⁰

²⁵ In the full form, where a dual or plural substantive with its own verb is summed up by singular substantives in separate clauses each with its own verb, as in *Il.* 5.244–48 or 5.576–86, there is of course no apposition.

²⁶ There is considerable emphasis on the fact that we have a pair. Of the ten examples of participles that I have noted, seven are in the dual, only three in the plural (two of these, *Od.* 24.483 and 9.462–63, necessarily so, since the group involved includes many persons — which leaves only *Od.* 19.230 with a plural participle where a dual might have been used). Furthermore, in one instance (*Il.* 3.211) ‘both’ is added (on this see further note 38), and in another (10.224) ‘two’ (but here the numeral is really necessary, to contrast with ‘one’ or ‘alone’ in the next line; see below). Also, in one instance (12.400) we have a pair of nouns, ‘Ajax and Teucer,’ joined with the participle. Of the five instances of nouns, all of which are in the plural (*Od.* 1.109 necessarily so), two have ‘two’ added (*Od.* 7.129 and 12.73); one has a pair of names, ‘Podalirius and Machaon’ (*Il.* 11.833), and one has a pair of groups, ‘heralds and squires’ (*Od.* 1.109) — which leaves only *Il.* 16.317 ‘the sons of Nestor’ with no emphasis on duality (perhaps it might be said concerning this that, since there has already been a reference to one son of Nestor, Thrasymedes, in 9.81, he as the second, and only remaining, member of the group is suggested by the immediate naming (in 16.318) of his not hitherto mentioned brother Antilochus).

²⁷ The last three examples to be cited, *Od.* 9.462–63, *Il.* 3.210–11, and 10.224–26, are exceptions.

²⁸ This is one explanation that has been given for *Il.* 3.211.

²⁹ They might as well see a “nominative absolute” in *Il.* 16.264–65, cited in the second paragraph of this section.

³⁰ Also, they would have to prove the non-existence of a plural or dual in a case other than the nominative followed by a singular in the same case; this they cannot do, in the face e.g. of such an indubitable instance of accusatives used in this way as *Il.* 5.27–28

Τρῶες δὲ μεγάθυμοι ἐπεὶ ἴδον νῆε Δάρητος
τὸν μὲν ἀλενόμενον, τὸν δὲ κτάμενον παρ’ ὄχεσφιν.

Perfectly straightforward and logical distributive apposition occurs in the following passages: *Od.* 1.109–12

κήρυκες δ' αὐτοῖσι καὶ ὀτρηροὶ θεράποντες
οἱ μὲν οἶνον ἔμισγον ἐνὶ κρητῆρσι καὶ ὕδωρ,
οἱ δ' αὖτε σπόγγοισι πολυτρήτοισι τραπέζας
νίζον καὶ πρότιθεν, τοὶ δὲ κρέα πολλὰ δατεῦντο

(the distributive idea is pointed up here if we are to assume, as do most of the editors,³¹ that there is a specific reference in οἱ μὲν (110) to the κήρυκες and in οἱ δ' (111) to the θεράποντες), *Il.* 7.306–7³²

τῷ δὲ διακριθέντε ὁ μὲν μετὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν
ἦι', ὁ δ' ἐς Τρώων ὄμαδον κίε,

Od. 7.129–31

ἐν δὲ δύω κρῆναι ἡ μὲν τ' ἀνὰ κῆπον ἅπαντα
σκίδνεται, ἡ δ' ἐτέρωθεν ὑπ' αὐλῆς οὐδὸν ἴησιν
πρὸς δόμον ὑψηλόν, ὅθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται,

19.229–31

τὸ δὲ θαυμάζεσκον ἅπαντες,
ὥς οἱ χρύσειοι ἔοντες ὁ μὲν λάε νεβρὸν ἀπάγχων,
αὐτὰρ ὁ ἐκφυγέειν μεμαῶς ἥσπαιρε πόδεσσιν

(here the second member has αὐτὰρ ὁ instead of the usual ὁ δέ).

Occasionally the strict parallelism is slightly violated by the addition to one member of a proper noun which has no counterpart in the other member. Thus in *Od.* 18.95–97

δὴ τότ' ἀνασχομένῳ ὁ μὲν ἤλασε δεξιὸν ὦμον
Ἴριος, ὁ δ' αὐχέν' ἔλασσευ ὑπ' οὐατος, ὅστέα δ' εἴσω
ἔθλασεν

Still another argument against the existence of a nominative absolute in the passages listed is the *invariable* prior position of the word designating the whole; there is a strong reason for this if we have partitive apposition, but none if we have a nominative absolute.

³¹ See e.g. Perrin and, at least so far as the first two go, Merry and Riddell. However, Butcher and Lang in their translation, 'some,' 'and some again,' 'and others,' do not suggest this.

³² Contrast with this the rather irregularly constructed passage *Il.* 5.12–13

τῷ οἱ ἀποκρινθέντε ἐναντίῳ ὀρμηθήτην·
τῷ μὲν ἀφ' ἔπποιον, ὁ δ' ἀπὸ χθονὸς ὤρνυτο πεζός,

which of course does not illustrate partitive apposition; here the member with μὲν refers to precisely the same pair as the preceding line, but gets its verb from the member with δ', while the latter refers to a different person altogether.

it is necessary for us to know which one of the pair merely struck at his opponent's shoulder, and which one struck his opponent's neck, crushing the bones; once we know Irus performed the first action, it is not necessary to be told that Odysseus performed the second; moreover, since the whole battle is of course narrated from the viewpoint of Odysseus, it is natural to mention his adversary's name rather than his own. On the other hand in 8.361-62

αὐτίκ' ἀναΐξαντε ὁ μὲν Θρήκηνδε βεβήκειν,
ἡ δ' ἄρα Κύπρον ἵκανε φιλομμειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη

both the genders and the context make it clear which one of the pair went to Thrace and which to Cyprus, but the addition of 'laughter-loving Aphrodite,' though unnecessary to the sense, adds charm to the picture, and is further justified by the fact that in the next four lines we hear how the Graces received her when she arrived at her destination.

In both the foregoing passages, the correspondence is almost perfect, since we have the parallel ὁ μὲν and ὁ δ', ὁ μὲν and ἡ δ', the only out-of-balance element being the proper noun which is ultimately added epexegetically, in the first example to the first member, and in the second example to the second member. But the balance is far less marked in *Il.* 24.509-12

τῷ δὲ μνησαμένῳ ὁ μὲν Ἑκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο
κλαῖ' ἄδινά, προπάροιθε ποδῶν Ἀχιλλῆος ἔλυσθεις,
αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς κλαῖεν ἑὸν πατέρ', ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
Πάτροκλον.

Here we have ὁ μὲν, but no ὁ δέ to correspond to it; δέ is replaced, as in *Od.* 19.229-31 (cited two paragraphs back), by αὐτὰρ, and ὁ is replaced by the proper noun, which appears immediately instead of being added later. Probably ὁ δέ would have been misleading here, since it might have suggested an individual other than Achilles, in view of the immediately preceding reference to him by name toward the close of the ὁ μὲν member.

In *Il.* 11.833-36

ἱητροὶ μὲν γὰρ Ποδαλείριος ἥδὲ Μαχάων,
τὸν μὲν ἐνὶ κλισίῃσιν ὀιομαι ἔλκος ἔχοντα
χρηρίζοντα καὶ αὐτὸν ἀμύμονος ἱητῆρος
κείσθαι, ὁ δ' ἐν πεδίῳ Τρώων μένει ὄξυν Ἀρηα.

the balance is destroyed by an anacoluthon due to the substitution of *τὸν μὲν δίομαι κείσθαι* for the expected *ὁ μὲν κείται*.

Often the second member is delayed, so that the original sentence contains only the first member, and if viewed in isolation presents an instance of partitive rather than distributive apposition. In such cases there is less likelihood of absolute parallelism between the two members.

Thus *Od.* 12.73³³

οἱ δὲ δὺω σκόπελοι ὁ μὲν οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἰκάνει

is followed by a long description of Scylla's cave, and when we finally come to the site of Charybdis in 101

τὸν δ' ἕτερον σκόπελον χθαμαλώτερον ὄψει,

it is natural that to show the balance we find not simply *τὸν δέ* but *τὸν δ' ἕτερον*.

In two other passages, though the interruption is shorter, the balance is less precise.³⁴ These are *Il.* 12.400–404³⁵

τὸν δ' Αἴας καὶ Τεῦκρος ὁμαρτήσανθ' ὁ μὲν ἰῶ
βελήκει τελαμῶνα περὶ στήθεσσι φαεινὸν
ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης· ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς κήρας ἄμυνεν
παιδὸς ἐοῦ, μὴ νηυσὶν ἐπι πρυμνήσι δαμείη·
Αἴας δ' ἀσπίδα νύξεν ἐπ' ἄλμενος

and 16.317–22

Νεστορίδαι δ' ὁ μὲν οὔτας' Ἀτύνιον ὀξεί δουρὶ
'Αντίλοχος, λαπάρης δὲ διήλασε χάλκεον ἔγχος·
ἦριπε δὲ προπάρουθε. Μάρις δ' αὐτοσχεδὰ δουρὶ
'Αντιλόχῳ ἐπόρουσε κασιγνήτοιο χολωθῆεις,
στὰς πρόσθεν νέκυσ· τοῦ δ' ἀντίθεος Θρασυμήδης
ἔφθη ὀρεξάμενος.

In each of these passages, one of a pair attacks the enemy first, and we hear something of his exploit before we learn of how his

³³ This line itself presents the second member of a pair, the first one being *ἔνθεν μὲν γὰρ πέτραι* (59).

³⁴ A possible Latin example is Vergil, *Aen.* 12.161–69. We have already noted (203) the same influence producing a shift in construction in *Il.* 7.8–12.

³⁵ I assume that *ὁμαρτήσανθ'* here is for the dual active participle *ὁμαρτήσαντε* (cf. note 26). So e.g. Paley. The translation in Lang-Leaf-Myers, "did encounter him," suggests that possibly Lang took it as an aorist middle *ὁμαρτήσαντο*.

comrade comes to his assistance. In the first passage, concerning Ajax and Teucer, *ὁ μὲν*, as often, means 'the latter,' namely, Teucer, so he is not named; but after the intervening lines devoted to Sarpedon and Zeus's protection of him, *ὁ δέ* might have suggested Teucer himself as opposed to Sarpedon, rather than Ajax, so we naturally find (404) *Αἴας δ'* instead of *ὁ δέ*. In the second passage, in which the attacking pair are simply designated as 'the sons of Nestor' instead of being individually named, *ὁ μὲν* is naturally defined by his name Antilochus (as it was by the name Irus in *Od.* 18.96). To balance this, we might have expected *ὁ δέ* . . . *Θρασυμήδης*, or (like *Αἴας δ'* in *Il.* 12.404) *Θρασυμήδης δέ*; but meanwhile we have become interested in Maris' championship of his brother Atymnius, and he is given precedence in the form *τοῦ δ'*.

More irregular is the interruption in *Od.* 24.483-86

ὄρκια πιστὰ ταμόντες ὁ μὲν βασιλεύετω αἰεῖ,
 ἡμεῖς δ' αὖ παίδων τε κασιγνήτων τε φόνοιο
 ἔκκλησιν θέωμεν· τοὶ δ' ἀλλήλους φιλέοντων
 ὥς τὸ πάρος, πλοῦτος δέ καὶ εἰρήνῃ ἄλις ἔστω.

The peculiarity is that the interpolation between the clauses so introduced deals with the second member, and not with the first: the forgetfulness of their bereavement instilled into the hearts of the Ithacans by Zeus and Athena will make possible their reconciliation with one another, which represents the second objective of the treaty, the first being the enduring reign of Odysseus. Various factions of the Ithacans have been quarreling with one another: Eupheithes, father of the slain suitor Antinous, has been urging the people to fight against Odysseus (426-37), while Medon and Halitherses have been preaching peace (439-62), and Eupheithes, true to his name, has been the more persuasive (465-71); meanwhile a small steadfast group is standing ready to defend Odysseus, including his father, his son, his two retainers, Dolius, and the latter's six sons. All these warring groups are now to make peace with one another. A slight complication is provided by the fact that Odysseus himself is a member of one of these groups, so that in a sense he is represented by *τοὶ δ'* as well as by *ὁ μὲν*; but the essence of the oaths is that Odysseus shall be king, and his people shall enjoy peace and prosperity, as in the days of old. Thus the balance is between *ὁ μὲν* in 483 and *τοὶ δ'* in 485,³⁶ and we have distributive

³⁶ Some of the editors do not seem to understand this. Thus Ameis takes the members making up the "whole" *ταμόντες* as *ὁ μὲν* and *ἡμεῖς δ'* (with both of which he

apposition here as elsewhere, though the two members to a certain extent overlap.

On the other hand, we have three passages which exemplify partitive apposition.

The simplest is *Od.* 9.462–63

ἐλθόντες δ' ἡβαιὸν ἀπὸ σπέιους τε καὶ αὐλῆς
πρῶτος ὑπ' ἄρνεϊοῦ λυόμεν, ὑπέλυσα δ' ἐταίρους,

which, though in form it is certainly an example of partitive apposition, none the less suggests distributive apposition, since 'I freed my fellows' suggests 'and my fellows were freed by me,' though it is natural to keep the all-important actor, Odysseus, as the subject.

Similarly the famous couplet *Il.* 3.210–11

στάντων μὲν Μενέλαος ὑπείρεχεν εὐρέας ὤμους,
ἄμφω δ' ἐξομένω, γεραρώτερος ἦεν Ὀδυσσεύς

can be explained as quasi-distributive apposition, since *γεραρώτερος ἦεν Ὀδυσσεύς*, especially in view of the reference to Menelaus in the preceding line, of course implies *ἦττον δὲ γεραρός ἦεν Μενέλαος*,³⁷ which would be banal in the extreme. Still, it must be noted that no *μὲν* appears after the dual participle, as it does when the second member, with *δέ*, is present even though postponed; and actually the contrast is not between the superiority of Odysseus (*μὲν*) and the inferiority of Menelaus (*δέ*) when both are seated, but between the superiority of Menelaus when both are standing (*μὲν*) and the superiority of Odysseus when both are seated (*δέ*).³⁸

believes *τοὶ δ'* is contrasted), apparently not realizing that the *ἡμεῖς* clause is not part of the oath; and Monro says that "after *ὁ μὲν* we expect *οἱ δέ* or some other nom. denoting the *Ἰθακήσιοι*" but "the form of the sentence is changed," not realizing that we have in *τοὶ δ'* precisely what he desiderates.

³⁷ Cf. above, note 28.

³⁸ The passage is complicated by the fact that *στάντων* and *ἐξομένω* differ in both case and number. It may be argued that metrical considerations were a decisive factor in ruling out a dual nominative *στάντε*, but still why not at least either *στάντες* or *στάντων*? The emphasis on the duality of *ἐξομένω*, obtained both by the dual number of the participle and the presence of *ἄμφω*, would seem to indicate that the plural *στάντων* refers not to the two men alone as some (e.g. Seymour) hold, but rather, as Paley says, to the whole multitude; compare the Lang-Leaf-Myers translation "while all stood up," "when both sat down." The shift in case also is rather odd; if *στάντων* refers just to Odysseus and Menelaus, we might expect the nominative here too as in *ἐξομένω*, and so this may be an additional argument for the view that *στάντων* refers to the entire assembly. Furthermore, why is it genitive? The editors are not in accord; Paley takes it with *ὑπὲρ* in *ὑπείρεχεν* (this of course is possible only if *στάντων* refers to the multitude), but it is more commonly viewed as a partitive genitive. In any case, it is doubtless of the stuff of which genitive absolutes are made, but I do not

Even more peculiar than *Il.* 3.210–11, and quite different from it,³⁹ is 10.224–26

σύν τε δὺ' ἐρχομένω, καί τε πρὸ δ τοῦ ἐνόησεν,
ὅππως κέρδος ἔη· μόνος δ' εἴ πέρ τε νοήσῃ,
ἀλλὰ τέ οἱ βράσσων τε νόος λεπτή δέ τε μῆτις.

Here again there is no *ὁ μέν*, nor could there be under any circumstances, for there is no contrast between the member of the pair who is the first to notice something, and his slower companion. The distinction is between what happens when men go in pairs, and what happens when one man goes alone; not only are the chances of noting something doubled in the first case, since one man before the other (i.e. one or the other) may notice what needs to be noticed, but also the ability to act suitably is doubled, since the man who is alone, *even if he does notice* what needs to be noticed, is less able to act. Thus here, and perhaps here alone of all the group of examples under discussion, we have indubitably an instance of partitive apposition, which cannot possibly be explained, as *Il.* 3.210–11 perhaps might be, as implied distributive apposition.

It is of some importance to my ultimate thesis to note that none of the foregoing examples involves a part of the body. While in the dative or the accusative the partitive apposition of a group and an individual may at the same time involve the partitive apposition of an individual and a part of his body,⁴⁰ this apparently never happens in the nominative; nor do I know of any nominative example in Homer involving such apposition alone.⁴¹ Apparently either (1) the noun or pronoun denoting the individual stands alone in the nominative, with the noun denoting the body-part represented by a dative of specification, as in *Il.* 3.192–94

εἴπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε, φίλον τέκος, ὅς τις ὄδ' ἐστίν,
μείων μὲν κεφαλῇ Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο,
εὐρύτερος δ' ὥμοισιν ἰδὲ στέρνοισιν ἰδέσθαι,

or by an accusative of specification, as in 3.226–27

τίς τ' ἄρ' ὄδ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιοὺς ἀνὴρ ἧς τε μέγας τε,
ἔξοχος Ἀργείων κεφαλὴν τε καὶ εὐρέας ὤμους;

believe it is itself a genitive absolute any more than I believe *ἐξομένω* is a nominative absolute.

³⁹ Despite the Scholiast (followed by Paley) who compares the two.

⁴⁰ Cf. above, note 20.

⁴¹ For a case cited as involving a subject in the accusative, see note 16. For a not generally recognized case in Solon, see note 15.

Or (2) the noun denoting the body-part stands alone in the nominative, with the noun or pronoun denoting the individual represented by a genitive of possession, as in *Od.* 20.348–49

ὅσσε δ' ἄρα σφέων/δακρύνοφιν πίμπλαντο,

or, more commonly,⁴² by a dative of reference⁴³ (with or without a localizing adverbial particle⁴⁴), as in *Il.* 1.104

ὅσσε δέ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετόωντι ἔϊκτην,

Il. 17.695–96 = 23.396–97 = *Od.* 4.704–5 = 19.471–72

τῷ δέ οἱ ὅσσε/δακρύνοφι πλῆσθεν,

or *Od.* 10.247–48

ἐν δέ οἱ ὅσσε/δακρύνοφιν πίμπλαντο.

B. Oblique Cases

We now turn from the nominative to the oblique cases, in all of which we find instances of partitive apposition involving an individual and a part of his body.⁴⁵ Interestingly enough, practically none of these instances can be regarded as absolutely certain. In the case of genitives and datives, in Greek as in Latin, the substantive denoting the owner of the body-part may be a genitive of possession or a dative of reference, such as often accompanies a body-part noun in the nominative; and in the case of accusatives, the substantive denoting the body-part might be an accusative of specification, such as often accompanies an owner noun in the

⁴² On the general problem of the genitive vs. the dative, compare Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* 458, and Schwyzler-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* 2.147–48 and 189–90. Both particularly cite *Il.* 5.176 vs. 22.335; concerning the latter, see again below, note 105.

⁴³ For another example, *Il.* 16.517–18, see below, note 105.

⁴⁴ Such adverbs are often combined with the noun and called prepositions, or combined with the verb and called preverbs. But that they are not yet really prepositions is shown by the fact that they do not affect the case of the noun, and that they are not yet really preverbs or prefixes is shown by their frequent wide separation from the verb, the so-called “tmesis” (for a supposed example of which cf. note 62). This was not clearly understood by the Roman poets, whose artificial imitation in Latin of what was a purely natural phenomenon in Greek produced some strange phenomena, of which the extreme instance is of course Ennius' notorious *cere comminuit brum*, though Vergil's *septem subiecta trioni* is almost as bad. Compare further notes 54 and 55.

⁴⁵ Manifestly, the group-individual type also occurs. Instances have been noted *en passant*; see notes 20, 24, and 30. Compare also, for a whole and part relation not involving a part of the body, *Od.* 19.317–18

κάτθετε δ' εὐνήν,
δέμνια καὶ χλαίνας καὶ ῥήγεα συγαλόντα.

nominative.⁴⁶ It is true that such an explanation is not usually given when we have a pair of accusatives, such pairs being regularly viewed as instances of partitive apposition whenever this is possible; that being the case, why should not a similar method be practiced in regard to pairs of genitives and datives? At all events, I shall list a number of them here, without committing myself as to the preferable classification of each.

1. Genitives

Instances with the genitive are comparatively few, quite possibly because phrases involving partitive apposition in the oblique cases usually depend upon a verb, and verbs which govern the genitive are comparatively few.⁴⁷

With verbs of touching, we find the following: *Od.* 22.310⁴⁸

Λειώδης δ' Ὀδυσῆος ἐπεσσύμενος λάβε γούνων,

⁴⁶ For examples see the final paragraph of section A, under type 2 and type 1 respectively. Of course the use of such genitives and datives is not confined to passages where the body-part noun is a nominative. For instances of the genitive or the dative where the body-part noun is an accusative, cf., respectively, notes 48 and 105. (However, in such instances the accusative for the person too is commoner; cf. note 67.)

⁴⁷ However, they are commoner in Greek than in other languages, which may account for the rarity or non-existence of examples of the genitive elsewhere; cf. note 11 above. With the genitives in *Od.* 22.310 and other Homeric passages cited directly below, contrast the accusatives in Hittite *KUB* 26.69.7.8-9 *nu-wa-za* ¹*Na-na-ya-an gi-nu-wa e-ip-pu-un* 'I clasped Nanayas (his) knees' (i.e. *anglice* 'I clasped Nanayas by the knees' or 'I clasped Nanayas's knees'). Note also the genitives in *N. T. Marc.* 5.30

τίς μου ἤψατο τῶν ἱματίων;

in contrast with the datives in its Gothic translation, *hwas mis taitok wastjom?* However, even in Greek, the noun denoting the part touched is not confined to the genitive; see note 48.

⁴⁸ Contrast with the genitive of the body-part here the accusative in *Il.* 24.465

λαβέ γούνατα Πηλεΐωνος.

In this passage the person-noun in the genitive is presumably a genitive of possession, as it certainly is in *Od.* 3.374

Τηλεμάχου δ' ἔλε χεῖρα.

This is perhaps an argument for so interpreting it in *Od.* 22.310 and kindred examples. Or is it possible to say that even here both nouns belong with the verb, the one denoting a body-part being the direct object, hence the accusative, and that denoting the entire person being partitive, hence the genitive? The meaning then would be 'clasp (a part) of Achilles, namely, his knees,' and the two nouns would correspond to each other as do a noun and its attendant genitive in the pairs that succeeded the earlier pairs of substantives in the same case in partitive apposition (cf. *TAPA* 84.93-95). On the other hand we also have the reverse combination, the genitive of the body-part and the accusative of the person, as in *Il.* 21.120

τὸν δ' Ἀχιλεὺς ποταμόνδε λαβὼν ποδὸς ἦκε φέρεσθαι,

22.339

γούνων ἄψασθαι Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος,

Il. 15.76

ἐμέϊο θεὰ Θέτις ἥψατο γούνων,

and *Od.* 19.348

τῇ δ' οὐκ ἂν φθονέοιμι ποδῶν ἄψασθαι ἐμέϊο.

In two of the above examples, *Od.* 22.339 and 19.348, the rather unusual word order, with the "whole" following the "part," is possibly, though not necessarily, an argument against partitive apposition;⁴⁹ and in the case of 19.348, an additional argument for viewing the pronoun as modifying the noun and denoting the possessor is the use of the possessive adjective in the almost directly preceding line 344

οὐδὲ γυνὴ ποδὸς ἄψεται ἡμετέραιο.

Yet Ameis specifically insists that the genitives in both these lines are to be taken with the verb,⁵⁰ hence in partitive apposition.

With a verb of hearing, we find the following: *Il.* 16.76

22.451

οὐδέ πω Ἀτρεΐδεω ὁπὸς ἔκλυον αὐδῆσαντος,

αἰδοίης ἐκυρῆς ὁπὸς ἔκλυον,

and *Od.* 12.198

φθογγῆς Σειρήνων ἠκούομεν οὐδέ τ' αἰοιδῆς.

4.463

τὸν δὲ πεσόντα ποδῶν ἔλαβε,

and 1.197

ζανθῆς δὲ κόμης ἔλε Πηλεΐωνα.

This combination, while common enough, is perhaps harder to account for, and in the first example it might be better to separate the two nouns, associating the accusative with the main verb and only the genitive with the participle (cf. note 76), an analysis probably favored by the word order; but in the second and third passages no such treatment is possible. Incidentally, there is still another variety, with double accusative, just as in Hittite (cf. note 47); an instance is *Od.* 18.258

δεξιτερὴν ἐπὶ καρπῷ ἐλὼν ἐμὲ χεῖρα.

⁴⁹ On the word order see below, notes 51, 60, 79, 99, and 116; and cf. *TAPA* 84.95, note 10, 105 and notes 65 and 68.

⁵⁰ He maintains that ἄπτομαι must govern two genitives, never a combination of genitive of person and accusative of part, or of accusative of person and genitive of part. But the not dissimilar verb λαμβάνω, which is used like ἄπτομαι with two genitives in *Od.* 22.310, cited just above, is met elsewhere with the accusative of the body-part and the genitive of the person, as in *Il.* 24.465 (quoted in note 48) and with the accusative of the person and the genitive of the body-part, as in *Il.* 4.463 (also quoted in note 48).

Here once more there are reasons for taking the person noun as a genitive of possession: in the case of the first two examples, the contrasting passage *Il.* 15.270

θεοῦ ἔκλυεν αὐδὴν,

and in the case of the third, the word order.⁵¹

We also have genitives of a quite different type in *Od.* 22.308–9 = 24.184–85

τῶν δὲ στόνος ὥρνυτ' ἀεικῆς/κράτων τυπτομένων.

Monro on the first of these says that the participle must be a genitive absolute; yet it is hard to separate it from the preceding pronoun,⁵² especially in view of the parallel lines *Il.* 10.483–84 = 21.20–21

τῶν δὲ στόνος ὥρνυτ' ἀεικῆς/ἄορι θεινομένων.

In that case we have a genitive of source rather than one of possession; or we may say that with *στόνος*, the genitive *τῶν* plus the participle is subjective, and the genitive *κράτων* plus the participle is objective.⁵³

2. Datives

Possible examples with the dative are commoner than those with the genitive, undoubtedly because many more verbs may be combined with a dative than with a genitive.

It should be noted that in all these instances the dative does belong with the verb. The presence of a so-called preposition such as *ἐν* or *ἐπὶ* does not affect or alter the construction. In Homer, at least in many cases,⁵⁴ such words are still locative adverbial particles, though we are tempted to call them prepositions when they seem to be joined with substantives, and preverbs when they seem to be joined with verbs.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Cf. note 49.

⁵² But I do not deny that it is probably in passages such as this that the genitive absolute had its genesis. Cf. above, note 38.

⁵³ Of course we should not expect to fit every genitive into a pigeon-hole; that — to vary the metaphor — means binding the language into a strait-jacket. Cf. Monro, *Hom. Gr.* 141–42; Hahn, *TAPA* 84.93–94.

⁵⁴ I do not say in all. There are instances where the meaning seems to be not merely pointed up but actually determined by the particle; cf. note 81. On the use of the particles as adverbs, cf. note 44.

⁵⁵ So too in Hittite, the attempt has been made by Miss Zuntz in her *Ortsadv.* to distinguish the use of such words as pure adverbs from their use as postpositions or

The temptation to view the particle as a preposition is particularly strong when it immediately precedes the noun denoting the body-part, as in *Od.* 20.61–62⁵⁶

αἶθε μοι ἥδη
ἰὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι βαλοῦσ' ἐκ θυμὸν ἔλοιο,

Il. 19.169

θαρσαλέον νύ οἱ ἦτορ ἐνὶ φρεσίν,

Od. 24.465

οὐ γάρ σφιν ἄδε μῦθος ἐνὶ φρεσίν,

5.190–91

οὐδέ μοι αὐτῇ/θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι σιδήρεος,

Il. 2.142

τοῖσι δὲ θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσιν ὄρινεν,

Od. 21.96

τῷ δ' ἄρα θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσιν ἐώλπειν.

On the other hand, it must be observed that elsewhere the “preposition” itself is directly preceded by the noun or pronoun denoting the owner of the body-part, and constitutes a postposition with this⁵⁷ quite as much as it constitutes a preposition with the other noun, as in *Od.* 15.326–27

τί ἦ τοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ τοῦτο νόημα/ἐπλετο;

and *Il.* 21.145–46

μένος δὲ οἱ ἐν φρεσὶ θῆκεν/Ξάνθος.

The effect is practically the same when only a postpositive particle separates the substantive and the “postposition,” as in *Il.* 1.55

τῷ γὰρ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεά

and 17.451⁵⁸

σφῶν δ' ἐν γούνεσσι βαλῶ μένος ἥδ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ.

Nor is there much difference when the intervening element is some other word or phrase which does not play a fundamental part in the

preverbs. Although her work is logical and thorough, none the less it seems to me futile, for I doubt whether Hittite has reached even the transitional stage that Homeric Greek had attained (cf. note 54).

⁵⁶ On the datives in this passage, see below, note 111.

⁵⁷ On the other hand in *Il.* 5.40 (quoted below, note 105) the particle may be viewed as a “postposition” with the body-part noun itself, though here the editors are more likely to combine it with the verb. On such “tmesis” see notes 44 and 62.

⁵⁸ This line will be cited again later in a contrast of the dative and the accusative. See note 210.

general structure of the sentence; such a locution may be an adverb, as in *Od.* 2.124–25

ὅν τινά οἱ νῦν/ἐν στήθεσσι τιθεῖσι θεοί

or a vocative, as in 2.363–64

τίπτε δέ τοι, φίλε τέκνον, ἐνὶ φρεσὶ τοῦτο νόημα
ἔπλετο;

which hardly differs from 15.326–27, cited five examples earlier. But above all conclusive proof that the “preposition” does not belong specifically with the body-part noun is furnished by those passages in which it opens the sentence,⁵⁹ with the “owner” substantive (preceding the body-part one⁶⁰) following either directly (except for particles), as in *Il.* 20.169

ἐν δέ τέ οἱ κραδίη στένει ἄλκιμον ἦτορ,

22.451–52

ἐν δέ μοι αὐτῇ/στήθεσι πάλλεται ἦτορ ἀνὰ στόμα,

1.188–89

ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ

στήθεσιν λασίοισι διάνδιχα μερμήριζεν,

6.253 (et al.)⁶¹

ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί,

or — still more significantly — after a considerable interval, as in 2.451–52

ἐν δέ σθένος ὤρσεν ἐκάστω/κραδίη.

⁵⁹ So, too, with other prepositions: e.g. ἀμφί in *Il.* 13.704–5 and 18.205 (on the latter passage see below, note 282).

⁶⁰ In three of the five examples here cited, the body-part substantive follows the owner substantive immediately. This order certainly produces the effect of partitive apposition; cf. note 49.

⁶¹ This rather peculiar but very vivid locution occurs eleven times altogether in Homer. Bekker takes the hand as belonging to the subject of the verb and expressing means, but the common double dative type, in which the dative of the person refers to the owner of the body-part, whether or not they are appositives, seems much more likely; nor would ἐν have much point if applied to οἱ only, without the limitation provided by χειρί; one can hardly grow in (or into) a person, even though one may be said to grow in (or into) his hand if one clasps it tightly. Besides, that ἐν, despite its position, is to be joined with χειρί is indicated by the rather similar passage *Od.* 10.397

ἔφυν τ' ἐν χερσὶν ἕκαστος.

Some editors compare Vergil, *Aen.* 8.124 dextramque amplexus inhaesit; I think 2.723–24 dextrae se parvus Iulus implicuit is a closer parallel.

Here, presumably because of its greater separation from the substantive, the particle has been taken with the verb by some editors,⁶² but I see no fundamental difference between its use here and its use in such passages as *Od.* 2.124–25 and 15.326–27, cited just above. Nor on the other hand do I see any fundamental difference between any of these passages, and those in which the particle immediately precedes the verb and therefore is joined with it in writing and is called a “preverb,” as in *Il.* 11.11–12,⁶³

Ἀχαιοῖσιν δὲ μέγα σθένος ἔμβαλ' ἐκάστω/καρδίῃ

and 2.259

μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῇ κάρη ὤμοισιν ἐπείη.

It should be noted too that these passages with “preverbs” are perfectly parallel to those with “prepositions”; in particular compare with each other *Il.* 17.451 (cited in the preceding paragraph) and 11.11–12.

In all the instances of double datives, whether or not a locative particle is present, we *may* view the two datives as differing from each other in type, thus ruling out the possibility of partitive apposition.

In some examples, where the dative representing the owner is clearly the complement of the verb, the dative denoting the body-part may be explained as either a dative of specification or a locative dative. It might be viewed as either one in *Il.* 1.24

ἀλλ' οὐκ Ἀτρεΐδῃ Ἀγαμέμνονι ἦνδανε θυμῷ,

Od. 8.571

ὥς οἱ φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ,

and 20.327

εἷ σφωιν καρδίῃ ἄδοι ἀμφοτέρωιν.

It is probably to be viewed as specification in *Od.* 14.221

ἀνδρῶν δυσμενέων ὃ τέ μοι εἴζειε πόδεςσιν,

and as locative in *Il.* 2.259

μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῇ κάρη ὤμοισιν ἐπείη

⁶² E.g. Seymour in his excellent school-edition; so too in regard to *Il.* 5.40 (on which see above, note 57). Probably the editor of a text intended for beginners is particularly likely to rule hard and fast lines in this way; the practice is helpful and welcome to young students, but I doubt whether it is true to the facts of language. On such supposed “tmesis,” cf. notes 44 and 57.

⁶³ Already cited above in a different connection: see note 20.

and 8.129

δίδου δέ οἱ ἡνία χερσίν.

With this last example we may contrast 18.545–46

*τοῖσι δ' ἔπειτ' ἐν χερσὶ δέπας μελιηδέος οἴνου
δόσκεν ἀνὴρ ἐπιών*

and 1.440–41

*τὴν μὲν ἔπειτ' ἐπὶ βωμόν ἄγων πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεὺς
πατρὶ φίλῳ ἐν χερσὶ τίθει,*

in both of which there is present a local adverb to point up the meaning; so too in all the passages discussed at the beginning of this section.⁶⁴ In practically all of these, the owner noun can regularly be classed as a dative of reference, though with the verb 'be' (as in *Il.* 2.259) or where there is no expressed verb at all (as in *Il.* 19.169, *Od.* 24.465, and 5.190–91), it might equally well be viewed as a dative of the possessor, and possibly in a few instances (as *Il.* 1.55, *Od.* 2.124–25, *Il.* 2.451–52, 11.11–12) it approaches an indirect object.

An example particularly interesting because of its numerous possibilities⁶⁵ is *Il.* 3.338 = *Od.* 17.4

εἶλετο δ' ἄλκιμον ἔγχος, ὃ οἱ παλάμῃφιν ἀρήρειν.

Here we may take the person dative directly with the verb, calling the body-part noun as a dative depending on a preposition in the first type, and as a dative depending on a compound verb in the second type. But in my opinion, as I have already indicated above (especially in note 44), it often happens that this explanation, though suitable enough for Attic Greek, will not do for Homeric.

⁶⁴ The followers of traditional grammar who consider the adverb either a preposition (as e.g. in *Il.* 19.169 etc.) or a preverb (as in *Il.* 11.11–12 and 2.259) will class the body-part noun as a dative depending on a preposition in the first type, and as a dative depending on a compound verb in the second type. But in my opinion, as I have already indicated above (especially in note 44), it often happens that this explanation, though suitable enough for Attic Greek, will not do for Homeric.

⁶⁵ Monro on *Od.* 17.4 calls the pronoun a dative of advantage and the noun an instrumental dative, but in regard to the latter I certainly cannot follow him.

⁶⁶ Perhaps *Il.* 18.600

τροχὸν ἄρμενον ἐν παλάμῃσιν

favors this view. We observe the same variation between the simple dative and the dative with a "preposition" in 13.188

κόρυθα κροτάφοις ἀραρυῖαν

vs. *Od.* 18.378

καὶ κυνὴ πάγχαλκος, ἐπὶ κροτάφοις ἀραρυῖα.

reference (as in the examples cited in the preceding paragraph). But here, where both datives fit so readily as complements of the verb belonging to the same category, the best explanation would seem to be that we have partitive apposition. Furthermore, I doubt whether there is a single instance of the double dative construction in which the possibility of partitive apposition is completely ruled out.⁶⁷

3. Accusatives

We now come to the one case which all agree presents unquestionable examples of partitive apposition: the accusative.

a. Verbs of Wounding

The construction occurs particularly often in the almost formulaic expression meaning 'A wounded B in a certain part of his body.' This type is met far more frequently in the *Iliad* than in the *Odyssey*, doubtless because there is much more occasion for it in the numerous battle scenes of the *Iliad*, but possibly also because partitive apposition, a very ancient form of expression, may have already been beginning to die out of the language by the time of the *Odyssey*.

By far the commonest verb in this usage is βάλλω 'hit' (with a thrown weapon), of which I have noted 29 occurrences.⁶⁸ Next to it in frequency comes οὐτάζω 'strike' (with a held weapon), 10 occurrences.⁶⁹ Other verbs similarly used are ἐλαύνω (2 instances),⁷⁰ κόπτω (1),⁷¹ πλῆσσω (3),⁷² and τύπτω (2),⁷³ all, like οὐτάζω,

⁶⁷ There is an additional reason for favoring the explanation that we have whole and part in many instances. This is the tendency to associate datives for person and body-part, rather than to substitute an accusative (of direct object or specification, respectively) for either. We shall note later on the same tendency to associate accusatives for person and body-part, rather than to substitute the dative (of reference or specification, respectively) for either. Cf. below, 226. (Really, these two statements amount to two different ways of saying the same thing: dative tends to combine with dative, accusative tends to combine with accusative.) See further notes 56, 104, 105, 111, 210, and 231.

⁶⁸ *Il.* 4.480-81, 491-92, 501-2, 527-28; 5.188-89, 580-82; 7.11-12, 14-16; 8.119-21, 312-13; 11.578-79, 583-84; 13.387-88, 411-12, 506; 14.409-12, 450, 465-66; 15.341, 433, 576-77; 16.289, 577-78, 586-87, 737-39; 17.348-49; 20.413-14; 21.166-67. *Od.* 22.277.

⁶⁹ *Il.* 5.55-56, 458, 883; 11.420-21; 13.437-39; 16.467-68, 597; 17.601; 20.401-2. *Od.* 22.294-95.

⁷⁰ *Il.* 5.79-80; 13.576.

⁷¹ *Il.* 23.690.

⁷² *Il.* 5.146-47; 11.240. *Od.* 10.161-62.

⁷³ *Il.* 13.541-42; 21.180.

meaning 'strike, smite'; also *νύσσω* 'prick, pierce, stab' (2 instances),⁷⁴ and *ἐπιγράφω* 'scratch, graze' (2).⁷⁵ I cite one example of each: *Il.* 15.433

τόν ρ' ἔβαλεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ οὔτατος ὅξει χαλκῶ,

5.55–56

ἀλλὰ μιν Ἀτρεΐδης δουρικλειτὸς Μενέλαος
πρόσθεν ἔθεν φεύγοντα μετάφρενον οὔτασε δουρί,

13.576

Ληίπυρον δ' Ἑλένος ξίφεϊ σχεδὸν ἤλασε κόρσην,

23.690

κόψε δὲ παπτήγαντα παρήμιον,

5.146–47

τόν δ' ἕτερον ξίφεϊ μεγάλῳ κληῖδα παρ' ὤμων
πληῆξ',

13.541–42⁷⁶

Αἰνείας δ' Ἀφαρῆα Καλητορίδην ἐπορούσας
λαιμόν τ' ὤψ', ἐπὶ οἷ τετραμμένον, ὅξει δουρί,

11.95–96

τόν δ' ἰθὺς μεμαῶτα μετώπιον ὅξει δουρί
νύξ',

Od. 22.279–80

Κτήσιππος δ' Εὖμαιον ὑπὲρ σάκος ἔγχεϊ μακρῶ
ὤμων ἐπέγραψεν.

Expressions of this sort are, as I have said, practically formulaic. They very frequently include, as do all except the fourth of the examples cited, a dative of means denoting the weapon to do the wounding.⁷⁷ Also common is the occurrence, as in the first and fifth of the examples cited, of a prepositional phrase delimiting the

⁷⁴ *Il.* 11.95–96; 20.487–89.

⁷⁵ *Il.* 11.388. *Od.* 22.279–80.

⁷⁶ Here as in some other passages (on which see notes 48 and 93) in which the subject of the verb is accompanied by a participle, it might be suggested that the two accusatives are to be separated, one being combined with the participle and the other with the verb. I think in general the odds are all in favor of keeping the two accusatives together; at all events here that is almost certainly to be done, for Homer, though he uses the accusative of jumping up on a chariot (*Il.* 17.481), apparently uses only the dative of springing at or upon a person (*Il.* 5.793; 15.520; *Od.* 23.342–43).

⁷⁷ A dative of this sort occurs in 65 of the passages under discussion. It is possible that the extremely common use of this dative may have been to a slight extent a contributing — though certainly not a compelling — factor in preserving the use of the two accusatives rather than permitting the substitution for either of a dative. While, as we have seen (cf. note 67), the combination of two datives relating respec-

precise portion of the body-part that receives the wound.⁷⁸ Such prepositional phrases I shall henceforth refer to as "localizing phrases." They limit the body-part noun as it itself limits the person noun, and thus usually follow it as it usually follows the person noun;⁷⁹ but of course they do not agree with it in case, for they do not themselves constitute a part of it, but define the part of it affected in relation to some other part of the body, or, less frequently, some part of the armor.⁸⁰ The case of the noun varies according to the introductory particle, which therefore in these expressions is doubtless to be viewed as already a true preposition.⁸¹ The commonest prepositions are *ὑπέρ* with the genitive or (less often) the accusative,⁸² *ὑπό* with the genitive or (less often) the accusative,⁸³ and *παρά* with the accusative;⁸⁴ we also meet *διὰ* with the genitive,⁸⁵ *ἐπί* with the dative,⁸⁶ and *περί* with the da-

tively to person wounded and to body-part wounded was favored, the reverse was probably true of the juxtaposition of two utterly unrelated datives of quite different types.

⁷⁸ The same part is played by a phrase of this sort as by a localizing adjective or an adverb. Both are combined in *Il.* 15.341

Δηίοχον δὲ Πάρις βάλε νείατον ὦμον ὀπισθεν,

where I think the meaning is 'the lower part of the shoulder in the rear,' not 'behind the lower part of the shoulder' as it is rendered in Lang-Leaf-Myers. Adjectives used in this way include *μέσος* (*Il.* 13.438, 506; 16.597; 20.486; 23.875; *Od.* 10.161; 22.295), *πρυμνός* (*Od.* 17.463; on this see note 116), *νείατος* (*loc. cit.*, also *Il.* 14.466), *μεταμάζιος* (*Il.* 5.19; cf. the common *παρά μαζόν*), all of which denote one part of a given member as opposed to another part; not however words for 'right' and 'left,' which denote one member as opposed to another member (contrast with *νείατον ὦμον* 'the lower part of the shoulder' in *Il.* 15.341 the common *δεξιὸν ὦμον* 'the right shoulder,' e.g. in 14.450); the two types are combined in *Od.* 17.504

οὗτος δὲ θρήνῃ πρυμνὸν βάλε δεξιὸν ὦμον.

Adverbs used in this way include, beside *ὀπισθεν* (in *Il.* 15.341 and 541), *ὑπερθεν* (11.421) and *τῇ* (5.858 and 23.875).

⁷⁹ Cf. note 49. The example of the genitive (cited at the close of this paragraph) follows the body-part noun; the only exceptions with prepositions that I have noted are *Od.* 10.161 (on which, however, see note 116), and, of armor (cf. note 80), *Od.* 22.279–80.

⁸⁰ The examples referring to armor are *Il.* 7.11–12, 12.183, 13.387–88, *Od.* 22.279–80.

⁸¹ This is one type that I had in mind in my qualifying comment in note 54.

⁸² With the genitive, *Il.* 4.528; 5.145; 13.616; 14.412; 15.433. With the accusative, *Od.* 22.279.

⁸³ With the genitive, *Il.* 7.12; 11.579; 13.412; 17.349; 21.591. With the accusative, *Il.* 13.388; 17.309.

⁸⁴ *Il.* 4.480; 5.146; 8.121, 313; 15.577.

⁸⁵ *Il.* 12.183; 20.479.

⁸⁶ *Il.* 5.458, 883; 17.601; *Od.* 22.277.

tive.⁸⁷ I quote a few typical examples as a supplement to those already given: *Il.* 4.527–28

τὸν δὲ Θόας Αἰτωλὸς ἀπεσσύμενον βάλε δουρὶ
στέρνον ὑπὲρ μαζοῖο,

11.578–79

καὶ βάλε Φαυσιάδην Ἀπισάονα ποιμένα λαῶν
ἦπαρ ὑπὸ πραπίδων,

4.480–81

πρῶτον γάρ μιν ἰόντα βάλε στήθος παρὰ μαζὸν
δεξιόν,

5.458⁸⁸

Κύπριδα μὲν πρῶτα σχεδὸν οὔτασε χεῖρ' ἐπὶ καρπῷ.

Instead of a prepositional phrase, we find a genitive in *Il.* 21.166–67.

The usage exhibited by the typical formula, 'A wounds B in a given part of the body,' often accompanied by a dative of means and/or a "localizing phrase," is subject to related extensions. Thus the action usually performed by one man who wounds another is in *Il.* 6.117⁸⁹

ἀμφὶ δέ μιν σφυρὰ τύπτει καὶ αὐχένα δέρμα κελαινόν

attributed to the hide forming the rim of the shield, which beats against or slaps the neck and ankles of its wearer or bearer; and in *Il.* 10.535⁹⁰

ἵππων μ' ὠκυπόδων ἀμφὶ κτύπος οὔατα βάλλει

to the noise which at least metaphorically strikes the ears of the hearer.

Again the accusative noun which receives the action is sometimes transferred, like the noun in the "localizing phrase,"⁹¹ from a

⁸⁷ *Il.* 12.401.

⁸⁸ Here and in *Il.* 17.601 and *Od.* 22.277, I think we may be certain that χεῖρ' is rightly written χεῖρ', standing for the accusative χεῖρα, not the dative χεῖρί, which would be quite unparalleled. Cf. note 104.

⁸⁹ There is no doubt that ἀμφὶ is adverbial here whether it means 'on both sides' (as it does in *Il.* 10.535) with reference to the ankles alone, or whether it means (as seems to me more likely) 'above and below,' with reference to the neck and the ankles jointly.

⁹⁰ I am assuming that μ' stands for μέ rather than μοί. On ἀμφὶ cf. note 89.

⁹¹ Cf. above, note 80.

part of the body to the piece of armor which covers that part, as in *Il.* 4.459 = 6.9

τόν ῥ' ἔβαλε πρῶτος κόρυθος φάλον ἵπποδασείης,
20.288–89

ἔνθα κεν Αἰνείας μὲν ἐπεσσύμενον βάλε πέτρῳ
ἢ κόρυθ' ἢ ἐσάκος,

and 11.563–65

ὥς τότε ἔπειτ' Αἴαντα μέγαν, Τελαμώνιον υἱόν,
Τρῶες ὑπέρθυμοι πολυηγερέες τ' ἐπίκουροι
νύσσοντες ξυστοῖσι μέσον σάκος αἰὲν ἔποντο.

In such instances, there is a tendency to add the body-part in combination with a preposition.⁹² Examples are *Il.* 5.98–99

καὶ βάλλ' ἐπαΐσσοντα τυχῶν κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον
θῶρηκος γύαλον,
17.605–6

Ἔκτορα δ' Ἰδομενεὺς μετὰ Λήϊτον ὀρμηθέντα
βεβλήκει θῶρηκα κατὰ στήθος παρὰ μαζόν,

and 12.400–402

τὸν δ' Αἴας καὶ Τεῦκρος ὁμαρτήσανθ' ὃ μὲν ἰῶ
βεβλήκει τελαμῶνα περὶ στήθεσσι φαεινὸν
ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης.

In the first of these passages the structure is not quite certain,⁹³ and in the second it might be possible to take *στήθος* precisely as in

⁹² So too in one passage without a person noun (cf. note 103), *Il.* 13.586–87 (referred to again at the close of note 114)

Πριαμίδης μὲν ἔπειτα κατὰ στήθος βάλεν ἰῶ/θῶρηκος γύαλον.

⁹³ Here again, as in *Il.* 13.541–42 (see note 76), we have a participle and a verb; and some editors (e.g. Paley) seem to show by their punctuation that they associate the body-part phrase with the participle and the accusatives denoting person and armor with the verb. A similar interpretation is possible with other passages with *κατὰ* (as *Il.* 5.578–79; 12.189; *Od.* 19.452), on all of which see below, note 117; also in one (*Il.* 4.106–8) with *πρός*. Yet I think that in these passages (with the exception of the one with *πρός*, on which see below, note 128) even more than in *Il.* 13.541–42 we must combine all complementary and modifying expressions with the verb. In the first place, it is obvious that the participle of *τυγχάνω* in passages about wounding does not need a complement, for frequently there is present only one accusative (denoting the person), which clearly belongs with the verb (as in *Il.* 5.858; 12.394–95; 13.371, 396–97); and in the second place, even when there are two accusatives (as in *Il.* 5.582), neither can belong with the participle, for *τυγχάνω* presumably needs the genitive (cf. e.g. *Il.* 5.587; 16.609; *Od.* 6.290). The truth is that *βάλε* . . . *τυχῶν* (as in *Il.* 5.98; 13.371; etc.) forms a single idea meaning 'hit successfully' or the like,

4.480, associating *κάτα* with *θώρακα*; and in both the use of *κατά* involves a special problem.⁹⁴ However, there can be no doubt about the third example.

The use of the accusative to denote the possessor seems to be less common⁹⁵ with articles of armor than with true parts of the body. There may be some significance in the structure of *Il.* 13.614–16

ἦ τοι ὁ μὲν κόρυθος φάλον ἤλασεν ἵπποδασείης
ἄκρον ὑπὸ λόφον αὐτόν, ὁ δὲ προσιόντα μέτωπον
ῥινὸς ὕπερ πυμάτων.

Here we have two balanced members sharing a common verb with two parallel subjects, *ὁ μὲν* and *ὁ δέ*, and also with two parallel objects, *φάλον* and *μέτωπον*; with the latter, a part of the body, we also have a second object denoting its owner, but with the former, an appendage of the helmet, we do not.⁹⁶ Again, note the presence of the accusative of the person in *Il.* 16.597

τὸν μὲν ἄρα Γλαῦκος στῆθος μέσον οὔτασε δουρί,

and its absence⁹⁷ in 7.258

Πριαμίδης μὲν ἔπειτα μέσον σάκος οὔτασε δουρί.

So too in the same passage just two lines below of Hector's opponent, 7.260⁹⁸

Αἴας δ' ἀσπίδα νύξεν ἐπάλμενος.

Since a member of the body is a physical part of its owner in a far truer and more essential way than is an article of armor, the fact that the former is combined more frequently than the latter

just as does the reverse combination *ἐτύχησε βαλὼν* (15.581), which likewise governs the accusative (*τόν* in 580); another way of conveying in duplicate the same single idea is to say (as in 11.350 et al.) *βάλεν οὐδ' ἀφάμαρτε* (we have the reverse in 5.287 *ἡμβροτες οὐδ' ἔτυχε*).

⁹⁴ This will be treated later; see especially note 114.

⁹⁵ That is, *proportionately* less common. There are, of course, plenty of instances of such omission with parts of the body too (cf. note 103).

⁹⁶ So too *Il.* 3.362; 13.552; 16.338. However, contrast 4.459 = 6.9 (already cited).

⁹⁷ Also its replacement by a genitive in *Il.* 15.528 (cf. 13.646).

ὅς τότε Φυλείδαο μέσον σάκος οὔτασε δουρί.

For this genitive cf. below, note 125.

⁹⁸ So too *Il.* 12.404. To be sure in this appearance of the line it might be argued that the force of *τόν* in 400 (quoted in the preceding paragraph) is still felt, despite the interpolation of a separate clause (on which see above, 207–8).

with the noun denoting the owner or “whole” is perhaps a confirmation of the view that such pairs of accusatives have their origin in partitive apposition. Another confirmation is provided by the overwhelmingly pronounced practice of placing the “whole” noun before the “part” noun.⁹⁹ I have noticed only one exception to this well-nigh invariable rule, *Il.* 21.180

γαστέρα γάρ μιν τύψε παρ' ὀμφαλόν.

Contrast with this the normal order in 13.506

Ἴδομενεὺς δ' ἄρα Οἰνόμαον βάλε γαστέρα μέσσην.

Both the “whole” noun and the “part” noun serve as objects of the verb. Either one can be omitted,¹⁰⁰ and the construction remains unchanged.¹⁰¹ We may cite as examples with the person noun alone¹⁰² *Il.* 15.11

ἐπεὶ οὗ μιν ἀφαιρότατος βάλλ' Ἀχαιῶν,

5.858

τῇ ῥά μιν οὔτα τυχῶν,

and 12.394–95

*ἀλλ' ὃ γε Θεστορίδην Ἀλκμάονα δουρὶ τυχήσας
νύξ',*

and as examples with the body-part alone¹⁰³ *Il.* 5.657

ὃ μὲν βάλεν αὐχένα μέσσον,

13.529

δουρὶ βραχίονα τύψεν ἐπάλμενος,

⁹⁹ Already referred to in notes 49, 51, 60, and 79.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. note 95.

¹⁰¹ There are also instances, as *Il.* 4.525

οὔτα δὲ δουρὶ παρ' ὀμφαλόν

and 20.168, where both are omitted. In the first a “localizing” prepositional phrase seems to replace the accusative of the body-part; cf. note 102.

¹⁰² Additional examples are *Il.* 5.533, 580; 12.387–88; 13.371; 20.378; *Od.* 17.278–79, 494. On *Il.* 11.109, 12.183, 13.396–97, 17.309, 17.617, 20.486, 23.875, in which the part of the body wounded is indicated by an adjective or by an adverbial phrase, see below, note 112.

¹⁰³ Additional examples are *Il.* 4.531; 5.19, 584, 657, 660–61; 10.455–56; 13.593–94; 15.541; 16.332, 404–5, 791, 806–7; 20.481; 21.591; *Od.* 18.95, 96; 22.81–82; probably also *Il.* 4.467–69, since *ἐρύοντα* probably (despite notes 76 and 93) depends on the participle *ιδών*. On 13.586–87, 13.651, and 20.469, in which the body-part noun is combined with *κατά*, see notes 92, 114, and 123.

14.497

αὐχένα μέσσον ἔλασσαν,

and 2.265–66

σκήπτρῳ δὲ μετάφρενον ἦδὲ καὶ ὦμῳ/πληξεν.

However, the two accusatives certainly have an affiliation for each other.¹⁰⁴ In the construction with verbs of wounding, there is evidently no tendency for a dative of reference as a substitute for the accusative person noun to be combined with the accusative body-part noun,¹⁰⁵ or for a dative of specification as a substitute for the accusative body-part noun to be combined with the accusative person noun.¹⁰⁶ Thus in this construction the body-part noun is surely to be viewed as closely related to the person noun;¹⁰⁷ it is not an accusative of limit of motion,¹⁰⁸ and it is not — at least not yet — an accusative of specification.

There are two additional reasons for not viewing it as an accusative of limit of motion.

¹⁰⁴ Hence my unhesitating decision in favor of the accusative in the very few ambiguous passages. See notes 88, 90, and 146.

¹⁰⁵ For the dative elsewhere, cf. e.g. *Il.* 3.270

βασιλεύσιν ὕδωρ ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἔχευαν,

and 22.335 (already referred to in note 42)

ὅς τοι γούνατ' ἔλυσα,

which is in marked contrast with such passages as 11.240

τὸν δ' ἄορι πληξ' αὐχένα, λῦσε δὲ γυῖα

and 16.465

τὸν βάλε νείαιραν κατὰ γαστέρα, λῦσε δὲ γυῖα,

where there is no pronoun in the corresponding clause but an accusative in the preceding clause. Of particular significance are the datives in 16.517–18

ἀμφὶ δέ μοι χεῖρ/ὀξεῖης ὀδύνησιν ἐλήλαται

and 5.40

πρώτῳ γὰρ στρεφθέντι μεταφρένῳ ἐν δόρῳ πῆξεν.

In the first (on which cf. note 43), with the body-part noun in the nominative, we cannot have partitive apposition, as already noted (see section I.A.); in the second (on which cf. note 57), with the body-part noun in the dative, the word referring to the owner is also in the dative — which certainly suggests that here too we have partitive apposition. See also below, notes 129 and 205.

¹⁰⁶ Elsewhere the dative and accusative of specification do alternate, as we saw above in *Il.* 3.227 and 193–94, quoted in the last paragraph of section I.A.

¹⁰⁷ Despite Monro and Hirt (see note 158).

¹⁰⁸ Despite Blümel (see section II.A.3). Of course I am not referring to cases in which the person noun is likewise an accusative of limit of motion. There are instances of the sort, notably in metaphorical expressions involving the heart, the feelings. See note 139.

The first reason is that when the direct object of the verb of striking or hitting denotes not the person wounded but the weapon which does the wounding (a much rarer usage), there is no tendency to use an accusative for the part of the body wounded,¹⁰⁹ even in combination with a “preposition”; the case used is the dative.¹¹⁰ Examples are *Il.* 5.345–46

μή τις Δαναῶν ταχυνώλων
χαλκὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι βαλὼν ἐκ θυμὸν ἔλοιτο,

and *Od.* 20.61–63¹¹¹

αἶθε μοι ἦδη
ἰὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι βαλοῦσ' ἐκ θυμὸν ἔλοιο
αὐτίκα νῦν.

Apparently then the compelling reason for the use of the accusative for the noun denoting the part of the body wounded when it is used in combination with the noun denoting the person wounded, is the appositional relationship of the two nouns.

The second reason is that the “localizing phrase” which so often accompanies the body-part noun when this is present frequently replaces it when it is absent. Thus in *Il.* 5.144–47

ἐνθ' ἔλεν Ἀστυνοον καὶ Ὑπείρονα ποιμένα λαῶν,
τὸν μὲν ὑπὲρ μαζοῦ βαλὼν χαλκῆρεϊ δουρί,
τὸν δ' ἕτερον ξίφεϊ μεγάλῳ κληῖδα παρ' ὦμον
πλῆξ',

¹⁰⁹ The corresponding passive construction with the weapon serving as subject occurs in *Il.* 5.399–400

αὐτὰρ οἷστος/ὦμφ ἐνὶ στιβαρῷ ἤλῃλατο.

Here too the body-part is represented by the dative with a “preposition.” We also find a variant construction where the thing that does the wounding serves as subject of an active verb; here the body-part noun appears as usual in the accusative as object of the verb, but the person wounded appears in the genitive, as with pieces of armor (cf. note 97), or in the dative. Thus with a departure from the usual formula, there is no tendency to use partitive apposition. Examples are *Il.* 17.599–600 (of a spear)

γράψεν δέ οἱ ὅστων ἄχρης/αἰχμῇ Πουλυδάμαντος,

and *Od.* 12.412 (of a falling mast)

πλῆξε κυβερνήτew κεφαλὴν.

¹¹⁰ We do find the accusative of the body-part noun with a verb that clearly demands the accusative of limit of motion, in *Il.* 5.290–91

βέλος δ' ἔθυενεν Ἀθήνη/ρίνα παρ' ὀφθαλμόν.

¹¹¹ Significant too is the fact that in this passage, where the dative is used for the body-part, so too is it used for the person wounded. Cf. note 56.

a phrase of this sort occurs alike in the first of the two balancing clauses, where there is no body-part accusative,¹¹² and in the second, where there is one. We may also compare the first clause with such a typical example as 4.527–28

τὸν δὲ Θόας Ἀιτωλὸς ἀπεσύμενον βάλε δουρὶ
στέρνον ὑπὲρ μαζοῖο.

It is clear that, unlike the body-part accusative, the localizing phrase cannot be taken closely with the person accusative: 'the man his collar-bone (beside the shoulder)' or 'the man his chest (over the nipple)' makes sense (as an instance of partitive apposition, even though not idiomatic English), but 'the man over the nipple' does not. Thus the localizing phrases must be combined with the verb, and in this connection it is interesting to note that they are regularly of a type that expresses place where rather than place whither.¹¹³ This seems to indicate that verbs of wounding do not imply the motion of the weapon held or hurled *toward* the man or the body-part wounded so much as the act of inflicting the wound *in* a particular place; hence the body-part noun should not be viewed as an accusative of limit of motion.

There remain to be considered a number of expressions consisting of *κατά* and an accusative noun. These are not at all like the localizing phrases including *ὑπέρ*, *ὑπό*, *παρά*, and *ἐπί*; on the contrary, they may be accompanied by such phrases. But they are apparently *not* normally accompanied by an accusative body-part noun used as the object of the verb,¹¹⁴ and it is to such a noun

¹¹² Other instances of this sort are *Il.* 11.109, 17.309, and 17.617; also, of armor, 12.183. In 13.396–97, 20.486, and 23.875 the adjective *μέσσον* or *μέσσην* (on which cf. note 78) virtually replaces the accusative of the body-part.

¹¹³ Note the rarity of the accusative in "localizing phrases." Both *ὑπέρ* and *ὑπό*, especially the former, take the genitive oftener than the accusative (see notes 82 and 83); and the accusative is not met at all with other prepositions, except with *παρά* (see note 84), which in Homer even when combined with this case frequently lacks any notion of movement (cf. Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* 2.122).

¹¹⁴ They are, however, in two instances accompanied by an accusative noun referring to a piece of armor. The passages are *Il.* 5.98–99 and 17.605–6, both quoted below (cf. notes 118 and 121); they have already been treated above (cf. note 94), in a slightly different connection. In these two passages, it seems as if the simple accusatives denoting the piece of armor which was pierced (*θώρηκος γύαλον* and *θώρηκα* respectively), and the accusatives with *κατά* denoting the part of the body which was also pierced (*κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον* and *κατὰ στήθος παρά μαζόν* respectively), are independently in partitive apposition with the accusative denoting the person wounded. We have a series of three accusative appositives in *Il.* 7.215 = 20.44 (on which see above, note 20) and perhaps in 21.122–23 (on which see below, notes 147 and 228);

that I think they correspond.¹¹⁵ In other words, *κατά* beside an accusative in this usage is regularly an adverbial particle like *ἐν* and *ἐπὶ* beside a dative in the usage noted above (in section 2).¹¹⁶

Thus compare *Il.* 21.406

τῷ βάλε θυῖρον Ἄρηα κατ' αὐχένα

with 7.11–12

Ἔκτωρ δ' Ἥιονῆα βάλλ' ἔγχει ὀξύνοντι
αὐχέν' ὑπὸ στεφάνης ἐυχάλοιο,

11.240

τὸν δ' ἄορι πλῆξ' αὐχένα,

and 16.586–87

καὶ ῥ' ἔβαλε Σθενέλαον Ἰθαιμένεος φίλον υἱὸν
αὐχένα χερμαδίῳ.

Compare *Il.* 5.45–46

τὸν μὲν ἄρ' Ἰδομενεὺς δουρικλυτὸς ἔγχει μακρῷ
νύξ' ἵππων ἐπιβησόμενον κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον,

but in the present instance the two “part” nouns are not in apposition with each other, and so it is natural that one is differentiated from the other by the accompanying *κατά*. A similar instance, but without a person noun at all, is 13.586, on which see note 92. For one example, or possibly two, of the rare prepositional use with a body-part noun, see note 116.

¹¹⁶ We also have precisely the same construction used metaphorically of the mind or heart, in *Il.* 19.125

τὸν δ' ἄχος ὀξὺ κατὰ φρένα τύψε βαθεῖαν.

Note here too the defining adjective used just like those referred to in note 78, and cf. Clapp *ad loc.*

¹¹⁶ This does not mean that *κατά* in combination with an accusative body-part noun is *never* used as a true preposition. It is certainly so employed in *Od.* 17. 462–63

θρήνυν ἐλὼν βάλε δεξιὸν ὦμον/πρυμνότατον κατὰ νῶτον,

where *κατὰ νῶτον* does not denote the body-part wounded but defines the special portion of the body-part that is affected. This is already done by the adjective *πρυμνότατον* (cf. note 78), in its turn further defined by the prepositional phrase, which perhaps we should view as actually modifying the adjective rather than the noun. It will be noted that I am following those who join *πρυμνότατον* with *ὦμον* (cf. e.g. Monro's note and Butcher and Lang's translation) and not those who take it with *νῶτον* (cf. e.g. Ameis' note and Dindorf-Hentze's punctuation). To me conclusive arguments are provided both by the meaning of the adjective and by the parallel passage 17.504

οὗτος δὲ θρήνυι πρυμνὸν βάλε δεξιὸν ὦμον.

I am not certain about the rôle of *κατά* in *Od.* 10.161–62

τὸν δ' ἐγὼ ἐκβαίνοντα κατ' ἄκνηστιν μέσα νῶτα
πλῆξα.

Od. 19.452¹¹⁷

τόν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς οὔτησε τυχῶν κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον,

and *Il.* 5.98–99¹¹⁸

καὶ βάλλ' ἐπαῖσσοντα τυχῶν κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον
θώρηκος γύαλον

with *Il.* 14.450¹¹⁹

βάλε δὲ Προθοήνορα δεξιὸν ὦμον

and 16.467–68

ὁ δὲ Πήδασον οὔτασεν ἵππον/ἔγχει δεξιὸν ὦμον.

Compare *Il.* 5.578–79¹²⁰

τόν μὲν ἄρ' Ἀτρεΐδης δουρικλειτὸς Μενέλαος
έστεῶτ' ἔγχει νύξε κατὰ κληῖδα τυχήσας

with 5.146–47

τόν δ' ἕτερον ξίφει μεγάλην κληῖδα παρ' ὦμον
πλήξ'.

Compare *Il.* 11.108

τόν μὲν ὑπὲρ μαζοῖο κατὰ στῆθος βάλε δουρὺ,

12.204

κόψε γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔχοντα κατὰ στῆθος παρὰ δειρήν,

and 17.605–6¹²¹

Ἔκτορα δ' Ἰδομενεὺς μετὰ Λήιτον ὀρμηθέντα
βεβλήκει θώρηκα κατὰ στῆθος παρὰ μαζόν

It is possible to take μέσα νῶτα as epexegetical to ἄκνηστιν (so Merry and Riddell and, apparently, Butcher and Lang), in which case (κατ') ἄκνηστιν is in partitive apposition to τόν, with κατ' an adverb, just as in *Il.* 5.46 etc. But it is also possible to take μέσα νῶτα as in partitive apposition with τόν (so Perrin), in which case ἄκνηστιν may be in partitive apposition with μέσα νῶτα with κατ' still an adverb, or κατ' ἄκνηστιν may be a prepositional phrase defining the noun νῶτα or even the adjective (as perhaps in *Od.* 17.463) μέσα. In short, 'middle of the back' and 'spine' may be coextensive; or 'spine' may be a part of 'back,' or even (viewing the back as extending from head to tail, not from side to side) 'middle of the back' may be a part of 'spine' (as the order suggests; cf. note 49). In either the second or the third case, we once more have a three-fold series of whole and part nouns, one (either the second or the third) defined by κατ'; cf. notes 20 and 114.

¹¹⁷ I do not think the presence of the participle here, or in the other examples with κατὰ cited below (*Il.* 5.98–99, 578–79, and 12.189), has any effect on the construction. See above, note 93; and below, notes 118, 120, and 124.

¹¹⁸ On the participle τυχῶν, see note 117; on the accusative γύαλον, note 114.

¹¹⁹ Also *Il.* 5.79–80, 188–90; 11.420–21; 16.289; *Od.* 22.279–80.

¹²⁰ On the participle τυχήσας, see note 117.

¹²¹ On the accusative θώρηκα, cf. note 118 and see note 114.

with 4.527–28

τὸν δὲ Θόας Αἰτωλὸς ἀπεσσύμενον βάλε δουρὶ
στέρνον ὑπὲρ μαζοῖο,

8.312–13¹²²

ἀλλ' Ἀρχεπτόλεμον, θρασὺν Ἑκτορος ἡνιοχῆα,
ἰέμενον πολέμονδε βάλε στῆθος παρὰ μαζόν,

and 14.409–12

τὸν μὲν ἔπειτ' ἀπίοντα μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας
χερμαδίῳ . . . /στῆθος βεβλήκειν ὑπὲρ ἄντυγος.

Compare *Il.* 16.465

τὸν βάλε νείαιραν κατὰ γαστέρα

and 17.312–13

Αἴας δ' αὖ Φόρκυνα δαΐφρονα, Φαίνοπος υἱόν,
Ἴπποθόῳ περιβάντα μέσσην κατὰ γαστέρα τύψεν

with 13.506

Ἰδομενεὺς δ' ἄρα Οἰνόμαον βάλε γαστέρα μέσσην

and 21.180

γαστέρα γάρ μιν τύψε παρ' ὀμφαλόν.

Two other examples of the same sort are *Il.* 8.81–83

τὸν βάλεν ἰῶ
δῖος Ἀλέξανδρος, Ἑλένης πόσις ἠυκόμοιο,
ἄκρην κακὴν κορυφήν,

and 14.493

τὸν τόθ' ὑπ' ὀφρύος οὐτα κατ' ὀφθαλμοῖο θέμεθλα.

Finally, we may note two passages in which the accusative of the owner is lacking:¹²³ *Il.* 13.651

καὶ ῥ' ἔβαλε γλουτὸν κάτα δεξιόν

and 20.469

ὁ δὲ φασγάνῳ οὐτα καθ' ἥπαρ.

We also find an accusative with *κατά* designating an article of apparel or of armor. Examples are *Il.* 5.615

τόν ῥα κατὰ ζωστήρα βάλεν Τελαμώνιος Αἴας

¹²² So too *Il.* 4.480–81; 8.119–21; 15.576–77.

¹²³ However, in both instances the person shot at has been indicated in the preceding clause, in the first passage by a genitive and in the second by a nominative. For other examples in which the person shot at is not named, see notes 92 and 103.

and 12.189¹²⁴

Ἰππόμαχον βάλε δουρὶ κατὰ ζωστήρα τυχῆσας.

We may note in addition 11.350–51

*καὶ βάλεν, οὐδ' ἀφάμαρτε, τιτυσκόμενος κεφαλῇφιν,
ἄκρην κὰκ κόρυθα,*

where, as in 13.651, there is no accusative of the person. Here again there is a smaller proportion of armor-nouns than of body-part nouns in partitive apposition with the possessor noun.¹²⁵

We also find two passages in which *πρός* seems to be used as *κατά* in the passages just discussed. In both instances we have *πρός* *στήθος*, which we may compare with *κατά* *στήθος* in 11.108 and 12.204. These passages are *Il.* 15.248–50

*οὐκ αἰεὶς, ὃ με νηυσὶν ἐπὶ πρυμνήσιν Ἀχαιῶν
οὓς ἐτάρους ὀλέκοντα βοὴν ἀγαθὸς βάλεν Αἴας
χερμαδίῳ πρὸς στήθος,*

and 4.105–8

*αὐτίκ' ἐσύλα τόξον ἐύξοον ἰξάλου αἰγὸς
ἀγρίου, ὃν ῥά ποτ' αὐτὸς ὑπὸ στέρνοιο τυχῆσας
πέτρης ἐκβαίνοντα, δεδεγμένος ἐν προδοκῇσιν,
βεβλήκει πρὸς στήθος.*

I have found no other example of *πρός* employed in connection with a verb of wounding, whether as an adverb with an accusative used as the object of the verb, or as a preposition in a localizing phrase combined either with such an accusative or, in its absence, with the verb. In the second passage quoted there *is* present a localizing phrase, here with the preposition *ὑπό* common enough in such expressions;¹²⁶ but the noun used with the preposition, denoting as it does a considerable expanse of the body, is one that we meet elsewhere only as the object (delimiting the person wounded) and never in a localizing phrase (delimiting the body-part wounded). A further difficulty is that this noun is practically synonymous

¹²⁴ On the participle *τυχῆσας*, see note 117.

¹²⁵ Here too (cf. note 97) we find the genitive used instead of the accusative to denote the possessor. Examples are *Il.* 3.347

καὶ βάλεν Ἀτρεΐδαι κατ' ἀσπίδα,

and the absolutely parallel passages (with different proper nouns) 3.356 and 5.281.

¹²⁶ Cf. note 83.

with the accusative noun,¹²⁷ and therefore does not delimit it. Because of this, and also because of the word order, I believe that here the *ὑπό* phrase must be separated from the *πρός* phrase, the former being combined with the participle *τυχήσας* and the latter with the verb *βεβλήκει*.¹²⁸

b. Miscellaneous Verbs

I have devoted a considerable amount of time and space to the discussion of accusatives in partitive apposition (as well as related details) in connection with verbs of striking and wounding, because the usage with these verbs seems best to illustrate the fundamentals and, I believe, the genesis of this form of expression. But the construction is by no means confined to passages including these verbs. On the contrary, in combination with any transitive verb of appropriate meaning an accusative denoting the person affected may have added to it in partitive apposition an accusative denoting the body-part affected.¹²⁹ Some examples follow:¹³⁰ *Il.* 23.782¹³¹

ἦ μ' ἔβλαψε θεὰ πόδας,

¹²⁷ Probably the connotations of the two nouns are slightly different: *στέρνον* is used in Homer of men only and in a strictly physical sense only, whereas *σῆθος* is used also of women, and often of the seat of the emotions (not only of human beings, but even of wolves in *Il.* 16.163), so that the two seem to correspond to each other roughly as do *chest* and *breast* in English. But so far as the region of the body denoted goes, I can see no difference between the two. The phrase *παρὰ μασθόν*, which is repeatedly used to define the *σῆθος* (*Il.* 4.480; 8.121, 313; 15.577), as also once the adjective *μεταμάστιον* (5.19), does not seem to be used of the *στέρνον*, whereas *ὑπὲρ μαστοῦ* is used of both (4.528; 11.108); but I doubt whether there is any significance in this. In particular as applied to animals (despite 16.163, noted above), we should expect little distinction: cf. e.g. 23.508 and 11.282, of the region covered by the sweat or foam of horses.

¹²⁸ Thus, as already remarked in note 93, this passage differs from the others there discussed.

¹²⁹ An alternative for the accusative of the person is the dative of reference (on which see also note 105), as in *Il.* 4.104

τῷ δὲ φρένας ἄφρονι πείθειν

and 7.271

βλάψε δὲ οἱ φίλα γούναθ'.

The corresponding passive construction is seen in *Il.* 12.428

ὄτεφ στρεφθέντι μετάφρενα γυμνωθείη

and 16.348-49

ἐνέπλησθεν δὲ οἱ ἄμφω/αἵματος ὀφθαλμοί

(with which compare 1.104, quoted in the last paragraph of section A above).

¹³⁰ It is not intended that this list shall be exhaustive. To avoid repetition, examples treated elsewhere in this paper, for one reason or another, are not quoted here.

¹³¹ I assume that the pronoun here is in the accusative, as in *Od.* 14.178 (quoted

21.268-69

τοσσάκι μιν μέγα κύμα διιπετέος ποταμοῖο
πλάζ' ὤμους καθύπερθεν,

Od. 11.578

γύπε δέ μιν ἐκάτερθε παρημένω ἦπαρ ἔκειρον,

Il. 3.35

ὦχρός τέ μιν εἶλε παρειάς,

4.526 (et al.)

τὸν δέ σκότος ὅσσε κάλυψεν,

16.502-3

ὥς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυψεν
ὀφθαλμοὺς ῥῖνās θ',

11.249-50

κρατερόν ῥά ἐ πένθος
ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκάλυψε κασιγνήτοιο πεσόντος,

Od. 16.15-16

κύσσε δέ μιν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλὰ
χεῖράς τ' ἀμφοτέρας,

1.64

ποιῶν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων,

Il. 24.58¹³²

"Ἐκτωρ μὲν θνητός τε γυναῖκά τε θήσατο μαζόν.

Naturally, words denoting the mind or soul follow the construction of words denoting the body. Words meaning 'heart' or 'breast,' since they fall into both categories, furnish a natural transition from one to the other. Many of the passages containing such words form more or less close parallels with those referring to physical parts of the body,¹³³ either (1) corresponding in general meaning, as in the first two examples cited below, or (2) even using

in the next paragraph). However, it might be dative, as in *Il.* 7.271 (quoted in note 129). Quite different is *Il.* 23.571

βλάβας δέ μοι ἵππους,

where there is no apposition, and only the dative is possible.

¹³² Paley has what seems to me a very strange note on this passage. He says that the first accusative "does not agree" with the second, but is the direct object of the verb. I think that the two accusatives, being in partitive apposition, do agree with each other, and *both* are direct objects of the verb. See further on this below, note 141.

¹³³ Cf. note 115 on *Il.* 19.125.

the same verbs, as in the next two examples. Thus (1) with *Od.* 11.578 compare *Il.* 3.438

μή με, γύναι, χαλεποῖσιν ὀνείδεσι θυμὸν ἐνίπτε,

and with *Il.* 3.35 compare *Od.* 18.331 = 391

ἦ ῥά σε οἶνος ἔχει φρένας.

And (2) with *Il.* 23.782 compare *Od.* 14.178

τὸν δέ τις ἀθανάτων βλάβε φρένας ἔνδον εἰσας,

and with *Il.* 4.526 and 11.249–50 compare 3.442

οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ' ὦδ' ἔρωσ φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν

and 14.294

ὥς μιν ἔρος πυκινὰς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν.

The construction is particularly common with expressions of grief, as in *Il.* 17.564¹³⁴

μᾶλα γάρ με θανῶν ἐσεμάσσατο θυμόν,

which, if the Scholiast quoted by Paley *ad loc.* is right in explaining the verb as used in the sense of ἐπληξε, is a parallel for passages with verbs of striking plus a body-part.¹³⁵ Suffering may be described as affecting a physical organ, as in *Il.* 11.249–50, but much more often, naturally, as affecting the heart, the mind, the spirit. Thus sorrow may be said to cover, to encompass its victim — himself (and) his heart — as in 8.124 and 17.83,¹³⁶ or not to leave him free, as in 15.24–25¹³⁷

ἐμέ δ' οὐδ' ὥς θυμὸν ἀνίει
ἀζηχῆς ὁδύνῃ Ἑρακλῆος θείου,

¹³⁴ Contrast *Il.* 20.425, where we have 'pierced my heart' as an alternative for 'pierced me, the heart.'

¹³⁵ However, Paley himself offers a different explanation on *Il.* 20.425.

¹³⁶ Quoted below, note 202, in another connection.

¹³⁷ Paley's treatment of this passage seems to me surprisingly confused. He envisages *θυμὸν* as susceptible of two different interpretations, to judge by his English paraphrase: "'not even so did the enduring grief for divine Hercules give me rest in my mind' (or anger)." Apparently on the assumption that the meaning *is* 'anger' and nothing else, he also offers a Greek paraphrase: *ἐπανσέ με θυμοῦ*. This does not jibe with his English version at all, for if this really is the sense, the English rendering would have to be 'did not give me rest *from* my anger,' and we would have an example of the separation type of pairs of accusatives treated especially below (see note 145).

or to surround him, as in 6.355

ἐπεί σε μάλιστα πόνος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκεν.

In this last example the accusative may be ascribed to the presence of *ἀμφί*, but we also have the accusative with simple verbs of motion,¹³⁸ as in 1.362

τί δέ σε φρένας ἵκετο πένθος ;

2.171

ἐπεί μιν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμόν ἵκανε,

11.88

ἄδος τέ μιν ἵκετο θυμόν,

and 23.46–47

ἐπεὶ οὐ μ' ἐτι δεύτερον ὦδε/ἕξετ' ἄχος κραδίην.

Probably these accusatives should be classed as accusatives of limit of motion¹³⁹ rather than as direct objects, though in the very similar passage *Od.* 20.286¹⁴⁰

δύη ἄχος κραδίην Λαερτιάδην Ὀδυσῆα

the accusatives are rather to be viewed as direct objects, since we also talk of 'entering' (i.e. putting on) clothes, etc. At all events, no matter how we characterize the accusatives, there is no doubt that in all these passages we have partitive apposition.

c. Verbs of Stripping or Depriving

A particular type of partitive apposition is perhaps involved in a group of passages that therefore need to be considered separately. We will start with the following examples: *Il.* 1.236–37

περὶ γάρ ῥά ἐ χαλκὸς ἔλεψεν/φύλλα τε καὶ φλοιὸν

In that case, however, a genitive might rather have been expected, as in his own paraphrase, or in the more logically expressed passage, *Il.* 17.539

κῆρ ἄχεος μεθέκα.

But there it is the *person* who gave his own heart or spirit relief, and it seems obvious and otiose to say that the *grief* could not give Zeus rest either 'in his anger' or 'from his anger'; the grief was itself the cause of his anger. Surely the meaning 'mind' or 'spirit' is far preferable for *θυμόν*.

¹³⁸ As is well known, such accusatives are particularly common in Homer. Cf. Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* 2.45–46.

¹³⁹ These are the instances referred to above in note 108.

¹⁴⁰ With this we may contrast *Od.* 18.348

δύη ἄχος κραδίην Λαερτιάδew Ὀδυσῆος,

where the person affected is represented by a possessive genitive instead of by an accusative. Cf. notes 48, 97, and 125.

and 21.37–38¹⁴¹

ὁ δ' ἐρινεὸν ὀξεί χαλκῶ/τάμνε νέους ὀρηκας.

These may be explained as meaning 'he peeled or stripped it (the shoot or branch forming the scepter), (its) leaves and bark' and 'he cut the fig-tree, (its) young shoots'; but at the same time they imply stripping the leaves and bark away from the branch, and cutting the shoots off the fig-tree.¹⁴² With these we may compare instances involving verbs of washing or cleansing¹⁴³ if we assume, as I think we may, that the foreign substance which needs to be removed, such as blood or brine, has temporarily become a part of the person to whose body it adheres.¹⁴⁴ Examples are 16.667–68

κελαινεφές αἷμα κάθηρον/ἐλθὼν ἐκ βελέων Σαρπηδόνα

and 18.345¹⁴⁵

Πάτροκλον λούσειαν ἄπο βρότον αἱματόεντα,

which I think mean 'clean up Sarpedon, the blood' and 'they might wash off Patroclus, the bloody gore.' With these we may compare a passage involving a verb with the not dissimilar meaning of 'licking (off),' namely, 21.122–23

ἐνταυθοῖ νῦν κείσο μετ' ἰχθύσιν, οἳ σ' ὠτειλήν
αἷμ' ἀπολιχμήσονται ἀκηδέες.

¹⁴¹ Paley compares *Il.* 24.58

Ἔκτωρ μὲν θνητός τε γυναῖκά τε θήσατο μαζόν,

but in this I cannot at all follow him or the scholiast whom he quotes in a note on each of the passages concerned; see note 132 above, on 24.58. In the latter passage there is of course no question of removing the part noun, the breast, from the whole noun, the woman! It would have been quite different had one or the other of these nouns been replaced by one designating the substance actually removed, the milk; for the combination of such a noun with the same verb, though in a slightly different construction, cf. *Od.* 4.89

ἀλλ' αἰεὶ παρέχουσιν ἐπηετανὸν γάλα θῆσθαι.

¹⁴² These operations may be compared to tearing off skin, flaying. See below, note 234.

¹⁴³ Constructions with these verbs will be discussed more fully below (section II.B) in a different connection. Cf. note 224.

¹⁴⁴ Thus Ameis on *Od.* 6.224 says that the brine "als feste Kruste für einen Körperteil angesehen wird," and compares three passages involving blood, all of which I shall cite immediately, *Il.* 16.667, 18.345, and 21.122–23.

¹⁴⁵ Here again (cf. note 141) Paley cites as a parallel a passage which seems to me quite different: namely, *Il.* 15.24. This passage, unlike 24.58, can be interpreted as involving a separation from the person accusative ('me') of the 'part' accusative (if taken as a quality, 'anger,' not as a body-part, 'mind'); but I have given my reasons above (note 137) for doubting this.

Here the pronoun, representing the person,¹⁴⁶ and the word for 'wound,' corresponding closely to a body-part noun, are unquestionably in partitive apposition with each other; and the word for 'blood,' if my way of analyzing passages of the sort is correct, is an additional member in partitive apposition with one or the other of them.¹⁴⁷

All the above passages and kindred ones are usually classed by the commentators¹⁴⁸ as exemplifying the double accusative with verbs of depriving, but to me they seem quite different, as we shall see if we examine instances of the latter category, such as *Il.* 1.182

ὥς ἔμ' ἀφαιρείται Χρυσήϊδα Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων

and *Od.* 1.403-4

ὅς τις σ' ἀέκοντα βίηφιν/κτῆματ' ἀπορραΐσει.

Passages such as these differ from the earlier group in two distinct ways. (1) The person who is deprived of some one or something and the person or thing of which he is deprived, have always been completely separate entities, with no internal connection between them; the separation does not involve the removal of a substance which until such separation has physically adhered to the person. (2) The grammatical construction of the two sets of pairs of accusatives is quite different; the two pronouns representing the persons who suffer deprivation really depend on the verb of depriving *plus* the person or thing which they lose,¹⁴⁹ for the sense would not be complete without the second accusative.¹⁵⁰ On the other hand in the examples which I think involve partitive apposition, the "whole" noun and the "part" noun are as usual in parallel relation with the

¹⁴⁶ I think that we may safely here as elsewhere (cf. note 90), on the basis of parallel passages, assume that the pronoun is an accusative, though Chantraine (*Gr. Hom.* 2.43, note 1) envisages as possible the alternative explanation that it is a dative.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. the triple series already referred to, *Il.* 7.215 = 20.44 (see note 20). The present passage is discussed further below, section II.B; see especially note 228.

¹⁴⁸ E.g. Seymour on *Il.* 1.236-37; Benner on 16.667 and 18.345; Clapp on 21.37-38, 21.122-23, and 23.40-41; Merry and Riddell on *Od.* 6.224. So too Chantraine in his *Homeric grammar* (2.43). Monro in his (134) lists verbs of taking away and verbs of cleansing as separate categories which alike govern double accusatives; see further note 151.

¹⁴⁹ So too in expressions of doing good or evil to some one, the substantive denoting the person so treated is really the object of the verb of doing *plus* the neuter adverbial accusative. On this see below, note 158.

¹⁵⁰ Note that rather similarly in English, I felt that I could not write simply "the person who is deprived"; I had to add "of some one or something."

verb, and either can be used alone: thus we can talk simply about washing off a person (as in *Od.* 19.317) or about washing off blood (as in *Od.* 24.189). It is true that when we combine the two objects in a single sentence (as in *Il.* 18.345 cited above), we do not deal with them in the same way in translation: we say 'wash blood off a person.'¹⁵¹ But we should not be misled by a mere diversity in idiom on the part of two different languages.¹⁵²

II. THE GREEK ACCUSATIVE

Our study of instances of appositional members consisting of substantives denoting respectively a person and a part of his body (including both physical and non-physical parts), has shown that these are apparently non-existent in the nominative; that in the genitive and the dative their existence, while probable, is not provable, since an alternative explanation is always possible; but that in the accusative they are numerous, conspicuous, and indubitable. It is not strange then that this type of construction left a permanent effect on the language¹⁵³ in the generation of another construction which, as partitive apposition grew rarer, itself became more common. This is of course the type of accusative which is so particularly a feature of Greek that it well deserves its name of "accusativus graecus."¹⁵⁴

As I have already indicated, I hold that the Greek accusative or accusative of specification developed from the body-part accusative in partitive apposition. This is the view upheld by Brugmann and to some extent even earlier by Delbrück, but the theory as they enunciated it certainly had one serious weakness, and met with

¹⁵¹ Cf. Monro, *Hom. Gr.* 134: "In such cases the Verb almost seems to be used in different senses — *cleanse* Sarpedon, *cleanse away* the blood, etc."

¹⁵² Even in English, we do not always make a distinction. Thus in translating *Il.* 3.273

ἄρνων ἐκ κεφαλῶν τάμνε τρίχας,

we can say either 'cut the hair from the lambs' heads' or 'cut off the hair from the lambs' heads.'

¹⁵³ What does seem to me strange, however, is that the prominence of partitive apposition in the accusative has in the thinking of many scholars (including among others Brugmann, Delbrück, and Schwyzer-Debrunner) obscured or even obliterated the fact that the phenomenon exists in other cases as well, and they have treated it as fundamentally a feature of one particular case. See *TAPA* 84.95-96.

¹⁵⁴ Humbert, without trying to account for the origin of the construction, attributes its "grande extension" in Greek to this language's verbal system, especially its "richesse en participes" (*Synt. gr.* 250-51).

considerable opposition; and in espousing it anew I intend to offer some reasons for my support that I think have not been presented before. But first it is in order to give a brief outline of the various opinions that have been expressed by scholars on this vexed subject.

A. Various Views on the Genesis of the Construction

1. Brugmann and Delbrück

Delbrück in *Grund. 3 = Vergleichende Syntax 1* (1893) definitely connected the accusative in partitive apposition and the accusative of specification. He starts with a reference to partitive apposition in the passive (385): "Wird die Konstruktion *passivisch*, so wird der Akk. des Ganzen zum Nominativ, während der des Theiles bleibt"; but he does not explain why this happens. He then goes on (385-86): "Dieser Akk. ist nun von dem Akk. der Beziehung nicht mehr zu unterscheiden." He does not, however, view this accusative as the exclusive progenitor of the accusative of specification, for he traces the latter back to the use in the accusative of *ὄνομα*,¹⁵⁵ with which he believes *γένος* and *γενεήν* would naturally become attached (389-90), and also the accusative with certain adjectives (390-91). He then continues (391): "Die bis hierher dargestellten Masse bekam nun Zuwachs von dem Akk. des Ganzen und des Theiles her, sobald durch die Umwandlung der Konstruktion in die *passivische* der Akk. des Ganzen verschwand."

Brugmann in his important article on the accusative of specification, *IF* 27.121-51 (1910), agrees with Delbrück that the body-part accusative with the passive of a "whole and part" expression cannot be separated from an accusative of specification (130), and he goes further than Delbrück did in the importance that he attaches, in the evolution of the latter construction, to the influence of the former, which he rightly believes¹⁵⁶ "macht den Eindruck hoher Alttertümlichkeit" (129). Instead of starting with the accusative with adjectives as Delbrück did, he views this as developed from the accusative with a passive participle (134): *nudatus pedem* became *nudus pedem*.¹⁵⁷ But he does not give a satisfactory expla-

¹⁵⁵ There is no doubt that the use of the word for 'name' as an accusative of specification really is inherited. To this I shall return in the Conclusion, section B.2, notes 298-302.

¹⁵⁶ This judgment has been amply confirmed by the great commonness of the construction in Hittite.

¹⁵⁷ See the quotation of the whole passage given above, note 4; and cf. *Grund.* 2.2.639-40. However, he (or his reviser Thumb) seems to reverse the development in *Gr. Gr.* 438, where a view more like Delbrück's is expressed.

nation any more than Delbrück did for the case of *pedem* with *nudatus*. The fact that the accusative with an active verb should remain accusative with a passive verb is the crux of the whole matter;¹⁵⁸ yet Brugmann dismisses the difficulty in the following cavalier manner (136): "Die Umwandlung des Nominativs in den Akkusativ war somit nichts anderes als die Überführung des Nomens von der Herrscherposition im Satz zur Position des Beherrschten." I cannot follow him here at all.

As for the obviously inherited use of the accusative *ὄνομα*, he separates this from the common Greek accusative of specification more sharply than does Delbrück by giving a new explanation for its origin (143-46). He traces it back to the predicate nominative in an independent, parenthetical "nominal sentence," "N (ist) der Name" (144); of course the fact that Sanskrit *nāma* and Greek *ὄνομα* are both neuter facilitated the shift from predicate nominative to accusative of specification. With *ὄνομα* he groups *γένος*, also

¹⁵⁸ It is because of this difficulty that Monro, *Hom. Gr.* 135 (1891), and Hirt, *IG* 6.94 (1934), though they both recognize the scheme of whole and part, refuse to believe that there is any internal connection between the accusative of the whole and the accusative of the part; both view the latter as entirely and independently belonging to the verb. Monro classes the two accusatives here with the two accusatives in *Il.* 9.540

ὅς κατὰ πόλλ' ἔρδεσκεν ἔθων Οἰνῆος ἀλῶν,

but the difference in my opinion is very great. In the first place, in instances of this sort, as with verbs of teaching, the two accusatives are of quite different kinds — an outer and an inner object. In the second place, as I have already remarked concerning verbs of depriving (cf. note 149) and as Monro says himself (134), in the construction seen in 9.540 the object denoting the person (in the passage quoted rather a place) is really construed with the phrase formed by the verb plus the other accusative; it could not be used alone with the verb. This, though Monro does not say so, explains why in the passive the person-noun alone goes into the nominative and the other accusative remains. Monro declares that we cannot separate *τὸν βάλε κνήμην* from *βλήτο κνήμην*, and that if we change *Il.* 7.215

Τρῶας δὲ τρώμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἕκαστον

to *Τρῶες ἔτρεμον τὰ γυῖα ἕκαστος*, the apposition between *Τρῶες* and *ἕκαστος* remains but *γυῖα* "is an Acc. qualifying the Verb." However, he still does not explain what kind of accusative *κνήμην* and *γυῖα* are; an accusative modifying a verb ought to be fitted into some category. Are they examples of the accusative of specification? Elsewhere (132) he lists the latter, calling it accusative "of the part affected" or "of reference"; but what he does not say is whether in the active *τὸν βάλε κνήμην* he classes *κνήμην* as an object of the verb or as an adverbial modifier. And if the latter, what does he do with it in *βάλε κνήμην*, without a personal object? (For examples of this construction, see above, note 103.) As for Hirt, he offers *ἀποτμηθέντες τὰς κεφαλὰς* as an example of the "scheme of whole and part" in the passive (94), but *κῆρ βεβολημένος* as an example of the accusative of specification (83), for which he has a completely different explanation (discussed below in section 5), and does not seem to realize that the relationship between the two at least merits some notice.

γενεήν (146–47), and neuter nouns of dimension, as *μήκος* etc. (147–48).

Naturally, Brugmann says much the same thing again in his later discussions of the problem: *Grund.* 2.2.633, 639–42 (1911); and *Gr. Gr.* 436, 437–38 (1913). In neither place does he make any attempt to account for the retention of the accusative in the passive.

Brugmann's view is accepted by Schwyzer-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* 2.81 and 84 (1950), at least so far as the post-Homeric use (Attic etc.) of the accusative of specification goes.

2. Kieckers

Kieckers in a short paper, *IF* 30.361–66 (1912), discussed the views of Delbrück and Brugmann in regard to *ὄνομα*, and also offered an explanation of his own.¹⁵⁹ Starting with the predicate accusative used with verbs of naming, as in *Il.* 6.402

τόν ῥ' Ἐκτωρ καλέσκει Σκαμάνδριον,

he points out (362) that an accusative of "Inhalt" may also appear in this construction in both Avestan and Greek, as in *Il.* 18.487

ἄρκτον θ', ἣν καὶ ἄμαξαν ἐπὶ κλησιν καλέουσιν,

and he believes that Greek, going further than Avestan, later extended this accusative of "Beziehung" to verbs also (363). He agrees with Delbrück that 'name' as an accusative of specification would have induced the similar use of 'race' (363).

Kieckers' theory has the advantage of justifying the usage with the feminine *ἐπὶ κλησιν* as well as with the neuter *ὄνομα*,¹⁶⁰ but the step from an accusative of "Inhalt" with a verb of naming to an accusative of "Beziehung" elsewhere seems to me rather difficult, especially as the original construction is a fairly restricted one. How would Greek have said 'it is called a wain by name'? This needs further elucidation as much as the shift in case of the body-part noun with a passive.

¹⁵⁹ The article should not be ignored, but I think it is without great importance for the problem of the Greek accusative of specification in general, since I agree with Delbrück and Brugmann that the widespread development of the construction was independent of the restricted use of *ὄνομα* and *ἐπὶ κλησιν*.

¹⁶⁰ This, however, is not a very great advantage, for the ambiguous *ὄνομα* (which may well have been common in speech) could have induced *ἐπὶ κλησιν* just as *γένος* did *γενεήν*. Blümel, however, separates *ὄνομα* and *ἐπὶ κλησιν*, believing that the latter was probably an adverb at a very early period (*IF* 33.21).

As for Brugmann's new theory about *ὄνομα*, Kieckers pronounces it as on the whole "durchaus möglich" (365), but he asks (*ib.*) why if it is correct only *nāma* developed into an accusative of specification in Sanskrit, since other short nominal sentences of the same type as 'N (is) the name' were certainly possible.

3. Blümel and Sommer

One of the principal opponents of Brugmann and Delbrück is Blümel, author of an important article on the accusative of specification, *IF* 33.1-96 (1913-14); and one of his principal reasons for opposing them rests on precisely the defect in their arguments that I have already pointed out. He states his objections at the outset (1): "Delbrücks und noch mehr Brugmanns Ableitung des Bereichsakkusativs aus dem Akkusativ des 'Teilobjekts' beruht ja im letzten Grunde auf der Anschauung, dass dieser Akkusativ des Teilobjekts im Passiv stehen bleibe." He does not believe that it is possible to derive the accusative of specification from the accusative of whole and part (29). One reason for his skepticism is the prior position of the accusative of specification in such phrases as *πῶδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς* (*Il.* 1.58 et al.) as opposed to the position of the whole before the part. However, by the time this order became stereotyped, apposition of whole and part had disappeared. A second reason is the use of the accusative of specification with intransitive verbs and adjectives as opposed to the transitive verbs to which the whole and part nouns are confined (29); such extensions he says can take place only through analogy (30). But that seems to me a completely adequate explanation: analogy is a tremendously powerful force, and changes under its compulsion are as common in syntax as in phonology or morphology. He also denies that the "part" noun with a passive could be accusative in any Indo-European language, and he specially cites the use of the nominative in Modern German (33). But every language may develop its own idiom; for instance, we have already noted that the "Greek accusative" is indeed peculiarly and almost exclusively Greek; and surely there are some features of every language-group which cannot be paralleled in any other language-group.¹⁶¹ To deny this would be to deny the existence of innovation. In Blümel's opinion then the body-part accusative with a passive verb can be *only* an

¹⁶¹ So too Sommer (*IF* 46.28) declares in rebuttal that the Greeks were not forced to do what the Germans do.

accusative of specification (35), and with an active verb in combination with a person accusative it must be *either* an accusative in partitive apposition *or* an accusative of specification, "keine Übergangsstufe" (*ib.*). The decision as to which we have must, he maintains, always be made though he admits it may sometimes be hard and we may sometimes judge falsely, "aber dann sind wir 'farbenblind.'" Who then is to judge? I ask. Surely the native users of a language are even more "farbenblind" than we who study it; does he believe the Greeks analyzed or could analyze every one of their accusative constructions? It is precisely because of the impossibility of ruling hard and fast lines in this way¹⁶² that I have already refused to discriminate between "object of the middle voice" and "accusative of specification."

After discussing other explanations of the construction, Blümel offers his own, which is as follows (83): "Der griechische Bereichsakkusativ entwickelte sich zu einer Zeit, da die Präpositionen als solche noch nicht vorhanden waren, aus verschiedenen örtlichen Akkusativen." These accusatives he enumerates as follows (84): I. Akkusativ des bestrichenen Raumes, Akkusativ der Richtung, Akkusativ der Entfernung; II. Zielakkusativ neben Verben des Treffens und Verwundens. I think this derivation has two weaknesses. (1) The accusative of specification does not seem to me to denote motion or extent as he assumes;¹⁶³ and in particular I have tried to show that the accusative with verbs of hitting and wounding has no notion of goal or place to which.¹⁶⁴ (2) If we could get back to that very early period when prepositions as such were not yet in existence, I think we would find that the case expressing goal is not the accusative but the dative (and indeed in Hittite we have reached that period, and we do find that this is so). It may be objected that *my* two objections cancel each other out: the accusative of specification does not express place to which, and neither did the original accusative! But even granted that, Blümel's argument is annihilated along with my objection to it.

Blümel later added three other articles, *IF* 34.285-95 (1914-15), 44.249-63 (1927), and 53.104-8 (1935), in which he commented

¹⁶² Compare again Sommer (*IF* 46.29): "Blümel's kategorisches 'entweder—oder' . . . vermag ich nicht mitzumachen." One type, he adds, might have influenced the other.

¹⁶³ He himself admits (53) that some examples are "weniger örtlich."

¹⁶⁴ Cf. above, note 108.

on the views of other scholars, supplemented his original article by additional examples both from Greek and from other languages, and to a considerable extent reiterated his original dicta. To a criticism of Sommer in *IF* 44.249, Sommer himself responded with an article in *IF* 46.27-43 (1928), in which, while he took issue with Blümel in regard to certain details,¹⁶⁵ he none the less expressed agreement with Blümel that the accusative body-part noun with a passive verb is derived from a "Richtungsakkusativ" (31), and praised Blümel's work as not only constituting the best treatment of the problem but as in the main correct (33).

In Blümel's final article he gives figures (53.107) to show that the accusative of specification is overwhelmingly more common than the "scheme of whole and part." I do not agree with his figures: many of his examples I would class as accusatives in partitive apposition rather than as accusatives of specification,¹⁶⁶ and many others, disregarding his stern rule of "entweder . . . oder," I would unblushingly class as ambiguous. But even granted that there may be, and doubtless are, more accusatives of specification than instances of the "schema," what does that signify? Partitive apposition was an old inherited construction that was going out; the accusative of specification was a new native construction that was coming into existence. At any given stage of the language, one might expect to find variations in the relative frequency of the two, with the innovation constantly gaining on, and finally utterly displacing, the archaism. At a period sufficiently far removed, as the Homeric Age was, from the time when partitive apposition was extremely common, a preponderance of examples of the accusative of specification as compared with partitive apposition, far from proving that the new usage could not be derived from the old one, might well be accepted as proving exactly the reverse.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁵ Cf. notes 161 and 162.

¹⁶⁶ Note that instances of accusatives with the passive voice, for which he categorically rules out the possibility of their being derived from partitive apposition, are exceedingly few, and even he must admit — in fact has admitted (35; cf. above, 244) — that many of the examples in the active voice are hard to classify.

¹⁶⁷ Blümel also says (108) that were Brugmann right, we would have to find many more instances of the "schema" in Homer than we do, and many more in the *Iliad* than in the *Odyssey*. I have already indicated that I do recognize many more instances in Homer than Blümel does, and I may add that many more of these are met in the *Iliad* than in the *Odyssey*, as my examples given above have clearly shown.

4. Havers

Between Blümel's second and third articles there appeared one by Havers, *Glotta* 13.171-89 (1924), which Blümel characterized as displaying a "beachtenswerten Gesichtspunkt" (*IF* 44.249), although a little later (256-58) he takes issue with it. Havers sets out to prove that in neuter nouns as well as pronouns there is exhibited "eine syntaktische Sonderstellung," namely, a general tendency to use the nominative-accusative as an "allgemeiner Casus obliquus" (173; so too 180).¹⁶⁸ For instance, a neuter noun often appears in the accusative absolute beside a masculine or feminine noun in the genitive absolute in Greek, or ablative absolute in Latin (186). This he believes is a remnant from old times when neuters, which he thinks acquired inflection later than masculines and feminines, were still indeclinable (187); and the accusative, being the case most closely associated with lifeless objects, became the case of the neuter par excellence (189). Since a great number of neuters were used to express specification, such as *ὄνομα*, *γένος*, words of size and shape, etc., like *μέγεθος*, *εἶδος*, *δέμας*, etc., the accusative employed in these instances tended to drive out the instrumental (i.e. dative) of specification (178-79).¹⁶⁹

There certainly are a number of neuters used as accusatives of specification, which may well have been something of a contributing factor in the shift of the body-part noun with the passive from accusative to nominative;¹⁷⁰ but whether it could actually have induced a widespread specialized use of the accusative which seems to have originated at a time when neuters really did have a complete

¹⁶⁸ While the absence of a parallel development in Latin would of course not nullify Havers' arguments (cf. above, note 161), still its presence would certainly reinforce them, and this he posits, pointing out that many body-part nouns in Latin are neuter (179). He believes that the use of a neuter as a general oblique case, such as *id genus* instead of *eius generis*, eventually passed from popular speech into literature (180). However, this is not the stuff out of which the Vergilian accusative of specification is made; and the fact that such accusatives are not met in Plautus and Terence (as he himself admits, 180, note 1), and that the accusative of specification did not appear at all in poetry until the Hellenizing Golden Age, would seem to me to support the usual view that the latter is a Grecism. Concerning the literary examples I agree with Blümel (*IF* 44.259-60): "Die lateinischen Beispiele machen im Gegensatz zu den echt volkstümlichen griechischen einen fremdartigen, gelehrten Eindruck . . . es handelt sich um künstliche Gebilde, nicht um einen Sprachgebrauch."

¹⁶⁹ Contrast the strange view once promulgated by Meillet, cited below, note 180, that the accusative of specification actually was in origin an instrumental.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. below, Conclusion, section B.2.

inflection I am inclined to doubt. There are plenty of masculines and feminines used in this construction,¹⁷¹ and I have seen no tendency to employ it with them less than with neuters.

5. Neckel, Hirt, and Biese

Hirt in his *Indogermanische Grammatik* goes much farther than Havers — and probably farther than any one else! — in his views on a “general” case or “casus indefinitus”; he does not confine himself as does Havers to a mere general *oblique* case in *neuter* nouns. According to him nominative and accusative alike consisted originally of a mere stem-form,¹⁷² the *-s* of the nominative and the *-m* of the accusative being alike late developments; see especially *IG* 3.39–40 (1927) on the nominative, and 44 on the accusative. The original identity of nominative and accusative being thus established at least to his satisfaction, he can interchange them at will in his explanations even for syntactic phenomena that apparently arose at a period long after the identity which he assumes as their original state had certainly ceased to exist. This is the sort of behavior that makes Hirt at once so tantalizing and so fascinating.

Thus the origin in a nominal sentence which Brugmann was enabled, by the fact that the common word for ‘name’ is neuter, to posit for ‘name’ as an accusative of specification, Hirt freely employs to an almost unlimited extent. He sees a nominal sentence in the type of compound usually named after one of its examples, called *bahuvrihi* ‘much rice’ (i.e. ‘possessing much rice’) by the Hindu grammarians, and *Dickkopf* by Hirt (4.38).¹⁷³ Thus *ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως* meant originally, according to Hirt, *IG* 4.39 (1928) ‘Eos, Rose ihr Finger’; presumably the second element of *ῥοδοδάκτυλος* has an ending which the first has not because it acquired it when the independent sentence became a compound adjective attached to a noun. With *ῥοδοδάκτυλος* he compares *ὠκύπους* and *ὠκυπόδης* (*ib.*); the former seems difficult to me, because, though the noun form *δάκτυλος*

¹⁷¹ Cf. Blümel, *IF* 44.256.

¹⁷² Also the genitive; see especially *IG* 6.99 and 117. But that does not concern us here.

¹⁷³ These constitute one type, the possessive compounds, of the general category called secondary adjective compounds in Whitney’s classification (see his *Skt. Gr.* 481 and 501–2). The type is probably, as Hirt says (4.38), very old, and it is particularly common for proper names in popular tales — as our own Goldie Locks, Red Riding Hood, etc. Originally an adjective, it is still so used in our “barefoot boy,” possibly in Goody Two-Shoes, since she is never, apparently, called just Two-Shoes.

may look like an adjective, the noun form *πούς* certainly does not, and I think here Hirt should explain why the subject of his original sentence acquired a regular noun ending and the predicate adjective did not. But when Hirt goes still farther, and attributes *πόδας ὠκύς* 'Ἀχιλλεύς to the same origin, I simply cannot follow him at all! This presupposes not only that the predicate adjective of his nominal sentence has been taken away from the subject and made to agree with 'Achilles,' but also that the original subject has been transferred from a nominative to an accusative; he does not explain how this happened, and I do not think he can. He gives the same explanation — which I do not think explains — in *IG* 7.22 (1937); but in 6 (1934) he goes slightly more into detail. First he says (6.83): "Ausser *ὠκύ-πους* 'schnell der Fuss,' konnte man auch sagen *ὠκύ-ποδα* und später *ὠκύς πόδας*, d. h. es wechselte die Akk.-Form mit dem Nominativ." But this seems to me a begging of the question, for he fails to point out that the variation between *ὠκύπους* and *ὠκύποδα* is not a haphazard one involving a change of case on the part of the subject of a nominal sentence, but was determined by the case of the noun modified, i.e. took place after the nominal sentence had become an adjective. Nor would this change, induced by agreement with an accusative noun, account for the case in *ὠκύς πόδας* of *πόδας*, which is always accusative no matter what the case of the noun modified (here it would be *ὠκύς* that would change). Then a little later, in 6.89, he gives a somewhat different explanation, declaring that before there was a genitive a noun modifying another noun stood in the "Kasus indefinitus," i.e. the accusative. I believe that before there was a genitive a noun modifying another noun stood in the same case as the noun modified,¹⁷⁴ and not in an "indefinite" case — and why should this "indefinite" case when so used have developed into an accusative? Furthermore, the accusative in the construction *πόδας ὠκύς* 'Ἀχιλλεύς does not modify another noun at all; it modifies (as Hirt himself has just said, 6.89) an adjective!

The truth is that such juggling of cases gets us nowhere. The state of affairs posited by Hirt may really have existed at a very, very early stage of the language — or it may not. But it did not exist when the accusative of specification (probably a purely Greek development) was in process of evolving; and so we have no right

¹⁷⁴ Hence "partitive apposition." Cf. *TAPA* 84.93-95.

to explain an historical phenomenon by speculations about pre-historic — nay, pre-prehistoric — possibilities.

Biese in an article in *Arctos* 2.89–114 (1931) presents views very similar to Hirt's, of which, however, he does not seem to be aware.¹⁷⁵ He after the manner of Hirt compares (99) ἵπποι . . . ὠκύποδες in *Il.* 10.568–69 with πόδας ὠκέα Ἴρις in 2.790; and he too assigns a common origin to the bahuvrihi compound and the accusative of specification (100).¹⁷⁶ But he at least does try to account for the shift from nominative to accusative, on the basis of their identity in neuters (108–9). This reminds us of Havers' defense of his quite different theory, and I have the same reservations about this assumption with respect to Biese's theories as I have with respect to Havers'.¹⁷⁷

As a matter of fact, this part of his theory had also been anticipated, though again he seems unaware of it,¹⁷⁸ in the course of an article by Neckel which had been published 25 years earlier, *IF* 19.253–54 (1906).¹⁷⁹ Neckel too traces both the bahuvrihi and the accusative of specification to an independent nominal sentence, and he, like Biese and unlike Hirt, views a neuter noun as the means by which a nominative turned into an accusative, but he stipulates that it must be a noun in which the "Objektkasus" was identical with the bare stem. He takes as his starting-point a compound adjective such as ὀνομάκλυτος, in which he sees an original ὄνομα κλυτός, on the basis of which πόδας ὠκός was formed. This at least

¹⁷⁵ The publication of Biese's paper followed that of *IG* 3 and 4, and preceded that of *IG* 6 and 7, but neither scholar makes any reference to the other.

¹⁷⁶ Also to the accusative absolute (102–3), which, however, he says is not so old as the accusative of specification (114). In regard to the accusative absolute, he declares its members have the relation to each other of subject and predicate (104). He does not seem to realize that this is true of *any* absolute construction (cf. Hahn, *Language* 30.250–51, on the Latin ablative absolute), so, unless he is prepared to say that the early language had nominal sentences with subject and predicate nouns or adjectives in the genitive or ablative from which the Greek genitive absolute developed, he had better abandon this line of reasoning. (As a matter of fact, the absolute constructions in the various Indo-European languages, which include in one language or another genitive, dative, accusative, locative, and ablative cases, are believed to be independent innovations on the part of the individual languages: cf. Brugmann, *KVG* 644–45, *Gr. Gr.* 604–5; Hofmann, *Lat. Gr.* 445; Meillet and Vendryes, *Traité de gram. comp.* 556.)

¹⁷⁷ See end of section 4.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. note 175.

¹⁷⁹ This article was occasioned by Brugmann's studies of word composition, but predated the publication of his theories on the origin of the accusative of specification. For Blümel's objections to it, see *IF* 33.43.

accounts for the accusative *πόδας* and for the masculine *ώκός*, but it does *not* account for the model masculine *κλυτός*. Surely the stage before *ὄνομα κλυτός* would have had to be *ὄνομα κλυτόν*, or, more probably, *ὄνομα* followed by another bare stem; how was the transition effected? Neckel does at least admit that, since we have no materials illustrating “das Aufkommen der Flexion,” we must be content “mit mehr oder weniger wahrscheinlichen Vermutungen”; such speculations are very pretty, but are they science?

6. Meillet

Meillet,¹⁸⁰ in his *Introduction* (seventh ed. 1934¹⁸¹), evades all difficulties inherent in our construction by opening his discussion of the accusative with the blanket statement (343) that “l’acusatif sert à déterminer le sens d’un verbe,” and continues that one example of it is *ἔχω τι* “‘j’ai quelque chose’” and another example “avec un sens un peu différent” is *ὁδὸν ἐλθέμεναι* “‘faire un voyage’ (littéralement ‘aller en route’).” Then a little later (344) he says further: “Et même l’acusatif dit ‘de relation’ que le grec a tant développé n’est peut-être qu’un cas particulier de l’emploi ordinaire; ainsi dans cette phrase de Platon *Rép.* 453 *b* *διαφέρει γυνή ἀνδρὸς τὴν φύσιν*, l’acusatif *τὴν φύσιν* est de même espèce que *ὁδὸν* dans *ὁδὸν ἐλθέμεναι*; le sens est ‘elle a une différence de nature.’”

I cannot agree with Meillet.

In the first place his definition of the use of the accusative does not define. The accusative is not the only case that determines the sense of the verb. The dative and occasionally the genitive in Greek, and in addition the ablative, the locative, and the instrumental in some other Indo-European languages, all can perform the same function, whether as complements or as adverbial modifiers. Furthermore, not all accusatives do determine the sense of a verb; there are plenty of instances of our own accusative of specification that determine the sense of an adjective.

In the second place, in regard to the two accusatives that Meillet calls ‘of the same sort,’ I cannot see the slightest similarity

¹⁸⁰ Meillet had earlier given a very strange explanation for the accusative of specification (already remarked on above in note 169) in *MSL* 8.243, note 1 (1894), namely, that it, as well as certain Sanskrit adverbs in *-m*, went back to an instrumental in *-m* which became confused with the accusative. But this suggestion he evidently abandoned later.

¹⁸¹ The same statement also appeared in earlier editions. It was familiar to Blümel, publishing in 1913, and was dismissed by him as not “vorteilhaft” (*IF* 33.44).

between them except that they both *are* accusatives! I do not understand the point of his (unduly free) translation of his (unduly late) example of the accusative of specification; translations, even literal ones, are not much use in any event for getting at the real force of a syntactic construction, and this particular rendering certainly does not suggest the slightest parallelism with the rendering that he had already offered (343) for *ὁδὸν ἐλθέμεναι*. In short, I do not think Meillet has told us anything helpful about the accusative in general, or the accusative of specification in particular.

This explanation which does not explain is echoed by Humbert in his *Syntaxe grecque* 251 (1945), and to it he adds (*ib.*) an elucidation which does not elucidate: “de fait, *διαφέρει* et *φύσιν* sont bien unis l’un à l’autre dans un *rapport immédiat*, selon la définition générale du cas.”

Rather surprisingly, a somewhat different explanation is given in Meillet and Vendryes, *Traité de gr. comp.* (1927). The two members in the scheme of whole and part are simply treated as two independent accusatives (502), and we are told that in the passive one of these “régimes” becomes the subject and the other stays accusative (503), but there is no suggestion, either pro or con, of any possible connection of this construction with the accusative of specification.¹⁸² Concerning the latter, we are simply told (505) that “l’accusatif indiquait en indo-européen certains rapports vagues avec les mots voisins.” Examples include *πόδας ὠκὺς* and *γηθόσυνος κῆρ*. I do not think the “rapports” here are particularly “vagues,” and, “vagues” or not, I question whether such “rapports” are indicated by the accusative in Indo-European; the construction, as I have said more than once, seems to have been wholly Greek.

7. Chantraine

A quite new approach is included in the recently published second volume of Chantraine’s *Grammaire Homérique* (1953). So far as I can make out, his view is closer to Blümel’s¹⁸³ than to any other scholar’s, but his treatment of the accusative in general is so

¹⁸² Nor is there any in Humbert, *Synt. gr.*, but he gives a better description of partitive apposition (248): “l’objet extérieur est repris par un autre rapport direct, qui le *restreint* ou le *précise*.”

¹⁸³ In a footnote (46, note 2) he cites “en particulier” the articles by Kieckers, Blümel, Sommer, and Biese, but makes no mention of Brugmann.

peculiar that I find difficulty in following him. After listing as examples of "l'accusatif de l'objet externe" (38) various instances of direct objects with transitive verbs (38-41), he continues: "Le grec emploie également à l'accusatif un complément d'objet 'interne' qui précise l'idée verbale." I find myself wishing for some further details which could "préciser" this definition! It troubles me in the same way as does Meillet's concerning the accusative in general (treated just above, in section 6). Surely any complement or modifier "précise l'idée" of the word which it completes or modifies. (It seems to me that a good working rule is that the "inner" object is created as the result of the action denoted by the verb, whereas the "outer" object has an existence independent of such action; the terms "effect" and "affect" sometimes used in this connection are in my opinion aptly chosen.¹⁸⁴) Chantaine proceeds to give some unexceptionable illustrations of the "objet interne," such as *πόλεμον πολεμίζειν, ζώεις βίον, ὄρκια ταμόντες, ἡδὺν γέλασαν* (41-42); and then turns to verbs which take two accusatives, "objet *externe* et objet *interne*" (42). Here his Class A, involving a combination of "un objet *extérieur* (généralement une personne) et un objet *intérieur*, exprimant l'aboutissement" (*ib.*), seems to me coextensive with the main division: what is the difference between "objet externe" and "objet extérieur," between "objet interne" and "objet intérieur"? But his Class B is amazing. It is defined thus: "L'objet interne peut servir à limiter l'objet externe et à le préciser. C'est ce que l'on a appelé l'accusatif de la *partie*." It is rather confusing, after learning that by definition the "objet interne" "précise l'idée verbale" (41), to find that now it "peut servir à limiter l'objet externe et à le préciser"; still, I suppose the "part" noun does in a sense "préciser" both the "whole" noun and the verb. But how can the "part" noun be viewed as any more "interne" (by any definition whatsoever) than the "whole" noun? How can either of them be called "interne"?¹⁸⁵ Surely there is a tremendous and fundamental difference between Chantaine's illustrations for Class A, e.g. *Il. 5.361*

λίην ἄχθομαι ἔλκος, ὃ με βροτὸς οὔτασεν ἀνὴρ,

¹⁸⁴ Cf. e.g. Gildersleeve and Lodge (*Lat. Gr.* 208): "Inner Object: Object Effected" and "Outer Object: Object Affected."

¹⁸⁵ Contrast the far preferable treatment in Humbert (*Synt. gr.* 248) quoted in note 182.

where one of the objects, the relative referring to the wound, is truly "inner"; and those for Class B, e.g. *Il.* 11.240

τὸν δ' ἄορι πλῆξ' αὐχένα,

where both objects, the man and his neck, seem to me equally "outer." I agree that the neck serves to limit or define (*préciser*) the man by showing the exact point at which he was struck; but how does the word for 'neck' limit the verb in any way different from the manner in which the demonstrative referring to the man does? And if it does not, then why is 'him' "externe" and 'neck' "interne"? Finally, Class C, in which the objects represent "la personne" and "la chose,"¹⁸⁶ contains a conglomeration (43), in which in some cases I agree that the "thing" object is "inner," as in *Il.* 16.424–25

κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργεν/Τρῶας,

but in other cases both objects once more seem to me "outer," as in *Od.* 21.339

ἔσσω μιν χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε.

From the "accusatif interne" Chantraine derives — doubtless correctly — the use of a neuter adjective or pronoun almost as an adverb (44), and — perhaps correctly — the accusative of extent of space and duration of time (45). And he finally concludes (46): "Les accusatifs 'd'objet interne' ou d' 'extension' ont fini par exprimer simplement une relation avec le verbe." Which at last brings us to the accusative of specification. I do not know quite what he means by "ou" here: the inner object and the accusative of extent are not coextensive alternatives, since he regards the second as a subdivision of the first. Can he possibly be referring by his "objet interne" to the particular manifestation of it which he sees — wrongly in my opinion, as I have shown — in the "whole"-"part" combination? If so, he agrees with Brugmann after all! And he would have no trouble about the use of the accusative with the passive, because, deeming the partitive apposition accusatives as he does simply a manifestation of the ordinary double accusative, he finds no difficulty in the fact that one of the two accusatives remains in this case with a passive: he dismisses this (42) with the bare statement, "Au passif, c'est le nom de la personne qui devient

¹⁸⁶ As a matter of fact, the whole and part nouns usually represent a person and a thing too.

sujet." He ignores the fact that the inner relationship between the two substantives — which is commented on by him (42), and which is pointed up by the almost invariable order, also commented on by him (*ib.*) — might be expected to affect the construction, precisely as it does in the case of a direct object combined with a predicate accusative; in the passive, *both* of these become nominative.¹⁸⁷

B. Proposed Explanation

I have made it abundantly clear in section A that I prefer the explanation offered by Brugmann and Delbrück for the genesis of the accusative of specification to any of the alternative ones subsequently proposed by other scholars; yet that I agree with those other scholars¹⁸⁸ who point out the serious weakness that perhaps vitiates this explanation. Therefore, if I wish to continue my support of Brugmann and Delbrück, it behooves me to try to remove the stumbling-block which they casually and cavalierly skirted: the fact that the body-part noun which in the active is (in my opinion) in apposition with the accusative person noun remains accusative in the passive instead of continuing to share the case of the (now nominative) person noun.

If we make the step directly from the active to the passive, as critics of Brugmann and Delbrück — and for that matter Brugmann and Delbrück themselves — have always done, we shall never solve the problem. But if we will use the middle — suitably enough in view of its character! — as the intermediate stage between active and passive, I think we shall at last attain success.

The middle represents the subject as acting either upon himself or for himself. In the former case it is parallel to an active verb with a direct object and equivalent to an active verb with an accusative reflexive, and in the latter case it is parallel to an active verb with an indirect object and equivalent to an active verb with a dative reflexive.

As an example of a verb in which in the middle the subject acts not upon himself but for himself, we may take *λω*.¹⁸⁹ Chryses

¹⁸⁷ Chantraine recognizes this category of accusative in a remark (*Gr. Hom.* 2.43-44) at the end of his section on double accusatives, but he does not touch on what happens to it in the passive.

¹⁸⁸ Notably Blümel (see section A.3, above). Cf. also note 158 on the views of Monro (writing before Brugmann) and Hirt.

¹⁸⁹ Of course it is regularly of the captor's action that the active is used, and of the action of the captive's friend or kinsman (or even, as in *Il.* 10.378, quoted just below,

comes to the Greeks in order to effect the release of his daughter *for himself*, hence the middle, *Il.* 1.13

λυσόμενός τε θύγατρα,

and he bids the Greeks to set her free *for him*,¹⁹⁰ hence the active with the dative, 1.20

παῖδα δ' ἐμοὶ λῦσαί τε φίλῃν τὰ τ' ἄποινα δέχεσθαι.

When a captive wishes to arrange for his own release, he acts both for himself and on himself; and as the middle verb can indicate only one or the other, in this instance the former, we have the interesting phenomenon of a middle verb combined, exactly like an active one, with an accusative reflexive, in 10.378

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐμέ λύσομαι.

Since we are concerned primarily with the appearance apart from active transitive verbs of the accusative denoting a part of the body, I shall cite an instance of this with a middle form which is equivalent to the corresponding active plus a dative reflexive. This is *Il.* 9.628–29

αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς

ἄγριον ἐν στήθεσσι θέτο μεγαλήτορα θυμόν,

meaning literally that Achilles made his proud heart wild *for* (or *in*) himself. Thus we have a parallel in the middle for the use in the active of an accusative body-part noun plus a dative of reference,¹⁹¹ and not for the use in the active of accusatives for both person and body-part.¹⁹² However, if the latter had been the case, the form would still have been the same, but the meaning would have been

of himself) that the middle is used: a particularly clear instance of this occurs in book 24, where the active is employed with reference to Achilles (116) and the middle with reference to Priam (118). Hence it is often convenient to use quite different translations for the two voices, such as 'set free' for the active and 'ransom' for the middle; but the essential difference in their force must be what I have indicated. Incidentally, the payment of ransom is by no means an indispensable part of the picture. Odysseus' activity in delivering his comrades from Circe's spells does not involve the payment of ransom; but the middle is naturally employed concerning it, both by Hermes (*Od.* 10.284) and by Odysseus himself (10.385), while the active is of course used of Circe's part in setting them free (10.387).

¹⁹⁰ I believe the force of the dative is felt closely with the verb, though of course it is in a sense also a dative of reference showing the possessor of the 'dear child.'

¹⁹¹ This is proved by other instances of the middle of *τίθημι* in a factitive sense.

¹⁹² On both cf. note 129.

that Achilles made *himself*, his proud heart, wild. In other words, we would have had an instance to all intents and purposes of partitive apposition.

A possibly ambiguous passage that seems to me particularly interesting in the light that it throws on the construction under consideration is *Il.* 7.172–73

οὗτος γὰρ δὴ ὀνήσει ἐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς,
καὶ δ' αὐτὸς ὃν θυμὸν ὀνήσεται.

Here I think it is possible to view *θυμὸν* as a vivid substitute for 'himself,'¹⁹³ reinforced by the nominative *αὐτός*, a natural though not quite logical substitute for the genitive.¹⁹⁴ Then the middle is employed because the subject is acting for himself, precisely as in 10.307

οἱ τ' αὐτῷ κῦδος ἄροιο,

where this use is emphasized by the accompanying pronominal forms in the dative.¹⁹⁵ The valiant hero of *Il.* 7 will benefit his soul (i.e. *himself*, more vividly expressed) for himself, just as the hero of

¹⁹³ Cf. the use of Sanskrit *ātman* 'soul' as a reflexive. The employment of 'soul' (as well as of 'body') to stand for the whole person, often with emotional overtones, is met in more than one language. In English *poor old soul* (probably with even more pathos than *poor old body*) is a moving substitute for *poor old woman*. Cf. too 'not a single soul survived,' and the occasional comparable use in Latin of *anima*, as in Vergil, *Aen.* 12.229–30 *pro cunctis talibus unam obiectare animam*, and perhaps of *genius*, as in Horace, *Carm.* 3.17.14–15 *genium mero curabis* (see especially Shorey and Laing *ad loc.*). For two other possible instances of the usage in Homer (*Il.* 9.189 and *Od.* 1.107) see below, note 246.

¹⁹⁴ The emphatic collocation of two pronominal forms in different cases is somewhat like that of *suum quisque* in Latin. Homer does sometimes use the more exact genitive in combination with a possessive, as in *Il.* 10.204–5

οὐκ ἂν δὴ τις ἀνὴρ πεπιθούθ' ἐφ' αὐτοῦ/θυμῷ,

so too the dative in apposition with a personal pronoun, as in *Il.* 10.307, quoted just below; and he also has instances of the nominative used precisely, as in *Od.* 6.218 (on which cf. note 221). But inversions of the sort seen in 7.173 are easily understandable. Had passive or intransitive verbs been used, the emphatic nominative would have been quite in order: 'the Achaeans will be benefited by him (or will benefit through him); and he himself will be benefited by himself (or will benefit through himself).' Here the active voice borrows a form of expression logical only with the passive, precisely as in the use of the accusative of specification the passive voice borrows a form of expression strictly logical only with the active. See again on this note 216. Cf. too the use in *Od.* 9.462–63 of an active proposition where a passive one would have given better balance (commented on in I.A, fourth paragraph from the end of the section).

¹⁹⁵ The use in *Od.* 2.125–26 and 5.188–89 is different, because in those passages the person indicated by the reflexive is contrasted with others.

Il. 10 would win glory for himself (suggested by the middle voice of the verb), yes indeed, *for himself* (explicitly and emphatically indicated by the pronouns). But on the other hand in *Il.* 7 we can also say that the middle verb shows that the subject is acting upon himself, being all alone a parallel for the preceding active verb with its direct object; and if it were to be replaced by an active verb plus a reflexive pronoun, the latter would be a parallel to 'Achaeans,' namely 'himself,' with 'soul' in partitive apposition with it: 'he will benefit the Achaeans, and he will himself benefit himself, his soul.'¹⁹⁶

We shall find plenty of examples of the sort involving middle verbs that are equivalent to an active verb plus an accusative. To these we now turn.

A verb of this sort resembles the active in that it represents the subject as acting (upon himself), and at the same time resembles the passive in that it represents the subject as being acted upon (by himself).¹⁹⁷ But it is the self who receives the action, and not the self who performs it, with which the body-part noun that also receives the action is to be associated.

Let us begin by examining some active verbs with reflexive pronouns, and comparing them with the corresponding middle forms.

The first thing to note is that there is of course no difference in use between reflexive pronouns and other personal pronouns. Compare the ordinary personal pronoun (as well as the demonstrative) in *Od.* 13.230

ἀλλὰ σάω μὲν ταῦτα, σάω δ' ἐμέ

with the personal pronoun used reflexively in 17.595

αὐτὸν μὲν σε πρῶτα σάω.

And the second point to note is that there is no appreciable difference between the reflexive verb and the middle.¹⁹⁸ Compare

¹⁹⁶ This second alternative must, in view of the construction with verbs of washing in the active with two accusatives, be the explanation for the structure of another passage involving a similar shift from active to middle, *Il.* 16.228–30: Achilles washes a cup (active) and then himself (*αὐτός* again; cf. notes 194 and 216) washes his hands (middle). This will be discussed in detail below (cf. note 215).

¹⁹⁷ Cf. the French reflexive verbs, which resemble active verbs in that a participle used with them agrees with the (preceding) direct object, and resemble passive verbs in that they are conjugated with *être*.

¹⁹⁸ Similarly in Latin the reflexive alternates with the medio-passive. Thus in Plautus a father anxious about his son can say either *med excrucio animi* (cf. *Ep.* 390)

Od. 17.595 just quoted and 21.309¹⁹⁹

ἔνθεν δ' οὐ τι σαώσεται.

Compare similarly the active verbs respectively with non-reflexive and reflexive pronouns, in *Il.* 16.103

δάμνα μιν Ζηνός τε νόος καὶ Τρῶες ἀγανοί

and *Od.* 4.244

αὐτόν μιν πληγῇσιν ἀικελίῃσι δαμάσσας.

Compare too the participles, the first active with a reflexive pronoun, and the second middle,²⁰⁰ in *Il.* 14.162

ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἴδην ἐν ἐντύνασαν ἔαυτήν

and *Od.* 12.18

ἦλθ' ἐντυναμένη.

Of particular interest is a group of expressions with the verb *πυκάζω*. I list them: *Il.* 17.551

ἡ πορφυρέη νεφέλη πυκάσασα ἔαυτήν,

Od. 12.225

ἐντός δὲ πυκάζοιεν σφέας αὐτούς,

22.488

ράκεσιν πεπυκασμένος εὐρέας ὤμους,

Il. 14.289

ὄξοισιν πεπυκασμένος εἰλατίνοισιν,

2.777

ἄρματα δ' εὖ πεπυκασμένα κείτο.

23.503

ἄρματα δὲ χρυσῷ πεπυκασμένα.

or *excrucior animi* (cf. *Mil.* 720). The former means 'I torment myself'; it is not possible to tell whether the latter means 'I torment myself' (middle) or 'I am tormented' (passive).

¹⁹⁹ I follow Ameis in regarding this verb as a true middle in force 'you will not save yourself.' The Butcher and Lang translation renders it as a passive, 'thou shalt not be saved alive,' but Antinous is rebuking the supposed beggar (Odysseus) with threats of a dire fate if he persists in his efforts to string the bow — such a fate that the presumptuous attitude which he is showing now in thus thrusting himself forward will not then avail for his deliverance. Antinous does not envisage the possibility of the beggar's being saved by any external agency (passive); if he is to be saved, he must by himself accomplish this for himself (middle).

²⁰⁰ Like the middle participle is the finite form in *Od.* 6.32–33

ὄφρα τάχιστα/ἐντύνεται.

The first two passages show reflexive forms, one a participle and one a finite verb. The third and fourth show participles which may be either middle or passive,²⁰¹ but the third at least, in view of its close parallelism with the first (just as Athena clothed herself in a cloud, so Odysseus clothed himself in rags), I believe to be middle rather than passive. The fifth and sixth (referring to objects — chariots in both instances) are clearly passive.

In *Il.* 17.551, had there been an indication of the specific part of Athena's body which she had covered with her cloud, it would of course have been in the accusative, in partitive apposition with the reflexive pronoun.²⁰² In *Od.* 22.488 we find the active participle plus a reflexive replaced by a middle participle. Here we do have an indication of the specific part of Odysseus' body which he had covered with his rags; and as might be expected it is in the accusative. The meaning is not that he, his broad shoulders, had covered himself; the meaning is that he had covered himself, his broad shoulders.²⁰³ Had we had a passive, meaning that he himself, his broad shoulders, had been covered, we might have expected that the body-part noun should be in the nominative and not in the accusative; but in view of the ambiguity of the participle, which as we have seen is probably middle here, but which might be either middle or passive in the following example, and is surely passive in the next two, it is not surprising that the case required when the participle has middle force is carried over to the instances — much fewer, as we shall see — when it has passive force.

We find several passages providing a good parallel in general meaning to *Od.* 22.488 but employing the perfect participle of different verbs, namely, *Il.* 5.186

νεφέλη ἐιλυμένος ὤμους,

²⁰¹ In *LSJ* the participle is specifically labeled passive only, and these two passages are specifically cited as examples for it; but I see not the slightest reason for such classification.

²⁰² Just exactly as 'heart' is in the accusative in apposition with 'Hector' in *Il.* 8.124 = 17.83

Ἑκτορα δ' αἰνὸν ἄχος πύκασε φρένας.

²⁰³ Later the meaning may have seemed to be that he had covered his broad shoulders for himself, in other words, that the word for 'shoulders' served as sole object, and that had the middle voice been replaced by an active plus a reflexive, that reflexive would have been in the dative. This is of course, as we have already noted, frequently the case when a middle verb takes an accusative as object. But the corresponding active forms, with two accusatives (cf. note 202), show that this was clearly not the case with this particular verb. The identity of the two types of expression has already been referred to.

17.492

*βοέης εἰλυμένω ὤμους,**Od.* 14.479*σάκεσιν εἰλυμένοι ὤμους,*and *Il.* 16.360*ἀσπίδι ταυρείῃ κεκαλυμμένος εὐρέας ὤμους.*

Surely, in the first of these passages, the god had wrapped himself in the cloud just as Athena did in *Il.* 17.551, and in the other three passages the men had covered themselves with their shields as Odysseus had covered himself with his rags in *Od.* 22.488, so in all three I am inclined to view the participle as middle just as in 22.488.²⁰⁴

Another interesting group of examples involves the verb *πίμπλημι*.

In the active, this verb may take two accusatives, in partitive apposition, as in *Il.* 17.573 (of Athena emboldening Menelaus)

τοίου μιν θάρσευς πλῆσε φρένας ἀμφιμελαίνας,

i.e. she (Athena) filled him (his) heart with such boldness, although it can also use the dative of reference for the person,²⁰⁵ as in *Od.* 19.117

μή μοι μάλλον θυμὸν ἐνιπλήσης ὀδυνάων,

i.e. lest you fill (my) heart for me with grief. We find several examples in the middle voice with the accusative of the body-part, which, as already pointed out, can be regarded as corresponding to either of the active forms. Thus *Il.* 22.312

μένεος δ' ἐμπλήσατο θυμὸν

can mean either he filled himself (his) heart with rage, or he filled (his) heart with rage for himself, but I think the former is a little more likely. So too *Od.* 9.296

*Κύκλωψ μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδύν,*and, with participles, *Il.* 22.504*θαλέων ἐμπλησάμενος κῆρ*and *Od.* 17.603*πλησάμενος δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἐδητύος ἡδὲ ποτῆτος.*

²⁰⁴ Here again the participles are called passives by *LSJ*; cf. note 201.

²⁰⁵ Cf. again notes 105 and 129.

The verb is also used absolutely (that is, without a limiting genitive) meaning 'fill oneself' in the sense of 'satisfy oneself,'²⁰⁶ in *Od.* 19.198

ἵνα πλησάιαιτο θυμόν.

When we have forms derived from the first aorist ἐπλησάμην we may be sure they are middle. The second aorist ἐπλήμην is less certain, for it is said to have served not only as a middle but also as a passive.²⁰⁷ Of course in such instances it is difficult and perhaps impossible to come to a decision; translation is certainly no use, for one language does not necessarily behave like another; all we can do is to examine the situation, and that is often far from conclusive. In *Il.* 17.498–99

ὁ δ' εὐξάμενος Διὶ πατρὶ
ἀλκῆς καὶ σθένεος πλῆτο φρένας ἀμφιμελαίνας

Automedon may have used two means to help him in his desperate battle, prayer to Zeus and independent stimulation of his own courage; or a modern psychologist might say that by performing the former act he actually performed the latter also. But I believe the meaning is rather that in response to his prayer he *was stimulated to courage by Zeus*,²⁰⁸ the inspiration came from without.²⁰⁹ Zeus was interested in the driver of Achilles' horses, whom he had already stimulated to courage (451²¹⁰ and 455), and so probably he

²⁰⁶ This passage is cited below with examples of other verbs used in the same sense. Cf. note 250.

²⁰⁷ *LSJ* definitely pronounces it passive (cf. notes 201 and 204). Chantraine, though he lists πλῆτο with athematic middle aorists and gives it a middle translation 'se remplir' (*Gr. Hom.* 1.381), says elsewhere that in sense πλῆτο and πλήσθη differ little (406) but the latter form is a new development met with mainly in the supposedly later parts of the *Iliad* (407). Certainly the middle form πλῆτο or πλήντο seems to be passive in sense quite as much in *Il.* 18.50 ('the grotto was filled') and *Od.* 8.57 ('the halls were filled') as the true passive form ἐπλήσθη in *Il.* 20.156 ('the plain was filled').

²⁰⁸ Chantraine lists this line as an example of a middle (1.381), but here he is thinking primarily of the form as such; note that he lists here also 18.50, where the sense is surely passive (cf. note 207). As already remarked, he elsewhere (406) states that there is little difference in meaning between this middle form and the (later-developed) passive. He may, however, be misled by the French idiom 'se remplir.' (Or am I misled by the English idiom 'be filled'? I think not, for surely the inanimate grotto did not act but was acted upon.)

²⁰⁹ So too in *Il.* 17.211–12 (quoted three paragraphs below), where we unquestionably have a passive, though with a different construction. Hector was strengthened by both Zeus (206) and Ares (210–11).

²¹⁰ This line has already been cited (cf. note 58) as an example of the double dative. Once more (cf. note 67), we note that the tendency is to use either (a) two datives, or (b) two accusatives (or else their substitutes, one accusative with a middle or passive).

is the actor just as was Athena in 17.573 (cited in the preceding paragraph). On the other hand in 22.312 (also cited in the preceding paragraph), where we have a form indubitably middle, the sense is middle as well,²¹¹ for Achilles in his pursuit of Hector needed no god to stimulate him.²¹²

I think the force is passive also in the very different passage 23.777

ἐν δ' ὄνθου βοέου πλήτο στόμα τε ῥίνας τε.

In a sense, Ajax filled his mouth and nostrils with filth, but he certainly did it involuntarily, and the meaning is rather that he was filled with filth (as to) the mouth and nostrils, i.e. in respectable English that his mouth and nostrils were filled with filth.

Of course what I have been doing is wholly artificial. Homer certainly did not consciously analyze his ambiguous forms as used in either a middle or a passive sense. Yet the fact that certain ambiguous forms, when used in a middle sense, could normally and naturally combine with an accusative body-part noun certainly must have helped them to do the same thing when used in a passive sense. And the next step would be that forms indubitably and exclusively passive would follow the lead of forms that could be passive as well as middle.

Yet interestingly enough this step, though he does take it elsewhere, Homer apparently did not take in connection with the verb *πίμπλημι*. With demonstrably passive forms of this verb, he employs not the construction with medio-passives which I view as derived from the combination with an active verb of accusative person noun and body-part noun in partitive apposition, but one of the two constructions which we observed much earlier²¹³ as substitutes for the non-existent combination with a (passive or intransitive) verb of nominative person noun and body-part noun in partitive apposition. We find the body-part noun in the nominative as

²¹¹ In another passage about Achilles, *Il.* 1.103-4 (quoted three paragraphs below), in which we have a quite different construction, with the body-part noun as subject (cf. note 213), the verb, again an ambiguous form (imperfect), is probably passive. His heart 'was filled' with anger, whether by Achilles' own action (which would correspond to the middle in 22.312) or by Agamemnon's insult (which would correspond to the passive in 17.499). The lines reappear in the *Odyssey*, 4.661-62, but are there bracketed by most editors.

²¹² Indeed, Zeus had even been tempted to thwart him! Cf. 22.167-76.

²¹³ At the close of section I.A, where some of the passages here quoted were already cited.

subject, and the person noun in the dative (of reference). Examples follow: *Il.* 17.211–12²¹⁴

πλησθεν δ' ἄρα οἱ μέλε' ἐντὸς/ἀλκῆς καὶ σθένεος,

16.348–49

ἐνέπλησθεν δέ οἱ ἄμφω/αἵματος ὀφθαλμοί,

17.695–96 = 23.396–97 = *Od.* 4.704–5 = 19.471–72

τὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε/δακρύνοντι πλησθεν.

There are also two examples with the ambiguous imperfect which are so similar to the two passages just cited that we may assume the sense of the verb here too is passive. These are *Od.* 10.247–48

ἐν δέ οἱ ὄσσε/δακρύνοντι πίμπλαντο,

in which the dative is accompanied by an adverbial particle; and 20.348–49

ὄσσε δ' ἄρα σφέν/δακρύνοντι πίμπλαντο,

in which we have a genitive of possession instead of a dative. And finally we may compare *Il.* 1.103–4

μένεος δέ μέγα φρένες ἀμφιμέλαιναι
πίμπλαντ', ὄσσε δέ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετόωντι ἔικτην,

in which again the sense is probably passive, as already pointed out in note 211; here the verb is accompanied by no designation at all of the person concerned, but a dative of reference appears in the following clause.

The alternative construction, with the person noun as subject and the body-part noun as a dative (instrumental or local), does not seem to occur with *πίμπλημι*, but it is certainly approached in *Od.* 11.452–53

ἢ δ' ἐμὴ οὐδέ περ νῆος ἐνιπλησθῆναι ἄκοιτις
ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἔασε,

where an accusative subject of the infinitive, corresponding to the nominative subject of a finite verb, is assuredly implied, though again we have to wait for the next clause before the form appears.

Another fruitful source of study is provided by passages with

²¹⁴ On the appropriateness of the passive here, see note 209.

verbs meaning 'wash' or 'bathe.' In the active they can take two accusatives, of person and body-part, as in *Od.* 19.356

ἢ σε πόδας νίψει,

echoed in 376

τῷ σε πόδας νίψω,

meaning 'she (or I) will wash you (your) feet.' With the middle the body-part accusative is retained, as in 2.261 (cf. 12.336)

χείρας νιψάμενος,

meaning 'having washed himself (his) hands,' with the middle verb (in this instance a participle) singly corresponding to the active verb plus its person object.

There is a very interesting passage, *Il.* 16.228–30,²¹⁵ describing how Achilles washed first his cup (*δέπας*, mentioned in 225) and then his hands: the active voice of the verb is used for the washing of the cup, an external object, and the middle voice for the washing of the hands, parts of the body. The passage runs as follows:²¹⁶

τό ῥα τότ' ἐκ χηλοῖο λαβὼν ἐκάθηρε θεείῳ
πρῶτον, ἔπειτα δ' ἔνιψ' ὕδατος καλῇσι ῥοῇσιν,
νίψατο δ' αὐτὸς χείρας.

Transference to a passive of the accusative that is normal with a middle would be particularly easy with verbs of this category, since the middle and passive are frequently indistinguishable in meaning as well as in form.²¹⁷ The context indicates that we have the middle in *Il.* 6.508

εἰωθὼς λούεσθαι ἐνρρεῖος ποταμοῖο,

²¹⁵ Already referred to above; see note 196.

²¹⁶ The use of *αὐτός* in 230 (already commented on in note 196) is not perfectly logical. Strictly speaking, the meaning should be 'he himself washes his hands,' and actually it might seem more surprising that he should wash his cup himself than that he should wash his hands himself (for the occasion is not a banquet where we might expect attendants to perform this service for the guests). Probably we have a transfer to the nominative from the accusative which would be really logical — 'he washes the cup' and 'he washes his own self (his) hands.' The nominative would have been quite in order with a passive — 'the cup is washed and he himself is washed — (his) hands' (cf. note 194). Thus the use of the nominative for the person with the middle would seem to be the reverse of the use of the accusative for the body-part with the passive. Both are perfectly natural departures from rigorous logic. We make a similar transfer — in the opposite direction from 16.230 — when we say "he knows how to wash his own face and hands" but mean "he knows how to wash his face and hands himself."

²¹⁷ Cf. the alternation in English between the reflexive *wash oneself* and the quasi-passive *get washed*.

of a runaway horse plunging into the stream, since no one else acts upon him; yet even here it might be objected that he does not so much bathe himself as get bathed by the water (instrument rather than agent).²¹⁸ In *Od.* 6.210

λούσατέ τ' ἐν ποταμῷ

it seems²¹⁹ as if Nausicaa directs her maidens to bathe Odysseus; and so when, after learning how the girls duly brought him clothing and olive oil, we read in 216

ἦνωγον δ' ἄρα μιν λοῦσθαι ποταμοῖο ῥοῇσιν,

I presume the infinitive is a true passive, 'they bade him be bathed.'²²⁰ I believe he certainly interprets it in this way, since he asks them to withdraw and emphasizes that he will himself²²¹ bathe himself²²² (218–19),

ἐγὼ αὐτός/ἄλμην ὤμουν ἀπολούσομαι,

and then goes on to say that he will not bathe himself in their presence (221),

ἄντην δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ γε λοέσσομαι.

Thus middles are used to answer a passive, with no formal difference so far as the verb goes.

On the other hand, the form would seem to indicate that we definitely have middles in *Il.* 10.576 = *Od.* 4.48

ἔς ῥ' ἀσαμίνθους βάντες ἐνξέστας λούσαντο.

²¹⁸ Cf. *Il.* 10.574–75 (quoted in note 231), where, after saying that the men washed themselves off, the poet switches to the active and says that the *wave* washed them off.

²¹⁹ I say "seems," for in reporting the episode to Alcinous Odysseus still uses the active (7.296)

καὶ λοῦσ' ἐν ποταμῷ,

though we know he did not permit the girls — still less Nausicaa — to bathe him. Here Butcher and Lang translate "let wash me in the river," and perhaps the active verb in 6.210 should be so handled, though there they translate "bathe him in the river."

²²⁰ However, Butcher and Lang translate it as if middle, "bade him wash."

²²¹ Note the emphatic ἐγὼ αὐτός. Here αὐτός is used logically, not as in *Il.* 7.172–73 and 16.228–30 (cf. notes 194, 196, and 216).

²²² On the verb of washing *off* used here, and its construction, cf. note 230.

In each case the following line tells what happened after the men had finished their bath: *Il.* 10.577 continues the middle,

τῷ δὲ λοεσσαμένῳ

'and they after they had bathed,' but *Od.* 4.49

τοὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οἷν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν

'and when the maids had bathed them' shifts to the active, which certainly would seem to have called for a passive in the previous line 'they were bathed' rather than 'they bathed themselves.'

Perhaps the conclusion to be drawn from all this is that the passive aorist in *-sth-*, which does not seem to be attested for Homer, did not yet exist, and that the middle still served for both middle and passive in the case of the verb 'wash' as elsewhere.²²³ Naturally, the more forms there are which function both as middle and as passive, the more chances there are for the construction with the middle to be carried over to the passive.

Expressions of 'washing off' vary as do expressions of 'washing,' but they are more complicated, because they may involve not merely two accusatives, person washed and body-part washed, which if they appear together are in partitive apposition, but also a third, the substance washed off, which I have already said²²⁴ I believe is to be viewed as also a part (before it gets washed off) of either the person or the body-part involved.²²⁵ In the active we may have just one accusative, representing the person, as in *Od.* 19.317

ἀλλὰ μιν, ἀμφίπολοι, ἀπονίψατε,

or the body-part, as in 19.387²²⁶

τοῦ πόδας ἐξαπένιζεν,

²²³ On the lateness of the passive aorist, see Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* 1.401–2, and compare what has already been said on this score, in notes 207 and 208, concerning the aorist of *πίμπλημι*.

²²⁴ Cf. the discussion with which section I.B.3 closes, and see especially note 143.

²²⁵ Cf. especially note 144.

²²⁶ We may note the presence here of the additional adverbial particle *ἐξ*, which is surely to be combined with the relative referring back to the cauldron mentioned in the previous line. The vulgate reading *τῷ* is preserved by Dindorf-Hentze and is defended by Ameis on the ground that *τοῦ* would have to refer to *πόδας*; however, I think the presence of *ἐξ* would not only justify the genitive but would, as Monro thinks, really demand it.

or the substance washed off, as in *Il.* 7.425

ἀλλ' ὕδατι νίζοντες ἄπο βρότον αἱματόεντα

and *Od.* 24.189

οἳ κ' ἀπονίψαντες μέλανα βρότον ἐξ ὥτειλέων.

We also find an active verb with the first and third, the person and the substance removed, combined in *Il.* 18.345

Πάτροκλον λούσειαν ἄπο βρότον αἱματόεντα

and 16.667–68

κελαινεφές αἶμα κάθηρον/ἐλθὼν ἐκ βελέων Σαρπηδόνα.

To these corresponds a middle with the accusative of the substance removed,²²⁷ in 23.40–41

εἰ πεπίθουεν

Πηλεΐδην λούσασθαι ἄπο βρότον αἱματόεντα.

A middle verb may also be accompanied by the other possible accusative, the body-part, as in *Od.* 22.478

οἱ μὲν ἔπειτ' ἀπονιψάμενοι χεῖράς τε πόδας τε.

Finally, one interesting passage shows an active verb governing accusatives of all three types, person, wound (corresponding to body-part), and substance removed (in this instance licked off instead of washed off), namely, *Il.* 21.122–23²²⁸

ἐνταυθοῖ νῦν κείσο μετ' ἰχθύσιν, οἳ σ' ὥτειλήν
αἶμ' ἀπολιχμήσονται ἀκηδέες.

I have noted two corresponding passages in the middle, of course showing just two accusatives, body-part²²⁹ and substance washed off. They are *Od.* 6.224–25²³⁰

αὐτὰρ ὁ ἐκ ποταμοῦ χροά νίζετο δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
ἄλμην

²²⁷ Oddly, Clapp in his note on 41 talks about “two accs. after the analogy of verbs of depriving.” But the infinitive being middle here there is only one accusative depending on it; the other accusative is its subject.

²²⁸ On the triple accusative, cf. note 147. On the accusative of the person, cf. note 146; on the accusative of the wound, contrast the use of the genitive in *Od.* 24.189, quoted just above.

²²⁹ I do not think the presence of ἀμφί with the body-part nouns in the second passage affects the construction. Cf. notes 89 and 90.

²³⁰ We meet a variant construction, with genitive of the body-part, just a little earlier, in *Od.* 6.219, quoted above. Cf. note 222 on 6.219, and see note 228 for another example of the genitive (24.189).

and *Il.* 10.572–73²³¹

αὐτοὶ δ' ἰδρῶ πολλὸν ἀπενίζοντο θαλάσση
ἐσβάντες κνήμας τε ἰδέ λόφον ἀμφὶ τε μηρούς.

Finally, there is one passage in which the accusative (for I think there is no doubt that it is an accusative) of the substance washed off is combined with a verb that is surely passive in force not middle. This is *Il.* 24.419²³²

ἐρσήεις κείται περὶ δ' αἷμα νένιπται.

If we regard the person and the blood wiped away from him, when they appear with the active, as two wholly independent accusatives, the retention of one of them with the passive might seem natural; but if, as I prefer, we regard them as in partitive apposition, the retention of one in the passive must be due to the analogy of such retention in the middle. However, particularly in view of the similarity of meaning, the usage with verbs of depriving may have had some influence in the development of the usage with a verb of cleaning off.

Not unlike verbs of washing off (blood, brine, etc.) is a verb of tearing off, scraping off (skin), namely, *δρύπτω*. Here again three entities are involved, the person and the parts of his body that are torn or scraped, and the skin that is torn or scraped off.²³³ In the active, I have not found any instance of more than one of these at a time.²³⁴ The person is referred to in *Il.* 23.187

ἵνα μὴ μιν ἀποδρύφοι ἐλκυστάζων,

²³¹ Just below, 574–75, we have a shift to the active

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σφιν κῦμα θαλάσσης ἰδρῶ πολλὸν
νύψεν ἀπὸ χρωτός.

But here the water and not a person does the washing (cf. note 218); and furthermore there is a complete change in construction, a dative replacing the usual accusative of the person, and a genitive replacing the usual accusative of the body-part. It is interesting that when one accusative disappears, so does the other (cf. note 111). Observe too *Il.* 11.829–30 = 845–46, where a genitive replaces the accusative of the person, and *Od.* 6.219 and 24.189, where a genitive replaces the accusative of the body-part (on these two passages see notes 222, 228, and 230).

²³² Here *περὶ* replaces the usual *ἀπό*.

²³³ The person and the skin are involved in the example of partitive apposition in the nominative that I cited from Solon (note 15).

²³⁴ However, we may perhaps compare the not dissimilar verbs 'peel' and 'cut,' occurring in *Il.* 1.236–37 and 21.37–38, cited above (see note 142).

and the body-part in 16.323–24²³⁵

πρυμνὸν δὲ βραχίονα δουρὸς ἀκωκῇ/δρύνῃ ἀπὸ μυώνων.

Od. 17.479–80

μή σε νέοι διὰ δώματ' ἐρύσσωσ', οἷ' ἀγορεύεις,
ἢ ποδὸς ἣ καὶ χειρὸς, ἀποδρύνωσι δὲ πάντα

is ambiguous: if the accusative *πάντα* is masculine singular, it refers to the person; if it is neuter plural, either to the whole body from which the skin is torn, or to all the skin that is torn away.²³⁶ We have one example in the middle (used not in a reflexive but in a reciprocal sense) with the accusative of the body-part, *Od.* 2.153

δρυν/αμένω δ' ὀνύχεσσι παρειὰς ἀμφί τε δειράς

'tearing each other's cheeks and necks'; and in the passive²³⁷ we have one example corresponding precisely to this, with the accusative of the body-part, *Il.* 23.395

ἀγκῶνας τε περιδρύνθη στόμα τε ῥινάς τε,

and another with the accusative of the skin torn away, *Od.* 5.426

ἐνθα κ' ἀπὸ ῥινοῦς δρύνθη.

The few examples available of the verb of scraping (off) can be fully understood only in the light of the parallel uses of verbs of washing (off). Certainly *δρυν/αμένω παρειάς* could not of itself have led to *ἀγκῶνας περιδρύνθη*. We need intermediate ambiguous forms like *νέμπται* to effect the transition. But of course such forms abound, and in many instances it is impossible to decide whether we have a middle or a passive. We have noted some of these in passing; here I mention just two more, *Il.* 11.169 = 20.503

λύθρω δὲ παλάσσετο χεῖρας ἀάπτους

²³⁵ This does not involve a partitive operation; the point of the spear tears one part of the body, the arm, from another part, the muscles, not from the whole body.

²³⁶ See Monro on *Od.* 16.21. Butcher and Lang evidently favor the third interpretation, for they translate "strip all thy flesh from off thee."

²³⁷ There is also one example in the passive, *Od.* 5.434–35

ὥς τοῦ πρὸς πέτρησι θρασειάων ἀπὸ χειρῶν
ῥινοὶ ἀπέδρυνθηεν,

in which the skin removed becomes the subject, and the body-part from which it is removed is in the genitive with a "preposition" repeating the "preverb." (For the genitive, cf. note 231.)

and 22.461

παλλομένη κραδίην.

The first may mean either 'he sprinkled himself (his) hands with blood,' or 'he (as to his) hands was sprinkled with blood.' The second may mean either 'shaking herself (her) heart' or 'shaken (as to her) heart.'²³⁸ In each case, the accusative would seem to be in order if the verb is middle, the nominative if it is passive. Yet the form of the verb is the same in each instance! What wonder then that the case of the body-part noun also turned out to be the same? If there were, as there probably were, enough verbs or types of verbs in which the middle meaning and the passive meaning clearly interchanged or overlapped, we could hardly expect anything else.

Along these lines probably an outstandingly important part in the development of the use of a body-part accusative with the passive was played by verbs of emotion — anger, joy, or sorrow. Transitive verbs of this type are extremely common in the middle and/or passive, though much less so in the active.

We have already noted in connection with *πίμπλημι* the difficulty of deciding whether, in situations that fill a person with rage, courage, etc., he is to be thought of as acting upon himself or as being acted upon. With single verbs expressing emotion, similar ambiguous medio-passive expressions are especially common,²³⁹ and we find them repeatedly used with an accusative noun²⁴⁰ denoting either a body-part regarded as a seat of the emotions, such as 'heart,' or a more abstract synonym, such as 'mind' or 'soul' or 'spirit.'²⁴¹ The usage is particularly frequent with participles,²⁴² though finite forms are met as well.

²³⁸ In the same way with 'heart' as subject, as in *Il.* 22.452

πάλλεται ἦτορ,

the meaning may be either 'shakes itself' (middle) or 'is shaken' (passive).

²³⁹ Cf. the pronounced tendency to use a reflexive for expressions of this sort in French and even in English (a language which in general seems more sparing of reflexive usage than French). Note e.g., as equivalents or substitutes for the "passive" form with *être* or *be*, reflexives such as French *se réjouir*, *s'amuser*, *s'affliger*, *s'attrister*, *se fâcher*; English *enjoy oneself*, *amuse oneself*, *distress oneself*, Scottish *fash oneself*, etc.

²⁴⁰ However, the alternative usage with a dative (with or without a "preposition") is also met. See notes 243, 245, 247, 252, 253, 255.

²⁴¹ Cf. notes 115 and 133.

²⁴² A long medio-passive participle followed by *κῆρ*, *ἦτορ*, or *φίλον ἦτορ* forms a particularly convenient tag-end for the hexameter.

To begin with expressions of anger,²⁴³ we may note ambiguous medio-passive forms of the verb *χολῶω* 'anger':²⁴⁴ perfect participle in *Il.* 14.367

κεχολωμένος ἦτορ

and pluperfect indicative in 16.585

κεχόλωσο δὲ κῆρ ἐτάροιο.

Aorists seem to be quite interchangeable: the middle in *Od.* 6.147

μή οἱ γοῦνα λαβόντι χολώσαιτο φρένα κούρη,

and, finally, the passive, which must have borrowed its accusative from the pure middle or, more probably, from the ambiguous forms, in *Il.* 4.494 (cf. 13.660)

τοῦ δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς μάλα θυμὸν ἀποκταμένοιο χολώθη.

An interesting phenomenon is the similar acquisition of an accusative by the verb *χῶμαι* 'be angry,' an intransitive serving as a synonym for the medio-passive of *χολῶω*. Participles thus used occur in *Il.* 1.44, 9.555, and *Od.* 12.376

χώμενος κῆρ

and in *Il.* 23.37

χώμενον κῆρ,

and finite forms are met in *Il.* 20.29

θυμὸν . . . χῶεται

and 16.616

θυμὸν ἐχώσατο.

Probably the commonest of verbs of joy is *τέρπω* 'delight, gladden.'²⁴⁵ The active, as usual with transitive verbs of emotion, is rare.²⁴⁶ We find the medio-passive present participle in *Il.* 9.186

φρένα τερπόμενον,

²⁴³ Datives occur instead of accusatives in *Il.* 1.217; 13.206; 16.61. Cf. note 240.

²⁴⁴ As usual, the corresponding active does not seem to be in common usage. Yet that it was at least theoretically possible in Homer is indicated by an actual example in Hesiod, *Th.* 568

ἐχόλωσε δέ μιν φίλον ἦτορ.

²⁴⁵ With datives *Il.* 19.19, 312-13; *Od.* 5.74, 8.368, 16.25-26. Cf. note 240.

²⁴⁶ We meet it twice (*Il.* 9.189 and *Od.* 1.107) with *θυμὸν* in the sense of 'delight one's spirit.' Here *θυμὸν* seems used almost in the sense of a reflexive 'oneself' (cf. note 193); and it is of course not a synecdochal accusative here any more than in *Il.* 24.119 and *Od.* 15.379, where it serves as object of the active *ιαίρω*.

and the middle aorist participle in 9.705

τεταρπόμενοι φίλον ἦτορ

and *Od.* 1.310

τεταρπόμενός τε φίλον κῆρ.

Finite forms (with *φρένα* or *θυμόν*) occur in the medio-passive (*Il.* 1.474, 20.23, 21.45; *Od.* 4.102) and the passive (*Od.* 8.131 and 17.174).

Probably due to the analogy of these last passages is the similar use of the passive of *λαίνω* 'warm, cheer'²⁴⁷ in *Od.* 23.47

θυμόν ἰάνθης

and 24.382

φρένας ἔνδον ἰάνθης,

with which we may compare that of *ἀναψύχω* 'cool, refresh, revive'²⁴⁸ in *Il.* 10.575

ἀνέψυχθεν φίλον ἦτορ.

Perhaps we may class here too verbs with the sense of 'satisfy, sate,'²⁴⁹ which seem to be mainly limited to the middle ('satisfy oneself' rather than 'be satisfied'). Examples are *Il.* 19.307

ἄσασθαι φίλον ἦτορ,

Od. 19.198²⁵⁰

πλησαίατο θυμόν,

²⁴⁷ There is also a rather peculiar passage, *Il.* 15.101–3

ἥ δὲ γέλασεν
χείλεσιν, οὐδὲ μέτωπον ἐπ' ὀφρύσι κυανέησιν
ἰάνθη,

in which the member affected is a purely physical one, the forehead. This noun might possibly be the subject and not the object of the verb, but I think it is more likely that the two verbs have a common subject 'she,' and also the word for 'forehead' is a better contrast as an accusative than as a nominative for the preceding dative 'with her lips.' (Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the verb of physical action 'laughed' does not take an accusative of specification as does the verb of emotion.) But in a number of passages (*Il.* 23.600 and 24.321; *Od.* 4.548–49 and 22.58–59) *θυμός* or *κῆρ* is the subject of *ἰάνθη*. We also have a dative combined with the same verb, in *Il.* 19.174; cf. note 240.

²⁴⁸ Cf. the active in *Il.* 13.84

ἀνέψυχον φίλον ἦτορ.

²⁴⁹ Such verbs may also be used in a pejorative sense, 'to have too much of a (bad) thing, to be weary,' as in *Il.* 11.87

ἐκορέσσατο χεῖρας.

²⁵⁰ Already cited above; cf. note 206.

8.98

κεκορήμεθα θυμόν,

and 14.28

κορεσαίατο θυμόν,

also 14.46

κορεσσάμενος κατὰ θυμόν.

The parallelism of these last two passages occurring in close juxtaposition affords fresh proof²⁵¹ that the construction is not affected by the presence of *κατά*.

Intransitive verbs with the sense of 'rejoice' or 'be glad' behave as do passives of transitive verbs. Here we may note (1) *χαίρω*²⁵² in *Il.* 6.481

χαρείη δὲ φρένα,

(2) *γηθέω*²⁵³ in *Il.* 8.559 = *Od.* 6.106

γέγηθε δὲ τε φρένα,

in *Il.* 11.683

γεγήθει δὲ φρένα,

and (again with *κατά*) in 13.416

γηθήσειν κατὰ θυμόν,

and (3) the deponent *γάννται* in *Il.* 13.493

γάννται . . . φρένα.

To these may be added the periphrasis 'enter upon good cheer' in *Od.* 23.52–53

ἐνφροσύνης ἐπιβήτον/ἀμφοτέρω φίλον ἦτορ.

The construction with *γηθέω* probably led to that with the allied adjective in *Il.* 4.272 = 18.557

γηθόσυνος κῆρ,

though the use of participles (i.e. adjectives) such as *τερπόμενος* may have also been a contributing factor.

Verbs of sorrow naturally follow the same pattern as those of joy. Here participles abound, especially from one particular verb

²⁵¹ As with verbs of striking and wounding. See above, section I.B.3.a.

²⁵² With the dative in *Od.* 24.545; cf. note 240.

²⁵³ With the dative in *Il.* 13.494; cf. note 240. There is also a passage with 'heart' as subject, *Il.* 14.139–40; cf. note 247.

of many ramifications, both active intransitive and medio-passive. We have various forms of the medio-passive present participle ἀχνύμενος followed by κῆρ no fewer than thirteen times: *Il.* 7.428, 431; 19.57; 23.165, 284, 443; 24.773; *Od.* 10.67; 12.153, 250, 270; 22.188; 24.420. We have various forms of the medio-passive perfect participle ἀκαχήμενος (or the metrically convenient variant ἀκηχεμένη in the feminine) with κῆρ, ἥτορ, or θυμόν eleven times: *Il.* 5.364; 18.29; *Od.* 9.62, 105, 565; 10.77, 133, 313; 13.286; 15.481; 20.84. We have the present active intransitive participles ἀχέων and ἀχέων (in the same sense as ἀχνύμενος) with κῆρ or θυμόν five times: *Il.* 5.399, 869; 9.612; 23.566; *Od.* 21.318. In view of the fact that the word for 'heart' etc. is certainly in the accusative with all these participles, I suppose it is so also with the finite medio-passive form in *Il.* 11.274 = 400²⁵⁴

ἤχθετο γὰρ κῆρ,

although it must be the subject²⁵⁵ in 6.523–24

τὸ δ' ἐμὸν κῆρ/ἄχνηται ἐν θυμῷ.

As a synonym for the medio-passive ἀχνύμενος and the active intransitive ἀχέων, we have the deponent intransitive τετιημένος 'grieving',²⁵⁶ which (with various inflectional endings) is followed by ἥτορ in eight passages: *Il.* 8.437; 11.556; *Od.* 1.114; 2.298; 4.804; 7.287; 8.303; 18.153.

A slightly different type of verb 'moan' is combined with 'heart' in *Il.* 18.33

ὁ δ' ἔστενε κυδάλιμον κῆρ

and *Il.* 10.16 = *Od.* 21.247

μέγα δ' ἔστενε κυδάλιμον κῆρ.

²⁵⁴ Another example with a finite verb, *Il.* 12.179, is in a passage generally viewed as spurious.

²⁵⁵ So too in *Il.* 14.38–39; cf. notes 247 and 253. A variant with the dative occurs in *Il.* 6.486; cf. note 240. Note the dative too with a synonymous periphrastic phrase, in *Od.* 7.218

καὶ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα.

²⁵⁶ The verb is apparently deponent in its finite forms, but it has two perfect participles, the one medio-passive in form that is cited in the text, and in addition an active one τετιηώς, which seems to mean the same thing (cf. Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* 1.432, and see further below, note 281), but which is used in a different construction, in agreement with θυμός, to which it thus bears the same relation as does a finite verb to its subject (cf. notes 255 and 257). See for examples *Il.* 11.555, 17.664, 24.883.

The first passage seems to prove that 'heart' is accusative also in the other two.

Once we have established the custom of saying that some one is enraged or raging, delighted or rejoicing or glad, grieved or grieving, *in heart*, other emotional effects may be expected to be similarly expressed. A few miscellaneous examples follow. (1) Passive verbs: *Od.* 18.212 'be charmed, bewitched'

θυμὸν ἔθελχθεν,

5.454 'be overcome, subdued'

δέδμητο φίλον κῆρ.

Od. 19.136 'be melted, wasted away; pine away'²⁵⁷

φίλον κατατήκομαι ἦτορ,

(2) Intransitive verb: *Il.* 15.627 'tremble'

τρομέουσι δέ τε φρένα.

(3) Medio-passive perfect participle: *Od.* 18.327 'stricken' i.e. 'stupid' (?)²⁵⁸

φρένας ἔκπεπαταγμένος.

(4) Intransitive present participle: *Il.* 15.10 '(being) senseless'

κῆρ ἀπινύσσων.

(5) Adjectives: 'mad' *Il.* 15.128 and *Od.* 2.243

φρένας ἡλέ (ἡλεέ).

And we find a number of instances of the expression 'struck to the heart.' This is a particularly natural locution,²⁵⁹ since verbs of striking, as we have seen, are so often combined in a literal sense with a noun denoting an organ. We meet the same verbs used figuratively, βάλλω in *Il.* 9.9²⁶⁰

βεβολημένος ἦτορ

²⁵⁷ But in the more nearly physical passages, *Od.* 19.204

τήκετο δὲ χρώς

and 208

τῆς τήκετο καλὰ παρῆια,

the body-part nouns are nominative. Cf. notes 255 and 256.

²⁵⁸ The general meaning of the phrase as 'witless' is clear, but not the precise force; see Monro *ad loc.* If the compound comes from πατάσσω, the passage should perhaps be combined with those containing verbs of striking.

²⁵⁹ For an example in the active, cf. above, note 115.

²⁶⁰ Cf. the same verb used absolutely, also in a figurative sense, just above, 9.3.

and *Od.* 10.247

κῆρ . . . βεβολημένος,

and πλήσσω in *Il.* 3.31

κατεπλήγη φίλον ἦτορ

and 16.403

πλήγη φρένας.

Here the perfect participles are passive in force, and the finite forms are passive in form as well; but the construction with the accusative could have been transferred from such an ambiguous form as ἀχνύμενος. From such figurative expressions as *Il.* 9.9 and *Od.* 10.247 it is but a step to similar phrases where the meaning is strictly literal and physical such as the following, in *Il.* 16.660²⁶¹

βεβλαμμένον ἦτορ,

17.535

δεδαῦγμένον ἦτορ,

13.782–83²⁶²

τετυμμένω ἐγχείησιν/ἀμφοτέρω κατὰ χεῖρα,

and 20.480

χεῖρα βαρυνθείς.

The sense of the first three participles, and the form of the fourth, show us that they are all passive. So too in the passages with finite verbs meaning ‘wound’ or ‘hit’: *Il.* 4.518–19

χερμαδίῳ γὰρ βλήτο παρὰ σφυρὸν ὀκρίοντι
κνήμην δεξιτερήν,

5.284

βέβληται κενεῶνα διαμπερές,

17.598

βλήτο γὰρ ὦμον δουρί.

And with these I would include 12.427

οὐτάζοντο κατὰ χροά νηλεί χαλκῷ,

²⁶¹ There exists here a variant reading δεδαῦγμένον as in the following example, and also an emendation to βεβλημένον has been suggested; the latter would of course give us a still closer parallel to *Il.* 9.9.

²⁶² Note κατὰ again, as above. Cf. note 251.

since, as I have said frequently,²⁶³ I do not think *κατά* affects the construction. This small group of examples is exceedingly important for the history of our problem, for it is they, or at least the first three of them, that are repeatedly cited as refuting Brugmann's theory that the accusative of specification is derived from the scheme of whole and part. And at first sight this does seem a valid objection: it might be possible to confound filling oneself and being filled with courage or anger, delighting oneself and being delighted, distressing oneself and being distressed, but never wounding oneself and being wounded! And yet I think if we operate as I have done, a step at a time, in tracing the evolution of this construction, it seems not so unlikely after all.

Other verbs involving physical suffering naturally behave like those of wounding. We may note, for instance,²⁶⁴ *Od.* 5.426

σὺν δ' ὅστέ' ἀράχθη

and *Il.* 23.396

θρυλίσθη δὲ μέτωπον ἐπ' ὀφρύσι.

From being wounded or bruised or broken or (as in *Il.* 20.480) weighed down, i.e. maimed, in a part of one's body to being swollen or weary in such a part is but a simple shift. This brings us to intransitive verbs. Note *Od.* 5.455

ᾧδε δὲ χροά πάντα,

and also the following: *Il.* 16.106

ὁ δ' ἀριστερόν ὦμον ἔκαμυνεν,

Il. 21.26 = *Od.* 21.150

κάμε χείρας,

Il. 2.389

χείρα καμείται,

23.63

κάμε φαίδιμα γυῖα,

²⁶³ Cf. just above, note 262.

²⁶⁴ It happens that in each of these passages the body-part noun might be the subject, but it is probably accusative to balance the accusative in the preceding clause, *Od.* 5.426

ἔνθα κ' ἀπὸ ῥινοῦς δρύφθη

and *Il.* 23.395

ἀγκῶνας τε περιδρύφθη στόμα τε ῥίνας τε

respectively, although the first accusative in *Od.* 5.426 is of a different type. Both these passages have been discussed above, 269.

Od. 12.279–80

οὐδέ τι γυῖα/κάμνεις,

and probably²⁶⁵ *Il.* 19.169–70

οὐδέ τι γυῖα/πρὶν κάμνει.

The accusative can also appear with adjectives, as in *Il.* 9.503

παραβλῶπές τ' ὀφθαλμῷ.

This is perhaps the place to point out — though it hardly needs pointing out — that intransitive verbs and adjectives parallel each other closely in their relationship to the accusative of specification, with participles perhaps forming the connecting link between them.²⁶⁶ Thus compare the following pairs or groups. (1) The verb in *Il.* 13.473

φρίσσει δέ τε νῶτον

and the participle in *Od.* 19.446

φρίξας εὖ λοφιήν.

(2) The verb in *Il.* 5.354

μελαίνετο δέ χροά,

the participle in *Od.* 11.528–29

κεῖνον . . . ὠχρήσαντα χροά,

and the adjective in *Od.* 15.133

κάρη ξανθός.

²⁶⁵ I say probably but not positively, because just before this there are two lines 165–66

ἀλλὰ τε λάθρη γυῖα βαρύνεται, ἥδ' ἐ κιχάνει
δίψα τε καὶ λιμός, βλάβεται δέ τε γούνατ' ἴοντι,

in which one would be inclined to take the two neuters as accusatives were it not for the fact that the dative ἴοντι proves that the second, and suggests that the first, is nominative. Similarly the neuter is ambiguous in 7.6

καμάτω δ' ὑπὸ γυῖα λέλυνται,

but must be nominative just below in 7.16

ὁ δ' ἐξ ἵππων χαμάδις πέσε, λύντο δέ γυῖα,

also in 21.114

τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ.

²⁶⁶ Cf. above, note 4, particularly the quotation from Brugmann.

(3) The verb in *Od.* 1.208–9²⁶⁷

αἰνῶς μὲν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ὄμματα καλὰ ἔοικας
κείνω,

the participle in *Il.* 8.305²⁶⁸

δέμας ἐκνυῖα θεῆσιν,

and the adjective in *Il.* 2.478²⁶⁹

ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν ἵκελος Διί.

(4) The verb in *Il.* 3.210

στάντων μὲν Μενέλαος ὑπείρεχεν εὐρέας ὦμους

and the adjective in *Il.* 3.227²⁷⁰

ἔξοχος Ἀργείων κεφαλὴν τε καὶ εὐρέας ὦμους.

CONCLUSION

A. Summary of Proposed Explanation

1. Why the Accusative in Partitive Apposition Could Generate a New Construction

We have seen in Part I that in Homer possible examples of partitive apposition abound, occurring in every case, nominative, genitive, dative, and accusative. There is a sharp difference, however, between (a) examples in the nominative and (b) those in oblique cases, inasmuch as the former seem to be confined to instances of appositives representing a group and a member of a group, and the latter, while they occasionally exemplify this type too, usually constitute instances of appositives representing a person and a part of his body. Examples in oblique cases also fall into two different sets, namely (a) examples in the genitive and the dative and (b) examples in the accusative, inasmuch as the former are in Homer not so markedly and indubitably instances of partitive apposition as the latter. It is my belief that all alike stem from

²⁶⁷ Cf. *Il.* 20.81 et al.

²⁶⁸ Cf. *Il.* 23.66–67 et al.

²⁶⁹ Cf. *Od.* 1.371, 21.411 et al.

²⁷⁰ Contrast the dative in *Il.* 3.168 and 193.

partitive apposition; that in a very early form of the *Ursprache* two substantives having any relation to each other were placed in the same case;²⁷¹ that this continued to be done at all periods of the derived languages' development when the two substantives were mutually coextensive (apposition), but that when they were not, either (type A) the lack of coextension was marked by the placing of the more extensive noun (the whole) in the genitive as a modifier of the less extensive noun (the part), or (type B) though the substantives continued to be placed in the same case, their mutual relationship was lost sight of, and they were interpreted as completely independent entities illustrating quite different uses of their common case.

Thus instances of partitive apposition in the nominative even as early as Homer have a rather anomalous air. Modern grammarians deal with many of them in a reproachful or apologetic or baffled way, often having recourse to such counsels of despair as the label "nominative absolute" for the noun denoting the group,²⁷² or "singular subject with a plural verb in loose agreement" for the noun denoting the individual.²⁷³ And probably even to the Greeks themselves they must have come to appear unnatural or awkward, for in the probably more self-conscious and perhaps more puristic literature of the later periods they seem to be relatively less common.

On the other hand instances of partitive apposition in the genitive followed the course that I have just designated as type A;²⁷⁴ in other words, the "whole" noun in the genitive developed into the genitive that we class as a possessive genitive or a partitive genitive, or in some instances into the genitive that we class as a subjective genitive or an objective genitive.²⁷⁵ And instances of parti-

²⁷¹ Cf. *TAPA* 84.92-93.

²⁷² Cf. above, Part I.A, especially notes 29 and 30. The construction is termed an anacoluthon by Schwyzler-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* 2.617. On the genuine nominative absolute or *nominativus pendens*, which certainly is a species of anacoluthon, and which seems on the whole to belong to post-Homeric rather than to Homeric Greek, and to prose rather than to poetry, see Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* 606, and Schwyzler-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* 2.66 and 705.

²⁷³ Cf. above, Part I.A, especially notes 9 and 21. See also Schwyzler-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* 2.616-17; and, for the comparable use in Latin, Hahn, *TAPA* 84.100-101, and *Language* 30.248.

²⁷⁴ This development of course long antedated Homer, and even Greek at any stage. It was already well under way even in so archaic a language as Hittite, which varies between partitive apposition and modifying genitive (cf. *TAPA* 84.97, note 23); and it must have been well established in Indo-European.

²⁷⁵ Cf. *TAPA* 84.93-94.

tive apposition in the dative followed the course that I have just designated as type B; in other words, the "whole" noun came to be used in such a way that it could be interpreted as one type of dative, indirect object or dative of reference (or, in some classifications, that monstrous invention, the "dative with a verb compounded with a preposition"); and the "part" noun came to be used in such a way that it could be interpreted as a different type of dative, place where, or means, or specification.²⁷⁶

These developments in the use of the genitive and the dative are well advanced in Homer's day, especially the former. The genitive, whether classified as possessive, partitive, subjective, or objective, can modify another noun in any case whatsoever. The dative referring to a person, whether classified as dative of indirect object or dative of reference, and the dative referring to a thing, whether classified as locative dative, instrumental dative, or dative of specification, can be used quite independently of each other, either one alone without the other, and either one in combination with a noun in some other case, say the accusative. Yet the fact that when the person noun is an indirect object (i.e. in the dative) the body-part noun is usually in the dative, and when the person noun is a direct object (i.e. in the accusative) the body-part noun is usually in the accusative, does seem to bear strong testimony that the two substantives were originally appositives; in such collocations there is no more need for the dative to be a "dative of specification" in origin than for the accusative to be an "accusative of specification" in origin.

This brings us to the accusative. Here partitive apposition certainly continues to be indubitable, or at least recognizable, longer than in the other cases.²⁷⁷ Thus modern editors are much more likely to find an instance of partitive apposition in such a passage as *Il.* 3.438²⁷⁸

μή με, γυναί, χαλεποῖσιν ὀνείδεσι θυμὸν ἔριπτε

²⁷⁶ Cf. above, Part I.B.2. Of course this development must have been facilitated by the fact that the Greek dative, being the representative of the Indo-European instrumental and locative cases as well as of the dative proper, had acquired all these uses independently.

²⁷⁷ Hence the error of many modern grammarians in treating it as the case of partitive apposition par excellence. Cf. above, note 153.

²⁷⁸ Listed above, I.B.3.b.

than in such a passage as 1.24²⁷⁹

ἀλλ' οὐκ Ἀτρεΐδῃ Ἀγαμέμνονι ἦνδανε θυμῷ.

What the Greeks thought about it — if indeed they thought about it at all! — we of course do not know. But the fact remains that partitive apposition did persist in unmistakable form longer in the accusative than in the dative (and very much longer than in the genitive); and when finally this case became, so to speak, the sole survivor of the construction, it naturally was particularly open to misinterpretation, so that eventually the body-part noun came to be looked upon as a separate and separable accusative denoting specification, in which capacity it ended up by almost wholly supplanting the dative, the case which had inherited this function.²⁸⁰

2. How the Accusative in Partitive Apposition Generated the Accusative of Specification

Yet the question may be asked, and has been asked, why, if the accusative of specification is an outgrowth of the accusative body-part noun used originally as one of the two objects (in partitive apposition) of an active transitive verb, we have absolutely no trace in Homer of a nominative body-part noun used originally as one of two subjects (in partitive apposition) of a passive verb. As was pointed out in Part I.A, no such instances exist. On the contrary, the accusative of specification is used freely with intransitive and passive verbs and participles, and even with adjectives. In other words, there are seemingly no signs of a transition-stage between *Il.* 5.188

καί μιν βάλλον ὤμον

and 17.598

βλήτο γὰρ ὤμον.

Therefore, as was shown in Part II.A, many authorities deny the genetic connection between the accusative in partitive apposition that is posited by Delbrück and Brugmann and their followers.

²⁷⁹ Listed above, I.B.2. The dative here is classed as locative in the school editions of Seymour and Benner, and Paley paraphrases "in his mind."

²⁸⁰ Cf. Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* 470, and Schwyzler-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* 2.167 and 168. On the other hand in Latin, in which the accusative in partitive apposition seems to have been much less common than in Greek (cf. above, note 14), the ablative maintained its inherited function as the case of specification, despite the occasional use of the accusative of specification that was introduced as a borrowing from Greek by the writers (mainly the poets) of the Golden Age (cf. above, Preliminary Remarks, especially note 2).

But in Part II.B I have tried to trace the possible evolution of the second construction from the first; and it may not be amiss here to recapitulate the various points that were there made in the course of an examination of many examples and groups of examples, some of which contributed one detail in the development and some another.

Point 1

With the active verb, there is no essential difference between an accusative reflexive pronoun which serves as a direct object and any other direct object.

An active verb may take two direct objects in apposition with each other, as a rule referring respectively to a person and a part (usually though not necessarily a body-part) of that person, the second substantive seeming to delimit the first (partitive apposition, scheme of whole and part). In such instances as elsewhere, the direct object referring to a person may be a reflexive pronoun.

Point 2

A middle verb resembles an active verb,²⁸¹ plus the added notion that the subject acts for or upon himself.²⁸² A middle verb may be parallel to an active verb in one of two ways.

²⁸¹ Actives and middles seem particularly close in many forms in Homer. See in particular Chantraine's remarks (*Gr. Hom.* 1.432, already referred to above, note 256) on the equivalence of the active and middle, especially the participles, in the perfect.

²⁸² Thus a middle verb really by itself (through its voice) implies an entity which has the relation to the verb of a direct or indirect object, much as every verb (except impersonals) by itself (through its personal ending) implies an entity which has the relation to the verb of a subject. A very neat illustration of the distinction between active and middle is provided by *Il.* 18.203–4

ἀμφὶ δ' Ἀθήνη
ὤμοις ἰφθίμοισι βάλλ' αἰγίδα θυσανόεσσαν

vs. 10.333

αὐτίκα δ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ἐβάλλετο καμπύλα τόξα

and 2.45 = 3.334 = 19.372

ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον.

The active is used of Athena putting equipment on Achilles; the middle of a man putting equipment on himself. In the latter instance of course no dative is needed. In the former none is absolutely needed either, because the preceding clause had made it evident that it was Achilles who was being arrayed; but none the less we do get a dative personal pronoun in the next line, 205

ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ κεφαλῇ νέφος ἔστεφε δῖα θεάων,

which is undoubtedly to be joined with ὤμοις as well as with κεφαλῇ (with which it forms our familiar double dative; cf. note 59).

(a) It may be equivalent to an active verb plus a reflexive pronoun in the dative. In that case an accusative may be added to it as a direct object, precisely as with an active verb. Such an accusative may denote a body-part, though of course it need not.

(b) It may be equivalent to an active verb plus a reflexive pronoun in the accusative. In that case an accusative, usually denoting a body-part, may be added to it to delimit the person receiving the action, i.e. the equivalent of a direct object with an active verb. Such an accusative corresponds to the second of the two accusatives in partitive apposition met with the active verb.

In either case we have a middle verb plus an accusative denoting the body-part. The accusative with type (a) was a true direct object, parallel to a direct object with an active verb. The accusative with type (b) originally corresponded to the second of a pair of direct objects with an active verb, of which the second was in partitive apposition with the first; but since no apposition was evident, it too could be regarded as the direct object of the middle verb. Or it could be viewed as a special new type of accusative, the accusative of specification.

Point 3

A passive verb in most instances resembles a middle verb in form.²⁸³ This is true of Homeric Greek to an even greater extent than it is of Attic, since some passive forms which in Attic are distinct from the middle were a late development.²⁸⁴ On the other

²⁸³ In Indo-European there were two voices, active and medio-passive. Latin specialized the latter mainly as a passive, though perhaps the so-called passive forms, especially the deponents, have middle meaning oftener than is realized (cf. Hahn, *Language* 30.253). Greek specialized it mainly as a middle, although in many instances the forms were also used as passives; sometimes the structure of the sentence, and sometimes only the context, enables us to distinguish which we have, but how far the Greeks themselves could and did distinguish in any given case is of course debatable. However, they certainly did have a passive, since in certain tenses forms were developed which were used as passives *only*. The voice never acquired its own endings, however; it borrowed those of the active in the aorist, and those of the middle in the future and the future perfect. Monro aptly says (*Hom. Gr.* 45) that the passive with middle forms grew out of the reflexive meaning, and with active forms out of the intransitive meaning. In Homer it is often impossible to determine whether a given active form should be classed as intransitive or passive in meaning. We may too note as a typical though perhaps specially striking example the three equivalent aorist participles all meaning 'angry,' middle *χολωσάμενος* (cf. *Il.* 3.413), passive *χολωθείς* (cf. 1.9), deponent intransitive *χωσάμενος* (cf. 3.414). See the detailed discussion above (271) about verbs of this type.

²⁸⁴ Thus according to Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* 1.447, the future passive occurs only once in Homer, in a probably late portion. We have already noted (notes 207 and

hand there are some formal distinctions between middle and passive even as early as Homer²⁸⁵ (were there not, it would obviously be improper to assign such a distinction to Homer at all).

In some instances there is little or no difference in force between the middle and the passive. When they are identical in form, it may be difficult or impossible to decide (and perhaps we should not even try to decide!) whether the meaning is middle or passive.²⁸⁶ Even when they are diverse in form, they frequently seem to be identical in meaning.²⁸⁷

In view of this close relationship, it is not surprising that a construction suitable with the middle only was transferred to the passive. This probably happened first with indistinguishable forms; then with instances that were different in form but very similar in meaning; last of all with instances that, whether ambiguous or unquestionably passive in form, were clearly passive in meaning, like the notorious but really very few examples of the passive of *βάλλω* meaning 'be hit.'

Thus we now have the accusative not only with the middle but also with the passive. In this case it cannot be viewed as an object; it can be classed only as an accusative of specification.

Point 4

The similar accusative with active intransitive verbs must have developed directly from its use with transitive verbs of kindred meaning, whether their form was (1) middle or (2) passive. If (1), it doubtless grew up *pari passu* just as the accusative with the passive did; if (2), its development followed, and proceeded from, the development of the accusative with the passive.

208) that the passive aorist in *-(σ)θ-* was a late and often indistinguishable substitute for the middle aorist (see again Chantraine 1.401 and 406-7).

²⁸⁵ Thus in contradistinction to the future passive (on which see note 284), there are future perfects which Chantraine (1.448) calls "nettement intransitifs ou passifs." Cf. too the special type of active perfect with intransitive sense (*ib.* 424-29) and the middle aorists with intransitive or passive sense (like our own *βλήτο*, on which see 380, also *πλήτο*, on which see 381, and also above, note 207), existing side-by-side with active and/or middle aorists. (On the equivalence of intransitive and passive, see note 283.)

²⁸⁶ Cf. particularly the discussion above concerning verbs of washing. See too note 283. I have already referred to the dictionary's classing as passive of certain participles which to me seem middle (notes 201, 204, and 207).

²⁸⁷ Cf. above, note 208.

Point 5

The accusative of specification with adjectives may have developed from verbs of kindred meaning because of their meaning, or from participles because of their kindred form and use.

B. Contributing Factors

Although my solution for the development of the accusative of specification is as just summarized, I am quite willing to believe that there were other contributing factors,²⁸⁸ even though I do not agree with those who regard one or another of them as fundamental.

1. Analogy

One factor may well have been the powerful force of analogy.

Verbs of striking and wounding could in the active take simply the accusative of the person wounded,²⁸⁹ as in *Il.* 20.378

μή πῶς σ' ἡὲ βάλλῃ ἡὲ σχεδὸν ἄορι τήψῃ

and *Od.* 17.278–79

μή τίς σ' ἔκτοσθε νοήσας/ἡ βάλλῃ ἡ ἐλάσῃ.

In the corresponding passive, the designation of the person wounded becomes the subject, as in *Il.* 13.288

εἴ περ γάρ κε βλήῃτο πονούμενος ἡὲ τυπείης.

Compare too the passages with passive participles, *Il.* 11.191 = 206

ἡ δούρῃ τυπείς ἡ βλήμενος ἰῶ

and 15.495

βλήμενος ἡὲ τυπείς.

But to the active verb plus the accusative of the person wounded, we can add an accusative of the body-part wounded, as in 7.14–16

Ἴφινόων βάλε δούρῃ . . . ὦμον.

Then it seems not unnatural also to add an accusative of the body-part wounded to the corresponding passive form, as in 17.598²⁹⁰

βλήτο γὰρ ὦμον δούρῃ.

²⁸⁸ Like Sommer (cf. above, note 162), I decline to subscribe to Blümel's rigid 'either . . . or.'

²⁸⁹ Cf. above, note 102.

²⁹⁰ Cf. too *Il.* 4.518–19 and 5.284. All these were cited above, 276.

And what helps to make it seem natural is that in many instances to the combination of active verb plus two accusatives corresponds the combination of passive verb plus one accusative.

It must be noted that with active verbs there are two distinct types of double accusatives.²⁹¹

The first type occurs with verbs of naming, choosing, making, deeming, etc. In this type the two accusatives are related to each other, and are in quite different relations to the verb: only the first is a direct object, and the other is in predicate relation to it. When this type is combined with a passive verb, both accusatives are replaced by nominatives, the predicate accusative of course becoming a predicate nominative.

The second type occurs (a) with verbs of asking, teaching, concealing, depriving, etc.; and (b) with verbs of doing (to some one) and saying (about some one). In this type the two accusatives are independent of each other, and each in its own right is a direct object of the verb; often, though not necessarily, one refers to a person, and the other (a) refers to a thing or (b) is in form a neuter equivalent to an adverb. When this type is combined with a passive verb, one accusative is replaced by a nominative, and the other is retained as an accusative.

Now accusatives in partitive apposition with each other do not belong to either type. They have something in common with the first type in that they have an internal relationship with each other, and we would certainly expect them to behave as accusatives of the first type do, *both* becoming nominatives with a passive verb. But they also have something in common with the second type in that they are both direct objects of the active verb,²⁹² and the circumstance that one of the two direct objects of the active verb remains as such with the passive verb might have helped to establish the retention of the body-part accusative also with the passive, though here it is certainly *not* what one would expect.²⁹³

The further this body-part accusative progressed in ceasing to

²⁹¹ It should be emphasized that different kinds of double accusatives have nothing in common except the accident of their being double. Each accusative must be examined and classified separately.

²⁹² Note especially the close approach of some instances of partitive apposition to the double accusative with verbs of depriving (section I.B.3.c).

²⁹³ I have already expressed disagreement with those who believe that in the scheme of whole and part we have the ordinary construction of two accusatives one of which is unquestionably to be retained in the passive.

be an element in partitive apposition (a development already begun in the middle) and in evolving into an accusative of specification, the more reinforcements there would be to the tendency for its retention with the passive, since the dative of specification with which it frequently interchanged²⁹⁴ was of course retained as such with a passive verb.

2. Occurrence of Neuters

The fact that many of the words which developed into accusatives of specification were neuters, and hence indistinguishable in nominative and accusative,²⁹⁵ *may* have to some extent facilitated or expedited²⁹⁶ the employment of an accusative where a nominative would have been expected.

These neuters fall into three categories.

(1) The words for 'name' and 'race.' This use of 'name,' which is supposed to have introduced that of 'race,'²⁹⁷ is almost certainly inherited from Indo-European,²⁹⁸ for it or something like it also occurs in Indo-Iranian (both Sanskrit and Avestan);²⁹⁹ but it is extremely restricted in use³⁰⁰ and fairly rare in occurrence,³⁰¹ and I have indicated disbelief³⁰² in the possibility of its having generated so widely-extended a construction as the accusative of specification. Whether even in the matter of gender it played a part³⁰³ seems to me extremely dubious.

²⁹⁴ Cf. above, note 240.

²⁹⁵ The ambiguity of such forms occasionally leads to uncertainty as to whether the word in question is an accusative of specification or the subject of the verb. Cf. notes 247, 264, and 265. To the dubious passages referred to there may be added *Od.* 5.454

ἀλλὶ γὰρ δέδμητο φίλον κῆρ.

²⁹⁶ But again I disagree with those, such as Havers and Biese (above, II.A.4-5), who think that this factor could by itself have produced such employment.

²⁹⁷ Cf. above, section II.A.1.

²⁹⁸ As to its origin in Indo-European, Brugmann's explanation may be right; but I think the objections to it of Kieckers (*IF* 30.365) are well taken, and I hope elsewhere to offer an alternative suggestion.

²⁹⁹ As for Latin, both *nomen* and *genus* are found in this use in Vergil, but this is probably an imitation of Greek.

³⁰⁰ Cf. Gray, *IF* 11.307-13. He does not believe it is an accusative of specification at all; see especially his close, 313.

³⁰¹ We find *ὄνομα* in *Od.* 7.54; 15.256; 18.5; 19.247 and 409; 20.288; but it is by no means certain that in any of these instances it is an accusative of specification, and in at least one (*Od.* 19.409) it seems certain that it is not.

³⁰² Cf. above, note 159.

³⁰³ We find neuters in the *Odyssey*: *ὄνομα* in 15.256; 18.5; 19.247; 20.288; *ὄνομ'* . . . *ἐπώνυμον* in 7.54 and 19.409 (cf. *ἐπώνυμον* alone in *Il.* 9.562). But in the *Iliad*

(2) A large number of general words meaning size, length, width, shape, form, body, etc. This usage too may be inherited.³⁰⁴ The use of these words as accusatives of specification has been diversely explained, as due to the neuter gender of a number of words which happened to have somewhat similar meanings, or as due to the meanings of a group of words which happened to be in the neuter gender. Since they are sometimes associated with the more specific body-part words, as in *Il.* 23.66–67

πάντ' αὐτῷ μέγεθος τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ' ἔκνυα
καὶ φωνήν,

Od. 19.381

ὥς σὺ δέμας φωνήν τε πόδας τ' Ὀδυσῆϊ ἔοικας,

and 11.337 = 18.249

εἶδος τε μέγεθος τε ἰδὲ φρένας ἔνδον ἔϊσας,

they may have had some influence on them.

(3) A large number of specific body-part words.³⁰⁵ But then there are plenty of masculine and feminine body-part words too!³⁰⁶

On the whole I would not attach so much importance to the influence of neuters as to that of double accusatives. But I think we need neither. I hope I have shown sufficiently how, purely as a result of its own independent development, the accusative denoting the part in the scheme of whole and part evolved into the accusative of specification, known also as the Greek accusative.

the usual accusative form is *ἐπὶ κλησιν*: 7.138; 16.177; 18.487; 22.29 and 506 (so too *Od.* 5.273). The situation is not the same as regards 'race'; the neuter *γένος* is considerably commoner than the feminine *γενεήν*.

³⁰⁴ Schwyzer-Debrunner (*Gr. Gr.* 2.86) groups these with nouns of name and race (cf. note 297), for which he accepts Brugmann's explanation.

³⁰⁵ Common examples are *μέτωπον*, *ὄσσε*, *παρήμιον*, *νῶτον*, *μετάφρενον*, *στέρνον*, *στήθος*, *ἦπαρ*; also *κῆρ* and *ἦτορ*.

³⁰⁶ Cf. above, close of section II.A.4 and note 171.