seems to have lost further ground and by historic times qa/aq reflexes are established in all the aeolic dialects, while qa is only represented in any number in lesbian.

In lesbian these o-colour zeroes fell together with the o-grades to produce a larger group of o-grades, which were extended by analogy at the expense not only of original zeroes in alpha but of original alphas, for example φόμμος and οίτος for φάμμος and *αιτός.

Furthermore in lesbian and Kymaian reduction of ι and ε (in the latter only) to ı produced a secondary r which became εq (in combination with the following k, eq).

In arkadian, but not in cypriot, several words in -qa-, ἐγάφω, στρατός and θρασίς were imported into the dialect from doric. There is no evidence to suggest that *stratos, *grbho or *dhysus had survived in arkao-cypriot in other, dialectally correct forms. At a later stage further forms were introduced in both dialects, replacing original forms, e.g. κράτης for κράτης. It seems that in cypriot some zero grades were reformed on the analogy of cognates in TRET as qa.

Although some smaller questions of dialectal treatments are not clearly answerable, the general picture of the treatment of r, ı in greek is plain. There are two changes of the vocalic liquids in greek. The first was at a stage when greek was already distinct from other IE languages for initial s before a vowel had become h before this change took place. But the change may have occurred when greek still had some contact with latin and celtic, in which similar, but not identical, changes occur. The second occurred after the separation of greek into the major dialect groups but before the invention of the linear B syllabary. Mycenaean and Arcado-cypriot have a different treatment from any other dialect, while Ionic has its own peculiar treatment of mr, ml.

Epigraphical -qa

By Anna Morpurgo-Davies, Oxford

1. There is considerable divergence between Linear B and Homer in the form and meaning of the so-called -qa case. The evidence has been studied in detail by Lejeune: here it will be

1) La désinence -qa en mycénien, BSL 52 (1957), 170—201 = Mémoires de Philologie mycéniennne, Paris 1958, 159ff. On Homer -qa see also (in addition to the bibliography quoted by Lejeune), G. P. Shipp, Studies in the language of Homer, Cambridge 1953, 1—17; id., Essays in Mycenaean
sufficient to repeat that while in Linear B, in spite of a few possible exceptions, the use of \(-\varphi\) is restricted to the athematic and \(-\alpha\)-declensions, such restrictions does not apply to Homer. Moreover, in Linear B \(-\varphi\) is joined directly to the noun stem, while Homer often interposes an \(-o\)-element between stem and ending. Syntactically, the usage is even more divergent. In Linear B almost all, if not all, \(-\varphi\) forms are plural in meaning\(^2\), while Homer uses \(-\varphi\) both for the singular and the plural; in Linear B \(-\varphi\) is used in a locatival and instrumental function, while in Homer \(-\varphi\) can take over the functions of practically any indirect case.

These are the facts: how they should be interpreted is doubtful. Even if, as most scholars seem to think, the Homeric usage merely represents a late development of an original situation similar to that of Linear B \(^2\), it still remains uncertain how far this reflects a parallel development in the spoken language and how far it is a product of the artificiality of the epic dialect. It would be possible to solve the problem if a third source of evidence were available and if this were demonstrably free of Homeric influence. The latter condition, however, is difficult to fulfil: one doubts the value not only of the Hesiodic examples, but also of the rare instances of \(-\varphi\) found in lyric poetry. Ibycus' \(ενvά\varphi\) (fr. 6 Page – 7 Diehl) is too Homeric to count as independent evidence, and though his \(Λενθα\varphi\) (fr. 53 Page = 57 Bergk) is a hapax it is unlikely that it ever belonged to the spoken language. Similar caution is appropriate when dealing with the vocative (!) \(δρα\varphi\) of Alaman (fr. 28 Page = 48 Diehl). Even if the text were correct — which is by no means certain — and if \(δρα\varphi\) were in fact a vocative, before

and Homeric Greek, Melbourne 1961, 29–41. On Mycenaean cf. my article in Palmer-Chadwick (edd.), Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, 1966, 191–202 (with the previous literature), and M. Doria, Strumentali, Dativi Ablativi e Dativi Plurali in Miceneo: alcune precisazioni, in the "Atti e memorie del Primo Congresso Int. di Miceneologia", Roma 1968, II, 764–780. I am more conservative than Doria in my interpretation of the \(-\varphi\) case and I should not like to follow him when he finds in Mycenaean some \(-\varphi\) forms with the meaning of a final dative: at present this does not seem to me to be supported by sufficient evidence.

\(^2\) I ignore here the dual \(du-\varphi\text{-}\varphi\), because it is not relevant for my thesis; for some possible (but very uncertain) examples of singular use in Mycenaean see Doria op. cit. (note 1).

\(^3\) But see Shipp, opp. cit. (in note 1), and especially Essays, loc. cit.
attributing such a form to the spoken language one should wonder if the extraordinary semantic shift required to explain it would not be more in place in a purely literary dialect 4).

2. In 1956/57 Lejeune6) was obliged to conclude that the only non literary evidence for -φι was to be found in the Boeotian phrase ... τὸ ὄνομα κή ἐπιπατρόφιον ... “name and patronymic” found in a Tanagra inscription of the third century B. C. 4). Lejeune did not discuss ἐπιπατρόφιον in detail but it may be convenient to look at the form more closely. It is not unknown: since 1901 it has found its way into all textbooks, thanks to an article by Felix Solmsen7), who, after a careful examination of all parallel expressions, concluded that ἐπιπατρόφιον was a nominal formation based on a phrase *ἐπὶ πατρόφι, comparable in meaning with Attic πατρόθενεν 8) and in form with Cretan ἐπὶ πατρός of the Dreros inscription ICI X 1.120f. As for *πατρόφι, we should have in it, according to Solmsen, a -φι form with an ablatival and singular meaning. I do not need to discuss the third point made by Solmsen, namely that the presence of *πατρόφι in Boeotian proved that the ancient grammarians were right in considering the ending exclusively Aeolic. Linear B has now disproved both Solusen and the ancient grammarians, but Solmsen’s first two points need to be considered. If they were right, *πατρόφι would suggest that a certain semantic extension of -φι (from instrumental and locative to ablative and from plural to singular) did in fact take place in the spoken language in the post-Linear B period. ἐπιπατρόφιον can hardly be Homeric. But if so, this isolated piece of evidence would

---

4) As Page pointed out (Aleman, the Partheneion, Oxford 1951, 127) ὄνομα τῶν ἐπιπατρόφων remains unique and incredible. Both Wilamowitz (Textgeschichte der griech. Lyriker, Berlin 1900, 55) and Page (loc. cit.) interpreted it as an ancient corruption in the text, but in his recent edition Page (PMG loc. cit.) does not obelize the word. For a defence of the text as it stands see H. Kodzu, On the dialect of Aeolian. Tokio 1937. 28f.

5) op. cit. (in note 1). For a correct assessment of the value of ἕσσεθεν -φι forms see Lejeune ibid. The Cyprian forms quoted by Meister and others (e. g. Schwezor, Gr. Gr., I, 551) are now doubted by Masson, Insr. Chypr. Syll., No. 315, and especially, Ζώα Antika 15. (1966), 259.

6) REG 12 (1899), p. 72 line 28 (cf. Schwezor DGE 482). The verb preceding the phrase is doubtful, but in lines 20/30 ἄφνημα τὰ ὄνομα κή ἐπιπατρόφων is certain.


8) e. g. in Plato, Legg. 753c ... γράφομαι τῶν ἐπιπατρόθεν καὶ φιλῆς καὶ ἔλημον ἔπαιν ἕως ἡμισέκτημα.
be more valuable than it appeared at first sight and would in fact contribute to solve the problem mentioned above. The question now is: was Solmsen right?

3. We have on Solmsen the advantage of time: since 1901 one and possibly two more cases of epigraphical -pri have become known, though they have not attracted much attention since their discovery.

In 1961 G. Pugliese Carratelli published from the notes of G. Oliverio an inscription carved in the rock from Messa in Cyrenaica *). The only word inscribed reads KAPÔPhí: this may be compared with the equally isolated words found on similar objects in parallel archaeological contexts. On the whole these are divine names in the genitive or nominative (Δάματος, Δαμή[ά]ριος, Ἀπόλλων, Κόρης). It seems reasonable to follow the editor, who compares Κάροφι with the name of Κήρης and recognizes in it a -pri case. What is its meaning? As for the number, it is impossible to establish if the dedicator thought of one or more Kērēς, though I should have some preference for the plural. For the rest a nominative or genitive is required: which did the dedicator have in mind? Both interpretations seem rather unlikely, the first more than the second. I would rather prefer to believe that Károphi, if it is in fact connected with Kērēς, is a form extracted from an archaic religious formula, probably not understood any more and used by somebody who did not have -pri in his normal spoken language. If this were so, it would be vain to discuss the original meaning of Károphi, as there is no hope to reconstruct the phrase from which it came, but it would be possible to point out that sometime, somewhere, in the religious language of Cyrenaica a form Károphi existed and shared with Homer, but not with Linear B, the new voyelle de liaison -o-.

More recently in Hesperia 35 (1966) 323ff. D. W. Braden has edited a fragment found at Nemea of a treaty between Argos and Cleonae written in Doric koina towards the end of the third century B.C. Once more, as in the Boeotian inscription of Tanagra, the names of the people concerned are to be written on stone and a broken sentence reads: --- ἄνδρα πατροφιστὶ τῶμ μασεσου[ε]υν---

*) Quaderni di Archeologia della Libia 45 (1961), p. 46ff., No. 26 (fig. 43) = SEG XX 756: according to the editor the inscription is written in "lettura molto ausilcia", SEG dates it tentatively to the fourth century B.C., but Pugliese Carratelli firmly states that "l'epigrafe e' databile al principio del secolo scorso" (cf. Maia, 16, 1964, 105f.).

Glotta XLVII 1/4
Thus we gain a new adverb πατρόφι to be compared in function, if not in origin, with the Attic πατρόθεν and the later πατριστι, πατριστι.

4. We have seen how Solmsen reconstructed from ἐπιπατρόφεν an earlier expression *ἐπί πατρόφι; πατροφιστι now brings us a step further. It looks in fact as if the productive Hellenistic ending -στι were added to an original *πατρόφι, which was no longer understood. -στι adverbs are frequent in this period and such possible models as ὄνωματι, πατριστι etc. can be compared. But this may help to explain the Boeotian phrase: it now becomes conceivable that *ἐπί πατρόφι is not the original formula but only the last-but-one stage in our reconstructed sequence. We can now think of an original *πατρόφι re-characterized by the preposition ἐπί in the same way as Homer’s and Ibycus’ σών ὥστερι replaces the original ὥστερι (still attested in the epos)\textsuperscript{10}, or as in Hellenistic prose ἐπὶ ὄνωθεν replaces an earlier ὄνωθεν\textsuperscript{11}.

Solmsen had compared his reconstructed *ἐπί πατρόφι with Attic πατρόθεν, Cretan ἐπί πατρός and the Attic and Ionic constructions καλεῖν καλείσθαι, ὄνωμα ἐπικαλεῖν ἔχειν ἐπί τινος “to call somebody after somebody else”, and had concluded that both the -φι case and the prepositional genitive here had an ablative origin and meaning. This is in itself doubtful and did not deserve the acceptance which it received in all the standard grammars of Greek\textsuperscript{12}, but in any case it is now irrelevant for our interpretation of *πατρόφι. In the Nemea inscription πατροφιστι must have meant something like “fatherwise”; probably *πατρόφι was originally taken to have the same meaning. The problem now becomes: how does this fit in with the semantic value or values of the -φι case?

\textsuperscript{10} In Homeric and classical Greek the function of the comitative is usually assumed by a proposition followed by the dativus, but expressions like the Homeric ἔποι ἐνδοιαν ὥστερι (e. g. in II. 11.698) are an exception. In Mycenaean the -φι case is often used with a comitative function.

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. Lejeune, Les adverbes grecs en -θεν, Bordeaux, 1939, 178f. and 400f.

\textsuperscript{12} Brugmann, Gr. Gr. 506 and Schwzyzer-Debrunner, Gr. Gr. II 471 do not seem to have any doubt, but Debrunner (loc. cit.) points out that „washalb ἐπι συμ Abl. tritt [in *ἐπί πατρόφι], ist dort [in Solmsen’s article] nicht gefragt“. Probably Solmsen has given too much importance to πατρόθεν, a propos of which Lejeune (op. cit. in note 11, p. 155) notices that the ablative meaning is “moins apparent dans des emplois traditionnels comme πατρόθεν ‘en ligne paternelle’ et surtout comme ὄνωμα πατρόθεν ‘patronyme’ (expression déjà formulaire, semble-t-il, à l’époque homérique).
5. First of all, it is unlikely that the question of the grammatical number can be discussed here in any fruitful way: a number of languages are apt to show some ambiguity in phrases of the type “they mentioned their name” or “names”, “their father” or “fathers”; plural and singular are interchangeable\(^{13}\)). When we find it, \(\*\piατρόφι\) is already a stereotyped formula with an almost adverbial meaning. It is impossible to say if, when it was first used, it was taken as singular or as a plural, and no such attempt should be made. Solmsen’s interpretation is based exclusively on the rather dubious parallel with the Dreros inscription and does not have any reliable evidence in its favour.

Our next task will be to try to reconstruct the phrase in which \(\*\piατρόφι\) first acquired its adverbial meaning. An expression of the type \(\*\piαλείν\) τίνα \(\deltaνομα\) \(\piατρόφι\) or \(\deltaνομα\) \(\piαρό\) \(\piατρόφι\) is likely to have fulfilled this function, though of course the exact words cannot be guessed. We should not confuse this type—as Solmsen did—with that of κεκλησθαυ \(\varepsilonπι\) \(\tauινος\). In our case the person in question is not “called after his father”, because he or she does not necessarily have the same name as the father. If so, what can have been the original meaning of our hypothetical phrases? The answer is immediate, if we do not object to giving to the -\(\varphiι\) case its primary function, that of instrumental and comitative. With this in mind, we can simply paraphrase: “to call somebody with his father” or “to name somebody with his father”\(^{14}\)). \(\*\piατρόφι\) is here on the borderline between two or three of the values which we (rather artificially) attribute to the instrumental case: comitative, genuine instrumental, and instrumental of accompanying circumstances. For the first and perhaps the last functions, it is possible to think of phrases such as e. g. “to mention John’s name and with [the name of] his father”: cf. once more the Homeric ἵπποι αὐτοίας

\(^{13}\) For some Greek examples compare the Homeric instances quoted in Monro, Hom. Gramm.*, 1891, 159 and in particular Π. 3.325 νεσ θεον εν γνοιν και τ' \(\deltaνομα\) μαθησαμεν and Π. 17.280 των \(\delta\'\)\'αλων τις θεν... \(\deltaνομα\) ετποι. In the latter example it is, of course, possible to read \(\deltaνομα\) Είμποι with Monro, but the texts, as it stands, is grammatically correct.

διόσαρν (e. g. II. 11. 698) “horses with their carriage”. For the second the IE (and Greek) use of the Instrumental with the word ‘name’ provides a good parallel 15).

6. A difficulty remains: on this interpretation *πατρόφι must have a pregnant meaning and must carry the sense “with [the name of] his father”. Is this possible? The answer is positive. This is nothing else than a special case of the so-called persona pro re construction, which appears sporadically in a number of languages, ancient and modern. Cf. Vedic rathām kam cid ... anyam aomad rīṣeḥ (RV i 129, 9) “you may ruin any chariot other than us” [i. e. “ours”]; Latin quis est qui possit ... conferre vitam Treboni cum Dolabella (Cic. Ph. 11, 9) i. e. cum vita Dolabellae 16). Closer parallels are provided by Greek itself. In an inscription of the second century B.C. 17) we read, within the space of a few lines

a) τοις δὲ βουλομένως ... ἀπογράφεσθαι ... τά τε αὐτῶν ὀνόματα καὶ ἥς ἀν δῶν φυλῆς

b) ἀπογράφεσθωσαν δὲ καὶ οὖτοι καὶ ἥς ἀν δῶν φυλῆς

c) δοσὶ δ' ἀν ἐπάχωσιν γνώκες καὶ τέκνα, ἀπογράφειν αὗτοις καὶ τά τοῦτων ὀνόματα. An even more convincing example from a much earlier period is offered by πατρόθεν itself. A propos of this adverb, attested from Homer onwards, the Thesaurus acutely notices (s. v.): “saepe autem accipitur pro Denominative a patre: si ita lecet loqui, ut adverbiurn reddatur adverbo, et quidem cum periphrasi, quum aloqui πατρόθεν sonet q. d. Paternitus: quoque dicendum potius De nomine patris” (my italics). Here at least πατήρ

15) Cf. Delbrück, Vgl. Syntax, I 272ff., and to the Germanic, Slavonic, Lituanian, Skt., Greek and Latin examples quoted add now Tocharian: see W. Thomas, IF 72 (1967), 58ff. and especially 61ff. For Hittite see KBo V 11 I 6f.: ḫa-[a] kan ḫa [at-ti] li lam-ni-ît ḫal-ši-ša-i “...calls them by name”, where in fact lam-ni-ît refers to the professional titles, mentioned in the following lines. The ‘Nennfunktion’ of the Instrumental is discussed in detail by H. Seiler, Relativsatz, Attribut u. Apposition, Wiesbaden 1960, 143ff. (with the previous litterature). 16) I have borrowed these examples from J. Gonda, op. cit. (note 14), pp. 55—57, to which I refer for a most interesting discussion of the subject. Strictly speaking the Latin example quoted should come under the heading of comparatio compendiaria (see Kühner-Gerth, Gr. Gr. II, 2, 310ff.) and not of persona pro re, but I find it difficult to see how such a distinction can be relevant in this case. 17) Dittenberger SIG* 633 11. 45—66 (from Miletus). For other examples see Dittenberger’s indexes, s. vv. ἀπογράφω, ἀναγράφω etc.
can be used for "father's name": once more this phenomenon is not limited to Greek. When establishing the procedure to be followed in a census, the Tabula Heracleensis states 18): "... corumque nominae prae-nominae patres aut patronos tribus cognomina et quot annos quisque eorum habet et rationem pecuniae ex formule census... ab eis iuratois accipito...". Here too patres 'stands for' nomina patrum 18).

7. To sum up: the new evidence makes it unlikely that we can reconstruct for Greek an expression *eipì patoròfì in which *patoròfì has a singular and ablative meaning. It is more probable that both épatoròfon and patoròfì are formed on an earlier *patoròfì with its archaic meaning of comitative and/or instrumental. It is impossible to establish if the form was initially used as plural or as singular. The conclusion is that from a syntactical point of view the epigraphical evidence for the -φì case adds little or nothing to what we already knew from Linear B.

Morphologically the problem is different. In the case of Boeotian épatoròfow the phonetic interpretation was doubtful. It was possible to isolate an -o-element inserted between the stem πατο- and the ending -φì, but it was also possible to assume that -ο- represented the Aeolic treatment of *rì in *πατο-φì. Now the presence of -ο- in a non Aeolic dialect makes this second hypothesis less plausible. Moreover an -o-element is also attested in KAPOΦI, where there is no other possible interpretation 20). We might wish for better and more conclusive evidence, but the data that we have at present suggest that the "epigraphical" -φì is joined to the stem by an -o-element. We know that this is a post-Mycenaean innovation; we also know that such an innovation could hardly have taken place if the -φì ending had not been extended previously to

18) Tab. Her. = Bruns 18, Dessau 6085, Ricoebono 13 (ll. 146 ff.). I am grateful to my husband J. K. Davies for this quotation.

19) The text of the Tab. Her. may be compared with the version (more prolix, but linguistically more explicit) of Dionysus of Halicarnassus, Ant. Rom. IV 15 6: ... πατέρων τε ὑπὲρ γράφωντας καὶ ἠλικῶν ἃν ἔχονα δηλοῦντας γυναικῶν τε καὶ παιδάς ὑμὸρφοντας καὶ ἐν τίνι κατιοκοῦσιν ἐκαστὸν τῆς πόλεως (φιλή) ἡ πάγη τῆς χώρας προστίθεντας.

20) I am aware, of course, that in Argolis *πατέρωφì could have been a Mycenaean form preserved in the local dialect as an archaism, but I do not find this very likely, inter alia because I do not think that in Mycenaean *rì would yield -ro- after a dental (see my article on "The treatment of r and l in Mycenaean and Arcado-Cyprian" in Atti e memorie del Primo Congresso Int. di Micenologia", Rome 1968, II, 791—812).
the thematic declension. This has some implications for the spoken language of the post-Linear B period. After Linear B the -φι case not only survived for some time outside the epic dialect, but was also extended to the thematic declension. Further than this we cannot go.

Michael Wittwer

Über die kontrastierende Funktion des griechischen Suffixes -τερος

Von Michael Wittwer, Brühl

Vorwort


Nun sind seit langem einige Adjektive bekannt, die mit -τερος gebildet sind und wie Komparative aussehen, aber keine komparatistische Bedeutung haben. In den Grammatiken werden diese Fälle im allgemeinen zutreffend als Adjektive mit kontrastierender Bedeutung erklärt, doch entsteht dabei der Eindruck, es handle sich um Ausnahmen oder vereinzelte Überreste eines alten Sprachzustandes. Ich werde versuchen, anhand zahlreicher Belege nachzuweisen, daß das Suffix im Griechischen von Homer durch die klassische Zeit bis in die Spätantike hinein die Fähigkeit, Kontrast-adjektive zu bilden, nicht verlor.

Auch im Altindischen geht der kontrastierende Gebrauch von -taraḥ (= gr. τερος) über den Bereich lokaler und temporaler Bil-