

# LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE FOR MYCENAEAN EPIC

Eilidh Macleod

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD  
at the  
University of St Andrews



2003

Full metadata for this item is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:  
<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:  
<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/14497>

This item is protected by original copyright

# **LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE FOR MYCENAEAN EPIC**

**Presented for the degree of Ph.D.  
by Eilidh Macleod**

**2nd September 2003**



ProQuest Number: 10171037

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10171037

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th E514

## **Declarations**

- i. I, Eilidh Macleod, hereby certify that this thesis, which is approximately 99,000 words in length, has been written by me, that it is the record of work carried out by me and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

2nd September 2003

- ii. I was admitted as a research student in September 1999 and as a candidate for the degree of Ph.D. in January 2000; the higher study for which this is a record was carried out in the University of St. Andrews between 1999 and 2003.

2 nd September 2003

iii. I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of Ph.D. in the University of St. Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

2nd September 2003

In submitting this thesis to the University of St. Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker.

2nd September 2003

## **Abstract**

### **Linguistic Evidence for Mycenaean Epic**

It is now widely acknowledged that the Greek epic tradition, best known from Homer, dates back into the Mycenaean Age, and that certain aspects of epic language point to an origin for this type of verse before the date of the extant Linear B tablets.

This thesis argues that not only is this so, but that indeed before the end of the Mycenaean Age epic verse was composed in a distinctive literary language characterized by the presence of alternative forms used for metrical convenience. Such alternatives included dialectal variants and forms which were retained in epic once obsolete in everyday speech. Thus epic language in the 2nd millennium already possessed some of the most distinctive characteristics manifest in its Homeric incarnation, namely the presence of doublets and the retention of archaisms.

It is argued here that the most probable source for accretions to epic language was at all times the spoken language familiar to the poets of the tradition. There is reason to believe that certain archaic forms, attested only in epic and its imitators, were obsolete in spoken Greek before 1200 B.C.; by examining formulae containing such forms it is possible to determine the likely subject-matter of 2nd millennium epic. Such a linguistic analysis leads to the conclusion that much of the thematic content of Homeric epic corresponds to that of 2nd millennium epic.

Non-Homeric early dactylic verse (e.g. the Hesiodic corpus) provides examples of both non-Homeric dialect forms and of archaisms unknown from Homer. This fact, it is argued, points to the conclusion that the 2nd millennium linguistic heritage of epic is evident also from these poems, and that they are not simply imitations of Homer, but independent representatives of the same poetic tradition whose roots lie in the 2nd millennium.

## Table of contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Chapter One:</b>	
<b>The Epic Dialect and its Evolution</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>The Ionic Element</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>The Aeolic Element</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>The Arcado-Cypriot Element</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Excursus: Dialect Distribution in the Second Millennium B.C.</b>	<b>19</b>
Proto-AC and Mycenaean	23
Proto-Aeolic	30
West Greek	36
Dialect Diversity: its implications for epic	37
<b>Non-Ionic Elements in Homeric Language</b>	<b>41</b>
Lack of Assibilation	42
Dative Plural in -εσσυ	45
Gemination and Compensatory Lengthening	47
Labiovelars	51
Long α	53
Vocalization of Sonants	56
The Preposition “towards”	61
Apocope of Prepositions	65
The Potential Particle	67
ζα	69

Infinitives in -μεν, -μενοι	70
<b>Stratification of Epic Language</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>The Antiquity of the Attic-Ionic Group</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Epic Language c. 1200 B.C.</b>	<b>84</b>

## **Chapter Two:**

<b>Archaisms: Epic as a Museum of the Greek Language</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Phonological Archaisms</b>	<b>95</b>
Digamma	96
Syllabic *l and *r	101
Consonantal /h/	110
Initial *s + Liquid / Nasal	116
Dative singular -ι vs. -ει	118
Final stops	124
<b>Morphological Archaisms</b>	<b>129</b>
Genitive in -οιο	130
The -φι case	132
Datives Plural: long and short	142
Augmentation	146
The Aorist	150
The Dual	160
Patronymic Formations	166
<b>Lexical Archaisms</b>	<b>171</b>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>176</b>

### **Chapter Three:**

**Tradition vs. Innovation in Homer: What belongs to Mycenaean Epic? 180**

**The Cast 184**

**The Exploits: κλέα ἀνδρῶν 215**

Warfare 216

Seafaring 226

**Military Equipment 236**

Weaponry 236

Shields 237

Swords 239

Helmets 242

Chariots and Horses 246

**Conclusions 259**

### **Chapter Four:**

**Homer and other Early Epic 264**

**Epic outside Ionia 269**

Hesiod 269

Epic in Laconia 285

**The Language of Non-Homeric Epic 290**

Non-Ionic Dialect Forms 292

Non-Homeric Archaisms 305

**Inscriptional Evidence 318**

Implications of Epic Language in Inscriptions 338

<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>339</b>
<b>Appendix: Test Cases</b>	<b>347</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>379</b>

## Introduction

In recent years it has been widely acknowledged<sup>1</sup> that the tradition of Greek epic verse represented by Homer developed over the course of several centuries. It is now almost universally accepted that, rather than having originated in Asia Minor in the early centuries of the 1st millennium B.C., epic verse and its distinctive language have their roots in 2nd millennium mainland Greece. The language of the early epic corpus is unlike any other variety of Greek, presenting us with some of the most archaic Greek extant, in addition to a remarkable blend of dialectal forms. This idiosyncratic variety of Greek is not one which is ever likely to have been used as the language of daily discourse at any time in any part of the Greek-speaking world: this can be deduced from the variations in diachronic and dialectal forms which we find in epic: although all languages / dialects contain alternative forms, no natural language<sup>2</sup> has as many alternatives as does epic. An analysis of the language of epic, therefore, provides strong evidence for a 2nd millennium origin for this type of poetry. This thesis will not only emphasize the 2nd millennium roots of the epic tradition, but will also

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Geoffrey Horrocks, "Homer's Dialect", *NCH*, 1997, 193-217, "The Antiquity of the Greek Epic Tradition: Some New Evidence", *PCPS* 1980, 1-11; Martin West, "The Rise of the Greek Epic", *JHS* 108, 1988, 151-72; C.J.Ruijgh, "D'Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique", J.P. Crielaard (ed.), *Homeric Questions*, 1995, 1-96, "Le mycénien et Homère", *Scripta Minora II*, 221-284; Richard Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*, 1982, 196

<sup>2</sup> A "natural" language: one which is employed in day-to-day parlance.

argue that epic verse was by the end of the Mycenaean Age composed in a highly developed, distinctive poetic language of considerable sophistication.

### **Continuity and heritage: epic in its cultural context**

There are other factors besides the language of epic which point to its 2nd millennium origins. Oswyn Murray wrote: "...the result of the collapse of Mycenaean culture was a dark age, lasting for some three hundred years. Discontinuity with the past was virtually complete."<sup>3</sup> The latter statement is highly debatable to say the least: there was, for example, continuity in language and at least in some aspects of religion. As Nilsson showed,<sup>4</sup> what the Greeks of the 1st millennium believed to be their history reflected conditions in the Mycenaean Age: the sites associated in legend with significant events and characters have been shown by 19th and 20th century archaeology to have been major centres of settlement and power. The Linear B documents name divinities still worshipped in the 1st millennium (e.g. Zeus, Hera, Artemis, Athene, Poseidon), indicating some degree at least of continuity of belief, although there is little evidence for Mycenaean cult practice and elements thereof which may have survived into the 1st millennium. There is also evidence from vase-painting that the practice of chariot-racing and other

---

<sup>3</sup> *Early Greece*, 2nd edition, 1993, 8

<sup>4</sup> *Mycenaean Origins of Greek Mythology*, 1932, 36-186

athletic contests continued from the 2nd millennium into the 1st.<sup>5</sup> Given these elements of continuity, it would be entirely unsurprising to find that traditions of song and poetry had survived from the Mycenaean Age down to the 1st millennium. Epic poetry also has all the indications of a cultural element which survived from the 2nd into the 1st millennium. Although best known in the Ionic form exemplified by the Homeric poems at a late stage in the development of the tradition, the language of epic poetry, as this thesis will show, was largely created on the mainland of Greece before the migrations which took place at the end of the 2nd millennium. Furthermore, one may legitimately speculate that epic poetry was highly valued for the link it provided with the past, and for this reason is likely to have been held in particularly high regard at the time of the migrations across the Aegean. Although little could be transported in the way of material possessions, traditional stories of a lost, glorious age, that which we call Mycenaean, are likely to have made the journey in the medium of epic verse, which in the absence of written records was the means whereby genealogies and other memories of the past were preserved.

---

<sup>5</sup> Emily Vermeule ("Baby Aigisthos and the Bronze Age", *PCPS* 33, 1987, 141) discusses evidence for Bronze Age games "funeral or otherwise", which may be depicted in Mycenaean paintings of boxing, archery, javelin-throwing and chariot-racing. The reader of epic will think of the funeral games held in honour of Patroclus as well as those attended by Hesiod which were held at Chalcis in Euboea in honour of a certain Amphidamas (v. p. 279).

The above-mentioned points provide support for the main arguments of this thesis, which are outlined below.

### **Scope and Objectives**

This investigation began as an attempt to determine which Homeric formulae were survivals from the Mycenaean Age, i.e. c.1600-1200 B.C. (or earlier), and indeed this question forms the basis of ch. 3, where Homeric formulae are analysed both for linguistic content and in terms of material culture in order to decide what genuinely belongs to the Mycenaean Age. However, other aspects of epic language in addition to old formulae point to a 2nd millennium origin for this type of verse and its characteristic poetic language. In this connexion, ch. 1 examines the dialect of epic poetry: at first glance, this is Ionic, the dialect of the region of Asia Minor where the poet named “Homer” was believed to have been active. Closer examination, however, reveals elements which are also known outside epic from the Aeolic and Arcado-Cypriot dialects: such elements are too deeply embedded within formula-systems to allow any realistic chance of their having entered the tradition in post-migration Ionia. Furthermore, correspondences with the Aeolic dialects<sup>6</sup> (Lesbian, the neighbour of Ionic in Asia Minor, and Thessalian and Boeotian, the mainland representatives of the Aeolic group) have in the past led many scholars to posit an “Aeolic phase” in the

---

<sup>6</sup> Such correspondences include the 3rd declension dative plural ending -εσσι, the preposition ποσί, and the potential particle κε(ν).

development of epic diction, and indeed this position is still held by some scholars today.<sup>7</sup> The notion of an “Aeolic phase” is, however, outmoded: epic language, as I intend to argue, was never identified with any individual dialect, nor was the epic tradition at any stage confined to the speakers of a single dialect, but was rather felt from its earliest days to be a pan-Greek possession. Epic language contains so many features in common with non-Ionic dialects that it is highly improbable that it underwent its most significant period of development in an East Ionic linguistic milieu. Therefore, to trace the origins of such features of epic diction, one must return to the 2nd millennium mainland. Since the principal source of linguistic accretions to epic was at all stages the spoken dialects with which its practitioners came into contact, an excursus in ch. 1 examines 2nd millennium dialect distribution in order to determine which dialects contributed to the formation of epic language.

The Homeric poems are, of course, revered as great literature. For the modern philologist, however, epic has the added advantage of being the repository for several linguistic forms otherwise unattested, which were current in 2nd millennium Greek, but are archaisms *vis-à-vis* the Greek language contemporary with the composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, hence the title of the second chapter, “Archaisms: Epic as Museum of the Greek Language”. If a museum is understood as the place where out-of-

---

<sup>7</sup> E.g. C.J.Ruijgh, “D’Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique”, 62; Richard Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*, 89-92; Martin West, “The Descent of the Greek Epic: a reply”, *JHS* 112, 1992, 173-5

date curiosities are preserved, epic performs this function for the Greek language. Some such archaisms (phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactical), known only from epic, antedate the state of language represented by the extant Linear B documents, dating from c.1200 B.C. Chapter 2 will examine such archaisms in order to determine which entered epic in the Mycenaean Age (or earlier).

Since the epic tradition of early Greece is disproportionately represented by the Homeric poems (27,800 lines compared to approximately a quarter of this number in other poems), this thesis naturally will concentrate for the most part on the language of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to ignore the other early representatives of the tradition (Hesiod, the Epic Cycle, Homeric *Hymns* and early inscriptions), as these provide valuable insights into the status and distribution of epic poetry in early Greece. The presence of hexameter inscriptions in epic language in locations as diverse as Ithaca, Boeotia and western Italy at dates too early to permit the influence of the Homeric poems strongly suggests that epic verse with its distinctive poetic language constitutes a pan-Greek inheritance from the 2nd millennium (or at least from its latter half): Homer is the best known, but not the sole representative of the tradition. Epic composition, as discussed in ch. 4, appears to have survived in mainland Greece after the turn-of-the-millennium migrations, the mainland tradition being represented by Hesiod, some of the *Hymns*, the Cyclic epics, and inscripational hexameters. Some of this poetry, as I intend to argue, contains linguistic forms more archaic than their Homeric

equivalents, suggesting that epic continued to be composed on the mainland, and was not reintroduced from Ionia in the form of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

All four of these subject areas mentioned above point to the same conclusion: the core of epic language belongs to the 2nd millennium B.C. Epic language, however, never stood still, but developed over the course of several centuries, probably originating before assibilation and vocalization of syllabic resonants had taken place, the latter making their erstwhile presence felt in certain ancient formulae which will scan regularly only when the syllabic resonant is restored. Prosodical irregularities of this type constitute a strong indication that we are dealing with an epic formula of pre-Mycenaean date (i.e. one whose creation antedates the time of the extant Linear B tablets). It is also possible that some elements of epic language may antedate the dialectal divisions which began to appear in Greek in the 2nd millennium: Mycenaean shows that assibilation of /ti/ had taken place in some dialects, while in the ancestor of the 1st millennium West Greek dialects this change had not happened. Epic, as will be discussed, developed in an East Greek linguistic milieu, and although one of the most significant isoglosses distinguishing East from West Greek is the assibilation of /ti/ to /si/<sup>8</sup>, epic has in some cases retained the older, unassibilated forms, e.g. ποτί, βοτιάνειρα. In the latter case, it is not surprising that an unusual word, unlikely to have been in everyday conversational usage, should have remained unaffected by phonetic changes which were general in the

---

<sup>8</sup> This development did not, however, affect the entire East Greek speech-area, as will be discussed (p. 22).

vernacular dialect. In the case of the preposition ποτί, however, the Linear B tablets show that the assibilated form po-si = \*ποσί was current in at least part of the East Greek speaking region in the Late Bronze Age, although epic seems still to have had the older ποτί at this date (p. 26). Thus we have in epic the possibility of tracing the development of the East Greek dialects almost from Common Greek to the fully-fledged East Ionic of perhaps the 8th century B.C. (although the Homeric poems are more likely to belong to the 7th than the 8th century, we must bear in mind that epic was an archaizing medium, and that there may thus have been a tendency to avoid neologisms, therefore at whatever date the poems actually were composed, their diction is likely to have sounded more archaic than quotidian spoken Ionic).

It is impossible to pinpoint exactly the date when Greek poets started to compose hexameter verse. Thematic correspondences between Greek epic and that of other Indo-European poetic traditions (e.g. Celtic, Germanic, Indo-Iranian) suggest a common stock of Indo-European heroic poetry<sup>9</sup>; such other poetic traditions, however, do not have a verse-structure similar to that of the dactylic hexameter. It is possible that this verse-form was adopted from Crete, the source of several other cultural influences which made their way to mainland Greece in the 2nd millennium, among which not the least was the art of writing. Admittedly this theory, however attractive, cannot be proven in the absence of metrical inscriptions in the

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Martin West, "The Rise of the Greek Epic", *JHS* 108, 1988, 153-5

Minoan language,<sup>10</sup> but it is not implausible, given that the archaeological evidence shows the presence in mainland Greece from c.1600 B.C. of grave goods either imported from Crete or of Cretan style. If Cretan influence is present in material goods, it is legitimate at least to speculate that it may also have made its mark on art-forms of which no record survives, e.g. poetry and music. The term “epic poetry” in this thesis will therefore refer to poetry in hexameter verse: it is entirely conceivable that prior to the adoption of this verse-form, Greek speakers had traditional poetry on themes familiar to us from Homer, perhaps using formulae which were inherited from a common Indo-European stock,<sup>11</sup> but I am here concerned with the type of poetry which has reached us under the name “Homer”, in a distinctive archaizing poetic language which is conditioned by the dactylic hexameter.

It is essential also to make clear that by the term “Mycenaean epic” is understood dactylic verse belonging to the Mycenaean Age, i.e. c. 1600-1200 B.C. (the latter being the approximate date of the conflagrations which destroyed the Mycenaean palaces). The adjective “Mycenaean” in this context is not directly connected with the dialect attested in the Linear B texts, although this is commonly referred to as “Mycenaean”; as will be reiterated, the language of these texts has little to do with the putative language of the epic poetry that is likely to have been contemporary with

---

<sup>10</sup> Indeed, as long as Linear A remains undeciphered, one can only speculate that some inscriptions in this syllabic script may be metrical.

<sup>11</sup> C.O. Pavese, *Studi sulla tradizione epica rapsodica*, 1974, 84-5

them, and where these two varieties of early Greek coincide, this is frequently in the lexical sphere. This is unsurprising: a large proportion of the epic that has reached us, the *Iliad* in particular, is concerned with warfare, while the Linear B archives include a number of inventories of weapons and armour. In the morphological sphere, epic sometimes coincides with Linear B usage because they share features of the spoken Greek contemporary with the inscribing of these tablets. However, in some instances, the Linear B language seems to be at a more evolved stage than that attested by some ancient epic formulae, which points to an origin for the epic tradition considerably before 1200 B.C. It would be unjustifiable to assume a close connexion between the Mycenaean dialect of the Linear B texts, i.e. the administrative language of the palace bureaucracies, and the language of epic: certainly there are correspondences between the two (e.g. the 2nd declension genitive singular desinence -οιο, and the case-ending -φι, originally an instrumental plural ending), but these are phenomena which were still current in everyday speech at the end of the Mycenaean Age, although by the time of composition of the Homeric poems they were obsolete in spoken Greek and thus are to be regarded as archaisms. Likewise, the significance of the 260 lexical correspondences<sup>12</sup> between Mycenaean and Homer should not be overestimated, as there is no evidence to determine when these may have dropped out of general use. The evidence suggests, in fact, that the origins of the epic tradition antedate the extant Mycenaean texts, and that epic language contains elements (both lexical and

---

<sup>12</sup> Statistics from A. Bartoněk, "Das Verhältnis des mykenischen Griechisch zur homerischen Sprachform", *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung*, J.Latacz (ed.), 1991, 305

morphological) which by that time were probably obsolete in current speech and already considered poetic.

The presence in epic of linguistic forms which antedate the Greek of the Mycenaean texts can be explained only if one assumes a linguistically conservative tradition of oral poetry which was already flourishing before the date of the extant Linear B documents. There is no example of written poetry in Greek before the 8th century B.C., when verse inscriptions appear (some of which will be examined), and although absence of evidence is by no means evidence of absence, it is safe to argue that Linear B was not used to record poetry.<sup>13</sup> Literacy in Bronze Age Greece was, by all evidence, extremely restricted. It does not appear to have had any applications other than that of compiling bureaucratic records. It was used neither for funerary inscriptions nor for graffiti, which one would expect to find had literacy been even slightly more widespread, as was the case in Archaic Greece, when alphabetic writing became widely known. Near Eastern palaces have revealed annals, diplomatic correspondence, treaties, religious and literary texts; in the Near East, tablets were deliberately baked, unlike the Mycenaean records, which survive because accidentally baked in the conflagrations which destroyed the palaces.<sup>14</sup> In Crete, however, literacy appears to have been considerably more widespread, with a greater range of

---

<sup>13</sup> Pace T.B.L. Webster, who argued at several points in his 1958 book *From Mycenae to Homer* that there was at least a possibility that the Linear B script had been used to record verse, e.g. "In the case of Mycenaean poetry we had to admit that we could find no reason why it should not have been recorded" (*op. cit.* 183).

<sup>14</sup> John Chadwick, *Linear B and Related Scripts*, 167

applications, Linear A inscriptions being found on altars and frescoes, as well as on tablets from the palace sites. Literacy does not appear to have been a skill which was highly prized by Mycenaean Greeks. The skills which were most highly valued by the influential sections of Mycenaean society appear to have been the martial abilities depicted in the art owned by the occupants of the palaces, qualities which (as discussed in ch. 3) are also those celebrated by the epic contemporary with this society, corresponding to some of the oldest formulae and vocabulary preserved in Homer.

There can be little doubt, then, that the origins of epic language belong in the 2nd millennium. Such is the conclusion evident from all four subject-areas herein examined. However, a greater proportion of epic diction than is commonly appreciated belongs to the Mycenaean Age: the 2nd millennium origins of epic language are apparent not only from a handful of well-known formulae whose prosodical anomalies betray their creation in the remote past,<sup>15</sup> but also in its dialectal mix and morphological system. It will be argued that already in the Mycenaean Age epic language was already a complex entity of considerable sophistication, with the same characteristics that defined it in its Homeric incarnation, namely alternative forms used as metrically required, and archaisms retained after they had become obsolete in daily speech. It is equally likely that at this stage epic language contained the prosodical anomalies that betrayed phonological

---

<sup>15</sup> E.g. Μηριόνης ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ (B 651, H 166, © 264, P 259), discussed by Ruijgh, "D' Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique", 85-8; West, "The Rise of the Greek Epic", 158; M. Durante, *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca*, 1971, 92-3; and in ch.2 of the present work.

archaisms, showing that the poetic language was developing in tandem with the spoken language,<sup>16</sup> as it continued to do until the advent of alphabetic writing permitted epic language to be recorded for posterity. Furthermore, it is probable that epic language was already at this stage perceived as being a compound dialect, not to be identified with that of any specific region of Greece. Throughout its history, this poetic language continued to evolve apace with the vernacular dialects of the regions where this type of verse was composed and performed: as this was an entirely oral medium until a late stage in its development, influence from the spoken language was inevitable, and there was no recorded form to show poets the “correct” version of epic diction. The advantage of the fluid nature of epic language that resulted from its entirely oral status was increasing flexibility over the course of its development: for example, later poets had at their disposal both old and new versions of a single morpheme, which provided them with useful metrical variants and permitted the modification of old formulae. This thesis will show, then, that not only did epic poetry exist in the Mycenaean Age, but that it was already at that stage a highly developed and sophisticated art-form, composed in an idiosyncratic type of language that was composite in both synchronic and diachronic terms, using as metrically convenient alternatives from the contemporary spoken dialects (datives plural in -οι and -εσοι), preserving archaisms (e.g. the old instrumental

---

<sup>16</sup> It may seem paradoxical to refer to the “spoken language”, when epic was itself an entirely oral medium until a late stage in its history; however, the phrase is justifiable, as epic language was always distinct from that of quotidian discourse.

singular ending of the 3rd declension, v. p. 22), and indeed creating artificial forms where necessary for metrical utility (e.g. ὄχέων, v. pp. 253-4).

Despite phonetic changes which took place in the intervening centuries, epic poetry composed by bards active in Archaic Ionia would have been recognizable to their Mycenaean forebears. Epic verse continued to be the vehicle for narrative about the same heroes, and used at least some of the same formulae which had been current in Mycenaean epic. The basic thematic content of epic did not change much between the Mycenaean and Archaic Ages: traditional themes and characters were elaborated upon, but careful examination of the language of the Homeric poems can tell us where the poet has been innovative in his choice of subject material. While new formulae were indeed created, these were based on old elements of the poetic diction, and did not depart from the traditional content of epic which had survived from the 2nd millennium.

## Chapter One

### The Epic Dialect and its Evolution

The *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which are the culmination of a centuries-old oral tradition with its origins in mainland Greece, are composed in a form of the East Ionic dialect associated with the Greek settlements of western Asia Minor. Yet this is not a dialect which could ever have been spoken, although various authoritative scholars<sup>1</sup> in the past held the view that it was the poet's Ionic dialect, explaining the non-Ionic forms it includes as belonging to the Aeolic dialect spoken in the region of Asia Minor and the islands immediately to the north and north-west of the Ionic-speaking area. The obvious problem with this view is that the Aeolic forms retained in the speech of Smyrna do not correspond to those of epic. Nowhere in Homer does there appear a form such as *πρήξοισι*, aorist subjunctive of *πρήσσω*, which is attested in a 5th century Chian inscription,<sup>2</sup> with Ionic stem (= Aeolic *πρᾶξ-*) and Aeolic ending *-οισι* < *-ονσι*. This fact was recognized by C. M. Bowra, who observed that Homeric Greek is "too rich and too artificial to have been an ordinary vernacular."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. B.F.C. Atkinson, *The Greek Language*, 1931, 200; T.W. Allen, *Homer, Origins & Transmission*, Oxford, 1914, 106; Georg Finsler, *Homer*, 1924, 106

<sup>2</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 1998, 188, no. 4: ἦν δὲ μὴ πρήξοισιν.

<sup>3</sup> *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*, 1930, 133

Furthermore, it is unlikely that any vernacular dialect would maintain alternative forms of a single morpheme to the extent that epic does, e.g. :

- alternative forms of the genitive singular of o-stems, -οιο and -ου (the latter sometimes replacing an earlier \*-οο), sometimes in the same phrase, e.g. φθιμένου ἐτάροιο (Π 581); ὑπ' ἀνδροφόνοιο Λυκούργου (Ζ 134);
- different forms of the potential particle ἄν and κε(ν);
- different forms of the 1st and 2nd person plural pronouns ἡμεῖς / ἄμμες and ὑμεῖς / ὕμμες;
- the variants -σι and -εσσι as the dative plural ending of the 3rd declension, e.g. Τρωσί / Τρώεσσι;
- accusative singular ἄνδρα / ἀνέρα.

Doublets of a different kind can be observed in the use of historic tenses with or without the augment, and locative cases with or without a preposition. The presence of doublets, either synchronic or diachronic, is one of the most characteristic features of epic language; diachronic doublets are found in the presence of contracted and uncontracted forms, e.g. νόος / νοῦς, σέο / σεῦ, of -σσ- and -σ- e.g. μέσσος / μέσος, and also in

the observance or neglect of digamma. Although all languages contain doublets to a certain extent, no spoken language has as many alternative forms as does Homeric language.<sup>4</sup>

The retention in epic language of forms of varying date bears witness to composition in an evolving yet traditional style: the Homeric poems are composed in an artificial language which had evolved over many generations, and was regarded as the appropriate vehicle for the telling of tales pertaining to the distant past. The artificial nature of the poetic language permitted the poets to maintain a style elevated above that of everyday speech, thus heightening the difference between the world of the poet and audience and that of the heroes of the past: this effect was increased by the retention of archaic morphological forms and glosses, obscure words of such antiquity that some were not understood even by the poets who used them (e.g. ἀτρύγετος, ἀλγίλιψ). These include some titles of gods: ἀτροντώνη, epithet of Athene, ἀργειφόντης and ἔριούνιος, both epithets of Hermes.

A major factor in the development of epic language was the dactylic hexameter, which encouraged not only the retention of obsolete linguistic forms, but also the creation of new forms without historical motivation, in other words, "artificial" forms. As Witte showed,<sup>5</sup> the

---

<sup>4</sup> F.R. Adrados, "Towards a New Stratigraphy of the Homeric Dialect", *Glotta* 59, 1981, 24-5

<sup>5</sup> "Zur homerischen Sprache", *Glotta* 1, 1909, 132-45; *Glotta* 2, 1910, 8-22; *Glotta* 3, 1912, 105-53, 388-93; *Glotta* 4, 1913, 1-21, 209-42

influence of the hexameter caused the creation of such artificial forms as accusative εὐρέα (instead of εὐρύν) πόντων on the analogy of the dative εὐρέϊ πόντω. There is a tendency to make the different case forms of a word prosodically equivalent, e.g. genitive Ἄντιφάττω, accusative Ἄντιφατῆα (as if from \*Ἄντιφατεύς). In addition, Homeric language contains many other metrically conditioned peculiarities such as metrical lengthening and diectasis. The propensity of epic verse to favour a dactyl in the 4th foot explains many linguistic peculiarities, e.g. πτολιπόρθιος for πτολίπορθος (ι 504, 530); ἀέθλιον, ἀέθλια for ἄεθλον, ἄεθλα (θ108, Ψ 537); Αἰτώλιος for Αἰτωλός (Δ399, E 706).

It will be argued here that the language of the poems makes it clear that the epic tradition did not have its genesis in Ionia, but rather in mainland Greece. In addition to the pervasive Ionic elements, there is a substantial Aeolic contribution, and also some elements which may come from an Arcado-Cypriot source. (There is, however, no West Greek contribution to Homeric language.) Certainly some of the Aeolic forms infiltrated epic from Lesbian, but others are so entrenched within the formulaic system that they are obviously ancient within the epic tradition, and probably pre-migration in origin. It is also debatable to what extent the conditions of upheaval in the immediate post-migration period (c. 1000 B.C.) and on mainland Greece in the two centuries following the collapse of the Mycenaean world are likely to have been conducive to the creation, as opposed to the elaboration or embellishment, of a new art-form. It may also be argued in favour of a pre-migration, mainland origin for epic verse that a

form of poetry or song which provided a sense of continuity with the past would have been greatly valued in early post-migration times.

### **The Ionic Element**

The specifically East Ionic nature of the Homeric dialect indicates that epic underwent a significant period of development in Asia Minor or the adjacent islands, the area where tradition locates the poet known as Homer: both Smyrna and Chios laid claim to "him".

The fact that "late", i.e. Ionic, forms are heavily concentrated in the extended similes and digressions (as shown by Shipp<sup>6</sup>) indicates that these belong to a recent stage of the tradition, and are probably the work of the poet(s) of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. If the tradition provided little formulaic diction for the topic of which the poet wished to sing, he would draw on the vernacular, thus Homeric similes are replete with neologisms. However, Ionic features are predominant even in the most traditional parts of the poems, e.g. battle-scenes. This fact points to the reworking of traditional themes by Ionic-speaking poets over the course of several generations.

The following characteristics of Homeric language prove (or in the case of 12, have been claimed to prove) that in its transmitted form it is predominantly East Ionic:

1.  $\bar{\alpha} > \eta$ , even after  $\iota$ ,  $\epsilon$  or  $\rho$ , where Attic has  $\alpha$ ;

---

<sup>6</sup> *Studies in the Language of Homer*, 2nd edition, 1972, 3 & *passim*

2. loss of digamma in all positions, with characteristic East Ionic compensatory lengthening of the vowel preceding the clusters -νϕ-, -λϕ- and -ρϕ-, e.g. κόρϕος > Ionic κοῦρος, Attic κόρος; ξένϕος > Ionic ξέλνος, Attic ξένος. This is the third and final phase of compensatory lengthening in Greek. The effect of the missing digamma can be observed in scansion: its one-time presence can be felt in lengthening by position and most obviously in hiatus, when a word ending in a vowel precedes one with initial vowel. Phrases which ignore digamma, and those in which its consonantal value cannot reasonably be restored by emendation cannot be dated to the pre-migration period. Neither ὄϕρ' (ϕ)εἶπω (5 times *Il.*, 5 times *Od.*) nor ἦμαρ (ϕ)ιδέσθαι (3 times *Od.*) can be of Bronze Age or Submycenaean origin.

3. metathesis of quantity, whereby a trochaic succession of vowels in hiatus becomes iambic, e.g. -ηο > -εω: νᾶός > νηός > νεώς; or antevocalic shortening, e.g. (-άων) > -ήων > -έων in the genitive plural of α-stems;

4. athematic infinitives in -ναι, eg. εἶναι;

5. -σαν as the ending of the 3rd person plural in past tenses (e.g. ἦσαν);

6. the potential particle ἄν instead of κε(ν); the two are probably related through false division of οὔκων or εἰκων, which is attested in Arcadian<sup>7</sup> (v. p. 67-9);

7. ἦν / ἦεν, originally 3rd person plural, as the 3rd person singular imperfect of εἰμί; Doric and Arcado-Cypriot have the older ἦς;

8. the personal pronouns ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς instead of forms based on \*ηs-sme and \*yus-sme, which give the Lesbian forms ἄμμες, ὕμμες; in Att-Ion the expected forms would be \*ἦμε < ᾔμε and ὕμε, but the Att-Ion. forms have received new endings;

9. agent nouns in -της for earlier -τηρ /-τωρ: αἰσυμνήτης (θ 258), but αἰσυμνητήρι (Ω 347)<sup>8</sup>;

10. πρός instead of ποτί, προτί (although all three forms occur in Homer);

11. labiovelars > dentals before a vowel of e-timbre, eg. τέσσαρες < \*q<sup>w</sup>etw-;

---

<sup>7</sup> K. Forbes, "The Relations of the Particle ἄν with κε(ν) κα καν", *Glotta* 37, 1958, 179-182

<sup>8</sup> Meillet observed (*Aperçu d' une histoire de la langue grecque*, 1930,170) that the majority of Homeric agent nouns have the ancient formation that was retained by Aeolic, eg. δοτήρ, δώτωρ; those of the Ionic type ἀγορητής he assigned to "la couche la plus récente du vocabulaire homérique".

12. ephelcystic  $\nu$ : this is often claimed as an Ionic trait, although it appears sporadically in all dialects, and its use in Cretan, for example, differs from its use in Ionic. Argive inscriptions of the 4th century B.C. have ephelcystic  $\nu$  preceding both vowels and consonants, at a date which is too early to assume the spread of the Attic *koine*. Ephelcystic  $\nu$  also appears in a Sicyonian vase-inscription of the late 6th century: ἔδοκεν Χαρόπτοι.<sup>9</sup> The theory that other dialects borrowed ephelcystic  $\nu$  from Attic therefore seems untenable; A. Hoekstra has pertinently asked<sup>10</sup> why, if epic borrowed ephelcystic  $\nu$  from spoken Ionic, is its occurrence in Homer disproportionate to that of other Ionic elements?

Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 10 are post-Mycenaean innovations; there is no evidence for the date of the development or selection of  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  in Att-Ion. Att-Ion. agreement with Arcadian in the choice of  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  over  $\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  suggests that this development antedates the Dorian invasion. There is no indication of ephelcystic  $\nu$  in Mycenaean, but this does not mean that it did not exist at that time, or that it was restricted to any specific dialect(s).

East Ionic was psilotic; the presence of the spiritus asper in our texts of Homer is due to redaction by Attic speaking scribes in accordance with the orthographic conventions of their own dialect. However, the *spiritus asper* is omitted, even when etymologically justified, when the

---

<sup>9</sup> *IG* IV, 424b

<sup>10</sup> "Hésiode et la tradition orale", *Mnemosyne* 10, 1957, 201, note 2

word in question was obsolete or unknown in Attic, eg. ἡμαρ (cf. ἡμέρα),  
ἀτάλαντος < \*ἠατάλαντος < \*ση-τάλαντος.

### **The Aeolic Element**

Despite the pervasive Ionic nature of the Homeric dialect, there appear also features which belong to the Aeolic dialects. This has been considered by many scholars as evidence that epic poetry went through a phase of composition in Aeolic before being taken over by Ionic-speaking bards.

The Aeolic dialects contemporary with the composition of the Homeric poems were Thessalian and Boeotian on the mainland, and Lesbian (Asiatic Aeolic), spoken on Lesbos and in the neighbouring coastal regions. As such, this was the Aeolic dialect with which Ionic speakers in Asia Minor came into contact. The mainland Aeolic dialects were heavily influenced by West Greek; Lesbian was thought for a long time to be the “purest” of the Aeolic dialects, but W. Porzig<sup>11</sup> showed that it borrowed several traits from Asiatic Ionic, e.g. assibilation of /ti/, introduction of the preposition πρὸς instead of Thessalian ποτί, o-vocalism in the verb βούλομαι instead of Thessalian βέλλομαι, possibly the infinitive ending -μεναι, which may have acquired -αι from Ionic -ναι. Among the Aeolic dialects attested in historical times, that which underwent the least external influence was East

---

<sup>11</sup> “Sprachgeographischen Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten”, *JF* 61, 1954,

Thessalian; it is likely that before coming under the influence of Ionic, Lesbian was very similar to East Thessalian.

Homer shows the following characteristics which are claimed to be Aeolic:

1. datives plural of consonant stems in -εσσι: this is common to all the Aeolic dialects, therefore its evolution antedates the migration to Asia Minor;
2. unsimplified -σσ- from \*ty, \*θy, e.g. μέσσοϛ <\*meth-yos <\*medh-yos; this is common to all Aeolic dialects and West Greek, and is in fact a retained archaism;
3. the preposition ποτί, which occurs in Thessalian, Boeotian and West Greek, instead of Ionic (and Lesbian) πρόϛ;
4. the potential particle κε(ν), which is common to Thessalian and Lesbian; Boeotian κα may have undergone West Greek influence, therefore κε(ν) can probably be regarded as common Aeolic;
5. forms of the aorist with -σσα: Thessalian has -ξᾶ and -σσα, Boeotian -ξᾶ and -ττα, West Greek and Arcado-Cypriot -σα and -ξᾶ;
6. athematic infinitives in -μεν, which occur in Thessalian, Boeotian and West Greek; and in -μενοι, the Lesbian form, instead of Ionic -νοι;

7. perfect participles active in -ων, -οντος, with the endings of the present tense; this is pan-Aeolic, and represents an innovation *vis-à-vis* Common Greek -(φ)ώς<sup>12</sup>;

8. gemination of liquids and nasals resulting from \*σ followed by a liquid or nasal, e.g. ἄμμε, ὕμμε, ἔμμορε, ἔμμεναι, ἐρεβεννός; this is a trait shared by Lesbian and Thessalian to the exclusion of Boeotian, which has compensatory lengthening like Att-Ion. and West Greek;

9. labiovelars > labial stops even before front vowels; this is a pan-Aeolic feature, as opposed to the dental stops which are the result of labiovelars in Att-Ion. and West Greek. Cf. such words as Φῆρες (equivalent to Ionic θῆρες < \*g<sup>w</sup>her-), βέρεθρον, πύουρες (cf. Lesbian πέσουρες, Boeotian πέτταρες, Thessalian πέτρο-), πέλομαι<sup>13</sup>;

10. some Aeolic forms which are metrically equivalent to the corresponding Ionic forms, but are not organic to the diction, and owe their use to particular conditions, e.g. αἰ for εἰ in the sequences αἰ κε, αἰ γάρ, αἴθε; Φῆρες used as a proper name (A 268, B 743); the words πέλομαι, πέλωρ, ἐρεβεννός, for which Ionic lacked a corresponding form<sup>14</sup>;

---

<sup>12</sup> F.R.Adrados, "Towards a New Stratigraphy of the Homeric Dialect", *Glotta* 59, 1981, 17

<sup>13</sup> Enclitic τε, attested in Mycenaean in the form -qe (the exact equivalent of Latin *-que*) has the dental result from the labiovelar in all Greek. The interrogative / indefinite pronoun τίς / τις < \*q<sup>w</sup>is (Latin *quis*) has the form κίς in Thessalian.

<sup>14</sup> Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse*, 353

11. the numeral ἓα, “one”;

12. ρι > ρε, e.g. \*Νεστόριος > Νεστόρεος.

Aeolisms in Homer are of two types: primary Aeolisms are those which entered epic language from the Aeolic of the mainland at pre-migration date (e.g. datives in -εσσι); secondary Aeolisms are those which came from Lesbian after the migrations to Asia Minor. Forms tied up with formulaic systems are likely to be of high antiquity; those which lack formulaic connexions are more likely to be of recent adoption from contemporary Lesbian, with which the poet would have been familiar.

### **The Arcado-Cypriot Element**

Traditionally, epic language was thought to contain an Ionic “layer”, which had superseded an earlier Aeolic “layer”. However, Antoine Meillet’s observation<sup>15</sup> that some elements of the epic vocabulary were found elsewhere only in the dialects of Arcadia and Cyprus led to the addition of another, “Achaean” or Arcado-Cypriot, “layer” underlying the Ionic and Aeolic. These apparently Arcado-Cypriot elements are as follows:

αῖσα, attested in Arcadian and Cypriot<sup>16</sup>

δῶμα, Arcadian

(Ϝ)ἄναξ, Arcadian, Cypriot and Mycenaean<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> *Aperçu*, 175

<sup>16</sup> αῖσα is also attested in Argolic, where it may represent a substrate survival.

κέλευθος, Arcadian

ἦμαρ, Arcadian<sup>18</sup>

οἶ(Ϝ)ος, Arcadian, Cypriot

ἀσκηθής, Arcadian

ἀνώγω, Cypriot

ἦπύω, Arcadian<sup>19</sup>

δέαμαι, Arcadian<sup>20</sup>

λεύσσω, Arcadian,

ἔρω, Arcadian, Cypriot

χραύω, Cypriot

Also attributed to Arcado-Cypriot are various glosses, the particles ἀντάρ (cf. Ionic ἀτάρ), ἰδέ and νύ, as well as items from the glossographers which also occur in the Linear B texts, such as φάσγανον, δέπας, ἄρουρα. The particle νύ appears in Arcadian, Cypriot and Boeotian; in Arcadian and Cypriot it is used for the formation of the demonstrative pronoun ὄνυ,<sup>21</sup> and in Cypriot it is also used as an independent particle as in Homer and Boeotian.

---

<sup>17</sup> In the Linear B texts, wa-na-ka refers to the king; in Homer ἀνάξ is used of Agamemnon, and in Cypriot it is retained in religious usage, which, like epic, is conservative.

<sup>18</sup> In the form ἄμαρ.

<sup>19</sup> In the form ἀπύω; the Homeric form has the regular Ionic treatment of original  $\bar{\alpha}$  as η.

<sup>20</sup> This verb appears once in Homer, in the form δέατο (ζ 242).

<sup>21</sup> This form of the demonstrative pronoun appears occasionally in Crete, where it may be a survival from the pre-Dorian substrate.

Manu Leumann<sup>22</sup> argued most implausibly that the words which appear only in Homer, Arcadian and Cypriot entered these dialects from epic. In fact, although there is every likelihood that these are indeed lexical survivals from the Bronze Age, as Householder and Nagy<sup>23</sup> observe, “any dialectal restriction to Arcado-Cypriot still remains to be proved.” Mycenaean is the only Bronze Age dialect which is graphically attested, therefore no evidence exists as to the words used by speakers of (e.g.) proto-Aeolic for swords, cups or fields. Nor is there any evidence that the words attested in Mycenaean did not continue in everyday use after the end of the Mycenaean Age in dialects other than those in which they are actually found. Householder and Nagy go on to comment that “the fact that most Homeric forms of suspected Arcado-Cypriot origin happen to be on the lexical level...has caused scepticism about the...relevance of Arcado-Cypriot to Homer.”

As C. J. Ruijgh observes,<sup>24</sup> the formulaic nature of the above lexical items, and the fact that they are absent from later Greek literature, except for imitators of epic, makes it probable that they belong to the ancient stock of epic vocabulary. κέλευθος, for example, occurs 39 times in Homer, 37 of these at verse-end; ἄρουρα is attested on the Idalion Bronze (in the Cypriot syllabary) and on the Pylos tablet PY Eq 213, and its traditional nature in Homer is clear from its 38 occurrences at verse-end out of a total of

---

<sup>22</sup> *Homerische Wörter*, 1950, 279 ff.

<sup>23</sup> *Greek, A Survey of Recent Work*, 1972, 63

<sup>24</sup> *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*, passim

44 (the end of the line is a repository for archaic forms). Moreover, they are not attested in inscriptions in Ionic or Lesbian, the dialects which were in a position to contribute to epic at the time of the monumental poet(s). Nevertheless, only their antiquity, and not their dialectal provenance, is thereby guaranteed. If such lexical items appear elsewhere, it is in West Greek, cf. Κελεύθεια in Sparta,<sup>25</sup> where the word is an epithet of Athena: it is significant that this word appears in a religious context, as religious usage, like epic, is conservative. In a similar vein, it is apposite to observe that in Thessalian, κίων, which in Homer signifies “pillar”, is often used instead of στάλλα (= στήλη).<sup>26</sup> It would, of course, be erroneous to assume from the occurrence of this word in Thessalian that it entered epic from this source.

It has been argued<sup>27</sup> that epic and Arcado-Cypriot may share one innovation on the morphological level in the athematization of -έω verbs to -ημι, with infinitive ending -ῆναι as in φορῆναι from φορέω (B 107, etc.) Arcadian ἀπειθῆναι, Cypriot ku-me-re-na-i = κυμερῆναι, from a present κυμερέω. “Contracted”<sup>28</sup> verbs are complicated and of diverse origins: those in -άω and -έω are in origin primitive verbs whose root ended in -α or -ε, and were originally athematic, tending to become thematic in Att-Ion. Athematic

---

<sup>25</sup> Pausanias 3.12

<sup>26</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 150

<sup>27</sup> Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen*, 67; Householder & Nagy, *Greek: A Survey of Recent Work*, 63

<sup>28</sup> The term “contracted” is somewhat misleading, as contraction of adjacent vowels is a late phenomenon as far as the epic tradition is concerned, occurring after the migrations to Asia Minor.

flexion seems to be normal for these verbs in Mycenaean, to judge by the infinitive *te-re-ja-e* = \*τελείαθεν (PY Ep 617) and 3rd person singular present *te-re-ja* = \*τέλεια (PY Eb 149). Lesbian is the only dialect to attest athematic forms of this type outside epic in the alphabetic period: Homeric δάμνα, πάλνα, Lesbian τίθη.<sup>29</sup> Since primary vowel-stem verbs belong to the athematic conjugation in Lesbian and Thessalian, the Homeric forms of this type have been claimed as Aeolisms, although Arcadian (and probably Cypriot) also conjugates “contracted” verbs in this way. Boeotian, like West Greek, has only thematic flexion of these verbs. This raises the question whether the generalization of thematic conjugation of all “contracted” verbs in Att-Ion. is the result of post-Mycenaean West Greek influence. If this is so, athematic flexion of “contracted” verbs in epic would be original, and a retained archaism shared by epic, Lesbian and Thessalian, rather than the result of Lesbian influence on epic or of an “Aeolic phase” of composition.

Denominative verbs in -έω, however, can only be explained as due to the analogical influence of causative-iteratives in \*-εγο, of the type φορέω corresponding to φέρω, with o-grade in the root and the suffix \*-εγο. Within the latter category the only thematic form attested in Mycenaean is *to-ro-qe-jo-me-no* = \*τροq<sup>w</sup>εγόμενος (PY Eq 213, with retention of intervocalic /y/). To this category were attracted denominatives from -es- stems, e.g. τέλος + -γω > \*τελέσγω > τελείω (which in Attic became τελέω). On the basis of φόρος / φορέω was created φίλος / φιλέω. It appears, then, that the athematic conjugation of iterative verbs in -έω is an AC innovation which

---

<sup>29</sup> F.R. Adrados, “Micénico, dialectos paramicénicos y aqueo épico”, *Emerita* 44, 1976, 74

did not affect Mycenaean. In Homer there are several infinitives of contracted verbs with the Aeolic athematic ending *-ημεναι*, but only *φορήναι* shows *-ναι* added directly to the stem. As this type of ending appears only 4 times with the same verb (B 107, H 149, K 270, ρ 224 ) it is probably an artificial formation within epic, created on the analogy of the Aeolic type *φορήμεναι* by adding the Ionic athematic ending *-ναι* to the stem *φορη-*. The correspondence with the AC infinitive type is therefore no more than coincidence.

Epic diverges from normal Ionic usage in exhibiting aorists in *-ξ-* from several *-ζω* verbs. Verbs ending in *-ζω* were originally based on either *-δ-* or *-γ-* stems: the result of all voiced plosives (except *β*) + /y/ is *ζ*, viz. *\*ἐρίδ-γω > ἐρίζω* (cf. *ἔρις*, *ἔριδος*); *\*πεμπάδ-γω > πεμπάζω* (aorist middle subjunctive *πεμπάσσειται* at δ 412; cf. *πεμπάς*, *πεμπάδος*). Subsequently *-άζω* and *-ίζω* became independent suffixes which could be attached to noun-stems of all types. This process had begun in prehistoric Greek, and was prolific in historical times. Such verbs could easily be taken over by one dialect from another, and could be formed with either dental or guttural stem. Att-Ion. and Lesbian (the latter presumably under Ionic influence) treat them mostly as dental stems, with aorist endings *-ασα*, *-άσθην*, etc., while the Doric dialects favour the guttural treatment, with aorists in *-αξα*, *-ιξα*. Ruijgh's assertion that *-ξ-* aorists in epic are of Arcado-Cypriot provenance<sup>30</sup> is probably correct: Homer observes the Arcado-Cypriot rule of never using *-ξ-* if there is a preceding velar. Arcadian

---

<sup>30</sup> *L'élément achéen*, 89

and Cypriot agree on this point and, as is also the case with other points of agreement between these two dialects, it is unlikely that they would have innovated in the same direction once they were no longer in contact. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that aorists (and futures) to -ζω presents had already been created by the late 2nd millennium B.C., and in proto-Arcado-Cypriot had -σ- after velars and -ξ- elsewhere.<sup>31</sup> Like Homer, the archaic dialects Arcadian, Argive, Cretan and East Thessalian have both types, but distribution of -(σ)σα and -ξα is arranged in such a way that conglomerations of velars are avoided. Thus Arcadian has δικάσαι but παρηεταξαί. Homer sometimes has both treatments for the same verb, eg. ἄρπαξα / ἄρπασα; ἀλάπαξα, aorist of ἀλαπάζω, but cf. ἀλαπαδνός, which implies a dental stem<sup>32</sup>; cf. κτερεῖζω, κτερεῖξα / κτέρισα, and also μερμήριξε, ἐξενάριξε, δαΐξαι, ἐγγυάλιξε, the latter four never varied. In many cases, the velar form seems to be older, but the two forms provide useful metrical alternatives. The aorists in -σ- and -ξ- to -ζω verbs constitute a case of two alternatives (whose origins in this case are obvious), of which dialects tended to generalize one or the other, sometimes without entirely imposing one of the pair.

---

<sup>31</sup> Warren Cowgill, "Ancient Greek Dialectology in the Light of Mycenaean", *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, H. Birnbaum & J. Puhvel (edd.), 1966, 91

<sup>32</sup> Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, 2nd edition, 1974, 98

## **Excursus:**

### **Dialect Distribution in the Second Millennium B.C.**

In order to determine which elements of epic language genuinely go back to the Mycenaean Age, and which dialects contributed to epic at that time, it is necessary to have as precise an idea as possible of the dialect situation in late 2nd millennium Greece. From Kretschmer<sup>33</sup> onwards it was generally accepted that Greek speakers entered Greece in three waves of migration, an Ionian migration followed by an Achaean or Aeolian (AC was considered to be the southern branch of Aeolic),<sup>34</sup> the final wave of migration being that of the Dorians c.1200 B.C. The stratification of three dialect groups in Greece, according to this theory, brought about the various dialects of historical times; linguistic forms at variance with those expected from the dialects in which they occurred were explained as due to substrate / superstrate influence. The theory of three successive waves of Greek-speaking invaders who brought the various dialects with them is now discredited: proto-Greek need not have been entirely uniform, but in all probability the dialectal differences within Greek developed in Greece.

Until the mid-20th century, it was generally believed that there were four main dialect groups of Greek: West Greek (which comprised Doric and Northwest Greek), Aeolic (comprising Thessalian, Boeotian and Lesbian), Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cyprian. Aeolic, Att-Ion. and Arcado-

---

<sup>33</sup> "Zur Geschichte der griechischen Dialekten", *Glotta* 1, 1909, 9-59

<sup>34</sup> AC and Aeolic were grouped together as "Central Greek".

Cypriot (AC) were believed to constitute a unity, East Greek, against West Greek,<sup>35</sup> while AC was intermediate between Att-Ion and Aeolic. However, this picture was challenged in the 1950s with the appearance of articles by Walter Porzig<sup>36</sup> and, even more influentially, by Ernst Risch.<sup>37</sup> The new view of dialectal divisions put forward in these articles grouped AC and Att-Ion. closely together to the exclusion of Aeolic. Risch attempted to establish a chronology for the major Greek isoglosses, and found that some of the earliest link AC and Att-Ion. together against West Greek and Aeolic (eg. /si/ < /ti/, shared by Att-Ion., AC and Mycenaean). He therefore postulated for the late 2nd millennium a South Greek dialect of a fairly uniform nature, the ancestor of the later AC and Att-Ion., and also concluded that there was no perceptible difference between Aeolic and West Greek before c.1200 B.C. on the basis of 20 relevant traits.<sup>38</sup> West Greek and Aeolic therefore, according to this theory, before 1200 B.C. constituted a North Greek unity against the supposed South Greek ancestor of AC and Att-Ion. This view Risch subsequently revised somewhat, and he later proposed that Aeolic became distinct from West Greek in the mid-2nd millennium.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> The terms East and West Greek refer to the geographical distribution of the representatives of these groups in historical times.

<sup>36</sup> "Sprachgeographischen Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten", *IF* 61, 1954, 147-69

<sup>37</sup> "Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht", *MH* 12, 1955, 61-76

<sup>38</sup> Retention of -τι (e.g. ποτί); retention of -σσ- of the type τόσσοσ, μέσσοσ; athematic infinitive in -μεν; ὄκα = ὄτε; αἶ κα / κε; e-grade \*g<sup>wel</sup>- in the verb "to wish"..., etc. ("Gliederung", 75).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. "Die griechischen Dialekte im 2. Vorchristlichen Jahrtausend", *SMEA* 20, 1979, 108

One of the most valuable results of Porzig and Risch's work was the revision of the previously accepted view that Lesbian was the "purest" of the Aeolic dialects, and that Thessalian and Boeotian had undergone a great deal of West Greek influence at the end of the Bronze Age (as a result of the "Dorian Invasion"). This is indisputably true of Boeotian, but in Thessaly the further east one goes, the fewer isoglosses appear in common with West Greek. Thus East Thessalian was shown to be the closest of the Aeolic group to its Bronze Age ancestor. Lesbian, on the other hand, formerly thought to be the least "corrupted" dialect of the Aeolic group, was shown by Risch to have absorbed a considerable amount of Ionic influence, and it was as a result of this influence that Lesbian had -σϜ for original -τϜ (which was retained in Thessalian and Boeotian in common with West Greek) and the preposition πρὸς instead of ποτὶ, which is common to Thessalian, Boeotian and West Greek. Thus the proof that Thessalian was the closest of the Aeolic dialects to their Bronze Age antecedent, and the more conservative nature of Aeolic in comparison to AC and Att-Ion. (e.g. Aeolic lack of assibilation, non-simplification of -σσ-<\*-ty-, t<sup>h</sup>y-), led Risch to group Aeolic and West Greek together as representatives of a putative earlier unified North Greek group.

Risch's theory about dialect relations in the late 2nd millennium I find unconvincing, as lack of assibilation and failure to simplify -σσ- are examples of retained archaisms which at one time were common to all Greek. East Thessalian, the most conservative form of Aeolic, does not

share any of the characteristic innovations of West Greek, e.g. ἰαρός, Ἄρταμις,<sup>40</sup> and the “Doric” future of the type δειξέω: Homer has similar futures in the middle voice (ἔσσειται), but West Greek has innovated in creating active forms in -σέω. I therefore favour the older classification of Aeolic as part of the East Greek group; it was the part which was more conservative than the southern part of East Greek, and did not participate fully in its innovations.<sup>41</sup> I would also take issue with the theory that the ancestors of Att-Ion. and AC were not distinct at the end of the Bronze Age: it is true that the major isoglosses which define the Att-Ion. group postdate the end of the Mycenaean period (e.g. /ā/ > /ē/), but it is unlikely that there was uniformity of dialect throughout the southern part of Greece. In all probability, the later dialect groups attested in the alphabetic period already existed in proto-forms before the Dorian Invasion, admittedly with less differentiation than they would later attest. Pausanias’ statement<sup>42</sup> that Athens and Argos spoke the same language before the Dorians arrived should not be taken as evidence that there was no dialectal differentiation,

---

<sup>40</sup> The fact that these pronunciations are common to both Doric and Northwest Greek suggests that they are early and antedate the Dorian Invasion. In any case, ἰαρός must be an innovation, as ἰερός (Mycenaean i-je-ro) < \*iheros < \*iseros, cf. Sanskrit *isirá*. Lesbian ἴρος is a contracted form and may have spread to Lesbian from Ionic, which has the form ἰρός. The formula προτὶ Ἴλιον ἰρήν must be a recent creation, as Attic has only ἰερός.

<sup>41</sup> In addition to these retained archaisms, Aeolic was probably also characterized by its distinctive 3rd declension dative plural ending, -εσσυ. However, it had not yet acquired many of its later characteristic features.

<sup>42</sup> Pausanias 2, 37. 3

but merely that the Argives spoke a non-Doric dialect: Pausanias was in any case writing many centuries after the Dorian invasion and had no knowledge of LBA dialects. Although Herodotus locates “Ionians” in the Peloponnese<sup>43</sup> this does not imply the presence of speakers of proto-Ionic outside Attica, but may mean simply that Ionians contemporary with Herodotus claimed Peloponnesian ancestry. Even if the differences at that date between the proto-AC speech of the northern Peloponnese and the proto-Ionic of Attica were slight, in all probability there was in the late Bronze Age an area of East Greek speech which differed in some respects from proto-AC and proto-Aeolic, which would subsequently evolve into the Att-Ion. dialect group.

### **Proto-AC and Mycenaean**

After the decipherment of Linear B in 1952, it became clear that the tablets, dating from c.1200 B.C., were composed in a dialect similar to those spoken in historical times in Arcadia and Cyprus. Several scholars (including Ruijgh,<sup>44</sup> Wathelet<sup>45</sup>) have taken this fact, coupled with the attestations of various vocabulary items in Homer and Arcado-Cypriot only, as proof of the older theory of Meillet<sup>46</sup> that epic was in Mycenaean times composed in an Arcado-Cypriot dialect, which now was identified with that of the Linear B texts. It will be argued here that epic language was never

---

<sup>43</sup> Herodotus 5,58.2; 7,94; 9,26.3

<sup>44</sup> “D’Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes”, 63; “Le mycénien et Homère”, 148

<sup>45</sup> *Les traits éoliens dans la langue de l'épopée grecque*, 377

<sup>46</sup> *Aperçu*, 175

language, but that there was an AC contribution to the early development of epic.

As Arcadian was surrounded in the 1st millennium by Doric dialects, Meillet<sup>47</sup> concluded that it was the descendant of the old "Achaean" dialect spoken in the LBA throughout the Peloponnese by the Achaeans of epic. The Peloponnese was invaded from the North c.1100 B.C. by West Greek speakers, who probably took advantage of, rather than caused, the collapse of the palace system. Thus settlers from the Peloponnese speaking a dialect of "Achaean"<sup>48</sup> type must have arrived in Cyprus by 1100 B.C. at the latest, as is corroborated by archaeological evidence. Settlement in Cyprus by refugees from the Peloponnese seems to be reflected in legend, which tells of heroes of the Trojan War, such as the Arcadian leader Agapenor,<sup>49</sup> founding cities in Cyprus. Unity prior to the Dorian invasion is the only explanation possible for the close similarity between the dialects spoken in historical times in Arcadia and Cyprus; not only are they hundreds of miles distant, but Arcadia is completely landlocked and was surrounded by West Greek speech areas.

The fact that the Linear B texts are written in a dialect of AC type shows that AC was spoken in the Peloponnese in the late 2nd millennium, but it should not be assumed that the language of the Mycenaean texts was the language of everyday discourse, or, indeed, of epic poetry. Far from it:

---

<sup>47</sup> *Aperçu*, 175

<sup>48</sup> "Achaean" will here refer to the AC dialects, including Mycenaean.

<sup>49</sup> Pausanias 8, 5. 2

Mycenaean seems to be the language of bureaucracy, a chancellery language, which was closely bound up with the palace system and did not survive the destruction of the palaces, thus had no direct descendants among the Greek dialects attested in the historical period.<sup>50</sup> Although Linear B texts (usually inscribed on clay tablets, but sometimes painted on clay jars) have been found in locations as geographically diverse as Crete, Thebes and Pylos, the dialect in which they are composed is of a remarkably uniform nature. As it is scarcely likely that the spoken language of 13th century Greece was even remotely as uniform as the language attested in written form, it must be concluded that Mycenaean conceals the true extent of dialect variation which existed in LBA Greece.

One of the most significant features of Mycenaean is the assibilation of original /ti/, eg pa-si = φασι < φατι, do-so-si = δώσονσι < -οντι (3rd person plural future of δίδωμι), e-ko-si = (h)έχονσι<sup>51</sup> < (h)έχοντι. As all West Greek dialects in the historical period retain original /ti/, assibilation in Mycenaean indirectly proves the existence in the LBA of the two main dialect groups, an East Greek group with assibilation (at least in its more innovative area) and a West Greek group, the ancestor of the later Northwest Greek and Doric dialects, without this innovation. It appears that, at the date of the Mycenaean tablets, assibilation of /ti/ was a

---

<sup>50</sup> "An extinct dialectal branch on the Late Helladic stem of dialects" - A. Bartonek, *Eirene* 9, 1971, 67

<sup>51</sup> The dissimilation of aspirates (Grassmann's Law) probably took place after the end of the Mycenaean Age.

comparatively recent phenomenon in East Greek, one which had not spread north of Attica and the Corinthian Gulf: as already discussed, the ancestor of the Aeolic dialects does not seem to have assibilated, but this is a retained archaism and does not indicate that Aeolic is to be included in the West Greek group.

Mycenaean and Arcado-Cypriot share several isoglosses:

- the preposition ἀπύ, as opposed to Att-Ion. and West Greek ἀπό; both of these may be inherited,<sup>52</sup> therefore this will be a choice between existing alternatives rather than an example of the AC change of final -o to -u;
- /o/ as the result of syllabic resonants, although this is not universal: e.g. Mycenaean qe-to-ro, “four”; pe-mo, pe-ma, = \*σπέρμο, σπέρμα, “seed”;
- the preposition po-si, “towards”, which occurs only in Mycenaean, but is closer to AC πός, which is probably derived from it by apocope, than to any other form (Att-Ion., Lesbian πρόσ, Thessalian, Boeotian, West Greek and Homeric ποτί, and also the aberrant προτί, v. p. 65). The Mycenaean form po-si = \*ποσί is clearly derived from ποτί by assibilation of /ti/.

---

<sup>52</sup> Chantraine, *DELG* 98, s.v. ἀπό: “Une forme \*apu peut également avoir existé en indo-européen, cf. skr. *anu* à côté de grec ἀνά.”

- 3rd person medio-passive endings -τοῖ , -ντοῖ (e.g. e-u-ke-to = εὐχετοῖ, PY Eb 297, Ep 704) as opposed to -ται, -νται in the rest of Greek; only East Thessalian differs, with -τει. Mycenaean, Arcadian and Cypriot appear to preserve the original form. All other dialects evolved by adopting -ται by analogy with other medio-passive endings (-μαι, -σαι). F.R. Adrados<sup>53</sup> argues that -τοῖ /-ντοῖ is a doublet which goes back to Common Greek. I find this convincing, as it is likely that if -τοῖ had been pan-Greek in the Mycenaean Age, traces of it would be attested outside AC; but in fact, not even so archaic a dialect as East Thessalian has -τοῖ.

- prepositions with ablative sense governing the dative case: ἐξ and ἀπύ in AC, pa-ro (= \*παρό) in Mycenaean.

Arcadian and Cypriot, on the other hand, share certain innovations which do not occur in Mycenaean. These are:

- the tendency to alter final -ο to -υ, e.g. Ἄτρεΐδαο > Ἄτρεΐδου (not connected with ἀπύ, which also appears in Mycenaean, equivalent to ἀπό; both of these seem to be inherited forms, from which the various dialects selected). This tendency is clearly old: it is already attested in the name Ὀφέλτου, in the genitive case, which is inscribed in the Cypriot syllabary on a bronze obelisk

---

<sup>53</sup> "Micénico, dialectos paramicénicos y aqueo épico", *Emerita* 44, 1976, 104

from Paphos, dated to the second half of the 11th century.<sup>54</sup> In Cypriot, the genitive singular of masculine  $\alpha$ -stems is always  $-\alpha\nu$  until the 6th century, when  $-\omega$  appears, eg. Πάφω. This tendency is also present in verbal forms of the middle voice with the endings  $-\tau\nu$ ,  $-\nu\tau\nu$  instead of  $-\tauο$ ,  $-\nu\tauο$ . As direct contact between Arcadia and Cyprus was terminated at the end of the 2nd millennium, isoglosses shared by these dialects must be of earlier date. The development of final  $-ο$  to  $-υ$  should be regarded as an isogloss of late Mycenaean date, whose evolution antedates the departure of the future Cypriot-speakers from the Peloponnese.

- The sound-change  $\epsilon > \iota$  before  $\nu$ , e.g. the preposition  $\iota\nu < \epsilon\nu$ , Arcadian  $\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ ,  $\iota\mu\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu\omega$ , Cypriot  $\iota\nu\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ .<sup>55</sup> The same sound-change appears also in some central Cretan inscriptions and in the Achaean colony of Metapontum; in both of these cases, it presumably represents a survival from the pre-Dorian substrate dialect. Likewise in Rhodes, which had been a Mycenaean, and at an earlier date a Minoan, colony, the indigenous inhabitants had the Arcado-Cypriot name  $\iota\gamma\eta\eta\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ .<sup>56</sup> The same treatment of  $\epsilon$  as  $\iota$  before  $\nu$  appears in  $\iota\gamma\nu\acute{\upsilon}\eta$  at N 212, which is unique in Homer. Mycenaean, on the other hand, preserves the original vocalism, e.g,

---

<sup>54</sup> Discovered in 1980; this is the earliest evidence for the use of the Greek language in Cyprus.

<sup>55</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 23

<sup>56</sup> Rhodes also attests  $\kappa\tau\omicron\iota\nu\alpha$ =Mycenaean  $ko-to-na / ko-to-i-na$ . This is the only attestation of the word in historical times.

e-ne-e-si = \*ἐνε(ἠ)ενσί, “they are in” (PY En 609). Homeric πινυτός (H 289, α 229, δ 211, etc.) probably represents a development of \*πενυτός: it is convincingly argued by E. Hamp<sup>57</sup> that the word entered epic language in this characteristic AC form at Mycenaean date. Arcado-Cypriot innovations which are absent from the Linear B texts were restricted to styles or social levels which did not make their way into the palace records.<sup>58</sup>

- Nouns ending in e-u- = -εύς are very common in Mycenaean. Arcadian, however, has -ής in the nominative singular of these nouns, while Cypriot usually has -εύς, but ἱερες (= ἱερεύς) once and βασιλες (= βασιλεύς) once. This implies that there was a degree of diversity within AC before the departure of the future Cypriots. The Mycenaean texts do not provide any examples of an accusative singular of a noun in -εύς, but in most dialects of the alphabetic period it was based on \*-ῆφα, except in Arcadian, which has -ήν; from -ήν there may have been created by analogy a nominative in -ής which competed with -εύς in AC. The Arcadian form of the nominative singular of these nouns (-ής) is probably an innovation of very early date; cf. the couplet Ζεύς / Ζήν, which suggests that the accusative in -ήν may date from the 2nd millennium.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> “Notes on Early Greek Phonology”, *Glotta* 38, 1960, 199

<sup>58</sup> Cowgill, “Ancient Greek Dialectology in the Light of Mycenaean”, 88

<sup>59</sup> M. Lejeune, “Essais de philologie mycénienne VII. La postposition -δε”, *RPh* 35, 1961, 203, note 28

If Mycenaean were the common ancestor of Arcadian and Cypriot, the features shared by these two dialects but lacking in Mycenaean would have had to develop before they were separated as a result of the Dorian invasion, which allows possibly a century for common innovation to occur after the date of the extant Linear B texts. It is much more likely that, rather than the common ancestor of these dialects, the Mycenaean of the palace documents is simply a standardized administrative language without continuation after the collapse of the palace system. Proto-AC was probably spoken over a wide area in Mycenaean times. As Leonard Bloomfield<sup>60</sup> observed, "dialect geography gives evidence as to the former extension of linguistic features that persist only as relic forms...when a feature appears only in detached districts separated by a compact area in which a competing feature is spoken, the map can usually be interpreted to mean that the detached districts were once part of a solid area. Thus dialect geography may show the stratification of linguistic features." This illustrates perfectly the way in which Arcado-Cypriot traits became fossilized and relegated to remote areas of the Greek-speaking world as a result of the enormous upheavals that took place at the end of the 2nd millennium B.C.

### **Proto-Aeolic**

The extent of the Aeolic group in the 2nd millennium is, as indicated above, a source of debate. In fact, following the theory of J. L.

---

<sup>60</sup> *Language*, 2nd edition, 1969, 340

García-Ramón,<sup>61</sup> some scholars even doubt its existence in the Mycenaean period. According to García-Ramón's theory, at the end of the Mycenaean Age (c.1200-1150 B.C.), the combination of East and West Greek isoglosses led to the appearance in Thessaly of a "proto-Aeolic" dialect, from which, he argued, Boeotian separated c.1125 B.C., leaving a Thessalo-Lesbian group. From the latter, according to this theory, "proto-Lesbian" separated c.1000 B.C. Lesbian, once in Asia Minor, developed innovations peculiar to itself (e.g. the type πάνσα > παίσα; τάνς, τόνς > τάλς, τοίς<sup>62</sup>), at the same time as undergoing the influence of Ionic, e.g. assibilation of /ti/, and πρόσ for ποτί.

García-Ramón's theory I find unconvincing. He supports a low date for the vocalization of sonants,<sup>63</sup> \*q<sup>w</sup>e > πe, dative plural in -εσσι, ρι > ρε. However, a different chronology for the appearance of these phenomena leads to the conclusion that, as they are common to all three Aeolic dialects,

---

<sup>61</sup> Expounded in *Les origines post-mycéniennes du groupe dialectale éolien*, Salamanca, 1975

<sup>62</sup> Cyrenaean Doric also shows this treatment of secondary -vσ-, which indicates that substrate theories should be treated with caution.

<sup>63</sup> This is Heubeck's theory ("Syllabic r in Mycenaean?", *Minos* 12, 1972, 55-79); but

Mycenaean shows that \*| and \*r| had already developed supporting vowels. Heubeck argued that the alternative spellings to-no (PY Ta 707) and to-ro-no (as a component of to-ro-no-wo-ko, KN As 1517) are "perhaps to be explained by the assumption that we have to do with different attempts to render spoken \*r| with the insufficient resources of the Mycenaean syllabary" (*art.cit.* 73).

some represent the preservation of ancient 2nd millennium traits, while others developed at the end of the Mycenaean Age, or were adopted from West Greek. The change of ρι to ρε, for example, is common to all Aeolic dialects and may have had a wider distribution before the Dorian Invasion brought speakers of a dialect which lacked this tendency.

The Bronze Age ancestor of the Aeolic dialects (proto-Aeolic) can indisputably be located in Thessaly. Thucydides tells us that the Boeotians were driven out of Thessaly and occupied τὴν νῦν Βοιωτίαν, πρότερον δὲ Καδμηίδα γῆν καλουμένην.<sup>64</sup> These Boeotians should be considered not as part of the Bronze Age Aeolic population of Thessaly, but as West Greek invaders, like the Thessalians who repulsed them. There is no reason to imagine that the Dorian Invasion was a monolithic event; it is more likely that the incursions of West Greek speakers into areas of East Greek speech took place over a considerable number of years, and that Thucydides' Boeotians were stragglers who arrived in a second or later influx, probably bringing with them the name of their previous location.<sup>65</sup> In historical times, Boeotian was separated from Thessalian by the North West dialects Phocian and Locrian, which contained the Aeolic type of dative plural ending -εσσι, possibly from the Aeolic substrate dialect.

---

<sup>64</sup> Thucydides 1, 12

<sup>65</sup> Buck (*The Greek Dialects*, 5) plausibly proposed Mt. Boeon in Epirus; cf. Desborough, *The last Mycenaeans and their Successors*, 247

Proto-Aeolic, then, was probably spoken over a large extent of mainland Greece to the north of the Isthmus, although it is unlikely that it extended further south than this. Aeolic-type datives in  $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  are attested in the alphabetic period in the Doric dialects of Corinth and the Argolid, and the North West dialect of Elis, and have been taken by some scholars to indicate the presence of Aeolic speech in the Peloponnese in the 2nd millennium.<sup>66</sup> Such an assumption is less convincing than the probability of an extension of a distinctive isogloss to several dialects of central Greece. This form of the dative plural would have been felt to be desirable as it had the advantage of maintaining the stem in recognizable form; frequently the stem was masked as the result of the combination of a final stop with  $-\sigma\iota$ , particularly in the case of a stem which had a final dental stop, e.g.  $*\pi\omicron\delta-\sigma\iota > *π\omicron\tau-\sigma\iota > \pi\omicron\sigma\sigma\iota$ . It is impossible to determine whether this dative plural ending in the Peloponnese is the result of a recent extension or whether it belongs to the "Achaean" substrate dialect spoken in this region in the 2nd millennium, but in view of the fact that these dialects are surrounded by areas which lack this isogloss, and given the generally conservative and archaic nature of Argolic, it is in all likelihood a relic from the 2nd millennium. Whatever the date of the adoption of this morpheme, it represents a borrowing from Aeolic. An isogloss can spread from one dialect to another which is not genetically close: in this way Ionic innovations spread to Lesbian in the 1st millennium.

---

<sup>66</sup> E.g. Palmer, *The Greek Language*, 1980, 70

Although the presence of enclaves of Aeolic speech in the 2nd millennium Peloponnese is unlikely, a wide distribution for proto-Aeolic can nevertheless reasonably be postulated, given that the Aeolic dative plural, -εσσσι, was in all likelihood part of epic language by the end of the Mycenaean Age (v. p.45-8). Epic was a pan-Greek possession and its language was an artistic *koine* without regional boundaries, and was unlikely to have adopted linguistic forms which would link it too closely with any particular region. Therefore proto-Aeolic is unlikely to have been confined to Thessaly. For the same reason, it is unlikely that there was any proto-Ionic contribution to epic in the Mycenaean Age, as this speech-form was in all probability restricted to a comparatively small area. Proto-Ionic was certainly distinct from proto-AC by the end of the Mycenaean Age, although in most respects very similar to it; but the fact that its distinguishing isoglosses were restricted to a small area, and therefore would have been considered parochial, meant that they would have been avoided by epic poets, whose poetry was intended for Greece in its entirety.

East Greek elements in mainland Aeolic (e.g. ἑρόος, οἱ instead of τοῖ) derive from the dialect spoken in this region before the arrival of the Dorians. (Lesbian is a different case, as it contains ancient, inherited East Greek elements as well as more recent isoglosses shared with Ionic.) Within mainland Aeolic, these East Greek elements are most heavily concentrated in East Thessalian, and in Boeotian are largely superseded by West Greek

forms.<sup>67</sup> Archaeology and myth indicate the presence of Mycenaean in all the territory which is later Aeolic, but nonetheless the “Mycenaeanisms” (e.g. ττ < πτ, as in ττολίαρχος < πτολίαρχος) appear to be particularly concentrated in one zone, Pelasgiotis, the easternmost area of Thessaly, and the one furthest removed from Doric influence. The forms πτόλεμος = πόλεμος and πτόλις = πόλις, common in Homer, where they are useful metrical variants, are indirectly attested for Mycenaean in the personal names e-u-ru-po-to-re-mo-jo<sup>68</sup>, the genitive of Ἐυρύπτολεμος; po-to-re-ma-ta, possibly Πτολεμάτας; po-to-ri-jo, interpreted by Ventris and Chadwick as Πτολίων,<sup>69</sup> and by C.J. Ruijgh as Πτόλιος.<sup>70</sup> Cypriot attests πτόλις several times in the form po-to-li-se (in the Cypriot syllabary), always with πτ-, and πτόλεμος is attributed by Eustathius to the Cypriot dialect. Arcadian always uses the form πόλις in inscriptions, but according to Pausanias, the ancient quarter of Mantinea was known as Πτόλις.<sup>71</sup> Cretan, as a Doric dialect, generally shows πόλις and πόλεμος, but the form πτολιοικος occurs on coins from Aptera, and presumably goes back to the pre-Dorian Achaean speech of the island. The appearance of πτ- forms in Thessalian is more surprising, as they are absent from the other

---

<sup>67</sup> The theory that Boeotian is the result of a combination of East Greek (i.e. Aeolic) and West Greek elements was first proposed by Felix Solmsen in a 1904 article: “Eigennamen als Zeugen der Stammenmischung in Böotien”, *RhM* 59, 481-505

<sup>68</sup> *Documents*, 418. The initial εϐ- is a restoration, which is convincing in view of the length of the word: ]po-to-re-mo-jo, PY Fn 324.27.

<sup>69</sup> *Documents*, 574

<sup>70</sup> *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, 1967, 150

<sup>71</sup> Pausanias 8, 12.7

Aeolic dialects, and the epic use of these forms is certainly not attributable to Aeolic. Thessalian attests *πολιάρχοι* and *ἀρχιπολιάρχεντος* (< \*πτολιάρχοι / \*ἀρχιπτολιάρχεντος) in a 3rd century inscription from Phalanna, and in a 3rd century inscription from Larissa, *Τολεμαῖος* for *Πτολεμαῖος*. The Lagides, originally from Macedonia, a region close to Thessaly, made famous the name *Πτολεμαῖος*, not \**Πολεμαῖος*. These Thessalian forms showing *ττ-* / *πτ-* in place of the expected *π-* are best explained as the result of Mycenaean influence in Thessaly in the 2nd millennium. Ruijgh is correct, therefore, in ascribing epic *πτόλις*, *πτολίεθρον*, etc. to the “Achaean” element in the language.<sup>72</sup> The distribution of these forms in the 2nd millennium seems likely to have been much wider than in the 1st millennium, as epic would not have incorporated a form which was associated only with a small region.

### West Greek

The fact that the 1st millennium West Greek dialects, unlike the Mycenaean of the Linear B documents, does not show assibilation indirectly proves the existence at that date of the two main Greek dialect divisions. The location of proto-West Greek speakers in the 2nd millennium has been subject to debate: the traditional view is that West Greek speakers were located in the north and west of Greece at this time, moving south only at the end of the 2nd millennium, a migration traditionally known as the “Dorian Invasion”.

---

<sup>72</sup> *L'élément achéen*, 76

The reality of the Dorian Invasion was not questioned until 1976, when John Chadwick<sup>73</sup> proposed that Dorians constituted the lower classes in the LBA Peloponnese, and that Mycenaeans, i.e. AC speakers, were their overlords. Because there is a dearth of archaeological evidence for the Dorian Invasion, Chadwick proposed that the Dorians, rather than being incomers whose arrival in southern Greece postdated 1200 B.C., already constituted the lower-class inhabitants of the Peloponnese, who were subject to Mycenaean overlords. Chadwick's view has found very little support: it is in any case highly improbable that two types of dialect, one (the minority dialect) with assibilation, the other (the speech of the majority) without this innovation, could have coexisted and remained distinct for any length of time. Although there does not seem to have been any significant Dorian population in the 13th century Peloponnese, the presence of individual Dorians (perhaps economic migrants?) cannot be excluded,<sup>74</sup> but West Greek dialects did not make any contribution to epic language at the Mycenaean stage.

### **Dialect diversity: its implications for epic**

Mycenaean itself, despite its generally uniform nature, does provide some evidence for dialect diversity. There are isolated differences which occur both within and between specific sites. In a significant minority

---

<sup>73</sup> "Who Were the Dorians?", *PP* 156, 1976, 103-17

<sup>74</sup> Victor Parker, "Gab es wirklich Dorier auf dem mykenischen Peloponnes?", *PP* 48, 1993, 241-66

of cases, Mycenae has -i as the dative singular ending of the 3rd declension, eg. po-se-da-o-ni = Ποσειδάωνι, as opposed to -e, which predominates at Knossos and Pylos, and is the inherited form (cf. early Latin -ei). This suggests that the local dialect of the Argolid had innovated in this direction.<sup>75</sup> Homer sometimes preserves traces of the older form (v. pp. 118-24), as do some Attic and Cypriot personal names, eg. Attic Διειτρέφης, Cypriot Διφείφιλος, Διφείθεμις. Also within Mycenaean, Knossos has very few examples of the symbol a<sub>2</sub> = /ha/; this suggests a lack of aspiration. Again at Knossos, there are examples of the instrumental plural case ending -pi = φι used with o-stems<sup>76</sup>; these formations do not occur at other sites, where this case-ending is restricted to consonant and a-stems.

As it is clear that there were at least slight dialectal differences between centres of Mycenaean civilization, it is reasonable to expect that such differences were also to be found outside this area, and in view of the fact that the Mycenaean of the Linear B tablets is a standardized administrative language, that they were even more noticeable in the spoken dialects. In Attica and on the neighbouring islands it is probable that there already existed in the 13th century a proto-Ionic dialect group, sharing with Mycenaean the southern innovation /si/ < /ti/. Some degree of dialectal diversity is also suggested by the Att-Ion. preposition πρός, which cannot be derived from Mycenaean po-si.<sup>77</sup> The date at which proto-Ionic selected

---

<sup>75</sup> Wathelet, "Mycénien et grec d'Homère 1. Le datif en -ι", *AC* 31, 1962, 5-14

<sup>76</sup> E.g. o-mo-pi (KN Se 891)

<sup>77</sup> V. pp.61-5 for a discussion of the various Homeric forms of the preposition "towards".

or developed  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  cannot be determined precisely; but the fact that it belongs to all branches of Ionic proves that it is pre-migration, therefore antedates 1000 B.C. There must also have existed in the North of the mainland a proto-Aeolic group. Its exact extent is debatable: it can certainly be postulated for Thessaly. Palmer<sup>78</sup> brought proto-Aeolic as far south as Corinth (Thucydides tells us that Corinth was once Aeolic<sup>79</sup>), and argued for the presence of Aeolic speakers in the Peloponnese, on the basis of  $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  datives in Elean, Corinthian and Argolic. As already discussed, the Aeolic group I include in East Greek, following the classification which was conventional from Kretschmer onwards, although it had not participated in the change  $/ti/ > /si/$ , or in the simplification of  $-\sigma\sigma- < *ty, *thy$ . The Linear B script does not indicate doubled consonants, so it is impossible to tell whether Mycenaean had simplified  $-\sigma\sigma- < *ty, *thy$ . However, it is a reasonable assumption that this evolution had already taken place throughout southern East Greek by the end of the Mycenaean Age, as Att-Ion. and Arcadian share this isogloss.

The Linear B dialect, then, is one of East Greek type, related to Ionic and AC, but of earlier date, and containing archaisms (eg. the  $-\phi\iota$  case) which do not occur in these dialects, while also lacking innovations belonging to them and to the rest of Greek. It is apparently closely related to Arcadian and Cypriot, but not their direct ancestor. As the language of administration, it was closely bound up with the palatial system, and did not

---

<sup>78</sup> *The Greek Language*, 70

<sup>79</sup> Thucydides 4, 42.2

survive its overthrow. The historical Arcadian and Cypriot dialects, on the other hand, are the probable descendants of dialects spoken in the Peloponnese in the Mycenaean Age, and were isolated and fossilized as a consequence of the Dorian Invasion.

The existence of all four main dialect groups<sup>80</sup> of the alphabetic period in proto-form at least therefore seems certain for the late 2nd millennium, although the differences between the dialects at the time of the Dorian invasion were probably very slight. The differences between East and West Greek at the end of the Bronze Age consisted mainly of a series of innovations (including choices<sup>81</sup>) made by East Greek, sometimes in differing forms according to dialect.<sup>82</sup> However, it is unrealistic to assume that East or West Greek was absolutely homogeneous at the end of the Bronze Age. In addition to doublets, there must have existed "pockets" of archaisms and innovations which were incomplete, e.g. the lack of assibilation in proto-Aeolic. In the same way, some highly isolated archaisms remained in the alphabetic period, e.g. Thessalian genitives in -οι by apocope from -οιο, Boeotian -φι, Attic ξύν. The mainland events alluded to in Homer are not confined to the Peloponnese, but include Thebes, Calydon and other localities, thus it is reasonable to assume that poems in the old epic language were sung at all Mycenaean courts. As there

---

<sup>80</sup> Pamphylian is excluded from this discussion.

<sup>81</sup> Choice between two differing forms is also an innovation.

<sup>82</sup> F.R. Adrados, "La creación de los dialectos griegos del primer milenio", *Emerita* 44, 1976, 245-6

is no reason to imagine that epic at this date was restricted to any particular region of the East Greek speaking area, the dialect of Mycenaean epic should not be identified with any local dialect of the 2nd millennium, but rather as a form of artistic *koine*<sup>83</sup> which was able to absorb elements from the spoken dialects with which it came into contact. These will thus have been Aeolic and Arcado-Cypriot in their contemporary forms; it is conceivable that Ionic also made a contribution at this early stage, although this is unlikely, since it was probably felt to be merely a parochial speech-form, or sub-dialect of the wider southern East Greek dialect. This process was analogous to the way in which, during the 1st millennium, epic absorbed forms from the dialects spoken in the region where it was recited, in this case the Ionic and Lesbian of Asia Minor, but was never closely identified with a closely circumscribed locality in this area, and thus could be regarded as a pan-Greek possession; indeed, epic was probably felt to be a pan-Greek possession in pre-migration times too. In a similar way, epic absorbed recent cultural elements and recent linguistic forms.

### **Non-Ionic Elements in Homeric Language**

As it seems probable that epic language in the Bronze Age was a literary (albeit oral) dialect of East Greek type which could absorb elements

---

<sup>83</sup> Hoekstra, *Homeric Modification of Formulaic Prototypes*, 150-1: "...I see no linguistic objection to the view that already before the twelfth century there developed an epic *κοινή* in which (South-) Mycenaean formulae were intermingled with expressions belonging to a dialect which... may be called 'proto-Aeolic' or 'North Mycenaean'."

from the spoken dialects of the regions where epic was sung, it is appropriate to examine the dialectal provenance of certain non-Ionic features of epic language.

### Lack of Assibilation

A significant period of development for epic language in the southern, more innovative area of East Greek can be postulated in view of the fact that epic almost always attests assibilation of /ti/. One very obvious exception is the personal name Ὀρτίλοχος (γ 489, φ16). Ὀρσίλοχος with assibilation is a *varia lectio* at E 547, reflecting ancient attempts to make the names identical, and Zenodotus read the unassibilated form Ὀρτίλοχος at E 549.<sup>84</sup> These efforts echo the common Greek practice of naming grandsons after grandfathers; but both forms derive from ὄρνυμι, and Ὀρτι- is the earlier form, becoming Ὀρσι- with assibilation. Aristarchus read Ὀρτι- for the grandfather and Ὀρσι- for the grandson; the poet may have felt that the older, unassibilated form was more appropriate for the older generation.<sup>85</sup> Hoekstra plausibly suggests that the unassibilated form may go back to the “Achaean-Aeolian nobility”, and was preserved through “aristocratic family pride”<sup>86</sup>; it is well known that personal names do often preserve archaic linguistic forms. The alternation between the -τι- and -σι-

---

<sup>84</sup> E 547-9: Ὀρσίλοχος δ' ἄρ' ἔτικτε Διοκλῆα μεγάθυμον

ἐκ δὲ Διοκλῆος διδυμάονε παῖδε γενέσθην

Κρήθων Ὀρσίλοχος τε...

<sup>85</sup> Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol.II, 115

<sup>86</sup> *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. II, 179

forms may be due to dialectal differences: although less common than the -σι- form, Ὀρτίλοχος is attested at Halicarnassus c. 400 B.C.<sup>87</sup> As Halicarnassus was a Dorian colony, this unassibilated form of the name may represent a family tradition. Even if this form of the name was directly inspired by epic, it shows that the text of Homer contained the form with -τι- before the Alexandrian period. Genealogies are in any case among the most traditional elements in epic,<sup>88</sup> and it is conceivable that these lines may be an adaptation of a passage of Mycenaean date: the forms Διοκλήα and Διοκλήος and the duals in the phrase διδυμάονε παῖδε γενέσθην are archaic, although the first syllable of παῖδε cannot be resolved. The use of the imperfect ἔτικτε at the trochaic caesura appears to be traditional; like the aorist middle, the imperfect of τίκτειν is more commonly used of the father than of the mother.<sup>89</sup>

This Homeric name is not attested in Mycenaean, but the same initial element appears in the personal name o-ti-na-wo, transcribed as \*Ὀρτίναφος (PY Cn 285). Similar cases are to be found in the Mycenaean personal names na-pu-ti-jo (KN Db 1232, PY Jn 845), which seems to occur in epic in the form νηπύτιος (N 292 νηπύτιοι ὄως), and ta-ti-qa-we-u (PY An 724), which probably represents \*Στατιγῶφεύς.

---

<sup>87</sup> *GDI* 5727d, 1.7

<sup>88</sup> D.Gray, "Mycenaean Names in Homer", *JHS* 78, 1958, 47: "The (Mycenaean) names...are most common in family histories and passages which may be called feudal..."

<sup>89</sup> Cf. B 628, Z 155, Λ 224, ο 243. Chantraine observes (*GH II*, 175) that Homer uses the aorist active τέκε(ν) 56 times, but the aorist middle τέκετο only 3 times, of the mother, and that the verse-end phrases τέκεν αὐτή, τέκε μήτηρ appear formulaic.

Homer has a few other forms lacking the expected assibilation of /ti/, but these are rare, and although no single explanation accounts for all of them, they seem to be words which did not belong to everyday Ionic speech: Wathelet cites ποτί (a traditional component of epic diction), Θέτις, μήτις (and its derivatives μητιόεις and μητιετα), φάτις, μάντις, βωτιάνειρα as words lacking the expected assibilation.<sup>90</sup> Some of these may have been created after the sound change /ti/ > /si/ was complete, but whether these words entered epic early or late, they did not belong to everyday speech, and would thus have avoided being affected by linguistic developments which affected words in common use. Wathelet remarks<sup>91</sup> that it is surprising that “Achaean” \*ποσί is absent from epic, speculating that Aeolic bards may have replaced it with ποτί; this assumes that there was an “Aeolic phase”. It is admittedly conceivable that epic did contain \*ποσί before the Dorian invasion, and that Ionic-speaking bards subsequently replaced it in the pre-migration period with ποτί, known to them from neighbouring Doric and Boeotian. Alternatively, and more probably, epic always had ποτί, which would rightly have been felt to be older and more traditional, alongside the innovative apocopated πός, which would have been used at a very early date when a monosyllable was required.

It is impossible to know whether 2nd millennium epic language participated in certain isoglosses which had not affected East Greek in its entirety. As far as assibilation of /ti/ is concerned, it is likely that epic had

---

<sup>90</sup> *Traits*, 103

<sup>91</sup> *Traits*, 103

participated in this development: the subject matter of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* suggests that epic was fostered by the culture of the ruling élite of the Mycenaean palaces, which developed in the Peloponnese and spread as far north as Thessaly. The administrative language of the palace system shows assibilation, as do Att-Ion. and AC, the descendants of the dialects spoken in the southern East Greek area in the Late Bronze Age. Thus if epic was associated with this civilization, as it appears to have been, it is only natural that it should have shared in an isogloss which characterized the region where the civilization developed, and that the newer forms with assibilation would have been used in free composition and in modification of formulae once this new phenomenon was firmly established in the spoken language, while some unassibilated forms would have been retained in formulaic contexts, viz. the probable retention of ποτί.

### **Dative Plural in -εσσι**

The dative plural in -εσσι is attested in all three Aeolic dialects, therefore is to be dated earlier than the fragmentation of proto-Aeolic. The traditional explanation<sup>92</sup> for the origin of this desinence is as follows: from regular datives plural of stems in -εσ- (eg. γένεσσι: γένος, ἀληθέσσι: ἀληθής) an independent ending -εσσι was extracted and added to all consonant stems. Jacob Wackernagel,<sup>93</sup> however, explained -εσσι by means of analogy with the second declension: thus, as nominative plural φίλοι + σι = φίλοισι, so nominative plural ἄνδρες + σι = ἄνδρεσσι.

<sup>92</sup> Found in F.Bopp, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, 1833, 292

<sup>93</sup> "Zur griechischen Nominalflexion", *IF* 14, 1903, 373-5

Wackernagel's theory, favoured also by C.J. Ruijgh,<sup>94</sup> has the advantage of basing the analogy on a more extensive group, namely thematic forms of animate genders, rather than the comparatively small group of neuters with stems in -εσ- and adjectives in -ης, whence the ending would have had to spread to the entire 3rd declension. The neuter gender would naturally have adopted the new ending for adjectives, in which the genitive and dative endings in the neuter are identical to those of the masculine. Subsequently the new ending would have been extended to athematic nouns, viz. πάντα : πάντεςσι = σώματα : σώματεςσι. The type γενέεςσι, rather than being an artificial creation of epic language, may be a genuine Aeolic form, as Wathelet has proposed,<sup>95</sup> in which the ending -εσσι was added to the stem of 3rd declension neuters in -εσ-, contrasting with the Common Greek and archaic type γένεεςσι, simplified in some dialects to γένεσι: all three variants are found in epic.

The creation of this morpheme would therefore have required the presence of -οισι in ο-stems (and perhaps also -ασι in -α-stems). Mycenaean still distinguishes datives in -ο-ι (probably pronounced /-oihi/),<sup>96</sup> and instrumentals in -ο (= /ois/). At post-Mycenaean date the dialects selected between the long and short endings and generalized the favoured

---

<sup>94</sup>“Les datifs pluriels dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien”, *Mnemosyne* 11, 1958, 97-116

<sup>95</sup> *Traits*, 262-3

<sup>96</sup> Intervocalic /s/ had not yet been restored in this position; its subsequent restoration was probably due to analogy with consonant stems, eg. ka-ke-u-si (= χαλκεύσι), where -u- is equivalent to /w/.

form. Thus the creation of the independent case-ending  $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  must be anterior to the generalization of  $-\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  as the dative plural of  $\omicron$ -stems in Thessalian and Boeotian. Lesbian  $-\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$  shows that the longer form was still in use in Aeolic at the time of the migration to Asia Minor; in Lesbian it was retained for a long time, as the change  $-\nu\varsigma > \iota\varsigma$  made the long form necessary in order to distinguish the accusative plural endings  $-\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ,  $-\alpha\iota\varsigma$  from the dative plural forms  $-\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$ ,  $-\alpha\iota\sigma\iota$ . Thus the only indisputable *terminus ante quem* for the creation of  $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  is the separation of Boeotian from the future Thessalian and Lesbian, but its prevalence in Boeotian implies that it was established in proto-Aeolic before Boeotian was cut off from Thessalian, therefore it must have existed before the Dorian Invasion.<sup>97</sup>

Thus it is highly likely that  $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  entered epic language in the Mycenaean Age, providing a useful metrical variant for  $-\sigma\iota$ . The antiquity of  $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  within the epic tradition is apparent from its frequent use at verse-end or before the trochaic caesura, which, with the penthemimeral, is one of the two oldest line divisions.

### **Gemination and Compensatory Lengthening**

Thessalian and Lesbian share, to the exclusion of Boeotian, gemination of sonants as the result of the prehistoric groups containing

---

<sup>97</sup> Wathelet, *Traits*, 260

liquid / nasal + \*s or \*y.<sup>98</sup> Boeotian, like Att-Ion. and the Doric dialects, and usually Arcadian, has compensatory lengthening of the previous vowel with loss of \*s or \*y.

The deficiencies of the Linear B writing system, which denotes neither long vowels nor double consonants, makes it difficult to determine the stage represented by Mycenaean. In all likelihood, Mycenaean represents a stage common to all Greek, in which the pronunciation of /s/ and /y/ had been reduced to /h/, whose presence generally is not indicated in Mycenaean, but which may still have been treated as a full consonant. The evolution of the various dialects in this respect corresponds to selections made in accordance with isoglosses of limited extension, e.g.:

\*φθέρ-γω > \*φθέρω (Mycenaean stage) > Att-Ion. φθέρω; Arcadian φθήρω; Thessalian, Lesbian φθέρω

\*χέρσας (cf. Hittite *kasr*) > \*χέρσας (Mycenaean stage) > Att-Ion. χέρσας; Thessalian, Lesbian χέρσας

As Att-Ion. and Doric show the same treatment of these groups, the first compensatory lengthening can be assumed to have taken place after the Dorian invasion, therefore between c. 1100 and 1000 B.C. As Thessalian and Lesbian differ from Boeotian, the development clearly occurred after the separation of Boeotian from the future Thessalian and Lesbian. Traces

---

<sup>98</sup> This excludes secondary -νσ-, e.g. πάνσα < \*πάντσα.

of gemination resulting from these groups are attested occasionally in Arcadian<sup>99</sup>; rather than representing an “Aeolic substrate” in the Peloponnese, this represents an isolated example within Arcadian of an alternative choice to the regular Arcadian development \*vowel + /r/ + /h/ > long vowel + /r/. Lejeune<sup>100</sup> explained the evolution of intervocalic liquid / nasal + sibilant as follows: these groups underwent an inversion, becoming \*sr, \*sl, \*sm, \*sn, then developed in the same way and contemporaneously with the ancient groups containing sibilant + liquid / nasal. Support for a stage at which the /s/ or /y/ of these groups was reduced to an aspiration can be found in the fact that Mycenaean does not show /s/, signifying that this sound had already disappeared; sometimes, however, it does indicate aspiration with the symbols transcribed as ro<sub>2</sub> and ra<sub>2</sub> = /rho/, /rha/, e.g. ku-pa-ro<sub>2</sub> / ku-pa-ro, a-ro<sub>2</sub>-a (neuter plural) < \*aryos, “better”, a-ke-ti-ra<sub>2</sub> / a-ke-ti-ri-ja. The result of ancient /s/ or /y/ appears to be the same, /h/, at the date of the Mycenaean tablets. A similar phenomenon can be seen in the hesitation between o- and jo-(=/yo/) in the conjunction ὄς: o di-do-si = \*ὄς δίδονσι.

---

<sup>99</sup> There are three Arcadian examples of geminated liquids or nasals: ἔ[κρ]ιννον in a 3rd century inscription from Orchomenus; ὀφέλλονσι in a 4th century inscription from Orchomenus, which also contains ἦναι (= εἶναι) < \*es-nai, with regular Arcadian compensatory lengthening instead of gemination; ὄμμε in a 3rd century inscription also including the form ὄμμε, the regular form with long /a/ resulting from \*ῆs-sme. These were accepted by F. Kiechle (*Kadmos* 1, 1962, 101) as evidence of an Aeolic component in the population of Orchomenus.

<sup>100</sup> *Phonétique*, 129

The fact that Thessalian and Lesbian attest geminated liquids and nasals as the continuation of ancient groups of liquid / nasal + s / y means that the phenomenon dates from before the Aeolian migration to Asia Minor. Compensatory lengthening of short vowels preceding ancient groups of liquid / nasal + s / y must likewise antedate the Ionian migration, as it occurs in both Attic and Ionic. Given that Mycenaean seems to represent a stage with liquid / nasal + /h/, these developments must have taken place between 1200 and 1000 B.C.

In nearly all cases of ancient sibilant + liquid / nasal, Homer attests the Ionic solution with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. A few words, however, appear in the Aeolic form, either because they provide a useful metrical alternative to the Ionic form, e.g. the pronouns ἄμμες and ὕμμες (and their corresponding case-forms) for Ionic ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς, etc.; or because the expected Ionic form does not exist, e.g. ἀργεννός, ἐρεβεννός, ἀγαννιφός; or because the corresponding form as used in Ionic would not fit into the hexameter, e.g. Aeolic ἐραννός (I 531, η 18) where Ionic ἐρατεινός would be metrically impossible.<sup>101</sup>

I 531 (verse-end) ...Καλυδῶνος ἐραννήης

η 18 (verse-end) ...πόλιν δύσεσθαι ἐραννήην

---

<sup>101</sup> Epic invariably has the Ionic adjective φαεινός, never the metrically equivalent Aeolic form φαεννός.

Neither of these extracts shows any hint of formulaic usage. The Meleager story in I seems to be a reworking of an earlier epic, while η seems to be highly untraditional, thus there seems to be no reason to consider ἐραυνός in any of its cases as a traditional part of bardic diction. The Ionic synonym ἐρατεινός is much commoner, occurring 16 times in the *Iliad*, 15 of these at verse-end, and 11 times in the *Odyssey*, all but one again at verse-end.

### **Labiovelars**

Linear B has a series of stops representing the Indo-European labiovelars; these stops are retained in Mycenaean in almost all positions.<sup>102</sup> In post-Mycenaean Greek, the labiovelars developed to simple stops according to dialect and phonetic environment. This change occurred after the Dorian Invasion in two waves, the first of which affected only Att-Ion. and West Greek, and to a certain extent AC, involving the change of labiovelars to dental stops before front vowels, through a stage of palatalization. AC sometimes attests an affricative pronunciation for the ancient labiovelars, which suggests that it participated in, but did not complete, the dentalization process which took place in Att-Ion. and West Greek.

---

<sup>102</sup> Except when a labiovelar occurs in the immediate vicinity of /u/, or when two labiovelars occur in the same word.

In the second stage, which also affected Aeolic, all remaining labiovelars became labial stops: thus labiovelars before vowels of a- and o-quality in Att-Ion. and West Greek became π, β, or φ, while labiovelars in all positions in Aeolic became labial stops. Thus \*g<sup>w</sup>hēr > Att-Ion. θήρ, Aeolic φήρ; \*q<sup>w</sup>etwr- (cf. Mycenaean qe-to-ro) > Ionic τέσσαρες, Attic τέτταρες, Thessalian πετρο-, Lesbian πέσσυρες. Clearly the development of all labiovelars to simple stops antedates the migrations to Asia Minor. It had taken place before the change /ā/ > /ē/ in Att-Ion., which, as it is common to all branches of Ionic, can also be assumed to be pre-migration in origin: a relative chronology for these sound-changes can be deduced from the development \*q<sup>w</sup>ālikos > \*παλίκος > πηλίκος, as /q<sup>w</sup>/ becomes /p/ before /ā/.<sup>103</sup>

Epic usually shows the Att-Ion. treatment of labiovelars, e.g. τέσσαρες < \*q<sup>w</sup>etw-, πέντε < \*penq<sup>w</sup>e, rather than Aeolic πέμπε. In a handful of words, however, the Aeolic treatment appears. These are: πέλομαι, “be, become”(65 times); πίσυρες, “four” (6 times); πέλωρ, “portentous” (33 times); Φήρες, “Centaur” (twice); βέρεθρον, “pit” (twice). All of these are in all probability secondary Aeolisms adopted from Lesbian, or in the case of πίσυρες, which has no apparent formular connexions, an artificial form (to be discussed, pp. 301-2).

---

<sup>103</sup> Palmer, *The Greek Language*, 63

## Long α

In most positions, Homer has the typical East Ionic treatment of inherited /ā/ as η. This is an innovation of the Att-Ion. group; the change is more thorough-going in East Ionic than in Attic, which restored α after ι, ε and ρ. All other dialects, including Aeolic, retained original /ā/. Yet Homer has some forms containing /ā/ where Ionic /ē/ would be expected, e.g. θεά, Ποσειδάων, and many examples of the original, Common Greek genitive endings, which are attested in Mycenaean in the form -a-o = -α(h)ο, -α(h)ων, as well as examples of the “modern”, Ionic endings with quantitative metathesis, often scanned as a single syllable with synizesis. However, there is not a single example in Homer of the older type with \*-ηο, \*-ηων, which must be reconstructed for Ionic: at an early date, proto-Ionic can be assumed to have had genitives of the type Ἄτρειδοο, which subsequently became \*Ἄτρειδοηο and finally Ἄτρειδεω, the latter familiar from Homer. The forms showing metathesis of quantity may sometimes replace earlier, elided \*-αο, e.g. Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος (A 1) for \*Πηληϊάδα Ἀχιλῆος; such cases represent modernization of ancient formulae, while cases of disyllabic -εω(ν) are rare and “do not show the slightest trace of formulaic employment”,<sup>104</sup> with the exception of νεῶν (<\*ναφῶν), whose formulaic usages must represent creations by recent poets.

---

<sup>104</sup> Hoekstra, *Modifications*, 32

The absence of -ῆ(ν) genitives in Homer has been taken by some scholars as evidence of an Aeolic phase of composition,<sup>105</sup> on the basis that Ionic had already adopted quantitative metathesis before Ionic bards took over the epic tradition from their putative Aeolic predecessors. It is certainly puzzling that Homer should not retain these archaic Ionic forms while using ῆ in such forms as νῆός < \*νᾱ́φος.<sup>106</sup> A possible explanation is that, when quantitative metathesis caused the sequence -ῆο- to become obsolete in spoken Ionic, bards found the resulting sequence -εω unmetrical, so replaced the obsolete forms with the metrically equivalent Aeolic forms -αο, -άων. This pronunciation was supported not only by the presence of the older forms in the neighbouring Aeolic speech community, but also by the fact that the second wave of compensatory lengthening had restored to Ionic the phoneme /ā/, viz. τάνς > τάς, πάνσα > πᾶσα. The adoption of these Aeolic genitive forms (which were also old Ionic forms, although the poets would not have been aware of this) was facilitated by the presence of other Aeolisms, such as datives in -εσσι, probably ποτί = πρός, and forms which were pan-Greek archaisms, but were perceived as Aeolic, e.g. μέσσος with unsimplified -σσ-, equivalent to μέσος. The existence of the alternatives -αο / -έω, -άων / -έων would have been perceived as being entirely in character for epic language, which retains doublets to a far greater extent than ordinary speech does.

---

<sup>105</sup> E.g. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*, 90

<sup>106</sup> The loss of digamma produced antevocalic shortening / quantitative metathesis. The latter was one of the latest phonological changes to affect epic language.

Epic includes several forms containing α lengthened by position which evolved to η, e.g. ἠνορέη, ἠνεμόεις, ἠγάθεος, but others in which metrically lengthened α retained its a-timbre, eg. ἄθνατος: in the latter category the association with everyday items of vocabulary was presumably more keenly felt than in the former category. In the case of ἠνορέη, lack of epenthetic -δ- may have obscured the etymological connexion with ἀνήρ, causing metrically lengthened initial ἄ- to become ἠ- in Ionian epic; there is a strong probability that \*ἄνορέα belonged to pre-migration epic, since it contains a non-Ionic result of the syllabic resonant in the zero-grade of the root of ἀνήρ (v. pp. 56-61). There is no single satisfactory explanation for the distribution of /ā/ and /ē/ in Homer, but as epic language was distinct from that of everyday discourse, it could maintain phonemes or groups thereof which were unwonted in normal speech. This plausibly accounts for the retention of /ā/ in proper names such as Αἰνείας, Ἑρμείας<sup>107</sup>: Αἰνείας was not a common name, quite apart from the fact that proper names frequently retain forms which are otherwise obsolete, and the god's name had the contracted form Ἑρμῆς in everyday Ionic. Thus these names were not affected by the normal evolution of the language, unlike formations with the suffix -ίδης / -άδης < -ίδας / -άδας. The retention in epic of the phoneme /ā/ before the 2nd compensatory lengthening took effect in Ionic would have been supported by its presence in Lesbian; epic seems to have

---

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Mycenaean e-ma-a<sub>2</sub> = Ἑρμάχας, becoming in Ionic \*Ἑρμῆας then Ἑρμέας; the vocalism of Homeric Ἑρμείας represents an attempt to combine the ancient vowel-quantity with the close quality of Ionic Ἑρμέας preceding vowel contraction.

been felt to be Ionic with some foreign importations, whose source was considered to be Lesbian.

### Vocalization of Sonants.

The vocalization in Greek of the syllabic liquids and nasals (\*l, \*r, \*n, \*ŋ) is a thorny problem which has given rise to much debate. Mycenaean shows that these sonants had already either developed to a vowel of a- or o-timbre in the case of the nasals \*n and \*ŋ, or had developed a supporting vowel in the case of the liquids \*r and \*l.

The traditional theory concerning vocalization of sonants, favoured by C.J. Ruijgh,<sup>108</sup> is as follows: \*n, \*ŋ > α in all dialects; \*r, \*l > αρ / ρα, αλ / λα except in AC and Aeolic, where they become ορ / ρο, ολ / λο. However, as will be seen, this theory is something of an over-simplification. In Mycenaean the preferred treatment for \*n and \*ŋ appears to be /a/, thus α-privative in compounds, e.g. a-ki-ti-to = ἄκτιτος; a<sub>2</sub>-te-ro = ἄτερος < \*sŋ-teros. This treatment is, however, not uniform: o-vocalization is also found in Mycenaean as the result of \*n and \*ŋ, e.g. pe-mo = \*σπέρομο /

---

<sup>108</sup> "Les sonantes voyelles dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien", *Mnemosyne*

11, 1958, 216

pe-ma = σπερμά < \*σπέρμη, the o-vocalization being the commoner of the two, probably affected by the adjacent labial consonant ; cf. also e-ne-wo-pe-za (PY Ta 715, etc.) = \*ένεφόπεζα, implying \*ένέφο as the name of the number nine; on the other hand, e-ka-ma- (PY Ta 642, etc.) = \*έχμα is never varied by \*έχμο, thus o-vocalization is not invariable, even in the presence of a labial. AC has traces of this treatment in numbers, e.g. δέκο < \*dekṃ, δέκο, δεκοτόν, έκοτόν.<sup>109</sup> As far as the liquids are concerned, in Mycenaean there is hesitation between o-and a-vocalization, with a tendency towards /o/, e.g. to-pe-za (PY Ta 642, etc.) = \*τόρπεζα, Attic τράπεζα; qe-to-ro = \*q<sup>w</sup>ετρο, Attic τετρα-, as the first element of a compound, e.g. qe-to-ro-po-pi (PY Ae 134) = \*q<sup>w</sup>ετροπόπι, “four-footed animals” (instrumental plural).

The regular result in Att-Ion. of these sonants is /a/. In Homer, however, we find several examples of an original sonant represented by -o-, e.g. aorist ήμβροτον < \*ήμῖτον (equivalent to Att-Ion. ήμαρτον), aorist subjunctive άβροτάξομεν (K 65), which suggests a present \*άβροτάζω related to άμαρτάνω; the adjectives βρότος < \*mῖτος, and from the same root, μόρσιμος, “fatal”, from an unattested action noun \*μόρσις < \*mῖtis. There are fewer examples of ancient \*l, although άολλής (E 498, M 78, etc.), corresponding to Ionic άλής < \*άφαλής, may represent

<sup>109</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 20,6

\*σμη-φάληης.<sup>110</sup> These are classified by Chantraine as Aeolisms<sup>111</sup> because of their o-vocalism: it was recognized in antiquity that the Aeolic dialects frequently attested a vowel of o-quality where Att-Ion. and Doric have -α-, e.g. Att-Ion., Doric στρατός, Boeotian στροτός.

Chantraine's classification of the above items as Homeric Aeolisms on account of their o-vocalism from a syllabic resonant is in accord with the common theory outlined above. This theory, however, does not explain the exceptions to be found in all dialects, and if one attributes to each dialect one particular vocalization, it is difficult to explain the coincidences between Homer, Mycenaean and sporadic occurrences throughout Greek. It is preferable to state what can be observed empirically, namely that the dialects of the historical period have a tendency towards one or other type of vocalization, Att-Ion. and Doric favouring the α-treatment, Aeolic and AC the o-treatment, although all dialects retain traces of the less favoured vocalization. Indeed, vocalizations with /o/ and /a/ are not the only results in Greek of the Indo-European syllabic resonants: examples of -υ- and -ι- also occur, e.g. ἄγυρις (cf. ἀγορρίς, ἀγορά, ἀγείρω), βρύχα, accusative singular corresponding to unattested \*βρύξ (cf. βρέχω). It should be no surprise that Greek has alternative vocalizations from syllabic resonants: other languages also show varying vowel-timbre, e.g. the Latin negative prefix *in-* < \*η, *anguis* < \*ηγ<sup>wh</sup>wis = ὄφις, *tentus* < \*τητος = τατός.

---

<sup>110</sup> Chantraine *DELG* 60, s.v. ἄληης

<sup>111</sup> *GHI*, 24-5

Thus, although the dialects of historical times tend to favour one of the common types of vocalization over the other, the favoured type is never totally imposed, and one can concur with Cowgill<sup>112</sup> that the contrast of -ορ- and -αρ- is of little significance for dialect classification. Thus such widespread forms as βροτός (cf. Sanskrit *mṛta*, Latin *mortuus*) cannot justifiably be claimed as Aeolisms in Homer. A form such as ἦτορ,<sup>113</sup> attested outside epic only in AC, can reasonably be assumed to have entered epic at a very early date, certainly before the stage of composition in Ionic, although its dialectal provenance cannot be ascertained (cf. ὄρχαμος, ἀμφίβροτος, ἀνδρειφόντη).

This process of generalization may already have begun at Mycenaean date, as doublets are not always found, although phonetic contexts would make them possible: cf. e-ne-ka = ἐνεκα, ka-ro = κάρπος, pa-we-a = φάρφε(η)α. The accusative singular of consonant stems shows only -α < \*η; the eventual generalization of -α in neuter nouns such as ἄρμα, σπέρμα may have been initiated by analogy with the accusative singular of consonant stems. Mycenaean has a-mo = \*ἄρμο, never a-ma; later Greek has only ἄρμα, but the o-vocalization is retained in derivatives

---

<sup>112</sup> "Ancient Greek Dialectology in the Light of Mycenaean", 82

<sup>113</sup> ἦτορ is isolated in epic, as it is the only neuter with -ορ < \*η, cf. ἄλειφαρ, ἦπαρ, ὄναρ,

ἦμαρ.

such as ἀρμόζω, ἀρμόσσω / -ττω<sup>114</sup>. Nonetheless, it is likely that the selection and regularization of type of vocalization is largely post-Mycenaean and took place independently according to dialect.

For Homeric language, the implication is that, as it is essentially Ionic and shares in the innovations and choices of this dialect, it will naturally choose -α- as the regular outcome of the ancient syllabic resonants. Where variants occur, they are foreign to the Ionic dialect, and may be survivals from the old, pre-migration epic language, e.g. θρόνος, ὄρχαμος (which is probably to be connected with ὄρχη).<sup>115</sup> There is some significance for epic in the fact that all three “Achaean” dialects (Mycenaean, Arcadian and Cypriot) attest o-vocalization, thus it cannot be regarded as a specifically Aeolic trait. Wathélet would classify epic forms with o-vocalization from ancient \*r̥ and \*l̥ as a mixed Aeolic / Achaean trait<sup>116</sup>; they appear in any case to be ancient. All the words in which such treatment is assured are foreign to East Ionic. Fluctuations in Mycenaean

---

<sup>114</sup> Ernst Risch, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium*, 1966, 157, proposed that the o-vocalization here resulted from the borrowing by other dialects of a Mycenaean technical term.

<sup>115</sup> Mycenaean o-ka, which occurs on the Pylos An tablets concerning military formations, is interpreted as \*ὄρχα by Ventris and Chadwick (*Documents*, 185), and is also connected with ὄρχη by Chantraine (*DELG*, 121) and by Palmer (*Interpretation*, 142, 151, 154). The vocalism, according to Françoise Bader (“De mycénien matoropuro à grec ματρόπολις, ἀλειφόβιος” *Minos* 10, 1969, 36), is “Achaean”, while on the morphological level o-ka (\*ὄρχα): ὄρχαμος recalls πλοκή:πλόκαμος.

<sup>116</sup> *Traits*, 173

and AC between o- and a-vocalizations from \*r̥ and \*l̥ suggest that ancient epic forms with o-vocalization should not be interpreted as Aeolisms but simply as part of the ancient epic language which, of course, lacked region-specific traits.

### The preposition “towards”

In addition to the normal Att-Ion. preposition πρὸς signifying “towards”, Homer also uses the alternatives ποτὶ and προτὶ. πρὸς, the everyday Ionic form, is by far the most frequent form in Homer; ποτὶ occurs in metrical positions from which πρὸς is excluded. These two prepositions are generally considered not to be alternative forms of the same word, but both inherited from Indo-European; cf. Sanskrit *prati*, Avestan *pāti*. προτὶ occurs only 16 times in the *Odyssey*, compared to 54 times in the *Iliad*; the difference is explained by the fact that the phrase προτὶ Ἴλιον (16 times *Il.*) does not occur in the *Odyssey*, while προτὶ ἄστῃ (24 times *Il.*) has only 8 occurrences in the *Odyssey*. If these phrases are excluded, προτὶ occurs only 12 times in the *Iliad* and 8 times in the *Odyssey*.

Homer has ποτὶ in common with Thessalian, Boeotian and all the West Greek dialects (except central Cretan, which has πορτὶ); Lesbian has πρὸς, probably under the influence of Ionic. As the earliest surviving Lesbian texts and inscriptions are late, it cannot be determined how early Lesbian adopted πρὸς, but as early Lesbian was in all probability similar to

Thessalian, it almost certainly had ποτί at early post-migration date. ποτί is absent from Hesiod and the Homeric *Hymns*, although these poems contain ποτί: e.g. ποτί Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν (*HyAphr* 280), which also occurs at N 724 with ποτί as the form of the preposition. It seems that ποτί was not part of the epic vocabulary of these poets.

Although several words appear in Homer combined in different places with different forms of the preposition, in general one form is more frequent than the others in combination with a given word, e.g.: ποτί χαλκοβατέξ δῶ (5 times), an apparently old formula, varied in πρὸξ πατρός ἐρισθενέος πυκινὸν δῶ (T 355). It is likely that the form of the preposition the poet used was determined by the form he had inherited, and thus he was not free to choose among the three available forms.<sup>117</sup> Metrical considerations would, of course, have been significant in selecting the required form, and in modifying traditional formulae. Before vowels, or hiatus resulting from loss of digamma, ποτί / ποτί is always used; πρὸξ never occurs in thesis in these conditions.

ποτί regularly develops by assibilation to \*ποσί (probably represented by Mycenaean po-si<sup>118</sup>); this probably developed to AC πός by means of apocope, which is common in prepositions. Thus it would not be

---

<sup>117</sup> W.F. Wyatt, "Homeric Πρὸξ Ποτί Ποτί", *SMEA* 19, 1978, 104-5

<sup>118</sup> Ebbe Vilborg observed (*Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek*, 1960, 123) that Mycenaean po-si may conceivably represent ποσί, but this seems improbable in view of AC πός.

surprising if ποτί antedated πός in the epic tradition. πός, however, is not attested in epic. Nevertheless, it may well have been the normal monosyllabic form of the preposition at an early stage of epic, replaced with πρός by Ionic-speaking poets, a process which may have started at pre-migration date. After the Dorian invasion, the form πός would have been unknown to Ionic-speaking poets and audiences, as they were not in contact with the AC dialects. Support for this assumption may be found in the fact that so-called "Attic" correption frequently occurs before πρός: in the *Iliad* a short vowel preceding πρός is scanned short 121 times, and long 86 times; the corresponding figures for the *Odyssey* are 132 short and 93 long.<sup>119</sup> Thus the common formula ἔπειτα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, in which the final -α of πτερόεντα is scanned short, may at an early stage have contained \*πτοσηύδα. ποτί, on the other hand, in addition to being part of the traditional epic vocabulary, was supported in the immediate pre-migration period by its use in the West Greek dialects adjacent to proto-Ionic on the mainland, and after the migrations by its probable presence in Lesbian until Lesbian adopted the Ionic form πρός.

The use of ποτί and πρός in epic is accounted for, as they belong to dialects spoken in the region where epic as we know it developed in its latter stages (or in the case of ποτί, belonged to one of these dialects for a time). προτί is a more awkward case. This form of the preposition occurs in

---

<sup>119</sup> Statistics from Richard Janko, "The use of πρός, προτί, and ποτί in Homer", *Glotta* 57, 1979, 24

the dialect of central Crete,<sup>120</sup> although elsewhere in Crete the usual West Greek form ποτί is found. προτί also seems to be attested once in Argolic in a fragmentary inscription from Tylissos, restored by J. Hatzidakis in 1914<sup>121</sup> as follows:

Φερόσθο *hoi* Κνόηιοι προτ' αυτός

in which, as observed by W. Vollgraff,<sup>122</sup> αυτός is equivalent to αὐτόνς, thus the meaning would be “to themselves, i.e. to their home”. There is, however, no support elsewhere for such a construction: Homer has οἰκόνδε φέρεσθαι (α 317), Herodotus a construction with the genitive case, φέρων ἐς σεωυτοῦ (1.108,5). If προτί is correctly restored in this inscription, Argolic will be the only Doric dialect to attest forms of the preposition both with and without -ρ- before the spread of the Attic *koine*.

However, Hatzidakis' restoration is not the only one possible, and Vollgraff proposed an alternative restoration:

Φερόσθο *hoi* Κνόηιοι πρό Ταυροφονίον.

The original restoration of this inscription was the only indication that προτί had ever existed in Argolic. If Vollgraff's emendation is adopted, there is no support for this aberrant form, and likewise the emendation προ[τι τὰ ἰαρά]<sup>123</sup> cannot be correct. The forms of the preposition in Argolic are the usual West Greek ποτί and also ποί, which may reasonably

---

<sup>120</sup> Central Cretan also has the form πορτί with metathesis.

<sup>121</sup> Ἀρχαιολογική Ἐφημερίς 1914, 94-98

<sup>122</sup> *Le décret d'Argos relatif à un pacte entre Knossos et Tylissos*, Amsterdam 1948, 18

<sup>123</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 283, no. 83

be supposed to be a survival from the pre-Doric substrate by means of an evolution \*ποσί > \*ποήι > ποί.<sup>124</sup> The presence of the forms προτί and πορί in central Cretan might tempt one to believe that forms with -ρ- are remnants of the “Achaean” substrate dialect. However, these forms in Cretan may be an innovation resulting from a conflation of ποτί with περί; the same combination appears to have given Pamphylian περτί.

πρός is commonly explained as resulting from προτί by assibilation and apocope.<sup>125</sup> W.F. Wyatt<sup>126</sup> has most plausibly proposed that πρός is a secondary development in Att-Ion., with intrusive -ρ- by analogy with πρό, παρά and περί, and that proto-Greek inherited only ποτί. Thus πρός is an innovation of Att-Ion. As Homeric προτί is not attested in Hesiod or the *Hymns*, it cannot reasonably be considered as an inherited component of epic diction; it is therefore best explained as an artificial form constructed by Ionian bards from πρός and ποτί.

### Apocope of prepositions

Another notable feature of Homer’s use of prepositions is the occurrence of apocope. This phenomenon almost never occurs in extant Att-

---

<sup>124</sup> Aspiration of intervocalic /s/ (cf. Laconian Πο/οιδάν < Ποσοιδάν; Arcadian has Ποσοιδάν) followed by loss of /h/.

<sup>125</sup> E.g. Janko, “The use of πρός, προτί and ποτί in Homer”, 28

<sup>126</sup> “Homeric Πρός, Ποτί, Προτί”, *SMEA* 19, 1978, 89-123

Ion., unless elision of final -ι before vowels is regarded as a form of apocope. Apocope of prepositions is, however, common in Aeolic, e.g.:

Sappho 31, κὰδ δέ μ' ἴδρωσ ψύχρωσ ἔχει

Alcaeus 346, κὰκ κεφάλωσ

Boeotian κὰγ γὰν

Thessalian κὰπ πάντωσ<sup>127</sup>

The presence of this phenomenon in Aeolic might be taken as evidence for an Aeolic phase of epic composition. The fact is, however, that apocope of prepositions is attested in all dialects except Att-Ion.:

Laconian καββαλικός

Arcadian κὰ μῆνα; πὲ (=πεδά) τοῖσ φοικιάταισ<sup>128</sup>

There are no examples of apocope in Mycenaean, but this does not imply that it did not exist in the spoken dialects of the 2nd millennium. Among 1st millennium dialects, Thessalian in general has the strongest tendency towards apocope, as in the genitive singular ending -οι < -οιο in o-stems. It is possible that Att-Ion. at an early date also apocopated prepositions, and has innovated in eliminating this tendency. Widespread apocope of prepositions results from generalization of the antevocalic form, e.g. παρ-θέμενοι like παρ-εόντες, πὰρ ποταμόν like παρ' ὁδόν.<sup>129</sup> Thus Homeric examples of apocopated prepositions may represent an archaism in

---

<sup>127</sup> The examples from Thessalian and Boeotian are cited by Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 81.

<sup>128</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 81

<sup>129</sup> Ruijgh, "D' Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes", 57, note 205

Ionic, and their retention in Ionian epic would have been supported by the presence of this phenomenon in neighbouring Lesbian.

### The Potential Particle

Homer uses two forms of the potential particle, ἄν and κε(ν); κε(ν) is by far the commoner, although there is a preference for ἄν in negative clauses. In classical times, Att-Ion. uses ἄν, Thessalian and Lesbian κε(ν), and West Greek and Boeotian κα (Boeotian was probably influenced in this respect by West Greek). Evidence is lacking for Mycenaean. Arcadian and Cypriot disagree on this point: Cypriot has κε, but Arcadian agrees with Att-Ion. in using ἄν.

All forms of the particle probably derive from an enclitic \*ken/ \*κη<sup>130</sup>: Aeolic adopted the full-grade variant, but Arcadian and Att-Ion. favoured the zero-grade option \*κη, which became κα before a consonant and καν before a vowel. The innovative form ἄν resulted from a false division of οὔκαν, a process which is reflected in Arcadian εἰκαν, equivalent to εἰ + ἄν, with -κ- by analogy with οὔκαν; it is significant in this connexion that in Homer ἄν is more frequent than κε(ν).<sup>131</sup> ἄν is the only form of the potential particle attested in historical Arcadian, except

---

<sup>130</sup> As explained by K. Forbes, *Glotta* 37, 1958, 179-82

<sup>131</sup> Palmer, "The Language of Homer", *A Companion to Homer*, Wace and Stubbings (edd.), 1962, 91

when it is immediately preceded by the particles εἰ or οὐ, in which case the phrases εἰκάν and οὐκάν are used.

Arcadian and Att-Ion. generalized the more recent form ἔν. The fact that ἔν was used by these two dialects, which in historical times were separated by areas of Doric speech using κα, implies that this development took place before the Dorian invasion. However, the difference between Arcadian and Cypriot usage in this respect suggests that ἔν was not generalized throughout the Peloponnese before the departure of the future Cypriots, and that they came from an area which retained the more conservative κε. C.J. Ruijgh<sup>132</sup> would infer from the fact that in Homer there are approximately 7 occurrences of κε(ν) for every 2 of ἔν that the date of Homer is to be placed shortly after the adoption of the epic tradition from Aeolic bards, and that it may even have been the quality of Homer's poetry that provided the incentive for Ionic to oust Aeolic as the dialect of epic. This is unconvincing: although κε(ν) does indeed outnumber ἔν in epic, the preponderance of the former probably reflects little more than that it was felt, correctly, to be more ancient than ἔν, thus more appropriate for the traditional genre of epic verse, and does not provide evidence for an "Aeolic phase". Its use in Ionian epic would have been supported by its presence in the neighbouring Lesbian dialect, and it would therefore still have been understood by poets and audiences. However, although κε(ν) is by far the more frequent form of the particle in Homer, despite the fact that 11 similes

---

<sup>132</sup> "L'emploi le plus ancien et les emplois plus récents de la particule κε /ἔν", *La langue et les textes en grec ancien*, 1992, F. Létoublon, (ed.), 77-8

are introduced by ὡς ὅτ' ἄν, there is not one simile introduced by ὡς ὅτε κε(ν): this indicates recent composition using a construction from vernacular Ionic.

## ἴα

The use of ἴα as the feminine of the numeral “one” is one of the most characteristic traits of the Aeolic dialects. In Homer its basic sense is not as a numeral, but signifies “one, the same”, as at Δ 437 and N 354, where it echoes ὁμός / -ον. In two Homeric instances, Φ 569 and ξ 435, ἴα is best taken as meaning “one”, equivalent to μία, the normal Homeric feminine of εἷς.

The form ἴος appears also in Messenian τόν γ' ἴον ἐνιαυτόν<sup>133</sup> with a meaning similar to its Homeric sense, “the same year”, and in Cretan in the 5th century Gortyn Law Code in the phrase ἴο πρὸ το ἐνιαυτο,<sup>134</sup> where its meaning seems to be equivalent to that of ἐκεῖνος. There is one Homeric occurrence (Z 422) of a form taking a thematic inflexion: ἴῳ, which appears to have anaphoric value.

In origin ἴος seems to be a deictic pronoun, containing the Indo-European demonstrative \*i-, which appears in the Latin pronoun *is*, and was also apparently preserved in Cretan, according to Hesychius, who glosses ἴν·αὐτῆ·αὐτήν· αὐτόν· Κύπριοι. Thus it is likely that ἴος is an archaism

---

<sup>133</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 94

<sup>134</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 320, no.117

wherever it is preserved, and its specialization to the feminine with the meaning “one” is an innovation of Aeolic (an innovation of pre-migration date, as it is shared by all three Aeolic dialects). The distribution of the pronoun without this specialized sense was in all probability at an early date much more widespread than the available evidence suggests.<sup>135</sup> In its Homeric occurrences with the meaning “(one and ) the same”, it is a simple archaism; where it means “one” it is likely to be a secondary Aeolism from Lesbian.

### **Infinitives in -μεν, -μεναι**

Aeolic belonged to an East Greek zone which selected the infinitive ending -μεν instead of -ναι for athematic verbs; -ναι was the choice common to West Greek and Att-Ion. Boeotian, East Thessalian and Homer have infinitives in -μεν for thematic verbs, which must represent an innovation against the rest of Greek, although it also appears in Cretan [προ]φερπέμεν.<sup>136</sup> This appears to be an innovation common to the 2nd millennium dialects of central Greece, and it is likely to have entered epic from that source: the type φερέμεν is firmly entrenched in epic formulae, providing a useful metrical variant to the type φέρειν. It does not occur in Lesbian, at least in the texts and inscriptions that are available to us; but as it

---

<sup>135</sup> W.F. Wyatt, “The Prehistory of the Greek Dialects”, *TAPA* 101, 1970, 616

<sup>136</sup> In Cretan Doric the infinitive ending -μεν may represent a survival from the “Achaean” substrate; this implies that there may have been localities in the 2nd millennium Peloponnese which favoured -μεν over -ναι.

is common in East Thessalian, which was probably very similar to early Lesbian, it may have been the Lesbian ending for thematic verbs until it was eliminated in favour of -ην under the influence of Ionic -ειν,<sup>137</sup> in which case the type φερέμεν would have been supported in epic in the Asiatic phase of composition by its presence for a time in Lesbian. -μεναι, the type attested in historical Lesbian, may be a conflation of the Aeolic type -μεν and Ionic -ναι. However, in view of the structural importance of infinitives in -μεναι, the possibility cannot be discounted that this infinitive type existed in 2nd millennium Aeolic, and was retained only in Lesbian.

### **Stratification of Epic Language**

Traditionally, everything in Homeric language that was not Ionic was considered to be Aeolic, or to be more precise, Lesbian. This view, which has been current since antiquity, arose from the fact that in Homer there occur forms such as infinitives in -μεναι, datives plural in -εσσι, words with geminated consonants (e.g. ἔραιννός, ἀργεννός) which, in terms of 1st millennium dialects, obviously belong to Lesbian. It was thought that the epic tradition had been adopted from Aeolic bards by Ionic-speaking poets, at whose hands the Homeric poems had received their final

---

<sup>137</sup> Both the Ionic and the Lesbian forms of the thematic infinitive ending result from the contraction of ε+ε following the loss of intervocalic /h/; the resulting long vowel received a close pronunciation in Ionic and an open pronunciation in Lesbian. In Mycenaean this infinitive ending almost certainly still had intervocalic /h/, viz. \*-ehen.

form, and August Fick even went so far as to translate the poems into Aeolic<sup>138</sup>.

This traditional view, however, caused great problems when it was observed that there also occurred in Homer forms which, in terms of 1st millennium dialects, could only have been interpreted as Doric or West Greek generally, such as -τι, τοι, τεός, ἀμός, etc. These forms were vaguely classified as Aeolic, as some of them appear also in Thessalian and Boeotian, where they were classified as “Dorisms”.

This point of view was gradually altered by the study of Arcado-Cypriot. Since Meillet,<sup>139</sup> many scholars have accepted a three-layered stratification of the epic dialect, beginning with “Achaean”, i.e. AC, which was subsequently overlaid first by an Aeolic and finally by an Ionic stratum. The decipherment of Linear B and the subsequent realization that the Mycenaean dialect was closely related to Arcadian and Cypriot increased the number of elements in epic thought to be of AC provenance. Consequently, Klaus Strunk in 1957<sup>140</sup> sought to deny any Aeolic contribution to the formation of epic language.

---

<sup>138</sup> *Die homerische Odyssee in ihrer ursprüngliche Sprachform wiederhergestellt*, Göttingen, 1883; *Die homerische Ilias in ihrer ursprüngliche Sprachform wiederhergestellt*, Göttingen, 1886

<sup>139</sup> *Aperçu*, 175

<sup>140</sup> *Die sogenannten Äolismen der homerischen Sprache*, Köln, 1957

Very few Homeric traits which are regarded as Aeolisms actually entered epic language from the Aeolic dialects. Such is the general conclusion of Wathelet, who minimized the Aeolic contribution to epic.<sup>141</sup> Yet his reconstruction of the transmission of the epic tradition is untenable<sup>142</sup>: at the end of the Mycenaean Age, according to this theory (shared by Janko<sup>143</sup>), Achaean bards took refuge in Thessaly, gradually incorporating Thessalian elements into their stock of formulae, and from Thessaly the epic tradition was taken to Lesbos, whence it was later adopted by Ionians. There is no evidence, whether linguistic, archaeological or mythological, to suggest such a scenario. In fact, the only basis for postulating a Thessalian stage in the development of the epic tradition seems to be the Thessalian background of certain myths, such as those concerning Achilles or the Argonauts. Many forms which are claimed as Aeolisms are simple archaisms (the -φι case, attested in Boeotian; patronymic adjectives, known in the alphabetic period from Aeolic; retention of -τι, e.g. ποτί; long α in the genitive endings -αο, -αων) retained in epic and one or more of the Aeolic dialects, and interpreted as Aeolic because they were known from these dialects, in particular from Lesbian. The fact that these forms were understood to be Lesbian allowed the poets of the tradition to incorporate forms from contemporary Lesbian when they provided a metrical alternative to the Ionic form, or when the word required did not exist in Ionic. Lesbian forms are secondary Aeolisms in epic: these include forms in which an

---

<sup>141</sup> *Traits*, 366

<sup>142</sup> *Traits*, 376

<sup>143</sup> *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. IV, 16

original labiovelar is represented by a simple labial stop before a front vowel; original liquid / nasal + \*s or \*y represented by a geminated liquid / nasal instead of a single liquid / nasal with compensatory lengthening of the preceding short vowel; and the perfect participle active with the endings of the present participle. Some of these, of course, occur in formulaic contexts (e.g. π(ρ)οτὶ Ἴλιον ἰρήν), but it must be remembered that epic had been developing in Asia Minor, and therefore had been exposed to Lesbian influence, for some three centuries at least before the Homeric poems reached their final forms. It is not surprising, therefore, that Lesbian forms should have been incorporated into formulaic expressions. In the context of a tradition which continually evolved over many centuries, it should not be imagined that “traditional” excludes post-migration developments and accretions.<sup>144</sup>

The evolution of the dialect of epic as we know it was subtler, but less complicated, than the concept of three successive dialectal stages involving translation from one dialect to another. This is in any case an unrealistic assumption: for one thing, all the dialects which contributed to epic were mutually intelligible, and at the end of the Bronze Age, when the “Aeolic phase” is assumed to have begun, the differences between the East Greek dialects were very slight. Furthermore, in the same way as the

---

<sup>144</sup> The frequent formula αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο was almost certainly created at post-migration date, as it contains καί, which was not used as a conjunction in Mycenaean (v. Wathelet, “Mycénien et grec d’Homère 2. La particule καί”, *AC* 33, 1964, 10-44); it may, however, have been used adverbially, in which case there was little reason for it to appear in the palace records.

choruses of Attic tragedy are composed in a form of Doric, as this was regarded as the appropriate dialect for this kind of verse, so would the epic dialect at any stage of its evolution have been felt to be the appropriate form of language for this genre of verse, and translation would not have been considered necessary.

Epic in the 2nd millennium, then, was composed in a literary dialect of East Greek type, which was susceptible to influence from the contemporary vernacular dialects. These appear to have been proto-AC and proto-Aeolic. However, it should not be imagined that epic poetry was composed specifically in either of those dialects. It is clear that by the end of the 2nd millennium epic was preserved in an area of Ionic speech,<sup>145</sup> as from that date epic language participates in the choices and innovations of the Att-Ion. group; subsequently, at post-migration date, it shared in the innovations and choices of East Ionic. The differences between the southern East Greek dialects in the late 2nd millennium were sufficiently slight to permit epic to be perceived as a form of proto-Ionic, and subsequently to develop in parallel with the Ionic dialect, whose main characteristics seem to have developed between 1000 and 700 B.C.

Homeric Aeolisms are to be divided into primary and secondary Aeolisms, as defined on p.12. Datives plural in -εσσιν are certainly to be counted as primary Aeolisms; the infinitive endings -μεν and -μενοι may also have entered epic at pre-migration date. These forms are structurally

---

<sup>145</sup> Cf. T.B.L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer*, 1958, 289

important within the hexameter: -εσσι occurs frequently at verse-end and before the trochaic caesura; -μενοι provides a convenient dactyl in the 4th or 5th foot. The ending -μεν is less common, and in some cases may replace an earlier \*-hev.

At the point when epic was first perceived to contain Lesbian elements (possibly at the time of the migrations to Asia Minor c. 1000 B.C.), the form of Lesbian in question was doubtless a more archaic one than that known to us from inscriptions and the Lesbian poets, and must have been closer to Thessalian. Thus it probably contained ποτι, which was later replaced by πρόσ, and lacked assibilation of /ti/. The same probably applies to infinitives in -μεν and 1st declension nominatives singular in -α<sup>146</sup>, which once probably belonged to Lesbian and were subsequently eliminated. After the migrations, certain forms belonging to the pre-migration epic language, which in fact are archaic in all dialects, were interpreted as Aeolic, e.g. -σσ- for -σ-; once these forms had received an "Aeolic" interpretation, it was felt to legitimize the admission into epic language of genuine Aeolic forms from contemporary Lesbian, or secondary Aeolisms, such as πέλωρ <\*q<sup>w</sup>έλωρ, ἄμμες <\*ἄhμες. Lesbian perfect participles active in -ων, -οντος are recent rather than remains of an older stratum covered by Ionic: the perfect participle in -(f)ως (e.g. βεβλη(f)ώς)

---

<sup>146</sup> Boeotian contains these nominatives; nominative singular in -α of masculine α-stems is probably a pan-Greek archaism, to judge by the genitive Νικιας Ἡρακλειδαιοι in a Thessalian inscription from Phalanna, besides the regular nominative forms in -ας (J.L. García-Ramón, *Les origines post-mycéniennes*, 28).

is pan-Greek, and Aeolic innovated in extending the endings of the present participle to the perfect. The archaic forms which in Asia Minor were interpreted as belonging to Lesbian might equally well have been attributed to Doric. That they were felt to be Lesbian is clear from the fact that Doric innovations, e.g. ἐμέος, αὐτοσαυτόν, are absent from Homer, while Lesbian innovations (although not late innovations such as the type παῖσα < πάνσα, τάλς < τάνς) are admitted.<sup>147</sup> Hesiod, however, uses certain Doric forms, which shows that those archaisms which in Asia Minor were interpreted as belonging to Lesbian were in the mainland tradition felt to belong to Doric (v. pp. 293-304).

### **The Antiquity of the Attic-Ionic Group**

Attica escaped the turmoil of the late 2nd millennium fairly unscathed: Athens was the only major Mycenaean settlement to escape destruction, and the archaeological evidence indicates continuous inhabitation there while other important centres were abandoned or destroyed.<sup>148</sup> This suggests that Attica could have provided a safe haven for the epic tradition to be preserved and continue its development (although this does not mean that epic verse disappeared entirely from the rest of Greece). Epic language was already by this time a literary language which was not associated with any narrowly defined region of mainland Greece,

---

<sup>147</sup> Adrados, "Stratigraphy", 22

<sup>148</sup> Michael Grant, *The Rise of the Greeks*, 1987, 35

but which could incorporate varying dialectal forms and innovations from the spoken dialects when they were metrically convenient, with the proviso that obvious innovations would not be used in epic because of its generally traditional nature. It is probable that one factor which ensured the continuation of the epic tradition was the link which it provided with the past, therefore innovations would have had to become firmly established in the spoken language before they could be admitted into epic. In this way the innovative simplified  $-\sigma-$  never entirely supplanted  $-\sigma\sigma-$   $<^*-\tau y, *^*\theta y$ , but both occur in formulae of old appearance.

As the various dialects at the end of the Mycenaean Age were still very similar to one another, lacking many of the characteristic innovations which were later to define the dialects of the historical period, a speaker of proto-Ionic, listening to the epic dialect, would have been able to accept it as a form of his/ her own dialect with the addition of some foreign forms. Once epic language was accepted as a form of proto-Ionic, it gradually started to incorporate some of the isoglosses of this dialect, perhaps replacing  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  with Att-Ion.  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  once West Greek speakers had cut off Attica from the region where the ancient "Achaean" speech remained; the AC form of the preposition would have become unfamiliar to Ionic listeners after the Dorian invasion. The incorporation of existing proto-Ionic isoglosses into epic meant that epic was felt to an even greater extent to be a form of the local dialect, and thus it was bound to participate in the developments which came to define the fully fledged Att-Ion. group.

The most characteristic Ionic isogloss is the change of original /ā/ > /ē/. That this change is pre-migration in origin is clear from the fact that it affected all branches of Ionic, although it is most thorough-going in East Ionic. The Parian Marble dates the Ionian migration to 1087 B.C., which is perhaps a few decades too early,<sup>149</sup> but this suggests that this sound-change must at least have started on the mainland by the mid-11th century. Theories that the change /ā/ > /ē/ is the result of Carian influence in Asia Minor<sup>150</sup> encounter the objection that this change does not affect the neighbouring Doric dialects.<sup>151</sup>

A relative chronology for this sound-change can be obtained from the development of the interrogative adjective πηλίκος < \*q<sup>w</sup>ālikos. As the original labiovelar is represented by a labial stop before a vowel of e-timbre, the labialization of labiovelars, i.e. the final stage in their evolution to simple stops, antedates the change of /ā/ to /ē/. Thus the stages are \*q<sup>w</sup>ālikos > \*πᾶλίκος > πηλίκος. The labiovelar stops disappeared shortly after the Dorian invasion, therefore if Mycenaean civilization was destroyed c.1200 B.C., and the Ionic change of /ā/ to /ē/ had at least begun by c.1050-1000 B.C., the elimination of labiovelars must have occurred between these dates.<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>149</sup> A. M. Snodgrass, *The Dark Age of Greece*, 14

<sup>150</sup> A. Bartoněk, *Development of the Long-vowel System in Ancient Greek Dialects*, 1966, 101

<sup>151</sup> Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*, 197

<sup>152</sup> Wathelet, *Traits*, 90

A low date for the change of /ā/ to /ē/ has been argued for on the basis of the Ionic form of the name of the Medes, who called themselves Māda, but in Greek were known as Μηδοί.<sup>153</sup> Chadwick claimed that the Ionians knew the name of the Medes while this sound-change was still in progress, as they called them not Μᾶδοι but Μηδοί, and that if the sound-change had been complete before the Ionians knew the Medes they would have called them Μᾶδοι, which was the form of their name in Cypriot (ma-to-i in the Cypriot syllabary). The Ionians could not, according to Chadwick, have known the Medes before the 9th century at the earliest. Yet this is unconvincing: the Ionians may indeed have known the Medes at least by name before the 9th century, and, had their language lacked the phoneme /ā/ when the name Māda first became known to them, they would simply have substituted the closest sound in their repertoire. It is clear that this sound-change was complete by the date of the second compensatory lengthening, as πάνσα became πᾶσα, not \*πησα, in Ionic, and also before the contraction of α+ε, as τίμαε (imperative) became τίμα, not \*τίμη. It also antedates the loss of digamma after /r/: this is clear from the case of \*κόρφα, which in Ionic became κούρη with 3rd compensatory lengthening, but in Attic, which was not affected by the 3rd compensatory lengthening, it gave κόρη, in which the η was retained after ρ because /w/ was still present when /ā/ became /ē/.

Once original /ā/ had been fronted in Att-Ion., the resulting vowel of e-timbre coalesced with inherited /ē/. This process was not yet complete in Central Ionic by the 6th century: inscriptions from Amorgos, Naxos and Ceos represent with eta the vowel of e-timbre resulting from inherited /ā/, but inherited /ē/ with epsilon. In East Ionic, however, the process was complete by the date of the earliest inscriptions, which use the same symbol,

---

<sup>153</sup> John Chadwick, "The Greek Dialects and Greek Prehistory", *Greece & Rome* N.S. 3, 1956, 42

eta, to represent the long open e-vowel from both sources. Once this process was accomplished, metathesis of quantity took place, whereby  $\eta\omicron > \epsilon\omega$  and  $\eta\alpha > \epsilon\bar{\alpha}$ ; this generally occurred where there had previously been an intervocalic digamma, e.g.  $*\nu\bar{\alpha}\phi\acute{\omicron}\varsigma > \nu\eta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma > \nu\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ , cf.  $*\text{'}\chi\iota(\lambda)\lambda\eta\phi\omicron\varsigma > *'\chi\iota(\lambda)\lambda\eta\omicron\varsigma > '\chi\iota(\lambda)\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ , although it is also common in the genitive of masculine  $\alpha$ -stems, e.g.  $\Pi\eta\lambda\eta\iota\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\omega$ ,  $\Lambda\alpha\epsilon\rho\tau\iota\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\omega$ : these are pronounced with synizesis, and as Hoekstra points out, may in some cases represent a modernization of ancient formulae<sup>154</sup>, with elision of final  $-\omicron$  before an initial vowel, viz.  $\Pi\eta\lambda\eta\iota\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\omega \text{'}\chi\iota\lambda\eta\omicron\varsigma < *'\Pi\eta\lambda\eta(\phi)\iota\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha \text{'}\chi\iota\lambda\eta(\phi)\omicron\varsigma$ .

Proto-Ionic and Doric underwent several common innovations after the Dorian invasion: the most obvious of these is the dentalization of the original labiovelars before front vowels, which antedates the pan-Greek labialization of all remaining labiovelars. Ionic and Doric also innovated in adding  $-\varsigma$  to the preposition  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  when used with the accusative to signify "into"; the resulting  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$ , which is preserved in Argive and Cretan, subsequently became  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  or  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ . The ancient, inherited use of  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  with the accusative (cf. Latin *in* + accusative) is retained in the North West dialects as well as AC, Thessalian and Boeotian; Lesbian  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  is obviously the result of Ionic influence. The form  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$  was clearly created at a date after the Dorian invasion but preceding the simplification of final  $-\nu\varsigma$ , and as the

---

<sup>154</sup> *Modifications*, 32

resulting εἰς / ἐς is common to all branches of Ionic, the innovation must antedate the migration to Asia Minor.<sup>155</sup>

Mycenaean shows that in 2nd millennium Greek, /w/ was retained in all positions, and in some dialects (e.g. Laconian, Boeotian, Cypriot) this phoneme remained in use until the local dialects succumbed to the Attic *koine*.<sup>156</sup> At the time of the earliest alphabetic inscriptions, /w/, represented by digamma, was still present in all positions except in Att-Ion. and some eastern Doric dialects ( those of Thera and its colony Cyrene, and of Rhodes and Cos).<sup>157</sup> Digamma had disappeared in Att-Ion. by the time of the earliest alphabetic inscriptions; despite a few archaic examples of digamma in Central and West Ionic (Γάρυφονες at Chalcis, αφυταρ at Athens, αφυτο at Naxos), its use is always as a glide sound between vowels, and it never appears in Ionic where it is etymologically justified. Formulae based on neglect of digamma, e.g. ἦγεν ἐς οἶκον (ξ 318, ρ 84) therefore came late in the history of the epic tradition; the fact that this phrase occurs only twice is an indication of the conservative nature of epic diction. Likewise the declension of some ancient formulae which had contained initial digamma could only have taken place at a late stage in the epic

---

<sup>155</sup> The significance of this development for the epic tradition will be discussed in ch.4., pp. 311-14

<sup>156</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 174

<sup>157</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 163

tradition, e.g. ἠδέος οἴνου, which was based on the dative phrase ἠδέει οἴνω < \*φαδέει φοίνωι<sup>158</sup>

Three stages can reasonably be postulated in the evolution of the Att-Ion. group:

1. the dialect of Attica was slightly differentiated from the other southern East Greek dialects in the Mycenaean Age;
2. the arrival of the Dorians brought about a series of Doric-Ionic isoglosses which further isolated Ionic from AC;
3. between the 11th and 8th centuries the Ionic dialect acquired its definitive identity; during these centuries there occurred the separation of Ionic and Attic and their increasing differentiation in some respects, e.g. psilosis, differing treatments of digamma, vowel contractions.

Ionic had completed its most significant innovations by the date of composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and while these innovations were in the process of development, epic participated in them.

---

<sup>158</sup> Hoekstra, *Modifications*, 48

## **Epic Language c.1200 B.C.**

I attempt a reconstruction of the epic dialect c.1200 B.C. and not earlier for the simple reason that at this date we have the language of the Mycenaean texts for comparison with the putative language of epic.

At the end of the Mycenaean Age, epic language was already a literary language of East Greek type, which was not linked with any narrowly defined region. It shared in the phonological features of all contemporary dialects: retention of labiovelars; /w/ in all positions; inherited /ā/; aspirates still undissimilated (Grassmann's Law probably took effect at post-Mycenaean date); forms containing the groups \*-hn, \*-hn, \*-hl, etc. from original groups of liquid / nasal + /s/; the sequence -vς still unsimplified. Obviously, at this date epic lacked innovations which belonged to later Ionic and Lesbian: ἐν would have governed the accusative where later epic had ἐς / εἰς < ἐνς.

On balance, it seems probable that epic language at the end of the Mycenaean Age participated in assibilation of /ti/. It is more difficult to determine whether it still used the older form of the middle ending, -τοῖ, as there is no trace of this form in Homer. Nevertheless, it is probable that epic language, because of its generally traditional and archaic nature, retained the older ending for as long as it was in contact with spoken dialects which preserved it. Thus, even if -τοῖ was still used in proto-Ionic when the Dorian Invasion had cut off this speech-community from AC, when it adopted -τοῖ the older ending would no longer have been familiar to Ionic

ears, and would have been replaced by -ται in epic, causing no metrical difficulties. There is another possible example of replacement of an archaic form that was no longer understood in the preposition ἐπί: there appears to have existed a doublet ἐπί / \*ὀπί at a very early date. Mycenaean has both e-pi and o-pi, both apparently with the same sense: cf. o-pi...qe-to-ro-po-pi (PY Ae 134) = \*ὀπί...q<sup>w</sup>ετροπόπι, o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja (PY Ta 708), o-pi-a-ra (PY An 657), e-pi-de-da-to (PY Vn 20) = \*ἐπιδέδαστοι, e-pi-ko-ru-si-jo (KN Sk 789) = \*ἐπικορυσίω (nominative dual), o-pi-ko-ru-si-ja (KN Sk 8100) = \*ἐπικορούσια (neuter plural). The simple preposition is always ἐπί in Att-Ion., but there remain traces of \*ὀπί in ὀπι(σ)θε, ὀπίσσω. As all branches of Ionic have ἐπί as the preposition, its generalization in this function almost certainly antedates the migration, and if Mycenaean epic contained \*ὀπί it would have sounded wrong to Ionic speakers once ἐπί was established as the favoured form of the preposition, and would have been replaced with this form without metrical disruption.

In the same way as Ionian epic is characterized by its use of doublets, so is it probable that Mycenaean epic language had this characteristic, selecting as metrically convenient between members of such pairs as ποτί / πός, ἀνέρες / ἄνδρες (the Linear B evidence shows that the form with epenthetic /d/ was already in common use: cf. the personal name a-re-ka-sa-da-ra (MY V 303) = Ἀλεξάνδρα), athematic aorists, e.g. δέκτο / ἄλτο alongside the more recent sigmatic forms δέξατο<sup>159</sup> /

---

<sup>159</sup> This form is attested in Mycenaean as de-ka-sa-to (PY Pn 30, etc.).

\*ἄηλατο < \*ἄλσατο (this verb appears in Homer in the form ἐσήλατο<sup>160</sup> with regular Ionic compensatory lengthening of the vowel preceding the group \*hl, and fronting of the resulting /ā/ > /ē/, -σι /-εσσι as the dative plural ending of the 3rd declension, and probably -σσ- simplified to -σ- in words like μέ(σ)σοσ, τό(σ)σοσ. Likewise, Mycenaean epic probably had the option of including or omitting the augment from verbs in the historic tenses as metrically required in the same way as it is optional in Homer; the language of the Mycenaean texts omits the augment, except in a few controversial cases.

The general characteristics which defined Mycenaean epic language seem to have been the same as those which defined epic language in its Ionian phase: it was a special literary language of a conservative, traditional nature, which retained archaic forms through metrical necessity, while also incorporating more recent developments, although avoiding obvious neologisms. As Ionian epic includes various artificial forms (diectasis, metrical lengthening), it is a reasonable assumption that Mycenaean bards also had such licences at their disposal. One metrical licence at least can reasonably be postulated for Mycenaean epic in the short scansion of syllables preceding an original stop + syllabic resonant (e.g. \*ἄνδροφόντq < \*ἄντq<sup>w</sup>hοντq: v. pp. 101-12 for a discussion of this and

---

<sup>160</sup> It is an indication of the conservative nature of epic language that the sigmatic aorist ἐσήλατο occurs only in the repeated phrase ὃς πρῶτος ἐσήλατο τείχος Ἀχαιῶν (M 438, Π 558), and in the subjunctive ἄληται (Φ 536), while there are over 50 occurrences of the archaic athematic aorist ἄλτο.

other Homeric examples of irregular scansion in old formulae which had once contained a syllabic resonant).

It is also likely that Mycenaean epic, in addition to its distinctive morphological peculiarities, was characterized by a special vocabulary which elevated it above everyday discourse. Some of the most traditional passages of Homer concern military activities, and some of the Mycenaean texts list military personnel and equipment, but the vocabulary of these texts in general does not correspond to that of Homer. The Mycenaean tablets mention a high-ranking officer with the title *ra-wa-ke-ta* = /lāwāgetās/, i.e. the leader of the λαφός: the title confirms what is already clear from Homer, namely that λαφός was an ancient term for the army. This title does not appear in Homer; the vowel quantities of this noun in its Mycenaean form make it impossible to fit into the dactylic hexameter.<sup>161</sup> It does, however, appear in Pindar,<sup>162</sup> and Sophocles fragment 221.12, in the contracted form λαγέτας. In general, the vocabulary of the Mycenaean texts pertains to mundane objects and activities, far removed from the subject matter of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and it is a reasonable assumption that the vocabulary of Mycenaean epic likewise was elevated above that of everyday discourse.

---

<sup>161</sup> Householder and Nagy (*Greek: A Survey of Recent Work*, 34) explain the long second vowel of this compound: "when two vowels come together as final and initial elements of two compound-formants, the resulting contraction entails the elision of the first and lengthening of the second." Thus \*λαφο- + \*ἀγέτας > λαφᾶγέτας in the same way as \*στρατο- + ἀγός > \*στρατᾶγός > Att-Ion. στρατηγός.

<sup>162</sup> *Olympian* 1,89; *Pythian* 4.107

Epic vocabulary was formed both by retaining words in an archaic sense and by excluding words in current usage. The commonest word for a slave in Greek is δούλος, a contracted form which evolved regularly from the older form which is frequently attested in Mycenaean as do-e-ro = \*δο(h)έλος; there is also a feminine do-e-ra = \*δο(h)έλα. In Homer, however, representatives of this word-family are rare, although the poets of the tradition would obviously have known them from everyday speech. To signify “domestic servant” Homer uses θεράπων (58 times *Il.*, 12 times *Od.*) with its verb θεραπεύω (ν 265); δμῶς (Γ 33, 33 times *Od.*) and the feminine plural δμῶαί (11 times *Il.*, 47 times *Od.*); the feminine noun ἀμφίπολος (13 times *Il.*, 47 times *Od.*); οἰκεύς (Ε 413, Ζ 366, 5 times *Od.*). However, δούλος is absent from Homer, and where its derivatives occur, they appear to be recent additions to epic vocabulary: the first syllable is nearly always in the strong part of the foot, and therefore is irresolvable: e.g. δούλην, Γ 409 at verse-end; δουλοσύνην, χ 423, where δου- is in the strong part of the foot. Furthermore, derivatives of δούλος do not occur in formulae, with the exception of δούλιον ἦμαρ, which always occurs at verse-end and was probably created on the model of ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ. The adjective ἐλεύθερος is rare in Homer, with only 4 occurrences, 3 of which are in this formula, and although it is well-attested in Mycenaean (in the form e-re-u-te-ro), it is never used as the opposite of do-e-ro. It is likely, therefore, that even if the formula ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ cannot be claimed as Mycenaean with any certainty, its creation antedates that of δούλιον ἦμαρ.

As Ernst Risch observed,<sup>163</sup> the vocabulary of the Mycenaean texts corresponds in many respects to the spoken language later reproduced in prose, comedy, inscriptions and the non-literary papyri. As the administrative language of the palace system, Mycenaean contains many words not attested in Homer, or at any rate very rarely found in epic, but found in post-Homeric texts. These include the names of various professions, eg. ka-na-pe-u = κναφεύς, a-to-po-qa = /artopok<sup>w</sup>os/ > ἄρτοπόπος > ἄρτοκόπος (with dissimilation of π after the labialization of labiovelars before back vowels). The form ἀμφιφορεύς occurs both in Homer and in Mycenaean, although the normal form in the poet's day was doubtless ἀμφορεύς, resulting by haplogy from ἀμφιφορεύς. The older form is more suited to the dactylic verse, but it is uncertain whether it is an archaism or an etymological reconstitution. Epic language was thus differentiated from quotidian parlance also by the retention or restoration of older forms.

Words which occur in Homer but do not belong to the traditional epic style are concentrated in the *Odyssey* or in "recent" parts of the *Iliad* (notably Ζ, Σ, Υ, Ψ, Ω), which are almost certainly the creation of the *Iliad* poet. In the same way that "recent" linguistic forms appear in high proportions in the extended similes and digressions, non-traditional vocabulary in the *Iliad* is likewise concentrated in passages which are probably the work of the poet who was responsible for the *Iliad* in its final form.

---

<sup>163</sup> "Il miceneo nella storia della lingua greca", *QUCC* 23, 1976, 22

It is, of course, impossible to prove with complete certainty that a specific word was part of the Mycenaean epic vocabulary; on the other hand, it can be proven that a particular word did not belong to the Mycenaean epic vocabulary if its restored Mycenaean form is incompatible with the dactylic hexameter (cf. \*lawāgetas). I do not propose to discuss in detail in this thesis the origins of the epic verse form; however, it is worth noting that in the opinion of C. J. Ruijgh (a view which goes back to Meister and Meillet) this metrical form was adopted by the Mycenaean from the Minoans.<sup>164</sup> In support of this hypothesis it can be observed that the names of several musical instruments (φόρμιγξ, κιθάρα, σάλπιγξ, λύρα, βάρβιτος<sup>165</sup>) have no known Indo-European etymology, and that the cultural influence of the Minoans is obvious in the Mycenaean writing system and in art. It is tempting to agree with Ruijgh's theory: although some epic themes seem to be represented in other Indo-European poetry, e.g. Vedic, Germanic, Celtic,<sup>166</sup> it appears feasible that Greek poetry on traditional themes may have started to be sung in a Minoan verse-form once the Mycenaean had begun to absorb cultural influences from Crete, in the same way that the dactylic hexameter was borrowed from the Greeks by Roman poets. Ultimately, however, attractive though this theory is, it cannot

---

<sup>164</sup> Ruijgh, "D'Homère aux origines proto-mycénienes", 3; "Le mycénien et Homère", 150

<sup>165</sup> Hoekstra, *Epic Verse before Homer*, 1981, 34

<sup>166</sup> M.L. West, "The Rise of the Greek Epic", *JHS* 108, 1988, 152-6, mentions Vedic phrases corresponding to Homeric κλέος ἄφθιτον, ὄνομα κλυτός, ὠκέες ἵπποι and other formulae.

be proven, as the Minoan language is unknown.<sup>167</sup> Whatever its origins, dactylic hexameter seems to have been the metre of epic verse before the date of the extant Linear B tablets, as some old formulae will scan regularly only once restored to a state of language antedating that shown in these texts.

Epic absorbed elements from the contemporary spoken dialects with which it was in contact, in all probability including “court Mycenaean”, the spoken language of the ruling élite, who may have included patrons of epic poets. This spoken language is not attested, except possibly indirectly in Homer; as a spoken dialect it is distinct from the written language of administration. Elements of court language may include the phrases  $\lambda\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\lambda\epsilon\rho\eta (\phi)\lambda\zeta$ , which were perhaps used as royal titles, periphrases of the type “His Royal Highness”, used by Homer with a proper name in the genitive case. Both phrases are clearly very old, as the nouns  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$  and  $(\phi)\lambda\zeta$  are obsolete in 1st millennium non-epic Greek.<sup>168</sup> The Homeric formula  $\delta\rho\chi\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$  likewise may be a title which entered epic from Mycenaean court speech:  $\delta\rho\chi\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma$  does not appear outside epic, and may be a derivative of a noun attested in the Mycenaean texts, if o-ka is correctly identified with Att-Ion.  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta$ . These formulae are

---

<sup>167</sup> The use of Linear A was much more widespread than that of Linear B: in addition to its administrative function, Linear A was used for religious and other secular purposes, and texts appear on ceramic vases, wall plaster, stone altars and clay seals (Alfred Heubeck, “L’origine della Lineare B”, *SMEA* 23, 1982, 195-208). It is not inconceivable that some of these inscriptions may be metrical.

<sup>168</sup> Hoekstra, *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey*, vol. II, 164

perfectly suited to the hexameter verse in both their Homeric and putative Mycenaean forms. The formula ποιμένα λά(φ)ων may also be Mycenaean: ποιμήν in the form po-me, is frequently used in the Mycenaean texts, and, as discussed, the title lawāgetas shows that the army was called λαφός.

It appears likely, in view of the old formulae whose correct scansion is restored only with their Mycenaean forms, and the absence of military terminology such as \*lawāgetas from the *Iliad*, that epic language at the end of the Mycenaean Age was conditioned by the dactylic hexameter, as it was in the 1st millennium. It also seems entirely reasonable that the epic dialect was always felt by poets and audiences to be a literary language which was elevated above everyday discourse, characterized by the retention of archaic forms and doublets, with the option of incorporating elements from the spoken dialects which were contemporary with it. Throughout its centuries-long development, this artistic language continued to evolve along with the contemporary vernacular, replacing some archaisms which had become incomprehensible with up-to-date metrically equivalent forms, retaining others because they were metrically indispensable, and creating new formulae suited to the metre, or modifying old ones, when evolutions in the vernacular made this possible.

## Chapter Two

### Archaisms: Epic as a Museum of the Greek Language

In the context of Homeric language, "archaisms" are to be understood as linguistic forms which were obsolete in the spoken Ionic contemporary with the composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Epic preserves a collection of linguistic phenomena which, by the time of composition of the Homeric poems, were lost, or retained only sporadically, in the rest of Greek, and are absent from the earliest Ionic inscriptions. These archaisms can in some cases be detected in the apparently irregular scansion of the verse, where the restoration of a phantom digamma or a syllabic liquid will allow the verse to scan regularly. Other archaisms belong to the morphological, syntactical and lexical spheres. Certain archaic features of Homeric language belong to a state of language earlier than that represented by the Mycenaean texts: this indicates that the epic tradition is older than the extant Linear B tablets. Such archaic forms are preserved because of the traditional nature of epic and its metrical constraints, and suggest also that epic language was already at the end of the Bronze Age a literary language elevated above that of everyday discourse. Linear B, on the other hand, represents the language of administration and the quotidian life of the palace system.

Epic language contains forms dating from different stages of the development of a centuries-old tradition. Its pervasive amalgam of old and new forms is the result of the way in which epic language gradually but

constantly altered over the course of centuries, admitting new forms from the vernacular as metrically convenient, while retaining older forms both for metrical reasons and to maintain the archaic feel of the diction, and also replacing archaic lexical items which may no longer have been understood with words in contemporary use. Thus the old dual ὄσσε < \*oq<sup>w</sup>ye occurs 44 times in the *Iliad*, but only 13 times in the *Odyssey*; this noun is always dual, but its contemporary equivalent ὀφθαλμοί almost always appears in the plural, in keeping with the obsolete status of the dual in Ionic speech. The language of the *Odyssey* in general gives a more “modern” impression than that of the *Iliad*; this is partly because its subject-matter is less traditional, but is also consistent with the view that the *Odyssey* is of later composition and by a different poet. Different authorship is indicated both by differing vocabulary and by variation of use between the two poems in several morphological phenomena (e.g. -φι, the -θη- passive). It is no surprise to find that Homer, representing an oral tradition which developed over many centuries, should preserve linguistic phenomena of great antiquity: it has long been recognized that such features are in many instances closely bound up with the metre.

The archaic and conservative nature of epic language means that it is possible through this medium to trace the history of East Greek backwards from the Ionic of c. 700 B.C. almost to Common Greek. This is exemplified by the preposition ποτί, which is inherited and belongs to Common Greek; in its unassibilated form it was retained in the historical period by West Greek and Aeolic, although lost in Att-Ion., where it was

replaced by the probable innovation πρός, while in AC it evolved through assibilation and apocope to πός. Thus ποτί is the oldest form of the preposition in the epic tradition, and is an archaism which goes back to Common Greek. The same is true also of such forms as μέσσοϛ and τόσσοϛ, where -σσ- evolved from homomorphemic \*ty, \*t<sup>h</sup>y, and was simplified in the more progressive southern dialects in the 2nd millennium.

### Phonological Archaisms

It is inevitable that, over the course of time, the pronunciation of any language will alter. Phonological innovations affect all elements of a language as used in daily discourse, although the situation with regard to epic is slightly different. Phonological archaisms are often to be detected in epic only because of the prosodical anomalies produced when epic language adapted itself to changes in pronunciation in the vernacular. Because of the conservative nature of epic diction, it is conceivable that poets strove to maintain traditional pronunciation, but ultimately the same phonological tendencies that affected the spoken language would have prevailed in epic. Thus there are no labiovelars,<sup>1</sup> final stops or syllabic liquids in epic because

---

<sup>1</sup> Jean Taillardat has proposed (“Homerica”, *RPh* 1997, 256) that Ionian bards could have maintained artificially “la diction traditionnelle pour les termes ignorés de l’ionien vivant, mais usités dans l’épopée, c’est à dire γ<sup>w</sup>έρεθρον, κ<sup>w</sup>έλομαι, χ<sup>w</sup>ήρες...etc.” Such a scenario is improbable: indeed bards may have striven to maintain traditional pronunciation, but once labiovelars had developed to dental stops before front vowels in pre-migration Ionic, the sequence labiovelar + /c/ would have sounded preposterous to proto-Ionic speaking audiences, and would have had no support in the vernacular.

such phonemes had no support anywhere in Greek, and /w/ had no support in the dialects which influenced epic as we know it at the time of composition of the Homeric poems. Although the sequence /ti/ is not a normal part of Ionic, its presence was supported in Ionian epic by the retention in Lesbian of Common Greek /ti/, thus epic words containing this sequence (mainly rare and poetic words which were never part of the spoken language) should not be attributed to Aeolic influence, but rather be regarded as retaining a Common Greek archaism. The same applies to /ā/, which is retained in the genitive endings -αο, -αων as well as certain forms which were not part of normal Ionic speech, e.g. θεά, ναῦφι: although the presence of this phoneme in Lesbian must have supported its retention in Ionian epic until the second compensatory lengthening brought /ā/ back into the Ionic phonetic repertoire, it should not be thought of as an Aeolism, but as a Common Greek archaism.

### **Digamma**

The best known such phantom consonant is /w/, a phoneme which in Mycenaean was retained in all positions, and in some mainland dialects<sup>2</sup> was still pronounced as late as the 2nd century B.C., represented in written texts by the symbol Ϝ. In Att.-Ion, however, /w/ was lost early, and had completely disappeared by the time of the earliest inscriptions, which for Attic was the late 8th century, and for Ionic, the early 7th; there are a few examples of digamma in Ionic inscriptions, but it always appears as a glide

---

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Cretan and Boeotian (Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 163)

sound between vowels, and never where etymologically expected. Digamma appears to have disappeared first between vowels, where its loss was followed by metathesis of quantity (e.g. \*βασιλῆφος > βασιλῆος > βασιλέως); the text of Homer regularly retains the older forms, such as βασιλῆες, which were fixed in the dactylic line before metathesis occurred.<sup>3</sup> Thus the loss of intervocalic digamma had no metrical effect, at least at first. Likewise there is no prosodical effect in Homer from the loss of postconsonantal digamma in the interior of a word: East Ionic, unlike Attic, experienced the third wave of compensatory lengthening, with the result that \*κόρφα (written as ko-wa in Mycenaean) became Ionic κούρη, but Attic κόρη.<sup>4</sup> Thus a formula such as κούρη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο (Γ 426, Ε 733, Θ 384, ν 252, ω 547, etc.) can easily be restored to \*κόρφα Διφὸς αἰγιφόχοιο,<sup>5</sup> the form which would antedate all the characteristic

---

<sup>3</sup> Metathesis of quantity is a fairly late development in Ionic; Hoekstra argues that it was the last development to affect epic language (*Modifications*, 31), but it is important to remember that all metatheses did not necessarily take place at the same time. Cf. Emilio Crespo's comments, "La cronología relativa de la metátesis de cantidad en jónico-ático", *CFC* 12, 1977, 191.

<sup>4</sup> Attic κόρη proves that postconsonantal digamma was lost after the completion of the change  $\bar{\alpha} > \eta$ ; had digamma disappeared first, the presence of /r/ would have ensured that the progress of /ā/ > /ē/ was halted then reversed in Attic (Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 234).

<sup>5</sup> The meaning of the epithet αἰγιόχος is not certain: it is conventionally understood as "aegis-bearing", referring to a goatskin shield, deriving its second element from the root of ἔχω < \*segh-. However, according to Aristotle (*Meteorologica*, 341b,3), αἰξ can have the meaning "thunderbolt", and if the verbal component of this compound is taken to belong to the root of the obsolete verb \*φέχω (cognate with Latin *veho*, English *weigh*), not only will

innovations of Ionic, and which could have existed in Mycenaean times: both ko-wa and di-wo, genitive of Zeus' name, are found on the Mycenaean tablets. The formula is also of traditional shape, designed to fit between the penthemimeral caesura in the third foot and the end of the verse; some of the oldest formulae begin at this position, or even more frequently at the trochaic caesura.

By far the majority of Homeric prosodical anomalies betraying the erstwhile presence of digamma occur in connexion with this phoneme in word-initial position., where its erstwhile presence can be detected in several epic formulae, as discovered by Richard Bentley in 1732. Although digamma is observed in more than 3,000 instances, it is neglected in some 600.<sup>6</sup> Before words which once began with digamma, there are frequently prosodical anomalies consisting of hiatus or irregular lengthening of final syllables. When verses are formulaic, they are regularly scanned as if digamma were still present, e.g.: Ἀτρεΐδης τε (Ϝ)ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, where the hiatus between τε and ἄναξ disappears once digamma is restored. Although digamma was no longer a part of Ionic speech when the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed, it is evidence of the traditional nature of epic that its metrical effect is almost always present, even in similes, which are among the most "modern" and non-formulaic elements. Thus N 703-4, βόε οἴνοπε

---

it be appropriate to restore digamma, but a most satisfactory meaning, "who propels the thunderbolt", emerges – satisfactory because it is entirely in keeping with Zeus' rôle as a weather god.

<sup>6</sup> Palmer, "The Language of Homer", *A Companion to Homer*, Wace & Stubbings (edd.), 1962, 101

contains an archaism in the observance of digamma, but as this occurs in a non-formulaic context, the poet was simply following the conventional practice of ἀοιδή. Poets are scarcely likely to have known that the reason for hiatus before certain words was the former presence of /w/, thus in observing the effect of digamma they were following the conventional practice of their art, rather than consciously archaizing. However, in νόστιμον ἦμαρ ἰδέσθαι (γ 233, ε 220, θ 466), the poet was innovating in departing from traditional practice: this phrase is obviously recent, as the final syllable of ἦμαρ is short before ἰδέσθαι, a verb with original initial digamma.

Also as a consequence of the disappearance of /w/, the 3rd person singular pronoun ἑ when elided disappeared completely (not even an aspiration remained because East Ionic was psilotic). Thus at Ω 154 (where Zeus is addressing Iris) the restoration of ϑ improves the metre; as the verse appears, it begins with a short syllable: ὄς ἄξει εἰὼς κεν ἄγων Ἀχιλῆϊ πελάσση. The restoration of ϑ' after ὄς produces a long syllable, viz. ὄς ϑ' ἄξει, and allows ἄξει to have a direct object, producing a construction parallel to that of Ω 183, where Iris relays Zeus' words to Priam: ὄς σ' ἄξει.<sup>7</sup> Thus the verse in question was not created by the *Iliad* poet; it is not possible to ascertain whether it was created for the episode in which Hermes escorts Priam to Achilles, but this is not unlikely in view of the fact that it occurs only in this context.

---

<sup>7</sup> Chantraine, "La langue de l'Iliade", *Introduction à l'Iliade*, Paul Mazon (ed.), 1948, 100

Loss of /w/ also caused the verb \*φέχω, “drive”, to fall into desuetude; this verb occurs in the Iliadic formula ἔχε μώνυχας ἵππους (E 829, 841, Θ 139, Λ 513, etc.). Ο 354, πάντες ὁμοκλήσαντες ἔχον ἐρυσάρματας ἵππους, is reminiscent of *Aspis* 369, τῷ ἐπιπειθόμενος ἐχέμεν ἐρυσάρματας ἵππους, where final -ος is scanned long, suggesting modification of a formula, as the verb was probably understood as a specialized meaning of ἔχω by the time of composition of the *Iliad*. It is from the same root as the Homeric “chariot” word \*(f)ῶχος, which occurs only in the plural ὄχεια, ὀχέων, ὀχεσφι (to be discussed in greater detail, pp. 252-4), and Mycenaean wo-ka =\*φόχα, a feminine substantive, one of several Mycenaean words signifying “chariot”. The loss of initial /w/ from this verb must have caused confusion with ἔχω <\*segh-, thus it would no longer have been productive within epic.<sup>8</sup> Outside epic this verb occurs only in Pamphylian φεχετω<sup>9</sup>, ἰσφεξε (\*ένσφεξε)<sup>10</sup> and Cypriot ἔφεξε.<sup>11</sup> The denominative ὀχέω appears a few times in Homer (Ω 731, α 297, λ 619, η 211), but lacks formulaic connexions, and poets would have had no reason to connect this verb with what they probably felt to be a specialized usage of ἔχω < \*segh-. At Ψ 536, (f)ἔχε is replaced by ἐλαύνει: λοῖσθος ἀνήρ ὄριστος ἐλαύνει μώνυχας ἵππους. This line is shown to be late

---

<sup>8</sup> One cannot legitimately argue that in the future tense (f)ἔξω would have remained distinct from ἔξω, since the psilotic nature of the Ionic dialect meant that the future tenses of these verbs would have been homophonous after the loss of /w/.

<sup>9</sup> Schwyzer-Cauer, *DGE* 686, 18

<sup>10</sup> Schwyzer-Cauer, *DGE* 686, 20

<sup>11</sup> Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*, 169

by the use of the definite article in ὄριστος = ὁ ἄριστος: the crasis may be the result of later editing of the text,<sup>12</sup> as resolution of ὠ- to ὀ ἄ- allows a dactyl in the 2nd foot, improving the scansion.

As the disappearance of /w/ from the spoken language occurred fairly late in the development of the epic tradition, little can be deduced about the date of creation of phrases where its effect is discernible: they could be coeval with the Mycenaean texts or even earlier, or post-migration. Loss of /w/ did, however, have the effect of making the diction more flexible, allowing the declension of formulae into cases which had previously been metrically inadmissible. Thus the verse-end formula μελιθήδεα φοῖνον, for example, was declined into the genitive case as μελιθήδεος οἴνου. The declined formula is shown to be late not only by the neglect of digamma (the final syllable of μελιθήδεος is scanned short as it is not followed by a consonant), but also by the irresolvable contracted genitive οἴνου in the final foot. Likewise καὶ μιν φωνήσας (φ)ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα could now be declined into the feminine, viz. ...φωνήσασ' ἔπεα πτερόεντα (O 35, 89, 145).<sup>13</sup>

### Syllabic \*l and \*r

The Mycenaean evidence (c. 1200 B.C.) shows that the syllabic liquids (\*r, \*l) had already developed supporting vowels, usually of a- or o-

---

<sup>12</sup> Chantraine, *GHI*, 85

<sup>13</sup> Chantraine, "La langue de l'Iliade", 103

timbre. Some Homeric formulae of old appearance betray the presence at a remote date of a syllabic liquid. One of the most notable such examples is the whole-verse formula Μηριόνης ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ<sup>14</sup> (B 651, H 166, Θ 264, P 259), whose second hemistich is a prosodical nightmare. In order to scan correctly, Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ must be pronounced in one of three ways:

1. with synizesis of -λίῳ and shortening of the result of the synizesis before the following vowel;
2. with synizesis of -υα-;
2. with synaloepha of -ω(ι) ἄν-.

What is more, although the epithet ἀνδρειφόντης appears to mean “man-slaying”, its morphological structure is bizarre: one would expect ἀνδροφόντης, and it is tempting to believe that ἀνδρειφόντης is an artificial adaptation based on Ἄργειφόντης, an epithet of Hermes<sup>15</sup> which is of obscure etymology and likewise occurs at verse-end.

---

<sup>14</sup> Although the epithet ἀτάλαντος is used of other heroes, e.g. Odysseus, the phrase ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ is restricted to Meriones.

<sup>15</sup> “Killer of Argos” must be a popular etymology, which may have arisen from the correspondence ἀνδροφόντης: ἀνδρειφόντης = \*ἀνδροφόντης: ἄργειφόντης. The epithet may signify “who kills in Argos”, containing Ἄργεϊ locative, or “who kills with his brightness”, containing \*ἄργος, a neuter s-stem which is the basis of ἄργεστος, ἄργεννος, ἑναργής. On the other hand, it may be a pre-Greek name, cf. Βελλεροφόντης (Ruijgh, “Le mycénien et Homère”, 182, note 49).

The metrical difficulties of this formula are, however, resolved when a considerably more archaic form is restored for the whole line: \*Μηριόνας χαπάλαντος (<\*σηπάλαντος) Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνιῖq<sup>w</sup>hόντq. \*ἀνιῖq<sup>w</sup>hόντq, containing a syllabic liquid, still without supporting vowel, and scanned as a short syllable, must date from before the time of the Linear B texts (v. pp.56-61). The Linear B texts also show that epenthetic /d/ in the oblique cases of ἀνήρ was already a *fait accompli*: cf. the personal name a-re-ka-sa-da-ra = Ἀλεξάνδρα, and a-di-ri-a-te = \*ἀνδριάντει, dative singular (with instrumental function) of ἀνδρίας, “statue”. Thus by 1200 B.C., \*ἀνιῖq<sup>w</sup>hόντq would have evolved to \*ἀνδροq<sup>w</sup>hόντq by the steps \*ἀνι- > \*ἀνρο-> ἀνδρο-. By this stage, the prosodical anomaly would already have existed, requiring the scansion of the initial syllable as short, despite the following group of three consonants. Subsequently, \*ἀνδροφόντq / -q<sup>w</sup>hόντq was replaced with the artificial form ἀνδρειφόντq / -q<sup>w</sup>hόντq, which necessitated synizesis to make the verse scan. It is impossible to determine the date at which \*ἀνδροφόντq / -q<sup>w</sup>hόντq was altered to \*ἀνδρειφόντq / -q<sup>w</sup>hόντq, but is not impossible that the substitution may already have belonged to Mycenaean epic; there is no reason to imagine that bards would not have used artificial forms at that date.

The verse is also shown to be old by the lack of epic correction (whereby a long vowel or diphthong is sometimes scanned short before an

initial vowel) in the final diphthong (-ωι) of Ἐνυαλίω in its restored, pre-Mycenaean<sup>16</sup> form. At this stage, Greek still had the consonant /y/,<sup>17</sup> thus -ωy was treated in the same way as -ων, -ωρ, -ως. The syllable boundary, therefore, was felt to come between ω and y, and the following syllable consisted of -y and the initial ᾱ- of \*ᾱνιϞ<sup>w</sup>hόνιϞ. The fact that this verse survived in Homer despite its metrical difficulties and epithet of bizarre construction is testimony to the conservative nature of the epic tradition. It could, admittedly, be argued that Enyalios' name + epithet phrase could have been preserved in religious language and adopted by epic from that source; indeed there is no reason why epic should not have adopted the phrase from such a source, but it would scarcely have been likely to attempt to incorporate the phrase if it was already grossly unmetrical. Therefore the phrase must have entered epic when its scansion was still regular, that is, before syllabic liquids had acquired supporting vowels and before the sequence \*nr had acquired an epenthetic /d/, developments which had taken place before the time of the extant Mycenaean texts.

---

<sup>16</sup> "Pre-Mycenaean" here means a state of language earlier than that attested by the Linear B texts.

<sup>17</sup> At the time of the Mycenaean texts, initial /y/ was in the process of becoming /h/; the conjunction ὡς is written sometimes as jo-, sometimes as o-, representing /yōs/ and /hōs/ respectively. However, /y/ was still present between vowels, e.g. -o-jo = -oyō, the ending of the 2nd declension genitive singular, and after sonants, eg. di-wi-jo / di-u-jo = \*ΔίϞοϞ, the adjective pertaining to Zeus (Ruijgh, "D'Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes", 86).

Further support for a very early date for the creation of this formula can be found in the attestation in Mycenaean of the epithet ἀνδροφόντης in the form a-no-ḡo-ta = \*ʷAnoḡhón̄tas, which appears as a personal name at Knossos<sup>18</sup> (KN Ak 615, Da 1289, Ve 173, etc.)- a name reflecting the values of Mycenaean society. Its first element is the zero-grade of the stem ἀνερ- “man”; cf. Old Attic ἀνδραφόνος, which contains ἀνδρα- < \*ἀνρα- < \*ἀνr̥-, reflecting the Attic tendency to generalize ρα/ αρ < \*r̥.<sup>19</sup>

The more common form of this epithet, ἀνδροφόνος, contains the linking vowel found in the type Δι(φ)ογένης. The first element of a compound in Greek regularly contains the zero-grade: cf. ἄπαξ < \*sḡ-, τράπεζα / to-pe-za = \*τόρπεζα < \*(q<sup>w</sup>)tr̥-, τρυφάλεια < \*(q<sup>w</sup>)tru-, the negative prefix ἄ- < \*h̥, e.g. ἄθάνατος. At an early period, Indo-European had the accent on the second members of compounds, thus the first member was reduced to zero-grade.<sup>20</sup> The full-grade belonged originally to the nominative and accusative singular (with *v̥ddhi*, or lengthening in the singular, thus ἀνήρ,

---

<sup>18</sup> As Palmer argued (*The Greek Language*, 53-4), the Knossos tablets are of the same date as those belonging to the mainland sites: it is improbable that their language would differ so little from that of the mainland tablets if some two centuries had elapsed between the composition of the Knossian texts and those from other sites, despite the fact that the Linear B language seems to be a formalized, bureaucratic *koine* which bore little relation to the spoken language of the 13th century.

<sup>19</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 197

<sup>20</sup> Ruijgh, “Le problème du degré zéro”, *Scripta Minora I*, 567

but ἀνέροα) and nominative plural ἀνέρες; subsequently -δ- from the zero-grade forms was generalized in all forms except the nominative and vocative singular.<sup>21</sup> As the archaic nominative ἀνέρες never occurs in prose, and could only have entered epic while it belonged to the spoken language, there is a strong possibility that it belonged to hexameter verse in the Mycenaean Age. The Mycenaean evidence suggests that ἄνδρες was used in the spoken language (cf. Ἄλεξάνδρα, \*ἀνδριάντει), and thus it seems that the original ἀνέρες was already an archaism: the tendency is always towards regularization of the paradigm. Thus the P<sub>2</sub> formula ἐπὶ δ' ἀνέρες ἐσθλοὶ ὄροντο (γ 471, also at ξ 104 with the verb in the present tense, ὄρονται) has a high likelihood of being of Mycenaean date; the initial ἀ- of ἀνέρες is metrically lengthened, which is no reason to consider the formula to be post-Mycenaean, and it is testimony to the retentive character of epic language that ἀνέρες was not replaced with the metrically equivalent contemporary ἄνδρες. In this case, the archaic nominative had the advantage of providing a dactyl in the 4th foot.

There are some similar examples from the root \*m<sub>1</sub>rt. The formula ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης (B 389, M 402, Y 281; at Λ 32 modified in the accusative ἀμφιβρότην...ἀσπίδα) likewise contains a prosodical peculiarity in the short scansion of -φι- followed by two consonants. The epithet was probably once \*ἀμφιμῆτας, and in this respect philology is in accord with archaeology, as the phrase ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης refers to the

<sup>21</sup> L. R. Palmer, "The Language of Homer", *A Companion to Homer*, 84

shield carried by the greater Ajax, which is always described as οάκος ἤϋτε πύργον, and seems to be identical with the body-shield which was in vogue in the 16th and 15th centuries B.C. The phrase contains another archaism in ἤϋτε, which is obsolete in 1st millennium Greek.

Similarly, νύξ ἀβρότη (Ξ 78) provides another example of awkward scansion as it appears in our texts; ἀμβρότη, which is possible in view of νύξ φθίτ' ἀμβροτος (λ 330), would give impossible scansion, but \*ἀμῖτα scans perfectly, and is an exact equivalent of Sanskrit *amṛta*. Also related to \*ἀμῖτα is ἀβροτάξομεν (Κ 65); if this is not a recent and artificial creation (v. p. 57), it may have entered epic in the form \*ἀμῖτάξομεν. By contrast, in the phrase ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρησι βροτῶν (δ 692), -ι must be scanned short before βροτῶν by metrical licence, as this verse lacks formulaic connexions.

Ἄφροδίτη is an awkward case: it belongs to several formulae which may be old (although this name, unlike many other theonyms known from 1st millennium Greek, is not attested in Mycenaean), e.g. Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἄφροδίτη (Γ 374, Ε 131, etc.), φιλομμειδῆς Ἄφροδίτη (Γ 424, Ε 375, Ξ 211, etc.). The goddess' name is of unknown etymology, and may be of eastern provenance; this does not preclude the presence of \*ϝ, and the Pamphylian form Ἄφοροδίτα could be taken to support such a theory, although it is just as likely that this is simply a case of

metathesis.<sup>22</sup> It is perhaps more probable that Greek adopted the name in the form Ἀφροδίτα, and that bards felt it legitimate to scan the first syllable short despite the following -φρ- because of the analogy of anomalous forms such as ἀμφιβρότης.

Τράπεζα is a compound derived from \*q<sup>w</sup>tr-pedya (the first element of the compound is in the zero-grade, and its first syllable disappears: cf. Τυρταίος, τρυφάλεια); the Mycenaean form to-pe-za = \*τόρπεζα suggests the one-time presence of \*r. τράπεζα is fairly common in Homer, particularly in the *Odyssey*, occurring at verse-end except at λ 419: ὡς ἀμφὶ κρητήρα τραπέζας τε πληθούσας. Its habitual verse-end position and combination with several words which are absent from prose and do not occur in epic in other contexts suggest that τράπεζα belongs to an ancient formula-system: e.g. παρέκειτο τραπέζῃ (Ω 476, φ 416); ἐπιπροΐηλε τράπεζαν (Λ 628). Final short vowels are always scanned short before τράπεζα, which suggests the possibility that formulae containing \*τρπεζα had been created before the development of a supporting vowel. If epic at an early stage used the form \*τόρπεζα, as known from Mycenaean, this would have created an unmetrical cretic, suggesting another prosodical anomaly at the Mycenaean stage. Ionic bards would have replaced this form with τράπεζα, the form understood by Ionic-speaking audiences.

---

<sup>22</sup> Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*, 187

The Homeric word for “chair”, θρόνος, appears in Mycenaean in the form to-ro-no, with the variant to-no, equivalent to \*θρόνος. The form of the word that is familiar from Homer is attested in Mycenaean in the compound to-ro-no-wo-ko = \*θρονόφοροι; \*θρόνος is confirmed by Hesychius’ gloss θρόναξ· ὑποπόδιον· Κύπριοι. The presence of \*r seems likely for this word; the two spellings in Mycenaean may represent variant pronunciations. In the formula κατὰ κλισμοὺς τε θρόνους τε, which has 8 occurrences in Homer (and also provides an example of the archaic construction ...τε...τε), τε is scanned short before θρ-, suggesting that θρόνος entered epic when it still contained \*r. It is possible that at an early date epic used the form θρόνος, which would later have been replaced with θρόνος.<sup>23</sup> θρόνος in this formula would have produced another cretic, and as poets would not wittingly have created an unmetrical formula, the likelihood increases that the formula antedates the vocalization of sonants. The phrase can be restored to the putative Mycenaean form

---

<sup>23</sup> Homeric θρόνος indicates a chair intended for the use of persons of high status, as at η 95, where θρόνοι is used of the chairs on which the Phaeacian βασιλῆες sat to feast; θρόνοι are also to be found in the palaces of Nestor (γ 389) and Odysseus (α 145). θρόνος occurs 14 times in the *Iliad*, mostly in connexion with gods, e.g. ἐπὶ θρόνον ...Ζεὺς ἔζετο, Θ 442-3, καθέζετ’ ἐπὶ θρόνου, Α 536, also referring to Zeus; Hera and other divinities also occupy θρόνοι, but they are less often associated with mortals. Nestor (Λ 645) and Achilles (Ω 515) rise ἀπὸ θρόνου at the arrival of a guest. The same is no doubt true of Mycenaean to-no = \*θρόνοι, adorned with ivory, gold, etc. It therefore seems highly likely that θρόνοι / θρόνοι and banqueting scenes were known to epic poetry of the Mycenaean Age.

\*κατὰ κλισμὸνς q<sup>w</sup>ε θόρονς q<sup>w</sup>ε: the enclitic \*q<sup>w</sup>ε (identical to Latin -*que*) is common in Mycenaean in the form qe, and regularly became τε when the labiovelar stops disappeared.

Short scansion of a naturally short vowel before *muta cum liquida* is an archaism (possibly extended in some instances to cases where there was no etymological justification for its use, e.g. Ἄφροδίτη); poets were unaware of the original reason for this metrical licence, viz. the erstwhile presence of syllabic \*r, only that this was an option available to them. Thus they cannot be said to have been deliberately archaizing in this respect, but rather taking advantage of a convenient metrical licence which was a traditional part of their craft, and which had apparently been available since a date before that of the Mycenaean tablets.

### **Consonantal /h/**

East Ionic was a psilotic dialect, lacking the phoneme /h/ which was retained in all mainland dialects, although even in dialects which retained aspiration in the 1st millennium it was not treated as a full consonant, as is clear from the fact that an initial *spiritus asper* has no effect on scansion. In the Mycenaean syllabary, the only means of indicating aspiration is by the symbol transcribed as a<sub>2</sub>, which has the value /ha/, and by those transcribed as pa<sub>2</sub> and pu<sub>2</sub>, with the values of φα and φυ respectively. Aspiration in Greek is frequently the result of weakening of the pronunciation of an antevocalic or intervocalic \*s, which had been

accomplished before the time of the Mycenaean texts, and sometimes the presence of /h/ from this source can be observed in Mycenaean when the symbol  $a_2$  is used, e.g. neuter plural o-pi- $a_2$ -ra = \* $\acute{o}\pi\acute{i}$ - $h\alpha\lambda\alpha$  (<\*sal-), “coastal regions”, pa-we- $a_2$  =  $\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\phi\epsilon\eta\alpha$ , plural of \* $\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\phi\omicron\varsigma$  >  $\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $a_2$ -te-ro =  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  <\* $s\eta$ -tero-; before other vowels Mycenaean has no way of indicating aspiration, which must be inferred from etymology and equivalents in later Greek, e.g. e-qe-ta (PY An 657, etc.) =  $\acute{\epsilon}q^w\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\varsigma$  < \* $seq^w$ - (cf. Latin *sequor*, and  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\varsigma$  in Pindar), the title of an important functionary.

In Mycenaean compounds, a short vowel at the end of the first element does not appear to be elided before /h/, thus o-pi- $a_2$ -ra = \* $\acute{o}\pi\acute{i}h\alpha\lambda\alpha$  contrasts with Homeric  $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu$  (B 538); however, it appears that Mycenaean does practise elision before a vowel, e.g. o-po-qo = \* $\acute{o}\pi\omega q^w\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , “with blinkers”, instrumental plural of \* $\acute{o}\pi\omega q^w\omicron\nu$ .<sup>24</sup> Yet despite the retention of intervocalic aspiration in Mycenaean, it cannot therefore be inferred that the aspirate was felt to have full consonantal force: it may have been weaker between vowels than initially.<sup>25</sup>

Although it seems probable that in 2nd millennium Greek, /h/ resulting from initial or intervocalic \*s was treated as a full consonant at least for a time, it may be that its force was disappearing by the end of the

---

<sup>24</sup> Ruijgh, *Études*, 53

<sup>25</sup> Lejeune, “Essais de philologie mycénienne IX”, *RPh* 39, 1965, 18, note 29

Mycenaean Age. There are, for example, few examples of the symbol  $a_2 = /ha/$  at Knossos, perhaps indicating a lack of aspiration in the spoken language there. Although Homeric formulae observing the prosodical force of  $/h/$  appear to be ancient, it is by no means certain that  $/h/$  continued to block elision throughout the 2nd millennium, and some formulae of ancient appearance do exhibit elision of a final short vowel before a word which formerly had initial  $/h/$ , e.g. Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες < \**h*έχοντες,<sup>26</sup> and the whole-verse formula δύσετο τ' ἥλιος σκιάωντο τε πᾶσαι ἀγυαί, which, if it is of Mycenaean date, would have had the form \*δύσετο q<sup>w</sup> ἄφέλιος σκιάοντο q<sup>w</sup>ε πάνσαι ἀγυαί.<sup>27</sup> The verb σκιάωντο shows diectasis, the re-extension of the result of vowel contractions: this was necessary in order to preserve the metrical pattern of the verb, and the result is an artificial form belonging only to epic. The status of the initial aspirate in Mycenaean poetry may have been similar to its status in Latin poetry: while  $/h/$  was normally pronounced in Latin, it was not observed in scansion as a full consonant and did not block elision.

---

<sup>26</sup> This formula has 10 occurrences in the *Iliad* and 3 in the *Odyssey*. Olympus is situated on the mainland, and like other references to the mainland this formula must belong to pre-migration epic.

<sup>27</sup> This formula, which occurs at β 388, γ 487, 497, λ 12, ο 185, 296, 471 contains several archaisms: the past desiderative δύσετο, ...τε...τε, uncontracted ἥλιος, which appears as contracted ἥλιος only at θ 271 in Homer. The fossilized nature of the noun ἀγυαί is clear from the fact that all its Homeric occurrences are at verse-end, with the exception of Υ 254, ...μέσην-ἔς ἀγυαίαν ἰοῦσαι. ἀγυαί is by no means a common word in 1st millennium prose, but its derivative Ἄγυιεύς is a title of Apollo as guardian of streets and ways (cf. Athene's title Κελεύθεια at Sparta).

Despite the fact that the dialect of the Homeric poems was psilotic like contemporary East Ionic, in whose evolution it had participated, certain words and phrases must date from a stage when /h/ was not only pronounced, but had the same prosodical value as other consonants. Homer exhibits several cases of hiatus and apparently irregular lengthening of final syllables which are explicable when the Mycenaean form is restored with treatment of /h/ as a normal consonant. The formula Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος (-οῦ, -ε), used 6 times as an epithet of Odysseus or Achilles, contains an unexpected lengthening of the final syllable of μῆτιν, which is short by nature. The reason for this becomes obvious with the restoration of the Mycenaean form \**haτάλαντος* < \**ση-τάλαντος*; in fact, the phrase scans equally well in its Mycenaean form with initial /h/ and in its pre-Mycenaean form with initial /s/ and the syllabic nasal \**η*, providing further reason to believe that some epic formulae date from a period before the Mycenaean tablets, which always show /a/ as the outcome of \**η*.

A hiatus can be observed in the formula πόντια Ἥρη, which occurs 25 times at verse-end. It is customary in classical Greek to elide a final short vowel before an initial vowel with spiritus asper. However, when the Mycenaean form \**πόντια hήρα* is restored, with /h/ functioning as a normal consonant, the phrase becomes prosodically regular. Prosodical arguments aside, this formula has every chance of being of high antiquity, as both its elements are attested on the Mycenaean tablets. Πόντια, in the

form po-ti-ni-ja, appears as a title of several goddesses, including Athene (a-ta-na), and also in the phrase si-to po-ti-ni-ja = σίτων πότνια, “Mistress of cereals”. The word is clearly of Indo-European origin, corresponding precisely to Sanskrit *pātṇi*, “mistress, goddess”<sup>28</sup>; it is an archaic feminine of πόσις,<sup>29</sup> an ancient term signifying both “husband” and “master of a house”. It is notable that Homer never declines this formula into the accusative, although Hesiod does (*Theogony* 11): πότνιαν Ἥρην is metrically regular in 1st millennium Greek, as /h/ was not regarded as a full consonant, but at some stage in the 2nd millennium it would have lengthened the preceding short syllable, -αν, rendering πότνιαν unacceptable in the dactylic verse. The retention of the formula in the nominative in spite of its hiatus in 1st millennium Greek, while the accusative, although potentially acceptable, never appears in Homer, shows that the formulaic tradition was particularly conservative as far as name + epithet combinations are concerned.

Another unexpected lengthening of a final syllable is to be observed in the formula βέλος (with -ος scanned long) ἔχεπευκές (A 51, Δ 129). The reason for the lengthening becomes clear if the epithet is restored to its putative Mycenaean form *\*hechepeuchēs*, with aspirates as yet undissimilated by the operation of Grassmann’s Law. Linear B does not

---

<sup>28</sup> Chantraine, *DELG* 932, s.v. πότνια

<sup>29</sup> H 411, δ 137; the same stem appears in δεσπότης < \*d̥ms-potēs, δεσποίνα < \*d̥ms-potn̥a, Sanskrit *dampati-*. πόσις occurs in Cypriot (in the form po-si-ne in the Cypriot syllabary) with the meaning “husband” as in Homer.

indicate whether Grassmann's Law had taken effect yet, so e-ke could represent ἔχει or \*ἔχει. In 1st millennium Greek, neither ἔχω (<\*segh-, cf. the zero-grade ἔσχω in the strong aorist), ὄφρα (<\*yo-), nor ἔθος (<\*swedh-) show initial aspiration in any dialect, therefore the dissimilation took place after the evolutions \*s > h, \*y > h, \*sw > wh<sup>30</sup>; the change y > h was taking place c.1200 B.C. Regardless of the likely date of Grassmann's Law, if βέλος ἐχεπευχές does indeed retain the prosodical effect of an initial /h/, the formula must have been created while /h/, representing antevocalic \*s, was still felt to be a full consonant.

It is conceivable that the weakening of /h/, which probably took place over the course of the 2nd millennium, and not, as Ruijgh would have it,<sup>31</sup> only after the end of the Mycenaean Age, caused a large number of hiatus in formulae; the fact that few examples remain may be due to the renovation of epic diction which was constantly practised throughout the course of the tradition. As Hoekstra observes,<sup>32</sup> many formulae may have been lost during the turbulence that accompanied the end of the Mycenaean Age. The phantom presence in epic of /h/ with full consonantal value suggests a date considerably earlier than the Mycenaean texts for the creation of the small number of formulae in which it can be detected. The formulae πόντια Ἥρη and Διὶ μήτιν ἀτάλαντος, the latter containing other indications of high antiquity, therefore have a high probability of

---

<sup>30</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 57

<sup>31</sup> *Études*, 53

<sup>32</sup> *Epic Verse Before Homer*, 86

being 2nd millennium creations. It can reasonably be concluded from these formulae that the loss of consonantal /h/ took place when there already existed an oral tradition in hexameters, and that, as there is reason to believe that the pronunciation of /h/ weakened gradually over the course of the 2nd millennium, the creation of formulae where its effect is observed antedates the Mycenaean texts.

### **Initial \*s- + Liquid / Nasal**

Epic contains a number of words in which a final vowel which is short by nature is scanned long before the initial liquid of the following word. In some of these cases, the initial liquid represents \*s + liquid, which must have made position at a very early stage, e.g.:

ε 327 τὴν δ'ἔφορει μέγα κύμα κατὰ ῥόον (<\*srowon)

Π 143 Πηλιάδα μελίην (<\*smel-)<sup>33</sup>

Μ 278 τῶν δ'ὄς τε νιφάδες (<\*snig<sup>wh</sup>-)

This phenomenon implies the existence of hexameter verse at a date before the time of the Mycenaean tablets. There is admittedly no Mycenaean

---

<sup>33</sup> The root \*smel- also appears in the epithet ἔϋμμελής, in which geminated μ indicates the erstwhile presence of the sequence \*sm-. Both noun and epithet seem to be of great antiquity within the epic tradition: μελίη in the sense “spear (of ash-wood)” is obsolescent in the *Iliad*, where the usual words for “spear” are δόρυ and ἔγχος, and it does not occur in later Greek except in imitators of epic. As Denys Page observed (*HHI*, 240), the more recent adjective from the same root μελιτινος does not cause lengthening of a preceding short vowel: this is an indication of the archaic and obsolete nature of μελίη, which causes lengthening in 11 of its 13 Homeric occurrences. Cf. also φερεμμελής, *Mimnermus* 14,4.

evidence for words which are known to have had initial \*s + liquid / nasal in Indo-European, but ra-pte = \*ῥαπτήρ, e-ra-pe-me-na = \*ἔρραπιμένα have shown the traditional etymology, <\*werp-, for this word-family to be wrong, as the Mycenaean orthography would in that case be wa-ra-; thus a more convincing etymology appears to be <\*serp-.<sup>34</sup> It seems likely, therefore, that initial \*s had been lost before a liquid or nasal before the date of the Mycenaean texts. Sometimes in the text of Homer a short vowel is lengthened before a word with an initial liquid where there was never an initial \*s, thus there is no etymological justification for the lengthening of short vowels before these words. This phenomenon therefore represents a licence assumed by bards to lengthen any short vowel before an initial liquid when metrically required on the analogy of lengthened vowels before words which genuinely did at an early stage begin with \*s + liquid. μέγας, for example, never had initial \*s (cf. Sanskrit *maha*), but where the archaic genitive \*-oo (v. p. 130-1) is restored before a compound whose initial element is μεγα- (e.g. κ 36, δώρα παρ' Αἰόλοο μεγαλήτορος) the second -o must be scanned long, which indicates that the licence to lengthen a short vowel before any liquid or nasal was not a new development within epic diction.

Sometimes the initial root liquid or nasal of an augmented historic verb is doubled in the text of Homer, e.g. ἔλλαβε <\*e-slag<sup>wh</sup>-, ἔννεον <\*e-snē-, “spin” (cf. Sanskrit *snāyati*); this practice preserves the metrical pattern which these forms had as long as the sequences \*sl-, \*sn-

---

<sup>34</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 119, note 4

etc. remained intact. An augmented verb would have been deemed to be a compound formation as long as augmentation was not felt necessary to indicate past time (v. pp 146-50), and the same phenomenon is found in other compounds of such verbs, e.g. εὐννητος (Σ 596, Ω 580, η 97), εὐρρεής (Z 508, Ξ 433, Ο 265).<sup>35</sup> Thus the prosodical effect of the missing \*s- is retained in 1st millennium epic. Presumably the pronunciation c.1200 B.C. would have been (e.g.) /e-hlagh<sup>w</sup>e/, /hmeliān/: in the case of augmented verbs, the usual Ionic practice of lengthening the preceding vowel to compensate for loss of /h/ would not have been followed as these were poetic, not vernacular, forms.

#### **Dative singular -ι vs. -ει**

In 1st millennium Greek, the ending of the 3rd declension dative singular is -ι, a short vowel, and an innovation *vis-à-vis* Indo-European, cf. Sanskrit -e, old Latin -ei, classical Latin -ī. In Mycenaean, the dative singular of this declension is usually -e = -ει, but in a substantial minority of tablets from Mycenae and in some from Pylos there is a tendency towards -i = -ι, the inherited locative ending, used as a dative, e.g. po-se-da-o-ni do-so-mo = Ποσειδάωνι δόσμος (PY Un 718), ka-ke-wi = \*χαλκήφι (MY Oe 121), which are clearly not locative; in s-stems there is a marked preference for -i as the ending of the dative singular, eg. e-u-me-de-i = \*Εὐμεδέ(η)ι

---

<sup>35</sup> This epithet occurs in the verse-end formula εὐρρεῖος ποταμοῖο, which must represent a modernized pronunciation of \*ἐνὸνρεφέηος ποταμοῖο: this restoration permits the preferred dactyl in the 4th foot.

(PY Fr 1184), corresponding to Εὐμεδής. This indicates that the spoken language had innovated in this direction before 1200 B.C., beginning the process of syncretism whereby the dative and locative cases coalesced; the functions of the instrumental seem to have fused with those of the dative in the singular, although not in the plural, before this stage. The generalization of the old locative ending in dative function is found in all 1st millennium dialects.

Examination of all 3rd declension datives singular in the text of Homer shows that many have short -ι; this is automatically the case in all words whose final syllable permits a dactyl, e.g. Ἀγαμέμνονι, where -ι must be short in order to avoid a cretic. When a word in the dative case contains two successive short syllables, the ending must be long for metrical reasons, and is usually lengthened by position before two consonants at the beginning of the next word. In some cases, however, final -ι, although scanned long, does not seem to be lengthened by position. In some verses it precedes a word beginning with a liquid / nasal, e.g.: T 58...ἔριδι μενεΐναμεν εἴνεκα κούρης. The verb μενεαίνω is derived from μένος, which never makes position; it never began with \*σμ-, cf. Sanskrit *manah*. This exemplifies the licence bards took to lengthen any short vowel before an initial liquid; this was extended from positions before an initial liquid representing original groups of \*sl-, \*sm-, \*sn-, \*sr-. The same licence can be observed in :

κ 359 πολλὸν ὑπὸ τρίποδι μεγάλῳ...

Ε 146 τὸν δ'ἕτερον ξίφει μεγάλῳ...

In these three verses, μέγας makes position, although it never began with \*sm-. Datives singular lengthened before consonants other than liquids or nasals must represent simple metrical lengthenings without an etymological basis.

Marcello Durante observed<sup>36</sup> that the ancient prosodical value occurs predominantly in datives which would otherwise present an unmetrical tribrach, e.g. Ἄρτέμιδι, δέποιϊ, ξίφεϊ, πατέρι. This is an archaism of which poets took advantage for metrical convenience, as is indicated by the use of dative πατέρι compared to accusative πατέρα: in the accusative πατέρα occurs 11 times, with its final syllable always lengthened by position, and πατέρ' with elision occurs 29 times, while πατέρι occurs 3 times, only once with lengthening by position, and never has its final syllable elided. This certainly does not indicate that phrases containing πατέρι are Mycenaean survivals, but that the prosodical effect is an archaism retained for metrical convenience as an alternative to the normal short -ι.

Nevertheless, the ancient dative singular in -ει does seem to be retained in a handful of formulaic expressions. The Mycenaean dative of Ζεύς is di-we = Διφεϊ; it is well known that proper names frequently preserve linguistic elements which are obsolete in everyday language, and at Athens the personal name Διειτρέφης is common from the beginning of the

<sup>36</sup> *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca* I, 1971, 78

5th century (it appears as Διετρέφης in the 4th century), and Cypriot has the personal names Διφείθεμις and Διφειφίλος,<sup>37</sup> the latter apparently corresponding to the Homeric epithet διφιλος,<sup>38</sup> whose second vowel is scanned long. This epithet occurs 17 times in the *Iliad*, always after the trochaic caesura, but is absent from the *Odyssey*, the *Hymns* and the Hesiodic corpus. This prosodical peculiarity and the perfect integration of the epithet into the formulaic system suggest that this compound dates from a time when the dative singular ending in the 3rd declension was still -ει. The long quantity of this vowel, the reason for which was, of course, unknown to the poets of the tradition, probably explains the substitution of φίλος Διῖ at ξ 440 and ο 341. In the formula Διῖ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος the presence of a long ending in the dative singular of Ζεῦς combined with another archaism, namely long scansion of -ιν before the initial \*h of \*ἡατάλαντος, render its high antiquity very probable.

It is somewhat perplexing that a number of Homeric formulae of ancient appearance should contain the athematic dative singular with a short ending. Some can readily be explained as modification by declension from another case, e.g. νόροπι χαλκῶ from νόροπα χαλκόν, ποιμένι λαῶν from ποιμένα λαῶν. In other phrases, the ending which is interpreted as a dative in the synchronic scheme may originally have been understood as a locative, e.g. ὕσμῖνι μάχεσθαι (B 863, Θ 56); ὕσμῖνι appears to belong to an unattested \*ὕσμίνης, which was reinterpreted as a 1st declension noun,

<sup>37</sup> Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*, 165

<sup>38</sup> Sometimes written as two words, viz. Διῖ φίλος.

ὄσμῑνη (v. p 221). Several spear-fighting formulae contain “short” datives in the 5th foot, e.g. ὄξεί δουρί (10 times *Il.*), χαλκήροει δουρί (3 times *Il.*), δουρί φαεινῶ (20 times *Il.*). There is a vast amount of spear-fighting in the *Iliad*, and it must be a traditional subject in epic. Yet all these apparently old formulae have short final -ι in the 5th foot. This is not the expected Mycenaean dative singular; although Mycenaean frequently shows -i as the dative singular of s-stems, this seems to be an innovation c.1200 B.C., and thus would have been unlikely to have made its way into epic at this stage. However, it is significant that the dative in -e (=ει) had already assumed the function of the instrumental, e.g. ti-ri-po e-me po-de = \*τριπος ἐμεῖ (= ἐνί) ποδεῖ (PY Ta 641); e-me = ἐμεῖ also appears in concord with du-wo-u-pi, which is probably to be interpreted as \*δυούφι, instrumental of δύο (PY Eb 495). It is not certain at what stage the dative and instrumental singular coalesced, but it is possible that Mycenaean retains traces of an instrumental ending -e < \*H<sub>1</sub>, e.g. e-re-pa-te (PY Ta 642, etc.) possibly = /elephante/<sup>39</sup>; such forms may have been felt by c. 1200 B.C. to be adverbial, like -φι forms in the 1st millennium (v. p. 132-41). Whether or not the administrative documents contain traces of an old case-ending, such a scenario would not be surprising for the retentive and archaizing medium that is epic. Thus it is possible that epic in the late 2nd millennium retained an archaism in the form of the “short” dative, i.e. instrumental, ending, used interchangeably with the “long” ending as metrically required, just as in Homer the “long” ending is an archaism

---

<sup>39</sup> Andrew Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, 252; Lejeune, “Essais de philologie mycénienne”, *RPh* 1965, 22, “une vieille désinence ē/ē”.

retained for metrical convenience. On the synchronic level of the 1st millennium, these endings as well as those representing the old locative singular would have been interpreted as datives. Thus a formulaic phrase such as ἄλκι πεποιθώς (E 299, N 471, P 61, etc.), which appears old because of its perfect participle active used intransitively and its fossilized noun which appears in no other cases,<sup>40</sup> may be Mycenaean, with an ending originally belonging to the instrumental case, but subsequently perceived as a “short” dative. This is paralleled in the Homeric long and short alternatives for dative plural endings in the 1st and 2nd declensions.

It has already been observed that Telamonian Aias is associated with the tower-shield which was in use in the mid-second millennium.<sup>41</sup> His name also appears with another archaic feature: out of 6 occurrences of this name in the dative case, 3 have the long ending:

Ξ 459 Αἴαντι δὲ μάλιστα δαΐφροني θυμὸν ὄρινε.

Ο 674 οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' Αἴαντι μεγαλήτορι ἦνδανε θυμῷ

Ρ 123 ὡς ἔφατ', Αἴαντι δὲ δαΐφροني θυμὸν ὄρινε

In these verses it is possible to restore the putative Mycenaean form \*Αἰφάντει. Admittedly at Ο 674 the long dative ending could be explained by the following initial nasal, but in the other examples there is no other explanation for the apparently anomalous final syllable of Αἴαντι. Long -ι

<sup>40</sup> ἄλκι is the only case-form remaining of an unattested root noun, possibly \*ἄλξ in the nominative; in 1st millennium Greek this noun had been reconfigured as feminine ἄλκι or neuter ἄλκαρ (A. Meillet & J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée*, 5th edition, 1979, 373).

<sup>41</sup> He is exclusively associated with the formulaic phrase φέρων σάκος ἦϊτε πύργον.

in the dative singular always occurs in the strong part of the foot, and it is thus impossible to exclude metrical lengthening. Nevertheless, there is a high probability that formulae referring to the greater Aias, who is associated with other linguistic archaisms, and Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος genuinely do contain ancient -ει: the latter formula admittedly has a long dative before a nasal, but μῆτις does not seem ever to have had initial \*s. On the other hand, Ζηνὶ μενεαίνομεν ἀφρονέοντες (O 104) cannot possibly be ancient: the long -ι of Ζηνὶ is clearly due to the following liquid (although μένος never had initial \*s-) and does not represent earlier \*Ζηνεῖ. The original dative of Ζεὺς is Δι(φ)εῖ, as shown by Mycenaean di-we, whereas the genitive and dative Ζηνός and Ζηνί are later creations based on the original accusative Ζῆν, while Διό is an analogical accusative based on the stem Διφ-.<sup>42</sup>

### Final stops

In 1st millennium Greek the only consonants tolerated at the end of a word are ν, ρ and ζ. However, at a very early date, Greek, like Latin, had stops in word-final position, losing them from all words except short unaccented proclitics which are closely connected with the following word, e.g. the negative particle οὐκ, the preposition ἐκ and apocopated forms of prepositions such as κατ, ἀπ. The date at which final stops were eliminated

<sup>42</sup> Wathelet, "Le Nom de Zeus", *Minos* 15, 1974, 195-225. There is also a single Homeric occurrence of the innovative accusative Ζῆνα (Ξ 157), a reinterpretation of Ζῆν, which represents Indo-European \*dyem.

is impossible to determine precisely: Mycenaean does not provide conclusive evidence, as the orthographic system does not indicate final consonants. It is, however, likely that they had indeed disappeared by the time of the Mycenaean tablets. C. J. Ruijgh plausibly argues as follows for this view: stops are always indicated in Mycenaean, even after the vowel of a final syllable, viz. wa-na-ka =  $\text{w}^{\text{a}}\text{n}^{\text{a}}\text{k}^{\text{a}}$ , a<sub>3</sub>-ti-jo-qo =  $^{\text{a}}\text{t}^{\text{i}}\text{j}^{\text{o}}\text{q}^{\text{o}}$ , where the “dead” vowel is identical with the vowel of the final syllable.<sup>43</sup> Thus wi-de (PY Ta 711) would represent  $\text{w}^{\text{i}}\text{d}^{\text{e}}$ , “(he) saw”, rather than  $^{\text{w}}\text{i}^{\text{d}}\text{e}^{\text{t}}$ , which would be written as  $^{\text{w}}\text{i}^{\text{d}}\text{e}^{\text{t}}\text{e}$ .<sup>44</sup> In neither of these examples is final -s represented, in accordance with Mycenaean orthographic convention. Against the retention of final stops in Mycenaean it can also be argued that these do not occur in any of the historically attested dialects, although it must be remembered that some post-Mycenaean innovations (e.g.  $^{\text{q}}\text{w}^{\text{o}} > \text{π}^{\text{o}}$ , probably Grassmann’s Law) are pan-Greek.

Although it is impossible to date the loss of final stops precisely, it is possible to establish a chronology relative to Osthoff’s Law, whereby a long vowel or diphthong was shortened before a sonant (including /i/ and /u/ as the second element of a diphthong) + consonant. Osthoff’s Law is pan-Greek, and it too is difficult to date, as Mycenaean does not indicate vowel quantities. However, it can be shown to postdate the earliest changes which affected words containing the sequence liquid / nasal + \*s, e.g.  $^{\text{m}}\text{ēnsos} > ^{\text{m}}\text{ēsnos} > ^{\text{m}}\text{ēhnos}$  (probably the Mycenaean stage)  $>$  Att-Ion.  $\mu\eta\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ,

<sup>43</sup> “Problèmes de philologie mycénienne”, *Minos* 19, 1985, 124

<sup>44</sup> *Études*, 43

Lesbian μήννος.<sup>45</sup> As this word retains its original long vowel in the 1st millennium forms, it is clear that the initial syllable no longer had the form \*mēn- when Osthoff's Law started to take effect; Mycenaean already has me-no as the genitive case.<sup>46</sup>

The shortening took place before the loss of final stops, as is evident from the evolution of 3rd person plural \*ἔγνωντ > \*ἔγνοντ > ἔγνον; had final stops been eliminated first, the resulting \*ἔγνων would have been acceptable in Greek.<sup>47</sup> Pindar uses 3rd person plural ἔγνον (*Pythian* 4,120), equivalent to Attic ἔγνωσαν; later, long vowels were reintroduced before sonant + consonant, often by analogy, and also as a result of vowel contractions.<sup>48</sup> Osthoff's Law, therefore, took effect between the disappearance of intervocalic \*s and the loss of final stops, both of which developments apparently belong to the 2nd millennium. However, traces of final stops survive in closely connected groups of words which were felt very early to constitute a single semantic unit, with the result that what had been a final stop was henceforth felt to belong to the interior of a word, e.g. Homeric ὄττι, Lesbian ὄττι (the neuter corresponding to masculine / feminine ὄστις) < \*ὄδ-τι, retaining the ancient final \*/d/ of the

---

<sup>45</sup> The original nominative singular \*mēns, cf. Latin *mensis*, is represented by μέις (T 117 and elsewhere), Doric μήις, Elean μεύις, where the long vowel or diphthong results from the simplification of -νς. The more common nominative singular μήν is analogical, based on the stem of the oblique cases.

<sup>46</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 220

<sup>47</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 219

<sup>48</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 220

neuter relative pronoun. Likewise the final \*/d/ of the neuter interrogative pronoun τί < \*q<sup>w</sup>id (= Latin *quid*) may be retained in τίπτε < \*τίτ-πε < \*q<sup>w</sup>ιδ-πε, with dissimilation of identical stops as in τίκτω < \*τίτκω.

It seems likely, then, that final stops had been eliminated by c.1200 B.C. Certain Homeric formulae indicate by their prosody the possibility that they were created when final stops were still present in Greek.

It is conceivable that the Homeric syntagma οὐ τι προσέφη (A 511, Δ 401, E 689, etc.) may be an archaism: there are several reasons for suspecting that creation of this phrase belongs to a very early phase of epic. The negative οὐ τι is older than οὐδεν, which eliminated it in contexts where initial digamma was lost from the following word, e.g. οὐδέν ἐοργώσ after the bucolic diaeresis at χ 318, possibly replacing an earlier \*οὐ τι φεφοργώσ; cf. οὐτις, which with different accentuation (Οὔτις) is given as Odysseus' name in the Cyclops episode (ι 366, etc.): its accusative, Οὔτιν, contains the original accusative singular of τις, reconfigured as τινα. The nominative οὐδέϊς is not in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*; the corresponding dative occurs only in the phrase τὸ δν μένος οὐδενι εἴκων (X 459, λ 515). It could be argued that the long scansion of τι before πρὸς is recent, as it is entirely consistent with contemporary Ionic prosody, yet the fact that the syntagma occurs 6 times in the *Iliad* and only once in the *Odyssey* suggests an archaism. The fact that τι is never elided suggests a connexion with the existence of \*-δ in the prehistory of the epic tradition; the existence of οὔτι before the disappearance of \*-δ is

corroborated by the adjective οὔτιδανός<sup>49</sup> based on \*ουq<sup>wid</sup>.<sup>50</sup> These facts make it possible that οὔ τι προσέφη is an ancient formula, and if it originates from a time when πός existed in epic, the prosody would have been regular before final \*-δ was eliminated, viz. \*οὔ q<sup>wiδ</sup> προσέφα.

Once again, Telamonian Aias appears to be associated with an earlier state of language than that which is represented by Linear B. The vocative case of his name is Αἶαν, representing the stem \*Αἶ(φ)αντ- with loss of the final stop. At Ψ 493, Αἶαν Ἴδομενεῦ τε may represent an earlier \*Αἶφαντ Ἴδομενεῦ q<sup>wε</sup>, as the second syllable of Αἶαν is scanned long before a vowel; this phrase seems to have been created for the hexameter line, as its putative (pre-)Mycenaean version forms a prosodically regular T<sub>1</sub> hemistich. The phantom presence of initial digamma cannot explain the lengthening here: the name of the Cretan king Idomeneus never had initial digamma, as is obvious from the feminine version of this name, i-do-me-ne-ja = Ἰδομενεῖα (PY Eb 498, Ep 212); the name is probably to be associated with Mt. Ida.<sup>51</sup> Metrical lengthening cannot be ruled out, but in view of the collection of other archaisms connected with the greater Aias, there is at least a chance that this sequence of names in the vocative goes back to a time when final stops were still present in Greek. It is not improbable that the juxtaposition of these two heroes' names may date from

<sup>49</sup> A 293; οὔτιδανός occurs at Λ 390 in a construction of archaic appearance:

ἀνδρὸς ἀνάγκιδος οὔτιδανοῖο, also exhibiting asyndeton.

<sup>50</sup> E.Crespo, *Elementos antiguos y modernos en la prosodia omerica*, 1977, 78

<sup>51</sup> Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. IV, 104

the Mycenaean Age: Aias is already associated with several archaic linguistic traits, and the Cretan Idomeneus is obviously a traditional figure in epic, constantly associated with Meriones, who has one of the most archaic-looking formulae in Homer, ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ (v. p. 11). Idomeneus may be a historical figure, the only Greek ruler of Knossos whose name was preserved in legend. Other examples where there is a possibility of the phantom presence of a final stop are debatable, but the fact that the greater Aias is already associated with other traits pertaining to a very early stage of the Greek language renders it very likely that the prosodical effect of final /t/ is indeed present here.

### **Morphological Archaisms**

Irregular scansion, as observed, often conceals an archaism. Many other archaisms are more obvious, preserved in a form which was obsolete in Ionic at the time of composition of the monumental epics because of metrical necessity, and also because they provided useful metrical alternatives to the corresponding vernacular forms. From this use of archaic forms for metrical convenience it is clear that the appearance of an old form in the text of Homer is not an indication of the early composition of any individual verse. The retention of linguistic forms which were obsolete in everyday speech and known only from the traditional, archaizing medium of epic must have had the effect of distancing this genre of verse from, and elevating it above normal discourse, perhaps imbuing the poet's words with the wisdom and authority of past ages; in this connexion one need only

think of the occasions on which Plato and other Attic authors cite Homer in support of some point or other.

### Genitive in -οιο

One of the most obvious archaisms retained in epic for metrical reasons is the ancient genitive singular of the second declension, -οιο, the ending known from Mycenaean, occurring in epic alongside and sometimes in the same phrase as its equivalent in contemporary Ionic, -ου. In addition to -οιο and -ου, Homer also shows traces of a disyllabic form \*-οο, from which -ου obviously derived with the advent of vowel contractions, and which must be restored in several verses in order to give correct scansion. The replacement of -οιο with \*-οο is a post-Mycenaean development; the date of this evolution is uncertain, but it can reasonably be placed after the fall of the Mycenaean palaces and before the migrations, as all dialects of the historical period, except Thessalian, attest the result of contraction of \*οο<sup>52</sup>; \*-οο therefore seems to have appeared between c.1200 and 1000 B.C. This ending is never attested (the contracted form had prevailed by the time of the earliest inscriptions), but its presence is indicated by the awkward scansion of the following verses:

B 518 υἱὲς Ἰφίτου (<\*φιτίτοο) μεγαθύμου Ναυβόλιδαο

Λ 1 ... παρ' ἀγανού (<\*-όο) Τιθωνοῖο

Ο 66 Ἴλιου (<\*-οο) προπάρριθε (also at Φ 104, Χ.6)

---

<sup>52</sup> -ου in Att-Ion., Doris mitior; -ω in Doris severior, Lesbian. Lesbian appears to have adopted \*-οο under Ionic influence, but early Lesbian probably had -οιο like Thessalian.

Ο 554 ...ἀνειψιοῦ (<\*-όο) κταμένοιο

Χ 313 ...ἀγροῦ (<\*-οο) πρόσθεν...

κ 36 δῶρα παρ' Ἀιόλου (<\*-οο) μεγαλήτορος...

κ 60 βῆν εἰς Ἀιόλου (<\*-οο) κλυτὰ δώματα...

In each of these verses, the manuscripts have the recent, contracted genitive in -ου, which makes the verse impossible to scan regularly; however, with the restoration of the obsolete \*-οο, the scansion becomes entirely regular.

In some instances, -ου may replace earlier \*-οι' with elision of the final -ο where the full form would not be metrically admissible, for example in a phrase such as Αἶαντε δὺν πολέμου ἀκορήτω (M 335), where πολέμου may have replaced an earlier \*πολέμοι'. Although this example does not provide conclusive evidence of an earlier \*-οι'(ο), the presence of another archaism in the dual ἀκορήτω increases its chances of being an old formula: the dual was obsolete in Ionic by the time of the earliest inscriptions, although it was still occasionally used in Attic, in some ways a more conservative dialect than its sibling Ionic.<sup>53</sup>

The o-stem genitive singular ending attested in Mycenaean, -οιο, appears elsewhere in Greek outside epic only in East Thessalian,<sup>54</sup> a highly conservative dialect, where it is frequently elided to -οι, but is likely to have been pan-Greek c.1200 B.C. Its retention in Homer reflects the

---

<sup>53</sup> Attic, for example, retained the phoneme /h/, which disappeared from East Ionic.

<sup>54</sup> In inscriptions dating from as late as the 3rd century, there are genitives such as Φαλακρειοιο, Παυσουνειοιο, Λαμουνειοιο (Wathelet, *Traits*, 240).

traditional and deliberately archaizing nature of epic language, as well as the fact that many of these genitives occur in phrases handed down over generations, which retained the ancient ending through metrical necessity, e.g. μάχης ἦδὲ πτολέμοιο (Λ 255), which contains another archaism in the conjunction ἦδέ, or ἄλως ἀτρυγέτοιο (Α 316, 327, Ω 752, α 72, ε 52, etc.), πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης (Α 34, Β 209, Ζ 347, ν 85, etc.), both of which in addition to an archaic genitive contain an epithet of obscure meaning which is obsolete in later Greek.

The use of -οιο in epic indicates that this was the current genitive singular of o-stems in the spoken language very early in the tradition. It does not in itself prove the existence of Mycenaean epic, as it is impossible to determine precisely when this form was lost from the spoken language. Nevertheless, -οιο seems to have disappeared in the vernacular before the migrations, and it is thus probable that the verse form which these endings fitted so well was already in existence before the intermediate \*-oo appeared.

### **The -φι case**

One of the most striking correspondences between Homeric and Mycenaean Greek is the case-ending -φι (transcribed as -pi in Mycenaean). It is, however, notable that in Homer its application is considerably wider than in Mycenaean. In the Linear B documents, -pi is basically an instrumental plural ending of the 1st and 3rd declensions (with some 2nd

declension examples at Knossos; this may point to an innovation in the spoken language there, a point which will be returned to below). In Homer -φι is found as a case-ending of all three declensions in both the singular and the plural, e.g. ἀγέληφι (B 480, etc.), κεφαλῆφι (Π 762, etc.), δακρυόφι (P 696, etc.), ὄστεόφι (μ 45, etc.), ναῦφι (B 794, etc.), ἴφι (A 38, 151, etc.), ὄρεσφι (Δ 452, etc.), ὄχεσφι (Δ 297, etc.). Some φι-forms are obviously recent, artificial creations<sup>55</sup>: these include 1st declension nouns with the ending -όφι, e.g. ἐσχάροφιν (ε 59, η 169, τ 389) from ἐσχάρη, singular forms based on α-stems, e.g. βίηφι (M 135, O 614, X 107, etc.), or a form such as κράτεσφι (K 156; this is a book replete with recent diction), created on the basis of s-stem nouns as part of the paradigm of κάρη, κρατός.<sup>56</sup>

Before the decipherment of Linear B, the ending -φι was known from non-literary sources only from the Boeotian adjective ἐπιπατρόφιον<sup>57</sup> and from the forms πασσαλόφι and Ἰδηφι, which are cited by Hesychius as Boeotian.<sup>58</sup> For this reason Chantraine concurred with the ancient grammarians in classifying -φι as a Homeric Aeolism.<sup>59</sup> The decipherment

<sup>55</sup> Chantraine, *GHI*, 235

<sup>56</sup> κάρη is obviously old, as it is obsolete in later Greek and highly formulaic in Homer, occurring in the nominative only in the verse-end formula κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί, modified at β 408 as κάρη κομόωντας ἑταίρους.

<sup>57</sup> Tanagra, 3rd century B.C. (Schwyzer-Cauer, *DGE* 462, A 28)

<sup>58</sup> Occurrences of -φι in lyric poetry have a high probability of being due to epic influence: Ibycus' σύν ὄχεσφι, Λεβυαφιγενῆς, a hapax which can scarcely have come from the spoken language, and Alcman's ὠρανίαφι.

<sup>59</sup> *GHI*, 234

revealed that *-φι* was used in Mycenaean as the instrumental plural ending of the 1st and 3rd declensions, sometimes with locative value; the 2nd declension instrumental plural desinence in Mycenaean is *-o*, probably representing */-ois/*. Only at Knossos does *-πι* occur in the 2nd declension: *e-re-pa-te-jo-pi* = \*ἔλεφαντειόφι (KN Se 891) beside *e-re-pa-te-o* = ἔλεφαντείοις (KN Sd 4403). This suggests that the spoken dialect at Knossos had innovated in extending this morpheme to the *o*-declension. There do not appear to be any singular uses in Mycenaean, but there is a possible dual: *du-wo-u-pi* (PY Eb 338, etc.).

Although in Homer this case-ending appears to have a plethora of functions, and despite claims that Homeric *-φι* is “a free-ranging maverick” which had “started its maverick career”<sup>60</sup> before the date of the extant Mycenaean tablets, it can be shown that its Homeric usage fundamentally remains remarkably consistent with that shown by Mycenaean, and that divergent uses in Homer are usually the result of formular modification.<sup>61</sup> Its significance in Mycenaean is as an instrumental, including the comitative function, and locative case-ending. Although some scholars interpret it in some instances as an ablative, all such instances can be interpreted as locatives, e.g. *do-e-ro pa-te ma-te-de ku-te-re-u-pi* (PY An 607) = \*δό(η)ελος πατήρ ματήρ δε χύτρευφι: if *ku-te-re-u-pi* here were to be understood as ablative, it would indicate the mother’s provenance, but it can

---

<sup>60</sup> Robert Coleman, “Early Greek Syncretism and the Case of the Disappearing *-φι*”, *Minos* 20-22, 1987, 122-3

<sup>61</sup> As shown by P. Nieto Hernandez, “La desinencia *-φι*”, *Emerita* 55, 1987, 273-306

equally well indicate her location. On the Pylos tablet Aa 76, po-to-ro-wa-pi MUL 4 ko-wa 4 ko-wo 3 seems to indicate the location of the women and their children. On the famous Pylos tablet An 1, e-re-ta pe-re-u-ro-na-de i-jo-te ...po-ra-pi, this -pi form might at first sight appear to be ablative, but if i-jo-te = ἴοντες, present participle of εἶμι, which has future sense, then po-ra-pi may equally well indicate the place where the rowers are awaiting their departure.<sup>62</sup>

The -pi case appears with a preposition only infrequently in Mycenaean, but in these cases also its value corresponds to the sphere of the dative-locative, eg. PY Ae 134, o-pi...qe-to-ro-po-pi o-ro-me-no = \*ὄπι ἠετρόποπι ὀρόμενος,<sup>63</sup> “watching over cattle”. It seems that it was only at a secondary stage in its history that the -φι case began to be governed by prepositions, but this must have occurred at an early date, as the Mycenaean evidence suggests. Therefore it is conceivable that the Homeric syntagma παρὰ ναύφι(ν) (Θ 474, Μ 225, Π 281, Σ 305, all before the trochaic caesura) is of Mycenaean vintage; where ναύφι clearly has ablative sense (ἀπὸ ναύφι, Π 246, before the trochaic caesura; ναύφιν, N 700, in verse-initial position) its use represents formulaic modification.

<sup>62</sup> Rupert Thompson, “Instrumentals, Datives, Locatives and Ablatives: The -φι Case Form in Mycenaean and Homer”, *PCPS* 44, 1998, 226

<sup>63</sup> This phrase cannot be compared to the Homeric use of “tmesis”, as the Mycenaean evidence shows that the preverb was already felt to be closely attached to its verb, as Geoffrey Horrocks has shown (*Space and Time in Homer*, 1980, 140-2).

A comparable case is πολὺς δ' ἄμφ' ὀστεόφιν θις / ἀνδρῶν  
 πυθομένων (μ 45-6). Heubeck<sup>64</sup> explains the second hemistich of 45 as an  
 adaptation of φθινύθει δ' ἄμφ' ὀστεόφι χρώς (π 145), in which ἄμφ'  
 would function as an adverb and ὀστεόφι would be equivalent to ὀστέων.  
 The word-order here is somewhat bizarre, and it may well be that the verse  
 in question is an adaptation of the formula at π 145, where ἄμφ' ὀστεόφι  
 is clearly locative; at μ 45-6, however, the peculiar word-order is simply the  
 result of modification of a formula outwith its regular context, thus there is  
 no reason to take ὀστεόφιν as a genitive. It makes perfect sense as a  
 locative: “a pile of men rotting around their bones”, the present participle  
 πυθομένων indicating that the action of decomposition was currently  
 taking place. This is the interpretation favoured by W.B. Stanford<sup>65</sup>, who  
 observed that “-φι is not elsewhere used by Homer as a simple genitive  
 depending on a noun.”

In no case can Mycenaean -pi forms be demonstrated to have  
 unequivocally ablatival sense. However, there exist examples in which the -  
 pi case form alternates with -si, the dative-locative plural of consonant  
 stems. For example, dative-locative pa-ki-ja-si = \*Σφαγιῶσι corresponds  
 to the function of instrumental pa-ki-ja-pi = \*Σφαγιῶφι.<sup>66</sup> This alternation  
 of instrumental and dative-locative cases of toponyms in Mycenaean  
 indicates that the two cases were practically equivalent in value; after this

<sup>64</sup> *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. II, 120

<sup>65</sup> *Commentary ad loc.*, 1959

<sup>66</sup> Ruijgh, “D' Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes”, 69, note 246

fusion of meaning, the distinction between the two cases disappeared, and the instrumental vanished from the spoken language. In the same way, the poets of the epic tradition clearly felt -φι to belong to the range of the dative rather than that of the genitive, which would include ablatival uses. At B 363, φρήτρηφιν governed by ἀρήγη can only be understood as a dative, and this interpretation is supported by φύλα δὲ φύλοις in the same verse. In τιτύσκομενος κεφαλῆφιν (Λ 350), the noun must be understood as a genitive, preceded by a verb which normally governs this case; however, this line is obviously late, as κεφαλῆφιν is used as a singular.

Frequently in Homer, a -φι form alternates with a dative in the same passage where both have equivalent semantic function, e.g. M 135 ...χείρεσσι πεποιθότες ἠδὲ βίηφι; Δ 303 ...ἔπποσύνη τε καὶ ἠνορέηφι πεποιθώς. The form βίηφι < -ᾱ-φι, like all Homeric forms in -ηφι is, curiously, singular, although in Mycenaean -a-pi belongs to the instrumental plural. It is possible that the form ἴφι < \*ῥίφι may have contributed to this reinterpretation<sup>67</sup>: ἴφι is generally understood to be an instrumental singular in Homer, but probably belonged to the plural at an early date when formulae such as \*ῥίφι κταμένοιο were created; (ῥ)ἴφι shows the ending -φι attached directly to the stem, in accordance with Mycenaean practice. The flexion of ἴς < \*ῥίς is defective in 1st millennium Greek (cf. Latin *vis*), and the plural is equally suitable for the sense (cf. Latin *viribus*). When -φι disappeared from the spoken language, bards may have considered ἴφι to be a singular form and created by analogy the form βίηφι from βίη, a word of

<sup>67</sup> As argued by Ruijgh, *Études*, 83

similar meaning. The instrumental plural \* $\text{f}\hat{\iota}\phi\iota$  may in fact originally have had a concrete sense, “with the force of one’s muscles”. The flexion  $\hat{\iota}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ , etc., is secondary: the accusative singular \* $\text{f}\hat{\iota}\nu$  was replaced by  $\text{f}\hat{\iota}\nu\alpha$ ,<sup>68</sup> in the same way as \* $\text{t}\hat{\iota}\nu$  was replaced by  $\text{t}\hat{\iota}\nu\alpha$  and  $\text{Z}\hat{\eta}\nu$  by  $\text{Z}\hat{\eta}\nu\alpha$ . Homeric instances of the short forms of these accusatives are not elided.

Homeric  $\hat{\iota}\phi\iota$  must, then, be old, as are  $\nu\alpha\hat{\upsilon}\phi\iota$ , and the type  $\delta\chi\epsilon\sigma\phi\iota$  (although the latter case-form is itself a “recent” creation, as will be discussed, pp. 253-4). In these the desinence is added directly to the stem as in Mycenaean without a linking vowel.  $\nu\alpha\hat{\upsilon}\phi\iota$  is clearly not part of the everyday Ionic paradigm of  $\nu\eta\hat{\upsilon}\varsigma < * \nu\acute{\alpha}\text{f}\varsigma$ , as it retains the ancient  $\alpha$  which forms a diphthong with the vocalized digamma, cf.  $\nu\acute{\eta}\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ , an artificial creation combining the Ionic stem with the Aeolic dative plural ending. In  $-\phi\iota$  forms from neuter s-stems, the stem retains  $\sigma$  directly before the ending, which indicates that these formations originated before intervocalic /s/ was aspirated, otherwise there would be no indication of /s/, which was not preserved elsewhere in the paradigm, with the exception of the nominative and accusative singular: cf. Mycenaean  $\text{pa-we-pi} = * \phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\text{f}\epsilon\sigma\phi\iota$ . From these regularly-formed  $-\phi\iota$  cases, poets extracted the ending  $-\epsilon\sigma\phi\iota$  to create the artificial  $\text{κράτεσφι}$ , whose Mycenaean equivalent is  $\text{ka-ra-a-pi} = * \text{κράαπφι}$  (PY Ta 722), constructed from the stem  $\text{κραατ-}$ , which in Homer appears in the genitive singular  $\text{κράατος}$ , dative singular  $\text{κράατι}$  and plural  $\text{κράατα}$ .<sup>69</sup> Homer also uses several forms ending in  $-\phi\iota$ :

<sup>68</sup>  $\hat{\iota}\nu\alpha$  appears at P 522, in a simile, thus is recent:  $\hat{\iota}\nu\alpha \text{ τ}\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta \text{ δι}\acute{\alpha} \text{ π}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\upsilon$ .

<sup>69</sup> M. Lejeune, “La désinence  $-\phi\iota$ ”, *BSL* 52, 1956, 194

although the Mycenaean evidence indicates that -φι had started to extend into the 2nd declension, at least at Knossos, Homeric forms in -οφι are not confined to the 2nd declension, but occur also in the 1st and 3rd, where they have conventionally been regarded as artificial.<sup>70</sup> However, comparison with Boeotian ἐπιπατρόφιον and other epigraphical forms which have come to light since Linear B was deciphered have cast doubt on the conventional explanation of 3rd declension forms in -οφι.

In 1961, G. Pugliese Carratelli<sup>71</sup> published an inscription from Messa in Cyrenaica containing the single word ΚΑΡΟΦΙ, most likely connected with the Κήρες; Anna Morpurgo Davies convincingly interpreted this as a plural form which belonged to “an archaic religious formula, probably...used by someone who did not have -φι in his normal spoken language.”<sup>72</sup> Discussed in the same article is a fragment from Nemea, containing part of a treaty between Argos and Cleonae, from approximately the end of the 3rd century B.C., including the adverbial form πατρόφιστι: this adverb appears to be formed from \*πατρόφι, which could no longer have been understood, with the addition of the Hellenistic ending -στι. Anna Morpurgo Davies thus explains the Boeotian term ἐπιπατρόφιον<sup>73</sup> as \*πατρόφι with the addition of the preposition ἐπί, in order to clarify its sense. πατρόφιστι has the adverbial sense “in the manner of one’s

---

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Chantraine, *GHI*, 235: “...le procédé est devenu artificiel. Une finale -οφι se trouve dans des noms qui ne s’ appartiennent pas à la déclinaison thématique...”

<sup>71</sup> “Appunti per la storia dei culti cirenaici”, *Maia* 16, 1964, 99-111

<sup>72</sup> “Epigraphical -φι”, *Glotta* 47, 1969, 49

<sup>73</sup> “Epigraphical -φι”, 51-3

father(s)”, and the sense of \*πατρόφι was presumably similar; it makes no difference semantically whether \*πατρόφι is interpreted as singular or plural. -φι clearly has the same function here as it does in Mycenaean, the sense of \*πατρόφι being either instrumental or comitative. \*πατρόφι is formed with -ο- as the *voyelle de liaison*, similar to κοτυληδονόφιν (ε 433), obviating consonant clusters which were no longer tolerated in 1st millennium Greek; cf. Mycenaean formations such as po-pi = \*πόπι < ποδ + φι, po-ni-ki-pi = \*φοίνιχιφι, and Homeric ἴφι, ναῦφι, in which the case-ending -φι is added directly to the stem.

Thus it is likely that Homeric -οφι formations based on athematic nouns are not all artificial creations, but come from a type of formation which at an early post-Mycenaean date was current in the spoken language. However, the syncretism of the dative and instrumental cases meant that -φι forms now had little support within the flexional system, and were eliminated from everyday speech. Inscriptional examples of such forms occur in legal or religious contexts, whose language, like that of epic, was conservative. Once -φι was obsolete in the spoken language, bards were able to exploit it to create new formulae such as ἐπ’ ἐσχαρόφιν (ε 59, τ 389), and by analogy ἀπ’ ἐσχαρόφιν (η 169). In epic, the retention of -φι contributed to the archaic and traditional character of the language, and by fulfilling the same function as the dative case it was entirely in keeping with one of the principal characteristics of epic language, the retention of doublets. -φι was in origin a case-ending common to all dialects, thus where its Homeric use corresponds to its Mycenaean use, it is a Common Greek

archaism. After the Mycenaean Age, forms in  $-\phi\iota$  became progressively more adverbial, ultimately surviving only in the adverb  $\nu\acute{o}\sigma\phi\iota$ , from which was created the verb  $\nu\acute{o}\sigma\phi\iota\zeta\omega$ , and in  $\acute{\iota}\phi\iota$ , which is found in proper names, e.g.  $\acute{\iota}\phi\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$ ,  $\acute{\iota}\phi\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ <sup>74</sup>, and in the adjective  $\acute{\iota}\phi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , found solely as an epithet of  $\mu\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha$ . Thus the formula  $\acute{\iota}\phi\iota\alpha \mu\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha$  is a fairly late creation, created when the formation of  $\acute{\iota}\phi\iota$  was no longer properly understood.

Existence of the ending  $-\phi\iota$  in both Homer and Mycenaean does not provide evidence for the existence of Mycenaean epic, as this case-ending may have survived in certain dialects for a considerable period after the end of the Mycenaean Age, but it must have entered epic at a time when its use was still current in everyday speech. However, as it was obsolete in Ionic by the date of the earliest inscriptions,  $-\phi\iota$  is an archaism in Ionian epic. The fact that it was obsolete in the vernacular allowed poets to exploit it for metrical convenience without the controlling factor of the spoken dialect: obviously bards would not use forms which sounded completely outlandish to their audiences. When used in an artificial way,  $-\phi\iota$  becomes a hyperarchaism.

---

<sup>74</sup> It is not surprising that proper names should preserve elements lost from everyday speech.  $\acute{\iota}\phi\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$  is clearly an old formation, observing the initial digamma of  $(\phi)\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$ , itself a very archaic word.

### Datives Plural: long and short

Closely connected with the question of syncretism of cases are the alternative forms in epic of the 1st and 2nd declension dative plural endings, -ησι / -αις (-ης), -οισι / -οις. The first member of each pair is the form belonging to the Ionic contemporary with the poets, while the second two are variously interpreted by modern scholars as archaisms or recent innovations. Richard Janko,<sup>75</sup> for example, categorizes the “long” endings as an archaism, and the “short” endings as an “innovation”. Shipp<sup>76</sup> too argued that -αις was a late addition to epic language, and that it was Attic, on the grounds that -αις would become -ης in Ionic. However, if -αις was not part of normal Ionic usage, it would not have undergone the normal Ionic sound changes, and its original vocalism would have remained intact, as in the case of ναῦφι, which did not become \*νηῦφι. The fact is that “long” and “short”, i.e. dative-locative and instrumental endings had been available as poetic alternatives for centuries.

The alternation of instrumental and dative-locative forms in Mycenaean indicates that the distinction between these two cases was breaking down by the end of the Mycenaean Age (e.g. pa-ki-ja-si / pa-ki-ja-pi = \*Σφαγιᾶνσι / \*Σφαγιᾶμφι). This is significant also in connexion with

---

<sup>75</sup> *Homer, Hesiod & the Hymns*, 55-6: “...short endings tend to occur in innovative contexts, and the reverse for long endings.”

<sup>76</sup> *Studies in the Language of Homer*, 57

the long and short datives plural in Homer, -οισι /-ησι <-ᾶσι<sup>77</sup>, and -οις /-αις (-ης). Two-thirds of Homeric examples of -οις and -ης occur before a vowel, so it is possible that they represent elided -οισι or -ησι; -οις and -ης are unequivocal only before a consonant or at verse-end, where elision was not practised. Where -ης does not represent elided -ησι,<sup>78</sup> it may be explained as an artificial form based on -ησι, by analogy with -οις, which presumably was felt to be a shortened version of -οισι. There are only three Homeric examples of dative plural -αις: ἄκτωις (M 284), πάσαις (χ 471), both at verse-end, and θεαίς (ε119), which occurs before a vowel and has the *varia lectio* θεάς. Because of their rarity, all of these have come under suspicion, but -αις forms occur in the five major Homeric *Hymns*, twice in Hesiod's *Works & Days*, and once in the pseudo-Hesiodic *Aspis*. Thus it is credible that -αις datives belong to the formative phase of the epic tradition.

C.J. Ruijgh, who believes that -οις and -αις were the Mycenaean dative plural endings of the 1st and 2nd declension, classifies short datives plural in these positions as “un trait achéen”.<sup>79</sup> Most scholars, however, understand Mycenaean -o-i and -a-i to represent /oihi/ and /āhi/, which must represent a stage before intervocalic /s/ was restored on the analogy of the 3rd declension ending /si/. All other plural case-endings of o-stems in

<sup>77</sup> -ησι was created on the analogy of -οισι.

<sup>78</sup> E.g. A 89, κοίλης παρὰ νηυσί; Π 766, ἐν βήσσης βαθέην; λ 242, ἐν προχοῆς ποταμοῦ

<sup>79</sup> “Les datifs pluriels dans les dialectes grecs”, *Mnemosyne* 11, 1958, 108

Mycenaean are written as -o, presumed to represent nominative -οι, accusative -οϛ, genitive -ων, and instrumental -οιϛ. By contrast with Ruijgh, Martin Peters<sup>80</sup> argues from the fact that the “short” endings, when they can be shown to be unelided, are of comparatively slight frequency, and that -οιϛ and -αιϛ in Mycenaean are confined to the instrumental function, that these were introduced by “Homer” himself (i.e. the monumental poet(s) ), or at any rate were a recent addition to epic language. This, however, is not convincing: if the distinction between dative-locative and instrumental was breaking down at the end of the Mycenaean Age, it is a reasonable assumption that the original instrumental ending -οιϛ could have been used in epic much earlier than “Homer”, and that -αιϛ could have been created by analogy with -οιϛ and used with similar functions. In fact, there is Mycenaean support for -αιϛ with instrumental function: twice in Mycenaean there occurs a participle ending -a in apposition with a 1st declension instrumental plural in -a-pi (qe-qi-no-me-na, PY Ta 707, 708). The most likely interpretation of this ending is -αιϛ, indicating that an instrumental plural of the 1st declension analogous to that of the 2nd declension had already been created.<sup>81</sup> Thus both endings were probably available to poets from an early date to be used as metrically suitable. At Γ 38, verse-end αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσιν could in theory have replaced an earlier \*αἰσχροῖσι πέεσσιν after digamma had disappeared; but in this case one might expect \*αἰσχροῖσιν ἐπέεσσιν with epheleystic ν blocking hiatus. This suggests that the “short” dative plural had been available for some time at

---

<sup>80</sup> “Zur Frage einer achäischen Phase des griechischen Epos”, *O-o-pe-ro-si*, A. Etter (ed.), 1986, 307

<sup>81</sup> Lejeune, “Note de morphologie mycénienne”, *BSL* 60, 1965, 10

least. -οις was not a creation of epic language: it was already in existence in the spoken language by the end of the Mycenaean Age, and at post-Mycenaean date, the dialects selected between the “long”, i.e. dative-locative, and “short”, i.e. instrumental, endings when all three cases had undergone syncretism. In the historical period Thessalian, Boeotian and West Greek use the short endings; Attic uses the long endings -οιοι, -ᾶοι until the 5th century, while Ionic retains the longer endings. Epic did not in any case make morphological innovations of its own, but as in the case of -φι could extend the use of forms which were obsolete in speech.

Although the “short” forms are proportionately more frequent in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*, this cannot be taken as evidence that they are of more recent date: as Ruijgh has pertinently observed, there is an analogy here with the “Achaean” particle αὐτόρ, which occurs more frequently in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*.<sup>82</sup> K.A. Garbrah<sup>83</sup> rightly classifies -οιοι and -ηοι as “vernacular Ionic”, i.e. belonging to the poet’s own native dialect, and -οις, -ης as “poetic alternatives to vernacular Ionic”, observing further that “for other poets other dialects will take the place of Ionic as the vernacular basis”.<sup>84</sup> It is likely that both alternatives were of equal antiquity, at least in the 2nd declension, and had been available within epic for a long time before the composition of the Homeric epics, providing useful metrical

---

<sup>82</sup> “Les datifs pluriels dans les dialectes grecs”, 108

<sup>83</sup> “The Dative Plural of o- and α-stems in Homer”, *Glotta* 60, 1982, 308

<sup>84</sup> For example, Hesiod; v. pp. 283-4 for a discussion of “short” datives plural in this poet’s work.

variants, which are entirely in accord with the prevalence of doublets in epic language.

### Augmentation

Homeric verbs present a vast array of forms which are anomalous from a synchronic point of view. Perhaps the most striking peculiarity of Homer's verbs is the optional status of the augment in the historic tenses. Augmentation is attested in Greek, Armenian and Indo-Iranian, but lacking in other branches of Indo-European, thus it is probably a comparatively recent innovation of the south-eastern Indo-European languages.<sup>85</sup> Before the decipherment of Linear B revealed the general lack of augmentation in Mycenaean, the optional status of the augment in epic was regarded as one of the most typical characteristics of Indo-European poetic language. As augmentation is optional also in Vedic poetry, this fact was taken by Wackernagel as evidence for an inherited Indo-European poetic language.<sup>86</sup>

It certainly true that the augment is lacking in past tenses of verbs with initial consonant in the Linear B texts, eg. a-pu-do-ke = \*ἀπύδωκε, de-ka-sa-to = δέξατο, and its athematic equivalent de-ko-to = δέκτο, te-ke = θήκε, wi-de = φίδε, etc. However, there is at least one verb<sup>87</sup> with initial

---

<sup>85</sup> Sihler, *A New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, 484-5

<sup>86</sup> "Indogermanische Dichtersprache", *Philologus* 95, 1943, 2-4

<sup>87</sup> And possibly more: a-pe-e-ke (PY An 724.2,5,7) may represent ἀπέ(η)κε, aorist of ἀφίημι.

consonant in the Mycenaean texts which appears to contain the augment: a-pe-do-ke = ἀπέδωκε (PY Fr 1184), clearly a compound of ἀπύ (= Att-Ion. ἀπό) and δίδωμι. As a-pe-do-ke logically forms part of a series of Mycenaean forms containing a-pu prefixed to the stem δο-/ δω- (a-pu-do-si = \*ἀπύδοσις, a-pu-do-so-[mo] = \*ἀπυδοο[μός], a-pu-do-ke = \*ἀπύδωκε), it is reasonable to understand the syllable -e- as representing the augment, whose presence in this compound verb is most likely a scribal error: in the same way as scribes sometimes wrote -i instead of -e (= -ει) as the dative singular ending of the 3rd declension, indicating the practice of their spoken dialect, so the augment seems to have slipped into the text here. It would appear that the augment was not part of the required administrative scribal style, and may have been removed once the text was transferred into a permanent record. The Linear B official language, of course, is only a partial representation of the language of everyday discourse, and has far less to do with that of epic poetry, but the fact that an augment appears at least once in Mycenaean suggests that an element of the scribe's vernacular had here crept into the text.

As the Mycenaean syllabary does not indicate vowel quantity, it is impossible to tell whether verbs with initial vowel had the temporal augment, which represents the very early contraction of the syllabic augment with the initial vowel of the verb: this is a phenomenon of Indo-European date.<sup>88</sup> The augment is in any case not required to indicate tense, as this function is performed by verb-endings and variations in stem-form.

---

<sup>88</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 243

In origin it was probably an adverb with anaphoric value, signifying “at that moment in the past”. Thus there is no indication as to whether e-re-u-te-ro-se (PY Na 395, etc.), if this is correctly interpreted as aorist of ἐλευθερώω, represents ἐλ- or ἦλ-. The absence of the syllabic augment from most verbs with initial consonant suggests that the intention was not to represent the temporal augment; it is, of course, possible that economy of symbols may explain the lack of augmentation in the Linear B texts, certainly as far as non-compound verbs with initial consonant are concerned, in which case the temporal augment may have been understood to be present.

In both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* there is a marked preference for unaugmented forms,<sup>89</sup> although the augment is used proportionately more often in the *Odyssey*. When the aorist has gnomic sense or is used in a simile,<sup>90</sup> it is almost always augmented; however, there is no functional difference between the Homeric historic tenses with and without augment. The same appears to be true of the Mycenaean verbs, as no difference in meaning can be discerned between a-pe-do-ke and a-pu-do-ke. It is notable also that the augment is lacking from all but 6%<sup>91</sup> of aorists in -σκον iteratives; these are not augmented in Ionic prose, but seem to be confined to literary use, therefore were not subject to the normal conventions of the language. As these forms are always historic, the augment is superfluous.

---

<sup>89</sup> The relevant statistics can be found at *GHI*, 484.

<sup>90</sup> As Shipp showed (*Studies*, 202-22), similes contain a high proportion of recent forms; 90% of aorists in Homeric similes are augmented (L. Bottin, “Studi del aumento in Omero”, *SMEA* 10, 1969, 69-145)

<sup>91</sup> Statistic from L. Bottin, *art. cit.*: only 19 iterative preterites out of 306 are augmented.

From a diachronic point of view, lack of augmentation suggests that iterative preterites were formed at a stage when the augment was still optional, which implies that they existed at Mycenaean date. The fact that such formations are absent from the Mycenaean texts implies simply that the administrative style did not require to mention repeated past actions. In this connexion it is relevant that the only imperfect attested in Mycenaean is the 3rd person singular of εἰμί: te-ko-to a-pe = τέκτων ἄπῆς (<\*ῆσ-τ).<sup>92</sup>

Yves Duhoux has argued<sup>93</sup> that the correspondence on this point between epic and Mycenaean reflects the usage of the Mycenaean aristocracy. However, just as Mycenaean epic language probably did not reflect the dialect of any particular region, likewise it is likely to have been “classless”. It is not improbable that the Mycenaean aristocracy included patrons of epic poetry, and it is a reasonable assumption that the subject-matter of epic at that time reflected to a large extent their values and priorities. Nevertheless, it is debatable whether epic would have survived the overthrow of the palace-system if it had been felt to be exclusively the preserve of the upper classes. Therefore whether the upper classes in the late 2nd millennium used the augment or not, it would have been optional for epic poets as metrically required in either syllabic or temporal form. Furthermore, the fact that augmentation is generalized in all 1st millennium

---

<sup>92</sup> Att-Ion. 3rd person singular ῆν < ῆεν < \*ῆσεν was originally 3rd person plural. It may have been used with singular meaning in proto-Ionic; on the model of the sigmatic aorist was created the alternative plural form ῆσ-αν, which would have been used in proto-Ionic in order to avoid ambiguity.

<sup>93</sup> “Les débuts de l’augment grec: le facteur sociolinguistique”, *Minos* 20-22, 1987, 163-71

dialects indicates that this innovation had taken place before the end of the 2nd millennium; metrical inscriptions lacking augmentation in historic tenses are imitations of epic.

As mentioned previously, augmentation appears to be a phenomenon of late Indo-European date. Therefore at whatever date it became generalized in normal speech, it was available to poets from the earliest stages of the tradition. Lack of augmentation in Homer is therefore an archaism retained from a time when its use was not mandatory, and was exploited by bards for metrical convenience. Although the augment is optional in epic, in certain positions its presence is metrically guaranteed: the old aorist ἔπεφνε(ν), for example, occurs 9 times in the *Iliad* before the trochaic caesura, which with the penthemimeral caesura is one of the oldest verse-divisions, suggesting a traditional pattern. Thus augmentation is clearly not a recent phenomenon in epic verse.

### **The Aorist**

Some of the most remarkable archaisms among Homeric verbs are the aorists occurring in formulaic contexts. As this is the natural tense for narrative, it is unsurprising that Homer should preserve a considerable number of very archaic forms belonging to this tense. The aorist, along with the present and perfect, was inherited from Indo-European. Several types of aorist were inherited, all of which are attested by Homer. These are: athematic root aorists; athematic intransitive aorists with the extension \*-ē;

thematic root aorists (type ἔ-λιπ-ον); and the sigmatic aorist. Ultimately the sigmatic aorist was the only productive type in Greek; the category of athematic aorists was in retreat from Indo-European times, although some types are well-represented in historical Greek, i.e. those in commonest use, such as the thematic root aorists ἔθανον, εἶδον < \*ἔφιδον. However, a number of aorist formations are known only from epic, and many of these are obviously archaisms with doublets of more recent formation.

As the final vowel of the 3rd person singular of the athematic aorist is long, e.g. ἦῶδα (this verb usually occurs at verse-end, but at A 92 it has been moved from its traditional position, and the scansion shows its final vowel to be long), the fact that such aorists were obsolete in spoken Greek brought about the creation of new verb-forms by false analogy from more archaic forms, e.g. ἀπηύρων: this was created on the basis of ἀπηύρα, an athematic aorist, which was misinterpreted, or, perhaps more accurately, reinterpreted on the synchronic level, as a contracted imperfect. ἀπηύρων can therefore only have been created after the contraction of α+ε>ᾱ, at a fairly late stage in the tradition. This verb is based on the proto-Greek stem \*φρα, with the lengthened augment which sometimes occurs before φ; this stem is also to be found in the aorist participle ἀπούρας, where -υ- represents a vocalization of digamma; from the same root was created a sigmatic aorist, ἀπό(φ)ερσε (Z 348). It is somewhat surprising that the apparently old aorist οὔτα (Δ 525, E 858, Λ 491, etc.) should end in a short

vowel, and this is plausibly explained by Chantraine<sup>94</sup> as a back-formation from οὐτάμενοι, which may have been the earliest form of this verb to be used in epic.

Homer preserves several aorist middle formations with passive sense. This is the means whereby Greek originally expressed passivity, e.g. ἔβλητο (Δ 518, Π 570, P 598), ἀπέκτατο (O 437, P 472); cf. Hesychius' gloss ἀπέφατο· ἀπέθανεν, from the root \*g<sup>w</sup>hen-. Greek had not inherited a passive voice distinct from the middle; the latter voice was distinct in function from the active in indicating the interest of the subject in the action of the verb. Greek also contains a group of aorists with the enlargement -ē, which also occurs in Latin in a series of presents indicating a state, e.g. tacēre, latēre. In Greek this extension was used to create aorists expressing a state, e.g. ἐχάρην corresponding to the present χαίρω, ἐφάνην to φαίνω, ἐμάνην to μαίνομαι. As these forms originally were stative and therefore intransitive, they came to be used to express passivity, a function which had previously been expressed by the aorist middle. The aorist in -η, although originally active in sense, came to be used as a passive and was very productive (ἐμίγην, etc.), although in Homer the aorist in -η is generally intransitive but not passive. However, this suffix was awkward when the verb stem ended in a vowel, thus the element -θη- was substituted in such situations. The source of -θ- is uncertain, but may be verbs such as τελέθω, φλεγέθω, a class of verbs expressing a state and therefore

---

<sup>94</sup> *GHI*, 380

intransitive; this type was inherited from Indo-European but was not productive in Greek.

It is not clear at what date the passive in  $-\theta\eta-$  was created: as the Mycenaean texts do not contain verbs in the passive, there is no evidence to indicate whether the  $-\theta\eta-$  passive existed at this date. The prevalence of the older formation in  $-\eta$  in epic indicates that it was felt, correctly, to be older than that in  $-\theta\eta-$ ; however, the  $-\theta\eta-$  passive must have been well-established in the spoken language before the Homeric poems were composed, and there is no reason to imagine that their comparatively paltry representation in Homeric formulae indicates that they are entirely of post-Mycenaean origin. An analogy may be found in the case of the potential particle  $\kappa\epsilon(v)$ , which, as previously discussed, is an archaism as far as Ionic is concerned, but is approximately three times as frequent in Homer as its Ionic equivalent  $\kappa\upsilon$ , although the latter seems to have been current in AC and Att-Ion. by the end of the Mycenaean Age. Furthermore, the fact that the  $-\theta\eta-$  passive is pan-Greek in its distribution suggests that it had at least begun to spread by the end of the 2nd millennium. It is thus highly probable that at least the aorist in  $-\eta$  existed in Mycenaean times, although not attested in the Mycenaean texts: there is little reason for the administrative documents of the palace system to use passive verbs.

Although the Homeric poems contain many examples of aorists in  $-\theta\eta-$ , particularly in participial form, these are largely absent from formulae, and when they do occur, they are often not true passives, but in sense are

closer to the middle voice: for example, εὐνηθείς in its various forms regularly appears at verse-end (B 821, Γ 441, Ξ 314, etc.), but its sense cannot be said to be passive, as it does not indicate that the action of the verb was performed by an agent other than the subject. The same is true of θωρηχθέντες, which appears 8 times at verse-end in the *Iliad* with a sense that is closer to that of the middle than of the passive voice. The *Odyssey*, although in general more “modern” than the *Iliad* in its language, does not yet make a clear distinction between middle and passive, thus πλόγχθη (α 2) and γυμνώθη (χ 1) are intransitive rather than passive in sense. It is impossible to deduce from the use of the -θη- passive in Homer exactly how it was used in the spoken language contemporary with the composition of the poems; nevertheless, its incorporation into epic and the regular verse-end position of participles of this type indicate that it was a well-established feature of spoken Greek, thus not a particularly recent innovation. The poets’ preference for old aorists middle with passive sense is symptomatic of the generally archaizing nature of epic language and its remoteness from everyday speech.

Thematic root aorists with reduplication are widely represented in epic, where they constitute an archaism, but seldom appear in the rest of Greek, with the exception of a handful of verbs of common usage, e.g. ἔειπον, εἶπον <\*e-we-wq<sup>w-</sup>, ἔσπετο, and the corresponding participle ἑσπόμενος <\*se-sq<sup>w-</sup>. In Homer the thematic root aorist occurs in some verbs whose aorist in Attic is of the sigmatic type: for example, ἐρείκω has the aorist ἤρουκε, with zero-grade of the root, which is obviously older than

the sigmatic aorist ἤρειξε, based on the present stem; likewise ἀγείρω (<\*ἀγέρ-γω, displaying the normal e-grade in the present stem) has the thematic root aorist ἤγηρετο with the zero-grade of the root, and a corresponding sigmatic aorist ἤγείρατο (<\*ἤγέρσατο). Similarly δέδαε (ζ 233, υ 72, etc.), from the same root as διδάσκω, is obsolete in later Greek, and was replaced by the sigmatic (ἐ)δίδαξε (E 51, Λ 832, etc.). The same is true of ἀμπεπαλών, the only representative of the reduplicated aorist of (ἀνα)πάλλω; the sigmatic aorist πῆλε < \*πᾶλε < \*πάλσε appears at Z 474 and Π 117. Likewise, ἔπεφνον < \*ἔq<sup>w</sup>heq<sup>w</sup>hνον, reduplicated aorist from the root \*g<sup>w</sup>hen- (cf. φόνος), was replaced by the sigmatic form from the same root, ἔθεινε < \*ἔq<sup>w</sup>heνσα (Φ 491); the preference for the sigmatic aorist of this verb was no doubt strengthened by the fact that the disappearance of labiovelars meant that the etymological connexion between the aorist and present stems was no longer felt. The archaic types of aorist are well-attested in formulae, but there is less formulaic use of the more recent types of formation: ἔπεφν(ε) and ἔπεφνες, for example, between them have 13 occurrences in the *Iliad* after the trochaic caesura, whereas ἔθεινε appears only once.

The sigmatic aorist (ultimately the most productive category in Greek) is an ancient Indo-European type, whose flexion was originally athematic, but in the indicative the addition of person-endings to the stem caused considerable difficulties: for example, after the loss of final stops, 3rd person singular \*δεικς < \*δεικστ would have been identical to the 2nd person form. Therefore where the person-ending had an initial consonant, a

short *-α-* was inserted (generalized from person endings which originally contained *\*η* or *\*η*), allowing this type of aorist to be clearly identified; it was this *-α-* which subsequently was felt to be the identifying feature of the sigmatic aorist in such forms as *ἔμεινα* < *\*ἔμενσα*. The 3rd person plural active ending *-σαν* (instead of *\*-σα[τ]* < *\*-σητ*) has its final nasal by analogy with the final *-ν* of the types *ἔλιπον* and *ἔβαν* (subsequent to the loss of final stops). Thus this old athematic aorist became a stem in *-σα* whose conjugation was clear and simple. This development had obviously taken place before the date of the Mycenaean texts, which have examples of sigmatic aorists in *de-ka-sa-to* = *δέξατο*, *e-re-u-te-ro-se* = *ἐλευθέρωσε*,<sup>95</sup> perhaps *a-ke-re-se* = *\*ἄγρησε* / *ἄγρεσε*, aorist of *ἀγρέω*.<sup>96</sup> Mycenaean also attests *de-ko-to* = *δέκτο*, the older, athematic equivalent of *δέξατο*, but as the sigmatic aorist is apparently the productive formation by this date it is improbable that aorists of other types, e.g. *ἄλτο*, *ῶρτο*, *ἔπεφνον*, *πεφιδέσθαι*, and indeed thematic root aorists such as *ἔφυγον* which remained in common use in post-Homeric Greek, were still being created. As some of these aorists are not attested in 1st millennium Greek outside

---

<sup>95</sup> Verbs in *-όω* (athematized as *-ωμι* in Aeolic) are recent creations within Greek, thus would only have aorists of the productive sigmatic type.

<sup>96</sup> This verb occurs in Homer only in the imperatives *ἄγρει* (E 765, etc.) and *ἄγρεῖτε* (v 149); it is common in Aeolic inscriptions (it is athematic in Aeolic: *καταγρέντων*, Schwyzer *GrGr I*, 620.151), and its presence in Homer has sometimes been claimed to indicate composition in Aeolic, or at least Aeolic influence, but its occurrence in Mycenaean suggests that it was formerly of wider distribution. Its Homeric usage may reflect that of colloquial Ionic, *viz.* "come on!", cf. Latin *age!*

epic, and in epic are used only in formulaic contexts, their use was obviously no longer current. Their defunct status in contemporary Greek is clear from the fact that in “recent” parts of Homer, where the poet apparently was composing freely, sigmatic aorists are employed, whereas the corresponding archaic forms occur in formulaic contexts. The antiquity and fossilization of the athematic aorists middle ὤρτο, γέντο, δέκτο, ἄλτο, etc. is indicated by their isolated and unproductive nature even within epic: they occur neither frequently nor in various positions in the verse. The question arises: when did such aorists of archaic formation drop out of everyday speech? The Mycenaean texts use vocabulary of a very mundane nature, and although they occasionally use innovations from the vernacular (eg. -i for -e in the dative singular, -o-pi as the instrumental plural in the 2nd declension), there never appear aorists of such archaic formations as (e.g.) πεφιδέσθαι. It is a reasonable assumption that these aorists had already been lost from the vernacular of the late 2nd millennium, and were confined to the archaizing, traditional medium of epic (and possibly also to religious and legal language).

All so-called “mixed aorists” Chantraine classified as artificial and “parfois accidentelles”.<sup>97</sup> These are formations which appear to combine the -σ- of the sigmatic aorist with the endings of the strong aorist, e.g.

---

<sup>97</sup> *Morphologie historique*, 182

βήσεται, δύσεται. Indeed, as C.P. Roth showed, some are indeed artificial.<sup>98</sup> However, the fact that they are confined to epic does not imply that they are artificial. Several of the archaic aorists discussed above are not attested outside epic, yet they are not artificial. Admittedly, “mixed aorists” lack parallel formations in other languages, yet lack of comparative material need not suggest that such formations are entirely poetic creations. They more probably represent a type which was an innovation within Greek, comparable to an extent to the -θη- passive, although the latter was widely used in later Greek, while “mixed aorists” were lost at an early date.

The Homeric “mixed aorists” which are genuinely likely to have come from the spoken language are (ἐ)βήσεται, (ἐ)δύσεται,<sup>99</sup> originally past desideratives, expressing intention in the past tense, equivalent to the later construction with μέλλειν. The other verb forms included in the category “mixed aorists” are infinitives and imperatives (e.g. οἰσόμενοι, Γ 120, Ψ 564, θ 399; οἶσε, χ 106; ἀξέμεν, Ψ 668, Ω 663; λέξεο, Ι 617, τ 598; ὄρσεο, Γ 250, ΙΙ 126, ζ 255), which are secondary and artificial. δύσεται and βήσεται, on the other hand, are clearly of traditional formulaic usage, and are in all probability fossilized remnants of an innovative formation created within Greek which was productive for a time until superseded by the periphrastic construction with μέλλω + future infinitive. By the time of composition of the monumental poems, however, the concept of a tense

---

<sup>98</sup> “Mixed Aorists” in *Homeric Greek*, 1990, 88-9: “...poetic features represent the preservation of synchronically unmotivated archaisms and their further use as bases for analogical innovation.”

<sup>99</sup> “Mixed Aorists in *Homeric Greek*, 59

expressing past futurity was lost, and the poets of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* seem to have understood them as aorists or imperfects, poetic equivalents to ἔβη or ἔδου. Thus it seems legitimate to classify “mixed aorists”, in reality ancient desideratives, as archaisms in Homeric language. It is highly improbable that all of these formations are artificial creations of epic: the epic tradition did not make morphological innovations unmotivated by the spoken language, but as in the case of -φι, it could take advantage of the obsolescence of certain morphological phenomena in the vernacular to extend their functions and create artificial forms.

If ancient verb forms had not been fossilized in verse, where they were required for metrical reasons, they would have been entirely lost, replaced in the spoken language by innovative forms. Thus it is highly likely that very archaic verb forms belonged to epic before the end of the Mycenaean Age: the evidence of the Mycenaean texts is admittedly limited, but their vocabulary is drawn from that of everyday life and indicates that the sigmatic aorist was gaining ground at the expense of other types. Formations such as ἔμεινα (< \*ἔμενσα), πῆλε (< \*πάλσε), ἐσήλατο (< \*-(h)άλσατο) are sigmatic and have undergone normal Att-Ion. compensatory lengthening, participating in the regular evolution of East Ionic, therefore are not recent creations, but can reasonably be assumed to have had prosodically equivalent Mycenaean antecedents. Verbs of apparently idiosyncratic conjugation which are retained in everyday speech tend to be those of commonest usage (e.g. εἰμί, εἶμι; cf. the verb “to be” in English, whose flexion is suppletive, comprising several roots). Homer’s

archaic aorists generally do not belong to the verbs of most frequent usage (πεφιδέσθαι corresponds to φείδομαι, ἀμπεπαλῶν to πάλλω, ἄλτο to ἄλλομαι). Thus it is likely that the forms of these verbs which Homer uses in old formulae had already been replaced in the spoken language by sigmatic equivalents by the late 2nd millennium, while epic retained the archaic forms either because they were already embedded in formulae or because they were felt to be more appropriate for the elevated style of the verse.

### **The Dual**

The dual is well-attested in Mycenaean and remained in use in mainland dialects until the 2nd century B.C. In Ionic it was obsolete by the time of the earliest inscriptions, but was retained in Attic until the 4th century. This suggests that Ionic lost the dual after the migration, therefore between the turn of the millennium and the 7th century, when alphabetic inscriptions start to appear in Ionia. As the dual is also obsolete in historically-attested Lesbian (by contrast with mainland Aeolic), Homeric duals cannot be attributed to that source. The dual has only slight representation in Homeric formulae, and is sometimes used interchangeably with the plural; this indicates that its use in Homer to some extent represents intentional archaizing.

Reference has already been made to the two Αἴωντες, who are mentioned sometimes in the plural, sometimes in the dual, Αἴωντε. The

Mycenaean evidence shows that this is a correctly formed 3rd declension dual nominative, comprising the stem + ending -ε. As Wackernagel<sup>100</sup> showed, the dual here originally referred to the greater (Telamonian) Aias and his brother Teucer, in accordance with a very old Indo-European usage. Later, the lesser (Oilean) Aias was created when this ancient use of the dual was no longer understood. As the greater Aias is associated with several other archaisms (the σάκος which he carries, his formula ἕρκος Ἀχαιῶν, his epithet Τελαμώνιος, understood as a patronymic adjective of a type well represented in Mycenaean, later preserved only in Aeolic), there is every reason to believe that this phrase in the dual belongs to the Mycenaean Age. Likewise it is possible that the phrase Αἴαντε δῦω πολέμου ἀκορήτω (M 335) belongs to the Mycenaean Age (with \*πολέμοι' instead of recent, contracted πολέμου): the Mycenaean evidence shows that -o (almost certainly representing -ō = -ω) was the ending of 2nd declension nominative and accusative duals, eg. ko-wo = \*κόρω.<sup>101</sup> It is difficult to determine at what date this usage was no longer understood, but the lesser Aias has considerable representation in formulae, almost always at verse-end, therefore cannot be a recent addition to epic. The dual of the older brother's name extended to include his younger sibling is employed elsewhere in Homer only in the double name Ἀκτορίωνε Μολλόνε, mentioned by Nestor in a reminiscence (Λ 750-2), which also appears ancient (to be discussed, pp. 203-6).

---

<sup>100</sup> *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, 2nd edition, 1920, vol.1, 82

<sup>101</sup> *Documents*, 84

Another dual phrase of ancient appearance is κοσμήτορε λαῶν used of Agamemnon and Menelaus at A 16 and 375, and of Castor and Polydeuces at Γ 236, in all three instances occurring at verse-end. This formula may be of Mycenaean date: the dual is correctly formed, and the genitive plural of the Mycenaean term for the army, \*λαῶρος is used instead of the singular \*λαῶο, which would not scan in this position. However, the repeated line A 16 = 375, Ἄτρειδα δὲ μάλιστα δύω, κοσμήτορε λαῶν, cannot be Mycenaean in its entirety, as Ἄτρειδα can only be a dual if it contains a contraction of -αε. -αι is the original dual ending of the 1st declension, replaced before 1200 B.C. by -ω in the feminine, by analogy with o-stems,<sup>102</sup> while masculines of the 1st declension in Mycenaean have the ending -e in the dual, e.g. e-qa-ta-e, which represents a borrowing from the 3rd declension.<sup>103</sup> Thus the dual Ἄτρειδα is probably based on the plural Ἄτρεῖδαι, occurring in the same position at A 17, H 385, I 341, and is therefore a false archaism. The "patronym" Ἄτρεΐδης is itself a somewhat perplexing form: its frequency and formulaic usage in the *Iliad* suggest that it is of considerable antiquity within epic. It is based on the stem of Ἄτρεΰς, which was originally \*Ἄτρη-, thus one would expect \*Ἄτρη(φ)ίδης, cf. Πηλη(φ)ιάδης. Ἄτρεΐδης therefore appears to be based on the Ionic stem Ἄτρε-, as seen in the genitive Ἄτρεος, which could evolve only after the loss of digamma

<sup>102</sup> Palmer, *The Greek Language*, 268

<sup>103</sup> Palmer, *The Greek Language*, 46

and antevocalic shortening.<sup>104</sup> The only means by which Ἄτρεΐδαι could be ancient would be by metrical shortening, a device which is considerably less frequent than metrical lengthening; however, given the importance of the house of Atreus in myth, bards must have had to incorporate this name somehow, so it is not inconceivable that they used the artificial form \*Ἄτρεφίδας. A comparable dual is to be found in the formula δύω Αἴαντε κορυστά (N 201, Σ 163), which cannot be entirely of Mycenaean date: although δύω Αἴαντε has a strong chance of being ancient, κορυστά implies a contraction of α+ε, impossible at verse-end or in the strong part of the foot. Thus a phrase such as ἄνδρα κορυστήν (verse-end, Δ 457, Θ 256, Π 603) is older within epic than the dual κορυστά, which can only have been inserted as a false archaism after vowel contractions had made its use possible in this position.

The fact that the dual was defunct in East Ionic allowed poets a degree of freedom in its use, and they could select between dual and plural as metrically required when there were two subjects. Thus at X 90-1, the subjects are Priam and Hecabe:

ὥς τῷ γε κλαίοντε προσαιδήτην φίλον υἷόν  
πολλὰ λισσομένω· οὐδ' Ἔκτορι θυμὸν ἔπειθον

Although the subjects are still the same, the second hemistich of 91 has a plural verb; the dual ἐπειθέτην would be unmetrical. This suggests that the poet has taken a traditional passage and expanded it.

---

<sup>104</sup> Wathelet, *Traits*, 349

Something similar appears to have happened at I 182 ff., in the passage concerning the embassy to Achilles, which comprises Phoenix, Odysseus and the greater Aias, accompanied by the heralds Eurybates and Hodios:

182 τὼ δὲ βάτην παρὰ θίνα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης

183 πολλὰ μάλ' εὐχομένω γαιηόχῳ ἔννοσιγαίῳ

185 Μυρμιδόνων δ' ἐπὶ τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἰκέσθην

186 τὸν δ' εὐρον ...

Lines 182-3 are in the dual, but by 186 the poet has changed to the plural without indicating a change of subject. It is likely that the expression τὼ δὲ βάτην (also at A 327, I 192) is a traditional phrase used in connexion with heralds - κήρυκες - who seem habitually to have worked in pairs. The verb in the dual seems to be of some antiquity, observing alternation of vowel length in the root aorist (cf. ἔβην < ἔβᾶν). Elsewhere an analogical dual aorist (ἐ)βήτην is used (e.g. Z 40, Θ 115, M 330): this is based on the singular, although originally the dual and plural of root aorists had a short vowel in the stem. Here it seems that the poet has expanded on an existing account of an embassy which incorporates the traditional dual phrase for heralds, τὼ δὲ βάτην, without adapting the passage to take account of the larger embassy here described.

The defunct status of the dual in spoken Ionic had the further consequence that there was an element of confusion over the appropriate

form of the verb.<sup>105</sup> Second and third person endings are occasionally inverted, thus ἐπέιγετον (K 361) and διώκετον (K 364) despite their second person endings are used as third person verbs where the correct third person ending -την would be metrically inadmissible (this is in a simile, in a book which is replete with recent diction). Similarly ἐτεύχετον at N 346 and λαφύσσετον at Σ 583 are clearly intended to be understood as third person, although in form they are second person. καμέτην (Θ 448), λαβέτην (K 545) and ἠθελέτην (Λ 782) are found as *variae lectiones* for the corresponding second person forms in -τον, but in these cases it is impossible to deduce from the metre which form was intended. The possibility of substituting a second person dual ending for a third person ending (and perhaps *vice versa*) indicates that, while the person endings -τον and -την were felt to be dual, little significance was attached to their original person attachment. In such cases the dual indicates "late" composition, as it could not have been used in this way if it had been a feature of the living language; it is therefore a literary extension of an obsolete linguistic trait, and can legitimately be regarded as a false archaism. The fact that the dual is largely absent from formulae means that only a few of its Homeric occurrences have a chance of originating in Mycenaean times.

Thus although the dual is frequent in Mycenaean, and also has formulaic representation in Homer, its presence in Homer does not in itself provide evidence of epic composition in Mycenaean times. Like all

---

<sup>105</sup> C.Gallavotti & A.Ronconi, *La lingua omerica*, 1955, 54

linguistic phenomena attested in epic, it could only have entered the tradition when it was part of the living language. The fact that Attic retains the dual after its demise in Ionic indicates that it became obsolete in Ionic at a stage which was fairly late in terms of the development of the epic tradition, that is, after the migrations. Among Homeric duals, the most convincing pieces of evidence for epic in the Mycenaean Age is Αἶοντε used to refer to the greater Aias and his brother, and the double name Ἴακτορῶνε Μολλῶνε (Λ 750, v. pp. 203-6).

### Patronymic Formations

Homer uses a series of patronymic adjectives ending in -ιος, e.g. Νηληϊός, a type of formation which is also common in Mycenaean, e.g. e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo (PY An 654, Aq 64) = \*Ἐτεφοκλεφέ(η)ιος, the adjective from \*Ἐτεφοκλέφης, signifying “son of E.” Homer and Mycenaean use patronymic adjectives in the same way as later Greek uses the genitive case of the father’s name. In historical Greek, this usage is retained only in Aeolic,<sup>106</sup> a fact which rather than indicating a phase of epic composition in Aeolic in fact represents an archaism retained by epic and the Aeolic dialects. The suffix -ιος is inherited from Indo-European and was used to form adjectives based on nouns, originally expressing the idea of

---

<sup>106</sup> Eg. Alcaeus G1, 13, τὸν Ἵρραον παῖδα, referring to Pittacus, with the adjective Ἵρραος formed from his father’s name Hyrras, with Lesbian psilosis and loss of intervocalic -i-. In *Idyll* 28, an Aeolic poem, Theocritus refers to the wife of Nicias as ἄλοχος Νικιάα.

“belonging”; thus its specialization in Mycenaean, Homer and Aeolic to express familial relationship is secondary. However, there are indications that epic used this suffix in its primary sense: at E 241, a verse which shows every indication of antiquity, in the second hemistich, Καπανήϊος ἀγλαὸς υἱός, the adjective has its basic sense, equivalent to the genitive case of the name Καπανεύς, thus the noun υἱός is not pleonastic.

An even older use of an adjective of this type is to be found in the T<sub>2</sub> formula βίη Ἡρακλεῖη, at B 658, O 640 (in the dative), E 638, T 98, λ 601 (accusative), B 666 (genitive), Λ 690 (nominative), providing a most irregular run of three spondees. The scansion, however, becomes more regular if a much earlier form is restored: \*γ<sup>w</sup>ια Ἡρακλεφεηια, which permits a dactyl in the 5th foot. This phrase is equivalent to a noun + epithet formula signifying “mighty Heracles”, in which the possessive adjective has the same function as the genitive of the name in later Greek. C.J. Ruijgh<sup>107</sup> sees in Homeric Ἡρακλεῖη a non-Greek suffix \*-eyo-, possibly identical with one which, as John Killen<sup>108</sup> argues, is to be found in a Linear A inscription and is widely used in Linear B texts at Knossos in the formation of possessive adjectives. While the assumed coalescence of a non-Greek suffix with the inherited Indo-European -ιος is credible for the Mycenaean tablets, it is harder to accept in the conservative epic tradition, thus it is preferable to assume that Ἡρακλεῖη exhibits metrical lengthening. Before loss of intervocalic /h/ and the subsequent vowel contractions, there must

---

<sup>107</sup>“Le mycénien et Homère”, 159

<sup>108</sup>“Mycenaean Possessive Adjectives in -e-jo-”, *TPhS* 1983, 66-99

have been lengthening of -ι- in the penultimate syllable of \*Ἡρακλεφέμια (there is no reason to assume that Mycenaean bards did not avail themselves of licences such as metrical lengthening), and later, after vocalic contraction had brought about the unmetrical \*Ἡρακλεεία, the first -ε- would have been lengthened to -η- by analogy with the type Πηλῆος, genitive of Πηλέυς, and the corresponding adjective Πηληϊός.<sup>109</sup> The possessive adjective here is not specialized in patronymic function as it was in the Linear B texts, thus its use is more archaic than that attested in Mycenaean.

It is notable that the greater Aias has the epithet Τελαμώνιος, which is understood as a patronymic adjective based on the name Τελαμών, and this is clearly how it was understood by poets and audiences. Yet it is curious that the most significant characteristic of the greater Aias is his association with the σάκος, the enormous tower-shield, which was supported on the left shoulder by means of a strap known as a τελαμών. It is not improbable, in view of the fact that Aias is a hero of great antiquity, that his epithet Τελαμώνιος originally referred to his τελαμών before the suffix -ιος was specialized to indicate familial connexion, and that it was subsequently reinterpreted as a patronymic adjective after this specialization had taken place.<sup>110</sup> This reinterperatation must have taken place before the

---

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Wyatt, *Metrical Lengthening in Homer*, 165

<sup>110</sup> Jean Aitchison pertinently observed in this connexion that the greater Aias is the only hero whose nominative verse-end formula is “not descriptive, but genealogical” (“Τελαμώνιος Αἴας and other Patronymics”, *Glotta* 42, 1964, 134).

end of the Mycenaean Age, as -ιος has already received this special significance by the time of the Linear B tablets.

Homer provides further examples of the possessive adjective used as an equivalent to the genitive case, e.g. Νεστορέας...ἵππους (Θ 113), Νεστορέη παρὰ νηϊ̄ (Β 54), Ἐκτορέης κεφαλῆς (Ω 276, 579), cf. Ἐκτορέην ἄλοχον (*Ilias Parva* fr.20). This last phrase contains the possessive adjective expressing familial relationship as in Aeolic (e.g. Theocritus' Νικιάας...ἄλοχῶ (*Idyll* 28,9), which may have been intended to echo this epic usage). Although in Mycenaean the ending -ιος is used only to form patronymics of men, it is entirely possible that it was extended to all family ties in the spoken language. Given Andromache's significance in the Trojan saga, it is highly credible that this expression dates from the Mycenaean Age. Νεστόρεος and Ἐκτόρεος look like old formations, exhibiting the change ρι > ρε which is known from the historically attested Aeolic dialects, but which was probably much more widespread in the 2nd millennium. Ἀγαμεμνόνεος, which occurs in conjunction with the nouns νηϋς (Ψ 326), ἵππος (Ψ 295, 525), ἄλοχος (γ 264) is a more recent formation based on Νεστόρεος, Ἐκτόρεος; Pindar uses the expected Ἀγαμεμνόσιος (*Pythian* 11.30).

In addition to patronymics in -ιος, which are confined to an older generation of warriors than the majority of those who fought at Troy, Homer frequently uses formations with the suffix -ίδης, -ιάδης, e.g. Ἀτρεΐδης, Αἰακίδης, Πηληϊάδης, of the same type as those which in

prose function as clan names, e.g. Πενθελίδαι, Ἰαλκμαίωνίδαι. These contain the suffix -ιδ-, which indicates “belonging”.<sup>111</sup> Of this type of name there is only one possible attestation in Mycenaean, namely ne-a<sub>2</sub>-ri-da = \*Nehalldas (TH Of 39) So-called “patronymics” in -ίδης / -ιάδης do not in Homer always refer to the bearer’s father, for example Αἰακίδης (Λ 805, etc.), used of Achilles and a derivative of his grandfather’s name Αἰακος; this provides a metrical alternative to Achilles’ usual patronymic Πηληϊάδης. This suggests that its use had always been the same as that which is seen in family names in classical times, and that such names are better translated as “scion of” rather than “son of”. If these formations are indeed clan names belonging to families of high status, it is unsurprising that they should in general be absent from the Mycenaean palace records. As Paul Wathelet proposed,<sup>112</sup> formations in -ίδης / -ιάδης in origin probably expressed a less rigidly defined relationship than that of father and son, simply membership of a family named after an ancestor. In this connexion it is noteworthy that such patronymic formations in the *Odyssey* have honorific implications, e.g. Ἰαγαμεμνονίδης (of Orestes, α 30), Πεισηνορίδαο (of Eurycleia, α 429). That these names are of some antiquity in epic is clear from the fact that they underwent the change -ι(α)δας > -ι(α)δης, and have the genitive ending -αο. The fact that Homer regularly uses patronymics of this type based on the name of a character’s father suggests that the use of such forms as patronymics was a practice peculiar to epic, and also that creation of such names had ceased

---

<sup>111</sup> Meillet & Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée*, 419

<sup>112</sup> *Traits*, 347

outside epic in the language contemporary with the composition of the Homeric poems. Many names of this type were used as personal names in Greek of the alphabetic period, thus could no longer have been felt to signify ancestry.

## Lexical Archaisms

Homer's vocabulary comprises many items not found in Ionic or Lesbian inscriptions or in prose literature. Some of these are known from other dialects of the historical period and from Mycenaean: this category includes words known in 1st millennium non-epic Greek only from dialects which were not in a position to influence epic as we know it (v. pp. 12-15). Such words are likely to have entered epic when they were common currency throughout Greek, and do not indicate a phase of composition in the dialect in which they are attested in the historical period. The same is true of words which occur in Mycenaean and epic only: as there is no evidence to indicate when such words as δῶ<sup>113</sup> or δέπας fell into disuse in spoken Greek, they cannot be taken as evidence of epic composition in Mycenaean times. Thus, although most of the Mycenaean terms for

---

<sup>113</sup> Known from Mycenaean in the form do-de, with allative -δε indicating motion towards; it is unclear whether the Mycenaean form represents δῶ or the expected \*δῶν < \*δῶμ, the root noun cognate with δέμω. δῶ is certainly old in epic, occurring 9 times at verse-end in the *Iliad*.

weaponry are shared with Homer,<sup>114</sup> and there is a very strong probability that these terms were used by epic in the Bronze Age, there remains a possibility that they remained a part of the standard vocabulary for some centuries after the end of the Mycenaean Age and therefore could, in theory, have entered epic at any time before their demise.

Among the category of lexical archaisms are to be included glosses, i.e. words of obscure meaning, e.g. titles of gods such as ἀκάκητα, ἀργεῖφόντης, ἀγελεῖη, and certain formulaic epithets such as ἀτρύγετος, ἀμιχθαλόεις. As these are unproductive in epic and are used only in fixed expressions, it is likely that these epithets were not understood even by the poets who used them: the less transparent an epithet is in synchronic terms, the greater its chances of being an archaism of considerable antiquity. Yet they must have meant something at some time: stock epithets of things, e.g. the sea, could only have entered epic when their meanings were understood, and as such epithets (or their components) do not seem to have been known in any 1st millennium dialect they must have belonged to epic for a long time before Homer. It is entirely possible that such epithets belonged to epic in the Mycenaean Age, and that their meanings were understood at that time, but this cannot be proven: there is no direct evidence for the poetic vocabulary in the Mycenaean Age, but it is beyond question that it had little in common with that of the Linear B

---

<sup>114</sup> L.A. Stella, *Tradizione micenea e poesia dell' Iliade*, 1978, 20, provides a list of the vocabulary for weapons common to Homer and Mycenaean, including e-ke-si, dative plural of ἔγχος, pa-ka-na = φάσγανα, ko-ru = κόρυς.

documents (tax documents are as far from poetry as one could hope to get). Divine epithets and titles are a somewhat different proposition: some of these may already have been centuries old, e.g. Ἄργεῖφόντης, which can be derived from \*ἄργος and the o-grade of the root \*g<sup>w</sup>hen-, although there remains a possibility that this may be a popular etymology resulting from an attempt to render a pre-Greek name in a form which made sense to Greek speakers. Likewise another epithet of Hermes, ἀκάκητα (Π 185) is of obscure meaning: it may be associated with Mt. Akakesion in Arcadia, but was probably understood by poets and audiences as a compound of α-privative and κακός, and it is possible that its true meaning had been lost as early as the Mycenaean Age.

If lexical correspondences between Homer and Mycenaean seem poetic, it is only because these were known exclusively from Homer and other poets before Linear B was deciphered. As Homer's vocabulary contains words which were obsolete in contemporary Ionic speech, so is it likely that epic language at the end of the Mycenaean Age contained words which were already obsolete in the spoken language, and as such have no representation in the palace inventories. One such case is σάκος: although sometimes used interchangeably with the contemporary term ἀσπίς, σάκος is for the most part confined to formulae. It is particularly associated with Telamonian Aias, a hero whose name appears in conjunction with several other archaic linguistic traits, and represents the tower-shield which was obsolete long before the time of the Mycenaean texts. The fundamental meaning of σάκος is not "shield", but that of the material from which it was

made, leather: it is etymologically connected with Sanskrit *tvacas*, “hide” and Hittite *tuekkas*, “body”. Neither \*τράκος nor any derivatives are found in the Linear B texts, in either its primary sense “hide” or its secondary sense “shield”; to refer to leather, Mycenaean uses the semantic equivalent *wi-ri-no* = \*φρινός, Homeric ῥινός, which in several passages also signifies “shield”, e.g. ῥινοῖσι βοῶν καὶ νόροπι χαλκῶ (N 406), σύν δ’ ἔβαλον ῥινούς (Δ 447 = Θ 61). In 1st millennium Greek, ῥινός is confined to poetry; Hesychius glosses γρῖνος·δέρμα, but the source of this gloss is unspecified. Thus the fact that σάκος in the sense “leather” had already been replaced in Mycenaean by its synonym \*φρινός, which is an archaism in Homer, suggests that σάκος was by the end of the Mycenaean Age an archaism which was confined to poetic language. Even within epic, σάκος is almost completely unproductive, with only two derivatives, φερεσσακῆς (*Aspis* 13, in the phrase φερεσσακέας Καδμείους, which looks like an under-represented formula), and the Homeric hapax σακέσπαλος (E 126). Of these, φερεσσακῆς appears older: the sequence \*τφ, which was retained in Mycenaean,<sup>115</sup> gives σ- initially, -σσ- medially, thus it is conceivable that \*φερετφακέ(η)ας Καδμείους belonged to Mycenaean epic. σακέσπαλος, on the other hand, is more likely to be a recent creation: the two elements of this compound, σάκος and πάλλω, do not occur together in Homer, whereas ἔγχος and πάλλω appear together 10 times in the formula ἀμπεπαλῶν προΐει δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος, and were used to create the compound ἐγχέσπαλος, which appears between the penthemimeral caesura and the bucolic diaeresis at B 131, Ξ 449 and

<sup>115</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 82

Ο 605. This epithet probably served as the basis for the hapax σακέσπαλος.<sup>116</sup>

Reference has already been made to some fossilized case-forms of nouns in Homer: ἴφι, ἄλκι, ὑσμῖνι, the latter two reconfigured within epic as 1st declension nouns. Often, lexical items which are obsolete in everyday speech are preserved as proper names or elements thereof.<sup>117</sup> A comparable fossil is δαῖ, “battle”: this word has derivatives δαῖφρων,<sup>118</sup> δῆϊος, δῆϊοτης, but the simple noun occurs only in the dative in Homer (Ν 286, Ξ 387, Φ 301, Ω 739). In addition it appears as an element of several personal names, both in Homer, e.g. Δηῖφοβος, Δηϊκόων, and in Mycenaean, da-i-qa-ta = \*Δαῖq<sup>w</sup>hόντας (KN Da 1164), “who kills in battle” -a name reflecting Mycenaean values. There is a strong probability that Homeric names of this type form part of an epic onomastic stock which goes back to the Mycenaean Age. Mycenaean also attests the synonyms πτόλεμος and μάχα, albeit indirectly, as components of names such as Εὐρυπτόλεμος and Μαχαφών; but as these nouns are common in 1st millennium prose, while δαῖ and its derivatives are confined to poetic language and names of a type inherited from the 2nd millennium, there is every probability that the noun whose dative case is fossilized in Homer as

---

<sup>116</sup> Marina Benedetti, “Osservazioni su omerico σάκος”, *SSL* 1980, 125-8

<sup>117</sup> Cf. English surnames such as Cooper, Fletcher, Wainwright.

<sup>118</sup> “Warlike” is the appropriate sense for all the Iliadic occurrences of δαῖφρων; in the *Odyssey* it seems to signify “intelligent”, but the Iliadic sense is probably the original one, and that found in the *Odyssey* secondary, resulting from a confusion with δαῖναι.

δοῖ was an archaism in the 13th century, already confined to poetic language and personal names.

In the same way that epic of the 1st millennium preserves old words not known from other sources, or attested only sporadically in the rest of Greek, so it seems likely that in the Mycenaean Age the epic tradition was a medium which through formulaic usage preserved words which had fallen into desuetude in the spoken language. As the Linear B texts reflect in a limited way the usage of normal parlance it is no surprise to find that, while much of their terminology for weaponry is shared with Homer, there are nonetheless words which first appear in writing in the Homeric poems half a millennium after the date when these texts were written, but which were probably obsolete in spoken Greek by the end of the Mycenaean Age.

## **Conclusions**

Epic, because of its diachronic development, is the only medium which provides us with a panoramic view of the evolution of the Greek language from a very early stage before that represented by the Linear B texts to the distinctly differentiated East Ionic dialect of the 7th century B.C. All linguistic forms attested in Homer could have entered the tradition only when they were part of the living language, with the exception of artificial creations, which were nevertheless motivated by features already existing within epic, e.g. the case-ending  $-\phi\iota$ . Thus epic absorbed linguistic phenomena from the recent state of language known to the poets of the

tradition, e.g. metathesis of quantity, absence of digamma, vowel contractions, back to a state of language corresponding to that represented by the Linear B texts, e.g. 2nd declension genitive singular in -οιο, retention of consonant sequences no longer tolerated in the spoken Greek of the 1st millennium (-θμ-, -πμ-), long dative singular in the 3rd declension (-ει). What is more, epic goes back beyond that state of language to one which still differentiated instrumental from dative singular in the 3rd declension, as appears from “short” dative singular endings in the 5th foot, e.g. ἄλκι πεποιθῶς, δουρὶ φαεινῶ, and had not yet developed supporting vowels for syllabic liquids, as in the case of ἀνδρεῖφόντη, which scans satisfactorily only when \*ἀνρ- is restored; indeed, epic takes us back to a state of language in which the progressive southern branch of East Greek had not yet undergone assibilation, viz. ποτί, the personal name Ὀρτίλοχος, and certain words almost certainly confined to poetic language from their earliest days and thus not susceptible to the regular sound-changes of the spoken language, e.g. the archaic Caland-form βωτιάνειρα. It is futile to argue that the bards of the Mycenaean Age said \*ποσί, and that this was replaced by ποτί in an “Aeolic phase” of epic composition: wherever epic poetry was composed, forms which appeared “foreign” were simply accepted as part of the tradition and it was not felt necessary to substitute the local variant. It is highly probable, then, that the beginnings of the epic tradition antedate assibilation, one of the most significant Greek isoglosses, which had taken effect before the date of the Linear B texts. Even more significant in assigning so early a date to the genesis of the epic tradition, as the prosody of the verse betrays its creation at an earlier stage

than the Mycenaean texts, is the presence of syllabic \*r̥ in formulae such as \*Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνιρῷ ἠόντα, \*ἀσπίδος ἀμφιμῆτας: there is no question of bards' having replaced the original forms with those from their vernacular, as there was no support anywhere in Greek for the phoneme /r̥/.

Other archaisms are of less value in proving an origin in the 2nd millennium for the epic tradition. Lexical archaisms are particularly problematic in this respect: it is impossible to tell when a word attested in (e.g.) 4th century Cypriot dropped out of use in the dialects likely to have influenced epic, or at what stage a gloss such as ἀμιχθαλόεις was no longer understood. Nevertheless, there are indications that a word such as σάκος / \*τράκος was no longer part of everyday speech in the 13th century, thus its preservation in documented 1st millennium Greek can only be due to epic.

Likewise the case-ending -φι is problematic in dating epic to the 2nd millennium: although some examples of its use look old, formed by adding -φι directly to the stem, e.g. ἴφι, also shown to be old by its formulaic usage, this termination seems to have lived on in the spoken language for a time after the end of the Mycenaean Age, and all that can be determined about its disappearance from spoken Greek is that this antedated the composition of the Homeric poems, as in them it is used in a free and inventive way.

Therefore, as all Homeric archaisms entered the tradition when they were still part of the living language, the best indicators of a 2nd millennium date for the beginnings of epic are those phenomena which were obsolete in the spoken language before the time of the Linear B texts, documents which are a rough and approximate guide to the spoken language, as this was the source on which they drew, albeit in a formalized, bureaucratic style. These phenomena are the presence of syllabic liquids, indicated by irregular scansion, and short datives in  $-t$  in old formulae. There is good reason to believe also that archaic types of aorist (eg. ἄμπεπαλῶν, πεφιδέσθαι) belonged to epic before the time of the Mycenaean texts: the sigmatic aorist was already the productive type by this date, and if aorists of other types were already being replaced in the spoken language by the sigmatic type (particularly in verbs of less common usage, such as those cited above), the older types of aorist would not have survived had they not been fossilized in verse.

Although other phenomena are of less value in assigning a 2nd millennium date to the genesis of the epic tradition, they nevertheless provide a valuable (but tantalizing) glimpse of the Greek language at various stages of its history prior to that which was contemporary with the Homeric poems and the earliest alphabetic inscriptions, including examples of some forms which are known only because they were preserved in epic. Thus it is legitimate to claim that epic is, *par excellence*, the museum of the Greek language.

### Chapter Three

#### Tradition vs. Innovation in Homer:

##### What belongs to Mycenaean Epic?

In the preceding two chapters I have attempted to show that the dialectal mix of Homer's language is too complex to have originated in post-migration Ionia, and that some of its components are of such antiquity that they were obsolete in spoken Greek not only before the migration to Asia Minor, but indeed before the end of the Mycenaean Age. As all the components of epic diction (with the exception of artificial forms) entered the poetic language from the spoken language when they were still living parts of that spoken language, this is a clear indication that epic had its genesis in the 2nd millennium B.C. The question to which this chapter will essay an answer is: what can be determined from the language of the Homeric poems about the content of 2nd millennium epic? It is only reasonable to suppose that, in the half-millennium or so between the collapse of the Mycenaean palaces and the composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, a great deal of epic material was lost. Nevertheless, there appears to be a sufficient number of old formulae retained in Homer to give an indication of the subject-matter of epic in the Mycenaean Age.

What can immediately be excluded from any search for Mycenaean elements in Homer are forms which obviously postdate the migrations. Thus Lesbian forms, or secondary Aeolisms, are excluded: for example, forms

which show geminated liquids and nasals instead of compensatory lengthening as the result of \*liquid / nasal + s, e.g. ἄργεννός <\*ἄργεσ-νος, or which ignore the third compensatory lengthening, e.g. ξένιος <\*ξένφιος.<sup>1</sup> Also to be excluded are formulae, admittedly few in number, which presuppose the characteristic developments of the mature Ionic dialect, e.g. Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεω, a T<sub>2</sub> formula which was created after vowel contractions and synizesis; -εω here does not replace elided -α(ο), which never occurred at verse-end.<sup>2</sup> In the latter stages of the tradition, poets were able to avail themselves of the characteristic innovations of Ionic in order to modify traditional formulae.

Just as one must exclude “recent” linguistic forms, so one must exclude any reference to cultural elements which post-date the end of the Mycenaean Age. Thus, since there is no evidence for Mycenaean temples or monumental statues, references to these in Homer (e.g. Z 297-311) are likely to date from after the end of the Mycenaean Age. Thus the criteria whereby it is possible to determine which elements of epic belong to the Mycenaean Age are linguistic and archaeological, and where possible the

---

<sup>1</sup> Pace Wathelet, “La langue homérique et le rayonnement littéraire de l’Eubée”, *AC* 50, 1981, 819-33, ξένιος, μονωθείς and other forms which ignore the 3rd compensatory lengthening are much more likely to have been adopted by epic from Lesbian than from Euboean.

<sup>2</sup> Pace Ruijgh, “Le mycénien et Homère”, 165, and “D’ Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes”, 61 who would “restore” this formula to a putative Lesbian form

\*Κρόνω πάρις ἀγκυλομήτα.

two combined. To find likely traces of Mycenaean epic preserved in Homer, one must ascertain which are the most traditional formulae by the following criteria:

1. whether these would be metrically admissible in their (restored) Mycenaean forms;
2. whether their content is compatible with conditions in the Mycenaean Age.

Cultural elements can have entered the epic tradition only when they were in contemporary use or had been used within living memory. It may be objected that such details may have been preserved in prose saga, but it is improbable that topographical details of mainland Greece could have been remembered in post-migration Ionia, or that a detailed description of an object such as the boar's tusk helmet (K 261-71) could have been preserved for long without being bound by metre. Furthermore, while there is solid evidence for the poetic tradition, there is no evidence that the art of prose saga was particularly developed in Greece.<sup>3</sup> Thus the principal means of transmission of heroic legend was the poetic tradition, that is, the epic tradition, which appears to have been the main vehicle for narrative.

It will be argued here that the content of epic in the Mycenaean Age reflected the values of the Mycenaean nobility, unsurprisingly, as among these people were probably the patrons of epic poets: he who pays the piper calls the tune. These values are also reflected in some of the

---

<sup>3</sup> C. O. Pavese, "L'origine micenea della tradizione epica rapsodica", *SMEA* 21, 1980, 346

personal names recorded in the Linear B tablets, some of which are paralleled by Homeric names. The names which are significant in this connexion are two-part compound names, which are in a minority among the personal names recorded in the Mycenaean texts (approximately 25%<sup>4</sup>), while many other Mycenaean names are hypocoristics, nicknames, ethnics or non-Greek names. Nevertheless, of the names which can be interpreted, a large number are of this type, which seems to be the type favoured by the Mycenaean aristocracy. People of high status within the palaces are usually referred to in the Linear B documents by their full, two-part compound names; some shepherds and smiths are likewise given their full names, but people from the lower social classes are more often referred to by short names, usually sobriquets or ethnics.<sup>5</sup> These two-part compound names are "Wunschnamen"<sup>6</sup> which give an insight into the values of those who give the name, i.e. the parents. This type of name formation provides the names of many of the main characters in Homer, but in addition to those of the principal heroes, epic contains so many personal names, some of characters who are introduced only to be killed, in common with the Mycenaean texts, that it is justifiable to assume that the poets of the tradition had at their disposal a stock of names of the type favoured by the Mycenaean aristocracy that was inherited from the 2nd millennium. The subject-matter

---

<sup>4</sup> P. Hr. Ilievski, "Vocabulary Words from Personal Names", *Colloquium Mycenaicum*, Risch & Mühlestein (edd.), 1975, 141

<sup>5</sup> P. Hr. Ilievski, "Some Structural Peculiarities of Mycenaean-Greek Personal Names", *Res Mycenaeeae*, Heubeck & Neumann (edd.), 1983, 205

<sup>6</sup> Günter Neumann, "Deutungsvorschläge zu Mykenische Namen", *Mykenaiika*, J.P. Olivier (ed.), 1992, 433

of Bronze Age verse is suggested also by scenes represented in contemporary figurative art<sup>7</sup>: the subjects of paintings, for example, can give an insight into the values of those who commissioned the paintings, and it is a reasonable expectation that those who were patrons of Mycenaean painters were also patrons of other artists, including epic poets.

By examining formulae concerning the themes of war, weaponry, chariots and seafaring, as well as name + epithet formulae for Homeric characters, I intend to demonstrate which elements of the diction related to these topics can be ascribed to the Mycenaean Age.

## The Cast

Epic is about the exploits of individual heroes, the πρόμαχοι; the massed body of fighting men, the λαός, has scarcely any rôle. λαός forms part of several old formulae, but itself lacks epithets, unsurprisingly, as the mass of undistinguished fighters exists in epic only as a backdrop for the aristocratic πρόμαχοι. In Homer, λαός denotes both “army” and “people”, even in the most traditional passages of the *Iliad*, e.g. λαός Πριάμοιο. Although less frequent in the *Odyssey*, it is used there in a non-military sense, suggesting that, although its use in a military sense may have been obsolete in contemporary Greek, it was still current in a non-military sense.

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer*, 27-63 for correspondences between Mycenaean figurative art and epic material.

λαός has only a few attestations in classical Greek, but the fact that it appears in Attic as λεώς,<sup>8</sup> exhibiting metathesis of quantity, indicates that it had not been lost from the spoken language. It was commonly used in the Hellenistic Age to designate the subjects, notably the indigenous ones, of eastern kingdoms, and this resurgence of its use is scarcely likely to be due to the influence of Alexandrian scholarship, which would have affected only literary genres. Therefore λα(φ)ός / λεώς must have remained in use throughout the Classical Age. It has a less clearly defined sense than that of δῆμος / δᾶμος, which in classical Greek denotes specifically the citizen body, a particular settled community with a legal identity, corresponding to its Mycenaean significance, as is to be inferred from da-mo-de mi pa-si = \*δᾶμος δὲ μὴν φασι (PY Ep 704), from a text apparently relating to a land dispute between the δᾶμος and the priestess e-ri-ta. λα(φ)ός, on the other hand, is only indirectly attested in Mycenaean, as a component of ra-wa-ke-ta = λαφαγέτας, generally understood to signify “leader of the war host”, and of several Mycenaean personal names, e.g. ne-e-ra-wo = \*Nehéλαφος, “who brings the army home safely”. Thus the military sense of λαφός, namely the mass of fighting men distinguished from the πρόμαχοι by a sense of mass indifferenciation,<sup>9</sup> clearly existed in the Mycenaean Age, but it cannot have been the primary sense, otherwise it would not later have been extended to include the general population. It can safely be inferred that Mycenaean distinguished between λαφός and δᾶμος in the same way as later Greek did, and that λαφός primarily denoted the massed populace,

<sup>8</sup> Plato, *Republic*, ὁ πολὺς λέως, 458d

<sup>9</sup> Henri van Effenterre, “Laos, laoi et lawagetas”, *Kadmos* 16, 1977, 51

the military sense being secondary, and one which fell into disuse after the end of the Mycenaean Age. Thus λα(φ)ός in the sense “army” is an archaism which was retained only by epic.

This is the significance of λαός as the first element of the compound λαόσσοος <\*λαφόσσοφος (4 times *Il.* always between the penthemimeral caesura and bucolic diaeresis).<sup>10</sup> The verbal element of this compound is the o-grade of the root of σεύομαι from the Indo-European root \*kyew, kyu, signifying “to set in motion”, cf. Sanskrit *cyánate*, a middle form meaning “moves”. In 1st millennium Greek, the sequence \*ky regularly gives σ- initially, -σσ- intervocalically; at the Mycenaean stage it seems to have been an affricate (/ʰss/), with the prosodical value of a geminate.<sup>11</sup> The epithet λαφόσσο(φ)ος, then, signifies “who moves the army”, and medial -σσ- suggests that it existed as a compound while the sequence \*ky was still represented by an affricate. It is possible that \*λαφόσσοφος was felt to mean “who moves the people”, but this seems less likely than “who moves the army”, the latter being in accord with the apparent values of Mycenaean society displayed in their figurative art.

The primary sense of λα(φ)ός, “the populace, the masses”, explains the epic formula ποιμένα λαών. This phrase seems ancient because it always appears at verse-end, and is a metaphor applied to warriors of high

---

<sup>10</sup>N 128 Ἰθηναίη λαόσσοος; P 398 Ἄρης λαόσσοος; Y 48 Ἐρις κρατερὴ λαόσσοο  
ν; Y 79 Αἰνεῖαν...λαόσσοον

<sup>11</sup> Ruijgh, *Études*, 49

status, but contains an apparently paradoxical juxtaposition of ποιμήν, “shepherd”,<sup>12</sup> with its peaceful connotations, and λαφός, “army”, both of which terms are known from Mycenaean, ποιμήν in the form po-me, and λαφός as a component of ra-wa-ke-ta. I suggest that originally this metaphor was applied to kings in their non-martial rôle, and that λαφών here does not have a military sense. Thus, if it originally referred to kings in non-martial contexts, ποιμένα λαφών could have been used in the Mycenaean Age of Agamemnon (B 243, K 3, Λ 187, etc.) and Nestor (K 73), and its extension to warriors who were not kings (e.g. Νεστορίδην Θρασυμήδεα ποιμένα λαών, I 81) is post-Mycenaean, the product of a time when poets and audiences no longer understood its original use.

ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν and ὄρχαμε λαών, also invariably at verse-end, create a formula system; \*ὄρχαμος λαών in the nominative would be unmetrical, while the vocative \*ὄρχαμε ἀνδρῶν would produce a hiatus. Of the pair, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν at least is likely to have been part of Mycenaean epic; it is not clear to what extent speeches were to be found in

---

<sup>12</sup> ποιμήν does not fundamentally signify “shepherd”, but a herdsman of any type of animals, cf. πῶν, ποίη; “herder of sheep” is a secondary specialization because of the economic dependence of the Mycenaean palaces on vast flocks of sheep (A. Leukart, *Minos* 20-22, 343). Sheep-rustling raids may have figured among the themes of epic verse in the Mycenaean Age, incorporating formulae such as πῶεα καλά (Λ 402, μ 129, ω 112, Σ 528). πῶν is a very archaic word, with no representation in prose, and no derivatives even within epic; in Homer the plural πῶεα occurs only in the 5th foot, and the singular likewise is confined to the 5th foot in the formula πῶν μέγ’ οἰῶν, except at Γ 198, where it is modified as οἰῶν μέγα πῶν before the trochaic caesura.

the earliest epic, and although they were certainly not unknown (witness the series of old words and phrases used to introduce direct speech, \*ἀπαμείβετο, \*φέγελα πτέρφεντα ποσηύδα), they may have become more common in the later stages of the tradition. ὄρχαμος is fossilized in epic, with no derivatives whatsoever and no representation outside these formulae (it is used once by Aeschylus, *Persae* 129, and in late poetry), but could have entered the epic vocabulary only when it was part of the spoken language. There is a very strong likelihood that ὄρχαμος is connected to Mycenaean o-ka = \*ὄρχα (PY An series), which occurs in a series of documents relating to military formations, apparently meaning “command”, equivalent to ὄρχα with a different vocalization of initial \*r. Other interpretations, e.g. Mühlestein’s \*ὄλκας, “transport ship”<sup>13</sup> are possible, but \*ὄρχα = ὄρχα makes excellent sense: o-ka is always preceded by a personal name in the genitive case, e.g. ma-re-wo o-ka = \*Μαλήφος ὄρχα, ku-ru-me-no-jo o-ka = \*Κλυμένοιο ὄρχα. While it is true that Homer is no guide to the world of the Linear B tablets, this is one case in which epic language (as the museum of the Greek language) can help to elucidate Mycenaean.

The majority of the Achaean heroes in the *Iliad* undoubtedly had a place in epic since the Mycenaean Age. As epic was apparently the means

---

<sup>13</sup> *Die o-ka Tafeln von Pylos*, 1956, 36-41; but Mühlestein subsequently changed his mind about this interpretation of o-ka, not on linguistic grounds, but because the numbers of men assigned to each o-ka, between 33 and 134 or even 154, vary too much to represent ships’ contingents. (“Nochmals zu den o-ka Tafeln von Pylos”, *Res Mycenaee*, 317)

of recording and celebrating the exploits of the aristocratic warriors of the Bronze Age, there is every likelihood that the Homeric heroes reflect genuine historical figures whose adventures were already immortalized in epic verse before the end of the Mycenaean Age. All of the major heroes have distinctive name + epithet formulae, or even formulaic lines / half-lines, which indicates a degree of antiquity within the epic tradition, particularly in view of the archaic linguistic forms often found in connexion with heroes' names: the formula Γεργήνιος ἱππότης Νέστωρ, for example, could only have been created when the obscure epithet Γεργήνιος (v. p.208) meant something to listeners. Despite their obvious lengthy establishment within the epic tradition, however, Homer's heroes did not all have a part in the original Trojan narrative.

The brothers Agamemnon and Menelaus from the Peloponnese, based in Mycenae and Sparta respectively, are of long epic standing; this is obvious from their name + epithet formulae. The phrase εὐρύ κρείων is used almost exclusively of Agamemnon, forming with his name a P<sub>2</sub> hemistich a dozen times in the *Iliad*, with the substitution of Ἐνοσίχθων at Λ 750. The epithet εὐρύ κρείων is generally understood as "wide-ruling", κρείων being taken as a participle, and this was how the ancients understood it, creating the feminine Κρέουσα, which was used as a personal name in legendary contexts, as indeed was the masculine, and declining it as a participle. The dental flexion may, however, be secondary, created by analogy with such forms as ἄρχων and μέδων; κρείων in fact

was probably in origin a comparative form, cf. Sanskrit *śréyas*, “better”.<sup>14</sup> The Mycenaean texts show that c.1200 B.C. the comparative degree of adjectives was still formed with the suffix *-ίων*, which survives in 1st millennium Greek only in those adjectives which were of commonest usage (e.g. *καλλίων*); at the end of the Mycenaean Age, the suffix *-τερος* appears still to have been used to distinguish members of a pair, e.g. *wa-na-ke-te-ro* = \**φανάκτερος*, “belonging to the king”, perhaps as opposed to the *δαμος* or \**λαφαγέτας*. The same suffix is found in the epic formula *γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων* (λ386, ψ 166). *κρείων* could have entered epic only when it belonged to the spoken language, quite possibly in the Mycenaean Age, although there is no evidence as to when it may have dropped out of use. The T<sub>2</sub> alternant of the preceding formula is *ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἄγαμέμνων*, which is almost certainly to be dated to the Mycenaean Age, as the title (F)ἄναξ was no longer used of humans (except perhaps in religious contexts) after the destruction of the Mycenaean palaces and their respective *φάνακτες*, thus the formula must have its origins in a time when the title *φάναξ* was still in familiar use in a secular context.<sup>15</sup> As *ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἄγαμέμνων* appears 35 times in the *Iliad* in the second hemistich, while Agamemnon’s name is replaced by one of equivalent

---

<sup>14</sup> Chantraine, *DELG*, 580 s.v.

<sup>15</sup> (F)ἄναξ was used of members of the royal family in Cyprus, but this fact is of no consequence for Homer, as the Cypriot dialect was not in a position to influence epic as we know it in the 1st millennium.

metrical value only 5 times,<sup>16</sup> it can safely be assumed that the phrase was created for Agamemnon.

In all of its Homeric occurrences, the name of Agamemnon's brother appears as Μενέλαος (<\*Μενέλαφος), instead of Ionic Μενέλεως, retaining its original vowel qualities and unaffected by quantitative metathesis. This proves only that Menelaus was included in epic before quantitative metathesis, a phenomenon which took place at a late stage in the tradition. It would be unjustifiable to claim that, merely because the name Μενέλαος always appears in this form which antedates the developments of the mature Ionic dialect, it entered epic in the Mycenaean Age. However, the construction of the name itself suggests that Menelaus belongs to the Mycenaean Age. In common with several other Mycenaean personal names it contains the element -λαφός, apparently the Mycenaean name for the army: cf. e-ti-ra-wo = \*Ἐρτίλαφος, e-ke-ti-ra-wo = \*Ἐγερτίλαφος, ra-wo-do-ko = \*Λαφόδοκος, ra-wo-po-ro = \*Λαφόφοργῶς (attested in 1st millennium Greek as Λεώφορβος). Thus the name Μενέλα(φ)ος is entirely consistent with Mycenaean onomastic preferences, indicating martial values; such names were bestowed in the hope that their bearers would possess the qualities implicit in their names.

The first element of the name Μενέλαφος appears also in Ἄγαμέμνων, which resulted by metathesis from \*Ἄγα-μέν-μων,

---

<sup>16</sup> Ἀγχίστης E 268, Αἰνείας E 311, Ἀυγείας Λ 701, Ἐυφήτης O 532,

Ἐϋμηλος Ψ 288

presumably because the sequence /mn/ is easier to pronounce than /nm/. As Heubeck showed,<sup>17</sup> it was a conventional practice to bestow on members of the same family names containing the same elements, as in the case of the Neleids, and thus these brothers cannot be the invention of the *Iliad* poet, who is unlikely to have been aware of the etymological link since it had been obscured by the metathesis \*-νμ->-μν-.

Based as they were in the Peloponnese, Agamemnon and Menelaus may not have had a place in the earliest version of the Trojan narrative. One hero who undoubtedly always was closely connected with the Trojan expedition is Achilles. If, as is not improbable, the earliest Trojan epic narrated the tale of an expedition from Thessaly,<sup>18</sup> Achilles, the leader of the Myrmidons (Ant-men? A totem-name?) from Phthia, was ideally placed to take part in it. His name is awkward to etymologize from Greek: it has been explained by Palmer<sup>19</sup> and Nagy<sup>20</sup> as a hypocoristic of \*'Αχιλάφος, a name of similar construction to Μενέλαφος, in which ἄχι- is the Caland form of ἄχος. The double -λ- can readily be explained when one recalls that

---

<sup>17</sup> "Agamemnon", *Gedenkschrift für W. Brandstein*, 1968, 357-61: thus 'Αγαμέμνων and Μενέλαος have a similar meaning, 'Αγαμέμνων signifying "who eminently (= ἄγα-, intensifying prefix) holds his ground (against the enemy)", and Μενέλαος "who holds his ground against the (enemy) army".

<sup>18</sup> Robert Drews, "Argos and Argives in the *Iliad*", *CPh* 74, 1979, 120: "...in the earliest stage of the heroic tradition about the sack of Troy, the 'Argives' were all Thessalian."

<sup>19</sup> *The Greek Language*, 37

<sup>20</sup> "The Name of Achilles. Etymology and Epic", *Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-European Linguistics offered to L.R. Palmer*, Davies & Meid (edd.), 1976, 209-37

gemination of consonants is frequently to be found in hypocoristics, e.g. Κλέομμυς from Κλεομένης, Κάλλιτος from Καλότιμος. The name Ἄχιλλεύς appears to be attested in Linear B in the forms a-ki-re-u, nominative (KN Vc 106) and a-ki-re-we, dative (PY Fn 79). The fact that the name of a major epic hero was in use at Pylos and Knossos c.1200 B.C. may indicate that versions of the Sack of Troy were current in the major centres of Mycenaean civilization in the 13th century, and that parents had named their sons after the hero of this tale (cf. the later Agamemnon of Cyme). It certainly indicates that the name Ἄχιλλεύς was not invented for the Homeric *Iliad*. The difficulty in accepting the etymology favoured by Palmer and Nagy lies in the fact that, as Palmer himself acknowledged,<sup>21</sup> a name which means “who brings grief to the army” is not consistent with the regular type of Mycenaean *Wunschnamen*, which indicate a hope that the bearer will show martial prowess, but certainly not that he will bring grief to his comrades. However, this problem is diminished if one accepts with Gary B. Holland<sup>22</sup> that ἄχος in this compound has its primary meaning “dread”, which is to be found in some of its cognates, e.g. English *awe*, Gothic *agis*, thus the name would signify “who brings dread to the (enemy) army”. There remains the problem that names in -λαφος, when they survive into the 1st millennium, form hypocoristics in -τωρ,<sup>23</sup> e.g. Μενέλα(φ)ος: Μέντωρ, Ἄγέλαφος: Ἄκτωρ, and thus C.J. Ruijgh may be correct in deriving

---

<sup>21</sup> *The Greek Language*, 37

<sup>22</sup> “The Name of Achilles: A Revised Etymology”, *Glotta* 71, 1993, 17-27

<sup>23</sup> A.Q. Moreschini, “Νηλεὺς, Νηληϊός, Νηληϊάδης”, *SMEA* 27, 1989, 257

Ἄχιλλεύς from the hydronym Ἀχελώϊος.<sup>24</sup> Nevertheless, it would be wrong to assume that, because these names never have hypocoristics in -εύς in 1st millennium Greek, such formations did not exist in the 2nd millennium, and the fact that the first element of this name, ἄχι-, may be a Caland form suggests that is a formation of considerable antiquity, and one should not dismiss the possibility that, at the time when it was created, names in -λαφος may have formed hypocoristics in -ευς.

Whatever its true etymology, the name Ἄχιλλεύς may have been associated by Greek speakers of the 13th century with ἄχος and λαφός, and its presence in Mycenaean documents indicates that it was known and apparently widespread in Mycenaean Greece, and it is possible that its bearers had been named after an epic hero. Achilles' epithets in the nominative, which, with the exception of δῖος, shared with Odysseus, are peculiar to himself, indicate that he had a history in epic: for example, although he is referred to numerous times as ποδάς ὤκυν Ἄχιλλεύς, he is not noted in the *Iliad* for fleetness of foot, but is shown running only at X 215 ff., where he requires divine assistance to catch up with Hector, an episode which may be motivated by his traditional epithet. ποδάρκης, occurring with δῖος 21 times after the trochaic caesura, conveys the same meaning in different metrical circumstances.

Achilles shares with Odysseus the epithet δῖος < \*δίφυγος in the nominative case. The ending -ιος signified "belonging", thus as an epithet

---

<sup>24</sup> *Mnemosyne* 42, 1989, 511-16, review of Palmer, *The Greek Language*

of heroes \*δίφυος would presumably have signified “belonging to, descendant of Zeus”<sup>25</sup>, equivalent to the later διογενής (but v. p. 227 on εἰς ἄλλα δῖαν). In the genitive, however, Achilles and Odysseus are not \*δίωιο but θείωιο, and the reason for the different epithets becomes clear when the Mycenaean forms of their name + epithet formulae are restored. \*δίφυος Ὀδυσσεύς / Ἀχιλλεύς scans perfectly, with the same metrical pattern as the Homeric version. The genitive formula, however, contains an adjective whose nominative at the Mycenaean stage was trisyllabic, consisting of three short syllables: \*θέηιος <\*θέσιος, an adjective in -ιος based on the stem of θεός. At the Mycenaean stage, \*θέηιος Ἀχιλλεύς / Ὀδυσσεύς would have been unmetrical in the final two feet. In the genitive, however, \*Ἀχιλλήφιος / Ὀδυσσήφιος θεήωιο provides a perfectly regular T<sub>2</sub> formula, whose preferred dactyl is restored when the contracted form θείωιο is resolved as \*θεήωιο. The alternative spelling of Odysseus’ name, Ὀδυσσεύς, lacks formulaic connexions (it occurs 3 times with δουρικόλυτος, but this is a generic epithet of heroes), which suggests that this version is recent, and this is confirmed by the phonological facts. Unlike Ἀχιλλεύς, Ὀδυσσεύς<sup>26</sup> has no attestation in Mycenaean, but the dialectal variations of his name (Οὐλίξεύς, Οὐλίξης, Ὀλυσσεύς, Ὀλυτεύς, Ὀλυττεύς, Ὀλισεύς, Ὀλυσσεύς) indicate that this hero’s fame was widespread in the 2nd millennium. At the Mycenaean stage the

<sup>25</sup> Ruijgh, “D’Homère aux origines protomycéniennes”, 81, note 280

<sup>26</sup> The name Ὀδυσσεύς is impossible to etymologize from Greek; the explanation at τ 407-9, where the name is associated with ὀδύρομαι, is a popular etymology.

expected epic pronunciation would have been \*/'Οδυ<sup>τ</sup>σσεύς/<sup>27</sup>; 'Οδυσσεύς shows the Ionic treatment of the affricate. Therefore this simplification of -σσ- to -σ- can only postdate the change from affricate to sibilant, by analogy with such epic doublets as μέσσοσ / μέσσοσ, κάλεσσοσ / κάλεσσο. 'Αχιλεύς, on the other hand, seems to be considerably older: its genitive is formulaic in verse-end position with Πηληϊόδεω, and as the geminated -λλ- seems not to be etymological but to be an expressive gemination of the type common in hypocoristics, this simplification could in theory have taken place at any stage of the tradition.

Beyond doubt also very ancient is Achilles' father Peleus, whose name is probably to be associated with Mt. Pelion, thus in form is an ethnic, rather than an Aeolic development of a name with initial labiovelar, viz. \*Q<sup>w</sup>ηλεύς,<sup>28</sup> which would be expected to give \*Τηλεύς in Ionic. If Πηλεύς were indeed the Aeolic form of an unattested \*Q<sup>w</sup>ηλεύς, this name would be a secondary Aeolism in epic and would have been adopted from Lesbian at a comparatively late stage in the development of epic, i.e. after the migrations.<sup>29</sup> In fact, I do not believe that any of Homer's major characters entered the tradition after the migrations: Peleus may not himself have a major rôle in the *Iliad*, but he is significant as the father of its protagonist.

<sup>27</sup> Ruijgh, *Études*, 49-50; Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 101

<sup>28</sup> Perpillou, *Les substantif grecs en -εύς*, 183, explains Πηλεύς thus.

<sup>29</sup> Linear B provides some examples of ethnics in -εύς: at Pylos are attested a-pa-je-u = \*'Αλφαιεύς, o-ko-me-ne-u = \*'Ορχομενεύς, tu-ru-we-u = \*'Θρυφεύς, ki-e-u = \*Χιεύς (P. Hr. Iliievski, "Some Structural Peculiarities of Mycenaean-Greek Personal Names", *Res Mycenaeae*, 204, note 9).

Given the importance of ancestry in epic, if Achilles belonged to 2nd millennium epic, so did Peleus. Therefore the phrase Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος has a very high likelihood of belonging to 2nd millennium epic in the form \*Πηληϊάδα' Ἀχιλῆφος.

Achilles' arch-rival, Hector, is likewise beyond doubt very ancient in the Trojan cycle. The name Hector seems to be attested in Linear B in the form e-ko-to (PY Eb 913, etc.). That Ἔκτωρ is the correct interpretation rather than \*Ἔκτος or \*Ἔκτων is indicated by the patronymic adjective in the dative e-ko-to-ri-jo = \*Ἔκτοριώ (PY Cn 45).<sup>30</sup> In epic the name Ἔκτωρ may represent an attempt by Greek speakers to assimilate an Anatolian name to one familiar from their own language. His antiquity is suggested by his distinctive name + epithet formula κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ, always at verse-end; its two components are inseparable, which is an indication of antiquity. The epithet κορυθαίολος is written in our texts of Homer as a single word because neither of its components was a commonly understood word in 1st millennium Greek, but when it was created it would have been understood as two words, viz. \*κόρυθ' αἰφόλος. This phrase could have been created only when both of its elements were readily understood as parts of the spoken language, thus when κόρυς was the normal word for "helmet", which on the evidence of the Linear B texts could have been the Mycenaean Age. The adjective αἰ(φ)όλος, used only in poetic language in the 1st millennium, is also known from Linear B in the form a<sub>3</sub>-wo-ro (KN Ch 896, etc.), used as the name of an ox. Its basic sense

---

<sup>30</sup> Page, *HHI*, 216

seems to be “swift”, as in ποδάς αἰόλος ἵππος, T 404, but it also refers to the sparkle of metal and armour.<sup>31</sup> It appears that the adjective possessed both senses in 2nd millennium Greek: αἰολοθώρηξ (verse-end Δ 489, Π 173) may also date from the Mycenaean Age, as both its elements are attested in the Linear B texts. Whether the Mycenaeans named their oxen Αἰφόλος in reference to their glossy coats, or in ironic reference to the creatures’ speed, one can only speculate, but I hope that it was the latter. As both components of κορυθαίολος appear in the administrative language of the Mycenaean palace system, whose vocabulary is drawn from that of quotidian parlance, there is every likelihood that the phrase entered epic in the Mycenaean Age. This type of construction whereby a noun in the accusative case was attached to an adjective or a participle with adjectival force had become obsolete in spoken Greek before the date of composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; this is clear from the fact that such phrases exist only as old formulae (which are never modified), while none were created by the poets of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, or by their recent predecessors.

Nestor clearly has a very long history in epic, but is unlikely to have figured in the earliest versions of the Trojan narrative. His earliest epic appearances were no doubt as a local hero of the south-west Peloponnese; his involvement in the Battle of Lapiths and Centaurs in Thessaly (A 259-74) is unlikely to be of Bronze Age origin. Like all mainland

---

<sup>31</sup> Chantraine, *DELG*, 37 s.v.

legends,<sup>32</sup> the story of the Lapiths and Centaurs must be very old, and the involvement of Nestor so far from home must be a device for working an ancient legend into the *Iliad*. It is not beyond credibility that Nestor was made such a significant and sympathetic character in the *Iliad* in order to find favour with wealthy Ionian families who claimed descent from the Neleids of Pylos.<sup>33</sup>

Personal names associated in legend with the Neleids are attested in Linear B texts from Pylos but no other sites, lending support to the view that Nestor and his father, the Homeric Neleus, were indeed genuine historical figures; Nestor's genealogy (λ 284 f.) is sufficiently detailed to be a genuine recollection of an ancient dynasty. On the Pylos tablets are to be found the names me-ra-to = Μέλανθος (PY Jn 832) and ko-do-ro = Κόδρος (PY Jn 706), which belong to smiths, suggesting that Pylians were named after heroes of local legend; Μέλανθος, although not an uncommon name, is particularly suitable for the Neleids, as it is a by-name of Poseidon, a god particularly associated with Pylos.<sup>34</sup> Also found at Pylos is ne-e-ra-wo = \*Nehéλαφος, a name of the same type as Μενέλαφος, containing the element -λαφος, "army". Both Νέστωρ and \*Nehéλαφος contain the same first element, almost certainly from the root of the verb

---

<sup>32</sup> As Nilsson showed (*The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*, 54), only foundation legends attach to the Ionian cities of Asia Minor.

<sup>33</sup> According to legend, Neleids from Pylos had taken refuge in Athens, and the Ionian settlement of Miletus was led by Neileos, one of their descendants (v. G.L. Huxley, *The Early Ionians*, 1966, 26).

<sup>34</sup> H. Mühlestein, "Namen von Neleiden auf Pylostäfelchen", *MH* 22, 1965, 155-65

νέομαι (<νέχομαι <\*νεσ-), but in a transitive sense, “bring home safely, save”; the active form \*νέω is not attested in alphabetic Greek, and must have fallen into desuetude at a very early date.

Thus \*Νεφέλαφος is of the same type of formation as Μενέλαφος, Ἀγέλαφος, etc., containing a verbal first element governing a nominal second element. \*Νεφέλαφος signifies “who brings the army home safely”, indicating that the ability to effect the safe homecoming of a fighting force was a quality prized by Mycenaean society; the safe return of an army appears to be depicted on a frieze from Thera,<sup>35</sup> whose subject-matter seems to mirror to a considerable extent that of contemporary epic. This transitive sense of the root \*nes- appears in other Mycenaean and Homeric names, e.g. pi-ro-ne-ta = \*Φιλονέστας (PY Jn 658), wi-pi-no-o = \*φιφίνοχος, Homeric Ἰφίνοος (KN V 958), “who brings home by might”, Ἀλκίνο(η)ος, “who brings home by defensive force”, not, as W.B. Stanford<sup>36</sup> interpreted the name, “brave -minded”, a compound of νόος >νοῦς, which would lack parallels in Mycenaean onomastic formations.

Νέστωρ is a formation of the same type as Ἄκτωρ, Μέντωρ, hypocoristics of Ἀγέλαφος, Μενέλαφος respectively. When such a hypocoristic is constructed from the stem \*νεσ-, the result is Νέστωρ. The

---

<sup>35</sup> Sarah P. Morris, “A Tale of Two Cities: The Miniature Frescoes from Thera and the Origins of Greek Poetry”, *AJA* 93, 1989, 511-35

<sup>36</sup> *Odyssey* Commentary vol.1, 309

Pylos tablets have revealed another personal name containing this verbal root, namely *ne-ti-ja-no* = \*Νεστιάνωρ (PY Cn 599), a *τερψίμβροτος*-type compound (i.e. a compound with verbal first element ending in -ι). Νέστωρ and \*Νεστιάνωρ are of almost identical meaning (“who saves men”), and form a couplet analogous to Κάστωρ and \*Καστιάνωρ, which is implied by the feminine name Καστιάνειρα, and to Μήστωρ and \*Μηστιάνωρ, which is implied by the genitive *me-ti-ja-no-ro* = \*Μηστιάνορος (PY Vn 1191).

One might legitimately wonder why, when we find in the Pylos tablets the name \*Νελέαφος, the Ionic version of which, Νειλέως, is the name of the legendary founder of Miletus, Nestor’s father is always known by the hypocoristic form Νηλεύς. This apparently primary form is found in the *Iliad* only at Λ 683 and 717, in a reminiscence of Nestor: Nestor’s reminiscences are notable for their “recent” linguistic character. When the adjectives Νηληϊάδης and Νηληϊός appear, the first syllable can always be resolved to \*Νελε-, but Νηλεύς, Νηληία, Νηληιος can be resolved only at Λ 692, λ 254 and ο 237. As -η- results from the contraction of ε + ε, one must conclude with Marcello Durante<sup>37</sup> that the adjectives Νηληϊάδης and Νηληϊός are older in the epic tradition than the name Νηλεύς. This name must have been created after both vowel contractions and the sound-change  $\bar{\alpha} > \eta$  had taken place in Ionic: the stem Νηληηϝ- was evidently understood by poets to belong to Νηλεύς in the same way that Πηληη- is the stem of Πηλεύς and Πηλη(ϝ)ιάδης, but Νηλη(ϝ)- also represents \*Νελεαϝ-, the

<sup>37</sup> “Νείλεως e Νηλεύς”, *SMEA* 3, 1967, 33-46

stem of \*Nehéλαφος, after contraction of ε + ε and fronting of ā. Thus, while it is conceivable that Νέστωρ Νηληϊός < \*Νέστωρ Νεηελάφιός (Ψ 349), Νηληϊάδαο < \*Νεηελαφιάδαο (Θ 100, Ο 378) and the vocative formula ὦ Νέστορ Νηληϊάδη < \*ὦ Νέστορ Νεηελαφιάδα belonged to epic in the 2nd millennium, Νηλεύς did not. Nor does Νηλεύς have any distinctive epithets, which indicates that Nestor's father never had an active rôle in epic. The epic form of the name of Nestor's father might be expected to be \*Νειλεύς, showing the Ionic contraction of ε + ε; the presence of -η- in the first syllable is not due to a supposed "Aeolic phase" of epic composition, but is the result of assimilation to Πηλεύς, the name of another shadowy figure who was significant only as the father of a major epic hero.

Despite the late addition of the name Νηλεύς, the kernel of Nestor's reminiscence at Λ 670-761 concerning the war between the Pylians and Eleans appears ancient because of references to mainland locations, Θρούοεσσα (711), the rivers Ἴαλφειός (712) and Μινυήτιος (722), Ἄρηνη (723), Βουπράσιον (756), πέτρη Ὠλενίης (757) and Ἄλειοίον (757), which are scarcely likely to have been known to a 7th century Ionian poet had they not been preserved in legend (whose vehicle was almost certainly hexameter verse). These details may well have come from a Pylian epic, as proposed by F. Bölte.<sup>38</sup> It is not improbable that much of the epic poetry of the Mycenaean Age narrated border raids of a relatively trivial nature, such as those recounted by Nestor in the *Iliad*, and

<sup>38</sup> "Ein pylisches Epos", *RhM* 83, 1934, 319-47

the scale of these may have been inflated by bards in order to flatter the egos of patrons who had participated in such skirmishes. If epic exaggeration was the norm, it is easy to understand how the Trojan campaign was vastly inflated in scale after epic verse had been exported to Asia Minor, partly as a result of local interest; but it is also unsurprising that, if the city of Troy was indeed destroyed by a Greek raiding expedition in the Late Bronze Age, and this was the last great achievement before the collapse of Mycenaean civilization, this event should have been fixed firmly in the collective memory of Mycenaean Greeks and their descendants, and have become the most popular subject of epic verse in the post-Mycenaean period.

In this same reminiscence of Nestor, the brothers referred to as Ἴακτορίωνε Μολλίονε (750) have caused a great deal of speculation. These names in the dual have been interpreted as a double patronymic, and in antiquity the brothers were even understood as Siamese twins.<sup>39</sup> Ἴακτορίωνε is indeed a patronymic formation, but Μολλίονε is of a different type of formation, as C.J. Ruijgh showed.<sup>40</sup> The decipherment of Linear B revealed many names with the suffix -φων, several of which occur in Homer, e.g. a-mu-ta-wo (PY Nn 831.7) = Ἰαμυθά(φ)ων (λ 259), a-re-ta-wo (KN As 645.3) = Ἰαρετά(φ)ων<sup>41</sup> (Z 31), ma-ka-wo (PY Jn 658.3) =

---

<sup>39</sup> E.g. the T scholiast on λ 710, citing "Hesiod" :ὅτι τερατώδεις τινὲς ἦσαν, ὡς Ἡσίοδος, ἄμφω ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι ὄντες. (Fragment 18, Merkelbach –West)

<sup>40</sup> "Sur le nom de Poséidon", *REG* 80, 1967, 15

<sup>41</sup> A name created from \*ἀρέτα, "excellence (i.e. in battle)", a quality which would have been prized by the militaristic society of the Mycenaeans.

Μαχά(φ)ων (B 732, Λ 512, 517, etc.). There are also names in -ίων, genitive -ίωνος (with long -ι-), which contain the same suffix, particularly hypocoristics such as Ἀμφίων: Ἀμφίμαχος, Ἀρίων: Ἀριφράδης (*vel sim.*); -ίων came to function as an independent suffix in names such as Ὑπερίων, Κυλλοποδίων. The original presence of /w/ is proven by Mycenaean, which includes the personal name a-ri-wo = \*Ἀρίφων (PY Cn 655.12), dative a-ri-wo-ne = \*Ἀριφόνει (PY Cn 131.8), and also a-ki-wo-ni-jo, probably equivalent to \*Ἀλκιφόνιος, a patronymic adjective from \*Ἀλκίφων, itself a hypocoristic of a name like Ἀλκίμαχος. Μολίονε is the dual of a name of this type, which is attested in Mycenaean as mo-ri-wo = \*Μολίφων (PY Cn 1287).

Names in -ίων < -ίφων, genitive -ί(φ)ονος, with long -ι-, as scansion indicates in Μολίονε, should be distinguished from names in -ίων, genitive -ίωνος, with short -ι-, based on adjectives in -ιος, which never had intervocalic digamma, e.g. οὐρανίων, based on the adjective οὐράνιος. In Homer the latter group is represented mainly by patronymics, e.g. Κρονίων, genitive Κρονίωνος, based on the adjective Κρόνιος, itself created from the name Κρόνος; these names can themselves function as personal names, e.g. Βουκόλιων (Z 23). These two morphological groups are in general still distinct in Homer: on the one hand are patronymics such as Πηλεΐων<sup>42</sup> and personal names such as Δευκαλίων and Ἐρευθαλίων,

<sup>42</sup> Πηλεΐων is a fairly late formation; it must postdate antevocalic shortening. The older

\*Πηληφίων is unmetrical, therefore Ionian poets must have introduced Πηλεΐων, which follows the model of the new stem as seen in the genitive Πηλέος instead of original

where there was never a digamma in the suffix and the -ι- is short; on the other hand are names such as Νομίλων, Δολοπίων, whose stem is in -ιον- with long -ι-, and where digamma has been lost from the suffix.

At Λ 750, Ἴακτορίωνε is a patronymic derived from Ἴακτωρ, but Μολίονε is the dual of a personal name, and cannot be a patronymic, having long -ι-, as the scansion shows; cf. Λ 322, where it occurs in the accusative singular, Μολίονα. In addition to their collective name in the dual, the brothers have the individual names Κτεάτος and Εὐρυτος at B 621, but as B is a book which contains many “recent” linguistic traits, it is safe to assume that they were given these names well after the significance of the dual had ceased to be understood. The loss of digamma and the obsolescence of patronymic formations in -ιος combined to cause confusion of the suffixes -ίφων, -ίφονος and -ίων, -ίωνος, as a result of which the name Μολίονε < \*Μολίφονε was taken for a patronymic or even metronymic, as their mother was given the name Μολιόνη and their

---

\*Πηληϊφος. Whether or not patronyms (rather than patronymic adjectives) of the

\*Πηληϊφίων-type were used in Mycenaean times (and there is no reason to doubt that they were- they must have been in use at some time in order to get into epic), Πηλεΐων is late. The metrical shortening argument, necessary to fit the Atreids into early epic, does not convince here, as there were already ways for poets to refer to Achilles in connexion with his lineage, viz. \*Πηληϊάδας, \*Αἰακίδας. Admittedly Πηληϊώνα /-ι frequently appears at verse-end, but poets knew that this was a regular location for more traditional forms, and thus could place recent formations here as a type of false archaism, cf. βίηφι Π 826, ὕσμίνη Δ 462.

grandfather the name Μόλος, since their real father was not Aktor but Poseidon (Λ 751).

There is, however, a much simpler explanation for ἼΑκτορίωνε Μολί(φ)ονε, with a parallel in Homer, which does not require the brothers to be Siamese twins or to bear a name derived from that of their mother Μολιόνη, the daughter of Μόλος.<sup>43</sup> It seems very probable that in origin Μολί(φ)ονε was a dual of the same type as Αἴαντε δύω, that is, Aias and his younger brother. Therefore the complete phrase \*ἼΑκτορίωνε Μολίφονε meant “the two sons of Aktor, Moliwon and the other one”. By the time that our *Iliad* was put together, not only was \*Μολίφονε, like Αἴαντε, no longer properly understood, but also the distinction between the suffixes -ίφων, known from Mycenaean personal names, and -ίων, in derivatives of adjectives in -ιος, was breaking down.<sup>44</sup>

If Μολίφονε is indeed an Αἴαντε-type dual meaning “Moliwon and his little brother”, this dual must have entered epic when the practice of naming a pair of brothers by the older one’s name in the dual was still in current usage. It is difficult to tell when this practice became obsolete, but

---

<sup>43</sup> The A scholiast on Λ 750: ...Ἡσίοδος ἼΑκτορος κατ’ ἐπικλησιν καὶ Μολιόνης αὐτοῦς γεγενεαλόγηκεν ... (Fragment 17b, Merkelbach – West)

<sup>44</sup> Jaan Puhvel (“Devatā-Dvandva in Hittite, Greek, and Latin”, *AJPh* 98, 1977, 403), explaining ἼΑκτορίωνε Μολίονε as “an asyndetic combination of two duals expressing the various filiations of the same set of twins”, does not take into account the fact that the former name is a patronym and the latter a personal name.

the lesser Aias was invented because the true significance of Αἴαντε was no longer understood, and his formulae suggest that he was not a recent addition to the epic cast. The fact that Agamemnon and Menelaus, characters who seem to have Mycenaean roots in epic, are never referred to as \*Ἀγαμέμνονε, which would be metrically acceptable, suggests that this usage was obsolete before the end of the Mycenaean Age. Therefore it is logical to conclude that the Μολίονε have a longer history in epic than do Agamemnon and Menelaus, and that their association with Nestor suggests that they belonged to the 2nd millennium epic corpus associated with Pylos and the Neleids. If the Μολίονε were included in epic before the advent of Agamemnon and Menelaus, their association with Nestor implies that he too antedates the Atreid brothers in the epic tradition, as the *Iliad* suggests at A 250-2:

τῷ δ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων  
 ἐφθίαθ', οἳ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ' ἐγένοντο  
 ἐν Πύλῳ ἠγαθέη, μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἀνασσειν

The connexion of the Μολίονε with Nestor and their lack of representation outside this narrative suggests that they were included in epic very early, and it is not improbable that they belonged to the Pylian epic corpus. As this usage is found only in connexion with the Αἴαντε and Μολίονε, and was sufficiently remote in time to be misunderstood in both cases by the predecessors of the *Iliad* poet, who created an additional Αἴας, and given that the greater Aias is already associated with features belonging to the Mycenaean Age, it is reasonable to conclude that not only the original

Αΐαντε (Aias and Teucer), but also the Μολίονε, belong to Mycenaean epic. Since the metrically admissible \*Ἀγαμέμνονε is never found, it would seem that Aias and Teucer have a longer history in epic than do Agamemnon and Menelaus, and it appears that the practice of referring to a pair of brothers by the dual of the older sibling's name was obsolete considerably before the end of the Mycenaean Age.

Nestor's formula Γερόνιος ἱππότη Νέστωρ occurs 31 times in the *Iliad*, and the noun ἱππότη 5 times after the bucolic diaeresis followed by Νέστωρ or another name of the same metrical pattern: Τυδεύς Ε 126, Οίνεύς, Ε 117, Πηλεύς, Π 33, Ψ 89, Νέστωρ Ι 52. ἱππηλάτα, a noun of apparently similar meaning, occurs 10 times in Homer in the metrically equivalent formula γέρον ἱππηλάτα + a bisyllabic name, but only twice (γ 436, 444) is the name Νέστωρ. Risch<sup>45</sup> plausibly argued that Γερόνιος ἱππότη Νέστωρ belonged to an ancient epic concerning Nestor and the Neleids. As ἱππότη forms part of the T<sub>2</sub> hemistich Γερόνιος ἱππότη Νέστωρ, it seems to have been originally an epithet reserved for Nestor. What Γερόνιος originally signified is impossible to ascertain. Later sources associate it with the toponym Γέρον, but if the ancient legends about Nestor had referred to such a place, one might expect it to have been mentioned among the Pylian contingent in the Catalogue of Ships. That it was understood by the time of the *Odyssey* poet to be synonymous with γέρον is apparent from the insertion of Νέστωρ into the

---

<sup>45</sup> "Der homerische Typus ἱππότη Νέστωρ und μητιέτα Ζεύς", *Festschrift Albert*

*Debrunner*, 1954, 393

formula γέρων ἰππηλάτα + bisyllabic name. However, the difficulty in accepting that Γερήνιος fundamentally means the same as γέρων lies in the fact that, in any Pylian epic recounting the exploits of Nestor, these would have been performed when he was in his prime. If Γερήνιος did indeed originally refer to a place, the fact that it was reinterpreted as a synonym of γέρων suggests that γέρων ἰππηλάτα + name is a post-migration formula, dating from a time when memories of such a location had been lost. This would also explain why there is no mention in the Catalogue of Ships of a place named Γέρον / Γερονία among the Pylian contingent. The Mycenaean texts may provide an inkling of support for the place-name explanation with ke-re-no (PY Cn 599.6, MY Au 102.6), interpreted as a personal name, possibly \*Γέρονος.<sup>46</sup> The likely association of Πηλεός (not <\*Q<sup>w</sup>ηλεός) and his spear Πηλιάδα μελίη with Mt. Pelion provides a possible analogy for a hero's epithet based on a place-name, although in the case of Peleus it is not his epithet but his own name which is based on a toponym.

The existence of a 2nd millennium Pylian epic corpus centred on Nestor is perfectly conceivable. Nestor's reminiscences in Homer are, however, noted for their "recent" language. One may legitimately enquire why, if these tales are an inheritance from the 2nd millennium, is their language among the most "modern" elements of the *Iliad*? The reason may be that the poet put these into the first person in order to work into a poem about the siege of Troy popular traditional stories which previously had

---

<sup>46</sup> *Documents*, 553

been narrated in the third person, embellishing them in the process. Nestor's δέπας (Λ 632) may have belonged to such a Pylian epos; the reference to this vessel in the *Iliad* suggests that it had a history independent of the Trojan narrative. The Pithecan cup whose inscription refers to the ποτήριον of Nestor (v. p. 321) does not indicate familiarity with the Homeric *Iliad* on the part of the writer of the inscription, but perhaps indicates familiarity with other ancient stories about Nestor which are only alluded to in Homer. Likewise Nestor's shield (Θ 192), whose κλέος is not explained in the *Iliad*, must have been known from earlier epic.

Other heroes who are included in the cast of the *Iliad* undoubtedly belonged to epic in the 2nd millennium in narratives other than that concerning the Sack of Troy. Idomeneus from Crete seems old, as does his ὀπάων Meriones, who is associated with the whole-verse formula Μηρίωνης ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντη, whose prosodical inconsistencies in its Homeric form suggest that it represents an earlier \*Μηριόνας χατάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀντιῳ<sup>w</sup>χόντα. As Meriones is always mentioned in connexion with Idomeneus, both of them are likely to be as old in epic as the vocalization of sonants. The prominent part played by Idomeneus<sup>47</sup> in the *Iliad* suggests that we have preserved in Homer a residue of Cretan epic tradition: it is impossible to determine precisely when such a Cretan epic may have come into existence, but the prosodical irregularities

---

<sup>47</sup> Idomeneus' descent from Zeus is detailed at N 450-2; at Γ 230 he is identified by Helen as one of the most outstanding Achaean heroes; he is represented at N 361 as being, like Nestor, of considerable age (μεσαιπόλιός περ ἑών).

of Meriones' formula indicate that it was in circulation considerably before the end of the Mycenaean Age. Calvert Watkins plausibly dates Meriones' formula to the mid-2nd millennium not only on linguistic but also on archaeological grounds: ἀτάλαντος, "of equal weight with", recalls Mycenaean ta-ra-si-ja = ταλα(ν)σία (KN Lc 535, Le 642, PY Jn 310, etc.), referring to a weighed quantity of wool or bronze, and a-ta-ra-si-jo = \*ἀταλάνσιοι (PY Jn 310, Jn 389, Jn 658, etc.), "without a ta-ra-si-ja". The creation of a formula designed to flatter a hero by suggesting that his weight is, metaphorically speaking, equal to that of a god "can only be understood at a time when scales were not trivial but cherished artifacts in Greece".<sup>48</sup> (A similar date can be postulated for the creation of Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος.) Scales are found as grave-goods in the early Mycenaean Age, but after c.1400 B.C. disappear from burials, therefore a date before 1400 B.C. can be postulated for the creation of both of these formulae. Although the formula ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ could in theory be used of other heroes with the substitution of a name of the same metrical value as Μηριόνης, it is used only of this Cretan, who shows other signs of antiquity. It is Meriones who gives Odysseus the antique boar's tusk helmet at K 261-5: although the language of this passage is recent, the history of the helmet and its various owners (K 266-70) is sufficiently detailed to suggest that Meriones' helmet was already known in epic before the composition of the *Iliad*.

---

<sup>48</sup> Calvert Watkins, "Linguistic and Archaeological Light on some Homeric Formulas", *PIE Studies in Honor of Marija Gimbutas*, S.N. Skomal & E.C. Polomé (edd.), 1987, 287-97

The comparisons in short similes such as ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ, Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος indicate that the gods had some part in Mycenaean epic. Comparison of his patron to a god was a means by which a bard could flatter the patron; the same effect could be achieved by embellishing a battle scene with intervention on the part of a god in order to assist a mortal. These two old formulae suggest that Enyalios and Zeus belonged to epic in the 2nd millennium. Distinctive formulaic epithets of goddesses, some very obscure, e.g. ἀτρουτώνη (of Athene), suggests that female divinities likewise have a long history in epic. Hera's verse-end formula πότνια Ἥρη, containing a hiatus which would have been prosodically regular when /h/ was still felt to be a full consonant, apparently in the 2nd millennium (v. p. 113-4). Since θεά is found in Aeolic but is not part of the Ionic vocabulary (Ionic uses θεός for both male and female deities), it has been claimed that θεά entered epic in an "Aeolic phase".<sup>49</sup> Indeed, Mycenaean never uses θεά, referring to te-o-jo do-e-ra = \*θεοῖο δοέλα regardless of the sex of the divinity in question. Yet θεά and its genitive plural θεάων (e.g. verse-end δῖα θεάων) are so firmly established within the formular system that it is hard to believe that they are not ancient. Of course, it is not inconceivable that θεά entered epic from an Aeolic source in the 2nd millennium. However, the fact that θεά is never attested in Mycenaean does not imply that the word was never used; the administrative documents of the palace system are unlikely to have had cause to distinguish female from male deities, but this does not mean that people did not talk about θεαί as opposed to θεοί, or that this distinction

<sup>49</sup> E.g. Wathelet, *Traits*, 367; Ruijgh, "D'Homère aux origines protomycéniennes", 52

was not made in the spoken language throughout Greece in the 2nd millennium. Ionic use of θεός for both male and female immortals may indicate that θεά was an isogloss in which proto-Ionic did not participate, or that it had dropped out of use in 1st millennium Ionic; and thus is to be regarded as an archaism which Ionic had lost (had it survived in Ionic, one would expect \*θεή in Homer). The Linear B evidence shows that feminine names ending in -α were created from their masculine equivalents, e.g. a-re-ka-sa-da-ra, feminine of Ἀλέξανδρος, which, although unattested in Mycenaean is assumed because of the presence of its feminine pendant, te-o-do-ra = Θεοδώρα, feminine equivalent of \*Θεόδωρος. Thus, if it was common practice to base 1st declension feminine names on 2nd declension masculine names, it would be reasonable to expect that Mycenaean Greeks spoke of female deities as θε(η)αί to distinguish them from masculine θε(η)οί. The spoken language was at all stages a source for epic, while the Mycenaean administrative records were not. Thus if people spoke of θε(η)αί, epic could use the same term. It is also significant that, while θεός may be substituted without metrical disruption for θεά in θεά γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, its genitive plural, θεῶν cannot be substituted in the verse-end formula δῖα θεάων.

Goddesses, then, have a long-established and traditional rôle in epic, and their formular representation makes it extremely probable that this is not a post-migration development. Certain mortal women are likely to belong to 2nd millennium epic, but as they have no distinctive epithets, sharing with other characters generic epithets, e.g. εὐπλόκαμος,

καλλιπάρηος it is not likely that they had any active rôle. The Homeric poems give female characters very little in the way of active rôles, but this is scarcely to be wondered at, as epic is primarily concerned with the adventures and exploits of individual aristocratic warriors. However, just as women are significant in Homer as the wives and mothers of heroes, so we may expect that Mycenaean women were commemorated in the same way as the wives and mothers of those whose exploits were celebrated in epic. Genealogies are bound to contain some elements of historical fact, and one Homeric example which is likely to be rooted in the Mycenaean Age is that which occurs at λ 254-9, listing the sons of Nestor's paternal grandmother Tyro. Obviously this passage is not entirely of Mycenaean date, containing several "recent" features: Πελίην τέκε καὶ Νηληΐα (254) not only contains connective καί, but also Νηληΐα, a recent reinterpretation of the name implied by the patronymic adjectives Νηληΐος and Νηληϊάδης; Κρηθῆϊ τέκεν βασιλεια γυναικῶν (258) is obviously post-Mycenaean, containing a dative with short ending (Κρηθῆϊ) in the 3rd foot, ephelcystic ν making position (τέκεν), and the feminine pendant (βασιλεια) of βασιλεύς, whose incorporation into the epic vocabulary appears to be a post-Mycenaean development. However, there is every chance that λ 259, Αἴσονά τ' ἠδὲ Φέρητ' Ἀμυθάονα θ' ἱπποχάρμην, belongs to the Mycenaean Age in its entirety, containing the archaic connectives ...τε...τε < \*...q<sup>w</sup>e...q<sup>w</sup>e (Mycenaean ...qe...qe) and ἠδὲ rather than the recent καί, and the epithet ἱπποχάρμης, which seems to reflect Mycenaean conditions (v. p. 247). Furthermore, three of the names in this passage appear to be attested at Pylos: ke-re-te-u = Κρηθεύς (PY Ea 800,

etc.), a-mu-ta-wo = Ἄμυθά(φ)ων (PY Nn 831, etc.), a<sub>3</sub>-so-ni-jo = \*Αἰσόνιος (PY An 261), the patronymic adjective based on Αἴσων. This suggests that 13th century Pylians may have been named after heroes from local legends. Thus there appears to be a kernel of historical truth in the Tyro story, which gives the Neleids links with Thessaly (Πελλίης μὲν ἐν εὐρυχώρῳ Ἰαωλλκῶ / ναίει πολύρρηγος, λ 256-7); this is not surprising, as there must have been links by marriage among Mycenaean dynasties. Similarities between Thessalian and Messenian toponyms should not, however, be taken to indicate the presence of Thessalian immigrants to Pylos in the 2nd millennium, as these may be pre-Greek<sup>50</sup>; cf. the hydronyms Don and Avon as names shared by widely separated locations in the British Isles.

### **The Exploits: κλέα ἀνδρῶν**

The above are some at least of the characters who would have populated Mycenaean epic; others may be completely unknown to us. It is their exploits which would have provided the subject-matter of epic, the κλέα ἀνδρῶν, which may itself be an old phrase, appearing at verse-end at I 189, 520 and θ 73. If this phrase is as old as the Mycenaean Age, it would have had the form \*κλέφεη' ἀνδρων (or indeed \*ἀνρῶν, if it was part of epic before the oblique cases of ἀνήρ generalized epenthetic /d/). In 1st millennium prose, κλέος has been superseded by δόξα, and thus is clearly

---

<sup>50</sup> This was maintained by Porzig, "Sprachgeographische Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten", *IF* 61, 1954, 165

not a recent addition to the epic vocabulary. This term is transparent in Mycenaean, and presumably denotes a quality valued by Mycenaeans, as one may assume from its use as a component in personal names attested in Linear B, e.g. e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo = \*Ἐτεφοκλεφέλιος (PY An 654), patronymic adjective from \*Ἐτεφοκλέφης, na-u-si-ke-re-we = \*Ναυσικλέφης (KN Xd 214); such names are also to be found in legends which can only have their origins in the 2nd millennium, e.g. Ἡρακλῆς, and are still in use in the 1st millennium, e.g. Θεμιστοκλῆς. Thus the presence of κλέ(φ)ος as a name-formant in Mycenaean times, coupled with epic formulae such as κλέ(φ)ος ἔσθλόν (E 3, 273, P 143, α 95, γ 78, etc.), κλέ(φ)ος ἄφθιτον (I 413; also at Hesiod, fragment 70.5, ἵνα οἱ κλέος ἄφθιτον εἴη), suggests that κλέος was a familiar and important concept to Mycenaeans, and that it figured in their epic poetry. κλέ(φ)ος ἄφθιτον seems to be a very ancient formula, paralleled in Vedic poetry by *śrávo...ákṣitam*<sup>51</sup>; both presumably represent an Indo-European prototype \**k'lewos ṛdhg<sup>w</sup>hitom*.

What, then, were the \*κλέφεη' ἀνδρῶν which would have been celebrated by Mycenaean epic?

## Warfare

The most cursory reading of the *Iliad* will show that warfare is a major theme of Homeric epic, and there is every reason to believe that it

<sup>51</sup> C. O. Pavese, *Studi sulla tradizione epica rapsodica*, 85

was also of the greatest importance in Mycenaean epic. Homer contains a wide range of war-related vocabulary which is otherwise obsolete in attested Greek, e.g. δαίττω, (ἐξ)ἐναρίζω, ἀλαπάξω, πελεμίξω, κτερεῖξω. Also to be included in this list is μάρναμαι, a verb which in 1st millennium Greek is confined to poetic language; it has no derivatives, and only the present stem is attested. In Homer this verb appears most frequently in the 3rd person imperfect, μάρναντο, with 10 appearances in the *Iliad*, 6 before the trochaic caesura. Three of these attestations are in the formulaic verse ὧς οἱ μὲν μάρναντο δέμας πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο (Λ 596, Ν 673, Σ 1), a verse which has a strong chance of belonging to the Mycenaean Age. In addition to the archaic athematic verb μάρναντο in the first hemistich, this verse contains three other archaisms in the second hemistich: δέμας, which Chantraine associated with δέμω,<sup>52</sup> is almost fossilized in epic, occurring 16 times in the *Iliad*, 11 of these after the trochaic caesura, and in the *Odyssey* 8 times out of 29 in this position; the verb \*αἶθω /-ομαι belongs to a type of formation, statives in -θω, which is obsolete in 1st millennium Greek, and in Homer this verb occurs only in participial form. The fact that it has the archaic genitive ending -οιο does not prove that this form entered epic in the 2nd millennium, but this is an entirely reasonable assumption in view of the fact that only once in Homer (X 135) does this participle have the contemporary genitive ending -ου. If one were to conjecture that the comparison of a battle to a blazing fire was a Mycenaean simile, this would not be a supposition without sound linguistic support.

---

<sup>52</sup> *Formation des noms*, 1968, 421

The two commonest 1st millennium terms for “battle, war”, μάχη and π(τ)όλεμος, are attested in Mycenaean personal names and regularly appear together in formulaic contexts in Homer, in the genitive case μάχης ἠδὲ πτολέμοιο (H 232, Λ 255, Ξ 430, Ο 160, etc.), and in the infinitives of their denominative verbs in the formula πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι (B 121, 452, Γ 67, 435, Η 3, Λ 12, Ξ 152). It is impossible to date the juxtaposition of these synonyms unequivocally to the Mycenaean Age, but it is not improbable. The scansion is improved if the uncontracted ending of the active infinitive is restored, giving πολεμίζέ(η)εν, thus permitting the preferred 4th foot dactyl. A similar example of formulaic juxtaposition of infinitives of similar meaning, the first active and the second middle, is to be found in διώκεμεν ἠδὲ φέβεσθαι (E 223, Θ 107). The verb φέβομαι is confined to epic in 1st millennium Greek, occurring in the *Iliad* 9 times at verse-end, and twice in other positions. The unattested active form \*φέβω is older than the denominative φοβέω, based on the noun containing the o-grade of the root, φόβος; the Mycenaean evidence suggests that denominatives of this type were already in use at this date (cf. p. 17), thus the verb \*φέβω was probably obsolete very early in spoken Greek. The T<sub>2</sub> formula διώκεμεν ἠδὲ φέβεσθαι may belong to the Mycenaean Age in its entirety; at the very least, one can confidently state that φέβομαι is an ancient verb confined to epic and traditionally used in one position. It can have entered epic only when it was part of the spoken language, and as it was replaced in general usage by φοβέω /-ομαι, a verb of more recent formation, which is already well represented in Homer, it is likely that it

formed part of the epic vocabulary in the 2nd millennium.<sup>53</sup> Although there is no Mycenaean attestation of medio-passive infinitives, the fact that the present infinitive passive is identical in form to that of the middle shows that this, like the person endings, was not a recent creation, and therefore it would not be an unreasonable inference that -εσθαι was the medio-passive infinitive ending in the Mycenaean Age. While both πολεμίζειν and μάχεσθαι are found in non-epic 1st millennium Greek, φέβεσθαι is known only from epic, and thus there is a high probability that its formula διώκεμεν ἠδὲ φέβεσθαι is to be dated to the Mycenaean Age, perhaps originally as \*φιώκεθεν ἠδὲ φέβεσθαι: the first of these verbs is attested in a Corinthian inscription in the 3rd person singular φιώκει, and in the same inscription is contrasted with φεύγει.<sup>54</sup> The cognate root-noun attested in Homer in the accusative singular ἰώκα (Λ 601) was reconfigured as a 1st declension substantive ἰωκή,<sup>55</sup> glossed by Hesychius as δῶξις. The loss of digamma presumably caused \*φιώκε(η)εν /-εμεν to be replaced by the more familiar διώκεμεν.<sup>56</sup> Thus even if πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι is not of Mycenaean vintage, this type of formula, containing two synonymous infinitives, one active, the other middle, has a very old prototype. A

<sup>53</sup> Hesychius glosses φέβομαι· φοβεῖσθαι, φεύγειν. According to Aristarchus (Apollon. Lex. Hom. 164.8) φόβος in Homer is synonymous with φυγή, But in epic (as Chantraine observes, *DELG* 1183) the domain of φέβεσθαι and φόβος is narrower than that of φυγή, restricted to flight in battle or among animals.

<sup>54</sup> Schwyzter-Cauer, *DGE*, 122.9

<sup>55</sup> Accusative plural ἰωκάς at E 521; the nominative singular is personified at E 740,

ἐν δ' Ἐρις, ἐν δ' Ἀλκή, ἐν δὲ κρυόεσσα Ἴωκή.

<sup>56</sup> διώκω appears to be an extension of δῶ / -ομαι (Risch, *Wortbildung* 279).

comparable construction can be found in φεύγεμεν ἢ μάχεσθαι (K 147, 327), but as this appears in a book containing much “recent” diction, this formula is likely to be based on the two earlier formulae.

The archaeological evidence of artefacts such as the Warrior Vase unearthed by Schliemann and inventories of weapons among the Linear B texts indicates that Mycenaean society was warlike and militaristic. This impression of Mycenaean values is confirmed by some of the names to be found in the Mycenaean texts: e.g. ma-ka-wo = Μαχάφων, po-to-re-ma-ta = \*Ποτολεμάτας (PY Jn 601), a-no-qo-ta = \*’Ανορ<sup>w</sup>hόντας (KN Da 1289, etc.), da-i-qo-ta = \*Δαί<sup>w</sup>hόντας (KN Da 1164), e-u-ru-qo-ta = \*Εύρου<sup>w</sup>hόντας (KN V 147), ra-wo-qo-ta = \*Λαφο<sup>w</sup>hόντας (PY Jn 750). These names indicate a desire that the bearer will distinguish himself in battle, war, the act of slaying men and armies over a wide area.

These names incorporate several synonyms for martial engagement: in addition to μάχα and π(τ)όλεμος, which remained in common use in 1st millennium prose, Mycenaean onomastics shares with epic the substantive δαί, the locative singular of a root-noun \*δάς.<sup>57</sup> Whether this was still part of the spoken language c. 1200 B.C. is impossible to determine, but it must have been used in spoken Greek at some stage in order to become part of the epic vocabulary. In Homer it appears in the dative-locative only, and as a component of the epithet

---

<sup>57</sup> Marcello Durante, “Etimologie greche”, *SMEA* 11, 1970, 44; the same root, with long /a/, appears in the personal name da-i-qo-ta = \*Δα(η)ι<sup>w</sup>hόντας (KN Da 1164).

δοῖκτάμενος (Φ 146, 301); this was probably not created as a compound epithet, but as a phrase consisting of two separate elements, namely δοῖ, the locative of the noun \*δάς, and κτάμενος, an aorist passive participle of archaic type, subsequently understood as a compound epithet in the same way as Διῖφιλος <\*Διφει φίλος. Within the same semantic field, epic also retained in the 1st millennium the obsolete noun \*ὑσμίνς,<sup>58</sup> attested only in the dative-locative singular and accusative plural. ὑσμῖνι μάχεσθαι (verse-end B 863, Θ 56) appears ancient; διὰ / κατὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας at verse-end (B 40, E 200, M 347, etc.) also has a good chance of belonging to Mycenaean epic, as the quantity of the final syllable at verse-end is ambiguous. Simplification of -ανς > -ας would have permitted the reinterpretation of this noun as a 1st declension substantive, and the creation of phrases such as ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὑσμίνῃ (E 712, Λ 468, etc.), κεδασθείσης ὑσμίνης (O 328, Π 306). The fact that this noun was reassigned to the 1st declension indicates that it was obsolete in the spoken language, as otherwise the controlling factor of vernacular usage would have prevented this purely epic innovation (in other words, an artificial form); this is shown also by the fact that even within epic it is completely unproductive with no derivatives at all. Long scansion of the final syllables of διὰ and κατὰ before κρατερὰς is certainly consistent with the prosody of Ionic contemporary with the composition of the *Iliad*, but does not indicate a late date for the creation of these phrases. The Linear B evidence

---

<sup>58</sup> ὑσμῖνι may be connected with Sanskrit *yúdhya*, “fights”. This noun belongs to a very old type of formation, apparently non-productive at a very early date; Risch (*Wortbildung*, 54) compares Σαλαμῖνος, σταμῖνεσσι, ῥηγμῖνες, ἔρμῖνα.

shows that syllabic liquids had developed supporting vowels before the end of the Mycenaean Age, and a word such as \*κρατεράνς would have been felt by the 13th century to begin with two consonants. Thus if a Mycenaean date is indeed correct for the creation of \*διά / κατὰ κρατεράνς ὑσμίνας, bards were obviously taking advantage of developments in the vernacular in order to extend the flexibility of epic language in exactly the same way as their 1st millennium successors were to take advantage of later developments including the loss of digamma and vowel contractions.

A similar reassignment to the 1st declension took place in the case of ἄλκι, the only case-form attested of an obsolete noun whose nominative may be reconstructed as \*ἄλξ, and which means fundamentally “the ability to defend oneself”. ἄλκι is found only in the verse-end formula ἄλκι πεποιθώς (E 299, N 471, P 61, etc.), a phrase with a strong claim to a place in Mycenaean epic: not only is ἄλκι fossilized in this case (cf. the archaic instrumental plural (Ϝ)ἰφι), but πεποιθώς<sup>59</sup> is an archaic type of perfect participle with o-grade of the root<sup>60</sup> and with intransitive sense although active in form, to be contrasted with the later πεπεικώς, with transitive sense and generalized e-grade, based on the present tense. The root seen in ἄλκι is also found in the reduplicated aorist ἄλαλκε (Ψ 185, infinitive ἀλαλκεῖν, T 30) corresponding to the present tense ἀλέκω / ἀλέξω, “to ward off”. The present stem appears in the personal name Ἀλέξανδρος, which is indirectly attested in Mycenaean by the

---

<sup>59</sup> Mycenaean shows an example of a perfect participle with active form used in an intransitive sense in a-ra-ru-ja a-ni-a-pa = \*ἀραρυῖα ἀνίαφι (KN Sd 4401, etc.).

<sup>60</sup> Cf. φοῖδα, δέδφοικα

feminine a-re-ka-sa-da-ra = Ἄλεξάνδρα (MY V 659); this is another personal name which reflects the values of the society in which it was current. The same root appears in Homeric personal names such as Ἄλκηστις (B 715),<sup>61</sup> Ἄλκιμέδων, Ἄλκιμος (probably a hypocoristic of the preceding name). ἄλκι can have entered epic only when it was part of the living language; that this happened at a very early date is suggested by the fact that it is fossilized in a single case in a single formula. The fact that \*ἄλξ was obsolete in the spoken language permitted the creation of a 1st declension noun, ἄλκή, which appears in Homer in the nominative, accusative and genitive singular, and which by analogy with ἄλκι is always situated at verse-end. At what date ἄλκή was created is impossible to say; it is possible that it was already used in the Mycenaean Age, if the personal name a-ka-wo (PY Jo 438, KN X 738) is correctly interpreted as \*Ἀλκώφων.<sup>62</sup> Certainly none of its Homeric uses shows any sign of great antiquity; it forms part of two similes, φλογὶ εἵκελος / -ον ἄλκην (N 330, Σ 154), and σὺν εἵκελος ἄλκην (Δ 253, P 281), neither of which can be of Mycenaean date, as σὺν and φλογὶ have a short dative ending in the 4th foot.

A further epic battle term without attestation in prose and very little representation in poetry outside epic is φύλοπις, usually in the 5th foot in the nominative or accusative singular, accompanied by the adjective

<sup>61</sup> The information given here about Alcestis indicates that her story is of some antiquity.

<sup>62</sup> Ruijgh, "Les noms en -won-", *Minos* 9, 1968, 129. As Ruijgh here observes, however, a-ka-wo may equally well represent \*Ἀχαίφος.

αἰνή; the genitive singular φυλόπιδος occurs 4 times, and an accusative φυλόπιδα once in the *Odyssey*, neither with any formulaic connexions. The accusative φύλοπιν appears to be earlier. The fact that this noun, like ἄλκι and ὕσμῖνι, is confined to poetic language, almost always in the same position in the verse, and without derivatives even in epic, suggests that it was lost from the spoken language very early. Unlike (f)ῖφι and ἄλκι, φύλοπις and \*ὕσμίνς have no representation as Mycenaean name formants. This suggests that they were not commonly used (or understood) by Greek speakers c. 1200 B.C., but must have been in use when they were adopted into the epic vocabulary. Therefore these must be very ancient words, obsolete in the spoken language before the end of the Mycenaean Age, and owing their survival to the epic tradition. The presence in epic of a series of synonyms pertaining to warfare and violence, and retention of otherwise obsolete lexical items belonging to this semantic field, indicates that these topics were of considerable significance in the epic tradition at a very early date.

In some instances, although all the elements of a formula are entirely comprehensible, the formation of a word can indicate that the formula is ancient. One such formula is μάχην ἐς κυδιάνειραν (Δ 225, Μ 325; with ἀνά in place of ἐς, Ν 270, Ξ 155; εἰς ἀγορὴν πωλέσκετο κυδιάνειραν Α 490 is shown to be late by the iterative verb in -σκ-<sup>63</sup>). The epithet κυδιάνειρα appears only at verse-end, and with the exception of

---

<sup>63</sup> Wathelet, "Études de linguistique homérique. Les itératifs en -(e)sk-" *AC* 42, 1973, 379-

ἀγορή at A 490 is used only of μάχη. This T<sub>2</sub> formula probably belongs to the Mycenaean Age: μάχα, as discussed, is guaranteed for the Mycenaean Age as it appears as a name-formant and remained a part of the quotidian vocabulary of the 1st millennium. κυδιάνειρα, which clearly signifies “bringing glory to men” is a compound of a very ancient type, containing κυδι-, the Caland form of the neuter s-stem κύδος, a type of compound formant which goes back to Indo-European.<sup>64</sup> Other such compounds in Greek based on s-stem neuters include Οιδίπους: οἶδος, “swelling”, and several compounds containing καλλι-: κάλλος, e.g. καλλιρροος, καλλίτριχες (always plural), καλλιπάρης, καλλίσφυρος. This type of formation is no longer productive in 1st millennium Greek, and all such compounds in Greek belong to poetic language. κυδιάνειρα, containing the full-grade of the stem of ἀνήρ, was clearly created before the generalization of /d/ from the zero-grade forms throughout the paradigm. On the evidence of Mycenaean a-re-ka-sa-da-ra = Ἀλεξάνδρα and a-di-ri-a-pi = \*ἀνδριάμφι (PY Ta 708.2), this had taken place some time before 1200 B.C. The formula under consideration can confidently be assigned to the Mycenaean Age, not only because it contains a noun which is known to have belonged to the vocabulary of the late 2nd millennium (μάχη < μάχα) and an epithet of an ancient type which is no longer productive in the 1st millennium, but also because its meaning “battle which brings glory to men” is entirely consistent with what is known about the values of the Mycenaean aristocracy from their onomastic preferences and their pictorial art.

---

<sup>64</sup> Palmer, *The Greek Language*, 98

## Seafaring

Ships and the sea are of considerable significance in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and it is hard to imagine that they were of less importance in 2nd millennium epic. The evidence of Mycenaean personal names indicates that ships and seafaring were held in high esteem. That the sea has a long history as a subject of epic is indicated by the fact that it has four names in Homer: θάλασσα, πόντος, ἄλς and πέλαγος. The first three all have traditional noun + epithet formulae, and there is every reason to believe several of these to be of considerable antiquity: πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης (8 times) and ἄλς ἀτρυγέτοιο (7 times)<sup>65</sup> are not only confined to traditional positions at verse-end, a regular position for archaisms, but both contain glosses in πολυφλοίσβοιο and ἀτρυγέτοιο, whose meanings were no longer understood by the time when the Homeric epics were composed (as they are not used with other nouns) and thus were completely unproductive both within epic itself and in later Greek. Likewise another maritime verse-end formula εἰς ἅλα δῖαν is clearly old: this formula may have been created when *h<\**s still had consonantal force, viz. \*ἐν ἡάλα δῖγαν, appearing in Homer with little more than phonological changes. εἰς is a post-Mycenaean innovation: in 2nd millennium Greek, ἐν with the accusative case denoted motion into (=

---

<sup>65</sup> The fact that both of these expressions contain the archaic genitive ending -οιο does not in itself guarantee great antiquity, as this desinence was available to bards composing at all stages of the tradition. ἀτρυγέτοιο occurs only with words for “sea”, except at P 425, αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτοιο, whose isolation indicates late composition.

Latin *in* + accusative). The creation of ἐνς in this function, while the original ἐν continued to be used with the dative-locative, is one of the innovations common to Att-Ion. and Doric, post-dating the Dorian invasion (v. p. 114). This formula indicates that the sea was already of significance in Mycenaean epic, unsurprisingly, as the adventures of Jason and the Argonauts, in which ships and the sea figure largely, and elements of which are to be found in the *Odyssey* (e.g. Circe, Alcinous, Arete) are likely to have Mycenaean origins. Jason was the rightful heir to Iolcus, a site of great importance in the Mycenaean Age.<sup>66</sup>

The antiquity of the formula εἰς ἄλλα δῖαν is also indicated by the obscure nature of the epithet δῖαν. δῖος < \*δίφυγος is the adjective created from the stem of Ζεύς, namely \*διϕ- (cf. Latin *diem*). Often used as an epithet of heroes (e.g. δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς), δῖος < \*δίφυγος appears to have been understood as “shining, illustrious” by the time of the *Iliad* poet, as φαίδιμ’ Ἀχιλλεῦ / Ὀδυσσεῦ is the vocative corresponding to the nominative δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς / Ὀδυσσεύς. This adjective is of the same type of construction as patronymic adjectives such as Νηληϊῖος < \*Νεηελάφιος, and by the time of the Mycenaean tablets, where it appears in the forms di-u-ja (PY Cn 1287), di-wi-a (KN Xd 97, PY An 607) and di-u-jo (PY Tn 316), it would have been understood as “belonging to, descendant of, Zeus”; the inherited type of adjectives in -ιος by c. 1200 B.C. was productive only in adjectives derived from proper names. This does not,

---

<sup>66</sup> Iolcus occurs in Homer only at verse-end in its uncontracted form Ἰωωλκόν (B 712), Ἰωωλκῶ (λ 256). This suggests that it was known in epic before the migrations.

however, explain the significance of the epithet in connexion with the sea. As Zeus is a sky-god, the epithet is likely to have meant in origin “connected with brightness; bright, shining”, a sense which, because more fundamental, is older than that expressing a divine relationship.<sup>67</sup> The more basic meaning, “shining” is the one to be found in the formula εἰς ἄλα δῖαν.

The noun ἄλας is indirectly attested in Mycenaean in the compound o-pi-a<sub>2</sub>-ra = \*ὀπίθαλα (PY An 657.11), “coastal regions”. Since both the noun and the epithet of this formula are known from Mycenaean, where the sense of the epithet is more recent than that found in the Homeric formula, it is entirely reasonable to conclude that this formula existed in Mycenaean times. For initial consonantal /h/, one can compare ὑπεῖρ ἄλα, εἰνάλιος, εἰν ἄλί, where the lengthened vowel of the prepositional element may represent a lengthening in compensation for a lost /h/, permitting the metrical structure of the verse to be retained. In 1st millennium Greek outside epic, ἄλας signifies not “sea” but “salt”; only in compounds does it refer to the sea, e.g. πάραλος. As a feminine noun referring to the sea, ἄλας is confined to poetic language, but must have belonged to the spoken language when it entered the epic vocabulary. In Homer, ἄλας is used mostly of inland waters,<sup>68</sup> while πόντος refers to the deep sea<sup>69</sup>: the Homeric use of ἄλας therefore corresponds to that found in Mycenaean \*ὀπίθαλα.

<sup>67</sup> Durante, *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca*, 101 .

<sup>68</sup> E.g. in the context of launching a ship, ἔλκεμεν εἰς ἄλα δῖαν (B 152, etc.).

<sup>69</sup> As observed by D.F. Gray, “Homeric epithets for things”, *CQ* 41, 1947, 112

πόντος too is an old word (cognate with πάτος, Latin *pons*),<sup>70</sup> which in 1st millennium Greek is confined to poetic language except when referring to a particular sea, e.g. πόντος εὐξεινος (Herodotus 1.6), but it could have entered epic only when it was a part of the spoken language, thus the distinction between ἄλς and πόντος was made very early in spoken Greek. πόντος likewise seems to have indirect attestation in Mycenaean in the personal name po-te-u = Ποντεύς (PY An 519, Cn 45), a name which is also bestowed on one of the Phaeacians at θ 113. It is almost certain that several of the names in this passage, in particular those based on the names of parts of ships, e.g. Ἐλατρεύς (111), Πρυμνεύς, Ἐρετμεύς (112), are the creation of the *Odyssey* poet, but the presence of such names as Ποντεύς and Ἀμφιάλος (114), which appears in Mycenaean in the form a-pi-a<sub>2</sub>-ro (PY An 192, etc.), suggests that the poet was here elaborating on a traditional stock of names connected with the sea. The element \*ναφ- is to be found in a few Mycenaean personal names: na-wi-ro (KN Db 1507), possibly to be interpreted as \*Ναφίλος, na-u-si-ke-re-we = \*Ναφσικλέφης (KN Xd 214; cf. Ναυσικλής), o-ku-na-wo = Ὠκύναφος (KN V 60), o-ti-na-wo = Ὀρτίναφος (PY Cn 285), e-u-na-wo = \*Ἐ(h)ύναφος (KN As 1520, B 799, Dr 1206). The last cited name is identical with Homeric Εὔνηος (H 68). In Mycenaean these are *Wunschnamen*, bestowed in the hope that the recipient of the name would possess the qualities it indicated: in the cases of \*Ἐ(h)ύναφος and \*Ὠκύναφος, the wish was implicit that the bearers would be the possessors of many or swift ships respectively.

<sup>70</sup> Chantraine explains πόντος as “l’élément qu’on traverse” (*DELG*, 873, s.v. πέλαγος)

Formulaic usages of πόντος are well established in Homer, e.g. ἐπὶ (φ)οἴνοπα πόντον (5 times *Il.*, 6 times *Od.*), ἐνὶ (φ)οἴνοπι πόντῳ (once in the *Iliad*, 6 times *Od.*). The epithet οἴνοπα /-ι appears in Homer only in the accusative and dative-locative singular except in a simile at N 703, βόε οἴνοπε, where the dual is a false archaism. The nominative is known only from Mycenaean in the form wo-no-qo-so = \*φοἴνοq<sup>w</sup>ς (KN Ch 897, Ch 1015) as a proper name for an ox, presumably referring to the animal's colour. As the epithet is clearly attested in Mycenaean, and the noun πόντος is clearly part of the Indo-European heritage, with a distinct significance in Greek which appears to belong to the 2nd millennium, there is every likelihood that the formula ἐπὶ (φ)οἴνοπα πόντον was a component of Mycenaean epic. Nor is it improbable that the dative-locative variant, ἐνὶ (φ)οἴνοπι πόντῳ, was also to be found in the epic poetry of this era. The fact that this variant is more frequent in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad* certainly does not indicate that it is of recent creation: 4 of its *Odyssey* occurrences are in connexion with storms and shipwrecks (ε 132, η 250, μ 388, τ 274), a subject which is absent from the *Iliad*. The bisyllabic form of the preposition, ἐνὶ for ἐν, is certainly a poetic form used for metrical convenience, of the same metrical pattern as ἐπί, and thus it is reasonable to assume that the dative-locative formula is based on the accusative version. However, this does not imply that ἐνὶ is a recent innovation within epic language, as Mycenaean attests the form e-ni-qe = \*ἐνὶ q<sup>w</sup>ε (KN L 595, etc.), probably equivalent to \*ἐνεστί τε.<sup>71</sup> Prefixed with μέσῳ (as at ε 132, η 250, μ 388, τ 274), the expression ἐνὶ (φ)οἴνοπι

<sup>71</sup> *Documents*, 543; Ruijgh, *Études*, 328

πόντω forms a T<sub>2</sub> hemistich, and this seems likely to be the form in which it originally appeared. There is no difficulty in ascribing μέσῳ to the Mycenaean Age, as it seems that the predecessors of Att-Ion. and AC had already simplified the sequence -σσ- resulting from homomorphic \**-ty-* and \**-θy-* in the late 2nd millennium.

ἄλς and πόντος are of Indo-European heritage; πέλαγος, the least frequently occurring, lacks formulaic connexions, but also seems to part of the inherited Indo-European vocabulary, from a root \**pelH<sub>2</sub>-*, which expresses the idea “flat, outstretched”, and may also appear in παλάμη, παλαστή.<sup>72</sup> θάλασσα, which is probably a borrowing from an unknown Mediterranean language, shows much formulaic usage, occurring almost always at verse-end. It appears to be a general word for “sea”, whether inshore waters or deep sea. Despite lacking an obvious Indo-European etymology, it appears to have a long history in Greek,<sup>73</sup> and certainly belongs to some epic formulae of old appearance, e.g. ἐπὶ / παρὰ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης, a T<sub>2</sub> phrase containing the dative-locative singular of a noun whose nominative is found only in Hesychius, and whose meaning is apparently “the place where the waves break”, thus is to be associated with ῥήγνυμι. If this etymology is correct, initial digamma is to be restored, which explains the long final vowels of ἐπὶ and παρὰ. It is no

<sup>72</sup> Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, 873, s.v. πέλαγος

<sup>73</sup> Hesychius glosses δαλάγχχαν· θάλασσα, which is presumed to be Macedonian.

Hesychius' gloss, however, is of no help in determining the source of this probable loanword, as Macedonian is almost certainly a variety of Greek with affinities to the North-West dialects. (Olivier Masson, *OCD* 3, “Macedonian Language”).

surprise that this formula should have been created before the loss of digamma, which took place at a fairly late stage in the development of the epic tradition, and therefore the erstwhile presence of digamma is no indication that a formula belongs to the 2nd millennium. Yet this formula stands a strong chance of belonging to epic in the Mycenaean Age: the noun has no prose attestations until fairly late,<sup>74</sup> and in epic is found only in the dative singular followed by θαλάσσης (with one appearance in the accusative singular at μ 214, ἄλὸς ῥηγμῖνα βαθεῖαν, and one in the genitive at Y 220,... ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνος ἄλὸς πολιοῖο θέεσκον); with the exception of Y 220, where the iterative verb θέεσκον indicates late composition, this noun is confined to a single position in the verse, in the 4th and 5th feet. ῥηγμῖνι is a locative (its final -ι is short), and thus it cannot be argued that it can only be a dative of post-Mycenaean creation. This noun contains the same suffix as ὑσμῖνι, another noun which is isolated in epic, belonging to a type of formation which is not found in 1st millennium prose: formulaic usage, lack of derivatives even within epic and restriction to a single position in the verse suggest that this noun fell out of use at a very early date, and it is not unlikely that this happened in the 2nd millennium.

Ships play a significant rôle in the Homeric poems, and νηῦς and its case-forms have many formulaic connexions. Obviously post-Mycenaean are late forms which presuppose the characteristics of the mature Ionic dialect, e.g. νέες ἐστιχώωντο (B 516, 602, 680, 733), which can have

---

<sup>74</sup> Aristotle, *Meteorologica*, 367<sup>b</sup>, 14, 19

been created only after fronting of /ā/, loss of digamma and antevocalic shortening had changed \*νῶρες to νέες via the stages \*νήρες and νήες, and after vowel contractions had changed \*ἔστιχάοντο to \*ἔστιχῶντο, the contracted form here artificially re-extended by means of diectasis. Also to be excluded from any tally of Mycenaean epic forms pertaining to ships is the artificial νέεσσι (verse-end Γ 46, 444, Ξ 51), which combines the Ionic stem νε- with the Aeolic dative plural ending -εσσι; νήεσσι, on the other hand (22 times *Il.*, 8 times *Od.*, all before the trochaic caesura), has a very strong chance of belonging to Mycenaean epic, representing older \*νῶρεσσι with only superficial changes of a phonetic nature, viz. /ā/ > /ē/ and loss of /w/. νέεσσι is used to modify old formulae: for example, ἐν ποντοπόροισι νέεσσι provides a dative plural variant of ποντοπόρος νῆυς (μ 69, ν 95, 161, ξ 339).

The genitive plural νηῶν, representing Common Greek \*ναφῶν, has 70 occurrences in the *Iliad*, 24 at verse-end. The Ionic form νεῶν appears 40 times in the *Iliad*, 7 times in the formula νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων. Forms in νε- are often associated with the huts of the Achaean camp, which suggests that the attack on the huts was a novel idea<sup>75</sup>: the “recent” stem νε- is also associated with κλισίαι in κλισίας τε νέας τε (A 487, Ξ 392) and κλισίησι μιγήμεναι οὐδὲ νέεσσιν (O 409). This explains why, although the language of the *Odyssey* is in general more “modern” than that of the *Iliad*, νέεσσιν appears only once in the *Odyssey* (ξ 230), and νεῶν only twice (ζ 271, μ 67): ships in the *Iliad* are for the

<sup>75</sup> Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary* vol. IV, 273

most part beached by the Achaean camp, while seafaring is an integral part of the narrative of the *Odyssey*. In this respect, the language of the *Odyssey* is more traditional than that of the *Iliad*. Most Homeric uses of case-forms of νῆυσ are based on the stem νη-, representing Common Greek \*ναϝ- with only phonological changes. There is a plethora of ship formulae which include the old Ionic stem (νη-), and these can be restored without metrical disruption to the forms they would have had in the Mycenaean Age, e.g. θοῶς ἐπὶ νῆας (15 times *Il.*), νῆα μέλαιναν (16 times *Od.*, twice *Il.*), κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας (13 times *Il.*, once *Od.*), νῆας ἐπὶ γλαφυράς (18 times *Il.*). That these formulae are of some antiquity within the epic tradition is evident from the fact that they regularly occur in the same verse-position. κοίλης / κοίλας can almost always be restored to \*κοφίλας / \*κοφίλανς, but this proves only that the formulae in question were created before the loss of intervocalic /w/, a fairly late development. It is virtually impossible to assign a date to the creation of ship formulae, as (with the exception of modifications based on the Ionic stem νε-) they scan equally well in both their Homeric and their putative Mycenaean forms. Thus such ship formulae as \*ἐν ναϝὶ μελάνγαι<sup>76</sup> > ἐν νηῖ μελαίνῃ, \*νᾶϝας ἐπὶ γλαφυράνς > νῆας ἐπὶ γλαφυράς, \*ναϝσὶν<sup>77</sup> ἐπὶ γλαφυράσι > νηυσὶν ἐπὶ γλαφυρήσι have every chance of being Mycenaean epic

---

<sup>76</sup> The Mycenaean texts provide no evidence for the development of the sequence \*νη c.1200 B.C.

<sup>77</sup> I do not accept that epheleystic ν was not available as a hiatus-blocking device at all stages of the tradition. What was innovative in the later stages of the tradition was its use to make position.

formulae which underwent changes only in pronunciation without creating metrical anomalies, and which contain no morphological peculiarities which might date them to the 2nd millennium. Yet it would be surprising if ships had not been significant in 2nd millennium epic, particularly in view of the formulae connected with the sea which, as already discussed, seem to have originated at this time. In the same way as warfare, shown by the archaeological evidence to have been a favoured pursuit among Mycenaeans, is a major topic in the epic poetry that has reached us, and is a preoccupation reflected in Mycenaean personal names, so is seafaring shown by the archaeological evidence to have been held in considerable esteem by Mycenaeans. The Linear B documents refer to na-u-do-mo = \*ναυδόμοι “shipbuilders” (PY Na 568, Vn 865, KN U 736; a term replaced in 1st millennium Greek by ναυπηγός), and to e-re-ta = ἐρέται, notably in the famous Pylos tablet An 1: e-re-ta pe-re-u-ro-na-de i-jo-te = ἐρέται Πλευρώναδε Ἴοντες.

Ships were clearly important to the influential sections of Mycenaean society: this can be inferred both from the archaeological evidence and from Mycenaean onomastics (v. p. 229). This alone makes it highly probable that the epic poetry of this time included formulae for ships. Certain epithets found in Homer in connexion with ships are known from Mycenaean as components of personal names (ὠκύς, θοφός), but are not used in 1st millennium prose. These adjectives can only have entered the epic vocabulary when they were commonly understood in the spoken language, and the evidence of Mycenaean names suggests that formulae

such as νῆα θοῆν <\*νᾶφα θοφάν, ὠκύαλος νηῦς <\*ὠκύαλος νάφς may have belonged to epic at that time. It is admittedly impossible to locate the creation of these formulae unequivocally in the Mycenaean Age, since there is no evidence to indicate when ὠκύς or θοφός disappeared from the spoken language, and there are no prosodical or morphological traits which imply so early a date for the origins of these formulae. However, as it seems improbable that the sub-Mycenaean period saw a great deal of maritime adventure, there is at least a possibility that these ship-formulae belong to the Mycenaean Age.

## Military Equipment

### Weaponry

Parallels are clearly to be found between the equipment of the Homeric warrior and, on the one hand, the evidence of Mycenaean art and archaeological finds from Mycenaean burials, on the other, Linear B inventories of weapons and armour. Weapons were obviously greatly valued by Mycenaean: names of weapons are found as components of their personal names, e.g. a-ko-te-u = Ἄκοντεύς (from ἄκων), e-ke-i-jo-jo = \*Ἐγγε(ἠ)λοιο, genitive (ἔγγος), qe-re-me-ne-u = \*Γῶελεμνεύς (\*γῶέλεμνον > βέλεμνον).<sup>78</sup> Homeric references to weapons and armour,

<sup>78</sup> P. Hr. Ilievski, "Some Structural Peculiarities of Mycenaean Greek Personal Names",

sometimes using linguistic features which were obsolete in 1st millennium Greek, raise the question whether any of the language related to this topic represents a survival from the Mycenaean Age.

## Shields

As previously discussed (p. 106), σάκος, cognate with Sanskrit *tvacas*, “hide”, and Hittite *tuekkas*, “body”, denotes the whole body shield which was in use in the 16th and 15th centuries B.C. Although sometimes used in Homer synonymously with the contemporary word ἄσπίς, its basic meaning is “hide”, and it came very early to denote a shield made from this material; by the date of the Mycenaean texts, \*τράκος appears to have lost this basic meaning, which is denoted in the tablets by *wi-ri-no* = \*φρίνος. Although there is no mention in the Mycenaean texts of shields, either ἄσπίδες or \*τράκελα, they are depicted in Mycenaean art (e.g. the Warrior Vase); ἄσπίς is clearly old within epic, viz. ἄσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης, which scans best when restored to a form which antedates the state of language contemporary with the extant Mycenaean texts (v. p. 106). This epithet occurs with no other noun, and is always in the same position, forming a P<sub>1</sub> hemistich (both factors implying antiquity), except at Λ 32.

ἄσπίς has no known etymology, but its formulaic usage clearly indicates that it is ancient within epic; it is most likely to be a loanword adopted at a very early date from an unknown language spoken in the

Balkan peninsula before the arrival of Greek speakers.<sup>79</sup> Although a loanword, ἄσπις appears from the evidence of the epic tradition to be as old in Greek as the vocalization of sonants, and to have been used as an alternative to \*τράκος from the earliest stages of the tradition: \*τράκεhos, forming a tribrach, is inadmissible in the dactylic verse, at any rate before an initial vowel, and thus the genitive case was supplied by ἄσπις.

The tower-shield is a cultural element which could have entered epic only when it was in contemporary use or had been used within living memory. The noun \*τράκος seems no longer to have been part of everyday vocabulary by the end of the Mycenaean Age, retained only as an epic archaism. Although the Mycenaean documents contain no reference to shields, the form \*τράκος is guaranteed for the Mycenaean Age by the existence of the Linear B syllabograms which are transcribed as *twe* and *two*. These indicate that the sequence \*tw- remained unaltered in Mycenaean. Subsequently \*tw- developed to σ- initially and -σσ- in intervocalic position, thus φερεσσάκεας (*Aspis* 13) is likely to have originated in the Mycenaean Age in the form \*φερετράκεhas. The formulaic phrase μέσον σάκος (H 258, N 646, O 528, etc.), running from the trochaic caesura to the bucolic diaeresis, may be of Mycenaean vintage, representing \*μέσον τράκος, as the scansion is unaffected by simplification of the sequence \*τφ-; μέσος < μέσσος with simplification in some dialects of the result of homomorphic \*θγ (v. p. 21) is probably to be dated to the Mycenaean period. Another possible candidate for creation

<sup>79</sup> Ruijgh, "Problèmes de philologie mycénienne", *Minos* 19, 1985 108

in the Mycenaean Age is δεινὸν σάκος ἑπταβόειον (H 245, 266; δεινός, like μέγας, is never used with ἄσπίς), in the form \*δφεινὸν τράκος ἑπταβόειον: this formula can plausibly be ascribed to the Mycenaean Age after *h*<\*s had lost consonantal force, as the final syllable of σάκος is not lengthened. In this putative Mycenaean form, the quantity of the second syllable of δεινόν is unaffected if \*τράκος is restored; in both of its occurrences this P<sub>2</sub> formula is preceded by Αἴαντος, whose final syllable likewise is unaffected if digamma is restored to \*δφεινόν.

### Swords

The noun ξίφος is attested in Mycenaean in the nominative / accusative dual qi-si-pe-e = \*q<sup>w</sup>σίφεhe (PY Ta 716), but the fact that Homer and Mycenaean coincide in some points of vocabulary relating to weaponry cannot be taken as evidence that such artefacts were part of the epic poetry contemporary with the Linear B texts. However, formulaic usage suggests that ξίφος is at least old within epic: the formula ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον has 7 occurrences in the *Iliad*, all at verse-end, and 4 in the *Odyssey* in the same position. ξίφος is still in widespread use in classical Greek, but its synonym φάσγανον, known both from Homer and from Mycenaean, where it appears in the plural pa-ka-na (KN Ra 1540, etc.), survived in the Classical Age only in Cypriot, according to the γλώσσαι κατὰ πόλεις.<sup>80</sup> The fact that this noun is obsolete in the dialects

<sup>80</sup> Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen*, 89

likely to have influenced epic at the time of composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as well as its formulaic usage in the phrase φάσγανον ὄξυ indicates that it is old within epic. However, a Mycenaean date for the creation of φάσγανον ὄξυ cannot be claimed with certainty, as it is possible that φάσγανον may have survived for some time in dialects other than Cypriot after the end of the Mycenaean Age. Yet the fact that φάσγανον is fossilized within epic, having no derivatives and being of highly formulaic usage, suggests that this word had fallen out of use in the spoken language at a remote date, and as its Linear B ideogram differs from that pertaining to ξίφος, it is a not unreasonable conjecture that φάσγανον in the late 2nd millennium denoted a type of weapon whose manufacture ceased soon after the end of the Mycenaean Age, with the result that its name was lost in the spoken language, Cypriot excluded. Thus it seems highly likely that both ξίφος and φάσγανον formed part of the epic vocabulary c. 1200 B.C. The fact that they denoted different types of weapons, on the evidence of the Linear B ideograms, is of little relevance for epic language: bards would have used either word for a bladed weapon as metrically required, thus ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον denoted such a weapon after the hephthemimeral caesura, and φάσγανον ὄξυ in the final two feet. The Shaft Graves at Mycenae yielded rivets with silver-plated heads for attaching the handles of swords or knives.<sup>81</sup> Gold-plated rivets occur more frequently, and as late as the end of LH II, but Homeric swords are silver-rather than gold studded because \*χρυσόφαλον > \*χρυσόηλον is not metrically suitable for this verse-end formula.

---

<sup>81</sup> Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments*, 273

It appears that φάσγανον and ξίφος were weapons in contemporary use which were represented in epic at the end of the Mycenaean Age. Epic uses an additional term for “sword” which has no attestation in Mycenaean, namely ἄορ, of dubious etymology, but usually associated with ἀείρω. ἄορ may have attestation in Mycenaean in the locative case as a component of the personal name a-o-ri-me-ne = \*’A(h)οριμένης, “whose μένος is in his ἄορ” (PY Qa 1296). If the conventional etymology were to be accepted, one would expect the Mycenaean spelling of this name to be \*a-wo-ri-me-ne. Ruijgh, however, proposes an alternative etymology,<sup>82</sup> deriving ἄορ < \*ἦσϛ (cf. Latin *ensis*), and points out that the original meaning of this term may have been “weapon” in general,<sup>83</sup> rather than “sword” in particular. Thus it is not improbable, as Ruijgh further observes, that this was the significance of ἄορ in the early stages of the epic tradition, which explains Apollo’s title χρυσάωρ: this god is usually perceived as wielding a silver bow (ἀργυρότοξος), but his weapon may have become golden in this epithet for metrical convenience in the reverse process to that which made the gold-plated studs uncovered by archaeology the silver studs of the epic ξίφος / φάσγανον ἀργυρόηλον.

---

<sup>82</sup> “Problèmes de philologie mycénienne”, *Minos* 19, 1985, 154

<sup>83</sup> Cf. the T Scholiast on Ξ 385: Ἄρκάδες καὶ Αἰτωλοὶ πᾶν ὄπλον ἄορ καλοῦσιν.

## Helmets

Homer uses several terms to denote a warrior's headgear, the commonest of which, κόρυς, is attested in Mycenaean, so was obviously a word of common currency in the spoken language contemporary with the extant tablets; however, at some stage between the Mycenaean Age and the Classical Age, this word was replaced in common usage by κρόνος, becoming a poetic relic. The presence of this common Mycenaean noun in Homer does not indicate that it indisputably entered epic in the Mycenaean Age, as there is no evidence to suggest when it may have disappeared from spoken Greek. Yet there is good reason to believe that helmets, like other pieces of military equipment, provided some of the material of Mycenaean epic. Also apparently ancient, although without Mycenaean attestation, is τρυφάλεια, a compound of the zero-grade of \*q<sup>w</sup>tʰ- (\*q<sup>w</sup>- is lost in composition), and φάλος, a noun denoting part of a helmet; the element τρυ- has no other attestation in known Greek, and for this reason alone the compound seems ancient.<sup>84</sup> τρυφάλεια appears to be the feminine of an adjective in -ης; when it is used with ἀλώπις (N 530, Π 795)<sup>85</sup> it is

---

<sup>84</sup> Durante, *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca*, 73

<sup>85</sup> The Homeric adjective seems to indicate that the helmet had a tube for carrying a plume. The basic meaning of ἀλώς is "tube"; in the Mycenaean texts it is used in connexion with chariots, apparently indicating part of a chariot pole (Plath, *Der Streitwagen und seine Teile*, 406). Certainly the fact that ἀλώπις occurs only with τρυφάλεια suggests that it is of considerable antiquity.

uncertain whether it is used as a substantive or as an adjective. Chantraine<sup>86</sup> takes it as a substantive on the basis of its other Homeric attestations (Γ 376, Κ 76, Σ 458, etc.), but it is probably best understood as a substantivized adjective (cf. \**ἰκκῶν* *φοχά*, p. 248), and Bechtel,<sup>87</sup> comparing Τ 380-1, *τρυφάλειαν ἀείρας...βριαρήν* and Χ 314-5, *κόρυθι...τετραφάλῳ*, correctly concluded that *τρυφάλεια* is equivalent to *κόρυς τετράφαλος*, “helmet with four *φάλοι*”. *φάλοι* appear to be horns or other projections from the helmet, but there is an element of confusion with *φάλαρρον* (plural at Π 106, a *hapax* in Homer), “metal plate”. The adjective *τετραφάληρον* (Ε 743, Λ 41) is not equivalent to *τρυφάλεια*.<sup>88</sup>

At Δ 424, the denominative verb *κορύσσεται* is used in a simile referring to a wave; this is a recent and innovative use of a verb which apparently belongs to ancient epic stock. It would seem that the basic meaning of *κορύσσομαι* < \**κορύθ-γομαι* is “arm (oneself) with a helmet”, but in many Homeric examples this meaning has been superseded. In the simile at Δ 422ff., *κορύσσεται* seems to be synonymous with *κορυφούται*. The fundamental meaning of *κορύσσομαι* is unequivocally required in none of its Homeric occurrences, although it is possible that the original sense can be detected in *κορύσσετο νόροπι χαλκῷ* at Η 206 (of Aias) and Π 130 (of Patroclus). *νόροπι χαλκῷ* is itself of ancient appearance: the fact that bronze, not iron, is the metal used for weapons in Homer is not in

---

<sup>86</sup> DELG, 1141.

<sup>87</sup> *Lexilogus zu Homer*, 319

<sup>88</sup> Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments*, 242

itself evidence that such phrases date from the Bronze Age, as memories may have persisted for a considerable time that bronze was previously the material from which such items were made. However, the fact that χαλκῶ occurs in a formulaic phrase in habitual verse-end position accompanied by the obscure epithet νόροπι<sup>89</sup> suggests that this is a very old phrase.

The perfect participle of κορύσσομαι, κεκορυθμένος (-α, -οι, -ον), occurs 11 times in Homer, always after the penthemimeral caesura., and most often appears in the masculine singular in the formulaic verse βῆ δὲ διὰ προμάχων, κεκορυθμένος αἴθοπι χαλκῶ (7 times *Il.*). κεκορυθμένος itself is shown by the sequence -θμ- not to belong to the spoken language contemporary with the *Iliad* poet. In 1st millennium Greek, dental stops are retained before nasals (e.g. ἀτμός) except when the final dental of a verb stem is replaced by -σ- before a suffix with initial μ-, e.g. πέπυσμαι for \*πέπυθμαι, πεπεισμένος for \*πεπειθμένος. Dental stops are retained intact in this position in Mycenaean, c.f. pe-pi-te-me-no-jo = \*Φεφιθμένοιο (genitive of a personal name, TH Ug 1).<sup>90</sup> κεκορυθμένος,

<sup>89</sup> Hesychius glosses νόροπι· λαμπρός, ὀξύφωνος, ἔνηχος, ἢ ὅτι τὴν ὄψιν ἀσθενῆ ποιεῖ. The word does not seem to have been understood in antiquity (it is already unproductive in Homer), but λαμπρός seems to have been accepted as a vague synonym.

<sup>90</sup> Ruijgh, *Études*, 47-8. A comparable change took place in the case of velar and labial stops in 1st millennium Greek. Velar stops are retained before nasals, e.g. ἀκμή, but the final velar of a verb stem is almost always replaced by -γ- before suffixes which begin with μ-, thus μεμορυγμένος; but cf. the *varia lectio* μεμορυχμένα at v 435, which may be preferable depending on the antiquity within epic of the verb μορύσσω <\*μορύχ-γω, which has cultic connexions with Dionysus.

however, was not affected by this change. Like all non-artificial components of epic language, the verb \*κορύσσω <\*κορύθ-γω could have entered epic only when it was a part of the living language, and the fact that its primary meaning can be detected in only an exiguous number of its occurrences suggests that, by the date of composition of the *Iliad*, the verb had been confined to epic for a long time. There are three reasons to suspect that the participle κεκορυθμένος entered epic language in the Mycenaean Age: κόρυς (and its denominative verb \*κορύσσω) are obsolete in 1st millennium non-epic Greek, while the Mycenaean evidence shows that the noun was a familiar part of contemporary speech; the sequence -θμ- is not tolerated in normal usage of the 1st millennium; κεκορυθμένος forms a P<sub>2</sub> sequence with αἶθοπι χαλκῶ, whose adjective, also used as an attribute of wine, appears only in the dative (instrumental) and accusative in the 5th foot, except at Λ 775; it has no known derivatives and thus was restricted at an early stage to a couple of fixed phrases. By itself none of these arguments is conclusive, as there is no evidence concerning the date at which κόρυς and its denominative verb, or the sequence -θμ- in the perfect participle passive, became obsolete in everyday language, but taken together they provide convincing grounds for believing that the formula in question is an epic survival from the Mycenaean Age. This formula is almost certainly the oldest known epic use of κεκορυθμένος; it is used metaphorically in the phrase δοῦρε δύω κεκορυθμένα χαλκῶ (Γ 18, Λ 43), where the neuter plural participle qualifying a dual suggests late composition.

## Chariots and Horses

The Pylos and Knossos tablets indicate the presence of large numbers of chariots at these sites, and Homer refers repeatedly to chariots in battle and in the *Odyssey* as Telemachus' means of conveyance from Pylos to Sparta. Not only do the Linear B tablets provide evidence for chariots; there are also pictorial representations of chariots in Mycenaean art. It would therefore be reasonable to expect that some at least of the Homeric chariot formulae are of Mycenaean vintage.

In order to ascertain which Homeric chariot formulae belong to the Mycenaean Age, it is essential to determine: 1) how chariots were used in the Bronze Age; 2) what terms Mycenaeans used for chariots. In connexion with the first question, it has been claimed that Homeric descriptions of the chariot used as a "taxi service" to convey élite warriors to and from the battle-field, the armed warrior dismounting to fight while the driver remains in the chariot and keeps the horses in readiness behind the front, represents a garbled memory of actual Mycenaean practice.<sup>91</sup> Such a use for chariots in the Mycenaean Age, as well as a means of conveying the wounded to safety, is not implausible. The general rule in Mycenaean times seems to have been to arrive by chariot and dismount, reflected in the old formula ἀφ' ἵππων

---

<sup>91</sup> E.g. Kirk, *Homer and the Oral Tradition*, 37: "The odd conception of the use of chariots that permeates the *Iliad* ... may represent a Dark Age perversion of a Mycenaean tradition..."; *op.cit.*, 66: "misunderstanding of...the use of chariots in war."

ἄλτο χαμᾶζε, and to fight on foot.<sup>92</sup> From this period may also date ὄπισθε μάχης ἠδὲ πτολέμοιο (N 536, Ξ 430), of horses waiting with their driver behind the lines; this describes Mycenaean practice in language which scans perfectly in both its Ionic and Mycenaean forms. In fact, there is every reason to believe that the Homeric use of chariots is in general an accurate representation of their use in Mycenaean times. While chariot scenes in Mycenaean art depict warriors travelling by chariot carrying shields and spears, the equipment which Homer tells us they used while fighting on foot, and battle-scenes depict warriors fighting on foot, nowhere have Mycenaean artists left representations of chariot-borne fighting. Nor is there any indication from Homer or archaeology that the chariots or horses were armoured, thus it appears that they were kept out of range of the fighting.<sup>93</sup> The chariot seems to have survived the break-up of the Mycenaean palace-system and the Dark Ages, and presumably retained its social prestige while there were still some people able to afford the upkeep of horses.<sup>94</sup> Thus chariots may have continued in military use in Greece throughout the Dark Ages, although the conditions no longer existed for dozens or even hundreds of chariots to be kept in the same place. By the 7th century, the likely date for the composition of the *Iliad*, hoplite tactics were the norm, and those who owned a horse rode to battle, but fought on foot. Chariots were, however, still used for processions and racing, which was an Olympic event.

---

<sup>92</sup> J. Latacz, *Kampfparänese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios*, 1977, 217, note 116

<sup>93</sup> J. Crouwel, *Chariots and other means of land transport in Bronze Age Greece*, 1981, 127

<sup>94</sup> J. Crouwel, "Chariots in Early Iron Age Greece and in Homer", *Homeric Questions*, 309

Thus chariot formulae in Homer may have been created at any time from the Mycenaean Age onwards. Homer uses four terms to denote “chariot”: ἄρμα(τα), ὄχρα, δίφρος and ἵπποι /-ω. From the evidence of the Linear B texts and Mycenaean art, as well as the many chariot references in the *Iliad*, one might expect that there would be a considerable amount of convergence in this respect between Mycenaean and epic terminology. Yet of the four Homeric chariot terms, not one is found in the Mycenaean texts in the sense “chariot”; to denote a chariot, Mycenaean uses either the feminine substantive wo-ka = \*φοχά (favoured at Pylos) or an apparently substantivized adjective, i-qi-ja = \*ἰκκ<sup>w</sup>λα (preferred at Knossos). The latter is an adjective in form, with the common ending -λος which by the end of the Mycenaean Age seems to have been used only to create adjectives based on personal names, and the use of this adjective as a substantive in Mycenaean is likely to result from an expression such as \*ἰκκ<sup>w</sup>λα φοχά, “horse-drawn chariot”.<sup>95</sup> Yet although \*ἰκκ<sup>w</sup>λα is a commonly used noun in the Mycenaean texts, and presumably was in common use in the spoken language at Knossos, and perhaps elsewhere, it never appears in Homer, where according to the normal post-Mycenaean phonological changes one would expect \*ἰππλή. The reason for the absence of such a word is simple: \*ἰππλή < \*ἰκκ<sup>w</sup>λα forms a cretic and is thus inadmissible in the dactylic hexameter. Therefore, as chariots seem always to have been pulled by pairs of horses, it is likely that the Mycenaean bards substituted for this metrically inconvenient form the dual \*ἰκκ<sup>w</sup>ω, or in the genitive the plural \*ἰκκ<sup>w</sup>ων,

<sup>95</sup> Ruijgh, “Faits linguistiques et données externes relatifs aux chars et aux roues”,

which in general would have been metrically more suitable than the dual \*ἵκκ'ωϊῖν. Formulaic usage of ἵπποι indicates that this synecdoche is ancient: ἀφ' ἵππων ἄλτο χαμᾶζε (Π 733, 755)<sup>96</sup> appears ancient also because of the fossilized verb-form ἄλτο, an athematic middle of a type which, if not obsolete in the spoken language contemporary with the Mycenaean tablets, was at any rate almost certainly no longer productive. The verb as it appears in our texts of Homer has Ionic psilosis, representing unaugmented \*ἠάλτο (cf. ἄλλομαι, Latin *salire*); the *spiritus asper* was not restored when the text of Homer was redacted by Attic-speaking scribes because this verb-form was unknown in their own vernacular. The accentuation in the text is analogous with aorists such as ὤρτο, which includes the temporal augment. The first syllable of \*ἠάλτο was long in any case, followed by the consonant sequence -λτ-; \*ἠάλτο would have been unmetrical in this formula. A further reason for considering this formula to be ancient is χαμᾶζε, cf. χαμαί, the only remaining form of a noun which is otherwise unattested in 1st millennium Greek. This noun may be attested in Mycenaean as ka-ma (PY An 724, KN L 520, etc.), apparently denoting a type of land-holding,<sup>97</sup> and probably representing \*χάμας, a neuter noun whose locative is \*χάμασι < \*χάμασι; χαμαί may have oxytone accentuation by analogy with καταί, a doublet of κατό. χαμᾶζε will thus represent the noun \*χάμας suffixed with allative -δε.<sup>98</sup>

<sup>96</sup> καθ' ἵππων at E 111, obviating hiatus after δε; ἐξ ἵππων at Ω 469, where a long syllable is required after the penthemimeral caesura.

<sup>97</sup> *Documents*, 261

<sup>98</sup> Ruijgh, *Compte Rendu: Chantraine, DELG, Lingua* 28, 1971, 166

Despite the apparently very early substitution of \*ἰκκ<sup>w</sup>ω /οι in the sense “chariot” for \*ἰκκ<sup>w</sup>ἰα, there is one Homeric epithet which contains this name for the chariot, namely ἱππιοχάρμης, which has two occurrences in Homer: Τρωΐλον ἱππιοχάρμην (Ω 257) and Ἄμυθῶνά θ’ ἱππιοχάρμην (λ 259), both at verse-end, where the epithet conveniently fills the adonic segment. The α-stem substantivized adjective \*ἰκκ<sup>w</sup>ἰα might have been expected to give the unmetrical \*ἱππιηχάρμης (cf. αὐδήεσσα, based on the a-stem noun αὐδή < αὐδά), and to obviate this metrical difficulty an o-stem was substituted for the first element of the compound (cf. ὕλη but ὕλοτόμος, Ψ 114, 123).

The second element of this compound, χάρμη, is obviously archaic, confined to Homer except for one Pindaric attestation, two in Lycophron, and one in the *Pseudo-Phocylidea*; in Homer it is almost always located at verse-end, except at N 82 and H 285, and is regularly used with certain verbs, notably ληθέσθαι and μνήσασθαι, usually in the aorist. Thus it is clearly of considerable antiquity within epic. The same element is also to be found in the compound μενεχάρμης (6 times *Il.*, not in the *Odyssey*), which is of identical structure to, but of differing metrical value from the epithet μενεπτόλεμος. As these two epithets are used in a similar way, in name + epithet combinations at verse-end, it is reasonable to infer with Marina Benedetti<sup>99</sup> that they are of similar meaning, and thus that χάρμη is a synonym of π(τ)όλεμος. Both epithets are likely to be of equal antiquity, fulfilling different metrical requirements, and are likely to have been part of

<sup>99</sup> “Il composto omerico ἱππιοχάρμης”, *RAL* 34, 1979, 169-85

the epic vocabulary in the Mycenaean Age. χάρις, although usually understood as “joy”, will thus be another of the terms belonging to the semantic field meaning “war, fighting” (cf. δαί, ὑσμίνι), and may already have been obsolete in spoken Greek by the end of the Mycenaean Age. It was later reinterpreted as signifying “joy in battle” because of its resemblance to χαίρω, but this is likely to be a secondary development, probably within epic language, and the primary sense is probably “combat”, as in προκαλέσσατο χάρις (H 218) with the old dative of purpose.<sup>100</sup> If the second element of ἵπποχάρις were indeed to be associated with the root of χαίρω, the compound would signify “who rejoices in the chariot”. An interpretation as “combat”, however, seems more plausible than the conventional one in view of the phrase προκαλέσσατο χάρις, where the noun clearly denotes “combat”, thus the epithet means “chariot(-borne) fighter”. In addition to its two Homeric appearances, it occurs three times in the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*:

Fr. 7.2 υἱε δὺν Μάγνητα Μακηδόνα θ' ἵπποχάριον

Fr. 9.2 Δῶρός τε Ξοῦθός τε καὶ Αἴολος ἵπποχάριος

Fr. 205.1 ...τέκεν Αἰακὸν ἵπποχάριον

All three are passages of very traditional appearance, similar to the *Odyssey* verse, part of the *Nekyia*, in which ἵπποχάριος is found. This does not indicate that the “Hesiodic” passages are based on the *Nekyia*

<sup>100</sup> Hoekstra, “A Note on the Dative of Purpose in Greek”, *Mnemosyne* 15, 1962, 15-23

passage or *vice versa*, but that ἵπποχάρμης traditionally formed part of genealogical lists of this type.

ἵπποχάρμης seems very likely to be a creation of Mycenaean date, as it denotes a Mycenaean phenomenon, a warrior who used a chariot in battle, whether or not he actually fought from it, and contains one of the Mycenaean names for a chariot as well as a noun apparently belonging to the same semantic field as π(τ)όλεμος which is unknown in 1st millennium prose. Also to be dated to the Mycenaean Age is the use of ἵπποι/-ω, ἵππων and possibly ἵπποῖν where the translation “horses” makes no sense. Although Mycenaean chariots were pulled by pairs of horses,<sup>101</sup> the genitive plural \*ἵκκ<sup>w</sup>ων would have been used for metrical convenience instead of the dual \*ἵκκ<sup>w</sup>οῖν (cf. Arcadian ἵπποιον) in ancient formulae such as ἀφ’ ἵππων ἄλτο / ὥσε χαμᾶζε. Yet in many Homeric examples, ἵπποι cannot possibly have the sense “chariot”, and when accompanied by the epithets ἀερίποδες, καλλίτριχες and ὠκύποδες, must have its primary meaning, “horses”. It appears that poets of the later stages of the tradition did not use ἵπποι to denote “chariot”; this sense appears only in old formulae or modifications thereof. That ἵπποι is to be included among epic chariot terms is shown by the context of corresponding passages, where frequently this substantive is

---

<sup>101</sup> J. Crouwel, “Chariots in Early Iron Age Greece and In Homer”, 311. The four-horse chariot in Nestor’s account of the raid on Elis is therefore a recent cultural element in a passage which is also linguistically recent.

interchangeable with other “chariot” words.<sup>102</sup> Thus in Ω, Priam’s two-wheeled chariot is called δῖφρος (322, 701), ἄρμα (440) and ἵπποι (469).

One of the Mycenaean chariot terms known from the Linear B texts, i-qi-ja, thus has representation in Homer, albeit indirect. The other Mycenaean “chariot” word, wo-ka = \*φοχά, a feminine substantive, presents problems as far as epic usage is concerned. The expected \*ὄχη < \*φοχά never appears in epic, but from the same root there is a neuter plural ὄχεα, apparently based on an s-stem neuter, \*φόχος, -εθος. Traditionally, ὄχεα is explained as a creation of epic language.<sup>103</sup> The fact that neuters in -ος derived from verbal roots usually have e-grade in the stem (cf. (φ)ἔπος) has led C.J. Ruijgh to propose that the substitution of \*φόχε(h)α, plural of an unattested neuter \*(φ)ὄχος, for \*φέχε(h)α<sup>104</sup> may have been due to the influence of Mycenaean wo-ka.<sup>105</sup> Yet it is not certain what kind of vehicle \*φέχος may have denoted, and it is not impossible that it was a non-heroic, therefore non-epic type of vehicle such as a cart or wagon. Therefore it is more probable that \*φοχέων, artificial heteroclitic genitive plural, was used in epic as the genitive plural of \*φοχά by analogy with the s-stem neuter \*φέχος for metrical reasons, changing gender late in the tradition, presumably when \*ὄχη was no longer in use in Ionic.

---

<sup>102</sup> Robert Plath, *Der Streitwagen und seine Teile*, 1994, 287

<sup>103</sup> E.g. Risch, *Wortbildung*, 77

<sup>104</sup> Hesychius glosses ἔχεσφιν ἄρμασιν

<sup>105</sup> “Chars et roues”, 213; “D’Homère aux origines protomycéniennes”, 60, note 216

O. Panagl<sup>106</sup> attempts to connect Homeric ὄχεα with Mycenaean wo-ka, arguing that the genitive ὀχέων cannot be unambiguously classified, and either could belong to an s-stem neuter, or otherwise be the Ionic version of the genitive plural of a feminine α-stem, viz. \*φοχά(h)ων > \*ὀχήων > ὀχέων, thus it would have appeared only after antevocalic shortening had taken place in Ionic, and the rest of the epic paradigm (accusative ὄχεα, dative ὀχέεσσι, instrumental ὄχεσφι) would have been based on the genitive plural. Yet this is scarcely convincing: an analogy can be made with the “recent” case-forms of ναῦς based on the stem νε-, which presupposes antevocalic shortening. By far the majority of Homeric ship formulae have a form of ναῦς based on the early Ionic stem νη-, representing Common Greek \*νοϝ-, and the few containing νε- are found in passages which can also be considered late for other reasons, e.g. νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων (B 91, 208, 464, Λ 803, Ξ 146, etc.), νέες ἐστιχόωντο (B 516, 602, 680, 733). Had ὀχέων been a recent form, it may have been resisted by poets, and might be expected to have little formulaic representation, but in fact it is found 27 times in the *Iliad* before the penthemimeral caesura, and it is scarcely likely that so traditional a medium as epic would have adopted a genitive plural which became available only after antevocalic shortening was a *fait accompli*, then created a paradigm based on it. Therefore the traditional explanation is more convincing: unless it is from an obsolete neuter \*φόχος, not likely in view of Mycenaean wo-ka, (ϝ)ὄχεα must be a creation of epic language, and the fact that only the

<sup>106</sup> “Ein lautlicher verkappter Mykenismus”, *Serta Indogermanica*, J. Tischler (ed.), 1982,

plural appears is presumably due to the influence of (e.g.) τεύχεα, ἔντεα, ἔναρα. Furthermore, ὄχεα has more formulaic connexions than its synonyms δίφρος and ἄρμα(τα). For example, αὐτικά δ' ἐξ ὀχέων (<\*ἐκ φοχέ(h)ων), ἦριπε δ' ἐξ ὀχέων, λύσας / λύσασ' ἐξ ὀχέων all appear ancient, with ὀχέων before the penthemimeral caesura. (f)ὀχέων is the earliest case-form of this noun used in epic: in none of the occurrences of the other forms, ὄχεα, ὀχέεσσι, ὄχεσφι, is digamma observed (although Σ 224, ἄψ ὄχεα τρόπεον is ambiguous as regards digamma).

Of the three synonyms for “chariot”, ὄχεα, δίφρος and ἵπποι /-ω, it is impossible to claim that one has a longer history in epic than the others, and there is every possibility that all are of equal antiquity and were used to fulfil varying metrical requirements: (f)ὀχέων was used when a genitive plural was required before the penthemimeral caesura (the other case-forms were not admitted until after digamma had disappeared in Ionic), ἵπποι /-ω as a substitute for the unmetrical \*ἵκκ<sup>w</sup>ία; δίφρος, although lacking distinctive noun + epithet combinations, appears 9 times in the archaic genitive singular δίφροιο before the trochaic caesura, suggesting some degree of antiquity.<sup>107</sup> Although not found in Mycenaean, δίφρος is of ancient formation: its first element δι- from the cardinal δύο (cf. Sanskrit *dvá*, Latin *duo*) already appears in composition in the parent language as \*dwi-, cf. Sanskrit *dvi-pád-*, Latin *bipes*, Greek δίπους, while the

<sup>107</sup> Lack of distinctive word combinations does not exclude the possibility that a word is ancient within epic; the archaic reduplicated aorist ἔπεφνε, for example, regularly occurs at the trochaic caesura without forming part of a distinctive word-group.

thematically extended second element -φο-ο- contains the zero-grade of the root of φέρω.<sup>108</sup> Thus it appears to refer to the cab, which, as Mycenaean pictorial evidence confirms, carried two people. It is a characteristic of epic in the later stages of the tradition that there exist doublets which fulfil varying metrical requirements. This seems also to have been a characteristic of epic in the 2nd millennium. Therefore alternative chariot-terms dating from the Mycenaean Age are entirely in keeping with epic practice of using synonyms, which may not be very precise, to fulfil different metrical needs.

The remaining Homeric term denoting a chariot, ἄρμα(τα), is more problematic. Both the singular and plural are well attested in Homer, with no difference in sense, but have few formulaic connexions. ἄρματα ποικίλα occurs 3 times (E 239, N 537, Ξ 431), and another 3 times in the formula ἄρματα ποικίλα χαλκῷ (Δ 226, K 322, 393), but the adjective ποικίλος is not exclusive to ἄρματα. In the singular, ἄρμα is attested in Mycenaean in the form a-mo = \*ἄρμο, denoting a wheel, and specifically a wheel with spokes. The extension of this old name for a wheel to signify the entire vehicle is easy to understand; one might have expected the dual \*ἄρματε, but Ionic had already lost the dual by the date of composition of the Homeric epics. As the dual is never found, it is unlikely that it was ever used in this sense: had \*ἄρματε genuinely been an old epic form, bards may have retained it for its antique air. The singular ἄρμα is found 21 times in Homer and the plural ἄρματα 46 times, of which only six

---

<sup>108</sup> Chantraine observed (*DELG* 288, s.v. δ(φ)ρος) that “le vocalisme zéro du second terme est singulier et doit être un archaïsme”.

are shown by the context to refer to more than one chariot (B 777, Π 371, 507, Σ 244, Ψ 8, 368). Metrical considerations very often dictate whether singular or plural should be used: in the genitive case only the singular ἄρματος (4 times) can be used, the plural ἁρμάτων forming an unmetrical cretic. Therefore ἄρματα is a poetic plural used for metrical convenience.<sup>109</sup> The fact that the Homeric sense of ἄρμα(τα) differs from that found in Mycenaean suggests that it was a recent term for “chariot”. Chariots seem no longer to have been in military use in the 7th century, the probable date of composition of the Homeric poems, but chariot-racing was still practised (it was an Olympic sport), and expressions based on ἄρμα are found in Classical prose authors in this connexion, e.g. ἄρματα τρέφειν, Xenophon *Hiero* 11.5; ἁρμάτειος δίφρος, Xenophon *Cyr.* 6.4,9; ἁρματηλατέω, Herodotus 5.9; ἁρματηλάτης, Xenophon *Symposium* 2.27.

The name of the horse in the dual or plural, ἵππω /-οι is clearly ancient within epic as a synecdoche for the chariot and its team, and in the singular as part of the epithet ἵππιοχάρμης which denoted a warrior who had a war chariot at his disposal. ἵπποι also belongs to some old formulae in its primary sense “horses”, unsurprisingly, as these creatures are depicted drawing chariots in Mycenaean art and are referred to in the Mycenaean texts. One such ancient formula is ἔχε μώνυχας ἵππους (8 times *Il.* at verse-end), in which ἔχε is the imperfect of the obsolete verb \*φέχω. The

---

<sup>109</sup> The use of poetic plurals for metrical reasons was scarcely a new phenomenon, cf. ancient formulae such as ποιμένα λαών.

epithet μώνυχας is conventionally understood as “single-hoofed”(i.e. having neither toes nor cloven hooves), consisting of \*σμη- (cf. ἄμα, zero-grade corresponding to *semel*, etc.) and ὄνυξ with initial ο- lengthened in composition. However, as the final -ε of (φ)έχε is invariably scanned short, one must conclude that, if the conventional etymology is correct, this epithet entered epic after the sequence \*σμη- >\*ημη had lost the prosodical effect of a double consonant. Page may have been correct to claim that the epithet is “among the incomprehensibles, bearing an illusory resemblance to the...roots of *semel* and ὄνυξ”.<sup>110</sup> This formula stands a high chance of belonging to Mycenaean epic in view of its obsolete verb \*φέχε and obscure epithet μώνυχας, of solely epic usage. This epithet appears 8 times in the *Iliad* in the nominative plural, but its earliest usage is likely to be in the accusative in the above formula: not only does this form a P<sub>2</sub> hemistich, but all other verbs which are substituted for (φ)έχε are either commonly used in 1st millennium Greek, e.g. ἐλαύνει (Ψ 536), ἔστρεφε (P 699) or are familiar from other epic usages, e.g. ἡρύκακε (E 321).

The Trojans are frequently called ἵππόδαμοι, and this is confirmed by the evidence of archaeology: the plain of Troy was an ideal location for the raising of horses, and enormous quantities of horse-bones have been found in the Troad, dating from the 2nd millennium B.C..<sup>111</sup> As there is archaeological evidence for contact between Mycenaeans and Anatolians, it is not unlikely that name + epithet combinations such as

<sup>110</sup> *HHI*, 295

<sup>111</sup> Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments*, 307

Τρώων ἵπποδάμων, a P<sub>2</sub> hemistich, date from the Mycenaean Age. At E 102, the Trojans are κέντορες ἵππων, but this phrase seems to have been extracted from Καδμεῖοι κέντορες ἵππων (Δ 391). The latter looks like an old formula, completing the verse from the penthemimeral caesura, and has a very strong likelihood of belonging to Mycenaean epic in the form \*Καδμεῖοι κέντορες ἵκκ<sup>w</sup>ων, which in early accounts of the siege of Thebes may have provided the P<sub>2</sub> alternant of the T<sub>2</sub> hemistich φερεσσακέας Καδμεῖου < \*φερετφακέας Καδμεῖου (*Aspis* 13); both of these formulae scan equally well in the nominative and accusative cases. The territory in which Thebes is situated appears to have borne the name Cadmeis in the Bronze age; according to Thucydides,<sup>112</sup> after the Trojan War Boeotians invaded the land formerly known as Cadmeis.

## Conclusions

The thematic content of epic verse changed little in the half-millennium or so between the end of the Mycenaean Age and the composition of the Homeric poems. This is not surprising: people continued to want to listen to songs about traditional themes such as war, heroic exploits, divine interventions, maritime adventures, and in particular after the migrations the link with the mainland and past glories would have been especially valued. As earlier chapters have shown, epic language was never

---

112

1.12:Βοιωτοί ...τὴν νῦν μὲν Βοιωτίαν, πρότερον δὲ Καδμηίδα γῆν ᾤκισαν

static, but became more flexible as it incorporated new developments in the spoken dialects with which it was in contact. This allowed modification of ancient formulae: for example, loss of digamma allowed \*φοχέων to be used in different combinations and case-forms; the “recent” 2nd declension genitive singular -ου permitted the declension into the genitive case of words which traditionally had appeared at verse-end in the accusative singular, e.g. δίφρον / δίφρου. New formulae were created which pertained to traditional epic themes: Ζηνὸς...ἔριγδούποιο (M 235) incorporating the new stem of Ζεὺς and a traditional epithet, was based on ἔριγδουπος πόσις Ἴηρης (4 times *Il.*, 3 times *Od.*). The traditional epic vocabulary was used in new ways as developments in the vernacular made it more flexible. For example, Νηλεὺς ἕζεσκεν θεόφιν μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος (γ 409)<sup>113</sup> refers to traditional themes: the father of a major hero (genealogies of heroes are very significant in epic) is likened to the gods – with traditional language (μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος). Several factors, however, betray the late composition of this verse: the name of Nestor’s father, Νηλεὺς, never occurred in pre-migration epic, but is a reinterpretation of \*Νεηέλαφος based on the patronymic formations \*Νεηελάφιος > Νηληΐος and \*Νεηελαφιάδας > Νηληϊάδης; the iterative verb ἕζεσκεν and the two occurrences of ephelecytic ν making position (ἕζεσκεν and θεόφιν) are late additions to the epic repertoire; and θεόφιν is a false archaism, using the original 1st and 3rd declension instrumental plural ending, -φιν, in an

---

<sup>113</sup> The second hemistich is already an established formula, appearing in the *Iliad* at H 366, E 318, P 477 and in the *Odyssey* at γ 110.

inventive way as the equivalent of a dative plural, whose Mycenaean form, \*θεhołh (like Ionic θεοῖσι) would be unmetrical here.

In some passages of Homer, vocabulary is used which is of a non-traditional nature: in particular this is true of the extended similes, which relate elements of traditional epic material to familiar scenes from everyday life. Everything in Homer has, however, a basis in tradition: extended similes represent a development of the traditional short comparison such as θεὸς ὥς, ὄρνιθες ὥς, whose prosody suggests that they have their origins at a time when postpositive ὥς <\*σφῶς was still distinct from ὦς <\*γῶς, which is not postpositive; the loss of digamma meant that the two were subsequently confused.

In addition to the extended similes, Homeric material differs from epic tradition in emotionally charged passages such as Z 392-502 and Ω, but even here traditional epic themes are clearly discernible, e.g. genealogy, fighting, and in Ω the theme of hospitality, which is developed to a greater extent in the *Odyssey*. The genius of the *Iliad* poet is seldom more evident than in these passages, where he has created enormous emotional effect while using vocabulary and formulae largely drawn from the traditional stock, e.g. Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο (Z 420), κατέπεφνε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (Z 423), Αἴαντε δῦω (Z 436), ἐξ ἵππων ἄλτο χαμᾶζε (Ω 469), etc.; at Z 416, Θήβην ὑψίπυλον refers to Andromache's hometown of Thebe in the Troad, but this may be a formula from the ancient mainland Theban cycle, containing a notable archaism in the singular of the toponym,

comparable to πολυχρύσοιο Μυκίνης (H 180, Λ 46). Despite the presence of these traditional phrases, the two passages betray their late composition with a series of iterative verb forms, e.g. ἀριστεύεσκε (Z 460), ἴζεσκε (Ω 472), and irresoluble vowel contractions e.g. Ἰλλίου ἴφι ἀνάσσειν (Z 478), ἀπὸ θρόνου ὤρτο (Ω 515), θεοειδέα with synizesis at verse-end (Ω 483).

For all the Homeric themes here discussed, there exist formulae which can be traced back to the Mycenaean Age, either because their prosody indicates that they were created at a time when the Greek language was at an earlier stage than that indicated by the Linear B texts (e.g. ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης), or because they contain a morphological feature which was obsolete by this time (e.g. αἶθοπι χαλκῶ, with a “short dative”, i.e. archaic instrumental, ending), or because they recall in obscure or outmoded language conditions which are unlikely to have prevailed after the end of the Mycenaean Age (e.g. ἱππιοχάρμης). Another indicator of a very old formula is the inclusion of vocabulary which is known only from epic and its imitators, although in this case it is more difficult to ascribe a formula to the Mycenaean Age because there is no indication of the date at which any particular lexical item may have been lost from the spoken language, and because the vocabulary of the Linear B texts is limited; therefore we cannot tell if Mycenaeans said \*φρηγμῖνι, \*νώροψ or τρυφάλεια. It is also a reasonable assumption that other themes not considered here likewise have associated formulae which can be assigned to the Mycenaean Age or earlier, e.g. κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε (a

formula which is likely already to have contained a prosodical anomaly by the end of the Mycenaean Age, v. p. 109), ἐς ῥ' ἄσαμίνθους βάντες, which are related to the themes of feasting and hospitality, subjects which are of considerable significance in the *Odyssey*.

As the epic tradition matured, poets generally did not introduce new themes, but embellished traditional themes by incorporating new cultural elements, for example βασιλῆες, who became individuals of high status after \*φάνακτες had disappeared, at least in the secular domain. The traditional themes of epic were embellished in the same way as the traditional epic language was embellished by the incorporation of elements of the contemporary speech with which its practitioners came into contact. By the time of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* poets, the Mycenaean bards may have had some difficulty in recognizing their art-form, but it had not changed beyond all recognition: the principal characters were still there, frequently with name + epithet formulae which had been inherited from the Mycenaean Age, taking pride in their ancestry, participating in the same types of adventure, namely fighting, charioteering, seafaring, and relaxing by feasting and imbibing wine, all of which themes still had related formulae in language which had been preserved since the 2nd millennium.

## Chapter Four

### Homer and other Early Epic

In chapter 1, I postulated that, at the end of the Bronze Age, the epic dialect was a "literary" language of East Greek type, which was not region-specific, but could incorporate as metrically required elements from the vernacular dialects with which its practitioners came into contact, with the proviso that these were not of such limited extension that their use would connect epic to a narrowly defined geographical area (it was also important that any new elements adopted by epic should be comprehensible to audiences wherever epic was performed). Archaeology indicates that there was a high degree of homogeneity in material culture throughout the areas where Mycenaeans had penetrated at this time, and it would thus not be unreasonable to assume that elements of culture which do not leave traces in the archaeological record, such as music and poetry, were of the same type wherever this culture prevailed. Furthermore, as previously discussed, the major traits which distinguish the dialects of the 1st millennium had not developed at this time. Therefore it seems reasonable to assume that epic was performed throughout most of mainland Greece in a dialect which was understood everywhere, although in certain respects, particularly the retention of archaisms and the use of doublets for metrical convenience, it differed from the contemporary spoken dialects. The branch of the epic tradition which ultimately produced the Homeric poems is that whose practitioners were active in an area of proto-Ionic speech at the end of the Bronze Age. However, this does not signify that the epic art was confined to

this part of Greece. As material culture was largely homogeneous throughout Mycenaean Greece, so it would be unjustifiable to assume that Attica or the proto-Ionic speaking region was the only part of Greece in which epic was performed at the end of the Mycenaean Age, and it is not unreasonable to expect that, wherever Mycenaean culture flourished, epic verse was performed.

Although the language of the Homeric poems is a form of Ionic, the Ionic elements (e.g. /ē/ for /ā/, neglect of digamma, vowel contractions) can in many cases be removed without affecting the scansion; indeed, the restoration of non-Ionic, or, more accurately, archaic forms (e.g. uncontracted adjacent vowels, syllabic resonants) often improves the metre. This shows, as already discussed, that the most significant period in the development of epic language was in mainland Greece before the turn-of-the-millennium migrations to Asia Minor, after which epic language as witnessed by Homer participated in the choices and innovations of East Ionic. Since some of the Ionic elements in Homeric language (e.g. /ē/ for /ā/) are superficial and do not have a prosodical effect, or as in the case of neglected digamma do not affect ancient formulae but only modifications thereof, it is legitimate to argue that the epic language known from Homer is largely the creation of mainland poets who were active before the settlement in Ionia, and that it was carried across the Aegean by settlers.<sup>1</sup> The relative proportions in Homer of the older genitives in -αο, -αων on the one hand and the Ionic genitives -εω, -εων on the other, the former being

---

<sup>1</sup> Pavese, *Tradizioni e generi poetici della Grecia arcaica*, 1972, 16

predominant, as well as the relative proportions for observed vs. neglected digamma, show how limited was the use of contemporary elements in epic diction, and how productive traditional elements continued to be.<sup>2</sup> This is scarcely surprising: the restrictions of the dactylic hexameter preserved formulae already created, and with them the ancient morphemes with which they had been created. Thus the core of Homeric language, although the poems which have reached us under the name "Homer"<sup>3</sup> have an Ionic veneer, belongs to the 2nd millennium mainland. This same poetic language created by 2nd millennium bards is the one which also continued to be used by mainland poets after the migrations. At the date of the migrations, those who carried with them the epic tradition and its distinctive language characterized by archaisms and metrically determined doublets no doubt already perceived this poetic language as a form of Ionic, since in the proto-Ionic speaking areas it would have participated in the choices and innovations which characterized the dialect with which bards were in daily contact.

Although epic as we know it is represented by poetry in a dialect of Ionic type, it would, as mentioned, be wrong to assume that epic poetry at the end of the Mycenaean Age was restricted to the area of proto-Ionic speech. Admittedly, as Athens was the only major site to resist destruction in the upheavals which took place at the end of the Bronze Age, and

---

<sup>2</sup> Pavese, *Tradizioni*, 24

<sup>3</sup> "Homer" is almost certainly not a personal name, but a secondary formation from Ὅμηρος, as Martin West has cogently argued in "The Invention of Homer", *CQ* 49, 1999, 364-82.

according to legend held out against the Dorian invasion, it would have been an ideal location for the preservation of a traditional art-form which was the vehicle for tales remembered from better times: indeed, if Athens had experienced an influx of refugees,<sup>4</sup> there is every probability that among such people were practitioners of the epic art, whose skills may at such a time have been greatly valued for keeping alive memories of past glories. Since Athens escaped the destructions at the end of the Bronze Age and her inhabitants boasted that they were “autochthonous”,<sup>5</sup> one might legitimately expect to find in Attica a strong tradition of heroic poetry with its roots in the Mycenaean Age, but there is no literary evidence for such a tradition. There are hints, however, at Attic interest in epic, and the Molione (who have a very long history in epic, v. p.99) are probably depicted in Geometric vase-painting, as are Centaurs c.725 B.C.<sup>6</sup> The earliest Attic inscription, c. 725 B.C. on the Dipylon oinochoe, is a hexameter (to be discussed under Inscriptional Evidence, no. 7). It should not therefore be imagined that epic composition ceased in Attica with the departure of the Ionian settlers at the turn of the millennium. Athens appears to lack epic presumably because its local legends, e.g. those about Theseus<sup>7</sup>, are not connected with the major cycles of epic, Troy and Thebes, treated by epic. Epic composition probably

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer*, 141.

<sup>5</sup> Thucydides 1.2.5, τὴν γοῦν Ἀττικὴν...ἄνθρωποι ᾤκουν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ.

<sup>6</sup> Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* 174 -5; Molione, plates 25a & b; Centaurs, plate 26

<sup>7</sup> The Megarian historian Hereas cites a fragment of hexameter poetry about Theseus:

.....τὸν ἐν εὐρυχόρῳ ποτ' Ἀφίδνῃ  
μαρνάμενον Θησεύς Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠΰκόμοιο  
κτείνεν... (Fr. Gr. Hist. 486, fr.2)

continued, although is not represented in the literary record, and it is legitimate to assume that subjects of local interest were preserved in hexameter poetry whose language continued to develop *pari passu* with the Attic dialect. This is suggested by the inscription on the Dipyilon oinochoe: the genitive plural ὄρχηστῶν (< ὄρχηστέων < \*ὄρχηστήων < \*ὄρχηστᾶων) shows the results of quantitative metathesis and vowel contraction, and is the only form admissible in the dactylic verse. Ionian epic would have \*ὄρχηστέων with synizesis. Furthermore, the formula λαμπράν τε σελήνην, known from Hesiod (*Th.*19,371) in this form,<sup>8</sup> suggests that epic had been composed in a local Attic form, and that Hesiod had learnt it from this source. Attic and Ionic are in any case so closely related that is highly probable that local Attic epic was supplanted very early by Ionian epic.

Likewise there is no reason to imagine that there were not other locations in mainland Greece where the epic tradition was kept alive at the end of the Mycenaean Age, its language continuing to evolve apace with the spoken language, participating in the choices and innovations characteristic of the local dialects. It must be remembered that the majority of innovations which distinguish the 1st millennium dialects postdate the end of the Mycenaean Age: thus the morphemes -αο, -αων, -οιο, and -φι, which are archaisms in Ionian epic, were pan-Greek and part of the quotidian spoken

---

<sup>8</sup> This formula appears also in the *Ilias Parva* in the form λαμπρά δ' ἐπέτελλε σελήνη (*Ilias Parva*, fr. F11a, Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, V. Pavese, *Studi sulla tradizione rapsodica epica*, 1974, 86; *Tradizioni* 65, 189 ff.

language c.1200 B.C. The literary tradition admittedly provides no examples of epic poetry preserved in mainland dialects, but some hints at the existence of such poetry are provided by hexameter and elegiac inscriptions in local dialects. Furthermore, although hexameter poetry which is known to have been composed in mainland Greece (e.g. the poems of Hesiod, the pseudo-Hesiodic *Aspis* and *Catalogue of Women*, and fragments of the Epic Cycle) is at first glance composed in the same Ionic-type dialect as are the Homeric poems, these also contain hints of a mainland tradition independent of the Ionian branch, in the form of dialectal elements which can only have come from mainland dialects of the 1st millennium and also certain archaisms which are absent from Homer.

## **Epic Outside Ionia**

### **Hesiod**

The Greek epic tradition is best known from the Homeric poems, composed in the Ionic form of epic language contemporary with their poets. Epic is also represented by Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, various other poems ascribed to Hesiod (*Aspis*, *Catalogue of Women* and fragments), the fragments of the cyclic poems<sup>9</sup> (*Thebaid*, *Cypria*, *Aethiopsis*,

---

<sup>9</sup> These represent the remains of a collection of epic poems which are probably of archaic date but gathered together by Alexandrian editors; these poems had been attributed to the author of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* because of their "relatively early date, subject-matter and style" (Malcolm Davies, *The Epic Cycle*, 2).

etc.) and the *Homeric Hymns*. All of these are composed in a dialect of Ionic type, virtually identical to that of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. It is generally assumed that the *Iliad* is the oldest representative of the tradition: this is argued by, among others, Richard Janko,<sup>10</sup> who places the Homeric and Hesiodic poems in the chronological order *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Theogony*, *Works and Days* by means of examining various features of their language, e.g. neglect vs. observance of digamma, long / short datives plural, etc. However, Janko's method is inconclusive: all that he has proven is that the language of the *Iliad* is the most traditional of the epic poems that we have. This does not indicate that the *Iliad* is the earliest of these poems: as discussed in ch. 3, in a few respects (notably in ship-formulae), the language of the *Odyssey* is more traditional than that of the *Iliad*, although the *Odyssey* is almost certainly a later composition: "traditional" need not imply an earlier date of composition if the tradition is still used creatively. Martin West, on the other hand, argues that the *Theogony* may be the "oldest Greek poem we have"<sup>11</sup>: West bases this opinion on external arguments,<sup>12</sup> but it is certainly impossible to determine on linguistic grounds which of the *Iliad* and *Theogony* is the earlier. Hesiod, composing in Boeotia, as opposed to the *Iliad* poet's native Ionia, may have been trained in a less conservative branch of the epic tradition, and indeed may have been using less traditional material for which there existed fewer traditional formulae, particularly in the *WD* which contains a considerable amount of Near Eastern wisdom lore.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*, 189

<sup>11</sup> *Hesiod: Theogony*, 1966, 46

<sup>12</sup> Cf. West's article "The Date of the *Iliad*", *MH* 52, 1995, 203-19

Herodotus (2.53,1) believed “Homer” and Hesiod to be contemporaries: this is not implausible, and certainly it is impossible to determine the relative dates of Hesiod and the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* poets by analysing the language of their respective poems. In antiquity it was not believed that Homer preceded Hesiod; this is a modern assumption based on the presence in Hesiod of Homeric diction.<sup>13</sup> Hesiod’s diction is more “advanced”, but this does not indicate that his poems are younger than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

Hesiod is, for example, less traditional than Homer in his observance and neglect of the prosodical effect of digamma. This might seem paradoxical when one considers that Hesiod’s quotidian speech form was Boeotian, a dialect which observed digamma until fairly late; however, as Martin West has suggested, Hesiod “neglected the digamma...in conscious imitation of the traditional poetic language; while the Ionian rhapsode did the opposite for the same reason”.<sup>14</sup> In other words, in neglecting digamma, Hesiod was composing under the influence of the Ionian style, and was taking advantage of an innovation of Ionian epic which allowed greater flexibility in epic composition. For example, at *WD* 63, we find verse-initial παρθενικῆς καλὸν εἶδος with two instances of neglected digamma: not only does Hesiod neglect the initial /w/ of φεῖδος, allowing the final syllable of καλὸν to scan short,<sup>15</sup> but he also neglects the

---

<sup>13</sup> James A. Notopoulos, “Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean Heritage of Oral Poetry”, *Hesperia* 29, 1960, 178

<sup>14</sup> *Hesiod: Theogony*, 91

<sup>15</sup> This short scansion in the initial syllable of καλός can be observed also at *Theogony* 585: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεύξε καλὸν κακὸν ἀντ’ ἀγαθοῖο.

digamma of the adjective whose inherited form, retained in Boeotian, is *καλφός*. As Homer always observes the prosodical effect of digamma in this word (the initial syllable of *καλός* is always long in Homer, showing the effects of the third compensatory lengthening as in East Ionic), the form here used by Hesiod cannot come from Ionian epic language. Nor can it be part of an ancient formula, as the phoneme /w/ was present in all positions in the formative stages of epic. However, close to Boeotia were spoken two dialects which had lost digamma without participating in the third wave of compensatory lengthening, namely Attic and Euboean. The short initial syllable of *καλόν* at *WD* 63 may represent a licence adopted from either of these dialects, in the same way as Ionian epic took advantage of forms without the prosodical effect of this phoneme from Lesbian, a dialect which likewise had not participated in the third phase of compensatory lengthening.

In general, Hesiod's language appears less traditional than that of Homer; for example, at *Th.* 11 we find *πότηνιαν Ἥρην*, the accusative of a traditional formula which appears in Homer only in the nominative, and which in the Mycenaean Age would have been unmetrical in the accusative as long as the initial /h/ of *Ἥρη* retained consonantal force, lengthening the preceding syllable. Why Hesiod should use this formula in the accusative while it appears only in the nominative in Homer is uncertain, but the possibility cannot be excluded that this formula had been lost in mainland poetry and was reintroduced by mainland bards influenced by Ionian poets; mainland practitioners of epic may not have felt as bound by the force of

tradition as did their Ionian counterparts. Another non-traditional usage found in Hesiod but never in Homer is θεῶν βασιλῆι καὶ ἀνδρῶν, of Zeus at *Theogony* 923: Homer uses both βασιλεύς and ἄναξ of humans, but only ἄναξ of gods, βασιλεύς most probably being a post-Mycenaean, if not post-migration, addition to the epic vocabulary. Again, Hesiod is less traditional than Homer in interpreting the stem κλυ- as a present tense, e.g. *WD* 726, οὐ γὰρ τοί γε κλύουσιν; in Homer, this stem belongs to the aorist, as in the verse-end formula κλύον ἦδ' ἐπίθοντο.<sup>16</sup>

As far as content is concerned, the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Thebaid*, *Aspis* and *Catalogue* are obviously poems of traditional type. All of these contain formulae relating to traditional subject-matter, which are used appropriately, and which can frequently (for various reasons, whether linguistic or historical and cultural) be traced back to the Mycenaean Age. Heroic epic, concerning the exploits of élite Mycenaean warriors, is clearly a highly traditional type, containing many ancient formulae, and appears to have been the most popular, particularly in Ionia, hence the emergence of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Genealogical and catalogue poetry constituted a concomitant to this type of epic, providing details about the characters who populated the heroic narratives. It would be erroneous, however, to assume that catalogue poetry was a Boeotian speciality on the grounds that the *Catalogue of Women* was associated with Hesiod, and that catalogues occur

---

<sup>16</sup> H 379, I 79, Ξ 133, 378, O 300, Ψ 54, 738. For the present κλύουσιν, cf. πέφνονσι, created by Oppianus Anazarbensis (2nd / 3rd century A.D.) on the basis of the aorist ἔπεφνε.

in the *Theogony* and *WD*.<sup>17</sup> While Greek epic may have begun as “court” poetry, commemorating the κλέα of the Mycenaean aristocracy, its appeal was not limited to aristocratic circles, and thus it could attract other types of material, e.g. folk-tales and proverbs, in effect, anything that seemed old, traditional or venerable: in this category may be included the fragments of the Χείρωνος Ὑποθήκαι. While there certainly existed traditional didactic epic on various subjects,<sup>18</sup> it is hard to believe that epic on topics such as those expounded in Hesiod’s *Works and Days* existed in Mycenaean times: the subject-matter is radically different from heroic epic, and there are no ancient formulae for topics such as trading by sea, building a plough or appointing casual labourers. As Bryan Hainsworth has observed,<sup>19</sup> Hesiod’s composition is more fluent in the contexts of a genealogy or catalogue, and

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol.I, 178-9: “...a supposed Boeotian ‘school’ of catalogue poetry...”

<sup>18</sup> Genealogical or catalogue poetry, for example, can be classified as didactic epic, and is associated with several traditional formulae. Likewise theogonic or cosmogonic poetry, as contained in Hesiod’s *Theogony*, can be considered as didactic: that there were other traditions about the origins of the world is clear from Ε 200-7. According to Proclus, the Epic Cycle began with a *Theogony*, different from Hesiod’s (Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry*, 22), therefore it is likely that theogonic poetry constituted a traditional category: Hesiod was not the first to compose such a poem. It is not impossible that the Mycenaean had such poetry, but insufficient theogonic epic survives to allow us to determine from its language whether this was the case. Hesiod’s *Theogony* has similarities with genealogical and catalogue poetry; it is genealogies of gods which are of interest in this poem, in which Cadmus’ marriage is recorded at 975 because his bride, Harmonia, is a goddess.

<sup>19</sup> “Criteri di oralità nella poesia non-omerica”, *I poemi epici rapsodici e la tradizione orale*, C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C.O. Pavese (edd.), 1981, 11

less so in narrative. He does not have at his disposal formulae for non-traditional terms which he introduces: for example, ἄροτος occurs 6 times in the *WD*, but does not have a stock epithet. Hesiod's genius is apparent in the way in which he adapts the traditional formulae of epic to these non-heroic concerns: at *WD* 689, for example, he dispenses advice about the danger of entrusting one's entire livelihood to the sea, μηδ' ἐν νηυσὶν ἅπαντα βίον κοίλησι τίθεσθαι, using a traditional formula in a non-traditional context, locating the adjective κοίλησι in the 4th and 5th feet, where it is situated 20 times in Homer in various case-forms.

The language of the *Homeric Hymns* is also more "recent" than that of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and lacks formulae exclusive to this genre of hexameter verse (such ancient formulae as they do contain, e.g. name + epithet formulae of gods, are shared with Homer and almost certainly are adapted from the more traditional heroic epic). The poets of the *Hymns* tend to resist archaic forms such as ἴφι, βίηφι (the latter is an artificial creation, but at this late stage poets and audiences may not have been aware of its artificiality); likewise scarce in the *Hymns* are obscure glosses such as ἀκάκητα, ἀμφιγυήεις, ὄβριμος. I suspect that narrative hexameter poetry specifically about gods, as opposed to heroic epic in which gods intervene, composed in the same diction as heroic epic, is a comparatively recent development, and an offshoot of more traditional epic: gods and goddesses have a long history in epic as patrons intervening to assist favoured warriors (witness name + epithet formulae e.g. Διὸς ἀλιγόχοιο, glosses which are epithets of gods, e.g. ἀτρυτώνη, ἀκάκητα). Nevertheless, the *Hymns* do

have a basis in the epic tradition inasmuch as bardic recitals and competitions seem to have been started with an address to a divinity; the shorter *Hymns* may provide an idea of the length of such addresses. The poets who performed heroic epic were already masters of the traditional diction and could transfer it to any topic of their choice, thus there is no reason to assume that individual bards specialized in any single type of epic. Thus Hesiod, presumably having undergone a traditional bardic training, produced hexameter poetry on topics as diverse as the birth of the gods, his own one and only sea voyage, the grape harvest, and perhaps, if one agrees with Notopoulos,<sup>20</sup> a poem detailing the κλέα of Amphidamas. As poets could turn their hand to any type of epic, they could use any formula in any type of hexameter poem, whatever the context. Thus we sometimes find ancient formulae extracted from their (assumed) original context used in the *Hymns* or *Works and Days*, works which are in general of less traditional linguistic character than Homer.

Non-Homeric epic is notably less formulaic than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: 23% of the Hesiodic corpus consists of lines and phrases repeated elsewhere in these poems, compared to 33% of lines and phrases in the Homeric poems.<sup>21</sup> The difference is probably to be explained by the exiguous amount of non-Homeric hexameter verse which survives in comparison to the almost 28,000 verses of Homer. Hesiod and other poets

---

<sup>20</sup> "Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean Heritage of Oral Poetry".182, note 18

<sup>21</sup> Statistics from Notopoulos, "Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean Heritage of Oral Poetry",

from non-Ionic speaking regions of Greece were dependent on the Ionian branch of the epic tradition only to the extent that by the late 8th century the Ionic form of the epic dialect seems to have gained the ascendancy over local varieties. This could only have been due to the prestige that this branch of the tradition had somehow gained; in addition, it had the advantage of the flexibility allowed by neglect of digamma and perhaps ephelcystic  $\nu$  making position.<sup>22</sup> The surviving non-Homeric epics are representatives of the same tradition, but do not depend on the Homeric poems for either their language or their content.

If West is right in dating the *Theogony* before the *Iliad* (and there is no reason why he should not be), it is notable that this poem is composed in the same Ionic-type dialect as the *Iliad*. This will mean that Hesiod, who was active in Boeotia, was composing hexameter verse in the Ionic style before the Homeric *Iliad* was known. This implies that Ionian epic poetry was known on the mainland before the composition of the *Iliad*. We can

---

<sup>22</sup> Ephelcystic  $-\nu$  is not solely a phenomenon of Att-Ion. (v. p.8), but also occurs in prose in other dialects at dates too early to admit Attic influence: it can be found in the dative plural in Thessalian, Locrian, Arcadian and other dialects, and in some verb-forms in Cypriot. Its use is less frequent, however, in poems composed on the mainland, e.g. *Theogony* and *WD* (21.5%), *Catalogue* (30.7%), *Aspis* (23.6%), *HyApP* (13.7%), *HyHerm* (15.5%): the frequency of ephelcystic  $-\nu$  may reflect the influence of Ionian epic, and in those poems where it is less frequent, its comparative infrequency may reflect its comparative infrequency in the vernacular dialects of the regions where these poems were composed (v. Janko, *HHH* 66).

discount the theory of C.O. Pavese<sup>23</sup> that Hesiod's poetry was composed first in Boeotian and subsequently "transcribed" into an Ionic written version. Pavese has argued that it was in Athens in the time of the Peisistratids that the Homeric poems were first written down, and that Hesiod's<sup>24</sup> poems were Ionicized at this time. This implies a "translation" from one dialect to another: however, Greek poetry was never "translated" from one dialect into another, but each genre of verse was composed in the dialect which was felt to be most appropriate for it; cf. the choruses of Attic tragedy, whose dialect is a type of (mild) Doric. Furthermore, Hesiod's poems would not scan properly throughout if transposed into different dialects, as Fick attempted to do, "translating" the *Theogony* into Delphic and the *WD* into Aeolic, assuming that these were the original versions of Hesiod's poems.<sup>25</sup> However, a useful result of Fick's work was the proof that the Aeolic and Ionic dialects were to a large extent mutually

---

<sup>23</sup> *Tradizioni*, 73-4: "...durante un periodo di trasmissione orale in ambiente beotico, i poemi di Esiodo siano venuti a contatto, oralmente, con un rapsodo attico o ionico...egli ha trascritto i poemi nel solo modo in cui poteva, cioè secondo la grafia che era naturale per lui, la grafia ionico-attica."

<sup>24</sup> "The Rhapsodic Epic Poems as Oral and Independent Poems", *HSCP* 98, 1998, 81; *Tradizioni* 113-4, "...il nostro testo di Esiodo e di altri poeti continentali si presenta in una forma ionica o meglio ionizzata, perché esso dipende ultimamente da una registrazione fatta a Atene, forse contemporanea alla redazione pisistratica di Omero". However, as G.L. Huxley has observed (*Greek Epic Poetry*, 122), the legend of the Peisistratean recension of the Homeric poems indicates only that the Athenians were in possession of texts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* by c. 525 B.C. It is hard to believe that until that date the *WD* and *Theogony* existed only in an epichoric Boeotian type of epic language, as Pavese would have it.

<sup>25</sup> *Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*, 1883

interchangeable, i.e. metrically equivalent, thus a putative change of dialect would in many cases have meant little more than a change of pronunciation: this is significant for the adoption by mainland poets of Ionian epic language at a late stage of the tradition. Needless to say, this adoption of the Ionic form of epic language would not have brought about the “translation” of pre-existing works, but rather a gradual alteration in the way words were pronounced in performance.

The obvious implication of Hesiod’s use of the Ionic epic dialect is that Ionic was already felt even in non-Ionic speaking areas to be the appropriate dialect for hexameter poetry before the composition of the *Theogony* (perhaps c.700 B.C.), thus it would be reasonable to postulate a major efflorescence of epic poetry in Asia Minor during the 8th century, as a result of which Ionic came to be perceived throughout the Greek-speaking world as the dialect *par excellence* for this type of verse. The most popular type of epic seems to have been that which recounted the κλέα of heroes, and this type flourished in Ionia; heroic poetry, as Notopoulos observed,<sup>26</sup> has often flourished in frontier zones, such as the Greek settlements in Asia Minor were, providing a link with the homeland and its history, and reinforcing immigrants’ sense of identity. Euboea presents itself as a likely candidate for the base from which Ionian epic poetry was disseminated to mainland Greece: Hesiod himself tells us of his only sea-journey,<sup>27</sup> when he travelled to Chalcis in Euboea to participate in a bardic contest as part of the

---

<sup>26</sup> “Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean Heritage of Oral Poetry”, 186

<sup>27</sup> *WD* 650 ff.

funeral games in honour of a certain Amphidamas.<sup>28</sup> Such gatherings of bards may indeed have attracted poets from Ionia,<sup>29</sup> and it is easy to imagine that Ionian practitioners of epic may have performed at the courts of Euboean βασιλῆες such as the occupant of the Lefkandi grave<sup>30</sup> or indeed that the Amphidamas of *WD* fame may have been such an individual. Incidentally, the poem with which Hesiod won this competition is not likely to have been the *Theogony*, as accepted by West,<sup>31</sup> which is of little relevance to the occasion; it is much more likely that it was a poem detailing

---

<sup>28</sup> According to Plutarch, *Moralia* 153f., Amphidamas perished in the Lelantine war, whose dates are disputed and obscure, but perhaps fall between 730 and 700 B.C. Since the *Theogony* is unlikely to have been Hesiod's prize-winning poem on this occasion, we still have no information about the date of the *Theogony*, but can speculate that Hesiod was active by c.700 B.C.

<sup>29</sup> While one might argue that details of mainland topography or genealogy in Homer were brought back by Ionian bards from conventions such as that attended by Hesiod at Chalcis, it seems more likely that they had been preserved in verse along with their related narratives since the migrations; otherwise they would have been unfamiliar to audiences and would have required more explanation than they receive in the epic verse that has reached us. Fleeting references to Cape Malea (γ 287, δ 514) or Bouprasion (Λ 756) suggest that Ionian audiences already understood the significance of these locations.

<sup>30</sup> Peter Blome, "Die dunkle Jahrhunderte – aufgehell't", *Zweihundert Jahre Homerforschung*, J. Latacz, 1991 (ed.), 46: at Lefkandi, which is perhaps to be identified with Chalcis, excavation in 1980-1 of a 10th century grave revealed opulent artefacts, some of which had been imported from Egypt and Cyprus. This suggested a much higher standard of living and a much more cosmopolitan outlook than had previously been assumed for this period.

<sup>31</sup> *Hesiod: Theogony*, 44; West accepts the theory proposed by H.T Wade-Gery, "Hesiod", *Phoenix* 3, 1949, 87.

the exploits (κλέα) of Amphidamas himself, his ancestry, the sons he had fathered, perhaps cataloguing those whom he had slain, and even including a few similes likening him to the gods, all traditional epic material as found in the *Iliad*. At *WD* 654, ἐπ' ἄεθλα δαΐφρονος Ἀμφιδάμαντος, Hesiod may deliberately be using language which harks back to this occasion: the traditional epithet δαΐφρονος conveniently forms a T<sub>2</sub> hemistich with the personal name, and these may be the very words Hesiod used in the prize-winning poem.

There is no evidence for Ionian bards frequenting mainland Greece in the 8th century or earlier, although it would not be surprising to find that such poets had performed in Euboea, at the courts of wealthy individuals such as the occupant of the Chalcis grave (such people, patrons of poets, are the βασιλῆες whom Hesiod praises in the *Theogony* and excoriates in the *WD*). There are, however, references to mainland poets earlier than or contemporary with "Homer", e.g. Kinaithon of Sparta, Eumelus of Corinth: it would be wrong to consider such poets to be imitators of "Homer", particularly as the dates ascribed to them are too early to permit the influence of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as we know them. This suggests, then, that the epic tradition continued to flourish on the mainland from the 2nd millennium to the time of Hesiod (the earliest known mainland epic poet whose work survives). Indeed it would be surprising if a poetic tradition which was probably regarded as a pan-Greek possession had disappeared everywhere except the Ionian colonies which were settled c. 1000 B.C. It is particularly improbable that a poetic tradition with a diction so complex as

that which is exemplified by Homer and mainland epic could have been reintroduced to the mainland after an absence of several centuries. In this connexion, it is significant that Hellenistic epic poets such as Apollonius Rhodius, for whom epic composition constituted a literary exercise rather than participation in a living tradition, use only a limited number of formulae without formula systems: literary poets use “ornamental epithets” (Parry’s phrase) in imitation of Homer, without awareness that formulae had been created and handed on through generations of oral poets for ease in versification.<sup>32</sup> Epic language appears already to have developed to a high degree of complexity before the end of the Mycenaean Age, and to have included a large number of inherited formulae, some so old that they were already unmetrical, e.g. \*Μηριόνας κατάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδροῦ<sup>w</sup>χόντᾱ; by this date it appears to have been the medium which preserved lexical items no longer used in contemporary everyday speech, e.g. ἄλκι, ὕσμῆνι; and furthermore it appears that it was already perceived as a composite dialect, characterized not only by the retention of archaisms, but also by the use of metrically convenient dialectal alternatives, e.g. dative plural -σι and -εσσι, perhaps infinitives in -μεν and -μεναι. It would be extremely surprising if a poetic language of such complexity, which had taken centuries to develop, had completely disappeared from mainland Greece, subsequently being reintroduced from Ionia with such success that it enabled poets such as Hesiod to compose lengthy works using this ancient diction, traversing Greece winning prizes for their skill in extemporization.

---

<sup>32</sup> Parry, *MHV* 36

What is perhaps deserving of surprise is the fact that all the remaining examples of epic are in the Ionic form of epic language.

Non-Homeric elements in the diction of mainland hexameter verse suggest that epic survived into the 1st millennium on the mainland in local dialect forms, or more accurately in the contemporary local forms of epic language, preserving morphemes and vocabulary which had become obsolete in normal speech, and which were retained in verse because they were closely bound up with old formulae, but changed phonetically as pronunciation altered in everyday speech. In this way one may expect that labiovelars evolved to labial stops even before e-timbre vowels in epic composed in, for example, Boeotia, while in very old formulae which had once contained a syllabic resonant the o-timbre result may have been favoured instead of the a-timbre vocalization favoured by Ionic. Boeotia is, in fact, an appropriate region in which to postulate a presumed local epic tradition, as the fact that Hesiod was active here suggests the survival of the tradition in this locality. Boeotian is a fairly conservative dialect *vis-à-vis* Ionic, retaining digamma until a comparatively late date, as well as retaining Common Greek /ā/, which was fronted in Att-Ion. In this dialect, which had generalized the original instrumental plural ending of the 2nd declension, -οις, when the instrumental case merged with the dative-locative, the original locative desinence -οιοι (/oihi/ at the end of the Mycenaean Age) would have been an epic archaism, preserved for metrical reasons but obsolete in everyday speech, in the same way as -οις was obsolete in Ionic vernacular usage, although it had been part of epic language in its formative

“modern” than Homer. If poets who composed in a Boeotian linguistic milieu had taken advantage of vowel contractions in their vernacular to create greater metrical flexibility than was permitted by the inherited desinences -αο, -άων, when they started to pronounce epic in the Ionian manner they would simply have said monosyllabic -εω, -έων instead of -α, -ᾶν. Similarly, the infinitive ending -μεν is proportionally more frequent in Hesiod than in Homer, appearing 7 times in the *Theogony* and 22 in the *WD*, perhaps because it had greater support in the vernacular.

### **Epic in Laconia**

Sparta is generally assumed to have had no epic of its own, probably because of Plutarch’s account<sup>36</sup> which tells how the lawgiver Lycurgus brought the Homeric poems from Samos to Lacedaemon. This does not imply that Sparta had no epic poetry of its own; on the other hand, it could be taken to imply a considerable amount of interest in epic on the part of Spartans. Although there is thus every reason to postulate the existence of a local epic tradition in Laconia, the ancient sources mention only one native Spartan epic poet, namely Kinaithon; of his work nothing remains, but according to Pausanias (8.53,5; 2.3,9) he composed a genealogical poem (a type of poetry frequently found in Homer, and one with a very high probability of having Mycenaean origins) which in some details differs from the genealogy of the Spartan royal house found in

---

<sup>36</sup> *Lycurgus*, 4.4

Homer: he gives Helen and Menelaus a son, Nicostratus,<sup>37</sup> while in Homer they have no son. Kinaithon is dated by Eusebius before the mid-8th century, a date which is almost certainly too early, as it is calculated by generations<sup>38</sup>; but even if his *floruit* was in the 7th century this is too early to admit influence from the Homeric poems, although it is not unlikely that he was composing under the influence of Ionian epic.

There was a considerable amount of local legend in Lacedaemon, much of which was surely preserved after the end of the Mycenaean Age by the local non-Dorian population. When West Greek speakers arrived, epic poetry may have been one of the cultural elements which they adopted from the “Achaean” inhabitants (along with elements of religion- cf. the sanctuary at Amyklai- and possibly the Spartan dyarchy, one branch of which was possibly descended from an older “Achaean” dynasty<sup>39</sup>), not least in an attempt to legitimize their presence and give themselves a history, the aetiology behind the legend of the Return of the Heraclids. Archaeological evidence suggests that Mycenaean civilization survived the

---

<sup>37</sup> Kinkel, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, fr.3. This detail is probably a post-

Mycenaean addition: the name Νικόστρατος is not of the type found in Mycenaean and the traditional onomastic stock of epic. λα(φ)ός, rather than στρατός, occurs in ancient two-part compound names with the meaning “army”, while the noun νίκα / -η has no attestation in known Mycenaean onomastic formations.

<sup>38</sup> G.L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry*, 40

<sup>39</sup> Pierre Lévêque, “La mémoire achéenne de Sparte. Analyse de la rue Aphetaïs” (in *La transizione dal miceneo all’alto arcaismo*, D. Musti, ed., 1991) 581: “...peut-être l’une des deux dynasties était achéenne.”

collapse of the palace system by some 150 years,<sup>40</sup> thus when West Greek speakers arrived in Laconia, they are likely to have found substantial cultural remnants of that civilization. Subsequently, the “Achaean” survivors of the Bronze Age population of the Eurotas valley became *περίοικοι*. The Dorian dialect dominated the “Achaean” in historical times; however, the earliest inscriptions suggest that the Doric of the *περίοικοι* was not “pure”, but retained traces of the Arcado-Cypriot-type dialect formerly spoken throughout the Peloponnese, e.g. *Ποηοιδᾶν* from the pre-Dorian form represented by Arcadian *Ποσοιδᾶν*.<sup>41</sup> The expected Doric form of the god’s name is *Ποτειδᾶν*, the final syllable contracted from *-ᾶων*, as in the Homeric form, and in Mycenaean *po-se-da-o-ne*. Although Messenia was under Doric control, its Doric dialect shows a vestige of the AC substrate in *ἕος*, “one (and the same)”.<sup>42</sup>

Although it is impossible to prove that epic survived among these descendants of the Bronze Age population of Laconia, it would be surprising if it had been completely lost: archaeological remains indicate Mycenaean settlement in Laconia, and tholos tombs suggest the presence of high-status families in the locality. In legend, not only Menelaus, but also Icarus, Penelope’s father, is associated with Sparta: he is the brother of Tyndareus, Clytaemnestra’s father.<sup>43</sup> Given such connexions, epic is as

---

<sup>40</sup> Siegrid Deger-Jalkotzky, “Zusammenbruch der mykenischen Kultur und dunkle Jahrhunderte”, 138 (in *Zweihundert Jahre Homerforschung*)

<sup>41</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 58

<sup>42</sup> Thumb-Kieckers, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte I*, 108

<sup>43</sup> Pausanias 3.1.1.f

likely to have been performed in Mycenaean Sparta as in all other locations where Mycenaean civilization held sway, and also as likely to have been preserved there after the end of the Bronze Age, with its traditional diction and dialect, as it surely was preserved elsewhere. Furthermore, the elegies of Tyrtaeus (who is sometimes claimed as an Ionian, although this is dubious) exhibit the influence of epic language, as well as vernacular Ionic, and it would be rash to assume that this epic influence came solely from Ionia. Also active in Sparta in the mid- to late 7th century was Alcman: he composed in Doric, incorporating epic forms. In his poetry are to be found the following forms which are shared with epic<sup>44</sup>: δαιτυμόνεσσι; ἔδμεναι; τόσσα instead of the vernacular τόσσα; datives plural -αῖσι and -οῖσι in the 1st and 2nd declensions, although the “short” forms prevailed in the local dialect<sup>45</sup>; all three forms of the preposition “towards”, ποτί, πρὸς and προτί<sup>46</sup>; ἔγεντο, *Partheneion* 88. It is, of course, not improbable that Alcman was composing under the influence of Ionian epic, but it is most unlikely that an imported verse-form would have exerted so great an influence on the work of a Laconian poet that its linguistic forms pervaded his verse: it is more likely that epic was already known in Laconia before Ionian epic language was accepted as the most desirable form for literary purposes, and thus it was deemed acceptable by poets composing in other genres to draw upon the metrical alternatives available in this traditional poetic language.

---

<sup>44</sup> Listed in Thumb-Kieckers, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte I*, 79

<sup>45</sup> Palmer, *The Greek Language*, 121

<sup>46</sup> The presence of πρὸς suggests the influence of Ionian epic.

The presence of epic forms in the works of 7th century Spartan poets (possibly contemporaneously with the composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*) shows how pervasive was the influence of the pre-migration epic language on both sides of the Aegean. Had epic language not survived on the mainland (albeit with local pronunciation), it is unlikely that the Homeric poems could later have been introduced successfully to places such as Sparta, where the local dialect was a Doric one. The Homeric poems met with widespread acceptance on the mainland because audiences had never lost familiarity with epic diction. One cannot rule out the possibility that certain formulae may have passed from mainland to Ionian poets and *vice versa*, learnt at meetings such as that attended by Hesiod at Chalcis. Nevertheless, had the epic tradition not survived on the mainland, such exchanges would have been impossible; epic would have been perceived by mainland Greeks as a parochial Ionian art-form.

It seems likely, then, that epic survived into the 1st millennium in local dialects, or the local versions of epic language, which were supplanted by the Ionic version in perhaps the 8th century, when, as a result of a major flowering of the epic art in Ionia, Ionic came to be perceived as the appropriate dialect for epic verse. This predates "Homer": the Homeric poems were part of, not the catalyst for, the resurgence of interest in the Heroic (i.e. Mycenaean) Age in Archaic Greece. Nor should it be assumed that the production of these two "monumental" poems in writing brought about the cessation of oral epic composition: it is possible that oral composition continued until the 6th or 5th century, falling out of favour

perhaps as a result of the growth of tragedy, although the tradition of oral poetry may have continued to be practised in backwaters of which nothing is known.

## The Language of Non-Homeric Epic

The Homeric poems are representatives of a traditional style of poetry which was widely diffused in all regions of archaic Greece. Non-Homeric epic contains very few expressions not attested in Homer. It is reasonable to assume that the absence from Homer of such epic expressions as are represented in non-Homeric hexameter poetry is to be attributed to one or more of the following causes:

1. they were lost in Ionian epic, but retained in other branches of the tradition;
2. they were created by post-migration poets composing in other parts of Greece;
3. they were not used in the Homeric poems because they were not required by the subject-matter.

Non-Homeric hexameter verse contains non-Homeric morphemes, e.g. genitive singular  $-\alpha < -\alpha\omicron$ ,<sup>47</sup> genitive plural  $-\acute{\alpha}\nu < -\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$ , and non-Homeric formulae. Non-Homeric forms and formulae are not likely to have

---

<sup>47</sup> A genitive of this type is to be found at "Hesiod" fr. 69,  $\kappa\alpha\iota \ \tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon \ \delta\eta \ \sigma\tau\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$

$\text{'}\text{A}\theta\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha \ \phi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\varsigma \ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron \ \text{Z}\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ ; cf. also  $\text{'}\text{A}\tau\lambda\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$  at *WD* 383.

been created by the individual poets in whose work they appear, but most probably are elements of traditional epic diction, and are likely to be as old as, if not older than, certain elements of Homeric diction. As they have no representation in Homer, it is most improbable that they were adopted from Ionian epic. Non-Homeric epic also attests some relatively recent dialectal elements which entered the mainland branch of the tradition after the Ionian branch had separated from it, thus between c. 1000 and 800 B.C., and which therefore remained unknown to Ionian epic. Such recent dialectal elements have no representation in old formulae, in the same way as Homeric secondary Aeolisms (i.e. Lesbian forms) have no representation in ancient formulae.

One such non-Homeric formula<sup>48</sup> is ἡ οἴη, which occurs frequently in the “Hesiodic” fragments, especially the *Catalogue of Women* (alternative name *Ehoiai*) and at *Aspis* 1, ἡ οἴη προλιπούσα...: this is a catalogue formula which begins verses concerning paternity, birthplace, or κλέα.<sup>49</sup> Much of the material of the *Iliad* concerns warfare, and Homer attests a considerable number of ancient formulae connected with this subject. However, at *Theogony* 713 appears the T<sub>2</sub> hemistich μάχην δριμεῖαν ἔγειραν, reflected by *Aspis* 261, μάχην δριμεῖαν ἔθεντο. The noun and epithet appear together only once in Homer, at O 696, where δριμεῖα μάχη bridges the main caesura. It is likely that Hesiod and the

---

<sup>48</sup> Among non-Homeric formulae I include formulae which occur in two or more non-Homeric epics: repetition of a phrase within the same poem, if it is not attested elsewhere, may signify only that an individual poet liked this formulaic phrase that he had created.

<sup>49</sup> Pavese, *Tradizioni e generi*, 123-4

*Aspis* poet have used this noun + epithet combination in a more traditional way than did the *Iliad* poet: whichever verb originally occupied the end of the verse, μάχην δριμύειαν looks like a traditional formulaic phrase designed to follow the trochaic caesura. It is the *Iliad* poet who has modified a traditional formula, as in the case of ἔῳ ἐγκάτθετο κόλπῳ (Ξ 223, v. p. 313)

### **Non-Ionic Dialect Forms**

Non-Homeric dialect forms tend to be non-formulaic and thus non-traditional, generally representing local dialect forms, and are not inherited from the tradition. Some are the results of modifications of old formulae.

At the end of the Mycenaean Age, epic language was unitary, an artificial “literary” language of generally East Greek type, characterized by the retention of archaisms (some of which were later interpreted as Aeolisms, giving Ionic-speaking poets licence to incorporate forms from Lesbian) and by the existence of metrically necessary doublets, notably the athematic datives plural -σι and -εσσι, the latter adopted from proto-Aeolic. This traditional poetic language was (as argued in ch. 1) one which lacked traits which would identify it with any narrowly defined geographical region, therefore it could subsequently take on, chameleon-like, the dialectal complexion of any locality where it was used; furthermore the most ancient elements of the diction are without traits which could be identified with specific 2nd millennium dialects, although, because pockets of archaisms are retained sporadically in the dialects of the 1st millennium, it may

sometimes appear that epic contains an Aeolic trait, e.g. ποτί, \*ῖ > ορ, ρο, ἐκόλεσσα. When the epic tradition divided into a mainland and an Ionian branch at the time of the migrations, the traditional poetic language continued to develop *pari passu* with the vernacular regional dialects by the process described in ch.1. In Ionia, this meant that epic language incorporated innovations of East Ionic such as quantitative metathesis, synzesis and neglect of digamma, with the use of some Lesbian forms when the Ionic equivalent was unmetrical. At some point before Hesiod, Ionian epic language was adopted on the mainland as the appropriate type for this poetry, but epic verse composed on the mainland in the Ionian style contains some dialect forms which could only have come from the post-migration mainland. Such forms indicate that epic continued to be composed in mainland Greece while the 1st millennium dialects were developing and diverging.

Certain elements of Hesiod's language have been perceived as belonging to West Greek. Some such forms are in fact simple archaisms retained in the West Greek dialects, which were in general more conservative than the East Greek dialects. In the same way, Homer presents some forms which might have been perceived as Dorisms (e.g. ποτί, unsimplified -σσ-) had the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* been composed in a milieu where Doric dialects were spoken<sup>50</sup>; these, however, were clearly

---

<sup>50</sup> Indeed Doric was spoken in South East Asia Minor, but not in the region where Homer is traditionally located. Although Ionian in Asia Minor was in contact with Doric dialects, there is no Doric contribution to the language of the Homeric poems. This probably results

perceived not as Dorisms but as Aeolisms, since Lesbian rather than Doric innovations (e.g. ἐμέος, αὐτοσσαντόν) were incorporated into Ionian epic.<sup>51</sup> However, Hesiod, a representative of the mainland epic tradition, uses a handful of Doric forms, therefore it is legitimate to assume that archaisms such as τοί, ποτί, -σσ- were in this linguistic milieu interpreted as “Dorisms”, thus legitimizing the incorporation into epic of West Greek innovations. A Boeotian vernacular element is to be found in Hesiod in the construction εἰ γάρ τις κε (*WD* 280), using the word order common to Boeotian and the West Greek dialects,<sup>52</sup> where the traditional epic word order εἰ γάρ κεν τις would be unmetrical. Boeotian in many cases shares isoglosses with West Greek, and not only shared archaisms, although it is fundamentally an East Greek dialect, part of the more conservative northern, Aeolic, branch of East Greek: these shared isoglosses include temporal adverbs in -κα, not -τε, e.g. ποκά, ὄκα; πρώτος, not πρώτος; -αε- > -η-, e.g. τιμήν = τιμᾶν; potential particle κα; ἰαρός not ἱερός; Ἄρταμις not Ἄρτεμις.<sup>53</sup> West Greek and Aeolic also share some isoglosses which may go back into the 2nd millennium, e.g. the conjunction αἰ = εἰ; e-vocalism in

---

from a feeling that the Doric dialects were *parvenus* without sufficient establishment to be admitted in epic; only the long-established East Greek dialects were felt to be appropriate contributors to epic. Ionic is itself to a considerable extent a post-Mycenaean entity inasmuch as it developed most of its characteristic isoglosses after the end of the Mycenaean Age, but came to be perceived as the appropriate dialect for epic by the process described in ch.1.

<sup>51</sup> Adrados, “Towards a new Stratigraphy of the Homeric Dialect”, *Glotta* 59, 1981, 22

<sup>52</sup> Pavese, *Studi* 107

<sup>53</sup> Ernst Risch, “La posizione del dialetto dorico”, *Le origini dei Greci*, D. Musti (ed.), 1985, 22

the verb “to wish”, Boeotian βείλομαι, Thessalian βέλλομαι, West Greek δήλομαι, δέλομαι (< \*g<sup>w</sup>els-), as opposed to o-vocalism in Att-Ion. βούλομαι, Arcadian βόλομαι. In the late 2nd millennium the mainland Aeolic dialects underwent varying degrees of West Greek influence: East Thessalian shows the least influence from West Greek, and is probably the closest of the Aeolic dialects to Common, or proto-, Aeolic; West Thessalian shows a greater amount of West Greek influence, while the greatest amount is found in Boeotian. As Boeotian had much in common with West Greek, epic which had developed *pari passu* with this dialect would have had no difficulty in incorporating West Greek forms from neighbouring dialects.

Short 1st declension accusatives plural in -ᾶς occur nine times in Hesiod, some at least in adaptations of formulae which traditionally occur in the nominative. In the formative stages of epic language, the 1st declension accusative plural was -ανς, which in the 1st millennium was retained in some positions by the conservative Argolic and Cretan dialects. In the Gortyn Law Code from Crete one finds τόνς ἐλευθερόνς, with the syllabic weight preserved in antevocalic position, but in anteconsonantal position τὸς καδεστάνς. When -νς was simplified, there appear to have coexisted for a time a short and a long accusative plural ending, -ᾶς, in anteconsonantal position, and -ᾷς, in antevocalic position, which allowed

the ancient prosody to be retained.<sup>54</sup> Subsequently, dialects selected and generalized either the short, antec consonantal form, or the long, antevocalic form. Ionic generalized the long version, and as a result in Ionian epic there was no divergence from vernacular usage: the prosody of traditional formulae was retained regardless of developments in the vernacular. Boeotian, like Ionic, also generalized the long ending, while the short accusative plural was generalized in Thessalian, Phocian and Locrian, dialects which were contiguous with Boeotian, and thus in modifying traditional formulae Hesiod may have had some support from these neighbouring dialects. The simplification of  $-v\varsigma$  thus constitutes the second wave of compensatory lengthening in Att-Ion., which took place after the change  $\bar{\alpha} > \eta$  had ceased to operate: this is obvious from the fact that  $*\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\sigma\alpha$  became  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$  and not  $*\pi\eta\sigma\alpha$ . Long  $\alpha$  appears to have begun its shift towards  $\eta$  by the mid-11th century, as it was operational before the migrations, and was probably complete by c. 900 B.C. Thus it is a reasonable estimate that the second compensatory lengthening occurred in Att-Ion. during the 9th century, and that other dialects which underwent this development did so at the same time. While the sequence  $-v\varsigma$  was still intact, the accusative plural endings of the 1st and 2nd declensions were long in all dialects; the alternation between endings with long and short vowels must therefore postdate the 2nd compensatory lengthening, and thus the generalization according to dialect of long or short endings took place very late in terms of the epic tradition, perhaps c. 800 B.C. The fact that there are very few short endings in Hesiod, and these not in old formulae but

---

<sup>54</sup> Anna Morpurgo Davies, "Doric features in the language of Hesiod", *Glotta* 42, 1964, 153  
296

in modifications thereof, is an indication of the conservatism of epic language. Since this possibility was available to mainland, but not to Ionian, poets, it gives no indication of the relative ages of the Homeric and Hesiodic poems.

Hesiod provides two examples of 1st declension genitives plural in  $-\hat{\alpha}\nu$ , a contraction of  $-\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$  known from West Greek:  $\theta\epsilon\hat{\alpha}\nu$  at *Theogony* 41 and 129, and  $\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\hat{\alpha}\nu$  at *WD* 145. The contraction of  $-\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$  to  $-\hat{\alpha}\nu$  is indeed known from West Greek, but is also found in Arcadian, Lesbian and Thessalian, and from the article in Boeotian. It would of course be unrealistic to suppose an Arcadian source for this genitive ending, but it is possible that it was adopted from Thessalian, and as Hesiod's father, as Hesiod himself tells us, came from Aeolian Cyme, one cannot altogether rule out the possibility that a 1st declension genitive plural in  $-\hat{\alpha}\nu$  was known to Hesiod from his father's speech. Nevertheless, I am wary of ascribing to the influence of Hesiod's father (or of any individual) any assumed Lesbian forms in the Hesiodic poems. It is much more likely that Hesiod incorporated useful forms from neighbouring dialects in the same way as the Ionian bards did, and as their 2nd millennium predecessors had done. Since a poet composing in Boeotia was not likely to be familiar with Arcadian, influence from neighbouring West Greek dialects or from Thessalian seems the most probable source for these genitives.

These two genitives do not, however, follow the usual pattern of adaptations from neighbouring dialects, in that they are metrically equivalent to their Ionic equivalents  $\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\hat{\omega}\nu$  and  $\theta\epsilon\hat{\omega}\nu$ , thus the reason for

using a form belonging to another dialect is not immediately obvious. If we assume that we have Hesiod's original spelling, the explanation offered by G.P. Edwards<sup>55</sup> for these genitives is convincing. θεῶν could refer to divinities male or female, and although θεάων (not found in contemporary Ionic, but a traditional epic form) is unambiguous, it is metrically inadmissible in the two *Theogony* verses in question. The West Greek θεῶν, however, gives the required sense and prosody. μελιῶν, the expected Ionic genitive, would be metrically acceptable at *WD* 145 in the 2nd and 3rd feet, and would cause no ambiguity, thus the explanation accepted above for West Greek θεῶν is not applicable in this instance. Edwards proposes that Hesiod used the West Greek genitive plural in order to avoid association with the traditional epic phrase ἐκ μελέων, "from his limbs", making it completely unambiguous that he is referring to "ash trees".

The few genuine West Greek elements in Hesiod's language, as opposed to simple archaisms which the traditional language of epic shared with the West Greek dialects of the 1st millennium, must postdate the Dorian invasion, and were absorbed by epic from the vernacular in the same way as Ionian epic adopted elements from contemporary Ionic and Lesbian, using these either in the non-formulaic part of the diction, or in order to modify old formulae. Thus Hesiod has used West Greek τέτορα (*WD* 698) in a non-formulaic context, and at *WD* 564 and 663, the short 1st declension accusative plural ending in modifying the traditional τροπαὶ ἠελίοιο. The date of the creation of this formula is difficult to determine: it may be pre-

---

<sup>55</sup> *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context*, 1971, 103

migration, as it is shared with Homer, appearing at ο 404 in the nominative at verse-end: τροπαὶ ἠελίοιο. The fact that it appears in the same position in both Homer and Hesiod gives grounds for believing it to be traditional. Hesiod, however, uses the term in a slightly different sense to that which it has in Homer, τροπαὶ ἠελίοιο in Homer referring to the place on the horizon where the sun rises at the summer or winter solstice,<sup>56</sup> while the Hesiodic variation refers to a time of year, the solstice itself. It is not necessary to assume that Hesiod had heard the formula from an Ionian bard and misunderstood it: he was using a traditional formula, which may well have survived on the mainland as well as in Ionia, in a less traditional way than the *Odyssey* poet because his subject-matter was less traditional.

At O 626 we find ἀνέμοιο δὲ δεινὸς ἀήτης after the penthemimeral caesura (in a simile, and not an ancient hemistich: the prosody of δὲ does not reflect the erstwhile digamma of \*δφεινός); this noun occurs several times at verse-end, ἀήται at ι 139, ἀήτας at Ξ 254, δ 567, *WD* 645, and δεινὰς ἀήτας at *WD* 675. The gender of this noun is subject to dispute because of O 626, where the form of the noun is also disputed, some manuscripts offering ἀήτης and others ἀήτη; since the noun occurs at verse-end, its final consonant, or the absence thereof, has no metrical effect. At δ 567, Ζεφύροιο λιγὺ πνείοντας ἀήτας is the alternative reading to πνείοντος favoured by Aristarchus, and would mean that ἀήτης was masculine, but this tells us nothing about the gender of the noun: πνέω / πνείω is late in epic, and the archaic word-family represented

---

<sup>56</sup> Hoekstra, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. II, 257

by ἄημι and its derivatives is without prose attestation.<sup>57</sup> Nevertheless, despite δεινός at O 626, the gender of this noun does seem to be feminine: δεινός is used in the nominative singular in order to obviate hiatus between final -η (or -α) and initial ἄ-. Furthermore, Sappho provides an example of the feminine accusative plural μεγάλας ἀήται[ς].<sup>58</sup> Ionian poets, however, could not decline this formula into the accusative plural: neither Ionic nor Lesbian provided them with a metrical alternative to -ᾶς < -αυς.<sup>59</sup> Hesiod took advantage of traits present in neighbouring mainland dialects to do just this. The presence of this formula in poetry composed on either side of the Aegean suggests that it was part of the traditional inherited epic stock, probably created for poetry concerning storms at sea, the context of Ξ 254, O 626. Hesiod has adopted traditional seafaring formulae to a particularly non-heroic context, that of trading by sea.

Other occurrences in Hesiod of short 1st declension accusatives plural may or may not be modifications of traditional formulae (*Theogony* 60, ἦ δ' ἔτεκ' ἔννεα κούρας, *Theogony* 267, ἠΰκόμους θ' Ἀρπυίας, both before the trochaic caesura), but are instances of the poet's taking advantage of this linguistic trait known from neighbouring dialects in order to gain greater flexibility in the traditional poetic language. In this respect,

---

<sup>57</sup> Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen*, 71

<sup>58</sup> Sappho fr. 20.9 LP

<sup>59</sup> Lesbian had 1st and 2nd declension accusatives plural -αις and -οις, having diphthongized the vowels α and ο in response to the simplification of -υς after first nasalizing them.

mainland epic language had an option which was not available to poets composing in the linguistic milieu of Asia Minor. The presence in epic of the 3rd declension accusative plural in  $-\alpha\varsigma$  may have been felt to give support from within the tradition itself to short accusative plural endings in the 1st declension<sup>60</sup>; however, there are no accusative plural endings in  $-\omicron\varsigma$  within epic, and this may explain the isolation of  $\lambda\alpha\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$  at *Aspis* 302, despite the fact that those dialects which had the short ending in the accusative plural of the 1st declension also had the short ending in the corresponding 2nd declension forms. Nevertheless it would be erroneous to assume that this licence is taken primarily from the 3rd declension, since this possibility was available also to Ionian poets, who did not take advantage of it.

$\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\rho(\alpha)$  at *WD* 698 is attested elsewhere only in the Doric and North West dialects, the equivalent of Ionic  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\alpha$ . Certain forms of the number “four” are based on the zero-grade  $*q^{w}etw\eta$ , e.g. Homeric  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ , Attic  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ , Boeotian  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ . The reason for Hesiod’s use of  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\rho(\alpha)$  at *WD* 698 is clear: neither the traditional epic form, nor the local Boeotian form, gave the required scansion here. When this scansion is required in Homer, the “Aeolic”  $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\upsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma$  is used (three occurrences in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* respectively). This Homeric “Aeolism” might be assumed to have been adopted from Lesbian, but is not attested anywhere else. Hesychius cites for Lesbian the form  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\upsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ , reflecting the zero-grade

---

<sup>60</sup> Janko, *HHH* 59

with variant vocalization in the second syllable, and the normal Aeolic result of the labiovelar before a vowel of e-timbre. Also claimed as Lesbian is the form πέσυρες, attested by Balbilla in the 2nd century A.D. However, caution is necessary here, as Balbilla is far too late to be used as evidence for the early Lesbian dialect which was in a position to influence Homer. As an Aeolic dialect, Lesbian had not simplified the sequence -σσ- < \*θy, \*ty, as in μέσσοϛ, a simplification which had apparently taken place in Att-Ion. and AC in the 2nd millennium; the development of the sequence \*τϕ > -σσ- / -ττ- is later than this, postdating the end of the Mycenaean Age, and is not simplified in any dialect in the interior of a word. It is possible, however, that Ionian poets had taken the licence to simplify this sequence in πέσυρες by analogy with the Aeolic type μέσσοϛ corresponding to Ionic μέσοϛ. This leaves the vocalism of the first syllable of πέσυρες to be explained: as the expected result of a labiovelar before /i/ is everywhere τ-, even in Aeolic (e.g. τι < q<sup>w</sup>ι(δ), τίμα = τίμη at Sappho 5.10, LP), this vocalism cannot be original, and may be explained as Hainsworth has plausibly suggested as “a development within the *Kunstsprache* itself, perhaps by assimilation to the fronted υ of Ionic”.<sup>61</sup> Therefore I believe Homeric πέσυρας to be something of a red herring: rather than a form adopted directly from Lesbian, it is an artificial form, a “false Aeolism”, created for metrical convenience, and it would be legitimate to describe it as a hyper-Aeolism in Homer, in the same way as Hesiod uses the hyper-Ionic Ἐρμελίην<sup>62</sup> (WD 68) while Homer has Ἐρμείων retaining original long α.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>61</sup> *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol.I, 263

<sup>62</sup> G.P. Edwards, *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context*, 102

Why the Ionian bards created an artificial form with initial π-, the Aeolic result of the labiovelar preceding a front vowel, rather than τ-, the Ionic result, is difficult to explain. One can only assume that Aeolic forms were felt to be older and somehow more desirable in epic: Lesbian did after all still use some forms which were used in epic but obsolete in spoken Ionic. Whereas Hesiod had at his disposal a genuine form from a neighbouring dialect which could be substituted for the traditional epic form as metrically required, the Ionian bards were not familiar with such a form in a spoken dialect, and thus created the hybrid πίουρες.

At *WD* 611 most manuscripts give the unmetrical ἀποδρέπειν, while others read the imperative ἀπόδρεπε, and others ἀπόδρεπεν. One might assume that ἀπόδρεπεν should be interpreted as an imperative with ephelecytic -ν blocking hiatus where the initial digamma of (Ϝ)οἴκοδε is neglected, but this is unparalleled: -ν is never added to an imperative.<sup>64</sup> Poets did indeed create artificial forms, but not forms which had no basis in the spoken language and would have sounded preposterous to listeners: only with morphemes which were obsolete in quotidian parlance could poets be creative (e.g. ἦφι βιῆφι). Although imperatival infinitives are well represented in epic,<sup>65</sup> here ἀποδρέπειν is unmetrical with or without initial digamma in the following word. As the thematic infinitive of the type

---

<sup>63</sup> A comparable Hyper-Ionism from mainland epic is to be found in δῆη at *Th.* 260 and Hesiodic fragment 70.10; in Homer this adjective always appears as δῆα.

<sup>64</sup> J.L. García-Ramón, "En torno a los elementos dialectales en Hesíodo I", *CFC* 11, 1976, 531

<sup>65</sup> Chantraine, *GH* II, 316 ff.

\*ἔχθηεν < \*seghesen (Mycenaean e-ke-e) is Common Greek and is likely to have belonged to both East and West Greek in the 2nd millennium, the origin of the type ἔχθηεν is not certain, but it is likely that after vowel contractions had given -ειν or -ην as the thematic infinitive ending, a similar process took place to that which occurred with the doublets εἶς / ἔς, τούς / τός, the form with long vowel being used in antevocalic position, that with the short vowel anteconsonantly, one of the pair subsequently being generalized according to dialect. Thus some dialects may have had both -ειν / -εν as infinitive endings at one stage, before generalizing the anteconsonantal version -εν. J.L. García-Ramón<sup>66</sup> is thus correct in arguing that -εν represents a sandhi variation on -ειν, but this is not, as he claimed, affected by Osthoff's Law, which took effect in the 2nd millennium.<sup>67</sup> In the same way as Ionian bards could use Aeolic infinitive endings (-μεν, -μεναι), so, it appears, Hesiod has taken advantage of a metrical possibility from a neighbouring dialect: -εν is the ending of the thematic infinitive in part of Arcadian, and in some West Greek dialects (Delphian, East Locrian, Argolic, Cretan). However, this type of infinitive has no formulaic representation, since it is a recent innovation and does not belong to the dialects which influenced epic language in its formative stages.

The diction of Hesiod and of other mainland epic is more "advanced" than that of the Homeric poems, not necessarily as a result of increased Ionian influence on mainland poetry, but rather because "non-

---

<sup>66</sup> "Le prétendu infinitif grec occidental", *Minos* 16, 1977, 194-5

<sup>67</sup> Lejeune, *Phonétique*, 220

heroic diction is generally more advanced than the heroic”<sup>68</sup>: in other words, there was more traditional diction for heroic poetry than for other subjects. The *Aspis* and *Catalogue*, for example, although generally believed to be of later composition than the *Theogony* and *WD*, are more formulaic and conservative than the two poems genuinely by Hesiod, because there was a greater amount of traditional material related to their subject-matter, *viz.*, genealogy and fighting. The presence of φερεσσάκεας Καδμείους (*Aspis* 13), the probable T<sub>2</sub> pendant of Καδμίοι κέντορες Ἰππῶν, shows that the *Aspis* poet was not dependent on Homer for his diction.

### Non-Homeric Archaisms

The non-Homeric epics contain a number of archaisms which are not found in Homer, certain of which have no Homeric parallels, while others are more archaic than their Homeric equivalents. Thus it is highly improbable that they were “borrowed” from Ionian epic, and their sources must be sought elsewhere.

Much early epic is lost, but fragments of the *Thebaid* survive, 17 verses in all. At least part of this poem was known to Pausanias, who quotes it at 9.9,5, but as much of the Theban epic is clearly known to the poets of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and to Hesiod, the *Thebaid* cannot be a late creation

---

<sup>68</sup> Pavese, “The Rhapsodic Epic Poems as Oral and Independent Poems”, *HSCP* 98, 1998,

designed to glorify Thebes, and its focus on Bronze Age Thebes, the Mycenaean connexions of its characters<sup>69</sup> as well as its linguistic character point to a poem derived from the oral tradition with a Mycenaean antecedent in the same way as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are orally-derived poems on traditional themes with a Mycenaean background. Its diction is clearly of the same traditional type as that of the Homeric poems: Ἄργος ἄειδε θεά echoes A 1, μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά, but there is no justification for assuming intertextual borrowing in either direction. ἄειδε θεά before the penthemimeral caesura is presumably a traditional way in which bards began a poem. Διὶ βασιλῆϊ is the most likely element of the fragmentary *Thebaid* to be innovative *vis-à-vis* traditional epic diction. This does not imply that these fragments are “post-Homeric”, i.e. later than the composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Traits unattested in Homer should not be considered later than Homer: φερεσσάκεας Καδμείους (*Aspis* 13) is a case in point, as it is probably as old as many Homeric formulae. Although Homer never refers to gods as βασιλεύς, using instead the Mycenaean term (f)ἄναξ, Hesiod, who may antedate Homer, also uses βασιλεύς of Zeus,<sup>70</sup> and Διὸς βασιλῆος occurs at *HyDem* 358.

At *WD* 498 we find the feminine dual καλυψαμένω, an aorist middle participle. The feminine dual of a-stems is rarely attested outside Attic, where its ending is -α, except for the definite article τῶ. In

---

<sup>69</sup> The Bronze Age connexions of the *Thebaid* are discussed by Emily Vermeule, “Baby Aigisthos and the Bronze Age”, *PCPS* 33, 1987, 138

<sup>70</sup> *Theogony* 886, 923, *WD* 668, *Fr.* 308

Mycenaean, however, the dual of feminine a-stems is clearly  $-\bar{o}$ , e.g. to-pe-zo = \*τορπέζω, ko-to-no = \*κτοίνω.  $-\omega$  as the ending of the feminine dual is also to be found in an Elean inscription: καταστάτω.<sup>71</sup> Nowhere in Greek do we find the inherited a-stem dual  $*-\alpha$  (= Sanskrit  $-e$ ); the fact that Mycenaean has  $-\bar{o}$  as the dual ending in the 1st declension points to a very early innovation on the part of Greek. Later attestation of the dual in Boeotian indicates that it was still alive in Hesiod's day, thus epic duals had vernacular support in this part of Greece, but lack of inscriptional evidence makes it impossible to determine the 1st declension dual ending at the time when he was active. δαρχιμάω<sup>72</sup> in a 4th century inscription suggests a refection at a later date, perhaps under the influence of the Attic dual in  $-\alpha$ . The 1st declension dual may have been commoner in the pre-migration stages of the epic tradition, although it was lost in Ionian epic, reflecting the fact that the dual became obsolete at an early stage in Ionic, and thus feminine duals in  $-\omega$  would have had no support in the vernacular. It is possible that such forms were replaced in Ionian epic with the metrically equivalent plural ending  $-\alpha$ , which is itself an innovation dating from the 2nd millennium, and replaced the inherited nominative plural  $-\bar{\alpha}\varsigma$  by analogy with 2nd declension  $-\alpha$ .<sup>73</sup> The dual was obsolete in East Ionic very early, thus such forms had no support in the Ionic vernacular.

---

<sup>71</sup> Schwyzer-Cauer *DGE*, 418

<sup>72</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 229, no. 39

<sup>73</sup> Palmer, *The Greek Language* 269

At *Theogony* 199, 283 and 705 we find the verb γέντο used in the same way as (ἐ)γένετο. This γέντο is a homophone of the athematic aorist which appears at Θ 43, N 25, 241, Σ 476, 477 with the meaning “grasped”. While one might assume that Hesiodic γέντο represents a misunderstanding of γέντο, “grasped”, either heard from Ionian bards and subsequently reinterpreted, or indeed reinterpreted within the mainland branch itself, it may equally well be an older athematic aorist from the root of γίγνομαι. The latter possibility becomes more attractive when one considers a 6th century inscription from Mycenae containing the phrase ἰκέτας ἔγεντο<sup>74</sup> where its meaning is the same as that of ἐγένετο. Thus it is not improbable that ἔγεντο survived in this dialect as an isolated archaism. From the evidence of Homer it appears that the thematic aorist (ἐ)γένετο was preferred in epic, presumably for metrical reasons: in the *Iliad* γένετο occurs 13 times after the penthemimeral caesura,<sup>75</sup> and the elided γένετ’ 12 times before the bucolic diaeresis as well as a further 6 times in the weak part of the 5th foot. A comparable form may be found in φέρτε at I 171, which could be explained as a syncopated form, but as epic lacks parallel syncopated imperatives it is legitimate to assume that this is an isolated athematic imperative. Similarly, athematic εὔκτο (v. *infra*) gave way in epic to thematic εὔχετο. In the case of γέντο it appears that Hesiod, despite the generally more “modern” nature of his language, has preserved an epic museum piece absent from Homer.

---

<sup>74</sup> Schwyzer-Cauer *DGE* 97

<sup>75</sup> This tally includes elided γένετ’ at A 49 and H 345

In fragment 3 of the *Thebaid* there occurs a non-Homeric archaism in εὐκτο, athematic aorist middle of a verb which is common in Homer, εὐχομαι. This verb is also known from Mycenaean in the 3rd person singular present indicative, e-u-ke-to = \*εὐχεται (PY Eb 297.1, Ep 704.5), where its sense is “claim, assert”, corresponding to the Homeric sense as seen in the formulaic use εὐχεται εἶναι at verse-end A 91, B 82, E 246, Y 102; the formula also occurs in the 1st person εὐχομαι εἶναι at Z 211, Θ 190, I 60, etc., frequently in connexion with genealogies, and also in the present participle εὐχόμενος in ὡς ἔφατ’ εὐχόμενος. The morphology of εὐκτο is unexceptionable: it is perfectly easy to accept that this is an athematic aorist middle of εὐχομαι, the same type of formation as δέκτο, ἄλτο or στεῦτο, without augment, its accentuation by analogy with forms such as ὦρτο, whose augment is temporal. εὐκτο derives from Indo-European: cf. Avestan aogədā < I.E. \*H<sub>1</sub>eughto. εὐκτο is found in extant Greek also in a fragment of Sophocles, possibly from the lost play *Theseus* (P.Ox. 2524, fr. 6.20), and the corresponding pluperfect ηὔγμην appears at Sophocles *Trachiniae* 610. Homer uses only the thematic forms εὐχεται, εὐχετο, εὐχομαι, corresponding to Vedic *ohate*, “praised”, as well as the sigmatic aorist εὔξατο: presumably the thematic forms were preferred from an early stage in epic for metrical reasons, combining with εἶναι after the bucolic diaeresis in the formulaic phrase εὐχεται / εὐχετο / εὐχομαι εἶναι. The doublet εὐχετο / εὐκτο is paralleled in γένετο and the Hesiodic γέντο, of which the thematic member may have been favoured for its metrical convenience, while εὐχετο / εὔξατο is almost paralleled in δέκτο / δέξατο, both of which are already attested in Mycenaean, which suggests that the

thematic preterites εὔχετο and γένετο may already have been used in epic in the Mycenaean Age.

Several verb-forms found in Hesiod are more archaic than their Homeric equivalents. At *Theogony* 30 appears ἔδον, an athematic 3rd person plural aorist of δίδωμι, and at *WD* 139 an imperfect ἔδιδον (also at *HyDem* 327). Att-Ion. and Homer favour the more recent sigmatic aorist δόσαν, which was clearly generalized in Att-Ion. at an early date, with eleven attestations in the *Iliad*, 5 in the T<sub>2</sub> formula θεοὶ δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα: this formula is thus the creation of Ionic-speaking bards. Such forms as the Hesiodic ἔδον have no attestation in inscriptions outside West Greek speech areas, but it is possible that they belong to the early stages of the epic tradition and were retained in mainland epic because they had support from vernacular speech. Parallel forms in mainland epic are ἔθεν, conjectured for θέσαν at fr. 205.7; aorist passive ἀπέσσυθεν at *Theogony* 183; κατέσταθεν at *Theogony* 674. Homeric parallels include ἔβαν (= ἔβησαν<sup>76</sup>), ἔτιθεν, διέτμαγεν (A 531), ἔβλαβεν (Ψ 461, 545). In these forms -ν represents the ancient ending \*-ντ, but was replaced in Att-Ion. with -σαν, by analogy with the sigmatic aorist, while the older ending was retained in West Greek.<sup>77</sup> These are therefore Common Greek archaisms which were retained in West Greek, supported in mainland epic

---

<sup>76</sup> As the members of this doublet are metrically different, the more recent form cannot have been substituted for the older one.

<sup>77</sup> Pavese, *Tradizioni*, 52; v. Anna Morpurgo Davies, "Doric features in the language of Hesiod", 147

by their use in the spoken dialects in some areas. Such forms as Hesiod's ἔδον and ἔδιδον are thus not inconsistent with the epic morphological system<sup>78</sup>: their absence from Homer may be explained by lack of vernacular support in the Ionian dialect.

Another archaic verb form used by Hesiod but absent from Homer is 3rd person plural ἦν, a contraction of ἦεν, the original athematic imperfect of εἶμι, as opposed to the thematic imperfect ἦσαν:

*Theogony* 321, τῆς δ'ἦν τρεῖς κεφαλαί

*Theogony* 825, ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαί ὄφις

In extant epic, as in Att-Ion., the 3rd person singular is most frequently ἦν, more rarely ἦεν, ἔην or ἔσκε; ἦν may have replaced the older 3rd person singular ἦς (<\*ἦστ) in the strong part of the foot (cf. the Corcyran *proxenos* inscription, *Inscriptional Evidence*, no. 6), while poets in Ionic-speaking areas may at a very early stage have substituted for the original 3rd person plural ἦεν its metrical equivalent ἦσαν. In both of the above verses, ἦν is irresoluble, as is τρεῖς, indicating recent composition, and it is possible that this is a form belonging to contemporary vernacular speech. Where this form occurs in Homer it belongs to the 3rd person singular, as in Att-Ion, as does its uncontracted form ἦεν, e.g. α 18, ἔνθα πεφυγμένος ἦεν, A 381, μάλα οἱ φίλος ἦεν. The plural form ἦσαν (ἔσαν without augment)

---

<sup>78</sup> Here I paraphrase Anna Morpurgo Davies ("Doric features in the language of Hesiod", 147), who refers to the "Homeric morphological system": epic morphology belongs to the epic tradition in its entirety, of which the Homeric poems are only the best known representatives.

appears to be a very early Att-Ion. innovation. Att-Ion. is the only dialect in which ἦν is found in the 3rd person singular. Inscriptional evidence is lacking for the Boeotian 3rd person plural imperfect form contemporaneous with Hesiod; παρεῖαν<sup>79</sup> (= παρήσαν) is influenced by the Attic form, but is in any case not attested until the 3rd century.

One of the most remarkable archaisms in Hesiod occurs as a *varia lectio* at *Theogony* 487, 890, 899 and fragment 343,7. While most modern editors accept the variant εἶν ἐσκάτθετο νηδύν, two manuscripts (b Q) offer ἐγκάτθετο. This formula is not attested in Homer, although one cannot exclude the possibility that it was adopted from Ionian epic, perhaps as a modification of ἐὼ ἐγκάτθετο κόλπῳ (Ξ 223). However, if this formula had indeed been borrowed from Ionian epic one would expect ἐσκάτθετο, because the verb is followed by a noun in the accusative. Thus it is highly improbable that we have here a borrowing from Ionian epic, and there is a strong possibility that it represents a mainland formula which was not known to Ionian poets.<sup>80</sup> Therefore there is a possibility that ἐγκάτθετο is the original form,<sup>81</sup> written as ἐσκάτθετο by Attic-speaking scribes who were unaware that ἐν with the accusative was an epic archaism. The inherited use of ἐν with the accusative case expressing motion into is obsolete in the progressive Att-Ion. and Doric dialects; these dialects made a

---

<sup>79</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects* 234, no. 43

<sup>80</sup> J.L. Garcia Ramon, "Hesiodica I, Εἶν ἐγκάτθετο νηδύν", *CFC* 11, 1976, 575-81

<sup>81</sup> This possibility is acknowledged by G.P. Edwards, *The Language of Hesiod* 106-7, and by Troxler, *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*, 1964, 115-6.

joint innovation in replacing ἐν in this usage with ἐνς, which later became ἐς / εἰς when the sequence -νς was simplified, although ἐνς is found in Cretan and Argolic. The creation of ἐνς therefore postdates the Dorian invasion and antedates the second compensatory lengthening. As Ionian epic language shared in the developments of the Ionian vernacular, in which there was no support for ἐν + accusative, formulae created with this construction can be expected to have replaced ἐν with ἐς, and thus Homeric formulae containing ἐς may conceal an ancient ἐν, while those containing εἰς may be recent, or conceal ἐν with metrical lengthening,<sup>82</sup> e.g. εἰς Ἰθάκην (α 18), and parts of εἰσαναβαίνω, several times at verse-end, e.g. ὅτε Ἴλιον εἰσανέβαινον (β 172, σ 252, τ 125). If these phrases are indeed ancient within epic, original ἐν would have been changed to εἰς because the construction of the phrases was entirely clear. κατ' ἐνώπια (Ο 320) and ἔναντα (Υ 67), however, are not comparable, as these are fossilized phrases where ἐν + accusative represents an archaism: had these phrases survived in contemporary Ionic they could be expected to have become \*ἐσώπια, ἔσαντα.<sup>83</sup>

The connexion between εἶν ἐγκάθετο νηδύν and formulae with ἐν governing the dative, e.g. ἐὼ ἐγκάθετο κόλπῳ, is clear: all form a T<sub>2</sub> hemistich. Similar formulae with the dative are to be found in Hesiod: τεῶ ἐνικάθεο θυμῶ (WD 27), τεῶ ἐγκάθεο οἴκῳ (WD 627). Yet none

<sup>82</sup> Pavese, *Studi*, 98

<sup>83</sup> J.L. Garcia Ramon, "Hesiodica I, 'Εἶν ἐγκάθετο νηδύν'", 577. It is notable also that the fossilized ἐνώπια contains the accusative singular of the obsolete noun \*ῶψ < ῶψ<sup>νς</sup>.

of these proves that the Hesiodic variant with the accusative has a prototype in Homer, firstly because it is not indisputably a modification of a Homeric (or, more accurately, Ionian) formula; and, secondly, because there is no Homeric attestation of a variant with accusative of direction, thus there is still no evidence to indicate whether such a Homeric formula would contain ἐγκάτθετο or (more likely) ἔσκάτθετο. This is comparable to the way that πός, apocopated form of the inherited \*ποσί < ποτί, may have been replaced in Ionian epic by the innovative πρός when speakers of proto-Ionic were no longer familiar with the older monosyllabic form of the preposition which was retained in AC. The mainland Aeolic dialects, Thessalian and Boeotian, retained the inherited use of ἐν + accusative, as did the North West dialects and AC (where the preposition takes the form ἴν). Therefore it is legitimate to interpret ἐν followed by the accusative in this formula as an element which reflects the usage of mainland dialects with which the poet had contact, but which in Ionian epic would have been an archaism and would have been altered to εἰς since the older usage no longer had any support in the vernacular.

As the innovation εἰς / ἐς < ἐνς is shared with Doric, the creation of the prototype formula may reasonably be supposed to antedate the Dorian invasion. It is a reasonable assumption that this is a pre-migration formula which is attested in mainland epic in its primary form, and in Ionian epic in secondary variations. If one accepts the likelihood that ἐγκάτθετο is original, the preverb ἐν may be attributed to the 2nd millennium epic language of the mainland or to Hesiod's Boeotian vernacular. This is an

instance in which Ionic and Lesbian have innovated and the mainland Aeolic dialects share an archaism with mainland epic language. In local Boeotian epic one would expect \*ἔόν instead of Ionicized ἔριν, and indeed it is possible that this is how Hesiod pronounced it in recitation; however, it is likely that by this time Ionic pronunciation had come to be perceived as the most appropriate for the performance of epic verse. Ionic pronunciation is of no relevance for the dating of a formula: η for α is merely a superficial Ionism with no effect on prosody. For mainland poets, the use of Ionic as the dialect for epic verse (dialect used does not alter diction, the elements of which the poetry is composed) would have had the advantage of rendering epic language more flexible, with the possibility of observing or neglecting digamma, and perhaps of using ephelcystic -v to make position.

At the time of Hesiod, if one accepts a *floruit* of c. 700 B.C., some relics of the ancient epichoric diction survived in non-Ionicized forms in mainland inscriptions. Literature is distinct from inscriptions: the latter are personal to the dedicator/ dedicatee, or the owner of the artefact on which the inscription appears, while the former is intended for public performance (even poems which were written down were intended for recitation), and as such is likely to be part of the wider consciousness of pan-Hellenic culture which appears in the 8th century, and is connected with the growth in interest in ancient tombs and the heroic past. This interest in the Heroic (i.e. Mycenaean) Age is probably one of the factors which contributed to the composition of the monumental Homeric poems. This growing consciousness of a unifying Greek culture (it is significant that the

traditional date for the founding of the Olympic Games is 776 B.C., and that Delphi became an international oracle around this time) is likely to have provided an incentive for epic to be composed in what was felt to be a uniform dialect, namely the contemporary Ionian version of the poetic language that was the creation of the 2nd millennium bards.

If it is accepted that, at a date before Hesiod, the Ionic style of epic composition became prevalent in mainland Greece, one may legitimately enquire into the linguistic nature of mainland epic before this development. Pavese<sup>84</sup> argued for two distinct poetic traditions, a northern and a southern, the southern being a Mycenaean tradition, which continued to develop in an Ionian milieu, and which ultimately produced the Homeric poems; Hesiod's poems, on the other hand, according to this theory, were representatives of the "northern", i.e. Aeolic, poetic tradition, until they were Ionicized. Similarities in the language of these respective poetic traditions Pavese explained as isoglosses common to the northern and southern parts of the 2nd millennium mainland, or due to "l'influenza d'una lingua poetica collaterale", that is, the claimed northern poetic tradition. It was this distinct northern poetic tradition, Pavese claimed,<sup>85</sup> that flourished in Mycenaean locations such as Thebes, Iolcus and Orchomenus. Equally implausibly, J.L.García-Ramón has argued for "una poesia continental con

---

<sup>84</sup> *Tradizioni*, 29

<sup>85</sup> *Tradizioni*, 30

centro en Delfos, en region vecino a Beocia”<sup>86</sup>; his argument is that Hesiod shares some isoglosses with North West dialects, including Phocian, e.g. τέτορα, ἐν + accusative, infinitives of the type ἔχεν. Yet this does not justify the assumption that this poetry was based in Delphi; the fact that the Delphic oracle is alleged sometimes to have issued responses in hexameter verse<sup>87</sup> seems to be the only basis for such an assumption, but this is no reason to imagine that Hesiod’s poetry belonged to a type based in Delphi. Hesiod and the Delphic hexameters were, rather, representatives of the same tradition, but independent of each other.

Since all “literary” epic verse has reached us in Ionic form, to determine the linguistic nature of mainland epic before Ionic came to be perceived as the correct dialect for this genre of verse, it is necessary to examine the only other representatives of archaic hexameter poetry. These are to be found in inscriptions, the oldest of which date to the second half of the 8th century (e.g. the Dipylon oinochoe c. 725 B.C., the Ithacan oinochoe c. 700 B.C.), and which are composed with formulae or formulaic expressions paralleled in the Homeric poems, but not derived from them. They show not that the Homeric poems were known, but that the technique of formular composition in a traditional poetic language whose origins lie in

---

<sup>86</sup> “En torno a los elementos dialectales en Hesíodo I: el elemento occidental”, *CFC* 11, 1976, 538

<sup>87</sup> It may be more accurate to say that the oracle’s responses were sometimes represented in hexameter verse, and the concomitant traditional language, after they had been delivered. Most responses seem to have been given in prose form. See Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle*, 1978, 194.

the 2nd millennium was practised in diverse parts of the Greek-speaking world in the 8th century,<sup>88</sup> before the composition with the aid of writing of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as we know them. The same technique was practised in hexameter inscriptions during the 7th and 6th centuries and beyond. Mainland hexameter inscriptions containing oral formulae, notably noun + epithet formulae, point to the existence of epic poetry on the mainland at a date which is too early to admit influence from the Homeric poems.

### **Inscriptional Evidence**

For convenience all of the following inscriptions are transcribed in the Ionian alphabet with (largely) Ionian orthography, although the originals were written in epichoric scripts. The earliest inscriptions known to us belong to the late 8th and early 7th centuries, a time contemporaneous with Hesiod and the poets of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. These inscriptions suggest that the art of composing in hexameters was sufficiently widespread in various regions of Greece to be practised on occasion even by “amateurs”<sup>89</sup>, that is, those who had not undergone a bardic training, but had “picked it up” simply by listening. Some of these inscriptions are composed with formulae also found in the Homeric poems; such formulae, however, are not derived from these poems, but rather represent elements of a common inherited poetic tradition with its roots in the 2nd millennium, which continued to develop on both sides of the Aegean after the migrations. Thus

---

<sup>88</sup> Pavese, *Studi*, 57

<sup>89</sup> Pavese, *Tradizioni*, 184

metrical inscriptions are composed in traditional poetic language, whose elements are spelt according to dialect, i.e. in accordance with local pronunciation. Inscriptions are found in both hexameters and elegiac couplets, and as elegy shares to a considerable extent the diction of epic it is legitimate to take elegiac inscriptions into consideration in a discussion of epichoric representation of epic language. When they are preserved in the literary tradition, however, metrical inscriptions are recorded in the Attic or Ionic form, for example the elegiac couplet for the Corinthian dead at Salamis, recorded in partly Atticized form by Dio Chrysostom (to be discussed, no. 8).

1. Μάντικλος μ' ἀνέθεικε φεκαβόλω ἀργυροτόξω

τᾶς δεκάτας· τὸ δὲ, Φοῖβε, δίδοι χαρίφετταν ἀμοιβάν<sup>90</sup>

This hexameter inscription is on a late 8th or early 7th statue of Apollo from Boeotia, perhaps contemporaneous with Hesiod. It uses epic diction, but its orthography represents Boeotian pronunciation: ἀνέθεικε is equivalent to Att-Ion. ἀνέθηκε, but in Boeotian the e-timbre vowel had a close quality. Digamma is retained, as it was in this dialect until late.

This couplet shares with Homer the formula χαρίφετταν ἀμοιβάν = χαρίεσσαν ἀμοιβήν (at verse-end, γ 58), showing the Boeotian treatment of the geminated sibilant from whatever source, equivalent to Att-Ion. -σσ- / -σ-, and other Aeolic -σσ-. As the formula is attested on both

<sup>90</sup> Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, 90, plate 7

sides of the Aegean, the chances are increased that it is inherited from the Mycenaean Age, when the expected form would be \*χαρίφεσσαν ἀμοιγῶν

Both of the epithets here used of Apollo are known from Homer, *φεκάβολος* in its Ionic form *ἐκήβολος* 8 times after the trochaic caesura in the *Iliad*, as here, as well as several times in the *Hymns* in the same position. This suggests that the epithet has a degree of antiquity within the tradition. This form of the epithet does not occur in the *Odyssey*: admittedly Apollo has a lesser rôle in this poem, but at υ 278 he is *ἐκατηβόλου Ἰπόλλωνος* after the penthemimeral caesura, the adjective perhaps created for these metrical conditions on the basis of the more traditional *ἐκήβολος* or *ἐκάεργος*.

Apollo's epithets *φεκάβολος* / *ἐκήβολος ἀργυρότοξος* are never juxtaposed in Homer, which might suggest that this is a mainland formula. Perhaps, but it is debatable to what extent it is appropriate to refer to "mainland" or "Ionian" formulae when the diction is to all intents and purposes unitary despite differing dialectal complexions. It is more appropriate to think in terms of formulae which appear in a certain location and perhaps are under-represented in others. It is significant that this inscription is found on a statue of Apollo: as religious language is conservative, one would be justified in thinking it improbable that a statue

of a god would bear an inscription whose language was that of a poetic genre recently introduced from overseas.<sup>91</sup>

2. Νέστορος ε[ίμ]ι εὔποτον ποτήριον

ὃς δ' ἂν τοῦδε πίησι ποτηρίου αὐτίκα κείνον

ἕμερος αἰρήσει καλλιστεφάνου Ἀφροδίτης<sup>92</sup>

A further example of an early hexameter inscription (the first line is iambic) bearing more than a passing resemblance to the language of the Homeric poems is that on the so-called Nestor's Cup from Pithecusae, a Euboean colony on the west coast of Italy, which dates to the last quarter of the 8th century, and contains elements which are paralleled in Homer or other hexameter verse.

This inscription, according to C.O. Pavese,<sup>93</sup> is not connected with Nestor's δέπας of Λ 632, but is rather a normal inscription of ownership. It may in fact be both of these things, labelling the vessel as the property of an individual named Nestor: heroic names are not unknown among Greeks of the Archaic Age, cf. Agamemnon of Cyme. However, whatever the significance of the inscription, it does not prove that the Homeric *Iliad* was known in the colonies of Magna Graecia: its date is almost certainly too early to allow such an influence. What it does indicate

---

<sup>91</sup> Hoekstra, "Hésiode et la tradition orale" 223: "...est-il nécessairement vrai que la forme de ces épigrammes ait été déterminée par la poésie d'outre-mer."

<sup>92</sup> L. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, 235 ff., plate 67

<sup>93</sup> "La iscrizione sulla kotyle di Nestor da Pithekoussai", *ZPE* 112, 1996, 1-23

is that Euboean settlers in Pithecusae were sufficiently familiar with epic language to use it to compose inscriptions, and perhaps also sufficiently familiar with epic material about Nestor's drinking-vessel to make a humorous allusion to it here.

Almost all the components of this inscription are echoed elsewhere in the early epic corpus. Νέστορος occurs in the same position at γ 452; ὄς δ' ἄν is paralleled at Δ 306, ὄς δέ κ' ἄνηρ; ἕμερος αἰρήσει is reminiscent of Homeric ἕμερος αἰρεῖ at verse-end Γ 446, Λ 89 and Ξ 328, which is scarcely likely to be the prototype, containing as it does an irresolvable contraction in the final syllable. Likewise the noun + epithet combination καλλιστεφάνου Ἀφροδίτης is reminiscent of καλλιστέφανος Δημήτηρ at *HyDem* 251 and 295, and also of καλλιστεφάνου πόσις Ἥρης, *Tyrtaeus* 2.12.

### 3. ξένφος τε φίλος καὶ πιστὸς ἑταῖρος<sup>94</sup>

This inscription belongs to an oinochoe from Ithaca dated c. 700 B.C. ξένφος / ξείνος is a long-established item of epic vocabulary, occurring in this position 35 times in the *Odyssey*, where it is connected with one of the pervasive themes, that of hospitality. Likewise πιστὸς ἑταῖρος appears to be a traditional formula, with two occurrences in the nominative in the *Iliad* (Ο 437, Σ 460) and another five in the

---

<sup>94</sup> L. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, 236, plate 7

accusative in the same position (O 331, P 500, 557, 589, Σ 235); the nominative formula appears also at “Hesiod” fr. 280.5, again at verse-end. Comradeship is a traditional theme of heroic epic: one thinks of Achilles and Patroclus in the *Iliad*, and of Odysseus’ ἐριήρες ἑταῖροι in the *Odyssey*. The presence of this hexameter inscription in Ithaca, an island off the northwest coast of mainland Greece, has nothing to do with the spread of the Homeric poems: it indicates familiarity with the traditional diction of epic, pronounced and spelt according to local dialect.

#### 4. Δφενία τόδε σάμα τὸν ὄλεσε πόντος ἀναιδής<sup>95</sup>

This epitaph, dating to c. 650 B.C., comes from south of Acrocorinth.

Δφενία is the genitive of the personal name Δφενίας: in West Greek dialects the inherited genitive ending -αο contracted to -α, resulting in a monosyllabic ending which is metrically equivalent to Ionic -εω pronounced with synizesis. πόντος is a well-known item of epic vocabulary, a word whose use in the 1st millennium is confined to verse, apart from occasional use to designate a particular sea. This inscription is reminiscent of epic also in its use of the verb ὄλλυμι without a preverb; in prose it is always prefixed with a preposition until late.

---

<sup>95</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 293, no. 91; Schwyzer-Cauer, *DGE* 124

A further Homeric parallel is to be found in τóδε σάμα, which is reminiscent of ἀνδρὸς μὲν τóδε σήμα (H 89). Certainly σήμα is used several times in Homer in the sense “tomb(stone)” (Λ 166, Ψ 45, 255, 257, Ω 16, 416, 801, α 291, β 222, λ 75), but its primary sense is more likely to be that seen in σήμα...ἀριφραδές (Ψ 326, λ 126, φ 217, etc.) before the bucolic diaeresis, and it is not clear to what extent the identification of graves is a traditional epic theme. If D. Gary Miller<sup>96</sup> is right in arguing that the *Iliad* poet is drawing on conventional epitaph-formulae at H 89, this suggests that the Homeric poems postdate the spread of alphabetic writing for inscriptional purposes. Literacy would presumably have had to be widespread before the significance of this *Iliad* verse could be appreciated.

5. σάμα τóδ(ε) ἼΑρνιάδα· χαροπὸς τόνδ' ὤλεσεν ἼΑρης  
 βαρνάμενον παρὰ ναυσὶν ἐπ' ἼΑράθθιοιο ῥοφαῖσι  
 πολλὸν ἀριστεύτοντα κατὰ στονόφεσαν ἀφυτάν<sup>97</sup>

This epitaph of Arniadas (ἼΑρνιάδα is another West Greek genitive with ending -α <-αο) is from Corcyra, and dates from the early 6th century. Corcyra was a Corinthian colony, and consequently this epitaph, although consisting of elements of epic diction, is in the Corinthian dialect.

<sup>96</sup> *Homer and the Ionian Epic Tradition*, 62

<sup>97</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects* 295, no. 94; Schwyzer-Cauer *DEG* 133

The second -τ- of ἄριστεύοντα is more likely to be redundant than an engraver's error for digamma. Here we have an inscription which expresses traditional epic values in traditional epic language: the infinitive ἄριστεύειν occurs at Z 208 and Λ 784 occupying the same *sedes* as the participle does here, and the adjective on which this verb is based, ἄριστος, is obviously of considerable antiquity within epic, appearing repeatedly at verse-end in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. χαροπός occurs once in the *Iliad* (in the genitive singular at B 672, Χαρόποιό τ' ἄνακτος) and once there occurs the athematic accusative χάροπα (Λ 426, Χάροπ' οὔτασε δουρί). In both verses the epithet is understood as a personal name; the relatively late date of the creation of both verses is betrayed by the neglect of digamma in ἄνακτος at B 672, and by the verb-form οὔτασε at Λ 426. The athematic form is likely to be earlier than the thematic, presumably representing a nominative \*χάροψ; similar is Apollo's epithet χρυσάωρ, which is athematic in Hesiod and at *HyAp* 123, but thematic in Homer. The plural χαροποί occurs once in the *Odyssey* (λ 611), and a further twice in the *Hymns* (*HyHerm* 194, *HyAphr* 70), with the genitive singular χαροποῖο λέοντος at *Th.* 321. It is possible that the earliest version of this formula is the genitive plural χαροπῶν τε λεόντων (only at *Hymn* 14, 4): the genitive plural of the athematic adjective would have permitted its reinterpretation as a thematic form. The formula may be of Mycenaean vintage: lions are depicted in Mycenaean art, e.g. the inlaid dagger from the shaft graves at Mycenae.<sup>98</sup> The fact that in each of the attestations cited, with the exception of the two occurrences in *HyHerm*, χαροπός occupies

---

<sup>98</sup> Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer*, plate 3

the same position after the hephthemimeral caesura suggests that it is a traditional component of the epic vocabulary, and its appearance in epic verse from both sides of the Aegean suggests that it is an inheritance from the 2nd millennium. The meaning of this epithet is uncertain, but its use with λέοντες and with Ἄρης, as in the inscription under discussion, suggests overtones of aggression, and it is likely that the epithet is associated with χάρις, which, as previously discussed, is more likely to be an ancient synonym for μάχη than for χάρις. Ernst Risch proposed<sup>99</sup> “with a look of battle-joy”, correctly associating the adjective with χάρις, but misinterpreting the sense of this noun; “of bellicose countenance” ideally renders the meaning of the epithet.

The participle βαρνώμενον occupies the same position as do μαρνώμενος and its case-forms at Γ 307, Ζ 204, 256, 328, Μ 429, Ν 96, 579, Ξ 25, ΙΙ 775; the spelling here shows dissimilation of the two nasals, cf. κυβερνώω < \*κυμερνάω.<sup>100</sup> Homer has the more conservative form of the verb, perhaps because this inscription was composed by an “amateur” poet with a less accurate knowledge of the traditional diction than that possessed by the “professional” *Iliad* poet. μάρναμαι is perhaps to be associated with Sanskrit मर्नाति, “crushes, overwhelms”.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> *Wortbildung*, 172

<sup>100</sup> This form of the stem is behind Cypriot κυμερῆναι (Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 75).

<sup>101</sup> Chantraine, *DELG* 668, s.v. μάρναμαι

Traditional epic diction is to be found also in the verb ὤλεσε, used as in Homer without preverb, and in the formula στονόεσαν ἄφυτάν, also at verse-end, λ 383 in the form στονόεσαν ἄυτήν. The adjective στονόεσαν (single -σ- representing -σσ-; geminates are frequently not represented as such in early inscriptions), appears in the same position at Ω 721, and ἄφυτά occurs 13 times in the *Iliad* in the form ἄυτή (-ην, -ῆς, -ῆ), 11 of them at verse-end, an indication of its traditional character within epic. Neither component of this formula is a common prose word in 1st millennium Greek, thus it likely that the formula was created at an early date, and the fact that it is attested both in Ionian epic and in a hexameter inscription from the other side of the Greek-speaking world, used in the same traditional verse-end position, suggests that this took place before the migrations. A further Iliadic parallel is to be seen in παρὰ ναυσίῳ, situated before the trochaic caesura, where it is located 36 times in the *Iliad* (in the Ionic form νηυσίῳ) counting the instances both with and without ephelcystic -ν.

Also of interest is ῥοφαῖσι, occupying the same verse-end position as does the Ionic equivalent, ῥοφῆσι, at Π 229, 669 and 679. This form preserves the ancient dative-locative ending -ασι, which became -αισι by analogy with 2nd declension -οισι. Corinthian had generalized the “short” endings -οις and -αις,<sup>102</sup> i.e. the old instrumental desinences, in all the functions of the dative case after the syncretism of the instrumental with the

---

<sup>102</sup> Pavese, *Tradizioni*, 87

dative-locative case. Thus -ασι / -αισι represents an epic archaism *vis-à-vis* the local dialect.

The early 6th century date of this inscription could in theory permit influence from the Homeric poems. However, it is improbable that within perhaps 50 or 60 years of their composition these poems could have gained such fame and prestige that their diction would have been rendered into a non-Ionic dialect for an inscription in Corcyra. A much more convincing explanation for the epic language of this inscription is that it uses the local form of a traditional poetic diction which had been inherited from the 2nd millennium and had continually been in use in the area of Corinth, developing *pari passu* with the local dialect as in Ionia it developed in tandem with East Ionic. Furthermore, the fact that the poet Eumelus was active in Corinth, perhaps in the 8th century,<sup>103</sup> suggests familiarity with epic in this part of Greece.

6. υἱοῦ Γλασίου Μενεκράτεος τόδε σῆμα

Οἰανθέως γενέαν· τόδε δ' αὐτῷ δάμος ἐποίηι

ἦς γὰρ πρόξενφος δάμου φίλος· ἄλλ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ

ᾤλετο, δαμόσιον δὲ κακὸν ῥο...

Πραξιμένης δ' αὐτῷ γαίας ἀπὸ πατρίδος ἐνθῶν

σὺν δάμῳ τόδε σῆμα κασιγνήτοιο πονήθη<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> G.L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry*, 62

<sup>104</sup> Schwyzer-Cauer, *DGE* 133.1

Here is another epitaph from Corcyra, dating from the early 6th century, also too early to allow influence from the Homeric poems.

Τλασίαφο is equivalent to the contracted genitive Τλασία < Τλασίαο with a non-etymological digamma. The composer is archaizing for metrical convenience in his use of the uncontracted genitive ending -αο, but the non-etymological digamma suggests that the epitaph was composed by an “amateur” poet.

γενεάν here occupies the same *sedes* before the penthemimeral caesura as is occupied by γενεή and its case-forms 18 times in the *Iliad* and 3 times in the *Odyssey*; presumably this is a traditional item in genealogical poetry. ἦς is of interest: this is the original 3rd person singular imperfect (<\*ἦστ) of εἰμί, replaced in Att-Ion, probably at pre-migration date, by ἦεν, the original 3rd person plural, which itself had been replaced by the neologism ἦσαν, with the sigmatic aorist ending -σαν. ἦς therefore constitutes an archaism *vis-à-vis* the Att-Ion. dialects and Ionian epic language, which by the date of this inscription appears to have been the most prestigious variety of epic language, but it was the form of this verb retained in the West Greek dialects, and presumably was the 3rd person singular form in all dialects in the formative stages of epic. ἐνθών is the

West Greek equivalent of ἐλθών,<sup>105</sup> which has 16 verse-end occurrences in the *Iliad*, the same position as it occupies here.

Epic phrases in this inscription which are obviously reminiscent of Homer are ἐνὶ πόντῳ and γαίας ἀπὸ πατρίδος: the latter is apparently a conflation of ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἴης (B 162, 178, α 203, 262, δ 521, ψ 353) and ἐς (probably ἐν at an earlier stage of the tradition) πατρίδα γαίαν (δ 476, ε 37, η 77, ζ 315, ο 129, etc.): γαία alternates with αἶα as metrically required. Epic accounts of the *Nostoi* were certainly in circulation before the composition of the Homeric poems, and one can imagine how listeners would be familiar with the phrase γαίας ἀπὸ πατρίδος from such poems.

In κασιγνήτοιο we find an epic word which is attested in Thessalian in the form κατίγνεις<sup>106</sup> in an inscription from Larissa. The fact that it is used in a non-assibilated form in Thessalian suggests that it was still a vernacular word. Here, however, the word shows the result of assibilation, although assibilation is not a feature of the West Greek dialects. This suggests that κασίγνητος was not an inherited vernacular word in the local West Greek dialect, and that its source was poetic language. One might argue that it had been learnt by West Greek speakers from Ionian

---

<sup>105</sup> West Greek and Arcadian show several examples of -ντ-, -νθ- from -λτ-, -λθ-, of which ἐνθελν is the most common (v. Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 64). This is a post-Mycenaean isogloss, as it affects West Greek and Arcadian to the exclusion of Cypriot.

<sup>106</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 144; Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen*, 138; *IG* 9, 2, 894.

κασίγνητος is also found in Cyprus.

epic, and indeed this possibility cannot be ignored, as Hesiod's poetry proves that Ionian epic was known in mainland Greece for at least a century before the date of this inscription. However, as *κασίγνητος* in most of its Homeric occurrences appears after the trochaic caesura, as in this inscription, occurring 26 times in the *Iliad* in various case-forms (including those of *κασιγνήτη*) in this position, and is found in inscriptions in Cyprus, a more economical hypothesis is that it represents an inherited element of traditional epic diction which, like other components of this inscription, had survived in mainland epic verse since the 2nd millennium.

7. ὅς νῦν ὄρχηστῶν πάντων ἀταλώτατα παίζει  
 τοῦ τόδε κμμνν<sup>107</sup>

Here is the inscription from the oinochoe found at the Dipylon in Athens in 1871, dated to c. 725 B.C.

The first hemistich is reminiscent of the Homeric formula οἱ δ' εἰς ὄρχηστύν (α 421, σ 304; cf. μολπή τ' ὄρχηστύς τε, α 152, ἄλλω δ' ὄρχηστύν, N 731, ψεῦσταί τ' ὄρχησταί, Ω 261): ὄρχηστύς appears to be traditional before the penthemimeral caesura. Coupled with

---

<sup>107</sup> This Barry Powell's reconstruction (*Homer and the Origin of the Greek Alphabet*, 158-60); the second line of the hexameter trails off into "a snippet from an abecedarium" (Powell, *op. cit.* 159).

ὄς νῦν πολλὸν ἄριστος ἐνὶ στρατῷ εὖχεται εἶναι (A 91), these Homeric phrases provide parallels for all the elements of this hemistich.<sup>108</sup>

This inscription is too early to have been composed under the influence of the Homeric poems, but certainly indicates Athenian proficiency in the use of the hexameter and its traditional language. That the dialect of this inscription is Attic and not its sibling Ionic is shown by the genitive ending -ῶν in ὀρχηστῶν, contracted from -έων <-ήων <-άων: Ionic would have monosyllabic -έων, pronounced with synizesis. In theory it could represent an Attic version of an Ionic hexameter, although this is an unnecessary assumption. The early date of this inscription suggests, rather, that it represents the result of a long history of hexameter verse in Attica.

8. ὦ ξένε, εὐυδρον ποτ' ἐνάλομεν ἄστῃ Κορίνθου  
νῦν δ' ἄμ' Αἴαντος νᾶσος ἔχει Σαλαμῖς

Between the middle and end of the 6th century, the elegiac couplet became standard in inscriptions, replacing hexameters.<sup>109</sup> However, traditional elements of epic diction continued to be used, thus it is legitimate to take elegiac inscriptions into consideration in a discussion of epichoric representations of epic language.

---

<sup>108</sup> Notopoulos, "Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean Heritage of Oral Poetry", 195

<sup>109</sup> M.L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, 19

The above elegiac couplet is the version of the epitaph for the Corinthian dead at Salamis recorded by Dio Chrysostom (37.18), who attributes it to Simonides. Inscriptions when preserved in the literary tradition are recorded, as is the above, in Attic-Ionic form. However, a fragment of the original, found *in situ*, dating to shortly after 480 B.C., is inscribed in the Corinthian dialect of those whom it commemorates:

Ἰόν ποκ' ἐνάλομες ἄστῦ Κορίνθου<sup>110</sup>

Two distinctive West Greek traits are to be found here. πόςκ(α) is equivalent to Att-Ion. πότε: West Greek selected -κα as the ending of temporal adverbs, while East Greek selected -τε. That these choices had already been made in the 2nd millennium is apparent from Mycenaean o-te = ὄτε (e.g. PY Ta 711). Secondly, ἐνάλομες has the West Greek 1st person plural ending -μες instead of East Greek -μεν: -μες was the original primary ending (cf. Latin *-mus*, Sanskrit *-mas*), and -μεν the secondary ending, the preferred desinence being generalized according to dialect. -μες is found throughout West Greek, while the Aeolic dialects agree with Att-Ion. and AC in using -μεν. This appears to be a fundamental isogloss distinguishing East from West Greek, perhaps more fundamental than assibilation of /ti/, since the latter did not affect proto-Aeolic. The fact that Att-Ion. and AC on the one hand, and all the West Greek dialects on the other agree in their respective selections points to a choice made in the 2nd millennium.

---

<sup>110</sup> Schwyzer-Cauer *DGE* 126

Although most mainland dialects retained digamma in the Classical Age, ἄστυ is used in this inscription presumably for metrical reasons, as φάστυ would not provide the required scansion. The pronunciation without initial /w/ reflects that of Ionian epic, which by this time was known throughout the mainland, but is also that of Attic vernacular usage, which would no doubt have been familiar to Corinthians; in the same way as Ionian epic poets used forms belonging to neighbouring Lesbian as metrically required, so may Doric-speaking poets of the mainland have taken advantage of metrically convenient forms from neighbouring dialects. As argued in ch.1, in all probability the bards of the 2nd millennium did something comparable, incorporating various dialectal forms as metrically required. Likewise, ξένε in the weak part of the 1st foot is the Att-Ion. form; in the Corinthian dialect one would expect to find ξένφε. Since the beginning of the verse is missing from the inscription, it is impossible to determine the original form used: ξένφ' may have been used with final -ε elided before the following vowel, but alternatively it is possible that Att-Ion. ξένε was used, as it may have been felt to provide better scansion.

Despite the “recent” elements in this couplet (neglected digamma, contracted genitive in Κορίνθου), the vocabulary used is traditional: the verb νάω belongs to old epic stock, but even within epic had been superseded by οἰκέω: νάω appears in formulaic contexts in Homer, whereas οἰκέω is found in passages which also appear “recent” for other reasons. (φ)ἄστυ is an old word with attestation in Mycenaean (pe-da wa-tu = πεδά φάστυ, KN V 114) and formulaic representation in Homer

(occurring 40 times in the *Iliad* before the trochaic caesura, and 20 times in the *Odyssey* in the same position), but its use in 1st millennium prose is infrequent and largely of restricted usage, such as the Attic use of Ἄστυ in reference to the city of Athens (as opposed to rural Attica), comparable to the restricted use of πόντος in the 1st millennium. The Atticized version of the couplet recorded by Dio Chrysostom has retained Doric νόσος presumably because similar forms retaining long -α- were known to Attic speakers from the “Doric” choruses in Attic tragedy.

This inscription is reminiscent of epic not only in its vocabulary, but also in its allusion to an epic hero, Telamonian Aias. It would be very surprising if the tradition that Telamonian Aias belonged to Salamis were known only from the *Iliad*; it is much more probable that this tradition had been preserved on the mainland independently of Ionian epic, and indeed that all the major Homeric heroes were known of in mainland Greece before the composition of the *Iliad*. As there is no evidence for Greek prose saga, the most likely means of keeping alive the memory of such ancient heroes as Telamonian Aias is epic verse.<sup>111</sup>

9. δέξο ἄναξ Κρονίδα Ζεῦ Ὀλύμπιε καλὸν ἄγαλμα

ἰλάω θύμῳ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις

---

<sup>111</sup> Jonathan Hall (*Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, 78) observes: “In non- or partially literate populations, a chronological or annalistic consciousness of history is generally limited by the capacity of the human memory and rarely stretches back more than three or so generations from the present.”

The above is the version recorded by Pausanias (5.24.3) of the elegiac inscription with which the Spartans are said to have dedicated a statue to Zeus at Olympia at the beginning of the Second Messenian War, although it is debatable whether the statue is indeed connected with this event: the statue seems to date from the 6th century, while the Second Messenian War happened before that time. The date of this event is, happily, beyond the scope of this thesis. The version recorded by Pausanias is partly Atticized, but the base of the statue was found *in situ* with its inscription in its original dialect:

[δέξ]ο φάν[αξ] Κρονίδα [Ζ]εῦ Ὀλύμπιε καλὸν ἄγαλμα  
 ἰλήφω [θύ]μω τοῖ Λακεδαιμονίοις<sup>112</sup>

This inscription contains a curious *mélange* of forms. δέξο is an archaic type of aorist imperative middle, corresponding to δέκτο / ἔδεκτο, known only from epic (T 10, *HyHerm* 312), where it is paralleled by λέξο (Ω 650, κ 320), corresponding to λέκτο / ἔλεκτο, and ὄρσο (E 109, Ω 88, η 342, χ 395) corresponding to ὄρτο. In 1st millennium Greek the regular aorist middle infinitive is of the type δέξαι (corresponding to ἐδέξατο), which is also to be found in Homer (E 227, P 480, Ω 137, etc.). As the aorist middle of the type ἔδεκτο seems to be in the process of being supplanted by the sigmatic type c. 1200 B.C., it is a reasonable assumption that the corresponding imperative was also obsolescent at that time. Since religious language, like epic, is a conservative medium, it is possible that δέξο φάναξ is a cultic formula, preserving two elements shared with epic. If

<sup>112</sup> Buck, *The Greek Dialects* 266, no. 68; Schwyzler-Cauer, *DGE* 7

archaic linguistic forms of this type were known in Laconia from cultic language, there is equally as much probability that they were also known from epic.

It is notable that digamma is written in  $\text{φάνοξ}$ , where it is etymologically correct, and likewise in  $\text{λήφω}$ , but omitted in  $\text{καλόν}$ , although the expected form in Laconian is  $\text{καλφόν}$ , as this dialect retained /w/ until late. It is possible that the spelling here is influenced by the Ionic language of elegy, as used by Tyrtaeus in the 7th century, and thus digamma may be included where it blocks hiatus, in effect as a glide sound between vowels, and neglected elsewhere.  $\text{λήφω}$  is a curious form: in its Homeric occurrences this adjective is  $\text{ἴλαος}$ , the form recorded by Pausanias; in Attic the regular form is  $\text{ἴλεως}$ , showing the results of fronting of /ā/ and metathesis of quantity. Thus the form used in this Laconian inscription is likely to be a hyper-Ionism, and perhaps an attempt by the engraver to be hyper-correct. Presumably this inscription is an attempt to mimic the elegy of such poets as Tyrtaeus: indeed the Dorian Tyrtaeus did use the Ionic dialect in his elegies, reflecting the Ionian origin of this verse-form, but elegy continued to use the traditional diction of epic, and the fact that an inscription in the Laconian dialect incorporates elements of epic vocabulary ( $\text{δέξο}$ ,  $\text{φάνοξ}$ ,  $\text{Κρονίδα Ζεῦ} = \text{Κρονίδεω Ζεῦ}$ ,  $\text{ἴλαος}$ ) suggests that Laconian poets were already familiar with this traditional poetic language.

## Implications of Epic Language in Inscriptions

It is legitimate to ask why, when several of these hexameter inscriptions are likely to be contemporary with Hesiod, whose epic verse is composed in the Ionic version of epic language, the inscriptions share the diction of this poetry but not the dialect which had apparently gained acceptance as the most appropriate for hexameter poetry. The answer is surely that, while bards wished their poetry to be perceived as pan-Hellenic, as their 2nd millennium predecessors likewise appear to have done, an inscription on a tomb or on a cup was a much more personal verse and therefore was composed in the dialect spoken by the dedicator or owner. The earliest hexameter inscriptions are independent of Homer, and therefore instead of deriving from "pre-Homeric" Ionian epic they represent survivals of local varieties of the oral formulaic style. The practitioners of these local varieties of epic contributed to the preservation of myths and legends (which were perceived as fact, as in the case of Telamonian Aias and the inscription for the Corinthian dead at Salamis), and paved the way for the acceptance of Ionian epic and the subsequent acceptance of Ionic as the appropriate dialect for epic. Hexameter inscriptions of the 8th and 7th centuries show that the art of composing in hexameters was widespread in Greece contemporaneously with Hesiod and the poets of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Some of these inscriptions are composed with formulae or formulaic expressions known from Homer, but not derived from that source. The existence of such hexameter inscriptions strongly suggests, as mentioned earlier, that oral hexameter composition was still practised in epichoric form

at this date: it was the professional bards, who may have had "literary" aspirations, who had adopted the Ionian style of epic as the most acceptable form.

## Conclusions

At the end of the Mycenaean Age, epic language was unitary, but thereafter diversified according to region and dialect: the majority of isoglosses which distinguish the 1st millennium dialects are of post-migration origin, because, firstly, communications had broken down after the collapse of Mycenaean civilization, and, secondly, because as a result of migrations Ionic and Lesbian developed differently from their respective mainland siblings Attic, on the one hand, and Thessalian and Boeotian on the other. There is no reason to assume that epic disappeared from all parts of the Greek-speaking world except Ionia: just as Ionian epic participated in the choices and innovations which characterized the Ionic dialect, so, it is a reasonable assumption, did epic in other regions of Greece participate in the choices and innovations which characterized their local dialects. No examples survive of substantial amounts of such epichoric epic, but dialect hexameter inscriptions and some linguistic curiosities in the Hesiodic poems, the *Hymns*, and the cyclical epics suggest the existence of local varieties of epic before Ionic came to be perceived as the appropriate dialect for the composition of such poetry. In a few cases, non-Homeric hexameter poetry preserves archaisms older than their Homeric equivalents: this strongly suggests the existence of epic verse in regions other than Ionia.

Such archaisms may have been known to Ionian bards, and are absent from Homer merely by accident; alternatively, some may have been completely lost in Ionia, and preserved in mainland poetry because they coincided with the usage of the local vernacular, most dialects being in any case more conservative than Ionic. Therefore the language of non-Homeric epic also points to an origin in the 2nd millennium for epic language.

Epic language could never have been understood as identical with any vernacular dialect, but at the end of the Mycenaean Age shared sufficient isoglosses with every dialect to allow it to be accepted as a form of the local dialect, and to develop in tandem with the vernacular dialects, pronounced in epichoric manner incorporating the phonological changes of the 1st millennium. At the turn of the millennium one branch of the epic tradition migrated with the Ionian colonists, while another remained in mainland Greece. During the three centuries or so between the migrations and the earliest written attestations of epic verse (the earliest being in all likelihood inscriptions), on neither side of the Aegean did epic diction diversify a great deal, since it was substantially the creation of 2nd millennium bards, and was felt to be complete before the branches separated; furthermore, poets from different parts of Greece could come into contact at pan-Greek contests, as epic was still felt to be a pan-Greek possession, not that of any specific region.

Wherever epic was recited at the end of the Mycenaean Age it can be expected to have developed *pari passu* with the speech of the

surrounding region. It is a reasonable assumption that vernacular elements entered mainland epic language in the same way that they entered Ionian epic. Since there was little dialectal variation in the 2nd millennium (even between the predecessors of the East and West Greek dialects of the 1st millennium), epic language is likely to have been perceived wherever it was heard as a variety of the regional dialect. Thus it was natural for it to develop phonologically in the same way as the vernacular, and to incorporate new morphological and lexical items from the vernacular once these were firmly established and no longer felt to be neologisms; when metrically convenient, forms belonging to neighbouring speech areas could be used instead of that of the region where the poetry was composed, e.g. the “Doric” infinitive ἀποδρέπεν (*WD* 611), comparable to Aeolic infinitives in -μεν, -μενοι in Ionian epic, which were used for metrical convenience in place of the Ionic ending -ειν.

In the same way that Lesbian in the early post-migration years probably retained archaisms such as ποτί in common with epic and Thessalian, the fact that such archaisms were also retained by West Greek may have allowed poets (eventually, once West Greek was no longer felt to be an intrusive or upstart speech form in southern Greece) to use West Greek forms which provided convenient metrical alternatives to traditional epic forms. It is impossible to determine how much time may have elapsed before it was felt that West Greek forms were admissible in epic verse. Nor is it possible to ascertain at what date it may have become “fashionable” to compose epic in the Ionic manner; this may have been in the 8th century, when pan-Greek events such as the Olympic Games were established, and

oracles, such as that at Delphi, acquired international renown.<sup>113</sup> If representatives of the entire Greek-speaking world could in theory mingle at Delphi and Olympia, we must accept that gatherings at which epic poetry was performed could also be international, i.e. pan-Greek, events, and thus it is perfectly feasible for Ionian bards to have performed on the mainland. Euboea is likely to have played a significant rôle in the dissemination of Ionian epic, although it was not the place where epic language as we know it reached its final form.<sup>114</sup>

The tendency towards composing epic verse in Ionic did not affect hexameter inscriptions: these are personal to the dedicator or dedicatee of a tomb, or to the owner of a cup, therefore it would have been felt appropriate to inscribe such items in an approximation of the local dialect, whereas epic was intended for public performance and may again, after the resurgence in interest in the "heroic" past, have been considered as a pan-Greek possession. Whereas in the Mycenaean Age epic language was a type of *koine*, with the result that wherever in the Greek-speaking world it was composed the same poetic language of East Greek type was used, now a

---

<sup>113</sup> Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle*, 5: "It (i.e. the oracle) had acquired some pan-Hellenic reputation by 700."

<sup>114</sup> Pace Wathélet, "La langue homérique et le rayonnement littéraire de l'Eubée", *AC* 50, 1981, 819-33, had epic language reached its final form in Euboea, it would have included (e.g.) the verb \*ἀνάπτω instead of ἀνασσω < \*(f)ἀνάσσω < \*φανάκτω: Euboean, in common with Attic and Boeotian, assimilated the affricate backwards, the opposite process to that which took place in East Ionic.

poetic language of specifically Ionic type became the *koine* used for this type of poetry.

Adapting local pronunciation of epic to the Ionian pronunciation may not have seemed a particularly radical move: the epic language inherited from the 2nd millennium already had several features in common with Ionic, e.g. single -σ- in some formulae where the corresponding forms in the more conservative dialects (Aeolic, West Greek) retained -σσ-. Thus if (e.g.) μέσῳ ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ were still known in non-Ionian or non-Arcadian areas in the 1st millennium, the single -σ- of μέσῳ could have been interpreted as an element belonging to either of these dialects depending on the locality in which a poet was active. If a Boeotian poet used this formula, the single -σ- could be interpreted as a form belonging either to Attic or to Euboean; if it were used by a poet composing in (e.g.) Laconia, it may have been understood as a form adopted from Arcadian.

Assibilation in non-Ionian epic is an awkward question. In much of mainland Greece in the 1st millennium, assibilation was not part of the vernacular dialects: although assibilation took place in the 2nd millennium (as shown by the Mycenaean texts, e.g. pa-si = φασί < φατί), it occurred only in the more progressive southern dialects of East Greek, proto-AC and proto-Ionic, and not in proto-Aeolic or West Greek. In the 1st millennium, the only mainland dialects distinguished by this isogloss are Attic and Arcadian. Whether 2nd millennium epic assibilated is impossible to ascertain, although I believe that it did: ancient formulae in Homer suggest

that epic was associated with the Mycenaean civilization, whose dialect did assibilate. Thus it seems a reasonable assumption that assibilation was an isogloss shared by proto-AC, proto-Ionic and epic language at the end of the Mycenaean Age. The fact that epic shared this isogloss with proto-Ionic would have contributed to the acceptance of epic language as a form of Ionic (as postulated in ch.1), allowing it to participate in the post-Mycenaean developments of the Ionic dialect. In areas where the vernacular dialects did not assibilate (e.g. Boeotia at all periods; the Peloponnese excluding Arcadia after the arrival of West Greek speakers), the presence in epic of non-assibilated forms, e.g. ποτί, βωτιάνειρα, may have permitted the perception of the epic dialect as a mixed dialect in some respects similar to the local speech-form, but also containing elements drawn from other dialects. Furthermore, it is unknowable to what extent assibilated forms occurred in ancient formulae: none of those previously argued to have originated in the Mycenaean Age contains an assibilated form.<sup>115</sup> The formulaic part of epic language was less innovative than the non-formulaic connective element. Similarly, there do not appear to be any ancient formulae containing a 1st person plural verb, but it is in any case improbable that had such a formula existed it would have been “translated” into the equivalent form in the local dialect. Thus the West Greek 1st person plural ending -μες is used in the inscription for the Corinthian dead at

---

<sup>115</sup> E.g. \*Διφός αἰγιόχοιο, \*φάναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων, ὡς οἱ μὲν μάραντο δέμας πυρός αἰθομένοιο, γερήνιος ἵπποτα Νέστωρ, ποδάς ὠκύς Ἀχιλλεύς, \*πολεμίζελεν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι, etc.

Salamis: whether East Greek -μεν or West Greek -μες is used is of no metrical significance.

The presence in epic of the Aeolic dative plural -εσσι, shared with Boeotian, would have assisted in the perception in this speech-area of epic language as a variation on the local dialect, which had imported some forms from Attic or Euboean. Likewise the potential particle κε(ν) is an archaism shared by epic and several other dialects (West Greek; Boeotian has κα, probably under West Greek influence), which may have facilitated such a perception of epic language. Other non-Ionic features of epic language, which in fact are archaisms retained by epic in common with one or more of the Aeolic dialects, such as patronymic adjectives in -ιος, ποτί, and aorists of the ἐτέλεσσα type, may have contributed to the acceptance of epic as a variant of the local dialect.

The most significant changes in epic language between the end of the Mycenaean Age and Homer were therefore phonetic. Few formulae were created after the migrations: new formulae were based on old ones, sometimes modifying them with new phonetic developments, sometimes taking advantage of the obsolescence of an old morpheme (e.g. the old instrumental desinence -φι) to create false archaisms, thus giving the language of this verse an antiquated feel and distancing it from everyday parlance. Some formulae can be ascribed with a considerable degree of confidence to the Mycenaean Age, in particular those which scan regularly only when a form antedating the Greek of the Linear B texts is restored

(Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ < \*Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀντῖq<sup>w</sup>hόντq, etc.), and those which contain a verb-form that was probably obsolete in the everyday spoken language by that date, e.g. ἄλτο < \*hάλτο, ἔπεφνε < \*ἔq<sup>w</sup>hεq<sup>w</sup>hνε.<sup>116</sup> Other formulae have no morphological or prosodical peculiarities which will date them to the 2nd millennium, but as these occur in poetry, both literary and inscriptional, from both sides of the Aegean, not to mention Italy, there is every chance that they constitute part of the common poetic inheritance from the 2nd millennium. The paucity of formulae attested by the non-Homeric epic poems and absent from Homer is to be explained by the fact that the poets of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, in creating epics which were of both local Ionian interest (focussing on the Trojan War and its aftermath) and also of pan-Hellenic interest (incorporating material from traditions unrelated to the Trojan narrative, e.g. Pylian material concerning Nestor, Meriones and Idomeneus from Crete, the Lapiths and Centaurs, and Telamonian Aias and his σάκος ἤύτε πύργον, which is of a type that was obsolete by the likely date of the Trojan imbroglio) took advantage of almost all the traditional formulae that were available at this late stage of the tradition. Only a very small number known to us were unused, e.g. φερεσσάκας Καδμείους, μάχην δριμείαν (v. p. 292): perhaps others were known, but were left out because not required by the subject-matter.

---

<sup>116</sup> As Grassmann's Law had probably not taken place before the end of the Mycenaean Age, I have reconstructed this reduplicated aorist with double aspiration.

## Appendix: Test Cases

After examining the 2nd millennium heritage of epic language and discovering how it has incorporated varying linguistic forms dating from all stages of its development, it is worthwhile to undertake a line-by-line analysis of several passages of Homer in order to assess the relative ages of the various components of epic diction there presented. This analysis will provide an idea of the proportion of Homeric diction which had survived from the Mycenaean Age.

### 1. H 132 - 49

αἶ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον  
ἦβῶμ', ὡς ὄτ' ἐπ' ὠκυρώ Κελάδοντι μάχοντο  
ἀγρόμενοι Πύλιοί τε καὶ Ἀρκάδες ἐγχεσίμωροι  
135 Φειδᾶς πὰρ τείχεσσι, Ἰαρδάνου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα.  
τοῖσι δ' Ἐρευθαλίω προμόσ ἴστατο ἰσόθεος φῶς  
τεύχε' ἔχων ὤμοισιν Ἀρηιθόιο ἀνακτος.  
δίου Ἀρηιθόου, τὸν ἐπὶ κλησὶν κορυνήτην  
ἄνδρες κίκλησκον καλλίζωνοί τε γυναῖκες,  
140 οὔνεκ' ἄρ οὐ τόξοισι μαχέσκετο δουρί τε μακρῷ,  
ἀλλὰ σιδηρεῖη κορύνη ῥήγνυσκε φάλαγγας.  
τὸν Λυκόοργος ἔπεφνε δόλω, οὐ τι κράτει γε,  
στεινωπῷ ἐν ὀδῷ, ὄθ' ἄρ οὐ κορύνη οἱ ὄλεθρον

χραΐσμε σιδηρείη· πρὶν γὰρ Λυκόοργος ὑποφθᾶς  
 145 δουρὶ μέσον περόνησεν, ὃ δ' ὑπτιος οὔδει ἐρείσθη·  
τεύχεα δ' ἔξενάριξε, τὰ οἱ πόρε χάλκεος ἼΑρης.  
 καὶ τὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἔπειτα φόρει μετὰ μῶλον ἼΑρης.  
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Λυκόοργος ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐγήρα,  
 δῶκε δ' Ἐρευθαλίῳ φιλῶ θεράποντι φορήναι.

Here, Nestor boasts about slaying the giant Ereuthalion. Ereuthalion is known in Homer only from this account, and it is likely that the *Iliad* poet is reworking old epic material from the mainland. According to the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius 1.64, there was an Arcadian festival called the Μώλεια which commemorated a battle between Lycurgus and Ereuthalion. If the scholiast is to be believed, we have confirmation that the *Iliad* poet is reworking very old material, as an Ionian poet of the 7th century is scarcely likely to have learnt of these characters from an Arcadian source. Areithoos appears to have been an Arcadian hero; Pausanias (8.11.4) reports having been shown his tomb near Mantinea. Like all of Nestor's reminiscences, however, this passage, despite its old content, is clearly of recent composition: this is shown by contracted forms such as ἦβῶμ' (145), for ἦβῶοιμι; this optative usually appears as ἦβῶοιμι in the whole-verse formula εἴθ' ὡς ἦβῶοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἴη (H 157, Λ 670, Ψ 629): this exhibits the results of vowel contraction, diectasis and metrical lengthening (*viz.* ἦβᾶω > ἦβῶ > ἦβῶω > ἦβῶω), so must be late, but the fact that H 133 is a modification of a formula which itself is a late creation tells us that this passage is very recent indeed.

μάχοντο (136) at verse-end is in the traditional position for parts of this verb, and since the Mycenaeans knew the noun μάχα (v. ch. 3, p. 217) and its denominative verb has much formulaic use in Homer, it is a reasonable conjecture that this verb was to be found in verse-end position in Mycenaean epic. The location of the river Κελάδων is not explained, and indeed this is unlikely to be a genuine hydronym, but an epithet signifying “roaring”, *vel sim.* (cf. ῥόος κελάδων, Φ 16; ποταμὸν κελάδοντα, Σ 576); it is possible that this usage represents a late misunderstanding of an old formula. The verse is in any case non-formulaic. ὠκυρόω, a compound of the old adjective ὠκύς and the root of ῥέω < \*σρεϝ-, does not observe the prosodical effect of the original double consonant, \*σρ-, of its second element: if this were an ancient formation, one could expect \*ὠκυρρόω, which in fact would be unmetrical, containing a cretic; cf. ἐϋρρεῖος < \*ἐϋρρῆφεος (Z 508, Ξ 433, Ο 265, Φ 1, Ω 692).

ἐγχεσίμωροι (134) seems to be an old adjective, occurring 3 times at verse-end. It seems to signify “fighting with swords”<sup>1</sup>, or perhaps “famed for their swords”, in which case the second element may be cognate with \*mēros in Germanic and Slavonic names, e.g. Volkmar, Vladiměru<sup>2</sup>. Its exact significance was unclear even in antiquity: cf. ἰόμωροι, probably created by analogy, and the later ὑλακόμωρος (Ξ 29, π 4).<sup>3</sup> The second hemistich of this line, Ἰαρδάνου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα, is clearly post-Mycenaean: although the

<sup>1</sup> Wathelet (*Traits*, 135) connects the second element with μάρναμαι.

<sup>2</sup> Risch, *Wortbildung*, 213

<sup>3</sup> Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen*, 93

contracted genitive Ἰαροδάνου could in theory be replaced with elided \*Ἰαροδάνοι before ἀμφί, the prosody of ἀμφί ῥέεθρα does not observe the original initial \*σρ- of ῥέεθρα < \*σρεφ-, cf. παρὰ ῥόον (Π 151), where long -ᾶ observes the original prosody of \*παρὰ σρόφον. ῥέεθρα seems to be a later addition to the epic vocabulary than ῥόος, as the original double initial consonant is never observed before this word.

Ἄρηϊθόοιο ἄνακτος (137) may be a genuine piece of pre-migration epic. The phantom initial digamma of (Ϝ)ἄνακτος obviates hiatus between the two parts of this phrase. The personal name Ἄρηϊθό(Ϝ)ος is of the Mycenaean onomastic type already discussed, signifying “swift in battle”, if its first component, ἄρης, is understood as “battle”.<sup>4</sup> This is apparently the original sense of the word, which was later personified as the name of the war-god. ἄρης presumably became a theonym by personification of the common noun, as used in the formulaic phrase μῶλον Ἄρηος (also at B 401, Π 245, Σ 134). μῶλος is confined to epic; Hesychius glosses μωλεῖ· μάχεται, εὐμωλος· ἀγαθὸς πολεμιστής. The noun also forms the basis of the neuter plural Μώλεια, the name of the Arcadian festival mentioned above. If Ἄρηος is taken as a common noun and printed as ἄρηος this formula is likely to be very old, since Ἄρης is a theonym already in the Linear B texts:(a-re = Ἄρη, dative,<sup>5</sup> KN Fp 14). Although this passage refers

<sup>4</sup> Ἄρης is frequently connected (e.g. by LSJ) with ἄρη, “bane, ruin”; cf. also the isolated perfect participle ἀρημένος = βεβλαμμένος.

<sup>5</sup> C.J. Ruijgh explains this noun as based on a pre-Greek stem \*arē, and the dative Ἄρη as analogous to datives of stems in -ā, e.g. e-ma-a<sub>2</sub> = \*Ἐρομάη, PY Tn 316 (*Études* 88, 196 note 482).

to χαλκίος Ἄρης (146), the epithet is not exclusive to this god, and unlike the epithets of some other gods is perfectly comprehensible; he is elsewhere called ὄβριμος, an epithet shared with Hector. Thus it seems that the god Ares is a comparatively recent addition to the cast of epic; he is certainly not essential to the plot of the *Iliad*. Although Ares as a god has no personal formula, the common noun ἄρης is found 4 times in the formula μῶλον ἄρης: μῶλος is confined to epic, but seems to be represented in the Mycenaean personal name mo-re-u = \*Μωλεύς (PY Jn 389, etc.). If this interpretation is correct, then we have here another example of epic martial vocabulary appearing in a personal name, again showing how epic reflects in its oldest formulae the values of the Mycenaean ruling classes that also were expressed in their names. In its earliest epic uses, ἄρης seems to have formed part of the array of synonyms referring to warfare, viz. π(τ)όλεμος, μάχη, δαῖ, ὑσμῖνι, χάριμη. Ἄρης as a god is a personification of the “spirit of war”.<sup>6</sup> Although the name a-re probably appears as a theonym in Mycenaean, Ἐνυάλιος is older in epic as a war god, with formulaic representation in the ancient whole-verse formula Μηριόνης ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντη.

The treatment of the name Ἄρηϊθoος in the next line betrays late composition: Ἄρηϊθoόου (138) with the contracted genitive ending, and δίου, late genitive of δῖος, which never appears in this case in old formulae. δίου occurs only here; the only other case-form of this adjective in Homer are the nominative and accusative, e.g. δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς, Ἐκτορα δῖον.

---

<sup>6</sup> Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 4, 103

When an equivalent formula in the genitive was required, poets of the early stages of the tradition used the adjective \*θέλιος (θέλιος in its Homeric form; for a discussion of the formula Ὀδυσσοῖος θελοῖο v. p. 194-5). Late composition is also revealed by οὐνεκ(α) = οὐ ἔνεκα, showing the results of vowel contractions, and by μαχέσκειτο, a frequentative imperfect: such forms are never found in old formulae.<sup>7</sup>

ἔπεφνε (142), an archaic reduplicated aorist from the root \*g<sup>w</sup>hen- (equivalent to the sigmatic aorist ἔθεινε) is in its traditional *locus* before the trochaic caesura; this is a highly archaic form used in a passage which contains linguistic forms betraying recent composition. τεύχεα δ' ἔξενάριξε also looks old: both of its components have many formulaic representations in Homer, and although the verb appears most frequently at verse-end, it is possible that the T<sub>1</sub> formula τεύχεα ἔξενάριξε is ancient, appearing at N 619, P 537 and Φ 183 as τεύχεα τ' ἔξενάριξε. The verb (ἔξ)ἐνάριζω invariably has the "Achaean" guttural flexion in the future and aorist, which suggests some degree of antiquity: verbs of this type can have either dental flexion in -ισε-, the Ionic type, or guttural flexion in -ξε-, as in AC, as metrically required (v. p.17-18). Although in theory this argument may not be 100% watertight, in practice the fact that certain verbs are never varied increases its validity. ἐνάριζω is a denominative based on ἐνάρα, always signifying "to strip (*sc.* armour)", and is a more recent creation than ἐνάριω < \*ἐνάρι-γω, which has lost this meaning and almost always means "slay".

<sup>7</sup> Wathelet, "Les itératifs en -(e)sk-", AC 42, 1973, 379-405

Both verbs are of poetic use only in 1st millennium Greek, suggesting that they fell out of common parlance at an early date.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Λυκόοργος ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐγήρα (148): this entire verse could conceivably have been sung by a Mycenaean bard, although it is more accurate to say that all of its components could have belonged to epic at the Mycenaean stage. Both αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ and ἐνὶ μεγάροισι(ν) are formulaic, the latter appearing 12 times in this position in the *Iliad*. μέγαρον, meaning “room”, usually a public room, is conventionally applied to Mycenaean architecture, but we cannot tell what the Mycenaeans themselves called their palaces. Formulaic usage of μέγαρον in Homer, however, suggests at least that this was an old and established term, and it is not impossible that this term was indeed in use in the Mycenaean Age. Although the Homeric μέγαρον appears to combine elements of Mycenaean architecture (flat roofs) with elements of Geometric architecture (pitched roofs), the Mycenaean μέγαρον with entrance porch, central hearth and columns appears to coincide with the basis of the Homeric μέγαρον.<sup>8</sup> Thus, if vestiges of Mycenaean architecture are retained in Homer, it is not unlikely that Mycenaean architectural terminology may also be retained in the formula ἐνὶ μεγάροισι(ν). The term ἐγήρα likewise is elsewhere represented in the locus which it here occupies, occurring also at P 197 and ξ 67. This verb is best understood as an athematic aorist, and indeed it makes best sense as such<sup>9</sup>; on the basis of the aorist was created the present γηράσκω.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> W. Beck, *LfgGE*, vol. 15, 63, s.v. μέγαρον

<sup>9</sup> Chantraine, *GHI*, 380

The infinitive **φορῆναι** (149) is not ancient, but a secondary formation within epic, legitimized by the fact that Lesbian contained -ε- stem verbs with athematic flexion. The correspondence with Arcadian infinitives of similar form is coincidental (v. pp. 15-17 for a discussion of this form). Late composition is again shown by the irresolvable contraction in another part of this verb, **φόρει** = \*φόρεε (147), in which a “modern” feature, vowel contraction, appears in the same word as an archaism of considerable antiquity, namely the omission of the augment.

## 2. N 673 - 84

ὡς οἱ μὲν μάρναντο δέμας πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο·

Ἐκτωρ δ' οὐκ ἐπέπυστο Διὶ φίλος οὐδέ τι ἦδη,

675 ὅτι ρά οἱ νηῶν ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ δηιόωντο

λαοὶ ὑπ' Ἀργείων. τάχα δ' ἂν καὶ κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν

ἔπλετο· τοῖος γὰρ γαιήοχος ἐννοσίγαιος

ᾧτρυν' Ἀργείους, πρὸς δὲ σθένει αὐτὸς ἄμυνεν·

ἀλλ' ἔχεν ἦ τὰ πρῶτα πύλας καὶ τείχος ἐσάλτο

680 ῥηξάμενος Δαναῶν πυκινὰς στίχας ἀσπιστῶν,

ἔνθ' ἔσαν Αἴαντός τε νέες καὶ Πρωτεσιλάου

θῖν' ἔφ' ἄλός πολιῆς εἰρυμέναι· αὐτὰρ ὑπερθε

τείχος ἐδέδημητο χθαμαλώτατον, ἔνθα μάλιστα

ζαχρηεῖς γίνοντο μάχῃ αὐτοὶ τε καὶ ἵπποι.

<sup>10</sup> Chantraine, *Morphologie historique*, 223

The Greeks and Trojans are fighting between the ships and the Achaean wall; in a battle scene such as this, one might expect to find a good deal of traditional vocabulary and formulaic phrases.

**ὥς οἱ μὲν μάρναντο δέμας πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο** (673) is a whole-verse formula with a strong chance of belonging to Mycenaean epic. Its prosody is entirely regular, and thus we cannot date the verse on phonological grounds to a time before the extant Mycenaean texts. However, the vocabulary used here is of a sufficiently elevated, non-prosaic nature to justify the suspicion that the formula was created very early. For a full discussion of this formula, v. p. 217.

**Διὶ φίλος** (674), with unexpected long final syllable in Διῖ, may be of Mycenaean vintage, representing \*Διφει φίλος, with the original dative singular ending of the 3rd declension, which was being replaced c.1200 B.C. by the locative desinence -ι. ἀρηϊφίλος is a later creation on the analogy of this phrase.

**ἔπλετο** (677) seems to be an ancient item of epic vocabulary. It is the aorist corresponding to τέλλομαι, both from the root \*q<sup>w</sup>el-, showing regular Ionic development of the labiovelar, viz. \*q<sup>w</sup>έλλομαι > τέλλομαι, \*ἔq<sup>w</sup>λετο > ἔπλετο. Thus it is possible that the formulae περιτελλομένους ἐνιαυτούς and περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν belonged to 2nd millennium epic in the forms \*περιq<sup>w</sup>ελλομένους ἐνιαυτόνς and \*περιq<sup>w</sup>λομένων ἐνιαυτῶν. Therefore there is no reason to consider ἔπλετο an Aeolism. The present πέλομαι,

however, might well be taken for a secondary Aeolism, since it shows the Aeolic treatment of the labiovelar before a vowel of e-timbre. It is more likely, however, that this is a secondary formation, based on the aorist, and created within epic after the disappearance of labiovelars had obscured the etymological connexion between ἔπλετο and τέλλομαι.

In the same verse, the P<sub>2</sub> hemistich γαιήοχος ἐννοσίγαιος (also at N 59, O 222; accusative at Ψ 584; dative at I 183, Ξ 355) looks old. These two epithets may be very old items of cultic vocabulary. Both mean “Earth-shaker / mover”: γαιήοχος < \*γαιάφοχος, with o-grade agent noun form the root of φέχω < \*wegh-, thus “who sets the earth in motion”; ἐννοσίγαιος, with the same first element (and synonymous second element) as ἐνοσίχθων, is a τερψίμβροτος-type compound with verbal initial component ending in -σι. The double -v- of ἐννοσίγαιος is to be explained as metrical lengthening at pre-migration date: Ionian epic lengthens -ε- to -ει- (cf. εἰνοσίφυλλος, ι 22, λ 316), but the option had long been present for bards to geminate or not as metrically convenient, cf. Ἄχιλλεύς / Ἄχιλεὺς, both found in old formulae.

ἔχεν (679) is an old part of epic vocabulary, the imperfect of the verb φέχω, “drive”, but recent composition is evident here from the fact that the initial digamma of this unaugmented preterite is neglected, causing elision of the final vowel of ἀλλ(ᾶ). There are other signs of recent composition in this passage: Πρωτεσιλάου, a contracted genitive at verse-end, and νέες (both 671) with contemporary Ionic prosody contrasting with νηῶν (675), which

retains the ancient prosody of \*ναφῶν. Also in 675, we find a recent form in **δηόωντο**, exhibiting the licence of diectasis. The -ω- is unexpected in an o-stem verb, whose contracted form one would expect to be \*δηῖουντο, giving \*δηῖοουντο after diectasis; it is possible that the earliest texts of the *Iliad* did not distinguish -ου- from -ω-, denoting both with -ο-, and also that the more numerous verbs in -άω exercised an influence here.<sup>11</sup> Late composition is again evident from **σθένει** (678), whose final diphthong is correpted before a vowel: at the Mycenaean stage, this form would have been \*σθένεη, a tribrach, which would be unmetrical in this position unless elided or followed by a double consonant. This is an example of the greater flexibility epic language gained as it incorporated vernacular developments, in this case the diphthongization of the sequence -ει- consequent upon the loss of intervocalic /h/.

### 3. II 145 - 54

145 ἵππους δ' Αὐτομέδοντα θοῶς ζευγνύμεν ἄνωγε,  
τὸν μετ' Ἀχιλλεῖα ρηξήνορα τίε μάλιστα,  
πιστότατος δέ οἱ ἔσκε μάχη ἔνι μείναι ὁμοκλήν.  
τῷ δὲ καὶ Αὐτομέδων ἕπαγε ζυγὸν ὠκέας ἵππους  
Ξάνθον καὶ Βαλίον, τῷ ἅμα πνοιῆσιν πετέσθην,  
150 τοὺς ἔτεκε Ζεφύρω ἀνέμῳ Ἄρπυια Ποδάργη,  
βόσκομένη λειμῶνι παρὰ ῥόον Ὠκεανοῖο.

<sup>11</sup> Chantraine, *GHI*, 80

ἐν δὲ παρηορήσιν ἀμύμονα Πηδασον ἴει,  
τόν ῥά ποτ' Ἡετίωνος ἐλών πόλιν ἦγαγ' Ἀχιλλεύς,  
ὅς καὶ θνητὸς ἐὼν ἔπεθ' ἵπποις ἀθανάτοισι.

Here, Patroclus is preparing to repulse the Trojans from the Greek ships, while Achilles still refuses to fight..

This passage contains a considerable amount of old epic vocabulary and formulaic material, but some of it is used in an innovative manner. Traditional vocabulary is found in **θοῶς** (epic only) and **ἄνωγε** (both 145), a verb known only from AC outside epic, thus is probably a relic form wherever it occurs. **ἄνωγα** is a perfect with present sense, but the 3rd singular form **ἄνωγε** allowed the creation of a present **ἀνώγω**; **ἄνωγε** here is understood as an imperfect, as it is balanced by **τιε** in the next clause

**Ἀχιλλῆα ῥηξήνορα** (146): ancient prosody is observed in this formula, the long final syllable of **Ἀχιλλῆα** pointing to the phantom presence of the initial digamma of **ῥηξήνορα** < \***φρηξάνορα**, a compound of **ῥήγνυμι** and **ἀνήρ**. This adjective occurs twice in the *Iliad* in the accusative (also at H 228), and twice in the dative (N 324, II 575), always with Achilles' name, and always with long final syllable in **Ἀχιλλῆα** / **Ἀχιλλῆι**. **(φ)ῥηξήνορα** / **-ι** always occurs after the penthemimeral caesura; observance of the prosodical effect of original initial digamma does not in itself indicate an ancient formula, but restriction of this adjective to two cases, a single position in the verse and a single character all point to

considerable antiquity, perhaps Mycenaean vintage. η- in the second syllable suggests that it was metrically lengthened at a very early date, and \*φρηξάνορα would thus have become (φ)ῥηξίνορα in Ionian epic because /ā/ combined with lack of epenthetic -δ- and -ο- as the final vowel in the stem (a non-Ionic result of \*r, therefore another reason to consider this compound a very old creation) obscured the etymological link with ἄνθηρ; κυδιανείρη, on the other hand, retained α in its third syllable because it had never required metrical lengthening.

πιστότατος (147) recalls the formula verse-end πιστὸς ἑταῖρος, which seems to be ancient: not only is it formulaic in Homer, but is also found in mainland inscriptions (v. p. 322). As this is the only occurrence of the superlative in Homer, it can be taken as a sign of late composition, with a nod in the direction of the old formulaic style of composition.

In ὠκέας ἵππους (148) we find an ancient formula which may be of Mycenaean date: ὠκύς is a poetic word in 1st millennium Greek, while the adverb ὠκα was attributed to Arcadian by the γλώσσα κατὰ πόλεις.<sup>12</sup> The fact that ἵππους here signifies “horses” rather than “chariot” does not militate against a Mycenaean date for this formula, as there are several other formulae of ancient appearance in which the animals are named, e.g. κέντορες ἵππων. These animals do seem to have a long history in epic, and it is possible that the hipponyms in the next verse, Ξάνθος and Βαλλίος,

---

<sup>12</sup> Ruijgh, *L'élément*, 165

“Bay” and “Dapple” respectively, belong to an ancient equine onomastic stock<sup>13</sup>: Εάνθος is attested as a man’s name in Mycenaean in the form ka-sa-to (PY An 39, KN Vc 75, etc.), perhaps a soubriquet referring to this individual’s colouring. The masculine pendant to Ποδάργη, Πόδαργος, also appears as a hipponym at Θ 185 and Ψ 295, probably signifying “white-foot”; po-da-ko is a boonym on the Knossos tablet Ch 899, and if Mycenaean gave horses and oxen the same type of names, this may indeed be part of a traditional equine onomastic stock.

Ἄρπυια (150): it is clear from α 241, ξ 371 and υ 77 that the Ἄρπυιαί are storm-winds. The Mycenaean had a cult of the winds, as can be deduced from the term a-ne-mo i-je-re-ja = ἀνέμων ἱέρεια (KN Fp1). Ἄρπυια on a vase from Aegina seems to connect it with the verb ἀνηρέψαντο, but this is probably a popular etymology. Ἄρπυια is probably to be connected with ἀρπάζω, as is ἄγυια with ἄγω: both are old words, as can be seen from the formulaic nature of the latter, and of a type that was no longer productive in the 1st millennium. Thus it is not impossible that Ἄρπυιαί were worshipped as storm-*daemones* by Mycenaean. Ἄρπυια itself has formulaic representation in Ἄρπυιαί ἀνηρέψαντο (α 271, ξ 371, υ 77); the fact that this phrase is not in the *Iliad* is due to the subject-matter, and says nothing about its antiquity. Although the verse here under examination lacks formulaic connexions (with the exception of ἔτεκε in the first and second feet), it seems that the poet has been inventive with some traditional material,

---

<sup>13</sup> It is, admittedly, also possible that these were ordinary names for horses in 7th century Ionia!

extracting elements from old formulae and weaving them together to create something new in the old oral style.

παρὰ ῥόον ᾿Ωκεανοῖο (151) seems to be a very old T<sub>2</sub> formula: the long final vowel of παρὰ points to the erstwhile presence of an initial double consonant in the following word, in this case \*σρ- or at any rate \*hρ-. The formula may have been associated with accounts of maritime exploration to the bounds of the earth as it was then perceived.

παρηγορήσιν (152): παρηγοῖαι are “traces”, and the adjective παρήγορος means “harnessed alongside”; the word is used correctly here, but reinterpretation at H 156 and Ψ 603 show that it was improperly understood. This suggests that it was an old word, but there is no indication as to when it may have entered the epic tradition. In the same verse, late composition is indicated by ἀμύμονα, an epithet which is used nowhere else of a horse.

#### 4. α 44 - 54

τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη:

45 ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη, ὔπατε κρειόντων,

καὶ λίην κείνός γε εἰκότι κείται ὀλέθρῳ·

ὥς ἀπόλοιο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαῦτα γε ρέζοι.

ἀλλὰ μοι ἀμφ' ᾿Οδυσῆϊ δαΐφροني δαίεται ἦτορ,

δυσμόρῳ, ὃς δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἄπο πήματα πάσχει

50 νήσω ἐν ἀμφιούτῃ, ὅθι τ' ὀμφαλός ἐστι θαλάσσης.  
 νήσος δενδρήεσσα, θεὰ δ' ἐν δώματα ναίει,  
 Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ ὀλοόφρονος, ὅς τε θαλάσσης  
 πάσης βένθεα οἶδεν, ἔχει δέ τε κίονας αὐτὸς  
 μακρᾶς, αἳ γαῖάν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσι.

The gods are assembled on Olympus; Athene responds to Zeus' complaint about the perversity of the human race.

**τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ... Ἄθῆνη** (44): in theory the entire verse could be of Mycenaean vintage, although it is preferable to regard it as comprising two hemistichs, each of which has a strong chance of belonging to Mycenaean epic. Τ<sub>1</sub> τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα occurs 36 times in the *Iliad*, and with the substitution of the feminine pronoun τήν another 12 times; if it did indeed belong to the Mycenaean Age it would have had the form \*τὸν /τάν δ' ἡμείγ<sup>w</sup>ετ' ἔπειτα. In the second hemistich, θεά, as discussed, is not used in Ionic, but is current in Lesbian, although this does not imply that it entered epic from an Aeolic source. θεά and its genitive plural, θεάων, are regular in formulae of old appearance; it would be wrong to assume that the non-appearance of \*te-a = \*θε(h)ά in Mycenaean means that people did not refer in speech to female \*θε(h)άι as opposed to male \*θε(h)όι.

**ἔπατε κρείοντων** (45): for a discussion of κρείων, v. p. 189-90. This phrase is based on Agamemnon's *Iliad* formula, εὐρὸν κρείων

Ἄγαμέμνων, where κρείων is in fact a comparative adjective, cf. Sanskrit *śréyas*; it was presumably misunderstood as a participle at post-Mycenaean date, when comparatives in -τερος had largely replaced the inherited type in -ίων. This phrase occurs also at α 81, ω 473 and Θ 31, where it is based on Agamemnon's formula εὐρὸν κρείων Ἄγαμέμνων and Ζῆν ὑπατον (E 756, Θ 22, P 339), which may be of Mycenaean date, as it contains the original accusative of Ζεύς, and at Θ 22 and P 339 forms part of the T<sub>1</sub> hemistich Ζῆν ὑπατον μήστωρα, including the old word μήστωρ, found only in formulaic contexts.

Ὀδυσῆϊ δαΐφρωνι (48): δαΐφρων is a traditional epithet used of many warriors in the *Iliad*, where it seems to mean "of warlike disposition", based on the obsolete noun \*δάς. In the *Odyssey* it seems to mean "intelligent, cunning", presumably associated with the root of δαΐφρων; this is unsurprising, as it is Odysseus' cunning and cleverness which are emphasized in the *Odyssey* more than his warlike nature (although he is ποικιλομήτης also in the *Iliad*). The reinterpretation of this epithet by the time of the *Odyssey* poet is apparent at ο 356, where it is used in reference to Odysseus' mother, Anticleia, κουριδίης τ' ἄλόχοιο δαΐφρονος: no Homeric woman, even Clytaemnestra, is warlike. The fact that δαΐφρων is metrically equivalent to περίφρων and πολύφρων may have contributed to its interpretation as a synonym of these two adjectives.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> S. West, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol.1, 81

The single -σ- of Ὀδυσσῆϊ shows late composition, as dialectal variants of the name point to an affricate at the Mycenaean stage, thus simplification to -σ- could have taken place only after the affricate had become -σσ- in Ionic. The spelling with single -σ- is more common in all its forms in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*.

ἦτορ (48) is an old word, obsolete in non-epic 1st millennium Greek, and isolated inasmuch as it is the only neuter with o-vocalization < \*r̥; cf. ἦπαρ. The nominative-accusative singular is the only case attested, and of its 46 *Odyssey* appearances, 40 are at verse-end, while the corresponding statistics for the *Iliad* are 32 out of 48, an instance in which the language of the *Odyssey* is more traditional than that of the *Iliad*. With the exception of the formulaic epithet μεγαλήτωρ, frequently used of warriors of high status, ἦτορ is completely non-productive, thus its antiquity is assured, and one would be justified therefore in assuming a 2nd millennium date for its entry into epic. Here it is used in its traditional position, but divested of formulaic word-associations.

νήσω ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ (50): also at α 198 and μ 283, this is a recent formulation, as shown by the prosody. -ω is correpted before a vowel, while ἀμφιρύτῃ, whose second element contains the zero-grade of the root of ῥέω (\*srw-) does not observe the original double consonant of this root which is represented in old formations such as ἔϋρρεϊος < \*ἐϋρρέφεος (Ζ 508, Ξ 433, Ο 265, Φ 1, Ω 692). However, ἀμφίρρυτος occurs at Hesiod, *Theogony* 983; it is not certain whether Hesiod used the original



as they are regularly formed, the suffix \*-φεντ- being directly attached to an α-stem noun. As ὕλησσα is a regularly formed and metrically equivalent synonym for δενδρήσσα, one must assume that the latter was created in order to avoid hiatus in the phrase ἄλσεα / -ῖ δενδρήεντα / -ι. Since ὕλη originally had initial \*s (cf. Latin *silva*), one may justifiably assume that the creation of the formula with δενδρήεντα / -ι postdates by a considerable period of time the loss of consonantal force in *h* < \*s. Indeed, although ὕλη and its case-forms, as well as the epithet ὕληεις and its case-forms, occurs several times at verse-end in the *Iliad* (δενδρήσσα / -εντι / -α is not found in the *Iliad*), none of its uses shows any sign of antiquity, so we cannot determine whether it formed part of the epic vocabulary in the Mycenaean Age.

δῶματα ναίει (51) adapts the old formula οἴκια ναίων; as the latter formula appears in the *Iliad* 5 times at verse-end, while the verb ναίω occurs only once with δῶματα, in a “recent” book (B 854, δῶματ’ ἔναιον), οἴκια ναίων is clearly the original formula. πῆματα πάσχει<sup>17</sup> echoes the traditional verse-end ἦματα πάντα. In both these phrases, the *Odyssey* poet has adapted elements of traditional epic diction and used them innovatively, in the latter example cleverly using assonance to create a new phrase which may have sounded traditional enough to convince listeners that it had always belonged to epic in the position where this poet put it.

---

<sup>17</sup> πῆματα πάσχειν at α 190; πῆματα πάσχεις at θ 411; πῆματα πάσχων at ε 33, ρ 444, 524; πῆματα πάσχω at η 152.

ὄλοόφρονος (52): this epithet is used of dangerous animals in the *Iliad*, while in the *Odyssey* it is used of Atlas, Aietes (κ 137) and Minos (λ 322), each of whom appears in the poem in connexion with a female relative. Each of its *Odyssey* appearances is in the genitive after the trochaic caesura, while in the *Iliad* it has no signs of formulaic usage, the genitive appearing twice and the nominative once. It is not improbable that the *Odyssey* usage is older, but whether it is of Mycenaean date is inconclusive.

This passage echoes traditional epic style, using some old items of vocabulary and at least a couple of hemistichs which in theory could be of Mycenaean origin. However, it is clearly of recent composition, making innovative use of some ancient elements of epic language. Indeed, Calypso's island is itself probably a fairly recent accretion to the epic tradition, perhaps under the influence of the Near Eastern *Epic of Gilgamesh*.<sup>18</sup>

## 5. η 1 -13

ὣς ὁ μὲν ἔνθ' ἦράτο πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,  
κούρην δὲ προτὶ ἄστυ φέρειν μένος ἡμιόνοιϊν.  
ἦ δ' ὅτε δὴ οὐ πατρὸς ἀγακλυτὰ δώμαθ' ἵκανε,  
στήσεν ἄρ' ἐν προθύροισι, κασίγνητοι δέ μιν ἀμφίς  
5 ἴσταντ' ἀθανάτοισι ἐναλίγκιοι, οἳ ῥ' ὑπ' ἀπήνης

---

<sup>18</sup> Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer*, 69; Martin West, *The East Face of Helicon*, 1997,

ἡμιόνους ἔλυον ἐσθητά τε ἔσφερον εἴσω.  
 αὐτὴ δ' ἐς θάλαμον ἔδν ἦτε· δαΐε δέ οἱ πύρ  
 γρηῦς Ἀθηραΐη, θαλαμηπόλος Εὐρουμέδουσα,  
 τήν ποτ' Ἀπειρήθεν νέες ἦγαγον ἀμφιέλισσαι.  
 10 Ἀλκινόω δ' αὐτὴν γέρας ἔξελον, οὔνεκα πᾶσι  
 Φαιήκεσιν ἄνασσε, θεοῦ δ' ὡς δῆμος ἄκουεν·  
 ἦ τρέφε Ναυσικάαν λευκώλενον ἐν μεγάροισιν.  
 ἦ οἱ πύρ ἀνέκαιε καὶ εἴσω δόρπον ἐκόσμιε.

Odysseus waits in Athene's sacred grove while Nausicaa returns to the palace. This is a highly non-traditional piece of epic, which nevertheless manages skilfully to incorporate ancient phrases and vocabulary.

δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (1) is already frequent in the *Iliad* and may be of Mycenaean date (cf. δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς). The T<sub>2</sub> hemistich πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς is very common in the *Odyssey*, where it is understood as “much-enduring”, but also occurs five times in the *Iliad* (Θ 97, I 676, K 248, Ψ 729, 778), where Odysseus' sufferings on the way home are not hinted at. It is possible that the *Iliad* poet was using a formula which originated as part of Odysseus' νόστος-tale; alternatively, and more probably, the epithet πολύτλας originally signified “much-daring”<sup>19</sup>, which is more appropriate for the *Iliad* contexts, and its subsequent reinterpretation as “much-enduring” may have motivated accounts of Odysseus' suffering *en route* for Ithaca. (Heroes' epithets do in some instances motivate

<sup>19</sup> Hainsworth, *A Commentary of Homer's Odyssey*, vol.1, 320

episodes in Homer: Astyanax is scared by Hector's helmet at Z 467 - 70 because of the ancient epithet κορυθαίολος; Achilles chases Hector round Troy in X because he is πόδας ὠκύς, ποδάροκης).

**πρὸς ἄστν** (2) occurs 17 times in this position in the *Iliad*, and 7 in the *Odyssey*. The discrepancy is due to the significance of the Trojan ἄστν in the *Iliad*; indeed, the formula πρὸς Ἴλιον occurs 19 times in the *Iliad*. ἄστν is frequent in this position with other prepositions, e.g. ἀνά, κατά. πρὸς is a comparatively recent formation in epic, probably post-migration, as it is not found in Hesiod or the *Hymns*.<sup>20</sup> The fact that this comparatively recent form of the preposition is more frequent in the *Iliad* suggests that the Trojan city became more significant in the later stages of the tradition; perhaps this is solely the work of the *Iliad* poet.

**μένος ἡμιονοῦν** (2) is very recent. Mules are non-traditional and un-heroic, occurring neither in old epic formulae nor in Mycenaean vase-paintings or frescoes. This phrase is based on the frequent *Odyssey* verse-end formula μένος Ἀλκινόοιο, and also has a semantic similarity to the ancient phrase βίη Ἡρακλεῖη < \*γῶια Ἡρακλεφεῖα including a possessive adjective, on which are based similar expressions with a name in the genitive case (to which the possessive adjective was equivalent, before it was restricted to family relationships at a date preceding 1200 B.C.), e.g. βίη θ' Ἐλένοιο ἀνακτος (N 770, 781).

---

<sup>20</sup> As W.F. Wyatt showed in "Homeric πρὸς, ποτὶ, πρὸς" *SMEA* 19, 1978, 89-123; v. pp.61-5 for a discussion of the various forms of the preposition "towards".

μένος, cognate with Sanskrit *mānas*, is obsolete in 1st millennium Greek outside epic, and is found as a name-formant in Mycenaean, viz. a-o-ri-me-ne (PY Qa 1296) = \*A(h)οριμένης, “whose μένος is in his weapon”. It has many occurrences in the *Iliad*, e.g. the verse-end formula μένος ἦϋ (Ω 6, 242); curiously, at Ω 242 this apparently old formula is used in conjunction with ἥμιόνοις, and it is also associated with these beasts at P 742. If one assumes that the *Odyssey* poet knew the *Iliad* (and there is every reason to believe that this was the case), it is not improbable that the present verse was inspired by the *Iliad* lines.

Late composition is also betrayed by contraction in οὔ < ἔοιο (3), οὔνεκα (10), and νέεξ (9), the latter displaying antevocalic shortening, not retaining the ancient prosody of \*νᾶφεξ as seen in νῆεξ, although this noun is accompanied by the old epithet ἀμφιέλισσαι. Irresoluble contraction is also found in verse-end ἐκόσμει < ἐκόσμεε (13).

ἀθανάτοις ἐναλίγκιοι (5): the adjective appears several times with θεός, but only here with ἀθάνατος. θεῶ ἐναλίγκιος / θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιοι after the trochaic caesura (e.g. at T 250, α 371, β 5, δ 310, etc.) may be old (if θεοῖς is interpreted as θεοῖσι with elision of the final vowel). ἐναλίγκιοι here is in its traditional *locus*, but this is its only appearance with ἀθανάτοις: a traditional concept is expressed in a slightly non-traditional way, although still using epic vocabulary. A similar idea is expressed by θεοῦ δ'ὥς ἄκουεν (11), modifying the old simile θεὸς ὥς; the prosody of the latter indicates the erstwhile presence of digamma, viz. \*θε(h)ὸς φῆως

(<\*σφώς). The modification in the present verse is late, as it contains a contracted genitive which can only postdate vowel contractions.

γέρας (10) echoes A 118, 120, 123, etc.; the selection of a woman as a γέρας may be a traditional theme. Εὐρουμέδουσα, “wide-ruling / counselling”, is an unexpected name for a person of low status such as a serving-woman. The *Odyssey* has a greater interest than does the *Iliad* in lower status characters, for whom there was not a traditional onomastic stock.

It is impossible to determine the antiquity of the Phaeacians in epic; it is possible that the *Odyssey* poet is reworking Argonautic material. These lines, however, despite their use of ancient vocabulary and formulae (πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, ἄστυ, μένος, ἀμφιέλισσαι, γέρας, ἄνασσε), clearly show the weaving together of new elements with the old epic style; particularly attractive is the “vigour (μένος) of the (non-heroic) mules”.

#### 6. Z 414 - 24

ἦτοι γὰρ πατέρ' ἀμὸν ἀπέκτανε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,  
415 ἐκ δὲ πόλιν πέρσεν Κιλικῶν ἔϋ ναιετάωσαν,  
Θήβην ὑψίπυλον, κατὰ δ' ἔκτανεν Ἡετίωνα·  
οὐδέ μιν ἐξενάριξε, σεβάσσατο γὰρ τό γε θυμῷ,  
ἀλλ' ἄρα μιν κατέκθη σὺν ἔντεσι δαιδαλέοισιν

ἦδ' ἐπὶ σῆμ' ἔχεν· περὶ δε πτελέας ἐφύτευσαν  
420 νύμφαι ὄρεστιάδες, κόβραι Διὸς αἰγίλοιο.  
οἳ δέ μοι ἑπτὰ κασίγνητοι ἔσαν ἐν μεγάροισιν,  
οἳ μὲν πάντες ἰὼ κίον ἦματι ᾿Αἴδος εἴσω·  
πάντας γὰρ κατέπεφνε ποδάρκης δῖος ᾿Αχιλλεύς  
βουσὶν ἐπ' εἰλιπόδεσσι καὶ ἀργεννῆς ὄτεσσι.

Here, Andromache relates to Hector the loss of her natal family. Using traditional style and vocabulary, the poet has created a scene of deep pathos.

The apparently 1st person plural possessive adjective **ἄμόν**, with long initial /a/, is here used as the equivalent of ἔμον for metrical reasons. This word, categorized by Chantraine as “probablement archaïque”<sup>21</sup>, has been regarded as Doric<sup>22</sup>, but as Doric has not otherwise contributed to the language of Ionian epic, this is improbable. It is more likely to represent a conflation of Lesbian ἄμμος and Ionic ἐμός, with metrical lengthening instead of gemination. Thus it is a secondary, artificial creation of epic language, which happens to coincide with the form in Doric vernacular usage, rather than a genuine borrowing from Doric. This form occurs only twice in Homer (also at Θ 178, after the bucolic diaeresis), neither of them in formulaic contexts, and it is thus reasonable to assume that this is a recent addition to the epic vocabulary. At the end of the same verse, **δῖος ᾿Αχιλλεύς** is a very old epic formula, with a strong probability of

---

<sup>21</sup> *GHI*, 272

<sup>22</sup> E.g. by Shipp, *Studies*, 80

belonging to the Mycenaean Age. In the next verse, **ἔϋ ναιετώσσαν** might at first glance look old, but in fact modifies **ἔϋ κτίμενον**, which would not scan here. The latter formula is clearly of considerable antiquity. **κτίμενον** is the participle of an athematic verb attested in Mycenaean both in participial form, e.g. **ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na** = \*κτοῖναι κτίμεναι (PY Eo 247, En 477) and in the 3rd person plural **ki-ti-je-si** = \*κτίενσι (PY Na 520); in 1st millennium Greek, this root is represented in the deverbative **κτίζω**. The verb **ναιετάω** is poetic only, based on the old verb **ναίω**, which is obsolescent even within epic (cf. **να(φ)ός**, “dwelling (sc. of a god), shrine”), and seems to be a creation of epic language.

**Θήβην ὑψίπυλον** may be a P<sub>1</sub> formula from old epic concerning mainland Thebes. Note the singular toponym; in old formulae, place-names tend to be singular, cf. **πολυχρύσοιο Μυκῆνης** (H 180, Λ 46). The metrically equivalent epithet **ἑπτάπυλον** (genitive at Δ 406) is likely to be a later creation than **ὑψίπυλον**: no Mycenaean citadel has been shown to have so many gates, and the concept “seven-gated” was probably inspired by the legend of the Seven against Thebes.<sup>23</sup>

**νύμφαι ὄρεστιάδες** (420) occurs only here in Homer; mountain-nymphs don't have much of a rôle in heroic epic. **κούραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο**, however, is the plural of an old P<sub>2</sub> formula whose original use was probably of Athene, as in **Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη κούρη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο** (ν 252, 371, ω

---

<sup>23</sup> Walter Burkert, “Seven against Thebes”, *I poemi epici rapsodici non-omerici e la tradizione orale*, Brillante, Pavese, Cantilena (edd.), 39

547), and Ἰθηναίη κούρη Διδὸς αἰγιόχοιο (E 733, Θ 384). The *Odyssey* whole-verse formula may be the original and may date from the Mycenaean Age, Ἰθηναίη being an adjectival form; Mycenaean attests qa-ra<sub>2</sub> (PY An 192, TH Of 37.8<sup>24</sup>). If this formula is indeed of Mycenaean date, it will have had the form \*Q<sup>w</sup>αλλὰς Ἰθηναία, κόρφα Διδὸς αἰγιόχοιο. Here, the *Iliad* poet has taken an ancient formula and used it in an innovative way.

ἰὼ κίον ἦματι: the feminine ἰα in the sense “one” (Δ 437, N 354, Φ 569) is an innovation of the Aeolic dialects (v. p.69-70). ἰός meaning “(one and) the same”, as here, seems originally to have been a deictic pronoun, and thus in this sense, also to be found in Cretan and Messenian Doric, it is an archaism which in all likelihood was of much wider distribution in the 2nd millennium. It can have entered epic with this meaning only when it was widely understood as such, and its distribution in 1st millennium Greek suggests that this took place at a pre-migration date. Thus it is a relic preserved by epic and these Doric dialects. Another relic in this verse is the noun ἦμαρ, which is found in Arcadian in the form ἄμαρ<sup>25</sup>; formulaic representation in Homer (e.g. the verse-end formula ἦματα πάντα) suggests that this noun entered epic very early, as it is shared by epic and a dialect with which Ionian bards of the Archaic Age are unlikely to have had any contact. The verb κίον likewise is a relic<sup>26</sup>: only the aorist appears in epic.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. IV, 295

<sup>25</sup> Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen*, 120

<sup>26</sup> Associated by Chantraine with the root of κινέω (*DELG* 537, s.v. κίω).

<sup>27</sup> However, Aeschylus (*Ch.* 680) created a present, κλείς, from this stem.

All of these, then, are traditional items of epic vocabulary; however, they are without formulaic connexions in this verse, thus although all are likely to have formed part of the epic vocabulary in the 2nd millennium, the *Iliad* poet has here used them in an innovative way, composing in the traditional oral style, but adapting old vocabulary to a new context.

κατέπεφνε (423) is a compound of the old verb (ἐ)πεφνε, which is confined in 1st millennium Greek to epic and its imitators, and even in epic is replaced in non-formulaic contexts by the sigmatic aorist (ἐ)θεινα from the same root. Here the simplex is found in its traditional *locus* before the trochaic caesura: however recent any passage of Homer may be in terms of composition, ancient elements of the diction may still be used in their traditional positions, giving the verse the desired sense of antiquity. In the same verse, the name + epithet formula ποδάρκης διος Ἀχιλλεύς, occurring 21 times after the trochaic caesura, expresses the same idea as πόδας ὠκύς Ἀχιλλεύς in different metrical circumstances: the epithet seems to be associated with ἄρκέω (LSJ), thus will signify “who runs to help”, *vel sim.* Achilles is almost certainly a hero from the Mycenaean Age; if one of his formulae is of that vintage, then it is reasonable to assume that it will have required a metrical variant, therefore both of these formulae stand a high chance of belonging to Mycenaean epic.

βουσίην ἐπ' εἰλιπόδεσσι (424) is likely to be a conflation of a P<sub>2</sub> prototype in the dative, \*ἐπὶ / ἐνὶ φείλιπόδεσσι βόφροσιν, and a P<sub>2</sub> formula in the

accusative, \*ἐπὶ / μετὰ φειλίποδας φέλικας βοῦς.<sup>28</sup> The dative ending -εσσι is likely to have belonged to 2nd millennium Aeolic, a dialect which was in a position to influence epic in its formative stages, so there is no reason linguistically why \*ἐπὶ / ἐνὶ φειλιπόδεσσι βόφεσσιν should not have belonged to the Mycenaean Age; poets were able to take advantage of the alternative dative plural βουσί(ν) to adapt the P<sub>2</sub> formula for the first hemistich. Thematically it is also possible that both of the aforementioned formulae belonged to Mycenaean epic. Possession of cattle was a sign of status for the Mycenaeans: \*γ<sup>w</sup>ούς is found as a name formant in Mycenaean, e.g. ta-ti-qa-we-u = \*Στατιγ<sup>w</sup>οφεύς (PY An 724). Indeed, ownership of many cattle would have been something to boast about, and it is unsurprising that the evidence of old formulae and accounts such as Nestor's of cattle-raiding expeditions points to a long establishment for the bovine species in epic; there are, however, no formulae of ancient appearance for a single ox, which is not surprising, as the ownership of one ox would have conferred little status.

Gemination of ν in ἀργεννής (24) indicates a secondary Aeolism, therefore a post-migration addition to epic vocabulary, although ancient sheep-related vocabulary such as πῶν suggests that sheep were not unknown to Mycenaean epic. Whether individuals of high status such as Andromache's brothers would have been caught tending sheep and cattle in Mycenaean epic is debatable: this is a non-heroic activity to say the least, and the putative Mycenaean patrons of epic employed shepherds (po-me-ne =

---

<sup>28</sup> Hoekstra, *Modifications*, 68

ποιμένες, PY Ea 800, etc.) and cowherds (qo-u-ko-ro = \*γ<sup>w</sup>ουκόλοι, PY An 852, etc.) to tend their flocks and herds. It is in any case likely that this incident is the creation of the *Iliad* poet: Andromache's brothers are not essential to the plot of the *Iliad* and do not appear elsewhere in Homer. Likewise Andromache herself is not essential to the plot, but given the significance of Hector and the antiquity of his name + epithet formulae, not to mention the importance of genealogies in epic, it is likely that this Anatolian prince was at a very early date given a consort with a Greek name which expresses the values of the Mycenaean patrons of epic: Ἀνδρομάχη presupposes a masculine \*Ἀνδρόμαχος, "who fights men" (cf. \*Ἀνορ<sup>w</sup>ήοντας, "slayer of men").

## Conclusions

While all the Homeric passages here examined at least nod in the direction of their 2nd millennium heritage, using ancient vocabulary and formulae, or modifications thereof, every one of them displays signs of recent composition, either with linguistic features from contemporary Ionic, e.g. vowel contractions in verb forms or the genitive singular of o-stems, or with "artificial" forms such as diectasis which presuppose the developments which characterize the fully fledged Ionic dialect. Likewise we find forms which, while far from colloquial, are literary only, one such being the frequentative preterites in -(ε)σκ<sup>-29</sup>, never found in old formulae. The fact that such frequentatives were absent from quotidian parlance allowed poets the licence to use them in an inventive way.

---

<sup>29</sup> Wathelet, "Les iteratifs en -(e)sk-", *AC* 42, 1973, 379-405

Even in a passage such as Z 414-24, which lacks strikingly “modern” linguistic features, recent composition is betrayed by non-traditional motifs, e.g. mountain nymphs who plant trees (unparalleled elsewhere in epic), and by modification of old formulae. The final conclusion to be drawn from this entire investigation is that epic language does indeed show clearly its 2nd millennium origins, while in its Homeric manifestation it shows that it has over the centuries absorbed many elements from vernacular usage, thus becoming more flexible than it surely was at the Mycenaean stage. Every passage analysed in this appendix blends together ancient and modern elements of the diction, and thus it is indeed the case that ancient and modern are inextricably intertwined in epic language. Nevertheless, sufficient remains from the old epic stock of words and formulae to have permitted the Mycenaean practitioners of epic, making allowances for changes in pronunciation over the intervening half-millennium, to recognize their art form in the poems that have reached us under the name “Homer”.

## Bibliography

- Adrados, F.R. "La vocalización de las sonantes indoeuropeas", *Emerita* 26, 1958, 249-309
- "Micénico, dialectos paramicénicos y aqueo épico", *Emerita* 44, 1976, 65-113
- "La creación de los dialectos griegos del milenio", *Emerita* 44, 1976, 245-78
- "Towards A New Stratigraphy of the Homeric Dialect", *Glotta* 59, 1981, 13-27
- Aitchison, Jean M. "Τελομώνιος Αἶας and other Patronymics", *Glotta* 42, 1964, 132-8
- Allen, T.W. *Homer, Origins and Transmissions*, Oxford, 1924
- Atkinson, B.F.C. *The Greek Language*, London, 1931
- Bader, Françoise "De mycénien *matoropuro*, *arepozoo* à grec. ματρόπολις, ἀλειφόβιος", *Minos* 10, 1969, 7-63

- Bartoněk, Antonin      *Development of the long-vowel System in Ancient Greek Dialects*, Brno, 1966
- “Greek dialects in the second millennium B.C.”, *Eirene* 9, 1971, 49-67
- Bechtel, Friedrich      *Lexilogus zu Homer*, Halle, 1914
- Benedetti, Marina      “Il composto omerico ἑπιοχάρμης”, *RAL* 34, 1979, 169-85
- “Osservazioni su omerico σάκος”, *SSL* 20, 1980, 115-62
- Blome, Peter      “Die dunkle Jahrhunderte – aufgehellt”, *Zweihundert Jahre Homerforschung: Colloquium Rauricum, Band 2*, J. Latacz (ed.), Göttingen, 1991, 45-60
- Bloomfield, Leonard      *Language*, 2nd edition, London, 1969
- Bölte, F      “Ein pylisches Epos”, *RhM* 83, 1934, 319-47

- Bottin, L. "Studi del aumento in Omero", *SMEA* 10, 1969, 69-145
- Bowra, C. M. *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*, Oxford, 1930
- Buck, C.D. *The Greek Dialects*, Bristol, 1998 (reprint of revised edition, 1955)
- Burkert, Walter "Seven against Thebes: an Oral Tradition between Babylonian Magic and Greek Literature", C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C.O. Pavese (edd.), *I poemi epici rapsodici non-omerici e la tradizione orale*, Padova, 1981, 29-51
- Chadwick, John "The Greek Dialects and Greek Prehistory", *Greece & Rome*, (n.s.) 3, 1965, 38-50
- "Who were the Dorians?", *PP* 31, 1976, 102-117
- Linear B and Related Scripts*, London, 1987



*Dialects*, Birnbaum & Puhvel (edd.),  
Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1966, 77-95

Crespo, Emilio

“La cronología relativa de la metatesis de  
cantidad en jonico-atico”, *CFC* 12, 1977,  
187-219

*Elementos antiguos y modernos en la  
prosodia omerica*, Salamanca, 1977

Crouwel, Joost

*Chariots and other means of land transport  
in Bronze Age Greece*, Amsterdam, 1981

“Chariots in Early Iron Age Greece and in  
Homer”, *Homeric Questions: essays in  
philology, ancient history and  
archaeology, including the papers of a  
conference organized by the Netherlands  
Institute at Athens (15 May 1995)*, J.P  
Crielaard (ed.), Amsterdam, 1995, 309-16

Davies, Anna Morpurgo

“Doric Features in the Language of  
Hesiod”, *Glotta* 42, 1964, 138-65

“Epigraphical -φτ”, *Glotta* 47, 1970, 46-54

- Davies, Malcolm      *The Greek Epic Cycle*, Bristol, 1989  
(ed.) *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*,  
Göttingen, 1998
- Delger-Jalkotzky, Siegrid “Zusammenbruch der mykenischen Kultur  
und dunklen Jahrhunderte”, *Zweihundert  
Jahre Homerforschung: Colloquium  
Rauricum no. 2*, J. Latacz (ed.), Stuttgart  
1991, 127-54
- Desborough, Vincent      *The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors*,  
Oxford, 1964
- Drews, Robert      “Argos and Argives in the Iliad”, *CPh* 74,  
1979, 111-35
- Duhoux, Yves      “Les débuts de l’augment grec: le facteur  
socio-linguistique”, *Minos* 20-22, 1987,  
163-72
- Dunbar, H.      *A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey of  
Homer*, rev. B. Marzullo, Hildesheim, 1971
- Durante, Marcello      “Νείλευς e Νηλεύς”, *SMEA* 3, 1967, 33-46

“Etimologie greche”, *SMEA* 11, 1970, 43-  
57

*Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica  
greca I & II*, Rome, 1971 & 1974

Edwards, G.P.      *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional  
Context*, Oxford, 1971

Effenterre, Henri van      “Laos, laoi et lawagetas”, *Kadmos* 16,  
1977, 36-55

Finsler, Georg      *Homer: der Dichter und seine Welt*, Berlin  
& Leipzig, 1914

Fontenrose, Joseph      *The Delphic Oracle*, Berkeley and Los  
Angeles, 1978

Forbes, K.      “The Relations of the Particle ἄν with κε(ν)  
κα καν”, *Glotta* 37, 1958, 179-82

Frisk, H.,      *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*,  
Heidelberg, 1960-72

Gallavotti, C..

- & Ronconi, A      *La lingua omerica*, 3rd edition, Bari, 1955
- Garbrah, K.A.      “The Dative Plurals of o- and α-stems in  
Homer: present problems and future  
perspectives”, *Glotta* 60, 1982, 300-9
- García-Ramón, Jose-Luis      *Les origines post-mycéniennes du groupe  
dialectale éolien*, Salamanca, 1975
- “Hesiodica I: Ἑὴν ἐγκάτθετο νηδύν”,  
*CFC* 11, 1976, 575-81
- “En torno a los elementos dialectales en  
Hesíodo I: el elemento occidental”, *CFC* 11,  
1976, 523-43
- “Le prétendu infinitif grec occidental”,  
*Minos* 16, 1977, 179-206
- GDI*      *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-  
Inschriften*, H.Collitz & O.Hoffmann (edd.),  
Göttingen, 1915
- Grant, Michael      *The Rise of the Greeks*, London, 1987

- Gray, D.H.F. "Homeric epithets for things", *CQ* 41, 1947, 109-21
- "Mycenaean names in Homer", *JHS* 78, 1958, 43-8
- Hainsworth, Bryan "Criteri di oralita nella poesia non omerica", *I poemi epici rapsodici e la tradizione orale*, C. Brillante, M. Cantilena & C.O. Pavese (edd.), Padova 1981, 3-27
- Hall, Jonathan *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge 1977
- Hamp, Eric "Notes on early Greek Phonology", *Glotta* 38, 1960, 187-203
- Hatzidikis, J. "Κνωσίων καὶ Τυλισίων συνθήκη", Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἐφεμερίς, 1914, 94-8
- Hernandez, P. Nieto "La desinencia -φι", *Emerita* 55, 1987, 273-306
- Heubeck, A., *et al.*, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, Oxford, 1988-92 (vol. I, bks. 1-8, Heubeck,

S. West, J.B. Hainsworth; vol. II, bks.9-16,  
A. Heubeck, A. Hoekstra; vol. III, bks. 17-  
24, J. Russo, M. Fernández Galliano, A.  
Heubeck)

Heubeck, Alfred

“Agamemnon”, *Gedenkschrift für W.  
Brandstein*, M. von Mayerhofer, F.  
Lochner-Hüttenbach & H. Schmeja (edd.),  
Innsbruck, 1968, 357-61 (= *Kleine Schriften*  
268-72)

“Syllabic *r* in Mycenaean?”, *Minos* 12,  
1972, 55-79

“Zum Problem der homerischen  
Kunstsprache”, *MH* 38, 1981, 65-80

“L’origine della lineare B”, *SMEA* 23,  
1982, 195-208

Hoekstra, Arie

“Hésiode et la tradition orale”, *Mnemosyne*  
10, 1957, 193-225

“A Note on the Dative of Purpose in  
Greek”, *Mnemosyne* 15, 1962, 15-23

*Homeric Modifications of formulaic  
Prototypes*, Amsterdam, 1965

*Epic Verse Before Homer*, Amsterdam,  
1981

Holland, Gary B. "The Name of Achilles: A Revised  
Etymology", *Glotta* 71, 1993, 17-27

Hornblower, S., &

Spawforth, A. (edd.) *OCD III = The Oxford Classical Dictionary*,  
3rd edition, Oxford, 1996

Horrocks, Geoffrey "The Antiquity of the Greek Epic Tradition:  
Some New Evidence", *PCPS* 1980, 1-11

*Space and Time in Homer: prepositional &  
adverbial particles in Greek*, New York,  
1981

"Homer's Dialect", *A New Companion to  
Homer*, Barry Powell & Ian Morris (edd.),  
Leiden & New York, 1997, 193-217

Householder, F.

- & Nagy, G. *Greek, A Survey of Recent Work*, The Hague, 1972
- Huxley, G. L. *The Early Ionians*, London, 1966
- Greek Epic Poetry*, London, 1969
- IG *Inscriptiones Graecae. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae editae*, vol. 1-14, Berlin, 1873-
- Ilievski, P. Hr. "Vocabulary words from Personal Names", *Colloquium Mycenaicum*, E. Risch & H. Mühlestein (edd.), Neuchâtel-Genève 1979, 135-46
- "Some Structural Peculiarities of Mycenaean Greek Personal Names," *Res Mycenaee*, A. Heubeck & G. Neumann (edd.), Göttingen 1983, 202-15
- Jacoby, Felix (ed.) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin, 1923

- Janko, Richard                    “The use of πρὸς, πρὸς and πρὸς in  
Homer” *Glotta* 57, 1979, 24-9
- Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic  
development in epic diction, Cambridge,  
1982*
- Jeffery, Lilian H.                *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: a  
study of the origin of the Greek Alphabet &  
its development from the 8th to the 5th  
centuries B.C., Oxford, 1961*
- Kiechle, F.                        “Ostarkadische Ortsnamen auf pylischen  
Linear-B Tafeln”, *Kadmos* 1, 1962, 98-116
- Killen, John                      “Mycenaean Possessive Adjectives in  
-e-jo-”, *TPhS* 1983, 66-99
- Kinkel, G.                        *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, Leipzig,  
1877*
- Kirk, Geoffrey                  *Homer and the Oral Tradition, Cambridge,  
1976*

Kirk, G.S., general editor *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Cambridge,  
1985-93 (vol.I, bks. 1-4, G.S.Kirk; vol. II,  
bks. 5-8, G.S. Kirk; vol. III, bks. 9-12, B.  
Hainsworth; vol. IV, bks. 13-16, R. Janko;  
vol. V, bks. 17-20, M.W. Edwards; vol. VI,  
bks. 21-24, N. Richardson)

Kretschmer, Paul "Zur Geschichte der griechischen  
Dialekte", *Glotta* 1, 1909, 9-59

Latacz, Joachim *Kampfparanäse, Kampfdarstellung und  
Kampf-wirklichkeit in der Ilias bei Kallinos  
und Tyrtaios*, München, 1977

Lejeune, Michel "La désinence -φι en mycénien", *BSL* 52,  
1956, 187-218

"Les adjectives mycéniennes à suffixe -  
went-", *REA* 60, 1958, 5-26

"Essais de philologie mycénienne VII. La  
postposition -δε en mycénien", *RPh* 35,  
1961, 195-206

“Essais de philologie mycénienne IX. Le  
génitif singulier thématique”, *RPh* 39,  
1965, 14-20

“Notes de morphologie mycénienne”, *BSL*  
60, 1965, 1-17

*Phonétique du grec ancien et du mycénien*,  
Paris, 1972

Leukart, Alex                    “Po-ro-qa-ta-jo, to-sa-pe-mo, a-mo-ra-ma  
and Others: Further Evidence for Collective  
Formations in Mycenaean and Early  
Alphabetic Greek”, *Minos* 20-22, 1987,  
343-65

Leumann, Manu                *Homerische Wörter*, Basel, 1950

Lévêque, Pierre                “La mémoire achéenne de Sparte. Analyse  
de la rue Aphetais”, *La transizione dal  
Miceneo all’Alto Arcaismo: dal palazzo  
alla città*, D. Musti (ed.), Roma, 1991, 573-  
81

Liddell, H., Scott, R.

- & Jones, H.S.      *LSJ: A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edition,  
Oxford, 1940
- Lorimer, H.L.      *Homer and the Monuments*, London, 1950
- Matz, F. &  
Buchholz, H.G.,(edd.) *Archaeologica Homerica; die Denkmaler  
und das frühgriechische Epos*, Göttingen,  
1967-
- Meillet, A. & Vendryes,      *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues  
classiques*, 5th edition, Paris, 1979
- Meillet, Antoine      *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*,  
Paris, 1930
- Merkelbach, R.  
& West, M.L.,      *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, Oxford, 1967
- Miller, D. Gary      *Homer and the Ionian Epic Tradition. Some  
Phonic and Phonological Evidence against  
an Aeolic "Phase"*, Innsbruck, 1982
- Moralejo Alvarez,

- Juan Jose "Sonantes y griego micénico", *Emerita* 41,  
1973, 409-26
- Moreschini,  
Adriana Quattordio "Elementi micenei nella tradizione  
formularia: Γερήνιος ἱππότα Νέστωρ",  
*SMEA* 25,1984, 337-47
- "Νηλεύς, Νηλήϊος, Νηληϊάδης", *SMEA*  
27, 1989, 225-67
- Morris, Sarah P. "A Tale of Two Cities: The Miniature  
Frescoes From Thera and the Origins of  
Greek Poetry", *AJA* 93, 1989, 511-35
- Mühlestein, H. *Die o-ka Tafeln von Pylos: ein mykenischer  
Schiffskatalog*, Basel, 1956
- "Namen von Neleiden auf Pylostäfelchen",  
*MH* 22, 1965, 155-68
- "Nochmals zu den o-ka Tafeln von Pylos",  
*Res Mycenaeae*, A. Heubeck & G.  
Neumann (edd.), Göttingen, 1983, 311-27

Nagy, Gregory "The Name of Achilles. Etymology and Epic", *Studies in Greek, Italic and IE Linguistics offered to L.R. Palmer on the occasion of his 70th birthday*, A.M. Davies & W. Meid (edd.), Innsbruck 1976, 209-37

Neumann, Günter "Zwischen Mykene und Homer: namenkundliche Beobachtungen erklären das 'Dark Age'", *La transizione dal Miceneo all' Alto Arcaismo; dal palazzo alla città*, D. Musti (ed.), Roma, 1991, 167-75

"Die homerische Personennamen", *Zweihundert Jahre Homorforschung, Colloquium Rauricum Band 2*, Latacz, J. (ed.), Stuttgart, 1991, 311-28

"Deutungsvorschläge zu mykenische Namen", *Mykenaiika: Actes du IX<sup>e</sup> colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens*, J.P. Olivier (ed.), Athens, 1992, 433-41

- Nilsson, Martin P.      *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek  
Mythology*, Cambridge, 1932
- Notopoulos, James A.    “Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean Heritage  
of Oral Poetry”, *Hesperia* 29, 1960, 177-97
- “Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry”,  
*HSCP* 68, 1964, 1-77
- Page, Denys              *History and the Homeric Iliad*, Berkeley &  
Los Angeles, 1959
- Palmer, Leonard        “The Language of Homer”, *A Companion  
to Homer*, A.J.B. Wace & F.H. Stubbings  
(edd.), London, 1962, 75-178
- The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek  
Texts*, Oxford, 1963
- The Greek Language*, London, 1980
- Panagl, Oswald         “Homerisch ὄχρα. Ein lautlicher verkappter  
Mykenismus”, *Serta Indogermanica.  
Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60.*

*Geburtstag*, J.Tischler (ed.), 1992

Innsbruck, 251-7

Parker, Victor

“Gab es wirklich Dorier auf dem

Mykenischen Peloponnes?”, *PP* 48, 1993,

241-66

Parry, Milman

*The Making of Homeric Verse: the*

*collected Papers of Milman Parry*, Adam

Parry (ed.), Oxford, 1971

Pavese, C.O.

*Tradizioni e generi poetici della greca*

*arcaica*, Rome, 1972

*Studi sulla tradizione epica rapsodica*,

Rome, 1974

“L’origine micenea della tradizione epica

rapsodica”, *SMEA* 21, 1980, 341-52

“Poesia ellenica e cultura orale”, *I poemi*

*epici rapsodici non-omerici e la cultura*

*orale*, C. Brillante, M. Cantilena & C. O.

Pavese (edd.), Padova, 1981, 115-78

“La iscrizione sulla kotyle di Nestor da Pithekoussai”, *ZPE* 112, 1996, 1-23

“The Rhapsodic Epic Poems as Oral and Independent Poems”, *HSCP* 98, 1998, 64-90

Perpillou, J.L. *Les substantives grecs en -εύς*, Paris, 1973

Peters, Martin “Zur Frage einer achäischen Phase des griechischen Epos”, *O-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, A. Etter (ed.), Berlin, 1986, 303-19

Plath, Robert *Der Streitwagen und seine Teile im frühen Griechisch: sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Mykenischen Texten und zum homerischen Epos*, Nürnberg, 1994

Porzig, Walter “Sprachgeographische Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekte”, *IF* 61, 1954, 147-69

- Powell, Barry                    *Homer and the Origin of the Greek  
Alphabet*, Cambridge, 1991
- Prendergast, G. L.                *A Complete Concordance to the Iliad of  
Homer*, rev. B.Marzullo, Hildesheim, 1983
- Puhvel, Jaan                      “Devatā-Dvandva in Hittite, Greek, and  
Latin”, *AJPh* 98, 1977, 396-405
- Pugliese Caratelli, G.            “Appunti per la storia dei culti cirenaici”,  
*Maia* 16, 1964, 99-111
- Risch, Ernst                      “Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte  
in neuer Sicht”, *MH* 12, 1955, 61-76
- “Les differences dialectales dans le  
mycénien”, *Proceedings of the Cambridge  
Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*,  
Chadwick & Palmer (edd.), 1966, 150-7
- Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, 2nd  
edition, Berlin, 1974
- “Il miceneo nella storia della lingua greca”,  
*QUCC* 23, 1976, 7-28

“Die griechischen Dialekte im 2.  
vorchristlichen Jahrtausend”, *SMEA* 20,  
1979, 91-111

“Der Homerische Typus ἰππότης Νέστωρ  
und μητίετα Ζεύς”, *Festschrift Albert  
Debrunner*, Bern, 1954, 389-97 (= *Kleine  
Schriften* 332-40)

“La posizione del dialetto dorico”, *Le  
origini dei greci. Dori e mondo egeo*, D.  
Musti (ed.), Roma & Bari, 1985, 13-35

Roth, C.P.                    “*Mixed Aorists*” in *Homeric Greek*, New  
York & London, 1990

Ruijgh, C.J.                *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*,  
Assen, 1957

“Les datifs pluriels dans les dialectes grecs et  
la position du mycénien”, *Mnemosyne* 11,  
1958, 97- 116 (= *Scripta Minora I*, 3-22)

“Les sonantes voyelles dans les dialectes  
grecs et la position du mycénien”,

*Mnemosyne* 14, 1961, 193-216 (= *Scripta Minora I*, 23-46)

*Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam, 1967

“Sur le nom de Poséidon et sur les noms en -α-φοϝ-, -ι-φοϝ- en grec alphabétique et en mycénien”, *REG* 80, 1967, 6-16 (= *Scripta Minora I*, 229-39)

“Les noms en -won- (-āwon, -īwon-), -uon- en grec alphabétique et en mycénien , *Minos* 9, 1968, 109-55 (= *Scripta Minora I*, 240-86)

“Faits linguistiques relatifs et données externes relatifs aux chars et aux roues”, *Colloquium Mycenaeum*, Neuchâtel, 1979, 207-20 (= *Scripta Minora I*, 138-51)

“Le problème du degré zero dans les adverbs du type κάρτα et dans d'autres types morphologiques”, *Hommages à*

*Maurice Leroy*, Bruxelles, 1980 (= *Scripta Minora I*, 561-70)

Compte rendu of Chantraine, *DELG*,  
*Lingua* 25-58, 1970-82 (= *Scripta Minora I*, 571-632)

“Le mycénien et Homère”, *BCILL* 26,  
1985, 143-90 (= *Scripta Minora II*, 221-68)

“Problèmes de philologie mycénienne”,  
*Minos* 19, 1985, 105-67 (= *Scripta Minora II*, 43-105)

Review of Palmer, *The Greek Language*,  
*Mnemosyne* 42, 1989, 511-6

“L’emploi le plus ancien et les emplois plus récents de la particule κε / ἄν”, *La langue et les textes en grec ancien*, F. Létoublon (ed.), Amsterdam, 1992, 75-84 (= *Scripta Minora II*, 677-86)

- “D’Homère aux origines proto-  
mycéniennes de la tradition épique”,  
*Homeric Questions*, J.P. Crielaard (ed.),  
Amsterdam, 1995, 1-96
- Ruiperez, Martin S. “Le dialecte mycénien”, *Minos* 11, 1970,  
136-69
- Schwyzler, Eduard *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. 1 & 2,  
München, 1930 & 1939
- Schwyzler, E. & Cauer, P. *Dialectorum graecarum exempla  
epigraphica potiora*, Leipzig, 1923
- Shipp, G.P. *Studies in the Language of Homer*, 2nd  
edition, London, 1972
- Sihler, Andrew *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and  
Latin*, Oxford, 1995
- Snell, B. &  
Erbse, H.(edd.) *Lexicon des frühgriechischen Epos*,  
Göttingen, 1955-
- Snodgrass, A.M. *The Dark Age of Greece*, Edinburgh, 2000

- Stanford ,W.B., (ed.), *Homer. Odyssey*, in 2 vols., London, 1958-9
- Stella, L.A. *Tradizione micenea e poesia dell' Iliade*, Rome, 1978
- Taillardat, Jean "Homerica", *RPh* 71, 1997, 253-64
- Thiel, Helmut van (ed.) *Homeri Ilias*, Hildesheim, 1996
- Thompson, Rupert "Instrumentals, Datives, Locatives and Ablatives: The -φτ Case Form in Mycenaean and Homer", *PCPS* 44, 1998, 219-50
- Thumb, A. & Kieckers, E *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte I*, Heidelberg, 1932
- Thumb, A. & Scherer, A. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*, Heidelberg, 1959
- Torres, José B. "El lenguaje tradicional de la *Tebaida* omerica", *Emerita* 64, 1996, 95-111

- Troxler, Hans *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*, Zürich,  
1964
- Vermeule, Emily “Baby Aigisthos and the Bronze Age”,  
*PCPS* 33, 1987, 122-52
- Vilborg, Ebbe *A Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek*,  
Göteborg, 1960
- Vollgraff, W. *Le décret d' Argos relatif à un pacte entre  
Knossos et Tylissos*, Amsterdam, 1948
- Wackernagel, Jacob “Zur griechischen Nominalflexion”, *IF* 14,  
1903, 367-75
- Vorlesungen über Syntax*, Basel, 1920-4
- “Indogermanische Dichtersprache”,  
*Philologus* 95, 1943, 1-19
- Wathelet, Paul “Mycénien et grec d'Homère 1. Le datif en  
-t”, *AC* 31, 1962, 5-14
- “Mycénien et grec d'Homère 2. La  
particule κατ”, *AC* 33, 1964, 10-44

“La coupe syllabique et les liquids voyelles dans la tradition formulaire de l’épopée grecque”, *Recherches linguistiques en Belgique*, Y. Lebrun (ed.), Wetteren, 1966, 145-73

*Les traits éoliens dans la langue de l’épopée grecque*, Rome, 1970

“Études de linguistique homérique. Les itératifs en *-(e)sk-*”, *AC* 42, 1973, 379-405

“Le nom de Zeus chez Homère et dans les dialectes grecs”, *Minos* 15, 1974, 195-225

“La langue homérique et le rayonnement littéraire de l’Eubée”, *AC* 50, 1981, 819-33

Watkins, Calvert

“Linguistic and Archaeological Light on some Homeric Formulas”, *PIE Studies in Honor of Marija Gimbutas*, S.N. Skomal & E.C. Polomé (edd.), Washington 1987, 287-97

- Webster, T.B.L. *From Mycenae to Homer*, London, 1958
- West, Martin *Hesiod: Theogony*, Oxford, 1966
- Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin & New York, 1974
- Hesiod: Works & Days*, Oxford, 1978
- The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, Oxford, 1985
- “The Rise of the Greek Epic”, *JHS* 108, 1988, 151-72
- “The Descent of the Greek Epic: a reply”, *JHS* 112, 173-5
- “The Date of the *Iliad*”, *MH* 52, 1995, 203-19
- The East Face of Helicon*, Oxford, 1997
- “The Invention of Homer”, *CQ* 49, 1999, 346-82

Wyatt, W.F

*Metrical Lengthening in Homer*, Rome,  
1969

“The prehistory of the Greek Dialects”,  
*TAPA* 101, 1970, 557-632

“Homeric Πρός, Ποτί, Προτί”, *SMEA* 19,  
1978, 89-123