

Article and Demonstrative: A Note

Author(s): Anna Morpurgo-Davies

Source: *Glotta*, 46. Bd., 1./2. H. (1968), pp. 77-85

Published by: [Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht \(GmbH & Co. KG\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40266129>

Accessed: 07-08-2014 18:03 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (GmbH & Co. KG) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Glotta*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## Article and demonstrative: a note

By ANNA MORPURGO-DAVIES, Oxford

The Boeotian inscription Schwyzer *DGE* 440, 4<sup>1)</sup>

Γοργίνιός ἐμι ὁ κότυλος καλὸς κ[αλ]ῶ

poses a syntactical problem<sup>2)</sup>. In this type of clause, both in prose and verse, the article normally does not appear. On the other hand the reading of the inscription is certain, and the alternative interpretation:

Γοργίνιός ἐμι· ὁ κότυλος καλὸς κ[αλ]ῶ

does not appear very satisfactory in view of the stereotyped formula used in comparable inscriptions<sup>3)</sup>. I quote almost haphazard from some textbooks and anthologies:

1) Aegina (Sixth Century):

Θέρσιός ἐμι σᾶμα· μέ με ἄνοιγε<sup>4)</sup>

Thasus (Seventh Century):

Γλαύρο εἰμι μνήμα τῶ Λεπτίνεω<sup>5)</sup>

Rhodes (Eighth Century):

Φοράρο ἡμι φύλιξ τ[<sup>6)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> = *Harvard Studies* 2 (1891), 89ff. (*S.E.G.* III 377). Schwyzer dates it to the sixth century but a date in the fifth century seems to me more likely.

<sup>2)</sup> Some time ago I showed this inscription to Professor E. Fraenkel, asking his opinion à propos of a different point. He then drew my attention to the abnormal presence of the article and insisted kindly but firmly that it required explanation. I can only hope that the solution suggested here may be even remotely worthy of scholar who first asked for it.

<sup>3)</sup> Obviously there is no difficulty in reading *Γοργίνιός ἐμι ὁ κότυλος, καλὸς καλῶ. Γοργίνιος*, needless to say, is the 'possessive' adjective, which is frequently used in Boeotian in the place of the Attic genitive. *καλὸς καλῶ* is an additional element, which does not belong to the basic structure of the sentence. One could perhaps compare the considerations of Schulze (*Kleine Schriften* 668f.) à propos of the word order exemplified in *Ἀκαμαντὶς ἐνίκα φύλή, Ἥρας ἱαρός εἰμι τᾶς ἐν πεδίῳ* etc.

<sup>4)</sup> Most of the inscriptions mentioned here are collected in a useful article by M. Burzachechi on *Oggetti parlanti nelle epigrafi greche* (in *Epigraphica* 24 [1962], 3ff.). References given here will be limited to Schwyzer *DGE*, Jeffery, *The Local Scripts* (Oxford 1961), Peek *GVI* I and Burzachechi's article. For this inscription in particular see Schwyzer 118, Burzachechi 24.

<sup>5)</sup> Jeffery p. 307 No. 61 (pl. 57), Peek 51 a, Burzachechi 27 f.

<sup>6)</sup> Jeffery p. 356 No. 1 (pl. 67), Burzachechi 28 (the transcription followed here is that by Burzachechi).

- Smyrna (Seventh Century):  
*Δολίωνός ἐμι φυλίχνη<sup>1</sup>*
- Athens (Seventh Century):  
*Θαρίο εἰμι ποτέριον<sup>2</sup>*
- Ptoion (Sixth Century):  
*Φοί]βο μὲν εἰμ' ἄγαλ[μα Δ]ατ[οί]δα καλ[όν]<sup>3</sup>*
- Camirus (Sixth Century):  
*Ἐδδου[τί]δα ἡμὶ λέσχα τοῦ Πραξιόδο τοῦφ(ύ)λο κτλ.<sup>4</sup>*
- Cumae (Seventh Century):  
*Ταταίεσ ἐμὶ λέρυθος κτλ.<sup>5</sup>*

Here *σᾶμα*, *μνημα* etc. are predicates; if the same assumption were to be made for *δ κότυλος*, the phrase would hardly fit the standard patterns of Greek syntax. It is certainly true that in the absence of any relevant work it is not possible to state with absolute certainty that all Greek dialects equally observe the general rule whereby in Greek the substantive, functioning as predicate in a verbal clause, is not preceded by the article. However, so far no evidence to the contrary can be adduced and it is best to consider the rule Greek and not only Attic or Ionic. Needless to say, even in literary texts this statement meets with a number of exceptions. For them it is enough to refer to Kühner-Gerth I 550 ff. and especially to A. Procksch in *Philologus* 40 (1881), 1 ff. However, even these so-called exceptions are strictly patterned and do not so much contradict our statement as delimit its terms. It is well known, for instance, that *δ αὐτός* preserves the article even in predicative position; if the article were omitted there would be no possibility of semantic distinction between *αὐτός* and *δ αὐτός*. But the Boeotian inscription, as proved ad abundantiam by the parallels that I have listed and by many more that one could quote, would not seem to fit in any of these 'regular' patterns.

A search, necessarily incomplete, for exact parallels, produces a few scattered examples. I offer here a list, which no doubt could be augmented—and I hope it will—if only the evidence were less scattered and easier to come by.

<sup>1</sup>) Jeffery p. 345 No. 69 (pl. 66); cf. *S.E.G.* XII 480, Burzachechi 30.

<sup>2</sup>) Jeffery p. 76 No. 4 (pl. 1); Burzachechi 31.

<sup>3</sup>) *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 472, Burzachechi 9.

<sup>4</sup>) Schwyzer 273, Jeffery p. 356 No. 15, Burzachechi 38.

<sup>5</sup>) Schwyzer 786, Jeffery p. 240 No. 3, Burzachechi 30.

## 2) Thisbe (?) (Sixth Century?):

Γοργίνιώς ἐμι ὁ κότυλος καλὸς κ[αλ]ῶ

## Camirus (Early Fifth Century):

Φιλτῶς ἤμι τᾶς καλᾶς ἅ κόλιχς ἅ ποικίλα<sup>1)</sup>

## Cyprus: Kourion (Early Sixth Century):

Ἐπιόρφο<ν> ἅ φιάλα ἐμί<sup>2)</sup>

## Nymphaeum (Fifth Century)

Ἐῶθυμίης ε(ι)μί ἠ κόλιξ<sup>3)</sup>

It may be opportune to stress once more that, against these four examples of “abnormal” construction<sup>4)</sup>, the instances of “normal”

<sup>1)</sup> Schwyzer 275; Segre-Pugliese, *Annuario* xxvii–xxix (1949–51), p. 271 No. 179; Jeffery p. 257 No. 27. The date accepted here is that suggested by L. H. Jeffery.

<sup>2)</sup> Masson, *Inscriptions Chypriotes Syllabiques [ICS]*, Paris 1961, 177. There is some difficulty in the reading of the first name: I follow here T. B. Mitford in *Studies in the Signaries of South-West Cyprus*, London 1961, p. 24 No. 11 (pl. 14). The last sign of *e-mi* was seen by the first editor, but is now completely obliterated; however the restoration (if it is a restoration) is certain. Cf. also (but with the old reading) Schwyzer 682.13, and for the new reading Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 398. Masson dates the inscription to the beginning of the sixth century.

<sup>3)</sup> Collitz *SGDI* 5579; Jeffery p. 373 No. 64. The cup comes from Nymphaeum, and not from neighbouring Theodosia, as wrongly stated in Collitz and Jeffery. For the best edition available see I. I. Tolstoi, *Grecheskie Graffiti Drevnik Gorodov Severnogo Prichernomorja*, Leningrad 1953, p. 73 No. 108. A reproduction of Tolstoi’s drawing can be found among other graffiti from Nymphaeum in Jeffery pl. 72 (for which see p. 373 No. 63). The text seems to have the signs *I* and *E* inverted in the word *IEMI*, but I wonder if one should read *EMI* and assume that the first stroke is only a vertical scratch or a sign of word-division. Tolstoi is uncertain whether to follow the first editor in reading *η* before *κόλιξ*, and wonders if one should rather read *ν*; to my mind there is no doubt that the sign is a somewhat badly written eta. With the whole inscription one may compare the rather later *ἠδύποτος κόλιξ εἰμι φίλη πίνοντι τὸν οἶνον* quoted by Tolstoi, *loc. cit.*

<sup>4)</sup> I could perhaps quote another instance of the same phenomenon in the sixth century inscription from Gela edited by Orlandini in *Kokalos* 3 (1957), 94ff. (cf. Guarducci, *Annuario* xxi–xxii [1960], 270): *Κ]υναίθο ἐμι το[– –]μα τῶ Ἐπόχο*. The trouble is that it is equally possible to assume that *το[* is followed by a different word (e.g. *ἀγαλ]μα*) or that *το[* should be restored into *τό[δ* or *τό[δε*, followed again by a substantive. In the former case we would have another example of the abnormal use of the article, but otherwise it would be possible to restore a sentence of type 8) below.

clauses could be multiplied practically ad infinitum. Owing to the strictly formulaic character of this type of inscriptions, the deviation appears significant and requires explanation. Some progress in this direction may perhaps be made if we compare other formulaic types used in dedicatory or funerary inscriptions.

The simplest form can be exemplified by:

3) Leucas (Sixth Century):

*Εὐφραῖος μ' ἀνέθεκε τὰθάναι<sup>1)</sup>*

A frequent variant, this time in verse, is e.g.:

4) Argos (?) (Seventh Century?):

*Χαλροδάμανς με ἀνέθεκε θιοῖν περικαλλῆς ἄγαλμα<sup>2)</sup>*.

Samos (Sixth Century):

*Χηραμύης μ' ἀνέθηκεν τῆρηι ἄγαλμα<sup>3)</sup>*.

Here the personal pronoun is followed by a substantive or a phrase which seems to be in predicative position. Occasionally two or more verbal forms clarify the whole idea expressed in the sentence, as in:

5) Methana (Sixth Century):

*Εὐμάρες με πατέρ Ἀνδροκλέος ἐντάδε σᾶμα  
ποιέσανς καταέθεκε φίλο μνᾶμα ἠνιέος ἔμεν<sup>4)</sup>*.

In this last example, together with the explanation of the purpose for which the stone was erected and inscribed, we find another frequent component of this type of dedication, i. e. a deictic element, which often appears in adverbial or pronominal form, as in:

6) Olossoon (Fifth Century):

*μνᾶμα δὲ τεῖδε πατέρ Ὑπεράνορος παῖς Κλεόδαμος  
στᾶσέ με Θεσσαλία καὶ μάτερ θνυατρὶ Κορόνα<sup>5)</sup>*.

A pronoun such as *ὅδε*, *τόδε* etc. is normally present in phrases of the type *τοῦ δεῖνα τόδε σῆμα*, or in simple dedications such as *ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκε τόδε ἄγαλμα*. Less frequently, but in a substantial number

1) Schwyzer 141, Jeffery p. 229 No. 1 (pl. 44).

2) Schwyzer 77; Jeffery p. 168 No. 3; Burzachechi 32.

3) Schwyzer 715.3; Jeffery p. 341 No. 4 (pl. 63); Burzachechi 7.

4) Schwyzer 105; Peek 158; Burzachechi 39.

5) Peek 942; for another example see Raubitschek 148 quoted p. 81 n. 1.

of examples, it appears—as Burzachechi has pointed out—in some constructions closely related with those of 6):

7) Larisa (Fifth Century):

*Ἀργεία μ' ἀνέθηκε ὑπὲρ πα[ι]δὸς τὸδ' ἄγαλμα<sup>1</sup>).*

It is possible that—as Burzachechi suggested—these sentences originate from a contamination of the two types *ὁ δεῖνα μ' ἀνέθηκεν* and *ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκε τόδε ἄγαλμα*, but this need not concern us here. What matters more is that, whatever their origin, they seem to be grammatically acceptable sentences.

More important for our problem is that this type 7) seems to be paralleled by the well attested formula:

8) Marathon (Sixth/Fifth Century):

*σῆμα τὸδ' εἰμι Κρότο Τελέφο Ἀφι[δναίω]<sup>2</sup>).*

Sinope (Early Fifth Century):

*τόδε σῆμα θυγατρὸς Νάδνος τῷ Καρὸς ἦμι.<sup>3</sup>*

Peiraeus (Fourth Century):

*εἰμι δὲ Λυσάνδρον Πυθίεως Ἀρχεστράτη ἦδε<sup>4</sup>).*

Sparta (Second Century A. D.):

*μητρὸς καὶ θυγατρὸς παιδὸς τ' ἔτι τόμβος ὄδ' εἰμι<sup>5</sup>).*

It is now time to look back at the evidence collected in 2), the starting point of this note. The formulas listed in 8) seem to provide the only close parallel to those of 2). Two problems then arise: a) what are in this context the syntactical function and the meaning of the phrases *σῆμα τόδε*, *τόδε σῆμα* etc.? b) Is it possible that in 2) the article has a value parallel or similar to that of *ὄδε*?

Question a) can be reformulated as follows: should we say that in 8) (and possibly in 2)) *σῆμα τόδε* etc. performs the functions of predicate or that it is rather to be taken as an apposition to the subject 'I' implicit in the first person of the verb? No doubt it is conceivable—though perhaps unlikely—that a distinction between predi-

<sup>1</sup>) Schwyzer 583. For two Attic examples see Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis*, Princeton 1949, 6 and 234. Raubitschek 148 should not be quoted in this context: the obvious restoration is *ἐνθάδ'* and not *τόδ'* (cf. Peek in *Wiss. Zeitschr. d. Martin-Luther-Univ.*, 3 [1954], 384 = *S.E.G.* XIV 12).

<sup>2</sup>) Peek 64; Burzachechi 38.

<sup>3</sup>) Peek 1960a.

<sup>4</sup>) Peek 1968 (line 10).

<sup>5</sup>) Peek 646. For a possible further example see above p. 79 n. 4.

cate and subject (or apposition to the subject) is meaningless in this type of context. And even if this view is not accepted, it remains possible that no likely answer can be given in the absence of formal elements such as prosodic features (intonation) etc. which could clarify the syntactical structure of the sentence<sup>1</sup>). However, a *prima facie* argument in favour of the predicate theory is perhaps provided by the comparison with the formulas in 4) and 7), where I would prefer an interpretation of the type “X. dedicated me [here] as *ἄγαλμα*”, rather than “X. dedicated me, i.e. [this] *ἄγαλμα*”. As far as I can see this is the only argument, however slight, that can be adduced in favour of the one or the other hypothesis. In fact, the other possible suggestion, that we should start from the sentences in 2) and compare them with e.g. Thuc. 4.85 *ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι . . . κίνδυνόν τε τοσόνδε ἀνεροίψαμεν κτλ.*; Thuc. 6.80 *Ἐννελόντες τε λέγομεν οἱ Συρακόσιοι κτλ.*; Eur. *Tr.* 190 *Τῷ δ' ἄ τλάμων πού πᾶ γαίας δουλεύσω γραῖς κτλ.*, where the apposition to the subject is preceded by the article, can hardly count as satisfactory<sup>2</sup>). The verb is never *εἶμι* and the parallelism with 2) is destroyed by the fact that in most cases the article precedes an adjective and not a substantive.

To sum up: however we understand our first text (e.g. “I, the *κότυλος*, am of Gorginos . . .” or “I am the *κότυλος* of Gorginos . . .”), the fact remains that the presence of the article is abnormal and it is only through the comparison with 8) that it can be explained. This brings us to our second question: is it possible that in 2) the meaning of the article is parallel or similar to that of *ὄδε*?

Two points support this hypothesis in the first instance. All the inscriptions in 2) are relatively archaic: a priori this makes it more likely that the article can preserve some of its original demonstrative value. Also, none of the inscriptions seem to be hexametric or elegiac. Now, in inscriptions from the various regions of Greece *ὄδε* frequently appears as a literary element, which does not belong to

<sup>1</sup>) To give a more modern example: in the Italian sentence “I fratelli hanno ucciso i fratelli” the subject may be represented either by the noun which precedes or by that which follows the verb. The only formal element which allows a distinction between the two different syntactical structure is given by the prosodic features of the sentence. I owe this example to the late Prof. Mario Lucidi of the University of Rome.

<sup>2</sup>) Rather than Kühner-Gerth, I would prefer to quote on this point the old grammar by Matthiae (*Ausf. griech. Grammatik*, Leipzig 1827<sup>2</sup>, II, p. 560), which gives a fuller series of examples.



the dialect and is found exclusively in metric and particularly in dactylic texts. Obviously this varies from dialect to dialect, but as a general point it is likely to be correct. Hence in our non-dactylic inscriptions the presence of the article and the absence of  $\delta\delta\epsilon$  could be justified in one of two ways: either the dialect in question did not know in this function any other deictic pronoun than the article, or, though it had acquired an equivalent deictic pronoun, the dialect still preserved the possibility of using the article in its place.

A definite confirmation of the suggestion that in 2)  $\delta = \delta\delta\epsilon$  would be available only if it could be proved that in the dialects in question, i.e. in Boeotian, Rhodian, Cyprian and Ionic of Nymphaeum, the article still had a deictic meaning. In fact, such an undertaking could hardly be attempted with any hope of success. It would require, in the cases of Camirus and of Cyprus, an extensive series of archaic documents, i.e. something which belongs more to the sphere of beautiful dreams than to that of the evidence available. As for Nymphaeum, the evidence is practically non-existent in any period. Finally, though rather more encouraging than in the other cases, even the archaic Boeotian evidence is not large and in this case one can hardly quote any relevant parallel.

On the other hand a more general, if vaguer, case can be made for the presence in Greek dialects of traces of a demonstrative use of the article. For the literary evidence one may refer to the standard historical grammars and in particular to Wackernagel's *Vorlesungen* (II 135), where the author points to an equivalence of  $\delta$  with  $\delta\delta\epsilon$  at least in a few cases (e.g. in the isolated  $\pi\rho\theta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon$  of Attic or in the famous dictum  $\eta\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  (v.l. [Plut.] 241 F) of the Spartan mother). That the article can have this same value in Homer is usually denied with more or less conviction (see e.g. Monro, *Hom. Gramm.* 227f.), but, to my mind at least, a good case could be made for it. In A 20, for instance, I would feel inclined to understand . . .  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \delta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\upsilon\alpha\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \kappa\lambda.$  as "this, the ransom . . .", in spite of Monro's interpretation "the other, the ransom . . ." <sup>1</sup>). This, at least, must have been what Plato understood, if in his paraphrasis in indirect speech of the whole passage (*Resp.* 393 E), he uses the article practically before all substantives where Homer omits it, but pointedly omits it in the only place where Homer used it, i.e.

<sup>1</sup>) Monro, *op. cit.*, 228. When Chantraine (*Grammaire Homérique*, II 162) speaks in this case of a "sens présentatif net" of the article, he is certainly not very far from accepting what I would call "demonstrative meaning".



before *ἄποινα*: “this” would hardly have been in its place in an indirect statement.

Part at least of the epigraphical evidence has been discussed by Lejeune<sup>1)</sup> in his enlightening article on the functions and meaning of *οὗτος*, *ὅδε*, *ὄν*, etc. in Attic and in some other dialects. In the case of Thessalian he tentatively suggests that in phrases of the type *τοῦ δεῖνα τόδε σῆμα, ὃ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκε τόδε ἄγαλμα* the functions of *τόδε* are fulfilled by the article: “aussi peut-on se demander si thess. *ὃ* ne répondait pas à att. *ὅδε* comme *ὄνε* à att. *οὗτος*. On observera que le thème \**to-* conservait sa valeur première dans thess. *ὑππροτᾶς* ‘auparavant’”. Perhaps the same considerations may apply to Boeotian where *οὗτος* always refers to something mentioned previously, *τοῖ* (there is no evidence for the singular) to something which follows, and *ὅδε* appears only in poetic inscriptions where it is undoubtedly a literary element borrowed from Homeric or Attic language<sup>2)</sup>. It is conceivable that part at least of the functions of Attic *ὅδε* are performed by the article, and it is possible that this is confirmed by such phrases as IG VII 3207 *Βοιωτοὶ τὸν τρίποδα ἀνέθεικαν* which continues the earlier formula . . . *τοῖ Ἀπόλλωνι τὸν τρίποδα ἀνέθειαν Βοιωτοὶ* of IG VII 2724.

I have pointed out before that there is no relevant evidence from Rhodes, but one may wonder if a sixth century inscription from Gela, a colony founded by Rhodians and Cretans, may be relevant. The text *Πασιάδαφο τὸ σᾶμα. Κράτες ἐποίησεν*<sup>3)</sup> shows a formula directly comparable with the standard *τοῦ δεῖνα τόδε σῆμα* or *σῆμα τόδε τοῦ δεῖνα* and it is likely that here *τό* has a demonstrative value similar to that of *τόδε*.

As for Cyprus, Lejeune has shown that in the Idalion inscription<sup>4)</sup> *ὅδε* performs the functions of Attic *οὗτος* as well as of Attic *ὅδε*. This need not apply to the whole of Cyprus: the presence of *ὄν* at Tamassos is a sufficient reminder of the remarkable dialectal differences which divided the island. Elsewhere the evidence is lacking; what is more, there is hardly any text as early as that quoted in 2) above. However, a later formula may perhaps show that my analysis is correct. An inscription from Dhrymou in West Cyprus, for which

<sup>1)</sup> M. Lejeune, *Revue de Philologie* xvii (1943), 120ff.

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. E. Clafin, *The syntax of Boeotian Dialect Inscriptions*, Baltimore 1905, 44ff., which, though out-of-date, is still valuable.

<sup>3)</sup> Schwyzer 302; Jeffery p. 278 No. 49 (pl. 53); for another inscription from Gela see above p. 79, n. 4.

<sup>4)</sup> Masson *ICS* 217; Schwyzer 679.

the editor does not suggest any date, but which is certainly later than our text, reads

*Κυπροκρατίφος ἡμὶ δὲ λαο(ς) ὄδε κτλ.<sup>1)</sup>*

The phrase fits our type 8) and the editor correctly translates “De K. je suis la pierre tombale que voici . . .”. The presence of the article, this time in conjunction with the demonstrative ὄδε, seems to fit the theory that what we have here is the development of an earlier formula in which the article by itself was sufficient to convey the ‘here and now’ meaning required<sup>2)</sup>.

If this is so, and if the explanation proposed for the formulas in 2) can be accepted, we have here yet another example of something which need to be continually stressed: Greek dialects often follow parallel lines of development, but they follow them at different times and at different speed. No correct exegesis of epigraphical, and one might add, literary texts, can be attempted if this is not kept in mind<sup>3)</sup>.

## Thessalian Patronymic Adjectives

By ANNA MORPURGO-DAVIES, Oxford

1. With a few notable exceptions, most of the recent work on Greek dialects has proceeded with two aims in mind, either to recognize a number of new isoglosses which may improve our know-

<sup>1)</sup> Masson *ICS* 84; Schwyzer 683, 7. See also Masson, *Glotta* 43 (1965), 226 from where I have taken the translation quoted below.

<sup>2)</sup> For a possible instance of demonstrative value of the article in a very early inscription from Cyprus see Masson, *Živa Antika* 15 (1966), 262 note 24a. In what precedes I have not considered the inscription Masson *ICS* 100: *Φιλοκύπρας ἁ Τιμόρμω(?) γυνά ἐμι*; it is conceivable that either the genitive *Φιλοκύπρας* or the nominative *ἁ . . . γυνά* is a mistake, and in any case I agree with Hoffmann (*Griech. Dial.* I 300) who considers the sentence “zusammengefloßen” from \**Φιλοκύπρας ἐμὶ τᾶς T. γυναικός* (cf. Masson *ICS* 124: *Πυντίλας ἐμὶ τᾶς Πυνταγόραν παιδός*) and *Φιλοκύπρα ἐμὶ T. γυνά* (cf. Masson *ICS* 126: *Τίμος Τιμαγόραν παῖς ἐμι*). Meister’s argument (*Griech. Dial.* II 288) according to which *ἁ T. γυνά ἐμι* is ‘regular’ because the article contributes to make an “Einzelbegriff” of the phrase seems to me rather woolly.

<sup>3)</sup> Quite frequently in decrees found outside Attica to the Attic *τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα* corresponds a simple *τὸ ψήφισμα* (or *ψάφισμα*); one may wonder if at least in the early examples we have here yet another instance of the original demonstrative value of the article.