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](#)

τοκων 'A Parent' and the Kindred Forms

W. Headlam

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 08 / November 2009, pp 401 - 404

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00031152, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00031152

How to cite this article:

W. Headlam (2009). τοκων 'A Parent' and the Kindred Forms. The Classical Review, 15, pp 401-404 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00031152

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

first syllable ends in a consonant. And the sole exception—shortening before *μν* as in *ὑμῶδε* Aesch. *Ag.* 990—would be due to the fact that *μν*, as an initial combination, belonged to the succeeding syllable. But we should expect, if the true ground of the convention were to be sought here, to find that such groups as *κτ*, *φθ* and the like permitted the shortening of a previous vowel, while the fluctuating treatment of *σ* in syllable-division would naturally be reflected in the 'common' quantity of a vowel followed by *σ* + cons.

It may be asked in conclusion what modifications or adaptations of the ancient rules should be adopted in modern printing.

Three would seem to be required :—

(1) The syllable should be confined within the limits of the word ; *ἐκ τούτου, κα-τ' ἐμοῦ* and the like are unsuited to modern typography.

(2) A consistent rule should be observed in the case of *σ* + cons.

(3) Similar consistency is desirable in the case of compounds. Perhaps the occasional occurrence of 'logical' division (*παρ-όντες*) in ancient texts may be held to justify its adoption (as against *πα-ρόντες κ.τ.λ.*) by modern printers.

H. STUART-JONES.

τοκέων 'A PARENT' AND THE KINDRED FORMS.

τοκέων (or *τεκέων*) is an old Ionic form to be restored in two epigrams of the *Anthology*, each of which uses it in reference to an old Ionian :

Meleager *A.P.* vii. 79 : εἰς Ἡράκλειτον τὸν Ἐφέσιον, τὸν σοφόν, τὸν ἀγέλαστον.

ΗΡΑΚΛ. Ὁνθρωπ', Ἡράκλειτος ἐγὼ σοφὰ
μῶντος ἀνευρεῖν
φαμί· τὰ δ' εἰς πάτραν κρέσσονα
καὶ σοφίῃσ'
λαξ γὰρ καὶ τοκέωνας, ἰὼ ξένε, δύσ-
φρονας ἀνδρας,
ἰλάκτευν. ΞΕΝΟΣ λαμπρὰ θρεψα-
μένοισι χάρις.

HP. οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ ; ΞΕΝ. μὴ τρηχύς.

HP. ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι
πέυση

τρηχύτερον πάτρας. ΞΕΝ. χαῖρε.

HP. σὺ δ' εἰς Ἐφέσου.

Heraclitus : *I, sir, Heraclitus, claim to have been alone¹ in discovering wisdom : and surpassing even wisdom was my behaviour towards my people. Ay sir ! for I assailed even my own parents, evil-minded folks, with contumelious abuse. Traveller : A brilliant return to those who brought you up ! Heraclitus : Away from me ! Traveller : No harshness ! Heraclitus : Because you shall presently hear something harsher than my people did. Traveller : Farewell. Heraclitus : And you get out of Ephesus !*

The MS. readings are *ἀνευρὼν* in *v.* 1 and

¹ The Greek admits the sense '*I was the only discoverer of wisdom,*' and this would be in character with the tradition about Heraclitus (Diog. Laert. ix. 1). But probably the meaning is rather '*I made my discoveries unaided, single-handed,*' for he was definitely credited with this pretension : Diog. L. ix. 5, Suid. *s.v.* Ἡράκλειτος.

in *v.* 3 *λαξ γὰρ καὶ τοκέων ἀσίῳ ξένε*, the first hand having written *τεκέων ἀσίῳ*

Leonidas *A.P.* vii. 408 εἰς Ἱππώνακτα τὸν τῶν ἰάμβων ποιητὴν· ἦν δ' οὗτος Ἐφέσιος.

Ἀτρέμα τὸν τύμβον παραμείβετε, μὴ τὸν ἐν ἵπνῳ

πικρὸν ἐγείρῃτε σφῆκ' ἀναπαιόμενον·
ἄρτι γὰρ Ἱππώνακτος ὁ καὶ τοκέωνε βαύξας
ἄρτι κεκοίμηται θυμὸς ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ.

'For the temper of Hipponax, that snarled even at his parents, has only just been lulled to sleep in peace'.

Here the 1st hand of the Palatine wrote ὁ καὶ τοκέων εἰα leaving the verse unfinished ; the reviser completes it with *βαύξας*. Planudes' copy has ὁ καὶ τοκέων εἰο βαύξας, the εἰο having been altered from εἰα in another ink.

Before proceeding to examine the form *τοκέων*, let me point out the steps that led to finding it. As usual, the plan was to eliminate improbabilities. In the first epigram *θρεψαμένοισι* of course means 'those who brought you up', as Kaibel *Ep.* 121 Δμῶις δρηστοσύνησι κεκασμένη, οἷσι ποθεινὴ θρεψαμένοις, τύμβον τοῦδε θανοῦσ' ἔλαχον : and Heraclitus is required to say 'I snarled at my parents', otherwise there would be no relevance in the comment made on his remark. καὶ in both epigrams implies a degree to which the subject carried his moroseness. In the second the clue lies in *βαύξας* : the regular construction of *βαύξεν* and *ἰλακτεῖν* 'to bark at' *adlatrare* is an accusative of the object : *βαύξεν* (which appears to be rather the Ionic word) Heraclitus in Plut. *Mor.* 787 c 'κύνες γὰρ καὶ βαύξουσιν ὃν ἂν μὴ γινώσκωσι' καθ' Ἡράκλειτον. Aesch. *Pers.* 13 νέον δ' ἄνδρα βαύζει. ἰλακτεῖν Ar. *Vesp.* 1402,

Isocr. p. 8 c, Theocr. vi. 29, Polyb. xvi. 24. 6, Lucian i. 548, 605, ii. 924, Heraclid. Pont. (Bekk. An. 178. 27), Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* i. 19. 2, Ael. *N.A.* xi. 5, Diog. Laert. vi. 2. 60, *ἔλαον* Hom. π 5. Plutarch has *ἔλακτείν τρός τινα* in *Cimon* 18 (bis) and *Ara.* 8: *κατά τινος* would be Greek, though I have not found it except in Phot. *Bibl.* 109. 1 *τοὺς λαθραίους μιμείται τῶν κυνῶν καθ' ἡμῶν ἔλακ- τῶν*: and *καθυλακτείν τινος* was in use with later writers. Planudes' *ὁ καὶ τοκέων ἔο βαύξας* is merely a conjecture, and a bad one, for it is not grammar, nor more conceivable as Greek than *λέγειν θεῶν* for 'to speak against the Gods'. *ὁ καὶ τοκέων κατα- βαύξας*, so far as grammar goes, would be correct, though I cannot see why it should have so baffled a transcriber. But there is another objection to it, which has been urged by Meineke: *βαύζειν* occurs often enough in verse, but it is always a tri- syllable, never *βαύζειν*, *βαῦξαι*: and the adjective in Aesch. *Persae* is *δυσβαῦκτος*, not

δυσβαυκτός. The presumption is that we have *ὁ καὶ βαύξας*, the blank to be filled with an accusative *τοκέων* or *τοκέωνα*, and that is confirmed when we see how simple it is to read *τοκέωνας* in the other place. The loud call *ἰὼ ξένε* suits the rising tone of defiance there, and is used to hail a passer-by in Kaibel *Ep.* 241 *οἱ δισσοὶ συνόμαι- μοι, ἰὼ ξένε, τῷδ' ἐνὶ τύμβῳ ἄψανστοι τεκέων κείμεθα κουριδίῳ*. It always looked as though the same solution would account for both these epigrams.

The word may very well have been used by one of these antique Ephesians, for it is old Ionic. The class it belongs to is a small one, and in that class the dialects make many variations, all of which are exhibited by *ξυνάων* = *κοινωνός*. *-άων* may be taken as the central form, which on one side contracts into Doric *-άν* or into *-ήν* which is one sort of Ionic; on the other hand becomes in Ionic *-ήων* or *-έων* and in Attic *-ών*. You see the tendency in other cases:

Μενέλαος ἄχαεσσα ¹	Μενέλαος χαιτάεις	ἡχῆεις χαιτήεις τελήεις βρωμήεις Θρήισσα χρητίζω λητίζομαι	Μενέλεως ἡχέεντα χαιτέεσσα τελέεντα βρωμέεις Θρέισσα χρετίζω λετίζομαι	Archilochus Simon. Amorg. Tyrtaeus ? Archilochus Herodas, (Hipponactean)
Θρᾷσσα				

The chances are that from a list we shall learn something further:

	Ἀμυθάν	Ἀμυθῶν Ἀμυθασονίδαί	Ἀμυθέων	
	Ἀλκμάν	Ἀλκμάων	Ἀλκμέων Ἀλκμεωνίδαί	Ἀλκμαίων Ἀλκμαιωνίς or -ονίς
Ἀλκμήνη Σελήνη	Ἀλκμανίδαί Ἀλκμάννα Σελάννα			
	Ποσιδάν	Ποσειδῶν	Ποσιδέων	Ποσειδῶν or -ών
	Παιάν	Παιήων		Παιών
	Ἰάν	Ἰήων		Ἰών
Τιτήν	Ἰάνη			Ἰωνίς
Τιτηνίς	Τιτάν			Τιτώ
Τιτηνή	Τιτανίς			Τιθωνός
νετηνίης νετήνις	νεάν νεᾶνις Λυκάν			
	Λυκῶν	Λυκῶν		
ξυνήν	ξυνάν κοινανέω	Τυφῶν ξυνῶν	Τυφέων ξυνέων	Τυφῶν ξυνῶν κοινῶν κοινωνός
		ὀπάων	ὀπέων ὀργεῶν ὀργεῶν ἀπατεῶν λυμεῶν πορθεῶν βοσκέων τοκέων	ὀργειῶν ὀργίῶν
	Πορθάν	Πορθῶν		
Ζήν	Ζάν ἰδμάν μεγιστάν			
μεγιστήν κευθήν πευθήν ἔσσῃν				

¹ Aesch. *Theb.* 899 *δόμων μάλ' ἀχαεσσα τοὺς <προπομπᾷ>*.

It appears from this comparison that the proper Ionic accent is paroxytone. *ἀπατεών*, *λυμεών*, *πορθεών* indeed are oxytone, and expressly mentioned as such by the grammarians on the subject of accentuation¹; but these three are the only examples of the form (except proper names) they quote at all—doubtless because these alone survived as Attic. Dr. Postgate makes a suggestion which I readily accept: 'It seems possible that the accentuation of *λυμεών* etc. is an Attic innovation; caused, it may be, by confusion with the collectives.' These were invariably oxytone; and in their case too the old Ionic termination seems to have been *-εών*, as in *πυλεών*, *ἐσχαρεών*, *ἀνθερεών*, *πρηγορεών*, *κενεών*, while *-ών* was the true Attic. Later 'Attic' writers, however, often used the termination *-εών*, a use reprehended by Phrynichus: see Lobeck p. 166, to whose list add *κωνωπεών*. In the case of *πρών* 'a promontory' we find the forms *πρών*, *πρώνες*, *πρωόνες*, *πρεών*, *πρεόνος*, *πρηών*, *πρηώνος*, *πρηόσιν*: and besides *ἀνδρών* and *ἀνδρεών* there is a lengthened form *ἀνδρειών* used by Leon. Tar. A.P. ix. 322. *ἡ παστάδα τις τοιοῖσδε καὶ ἀνδρειῶνα καὶ αὐτὰν κοσμεῖτω*. Probably it was the call of metre that dictated this extension and also that of *ὄργεων* 'a performer of ritual' or 'a sacrificial priest' to *ὄργεών* or *ὄργίων*: in *Hom. h. Apoll. Pyth.* 211 we have *οὐστinas ἀνθρώπους ὄργιονας εἰσαγάγοιτο*: in a fragment of Antimachus (*ἐνθα*) *Καβάρωνος θῆκεν ἀγακλέας ὄργιονας*²: and in *Hermesianax* (Ath. 597d) Hermann is evidently right in reading *Ἀντιστήν, ἥ τε πολὺν μύστησιν Ἑλευσίνος παρὰ πέζαν εὐασμὸν κρυφίῳν ἐξεφόρει λογίων, Ῥάριον ὄργεῳν νόμῳ διαποιπνύουσα Δήμητρα* for *ὄργωνανέμωι*. From Phot. s.v. *ὄργεῳνες* we learn that it was used by Aeschylus—in the *Μυσοί*, it may be noted—*ποταμοῦ Καίκου χαῖρε πρῶτος ὄργεῳν, εὐχαῖς δὲ σῶζεις δεσπότης παιωνίας*, and that it also figured in the *ἄξονες* of Solon: from Harpocration that there was a speech of Isaeus *πρὸς τοὺς ὄργεῳνας* and apparently that Theophrastus used it in his will (though it does not occur in it as given by Diog. Laert.). Doubtless also Lysias:—we are told, indeed, that he used *ὄργεῳν* as a genitive plural: Harpocr. *Ὀργεῳν*: *ἀντὶ τοῦ ὄργεῳνων Λυσίας ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Θεοπόμου κλήρου*: Suid. p. 1150 Bernhardt *Ὀργεῳν* (sic): *ἀντὶ τοῦ ὄργεῳνων Λυσίας*: but the

grammarian who originated this is generally held to have been deceived by a defective text (*Thes.*, Schmidt on Hesych. *Ὀργεῳν*: *ιεῳν ἢ ιερέων*). Though there does not appear anything *a priori* against *ὄργεῳν*, there is no record of it elsewhere, and certainly no one was less likely than Lysias to employ an unfamiliar form. Athenaeus, Harpocration and Photius use the adjective *ὄργεωνικός*. As an Attic word, therefore, *ὄργεῳν* may be permitted to be oxytone; but when we find in Hesych. *βοσκέων*³: *ὁ τροφεύς*, Liddell and Scott have no warrant for saying *βοσκέων* (not *βοσκέων*), nor the editors generally for altering *ἄλα ξυνέων* in *Alexand. Aetol.* v. 15 (*Parthen.* 14. 3).

Hesych. gives *τιτῆναι*: *βασιλίδες*. <*Διοσχύλος Φρυξίν*> ἢ *Ἐκτορος λύτροις*, and (*τιτῆν* by an error for) *τιτῆν*: ἢ *βασιλίσσα*. I think if you compare *Ἀλκμάν* and *Ἀλκμήνη* it will be seen that *Τιτῆν* is merely a feminine of *Τιτῆν* or *Τιτάν*. He also gives *τίταξ*: *ἐντιμος*. ἢ *δυνάστης*. οἱ δὲ *βασιλεῖς*: which is formed like *νέαξ*, *πλούταξ* and the like. In both these words the *iota* must be long; so that it was an unfortunate proposal of Hermann's (*Opusc.* v. 162) to read in *Aesch. Cho.* 398 *τὰ χθονίων τιτῆν*: I do not suppose that even *χθονίων τιτῆν* could have been said any more than *χθονίων Τιτάνες*.—*Τιτώ*, which was used by *Lycophr.* 941 and *Callimachus* (*Tzetz.* *ad loc. cit.*) for *ἡμέρα* or *ἡώς* (Schmidt on Hesych. iv p. 161), is of course a feminine *ὑποκοριστικόν* of *Τιτάν* as the *Sun*. *Τιθωνός* is explained as meaning ἡ *ἡμέρα* by *Et. Mag.* 758. 28 and *Tzetz.* on *Lycophr.* 18, and the *Schol.* on *Hom.* Δ1 makes the same connexion as my comparative list had led me to infer: *Ἡὼς δ' ἐκ λεχέων παρ' ἀγαυοῦ Τιθωνοῖο*] *τὸ ὅλον τοῦτο νομιστέον ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέρα γέγονεν*. *Τιθωνοῖο* δὲ ὥσει ἔλεγε *Τιτῶν*. *Τιτάν* γὰρ ὁ Ἀπόλλων, ὅτι ἀπὸ *Λητοῦς* τοῦτον δὲ καὶ ἡλίου *νενομίκαμεν*. Whatever be the original meaning of the root (which I should look for in *Iranian*), I believe *Τιτάν* to be related to *Τιθωνός* as *κοινάν* to *κοινωνός*.

If you wanted to form a verb from such a substantive as *λυμεών*, what would you make the termination? There was a choice of four: if you meant simply 'to be a *λυμεών*', you would make it *-εω*, as *κοιναῖω*, *κοινωνέω*, *τελωνέω*: if you meant rather 'to play the *λυμεών*', 'to act as such', you could choose between *-εῳ*, *-εῳμαι* (the middle was generally used), *-ίζω*, *-ίζομαι* or *-αῖνω*: often you find several of these terminations formed from the same substantive or adjective. But

¹ Lentz *Herodian* I p. 19, II p. 724. For forms in *-άν*, *-ήν* see I 12 sqq., II 717 sqq., Lobeck *Parall.* 189 sqq.

² Phot. s.v. *ὄργεῳνες* p. 24 Naber, who says *ἄγακλέας ὄργιωνας*: whence Suid. II p. 1150 has *ἀβακλέας ὄργεῳνας*.

³ Not in the *Thesaurus*. Add to the Dictionaries *ιδμάν* Lentz *Herodian*. I p. 13, 32.

far the commonest was *-εύεσθαι*, and *λυμω-νεύεσθαι*¹ was used by Polyb. v. 5. 8 οἱ μὲν οὖν λυμωνεύόμενοι ταῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα συν-βούλευον. It may seem strange, but not to those who know something of the freedom with which these verbs were coined. This to the Thesaurus is merely 'the reading of several MSS. for *λυμαινόμενοι*'—who finding *λυμαινόμενοι* would write *λυμωνεύόμενοι*!—while Liddell and Scott make it worse by adding *de suo* '= *λυμαίνομαι*.' It is no more equivalent to *λυμαίνομαι* than *χαριεντίζομαι* to *χαρίζομαι*: *λυμαίνομαι* is transitive, while *λυμωνεύομαι* and *χαριεντίζομαι* are intransitive and formed from *λυμῶν* and *χαριείς*: and that is just the point which critics often, and the Dictionaries with them, fail to recognize. There will be room presently for another list.

In Meleager's epigram Stadtmueller ought to have accepted my correction *ἀνευρεῖν*. Jacobs, I find, had already proposed *ἐφευρεῖν*, but there was no reason for objecting to

¹ The Ionic (*προ*)λεσχηνεύεσθαι (Heraclit., Hippocr., Hdt.), implies a genitive *λεσχηνος*, though not necessarily a nominative *λεσχήν*.

ἀνευρεῖν: in fact it was in illustrating the phrase *ἀνευρίσκειν σοφά* (Eur. *fr.* 267, *Trag. fr. adesp.* 488, 509) that I made the correction originally. *ἀνευρών* cannot stand; we must in any case have had *ἐγὼ ὁ σοφὰ μόνος ἀνευρών*, and *φαμί* cannot of course mean 'I speak.' The phrase as restored is of a common type, as when Parrhasios (Ath. 543c) asserts of himself *εἰ καὶ ἅπιστα κλύουσι, λέγω τάδε· φαμί γὰρ ἤδη τέχνης εἰρησθαι τέματα τήσδε σαφῇ χειρὸς ὑφ' ἡμετέρης, ἀνυπέρβλητος δὲ πέπηγεν οὖρος*.

When giving a list before, of words like *φύζα* (*C.R.* xiv. p. 112), I ought to have corrected Hesychius *ρύζα*: *βία. ἡ τοῦ τόξου τάσις*. It should be *ρύζα βιοῦ*: *ἡ τοῦ τόξου τάσις*, as on the next page *ρύσιαν βολάν*: *τὴν τῶν τόξων τάσιν*, like *τόξον ῥῦμα* in the *Persae*. If he had given any other explanation, it would not have been *βία* but *ὀλκή*. For *ἀροτόν*: *τὸν ὀλκὸν τοῦ Ἑκτορος, ἡ τὸ ἀντίσταθμον*. *Αἰσχύλος Φρυγί* it will be evident from Hom. X 351 and the schol. (Nauck p. 84) that we should read *ἀρ υ τ ὄ ν* or *ἐρυτόν*.

W. HEADLAM.

ELUCIDATIONS OF LATIN POETS.

III

HORACE EPODE XV 1—10.

Nox erat et caelo fulgebat luna sereno
inter minora sidera,
cum tu magnorum numen laesura deorum
in uerba iurabas mea,
artius atque hedera procera adstringitur
ilex
lentis adhaerens brachiis,
dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion
turbaret hibernum mare
intonsosque agitare Apollinis aura ca-
pillis,
fore hunc amorem mutuum. 10

Since it is nonsense to say 'dum lupus turbaret mare,' the construction of 'dum pecori lupus' is commonly explained by the note 'scilicet *infestus esset*.' Such explanations are easier written with the hand than entertained in the head. For a wolf to cause storms at sea is doubtless difficult; but not more difficult than for the same adjective to serve as attribute to one noun and as predicate, with *esset* understood, to another. 'Pruissime' says Madvig 'primum ad *infestus* auditur *esset*, deinde idem adiectivum

sine *esset* cum Orione coniungitur, subiecto alio uerbo, quod nullo modo fieri potest.'

Bentley was too busy corrupting the tenses of the verbs to examine the construction of the sentence; and the only editors, so far as I know, who have seriously considered it are Peerlkamp, Lehrs, and Lucian Mueller. Peerlkamp, ever in chase of the spurious, ejected verses 8 and 9, the latter of which he did not understand: this leaves 'dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion, | fore hunc amorem mutuum,' an omission of *esset* without parallel in Horace, as Lucian Mueller has observed. Mueller himself writes 'man könnte das Ueberlieferte nothdürftig vertheidigen, wenn man hinter *Orion* interpungirte und zu u. 7 *esset* ergänzte. Dann stände *turbaret* intransitiv, wie Aen. vi 800 *et septemgemini turbant trepida ostia Nili*, Lucr. ii 126 *corpora quae in solis radiis turbare videntur* und sonst..... Allein die Auslassung von *esset* wäre sehr hart und ohne Beispiel bei Hor., auch wird man nur ungern u. 8 vom Orion, der zu Anfang des November untergeht (i 28 21), trennen.' Therefore he prefers the proposal of Lehrs, to assume the loss of two verses between *lupus* and *et nautis*, 'in der noch ein oder