

## SHORT ACCUSATIVE PLURALS IN GREEK

WILLIAM F. WYATT, JR.

*Brown University*

Recently (*Glotta* 42 [1964] 138–65) Anna Morpurgo Davies has argued that Doric linguistic features are absent from the language of Hesiod. Her conclusions on this score are generally convincing,<sup>1</sup> but I find unconvincing her explanation of the origin of one of the features in question, the accusative plural of feminine nouns ending in short *-/as/*. For the moment I do not consider whether such forms are Doric or not.

Briefly, Mrs. Davies' explanation is this. At an early stage of the Greek language the accusative plural of *o*- and *a*-stems was *\*/ons/* and *\*/ans/* respectively. Subsequently, but at a time when dactylic oral epic was already being composed, these forms developed two allomorphs: *\*/ons/* and *\*/ans/* occurred before vowels, *\*/os/* and *\*/as/* before consonants. Later *\*/ons/* and *\*/ans/* developed to *\*/o:s/* (= *ovs*) and *\*/a:s/* in Attic-Ionic, and the short forms were eliminated from the colloquial language. But they remained in epic formulae in preconsonantal position whence they later spread to prevocalic position as well, but only in Hesiod, and only in *a*-stems.<sup>2</sup>

Three questions concerning this interpretation spring to mind: (1) How did the short forms of the accusative plural come to be used before a vowel? (2) Why do such forms not occur in Homer? (3) Why do they occur only in *a*-stems?

(1) Short accusatives are discernible in Hesiod only before a vowel, and they have metrical utility only there. And yet, according to Mrs.

<sup>1</sup> But there is one certain Doric form, *τέτορες* "four" (*τέτορ'*, *Op.* 698; *τέτορες*, fr. 267), as Mrs. Davies admits (149–50).

<sup>2</sup> I do not wish to assert that the development sketched by Mrs. Davies is impossible: indeed it actually took place in Thessalian, Arcadian, Theran, and Coan both in *a*- and *o*-stems (C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* [Chicago 1955] 68). I do, however, deny that this explanation will do for Hesiod.

Davies, they originated before a consonant. How did they come to be used before a vowel? One would imagine that as the short forms were replaced by the longer forms in everyday discourse, they would be similarly replaced in verse. One would not expect the original distribution of allomorphs to remain. Mrs. Davies (162) answers this question by assuming that in the process of aoidic variation on formulae a formerly preconsonantal short accusative plural came to stand before a vowel. One might legitimately object that formulaic variation ordinarily (though certainly not always) preserves the metrical shape of the phrase. Thus if a poet were to vary *πολλὰς ψυχὰς*, he would most likely simply substitute another word of similar metrical shape for *ψυχὰς*, say *κούρας*, rather than on the basis of that formula create something like *πολλὰς ἀοιδὰς*. And it is of course clear that one short-vowel form at least, *μεταναιέτας* (*Th.* 401), could not have appeared in any formula with a long final syllable, since it would be metrically impossible, and that this word, at least, must be analogical to something. But one must probably grant that if short-vowel forms could arise before consonants, and if they were preserved by the tradition, it would have occurred to some aoidos to use them before vowels as well. Hence my raising of the question of how these forms came to stand before a vowel is not intended so much to call attention to a weakness in Mrs. Davies' argument as to stress, as she does (162), the obvious metrical utility of short accusative plurals.

(2) But their very metrical utility makes the fact that they do not occur in Homer even more difficult to understand.<sup>3</sup> Mrs. Davies

<sup>3</sup> There are, though, three variant readings with *-ās* in Homer. One, *θηλέας*, in *Il.* 5.269,

*λάβρη Λαομέδοντος ὑποσχὼν θηλέας ἵππους,*

can be dismissed immediately: it is not a shortened form of the feminine *θηλείας*, but rather is the masculine form used for the feminine (Davies 156, note 3). The second, *προφανείσας* at *Il.* 8.378,

*γηθήσει προφανέντε ἀνὰ πολέμοιο γεφύρας,*

(of Hera and Athena) is more interesting. Clearly it cannot be the correct reading (cf. Leaf *ad loc.*), but is one attempt (of many), this one dating back at least to Zenodotus, to correct the seemingly anomalous *προφανέντε* (or *προφανείσῃ* feminine dual). The third example, *πλευράς* in *Od.* 17.231-32,

*πολλὰ οἱ ἀμφὶ κάρη σφέλα ἀνδρῶν ἐκ παλαμῶν  
πλευραὶ ἀποτρίψουσι δόμον κᾶτα βαλλομένοιο,*

explains this most striking fact by accepting the argument that Hesiod was an oral poet and not merely a linguistic imitator of Homer. If such is the case, he might have preserved some formulae or linguistic features which happen not to occur in Homer, and of which Homer was ignorant. But not everyone believes that Hesiod was an oral poet,<sup>4</sup> and for those who do not, her argument loses much of its force. And even if one accepts that Hesiod was an oral poet, the argument is still unconvincing. For surely Homer would have known of the possibility of using short accusative plural forms before a vowel, had old formulae containing such things existed, just as he knew of the habit of using *ἐς* before a vowel (Davies 163–64). It will not do to say that Hesiod, who was in the same linguistic tradition as Homer, knew formulae stemming from more or less remote antiquity which were unknown to Homer. The possibilities are two: either Homer knew of these forms but considered them *infra dignitatem*; or he did not know of them at all because they either had not yet come into being in his own day, or were not in use in the area in which he lived.

(3) With one exception, to which we shall return later, all short accusative forms are of *a*-stems, even though short *o*-stem forms would have been equally convenient metrically. Mrs. Davies has no convincing explanation for this fact, and her attempts at an explanation (157, note 2) are half-hearted. She recognizes it for the serious obstacle to her hypothesis that it is.<sup>5</sup>

is interesting only because Epicharmus later used this form (see below, note 37). Did Epicharmus have this passage in mind, thus indicating that the variant reading is an old one? Or did the scribe of the Homeric text, remembering the form from Epicharmus, introduce the accusative here in order to avoid what seemed to him a syntactic difficulty? Or is this simply a coincidence—either pure and simple, or is there something about the word itself which lent itself to the creation of a short accusative?

<sup>4</sup> Mrs. Davies (158–59) following Nopopoulos and Hoekstra (refs. Davies 158, note 5). But in order to convince, she must demonstrate not only that Hesiod was an oral poet, but that he was a poet in an oral tradition independent of the Homeric. This has in fact been maintained by J. de Hoz, "Poesia oral independiente de Homero en Hesiodo y los himnos homericos," *Emerita* 32 [1964] 283–98, but has been, correctly, denied by J. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* = *Verhandelingen der kon. Nederl. Akad. van Wetens. Afd. Letterkunde*, n. s. 71, no. 1 (Amsterdam 1965) p. 26.

<sup>5</sup> In Pindar there are a number of *variae lectiones* involving short accusative plurals or *o*-stems, but they are all highly unlikely (Davies 152, note 3). In *Ol.* 1.53, *κακαγόρος* is indeed metrically possible, but not at all necessary. A. Turyn (*Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* [Oxford 1952]), prints *κακαγόρους*. In *Ol.* 2.71, *μακάρων νῆσος*, an accusative plural, would better suit the phrase *μακάρων νήσοισι* in Hesiod, *Op.* 171, the phrase on

Taking these points together, we find that short accusative plurals are metrically useful forms restricted to *a*-stems, appearing only in certain poets. A situation of this sort indicates that a purely phonetic explanation of the phenomenon is impossible, and that we should seek some morphological reason for it. What is there in *a*-stems that would favor the creation of accusative plurals in *-as*?<sup>6</sup>

*A*-stems are peculiar in that they can be broken up into several classes. One class, composed of masculine nouns, differs from the

which this one may well be based. Mrs. Davies says that the reading here is metrically possible, but not satisfactory, but this seems overstated: it is perfectly satisfactory, whether or not metrically possible. Turyn (2.78) prints the singular *vāson*. In *Nem.* 3.29, *ἐσλὸς αἰνεῖν*, either a singular or a plural would be possible: it depends on whether the statement is generic or specific. It seems better to take it as specific, and hence read the singular *ἐσλὸν* as Turyn does. The forms at *Nem.* 1.24 and *Nem.* 3.24 are unmetrical. *Nem.* 10.62, *ἡμένος*, is surely wrong. The meter allows either a long or a short here, but the sense demands the singular *ἡμενον* which Turyn prints. Only Castor was seated in the tree. But the reading *ἡμένος* is doubtless old, and stems from an attempt to account for the fact that Castor and Pollux are rarely apart, and for Pollux' subsequent rapid appearance. Not one of these forms is secure, and many are impossible, and hence Pindar does not provide early evidence of short accusative plural forms of *o*-stems. There are no short *a*-stem accusatives in Pindar. The only other possible early *o*-stem accusative occurs in the quite definitely non-Doric Archilochus (116 D):

καὶ βήσσας ὀρέων δυσπαιφάλους, οἷος ἦν ἐπ' ἥβης,

for which some write *δυσπαιφάλος*. But Hephaestion (15.8, p. 50 C., quoted by Diehl) allows a cretic in that position. As Mrs. Davies says, the problem is essentially metrical, and does not affect our question.

<sup>6</sup> An alternative line of approach, suggested by the referee of this paper, but mentioned first by A. v. Blumenthal (*Hermes* 77 [1942] 103-4), answers the third of my objections and is not affected by the first. According to these scholars the ending *-ās* is the ending of consonant stems simply transferred to the *ā*-stems. Von Blumenthal did not say how this transfer can have occurred, but the referee suggests as a bridge relations such as *εὐπατρις* with acc. plur. *εὐπάτριδās* beside *εὐπατρίδης*, *εὐπατρίδās*, with the accusative plural of the first being used for the accusative plural of the second. This suggestion is a good one as far as *-is*, *-idēs* formations go, and perhaps (e.g.) *Δαρδάνιδās* might have been taken as the accusative plural of *Δαρδανίδης* rather than of *Δάρδανις*. There is, though, the question of gender, since *-is* forms are all feminine, *-idēs* all masculine, and it seems perhaps unlikely that an accusative plural feminine would be used for a masculine. There is also the further objection that if the consonant stems were involved, we might expect to find *-ās* used in consonant stems sporadically in place of *-ās* (Davies 157). For these reasons I feel that the consonant-stem ending as such had nothing to do with the use of *-ās* in *ā*-stems: it seems unlikely that one well-understood ending should be substituted for another well-understood ending. But it is not impossible that the coexistence of words in *-is* and *-idēs* from the same stem had something to do with the spread of *-ās* once constituted, though there is no specific evidence to which one could point in support of such a development.

feminines in having a nominative singular in *-ης* (*-ās*) and a genitive in *-ᾶο*. Also some masculine *a*-stems have a nominative-vocative allomorph *-ᾶ*, such as *κυανοχαῖτα* and *ἵππóta*. The other class, that of the feminines, contains two sub-classes, the one composed of nouns in *-η* with accusative *-ην*,<sup>7</sup> the other of nouns and adjectives in *-ᾶ*, *-ᾶν*. But there are no sub-classes in the plural, and all *a*-stems have exactly the same endings there. Hence if it should happen that one type of *a*-stem should for any reason develop a short allomorph *-as/* in the accusative plural, all other types might be expected sooner or later to pick it up also as a legitimate variant.

Short accusative plurals can have originated in only one place, it seems to me, and that one place is the masculine *a*-stems. Most early speakers of Greek, in hearing or possibly even reading the Homeric poems, would have been much struck by forms such as *ἵππóta*, *κυανοχαῖτα* (nominative and vocative), and the like, forms for which they in their own speech had *ἵππότης* and *κυανοχαίτης* if they spoke Attic or Ionic, *ἵππóτας* and *κυανοχαίτας* if they spoke any other dialect. The Homeric forms contained a short vowel where their own dialect contained a long. But Homer never used these words in the accusative plural: in fact he rarely used them in any forms other than the nominative and vocative.<sup>8</sup> Later writers were therefore free to speculate on what the plural forms of these nouns might be. Clearly the most obvious possibility would have been *-as/*, for that was the regular accusative plural of masculine *a*-stems, but clearly, too, the relation of the nominative singular forms *-ης* (*-ās*) and *-ᾶ* would thereby be obscured. Hence some at least hit upon *-as/*. This form rested on the proportion: as *-ης* (*-ās*) of the nominative singular is to *-ᾶ*, also of the nominative singular, so must *-ās* of the accusative plural

<sup>7</sup> I omit *θεά* and other nouns in *-ᾶ* (*-ās*) such as *Ναυσικία*, *Φεία*, *Αἰνείας*, etc., which constitute another class. These show *-ᾶ* throughout, even in the genitive plural *θεῶν* (*Th.* 41).

<sup>8</sup> Declined forms are: *αἰχμητῇ* (*Il.* 4.87), *αἰχμητήν* (freq.), *αἰχμητά* (dual, *Il.* 7.281), *αἰχμηταί* (*Il.* 2.453, 12.419), *αἰχμητάων* (freq.). But this word is unusual in the context of short nominative-vocative forms, for the Homeric nominative is ordinarily *αἰχμητής*, of which the above forms would be ordinary declensional forms. *Αἰχμητά* occurs but once (*Il.* 5.197), and seems a secondary analogical form to words like *ἵππóta*. For the rest we find only *κυανοχαίτη* (twice) from *κυανοχαῖτα* (twice), *κυανοχαίτης* (twice); *νεφεληγερέταο* (freq.), *Θυέστης* (*Od.* 4.517), *Θυέστη* (*Il.* 2.106). But here again *Θυέστ'* (*Il.* 2.107) may be analogical, and the regular nominative *Θυέστης*. *Εὐρύπota* occurs both as a nominative and as an accusative.

stand to  $x$ ;  $x$  clearly has to contain a short vowel, hence  $-\tilde{a}s$ . Thereupon  $-\tilde{a}s$  could spread to other, feminine nouns, until all  $a$ -stem nouns and adjectives could have either  $-\bar{a}s$  or  $-\tilde{a}s$  in the accusative plural, the choice depending upon metrical requirements. The stages of this spread of  $-\tilde{a}s$  would most likely have been from masculine nouns with nominative in  $-\tilde{a}$  to (1) masculine nouns in  $-\eta s$  (with vocative in  $-\tilde{a}$ ); (2) feminine nouns and adjectives in  $-\tilde{a}$ . But in fact this does not happen in non-Doric poets, and the only  $\tilde{a}$ -stem feminine prior to Theocritus to show  $-\tilde{a}s$  in the accusative plural is Hesiod's *Ἀρπυίας* (*Th.* 267), and we shall see that there was a different cause for the creation of this form. Apparently the fact that the relation of nominative singular  $-\tilde{a}$  to accusative plural  $-\bar{a}s$  was clearly correct and well known in these forms, served to prevent the spread of  $-\tilde{a}s$  to them. Short accusative plurals occurred only where there was a contrast, real or fancied, in the nominative singular between long and short forms. Hence short accusative forms spread directly to (3) feminine nouns in  $-\eta$  ( $-\bar{a}$ ). This development of a new allomorph  $-\tilde{a}s$  may strike the reader as artificial, and perhaps will seem the work not of poets but of school-masters. But the difference between poet and school-master may not have been great in any event, and we may recall that Tyrtaeus, with whom we may begin, was in fact a school-master. The following treatment applies only to non-Doric poets.<sup>9</sup>

For Tyrtaeus a phonological explanation is excluded by the lateness of his date and the obviously literary, as opposed to oral, character of his work. He must have either created these forms on some analogy, correct or otherwise, or have imitated somebody else's usage in this matter. If he was imitating anybody, it must have been Hesiod, but it seems best provisionally to assume independent creation.

In fragment 1.14 D we read:

ἐπισσ]εύοντ' ὀπίσσω  
]χαίτ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς.

<sup>9</sup> Short forms occur also in Doric poets like Epicharmus and Theocritus (in his Doric poems), and it is possible that they do reflect some (literary) Doric dialect. Cf. D. L. Page, *Alcman, The Partheneion* (Oxford 1951) 131-33. One then wonders whether the development I have sketched for non-Doric poets can have obtained also for Doric poets, and further whether it affected Doric prose usage. We shall leave this question aside for the moment, regarding the non-Doric and the Doric developments as independent, though possibly parallel. We will attempt a synthesis in our conclusion.

We do not know to whose *χαίρας* the poet is here referring, though it seems probable that they are a horse's; and we know that it is an independent word and not the second element of a compound, not from the papyrus, but from the fact that Tyrtaeus does not run words over from the first to the second half of the pentameter. But the form is almost certainly an accusative plural, and the vowel is definitely short. It is short because Tyrtaeus felt that he had an analogy or example in Homer. *Χαίρη* occurs in Homer in two forms. The first is the simple *χαίρη*, which appears rarely in the nominative (twice) and accusative singular (once), but more frequently in the plural: nominative (seven times), accusative (five times), and genitive (twice). But the word also appears as the second element of the compound *κvanoχαίρης*, an epithet of Poseidon.<sup>10</sup> *Κvanoχαίρης* as such occurs at *Od.* 9.536 and *Il.* 20.144, and the dative *κvanoχαίρη* is also exemplified. But beside these more or less regular forms there also occurs *κvanoχαῖτα* in both nominative (*Il.* 13.563, 14.390) and vocative (*Il.* 15.174, 201, *Od.* 9.528) function. Tyrtaeus seems to have been uncertain about these forms, and felt that they were subject to reinterpretation. His reasoning (or that of his model) must have gone somewhat as follows: since *χαίρη* can appear in the nominative singular both as a spondee (*χαίρη*, *-χαίρης*) and as a trochee (*-χαῖτα*), a similar relation of quantity must exist in the plural also. Thus since *χαίρη* and *-χαίρης* have a long vowel *-ā* in the accusative plural, *-χαῖτα* must have a short vowel *-ă*. And which form one chose to use in one's verse would depend on the metrical requirements of the verse. How deeply Tyrtaeus thought about the matter, I do not know, but he did presumably follow some line of reasoning similar to that which I have presented. In any event his short-form accusative plural derives from a possible interpretation of linguistic relations seen in the Homeric poems, and should not be seen as a regular phonological development of *-ans/* to *-as/*.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> It is used once of a horse (*Il.* 20.224), really Boreas in disguise, and in the hymn to Demeter (357) it is used as an epithet of Hades.

<sup>11</sup> The Homeric scansion of plural forms of *χαίρη* may also have aided Tyrtaeus in his creation of *χαῖτᾱς*. In the *Iliad* *χαῖται* occurs scanned as a trochee before a vowel (1.529, 23.284); as a spondee before a consonant (23.367), or at the end of the line (6.509, 15.266, 22.401), the only position in which *χαίρας* occurs (10.10, 14.175, 21.407). In all these cases a trochaic stem *χαῖτᾱ-* would work as well as *χαῖτᾱ-*. In the *Odyssey*

This explanation of *χαίτᾱς* will seem contrived, but it may seem less so when we look at the other two short accusatives in Tyrtaeus:

*πρεσβυγενέας τε γέροντας· ἔπειτα δὲ δημότας ἄνδρας. . .* (3a.5 D)

*δεσπότης οἰμώζοντες ὁμῶς ἄλοχοί τε καὶ αὐτοί. (5.4 D)*

Both *δημότας* and *δεσπότης* are accusative plural masculine *a*-stem nouns. As such they had two nominatives: *δεσπότης*, the general Attic-Ionic form, and *δέσποτα*, a form which occurs as a vocative in what appears to be a formulaic *ὦ δέσποτ' ἄναξ* (Arist. *Pax* 90, Men. 312.5) varied to *ὦναξ δέσποτα* (Arist. *Pax* 389, fr. 598). *Δεσπότης* does not happen to occur as a nominative, but there were forms in Homer ending in *-οτα*, most notably the frequent and formulaic *ἱππότης*, beside the later *ἱππότης*. It seems clear that both *δημότας* and *δεσπότης* were formed on the basis of the Homeric *ἱππότης* and speculation as to what the accusative plural of such a form would be. Epic *ἱππότης* beside later *ἱππότης* should have as its accusative plural *\*ἱππότης* beside later *ἱππότης*. All other formations in *-της ~ -τᾱ* would behave the same way.

In Tyrtaeus the only metrically clear accusative plural forms to occur were short, and we have seen the analogy on which all were created. In Hesiod long (i.e. regular) forms also occur, and it is not always easy to find the analogy on which the short forms arose. I shall first treat of those Hesiodic forms that conform to the explanation given for Tyrtaeus, and in a measure confirm it, and then will investigate the normal accusative plural forms in *-a:s/*, and will only then discuss individually the short vowel forms. For it is not enough only to explain how short forms arose. We must also explain why the long forms also appear.

*Αἰθίοπας τε Λιγύς τε ἰδὲ Σκύθας ἱππημόλους* (fr. 55).

The nominative of this word is *Σκύθης*, but the vocative *Σκύθα* also occurs (Theognidea 829, Arist. *Thes.* 1112), and hence it fits into the pattern of *a*-stem masculines for which short accusatives are formed. This example is all the more impressive, and strikingly supports my

the word always appears at the end of the line, thus in a metrically noncriterial position. Thus Homer provided the model for trochaic scansion (or spondaic with following consonant making position), which Tyrtaeus followed. We shall see below, with Hesiod, the significance of the Homeric metrical model.

contention that there is a connection between nominatives in *-a/* and short accusative plurals, because of the existence of the line,

ἐνθάδε Φοινίσσας νῆας καὶ Πέρσας ἐλόντες,

in Simonides 96.3 B<sup>4</sup>.<sup>12</sup> The vocative of *Πέρσης*, when used in the meaning "Persian," is *Πέρσα* (*LSJ* s.v.), though as a personal name it is *Πέρση*. And in all Greek, so far as I know (cf. Kühner-Blass, *Griechische Grammatik* 1.387), *Πέρσης* and *Σκύθης* are the only ethnic nouns to have a vocative singular in *-a/*. The fact that both occur in poetry with short accusative plural *-as/*, and are the only ones so to do, certainly argues very strongly for a close connection between nominatives in *-a/* and accusatives in *-as/*.<sup>13</sup>

παῖδας δ' ἥματα πάντα εἰς μεταναιέτας εἶναι (*Th.* 401).

*Μεταναιέτας* is a hapax, probably a creation of Hesiod himself, though he may have had *Il.* 24.488 in mind for the formation:

καὶ μὲν που κείνον περυναίεται ἀμφὶς ἔοντες.

But the Homeric form provides no clue as to the quantity of the final vowel, and indeed if anything, because of the word's appearance in Homer before a vowel, might give the impression that the final syllable should be short. In any event, using the same sort of analogy as with the other forms so far discussed, Hesiod created a \**μεταναιέτα*, with accusative plural *μεταναιέτας*.

<sup>12</sup> This is the famous Salamis epigram (*IG* 1<sup>2</sup> 927), the authenticity of which has often been questioned. Particularly dubious is the second distich of the poem, that with which we are concerned, containing as it does a short accusative plural and an early distinction between Medes and Persians. But recently A. L. Boegehold (*GRBS* 6 [1965] 179-86), following a fresh examination of the stone, has concluded that there is no reason to impugn the genuineness of these lines (186): "In the absence of other specific objective evidence, there seems little reason to reject the tradition that the epigram was originally composed in two distichs, those which are preserved in substance in Plutarch and Favorinus." He feels that *Πέρσας* speaks for the authenticity of line 3.

<sup>13</sup> Herodian (2.16 L) cites *ναύτας* and *Σκύθας* in support of his statement: τὸ ἄ ἐκτείνονμενον ἐπὶ πληθυντικῶν αἰτιατικῶν οἱ Δωριεῖς συστέλλουσι ναύτας Σκύθας. It is interesting that he should cite only masculine nouns in *-ης*, thus providing support for my hypothesis. And it is further interesting that he should choose a form from Hesiod. This suggests that possibly *ναύτας* also comes from poetry (cf. *Th.* 876), and that the explanation of Doric origin for short-vowel accusatives may have been devised more or less *ad hoc* to explain these forms in Hesiod; or if not, at least that it originally applied only to poetry, and not to ordinary Doric usage.

The following forms with long vowel occur:<sup>14</sup>

- Th.* 53: τὰς ἐν Πιερίῃ Κρονίδῃ τέκε πατρί μιγεῖσα.  
*Th.* 220: αἶ τ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε παραιβασίας ἐφέπουσιν.  
*Th.* 631: ἀντίον ἀλλήλοισι διὰ κρατερὰς ὕσμινας.  
*Th.* 663: μαρνάμενοι Τιτῆσιν ἀνὰ κρατερὰς ὕσμινας.  
*Th.* 712: ἐμμενέως ἐμάχοντο διὰ κρατερὰς ὕσμινας.  
*Th.* 675: πέτρας ἡλιβάτους στιβαρῆς ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες.  
*Op.* 645: ἔσσεται, εἴ κ' ἄνεμοί γε κακὰς ἀπέχουσιν ἀήτας.  
*Op.* 828: ὄρνιθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων.

In many cases we can say definitely why the ending contains a long vowel. *Th.* 631, 663, 712 clearly contain the well-known Homeric formula; *Op.* 828, if genuine,<sup>15</sup> may well recall the familiar

ἦέ σοι ἐνθάδ' ἄγω, ἵν' ὑπερβασίας ἀποτίσῃς

of *Od.* 22.168; and *Th.* 220 may be modeled in turn on *Op.* 828. It is also clear that none of these forms would fit the verse if the last syllable were short. *Th.* 675 is a simple variation of *Il.* 16.35:

πέτραι τ' ἡλίβατοι· ὅτι τοι νόος ἐστὶν ἀπήνης.

The other two forms, τὰς and κακὰς, though without any specific Homeric analogies, need no defence. Both are forms of feminines in -/a:/ formed to masculines in -/os/ or -/o/ in which there could be no question of a nominative in -/a/. From this summary of the facts it appears that Hesiod uses long accusative plural forms when he is merely repeating or slightly modifying Homer, and in adjectival or pronominal forms. A further condition is of course that of metrical necessity: he would never shorten an accusative plural only to render it thereby impossible for use in his verse.<sup>16</sup> We may expect, then, that

<sup>14</sup> Mrs. Davies also includes *Οὐρανίδας* among forms with a long vowel because of *Th.* 502:

*Οὐρανίδας, οὓς δῆσε πατήρ ἀεσιφροσύνησιν.*

I prefer to leave this form as indeterminate because light syllables could be treated as heavy in epic verse before caesurae and punctuation. We cannot be absolutely sure here that the syllable is not long by position.

<sup>15</sup> F. Krafft, *Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod* = *Hypomnemata* 6 (Göttingen 1963) 71, feels that this verse was "eindeutig als Anschlussvers zu der in manchen antiken Ausgaben folgenden 'Ορνιθομάντεια' eingeschoben."

<sup>16</sup> Notice that v. Blumenthal's explanation of the short vowel forms as being those of Hesiod's own dialect, and the -ās forms as cases of epic lengthening (*Hermes* 77 [1942] 104), though highly unlikely for a number of reasons, will adequately account for the Hesiodic situation.

Hesiod will use short forms of the accusative plural when he departs from or reinterprets Homeric models.<sup>17</sup>

A situation similar to that encountered with *μεταναιέτας* occurs with \**Αρπυιας* in *Th.* 267:

ἡνκόμους θ' \**Αρπυιας*, \**Αελλώ τ' Ὠκυπέτην τε.*

There is no exact Homeric parallel, though the word does occur three times in the *Odyssey*: *ἄρπυιαι ἀνηρείψαντο* at the end of the verse (1.241 = 14.371, 20.77). Again what Homeric evidence there was, indicated that the final syllable was short. Buttressing this impression of course was the nominative \**Αρπυια* with short -α at *Il.* 16.150. But there were probably no other personal names in -υια which had plural forms, and Hesiod was therefore free to create such a form. Here masculine nouns in -της (-τᾱ) could not provide the model, but the opposition between personal names in -ᾱ (*Τριτογένεια*, *Εἰλείθυια*) and abstracts in -η (*ἀλθθείη*, *ἀναδείη*, *μητρυνή*) could. Since the accusative plural of abstracts was -ᾱς, then the accusative plural of personal names, if it could occur, would be -ᾱς. But perhaps the combination of the fact that Homeric poetry scanned the word - - υ with the short vowel in the nominative singular was enough to suggest the creation of -ᾱς.

There seems to be no linguistic analogy, only a formulaic one, for *Op.* 564 and 663:

εὔτ' ἂν δ' ἐξήκοντα μετὰ τροπὰς ἡέλιόιο.  
ἥματα πεντήκοντα μετὰ τροπὰς ἡέλιόιο.

Mrs. Davies correctly points out (162) that the phrase corresponds to the Homeric *Od.* 15.404:

\**Ορτυγίης καθύπερθεν*, ὅθι τροπαὶ ἡέλιόιο;

and this correspondence doubtless explains why Hesiod was tempted to create \**τροπά* and hence *τροπάς*. The Homeric poems provided no evidence as to the quantity of the nominative singular (the word occurs only once in Homer), and indeed could not be used in the meaning "solstice" in the nominative singular. Homeric *τροπαί* gave Hesiod the clue only that the word contained two short syllables when

<sup>17</sup> I omit from consideration here *εἴρας* (so Rzach) of *Th.* 804, as does Mrs. Davies (152, with note 1), and for the same reasons. See below, note 30.

placed before a vowel. Here we find the metrical model, but not the linguistic. Presumably Hesiod created this form only after he had come to feel that all accusative plural forms of *a*-stems could contain short vowels. Alcman (17 Page) clearly adopts the quantity of Hesiodic τροπᾶς in adapting the phrase to πεδὰ τροπᾶς.<sup>18</sup>

Another deviation from Homer seems to occur in *Op.* 675:

καὶ χειμῶν' ἐπιόντα Νότοιο τέ δεινὰς ἀήτας.

Δεινὰς is particularly striking because it is the only adjective form in Hesiod to show a short accusative plural. But as Mrs. Davies points out (162) there is again a formulaic analogy in the Homeric *Il.* 15.626:

ἄχνη ὑπεκρύφθη, ἀνέμοιο δὲ δεινὸς ἀήτη.

Ἀήτη in this line has been much discussed. Schol. A *ad loc.* (Aristonicus) argues against the reading δεινὸς ἀήτης which makes of ἀήτη a masculine noun, and adduces as a parallel for δεινὸς the phrase κλυτὸς Ἴπποδάμεια (*Il.* 2.742). But Schol. BT to the same line favors ἀήτης, for the masculine gender makes the word more emphatic, and this doctrine seems to be continued in Hesychius' ἀήτη· πνοή· θηλυκῶς contrasted to ἀήτης· ἄνεμος· ἄρσενικῶς. Eustathius (1509.48 *ad Od.* 4.567) apparently read πνείοντας instead of πνείοντος at *Od.* 4.567,

ἀλλ' αἰεὶ Ζεφύροιο λιγὺ πνείοντος ἀήτας,

<sup>18</sup> Τροπᾶς in turn seems to have given rise to ἀντολᾶς in Theocritus (5.103). The other short-vowel form in Alcman, Αἴας (fr. 68), seems influenced by Homer also, but in a different way. The vocative of Ajax ordinarily contained a short vowel (*Il.* 7.288, 13.68, 824), but once in Homer (*Il.* 23.493) is long. Whatever the explanation of the long vowel (cf. Leaf *ad loc.*, and W. Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae* [Gütersloh 1892] 415-16), it provides us with the contrast between long and short vowels necessary for the creation of short accusatives, and in this case for the creation of a short nominative. As there was the possibility in Homer of both a long and a short vowel in the vocative of Αἴας, so there was the possibility of the same variation in the nominative.

Perhaps worth noting here is a possible discrepancy in the meaning of τροπαί between Homer and Hesiod. There is no question that by τροπαί Hesiod intends "solstice." But there is question as to what Homer meant. Some (Eust. 1781.20, cf. *LSJ* s.v.) took it to mean the place where the sun turns around, i.e. where it sets, and this seems the most reasonable interpretation of the Homeric passage; while others ("alii," Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum* 2.348) felt that it means "solstice" in Homer as well. Hesiod seems to have understood Homer to mean by τροπαί the place where the sun sets, and set out to correct what he felt was a mistaken usage on Homer's part. He emphasizes the correction by utilizing the Homeric scansion and position in the verse, but with the "correct" (i.e. Hesiodic or Boeotian) meaning and quantity.

thus holding that ἀήτης is a masculine noun, and that Hesiod's use of the feminine is δωρικώτερον. All moderns are in agreement that only ἀήτη as a feminine is historically correct.<sup>19</sup> But ancient authors were unaware of this, and were at a loss to explain the Homeric phrase as early as Hesiod. There seem to have been three schools. One (etymologically) correctly held that ἀήτη (feminine) was the proper form,<sup>20</sup> while another held that the correct form was ἀήτης.<sup>21</sup> But Hesiod seems to have had a view of his own in this matter, a view that suited his metrical requirements.

Hesiod knew that ἀήτη was feminine, but knew also that Homeric concord with it was queer. I believe that he felt that somehow Homer had slipped up and had incorrectly made of ἀήτη a masculine noun. But this slip suggested to him the possibility both of correcting Homer and of creating a striking phrase reminiscent of Homer. The Homeric ending of this noun, -της, brought ἀήτη into the class of nouns like ἵπποτα, which had an alternative nominative in-ᾶ.<sup>22</sup> As such it could have a short accusative plural in -τᾶς. This fact he could not demonstrate by modifying the Homeric formula, for in Homer the word appears at the end of the line. In order to show that he was aware both that Homer was wrong in the gender of ἀήτη, and that ἀήτας was a possible epic form of the accusative plural, he made the adjective agree with it not only in gender, number, and case, but in quantity as well. In this he did as Empedocles later did with his μυρίας ὥρας (115.6 D) and the author of the Rhodian *chelidonismos* with his καλὰς

<sup>19</sup> E. Risch, *Lexicon der früh-griechischen Epos*; Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* 1.501 with note 9; E. Fraenkel, *Gesch. d. griech. Nomina agentis*, 2 (Strassbourg 1912) 134-35 with note 1; M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* (Basel 1950) 268 with note 13; Mrs. Davies (162, note 3) goes so far as to refer to the "supposed masculine ἀήτης (still accepted in LSJ s.v.)," implying that such a form never existed.

<sup>20</sup> Simonides 41.1 B<sup>4</sup>=90.1 Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci*; Bacchylides 17.91 Snell<sup>7</sup>; Sappho 2.10, 71.7, 20.9 Lobel and Page.

<sup>21</sup> Apollonius Rhodius 1.423, 4.1537; Theocritus 22.9 (in an Ionic poem reminiscent and imitative of Homer); Kerkidas 2a.12 D; Callimachus' (fr. 110.53) θῆλυς ἀήτη clearly represents his witty stand on the question of the gender, together with a reminiscence of θηλέας ἵππους, *Il.* 5.269: see above, note 3. Other cases of θῆλυς with feminine nouns in Homer include: θῆλυς ἔεργη (*Od.* 5.467), "Ἥρη θῆλυς εὐούσα (*Il.* 19.97). All instances of ἀήτης as a masculine occur either in poetry in the Homeric vein, or derive directly from the phrase δεινὸς ἀήτης.

<sup>22</sup> This was the class to which Bacchylides and Simonides, with their ᾄητα or ᾄητα, thought it belonged. Wilamowitz (*Griechische Verskunst* [Berlin 1921] 300) felt that ᾄητα was a normal Lesbian masculine taken as a feminine by Ionic poets.

ῶρας (848.2 Page). I feel, then, that Hesiod in *Op.* 675 intended δεινᾶς ἀήτᾶς.<sup>23</sup>

There is no obvious linguistic or metrical analogy for the scansion of *Th.* 60:

ἦ δ' ἔτεκ' ἐννέα κόρας δμόφρονas, ἦσιν αἰοιδῆ.

In Homer κοῦραι occurs, almost always in the phrase κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο, referring either to the nymphs (*Il.* 6.420; *Od.* 6.105, 9.154, 13.356, 17.240) or the Muses (*Il.* 2.598) or the Λιταί (*Il.* 9.502). In other occurrences κοῦραι refers to the nymphs (*Od.* 24.58), though not in the same formula; and in *Il.* 9.396 to daughters of Helladic chieftains. The accusative κόρας occurs twice in the *Odyssey* (20.66, 77), both times scanned as a spondee with the second syllable in the arsis followed by a vowel, but in neither case does it refer to the daughters of Zeus. And in the *Iliad* at least, though κοῦραι itself forms a trochee only once (9.396), the accompanying νύμφαι and Μοῦσαι always form trochees. There was, then, precedent for trochaic scansion of *a*-stems in phrases involving κοῦραι, and Hesiod might have for this reason felt himself justified in extending this scansion to the accusative plural, especially when κοῦραι was used in the more or less technical sense of "daughters of Zeus."

As a result of this association of κοῦραι, Μοῦσαι, and νύμφαι, Hesiod came to feel that there existed a form κοῦρα beside κόρη, the accusative plural of which was κούρᾶς. It remains only to show how he came to this conclusion. Κοῦρα in fact occurs in late poets. It appears as a vocative in Theocritus (27.52),<sup>24</sup> Callimachus (*H.* 3.72), and Bion (2.28).<sup>25</sup> It is more than likely that this form owes its existence to the

<sup>23</sup> I do not know what Hesiod saw or heard in his text of Homer, but the above reasoning would lead me to suppose that the variant δεινὸς ἀήτης is as old as Hesiod. In any event I do not see how Leumann (above, note 19) can state definitely that Hesiod read ἀήτη.

<sup>24</sup> Whoever wrote this poem allowed the analogy of short nominatives to carry him away, and a few lines later (55) created μίτραν. This form is ultimately based on masculine compounds ending in -μίτρης, such as αἰολομίτρην (*Il.* 5.707), just as χαίτας in Tyrtæus was based on the masculine compound κυανοχαίτα.

<sup>25</sup> Anacreon 74 (B. Gentili, *Anacreon* [Rome 1958]) has κούρα in the manuscripts, and this was corrected to κοῦρα by Bergk and Wilamowitz. But Gentili himself prints κόρη, which is likely to be correct, and the form is not of much use anyway, since it appears at the end of the line.

phrase *νύμφα φίλη* (*Il.* 3.130; *Od.* 4.743), as suggested by Schwyzler (*Griechische Grammatik* 1.558) and Gow (*Theocritus* 2.491).<sup>26</sup> *Νύμφα* itself occurs as a vocative also in Sappho (116 Lobel and Page) and Callimachus (*H.* 4.215, fr. 66.2, 788 Pfeiffer), and the short accusative plural based on it appears in Theocritus (4.29). *Μοῦσα*, of course, has an etymologically short *-a*, so occurrences of a vocative *Μοῦσα* are not unusual, but the appearance of the accusative plural *Μοίσας* in Bion (14.1) is. All these forms have a vocative in *-ᾶ*, and all three have short accusative plurals in *-ᾶς*, and of course all were connected in the minds of the Greeks since both muses and nymphs were daughters of Zeus. It was this intimate connection, plus the striking *νύμφα* in Homer, that brought *κούρᾶς* into being.

Another possible instance of the short accusative plural, not mentioned by Mrs. Davies, occurs several times in Hesiod. I refer to *θέμιστας* (*Th.* 85, *Op.* 9, 221). We of course know from Homer (*Od.* 9.112, 16.403) that the nominative plural of this word was *θέμιστες* and that the noun was declined according to the third declension, but Hesiod may have had doubts. At *Th.* 235 Rzach prints

*οὔνεκα νημερτῆς τε καὶ ἥπιος, οὐδὲ θεμιστέων,*

on the basis of the manuscript readings: GHΨ *θεμιστέων*, I *θεμισθέων*, Ωb *θεμιστάων*. Clearly this reading best reflects the evidence of the manuscripts and indicates that an ancient exemplar had *θεμιστέων*. But this of course does not prove that Hesiod used the form, and many scholars would print *θεμίστων* here in spite of the manuscripts. J. Wackernagel (*Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* 4-5, note 3) attributes the form *θεμιστέων* to scribes who interpreted *θέμιστας* (so accented) as the accusative plural of an *a*-stem. He feels that Hesiod himself intended *θεμίστων-θέμιστας* declined according to the third declension. I do not know about the accentuation, but that scribes alone were responsible for *θεμιστέων*, a form counter to everything they must have known, seems incredible, especially if the manuscript they were copying had *θεμίστων*. It thus appears most likely to me that the form stems from Hesiod, and that it was he who interpreted *θέμιστας* as a first declension noun to which he formed

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Leaf *ad Il.* 3.130 for the explanation of this form, and suggestive connections with masculine *a*-stems.

θεμιστέων. The Homeric declension of this noun in the plural clearly includes θέμιστες (*Od.* 9.112, 16.403), θέμιστας (frequent), but there are no dative and genitive forms in Homer.<sup>27</sup> One would imagine that when forming a genitive Hesiod would have chosen a form θεμίστων after the consonant declension, but he may here again be consciously departing from Homer.<sup>28</sup>

If Hesiod did indeed write θεμιστέων, then he certainly felt that θέμιστας, however accented, represented a short accusative plural form. And perhaps it is this short accusative plural θέμιστας which caused him by analogy to create βουλάς:

*Th.* 534: οὔνεκ' ἐρίζετο βουλάς ὑπερμενεί Κρονίωνι.

*Th.* 653: ἡμετέρας διὰ βουλάς ὑπὸ ζόφου ἡερόεντος.

For in Homer we find βουλάς and θέμιστας occasionally connected, perhaps most notably in *Od.* 16.402-3:<sup>29</sup>

ἀλλὰ πρῶτα θεῶν εἰρώμεθα βουλάς.

εἰ μὲν κ' αἰνήσωσι Διὸς μέγαλοιο θέμιστες,

and 9.112: τοῖσιν δ' οὔτ' ἀγοραὶ βουληφόροι οὔτε θέμιστες. And

<sup>27</sup> The only early genitive forms occur here in the *Theogony* and in Pindar, fr. 228 (see below, note 28), and the only dative in Pindar, *Pyth.* 4.54. All early declensional forms of θέμις have been collected by Frisk (*Eranos* 48 [1950] 8-10).

<sup>28</sup> There seems to be no other direct evidence for an *a*-stem declension of θέμις. Turyn prints Pindar, fr. 228 (= Schol. *ad Pyth.* 4.4):

Δελφοὶ θεμίτων μάντιες Ἀπολλωνίδαι,

for the manuscripts' (EGHCV) θεμίστων ὕμνων with the variant reading (B) θεμιστῶν ὕμνων. He is doubtless right in following Heyne in removing ὕμνων, and may be right in restoring θεμίτων, but it is certainly suggestive and interesting that the only two early cases of θέμις in the genitive plural show uncertainty as to the form. B's θεμιστῶν might point to an *a*-stem form, but of course in Pindar the genitive plural should end in -ᾶν. In SGDI 1.143 (no. 370) appeared the Thessalian inscription: -s Ὀρεστάδα ὀνέθεκε τᾷ Θεμίσστα[ι]; but already on page 360 of the same volume Lolling's reading Θέμισσσι was recorded, and this is the form that appears in IG ix 2.1236 which now reads: -s Ὀρεστά[ι]α ὀνέθεκε τᾷ Θέμισσσι. Hence this does not provide evidence of an *a*-stem. The only other evidence is morphological and most uncertain. The verb θεμιστεύω might point to a \*θεμίστα, just as ἀγορεύω and βουλευέω points to ἀγορά and βουλά. But E. Risch (*Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* = *Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft* 9 [Berlin 1937] 282) feels that all these verbs are analogical to βασιλεύω.

<sup>29</sup> There is an ancient *varia lectio*, τομοῦροι, for θέμιστες recorded in Strabo (328), and Eustathius has Τόμουραι (1760.47, 1806.37). It is difficult to see how such a variant can have arisen, but it seems most unlikely that it provides any evidence for \*θέμισται.

further we find *βουλήν* as the object of *θεμιστεύειν* in the *Hymn to Apollo* 252–53:

τοῖσιν δέ τ' ἐγὼ νημερτέα βουλήν  
πᾶσι θεμιστεύοιμι χρέων ἐνὶ πτόνι νηφί.

Analogy with *θέμιστας* is the only explanation I can find for Hesiod's creation of *βουλάς*.<sup>30</sup>

To sum up the investigation thus far: Masculine *a*-stems in both Hesiod and Tyrtæus have short accusative plural forms because of fancied Homeric analogies. But Hesiod extended this license to include feminine *a*-stems as well: to *ā*-stems only in the case of "*Ἀρπυίας*,"<sup>31</sup>

<sup>30</sup> *Ἐῖρας*, if that is the correct reading in *Th.* 804, may also be influenced by *θέμιστας*. Hesychius connects the word with *ἐρώτημα*, and both Homer and Hesiod seem to have also, for the connection of *εἶρη*, *βουλή*, and *θέμις* was already made in the *Odyssey* passage (16.402–3) quoted in the text. This connection may also help toward a decision concerning the etymology of this word. Frisk (*Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1 [Heidelberg 1960] 466) connects it with *ἐρῶ εἶρηκα* "say," as did the *Etymologicum magnum* and Aristonicus before it (Leaf *ad Il.* 18.531). But it seems, on the basis of the phrase *εἰρώμεθα βουλάς*, that perhaps it should be connected rather with *εἶρομαι*, (< \**erwomai*—Frisk, *GEW* 1.467) "ask." As *βουλά* is both the wish and the assembly, so *εἶρα* is both the question and the assembly. *Ἐῖρη*, then, represents an earlier \**erwā* (or \**erwā*).

<sup>31</sup> One or two variant readings perhaps should be mentioned here. In his work on Hesiod's dialect ("Der Dialekt des Hesiodos," *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Suppl. 8 [1876] 353–466) Rzach mentions (401) the reading *πάσας ἐδέξατο* recorded by F for *Th.* 184:

ὄσσαι γὰρ ῥαθάμυγες ἀπέσσυθεν αἱματόεσσαι,  
πάσας δέξατο Γαῖα.

But he does not include this variant in the apparatus of his editio minor of 1908. J. Paulson, however, mentions it in his *Index Hesiodicus* (Lund 1890). I have no way of knowing the strength of this variant, but a feminine paradigm including *πᾶσα πᾶσαν πᾶσαι πᾶσας* would certainly be plausible if one were ready to create short accusative plural forms. Furthermore Theocritus later uses *πάσας* several times (1.83, 4.3, 5.146), and it is at least possible that Hesiod was his model. But the variant *δήσας* at *Th.* 521,

δῆσε δ' ἄλυκτοπέδησι Προμηθέα ποικιλόβουλον,

based as it must be on the assumption that all final *-ās* could appear as *-ās* in Hesiod, clearly results from semi-learned speculation. Of other such forms, we have already treated *Αἴας* in Alcman (above, note 18). In addition is recorded *τάλας* (Theocritus 2.4), but this may not be the correct reading, and in any event is a vocative, in which one would expect the short vowel: *τάλας* simply replaces the vocative *τάλᾱν*. The same can be said of *Palladas'* vocative *τάλας* (*A.P.* 9.378), but he is too late to be of any evidential value, and the poem is otherwise written in the epic dialect. More interesting and more serious is Rhianus' *λίθος μέλας* (fr. 58 Powell=J. U. Powell, *Collectanea*

and to  $\bar{a}$ -stems in all other cases. In Hesiod, though, we find in addition to linguistic analogies metrical analogies based on Homer. *Δεινός*, *\*Ἀρπυίας*, *μεταναιέτας* (?), *τροπός* all occur in the same position in the verse in Hesiod and in Homer; and what is perhaps more important, all the Homeric models, save *δεινός*, for which special factors intrude, appear in the nominative plural with the final syllable corrected before a vowel. And we have seen, too, that the nominative plural had something to do with the creation of *κούρας*. Surely this is not due to chance.

The nominative plural, like all other plural forms, was common to all *a*-stems. But it alone of *a*-stem forms both could appear as a light syllable before a vowel and contained a short /a/. Since both short *a*-stems and long *a*-stems had *-αι* in the nominative plural, one could not, merely by looking at the nominative plural, tell to what class the noun in question belonged in the singular. Hence the nominative plural could serve as a kind of bridge by which short accusative plural forms could pass from nouns in  $\bar{a}$  to nouns in  $\bar{a}$  ( $-\eta$ ). It could serve as a bridge, however, only after the possibility of short accusative plural forms had arisen on other grounds. Another factor contributing to the spread of short-vowel accusative forms from the masculine to the feminine was the re-analysis of compounds. For though Tyrtaeus took *κvanoχαῖτα* (masculine) as his base for the creation of a short accusative form, he in fact used that form, *χαίτᾱς*, as the accusative plural of the feminine *χαίτη*.

*Alexandrina* [Oxford 1925]). But this is not what the manuscripts give. Choeroboscus, from whom the Rhianus passage comes, is here (Bekker, *An. Gr.* 3.1463) discussing those masculine nouns which end in *-ας*, and reports that, whereas all nouns, like *θῶας*, have  $\bar{a}$ , *λᾱας* and *μέγας* regularly have a short final syllable, and Doric writers can shorten any final syllables in *-ας*. In support of his statement he adduces *δῆσας* in Hesiod and *λίθος μέγας*. Because this phrase exemplifies nothing, and because *μέγας* had already been mentioned above, Bekker emended to *λίθος μέλας*, thus adding another to the small list of Doric shortenings in forms other than the accusative plural feminine. But Bekker's emendation is not likely to be correct. Elsewhere Choeroboscus discussed the same matter (Cramer, *An. Ox.* 3.283.11), and again cites *λᾱας* and *μέγας* as forms which contravene the rule. Hence these two words were always in his mind in connection with this topic, and I thus feel that he is either quoting Rhianus correctly as an example of *μέγας*, a regularly short masculine, or more likely, is misquoting the phrase *λᾱας μέγας*, again to exemplify at one blow the two regular exceptions to his rule. There are therefore no examples to support the rule  $-\text{ans}/ > -\text{as}/$  in forms other than the accusative plural feminine.

Empedocles, too, allowed himself the license of a short accusative plural form in 115.6 D:

*τρίς μὲν μυρίας ὥρας ἀπὸ μακάρων ἀλάλησθαι.*

And here, too, the nominative plural may have helped in the development, for *ὥραι* in the meaning "seasons" generally appears in the nominative plural in Homer and Hesiod, thus providing the connection with short *a*-stems. But this consideration may not have been operative for Empedocles, and in any event more important for our purposes here is that, in the passage in question, he is clearly recalling Hesiod *Th.* 782 ff. In underlining his indebtedness to the Hesiodic passage he used a Hesiodic (and hence non-Homeric) form. It is more difficult to say what the immediate model for *ὥρας* was, and I can do no more than suggest two possibilities, which are not mutually exclusive.

It is possible that Empedocles was thinking particularly of *τροπάς* in *Op.* 564, 663. The *ὥραι* are frequently mentioned in passages suggesting *τροπαί*, perhaps particularly in *Th.* 58 (= *Od.* 10.469): *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἐνιαυτὸς ἔην, περὶ δ' ἔτραπον ὥραι*; and in Homer the numerous passages pairing *ἔτος* and *ὥραι* by means of the phrase *καὶ ἐπήλυθον ὥραι* (*Od.* 2.107, 11.295, etc.). And indeed Schol. BHQ to 11.295 explicitly connects the two words in the note: *παρήλθον οἱ καιροί, ὃ ἐστὶν αἱ τροπαί*. Apparently *ὥραι* could refer either to the seasons or to their boundaries, the solstices and equinoxes. This connection of *ὥρας* and *τροπάς*, plus the fact that *ὥρας* occurs in Hesiod (*Op.* 75) only at the end of a line, where it could have been read as a trochee, might have been enough to cause Empedocles to use *ὥρας*. Perhaps he then added the irregular scansion of *μυρίας* because of Hesiod's phrase *δεινὰς ἀήτας*.

The other impetus to create *μυρίας ὥρας* may have come from the imitated passage of the *Theogony* itself. There we find (803-4):

*δεκάτῳ δ' ἐπιμίσγεται οὐδ' ἐπὶ δαίτας  
εἶρας ἐς ἀθανάτων, οἳ Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσιν.*

The manuscripts here have *εἶρέας*, but Rzach's reading may be correct, and the Empedoclean passage may well provide evidence for this reading, or at least for a reading containing *-ᾶς*. For Empedocles was

perhaps inspired to use a short accusative plural form precisely by a similar form in the passage he was imitating.<sup>32</sup>

Another form, this one of direct interest to Mrs. Davies' contention that there are no Doric, particularly Delphic, influences in Hesiod, occurs in a Delphic response (H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, vol. 2 [Oxford 1956] no. 220, p. 91, quoting from Oenomaus *apud* Eusebius *P.E.* 5.28). The oracle there responds to Lycurgus' inquiry, apparently concerning a constitution:

ἕως ἂν μαντεύησιν ὑποσχεσίας τε καὶ ὄρκους  
καὶ δίκας ἀλλήλοισι καὶ ἀλλοδαποῖσι διδῶτε.

This line would be impressive evidence for an independent tradition of Doric short accusatives, were it not for the fact that it strongly recalls a Hesiodic line (*Op.* 225),

οἱ δὲ δίκας ξείνοισι καὶ ἀλλοδαποῖσι διδῶτε.

We may therefore suppose in this case that the oracle is in fact reminiscent of Hesiod, and that the short accusative form is used in order to accentuate the Hesiodic connection.<sup>33</sup>

It is interesting that the oracle should have chosen δίκας, for δίκη is one of those few feminines in Greek to have a vocative in -ᾶ: Δίκα (Sappho 81b.1 Lobel-Page).<sup>34</sup> We thus find another instance of coin-

<sup>32</sup> The phrase καλὰς ὥρας in the Rhodian *chelidonismos* (848.2 Page *PMG*) seems clearly to be an imitation either of Empedocles or another imitation of Empedocles' model. There are two other short accusatives worth mentioning. Mrs. Davies (152) considers ἀθρόας in the *Hymn to Hermes* 106 a short accusative:

καὶ τὰς μὲν συνέλασεν ἐς αὔλιον ἀθρόας οὔσας.

But surely it was pronounced as a disyllable with contraction. There is, though, an almost certain example provided by Stesichorus (7 Page *PMG*):

Ταρτηρσοῦ ποταμοῦ παρὰ παγὰς ἀπείρονας ἀργυρορίζους.

The chances here are good that Stesichorus provides us with another reminiscence of Hesiod, for the incident described draws its inspiration from *Theogony* 287-94.

<sup>33</sup> The reminiscence was noted by H. Troxler, *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods* (Zürich 1964) 74, note 43. The oracle was clearly indebted to both Homer and Hesiod for its verse technique (W. McLeod, "Oral Bards at Delphi," *TAPA* 92 [1961] 317-25), and we may imagine also for the framing of many of its ideas.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* 1.558; Eva-Maria Hamm, *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios* = *Abh. der Deutschen Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin* 1951, no. 2 (appeared 1957) p. 147.

cidence between the vocative in  $-\tilde{a}$  and accusative in  $-\tilde{a}s$  as in the case of  $\Sigma\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\theta a s$  above, a coincidence which again supports our hypothesis. The fact that the oracle chose to modify a Hesiodic line containing  $\delta\acute{\iota}k a s$  would tend to indicate that she (?) felt that the quantity of  $\delta\acute{\iota}k a s$  in Hesiod, where ambiguous to us, was short.<sup>35</sup> What the oracle felt of course has only slight bearing on what the quantity actually was in the *Works and Days*.

The only short accusative plural of an  $o$ -stem to appear before Theocritus is in the *Shield* 302:<sup>36</sup>

πύξ τε καὶ ἐλκηδόν· τοὶ δ' ὠκύποδας λαγὸς ἤρουν.

Clearly no great antiquity can be accorded this form, and it cannot be used as early evidence for  $-/ons/ > -/os/$ . It is further most striking that the only early  $-/os/$  form should occur in a work from which  $-/as/$  is excluded, and it seems therefore likely that a different, though in principle similar, line of attack must be discovered to explain it. The answer lies in the declension of  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$ . The Homeric declension,  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$   $\lambda a \gamma \omega \sigma \upsilon$  etc., later yielded by contraction a  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$   $\lambda a \gamma \acute{\omega}$  (or  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{\omega} s$   $\lambda a \gamma \acute{\omega}$ ), and this declension remained in Attic. But a new declension arose elsewhere, notably in Ionic (Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte* 3.114-15), which had  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$   $\lambda a \gamma \omega \sigma \upsilon$  etc., just like any  $o$ -stem, the accusative plural of which was  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} u s$ . But beside this, even in Ionia, there coexisted the declension in  $-\acute{\omega} s$ , as witnessed by Hipponax (39.7 D), who uses an accusative plural  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$ . Hence the two declensions existed side by side, and as the accusative plural of  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$  was  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$ , i.e. the nominative singular form served also as the accusative plural, so the accusative plural of  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$  became  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$ . It was again the presence of a long-vowel declension beside a short-vowel one, as in the  $a$ -stems, that called forth the anomalous  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$ .

Theocritus, perhaps alone of the poets we have had occasion to mention, has a good Doric pedigree, and hence stands a better chance of

<sup>35</sup> As in the line in question and *Op.* 124 = 254, 262.  $\Delta\acute{\iota}k a s$  in *Op.* 263 is almost certainly incorrect. Cf. v. der Mühl (*Glotta* 10 [1920] 143-46). Possibly also helping in the development of  $\delta\acute{\iota}k a s$  was the compound  $\delta\acute{\iota}k a \sigma \pi \acute{o} \lambda o s$ , frequent from *Iliad* 1.238.

<sup>36</sup> The possible cases in Pindar have been discussed above (note 5). I assume that  $\lambda a \gamma \acute{o} s$  in the *Shield* is a genuine instance of a short form and not merely a blunder. If it should be a blunder, then there are no cases until Theocritus, save for the one use of the article in Epicharmus 170.13.

having used native Doric linguistic features.<sup>37</sup> Nonetheless the problem is a complicated one even for him. Short accusative plural forms do not occur in poems 8, 11–14, 16–20, 22–30. This means that they are excluded from the Ionic poems (12–13, 16–17, 22, 24–25) and the Aeolic poems (28–30), and appear only in the Doric poems, as one might expect, but not in all of them. In the Doric poems metrically assured examples of accusative plural forms are lacking in 8, 11, 18. And of the remaining poems only 1–7, 9–10, 15, and 21 contain short accusative plurals. The evidence is therefore restricted, and is for that reason somewhat difficult to assess.

The following list contains all the short accusative plural *a*-stems: *πάσας* (1.83, 4.3, 5.146), *ὄχνας* (1.134), *Μοίρας* (2.160), *αὐτάς* (3.2, 4.2, 5.42), *τάς* (3.3, 5.64, 73, 109), *Νύμφας* (4.29), *ἀντολάς* (5.104), *σκήλλας* (5.121), *κίσσας* (5.136), *θύρας* (6.32, 15.65), *καλάς* (7.87, 10.38), *τρωγοίσας* (9.11), *καινάς* (10.35), *τέχνας* (21.1).<sup>38</sup> Most of these examples occur in poems that are generally considered genuine (Gow, *Theocritus* 1.lxxvi): only *τρωγοίσας* and *τέχνας* may not be genuine Theocritean forms. The largest concentrations are in poems 1 and 5. Long vowel forms also occur: *θύρας* (2.6, 104), *τάς* (5.89), *φίλας* (7.104), *κοχλίας* (14.16), and (in poems generally considered spurious) *αὐλείας* *ιδίας* (23.54) and *πτελέας* (27.13). All long forms occur in the arsis, all short forms in the thesis. From this fact Gow concludes (*Theocritus* 2.37): “The acc. pl. termination of the 1<sup>st</sup> decl., short in Doric, is

<sup>37</sup> Doric accusatives do occur in other Doric poets. Epicharmus (*Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. G. Kaibel [Berlin 1899]) has a number of such forms: *μωράς* (9), *πλευράς* (90), *ἀφύας* (124), as well as two examples of the article, *τάς* (42.10) and *τὸς* (170.13), this last being the earliest example of an *o*-stem form. Forms of the article measured as short are not particularly surprising, could occur anywhere, and do occur in Theocritus. The other forms are more difficult, but perhaps significant is that one of them, *ἀφύας* (also Epicharmus 60, 89) is a *plurale tantum*, and another, *πλευράς*, would naturally occur most frequently in the plural. No such situation obtains with *μωράς*. Leonidas of Tarentum (*A. P.* 6.288.7 = A. S. F. Gow & D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* [Cambridge 1965] 41.7) has *σπάθας* in a dactylic poem.

<sup>38</sup> A list of these forms can be found in Morsbach, “Über den Dialect Theocrits,” *Curtius Studien* 10 [1877] 1–38. He omits only *τέχνας* (21.1). Little can be said about the reason for the short accusatives in Theocritus, save that all, except *θύρας* (cf. *θύραζε?*), *ὄχνας*, and *ἀντολάς* (after *τροπάς*, Hes. *Op.* 564, 663), stem from nouns with *-ā* in the nominative singular. This is true also of *πάσας*, though not of any of the other adjectives, but may be due to chance. It really does appear that Theocritus felt that the vowel of the feminine accusative plural could be either long or short.

regularly lengthened by T. in arsis." And this is certainly a plausible interpretation of the data, if one accepts the short accusative as a fact of colloquial Doric usage. But it is also possible that Theocritus is imitating or recalling Hesiod, and hence showing a literary, rather than a dialectal, form. Perhaps a discussion of the *o*-stems will help us decide in this matter.

But for *τός* in Epicharmus and *λαγός* in Hesiod the first short accusative plurals of *o*-stems occur in Theocritus. Forms allowing a decision as to length are as follows: short, *παρθένος* (I.90), *λύκος* (4.11, 5.106), *διδυματόκος* (5.84), *ἀμπέλος* (5.109), *δασυκέρκος* (5.112), *κανθάρος* (5.114); long forms are relatively more common than are long feminine *a*-stem accusatives: *ὀφθαλμώς* (I.88), *δρυμώς* (I.117), *ταλάρως* (8.70), *τώς* (10.34), *πόκως* (15.20), *χρησμώς* (15.63). The *-ος* forms are rare, occurring only in poems 1, 4, and 5 beside *-ᾶς* forms, but they do not occur elsewhere, even where *-ᾶς* forms do. Theocritus was thus more sparing in their use, and we are again faced with a dichotomy between *o*- and *a*-stems. And this, plus the apparently literary origin of the short forms in Tyrtaeus and Hesiod, makes likely a literary origin for the Theocritean *o*-stem forms as well.

The suspicion of a purely literary origin of these forms is strengthened by a consideration of their gender. Of the six short accusatives four are either feminine nouns (*παρθένος*, *ἀμπέλος*) or compound adjectives modifying feminine nouns (*διδυματόκος*, *δασυκέρκος*). All long accusative forms are masculine, and special circumstances may have intervened in the case of the short masculines. *Λύκος* in both instances may owe its short quantity to the analogy of the *λαγός* of *Shield* 302, especially in 5.106, *ὃς λύκος ἄγκει*, where it appears in the same position in the line. And *κανθάρος* in 5.114 seems clearly to owe its short quantity to the *δασυκέρκος* of 5.112, the line to which 114 is the response. And neither one of these words has a genuine feminine.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>39</sup> *Λύκαινα* of course occurs, but is clearly modeled on *λέαινα*, and occurs first in Arist. *HA* 580a18. Interestingly, feminines of these words do occur as personal names: *Κανθάρα*, *Λύκα* (Fick-Bechtel, *Die griechischen Personennamen*<sup>2</sup> [Göttingen 1894] 321; H. Lommel, *Studien über indogermanische Femininbildungen* [Göttingen 1912] 15–16). But, as Lommel says, we should not conclude from this fact that they occurred also as lexical items. Perhaps Theocritus, in using the short accusatives here, was making a joke on these names. In any event there is with *λύκος* and *κάνθαρος* a connection, albeit a tenuous one, with feminine nouns.

All this suggests that the rule governing Theocritus' choice of long or short *o*-stem forms was governed by the gender of the noun in question, or the gender of the noun modified by the two-termination adjective. And the rule for feminine *a*-stems was: *-/a:s/* in the arsis, *-/as/* in the thesis. Neither of these rules conforms to the supposition that Theocritus was using dialectal forms, whether Coan Doric or not.

To recapitulate: All *o*-stem forms are of literary origin, save the *τός* in Epicharmus (170.13), and enclitic or otherwise weakened forms are apt to appear in the article (cf. M. Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*<sup>2</sup> [Paris 1955] 272). For this form we may assume colloquial origin. Hence in its earliest phases at least the Doric accusative was restricted to *a*-stems. We have seen that Alcman, Empedocles, Stesichorus, and the Rhodian poet of the *chelidonismos* were dependent on Hesiod, and are thus not to be considered independent evidence. Theocritus and Leonidas of Tarentum are too late to be reliable, though they cannot be ignored completely. The early evidence is restricted to Tyrtaeus, Simonides, Hesiod, and Epicharmus, only the last (and latest) of whom was a native Dorian, a fact which would tend to diminish the likelihood of Doric origin. But Tyrtaeus and Simonides, though non-Dorian, were writing for Dorians when they used the short forms, and hence may have been consciously adopting a feature of Doric poetry. Whatever the case, they, and Herodian too, show that the Doric accusative was most at home in the masculine *a*-stems.

From the fact that the Doric accusative first appears in masculine *a*-stems, we may conclude that it originated there. And we may further conclude that it arose not on phonological grounds but on morphological: as the long vowel of the feminine nominative singular stood to the short vowel of the masculine nominative singular, so the long vowel of the feminine accusative plural must stand to the short vowel of the masculine accusative plural, hence *-/as/*. *\*/ans/* by regular phonological change should yield *-/a:s/* in the masculine as in the feminine. Did this morphological change originate among the Dorians, possibly among Dorian poets, or was it an importation into the Doric world by non-Doric poets? We have supposed above that it originated as a result of the interpretation of certain striking Homeric forms, hence most likely among Ionians. It seems that there can be no doubt that these Homeric forms at least helped, if they did not cause, the development of *-ās* forms, and we have seen also that Homeric

influence was definitely present and operative on Hesiod when he created many of his short accusatives. But possibly the Homeric influence is secondary after all, and the formation original to non-Ionic poets, and at least initially independent of the influence of Homer. In order to decide this matter, since I earlier presented the evidence in such a way that it would appear that these forms were of Ionic origin, I shall present here in its best light the case for a non-Ionic, though not specifically Doric, origin. I leave aside for the moment the question of Homeric influence.

External evidence: Those poets whose early date qualifies them for consideration, whether or not themselves non-Ionic, were writing or singing for non-Ionic audiences. Hesiod was Boeotian, and was as it were the voice of Boeotia; Simonides, an Ionian, on the relevant occasion was writing for Doric Corinthians; Tyrtæus, an Athenian, wrote for Spartans, and in one instance (3b D = Plu. *Lyc.* 6; Parke & Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, vol. 2, no. 21, pp. 9-10) was paraphrasing a Delphic response. And another early form is contained in a Delphic oracular response, and, though reminiscent of Hesiod, provides support for a Heliconian origin of these forms.

Internal evidence: The analogical proportion, long vowel in nominative singular (feminine) : short vowel in nominative singular (masculine) :: long vowel in accusative plural (feminine) : short vowel in accusative plural (masculine and then feminine), does not appear convincing when expressed in terms of Ionic vocalism ( $-\eta$  :  $-\tilde{a}$  ::  $-\tilde{a}s$  :  $-\tilde{a}s$ ), for the nominatives are not sufficiently similar. But it begins to appear more convincing when  $-\tilde{a}$  is substituted for  $-\eta$ , that is to say, in non-Ionic dialects. And it would be more convincing still if we could express it in terms only of the masculine—m. nom. sing.  $-\tilde{a}$  : m. nom. sing.  $-\tilde{a}$  :: m. acc. pl.  $-\tilde{a}s$  : m. acc. pl.  $-\tilde{a}s$ . This would be a nearly perfect proportion, and it actually exists. Certain dialects, Boeotian and the dialects of the Northwest Greek group, do in fact have a nominative singular in  $-\tilde{a}$  in masculine nouns: cf. Boeotian *Πυθιονίκα*, *Μογέα*, *Καλλέα*; Dryopian *Ἀριστοκλέα*; Leucadian *Φιλοκλείδα*; Acarnanian (genitives) *Μεννείας*, *Δικαίας*.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore we know that Boeotian possessed short-vowel masculines (*καίετα· καλαμίνθη*,

<sup>40</sup> Schwyzler, *Griech. Gramm.* 1.560, who writes  $\tilde{a}$  for the forms attested only epigraphically, thus taking no stand on the quantity of the final vowel; Fraenkel (above, note 19) 2.185, note 1; Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte* 1.268.

Hesych.; ὀρσοστρίαυνα, Pi. Ol. 8.48, Pyth. 2.12) beside long-vowel forms (Μογέα).<sup>41</sup> A similar relation may have obtained in Elean also, but this is uncertain.<sup>42</sup>

Given the facts that the analogical proportion works best in Boeotia or among Northwest Greek dialects, and that Hesiod was a Boeotian, and the Delphic oracle located in Northwest Greek dialectal territory, it seems impossible to deny a Boeotian or Northwest Greek, perhaps specifically Delphian, origin to the short accusative plural of *a*-stems. Thus we find another certain case of a Doric (or better Northwest Greek) linguistic feature to go with τέτορες (above, note 1): Hesiod definitely was influenced linguistically by his surroundings. From Delphi and Boeotia the formation spread, by means of Hesiod's poems and the oracle's responses, to all non-Ionic poets. Hesiod utilized -ās forms not only in *a*-stem masculines, but also in *a*-stem feminines, but in general only when he was recalling Homer, and then generally only when correcting him, thus calling attention to and underlining the essential correctness of his own doctrine as opposed to Homer's. Later poets also used this scansion, but again in general only when they wished to align themselves in the Hesiodic tradition as against the Homeric and the Ionic. The tendency to utilize short *o*-stem accusatives did not begin until Theocritus, where indeed it also ended, and Theocritus had some queer and original ideas about these forms, ideas apparently not derived from dialectal resources, his own or any other.

Was the development of -as/ a colloquial one, and did all Boeotians and Delphians use this form as the accusative plural of their masculine *a*-stems? That is, did they have two paradigms in the masculine *a*-stems, the one showing nominative singular -ā and accusative plural -ās, the other -ā and -ās? If they did, we should have to suppose only that this colloquial allomorph was extended poetically to all *a*-stems, both masculine and feminine. Or was it a peculiarly literary development, as I have supposed above? We will never be able to provide a

<sup>41</sup> Buck (above, note 2) no. 38.5, p. 228; E. Schwyzler, *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Potiora = Del.*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig 1923) no. 441, p. 227.

<sup>42</sup> Τελέστα occurs (Schwyzler [above, note 41] 413.8; Buck [above, note 2] no. 62, p. 261), but since the nominative elsewhere ends in -as (φέτας on the same inscription; Ἐλλανοζίκας, Schwyzler 409.5; Buck, no. 61, p. 260), this form may well simply be a mistake for τελέστας.

definite answer to this question, but the odds favor a literary origin. The tendency to create  $-\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$  in masculine  $\tilde{\alpha}$ -stems was present to all the Greeks as a result of the archaic masculine nouns in  $-\tilde{\alpha}$  preserved in the Homeric poems. But it became current only among Boeotians and speakers of Northwest Greek dialects, because only there did these  $\tilde{\alpha}$ -masculines find an echo in masculines in  $-\tilde{\alpha}$ ; elsewhere the nominative in  $-\eta\varsigma$  or  $-\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$  prevented this development. We may conclude that the Doric, or better Northwest Greek, accusative in  $-\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$  arose on or near Helicon as a result of a local interpretation of the declensional implications of  $\text{ἰππότα}$  and forms like it.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>43</sup> An earlier version of this paper was read at the ninety-seventh annual meeting of the American Philological Association held at Providence, R. I., December 1965. I prepared this final version while a postdoctoral fellow at the Institute for Research in the Humanities of the University of Wisconsin. I am grateful to the Institute and its director, Kenneth Setton, for providing me pleasant surroundings in which to work.