

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Some Forms of the Homeric Subjunctive

C. M. Mulvany

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 01 / February 1896, pp 24 - 27
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202953, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202953

How to cite this article:

C. M. Mulvany (1896). Some Forms of the Homeric Subjunctive. The Classical Review, 10, pp 24-27 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202953

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SOME FORMS OF THE HOMERIC SUBJUNCTIVE.

I.

AN examination into Bekker's list of Subjunctives in $\eta\sigma\iota$, into their number and their nature, seems to show conclusively that they are not a poetical coinage, but genuine representatives of the original forms in $\eta\tau\iota$.

Bekker (*H. Bl.* i. 218) gives a list of 88 (76, if compounds are not separately reckoned), to which $\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\gamma\eta\sigma\iota$ is to be added. This is a considerable number, since subjunctive forms are not really very numerous in Homer ($\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\eta$, $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta$, and other obvious forms do not occur at all), and a comparison with the frequency of the corresponding forms in η confirms the view that $\eta\sigma\iota$ is a normal form of the Homeric Subjunctive. Of the 77, 58 correspond to thematic Presents or Aorists, viz. 35 Presents, 23 Aorists. Of the Presents 21 forms occurring 27 times, of the Aorists 7 forms occurring 12 times have no corresponding form in η ; the remaining 14 Presents occur 57 times in $\eta\sigma\iota$, 28 in η , and the 16 Aorists 67 times in $\eta\sigma\iota$, 77 in η ; in the several instances the difference between the frequency of the two endings does not go beyond 5, except in $\epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\iota$ 29 to $\epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$ 6, and $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta\sigma\iota$ 11 to $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta$ 26; these two set apart, the numbers are for Presents 28 to 22, and for Aorists 56 to 51.

An examination of Od. i.—iv. gives similar results. We find 39 forms of 3rd person sing. subj. act. occurring 53 times. Of these 12 are Presents, viz. 8 (including $\phi\eta\sigma\iota$) in $\eta\sigma\iota$ occurring 13 times, and 4 in η occurring 4 times: 13 are thematic Aorists, viz. 9 in $\eta\sigma\iota$ (15 times) and 4 in η (7 times).

We are justified then in regarding $\eta\sigma\iota$ as a genuine termination, unlike $\omega\mu\iota$, $\eta\sigma\theta\alpha$, at least in the Subjunctive of stems with the thematic vowel. If genuine, it can only represent $\eta\tau\iota$. *A priori* the retention in the Indicative of $\tau\iota$ after long, though it was lost after short, vowels is in favour of this view: $\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta\sigma\iota$: $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ ($>\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\eta$) = $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\sigma\iota$: $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota$. Nor does the $\acute{\iota}\omega\tau\alpha$ form a difficulty. It may be post-Homeric: 'In Odys. a 168 *omnes libri* exhibent $\phi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu$ aut $\phi\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$, vera lectio in Aristarchi annotatione tantum servata est. Similiter Odys. θ 318 nullus est liber qui $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota\nu$ servaverit, sed aut $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ aut $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omicron\iota$ exhibent' (Cobet, *Misc. Cr.* 339), and Cobet points out that Zoilus and Chrysippus probably read $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota$ in A 129. But let the $\acute{\iota}\omega\tau\alpha$ be early and Homeric: then $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\sigma\iota$ has followed the

analogy of $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\sigma$, $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta$. Inasmuch however as the subjunctive form in η , i.e. $\eta\tau$, survived in dialects into historical times (v. Brugmann, *Gr.* ii. 1347, *M. U.* i. 183, and Meister, *Gr. Dial.* ii. 112), it is not unreasonable to follow the MSS. when they omit, rather than when they insert, $\acute{\iota}\omega\tau\alpha$ in this ancient form in $\eta\sigma\iota$. However this may be, we are justified in equating ω , $\eta\sigma$ ($\eta\sigma$), η (η), $\eta\sigma\iota$ ($\eta\sigma\iota$) with old Indian \bar{a} , \bar{as} , \bar{at} , \bar{ati} in Subjunctives corresponding to thematic Indicatives.

With these Subjunctives are to be grouped a few forms of the Perfect that do not correspond to thematic Indicatives, but are formed as if they did. Such is $\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\gamma\eta\sigma\iota$ and possibly $\delta\rho\rho\acute{\omega}\rho\eta\sigma\iota$ N 271 (van Leeuwen): perhaps also $\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\eta}\kappa\eta\sigma\iota$ which we have treated hitherto as a Present. As the scholiast (Γ 353) perceived, $\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\gamma\eta\sigma\iota$ is an instance of the intrusion of the forms of the thematic Present into the Perfect, on which cf. Monro *H. G.*² p. 30 ($\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\iota$ *H. H. Apoll.* 165). Again $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\sigma\iota$, and probably $\epsilon\eta\sigma\iota$, and possibly $\eta\sigma\iota$ (*vide infra*), are thematic formations, cf. $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota$, $\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\omicron\sigma\theta\eta\sigma$, $\acute{\iota}\acute{\omega}\nu$, and $as\acute{a}tha$, $ay\acute{a}s$, $ay\acute{a}t$ (Whitney, *Sk. Gr.* p. 192).

Only 8 forms have any claim to belong to the sigmatic Aorist. Of these $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\sigma\iota$, $\kappa\acute{\lambda}\acute{\iota}\eta\sigma\iota$, $\delta\rho\rho\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\sigma\iota$ are ambiguous, but are probably Presents used as Aorists by reason of the identity in the first person of Present and Aorist. $\kappa\acute{\lambda}\acute{\iota}\eta\sigma\iota$ is certainly aorist in use, as it follows $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}$; cf. the use of the same conjunction with $\delta\rho\rho\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\sigma\iota$ Z 83. But $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\iota$ δ 775, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\sigma\eta\sigma\iota$, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\phi\eta\sigma\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\eta\sigma\iota$ (O 60: cf. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\mu\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\eta\sigma\iota$ δ 357 and v. Schulze, *Q. Ep.* p. 279), may be ejected without scruple in favour of the corresponding Presents, cf. δ 672 where the correct $\nu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ is retained only by one good MS. Only one form preserves σ - and is also metrically fixed, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\psi\eta\sigma\iota$ O 62, i.e. the interpolation in that speech begins at v. 61, not v. 64.

An isolated form is $\acute{\iota}\eta\sigma\iota$ N 234—no other Present Subj. is found from $\acute{\iota}\eta\mu\iota$, $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$, $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$, $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$: cf. Messen. $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\eta\tau\iota$. It is due to assimilation to the root Aorists, $\eta\sigma\iota$, $\theta\eta\sigma\iota$, $\phi\eta\sigma\iota$, $\phi\theta\eta\sigma\iota$, $\delta\acute{\phi}\sigma\iota$, which with $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta\sigma\iota$, $\phi\theta\acute{\alpha}\eta\sigma\iota$ are the only Subjunctives in $\sigma\iota$ $<\tau\iota$ remaining.

II.

Old Indian Subjunctives to $\acute{a}sth\bar{a}m$, $\acute{a}d\bar{a}m$, $\acute{a}dh\bar{a}m$, are $s\bar{t}h\bar{a}ti$, $d\bar{a}ti$, $dh\bar{a}ti$, but we read in Whitney (*Sk. Gr.* § 835, Modes of the Root-Aorist) that 'in Subjunctive use, forms

identical with the augmentless Indicative of this Aorist are much more frequent than the more proper Subjunctives, *i.e.* *dās, dāt*, which = **δως, *δω(τ)*, are used as Subjunctives (Injunctives). Now *dās, dāt, gās, gāt, dhās, dhāt* are to *δῶς, δῶ, βῆς, βῆ, θῆς, θῆ*, just as *bharāt (supra)* to *φέρη, i.e. δῶς* H 27, *στῆ* σ 334, *φῆ, τ* 122, *ἀναβῆ* β 358, *γνῶς* χ 373, *γνῶ* A 411 = Π 273 are Injunctives, disguised by that process of assimilation to the commoner type *φέρω, -ης, -η, -ωμεν* (which is itself indebted for its *ῶτα* to *φέρεis, -ει, -ομεν*) which created *δῶ* (ι 356, υ 296) and produced *μεθῶμεν* K 449, *βῶσι* ξ 86 for **ῆμεν, *βῆσι* cf. *τιθῶσι*, but *Messen. τιθῆντι*. Monro is then right in his view *H. G²* p. 70—except that he has not gone far enough—and there is no need to suspect these forms and emend them as van Leeuwen does (*Enchir.* p. 308).

Certainly we must not expel *δῶσι* to bring in *δώσι* as he proposes, for of the three forms *δῶσι, δῶη, δώσι* the last is the only one that must be regarded as an epic coinage. It does not stand to *δώ* as *ἔλθῆσι* to *ἔλθη*, for *δώη*, as *δώομεν* and the like show, is for *δώει*; but it might be compared with forms of the sigmatic Aorist in *-ησι* if any of them could be regarded as early. A comparison of A 137 with A 324 (*αἰ δέ κε μὴ δῶωσι*, and *αἰ δέ κε μὴ δώησι*) suggests that the third plural has supplied the pattern: but *δώωσι* was probably *δώουσι* in the epic period. It remains then to regard *δώησι* as *δω + ησι*, a non-thematic form that has borrowed the thematic termination. The same explanation must be applied to the only similar form *παραφθῆησι* K 346. We must suppose that this last form was taken for an optative and assimilated to *φθαίην*; cf. Schol A on Z 459 (*εἰπῆσι* for *εἶποι ἄν*) and on Δ 191: J. Schmidt's aeolic *φθαίω* < *φθα-ιω* (*K. Z.* 23, 298, and 27, 295) is not very plausible, especially since Schulze's *Quaestiones Epicae*.

However Ven. A writes *-η* in the optative seven times, *φθαίη* K 368, *εἶη* Π 568, &c. (La Roche, *Hom. Textkr.* p. 410), and in this place an optative would be quite appropriate: perhaps *παραφθαίη γε* or something of the sort. The one similar form *δώησι* occurs twice, but M 275 for *αἰ κε Ζεὺς δώησι* we may substitute *αἰ κε ποθι Ζεὺς δῶσι* from A 129 and α 379 = β 144, and at A 324 *εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώη* *Fe* would be tempting, if one felt sure that such an order were possible: note, however, that the irregular *παύσῃσι* (only Δ 191) might be removed in a similar way by reading *φάρμαχ' ἄ κεν παύσῃ σε μελαινῶν ὀδονῶν*.

One cannot tell whether *δῶμεν* θ 389, υ 13, *γνώμεν* X 382 are properly Injunctives or Subjunctives, as the Indian Subjunctive shows only the secondary ending in this person. *ἐπιβῆτον* ψ 52, and *γνώτον* φ 218 may be Injunctives. The remaining form is *γνώσι* Z 231.

III.

The Subjunctives of the root-aorists **φθῆσι, *φθῆ(τ)* and **φθῆει* formed the model for many others. Thus *μετείω* Ψ 47, *εἶη* H 340, I 245, Theogn. 689 and *παρείη* in the proverb are Subjunctives of a stem *ῆ-* abstracted from the imperfect forms *ῆν, ἔην, ῆμεν, ῆσαν*, beside *βῆ, ἔβη, βῆμεν, βῆσαν* &c.: cf. the same analogy working in the other direction to produce *φῆσθα* beside *ῆσθα*.

Schulze's view (*Q. Ep.* 433) that *εἶω, εἶη* which appear only in the sixth foot form *στίχοι μείουροι*, is not very acceptable; and still less] plausible is Christ's derivation from *ἐσ-ιω, ἐσ-ῆη* (*Rh. M.* 36, 30) since, a form corresponding to *dā-syāmi* would be *ἐσ-σιω > ἔσσω*: we have no right to break up *-sya-*. Other forms of this Subj. are perhaps *ῆσι*, and *ῶσι* (θ 163, T 202; ω 491 Ξ 274)—*ἔην, ῆν*: *εἶω, εἶη*: *ῆσι = ἔφη, φῆ*: *φῆη*: *φῆσιν* (α 168) and with *ῶσι* cf. *βῶσι* beside *βῆη* and *βῆ*. However if *οὔσης* τ 489, *ὄντας* η 94 are genuine, then *ῆσι, ῶσι* < *σῆσι, σῶσι*: *ἔ(σ)ῆσι = οὔσης, ὄντας* < *σοὔσης, σόντας*: *ἔ(σ)ούσης ἔ(σ)όντας*, and the forms are thematic (*supra*).

But the most important extension was to the passive Aorists in *-ην* (with which we may reckon *ἔάλων*), and *-θην*. It took place, for metrical reasons as we shall see, in such wise that the longer forms are commoner in the Aorist in *-ην*, the shorter in that in *-θην*. We find *δαμείω, δαμείης, δαμείετε, θερέω, μυγῆης, μυγέωσι, σαπήη, φανῆης* (once each), and *φανῆη* (5), *τραπέομεν* (3), *δαείω* (4), *ἄλώω* (2), and *ἄλώη* (5), as against *φανῆ* (1), and *δαῶμεν* (1). From Aorists in *-θην* we have *ἀληθῆ, ἀμερθῆ, ἰανθῆς, ἰανθῆ, χολωθῆς, κρινθῆτε, πειρηθῆτον* (once each), *πειρηθῶμεν* (twice), *πιστωθῆτον* (once) as against *νεμεσσηθῆομεν* restored Ω 53. The reason for this difference between the two Aorists is that the syllable preceding *-θην*, unlike that preceding *-ην*, is long by position; whence the use of the so-called contracted forms in the first five instances of *-θην*: on the metrical awkwardness of forms like *ἀληθῆη* _____ vide Schulze, *Q. Ep.* pp. 258 seq. Similarly, *πειρηθῆτον* is more manageable than _____: *διακρινθῆτε* ω 532, if it may be counted as Homeric, may be balanced against *φανῆη*.

An argument for this view, that contraction in these Aorists is not represented at all in the two Epics, except perhaps in ω 532 if that book be very late, may also be found in the occurrence of three examples, and three only, ἀφέη II 590, θερέω ρ 23 and μιγέωσι B 475, of the intermediate stage between the Homeric ἀφήη (ἀφήει) and the later ἀφήη. Obviously that δαῶμεν &c. are now accented as though contracted is no argument one way or the other. The later forms resulting from shortening and contraction of -ηω, -ηης, &c., were identical with the earlier forms in -ω, -ης, and determined their accentuation in our texts. Similarly the monosyllabic εω < ηω has been intruded into φθέωμεν π 383 and φθέωσι ω 437 (unless this passage be quite late) for -ωμεν and -ωσι. For στέωμεν Λ 348 X 231 and ἔωμεν T 402 read στῶμεν, ὤμεν (*ἔσσην) unless, on considerable MS. authority X 231 and T 402, we prefer στέομεν, ἔομεν with εο < ηο like ἀφέη &c., whereas Ionic στεωμεν comes from σθηομεν by way of σθηωμεν or στεωμεν with the long vowel introduced from φερωμεν &c.: σαῶμεν (van Leeuwen) would only come directly from σταῶμεν and is therefore improbable. Also we must either read the regular *κτενομεν χ 216 or κτῶμεν, which is to ἐκτᾶ as συνῶμεθα to ζύνετο.

For the Subjunctive of the root-aorist Active Voice also affected the Middle: and corresponding to φανῆ, φανῆη we find ζύμβληται η 204, θῆται τ 403, συνῶμεθα N 381, περιδώμεθα (-ον) Ψ 485, and on the other hand βλήται Y 335 (βλήσσαι codd.), βλήται ρ 472, θῆται (thrice), θῆται δ 163 (θήσσαι codd.), ὀνῆται Z 260 (ὀνήσσαι codd.), φθῆται β 368 (φθῆσαι codd.: similarly read ἔφθιτο Σ 446 in fourth foot for ἔφθιεν), φθῆται Y 173, φθῶμεσθα Ξ 87—the emendations given are due to Cobet and van Leeuwen. The latter would reject the forms without ο/ε, or remove them in favour of the not much commoner type with the vowel. But not only do they support one another, but perhaps derive support also from the Presents δαινῶται θ 243, τ 328 Schulze, ἰ. l. 331, δύνῶται Z 229, ἐπίσθηται II 243 (the variants ἐπίσταται AL, -εσται Zen., are due to the belief that it is ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπίσταται Schol. A *ad loc.*) as well as the dialectal forms δυνᾶμαι, καθιστᾶται &c. (*apud* G. Meyer, p. 502), which, like ἴησι and τίθηντι already quoted, may be extensions of the type δῶσι, βῆσι (< βητι < βατι). μεμνῶμεθα ξ 168 is probably a thematic form: it is defended against alteration to μνησῶμεθα or *μνᾶωμεθα (Fick) by the dependent Accusative, a case found only with the Perfect, and also

by the circumstance that μνησῶμεθα appears only in one type of phrase (*vide infra*).

IV.

The terminations -ωμι, -ησθα like ησι are properly confined to Subjunctives with ω/η: the only possible exceptions are κτείνωμι τ 490, δηθύνησθα μ 121 (both of which in their contexts may be present), and ἐλάσσησθα Ψ 344 in a speech of Nestor, and probably late.

The impulse to the formation of -ωμι and to the extension of -θα to the Subjunctive was given by the third persons in -ησι. Four of the six instances of -ωμι—ἀγάγωμι, ἐθέλωμι, εἴπωμι, τύχωμι—and seven of the twelve in -ησθα have beside them -ησι—in only two verbs ἐθέλειν, εἰπεῖν is the full series found—but in no case does the same verb show both -ωμι and -ησθα, yet want -ησι. They occur rarely; only ἐθέλωμι, τύχωμι, probably εἴπωμι, and ἐθέλησθα, εἴησθα occur more than once, and only the forms from ἐθέλειν and probably εἰπεῖν are frequent. εἴπωμι occurs once only in our texts χ 392, but that passage (ῥῆμα ἔπος εἴπωμι, τό μοι καταθύμιόν ἐστι) probably gives the true version of the nine times recurring ῥῆμα εἴπω, τά μοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κτελεί, which also occurs T 102 with the variation ἀνώγει—this leaves only three instances of elision before εἰπεῖν. Further we may introduce it δ 348. This supposed frequency of εἴπωμι is not surprising, since εἴησι is very frequent (fourteen times, a number approached only by ἔλθῃσι eleven times and surpassed only by ἐθέλῃσι), and besides is found in a phrase marked as ancient by its unique syntax—καὶ ποτέ τις εἴησι (Z 459, H 87).

The relation between -ωμι, -ησθα, and -ησι appears clearly in the case of ἐθέλειν. Το I 146 with ἐθέλῃσι correspond v. 288 with -ησθα and v. 397 with -ωμι. Further ἐθέλῃσι appears twenty times out of the twenty-nine in collocations such as αἶ κ' ἐ., ὄν κ' ἐ., and ἐθέλησθα seventeen times out of eighteen in the same collocations, ἐθέλωμι two out of three times. In the third instance A 549, the Optative of the MSS. is quite defensible cf. δ 600. Should we read ῥ κ' ἐθέλωμι || δόμεν for ῥ κ' ἐθέλω δόμεναι φ 345? On the other hand ἴδωμι || φίλον Σ 63 (Ven. A) may be wrong like I 414 ἴκωμι || φίλος of the same MS. Should the Optatives βάλοισθα O 571, κλαίοισθα Ω 619, προφύγοισθα χ 325 be changed to Subjunctives? All three stems show -ησι, and βάλησθα once occurs. The change is easy, except in O 571, but cf. φ 260 and read κεν for που—εἰ κέ τινα Τρώων ἐξάλμενος ἄνδρα βάλησθα.

V.

Among the forms in *-ωμι, -ησθα, -ησι* we found, besides *ἐλάσθησθα* and *στρέψησι*, both in interpolations, only a few forms like *ἐγείρησι* which might be Subjunctives of non-thematic Aorists. In the case of *κλίνησι* T 223 the aoristic use is proved by the conjunction *ἐπεί*, and the same holds good of *ἐποτρύνητον* Z 83, nor is this really surprising, since forms like *ἐγείρω, κλίνω, δτρύνω* are equivocal and could affect the other persons. Apart from these we may reject all instances of *ω/η* in the Subjunctive of the non-thematic Aorist.

(1) *ὄρσωμεν, ὄρσητε* belong to the Thematic Conjugation and are to *ὄρσομεν* (Δ 16) as *ὄρσοο* (seven times) to *ὄρσο* (five): and *ἄληται* (Φ 536) is also thematic, standing to *ἄλλομαι* as *βαλεῖν* to *βάλλειν*, or as *ταμείν* to *τάμνειν*; cf. *O. T.* 1311 (Jebb). *ἄλεται* Λ 192=207 is Subj. of a non-thematic *ἄλ* or *ἄλ*, rightly or wrongly abstracted from *ἄλτο* (better *ἄλτο*), which however may be for *ἄλσ-το* in which case *ἄλεται* is wrongly formed.

(2) *δείσητ'* Ω 779 is due to the tendency to remove legitimate hiatus. We must read *δείσετε*, just as we must read *ὡς δ' ὅτε* for *ὡς δ' ὅταν* (thirteen times and always in the first foot), and *οἷθ' ὅτε* in the same position λ 18: in the remaining instances of *ὅταν* in a general sentence read *οἷτ'* B 397, *αἷτ'* ν 101.

(3) The context requires the Optative π 369 (*φθίσωμεν*) and favours it ο 453 (*περάσσητε*) and the MSS. support the Present Φ 467 (*πανσώμεθα*) and ν 383 (*πέμψωμεν*)—*v.* Monro, *H. G.* pp. 71 and 270. Hence we may venture to correct *πανσώμεσθα* H 290, cf. Φ 467, *παύσωμεν* H 29, *βουλεύσωμεν* π 234, *ἀντιάσητον* M 356, to Present Subj. or, in the last case, to the Aorist Optative, cf. Monro, p. 71. Also *μνησώμεθα* must give way to a *μνηώμεθα*, Subj. to *μνηόμενος, μνήοντο*: it must have been changed before the Participle and Imperfect became 'assimilated' (cf. *πρώονες* for *πρήονες*). Its very frequency (six times) is against the genuineness of *μνησώμεθα* (in view of the rareness of such forms with the long vowel), and so is the probable antiquity of the phrase *μν. χάρμης* (thrice) which formed the type for the remaining instances.

(4) Some passages that are doubtful on other grounds show the forms in question. The most interesting is τ 12=π 293. Verses τ 10-13=π 291-294 form a period that is marked as late by the proverb '*αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος.*' The mere mention of iron is certainly not enough to prove a passage to be late (cf. Jevons, *J. H. S.* xiii. 25), but such a use of the generic word 'iron' instead of the special word 'knife,' 'sword' as we get here means not only that iron is known, but that it is regularly used in such articles. Further the proverb undoubtedly refers to daggers and to stabbing, and, any way, the passage shows a misconception of the situation, for the suitors retained weapons enough to spoil any feast *οἰνωθέντες*, for they had their *φάσγανα* χ 90. *ἀνήγηται* I 510 is in the allegory of the *Λιταί*: it may be an early extension of the type *κρίνησι, δτρύνητον. ἐνιπλήξωμεν* M 72 is wedged in between what are probably interpolated passages 3-33 and 86-107 (*v.* Leaf) and may reasonably be attributed to a late hand.

Lastly Γ 107 *μή τις ὑπερβασίη Διὸς ὄρκια δηλήσσηται* may be considered to be an adaptation of the phrase *ὑπὲρ ὄρκια δηλήσασθαι* Δ 67, 236, by some one who considered *ὑπὲρ* to go with the verb, replaced it by *ὑπερβασίη* and invented the phrase found here only *Διὸς ὄρκια*. If the line is to be defended, it must be on the ground that the thematic *οἴσετε* and *ἄξετε* precede (vv. 103, 105) and suggested this thematic form. But on the most favourable view of the case the only reasonably probable instances of *ω/η* outside the thematic conjugation are *κρίνησι, δτρύνητον, &c.*, which have a special excuse, and *ἀνήγηται* on their model together with *ἐνιπλήξωμεν, δηλήσσηται, and μνησώμεθα* on the pattern of *ὄρσωμεν*; and these instances are so few, that really nothing is found in Homer to defend *-σης, -ση, -σσοι*, or to make it surprising that the third person, singular and plural, shows the short vowel in inscriptions of the fifth cent. from Ephesus, Teos and Chios (Schulze, *Hermes* xx. 493).

C. M. MULVANY.