

# IN DEFENSE OF THE SPECIAL DUAL FEMININE FORMS OF THE ARTICLE AND PRONOUNS *τά, ταῖν, ταῦτα, ταῦταιν, κτλ.* IN ATTIC GREEK<sup>1</sup>

GUY L. COOPER, III  
*University of North Carolina, Asheville*

Introduction to the Dispute and Sketch of the Position Taken in  
This Article.

The manuscripts of the Attic authors often show dual forms of the article and the pronouns—as for example *τώ, τοῖν, τοῦτω, τούτοιν, αὐτώ, αὐτοῖν, τώδε, κτλ.* which are used freely as either masculines or feminines. But the manuscripts also show in a number of cases special feminine dual forms for the article and pronouns, as for example *τά, ταῖν, ταῦτα, ταῦταιν, αὐτά, αὐταῖν, τάδε, κτλ.* A doctrine which is at the present time wide-spread among reputable grammatical authorities holds that these special feminine dual forms are mistaken and late and only appear in the manuscripts because of ignorant and careless scribes.<sup>2</sup> It is a natural and logical consequence of this doctrine that

<sup>1</sup> See my Zürich dissertation *Zur syntaktischen Theorie und Textkritik der attischen Autoren*, Zürich, 1971 (hereafter referred to as STT) and my subsequent articles in CQ 65 (1971) 62–4 and AJP 92 (1971) 307–11.

<sup>2</sup> This is the position of LSJ p. 1194 s.v. *ὁ* and p. 1275 s.v. *οὗτος*. See also Ed. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (Berlin 1938 = München 1953): “Sicher jung sind die feminine Dualformen von Pronomina (wie att. *τά, ταῦτα*, häufiger *-αιν*), nach den Inschriften wohl nur ein Fehler für die maskuline Formen, die auch für das Feminin gelten, z.B. *τῷ στήλα, τοῖν χερσίν*.” Schwyzer does not elaborate further, but it may be his opinion is in part a hasty conclusion due to the fact that comparative linguistics show the *τά, ταῖν* forms to be relatively recent innovations peculiar to the Greek and unknown in the cognate languages. The immediate and certain answer to this argument is that comparative linguistics only prove the forms to be recent relative to the hypothetical Indo-germanic common ancestor of both Greek and Sanskrit. It does not prove them “recent” in the course of the historical development of the language. P. Chantraine (*Morphologie Historique du Grec* [Paris 1947]), who is of course completely

the authorities who uphold it wish to change the special feminine forms wherever they occur and to replace them in each case with the dual forms of common (promiscuous) gender *τώ, τοῖν, τούτω, τούτοιν, αὐτώ, αὐτοῖν, τώδε, κτλ.* It is the purpose of this paper to show that the special feminine forms should be respected, and that the teaching which underlies the attempt to do away with them is really nothing more than a sort of modern grammatical superstition set up originally in irresponsible haste and perpetuated by uncritical pseudo-scientific enthusiasm, despite the gradual accumulation of overwhelming contradictory evidence. The argument offered in this sense rests primarily on the firm foundations of the copious and unexceptionable transmission of these forms in the manuscripts and on inscriptions and on the internal consistency of the stylistic picture which they present in the contexts where they are so transmitted. It is, however, perhaps too much to hope that the simple presentation of these objective

---

familiar with the results of comparative linguistics (cf. e.g. on p. 31 "le duel des thèmes en -a, . . . une innovation propre au grec . . . etc." and further on p. 38) does not fall into any such error. After remarking on page 129 "le duel féminin est en général identique au masculin et neutre *τώ, τοῖν*" he goes on to add judiciously that there are indeed "quelques exceptions." See also p. 130. It will become apparent in the course of this discussion that many other important modern grammarians and editors including Hasse, Blass, Gildersleeve, Miller, Kenyon, Burnet, Marchant, Cuny, Körte, Hatzfeld, Dain, Thierfelder and others have never assented to the total extirpation of the *τά, ταῖν* forms. In this they agree with the traditional Greek authorities. Cf. e.g. Herodian (ed. Lentz I p. 473) 1.29 ff.: *πάν ἄρθρον ὀξύνεται χωρίς τῶν γενικῶν καὶ δοτικῶν. αὗται γὰρ περισπῶνται τοῦ τῷ τῆς τῇ, τοῖν ταῖν, τῶν, τοῖς ταῖς*; Choeroboscus 129.11 (= Herodian, Lentz 2 p. 668): *πάσα εὐθεῖα δυνικῶν εἰς ᾧ λήγουσα προσθέσει τοῦ ἱν ποιεῖ τὴν γενικὴν καὶ δοτικὴν οἶον τῷ κοχλία τοῖν κοχλῖαι, τῷ Αἰνείᾳ τοῖν Αἰνείαι, τὰ μούσα ταῖν μούσαι, τὰ Ἑλένα ταῖν Ἑλέναι*; Herodian ib. I p. 420: *τὸ γὰρ ἐν δυνικοῖς ᾧ μακρόν ἐστιν, ὃ Αἰνείας τῷ Αἰνείᾳ, ἢ Μῆδεῖα τὰ Μηδεῖα*; id. ib. II p. 660: *οὐδὲ γὰρ λέγομεν τὰ Λητοε καὶ τὰ αἰδοε τὴν εὐθειαν τῶν δυνικῶν, ἀλλὰ τὰ Λητώ καὶ τὰ αἰδώ.* It is true that such citations cannot *prove* anything for the classical period. But it would nevertheless be exaggerated incredulity to see nothing in them but the proof of analogical activity on the part of the elder literary men. They were after all grammarians and had to have their paradigms. How were they to present the material which they found present in the literature otherwise? Forms which appear in such presentations are not made suspect by this very fact alone. Rather they are to some degree substantiated by them. The decisive witnesses are those from the classical time itself. If there were not classical witnesses convincingly numerous, strongly transmitted, and above all consistent in sense and style, then the grammarians' statements might with some show of reasonableness be disregarded. But since there are in fact such witnesses aplenty in classical texts, the grammarians' statements do have some value as clinching arguments.

arguments will suffice to combat the received teaching without a preliminary presentation of a short outline of the modern development of the question.

Such a history is moreover something of an eye-opener altogether and has a certain interest and shock-value in its own right. Scholars of today often show an exaggerated reverence for the giants of our field of 100 years ago and find it difficult to credit the carefree and contentious abandon with which much of our standard grammatical and syntactical doctrine was originally set up in the middle of the nineteenth century. The particular teaching here brought into question is well suited to disabuse such credulous persons among us. It has caused the alteration and perceptible impoverishment of literally dozens of passages in many of the best and most widely studied authors. Yet it really never had any foundation except for the personal and arbitrary opinions of a few, but by no means all, leading scholars.

### Polemical History of the Question

How then did the controversy begin and who was it who first cast the legitimacy of the special forms into doubt? It was Cobet in his *Novae Lectiones* who started it all.<sup>3</sup> He first spoke out his demand for a supposed clean-up operation on the texts in the first edition (1858) of this work. He then repeated himself essentially unchanged in the edition of 1873, pp. 69–71—ignoring the important criticism which had in the meantime appeared in N. Wecklein's valuable work of 1869, the *Curae Epigraphicae*.<sup>4</sup> The original occasion of Cobet's teaching was a critical remark on a prettily elliptical sentence which is found in the first paragraph of a letter of Alciphron (26[iii 62] = Benner-Fobes 212–16): *μυστήριον ἐν αὐταῖς* (sc. *ταῖς γυναιξὶ*) *στρέφεται ταῖν θεαῖν ταῖν Ἐλευσινίαιν ἀσφαλέστερον, καὶ βούλονται ἡμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν τοὺς εἰδότες* = "The ladies are making a great fuss about a secret, which they are keeping more strictly than (sc. the mysteries) of the Goddesses of Eleusis. They want us to stay in the dark about it, although we are actually already completely in the picture." Cobet

<sup>3</sup> *Novae Lectiones quibus continentur Observationes Criticae in Scriptores Graecos scripsit C. G. Cobet* (Batava 1858). *Editio secunda auctior* 1873.

<sup>4</sup> *Curae Epigraphicae ad Grammaticam Graecam et Poetas Scenicos pertinentes scripsit N. Wecklein* (Lipsiae 1869).

first demands *τρέφεται* in place of the *στρέφεται* of the manuscripts—a completely needless change<sup>5</sup>—and then goes on to pontificate: “*τὸν θεοῖν ἡοῖν Ἑλευσινίῳ* Graecum est, *ταῖν θεαῖν* non est.” Attempting to substantiate this sweeping contention Cobet then maintains that *τὼ θεῷ, τοῖν θεοῖν* is read in various authors and that where, as is—even he admits it—repeatedly the case in Aristophanes, *ταῖν θεαῖν* stands in the tradition, this must simply be changed. Indeed Cobet goes still further and maintains by way of fiat that not only *τά, ταῖν, ταῦτα, ταῦται* κτλ. but also any and all adjectives and participles with these same endings must be “corrected.”<sup>6</sup> This “proof” of the suggested emendation shows just how dangerous it is to put any great reliance on Cobet’s critical sense. Alciphron lived at the end of the second and into the beginning of the third century A.D., and here Cobet attempts to correct his text with comparisons from *Aristophanes*, i.e. with comparisons from texts which are about 600 years older than the passage to be corrected! Not only that, but the passages adduced actually *support* the reading received for Alciphron unless they in turn are altered to fit Cobet’s standard! Supposing for the present, however, that Cobet had judged the Attic usage correctly and the passages in Aristophanes really should be changed, what would that prove for Alciphron? If Cobet was looking for parallels to justify or

<sup>5</sup> For *στρέφεται* in the sense “to be always engaged in or about” cf. LSJ p. 1634 s.v. *στρέφω*, Biii where Plat. *Thet.* 194B: *ἐν τούτοις στρέφεται καὶ ἐλίσσεται ἡ δόξα* is cited.

<sup>6</sup> One witness for an *anti-analogical* posture on the part of at least some of the elder scholars in relation to these forms, which has in a way more significance than the apparently analogically oriented citations from Herodian and Choeroboscus above in note 2, is the fascinating remark of the scholiast to Ar. *Thesm.* 566: (γυνή ἃ) Οὐ τοι μὰ τὼ θεῷ σὺ καταπρόϊξι λέγουσα ταυτί. The scholiast says on τὼ θεῷ] ὡς τὼ χεῖρε. οὐκέτι δὲ τοῖν θεοῖν ἀλλὰ ταῖν θεαῖν. The import of this statement is surely that the Aristophanic flexion is τὼ θεῷ, ταῖν θεαῖν, ταῖν θεαῖν, τὼ θεῷ and *not* either τὼ θεῷ, τοῖν θεοῖν, τοῖν θεοῖν, τὼ θεῷ or τὰ θεά, ταῖν θεαῖν, ταῖν θεαῖν, τὰ θεά. The scholiast insists in other words that the true Aristophanic flexion is *not* an analogically regular flexion. He is trying to direct attention to a remarkable and interesting peculiarity of the language of old comedy. It is not without a certain piquancy that the scholars of the last century and this who attack *ταῖν θεαῖν* substituting *τοῖν θεοῖν* not only take up a false analogy which the scribes conscientiously avoided, and against which at least some of the elder scholars issue warnings, but even go on to accuse their predecessors of carrying on a corrupting analogical activity. They blame the elder authorities for the very same mistake which they themselves commit. For the general avoidance of the nom.-acc. forms *τά, ταῦτα, κτλ.* which underlies and explains this anomaly, cf. *infra* note 17.

damn the Alciphron passage, why did he not turn to Alciphron's contemporaries? If he had done so he could have found *ταῖν θεαῖν* much closer than Aristophanes. Cf. e.g. Lucian *DMeretr.* 1 (= Hemsterhuys iii 296): "Ωμοσε γάρ, ὦ μῆτερ, κατὰ *ταῖν θεαῖν* καὶ τῆς *Πολιάδος*.<sup>7</sup> Would Cobet pretend that this passage too is, as he pretends of the Aristophanic and other passages, *scriborum vitia et errores*? It would hardly be possible to prove such a contention, for *ταῖν θεαῖν* is read on an Attic inscription of the Imperial period. Cf. *CIG* 828, 5-6 = *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3586: *Κλαύδιος καὶ Κλαυδία / Γ. Κλαύδιον Ζεῖλι/ανὸν Πολύκριτον / τὸν υἱὸν μνηθέντα / ἀφ' ἐστίας ταῖν θε-/ αῖν ἀνέθηκαν / ἐπὶ ἱερείας Κλαυδίας / Τειμοθέας τῆς Τειμο-/ θεύς Γαργηττίου θυ [γατρός].* It seems clear that Cobet undertook his attack on the Alciphron passage without bothering to check the most immediately relevant texts.

But his attack on the Attic texts is just as ill-advised. We will come back to the question of Aristophanes' fellow Attic authors later, but for now let us simply consider the problem from the viewpoint of Alciphron and his Atticising contemporaries. As far as the true Attic authors are concerned no strict demonstration is possible on the basis of this later material, but it does surely provide a secondary substantiating argument. Writers of this later period such as Alciphron and Lucian did certainly suppose that they were imitating Attic usage closely. What right have we to presume automatically that they failed of their intention? Who doubts that they had read more widely in the later comedy than we, or that they disposed of excellent exemplars? We are concerned here with a peculiarity of the language of cult. The phrase *ταῖν θεαῖν* is precisely the sort of thing which would be bound to interest archaising authors especially. Such witnesses from a post-classical period could not of course be taken as more than supplementary. On the other hand they do not automatically make suspect a similar passage of the classical period. Rather, they tend to substantiate such usage when it occurs in such texts. Thus Cobet misuses his later evidence just as much as his earlier, and attempts to make one proof out of two unproven assertions. He is not able to invalidate

<sup>7</sup> The citation has all the more weight because according to general consent Alciphron in his letters is *imitating* Lucian. On Lucian's exactness in imitating at least some aspects of the Attic usage, cf. *infra*, note 27.

either set of examples and so blissfully begins to use them *against* each other! This leads us back to the Attic examples themselves, and what is of course the most damning evidence against Cobet from our present properly classical point of view. Despite his statements to the contrary Cobet seems to have had really no proper notion of what a body of usage in the classical period he was so cavalierly dismissing. He mentions, for example, that Andocides has *τοῖν θεοῖν* in more than one passage, but he neglects to mention that Andocides also shows *ταῖν* twice, in one instance quite without variant. Cobet does concede that *ταῖν θεαῖν* occurs twice in the mss. of Aristophanes and *θεαῖν* alone in two further passages, but he fails to mention that *ταῖν* is also found with *θεσμοφοροῖν* in this author, and that special feminine forms of the article and pronoun are transmitted altogether in no less than 13 instances in Aristophanes. Cobet does consider two passages where such forms occur without variant in Isocrates, but one learns nothing about the additional seven passages in this author where such forms occur as abundantly witnessed variant readings. Cobet requires the alteration of a feminine article of the special form in Sophocles. But he does not mention that this same or similar forms are read almost without variant in nine additional passages of this tragedian's dramas. As to the various other Attic authors which show these and similar forms, namely Lysias, Plato, Xenophon, Isaeus, IG II<sup>2</sup> 588, Hyperides and Menander, Cobet does not mention them at all. If we are to take his own statement literally, he knew about all of these passages and had considered them long and carefully, for he states (p. 79): "*Equidem omnibus locis et testimoniis veterum diu et multum perpensis in hanc sententiam adductus sum, quam nunc satis habeo paucis dixisse: in pronominibus, adiectivis, participiis una atque eadem forma est triplici generi communis τῶ, ᾧ, αὐτῶ, τούτῳ, ἀλλήλῳ.*" Yet it is hard to believe that this is literally true. For if he knew about all of this evidence, which is in fact contrary to his own argument, was he not bound in fairness to mention it specifically? As it is, we are left to suppose that he is either being untruthful about having read and re-read the Attic texts especially in this connection, or that he is in his account deliberately suppressing relevant evidence from view. The one supposition is about as discreditable to Cobet as the other.

Be that as it may, and hard as it is to forgive Cobet for the destructive

effect that he has had on the texts, he did at least provoke scholarly interest in these rare forms. The emulation and the reaction which he inspired gradually contributed to the illumination of the phenomenon, and if we ultimately arrive at a better understanding of it this will in a perverse way be partly due to his mistaken initiative.

Wecklein in the *Curae Epigraphicae* was the first to raise some objection. The effect of this important work on the question has been both positive and negative. It was the great positive contribution of Wecklein that he first took the evidence of the inscriptions, as far as they were known in his day, into consideration. The advantage of this material as evidence is that it is in the positive sense, i.e. if the inscriptions actually show a form, irrefutable. Wecklein did succeed in demonstrating the adjectival forms ἀργυρά, χρυσᾶ, χαλκᾶ, ποικίλα and the participial form καλυψαμενά on classical inscriptions.<sup>8</sup> This was the perfect refutation of the last two-thirds of Cobet's statement: "in pronominiibus, adiectivis, participiis una atque eadem forma est triplici generi communis." Wecklein did not, however, find the pronominal forms τά, ταῖν, ταύταιν, κτλ., and drew the premature, mistaken conclusion that the first third of Cobet's doctrinal statement was accurate.<sup>9</sup> In so doing he accepted an argument from silence, confusing mere inconclusive circumstantial evidence with really compelling proof. Not only did he fail to appreciate that the conclusions, which the small amount of material at his disposal would allow, were limited, but he also neglected one of the most fundamental rules of descriptive stylistics: the grammar of no literary genre can be accounted valid without reservation as a standard for any other literary genre. It never occurred to Wecklein to consider that these forms might simply not be suited to the *style* of inscriptions, while being on the other hand very appropriate for texts of some other department of literature. If he had investigated the literary tradition more closely,

<sup>8</sup> Some of Wecklein's examples for the participles had subsequently to be discarded, but this does not change the validity of his conclusions. Cf. J. Wackernagel in *Philolog. Anzeiger* (1885) 191 and the *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften* von K. Meisterhans, Dritte vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage besorgt von Eduard Schwyzler (Berlin 1900) 122.

<sup>9</sup> Wecklein remarks (op. supra cit. 14) on Cobet's doctrine: "Horum alia vera sunt, alia non item. Titulis comprobatur veteres Atticos communi forma dixisse τοῖν, τούτοιν, i.e. omnia quae cum articulo cohaerent vel articuli rationem sequuntur: τῷ, τῷδε, τούτῳ, αὐτῷ, ᾧ, ᾧτινι, τοῖν, τοῖνδε etc., in participiis autem . . . habuisse propriam feminini formam."

this possibility—which is in fact the actual case—might have suggested itself to him. But he left this work to subsequent researchers for the most part—and they were at first too dazzled by his preceding work to take a genuinely sceptical attitude in relation to it.

Prominent among these successors to Wecklein is S. Keck.<sup>10</sup> His work, which appeared in 1882, seeks and finds only additional substantiation for the stylish doctrine which was at that time rapidly taking shape as the established and popular position. Keck is so prejudiced that he takes *no* passage in Isocrates into consideration, although the vulgate, which contains over 100 mss., shows no less than 12 forms in 9 passages, and in two of these passages the rarer form is the *only* form which is reported by *any* mss. Keck defends this decision with the remark (p. 27) that “für Isokrates nur der cod. Urbinas massgebend ist” and (p. 29) because “die schlechten Handschriften, . . . nicht in Betracht kommen können.” Now it is true that the Urbinas, which shows the special feminines in only two places, has—whether rightly or wrongly—enjoyed a special consideration among editors. But it was in 1882 already perfectly well understood that eclecticism is unavoidable even in the establishment of the text of Isocrates. In the *praefatio* to his new edition of Benseler’s Isocrates, F. Blass collected in 1878 many passages where the Urbinas must be corrected by means of the mss. of the vulgate. He comments on this collection (1.7) “auctoritatem optimorum librorum in universum sequendam esse consentaneum sit, tamen sciamus oportet, hac ratione saepissime quidem menda tolli, *nonnumquam vero inferri*.” He writes then again in 1879 in the *praefatio* to the second volume (2.5) “operae pretium videtur, ut . . . ea colligam, quae demonstrent Urbinatem Ambrosianamque codices, si eos temere sequaris *longe ab recta via interdum deducere*.”<sup>11</sup> There was in other words no justification whatsoever for

<sup>10</sup> Stephen Keck, *Über den Dual bei den Griechischen Rednern mit Berücksichtigung der Attischen Inschriften* (Würzburg 1882). Wackernagel (*Philolog. Anzeiger* loc. supra cit. 190—unfortunately not reprinted in the *Kleinen Schriften*) introduces his substantial criticism of many details of this work with the following general comment: “(sc. Keck’s Arbeit) steht . . . bedeutend hinter anderen in der gleichen sammlung zurück . . . Man hat den eindruck dass der verfasser . . . seine cite aus Humboldt u.s.w. mehr zur verzierung der ihrer natur nach schmucklosen erörterung beigebracht habe, als dass er wirklich gelernt hätte sprachliche tatsachen richtig zu würdigen.”

<sup>11</sup> This evaluation of the mss. was subsequently reaffirmed by Drerup (ed. lxxiii–lxxx 1907) and by Mathieu-Brémond (ed. 1956 Introduction xxii). These write, “L’Urbinas



Keck's categorical refusal even to consider the readings of the majority tradition. But he went so far that even in the two places where the Urbinas and the vulgate agree—as in the two additional places where the Ambrosianus, commonly supposed the second best ms., accords with the vulgate—he discounts the feminine on paleographical grounds. It almost goes without saying that in the additional eight passages in Attic orators where he must confess that the only reading possible according to the mss. is the special feminine, Keck ultimately “emends” to the forms of common gender ruthlessly. All of these reproaches cannot change the fact that Keck's essay, after the contributions of Cobet and Wecklein, effectively established a dogma of syntactical and text-critical science which has up to now maintained itself as the dominant teaching despite all attempts at refutation.

This issue of the controversy might have been different, if the investigations of E. Hasse<sup>12</sup> had received the attention which they actually deserve. First with his collections of material and theoretical

---

III(Γ), qui se trouve à la Bibliothèque Vaticane, date du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle ou au plus tard du X<sup>e</sup> et reproduit sans doute un manuscrit du début de l'ère chrétienne. Il a été corrigé à six reprises du X<sup>e</sup> au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle et surtout d'après les manuscrits de la vulgate. C'est de beaucoup le meilleur des manuscrits d'Isocrate et depuis sa découverte par Bekker qui en tira cinq mille corrections, c'est celui auquel se sont en général fiés les éditeurs. *Cependant il n'est pas exempt, surtout dans les lettres, de fautes que la vulgate permet souvent de corriger.* . . . D'ailleurs deux manuscrits qui s'en dérivent, le Vaticanus 936 (Δ), du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle, et surtout l'Ambrosianus 0144 (E), du XV<sup>e</sup> permettent d'établir de façon à peu près sûre la tradition de cette famille.” The still more recent tendency is to further discount Γ. Helmut Erbse has taken up this position in the *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur* (Zürich 1961) 1.205, attacking Γ as being a special medieval edition which abbreviates and otherwise distorts the ancient text. I believe that he is quite right in casting doubt on the antiquity of the prototype of the Urbinas and its family: “Die Herausgeber pflegen sich seiner Führung (d.h. der von Γ) anzuvertrauen, da sie annehmen, es sei unmittelbar aus einem antiken Exemplar vielleicht sogar aus einem Buch hadrianischer Zeit abgeleitet. Diese Vermutung bestätigt sich jedoch nicht; denn Γ weist nicht selten Fehler auf, während die Vulgata die bessere Form bietet.”

<sup>12</sup> *Über den Dual bei Xenophon und Thukydides.* von Ernst Hasse. Beilage zum Programm des königl. Gymnasiums zu Bartelstein (1889).—*Über den Dual bei den attischen Dramatikern.* von Ernst Hasse. Beilage zum Programm des königl. Gymnasiums zu Bartelstein (1891).—*Über das unreflektierte δύο.* Fleckeisens Jahrbüchern (1892) 540 ff.—*Der Dualis im Attischen.* von Ernst Hasse, Oberlehrer am Gymnasium zu Bartelstein. Mit einer Vorrede von Professor F. Blass (Hannover u. Leipzig 1893).—These monographs will be subsequently cited as Hasse 1889, Hasse 1891 etc. There was in the years 1878–1890 considerable investigation into the dual generally. Hasse 1893 gives a good bibliography of this development on p. 2; and his own pamphlet is itself a full and dependable résumé of the results which had been reached up to that time.

criticism of Cobet, Wecklein and Keck (Hasse 1889), then with the continuation of this activity and the publication of important new inscriptional evidence (Hasse 1891), and finally with a careful review of almost all inscriptions *and* literary citations (Hasse 1893), Hasse laid the foundation for a reform and a return to sounder views on this question. The fact that his work has never received sufficient attention and that the needful reform still has not taken place is not his fault. Hasse's first pamphlet was an attempt to bring the materials which he had himself collected from Xenophon and Thucydides together with the material which had already been collected from other authors and thus to show that the total mass of evidence is simply too great to be dismissed with contempt. But he also went further offering the theoretical criticism that "Es ist . . . unstatthaft, den Gebrauch der Artikelform bei Femininis, wie er in den Inschriften herrscht, als Maszstab für den Sprachgebrauch des Aristophanes und Sophokles (wie Wecklein es tut) und für den der attischen Redner (wie Keck es will) anzulegen." Hasse saw in other words that inscriptional grammar and literary grammar are two different things which cannot be simply equated and identified with one another. In this correct conviction he undertook to reaffirm the independence of the literature with respect to inscriptional usage. He began a new and more careful review of the dramatic material. But even as he busied himself with this review he was agreeably surprised by a great and unexpected sensation. He had sent a copy of the pamphlet of 1889 to the famed Karl Meisterhans, the author of the *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, and this scholar now returned the kindness with a letter which Hasse naturally had printed at the beginning (p. 3) of the pamphlet of 1891. The letter runs: "In dem neuesten Bande des CIA (v. ii, pars iii) findet sich unter No. 1559 (= 4 Jahrhundert vor Chr., Prosa) in der Tat die Artikelform ταιν :[Φ]ίλη ταιν θεαιν [ε]ύξαμένη ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδίου<sup>13</sup> neben circa

<sup>13</sup> The newer enumeration is *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4588, where the dating is given as the middle of the 4th century. This is also the dating of Svoronos in his catalogue of the National Museum in Athens which includes the inscription in its collections. In Svoronos' publication (*Τὸ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐθνικὸν Μουσεῖον. ὑπὸ Ἰ.Ν. Σβορώνου* [Athens 1904-11]) the stone figures on a large photographic plate (vol. 3, pl. CCXIX) amid several others of contemporary date. The similarity of lettering styles among them is striking. The dating is however by no means dependent upon letter style alone. There is a curious band of sculpture above the inscription proper upon which three objects which look like nothing so much as old fashioned four-bladed airplane propellers, but which are perhaps

dreissigmaligem  $\tau\omicron\iota\nu$   $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\nu$  (= Demeter und Persephone) auf Inschriften aus dem 5. und 4. Jahrhundert.”

Now Hasse's own investigations were certainly not without interesting results. He was able to ascertain that practically *nowhere* in drama, in contrast to the inscriptional usage, is  $\tau\omicron\iota\nu$  used with a feminine substantive—a fact which, surprisingly enough, no earlier investigator had remarked.<sup>14</sup> This result, important as it was, still paled quite naturally in comparison with Meisterhans' communication. For neither Hasse nor anyone else, least of all Wecklein or Keck, had ever questioned the cogency of inscriptions when they give a positive citation for a particular form. If a form can be cited on a contemporary inscription then that same form may of course stand when transmitted in the mss. Moreover the age of this particular inscription was precisely right to confirm forms common to it and the literary texts which have been transmitted from the best period of Attic literature and show the disputed forms in their manuscript traditions. Let us for purposes of illustration take the date 350 B.C.—for in the newer edition of the Attic inscriptions the date is given more precisely as the *middle* of the fourth century. We then find that one author whose manuscript tradition shows forms such as  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\tau\alpha\iota\nu$ ,  $\kappa\tau\lambda$ . (Sophocles) was only 54 years dead at that time. Another such author (Andocides) was only 40 years dead. A third (Aristophanes) was only 15 and a fourth (Xenophon) only 3 years gone. Isaeus died in the course of this same

---

more likely carefully shaped loaves of bread, are depicted. Hans Möbius in the *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 39 (1924) 13 publishes a photograph of another stone which bears a similar sculptural motif above the inscription  $\Gamma\lambda\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\eta$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon$ —also in fourth-century lettering. Möbius supposes that both these sculptured inscriptions reflect a fourth-century custom of making a more common and less expensive offering of similarly shaped actual loaves. Now if, as Möbius states, this sculptural motif is confined to fourth-century dedications to Persephone and Demeter we are surely right in seeing in this a strong external verification of the commonly received dating. The reference to Möbius' article which is given in the apparatus criticus of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4588 where, as has been noted, the traditional dating is reaffirmed, suggests that the editors of the *IG* took his argument in this sense and considered it cogent. In this I believe they were surely correct. On the basis of the considerable available external evidence there does not seem to be any doubt that the stone actually dates from the 4th century. My thanks go to A. Burford for helping me to get control of these epigraphical matters.

<sup>14</sup> Kock's remark on *Equites* 424 concerns itself only with Aristophanic usage. The only dubious passage would seem to be *Ar. Pax* 1308 (= citation 19 in the text below, see the discussion there.)

year 350 and three more authors (Plato, Isocrates and Hyperides) *were still alive in this year*. Plato did die only three years later in 347, but Isocrates lived on for 12 years until 338 and Hyperides did not die till 18 years later in 332. Menander, whose tradition shows three of the suspect forms, did not even see the light of day until *eight years later*, and did not die until about 60 years later in 290/1.

Such a publication could not go entirely unnoticed in the most responsible circles of the learned world. Thus, as might have been expected, it was only true to the form of that fine philological veteran Friedrich Blass that he gave an admirable proof of his scientific elasticity in this matter. He had written in his new edition of Kühner's *Formlehre*<sup>15</sup> in 1890 (pp. 604–5): “Die weiblichen Dualformen  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  und  $\tau\alpha\hat{\iota}\nu$  sind . . . in den Handschriften der Schriftsteller selten, namentlich  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ , indem die Formen  $\tau\acute{\omega}$  und  $\tau\omicron\hat{\iota}\nu$  zugleich auch für das weibliche Geschlecht eintreten . . . Die att. Inschriften jedoch (abzüglich solcher der Kaiserzeit, wo der Dual in der weiblichen Sprache vorlängst erloschen war) bieten ausnahmslos  $\tau\acute{\omega}$ ,  $\tau\omicron\hat{\iota}\nu$ ,  $\tau\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\nu$ ,  $\omicron\hat{\iota}\nu$ , und darum pflegen die Herausgeber jetzt solche Beispiele zu korrigieren, wozu z.B. bei Platon auch die vorwiegende Überlieferung der Handschriften selber anleitet.”<sup>16</sup> After he had become familiar with Hasse's work, Blass had the considerable grace to turn right around and take all of this back in 1892. What he says in his *Berichtigungen und Nachträge* in the second volume, p. 584, is also a pregnant résumé of Hasse's results: “Eine genaue Untersuchung über den Tatbestand der Überlieferung giebt E. Hasse, Über d. Dual usw. . . . Zu vörderst ist es nicht mehr richtig, dass die attischen Inschriften *kein* Beispiel von  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\tau\alpha\hat{\iota}\nu$  gäben: C. I. Att. II, no. 1559 steht einmal  $\tau\alpha\hat{\iota}\nu \theta\epsilon\alpha\hat{\iota}\nu$ , . . . So dann ist bei den Dramatikern niemals  $\tau\omicron\hat{\iota}\nu$ ,  $\tau\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\nu$ , usw. als fem. überliefert, sondern immer  $\tau\alpha\hat{\iota}\nu$  . . . , dagegen allerdings  $\tau\acute{\omega}$ , ( $\tau\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega$ ,  $\tau\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon$ ,  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$ ,  $\acute{\omega}$ ,  $\acute{\omega}\tau\iota\nu\epsilon$ ) als fem., wie wohl auch  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\tau\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\alpha$ ,  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon$  vorkommen,

<sup>15</sup> R. Kühner-F. Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Erster Teil, Erster Band* (Hannover 1890) and then two years later the *Zweiter Band* (Hannover 1892).

<sup>16</sup> That a man like Blass could be responsible for a remark like this last statement concerning the manuscript tradition of Plato shows just how vague ideas about the facts of the tradition still were in knowledgeable quarters in 1890—just before Hasse's publications—but more than 30 years after Cobet's curt and peremptory formulation. The fact is that there are 5 passages in Plato which show a total of 7 of the questioned forms. In only *one* passage is there a variant reading, and this occurs in only *one* of the several important manuscripts.

nam. in Verbindung mit Subst. 1. Deklination . . . das Ergebnis ist überall ein ähnliches, nur dass *τά*, *ταύτα* in der Prosa nirgends mehr stehen,<sup>17</sup> und *τοῖν* neben *ταῖν* vorkommt (bei Plat. 6 Beisp. für *τοῖν* nb. 4 für *ταῖν*), . . . Nicht bezeugt ist *ᾶ*, *ἀλλήλα*; . . . aber *ἀλλήλοιν* u. *-αιν*."

But Blass was not satisfied merely with this plain-spoken change of mind. When Hasse brought out his last pamphlet (Hasse 1893) Blass was generous enough to recommend the work with a well-considered preface wherein he writes: "Wie schwierig und wie mühsam, und wie sehr vielfältigen Irrungen ausgesetzt die Untersuchung auf dem Gebiete der griechischen Grammatik ist, lehrt ganz besonders die Geschichte der Forschung über den Gebrauch des Dualis. Wir arbeiten mit unzulänglichem Material, indem die Handschriften nicht durchaus zuverlässig, und die Inschriften spärlich sind, so kann es kommen, dass eine kleine Vermehrung des letzteren Materials den Stand der Frage plötzlich völlig ändert. Das Erste und Notwendigste ist also eine vollständige Übersicht der zur Zeit vorhandenen Tatsachen, und die wird in der vorliegenden kleinen Schrift für den attischen Dualis in ausgezeichnete Weise geboten, . . . Es wird daher keiner weiteren Worte bedürfen um die Schrift des Herren E. Hasse, der nicht zum ersten Male sich um diese Frage verdient gemacht hat, dergebührenden Aufmerksamkeit und dem Studium der Fachgenossen zu empfehlen." It is obvious from these words that Blass feared that the learned world had grown weary all too soon with the difficulties and complexities of the dual, and that he foresaw the danger that hasty conclusions drawn from the first stages of the special investigation of these phenomena

<sup>17</sup> I must beg to differ with Hasse and Blass on this one point. I see no reason to confine the *-a* forms to the poets. It is however very clear that the gen.-dat. is everywhere significantly commoner than the nom.-acc. My collations show the following distributions: *τά*—8, *ταῖν*—34, *ταύτα*—4, *ταύταιν*—7, *τάδε*—1, *ταῖνδε*—4, *αὐτά*—1, *αὐταῖν*—2, *ἀλλήλαιν*—1, *ἐκείναιν*—1, *αἶν*—2. Of the total of 65 forms, 14 are nom.-acc. Of these 9 are poetic (5 from the old comedy) and 5 are found in the orators. It is tempting to conclude that the similarity of the feminine dual to the neuter plural forms—which is in the cases of *τά*, *τάδε*, and *αὐτά* perfect except for the long alpha in the fem. dual forms—inhibited the use of the special feminines due to the possible ambiguity involved. The common confusion between the fem. dual *ταύτα* and the neut. pl. *ταῦτα* in the mss. (cf. citations 16, 32 and 40 below) would thus correspond to a slight linguistic difficulty which affected usage even as early as the classical time. Cf. further, *supra*, note 6.

might subsequently prove very difficult to root out—even after they had been shown in detail to be untenable.

This fear has proven only too well justified. With a few notable exceptions, teaching and, to some extent, editorial practice persists stubbornly in ignoring Hasse's work.<sup>18</sup> Perhaps the single most important factor in perpetuating the misunderstanding has been the inadequate or rather actually misleading treatment accorded the subject in Schwyzer's re-edition of Meisterhans' *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*.<sup>19</sup> At the appropriate paragraph 48B 17E (p. 123) Schwyzer says: "Beim Artikel sind Dualformen auf -α. -αιν selten: τῷ στήλα, τῷ κλίμακε, τοῖν πολέοιν, τοῖν Νίκαιν, woneben das jüngere ταῖν θεαῖν." In the footnote on ταῖν θεαῖν in this part of his text Schwyzer continues: "Aber, neben der späteren Femininbildung θεά: ταῖν θεαῖν CIA II.1559,1 (IV.-I.J(ahrh.)); III.828,5-6 (Kaiserzeit, nicht genauer datierbar) Hasse, 1893, 15 ff." Now, what basis did Schwyzer have for suggesting with the attribution "IV.-I.J." that the inscription we have reference to might be 300 years more recent than it is dated in the standard epigraphical publications? It is hard to see what reason for this dating Schwyzer can have had unless it was simply that he was influenced by his own belief that ταῖν θεαῖν "should" not appear on such an ancient stone. The newer editors (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4588), in contrast to Schwyzer, actually insisted upon the older dating by specifying a mid-fourth century attribution, and, as we have seen above in note 13, they did this on the basis of unusually strong epigraphical evidence. Schwyzer had, of course, a right to his own opinion. But he should have somehow made clear that this dating was as a matter of fact simply his personal preference. It is doubly misleading to associate this personal opinion with a reference to Hasse who argues, like Meisterhans before him, a completely different dating. As it stands, editors of texts

<sup>18</sup> Basil Gildersleeve and Charles W. E. Miller (*Syntax of Classical Greek*, 1.1900, 2.1911, Baltimore) 1.51 #110 recommend Hasse 1893 as a comprehensive treatment of the whole problem of the dual and at 2.203 #496 they place themselves explicitly on his side of the question here discussed: "there are also special feminine forms, which are preferably used in the genitive and dative." This same position is taken up implicitly by Albert Cuny throughout his treatment of the Greek dual (*Le Nombre Duel en Grec* [Paris 1906]).

<sup>19</sup> In his own *Griechische Grammatik* (op. sup. cit., note 1) Schwyzer seems not even to mention Hasse.

turn to Schwyzer for information about inscriptional usage and get a completely wrong impression. They come to him with the preconceived notion that  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu$ ,  $\kappa\tau\lambda$ , are not classical and they find nothing in Schwyzer's re-edition of Meisterhans to suggest that their preconceived notion might bear reconsideration. Pearson in his edition of the fragments of Sophocles (1917) shows exactly how this unfortunate error has perpetuated itself. In fragm. 881 (= Nauck<sup>2</sup>, *Soph. fragm. dub.* 1018 = citation 39 below) the form  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  (or  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon$ ) which has been transmitted was changed by Bloomfield to  $\tau\acute{\omega}$ . Pearson justifies this change with the following remark: " $\tau\acute{\omega}$ . The epigraphic evidence is decisive in favour of this form, see Meisterhans,<sup>3</sup> p. 123. The same considerations apply to the feminine forms of the pronouns  $\omicron\tilde{\nu}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\omicron\varsigma$  for which see Jebb on *Ant.* 769, *O.T.* 1472, Cobet *V.L.* 69 ff." It was no doubt these same mistaken "considerations" which led Pearson to remove completely the special feminines from his Oxford Sophocles of 1923 and replace them with the forms of common gender. The blame for this serious corruption is, however, not his alone. At least in part he was the victim of misleading counsel.<sup>20</sup>

But enough of this distressing recital of an all too typical polemical progress. Apart from the authorities and their divagations there is one sure recourse. The primary materials in this as in so many other cases speak their own far clearer language. It is now time to turn to this instance, where by heeding the ancients themselves we may discover the definitive solution to the question.

<sup>20</sup> Fortunately A. Dain and P. Mazon in their Paris "*Sophocle*" (1 [1955], 2 [1958], 3 [1960]) refuse to go along with this "correction." It is generally speaking remarkable that a good many editors have refused to allow themselves to be carried away by the drive to extirpate these forms. Long familiarity with the individual author and with his manuscript tradition have obviously served to protect them from pseudo-critical excesses. The editors of Plato especially show themselves serene in the knowledge that they enjoy the advantage of an incomparably strong manuscript tradition. Plato's writings received during both later antiquity and the middle ages as well as certainly during the Hellenistic period the kind of scrupulous care which is usually reserved for religious texts. The Plato editors therefore typically refuse to admit "correction" of the duals against the unanimous voice of their tradition and they are certainly right in doing so. But they are not the only editors to take this stand. Marchant and Hatzfeld refuse to alter Xenophon's *Hellenica*. Kenyon gives  $\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu$  in *Hyperides*. And on the editors of Menander, Körte and Thierfelder, who are in this respect exemplary, cf. *infra* note 23.

### Stylistic and Semantic Analysis of all Citations.

The question remains: What can be done to vindicate these forms in the face of the unjustified attack to which they have been subjected? No doubt a good deal has already been done simply by drawing attention to *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4588* once more. But this piece of evidence, conclusive as it is, is still rather fortuitous. It might so easily have suffered the fate of many other inscriptions and perished. In that case it would still be right to respect the forms in *-α* and *-αῖν* simply on the basis of the manuscript tradition. However, Hasse's careful and copious tabular collections of these occurrences in the tradition of the manuscripts have proven ineffective. A new tactic must be found. In order to put the material into a new and more arresting light, I would like to go back to the way in which I first became conscious of the whole problem. I was systematically checking the citations of K. W. Krüger in his *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen* (Berlin 1873) against the critical editions of today, and came in the process to that short series of examples at paragraph 59.1.3 on pp. 235–36 where Krüger documents the alternation of *τῶ, τοῖν* with *τά, ταῖν* forms in the Attic literature. To my considerable amazement I ascertained that such special forms had in my editions often been altered. The reason I was so surprised was because it seemed clear to me that the special feminines were in fact hyper-feminine in meaning, and that there was a definite stylistic distinction between the alternating sets of forms. The special feminines in *-α, -αῖν* seemed often to carry a pejorative or obscene suggestion which is associated with their specific emphasis upon natural gender. On the one hand the special feminines were apparently used in a hypocoristic way, i.e. they were "cute" and familiar in tone. On the other hand they were used in personification, in which case the effect was rather poetic and/or technical—but even in this case there seemed usually to be some affective color and a pejorative suggestion. My subsequent further acquaintance with this material has only deepened the original impression and proven it correct. I therefore believe that I can go a step beyond Hasse's analysis in the direction of *interpretation*.

In Hasse's presentation the material—impressive as it is in terms of mass—is so broken up by his strictly morphological analysis that the internal consistency of the usage in a semantic or stylistic sense does not



appear. I should like to reintegrate the forms into their contexts, and, treating them without distinction between the article and the various pronouns and irrespective of grammatical case, to set up two new analyses—the first according to the *place* of appearance, i.e. according to genre and author, the second according to the *immediate occasion*, i.e. the specific semantic context of appearance. In this way I hope to cause the inner consistency of the usage of these forms to appear so that the reciprocal support they provide one another is brought into view. I report the first analysis only in schematic form and discuss it then in a short commentary. As for the second analysis, after I give it in outline, I then introduce the actual citations arranged according to this scheme, accompanying them with an eclectic critical apparatus and a few short explanatory remarks. The first or stylistic analysis looks like this:

Register of the Special Feminine Dual Forms of the Article and Pronouns in Attic Greek Arranged According to the Place of Appearance, i.e. According to Literary Genre and Author.

1. Totals—6 genres, 10 authors and 1 authoress, 48 passages, 65 forms.
2. Tragedy—1 author (Sophocles), 10 passages, 14 forms.
3. Comedy—2 authors (Aristophanes, old comedy and Menander, new comedy), 13 passages (old comedy 12, new comedy 1), 17 forms (old comedy 14, new comedy 3).
4. Oratory—5 authors, 17 passages, 24 forms.  
(Andocides 1 passage—2 forms, Lysias 1—1, Isaeus 5—8, Isocrates 9—12, Hyperides 1—1).
5. Philosophy—2 authors, 6 passages, 8 forms.  
(Plato 5 passages—7 forms, Xenophon 1—1).
6. History—1 author (Xenophon), 1 passage, 1 form.
7. Inscriptions—1 authoress (Phile), 1 passage (stone), 1 form.

Commentary on the First Analysis:

1. Totals.—These are very reassuring and very important too. It is, of course a most elementary principle of scientific method that an all too fine and detailed analysis can be quite as misleading as simple crudity. One must consider in this case that the dual is nowhere in the literature anything like as common as the singular and plural

numbers. Only a minority of all dual forms are pronominal and only a part of these are used as feminines. The particular feminine forms which are here discussed were only used in the rather rare cases where a hypocoristic or personifying word would be appropriate. All of these factors reduce the frequency with which one *would naturally expect* these particular forms to appear. The relatively thin but broad distribution throughout the literature thus presents a general picture which is reasonable and acceptable.

2. Tragedy.—A phenomenon comes up in the first genre which is discovered repeatedly throughout this analysis. It is just as important to ascertain where these forms are *lacking* as to ascertain where they *do occur*. The significant fact here is that the forms are totally absent from Aeschylus and Euripides. They cannot therefore be considered especially “tragic” forms. They cannot have as such a particularly elevated effect. The fact that they are comparatively common in Sophocles has its explanation in Sophocles’ special preoccupation with the legend of Oedipus, which brings with it in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Oedipus Coloneus* and *Antigone* the frequent presence and constant involvement of the youthful sister-pair Ismene and Antigone: they are frequently spoken of by their father Oedipus, their uncle Creon or their brother Polynices with these forms. It is natural to suppose that this usage corresponds to an intimate or familiar tone of the forms, not because of a specifically elevated effect which they have. The girls are spoken of in this way by members of their family, despite the fact that the play is a tragedy, in order to intensify the idea of kinship which is central throughout the Oedipus legend. In the one passage where Sophocles uses such a form in personification the entities involved are the personified continents of Europe and Asia. The personification is therefore political and technical, and the affective connotation recedes in importance.

3. Comedy.—Everything familiar and popular comes in comedy into its own—and that is the good reason why the forms we are dealing with are rather common here. The most popular of all divinities at Athens, Demeter and Persephone, the Eleusinian divinities of feminine religiosity and family life, are the objects of much attention in comedy. The relationship here has an immediacy and naturalness which requires forms of expression peculiar and appropriate to the family. These

same precise forms, hyper-feminine and hypocoristic as they are, are despite their genuinely religious usages also appropriate for obscene expressions, and this too fits into the world of comedy most naturally. The rareness of the forms in new comedy is a consequence of the fact that the dual generally in all its forms was well nigh extinct by the time this literary type developed.

4. Oratory.—Neither the familiarity of tone nor the appropriateness to personification would seem to make these forms especially suited for the orators, but they would under certain circumstances fit in. When, for instance, Lysias and Isaeus recount family narratives there would be good occasion for such usage. Isocrates, who sometimes has lyrical tendencies, would naturally incline to the special feminines in personification, but it comes as no surprise that this self-conscious device is restricted to the great demonstrative orations (*Παναγυρικός* 4, *Περὶ εἰρήνης* 8, *Παναθηναϊκός* 12) where, as the orator himself confesses,<sup>21</sup> the deliberate attempt is made to show every trick, stop and variation in the repertoire of the virtuoso. It seems likely on the other hand that Demosthenes refrains from the *-α*, *-αιν* forms entirely because he felt that they were beneath the level of his great earnestness.

5. Philosophy.—The language of philosophy takes something of a median position. Although it is, fundamentally speaking, very serious prose it does admit the most various elements in passing. Popular and poetic expressions, where these seem appropriate, are taken up without hesitation in the heat of the discussion and the free play of literary allusion. There are also a number of special scientific usages—in particular technical personifications—which are characteristic of philosophy. One would therefore expect that the *τά*, *ταῖν* would occur in philosophy with fair but not excessive frequency. And one would further expect that these occurrences might be explicable on various and heterogeneous grounds. This expectation is not disappointed.

6. History.—Although historiography is essentially pragmatic, and our forms cannot for that reason be common in works of this genre, it comes as no surprise that Xenophon employs an isolated political personification involving an example of *ταῖν*. This author shows a

<sup>21</sup> Cf. e.g. Isocrates 12.246: *προελομένου . . . συνθεῖναι λόγον μηδὲν ὅμοιον τοῖς ἄλλοις . . . παντοδαπῆς δὲ μεστὸν ποικιλίας καὶ ψευδολογίας*.

certain predilection for doublets of regular forms of literary Attic, for poetic alternatives and so on, which makes this passing aberration actually accord with his personal rule. Thucydides however finds no occasion to desert his deliberate grandeur and avoids our forms entirely.

7. Inscriptions.—Our forms are of course very rare on inscriptions. It is the typical concern of those composing inscriptional texts that these be precise, business-like, binding and correct. The tone of religious texts too is seldom really personal, and mostly has a solemn cast. The more earnest form in the formula *τοῖν θεοῖν* is on Eleusinian votive inscriptions actually a matter of course. Fortunately, however, time has spared us one inscription where a woman who speaks in fervent thankfulness in effect allows the more intimate form to gush out. This woman, whose name has been preserved upon the stone as Phile, had been distressed with care for a child and had made a vow on its behalf to the mother and daughter goddesses. The child was then granted to Phile to bear, or, as the case may have been, was delivered to her out of its perilous sickness. Thereupon in the votive inscription with which Phile faithfully carried out her end of the bargain she slipped, speaking as a grateful mother, unselfconsciously into the more intimate form, natural piety having gained the hand over mere correctness with her. In seeking to explain this seeming solecism to ourselves we must recall that the women of Attica saw in Demeter and Persephone not only those responsible for all the cares but also those most closely allied in all the joys of life. This inscription is a witness to us not merely of a grammatical form which is epigraphically speaking an oddity but also bears testimony as to how spontaneously and fervently the sympathy between the divinities of Eleusis and their devotees could sometimes manifest itself.

Conclusions.—The first analysis of the citations of these forms according to the place of occurrence shows a general distribution of the forms over the literature which may be easily recognized as the consequence of the hyper-feminine nuance in meaning which we wish to demonstrate.

The second or semantic analysis will approach the material more closely by means of actual quotation. However, so as not to lose the over-all view in this more detailed presentation, it will no doubt be best to give a general outline by way of introduction. That would look something like this:

Outline of the Second Analysis wherein the Citations are Ordered According to the Immediate Occasion, i.e. the Specific Semantic Content of the *τά, ταῖν* form.

- I. Hypocoristic (diminutive) usages (citations 1-23). The form is used in relation to:
  - A. Actual persons (1-16)
    1. infants (1-2)
    2. pairs of maiden sisters (3-14)
    3. courtesans (15-16)
  - B. Parts of the body (17-23)
    1. sensitive parts (17-23)
    2. intimate and obscene parts (20-23)
- II. Personifications (24-48):
  - A. parts of the body in the transitional case of *χεροῖν* (24-26)
  - B. the divinities of Eleusis: Demeter and Persephone (27-33)
  - C. abstract ideas from the realms of philosophy, politics and law
    1. used with a color of bitterness or irony (34-39)
    2. used with a weakened affective color (40-48)

The second analysis proper looks like this:<sup>22</sup>

IA. *Hypocoristic usages in relation to actual persons: infants*.—Menander uses the dual rather rarely. Probably the reason why the dual does occur at this place in this author at all is because the hypocoristic connotation of the feminine dual forms suits the thought content of the passage so closely. Menander is speaking of *actual infants*, and these are the most peculiarly appropriate subjects of hypocoristic language. (1.) Menander F. 453 (Körte-Thierfelder<sup>23</sup> = Meineke 4.224 = Suda, s.v. ἄβρα): *Μήτηρ τέθνηκε ταῖν ἀδελφαῖν ταῖν δυεῖν / ταύταιν τρέφει*

<sup>22</sup> The citations in this analysis are numbered progressively so as to facilitate cross references. My material is largely the same as that in Hasse 1893, 14-17. I consider altogether 10 passages which he leaves out of account or does not mention. Most of these (9 passages) are from Isocrates. Hasse was probably still too much under the influence of Keck to consider them. Cf. supra, note 11. The unique new non-Isocratean passage (citation 39, a fragment from Sophocles) was indicated to me in private correspondence by B. Sparkes. For some passages in Hasse which I do not consider in this analysis, cf. infra, note 27.

<sup>23</sup> Körte and Thierfelder are the only editors I know who take specific issue with the presentation of the epigraphical facts which is given in Meisterhans<sup>3</sup> 123. They have a remark on this fragment (453) as follows: "ταῖν bis libri. Cum in uno titulo Attico medii saeculi quarti (IG II<sup>2</sup> 4588) ταῖν θεαῖν legatur, formam inusitatum (v. Meisterhans-Schwyzler, *Gramm. d. att. Inschr.*<sup>3</sup> 123) mutare non audeo."

δὲ παλλακὴ τις τοῦ πατρὸς / αὐτάς, . . . (ταῖν . . . ταῖν . . . ταύταιν omnes et codd. et edd.) The appropriateness of the forms for everything connected with the little child is shown by (2.) Plat. Legg. 775E-776A: εἶναι χρὴ . . . ταῖν οἰκίαιν ταῖν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ τὴν ἑτέραν οἶον νεοττῶν ἐγγένησιν καὶ τροφήν . . . (ταῖν . . . ταῖν . . . omnes et codd. et edd.). The home is considered here essentially as a nursery and is treated accordingly.

IA2. *Maiden sister-pairs*.—Even if it is not a question of actual infants, the feeling in relation to young, unmarried girls can be quite similar. This usage is the commonest of all and occurs both in the writings of tragedians and of advocates. In either case the author in such passages is relating a family narrative. The simple unpretentious language which he uses is supposed to correspond to and emphasize the elementary human appeal which is always present in such tales. These forms are thus part of the author's attempt to win the hearer's sympathy and attention. (3.) Soph. *Ant.* 769: τὰ δ' οὖν κόρα τὰδ' οὐκ ἀπαλλάξει μόρου (τὰ . . . τὰδ' . . . codd., Dain-Mazon τὼ . . . τῷδ' . . . Dindorf, Pearson). (4.) Lysias 19.17: ταῖν τε θυγατέροιν πολὺ ἀργύριον ἐπέδωκε (ταῖν codd. τοῖν Hude, Gernet-Bizos). (5.) Isaeus 6.39: ὅπως μηδεὶς ἐξαγγεῖλει μήτε ταῖν θυγατέροιν μήτε τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ (ταῖν codd. τοῖν Naber, Wyse, Roussel, Forster). (6.) Isaeus 8.11: ταῖν δ' ἀδελφαῖν ταῖν δυοῖν . . . τὰ χρήματα εἰσεπράττετο ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκείναις συνοικούντων . . . (ταῖν . . . ταῖν . . . codd. τοῖν . . . τοῖν . . . Naber, Wyse, Roussel, Forster). (7.) Soph. *O.T.* 1462-66: ταῖν δ' ἀθλίαιν οἰκτραῖν τε παρθένοιν ἐμαῖν / αἶν οὐποθ' ἡμὴ χωρὶς ἐστάθη βορᾶς / τράπεζ' . . . / . . . / αἶν μοι μέλεσθαι (ταῖν . . . αἶν . . . αἶν (ταῖν) . . . codd., Dindorf, Dain-Mazon τοῖν . . . οἶν . . . τοῖν . . . Heath, Pearson). (8.) Soph. *O.C.* 1290: ἀφ' ὑμῶν, . . . / καὶ ταῖνδ' ἀδελφαῖν (ταῖνδ' codd., Dindorf, Dain-Mazon τοῖνδ' Nauck, Pearson). (9.) Isaeus 6.6: ταῖν δὲ ἀδελφαῖν τῇ μὲν ἑτέρα, . . . οὐκ ἦν ἄρρεν παιδίον (ταῖν codd., τοῖν Naber, Wyse, Roussel, Forster). Citation 7 above shows that relative pronouns may be used in this same relationship and that goes too for anaphorical pronouns. As a transitional example cf. (10.) Soph. *O.C.* 446: Ἐκ ταῖνδε δ' οὐσαι παρθένοιν, ὅσον φύσις / δίδωσιν αὐταῖν, καὶ τροφὰς ἔχω βίου (ταῖνδε codd., Dindorf, Dain-Mazon τοῖνδε Pearson αὐταῖν codd. pler., edd. αὐτῶν recc.). Examples where the connection in thought is the same but the gram-

metrical reference is more remote are (11.) Soph. *Ant.* 770: Ἀμφὼ γὰρ αὐτὰ καὶ κατακτείνει νοεῖς; (αὐτὰ codd., Dain-Mazon αὐτῶ Dindorf, Pearson). (12.) Soph. *O.C.* 1149: τί δεῖ / κομπεῖν ἄ γ' εἴσῃ καὺτὸς ἐκ ταύταιν ξυνών; (ταύταιν codd. τούτοις Nauck, Pearson). (13.) Soph. *O.C.* 859: ἐφάβομαι γὰρ οὐ ταύταιν μόναιν (ταύταιν codd., Dain-Mazon ταύτοις Nauck, Pearson). (14.) Soph. *O.T.* 1504: μόνος πατήρ ταύταιν / λέλειψαι (ταύταιν LA recc. Dain-Mazon τούτοις corr. in L, Pearson).

IA3. *Courtesans*.—Hypocoristic expressions are always appropriate for suggestive uses. (15.) Aristophanes *Eccl.* 1106: ἔάν τι πολλά τολλάκῃς πάθῳ / ὑπὸ ταῖνδε ταῖν κασαλβάδῳιν . . . (ταῖνδε ταῖν codd. τοῖνδε τοῖν Cobet, Dindorf, edd.). Similarly then with grammatical anaphora (16.) Ar. *Pax* 847: Πόθεν δ' ἔλαβες ταῦτα σύ; (ταῦτα Brunck ταῦτα codd. pler. ταύτας RV edd.).<sup>24</sup>

IB1. *Hypocoristic usages of parts of the body which are thought of as being sensitive (pathetic)*.—(17.) Ar. *Vesp.* 7: κατὰ ταῖν κόραιν ὕπνον τι καταχεῖται γλυκύ (ταῖν codd. τοῖν Hirschig, edd.). (18.) Ar. *Eccl.* 502: Ἄλλ' ἐπείγου / ἅπανα καὶ μίσει σάκον πρὸς ταῖν γνάθῳιν ἔχουσα (ταῖν codd. τοῖν Cobet, edd.). (19.) Ar. *Pax* 1308: Ἄλλ' ἀνδρικῶς ἐμβάλλετε / καὶ σμύχετ' ἀμφοῖν ταῖν γνάθῳιν (ταῖν Suidas, an recte? sed vide Ar. *Eccl.* 502 supra τοῖν RV edd.).

IB2. *Intimate and obscene parts of the body*.—This group is a direct continuation of the preceding. (20.) Plat. *Tim.* 79D: δυοῖν δὲ ταῖν διεξόδαιν οὔσαι, τῆς μὲν κατὰ τὸ σῶμα (i.e. κατὰ τὸν πρωκτὸν) ἔξω, τῆς δὲ αὖ κατὰ τὸ στόμα καὶ τὰς ρίνας, . . . (ταῖν codd. pler., Stob. τοῖν cod. unus Vindobonensis 55, Burnet, Rivaud). (21.) Ar. *Equit.* 424: ἀποκρυπτόμενος εἰς τὰ κοχώνα (τὰ codd. pler., Chantraine *Morphologie Historique du Grec* #134, p. 129 τὸν M τῶ Dobree, edd.). (22.) Ar. *Equit.* 484: εἴπερ ἀπεκρύψω . . . / εἰς τὰ κοχώνα τὸ κρέας, . . .

<sup>24</sup> This citation, number 16, is, paleographically speaking, the weakest passage in the collection. The two most highly prized mss., R and V, have ταύτας. I prefer ταῦτα because the parallelism of the content of this passage to the content of the foregoing passage, citation 15, Ar. *Eccl.* 1106, is perfect. Ταῦτα refers here to ἡ Ὀψώρα καὶ ἡ Θεωρία, two divinities who, as the context in Aristophanes and the scholiast *ad loc.* indicate, appear in the guise of courtesans. I suppose that ταύτας is an early emendation for the unsatisfactory neut. pl. ταῦτα after an incorrect accentuation had corrupted the original form ταῦτα. Ταῦτα, not ταύτας, is the interesting *lectio difficilior*. It might be possible to suppose that ταῦτα σύ arose from ταύτας σύ through haplology. See however against this explanation note 30.

(τὰ κοχῶνα R, Chantraine loc. supr. cit. τὰς κοχῶνας Φ τας κοχῶνας V τὼ κοχῶνα Dobree, edd.). (23.) Ar. *Lys.* 229–30: (Λυ.) Οὐ πρὸς τὸν ὄροφον ἀνατενῶ τὰ Περσικά<sup>25</sup> / (Κλ.) Οὐ πρὸς τὸν ὄροφον ἀνατενῶ τὰ Περσικά (τὰ codd. τὼ Dindorf, edd.).

III. *Personifications—the transitional case* χεροῖν.—The hands are of course also parts of the body. To that extent this group is a further extension of the last group. But there is about the hands a rather different feeling than there is about the other body parts adduced above. The hands are often used as to a certain extent representative of the whole human being.<sup>26</sup> They thus approach to being their own, independent, more or less responsible beings, and whatever may be so considered has a personality of its own. Therefore these passages with ταῖνδε χεροῖν κτλ. fall under the second great heading of this analysis. They are to be accounted examples of “personification.” The strongly affective, sometimes pejorative feeling which is more pronounced in group IIC1 below, is also present in this group.<sup>27</sup> (24.) Soph. *El.* 1133: πρὶν ἐς ξένην σε γαῖαν ἐκπέμψαι χεροῖν / κλέψασα ταῖνδε (ταῖνδε codd. Dindorf, Dain-Mazon τοῖνδε Pearson). (25.)

<sup>25</sup> Τὰ Περσικά, actually a sort of elegant lady’s slipper, is here metaphorically the equivalent of members of the person. Cf. the scholiast ad loc. τὰ Περσικά: *Εἶδος ὑποδήματος. ἐκ δὲ τούτου τοὺς πόδας ἀνατενῶ, ἐν τῇ στέγῃ συνουσιάζουσα.*

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *LSJ* p. 1984 s.v. χεῖρ III 1 and 2.

<sup>27</sup> Hasse includes fem. dual forms of adjectival pronouns ἐμός, σός, ποῖος in his collections as being comparable to pronouns proper. I find these forms strictly speaking a little too close to adjectives to be really entirely convincing evidence, and so I omit them. The passages where an adjectival pronoun in the special fem. dual form is construed with χεροῖν do have a certain corroborative force however. The impression is that the adjectival pronouns are nothing other than a tragic replacement for the possessive article. To that extent therefore the following passages are in fact close parallels to the passages which have been admitted as fully valid evidence of the -α, -αιν forms of pronouns in the narrower sense of the word and of such forms of the article. Cf. Soph. *O.T.* 821: Λέχῃ δὲ τοῦ θανόντος ἐν χεροῖν ἐμαῖν / χραίνω, δι’ ὧν περ ὤλετ’ Eur. *Alc.* 847: Κᾶνπερ . . . αὐτὸν . . . / μάρψω, κύκλον δὲ περιβάλω χεροῖν ἐμαῖν / οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις αὐτὸν ἐξαίρησεται Soph. *Trach.* 1066: Δός μοι χεροῖν σαῖν αὐτὸς ἐξ οἴκου λαβὼν / ἐς χεῖρα τὴν τεκοῦσαν Eur. *Heracl.* 578: σοὶ παῖδες ἔσμεν, σαῖν χεροῖν τεθράμμεθα. It is fascinating to observe how exactly Lucian imitates this usage, both in its prose and poetic versions. Thus in a work of prose, e.g. the especially rowdy passage *Somnium* 6 (= Hemsterhuys 1.8): Δύο γυναῖκες λαβόμεναι ταῖν χεροῖν ἐλκόν με πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἑκάτερα μάλα βιαίως καὶ καρτερῶς, he uses the special form of the article. But in a passage of tragical parody we find instead the adjectival pronoun. Cf. *Tragopodagra* 210–11 (= Hemsterhuys 3.657): εἶδον . . . φρένα / νικωμένων, ἀνασσα, σαῖν βίας χεροῖν.



Andoc. 1.144: *βίον ἡργασάμην ἐκ τοῦ δικαίου, τῇ γνώμῃ καὶ ταῖν χεροῖν ταῖν ἐμαυτοῦ* (ταῖν . . . ταῖν(τοῖν A<sup>2</sup>) A<sup>1</sup> τοῖν . . . τοῖν Marchant, Dalmeyda, Maidment). (26.) Xen. *Mem.* 2.3.18: τὼ χεῖρε, ᾧς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τῷ συλλαμβάνειν ἀλλήλαιν ἐποίησεν (ἀλλήλαιν codd., Krüger *Sprachlehre* #58.1.3 p. 236 ἀλλήλοιν Cobet, Marchant, Marchant-Sauppe).

IIB. *The divinities of Eleusis*.—As goddesses of the family and women, Demeter and Persephone were certainly in private and intimate language referred to—in the gen. and dat.—with the special dual forms. There is a cross-relationship here, no doubt, to the passages in group IA above, where actual persons considered as members of the family were referred to with the familiar forms. These goddesses too were plainly thought of sometimes as being in some manner members of the family. —(27.) Ar. *Thesm.* 295: *Εὐχέσθε ταῖν Θεσμοφόροι*ν (ταῖν codd. τοῖν Meineke, edd.). (28.) Ar. *Thesm.* 285: *θύσω ταῖν θεαῖν* (ταῖν codd. τοῖν Cobet, edd.). (29.) Ar. *Vespae* 378: τὰ ταῖν θεαῖν ψηφίσματα (ταῖν θεαῖν codd. pler. τῶν θεῶν R τοῖν θεοῖν Cobet, edd.). (30.) IG II<sup>2</sup> 4588 (= CIA II<sup>3</sup> 1559.1) (*med. s.IV a.*): [Φ]ίλη<sup>28</sup> ταῖν θεαῖν / [ε]ύξαμένη ὑπὲρ / τοῦ παιδίου. There are in this group as in the others also related uses of the anaphorical pronouns. (31.) Ar. *Thesm.* 950–53: ὄργια . . . θεαῖν<sup>29</sup> . . . ἄπερ καὶ / Παύσων σέβεται . . . / πολλάκις αὐταῖν . . . / . . . ξυνεπευχόμενος (θεαῖν . . . αὐταῖν codd.

<sup>28</sup> That a woman speaks in this inscription is very important. In every passage cited from Aristophanes, Lucian, and Alciphron for ταῖν, αὐταῖν, θεαῖν used in relation to the divinities of Eleusis,—seven passages in all, with this inscription eight,—with the single exception of *Vespae* 378 (cit.29) (choral lyric), a woman or a man dressed as a woman (hyperfeminism) speaks or is directly or indirectly quoted—and in fact even *Vespae* 378 can be explained as a reference to feminine speech. For the use of the -αῖν feminine in connection with a diminutive in -ιον cf. Isaeus 6.6 (cit. 9) where the same diminutive occurs, and see further on the diminutives in -ιον in general the excellent remarks of A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg 1917) 147. I have touched briefly on this inscription and related literary texts in STT p. 174. Cf. further supra note 13. Ταῖν θεαῖν as used by Harpocration s.v. Ἀνθεμόκριτος (here in association with a fragment of Isaeus), and again s.v. Κιττοφόρος is evidently a hyper-atticism which betrays the learned lexicographer's special interest in the less common and more specifically Attic expression. Certainly there is no reason to think that the phrase is with him an invention of grammatical analogy. Rather, since the reference in both cases is plainly to the goddesses of Eleusis, it should be supposed that these uses of ταῖν θεαῖν represent an echo—at what precise remove would be hard to say—from some of Harpocration's antiquarian source material, or even from his own reading in the Attic ancients.

<sup>29</sup> Θεαῖν alone, without article (anarthrotic) is found in the mss. also at *Thesm.* 1151.

θεοῖν . . . αὐτοῖν Cobet, edd.). (32.) Isaeus 6.49: *περὶ πολλοῦ ποιούμενοι καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα*<sup>30</sup> *καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς εὖσεβεῖν* (*ταῦτα* Reiske *ταῦτα* codd. *ταύτας* Wyse *τούτω* Herwaerden, Roussel).

II C1. *Personifications of abstract ideas from the realms of philosophy, politics, and law.*—This group often shows in its stylistic tone a cross-connection with the hypocoristic uses given above under I. In Plato the special forms are part of the irony of dialectical presentation. In the orators they are especially found during rehearsals of the views and arguments of the other side. In other cases a bitterness which resides in the thing (associated substantive) itself, e.g. in taxation or unwelcome military service, suggests the alternative pejorative expression. (33.) Plat. Pol. 260C: *Τί μὴν;—Φέρε δὴ, ταύταιν ταῖν τέχναιν ἡμῖν τὸν βασιλικὸν* (sc. *ἄνδρα*) *ἐν ποτέρᾳ θετέον; (ταύταιν ταῖν et codd. et edd.).* (34.) Plat. Legg. 894B: *Ἀρ' οὖν κινήσεις πάσας εἰρήκαμεν . . . πλήν γε, . . . δυοῖν;—Ποίαιν δὴ;—Σχεδόν, ὡγαθέ, ἐκείναιν ὧν ἔνεκα πᾶσα ἡμῖν ἔστιν ἡ σκέψις τὰ νῦν (ἐκείναιν et codd. et edd.).* (35.) Isaeus 5.15–16: *Ταύταιν δὲ ταῖν διαθήκαιν, ἣν μὲν . . . ἣν δὲ . . . Ἀμφοῖν δὲ ταῖν διαθήκαιν ἀκύροιν γιγνομέναιν, . . . (Ταύταιν . . . ταῖν . . . ταῖν . . . codd., Krüger Sprachlehre #51.1.13, p. 235 Τούτοιν . . . τοῖν . . . τοῖν . . . Naber, edd.).* (36.) Hyperides Eux. 17 (col. 13): *γράφεις τὰς ὀκτὼ φυλὰς πορίσαι ταῖν δυοῖν φυλαῖν τὰ διάφορα, καὶ ἀποδοῦναι, ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἐλλατῶνται* (*ταῖν* Babington, Kenyon *ταν* Pap. Ardenianus [= Mus. Brit. Pap. 115] *τοῖν* Westermann, Blass

<sup>30</sup> The neut. pl. *ταῦτα* of the mss. will not do and some correction is necessary. My first, but less important, reason for preferring Reiske's *τούτω* is that this can be obtained by a mere change of accentuation, an alteration which is, as Robert Renehan remarks in his *Greek Textual Criticism* (Cambridge, Mass. 1969) #7, p. 12, so slight that it hardly counts as a change at all; cf. STT 112–44. (*Τούτω* is on the other hand, paleographically speaking, much less likely. Wyse's proposal *ταύτας* is not quite so hard. But it must be remarked that here in contrast to Ar. Pax 847 (citation 16) a supposed loss of a sigma cannot be explained by supposed haplography). The second and more decisive reason for my preference of *ταῦτα* is the fact that this pronoun refers anaphorically to the goddesses of Eleusis and is located right in the middle of the recital of a family narrative. Cf. immediately preceding (47) *τὰς Εὐκτήμενος θυγατέρας* and immediately succeeding (49) *ἣ δὲ τούτων μήτερ*. The relatively high number of special feminine dual forms of pronouns which are given quite without variant by the manuscripts of Isaeus, seven in all, is important circumstantial evidence. Isaeus has proportionately more dual forms of all parts of speech susceptible to distinctions of number than any other Attic prose author, and this fact naturally makes it more credible that he might well have originally used any one particular rarer form.

[1894]<sup>31</sup>). (37.) Plat. *Legg.* 955D: *δυοῖν οὔσαιν ταῖν εἰσφοραῖν* (ταῖν et codd. et edd.). (38.) Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.17: *φρουρὰν μὲν ἔφαινον οἱ ἔφοροι ταῖν ὑπολοίπον μόραιν μέχρι τῶν τετταράκοντα ἐφ' ἥβης* (ταῖν codd. Marchant, Hatzfeld τοῖν Cobet).

IIC2. *Colorless personifications*.—In a few passages, principally in Isocrates, the affective color of the special forms is much weakened. They appear in Isocrates only with *πόλεε* and *πολέοιν*. The orator seems to have employed this means to freshen up his recurrent *σύγκρισις* or comparative contrast of Athens with Sparta.<sup>32</sup> The scribe of *Γ* “normalized” these forms with only two exceptions (citations 42 and 46) because, as I suppose, he felt some remnant of the original nuance and did not feel that it was quite in good taste to use the hyper-feminines.<sup>33</sup> (39.) *Soph.* fragm. dub. 1018 N<sup>2</sup> (= Pearson 881): *ἐδοξάτην μοι τὰ δυ' ἡπείρω μολεῖν* (τὰ δυ' Valckenaer τάδ' ἡπείρω Schol. Aesch. *Pers.* 181: τὰ διὲ πείθου Herodiani qui perhibetur Philetaer. p. 434 ed. Piers. τὼ δυ' Bloomfield, Pearson). (40.) Isocrates 8.116: *σκέψεσθε τί τὸ ποιῆσαν ἐστὶ τὰ πόλεε ταῦτα . . . ἄρξαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων* (τὰ πόλεε ταῦτα [vel ταῦτα] vulg. τὰ πόλῃ τούτῳ *Γ*<sup>2</sup> E τὼ πόλεε τούτῳ *Γ*<sup>1</sup> A Pap. Brit. Mus. 132 Benseler, Mathieu τὼ πόλῃ / τούτῳ Bekker, Blass). (41.) Isoc. 12.156: *Εἰ γὰρ τις φαίῃ τὰ πόλεε ταῦτα πλείστων ἀγαθῶν αἰτίας γεγενῆσθαι τοῖς Ἑλλήσι* (τὰ πόλεε ταῦτα vulg. τὼ πόλεε τούτῳ *Γ*,<sup>1</sup> edd.). (42.) Isoc. 12.97 *Πλείστοι μὲν οὖν κατηγοροῦσιν ἀμφοῖν ταῖν πολέοιν* (ταῖν *Γ*<sup>1</sup> vulg. τοῖν *Γ*<sup>2</sup> A edd.). (43.) Isoc. 4.139: *ἀπέφαινον αὐτὸν ἅμα ταῖν πολέοιν ἀμφοτέραιν πρότερόν ποτε περιγεγενημένον* (ταῖν πολέοιν ἀμφοτέραιν vulg. τοῖν πολέοιν ἀμφοτέροις *Γ*, edd.). (44.) Isoc. 4.75: *οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τῶν . . . δυναστευσάντων ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ ταῖν πολέοιν δίκαιον ἀμνημονεῖν* (ταῖν vulg. τοῖν *Γ*, edd.). (45.) Isoc. 12.48: *τὴν μὲν οὖν ἀρχὴν ταῖν πολέοιν ἑκατέρα τοιαύτην ἐποιήσατο* (ταῖν πολέοιν ἑκατέρα vulg. ἑκατέρα τοῖν πολέοιν *Γ*, edd.). (46.) Isoc. 12.108: *ὅποια τις*

<sup>31</sup> Blass does retain Westermann's conjecture *τοῖν* from his own earlier edition in his text of 1894, but he then goes on to remark in his critical apparatus specifically “ταῖν Babington (quod et ipsum ferri potest, v.E. Hasse d. Dualis im Attischen p. 12).” Babington's emendation—which Kenyon rightly accepts—is merely the correction of a wrong spelling in the papyrus which is easily explained by the itacism which prevailed in later times.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. note 21.

<sup>33</sup> On *Γ* (= Urbinas 111) and *E* (= Ambrosianus O 144) cf. supra, note 11.

*ταῖν πολέοιν ἐκατέρα περὶ τοὺς ῥῆλληνας γέγονεν (ταῖν Γ<sup>1</sup> vulg. τοῖν Γ<sup>2</sup> edd.). (47.) Isoc. 4.37: Βούλομαι δ' ὀλίγῳ μακρότερα περὶ ταῖν πολέοιν ταύταιν εἰπεῖν καὶ μὴ ταχὺ λίαν παραδρομεῖν (ταῖν πολέοιν ταύταιν vulg. Ε<sup>2</sup> τοῖν π. ταύταιν Ε<sup>1</sup> ταῖν π. τούτοις Vict. τοῖν π. τούτοις Θ<sup>2</sup> τοῖν πολέοιν Γ, edd.). (48.) Isoc. 12.94: εἰ μὴδὲν εἴχομεν ἄλλο περὶ ταῖν πολέοιν εἰπεῖν, ἐκ τούτων ῥᾶδιον εἶναι καταμαθεῖν τὸν τρόπον ἐκατέρας αὐτῶν (ταῖν vulg. τοῖν Γ, edd.).*

#### Short Restatement.<sup>34</sup>

When Cobet demanded that only *τώ, τοῖν, τούτω, τούτοις* κτλ. be recognized as genuine Attic forms for both the masculine and the feminine, this was really just a bold guess on his part, which only mistakenly seemed to be supported by the later work of Wecklein and Keck. In fact neither Cobet, Wecklein nor Keck was familiar enough with either the manuscript or epigraphical tradition to make the emendations which they suggested really believable. Moreover these investigators did not have enough stylistic sense for Greek to enable them to compensate for the material which they lacked by intuitive feeling. Nevertheless by the time Hasse and Meisterhans had carried out their systematic search through the actually transmitted texts, Cobet's teaching had been accepted by so many editors and grammarians that the results which Hasse and Meisterhans obtained could not vindicate the controversial forms against the inertia of this comparatively new but increasingly established teaching. A critically founded stylistic and semantic evaluation of the material which actually presents itself in the tradition has been in this article for the first time carried out. It shows that the rarity of the disputed forms can be explained in terms of the particular meaning which they convey—a meaning which the authors only needed to convey in fairly isolated instances. The analysis further shows that the usages which do occur fall into coherent groupings, and may thus be considered to offer

<sup>34</sup> I would like to express my thanks to Prof. E. Risch of Zürich who read this article in an earlier, shorter, German version and offered several helpful suggestions. I also owe a great debt of gratitude to Prof. W. Thurman of the University of North Carolina at Asheville and to Prof. J. W. Poultney of the Johns Hopkins University. They have both given the present version a close reading and discovered a number of matters which I have been glad to correct.

strong reciprocal guarantees for each other. Cobet's teaching is therefore in contradiction to Attic usage, and the systematic removal of *τά, ταῖν, ταῦτα, ταῦταιν, κτλ.* only impoverishes the style of Attic authors, robbing them of a genuine and important means of expression of which they availed themselves on such occasions as they felt the need. Without these forms Plato and Xenophon are less ironic, Aristophanes is less bawdy, the minor orators are less unaffectedly colloquial and Isocrates less preciously contrived, the feeling for family which distinguishes much of Sophocles and Menander is attenuated. There is therefore no excuse for the changes which have been made, and the disputed forms should be returned to the texts whence they have been ejected.