



**HAL**  
open science

## Some like it short? , and for in Doric

Alcorac Alonso Déniz

► **To cite this version:**

Alcorac Alonso Déniz. Some like it short? , and for in Doric. Anna Panayotou; Giovanbattista Galdi. *λληνικες διαλεκτοι στην αρχαιολογια*. Actes du VI<sup>e</sup> Colloque international sur les dialectes grecs anciens (Nicosie, Université de Chypre, 26 – 29 septembre 2011), Peeters, pp.117-141, 2017, 978-90-429-3193-0. halshs-01660015

**HAL Id: halshs-01660015**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01660015v1>**

Submitted on 8 Oct 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

This pdf is a digital offprint of your contribution in A. Panayotou & G. Galdi (eds), *Hellenikes dialektoi ston archaio kosmo*, ISBN 978-90-429-3193-0

The copyright on this publication belongs to Peeters Publishers.

As author you are licensed to make printed copies of the pdf or to send the unaltered pdf file to up to 50 relations. You may not publish this pdf on the World Wide Web – including websites such as academia.edu and open-access repositories – until three years after publication. Please ensure that anyone receiving an offprint from you observes these rules as well.

If you wish to publish your article immediately on open-access sites, please contact the publisher with regard to the payment of the article processing fee.

For queries about offprints, copyright and republication of your article, please contact the publisher via [peeters@peeters-leuven.be](mailto:peeters@peeters-leuven.be)

BIBLIOTHÈQUE DES CAHIERS  
DE LINGUISTIQUE DE LOUVAIN — 137

*Ἑλληνικὲς διάλεκτοι  
στὸν ἀρχαῖο κόσμος*

*Actes du VI<sup>e</sup> Colloque international  
sur les dialectes grecs anciens  
(Nicosie, Université de Chypre,  
26 – 29 septembre 2011)*

édités par

**Anna PANAYOTOU — Giovanbattista GALDI**



**PEETERS**  
LEUVEN – PARIS – BRISTOL, CT  
2017

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Dédicace à António López Eire . . . . .	V
Photo des participants au colloque . . . . .	VI
Πρόλογος των εκδοτών . . . . .	VII
Avant-propos des éditeurs . . . . .	VIII
Adresse du Vice-recteur des Affaires Académiques, Prof. Athanasios Gagatsis . . . . .	IX
Χαιρετισμός της Καθηγ. Άννας Παναγιώτου εκ μέρους της Οργα- νωτικής Επιτροπής . . . . .	XI
Adresse de la Prof. Anna Panayotou de la part du Comité d’Organisation . . . . .	XV
Πρόγραμμα – Programme . . . . .	XVII
Références bibliographiques communes . . . . .	XXIII

**Introduction . . . . .** 1

Anna PANAYOTOU – Giovanbattista GALDI, <i>I colloqui internazionali di dialettologia greca antica, 1986-2011</i> . . . . .	3
Antonio LILLO, <i>López Eire and Greek Dialectology: an analysis of the relevance of his work and influence for the publication of the Opuscula Selecta</i> . . . . .	11

**Documents nouveaux – Perspectives sur les dialectes . . . . .** 27

Yannis TZIFOPOULOS, Matthaios BESSIOS, Antonis KOTSONAS, <i>Panhel- lenes at Methone, Pieria (ca. 700 BCE): New inscriptions, graffiti/ dipinti and (trade)marks</i> . . . . .	29
Antonín BARTONĚK, <i>The degree of recognizing immediately a concrete Ancient Greek dialect in the speech of native speakers</i> . . . . .	45

**Le monde achéen . . . . .** 55

Yves DUHOUX, <i>L’emploi des particules en chypriote et ailleurs</i> . . . . .	57
Anna PANAYOTOU, <i>Les parlers locaux chypriotes de l’époque archaïque à la fin du IV<sup>e</sup> s. a.C.</i> . . . . .	71
Michael MEIER-BRÜGGER, <i>La Pamphylie et le pamphylien.</i> . . . . .	95

Panagiotis FILOS, <i>Dialect evidence for Koine Greek: Pamphylian -ιως</i> (→ -ις) vs. <i>Koine -ιος</i> (→ -ις) revisited . . . . .	103
<b><i>Le monde dorien</i></b> . . . . .	115
Alcorac ALONSO DÉNIZ, <i>Some like it short? On &lt;εν&gt; and &lt;ηυ&gt; for &lt;εω&gt;</i> <i>in Doric</i> . . . . .	117
Araceli STRIANO, <i>A propósito de las formas χρηῖνται y ἐποικοδομηῖν</i> (= χρέωνται y ἐποικοδομέων) procedentes de las laminillas de <i>Dodona</i> . . . . .	143
Catherine DOBIAS-LALOU, <i>Sur quelques correspondances lexicales entre</i> <i>Cyrène, Rhodes et Cos</i> . . . . .	157
Enrique NIETO IZQUIERDO, <i>Again on the original vocalism of the dialect</i> <i>of Hermione</i> . . . . .	173
Sophie MINON, <i>Le phratronyme argien Ἀμφιαρτεΐδας : un dérivé du</i> <i>héronym local Ἀμφιάρης ?</i> . . . . .	187
Miltiade B. HATZOPOULOS, <i>Un nouveau terme juridique macédonien</i> . .	203
<b><i>Le monde ionien</i></b> . . . . .	211
Laurent DUBOIS, <i>Autour du sampi</i> . . . . .	213
<b><i>Le monde éolien</i></b> . . . . .	231
José Luis GARCÍA RAMÓN, <i>La desinencia tesalia de 3pl. -(ι)εν: pretérito</i> <i>y optativo</i> . . . . .	233
Bruno HELLY, <i>Deux notes lexicographiques sur des inscriptions thessa-</i> <i>liennes inédites</i> . . . . .	247
Julián MÉNDEZ DOSUNA, <i>Aristophanes, Acharnians 869: What on earth</i> <i>befell the Theban merchant and his pennyroyal flowers?</i> . . . . .	271
María Luisa del BARRIO VEGA, <i>Some problematic forms from Byzantion</i>	291
<b><i>Développements interdialectaux</i></b> . . . . .	305
Elena MARTÍN GONZÁLEZ, <i>Movable nu in Archaic Greek epigraphic</i> <i>prose</i> . . . . .	307

<i>Liste des auteurs</i> . . . . .	323
<i>Indices</i> . . . . .	325
I. Textes épigraphiques . . . . .	327
a. Inscriptions en linéaire B . . . . .	327
b. Inscriptions en syllabaires chypriotes . . . . .	327
c. Inscriptions alphabétiques . . . . .	329
II. Formes grecques . . . . .	339
a. Index syllabique mycénien . . . . .	339
b. Index syllabique chypriote . . . . .	339
c. Index alphabétique . . . . .	340
III. Auteurs anciens et byzantins . . . . .	363
IV. Noms de lieux . . . . .	367
V. Dialectes et koiné, alphabets et syllabaires locaux . . . . .	373
VI. Index analytique des principales matières discutées . . . . .	383
<i>Table des matières</i> . . . . .	389

# SOME LIKE IT SHORT? ON <EY> AND <HY> FOR <EΩ> IN DORIC

Alcorac ALONSO DÉNIZ  
EPHE (Paris)

‘You will not apply my precept’, he said, shaking his head. ‘How often have I said to you that when you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, *however improbable*, must be the truth?’  
(A. Conan Doyle, *The Sign of Four*, 1890, 93)

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ. — Η ανάλυση των παραδειγμάτων με γραφές <ευ> και <ηυ> αντί της <εω> στις δωρικές διαλέκτους αποδεικνύει ότι η φωνολογική ερμηνεία δεν ευσταθεί. Το ροδιακό ανθρωπωνύμιο *Κλεύνυμος* αντί για *Κλεώνυμος* οφείλεται σε λανθασμένη ανάγνωση και η γενική ενικού *Μενεσθεύς* δεν είναι η εξέλιξη του τύπου *Μενεσθέως*, αλλά ο αναμενόμενος τύπος γενικής *Μενεσθέος* της δωρικής. Θα καταδειχθεί επίσης ότι η αναλογία στη μορφολογία ερμηνεύει με ικανοποιητικό τρόπο αφ’ ενός τα ονόματα *Τιμοκρηῶν* = *Τιμοκρέων* και *Ἐρμοκρηῶν* = *Ἐρμοκρέων* της Τήλου και τις μετοχές *ἐποικοδομηῶν* = *ἐποικοδομέων*, *ναυκλαρηῶν* = *ναυκλαρέων* της Δωδώνης και αφ’ ετέρου την υποτακτική *χρηῶνται* = *χρέωνται* που μαρτυρείται επίσης στη Δωδώνη.

RÉSUMÉ. — L’analyse des exemples d’<ευ> et <ηυ> pour <εω> dans les dialectes doriens montre qu’une interprétation phonologique est à écarter. L’anthroponyme rhodien *Κλεύνυμος* pour *Κλεώνυμος* relève d’une fausse lecture et le gén. sg. *Μενεσθεύς* n’est pas l’avatar phonétique de *Μενεσθέως*, mais du génitif dorien attendu *Μενεσθέος*. On montrera aussi que diverses analogies morphologiques expliquent de façon satisfaisante, d’une part, les noms *Τιμοκρηῶν* = *Τιμοκρέων* et *Ἐρμοκρηῶν* = *Ἐρμοκρέων* de Téos et les participes *ἐποικοδομηῶν* = *ἐποικοδομέων*, *ναυκλαρηῶν* = *ναυκλαρέων* de Dodone et, d’autre part, le subjonctif *χρηῶνται* = *χρέωνται*, attesté aussi à Dodone.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Doric dialects exhibit different outcomes of the sequence /eɔ:/ (from older \*-esō-, \*-ejō- and \*-ewō-).<sup>1</sup> It remains unchanged in most varieties, but contraction

<sup>1</sup> This paper is part of the research project FFI 2009-07645 (“Interdialectal contact in Ancient Greek”) of the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (MICINN). I thank Julián Méndez

or synizesis of /e/ is also attested. However, some scholars have contended that, on the one hand, the spelling <ευ> for <εω> is evidence of a reduction, viz. shortening, of /ɔ:/ that led to a diphthong /e̯/; on the other, <ηυ> for <εω> allegedly betrays an ‘inverted quantitative metathesis’ /εɔ:/ > /ε:ɔ/ that eventually became /ε:̥/. My paper will focus on these two anomalous spellings. I will try to show that phonology is not behind them.

## 2. <EY> FOR <EΩ> IN RHODIAN

Rhodian amphora stamps bear the dating formula with the name of the eponymous magistrate (the yearly priest of Helios, cf. GUARDUCCI 1967-1978, vol. 2, 509-511) and the month in the genitive:

ἐπὶ Π[ρ]ατοφάνευς. Θεσμοφορίου

Two different Κλεώνυμος are attested as eponyms in the 3rd and 2nd c. BC (for the chronology of Κλεώνυμος I and II, see FINKIELSZTEJN 2001, 56-57, 190-192; HABICHT 2003, 565). While the spelling Κλεω<sup>ο</sup> is attested in hundreds of stamps, Κλευ<sup>ο</sup> occurs in two found in Pergamon:

ἐπὶ Κλευνύμου (*I. Pergamon* II, no. 1097 and 1098 = *SGDI* 4245, no. 499 and 500)

Amphora stamps may also contain the name of the owner of the workshop, often in the genitive: Μενεσθέως (*IG* XII 1, 1351.1). But what seems to be the same genitive occurs with <ευ>:

Μεν<ε>σθεῦς, Πανάμου (*IG* XII 1, 1351.2; Μενισθεῦς stamp)  
Θεσμοφορίου, Μενεσθεῦς (*IG* XII 1, 1351.3)

On only one occasion, Μενεσθεύς is attested as an eponym with ἐπί:

[ἐ]πὶ Μενεσθεῦς. Ὑ[α]κ[ι]ν[θ]ίου (*IG* XII 1, 1165)

According to various scholars Κλευνύμου and Μενεσθεῦς attest to a reduction of /εɔ:/, that developed into a diphthong /e̯/: Κλεώνυμος > Κλεύνυμος, Μενεσθέως > Μενεσθεῦς (BJÖRKEGREN 1902, 54; HOFFMANN *apud* *SGDI* 4, 593; BECHTEL 1923, 621-622; THUMB – KIECKERS 1932, § 153.4; STRIANO 1991, 148-149). Allegedly, this treatment is paralleled by /εο/ > /e̯/,

---

Dosuna for his invaluable comments and suggestions, and Dolores Sanz Villanueva, who has helped me find some references. Unless otherwise mentioned, abbreviations of ancient authors, *corpora* of inscriptions and papyri are those found in the lists of the *Diccionario Griego-Español* available at <http://dge.cchs.csic.es/1st/21st-int.htm>.



which is profusely attested in Rhodian stamps and inscriptions (BECHTEL 1923, 621; THUMB – KIECKERS 1923, § 153.4; BUCK 1955, § 261): ἐπὶ Ἀριστομένεως (IG XII 1, 1100), ἐπὶ Σωστ[ι]κλεῦς (IG XII 1, 1189), etc.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, -εου- (/eo:/) > -ευ- (/eu/) is also found in Rhodian documents: παρασκευαξέουσας = παρασκευασούσης (I. Lindos 2, col. D.103-104, Lindos, ca. 99 BC), κυεῦσαν = κυοῦσαν (I. Lindos 671.6, Kamiros, early 1st c. BC), probably κυεῦ[σα] (I. Lindos 182.2, Lindos, 200-170 BC).<sup>3</sup> Therefore, there was a similar development of all *o*-vowels preceded by /e/.

To my mind, the traditional explanation is unlikely on several grounds.

### 2.1. Lack of regularity

Lack of regularity is a major problem to the above interpretation. The exceptions to the alleged sound change are numerous: ἐργασθέωντι (IG XII 1, 677.7, Ialysos, 4th c. BC), ἔωντι (IG XII 1, 155, d, II.55, Rhodes, 2nd c. BC), α[ῖ]-ρεθέωντι (SEG 3, 674, A.31, Rhodes, 182-176 BC), gen. pl. Καμυρέων (IG XII 1, 694.1 and .18, Kamiros, ca. 325 BC), Ἀμφινέων (IG XII 1, 695.A20+, Kamiros, 3rd c. BC?), Πριτηνέω[v] (DGE 289.1+, Priene < Rhodes, 196-178 BC), ἱερέων (IG XII 1, 761.39, Lindos, 3rd c. BC), ἐπιτελέων (DGE 288.5, Hierapytna < Rhodes, 3rd c. BC), τριτηρέων (IG XII 1, 43.20, Rhodes, 125-100 BC), τεττηρέων (IG XII 1, 45, 1st c. BC-1st c. AD), nom. sg. πλέων (Syll<sup>3</sup> 1225.6, Rhodes, 3rd c. BC), Ἄντιλέων (GRACE 1953, 124, no. 26), etc.<sup>4</sup> By contrast, <ευ> for <εο> is abundantly attested in many of these inscriptions.

Moreover, HABICHT (2003, 565) has convincingly shown that the eponym Κλεώνυμος II of stamps (FINKIELSZTEJN 2001, 56-57) occurs in four inscriptions: Κλεώνυμος Δαμοκράτεως (Syll<sup>3</sup> 585.224, Delphi, 180 BC), Κλεώνυμον Δαμοκράτεως (Syll<sup>3</sup> 614.25, Delphi, 180 BC), Κλεώνυ[μος Δαμο]κράτεως (Tit. Cam. no. 157b, Kamiros, 200-150 BC) and Κλεωνύμο[v] (I. Lindos 698.10, ca. 200; metrical: Κλεω- = υ —). Significantly, there is no trace of <ευ> for <εω>.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Forms like Ἀπολλωνίδεως (NSERod. no. 4, II.1, 2, Rhodes, 100-70 BC) for expected Ἀπολλωνίδα (NSERod. no. 4, I.22) are probably due to Ionic influence.

<sup>3</sup> Spellings like Ἀγαθοκλέους (IG XII 1, 1210, no. 7, Hell.), Ἀριστοκλέους (IG XII.1, 1096, Hell.), Δαμοκλέους (IG XIV 2393, no. 202, Sicilia < Rhodes) etc. in amphora stamps are not to be interpreted as instances of <εου> for <εω>, but as loans from Attic.

<sup>4</sup> Despite claims to the contrary, Λευτυχίδαν in a fragment of the Rhodian poet Timocreon (fr. 727.2, PMG, Page) cannot be considered an instance of <ευ> for <εω> (cf. ALONSO DÉNIZ ms.).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. also <εω> in his grandfather's name, Δαμοκράτης Κλεώνυμου (Tit. Cam. 43, II.10, Kamiros, ca. 204 BC). It is uncertain whether the ancestor of Κλεώνυμος II, mentioned in I. Lindos

## 2.2. Development of /eɔ:/

The shortening and rising of /ɔ:/ in /eɔ:/ is unheard-of in other Doric dialects. The sequence is well preserved in most varieties: Arg. εὐμενέδων, δυσμενέδων (*DGE* 84.11-12, Tylisos < Argos, 460-450 BC?), Coan διατελέωντι (*SGDI* 3/1, 3634.8, Cos, late 4th-early 3rd c. BC), WLocr. ἐπιτιμέων (*IG IX*.1<sup>2</sup> 3, 712.8, Phaistinos, 2nd c. BC), Cyren. [τελε]σφορέων (*SEG* 9, 68.2, 3rd c. BC), σωθέωντι (*IGDS I*, 212.13, Entella, 254-241 BC), etc. Contraction is also found in Doric, mostly when preceded by a vowel,<sup>6</sup> although not exclusively (cf. NIETO IZQUIERDO 2009, 196-197): Delph. ποιῶντι (*SGDI* 2, 2561, B.25, 400-350 BC), El. ἐνποιδῶν (MINON 2007, 4.3-4, 525-500 BC), Troiz. ποιδῶν (*LSAG*<sup>2</sup>, 182 no. 6, 450-425 BC?), εὐτακτῶντι (*IG IV* 749.6, 4th-3rd c. BC),<sup>7</sup> etc. Synzesis of /e/, viz. loss of syllabicity, is also attested (for this phenomenon, see MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 1993a): Arg. Θιωνίς (*IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 208.1, Epidauros < Argos, 3rd c. BC), Lac. ἀνιοχίδων (*DGE* 12.8+, Sparta, *post* 403 BC), Heracl. ἐγφῆληθίῶντι (*IG XIV* 645, I.152, 4th/3rd c. BC), Cret. πειθθίῶντι (*IC IV* 184.24, Gortyn, 2nd c. BC.), etc.

Scholars take for granted that, since /eo/ > /eɥ/ and /eo:/ > /eɥ/ occur in Rhodian, /eɔ:/ developed correspondingly. But this conclusion is unwarranted.

First of all, the evidence suggests that in other Ancient Greek dialects where /eo/ > /eɥ/ and /eo:/ > /eɥ/ is documented, /eɔ:/ was never modified. In Hellenistic Coan documents <εϋ> for <εο> and <εου> are profusely attested: εϋντων (*LSCG* 155, a.13, 300-250 BC), νευμηνιάις (*SGDI* 3/1, 3634, AI.19, 4th/3rd c. BC) τέλευν (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 398.34, 278 BC), κυεῦσα (*SGDI* 3/1, 3637.3, 4th c. BC), τελεῦσα[v] (*LSCG* 166.31, 2nd-1st c. BC), etc. However, <εϋ> for <εω> is never found.<sup>8</sup>

The development /eo:/ > /eɥ/ must also be early in Ionian (*GG I*, 204, PASSA 2001)<sup>9</sup> and often occurs in Homer (cf. CHANTRAINE 1958, 62): Hom. ἐξοιχνεῦσι (*Il.* 9.384), εἰσοιχνεῦσαν (*Od.* 6.157), etc. At a later date, Herodas has <εϋ> for <εου> systematically: κατοικεῦσιν (4.10), ποιεῦσι (6.69), ἐγχεῦσα

698, who was also a priest of Helios (προπάτωρ πάλοι αἰσίωι Ἥελίοιο κοσμεῖται, .14-15), refers to his grandfather. If this may be so, the latter should be identified with Κλεώνυμος I of FINKIELSZTEJN (2001, 56-57).

<sup>6</sup> In these cases, some scholars speak of 'hypheresis' (cf. LHÔTE 2006, 393-394).

<sup>7</sup> For other examples of contraction, see § 3.5.

<sup>8</sup> In the Doric poems of Theocritus, <εϋ> often stands for <εο> (cf. RUIJGH 1984, 64; MOLINOS TEJADA 1990, 89-96, and *infra* n. 56), but monosyllabic /eɔ:/ is never spelled with <εϋ>: βωστρέωμες (5.66), φρουρέωμες (7.122) (see VESSELLA 2008, 353).

<sup>9</sup> HUALDE PASCUAL (1993, 55) believes that <εϋ> for <εου> is not phonological, but PASSA (2001, 409) has convincingly refuted her arguments.

(6.77), κινεῦσι (7.73), etc. (cf. CUNNINGHAM 1971, 212). Even if the spelling <ευ> for <εου> in Ionian poets was incorporated into the tradition by late editors (cf. WEST 1974, 80), <ευ> for <εω> is never attested in these poets, even if <εω> scans as monosyllabic (from older \*-ē(s)o-, \*-ē(j)o- and \*-ē(w)o- with ‘quantitative metathesis’, see CHANTRAINE 1958, 64-66),<sup>10</sup> cf. the gen. sg. -εω < -ηο (< -ēho < \*-ā-so). For instance, in a fragment of Archilochus (fr. 183 West) the transmitted text has φρονεῦσι as against ἐγκυρέωσιν in the same line. This can only be accounted for if the development of /εο:/ and /εο:/ was different.

As I try to show elsewhere (ALONSO DÉNIZ ms.), a phonetic change /εο:/ > /ευ/ in Ionic, allegedly supported by <ευ> for <εω>, must be also ruled out. The gen. -ευ of masculine η-stems (Ion. πολίτεω = Att. πολίτου), attested particularly in Erythrai, e.g. Ἀπολλωνίδεω (SEG 37, 917.A3, Erythrai, 5th/4th c. BC), is analogical (HUALDE PASCUAL 1993, 54; RUIJGH 1996, 90). Thasian θεωροί (e.g., IG XII 8, 267.2, 3rd c. BC) reflects a late reshaping of θεωρός in θεωρός under the influence of θεός and possibly of ἔφορος/ἐπίορος (BUCK 1953). Finally, the Spartan name Λευτυχίδης (Hdt. VI, 65+) does not stand for Λεωτυχίδης, but for Λεοτυχίδης, with a first member of the compound Λεο<sup>o</sup> found in other personal names (e.g. Λεόβριμος, cf. MASSON 1993, 230).<sup>11</sup>

Generally speaking, lower vowels are intrinsically longer than high ones (LEHISTE 1970; DE LACY 2007, 418). Accordingly, the development /εο:/ > /ευ/ is not prototypical, /ο:/ being both low and long. In my opinion, /εο:/ > /ευ/ and the rising /ο:/ > /υ:/ (see ALLEN 1987, 77-78) must be connected.<sup>12</sup>

It is not accidental that the evolution of /εο/ (with a short vowel) differs from that of /εο:/.<sup>13</sup> Loss of syllabicity in /εο/ may be right- or left-orientated: Θεοκλῆς > Θευκλῆς, with /εο/ > /εο/ > /ευ/, and θεός > θιός, with /εο/ > /εο/ > /ιο/. Similarly, the so-called ‘hypheresis’ (complete vowel loss) can affect any of the two vowels in the sequence /εο/ before -nt-: Arg. κοινανόντι

<sup>10</sup> For the interpretation of this phenomenon and the cluster <εω> see § 3.2.

<sup>11</sup> Isolated πλευρόν· πυλωρόν (Hsch. π 4354 HANSEN) does not stand for \*\*πυλωρόν, but for πυλουρόν (Hdt.). The etymology connecting πέτευρον ‘roosting-perch’ with an old \*\*πετέωρον is impossible (see EDG II, s.v. πέτευρον).

<sup>12</sup> There is no positive evidence for the rising of /ο:/ outside Thessalian (but see GG I, 185). Some scholars believe that Rhodian Ἄγλου<sup>o</sup> for Ἄγλω<sup>o</sup> and τιμοῦντες for τιμώντες attest to /ο:/ > /υ:/ (cf. BJÖRKEGREN 1902, 34; HOCK 1971, 445-446). However, according to STRIANO (1991), in the dialect a regular evolution /ao/ > /εο/ occurred and the new sequence /εο/ eventually developed into /ο:/ Ἄγλαο<sup>o</sup> > \*Ἄγλεο<sup>o</sup> > Ἄγλου<sup>o</sup> and τιμαο- > \*τιμεο- > τιμου-. This outcome was later than /εο/ > /ευ/.

<sup>13</sup> Forms like γραμματέουσ for γραμματέως, ἱερέουσ for ἱερέως in late papyri are due to loss of quantity (cf. GIGNAC 1981, 85).

(VOLLGRAFF 1909, 450-455 no. 22.14, Argos, 4th-3rd c. BC)<sup>14</sup> vs. Cyr. Λεόντιχος > Λέντιχος (SEG 20, 735b, col. I.174, late 4th c. BC), ἐκτιμασέντι (SEG 11, 72.58, 4th c. BC), etc.<sup>15</sup> Conversely, we have seen that /εο:/ could only undergo contraction to /ο:/ or synizesis to /jο:/.<sup>16</sup>

### 2.3. Lack of <εω> for <ευ>

In dialects with <ευ> for <εο> hypercorrect <εο> for <ευ> is also documented: ἐλεόθερος (IGDolbia 23.8, Berezan, late 6th c. BC), εῖδ (DANA 2007, no. 4.4, Olbia), σπεόσην (DANA 2007, no. 5), Εῶκριτος (I. Ephesos Add. 126.23, 4th c. BC), Cor. Τεῶρος (WACHTER 2001, COR 23g), etc. As PASSA (2001, 395) shows, <εου> may also stand for <ευ>: Cor. Ἀχιλλεοῦς (WACHTER 2001, COR 30c), Ion. ἀδε<λ>φεύς = ἀδελφεοῦς (IGDolbia 23.12, Berezan, ca. 500 BC).<sup>17</sup>

If /εο:/ > /εμ/ occurred in Rhodian, a similar orthographic interchange would be expected. However, as far as I know, eponyms in Rhodian amphora stamps like Εῦδαμος, Εὐκράτης, Θευγένης, Θευφάνης, Κλεῦδικος, Κλευκράτης or Κλεῦτιμος are never spelled \*\*Εῶδαμος, \*\*Εῶκράτης, \*\*Θεωγένης, \*\*Θεωφάνης, \*\*Κλεῶδικος, \*\*Κλεωκράτης or \*\*Κλεῶτιμος, etc.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. also Cret. ἐπιτορκόντι (IC III, iii 3, B.17, Hierapytna, 2nd c. BC), Delph. θεαρόντων (CID 1, 8.6, Delphi, ca. 400 BC).

<sup>15</sup> ‘Hypheresis’ occurs in other contexts: νεομηνία > νεμηνία (IGDS I, 208.5, Entella, 254-241 BC?), Θεόδωρος > Θεῆδωρος (SEG 30, 523.4-5, Corcyra, ca. 500 BC), Κλεμήδης (LHÖTE 2006, no. 39, 3rd c. BC?), Θέμναστος (SEG 13, 317.4, Megara, 4th c. BC), Θεκλέος (SEG 47, 607, Corcyra, 3rd.-2nd c. BC), Θέκλεια (I. Apoll. 40, 250-200 BC) and Meg. Θεοκρίνης (IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 71. 54+, Epidaurus < Megara, 242-238 BC), Θεοκλείδας (IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 71.55+).

<sup>16</sup> HINGE (2006, 59) believes that ὀρέων (Alcm. 89.1 PMG, Page), scanned υ —, was pronounced /oreɔn/, not /oreɔ:n/. According to the Danish scholar, if we had /oreɔ:n/, the non-vocalic /e/ would have caused the preceding syllable to become heavy: /oreɔ:n/. This is unlikely. Apart from the fact that we would expect a spelling \*\*ὀρέον or \*\*ὀρεῦν for /oreɔn/, the contraction ὀρέων > ὀρῶν, not \*\*ὀροῦν, contradicts HINGE’s claim. On the other hand, re-syllabification induced by synizesis of /e/, although possible, is not compulsory, cf. Hom. πόλιος (Il. 2.811) with a first light syllable despite synizesis of /i/. Contrary to HINGE’s opinion (cf. already hesitantly KAPSOMENOS 1990, 321-322), the scansion πόλιος υ — in Homer (cf. also Empedocles, AP IX 569.4) has nothing to do with a purported evolution /pólios/ > /pólios/ (synizesis to the right). It is an artificial lengthening of a last short syllable in *princeps* position, cf. πόλιος υ υ — (Il. 11.168, Od. 6.262, 16.471, all followed by a vowel). The alleged scansion of prevocalic Δία and διά as a heavy syllable (see references in HANDLEY 1965, 72 and GOMME – SANDBACH 1973, 252) must be rejected: in all cases /dia/ or /dja/ is to be preferred (WEST 1982, 14, 92 n. 52).

<sup>17</sup> The original text ἀδε<λ>φεύς was corrected to ἀδε<λ>φεός (cf. DUBOIS *ad* IGDolbia 23, 53).

Two possible examples of <εω> for <ευ> have been claimed to occur in Rhodian documents.<sup>18</sup>

A Hellenistic funerary inscription reads Ἀντίοχος Ἐπικούρου Ἀντιοχέως (*SERod.* 74a, no date = MARTÍN VÁZQUEZ 1988, III, 1032, no. 1.884) where Ἀντιοχέως allegedly stands for expected Ἀντιοχεύς. But this interpretation is wrong. Ἀντιοχέως is demonstrably a genitive<sup>19</sup> agreeing with the patronymic, as in Ἀρχέλαος Λυσανία Βρασίου (*SEG* 39, 783c, no date).<sup>20</sup>

If the reading ἐπὶ Ἀριστοκλέως (BOTTI 1897, 91, no. 12 = *SB* 1, 2150, Alexandria < Rhodes) is correct,<sup>21</sup> the ending -κλέως must be explained analogically from the genitive of names in -εύς. In fact, -κλέως for -κλέος or -κλέους occurs sporadically elsewhere: Ἡρακλέως (*SEG* 28, 103.22+, Eleusis; see THREATTE 1996, 204-205), Τηλεκλέως (ROBINSON 1938, 52, no. 6.9-10, 4th c. BC, Olynthus), ἐν Ἡρακλέως πόλει (*P.Petr.* 3 53.17, 264 BC; MAYSER 1938, 40), Ξενοκλέως (*IG IX* 1.4, 1150, Corcyra, 2nd-1st c. BC) vs. Ξενοκλέος (*IG IX* 1.4, 1111, 2nd c. BC), Μενεκλέως (*Iscr. di Cos* EF 820.2, Cos < Phaistos, 2nd-1st c. BC?), etc.<sup>22</sup>

Finally, STRIANO (1991, 149) claims that Ἐριναέους (*IG XII* 1, 732.10, Ialysos) stands for gen. Ἐριναέως (cf. HILLER's correction Ἐριναέ<ω>ς at *IG XII* 1) attesting to the development /εω:/ > /εϋ/. However, the context calls for a nominative Ἐριναεύς (see PAPACHRISTODOULOU 1989, 167-168, no. 3, with ph.). For Hellenistic examples of -εους for nominative -ευσ in Rhodian, see MARTÍN VÁZQUEZ (1988, I, 332 and 346).<sup>23</sup> As it happens, the last two lines of the inscription, where Ἐριναέους occurs, were engraved a century later than lines 1-8, dated to the 3rd-2nd c. BC.

<sup>18</sup> For PN with <κρέων> for <κρέοντ>, see § 3.3.

<sup>19</sup> For other ethnics in the genitive in Rhodian Hellenistic epitaphs, cf. Τιμαγόρα Ἐρατωνόμου Κασαρέως (*SEG* 38, 789, a Kamirian demos), Δημητρίου Ἀντιοχέως (*IG XII* 1, 539b), Ἀπολλωνίου Ἀντιοχέως (*NSERod.* no. 149), etc.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the expected nominative in Δαμαρχίδας Πολυχάρμου Βράσιος (*SEG* 46, 995, 2nd – 1st c. BC).

<sup>21</sup> A Rhodian amphora stamp found in Emporion bears ἐπὶ Ἀριστοκλεῦς (*SEG* 47, 1536, no. 10). For the genitive Ἀριστοκλεῦς (without ἐπὶ), see NILSSON (1909, 386-387, no. 100).

<sup>22</sup> Two further examples of <εω> for <ευ> are highly suspect, since reproductions are not available. Θεωδόρου (*IG XIV* 2393, no. 280) for Θευδόρου is based in the notice of VIOLA (1886, 102). If the reading is correct, since <ο> has also been written for <ω> and Θεοδόρου is apparently attested (cf. NILSSON 1909, 148), we could posit a simple transposition of letters. The same combination of eponym and month occurs again in ἐπὶ Θευδόρου. Σμινθίου (BOTTI 1897, 92 no. 32 and perhaps (PORRO 1916, 116, no. 110). As for ἐπὶ Πυθογένεως Ἰακινθίου (MUNRO – TUBBS 1890, 34, cf. NILSSON 1909, 148), NICOLAOU (2005, 412, no. 35) edits Πυθογένεως. Other *matrices* with the same eponym and month show Πυθογένεως (cf. for instance JÖHRENS 2001, 400, no. 108).

<sup>23</sup> For even more late examples, particularly in Asia Minor, see ROBERT (1938, 194).

#### 2.4. <εο> for <εω> in Rhodian stamps

According to BJÖRKEGREN (1902, 70-71), BECHTEL (1923, 621-622) and STRIANO (1991, 149) /εο:/ > /εϋ/ in Rhodian is further represented by <εο> for <εω> in some amphora stamps (cf. NILSSON 1909, 446):

Κλεόνυμος (*IG* XII 1, 1335.2)

ἐπὶ Κλεονύμου (BOTTI 1900, 165, no. 93 = *SB* 1, 2753)

ἐπὶ Κλεονύμου Ἀγριανίου (BOTTI 1900, 165, no. 91 = *SB* 1, 2751)

ἐπὶ Κλεονύμου Θεσμοφορίου (BOTTI 1900, 165, no. 90 = *SB* 1, 2750)<sup>24</sup>

According to their hypothesis, Κλεόνυμος attests to a prior reduction /εο:/ > /εο/ that eventually developed into /εϋ/ like original \*-εο-.

However, an influence of Rhodian personal names in Κλεο- is possible (SCHWEIZER 1898, 71): Κλεόνικος (*SEG* 39, 750.7, Rhodes, 100-70 BC), Κλεομάχου (*SEG* 51, 1555.18, Thera [*Tasynice*] < Rhodes, 225-150 BC), Κλεοβούλου (*Tit. Cam.* 3, Ea.5, Kamiros, 1st c. AD?), Κλεόνικος (*Tit. Cam.* 3, Eb.26), in an inscription with examples of <εϋ> for <εο>: Κλεύροδος (*Tit. Cam.* 3, Ec.8), Κλεύδωρος (*Tit. Cam.* 3, Dd.4). The reverse influence is attested in Attic Κλεωμέδων (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1138, col. IV.23, 403-402 BC) for Κλεομέδων.<sup>25</sup> In a similar fashion, θεός has influenced the Rhodian month's name Διόσθους: Διοσθέου (BÖRKER – BUROW 1998, "Börker" no. 13, 364, 525; PORRO 1916, 116, no. 94.2 and 94.3).<sup>26</sup>

Furthermore, a misspelling Κλεόνυμος for Κλεώνυμος cannot be ruled out: cf. in Attic inscriptions Εϋοννυμε[ύς] (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 6169.3, 2nd c. BC) for Εδωννυμής, Λεόφιλος (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1927.50, post 350 BC) for Λεώφιλος.

In any case, lack of accurate publications, with no photographs or reproductions, casts doubts on the reading Κλεόνυμος of these stamps (cf. NILSSON 1909, 106-120 for a general *caveat* on stamp editions). In fact, the right spelling is attested in similar stamps: Κλεώνυμος in CANKARDEŞ-ŞENOL – CANOĞLU (2009, 133-134, no. B47), ἐπὶ Κλεωνύμου in JÖHRENS (1999, 57, no. 145), ἐπὶ Κλεωνύμου Ἀγριανίου in JÖHRENS (1999, 58, no. 146) and ἐπὶ Κλεωνύμου Θεσμοφορίου in BÖRKER – BUROW 1998, 34, "Börker" no. 269).

Two further examples of <εο> for <εω> will illustrate how amphora stamps editions must be carefully handled before extracting linguistic conclusions.

<sup>24</sup> For Rhod. gen. Ἰγασείος and Ἐριναίος, see § 2.6.

<sup>25</sup> This occurs also in Νεωστράτη (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 7211, 2nd c. BC) and Νεωστράτου (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 6221, late 4th c. BC), considered by THREATTE (1980, 224) as an influence of νεωκόρος.

<sup>26</sup> According to SCHWEIZER (1898, 76) and BJÖRKEGREN (1902, 36), these examples betray a close pronunciation of /e/. KALÉN (1918, 13-14) considers that foreigners had difficulties pronouncing /y(:)/.

On Sinope amphorae, the *astynomos* Χορηγίων τοῦ Λεωμέδοντος is attested (cf. GARLAN 2004, 188-189). DOMĂNEANȚU (1993, 64-65, no. 20) publishes an amphora stamp from Sinope found in excavations from Histria as follows:

Ἀστυνομοῦντος Χορηγίωνος τοῦ Λεομέδοντος

In the photograph the spelling Λεωμέδοντος is however clearly legible. In fact, the *matrix* of this stamp has systematically Λεωμέδοντος, cf. CONOVICI – AVRAM – POENARU-BORDEA (1989, 123, no. 220), GARLAN (2004, 188-189, no. 348).

LEVI (1965-1966, 553, no. 18) published the following Rhodian amphora stamp:

[ἐ]πὶ Κλεωνύμου [Βα]δρομίου.

But the photograph in page 552 confirms the reading Κλεωνύμου (cf. for a similar stamp CANARACHE 1957, 248, no. 579).

## 2.5. Κλεύνμος, a ghost form

BÖRKER – BUROW (1998, 33-34, “Börker” no. 260) reedit *I. Pergamon* II, no. 1097 as ἐπὶ Κλεωνύμου. The editor states that “[d]as ω in der 1. Zeile kopfstehend”.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, the second example *I. Pergamon* II 1098 is now reedited in BÖRKER – BUROW (1998, 34-35, “Börker” no. 273), where the editor gives the correct form ἐπὶ Κλεωνύμου [Π]ανάμου.<sup>28</sup> After all, Κλεύνμος is nothing but a ghost form.

## 2.6. Μενεσθεῦς for Μενεσθέος

Some scholars have suggested a nominative Μενέσθης (BÖRKER – BUROW 1998, 158; FINKIELSZTEJN 2001, 160), and accordingly interpret a gen. Μενέσθευς in *IG* XII 1, 1165 (cf. § 2). There is no other evidence of Μενέσθης, however, in Rhodian personal names (cf. *LGPN* I).<sup>29</sup> Although the identification of the eponym in *IG* XII 1, 1165 is doubtful, Μενεσθεῦς

<sup>27</sup> Another example of the same *matrix* (BÖRKER – BUROW 1998, “Burow” no. 238), where the *omega* is also inverted.

<sup>28</sup> According to the editor, “Lesung nach einigen stempelgleichen Stücken im Amph. Dept. hergestellt”.

<sup>29</sup> Μενέσθης is attested in Euboea (*IG* XII 9, 1220, Histiaia, no date).

assuredly occurs as a priest of Helios in an inscription: ἐπ' ἱερέως Μενεσθέως (GAERTRINGEN 1901, 161.3, 3rd-2nd c. BC). Finally, a nominative Μενέσθης cannot account for the genitive Μενεσθέως on other stamps bearing the potter's name (cf. NILSSON 1909, 455, no. 307).<sup>30</sup>

In fact, Μενεσθεῦς can be interpreted as a regular Doric genitive Μενεσθέος with the expected evolution /eo/ > /eu/ (cf. THUMB – KIECKERS 1932, § 154.4). Although in Rhodian inscriptions and amphora stamps<sup>31</sup> nouns in -εως present a genitive -εως almost universally, this must be due to an early Ionic influence. However, two examples of -εος are attested:<sup>32</sup> Ἀλεξιμάχου Εὐσθένευς Ὑγασέος (*IG* XII 1, 297.1, Rhodes, Hell.)<sup>33</sup> and Καλλικράτεως Καλλικράτεως [Ε]ρ[ι]ναιέος (*IG* XII 1, 196.3, Rhodes, Hell.),<sup>34</sup> both corrected in Ὑγασέ<ω>ς and [Ε]ρ[ι]ναιέ<ω>ς by HILLER.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, βασιλέος occurs in coins in the Rhodian colony of Acragas (cf. βασιλείος Φιντία, ca. 287-279 BC).<sup>36</sup> We may therefore safely assume with RUIJGH (1993, 241) that Rhodian did not differ from most Doric dialects and had the characteristic genitive -εος.<sup>37</sup> The ending -εος could eventually have evolved to -εῦς, as in other Doric dialects, cf. Megar. ἐπ' ἱαρεῦς (*IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 74.1, Epidaurus < Megara, 242-237 BC), Ματρέας Ξανθεῦς (*IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 33), etc.<sup>38</sup>

In addition, late examples of -εος for expected -εως in the inflection of εὔ-stems are found elsewhere in Greek documents due to a morphological

<sup>30</sup> In the case of *IG* XII 1, 1351.2 and .3, it may be considered alternatively that Μενεσθεύς stands for the nominative of the potter's name, cf. the alternations Ἱεροτέλεως (*IG* XII 1, 1317, no. 1+) vs. Ἱεροτέλης (*IG* XII 1, 1317, no. 8, cf. LAWALL – SAVVATIANOU-PETROPOULAKOU – PANAGOU 2007, 39, no. AH 21a-c), Διοκλῆς (EMPEREUR 1977, 213, no. 36) vs. Διοκλεῦς (NILSSON 1909, 419, no. 177), Μαρσύας (EMPEREUR 1977, 222, no. 68) vs. Μαρσύα (NILSSON 1909, 452-453, no. 298). According to NILSSON (1909, 114, n. 1), an irrational nominative in ἐπὶ Μενεσθεύς (*IG* XII 1, 1165) would be paralleled by ἐπὶ Ἀρχο[κρ]άτης (*IG* XII 1, 1111, no. 8).

<sup>31</sup> Eponyms and potters in -εως are not common, but ἐπὶ Ἀριστεύς is well attested (cf. NILSSON 1909, 88). The form ἐπὶ Χρυσασθέως (*SB* 1, 1359) is not included in the list of eponyms by BLECKMANN 1912, HILLER (*RE* Suppl. V, col. 835-840) or GRACE (1953), and the name does not figure in *LGPN* I.

<sup>32</sup> Αἰνῆτωρ Ἐπικράτεως Ὑγασεῦς (*NSERod.* 88) must be corrected in Ὑγασεύς.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. [Α]στυμήδους Λυσανία Ὑγασεῶς (*IG* XII 1, 197), Στασίωνος Ἐπιγόνου Ὑγασεῶς (*NSERod.* 89).

<sup>34</sup> The inscription is only known by a copy made by Simon Georgiadis and published by LOEWY (1886, 218, no. 12).

<sup>35</sup> For Attic inflection in Rhodian inscriptions, see BILE (1996, 138).

<sup>36</sup> An amphora stamp published by DUMONT (1872, 114, no. 10) with reproduction gives ἐπὶ ἱερεῦς.

<sup>37</sup> Ἰδαμενῆος is attested early in a Rhodian *kylix* (*LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 357, no. 19, ca. 550-525 BC).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. also Epid. ἱαρεῦς (*IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 103, B.21+, ca. 370-340 BC vs. ἱαρέος in the same document, cf. NIETO IZQUIERDO 2009, 193), Ἀριστεύς Ἀριστεῦ[ς] (*IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 96, ca. 300-250 BC), Locr. Epiz. Εὐχέλα Ἀριστεύς (COSTABILE 1992, no. 38.4+, 350-250 BC), etc.



levelling (see THREATTE 1996, 236-237 for Attic, and SCHWEIZER 1898, 148 for late inscriptions).<sup>39</sup>

### 3. <HY> FOR <EQ>

A Telian list of πυθαισταί from ca. 200-175 BC<sup>40</sup> attests three instances of the spelling <ηυ> for <εω> in the nominative of two personal names in ὀκρέων, Τιμοκρέων and Ἐρμοκρέων:

Τιμοκρηῦν Ξενοφῶντος (IG XII 3, 34.25, 2nd c. BC)  
 Ἐρμοκρηῦν Ἐρμανδρίδα (IG XII 3, 34.27)  
 Ἐρμοκρηῦν Νικάνακτος (IG XII 3, 34.28)

Ancient *eo* is systematically written -ευ- in the same inscription: Ἀριστομένευσ (.3), Δαμοκράτευσ (.5), Κλευμήδης (.6), etc.

The same spelling occurs in *lamellae* from Dodona in two participles in -έων:

[...] ἔπειτα χρ[όν]ον ἧ αὐτὰν μόναν πεπαμένος καὶ ἐποικοδομηῦν (LHÔTE 2006, no. 118, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC)  
 θεός. τύχαι ἀγαθᾶ[ι. ἐπι]κο(ι)νῆτα[ι] Ἰππόστρατος τῶι Δι τῶι Νάωι καὶ τῶι Διώναι ἧ μὴ ν[α]κλαρη[ῦ]ν λῶιογ καὶ ἄμεινομ (*sic*) πράσσοιμι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 93, 4th-3rd c. BC; ν[α]κλαρη[ῦ]ν *lam.*).

In LHÔTE 2006, no. 118, coordination with πεπαμένος makes ἐποικοδομηῦν undoubtedly a present participle of ἐποικοδομέω.

Following a suggestion of Carl Robert, POMTOW (1883, 321-322, no. 9, n. 30) proposed an infinitive ν[α]κλαρηῦν in LHÔTE 2006, no. 93,<sup>41</sup> accepted by HOFFMANN (SGDI 2, 1583),<sup>42</sup> who also explained the awkward syntax as a careless blending of two different constructions, often attested in oracular *lamellae*: ἧ μὴ ναυκλαρηῦν λῶιον καὶ ἄμεινον αὐτῶι (εἶη/ἔστι)<sup>43</sup> and ἧ μὴ

<sup>39</sup> Cf. also some examples of -εος for names in -ις in Attic inscriptions (THREATTE 1996, 213) and in Ionic inscriptions (THUMB – SCHERER 1959, § 312.5). The inflection with gen. sg. ἱερέος is attributed to the *koiné* by some grammarians: διὰ τοῦ <εο> κοινῶς οἶον Ἀχιλλέος, βασιλέος (Hdn. II 673, 36-37).

<sup>40</sup> For the date, see LGPN I, s.v. Τιμοκρηῦν. The readings with <HYN> are confirmed by SUSINI (1963-1964, 271).

<sup>41</sup> He also proposed ἧ μηνῶν Κλάρην 'if denouncing Clares', but there is no enough room for the <ω>.

<sup>42</sup> The *editor princeps* (CARAPANOS 1878, 78) had failed to see that his no. 16 and no. 17 were part of the same *lamella*.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. αἰ ἀ<ν>εκτ[ό]ν ἔστι τᾶ Θέμι<σ>τι καὶ βέλτιον ἐσκιχρέμεν (LHÔTE 2006, no. 8B, 3rd c.-167 BC).

ναυκλαρέων λώτιον καὶ ἄμεινον πράσσοι.<sup>44</sup> However, as POMTOW had already seen, the breaking point allows for an additional letter. Consequently, restitution ν[α]<υ>κλαρη[ῶ]ν by LHÔTE is to be preferred (cf. MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 2008, 66 n. 20).<sup>45</sup>

A third case of <ηυ> for <εω> appears in the 3rd pl. subj. χρῆνται (= Att. χρώνται):

[οἱ δεῖνες ἐπικοινωνῶνται τῶι Διὶ] τῶι Νάωι καὶ τῶι Διώναι ἧ μὴ χρῆνται  
Δωρίωι τῶ[ι] ψυχαγωγῶι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 144, 420-410 BC)

Although the deliberative subjunctive is rare with a 3rd pl., it is attested again in the *lamellae*: πότερον αὐτεῖ οἰκέωντι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 131, 4th c. BC; see LHÔTE, l.c., p. 343-344; MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 2008, 55-56; for other examples in Greek authors in indirect questions, see GG II, 318).

Admittedly, χράομαι/χρῶμαι ‘use’, ‘consult (an oracle)’ exhibits three different conjugations outside Attic: a) χρήομαι (probably El. χρέεστ[αι], MINON 2007, no. 6.3, Elis, 525-500 BC; χρῆόμενος > Ion. χρεῶμενος; etc.),<sup>46</sup> b) χρέομαι (χρεῦμενος, LHÔTE 2006, no. 89, Aa, 4th c. BC) and c) χρῆομαι (χρηεῖσθω, *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1009.7, Kalchedon, 1st c. BC). Therefore, χρῆνται can either stand for 3rd pl. subj. χρήνται<sup>47</sup> or χρέωνται.

### 3.1. Phonetic explanation

According to some scholars (ROSS 1846, 62, BABINGTON 1874, 119, and independently LHÔTE 2006, 392-393)<sup>48</sup> the spelling <ηυ> in Τιμοκρηῦν and Ἐρμοκρηῦν can be explained as ‘inverted quantitative metathesis’ followed by synizesis to the right. The conventional theory (see LEJEUNE 1972, §§ 283-284) contends that in normal ‘quantitative metathesis’ a short vowel is lengthened after shortening of a preceding long vowel: βασιλῆος > βασιλέως. In the ‘inverted quantitative metathesis’ a short vowel is allegedly lengthened

<sup>44</sup> Cf. ἡ ἡρώων ἢ δαιμόνων εὐχόμενοι καὶ φόντες λῶτιον καὶ ἄμεινον πράσσοιεν (LHÔTE 2006, no. 8A, 3rd c.-167 BC), ἐπερωτῶι Λογίσκος [...] εἰ [...] [πλ.]αζόμενος εὐτυχοῖ καὶ βέλτιον πράσσοι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 91, late 4th c. BC).

<sup>45</sup> The interchange of the 3rd person in the main clause (ἐπι]κο(ι)νῆτα[ι] Ἰππόστρατος) and the 1st person in the interrogative (πράσσοιμι) is common in the *lamellae*, cf. ἐπερωτῆι... τίνει... πράξαιμι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 47), ἐπερωτῶι... ἧ ἔσται μοι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 48) and ἐπερωτεῖ... [α]ἷ πράσσοιμι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 92); cf. also περὶ πανπασίδ αὐτοῦ... τίνι θεδν εὐχόμενος πράσ(σ)οιμι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 116).

<sup>46</sup> Cf. also Rhod. καταχρηῖσθαι from \*χρή-εσθαι (RUIJGH 1993, 243).

<sup>47</sup> From χρήνται or χρέωνται.

<sup>48</sup> BJÖRKEGREN (1902, 34) posits a reduction of /o:/, but he does not explain the origin of the spelling with <η>.

as a consequence of the shortening of the following long vowel: Τιμοκρέων > \*Τιμοκρήον, Έρμοκρηῦν > \*Έρμοκρήον, ἐποικοδομέων > \*ἐποικοδομηῶν. In this view \*Τιμοκρήον, \*Έρμοκρήον, \*ἐποικοδομηῶν eventually developed into Τιμοκρηῦν, Έρμοκρηῦν, ἐποικοδομηῦν, with an evolution /ε:ο/ > /ε:υ/ similar to /εο/ > /ευ/.<sup>49</sup>

As for χρηῦνται, LHÔTE (2006, 392-393) posits an ‘inverted shortening’: χρήωνται > \*χρήονται. Allegedly, this is the reverse of the shortening rule which applied in Ionic βασιλήων > βασιλέων. Like the examples above, this further developed into χρηῦνται through synizesis of /ο/.

LHÔTE hypothesizes that this feature was characteristic of popular Doric, a fact which allegedly accounts for the scantiness of examples.

### 3.2. *Phonetic implausibility*

Unfortunately, the above phonological evolution is far from convincing (cf. already MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 2008, 66).

To begin with, the purported phenomenon, ‘inverted quantitative metathesis’, is unheard-of both in Ancient Greek or in the other languages of the world, past and present.

Moreover, a ‘transference of quantity’ /εο:/ > /ε:ο/ is unlikely. According to MÉNDEZ DOSUNA (1993b), ‘quantitative metathesis’ in βασιλήων > βασιλέως is the result of synizesis with concomitant compensatory lengthening. The loss of syllabicity of the first vowel, which naturally entailed the reduction of the weight of the syllable, was partially compensated by the lengthening of the following one: [basilé:os] > [basilé:s].

Theoretically, we could contemplate the ‘inverted quantitative metathesis’ presupposed in the formulation Τιμοκρέων > \*Τιμοκρήον as a special case of synizesis followed by compensatory lengthening: [εο:] > [εϚ] > [ε:Ϛ]. But this is phonetically questionable. As it happens, in various Ancient Greek dialects <ιV> for <εV> attests to the synizesis of antevocalic /ε/ (see § 2.2): Lac. μογέομες > μογιόμες,<sup>50</sup> Heracl. Τιμοκράτεος > Τιμοκράτιος, Cret. ἐόντες >

<sup>49</sup> In my opinion, <η> for <εω> in θεοκολήον Ἀγήσω(ν) Εὐβολλέος in a 4th c. BC *phiale* (RIZAKIS 2008, DY 11, ‘planche IV’) is doubtful. The interpretation of the text as a date mark with a nominative θεοκολέων (“étant théocole Hagéson, fils d’Eubouleus”, RIZAKIS) is wrong. In fact, a genitive is expected, cf. θεοκολέοντος δὲ τῷ Ἀσκαπιῶ τῷ ἐν Ἀμφί[σ-σ]α Ἀρχία τοῦ Θεοδώρου (IG IX 1<sup>2</sup>, 755, b.3-4, Amphissa, 1-50 AD), [θεοκο]λεούσας δὲ Μεγαρίστας Φιστυῖδος (IG IX 1<sup>2</sup>, 98.7-8, Phystion, 2nd c. BC), etc. It must be read instead θεοκολήον(τος) Ἀγήσω(νος) Ευβόλλεος. For prevocalic <η> instead of <ε> in NW Doric dialects, see MÉNDEZ DOSUNA (1985, 229).

<sup>50</sup> For the accentuation, see MÉNDEZ DOSUNA (1993a).

ιόντες, etc. This synizesis may spawn compensatory lengthening of the following vowel (cf. MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 1993b): μετρεόμεναι > Heracl. μετριώμεναι, ὁμεόμεθα > Lac. ὁμώμεθα (Ar., *Lys.* 183), εὐωχεομένων > Epich. εὐωχεομένων (fr. 113.242 *PCG*, K.-A.). However, synizesis to the right is never followed by compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel: [eo] > [eɔ̯] > [eɰ] (cf. Lat. *ego* > \*EO > Port. *eu* ‘I’), not [eo] > [eɔ̯] > \*\*[ε:ɔ̯].

The different behaviour is easy to account for. Unlike in left-orientated synizesis (A), in synizesis to the right the result is systematically a heavy syllable (B):

- A. Synizesis to the left: /Ceo/ > /Cεo/ > /Cjo/
- B. Synizesis to the right: /Ceo/ > /Ceɰ/.

Crosslinguistically, elements to the left of the nucleus are predictably irrelevant to syllable weight (see GORDON 2006, 189-191 for some exceptions). But in the alleged ‘inverted quantitative metathesis’ the newly created sequence would have been a diphthong [eɔ̯] and accordingly the syllable, heavy. Therefore, compensatory lengthening of /e/ would be phonologically unmotivated.

Finally, the purported ‘inverted shortening’ in χρήωνται > χρήονται lacks convincing parallels. On the one hand, synizesis of /ε:/, not shortening, accounts for the evolution βασιλήων > Ion. βασιλέων. On the other, forms like Ion. χρέος, πλέος, βασιλέος from older \*χρῆος, \*πλῆος, βασιλῆος (vs. Attic χρέως, πλέως, ἴλεως, βασιλέως with regular ‘quantitative metathesis’) are nothing but paradigmatic regularizations (see WACKERNAGEL [1955]-1979, I, 576, RAU 2008, 174-175, PASSA 2009, 81-83).

### 3.3. An alternative interpretation of -ηνν for -εων

In the Doric dialect of Telos the regular phonetic change /eo/ > /eɰ/ had generated an anomalous inflection in personal names in °κρέων: nom. Ἐρμοκρέων vs. genitive Ἐρμοκρεῦντος.<sup>51</sup> According to BECHTEL (1923, 612) the nominatives Ἐρμοκρηῦν and Τιμοκρηῦν were created after the following proportional analogy (cf. already BECHTEL *ad SGDI* 3488, followed by MEYER 1896, 213, BRUGMANN – THUMB 1913, 62, 105, BUCK 1921, 265, THUMB – KIECKERS 1932, § 161.7, *GG* I, 200):

Παρμένοντος: Παρμένων:: Τιμοκρεῦντος: x, where x = Τιμοκρηῦν.

The inflection Παρμένων: Παρμένοντος exhibits a typical ablaut: short vowel in the oblique cases as opposed to a long vowel in the nominative. In a

<sup>51</sup> For Ἐρμοκρῶν, cf. *infra* in the text.

similar way, in the new inflection Τιμοκρηῶν: Τιμοκρεῦντος the short diphthong of the oblique cases corresponds to a long diphthong in the nominative.

To my mind, it is not coincidence that <ηυ> for <εω> in the oracular *lamellae* also occurs in two nominatives of the *-nt-* inflection: ἔποικοδομηῶν and ν[α]<υ>κλαρη[ῶ]ν. BECHTEL's hypothesis can also explain the two participles:

φέρωντος: φέρων: ἔποικοδομεῦντος: x, where x = ἔποικοδομηῶν

Admittedly, nominatives are often reshaped under the influence of oblique cases. Personal names in <sup>ο</sup>κλήης (with regular contraction from -κλήης) were replaced by <sup>ο</sup>κλήης under the influence of -κλέα, -κλέους/-κλέος, etc (see THREATTE 1996, 183). Phonologically regular μείς has been replaced in Attic by μήν and in Epidaurian by μής after regular μηνός, μηνί (MEISSNER 2006, 147). In Elean μεύς was brought about by Ζηνός: Ζεύς (cf. SOLMSEN 1888, 62).<sup>52</sup> A new nominative/accusative οὔας (Simon. fr. 543.20 *PMG*, PAGE) or ὄας (Sophr. fr. 4.4 *PCG*, K.-A.) was formed after gen. οὔατος/ὄατος, etc. (cf. for the details WACKERNAGEL 1888, 141 and DE LAMBERTERIE 2009, 100-102).

Coming back to BECHTEL's hypothesis, the proposed analogical nominative -ηῶν is only expected in a dialect with <ευντ> for <εοντ>. This spelling is not attested in the inscriptions of the NW Doric dialects (see MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 1985, 79-85). As it happens, in Epirote documents <εο> rarely competes with <ου> of the *koiné*: ἔοντι (*SEG* 50, 542.2-3, Dodona, ca. 340-330 BC), προστατέοντ[ο]ς (*SEG* 50, 542. 7).<sup>53</sup> LHÔTE (2006, p. 368) hesitantly attributes no. 118, where ἔποικοδομηῶν occurs, to Epirus,<sup>54</sup> but there is no further indication of this origin.<sup>55</sup> Since <ευντ> for <εοντ> may appear in other Doric dialects,<sup>56</sup> the specific provenance of ἔποικοδομηῶν and ν[α]<υ>κλαρη[ῶ]ν in Dodona remains uncertain.

<sup>52</sup> An evolution *\*meh<sub>1</sub>-n-s(s)* > *\*mēns* > *\*mens* > μεύρ is unlikely, since *\*-ons* and *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>-ns* yields -οιρ and -αιρ in Elean. Only Cypriot attests *-ans* > *-aus* (see EGETMEYER 2010, I, 175).

<sup>53</sup> It is also found exceptionally in Delphic decrees: παρεῦντ[ε]ς (*CID* 2, 55.2, Delphi ca. 337 BC), ποιεῦντα (*SGDI* 2, 2011.5, 195 BC).

<sup>54</sup> He classifies no. 93 among the *lamellae* with uncertain Doric dialect.

<sup>55</sup> The evolution οἰκέοιεν > οἰκέοεν > οἰκεῦεν (*lam.* οἰκεῦεγ) in a consultation made by a *sympoliteia* of Corcyra and Oricos (LHÔTE 2006 no. 2, 350-300 BC) is contested by MÉNDEZ DOSUNA (2008, 66). A monophthongization [o] > [y:] is unexpected in the 4th c. BC.

<sup>56</sup> It further appears in colonies of Megara (στραταγεῦντας, *Syll<sup>B</sup>* 645.74-75, Seleukeia on the Kalykadnos < Kalchedon, 172 BC) and in the Doric dialect of Theocritus (φιλεῦντι, V 80; οἰκεῦντες, VII 116).

As far as I know, the evolution  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\epsilon\omicron\nu\tau-$  >  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\epsilon\upsilon\nu\tau-$  is never attested for names in  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$  in Telian or Rhodian inscriptions: Ἑρμοκρέων Ἑρμοκρέοντος (*IG XII 1*, 46.241, Rhodes < Telos, 69 BC), Ἐχέβουλος Ἀγησικρέοντος (*Tit.Cam.* 27.10, Kamiros, ca. 235 BC). But the change at issue is confirmed by 3rd pl. and participles in the Doric islands: ἀποδωσεῦντ<α>ι (*IG XII 1*, 694.7, Kamiros, ca. 325 BC), νοσεῦντ[ων] (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 943.5, Cos, 3rd c. BC), ἐπι[σ]τατεῦντος (*IG XII 3*, 178.1-2, Astypalaia, 2nd c. BC), τῶν κατοικεῦντων (*IG XII 3*, 1269.12, Syme, 2nd c. BC), etc.

That /eo/ > /eɥ/ was on its way in Rhodes already in the first half of the 5th c. BC is supported by the poet Timocreon of Rhodes (fr. 727 *PMG*, Page): ἐόντα (.5), Θεμιστοκλέος (mss. Θεμιστοκλέους). Unsurprisingly, <eo> is monosyllabic in Τιμοκρέοντα (.10).<sup>57</sup>

Be that as it may, personal names in  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$  show traces of analogical leveling. The -ω- of the nominative has been extended to other cases: Ἑρμοκρέωντος (*SEG 12*, 360.12, Rhodes, ca. 400 BC), Μεγακρέωντος (*SGDI 5657.4*, Chios, 5th c. BC), Διοκρέωντος (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 272, I.23, Miletos, 350-300 BC), Νεοκρέωντος (*CEG 674.2*, Paros, 350-300 BC).

A nominative  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu$  (see BUCK 1921, 261 n. 1 for the accentuation), alternating with  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ , is attested for a Telian citizen (see STAVRIANOPOULOU 1997, 128-129): Ἑρμοκρῶν Ἑρμοδόκου (*IG XII 1*, 46.219, Rhodes < Telos, ca. 100 BC) and Ἑρμοκρέων Ἑρμοδόκου (*IG XII 1*, 47.11, Rhodes < Telos, ca. 100 BC). The -ω- of the new nominative  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu$  is generalised to other cases, following the model of  $^{\circ}\phi\tilde{\omega}\nu$ :  $^{\circ}\phi\tilde{\omega}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $^{\circ}\sigma\tilde{\omega}\nu$ :  $^{\circ}\sigma\tilde{\omega}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , as shown by the alternation in the same Telian individual: [Ἑρ]μόδοκος Ἑρμοκρῶντος (*IG XII 1*, 107.20, Rhodes < Telos, ca. 100 BC) as against Ἑρμοκρέων Ἑρμοκρέοντος (*IG XII 1*, 46.241, Rhodes < Telos, 69 BC). Significantly enough, the inflection  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu$ ,  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$  occurs also in the name of the great-grandfather of Τιμοκρηῖν: Ξενοφῶν Τιμοκρῶντ[ο]ς (*SEG 25*, 852.14, Telos, ca. 275 BC).<sup>58</sup>

<sup>57</sup> HARTUNG (1859, 220) edited Τιμοκρεῦντα and HERMANN (1844, xix), Θεμιστοκλεῦς. The transmitted ὑπόπλεως (.10) is also probably an Atticism for the expected ὑπόπλεος or ὑπόπλευς.

<sup>58</sup> BECHTEL (*ad SGDI 3488*) considered forms in  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu$  in Telos and Rhodes as hypocoristics of  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ,  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$  or  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ , and rejected a contraction  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$  >  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu$ . He accordingly accentuates Ἑρμόκρῶν, Τιμόκρῶν, etc. But if the latter were *Kurznamen*, we would expect an inflection  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu$ ,  $^{\circ}\kappa\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , like Boeotian Φαναξὼ Καλλίκρῶνος from Καλλικράτης (*SEG 28*, 444.2-3, Chaironeia, 2nd c. BC).

### 3.4. Long diphthongs and ablaut

LHÔTE (2006, p. 392) quaintly dismisses BECHTEL's interpretation: "[L']explication est évidemment absurde".<sup>59</sup> But ablaut of a diphthong in morphological paradigms is attested in Ancient Greek and Vedic.

To begin with, verbs with initial εϝ- show a long diphthong in the secondary tenses of the indicative in Ancient Greek: εϝχομαι vs. ηϝχόμεν.

The nominative πειθῶι for Attic πειθῶ occurs in several dialects: Ἄριστῶι (CEG 2 816, ii.19, Argos, 303 BC), Τροπῶι (CEG 2 683, Samos, 4th c. BC), etc.<sup>60</sup> Some scholars consider this nominative without \*-s to be inherited in the amphikinetic inflection nom. \*b<sup>h</sup>eṛd<sup>h</sup>-(h<sub>2</sub>)ḍī, gen. sg. \*b<sup>h</sup>eṛd<sup>h</sup>-(h<sub>2</sub>)ḍī-oles (see DOBIAS-LALOU 2000, 97; WACHTER 2001, 204, n. 800; WEISS 2009, 242). The prevalent belief holds, however, that πειθῶι is a form built on the voc. -οῖ (*dubitanter* RIX 1976, § 160e; SIHLER 1995, 333, n. 1; HAMP 1997-1998, 55-6): Ἄπολλων: Ἀπόλλων:: πειθοῖ: x, where x = πειθῶι.<sup>61</sup> Whatever it may be, nom. -οῖ originated from the ablaut of a short diphthong.

The sigmatic aorist originally showed a long grade in the active paradigm of the indicative/injunctive singular (JASANOFF 2003, 174-178).<sup>62</sup> In Vedic the long grade was extended to all persons (cf. NARTEN 1964, 18): present *bharati* 'bear' vs. aorist 1sg. *ābhārṣam*, 2nd. du. *ābhārṣtam*. As it happens, roots with /u/ or /i/ take ṽṛddhi, i.e. a long diphthong: pr. *yuyomi* 'separate' (<o> = /au/), vs. ao. injunctive 1st. pl. *yauṣma*, 3rd. pl. *yauṣur* (<au> = [a:u]); pr. *jáyati* 'conquer' vs. ao. ind. 1sg. *ájaiṣam*, 1st. pl. *ájaiṣma* (<ai> = [a:i]).

In Proto-Indo-European the so-called "Narten presents" (cf. NARTEN 1995, 97-101) had a lengthened ablaut in the singular indicative/injunctive: \*dēk- (Ved. 3rd sg. *dāṣṭi* 'make offering') vs. \*deḱ- (Gr. δέχαται). In Vedic the original situation is preserved with minor alterations.<sup>63</sup> In roots with /u/ the active singular indicative takes ṽṛddhi, whereas other persons have a zero

<sup>59</sup> To my mind, LHÔTE has misunderstood BECHTEL's hypothesis: "Bechtel suppose [...] que -κρηυν = -κρεϝν, et que l'alphabet ne permettant pas de noter la quantité de υ, cette quantité a été notée en remplaçant ε par η".

<sup>60</sup> Cf. also Εϝφρωῖ (*IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 321, Epidaurus < Argos, 3rd c. BC), Νικῶι (*IG* XII 3 Suppl., no. 1665, Melos, 4th c. BC), λεχῶι (*SEG* 9, 72.16, Cyrene, 4th c. BC), Πεισῶι (*IC* III, iv, no. 31, Itanos, 2nd c. BC), Χαροῖ (*SEG* 39, 333D, Aegina, 6th/5th c. BC).

<sup>61</sup> Messenian Ἀρετοῖ (*IG* V.1, 1500), etc. are considered old vocatives (THUMB – KIECKERS 1932, § 114b).

<sup>62</sup> This ablaut is partially preserved in various languages (see MEISER 1998, § 135.2). In fact, this may have been the situation in Proto-Greek before the action of Osthoff's Law: \*édēḱsmi > ἔδειξα.

<sup>63</sup> The expected full grade outside the singular forms has been replaced by zero grade (see JASANOFF 2003, 42).

grade: 3rd sg. *stáuti* (< \**stēu-*) ‘praise’ vs. 3rd pl. *stuvanti* (\**stu(u)-*); cf. Gr. στεῦται), 3rd sg. *κῆναιτι* ‘whet’ vs. past participle *κῆνιτά*.

The above examples show that a diphthong can be lengthened in morphological paradigms. In my opinion, BECHTEL’s morphological hypothesis for the creation of the nominative -ῆῶν remains the most convincing interpretation.

### 3.5. *χρηῶνται: an alternative explanation*

If the above explanation of -ῆῶν for -έων in personal names and participles is correct, *χρηῶνται* remains in isolation.

A relic of the regular evolution subj. *χρήωνται* > *χρήονται* (eventually *χρηῶνται* with synizesis to the right), due to Osthoff’s law, is unlikely. Even if we endorse NASSIVERA’s (2000, 67) view, who posits a post-Mycenaean chronology for this phonetic change, there is no further evidence in Ancient Greek of 3rd pl. thematic subjunctive -οντι, -ονται.<sup>64</sup> Therefore, since a phonological motivation is ruled out (cf. also § 3.2), we are inevitably forced to search for a morphological explanation.

The conjugation of -εο/ε- verbs was highly irregular as a consequence of phonetic changes. Contraction applied naturally in -εε-, -εει- and -έη-, whereas -εο- and -εω- remain unchanged,<sup>65</sup> or underwent different evolutions: -εο- > -ευ- (synizesis to the right),<sup>66</sup> -εο- > -ιο-, -εω- > -ιω- (synizesis to the left),<sup>67</sup> -εο- > -ιω- (synizesis and compensatory lengthening),<sup>68</sup> -εοντ- > -οντ-<sup>69</sup> or -εντ- (‘hypheresis’).<sup>70</sup> Evolution may differ depending on the phonetic context even in the same dialect. For instance, in a decree of Entella, /eo/ remained unchanged in οἰκέομες (*IGDS* I, 204.6, 254-241 BC?) and οἰκέομες (*IGDS* I, 204.10), but was contracted after a vowel in ποιοῦντι (*IGDS* I, 204.11). In West and East Crete /eo/ underwent e-hypheresis before *nt*, but was contracted in open syllables (see THUMB – KIECKERS 1932, § 141.4):<sup>71</sup> συντελόντε<ς>

<sup>64</sup> The purported Rhod. 3rd sg. subj. [β]ώλεται and βούλεται, with a short vowel, have been discarded by RUIGH (1993, 242).

<sup>65</sup> Ind. διατελέοντι (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 637.6, 13, Delphi, 178 BC), subj. οἰκέοντι (*SGDI* 3/1, 3621.14, Cos, late 3rd c. BC), συντελέωνται (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 953, A.73, Calymna, early 3rd c. BC).

<sup>66</sup> ἐπιστατεῦντος (*SGDI* 3/1, 3661, Cos, 1st c. BC), εἰδορκεῦντι (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 953, A.32, Calymna, early 3rd c. BC), τελευμέναις (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1006.5, 9, Cos, ca. 350 BC).

<sup>67</sup> Cret. ptc. κοσμίοντος (*IC* IV 72.51-2, Gortyn, 480-450 BC), subj. κοσμίωντι (*IC* I, xvi 3.12, Delos < Lato, 120-115 BC).

<sup>68</sup> Ptc. μετριώμεναι (*DGE* 62.18+, Herakleia, 4th/3rd c. BC).

<sup>69</sup> Arg. κοινανόντι (*VOLLGRAFF* 1909, 450-455, no. 22.14, Argos, 4th-3rd c. BC).

<sup>70</sup> Ptc. δαμιεργέντων (*SEG* 11, 2.12+, Cyrene, 4th c. BC).

<sup>71</sup> See however ind. παρακαλῶντι (*IG* XII 5, 868.5, Tenos < Lappa, 2nd c. BC).



(*IC* II.i, 2, B.15, Allaria, early 2nd c. BC) vs. εὐχαριστῶμες (*IC* II, i 2, B.26), κοσμώντων (*IC* III, iii: 4.62, 78, Hierapytna, early 2nd c. BC) vs. ὠνωμένος (*IC* III, iii 4.16 = Att. ὠνουμένου).<sup>72</sup>

Unsurprisingly, the highly irregular paradigms resulting from the above phenomena were often modified. Let us see some examples.

Forms like Delph. ποιείνται for ποιέονται or ποιούνται (*IG* IX 1, 97.13, Elateia, 300-250 BC), ποιείμενος for ποιούμενος or ποιεόμενος (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 734.5, 1st c. BC), etc.<sup>73</sup> were created from forms with regular contraction, like ποιεῖσθαι and ποιεῖσθε (see MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 1985, 500).

The 3rd sg. subj. WLocr. λιποτελέει (*IG* IX 1<sup>2</sup>. 3, 718.14-15, Chaleion, 500-475 BC), δοκέει (*IG* IX 1<sup>2</sup>. 3, 718. 39), Delph. ἀδικέη (*SGDI* 2, 2088, Delphi, 140-100 BC), ποιέη (*FD* III.3, 32.8, Delphi, ca. 148 BC) were based on truly uncontracted forms like 3rd pl. ἀδικέωντι, ποιέωντι (MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 1985, 225-230). Quite similarly, in Argive the imperfect ἐποίεε (*Bull.Épigr.* 1987, 613.1, Argos, no date) was formed after uncontracted ἐποιέομες (NIETO IZQUIERDO 2009, 83).<sup>74</sup>

All things considered,<sup>75</sup> in a Doric dialect with 3rd pl. χρεῦνται (and probably 1st sg. χρεῦμαι, 1st pl. χρεῦμες), cf. χρεόμενος > χρεύμενος (LHÔTE 2006, no. 89, Aa, 4th c. BC), the subjunctive χρέωνται may have been reshaped following the analogy of the thematic conjugation: φέρονται : φέρωνται::

<sup>72</sup> An unexpected contraction in the present (type ὀρκοῦντι) is attested in late inscriptions in some Doric areas, probably due to the influence of the contracted paradigm in the *koiné*. This was further extended to the Doric future (πραξοῦντι, *IG* XII 3, 330.258, Thera, 210-195 BC, etc.). NIETO IZQUIERDO (2009, 187) contends however that -σεοντ- > -σοῦντ- is genuine in Troezen: ἐκδωσοῦντι (*IG* IV 841.18, Kalareia, 3rd c. BC), θυσοῦντι (*IG* IV 841.21), etc.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. also συντελείντω for Delph. συντελεδόντω (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 671A.2, Delphi, 160 BC), χρεείμενος for χρεόμενος (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 395.4, ca. 277 BC), Cret. χρημέωνος for χριομέωνος (*IC* IV 184.8, Gortyn, 200-150 BC).

<sup>74</sup> According to LHÔTE 2006, 394, in ὠνόμ[ε]νο(v) for ὠνεόμενον (LHÔTE 2006, no. 95, ca. 400-390 BC) *e*-‘hyperesis’ has extended from forms with -εοντ- > -οντ-. But the word shows traces of other misspellings due to lack of space.

<sup>75</sup> The original Doric future in \*-seole- shared the same irregularities with presents in -εο/ε-. Modifications affected partially the inflection of the indicative in the dialect of Syracuse. According to CASSIO (1999, 193-195; cf. also WILLI 2008, 67) λεξοῦ[μαι] (Epich. fr. 97.7 K.-A.) and θωσοῦμεθα (Epich. fr. 198 K.-A.) are phonologically regular: synizesis of prevocalic /e/ triggered compensatory lengthening of /o/, cf. εὐωχομένων > εὐωχουμένων (Epich. fr. 113.242, *PCG*, K.-A.). In the future, the glide from synizesis was eventually absorbed by the preceding /s/: /seo/ > /sɛo:/ > /sjo:/ > /so:/. However, 3rd pl. -σέοντι evolved into -σόντι, like Heraclian κοψέοντι > κοψόντι with ‘hyperesis’. Therefore, δωσοῦντι (Stes. fr. 222(b).278) replaced δωσόντι through the extension of the long vowel in other persons. According to LHÔTE, fut. πραξοῦντι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 7, Byllis in Epeiros, 4th c. BC) and λαψοῦμαι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 110, 4th-3rd c. BC) attest to a similar analogical long vowel. Outside the future, a similar extension explains perhaps Tarent. pres. ind. ἀφορμῶντι (Ps.Archyt., fr. Thesleff 45.20-30) for expected ἀφορμόντι (< ἀφορμέοντι for ἀφορμάοντι).

χρεῦνται : x, where x = χρηῦνται, with a secondary ablaut of the diphthong of the indicative (for this ablaut, see § 3.4). An equivalent proportional analogy explains the athematic subjunctives like Mess. τίθηντι for τιθέωντι, ἦνται for ἔωντι, Delph. ἦται for ἦ, γράφηντι for γραφέωντι, etc. (see BUCK 1955, § 151).

The analogical reshaping that brought about χρηῦνται was exceptional and did not have much success.<sup>76</sup> In Rhodian and in the neighbouring islands, where 3rd pl. ind. -ευντ- was common, this analogy is unattested in the subjunctive: ἔωντι (*IG XII 1*, 155, face d, II.55, Rhodes, 2nd c. BC), συντελέωνται (*Syll<sup>3</sup> 953*, A.73, Kalymna, early 3rd c. BC), οἰκέωντι (*SGDI 3621.14*, Cos, late 3rd c. BC), etc.

I am aware that the absolute lack of parallels casts doubts on the analogical origin of χρηῦνται. Therefore, until new data come to confirm my interpretation, we cannot exclude the possibility that χρηῦνται betrays a misspelling for χρή<ω>νται (for χρήομαι, cf. § 3). Oracular *lamellae*, like *defixiones*, are known for their careless language and errors (MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 2008, 63). *Pace* LHÔTE, the morphologically aberrant optative πραμι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 22, face Bb, 3rd c.-167 BC) is nothing but a mistake for πράσσοιμι (cf. the discussion in MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 2008, 65). Similarly, dat. ἐπιδημοῖντι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 52, ca. 300-167 BC)<sup>77</sup> stands for ἐπιδημοῦντι.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

Despite claims to the contrary, <ευ> and <ηυ> for <εω> in Doric dialects do not show a development /eɔ:/ > /eɥ/. First of all, Κλεύνυμος for Κλεώνυμος in Rhodian amphora stamps is a ghost form and Μενεσθεῦς is not the phonetic result of Μενεσθέως, but of the expected outcome of genitive Μενεσθέος. Furthermore, in Telian Ἐρμοκρηῦν for Ἐρμοκρέων, Τιμοκρηῦν for Τιμοκρέων and in two participles from Dodona, ἐποικοδομηῦν for ἐποικοδομέων and ναυκλαρηῦν for ναυκλαρέων, there is no ‘inverted quantitative metathesis’ /eɔ:/ > /ε:ο/. In a dialect with the evolution -εοντ- > -ευντ-, a new nominative -ῦν is likely to have replaced -έων after alternations like Παρμένων: Παρμένονος. Finally, the unique subj. χρηῦνται was perhaps created to shun the anomalous alternation ind. χρεῦνται vs. subj. χρέωνται,

<sup>76</sup> Other subjunctives in Dodona may belong to different Doric dialects: αἰτέομαι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 61B, ca. 350-250 BC), οἰκέωντι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 131.3, 4th c. BC), πωλέω(ν)τι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 101, 4th c. BC), ὠνέωμ[α]τι (LHÔTE 2006, no. 50, ca. 350-300 BC).

<sup>77</sup> Lhôte’s text has ἐπιδημοῦντι, but cf. his own reproduction and PARKE (1967, 133).

following the model of the thematic inflection φέρονται: φέρωνται. However, due to the lack of parallels, it is perhaps safer to correct χρή<ω>νται until new data come to confirm my hypothesis.

### References

- ALLEN, W. S. 1987 *Vox Graeca. A guide to the pronunciation of Classical Greek*, Cambridge, Clarendon Press.
- ALONSO DÉNIZ, A. ms. *Λευτηχίδης and the origin of <ev> for <ew> in Ionic*.
- BABINGTON, C. 1874 *On various Greek inscriptions from Telos, Cos, Attalia, and the region of the Black Sea, Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom*, 10, 112-135.
- BECHTEL, F. 1923 *Die griechischen Dialekte II. Die westgriechischen Dialekte*, Berlin, Weidmann.
- BILE, M. 1996 *Une koina est-égéenne?*, in BRIXHE, C. (ed.) 1996, *La koiné grecque antique II: La concurrence*, Nancy – Paris, Association pour la diffusion de la recherche sur l'Antiquité, 131-146.
- BJÖRKEGREN, R. 1902 *De sonis dialecti Rhodiaca*, Upsala, Almqvist & Wiksell.
- BLECKMANN, F. 1912 *Zu den rhodischen eponymen Heliospriestern*, *Klio*, 12, 249-258.
- BÖRKER, C. – BUROW, J. 1998 *Die hellenistischen Amphorenstempel aus Pergamon. Der Pergamon-Komplex. Die übrigen Stempel aus Pergamon*, Berlin- New York, de Gruyter.
- BOTTI, G. 1897 *Fouilles à la colonne théodosienne (1896)*, Alexandrie, Société Archéologique d'Alexandrie.
- BOTTI, G. 1900 *Catalogues des monuments exposés au Musée Gréco-Romain d'Alexandrie*, Alexandrie, A. Mourès.
- BRUGMANN, K. – THUMB, A. 1913 *Griechische Grammatik. Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre, Syntax*, München, Beck.
- BUCK, C. D. 1921 *Studies in Greek noun-formation. Dental terminations II.2*, *CPh*, 16, 260-279, 367-383.
- BUCK, C. D. 1953 *Θεωρός*, in MYLONAS, G. E. – RAYMOND, D. (eds.), *Studies presented to David Moore Robinson on His Seventieth Birthday*, I, Saint Louis, Missouri, Washington University, 443-444.
- BUCK, C. D. 1955 *The Greek dialects. Grammar. Selected inscriptions. Glossary*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- CANARACHE, V. 1957 *Importul amforelor stampilate la Istria*, Bucarest, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine.
- CANKARDEŞ-ŞENOL, G. – CANOĞLU, E. 2009 *Mısır-Alexandria Greko-Romen Müzesi'nde Bulunan Düğme Formlu Mühürler (Button-Type Amphora Stamps in the Greco-Roman Museum in Alexandria-Egypt)*, *Arkeoloji Dergisi*, 14, 109-164.
- CARAPANOS, C. 1878 *Dodone et ses ruines*, Paris, Hachette.
- CASSIO, A. C. 1999 *Futuri dorici, dialetto di Siracusa e testo antico dei lirici greci*, in *KATÁ DIÁLEKTON*, 187-214.
- CHANTRAINE, P. 1958 *Grammaire homérique. I: Phonétique et morphologie*, 3e tir. avec une conclusion nouvelle, Paris, Klincksieck.

- CONOVICI, N. – AVRAM, A. – POENARU-BORDEA, P. B. 1989 *Nouveaux timbres amphoriques sinopéens de Callatis, Dacia*, 33, 111-123.
- COSTABILE, F. 1992 *Polis ed Olympieion a Locri Epizefiri. Costituzione, economie e finanze di una città della Magna Grecia. Editio altera e traduzione delle tabelle locresi*, Soveria Mannelli, Catanzaro, Rubbettino.
- CUNNINGHAM, I. C. 1971 *Herodas. Mimiambi*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- DE LACY, P. V. 2007 *The Cambridge handbook of phonology*, Cambridge-New York, Cambridge University Press.
- DOBIAS-LALOU, C. 2000 *Le dialecte des inscriptions grecques de Cyrène (Karthago 25)*, Paris, CEAM.
- DOMĂNEANȚU, C. 1993 *Un sanctuaire hellénistique du site de Nuntași II (comm. d'Istria, dép. de Constanța), Dacia*, 37, 59-78.
- DUMONT, A. 1872 *Inscriptions céramiques de Grèce*, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale.
- EGETMEYER, M. 2010a *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre. Tome I: Grammaire, tome II: Répertoire des inscriptions en syllabaire chypro-grec*, Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- EMPEREUR, J.-Y. 1977 *Timbres amphoriques de Crocodilopolis-Arsinoé, BIAO*, 77, 197-233.
- FINKIELSZTEJN, G. 2001 *Chronologie détaillée et révisée des éponymes amphoriques rhodiens, de 270 à 108 av. J.-C. environ. Premier bilan*, Oxford, Archaeopress/British Archaeological Reports.
- GARLAN, Y. 2004 *Les timbres céramiques sinopéens sur amphores et sur tuiles trouvés à Sinope. Présentation et catalogue*, Istanbul – Paris, Corpus international des timbres amphoriques, 10; Varia anatolica, 16), Institut Français d'études anatoliennes Georges Dumézil – de Boccard.
- GOMME, A. W. – SANDBACH, F. H. 1973 *Menander. A commentary*, London, Oxford University Press.
- GORDON, M. K. 2006 *Syllable weight. Phonetics, phonology, typology*, New York, Routledge.
- GRACE, V. 1953 *The eponyms named on Rhodian amphora stamps, Hesperia*, 22, 116-128.
- GUARDUCCI, M. 1967-1978 *Epigrafia greca*, 1-4, Rome, Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato.
- HABICHT, C. 2003 *Rhodian amphora stamps and Rhodian eponyms, REA*, 105, 541-578.
- HAMP, E. P. 1997-1998 *Fidēs and the Latin 5th declension, Glotta*, 74.1-2, 54-56.
- HANDLEY, E. W. 1965 *The Dyskolos of Menander*, London, Methuen.
- HARTUNG, I. A. 1859 *Die griechischen Elegiker. II. Die Elegiker unter den ersten Ptolemäern*, Leipzig, Engelmann.
- HERMANN, J. G. J. 1844 *Epitome doctrinae metricae*, Leipzig, Fleischer.
- HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, F. 1901 *Inschriften aus Rhodos, ÖJh (Beiblatt)*, 4, 159-168.
- HINGE, G. 2006 *Die Sprache Alkmans. Textgeschichte und Sprachgeschichte (Serta Graeca 24)*, Wiesbaden, Reichert.
- HOCK, H. H. 1971 *The so-called Aeolic inflection of the Greek contract verbs*, Yale, Yale University.
- HUALDE PASCUAL, M. P. 1993 *Hiato /eol/ y diptongo /eul/ en el dialecto jonio de Asia Menor, Minerva*, 7, 43-56.

- JASANOFF, J. H. 2003 *Hittite and the Indo-European verb*, Oxford, OUP.
- JÖHRENS, G. 1999 *Amphorenstempel im Nationalmuseum von Athen, zu den von H.G. Lolling aufgenommenen "unedierten Henkelinschriften"*, Mainz, von Zabern.
- JÖHRENS, G. 2001 *Amphorenstempel hellenistischer Zeit aus Tanais, EurAnt*, 7, 367-479.
- KALÉN, T. 1918 *Quaestiones grammaticae graecae*, Göteborg, Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.
- KAPSOMENOS, A. 1990 *Synecphonesis and consonantalization of iota in Greek tragedy*, in CRAIK, E. M. (ed.), 'Owls to Athens'. *Essays on classical subjects presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 321-330.
- LAMBERTERIE, Ch. de 2009 *En hommage à Michel Lejeune: mycénien o-wo-we et le nom de l' "oreille" en grec*, in BIVILLE, F. – BOEHM, I. (eds.) 2009 *Autour de Michel Lejeune. Actes des journées d'étude organisées à l'Université Lumière-Lyon 2-Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, 2-3 février 2006*, Lyon, Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée-Jean Pouilloux, 79-116.
- LAWALL, M. – SAVVATIANOU-PETROPOULAKOU, M. – PANAGOU, T. 2007 *Hellenistic stamped amphora handles*, in MITSOPOULOS-LEON, V. – LANG-AUINGER, C. (eds.), *Die Basilika am Staatsmarkt in Ephesos 2. Teil: Funde klassischer bis römischer Zeit*, Forschungen in Ephesos IX/2/3, Vienna, Österreichisches Akademie der Wissenschaften, 28-60.
- LEHISTE, I. 1970 *Suprasegmentals*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, The M.I.T. Press.
- LEJEUNE, M. 1972 *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- LEVI, D. 1965-1966 *Le campagne 1962-1964 a Iasos, ASAA*, 43-44, 401-546.
- LOEWY, E. 1886 *Inschriften auf Rhodos, AM*, 10, 216-222.
- MARTÍN VÁZQUEZ, L. 1988 *Inscripciones rodias. I-III*, Madrid, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- MASSON, O. 1993 *Quelques noms grecs dialectaux*, in *Dialectologica Graeca*, 229-236 (= *Onomastica Graeca Selecta III*, 2000, 164-171).
- MAYSER, E. 1938 *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. I. Laut- und Wortlehre. I.2: Flexionslehre. I.3:Stambildung*, Berlin-Leipzig, de Gruyter.
- MEISER, G. 1998 *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- MEISSNER, T. 2006 *S-stem nouns and adjectives in Greek and Proto-Indo-European. A diachronic study in word formation*, Oxford – New York, Oxford University Press.
- MÉNDEZ DOSUNA, J. 1985 *Los dialectos dorios del Noroeste. Gramática y estudio dialectal*, Salamanca, Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- MÉNDEZ DOSUNA, J. 1993a *El cambio de <ε> en <ι> ante vocal en los dialectos griegos: ¿una cuestión zanjada?*, in *Dialectologica Graeca*, 237-259.
- MÉNDEZ DOSUNA, J. 1993b *Metátesis de cantidad en jónico-ático y heracleota, Emerita*, 61, 95-134.
- MÉNDEZ DOSUNA, J. 2008 *Novedades en el oráculo de Dodona. A propósito de una reciente monografía de Éric Lhôte*, *Minerva*, 21, 51-79.
- MEYER, G. 1896 *Griechische Grammatik*, Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel.
- MOLINOS TEJADA, M. T. 1990 *Los dorismos del Corpus Bucolicorum*, Amsterdam, Hakkert.
- MUNRO, J. A. R. – TUBBS, H. A. 1890 *Excavations in Cyprus, 1889. Second season's work.-Polis tes Chrysochou-Limniti, JHS*, 11, 1-99.

- NARTEN, J. 1964 *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*, Wiesbaden, O. Harrassowitz.
- NARTEN, J. 1995 *Kleine Schriften I*, Wiesbaden, Reichert.
- NASSIVERA, M. 2000 *The Development of the PIE words for 'sky', 'cow' and 'ship' and the relative chronology of Osthoff's law*, *HS*, 113, 57-70.
- NICOLAOU, I. 2005 *The stamped amphora handles from the House of Dionysos (Paphos V)*, Nicosia, Department of Antiquities.
- NIETO IZQUIERDO, E. 2009 *Gramática de las inscripciones de la Argólide*, Madrid, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- NILSSON, M. P. 1909 *Timbres amphoriques de Lindos. Publiés avec une étude sur les timbres amphoriques rhodiens*, Copenhagen, Bianco Luno.
- P. Petr. MAHAFFY, J.P., *The Flinders Petrie Papyri*, 3 t. (Royal Irish Academy, Cunningham Memoirs, 8, 9, 11), Dublin, 1891, 1893, 1905.
- PAPACHRISTODOULOU, I. 1989 *Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ῥοδιακοὶ δῆμοι. Ἱστορικὴ ἐπισκόπηση. Ἡ Ἰαλυσία*, Athens, Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 110.
- PARKE, H. W. 1967 *Three new enquiries from Dodona*, *JHS*, 87, 132-133.
- PASSA, E. 2001 *L'antichità della grafia εν per εο, εοι nell'epica. A proposito di una recente edizione dell'Iliade*, *RFIC*, 129, 385-417.
- PASSA, E. 2009 *Parmenide. Tradizione del testo e questioni di lingua*, Roma, Quasar.
- POMTOW, H. 1883 *Die Orakelinschriften von Dodona*, *JKPh*, 29, 305-360.
- PORRO, G. G. 1916 *Bolli d'anfore rodie del Museo Nazionale Romano*, *ASAA*, 2, 103-124.
- RAU, J. 2008 *The origin of the short-vowel eu-stems in Homer*, *Glotta*, 84, 169-194.
- RIX, H. 1976 *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- RIZAKIS, A. D. 2008 *Achaïe III. Les cités achéennes: Épigraphie et histoire* (MEΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ, 55), Athens, Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity, National Hellenic Research Foundation – Paris, de Boccard.
- ROBERT, L. 1938 *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*, Paris, Champion.
- ROBINSON, D. M. 1938 *Inscriptions from Macedonia*, 1938, *TAPhA*, 69, 43-76.
- ROSS, L. 1846 *Hellenika I*, Halle, Schwetschke und Sohn.
- RUIJGH, C. J. 1984 *Le dorien de Théocrite: dialecte cyrénien d'Alexandrie et d'Égypte*, *Mnemosyne*, 37, 56-88 (= *Scripta Minora* II, 405-437).
- RUIJGH, C. J. 1993 *Review of Martín Vázquez 1988*, *Mnemosyne*, 46, 237-244 (= *Scripta Minora* II, 500-507).
- RUIJGH, C. J. 1996 *Scripta minora ad linguam graecam pertinentia*. II, Amsterdam, J. C. Gieben.
- SB PREISIGKE, Fr., *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten* (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur), I, Strasbourg – Berlin 1913.
- SCHWEIZER, E. [SCHWYZER] 1898 *Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften. Beiträge zur Laut- und Flexionslehre der gemeingriechischen Sprache*, Berlin, Weidmann.
- SIHLER, A. L. 1995 *New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*, Oxford – New York, Oxford University Press.
- SOLMSEN, F. 1888 *Sigma in Verbindung mit Nasalen und Liquiden im Griechischen* [I], *KZ*, 29, 59-124.
- STAVRIANOPOULOU, E. 1997 *Die Prosopographie von Telos, Tekmeria*, 3, 79-149.
- STRIANO, A. 1991 *Rhodiaca: Ἀγλούμβροτος, Τιμούρροδος et al.*, *Emerita*, 59, 143-153.

- SUSINI, G. 1963-1964 *Supplemento epigrafico di Caso, Scarpanto, Saro, Calchi, Alin-  
nia e Tilo*, ASAA, 41-42, 203-292.
- THUMB, A. – KIECKERS, E. 1932 *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte I*, Heidelberg,  
Winter.
- THUMB, A. – SCHERER, A. 1959 *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte. II*, Heidelberg,  
Winter.
- VESSELLA, C. 2008 *Teocrito*, in CASSIO, A. C. (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie  
greche*, Florence, Le Monnier Università, 337-356.
- VIOLA, L. 1886 *Nota del Prof. L. Viola, sopra alcune tombe antiche scoperte entro il  
recinto urbano*, NSA, 100-102.
- VOLLGRAFF, W. 1909 *Inscriptions d'Argos*, BCH, 33, 445-466.
- WACHTER, R., 2001 *Non-Attic Greek vase inscriptions*, vol. VI, Oxford, OUP.
- WACKERNAGEL, J. 1888 *Miscellen zur griechischen Grammatik*, KZ, 29, 124-152  
[= *Kleine Schriften I*, pp. 627-655].
- WACKERNAGEL, J. [1955]-1979 *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- WEISS, M. L. 2009 *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin*, Ann  
Arbor, Beech Stave Press.
- WEST, M. L. 1974 *Studies in Greek elegy and iambus*, Berlin-New York, de Gruyter.
- WEST, M. L. 1982 *Greek metre*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- WILLI, A. 2008 *Sikelismos. Sprache, Literatur und Gesellschaft im griechischen Sizi-  
lien (8.-5. Jh. v. Chr.)*, Basel, Schwabe.

Alcorac ALONSO DÉNIZ  
41-43, quai de Valmy  
Paris, 75010  
France  
alcorac.alonso@gmail.com