TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

1854.—No. 11.

June 23,

The BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S in the Chair.

The following Papers were read :—

- I. "On certain instances of Synkope ;" by the Rev. T. OSWALD COCKAYNE.
 - II. "On Metathesis ;" by T. HEWITT KEY, Esq.
-

I. "On certain instances of Synkope."

Our most recent elementary Greek grammars frequently set forth to learners certain roots or present tenses or themes which have no real existence, but are pure etymological speculations. Practically this method produces great inconvenience, for in addition to the task imposed on the young mind of committing to memory the phænomena exhibited to the eye, there is also a confusion to be continually unravelled, and the imaginary is to be kept distinct from the real. The mischief is, moreover, much aggravated when, as sometimes happens, these speculations are themselves unsound. It will be the object of this short paper to argue, in the first instance, the incorrectness of some traditional doctrines in this behalf, and then to proceed to some observations connected with the subject.

The most popular grammars of the present day follow their predecessors in inventing a present $\beta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\omega$ in order to form $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha$, the perfect of $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$. In the same manner $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\eta\kappa\alpha$ cannot be arrived at but by a metathesis, which gives $\theta\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\omega$.

Should any etymologist refuse to surrender his foregone judgment, that these words *θνάω*, *βλάω* were parts of the Greek language, he must of necessity concede that they are not components of the written language; and beyond the families of *βέβληκα*, *τέθνηκα*, there exists no trace of them whatever. By a similar retrospective erroneous process we find present *δμέω*, *κλάω*, for *δέμω*, *καλέω*, *κμάω*, *πράω*, *πτέω*, *τμάω* and the like. These forms are pure fictions, and not only so, but prodigies. No such words as these ever were the basis of the tenses of the genuine verbs, and they should at once be struck out of every page of our Greek grammars.

The process by which *βέβληκα* was arrived at may be seen in a moment: *βάλλω*, *βαλῶ*, *βεβάληκα*, *βέβληκα*. And this is also true of the others: the present *θνήσκω* was thus obtained, *θάνω*, *θανήσκω*, *θνήσκω*, and the perfect *θάνω*, *θανῶ*, *τεθάνηκα*, *τέθνηκα*. Nor is this merely a neater method of reaching a given result: the true root in *βάλλω* runs through several languages, as *βέλος* in Greek, *ball*, *bullet*, etc. in English, *bullā*, *bullio*, etc. in Latin. The element *θαν* appears in *θάνατος*, and is ascertained in it. These etyma, substantial and true ones, are acknowledged even by the manufacturers and dealers in the counterfeits *βλάω*, *θνάω*. In the same manner therefore—

δάμνω, *δαμῶ*, *δεδάμηκα*, *δέδμηκα*, tame;
δέμω, *δεμῶ*, *δεδέμηκα*, *δέδμηκα*, build;
καλέω, *καλήσω*, *κεκάληκα*, *κέκληκα*, call;
κάμνω, *καμῶ*, *κεκάμηκα*, *κέκμηκα*, toil;
κεράω, *κεράσω*, *κεκέρακα*, *κεκέραμαι*, *κέκραμαι*, mix;
περάω, *πιπεράσκω*, *πιπράσκω*, sell;
περάω, *περάσω*, *πεπέρακα*, *πέπρακα*, sell;
τέμνω, *τεμῶ*, *τετέμηκα*, *τέτμηκα*, cut;

with some others. And here I mean only to trace in the way of discussion the proper process; not intending to attribute to the known Greek language the form *δάμνω*, but to presume that it did once contain it, as it contained in Homer's time *δάμνημι* (*δάμνησι στίχας ἀνδρῶν*, Θ. 390), as the Latin contains *domo* and the English *tame*. And I hold that we have no trace of *δμάω*.

In the present tense of ἔμολον this erroneous principle of metathesis has been carried so far as to produce a portentous word βλώω. The true method is, μόλω, μολώσχω, μλώσχω, μβλώσχω, βλώσχω; following the analogy of *mors*, μοροτός, μροτός, μβροτός, βροτός; and of ἡμβροτον for ἡμαρτον, *number* from *numerus*, etc.

It is the more strange that this easy road to the object should have been neglected, since Kühner, for instance, at § 178, the section next preceding these vicious doctrines about metathesis, gives several examples of synkope, as πέτομαι, πτήσομαι, ἐγείρω, ἡγρόμην, with at least eleven others quite beyond dispute.

We might have been inclined to expect that in words apparently derived from a root BAL, this syllable should have either its full sound, as in βάλλω, or at least some fullness of sound, as in βέλος, βολή. But first, I confine myself to saying that βέβληκα may be conveniently got from βάλλω, to the exclusion of βλάω. I do not maintain that the original root took that precise shape; although there is something of a presumption in its favour in the probability that it was onomatopoeitic, and borrowed from the sound of the blow. Secondly, the word βέβληκα was not pronounced as we arrange the syllables; the first syllable was βέ-; it remained a short syllable: the next, as is the rule in the Oriental languages, gave every letter a full sound β'λη, and thus the word in the form βέ-β'ληκα retained some trace of its original. To borrow an illustration as we go, the word above given will itself appear akin to βάλλω, if we pronounce it *b'low*.

The consideration of these verbal forms having led us to assert the frequency of synkope in the formation of the Greek language, as of course it must occur in all languages, we may next pursue the subject into some instances found in the Homeric vocabulary. An example worth notice may be observed in the word δέγμενος. The grammarians from Buttmann say that "δέχομαι is used for *await*. Thus also the third plural δέχεται and the plusquam perfectum as an imperfect ἐδέγμην. We have also ἔδεκτο, δέχθαι, as a synkopated aorist in the sense of take." Not the slightest appearance of foun-

dation exists for this careful distinction of the parts of the verb into separate significations, *await* and *take*. Passow is still more microscopic, and follows up Buttman's minute observations with the remark that *δέγμενος* in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* means *awaiting*, and in the Homeric hymns is found for *taking*. Thus he endeavours to discover a critical variation between the *δέχθαι*, *to take*, of the *Iliad* (καὶ ἀγλαὰ δέχθαι ἄποινα) and its own participle in the Hymns. The fact is, the verb under one or other form signified *accipere*, *expectare*, and *videri*: the first sense is most frequent, and in some forms, as *πανδοκευτρία*, a *hostess*, takes kappa: the second is claimed truly for the simple verb in Homer, and occurs in the compounds, as *ἐκδέχεσθαι*, *ἀναδέξασθαι* (e. g. *Dion. Halik. III. § 6. § 17.*), *προσδέχεσθαι* and *προσδοκᾶν*. How much the verb had adopted the sense of *look* may be seen by a passage in *Iliad* Θ. 338:—

ὥς δ' ὅτε τίς τε κύων σὺς ἀγρίου ἢ λέοντος
ἄπτηται κατόπισθε, ποσὶν ταχέεσσι διώκων,
ἴσχιά τε γλουτούς τε Φελισσόμενόν τε δοκεῖν

The third sense, *videri*, occurs in *δοκέω* and the impersonal *δοκεῖ*; answering to the other sense of *look*, as “he looks pale.” These senses then, so far from requiring a nice discrimination between infinitive and participle, extend throughout the verb.

To assert that *ἐδέγμην* is an aorist is also contrary to the principle that a verb wants only one aorist, which in this case is *ἐδεξάμην*, a form as frequent in Homer as might be expected, occurring in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* forty times in the uncompounded verb alone: e. g. *A. 111: Χρυσήϊδος ἀγλαῖ ἄποινα Οὐκ ἔθελον δέξασθαι*.

Now to explain the phenomena exhibited in this verb, observe first the way in which K and M sounds enter into combination:—

τετάραγμαί, τετάραξαι, τετάρακται,
τεταράγμεθον, τετάραχθον, τετάραχθον,
τεταράγμεθα, τετάραχθε, τεταράχχεται.

Here, as soon as a K comes before an M it changes into a G. Thus the synkopated *εἰρίκαμεν* becomes, not *εἰρικμεν*, but *εἰοι-*

γμεν. Homer, to introduce δεχόμενος into his hexameters, must synkopate it; whence it changes into δέγμενος. This participle is a present, and used so continually. Thus Iliad, K. 123 : 'Αλλ' ἐμέ τ' εἰσορόων καὶ ἐμὴν ποτιδέγμενος ὄρμην. I. 190 : Πάτροκλος δέ Φοι οἶος ἐνάντιος ἤστο σιωπῇ Δέγμενος Αἰακίδην ὁπότε λήξειεν αἰείδων. B. 792 : ὃς Τρώων σκοπὸς ἔξε ποδωκέλῃσι πεποιθὼς Δέγμενος ὁπότε ναῦφιν ἀφορμηθεῖεν Ἀχαιοί. It is easy, after thus obtaining a present participle δέγμενος, to form the remaining portions on the same analogy, as κείμει, κείσο, κείσθαι, κείμενος :

δέγμαι, } δέξο, δέχθαι, δέγμενος.
ἐδέγμην, }

A similar synkopation partially occurs in οἶμαι, λούμαι. But it may be added, that there is much appearance of an identity of termination having given origin to the separate paradigms of the present and of the perfect.

ταράττομαι—ταράττεσο—ταράττεο—ταράττου—
τεταράκομαι, τετάρακμαι, τετάραγμαι,
τεταράκ-εσο, τετάρακσο, τετάραξο.

So also of the infinitive. If the present were originally ταράττ-εθαι, the sigma being a collateral form as in τυπτόμεθα, poetic τυπτόμεσθα, we should have the parallel continued : ταράττεθαι, ταράττεσθαι, τεταράκ-εθαι, τεταράχθαι. Thus δέχθαι, δέξο are the same words as δέχεσθαι, δέχου.

To proceed now to another example of synkope. Some of our grammarians have truly formed the Homeric ἐγρήγορθε from ἐγρηγόρατε; against Thiersch, who, though he studied his author carefully, makes it a passive from ἐγρήγερμαι. They have also truly shown that κεκράγατε becomes κέκραχθε, and πεπόνθατε, πέποσθε, but have not treated of the imperative form κέκραχθι. To solve this imperative, we observe, that the old language and Homer favour the terminations in -μι. Thus Homer writes δάμνημι as above. In the imperative ἔληθι, κλύθι, κέκλυθι, and in the Attic, drink was πῖθι, go was ἴθι, and so on. The optative in the ordinary form τύπτοιμι belongs to verbs in μι; we have also παραφθαίησι, ἀγνολήσι, in Homer. The subjunctive in Homer frequently

takes the form *τύχωμι*, and the third singular is *ἐθέλησι*. (Thiersch, p. 300.) The commonest words make their infinitives like *τιθέναι*, as *εἰδέναι*, *φάναι*, *ἰέναι*, and all the perfects, as *τετυφέναι*. Homer also writes *φορῆναι*=*φορεῖν*: so likewise in the passive *τυφθῆναι*, *τυπῆναι*. The participle is not different, *τιθείς*=*τιθὲς* and *τύπτων*=*τύπτονς*. Hence the original form of the imperative *τύπτε* was *τύπτεθι*, and we have by synkoptation *ἀνώγεθι*, *ἄνωχθι*; *ἀνωγέτω*, *ἀνώχθω*.

Probably Thiersch was anxious to explain *ἐγρηγόρθε* by the passive, because he saw a parallel form *ἐγρηγόρθαι*, which wore a strongly passive aspect. But it more likely was *ἐγρηγορέναι*, *ἐγρηγόρναι*, *ἐγρηγόρθαι*. To this is to be added a participle (Od. v. 6) *ἐγρηγορόων*, and the parallel *κεκληγόντες* (as Il. II. 430, etc.). These are only collateral modes of uttering *ἐγρηγορώς*, *κεκληγότες*, retaining the N which originally belonged to them. Thiersch (p. 289) has called *ἐγρηγορόων* a present, and has classed it with reduplicated presents.

The second Paper was then read.

“On Metathesis;” by T. HEWITT KEY, Esq.

Few obstacles have been more efficacious in impeding the onward course of linguistic science than the inconsiderate use of the so-called figures of grammar or rhetoric. It would not be correct to pronounce judgment against the Greek words employed upon this service as being unqualified nuisances. So long as they are regarded as mere labels to give name to a collection of similar facts, they perform an ignoble, perhaps, but still useful part; but the evil grows into one of serious magnitude when they are accepted as philosophical explanations, and so close the path of inquiry. Still worse is it when, as not unfrequently happens, they give a false statement of the facts which are grouped under them. Thus the ugly word *paragoge* is perhaps never used but to reverse the genuine explanation. We are told for example that *mirarier* is deduced from *mirari* by the addition of a paragogic syllable, just as though the archaic form—for such is *mirarier*—had been formed from