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](#)

On the Quantity of Names in ἰνῆς

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 04 / May 1898, pp 205 - 206

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030572, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030572

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1898). On the Quantity of Names in ἰνῆς. The Classical Review, 12, pp 205-206 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030572

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

objection to supposing that *quid faciam?* may be used in both senses, representing at different times entirely distinct uses of the subjunctive mood. But the question of the

origin of this use has been discussed more fully elsewhere.

H. C. ELMER.

Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

ON THE QUANTITY OF NAMES IN -ινης.

ON p. 20 of the *Classical Review* for February, Professor Gilbert Murray discloses his reasons for marking the penultimate of *Λεπτίνης* long. These reasons are (I) the fact that Fick, in his *Personennamen* (not '*Eigennamen*' as quoted) gives -ινης (marked long) as a parallel form to -ίνος, and 'quotes fourteen names in -ινης', and (II) the 'usage' of Rhianus.

(I) The 'usage' of Rhianus is confined to a single passage in an epigram preserved in *Anth. Pal.* xii 93, where the editors print ἦν δ' ἐπὶ Λεπτίνεω at the beginning of a hexameter line. Now, (1) *Λεπτίνεω* is not the reading of the MS, but a conjecture for *Λεπτίνεω*; (2) even assuming the conjecture is correct, it is a solitary instance, and it is only found in a poet of the Alexandrine age; and (3) it is not conclusive, since *Λεπτίνεω* may be scanned as four syllables, which was the view held by an eminent scholar who will be quoted below.

(II) The names quoted by Fick are 'Αλκίνης, Δαίνης, Ἐλπίνης, Καλλίνης, Κροκίνης, Λευκίνης, Μυρίνης, Πρατίνης, Πυθίνης, Πυρρίνης, Σμυκρίνης, Τηλίνης, Φιλτίνας. Most of these names occur only in solitary instances in Greek inscriptions which give no clue as to the quantity of the penultima. But they cannot be accepted as '14 names in -ινης.' One, at least, of them *Μυρίνης* (the name of a wine) certainly has the penultimate short in Poseidippus and Diphilus, as quoted by Athenaeus p. 32 b, 132 d; and another *Σμυκρίνης* has the same syllable short in Meineke's *Com.* vol. iv p. 120. As Prof. Murray himself has observed, neither *Αισχίνης* nor *Λεπτίνης* is included in Fick's fourteen names. The quantity of the former is determined by Theocr. xiv 2, which refutes the blunder of the Byzantine Christodorus, who makes the penultimate long; and any difficulty that may be felt about *Αισχινάδης* in Aristoph. *Pax* 1154 disappears, if we accept in its place either *Αισχινάδου* or *Ἀρχινάδου*.

But Fick cannot really be quoted at the present date as holding that the penultimate of such names is long. We need only turn

from his first edition of 1874 (the work quoted by Prof. Murray), to his greatly altered second edition of twenty years later, to find that in 1894 the termination -ινης gives place to -ίνης in the simple and unimpeachable statement:—

'Aus Verbindungen mit dem i-Suffixe entstehen die Formen auf -ίνος wie *Καλλίνος*, und -ίνης wie *Αισχίνης*, *Καλλίνης*' (p. 28).

There is nothing to prove the quantity of *Καλλίνης*, but the fact that *Αισχίνης* is mentioned just before suggests that Fick had given up the view that *ι* in -ινης was long. In any case -ινης has disappeared.

If we now turn from Fick to a scholar whose minute knowledge of all the by-paths of Greek grammar is still unrivalled in Europe, we find Lobeck in his *Pathologiae Sermonis Graeci Prolegomena*, p. 214, clearly distinguishing Greek names ending in -ίνος with the penultimate long, from names ending in -ίνης with the penultimate short. After pointing out that, in the names of certain foreign rivers (e.g. *Ἀκεσίνης* and *Βαρδίνης*) the penultimate is long, he continues: *sed Graecorum penultima brevis est.*

As examples he gives *Σμυκρίνης* (Meineke l.c.), *Κρητίνας* (Scymnus fragm. v 212), *Αισχίνης* (Theocr. xiv 2).

In the passage of Rhianus, quoted above, he holds that all the vowels of *Λεπτίνεω* should be pronounced separately, as in *ἀχαίνεω* at the end of a pentameter in *Anth.* vi 165, and in *κεγχρίνεω* in Nicander, *Ther.* 464. *Λεπτίνης igitur pronunciamus media correpta*, et similiter alia quibus poetae abstinent, *Ἀψίνης*, *Ἐλπίνης*, *Μικίνης*, *Τηλίνης*. The short quantity of the penultimate in proper names in -ίνης is illustrated by the short quantity of the penultimate in adjectives of the same termination, e.g. *δρυίνης*, *κεγχρίνης*, *δξίνης*, *ἐργατίνης*, *τυρακίνης*, all of which have that syllable short in the poets. Metre and accent alike prove the quantity in *κεντρίναι* (Oppian, *Hal.* i. 378); accent alone is enough in *καυλίναι* and *σπαθίναι*.

The terminations -ίνος and -ίνης are clearly distinguished by Blass in his edition of

Kühner, vol. i 2, p. 280, where the examples given are Φαίλιος, Κρατίος, and Αισχίνης, Λεπτίνης. (Παρίνας and Παράτιος may thus exist side by side as parallel forms with penultimate syllables of different quantity.)

English scholars who, in dealing with Demosthenes, have hundreds of times said

Leptínes, may rest assured that in that pronunciation they have the approval of Lobeck, as well as of Blass, and may confidently continue to say *Leptínes* for the future.

J. E. SANDYS.

PLATAEA.

IN reply to Mr. Grundy's note in the last number of the *Classical Review* (April 1898, p. 161 *sq.*) I most willingly acknowledge that in his monograph on Plataea (p. 7 *sq.*) his reference to the rock-cut graves does not, strictly interpreted, bear the construction which I put on it. There is nothing in Mr. Grundy's language to show that he supposed the graves in question to be those of the men who fell in the battle. I was therefore wrong in assuming that he thought they were so, and I beg him to accept my sincere expression of regret at having attributed to him an opinion which, it appears, he does not hold.

On all other points Mr. Grundy's explanations fail to convince me that I have misapprehended him, or that my attitude, not certainly of incredulity, but of criticism and reserve, towards his topographical theories was other than well founded.

(1) As to the supposed 'Pass No. 2' over Mt. Cithaeron, Mr. Grundy is mistaken in saying that the Austrian map shows a road going over Cithaeron from *Vilia*. His eye has deceived him. The line which he takes to be a road is merely the upper part of a stream which comes down from (but naturally does not cross) the mountain. The stream, Mr. Grundy will observe, is continued below the village and forms a tributary of the *Kokinopotamos*. Its line is quite distinct from that of the road which is shown running, as Mr. Grundy correctly says, from a point south of Eleutheræ to *Vilia*. If on looking again at the map Mr. Grundy still feels any doubt about this, his doubt will be at once dispelled on consulting the larger and far better map of the French Survey, where the stream is indicated in a way not to be mistaken. In its bed a spring (*Source*) is marked, and an aqueduct is indicated by a dotted line coming down from the spring to the village.¹

¹ In case Mr. Grundy should imagine that this dotted line marks a road rather than an aqueduct, I

But in the French, as in the Austrian, map there is no trace of a road crossing the mountain at this point.

Why, by the way, does Mr. Grundy speak of the Austrian map as 'the map of the Austrian survey'? Such language, he will admit on reflexion, might easily mislead readers who do not know that there never has been any survey of Greece as a whole except the French one of 1829-1831; that the map based on that survey (*Carte de la Grèce*, Paris, 1852) is still the only fairly trustworthy one that we possess; and that the Austrian map is substantially a reduction of the French one, embodying, it is true, some new material, but marred by such monstrous blunders (Locris, *e.g.* is called Phthiotis, Eleusis appears in Boeotia, and, *incredibile dictu*, Delphi in Attica) as to render its testimony always open to suspicion, except where it either follows the French map or is confirmed by independent evidence. It is surprising that in his recent note as well as in his monograph on Plataea (p. 45) Mr. Grundy should have thought it worth while to refer seriously to this untrustworthy map without checking it carefully by a comparison with its French original. In the present case, though the Austrian map happens not to be incorrect, the larger scale of the French map would have saved Mr. Grundy from the mistake into which he has fallen.

The 'tracks of wheels deeply worn in the limestone rock' which Mr. Grundy describes as visible 'a little to the west of *Kriekouki*' may or may not be good evidence of the existence of the pass for which he contends. Not having seen them I cannot pronounce an opinion. That they exist as Mr. Grundy will ask him to notice, (1) that the line begins at the spring and ends at the village; (2) that roads on the French map are regularly represented by continuous, not by dotted, lines; and (3) that on the same section of the map a similar dotted line in the neighbourhood of Eleusis is identified as an aqueduct by the legend *Aqueduc*.