



**HAL**  
open science

# The dialect of Thasos and the transmission of Archilochus' fragments

Alcorac Alonso Déniz

► **To cite this version:**

Alcorac Alonso Déniz. The dialect of Thasos and the transmission of Archilochus' fragments. Giannakis, Georgios; Crespo, Emilio; Filos, Panagiotis. Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea, De Gruyter, pp.531-560, 2018, Trends in Classics - Supplementary Volumes 49, 978-3-11-053213-5. 10.1515/9783110532135-027 . halshs-01724045

**HAL Id: halshs-01724045**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01724045v1>**

Submitted on 7 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.

Alcorac Alonso Déniz

# The Dialect of Thasos and the Transmission of Archilochus' Fragments

## 1 Paros and Thasos: a linguistic tale of shared features (and some disagreeing isoglosses)

Thasos was established by Parian pioneers in all certainty in ca. 650 BC.<sup>1</sup> As frequently attested in the different processes of colonization in Archaic Greece, both the metropolis and the colony shared religious cults, civic institutions, prosopography, alphabet and, last but not least, linguistic features.

The ancient Greek variety spoken in Paros and in its northern colony Thasos belong to the central Ionic or Cycladic dialect of the Ionic branch (Colvin 2007, 22; Miller 2014, 151). Among other South Greek characteristics (e. g. assibilation of \*-ti, ὄσος 'as great as' (masc. nom. sg.), οἱ/αἱ 'the' (nom. pl., masc. and fem.), εἴ 'if', etc.), they share the following features (Del Barrio Vega 2014; Del Barrio Vega 2015b, 160–161):

- Universal raising of /a:/ > /æ:/ > /ɛ:/.<sup>2</sup>
- 'Quantitative metathesis' of \*ē before \*o and \*a.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 This paper is part of the research project "Interdialectal contact in Methone and Dodona" of the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Concurrence (FFI2012–35721-C02–02). I would like to thank Matthew Scarborough both for some insightful comments and for the proofreading of my English. Abbreviations of ancient authors, corpora of inscriptions and papyri not included in *LSJ* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.) and *OCD* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) or in the lists of the *Diccionario Griego-Español* (<http://dge.cchs.csic.es/lst/lst-int.htm>) can be found at the end of the paper ('References'). The epigraphic forms written in the Parian-Thasian alphabet (PTA), where <ω> is used for /o/ and /o:/, and <ο> for /ɔ:/, have been left unmodified. For the sake of clarity, I distinctly mark with the abbreviation PTA the documents where this spelling occurs. Unless otherwise stated, translations of Greek authors are those of the Loeb Classical Library.

2 *πρησώντων* 'do' (3pl. act. pres. imp.) (*SEG* 42, 785.40+, ca. 470–460 BC [PTA]), *τὴν πύρην* 'the funerary-pyre' (acc.) (*SEG* 51, 1071, Paros, late 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC), *Ἥστῆ* 'Hestia' (dat.) (*IG XII Suppl.*, 646, Thasos, ca. 250 BC), *Ἥστῆς* 'Hestia' (gen.) (*IG XII* 5, 238, Paros, 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC).

3 *Κριτωνίδεο* 'Kritonides' (gen.) (*CEG* 413.ii, Paros, 535–500 BC [PTA]), *Καταβάτew* 'Kataibates' (gen.) (Papadopoulos 2013, no. 4, fig. 6; Paros, boundary marker, ca. 450–400 BC), *Λεαρέτῃ* 'Learetēs' (dat.) (*CEG* 161, Thasos, 500–490 BC), *πόλιος* (*CEG* 415, Thasos, late 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC, [PTA]), *πόλιος* 'city' (gen. sg.) (*IG XII Suppl.*, 347.II.4, ca. 430–425 BC).

- Synzesis of /o/ after /e/,<sup>4</sup> later written <ευ>.<sup>5</sup>
- γίγνομαι > γίνομαι ‘become’.<sup>6</sup>
- Retention of ρσ.<sup>7</sup>
- Genitive πόλεως ‘city’.<sup>8</sup>

**4** Τηλεφ[άνε]ως ‘Telaphanes’ (gen.) (CEG 159, Thasos, ca. 500 BC [PTA]), Νεοκρέωντος ‘Neokreon’ (gen.) (CEG 674, Paros, 350–300 BC), [Ε]υάνθεος ‘Euanthes’ (gen.) (CEG 843, Paros, late 4<sup>th</sup> – early 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC). Synzesis of /o/ after /e/ is well attested in Archilochus’ iambic compositions (written εο or ευ in manuscripts and papyri): πονεομένη ‘toil’ (pres. ppl., fem. nom. sg.) (42.2 W.), σεο ‘you’ (gen. sg.) (106.4 W.), χαρίζεο ‘favor’ (2sg. pres. imp.) (108.2 W.), Νεοβούλης ‘Neoboule’ (gen.) (118 W.), ἀλέξεο ‘ward off’ (2sg. pres. imp.) (128.2 W.), ἐφρόνεον ‘be minded’ (3pl. act. impf.) (226 W.), τιθεῦ ‘stand’ (2sg. mid. pres. imp.) (23.10 W.), πωλευμένωι ‘go about’ (mid./pass. pres. ppl. masc./neut. dat. sg.) (49.7 W.), ἐμεῦ ‘me’ (gen. sg.) (200 W.). A similar phenomenon is attested for -εου-: φρονέουσι ‘be minded’ (3pl. act. pres.) (132 W.), δολοφρονέουσα ‘planning craft’ (pres. ppl., fem. nom. sg.) (184 W.). The sequence remains, however, uncontracted at the end of the line: ἀγάλλεο ‘glorify’ (2sg. mid./pass. pres. imp.), ὀδύρεο ‘lament’ (2sg. pres. imp.) (128.4, .5 W.), ἠλείφεο ‘anoint’ (2sg. mid./pass. impf.) (205 W.). For this problem in the Homeric text see Passa (2001); for the iambic poets see Kaczko (2008, 234), Hawkins (2013, 49–50) and Miller (2014, 154).

**5** Already in the 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC πλεῦνως ‘more’ (gen. sg. masc.-fem.-neut.) (Pouilloux 1954, 139, 18.9, 411–409 BC [PTA]), frequently attested afterwards: Κλεῦστρατος ‘Kleustratos’ (Dunant & Pouilloux 1958, 223, no. 372, 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC), Κλευμνήστου ‘Kleumnestos’ (gen.) (SEG 54, 794.16, Paros, late 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC), Θευτέλης ‘Theuteles’ (IG XII Suppl., 431.2, Thasos, ca. 350 BC), Θεύπομπος ‘Theupompos’ (SEG 33, 681.1, Paros, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC). According to A. Matthaïou (*apud* SEG 54, 794), Parian Κλευμνήστου is a Doric form, since <ευ> for <εο> is seldom attested in the Ionic-speaking Cycladic islands; cf. Νευκλεί[ωι] ‘Neukleios’ (dat.) (IG XII 5, 872.66, Tenos, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC), Κλευδίκου ‘Kleudikos’ (gen.) (IG XII 7, 412, Aegiale, 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC), Θευτιμίδου ‘Theutimides’ (gen.) (SEG 14, 532.23, Ioulis, 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC), Κλευκρίτη ‘Kleukrite’ (IG XII 5, 495, Siphnos, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC?), Κλευμένεος ‘Kleumenes’ (gen.) (IG XII 7, 32.14, Arkesine, late 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC). A certain Rhodian influence can account for some of the personal names, particularly in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC, when the influence of Rhodes in the Cyclades was stronger. But since a monosyllabic scansion of <εο> is attested in epigrams of the Ionic-speaking Cyclades, e. g. Δεινομένεος ‘Deinomenes’ (gen.) (CEG 403, Naxos, ca. 650 BC), Κλεομάνδρῳ ‘Kleomandros’ (gen.) (CEG 664, Amorgos, 400–350 BC), γένεος ‘race’ (gen. sg.) (CEG 673, Tenos, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC?), we cannot exclude the possibility that the phenomenon developed independently in the area.

**6** γινομένου (IG XII Suppl., 349.5, Thasos, late 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC), γίνηται (SEG 56, 1017.4 and 26–27, Thasos, ca. 389–350 BC) and ἐκγινόμενα (IG XII 5, 108.9, Paros, late 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC).

**7** ἄρσεν ‘male’ (nom.-voc.-acc. neut. sg.) (IG XII 8, 358.1, Thasos, ca. 490–480 BC), Θερσέλεο ‘Therseleos’ (gen.) (CEG 413.i, Paros, 535–500 BC [PTA]).

**8** πώλεος (IG XII Suppl., 412, Thasos, ca. 500 BC [PTA]), πόλεως (SEG 48, 1140, Thasos, ca. 350–300 BC), πόλεως (SEG 48, 1140, Paros, ca. 350–300 BC).

- Dat. pl. -οις and -ηις in the article but also in lexical words.<sup>9</sup>
- The participle ἔοντ- 'be'.<sup>10</sup>
- Θεωρός instead of θεωρός 'theoros'.<sup>11</sup>

Due to the distance separating Paros and Thasos and despite their historical bonds, the dialects of both islands unsurprisingly exhibit some divergent linguistic features:

9 [Θα]σίοις 'Thasians' (dat.), τοῖς 'the' (masc. dat. pl.) (*IG XII 5*, 109, Paros, after 411 BC) and τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς 'the other gods' (dat.) (*IG XII 8*, 264.8, Thasos, early 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC), τοῖς ἄλλοις Θασίοις 'the other Thasians' (dat.) (*ibid.* 11), ἐμ πίθοις (*IG XII Suppl.*, 347.5, ca. 430–425 BC) vs. the early τριηκωσίων '300' (dat.) (*SEG 18*, 347.8, Thasos, ca. 480–460 BC [PTA]). No examples of -οισιν survive from Paros. The only case of extension to lexical words of -ηις comes from Paros: τῆς συνθήκης 'the conventions' (dat.) (*IG XII 5*, 109.5, after 411 BC). In Thasos, the early documents attest to -ηισιν in lexical words and τῆς in the article (always before a vowel): Νύμφηισιν 'Nymphs' (dat.) (*IG XII 8*, 358, 490–480 BC), ἐπιστάτηισιν 'overseers' (dat.) (*SEG 42*, 785, ca. 470–460 BC), ταύτηισιν 'those' (dat.) (*IG XII 8*, 261.4, 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC), τῆς ἀπωικίηισιν 'the colonies' (dat.) (Pouilloux 1954, 139, no. 18.7, ca. 411–409 BC [PTA]), τῆς ὡδῶις[---] 'the streets' (dat.) (*IG XII Suppl.*, 420 fr. a.1, 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC [PTA]), ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμπέ[λοισι] 'on the vines' (*IG XII Suppl.*, 347, ca. 430–425 BC), and in a metrical inscription ναύτηισιν 'ships' (dat.) (*CEG 162*, ca. 500–490 BC?). We do not have any safe examples of -ηις extended to lexical words in Thasos, but the parallel of -οις is compelling (Deplazes 1991, 74–76). In fact, it is almost certain that [τοῖς Νεαπολίτηις] 'the Neapolitans' (dat.) must be read in *IG XII 8*, 264.1, a *stoichedon* inscription (see Pouilloux 1954, 210). Archilochus' text attests to -οις, both in lexical words, e.g. ὄγμοις 'furrows' (dat.) (188.2 W.) and the article (e.g. τοῖς 130 W.), and to -ηις: ἧις 'which' (fem. dat. pl.) (172.3 W.), θαλίηις (16.2 Nicolosi), ἀγκάληις 'festivities' (dat.) (213 W.; ἀγκάλαις mss.) and perhaps αἰοιδῆις 'songs' (dat.) (253 W.; αἰοδαῖς pap.). Arguably, -οις and -ηις may be an old feature of the Parian-Thasian dialect, but since the phenomenon is attested in Homer (-ηις as an artifact of the *aedoi*, see Deplazes 1991, 91–93), Archilochus may have borrowed it from the epos. Outside Homer, the phenomenon is also attested in Ionic, perhaps as early as Hipponnax's time, according to the prevailing interpretation (73.5 d.; pap. εντραισγι[ or εντηισγι], ἐν τοῖσι γνάθοισι mss., ἐν ταῖς γνάθοισι 'in the jaws'; see Masson 1962, 143 on fr. 173; but cf. also Degani's comment *ad loc.*) and later in Herondas: τῆς νεωτέρηις 'the youngers' (fem. dat.) (1.19).

10 Acc. ἔώντα (Pouilloux 1954, 139, no. 18.1, 411–409 BC [PTA]) and gen. ἔόντω[ν] (*IG XII 5*, 109.24, Paros, 411–409 BC).

11 θεωρ[ός], θεωρ[οί] (*IG XII 5*, 108.5–6 and 7–8, Paros, late 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC), gen. θεωρῶ[ν], (*IG XII 8*, 263, Thasos, 412 BC), ἔθεόρεον 'to be a *theoros*' (Salviat 1979b, 116, col. 1.15, early 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC), θεωρούς (*IG XII Suppl.*, 358.6, Thasos, 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC). The hypothesis that θεωρός is the phonological evolution of θεωρός cannot be accepted (Alonso Déniz 2017 (forthcoming)). The θεωροί at Paros and Thasos were official civic magistrates, whereas the θεωρ- in the Parian granting of *asylia* on Magnesia (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 562.6, ca. 208 BC) is a religious term (Rutherford 2013, 128–130).

- Paros presents  $\text{ἱερ-}$ ,<sup>12</sup> whereas Thasos has  $\text{ἱρ-}$ .<sup>13</sup>
- $\langle\epsilon\omicron\rangle$  for  $\langle\epsilon\nu\rangle$  and  $\langle\alpha\omicron\rangle$  for  $\langle\alpha\nu\rangle$  seem to be attested only in Thasos.<sup>14</sup>
- $\eta\mu\text{ισ}\nu$  ‘half’ (neut.) is found in a Parian document,<sup>15</sup> whereas dialectal Thasian inscriptions only attest to  $\eta\mu\text{ισ}\nu$ .<sup>16</sup>

**12**  $\text{ἱερόν}$  ‘sanctuary’ (Papadopoulos 2013, no. 4, fig. 6; Paros, boundary marker, ca. 450–400 BC),  $\text{ἱερών}$  ‘sanctuary’ (*IG XII 5*, 108.3, late 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC),  $\text{ἱερών}$  (*SEG 28*, 708.2, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC). Cf. also the forms of the *Marmor Parium* (*IG XII 5*, 444.7 and 87, ca. 264 BC). The only example of  $\text{ἱερ-}$  in Archilochus’ text occurs in the new fragment of elegiacs:  $\text{Ἴλιον εἰς ἱερῆν}$  ‘to the sacred Iliion’ (fr. 12 Nicolosi; another example in the epigram fr. 326 W, but the attribution remains dubious, see Casadio 1996, 76–77). A Parian late dedication (*IG XII 5*, 227; cf. also the *addenda* to the inscription on *IG XII 5*, 311) attests to  $\eta\text{ ἱρῆ}$  (= Ion.  $\eta\text{ ἱερῆ}$  ‘the priestess’) or  $\eta\text{ ἱρῆ}$  (=  $\eta\text{ ἱερά}$  ‘the sacred one’ (fem.)), according to Kern 1911). In my opinion, an Ionic form  $\text{ἱρέη}$  ‘priestess’ must be excluded in light of the early examples  $\text{ἱερ-}$  in the area cited above. A late development of Attic  $\text{ἱέρεια}$  is more likely. To begin with,  $-\epsilon\text{ια} > -\epsilon\alpha$  is attested on the island, e.g.  $\text{Σωκράτεια}$  ‘Sokrateia’ in an epigram (*IG XII 5*, 310.4 and 18, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD), with a penultimate light syllable. Furthermore, the contraction of  $-\epsilon\alpha$  after /j/-loss results in  $-\eta$  in other Ionic-speaking areas, e.g. the personal names in  $-\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\alpha > -\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\alpha > -\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\eta$ ,  $-\pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha > -\pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\alpha > -\pi\acute{o}\lambda\eta$  and  $-\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\alpha > -\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\alpha$  in Ceos, Mykonos, Amorgos and Chios; cf. also  $\text{Πρόκλειη}$  ‘Prokleia’ in Thasos). As for the spelling  $\text{ἱρ-}$ , if not a stone-cutter mistake (note that  $\langle Y \rangle$  has been added in the last line between B and A in  $\text{Βαυβοῖ}$ ), we may posit a late development of  $\text{ἱερ-} > \text{ἱρ/εἱρ-} /i:r-/$  attested in late prose documents: e.g.  $\text{ἐν τῷ ἱρῶ}$  ‘in the sanctuary’ (*Gonnoi II*, 72.10, ca. 150 BC),  $\text{ἱρεύς}$  ‘priest’ (*IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 3934.1, AD 50–59),  $\text{εἰρέως}$  ‘priest’ (*IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 4481.3, AD 85–94); see Threatte (1980, 392) and García Ramón (1992, 201–202). The Parian dedication is dated to the 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC, but a later date should not be excluded.

**13**  $\text{ἱρή}$  ‘sacred’ (fem.) (*SEG 32*, 846.B, before 480–470 BC),  $\text{ἱρά τὰ χρήματα}$  ‘the sacred things’ (*IG XII 8*, 263.5, ca. 410 BC),  $\text{ἱρή}$  (Pouilloux 1954, 139, no. 18.4, ca. 411–409 BC),  $\text{ἱροποῖόν}$  ‘overseer of temples’ (acc. sg.),  $\text{ἱρ[όν]}$  (*IG XII 8*, 264.14, early 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC),  $\text{ἱρά}$  (*ibid.* 16),  $\text{ἱρά}$  (*SEG 38*, 853.11),  $\text{ἱρόν}$  (*SEG 56*, 10174, 10+, ca. 389–350 BC),  $\text{ἱροποῖόν}$  (*ibid.* 12+),  $\text{ἱρομνήμονα}$  ‘a kind of magistrate’ (acc. sg.) (*ibid.* 28). In *IG XII 8*, 265 (4<sup>th</sup> c. BC), a document only known from a copy made by Dr. Christidis in the 19<sup>th</sup> c. (see Bergmann 1869), we find  $\text{ἱρόν}$  (l. 9) and  $\text{ΤΩΗΡΕΙ}$  (l. 10), which must be an error of the copyist for  $\text{ΤΩΗΡΕΙ} = \text{dat. sg. τῷ ἱρεῖ}$ . These two examples contrast with  $\text{ἱερέα}$  (l. 7), which must be an Attic form, just like  $\text{ἀγορανόμος}$  ‘clerk of the market’ (l. 11) vs.  $\text{ἀγορηνόμος}$  (l. 7), if the copy is correct. For  $\text{IHPON}$  see § 3.

**14** Most of the examples are attested in amphora stamps:  $\text{Εὐαγόρης}$  ‘Euagores’ (Garlan 1999, no. 178),  $\text{Εὐαγό(ρη)ς}$  (Garlan 1999, no. 386),  $\text{Εὐρυάναξ}$  ‘Eurynax’ (Garlan 1999, no. 903); cf. also in one funerary inscription  $\text{Εὐρυκ[---]}$  (*IG XII 8*, 406.2);  $\langle\alpha\omicron\rangle$  for  $\langle\alpha\nu\rangle$ :  $\text{Γλαόκων}$  ‘Glaukon’ (Garlan 1999, nos. 406, 504, 520 and 560),  $\text{Παοσαν(ης)}$  ‘Pausanias’ (Garlan 1999, no. 990),  $\text{Παοσαν(ης)}$  (Garlan 1999, no. 506). For  $\langle\epsilon\nu\rangle$  for  $\langle\epsilon\omicron\rangle$  and its rarity in Paros inscriptions see *supra* fn. 5.

**15** Cf. *IG XII 5*, 108.6 (late 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC).  $\eta\mu\text{ισ}\nu$  ‘half’ (neut.) is found in an inscription entirely written in koine (*SEG 33*, 679.51–52, ca. 175–150 BC). As it happens, it is the preferred form in Attic public documents after ca. 375 BC (see Threatte 1980, 262–263).

**16** Cf. e.g.  $\text{τῶμισυ} = \text{τὸ ἡμισυ}$  (*SEG 42*, 785.30+, early 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC [PTA]).

- The extension of personal names derived from Ion. νοσσός 'nestling' is found in Thasos, but never in Paros. Typical Ionic personal names in -ᾱς (gen. -ᾶδος) are attested only in Thasian in the dialectal period.<sup>17</sup>

In this paper I will examine in detail two features only found in inscriptions from Thasos: the loss of word-initial aspiration (psilosis) and the analogical interweaving of masculine *ā*- and *s*-stems. Since both characteristics are marginally attested in the text of Archilochus, I will argue that Thasos may have played a role in the transmission of his work and that this evidence may correlate to other archaeological, religious and historical data.

## 2 Aspiration in Paros

The preservation of word-initial aspiration is attested in the earliest inscriptions of Paros. In addition to its most striking characteristics, especially <C> = /b/, <Ω> = /o, o:/ and <O> = /ɔ:/, <H> regularly stands for both word-initial /h/ and /ε:/. This feature is shared by most islands of the Ionic-speaking Cyclades (Knipl 1938, 7 and 54–55):

ἠωρπύλω (= ὁ Ἐρπύλου) 'the (son) of Erypylos', κάπωιησε (= καὶ ἐποίησε) 'and he made' (SEG 48, 1136, Paros, ca. 525–500 BC [PTA])  
 ἠώρον 'boundary' (acc.), ἠο (sic) 'the' (nom. sg. masc.),<sup>18</sup> πύρην 'funerary pyre' (acc.) (SEG 51, 1071, Paros, late 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC [PTA])

Metrical inscriptions of the same date attest also to the same spelling phenomenon:

ἠω, ἀνέθηκεν 'set up' (3sg. act. aor. ind.) (CEG 412, Paros, 550–525 BC? [PTA])

<sup>17</sup> See LGPNI (4<sup>th</sup> c. BC to 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC) and Del Barrio Vega (2015a, 174–175) for examples of Νοσσίκας 'Nossikas' and Νόσσοσ 'Nossos' in Thasos, and Curbera (2013, 136) for its origin. Interestingly, Archilochus attests to νεοσσιή 'nest' (175.5 W.). In the Cyclades, Νόσσοσ is the name of a Hellenistic magistrate at Naxos (LAGM, 717). As for the names in -ᾱς, see Παμφᾶς (5<sup>th</sup> – 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC, cf. LGPNI). The first instances in Paros are attested only from the 1st c. BC onwards: e.g. Σωτᾶς (see LGPNI). In the other Ionic speaking Cycladic islands the suffix is attested quite early: Πυγμαῖς (Amorgos, 7<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC, see LGPNI).

<sup>18</sup> The correct interpretation of the sentence requires the article ὁ, which is written ἠω in the Parian-Thasian alphabet: cf. πρῶς (l. 2), σωρών (l. 4), etc. I cannot determine in Matthaiou's photograph if it is really an <O>.

An isolated exception occurs in the inscription of the builder Thrason (*IG* XII 5, 252, ca. 55 BC? [PTA]): ἐβδω[μη]φωντώτης ‘70’ (ll. 2–3). The form attests to psilosis due to the analogy from the following numerals in the series (ὀγδώκοντα ‘80’, ἐνενήκοντα ‘90’).<sup>19</sup>

Aspiration is also attested in inscriptions dated to the 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC that are still written in the local alphabet:

ηεκηβώ[λοι] ‘attaining his aim’ (masc. dat. sg.) (*CEG* 840 = 414a, Paros, 500–450 BC? [PTA])  
 ηω (*CEG* 156, Paros, ca. 475 BC [PTA]), cf. also [μν]ῆμα ‘memorial’ and κασιγνήτη ‘sister’ (dat.)

Some 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC documents that are written in the local alphabet fail to attest the use of <H> for initial aspiration:

Ως ‘who’ (masc. nom. sg.), Ωδῶ ‘street’ (gen.) (*IG* XII 5, 107.1 and 5, ca. 475–450 BC [PTA]);<sup>20</sup>  
 cf. also βάλλητι ‘throw’ (3sg. act. pres. subj.).  
 [Ω]ρωσ Υπάτω ‘boundary of (sc. Zeus) highest’ (*IG* XII 5, 183, 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC [PTA]).  
 Ως, Αλοίω ‘of the threshing-floor’ (masc. gen.) (unpublished legal document; ca. 475–450 BC [PTA]).<sup>21</sup>

Although one may be tempted to explain the above cited examples as being due to psilosis, a recently published boundary marker written in Ionic alphabet and exhibiting *ηερόν* (Papadopoulos 2013, no. 4) excludes this hypothesis. Arguably, the increasing familiarity with the Ionic alphabet triggered the orthographic

**19** Cf. the reverse phenomenon in e.g. Heracleian *ηοκτώ* ‘eight’, Therean and Locrian *ἑνάτος* ‘ninth’, Dor. *ἡέβδεμος* after *ἑπτά* ‘seven’ (Buck 1955, § 58).

**20** In the same document, *ἐκ(κ)αθάρματα* (ll. 2–3).

**21** Presented by A. Matthaïou (19. 03. 2013) à l’EPHE (Paris). In the same document we find *Αλοίω* [PTA], but the aspiration of Att. *ἄλωσ* ‘threshing-floor’ seems to be secondary (Beekes 1971, 350–352). Other examples are not relevant here. *IG* XII 5, 214, a boundary marker in the Ionic alphabet showing *ῥος*, dated to the 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC by Hiller, belongs to a larger group of similar stones now dated to ca. 400–350 BC (see Papadopoulos 2010–2013, nos. 1–6; no. 6 corresponds to *IG* XII 5, 214). The example of the relative pronoun in the sentence *ξένοι Δοριῆι ωὐ θέμι[ς] δρ[ῶν] ωὐδὲ γυναικί / ωὐδὲ δ[ῶλ]οι, ἃ Κώρηι ἄστοι ἔ[σ]τι* ‘It is not legal for a foreign Dorian nor for a woman nor for a slave to do the sacrifices for Kore Citizen’ (*IG* XII 5, 225 + *IG* XII *Suppl.*, 206, ca. 450 BC [PTA]), is not certain, as shown, among others, by Butz (1996, 82–86), who edits *Χσένοι Δοριῆι ωὐ θέμι[ς] εἰσέναι / ω . . . . ΟΙΑ Κώρηι Ἄστοι ε[---]ca. 6---*. Finally, in *[Ι]στίης / Δημίης* (*IG* XII 5, 238; 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC), where initial <H> can be discarded, the initial aspiration is not etymological.

dropping of <H> and initial aspiration ceased to be written, a spelling phenomenon found in other areas too.<sup>22</sup>

First of all, the Eastern Ionic alphabet appears in *IG XII 5*, 183, where the use of <Ω> for /ɔ:/ in ἀτελέστωι seems an innovation in the light of ὠὺ 'no', ὠὺδε 'and not' in the same document.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, in a funerary stele made for two Ikarian patrons by the Parian sculptor Platthis (*IG XII 6 2*, 1288.3, ca. 475–450 BC, cf. *DNO* 1288), <Ω> stands for /o/ as expected, but the Ionic lambda <Λ> is used instead of the Parian-Thasian form of the letter <Γ> (Matthaiou & Papadopoulou 2003, 78). Some years later, his colleague and compatriot Euphron signed one of his works on the Dorian island of Nisyros entirely in the Ionic alphabet (*IDorIns.* 71, cf. *DNO* 660, ca. 450–400 BC).<sup>24</sup>

Later Parian documents from the 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC are all written in the Ionic alphabet and are heavily influenced by the Attic dialect. There is no sign of psilosis in these documents, cf. καθάπερ 'as' (*IG XII 5*, 111.10, decree, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC). In the following century, initial aspiration is found in all documents, e. g. ἀφ' οὗ 'from the time when' in the so-called 'Marmor Parium' (*IG XII 5*, 444 *passim*, 263 BC). In the 'Mnesiepes inscription' καθ' ᾧ belongs to the answer of the Pythian oracle (*SEG* 15, 517.E<sub>1</sub>.2.15, ca. 250 BC). There are cases of aspiration in other parts of the latter text, which are written for the most part in Attic καθ' ᾧ (*ibid.* E<sub>1</sub> 2.19), ἐπειθ' ὑπό 'when', 'under' (*ibid.* E<sub>1</sub> 2.43). The chronicle written by Sosthenes in the early 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC (*IG XII 5*, 445)<sup>25</sup> seems to attest to a case of psilosis, according to Hiller's edition: ἀποκατιστάνα[ι] 'reinstate' (act. pres. inf.) (A, I.42). In fact, the document exhibits a stonecutter's mistake, ΑΠΟΚΑΤΙΣΤΑΘΑ, which was emended by the same stonecutter or another one in ΑΠΟΚΑΘΙΣΤΑΝΑ (Tsantsanoglou 2003). Moreover, the document has οὐχ ὑπολειπόμενος 'not falling short' (*IG XII 5*, 445, col. VII.15; epigram of Sosthenes).

In conclusion, there are no certain examples of psilosis in Parian documents.

<sup>22</sup> For a similar orthographic explanation of the sporadic omission of <H> in Attic documents see Threatte (1980, 494).

<sup>23</sup> Arguably, a shortening of the final diphthong -ωι (i. e. ἀτελέστοι) could not be excluded.

<sup>24</sup> Two Euphron's works in Athens bare his signature in the Ionic alphabet. <H> for /h/ is never used in either document, but this may be due to the Ionian patrons who dedicated the statues. *CEG* 316 (ca. 475–450 BC, cf. *DNO* 657) is dedicated by (H)ermostratos from Abdera, and *CEG* 273 (470–450 BC, cf. *DNO* 659) is dedicated by Mikythe, whose name clearly indicates an East Ionian origin. Euphron made another work for an Athenian patron, and the dedication and his signature are both written in the Attic alphabet (*IG I<sup>3</sup>*, 856, cf. *DNO* I 658).

<sup>25</sup> Sosthenes' chronicle is based on the account of Demeas, a Parian historian who probably lived in the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC (see the commentary by J. P. Sickinger *apud BNJ* 502 F 1).



### 3 Psilosis in Thasos and in the Thasian settlements on the Thracian coast of the Aegean

Although the Parians that settled in Thasos brought along their local alphabet, in the earliest Thasian documents <H> is exclusively used for /ε:/ and never for word-initial /h/:<sup>26</sup>

οἰ ‘who’ (masc. dat.) (SEG 14, 565.3–4, late 7<sup>th</sup> c. BC [PTA]), cf. μνήμα ‘memorial’.

Ηρακλεῖ ‘Herakles’ (dat.), ὡς ‘who’ (masc.) (CEG 416, 525–500 BC [PTA]), cf. ἀνέθηκεν ‘set up’ (3sg. act. aor. ind.), ἤρχοεν ‘rule’ (3sg. act. aor. ind.), etc.

ἐστᾶσιν ‘set up’ (3pl. act. prf. ind.) (CEG 415, 525–500 BC [PTA]), cf. Ζηνῶς ‘Zeus’ (gen.), Σεμέλης ‘Semele’ (gen.), etc.

Ἑρμη[ι] ‘Hermes’ (dat.) (IG XII 8, 357, ca. 500 BC [PTA])

ᾧτ(ε) ‘when’ (CEG 159, ca. 500 BC [PTA]), cf. μή ‘no’, Τηλε[φάνε]ως ‘Telephanes’ (gen.).

Ἡρακλέως ‘Herakles’ (gen.) (IG XII *Suppl.*, 423, ca. 500 BC? [PTA])

ὦ ‘the’ (masc. nom.) (I.*Thrac.Aeg.* E30, Abdera < Thasos?, ca. 550 BC [PTA])<sup>27</sup>

ἄμ = ἄ ‘which’ (nom. pl.) + ἄν (IG XII 8, 358, 490–480 BC [PTA]), cf. βῶλιτι ‘Council’ (dat.)

Ἡρακλεῖ ‘Herakles’ (dat.), Ἑρμιππος ‘Hermippos’ (CEG 417, ca. 450–440 BC [PTA]), cf. ἀνέθηκε(ε) ‘set up’ (3sg. act. aor. ind.)

Ἡραγῶρεο ‘Heragores’ (gen.) (Pouilloux 1954, 36, no. 6; ca. 450 BC? [PTA])

ἐχσακῶσαι ‘600’ (fem.), ἐχσήκωντα ‘60’ (Salviat & Servais 1964, ll. 5–7, *Aliki*, 450–440 BC [PTA])

ἠδωῖς ‘streets’ (dat.) (IG XII *Suppl.*, 420, ca. 450 BC? [PTA])

Ἑκάτης ‘Hekate’ (gen.) (IG XII 8, 359, ca. 450 BC)

ἱρά ‘sacred’ (nom. pl.) (NGSL 21.12, ca. 430–420 BC), cf. ἀνέθηκεν ‘set up’ (3 sg. act. aor. ind.) (l. 13).<sup>28</sup>

Even more revealingly, in word boundary voiceless stops remain unchanged before words which originally exhibited initial /h/:

κατάπερ ‘as’ (SEG 36, 790.8, ca. 480 BC [PTA]), cf. also without initial <H> ἐτέρην ‘other of two’ (fem. acc.) (l. 7), ὄρκως ‘oath’ (l. 9), ᾧ ‘what’ (l. 3).

τῶτερον = τὸ ἕτερον ‘the other of two’ (neut. nom.-acc.)’ (SEG 59, 957, ca. 475 BC, [PTA]; cf. Rolley 1965, 447, no. 6, ca. 475 BC and Guarducci 1967–1978, vol. IV, 12).

κατάπερ ‘as’, ἐπ’ ᾧ ‘in the time of which’ (masc. pl.), τῶμισυ ‘the half’ (neut.), κατ’ ἕκαστον ‘each one’ (masc. sg.) (SEG 42, 785.2, 11, 39+, 46+, early 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC [PTA]).

<sup>26</sup> See Del Barrio Vega (2015a, 157–160).

<sup>27</sup> I endorse the view of the editors, according to whom the epitaph is written in the Parian-Thasian alphabet (see Pl. 10). Del Barrio Vega’s (2015a, 171) doubts are unfounded.

<sup>28</sup> The dedication Ἄγρων Ἡρώι ‘Agron to the Hero’ (Pouilloux, 1954, 87, no. 14; Pl. IX, 2, ca. 430 BC?) is in the Ionic alphabet.

According to Pouilloux (1954, 443), the local alphabet stopped being used in Thasos around 430–425 BC. The documents in Ionic alphabet dated after this period also show some examples of psilosis in *sandhi*:<sup>29</sup>

κατόπερ 'as' (*IG XII Suppl.*, 347.II.14–15; post 410 BC).<sup>30</sup>  
 ἐπ' ᾧ (the place) on which' (*SEG* 56, 1017.22, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC).<sup>31</sup>

All the above data are strong evidence that the dialect of Thasos lost word-initial aspiration after ca. 650 BC.

There are two alleged spelling oddities that may contradict the above conclusion, i. e. that initial aspiration was lost in the Thasian dialect:

- a) ΕΠΩΗΕΣΕ for the expected ἐπώ(ι)ησε 'make' (3sg. act. aor. ind.) (*CEG* 157, ca. 525–500 BC [PTA]).
- b) ΙΗΡΟΝ for the expected ἱρόν 'sanctuary' (*IG XII* 8, 360, 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC?).<sup>32</sup>

However, these examples may be dismissed for several reasons. According to Pouilloux (1954, 449), <HP> in (b) represents the result of the aspiration of /s/ in the evolution \**h<sub>1</sub>ish<sub>2</sub>rós* > \**h<sub>1</sub>isrós* > \**isrós*, which is highly unlikely.<sup>33</sup> Del Barrio Vega (2015a, 157–158) claims that originally in the Parian-Thasian alphabet /hε:/ and /he/ could be represented by <HE>, but also by <H>, with the same value.<sup>34</sup> Once psilosis occurred in Thasos, <H> and <HE> could still represent /ε:/, which accounts, allegedly, for the spelling ΕΠΩΗΕΣΕ under (a). Accordingly, <H> may also stand for /ε:/ and /e/ in the Thasian alphabet, which could explain the spelling ΙΗΡΟΝ under (b).<sup>35</sup>

Unfortunately, this hypothesis encounters some problems. As to ΙΗΡΟΝ, a Thasian ἱερόν (written ἠρόν) would be at odds with the other examples of this

<sup>29</sup> There are no examples in *IG XII* 8, 401, nor in Pouilloux 1954, 139, no. 18 (ca. 410 BC), which is exceptionally written in the local alphabet.

<sup>30</sup> κα[τά]περ 'as' (*IG XII Suppl.*, 347.4–5, ca. 430–425 BC) is possible.

<sup>31</sup> The reading ἐπ' ᾧ in the transcription of the text by the editors (Grandjean & Salviat 2006, 296), reproduced by *SEG*, is incorrect (see fig. 4 in Grandjean & Salviat 2006, 299; cf. P. Hamon, *BÉ* 2009, 519, no. 410).

<sup>32</sup> The inscription, written in the Ionic alphabet, was seen in the stairs of a private house in Thasos by Reinach (1882, 443), by a certain Dr. Christidis (see Reinach 1884, 90, fn. 91) and by Karl F. Kinch (see Fredrich *ad IG XII* 8, 360). All three confirmed the reading ΙΗΡΟΝ.

<sup>33</sup> See García Ramón (1992, 194–195) for the distribution of ἱρός/ἴρος.

<sup>34</sup> There is a possible syllabic use of <H> in a Thasian document found at Abdera: ΗΤΑΙΡΟΙ = h(ε)ταίρωι 'friend' (dat. sg.) (*I.Thrac.Aeg.* E30.3). See *infra*.

<sup>35</sup> The spelling of /e/ in ΙΗΡΟΝ is similar to Αh(ε)οvρῆς in a Corinthian vase, written ΑΗΟΝΤΕΜ (*NAGVI* 66h).

stem on the island (see fn. 13). It seems that the boundary marker of the sanctuary of Peitho is written in an alphabet (perhaps also a dialect) alien to the local uses (see Lejeune 1949, 11, fn. 4; *LSAG*<sup>2</sup>, 301; García Ramón 1992, 200–201, fn. 98). Similar confusions of <H> and <E> are attested in Attic epigraphy of the late 5<sup>th</sup> and early 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC (see Threatte 1980, 159–162).

Coming now to ΕΠΩΗΕΣΕ, no Parian example supports the historical development <HE> = /hε:/ > <HE> = /ε:/ and similar redundant spellings of /ε:/ in other psilotic areas are wanting. I believe that ΕΠΩΗΕΣΕ is simply a stone-cutter's mistake (ἐπώη{ε}σε), probably triggered by his hesitations about the use of <H> as a vowel (see Lejeune 1949, 11–12). Significantly, the text also exhibits [Θ]ΡΑΣΥΚΛΗΩΣ (l. 1), instead of the expected Thasian form Θρασυκλέως, and μέτῆρ (l. 2).

Some 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC documents exhibit compound verbs with an aspirate stop in the preverb due to initial aspiration:

καθελεῖν (*IG XII 8*, 264, early 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC), cf. also καθάπερ.<sup>36</sup>

[ἀ]φρηγεύμενοι, ἀφρηγίσθω (*SEG 38*, 851 + *IG XII 8*, 262.A.10 and 14, ca. 390 BC, decree)

ἀφίκωνται (*SEG 57*, 820.A.17, 360–350 BC, decree)

No compound verbs are attested in early inscriptions. Arguably, the above forms had become agglutinated at an early date prior to /h/-loss.<sup>37</sup> This phenomenon is attested in 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC inscriptions in psilotic areas in Anatolia. Moreover, the influence of the Attic dialect becomes more important in 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC documents, and Attic features are pervasive in certain texts (e.g. *SEG 57*, 820).<sup>38</sup> Therefore, the inference made by Knitl (1938, 55) that the compound forms are the local dialectal forms, whereas κατάπερ, etc., is influenced by Ionic, is unfounded.

The linguistic situation in the Thasian settlements on the Thracian coast to the east of the mouth of the river Nestos is fundamental for the assessment of the

<sup>36</sup> A Parian version may be at the base of this text, similar to the accord between the Thasians and Neapolitans recorded in Paros (*IG XII 5*, 109; see Pouilloux 1954, 178–192).

<sup>37</sup> In *SEG 38*, 851 + *IG XII 8*, 262 (ca. 390 BC), which records the result of an arbitration of Akanthos, the influence of an Akanthian original text is also possible. In both Akanthos, a colony of Andros, and Andros aspiration is attested: Τίμυλλος καλὸς ἡὸς τόδε τὸ πρόσοπον (Akanthos, Attic or Chalcidean alphabet; *BÉ* 1988, 531); ηελέσθῶ (*CID* 1.7.B.6, Delphi < Andros, ca. 450 BC); ηεορτή (*SEG 59*, 932, ca. 450–400 BC, but see Matthaiou (2013, 83), who reads ἡ έορτή, with Ionic alphabet). For the aspiration in Akanthos see Panayotou (1990, 224 and 1991, 128–129). According to Ph. Gauthier (*BÉ* 1990, no. 384), *SEG 38*, 851 + *IG XII 8*, 262 could be a Parian document. The form ἐφ' ὧι, quoted by Knitl (1938, 54), is a ghost (cf. Dunant & Pouilloux 1958, 413, fn. 2).

<sup>38</sup> For instance, ἐχφορά (A.2), dat. pl. -αις (ἡμέραις A.4, ταῖς θωαῖς A.7, etc.).

chronology of the initial /h/-loss. <H> is not found in documents written in the Parian-Thasian alphabet:

ῶρωσ (Cumont 1898, no. 1, Galepsos, 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC [PTA]).<sup>39</sup>

ὑστέρηι (SEG 51, 797.4–5, Berge, ca. 470–460 BC [PTA]).<sup>40</sup>

Other documents are written in the Ionic alphabet and are consequently irrelevant for this investigation since they exhibit no cases of word-juncture where psilosis may be detected.<sup>41</sup> However, in three or four boundary markers from the sanctuary of Demeter near Galepsos, dated to the second half of the 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC, both <H> = /h/ and psilosis in word-juncture occur: Δήμητρως ἠώρωσ εἰμί τῶκατωνπέδω (SEG 43, 400, ca. 550–500 BC [PTA]).<sup>42</sup> Psilosis of the numeral ἑκατόν is in all probability analogical of ὀγδώκοντα, ἐνενήκοντα. I have pointed before (see § 2) to a similar phenomenon in a 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC Parian document: καὶ ἐβδω[μη]ρωντώτης ‘and 70’ (IG XII 5, 252.2–3, ca. 550 BC? [PTA]).

Since the boundary markers of Galepsos exhibiting ἠώρωσ are dated to ca. 550–500 BC, the initial aspiration may indicate that psilosis only expanded in the area of Thasos and the Thracian settlements after that date.<sup>43</sup> Another piece of evidence confirms this hypothesis. An early epitaph written in the Parian-Thasian alphabet and found in Abdera, dated by the editors to ca. 550 BC, exhibits ῶ ‘the’ (masc. sg.) and ΗΤΑΙΠΟΙ = h(ε)ταίρωι ‘friend’ (dat.) (*I.Thrac.Aeg.* E30.3). According to the editors, the monument was most likely set up by a Thasian for a friend who died outside his fatherland.<sup>44</sup> The form ΗΤΑΙΠΟΙ = h(ε)ταίρωι mirrors some

**39** See Collart (1937, 79, fn. 74). Another boundary stone, written in the Ionic alphabet, attributed to Galepsos attests to the epithet of Zeus Ἐρκείο (see Perdrizet 1894, 440, Galepsos, late 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC; cf. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 991).

**40** Cf. Bonias (2000) and Matthaïou (2000–2003). According to Zannis (2014, 441, fn. 230), Time-sikrates, the receiver of the land, is of Thasian origin.

**41** Ἐρκείο (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 991, Galepsos, 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC). The 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC regulations concerning Pistiros issued by a successor to the Thracian king Kotys I (*IGBulg.* V, 5557<sup>ter</sup>, XLIII–XLIV) are written in Ionic (e. g. φρουρήμ, l. 13). It is attested in the following compounds: ἀφαρεῖ[σθ]αί (ll. 11–12), ἀφαρῆσμαι (ll. 28, 34). Pistiros was probably an *emporion* of Thasos, but merchants from Maroneia and Apollonia Pontica also established themselves there (see Veligiani-Terzi 2004, 313–324).

**42** See *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> (370, no. 479), Trippé (2014, 276, fig. 276), Zannis (2014, 363, with previous bibliography). Two of the stones are now exhibited in the museum of *Kavala*. I thank María Luisa del Barrio Vega for this information.

**43** The Thasians established a colony at Galepsos not earlier than the late 7<sup>th</sup> c. BC; they probably occupied an older Thracian settlement (Isaac 1986, 9; Berranger 1992, 169–170; Loukopoulou 2004; Zannis 2014, 244–245). A certain Parian influence in Galepsos is attested through its coinage, which shows a goat on their obverse (Psoma 2003, 239; Psoma 2006, 78; Zannis 2014, 363).

**44** As it happens, another Thasian *emporion*, Stryme, was established by Thasos in the 7<sup>th</sup> c. or early 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC to the east of Abdera. According to Isaac (1986, 79–80) Thasos tried to establish

examples in the Cycladic islands where <H> stands for /he/ or /hε:/.<sup>45</sup> If the date is correct, the document may attest to an ongoing lenition of the initial /h/, which naturally started affecting only grammatical words.<sup>46</sup> Interestingly, the Parian presence some kilometers away to the north-west of Galepsos is confirmed by a funerary epigram: μνήμ' ἀρετῆς ἔθεσαν Πάριωι Τόκεο ἠ[ώ]νεκεν 'the Parians set up a memorial of Tokes on account of his virtue' (CEG 155, 476 BC [PTA]).<sup>47</sup> The use of <H> in Tokes' epigram for initial aspiration contrasts with the Thasian contemporary documents of the first half of the 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC (see *supra*).

According to Del Barrio Vega (2015a, 160), psilosis in the Thasian documents could be due to the influence of Eastern Aeolic. Additionally, all the divergent isoglosses that separate Paros from Thasos (Thasian ἰρ-, <εο> for <ευ> and <αο> for <αν>, ἦμυσο, PN in Νοσσ-, see § 1) are also fairly common in Eastern Ionic, and the oriental cultural influence on Thasos was strong (Zannis 2014, 243). Psilosis may also have been a feature of some Eastern Ionian and Aeolian colonial settlements on the Thracian coast.<sup>48</sup>

## 4 Archilochus' text and psilosis

Word initial aspiration occurs in cases of word-juncture in the transmitted iambic and elegiac verses of Archilochus. We have examples in early papyri dating to the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC and in a verse transmitted in the so-called 'Mnesiepes inscription', also dated to the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC:

---

settlers in the Phoenician site of Abdera between the Clazomenian and Teian colonizations (ca. 654 and ca. 545 BC respectively), but this hypothesis is rejected by Graham (1992, 48).

**45** See Lejeune (1949).

**46** Another linguistic feature, the gen. Πρωτίω = Πρωτίο or Πρωτίῳ, excludes the possibility of attributing *I.Thrac.Aeg.* E30 to a Parian expatriate, since -εο for -εω in the masculine  $\bar{a}$ -stems is never attested in Paros (see *infra*).

**47** The date given here is based on Hansen's historical interpretation of the epigram (*ad CEG* 155). According to Hansen, Tokes fell in 476 BC during the siege of Eion, when the city was defended against the Athenian fleet by its Persian governor Boges (Hdt. 7.107). Parians remained loyal to the Persian invader until after the battle of Salamis, when they became part of the Delian League (Berranger 1992, 316–318). The contingent of Parians that honored Tokes came to help Boges defend Eion in 476 BC. Other scholars set the historical frame of the inscription to ca. 520–490 BC (see Lazaridis 1976 and Loukopoulou 2004, 860).

**48** Myrkinos (Milesian colony), Abdera (colonized first by Clazomenae and eventually by Teos), Dikaea (perhaps a Samian colony), Maroneia (colonized by Chios), and Ainos (a Alopekonne-sian, Mytilenaeon and Kymaeon colony).

τόθ' ἤδε 'then this' (220 W., from *P.Hib.* 2.173 [Brit.Lib. inv. 2946], 270–240 BC)  
 ὑφώμεθα 'let us lower' (106.2 W., from *P. Lit. Lond.* 54 [Brit.Lib. inv. 2652A], 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC)<sup>49</sup>  
 ῥήμαθ' ὅς 'words who' (89.18 W., from *SEG* 15, 517.B<sub>1</sub>.32, Paros, ca. 250 BC)

Initial aspiration is also attested in late Egyptian papyri containing some Archilochus verses, and is also documented in citations of medieval manuscripts:

[δέ]δοιχ' ὅπως 'I am afraid that' (196a.39 W., from *PKöln.* 2.58, ll. 1–35, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD), ἐφρηψάμην 'I touched' (l. 48), ἀφήκα 'I left' (l. 52)  
 [οὔκε]θ' ὁμῶς 'no longer' (188.1 W., from *PKöln.* 2.58, ll. 36–40; 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD), καταρρεῖ 'take down' (l. 2), ἀφ' ἱμερτοῦ 'from the face' (l. 3)  
 ἐφ' ὑψηλῶι 'on the lofty' (175.4 W., from *POxy.* 2315, 3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD)  
 ἐτράπεθ', αἱματόεν 'turned upon, a bloody' (16.8 Nicolosi, from *Stob.* 4.56.30)  
 ἄφελκε 'pull over' (2sg. act. pres. imp.) (10.7 Nicolosi, from *Ath.* 483d)  
 ἐφέπων 'by pursuit' (13.2 Nicolosi, from *Plut. quomodo aud. poet.* 33b)  
 ἔθ' ὑμέων 'still of you' (122.6 W., from *Stob.* 4.46.10)  
 φίλταθ' ἐταίρων 'the dearest of my companions' (168.3 W., from *Heph.* 15.6)  
 ἐφ' ἥπατι 'in your liver' (234 W., from *Ath.* 107F)  
 ἐφίμερος 'desirable' (masc.-fem.) (22.1 W., from *Ath.* 523d)  
 κάθηται 'sit' (3sg. pres.) (176.3 W., from *Attic.*, fr. 2 des Places)

However, there are some exceptions to this general picture. Let us begin with the following two:

ἐπ' ἡμέρην ἄγη 'the day the (Zeus) brings on' (131 W.): ἐφ' ἡμέρην (*Stob.*, 1.1.18, *Theon Prog.*, 1.153) vs. ἐπ' ἡμέρην (*Diog. Laert.* 9.71)  
 ὅτεύνεκεν 'for that' (*Iamb. adesp.* 38.12 W., from *POxy.* 2317); attributed to Archilochus (see Lennartz 2000).

The initial aspiration of ἡμέρη 'day' is a secondary phenomenon.<sup>50</sup> We can safely assume that the text of Diogenes Laertius preserves the archaism, whereas *Stobaeus* and *Theon* have introduced an Atticism.<sup>51</sup> The combination ὅτεύνεκεν may preserve the original pronunciation of this word (*Hom.* τούνεκα vs. *Att.*

<sup>49</sup> The verb is alternatively interpreted as ὑφάω 'weave' by Tarditi in his index. However, this fragment belongs in all probability with fr. 105 W, where the general meaning of the phrase is reproduced by the context of the citation τὴν κεραίαν ὑφίησι 'he lowers the yard' (*Plut.*, *Mor.* 169b).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. also ἀλιτήμερα 'premature' (neut. pl.) (*Archil.* 196a.39 W., from *PKöln.* 2.58, ll. 1–35, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD).

<sup>51</sup> Aspiration is normative in documents after ca. 450 BC (*Threatte* 1980, 500).

όθούνεκα), since the initial aspiration in ἔνεκα is secondary (García Ramón 2007, 83–86).

Plutarch's manuscripts transmit the form καθουανεῖ 'will make dry up' in an Archilochean passage (1071 W.), which was imitated by Lycophron in his verse νέκυν / δελφίνος ἀκτίς Σειρίου καθουανεῖ 'the dolphin's dead body the rays of Sirius shall wither' (*Alex.* 396–397). Some of the manuscripts of the Alexandrian poet exhibit a psilotic form καταουανεῖ,<sup>52</sup> and Lycophron may have read a psilotic form in the text of Archilochus which he actually knew. The initial aspiration on the verb αὐαίνω 'dry' (cf. Att. ἀφουαίνω 'dry up') is disputed, however, and may be also secondary.<sup>53</sup>

The tradition is not unanimous in the following cases:

Γλαῦχ', ὄρα 'Look, Glaucus!' (105.1 W.): Γλαῦχ' (Heraclit. 5.3; Syrian., in *Hermog.* 2.349.9) vs. Γλαῦκ' Theophr. *Sign.* 3.8 (v.l. in *Marc.* IV.58, 13<sup>th</sup> c. AD), Γλαυκε ορα (Plut. *Mor.* 169b)  
 θήτέρη 'in the other (sc. hand)' (184.2 W.): τῆ ἐτέρη (Plut. *Mor.* 959e), τῆ δ' ἐτέρη (Plut. *Dem.* 35.6, *Mor.* 1070a)

It could be argued that the different versions of these texts descended from an older psilotic text with non-aspirated stops.

Be it as it may, the transmitted text is unequivocally psilotic in two cases:

ἐπ' ἦβης 'in my youth' (190 W., from Heph. 15.8)  
 ἐπ' ἡσυχίης 'at leisure' (196a.16 W., from *PKöln.* 2.58; see *supra* for other examples of non-psilotic forms in the same papyrus).<sup>54</sup>

52 καθουανεῖ in A (*Marcianus gr.* 475, 11<sup>th</sup> c.) and B (*Parisinus Coislinianus* 345, 10<sup>th</sup> c.) vs. καταουανεῖ in Scheer's second family of mss., i. e. E (*Palatinus gr. Heidelbergensis* 18, 14<sup>th</sup> c.), C (*Parisinus gr.* 2723, 13<sup>th</sup> c.), D (*Parisinus gr.* 2403, 13<sup>th</sup> c.) and Tzetzes, who used a ms. that belongs to the second family.

53 From \*saus-, according to Peters (1980, 11), or from \*h<sub>2</sub>sus-o-/\*h<sub>2</sub>esu, according to Lubotsky (1985) and accepted by *LIV*<sup>2</sup>, s. v. *h<sub>2</sub>seus*-.

54 Casadio (1996, 33–34 and 96) argues that Archil. 302 W., normally considered among the *dubia*, may belong to the poet. He considers that in the transmitted text of Ael., *V.H.* 4.14, (χρήματα) εἰς πόρνης γυναικὸς ἔντερον καταίρουσι '(the money) finishes up in the intestines of a prostitute woman', we could read κατατρέουσι or κατατρεῦσι (= Att. καθαροῦσι). The closest parallel of the text is found in a verse ascribed to Alcaeus (117b.26–27 L.-P.): πόρνη δ' ὅ κέ τις δίδ[ω] ἴσα κά[ρ] πολιᾶς κύμ' ἄλ[ο]ς ἐσβ[ά]λῃ 'what one gives to a prostitute might as well be thrown into the waves of the grey sea'. The expression καθαρέουσι χρήματα εἰς ἔντερον 'they take down [the money] into the belly of a prostitute' seems awkward in Greek. Alcaeus' fragment is attributed to Sappho by Liberman (1999, vol. I, LXXXVII-XCI), *contra* Lentini (1999, 20–26; 2007).

Most scholars dismiss all examples of psilosis in Archilochus' poetry as hyper-Ionicisms made by late copyists (Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1884, 318; Hoffmann 1898, 549; Merkelbach & West 1974, 98; West 1974, 89; Bremer *et al.* 1987, 3).<sup>55</sup> This hypothesis is based on the fact that archaic texts have been heavily modified by the transmission process.<sup>56</sup> But, in my opinion, the rationale for the introduction of an East Ionic feature is lacking.

It has been claimed that Archil. 131.2 W. ὀκοῖν ‘what sort’ (fem. acc.) (or ὀκοῖον), transmitted by almost all sources (see West 1989–1992, vol. I, *ad loc.*), and dat. ὀκοῖοις in 132 W. (from [Ps.-]Plat., *Erx.* 397e) “may be attributed to dialect-conscious scribes” who introduced East Ionic features in Archilochus' text (West 1974, 90). Other connected forms exhibit systematically a labial consonant: πῶ ‘up to this time’ (19.2 W.), ποτ’ ‘then’ (23.18 W.), πῆι ‘somehow’ (88 W. < πᾶι), πού ‘somewhere’ (127 W.), ποῖον ‘which one (neut.)’ (172.1 W.), πῶς ‘how’ (237 W.). Thasian and Parian documents only attest to ὀπ-. But Archilochus may have preserved the original distribution of the phonological development of the voiceless labiovelar stop, i. e. a velar outcome between two /o/ vowels (ὀκοῖος)<sup>57</sup> and a labial in initial position and before other non-front vowels (Archil. ὅπαι > ὅπηι ‘wherever’, fr. 29.7 W., from *POxy.* 2310 fr. 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD). Eventually ὀκ- was replaced by ὀπ- on the analogy of the forms with initial labial stop (see Wackernagel 1916, 35, fn. 1; Hawkins 2013, 64–65 with further references).<sup>58</sup> If we accept this interpretation,<sup>59</sup> [ὀ]πῶς and ὅπῶς in Archil. 196a.33 and .39 W. (from *PKöln.* 2.58, 2<sup>nd</sup>

55 As far as I can tell, no one has proposed the hypothesis that a *scriptio* (or *scriptura*) *plena* that overlooked the elision required by the meter (i. e. \*ἐπὶ ἥβης, \*ἐπὶ ἡσυχίης) may account for these readings. For the concept of *scriptio plena* see Threatte (1977, 171–174) and Devine & Stephens (1994, 263–264).

56 For instance, in the elegies of Euenos of Paros, who probably lived in the 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC, non-Ionic forms have been introduced: δοκοῦντ’ ἔστω ‘Let the opinions’ (1.4 W., from Ath. 367d–e) instead of δοκέοντα or δοκεῦντα, ῥάσσης and διδασκαλίας (*ibid.* 6) instead of ῥήσσης ‘easiest’ (fem. gen.) and διδασκαλίης ‘teaching’ (gen.).

57 The development is post-Mycenaean: see Myc. *a-to-po-go* /*artopok<sup>w</sup>os*/ (PY An 39.11+), but with metathesis \**artopok<sup>w</sup>os* > \**artok<sup>w</sup>opos* > ἄρτοκόπος ‘baker’. An assimilation ἄρτοκόπος > ἄρτοπόπος is attested in Attic (Phryn. 193 F.). Cf. also θεοκόλος ‘servant of a god’ vs. αἰπόλος ‘goatherd’, ἀμφίπολος ‘attendant’. According to Peters (1990, 605), Hdt. ὀποδαπός ‘of what country’ instead of ὀκοδαπός shows that the rule only applies when either of the two /o/ bears the accent.

58 In East Ionic, the analogy was the opposite and the velar stop was extended.

59 Similarly, the relative ὄτεῖος (Gortyn, 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC) and the unattested \*ὄτῆ have been replaced by ὀπέιος (Gortyn, 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC) and ὀπῆ (Gortyn, 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC) on the analogy of the simple forms of the indefinite/interrogative (πῶ, ποί, etc.) and other relative adverbs (ὅπαι, etc.). Note that \*-*k<sup>w</sup>u-* may undergo delabialization in Mycenaean: \**pres-g<sup>w</sup>h<sub>2</sub>-* > *pe-re-ku-ta* /*presgūtās*/ ‘old man’ (PY An 172.2), \**g<sup>w</sup>(e)nah<sub>2</sub>-* > *ku-na-ki-si* /*gunaiksi*/ ‘women’ (dat.) (TH Av 100.2), cf. Att-



c. AD) may have been introduced in later phases of the transmission of the compositions, when this analogy had ousted all forms with *όκο-*. Similarly, the manuscripts of Sextus Empiricus (*M.* 7.127) present *όποίην* in the version of 131.2 W., in contradiction to the ample evidence of the remaining sources. All in all, *όκοϊος* does not support the hypothesis that psilosis may have been triggered by a late *interpretatio Ionica* of Archilochus.

Arguably, in editing Archilochus' text the Alexandrian scholars relied on various sources. One of these sources may have been a Thasian *έκδοσις* or *διόρθωσις*, which naturally exhibited the local feature of psilosis which is found in local documents (see § 3).<sup>60</sup>

## 5 The genitive *-εος* of masculine *ā*-stems in Archilochus and Thasos

In order to test my hypothesis, i. e. that psilosis may have been present in a current text of Archilochus in Thasos, I should expect other Thasian characteristics to be found in the transmitted text of Archilochus.

The name of Lycambes appears in the genitive in the verse *οἴην Λυκάμβεος παῖδα τήν ὑπερτέρην* 'only the superior daughter of Lycambes' (Archil., 38 W.). The line is only transmitted by a scholion to the *Iliad* (Sch. *Il.* A, 11.786), which quoted in all probability Aristonicus' *Περὶ σημείων Ἰλιάδος καὶ Ὀδυσσεΐας* (1<sup>st</sup> c. AD) (see Friedländer 1853, 203). However, the eminent British scholar Peter Elmsley (*apud* Gaisford 1823, vol. III, 129, fr. cxxix), emended the transmitted form into *Λυκάμβεω*.<sup>61</sup> This was subsequently accepted by most modern editors (see Bergk 1882, fr. 28; Edmonds 1931, fr. 28; Diehl 1952, fr. 24; Lasserre & Bonnard 1958, fr. 202; Rodríguez Adrados 1959, fr. 56; Tarditi 1968, fr. 24; West 1989–1992, vol. I, fr. 38).

---

Ion. *γυνή*. However, analogy has reintroduced a labial in Arg. *λόπι*, Cret. *όπι*, Syrac. *πύς* 'whither'.

**60** According to Hauvette-Besnault's view (1905, 120), Archilochus himself adopted different pronunciations in his compositions. If I understand him correctly, psilosis may have developed as early as Archilochus and his fellow colonizers coming to Thasos (ca. 650 BC). However, as I have shown above, the /h/-loss in Thasian is not attested for the first time before the second half of the 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC, and the evidence for a similar development in Paros is flimsy.

**61** The scholion also has *αρχιλογον*, for *Ἀρχίλοχον* 'Archilochus' (acc.). Liebel (1812, 90; cf. also his second edition in 1818, 87–89) strangely printed *Λυκάμβεω*, as if this were the reading of the scholion. But his source, the edition of the scholia by Villoison (1788, 289), has *Λυκάμβεος*.

As it happens, no other example of -εος in the genitive of masculine  $\bar{a}$ -stems occurs in the text of Archilochus, either preserved in citations or found in papyri:

- Ἄρθμιάδew 'Arthmiades' (gen.) (29.2 W., from *POxy.* 2310 fr. 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD)  
 [Δω]τάδew 'Dotades' (gen.) (57.7 W., from *POxy.* 2312 fr. 5(1), 2<sup>nd</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD)  
 [Δωτ]άδew 'id' (151.3 W., from *POxy.* 2313 fr. 17, 1<sup>st</sup> – 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD)  
 Γύγεω 'Gyges' (gen.) (19.1 W., from Plut., *Mor.* 470bc)  
 Σελλήϊδew 'Selleides' (gen.) (183 W., from Hsch. σ 391 Hansen)  
 Λεπτίνew 'Leptines' (gen.) (131.1 W., from Stob. 1.1.18 etc.)

Elmsley's correction, however, has not gained universal approval. A notable exception in 19<sup>th</sup> c. editions is Schneidewin (1839, 178, fr. 24), but it was Fick (1886, 270) who first drew attention to the fact that the gen. ending -εος in masculine  $\bar{a}$ -stems is attested in Thasian inscriptions. Since the morphological phenomenon is found in various Ionic-speaking regions, he believed that this could have been a feature of the dialect of Archilochus. Fick's hypothesis was notably endorsed by Smyth (1894, 419), Hoffmann (1898, 215–216, 333) and Bechtel (1924, 31 and 55).

However, the ending -εος instead of -εω is never attested in Parian documents, as shown by the following list:

- Κριτωνίδew 'Kritonides' (gen.) (*CEG* 413, 525–500 BC? [PTA])  
 Τόκεω 'Tokes' (gen.) (*CEG* 155, ca. 476 BC [PTA])  
 Καταβάτew '(Zeus) Kataibates' (gen.) (Papadopoulos 2013, no. 4, Paros, boundary marker, ca. 450–400 BC).  
 Ἄλεκτορίδew 'Alektorides' (gen.) (*ID* 53, Delos, metrical dedication, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC)  
 Ἄμφηρίδew 'Ampherides' (gen.) (*IG XII Suppl.*, 221, epitaph, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC)  
 Καταβάτew '(Zeus) Kataibates' (gen.) (*IG XII* 5, 233, 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC – 1<sup>st</sup> c. AD).<sup>62</sup>

Significantly, the genitive Λυκάμβewος correlates with the Thasian evidence. In the archaic documents, the expected form, i. e. -εω, occurs, e. g. Λεπτίνew 'Leptines' (gen.), Βρέντew 'Brentes' (gen.) (*SEG* 14, 565, Thasos, epitaph, late 7<sup>th</sup> c. BC [PTA]). From ca. 380 BC -εος is commonly attested in competition with -εω (see Pouilloux 1954, 453–454). Around the 360s BC the city decided to transcribe the list of the

<sup>62</sup> Hiller's reconstruction Μεγακλείδ[ης] | Μεγακλείδ[εως] 'Megakleides, son of Megakleides' (*IG XII* 5, 212, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC) is tacitly based on the genitives Πλεισθένης 'Pleisthenes, son of Onamakeides' (Pouilloux 1954, 262, col. 5.24) and Εὐακλίδης 'Euakleides, son of Amphikleides' (Pouilloux 1954, 262, col. 7.52) found on the Thasian list of officials known to him. However, the form Τρεφέλεωσ (l. 3) shows that in all probability the list only contained personal names in nominative. The two Μεγακλείδης forms may have been differentiated by an addition of some sort (see Rubensohn 1962, 53–54, no. 2).

*theoroi* and archons in the walls of three or four different buildings, year after year starting in ca. 650 BC (see now Hamon 2015-2016, 70-91). The names of the magistrates of the early centuries rarely attest to the phenomenon:

Ἀθηνάδεος ‘Athenades’ (gen.) (Pouilloux 1954, 269, no. 31.11; archon, ca. 550–530 BC).  
Φρασηρίδευς ‘Phrasierides’ (gen.) (Salviat 1979b, 116, col. 4.16; theoros, ca. 450 BC).

In the 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC one and the same person is attested with both forms of the genitive:

Φίλισκος Ἀριστοληΐδew (Pouilloux 1954, 262, col. 6.28, copy of the passage of the *Theoroi*, ca. 390–360 BC), Φίλισκος Ἀριστοληΐδew *IG XII 8*, 271–272.B.18 (small list of *theoroi*), and Φίλισκος Ἀριστολεΐδew (Dunant & Pouilloux 1958, 228, no. 404.2, ca. 390–360 BC) ‘Philiskos, son of Aristoleides’  
Δημοσῶν Πυθαγόρευς (Pouilloux 1954, 262, col. 6.24, ca. 390–360 BC) vs. Δημοσῶν Πυθαγόρῳ (*IG XII 8*, 271–272.B.14) ‘Demoson, son of Pythagores’

After ca. 360 BC Thasians continued to add systematically the names of the incumbent officials. The genitive -εος in masculine  $\bar{a}$ -stems is used frequently in the same lists and in other catalogues as well:

Λυσαγόρευς ‘Lysagores’ (gen.) (Pouilloux 1954, 262, col. 7.8, 360–330 BC)  
Ἀθηνάδεος ‘Athenades’ (gen.) (Pouilloux 1954, 235, no. 25.3, late 4<sup>th</sup> BC) vs. Κλεοδημίδew (*ib.*2)  
Φρασηρίδευς ‘Phrasierides’ (gen.) (Grandjean 2012–2013, no. 5.23, late 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC)  
Ἀθηναγόρευς ‘Athenagores’ (gen.) (*IG XII Suppl.*, 486, corrected by J. Pouilloux, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC)<sup>63</sup>

**63** The divergence between Thasos, with -εος for -εω in masculine  $\bar{a}$ -stems, and Paros, with no examples, is mirrored by Euboea and the Ionic-speaking colonies in Chalkidike, where settlers from Eretria and Chalkis established several cities. With the exception of the isolated case in an Eretrian epitaph Λυκίδew[ς] (*IG XII Suppl.*, 617), the genitive -εος in the masculine  $\bar{a}$ -stems is otherwise unattested in the island, but it occurs frequently in numerous Ionic-speaking areas of Chalkidike: Εὐβουλίδew (Game 2009, no. 13.8, Olynthos, late 5<sup>th</sup> – early 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC) vs. Εὐβουλίδew ‘Euboulides’ (gen.) (Game 2009, no. 21.3–4, Olynthos, ca. 350 BC), Κλε[οβουλίδ]εος ‘Kleoboulides’ (gen.) (Game 2009, no. 13.14–15), Καλλιπιδew ‘Kallipides’ (gen.) (Game 2009, no. 38bis.2, Aphytis, 351 BC) Ἀντιπατρίδew ‘Antipatrides’ (gen.) (Game 2009, no. 38bis.20), Ταυριάδew ‘Tauriades’ (gen.) (Game 2009, no. 37.4–5, Spartolos, ca. 353 BC), [---]ρωνίδew (Game 2009, no. 26.5, Olynthos, ca. 375–350 BC), ἐπιστάτew ‘overseer’ (gen.) (Game 2009, no. 30.11, Stolos, ca. 350 BC), Ἡρακλεΐδew ‘Herakleides’ (gen.) (*SEG* 58, 662, area of *Vasilika*, 351–350 BC). I cannot find any safe examples of the genitive -εος in the masculine  $\bar{a}$ -stems in other Ionic-speaking Cycladic islands. Violeta Gomis García has kindly pointed out to me a fragmentary proxeny decree from Karthaea in Keos (*IG XII 5*, 542, ca. 400–350 BC), which exhibits [Π]ύθων Ἡρακλεΐδew[ς] (l. 23) instead of Ionic Ἡρακλεΐδew (see now Gomis García forthcoming). But the form is problematic. On the one hand, according to some scholars, this Python was a member of the family of Python

The opposite phenomenon, -εω instead of -εος/-εως for the genitive of *s*-stems, is also attested in these lists as well as in other documents:

Τηλεφάνεω 'Telephanes' (gen.) (Salviat 1979b, 116, col. 1.3; inscription of ca. 360 BC; theoros, ca. 510 BC)

[Δ]ημάκω 'Demalkes' (gen.) (*IG XII Suppl.*, 369.3, Thasos, ca. 390–360 BC)<sup>64</sup>

Εύθυκλέω 'Euthykles' (gen.) (Pouilloux 1954, 278, no. 35, col. 2.10, Thasos, ca. 315–285 BC)

To my knowledge, this second analogical phenomenon is not documented in Parian inscriptions either:

Ἀψέφωρος 'Arsephes' (gen.) (Papadopoulos 2015, no. 1, Paros, ca. 450 BC [PTA])

Κλεσοθένεος 'Kleosthenes' (gen.) (Papadopoulos 2015, no. 2, Paros, late 5<sup>th</sup> – early 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC)

Τελεσικλέος 'Telesikles' (gen.) (*CEG* 674.1, Paros, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC; father of Archilochus!)

Εύάρεος 'Euares' (gen.) (*IG XII* 5, 401, Paros, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC)

Εύάνθεος 'Euanthes' (gen.) (*CEG* 843, Paros, 4<sup>th</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC)<sup>65</sup>

Interestingly, another analogical phenomenon affected sporadically the genitive of masculine *ā*-stems and *s*-stems in Thasos. An early epitaph found in Abdera written in the Parian-Thasian alphabet (mentioned above) attests to the genitive Προτίω (*I.Thrac.Aeg.* E30.2, ca. 550 BC [PTA]).<sup>66</sup> Arguably, Προτίω exhibits the ending -εο, with vowel drop (cf. \*ἀποαίρεο > Hom. ἀποαίρεο 'take away' (2sg. mid. pres. imp.)), i. e. Πρωτίο, or perhaps contraction after a vowel, i. e.

---

and Herakleidas, two brothers from Ainos mentioned by ancient sources (e. g. Arist., *Pol.* 1311b; see Koehler 1884, 277; Bechtel, 1887, 49, no. 49; Hiller von Gaertringen *ad IG XII* 5, 542). However, Ainos was founded by Alopekonesians, Mytilenaeans and Kymaeans, all of them of Aeolian origin, but the gen. -ίδεος does not occur in the Eastern Aeolic dialect. More importantly, according to Mack (2013, 330; 2015, 321–323), the Python mentioned in l. 23, cannot be a citizen from Ainos, because all men appearing in ll. 11–24 of the decree are from eastern Peloponnese cities. On the other hand, the document quite unexpectedly exhibits a non-Ionic genitive -α in the patronyms of two citizens from Euboea: [ὁ δεῖνα ----]ίδα Ἐρετριεύς (l. 8) and in [ὁ δεῖνα Θ]ρασειά Χαλκ[ιδεύς] (l. 10; this is Mack's (2013 and 2015) reconstruction of the line; previous editors have Χαλκ[ηδότιος]). One cannot exclude Ἡρακλείδεν, but -εο/-εω for -εω (see *infra* for this ending) is never attested on Keian inscriptions.

<sup>64</sup> For this reading see Pouilloux (1954, 454, fn. 1). Hiller has [Δ]ημάκω[ς], following the *editor princeps*, who however was skeptical (Daux 1928, 54, fn. 2).

<sup>65</sup> The phenomenon is attested in Euboea in an Eretrian catalogue of the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC, e. g. Θεοκλέω 'Theokles' (gen.) (*IG XII* 9, 249.B.186; see now Del Barrio Vega 2015b, 99), and it also occurs in the Ionic-speaking colonies of Chalkidike, e. g. [Μ]ενεκλέω 'Menekles' (gen.) (Game 2009, no. 35.3, 351 BC). As far as I know, it never occurs in any of the other Ionian Cycladic islands.

<sup>66</sup> Laurent Dubois (*BÉ* 2005, no. 2) reads Προτιο, i. e. Πρωτίω, but the final *omega* is clear to me.

Πρωτίδῳ. The ending -εο is attested in other Ionic-speaking areas, but never in Parian inscriptions.<sup>67</sup> Crucially, the phenomenon is documented also in two later Thasian epitaphs:

Λεωνίδεω ‘Leonides’ (gen.) (SEG 31, 782, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC)  
 Σοκράτεω (sic!) ‘Sokrates’ (gen.) (Pouilloux 1954, 313, no. 108, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC; for the reading -εω instead of -εως see Sève 1981, 187, fn. 6).<sup>68</sup>

## 6 Thasos and Archilochus

Although we have no record of it, the text of Archilochus may have been preserved in Thasos for several reasons. Born in Paros in the 7<sup>th</sup> c. BC, Archilochus had an active role in the foundation of Thasos. He is frequently referred to as a Parian citizen in our sources. However, in a fragment of the *Archilochoi*, where Cratinus represents an *agon* between Homer and Archilochus, the latter is identified as ‘the sauce of Thasos’ (Pretagostini 1982):

εἶδες τὴν Θασίαν ἄλμην οἷ ἄττα βαύζει  
 ‘Did you see the Thasian sauce, what things he is shouting?’ (Cratin. 6.1 K.-A.)

**67** Μασσαλήτεω ‘Massalian’ (gen.) (Schwyzer *DGE*, no. 705, Delphi < Massalia; early 5<sup>th</sup> BC), [ἄρ] χηγέτεω ‘leader’ (gen.) (*IEryth*. 151.36, ca. 340 BC), Γλαυκίω ‘Glaukos’ (gen.) (*I. Reggio Calabria* 26A, 450–420 BC, Rhegion, cf. *IGDGG* 1.39a), Ἀριστομένεω ‘Aristomenes’ (gen.) (*IEryth*. 153.15, 5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> c. BC). See Stüber (1996, 66–67). The ending has been extended from the pronouns ἐμεο/ἐμεῦ, τέο/τεῦ, etc. (see Ruijgh 1998, 90).

**68** Another anomalous genitive, Φρασηρίδω ‘Phrasierides’ (gen.), i.e. Φρασηρίδο or Φρασηρίδω, instead of the expected Φρασηρίδεο, i.e. Φρασηρίδεω, occurs in an archaic dedicatory epigram composed in iambic trimeters (*CEG* 162, Thasos, 500–490 BC [PTA]; the word is attested at the end of the verse, where either a light or a heavy syllable may occur). The *omega* can be seen in the photograph published by Baker-Penoyre & Tod (1909, 96) and the reading has been confirmed by Launey (1934, 180, fn. 3) and by Pouilloux (1989, 195, fn. 5). To my mind, the ending of Φρασηρίδω can be accounted for as analogical of the type Πρωτίω = Πρωτίω or Πρωτίδῳ. A similar morphological phenomenon is attested in other Ionic dialects where -ω replaced -εω under the influence of -ίω and -έω (< \*-έεω) for which vowel dropping or contraction is regular: cf. Ἀριστίδω ‘Aristides’ (gen.) instead of Ἀριστίδεω (*IG* XII 6 2, 996, Samos, ca. 550 BC), Διαγόρῳ ‘Diagores’ (gen.) instead of Διαγόρεω (*IG* XII 6 2, 620, ca. 550 BC), Ποσειδεωνίω ‘Poseidonies’ (gen.) and Ξανθίῳ ‘Xanthies’ (gen.) in the same period (*IG* XII 6 2, 996); Eretrian Χαίροντίδω ‘Khairontides’ (gen.), Πρεσβύτῳ ‘Presbytes’ (gen.), Φιλωτάδῳ ‘Philotades’ (gen.), Αἰσχίνῳ ‘Aiskhines’ (gen.), all four in a catalog of the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC (see Del Barrio Vega 2015b, 99).

The text of Archilochus may have been preserved at Thasos in connection with the cult of some of the leaders of the colonization.<sup>69</sup> His father, Telesikles, participated in the colonization of Thasos (Steph. Byz. 303),<sup>70</sup> and Archilochus' companion Glaukos was worshiped in the 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC by the phratry of "the sons of Brentes" (Pouilloux 1955). It appears that this cult was still well alive in the Hellenistic period as shown by the integration of the monument in the agora (Pouilloux 1959; Blondé *et al.* 2008, 420).

Archilochus and his family were directly related to Thasian cults. Pausanias visited in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD the *Lesche* of the Knidians at Delphi (Paus. 10.28.3). He describes in full detail the 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC frescoes of Odysseus' trip to the underworld depicted by Polygnotus. The famous Thasian painter did not forget to include in his painting two important figures related to the Parian poet and the colonization of Thasos: his grandfather Tellis, and the priestess Kleoboea, who brought the mysteries of Demeter to Thasos. Interestingly, the cult of Demeter and Kore is attested in Thasos in the Thesmophorion *extra muros*, which is particularly associated with the foundation of the city and Archilochus' family (Rolley 1965, 465; Rolley 1990, 406).<sup>71</sup> The relation of the poet with the goddess is well known (Miralles 1981, 37; Miralles & Pòrtulas 1983, 72; Rotstein 2010, 181). A small fragment where Demeter and her daughter are cited is attributed to the poet (322 W., cf. Casadio 1996, 61–66) and it is said that Archilochus composed a hymn for Demeter in Paros (Berranger 1992, 188).<sup>72</sup>

Herakles was the most important divinity in Thasos. Alongside Dionysos, he was worshipped as 'protector of the city' (Bergquist 1973). Herakles was worshipped as Kallinikos in the 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC in Paros (*IG XII 5*, 234; see Berranger 1992, 191–192) and a fragmentary hymn attributed to Archilochus by some sources starts with the words τήνελλα καλλίνικε / χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεις 'Tenella gloriously triumphant, hail lord Heracles' (334 W.; cf. Casadio 1996, 67–72). This hymn may

**69** For the particular predicament of hero-cult and the festival of the feast known as Ἡροξείνια at Thasos (Sokolowski 2.69, 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC) see Salviat (1958, 258).

**70** It has been suggested that the sanctuary vaguely mentioned as παρὰ ἀρχηγέτην 'near the founder' by Hippocrates (*Epid.* 2.694) refers to a *temenos* for Telesicles, which is perhaps to be situated in a circular monument in the agora (see Fredrich 1908, 235; Pouilloux 1950, 337–341; Pouilloux 1954, 334–335 and 341). But see Clay (2004, 71–72) and Ornaghi (2009, 269, fn. 18) for some doubts.

**71** [Δ]ήμητρος [τῆς Ἐλε]υσίνης 'Demeter Eleusinian' (gen.) (Pouilloux 1954, 330, no. 125, 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC). See Salviat (1979a) for a more accurate restitution of the text and a discussion of this cult in the Thasian agora.

**72** δοκεῖ δὲ πρῶτος Ἀρχίλοχος ἐν Πάρῳ νικήσας <ἄσας> τὸν Δήμητρος ὕμνον τοῦτο (sc. τήνελλα) ἐπιφωνηκέναι 'It seems that Archilochus was the first who after a victory in Paros sung this hymn of Demeter and spoken that word (sc. *tenella*)' (Sch. Ar. Av. 1764).

have been associated to the Thasian cult, where some inscriptions attest to a similar cult of Herakles Kallinikos (Bergquist 1973, 29–30 and 35).<sup>73</sup>

The cult of Archilochus in Paros in the 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC and afterwards is well known (Clay 2004). It may go back to the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC, as shown perhaps by a famous relief from Paros that has been thought to represent the poet (Archaeological Museum of Paros, no. 758 M; Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 33, Pl. 3–4). The similarity between the mentioned Parian relief and a later Thasian *cena heroica*, dated to ca. 470–460 BC, now in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum, is striking (inv. no. 1947; Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 34, Pl. 5). The Thasian relief has also been interpreted as a representation of the poet (Gasparri 1982; Corso 2008). Even if this interpretation is not accepted, both reliefs belong to the votive type and relate to the cult of heroes, which was very important in Thasos (see the analysis of Dentzer 1982, 252–262).

In conclusion, it is possible that Archilochus and his poetry may have been important to Thasian cultural and religious life, as they were of course in Paros too.

## 7 Thasian scholarship: Stesimbrotus and Hippias

We do not have any evidence directly supporting my hypothesis of Thasian philological activity about Archilochus' work. However, some scholars from the island devoted themselves to Homer and the remains of their work interestingly offer us a glimpse of Thasian dialectal features, including psilosis.

Stesimbrotus of Thasos, who probably lived in the second part of the 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC, is particularly known for his work as a historian, but he also appears to have worked as a Homeric critic and commentator. He interpreted the following passage of the *Iliad*, in which Poseidon responds angrily to Iris' request to cease all backing to the Greeks:

τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται, ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς. / ἦτοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολὴν ἄλα ναιέμεν  
αἰεὶ / παλλομένων, Αἴδης δ' ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠερόεντα, / Ζεὺς δ' ἔλαχ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἐν αἰθέρι  
καὶ νεφέλησι. / γαῖα δ' ἔτι ζυγὴ πάντων καὶ μακρὸς Ὀλυμπος

<sup>73</sup> Ἡρακλῆ Καλλ[ινίκω] 'Herakles Kallinikos' (dat.) (*IG XII Suppl.*, 413, dedication, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD), ὁ τοῦ Διὸς παῖς καλλίνει[κ]ο[ς] ὁ Ἡρακλή<ς> 'the son of Zeus, Herakles Kallinikos' (*IG XII Suppl.*, 424, graffito, late).

And in three ways have all things been divided, and to each has been apportioned his own domain. I indeed, when the lots were shaken, won the gray sea to be my home for ever, and Hades won the murky darkness, while Zeus won the broad heaven in the air and the clouds; but the earth and high Olympus still remain common to us all. (Hom., *Il.* 15.187–193)

Stesimbrotus found a contradiction between the fact that ‘all things have been divided’ (fr. 187) and at the same time some things ‘remain common’ to the three brothers (fr. 193). Consequently, he proposed to read *τριχθὰ δὲ πάντ’ ἃ δέδασται* ‘triple [are] all things that are divided’ (*FGrH* 107 F 24 = Sch. *Il.*15.187 A, cf. also Sch. T, without any reference to Stesimbrotus).<sup>74</sup> Interestingly, his interpretation proposes a psilotic relative pronoun ἃ, with πάντ’ ἃ = πάνθ’ ἃ (Janko 1997; West 2001, 32; Cassio 2002, 125–127). As I contend *supra* (§ 3), psilosis was probably a feature of the Thasian dialect as spoken by Stesimbrotus and also of the Homeric text circulating in the island.

The scholar Hippias of Thasos also proposed his own interpretation of a specific Homeric line. In the episode during the funeral games in honor of Patroklos, Nestor advises his son Antilochos on chariot-race tactics and describes the sign of the turning-post to him:

ἔστηκε ξύλον αὖτον ὅσον τ’ ὄργυι ὑπὲρ αἴης / ἢ δρυὸς ἢ πεύκης, τὸ μὲν οὐ καταπύθεται ὄμβρω

‘He has set up a dry pole and a fathom’s height above the ground, of oak or of pine; this is not rotten by rain’ (Hom., *Il.* 23.327–8; my own translation)

It seemed that Hippias objected to the fact that oak and pine, albeit their resistance, rot like all types of wood. Aristotle has preserved Hippias’ solution to this apparent conundrum in two famous passages:

κατὰ δὲ προσφθίαν (sc. δεῖ λύειν), ὥσπερ Ἴππίας ἔλυεν ὁ Θάσιος, τὸ “δίδομεν δέ οἱ εὖχος ἀρέσθαι” καὶ “τὸ μὲν οὐ καταπύθεται ὄμβρω.”

‘[Some questions should be solved] with reference to the pronunciation, as Hippias of Thasos solved [the question of] “but grant that he gain his prayer” [instead of we grant], and “part rotted by rain” [instead of “not rotted”]’ (Arist., *Pol.* 1461a21–22, translation Janko 1987, 39)

τὸν Ὅμηρον ἔνιοι διορθοῦνται πρὸς τοὺς ἐλέγχοντας ὡς ἄτοπον εἰρηκότα “τὸ μὲν οὐ καταπύθεται ὄμβρω”. λύουσι γὰρ αὐτὸ τῆ προσφθία, λέγοντες τὸ “ου” ὀξύτερον

<sup>74</sup> In fact, the text of the scholia shows πάντα. For the correction πάντ’ ἃ see Brogiatto (2001, 182, fn. 162). It seems that this interpretation was later accepted by Crates in the second book of his *Ομηρικά* (cf. Brogiatto 2001, 182–183; Thiel 2014, vol. II, 554–555).



‘Some people correct Homer to address the critics that object that his phrase “not rotted by rain” is a strange one. For they solve it by a change of accent, pronouncing the *ou* with a higher pitch.’ (Arist., *Soph. el.* 166b4–7; my own translation)<sup>75</sup>

Hippias read the Homeric text in l. 328 with the gen. pronoun *οὔ* instead of the negative *οὐ*:<sup>76</sup> ξύλον αὔον [...] τὸ μὲν οὔ καταπύθεται ὄμβρω ‘a dry pole [...], a part of which is rotted by rain’.<sup>77</sup> By the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC, and later in Aristotle’s time, the similarity in pronunciation between *οὔ* and *οὐ* was straightforward for a speaker of a dialect with psilosis and with monophthongization of /ow/, since both words were pronounced /o:/ and only differed in terms of their accentuation. Note that in Aristotle’s passage no initial aspiration is mentioned, as one would expect for a speaker of Attic. We have seen that psilosis is well attested in Thasian documents, and monophthongization of /ow/ occurs sporadically in some inscriptions from Thasos:

τῶτο ‘that’ (SEG 38, 851.B.14, Thasos, ca. 390 BC)

ὦ θέμις ‘it is unlawful’ (IG XII Suppl., 409; archaizing inscription, date unknown [PTA])

The interpretation of Archilochus seems to have been an intense scholarly activity between the 4<sup>th</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC and this gave birth to various *syngammata* and *hypomnemata* and, certainly, to an edition of the compositions arranged by meter (see Porro 2007, 208–211). Additionally, the text of Archilochus in the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC, attested in both papyri and the ‘Mnesiepes inscription’ (SEG 15, 517, Paros, ca. 250 BC), derives in all probability from an Alexandrian philological work, composed from several sources, but mainly from a local Parian tradition and the philological work of the Athenian Peripatetic school (Porro 2011, 159). It may also be possible that the fragments of Archilochus in the inscription of Sosthenes belonged to a local edition arranged thematically and inserted in the work of Demeas.

<sup>75</sup> The *scholion* to this verse on one Homeric manuscript (T) may refer to Hippias’ controversy (see Erbe’s note *ad loc.*, vol. IV, 421).

<sup>76</sup> A Byzantine commentary on Aristotle’s passage states exactly the opposite, i. e. that Hippias was the inventor of the reading *οὐ καταπύθεται* ([Ps.-]Alex.Aphr., in *Soph. el.* 166b1, 33–35 Wallies). Most modern scholars adhere to this interpretation (e. g. Bywater 1909, 337–338; Gudeman 1934, 433; Lucas 1968, 243–244; Dupont-Roc & Lallot 1980, 395; Dorion 1995, 229). However, Aristotle on the second passage (*Soph. el.* 166b.4–7) clearly indicates that Hippias advocated for a form with a higher pitch (ὀξύτερον), which cannot be other than *οὔ*, because the negative *οὐ* was proclitic (cf. *Soph. el.* 177b35–178a3). The latter interpretation was championed by Wackernagel (1893, 8–10 = Wackernagel 1955–1979, 1077–1079), followed by Hanschke (1914, 217), Laum (1928, 104–105 and 329), and Probert (2006, 16–17, particularly her discussion in fn. 4).

<sup>77</sup> For another possible interpretation of the text assumed by Hippias see Wackernagel (1893, 9).

Demonstrably, this edition preserved some old Parian characteristics, like initial aspiration and the genitive -εω. But if we assume that the text of Archilochus was preserved in Thasos, the deviations observed in both features, i. e. psilosis and the genitive -εος of masculine  $\bar{a}$ -stems, point to a particular local Thasian tradition of philological work, which naturally tainted the original poet's lines with local Thasian features.

## 8 Conclusions

In this paper I have argued that the discrepancies between the dialect of Paros and the dialect of Thasos may have tainted the transmission of Archilochus' text. Although a cult of Archilochus in Thasos is still to be found, his poetry may have been preserved in the context of the rituals performed by the Thasians in honor of his family and other fellow Parian pioneers, as well as in the religious ceremonies brought from Paros by Archilochus and the first colonizers. This hypothesis adds some support to the idea that just like his family (Telesikles and Tellis) and his companion Glaukos, Archilochus and his compositions were still a fundamental part of the local traditions in Thasos.

## References

- Alonso Déniz, A. 2017 (forthcoming). "Some like it Short? <εο>, <εευ> and <ηυ> for <εω> in Doric", in: A. Panayotou & G. Galdi (eds.), *Ελληνικές διάλεκτοι στον αρχαίο κόσμο. Actes du VIe Colloque international sur les dialectes grecs anciens (Nicosie, 26–29 septembre 2011)*, Louvain – Paris.
- Baker-Penoyre, J. F. & Tod, M. N. 1909. "Thasos", *JHS* 29, 91–102.
- Barrio Vega, M. L. del. 2014. "Ionic", in: G. K. Giannakis *et al.* (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, vol. II, Leiden – Boston, 260–267 (online: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X\\_eagll\\_COM\\_00000194](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000194)).
- 2015a. "Η ιωνική του βόρειου Αιγαίου (από τον Στρυμόνα μέχρι τον Έβρο)", in: G. K. Giannakis (ed.), *Ο γλωσσικός χάρτης της κεντρικής και βόρειας Ελλάδας κατά την αρχαιότητα*, Thessaloniki, 153–182 (online: [http://ancdialects.greeklanguage.gr/sites/default/files/studies/glossikos\\_xartis.pdf](http://ancdialects.greeklanguage.gr/sites/default/files/studies/glossikos_xartis.pdf)).
- 2015b. *Paradeigmata. Recueil d'inscriptions grecques dialectales* II, 2. *L'Eubée*, Nancy – Paris.
- Bechtel, F. 1887. *Die Inschriften des ionischen Dialekts*, Göttingen.
- 1924. *Die griechischen Dialekte*, vol. III. *Der ionische Dialekt*, Berlin.
- Beekes, R. S. P. 1971. "The Writing of Consonant Groups in Mycenaean", *Mnemosyne* 24, 337–357.
- Bergk, Th. 1882. *Poetae lyrici graeci. II Poetas elegiacos et iambographos continens*, Leipzig.

- Bergmann, R. 1869. "Über zwei griechische Reliefs und eine griechische Inschrift von Thasos", *Hermes* 3, 236–242.
- Bergquist, B. 1973. *Herakles on Thasos. The Archaeological, Literary and Epigraphic Evidence for his Sanctuary, Status and Cult Reconsidered*, Uppsala.
- Berranger, D. 1992. *Recherches sur l'histoire et la prosopographie de Paros à l'époque archaïque*, Clermont-Ferrand.
- Blondé, F., Muller, A., Mulliez, D., Kohl, M. & Sanidas, G. 2008. "Thasos in the Age of Archilochos. Recent Archaeological Investigations", in: S. Katsarou-Tzeveleki, D. Katsonopoulou & I. Petropoulos, 409–425.
- Bonias, Z. 2000. "Une inscription de l'ancienne Bergè", *BCH* 124, 227–246.
- Bremer, J. M., Slings S. R. & Van Erp Taalman Kip, A. M. 1987. *Some Recently Found Greek Poems. Text and Commentary*, Leiden.
- Broggiato, M. 2001. *Cratete di Mallo. I frammenti*, La Spezia.
- Buck, C. D. 1955. *The Greek Dialects. Grammar. Selected Inscriptions. Glossary*, Chicago.
- Butz, P. A. 1996. "Prohibitionary Inscriptions, ξένοι and the Influence of the Early Greek Polis", in: R. Hägg (ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis. Proceedings of the Third International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16–18 October 1992*, Stockholm, 75–95.
- Bywater, I. 1909. *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry. A Revised Text with Critical Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Casadio, V. 1996. *I «dubbi» di Archiloco*, Ospedaletto (Pisa).
- Cassio, A. C. 2002. "Early Editions of the Greek Epics and Homeric Textual Criticism", in: F. Montanari & P. Ascheri (eds.), *Omero tremila anni dopo*, Rome, 105–136.
- CID = Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes, I-IV (1977-2002), Paris.
- Clay, D. 2004. *Archilochos Heros. The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis*, Washington DC – Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- Collart, P. 1937. *Philippes: ville de Macédoine depuis ses origines jusqu'à la fin de l'époque romaine*, Paris.
- Colvin, S. 2007. *A Historical Greek Reader. Mycenaean to the Koiné*, Oxford – New York.
- Corso, A. 2008. "The Portraiture of Archilochos", in: S. Katsarou-Tzeveleki, D. Katsonopoulou & I. Petropoulos, 267–288.
- Cumont, F. 1898. "Notices épigraphiques", *Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique* 41, 328–340.
- Curbera, J. 2013. "Simple Names in Ionia", in: R. Parker (ed.), *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*, Oxford, 107–143.
- Daux, G. 1928. "Inscriptions de Thasos", *BCH* 52, 45–65.
- Del Barrio Vega, M. L.: see Barrio Vega, M. L. del.
- Dentzer, J.-M. 1982. *Le motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde grec du VIIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C.*, Rome – Paris.
- Deplazes, N. 1991. *Der griechische Dativ Plural und oblique Dual untersucht anhand des ältesten inschriftlichen Materials sowie ausgewählter Literatur*, Bern.
- Devine, A. M. & Stephens, L. D. 1994. *The Prosody of Greek Speech*, New York – Oxford.
- Diehl, E. 1952. *Anthologia lyrica graeca, 3. Iamborum scriptores*, Leipzig.
- DNO: see Hallof, K, Kansteiner, S. & Lehmann, L. (eds.) 2014.
- Dorion, L.-A. 1995. *Aristotle. Les réfutations sophistiques*, Paris – Québec.
- Dunant, C. & Pouilloux, J. 1958. *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos II: De 196 avant J.-C. jusqu'à la fin de l'antiquité*, Paris.

- Dupont-Roc, R. & Lallot, J. 1980. *Aristotle. La poétique*, Paris.
- Edmonds, J. M. 1931. *Elegy and Iambus Being the Remains of All the Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poets from Callinus to Crates, Excepting the Choliambic Writers*, London – Cambridge, Mass.
- Fick, A. 1886. "Die Sprachform der altionischen und altattischen Lyrik [I]", *BB* 11, 242–272.
- Fredrich, C. 1908. "Thasos", *MDAI (A)* 33, 213–246.
- Friedländer, L. 1853. *Aristonici Περὶ σημείων ἑλλάδος reliquiae emendatiores*, Göttingen.
- Gaisford, Th. 1823. *Poetae minores Graeci*, 4 vols., Leipzig.
- Game, J. 2009. *Actes de vente dans le monde grec. Témoignages épigraphiques des ventes immobilières*, Lyon.
- García Ramón, J. L. 1992. "Griechisch ἱερός und seine Varianten, Vedisch *iṣirá*", in: R. S. P. Beekes, A. Lubotsky & J. Weitenberg (eds.), *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie*, Innsbruck, 183–205.
- 2007. "Langue poétique, hyperdialectalismes et langue de chancellerie. Le cas des textes thessaliens et l'origine de ἔνεκα", in: A. Blanc & E. Dupraz (eds.), *Procédés synchroniques de la langue poétique en grec et en latin (Colloque Rouen, 13–14. 10. 2005)*, Brussels, 77–93.
- Garlan, Y. 1999. *Les timbres amphoriques de Thasos: I. Timbres protothasiens et thasiens anciens*, Athens – Paris.
- Gasparri, C. 1982. "Archiloco a Taso", *QUCC* 11, 33–41.
- Gomis García, V. forthcoming. "Interactions analogiques dans les flexions des noms propres masculins en -ā- et en -s- à Thasos", in: A. Alonso Déniz, L. Dubois, Cl. Le Feuvre & S. Minon (eds.), *La suffixation des anthroponymes grecs antiques (SAGA). Actes du colloque international de Lyon, (17–19 septembre 2015, Université Jean-Moulin–Lyon 3)*, Geneva.
- Graham, A. J. 1992. "Abdera and Teos", *JHS* 112, 44–73.
- Grandjean, Y. 2012–2013. "Inscriptions de Thasos", *BCH* 136–137, 225–268.
- Grandjean, Y. & Salviat, S. 2006. "Règlements du Délion de Thasos", *BCH* 130, 293–327.
- Guarducci, M. 1967–1978. *Epigrafia greca*, 4 vols., Rome.
- Gudeman, A. 1934. *Aristotle. Περὶ ποιητικῆς*, Berlin – Leipzig.
- Hallof, K., Kansteiner, S. & Lehmann, L. (eds.) 2014. *Der Neue Overbeck. Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*, Berlin – Boston.
- Hamon, P. 2015–2016. "Études d'épigraphie thasienne. IV: Les magistrats thasiens du IVe s. av. J.-C. et le royaume de Macédoine", *BCH* 139–140, 67–124.
- Hanschke, P. 1914. *De accentuum graecorum nominibus*, Bonn.
- Hauvette-Besnault, A. 1905. *Archiloque, sa vie et ses poésies: un poète Ionien du VIIIe siècle*, Paris.
- Hawkins, Sh. 2013. *Studies in the Language of Hipponax*, Bremen.
- Helly, B. 1973. *Gonnoi*, 2 vols., Amsterdam.
- Hoffmann, O. 1898. *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange*, vol. III. *Der ionische Dialekt*, Göttingen.
- IDorIns.*: see Peek, W. 1969.
- IGBulg.* V: see Mihailov, G. 1997.
- Isaac, B. 1986. *The Greek Settlements until the Macedonian Conquest*, Leiden.
- Janko, R. 1987. *Aristotle. Poetics I*, Indianapolis.
- 1997. "The Physicist as Hierophant: Aristophanes, Socrates and the Authorship of the Derveni Papyrus", *ZPE* 118, 61–94.
- Kaczko, S. 2008. "Il giambo", in: A. C. Cassio (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*, Florence, 231–247.

- Katsarou-Tzeveleki, S., Katsonopoulou, D. & Petropoulos, I. (eds.) 2008. *Πάρος II. Ο Αρχίλοχος και η εποχή του. Πρακτικά Β' Διεθνούς επιστημονικού συνεδρίου αρχαιολογίας Πάρου και Κυκλάδων, Παροικιά Πάρου, 7–9 Οκτωβρίου 2005*, Athens.
- Kern, O. 1911. “Hieroi und Hierai”, *Hermes* 46, 300–303.
- Koehler, U. 1884. “Proxenielenliste von Keos”, *MDAI* 9, 271–278.
- Knittl, E. 1938. *Die Sprache der ionischen Kykladen nach den inschriftlichen Quellen*, Inaugural Diss. (Munich), Speyer am Rhein.
- LAGM: see Leschhorn, W. 2009.
- Lasserre, F. & Bonnard, A. 1958. *Archiloque. Fragments*, Paris.
- Laum, B. 1928. *Das Alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem unter Zugrundelegung der theoretischen Lehren der Grammatiker und mit Heranziehung der praktischen Verwendung in den Papyri*, Paderborn.
- Launey, M. 1934. “Une dédicace thasienne à Héraklès”, *BCH* 58, 173–183.
- Lazaridis, D. 1976. “Επίγραμμα Παρίων ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν”, *AEPH*, 164–181.
- Lejeune, M. 1949. “En marge d’inscriptions grecques dialectales. VI: Sur l’extension de H pour noter e long”, *REA* 51, 5–15.
- Lennartz, K. 2000. “Fragmentum iambicum adespotum 38 W”, *Philologus* 144, 22–28.
- Lentini, G. 1999. “Un carme allegorico in *POxy 1788*: il fr. 119 V. di Alceo”, *RFIC* 127, 5–31.
- 2007. “P.Oxy. XV 1788: Alceo o Saffo?”, in: B. Palme (ed.), *Akten des 23. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses (Wien, 22.-28. Juli 2001)*, Vienna, 387–391.
- Leschhorn, W. 2009. *Lexikon der Aufschriften auf griechischen Münzen*, vol. II. *Ethnika und «Beamtennamen»*, Vienna.
- LGPNI.A: Fraser, P. M. & Matthews, E. (eds.) 1987. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. I. *Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*, Oxford (online: [www.classics.ox.ac.uk/online](http://www.classics.ox.ac.uk/online)).
- Lieberman, G. 1999. *Alcée. Fragments*, Paris.
- Liebel, I. 1812. *Archilochi iambographorum principis reliquae*, Leipzig (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.: 1818).
- LIV<sup>2</sup>: see Rix, H. et al. 2001.
- Loukopoulou, L. 2004. “Thrace from Strymon to Nestos”, in: M. H. Hansen & Th. H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 900–923.
- Lubotsky, A. 1985. “The PIE Word for ‘Dry’”, *KZ* 98, 1–10.
- Lucas, D. W. 1968. *Aristotle. Poetics*, Oxford.
- Mack, W. 2013. “The Proxenois-lists of Karthaia”, *REA* 113, 319–344.
- 2015. *Proxeny and Polis. Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford.
- Masson, O. 1962. *Les fragments du poète Hipponax. Édition critique et commentée*, Paris.
- Matthaiou, A. 2000–2003. “Επιγραφή ἐκ Βέργης”, *Horos* 14–16, 227–232.
- 2013. “Επιγραφικά σύμμεικτα”, *Grammateion* 3, 81–84.
- Matthaiou, A. & Papadopoulou, G. K. 2003. *Επιγραφές Ικαρίας*, Athens.
- Merkelbach, R. & West, M. L. 1974. “Ein Archilochos-Papyrus”, *ZPE* 14, 97–113.
- Mihailov, G. 1997. *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae*, vol. V, Sofia.
- Miller, D. G. 2014. *Ancient Greek Dialects and Early Authors: Introduction to the Dialect Mixture in Homer, with Notes on Lyric and Herodotus*, Boston – Berlin.
- Mirallas, C. 1981. “L’iscrizione di Mnesiepes (Arch. test. 4 Tarditi)”, *QUCC* 9, 29–46.
- Mirallas, C. & Pòrtulas, J. 1983. *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry*, Rome.
- Nicolosi: see Nicolosi, A. 2013.
- Nicolosi, A. 2013. *Archiloco: elegie*, Bologna.
- Ornaghi, M. 2009. *La lira, la vacca e le donne insolenti contesti di ricezione e promozione della figura e della poesia di Archiloco dall’arcaismo all’ellenismo*, Alessandria.

- Panayotou, A. 1990. "Des dialectes à la Koiné: l'exemple de la Chacidique", in: M. B. Sakellariou (ed.), *ΠΟΙΚΙΛΙΑ, ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ 10. Recueil d'articles*, Athens, 191–228.
- 1991. "Textes d'Acanthos d'époques archaïque et classique", in: P. Goukowsky & C. Brixhe (eds.), *Hellènika Symmikta. Histoire, archéologie, épigraphie*, Nancy, 127–132.
- Papadopoulou, Z. D. 2010–2013. "Παριακά", *Horos* 22–25, 403–418.
- Papadopoulos, G. K. 2013. "Επιγραφές Πάρου", *Grammateion* 2, 17–26.
- 2015. "Επιτύμβιες επιγραφές από την Πάρο", *Grammateion* 4, 27–47.
- Passa, E. 2001. "L'antichità della grafia εϋ per εο, εου nell'epica: a proposito di una recente edizione dell'Iliade", *RFIC* 129, 385–417.
- Peek, W. 1969. *Inschriften von den dorischen Inseln*, Berlin.
- Perdrizet, P. 1894. "Voyage dans la Macédoine première", *BCH* 18, 416–445.
- Peters, M. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*, Vienna.
- 1990. "Indogermanische Chronik. Altgriechisch", *Die Sprache* 34, 253–690.
- Porro, A. 2007. "Archiloco e gli Alessandrini", in: R. Pretagostini & E. Dettori (eds.), *La cultura letteraria ellenistica. Persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione*, Rome, 209–222.
- 2011. "Archilochus", in: G. Bastianini (ed.), *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta (CLGP)*. I.1.3. *Apollonius Rhodius – Aristides*. Berlin – Boston.
- Pouilloux, J. 1954. *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos. I: De la fondation de la cité à 196 avant J.-C.*, Paris.
- 1955. "Glaucos, fils de Leptine, Parien", *BCH* 79, 75–86.
- 1959. "Inscriptions, topographie et monuments de Thasos", *REA* 61, 273–299.
- 1989. "Akératos de Thasos. Poésie et histoire", in: R. Étienne, M.-Th. Le Dinahet & M. Yon (eds.), *Architecture et poésie dans le monde grec. Hommage à Georges Roux*, Lyon, 193–204.
- Pretagostini, R. 1982. "Archiloco «Salsa di Taso» negli «Archilochi» di Cratino (fr. 6 K.)", *QUCC* 11, 43–52.
- Probert, Ph. 2006. *Ancient Greek Accentuation. Synchronic Patterns, Frequency Effects, and Prehistory*, Oxford – New York.
- Psoma, S. 2003. "Les «boucs» de la Grèce du Nord. Problèmes d'attribution", *RN* 159, 227–242.
- "The «Lete» Coinage Reconsidered", in: P. G. van Alfen (ed.), *Agoronomia. Studies in Money and Exchange Presented to John H. Kroll*, New York, 61–86.
- Reinach, S. 1882. "Variétés", *BCH* 6, 442–444.
- 1884. "Chronique d'Orient", *RA* 4, 76–102.
- Rix, H. et al. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben (LIV). Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Wiesbaden.
- Rodríguez Adrados, F. 1959. *Líricos griegos. Elegiacos y yambógrafos arcaicos, siglos VII-V a.C.*, vol. I, Barcelona.
- Rolley, C. 1965. "Le sanctuaire des dieux patrôoi et le Thesmophorion de Thasos", *BCH* 89, 441–483.
- 1990. "Le sanctuaire d'Éνραιοκαστρο: mise à jour du dossier", in: T. Petrides (ed.), *Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη. Πόλις καί χώρα στην αρχαία Μακεδονία καί Θράκη. Πρακτικά αρχαιολογικού συνεδρίου (Καβάλα, 9–11 Μαΐου 1986)*, Thessaloniki, 405–408.
- Rotstein, A. 2010. *The Idea of Iambos*, Oxford – New York.
- Rubensohn, O. 1962. *Das Delion von Paros*, Wiesbaden.
- Ruijgh, C. J. 1998. "Review of Stüber 1996", *Mnemosyne* 51, 86–93.

- Rutherford, I. 2013. *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece. A Study of Theōriā and Theōroi*, Cambridge – New York.
- Salviat, F. 1958. “Une nouvelle loi thasienne. Institutions judiciaires et fêtes religieuses à la fin du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.”, *BCH* 82, 193–267.
- 1979a. “Déméter Eleusinié Patroïé”, in: *Thasiaca*, 407–410.
  - 1979b. “Les colonnes initiales du catalogue des théores et les institutions thasiennes archaïques”, in: *Thasiaca*, 107–127.
- Salviat, F. & Servais, J. 1964. “Stèle indicatrice thasienne trouvée au sanctuaire d’Alikī”, *BCH* 88, 267–287.
- Schneidewin, F. W. 1839. *Delectus poesis graecorum elegiacae, iambicae melicae*, vol. II, Göttingen.
- Schwyzler DGE: Schwyzler, E. 1923. *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora*, Leipzig.
- Sève, M. 1981. “Inscriptions de Thasos”, *BCH* 105, 183–198.
- Smyth, H. W. 1894. *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects. Ionic*, Oxford.
- Stüber, K. 1996. *Zur dialektalen Einheit des Ostionischen*, Innsbruck.
- Tarditi, G. 1968. *Archilochus. Fragmenta*, Rome.
- Thasiaca: Thasiaca*, *BCH* Suppl. V, Athens – Paris, 1979.
- Thiel, H. van: see Van Thiel, H. 2014.
- Thoenges-Stringaris, Rh. N. 1965. “Das griechische Totenmahl”, *MDAI (A)* 80, 1–99.
- Threatte, L. 1977. “Unmetrical Spellings in Attic Inscriptions”, *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 10, 169–194.
- 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, vol. I. *Phonology*, Berlin – New York.
- Trippé, N. 2014. “Entre ionien attique et ionien d’Asie. Quelques phénomènes de langue dans les inscriptions archaïques des Cyclades”, in: G. Bonnín & E. Le Quéré (eds.), *Pouvoirs, îles et mer: formes et modalités de l’hégémonie dans les Cyclades antiques*, Bordeaux, 269–278.
- Tsantsanoglou, K. 2003. “Archilochus Fighting in Thasos. Fr. 93a+94 from the Sosthenes Inscription”, *Hellenica* 53, 235–255.
- Veligianni-Terzi, Ch. 2004. *Οι ελληνίδες πόλεις και το βασίλειο των Οδρυσών από Αβδήρων πόλεως μέχρι Ίστρου ποταμού*, Thessaloniki.
- Wackernagel, J. 1916. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*, Göttingen.
- 1955–1979. *Kleine Schriften*, 3 vols., Göttingen.
- West, M. L. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin – New York.
- 1989–1992. *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, 2 vols., Oxford.
  - 2001. *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, Munich – Leipzig.
- Van Thiel, H. 2014. *Aristarch, Aristophanes Byzantios, Demetrios Ixion, Zenodot. Fragmente zur Ilias gesammelt, neu herausgegeben und kommentiert*, Berlin – Boston.
- Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U.: see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von 1884.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von 1884. *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin.
- Zannis, A. G. 2014. *Le pays entre le Strymon et le Nestos. Géographie et histoire (VIIe – IVe siècle avant J.-C.)*, *ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ* 71, Athens.