

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ANCIENT GREEK LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 3
P–Z, Index

General Editor
Georgios K. Giannakis

Associate Editors
Vit Bubenik
Emilio Crespo
Chris Golston
Alexandra Lianeri
Silvia Luraghi
Stephanos Matthaios



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2014

Table of Contents

VOLUME ONE

Introduction	vii
List of Contributors	xi
Table of Contents Ordered by Thematic Category	xv
Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	xxi
List of Illustrations	xxiii
Articles A–F	1

VOLUME TWO

Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	vii
Articles G–O	1

VOLUME THREE

Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	vii
Articles P–Z	1
Index	547

W

Wackernagel's Law I

1. INTRODUCTION

Wackernagel (1892) observes that, across archaic Indo-European languages (Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, Gothic, etc.), enclitic and → postpositive items tend to occur second in their → clause or → sentence (depending on the → clitic), as in the following example from Herodotus (= marks the host-clitic relationship; the relevant clitic is in bold):

- (1) *eíretó=**min** ho Astuágēs*
asked-him the Astyages
'Astyages asked him' (Hdt. 1.17.2)

The 3rd pers. acc. sg. pronominal enclitic *min* is hosted by the first word of the clause, *eíreto* 'asked' (the presence of the clitic triggers the secondary accent on the ultima). This is canonical second-position behavior. Since Wackernagel's observation regarding archaic Indo-European, second-position phenomena have been observed across a wide array of languages: see Kaisse (1985) for an overview.

Ancient Greek is well known for its rich clitic and particle lexicon. It is customary in the philological literature to draw a distinction between enclitics and postpositives (Dover 1960). Enclitics bear no graphic accent, as with *min* above. Postpositives behave like enclitics (in that they cannot occur clause-initially), but they do bear a graphic accent: to this class belong discourse particles like *mén*, *dé* and *gár*, as well as the modal particle *án*. As the accentuation system is the product of the Hellenistic period (its inven-

tion is traditionally ascribed to Aristophanes of Byzantium, on the evidence of Arcadius 186.4; see further Laum 1928), there is debate as to how prosodically real this distinction in the writing system is, and what exactly it corresponds to (for further discussion, see Goldstein 2010). As far as second-position behavior is concerned, there is (thus far at least) no generalization that breaks down according to the clitic/postpositive distinction. For instance, the modal particle *án* and the object pronominal enclitics exhibit strikingly similar (cf. Fortson 2010:161) syntactic and prosodic behavior (→ Prosody). They are both admitted at Porson's Bridge, for instance (→ Bridges; see Devine and Stephens 1984).

While Wackernagel's observation commands widespread belief (for arguments that Wackernagel's Law does not exist in Sanskrit, see the recent work of Mark Hale, e.g. Hale 2008), there is much that remains unclear. A general claim that clitics occur in 'second position' is too vague to be of much use. Below, this article will describe three dimensions of second-position behavior that any adequate analysis must address: the nature of first position, domains of cliticization, and clitic chains. This is followed by a brief survey of how second-position behavior is derived between syntax and phonology (both canonical and exceptional). Comparative and diachronic aspects of Wackernagel's Law are briefly considered in conclusion.

2. DEFINING FIRST POSITION

The first question is to consider what counts as first position. The prevalent claim in the literature (both in Greek as well as other languages)

is that second-position items occur after the first → prosodic word of a particular domain. The modal particle *án* and the pronominal clitics, for instance, occur after the first prosodic word of their clause:

- (2) *ho hēlios=án*
 'the sun ...' (Hdt. 2.26.2)

The definite article *ho* is (typically) proclitic (Allen 1973:25; Sommerstein 1973:136–139; Probert 2003:§267(a), §277), so together *ho hēlios* form one prosodic unit, which can be termed a prosodic word. Thus while the modal particle is the third lexical item in the clause, it is nevertheless considered to be in 'second' position because it is hosted by the first prosodic word of its domain.

This generalization predicts that second-position enclitics occur within syntactic constituents, which is in fact the case:

- (3) *polloi=dé=min ándres ísasin*
 many-DM-it men know(3pl.)
 'and many men know it' (*Il.* 6.151)

Here, the postpositive discourse marker (DM) *dé* and the pronominal enclitic *min* occur after the first prosodic word of the clause (*polloi*) and within the noun phrase *polloi...ándres*. This prosodically-based calculation of second position stands in contrast to the V2 phenomenon in German, whereby finite verbs occur after the first syntactic constituent in main clauses. For other clitics (especially *mén*, *dé* and *gár*), however, first position apparently does not correlate with the first prosodic word of a domain:

- (4) *hē dè Puthiē=sphi khrâi táde*
 the-DM Pythia-them(dat.) prophesies this
 (acc.pl.)
 'The Pythia prophesies this to them ...' (Hdt. 1.66.2)

If we assume that *sphi* occurs after the first prosodic word of its clause, that then means that *hē dè Puthiē* constitutes a prosodic word. If this is the case, then *dé* seems to be hosted simply by the first lexical item of the clause. But here we enter very uncertain territory, as there are at least three possible explanations, none of which have been adequately investigated. First, it is possible that the addition of *dé* somehow pro-

motes *hē* to a prosodic word. It would thereby become a licit prosodic host on its own. Such a view, however, would then face the question of why *sphi* is not also hosted by *hē*. (The topic of split distributions like we find in (4) is discussed further below in relation to clitic domains.) Second, it is possible that *dé* can be hosted by subprosodic words (Agbayani and Golston 2010a make just such a claim). Under such a view, the notion of 'host' becomes more syntactic than prosodic. Lastly, there is reason to believe that *dé* in cases like (3) is actually proclitic, and that both *hē* and *dé* are hosted by *Puthiē*. Evidence for such a view comes from resolution bridges: in this case, a prosodic word boundary is not permitted between *dé* and *Puthiē* (see further Goldstein 2010:62–63).

A final observation to make about first position is that there is variation. To take *dé* again, when a prepositional phrase begins a sentence, the particle typically occurs immediately after the preposition, as in *ek dè toû hetérou* 'from the other' at Hdt. 1.72.2. We do, however, find cases where the particle does not immediately follow the preposition: *ek toútou dè* 'from this one' (Hdt. 1.157.2). Variation of this sort raises the question of whether the difference involves any interpretive effect that might influence the prosodic coding of the preposition or the prepositional phrase as a whole.

3. DOMAIN OF CLITICIZATION

As noted above, and already illustrated in example (3), Ancient Greek is rich in second-position items, and there is no single 'Wackernagel's Law' (i.e., one single generalization) that will capture the behavior of the entire system. In fact, no such analysis has yet been attempted. The clitic lexicon is standardly divided into the following three classes: sentence-connective clitics, sentential clitics and word-level clitics (Fortson 2010:162–163). The argument pronominal clitics and modal particle *án* have scope over the clause, while sentence-connective particle *gár* has scope over the entire sentence:

- (5) *áneu=gár=dè mágou ou=sphi nómos estí*
thusías poiéesthai
 without-for-DM magus(gen.) not-them(dat.)
 law is sacrifices(acc.) perform(inf.)
 'For without a magus it is not licit for them to perform a sacrifice' (Hdt. 1.132.3)

Crucial here is the appearance of *gár=dé* well before *sphi*. The prepositional phrase *áneu=gár=dè mágou* has been preposed to a layer of syntax external to that of the nuclear clause. As *gár* has scope over the entire sentence, the preposed focus domain is included in its calculation of second position. By contrast, *sphi*, which only has clausal scope, is excluded from the preposed phrase, and assumes second position within the nuclear clause. (5) thus illustrates the possibility of multiple 'second' positions in a sentence. Word-level clitics scope over a word or phrase and accordingly appear second within a nominal domain:

- (6) *ou gâr ékhō toûtó=ge eipeîn atrekéōs*
not for I hold this-EMPH say(inf.) precisely
'For I am not able to say how much (lit. 'this') precisely' (Hdt. 1.160.2)

The clitic *ge* scopes solely over its host *toûto* and thus occurs second within that domain (and not within the clause). Where possessor clitics fit into this scheme has yet to be investigated.

4. CLITIC CHAINS

Despite the possibility of split distribution, it also happens that clitics cluster together, and thereby create a clitic chain:

- (7) *eí=pou=tís=tina ídoi ekhthrón...*
if-ever-one-some(acc.) saw(opt.) enemy(acc.)
'Whenever anyone saw an enemy ...' (Thuc. 4.47.3)

Here the complementizer *ei* 'if' hosts the clitics *pou*, *tís* and *tina*. (In clitic chains, each clitic receives an accent, except the last one.) Clitic ordering has received very little attention, and the studies that do exist focus mostly on Homer (e.g. Delbrück 1900:51–53; Ruijgh 1990; Wills 1993; Souletis 1998; Scheppers 2011:91–97, however, is based on Classical Greek prose). Roughly speaking, it seems that clitic position correlates with semantic scope: the wider the scope of the clitic, the earlier it appears (cf. Rice 2000 on Athapaskan and Agbayani & Golston 2012 on Hittite). So *pou*, since it is a discourse marker that scopes over the entire clause, precedes the verbal arguments *tís* and *tina*. The difficulty in analyzing clitic chains lies not just in determining and motivating the standard order, but also

in accounting for the variation. For instance, in Herodotus we find cases of a relative pronoun followed by *án dé* (modal particle *án* plus discourse particle *dé*; e.g. Hdt. 1.138.5) as well as the opposite sequence *d' án* (with elision of the vowel *e* before the initial vowel of *án*: e.g. Hdt. 2.65.21). Wackernagel (1892:344, 369) observes that the internal order of clitics within a chain can differ according to dialect.

5. DERIVING CLITIC DISTRIBUTION

How one accounts for the complexities of second-position distributional patterns is a matter of considerable debate. While there is as yet no standard analysis for Ancient Greek, the question is essentially to what extent prosody and syntax each contribute to the surface distribution. It needs to be emphasized from the outset that the debate, at least as far as Ancient Greek is concerned, is not one of syntax *versus* prosody: both components are necessary, and the question is rather that of to what extent each plays a role (for a typology of second-position clisis analyses, see Bošković 2001:9).

Counterexamples, i.e., cases in which the clitic is not in surface-second position, offer the most insight into the nature of clitic distribution. One possible derivational account for pronominal object clitics, would run as follows. They are base-generated in VP, and then raise to adjoin to TP (or, alternatively, move directly to C⁰; for this type of analysis for Sanskrit, see Hale 2007). If CP is occupied, its occupant becomes the phonological host for the clitic. If CP is empty, however, then it will undergo 'prosodic flip' (Garrett 1989, Halpern 1995), a process by which the clitic jumps to the right the minimal distance necessary to find a licit prosodic host. This analysis has the advantage that it can handle cases of preposing, as these simply involve leftward movement to some extracausal layer of the sentence. Elsewhere, however, it runs into problems. One of its predictions is that the clitic appears no more than one prosodic word from the left edge of TP. This prediction is violated in examples from metrical texts like the following:

- (8) *hótan=d' híkētai, tēnikaût' egò kakòs*
when-DM he arrives, then I bad
mè drôn=án eîēn pánth' hós'=án dēloi theós
not doing-PRT I would be(opt.) as much
as-PRT indicates(opt.) god

'when he gets here, I would be wrong
if I didn't do whatever god indicates' (Soph.
OT 76–77)

In a canonical situation, *tēnikaût'* in line 76 would host *án*. Unless one were to argue that *tēnikaût' egò kakós* somehow sits in CP (or some higher layer of the clause), the modal particle occurs farther into the clause than is predicted. A second problem concerns clausal conjunction. If *kaí* is the head of a phrase ConjP that sits above CP, it should not be a licit clitic host, and yet sometimes it is, as in the following example:

- (9) *kaí=spheas hōs oudeis ekálee ektrépontai ep' Athēnéōn*
and-them(acc.) as no one called they
turn(hist.pres.) to Athens
'And since no one invited them, they turned
toward Athens' (Hdt. 6.34.2)

The pronominal clitic *spheas* is the object of the verb *ekálee*, and as such one would expect it to be hosted by the complementizer *hōs*.

Both of these empirical issues can be circumvented, if prosody is allowed to play a greater role in clitic distribution. For instance, one could set up a prosody-dominant analysis, in which a clitic selects for a host that occupies the left edge of an intonational phrase (as argued for in Goldstein 2010; for similar prosody-oriented analyses, see Fränkel 1933 and Taylor 1996). Syntactic constraints, such as that the clitic be hosted in an intonational phrase that correlates with some part of the nuclear clause, would then play a secondary role. We could then explain cases like (9) by arguing that the prosody of the metrical verse licenses additional positions for clitics that are not available in non-metrical environments. (This phenomenon has also been argued to exist in the *Rgveda*, e.g. 1.165.12cd, 6.27.7ab; see further Hale 1987:79–80; Hock 1992:46–50). (9) also ceases to present a problem if we can assume the following prosodic constituency: (*kaí=spheas hōs oudeis ekálee*) (*ektrépontai ep' Athēnéōn*). The sentence would then be divided into two intonational phrases, and clitic *spheas* would be hosted at the left edge of the intonational phrase that encompasses its governing verb. While prosody-dominant analyses of this type allow for greater empirical coverage, they do counter the principle of 'phonology-free syntax', which is considered by many to be a fundamental prop-

erty of the → syntax-phonology interface, as clitics would have access to prosodic information in the syntactic derivation.

Examples like (9) have led Agbayani and Golston (2010a, 2012) to a new analysis of second-position phenomena. As conjunctions like *kaí* are assumed to lie between the clauses they conjoin, Agbayani and Golston argue that 'second-position' clitics (such as *spheas*, in this case) are actually in *first* position, at the beginning of the clause. 'Second-position' clitics are just postpositives by this analysis, words that cannot occur at the beginning of a phonological phrase (readers should be aware that this is an idiosyncratic use of the term *postpositive*). In (9), *kaí* shields *spheas* from the beginning of the phonological phrase, and allows it to surface in situ at the beginning of the clause. When there is no clausal conjunction, or when the clausal conjunction is itself postpositive, material from inside the clause is prosodically moved (Agbayani & Golston 2010b) to shield the postpositive from the left edge and the 'second-position' clitics remain clause-initial *sensu stricto*. This account faces severe theoretical and empirical challenges.

6. WACKERNAGEL'S LAW FROM A COMPARATIVE AND HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

As noted at the beginning of this article, second-position phenomena are not limited to Ancient Greek, but found across archaic Indo-European, including Hittite (Garrett 1989, 1990; Agbayani & Golston 2012), Sanskrit (Hale 1987a, 1987b, 1996, 2007, 2008; Hock 1992, 1996; Krisch 1990, 1997, 1998, 2000; Keydana 2011; Lowe 2011), Latin (Adams 1994a, 1994b; Bauer 2009: 294–299), and Gothic (Ivanov 1999). As a result, Wackernagel's Law is reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European itself, and is in fact one of the very few claims made about the syntax of the protolanguage (Watkins 1964:1036). It is far from clear what the specifics of second-position phenomena were in Proto-Indo-European, and which of the daughter languages it resembled most closely.

As far as the inner-Greek history of Wackernagel's Law is concerned, it is often claimed, going back at least to Wackernagel (1892:363, 370), that the second-position mechanism weakens in the period between Homer and Classical Greek (see also Dover 1960: 15–19; Taylor 1990: 30, 131–133; and Fraser 2001:164–166). None of these studies

acknowledges e.g. the preposing construction mentioned above. In effect, what we have between Homer and the Classical period is not a weakening of Wackernagel's Law, but rather an increase in the use of such constructions. This increase is conditioned by text-type and does not reflect an actual syntactic change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agbayani, Brian and Chris Golston. 2010a. "Second-position is first-position: Wackernagel's Law and the role of clausal conjunction", *IF* 115:1–21.
- . 2010b. "Phonological movement in Classical Greek", *Language* 86.1:133–167.
- . 2012. "Clitic order in Hittite." In: *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, 1–15. Bremen.
- Adams, James N. 1994a. *Wackernagel's Law and the placement of the copula esse in Classical Latin*. Cambridge.
- . 1994b. "Wackernagel's Law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Classical Latin", *TPhS* 92:103–178.
- Allen, William S. 1973. *Accent and rhythm. Prosodic features of Greek and Latin: a study in theory and reconstruction*. Cambridge.
- Bauer, Brigitte L. M. 2009. "Word order." In: *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax: syntax of the sentence*, ed. by Philip Baldi and Pierluigi Cuzzolin, 241–316. Berlin – New York.
- Bertrand, Nicolas. 2009. "Les pronoms postpositifs dans l'ordre des mots en grec: domaines syntactiques, domaines prosodiques", *Lalies* 29:227–252.
- Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1900. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Dritter Teil. Strassburg.
- Devine, Andrew M. and Laurence Stephens. 1984. *Language and metre: resolution, Porson's bridge, and their prosodic basis*. Chico.
- Dover, Kenneth J. 1960. *Greek word order*. Oxford.
- Fortson, Benjamin W. 2010. *Indo-European language and culture: an introduction*, 2nd ed. Malden.
- Fränkel, Eduard. 1933. "Kolon und Satz, II: Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes", *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist.*, 319–354. Göttingen.
- Fraser, Bruce. 2001. "The clause start in Ancient Greek: focus and the second position", *Glotta* 77:138–177.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1989. "Ergative case assignment, Wackernagel's Law, and the VP base hypothesis." In: *Proceedings of the North East Linguistics Society* 19, 113–126.
- . 1990. *The Syntax of Anatolian pronominal clitics*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University. Cambridge, MA.
- Goldstein, David M. 2010. *Wackernagel's Law in fifth-century Greek*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Hajdú, Istvan. 1989. *Über die Stellung der Enklitika und Quasi-Enklitika bei Pindar und Bacchylides*. Diss. Lund.
- Hale, Mark. 1987a. *Studies in the comparative syntax of the oldest Indo-Iranian languages*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University. Cambridge, MA.
- . 1987b. "Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the language of the R̥gveda." In: *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985): Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference*, ed. by Calvert Watkins, 38–50. Berlin – New York.
- . 1996. "Deriving Wackernagel's Law: prosodic and syntactic factors determining clitic placement in the language of the R̥gveda." In: *Approaching second: second position clitics and related phenomena*, ed. by Aaron L. Halpern and Arnold M. Zwicky, 165–198. Stanford.
- . 2007. *Historical linguistics: theory and method*. Oxford.
- . 2008. "Wackernagel's so-called Law", paper presented at the 10th Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference, Cornell University, 9 August 2008.
- Halpern, Aaron. 1995. *On the placement and morphology of clitics*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford.
- Hock, Hans H. 1992. "What's a nice word like you doing in a place like this? Syntax vs. phonological form," *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 22:39–87.
- . 1996. "Who's on first? Toward a prosodic account of P2 clitics." In: Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: second position clitics and related phenomena*, 199–270. Stanford.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. 1999. "Indo-European syntactic rules and Gothic morphology." In: *UCLA Indo-European Studies* 1, ed. by Vjačeslav V. Ivanov and Brent Vine, 103–120. Los Angeles.
- Kaisse, Ellen M. 1985. *Connected speech: the interaction of syntax and phonology*. Orlando.
- Keydana, Götz. 2011. "Wackernagel in the language of the R̥gveda", *HSF* 124:80–107.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1990. "Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutiger Sicht." In: Heiner Eichner & Helmut Rix (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute: Kolloquium der indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 13. bis 15. Oktober 1988 in Basel*, 64–81. Wiesbaden.
- . 1997. "Delbrücks Arbeiten zur Wortstellung aus heutiger Sicht." In: Emilio Crespo & José-Luis García Ramón (eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy. Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid, 21–24 de septiembre de 1994*, 283–309. Wiesbaden.
- . 1998. "Zum Hyperbaton in altindogermanischen Sprachen." In: Wolfgang Meid (ed.), *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen: Akten der X. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Innsbruck, 22.–28. September 1996*, 351–384. Innsbruck.
- . 2002. "Indogermanische Wortstellung." In: Heinrich Hettrich (ed.), *Indogermanische Syntax: Fragen und Perspektiven*, 249–261. Wiesbaden.
- Laum, Bernhard. 1928. *Das alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem*. Paderborn.
- Lowe, John J. 2011. "R̥gvedic clitics and 'prosodic movement'." In: *Proceedings of the Lexical Functional Grammar 11 Conference*, ed. by Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King, 360–380. Stanford.
- . (forthcoming), "Accented clitics in the R̥gveda", *TPhS*
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2012. "Position matters – the placement of clitics in metrical texts of Tocharian B", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13:153–162.
- Probert, Philomen. 2003. *A new short guide to the accentuation of Ancient Greek*. London.
- Rice, Keren. 2000. *Morpheme order and semantic scope: word formation in the Athapaskan verb*. Cambridge.
- Ruijgh, Cornelius J. 1990. "La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel." In: *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: J. Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, ed. by Heiner Eichner and Helmut Rix, 213–233. Wiesbaden.
- Scheppers, Frank. 2011. *The colon hypothesis: word order, discourse segmentation and discourse coherence in Ancient Greek*. Brussels.

- Sommerstein, Alan H. 1971. *The sound pattern of Ancient Greek*. Oxford.
- Souletis, Marie-Ange. 1998. *Chaines pronominales dans l'Iliade. Ordre préférentiel, variations d'ordre et fonction de quelques particules*. Ph.D. Dissertation, École pratique des hautes études. Paris.
- Taylor, Ann. 1990. *Clitics and configurationality in Ancient Greek*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, PA.
- . 1996. "A prosodic account of clitic position in Ancient Greek." In: *Approaching second: second position clitics and related phenomena*, ed. by Aaron L. Halpern and Arnold M. Zwicky, 477–504. Stanford.
- . 2002. "The distribution of object clitics in Koiné Greek." In: *Indo-European perspectives*, ed. by Mark R. V. Southern, 285–315. Washington, DC.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. "Über ein Gesetz der indo-germanischen Wortstellung", *IF* 1:333–436.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1964. "Preliminaries to the reconstruction of Indo-European sentence structure". In: *Proceedings of the 9th International Congress of Linguists*, ed. by H. G. Lunt, 1035–1045. The Hague.
- Wills, Jeffrey. 1993. "Homeric particle order", *HSF* 106:61–81.

DAVID GOLDSTEIN

Wackernagel's Law II (V'S)

The second member of a compound in Greek often begins with a long \rightarrow vowel, where a short vowel would be expected based on the vowel of the root. The lengthening (Germ. *Dehnung*) of that vowel has come to be known as Wackernagel's other law, Wackernagel II, the Law of Lengthening, or the *Dehnungsgesetz*, after Wackernagel (1889). Note that long \bar{a} , \bar{e} , \bar{o} in the second member of each Homeric compound below ($\bar{a}\bar{e}\bar{s}$, etc.) correspond to a short initial vowel in the related free-standing word ($a\bar{e}nai$, etc.):

- *dus- $\bar{a}\bar{e}\bar{s}$* , 'ill-blowing' < *a $\bar{e}nai$* , 'to blow'
- *khrus- $\bar{a}\bar{o}ros$* , 'gold-sworded' < *áor*, 'sword'
- *phil- $\bar{e}retmos$* , 'oar-fond' < *eretmón*, 'oar'
- *eu- $\bar{e}n\bar{o}r$* , 'manly' < *ánér*, 'man'
- *sterop- $\bar{e}ger\bar{e}ta$* , 'lightning-waker' < *egeírein*, 'awaken' or *ageírein*, 'gather together'
- *an- $\bar{o}numos$* , 'un-named' < *ónoma*, 'name'
- *dus- $\bar{o}numos$* , 'ill-named' < *ónoma*, 'name'

The lengthening is especially motivated and prevalent in \rightarrow meter, where it allows otherwise light syllables to fit into heavy positions in the verse \rightarrow foot. Wackernagel notes that early poets like Homer, Hesiod, Simonides, and Pindar regularly use $\bar{a}\bar{g}\bar{o}s$ or $\bar{e}\bar{g}\bar{o}s$ 'leader' as the second member of a compound (e.g. *strat- $\bar{e}g\bar{o}s$* 'army-leader,

general') rather than expected $\bar{a}g\bar{o}s$, which doesn't occur before Herodotus and Sophocles in the 5th c. BCE (e.g. *paid- $\bar{a}g\bar{o}g\bar{o}s$* 'child-leader, tutor'), suggesting that the lengthening was a feature of earlier Greek, possibly even of Indo-European, since a similar process is found in Sanskrit (Whitney 1899:§247). According to Schwyzler (1939:399ff.), the lengthening in Greek was originally due to the \rightarrow contraction of the final vowel of the first member of a compound with the initial vowel of the second: *strato- $\bar{a}g\bar{o}s$* > *strat- $\bar{e}g\bar{o}s$* (cf. Doric *strat- $\bar{a}g\bar{o}s$* for no change in vowel quality). If this is true, the resulting vowel does not fit into the general rules of vowel contraction according to which $o + a$ yields \bar{o} rather than \bar{a} (cf. *aid\bar{o}-a > *aid\bar{o}* 'shame, respect (acc.)'). The contraction hypothesis would imply that the Law emerged as a result of a (wrong) re-analysis of e.g. *phil\bar{e}retmos* (< *phil\bar{o}-eretmos*) as *phil-eretmos* (with automatic lengthening in the compound) that was then analogically extended to *dus- $\bar{o}numos$* and others.*

Whatever its heritage, it was probably never productive (i.e., not a Law *sensu stricto*). Consider the short vowels at the beginning of the second member of the following compounds, all from Homer:

- *andr- $\bar{a}gria$* , 'man-spoils' < *ágrē*, 'chase'
- *pan- $\bar{a}palos$* , 'all tender' < *hapalós*, 'tender'
- *eu- $\bar{e}rk\bar{e}s$* , 'well-walled' < *hérkos*, 'wall'
- *an- $\bar{o}lethros$* , 'un-destroyed' < *ólethros*, 'destruction'
- *pan- $\bar{u}statos$* , 'very last' < *hústatos*, 'last'

Later authors also show a mix of long and short vowels at the beginning of the second member of the compound. We find cases where the vowel is long:

- *strat- $\bar{e}g\bar{o}s$* , 'army-leader' < *agós*, 'leader' (Hdt., Soph.)
- *eu- $\bar{e}nemos$* , 'well-winded' < *ánemos*, 'wind' (Eur.)
- *an- $\bar{o}malos$* , 'un-even' < *homalós*, 'even' (Thuc.)
- *pan- $\bar{e}guris$* , 'pan-assembly' < *agorá*, 'assembly' (Thuc.)

and cases where the vowel is short:

- *paid- $\bar{a}g\bar{o}g\bar{o}s$* , 'boy-guide' < *agōgós*, 'guide' (Hdt., Soph.)
- *eu- $\bar{e}p\bar{e}s$* , 'well-spoken' < *épos*, 'word' (Hdt., Xen.)