

A Note on Thessalian

Author(s): Anna Morpurgo Davies

Source: *Glotta*, 43. Bd., 3./4. H. (1965), pp. 235-251

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40265970>

Accessed: 23/10/2013 08:20

---

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](mailto:support@jstor.org).



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

<http://www.jstor.org>

## A Note on Thessalian

By ANNA MORPURGO DAVIES, Oxford

1. The study of Greek dialects is badly hindered by the gaps and discontinuities in the evidence available. In many cases, though not always, this may prevent both the full exploitation of the techniques normally applied in diachronic dialectology (linguistic geography, etc.) and the establishment of a diachronic or even synchronic description of the single dialects. Thus in two different ways the target of dialectological research is missed: the dialect remains elusive both *qua* dialect, namely *qua* member of a linguistic dia-system, and *qua* independent linguistic structure characterized by its own systemic features and by its own history. For the historical linguist this latter point often results in the frustrating experience of dealing with dialect innovations for which an approximate geographical and chronological definition is possible, but no satisfactory explanation is available. Yet, the linguistic proximity of the dialects, a most tempting and yet exasperating factor for the linguistic geographer, may be beneficial for the philologist. The high degree of mutual intelligibility, which we may assume among speakers of different dialects, brings a welcome synchronical confirmation of a hypothesis which we were led to by historical considerations: the basic structural unity of the Greek dialects. If so, however, even a very limited amount of evidence may be exploited, at different levels of linguistic analysis, for reconstructing, at least in its broad lines, a larger frame in which to insert the single feature to be considered, be it an innovation or an archaism.

It is opportune to emphasize the advantage of working at the same time on different linguistic levels. It is likely that the approach indicated above will bring little benefit at the phonological level where, owing to the limited number of phonemes, the modifications introduced by each dialect in the basic phonemic inventory may lead to a drastic change in the whole structure. However, the position is different at the morphological or syntactical level. In the average dialect the phonemic system is broadly known, but only isolated morphological and syntactical facts are attested. It is the assumption of this paper that in such cases it is legitimate to exploit the available phonological evidence, together with the morphological and syntactical evidence deriving from our knowledge of "Greek" in general, in order to reach a better understand-

ing of the general framework of the dialect in question. The advantages of this method are obvious; its dangers should be at least as clear and a plea for caution should be made at each stage of the investigation. However, it is likely that bringing such principles into the open will cause an increase and not a decrease of prudence: it is superfluous to point out how frequently and with what lack of awareness they have been applied in the past.

In what follows I shall try to show how at least in one case this approach may shed some light on a problem of historical linguistics which the scholarship of the last 90 years has left unsolved. However, it is to be hoped that its main use may be found not so much in the solution of philological puzzles as in that type of enquiry which, through the study of the interdependence of the various levels of linguistic analysis, aims at a structural reconstruction of the individual Greek dialects.

2. In Thessalian the third person plurals of the aorist and imperfect indicative are a well known philological problem. The main data have been recently collected by Scherer (Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch der griech. Dial.*, II (1960), 68) and may be summarized as follows:

1) Pharsalos: RPh 35 (1911), 301 ff., No. 50<sub>1</sub> and Polemon 1 (1929), 221—4 (early fourth century, according to the editor, A. Arvanitopoulos): *ὄνεθ'εἰκαεν*

ibid.: IG IX 2 [IG] 234<sub>3</sub> (mid fourth century, according to Arvanitopoulos, loc. cit., 303 and 305; third century according to the editor of IG *ad. loc.*): *ἐδουκαεμ*

ibid.: IG 237<sub>1</sub> (third century): *ἀνεθεικαεν*<sup>1</sup>)

ibid.: IG 244<sub>4</sub> (fourth century): *ὄνεθεικαεν*

Larisa: IG 517<sub>12</sub> (ca. 214 B. C.): *ἐνεφανισσοεν*

Atrax(?): AE (Ἀρχ. Χρον.) 1932, 17 ff., No. 1<sub>2</sub> and AE (Ἀρχ. Χρον.) 1933, 6 (dated to the end of the fourth century by the editor, N. Giannopoulos): *ὄνεθεικαεν*<sup>2</sup>)

(Near) Spilia (from a sanctuary on the northern slope of Ossa, above the valley of Tempe): BSA 15 (1908—9), 244 f., No. 1<sub>3</sub> (fourth century): *ὄνεθεικαε[ν]*

<sup>1</sup>) This is the correct reading; for it see IG IX 2 Corrigenda, p. xii; the *ἀνεθεικαιν* which has found its way into some manuals is a *vox nihili*.

<sup>2</sup>) This form is not listed in Thumb-Scherer, loc. cit.

2) Phalanna: IG 1229<sub>19</sub> (second century): *ἐταῖαν*<sup>1</sup>).

In spite of our lack of evidence for the treatment of the vocalic cluster *-æ-* and for its possible change to *-ai-*, it seems phonetically plausible, and it is now *communis opinio*, that *ἐταῖαν*, attested in a relatively late inscription, represents a phonetic development of *\*ἐταῖαεν* or of a parallel form. Thus the evidence available for *-ει/-ι* is distributed over five localities, belonging to four different regions: Phthiotis<sup>2</sup>), Pelasgiotis, Magnesia and Perrhaebia.

The literature on the subject is vast, but scarcely enlightening. Ahrens and Meister<sup>3</sup>) did not know these forms, but in 1881 Fick (BB 7 (1881), 284) explained them as derived from *-αι*, comparing e.g. Boeotian *ἔθειαν*, Cyprian *κατέθιαν*, etc.; a few years later he was followed by Prellwitz, author of a monograph on Thessalian (W. Prellwitz, *De dialecto Thessalica*, Göttingen 1885, 9f.). The other dissertation on Thessalian which appeared in the same year (E. Reuter, *De dialecto Thessalica*, Diss. Berlin 1885, 63f.) contained the different suggestion, that *-ει* was an innovation formed on the analogy of the aorists like *ἔθειν*, of the imperfects like *(ἐ)τιθεν*, etc. Also in 1885 a dissertation on the Aeolic dialects (A. Brand, *de dialectis Aeolicis quae dicuntur*, I, Diss. Berlin 1885 (sic)<sup>4</sup>), 57) suggested a third possibility, that *ἔδονκαεμ* was to be interpreted as a phonetic treatment of *\*ἔδονκα-η* (< *ἔδονκαν*)<sup>5</sup>). It is not clear whether Solmsen knew Brand's suggestion<sup>6</sup>) when he

<sup>1</sup>) The mention by Buck (*Greek Dialects*, 1955, 112f.) and Schwyzler (*Griech. Gramm.* I, 664) of *ἔδωναν* in a Delphic inscription probably refers to SGDI II 2631, where Baunack read *ἔδωναν* ("der Stein hat *ο*KAIN, wie ich bei wiederholtem Prüfen constatierte"), but the inscription has been republished in FdD III 4,8, where G. Colin reads *ἔδωναν* with a footnote "dans *ΕΔΩΚΑΝ*, la dernière syllabe est refaite en surcharge", which seems to be confirmed by the photograph.

<sup>2</sup>) Pharsalos is frequently considered part of Thessaliotis (thus, for instance, Schwyzler DGE and Van der Velde, *Thessalische Dialektgeographie*, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1924), but it actually belongs to the Tetras Phthiotis: see Hiller von Gärtringen, *PWRE* VI A 1 (s.v. Thessalia), 98 and M. Sordi, *La lega Tessala*, Roma 1958, 3 note 1.

<sup>3</sup>) Meister, *Griech. Dial.*, I (1882), 306 quotes only *ἀνεθειαν* (see p. 236, 1), an "auffallende Schreibung".

<sup>4</sup>) The date MDCCCXXXV on the title page is due to a misprint.

<sup>5</sup>) In spite of the many criticisms which Cauer made of Brand's book, this part received his complete approval: see *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, III (1886), 1090 and *ibid.*, 1030 (with criticism of Prellwitz).

<sup>6</sup>) Though Brand's monograph is mentioned in both the passages referred to by Solmsen: *Meyer, Griech. Gramm.*<sup>2</sup> (1886), 415 and *Brugmann, Griech. Gramm.*<sup>2</sup> (1889), 147.

wrote his article in BB 17 (1891), 334—7: for him *-aev*, *-aiv* and *-oev* represented various attempts to express in the spelling a disyllabic pronunciation [*-a-ŋ*], [*-o-ŋ*] required by the analogy with *-αμεν*, *-ατε*, *-ομεν*, *-ετε*, etc. Neither Fick's nor Solmsen's suggestion, both phonetically rather improbable, won much acceptance. Later scholars seem to tend, more or less doubtfully, towards an analogical explanation parallel to that of Reuter. Hoffmann (Griech. Dial., II (1893), 319) pointed out the lack of a satisfactory explanation and then wondered if *-ev* should be identified with that ending *-ev* which appears in Homeric *ῆεν*, in the optative *εἰεν*, etc. This was tentatively repeated by Brugmann, Griech. Gramm.<sup>3</sup> (1900), 325f.<sup>1</sup>) and by Bechtel (Griech. Dial., II (1921), 192), who assumed that the innovation started in the imperfect in order to distinguish the third person plural from the first person singular, and was due to the analogy with *ῆεν*. Buck (Introduction to Gr. Dial., 1910, 104, and again Greek Dialects, 1955, 112) could not decide between the phonetic (*-aev* < *\*-aav*) and the analogical explanation. In 1924 R. van der Velde (Thessalische Dialektgeographie, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1924, 106ff.) had gone back to the original explanation by Reuter (*ἐθεικαεν* as a product of the contamination between *ἐθεν* and *ἐθεικαν*), but in 1939 Schwyzler (Griech. Gramm., I 664) was more sceptical: "nicht sicher erklärt". In 1961 Scherer (Thumb-Scherer, loc. cit.) does not feel the need to change what Thumb had written in 1909 (A. Thumb, Griech. Dial., 1909, 243): "Unaufgeklärt . . .". From this list, incomplete but representative, of doubts, hypotheses and criticisms, nothing emerges which need be retained: none of the explanations listed above was suggested with any great conviction and the final note is one of scepticism.

3. Yet, in 1934 a new piece of evidence had emerged. Other inscriptions, recently published, have confirmed this first finding so that to the list in section 2 above some other items may now be added:

- 3) W. Peek, AM 59 (1934), 57, No. 15<sub>2</sub> (Proxeny of the Thessalians written on a bronze tablet; exact origin unknown: fourth century): *ἐδωκαεν*

<sup>1</sup>) It is interesting to see what Brugmann had written in 1889 in the second edition of his Griechische Grammatik (page 147): "Die thess. Formen . . . sind unaufgeklärt . . .; die richtige Deutung ergäbe sich vielleicht, wenn Form und Gebrauch des Opt. in Thess. bekannt wären."

Y. Béquignon, BCH 88 (1964) 403, No. 3<sub>1-2</sub> (Proxeny written on a bronze tablet, from Pherai: late (?) fifth century): [ἐ]δδ-  
[κ]αιεν

Y. Béquignon, *ibid.*, 407, No. 8<sub>3</sub> (Proxeny written on a bronze tablet, from Pherai: fourth-third century??): ἐδωκαιεν.

So far these forms in -αιεν have not attracted the attention of the philologists<sup>1</sup>). Béquignon, *loc. cit.* 403, simply refers to Peek's tentative suggestion that -αιεν looks like "eine Verkoppelung der bisher allein bezeugten Bildungen -αιεν und -αιν". Philologically this can hardly be accepted. If -αιν represents a phonetic development of -αιεν, it is difficult to imagine how the contamination of two chronologically incompatible forms may have taken place. However, the discovery of these new morphemes, though creating some new problems, seems to clear up a number of points.

In spite of their different geographic distribution there is no reason why -αιεν and -αιεν should not be considered as belonging to the same trend of morphological innovation. However, before enquiring any further into the whens and hows of this innovation, it may be wondered if it is possible to establish a chronological sequence -αιεν > -αιεν > -αιν, which would leave us with a single form to account for.

Geographically the pattern is not completely clear: -αιεν is found twice in Pherai (alongside with ἐδωκαιεν in AM 59 (1934), 56, No. 14<sub>4-5</sub>; BCH 88 (1964), 400ff., Nos. 5<sub>2-3</sub>, 9<sub>1?</sub>, 10<sub>1+2</sub>, 11<sub>1?</sub>, and ἐδοσαν, *ibid.* 2<sub>3</sub>, etc.). A third time it appears on a bronze tablet with a Thessalian proxeny decree. The fact of writing on bronze<sup>2</sup>), the proxeny formulae and this peculiar form ἐδωκαιεν recall the proxeny decrees of Pherai, but it is most unlikely that in the fourth century Pherai would write decrees on behalf of the Thessalian league, if we except the relatively short period of her supremacy or the time in which the whole of Thessaly had lost its independence under Philip. For the origin of the inscription it is theoretically possible to think of Larisa or Pharsalos<sup>3</sup>), but it would certainly be more prudent to

<sup>1</sup>) Béquignon points out that they are not registered in Thumb-Scherer, *op. cit.*, 68.

<sup>2</sup>) For a list of public documents on bronze see L. Robert, *Coll. Froehner*, I (1936), 47 and *Hellenica* X (1955), 290, note 1, J. et L. Robert, *REG* 78 (1965), 80.

<sup>3</sup>) See M. Sordi, *La lega Tessala*, Roma 1958, 232. Our inscription is discussed at page 333f.

be less definite and to attribute it generically to "un sanctuaire de la Confédération thessalienne" (L. Robert, Coll. Froehner, I, 47). Peek did not publish a photograph of the decree; it is probable that it belongs to the middle or to the second half of the fourth century, but I am not able to define this date more closely<sup>1</sup>). As for the *-aev/-av*, *-oev* forms, none of them comes from Pherai: they belong to the fourth, third and second centuries and seem to be concentrated round Pharsalos and Larisa. With Atrax we are still in Pelasgiotis. The odd instances in Phalanna and on the northern slope of Ossa are not surprising: South Perrhaebia and Northern Magnesia must have been for a period under the influence of Larisa, both linguistically and otherwise<sup>2</sup>). The fact that Larisa has one single form in *-oev* and no forms in *-aev* should not be overrated: this is the only instance of a complete third person plural indicative aorist or imperfect in the dialect inscriptions of Larisa (but see *ἔδονκα[ν]* in IG 506<sub>25</sub>). As in Pherai, forms in *-av* are also present in Phalanna and in Pharsalos: see *ὀνέθεικαν* in IG 1233 (Phalanna: third century) and *ἀνέθ[η]καν* in IG 241 (Pharsalos: fourth century), though the latter instance is obviously due to an extra-dialectal influence. *ἔδδκαν* and *ἐπολέσαν* are attested in the fifth century, but in the rather different dialect of Thetionium (IG 257 = Schw. 557).

A shift *-aiev* > *-aev* or *\*-oiev* > *-oev* is possible only if it can be proved that *ι*, when the second element of a diphthong, was likely to drop before another vowel. The evidence for this is not readily forthcoming; a post-vocalic *ι* seems to be preserved both before a vowel and before a consonant. It is sufficient to quote the endless examples of patronymics in *-αιος* (from names in *-ας*) or in *-αιειος* (from names in *-αιος*): see for instance *Γενναίειος* (from *Γενναῖος*) and *Εὐβοίειος* in IG 234<sub>31-2.96</sub> (Pharsalos), *Δικαίειος* in IG 580<sub>13</sub> (Larisa), etc. The very few exceptions (Pherai, BCH loc. cit., No. 9<sub>1</sub>: *[Φ]έραιοι*; IG 480<sub>2</sub> (third-second century): *Γενάειος*; IG 461<sub>18</sub> (second

<sup>1</sup>) The form *Περθαλοι* is remarkable; epigraphical evidence for it is found only in some late inscriptions quoted by Peek, loc. cit., but L. Robert (Coll. Froehner, loc. cit., note 4) opportunely recalls the coins of the mid fourth century with the inscription *ΠΕΤΘΑΛΩΝ* (Head, *Historia Numorum*<sup>2</sup>, 304), which Hiller has attributed to the Thessalian league (*Zeitschrift für Numismatik*, 33 (1921—2), 44f.); see also E. Rogers, *The copper coinage of Thessaly*, London 1932, 16f., and H. Westlake, *Thessaly in the Fourth Century B. C.*, London 1935, 146.

<sup>2</sup>) Our knowledge of Thessalian linguistic geography is still extremely limited in spite of Van der Velde's efforts: for a criticism of part of his work see Lejeune, *REG* 64 (1941) 176f., note 38 (see also note 43).



century): *Γερνῶλοι*; BCH 59 (1935), 55f. No. 2<sub>37</sub>, (second century): *ποέσσ[ας]*<sup>1</sup>, etc.) are much too sporadic and too late (with the exception of the instance from Pherai) to carry any weight. The change *-αι* > *-ει* is peculiar to Larisa, and not relevant here, because it applies almost exclusively to the final syllable of the word<sup>2</sup>).

In conclusion, a change *-αιεν* > *-αιν* does not seem likely; at any rate it is probable that if *-αιεν* had developed into *-αιν*, this would have happened much later than our first occurrences of the ending, and a further change *-αιν* > *-αιν* would not have been easy. We are then left with two forms *ἔδωκαεν* and *ἔδουκαεν*, both obviously due to a recharacterization of *ἔδουκαν*, itself an analogical formation. The original forms *ἔδον*, *ἔθεν* etc. are not found in Thessaly.

Thus the hypothesis which sees in *ἔθεικαεν* the product of a contamination between *ἔθεν* and *ἔδον* seems to be faulty in two respects: it operates with two morphemes, one of which is not attested and is unlikely to have existed at the same time as the second, and it fails to account for the forms in *-αιεν*. For these there is only one possible origin, the analogy with the optative: the characteristic *ι* does not appear anywhere else in conjunction with a secondary ending. However, if at least one point is now cleared up, many others seem to be even more confused. Why should the optative have influenced the indicative? And why should this influence have worked in two different ways, so that in the one case we have forms in *-αιν* without the *ι*, and in the other case the *ι* is felt to be part of the ending and taken over too? The answer is not easy; both these facts are unparalleled in the history of Greek. If Hoffmann's suggestion has not met with any favour, it is because it was generally thought that there should be no connection between the optative and the indicative or, worse, between the optative and the

<sup>1</sup>) For the reading, which is doubtful, see Lejeune, REG 54 (1941), 79f.

<sup>2</sup>) The interpretation of the endings *-τει*, *-ντει* etc. for *-ται*, *-νται* etc. is disputed, but a shift *-αι* > *-ει* seems likely. The evidence for it is limited to Larisa (passim, see Thumb-Scherer, op. cit., 68) and to a possible instance from Crannon (BCH 59 (1935), 36ff., No. 1<sub>22</sub>, but see Lejeune, REG 54 (1941), 75f.). The only instance of a shift *-αι* > *-ει* not in the final syllable of the word seems to occur in a proper name (Thumb-Scherer, loc. cit.). There do not seem to be any other signs of a non-diphthongal pronunciation of *-αι*-, because I confess that I do not know how to explain the form *γενεσ-φ[ε]ν* read by Axenides in a third century decree of Larisa (Platon, 2 (1950), 52—68 and 157 = S. E. G. XIII 390<sub>11</sub>; see also J. and L. Robert, REG 64 (1951), 168f.). If it is to be considered equivalent to the Attic *γενέσθαι*, as the editor seems to think, why does it end in *-[ε]ν* and not in *-[ε]ν*, as is the rule in the dialect of Larisa? Are the reading and the restoration certain?



imperfect. We are now confronted with an even more exceptional fact: not only does the indicative assume the ending of the optative, but also that *ι*-morpheme, which distinguishes the latter mood and is peculiar to it, is treated as if it were a part of the ending.

4. It is clear that the problem calls for a different approach. If this development appears incredible in the normal framework of Greek (or of Attic, because this is what we think of, when we speak of Greek), what makes it permissible in Thessalian?

Our knowledge of Thessalian morphology is extremely fragmentary; the few extant inscriptions are highly formulaic and therefore uninformative. However, what we do not know, we can in part reconstruct. The first relevant fact is that at least a part of Thessalian, namely the dialect of Pelasgiotis and of part of Perrhaebia, adopted an athematic flection for the so-called contracted verbs in *-έω*: thus *φιλήμι* replaces *φιλέω*, etc.<sup>1</sup>). We do not have any evidence for Pharsalos, but the usual assumption, that Pharsalos, being part of Thessaliotis (see above p. 237, 2), had a thematic inflection like Thetonium, has nothing to be said for it. At any rate, owing to the frequency of these denominative formations, both in Thessalian and in the rest of Greek, it is likely that the phenomenon, wherever it occurred, assumed a major importance in the history of the verbal conjugation. While in Attic the athematic flection became more and more obsolete and the newly formed verbs followed the other conjugational pattern, the same cannot be assumed for Thessalian. It follows that in Thessalian (within the limits defined above) the morphemes of the athematic conjugation are likely to have played a different—and presumably more important — rôle than in Attic. How this is possible we shall see shortly.

A second point to investigate concerns not the morphemic, but the phonemic structure of Thessalian. At the time when we come

---

<sup>1</sup>) For the evidence see Thumb-Scherer, *op. cit.*, 69 and Van der Velde, *op. cit.*, 113ff. The presence of this athematic conjugation in Atrax may be doubted on the strength of the *π[ρ]οκαλεσθαι* found in a very archaic decree published by Giannopoulos in *AE* 1934—5, 140ff. and tentatively attributed by him to Atrax or Argoura (see also L. H. Jeffery, *The local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, Oxford 1961, 99 No. 6, who dates it to *ca.* 475 B. C.). But the decree is extremely fragmentary and cannot be restored; the isolated *π[ρ]οκαλεσθαι* might well be a subjunctive (perhaps to be compared with *]]ιδίδοε* in line 1). On the other hand the same inscription from which we have quoted *ὄνθευκαεν* has some athematic participles of verbs in *-εω*.

to know it, the dialect<sup>1</sup>) seems to have five phonemes in the long vowel series vs. the seven of Attic: /ā/, /ē/, /ō/, /ī/, /ū/. Obviously these are not the only differences from Attic: there are also differences in distribution and/or frequency (for instance in Thess. /ā/ vs. Attic /ā/), and in phonetic realization (for instance Thess. /ū/ vs. Attic /y/), etc., but at the moment these are not relevant for our purposes. The statement made above about the number of vocalic phonemes has recently been challenged<sup>2</sup>), but the evidence adduced against it seems too weak to be given too much weight and it has already been refuted<sup>3</sup>). At any rate, even if Thessalian had known a system of seven long vowels, it is improbable that it would have been preserved after the sixth century, and therefore it would not have been likely to interfere with the period in which we are interested. If then we can assume the existence of a symmetric vocalic structure composed of five long and five short phonemes (not considering the diphthongs), the consequences for the morphological system of Thessalian and for the verbal flexion in particular are remarkable—and even more so if we take into account the parallel development of the diphthongs. Unfortunately this will necessitate a rather long digression.

It is well known that by the fourth century the long vowels /ē/ and /ō/ came to be indicated by *ei* and *ov*<sup>4</sup>); this points at the same time to a narrow pronunciation of the vowels in question and to a change of the diphthongs /ei/, /ou/ into monophthongs /ē/, /ō/. The date of this change has recently been discussed by Bartoněk (loc. cit.), who concludes that the change had certainly taken place at the time of the introduction of the Ionic alphabet, but that it is impossible to define this date more closely. However, three pieces

<sup>1</sup>) This vocalic shift applies to a rather large zone, which certainly includes all the places which we have listed.

<sup>2</sup>) By J. S. Lasso de la Vega, *Sobre la historia de las vocales largas en griego*, *Emérita* 24 (1956), 273.

<sup>3</sup>) See A. Bartoněk, *The Boeotian and Thessalian narrowing of long vowels: a comparative study*, in *Sborník Prací Filosofické Fakulty Brněnské University*, 10 (1962), 167ff. at 174. The non-Thessalian character of the forms with *η* and *ω* had already been pointed out by Bechtel, *Griech. Dial.*, I (1921), 146, but see also Lejeune, *REG* 54 (1941), 61 and 63f., Van der Velde, *op. cit.*, 32f. Bartoněk's assumption that the narrowing of the long vowels occurred before, and not after, the monophthongization of the diphthongs may well be right, but is not useful for an absolute chronology.

<sup>4</sup>) The time at which the spellings *ei* and *ov* for /ē/ and /ō/ were adopted varied in the various towns: see van der Velde, *op. cit.*, 32ff.

of evidence other than those referred to by Bartoněk may be taken into consideration here: a fifth century memorial stone from Pharsalos (IG 250 = Schwyzzer 564): *Σίμων ὁ Μυλλίδεος ἐπέστασε | ματέρει ἡεὶ Μυλλίδι . . . σσ . . .*; a grave inscription (very fragmentary) from Phalanna (fifth century; IG 1240 = Schwyzzer 610): *. . . α[ς ἀπ]έ-θαν[ε.] | Φασίδαμος: πα[τ]ρ[ος] [Π]ε[ρ]ιδό[ν]εος ἐπ' Ἀζ[ῶ]ροι ἀπέ(θ)ανε κτλ.*; and an early (?) fourth century stele (IG 405 = Schwyzzer 573, 1) from Pharsalos (??), inscribed *Ἀφθονέτω Μανιχέω*<sup>1</sup>). In these three texts *Μυλλ(λ)ίδεος*, *[Π]ε[ρ]ιδό[ν]εος* and the later *Μανιχέω* must be taken as patronymic or matronymic adjectives<sup>2</sup>): if they were simply genitives from *Μυλλίς* (see IG 383), *Περίδων* (e.g. IG 414a<sub>8</sub>, 234<sub>170</sub> with the patronymic *Πειθόνειος* in IG 431 and S.E.G. XIII 395<sub>8</sub>) and *Μάνιχος*<sup>3</sup>), we should have \**Μυλλίδος*, \**Πείθονος* and *Μανίχω* respectively. -*ΕΟΣ*, -*ΕΩ* must then be identified with the later -*ειος*, and -*είων*, the well known Thessalian patronymic suffix. The other possible interpretation, -*εος* (from -*ειος*, with dropping of the prevocalic *ι*), is highly improbable, as all the later evidence testifies to the preservation of the *ι*. If so, however, the spelling *Ε* in a pre-Ionic alphabet here indicates a pronunciation [ē] of what was originally a real diphthong [ei].

A few other inscriptions should be mentioned here, though the interpretation of some of them is very doubtful indeed. From Thessalian Eretria (Achaia Phthiotis) comes an early (??) fifth century inscription (IG 199 = Schwyzzer 551. 5), which unfortunately we know only from a nineteenth century copy<sup>4</sup>): *Μεθίστας Πιθόνειος Ἀπλωνι* (ου stands for original /δ/). To the same region, but to a different town (Melitea) belongs a mid (?) fifth century epitaphion (IG 209: \**Ἀλχιμάχου [Σ]εκυνάθεν*), where /δ/ (< -oo) is indicated by ου<sup>5</sup>). Much older are IG 1202 (= Schwyzzer 603) from the Apollonion at Magnesia (ca. 550 B.C.?)<sup>6</sup>), where the usual

<sup>1</sup>) See Lejeune, REG 54 (1941), 63 ff.

<sup>2</sup>) A similar interpretation of *Πειθόνεος* may already be found in Prellwitz, loc. cit., 14 ff., who, however, still reads *Πεθόνεος*. For *Μανιχέω* see Lejeune, loc. cit. (note 22). *Μυλλίδεος* has been identified as a matronymic by Schulze apud IG.

<sup>3</sup>) For this name see Bechtel, Personennamen, 294.

<sup>4</sup>) See L. H. Jeffery, op. cit., 98 note 1.

<sup>5</sup>) For a similar inscription, but much later in time, see Giannopoulos, AE 1925—6, 185 ff. IG 209 is now lost, but it does not seem likely that it is to be identified with the stone found by Giannopoulos. For a discussion of the linguistic features of IG 209 see Lejeune, REG 54 (1941), 61 ff.

<sup>6</sup>) L. H. Jeffery, op. cit., 98 No. 1.

reading is *παρε]ξσε* though *παρέξει* is required<sup>1)</sup>, and an aryballon in Corinthian style dated by L. H. Jeffery, *op. cit.*, 125 note 3, to the third quarter of the seventh century B.C. On the handle the vase has the inscription *ΑΙΛΙΟΥΝ*. Lejeune REA 47 (1945), 7ff. has suggested that *\*Απλουν* is to be identified with the Thessalian name of Apollo and that it was presumably written by a Thessalian. L. H. Jeffery, on the contrary, prefers to see here a Corinthian inscription, perhaps showing a "syncopated version of the owner's name, *Ἀπλουν[ιος*, as Lejeune suggests". However, even a name *Ἀπλοῖνιος* or the like, if it existed<sup>2)</sup>, could not help being Thessalian, and the problem would still be open. If Lejeune's thesis is to be accepted<sup>3)</sup>, the inscription proves that the narrowing of the long vowels and the shift */ou/ > /ō/* were already a *fait accompli* in the seventh century<sup>4)</sup>. At any rate, however this may be, there is no reason for doubting that the two fifth century instances of *-εος* for *-ειος* and the three examples of *ov* for */ō/* indicate that by this date */ei/* and */ou/* had already become */ē/* and */ō/*. It is also worth noticing that the examples quoted prove *ad abundantiam* that the pronunciation of the original */ei/* underwent the same changes both in preconsonantal and in prevocalic position<sup>5)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> Thus the editor *ad loc.* and Schwyzler DGE 603. L. H. Jeffery, *loc. cit.*, seems to prefer a different interpretation: see her transcription at page 402 (Plate 11, No. 1).

<sup>2)</sup> A month name *Ἀπλοῖνιος* is attested in Thessaly: BCH 59 (1935), 55 No. 2<sub>10</sub>.

<sup>3)</sup> The existence of a Thessalian artist working in Protocorinthian style in Corinth or elsewhere cannot be excluded *a priori*: for foreigners working in Corinth, see H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia*, Oxford 1931, 389.

<sup>4)</sup> For the sake of completeness two other inscriptions may be mentioned: IG 151 (fifth-fourth century), where Lejeune REG 54 (1941), 58ff. reads *Ἀνθρου|πύλα Θε[λ]ο[υ]νεία?* and the grave inscription from Meliboea in Magnesia published by Woodward in JHS 33 (1913), 313ff. No. 1 and dated by him to the mid fifth century: *Ἀνφιῶνεία ἀ στάλα τοῦ Φρόνετος*. However, the reading of the former inscription is very doubtful indeed and, as for the second, Kretschmer, *Glotta* 7 (1916), 327f. has suggested a reading *τοῦφρῶ-νῆτος* (*τῷ Εὐφρῶ.*), which seems more satisfactory (see also Schw. 605). The dedication *Καμὸν ἐθύσε τῷ Κόρῳ* quoted by Bartoněk, *op. cit.*, 178 note 21 has long since been recognized as Arcadian (*Καμὸ ἐνέθυσε . . .*): see IG V 2 554 and L. H. Jeffery, *op. cit.*, 215 No. 12.

<sup>5)</sup> This point should be made, because a comparison with the development of the diphthong */oi/* in Boeotian (Thumb-Scherer, *op. cit.* 26) might suggest that the spelling *ει* covered both a diphthong */ei/* in prevocalic position and a monophthong */ē/* in preconsonantal position. This is made unlikely by forms such as *βασίλειος* (e.g. in IG 517 *passim*), where *ει* indi-

To sum up: in the fifth century, and probably earlier, Thessalian already had a vocalic system with presumably four or five short diphthongs /*eu, au, ai, oi, ui?*/, five long vowels /*ā, ē, ō, ī, ū*/ and five short vowels /*a, e, o, i, u*/. It is likely that the long diphthongs had already disappeared. Historically /*ē*/ and /*ō*/ may be traced back to Proto-Greek *ē* and *ō*, to short *e* and *o* lengthened through contraction and possibly compensatory lengthening, and to the diphthongs /*ei, ou, ēi, ōu*/. In morphology this means that all those distinctions which in Attic are expressed through e.g. the opposition of *εἰ* and *ἦ* are obliterated. It is likely, for instance, that in a normal thematic verb there was no distinction in the singular between the present indicative and the present subjunctive. Both must have been /*luō*/, /*luēs*/, /*luē*/ or, in Thessalian spelling, \**λῶν*, \**λῶεις*, \**λῶει*.

5. It now remains to be seen how relevant these two facts, the different importance of the athematic flexion and the reduced number of the vocalic phonemes, are for the Thessalian verbal inflection in general and for our third person aorists and imperfects in particular. It has already been pointed out that *ἐδῶκαεν* cannot be due to anything else than the influence of the optative. The same explanation should obviously also account for *ἐδουκαεν*. This requires a third person optative ending in *-(ι)εν*, but the Thessalian evidence for this mood is limited to the *παρβαλναι* of the Sotairos inscription (IG 257) which is not relevant here. This, however, does not exclude the presence of the optative in spoken Thessalian any more than the very small number of these forms found in Attic inscriptions prove the absence of the optative in spoken Attic<sup>1</sup>). As for the forms which the mood may have assumed in Thessalian, these may be partially reconstructed, owing to the basic similarity which the formation of the optative has in all Greek dialects, including Lesbian and Boeotian<sup>2</sup>).

cates an original diphthong, but is definitely disproved only by the examples quoted above.

<sup>1</sup>) See Meisterhans-Schwyzler, *Grammatik der attischen Inschr.*, Berlin 1900, 247f. The assertion that there are no optatives in Attic inscriptions before 450 B.C. is no longer true: see e.g. S.E.G. X 237 (ca. 520 B.C.). For the use of *παρβαλναι* in the Sotairos inscription see G. Fohlen, *Untersuchungen zum Thess. Dial.*, Diss. Strassburg, 1910, 67ff. The *εἰσιεν* quoted by Thumb-Scherer, op. cit., 70, belongs to a late inscription written in koine.

<sup>2</sup>) For Lesbian in particular see E. M. Hamm, *Gramm. zu Sappho u. Alk.*, 1957, 163f. The so called Aeolic optative is limited to the sigmatic aorist

There is no reason to suppose, for instance, that in Thessalian the present optative of, say, *τίθημι* had a different form from that which we know from the epigraphical and literary evidence of the rest of Greece: *τιθέην, τιθέης, τιθέη, τιθεῖμεν, τιθεῖτε, τιθεῖεν*<sup>1</sup>). However, in Thessalian these forms were bound to undergo some phonetic changes which, in their turn, had remarkable morphological repercussions. Owing to the presence in the dialect of a single /ē/ phoneme and to the merging of /ei/ with /ē/, the forms listed above must be re-written as:

/tithēēn/, /tithēēs/, /tithēē/, Plur. /tithēēmen/, /tithēēte/, /tithēēn/. In Thessalian a sequence /ēē/ was contracted into /ē/, as we know from third person subjunctives such as *δοθεῖ* (IG 517<sub>15</sub>) i.e. /dothē/, which show an /ē/ as the result of the contraction of /ēē/ (similarly in Attic *δοθῆ* < *δοθήη*). Thus in the singular the present optative was /tithēēn/, /tithēēs/, /tithēē/<sup>2</sup>).

Eventually, and as a result of this phonetic change, the paradigm must have reached an almost complete regularity: the endings were added directly to the stem /tithē/ and the original ablaut pattern ceased to be recognizable, though it is conceivable (but unlikely) that the accent had preserved traces of it. In this new inflectional type, which presumably *τίθημι* shared with verbs like \**φίλλημι* etc., and the importance of which, therefore, should not be underrated, the most remarkable feature is the absence of the mood-indicator *ι*, which elsewhere is the constant mark of the optative. It follows that the optative comes to be much nearer to the imperfect, with which it shares the secondary endings, than it is e.g. in Attic. The two paradigms must have been as follows:

---

and need not concern us here. At any rate it is likely that the "Aeolic optative" is an Ionic-Attic and not an Aeolic innovation (see K. Forbes, *Glotta* 37 (1958), 165ff. at page 176).

<sup>1</sup>) I shall not consider here the forms of the dual: we have no direct evidence for them in Thessalian, and it is possible that they had disappeared before our earliest documents.

<sup>2</sup>) There is no reason to think that owing to the original diphthongal character of the optative, the contraction should not have taken place: a form like \**τιθεῖε* was not likely to survive for long. It is remarkable that, if this reconstruction is correct, the second and third person subj. (/tithēēs/ < /tithēēs/, /tithēē/ < /tithēē/) must have been identical with the second and third person optative. This possibility should be kept in mind in the actual work of interpretation of the inscriptions.



I)	Imperfect	Optative
	<i>/etithēn/</i> (*ἐτίθειν)	<i>/tithēn/</i> (*τιθεῖν)
	<i>/etithēs</i> (*ἐτίθεις)	<i>/tithēs</i> (*τιθεῖς)
	<i>/etithē/</i> (*ἐτίθει)	<i>/tithē/</i> (*τιθεῖ)
	<i>/etithēmen/</i> (*ἐτίθεμεν)	<i>/tithēmen/</i> (*τιθεῖμεν)
	<i>/etithēte/</i> (*ἐτίθετε)	<i>/tithēte/</i> (*τιθεῖτε)
	<i>/etithen/</i> (*ἐτιθεν)	<i>/tithēen/</i> (*τιθεῖεν) <sup>1</sup> .

There is no reason to think that the third person plural optative underwent a contraction parallel to that of the singular. The analogy with the first and second person plural would have preserved the disyllabic ending in any case, but we also know from forms like *Αἰολεῖσσι* (BCH 59 (1935), 55 No. 2<sub>19</sub>) that the sequence */ēe/* could be retained in Thessalian<sup>2</sup>).

Similar considerations may be offered for the aorist optative of *τίθημι* (*/thēn/*, */thēs/*, */thē/*, */thēmen/*, */thēte/*, */thēen/*) and, what is perhaps more important, for the optative of the aorists (or aorist passives) in *-ην* or *-θην*. The latter group covers a considerable number of elements and includes forms belonging both to thematic and non-thematic verbs. Here, however, the optative finds its nearest formal parallel, obviously not in the imperfect, but in the aorist indicative:

II)	Indicative	Optative
	<i>/ekharēn/</i> (*ἐχάρειν)	<i>/kharēn/</i> (*χαρεῖν)
	<i>/ekharēs</i> (*εχάρεις)	<i>/kharēs</i> (*χαρεῖς)
	<i>/ekharē/</i> (*ἐχάρει)	<i>/kharē/</i> (*χαρεῖ)
	<i>/ekharēmen/</i> (*ἐχάρεμεν)	<i>/kharēmen/</i> (*χαρεῖμεν)
	<i>/ekharēte/</i> (*ἐχάρετε)	<i>/kharēte/</i> (*χαρεῖτε)
	<i>/ekharen/</i> (*ἐχάρεν)	<i>/kharēen/</i> (*χαρεῖεν) <sup>3</sup> .

<sup>1</sup>) Needless to say, all the accentuation is purely conjectural. It is possible that in the imperfect the plural generalized the long vowel on the analogy of the singular: cf. *ῥμνην*, third person plural imperfect in Sappho 44,34 Lobel-Page. In this case the parallel with the optative would be even clearer. On the other hand, even if the optative had generalized the *-ιη-* form in the plural, after contraction the final result would be identical both in this and in the following paradigm (*/-ēēmen/* (*-ειειμεν*) > */-ēmen/*). I have assumed that the ending of the first person plural was *-μεν* (see IG 157<sub>13</sub>), but even if it had been *-μες*, this would not change anything in the argument.

<sup>2</sup>) This is likely to be true at least in those cases in which there was a juncture between two morphemes, and our third person plural certainly satisfies this condition.

<sup>3</sup>) My choice of *ἐχάρεν* as an example is meant to show that both semantically and otherwise the aorist in *-ην* (*-θην*) need not be felt as a passive.



The regularity of the pattern is enhanced by the comparison with the subjunctive (presumably: /*kharēō*/, /*kharēs*/, /*kharē*/, /*kharēōmen*/, /*kharēte*/, /*kharēōnti*/)<sup>1</sup>). Here the opposition between primary and secondary endings is at its clearest in the first person singular and in the first and third persons plural, so that the solidarity of optative and indicative vs. subjunctive is confirmed. The regularity of the optative-indicative correspondence (the distinction rests essentially on the augment and probably on the accent) must obviously carry with it the identification of the endings. This is automatic for all the persons, with the exception of the third person plural, which is irregular in two respects: first, because the analogy with the first and second person plurals would require a disyllabic ending, and secondly because the correspondences set out in I) and II) would require an ending *-εν* and not an ending *-ν*, in order to have a unified set of secondary endings<sup>2</sup>). There were probably two ways out of this lack of symmetry: either in I) and II) the third person plural imperfect and aorist indicative was felt as having an ending /*en*/ added to a reduced stem /*etiθ-*/ and /*ekhar-*/, or a new form \*/*etiθeen*/ or (in II) \*/*ekharēen*/ was created. In either case the ending /*en*/ was identified as the normal athematic secondary ending for the third person plural. It was then an easy step to use this ending in order to recharacterize those forms which, in their turn, were irregular in their own paradigm. It is enough to think of *ἔλυσαν* vs. *ἔλύσαμεν* and *ἔλύσατε*, and of *ἔλυσον* vs. *ἔλύομεν* and *ἔλύετε*<sup>3</sup>). Thus a new third person was formed for which we have evidence in *ἔδου-καεν*, *ἔταξαν*, *ἐνεφανίσσεν* etc.; no doubt the innovation was limited to a part only of Thessaly and it is possible—and indeed probable—

---

For a possible extension of the *-ην*-forms to the optative plural and of the long vowel to the indicative plural see above page 248 note 1.

<sup>1</sup>) For the subjunctive we have many instances of the third person singular (*γχαπεῖ*, *δοθεῖ* etc.); the other persons are reconstructed. The assumption that the subjunctive had a thematic form and that the sequence /*ēō*/ was not contracted is based on the comparison with forms like *κατοιμελουνθι* (third pers. plur. subj. pres.: IG 514<sub>3</sub>), but cannot be definitely proved.

<sup>2</sup>) It is possible to wonder why *-εν* would replace *-ν* and not *-ν -εν* (the latter innovation actually happened in some dialects: see page 250 note 2), but apart from anything else, if this had happened in Thessalian, the third person plur. opt. would have become identical to the first person singular and the final outcome of the innovation would have been anti-economical in the extreme.

<sup>3</sup>) It is likely, however, that the thematic imperfect was the last form to undergo the change.

that it originated independently in the various towns in which it is attested<sup>1</sup>). The phonetic changes which underly it are found in all the towns concerned<sup>2</sup>).

It now remains to see how in Pherai, and possibly, but not certainly, in another place, similar causes brought round a similar, but not identical innovation. There is no need to repeat the arguments adduced previously to show how in the athematic present and in the aorist in  $-\eta\nu$  and  $-\theta\eta\nu$  the present optative and the imperfect on the one hand and the aorist optative and indicative on the other hand were brought together; the proportions  $|kharēn| : |kharēn| = |ekharēs| : |kharēs| = |ekharē| : |kharē| = |ekharēmen| : |kharēmen| = |ekharēte| : |kharēte|$  (see II) are clear enough. As we have noticed above, the third person plural breaks the symmetry of the pattern, and an analogical formation  $|ekharēen|$  is a possible way out. If so, however, aorists like  $|ekharēn|$ ,  $|eluthēn|$  etc. create a complete pattern of optative-indicative correspondence, in which the former is distinguished from the latter only through the lack of the augment and presumably the displacement of the accent. Thus it is possible to establish a proportion:

$$|kharēen| : |ekharēen| = |staien| : X,$$

in which X may be identified with  $|estaen|$ , so that a new form can replace the original  $|estan|$ . This process would have been easier if a form such as  $|estaen|$  (or  $|edōkaen|$ ) had existed in a period anterior to that in which the forms in  $-auev$  were created. In this

<sup>1</sup>) It should be pointed out, however, that in the fourth century first the tagia of Jason, with his attempts to unify Thessaly under his supremacy, and then—and especially—the re-creation of the Thessalian league, which brought together most of the towns and their armies against Pherai, must have done much to diffuse a certain number of linguistic features and to obliterate, at least partially and in certain social strata, some of the most striking dialect peculiarities.

<sup>2</sup>) Up to now I have not mentioned the possible influence which the presence of a third pers. plur. imperfect  $\eta ev$  (i.e. Thess.  $*e\eta ev$ ), phonemically identical to the optative  $e\eta ev$ , may have had in this development. We have unfortunately no direct evidence for the third person plur. imperfect of  $\xi\mu\mu\iota$ , and a form  $e\eta ev$ , though likely, is far from being certain.—At this point is also necessary to recall the Delphian and Locrian third pers. plur. opt. in  $-ow$  (third-second century B. C.), which obviously owe their origin to the analogy with the imperfect. They have been studied in great detail by Lejeune (*Mélanges Ernout*, Paris 1940, 225—30) and they need not detain us here, though they offer an opportunity of pointing out how different linguistic circumstances may produce different results (see also p. 249 n. 2).

case the introduction of the -i- in the ending would also have been favoured by the low frequency of the sequence /ae/ in the language and by the need to replace it with a more normal vocalic cluster.

I do not need to emphasize that the explanation offered above for the third person plural of the Thessalian aorist and imperfect is in some part hypothetical and may have to give way if new evidence is produced. Yet, I do not doubt that, though the details may vary, a reconstruction, however partial, of the Thessalian verbal system can throw some new light on the linguistic circumstances in which the innovation took place and consequently on the causes which determined it.

### A Special Sense of ἐπισπένδειν?

By R. F. WILLETTTS, Birmingham

The natural sense of ἐπισπένδειν is of *pouring a libation upon a sacrifice*, literally and metaphorically<sup>1</sup>). It is used once, in the middle, with the sense of *making a fresh treaty*, where it is merely a compound form of σπένδεσθαι in the common usage of *exchanging libations* in making treaties<sup>2</sup>). In the Gortyn Code, however, it is used, in the active, to mean *promise* or *pledge* and, in the middle, *to accept in pledge*. It has naturally been supposed that a solemn kind of promise is suggested by the use of the verb in this sense; and, further, that it has always something to do with betrothal or marriage<sup>3</sup>). If so, we could compare Latin *spondeo*, *sponsa* as more than morphological parallels. But to what extent does the internal evidence justify the suggestion?

In the regulations which deal with the division of property among the children of the family, it is laid down<sup>4</sup>) that, if a father should, in his lifetime, wish to make a gift to his daughter on her marriage,

<sup>1</sup>) As in Hdt. 2.39; 4.60, 62; 7.167; A.Ag. 1395, *id.* Ch. 149; Theoc. 23.28.

<sup>2</sup>) Th. 5.22.

<sup>3</sup>) By Pringsheim *The Greek Law of Sale* p.15 n.9, with every reserve, since, as he points out, the whole institution has never been explained or even analyzed. Also by Guarducci *Inscr. Cret* 4. p. 158 (ad vv. IV. 52—V. 1).

<sup>4</sup>) IV. 48ff.