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](#)

The Genitives Τλσο and Πασιάδο

Carl D. Buck

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 04 / May 1897, pp 190 - 191

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00026706, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00026706

How to cite this article:

Carl D. Buck (1897). The Genitives Τλσο and Πασιάδο. The Classical Review, 11, pp 190-191 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00026706

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

in the days of Augustus or Caracalla, and quite of a piece with much that was then calmly narrated and believed, cannot with equal propriety be attributed to an Athenian statesman of the fourth century B.C. Whether Strabo or Lycurgus would have judged better in a case where knowledge was equal, we need not inquire; in this case knowledge, vital and efficient knowledge, could not be equal, and the advantage was greatly with Lycurgus. What makes the account of Strabo impossible (given for Tyrtaeus the date which he asserts) is the deep and wide difference in language, linguistic affinity, taste, habit, and tradition, which existed between Athens and Sparta until long after the era assigned, and which at that era, so far as we can conjecture, had not even begun to be bridged. Now to educated men in the age of Augustus, or even in the age of the Diadochi, distinctions of this kind, between Greek and Greek, had almost no practical importance, and were known only as matters of history, erudition, or literary fancy. The process of amalgamation, the process of which the introduction of Tyrtaeus and his works to Sparta was one, not unimportant, stage, had been accomplished, and all dialectical or local peculiarities merged, so far as concerned the ordinary life of educated men, in one common language, which flattered itself that it was Athenian. Compared with the actual state of the world, the fifth century was almost as remote and unreal as the seventh; and

there was nothing to prevent a confusion between the two but the weak barrier of acquired science. Altogether different was the position of an Athenian statesman in the fourth century, of such a man as Lycurgus. To him the moral and mental difference between Attica and Lacedaemonia was not a matter of historical or literary learning; it was a fact of vital importance in common life and current politics. The process of assimilation between the peoples, and the creation of a common medium, had by no means yet been brought so far as to put out of sight the time when it had been begun and the stages by which it had been carried on. In the very passage before us Lycurgus, as we have seen, shows himself perfectly aware that even then, in his own day, Lacedaemonia, as a whole, was a field practically closed against that literature which was being studied, admired, and enlarged by Athens. Of all that made the story of Tyrtaeus and his elegiacs, as Lycurgus tells it, possible for the middle of the fifth century, but impossible for the beginning of the seventh, Lycurgus could not, as it would seem, be ignorant. For this reason, as well as others, I take him to mean the simple, natural, and reasonable thing, which he appears to say. And since his account is contradicted by no one, who, on such a point, is entitled comparatively or positively to consideration, I accept it, as at present advised, without hesitation as true.

A. W. VERRALL.

THE GENITIVES Τλαστιάφο AND Πασιδάφο.

A COMPANION piece to the much-discussed Τλαστιάφο of the Menecrates monument at Corfu (Roberts, *Introd. to Grk. Epigraphy*, no. 98, Cauer, *Delectus*,² no. 83) has recently turned up in an inscription from Gela published in the *Notizie degli Scavi* of April-June '96. Written βοοστροφηδόν in archaic characters as shown by the facsimile, the editor, Salinas, is fully justified in claiming it as the oldest Greek inscription of Sicily. It reads with the proper transcription: Πασιδάφο τὸ σῶμα· Κράτης ἐποίησεν. In a note which the editor adds to his own comments, Comparetti remarks on the genitive form with *f* as paralleled only by the Coreyran Τλαστιάφο and that in a metrical inscription, adding further that the uncon-

tracted form in *-āo* on a prose inscription of Sicily is itself a sign of considerable antiquity.

This new form after the not uncommon habit of new facts seems at first only to add to our embarrassment. For, unless I am mistaken, it completely upsets the explanation of Τλαστιάφο which up to this time has seemed the most acceptable. I refer to the view of Blass, *Sat. phil. Sauppe obl.* p. 131, approved by G. Meyer, *Grk. Gr.*² p. 335, Brugmann, *Grk. Gr.*² p. 120 and others. Blass supposes that the writer of the Menecrates epitaph, in using the epic *-āo* in place of the contracted genitive in *-ā* familiar to his own speech, was led by *vāfós*, *lāfós*, etc. to the spelling *-āfo*. For a single occur-

ence and that too in a metrical inscription this was plausible enough, but when we meet with a second occurrence and this time in a prose inscription, we are forced to the conviction that there is something more behind it. And yet our knowledge of the history of the genitive formation is sufficient to make it impossible to attribute any etymological value to the *F*, Fick, BzB. 11,248, notwithstanding. There is only one form of explanation left, namely that the *F* is due to a secondary development. One recalls the Delian *ἄφου* and in looking up the other instances of such sporadic spelling one notes that besides the Cretan *ἀμφουράσθαι* and *ἄφουράν* (Comparetti, *Monumenti Antichi*, iii., nos. 12-13, 18), Attic *ἄφουράν*, *ναφύπηγός* (*C.I.A.* iv. pt. 1, pp. 189, 198), an *ἄφουράν* is found on another Coreyran tombstone (Roberts, no. 99) of the same age as that containing *Τλαστιάφο*. In these cases the *F* is only the expression of that slight glide sound which is naturally produced in passing from another vowel sound to that of *u*. Anyone may make the experiment and observe it clearly in the case of *ā-u* when pronounced slowly. But one is hardly conscious of such a glide and hence it is only rarely that it is indicated in the writing. Now the same glide is possible before a close *o*. The Greek *o*, as we know, was relatively close in those dialects in which the lengthened *o* was indicated by *ou* not *ω*, and to these belong the Rhodian and

Corinthian. It is possible, though this is not a necessary assumption, that at Coreyra and Gela the final *o* was especially close, so that the pronunciation of the ending was not so very different from that of the Arcadian and Cyprian, which was always written *-av*. An Arcadian genitive in *-afu* would give us no trouble, in view of spellings like *ἄφουράν*, and my contention is that the *F* of *Τλαστιάφο* and *Πασιάδαφο* is to be regarded in the same light.

Aside from the genitive form, the interest of the inscription is solely palaeographical, it being the second important addition to the material for the study of the alphabet of Rhodes and its colonies which has appeared since the discussions of Kirchhoff and Roberts. It shows neither the Argive type (Kirchhoff p. 48, Roberts, no. 131) which has *san*, not *sigma*, nor that represented by vases of Cameirus and now by the earliest stone inscriptions of Rhodes (*Mith.* 16, 107 f.) which besides the $\Psi = \chi$ has $H = \eta$. But, though most of the characteristic letters are wanting, nothing stands in the way of identifying its alphabet with that of the bronze plate found at Olympia and bearing the name of Gela (Roberts, p. 322). The two agree against the others in the combination of the three-barred sigma with $E = \eta$.

CARL D. BUCK.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
January '97.

THE EARLIEST APPEARANCE IN PRINT OF THE FIRST IDYLL OF MOSCHUS.

THE rare volume printed by Goltz at Bruges in 1565 under the editorship of Adolph Mekerch holds the rank of the *Editio Princeps* of Moschus and Bion. But, as is well-known, the three principal and longest Idylls of Moschus together with several of those of Bion are to be found mixed up with those of Theocritus in the volume printed by Aldus in 1495-6 which purports to contain the Eclogues of Theocritus, the verses of the Gnomical Poets, those of Hesiod and some others. This book has hitherto been supposed to be the earliest printed volume which contains any of the Idylls or fragments of Moschus, and it has escaped the notice as well of the editors of this poet as of all bibliographers that his first Idyll *Ἔπος δριπένης* had been printed

six years earlier, and is in fact one of the earliest printed pieces of classical Greek, since at the date of its appearance thirteen Greek books only had issued from the press, and of these there are only three that can be considered as classics — Homer, Aesop, and the *Batrachomyomachia* — the other ten being Psalters, Grammars and Dictionaries.

Although a few words were printed with Greek letters as early as 1465 in the *Paradoxa* of Cicero given by Fust and Schoeffer in that year, and though in the works that issued from the press of Sweynheym and Pannartz from 1465 to 1470, and notably in the Aulus Gellius of 1469, as well as in one or two books of others printers, there are long passages in Greek characters, the