

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Epigraphical -φλ

Author(s): Anna Morpurgo-Davies

Source: *Glotta*, 47. Bd., 1./4. H. (1969), pp. 46-54

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40266075>

Accessed: 23/10/2013 08:21

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>

seems to have lost further ground and by historic times *qa/aq* reflexes are established in all the aeolic dialects, while *qo* 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 *ψόμμος* and *οἶτος* for *ψάμμος* and **αἶτός*.

Furthermore in lesbian and Kymaian reduction of *ι* and *ε* (in the latter only) to *ῑ* produced a secondary *ʀ* which became *εʀ* (in combination with the following *ῑ*, *εʀʀ*).

In arkadian, but not in cypriot, several words in *-ρα-*, *γράφω*, *στρατός* and *θρασύς* were imported into the dialect from doric. There is no evidence to suggest that **στῆτος*, **γῆρβο* or **δῆρσος* 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 *κρέτης*. It seems that in cypriot some zero grades were reformed on the analogy of cognates in *TRET* as *qo*.

Although some smaller questions of dialectal treatments are not clearly answerable, the general picture of the treatment of *ʀ*, *ʀ̄* 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 Arcaido-cypriot have a different treatment from any other dialect, while Ionic has its own peculiar treatment of *mʀ*, *mʀ̄*.

Epigraphical -φι

By ANNA MORPURGO-DAVIES, Oxford

1. There is considerable divergence between Linear B and Homer in the form and meaning of the so-called *-φι* case. The evidence has been studied in detail by Lejeune¹): here it will be

¹) La désinence *-φι* en mycénien, BSL 52 (1957), 170—201 = Mémoires de Philologie mycénienne, Paris 1958, 159ff. On Homeric *-φι* 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 *-φι* is restricted to the athematic and *-α*-declensions, such restrictions does not apply to Homer. Moreover, in Linear B *-φι* is joined directly to the noun stem, while Homer often interposes an *-ο*-element between stem and ending. Syntactically, the usage is even more divergent. In Linear B almost all, if not all, *-φι* forms are plural in meaning²), while Homer uses *-φι* both for the singular and the plural; in Linear B *-φι* is used in a locative and instrumental function, while in Homer *-φι* 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 B³), 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 *-φι* found in lyric poetry. Ibycus' *σὸν ὄχεσφι* (fr. 6 Page = 7 Diehl) is too Homeric to count as independent evidence, and though his *Ἀεβναφινερός* (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 (!) *ὠρανόφι* of Alcman (fr. 28 Page = 48 Diehl). Even if the text were correct — which is by no means certain — and if *ὠρανόφι* 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 Micenologia", Roma 1968, II, 764—780. I am more conservative than Doria in my interpretation of the *-φι* case and I should not like to follow him when he finds in Mycenaean some *-φι* 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-wo-u-pi*, 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, op. 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 dialect⁴).

2. In 1956/57 Lejeune⁵) was obliged to conclude that the only non literary evidence for *-φι* was to be found in the Boeotian phrase . . . τὸ ὄνομα κῆ ἐπιπατρόφιον . . . “name and patronymic” found in a Tanagra inscription of the third century B. C.⁶). 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 *ἐπι πατρόφι, comparable in meaning with Attic πατρόθεν⁸) and in form with Cretan ἐπι πατρός of the Dreros inscription IC I IX 1.120f. As for *πατρόφι, we should have in it, according to Solmsen, a *-φι* form with an ablative 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 Solmsen 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 (Alcman, the Partheneion, Oxford 1951, 127) ὠρανίαφι 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 Alcman, Tokio 1937, 28f.

⁵) op. cit. (in note 1). For a correct assessment of the value of Hesychius’ *-φι* forms see Lejeune *ibid.* The Cyprian forms quoted by Meister and others (e. g. Schwyzler, Gr. Gr., I, 551) are now doubted by Masson, Inscr. Chypr. Syll., No. 318, and especially, *Živa Antika* 15 (1966), 259.

⁶) REG 12 (1899), p. 72 line 28 (cf. Schwyzler DGE 462). The verb preceding the phrase is doubtful, but in lines 29/30 ἀνγράφῃ τὰ ὀνόματα [κῆ ἐπιπατρόφια is certain.

⁷) Felix Solmsen, *᾽Ονομα κῆ ἐπιπατρόφιον*, Rh. Mus. N.F. 56 (1901), 475—77; cf. Schwyzler-Debrunner, Gr. Gr. I 551, II 471.

⁸) e. g. in Plato, Legg. 753c . . . γράψαντα τοῦνομα πατρόθεν καὶ φυλῆς καὶ δήμου ὀπόθεν ἂν δημοτεύηται.

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 *-φι* 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 Cyrenaica⁹⁾. The only word inscribed reads *ΚΑΡΟΦΙ*: 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 (*Δάματρος, Δαμ[άτ]ερος, Ἀπόλλων, Κωρής*). It seems reasonable to follow the editor, who compares *Κάροφι* with the name of the *Κῆρες* and recognizes in it a *-φι* case. What is its meaning? As for the number, it is impossible to establish if the dedicator thought of one or more *Κῆρες*, 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 *Κάροφι*, if it is in fact connected with *Κῆρες*, is a form extracted from an archaic religious formula, probably not understood any more and used by somebody who did not have *-φι* in his normal spoken language. If this were so, it would be vain to discuss the original meaning of *Κάροφι*, 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 *Κάροφι* existed and shared with Homer, but not with Linear B, the new *voyelle de liaison* *-ο-*.

More recently in *Hesperia* 35 (1966) 323ff. D. W. Bradeen 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: --- *ὄνδ[]ματα πατροφισι τῶμ παρεσομ[έ]ν[ων]---*

⁹⁾ Quaderni di Archeologia della Libia 45 (1961), p. 46f., No. 26 (fig. 43) = SEG XX 756: according to the editor the inscription is written in "lettere molto antiche", SEG dates it tentatively to the fourth century B. C., but Pugliese Carratelli firmly states that "l'epigrafe e' databile al principio del sesto secolo" (cf. Maia, 16, 1964, 105f.).

(1.5). Thus we gain a new adverb *πατροφιστί* to be compared in function, if not in origin, with the Attic *πατρόθεν* and the later *πατριαστί*, *πατριστί*.

4. We have seen how Solmsen reconstructed from *ἐπιπατρόφιον* an earlier expression **ἐπι πατρόφι*; *πατροφιστί* now brings us a step further. It looks in fact as if the productive Hellenistic ending *-στί* were added to an original **πατρόφι*, which was no longer understood. *-στί* adverbs are frequent in this period and such possible models as *ὀνομαστί*, *πατριστί* etc. can be compared. But this may help to explain the Boeotian phrase: it now becomes conceivable that **ἐπι 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' *σὸν ὄχεσφι* replaces the original *ὄχεσφι* (still attested in the epos)¹⁰, or as in Hellenistic prose *ἀπ' ἄνωθεν* replaces an earlier *ἄνωθεν*¹¹.

Solmsen had compared his reconstructed **ἐπι πατρόφι* with Attic *πατρόθεν*, Cretan *ἐπι πατρός* and the Attic and Ionic constructions *καλεῖν καλεῖσθαι*, *ὄνομα ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχειν ἐπί τινος* "to call somebody after somebody else", and had concluded that both the *-φι* case and the prepositional genitive here had an ablatival origin and meaning. This is in itself doubtful and did not deserve the acceptance which it received in all the standard grammars of Greek¹²), but in any case it is now irrelevant for our interpretation of **πατρόφι*. In the Nemea inscription *πατροφιστί* 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?

¹⁰) In Homeric and classical Greek the function of the comitative is usually assumed by a preposition followed by the dative, but expressions like the Homeric *ἵπποι ἀντοῖσιν ὄχεσφι* (e. g. in *Il.* 11.698) are an exception. In Mycenaean the *-φι* case is often used with a comitative function.

¹¹) Cf. Lejeune, *Les adverbes grecs en -θεν*, Bordeaux, 1939, 178f. and 400f.

¹²) Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* 506 and Schwyzler-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* II 471 do not seem to have any doubt, but Debrunner (loc. cit.) points out that „weshalb *ἐπι* zum Abl. tritt [*in *ἐπι 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 ablatival meaning is "moins apparent dans des emplois traditionnels comme *πατρόθεν* 'en ligne paternelle' et surtout comme *ὄνομα 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 interchangeable¹³). When we find it, **πατρόφι* 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 **πατρόφι* first acquired its adverbial meaning. An expression of the type **καλεῖν τινα ὄνομα πατρόφι* or *ὀνομάζειν τινά πατρόφι* 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 *κεκλησθῆναι ἐπὶ τινος*. 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 *-φι* 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). **πατρόφι* 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 *ἔπειοι αὐτοῖσιν*

¹³) For some Greek examples compare the Homeric instances quoted in Monro, *Hom. Gramm.*², 1891, 159 and in particular *Il.* 3.325 *ὄς κεν ἐν γνώην καὶ τ’ὄνομα μνησαίμην* and *Il.* 17.260 *τῶν δ’ἄλλων τίς κεν . . . ὀνόματ’ εἶποι*. In the latter example it is, of course, possible to read *ὄνομα Φείποι* with Monro, but the texts, as it stands, is grammatically correct.

¹⁴) The absence of the possessive adjective or pronoun does not cause any difficulty and is common in ancient IE languages: see Schwyzler-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* II, 200 and especially J. Gonda, *Ellipsis, Brachylogy and other Forms of Brevity in Speech in the R̥gVeda*, Amsterdam 1960 (*Verh. Kon. Ned. Ak. v. Wet., Afd. Lett., N. R.* LXVII, No. 4), 32f.

ὄχεσφιν (e. g. Il. 11.698) “horses with their carriage”. For the second the IE (and Greek) use of the Instrumental with the word ‘name’ provides a good parallel¹⁵).

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 *ratham kam cid . . . anyam asmad ririseh* (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) τοὺς δὲ βουλομένους . . . ἀπογράφεσθαι . . . τὰ τε αὐτῶν ὀνόματα
καὶ ἧς ἂν ὦσιν φυλῆς

b) ἀπογραφέσθωσαν δὲ καὶ οὔτοι καὶ ἧς ἂν ὦσιν φυλῆς

c) ὅσοις δ' ἂν ὑπάρχωσιν γυναῖκες καὶ τέκνα, ἀπογράφειν αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ τούτων 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 liceat loqui, ut adverbium reddatur adverbio, et quidem cum periphrasi, quum alioqui *πατρόθεν* sonet q. d. Paternitus: *pro quo dicendum potius De nomine patris*” (my italics). Here at least *πατήρ*

¹⁵) Cf. Delbrück, Vgl. Syntax, I 272ff., and to the Germanic, Slavonic, Lituianian, 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.: LÚI.DU₈-ma-as-kan ha-[at-ti]-li lam-ni-it hal-zi-iš-ša-i “. . . calls them by name”, where in fact *lam-ni-it* 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, 143 ff. (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 compendiaris* (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 SIG³ 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): "... eorumque nomina praenomina patres aut patronos tribus cognomina et quot annos quisque eorum habet et rationem pecuniae ex formula census ... ab eis iurateis accipito ...". Here too *patres* 'stands for' *nomina patrum* ¹⁹).

7. To sum up: the new evidence makes it unlikely that we can reconstruct for Greek an expression *ἐπι πατρόφι in which *πατρόφι has a singular and ablatival meaning. It is more probable that both ἐπιπατρόφιον and πατροφιστί are formed on an earlier *πατρόφι 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 -φι case adds little or nothing to what we already knew from Linear B.

Morphologically the problem is different. In the case of Boeotian ἐπιπατρόφιον the phonetic interpretation was doubtful. It was possible to isolate an -ο- element inserted between the stem πατρ- and the ending -φι, but it was also possible to assume that -ρο- represented the Aeolic treatment of *r̥ in *πατρ-φι. Now the presence of -ρο- in a non Aeolic dialect makes this second hypothesis less plausible. Moreover an -ο- element is also attested in ΚΑΡΟΦΙ, 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' -φι is joined to the stem by an -ο- element. We know that this is a post-Mycenaean innovation; we also know that such an innovation could hardly have taken place if the -φι ending had not been extended previously to

¹⁸) *Tab. Her.* = Bruns 18, Dessau 6085, Riccobono 13 (ll. 146ff.). 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 ὧν εἰσι γράφοντας καὶ ἡλικίαν ἣν ἔχουσι δηλοῦντας γυναικᾶς τε καὶ παῖδας ὀνομάζοντας καὶ ἐν τίνι κατοικοῦσιν ἕκαστοι τῆς πόλεως (φυλῆ) ἢ πάγῳ τῆς χώρας προστιθέντας.

²⁰) I am aware, of course, that in Argolis *πατρόφι 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 *r̥ would yield -ro- after a dental (see my article on "The treatment of r̥ and l̥ 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.

Über die kontrastierende Funktion des griechischen Suffixes *-τερος*

VON MICHAEL WITTWER, Brühl

Vorwort

In dieser Arbeit soll das griechische Suffix *-τερος* hinsichtlich seiner kontrastierenden Bedeutung untersucht werden. Dieses Suffix wird auch zur Bildung von Komparativen verwendet, worauf ich nicht ausführlich eingehe; hierfür sei auf die einschlägigen Handbücher verwiesen (s. Literaturverzeichnis). Historisch betrachtet ist diese Funktion von *-τερος* sekundär, in primärer Funktion begegnet es als Bildungselement meist lokaler und temporaler Adverbien und Adjektive sowie einiger Pronomina, in denen ein Gegensatz ausgedrückt werden soll, e. g. *πρότερος*, *ὑστερος*, *δεξιτερός*, *ἀριστερός*, *πότερος*, *ἡμέτερος*, *ὕμετερος*. Diese Bedeutung erweist sich durch ihre weite Verbreitung in den indogermanischen Sprachen als alt. Die Funktion des Suffixes, Komparative zu bilden, ist dagegen eine Besonderheit des Griechischen und Indoiranischen.

Nun sind seit langem einige Adjektive bekannt, die mit *-τερος* gebildet sind und wie Komparative aussehen, aber keine komparative 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, Kontrastadjektive zu bilden, nicht verlor.

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