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Dear Professor Palmer,

This volume comes to you on your seventieth birthday together with the warmest wishes of all those who contributed to it. They would have been far more numerous if the editors had not had to yield to practical considerations and had not steeled themselves—however reluctantly—to be ruthless. As it is—and in spite of its 46 articles—the volume must only be a token of gratitude rather than a true return for the many books and articles which you have donated in the past to the scholarly world and which you continue to produce with unfailing regularity.

Your scholarly career led you among ever increasing honours from Cardiff to Cambridge, to Vienna, to Manchester, to London, to Oxford, and now back again to Austria. It seemed appropriate that these Studies should appear as a joint enterprise sponsored by the two countries which have most profited by your presence and your work and which have provided the necessary background for them. From 1971 Oxford’s loss has been Innsbruck’s gain, but more than forty years ago your scholarly work first started to bear fruit in Vienna, in close contact with such leading Greek specialists as P. Kretschmer and L. Rademacher and such a revolutionary linguist as N. Trubetzkoy. From Vienna you brought back to England first and foremost a wife, a remarkable scholar in her own right, but also that degree of expertise and maturity which soon allowed you to write your first two books; it may not be chance that one of them discussed the principles of modern linguistics and the other was concerned with post-Ptolemaic Greek. Now in Innsbruck your two latest books are completed or are about to be completed; once more the first deals with the principles of linguistics and the second with Greek, but while one embraces both synchronic and diachronic linguistics, the other tackles the whole history of ancient Greek. There has been no return to old work and old ideas, but progress and development.

In the meanwhile the flow of books and articles has been continuous. Shorter works have made important contributions to classical and Indo-European philology or to the study of such recondite languages as Hieroglyphic Luwian. The Latin Language has given students in Britain and elsewhere a chance to see that the classical languages are not monolithic units governed by unassailable rules, but have a history of their own which is nothing but enthralling for anyone who is led to it by the right guide. The more specialized work on Linear B into which you threw yourself in the early fifties with the humble devotion of a neophyte but the
Dedication

sharpness and the expertise of a leading scholar soon made you into a world authority in this field, most often admired, frequently imitated, sometimes disliked because of your devastating habit of being right so often—never ignored. Then came archaeology. Suddenly we learnt that the Oxford Professor of Comparative Philology was no longer content with the study of language. This had led him to results which could only be supported or invalidated on the basis of archaeological evidence: never did archaeology have a more eager or enthusiastic student. This time your results were so different and so revolutionary that they became known even outside the scholarly world. In Oxford even shop assistants were eager to meet Professor Palmer 'the archaeologist'. The scholarly battle about the chronology of Knossos and its documents still rages, nor is this the place for a bulletin from the front, but no one—on whatever side he is—will deny that much good has come from your courageous attempt to reject all preconceived ideas, to settle nothing for granted, to check all sources with dogged single-mindedness accompanied by sudden flashes of inspiration. Archaeology had to be excluded from these Studies for a very simple reason: if all those whose work had been influenced in one way or another by your own contributions had been invited to write something for it, this volume would have shared the destiny of the biblical loaves and fishes.

You once wrote: 'I have not everywhere been able to conceal the fact that I have opinions of my own'. You will forgive us if we now dare to contradict you. That sentence was an understatement and can only count as a pale approximation to the truth. It is just because you have always had opinions of your own and expressed them with the sharpness, the vigour and the originality of the true scholar that we have wanted to say 'thank you' on this very day, your seventieth birthday.

June 5, 1976

Anna Morpurgo Davies

Wolfgang Meid
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The -σον datives, Acolic -ss-, and the Lesbian poets

'The proportion formula is still indispensable to philological theory'.
L. R. Palmer

1. It is well known that in the athematic declension Greek replaced the original ending of the dative plural (*-bb-|-ms- |) by the ending of the locative plural1. The forms in -αα or -αν (φάκαν, etc.) which we know from Attic are in all respects parallel to the thematic forms in -αν(υ) (λάκανυ, etc.), which are originally locatives and which we find attested in early Attic and in a number of dialects. Yet in some dialects the athematic stems have replaced -α with two alternative morphs: -σον, which is found in literary texts (above all Homer and the Acolic poets) and in inscriptions (mostly Acolic), and -οις, which occurs in epigraphical texts from the North-West-Greek dialects. The result is that we have datives like παύσονα and παύσαοι.2 The origin of the -οις forms is clear; they are modelled on the -οις datives of the thematic declension (such as λάκανυ); the origin of the -σον forms is disputed. However, one thing is clear: the 'success story' of both endings is due to the fact that they both began with a vowel. The earlier -α occurred in consonantal clusters which were not admitted in Greek, so that when normal sound rules operated, the regularity of the paradigm was altered (cf. Attic λάκονα from *λεωντων + αι). No such problems were created by -σον or -οις.

2. We must now explain the origin of -σον. Two theories have been formulated. According to the first -σον originated in the -σα stems (γέρσα, εύγερσα, etc.) where it was etymologically justified (Dat.-Los. pl. γέρσα, εύγερσα, etc.) and from there it spread analogically to other stems of the athematic declension. This explanation, which is at least as old as Bopp's Vergleichende Grammatik3, was strongly criticized by Wackernagel at the beginning of this century4. He pointed out that in the early history of the -σα stems the -σον dative or locative plural corresponded to an -ες dative or locative singular (< *-ss + ι) and to an -οις genitive plural.

---

1 This paper has been a long time in the making — largely because I could not solve or even see clearly some of the general questions which it raises. Earlier versions were read in the United States at the invitation of the Department of Classics, Harvard University and the Department of Linguistics, Yale University, and in England at the Mycenaean Seminar of the Institute of Classical Studies, University of London. If the paper is now less faulty and above all less incomprehensible than it originally was this is no doubt due to the discussions which followed these occasions. Henry Hoenigswald and Andrew Gooden also read an earlier draft and pointed out obscurities, mistakes and omissions; I am grateful to them both.

2 For the origin and diffusion of the -οις datives see M. Lejano, Observations sur la langue des actes d'affranchissement délideques, Paris 1940, 129—31 (with the earlier literature).
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If so, we should accept Wackenagel's point, since it is impossible to see how a morph -ΣΑΙΣ could be segmented in the -Σ stems. On the other hand Wackenagel's own proportion would not fit within this definition: according to his hypothesis -ΣΑΙΣ is an entirely new creation. The discussion could — and should — carry us very far, but it is unlikely to help us solve the very concrete problem from which we started, and I turn now to some more factual observations.

3. A few words should be dedicated to the evidence for -ΣΑΙΣ and its distribution.

The earliest texts from which dative of the -ΣΑΙΣ type are known are the Homeriac poems, to which -ΣΑΙΣ offers a convenient metrical doublet for the inherited -Σ. Outside Homer and outside the poetic language influenced by him, -ΣΑΙΣ occurs in Sapphine poetry, in Corinna, and in the epigraphical evidence from the three Acolic dialects (Boeotian, Thessalian and Acolic of Asia Minor). Examples (though of a more sporadic nature) are also found in NWG inscriptions from Continental Greece, in the inscriptions of the colonies of Cunth, at Corone and in Parmynhia. There is almost general agreement that in Homer — and in the poetic language in general — -ΣΑΙΣ is an Acolic feature. If so, clues for the origin of -ΣΑΙΣ should be looked for in the proper domain of the ending, viz. the Acolic dialects, and the Homeriac evidence, though chronologically earlier, should take second place in comparison with that of the Acolic dialects and the Acolic inscriptions. We must ignore at this stage the sporadic instances of epigraphical -ΣΑΙΣ outside Acolic; they raise a problem which cannot be tackled here. We are then led to consider the earliest evidence available for the Acolic dialects, that offered by the language of Sappho and Alcaeus.

2.1. In the works of the Lesbian poets we find, as expected of other dative (like -ΣΑΙΩΝ) as well as a certain number of -Σ datives (like -ΣΟΝ). The

257—258. It seems to me that in spite of the earlier hopes generative grammars (including generative phonology) has not solved all the problems and in particular has not been able to determine what causes morphological reduplication and what determines the choice of one type of segmentation rather than another. Similarly the conditions under which rule generalization and rule simplification occur do not seem to be as much clearer than they were in the past; for an illustration of some of these problems see K. Hale in Current Trends in Linguistics, vol. 11, The Hague 1973, 401 ff.

I have discussed the more general problems in my Collitz lecture on "Analogy and Greek" presented to the Summer Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America in Tampa (Florida) on 25 July 1976. The interesting point is that if we accept Wackenagel's hypothesis of a general law such as Greek as it were an agglutinative language which created a new morph of plural by adding a preceding morph (already endowed with the meaning of the noun), plus a morph. I hope to show in the published version of my lecture that this is not a unique case and that Wackenagel's suggestion cannot be rejected on this ground.

The basic evidence for these datives in the Homeriac poems has been collected by K. Wits, Ostraka 5 (1914), 48—57.

This was disputed by K. Strunk in his somewhat iconoclastic thesis about the Aeolicia of the Homeriac language (Die olympausen Aeolischen der homerischen Sprache, Diss. Köl n 1967, 72 ff.), but see P. Walthoel, Les traits d'acents dans la langue de l'epoque grecque, Rome 1970, 382 ff.

Most recent evidence for these datives in the Homeriac poems has been discussed by P. Wathoel, op. cit., 288 ff. and especially by D. L. Garcia Ramón, "El llamado sustantivo Bélico, Revisión critica", Cuadernos de Filología Clásica 5 (1973), 390 ff.
latter create a problem in themselves, but need not concern us here. More important is that whenever we have a dative plural of an -στεί helmet type, this never ends in -στει but always ends in -στει. The evidence is not plentiful and it may be
opportune to tabulate it here; if nothing is stated the trochaic quantity of -στει and the pyrrhic quantity of -στει are guaranteed by the metre; a question mark indicates that the metre is not sufficient to establish the quantity.

1. -στει dative:

a) Skepsi: 2, 14 κυλίσεσθαι; 31, 11 ἁρπάσται; 64 (4) Σέλευκους (1); 70, 13 οἰκονομοῖ (1); 96, 6—7 γυναικεῖον.

β) Αλκιβιάδης: 235 (15) άργος; 208 (α) ἱδί 6 μεμβρανήσθαι; 385 νέωσθαι (1);
Sappho, 222, 20 Σέλευκος (1)

κ) ἵον ευδ. 16, 1 πόλεσθαι; 21 ἄρχεται; 22 Αρεσκέως (1)

2. -στει dative:

a) Sakhi: 2, 10 ἀνάκει; 31, 6 στείλεσθαι; 106 (c) ἕνα; 120 στείλεσθαι (1); 158 στείλεσθαι;

b) Alkibiades: 10 Β 5 στέλεσθαι; 30, 6 ενεργεῖσθαι; 283, 3 στείλεσθαι.

The distinction between the -στει ending of the athematic stems and the -στει endings of the -στει stems was first observed by Lobel in 1954,28 after that at least one new example of -στει (Σάλος) in Sappho has confirmed Lobel’s rule. The figures are not large but the pattern is entirely consistent and calls for an explanation.

3.2. If, as is usually assumed, we argue that -στει is the only correct Lesbian form both for the athematic declension in general and for the -στει stems in particular, we have to explain how -στει came to appear in the text of the Lesbian poets in connection with the -στει stems only. Error of xoribés or trivialization of grammarians are excluded by the metre. We may look for support or otherwise in the epigraphical evidence of the Aedolic dialects, but as we shall see, this is relatively unhelpful.

3.3. Aedolic dialects offer ample epigraphic evidence for the -στει dative of the common athematic stems (ἐξώστεια νοτίωστεια etc.),29 but the position is different for

28 For the evidence E. M. Hamann, Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios, Berlin 1928, 149 f. V. Wachtelt, op. cit., 327 follows J. Kastek—Zawadzki, De SapphoCat Alcideaque eloquentia coloris epici, Wrocław 1934, 46 f. in arguing that these forms are ago borrowings, but I am not persuaded by the argument that the presence of the ny ephklision indicates loan influence (the same phenomenon happens with the -στει dative which the Aedol of Alcides). Is it possible, of course, to interpret these forms as survivals of an earlier stage which preceded the period in which -στει took over completely. I shall argue later that -στει is a common Aedol creation (cf. 4), but I do not want to maintain that the new morph is immediately ousted its predecessor in all types of inflection.

The texts are quoted according to the numeration of E. Lobel and D. Pago, Postquam Lesbiorum Fragmenta, Oxford 1985 and of D. Pago, Supplementum Lyricum Graecum, Oxford 1974 (Sappho). I have also consulted E. M. Voigt, Sappho et Alcione, Fragmenta, Amsterdam 1971.

29 E. Lobel, SAI 90 OT MBEA, Oxford 1925, pp. 1–6. It is worthwhile to quote the passage in extenso: “Dative plurals of neuter stems in -στει, which one might have expected to find in the form -στειν(ι), never have any form but -στει(ι), as far as our present evidence goes. It is, therefore, more reasonable to suppose that all these dative have an original singular -στει (which is never doubled), than they have original double -στει, which is always simplified.” Cf. also Hamann, loc. cit. (in note 12).

30 See e.g. Thun—Scheuer, Handbuch der griech. Dialekte, Heidelberg 1899, vol. 2, 24 (Brockhaus), 58 (Deutsch), 96 (Lesbian). There are odd examples of -στει instead of -στει (cf. e.g. Thun—Scheuer, 58 for Boccard) but they are more likely to be due to

31 For the dative plural of the -στει stems, in Boccean there seems to be no evidence for them, though obviously this may be due to our lack of an up-to-date collection of Boccean inscriptions or to my incompetence in searching through epigraphical publications.31 In the Aecol of Asia Minor (Lesbosis included) there is only one certain instance of a dative plural of an -στει stem: the form τρίκλεωθος attested in a second century inscription from Aecol Kyno (D 20) recently published.32 This evidence should be used with caution; the inscription is written partly in dialect and partly in koiné, but even the dialect parts show some spurious forms (such as τρίκλεωθος, with an hyperaeolism 2) which are obviously artificial. As for τρίκλεωθος, 15 is the first good evidence we have outside Homer for this type of dative — obviously an analogical formation which may be later than the creation of τρίκλεωθος and the like. A rather shaky support for the form comes from an inscription of doubtful date from the region of Troy where τρίκλεωθος could conceivably be restored as τρίκλεωθος.33

Until recently Thessalian seemed to show no evidence for the dative plural of the -στει stems, but we now have an extremely interesting inscription from Metropolis in Histiaeotis, the South-Western part of Thassos.34 The dialect in which the text

32 For Thessalian in general cf. R. van der Volko, Thessalische Dialetknologie, Nijveren.—Utrecht 1924, which is in part outdated, and the list of new inscriptions which is no longer published, by A. S. McDoarst, Inscriptions from Thessaly, Hildesheim 1970. The inscription from Metropolis has been published by B. Holly in RCG 94 (1970), 161—89 (cf. also the preliminary account by D. Theodoris, AD 19 (1964), 266, pl. 307 and the comments by J. and L. Robert, RGG 84 (1971), 440 no. 372).
is written is very different from that of Polagiotis, though it has some points in common with it, but what matters most is that in the second part of the third century B.C., we have actually written on stone a form ἀγγίζων (line 10). In other words we find here for the first time real evidence for the form which according to all text-books is that of the standard Aeolic dative and may be responsible for the creation of the ἀγγίζων type.

It must be obvious by now that the epigraphical evidence does not lead us to an useful generalization: one dialect offers no evidence, one dialect has an -έτος form in a late inscription from an out-of-the-way region, and a third dialect has the -έτος form, which is only paralleled in Homer, and which is certain to be an analogical creation.

3.2.2. We now return to Sappho and Alcaeus. The epigraphical evidence does not help us to establish the "genuineness" or otherwise of the -έτος forms (ἐξάκης etc.) but we have already seen that they cannot be due to a mistake in the tradition. Are we to believe that they are instances of epic influence in the language of the two poets? In my opinion the answer must be negative. In the language of Sappho and Alcaeus epic influence of a phonological or morphological nature seems to occur (1) in well-defined metrical contexts and poetic genre (e.g. in the so-called "abnormal" poems of Sappho) (2) in recognizable formulae which are borrowed from the traditional poetic language; (2) in isolated morphs which alternate with the "correct" Aeolic form and which serve a metrical or stylistic purpose. In the case of the dative (1) it does not seem to be borne out by the texts, (2) certainly does not apply, while the regularity of the morphological fact speaks against (3). If so, we have to acknowledge the genuine character of these forms and we must explore the series of problems which they create. (a) How relevant is the existence of -έτος datives of the -έθος type to the problem of the forms which we started, the origin of the -έτος dative (ἐξάκης etc.)? (b) How do we account for these -έτος forms? (c) How do we explain the presence of both -έτος (Lesbian) and -έτος forms (Thessalian) from the same type of stems in the same group of dialects?

3.3. If ἀγγίζων and the like are "genuine" Lesbian forms it becomes impossible to argue that the -έτος and the like owe their endings to the -έθος type. -έτος cannot have been generalized from forms which ended in -έθος. Obviously it could be argued that ἀγγίζων etc. represent a later development of an earlier ἀγγίζων and that παγέτους was formed at this earlier stage. But if so we would have to explain how it is possible that ἀγγίζων became ἀγγίζω in while παγέτους did not become παγέτους. This would be just conceivable in a Kastengebruch, but does not make sense in terms of the "normal" Lesbian dialect.

It follows that Wackernagel's rejection of the traditional explanation of -έτος is proved to be right. It does not necessitate further that Wackernagel's own explanation of -έτος is correct but in a sense this goes by default. In some 150 years of scholarly work on the subject no other explanation has been suggested and no serious objection
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has been advanced against Wackernagel's theory; in other words, a strong case may be made for it and in what follows we shall proceed on the assumption that -έτος was created in the way suggested by Wackernagel.

4. We have now moved a long way towards a solution of our original problem, but, as we have seen, new questions arise (cf. 3.3). First of all, what is the origin of ἀκρός etc. in Lesbian? According to the communis opinio the expected form is ἀκρός; if we want to argue that ἀκρός does in fact derive from ἀκρός we must assume that at some stage a phonetic change took place and the geminate syllable was simplified (-'.$-$). However this change did not affect the -έθος ending of the exceptional stems so that it cannot have been a permanent feature of Lesbian; it must have been limited in time to a period earlier than that of the creation of -έτος. When was this period? The new -έτος morph predates Homer and is shared by all Aeolic dialects; there seems to be a case for arguing that it is a common Aeolic creation, i.e. that it did not arise independently in Boeotian, Thessalian and Lesbian. It should follow that the change of -έθος to -έτος in the -έθος stems was common Aeolic too. If so, ἀκρός and the like cannot be peculiar to Lesbian but at some stage must have been standard Aeolic formations. We have seen that the epigraphical evidence neither supports nor contradicts this view (provided we can explain the isolated ἀγγίζων from Metropolis in Hesiodos).

4.1. Our conclusion follows from the evidence given, but contradicts the communis opinio which maintains that Aeolic preserved -έθος, as attested in Homer, as the chief evidence for this view. This may be taken as an invitation to caution: before dispensing with the accepted view, we should try to reconsider once more the earlier history of the supposed Aeolic ἀκρός.

4.1.1. Homerian forms like ἀκρός have often been labelled as etymologically justified or inherited since they arise from the addition of a -έθος morph to an -έθος stem. However, there is a sense in which the word 'inherited' may be wrongly used. We

---

28 An objection which is often repeated is that -έτος occurs in dialects which have no -έθος forms, but we have seen (p. 2) that Wackernagel himself has offered the solution to this problem: More serious is the instinctive dislike which one may feel for a type of analogy which treats Greek as if it were an agglutinative language, but see above note 8.

29 Wackernagel's theory has also found some recent support: cf. for instance C. J. Ranz, "Zur Homerischen Grammatik" 14 (1938), 120ff. and the printed summary of L. Gómez-Rivas, B.A. dissertation, Subsístas y superesístas en los dialectos Griegos: Tosónia y el Protocolo, Madrid 1974, 26ff.

30 That the -έτος dative belongs to Common Aeolic is argued among others by P. Wackernagel, op. cit. (note 10), 200ff. I am grateful to Dr. G. Remón for bringing to my attention the summary of his thesis (op. cit. in note 33), where he argues (p. 31) that the creation of -έτος must be later than the separation of Boeotian from Common Aeolic since it was prompted by the loss of certain intervocalic clusters (-έτος etc.) which were still present in Common Aeolic. The point is important and deserves full consideration. Even so, I am not persuaded that Common Aeolic necessarily preserved all consonantal clusters which occurred before the -έθος ending of locative plural. It seems plausible to assume that -έτος was changed into -έτος before Boeotian separated from the other dialects. But this is equally plausible that this is equal plausible that this is equally plausible that this was due to the aspiration of the aspirant consonants of the same series was neutralized before -έτος even in Common Aeolic. If so, even at an early stage there would have been need for a morph which could replace -έτος — though it seems likely that the complete take-over by -έτος happened independently in the individual Aeolic subgroups or dialects.
have some evidence which shows that an original IE *-es- which occurred at a morphemic juncture was already simplified in the parent language itself; correspondences such as Greek εί 'thou art', Velici *ai, OP ahiy, Gathio ahi seem to imply that the expected *es- was simplified to *ei- at an early stage before the Greek change of *-es- to -ei- and the similar Iranian change. On the same grounds we should expect that an original *genesi + *ei was simplified to *genesi at an early stage and traces of this simplification are in fact attested: cf. RV VIII, 4, 14 apadna (from apadha), AV VI, 36, 2 awhass (from whadha) and the equivalent karsha of Avestan. These are no more than traces, but because of this they are all the more significant; the bulk of the Indic-Iranian evidence speaks for an early restoration of *es-. However, it seems probable that Greek inherited from IE forms like *esi (cf. *s) and *genesi or *genesi at a stage which preceded the change of intervocalic -es- to -es- and its later disappearances. If so, there is little doubt that Greek, just like Indo-Iranian, at some stage formed (or re-formed) new -es- clusters at morphemic junctures; not only has Homer ερασι and ἦτο 'thou art', but -es- forms of the future of the verb 'to be' (ερασι) etc. are also attested in the Aecolic dialects and in Doric. Yet, if these forms owe their -es- to restoration or analogical reconstitution there is no reason to suppose that they all arose at the same time; we are not dealing either with the survival of IE *es- or with a sound change from -es- to -es-.

4.1.2. We are now led to consider two alternative possibilities. First, Greek may have inherited *genesi (or *genesi) and kept it until the time in which intervocalic -es- shifted to -ei-. If so, the different dialect groups would have known a form *genesi rather than the supposed *genesi and could have independently restored -es- or even -esi-. Alternatively, it is possible that Greek inherited *genesi or *genesi but immediately restored -es- on the analogy of the other forms of the stem and the other -es- locatives, so that to all intents and purposes we would have to deal in Greek with a form *genesi, as is generally assumed.

The first hypothesis allows us more freedom of movement, but we should remember that even so it cannot account for the discrepancy between the ερασι of the Lesbian poets and the ερασιν of late Thesalian. Whatever form replaced the supposed *genesi in the Aecolic dialects, it must have been common at some stage to the whole of Aecolic, since it is impossible to suppose that the restoration of -es- in the dialects took place independently in e.g. Lesbian and Thesalian. On the other hand, according to this suggestion, there is no need to postulate a change -es- > -ei- in Aecolic (cf. 4. above).

The second hypothesis takes us back to the point from which we started: if Greek at an early stage replaced *genesi with *genesi, Aecolic must have altered *genesi to γενεσι, by simplifying the geminate and this sound change must have taken place before the creation of πανερια and the like (cf. 4. above). A corollary of this view is that we should not expect to find any inherited intervocalic -es- in the Aecolic dialects.


This chronology is of course necessary to explain Ionian-Aetic εί (es > *esi > *chi > *ei).

59 The change of the restoration of -es- could be provided by forms like the Homeric γέος, where *es- was preserved in preaccentual position. That *es- in postvocalic position was altered to -es- has often been disputed, but is now proved by the Mycenaean evidence (see below note 41).
The -σεν dative, Apollo -σε, and the Lesbian poets

4.3.2. Thessalian is more complicated. According to both our reconstructions συγγενέσ is cannot preserve the original form of the dat.-loc. plural of the -σε stems; it must be a new formation. The insertion in which it occurs (see note 19) is unique in its genre, and is the only extant document which gives us some real evidence for the dialect of Hestiaiotis. Unfortunately it is not earlier than the second part of the third century B.C. and it shows a number of peculiarities which make this dialect somewhat remote from the 'standard' Thessalian of e.g. Palagiotis. It would be easy to dispose of συγγενέσ by arguing that it is an hyperpaelologue, i.e. that it does not belong to Thessalian proper but is simply the result of an attempt to write in Thessalian made in a region where the original dialect was different. However, that might too be cavalier an attitude to take and other explanations are possible.

In Thessalian, as in Acolian of Asia Minor, there must have been a period when our reconstructed *geneis represented the only morphological type which had a dative plural ending in -σε rather than in -ση. The tendency to replace it must have been strong. We do not know when and how this tendency was first yielded to, but we may expect that somehow it caused the introduction of -ση into the paradigm of the -σε stems. This may be sufficient for our purposes but we may also want to ask why this tendency did not produce the same result as in Acolian of Asia Minor, viz. the creation of an -ση form. One possible suggestion is that συγγενέσ is not due to straight analogy but to contamination (non proportional analogy) between the expected *-γενεσ and the more numerous -ση forms. Alternatively we may provide a different answer, but in the absence of more definite evidence this is bound to be very speculative.

It is one of the features of Acolian of Asia Minor that -σε is retained in hiatus before another vowel. In Southern Thessalian, on the other hand, -σε either contracted with the following vowel or - - - before -σε and -σε - was raised to - . The same insertion from which we have συγγενέσ also offers θες (< *θεσι), γενέσ (< *γενεσι), and γησια. The exact pronunciation of forms such as those quoted is doubtful but there is a considerable amount of evidence which shows that before a front vowel and before [i] in particular most consonants were palatalized and geminated; the -σε was often absorbed so that spellings of the type ἄροπος (from ἄροπος) were relatively frequent. In the Metropolis inscription we find ἀραπεῖα alongside with ἀραπεῖας and ἀραπεῖα that the phoneme is well documented there too. As far as the -σε stems are concerned, this implies that the inflectional forms which showed an original -σε before a central or back vowel were likely to change it to -σε and sooner or later to absorb it in the palatalized consonants which preceded it. In other words synchronically it would be possible to treat these forms as if they belonged to stems which ended in a palatalized consonant, alternating perhaps with a non palatalized consonant in the nominative and dative singular.

22 Among other new forms the insertion shows an extraordinary change of final -σε and -ση to -σεν and -σην, which is unparalleled elsewhere. I hope that I shall be able to discuss these forms elsewhere, and to argue, inter alia, that -σεν is simply a spelling for a schwa-like vowel in unstressed position. For the rest the text gives good evidence for the -σεν dative of the consonantal stems even in Hestiaiotis (cf. the form σεισί).

23 I feel reluctant to suggest that -σεν is due to a contraction of -σην into -σην and to a later shortening.

24 I have mentioned some of the evidence in Glotta 46 (1968), 102ff. Though I may have given the wrong impression that palatalisation was limited to nasals, liquids and sibilants, while it obviously concerned vowels as well.
The Lesbian equivalents of τελέο and its forms are tantalizing. Sappho has in the same poem and in fact in the same verse τέλεον with -σα and τέλεον with -σα (1, 28 and 1, 27). Other forms of the same verb appear alternatively with -σα and -σα (Sappho 17, 5: ἡτελεσθέντας; 6, 3: τέλεον!; 76, 2: τέλεσες; in Alcaeus 381 τέλεον is due to an enclitization which seems certain). There is no suggestion that the -σα forms occur only in the 'abnormal' poems of Sappho. Finally it should be mentioned that a 'non-etymological' gnomine salient occurs at least once: Alcaeus, 389.1 has κάθεσαν where he should expect τέλεον from a disyllabic stem which did not originally end in a silabent.

The picture offered by the epigraphical evidence is not identical but similar. All tablets consider the earlier phases reconstructed in our two tables (cf. 4.2.1 and 4.2.2). The main difference between the two reconstructions is that the second (Table II), differently from the first, assumes a change -σα > -σα in the shift between Proto-Greek and Proto-Aolic. If so, the first point to consider is whether such a change is in contrast with the available evidence.

As I pointed out earlier, it is traditionally assumed that the Aolic dialect preserved an original -σα after a short vowel. This view is based on two types of evidence: the -σα morph of the datives of the consonantal stems and the verbal forms of the type ἐκάλεσα, ἐκάλεσα, etc., where -σα + σ occurs at a morfemic juncture. We have shown that the -σα datives are a new creation and therefore are not relevant to the problem at hand. All they allow us to is that after their creation -σα was not simplified to -σα in the Aolic dialects. Obviously this does not prove that -σα was not simplified at an earlier stage.

The verbal forms are in a different position but one point must be stressed. They cannot be compared with the datives of the -σα stems. The datives can be traced back to IE locatives, while neither the Greek sasmetric nor the Greek future are coterminous with IE creations. We do not know for instance at what date the sasmetric of Greek acquired its characteristic -σα suffix. However, if both sasmetric and sasmetric future are attributed to Proto-Greek, it should follow that Aesopic inherited these forms with the same sequence. In terms of our table II this is not altogether impossible. Even if Aesopic inherited a supposed (ὑδελεσσα and changed it to ἐτελεσθά, -σα could have been restored analogically at a later stage since at all times a proportion of the type (ὑδελεσσα, -σα) could be set up. In other words, the existence of -σα-as or futurs where Proto-Greek had -σα-as or futures is not necessarily incomparable with the reconstruction of Table II where it is assumed that Proto-Aeolic changed -σα to -σα. It remains to be seen however, whether a study of the actual evidence can help us to see how plausible this view is.

4.4.2. Altogether Sappho and Alcaeus have six instances of ἐσοβοι, ἐσατες, ἐσοβοι etc. (Sappho 50, 2; 55, 2; 56, 2; 98 b; Alcaeus 67, 5; 303 ff) and one of the imperative ἐσοβ (Sappho 1, 28); in most of these cases the presence of -σα is guaranteed by the metre and in no case the metre gives evidence for -σα. The data for

---

24 On this assumption the declension of ο. γάρ would be as follows: sing. NAV [gen.], Gen. [gen.], Dat. [gen.]; plur. NVA [gen.], Gen. [gen.], Dat. [gen.], etc. (later replaced by [gen.]).

25 Cf. o. g. IX XII Suppl. p. 3, no. 6. 27 (ἐσοβοι), H. 1967, 462 ff., C. 10 (ἐσοβέσσα) for the Aesopic of Aesopic Minor; Schwyzer, DGS 142.5 (ἐσεροι) for Boeinian and Ill IId 1147, 11 (ἐσεροι) for Thessalian.

26 For the Aesopic of Aesopic Minor cf. o. g. XII XII 124.8 (ἐσεροι), 242.9 (ἐσερος), 230.14 (ἐσερος), 213 (ἐσερος), 14, no. 17 (ἐσερος), 30, no. 598 (ἐσερος), 14, 1 (ἐσερος); for Boeinian see Ill VII 2414 (ἐσερος).

27 The value of this evidence is not always certain. Some of the instances quoted from Lesbian inscriptions may be hypermetric: I should not take too seriously for instance, frequentation of XII XII 124.8, 242.9. However, what the forms with non-etymological -σα prove is that some spreading of -σα was going on at the time.
sense, Greek probably inherited a locative plural *genato and changed it to *genes at an early stage, since there is no trace of -s forms in any of the dialects. If so, however, the locative singular *genes and the locative plural *genes (from *genes + st) must have been identical both before and after the change of inter-vo -s to -e. This is in marked contrast with the normal rules of Greek structure which do not allow for the morphological identity of singular and plural in the same case. Is this not a strong argument in favour of an early replacement of *genes by *genes at a Proto-Greek stage? (see Table II). Unfortunately, just as an economy of hypothesis is not sufficient to decide the case in favour of Table I (linguistic history is often more complicated than we should like it to be), the fact that analogical change did not occur, though we should have liked it to, cannot decide the case against Table I. We are not yet able to predict with certainty that a particular instance of analogical change will be triggered off by a given cause.

4.6. From what precedes it would seem necessary to conclude that both reconstructions offered in 4.2.1. and 4.2.2. are plausible, but it is not possible to decide between the two. We should then stop here and be content with having produced some data against the traditional explanation of the *-at dative.

Perhaps we can afford to be a little pessimistic. Strangely enough one of the points which so far seemed to count against the reconstruction presented in Table II, viz. the reconstructed Aecleio change *-e to *e, may now be employed as an argument in its favour. To do so, however, will require some lengthy discussion and an apparent digression.

4.6.1. The change of inter-vo *e to *A is normally attributed to the Proto-Greek period, though it is not easy to establish an absolute chronology. More difficult is to decide the chronology of the restoration of -e in those morphemes which had been affected by the previous change of inter-vo *e to *h. Presumably *polei yielded *polei and then the *e was restored (polei). In the Dat.-Loc. plural of the -e- and *e-stems the restoration occurred before the time of the Linear B tablets (ks-ke-sei etc.), and the same is true of the corista and future of those verbs whose stem ended in a vowel (e-ros-e-ros-se, a-ke-se-se, do-se etc.). On the other hand, Greek still has pei (= *pehpei or *pehpe 'to them'), and -e, i. e., *-o(e), is written for the later *-e (from an earlier *-o(e) → *-i(e) → *-o(e)). It seems that some at least of these restorations must have occurred independently in the various dialect groups, and it may be necessary to assume that all of them happened independently.

Let us now consider more closely the conditions which must be satisfied before a restoration of *e in inter-vo position can occur. When inter-vo *e changed to *h, this cannot have had a very disruptive effect on the system. Either *h counted as an allophone of *e, automatically selected in inter-vo position, or the very least the contrast between *e and *h, if these were phonemically distinguished

40 The reasons for this change do not concern us here: most recently see M. Petru-kevskii, Mitteilg. G. Doux, Paris 1975, 309–13 (with the earlier literature).
41 See above note 28 with the references to Lejano. If an earlier *o(e) yielded -o(e) which was then remodelled into -o(e), it seems also likely that *polei changed into *polei before the final restoration of -e (I ignore here the problems caused by the vocalism of Attic rézen).
42 See above note 29 and 41.
43 See below note 48.
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(whence improbable)44, was neutralized intervocalically. As long as this was the case it is difficult to assume that an analogical process which restored *e-between vowels could occur. On the other hand the analogical process would be much easier to understand if other changes had previously brought about the creation of a new inter-vo (siblid) *e-. It seems likely that an early stage Greek borrowed from the substratum or from the neighbouring languages words which in their classical form appear with an intervocalic *e-: áxados may be an example. Yet I find it difficult to suppose that these borrowings, which for a long period cannot have been entirely integrated in the language, were sufficient to provide the necessary model for the restoration of intervocalic *e-. More important could be the phenomenon which altered *e-to *e- after long vowel; there is no evidence which allows us to attribute it to some dialect groups rather than to some others and the phenomenon should belong to Proto-Greek. Yet, even this change would only affect a very few forms (most examples of *e-in this position derive from clusters of the *e-type which survived as such for a long time and which are not relevant here). Some dialect groups had other sources of inter-vo*-e: Mycenean, Attic- Ionic, Arcado-Cyprian, for instance, changed most occurrences of *e-to *e-. Other siblid forms in the pre-Mycenean period from consonantal clusters, though it is not yet clear whether, for instance, Myc.-to must be read as to-* or to-*c. Anyway, after these changes no phonological reason could prevent any longer the restoration of *e-in the dative plural and the verbal forms.

4.6.2. We now turn to Aecleio. We have argued above (4. and 4.2.) that the creation of the *e-at dative (or locative) in the consonantal stems belongs to Proto-Aecleio and presuppose the existence of *e-at, i. e. the restoration of *e instead of *h-in the loc. plural thematic. We may now ask what the sources of inter-vo *e-in Proto-Aecleio are likely to have been. We have suggested that borrowings are not sufficient to account for the change of *e-to *e- after long vowel is also an unsatisfactory source. The other source of inter-vo *e-simply do not concern Proto-Aecleio. Bocotian and Thessalian preserved *e- so that it is unlikely that this sequence had changed into *e in common Aecleio; the other consonantal clusters show different treatments in Bocotian and the remaining dialects so that they were probably still preserved as such in the common period. Yet we want to argue that the resto-

44 This partly depends on two factors which are not entirely clear: the chronology of the change of initial (prevocalic) *e-to *h and the treatment of *e-. It is usually assumed that -wV yielded -wV and that *h was lost at a later stage, but I do not see that this can be proved.
45 For the general point made here cf. e. g. B. Tranka, "On analogy", Zeitschrift für Phonistik 21 (1965), 345–51.
46 The first part of this article was completed when I read the preprint of an important paper about "Les consonnes palatalisées dans le grec du IIe millénaire et des premiers siècles du IIIe millénaire" presented by Ernst Riech at the Sixth International Mycenean Colloquium (Chauvien, 7–13 September 1975). Interestingly enough Riech argues that the restoration of inter-vo *e-in the corista etc. became possible as soon as the Greeks borrowed some words with initial and inter-vo *e-from the substratum and other sources. It must be obvious from what was said above that, while I entirely agree with the point that the restoration must have occurred after the introduction into the language of a phonemic contrast between *e and *h, I still do not think that the borrowings were sufficient to create this contrast.
47 Cf. Lejano, Phokichique historique, op. cit., 102.
ration of -s- occurred in Common Aeolic. If we could assume that in Common Aeolic -as- had been simplified into -s- it would become clear how the restoration could have taken place. In effect this means to accept the reconstruction suggested in Table II (4.2.2.). According to it the change of -as- to -s- would have yielded forms like ygeates, which could have formed a very suitable model for the restoration of -s- in the dat.-loc. plurals. Similarly, if we attribute to Proto-Greek or Proto-Aeolic *as-ate, the change would have yielded forms like *a(ete)te, which could have been used as a starting point for the restoration of post-vocalic -s- in the aijtative. Thus, the hypothesis in terms of which Table II is constructed, viz. the Aeolic change of -as- to -s-, helps us to understand other features of the history of Greek and of Aeolic. In other words, we have gained a small piece of evidence which favours the reconstruction of Table II over that of Table I. For what concerns the change itself we may also add that it seems structurally conditioned: first intervocalic -as- changed to -s- and in a second moment intervocalic -as- changed to -s-.

We know that a similar change affected the Attic-Ionic dialects and there is scope for a further enquiry aimed at establishing whether what we labelled Proto-Aeolic should not in fact be attributed to Proto-Greek — but this belongs to another paper.\(^{43}\)

5. We must now sum up. It seems probable that Wackernagel's explanation of the -as- dative is correct (cf. 3.3.). If so, this carries some consequences and one of them is that in all likelihood we must postulate a sound change from -as- to -s- for common Aeolic (cf. 4. 4.2.2., 4.6.1., and 4.6.2.) or for the phase which proceeded it. The instances of -as- which we find in the Aeolic dialects were all created or recreated later than the change -as- > -s- (cf. 4.4.1.). Some more specific consequences concern the dialect of the Lesbian poets: first, we are now able to analyse the datives of the ἀπόστασις type which occur in Sappho and Alcaeus as 'genuine' Aeolic forms. Secondly, we may also suggest that alternations of the τάξασα / τάσσων need not be due to Homeric influence (though this cannot be excluded) but may also be archaic features which were eliminated in the later phases of the dialect (cf. 4.4.1.). On the other hand while Homeric τάξασα, τάσσων etc. belong to the Aeolisms of the epic language, ἀπόστασις, ἀπόστασις etc. are in a different position. These forms must be either survivals from an extremely early layer of the epic language or — more likely — creations of the epic language due to the influence of the τάξασα type.

Finally there is a more general point to make. Wackernagel objected to the traditional explanation of the -as- dative that it presupposed an abnormal type of analogical change. At the time his own explanation seemed theoretically more satisfactory since it could be stated in proportional terms: -as- : -as- = -as- : -as-.

We have seen that more recent work has treated analogy as a process of redistribution of allomorphs\(^{49}\) and that Wackernagel's explanation does not fit this definition (cf. 2.1.). Yet the explanation seems to be correct. We must now wonder why it is that analogical proportions are both so unattractive for the modern theoreticians and so indispensable a tool for the practising historical linguist?\(^{50}\)

\(^{43}\) See above 2.1. and note 7.

\(^{49}\) For an interesting discussion of some of the current misapprehensions about the proportional formula see L. H. Palmer, Descriptive and Comparative Linguistics, London 1972, 242 ff. From where I have taken the sentence reproduced at the beginning of this article (ibid., p. 244). For a recent criticism of analogical proportions see Kiparisky, op. cit. (in note 7); I have discussed the status and the possible formalizations of these proportions in my Collitz lecture (see above note 8).