

CURRENT TRENDS IN LINGUISTICS

VOLUME 9

★ ★

CURRENT TRENDS IN LINGUISTICS

Edited by

THOMAS A. SEBEOK

Indiana University

VOLUME 9

Linguistics in Western Europe

★ ★

Associate Editors:

EINAR HAUGEN – WERNER WINTER

Assistant Editor:

CURTIS BLAYLOCK

Assistants to the Editor:

ALEXANDRA DI LUGLIO – LUCIA HADD ZOERCHER



1972

MOUTON

THE HAGUE • PARIS

© Copyright 1972 in The Netherlands
Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers, The Hague.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER: 64-3663

Printed in The Netherlands by Mouton & Co., Printers, The Hague.

PART TWO

THE STUDY OF LANGUAGES

GREEK

FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER AND GREGORY NAGY

INTRODUCTION

The report which follows will be eclectic: it is neither a bibliographical survey nor an exhaustive chronicle of progress. For examples of the former approach, one may consult e.g. Meillet (and Masson) 1965: xiii-xx and Schwyzler 1939: xxvi-xxvii, as well as such publications as *Glotta*, *Gnomon*, *IdgJb* (= *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch*), *L'année philologique*, *Kratylos*, and *Sprache*; there are also aids designed for highly specialized areas of interest, such as *Nestor* (ed. by Bennett 1958-) and *SMID* (= *Studies in Mycenaean Inscriptions and Dialect*, ed. by Chadwick and Palmer 1956-). As for the latter approach, a distinguished example besides those listed by Schwyzler (1939: xlv-xxvii) is Risch's *Zusammenfassender Literaturbericht* (1954a). Instead, however, the main attempt here is simply to outline given trends, either dynamic or routine, in the study of Greek; besides a general discussion (Part I), there is also need for adequate perspective on methodology by citation of specific examples (Part II). We should also aim at a controversial but necessary juxtaposition with ideal trends, again by use of specific examples (Part III), which in turn can be followed up by a general statement about prospects in the study of the Greek language. Because of the nature of Part III, certain original grammatical observations are presented.*

Of course, the delimitation of ideal, productive trends from those which are unproductive should not be construed as equivalent to an opposition of dynamic vs. routine trends respectively. Schwyzler's *Griechische Grammatik* (1939 and, with A. Debrunner, 1950), for example, may represent a routine trend in that it is simply an updated compendium of scholarly views on the Greek language; and yet, by its exhaustive approach it too is productive, because it is a readily-available consolidation of knowledge without which further progress in specific areas may not be achieved. (In this sense, even the publication and general availability of a given Greek text is a

* Although the two authors agree in the judgments expressed here, the original ideas (expressed particularly in Part III) are to be credited to the junior author. We wish also to acknowledge the help and advice, in the first instance, of W. S. Allen, W. Cowgill, H. Hoenigswald, J. Puhvel, R. Renehan, O. Szemerényi, C. Watkins, and W. Wyatt, and secondarily of Sandra L. Chung, Lowell Edmunds, Douglas Frame, Anne P. Mark, Ann N. Michelini, Leonard Muellner, Marilyn A. Roberts, and Michael Silverstein.

productive trend.) But even for grammatical synthesis, there is required the important procedural factor of selectivity, conditioned by structural perspective on the Greek language taken as a whole; in this too Schwyzer's grammar is a success, as Risch (1954a:184) points out: 'Alles ist bei Schwyzer aufs sorgfältigste aufgezeichnet und belegt, charakteristisch ist auch, dass er gerade den feinsten und verstecktesten Äusserungen der Sprache liebevoll nachgeht.' With such a perspective Schwyzer has continued a productive trend already set by the distinguished antecedent of his book, the *Griechische Grammatik* of Brugmann himself (revised by Thumb: 1913), which Meillet had called (1937:498) 'le meilleur exposé, méthodique et complet, qu'on ait de la grammaire comparée d'une langue indo-européenne.' In a sense, then, the best understanding of current trends in the study of Greek can be attained by a thorough reading of a work like Schwyzer's *Griechische Grammatik*, since a personal accumulation of facts on the language is the soundest basis for discerning what rules have already been discovered in Greek and what problems persist leading to the future discovery of still further rules. The format of Schwyzer's grammar allows for examination of controversies, but if we choose to dispense with this option, the process of accumulating facts can be streamlined even more by consulting syntheses limited to data free from controversy: in such a concentrated synthetic category belongs the comparative grammar of Meillet and Vendryes (1963), as well as the valuable specialized grammars of Lejeune on phonology (1955), Chantraine on morphology (1961), and Humbert on syntax (1960).

Finally, a word on organization: for the specific examples of Part II, it was impractical to divide the material simply in terms of different phases in the Greek language, such as Mycenaean, Homeric, Attic, Koivῆ, etc.: not only are there already-existing reports on some of these (e.g. Chadwick on Mycenaean: *Trends in modern linguistics*, 1963b), but also the very delimitation of phases is inadequate as such. The factor of genre often has an equally important bearing on the type of linguistic analysis possible, as the discussion in Part I will show. It also seemed advisable to review different stages of Greek likewise in the general format of Part I, and to divide the concrete examples of Part II simply into various levels of linguistic analysis, namely phonology, morphology, syntax, etymology/vocabulary, and dialectology.

I. GENERALITIES

The very subdivision of etymology/vocabulary, just mentioned, is an indication of recent trends in the study of Greek. With details reserved until discussion under the appropriate heading, suffice it to mention here that several contemporary investigations of this or that Greek word take their point of departure not from Indo-European etymology but rather from the hierarchy of rules in the actual attestations of such a word. That is, synchronic analysis takes precedence over diachronic. In fact, the methodological primacy of internal analysis will be openly advocated throughout this

present report also. Nor is there any downgrading in this hierarchy of diachronic vs. synchronic analysis: rather, the former is enhanced by the latter. One of the foremost masters of diachronic analysis, Antoine Meillet himself (cf. his *Méthode comparative*, 1925), frequently took the system of the synchronic structure as point of departure: *la langue est un système où tout se tient* (pace Trnka 1948, 1966:158; for an exemplar, cf. Meillet 1926). Hence the validity of Risch's statement describing Meillet's school of thought (1954a:181): 'Charakteristisch ist ... das Streben nach systematischer Klarheit und die Tendenz, möglichst viele Erscheinungen unter einem einzigen gemeinsamen Nenner zu vereinigen.' With this much said about methodology, it becomes all the more fitting that the foremost contemporary achievement in Greek-language studies (and first to be discussed here) was made possible precisely with the aid of internal analysis.

Indeed, the decipherment of Linear B by Michael Ventris makes 1952 the zenith for progress in study of Greek in this century. The sheer dramatic impact of such a scholarly breakthrough, as vividly described by Chadwick (1967; cf. especially pp. 4, 26, 41, 67 on Ventris' techniques of internal analysis) and as made amply evident with the facts assembled by the decipherer and his collaborator (Ventris and Chadwick 1956), has made the study of the so-called Mycenaean dialect a vast new sub-section of Hellenic philology, involving a staggering amount of bibliography (cf. e.g. the cumulative reports in *Nestor*, ed. by Bennett 1958-). Clearly, the decipherment ranks as the most dynamic trend-setter for the study of Greek. Despite its popularity, however, Mycenaean philology is still far from being smoothly correlated with the central discipline of Hellenic philology: retrogressive attitudes persist even in distinguished scholarly circles: thus e.g. the editors of the *Supplement* to Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English lexicon* express doubts about the validity of the decipherment (Barber et al. 1968:v). Despite Chadwick's vigorous polemics (e.g. 1967:81-100) and the classical orientation of most of his presentations (cf. e.g. the format of the Mycenaean dictionary by Chadwick and Baumbach 1963), there is still room for developing further techniques in an effort to make Mycenaean even more practically relevant to classical Greek. Among these is the detection of Mycenaean collocations surviving into the classical era and the matching of these with corresponding collocations attested in Linear B: cf. e.g. the discussion of Elean τελεστα/δαμος vs. Mycenaean *te-re-ta/da-mo* in Part III *infra* (for a list of other examples, cf. Nagy's review of Chadwick 1967, forthcoming in *GL*). In general, however, the most important working rule in Mycenaean studies remains this: a strict adherence to the internal control of context (cf. Chadwick 1960); a prime illustration is the treatment of the famous Knossian 'horse-tablet', Ca 895, by Ventris and Chadwick themselves (1956:210-11). Instead of the scholarly account, we give here the actual text of the tablet, followed by Chadwick's lively personal reminiscence (1967:85-6) in his later book written after Ventris' premature death.

| | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---|
| line 1: <i>i-qa</i> | ^[female] HORSE | 5 HORSE | ^[male] 4 <i>po-ro</i> HORSE[|
| line 2: <i>o-no</i> | ^[female] HORSE | 3 <i>po-ro</i> HORSE | 2 HORSE ^[male] 4 [|

(Capitalized lettering indicates pictographic symbols; italic transliterates the Linear B syllabary; arabic numerals represent the Linear B digital system; the strokes for 'male' and 'female' had been contextually ascertained; the dotted line approximates the break which Chadwick describes *infra*.)

I found a largish piece which was the left-hand end of a two-line tablet; the break showed plainly half a horse's head — the ideographic sign for 'horse'. Now horses appear in the Knossos tablets only in the records of the chariot force, which have a quite different form, and in an isolated tablet showing horses and foals — a famous tablet on which Evans had identified, and discarded, the word for 'foal'. The left-hand edge of this was missing: was this the piece? I cleaned it hurriedly and carried it downstairs to the glass case where the tablet was on exhibition. I laid it on the glass; it looked a good fit. Platon came and opened the case, and the join was sure. A happy discovery; but there was something on this fragment which shook Platon's scepticism, for we now had the introductory words for each line, and they read: *i-qa* 'horses' and *o-no* 'asses'. Again Blegen's question could be asked: is coincidence excluded? What are the chances that two series of equine heads will be introduced by words exactly corresponding to the Greek for horses and asses? Such probabilities are beyond mathematical analysis; we can only have recourse to the guidance of common sense.

As but two examples of monograph-length Mycenological works which are distinguished for judicious methodology in contextual exegesis, cf. Palmer 1963a and Ruijgh 1967; for an example of orthographical analysis, cf. Householder 1964. For a model article-length inquiry in contextual exegesis, cf. Ruijgh 1966. Without the corroboration of internal analysis, projection of any Linear B item forwards or backwards in time (whence the purported classical and Indo-European correspondences respectively) becomes tenuous at best. In fact, as it has already been pointed out, the actual decipherment would have been impossible without this basic approach.

By contrast, the discussion now shifts to an important body of attested Greek textual material which defies successful analysis simply in terms of *un système où tout se tient*. The case in point is the Epic, primarily represented by the Homeric corpus. A breakdown in the mechanical applicability of the dictum above is caused by the fact that the language of the Epic is not a natural language: it has synchronic reality only in terms of a *Dichtersprache*. The better we understand the genre of the Epic, the clearer it will become how radically its *Dichtersprache* differs from the natural language which gave rise to it. It was Milman Parry's discovery (cf. e.g. 1928a and b) that with the passage of time, the structural mechanics of inherited poetry (whether recited or sung) become independent from the natural language engendering them. Thus a given grammatical rule may undergo atrophy and ultimate extinction in the natural language while in the poetic language it may not only survive but even become extended — overextended, from the standpoint of the original natural language which

afforded the initial precedent. What grammatical rules we must devise for the Epic, then, may often accommodate processes independent of the natural language, bearing witness to erosion of the original hierarchy of constraints. What is more, such rules may not turn out to be universally applicable, in that the key factor in application is the caprice of precedent. For example, we know from the Indo-European cognates of Greek νιφ-, such as English *snow*, that we must reconstruct the former with an initial **sn-*; now some of the formulaic collocations in Homer must go back to a prehistoric time when word-initial **sn-* was still extant in Greek: hence the making of position by initial ν- in the metrical scheme of e.g. ὄρεϊ νιφόμεντι in *N* 754 (henceforth books of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* will be cited with upper- and lower-case Greek letters respectively), scanned ◡◡-◡◡-◡. Sporadically, however, the factor of precedent extends such a license beyond its pristine natural confines: hence e.g. the making of position by initial ν- in ἄμα δὲ νέφος (Δ 274: ◡◡-◡◡), even though this ν- had never been **sn-* (as we see from the Sanskrit cognate *nābhah*). Upon further examination, it becomes clear that initial **s-* plus any given sonorant (*R*), phonologically reflected in classical Greek as plain *R-*, has triggered in the Epic language a general option of making position with word-initial sonorants. And without the comparative lexical evidence of cognates in other Indo-European languages, from which we discern an original contrast between **sR-* and **R-*, the diachronic locus of diffusion for synchronically making position with *R-* would be nearly impossible to determine by internal analysis.

Even before Parry, of course, there had been recognition of *Dichtersprache* as opposed to natural language in Homer. But the stress was on the artificiality itself rather than on the internal dynamics producing it. One of the most intuitive pre-Parry works emphasizing *la puissance créatrice du mètre* was Witte's famous article in the Pauly-Wissowa classical encyclopedia (1913; cf. Ruijgh 1957: 3): his explanation of Epic εὔρεα πόντον (vs. εὔρην πόντον in the natural language) as an artificial creation on the model of εὔρετ' πόντῳ has become a *Paradestück* for illustrating the idiosyncrasies of Homeric Greek. The prime concern for Witte was the concomitant issue of dialectal layers in Homer (on which more in Part II, *dialectology*), and this trend in interest was productively continued in such distinguished works as Meister's *Die homerische Kunstsprache* (1921). But the factor of varying dialectal layers is not germane to the issue: aside from the question of dialect, it is Parry's concept of the formula, and the dynamism of *jeux des formules*, which lead to a more profound understanding of *Dichtersprache*, with its self-sustained equilibrium and momentum partially detached from the natural language but constantly affected by it and originally even united with it. Parry later extended his theories on the Epic language to evolve the concept of Homeric poetry as so-called oral composition (cf. especially his extensive articles of 1930, 1932), and since his premature death in 1936 his work has been successfully continued and enhanced by A. B. Lord: cf. the latter's standard presentation, *The singer of tales* (1960; for a complete bibliography of Parry's publications, cf. Lord 1948: 43-4). The Parry-Lord theories on oral com-

position have been applied not only to the Homeric corpus (Lord 1960: chapters 7–9), but also especially to Serbo-Croatian Epic (under the intensive control of actual field-work). An example of still further application, in this case to Anglo-Saxon narrative poetry, is the notable contribution of Magoun (1953). We find a valuable but highly critical account of progress in the theory, as applicable to Homer, in the survey of Kirk 1960a (cf. also 1960b). As two working exemplars for the application of Parry's methodology, we cite (1) Ruijgh 1957 and (2) Hoekstra 1965 generally, and specifically their respective discussions of (1) relative dating for formulas and (2) determination of structural shifts resulting from the actual inflection of whole formulas. For further attempts at refining the techniques of synchronic formula-analysis, cf. e.g. Hainsworth 1962, Notopoulos 1964, Russo 1966; cf. also Lord's critiques, 1968.

Approaching the Homeric corpus from Parry's standpoint of *Dichtersprache* will also be relevant to each of the subdivisions in Part II: phonology (on the distribution of *digamma*), morphology (on the construct ἱερὸν μένος plus genitive of name), syntax (on the formal anomaly of Ζεῦ πάτερ ... Ἡελίος τε), etymology/vocabulary (on Ἥρη, etc.), dialectology (on the pronoun ὑμεῖς). That each of these branches should thus require qualification from the Homeric standpoint is in itself eloquent testimony to the idiosyncrasy of the Epic language.

The interplay of formulas, an important factor among the impediments to synchronic analysis of Homeric Greek, is by the same token advantageous to diachronic perspective because of its conservative effect on the linguistic heritage. Configurations which otherwise would have long ago become extinct remain embedded in this or that expression preserved by the formulaic structure. It is to the Epic that we owe the perpetuation of the most archaic words in the Greek repertory, often coexisting side-by-side in the same line with the most recent (on which more in Part II, *etymology/vocabulary*), by virtue of the genre. Despite such coexistence of archaisms and innovations, however, the former generally outnumber the latter. For example, let us consider the 143 attested Homeric occurrences of noun + epithet combinations referring to the sea. Page's summary (1959: 225–6) is a model account:

The 143 noun + epithet combinations are almost entirely made up of a small number of repeated phrases, — πολὺν ἄλα, οἶνοπι πόντῳ, πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης, and the like. There are seventeen of these formulas, accounting for all but 15 of the 143 passages. Moreover, in the *Iliad*, excepting a single line in the Fifteenth Book, the law of economy is strictly observed: each formula is unique, in the sense that it cannot be replaced by any other formula in the same part of the line. In this example, then, we find that the traditional formula-system accounts for more than nine-tenths of the composition: we have a glimpse not into the poet's mind but into his memory. For this one idea, 'the sea', and for its expression in noun + epithet phrases only, he relied upon his memory to provide him with a ready-made formula for almost every requirement; and the traditional vocabulary was now so highly developed, so refined and reduced, that for each requirement he found never, or hardly ever, more than one single formula. He has no freedom to select his adjectives: he must adopt whatever combination of words is supplied by tradition for a given part of the verse; and that tradi-

tional combination brings with it an adjective which may or may not be suitable to the context.

The book *History and the Homeric Iliad* (1959), whence the preceding quotation, is otherwise also of high value, for its outline of not just generally archaic but specifically Mycenaean lexical reflexes in the Epic: cf. especially chapter 6 = pp. 218–96; cf. also Gray 1947, 1958; and Puhvel 1964. As for the controversy between Risch 1958 and Ruijgh 1957, it is based not on the validity of actual Mycenaean heritage in Homer, but rather, on how much of this heritage should be classified as Aeolic rather than Arcado-Cypriote, on which more in Part II, *dialectology*. Then too, the Shipp-Chadwick controversy (1961/1958) on the validity of correlating actual Linear B entries with Homeric equivalents will probably be resolved ultimately in favor of the latter, after (1) intensive application of such analytic methods as employed e.g. by Page 1959 and (2) further investigation of the extent to which the Linear B style reflects the official language as distinct from the vernacular(s).

Nor is vocabulary the only level on which Epic archaisms outnumber innovations; for another example of this phenomenon, let us look now on the level of morphology: besides 50-odd Homeric instances of archaic athematic-stem ᾠπτο 'arose', there are but three of the relatively innovating thematic-stem ᾠπετο (*M* 279, *Ξ* 397, *X* 102). Because of this relationship of archaisms to innovations, statistics may even be used for the relative diachronic calibration of certain grammatical categories. For example, let us test the conclusion, reached with the methodology of comparative grammar, that the verbal class in -όω is derived or extended from (and originally restricted to) the aorist system, while the verbal classes in -άω and -έω are derived or extended from the present system (cf. Schwyzler 1939: 727). The statistical evidence of the Homeric corpus serves as an indication:

64 verbs in -άω and 49 verbs in -έω found only in the present;

16 verbs in -άω and 30 verbs in -έω found only in the aorist;

5 verbs in -όω found only in the present;

23 verbs in -όω found only in the aorist.

In other words, the Homeric corpus shows that the present/aorist proportion of verbs in -όω is inverse to that of verbs in -άω and -έω (Schwyzler, *Ibid.*); thus the Epic here statistically reflects the evolution from (a) the prevalence of the original constraints on these three verbal classes to (b) their subsequent eventual breakdown.

So much for the diachronic evaluation of grammatical categories in the Homeric corpus. There have also been attempts to extend such inquiry into determining the relative earliness or lateness of particular passages on grammatical grounds. For example, Shipp concludes (1953; cf. especially p. 18) from the data on innovations assembled in Chantraine's *Grammaire homérique* (1953, 1958) that newer configurations are more frequent in e.g. the simile-passages than in the rest of the text, whence Shipp's tentative proposal that the similes themselves may be a relatively recent accretion to the attested Homeric corpus. An objective critique of this theory is offered by

Ruijgh (1957:22–5), who bases his counter-arguments primarily on the factor of genre-conditioning in formal language. In essence, a given Homeric simile may well be as old as or even older than the text surrounding it, but its genre may be more recent, whence the possibility of a higher proportion of grammatical innovations. The same perspective may also be extended to the subject-matters of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and the effects which their themes may exert upon the grammatical texture. On the other hand, grammatical criteria are valid for establishing different traditions, if not different authorship. For example, in *Homerische Wörter* Leumann points out (1950: 167–8) that the adverbial use of ἀπριάτην ‘without purchase’ in *Odyssey* ξ 317 is a false extension from the correct adjectival usage of ἀπριάτην as in *Iliad* A 99; on this account the possibility is raised that the author of ξ 317 is different from that of A 99. An important modification must be added to this approach, however: we cannot assume that the source for ξ 317 was necessarily A 99: such an assumption, as Page points out (1955b:164, fn. 24), ‘presupposes what we certainly do not know and have no reason whatever to believe — that the *Iliad*’s phrase ἀπριάτην ἀνάποινον (or the like) could not have been known to the Odyssean poet from the traditional stock of phrases common to all poets, and existed nowhere in the world but in that one line of the *Iliad*.’ The mutual exclusion illustrated by this example establishes different traditions only — and not necessarily different authorship.

Aside from theoretical considerations, by far the most accessible way of gaining perspective on the Homeric language is a thorough reading of a synthetic but detailed treatment like that of Chantraine, on syntax (1953) as well as phonology and morphology (1958); similarly recommended is Palmer’s outline (1963a) and Risch’s separate treatise on morphology (1937).

As for the Homeric Hymns, it is again by the criterion of grammar that we can prove easily that they are not directly derivative from the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* and that their background must have stemmed from an Epic phase less clearly defined from the canonical standpoint, i.e. dating back to a time before the establishment of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as they have survived (for the notion of fixed texts, cf. Lord 1960, especially chapter 6 = pp. 124–38). In other words, it was a phase when the Epic *Dichtersprache* was not yet moribund (i.e. before the onset of fixed texts) that must have given rise to the elements in the Homeric Hymns which are clearly independent of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Such independence is demonstrable wherever the *Hymns* preserve a grammatical archaism corresponding to an innovation in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Granted, the situation is more often the reverse, whence the false notion that the *Hymns* are in all respects more recent: e.g. innovating thematic-stem πολυπιδάκου ‘rich in springs’ (’Ιδης) in *Hymn to Aphrodite* 54 vs. archaic athematic-stem πολυπίδακος (’Ιδης) in Ξ 157, etc. But the counter-examples (cf. Forde 1958:95–6), however rare, are sufficient to prove that while the *Hymns* may be later, they are nevertheless at least partially independent survivals of an unattested stage of Epic *Dichtersprache* which gave rise to the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Hymns* — all three; e.g.:

archaic athematic-stem χρυσάορα 'with sword of gold' in *Hymn to Apollo* 123
vs. innovating thematic-stem χρυσάορον in *O* 256

archaic reflex κατάκειαι 'you lie down' (with intervocalic σ phonologically lost)
in *Hymn to Hermes* 254
vs. innovating creation κείσαι (with intervocalic σ morphologically restored) in
e.g. *T* 319.

archaic line-final (τό σε φράζεσθαι) ἄνωγμεν 'we bid (you consider this)' in *Hymn to Apollo* 528
vs. innovating *ἄνώγαμεν, with paradigmatic extension of α; the similarly line-final but 1st singular (τά σε φράζεσθαι) ἄνωγα of υ 43 (etc.) could not have formulaically generated the archaic 1st plural ἄνωγμεν, while the predictable *ἄνώγαμεν could not fit metrically.

The factor of *Dichtersprache*, of course, extends beyond the language of Homer and the *Hymns*: not only is it equally relevant in non-Homeric Epic such as the Hesiodic corpus (cf. e.g. Hoekstra 1957, Notopoulos 1960, Troxler 1964, McLeod 1961), but also in the separate genre (or, more accurately, genres) of Lyric. (For the sake of convenience, we will include iambic and elegiac poetry in this category, and restrict the category of Epic to poetry using only dactylic hexameter.) From e.g. the individual contributions of Dover, Page, and Scherer (all 1964) on the poetry of Archilochos, we may observe trends toward recognition of genre-conditioning of poetic language by Lyric as apart from Epic. Thus whereas Page argues (1964:131) that the technique of composition in Elegy is essentially the same as in Epic, Dover points out (1964:190–1) that the elegiac language of an early poet like Tyrtaios already employs non-Homeric phraseology in slots where Homeric phraseology would have fit just as well. Let us make a comparison from Tyrtaios 7.21 ff. (for the current Lyric cross-reference system, cf. Fatouros 1966:i-iii), a text contextually parallel to *Iliad* X 66 ff., dealing with Priam's musing about his own fate:

Tyrtaios (27): νέοισι δὲ πάντ' ἐπέοικεν 'it is altogether fitting for the young'
vs. Homer (71): νέῳ δέ τε πάντ' ἐπέοικεν.

'All awkwardness could have been avoided if Tyrtaios had availed himself fully of epic diction and said νέῳ δέ τε; but, like all the early elegists and the composers of verse inscriptions, he eschewed those combinations of particles which are characteristic of epic and distinguish it from drama and prose' (Dover 1964:191). Or again, in the previous line from Tyrtaios (26), we read

αἰσχρὰ τὰ γ' ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νεμεσητὸν ἰδεῖν
'shameful and deserving of *nemesis* to see with the eyes'.

The syntactical disagreement here between singular and plural neuter could have been obviated by replacement of νεμεσητόν with νεμεσητά and by observation of the

initial *digamma* latent in ἰδεῖν: the switch to overt *digamma* is a lexically-conditioned metrical precedent regularly operative in the Epic (the overtness of course is not phonological but metrical: cf. Part II, *phonology*). And yet, Tyrtaios regularly eschews this metrical precedent (documentation by Dover, *Ibid.*). 'In this respect Tyrtaios's principle is that of the Ionian elegiac poets, but it is conspicuously at variance with that of all the archaic verse inscriptions, which, whatever their metre and whatever the degree of epic phraseology they adopt, observe *digamma* in regions where the vernacular observed it and omit it in regions where the vernacular omitted it' (Dover 1964:191–2). In sum, although we will leave questions of dialect unspecified here, we may still agree with Dover that 'the language of Tyrtaios is derived not primarily or directly from epic' (1964:190). Also relevant are the arguments assembled by Page (1964:144–6) for the possibility that the genres of non-dactylic meters used by Archilochos (i.e. the iambic and trochaic poems) stem from a preliterate period of poetic tradition; among the factors considered is the very existence of an archaic poem like the *Margites*, with its agglomeration of dactylic hexameters interspersed with occasional iambic trimeters. Nevertheless, Page argues from the evidence of the actual Archilochean corpus that not only the elegiac but also the admittedly separate genres in iambic and trochaic meters derive most if not all traditional elements directly from the Epic (1964:150, 154, 161). As Page concludes (1964:161), 'The formula-element comes almost exclusively from the Epic, and the new style is formed by more or less extensive adaptation of traditional phrases combined with components, generally in moderate measure, of premeditated word-selection.' In other words, separateness from Epic is acknowledged for any Lyric genre only in terms of innovation from the former to the latter, never in terms of individual archaism in the latter. This was also the trend in Dover's already-discussed analysis of Tyrtaios, as well as in such standard works on Lyric as Page's *Alcman* (1951), or again his *Sappho and Alcaeus* (1955a). And it is this same trend in e.g. Zumbach's approach to the Hymnic corpus (1955) that has prompted Forde's already-mentioned critique (1958).

In an attempt to modify the disputed trend in Lyric-analysis too, let us consider Page's theories on Lesbian poetry. He concedes that e.g. Sappho's poetic language, unlike that of Archilochos, generally resists the influence of Epic (1955a:30); at the same time, wherever in the Sapphic corpus there happens to be deviation from what we can establish as the regularities of the contemporary Lesbian vernacular, Page automatically ascribes such an anomaly to Epic influence (cf. e.g. 1955a:8, 67 on Sappho 1.10 ff. specifically, or p. 327 on Sappho and Alcaeus generally). The possibility of at least residual non-Epic, native Lesbian archaisms is not seriously considered, as if the only traditional elements in Lesbian poetry were those traceable to the Epic. Likewise in Harvey's valuable study of epithets in Lyric (1957), contextually inappropriate usages reflecting ornamental (and therefore inherited) epithets are regularly explained as archaisms only in terms of stylized cross-references to the Epic (cf. especially Harvey 1957:215–18, 220–1, on the Lesbian material). And yet to deny the possibility of archaisms generated by Lyric independently of Epic is also to deny

a basic historical fact about the primary external form of Greek poetry, meter. From the metrical point of view, the very structures of the Greek poetic genres are conducive to intuiting that the dactylic hexameter is highly complex and derivative, while e.g. the Sapphic and Alcaic verses are by comparison simple and primitive (Wilamowitz 1921: 97–103). In fact, Meillet (1923) has convincingly established a structural correspondence between the latter and the *triṣṭubh/jagatī* verses of Vedic Sanskrit. In other words, the comparative method allows Lesbian meters to be derived directly in terms of Indo-European (for further refinement of the theory, cf. Jakobson 1952 and Watkins 1962b); on the other hand, the complex metrical structure of the dactylic hexameter resists any such direct derivation (Watkins 1962b: 202, fn. 1). Granted, the Epic has ultimately prevailed as the panhellenic instrument of *paideia* in the form of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, whence the likelihood of its influence on other, moribund, genres like Lesbian Lyric. All the same, the comparative evidence afforded by the metrical structure suggests that at least in some elements of phraseology too, Lyric might preserve more archaic material than Epic. Contextual evidence bears out this possibility, as in the restricted and etymologically accurate semantic sphere of κλέος ἄφθιτον in Ibykos 1.47 vs. the generalized Homeric usage (Durante 1960: 244–5 and 1962: 34, fn. 36). An obvious desideratum, then, is to establish the existence in Lyric of archaic grammatical configurations which could not have been motivated by the Epic; Nagy proposes to present a series of forthcoming inquiries on this topic. Already, moreover, phraseological elements dating even further back in time, to Indo-European, have been discovered in both Epic and Lyric (although the interrelations within Greek have yet to be established precisely): cf. the survey by Schmitt (1967) of such Lyric-Epic expressions as κλέος ἄφθιτον (vs. Vedic *śrávo* ... | ... *ākṣitam*), etc.; cf. also Part II, *etymology/vocabulary*. In light of Durante's already-cited arguments that at least one Lyric attestation of κλέος ἄφθιτον could not have been motivated by the Epic, the relevance of this syntagma is all the more enhanced by its Indo-European pedigree. For other phraseological survivals from the *indogermanische Dichtersprache*, cf. e.g. Thieme 1938, 1952a–c, on ἀριδείκετος/ἐρικυδής, νέκταρ/ἄμβροσια/Αἰδής; also Durante 1958, 1960, 1962, on ἔπεα πτερόεντα, πλέκειν ὕμνον (etc.), ὠκέες ἵπποι (etc.).

Even though metrical studies have now been cited as a tool for resolving broader questions of genre, it should be made clear that a great deal remains undiscovered about the structure and dynamics of Greek meter, both on the diachronic and synchronic levels. For the former, the most productive works already available as points of departure for further investigation have already been mentioned: Wilamowitz 1921, Meillet 1923, Jakobson 1952, Watkins 1962b (cf. also Schmitt 1967: 307–13); as for the latter, among the most useful syntheses are those of Maas 1962 in general or of Kirk 1966 and Dale 1957, 1968 in the specific areas of Epic and Lyric respectively. (The former especially has prompted many important structural studies: cf. e.g. O'Neill 1942, Porter 1951, Fränkel 1960.) In the even more basic area of metrical typology, cf. Lotz 1960 and Householder's comments, 1960: 346–7.

On the synchronic level, probably the most revolutionary inquiry into Greek meter

has been Allen's correlation of verse-*ictus* with a new theory of Greek lexical *stress* (1966). The latter is supposed to be conditioned entirely on the phonological level, remaining independent of a likewise-posed lexical (as opposed to syntactical) *intonation*, the well-documented Attic-Ionic patterns of which are morphologically as well as phonologically conditioned except in finite forms of the verb (where the conditioning is solely phonological). Moreover, the phonological conditioning for *stress* is different from the phonological conditioning for lexical *intonation*, familiar from the most elementary grammars (e.g. proparoxytone becomes paroxytone when the ultimate vowel is long). We might add, in fact, an unmentioned but important implication of Allen's theory: from the standpoint of phonological evolution to modern Greek, the lexical repertory preserves the patterns of intonation and loses those of stress, but at the same time it replaces the phonological dynamics of intonation with those of stress. In other words, the evolution to the modern Greek stress-system with patterns inherited from an old intonation-system reflects a sort of chiasitic compensation. As for the actual phonological conditioning of stress in ancient Greek, Allen's formula is as follows (1966:123):

- a) WORDS WERE PRIMARILY STRESSED ON THEIR LAST HEAVY SYLLABLE [monosyllabic words generally do not count, since they afford no opportunity for contrast of stress within the word]
- b) A SECONDARY STRESS FELL ON PRECEDING HEAVY SYLLABLES IF SEPARATED FROM THE PRIMARY STRESS BY AT LEAST ONE MORA OF QUANTITY.

(The dots underneath the *macron/brevis* will henceforth indicate stress.)

E.g. *Odyssey* α 1: ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ

Sophokles, *Antigone* 1: ὦ κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον Ἰσμήνης κάρα.

The testing of this hypothesis on any sample line of dactylic hexameter or iambic trimeter leads to an obvious conclusion: if the formulation is correct, then Greek metrical ictus essentially coincides with Greek lexical stress. (N.B.: the line-final *anceps* counts as latent \cup or $-$ when the verse-rhythm is $\dots - \cup \dots$ or $\dots \cup - \dots$ respectively.) From the diachronic point of view, then, Greek lexical stress can be motivated as the underlying factor of meter itself. Applicable again is the dictum that the dynamics of poetic language, whether or not they are still dependent on the natural language, nevertheless originate from the actual grammatical rules of the latter (cf. Meillet 1923:19 and Allen 1966:118). Appropriate too is the following remark of Wilamowitz (1921:96): 'Das geschichtlich wichtige Ergebnis ist, dass die ausgebildete Metrik in dem was ihr gemeinsam ist und auch in ihren Anomalien auf einen Zustand weist, in dem sich alles vertrug.' What is more, Allen's theory (1966:146) 'gives an immediate and simple explanation of a number of the "laws", "canons", "bridges", etc., regarding the positions at which heavy word-finals may or may not occur; all

reduce simply to the *avoidance of word-division where this would produce conflict between stress and ictus* — more particularly in the coda section of a metrical structure.’ Especially productive is the application of Allen’s hypothesis to ‘Porson’s Law’ in iambic trimeter (1966:129–35), and it is this very applicability, in the specific instance just mentioned and others, which best refutes any charge of circularity. As Allen himself argues (1966:147), ‘the detailed testing of the hypothesis involved certain specific phenomena, which had not been considered as such in establishing the hypothesis, and which in some cases concerned quite different metres — and was nevertheless found to have considerable explanatory power in relation to them.’ What is more, the hypothesis itself was derived from empirical observations about the nature of the two basic classical Greek metrical rhythms, dactylic and iambic, ‘and the fact that any single set of correlations was traceable, that a hypothesis based on them produced a high proportion of agreement in both types, and that the distribution of agreement and disagreement in the line showed clear and intelligible patterns, seems likely to be significant’ (Allen, *Ibid.*).

The hypothesis also allows valuable new insight into such grammatical phenomena as enclisis and word-juncture (Allen 1966:132–4); also into stylistic devices achieved with meter. As an example of the latter, we cite the utilization of an exceptional slot allowing disagreement between stress and ictus: if the penthemimeral caesura of the iambic trimeter divides a spondee, i.e., if a word-break in the third foot is between two long syllables, then stress clashes with ictus (| = foot-juncture, || = caesura):

⊣ ⊣ | ∨ – | ⊣ || – | ... (from the standpoint of stress)

vs. hypothetical

⊣ ⊣ | ∨ ⊣ | – || ⊣ | ... (what we would have expected from the standpoint of ictus).

Nor is a spondee avoided in this slot: according to Allen’s statistics (1966:125), lines with penthemimeral caesura have a spondee for the 3rd foot 75 per cent of the time. Allen therefore raises the possibility (*Ibid.*) that the resulting tension between stress and ictus here was deliberately induced, as a line-initial counterbalance to the cadence. That the non-avoidance is deliberate is also suggested by the fact that Sophokles often uses this slot for the sake of contrast in repetition, as in *Oidipous Tyrannos* 216 (with stresses marked):

αἰτῆϊς | ἄ δ’ αἰτῆϊς || – | ... (cf. Allen 1966:125–6).

We might also compare Archilochos 94.1:

ὦ Ζεῦ | πάτερ | Ζεῦ || – | ...

A vexing complication in linguistic analysis of the Lyric is its generally poor textual tradition. Not only has there been an irretrievable lapse in transmission for the majority of Lyric texts but even what few remain are highly vulnerable to corruption, given the nature of their fragmentary survival as quotations or paraphrases (*Zitatfragmente*) and the like. The occasional valuable discovery of an early and relatively complete

copy of a Lyric poem, such as the famous Louvre-papyrus (ca. first century A.D.) of Alkman's *Partheneion*, may often reveal the inaccuracy of the later transmission which had previously been the only basis for establishing the text. Here, for example, are (1) lines 64–5 of the *Partheneion* as attested in the Louvre-papyrus, followed by (2) the version derived in quotation-form from the medieval textual tradition:

1. οὔτε γάρ τι πορφύρας | τόσσοις κόρος ὥστ' ἀμύναι
2. οὐ γὰρ πορφύρας τόσσοις κόρος ὥστ' ἀμύνασθαι (cf. Page 1951:103–4).

Such illustrations (for others, cf. Schwyzler 1939:108), then, show the need for sound and systematic grammatical investigation of the Lyric fragments. On Alkman, cf. e.g. the work of Kodzu 1937; on Sappho and Alkaios, cf. Hamm 1958; for an exemplary edition of a given Lyric corpus by a linguist, cf. Olivier Masson 1962 on Hipponax.

The textual tradition of Alkman illustrates still another complication of linguistic relevance. In the Alexandrian exegetical tradition, a consistent awareness of the contrast between unlocalized Epic dialect and localized Lyric dialect prompted sometimes misdirected efforts at fidelity to the manifold and varying idiosyncrasies of the latter. For example, the Lakonian provenience of Alkman's poetry gave rise to the regular substitution of σ for ϑ in the Alexandrian edition of the *Partheneion*: e.g. $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omicron\nu$ for $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\nu$ in line 35, $\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ for $\pi\alpha\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in line 84, etc. Granted, the process $\theta > \sigma$ is a Lakonian phenomenon, attested also in e.g. the Lakonian passages of Thucydides ($\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ for $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, 5.77) and Aristophanes ($\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ for $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, *Lysistrata* 81); $s (< \theta)$ is also clearly attested in the latter-day descendant of the Doric group to which Lakonian belonged, Tsakonian: e.g. *to séri* 'harvesting-time' ($\tau\acute{\omicron}$ $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma$), *silikó* 'female' ($\theta\eta\lambda\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$), etc.; cf. Bourguet 1927: 75 ff. and Pernot 1934:132 ff. Nevertheless, the earliest yet-attested instance of σ for θ in Lakonian is now dated to the early fourth century B.C., and the more archaic inscriptions regularly show θ (Bechtel 1923: 302–3). As Risch concludes, since only θ is possible for the period of Alkman's *floruit* (ca. 7th c. B.C.), 'Dieser typische Lakonismus σ statt θ muss daher ... auf nachträglicher Modernisierung beruhen' (Risch 1954b: 29). In other words, the Alexandrian exegetical tradition is sometimes responsible for dialectal features unwarranted by the previously transmitted Lyric text. In fact, there may well be even more serious Alexandrian modifications: on the grounds of genuine formal convergences between the dialect of Lakonia and the dialect of Kyrene, remote and familiar respectively from the Alexandrian standpoint, the editorial tradition may have overextended these convergences by selective application of Kyrenaian forms to the Alkman-text: 'bleibt als einziger Ausweg nur noch die Annahme, dass der uns vorliegende Alkman-text in verschiedenen Punkten nicht authentisch ist, sondern nachträglich an den Dialekt von Kyrene angepasst wurde' (Risch 1954b: 35). On methodological grounds, however, we need not necessarily fault the use of dialectal material from Kyrene as a linguistic point of reference for establishing the text of Alkman. Though only indirectly, Kyrene was nonetheless founded by Lakonia and probably preserved linguistic and

other social archaisms lost by the mother-state. It is important to add in support of the validity of this Alexandrian approach that the application of Kyrenaian forms was selective (cf. e.g. the textual convention of σ for θ , which is Lakonian only and foreign to Kyrene). Hence the aptness of Risch's conclusion (*Ibid.*): 'Wenn man bedenkt, dass Kyrene für Alexandrien schliesslich die nächste dorische Stadt war und dass kein geringerer als Kallimachos aus dieser Stadt stammte, wird man die Möglichkeit, dass die alexandrinischen Gelehrten sich bei der Bereinigung des Alkman-textes bis zu einem gewissen Grade nach dem Vorbild des kyrenäischen Dialektes richteten, nicht von vornherein verneinen dürfen.' In analyzing the text of Alkman, therefore, we have to reckon with three possible layers: (1) the archaisms of an inherited *Dichtersprache*, (2) a Lakonian veneer, (3) Alexandrian editorial modifications based on dialectal studies of Kyrenaian and Lakonian; this tripartition is a modified version of the one proposed by Risch (1954b: 37).

Nor is the factor of *Dichtersprache* confined to Greek Epic and Lyric. It is also ever-present in such genres as the Attic Tragedy, where e.g. even in the dialogue, borrowed Doric \tilde{a} occurs for lexical entries without a native Attic equivalent in η : e.g. metrically-conditioned $\nu\tilde{\alpha}\acute{o}\varsigma \nu\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\omega}\nu$ vs. native Attic $\nu\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma \nu\epsilon\acute{\omega}\nu$, but exclusively $\nu\eta\grave{\iota} \nu\eta\epsilon\varsigma$ rather than the metrical equivalents in Doric, $\nu\tilde{\alpha}\grave{\iota} \nu\tilde{\alpha}\epsilon\varsigma$ (cf. Björck 1950, *pace* Mahlow 1926). For a model survey of Attic Tragedy and Comedy, cf. Meillet 1935/1965: Part II, chapters 9 and 10 = pp. 217–22 and 223–7 respectively. Part II of Meillet's *Aperçu* ('Les langues littéraires') also conveniently provides surveys of the other major Greek poetic genres, namely Epic (chapter 6 = pp. 157–86) and Lyric (chapter 8 = pp. 195–215). In fact, Meillet broadens the perspective from the confines of *Dichtersprache* into a more general notion of *Kunstsprache*, by distinguishing literary prose too from the natural language as such. The basic principle is this: 'Chaque grand groupe dialectal a tendu à se créer sa langue littéraire propre' (120); in the more restricted sphere of poetry, Wilamowitz had noticed the same phenomenon when he remarked: 'Versmass und Sprache gehören zusammen' (1921: 42). Extending this principle from poetry to prose, Meillet offers this formulation (1935/1965: 229):

Les Grecs de dialecte éolien semblent avoir créé les grandes langues poétiques: celle de l'épopée, qui a été ionisée, et celle de la lyrique chorale, qui a été un peu dorisée; à défaut de textes éoliens de ces deux grands genres littéraires, on connaît leur lyrique familière. Il n'apparaît pas qu'ils aient eu une prose.

A en juger par ce qui a subsisté, la prose littéraire est une création des Ioniens.

Pour la civilisation, cette nouveauté a été chose décisive.

What with the firm establishment of Ionian as the official vehicle of prose, it becomes clear why Athenian prose had such a hard time becoming Attic (237):

La prose ionienne a été presque la seule prose grecque avant la prose attique. On jugera de l'importance qu'elle avait prise par la difficulté qu'a eue la prose des Athéniens à devenir attique.

For a survey of Ionic and Attic prose as *Kunstsprache*, cf. Meillet 1935/1965: Part II,

chapter 11 = pp. 229–46. It is characteristic of Meillet, who is known for 'die Betonung, dass die Sprache und jedes Wort ein Glied des sozialen Lebens ist' (Risch 1954a: 181), that he gives a social motivation for the dialectal repartitions of Greek *Kunstsprache* (1935/1965:140):

La variété des parlers locaux, tous sentis comme helléniques, préparait les Grecs à admettre la variété des langues littéraires qui est un trait caractéristique de leur littérature. De même que les chefs des cités, obligés à négocier avec des cités étrangères, avaient l'habitude de comprendre des parlers divers, les gens cultivés comprenaient sans effort des langues littéraires diverses. Une aristocratie, politique ou intellectuelle, a toujours quelque chose d'international. Or, la littérature grecque a été faite pour des aristocraties.

After considering the full extent of *Kunstsprache* in ancient Greek, we come to the realization that what we really lack is a sufficient attested corpus of the natural language (119):

Sauf les inscriptions rédigées en quelque parler local et les restes conservés des glossaires et parlers locaux relevés par des observateurs de l'antiquité, tout ce qui subsiste du grec pré-alexandrin, ce sont des textes littéraires. Quand on parle de grec, c'est presque toujours à une langue littéraire qu'on pense, et d'abord à la langue écrite d'Athènes. Sur le parler grec courant, les données sont plus maigres que sur le parler latin; on n'a pas, en grec, l'équivalent de Plaute ou de Pétrone. Pour donner une idée du développement du grec, il faut donc déterminer ce qu'ont été ces langues littéraires et comment elles se comportent par rapport au parler courant....

En fait, la plupart du temps on ne connaît des langues anciennes que des formes littéraires. Il arrive même que les langues littéraires soient assez éloignées de l'usage courant pour ne laisser presque rien entrevoir du parler courant des hommes qui les employaient.

One important contemporary analytic tool used to delimit e.g. stylistic factors from the regularities of the natural language is the computer. For examples of preliminary work in this area, cf. Brandwood 1956 and Levison et al. 1968 on Plato. A cumulative bibliography on the application of computer-technology to classical studies in general is available in *Calculi* (ed. by Waite 1967–). For a general discussion of methodology, cf. Kuno 1967.

Given that the Hellenic institution and way of life subsumed under the name πόλις was pivotal in the maintenance of individual dialects in the classical period, the emergence of a common Greek language, a Κοινή, becomes inevitable in the days of leagues and far flung empires. But its dialectal components need not have been inevitable. How, then, do we explain the Attic-Ionic basis of the Κοινή which actually did evolve? Even in the era of the πόλις, there had been a latent tendency towards the ultimate leveling-out of localized idiosyncrasies (Meillet 1935/1965:143):

Beaucoup de cités ont employé le parler local dans leurs actes officiels, et les inscriptions en portent témoignage. Mais autre chose est un acte officiel destiné aux membres d'une étroite communauté, autre chose une œuvre littéraire qui s'adresse à une nation ou à une partie notable d'une nation. La langue des œuvres littéraires représente donc une sorte de moyenne entre plusieurs parlers locaux, ou le résultat de mélanges.

A prototype of *une langue commune*, a Κοινή, is the official Ionic of the classical period (86, 230), but the constitution of what now actually goes under the name Κοινή ultimately resulted from a whole series of dynamic historical processes: (1) hegemony of the Achaemenid Empire over Ionian cities, (2) growth of the so-called Athenian Empire, (3) the ascendancy of Macedonia in the Hellenic world, (4) the conquests of Alexander the Great, and (5) the superimposition of the Roman Empire. The consequent social effects on the evolution of the Greek language have been masterfully outlined by Meillet (1935/1965: Part III "Constitution d'une langue commune", chapter 2 "Conditions historiques" = pp. 259–70). The key to the prevalence of Attic through these processes is cultural prestige (263–4):

L'attique qui a servi de modèle n'a pas été le parler familier, qui n'avait pas de prestige particulier. C'est la langue des hommes cultivés, celle qu'employaient les philosophes, les orateurs, les poètes comiques, celle qu'admettait la cité dans ses décrets et ses inscriptions. L'action d'Athènes est due à la supériorité de sa civilisation; c'est la langue de cette civilisation qui s'est propagée au dehors. Les extensions de langue sont moins des extensions de langues vulgaires qu'on ne l'a longtemps enseigné. Dans le cas de l'attique, l'action a été exercée par la langue d'une aristocratie intellectuelle.

Even more interesting, however, is the key to the specifically mixed Attic-Ionic basis of Κοινή; Meillet's formulation is a *tour de force* in its display of perspective on language both φύσει and θέσει (266):

Devant une telle extension, les caractères propres de la langue du petit pays qu'était l'Attique ne se maintiennent naturellement pas tous. De même que, plus anciennement, la langue commune des Ioniens d'Asie, la nouvelle κοινή est un idiome exempt de particularités locales singulières. Les hommes qui portaient avec eux l'attique n'étaient pour la plupart pas des Athéniens. Les cours où l'on employait cette langue étaient superficiellement *atticisées*, *non attiques* [italics supplied]. Et les pays ioniens ont fourni à l'hellénisme qui se généralisait le plus grand contingent des hommes pour qui le grec était une langue maternelle, une langue nationale. Trop proche de l'attique pour ne pas se mélanger aisément avec celui-ci, l'ionien a contribué à éliminer de la κοινή les particularités spécifiquement attiques et à y introduire des termes ioniens que l'attique courant n'avait pas admis, mais dont plus d'un avait passé dans l'ancienne littérature: il se trouve ainsi que des mots employés par les tragiques et inconnus de la prose attique figurent dans la κοινή. La κοινή est ainsi de l'attique savant adopté et enseigné surtout par des Ioniens ou par d'autres Hellènes, et devenu langue de communication internationale pour toutes sortes d'étrangers.

Therefore, elements of natural language previously repressed in official Attic and Ionic come to the fore in Κοινή, but in the latter too, there persists a dynamic tension between *la langue courante* and *la langue littéraire* (254). For examples of inquiries into Κοινή which betray an awareness of this factor, cf. Palmer 1946 and Radermacher 1947. For a specific example of how Κοινή pervades local dialects and reshapes them, cf. Wackernagel 1921/1953:510–11, on the use of ἐνρί as both 3rd singular and 3rd plural in the language of Archimedes (and of Syracuse in general).

One of the most useful diachronic syntheses of modern Demotic, as derivative from Κοινή and therefore providing an important criterion for determining elements of

the latter's *langue courante*, remains that of Thumb 1910. For more on the value of the modern Greek material for diachronic perspective, cf. Part III *infra*. For a synchronic analysis of literary Demotic, cf. e.g. Mirambel 1959 and Householder, Kazazis, and Koutsoudas 1964.

Previous mention of *la langue commune* during the discussion of Κοινή finally leads us now to the Κοινή *par excellence*, the Common Greek which we can reconstruct as far back as we can from the attested language and which is also within reconstructable distance from Indo-European. (For a contemporary survey, cf. Chadwick 1963a.) From the standpoint of nineteenth-century linguistic science, mention of this hypothetical stage of Greek should have appeared first in this nearly concluded section (Part I) (cf. e.g. Pedersen's discussion of Greek, 1931: 84-91), since the methodological point of departure for the study of any Indo-European language is deemed to be Indo-European itself. While this approach need not be faulted, the emphasis on current trends has obviated the necessity for such an *incipit*. The main area of progress from the contemporary point of view is the continuing refinement of perspective on the actual linguistic material available. And the better our understanding of the mechanisms operative in all attested phases of the Greek language, the more extensive becomes the contribution of Greek to our understanding of Indo-European itself. This, in essence, is the contribution of *philologie* to *grammaire comparée* (in the sense which Chantraine implies, 1965:43).

II. SPECIFICS

Phonology

Despite the attestation of Greek as far back in time as the second millennium B.C., a chronological chasm between Indo-European and Greek remains, and this is most apparent perhaps on the phonological level from the standpoint of problems in reconstruction. The necessity for positing a multitude of phases and patterns of phonology which must have been operative once in prehistoric Greek but which reveal only residual traces in extant Greek is well illustrated by such Indo-European studies as those of Kuryłowicz (1956) and Szemerényi (1964). Granted, the very discovery of Greek in Linear B brings us appreciably closer to Common Greek in some respects: e.g. the attestation of labiovelars, of intervocalic *-i-* (*contra* Meillet 1935/1965:22-4), etc.; in other respects, however, it makes us realize even more clearly than before the remoteness of Common Greek from all attested stages of Greek, including Mycenaean. From certain angles, Mycenaean only complicates our reconstruction of unattested phases in the history of Greek, in that it presents idiosyncrasies which could only be suspected at best from the evidence of extant post-Mycenaean Greek. On the phonological level, for instance, the multiple and varied Mycenaean reflexes of the Common Greek syllabic sonorants **r* **l* **m* **n* point to

more complications than we could ever have imagined from the surviving classical reflexes; the evidence now forces us to reckon with the possibility of conditioning on the following levels: (1) purely phonological, (2) morphological, (3) dialectal, or (4) any combination of the preceding three; cf. Kuryłowicz 1956:166–208 for general background; for specifics, cf. e.g. Ruijgh 1961 and Morpurgo Davies 1960, 1968. (For a general phonological outline of Mycenaean, cf. Bartoněk 1964.)

Nor is the Mycenaean evidence appreciably more helpful than the classical in elucidating the numerous problems involved in the Greek transmission of the Indo-European consonantal series known as the laryngeals. The extent of the transmission which can be readily intuited has been conveniently outlined by Lejeune (1955:170–6) on the phonological level, while the more elusive morphological conditioning is motivated by Kuryłowicz (1956:166–208). Much remains unexplained about laryngeal-reflexes in Greek, with even Sapir's typological inquiries (1938) being only partially successful; for critical surveys, cf. Wyatt 1964 and Cowgill 1965. In defense of the laryngeal theory, however, we must observe that a preponderance of difficulties on the phonological level is only to be expected, since the primary impetus for postulating the laryngeal series was not phonological but morphological: that is, the mechanism of Indo-European root-apophony (on which phenomenon cf. Kuryłowicz 1956 *passim*). Another structural *raison d'être* for maintaining the concept of laryngeals, namely Benveniste's hypothesis of the 2- and 3-consonantal Indo-European root (1935:chapter 9 = pp. 147–73), is likewise morphologically motivated: only after Benveniste's demonstration of the morphological dynamics operative in the alternation of root-themes I/II = CeC-C'/CC-eC'- could it be structurally feasible to postulate the presence of hypothetical laryngeals in the expected C-slots of e.g. several attested Greek roots.

Occasionally, the Homeric corpus reveals more about prehistoric Greek phonology than the Bronze-Age evidence of Linear B itself: cf. e.g. the metrical traces of *s* + sonorant in word-initial position, as discussed in Part I *supra*. There is even at least one instance where Epic has preserved a phonological (and ultimately morphophonemic) mechanism traceable all the way back to Indo-European. On the comparative evidence of Greek and Indo-Iranian, Wackernagel (1889/1953) had founded his famous *Dehnungsgesetz*: that with the coming together of two vowels as the final and initial elements of two compound-formants, the resulting contraction will entail the elision of the first and the lengthening of the second: $-V_1 + V_2 = -\bar{V}_2$, e.g. *στρατο + αγός = *στρατᾱγός > στρατηγός. The latter reflex also illustrates the anteriority of this contraction to the type resulting from the Greek innovation whereby e.g. intervocalic *σ* is lost: here *οα > ω rather than η, as in θάττ-ω (< *...-οσα). But the *Dehnungsgesetz* becomes extended, in that an initial vowel of the second compound-formant becomes lengthened no matter what the final element in the first formant may be: e.g. *κυν + αγός = *κυνᾱγός > κυνηγός. Here we see the removal of one constraint in the natural language. But in the literary language of the Epic, there are further extensions of a now-artificial *Dehnungsgesetz*, as Kuryłowicz has shown (1956:

264–72, 276–85): lengthening of initial vowel spreads from the second compound-formant to simplex nominals as well, and ultimately to any word. One locus of diffusion, we may add, is probably from compounds where the first constituent was an adverb: after the adverb evolves into a preposition (as well as preverb) there is an opportunity for transition of artificial *Dehnungsgesetz* from (a) compound consisting of adverb + noun to (b) preposition + object of preposition; for a possible parallel, cf. Meister 1921:14. Finally, even the constraint of word-initial vowel is removed (\parallel = word-boundary): i.e., $-VC + \parallel V- = -VC\parallel V-$ is extended to $-V + \parallel CV- = -V\parallel CV-$, so that any word-initial syllable becomes subject to lengthening in the Epic language. Hence e.g. such artificial vs. spoken pairs as ἀνήρ (*B* 553/*B* 701, etc., with/without elision) vs. ἀνήρ (*B* 673, etc.), Οὔλυμπον (*A* 221/*A* 497, etc., with/without elision) vs. *Οὔλυμπον (*A* 402, etc.); also μέιλανι (*Ω* 79) vs. μέλανα (*H* 265, etc.), Πούλυ-δάμας (*M* 60, etc.) vs. Πολύ-φημος (*ι* 407, etc.). This artificial *Dehnungsgesetz* of Epic was operative even after the Ionic phonological process whereby \bar{a} became η had ceased: hence e.g. ἀνήρ rather than *ἡνήρ in *B* 553, vs. the compound-formant -ἡνωρ showing the archaic product of natural *Dehnungsgesetz* and stemming from a period of Ionic when the process $\bar{a} > \eta$ was still operative (cf. Kuryłowicz 1956: 284). As for the type ἡνωρέη (*Z* 156, etc.: instead of *ἄνωρέη), the artificial *Dehnungsgesetz* which produced it goes back to the same archaic period when $\bar{a} > \eta$ was operative; the ultimate morphological extinction of the configuration *ἄνωρέη in spoken Ionic has precluded the recent poetic creation of *ἄνωρέη, whence the survival of inherited and residual ἡνωρέη. For more on \bar{a}/η in Homer, this time with \bar{a} -samples representing not an innovation but a chronological layer still more archaic than η -samples, cf. *infra* under *Dialectology*.

So much for instances where the obsolescence of a phonological rule in the natural language permits the ultimate extension of the same rule beyond its etymological confines, in the retentive poetic language of the Epic. Retention can also be static, however, and subject to ultimate attrition. For example, let us consider the early loss of w (= F , or *digamma*) in a prehistoric phase of Ionic, the last layer of the Homeric corpus. As Parry points out (1934:132), F was lost in Epic diction ‘neither sooner nor later than it was lost in the daily speech, but the singers who had to compose in a rigorous and therefore highly conservative verse-form, still used the old phrases and verses because that was their way of making poetry, because to have given up the traditional phrase wherever the loss of the digamma now caused hiatus or failure to make position, would have been to destroy the diction almost entirely.’ Thus in contrast to ca. 300 Homeric cases of elision despite *digamma*, there are still ca. 2,000 cases of non-elision because of *digamma* (cf. Meillet 1935/1965:160). In other words, ‘Homer’s language has traces of the digamma, but not the digamma itself’ (Parry 1934:131; *pace* Richard Bentley). But although the formulaic language of the Epic is an admirable preservative of traditional patterns dating back to a time when F was still extant, new patterns ignoring the etymological F eventually emerge — sometimes even in the most highly formulaic expressions. To quote Parry again (136–7): ‘Just as

we can show the metrical usefulness of the older phrase, and the fixed place which it holds in the diction, so can we do for phraseology with newer forms.' For instance, before loss of φ , the following verse-type could refer only to a masculine speaker:

καί μιν φωνήσας (ϕ)έπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα 'and addressing him he spoke winged words'.

In the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, there are 30 occurrences of this verse; but there are also 9 others where the speaker is feminine, and the necessitated elision is possible only without φ :

καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα.

At times the same formulaic line will entail both the presence and absence of *digamma*-factor in the metrical pattern: e.g. Δ 403, *P* 90, Σ 5, etc.:

ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα (ϕ)εἶπε πρὸς (-)ὄν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν 'angered, he said to his great-hearted *thumos*'.

In sum, we have to contrast 'the stability of the diction as a whole' with 'the fluidity of the diction in the grouping of its elements' (Parry's expressions; 1934:138).

For an exemplary single work on a Homeric phonological problem linked with the factor of *Dichtersprache*, cf. Werner 1948.

There have been thorough synoptic treatments of Greek phonology from both the diachronic and synchronic points of view: cf. Lejeune 1955 and Allen 1968a respectively; also still useful is Sturtevant's *Pronunciation of Greek and Latin* (1940). In Lejeune's just-mentioned *Traité* (1955), there is an especially valuable *index analytique* (345–62), with such important rubrics as *chronologie absolue* (350) and *chronologie relative* (350–1).

In the case of vowels, there has been a noteworthy contribution to our understanding of their system by Ruipérez (1956), who has employed the structuralist techniques of Martinet (1964) in interpreting the consecutive stages of especially the Attic-Ionic vowel-system with reference to the dynamics of pressure and counter-pressure in that system. Bartoněk (1966) has provided further details and Szemerényi (1968a), further refinements. In particular, Szemerényi has revised the relative scheme for the fronting of \bar{u} to \bar{i} and for the Attic *Rückverwandlung* of \bar{a} to \bar{e} .

As for consonants, efforts to establish the prehistory by structuralist techniques are adequately represented by the works of Allen (1958) on palatalization and of Stang (1957) as well as Diver (1958) on the propounded prehistoric phenomenon of gemination before $*-y-$. Bartoněk (1961) has attempted reconstructions of the consonantal systems of several well-known dialects at several (including late) developmental stages. Occasionally, certain latent features of a consonantal series become overt only within the framework of specialized orthographic conventions. For instance, π and κ are regularly φ and χ immediately before θ as in the aorist passive constructions with $-\theta\eta-$: $\tauέρπω$ vs. $\acute{\epsilon}τάρφθην$, $\deltaέρκομαι$ vs. $\acute{\epsilon}δέρχθην$, etc. But the backwards-assimila-

tion here is probably not from non-aspirated to aspirated (and in this sense the spelling here is imprecise) but from tense ($\pi \kappa$) to lax ($\phi \chi$), and the feature of laxness in the Greek series of aspirated stops would not become apparent if it were not for this convention in the spelling of consonantal clusters: cf. Lejeune 1955: 59 and Dow 1967. (Qualification: it must be conceded, however, that an immediate succession of two aspirated stops is not typologically impossible: cf. Allen 1968a: 24–6; but the κ in compromise-spellings like $\langle \delta \epsilon \delta \omicron \kappa \chi \theta \alpha \iota \rangle$ suggests that aspiration is not the assimilating feature here; cf. Dow 1967: 220–1.) In fact, we may posit as a general principle that the constraints and licenses of the various Greek orthographic systems are the primary key to evaluating the nuances of the underlying phonological systems.

Conversely, the evolution of Greek writing-systems is inextricably linked with the evolution of the Greek phonological system itself (cf. Pfohl 1969). Besides the indispensable survey of early alphabetic phases by Jeffery (1961), the most important contemporary trend has been in the direction of recognizing the extent to which linguistic conditions affect graphic conventions. We can illustrate this relationship by observing the representation of e , \bar{e} (resulting from a collapsed opposition of \bar{a} vs. \bar{e}), and \bar{e} by $\langle \epsilon \rangle$, $\langle \eta \rangle$, and $\langle \epsilon \iota \rangle$ respectively in the post-Euclidian Attic alphabet, vs. the cumbersome representation of all three by $\langle \epsilon \rangle$ in the archaic Attic alphabet. The basic motivation for this eventual orthographic reform was not the genius of some εὐπετής, but rather, the accidental convergence of (1) the studious but mechanical application of the acrophonic principle of the alphabet and (2) phonological shifts in the Attic-Ionic vowel-system. Of the two Semitic aspirate-signs $h\bar{e}th$ and $h\bar{e}$ the former was apparently the closer approximation to the single Greek *spiritus asper*, whence the original generalization of Semitic $h\bar{e}th = \langle \eta \rangle$ as representing Greek h - (or e.g. *he*-, on the acrophonic principle). Consequently, there was no need for another aspirate-sign, and the initial element of $h\bar{e}$ is viewed simply as \bar{e} from the Hellenic standpoint: hence the original generalization of Semitic $h\bar{e} = \langle \epsilon \rangle$ as representing both short- e and long- e in Greek. With the onset of psilosis (loss of *spiritus asper*) in East Ionic dialects, however, the initial element of $h\bar{e}th = \langle \eta \rangle$ becomes viewed as \bar{a} (which later loses its distinction from \bar{e}), whence now the restriction of $\langle \epsilon \rangle$ to representation of e and \bar{e} only, vs. the generalization of $\langle \eta \rangle$ for \bar{e} ($< \bar{a}$). For a Central Ionic dialect where \bar{a} and \bar{e} are still distinct and still represented by $\langle \eta \rangle$ and $\langle \epsilon \rangle$ respectively, cf. Buck 1955:190, on e.g. archaic Naxian; in this instance, however, there is the added complication that the orthographic systems of psilotic (East Ionic) and non-psilotic (Central Ionic) converge: hence $\langle \eta \rangle =$ both h - and \bar{a} respectively. Finally, the Attic-Ionic monophthongization of $*ei$ to \bar{e} in ca. the fifth century B.C. leads to the opportunity of representing all instances of \bar{e} , whether etymologically diphthongal or not, with $\langle \epsilon \iota \rangle$. If this Attic-Ionic monophthongization had occurred ca. two centuries earlier, as in Corinthian (Buck 1955: 28–30), the putative sophistication of a separate graph $\langle \epsilon \iota \rangle$ for \bar{e} might have been regularized that much earlier in e.g. the Attic script too. For a general survey showing that the very introduction of a vocalic system into the Greek alphabet was no original invention but rather the generalization of a

Semitic mechanism founded on the principle of *matres lectionis*, cf. Gelb 1963:181–3; for a more specific study using like methodological principles, cf. Einarson 1967. We must acknowledge, however, that the practical improvement resulting from the separate representation of vowels and consonants is remarkable: it amounts to a shift from syllabary to alphabet, i.e. a movement away from the constraint of representing only phonetically concrete segments toward the admission of such phonetically abstract segments as *p t k* (which cannot be produced in isolation, e.g. without adjacent vowels or aspiration). For typological commentary on the limitations of a syllabary like Linear B in representing Greek, cf. Householder 1964 and Cowgill 1966:83–4, fn. 21. For an illuminating inquiry into the linguistic background of the Linear B script, cf. Lejeune 1966.

In the specific department of accentuation, we have to distinguish between intonation and stress (on the latter, cf. Allen 1966 and Part I *supra*). It is the former which preoccupies the testimony of grammatical tradition (cf. e.g. Wackernagel 1893/1953) and which partially preserves reflexes of Indo-European accentuation (Kuryłowicz 1958). To Jakobson (1937/1962) we owe the basic description of intonational dynamics: the interrelation between mora-structure and accent-limitation. Kuryłowicz has provided diachronic perspective by outlining the origins of Greek intonation (1958:106–13). Allen (1967) has added still further perspective on the mora-structure, even indirectly raising the issue whether recessive accentuation should be connected with generalization of intonational variants not *in pausa* (i.e. with a type of syntactic leveling; cf. especially pp. 46–7). For an approach to intonation using the techniques of generative phonology, cf. Kiparsky 1967. As for latter-day attempts to recreate ancient Greek intonation by training in pronunciation, Allen has put it succinctly (1968b:306): ‘A primary stumbling-block, as Pike explains, is not so much the inability to handle pitch, but rather to divorce lexical pitch from attitudinal intonation.’

Morphology

The present sequence of treating morphology immediately after phonology is appropriate because of the frequent interrelations between these two levels. It can even be formulated typologically, without specific reference to Greek, that where phonology and morphology come into conflict, the resolution is generally in favor of the morphological level. An ideal example from Greek itself is the morphological restoration of intervocalic *s* in e.g. the future tense (hence λύσω), despite its prehistoric loss on the phonological level (Lejeune 1955:79–81). (Alternative explanations are also possible, of course.) The key to such restoration is the factor of the morpheme-boundary: in the instance of the future, it is between verbal base and future-marker *s*: thus it is simply a matter of extension from base-final consonant + *s* to base-final vowel + *s*, whence the re-establishment of *s* between vowels. Where the base always ends in a vowel, on the other hand, *s* cannot be restored: hence optative -οι-ο, -αι-ο (never

*-οι-σο, *-αι-σο); elsewhere, the generalization of *s* from consonantal base-final to vocalic base-final is still attested in a state of transition: that is, morphological restoration of *s* has not yet leveled out the phonological reflex without it. Thus e.g. besides the morphological innovation μέμνη-σαι 'you remember' (Ψ 648), Homeric Greek also preserves the archaic phonological reflex μέμνη-αι (Φ 442; same meaning); cf. Lejeune 1955: 81. The relevance of such morphological restructuring to the language of Linear B is likewise discussed by Lejeune in the sub-article "Restauration analogique de la sifflante intervocalique" of "Notes de morphologie mycénienne" (1965:1-7).

If we define morphophonemic rules strictly in the sense of those phonological rules which apply only within a restricted morphological framework, then from within the confines of this definition we discover that there emerge markedly few instances of morphophonemic rules in Greek (or even in Indo-European), and this dearth is especially striking when we compare it with other languages of the world. Among the few morphophonemic rules that can be singled out in Greek is the generation of ν ἐφεκυστικόν after word-final -ε or -ι only in the dative plural -σι-ν (but not in e.g. dative singular -ι), in the 3rd singular or plural -σι-ν/-τι-ν, in the 3rd singular -ε-ν, and in a few select individual forms like εἴκοσι(ν) 'twenty', πέρυσι(ν) 'last year', ἄμμι-ν/ὑμμι-ν 'for us'/'for you' (cf. Schwyzler 1939:405-6). Another is the predetermination of -ο- or -ω- before the comparative formant -τερος, depending on whether the syllable preceding -ό-τερος or -ώ-τερος is long or short (cf. Schwyzler 1939: 534-5). Much research remains to be accomplished on such phenomena, especially from the diachronic standpoint, but there might be room here for some preliminary observations. The phonological conditioning exerted upon the alternation between e.g. two different morphemes, a typical morphophonemic situation, might for the sake of this discussion be connected with the starting-point of Kuryłowicz's fourth law of analogy (1945-49:169), which postulates that if new form A and old form B come into conflict for possession of the same function, then this function will retain its primary aspect but will also develop a new secondary aspect which is only a subdivision of the primary aspect, and that form A will acquire the primary function while form B will be relegated to the secondary. However, this typologically valuable formulation covers just one of several developmental options possible after form A and form B converge upon the same function. For example, form B may lose its status as a functional subordinate of form A and become completely disconnected from its old function, which becomes expropriated entirely by form A; or form B may be ousted altogether by form A, so that the former does not even survive; or again, forms A and B may both survive and remain equivalent, with their complementary distribution becoming determined not by functional factors (as is the case in Kuryłowicz's fourth law of analogy) but rather by the formal factor of phonological opposition. A particularly clear example of the last of the possibilities here proposed is the ultimate Hittite treatment of the Indo-European proclitic/enclitic morphemes *-o- and *-yo-, which show functionally distinct reflexes in several Indo-European languages; in Hittite, however, the reflexes of the two are equivalent (both meaning 'and') but phonologi-

cally conditioned, with *-a* (< **-o*) in final postconsonantal and *-ya* (< **-yo*) in final postvocalic position respectively (Watkins 1962c:16–17). Similar interpretations, then, might be developed for morphophonemic rules of Greek. In one instance, the historically extant phases themselves suggest the broad outlines of an explanation. The case in point is the morphophonemic conditioning of the preconsonantal augment in Demotic Greek: the general rule is that the augment occurs only where the accent would fall upon it: e.g. ἔ-γραψα ‘I wrote’ vs. γράψαμε ‘we wrote’. Now since the past-tense endings by themselves are functionally sufficient for the Demotic Greek verb, the augment is superfluous, whence its susceptibility to morphophonemic redistribution. But here the historical background is also relevant: in the earliest attested phases of Greek, attachment of the augment in past tenses was still optional, by virtue of its etymology as a segmentable syntactical connective (on which cf. Watkins 1962a:113–15, 1962c:13–16, Kiparsky 1968:45). The regularization of augment as obligatory marker of past tenses in classical Attic-Ionic should be considered as only transitional, as we can see from the newly-segmentable augment of Demotic past tenses, albeit caused this time by morphophonemic rather than syntactic factors. For an example of a work which reveals at least partial insight from a morphophonemic angle into a problem which had previously been treated only on the purely phonological level, we cite that of Winter 1950.

Aside from the obvious value of such synoptic treatments of Greek morphology as Chantraine’s in general (1961) or Risch’s in the particular sphere of Homeric Greek (1937), any attempt at surveying or evaluating trends in morphological studies is especially elusive. Customarily, the chosen basis of inquiry is a given suffix, the attested distribution of which is then thoroughly investigated, leading to diachronic conclusions often extending in relevance even to Indo-European. Distinguished examples of this genre are Lejeune’s work on *-θεν* (1939), Holt’s on *-σις* (1940), Redard’s on *-της/-τις* (1949), Prévot’s on *-θη-* (1935). Where the suffix in question is specifically derivational and not inflectional, many aspects of such studies may overlap with the factors of vocabulary (cf. *infra*, under *Etymology/Vocabulary*); for a comprehensive treatise where this overlapping is continually illustrated, cf. Chantraine 1933 on the taxingly broad subject of Greek nominal derivation. Specially to be noted for its cohesiveness in the simultaneous treatment of morphology, vocabulary, and syntax is Benveniste’s examination of *nomina agentis/actionis* and ordinals from the Indo-European viewpoint (1948), with pivotal evidence adduced from Greek. As for an exemplary treatment of suffixal formations which are inflectional rather than derivational, we cite Chantraine’s history of the Greek perfect (1926). For diachronic analysis of inflectional categories, the evidence of heteroclitics provides particularly valuable material, as demonstrated by Meillet 1926; on Greek heteroclitics specifically, cf. Egli 1954. Implications of the dichotomy between inflectional and derivational categories, as well as several other morphological typologies viewed principally from the Indo-European standpoint, have been outlined by Kuryłowicz (1964), often with instructive references to Greek examples.

A contemporary book on Greek morphology which is distinguished for its originality in inventive conception and format is Kastner's investigation (1967) of simplex adjectives in *-ος/-ov* (instead of *-ος/-η/-ov*). In the compound adjectives of e.g. Attic, the prevalent split from an originally unitary animate *-ος* into a binary masculine/feminine opposition *-ος/-η* has been repressed by an obligatory rule, which thereby preserves the archaism of an old animate/inanimate opposition *-ος/-ov* inherited from Indo-European. In the simplex adjectives as distinct from the compound, by contrast, the new tripartite rearrangement into masculine/feminine/neuter = *-ος/-η/-ov* has prevailed; but the archaic arrangement *-ος/-ov* has been sporadically preserved for simplex adjectives too, because of the archaism of certain inherited combinations of *o*-stem adjective + feminine substantive. It is these sporadic reflexes which Kastner undertakes to investigate, and his collocation-oriented examination thus constitutes an intensive survey of archaic expressions within archaic contexts, thereby becoming a veritable panorama of archaisms in the social and cultural heritage of Greece; at the same time, this panorama is neatly delimited in scope by a single morphological factor. Even Kastner's indices are a revelation: in one of them (1967:131-2: *Die wichtigsten Wortfelder*), for instance, we find a guide to the various semantic spheres in which the archaic combination of *o*-stem adjective + feminine substantive may be found; among the rubrics of this index are: religion (sacrifice, hearth, festivals, oath, oracles, etc.), government and law, heredity, epichoric features, etc. The novelty of Kastner's approach, then, is that besides morphological archaisms themselves, their combinatory features are also taken into consideration; and this amounts to a survey of old contexts as well as old forms.

A notable example of a straightforward study on evanescent vs. incipient morphological mechanisms is Seiler's treatment of the Greek comparatives (1950). Schwyzer's critical comparison of Greek *-άζω* with Gothic *-atja* (1937), on the other hand, is an ideal illustration of the procedural need to examine both the derivational distribution and the functional exponents of a Greek suffix in terms of Greek itself before any attempt at comparison with an apparent formal cognate from the Indo-European standpoint. A similar lesson may be derived from Cowgill's detailed analysis (1964) of two difficult forms from the Cypriote *Edalion Bronze*.

On the morphological as also on other linguistic levels, the Homeric corpus frequently preserves archaisms lost elsewhere in extant Greek. For example, such Homeric expressions as *ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο* or *ἱερὴ ἱς Τηλεμάχοιο*, which at first seem like stylistically-motivated periphrastic constructs, actually turn out to be reflexes from a prehistoric period when the so-called Caland's rule was still operative. This rule is of Indo-European origin and essentially entails the following distribution: suffix **-i-* for adjective-root when it is the first constituent of a compound, vs. suffix **-ro-* replacing **-i-* when the root forms a simplex adjective and is not in compound formation (cf. Caland 1893 and Wackernagel 1897/1953). Thus **ἱεπο-μενο-* or **ἱεπο-φι-* would be violations of Caland's rule, since *ἱε-πο-* is the non-compound variant; on the other hand, the phonological reflexes of the morphologically pre-

dictable **isai-(meno-)* or **isai-(wi-)* would disrupt any overt synchronic formal connection with non-compound *ἱερός* (i.e. **iei-* or the like could no longer be perceived as related to *ἱερό-*). Hence the circumvention resulting in *ἱερόν μένος* or *ἱερή ἱς* + genitive; but the very occurrence of this circumvention indicates that Caland's rule was still operative at the time that these expressions became embedded in the Epic formulaic system (cf. Pagliaro 1961:114, fn. 16 and Schmitt 1967:111, fn. 678).

Homeric diction, in fact, is replete with morphological phenomena long since replaced by new counterparts in classical Greek. For example, let us consider the phenomenon, well-attested in classical Greek, of *n*-infix present-tense formations generated from the old thematic ('2nd') aorist: e.g. present *λήθω*, aorist *ἔ-λαθ-ον* → new present *λα-ν-θ-άνω*; present *λείπω*, aorist *ἔ-λιπ-ον* → new present *λι-μ-π-άνω* (Sapphic); present *φεύγω*, aorist *ἔ-φυγ-ον* → new present *-φυ-γ-γ-άνω*; present *κεύθω*, aorist *ἔ-κυθ-ον* → new present *κυ-ν-θ-άνω* (*κυνθάνει· κρύπτει*: Hesychios), etc.; cf. Schwyzler 1939:699–700. In many instances, the new *n*-infix present has ousted the older variant altogether: hence *μα-ν-θ-άνω* from *ἔ-μαθ-ον* (zero-grade root **m \acute{a} th-*), with only a trace of the older present (full-grade root **menth-*), in the nominal derivative *μενθήρη· φροντίς* (Hesychios). Elsewhere, the old present survives, because it was appropriated by the formulaic system of Homeric diction: hence Homeric present *πέυθομαι*, aorist *ἔ-πυθ-όμην* → classically prevalent present *πυ-ν-θ-άνομαι*. Significantly, forms of *πυνθάνομαι* occur only twice in the Homeric corpus, vs. 16 instances of *πέυθομαι*.

Syntax

In the area of comparative syntactical analysis, the Greek language has actually provided material for some new strides. For example, the technique of employing the analytical criterion marked/unmarked (from the functional standpoint) has been applied by Kiparsky (1968) to specific phenomena of Greek syntax (cf. also Jakobson 1932/1964 on the Russian verb), with explanations deriving these phenomena as reflexes of an Indo-European process which he calls conjunctive reduction. In effect, his main discussion concerns reflexes of the so-called injunctive in Greek and other Indo-European cognate languages: this injunctive essentially entails a neutralization of oppositions in tense and mood, wherein the verbal forms after the ensemble of first verb + conjunction revert to the unmarked exponent of the oppositions in tense and mood, namely to the injunctive. Especially interesting is Kiparsky's suggestion (1968:44) that from the Indo-European standpoint tense and mood were originally adverbial constituents in the deep structure (for the latter concept, cf. Chomsky 1965:16–18) and that they were in complementary distribution with certain functionally related classes of adverbs. Thus e.g. in the prohibitive constructions of Greek, *μή* is combined with the aorist subjunctive — *qua* reflex of the injunctive (= zero) mood — because *μή* itself is 'the realization of the mood constituent' (Kiparsky 1968:48). Now there is at least one other instance in Greek which illustrates that the same prin-

ciple used by Kiparsky on tense and mood might be applied to the verbal constituent of aspect as well. We read in a familiar Greek grammar like that of Smyth (1963:429) this definition of the aorist: 'The aorist expresses the mere occurrence of an action in the past. The action is regarded as an event or single fact without reference to the length of time it occupied.' This statement by itself provides an adequate description of the aspectually unmarked past tense (vs. the marked past tense called the imperfect), but it seems to become vitiated by a subdivision found further on in the book, one which alludes to a supposed capacity of the aorist to express the marked imperfective aspect as well: under the rubric *empiric aorist* (Smyth 1963:431), we read: 'With adverbs signifying *often, always, sometimes, already, not yet, never*, etc., the aorist expressly denotes a fact of experience (ἐμπειρίᾱ).' We may yet reconcile the apparent anomaly here by equating e.g. (1) *often* + unmarked aorist with (2) the marked imperfect without an overt adverbial adjunct but with an underlying adverbial implication of *often* by virtue of the aspectual markedness of the imperfect. As for the gnomic aorist in Greek (expressing a general truth without implication of tense), it is an archaic remnant from a prehistoric phase when the primary function of the aorist was not yet temporal but still aspectual (specifically, zero-aspect vs. marked imperfective aspect). By the period of classical Greek, however, a primary opposition in tense had developed (present vs. past), and the basic aspectual dichotomy had become a subdivision within the temporal framework: imperfective present vs. imperfective/aorist past; or, in traditional terms: present vs. past, with past subdivided into imperfect (marked) vs. aorist (unmarked). (It can also be argued that the aorist indicative is marked for aspect, while the imperfect is unmarked; both are marked for tense.)

Kiparsky also applies the principle of conjunctive reduction to case as well as mood and tense (1968:54-5). Given that the vocative is a marked nominative (cf. Part III *infra*), Kiparsky adduces several Vedic instances of vocative + conjunction followed by unmarked nominative. Since the conjunction *-ca* is enclitic, the actual Vedic realization of this conjunctive reduction is Voc Nom + *ca*. As for Greek, the cognate of *-ca* is enclitic *τε*; significantly, the same archaic construct as in Vedic is found in Greek only within the formulaic heritage of the Homeric corpus, and there too only once:

Γ 276 Ζεῦ πάτερ, Ἰδῆθεν μεδέων, κῦδιστε μέγιστε,
 Ἥελιός θ', ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷς καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις
 'Father Zeus, ruler of Ida, most renowned and greatest,
 and Sun, who oversees and hears all.'

That the type Ζεῦ πάτερ ... Ἥελιός θ' should still be extant at all is testimony to the preservative force of the Epic also in syntax. As Wackernagel puts it (1926:7), 'So enthüllt sich in dieser minimalen Kleinigkeit die Macht der Gewohnheit und der Einfluss der Vererbung.'

Aside from its preservation of such Indo-European archaisms as the one just discussed, Greek syntax is also replete with phenomena appropriate for the synchronic

study of linguistic universals. For example, let us consider Benveniste's typological formulation of the 3rd person singular as the zero-person functionally (1946/1966; cf. also 1956a/1966, 1958/1966); because of its function as zero-person, base + 3rd singular ending is subject to formal reinterpretation as base + zero ending, with the old ending absorbed into the base, whence the constitution of new conjugational paradigms on the now new base. That is, as Watkins points out (1962:90–6), the productive endings of the other persons can now be added directly onto what used to be base + 3rd person ending but which has become reinterpreted as pure base + zero ending. Such a paradigmatic shift, based on a functionally-prompted formal resegmentation, is obvious in e.g. the paradigm of the verb 'be' in Polish (with the exemption of only the 3rd plural):

| | singular | plural |
|-----|---------------|------------------|
| 1st | <i>jestem</i> | <i>jestęśmy</i> |
| 2nd | <i>jestes</i> | <i>jesteście</i> |
| 3rd | <i>jest</i> | <i>są</i> |

(For this example and others, cf. Watkins, *Ibid.*) The same sort of paradigmatic shift is evidenced by Demotic Greek, in e.g. the 2nd and 3rd singular of contract verbs like *ρωτάεις*, *ρωτάει* extant in Epeiros, Central Greece, Ionic Islands, Peloponnesos. What we see here is the addition of the productive 2nd singular and 3rd singular endings -εις and -ει to the old 3rd singular form (ἐ)ρωτᾷ, still preserved elsewhere in Greece along with 2nd singular *ρωτᾷς* (cf. Thumb 1910/1964:170–1; the iota subscript in the preceding transcriptions is of course merely orthographic).

Brief lists of noteworthy *Einzelschriften* on Greek syntax are readily available in e.g. the treatise of Löfstedt 1956a and b *passim* (especially 1956a:xiii–xxv) — despite the primary concern there with Latin. Singled out here as examples of syntactical treatises on Greek are the following: Denniston 1954, Burguière 1960, Guiraud 1962, Monteil 1963. Particular illuminating insights into Greek syntax (as well as Latin and Germanic) are to be found in Wackernagel's distinguished *Vorlesungen über Syntax* (1926, 1928); in fact, it is safe to predict that this collection of observations will remain useful for countless succeeding generations of linguistic scholarship, on the merit of its concentration on typologies and its straightforward exposition of intuitively appealing concepts; for an example, we may cite Wackernagel's discussion of the 3rd singular in terms of *die unpersönlichste Form* (1926:113, with the adducing of forms like *σαλπίζει* 'the trumpet is blown') — in anticipation of Benveniste's definitive treatise on the 3rd singular in 1946 (cf. *supra*).

But even aside from such synoptic works as Wackernagel's, it is important to note that there are numerous trend-setting observations on syntax in such compendia as the *Griechische Grammatik* vol. 2 of Schwyzler and Debrunner. What now follows is an illustrative selection of such observations, with commentary, from the first 150 pages of this volume.

Certain case-functions no longer current might still survive embedded in onomastic

compounds, prone to archaism: e.g. the genitive in Διόσδοτος 'given from Zeus'; cf. the German plant-name *Vergissmeinnicht* 'forget-me-not' (with residual genitive *mein*) vs. the current syntagma *vergiss mich nicht!* (6, fn. 4).

Just as the French genitive *de* + noun springs from Latin *dē* + noun/ablative, a syntagma restricted in classical Latin to just one area of functional overlapping with the genitive, namely the partitive, so also many of the Greek case-forms inherited from Indo-European might have originally borne a similarly restricted function, later subsumed into the broader functional categories of the evolving case-system (9–10). In other words, just as French *de* + noun betrays a systematic removal of functional constraints from the historical standpoint of Latin (inasmuch as the Latin equivalence of partitive noun/genitive = partitive *dē* + noun/ablative leads to the latter's extension into the functions of possessive etc. originally restricted to the former, and then to the ultimate displacement of the former by the latter), so also in Greek a case like the dative must have an Indo-European antecedent far more restricted functionally.

'Das Mundartstudium, das besonders fruchtbar ist, wenn der es betreibende Gelehrte selbst noch eine Mundart spricht, ist auch für die Syntax als Kontrolle und Anregung unentbehrlich' (10).

A list of syntactical innovations in Greek, juxtaposed with those of other Indo-European languages implicitly illustrates the principle of common innovation (12).

Modern Greek compensates for loss of the dual by 'die Anschauung der Paarigkeit' in nominal composition: e.g. ἀνδρόγυνον 'married couple', γυναικόπαιδα 'wife and children', etc. (12).

Syntactically most versatile, from the Indo-European/Greek points of view, is the substantive: it may function as subject, object, attribute and apposition, predicate, adverb; the adjective is restricted to the functions of attribute, predicate, adverb; the verb serves as predicate (17).

In the Epic, the formal archaisms τοί ται (masculine/feminine plurals of ὁ ἡ τό etc.) are attested with the obligatory function of demonstratives: this is also the most archaic function of ὁ ἡ τό etc. that we can reconstruct from Indo-European; on the other hand, the formal innovations οἱ αἱ (modeled on singular ὁ [ᾱ >] ἡ respectively) are only optionally demonstratives and are also attested e.g. in the function of definite article (20–1). Since it is the latter function of ὁ ἡ τό etc. which ultimately prevails in classical Ionic, the preclassical antecedent of which is the last and most important major dialectal layer of the Epic, it is crucial that the very language of the Epic thus betrays, through its hierarchy of functional constraints, the functional progression of ὁ ἡ τό etc. from demonstrative to definite article in Ionic. Likewise with e.g. τοῖο τῶων τοῖσι(ν): none of these has been retained in classical Ionic, and each is attested exclusively with the archaic demonstrative function in the Epic; by contrast, the corresponding forms of classical Ionic, τοῦ τῶν τοῖς, are attested in the Epic both as demonstrative and as definite article. Nor are the constraints just functional; another sign of the archaism of e.g. τοῖο and τῶων is positional: τοῖο occurs almost exclusively in the first or fifth foot of the dactylic hexameter, while τῶων is in absolute

line-initial position everywhere in the Homeric corpus except Π 833 (for more on the archaism of $\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$, cf. *infra* under *Dialectology*). No such positional restrictions hold for $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ and $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$, which are the forms that have prevailed in classical Ionic, including of course Attic (21). It is such collocational evidence, by virtue of its cumulative impact, which has led to the following operational principle in formulaic analysis (as practiced e.g. by Ruijgh 1957 and Hoekstra 1965): the narrower the range of positional variation for any given word or phrase in the dactylic hexameter of the Epic, the greater the archaism involved. Epic, of course, is not the sole repository for such archaisms; an equally potent preservative, *mutatis mutandis*, is the genre of Lyric. Thus for example the poetry of Archilochos reveals a restriction of $\delta\ \eta\ \tau\acute{o}$ etc. to the pronominal usage (23). Or again, in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousai* 100 ff., the absence of articles in Agathon's lyrical outpourings is noticeable in contrast to their presence in the adjacent dialogue (23, fn. 1). Legal formulae too provide an ideal context for petrified demonstrative usage of $\delta\ \eta\ \tau\acute{o}$ etc., as in the expression $\tau\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\ \delta\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\tau\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$, Plato's *Laws* 721b (21, fn. 8). Even ordinary Attic prose has sporadically preserved the demonstrative function, embedded in such phrases as $\delta\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \dots\ \delta\ \delta\epsilon,\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu,\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, etc.; a typological parallel is German *dér Art*, French *de lá sorte* (21, fn. 11). In certain archaic expressions, precedent for the insertion of the functionally recent definite article has been consistently wanting: hence such inherited collocations as $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu,\ \pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\varsigma,\ \delta\epsilon\chi\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \delta\iota\delta\acute{o}\nu\alpha\iota$, etc. (24); in some cases the collocation can be more precisely defined in terms of syntactical components: e.g. prepositional phrases like $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\ \theta\acute{\eta}\rho\alpha\nu,\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\iota}\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, etc. and possessive constructions like $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ (instead of $\tau\acute{o}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$), $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{\eta}\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\varsigma$, etc. (24). Finally, as an extension of Kiparsky's already-mentioned theories on conjunctive reduction (1968), it is possible to cite the cancellation of the second article: $a(b+c)$ instead of $ab+ac$; e.g. $\tau\eta\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \gamma\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota,\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{\eta}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, Thucydides 1.143.5 (24). It is significant that the marked exponent ac is the innovation and the unmarked c , the archaism. Likewise in e.g. Vedic, the unmarked injunctive (c) is formally older than any of the four moods (ac) from which it is conjunctionally reduced, in a synchronic sense.

Residually-attested suffixless cases such as $\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\acute{\epsilon}\nu/\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ are explained as reflexes of a caseless period in Indo-European (56).

In Attic, $\tilde{\omega} +$ vocative becomes the unmarked correlate of the plain vocative, which takes on the marked function of indicating 'die Bedeutung des streng Sachlichen, Zurücksetzenden, Würdigen, Kalten, auch Unwilligen, Formlosen, Verächtlichen' (61); hence e.g. in *de Corona*, Demosthenes addresses his opponent exclusively as Αἰσχίνη , not $\tilde{\omega}\ \text{Αἰσχίνη}$ (*Ibid.*). Or again, in Plato's *Symposium* $\tilde{\omega}$ occurs $70\times$ with proper names and is missing only $8\times$, while the *Protagoras* yields exclusively $\tilde{\omega} +$ proper name, ca. $100\times$ (61, fn. 2).

The vocative is examined as a functionally restricted compartment of the nominative, from the diachronic point of view (59, fn. 3; 63); thus a formal split between nomina-

tive/vocative may result from an earlier unitary nominative. Certain petrified expressions dating back to a period before this formal split may actually preserve the archaism of nominatives in vocative function and resist the imposition of a specific vocative form: hence e.g. the formulaically-preserved φίλος for φίλε, in φίλος || ὦ Μενέλαε ‡, Δ 189, etc.

One of the most valuable statements on methodology in syntactical analysis (67): 'Dem Sprachpraktiker, der in erster Linie dem Verständnis und der Übersetzung der Texte zu dienen hat, steht das Häufige und Eigentümliche im Vordergrund (so der Akkusativ des Objekts und der accusativus Graecus); dem Sprachhistoriker müssen vielleicht Verwendungen zum Ausgangspunkt werden, die dem Praktiker nur Unregelmässigkeiten oder erratische Blöcke sind (der Akkusativ der Richtung).' Of course, the locus of diffusion (*Ausgangspunkt*) is often elusive as an operative mechanism, simply because the given grammatical category may no longer be productive, and such a condition leads to atrophy of old boundaries. Vestigial features in turn count as irregularities from the synchronic point of view, whence the difficulty in effecting an adequate diachronic perspective. Therefore it seems justified to modify the claim that 'Jede Anordnung — und dies gilt nicht nur für die Kasuslehre — ist ein Kompromiss' (67): the inevitable compromise may simply be the after-effect of jamming together the synchronic and diachronic perspectives. After all, Schwyzer himself succeeds in deriving the accusative of the object from the accusative of goal/direction (70); once this is diachronically achieved, a synchronic analysis may still justifiably be expected to induce new and different perspectives.

Certain transitive verb-formants which evolved within Greek, such as aorist in -σα-, aspirated perfect, and perfect in -κ-, may represent formal *termini ante quem* for genesis of the functionally objective accusative (71).

On the syntagma known as σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος, where a double-accusative construction specifies both person and part of body, e.g., τόν ῥ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ... βάλε δουρὶ | κόρσῃν 'Odysseus aimed and hit him with a spear on the temple' (Δ 501–2): 'Die Entstehung des Schemas durch Zusammenziehung von zwei Sätzen ist im Musterbeispiel angedeutet' (81). In essence, what has been contrasted here is 'deep' vs. 'surface' structure (cf. Chomsky 1965:136, 198–9).

List of distinctions, in functional load, between various morphemes originating from Indo-European and ultimately belonging to the genitive case (90): e.g. *-ōt/d had once been exclusively ablative, not partitive; or again, *-ōm had once been exclusively partitive and possessive. Such an accumulation of distinctions establishes in broad outline a relative chronology for the *Entstehungsgeschichte* of the genitive case as attested in classical Greek.

A functional opposition between genitive and ablative, despite formal merger in Greek, can nonetheless be formally preserved — by combination (100); thus e.g. the formal contrast of comparative vs. superlative, combined with the formal genitive, makes overt an opposition between functional ablative and functional genitive respec-

tively: σοφώτερος πάντων 'wisest' = 'wiser than all' (ablative) vs. σοφώτατος πάντων 'wisest' = 'wisest among all' (genitive, specifically partitive).

That the *genitivus auctoris* of Greek was not originally ablative is readily demonstrable from other Indo-European languages: e.g. the type Διόσδοτος is paralleled in Sanskrit by the regular construction of genitive (indicating agent) + verbal adjective in *-ta-*; since Sanskrit still preserves a formal distinction between genitive and ablative, its syntactical testimony is decisive (119).

Despite formal collapse of the instrumental, locative, and dative in favor of the last, the classical Greek dative never really became a syntactically integral entity (138): 'vom echten Dativ und unter sich bleiben einzelne Anwendungen des Lokativs und Instrumentals syntaktisch stets geschieden, und die Unterschiede werden auch wieder sichtbar durch den Präpositionsgebrauch (im allgemeinen ἐν u.a. bei lokativischem, σύν bei instrumentalem Dativ, Präpositionslosigkeit beim echten Dativ).' Such lack of syntactical consolidation must have contributed to the formal loss of the dative in Modern Greek; even in the latter, the instrumental function of the dative has gone on its own way, so to speak, from the formal point of view: 'seinen eigenen Weg geht' (139); hence μετά/μέ + accusative, vs. εἰς + accusative for the functions of locative and genuine dative. Also to be consulted is Humbert 1930 on the loss of the dative in Greek.

Etymology and Vocabulary

A basic prerequisite of etymological studies in general, as Benveniste has pointed out, is simply 'common sense' (1954/1966: 289):

Mais, en matière de sens, on n'a pour guide qu'une certaine vraisemblance, fondée sur le 'bon sens', sur l'appréciation personnelle du linguiste, sur les parallèles qu'il peut citer. Le problème est toujours, à tous les niveaux de l'analyse, à l'intérieur d'une même langue ou aux différentes étapes d'une reconstruction comparative, de déterminer si et comment deux morphèmes formellement identiques ou comparables peuvent être identifiés par leur sens.

But the 'sens' of a linguistic form must be viewed in the entire ensemble of its distribution. One of Benveniste's most dramatic illustrations involves the Greek word πόντος 'sea' and its formal cognates in other Indo-European languages: Latin *pōns* 'bridge', Armenian *hun* 'ford', Old Church Slavonic *pъtъ* and Old Prussian *pintis* 'path', Sanskrit *pānthāḥ*, and Avestan *pantā* 'path'. The problem is to bridge the semantic gulf between e.g. Greek πόντος and Latin *pōns*. Benveniste maintains that the key to the solution is to discover which, if any, of the cognates preserves the primary meaning, the least common denominator (1954/1966: 296): the secondary meanings of the other cognates could then be motivated as divergences from (or modifications of) the primary meaning. After arguing that the semantic spheres of e.g. *hun* 'ford', πόντος 'sea', and *pōns* 'bridge' must be secondary because they are mutually irreconcilable, Benveniste shows that the semantic common denominator survives in

Indo-Iranian, most clearly seen in the Vedic usages of *pánthāḥ*, commonly glossed as 'path', 'chemin' (1954/1966: 297–8):

Ce qui caractérise le *pánthāḥ* est qu'il n'est pas simplement le chemin en tant qu'espace à parcourir d'un point à un autre. Il implique peine, incertitude et danger, il a des détours imprévus, il peut varier avec celui qui le parcourt, et d'ailleurs il n'est pas seulement terrestre, les oiseaux ont le leur, les fleuves aussi. Le *pánthāḥ* n'est donc pas tracé à l'avance ni foulé régulièrement. C'est bien plutôt un 'franchissement' tenté à travers une région inconnue et souvent hostile, une voie ouverte par les dieux à la ruée des eaux, une traversée d'obstacles naturels, ou la route qu'inventent les oiseaux dans l'espace, somme toute un chemin dans une région interdite au passage normal, un moyen de parcourir une étendue périlleuse ou accidentée. L'équivalent le plus approché sera plutôt 'franchissement' que 'chemin', et c'est bien ce sens qui explique la diversité des variantes attestés.

Thus it is from the pristine notion of 'chemin' that the ultimate context of πόντος has developed, and it is this same semantic sphere which gave rise to such Epic expressions as ὕγρα κέλευθα (Frisk, *GEW* II.579). As for the still more basic notion of 'franchissement', it is still preserved in the compound Ἑλλάς-ποντος (Benveniste 1954/1966: 298).

The notion of 'une étendue périlleuse ou accidentée' is still latent in Homeric collocations of πόντος with the harmless-looking epithet ἰχθυοίς:

- δ 516, ψ 317 πόντον ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντα φέρειν βαρέα στενάχοντα (cf. also ε 420)
 'took him, heavily groaning, over the *ichthuois* ["fish-filled"] *pontos*'
 (Subject: *thuella* 'squall')
 κ 458 ἡμὲν ὅσ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθει' ἄλγεα ἰχθυόεντι
 'and how much suffering you underwent in the *ichthuois pontos*'.

(For other collocations of πόντος with πάσχειν, perhaps likewise relevant to *pánthāḥ* from the comparative point of view, cf. α 4, β 370, ε 377.) The original selection of ἰχθυοίς was probably motivated not by a striving for fanciful descriptions of the sea, but rather, by the implication of lurking danger underneath the ship:

- ξ 135 ἢ τὸν γ' ἐν πόντῳ φάγον ἰχθύες ... 'or the fish devoured him in the *pontos*'
 ω 291 ἢέ που ἐν πόντῳ φάγον ἰχθύες ... 'or perhaps the fish devoured him in the *pontos*'.

Of course it can happen that in a given set of cognates with a Greek word, the least common denominator of the semantic sphere is no longer extant in any of the Indo-European languages with relevant lexical evidence. For example, despite the formal correspondence between Greek δίκη and Sanskrit *disā*, there is a functional anomaly between the two, in that neither can be motivated semantically in terms of the other: the second means 'direction, celestial district' vs. the basic notion 'rule, ruling' in the first. The *-ā*-stem in both is irrelevant to this anomaly: it is just a formal renovation of the root-stem **dik-*, and the latter is actually attested in Sanskrit *dis-*, with the same meaning as that of *disā*; so also in Latin *dic-is* (*causā*) '(for the sake of) judicial form', with basically the same meaning as that of δίκη. But we may seek a more general

functional relevance in the morphology: specifically, in the expansion of the root-stem by *ā*-stem here: it is significant that the latter is an inherited formant of deverbative *nomina actionis*. Thus the nominal root-stem **dik-* was also a *nomen actionis* until its replacement by **dik-ā-*. And the founding verb is still reflected in Greek: δείκνυμι 'designate'; then from the original root-stem *nomen actionis* **dik-* 'designation' evolve the specific notions 'direction, celestial district' (*dis-/disā-*) and 'rule, ruling' (δίκη): cf. Palmer 1950, 1956; also Chantraine 1968:284. And since there is no indication that a *nomen actionis* with the configuration **dik-* was not already inherited from Indo-European, we may by extension call *disā* and δίκη cognates.

Often, however, the etymology given as the least common denominator of the semantic sphere may seem to be nothing more than a conjecture, if the only criterion is the formal pairing of a given Greek word with an apparent cognate from some other Indo-European language. Thus e.g. from the matching of Greek θέλγω 'enchant' with Lithuanian *žvelg(iù)* 'glance', we might surmise that the original meaning of the base, from the Indo-European standpoint, had been 'enchant by glancing at' (cf. Frisk, *GEW* I.659). The latter gloss serves as an adequate least common denominator, in that the ultimate semantic development of Lithuanian *žvelgiù* could then be viewed as involving loss of the hieratic and retention of the physical connotation; as for Greek θέλγω, by the same token, there is loss of the physical and retention of the hieratic connotation. Such a theory would seem circular, however (cf. the doubts expressed by Frisk, *Ibid.*, on 'Bezauberung durch den bösen Blick'), if it were not for the corroborating evidence available from the language of the Epic. The formulaic structure of the latter genre has insured the preservation of grammatical configurations and syntagmata from such varied diachronic phases as to span about a millennium, sometimes within the very same line of dactylic hexameter. From the Homeric corpus, the following phrases are relevant to the etymological problem at hand (|| = 'caesura', # = 'absolute line-initial/final position'):

Ω 343, ε 47, ω 3: || ὄμματα θέλγει #

N 435: # θέλξας ὄσσε φαεινά ||.

Both phrases are traditional: the first occurs exclusively in the archaic slot between the bucolic diaeresis and absolute line-final position, the so-called Adonic segment (with metrical pattern as in Sapphic ὦ τὸν Ἄδωνιν); the second, between the end of the first foot and the trochaic caesura, is in a slot which allows interchange with the same Adonic segment. In fact, just such an interchange is attested, in the Adonic segment itself, for this particular phrase (# ~ ∪ ∪) ὄσσε φαεινά ||: e.g. || ὄσσε φαεινῶ # in N 3, etc. (For the variation of innovated φαεινά vs. archaic φαεινῶ, cf. ἤμιν before the trochaic caesura vs. ἤμιν in absolute line-final position, as discussed *infra* under *Dialectology*.) Given the archaic nature of these Epic connections between θέλγω and words for 'eye(s)', we may posit the formulaic preservation of the physical connotation originally inherent to the ancestral forms of θέλγω but ultimately eroded

in Greek, except for residual evidence in the collocational patterns of the Homeric corpus.

At times the collocational patterns of a given word in the Epic may suggest an etymological connection with another Greek word, even without the additional aid of any comparative Indo-European evidence as in the case of θέλω. An example is ἥρως, a word for which, apparently, no Indo-European cognates are verified. From the internal evidence of Greek alone, it is possible to compare the feminine proper names Πατρώ Μητρώ Ἡρώ with the masculine substantives πάτρωζ μήτρωζ ἥρωζ (Schulze 1966/1885: 50), but beyond this point it is difficult to make further morphological generalizations. In the Epic meter, the archaism of ἥρως is apparent from the highly restricted positional range of e.g. its nominative; although the flexibility of the dactylic hexameter could have theoretically allowed eleven positions, ἥρως is actually found in only these three: (1) absolute line-initial, (2) absolute line-final, (3) paired with the preceding word γέρων, after the trochaic caesura. In one of these archaic slots (2), Ruijgh (1957: 37–8) has noticed an interesting precedent for substitution: whereas the formula αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἥρως occurs after the bucolic diaeresis 7 times in the Homeric corpus, there is also one instance of αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' Ἡρην (Φ 367) attested in the same metrical slot. Ruijgh supposes that this formulaic interchange between Ἡρην and ἥρως was motivated by 'l'association des sons' (1957: 38). Another instance of this substitution in the same slot is absolute line-final ἥγαγεν Ἡρην of *E* 731 vs. ἄγεν ἥρως of *K* 179; here too the explanation of 'l'association des sons' could still possibly be invoked, but there also emerge other instances which show that this association of ἥρως and Ἡρην calls for a different and deeper motivation. For example, the absolute line-final ἥλυθεν ἥρως of γ 415 is matched by the common formula ἥλυθεν Ἡώς 'dawn came' of κ 541 etc., where again the factor of sound-association might still be claimed, but in this case there are attested further matchings which rule out such a purported factor: e.g. ἥλυθε μήτηρ 'mother came' (*Z* 251) and ἥλυθεν ὄρνις 'bird came' (Θ 251, υ 242) in the same metrical slot. It is crucial that there is a latent contextual link joining Ἡρην, Ἡώς, μήτηρ, and ὄρνις:

1. like Ἡρην, Ἡώς is a goddess:

E 721, etc.: # Ἡρην, πρέσβα θεά ||

B 48: # Ἡώς μέν ῥα θεά ||

Hymn to Aphrodite 223, 230: || πότνια Ἡώς #

δ 513, etc.: || πότνια Ἡρην #

2. μήτηρ is a regular title of goddesses in line-final position:

A 357, etc.: || πότνια μήτηρ #

3. a standard epiphany of goddesses is in the form of an ὄρνις (Nilsson 1921: 13–14):

e.g. α 319: ... ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, | ὄρνις δ' ὥς ἀνοπαῖα διέπτατο. τῷ δ'
ἐνὶ θυμῷ | θῆκε μένος καὶ θάρσος, ὑπέμνησέν τέ ἐ πατρός | μᾶλλον
ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθεν. '... glaukōpis Athena went away and like a bird
she flew up, and into his *thumos* she put strength and daring, and she
reminded him of his father even more than before'.

In the last three lines above, the attributes of a hero are being conferred on Telemachos by the goddess appearing as a bird. So too in *E* 778–9, Hera and Athena have a joint epiphany as birds for the sake of helping the Achaeans:

αἱ δὲ βάτην τρήρωσι πελειάσιν ἴμαθ' ὅμοῖαι, | ἀνδράσιν Ἀργείοισιν ἀλεξέμεναι
μεμαυῖαι. 'the two of them went, like ... doves, eager to protect the Argive men.'

Thus even contextually as well as formulaically, the ἥρως is correlated with goddesses. And the fact that the mother-goddess *par excellence*, Ἥρη (even Athena is her surrogate: e.g. *A* 194–5), is included in these correlations with ἥρως now takes on a formal significance: i.e. that the language of the Epic betrays traces of an early period when the masculine configuration **hērōs* was still synchronically motivated by a feminine **hērā*. There may even be traces of stylistic juxtaposition, as in *E* 747–8 = *Θ* 391–2:

ἥρων οἴσιν τε κοτέσσεται ὀβριμοπάτρη
Ἥρη δὲ μάστιγι θοῶς ἐπεμαίετ' ἄρ' ἵππους.

It is also significant that the Hellenic ἥρως *par excellence* is none other than Ἡρακλῆς.

Once granted that a connection between ἥρως and Ἥρη can be detected from the language of the Epic, we may claim a new corroboration of Nilsson's theories on the evolution of the Mycenaean mother-goddess in general and of Athena in particular. From non-linguistic evidence, Nilsson posited that the Minoan mother-goddess had originally been a guardian-deity residing in the king's palace (1921:16); but with the advent of Mycenaean hegemony and the concomitant usurpation of Minoan institutions, the goddess took to the field, as it were, in support of the warlike Mycenaean princes now in her charge: 'Sie ist die Beschützerin und persönliche Helferin der Helden' (*Ibid.*). While Zeus is the patron of a king like Agamemnon from the legal and moral points of view, a goddess like Athena is a hero's patroness from the personal point of view: whence the possibility of actually inheriting the latter relationship, as from Odysseus to Telemachos (*Ibid.*). Now we may add that the relationship of a personal charge **hērōs* to a patroness **hērā* is grammatical as well as contextual.

After the above examples of establishing etymologies with the help of collocational evidence from archaic Greek poetry, it is important to add that collocational evidence from the archaic poetry of other Indo-European languages too occasionally helps settle the etymology of a Greek word. For instance, the derivation of νέκταρ, an archaic configuration owing its preservation in classical Greek perhaps solely to its transmission in the language of the Epic, can be resolved only with reference to Vedic poetry. The central etymological problem in νέκταρ is the semantic connection between its components. There is little difficulty with the initial νεκ-: it is radical theme II **a₂nek-* (in Benveniste's terminology; 1935:155) 'death', also seen in e.g. νεκ-ρός, νέκ-υς, νέκ-ες ('νεκροί: Hesychios), Latin *nex*, *ē-nec-tus*, *noxa*, *noceō*, etc.; Hittite *henk-an* 'pestilence, death' is an example of radical theme I **a₂enk-*. As for the final segment -ταρ, however, Benveniste's explanation in terms of a suffixal formation

(1935:18) leads to a semantic aporia, from the standpoint of the Homeric context of $\nu\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\rho/\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$. The solution of Thieme (1952a: 5–6) is that $-\tau\alpha\rho$ is not a suffix but rather the second constituent of a compound, from the root $*t\check{r}\check{\alpha}_2$ - as seen in the Sanskrit verb $t\acute{a}rati$ ‘overcome’: $*\check{\alpha}_2nek-tr\check{\alpha}_2$, with prevocalic external *sandhi*-generalization of the zero-grade $*-t\check{r}\check{\alpha}_2$ into $-\tau\alpha\rho$. The ideal corroboration of this etymology would be the Indic attestation of a syntagma involving ‘death’ + $*t\check{r}\check{\alpha}_2$ - corresponding to $\nu\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\rho$, i.e. corresponding to the Greek attestation of a compound originally motivated by this syntagma. Thieme could find no such combination in the *Rig-Veda* (1952a:15), but his efforts were proved justified by Schmitt (1961: 88), who succeeded in finding the sought combination in the *Atharva-Veda*, 4.35; in the refrain of this song of praise to the *odaná-*, the ‘rice-mess’ of the Brahmins, we read (1d–6d):

ténaudanénáti tarāṇi mṛtyúm
 ‘by that rice-mess let me overcome death’.

Likewise (2a):

yénátaran bhūtakṛtó ’ti mṛtyúm
 ‘by which [i.e. rice-mess] the being-makers overcame death’.

Likewise *Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā* 40.14 = *Īśopaniṣad* 14:

vināśéna mṛtyúm tīrtvá sámbhūtyāmṛtam aśnute
 ‘after having crossed death by destruction, he reaches immortality by becoming ...’
 (Thieme’s translation; Schmitt 1967:190, fn. 1131).

The Homeric word $\nu\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\rho$, then, is but a faint vestige of a whole nexus of related ritualistic terminology from the *indogermanische Dichtersprache*.

There are instances where an etymological solution is achieved without direct use of the comparative method but rather with internal analysis of the relevant Greek morphology and syntax. In the case of the Attic-Ionic particle $\acute{\alpha}\nu$, attempts to connect it with Latin *an* and Gothic *an* have proved unsuccessful, simply because the formal plausibility of this connection is not matched by the functional: neither the Latin nor the Gothic *an* is used as a potential particle.

This identification implies that an Indo-European *an* of unknown function persisted through the common proto-Greek period and was preserved solely by the speakers of Attic-Ionic and Arcadian (not Cypriot!), who employed it to differentiate the prospective subjunctive and the potential optative, whereas the other groups of Greeks, though making essentially the same syntactical differentiation (this is the essential common feature of all the Greek dialects), used another word. Such procedure violates the first law of etymology, which has been phrased ‘Look for Latin etymologies first on the Tiber’ (Palmer 1963a:90–1).

Attic-Ionic $\acute{\alpha}\nu$, then, must be compared with its equivalents in the other dialects: Arcadian (κ) $\acute{\alpha}\nu$, West Greek $\kappa\alpha$, Aeolic and Cypriote $\kappa\epsilon(v)$. We repeat that all these particles are syntactically equivalent to each other.

Now the zero-grade of a full-grade $\kappa\epsilon v$ would be $*k\check{n} > \kappa\alpha$ (in preconsonantal

position) or $\kappa\alpha\nu$ (in prevocalic position); then $\kappa\alpha\nu : \kappa\alpha = \kappa\epsilon\nu : \text{new } \kappa\epsilon$ (Forbes 1958:180). As for the West Greek $\kappa\bar{\alpha}$ (vs. $\kappa\alpha$), it can be explained as a metrically-conditioned variant (Forbes 1958:180). At this point, only $\check{\alpha}\nu$ remains to be motivated: the solution of Forbes (1958:182) is that $\check{\alpha}\nu$ is a new positive to a negative $\omicron\kappa\check{\alpha}\nu$; the etymologically false division of $\omicron\kappa\alpha\nu$ as $\omicron\kappa\check{\alpha}\nu$ instead of $\omicron\kappa\alpha\nu$ must have been triggered by the morphophonemic alternation of prevocalic $\omicron\kappa$ vs. preconsonantal $\omicron\kappa$. Furthermore, as Forbes points out (*Ibid.*),

It is remarkably interesting, if this solution is correct, that $\check{\alpha}\nu$ in Homer is found most frequently in the phrase $\omicron\kappa\check{\alpha}\nu$, commonly thought to be an Ionicism from Aeolic $\omicron\kappa\epsilon\nu$. It is hardly to be wondered at that $\omicron\kappa\epsilon\nu$ was not interpreted as $*\omicron\kappa\check{\epsilon}\nu$ where $*\check{\epsilon}\nu$ would be homonymous with the preposition. Likewise $\omicron\kappa\alpha$ would scarcely give rise to $*\omicron\kappa\check{\alpha}$ because there were no Greek words apart from certain forms of the article and the verb 'to be', which belonged to clear semantic groups, consisting only of a single vowel, except for the interjection δ (where also the vowel is long).

In sum, internal analysis forces us to connect Attic-Ionic $\check{\alpha}\nu$ not with Latin and Gothic *an*, but with e.g. Sanskrit *kám* and Hittite *kan*, however unlikely this equation seems at first, on the surface. Final corroboration comes from such collocational matchings as Homeric $\nu\omicron\kappa\epsilon\nu$ vs. Sanskrit *nú kám* vs. Hittite *nu-kan* (Forbes 1958:180).

As a conclusion to the discussion of trends in Greek etymology, it seems appropriate to cite some perceptive comments from the preface to Chantraine's dictionary (1968).

On the reasons for the last three words in the title, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque, histoire des mots* (modeled on the title of the famous Latin etymological dictionary by Ernout and Meillet, 1959): '... l'étymologie devrait être l'histoire complète du vocabulaire, reflet de l'histoire tout court, que je me suis donné le plus de peine' (vii).

On the application of structuralist methodology: 'Pour qu'une étymologie soit irréfutable, il est nécessaire d'une part que la structure du mot envisagé s'insère de manière évidente dans le système des alternances et de la morphologie indo-européenne, de l'autre que l'on trouve des correspondants nets dans plusieurs langues indo-européennes bien attestées' (viii).

On the controversial theories of a pre-Hellenic substratum commonly designated 'Pelasgian': 'Le pélasgique est pour l'instant une vue de l'esprit et son cas diffère essentiellement de celui de l'indo-européen. L'indo-européen n'est pas attesté, mais c'est un système cohérent défini par les lois rigoureuses. Ce n'est pas le cas du pélasgique et cela ne le sera peut-être jamais' (ix). For a detailed analysis of the Pelasgian issue, cf. e.g. Hester 1965.

On words from the pre-Hellenic non-Indo-European substratum: 'Il faut toutefois prendre garde que l'hypothèse de l'emprunt à une langue inconnue est une solution paresseuse et qu'il faut tâcher de tirer parti du témoignage des langues plus ou moins mal connues qui bordent les rives de la Méditerranée' (ix). For exemplars in methodology, cf. Heubeck 1961 and Neumann 1961.

On the etymology of words traceable to Indo-European: 'elle a donné naissance à une bibliographie accablante: examiner les multiples hypothèses qui sont venues à l'idée de savants d'ailleurs honorables et bien informés, c'est parcourir le plus souvent, comme on l'a dit, un cimetière d'enfants mort-nés' (vii-viii).

In the specific department of vocabulary, a current trend has been toward internal investigation of word-formations and away from an earlier emphasis on Indo-European origins. Representative of works about vocabulary which rely mainly on internal analysis are those of Fournier 1946, Laroche 1949, Trümper 1950, Redard 1953, Chantraine 1956, van Brock 1959, Bader 1965, Corlu 1966, Casabona 1967, Latacz 1967. Of course, the research still to be accomplished on Greek vocabulary from the Indo-European standpoint is boundless. Benveniste's 'Don et échange dans le vocabulaire indo-européen' (1951/1966) illustrates how rewarding such an approach may be. For example, the apparent semantic clash between Greek δω- 'give' and Hittite *dā-* 'take' does not invalidate the certainty that they are formal cognates, simply because both can be explained as verbal manifestations of a social institution called reciprocity, well-documented in latter-day anthropological fieldwork and in this instance deriving from an original Indo-European matrix: the root **dō-* actually means 'seize in order to engage in a social transaction', and its reflexes in Hittite and Greek merely show the generalization of one transactional option or the other, give or take; cf. Benveniste 1951/1966: 316-17. Besides several other illustrations from Greek showing reflexes of this phenomenon of reciprocity (e.g. νέμω, δαπάνη, ἀλφάνω, etc.), Benveniste's repertory of examples could even be expanded further: worth studying in this context, for example, is the usage of ὠνεῖν in the sense of πωλεῖν in Cretan, particularly Gortynian (cf. Willetts 1965). Or again, social implications derivative from the Indo-European perspective are invaluable in the study of such Greek tabu-constructs as λαγώς 'hare' < λαγ-ώς, diachronically traceable to the original meaning 'floppy-ears'; cf. Havers 1946: 51 and Benveniste 1949/1966: 311. For a valuable but brief diachronic study of a single Greek word, it is worth citing Burkert's perceptive investigation of *Elusion* (1960-61).

One of the most arduous tasks in the study of Greek vocabulary is to confront the elusive problem of early — even prehistoric — borrowings. A contemporary contribution has been that of Émilie Masson (1967), on the oldest layer of Greek borrowings from Semitic. As for borrowings from the neighboring Anatolian languages, an important advance has been Benveniste's establishing the ultimate provenience of ὄβρυζα 'crucible' from Hurrian-Hittite *hubrušhi* (DUG *hu-u-ub-ru-uš-ḫi*) 'vase de terre, terrine' (1962:126-31). Such links, aside from their linguistic value, are of profound significance from the viewpoint of cultural history as well. Accordingly, when factors revealing an ultimate Anatolian derivation appear in the Greek Epic itself, their import is all the more to be emphasized. Hence we must accord the most careful attention to the article of van Brock (1959) on Hittite ritual-substitution and its relevance to the *Iliad*. The Hittite ritual in question is meant to transfer a miasma from the king to a substitute, preferably to one that is alive: *le transfert du mal*. The

word for this substitute is *tarpalli-*. As for the conditioning on the selection of the surrogate, it is extraneously motivated, whence the range (or perhaps evolution) of the victim from relative to friend to stranger to criminal to animal to some symbolic object. But the basic principle is that the closer the surrogate is to the king, the more pleasing the sacrifice becomes to the gods. 'Le *tarpalli-* est un autre soi-même, une projection de l'individu sur laquelle sont transférées par la magie du verbe toutes les souillures dont on veut se débarrasser' (van Brock 1959:119). Now there are several nominal by-forms of *tarpalli-*, among them *tarpašša-* and *tarpanalli-*; and the themes *tarpassa-/tarpan-* van Brock has convincingly connected as the ultimate formal sources for θέραψ/θεράπων (1959:125 ff.). Moreover, the θεράπων *par excellence* in the *Iliad* is Patroklos himself, who is killed wearing the very armor of Achilles.

Π 653 ὄφρ' ἥς θεράπων Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
'until the good *therapōn* of Achilles, son of Peleus'
(context: Zeus ponders the death of Patroklos = the *therapōn*)

P 164 τοῖου γὰρ θεράπων πέφατ' ἀνέρος, ὃς μέγ' ἄριστος
'killed was the *therapōn* of such a man who is by far the best'
(context: the Trojans ponder what to do with the corpse of Patroklos)

Σ 151 οὐδέ κε Πάτροκλόν περ ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ
ἐκ βελέων ἐρύσαντο νέκυν, θεράποντ' Ἀχιλῆος
'nor could they, well-greaved Achaeans though they were,
save from the missiles the corpse, the *therapōn* of Achilles'

From the internal evidence of the *Iliad* itself and with an approach completely different from that of van Brock, Whitman (1958) has also noticed the same sort of surrogate-motif in the rôle of Patroklos, 'who represents the human side of Achilles' (136); 'Achilles is indispensable, but Patroclus is dead' (137). At the climactic moments of his onslaught in place of Achilles, even the epithet of Patroklos is switched from just the customary patronymic (Μενoitιάδης) or qualifier (ἱππεύς 'knight') to the title δαίμονι ἴσος 'equal to a god' (Π 705), even at the moment when Patroklos confronts Apollo himself (Π 786), just before the god destroys him; significantly, the epithet δαίμονι ἴσος is later applied to Achilles too (Y 447), who makes three charges like Patroklos, whence not only an echo of the *Patrokleia* but also a conjuring-up of the identity in rôles (cf. Whitman 1958:345, fn. 50). A convenient summary of Whitman's theory is the following (1958:200):

There can be little doubt that the change in Patroclus' character and characteristic epithets is not due simply to his presence in a battle scene. A kind of double image, as in surrealist painting, is involved. Patroclus is playing the *role* of Achilles [italics supplied]. For the moment, he has become Achilles, and acts much more like the great hero than like himself. [Cross-reference here to bibliography on the important theory that the *Patrokleia* of the *Iliad* was modeled on the death of Achilles in the *Aithiopis*.] When Achilles prays to Zeus for

Patroclus' safety, he seems to ask, indirectly, whether his friend can play his role adequately or not:

(Π 241ff.) ... Give him glory, far-sighted Zeus,
 Strengthen the heart in his breast, even that Hector
 May learn whether this companion of ours
 Knows how to wage the war, or if only his hands
 Rage resistless, when I myself go to the moil of Ares.

And the actual Greek word for 'companion' in Whitman's translation of Π 243 is *θεράπων*. Then too, given that the provenience of the god Apollo is Anatolian (cf. Frisk, *GEW* I.124–5), it is important to add the following quotation (Whitman 1958: 201–2):

Nowhere else in the *Iliad* [except in the slaying of Patroklos by Apollo] does a god directly, with his own hand, overcome a hero. The passage where Apollo approaches Patroclus like a mist is one of the most unholy terror, a blinding vision of the identity of glory and death. But it belongs to Achilles more than to the man who has only for the moment assumed the tragic mask. ... the bitterest poignancy in Achilles' tragedy lies not in his own death, but in that of the friend who was so far a part of himself that he played his mortality for him. Achilles accepted Patroclus as his proxy as a means of being at the same time above all other men and yet one of them, and this was, of course, impossible and incompatible with life.

In fact, the collocational evidence of the Homeric corpus might help remove some other reservations about traces of Greek-Anatolian contacts. For instance, the place-name *Lazpaš* in the Hittite documents has been tentatively connected with the Greek island Lesbos, but without hope of verification (cf. e.g. Page 1959: 24, fn. 4). Now in e.g. the document *Keilschriftkunden aus Boghazköi* XIX 5 Vs 8, *Lazpaš* is mentioned in the same context with an adventurer named *Piyamaraduš* (for a brief discussion, cf. Page, *Ibid.*). We suggest that the following passage from the *Odyssey* might be relevant:

(δ 342–4 = ρ 133–5)

τοῖος ἔὼν οἷός ποτ' ἐϋκτιμένη ἐνὶ Λέσβῳ
 ἐξ ἔριδος Φιλομηλείδῃ ἐπάλαισεν ἀναστάς,
 καδ' δ' ἔβαλε κρατερῶς, κεχάροντο δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί.
 'being such a man as the one who [i.e. Odysseus], in well-founded Lesbos,
 in rivalry stood up and wrestled Philomeleides
 and threw him down mightily, and all the Achaeans were glad'.

Granted, the collocational pairing of *Lazpaš*/*Piyamaraduš* vs. Λέσβος/Φιλομηλείδης might only lead to a mirage, but we insist here simply on a point of methodology: tentative formal comparisons of Hittite and Greek elements in a search for links must be accompanied by an investigation of combinatory factors in the respective contexts. Also, a matching of e.g. *Piyamaraduš* with Φιλομηλείδης, even if the latter seems to consist of plausible morphological segments in terms of Greek, does not inevitably suggest that the proposed Hittite counterpart is some deformation of a genuine Greek

construct: more likely, the Anatolian name *Piyamaraduš* would have been deformed into morphologically recognizable elements when it was taken over into Greek. (For a collection of arguments for the existence of Hittite/Greek contacts, supplemented with bibliography presenting the opposing arguments as well, cf. Harmatta 1968.)

In the study of Greek vocabulary, morphology and syntax are often contributing factors which must be considered. Awareness of such interrelations is especially evident in an article of Benveniste (1964): basing his observations especially on Greek designations for eating and drinking, he offers valuable typological insights on the historical interaction between lexical and suffixal factors. In the same work (1964: 34), Benveniste notes a disequilibrium in the nominal derivation with -τυχ from the root for 'eat' *ed- (ἐδῆτύς, with normalized base-enlargement) vs. the nominal derivation with -σις from the root for 'drink' *pδ- (πόσις). Such disequilibrium in these *nomina actionis* is not of Indo-European origin, however: the suffixes -τυχ and -σις had simply shifted onwards to other bases meaning 'drink' and 'eat' respectively. But this issue raises a still broader one: a functional distinction between the actual derivational suffixes -τυχ and -σις is indeed of Indo-European origin, as demonstrated by Benveniste himself in *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen* (1948). Besides the exposition of *nomina actionis* as well as *nomina agentis*, he also includes a treatment of the comparative, superlative, and the ordinal (1948:114-68) from the Indo-European standpoint but with a relevance to Greek syntax and vocabulary; for an extension of Benveniste's treatise on the syntax of the ordinal, with significant Greek examples included, cf. Watkins 1965:287-97.

In the field of lexicography, a contemporary advancement has been the issuance of a supplement to the ninth edition of Liddell/Scott's *Greek-English lexicon* (Barber et al. 1968). There are also important additions by Renihan (1968), derived mainly from the corpus of the classical literature itself. Representative of a critical and diachronically-oriented selection of vocabulary from a specific literary area is Bechtel's *Lexilogus zu Homer* (1914). As for the onomastic aspect of Greek, suitable exemplars of inquiries are those of Bechtel on historical personal names (1917), of Strömberg on plant-names (1940), or of Risch on *ethnika* (1957).

Under the rubric of lexicography we must also include the valuable research surviving from the ancient world; foremost is the Alexandrian lexicographical tradition, and the primary exponent of the latter is the so-called Hesychian corpus. A new edition of the latter by Latte (1953, 1966) is being issued, at a time when the reliability of the Alexandrian collection, in however abbreviated form it has been transmitted, has been vindicated (cf. especially Latte 1924:143). Even from the Indo-European viewpoint, the Hesychian lexical repertory is sometimes the sole source for a Greek word corresponding to cognates well attested in other Indo-European languages. For example, let us consider the Greek formal counterpart to Latin *soror* 'sister' < *swe-sor, literally 'female belonging to self'. Especially in view of the etymology involving *swe- 'self', the Hesychian glosses corresponding to *soror* prove to be significant lexicographical contributions: ἔορ θυγάτηρ, ἀνεψιός ('daughter, cousin'), ἔορες

προσῆκοντες, συγγενεῖς ('those akin, relatives'). Nowhere else is the formal cognate of *soror* to be found in attested Greek, and this instance of *hapax*-attestation as well as numerous others corroborates the lexicographical value of the Hesychian corpus all the more (cf. Hofmann 1950:86 and Risch 1954a:184).

Dialectology

First to be surveyed is the dialectal situation in late Bronze-Age Greece, as it is deduced from the evidence of Linear B (the dialect of which will be called Mycenaean, simply for the sake of convenience), from archaic poetry (especially Epic), and from internal reconstruction (with the classically-attested dialects as frame of reference).

(In the evaluation which now follows, we will regularly use the criterion of shared innovation to establish the affinity of dialects; for the probative value of shared innovation vs. shared retention, cf. Adrados 1952.)

A prime problem is the dialectal constitution of Epic. That there are at least three main dialect-layers embedded in the Homeric corpus is probably the most plausible analysis, as tentatively acknowledged by Meillet (1935/1965:183). This three-layer theory is clearly outlined in the expanded and refined version of Parry (1932). Of course the first of the three dialects must have extended all the way back to the Mycenaean period (cf. Part I *supra*), but an important problem remains in identifying this dialect on the basis of the classically-attested survivals. From among the latter, the group most likely to have descended from the earliest dialectal layer of Epic seems to be Arcado-Cypriote. The primary reason for subsuming Arcadian (the only significant integral non-Doric dialect-enclave in the Peloponnesos) and Cypriote (the frontier-dialect of a studiously archaizing and Achaean-conscious insular culture) under a unified heading is that these two dialects, as Chadwick points out (1963a:9) 'display an astonishing similarity, for at the time they are recorded (fifth to fourth centuries B.C.) they had certainly been out of touch for at least five centuries'. After listing some of their mutual similarities (among which the instances of shared innovation should of course be separated and treated as more significant than those of shared retention), Chadwick concludes (*Ibid.*): 'Historically these facts are only explicable if these two dialects are the remnants of a widespread dialect which was elsewhere displaced by West Greek [= a more precise term for Doric]; this implies that Mycenaean Greek should also belong to the same group, and the decipherment of the Linear B script has shown this to be true [cf. e.g. the list of correspondences in Vilborg 1960:20-1], though Mycenaean does not show all the features shared by Arcadian and Cypriot [cf. again Vilborg 1960:22-3].' We may add to the immediately preceding proviso this further qualification devised by Risch (1968): that even the Greek of the Linear B script seems to betray at least two dialectal strains, that one of these is apparently the standard language — for the scribes — by virtue of its predictable textual occurrences while the other is substandard in the unpredictability of its occur-

rences, and finally that it is the substandard features which are generally still attested in most classical dialects while the standard features become extinct with the collapse of Mycenaean civilization (except for sporadic survivals); on all of which more *infra*. There is another complication still: Mycenaean shares some features with Attic-Ionic to the exclusion of Arcado-Cypriote (Vilborg 1960:21), and likewise with Aeolic (Vilborg 1960:21-2). The former perspective is relevant to Risch's arguments (1955; cf. also Porzig 1954) that in the late Bronze Age, the ancestor of Attic-Ionic was essentially undifferentiated from that of Arcado-Cypriote, or for that matter, from Mycenaean. As for the latter perspective, it encourages those like Palmer (1963b:60-4) who see a closer prehistoric affinity between Arcado-Cypriote and Aeolic. There is a direct clash here, especially since Risch's corollary (1955:70-1) is that the dialect of the Pelasgiotis in East Thessaly (with e.g. unassibilated -ττ-) is more representative of ancestral Aeolic than is Lesbian (with e.g. assibilated -στ-, < *-ti-), which has supposedly undergone extensive remodeling by the *Sprachbund*-pressure of the neighboring Ionic: in other words, that prehistoric Aeolic was closer to Doric. (From here on, Aeolic will be understood in the narrow sense of the dialect ancestral to Thessalian and Lesbian; Boeotian will be left out of consideration because of a massive Doric superimposition: cf. Buck 1955:152 and Thumb and Scherer 1959:18.) Now the exclusively-shared features between Mycenaean and Aeolic as listed by Vilborg (1960:21-2) appear to be instances of shared retention; therefore all we need postulate in order to explain the exclusion of Arcado-Cypriote (and thereby vindicate its affinity to Mycenaean) is that the latter had lost certain archaisms still surviving in Aeolic. A more important factor, however, is that there apparently exist instances of innovation shared by Mycenaean and Arcado-Cypriote to the exclusion of Aeolic and Ionic:

1. The 3rd singular middle primary *-tai* is remade into *-toi* on the model of corresponding secondary *-to* (so Palmer 1963b:60-4, definitely, and Cowgill 1966:81, fn. 14; 93, tentatively; *pace* Ruipérez 1952).

2. A dative after *pa-ro/παρο* is generalized to the exclusion of the genitive in Mycenaean/Arcado-Cypriote (Palmer, *Ibid.*; for a collection of Mycenaean facts, cf. Householder 1959). Pivotal is the analysis of Morpurgo Davies (1966:196-7, 201-2), who suggests that the ouster of genitive by dative here in Arcadian and Cypriote was triggered by the preposition itself, and that such ousters 'fit into a general tendency of Greek to simplify prepositional constructs' (1966:196; cf. Wackernagel 1928:206-13). The locus of diffusion for the classically-attested ablative function of the construct *παρο* + dative was the pristine ablative case itself (merely reinforced originally by the adverbial ancestor of *παρο*); but the significance of dialectal innovation lies not in the ultimate restriction of this Arcado-Cypriote construct to ablative function (*pace* Cowgill 1966:92) but in its restriction to the dative form as early as Mycenaean, vs. e.g. the contrast of *παρά* + genitive with *παρά* + dative as late as classical Attic-Ionic.

In sum, Arcado-Cypriote is the only dialect division (established with criteria from

the evidence of the classical period) which seems to share exclusively in dialectal innovations with Mycenaean: Arcado-Cypriote is thus the division which comes closest to identity with Mycenaean (cf. also Lejeune 1968). The one important dialectal innovation which the latter shares with Attic-Ionic is of lesser analytic importance, since it is not exclusively shared: i.e. assibilation of **-ti-* to *-σι-* is attested not only in Attic-Ionic but also in Arcado-Cypriote (for the phonological and morphological conditioning of this assibilation, cf. Nagy 1968). But at least in this respect, Attic-Ionic may be considered closer to Mycenaean than Doric and possibly even Aeolic. It is hazardous, however, thereby to exclude Aeolic from Mycenaean as if the relationship of the former to the latter were on the same remote genetic level as that of Doric vs. Mycenaean; to make the latter opposition more clear, we may extend it thus: West Greek (= Doric) vs. East Greek (= Arcado-Cypriote, Attic-Ionic, and Mycenaean). Now since the traditional view, as propounded by Buck, is that 'the most fundamental division of the Greek dialects is that into the West Greek and the East Greek dialects' (1955: 7), and since the first isogloss to be listed for East vs. West Greek in e.g. Buck's synopsis is the assibilation vs. non-assibilation of *-τι-* (154), it is important to reconsider the ambiguity of classical Aeolic in this regard. As we have already mentioned, Risch posits unassibilated *-τι-* for the ancestral dialect of Thessalian and Lesbian (1955: 70-1), thereby relegating Aeolic at least one stage behind Attic-Ionic in the relative proximity of the two to Mycenaean. Cowgill's qualification, however, is crucial (1968:182):

I would guess that the inhabitants of Late Helladic sites in Thessaly used a dialect of Aeolic type, and that if Linear B tablets are ever found in that area they will turn out to exhibit this local dialect (perhaps overlaid by Southern features from an administrative koiné).

At least some subdialects of this Aeolic must have preserved *-ti* unchanged. But it is not easy to suppose that the *-si* of Lesbian was borrowed in Asia Minor from Ionic; if a feature as central as this had been borrowed, one would expect many others to have been borrowed as well. Perhaps rather Aeolic was already differentiated in this feature in the second millennium, and the speech of the Asiatic colonists reflects a variety of Aeolic into which the wave of assibilation from the South had penetrated, while in Thessaly and Boeotia varieties which had resisted this wave won out (perhaps with help from the neighboring West Greek dialects).

Also, the archaic dialect of Pamphylian, which Buck actually classifies under the heading of Arcado-Cypriote (1955:147), persists in the non-assibilation of *-τι-*. (For traces of non-assibilated *-ti-* in Mycenaean and for possible dialectal implications, cf. Nagy 1968, 1970.) Furthermore, there is at least one possible instance of common divergence between Mycenaean and Aeolic to the exclusion of Attic-Ionic (Ruipérez 1955:166-7, *pace* Risch 1955: 72). Finally, if indeed ancestral Attic-Ionic had really been as close to Mycenaean as ancestral Arcado-Cypriote (or possibly even undifferentiated from Mycenaean), we still have to reckon with a central aporia which defies rationalization; the problem has been eloquently formulated by Benveniste (1956b:263):

Pour en venir au problème plus général d'un dialecte 'méridional', hypothèse qui a les préférences du rapporteur [i.e. Risch], la seule coïncidence vraiment remarquable entre sa

branche arcado-cypriote et sa branche ionienne à date historique est l'assibilation $-\tau i > -\sigma i$, que présente déjà le mycénien. Mais, à poser le problème en termes de chronologie absolue, entre nos derniers textes mycéniens et nos premiers textes dialectaux alphabétiques (abstraction faite des poèmes homériques), il s'écoule environ six cents ans. Il faudrait admettre, durant cette période, dans l'hypothèse soutenue par Risch, une remarquable conservation du mycénien dans sa lignée arcado-cypriote, une profonde évolution du mycénien dans sa lignée ionienne. N'est-il pas plus plausible de supposer qu'à l'époque de nos tablettes, l'ionien (qui n'y est pas représenté) était déjà plus ou moins largement différencié?

The most plausible conclusion, then, is that the prehistoric phases of Arcado-Cypriote, Aeolic, and Attic-Ionic were already differentiated in the late Bronze Age, and that the dialect which comes closest to identity with Mycenaean is the ancestral Arcado-Cypriote. But to posit complete identity is unnecessary, as Palmer points out (1963b: 61):

'Arcado-Cypriot' is merely the name given to a group of linguistic features which philologists assign to the dialects of the Mycenaean Peloponnese. It does not imply a completely uniform 'Mycenaean' language. The documents of later Cyprus and Arcadia themselves show dialectal differentiation, and we may expect to find in the Linear B tablets forms which differ from Arcado-Cypriot not simply because they are more archaic but because they mirror a variety of 'Mycenaean' in some respects different from the direct ancestors of Arcadian and Cypriot.

Moreover, there is evidence for not only dialectal differentiation but also dialectal cross-influence in this early period: for example, there are strong arguments in favor of positing the penetration, in the late Mycenaean era, of Aeolic or North-Mycenaean elements into such South-Mycenaean dialectal areas as the Peloponnesos (cf. e.g. Kiechle 1960), even including parts of Arcadia itself (Kiechle 1962).

We may now return to the initially-posed question of dialectal stratification in the Epic. From the preceding arguments, it is reasonable to reaffirm that the earliest dialectal layer of Epic is for all practical purposes the ancestral phase of Arcado-Cypriote. But there emerge again the same difficulties already encountered in attempts to establish a direct affinity between the Mycenaean of the Linear B texts and Arcado-Cypriote: shared retention is of relatively little probative value. In other words, the detection of archaisms exclusively shared by Arcado-Cypriote and e.g. Homeric may well establish the Mycenaean pedigree of the Epic configuration involved, but the question remains, which Mycenaean? The given archaism might have been still extant in e.g. the ancestral Aeolic or Ionic coeval with the ancestral Arcado-Cypriote of the Mycenaean era. This possibility is significant because Aeolic and Ionic, in that chronological order, are the next two dialectal layers of the Epic. Despite attempts to remove its relevance (cf. the survey by Risch 1958: 91, fn. 1 and Cowgill 1966: 86), the Aeolic layer remains established as an inextricable structural element of the formulaic repertory; a still more obvious and all-pervasive structural element is of course Ionic itself. Even in the case of Aeolic and Ionic, however, solid establishment of their dialectal presence in Epic is predicated on the pervasiveness not of their archaisms but rather of their innovations, e.g. the perfect participle in $-\sigma\upsilon\tau$ and the

particle ἄν respectively. It stands to reason, then, that of the three dialect-constituents of Epic, the Arcado-Cypriote should be the most elusive: it is not only the most archaic *dialectal* layer but also the most archaic *formulaic* layer. Hence the inherent difficulty of gleaning linguistic innovations from inherited material preserved in slots where succeeding dialects had no formal equivalents.

It is methodologically insufficient, therefore, to consider a given Epic entry as Arcado-Cypriote simply after showing that (1) it is deeply embedded in the formulaic system and (2) it is still extant in the classical period of Arcadian or Cypriote. The latter factor is admittedly of interest because the very fact of attestation, either epigraphical or lexicographical, betrays the archaism of both Arcadian and Cypriote. Especially interesting is the testimony of the Alexandrian lexicographical tradition as represented by the γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις (cf. Latte 1924): one of the research-aims in Alexandrian scholarship was to find residual epichoric attestations of poetic words long obsolescent in the general Greek-speaking world. For example, the people of Clitor (Kleitorioi) in Arcadia are credited with the following lexical repertory:

ἄηται· ἄνεμοι ('winds')
 αὐδή· φωνή ('voice')
 δέδορκεν· ὄρᾳ ('sees')
 ἔνεροι· νεκροί ('corpses')
 ἐσθλόν· ἀγαθόν ('worthy')
 λεύσει· ὄρᾳ ('sees')
 πάροισεν· ἔμπροσθεν ('in front')
 χηλός· κιβωτός ('coffer')
 ὄκα· ταχέως ('quickly')
 ὠλέναι· βραχίονες ('arms')

That so many Epic words should survive in the banal spoken language of such a remote community is significant even in illustrating how our very perspective on the Greek language is limited by the predominance of formal genre in the literary and official languages (cf. Part I *supra*). The Clitorian samples are also a testimonial to what could only have been the result of thorough probing by the *Lokalantiquar* who was responsible for them: our investigator was probably a Clitorian himself, and his *terminus* can be detected in terms of consultations by the younger Zenodotos (as we see from the *scholia* to Apollonios Rhodios 2.1005; cf. Latte 1924: 151–2). Our central point of view, however, is now the Homeric language itself, just as this has consistently been central: witness e.g. the attitude behind the late textual regularization in the Clitorian gloss αὐδή· φωνή: it tells us that the Homeric word αὐδή means 'voice' and that this meaning is still preserved in Clitorian, but the actual local form, which must have been αὐδᾶ, is not even specified (cf. Ruijgh 1957: 68). Granted that we see here the survival of a word all the way from the Bronze Age: nevertheless, any dialectal restriction to Arcado-Cypriote still remains to be proved. Furthermore, the fact that most Homeric forms of suspected Arcado-Cypriote origin happen to be on the lexical

level (cf. Ruijgh 1957) has caused general scepticism about the very relevance of Arcado-Cypriote to Homeric (cf. Risch 1958).

There is, however, at least one rare instance of a morphological-level innovation which is exclusively shared by Epic and Arcado-Cypriote: the athematization of verbs with -έω into verbs with -ημι (and paradigmatic generalization of full-grade -η-) leads to the new infinitival ending -ῆναι (vs. Aeolic -ήμεναι and Attic-Ionic -εῖν) as in Homeric φορῆναι (*B* 107, *H* 149, *K* 270, ρ 224), Arcadian ἀπειθῆναι (Bechtel 1921: 360), Cypriote *ku-me-re-na-i* = κυμερῆναι (Olivier Masson 1961: 284). There are several reasons for rejecting Risch's counter-claim (1958: 92) that φορῆναι is an artificial creation from φορήμεναι (*O* 310), on the model of original athematic μιγῆναι (*Z* 161, etc.) vs. μιγήμεναι (*I* 133, etc.). For one thing, no other Homeric verbs with original -έω have -ῆναι for infinitive: καλήμεναι *K* 125, πενθήμεναι σ 174, ποθήμεναι μ 110, φιλήμεναι *X* 265 (Chantraine 1958: 306). As for the original athematic aorist passive pairs like δαμήμεναι/δαμῆναι, δαήμεναι/δαῖναι, μιγήμεναι/μιγῆναι, φανήμεναι/φανῆναι, etc., the type in -ῆναι regularly occurs in the archaic slot of line-final position, or in the secondary conversion-slot immediately preceding the trochaic caesura; the type in -ήμεναι, on the other hand, regularly occurs immediately preceding the bucolic diaeresis. Now the latter slot tends to suit a relatively greater proportion of innovated forms, by virtue of the idiosyncratic metrical dynamics of the 4th foot in dactylic hexameter: in the fourth foot, there is a regular tendency to avoid a trochaic word-ending = caesura (– ∪ || ∪) and to substitute instead a dactylic word-ending = bucolic diaeresis (cf. Meister 1921: 10–27). This tendency, then, causes the *Verzerrung* of many trochee-final words into dactyl-final words, and thus the admission of a wide variety of innovations before the bucolic diaeresis. For instance, besides the 50-odd Homeric cases of archaic athematic-stem ὄρω (occurring for the most part immediately after the bucolic diaeresis), the three exceptional cases of innovating thematic-stem ὄρετο are all immediately before the bucolic diaeresis (*M* 279, Ξ 397, *X* 102). In other words, the trochee-final archaism ὄρω had undergone *Verzerrung* in the 4th foot, resulting in accommodation to the innovation ὄρετο. Or again, let us consider the 25 Homeric cases of apophonically archaic μητρός (cf. also πατρός) vs. the 7 corresponding cases of the innovation μητέρος, created by paradigmatic leveling (cf. also πατέρος; discussion of this innovation by Palmer 1963a: 83–4). Of the 7 mentioned cases of μητέρος, only one is immediately after the bucolic diaeresis (φ 110); the rest are all immediately before the bucolic diaeresis (*T* 422, Ω 466, γ 212, ξ 140, ο 432, σ 267). Prevocalic μητρός (i.e., trochee-final μητρός) simply does not occur in the 4th foot: instead, it undergoes *Verzerrung* to suit the innovated μητέρος, even when it is in collocation with the archaic πατρός (cf. Meister 1921: 18):

- T* 422 νόσφι φίλου πατρός || καὶ μητέρος || ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔμπης
 Ω 466 καὶ μιν ὑπὲρ πατρός || καὶ μητέρος || ἡυκόμοιο
 ξ 140 οὐδ' εἴ κεν πατρός || καὶ μητέρος || αὖτις ἴκωμαι

ο 432 ὄφρα ἴδῃ πατρός || καὶ μητέρος || ὑπερεφές δῶ
 σ 267 μεμνήσθαι πατρός || καὶ μητέρος || ἐν μεγάροισι.

Likewise the trochee-final type μιγῆναι (i.e. prevocalic type μιγῆναι) is avoided in the 4th foot, whence the *Verzerrung* to suit the type μιγήμεναι (acquired from the Aeolic stock of formulas), which thus regularly occurs before the bucolic diaeresis. When we test the new aorist passive in -θη-, which had ultimately replaced the residual aorist passive in -η- (such as μιγ-ή-μεναι/μιγ-ῆ-ναι), the distribution of its infinitives in the line makes even more apparent which variant, -ήμεναι or -ῆναι, is more archaic from the formulaic point of view: those in -θη- which fit the slot of line-final position still regularly occur there, but the more rare infinitive in -θήμεναι becomes disrupted in positional patterns and 'donne l'impression d'être assez artificiel' (Chantraine 1958: 488). To sum up: the -ῆναι of the aorist passive seems more archaic than -ήμεναι in both form and position. If therefore the pair-type φορήμεναι/φορῆναι is modeled on the metrically-equivalent pair-type μιγήμεναι/μιγῆναι, we would expect the direction of motivation to be from φορῆναι to φορήμεναι, not the reverse. Furthermore, on the evidence of the metrically-equivalent aorist passive infinitives, the occurrence of καλήμεναι πενθήμεναι ποθήμεναι φιλήμεναι φορήμεναι, all five, exclusively before the bucolic diaeresis makes these seem less archaic than *καλῆναι *πενθῆναι *ποθῆναι *φιλῆναι φορῆναι; the sole Homeric attestation of the fifth makes it seem even more residual. Also, the consistent verbal complement with φορῆναι emphasizes the archaism of the whole construct: δῶκε, δῶκε, δοίης, δῶκ' in the four Homeric attestations of φορῆναι (*H* 149, *K* 270, ρ 223, *B* 105). Relevant to this construct is the Mycenaean formula *do-ra-qe pe-re po-re-na-qe a-ke*, repeated four times in the Pylian tablet Tn 316 (lines 2, v. 2, 5, 8); for a discussion of the whole text, cf. Ventris and Chadwick 1956: 285. If we may translate, so to speak, into δῶρά τε φέρει φορῆναι τε ἄγει (without any specification of syntactical boundaries here), then the following significant collocations emerge: (1) a *figura etymologica* in the juxtaposition of φέρει φορῆναι, (2) a correspondence of Mycenaean δῶρα ... φορῆναι with Homeric δῶκε/δοίης ... φορῆναι, and (3) a correspondence of Mycenaean φέρει ... ἄγει with e.g. Homeric φέρειν ... ἄγειν:

Ψ 512 δῶκε δ' ἄγειν ἐτάροισιν ὑπερθύμοισι γυναῖκα
 καὶ τρίποδ' ὠτώεντα φέρειν.
 'And he gave to his *hyperthumoi* comrades a woman to lead away
 And a tripod (with ears) to carry.'

On the phonological level too, it is possible to find traces of a pre-Aeolic layer in the Epic. In fact, the examples to be cited here are from the dialectal layer constituting what Risch (1966) calls standard Mycenaean (cf. *supra*), elements of which survive only sporadically in any classically-attested dialect. The only two such elements which Risch definitely cites (1966:157) are current even in classical Attic: ἵππος and ἀρμόζω. What with the far greater proximity of Epic to Mycenaean, however, we should be

able to find survivals of standard Mycenaean elements in the Homeric corpus as well. Let us consider the phonological rule resulting in a form such as ἱππος; the rule is to be formulated as follows: $e > i$ when it is directly contiguous to a labial element. From among the three criteria which Risch has proposed to distinguish between standard and substandard Mycenaean in the Linear B texts (1966:150), only this one is clearly definable as a linguistic innovation: hence it is the most eligible for testing on the linguistic evidence of the Epic. Among the more obvious Homeric reflexes, then, of this standard Mycenaean phenomenon are these two entries:

πινυτός (α 229, etc.): the morphologically plausible form is original *πενυτός (cf. Frisk, *GEW* II.509; also already Hamp 1960:200).

πίσυρες (ε 70, etc.): the original zero-grade * k^w etures (vs. full-grade * k^w etwores) still survives in Lesbian πέσυρες (for commentary on the morphological variants, cf. Szemerényi 1966:34).

It is possible, therefore, that many other non-Ionic characteristics of the Homeric corpus are also derived from a dialectal phase even more remote from Ionic than the Aeolic phase (cf. Chantraine 1958:507–8). But neither can we dispense with positing Aeolic as mid-phase. For example, while the 1st and 2nd plural nominative pronouns are attested as ἄμμες and ὕμμες in the Homeric corpus, the corresponding Arcado-Cypriote forms, as we may reconstruct primarily from the phonological evidence of classical Arcadian (Thumb and Scherer 1959:113, 126), would be ἄμες and ὕμες. Ruijgh remarks on the latter (1957:7): ‘les Ioniens eussent certainement préféré la forme achéenne [= Arcado-Cypriote] ὕμέξ, plus proche de la forme ionienne ὕμεῖς, à ὕμμες, s’ils l’eussent connue.’ Be that as it may, the Arcado-Cypriote variants do seem to emerge in Homeric attestations of the possessive adjectives for ἄμμες and ὕμμες, namely ἄμός and ὕμός vs. Ionic ἡμέτερος and ὑμέτερος. With the theory of μεταχαρακτηρισμός now seriously challenged (cf. e.g. Goold 1960), it is no longer possible to assume that the textual forms ἄμμες/ἄμός and ὕμμες/ὕμός are products of arbitrary editorial selection in interpreting some supposedly archetypal spellings αμες/αμος and υμες/υμος (*pace* Meillet 1935/1965:173). Rather, the neat split in ἄμμες/ἄμός and ὕμμες/ὕμός (vs. the unitary ἡμεῖς/ἡμέτερος and ὑμεῖς/ὑμέτερος) points to disparate dialectal layers, namely Aeolic/Arcado-Cypriote. On linguistic accuracy in the unwritten transmission of even suprasegmental features (especially accentual patterns), cf. e.g. Nagy 1970:120–2. Presumably there was no Aeolic *ἄμμος and *ὕμμος available to level out an earlier ἄμός and ὕμός. That the latter two did not stem from prehistoric Ionic is suggested by the failure of ἄμός to survive as *ἡμός (cf. *supra* under *Phonology*). As for the late Ionic contemporary with the constitution of the extant *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, no form was available from this phase to level out either ἄμός and ὕμός or ἄμμες and ὕμμες. However, we must qualify the second portion of this statement: in preconsonantal position, ἄμμες and ὕμμες become metrically equivalent to ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς, so that they do become leveled out from these slots: hence ἄμμες and ὕμμες are found only in prevocalic position. One further qualification: even where there is a current Ionic equivalent available, a dialectal form

may nonetheless elude leveling: hence e.g. the survival of Aeolic absolute line-final ἄμμι (e.g. *N* 379), despite the fact that Ionic ἡμῖν (e.g. α 10) is a metrical equivalent. A factor which inhibits leveling in this instance is a common formulaic conversion-rule operative in the Epic: the optional switch of the Adonic segment (i.e. the segment between the bucolic diaeresis and the end of the line) into the slot immediately preceding the trochaic caesura, whenever the underlying value of the *anceps* final syllable is short or can be shortened by hiatus; now line-final ἄμμι does not prevent this switch (hence ἄμμι before trochaic caesura in e.g. γ 140) whereas line-final ἡμῖν does: it freezes the given expression within the confines of the Adonic segment. (A breakthrough is nonetheless accomplished with the seemingly artificial Ionic ἡμιν, occurring only before the trochaic caesura: *P* 415, 417, θ 569 = υ 177, κ 563, λ 344, ρ 376, υ 272; cf. also line-final ὄσσε φαεινῶ as in *N* 3 vs. ὄσσε φαεινᾶ before the trochaic caesura, as in *N* 435.) In sum, dialectal leveling is sporadic where the grammatical or metrical conditioning is ambiguous.

Conversely, dialectal leveling is precisely predictable where the grammatical and metrical conditions are themselves equally predictable. For example, let us consider the \bar{a} of the frequent Homeric form θυράων vs. θύρησι and θύρηφι. Since inherited Ionic η pervades the paradigm, we begin by assuming that \bar{a} survives in θυράων because Ionic had no corresponding *θυρήων to level it out. And yet, *θυρήων must have once existed in prehistoric Ionic as well, since it is the formal ancestor of native Ionic θυρέων (υ υ -, φ 191), ultimately contracted into θυρῶν (whence the scansion υ - of θυρέων in φ 47). For the traditional metrical slot υ - -, therefore, why is the corresponding form not *θυρήων rather than the apparently dialectal θυράων? The answer must be that as long as the phonological mechanism of quantitative/qualitative metathesis (-ηω- > -εω-) was operative in the natural language of the Ionic dialect, the poetic tradition of this particular dialectal phase rejected the combination -ηω- because of the automatic phonological conversion into -εω- by the natural language: therefore the only way to accommodate the inherited slot for which -ηω- was now impossible became the admission of dialectal and metrically equivalent - \bar{a} ω- (probably Aeolic: cf. the paradigmatically-restored \bar{a} of genitive plural - \bar{a} ων, still extant in attested Thessalian). Hence the failure of the Ionic phase in Epic to level out \bar{a} with η in the grammatical slot of genitive plural. To show the extent of the dialectal underpinnings of Epic, we note that archaic and non-Ionic τᾶων is more than twice as frequent as the recent and native Ionic τῶν (cf. Meillet 1935/1965:171). As for the apparently dialectal nominative/vocative θεᾶ (e.g. *A* 1), Ionic failed to level it out with θεή because the Ionic word for 'goddess' is (ἡ) θεός.

The same arguments which are used to explain the genitive plural in - \bar{a} ων are also applicable to the genitive singular masculine - \bar{a} ο; but here, even further grammatical and metrical conditioning affects the ultimate distribution: - \bar{a} ο has become restricted to preconsonantal position, even though it could suit the prevocalic position as well (with elision of -ο): e.g. Νηληϊᾶδ \bar{a} ο γέροντος (Θ 100) vs. Νηληϊάδεω ἀφίκοντο (Λ 618). Hence the validity of Meister's rhetorical question (1921:170): 'Haben sie

[i.e. die Sänger] etwa archaische Formen nach strengern prosodischen Gesetzen behandelt als moderne?' Meanwhile, of course, the quantitatively/qualitatively meta-thesized native Ionic -εω (< -ηο) has itself spread throughout the formulaic structure, from prevocalic position (with the locus of diffusion probably set by -ᾠο V- > -ᾱ' V-) to preconsonantal and even line-final as well: the frequency of a line-final phrase like Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω is ample illustration for the pervasiveness of Ionic itself (Meister 1921: 164). Suggestive of relative intensity in the preservation of dialectally-inherited mechanisms are the following statistics on the ratio of -ᾠο to -εω: 4.5 to 1 in the *Iliad*, 2.8 to 1 in the *Odyssey*, 1 to 1 in Hesiod (*Erga* and *Theogonia*); on the ratio of -ᾠων to -έων: 8.7 to 1 in the *Iliad*, 6.5 to 1 in the *Odyssey*, 3 to 1 in Hesiod (cf. Hoekstra 1957: 202). For a survey of occasional ᾱ/η variations in morphologically ambiguous slots, cf. Meister 1921: 168-9; especially interesting is the apparent hyper-correction ἱλᾱος (*A* 583), despite its etymology **si-slēwos* (> *ἱληος > ἱλεως); a factor here is the inherited alternation between full-grade *-*slēw-* and zero-grade *-*slāw-* (as in line-final ἱλᾱος ἔστω, *T* 178); cf. also Frisk, *GEW* I.721-2.

The artificial poetic mechanism of *Dehnungsgesetz*, discussed *supra* under the subsection *Phonology*, can also serve as a valuable analytic tool in distinguishing Ionic from generally pre-Ionic dialectal phases of Epic. One Attic-Ionic phonological process to be tested is the prehistoric split from one long-*e* and one long-*o* into two each, featuring a new opposition of open vs. closed = \bar{e}/\bar{o} vs. \bar{e}/\bar{o} , spelled η/ω vs. ει/ου in the standard post-Euclidian Attic alphabet. Configurations with \bar{e}/\bar{o} correspond etymologically to the \bar{e}/\bar{o} inherited from Indo-European, while those with \bar{e}/\bar{o} are new creations from a dialectal phase of Greek. Therefore it is to be expected that the natural morphophonemic mechanism of *Dehnungsgesetz*, inherited from Indo-European, should produce \bar{e}/\bar{o} from the initial vowel *e/o* of a compound's second constituent: hence e.g. φιλ-ήρετμος 'fond of the oar' (*α* 181, etc.) vs. ἑρετμόν 'oar' (*λ* 77, etc.), δυσ-ώνυμος 'bearing an ill name' (*M* 116, etc.) vs. ὄνομα 'name' (*X* 51, etc.). But with the onset of a split for long-*e* and long-*o* in Attic-Ionic, the old short/long opposition switches from inherited ε/η and ο/ω to synchronic ε/ει and ο/ου: hence e.g. the Attic names εἶ and οὖ for the letters *E* and *O* (cf. Plato, *Kratylos* 426C, etc.) on the principle, stated by Herodianos (2.403), that πᾶν ὄνομα μονοσύλλαβον μακροκαταληκτεῖν θέλει 'every monosyllabic word tends to be [the equivalent of] a long final syllable'; cf. the discussion by Allen 1968a: 84-5. Therefore it is also to be expected that after the period of split long-*e* and long-*o* in Attic-Ionic, the artificial *Dehnungsgesetz* of Epic should produce \bar{e}/\bar{o} from a spoken *e/o* in the initial syllable of a word: hence e.g. εἰᾱνός (*Π* 9) vs. ἔᾱνός 'fine robe' (*Φ* 507, etc.), οὔνομα (*ζ* 194, etc.) vs. ὄνομα 'name' (*ι* 16, etc.). Again we may apply the methodological principle that configurations with morphological mechanisms which had become extinct in Ionic may *optionally* be preserved by Epic in their non-Ionic form, even when an Ionic metrical equivalent is available. Thus e.g. besides the common ου-*Dehnung* of the type οὐλόμενος 'accursed' (*κ* 394, etc.) we find such rare examples of ω-*Dehnung* as ὠλεσίκαρποι 'losing their fruit', epithet of ἱτέαι 'willows' in *κ* 510. Since the com-

pound-formant ὄλεσι- is actually attested in Ionic poetry (cf. ὄλεσ-ήνορας 'man-destroying' in Theognis 399, ὄλεσι-θηρος 'beast-slaying' in Euripides, *Phoinissai* 664), we cannot assume that it was unfamiliar to the earlier Ionic tradition. One other possible reason, then, for a constraint against reforming ὄλεσι- into οὐλεσι- remains: ὄλεσι- could have prevailed by virtue of its provenience from the prestigious tradition of another dialect where no split in long-*e* and long-*o* has occurred. Both Aeolic and (apparently) Arcado-Cypriote are such dialects (cf. Buck 1955:28-9). As for βωτι-ανείρη 'nurse of heroes, man-feeding' (*A* 155; vs. βόσι-ν 'feeding' in *T* 268), its non-Ionic ω-*Dehnung* is also relevant from the standpoint of the region for which it serves as epithet: Phthia, homeland of Achilles; the absence of assibilation in the -τι- of βωτι- is also dialectally significant: cf. Nagy 1970:150-1. (The Epic instances of ποτί/προτί are likewise probably from a dialectal substratum, *pace* Palmer 1963a: 89, fn. *a*; their preservation is directly ascribable to the failure of [**poti*/**proti* >] **ποσί*/**προσί* to survive in spoken Ionic; ποτί is still attested in the Thessalian and Boeotian of the classical period. In Mycenaean, the corresponding form shows assibilation: *po-si*. As for προτί, the extent to which it is embedded in the most archaic layers of Epic is illustrated by the fact that out of its 60 Homeric occurrences, 57 are before words with initial *ɸ* etymologically established; cf. Meister 1921:256. Also relevant is Arcadian πός; the latter and Ionic πρός were probably prehistoric *sandhi*-variants of ποτί and προτί; for morphological considerations, cf. Coleman 1963:89-90.)

The traditional language of Aeolic poetry has extended the mechanism of *Dehnungsgesetz* even further by annexing another artificial mechanism of metrical lengthening: -CV+||R- = -CV||RR- (where R stands for sonorant, || for word-break). The precedent for the metrical lengthening of spoken R into RR here was set by the etymologically valid making of position by prehistoric *s*R, which became RR in Aeolic (cf. Chantraine 1958:173-8): hence e.g. the **sn-* in the root **sneig^wh-*, as reflected in ἀγά-ννιφος 'snowy' (*A* 420, etc.) and in the underlying vv- of ὄρεϊ νιφόνεντι 'on the snowy mountain', ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ (N 754). We have already observed in the discussion of Epic in Part I that the metrical precedent of word-initial RR- for spoken R- becomes extended beyond its etymological confines, whence e.g. the underlying vv- in ἄμα δὲ νέφος 'and at the same time, a cloud', ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ (Δ 274), even though v- here had never been **sn-*. As for the adaptation of the poetic mechanism -CV+||R- = -CV||RR- to the poetic mechanism of *Dehnungsgesetz*, it involved simply the re-adjustment of word-boundary: -C+||VR- = -C||VRR-, equivalent to Ionic -C+||VR- = -C||V̄R-. As an example of the Aeolic extension of *Dehnungsgesetz*, cf. e.g. ἐννοσί-γατος 'earth-shaker' (N 43, etc.) vs. spoken ἐνοσί-χθων 'earth-shaker' (H 445, etc.) and ἔνοσι-ς 'quake' (e.g. Hesiod, *Theogonia* 681, 849). However, the more simple Ionic mechanism of *Dehnungsgesetz* produces an εἰνοσι- corresponding to the Aeolic ἐννοσι-, and the former has actually ousted the latter in the Epic epithet εἰνοσί-φυλλος 'with quivering foliage' (B 632, etc.), vs. the residual ἐννοσί-φυλλος in Simonides 595.1 (epithet for ἀήτα: cf. the Clitorian gloss ἀήται· ἄνεμοι *supra*). But

as for ἐννεσίη 'suggestion', found only as dative plural ἐννεσίησι(ν) in the Epic (*E* 894, etc.), its synchronic morphological motivation (*ἐννεσίη from ἐν-ίημι as ἐξέσιη 'embassy' from ἐξ-ίημι; Risch 1937:115) became defunct so early that the Aeolic ἐνν- could resist displacement by an equivalent Ionic εἰν- (as in the gloss εἰνεσίαι· ἐπιστολαί 'orders', from the Hesychian tradition), simply because *ἐννεσίη could not be intuited automatically from ἐννεσίη. Even beyond the mechanism of *Dehnungsgesetz*, the Ionic/Aeolic contrast -εἰνV-/-εννV- in Epic is also apparent on a lexical level, as e.g. in the adjectivization of *es*-stem nouns (type γέν-ος, φά-ος) into *-*es-nos* > Ionic -εινος (type φαεινός 'bright') vs. Aeolic -εννος (type φάεννος). Since the synchronic morphological motivation of -εινος/-εννος by -ος was moribund in the attested periods of both Ionic and Aeolic, the leveling-out of substratal Aeolic entries with -εννος can occur only where a corresponding entry with -εινος has still survived in Ionic: hence e.g. the loss of *φαεννος and *άλγεννος to attested Homeric φαεινός and ἀλγεινός, vs. the retention of -εννος in the formula ἔρεβεννή νύξ 'dark night' (*E* 659, etc.); 'c'est que l'adjectif dérivé de ἔρεβος n'existait pas en ionien' (Meillet 1935/1965:172).

For the possibility of Attic traces (as distinct from Ionic) in Homer, cf. e.g. Palmer 1963a:105–6 and 175, fn. *a*. We should draw a distinction in relative values, however, between (1) invocation of supposed factors like μεταχαρκτηρισμός or a Peisistratean Recension and (2) purely linguistic arguments for Attic elements. For an introduction to the controversy about possible Doric elements in the Epic, cf. Morpurgo Davies 1964; especially astute in this work is the formulation of a textual factor operative on an important Hesiodic dialectal criterion, and it deserves to be singled out for its perceptiveness: 'a short accusative in -ᾶς was *prosodically odd, but graphically correct* [*italics supplied*], while a short accusative in -ος was likely to be automatically corrected either into the equivalent long form in -ους or into a singular in -οῦ' (157, fn. 2). On the issue of dialectal stratification in Choral Lyric, cf. e.g. Pavese 1967. Cf. also Part I for a discussion of interrelationships in genre and dialect.

One of the most thoroughly-reported facets of the Greek language involves the epichoric dialectal inscriptions: cf. the surveys by Bechtel 1921, 1923, 1924; Thumb and Kieckers 1932; Thumb and Scherer 1959; and Buck 1955. For a particularly useful bibliographical summary of source-material, cf. Thumb and Kieckers 1932: 13–47 ('Die Quellen der griechischen Dialekte. Literarische Hilfsmittel'). Exemplary of individual studies are those of Jacobsthal 1907 and Lejeune 1940. Besides steady progress since the nineteenth century in the collection and analysis of the evidence, there has also emerged an important contemporary trend in attempts at a broader perspective on the bewildering variety of attested dialects. The foremost proponent of this trend has been Risch (1949; cf. also 1955), who 'used principles of dialect geography to show that when isoglosses do not agree with tribal boundaries (e.g. the treatment of *-ns), the most likely inference is that the innovations in question are relatively late, rather than that tribal mixture and overlaying has occurred' (Cowgill's summary; 1966:78). For a cautious attempt at correlating attested dialectal geo-

graphy with reconstructed dialectal prehistory, cf. Coleman 1963 (for a convenient summary of his views by the author himself, cf. Coleman 1968:169–70).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

For an understanding of the Greek language as the complex and variegated system that it is, the surest approach remains simply the mastery of such synoptic and exhaustive treatments as have been surveyed. The texts needed for further analysis are generally accessible. For an example, let us consider the Greek dialectal inscriptions: not only are the publications of epigraphically-attested dialectal material thoroughly listed in the *Handbuch* of Thumb and Kieckers (1932:27–33), but there is also a conveniently compact one-volume collection of practically all dialect-inscriptions of any significance (Schwyzer and Cauer 1923). There are also such invaluable localized collections as that of Olivier Masson (1961; with incisive commentary) on the Cypriote inscriptions; unfortunately in this particular case, however, Masson's reference-work is incomplete, for reasons beyond the control of the editor, and it has to be supplemented with Mitford's publication of additional material (1961). In fact, such anomalies of progress are a frequent problem, and an important *desideratum* is the orderly and unified supplementation of textual collections; this of course holds not only for the Cypriote collection (cf. Szemerényi's comments, 1968b) but also for textual collections in general — literary as well as epigraphical. As for exemplary treatments of dialectal inscriptions which are in a highly specialized context, we cite Nehrbass on the *Iamata* of Epidauros (1935) and Willetts on the *Law Code* of Gortyn (1967).

There are abundant analytical tools available for the study of Greek, ranging all the way from e.g. such generally useful reference-volumes as the reverse indices of Buck and Petersen (1944; a list covering nouns and adjectives, with chronology and commentary) and Kretschmer and Locker (1963; a simple list covering all parts of speech) to such specific collections as Thompson's glossaries on birds (1936) and fish (1947). A cautionary note is in order here: with the passage of time, certain early compendia on Greek grammar and dialectology have tended to become neglected or even forgotten by succeeding generations of scholars, despite the value of these works not only for linguistic insight but also for a conscientious assimilation of the extant grammatical and dialectal testimonia of the ancient world; representative of such compendia are those of Lobeck 1853–62 and Ahrens 1839, 1843. Drawing attention to these is all the more relevant because later treatises tend to betray far less appreciation or awareness of the ancient testimonia. Another problem of obsolescence is that certain reference-manuals slated for replacement remain useful; for example, despite the admirable additions, improvements, and streamlining in Frisk's etymological dictionary of Greek (1960, 1961–), the details collected in Boisacq's reputedly obsolescent manual (1950) retain their value as possible points of departure for

further investigation. Then too, Chantraine's etymological dictionary (1968-) should not be viewed as a replacement of Frisk's in turn, but rather as a complement to it; each has its own value, practically its own genre: one is, straightforwardly, *ein griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch — was der Titel besagt* (Frisk 1960: v), while the other, transcendently, aspires to be *une histoire des mots* (Chantraine 1968: vii) — and apparently succeeds. Finally, for the purpose of acquiring increasingly greater skill in the analysis of Greek, we must emphasize the propaedeutic importance of sharing in the understanding of those who have cultivated a sweeping and profound mastery of the Greek language, whence the preponderant value of their *Kleine Schriften*: e.g. of Meillet (1921, 1936), of Wackernagel (1953), of Schulze (1966). Few exercises are more instructive than reading confrontations of these men's knowledge and analytical techniques with specific problems discovered in their study of Greek.

In the best of possible worlds, scrutiny of the Greek language will become such a discipline that it will impel its scholars to ever greater efforts at consolidating both the relevant textual material and the analytical contributions. The format of these contributions, furthermore, will eventually require that the author explain any grammatical phenomenon cited by him and essential to his arguments but likely to be unknown or unfamiliar to his readers: in other words, there would be no more relegations of such phenomena to obscurity by the expedient of cross-referencing to another remote work for an explanation and then expecting the reader to consult immediately in order to understand the argument at hand. If knowledge of the given phenomenon is not commonplace, then an immediate summary of it — though it may not be original — is nonetheless a contribution to the continuity of Greek study. The transmission of knowledge about the Greek language must not be impeded or made cyclic, and thereby the following sort of odious situation will be avoided:

For reasons that are both obvious and highly functional, science textbooks ... refer only to that part of the work of past scientists that can easily be viewed as contributions to the statement and solution of the texts' paradigm problems. Partly by selection and partly by distortion, the scientists of earlier ages are implicitly represented as having worked upon the same set of fixed problems and in accordance with the same set of fixed canons that the most recent revolution in scientific theory and method has made seem scientific. No wonder that textbooks and the historical tradition they imply have to be rewritten after each scientific revolution. And no wonder that, as they are rewritten, science once again comes to seem largely cumulative. (Kuhn 1962:136-7; this is part of a passage quoted in a particularly interesting context by Thorne 1965:74.)

In sum, the steadier the continuity and co-ordination in the linguistic analysis of Greek, the greater the progress.

III. TOWARDS A WIDER PERSPECTIVE ON THE GREEK LANGUAGE

by Gregory Nagy

There is always a strong tendency for the language of any period or area meriting special cultural interest to dominate attention from the linguistic standpoint as well. In the study of the Greek language this trend is aggravated even further by the fact that periods and areas of slight cultural impact frequently go without attestation: written documents simply do not survive. Then again, the area might have had cultural prestige, but its written evidence could still have perished. Thus, e.g., if we were to look for documents from the Magna Graecia of ca. the third century A.D., we would have to content ourselves with such material as a Greek-Latin check-list of words, phrases, and idioms useful to a Latin-speaking traveler in the Greek-speaking area of southern Italy. Here for example are some idioms selected at random from this list (the so-called *Hermeneumata Montepessulana*; an adequate sample is provided by Rohlfs 1956: 58–9, whence the extracts which follow):

hedeos se eidon : libenter te vidi
kai ego se : et ego te

pos ta paidia : quomodo infantes
zosin : vivunt

e kyria : domina
pou estin : ubi est
ydas pou menei : scis ubi manet

poreuou pedarion : vade puer
kai aggilon : et nuntia
oti erkomai : quoniam venio

elthe met emou : veni mecum

Admittedly, these can be interesting glimpses of banal and sometimes even sordid universals in *la condition humaine*, but aside from the understandable fascination which such texts should arouse in the antiquarian-at-heart, they will remain nothing more than a surviving oddity from the peripheral realms of the classical world. For that very reason, i.e. because of the absence of significant textual material surviving from this setting, the teleology of Greek in southern Italy is barely heeded in classical studies. And yet, it so happens that the Greek language has survived to this very day in that area, with one enclave in Apulia, the other in Calabria; then too, there is now available for classical scholarship not only a historical grammar of these two enclave-dialects (Rohlfs 1950), but also an etymological dictionary (Rohlfs 1964). What is more, the format of this etymological dictionary has been specifically designed to aid the linguist with a classical orientation, in that the entries are arranged with reference to the classical etyma rather than to the lexical repertory of the synchronically-attested dialects. Despite these valuable reference-works, few contemporary students of Greek have shown any interest in this remote manifestation of the language (cf. e.g. the bibliography in Rohlfs 1964: xvii–xxix), even though Rohlfs has demonstrated (e.g. 1962: 89–148) that in these dialects there survive ancient dialectal elements not leveled out by Κοινή, as in the standard Demotic. This circumstance alone means that the modern Greek of Apulia and Calabria might occasionally supply certain areas of information on the diachronic evolution of Greek which we cannot find elsewhere. It is precisely for this reason that we have chosen such a neglected area to illustrate how certain facts about the development of the language may sometimes be understood only when the descriptive grammar of a culturally negligible speech-form is taken into account. The discussion which follows is intended to adduce such an instance, with full use of material already collected by Rohlfs.

A study of the arrangement and context of syntactical connectives (the so-called particles) in classical Greek sheds light on the etymology of words denoting affirmation and negation in the modern Greek dialects of southern Italy. But the mere derivation of modern Greek elements from ancient counterparts is only one aspect of the investigation required: the reverse perspective is more informa-

tive for methodology and more interesting for content: given such modern Greek petrified survivals (phase A) of particles familiar to us from classical Greek (phase B), we may observe the teleology of such elements not only in terms of an attested progression from phase B to A, but sometimes also in terms of the prehistory predictable from phases B to A, i.e. ...*C to B to A.

| | 'yes' | 'no' |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Calabrian | <i>manè</i> | <i>ðè</i> or <i>uðè</i> |
| Apulian | <i>úmme</i> | <i>dèn gje</i> , etc. |
| (cf. standard Demotic | <i>vai</i> | <i>ðxi</i>) |

From a formal standpoint, it is easy to derive e.g. *manè* from a combination of what would be classical *μά* and *vaí*. Left on this level, however, such an etymology is not by itself convincing, especially since it is vulnerable to the possible objection that *manè* might yet be explained as simply the reinforcement of the standard Demotic type *vai* (= *nè*) by the widespread Mediterranean particle *ma*, as if *manè* were a syntactical borrowing from e.g. the contiguous Italian '*ma sì*'. But this objection we can easily remove by observing a basic synchronic fact of distribution: beside the positive *manè*, there is no parallel negative **madè* (Rohlf's 1962:141). Any synchronically-motivated generation of *manè* on the basis of a currently-used particle *ma* would have entailed the simultaneous generation of a **madè*. Thus a diachronic motivation should be found, and for this we must (1) observe the arrangement and context of *μά* and *vaí* in the classical period and (2) determine how these two elements might have led ultimately to the function of what is today *manè* 'yes'. Simplex *vaí*, as reflected in standard Demotic, had functioned in classical Attic as an emphatic 'yes' and, optionally, in the introduction of oaths; simplex *μά* in classical Attic had become restricted to the obligatory function of introducing oaths: likewise the complex *vai má* (e.g. Pindar, *Nemean* 11.24: *vai má tòn òrkon*), and its rare variant *má vaí* as e.g. attested in the classical Cypriote inscription ICS 8, lines 6-7 (Olivier Masson 1961:105):

—]-?-o-mo-mo-ko-ne to-no-ro-ko-ne to-te ma-na-i e-ko [to-no]-ro-ko-ne to-te

transliteration: ...ὁμόμοκον τὸν ὄρκον τόνδε μά vaí ἐγὼ τὸν ὄρκον τόνδε.

On the basis of this much classical evidence, we should be led to conjecture that it was from the specific context of oath-taking (as in the actually-attested *má vaí*) that the latter-day *manè* 'yes' arose; we might even be tempted to extend this explanation to standard Demotic *vai*: that its later meaning should specifically be derived from its optional context involving oaths. At this point, however, further application of the comparative method becomes crucial for the rejection of this surface-level hypothesis. The pivotal form, from the diachronic standpoint, emerges in the modern enclave-dialect neighboring on Calabrian Greek, namely Apulian Greek; as already cited *supra*, the word for 'yes' in the latter dialect is *úmme*, vs. the *manè* of Calabrian. For *úmme*, Rohlf's (1962:142) has suggested the formally plausible etymon of ancient οὖν μέν, but without adequate functional justification. His point of departure, however, is suggestive: that the etymologically pristine connotation of μέν is one of affirmation (cf. also Frisk, *GEW* II.227: 'wahrlich, zwar'); in this connection, he cites the affirmative particles μέν οὖν and μέν οὖν γε 'indeed' in the *New Testament* (Rohlf's 1962:142, fn. 242). And yet, the initial position of οὖν is left unexplained, because it cannot be motivated in terms of classical Greek word-order; citing the post-classical shift of τοῖνυν into sentence-initial position as a typological parallel provides only a partial explanation. The solution to this aporia may well be found in the interrogative particle οὐκοῦν 'nicht wahr?' (in Κοινή, the sporadic Attic feature of separated οὐ... οὖν has been extended: Schwyzler and Debrunner 1950: 587): an affirmative answer which could have been generated from the question 'οὐκ — οὖν?' is 'οὖν — μέν!'. (Cf. the asseverative usage of μέν δὲ in Plato's *Philebos* 55e and *Laws* 901a.) It is significant too that the very combination of negative and οὖν, namely μὴ + οὖν = μῶν, is still attested in the Apulian particle *áramo* 'wer weiss?', from ἄρα μῶν (Rohlf's 1962:139). However, even if the etymology of *úmme* as οὖν μέν is accepted, it has yet to be made clear how this form *úmme* is pivotal in our argument: on the surface, there seems to be no etymological relation between Apulian *úmme* and Calabrian *manè*. But here we must draw attention to another interesting modern dialectal Greek form mentioned by Rohlf's only in passing (1962:142): it is the word for 'yes' in the Rhodian town of Kallythiès: *úmma*. An obvious conclusion from the comparison of latter-day Apulian *úmme* and Rhodian *úmma* is that μέν and μά were iso-functional. We may cite, after duly noting the additional (but here peripheral) factor of lexical con-

tamination from neighboring Mediterranean languages, a comparable pair in the dialectal attestations of the adversative particles *ammè* and *ammá* 'but'; besides the *μév* and *μά* here, there is also attested not only a lengthened-grade *μήν*, in *ammí*, but also a correlative *δέ*, in Apulian/Calabrian *andè* 'sonst'. Presumably the first part of these particles *ammè ammá ammí andè* is from *ǵn* 'if' (this etymology is specifically suggested for *andè* by Rohlfs himself; 1964: 32); but the focus remains on the *-mè -má -mí -dè*. If we accept that *μév* and *μά* must have been isofunctional in producing Apulian *úmme* and Rhodian *úmma*, we may then immediately discern a link between Apulian *úm-me* and Calabrian *ma-nè*. Add to this the fact that *vaí μév* had constituted an intensification of *vaí* in classical times, and suddenly there begins to loom a different perspective on the etymology of the ancient Greek particles *μév* and *μά*. It now becomes relevant that in the classical period of Greek, the Thessalian dialect still shows *μά* as a simple connective particle meaning 'but'; and the isofunctionalism established for modern Greek *-me-* and *-ma-* can then be extended back to ancient Greek *μév* and *μά*, in that both are attested with the two functions of 1) asseverative and 2) connective; only, the attested repertory of the classical period happens to show *μά* restricted to the former function, except for the residual Thessalian *μά*, and *μév* restricted to the latter, except for the residual type *vaí μév*. Surely the classically-attested exceptions would be insufficient to remove the etymological blur caused by this eventually mutual exclusion of originally shared functions, if it were not for the modern Greek reflexes surviving from the unattested periphery of the classical material:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| <i>μév</i> | □ |
| <i>μά</i> | × |
| <i>vaí</i> | × |
| <i>vaí μév</i> | ↓ |
| <i>vaí μά</i> | □ |
| <i>μά vaí</i> | ↓ |
| <i>μév ούν</i> | × |
| <i>ούν μév</i> | ↓ |
| <i>ούν μά</i> | × |

(□ = attested in ancient Greek; × = attested in modern Greek; a vertical line between two elements indicates that the formal connection can be descriptively correlated with a functional connection.) So it is on the strength of evidence from the modern period that we can suggest an isofunctionalism between classical *μév* and *μά*, which would then be etymologically motivated by being dated back to a remote time when the Indo-European apophonic mechanism of alternating full-grade with zero-grade was still operative: **men* vs. **mh₂*, > *μév* vs. *μά* (cf. also lengthened-grade *μήν*). Of course, this etymological interpretation of *μά* is not to be found in Frisk's *GEW* (II.154). The classical evidence alone is presumably insufficient to warrant it.

So much, then, for an instance where the tracing of the teleology in attested phases B to A may reveal the outlines of unattested phases further back in time: ...*C to B to A. To illustrate this point, we have used the words for 'yes' in the modern Greek enclave-dialects of southern Italy. Now in turn the words for 'no' in the same area may be used to illustrate another point: in tracing a progression from phase B to A, it is possible to come upon transitional nodes between the two phases. In other words, there may be points where the path from B to A is subject to becoming obviated. Let us consider Calabrian *ðè* and *uðè* 'no' (*ðè* is also the standard Demotic negative for 'not'); as in the previous examples *manè* 'yes' and *úmme* 'yes', from a purely formal standpoint it is relatively easy to derive both *ðè* and *uðè* from a classical antecedent: in this case, *οὐδέν*. But here too as with *manè* and *úmme*, the etymology is also justifiable from a functional standpoint: classical *οὐδέν* is actually attested with the emphatic negative denotation of 'not at all', as in Aristophanes (*Clouds* 694). What therefore becomes significant in this formal and functional correspondence is this: 'Gegenüber dem neugriechi-

schen $\delta\chi\iota$ (< $\sigma\upsilon\chi\iota$) zeigt diese Partikel [i.e. $\mu\delta\epsilon$ or $\delta\epsilon$] die Bewahrung einer nicht von der Κοινή zerstörten älteren Sprachphase' (Rohlf's 1962:141). We see here an instance where a remote latter-day dialect has preserved a classically-attested feature while the standard dialect merely reflects a corresponding and less archaic feature (from Κοινή) which superseded it. The same holds for the Apulian *dèn gje* as for the Calabrian $\delta\epsilon/\mu\delta\epsilon$: the former can be directly connected with classical $\sigma\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$ γε 'not at all', as in Aristophanes (*Birds* 1360; on the formal even if not directly on the syntactical level, we may compare with $\sigma\upsilon\delta\delta\epsilon\nu/\sigma\upsilon\delta\delta\epsilon\nu$ γε the already-mentioned $\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu/\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ γε of the *New Testament*). Between the classical phase B with $\sigma\upsilon\delta\delta\epsilon\nu$ and the modern phase A with $\delta\chi\iota$, there has clearly been an obviation from the standpoint of standard modern Demotic — an obviation which we happen to witness becoming imposed in the intervening period of Κοινή; by the same token, this obviation from classical $\sigma\upsilon\delta\delta\epsilon\nu$ (γε) to its expected latter-day reflexes was not enacted from the standpoint of the modern enclave-dialects of southern Italy, whence Calabrian $\delta\epsilon/\mu\delta\epsilon$ and Apulian *dèn gje*. The Κοινή-form simply did not prevail in this peripheral area: $\delta\chi\iota$ is absent in southern Italy.

We conclude this typological discussion centering on the enclave-dialects of southern Italy by referring to the *Scavi linguistici* of Rohlf's (1933) for further consultation. There have been other valuable works on the survival of non-Kοινή elements in modern Greek, such as the synthesis by Tsopanakis (1955) of specifically Doric traces in the latter-day dialects of Cyprus, the Dodecanese (especially Rhodes and Karpathos), Crete, Thera, Kythera, the Peloponnese (especially Tsakonian), the islands of the Ionian Sea, the Epirus-coast, Chimara, and of course the enclaves in southern Italy. But we single this article out here only because while it is an important contribution to discover some local persistence, however substratal, of a major dialectal group for around 3,000 years, the relevance of such an interesting circumstance is more historical than linguistic. From the purely linguistic standpoint, we must reckon with the fact that the Doric dialects have been generally leveled out by Κοινή, with Tsakonian remaining as the only dialect with overt Doric features of more than just substratal nature. Granted, the survival of substratal elements elsewhere too is historically significant, and the detection of such elements should be considered a scholarly feat. In fact, such detection can even be crucial for other disciplines, as we see in e.g. the contribution of Rohlf's to classical philology in pointing out that the bucolic terminology of modern Calabrian Greek contains elements found elsewhere only in the pastoral poetry of Theokritos (cf. Rohlf's 1933:160); given the Sicilian Doric *milieu* of the latter, such a correlation is significant. But the point here is that the detection alone of, say, Doric survivals does not necessarily contribute to the understanding of the Greek language as a system (in the sense of the word as used by Meillet), from either the synchronic or the diachronic point of view. Hence the value of studies such as the one by Rohlf's on particles for 'yes' and 'no' in Calabrian and Apulian Greek: besides the historically interesting comparisons made with corresponding particles in dialects of Greek in the classical period, it is the actual procedure of comparison which helps elucidate the nature of $\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $\mu\acute{\alpha}$.

Despite efforts to view the entire system of the Greek language and its components from a teleological standpoint, the factors of time and space do continually assert themselves. In the case of $\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $\mu\acute{\alpha}$ just cited, for instance, we have had to resort to expressing these elements with reference to (1) a late Byzantine script, (2) an accentual scheme formulated by Alexandrians, and (3) an orthography formalized in classical Athens. Even more important, on the surface one tends to think of $\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $\mu\acute{\alpha}$ predominantly in terms of classical Attic, because of its cultural prestige. Standard dictionaries of ancient Greek list entries in their classical Attic manifestation, and we are easily tempted to view early, late, or dialectal variants as quaint aberrations, rather than as grammatically relevant alternative transformations of a form we happen to know best in its classical Attic transformation. But given the facts of attestation and the primacy of classical Attic in this respect too, the use of classical Attic forms as points of reference to any other corresponding Greek forms is the most economical standard practice in grammatical studies. We have already noted, for instance, the general usefulness and accessibility of Rohlf's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der unteritalienischen Gräzität* (1964) because of its arrangement of material under entry-headings given in the classical Attic form.

Taking the other extreme from the chronological point of view, we note that the Chadwick and Baumbach etymological dictionary of late Bronze Age Greek ("The Mycenaean Greek vocabulary": 1963) is likewise arranged with entry-headings in classical Attic. As Chadwick says (158),

A very great number of interpretations have been examined and rejected, in some cases not because there is any definite reason for disbelieving them, but simply because they do not offer any reliable

grounds for asserting the presence in the Mycenaean vocabulary of the Greek element in question. This index is therefore not to be regarded as a reference book for those engaged in the interpretation of Mycenaean texts; it approaches the subject from the point of view of the researcher who wishes to know whether there is any evidence for the existence of a particular Greek root in Mycenaean, and whether its form in that dialect throws any light on the etymology.

This statement is crucial and exemplary for its methodological principles: the primary consideration is here clearly revealed to be the goal of enhancing in the broadest sense our knowledge of the Greek language as a system. Since we are now dealing with the lexical level of language, the developmental analysis achieved in this given instance is therefore mainly in the sphere of etymology. Of course, with the lapse of about half a millennium between Mycenaean Greek and the most archaic classical Greek, the diachronic perspective afforded by the former for motivating developments in the latter is equally important on the levels of phonology, morphology, and syntax; but the lexical level alone is sufficient for illustrating the usefulness of analyzing an earlier phase of a language with the specific intent of finding motivations for developments in a much later phase of the same language. Relevant to such a procedure is the following methodological statement by Watkins (1962a: 5):

Let us make the larger assumption, namely, that our asterisked forms try to correspond, on whatever level or however approximately, with a preexisting linguistic reality. Then an asterisked form, or a sequence of asterisked forms, becomes not an isolated symbol, but an entire model of a temporal sequence of systematic linguistic transformations leading to an attested form. Once this is admitted, then it is apparent that the simple exercise of reconstructing forwards in time may prove a fruitful and productive line of speculation.

The attestation of Greek at such an early stage as the Bronze Age therefore provides an invaluable control for the technique of 'reconstructing forwards in time' (as Watkins calls it). It is as if a whole series of asterisks were removed, making the procedure of reconstructing forwards that much more reliable. In fact, the Linear B Mycenaean Greek texts have in some instances provided evidence pivotal for modifying the traditional reconstructions of such classically-attested words as ἔνεκα, Ἑρμῆς, Ἥρα, ὅτε, ὀφείλω, παλαιός, πᾶς, πέρυσσι, ῥάπτω, φέρβω (Chadwick 1963a:159). On the whole, however, the sudden attestation (in the mid-fifties) of Greek from the second millennium B.C. has corroborated rather than invalidated the etymologies of the classical Greek lexical repertory as determined by the techniques of internal and comparative reconstruction: 'It has indeed been suggested that the decipherment is disappointing in the meagre contribution it has made to Greek etymologies; this is rather an eloquent testimonial to the accuracy of the reconstructions of earlier scholars, that so few of their conclusions need to be modified' (Chadwick 1963a:158).

In order to find ways of improving techniques in the analysis of the Greek language, it is instructive to examine an instance where the traditional reconstruction of a word has not been corroborated by the newly-found evidence of Linear B. Let us choose an entry from the list drawn up by Chadwick (i.e. from the just-mentioned words ranging from ἔνεκα to φέρβω). The case in point will be the goddess's name Ἥρα, the archaism of which is obvious even from its morphological distribution in, say, compounds. For instance, in order to denote possession for heroes' names in compound nominalizations containing Hera's name, the regular construction found in the Homeric corpus is the adjective, as opposed to the relatively more recent genitive: hence βίη Ἡρακλείη, just like such other exponents of older Epic as βίη Ἑταοκλήϊη, βίη Ἰφικλήϊη, etc., vs. such exponents of newer Epic as Πριάμοιο βίη, Πατρόκλοιο βίη, etc. (Wackernagel 1928:69). No Indo-European etymology for the goddess Hera is readily plausible, but this circumstance itself makes Ἥρα all the more suitable for our present purposes, since any proposed formal reconstruction will have to be motivated solely in terms of the word's development within attested stages of the Greek language. Now the traditional reconstruction of Ἥρα is **hērwā*, as we find it in Hofmann's etymological dictionary (1950:109). The evidence of Linear B, however, contradicts this etymology: in the Pylian tablet Ta 316 (verso), line 9, the male recipient of offerings is one *di-we*, coupled with a female recipient, *e-ra*. These forms are obviously the datives **diwei* (cf. classical Cypriote Διφει-φιλος) and **hērāi* of what ultimately became nominative Ζεύς and Ἥρα in classical times (Chadwick and Baumbach 1963:201). But even aside from Linear B, there is also classically-attested evidence for the reconstruction **hērā* rather than **hērwā*. As Frisk correctly points out (*GEW* I.642), **hērwā* should have resulted in Attic **Ἡρη*, just as **korwā* (cf. Mycenaean *ko-wa* 'girl') becomes Attic κόρη, not **κόρῃ*. Besides,

in the classical Cypriote inscription *ICS* 90 (Olivier Masson 1961:146), where *-w-* is regularly featured by the syllabary, we read in line 5:

-ta-i-te-o-i-ta-e-ra-i

transliteration: ... τᾱι θεῶι τῆ Ἥρᾱι.

Again, there is no trace of *digamma* in Ἥρᾱ. (For proof of no *digamma* from the archaic epigraphical evidence of the Argolid alone, cf. Pötscher 1965.) Why, then, has **-w-* ever been posited at all for this word? It is because of the Elean inscription *DGE* 413 (Schwyzer and Cauer 1923:213 f.) from Olympia, dated to the sixth century B.C. It reads as follows:

- 1 α φρατρα τοιρ φαλειοις και τοις ερ-
- 2 ραιοις. συνμαχια κ' εα εκατον φετα,
- 3 αρχοι δε κα τοι. αι δε τι δεοι αιτε φεπος αιτε φ-
- 4 αργον, συνεαν κ' αλαλοις τα τ' αλ(α) και πα-
- 5 ρ πολεμο. αι δε μα συνεαν, ταλαντον κ'
- 6 αργυρο αποτινιοιαν τοι δι ολυνπιοι τοι κα-
- 7 δαλεμενοι λατρειομενον. αι δε τιρ τα γ-
- 8 ραφεα ται καδαλειοιτο αιτε φετας αιτε τ-
- 9 ελεστα αιτε δαμος, εν τεπιαροι κ' ενεχ-
- 10 οιτο τοι 'νταυ' εγραμενοι

We append Buck's translation (1955:261):

The covenant of the Eleans and the Heraeans (of Arcadia). There shall be an alliance for one hundred years, beginning with the present year. If there shall be any need of word or deed, they shall combine with one another both in other matters and in war. If they do not combine, let those who violate (the agreement) pay a talent of silver consecrated to Olympian Zeus. If any one violates these writings, whether private citizen, official, or the state, let him be held in the penalty here written.

We must therefore find an explanation for the form <ερφαοις> of lines 1–2, and for this it is particularly important to avoid a mistake endemic to the neogrammarian approach: that is, we must not confuse the orthographical superficialities with the underlying phonological realities. Now the spelling <ερφαοις> represents the dative plural of a derivative referring to the inhabitants of the Arcadian district Ἥρᾱ, named after the goddess Ἥρᾱ (to be noted again is the absence of *digamma* even in the earliest native Arcadian spellings of Ἥρᾱ, dated to the sixth century B.C.). For this derivative, we can find a morphological parallel: the inhabitants of Γέλᾱ are the Γελοᾱοι, a form which then becomes Γελῶοι (both the uncontracted and the contracted phases are attested; cf. Schwyzer and Cauer 1923:154). It is thus possible to symbolize the formal precedent operative here with the following proportion:

Γέλ-ᾱ : Γελ-ο-ᾱοι = Ἥρᾱ-ᾱ : Ἥρα-ο-ᾱοι.

The last of these forms is actually attested, with its uncontracted phase, in the following abbreviation on archaic Arcadian coinage: <ηραοαι> (Schwyzer and Cauer 1923:214). As for a contraction of Ἥραοᾱοι, we expect *Ἥραῶοι, further contracted to *Ἥρῶοι. Now it is crucial to observe that **-w-* had already been lost before **-δi-* by the time of this Elean inscription under discussion: hence e.g. the <δεοι> for the expected *δεφοι in line 3 and the <αποτινιοιαν> for the expected *αποτινφοιαν in line 6. We might note here in passing that there might have been an etymological *φ* in -ᾱοι itself, if indeed the latter is not a suffix but a compound-formant **-αιφοι* (<**-saiwoi*>, meaning 'inhabitant of' and being cognate with Sanskrit *sev-* 'inhabit' (Schulze 1888/1966:392). Of course, once genuine **-wδi-* had become **-δi-*, it was thereafter possible to introduce an etymologically spurious *digamma* before any <οι>, in hyperarchaizing spelling: hence <ερφοις>; finally, by likewise archaizing diectasis, we arrive at <ερφαοις> representing the posited genuine */ērōiois/*. It is possible to cite a famous parallel to such a hypercorrect Elean *φ*, in the early Corinthian spelling <ποτΕδαφον> corresponding to the etymologically correct Linear B <po-se-da-o> = /poseidāōn/; here again, **-wδ-* has become **-δ-*, whence the possibility of spelling etymological <ο> as <φο>. In sum, even from

internal evidence the f of <ερφαοιοις> cannot be justified, and the connection of Linear B *e-ra* with *H \bar{p} a stands vindicated.

The impetus for rejecting a phonemic *digamma* in the <ερφαοιοις> of DGE 413 was primarily the conflicting evidence of Linear B. It was this conflict which had prompted the need to reconcile the relevant Elean and Mycenaean facts, and it was from the actual procedure of comparison that we could effect a correct perspective on the formal development of *H \bar{p} a in the Greek language. But in order to refute conclusively the presence of *digamma* in <ερφαοιοις>, the ultimate step had to be the internal analysis of DGE 413 itself. What is more, in terms of linguistic proof, the evidence of DGE 413 itself is primary, because it is internal; the testimony of Linear B *e-ra* is extrinsic and therefore secondary: it is but a corroboration. But in terms of actual impetus to investigation, we must admit that the relative value of the Elean and Mycenaean evidence is in the reverse order. Of course, internal analysis too has its shortcomings, since it often fails to provide all the evidence required: in the case of <ερφαοιοις>, for instance, its information is negative rather than positive: we are simply not justified in automatically accepting f in <ερφαοιοις> as etymologically genuine, *but it could still be so*. The latter possible corollary is then removed by the secondary evidence of Linear B.

For the sake of expanding this methodological discussion, let us now examine other phonological problems in the Elean inscription DGE 413, this time restricting our attention to phenomena where no extrinsic corroborative evidence is needed from other dialects of Greek. One such is the word-final rhotacism of *-s-, as in <τοιρ> of line 1 and <τιρ> of line 7. On the surface, no predictable pattern is apparent, although the extreme neogrammarian might be content to state that -ς becomes -ρ before f - (<τοιρ φαλειοις>) and before t - (<τιρ τα>); such an attitude is on the same level as if one were moved to postulate degemination in early Elean simply on the grounds that double consonants are not spelled out in e.g. DGE 413 (<αλαλοις, αλα, καδαλεμνοι, καδαλειτο, εγραμενοι>). The just-mentioned formulation for the rhotacism would be not only incomplete but also *ad hoc*, and could not endure the evidence of all the other extant Elean material dated to the same era (DGE 409–12, 414–17). Hence e.g. in DGE 409.1, we find <τοις φαλειοις> in line 1 and <τις τον> in line 7; but also <ορ φαλειο> in line 2. In order to make a synchronic analysis of the distribution -s/-r in archaic Elean, we must therefore consider first the phonological genesis of rhotacism in word-final position. From the typological point of view, there are two basic contexts which could have triggered the progression -s > *-z > -r: to wit, (1) -s + vowel and (2) -s + voiced consonant. But already in DGE 413, we see <φεπος αιτε> and <τιρ τα> respectively; or again, <αδικος γα> in DGE 411.3. Such instances as <τιρ τα> show that the original constraints for word-final rhotacism have been removed, so that the process has ultimately been generalized without conditioning by external *sandhi*. Thus the very writing-out of -ς is an archaism, leading even to such hypercorrect spellings as <φεπος αιτε> and <αδικος γα>. It could still be objected that -s might have remained overt in phrase-final or clause-final position, whence the possibility of an underlying 'archiphonème' -s; but even for this slot we find instances of -r: e.g. <μαντιερ> in DGE 414.4.

Phonological analysis of archaizing texts like DGE 413 becomes even more complicated when underlying forms are morphologically conditioned. By the designation of underlying forms here, we mean instances like overt *συν-* before non-labials vs. latent *συν-* before labials (where the phonological rule $n + \text{labial} > m + \text{labial}$ automatically goes into effect); because the segment *συν-* is morphologically productive, the phonetic reality of e.g. /summak^hiā/ may be spelled <συνμαχια> as in DGE 413.2. The native speaker's awareness of the morpheme-boundary between underlying *συν-* and -μαχια has here induced the non-phonetic spelling <νμ>. So much for <συνμαχια>; the present task, however, is different in that we wish to examine an instance where deliberate archaizing — an occupational hazard especially for the analyst of early Greek texts — is also a factor influencing the way in which a morphologically induced underlying form may be represented. The form to be analyzed is the 3rd singular optative of εἶμι, <εα> in DGE 413.2. Now the Attic equivalent of Elean εα is εἴη, to be reconstructed as *eiē rather than *eīā from the Indo-European standpoint. Why, then, the spelling <εα>? First, we must note that Common Greek *ē survives as an open vowel in Elean, whence Lejeune's transcription \bar{a} (1955:206). From the Elean standpoint, how does one represent this \bar{a} graphemically, when the only orthographic devices available from the transplanted archaic alphabet are <α>, meant for \bar{a} , and <ε>, meant for \bar{e} ? This *chevauchement* of \bar{a} results in such Elean orthographic hesitations as in <πλε(θουοντι)> vs. <πλα(θουοντα)>, representing a root with original *plē (Lejeune 1955:206). As for the reflex of optative *eiē, Elean shows not only the already-mentioned spelling <εα> but also <εε>, and the latter is once actually attested coexisting with <εα> in the same

Elean inscription (*DGE* 410 lines 5, 6, 7). But there is more to this variation between <εα> and <ειε>: we note that the ε-spelling is regularly accompanied by a preceding *iota*, which in turn is absent from the α-spelling. Now it is relevant to mention at this point that in Elean, ξ becomes ā after ι and ρ (Lejeune 1955: 209); we may then surmise here the generalization of a rule familiar to us from Attic, where it is restricted to the long vowels: η becomes ā after ι and ρ (cf. Szemerényi 1968a). Given the orthographic ambiguity between Elean <ε> and <α> representing ā, there is nothing to prevent us from supposing that in Elean there was also a neutralization of phonological opposition between etymological *ē and *ā (as well as between *ē and *ā) after ι and ρ. Were there such a neutralization, that might help explain the orthographic constraints on representing *iota* in <εα> vs. <ειε>. The essential factor is that the neutralization would have to be in favor of one or the other original component of the opposition; the obvious priority is ā over ē, since if (*ē/ā >) ā/ā becomes ā after ι and ρ, then this would be parallel to ē/ā > ā in the same context. In order to represent the ā of the Elean optative /eiā/ (as opposed to ā) with <ε>, the spelling of a preceding *iota* would be necessary; but if this same ā were to be represented with <α>, there is no need to spell the *iota*. So much for the orthographic constraints on *iota* in the alternative representation <εα> vs. <ειε>. But the question remains, what was the actual motivation for the non-phonetic spelling in the latter? We submit that the factor operative here is morphological: given an Elean optative paradigm

eiān, eiās, eiā, eimen, eite, eian (cf. *συνεαν* in *DGE* 413.4, 5),

the paradigmatic pressure of the 1st and 2nd plural (potentially spelled *ειμεν* and *ειτε*) could induce the spelling <ει> before /ā/, which in turn then has to be represented by <ε>; whence <ειε>.

The basic purpose of the preceding methodological exercises on Elean has been to illustrate not so much the various types of contemporary approaches to the analysis of archaic Greek texts, but rather, the applicability of any given manifestation of Greek *parole* to our total understanding of the *langue*. Thus we have seen

1. corroboration of the etymology *hērā for e.g. Attic Ἥρα
2. visible traces of external *sandhi* (a general phonological aspect intuited only with the greatest difficulty from the attested linguistic history of Attic alone), subsequently leveled out
3. full extension of a vocalic rule that applies only half-way in Attic:

ε → ā // ρ, ι ____ vs. η → ā // ρ, ι ____ respectively.

It is no coincidence that for each of these three points, our natural frame of reference is Attic. The reasons for this have been amply discussed already. In order, then, to persevere in our renunciation of too strict a perspective on Greek, we will discuss one more feature of *DGE* 413 which contributes to our understanding of the Greek language, only this time the specific aporia will be important in terms more of Mycenaean than of Attic, and on the morphological level instead of the phonological.

The new problem involves the nominative singular of the Mycenaean masculine *tā*-stems. As Vilborg says (1960: 70), 'We cannot determine whether the nom.sing. had already taken the -s on the analogy of the *o*-stems. In view of the Homeric and dialect forms without -ς (/Elean/ τελεστα etc. ...), it is quite possible that it was absent.' From the standpoint of Indo-European and Common Greek, we may add the following observations on the masculine (*t*)ā-stems (the optional *t* will henceforth be omitted in our references):

1. there are numerous Homeric attestations of masculine -ā in nominative, not vocative, function; likewise of nominative singular feminine -ā vs. -ā, and there is no cogent internal evidence that the nominative usage is an extension from the vocative usage (Schwyzer 1939:560);
2. an old nominative -ā could easily have been replaced by -ā, in a process of declensional leveling from the oblique cases with -ā-; in accordance with Kurylowicz's fourth law of analogy (1945-49:169), whereby an ousted old form takes on a secondary function in relation to the acquired primary function of the new form which ousted it, an ultimate repartition of -ā as nominative vs. -ā as vocative could arise; traces of the old nominative -ā could be metrically preserved in the Epic;
3. the length in masculine -ā (vs. -ā) predicates the formal mechanism of adding -s for the nominative in the Epic meter; absence of -s conversely implies -ā (vs. -ā);
4. the genitive singular of nominative masculine -ā is -ās; once -ā is replaced by -ā, however, the genitive singular is reconstituted as -āo in e.g. the Epic; -os : -oo = -ās : -āo (Schwyzer 1939:560),

Now the regular genitive singular of masculine \bar{a} -stems in Linear B is $-\bar{a}o$, written $\langle -Ca-o \rangle$; transcending Vilborg's given formulation, we may conclude from criterion 4 that the nominative singular of $-\bar{a}o$, written $\langle -Ca \rangle$, was already $-\bar{a}s$. But there are also attested in Linear B some residual instances of contextually-ascertained genitive singular masculine $-\bar{a}s$, written $\langle -Ca \rangle$ (Lejeune 1958:38). The nominative singular of such masculine \bar{a} -stems must have been $-\bar{a}$, according to all four of the criteria above, especially the last two. But if the genitive singular of a given masculine noun in $-(t)\bar{a}$ - is not attested in Linear B, are we to read $-(t)\bar{a}$ or $-(t)\bar{a}s$? How, for instance, can we discern whether the nominative singular masculine $te-re-ta$ of Pylian tablet Eo 224 should be read *telestā* or *telestās*? Here the contextual evidence of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha$ in the Elean inscription DGE 413 (lines 8–9) from Olympia becomes crucial. We already have reason to expect Mycenaean reflexes from Olympia: for example, it is possible to correlate the report of Pausanias (4.20.2) that the priestess of Eileithuia at Olympia put out for her $\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\alpha\varsigma \mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\tau\iota$ 'barley-cakes kneaded with honey' (italics supplied) with the text of Knossian tablet G 705, where Eileithuia is recipient of an offering likewise of honey (Ventris and Chadwick 1956:310). It is suggestive, then, that the collocation of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha$ and $\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma$ in DGE 413.8–9 has a parallel in the collocation of $te-re-ta$ and $da-mo$ in the land-tenure tablets of Pylos (cf. e.g. Bennet, April 1962:182; also Palmer 1963b:191). Even from the minimalist approach in contextual analysis, such as that practiced by Jones (1966:245), we can establish that the rubrics $ki-ti-me-na$ vs. $ke-ke-me-na$ are a basic official distinction for Pylian land-tenure, that the $da-mo$ is the disposer of $ke-ke-me-na$ land, and that the $te-re-ta$ is holder of $ki-ti-me-na$ land. We may therefore postulate a Mycenaean-inherited collocation in the Elean usage of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha/\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma$ and the nominative singular $-ta$ implies that Pylian $te-re-ta$ should be read as archaic *telestā*, not *telestās*. It is important too that the apparently non-Mycenaean adjunct to $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha/\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma$ in DGE 413, namely $\phi\epsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma$ (line 8), shows the synchronically productive ending $-tās$ as opposed to the residual $-tā$.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following list contains primarily articles and books referred to in the discussion. A small selection of other recommended works is also included.

- ADRADOS, FRANCISCO RODRÍGUEZ. 1952. La Dialectología griega como fuente para el estudio de las migraciones indoeuropeas en Grecia. Salamanca, Acta Salmanticensia 5/3.
- AHRENS, HEINRICH LUDOLF. 1839, 1843. De Graecae linguae dialectis. 2 vols. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- ALLEN, W. SIDNEY. 1958. Some problems of palatalization in Greek. *Lingua* 7. 113–33.
- . 1966. Prosody and prosodies in Greek. *TPhS* 107–48.
- . 1967. Correlations of tone and stress in ancient Greek. To honor Roman Jakobson: essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, 1.46–62. 's-Gravenhage and Paris, Mouton.
- . 1968a. *Vox graeca*. A guide to the pronunciation of classical Greek. Cambridge, The University Press.
- . 1968b. Review of *The sound of Greek: studies in the Greek theory and practice of euphony*, by W.B. Stanford. *Gnomon* 40.305–7.
- BADER, FRANÇOISE. 1965. Les composés grecs du type de *demiourgos*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- BARBER, E. A. (ed), with the assistance of PAUL MAAS, MEINRAD SCHELLER, and M. L.

- WEST. 1968. A Greek-English lexicon: a supplement [to the 9th ed. of H.G. Liddell, Robert Scott, and H. Stuart Jones]. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- BARTONĚK, ANTONÍN. 1961. Vývoj konsonantického systému v řeckých dialektech (Development of the consonantal system in ancient Greek dialects). *Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis (Facultas Philosophica)* 77. Praha.
- . 1964. Outline of phonemic system in Mycenaean Greek. *SFFBU A* 12.195–209.
- . 1966. Development of the long-vowel system in ancient Greek dialects. *Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis (Facultas Philosophica)* 106. Praha.
- , ed. 1968. *Studia mycenaea*. Proceedings of the Mycenaean Symposium (Brno, April 1966). *Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis (Facultas Philosophica)* 127. Brno.
- BECHTEL, FRIEDRICH. 1914. *Lexilogus zu Homer*. Etymologie und Stammbildung Homerischer Wörter. Halle, Niemeyer.
- . 1917. *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*. Halle, Niemeyer.
- . 1921, 1923, 1924. *Die griechischen Dialekte*. 3 vols. Berlin, Weidmann.
- BENNETT, EMMETT L. 1958–. *Nestor*. A monthly newsletter distributed from the Institute for Research in the Humanities, University of Wisconsin, Madison. Begun as *Mycenaean Bibliography*, 23 February 1957; first published as *Nestor* in October 1958. Continuous pagination.
- BENVENISTE, ÉMILE. 1935. *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris, Adrien Maisonneuve.
- . 1946. Structure des relations de personne dans le verbe. *BSL* 43.1–12. Reprinted in Benveniste 1966:225–36.
- . 1948. *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen*. Paris, Adrien Maisonneuve.
- . 1949. Euphémismes anciens et modernes. *Sprache* 1.116–22. Reprinted in Benveniste 1966:308–14.
- . 1951. Don et échange dans le vocabulaire indo-européen. *ASoc* 3^e série 7–20. Reprinted in Benveniste 1966:315–26.
- . 1954. Problèmes sémantiques de la reconstruction. *Word* 10.251–64. Reprinted in Benveniste 1966:289–307.
- . 1956a. La nature des pronoms. For Roman Jakobson, 34–7. 's-Gravenhage, Mouton. Reprinted in Benveniste 1966:251–7.
- . 1956b. Comment on the *rapport* by Ernst Risch (Caractères et position du dialecte mycénien). *Études mycéniennes*, ed. by M. Lejeune (1956:263).
- . 1958. De la subjectivité dans le langage. *JPsych* 257–65. Reprinted in Benveniste 1966:258–66.
- . 1962. Hittite et indo-européen. *Études comparatives*. Paris, Adrien Maisonneuve.
- . 1964. Renouveau lexical et dérivation en grec ancien. *BSL* 59.24–39.

- . 1966. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris, Gallimard. When cross-references are made in the text to articles by Benveniste contained in this collection, the year of original publication will be given beside the figure 1966.
- BJÖRCK, GUDMUND. 1950. *Das Alpha impurum und die tragische Kunstsprache. Attische Wort- und Stilstudien*. Uppsala, Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala 39/1.
- BOISACQ, ÉMILE. 1950. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. 4th ed., with index by Helmut Rix. Heidelberg, Winter.
- BOURGUET, ÉMILE. 1927. *Le dialecte laconien*. Paris, Champion.
- BOWRA, C. M. 1959. *Glössai kata poleis*. *Glotta* 38.43–60.
- BRANDWOOD, LEONARD. 1956. Analysing Plato's style with an electronic computer. *BICS* 3.45–54.
- BROCK, NADIA VAN. 1959. Substitution rituelle. *RHA* 65.117–46.
- . 1961. *Recherches sur le vocabulaire médical du grec ancien: soins et guérison*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- BRUGMANN, KARL, and ALBERT THUMB. 1913. *Griechische Grammatik*. 4th ed. München, Beck.
- BUCK, CARL D. 1955. *The Greek dialects: grammar, selected inscriptions, glossary*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- , and WALTER PETERSEN. 1944. *A reverse index of Greek nouns and adjectives. Arranged by terminations with brief historical introductions*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- BURGUIÈRE, PAUL. 1960. *Histoire de l'infinitif en grec*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- BURKERT, WALTER. 1960–61. *Elysion*. *Glotta* 39.208–14.
- CALAND, WILLEM. 1893. Beiträge zur kenntnis des Avesta. 26. *Adjectiva auf -ra in der composition*. *KZ* 32.592.
- CASABONA, JEAN. 1967. *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec, des origines à la fin de l'époque classique*. Aix-en-Provence, Éditions Ophrys.
- CHADWICK, JOHN. 1958. *Mycenaean elements in the Homeric dialect*. *Minoica: Festschrift für Johannes Sundwall*, pp. 116–22. Berlin, Steiner.
- . 1960. Context and etymology in Mycenaean interpretations. *SClas* 2.59–64.
- . 1963a. The prehistory of the Greek language. *Cambridge Ancient History*, ed. by I. E. S. Edwards, C. J. Gadd, and N. G. L. Hammond, vol. 2, ch. 39. Issued as a separate fascicle with separate pagination. Cambridge, The University Press.
- . 1963b. *Mycenaean Greek. Trends in modern linguistics: edited on the occasion of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists ... by Christine Mohrmann, F. Norman, and Alf Sommerfelt*, 95–103. Utrecht and Antwerp, Spectrum.
- . 1967. *The decipherment of Linear B*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, The University Press.
- , and LYDIA BAUMBACH. 1963. The Mycenaean Greek vocabulary. *Glotta* 41.157–271.
- , and L. R. PALMER, eds. 1956–. *Studies in Mycenaean inscriptions and dialect*.

- Later added to the editorial staff: L.J.D. Richardson and Anna Morpurgo Davies. Published by the University of London, Institute of Classical Studies.
- CHANTRAINE, PIERRE. 1926. *Histoire du parfait grec*. Paris, Champion.
- . 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris, Champion.
- . 1953. *Grammaire homérique*. Vol. 2. *Syntaxe*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- . 1956. *Études sur le vocabulaire grec*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- . 1958. *Grammaire homérique*. Vol. 1. *Phonétique et morphologie*. 3rd ed. Paris, Klincksieck.
- . 1961. *Traité de morphologie grecque*. 2nd ed. Paris, Klincksieck.
- . 1965. A propos de *θωχθείς, τεθωγμένος, τεθαγμένος* etc. ...; philologie et grammaire comparée. *Symbolae linguisticae in honorem Georgii Kuryłowicz*, 39–43. Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków, Polska Akademia Nauk — Oddział w Krakowie, Prace Komisji Językoznawstwa.
- . 1968—. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. Vol. 1, α–δ. Paris, Klincksieck.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass., The M.I.T. Press.
- COLEMAN, ROBERT. 1963. The dialect geography of ancient Greece. *TPhS* 58–126.
- . 1968. Reply to the question 'To what extent was the Greek world dialectally differentiated as early as the Middle Helladic period, and provided it was clearly differentiated, in what degree did this differentiation correspond with that of the Classical Era?' *Proceedings of the Mycenaean Symposium* (Brno, April 1966), ed. by A. Bartoněk (1968:169–70).
- COLLINGE, N.E. 1959. External sandhi in Indo-European. *Lingua* 8.225–32.
- CORLU, ANDRÉ. 1966. *Recherches sur les mots relatifs à l'idée de prière d'Homère aux Tragiques*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- COWGILL, WARREN. 1964. The supposed Cypriote optatives *duwánoi* and *dōkoi*, with notes on the Greek infinitive formations. *Lg* 40.344–65.
- . 1965. Evidence in Greek. Evidence for laryngeals, ed. by Werner Winter, 142–80. 2nd ed. (*Janua linguarum, series maior*, 11.) 's-Gravenhage, Mouton.
- . 1966. Ancient Greek dialectology in the light of Mycenaean. *Ancient Indo-European dialects*. *Proceedings of the Conference on Indo-European Linguistics*, held at the University of California, Los Angeles (April 25–27, 1963), ed. by Henrik Birnbaum and Jaan Puhvel, 77–95. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- . 1968. Reply to these questions: 'What was the place of Aeolic in the Mycenaean world? What form of the original suffix *-ti-* can be assumed for the Mycenaean precursor of Aeolic?' *Proceedings of the Mycenaean Symposium* (Brno, April 1966), ed. by A. Bartoněk (1968:182).
- DALE, A.M. 1957. Greek metric 1936–1957. *Lustrum* 2.5–51.
- . 1968. *The lyric metres of Greek drama*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, The University Press.

DAVIES: see Morpurgo Davies.

DENNISTON, J.D. 1954. *The Greek particles*. 2nd ed., revised by K.J. Dover. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

DGE: see Schwyzler and Cauer 1923.

DIVER, WILLIAM. 1958. On the prehistory of Greek consonantism. *Word* 14.1–25.

DOVER, K.J. 1964. The poetry of Archilochos. *Archiloque* 183–222. (Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique, Entretiens 10.) Genève, Vandoeuvres.

———. [1960]. *Greek word order*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

DOW, STERLING. 1967. Ekphantos. *Glotta* 45.202–21.

DURANTE, MARCELLO. 1958. Epea pteroenta. La parola come 'cammino' in immagini greche e vediche. *RALinc* 13.3–14. Reprinted (and translated into German) by Schmitt 1968:242–59. Addenda (1966) on p. 260.

———. 1960. Ricerche sulla preistoria della lingua poetica greca. La terminologia relativa alla creazione poetica. *RALinc* 15.231–49. Reprinted (and translated into German) by Schmitt 1968:261–90.

———. 1962. Ricerche sulla preistoria della lingua poetica greca. L'epiteto. *RALinc* 17.25–43. Reprinted (and translated into German) by Schmitt 1968:291–322. Addenda (1966) on pp. 322–3.

EGLI, JAKOB. 1954. Heteroklisie im Griechischen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Fälle von Gelenkheteroklisie. Zürich, Juris.

EIDENEIER, HANS. 1966. Sogenannte christliche Tabuwörter im Griechischen. *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia* 5. München.

EINARSON, BENEDICT. 1967. Notes on the development of the Greek alphabet. *CPh* 62.1–24.

ERNOUT, ALFRED, and ANTOINE MEILLET. 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. 4th ed. Paris, Klincksieck.

FATOUROS, GEORGIOS. 1966. *Index verborum zur frühgriechischen Lyrik*. Heidelberg, Winter.

FORBES, KATHLEEN. 1958. The relations of the particle *äv* with *κε(v) κα καν*. *Glotta* 37.179–82.

FORDERER, MANFRED. 1958. Review of *Neuerungen in der Sprache der homerischen Hymnen*, by Othmar Zumbach. *Gnomon* 30.94–100.

FOURNIER, HENRI. 1946. *Les verbes 'dire' en grec ancien*. Paris, Klincksieck.

FRÄNKEL, HERMANN. 1960. *Der kallimachische und der homerische Hexameter*. Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens, 2nd ed., 100–56. München, Beck.

FRISK, HJALMAR. 1960, 1961–. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. (Regularly abbreviated as *Frisk, GEW* I, II.) Heidelberg, Winter.

GALLAVOTTI, CARLO. 1957. Nomi di colori in miceneo. *PP* 57.5–22.

———. 1960. Esiti e segni di jod in miceneo. *PP* 73.260–81.

GELB, I.J. 1963. *A study of writing. A discussion of the general principles governing the use and evolution of writing*. 2nd ed. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

- GEORGACAS, DEMETRIUS J. 1959. A Byzantinism in Central Italian dialects. VR 18.107-23.
- GOOLD, G.P. 1960. Homer and the alphabet. TAPA 91.272-91.
- GRAY, D.H.F. 1947. Homeric epithets for things. CQ 61.109-21.
- . 1958. Mycenaean names in Homer. JHS 78.43-8.
- GRAZ, LOUIS. 1965. Le feu dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée. ΠΥΡ: champ d'emploi et signification. Paris, Klincksieck.
- GUIRAUD, CHARLES. 1962. La phrase nominale en grec, d'Homère à Euripide. Paris, Klincksieck.
- HAINSWORTH, J.B. 1962. The Homeric formula and the problem of its transmission. BICS 9.57-68.
- . 1964. Structure and content in Epic formulae: the question of the unique expression. CQ 14.155-64.
- HAMM, EVA-MARIA. 1958. Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios. 2nd ed. ADAW 1951/2.
- HAMP, ERIC P. 1960. Notes on early Greek phonology. Glotta 38.183-203.
- . 1961. To rima en ti simerini omiloumeni Elliniki glossi. Athena 65.101-28.
- HARMATTA, JÁNOS. 1968. Aḥḥiyawā names — Mycenaean names. Atti e memorie del 1° congresso internazionale di micenologia, 1.401-9. (Incunabula Graeca 25/1.) Roma, Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- HART, GILLIAN R. 1965. The grouping of place-names in the Knossos tablets. Mn 18.1-28.
- HARVEY, A.E. 1957. Homeric epithets in Greek lyric poetry. CR 7.206-23.
- HAVERS, WILHELM. 1946. Neuere Literatur zum Sprachtabu. SbÖAW 223/5.
- HESTER, D.A. 1965. 'Pelasgian' — a new Indo-European language? Lingua 13. 335-84.
- HEUBECK, ALFRED. 1960-61. Zur dialektologischen Einordnung des Mykenischen. Glotta 39.159-72.
- . 1961. Praegraeca. Sprachliche Untersuchungen zum vorgriechisch-indogermanischen Substrat. Erlangen, Universitätsbund Erlangen.
- HOEKSTRA, ARIE. 1957. Hésiode et la tradition orale. Mn 10.193-225.
- . 1965. Homeric modifications of formulaic prototypes. Studies in the development of Greek epic diction. VKNA 71/1.
- HOFMANN, JOHANN BAPTIST. 1950. Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen. München, Oldenbourg.
- HOLT, JENS. 1940. Les noms d'action en -σις (-τις). Études de linguistique grecque. Aarhus, Universitetsforlaget.
- HOOKE, J.T. 1965. Some interpretations of Mycenaean *ekeqe* and Homeric τε. Glotta 43.256-77.
- . 1967. Homeric nominatives in -τᾶ. Glotta 45.14-23.
- HOUSEHOLDER, FRED W. 1959. *Pa-ro* and Mycenaean cases. Glotta 38.1-10.
- . 1960. Retrospects and prospects, from the viewpoint of linguistics: opening

- statement. *Style in language*, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, pp. 339–49. Cambridge, Mass., The M.I.T. Press.
- . [1960]. Early Greek *-j-*. *Glotta* 39.179–90.
- . 1964. A morphophonemic question and a spelling rule. *Mycenaean studies*, ed. by Emmett L. Bennett, 71–6. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press.
- , KOSTAS KAZAZIS, and ANDREAS KOUTSOUDAS. 1964. Reference grammar of literary *Dhimotiki*. 's-Gravenhage, Mouton.
- HUMBERT, JEAN. 1930. *La disparition du datif en grec*. Paris, Champion.
- . 1960. *Syntaxe grecque*. 3rd ed. Paris, Klincksieck.
- ILIEVSKI, PETAR HR. 1968. A re-examination of the PY Cn tablets. *Atti e memorie del 1° congresso internazionale di micenologia*, 2.616–32. (*Incunabula Graeca* 25/2.) Roma, Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- JACOBSTHAL, HANS. 1907. Der Gebrauch der Tempora und Modi in den kretischen Dialektinschriften. *IF Beiheft* 21.
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN. 1932, 1964. Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums. *Charisteria Guilelmo Mathesio quinquagenario oblata*, 74–84. Reprinted in *A Prague School reader*, ed. by Josef Vachek, 347–59. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- . 1937. Z zagadnień prozodii starogreckiej. *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu*. Translated into English in *Jakobson's Selected Writings* 1962, vol. 1, *Phonological studies*, 262–71. 's-Gravenhage, Mouton.
- . 1952. Studies in comparative Slavic metrics. *OSIP* 3.21–66.
- JEFFERY, L.H. 1961. The local scripts of archaic Greece: a study of the origin of the Greek alphabet and its development from the eighth to the fifth centuries B.C. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- JONES, D.M. 1966. Land tenure at *Pakijane*: some doubts and questions. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*, ed. by L.R. Palmer and John Chadwick, 245–9. Cambridge, The University Press.
- KASTNER, WOLFGANG. 1967. Die griechischen Adjektive zweier Endungen auf -OΣ. Heidelberg, Winter.
- KIECHLE, FRANZ. 1960. Pylos und der pylische Raum in der antike Tradition. *Historia* 9.1–67.
- . 1962. Ostarkadische Ortsnamen auf pyllischen Linear B-Tafeln. Ein Beitrag zur Besiedlungsgeschichte Arkadiens. *Kadmos* 1.98–116.
- KIPARSKY, PAUL. 1967. A propos de l'histoire de l'accentuation grecque. *La phonologie générative*, ed. by Sanford A. Schane, 73–93. Paris, Didier and Larousse (*Langages* 8.)
- . 1968. Tense and mood in Indo-European syntax. *FL* 4.30–57.
- KIRK, G. S. 1960a. Homer and modern oral poetry: some confusions. *CQ* 10.271–81.
- . 1960b. Objective dating criteria in Homer. *MH* 17.189–205.
- . 1966. Studies in some technical aspects of Homeric style. I. The structure of the Homeric hexameter. II. Verse-structure and sentence-structure in Homer. *YCS* 20.75–152. (Vol. 20 was edited by G.S. Kirk and Adam Parry.)

- KODZU, HARUSHIGE. 1937. On the dialect of Alcman. Tokyo, Iwanami.
- KRETSCHMER, PAUL, and ERNST LOCKER. 1963. Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache. 2nd ed., with additions by Georg Kisser. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- KUHN, T.S. 1962. The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- KUNO, SUSUMU. 1967. Computer analysis of natural languages. *Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics* 19.52–110.
- KURYŁOWICZ, JERZY. 1945–49. La nature des procès dits 'analogiques'. *AL* 5.15–37. Reprinted 1960 in his *Esquisses linguistiques*, 66–88. Polska Akademia Nauk, Prace Językoznawcze 19. Wrocław and Kraków. Also reprinted 1966 in *Readings in linguistics*, ed. by Eric P. Hamp, Fred W. Householder, and Robert Austerlitz, 158–74. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. Because at the time of this writing the third version was most readily available, its pagination will regularly be cited for reference.
- . 1956. L'apophonie en indo-européen. Polska Akademia Nauk, Prace Językoznawcze 9. Wrocław.
- . 1958. L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes. 2nd ed. Polska Akademia Nauk, Prace Językoznawcze 17. Wrocław and Kraków.
- . 1964. The inflectional categories of Indo-European. Heidelberg, Winter.
- LANDAU, OSCAR. 1958. Mykenisch-Griechische Personennamen. Göteborg, Alqvist & Wiksell.
- LAROCHE, EMMANUEL. 1949. Histoire de la racine NEM- en grec ancien. Paris, Klincksieck.
- LATACZ, JOACHIM. 1967. Zum Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers. Heidelberg, Winter.
- LATTE, KURT. 1924. Glossographika. *Philologus* 80.136–75.
- , ed. 1953. *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*. Vol. 1, A-Δ. København, Munksgaard.
- , ed. 1966. *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*. Vol. 2, E-O. København, Munksgaard.
- LEE, D.J.N. 1959. Some vestigial Mycenaean words in the Iliad. *BICS* 6.6–21.
- LEJEUNE, MICHEL. 1939. Les adverbres grecs en -θεν. Bordeaux, Éditions Delmas.
- . 1940. Observations sur la langue des actes d'affranchissement delphiques. Paris, Klincksieck.
- . 1955. *Traité de phonétique grecque*. 2nd ed. Paris, Klincksieck.
- , ed. 1956. *Études mycéniennes*. Actes du colloque international sur les textes mycéniens (Gif-sur-Yvette, April 1956). Paris, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- . 1958. *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne*. Vol. 1. Paris, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- . 1964. Dix ans d'études mycéniennes. Actes du vii^e Congrès (de l'Association G. Budé), Aix-en-Provence, 1–6 April 1963, 60–8. Paris.

- . 1965. Notes de morphologie mycénienne. BSL 60.1–17.
- . 1966. Doublets et complexes. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*, ed. by L.R. Palmer and John Chadwick, 135–49. Cambridge, The University Press.
- . 1968. Rapport sur le grec mycénien. *Atti e memorie dell'1° congresso internazionale di micenologia*, 2.726–32. (*Incunabula Graeca* 25/2.) Roma, Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- LEUMANN, MANU. 1950. *Homerische Wörter*. (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 3.) Basel, Reinhardt.
- LEVISON, MICHAEL, A.Q. MORTON, and A.D. WINSPEAR. 1968. The seventh letter of Plato. *Mind* 77.309–25.
- LOBECK, CHRISTIAN AUGUST. 1853–62. *Pathologiae Graeci sermonis Elementa*. Königsberg, Borntraeger.
- LÖFSTEDT, EINAR. 1956a. *Syntactica*. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins. Vol. 1. Über einige Grundfragen der lateinischen Nominalsyntax. 2nd ed. (*Acta Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis* 10/1.) Lund, Gleerup.
- . 1956b. *Syntactica*. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins. Vol. 2. Syntaktisch-stilistische Gesichtspunkte und Probleme. (*Acta Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis* 10/2.) Lund, Gleerup.
- LORD, ALBERT B. 1948. Homer, Parry, and Huso. *AJA* 52.34–44.
- . 1960. *The singer of tales*. (*Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature* 24.) Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- . 1968. Homer as an oral poet. *HSPH* 72.1–46.
- LOTZ, JOHN. 1960. Metric typology. *Style in language*, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, 135–48. Cambridge, Mass., The M.I.T. Press.
- MAAS, PAUL. 1962. *Greek metre*. Translated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- MAGOUN, FRANCIS P., Jr. 1953. Oral-formulaic character of Anglo-Saxon narrative poetry. *Speculum* 28.446–67.
- MAHLOW, GEORG H. 1926. *Neue Wege durch die griechische Sprache und Dichtung*. Sprachgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. Berlin and Leipzig, de Gruyter.
- MANESSY-GUITTON, JACQUELINE. 1966. Temenos. *IF* 71.14–38.
- MARTINET, ANDRÉ. 1964. *Économie des changements phonétiques*. *Traité de phonologie diachronique*. 2nd ed. Berne, Francke.
- MASSON, ÉMILIA. 1967. *Recherches sur les plus anciens emprunts sémitiques en grec*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- MASSON, OLIVIER. 1961. *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques*. Paris, de Boccard.
- . 1962. *Les fragments du poète Hipponax*. Édition critique et commentée. Paris, Klincksieck.
- MCLEOD, WALLACE E. 1961. Oral bards at Delphi. *TAPA* 92.317–35.

- MEILLET, ANTOINE. 1921. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Vol. 1. Paris, Champion.
- . 1923. *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs*. Paris, Presses universitaires de France.
- . 1925. *La méthode comparative en linguistique historique*. Paris, Champion.
- . 1926. A propos de οἰστός. *Festschrift für Universitäts-Professor Hofrat Dr. Paul Kretschmer*, 140–1. Wien and Leipzig, Deutscher Verlag für Jugend und Volk.
- . 1935. *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*. 4th ed. Reissued 1965 as 7th ed., with a new bibliography by Olivier Masson. Paris, Klincksieck.
- . 1936. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Vol. 2. Paris, Klincksieck.
- . 1937. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. 8th ed. Paris, Hachette.
- , and JOSEPH VENDRYES. 1963. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. 3rd ed. Paris, Champion.
- MEISTER, KARL. 1921. *Die homerische Kunstsprache*. Leipzig, Preisschriften der Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft, 48.
- MILANI, CELESTINA. 1965. I pronomi nel greco dell'età micenea. *Aevum* 39.405–40.
- MIRAMBEL, ANDRÉ. 1949. *Grammaire du grec moderne*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- . 1950. L'opposition de *ts* à *dz* en grec moderne. *BSL* 46.58–68.
- . 1953. Monosyllabes en grec moderne. *BSL* 49(138).52–66.
- . 1959. *La langue grecque moderne; description et analyse*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- MITFORD, T.B. 1961. *Studies in the signaries of South-Western Cyprus*. University of London Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Supplement 10. London.
- MONTEIL, PIERRE. 1963. *La phrase relative en grec ancien, des origines à la fin du V^e siècle*. Paris, Klincksieck.
- MORPURGO, ANNA. 1960. L'esito delle nasali sonanti in miceneo. *RALinc* 15.321–36.
- MORPURGO DAVIES, ANNA. 1964. 'Doric' features in the language of Hesiod. *Glotta* 42.138–65.
- . 1966. An instrumental-ablative in Mycenaean? *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*, ed. by L.R. Palmer and John Chadwick, 191–202. Cambridge, The University Press.
- . 1968. The treatment of **r̥* and **l̥* in Mycenaean and Arcado-Cyprian. *Atti e memorie del 1^o congresso internazionale di micenologia*, 2.791–814. (Incunabula Graeca 25/2.) Roma, Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- MÜHLESTEIN, HUGO. 1965. Namen von Neleiden auf den Pylostäfelchen. *MH* 22.155–65.
- NAGY, GREGORY. 1968. On dialectal anomalies in Pylian texts. *Atti e memorie del 1^o congresso internazionale di micenologia*, 2.663–79. (Incunabula Graeca 25/2.) Roma, Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

- . 1970. Greek dialects and the transformation of an Indo-European process. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- NEHRBASS, RUDOLF. 1935. Sprache und Stil der Iamata von Epidauros. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung. *Philologus-supplement* 27/4. Leipzig.
- NEUMANN, GÜNTER. 1961. Untersuchungen zum Weiterleben hethitischen und luwischen Sprachgutes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- NEWTON, BRIAN E. 1967. The phonology of Cypriot Greek. *Lingua* 18.384–411.
- NILSSON, M.P. 1921. Die Anfänge der Göttin Athene. *København, ODVS* 4/7.
- NOTOPOULOS, J.A. 1960. Homer, Hesiod and the Achæan heritage of oral poetry. *Hesperia* 29.177–97.
- . 1964. Studies in early Greek oral poetry. *HSPH* 68.1–77.
- O'NEILL, EUGENE G. 1942. The localization of metrical word-types in the Greek hexameter; Homer, Hesiod, and the Alexandrians. *YCS* 8.102–76.
- PAGE, DENYS L. 1951. *Alcman. The Partheneion*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- . 1955a. Sappho and Alcaeus. An introduction to the study of ancient Lesbian poetry. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- . 1955b. *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- . 1959. *History and the Homeric Iliad*. (Sather Classical Lectures 31.) Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- . 1964. Archilochus and the oral tradition. *Archiloque*, 119–79. (Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique, *Entretiens* 10.) Genève, Vandoeuvres.
- PAGLIARO, ANTONINO. 1961. 'ἱερός in Omero e la nozione di 'sacro' in Grecia. *Saggi di critica semantica*. 2nd ed. Messina and Firenze, d'Anna. First appeared under the title *Riflessi linguistici della nozione di 'sacro' in Grecia*, *SMSR* 21.32–57 (1947–48).
- PALMER, L.R. 1946. A grammar of the post-Ptolemaic papyri. Vol. 1: accident and word-formation. Part 1: the suffixes. (Publications of the Philological Society 13.) London, Oxford University Press.
- . 1950. The Indo-European origins of Greek justice. *TPhS* 149–68.
- . 1956. The concept of social obligation in Indo-European. A study in structural semantics. *Hommages à Max Niedermann*, 258–69. Collection Latomus 23. Bruxelles.
- . 1963a. The language of Homer. A companion to Homer, ed. by Alan J.B. Wace and Frank H. Stubbings, 75–178. London, Macmillan.
- . 1963b. The interpretation of Mycenaean Greek texts. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- PARRY, MILMAN. 1928a. *L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère*. Paris, Éditions 'Les Belles Lettres'.
- . 1928b. *Les formules et la métrique d'Homère*. Paris, Éditions 'Les Belles Lettres'.

- . 1930. Studies in the epic technique of oral verse-making. I: Homer and Homeric style. HSPH 41.73–147.
- . 1932. Studies in the epic technique of oral verse-making. II: The Homeric language as the language of an oral poetry. HSPH 43.1–50.
- . 1934. The traces of the digamma in Ionic and Lesbian. Lg 10.130–44.
- PAVESE, CARLO. 1967. La lingua della poesia corale come lingua d'una tradizione poetica settentrionale. Glotta 45.164–85.
- PEDERSEN, HOLGER. 1931. The discovery of language. English translation by John W. Spargo. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; reissued 1962: Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- PERNOT, HUBERT. 1934. Introduction à l'étude du dialecte tsakonien. Paris, Éditions 'Les Belles Lettres'.
- PFOHL, GERHARD, ed. 1969. Das Alphabet. Entstehung und Entwicklung der griechischen Schrift. (Wege der Forschung 88.) Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- PORTER, H. N. 1951. The early Greek hexameter. YCS 12.3–63.
- PORZIG, WALTER. 1954. Sprachgeographische Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten. IF 61.147–69.
- PÖTSCHER, WALTER. 1961. Hera und Heros. RhM 104.302–55.
- . 1965. Der Name der Göttin Hera. RhM 108.317–20.
- PRÉVOT, ANDRÉ. 1935. L'aoriste grec en -θήν. Paris, Champion.
- PUHVEL, JAAN. 1964. A Mycenaean-Vedic titular coincidence. KZ 79.1–7.
- RADERMACHER, LUDWIG. 1947. Koiné. SbÖAW 224/5.
- REDARD, GEORGES. 1949. Les noms grecs en -της, -τις et principalement en -ίτης, -ίτις. Étude philologique et linguistique. Paris, Klincksieck.
- . 1953. Recherches sur XPH, XPHΣΘAI. Étude sémantique. Paris, Champion.
- RENEHAN, ROBERT. 1968. Some Greek lexicographical notes. Glotta 46.60–73.
- RISCH, ERNST. 1937. Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache. (Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 9.) Berlin and Leipzig, de Gruyter.
- . 1949. Altgriechische Dialektgeographie? MH 6.19–28.
- . 1954a. Zusammenfassender Literaturbericht für die Jahre 1939–1950: Griechische Sprache. Glotta 33.179–227.
- . 1954b. Die Sprache Alkmans. MH 11.20–37.
- . 1955. Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht. MH 12.61–76.
- . 1957. Zur Geschichte der griechischen Ethnika. MH 14.63–74.
- . 1958. Review of L'élément achéen dans la langue épique, by C.J. Ruijgh. Gnomon 30.90–4.
- . 1966. Les différences dialectales dans le mycénien. Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, ed. by L.R. Palmer and John Chadwick, 150–7. Cambridge, The University Press.

- ROHLFS, GERHARD. 1933. *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Graecia*. Roma, Collezione Meridionale Editrice.
- . 1950. *Historische Grammatik der unteritalienischen Gräzität*. SbBAW 4.
- . 1956. *Sermo vulgaris latinus*. *Vulgärlateinisches Lesebuch*. 2nd ed. Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- . 1962. *Neue Beiträge zur Kenntnis der unteritalienischen Gräzität*. SbBAW 5.
- . 1964. *Lexicon graecanicum Italiae inferioris*. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der unteritalienischen Gräzität*. 2nd ed. Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- ROUGH, C.J. 1957. *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*. Assen, Van Gorcum.
- . 1961. *Le traitement des sonantes voyelles dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien*. Mn 14.193–216.
- . 1966. *Observations sur la tablette Ub 1318 de Pylos*. Lingua 16.130–52.
- . 1967. *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam, Hakkert.
- RUÍPÉREZ, MARTÍN SÁNCHEZ. 1952. *Desinencias medias primarias indoeuropeas sg. 1a *-(m)ai, 2a *-soi, 3a *-(t)oi, pl. 3a *-ntoi*. Em 20.8–31.
- . 1955. *Les études sur le Linéaire B depuis le déchiffrement de Ventris*. Minos 3.157–67.
- . 1956. *Esquisse d'une histoire du vocalisme grec*. Word 12.67–81.
- . 1960. *Historia de θέμις en Homero*. Em 28.99–123.
- RUSSO, JOSEPH A. 1966. *The structural formula in Homeric verse*. YCS 20.219–40. (Vol. 20 was edited by G.S. Kirk and Adam Parry.)
- SAPIR, EDWARD. 1938. *Glottalized continuants in Navaho, Nootka, and Kwakiutl (with a note on Indo-European)*. Lg 14.248–74. Reprinted in *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture and personality*, ed. by David G. Mandelbaum, 225–50. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- SCHERER, ANTON. 1964. *Die Sprache des Archilochos*. Archiloque, 89–116. (Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique, Entretiens 10.) Genève, Vandoeuvres.
- SCHMITT, RÜDIGER. 1961. *Nektar*. KZ 77.88. Reprinted by Schmitt 1968:324.
- . 1967. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- , ed. 1968. *Indogermanische Dichtersprache*. (Wege der Forschung 165.) Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- SCHULZE, WILHELM. 1888. Γελῶς, Ἡρφαῶς. KZ 29.265–6. Reprinted in Schulze 1966:391–2.
- . 1966. *Kleine Schriften*. 2nd ed., with supplements, by Wilhelm Wissmann. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. When cross-references are made in the text to articles by Schulze, the year of original publication will be given beside the figure 1966.
- SCHWYZER, EDUARD. 1937. *Griechisches -άζω und gotisches -atja*. Mélanges lin-

- guistiques offerts à M. Holger Pedersen, 63–75. *Acta Jutlandica: Aarsskrift for Aarhus Universitet* 9/1. Aarhus.
- . 1939. *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. 1: Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion. München, Beck.
- , and PAUL CAUER. 1923. *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora*. Leipzig, Hirzel. Abbreviated as DGE.
- , and ALBERT DEBRUNNER. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. 2: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik. München, Beck.
- SEILER, HANSJAKOB. 1950. *Die primären griechischen Steigerungsformen*. Hamburg, Hansischer Gildenverlag.
- . 1952. *L'aspect et le temps dans le verbe néo-grec*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- . 1958. Zur Systematik und Entwicklungsgeschichte der griechischen Nominaldeklinaton. *Glotta* 37.41–67.
- SHIPP, G.P. 1953. *Studies in the language of Homer*. Cambridge, The University Press.
- . 1961. Mycenaean evidence for the Homeric dialect? *Essays in Mycenaean and Homeric Greek*, 1–14. Melbourne, Australian Humanities Research Council.
- SMYTH, HERBERT WEIR. 1963. *Greek grammar*. Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- STANG, CHRISTIAN S. 1957. Quelques remarques sur le système consonantique du grec commun. *SymbOsl* 33.27–36.
- STRÖMBERG, REINHOLD. 1940. *Griechische Pflanzennamen*. Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift 46/1. Göteborg.
- STRUNK, KLAUS. 1967. Nasalpräsentien und Aoriste. Ein Beitrag zur Morphologie des Verbums im Indo-Iranischen und Griechischen. Heidelberg, Winter.
- STURTEVANT, EDGAR H. 1940. *The pronunciation of Greek and Latin*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, Linguistic Society of America.
- SWANSON, DONALD. 1960. *Modern Greek studies in the West*. New York, The New York Public Library.
- SZEMERÉNYI, OSWALD. 1964. Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the nature of Indo-European accent. Napoli, Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli.
- . 1966. The labiovelars in Mycenaean and historical Greek. *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 1.29–52.
- . 1968a. The Attic 'Rückverwandlung' or atomism and structuralism in action. *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde, Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein (1898–1967)*, ed. by Manfred Mayrhofer, 139–57. IBK 14.
- . 1968b. Review of *Studies in the signaries of South-Western Cyprus*, by T.B. Mitford. *Gnomon* 40.167–74.
- TEGYEY, IMRE. 1965. Observations on a Linear B cadastral list. *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 1.1–10.
- THIEME, PAUL. 1938. ἀριδείκετος, ἐρικυδής und Genossen. Chapter 6 of *Der*

- Fremdling im R̥gveda. Eine Studie über die Bedeutung der Worte *ari*, *arya*, *aryaman* und *ārya*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 23/2. Leipzig. Reprinted by Schmitt 1968:53–60.
- . 1952a. Nektar. Chapter 1 of Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte. BVS AW 98/5.5–15. Reprinted by Schmitt 1968:102–12.
- . 1952b. Ambrosia. Chapter 2 of Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte. BVS AW 98/5.15–34. Reprinted by Schmitt 1968:113–32.
- . 1952c. Hades. Chapter 3 of Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte. BVS AW 98/5.35–55. Reprinted by Schmitt 1968:133–53.
- THOMPSON, D'ARCY WENTWORTH. 1936. A glossary of Greek birds. London, Oxford University Press.
- . 1947. A glossary of Greek fishes. London, Oxford University Press.
- THORNE, JAMES PETER. 1965. Review of Constituent structure. A study of contemporary models of syntactic description, by Paul Postal. JL 1.73–6.
- THUMB, ALBERT. 1910. Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache. 2nd ed. Strassburg, Trübner. English translation by S. Angus, reissued 1964: Chicago, Argonaut.
- , and ERNST KIECKERS. 1932. Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte. Vol. 1, 2nd ed. Heidelberg, Winter.
- , and ANTON SCHERER. 1959. Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte. Vol. 2, 2nd ed. Heidelberg, Winter.
- TRIANDAPHYLLOIDIS, MANOLIS. 1941. Neoelliniki Grammatiki (tis Dhimotikis). Athens Organismos Ekdoseōs Scholikōn Bibliōn.
- TRNKA, BOHUMIL. 1966. Linguistics and the ideological structure of the period. Appendix 3 in The linguistic school of Prague, by Josef Vachek, 152–65. Bloomington and London, Indiana University Press. Originally published as Jazykozpyt a myšlenková struktura doby, SaS 10.73–80 (1948).
- TROXLER, HANS. 1964. Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods. Zürich, Juris.
- TRÜMPY, HANS. 1950. Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos. Untersuchungen zum Wortschatz Homers. Basel, Helbing & Lichtenhahn.
- TSIRPANLIS, EMIL C. 1966. Patronymics in Homer. Platon 35/36.241–56.
- TSOPANAKIS, AGAPITOS G. 1955. Eine dorische Dialektzone im Neugriechischen. ByzZ 48.49–72.
- TZARTZANOS, ACHILLES A. 1946, 1953. Neoelliniki Syntaxis (tis Koinis dhimotikis). Athens, Organismos Ekdoseōs Scholikōn Bibliōn.
- VENTRIS, MICHAEL, and JOHN CHADWICK. 1956. Documents in Mycenaean Greek. Three hundred selected tablets from Knossos, Pylos and Mycenae with commentary and vocabulary. Cambridge, The University Press.
- VILBORG, EBBE. 1960. A tentative grammar of Mycenaean Greek. (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 9.) Göteborg, Almqvist & Wiksell.
- WACKERNAGEL, JACOB. 1889. Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Komposita

- Programm zur Rektoratsfeier der Universität Basel, 1–65. Reprinted in Wackernagel 1953:2.897–961.
- . 1893. Beiträge zur Lehre vom griechischen Akzent. Programm zur Rektoratsfeier der Universität Basel, 3–38. Reprinted in Wackernagel 1953:2.1072–107.
- . 1897. Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde. Programm zur Rektoratsfeier der Universität Basel, 8–14. Reprinted in Wackernagel 1953:1.769–75.
- . 1921. Zu altir. *fitir*. IF 39.220–3. Reprinted in Wackernagel 1953:1.509–12.
- . 1926. Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch. Vol. 1, 2nd ed. Basel, Birkhäuser.
- . 1928. Vorlesungen über Syntax. Vol. 2, 2nd ed. Basel, Birkhäuser.
- . 1953. Kleine Schriften. 2 vols. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. When cross-references are made in the text to articles and monographs by Wackernagel contained in this collection, the year of original publication will be given beside the figure 1953.
- WAITE, STEPHEN V. F. 1967–. *Calculi*. A monthly newsletter distributed from the Classics Department of Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire. Begun in January 1967. Continuous pagination.
- WATKINS, CALVERT. 1962a. Indo-European origins of the Celtic verb I. The sigmatic aorist. Dublin, The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- . 1962b. Indo-European metrics and archaic Irish verse. *Celtica* 6.194–249.
- . 1962c. Preliminaries to a historical and comparative analysis of the syntax of the Old Irish verb. *Celtica* 6.1–49.
- . 1965. Notes on Celtic and Indo-European morphology and syntax. *Lochlann* 3.286–97.
- WEBSTER, T. B. L. 1960. Notes on the writing of early Greek poetry. *Glotta* 38. 251–63.
- WERNER, RUDOLF. 1948. η und $\epsilon\iota$ vor Vokal bei Homer. Zürich, Paulus.
- WEST, M. L. 1967. *Epica*. *Glotta* 44.135–48.
- WHITMAN, CEDRIC H. 1958. *Homer and the heroic tradition*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, ULRICH VON. 1921. *Griechische Verskunst*. Berlin, Weidmann.
- WILLETS, RONALD F. 1965. $\omega\nu\epsilon\iota\nu = \pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$. *Kadmos* 4.165–8.
- . 1967. *The Law Code of Gortyn*. (Kadmos Supplement 1.) Berlin, de Gruyter.
- WINTER, WERNER. 1950. *Studien zum 'Prothetischen Vokal' im Griechischen*. Hamburg, Heitmann.
- WITTE, KURT. 1913. *Homer, Sprache*. *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 8.2213–47.
- WYATT, WILLIAM F. 1964. *Structural linguistics and the laryngeal theory*. *Lg* 40. 138–52.

- ZSILKA, J. 1965. Das Passiv in Homers Heldengesängen. Die Ausbildung der Funktion des Passivs und seine grammatischen bzw. lexikalischen Beziehungen. *AAntH* 13-26.
- ZUMBACH, OTHMAR. 1955. Neuerungen in der Sprache der homerischen Hymnen. Winterthur, Keller.

STUDIES OF LATIN AND LANGUAGES OF ANCIENT ITALY

GIACOMO DEVOTO

1. The end of World War I corresponds to a shift of interest in the field of Latin studies. Before the war, there were two approaches: on the one hand, that of the comparatists, who were interested primarily in prehistoric problems of the genetic relationships of languages, and, on the other, that of the classical philologists, whose linguistic interests were concentrated on the language of particular authors, their stylistic traits, and problems of attribution and authenticity. At the end of World War I, the epitomizations of the two points of view were, on the one hand, the *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* of Ferdinand Sommer, which appeared in a 2nd and a 3rd edition in 1914, and, on the other hand, the *Antike Kunstprosa* of Eduard Norden, which appeared for the first time in 1898, and whose fifth printing took place in 1958.

The first attempt at a synthesis on the part of the 'grammarians' was represented in 1928 by the new edition of the *Lateinische Grammatik* of F. Stolz. This work had been revised from the point of view of phonetics and morphology by Manu Leumann, and from the point of view of syntax by J.B. Hofmann, and represented an attempt to document the facts, especially in regards to the formation of words. The next edition (1963-65) is unchanged in phonetics or morphology, while the syntax and stylistics have been revised by A. Szantyr. From a more philological point of view, the attempt made to achieve a closer relationship with linguistics is represented above all by the names of F. Skutsch, P. Kretschmer, W. Kroll, and M. Niedermann. Skutsch's attempt consists of a preference accorded to Latin explanations *vis-à-vis* Indo-European explanations of linguistic facts. His method is well documented by the edition of his collected *Kleine Schriften* (1914). Kretschmer thoroughly documents his study in a survey of the Latin language in 1923 (*Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, 3rd ed., VI.102-21), Kroll in the "Entwicklung der lat. Schriftsprache" (*Glotta* 22.1-27, 1933) in relation to the preceding review in *Kultur der Gegenwart* (3rd ed. 1912, 523-65). Finally, I call attention to Niedermann's work, *Essais d'étymologie et de critique verbale latines* (1918), in which are combined, in exemplary fashion, his qualities as a philologist and a linguist, and the *Précis de phonétique*, which, first published in 1906, appeared in a third edition in 1945.

The tradition being developed by the more comprehensive approach of a comparison with Greek, is represented, above all, by the *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques* by Antoine Meillet and Joseph Vendryes (1924, 2nd ed. 1948). The

picture of these later developments can be completed, for those studies limited to Latin, by mention of the *Historische lateinische Grammatik* of Ernst Kieckers (2 vols., Munich 1930–31), the very remarkable *Latin language* of L. R. Palmer (1955, 3rd ed. 1961) and, finally, the *Grammatica Latina storica e comparativa* of Vittore Pisani (Turin 1948, 3rd ed. 1962).

Naturally, this tendency has been counterbalanced by others, directed towards more strictly linguistic ends. In this case it is not appropriate to give a complete bibliographical review, but rather to select only a small number of books or memoirs which give an impression of the history and the variety of these developments.

2. There are other new methods besides this new attempt to gain an equilibrium by drawing together the two traditional currents. The first consists in the Latin applications of the principles of general linguistics, which were made known, for the first time, by Maurice Grammont, in *La dissimilation consonantique* (Dijon 1895). The application of general linguistic principles to Latin grammar is due to another scholar, Abel Juret, who published *Dominance et résistance dans la phonétique latine* (1913), *Manuel de phonétique latine* (1921, 2nd ed. 1938) and finally *Système de la syntaxe latine* (1926, 2nd ed. 1933). Although these new approaches have some scientific interest, they contain excessive generalizations, and, in the domains of the development of Latin throughout the thousand years of its history, they do not help to clarify the uncertain or obscure aspects. I have myself experimented with the advantage and dangers of those studies which are tied to the notion of 'linguistic systems', in which, as Antoine Meillet has said, 'tout se tient'. For my book, *Adattamento e distinzione nella fonetica latina* (Florence 1924), I retain the conviction that it has been useful in order to give a definition of many phonetic problems in relation to the notion of system, but that the results, as they have appeared so far, are far from constituting a mature statement. The notion of system began its public history with the *Cours* of F. de Saussure (1916). But it was some time before its influence was felt. Meanwhile, an attempt was made to establish a description of languages, although by historical means. The *Charakteristik des lateinischen Lautsystems* formulated by Eduard Hermann, in 1919 (*NAWG*, 229–86) should be recalled in this context. Along this same line, the characteristics of two linguistic groups have been compared, as in the 1966 work of E. Polomé, "Germanisch und Italisch im Lichte der deskriptiven Sprachbetrachtung" (*Orbis* 15.160ff.). But the idea of system was, by 1950, already ripe, when André Martinet used it in order to solve a problem of historic origin (*Word* 6.26–41).

The spirit which inspires these works is the need of 'rigor', stemming from models used in the natural sciences, and which even makes use of mathematical symbols. Since it is not possible to indicate all of these works, I shall limit myself to those by Gualtiero Calboli, such as the *Studi grammaticali* (Bologna 1962) or "Scarto stilistico e arricchimento del sistema" (*LeSt*, 149ff., 1966).

3. Independently of the tendencies of general linguistics, an effort to pinpoint the notions of linguistic origins in a direction different from genetic relationship has been made by Antoine Meillet in his work *Les Dialectes indo-européens* (2nd ed. 1922), who implicitly, and thanks to his 'cellular' view of intra-Indo-European relations, posed the problem of the 'position' of Latin and other Indo-European languages of Italy as considered in a framework of sister-languages. I recall, as an example, the study by Michel Lejeune (1943) (translated into Spanish), "La position du latin dans le domaine indo-européen" (*Mémorial des études latines*, 7-31, Paris). The cellular view represents progress in relation to the study of genetic relationships, but it remains somewhat untenable because it considers the linguistic boundaries to be permanent.

Over a short period of time, the 'cellular' view of 'languages' was replaced by the geographic view of linguistic 'facts', i.e. by a new method of comparison developed on the basis of experiments in the *Atlas linguistique de la France* by Jules Gilliéron, who renewed the studies of Romance dialects, between 1915 and 1923.

An elementary attempt to apply this method to studies of Italic languages has been reported by J. Schrijnen, in his memoir "Italische Dialektgeographie" (*Nph* 7.223-39, 1922). But the facts which were compared were quite heterogeneous from the point of view of documentation, and the attempt remains modest and audacious at the same time. A more balanced application of these principles appeared in W. Porzig's memoir, *Altitalische Sprachgeographie* (Heidelberg 1960). But the systematic development of these principles is due principally to two Italian scholars, Benvenuto Terracini and Matteo Bartoli. Among the different structures which make up the fundamental part of the doctrine of linguistic geography, there is one which has had particularly important consequences for Italic studies, i.e. the norm of lateral areas: the correspondences between more distant areas relate to stages which are older than those between contiguous areas — the correspondence between Spanish *hablar* and Friulian *favlà* proves that the stage of vulgar Latin *FABULARE* is anterior to the stage *PARABULARE*, because the latter is based on the correspondence between the contiguous areas of the French *parler* and the Italian *parlare*.

The traditional notions which have felt the impact of the linguistic geographical approach even more were Italo-Celtic and common Italic. A first blow was dealt the Italo-Celtic doctrine in 1917 by Alois Walde (using traditional methods), in his *Rektoratsrede über älteste sprachlichen Beziehungen zwischen Kelten und Italikern*, in which he asserted closer relationships between, on the one hand, the Gaelic group and Latin, and, on the other, between the Brittanic group and Osco-Umbrian. Also following 'geographical' methods, I fought against the Italo-Celtic notion, emphasizing the fact that most of the resemblances were founded upon evidence of conservation. The fact that there are verbal flectional endings with *r* does not prove that there is any particular relationship between the two groups, but rather that it is a question of the traces of an original correspondence which can be found in two other regions, such as Hittite and Tocharian, due to an historical fluke, which does not establish specific family relationships (cf. *AGI* 22-3.200-39, 1929-30). I tried, using the same method,

to discover from the Italic facts whether Latin *ignis* 'fire' has a corresponding form in the Sanskrit *agnis*. If this correspondence between two non-contiguous regions is interrupted by Umbrian *pir* and Greek *pyr*, which are contiguous, that proves that the Umbrian tradition was developed within the Indo-European world in accordance with the Greek tradition, i.e. there is no justification for a recent phase in common with the Latin tradition (cf. my *Gli antichi Italici*, 41ff., 3rd ed. Florence 1967). The ultimate development of this method as applied to the general domains of not only the Italic, but also the Indo-European world, is found in the "Studi sulla stratificazione delle lingue indoeuropee II. Il posto che spetta al latino" (*AGI* 26.1-42, 1934) by Bartoli, and, in a more general framework, in my *Origini Indoeuropee* (1962:382-9).

4. The same diversity of attitudes which constituted the opposition between the comparatist grammarians and the non-comparatists was revealed in the early part of this fifty-year period in the domain of etymology. The heritage of the comparative view is represented by the *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* of Alois Walde, which first appeared in 1906 and was enriched, especially in regards to bibliographical information, by J.B. Hofmann, beginning with the 3rd edition (1938-54). The philological heritage, fortunately harmonized with the comparative one, appeared in the *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Latine* of A. Ernout, primarily a philologist, and Antoine Meillet, a linguist. The former presented the basic historical outline for the history of words, and the latter chose the most reasonable etymological explanations, without feeling compelled to propose new ones. This dictionary, appearing for the first time in 1937, has appeared in a 5th edition in 1967. Some new elements can be found in my *Avviamento all'etimologia* of 1966, in which the Latin vocabulary is classified according to a Mediterranean and an Indo-European stage, and this classification is itself analyzed into words which belong to the lexical heritage, witnessed in practically all Indo-European languages, and into two other lexical categories; one, previously recognized by Antoine Meillet, belongs to the Northwest (and thus is in contrast with a vocabulary of the Southeast, linked primarily to the Greek and Aryan worlds), while the other is based on the opposition between peripheral and central areas.

The rejuvenation of etymological research is seen also in the relationships which have been established between words and things, between languages and civilizations, in brief, in the recognition of words as sources of history. Indeed, the first attempts in this direction go back to the nineteenth century and the names of Adolphe Pictet and Otto Schrader, which still have a certain renown. But a modern example of this attitude, which should be mentioned, is the article by Bonfante on the "Tracce di terminologia palafitticola nel latino" (*AIV* 97/2.51-70, 1937-38). The aristocratic structure of the society from which the Latin vocabulary concerning the state, law, and family stem, has been brought out by Joseph Vendryes (*MSL* 20.265-85, 1918), and later, in more systematic fashion, by me, in the German edition of my *Storia della lingua di Roma* (Bologna 1939; *Geschichte der Sprache Roms*, 22-9, Heidelberg 1968).

5. The new developments in etymological research lead us to consider these fifty years as the period in which, against the genealogical exclusiveness of Latin etymology, enclosed in its Indo-European prison, the necessary importance was given to the notion of substratum and, in particular, to that substratum called 'Mediterranean'. After the first proposals made by Antoine Meillet (*MSL* 15.161ff., 1908) and Jakob Jud (*Bulletin der Dialectologie romane* 3.1-18, 63-86, 1912), the important developments in this field are traced to Francesco Ribezzo, who underlined in 1920 the 'Tyrrhenian' unity of the toponymic data in ancient Italy (*RIGI* 4.83ff.). This was followed by studies of the toponymy of Sardinia by Benvenuto Terracini (*Osservazioni sugli strati piu antichi della toponomastica sarda*, 2nd ed. Reggio Emilia 1929), who proved that this area was not unitary, but rather linked, on the one hand, to the Ligurian world and on the other, to the Libyan and Iberic worlds. In 1931 there appeared the celebrated "Problèmes de substrat" (*BSL* 32.93-184) by Vittorio Bertoldi. It was also during this same period that there appeared the work of Carlo Battisti, who was later to collect the most important contributions in the volume *Sostrati e parastrati* (Florence 1959). I note, finally, the article by C. Tagliavini in *ZRPh* 86.27-54 (1926).

In Italy, the works of Giovanni Alessio, notably *Le lingue indoeuropee nell'ambiente mediterraneo* (Bari 1954) and in Switzerland the very remarkable contributions of J. Hubschmid, such as *Sardische Studien* (1953) or *Thesaurus praeromanicus* I-II (1963-65), belong to the following generation. With the materials provided by Hubschmid, one gains insight into the 'nostratique' stage, shared by the two most restricted, Basco-Caucasian and Ibero-African.

Considerable scepticism accompanied this flow of ideas, which had its greatest influence in Italy and in Switzerland. This is not difficult to understand. But the original thesis, by which there was in Italy a linguistic void before Indo-Europeanization, cannot be maintained. There were men living in Italy centuries before the arrival of the first Indo-European tribes, and it is quite probable that the lexical definitions, for example in the domain of geography and vegetation, belonged to autochthonous stages and were adopted by the 'invaders'. The most severe criticism of the Mediterranean theses came not from Western, but from Eastern Europe — the Bulgarian scholar, V. Georgiev; see his article on "La toponomie ancienne de la péninsule balkanique et la thèse méditerranéenne", *Linguistique balkanique* 3.50 (1961). The problem of substrata involves more than just the relationship between two stages, the Mediterranean and the Indo-European. The relationships of the substrata correspond to relationships which are not genetic, and which are found in many other cases. The most acknowledged theoretician of the substratum in this period was Benvenuto Terracini, who took a very definite stand, especially in his memoir of 1937 (*Studi in onore di Alfredo Trombetti*, 321-64, Milan). In this memoir he separates himself from those who negate the theory, or reduce it to a minimum, as well as from those promoters who consider it to be a biological fact, such as C. Merlo, in his important memoir, "Il sostrato etnico e i dialetti italiani" (*ID* 9.1-24, 1933).

Finally, from a different point of view, J. Schrijnen attempted to establish a connection between the 'Alarodian' hypothesis of the Slovenian scholar K. Oštir, and the development of the Indo-European languages in the Mediterranean area, in the article 'L'alarodien et l'accent d'intensité initiale dans les langues indo-européennes' (*MSL* 23.53-71, 1927).

All this did not prevent the theories which were opposed to the notion of substratum from also being pursued apart from the study of Latin antiquity. They were extended to the study of Romance languages, especially by G. Rohlfs (*GRM* 18.48 ff., 1930).

6. Independently of the notion of substratum, and on the basis of the similarities and contrasts which are inevitable between an Indo-European and a Mediterranean level, the presence of Etruscan linguistic material within ancient Italy constitutes the most important element for the linguist. The interest shown in the Etruscan linguistic mystery is an old one. At the beginning of this century there were two basic attitudes towards the question, the one, rooted in Italy, was that Etruscan was an Italic language. The last representatives of this school were Elia Lattes and his student, Bartolomeo Nogara (see his *Gli etruschi e la loro civiltà*, Milan 1933), who were, moreover, epigraphists rather than linguists. The other trend was represented primarily in Germany, following the views of Skutsch, who had formulated it in the *Realenzyklopädie* of August Friedrich von Pauly (edited by G. Wissowa) in 1907 (VI.770-806). The great breakthrough was made in 1926 by Alfredo Trombetti, not because he thought that he had interpreted the Etruscan texts, but because he had managed to give a clear definition of the stages between which Etruscan should be inserted. According to him, there was a first phase, that of the Basco-Caucasian ties, and a last phase, (the third), the Indo-European. Between these two there should be another phase, i.e. the contacts between Italy and the Aegean culture, which could be called the Etruscan phase. (See Trombetti's *La lingua etrusca*, Florence 1928; and "Saggio di antica onomastica mediterranea", *SE* 13.263 ff. [1939], 14.183 ff. [1940].)

The intervention of Trombetti resulted in a renewal of interest for the Etruscan problem. A new method was discussed which opposed the old method, based on comparative etymology, that is, the combinatory method for which Skutsch gave such a well-founded example. There was an attempt made, in the case of E. Goldmann, to renew the Indo-European explanations by basing them, not on etymological resemblances, but on a structural analysis. Vetter has employed all his powers as an epigraphist in order to further the success of the combinatory method, but in his *Etruskische Wortdeutungen* of 1937, he was not able to avoid certain 'Indo-Europeanizing' tendencies. Eva Fiesel has clarified the question of grammatical gender in *Das grammatische Geschlecht im Etruskischen* (Göttingen 1922). All the same, the most complex personality in the field of Etruscology is Massimo Pallottino, born in 1909, who achieved a synthesis of linguistic, archaeological, and epigraphical information in order to approach the interpretation of Etruscan texts in an integrated manner. His *Testimonia linguae etruscae* (Florence 1954) and his *Manuale di Etruscologia* (Milan

1942, 5th ed. 1963) constitute a necessary source for the researcher. Not far from this tradition, established in Italy, were two German-speaking scholars who were first-rate in this field: K. Olzscha, who lived in Hamburg, and A.J. Pfiffig, an Austrian. See, for example, Olzscha's "Interpretation der Agramer Mumienbinde", *Klio* 40 (1939), and Pfiffig's *Studien zu den Agramer Mumienbinden* (Vienna 1963). Both worked with the 'bilinguistic' method, which no longer compares isolated etymologies, but the structures (not solely linguistic), the formulas, and the characteristics of regions which have come into the most contact. Rix (in his *Das etruskische Cognomen*, Wiesbaden 1963) and Untermann complete the picture of the present Etruscan scholars. The recent discovery of Punico-Etruscan inscriptions at Pyrgi, north of Rome, has opened discussions on a very high level.

7. The bilinguistic method presents a theoretical problem as to the interlinguistic relationships which are due to neither genetic relationships nor substrata. In this case, it is a question of a third type of relationship, known technically as 'adstratum', and which aims to study influences of adjacent languages and linguistic 'mixtures'; see Pallotino in *SE* 34.175–210 (1966).

This problem was recognized on the practical level before the theoretical. I note, at the beginning, the German scholars Gustav Herbig and Eva Fiesel. Herbig, with a simple article in the *Indogermanische Forschungen* of 1917 (37.163–87), entitled "Etruskisches Latein", suggested that it was possible that we had under our very eyes a Latin which contained many Etruscan elements. Mrs. Fiesel, in her *Namen des griechischen Mythos im Etruskischen* (Göttingen 1928), renewed the study of foreign elements in Etruscan, a study initiated, long ago, by W. Deecke, and pursued by myself in *SE* 1.255–87 (1927).

Finally, Terracini, in two large memoirs (1929 and 1931) in *Studi etruschi* (3.209–48, 5.317–46), clarified numerous points which involved not only the appearance of Etruscan words in the Italic world and *vice versa*, but also reciprocal influences, even on the morphological level, between Latin and Umbrian or Oscan, or between Umbrian and Etruscan.

All this led me to elaborate upon the notion of 'peri-Indo-European' in *SE* 18.187 ff. (1944), i.e. of an intermediate area in which different linguistic traditions had come into contact with one another, but had not exerted a lasting influence. This led in turn to an interpretation of certain resemblances between Etruscan and Indo-European, without arriving at any conclusions about genetic relationships.

But this has absolutely no value in regards to another mystery, that of the Picenian language of the inscription of Novilara, for which I refer the reader to a recent study made by Durante in *RicLing* 5.65–86 (1962).

8. The need for the consideration of the linguistic problems of ancient Italy from a unified point of view led Ribezzo to found, in 1917, the *Rivista indo-greco-italica*, which appeared until 1937, with 21 volumes. The systematic counterpart of this need

was filled, from an epigraphical point of view, by the *Praeitalic dialects* (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), written, with the Englishman R.S. Conway, by J. Whatmough and S.E. Johnson, and from a linguistic point of view by the work of V. Pisani, *Le lingue dell'Italia antica oltre il latino* (Turin 1953, 2nd ed. 1964). In order to give a survey of the development of ideas it is necessary to divide the material into two parts, that of Indo-European languages which remained rather distant from Latin, and the 'Italic' languages which have influenced Latin or *vice versa*. The problems of the Messapian and Lepontic languages belong to the first group.

a) The interest in the Messapian language was first developed by Francesco Ribezzo, who included in *Rivista indo-greco-italica* a first attempt at a 'Corpus inscriptionum messapicarum', which included, during the twenty years of publication of the *Rivista*, about 200 inscriptions. The next edition can be found in the volume entitled *Studi messapici* by Oronzo Parlangeli (Milan 1960). An important contribution, *Messapische Studien*, was made by Otto Haas (Heidelberg 1962). Finally, C. de Simone has worked on the *Sprache der Illyrier* of Krahe,¹ and has also given a bibliographical review in 1962 (*Kratylos* 7.113-35). In effect, for a certain time the notion of Messapian, like that of Venetic, has been associated with a more inclusive notion of 'Illyrian', of which H. Krahe has been for decades an active patron. For all of ancient Italy, he has sought parallels to his treasure of toponyms and personal nouns found in the area of the Danube (*Die alten balkanillyrischen geographischen Namen*, Heidelberg 1925; and *Lexikon altillyrischer Personennamen*, 1929). Nevertheless, the golden age of Illyrianism seems to have come to an end. The Messapian language appears to correspond to a mixture of 'two' Indo-European traditions, the Illyrian and the Thracian; (cf. my *Origini indeuropee*, 398ff., Florence 1962).

b) The second tradition developed in that linguistic area called 'Lepontic'. In reality, at the beginning of the period which we are discussing here, the term 'Ligurian' was still being used, and Max Niedermann, in 1919, reported, in a very reasonable manner, on "Das Problem der sprachlichen Stellung der Liguren" in the *Jahrbuch des Vereins schweizerischer Gymnasiallehrer* (176ff., Aarau 1919). But the term was ambiguous, and we were not, at that time, in a position to decide if it indicated a primitive, pre-Indo-European stage, or an Indo-European stage different from the Celts as well as the Italic peoples. The solution was found in 1927 by Terracini, who demonstrated, in "Spigolature liguri" (*AGI* 20.1-39), on the basis of onomastic and toponymic information, the existence of the remaining pre-Indo-Europeans and Indo-Europeans, at the same time, in the territory between Genoa and the plain of the Po, and suggested calling the only remaining pre-Indo-Europeans 'Ligurians', and those of the Indo-European tradition, independent of the Celtic or Italic peoples, 'Lepontics'. These results, which did not seem conclusive, were enriched by myself, in an article in *RPh* 88.197-208 in 1962. Thus there was established a link between the epigraphic information found in the Swiss canton of Tessin (col-

¹ Vol. I, Wiesbaden 1955; Vol. II, on *Die messapischen Inschriften*, was edited by C. de Simone, Wiesbaden 1964; cf. *Die messapischen Personennamen* by J. Untermann.

lected in the above-mentioned works of Whatmough and Pisani), and the indirect evidence of the northern Apennines.

9. The uncertainties as to the grouping of problems are still present if the field of observation is restricted to languages more properly Italic, taken even in a large sense, and are more geographic than grammatical.

The preliminary problem has been formulated by Haas in his book of 1960, *Das frühitalische Element* (Vienna), who has undertaken to resolve the questions which do not easily fit in the recognized framework of Latin, Osco-Umbrian, and Venetic. The conclusions of Haas are not decisive, but they do honor to European linguistics, which is so favorably disposed to problems which are different from the traditional ones. The path which I followed was totally different. I find acceptable a certain connection between the three notions of Venetic, Osco-Umbrian, and Latin, provided that the influences which the various Indo-European traditions have undergone on Italic soil are acknowledged, as I have shown, pp. 57–70 in the German edition (1968) of my *Storia della lingua di Roma*. Even the Latin of Rome shows traces of these ancient influences in aligning three different variations of the ancient aspirated voiced DH, i.e. the voiced *ruber* (of Venetic origin), the aspirated *rufus* (of Osco-Umbrian origin), and the voiceless T (of proto-Latin origin) in *rutilus*.

Concerning the notion of 'Proto-Latin', I must acknowledge the great merit of Ribezzo, who energetically supported it in the *Rivista indo-greco-italica*, e.g. 12.192ff. (1928), in spite of the resistance of most linguists who were attached to the genetic methods.

Outside of these general problems, and again under the influence of the *Rivista* of Ribezzo, the first few years of this period were dedicated to Osco-Umbrian problems. Fifty years after the publication of the great manuals and editions of v. Planta and Conway, there appeared the manuals of G. Bottiglioni (*Manuale dei dialetti italici*, Bologna 1954) and Emil Vetter (*Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*, Heidelberg 1953), containing all the Osco-Umbrian inscriptions, and the edition including the commentary of the Eugubine Tables which I produced (*Tabulae iguvinae*, Rome 1937, 3rd ed. 1962). The differences which separate the Osco-Umbrian from the Latin tradition are generally accepted, but they do not exclude, as I just mentioned, the possibility of contacts and uninterrupted influences. Another achievement in this period was the solution of the 'protosabellic' problem which, thanks to the studies of V. Pisani (*Le lingue dell'Italia antica*, etc., 225ff., 2nd ed. Turin 1964) and G. Radke (pp. 1764ff. in Pauly-Wissowa's *Realenzyklopädie*, Suppl. IX) should be considered as a problem of an 'archaic Umbrian'. The strictly structural and combinatory philological method followed in my *Tabulae iguvinae*, has inspired other works, even if it has not had any unanimous following. In my opinion, the Roman sources, the Latin etymologies, often hinder the spontaneous activity of interpreters. It is nonetheless necessary to note the work of G. B. Pighi on the Umbrian pantheon ("I nomi delle divinità iguvine", *RFIC* 82.225–61, 1954), and the monographs by Rix and Untermann. Also to be

noted is the work of a young epigraphist Adriano La Regina, *Le iscrizioni osche di Pietrabbondante*, etc. (*RhM* LIX.260–86, 1966).

Adjacent to Umbrian, there is a much less important language, Faliscan, which has undergone the most varied influences: its origin would appear to be 'Proto-Latin', and the influences are Etruscan, from a cultural point of view, and Sabine, from a morpho-phonological view. The general work, which contains all the known information on Faliscan, is due to Mrs. Gabriella Giacomelli (*La lingua falisca*, Florence 1963). Certain more specific questions have been pinpointed by G. Bonfante (*AGI* 51.1–25 (1966) and especially E. Peruzzi (*Maia* 16.149–75, [1964]; *PP* 19.138ff., 309ff. [1964]). But the studies which have advanced the farthest in the last few years have been, thanks to Michel Lejeune ("Notes de linguistique italique", *REL* XXI/44. 141–81, 1966) and G.B. Pellegrini, the Venetic studies. The point of departure was then extended to more general questions by an American scholar, M.S. Beeler, in his book on *The Venetic language* (Berkeley, Calif., 1949). But the tens of detailed studies by Lejeune and G.B. Pellegrini, above all on the new epigraphic discoveries of Lagole, have made it possible to realize the great work of G.B. Pellegrini and A.L. Prosdocimi, *La lingua venetica* (Padua and Florence 1967). This book constitutes, as long as no new epigraphic discoveries are made, the real 'treasury' of our knowledge of this subject. The book by J. Untermann, *Die venetischen Personennamen*, happily completes this survey of our knowledge of this subject (Wiesbaden 1961).

A new development (and a complication) is represented in this period by the inscriptions of the Val Camonica, illustrated the first time in an exaggerated manner by F. Altheim and E. Trautmann, who compared them with Latin in *Vom Ursprung der Runen* (Frankfort 1939). Radke linked them to Umbrian in Pauly-Wissowa's *Realenzyklopädie* (1782ff., Suppl. IX). The more correct solution to the problem is found in the memoir of A.L. Prosdocimi, *Per una edizione delle iscrizioni della Val Camonica*, where he wisely refuses to link them to one rather than another 'Italic' stage (*SE* 33.575–99, 1965).

The great crisis which Latin went through in the fifth century B.C. renders unintelligible the most ancient texts, not only of the Proto-Latin tradition (such as the inscription of Centuripae which Antonino Pagliaro, among others, studied with great skill (cf. *Atti del III Congresso internazionale dei Linguisti*, 151ff., Rome 1933), but also those of Rome itself.

The European bibliography for the twentieth century concerning these texts (the inscription from the Forum, that of Duenos) is immense. It is only possible here to choose a few significant examples. I note two attempts in German because of the methodological innovations that they represent, i.e. the collaboration of linguists and jurists: the list includes Johannes Stroux (*Philologus* 86.460ff., 1931) and Emil Goldmann and Hans Leifer (*Klio* 14, 1932), for the inscription from the Forum, and Goldmann (*Die Duenos Inschrift*, Heidelberg 1926) and Peruzzi (*PP* 13.328–46, 1958) for the inscription of Duenos. From an archaeological point of view, some interesting points have been made by S. Ferri about the latter inscription. Very elegant efforts

have been made by E. Peruzzi (*PP* 112.29–45, 1967) to understand the language of Numa, and of Royal Rome.

At first, the archaic Latin texts also posed some questions concerning an alphabet. These questions were settled as a whole before World War I. I call attention to one exception, however, in the work of Magnus Hammarström, who took an autonomous position, not only on the linguistic, but also the cultural level, in regards to the transmission of Greek models in the Occident, with or without Etruscan intermediaries (*Beiträge zur Geschichte des etruskischen, lateinischen und griechischen Alphabets*, 1920).

10. The glory of this fifty-year period is represented by the elaboration of the concept of linguistic history. There had been books in the past entitled 'histoire de la langue latine', but that of J. Walch (*Historia critica linguae latinae*, 2nd ed. 1734) represented an age which was still pre-scientific, and the works of the neo-grammarians did not make it clear in what sense linguistic history was to be distinguished from historical grammar: such is the case with the *Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* of Franz Stolz.² The beginning of a new approach was signaled, in regards to Latin, by Antoine Meillet, whose *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, appearing in a first edition in 1913, was recognized universally as a masterpiece. The parallel *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*, appearing in 1928 (reprinted in 1966 with a bibliography by J. Perrot), was important as an introduction of this new concept into Latin studies. But the execution of Meillet's plan was somewhat hurried, and the book does not consider in just proportion the relationship between the historic and pre-historic periods. The latter were greatly favored at the expense of the former.

I have myself tried to develop this concept, in my *Storia della lingua di Roma* (1939) and to apply it in a coherent manner as a history of Rome seen in linguistic perspective. The book has nothing in common with the historical grammars, and retains in its German translation (1968) a structure that is independent of any traditional organization. A very important commentary was written by Berengario Gerola (*SE* 16. 598–626, 1942).

Only a part of V. Pisani's *Storia della lingua latina*, up to the age of Virgil, has appeared (Turin 1962). The work of Altheim (Frankfurt 1961) has an inexact title, for 'Geschichte des lateinischen Sprache' is followed by a more precise 'bis zum Beginn des literarischen Überlieferung', i.e. it is not a history, but a pre-history.

The definition given by A. W. de Groot of classical literary Latin as the standard language of authors from the age of Caesar to Augustus, such as was spoken in cultivated circles (*REL* 1.114, 1923), corresponds to a historico-linguistic interpretation (and not a grammatical interpretation) of the facts. But in general, it should be remembered that the historico-linguistic interpretation has not had any direct consequences for the study of literary language, which remains, in general, within the limits of the philological, rhetorical, and stylistic traditions.

² Revised by W. P. Schmid, Berlin 1966. An Italian translation with an important introduction by A. Traina was published in 1968.

As a basis of comparison for these problems, I suggest the book by an American scholar, Ernst Pulgram, *Tongues of Italy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), which does not have a classic structure, but contains sufficient material to be considered as a work of linguistic history.

11. If the question is asked whether, as opposed to the partial success of Latin linguistic history as a whole, there were any real successes in somewhat more restricted fields, the answer is in the affirmative, above all for two authors and two of their works. The first is J. B. Hofmann (the collaborator of Leumann in the editing of the part on syntax of the great Latin grammar), who, in 1926, published his famous book on the *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (3rd ed. Heidelberg 1951). It was a study which brought out all the formulas which appeared in literary works but which belonged neither to veritable literary language nor to external, dialectal influences. It is clear that the sources of comedy were essential to this study. The book of Hofmann was a total success. The only criticism which I would like to make is that that in the book which is opposed to the unitary concept of literary language is itself not unitary. The *Umgangssprache* is organized on two different, if not contradictory levels: the one underlines intimateness and expressiveness, and is truly the language of a family environment; the other stresses rather the apathy and banality of the office and shops which has, above all, negative characteristics.

The other scholar is Jules Marouzeau, author of the other masterpiece, *Traité de stylistique appliquée au latin* (1935). This book, inspired by the ideas of Ch. Bally's school in Geneva, documents the richness of choices: the concept of a stylistic choice is introduced into the history of Latin linguistics by this book, and has become a fundamental notion for stylistics in general.

The *Traité de stylistique* represents for Jules Marouzeau the conclusion of a large amount of research on the subject of the analysis of social levels in the Latin language. His work has passed through various stages since the volume *L'ordre du mot dans la phrase latine* (Paris 1922) from the Latin of peasants³ up to its effort to raise itself to a literary language in the memoirs *Le latin à la conquête de l'abstrait* (1947)⁴ or *L'accès de Rome à son destin littéraire* (BAGB 52-72, 1954). A number of works constitute a sort of constellation around these two masterpieces. I will cite an Italian example, the study of popular elements in Horace by G. Bonfante (*Em* 4.86-119, 1936). A very important work in this field is *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter* of Ilona Opelt (Heidelberg 1965).

12. The history of Latin is the history of a language which has mixed origins, a first burgeoning in the age of the monarchy, as I have described, previous to a period of almost fatal crisis, and finally a 500-year expansion, from 350 B.C. to 150 A.D.

³ *Mélanges Vendryes*, Paris 1925; cf. G. Bonfante's article in *REL* 32.162ff. (1954).

⁴ *Anales de Filología clásica* (Buenos Aires) 4.7ff. (1947). The subject is further developed in E. Mikkola's book on *Die Abstraktion im Lateinischen* (Helsinki 1966).

The processes of mixing on a protohistorical level have been illustrated above. There remain to be explained those of an historical order, which are characterized essentially by loanwords. Concerning the dialectal elements which had penetrated into Latin, the elaboration by A. Ernout, in his celebrated *Eléments dialectaux du vocabulaire latin*, belongs to a period which precedes the compass of this study (1st ed. 1909). After a parallel (and less successful) work on the Latin loanwords in Etruscan (*BSL* 30.82–124, 1929), Ernout devoted himself to studies of vocabulary in *Philologica* I–III (1946, 1957, 1965), and in his *Aspects du vocabulaire latin* (1954), which are all exemplary works.

Among the minor contributions, I note the very clear position taken by P.G. Goidanich 'against' the tendency to recognize excessive dialectal influences within the Roman area (*Atti del primo Congresso di studi romani*, Rome 1928). Much more recent and convincing is the memoir of E. Campanile, "Elementi dialettali nella fonetica e nella morfologia del latino" (*SSL*, 1–21, Pisa 1961).

The last fifty years has witnessed the reinterpretation of the problem of Greek loanwords. Multiplying its various aspects, the problem was transferred from the pathological domain, where it had been put by the linguistics of genetic relationships, to a more concrete level of sources and stages. B. Friedmann, in his book *Die ionischen und attischen Wörter im Altlatein* (1937) gave one of the first examples of such an analysis.

F. Altheim (*Griechische Götter im alten Rom*, Giessen 1930) and G. Pasquali (*Preistoria della poesia romana*, Florence 1937) have shown the precocity of the first Greek influences on Latin, exerted as early as the age of the monarchy in the realms of religion and marine activities.

Not only linguistic, but also philological and literary studies of the age of Plautus have revealed two contemporary stages of a low Greek influence, tied to the arrival of the first slaves from the Greek world, and another stage, that of an interest in the Greek grammarians, philosophers, and scholars which developed between the second and third Punic wars. The Greek loans of the Imperial Age pose new problems, such as the relationships of equality between the Greek and Latin areas, of which Terracini has given some interesting examples, and that of Christian sects being adapted to a new framework, a problem which still calls for much work.

13. Now that the large problems have been clarified, with the analysis, let us say, of the positions occupied by Leumann, Ernout and Meillet, Hofmann and Marouzeau, my *Storia della lingua di Roma*, and the Italic panorama of Pisani, the more particular questions can be presented in a more concentrated manner.

The essential points begin with the closely allied questions about the nature of the Latin accent and rhythm. Fifty years ago, theories of Latin accent were divided, in Europe, into two schools. The first represents above all the French tradition, which recognizes, during a provisional, prehistoric phase, an initial accent of intensity, followed by an accent of pitch on the penultimate or antepenultimate vowels during

the whole of the Classical period. Only with the end of the Empire was this accent replaced by an accent of intensity (cf. A. Meillet and J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*, 2nd ed. Paris 1968). The second theory, promoted especially by German scholars, considers the accent of intensity as permanent, from the prehistoric age to the classical age, until the end of the Empire, giving way only at the beginning of the Republican age to the change from the first to the penultimate or antepenultimate syllable. In the last fifty years, the debate has had a single remarkable manifestation, in the work of Eduard Fraenkel. Fraenkel supported the German doctrine, using new arguments, especially that of the coincidence of the ictus and the accent of words (*Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers*, Berlin 1928), while Giorgio Pasquali (*RFIC* 58.157–88, 1930), in a long report, has maintained, and even emphasized, the traditional objections of the French school. H. Drexler, O. Skutsch, and H. Haffter⁵ have made important contributions. A lengthy review of the question has been published in Italy by G.C. Lepschy (*ASNP* 31.199–246, 1962), in a well-informed and very useful memoir.

Concerning the ancient rhythm, besides the book by W.M. Lindsay, *Early Latin verse* (1922), there has appeared the *Prosody of Terence* by L. Laidlaw (1938). But the most important work is once again due to G. Pasquali, the *Preistoria della poesia romana* cited above, in which he has given a new explanation of Saturnian verse, related to the first Greek influences on Roman civilization. Two other Italian authors have made some contributions which should be mentioned: Massimo Lenchantin, with a series of articles on the classical accent,⁶ and F. di Capua with two memoirs (*Il ritmo prosaico nelle lettere dei papi*, I: 1937, II: 1939, Rome) on prosaic rhythm in the age of transition between the musical accent and the accent of intensity, during the Lower Empire and the Middle Ages.

14. Strictly phonetic problems have not given rise to any first-rate works. I cite here, as an attempt to expand the horizons of traditional research, on the one hand, the large memoir of Albrecht Götze on the relative chronology of certain innovations (*IF* 41.78–149, 1923) and especially the memoir of A. Martinet (*L'évolution phonétique et les sons du latin ancien*, 2nd ed. Louvain 1955), who considers a certain number of innovations in the framework of a more general system.

In the second place, and as authentic statements of present scientific methods, I cite the work of G. Bottiglioni (*Il dileguo delle brevi atone interne nella lingua latina*, Pisa 1923), on examples of syncope in Latin, the study of Latin anaptyxis by the remarkable Dutch Latinist A.W. de Groot (Göttingen 1921), and finally the *Estudios de fonética y morfología latina* of A. Pariente (Salamanca 1949).

⁵ In chronological order: Drexler, *Plautinische Akzentstudien* (Breslau 1932); Skutsch, *Prosodische und metrische Gesetze der Iambenkürzung* (Göttingen 1934); and Haffter, *Untersuchungen zur alt-lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Berlin 1934).

⁶ "Studi sull'accento greco e latino", nineteen articles, the last of which appeared in *RFIC* 51.177–91 (1922).

A rather secondary domain, that of Latin pronunciation, has not offered any opportunities for successive authors, of a number of publications, to achieve any exceptional results.

15. In the field of morphology, the most important fact has been the renewal of interest for word derivations. In this area, the great master has been Manu Leumann, who, in his best research, concentrated on grammar, as was cited several times above. Among the many monographs, I note that of J. Perret, *Les dérivés latins en -men et -mentum* (Paris 1961). As a general manual, the *Morphologie historique du latin* of A. Ernout has been readily accepted in Europe (2nd ed. 1926), and has been translated many times. A very important contribution is the study of Alessandro Ronconi on the Latin verb (1946, 2nd ed. 1959). Three particular works should be mentioned in their very different realms: the *Rückläufige Ableitung* of Franz Brender (1920), the study of Latin imperfect of A. Mayer (*Glotta* 35.114–33, 1956), who discusses different hypotheses which have been proposed in the last forty years, and, on the borderline between morphology and syntax, the “Genus und Sexus” of B. Löfstedt (*SymbOsI* 38.47–68, 1963).

The *Etudes de phonétique et de morphologie latine* (Neuchatel 1928), of A. Burger, are essential for the explanation which they give of the formation of the perfect in -u; as well as the explanation of the relation between the present and imperfect in Latin subjunctive by J. Perret (*Latomus* 23.197–212, 1964).

16. There is no possible comparison between the research done on Latin phonetics and morphology, on the one hand, and syntax, on the other. Syntax represents a richness and a flourishing, which the other parts of the grammar could not even approximate. This situation might also be a result of the fact that the studies of syntax were made much later, and that the syntactical report of the *Grundriss* by Karl Brugmann was not as well received as its author, Berthold Delbrück, deserves. In 1918 the situation was about the same as in 1860. The need for a change was expressed in a booklet by W. Kroll, *Die wissenschaftliche Syntax im lateinischen Unterricht* (Berlin 1917).

What was needed was to make up for lost time. It was an indirect student of Delbrück, the great Swiss scholar Jakob Wackernagel, who was to reawaken the interest in these neglected problems. He did this with his *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, which corresponded to lectures actually given at the end of World War I and published between 1920 and 1925 in a first edition, between 1926 and 1928 in the second. Wackernagel shows traditional specialists in syntax (and in contrast with the views of Franz Skutsch), the advantage of comparing Latin syntagms with those of Greek and Germanic, at the same time showing comparatists the advantage of relying not on formulas, but on texts which the author completely masters. Two theoretically opposed, but both very important points of view are presented respectively, by P. Giuffrida in his *Principi di sintassi latina* (Turin 1938) linked to philosophical prin-

ciples, and by A. Traina, *Esegesi e sintassi* (Padua 1955), who insists on the connection between syntax and interpretation.

In addition to this main attempt to expand horizons, and the methodological innovations, there developed also in this period an attempt at more profound studies, due above all to the doctrine of Swedish scholars and of their master, Einar Löfstedt. The Swedish school concentrated on the most recent texts of the Imperial age, and took into account, with the two volumes of *Syntactica* of Löfstedt (I: 1942, II: 1933) all the syntactical problems that can be gleaned from them: such as, concerning Tacitus, the different use of archaisms in his evolution as a writer, and the relations between late and archaic authors, according to the schema which F. Marx had indicated in 1909, and which was adopted by A. Ronconi in 1957 ("Arcaismi o volgarismi?", *Maia* 9.7-35). Clustered around Löfstedt, there were the volumes of M. Salonić dedicated to the *Vitae Patrum* (1920), of J. Svennung on Palladius (*Untersuchungen zu Palladius*, Uppsala 1936), of H. Hagendahl on the metrical prose of Arnobius (Göteborg 1936), and finally the *Syntaktische Forschungen* of Dag Norberg (1943). These works are comparable to excavations which have uncovered real treasures.

But the syntactical problems are not limited to the imposing successes of the Swedish school. There are two others which should be mentioned, even if they have given rise to fewer scientific debates: the first is that of the passage of parallel periods, as the laws of the XII Tables in the hypotactical periods which triumphed in the age of Cicero. I cite in regards to this the memoir of M. Durante, "Prosa ritmica, allitterazione e accento nelle lingue dell'Italia antica" (*RicLing* 4.61-98, 1958). The second is the problem of the free, indirect style studied, for example, by J. Bayet,⁷ who gives a demonstration of the innovation and audacity already present in the *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, at the beginning of the second century A.D.

Corresponding in the importance of their research to the Swedes, who dedicated themselves to syntax, are the scholars of the Dutch school of Nijmegen, who have concentrated on the language of Christian authors, first under the guidance of Mgr. Schrijnen and later of Christine Mohrmann. It is not necessary to give a long list of these works, such as those of H. H. Janssen and W. Teeuwen. Its main interest for this survey of European linguistics can be seen from the beginning in the fundamental memoir of J. Schrijnen, *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Lateins* (1932), in which the author demonstrates that there is not one Christian Latin, but two, and that each of the two differs much more from the other than from the Latin of the pagans.

As for the Latin used by the Church Fathers, as long as they were concerned with problems of doctrine, there was no reason why they should detach themselves from the traditional language, which was so well suited to any theoretical debate, while the apologists, Apostles and preachers, had many reasons for adjusting their language to the tastes of the faithful and to their ability to comprehend. For the same reason, in

⁷ *RPh* 57.327-62 (1931), 58.336-72 (1932). Cf. C. Hyart, *Les origines du style indirect libre* (Brussels 1954).

liturgical ceremonies, the formulas for the ritual were pronounced with all the force corresponding to the sentiments of universality and eternity; compare this with the Gospel, which must be intimate and almost individual, even on the linguistic level.

17. The expansion of the Imperial administration of all the civilized West to Trajan, and the application of citizens' rights to all subjects of the Empire by Emperor Caracalla, in 212 A.D., poses some problems as to linguistic unity, which was at that time being threatened by two different forces. These forces arose at the same time: on the one hand, there is the depth of the linguistic stratum which always leads to the establishment of a superior layer, which remains unitary, and an inferior layer, which gradually becomes heterogeneous. The linguistic concept corresponding to this layer was named 'Vulgar Latin'. From the point of view of the superior layer, the direct evidence of the inscriptions reveals, until the end of the Republic, the effort made to stabilize the language and its orthography, but at a certain moment shows us also that there were centrifugal forces at work. The work of the Finnish scholar V. Väänänen on *Le latin des inscriptions pompéiennes* (1937, 3rd ed. Berlin 1966), shows us that it is possible to render the same text in two languages which are nevertheless quite different: *quis amat valeat* = *qui ama valia*, i.e. here is an early example of a 'socio-linguistic' problem. On the other hand, they confirm not only linguistic innovations, but *neue Denkformen*, according to the formula of Karl Vossler (*Festschrift Becker*, 170–87, Heidelberg 1922), which influenced the linguistic equilibrium which had been achieved at that time. The romanist Eugen Lerch, a student of Vossler, has been able to give his book, on the origin of the Roman future tense, the title: *Die Verwendung des romanischen Futurums als Ausdruck eines sittlichen Sollens* (1919).

18. But the sociological divisions are nothing in comparison with the geographical divisions which developed, at first very discretely, later to be revealed in all their profundity. Classical linguistics has remained for a long time blind to this event. Nineteenth century authors, such as Karl Sittl and Friedrich Georg Mohl, who had envisaged a Vulgar Latin sensitive to geographical (and ethnic) differences, were regarded with disdain at the beginning of the twentieth. This disdain would have continued into our period were it not for the intervention of Romance linguistics, which was more flexible and open to new ideas.

All the same, it would not have been difficult to admit in principle that the Latin language, already exposed to foreign influences within its national center, would have necessarily been submitted to much more powerful influences as soon as it drew farther away from Rome.

The notions of substratum and mixture, which were adopted, not reluctantly, in regards to the establishment of Indo-European linguistic traditions in Italy, were so accepted not only because of the force of the facts, but thanks also to the attitudes of the Romanists. Thus the idea was accepted that Latin, in spreading throughout Italy,

was shared by regions favorable to mixtures, and in regions which did not favor them. It is thus that the Latin of Sardinia, Tuscany, Venetia, and Messapia, only slightly mixed, was able to be conserved rather faithfully up to our day. In the other regions, it must have been influenced by the Osco-Umbrian languages and, with devastating results, by the Gallic languages. A very nice description of the adaptation of Latin in the Gallic world has been given by Terracini in "Gallico e Latino" (*RFIC* 49.401-30, 1921). A report which emphasizes the foreign influences, and above all those of Germanic languages, on the development of Latin, has been made by W. von Wartburg in *Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker* (Halle 1939). The most recent summary of the dialectal groupings of Latin in Italy I myself presented under the title "Italia dialettale" (*Atti del V Convegno di studi umbri*, 93-127, Gubbio 1967).

The traces of Greek shown in Calabria revealed by Rohlf's have met with opposition in Italy ("Autochthone Griechen oder byzantinische Gräzität?", *RLR* 4.118-200, 1928). They do not eliminate the possibility that a Latin tradition, although restricted, was conserved in the cloister and isolated spots (see my *Geschichte der Sprache Roms*, 176).

At present there is the problem of the termination of Latin as a living language. The two extreme solutions are represented by H. F. Muller, who assigns it to the Age of Charlemagne (in *A chronology of vulgar Latin*, Halle 1929), while in my *Storia della lingua di Roma*, I retain the classic date of 476 A.D. Some very recent and remarkable considerations are found in D. Norberg's "A quelle époque a-t-on cessé de parler latin en Gaule?"⁸

The bibliographical information which makes it possible to follow the scientific activity in the realm treated in these pages can be found in *Année philologique* (since 1924) under the supervision of Juliette Ernst, and in the *Bibliographie linguistique* (since 1949), in the care of Christine Mohrmann.

It is still impossible to foresee whether the reconciliation between the comparatists and philologists announced at the beginning of this period will result in a true unification.

⁸ *BL* 21.346-56 (1966). Cf. F. Lot, "A quelle époque a-t-on cessé de parler latin?", *ALMA* 6.97-159 (1931).

COMPARATIVE ROMANCE LINGUISTICS*

YAKOV MALKIEL

1. DELIMITATION OF SCOPE

For several decades Romance philology — and comparative Romance linguistics, as its indisputable core discipline — enjoyed a position of great prominence and presented a tremendous appeal to Western and Central Europe's intellectual élite. In fact, few scholarly pursuits can be so neatly placed on the geographic map: while there have been intermittent attempts to implant Romance linguistics in such far-away places — if one is to measure the distance from, say, Paris — as Turkey, Israel, the Congo, Ghana, South Africa, Hong Kong, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and the Americas,¹ it is undeniable that this domain, for better or worse, represents a European tradition; that it has been cultivated, in the overseas countries, with limited success, almost invariably in overt emulation, or imitation, of European patterns; and that its advance has been spearheaded by scholars reared in Europe or, at least, trained at European universities. This limitation is not necessarily wholesome and it need not indefinitely hold true in the future; but it must be carefully kept in mind in any critical digest of significant research carried out in the last half-century.

Comparative Romance linguistics reached its flowering in the Old World between 1860 and 1935,² and within this seventy-five year period it is permissible to set off the triple decade 1885–1915 as, presumably, its all-time crest. The First World War and the war's aftermath marked the discipline's first retreat from inherent eminence and from outward recognition, while the Second World War, including its prelude and its epilogue, dealt a far more severe blow to its continued growth. The danger of its extinction — if there ever was any — has, however, been averted, and the pendulum seems to be swinging back on both sides of the Atlantic. Some European countries, at least, boast once again a respectable rate of production, as regards the numerical representation of newly recruited experts and the thoroughness of their published research. What remains at issue — and on this score the next few years may well prove to be decisive — is the ability of the pacesetters to rejuvenate the methodology, to set new goals (clearly defined and attractive to talented, ambitious workers), and to re-establish a much-needed rapport with general linguistics, which has somehow been

* Let me thank Curtis Blaylock, my late friend Percival B. Fay, and Benjamin M. Woodbridge, Jr., for their critical reading of the manuscript.

lost in the last few decades.³ The specific reasons for the temporary decline of comparative Romance linguistics will be laid bare in this chapter (Sections 6–7), and an attempt will be made in that context to identify some conditions which should — and very well may — ensure its successful comeback.

To keep this chapter within reasonable limits and to enhance its homogeneity, I shall interpret the label comparative as implying genetic kinship and the diachronic perspective, or, at least, an approach indirectly conducive to fruitful historical analysis. One can, of course, jointly study a certain feature in several, or even all, Romance languages without the slightest concern about comparison, i.e. through sheer juxtaposition; and one is free, especially in descriptive inquiries, to engage in comparison entirely devoid of any reconstructive design.⁴ Such research, legitimate as it is, and distinguished as it may become, will not generally claim our attention here.

2. THE CLASSICAL STANDARD OF COMPARATISM

While for many tastes Romance linguistics at its most daring and original is exemplified by Hugo Schuchardt's far-flung *œuvre*, the standard for austere comparative work was set, beyond the shadow of a doubt, by Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke. The period of tone-setting excellence, in that Swiss-born scholar's life (his career took him from Zürich to Jena to Vienna, and from there back to Germany [Bonn]),⁵ lasted from his splendid earliest "Beiträge zur romanischen Laut- und Formenlehre", which he published as a relatively young man,⁶ to those studies in old-style phonology and in lexicology which fall into the concluding years of his life, after 1930.⁷ The two pillars that support his broad reputation as a distinguished comparatist are, first, the *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* (= *GRS*, 3 vols., 1890–1902), whose opening volume, palpably influenced by the then recent discovery of K. Verner's Law, is a real masterpiece; and, second, the *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (= *REW*, 1911–20; rev. ed., 1930–35). Insiders know that Meyer-Lübke was too young when he wrote his grammar and too old when he compiled and, especially, when he revised his dictionary; also, on both occasions he worked far too hastily and was ill-advised to carry on his shoulders the entire burden of responsibility. For all their shortcomings, these two oft-consulted reference works have never been replaced, and progress, as Jakob Jud pointed out in his incisive necrology, was measured for decades with Meyer-Lübke's syntheses serving as a handy frame of reference. His workmanship was at its finest in his *Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache*, in which comparativism, by definition, is necessarily implied rather than overt;⁸ and, somewhat like his contemporary A. Meillet and not unlike Meillet's intellectual heir and our own contemporary É. Benveniste, Meyer-Lübke made it a point to turn his attention, almost cyclically, now to one Romance language, now to another, paying heightened attention to such relatively neglected descendants of Latin as Rumanian, Sardinian, and Old Portuguese.⁹ It is in this context that his most controversial venture, the glotto-historical monograph on Catalan (1925), acquires its true significance. To Meyer-

Lübke's pen we also owe the most authoritative, if by now obsolete, introduction to the methodology of Romance linguistics (the *Einführung* appeared in 1900; then, revised, in 1909; eventually, once more refurbished, in 1920);¹⁰ one would search it in vain, however, for an auto-analysis of the author's own style and strategy of research, since a certain restraint and *pudeur* hindered Meyer-Lübke and most scholars of his generation from engaging in such self-explication.

Meyer-Lübke's power of synthesis (linked to a willingness to take risks); the fairly even spread of his curiosity over all major Romance dialects and, *a fortiori*, languages and over several periods; his, all told, excellent grounding in Latin (demonstrated by his editorial comments scattered through the successive fascicles of the monumental *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*); finally, his ability to keep his knowledge of past, present, and immediately foreseeable research in significant perspective,¹¹ all combined to make him something of a leader whom it has proved impossible for later generations to replace. While — to cite but two examples — it is undeniable that Menéndez Pidal far surpassed him in the accurate interpretation of Hispanic records and that Wartburg's dictionary is incomparably more meticulous and circumstantial than Meyer-Lübke's modestly-sized *REW*, even these seasoned and well-informed scholars lacked the sweep of Meyer-Lübke's uniquely pan-Romanic overview.

In the mid-'twenties it became fashionable to disagree sharply and even loudly with Meyer-Lübke's general approach to research and with many of his specific pronouncements and predictions, to rebel against his — until then undisputed — authority. Leo Spitzer, a direct student but hardly a disciple, missed in his teacher's etymologies a 'feel' for the metaphor, which can serve as a clue to life in all its protean manifestations. Jakob Jud criticized the sheer inaccuracy of many raw data cited and, more broadly speaking, the lack of filtering, of critical assessment of the heterogeneous material adduced. A still very young Amado Alonso, in his celebrated critique of Meyer-Lübke's ill-fated book *Das Katalanische* (a critique which he undoubtedly wrote with the encouragement and tacit help of his own teacher, Menéndez Pidal), had little difficulty in showing that Meyer-Lübke did not have the Spanish material under firm control in attempting to demonstrate that Catalan was essentially a southerly, trans-Pyrenean prong of Provençal, i.e. of Gallo-Romance; not without a touch of humor, a self-confident Alonso preferred instead to view Provençal as a northerly prong of Hispano-Romance — a change in perspective which immensely flattered his compatriots.¹² Whatever the merits of these objections and of the alternatives proposed, the angry young dissenters were a shade unfair toward a master then passing through a difficult stretch of his life, and the arguments involved a certain dosage of misapprehension of the inherent limitations of comparatism, an appraisal which unavoidably entails a certain disengagement from too detailed, too concrete concern with any single culture, language, and period. Perhaps the answer to the resultant inadequacy (as Meyer-Lübke's great counterpart Meillet seems to have been the first to sense) lies in all manner of team-work, with dictionaries and historical grammars of the future combining the wide-meshed approach of an audacious comparatist and the philo-

logical skill and expertise of a group of specialists, each steeped in thorough knowledge of a particular culture, including all relevant sources of information. However that may be, Meyer-Lübke must not be light-heartedly accused of any excessive rigidity of thinking, any stunted growth, or any stubborn indifference to new trends. He responded affirmatively to the implications of dialect geography (including Gilliéron's homonymics), to the *Wörter-und-Sachen* technique, and to numerous other innovatory currents; he zestfully restructured his edifice of phonology so as to de-emphasize the role of stress (thus retreating from his earlier subservience to Verner) and to piece together more neatly the presumable sequence of events; and, in 1921, he rearranged the derivational suffixes of French in such manner as to bring out more incisively their functional affinities and the rivalries flowing from this enmeshment.¹³

3. COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS AS A MODEL OF BROADLY CULTURAL ANALYSIS

Nothing bespeaks more eloquently the pre-eminence of comparative linguistics within the frame of philological disciplines during the latter's apogee than the place of honor accorded it in such ambitious encyclopedic ventures as G. Gröber's long-influential *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (orig. ed., 1888–1902). The opening volume in its entirety was given over to an array of linguistic studies and surveys, including a string of succinct historical grammars. It was this linguistically-oriented volume that, significantly, contained, *in nucleo*, the vindication of the whole enterprise — and of the diversely channeled scholarship that stood behind it; that justified, with measurable accuracy, the very concept of a loosely unified Romance culture marked by common roots. Into this neatly bounded mold Gröber comfortably pressed, in the remaining volumes, the study of Romance metrics and of Romance vernacular literatures. His plans went much farther: it was his intention to include, among auxiliary or ancillary disciplines (*Grenzwissenschaften*), an account of the medieval segment of the history of the Romance nations (entrusted to H. Bresslau); a sketch of the tradition of visual arts, within the matrix of Romance cultures (from the pen of A. Schultz); and an outline of scholarly, speculative, and scientific endeavors that, over the years, have been launched on Romance soil (surveyed by the philosopher W. Windelband). He even toyed with the idea of having Romance style and Romance music analyzed for the benefit of philologists. It is unimportant why the original, over-ambitious project was subjected to later retrenchments.¹⁴ What matters is that the initial scope of the encyclopedia thus transcended by a wide margin the range of that excellent learned journal, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, which the very same scholar had founded in 1877 — and which has survived to this day, weathering all storms. One may, of course, question the legitimacy or the wisdom of such constructs as 'Romance sculpture', 'Romance folk music', even 'Romance paroemiology', to say nothing of the highly controversial 'Romance nations'; even if one rules them out, the compliment implicitly paid to comparative Romance linguistics is flattering and may serve as a measuring rod of the discipline's quickly soaring prestige at that juncture.

The original volume on Romance linguistics in the *Grundriss* series (1888) was thoroughly recast by all contributors, or by suitable substitutes, in 1904–06. But when, between the two wars and under a different helmsman, new volumes began to be added to the set on the literary side, there unfortunately occurred no compensatory buttressing of the linguistic quota, with the result that the balance an inspired Gröber had so steadfastly envisaged was in the end irremediably destroyed.

The reason for the prominence which Gröber accorded comparative Romance linguistics was not a matter of whim or of conformity with a prevailing fashion: as he realized, it is the privilege of the Romance linguist to move up and down an axis of fully two thousand years, whereas the student of Romance literature(s) has before him, at best, material extending over a single millennium. By using linguistics as a standard-setter, Gröber immensely extended and enriched his discipline. This chronological disparity between the linguistic and the literary corpus entails a difficulty bordering on an impasse for the global observer of Romance culture; the only solution for the Romanist eager to resolve the balance is to encompass, within his purview, also medieval Latin literature, which provides a link to late, decadent Antiquity. This Gröber proceeded to do, contributing to his own encyclopedia the famous pioneering “Übersicht über die lateinische Literatur von der Mitte des 6. Jahrhunderts bis 1350”, vaunted in such glowing terms by an expert of the rank of E. R. Curtius.

Curtius himself, a versatile and erudite literary scholar and critic who scrupulously avoided trespassing on linguistic territory, as well as his latter-day rival Erich Auerbach and the predecessor of both, Karl Vossler, who established a far better record among connoisseurs of literature than among linguists, shared, despite many differences, one feature that makes the mention of their names relevant in this context: they made a point to study Romance literature as an organic whole,¹⁵ a vision many of their own fellow-scholars would not endorse or applaud, but one which patently and very effectively mirrors the view and demarcation of comparative Romance linguists. By so doing, they imaginatively perpetuated until 1960 a concept that crystallized in the past century.

4. COMPARATISM ON A REDUCED SCALE

Meyer-Lübke and Gröber were not, of course, the inventors of the comparative approach in Romance linguistics — Diez, Diefenbach, and Fuchs, to say nothing of Ascoli and Schuchardt, had been active long before them¹⁶ — but their skill as systematizers and their success as authors of textbooks and reference works admittedly helped to impose their predilections and proclivities, in matters of classification, on the thinly scattered community of Romance linguists the world over. It was they who cautiously enriched the inventory of autonomous Romance languages by granting that status to Sardinian and to newly discovered Dalmatian, while trying to withhold comparable recognition from Catalan, from Franco-Provençal, and from North Italian, in which they saw mere bundles of characteristic dialects.¹⁷

The edifice they erected turned out to be so intricately structured that later generations of scholars, for didactic and other practical reasons, frequently retreated from that standard of excellence, declaring themselves content to operate with a skeleton model of Romance languages, encompassing a mere four to six daughter-languages, truly characteristic and, at the same time, of more obvious importance to the layman than, say, Central Sardinian and Southern Dalmatian. In a way, this retreat involved a partial return to the earlier position of Diez and that pioneer's contemporaries.¹⁸ Also there appeared countless books — often half-baked or fragmentary doctoral dissertations — which were comparative in approach but advisedly modest in the range of languages selected for joint assessment. Typical monographs of this kind either explicitly identify the three or four languages included in the author's purview, or qualify the pan-Romance perspective by candidly adding, in the title: '... with especial consideration of ...', or 'with particular emphasis on ...'.¹⁹ The results of this type of skewed or one-sided analysis have, in part, been deleterious, because of the implied threat to the all-important balance of documentation.

5. THE COMPARATIVE MODEL EXPANDED AND REFINED

Far more exciting than these lame or 'realistic' compromises with limitations on the resources of time and talent have been those departures from the classical standard which aimed at improvement and led either to an enlarged model or to a finer-meshed network. One can point out four such forward thrusts, each made in a slightly different direction.

First, while no new Romance languages have been discovered in the last seventy years, very unusual Romance dialects have for the first time been individuated and analyzed — so strikingly as to affect our general conception of the configuration of ROMANIA. The single most important exploration of this caliber was H. Lausberg's startling inquiry (1939) into the somewhat hidden South Italian dialects of Lucania (Basilicata).²⁰ The relation of a conspicuously deviant modern dialect to a medieval 'scripta' (or *Schriftsprache*) has also been presented, this time by L. Remacle and in reference to Old Walloon (1948), with such sophistication as to have revolutionized all earlier thinking.²¹ Other innovatory studies have borne on a 'Western Franco-Provençal' unit, along the mid-stretch of the Atlantic Coast and its hinterland; on Gascon; and on the position of Istrian.²²

Second, shafts of new light have been cast on the provincial differentiation of colloquial Latin. Indo-Europeanists in general, and Germanists as well as Celticists in particular, have all along been concerned with the penetration of the Latin vocabulary into a number of languages which, to use the familiar kinship metaphor, can be viewed as 'nieces' or 'nieces once removed', if not as true 'daughters', of Latin. Such Latin layers have been laid bare in Albanian; in Old English and Old High German; in several varieties of Celtic (for a readily assimilable, up-to-date presentation of these

discoveries see the excellent *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, by A. Meillet and A. Ernout²³). In possibly the most scintillating of the many excellent articles from his pen ("Probleme der altromanischen Sprachgeographie") a still young Jakob Jud demonstrated how the study of these Latin loanwords in Celtic and Germanic and inquiries into the Romance lexicon of Latin provenience can be conducted in mutually illuminating fashion.²⁴ It is a matter of profound regret that Jud, engrossed by his work on the Italo-Swiss linguistic atlas and by his feverish editorial and pedagogical activities, became side-tracked and never bothered to expand his brilliant article into a full-sized book; he did find time to clarify countless individual strati-graphic problems.²⁵ Aside from the solid Celtic and Germanic domains, it is the lexical relics of Latin in territories once Romanized, including the Rhine Valley, the upper and central Danubian basin (Noricum, Pannonia), and all of North Africa,²⁶ plus the Latin (as against the later Romance) incrustations in Basque,²⁷ that now permit the full-fledged Romance comparatist to reconstruct the speech of the Roman Republic and the later Empire in all its variegated spendor and luxuriance.

Third, the older comparative models have been greatly complicated, in the last half-century or so, by steady elaborations on the formula for the relationship of Latin and Romance. No one today would stoop to operate with the concept of a uniform Plautine (or Ciceronian, or Augustan) Latin serving as the common starting point for the various Romance tongues. We realize that the structure of individual provincial societies holds the key to the varying mixtures of indigenous speech ('substratum') and imported Latin; we also fully understand that Latin itself must be viewed dynamically as a language constantly on the move, along the time axis and across the wide open spaces, and we possess sufficient knowledge of plain ancient history, through the accounts of historiographers and through archeological discoveries, to succeed in dating quite accurately the arrival of major contingents of Romans in Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul, in Numidia, in several slices of Spanish territory, in Dacia, in Egypt, and elsewhere. Also, we have come to realize that, as a rule, the initial 'shock wave' of sailors, traders, settlers, or conquerors is bound to leave an indelible imprint on the autochthonous population, a state of affairs which explains why, in crucially important respects, Sardinia and Spain, colonized — so far as the strategic coastlines are concerned — by the third century B.C., display a larger assemblage of archaic features in their Latinity than does, for instance, Rumania, annexed to the Empire as late as the middle of the second century A.D. So far, so good; what is less transparent to today's observers is the maintenance of the communication lanes between the metropolis and the outlying provinces. Specifically, to what extent did subsequent speech waves raying out from Rome reach and penetrate nearby and distant zones amenable to further influence — as regards configuration of stress, intonational curves, grammatical patterns, lexical inventories, syntactic devices, and the like? In groping for answers to these questions, on which the ancient historiographers were — understandably — silent, even the most advanced scholars have, at best, drawn tentative conclusions from the actual, necessarily fragmentary, record of speech forms as the

only available pool of information, thus exposing themselves to the hazard of circularity and hoping that some independent corpus of evidence might free them from this impasse.²⁸ (Some of them have invoked more closely observable analogues, e.g. the spread and partial differentiation of Spanish in the New World.²⁹)

Another unanticipated intricacy in the relation of parent languages to daughter languages arises from the fact that in most territories under survey the given variety of Romance did not succeed Latin in a tidy sequential pattern, but that there occurred a discernible temporary overlap, with a local form of Medieval Latin and a Romance dialect — as a rule not yet elevated to the rank of a standard language — coexisting for a century or two and presumably influencing each other. (A nearly parallel situation has long been familiar to literary scholars, as when, in hagiography, say, the Latin tradition of saints' lives continues to flourish even after the appearance of the earliest vernacular versions, a situation constantly inviting conflation between members of the two parallel 'strains'.³⁰) Comparatists now reckon with the likelihood of osmosis or contamination during the period of a vernacular dialect's infancy, while it is still under the tutelage of a semi-congealed standard language: at that transitional stage, learned features can seep through or even freely pour from progressively frozen Latin into the inchoate Romance dialect; conversely, ingredients of racy local folk speech can percolate into the local variety of the official language (i.e. of medieval Latin) and dilute it to the point of complete barbarization (witness the disintegration of Merovingian Latin³¹). It is far from easy to draw a scheme doing justice to all these cross-currents produced by invasion and backlash; among familiar devices, neither the family-tree diagram nor the simpler versions of a wave-theory diagram begin to exhaust the answers to the researcher's problems.³²

The fourth complication issues forth from the interferences of borrowing or, if one prefers a different terminology, of diffusion. Particularly tricky, because often not immediately recognizable on account of all manner of disguises and camouflages, has been inter-Romance diffusion; from one dialect to another under the aegis of the same national language; from one major language to another; and from one dialect to another across forbidding and formidable language boundaries.³³ If there has been one line of uninterrupted advance in Romance linguistics over the last one hundred years, then it has been in this demarcation of the steadily widening margin of borrowed ingredients.³⁴

6. THE EXTERNAL ORGANIZATION OF ROMANCE LINGUISTICS

Like other humanistic disciplines of long standing, comparative Romance linguistics — however one cares to mark off its boundaries on a purely intellectual plane — thrives or withers in a particular social and intellectual climate; heavily depends on certain modes of official or *avant-garde* recognition; interacts, on the one hand, with each 'Romance country's' domestic program of study and research in its own language

(viewed pre-eminently as a stabilizer of its national unity and as a vehicle of a prestigious literature) and, on the other, with the lay curiosity about, and the practical teaching of, foreign languages, dead and living, in specific tone-setting milieux. It may even be hampered or activated by political and demographic considerations — e.g. a dwindling Romance élite's fear to be engulfed by an Anglo-Germanic or a Slavic tide.

Leo Spitzer once remarked that the well-being of Romance comparatism hinged on an equilibrium — a harmonious interplay of researches conducted within the 'Romance countries' and without, an interplay potentially conducive to some stimulating dialogue, such as the protracted exchange of etymological opinions between a Graz-based Hugo Schuchardt and a Paris-oriented Antoine Thomas. There is some point in this remark, because the intuitive feeling for Romance languages, easily acquired in childhood and later deepened through introspection and observation in the hubs of Romance culture, should ideally be balanced against predominantly objective and plurifocal inquiries best initiated and conducted by patriotically less committed workers. It is a fact — and a deeply regrettable one — that in the world centers of Romance culture comparativism has fared none too well; one may even speak of its decline in the last quarter-century. In this respect, the record of Paris, Rome, and Madrid has been distinctly less than impressive. In some contexts, I repeat, it takes a crisis, an emergency situation — a resilient, resourceful community's keen awareness of loss of ground or of the threat of encirclement — to ignite enthusiasm for comparative Romance linguistics. Not for nothing, then, have Liège, Lausanne, Barcelona, and Bucharest been far more active in the domain here surveyed than the aforementioned metropolises; and, in France, it is the generally less favored Southern universities: those of Bordeaux, Toulouse, Montpellier, Nice, plus the Catholic University of Lyon, rather than the three celebrated Parisian citadels of learning that have, over the years, witnessed a modicum of fermentation.³⁵

The outer shell of the edifice of Romance linguistics comprises such heterogeneous entities as properly staffed and equipped institutes dedicated — exclusively or partially — to this purpose, such as Oxford's Taylorian Institution, Lyon's Institut de Linguistique Romane, Strasbourg's Centre de philologie romane (which perpetuates G. Gröber's legacy), Louvain's world center for dialectological studies founded by the exiled Rumanian scholar S. Pop and best-known for its journal *Orbis*, Barcelona's embattled Institut d'Estudis Catalans, Lisbon's Centro de Estudos Filológicos; and what remains of Madrid's once celebrated Centro de Estudios Históricos founded by the late R. Menéndez Pidal, plus a network of semiautonomous 'seminaries' characteristic of the Central European and Scandinavian scene (Denmark's 'Instituts d'études romanes' have of late jointly sponsored a *Revue romane*). To this kernel must be added a machinery of clubs, circles, associations, and societies, some local (like the groups that have crystallized in Liège and in Strasbourg and that aim at younger enthusiasts), others national (as in Switzerland and Rumania), a very few in theory international and in practice, at least, pan-European (such as, in 1909–14, the Société

de dialectologie romane, with headquarters in Hamburg; and, after the mid-'twenties, the Société de linguistique romane, whose operational bases are Lyon and Strasbourg and which every three years organizes a congress in such places as Rome, Lisbon, and Bucharest) — each with its own bulletins, journals, and, less common, volumes embodying transactions at triennial meetings. Then again, there exist chains of university-sponsored symposia and colloquia focusing on carefully chosen *ad hoc* themes of particular appeal and predictable controversiality, e.g. the assessment of the linguistic evidence entombed in medieval charters, or traditionalism vs. modernism in grammatical analysis; along this line, Liège and Strasbourg have in recent years accomplished more than all other European universities combined. Another important ingredient has been a string of learned journals — either quarterlies or, infrequently, yearbooks — not a few of them privately sponsored by high-minded and far-sighted 'Akademieverlage', which consequently play the rôle reserved in North America for university presses.³⁶

Among the European journals one conspicuously important for comparative Romance linguistics is to this day the *ZRPh*, into which a new, high-minded editor, the Swiss-born Kurt Baldinger, has instilled new vigor. The *RF*, whose vicissitudes include a succession of ups and downs and which, over the years, has several times changed its format and editorial policy, has, on balance, gained in strength, especially as a mouthpiece of critical opinion, while the *VR* has declined in influence beyond the frontiers of Switzerland, having never fully recovered from the severe setback it suffered through the death of its ebullient founding editor, J. Jud. Through a concatenation of unfavorable circumstances — especially through the absence of imaginative leadership — it has of late fallen short of reflecting, at its most compelling, the discipline it purports to serve. Among genuine yearbooks (as distinct from delayed quarterlies consolidated into yearbooks for the sake of acceleration) Hamburg's *RJb* and Barcelona's *Estudis romànics* easily take pride of place.

This century's two major wars have exacted their heavy toll from periodicals feeding Romance linguistics: in the wake of World War I the short-lived twin ventures *Bulletin* and *Revue de dialectologie romane* (1909–15) irretrievably disappeared; also, the excellent digests of K. Vollmöller's *Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie* (Vol. I, covering the year 1890, appeared in 1892–95) came to an abrupt end (much like Gröber's *Grundriss* in its original design — see above). World War II led to the extinction of that superb bibliographic guide, the *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, in which for decades a Schuchardt and a Meyer-Lübke, among a legion of other experts, would report, in a critical vein, on their latest quotas of reading. The ethnolinguistically oriented quarterly *Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen*, after reaching its peak in the early 'thirties, also ground to a halt in 1944. Several other journals have been revived after a break (e.g. the *ASNS*, the *GRM*, the *RFE*, the *Wörter und Sachen*, the *ZFSL*); but neither these nor their counterparts issued in neutral countries, hence never discontinued (say, Portugal's *BF* and Sweden's *SNPh*), show as much bounce as one is entitled to expect.

Certain newly-founded, in part experimental media (East Germany's *Romanische Beiträge*, say, launched in 1961) have so far displayed severely limited initiative and originality as regards their concern for comparative Romance linguistics. After an impressively promising start in the mid-'forties, the *RPF* seems to have hit the doldrums.³⁷

The vitality of a discipline is further demonstrated — and its practitioners' *esprit de corps* commensurately raised — through the organization of all sorts of monograph series, not infrequently planned as a string of supplements to a journal or as a parallel venture; it may even happen that long after the demise of the periodical the 'Beihefte' or 'Anejos', paradoxically, continue to appear — as has been true of the *Biblioteca dell' 'Archivum Romanicum'*. The monographs so issued typically embody doctoral dissertations — in this qualification lie both the strength and the weakness of such undertakings. Thus, to cite but one example, among the two shelf-fuls of *Romanica Helvetica* book ventures, one finds a half dozen 'mature' works: a bulky *Festschrift* in honor of Jakob Jud, a study in Sardinian derivation from the pen of M. L. Wagner, two carefully spaced collections of articles by K. Jaberg, an occasional thrust into substratal terra incognita by J. Hubschmid, as against an estimated eighty volumes of doctoral theses. True, well-established advanced scholars in Europe have at their disposal such channels as Academy Memoirs (a medium of which E. Gamillscheg and G. Rohlfs have repeatedly availed themselves), if they wish to avoid stooping to the textbook level. Nevertheless, the practice that prevailed between the wars of having two parallel series, one open — for all practical purposes — to beginners, the other reserved for a master-class of experienced performers (cf. the original policy of the *RFE*) had much in its favor. Ideologically tinted monograph series are less common in such 'traditional' fields as Romance philology than in present-day general linguistics, so rich in theoretical cleavages; cf., for one exception, the '*Langue et Parole*': *Sprach- und Literaturstrukturelle Studien* sponsored by Munich's Max Hueber Verlag.³⁸

While only a small minority of monographs — particularly among those contributed by relative tyros — are truly pan-Romanic in design and comparative in analysis, the classic European institution of a Romance *Festschrift* has been extremely effective in bolstering the comparativist ingredient of Romance scholarship. Whether or not the recipient of the honor himself cultivated such a many-pronged approach, it has been the unshakable tradition of Western and Central European scholarship — from Sweden to Italy and from France to the Central Danubian countries — to have, on such occasions, as many Romance languages represented as possible, both as objects and as vehicles of inquiry, and to include, if that ideal was at all attainable (and compatible with limitations on space), a modicum of overtly comparative, reconstructionist, pan-Romanic probings. This goal can be traced to pioneering late-nineteenth-century ventures, including the standard-setting miscellany honoring posthumously two Italian trail-blazers, N. Caix and U. A. Canello (1886), and is still discernible in fairly and even quite recent gifts tendered to A. Lombard, G. Rohlfs, W. von Wartburg,

and many others, especially those of conservative persuasion. From Europe's heartland the idea and the specific attributes of the *donum natalicium* spread to other parts of the world where Romance scholarship had struck root, with sufficiently heavy emphasis on its linguistic facet: Eastern Europe (testimonials in honor of I. Iordan and A. Rosetti in Rumania, of V. Šišmarëv and B. A. Krževskij in the Soviet Union), Israel (H. Peri Memorial), Mexico (commemorative issues of the *NRFH* dedicated to A. Alonso and A. Reyes), and no doubt many other countries; the first experimental adaptations of this idea to North American conditions — within the confines of Romance — involve the separate volumes dedicated to the Johns Hopkins scholar A. Marshall Elliott (1911) and to the Columbia pioneer H. A. Todd (1930). Though the collection of a distinguished author's *Scripta Minora* ('*Kleinere Schriften*'), in the twilight hour of his career or posthumously, has occasionally served in Europe as a substitute for, and only under optimal circumstances as a companion piece of, a standard testimonial or memorial — both genres, to cite just one affinity, invite the inclusion of a fine-meshed bibliography — the benefit accruing to comparative Romance linguistics from such a more homogeneous collection of writings has, as a rule, been more modest.³⁹

One neatly identifiable factor in the consolidation of a discipline is its spokesmen's willingness to prepare creditable accounts of its rise and subsequent development. On this score Romance linguistics has, on the whole, been vulnerable to criticism. G. Gröber's reports, of which the latest goes back to the revised opening volume of his *Grundriss* (i.e. to 1904), are hopelessly antiquated, and K. Vollmöller's annual digest, which for a while could be tapped as an attachment to if not as a substitute for a historical sketch, before long became a war casualty. The difficulty was compounded by the fact that historians of Indo-European and general linguistics, for reasons which need not here be ventilated, with rare exceptions swept Romance studies under the rug, thus leaving a dangerous vacuum. Between the wars, I. Iordan's book on the history of Romance linguistics, the outgrowth of an article reflecting the taste of the mid-'twenties, became temporarily fashionable, especially in its stylistically polished English version prepared by J. Orr (1937); the book boasted an excellent chapter on dialect geography, but showed many serious shortcomings (omission of the Spanish and the Rumanian scenes, disregard of the 'Anglo-Saxon' and the Slavic shares, obtuseness toward structuralism). In recent years the book has been once more expanded, perhaps most effectively so by W. Bahner in his German translation and adaptation (Berlin, 1962), a change which has made it chock-full of information and a bit unwieldy, but not necessarily better structured; there is a chance, however, that an English-language edition now in print, enriched by Rebecca Posner's ambitious Supplement, may clinch the problem of the book's continued usefulness. A very recent report written by a versatile, well-informed, open-minded, and talented medievalist: A. Vârvaro, *Storia, problemi e metodi della linguistica romanza* (Napoli, 1968), has the dual advantage of a certain breeziness and of monolithic, rather than multi-layered, architecture. Other treatments seem less relevant, limiting the horizon, as some of

them do, to a single country — witness D. Macrea's *Lingviști și Filologi Romini* (București, 1959) — or attempting to link the record of research in a single Romance language directly to the trajectory of general linguistics, with minimum attention to comparative Romance linguistics as the intermediate link, which it has been ever since 1820 — under this rubric one may place L. Kukenheim's controversial *Esquisse historique de la linguistique française et de ses rapports avec la linguistique générale* (Leiden, 1962).⁴⁰

One can assign a niche in the immediate vicinity of full-blown histories of linguistics to — typically, decennial — progress reports. The last time a number of carefully formulated plans for such a program of reports were drawn in 1924, by an enthusiastic team of predominantly younger workers recruited from the founding members of the Société de linguistique romane. The following year, Vol. I of that society's *RLR* contained, in addition to a noteworthy blueprint of those plans (iii-iv), a masterly, if avowedly lacunary, synthesis, in bird's-eye view, of research comparatively slanted or, at least, important to the comparatist ("Die romanische Sprachwissenschaft der letzten zwölf Jahre", 9-34), from the pen of the leading authority, a seasoned Meyer-Lübke. That report, conceivably the last of its kind written from a compelling vantage point, was flanked by a number of narrower chronicles, critical surveys, digests of recent studies, and the like, contributed by A. Alonso for Spanish (171-80, 329-47), by C. Battisti for Ladin (414-39), by Ch. Bruneau for medieval and modern Lorrain (348-413), by A. Griera for Catalan (35-113), by G. Rohlfs for South Italian (278-323), by A. Rosetti for Rumanian (146-71), and by J. Vendryes for Celto-Romance relations (262-77). Very minute investigations, typically focused on a cluster of etymological cruxes, were in a minority (P. Barbier, V. Bertoldi, K. Jaberg, J. Jud) and displayed as a redeeming feature some methodological novelty. The following years saw a gradual retreat from this standard of excellence, with narrow-gauged investigations — some of them, I hasten to admit, highly competent — irresistibly crowding out the surveys marked by broad perspectives.

The last major attempt — not entirely successful — to survey approximately a ten-year-segment of research in the entire province of Romance linguistics, with constant attention to the comparative angle, was made by A. Kuhn in 1951; his task was the more difficult as the chosen time segment (ca. 1937-47) straddled the war years and the confusion in their aftermath. Kuhn brought to his task the virtue of studied impartiality as regards scientific doctrines and political undercurrents, the patience of a Benedictine monk, a trained bibliographer's flair for all sorts of scattered media of dissemination and out-of-the-way items, and genuine expertise in a single, highly rewarding field of investigation: the study of Upper Aragonese dialects. These four assets stood him in good stead, and his abundantly documented, tidily printed book remains to this day an unsurpassed mine of information; but the measurement of real progress presupposes an evaluative frame of reference which in this day and age must be explicitly, almost programmatically, stated at the outset. Such a norm of assessment, fixed or flexible, Kuhn was unable to provide; as a result, his book serves ad-

mirably to fill bibliographic gaps, but furnishes no firm guidance and rays out no real enlightenment.⁴¹

Other progress reports, to the extent that they are not merely annotated bibliographies (see below), are both scarce and partial in the scope of their coverage. There exist, for the study of French qua language, guides of the *Où en sont les études de ...?* type, including one by A. Dauzat; counter to first impressions, K. Baldinger's *Die Herausbildung der Sprachräume auf der Pyrenäenhalbinsel* (Berlin, 1958) has been so slanted as to provide a compromise between an autonomous inquiry and an incisive digest of recent research (note the tell-tale subtitle: *Querschnitt durch die neueste Forschung und Versuch einer Synthese*, which was, unaccountably, omitted from E. Lledó's translation into Spanish of a revised and vigorously expanded version: *La formación de los dominios lingüísticos en la Península Ibérica* [Madrid, 1963]). Finally, M. de Paiva Boléo, in an early supplement volume to his *RPF*, offered a woefully uneven collection of reports on the recent accomplishments of several countries in exploring Romance linguistics; judging from critical reactions, a second such volume, of recent vintage, is not much better.⁴²

No account of comparatively skewed annual digests would be complete without mention of Rebecca Posner's increasingly impressive contributions to that excellent British institution, the *YWMLS*, sponsored by the Modern Humanities Research Association (and owing part of its growing influence to its prompt appearance). The Comparative Romance Linguistics section, initiated (1957) in a low key by J.A. Cremona (a student of W.D. Elcock's), was, I hasten to add, preceded by very respectable, in part superb, sections dedicated to individual Romance languages, primarily French (S. Ullmann, P. Rickard, C.A. Robson, F.W.A. George; later D. Evans and G.O. Rees), Italian (for many years B. Migliorini; at present G.C. Lepschy), and Spanish (for decades the Orientalist and Medievalist I. González-Llubera, who was also responsible for his native Catalan; after his death both sections have suffered a certain decline), with some assistance from A.D. Deyermond for Portuguese, from S.C. Aston for Provençal, and from E.O. Tappe for Rumanian. By 1962 a young and pugnacious Rebecca Posner joined Cremona, and after two years of condominium she alone emerged in full command of the Comparative Romance section which, in each volume, is strategically placed in close proximity to the opening pages. Given Rebecca Posner's overtly comparative background (as shown in her splendid Oxford dissertation on Romance consonant dissimilation [1962] and in her popular paperback: *The Romance languages: a linguistic introduction* [1966]); given further her record of foreign study and overseas traveling (Yale, Rumania, Ghana), her concern for modern linguistic theory — still infrequent among European Romanists — and her vigor and enviable spunkiness, Rebecca Posner may, with a measure of luck, in time very well become the leading analyst — and annalist — of progress in Romance linguistics.⁴³

Another tool for bracketing Romance studies, scotching centrifugal tendencies, and effectively displaying the unifying comparative ingredient, has been the preparation of special encyclopedias geared to the needs of this discipline. We know already that the