

The Classical Quarterly

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

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



The Greek Adjectives Ending in -ης

Roderick McKenzie

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 13 / Issue 3-4 / July 2019, pp 141 - 148
DOI: 10.1017/S000983880001363X, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S000983880001363X

How to cite this article:

Roderick McKenzie (2019). The Greek Adjectives Ending in -ης. The Classical Quarterly, 13, pp 141-148 doi:10.1017/S000983880001363X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE GREEK ADJECTIVES ENDING IN -ης.

It is generally assumed that every adjective ending in -ης is an s-stem like *εὐγενής* (gen. *εὐγενοῦς* from *εὐγενέ(σ)-ος*; cf. *γένος* gen. *γένε(σ)-ος*, Lat. *genus gener-is*, Skr. *janas-janas-as*) or *δυσμενής* (: *μένος*; cf. Skr. *dur-manās* gen. *dur-manas-as*). Solmsen, for instance, does not hesitate (*Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung* 16) to regard *ὄμ-ηγερός* (*πολυ-ηγερός*, *θυμ-ηγερός*) as evidence for the s-stem *geres* which he wishes to find in *ἀγοστός* (*ἀγο(ρ)σ-τός*), and Bechtel (*Lexilogus* 274) infers a stem *παγεσ-* from *ὑπερπαγής*. The result of this well-nigh universal belief¹ has been that hardly anybody has thought it worth while to examine these words carefully.

While it may be admitted that a large number of adjectives ending in -ης are s-stems, the following facts may serve to show how impossible it is to analyse them all in that way, and how easily many of them lend themselves to other explanations.

It does not seem to have been noticed how often an adjective ending in -ης is accompanied by an Aorist Passive in -ήναι. I have observed the following cases of this parallelism:

Γυναιμανής (Hom.): *μανήναι*.

τηλεφανής (Hom.): *φανήναι*.

ἀρισφαλής (Hom.): *σφαλήναι*.

ἡμιδαής 'half-burnt' (Hom.). The corresponding Aorist occurs only in

Hesychius: *ἐκδαFῆ · ἐκκαυθῆ* (emended by Ahrens).

ὀρθοδαής (Aesch.): *ἐδάην* (Hom.).

περικαής Hippocr. *Epidem.* VI. 14 (V. 274 Littré), cf. *πυρκαής* Hippocr.

Epidem. VI. 2, 10 (V. 282 Littré): *ἐκάην*.

μεσσοπαγής (Hom.): *παγήναι*.

*ἀαγής*² 'unbreakable' (Hom. λ 575): (*F*)*αγήναι* (Hom.). Aor. of *ἄγνυμι*.

μελοτυπής (Aesch.): *ἐτύπην* (Hom.).

ἀσαπέως Hippocr. *περὶ διαίτης ὀξέων* 16 (I. 116, 20 Kühlewein): *ἐσάπην* (Hom.).

τριχορρυής (Aesch. fr. 275): *ρύναι* (Aesch. etc.).

¹ W. Schulze's observation (*Quaestiones Epicae*, p. 254, note 4) that *φειδῶ* : *ἀφειδής* is a case of *εἶσ* ablaut is one of the rare admissions that an adjective ending in -ης can be anything but an s-stem. Another is Wackernagel's analysis of *ἀγκυλο-χῆλης*. I return later to these views and to those of Bechtel (on *δυσαής*).

² The second *a* is probably short, although *ἀαγής* stands at the end of a hexameter in λ 575, and W. Schulze (*Quaest. Epicae*, 436) thinks that *ἀαγής* might be defended. The line λ 575 is metrically exceptional, and ends in *ουου* (on such lines see Schulze l. c.), Sophocles, who has *κιματοῦγής*, *Oed. Col.* 1243, did not know that.

- εὐσταλής (Aesch. Soph. Thuc.): σταλήναι (Pind. etc.).
 παμμυγής (Aesch.): ἐμύγην (Hom.).
 αἰμορραγής (Soph.): ἐρράγην (Soph. etc.).
 ἐυραφής (Hom.): ῥαφήναι (Eur. etc.).
 νεοζυγής (Aesch.): ζυγήναι (Pind. Trag.).
 ἀκαρής¹ 'indivisible' (ἐν ἀκαρεῖ 'in an instant') (Aristoph. etc.): καρῆναι
 (κείρω).
 αἰμοσταγής (Aesch.): ἐστάγην (this Aorist however is very late).
 παλυστραφής (Soph. Ἰχν. 112): στραφήναι.
 εὐτραφής² (Trag. Hippocr. Plato.): τραφήναι (τρέφω).
 ἑτεροκλινής (Hippocr. Μοχλ. 14; II. 253, 18 Kühlewein): κλινῆναι.
 μιληλιφής (Hdt.): ἀλιφήναι (Plato).
 δημορριφής (Aesch.): ῥιφήναι (Plato etc.).
 ἐπιχαρής (Aesch.): ἐχάρην, κεχαρηώς.
 νεοσφαγής (Soph.): σφαγήναι (Trag. etc.).
 φρενοπληγής (Aesch.): πληγήναι (Hom.).
 καταπλαγής (Polyb.): καταπλαγήναι (Trag. etc.).
 ψευδαγγελής (Aristoph. Av. 1340): ἀγγελῆναι (first in Euripides, I.T. 932).
 κατασκαφής (Soph.): ἐσκάφην (Trag.).
 πολυβαφής (Aesch.): ἐβάφην (Plato, Hippocr.).
 ὀστρειογραφής MamerCUS (Bergk, P.L.G. p. 501): γραφήναι.
 ἀτριβής (Thuc.): τριβῆναι (Aristoph. etc.).
 εὐφνής (Hom.): ἐφύην (found as early as Hippocrates).
 ἡμιβραχής, ἐλαιοβραχής, εὐβραχής and other words in which -βραχής
 alternates with -βρεχής are given by Lobeck, *Phryn.* 577. They are
 all late. The forms in -βραχής may be compared with ἐβράχην, those
 in -βρεχής with ἐβρέχην. These Aorists of βρέχω are discussed by
 Solmsen (*Glotta* II. 313).
 εἰληθερής (or ἐλιθερής) occurs in Hippocr. *περὶ νούσων* II. 27 (VII. 44
 Littré): τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν φύλλων εἰληθερές 'la préparation susdite des
 feuilles chaude' (Littré) and again in II. 30 (VII. 48 Littré). Cf.
 ἐλιθερὲς, τὸ ὡς ἀπὸ ἡλίου θερμόν Galen *Gloss.* Perhaps θερέω Hom.
Od. 17, 23 (subjunct. of ἐθέρην) should be compared.

In my opinion this parallelism arises from the fact that many of these adjectives are not s-stems but ē-stems (like the Fifth Declension in Latin). *Γυναιμανής* contains the same stem *μανη-* as ἐ-μάνη-ν.

The existence of ē-stems in Greek was first asserted by Bechtel (*Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 1886, pp. 378-381; cf. *Ion. Inschriften* 66*). He pointed especially to the declension Ἄρης acc. Ἄρην gen. Ἄρεω (Archi-

¹ The connexion of ἀκαρής with κείρω was perceived by the ancients (see Solmsen, *Beiträge zur griech. Wortforschung*, p. 162 footnote).

² Τραφήναι is first found in Tragedy. Homer has only ἔτραφον, which he uses in a passive

sense, v. Solmsen, *Glotta* II. 311 (after Ph. Buttmann). With this fact the Homeric preference for -τρεφής (ἀνεμο-τρεφής and many others) may be connected.

lochus fragm. 48), to the Boeotian proper names in -ει, Ἀθανίικκει, Ἀκύλλει, etc., and to the Ionic genitive forms *ἰέρεω* and *μύκω*. He supposed that on the one hand the old Greek \bar{e} -stems had become confused with and absorbed by the $\bar{e}u$ -stems (*ἰερός* by *ἰερεύς*, *Τύδης* by *Τύδευς*, etc.), while, on the other, misinterpretation of the existing forms of \bar{e} -stems gave rise to new analogical forms—e.g., *ζαῖς* (an s -stem according to Bechtel) acquired the acc. *ζαῖν* in accordance with the proportion Ἄρης Ἀρην and similarly many other s -stems acquired accusatives in -ην.

By 1908 Bechtel had apparently come to perceive that among the adjectives in -ης some were \bar{e} -stems originally, and not merely pseudo \bar{e} -stems arising from analogy. He perceived this in the case of the words in -αῖς. In his book on *Vowel Contraction in Homer* (p. 56) he notes that the acc. *ζαῖν* and the gen. *δυσαῖων* contain the original η - of the stem, which is also the stem of *ἄη-μι*. That his perception of the truth about the adjectives in -ης had not got beyond this stage even in 1914 is proved by the already mentioned fact that in his *Lexilogus zu Homer* (published in that year) he infers from *ὑπερπαγῆς* a stem *παγεσ-*, and by his latest (pre-war) pronouncement on \bar{e} -stems (*Lexilogus*, p. 59).

It is clear that there was a close relationship, whatever its origin may have been, between a number of adjectives in -ης and the corresponding Aorist Passive forms. This relationship gave rise, moreover, to a number of analogical formations. For instance, *ψευδαγγελῆς* cannot be anything but an analogical formation from *ἀγγελῆναι*, since *ἀγγελλῆναι* does not give ground for assuming an old \bar{e} -stem *ἀγγελη-*, being itself a recent analogical formation, as is proved by the fact that it is one of the only two second Aorist Passive forms from a denominative verb (the other being *ἀλλαγῆναι*). This influence of the Aorist forms on the adjectives at a late date is further proved by *καταπλαγῆς* and *ἐκπλαγῆς*. In early Greek, where we find *ἐπλήγην*, we also find *φρενοπληγῆς*. *Καταπλαγῆς* and *ἐκπλαγῆς* betray their analogical origin from *πλαγῆναι* in four ways: (1) by their agreement with it in the short a ; (2) by their late occurrence (not before Polybius); (3) by the coincidence in the choice of preposition with *ἐκπλαγῆναι* and *καταπλαγῆναι*; (4) by their passive and verbal meaning. The behaviour of the words in -τρεφῆς (-τραφῆς) and -βρεχῆς (-βραχῆς)—see above—must also be due to this analogical accommodation of the adjective to the Aorist form.

For the purpose of estimating whether in an individual case we have before us an analogical formation or a real original \bar{e} -stem the following list of the other words containing the same end-element as those mentioned above may be of value:

Besides *γυναιμανῆς* (Hom.) there are *θεομανῆς*, *φρενομανῆς*, *ἵππομανῆς*, *δοριμανῆς*, *θυρσομανῆς* (all occurring in Tragedy), *ἥλιομανῆς*, *χορομανῆς* (Aristoph.). All of these have a noun as first element. Ἀκρομανῆς (Hdt.) has an adjective, and *ἐμμανῆς* (Aesch.) a preposition (or adverb). Any of these might contain an old \bar{e} -stem noun **μανη-ς* (formed like Lat. *fides*).

Besides *τηλεφανής* (Hom.) there are only words beginning with a preposition (or adverb): *άφανής* (Sappho 68 etc.), *έμφανής* (Pind. etc.), *έπιφανής* (Pind.), *διαφανής*, *καταφανής* (Aristoph.), *προφανής* (Hippocr. Thuc. etc.), *συμφανής* (Aristotle, Polyb. etc.). The existence of *έπιφανήναι*, *διαφανήναι*, etc., suggests an analogical origin for most of these words.

Besides *άρισφαλής* (Hom.) there are *άσφαλής* (Hom. etc.), *έπισφαλής* (Plato etc.), *δομοσφαλής* (Aesch.), *άκροσφαλής* (Polyb.).

Besides *ήμιδαής* 'half-burnt' (Hom.), we have *θεσπιδαής* (Hom.).

Besides *όρθοδαής* (Aesch.) we have *άυτοδαής* and *άδαής* (Soph. etc.).

Besides *μεσσοπαγής* we have *πρωτοπαγής* (Hom.), *δοριπαγής* (Aesch.), *γομφοπαγής* (Aristoph.), *άπαγής* (*πίλος*) (Hdt.).

Besides *τριχορρυής* (Aesch.) we have *γορορρυής* LXX. cf. *περορρυεύν* (Aristoph.), *τριχορρυεύν* *id.* and (with a preposition) *καταρρυής* (Soph.).

Besides *παμμιγής* we have *πολυμιγής*, *συμμιγής* (Aesch.), *άμμιγής* (Plato etc.).

Besides *άιμορραγής* we have *διχορραγής*, *ψυχορραγής* (Eur.) *πυρορραγής* (Aristoph.) *άρραγής* (Hippocr.).

Besides *έυρραφής* we have *λινορραφής* (Aesch.).

Besides *άιμοσταγής* we have *δειματοσταγής* (Aesch.), *νεκταροσταγής* (Com.).

Besides *παλινστραφής* we have *άστραφής* and *άμφιστραφής*. *Παλινστραφής* is no doubt coined by Sophocles, the combination *-νστρ-* being unheard of in a genuine old Greek word.

Besides *έτεροκλινης* we have *κατακλινης* (Hippocr.), *συγκλινης* (Aesch fr. 84), *άκλινης* (LXX.).

Besides *μλτηλιφής* we have *διηλιφής* (Soph.¹).

Besides *δημορριφής* we have *πετρορριφής* (Eur.), *χαμαιριφής* (Eur. *Bacch.* 1111). This last is on a par with *παλινστραφής*, the first element being not a bare stem but a complete word.

Besides *έπιχαρης* we have *περιχαρης* (Soph. Ar. etc.), *ύπερχαρης* (Polyb.).

Besides *νεοσφαγής* we have *άυτοσφαγής* (Eur.).

Besides *πολυβαφής* we have *κροκοβαφής* (Aesch.), *άιμοβαφής* (Soph.).

Besides *άτριβής* we have *νεοτριβής* (Pseudo-Phocyl. 155), *όικοτριβής* (Critias 2. 14, *Bgk.*), *παλιωτριβής* (Soph.), *έντριβής* (Soph.).

Besides *έυφυής* we find *προσφυής* (Hom.), *έμφυής* (Pind.), *διφυής* (Soph.), *άφυής* (Soph.), *έλαιοφυής*, *όδοντοφυής*, *λεοντοφυής* (Eur.), *ύπερφυής* (Aristoph. etc.), *στενοφυής* (Alexis etc.).

It will scarcely be maintained that in all these cases of parallelism with the Aorist Passive we are dealing with analogical formations from the Aorist. There seems therefore to be no escape from the conclusion that the parallelism affords proof of the existence of Greek *ē*-stem nouns.

I have reserved for special consideration the word *νεαλής* 'newly caught' with its congeners *δουριαλής* and the adverb *εύαλώς*, which Hesychius trans-

¹ Herodian, *περί όρθογραφίας*, II. p. 473 (Lentz), quotes *ύπηλιφής* and *άνυπηλιφής*. Eustathius,

Od. 1561, says: *άνηλιφής ναύς ή μη άλιφείσα πίσση, και πισσαλιφής, ή πεπισσωμένη.*

lates into *εὐχερῶς θηρώμενος*. (These three words are combined by Baunack, *Philologus* 73, 36 f.) Here also we recognise a relation to a Passive Aorist, viz., *άλῶναι*. It is a case of *ē|ō* ablaut: *άλη-*: *άλω-*.

Wackernagel (*Dehnungsgesetz* 4) has shown that *ύγιής* is composed of *ύ*=Skr. *su-* 'well' and the root of *βίος* 'life.' It is now possible to analyse *-γιής* more exactly: *-γιής* stands to *βιώναι* as *-αλής* (in *νεαλής*) to *άλῶναι*. Moreover *ύγιη-ρός* has preserved its original *η*.

It is tempting to recognise in *αἰδής*—(1) unseen, (2) blind—the *ē*-stem of *widere*. *ἄτενης* (cf. *έκτενης αλίτενης βυρσοτενης σχουσοτενης*) may contain the stem of Lat. *tenerē*. *ἄφραδής* (cf. *αριφραδής δολοφραδής πολυφραδής εὐφραδής κακοφραδής περιφραδής*) may contain the same stem as Lith. *girdē-ti* 'to hear'; this would confirm the well-known identification of *φράζω* (*φράζομαι*) with *girdžiu* 'I hear.' The word *άθερές* (neut.) which Hesychius explains by *άνόητον, άνόσιον, άκριβές* (Leo Meyer, *Etym.* I. 163) may contain the same stem as Lith. *derē-ti* 'to suit, be fit for, be of use': *άθερές* would originally have meant 'useless' and *άθερίζω* 'to deem useless.' Others, however, connect *άθερίζω* with Skr. *ádharma-* (L. Meyer, *Vgl. Gramm.* II. 53; Bechtel, *Lexilogus* 15).

Brugmann has identified the *ē* of Lat. *fides* with that of *πιθήσω* (*Grundriss* II². I. p. 220). We may add that *fides* is to be identified with the second element of *εὐ-πιθής*. He has also shown that many Latin third declension words in *-ēs*, which were supposed by some to be *s*-stems, are really *ē*-stems, e.g. *sēdēs*, which has the same stem as Lith. *sēdē-ti* 'to sit.' I would add *sub-ōles* and *prōlēs* (*prō-ōlēs*), which have the stem of *ad-olēre* 'to grow,' cf. *νεαλής* 'young, fresh.' The *ol-* of *ad-olēre* comes from *al-* (see Walde, *Etymolog. Wörterbuch*, s.v. *alē*), and *alē-* is as it were a passive of Lat. *alo*. The identification of *-πηγής* in *εὐ-πηγής, καινο-πηγής, μελαμ-πιύγής* with Lat. *-fāgēs* (third decl.) in *comfāgēs*, so far from being an obstacle to Brugmann's theory (as it must have been from his point of view) confirms it, both words being *ē*-stems.

Sometimes the *ē* is observable in the Greek conjugation though not in the Aorist Passive. For instance, *αἰδής* (*Theognis* 296 as emended by Brunck) has the *ē* of *αἰδήσω*, fut. of *αὐδάνω* (cf. *αὐθάδης*, Ionic *αὐτώδης*, from *αὐτο-αδης*, Schulze, *Quaest. Epicae*. p. 453); *έπιδενής* that of *δενήσομαι*, cf. *ένδεής έπιδεής άνεπιδεής άπροσδεής ύπερδεής* which have the *ē* of *δεήσει*. The same principle can be applied to *άμελής* (: *μελή-σει*); *πατροστερης* (cf. *όμματοστερης άργυροστερης ήλιοστερης βιοστερης*): *στερήσω*; and to *προαυξής* and *άναυξής* (Hippocr.), cf. *αύξήσω*. The *η* of *νεοαρδής* is perhaps related to that of *άρδη-θμός*.

As has been mentioned already, Schulze observes (*Quaest. Epicae*, p. 254, note 4) that *φειδώ* stands to *άφειδής* in the same relation as *αιδώς* to *άναιδής*, i.e. it is a case of *ē|ō* ablaut. On the same principle one may connect *άπειθής* with *πειθώ*, *άπειθής* with *πειθώ* (unless Avestan *baodah-* has a prior claim), and *παλυηχής* (*ύψηχηής*) with *ήχώ*. Sometimes the noun in *-ώ* has been replaced by

one in -ω-λή (cf. φειδώ : φειδωλή), e.g. ἀελπής : ἐλπωρή (for *ἐλπωλή); ἀτερπής : τερπωλή; δυσθαλπής : θαλπωρή (but also τὸ θάλλπος); ἀμεμφής : μεμφωλή; perhaps also νηλεής is similarly related to ἀλεωρή. Schulze, *K.Z.* 29, 262 and *Quaest. Epicae*, p. 289, distinguishes νᾶλεφής 'inevitable, ἄφυκτος' from νηλεής 'pitiless.'

Wackernagel's analysis of ἀτειρής as ἀ-τερσ-ής (τέρσομαι)—*Vermischte Beiträge*, p. 16—may be right. If it is an \bar{e} -stem, τερσή-μεναι should be compared.

Ἄλής 'assembled' (cf. ἄλία 'assembly,' ἄλια on the Heracleian Tables) may stand for *sm*-Fᾶλής 'massed together' and be thus related to the Aorist Passive *Fαλῆναι* (: εἰλέω Dor. *Fηλέω* from *Fελ-νέω*). Similarly the Elean word ἄΦλανέως (implying ἄΦλανής) may, if the second *a* is short, be related to a hypothetical ἐ-*Fλᾶ-ν-ην*, Aorist Passive of this same **Fελ-νέω*, as ἀκλινής to ἐ-κλί-ν-ην. But the problem is complicated by the existence of ἀολλής and ἀελλής, cf. Solmsen, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 285 ff.

Especial significance attaches to εὔσταθής, as it contains the enigmatic θ of the -θην Aorist. Εὔσταθής and ἐστάθην are both found in Homer. If Wackernagel's theory of the -θην Aorist is right (viz. that it began in the second person sing. and ἐ-δό-θη-ς = Skr. *a-di-thā-h*) then εὔσταθής must be an analogical formation from ἐστάθην. But no sooner is εὔσταθής thus disposed of than the θ reappears in σταθερός. This might, it is true, be an analogical formation from σταθῆναι according to the relation βλαβερός : βλαβῆναι, τακερός : τακῆναι, σφαλερός : σφαλῆναι, φανερός : φανῆναι. But when two such assumptions have to be made, both of them become less probable. We may also ask, *en passant*, whether εὔσταθής contains the Indo-Eur. suffix -*dhē-* which Thurneysen finds in Lat. *rūbēs* (see Walde, *Wörterbuch*, s.v.).

The extent to which new adjectives in -ής were formed at a late date according to the most various analogies has been greatly underestimated. I have already mentioned that Wackernagel (*K.Z.* 29) recognised that ἀγκυλοχείλης (correct spelling ἀγκυλοχήλης), ἑτεραλκής and εὐρυπυλῆς are simply formed from χήλη ἄλκή πύλη. Additional examples of this type are: νεηκονής, Soph. *Ajax* 820 (: ἀκόνη); ἀκαλυφή; Soph. (cf. περικαλυφή, Plato, *Laws* 242 D); κυαναυγής, Eur. (αὐγή); ἀν. υδής, Epicrat. (*Com.*) 3, 371, Meineke; ἐπαναγκής, Menander 4, 249, (Meineke) and Koinè inscriptions, e.g. *G.D.I.* 3749₃₈; πολυπλανής, Eur. (πλάνη); χρυσολαβῆς ἐγχειρίδιον, Menander 4, 77, Meineke (λαβή); περιπτυχής, Soph. (πτυχή); περιοργής, Thuc. (ὄργη); συναφής, Hippocr. ἀναφής, Plato (ἀφή); ἀγευνής, Eur. θεογευνής, Soph. (γέννα); perhaps also νεήκης προήκης ἀμφήκης ξυρήκης (: ἀκή) and πλωθυφής ταναυφής εὐυφής (ύφή but cf. ύφος). There is therefore no objection on the score of word-formation to Buttmann's combination of ὄξυπευκής (ἐχπευκής, περιπευκής) with πεύκη.

Several of the words which I have compared with Aorist Passive forms can also be referred to a fem. \bar{a} -stem, e.g. ἀαγής to ἀγή 'breakage'; αἰμορραγής to ῥαγή 'eruption,' Hippocr. (cf. καταρραγή, διαρραγή id.); εὐρραφής to ῥαφή;

δημορριφής to ριφή (Lycophron); ἐπιχαρής to χαρά (Ionic χαρή); νεοσφαγής to σφαγή; φρενοπληγής to πληγή; κατασκαφή to σκαφή; πολυβαφής to βαφή; δστρειογραφής to γραφή; νεοτριβής to τριβή; εὐφύης to φυή.

Which of these explanations is right in each case, e.g. whether αἰμορραγής is related more closely to ραγήναι or to ραγή, is a matter on which a decision is not always possible, though close study of the forms and meanings sometimes affords a clue, e.g. στενοφυής is clearly formed from φυή, not from φυήναι. Dates must also be considered, e.g. νεοζυγής (Aesch.) can scarcely have been formed from -ζυγή, which is first found in the Koinè word ἀναζυγή.

What is clear is that an adjective in -ής (or several such) which at first belonged closely to an Aorist Passive form, came to be regarded as derived from a fem. *ā*-stem which happened to exist alongside of it, and then νεηκονής and such words began to be formed from fem. *ā*-stems of all kinds according to the pattern thus created.

This seems to have happened not only in Ionic-Attic (where the nouns in question ended in -ή for the most part and not in -ά) but also in dialects which preserved the original -*ā*. This theory, if correct, provides a new explanation of certain Doric names ending in -νίκης, especially Λανίκης¹ on an old inscription of Thera, *G.D.I.* 4805. Until recently it was customary to refer these names in -νίκης to τὸ νίκος, the Hellenistic equivalent of νίκη. Wackernagel, however, has explained νίκος as a contamination of νίκη and νείκος and therefore not older than the date when ει became *ī*. Fraenkel therefore rightly hesitates (*Glotta* IV. 40) to find this Hellenistic τὸ νίκος in so old a name as Λανίκης, or in the Arcadian Κ]λ(ε)ονίκεος (gen.) in *G.D.I.* 1231 b 8. His own theory that these names were originally *o*-stems (nom. sing. ending in -νικος) and were then assimilated to those in -σθένης and -κράτης, has no plausibility. I see no difficulty in supposing that Λανίκης was formed from νίκα after ἀριφραδής had come to be regarded as formed from φραδά.

Another class of analogically-formed adjectives in -ής is constituted by those which accompany a Second Aorist Active. The following list contains most, if not all, of those which are to be met with in the earliest Greek.

θυμοδακής (Hom.) ὠμοδακής (Aesch.) cf. ἔδακον.

διπετής (Hom.) διοπετής (Eur.) γονυπετής (Eur.) κλινοπετής (Hippocr.)
 δυσπετής (Hippocr.) εὐπετής (Hippocr., Hdt., etc.) χαμαιπετής (Aesch.)
 δακρυοπετής (Eur.) δοριπετής (φόνος) (Eur.) περιπετής (Eur.) cf. Doric
 ἔπετον 'I fell'.

βαρυπεσής (Aesch.) (: ἔπεσον).

δορικανής (Aesch.) πολυκανής (Aesch.) (: ἔκανον 'I slew').

δυσμαθής (Aesch.) εὐμαθής (Aesch.) ἀμαθής (Eur.) ἀρτιμαθής (Eur.)
 (: ἔμαθον).

εὐλαβής (Attic prose) μεσολαβής (Aesch.) (: ἔλαβον).

¹ The *ā*-stems ending in -νίκης (-νίκαs) are quite distinct. On their history see E. Fraenkel, *Nomina Agentis*, II. 98.

ἀνδροτυχῆς, εὐτυχῆς, κακοτυχῆς, ἐπιτυχῆς (: ἔτυχον, unless some of these are formed from τύχη).

ἀχανῆς (Hegesipp. 4, 480 Mein. etc.) (: ἔχανον).

εὐδρακῆς (Soph.) (: ἔδρακον).

ἔλλιπῆς (Plato, etc.) περιλιπῆς (Polyb.) (: ἔλιπον).

ἀρτιθανῆς (Eur.) δισθανῆς (Hom.) (: ἔθανον). Bechtel, *Lexilogus* 103, calls δισθανῆς an incorrect formation, and says it ought to have been διθανῆς. The fact observed by Bechtel is an additional proof that the word is formed by analogy. We find a complete word, and not merely a stem, as first element in other analogical formations as well, e.g. χαμαιριφῆς, χαμαιπετής, τηλεφανῆς, παλινστραφῆς, παλιντριβῆς, παλιμβλαστῆς, and also in the only other compound of -θανῆς, viz. ἀρτιθανῆς.

ἀμφιβαλῆς (Eur.) (: ἔβαλον).

παλιμβλαστῆς (: ἔβλαστον).

συμπαθῆς (Polyb.) ἐκπαθῆς (Polyb.) ἀπαθῆς (passim) αἰνοπαθῆς (Hom.).

κληροπαλῆς (*Hymn to Mercury*) δυσπαλῆς (Aesch.) cf. πεπαλών.

ἀκραγῆς (Aesch.) (: ἔκραγον).

τιμαλφῆς (Aesch.) (ἀλφεῖν).

The starting-point of such formations may have been provided by the words in -παθῆς. Wackernagel (*Vermischte Beiträge*, p. 16) shows that αἰνοπαθῆς is a compound of πένθος, and gives other examples in which the penultimate syllable has the weak grade (to his examples add ἀδιῆς [: δέος = δφέγος] *G.D.I.* 4801 Thera, Hoffmann *ad loc.*)

The relation of πένθος to -πιθῆς was lost sight of after the sonant nasal had become α, and it was naturally assumed that -παθῆς was derived from παθεῖν.

Προσφιλῆς (κοινοφιλῆς, θεοφιλῆς, εὐφιλῆς, δυσφιλῆς) and βροτοστρυγῆς (θεοστρυγῆς)—all fifth-century words—are perhaps analogically formed from ἐφίλλη-σα ἐστύγη-σα at a date when ἀκρατής had become detached from κράτος and attached to κρατεῖν, or εὐθαρσῆς to θαρσεῖν.

Finally, the neuters in -ος, to which so much respect has been paid in the past, are not always so very ancient. In fact, some of them, instead of being older than the corresponding adjective in -ης, may have been formed from it, as πάθος is admitted to be at least influenced by αἰνο-παθῆς. No one will now maintain that τὸ μάθος is a very old word, in view of the ease with which it could be analogically formed from ἀμαθῆς. Other words in -ος seem to have replaced feminine nouns in -ώ. At any rate the form τὸ ἄχος could easily be understood as an analogical formation from ἄχεος, ἄχει, and these may belong originally to ἤχώ. Schulze (*Quaest. Epicae*, p. 254 note 4) shows that the -ώ nouns once had ablaut: Γοργώ: Γοργεῖος (= Γοργεγ-ιος), φειδώ: ἀφειδῆς.