Oswald Szemerényi

THE AGENT NOUN TYPES *lāwāgetās* — *lāwāgos*

In recent years I have tried to show in a number of studies that the Mycenaean evidence often helps us towards reaching definitive solutions of long-standing problems of historical Greek such as the *-t-* suffix of the perfect participle active, the nasal enlargement of certain Greek comparatives, etc. This time I should like to take up the compound agent noun type which can be exemplified with Mycenaean *lāwāgetās* or Homeric κυνη-γέτης. Our efforts to clarify the complexities of this formation will receive considerable help from the data of Mycenaean Greek*.

A survey of the historical facts best starts with the noun κυ-νηγέτης which appears in Homer (once, at *Od.* 9.120) and con-tinues in use down to the end of the Classical period (Plato, Plato Com., etc.). From it are derived the verbs κυνηγέσσω (Attic κυνηγέττω) and the clearer κυνηγετέω as also the nominal forms κυνηγετικός, κυνηγέσιον, all used in Classical times. Although -ηγέτης itself only appears in this word in Homer, there is a size-able group of compounds formed with it in later Greek, some of which, although attested much later, are obviously very old:

Μουσηγέτης, Νυμφηγέτης, Μοιρᾱγέτης, ἑβδομαγέτης;
λᾱγέτᾱς, ἀρχηγέτης;
στρατᾱγέτᾱς, ξενᾱγέτᾱς, λοχᾱγέτᾱς, ποδηγέτης.

Some again have derivatives:

ἀρχηγετέω, ποδηγετέω, στρατηγετέω.

In view of the fact that, beside these compounds, we also find the type in -ηγός —accidentally first attested by Homer's ἀνήρ ὀχετηγός *Il.* 21.257, followed by Archilochus' στρατηγός, Alcman's χοραγός, Aeschylus' κυναγός etc.— one is led to seek compounds with ἄγω in the type κυνηγέτης, too[1]. But Meillet thought that ἡγέομαι was a better fit[2], and Chantraine, who some years ago re-examined the question[3], decided that while -ηγος was clearly from ἄγω, κυνηγέτης was easier to understand with ἡγέομαι[4].

In these circumstances one would like to see the question settled whether phrases like κυνῶν ἡγεῖσθαι or κυσὶν ἡγεῖσθαι were ever used in Greek. As far as I can see, this is never the case, and therefore it would seem impossible to try to find ἡγεῖσθαι in κυνηγέτης. The verb ἄγω, on the other hand, is frequently used with animal names and collocations like ἵππον, ἡμίονον, βοῦν ἄγειν are frequent. Even the phrase κύνα ἄγειν occurs in Homer, though not in the sense of hunting but «bringing up (from Hades)», see *Il.* 8.368 and *Od.* 11.623. But the fact that κύνα(ς) ἄγειν does not occur in the meaning «hunt» seems an accident. For in the *Odyssey* (17.294 f.) it is said of Argos, Odysseus' faithful hound:

τὸν δὲ πάροιθεν ἀγίνεσκον νέοι ἄνδρες
αἶγας ἐπ' ἀγροτέρας ἠδὲ πρόκας ἠδὲ λαγωούς

«In years gone by the young huntsmen had often taken him out after wild goats, deer, and hares» (Rieu, *Penguin Odyssey*). Here the phrase κύνα(ς) ἀγινεῖν obviously continues an earlier κύνα(ς) ἄγειν.

This interpretation receives decisive support from the Mycenaean tablets. They have produced not only the word *ku-na-ke-ta* = κυναγέτᾱς but also the much nobler, and much more important, *ra-wa-ke-ta* = λᾱϝᾱγέτᾱς «leader of the army»[5]. The

---

1   Cf. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 935; E. Fränkel, *Nomina agentis* I, pp. 59 ff.; Björck, *Das Alpha impurum*, 1950, pp. 136 f., 291 f.

2   *BSL* 23, 1922, pp. 83 f.

3   See his *Etudes sur le vocabulaire grec*, 1956, pp. 85 f., esp. 91-92.

4   This is also Frisk's view, *GEW* I, p. 621.

5   Chadwick, *MT II*, 1958, p. 107, interprets *e-ro-pa-ke-ta* as ἐλαφᾱγέτᾱς «rounder up of deer». This may be correct, although both *ro* = λα (elsewhere «deer» is

(linguistic) importance of the latter lies in the fact that, while *ku-na-ke-ta* may from the formal point of view be either from ἀγέομαι or from ἄγω, *ra-wa-ke-ta* can only be from ἄγω. For in Mycenaean the intervocalic -*s*- had only recently disappeared and as a result the hiatus had not yet been eliminated by contraction. Just as κτοινο-(h)οχος appears as *ko-to-no-o-ko*, so *λᾱϝο-hᾱγέτᾱς would appear as *ra-wo-a-ke-ta* or *ra-wo-a₂-ke-ta*. But a compound with ἄγω, λᾱϝοαγετᾱς, was contracted according to the «early» laws and resulted in *lāwāgetās*. And if *lāwāgetās* can only contain ἄγω, not, although the meaning would be suitable, ἀγέομαι[6], κυνᾱγέτᾱς, where ἡγεῖσθαι is impossible semantically, must for two reasons contain ἄγω. This conclusion is borne out by the fact that in later times, when a competing term κυνηγός is coined, it is again the verb ἄγω that is used[7].

Furthermore, we must not lose sight of the fact that from ἡγέομαι we should expect a derivative ἡγητής, not ἡγέτης; the expected form is seen in ἡγήτωρ[8]. If we find οἰκέτης, γαμέτης, the reason is that they are not derived from οἰκέω, γαμέω, but from οἶκος, γάμος, just as φυλέτης, δημέτης derive from nouns, not verbs. The true agent noun from οἰκέω is attested in οἰκη-τής and the difference between it («dweller») and οἰκέτης («slave») could not be greater; cf., e. g., Plato, *Phaedo* 111b: οἰκήτας θεούς εἶναι. One of the most archaic representatives of the type, the noun ἔτης «clansman, citizen» is in any case a denominative, not a deverbative substantive[9]. If, at a late date,

---

e-ra-po-) is to be noted and the meaning of ἄγω (or ἡγέομαι) does not suit the meaning of the compound; ἐλαφᾱγέρτας might be conceivable, cf. ἀγέρται, σιταγέρται. — On the Mycenaean *ra-wa-ke-ta* see the recent studies (all with further references) of Adrados, Effenterre and de Lorenzi in *Atti Roma*, pp. 559 f., 588 f., 888 f.; and K. Wundsam, *Die politische und soziale Struktur in den mykenischen Residenzen nach den Linear B Texten*, Vienna 1968, pp. 50 f.

6 This also applies to the later στρατᾱγέτᾱς, obviously based on λᾱϝᾱγέτᾱς.

7 The essence of this argument was given at *JHS* 78, 1958, p. 148, and is now accepted by Ruijgh also, see his *Etudes*, pp. 69 with n. 103, and 119.

8 Specht (*KZ* 59, 1932, pp. 53 f.) even thinks that ἡγεμών cannot be from ἡγέομαι but is from ἀγεμών: *ἄγω was changed after ἡγέομαι. Cf. Fränkel, *Glotta* 32, 1952, p. 25; Bolelli, *ASNPisa* 22, 1953, p. 6 n. 1.

9 Risch is, I think, wrong in trying to derive (*Wortbildung der hom. Spr.*, p. 31, but see now also *MH* 14, 1957, p. 65) all denominatives (including ἔτης, τοξότης,

there are nouns in -ηγέτης which must be traced to ἡγέομαι[10], that was made possible by the increasing semantic proximity of ἄγω and ἡγέομαι. The presence or absence of -ε- in the compounds of ἄγω (i. e. -ηγέτης but κυνάκτας παράκτας)[11] would be paralleled by -ηγερετα : ἐγέρτης (or ἀγέρτης?), εὐμενέτης : Μέν-της, ὑψιβρεμέτης : ἀναξιβρέντᾱς ἀργιβρέντᾱς[12].

The later development of this type also presents points of interest[13]. As we have seen above, -ᾱγετᾱς comes to be replaced by -ᾱγός, and the various compounds, among them χορᾱγός, λοχᾱγός, στρατᾱγός, almost completely oust the former type from this sphere. But the latter type itself acquires a formidable rival in the type with -αγωγός which begins to flourish in the 5th century B.C.: ἐπαγωγός, ξυναγωγός etc., νυμφαγωγός, παιδαγωγός, ψυχαγωγός, δημαγωγός etc. The old ὀχετηγός gives way to *ὀχετα-γωγός (in ὀχεταγωγία), and when «leader of a pack» is required, κυναγωγός steps in for the unusable κυνηγός. Only nautical terms escaped the general decay, they even experienced a limited revival: contrary to the general trend, the «old» νῆες ὁπλιταγω-γοί, ἱππαγωγοί, σιταγωγοί, οἰναγωγοί begin to be replaced by ἱππηγός, σιτηγός, ἱματηγός, ἁληγός and even ποταμηγός.

The outline of the development seems fairly clear: early -ᾱγ-έτας begins to be replaced by -ᾱγός with the first appearance of literary records, only to give way to -αγωγός from about the 5th century. These successive changes demand some explanation.

The first change, from -ᾱγετᾱς to -ᾱγος, is rather exaggerated. The fact that from the Mycenaean period we have, so far, only the type in -ᾱγετᾱς, must be due to the hazards of capricious

---

ναύτης, ἀγρότης) from deverbatives; see against this Redard, *Les noms grecs en* -ΤΗΣ, -ΤΙΣ, 1949, p. 232 n. 8. Risch also compares κυνηγέτης with ἡγήτωρ (28, approved by Redard, p. 5, Chantraine, p. 89 n. 5) without explaining the difference in the vowel, see *JHS* 78, 1958, p. 148. Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* I, p. 500, traces the nouns οἰκέτης etc. to the single ἔτης but this noun presupposes *swe-tā, the alleged *swet- is meaningless.

[10]   E. g. προκαθηγέτης, see Chantraine, p. 89.

[11]   See Latte, *Glotta* 32, 1952, pp. 36 f.

[12]   But see the text further on.

[13]   The facts are given by Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 954 f.; Björck, *op. cit.*, pp. 292 f. See also Sommer, *Zum Zahlwort*, 1951, p. 12 n. 1.

transmission. Since the «later» type in -ᾱγος is well-established at the beginning of history and is shown to be the IE type both by the agreement of Avestan *navāza-* = Skrt. *nāvāja-* «boatman», and the archaic lengthening of -ᾱγ-, it can hardly be assumed that it is a post-Mycenaean innovation. From which it seems to follow that the -ᾱγος stratum is a yet submerged area; the only representatives to emerge so far have undergone some influence as a result of which the original -ᾱγος was changed to -ᾱγετᾱς. Once the facts are put in this perspective there can be little doubt that the original λᾱϝᾱγός became λᾱϝᾱγέτᾱς under the influence of the group mentioned before: ϝέτᾱς, ϝοικέτᾱς etc. We should also bear in mind that we know one other Mycenaean term that shows the same structure: whatever his exact status, the *ekʷetās* can be described as a courtier of some standing, while the form of his name shows the suffix -έτᾱς. The other term in -ᾱγετᾱς, Myc. κυνᾱγέτᾱς, belongs in meaning and standing either to the sphere of the ϝοικέτᾱς or, if he ranks higher, of the *ekʷetās* and *lāwāgetās*.

As is known, the term λᾱϝᾱγέτᾱς survived into historical times. Pindar uses λᾱγέτᾱς several times (*Ol.* 1.89; *P.* 3.85; 4.107; 10.31), as does Sophocles (fr. 221.12), while the Ionic form appears as ληγέτης in the name of a Delphic proxenos from Elea[14]. The latter is important because it can hardly be transposed from a non-Ionic λᾱγέτᾱς. It rather shows that the Mycenaean λᾱϝᾱγέτᾱς survived among the later Ionian colonists and regularly became λη(ϝ)ηγέτης and eventually ληγέτης[15]. But along with it we also have Λᾱγος from λᾱϝᾱγός (with the usual accent change in the name) in the name of the father of Ptolemy I[16]. There is no reason to assume that κυνηγός is merely an Ionicized form of

[14]   See Dittenberger, *Sylloge*[3], p. 585 l. 230, referring to 179/8 b.c. — On Λᾱγέτᾱς see Robert, *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine* I, 1963, pp. 115 f.

[15]   This is also Bechtel's view, see his *HPN*, p. 279.

[16]   See *RE* *s.u.*— For a short while it seemed as if a stirrup-jar found at Mycenae in 1966 had produced evidence of the early existence of *lawagos*, cf. Wundsam, *op. cit.*, pp. 55, 63. But the inscription seems to be]*ka-ra-u-ko* which, if complete on the left, could be the name Glaukos, see now Joost Crouwel, *Nestor* 520; Raison, *Vases*, p. 147. On Mycenaean *ra-wa-ke-ja* see Ruijgh, *Etudes*, pp. 119, 265 n. 151.

Doric κυναγός[17], just as the word στρατηγός, first attested in Archi-
lochus (60, 1 D), cannot be anything but an Attic-Ionic term.
The Doric, more explicitly Spartan, influence came later; its
representatives, λοχαγός, οὐραγός, ξεναγός, were never acclimatized
into -ηγός. With χορηγός one feels rather less certain. If native
Attic, the form ought to be χοραγός. On the other hand the origin
of Attic drama is traced to Doric countries, so that Doric prove-
nience cannot be excluded. Against this stands the fact that
χοροί are well-known in Homeric society and cannot be borrowed
from the Dorians. On balance, it seems safer to consider χορηγός
a native Attic term, which owes its -ηγός to the other compounds[18].

The contradictory picture presented by Mycenaean and Early
Historical Greek, so puzzling at first, may thus be resolved into
a difference between ordinary Greek and the special terminology
of the Mycenaean court(s). The type in -αγός was, at least in a
small group of words, well-established from IE times and through-
out the Mycenaean period. At the court, however, some of the
courtiers acquired -έτας as a sign of their special closeness to the
ruling clan (or class). But when the palace society broke down,
the old type, surviving in the country and in outlying areas (hence
also Doric), reasserted itself and appeared as the only productive
type at the beginning of the historical period[19].

---

[17]   This seems to be Chantraine's view, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

[18]   The word is of course from χορὸν ἄγειν, not ἡγεῖσθαι (as seems suggested by
Chantraine, p. 91, end of 2nd paragraph). Note the phrases χοροὺς εἰσάγειν,
ἀνάγειν. In view of the fact that ἡγέομαι semantically differs considerably from
the usually compared words of other languages, i.e. Lat. *sāgiō*, Gothic *sōkjan*
«seek» (cf. Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* I, p. 29; Frisk, *GEW* I, p. 622) one is even
led to suggest that ἡγέομαι has nothing to do with these words (so rightly Mezger,
KZ 62, 1934, p. 261 n. 2) and that it is a secondary Greek creation based on
the courtly terms in -αγέτας «leader». From this a stem *āge- could be extracted.
This would easily account for the peculiar -ε- in derivatives of ἡγέομαι. The
usual construction with the dative is due to ἕπομαι (the genitive to the verbs
of ruling), so that ἕπομαι could also account for the secondary aspiration of
ἀγέομαι.

[19]   This does not mean of course that the old terminology disappeared without a
trace; κυνηγέτης for example and its group were long dying (see Chantraine,
Etudes sur le vocabulaire grec, pp. 85 f., esp. 92 f.). We are all familiar with the
phenomenon that the traditions and pastimes of a disappearing social stratum
are taken over by the «new men». And we can see that the old noble terms had

But, as we have seen, the type in -ᾱγος was from the 5th century B. C. onwards endangered and eventually ousted by the more vigorous rival in -αγωγός. This again poses an important question: where did the new type come from?

The data of the 5th century give us an unmistakable clue. Wackernagel observed that, in the case of prepositional compounds with ἄγω, adjectival derivatives present, from Aeschylus onwards, -αγωγός: ἐπαγωγός, ξυναγωγός, ἀπαγωγός, προσαγωγός, προαγωγός, συμπεριαγωγός, ἀναγωγός, characterised by ᾰ (in contrast to the old -ᾱγός) and the peculiar reduplication. The short α and the time of first attestation combine to show that the type cannot be old. In fact -αγωγός cannot be explained in this form since an active adjective of this type (with reduplication) is otherwise unknown. But, says Wackernagel, a noun of action, ἀγωγή, also makes its first appearance with Aeschylus and «this shows a normal formation; ἀγωγή: ἀγ- = ἀκωκή: ἀκ-, ἐδωδή: ἐδ-, ὀπωπή: ὀπ-» (*loc. cit.*, p. 954). And since the relation of τροφή: τροφός, ὀχή: ὀχός etc. was a living pattern, adjectives in -αγωγός were built on the old ἀγωγή. An exact parallel is presented by Hippocrates' ἐδωδός formed from ἐδωδή (already in Homer).

There can be no doubt that Wackernagel's explanation is, on account of its very simplicity, rather attractive: all we need to accept is that the new type in -αγωγός was made possible by the existence of the noun ἀγωγή. All the same, the problem is not solved really. It is all important to know at what time the innovated -αγωγός became possible, in other words, at what time ἀγωγή itself was created. For it is needless to argue at length at this late hour that ἀγωγή is neither itself of Indo-European date[20] nor its type of Indo-European origin: it is confined to Greek[21], and is represented by very few words indeed. Wacker-

---

a special hold on the language of cult: Μοισαγέτας, Νυμφηγέτης, ἑβδομαγέτας etc. are survivals or innovations ventured on the model of the old terms. Lycophron's ἱππηγέτης, ναυηγέτης, ποδηγέτης are a noteworthy exploitation of the noble type by a late-comer.

[20] Ambrosini (*ASNPisa* 26, 1957, p. 86) still tries to explain ἐδωδή, ἀγωγή as Indo-European lengthened-grade forms.

[21] This is rightly emphasized by Chantraine, *Formation*, p. 20.

nagel, to be sure, regarded ἀγωγή as a regular formation, justi-
fied by the existence of ἀκωκή, ἐδωδή, ὀπωπή (all in Homer).
But the truth is that ἀκωκή, like ἀγωγή, is from a root with *a*-
vocalism, ἀκ-, with a «remarkable *ō*-degree»[22]. The word ἐδωδή
is from a root with *e*-vocalism, ἐδ-, and therefore an *ō*-degree
might seem less surprising; but the fact is that there is no *ō*-degree
in this root[23] and the combination of this feature with redupli-
cation remains something that calls for an explanation. The
remaining word, ὀπωπή, is less of a puzzle: forms like ὦπα, εἰς
ὦπα, so-called lengthened-grade forms, are well-known; the
reduplication is the normal one seen in the perfect ὄπωπα; so
a noun ὀπωπή seems a possible formation, although it appears
to be based on a perfect. But even if ὀπωπή were accepted as a
«correct» form, it is impossible to see how it could have produced
ἀκωκή, ἐδωδή (ἀγωγή). Surely, the only pattern that a speaker
could perceive in ὀπωπή was ὀπ-ωπ-ή, an *ā*-stem in which the
well-known root ὀπ- was doubled, the second time even lengthen-
ed. This pattern could only have led to ἀκ-: *ἀκ-ᾱκ-ᾱ, ἀγ-:
*ἀγ-ᾱγ-ᾱ, ἐδ-: *ἐδ-ηδ-ᾱ, but never to ἀκ-ωκ- etc.; this is in fact
what we find in ἀκήκοα etc.

A better explanation offers itself if we examine ἐδωδή. Risch
suggested that this was a normal reduplicating formation based,
not on the attested perfect ἐδηδ-, but on a lost ἐδωδ-[24]. In other
words, the reduplicated perfect itself originally had *ō*-vocalism
in the root. But it is difficult to see how such a form can be jus-
tified. The assumption that the perfect participle of this verb
(ἐδηδώς in Homer) ever had a different vocalism from that of

---

[22]   Chantraine, *loc. cit.*

[23]   I ignore here both Arm. *owtem* «eat», usually derived from *ōd-, and, even more
       so, Lithu. *úodas* «midge» (allegedly «eater»). For the latter see Vasmer, *REW* I,
       p. 163 (*vadéń*) and II, p. 249 (*ovod*); it is in my view simply Russian *ovod* contract-
       ed to *ōd* and then adapted to Lithu. *uod-*. For the Armenian verb Frisk, *GEW* I,
       p. 444, and Godel, *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes*, N.S. 2, 1966, p. 26, still accept
       an iterative *ōdeyō for which there is no parallel; it is quite sufficient to assume
       a compound *op-ēd- (cf. Slavic *ob-ēd-*) which developed into *owit-, *out-, owt-.
       — On the presents *ēdmi/edmi* see now also Narten, *Studies Kuiper*, 1969 p. 15
       n. 44.

[24]   Risch, *Wortbildung der hom. Spr.*, pp. 8, 292.

the perfect singular[25] is without foundation, is in fact only made to explain the awkward noun ἐδωδή. Lat. *ēdī*, Gmc. (plur.) *ētum*, clearly show that the perfect was never *ōd-*, but *ēd-*, obviously because the «reduplicated» *e-ed-* (in laryngealist terms $H_1e\text{-}H_1ed\text{-}$ or even $H_1e\text{-}H_1d\text{-}$)[26] contracted to *ēd-* already in Indo-European. In any case, what one expects in a noun (*nomen actionis* or *acti*), formed from an *e*-vowel root, is simply the *o*-grade[27]: φορά, τομή etc. It is therefore from *ὀδά that we must start. The real question is whether the wide gap between *ὀδά and the attested ἐδωδή can be bridged. Kuryłowicz (*loc. cit.*) speaks of a reduplicated formation (*ἐδ-οδ-ά) which, with «morphological» lengthening, resulted in ἐδωδή. This ingenious interpretation is elaborated in a later chapter where he explains the origin of the so-called Attic reduplication: ὄλωλα, ἀκήκοα, etc. (*loc. cit.*, pp. 269 f.). Since, as we have seen, our nouns are generally connected with this reduplication, we must examine the new theory.

Abandoning his earlier explanation[28], Kuryłowicz now maintains that this peculiar reduplication developed after the emergence of the so-called prothetic vowels. By that time the inherited verbal forms *leudh-* (present): *leloudhe* (perfect) had changed to *ἐλευθ-*: *ἐλελουθε, and the new pattern naturally resulted in the reinterpretation of the perfect as *ἐλ-ελουθ- where ἐλουθ- showed the regular *o*-vocalism of the root ἐλευθ- (cf. -λοιπ-, etc.), while ἐλ- was felt to be a kind of repetition of the root. The attested ἐληλουθ- arose when ἐλελουθ-, under the influence of the compositional lengthening seen in ποδ-ήνεμος, introduced the same lengthening.

However ingenious this new «morphological» principle, I cannot agree that it explains the phenomena any better than

---

[25] Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* I, p. 541.

[26] See Benveniste, *Archivum Linguisticum* 1, 1948, pp. 16 f. Winter reconstructs *Hd--e-Hd-* (*Language* 26, 1950, p. 368). On Cowgill's Germanic *eat* (*Language* 36, 1960, pp. 491 f.) see Makajev, *Linguistics* 10, 1964, p. 42 n. 49; Polomé, *Proceedings of the 9th Congress of Linguists, 1962*, 1964, p. 873; Lindeman, *NTS* 22, 1968, p. 76.

[27] Kuryłowicz, *Apophonie*, p. 186, rightly speaks of the type τομή.

[28] See, e. g., *Etudes indo-européennes* I, 1935, pp. 32-33. On Nikitina's attempt to save the old explanation see Szemerényi, *Syncope*, 1964, pp. 7 n. 1 and 112 n. 2.

Kurylowicz's own phonetical explanation which is now discarded. At no time could there have been in any Greek speaker's mind a connection between ἐλ-ελουθ- and ποδ-ἄνεμος; the former is not a «compound» in any sense of the term. This principle, applied by Kurylowicz several times in the new book, remains unconvincing. He also has to assume that the new pattern of the prothetic roots was then transferred even to roots with inherited initial vowel: *ἤδα became *ἔδ-ηδ-α; *ὧρα, *ὧλα, *ὤμ-, *ἤλα- gave way to ὄρωρα, ὄλωλα, ὀμωμ-, ἐληλα- etc.

There is no doubt that *if* the first step, the explanation of ἐληλουθ- is granted, the others follow without any major hitch. But, as we have seen, the first step is unacceptable. On the other hand, it is also clear that the chain works just as well the other way around. If monosyllabic stems like ἐδ-, ὀδ-, ὀρ-, ὀλ- replaced the old perfects *ἤδα, *ὧδα, *ὧρα, *ὧλα, by ἔδ-ηδα, ὀδ-ωδα, ὀρ-ωρα, ὀλ-ωλα, then disyllabic stems such as ἐλα-, ἀκου(σ)-, ἐλευθ-, ὀρεγ-, ἐνεκ- easily followed suit and formed ἐληλα-, ἀκηκου-, ἐληλουθ-, ὀρωρογ-, ἐνηνοκ-, irrespective of whether the initial vowel was inherited or prothetic[29]. The question is whether we can see why such a change should have taken place.

Now, as mentioned earlier, Lat. *ēdī* and Gmc. *ēt-* guarantee the perfect *ēd-* and there can be no doubt that this is represented by (εδ-) ηδ-. The perfect-inflection would have been ἤδα/ἦσθα/ ἦδε//ἦστον//ἤδμεν/ἦστε/(?)ἤδασι. It is at once clear that most of these forms were quite useless because they were homonymous with other verbal forms, both of ἔδμι (impf. ἤδμεν, ἦστε, ἦστον) and of εἰμί (ἦσθα, ἦστον, ἦστε). Something had to be done, and the way out is clearly indicated by other forms of this stem. Wak-kernagel drew attention to the fact[30] that the Homeric ὠμησταί appears in Herodotus in the forms κρεῶν ἐδεσταὶ ὠμῶν (3.99); ἐδεστής, as he perceived, replaced *ἔστης (ἐδ-τᾱ-ς), by prefixing the stem ἐδ- to ἔστης which had become obscure. In the same way[31] *ἐστός, ἐστέον were «refreshed» after ἔδομαι, ἐδηδ-. There

---

[29] Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* 1, pp. 650, 766, also thinks that ὄρωρα replaced *ὧρα etc., but does not explain how.

[30] Wackernagel, *KZ* 33, 1893, p. 38 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 717; Fränkel, *Nomina agentis* I, p. 226; Chantraine, *RPh* 34, 1960, pp. 180-181.

[31] Wackernagel, *loc. cit.*; Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* I, pp. 503, 775 n. 7. — See now also Benveniste, *BSL* 59, 1964, pp. 28 f.

is perhaps one further example in Homer himself. The well-known ἐδητύς which occurs only in the genitive is rather baffling from the point of view of formation. To say that here the suffix -τυ- is added by means of the enlargement -ē-[32] is not an explanation, especially if we notice that the expected form *ἔστυς is paralleled by *ἔστος (from *ed-to-) which appears in δείπνησ-τος, δορπηστός[33]. There can be no doubt that ἐδητύς replaces the expected *ἔστυς. But how? Since substantival derivatives of *εδ- appeared in compounds (δείπνηστος, νῆστις etc.) with a lengthened vowel, this was first extended to the simplex[34], making it *ἤστυς. This was then reshaped to ἐδ-ηστυς, and it seems clear that ἐδητύς in our texts is due to dissimilation. One of the most important and frequent phrases containing our word is αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδη(σ)τύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο[35]. Here the radical σ of ἐδηστύος was followed by two further σ-s and also preceded by two. An additional factor may have been that nouns in -ητυς (*ὀρχητυς) tended to be reshaped to -ηστυς; during the transitional period there occurred hyper-correct forms, and ἐδητύς must be of that type[36].

---

[32]   See, e. g., Chantraine, *Formation*, p. 290. Frisk, *GEW* 1, p. 444, refers to βοητύς ἀγορητύς (as does Benveniste, *BSL* 59, 1964, p. 30) but here *ē* belongs to the verbal stem.

[33]   Wackernagel, *Das Dehnungsgesetz*, p. 31 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 927; Frisk, *GEW* I, p. 358.

[34]   Unless the simplex was in fact extracted from compounds; on the relation of -*tu*- in compounds and simple nouns, see Benveniste, *Noms d'agent et noms d'action*, 1948, pp. 109 f. — For a parallel -*ti*-stem ἐστι- from *ed-ti- (denied by Chantraine, *BSL* 59, 1964, pp. 16 and 19) we need not content ourselves with Iranian *asti*- (Benveniste, *ibidem*, pp. 34 f.), for it survives in Greek, too, first in ἐσθίω which is simply *ἐστι-(y)ω transformed after the very frequent root-imperative ἔσθι, from *ed-dhi, secondly in ἐστιάω which means «to feast someone» and has (originally at least) nothing to do with the hearth but is simply from *ἐστίᾱ «eating» (a derivative of *esti- in ἐσθίω), and meant «to give to eat».

[35]   E. g. *Il.* 1.469; 2.432; 7.323, etc. (22 times).

[36]   At *Glotta* 7, 1916, pp. 202 n. 2, Wackernagel suggested that Hom. ἐπητύς (and ἐπητής) were from ἔπω with the *ē* seen in ἐδητύς; but the formation still remains unjustified. Is it possible that ἐπητύς represents ἐπι-πη-τυς (and ἐπητής an earlier ἐπι-πη-της) from IE *pā- «protect»? — The equally puzzling ποτῆτος, ποτῆτα, prompted Wackernagel's suggestion (*GGN* 1914, p. 35 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 1137) that an old *ποτή «drinking» in the phrase ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆς was transformed into a hexameter end by changing it to ποτῆτος. Fränkel (*Glotta* 32, 1952, p. 30,

The forms ἐδ-εστής, ἐδ-εστός, ἐδ-η(σ)τύς clearly indicate a process to which Greek often had recourse in order to re-establish etymological relations that had become blurred by phonological developments. The forms ἐδ-ησθα, ἐδ-ηστε, and then of course also ἔδηδα, ἔδηδε, are due to this instinct of self-preservation[37].

It will be seen now how *ὀδᾶ, the expected noun of ἐδ-, could become *ἐδοδᾶ. And once this stage was reached, a connection between *ἐδοδᾶ and ἔδηδα became inevitable. And since the normal relation between verb : noun was ē:ō (but not ē:o) —this is seen in ῥήγνυμι/ῥώξ but also in ἀρήγω: ἀρωγή— *ἐδοδᾶ had to become ἐδωδή. The normal tendency to alternate η with ω, and even ε-η with ο-ω, is well illustrated by ἀλληλ-οδωδόται· ἀλληλοβόροι Hsch.[38]

That the reduplication in these nouns is a «fortuitous» development and *not* due to the noun being really derived *from perfects* is of course quite clear[39]. In the case of ὀπωπή we have one further reason for suspecting the «reduplicated» noun. The expected noun ὀπᾶ (cf. *ὀδᾶ) is only attested in Aristophanes' ὀπή «opening, hole», but its early coinage is guaranteed not only by the semantic development from «eye» (cf. window = wind-eye, needle's eye) but also by Hom. ἀνόπαια[40]. It is also attested, with the normal

---

see now also Chantraine, *BSL* 59, 1964, p. 15) tries to defend an abstract ποτο-τητ- (gen. ποτοτητος by haplology gave ποτῆτος) but misses the point that a derivative in -τητ- just does not fit in; ἐσθής lends no support whatever to this notion. But since ποτόν (and πότος?) exist, there is no need to postulate a *ποτή. We shall rather assume that in ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτοῖο a bard, carried away by the ringing tone of ἐδητύος, produced ἐδητύος ἠδέ ποτ-ητ(υ)ος with loss of the consonantalized *u*. He, or a successor, then ventured to form βρωτὺν οὐδὲ ποτῆτα (*Od.* 18.407). This would be a nice example of Leumann's principle in action.

[37]   Note also ἐσ-μέν for *(σ)μέν, ἐενσί for *ἐνσί, etc.

[38]   See Fränkel, *IF* 28, 1909, pp. 249 f.; Brugmann, *Grundriss*² II, 3, 1916, p. 447. But -οδωδοται does not presuppose *ἐδωδα or *ὀδωδα, only ἔδηδα! Benveniste (*BSL* 59, 1964, p. 32) wishes to start from *ōdā but the Slavic *ēdā, quoted as a parallel, is clearly dependent on the existence of the verb *ēdmi with the lengthened grade which does not exist in Greek.

[39]   Schwyzer attempts to trace these reduplicated nouns to primary reduplicating onomatopoeics (*Griech. Gramm.* I, p. 423) but can hardly produce any convincing examples.

[40]   Sommer, *Nominalkomposita*, 1948, p. 1 n. 3.

compositional lengthening, in στενωπός «(with a) narrow (open-ing)», πολυωπός «with many holes, meshes» (δίκτυον), both in Homer. But there is no denying that the literal meaning is much more closely associated with ὠπ- (ὦπα, etc., with length from the compounds[41]) and the noun ὀπωπή. Yet, the compound παρθενοπίπης «one who ogles maidens» and the verb ὀπιπεύω are sufficient warning against regarding ὀπωπή as a reduplicated form. To be sure, Schwyzer states that ὀπιπεύω has its ὀπ- from ὄπωπα while ῑπ- is from ι-οπ-[42]. If true, this could mean that a reduplicated present ῑπ- was «refreshed» to ὀπ-ῑπ- in the same way as was ἦδα to ἔδηδα etc. But it seems quite unlikely that Skrt. *īkṣ-* «see» (which is perhaps from a reduplicated *$\ast i\text{-}ok^w\text{-}s\text{-}$) should be represented by ῑπ-; besides, ὀπιπεύω presupposes an adjective ὄπιπος (or a noun) but not a verb. If so, ὀπῑπο- must represent the same type of compound as μέτωπον πρόσω-πον. These are generally equated with the Sanskrit type seen in *pratīka-* «face» from *proti-ok^w-* (almost identical with πρόσωπον)[43]. Now that the old preposition ὀπι has reappeared in Mycenaean, it seems legitimate to conclude that ὀπῑπο- represents $opi\text{-}(o)k^wo\text{-}$. A further variant appears in Myc. *o-po-qo* «horse's cheek-piece» from *$op\text{-}ok^w\text{-}o\text{-}$* (Palmer). Since the historical form would be ὄπωπον, one cannot help concluding that ὀπωπή itself is not a reduplicated *$\ast ok^w\text{-}ok^w\text{-}$* but a compound *$\ast op\text{-}ok^w\text{-}$*.

After the labialization of the Mycenaean labiovelars —which probably took place soon after the break-up of the «empire»—ὀπωπή changed its character completely. Whereas earlier it was merely a compound with -ωπ-, now it inevitably became a «redu-plicated» form. Coupled with ἐδωδή, it would give the impres-sion that the root (ἐδ- ὀπ-) was followed by its lengthened ō-grade variant. Interpreted in this way they could give rise to ἀκ-ωκ-ή and subsequently even to ἀγ-ωγ-ή.

The aim of the preceding discussion has been to show how ἀγωγή could emerge within the history of Greek. The facile pro-

---

[41] Sommer's neuter *ὦπ 'eye' (*ibidem*, p. 10) has a length that cannot be justified in a neuter; if it existed, it was *ὄπ.

[42] *Griech. Gramm.* I, p. 648, cf. also p. 350.

[43] See Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Ai. Gr.* II 2, pp. 141, 156 f. On the Greek words see also Sommer, *Nominalkomposita*, p. 115 n. 1.

jection into Indo-European will, it is to be hoped, be abandoned now. But I cannot suppress certain misgivings. The noun ἀγωγή is a noun of action, expressing in a nominal form the activity described by ἄγω; cf. εἰσαγωγή: εἰσάγω etc. In contrast to it, ἐδωδή and ἀκωκή are concrete nouns, «food» and «point» respectively, and it is difficult to see how they could have produced the pure abstract ἀγωγή. The explanation of ἀγωγός or ἀγωγή would be simplest if we could assume a type in -ωγός from -ο-άγος, which succeeded the earlier (even Ur-Greek) type with -ᾱγος from -ο-ᾱγος. For in that case a ἱππωγός, e. g., which was not quite clear, could be «refilled» to ἱππ-αγ-ωγός[44]. An interesting example of this process is presented by a group of abstracts in -οκωχή, formed from ἔχω. As was shown by Wackernagel[45], early compounds with the «normal» abstract -οχή from ἔχω led, in the case of prepositions ending in -α, to -ωχή from -α-οχή; cf. *ἀνωχή from ἀνα-οχή, but ξυν-οχή. The contracted -ωχή was then «refilled» to -οχωχή > -οκωχή in the same way as ἐδεστός replaced *ἐστος, etc.

Whatever the exact details of the process by which the early type in -ᾱγος came to be supplanted by the Classical -αγωγος, this itself was soon to make room for -ηγος in the well-defined circle of nautical terms. Here again the historian is faced with an intriguing question: why and where from does this new impulse come?

In Attic itself the 5th century only uses the terms ἱππαγωγός, ὁπλῑταγωγός, σιταγωγός, οἰναγωγός, etc., with or without ναῦς (or πλοῖον). But from about the middle of the 4th century σιτα-γωγός begins to be replaced by σιτηγός (accompanied by σιτηγέω, for earlier σιταγωγέω, and σιτηγία), first attested (for us) in Demosthenes (σιτηγός 50.20; σιτηγέω 20.34; 34.36; σιτηγία 56.11) but in continued use after him (Lycur. 27; *Zenon Papyri*). Similarly, ἱππαγωγός, used by Herodotus, Thucydides, Aristophanes and Demosthenes, also in inscriptions (*IG* II 2², 1620.14; Ἱππαγωγός, name of a ship), gives way to ἱππηγός,

---

[44]   The aorist-stem ἀγαγ- could have produced ἀγαγος or ἀγαγη but it is impossible to see why and how these should have been cha· ged to ἀγωγός/-ή.

[45]   *GGN* 1902, pp. 739 f. = *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 129 s. - Benveniste, *BSL* 59, 1964, p. 32, would start from a perfect *ὄκωχα.

which appears in the inscriptions (*IG* II 2², 1628.423; 1629.722, 944: τριήρης ἱππηγός) and Philochoros (132)[46], Polybius (1.27.9) and Diodorus Siculus (20.83).

In view of these facts we cannot say that -ηγός «held its own as an attribute to boats»[47]. It is quite clear that ἱππηγός did not exist side by side with ἱππαγωγός but emerged in the course of the 4th century and *replaced* ἱππαγωγός. If we can go by our fragmentary evidence, we may even conclude that ἱππηγός was still unknown to (or not admitted by) Demosthenes who only uses ἱππαγωγός[48]. The model for this new formation can still be identified.

For «one who carries cargoes, a merchant» the compound φορτηγός had been in use for a very long time. It occurs in Theognis who speaks with disgust of the rich merchants lording it over their fellow-citizens (1.679: φορτηγοὶ δ᾽ ἄρχουσιν), and in Simonides (fr. 178 B)[49], Aeschylus (fr. 263). The derivative φορτηγικός is used of boats (πλοῖα) carrying loads, merchantmen, by Thucydides (6.88) and Xenophon (*HG* 5.1.21). But about the same time the basic word, φορτηγός, itself begins to be used in the same way. Our only piece of evidence for this period comes from Critias who speaks of ἄκατοι φορτηγοί (fr. 2.12 DK) but there can be no doubt that this usage is directly continued by Polybius (1.52.6: νῆες) and then again by Diodorus Siculus (14. 55: πλοῖα). The verb φορτηγέω is used from Herodotus onwards (2.96) and the abstract φορτηγία appears in Aristotle (*Pol.* 1258b 23).

The chronology of these terms is, then, as follows:

6th century ὁ φορτηγός		
	ἱππαγωγός	σιταγωγός
5th century		
ἄκατος φορτηγός		
mid-fourth century		σιτηγός
late fourth century	ἱππηγός	

---

[46] Müller, *FHG* I, p. 385, IV, p. 646.

[47] Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 956.

[48] Björck is right in modifying Wackernagel's statement (*Das Alpha impurum*, p. 293): «oder richtiger es (sc. -ηγός) ist wieder aufgelebt».

[49] But this can hardly be used if Bergk is right in attributing it to Asclepiades (= *Anthol. Pal.* 5.159).

We can hardly go wrong in taking this sequence at its face-value: φορτηγός first changed the fashion from σιταγωγός to σιτηγός, then these two produced ἱππηγός which slowly supplanted ἱππα-γωγός. The intimate connection between φορτηγός and its fol-lower σιτηγός is further illustrated by the appearance of σιτη-γέω and σιτηγία (from mid-fourth century) following in the wake of φορτηγέω and φορτηγία. That the late fourth century is the time at which this change in fashion took place is empha-sized by the fact that the term ἱματηγὸς ναῦς «boat loaded with apparel» makes its first (and so far only) appearance in Theo-phrastus[50]. Nor is it a coincidence that the next century brings χορτηγὰ πλοῖα «hay-carrying boats». Around the beginning of our era θαλαμηγός «carrying θάλαμοι = house-boat» (ναῦς, πλοῖον) is coined (Strabo 17.1.15) and Plutarch even has ἁληγός (2.685e). All these words clearly preserve the old meaning of the suffix: «carrying something»[51]. It is therefore rather surprising to find as a unique deviation the word ποταμηγός (σκάφη, Dion. Hal. 2.53, 55; 3.56) «going by river».

This survey has brought out the important changes that took place in the compounds with ἄγω between the time of our earli-est records and the beginning of our era. As we have seen, the type in -ᾱγος, inherited from Indo-European, was, under the influence of certain early terms, changed to -αγέτας in the aristocratic term λᾱϝᾱγέτᾱς. The fashion thus created was follow-ed by other terms, mostly cultic, which survived the debacle of the Dorian invasion. But on the whole this disastrous event led to the remarkable reassertion of the old type in -ᾱγός: στρα-τᾱγός, φορτηγός, etc. are henceforth almost unchallenged. None-theless the weak frame of -ηγός proved incapable of coping

---

[50]   *De lapidibus*, p. 68. Wackernagel is surely right in saying (*Kleine Schriften*, p. 956) that we must read ἱματιηγός.

[51]   For the proliferation of this type in the Post-Ptolemaic period note the compact semantic groups presented by the verbs ἀχυρηγέω, δραγματηγέω, κοπρηγέω, σακκηγέω, σταφυληγέω, ταριχηγέω, χορτηγέω,; and the nouns ἀμμηγία, δραγματηγία, κοπρηγία, οἰνηγία, σακκηγία, χορτηγία, see L. R. Palmer, *A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri* I, 1946, pp. 127 and 75. Unique forms like ὑδραγωγέω (127) and πομπαγωγία (75) are therefore even more remarkable archaisms.

with the increasing demand for clear compounds with the unmistakable meaning «carrying» or «leading». Hence the 5th century saw the emergence of the more satisfactory forms -αγωγός and -αγωγή, and even the independent ἀγωγός, ἀγωγή. The 4th century witnessed a reversal in the fortunes of this very productive suffix which is alive even today (demagogue, pedagogue). In one particular semantic field, that of shipping, the old and indispensable φορτηγός proved of great resistance and even of considerable expansive force: it absorbed the old σιταγωγός and ἱππαγωγός, substituting for them σιτηγός, ἱππηγός, and this nucleus then went on expanding further.

Once again, the Mycenaean evidence was of overriding importance. It was only with its help that we could decide what the structure of *lāwāgetās, kunāgetās* was. A clearer assessment of the historical development than had been possible before could also be achieved on this foundation.