

Thessalian Patronymic Adjectives

Author(s): Anna Morpurgo-Davies

Source: *Glotta*, 46. Bd., 1./2. H. (1968), pp. 85-106

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40266130>

Accessed: 07-08-2014 18:16 UTC

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

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



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

<http://www.jstor.org>

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

Κυπροκρατίφος ἡμὶ δὲ λαο(ς) ὅδε κτλ.¹⁾

The phrase fits our type 8) and the editor correctly translates “De K. je suis la pierre tombale que voici . . .”. The presence of the article, this time in conjunction with the demonstrative ὅδε, seems to fit the theory that what we have here is the development of an earlier formula in which the article by itself was sufficient to convey the ‘here and now’ meaning required²⁾.

If this is so, and if the explanation proposed for the formulas in 2) can be accepted, we have here yet another example of something which need to be continually stressed: Greek dialects often follow parallel lines of development, but they follow them at different times and at different speed. No correct exegesis of epigraphical, and one might add, literary texts, can be attempted if this is not kept in mind³⁾.

Thessalian Patronymic Adjectives

By ANNA MORPURGO-DAVIES, Oxford

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

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

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

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

ledge of the prehistoric classification of the dialects or to search for a few archaic features which may give us new insights on the parent IE language. However, in spite of its limitations, the evidence is often sufficient to allow a study of the individual dialects for their own sake. Frequently such an experiment is rewarding in that it can lead us to a new point of view on a piece of Greek otherwise unknown or misjudged.

Greek patronymic adjectives have recently called for a large amount of attention caused in part by the parallelism with the newly discovered Mycenaean evidence and in part by the recurrent polemics about the dialect features of the epic language¹). In what follows I shall ignore both these problems and I shall try to concentrate on the study of the use and distribution of these adjectives in a restricted linguistic ambience: the Thessaly of the Fifth-Second Century. However, before tackling the major problems, it is necessary to clarify a few minor points.

2. Standard textbooks seem to agree in attributing the use of patronymic adjectives to the whole of Thessaly since the earliest times. The only exception is found in Thessaliotis where the Sotairos inscription (fifth century) is interpreted as having a normal genitive for the father's name. Moreover, according to Buck²): "when the father's name is itself a patronymic form in *-δας* or *-ιος* the genitive is regularly employed in Boeotian; so also in early Thessalian, but later the adjective forms . . . are usual".

These statements need checking. I shall tackle first the problem of the *-δας* names and then that of the evidence relative to Thessaliotis.

¹) The older bibliography can be found in A. Sacconi, *Due note sul patronimico greco in -ιος*, *Rendiconti Acc. Lincei* 16 (1961), 275ff. On Mycenaean see also N. van Brock, *Notes mycéniennes*, II. Les "patronymiques", *RPh* 34 (1960), 222ff.; Ruijgh, *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec Mycénien*, Amsterdam 1967, 99ff. (passim). On Homer: J. M. Aitchinson, *Τελαμώνιος Αἴας* and other patronymics, *Glotta* 42 (1964), 132ff. Recently O. Masson has published a note entitled "Sur de prétendus emplois de l'adjectif patronymique en *-ιο-* hors de l'éolien" (*Glotta* 43, 1965, 217ff.) to which I shall frequently have to refer.

²) Reference is made here and elsewhere to C. D. Buck, *Greek Dialects*, 1955 (here at p. 134); Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch der griech. Dial.*, II, 1960; F. Bechtel, *Griechische Dial.*, II, 1921; O. Hoffmann, *Griech. Dial.*, II, 1893. On Thessalian in particular the most recent monograph is that by R. van der Velde, *Thessalische Dialektgeographie*, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1924. For the texts I shall give whenever possible the reference to IG IX 2 or to Schwyzler *DGE*, but in some cases better additions are available and many inscriptions have been published after the appearance of IG IX 2 (1908).

It is certainly true that Boeotian does not form adjectives from *-δας* names; as Buck acknowledges, the position is different for standard Thessalian inscriptions which keep breaking the rule. However, I have not found any definitive evidence to the contrary for the early period and I must assume that Buck's statement, which is carried on from the first edition of the book (1909), relies on the views expressed by Solmsen in *RhM* 59 (1904) 496 note 1 and repeated by Ernst Fraenkel in *IF* 21 (1911) 234. But these are based exclusively on IG IX 2 1236, a fifth (?) century inscription from Perrhaebia, broken at the beginning and difficult to read. Kern in IG followed Hiller in reading]ς Ὀρεστα[ί]α ἀνέθηκε τῷ Θέμισσι, but Lolling, the first editor, followed by others, read Ὀρεστάδα assuming presumably that the offerer [. . .]ς had an Ὀρεστάδας for father. However the reading and the restoration seem far from certain, even though the lack of a reliable photograph does not allow us to pronounce an independent judgement. Moreover a genitive masculine ending in *-ā* in the fifth century might require some justification. Phalanna, admittedly, knows at a much later date both forms in *-ā* and in *-āo*, but one might expect for the earlier period the non contracted forms (as in the later IG IX 2 1229, of the second century). Also, before assuming that Ὀρεστάδα is a genitive it remains to be proved that it is not an asigmatic nominative of the type frequently attested in Boeotian¹): in this case it would be possible to interpret it not as a patronymic, but as a name of phratry or of a *genos*²). To sum up, it looks as if, as long as no more valid evidence is produced, Buck's rule is to be simplified in favour of a statement parallel to that of Thumb-Scherer (p. 74): "Die im Boiotischen zu beobachtende Regel über die Verwendung des Genetivs bei Namen, die selbst Patronymika sind . . ., scheint dem Thessalischen fremd zu sein."

3. The supposed absence of patronymic adjectives in Thessaliotis is explained as due to the particularly Western Greek character of this part of Thessaly. What remains to be proved, however, is that patronymic adjectives are not used in Thessaliotis. If we ignore the large number of them found in Pharsalos, because this town cannot be considered as belonging to Thessaliotis proper, we are left with a number of latish inscriptions from Cierium (second century),

¹) For these see my article in *Glotta* 39 (1961), 104ff. The list must now be increased by the three new examples published by J. Venencie, *BCH* 84 (1960), 596 and 611.

²) For these see below p. 91, n. 4.

which show a regular use of patronymics—and with the Sotairos inscription (IG IX 2 257). No other relevant evidence is available. The problems presented by IG IX 2 257 are well known¹): if the inscription is to be taken as a unit, with the final words written on the top margin, the last phrase is *Ὀρέσταο Φερεκράτες (?) ἡλυδρέοντος Φιλονίκῳ ἡνῖος* (according to the standard interpretation), or *Φερεκράτης (?) ἡλυδρέοντος Φιλονίκῳ ἡνῖος* (if we follow Marta Sordi²) in taking *Ὀρέσταο* as a genitive depending on *ἔσδσε*. In the first case *Φερεκράτης* indicates the name of the father of *Ὀρέστᾱς* and is totally ungrammatical³). A correction may restore either *Φερεκράτε<ο>ς* or *Φερεκράτε<δ>*, which would be, at this date, an acceptable form of patronymic adjective in the genitive. It is obviously impossible to decide between the two⁴). As for *Φιλονίκῳ*, if it refers to the grandfather of *Ὀρέστας*, a patronymic adjective would be impossible in any case and could not be expected. In the second hypothesis, *Φερεκράτης* is the *ἑλωρός* (and a correction *Φερεκράτε<ο>ς* is required) and his father was *Φιλόνικος*. Here a patronymic adjective might be expected, but it should be made clear that the presence of the word *ἡνῖος* destroys the entire value of the document. Before a substantive, a genitive and an adjective are equally possible and there is no question of a ‘proper’ Aeolic or Thessalian form⁵). The other possibility, namely that the Sotairos tablet contains the end of another inscription *ἔς ἡλυδρέοντος Φιλονίκῳ ἡνῖος*, if real, would provide evidence parallel to that discussed above and need not to be considered here. I do not think that it is possible to argue any further. The early evidence for Thessalitis appears to be totally ambiguous, and the second century inscriptions⁶) may either reflect a more or less artificial linguistic unification, taking place in Thessaly under the Roman domination, or may provide us with an archaic

¹) For the recent bibliography on the inscription see L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, Oxford 1961, 99 No. 10 and add the article quoted below, note 6.

²) *Rivista di Filologia* 36 (1958), 59ff. See also by the same author, *La Lega Tessala*, Roma 1958, 107ff.

³) The old hypothesis by Hoffmann (*Philologus* NF 15, 1902, 248) that *-ῆς* is an acceptable genitive ending in Thessalian is far from being generally accepted and has little chance of being correct.

⁴) I have discussed the spelling *-ΕΟΣ* for *-ΕΙΟΣ* in *Glotta* 43 (1965), 244 (see also p. 100, n. 4).

⁵) That this is the case is proved e.g. by the alternation of adjective of ‘belonging’ and genitive of ‘belonging’: see below § 7a *propos* of the two fifth century inscriptions *Ἀμφιονεία ἀ στάλα . . .*, and *Φιλομρότοι τῶπίσῃμα*.

⁶) e.g. IG IX 2 258.

relic of the local dialect¹). At present it is not possible to decide between these two suggestions.

4. Use and distribution of patronymic adjectives are two completely intermixed problems; we shall have to deal with them simultaneously and we shall also have to refer frequently to our next paragraphs which are concerned with the problem of their formation.

In Thessalian inscriptions the patronymic adjective immediately follows the personal name and is not preceded by the article. Whenever the father's name is to be indicated a patronymic adjective is used²). A few exceptions need to be discussed here. Some of them of course should not detain us: they simply indicate the beginning of the koine influence on Thessalian, or, possibly, the deliberate intention not to use the dialect in the inscription. From the former point of view any inscription of the third and second centuries may be expected to show signs of extra-dialectal influence. This often appears in those inscriptions which show only a sporadic use of the patronymic adjective: one may quote here as an example IG IX 2 1233 (Phalanna: third century) where the names of the five *πολλάρχαι* are followed in three cases by a patronymic adjective and in two cases by the genitive of the father's name. That the three adjectives are all formed from *-α-* stems and the two genitives from *-ο-* stems may not be due to pure chance, but the extant evidence does not allow us to go any further than pointing out this remarkable distribution. Similar cases of alternation of adjectives and genitives are occasionally found from the third century onwards. Another interesting example is IG IX 2 1228 (Phalanna: third century) where the *λειτοργεύων* and the *ταγέοντες* all have a patronymic adjective but the names of the new citizens are accompanied either by the genitive or by the adjective³).

However, other cases may be quoted in which the absence of the adjective and the presence of the genitive cannot simply be ex-

¹) The point is interesting and I hope to be able to return to it elsewhere. It is my impression that in Thessaly and perhaps in other regions of Greece (Laconia is the obvious example) the dialect may have been kept in official decrees for political reasons even when as a *written* language it had been superseded by the koine.

²) It is easy to give the wrong impression here: patronymic adjectives proper do not appear before the late fifth century or the fourth century. The mass of the evidence comes from a later period.

³) For a discussion of this syntactical type in Thessalian and especially in Boeotian, where it is more frequent, see below § 8.

plained in terms of heterodialectal influence. An easy instance is IG IX 2 683*b* *Δαμοκράτεια Δαμοκράτεος*. The lemma tells us that the inscription is slightly earlier than 683*a* where a regular adjective is used (*Ἀμφίδαμος Ἀμφιαῖος*). Before thinking of koine influence in *b*, one must remember that a regular use of the patronymic adjective would have produced an apparent repetition **Δαμοκράτεια Δαμοκρατεία*. Presumably this was to be avoided and a genitive was preferred¹⁾.

Another example which seems to be sufficiently important to be discussed here is that of a fifth century inscription from Meliboeae²⁾: *Ἀμφιδνεία ἃ στάλα τοῦφρόνετος*. Here an adjective formally identical with a patronymic indicates the name of the man for whom the stele was erected, and the following genitive presumably refers to his father. A patronymic adjective, though possible³⁾, would have made the phrase more ambiguous. As for *Ἀμφιδνεία ἃ στάλα*, the construction has many precedents both in the epic language (e.g. B 54 *Νεστορέη παρὰ νῆϊ Πυλοικενέος βασιλῆος*) and elsewhere (e.g. in Boeotian; see for instance Schwyzler *DGE* 440.3 *Καλιαία ἐμὶ τῷ Κέντροδος* where presumably *Κέντροδν* is the father of *Καλία(ς)*). The only remarkable thing in this document is the use of the article, which does not normally precede the patronymic adjective or the genitive either in Thessalian or in Boeotian. However this may be, the example is enough, I believe, to prove that, though standard Thessalian usage required a patronymic adjective, the use of the genitive in this function was possible and acceptable in the dialect in some particular phrases⁴⁾. Not all prose instances of genitive in this function should therefore be attributed to heterodialectal influence or considered late.

The last text to discuss is IG IX 2 250, a fifth century inscription from Pharsalos:

Σίμων δ Μυλ(λ)ιδεος ἐπέστασε ματέρει ἡεᾶ Μυλλίδι . . .

The standard interpretation, which sees in *Μυλ(λ)ιδεος* a matronymic, i.e. an adjective derived from the name *Μυλλίς* of the mother of

¹⁾ This is worth noticing in view of the fact that one of the supposed examples of non-Aeolic patronymic adjectives (IG IX 1 73: *Ἀλακρατεία Ἀλακρατεία*) is now challenged by Masson (*Glotta* 43, 1965, 221), who assumes that the name is merely repeated.

²⁾ Woodward, *JHS* 33 (1913), 313ff. No. 1: cf. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 7 (1916) 327ff. and Schwyzler *DGE* 605.

³⁾ See below § 7.

⁴⁾ See above p. 88, n. 5. For the use of the article cf. below p. 91, n. 4 and 5.

Σίμων is one which I have supported elsewhere¹⁾ and which still seems to me the most plausible²⁾. The objection which, as far as I know, nobody has considered before is that the article is nowhere else used before an adjective of this kind, and also that either the matronymic or the phrase *ματέρι ἡεᾶ* appear slightly superfluous in the same context. I cannot quote any parallels from Thessaly. Two alternatives suggest themselves: either *Μυλ(λ)ιδεος* is a genitive referring to a father's name such as **Μυλ(λ)ιδεύς*³⁾, or *Μυλ(λ)ιδεος* is neither a matronymic nor a patronymic (at least in function), but, instead, possibly indicates Simon's membership of a *genos* or a *phratry*, and it is only coincidence that it is formally similar to the name of Simon's mother⁴⁾. Neither hypothesis is immediately convincing, but it seems impossible to proceed any further without additional evidence. The rather attractive speculation that matronymics are syntactically distinguished from patronymics by the use of the article and thus are somehow treated like gentilicia is also not supported by other evidence⁵⁾.

¹⁾ Glotta 43 (1965), 244.

²⁾ See also Masson, Glotta 43 (1965), 234 addenda No. 1.

³⁾ There is at least one important objection: -εύς names are extremely rare—and in fact they barely exist in Thessalian inscriptions. For a recent discussion of one of them (*Νεϊλεύς*) see now M. Durante in *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 3 (1967), 43f. note 44.

⁴⁾ This suggestion runs into some difficulties because Thessalian seems to have specialized the suffix -ίδας, -άδας etc. for names of γένη (or phratries?) and to have reserved -ιος/-ειος for patronymics and adjectives of 'belonging'. For -δας in this non-patronymic function cf. IG IX 2 524. On the other hand another possible example of article preceding a *genos* or *phratry* name is that found in an archaic inscription (ca. 550?) edited by Arvanitopoulos in *Polemon* 1 (1929), 216ff. (cf. also Jeffery, op.cit., pp. 97 and 99 No. 2 and Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca*, I, Roma 1967, 358ff.). The text *Ἀνδρογυδῆς ἔφρονσε / ρόλουρος δικαστορέφον / ἔτενξε ὁ Παισιάδας τὸ τέγος* has been variously interpreted. L. H. Jeffery takes *Παισιάδας* as a personal name in the nominative, M. Guarducci takes it as a personal name in the genitive referring to the father of *ρόλουρος*. The first hypothesis does not account for the article, the second assumes the existence of a genitive in -ας which would be unique at this date and in this region and of a patronymique which would also be unique. I would prefer to take *Παισιάδας* as a nominative agreeing with *ρόλουρος* and indicating his *genos* (or his *phratry*). O. Masson now tells me (per litteras) that the whole inscription is the object of a forthcoming article in BCH.

⁵⁾ It may well be that this is a pseudo-problem altogether. Attic does not normally use the article before the patronymic in official decrees, but in non official inscriptions the article is used (e.g. in vases, dedications etc.): see Meisterhans-Schwyzler, *Gramm. der att. Inschr.*³, 1900, 223f. It is conceivable that Thessalian was in a similar position.

5. We come now to some more complicated problems. Not much work has been done on the formation of Thessalian patronymic adjectives, but the facts are straightforward: *-a-* stems form their adjectives adding *-ιος* to the stem (including the *-a-* vowel), all the other stems add *-ειος* to the root with the exception of the *-s-* stems (*-ειος* < **-es-ιος*).

In itself this morphological type is hardly surprising: derivatives in *-αιος* are frequent in the whole of the Greek world, derivatives in *-ειος* of the type *Ἡφαίστειος* etc. are also found outside Thessaly and outside Aeolic territory¹). As for the semantic value of these formations, i.e. for their patronymic meaning, Thessalian agrees with Boeotian and Lesbian in what appears to be an Aeolic isogloss.

What is remarkable in Thessalian, however, is the perfect consistency and regularity of this morphological type. To my knowledge, there is no exception to the rules stated above: if there are exceptions they seem to depend on erroneous readings of epigraphists who have not been alert to the linguistic problems involved in their editions. Thus in IG IX 2 234₁₆ *Μυλλίνειος* is not an abnormal derivative of *Μυλλίνας*, but a misprint (?) for *Μυλλινᾶιος* (see the edition in capitals; the error is repeated in the Index), *ibid.*₁₄₂ *Μαρωναῖος* is a misprint for *Μαρωναῖος* (see capitals and Corrigenda p. xii); *ibid.* 258 *Ἀκωνιμίον*, with an apparent suffix *-ιος*, is a misreading for *Κινυγαῖον* (see Corrigenda p. xii). In *REA* LXVI (1964) 313 line 15 Mastrakostas reads *Μεγαλοκλεδίοιο*, which assumes the existence of a rather unlikely name with an unlikely patronymic formation. A glance at the photograph provided by the editor permits us to restore the correct reading *Μεγαλοκλεαῖοιο*²).

More complex is the case of *Ναυκιδαιονιε* suggested as a possible reading by L. H. Jeffery in IG IX 2 1209, a late sixth (?) century fragment from Magnesia³). If this were a patronymic the very early

¹) For the complex origin of the Attic forms in *-ειος* see Ruijgh, *Études* (op.cit. p. 86, n. 1), 283ff. and especially 285f. Needless to say in all non Aeolic dialects some confusion must have arisen between adjectives of belonging in *-ιος* and adjectives of material in *-εος* (< **-εῖος*).

²) Some misreadings in Mastrakostas' article are pointed out by Daux, *Notes de lecture*, BCH 89 (1965), 301ff., but this one was not noticed. That *-κλεαῖοιο* is correct is obvious: names in *-κλεας* are frequent in Thessaly and in this inscription *Δ* and *Λ* can easily be confused. In any case, that the stone-cutter wrote *Δ* and not *Λ* is clear from the photograph.

³) For the bibliography see L. H. Jeffery, op.cit. (p. 88 n. 1), pp. 97 and 99 No. 3 and add T. A. Arvanitopoulos, *Polemon* 2 (1934–40), 64 No. 185. I am

date of the inscription could make it possible to accept a form otherwise exceptional, but, to my mind at least, the photograph is against the suggestion. Three dots divide the first ν from the rest and this seems to imply a word division which contrasts with Dr. Jeffery's interpretation of the whole inscription¹).

6. The complete regularity of the formation is impressive in view of the figures involved. I have counted more than 850 patronymic adjectives in Thessalian inscriptions belonging to a period between the fifth and the second centuries B.C.

This creates a problem. In the case of the consonantal stems (the $-s-$ stems excepted) $-\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is an innovation; $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is expected. The same applies to the thematic stems. Bechtel's assumption that here $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is added to the thematic vowel $-e-$ was unlikely a priori in view of the large number of thematic stems which form derivatives adding the suffix directly to the root²), and is now totally disproved by Mycenaean which shows forms like *ku-sa-me-ni-jo* (from **ku-sa-me-no*) or like *ku-ru-me-ni-jo*, which is connected with a thematic name *ku-ru-me-no* (*Κλύμενος*)³). As Linear B tablets cannot owe their formations to literary influence the point is proved ad abundantiam.

The total consistency of the Thessalian innovation is unparalleled elsewhere. In the similar formations known outside Aeolic territory $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $-\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ alternate without any definite rule. No doubt there is here a complicated interweaving of literary influences and metrical needs, but whatever the cause the situation is different from that of Thessalian. In Aeolic itself, Boeotian uses—or at least I think so—the original suffix $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ⁴), and here too there are some exceptions. $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is not used with $-\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ names and the situations of the names grateful to Miss Jeffery who let me have some very good photographic reproductions of the document.

¹) In any case, even if this were correct, there would be no reason to for taking *Ναυκιδαιόνιε* as a patronymic: it might well be a personal name of the type *Ἐὐφρόνιος*.

²) Bechtel, *Griech. Dial.*, I, 108f.

³) For the evidence see Ruijgh, *op.cit.*, 143.

⁴) Bechtel (*Griech. Dial.* I 221) suggests that Boeotian $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is from $-\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$. More cautiously Ruijgh, *op.cit.*, 282 prefers to leave open the possibility that $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is either from $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ or from $-\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$. However, one of the arguments against Bechtel's thesis is that in Boeotian all the early instances of patronymics and adjectives of 'belonging' show an $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ formation, though in our earliest documents it is possible to find the spellings EI and E for the original **ei*. That these spellings never appear in patronymics, must be significant. One could adduce other arguments, but I prefer to reserve them for another article where I hope to discuss Boeotian patronymics.

which are themselves *-ιος* formations appears to be confused¹). The Eastern Aeolic evidence is poor and can hardly be used: *-ειος* appears to be the usual form, but the situation is again different for the *-ιος* names²).

If so, however the position of Thessalian is remarkable. On the one side the innovation cannot be accounted for from a general Aeolic point of view (Boeotian prevents it), but requires an ad hoc explanation taking into account the linguistic peculiarities of the dialect; on the other side it is possible to exploit this type of morphemic change to learn something about the semantic and perhaps the syntactical patterning of the Thessalian derivative formations.

I shall tackle the second point first and I shall then come back to the first problem.

7. It is well known that formations of the type *Πηλῆϊος* show a suffix *-ιος* which both in origin and use is not different from the multi-purpose *-ιος* whose “fonction essentielle a été de former des adjectifs dérivés des noms”³). As such the suffix appears to be productive at all stages of Greek and in all its dialects. In this respect Aeolic fits into general pattern with two differences: a) the suffix is employed to form patronymic adjectives on a scale which remains unknown in other dialects, b) the suffix replaces the original **-ειος* used to form adjectives of material: hence forms like *λίθιος* and *ἀργύριος*⁴). In Thessalian *-ιος* is still productive in the usual way: it appears in ethnics (*Φαρσάλιοι*, *Κραννούνιοι*, *Λα(ρι)σαῖοι* etc.), in month names (*Θεμιστίος*, *Ἀγαγύλιος*), in proper names (*Ῥάδιος*, *Εὐφρόνιος*, *Στράτιος* etc.)⁵). It also preserves the old Aeolic feature of appearing in adjectives of material: the four occurrences of *λίθιος* are enough to attest it⁶) and are not contradicted by the

¹) The patronymic of a name like *Διονύσιος* seems to be *Διονύσιος* (e.g. in SEG III 333₂₂). Buck's statement (quoted above in § 2) that *-δας* and *-ιος* names do not form patronymic adjectives, but are themselves in the genitive with a patronymic function is not entirely correct. In the case of the *-ιος* names both the genitive and an adjective in *-ιος* (formally identical — at least in spelling — to the name itself) are possible.

²) The position is not different from that of Boeotian: see Bechtel, *Aeolica*, Halle 1909, 23.

³) Chantraine, *Formation des noms*, 35.

⁴) It is difficult to assume that in e.g. *λίθιος*, *-ιος* represents a phonetic treatment of *-εος* < **-ειος*; it is much more likely that in Aeolic *-ιος* replaced *-εος* at an early stage (see Ruijgh, op.cit. p. 86, n. 1, 233).

⁵) No doubt these forms are fossilized derivatives from personal names: either patronymics or adjectives of ‘belonging’.

⁶) IG IX 2 460, 517_{21.44}, BCH 59 (1935), 55 No. 2₃₀.

rare instances of *λίθινος* which no doubt are due to koine influence. All these formations show the suffix in its original form *-ιος*. A morphological contrast is then established between the suffix *-ιος* and the suffix *-ειος* present in patronymic adjectives. In other words the morphemic innovation *-ιος* > *-ειος* points to a split in a derivational category which was originally coherent. In itself this is hardly surprising. Elsewhere too the spreading of the *-ιος* derivational form has brought about the creation of a number of specialized categories defined by a divergent form of the suffix. It is enough to think, for instance, of the specialized role assumed by *-ιαίος* in the formation of Attic measure adjectives (*σταδιαῖος*, *ποδιαῖος*, *πλεθριαῖος* etc.)¹⁾. What is interesting, however, is the way in which the split took place. First of all, *-ειος* is not used throughout the whole category of patronymic adjectives: with *-α-* stems *-ιος* still appears (*-αίος*). Secondly, *-ειος* is not limited to patronymic adjectives. It is also productive in those derivatives of proper names which indicate belonging to—or special relationship with—the person indicated by the name. The examples are plentiful, from the archaic *Ἀντιδνεῖα ἃ στάλα τοῦ φρόνετος*²⁾, to the fourth and third centuries *Νικοδόμα γυνὰ Κλεαρχεία*³⁾ or *Δαμαιοῦ Πυρρεαία γυνὰ Κριωννεῖα ματεῖρ*⁴⁾ or to the fourth century Thessalian vase from Macedonia inscribed *Ἀστιοννεῖος Ἀναξαγοραῖοι ἐς Λαρίσας*, which J. Bousquet correctly paraphrases ‘objet appartenant à Astion fils d’Anaxagoras de Larisa’⁵⁾. It would be possible to say that two semantic categories seem to share the same morphemic innovation, but this would probably be the wrong formulation. In fact, it is the innovation itself which proves that no great difference was felt to exist between patronymic adjective and adjective of ‘belonging’. Needless to say the argument applies essentially to the period in which the morphemic change took place and need not to apply to a later period. However, our texts far from disproving this point, seem to confirm it. In fact, it is only from looking at the *-ειος* derivatives from this ‘unitary’ point of view that we can make sense of the document quoted above *Ἀστιοννεῖος Ἀναξαγοραῖοι ἐς Λαρίσας*. If it were true that at least in the fourth and third centuries the *-ειος* adjectives ought to be taken as patronymics, except than when defined other-

¹⁾ See Chantraine, *Formation des noms*, 49.

²⁾ See above note 15.

³⁾ RPh. 35 (1911), 130 No. 33.

⁴⁾ Polemon 6 (1958), 17–26, No. 6.

⁵⁾ See J. Bousquet in BCH 90 (1966), 281 f., with the previous bibliography.

wise by a substantive with which they agree, the inscription would remain incomprehensible. The text makes sense only if the first adjective is taken as an adjective of 'belonging' and the second as a patronymic; there are no substantives present, and the meaning is clear only because of the 'physical'—not of the linguistic—context in which the words appear. A certain ambiguity remains and the contrast with the fifth century *Ἀνφιῶνεία ἁ στάλα τοῦ φρόνετος* quoted above is enlightening. Here, in order to avoid the ambiguity, a genitive takes the place of the more usual adjective¹), but the genitive replaces the patronymic and not the adjective of 'belonging'. Elsewhere the opposite might occur. I have not found any direct evidence for it, but the fifth century *Φιλομρότοι τῶ πίσσῃ*²) has a genitive in a position parallel in all respects to that of *Ἀνφιῶνεία*.

8. If that is so, there seems to be no reason for a drastic separation of two derivational categories which are used in parallel linguistic situations and share the same morphological development. When in a list of magistrates or soldiers the proper name is followed by an adjective derived from another proper name, the latter is taken to be a patronymic because this is the only useful point which need to be mentioned in such a list. However on a stele or a vase an adjective morphologically identical will be taken as indicating the 'owner' of the stele or the vase, without any dynastic connotation. If facts are put in these terms, the sort of magic aura which in dialectological studies surrounds the notion of patronymic adjective evaporates in a rather more prosaic atmosphere³). As Wackernagel maintained—starting, however, from historical and not from descriptive considerations—the patronymic adjective does not differ from the normal genitive⁴). The latter is used in an enormous variety

¹) See above § 4. ²) JHS 33 (1913), 316 = Schwyzler *DGE* 607.

³) "prosaic" may be the right word here: patronymic adjectives and adjectives of 'belonging' seem to be avoided in Thessalian metrical inscriptions. One may suggest that they were felt to be too 'colloquial' and therefore not suitable for the high style that those rather mediocre poets wanted to use in their poetry, but I hope to come back to this in a note on the language of these inscriptions. —The observation made above may also explain why our earliest examples of *-ειος* adjectives are adjectives of 'belonging' and not patronymics proper. As in Attica the maximum diffusion of patronymics must have started rather late; before that—but well in historical times—they must have counted only as specialized forms of the adjectives of 'belonging'.

⁴) Wackernagel, *Melanges de Saussure*, Paris 1908, 137 ff. = *Kleine Schriften II*, 1358.

of contexts where its meaning varies according to the context itself; in particular, when written on a vase or a stele refers to the 'owner' or to the buried man, and when written after a proper name in a list of magistrates or soldiers it is a patronymic.

From a grammatical point of view the adjective has an advantage over the genitive: it is syntactically more definite. As it has masculine and feminine (and, if necessary, neuter) and all the cases and numbers, it stands with the substantive to which it refers in a less loose connection than the simple genitive case: the syntactical interpretation does not depend exclusively on word order and on the semantic considerations imposed by the context. That this is not a purely theoretical argument is proved by Boeotian inscriptions. Between the period in which the patronymic adjectives are totally submerged by the koine and the period in which they are constantly used, there are some transitional years in which the adjectives appear only when they follow the names of magistrates in the genitive¹). The reason is obvious: similar phrases are much less ambiguous than the later constructions in which, in a series of genitives formally identical, some must be taken as name of magistrates and some as their patronymics. It is possible that we have traces of the same phenomenon in IG IX 2 1228, an inscription which I have discussed above in § 4. Attic itself shows that the point is a valid one; in the official decrees of the fourth century the article precedes the patronymic only when the name itself is in the genitive²). It is then possible that this syntactical clarity, which for a while prevented the disappearance of patronymic adjectives from Boeotian and possibly from Thessalian, was also one of the motivating causes for their diffusion in Aeolic territory.

9. A not too remote example of a similar syntactical phenomenon is offered by Hieroglyphic Hittite, where the genitive is expressed either by a declined adjective in *-asa-* or by a real case form ending in *-sa*³). A similar position is that of the so called accusativus genitivi or ablativus genitivi of Lycian. Luvian has carried the phenomenon even further and does not seem any longer to have a proper genitive

¹) See e.g. M. Feyel, *Polybe et l'histoire de la Béotie*, Paris 1942, 193ff.

²) Meisterhans-Schwyzler, *op. cit.* (p. 91, n. 5), 223f.

³) The most recent and up to date grammar of Hieroglyphic Hittite is that by P. Meriggi, *Manuale di Eteo geroglifico*, I, Roma 1966: for the adjectival genitive see p. 27 and p. 83. For a discussion of the origin of this form of genitive see Laroche BSL 55 (1960) 155ff.

case¹). But these are extreme examples of a pattern which appears in more moderate terms in Thessalian and in the Aeolic dialects in general. It is as well to point out at this stage that here and elsewhere the replacement of the genitive by an adjective, though allowing a more concrete indication of the syntactical relations in the phrase, semantically presents at least one uneconomic feature. Thus, if one can quote a rather different literary genre, in Homer's description of the Chimaera (*Il.* 6.180) *ἥ δ' ἄρ' ἔην θεῖον γένος, οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων, θεῖον* may correspond grammatically to *θεοῦ* or to *θεῶν* and in itself does not indicate the number of the substantive. Similarly in Hieroglyphic Hittite a phrase like that of Kargamis A 15 b. 4 *ta₄-nà-ma-sá-n LAND-nà-sá-a-n- CHILD-nà-n²* 'the child (Accusative) of all countries' or 'of every country' is clear only because of the adjective *ta₄-nà-ma-sá-n* '(of) all, every'. Otherwise, the simple *LAND-nà-sá-a-n-*, a derivative (in the accusative) of the word for 'land', would be ambiguous; 'of the country' or 'of the countries'? The point would be worth pursuing in various languages to see if in those linguistic systems in which adjective and genitive coexist it is possible to perceive some differentiation in usage for which the two formations take over different functional aspects³). In the case of Thessalian, however, the problem does not arise, as this adjectival type is limited exclusively to derivatives from proper names, where no problem of grammatical number comes in. In fact, it is possible to wonder if the limitation is due to precisely this point.

10. This brings us to our next question. As we have seen, the *-aios/-eios* suffixes are productive in Thessaly from the fifth to the second centuries, and form derivatives from any type of proper names. Proper names of the type *Εὐφρόνιος*, on the other hand, are fossilized forms of ancient patronymics anterior to the morphemic

¹) Laroche, *Esquisse d'une grammaire de la langue louvite*, Paris 1959, 136; cf. the article quoted above p. 97, n. 3.

²) The transcription adopted here is that followed by Laroche, *Les Hieroglyphes Hittites*, Paris 1960, though I have transcribed the ideograms with English and not with French words.

³) For instance one could study the problem in Slavonic: see Meillet-Vaillant, *Le slave commun*, Paris 1934, 356f. On the other hand it is obvious that I have oversimplified the problem. Quite frequently one does not deal with a two-terms opposition, but with a contrast of three or more terms. In Greek for instance one should take into account the existence of compounds: a form like *μητροπάτωρ* is semantically equivalent to *μητρός πατήρ*, but from a grammatical point of view *μητρο-* may be replaced by *μητρός* or by *μητρῶν*.

change *-ιος* > *-ειος*. We have also seen that *-ιος* is still productive, but in other types of derivatives. Thus it would be possible to suggest that it is the special meaning of 'belonging' or relationship which distinguishes *-αιος/-ειος* from e.g. *-ιος* or other derivational suffixes. This would be correct, but perhaps not sufficient. An adjective like *πατρύεος*¹⁾ (Attic *πατρώιος*) is semantically connected with *πάτριως*, *πάτριως* (if we accept Wackernagel's suggestion²⁾) in the same way in which an *-ειος* adjective is connected with the name from which it derives. However, in *πατρύεος -ειος* cannot represent *-ειος*, as there is no question of an intervocalic *ι* dropping³⁾. It follows that we must accept Schulze's interpretation⁴⁾ and assume that *-εο-* comes from *-ιο-* and the phonetic change is due to the neighbourhood with *-ρ-*. If so we reconstruct an original */patrōios/* in which */ios/* has not been replaced by */eos/* (*-ειος*). This points to the fact that the semantic definition of the morphemic change *-ιος* > *-ειος* is important, but not sufficient. There is another element which should be stressed, namely that the phenomenon is limited to derivatives of proper names. This is remarkable. Proper names in Greek are not normally distinguished by any peculiar morphological feature. Obviously enough they are singularia tantum, but a plural is included in the morphological possibilities of the language even if it is exceptional. One thinks of the *Ἀλκμήνας* and *Ἀλόπας* of Aristophanes (*Aves* 558f.), of Aeschylus' *Χρυσήϊδων* (*Agamemnon* 1439)⁵⁾, and of Plato's *Φαίδρονος* and *Ἀριστοφάνης* (*Conv.* 218ab)⁶⁾. Obviously enough, proper names are very rarely the starting point of derivative formations, but all the same these are possible; one can think of verbs like *Γοργιάζειν* or of diminutives like *Σωκρατίδιον*. This amounts to saying that, though semantically and syntactically different, from a morphological point of view, proper names behave on the whole as usual Greek nouns in their declension and in their derivational processes⁷⁾. But now Thessalian offers us a peculiar example of

1) The form *πατρύεαν* appears in IG IX 2 234₄.

2) Kleine Schriften, I, 478f.

3) Those inscriptions which show a suffix *-ΕΟΣ* belong to a period (before the introduction of the Ionic alphabet) in which the original **ei* has changed into a monophthong [ē] and is occasionally written Ε.

4) GGA 159 (1897), 904.

5) See E. Fraenkel, *Agamemnon*, Oxford 1950, III, 679 (with bibliography).

6) Cf. Schwyzler-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.*, II 45.

7) Of course there are some exceptions. In Boeotian the nominatives masc. in *-α* of the first declension are frequent, but they are almost always found in

a morphological process of derivation which distinguishes between proper names and common nouns. The fact is exceptional enough for the point to be worth stressing.

11. It now remains to discuss the first of the two problems mentioned above in § 6. Why this $-ιος > -ειος$ innovation? And why so limited a) to proper names, b) to non $-α-$ stems?

First of all we can dismiss the most obvious explanation. I have pointed out above (§ 6) that there is no reason to accept Bechtel's theory that the original form of the patronymic of the e/o stems included the thematic vowel. Had it been so, one might easily have argued that the preponderance of the suffix $-ειος$, which would have appeared in all thematic stems and in all $-s-$ stems, could well have caused a general levelling of $-ειος$ to other stems. However, as this is not true, the explanation has to be given up. Insofar as philologists have concerned themselves with the problem after Bechtel, either they have doubtfully suggested with Thumb-Scherer¹⁾ that the origin of the innovation must be found in the $-s-$ stems, or they have gone a step further as Ruijgh has done with his observation that the $-ης$ names are 'assez nombreux'²⁾.

The first point to consider it this: should we take $*-ειος$ at its face value? I have pointed out elsewhere³⁾ that even in prevocalic position there is good evidence for an early change of $/ei/$ to $/ē/$. Thus the spelling $-ειος$ must correspond in all our documents to $/ēos/$; its origin may be traced to $*-eios$ or to $*ēos$ or to $*-ēios$ ⁴⁾. This brings

proper names (with one exception: *Πυθιοίτις* in IG VII 1888); again in Boetian the $-ει$ nominatives of the athematic declension are limited to proper names. Elsewhere, the $-ᾱς$ names present some peculiarities in their declension (cf. Masson in Sybaris, Festschrift Krahe, Wiesbaden 1958, 69ff.). For "la position linguistique du nom propre" see J. Kuryłowicz in Esquisses Linguistiques, 182ff.

¹⁾ Griech. Dial., II, 73.

²⁾ Études 282.

³⁾ See p. 88, n. 4. As for the examples quoted in my 1965 article, I would now be more doubtful about *Μυλλιδεος* (see above § 4), but I would add the stele edited by Arvanitopoulos in Eph. Arch. 1916, 19 No. 273: *Μεροχδ II* [e[ρ]ιγ]ερέα or *I[h]e[ρ]ογ]ερέα*, where E stands for EI. Biesantz (Die thess. Grabreliefs, Mainz 1965, 10 No. 10) now dates stele and inscription to the third fifth of the fifth century.

⁴⁾ It is true that there are good examples of $-ΕΙΟΣ$ spellings in inscriptions anterior to the introduction of the Ionic alphabet, but in itself this is not significant. $-ΕΙΟΣ$ and $-ΕΟΣ$ spellings are contemporary and simply indicate that the monophthongization of $*ei$ has already happened. It is useful to remember that in historical times Thessalian knows only 5 long vowels and 4 diphthongs: $/ā, ē, ō, ī, ū, ai, au, eu, oi/$.

in another conceivable—though not much more than that—starting point for the innovation, namely the *-εύς* names. An original **-ēwios* after the dropping of *-u-* would have changed into **-ēios* and later into */ēos/* (written *-ειος*). However, we have had occasion to point out above (note 20) that proper names in *-εύς* are almost non-existent in Thessalian inscriptions. Admittedly Mycenaean now teaches us something that we should have learnt before from the epic language, namely that *-εύς* names were more frequent in early times, but there is no reason to assume that the change in which we are interested dates back to such a remote period¹⁾, and therefore we cannot make too much of the possible influence of the *-εύς* names, though it is as well to keep it in mind.

On the other hand the numerical prevalence of the *-s-* stems does not seem sufficient in itself to justify the spreading of the innovation. Obviously enough inscriptions cannot give anything but a very pale image of the real figures, but I have counted ca. 220 patronymics from *-a-* stems, ca. 140 from consonantal stems (excluded *-s-* stems), ca. 400 from *-e/o-* stems, and ca. 105 from *-s-* stems²⁾. Once more, these figures may be misleading but they are high enough to suggest that there may at least be something in the ratios. *-s-* stems have the last place in the series: if they started a new linguistic pattern this cannot be due to their numerical preponderance³⁾.

12. It may be useful to reconstruct the earliest system. We must imagine a stage in which normal derivation took the form:

-C-ios (*-C-os*), *-C-aios* (*-C-ā[s]*), *-C-ios* (*-C-[s]*), *-Ceios* (*-C-ēs*), *Cēwios* (*-C-eus*) etc.⁴⁾.

In the case of the *-τας* names the formation was presumably different, namely *-τιος* and not *-ταιος*⁵⁾. There must also have been a

¹⁾ This is proved *inter alia* by a large number of *-ιος* names in Thessalian itself. There is no reason for assuming that they are all borrowings from other dialects and obviously enough they testify to a stage in which the suffix was still *-ιος*.

²⁾ These figures have been reached adding up names of various periods: a sort of check, however, is provided by the fact that all the names are 'extracted' from adjectives of 'belonging' or from patronymic adjectives. This limits the period in question to two or three centuries.

³⁾ Of course one could think that the *-ης* names were more fashionable in the period in which the change took place, but obviously enough there is no evidence to support this theory.

⁴⁾ Here and elsewhere C indicates any consonant. The forms in parentheses refer to the nominative of the name from which the patronymic is derived.

⁵⁾ Cf. Ruijgh, *Études*, 164f.

few stems belonging to the athematic declension and ending in *-i-* and *-u-* for which it is difficult to reconstruct the original form of the patronymic.

Presumably one of the earliest analogical changes to take place was that concerning the *-τας* names: *-τιος* (:-*τᾱς*) must have been replaced by *-ταιος*, the reason being the obvious one that the formation was not sufficiently clear. Two other phonetic events must have followed: the dropping of intervocalic *-υ-* and the Thessalian merging of */ei/*, */ēi/*, and */ēi/* into */ēi/*. This in itself must have created a considerable element of disturbance. The formation which previously was immediately analysable and totally unitary, was now divided into two types; on the one side the suffix was */ios/*, on the other */ēos/*, in the following manner:

-C-*ios* (-C-*os*), -C-*aios* (-C-*ā[s]*), -C-*ios* (-C-*[s]*), -C-*ēos* (-C-*ēs*), -C-*ēos* (-C-*eus*), etc.

It is at this stage that the split must have taken place: on the one side the derivatives of personal names generalized the */ēos/* forms, with the exception of the *-a-* stems, while on the other side the remaining derivatives preserved the old type of suffixation.

The question is obviously twofold: why did the first category innovate in this way? And why did the innovation not touch the *-a-* stems?

13. The first point may be paraphrased in this way: if the general tendency to levelling required a choice between */ēos/* and */ios/* why was the former suffix preferred and not the second? Even allowing for a percentage of *-εύς* names in a way totally out of proportion with our historical documents, */ēos/* was in a minority. We have seen above (§ 11) that *-s-* stems are much less frequent than *-o-* and *-a-* stems and certainly not more frequent than other consonantal stems. */ēos/* must then have offered some advantages which */ios/* did not have. These are not too difficult to recognize. First of all, */ēos/* could follow almost all endings of vocalic stems without danger of contraction. Thus where Boeotian and Lesbian have an unclear form of patronymic for names which are themselves patronymics in *-ιος*¹⁾, Thessalian knows forms of the type *Δικαιεῖος*, *Ἀπολλωνιεῖος*, *Δαματρεῖος*, *Ῥαδιεῖος*, *Στρατιεῖος* etc. Similar problems which would arise in relation to the—admittedly rare—*-i-* stems of the athematic declension could be solved in a parallel way.

Secondly, */ios/* itself was in danger of being obliterated as a clearly defined suffix. It is well known that Thessalian pushes further than

¹⁾ See above p. 94, n. 1 and 2

Lesbian or Boeotian the general Aeolic tendency to turn the prevocalic *-i-* into a consonant and to palatalize the previous consonant. This means that after all liquids, nasals and sibilants, probably after most voiced plosives and possibly after some unvoiced plosives¹⁾, the tendency was not only to consonantize the *-i-* of /ios/, but presumably to palatalize and eventually to geminate the previous consonants, with subsequent disappearance of the *-i-*. Thessalian documents testify this tendency with spellings in which either the consonant is geminated and *-i-* is preserved or the consonant is geminated and the *-i-* disappears even from the spelling²⁾. There is no reason to keep the two phenomena a part. In fact it is much more plausible to suppose that we have here two different spelling conventions—one more and one less conservative—for a single linguistic change, namely the dropping of the secondary *-i-* in hiatus. The evidence is listed in Bechtel and in Thumb-Scherer³⁾, but both lists could be considerably increased by a complete indexing of the documents. However, the evidence is plentiful and there is no need to repeat it here. What matters rather is that the texts quoted e.g. in Thumb-Scherer do not seem to be anterior to the fourth Century. Should we then assume that the change is relatively late and therefore cannot have influenced our morphological phenomenon which no doubt goes back to an earlier period? We cannot hope to find many examples of geminates in archaic inscriptions: it is well known that, if anything, archaic script tends to simplify them in spelling. Thessaly itself offers good examples of this, e.g. in IG 270 (beginning of the fifth century)⁴⁾ with ἀλ' for ἀλλά, πολόν for πολλόν. However, we are exceptionally lucky in having an early document from Atrax (L. H. Jeffery dates it to ca. 475), which, though fragmentary, is partially readable⁵⁾. Here the editor has recognized the word

¹⁾ The position of the clusters of plosive and secondary consonantal [i] is not altogether clear. There are some good examples of δδ before prevocalic ι (for these see the references in notes 2 and 3). The form ἐ]ξεικάττιοι (with ττ) written in a decree from Delphi recently republished by Daux (BCH 67, 1942-3, 143ff., line 4) is not mentioned by Bechtel and Thumb-Scherer and remains obscure. It is possible that we have here too an example of palatalization and gemination.

²⁾ See Van der Velde, *Thessalische Dialektgeographie*, 36ff.

³⁾ Bechtel, *Griech. Dial.*, I, 140; Thumb-Scherer, *Griech. Dial.*, II, 56. See also M. Scheller, *Die Oxytonierung der griech. Substantiva auf -iā*, Zürich 1951, 108ff.

⁴⁾ For the recent literature about this inscription see Peek GVI I 69; Jeffery, *op.cit.*, 99 No. 4; Guarducci, *op.cit.* (p. 91, n. 4), 359f.

⁵⁾ N. Giannopoulos, *Eph. Arch.* 1934-5, 140-5; cf. Jeffery, *op.cit.*, 99 No. 6.

Πολυδάδι in a formula which he correctly restores as *τᾷ Ἀθάναι τα]ῖ Πολυδάδι*. The restoration is convincing and the reading appears to be certain. If so, we have a very early and most unexpected example of gemination of liquid before a prevocalic *-i-*. The phenomenon can then be confidently dated to an early period—in fact to a period earlier than any of our examples of patronymic or of adjectives of ‘belonging’.

14. One may wonder if the point made above about the instability of the *-ιος* suffix in post-consonantal positions, though phonetically correct, is relevant here. The evidence for plosives is too ambiguous and cannot be used (see above) except than as a secondary point. Why should we then consider that nasals and liquids form the majority of the consonants in question? There is an immediate answer to this. Of 130 patronymic adjectives from consonantal stems (excluded *-s-* stems), 3 have a guttural stem (*-k-*), 7 a dental stem (*-t-* : 6; *-d-* : 1), 7 a liquid stem (*-r-*), 113 a nasal stem (*-n-*)¹. This means that out of the 130 names from which the patronymics are derived 120 have a liquid or nasal stem and only 10 a plosive stem. In spite of the usual reservations on their value, the figures are impressive enough.

This implies that the phonetic argument adduced above (§ 13) is valid at least as far as athematic stems were concerned. In a regular process of analogy it is likely that these were the first to have felt the influence of the derivatives of the *-s-* stems. As for the patronymic formations built on *e/o* stems, needless to say, the figures would be different. It is true, however, that in a large portion of them the prevocalic *-i-* would follow a continuant, with the consequences already described.

In fact out of a sample of 130 patronymic adjectives chosen at random from those formed on thematic stems, 56 have a stem ending in continuant (*-n-* 19, *-m-* 9, *-l-* 13, *-r-* 13, *-s-* 2)² and 41 a stem ending in plosive³. Moreover of the remaining 33 vocalic stems, in 16 the thematic vowel is preceded by *-i-* (*Δικαῖος* etc.), and in 17 by

¹) Numbers and letters in brackets refer in more detail to the various types of consonantal stems and to their frequency: e.g. out of 7 examples of dental stems, 6 end in *-t-* and 1 in *-d-*.

²) Obviously enough the position of the sibilants is peculiar; original *s* would have dropped in intervocalic position, but there are examples of secondary *s* or of post-consonantal *s* which have been preserved.

³) These are distributed in the following manner: *p* 6, *t* 16, *k* 6, *th* 2, *kh* 10, *b* 1.

-o- (7) or -a- (10)¹). In the choice between /ios/ and /ēos/, as we have seen, phonetic and morphological reasons pointed to /ēos/ both after continuants and after -i-, ie in the majority of the examples.

It now remains to see why the general levelling after the choice of /ēos/ and /ios/ had taken place should have stopped short of the -a- stems. Why -αιος and not *-αιιος? Once more we must consider at least two different orders of facts. First it is probably true that a disyllabic cluster of the type /aē/ tended to be avoided and can scarcely be paralleled in the language. Secondly, a derivative form in *-αιιος from an -a- stem might have been ambiguous in that it would have coincided completely with a derivative from -αιος names. On the other hand, -αιος derivatives offered a formation phonetically stable and morphologically acceptable. Hence its preservation.

15. A final problem brings us again to personal names. If the analogical innovation for which /ios/ is replaced by /ēos/ (-ειος) is caused by a complex of morphological and phonetic reasons, all of which must apply to all original -ιος derivatives, why is it limited to personal names? Any attempt to answer this question is necessarily tentative, but here a few speculative suggestions are offered. The normal connection between a name or a verb and its derivatives is a loose one; often enough the new formation follows ways of its own which bring it to align itself with other and different nominal or verbal series and break the original tie with the primary formations. This is typical of normal semantic and morphemic development and is one of the factors which allow linguistic change. But the position of the derivatives of personal names is different. Context and general semantic notions cannot help to extract the original name from a derivative whose formation is not totally transparent: in that case its informative power is nil. In these forms, which, as we have seen, seem to take the place of a normal inflectional case, a maximum of morphemic clarity is required. The change which we have been discussing has its starting point in a number of phonetic tendencies of the dialect, but no doubt is carried through by the need to preserve the individuality of the derivational morpheme, which ran the risk of being obliterated. That this need is more felt in the case of derivatives of personal names than in the case of other derivatives is not extraordinary. Moreover it would be possible to assume that the change happened in a period in which for administrative, historical and political reasons the use of patronymics was being

¹) The last figures refer mainly to names of the type -ροος or -λαος.

generalized. This last hypothesis could only be proved by a much larger number of documents than we have at the moment. For the time being it is bound to remain speculative, but has some chances of being right.

Über den ‚emphatischen Grundwert‘ der Partikel *äv*

Von RUTH CAMERER, Wertheim

P. Chantraine hat im 2. Teil seiner *Grammaire Homérique* (Paris 1958) für diese Ausführungen das Thema gestellt. Er sagt auf S. 210f. mit Bezug auf die ‚nicht mechanische Verwendung‘ beider Modalpartikeln bei Homer: „elles soulignent un cas particulier, marquent une emphase et s’emploient avec le subjonctif éventuel plutôt qu’avec le subjonctif de volonté“. Mit Bezug auf *æ* wird danach von ihm festgestellt: „La particule *æ* par exemple, exprime l’idée de ‘alors, dans ces conditions’ . . . La première personne est particulièrement fréquente, ce qui s’explique par le caractère emphatique et subjectif de ce tour.“ Zwar geht Chantraine grundsätzlich von einer Äquivalenz beider Modalpartikeln aus (a. O. 345). Aber bei dem endlichen Versuch, leichte Unterschiede im Wert und Vorkommen der beiden zusammenzustellen, heißt es speziell über *äv*: „D’autres traits donnent à penser que la particule *äv* comporte une valeur emphatique appréciable“ (S. 346) . . . und: „La valeur emphatique de *äv* a conduit à employer cette particule lorsqu’une opposition est marquée“. Daß es sich dabei um eine Unterscheidung gegenüber *æ* handelt, macht der Zusatz klar: „La particule atone *æ* sert volontiers à marquer le parallélisme entre deux propositions“ (S. 347).

Die Bezeichnungen ‚Emphase‘, ‚emphatische Wendung‘ und ‚emphatischer Wert‘ (letzteres nur für *äv*) scheinen in einem herkömmlichen Sinn gebraucht. Ich beziehe mich auf Marouzeau, *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique* s. v. ‚emphatique‘: „Appliqué à l’énoncé, le mot qualifie tout mode d’expression qui comporte une intensité notable ou une certaine grandiloquence: pluriel emphatique, tour emphatique . . .“. Das würde bedeuten, daß der beträchtliche ‚emphatische Wert‘ von *äv*, den Chantraine aus dem Gebrauch erschließt, auf seinen lautlichen Qualitäten beruhen