

The Aeolic Dialects of Ancient Greek

Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics

Series Editors

Olav Hackstein (*Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich*)
Michael Weiss (*Cornell University*)

Founding Editor

Craig Melchert (*UCLA, Los Angeles*)

Editorial Board

Paola Cotticelli (*University of Verona*)
José-Luis García-Ramón (*University of Cologne*)
David Goldstein (*UCLA, Los Angeles*)
Stephanie Jamison (*UCLA, Los Angeles*)
Ronald Kim (*Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań*)
Alexander Lubotsky (*Leiden University*)
Melanie Malzahn (*University of Vienna*)
Alan J. Nussbaum (*Cornell University*)
Georges-Jean Pinault (*École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris*)
Jeremy Rau (*Harvard University*)
Elisabeth Rieken (*Philipps University of Marburg*)
Stefan Schumacher (*University of Vienna*)

VOLUME 26

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/bsiel

The Aeolic Dialects of Ancient Greek

*A Study in Historical Dialectology
and Linguistic Classification*

By

Matthew Scarborough



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: POxy. 1232 (Sappho fr. 44). Image from B.P. Grenfell & A.S. Hunt. 1914. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part x*, London: The Egypt Exploration Society. Plate 1.

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at <https://catalog.loc.gov>
LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2023012542>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1875-6328

ISBN 978-90-04-43321-2 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-54371-3 (e-book)

Copyright 2023 by Matthew Scarborough. Published by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands. Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Hotei, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau, V&R unipress and Wageningen Academic. Koninklijke Brill NV reserves the right to protect this publication against unauthorized use. Requests for re-use and/or translations must be addressed to Koninklijke Brill NV via brill.com or copyright.com.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

For my parents



Contents

Preface	XI
Acknowledgements	XIV
List of Figures	XVI
List of Tables	XVII
Abbreviations of Corpora and Reference Works	XVIII
Grammatical and Linguistic Abbreviations	XXI
Epigraphic and Papyrological Abbreviations	XXIV
Note on the Accentuation of Dialect Forms	XXV
A Note on the Transcription of Ancient and Modern Greek Proper Names	XXVI
1 The Problem of Aeolic in Ancient Greek Dialectology	1
1 Introduction	1
2 The Notion of Aeolic in Antiquity	1
2.1 <i>Aeolic as Ethnicity</i>	1
2.2 <i>Aeolic as Dialect</i>	3
3 19th Century Debates: Ahrens, Meister, and Hoffmann	7
4 Twentieth Century Developments	13
4.1 <i>Bechtel and the Status Quaestionis at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century</i>	13
4.2 <i>Ancient Greek Dialect Geography</i>	14
4.3 <i>New Data: The Decipherment of Mycenaean</i>	15
4.4 <i>Early Quantitative Approaches</i>	16
4.5 <i>Sociolinguistic and Wave Model Explanations for Dialect Diversity</i>	18
4.6 <i>A Family-Tree Model for Aeolic?</i>	19
4.7 <i>Can the Greek Dialects Be Genealogically Classified at All?</i>	21
5 The Twenty-First Century: Problems and Methods, Old and New	23
5.1 <i>The Problem of Convergence in the Formation of Subgroups</i>	23
5.2 <i>Computational Cladistic Approaches to the Greek Dialects</i>	30
5.3 <i>Recent Challenges to Aeolic Classification</i>	32
6 Resolving the Impasse: The Aims and Structure of This Work	36

2	Methodological Preliminaries	40
1	Introduction	40
2	Methodological Considerations in the Selection of Isoglosses	40
	2.1 <i>Types of Characteristics in Phylogenetic Cladistics</i>	42
	2.2 <i>Application to Linguistic Data</i>	42
	2.3 <i>'Selections from Inherited Alternatives'</i>	44
	2.4 <i>'Significant' versus 'Easily Repeatable' Innovations</i>	45
	2.5 <i>Borrowing and Convergent Development</i>	48
	2.6 <i>Terminological Excursus: Proto-Greek and Common Greek</i>	49
3	Sources and Methodological Issues	49
	3.1 <i>Definitions</i>	49
	3.2 <i>Issues in Relative Chronology within the Sources</i>	54
	3.3 <i>The Question of an 'Aeolic Phase' in Homeric Composition and Transmission</i>	56
	3.4 <i>Issues in the Use of Literary versus Epigraphic Sources</i>	56
4	The Data Collection for This Study	58
5	Concluding Remarks	59
3	The Core Aeolic Isoglosses	60
1	Introduction	60
2	The Position of Mycenaean in Classification and Relative Chronology	60
3	Some Preliminary Assumptions: Exclusion of Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Greek Synapomorphic Characters	61
	3.1 <i>PIE *s > h / #_V, #_r, V_V</i>	62
	3.2 <i>Thematic Present Active Infinitive in *-es-en</i>	62
	3.3 <i>Changes to Nominal and Verbal Accentuation</i>	62
4	Common Innovations from Proto-Greek	63
	4.1 <i>Labial Reflexes of */k^w/, */g^w/, */g^{wh}/</i>	65
	4.2 <i>Reflexes of *r > or/ro</i>	92
	4.3 <i>Lowering of */i/ > /e/ / r_</i>	107
	4.4 <i>Syllabicity Loss in Prevocalic */i/: *-iV- > -iV-</i>	108
	4.5 <i>The -εσσι Dative Plural</i>	110
	4.6 <i>The -ων, -οντος Thematic Perfect Active Participle</i>	117
	4.7 <i>The 1.PL Verbal Ending -μεν</i>	120
	4.8 <i>ἴα 'one' F.SG.</i>	122
	4.9 <i>Patronymic Adjectives</i>	127
5	Conclusions	129

- 4 The Peripheral Aeolic Isoglosses** 130
- 1 Introduction 130
 - 2 Isoglosses Shared by Two of Three Dialects 130
 - 2.1 *Lesbian-Thessalian Isoglosses* 130
 - 2.2 *Lesbian-Boeotian Isoglosses* 158
 - 2.3 *Thessalian-Boeotian Isoglosses* 161
 - 3 Isoglosses Shared with Neighbouring Dialects 191
 - 3.1 *Lesbian-Ionic Isoglosses* 191
 - 3.2 *Thessalian-Boeotian Isoglosses Shared with Northwest Greek* 194
 - 3.3 *Thessalian Isoglosses Shared with Northwest Greek* 203
 - 3.4 *Boeotian Isoglosses Shared with Northwest Greek* 203
 - 3.5 *A Boeotian-Attic Isogloss: The Outcome of Palatalized Dentals* 208
 - 4 Conclusions 210
- 5 A Probability-Based Clade Test for Aeolic** 212
- 1 Introduction 212
 - 2 The Probabilistic Method 213
 - 2.1 *Language Classification versus Dialect Classification: A Problem of Scalarity* 213
 - 2.2 *Estimating Repeatability: How Likely Is Independent Innovation?* 215
 - 2.3 *Estimating Innovability: What Is the Probability of an Individual Innovation?* 219
 - 2.4 *Pulling the Pieces Together: The Operation of the Clade Test* 224
 - 2.5 *Clades and Sub-Clades* 225
 - 3 Evaluation: Application of the Clade Test to the Aeolic Data 226
 - 3.1 *Introduction* 226
 - 3.2 *The Core Aeolic Isoglosses* 227
 - 3.3 *Peripheral Isoglosses: Internal Subgrouping* 228
 - 3.4 *The Clade Test Results* 230
 - 4 Discussion of Results and Some Relative Chronologies 231
 - 4.1 *Developments to Proto-Aeolic* 231
 - 4.2 *Relative Chronology and Internal Subgrouping* 233
 - 4.3 *Relative Chronology and the Systems of Infinitives in the Aeolic Dialects* 234
 - 4.4 *Relative Chronology and Internal Subgrouping: Conclusions* 237
 - 5 Conclusions 238

Concluding Remarks	241
Appendix 1: Catalogue of Epigraphic References	243
Appendix 2: Aeolic Dialectal Isogloss Tables	293
Bibliography	297
Index Verborum et Nominum Propriorum	330
Index Rerum	355
Index Locorum	357

Preface

The field of Greek philology, and especially dialectology, represents a distinct and seemingly arcane enclave within the discipline as a whole, rendered all the more bewildering by the fact that universal consensus rarely exists. (Hall 1997: 153)

The problem of the attested dialect geography of Ancient Greek in the first millennium BCE has historically long eluded a simple solution. Sharp discontinuities combined with crisscrossing isoglosses point to some combination of prehistoric migrations and *in situ* network-like evolution, but exactly how these features were distributed from linguistic contact, convergence, or disruption of earlier dialect continua has been one of the most difficult questions to resolve in Ancient Greek linguistics and Aegean prehistory. Aspects of a family tree model of analysis as well those of a wave model are both necessary to explain all the attested data. The main goal of this study is to address one small aspect of this larger problem to try to move the discussion forward from a state of impasse that has existed in some form or another since the beginnings of Ancient Greek dialectology as a discipline, but especially since some of the more polemical works since the 1980s which have doubted whether a phylogeny for the Ancient Greek dialects can, in fact, be established at all.

To this end, this study is about determining subgroupings of dialects in historical dialectology. It also deals with a specific problem in Ancient Greek dialectology, the question of whether or not the Aeolic dialects, traditionally understood as a subgrouping of the Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian dialects of Ancient Greek, form a clade in a phylogeny descended from Proto-Greek, the putative ancestor of all Ancient Greek dialects attested in Archaic and Classical Greece. To this day there remains poor consensus on many aspects of the internal prehistory of the Ancient Greek dialects, making it difficult for non-specialists in other branches of Greek linguistics and Hellenic studies to evaluate competing hypotheses. This is regrettable, since the data from the dialects do provide evidence that can corroborate or problematize alternative historical reconstructions obtained from archaeology and the Greek historiographical tradition.

Much of the previous scholarship on Ancient Greek dialectology has emphasized the qualitative evaluation of dialect isoglosses in establishing their relative value for historical reconstruction. This study takes a new approach, and argues that in this situation a principled quantitative analysis can be fruitfully used to determine the relative likelihood of competing histor-

ical hypotheses in the subgrouping of the dialects. This study argues that the best evidence for testing a proposed genetic relationship between two dialectal sub-varieties is not in the relative quality of a few highly marked linguistic innovations, but rather by the entire bundle of innovatory isoglosses. In probabilistic terms, the more innovatory isoglosses that are shared between distinct dialectal varieties, the less likely they all will be shared due to chance. This study explicitly develops a probabilistic methodology in order to evaluate the relative likelihood of a linguistic innovation within the corpus of the attested dialects. Using this methodology, a probabilistic clade test is developed, and through its application to the Aeolic data, it is argued that the traditional hypothesis of genetic relationship between Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian is statistically likely.

The structure of this work consists of five main chapters. The first chapter consists of a critical literature review, providing an overview of the history of dialectal subgrouping of Ancient Greek in modern scholarship, and a critique of the most recent literature on Aeolic. It argues in addition that Aeolic classification is not just a single problem within Greek dialectology, but is part of a more fundamental debate currently within the sub-discipline, namely whether or not phylogenetic relationships represent a viable model for Ancient Greek dialectal evolution. The second chapter outlines the preliminary assumptions necessary to evaluate the Aeolic hypothesis using a quantitative approach, giving the criteria for the selection of isoglosses to be evaluated using the principles of phylogenetic systematics. Particular attention is drawn here to the use of Hennig's Auxiliary Principle, which has been hitherto ignored by many dialectologists who take a hypercritical position on classification. This chapter also addresses methodological problems from the disparate source material for the Aeolic dialects.

The third and fourth chapters consist of the main data analysis, evaluating the innovatory isoglosses shared by Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian as to whether they may be used in the probabilistic clade test. The third chapter treats the 'core' innovations, shared by all three dialects, while the fourth treats the 'peripheral' innovations which are shared by two of the three. The fourth chapter also draws attention to the presence of features that are in areal distribution with their neighbouring dialects, and eliminates these features where convergent development is likely.

The fifth and final chapter contains the mathematical derivation of the probabilistic clade test and its implementation. Its implementation finds a genetic subgrouping of Aeolic dialects statistically likely, but no sub-clades are predicted from the probabilistic method. Following the operation of the clade test it is further argued that most economical relative chronology to account

for the linguistic and philological facts is a primary split of Lesbian from the Proto-Aeolic clade, followed by a common period of Thessalian and Boeotian innovation, followed by a secondary split of the latter two dialects.

Acknowledgements

This study originated as my doctoral dissertation which was written between October 2011 and September 2016 under the auspices of the 'E' Philology and Linguistics Caucus at the Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge. I had hoped that the present monograph version of this work would have appeared much earlier to the time of its original completion, but as I am sure many other early career researchers can attest the difficulties with obtaining stable postdoctoral employment and other life complications—no less compounded by the lockdowns and library closures following outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic only month after the contract to publish this book was signed with Brill—contributed to the significant delay in its appearance in monograph form. I am thankful to Olav Hackstein and Craig Melchert, the editors of Brill's *Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics*, for their patience for the delivery of the manuscript almost two years later than originally planned. Above all with respect to the revision of the manuscript, I stand in great debt and gratitude to Thomas Olander for allowing me to use project time while employed as a postdoc on his research project *Connecting the Dots: Reconfiguring the Indo-European Family Tree* (Independent Research Fund Denmark, grant no. 9037-00086B) to finally bring this monograph to completion.

For the original dissertation I am above all indebted to my principal supervisor Rupert Thompson, without whose advice in matters of Greek dialectology and application of statistical and mathematical methods to linguistic data the original dissertation would have been a methodologically much impoverished study. My internal and external examiners, respectively James Clackson and Stephen Colvin, I am likewise indebted to for their incisive criticism after the *viva voce* examination which made this a far better work than it may have been otherwise. Torsten Meißner also read an entire draft of the original dissertation and provided much useful feedback on the history of the scholarship, and on many individual points of philological and linguistic discussion. During the manuscript revision process which was largely completed while employed at the Department of Nordic Studies and Linguistics I have had opportunity to discuss my work with members of the Roots of Europe research center and I would like to thank in particular Thomas Olander, Birgit Olsen, Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead, Simon Poulsen, and Julia Sturm for their input on individual points of detail during the manuscript revision process.

The Philology and Linguistics 'E' Caucus in the Faculty of Classics at the University of Cambridge was a very supportive environment where much of the present study was originally written. I thank the usual occupants of the

Mycenaean Epigraphy Room during my time, John Killen, Torsten Meißner, Anna Judson, Roeland Decorte, and Ester Salgarella for tolerating my presence as someone only marginally focused on Linear B and responding to various enquiries about Mycenaean matters. In addition, I would also like to acknowledge others from the group with whom I formally around the faculty and informally at the pub, especially, Annie Burman, Geoff Horrocks, Pippa Steele, and Oliver Simkin. I would also like to acknowledge other colleagues with whom I have discussed aspects of this work or have made available to me their published and unpublished research: Alcorac Alonso Déniz, José Luís García Ramón, Paloma Guijarro Ruano, Daniel Kölligan, Julián Víctor Méndez Dosuna, Andrew Merritt, Enrique Nieto Izquierdo, Roland Pooth, and Christina Skelton. This work has benefited from everyone who has provided feedback at various stages of this work. It goes without saying that not everyone agrees with all aspects of what I propose in this study, and I am, of course, responsible for all errors that remain.

The original dissertation was partly funded through a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Doctoral Fellowship (Award No. 752-2011-1532). Research travel funding was generously granted to me throughout the writing of this work from the Cambridge Faculty of Classics Henry Arthur Thomas funds, the Travel Funds and Moses Finley Travel Bursaries of Darwin College. I would like to give a special thanks to José-Luís García Ramón and Daniel Kölligan for hosting me as an ERASMUS visiting researcher at the Institut für Linguistik of the Universität zu Köln during Wintersemester 2013/2014, and to the European Union for providing the relocation funding and living expenses that made that research visit possible.

While they did not have any direct input on this study, I would like to give acknowledgement and thanks to former teachers and mentors in Canada, above all my former BA and MA supervisor Selina Stewart and the late Egyptologist James E. Hoch who inspired and encouraged me to pursue further studies in comparative philology and linguistics. Finally, I must thank my parents Amber and Charlie Scarborough. Without their unconditional love and support this work would never have been written. This book is dedicated to them.

Figures

- 1 The Family Tree of 'Aeolic' According to Meister (1882) 10
- 2 The Family Tree of the Greel Dialects According to Hoffmann (1891–1898) 12
- 3 Cowgill (1966)'s 'Quadrants' for the Prehistoric Dialect Geography of Ancient Greek 15
- 4 Coleman's Factorial Analysis of Greek Dialect Features (after Coleman 1963: 125) 17
- 5 The Fragmentation of the Aeolic Dialects According to García Ramón (1975) 20
- 6 Hypothetical Speciation and Character Transformation 43
- 7 $P(X \geq 2) < 0.05$ Graphically Solved for Different Values of n 218
- 8 Estimating Probability Based on Observed Frequency \hat{p} in a Coin-Toss Experiment 220
- 9 Stemma of the Greek Dialects Including the Proto-Aeolic Clade 232
- 10 A Tentative Proposed Phylogeny of the Greek Dialects 239

Tables

1	The Development of the Labiovelars in Attic-Ionic and the West Greek Dialects	67
2	Synopsis of Labial Reflexes of Labiovelars	79
3	Boeotian Attestations of τίς	81
4	Thessalian Attestations of τίς and κίς	81
5	Boeotian Attestations of τε	82
6	Thessalian Attestations of τε	82
7	Epigraphic Lesbian Attestations of τε	83
8	πέντε in Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian	84
9	Synopsis of Dental Reflexes of Labiovelars	88
10	The Observed Reflexes of the Labiovelars in Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian	89
11	Proportional Analogical Origins of DAT.PL -εσσι	111
12	Schematic Overview of the Development of μίᾱ/ῖᾱ in Early Greek (cf. Parker 2008: 449)	124
13	Development of GEN.SG.F and DAT.SG.F Pronouns in Vedic and Avestan (after Hill 2012: 176)	125
14	ὄν- vs. ἄν- in Thessalian	147
15	ὄν- vs. ἄν- in Epigraphic Lesbian (adapted from Hodot 1990: 145–146)	148
16	Attestations of -ζοτος Names by Place of Origin in <i>LGPN</i>	186
17	Attestation of -δοτος Names in the Same Regions as Table 16 in <i>LGPN</i>	186
18	Boeotian and Thessalian -δοτος Names by Original Dialect of Text	187
19	Boeotian and Thessalian -ζοτος Names by Original Dialect of Text	188
20	Critical Values of p for $P(X \geq 2) < 0.05$ for Integers of n	218
21	Sample of w^{min} and w^{max} Values Calculated at $z = 1.9599$ for Selected Isoglosses	223
22	Upper Boundaries of Wilson Intervals for Core Aeolic Innovations at $z = 1.9599$	228
23	Upper Boundaries of Wilson Intervals for Boeotian-Lesbian Innovations at $z = 1.9599$	229
24	Upper Boundaries of Wilson Intervals for Boeotian-Thessalian Innovations at $z = 1.9599$	230
25	Upper Boundaries of Wilson Intervals for Lesbian-Thessalian Innovations at $z = 1.9599$	230
26	Overview of Active Infinitive Formations in Greek	236

Abbreviations of Corpora and Reference Works

AA	<i>Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον</i> / <i>Archaialogikon Deltion</i> (Athènes: Hypourgeio Politismou, 1915–)
Brugmann, Grundriß ²	Brugmann, Karl. 1897–1916. <i>Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen</i> (2e Aufl.). Leipzig: K.J. Trübner Verlag.
<i>Affranchissements</i>	Darmezin, Laurence. 1999. <i>Les affranchissements par consécration en Béotie et dans la monde grec hellénistique</i> . Nancy: Association pour la Diffusion de la Recherche sur l'Antiquité.
CEG	Hansen, Peter Allan. 1983–1989. <i>Carmina Epigraphica Graeca</i> . Berolini et Novi Eboraci: Walter de Gruyter.
CID	Rougement, G., J. Bousquet & A. Bélis. 1977–. <i>Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes</i> . Paris: De Boccard.
CIG	Boeckh, Augustus (ed.) 1828–1877. <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> . Berolini: Ex Officina Academica.
DELG	Chantraine, Pierre. 1968–1980. <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque</i> . Paris: Klincksieck.
DGE	Schwyzler, Eduard. 1923. <i>Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora</i> . Leipzig: S. Hirzel Verlag.
DMic.	Aura Jorro, Francisco. 1985–1993. <i>Diccionario Micénico</i> (2 Vols.). Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
EDG	Beekes, Robert. s.p. 2010. <i>Etymological Dictionary of Greek</i> . Leiden: Brill.
EWAia	Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992–2001. <i>Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen</i> . Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
<i>F.Delphes</i> III	Bourget, É. et al. (eds.). 1909–1985. <i>Fouilles de Delphes</i> . III. <i>Épigraphie</i> . Paris: De Boccard.
GEW	Frisk, Hjalmar. 1960–1972. <i>Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> (3 Vols.). Heidelberg: Winter Verlag.
<i>I.Atrax</i>	Tziafalias, Athanasios et al. 2016. <i>Corpus des inscriptions d'Atrax en Pélasgotide (Thessalie)</i> . Athènes: École française d'Athènes.
<i>I.Cret.</i>	Guarducci, Margherita. 1935–1950. <i>Inscriptiones Creticae</i> (4 Vols.). Roma: Libreria dello Stato.
ICS	Masson, Olivier. 1983. <i>Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques. Réimpression augmentée</i> . Paris: De Boccard.
<i>I.dial. éléennes</i>	Minon, Sophie. 2007. <i>Les inscriptions éléennes dialectales (VIe–IIe siècle avant J.-C.)</i> . Genève: Droz.
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> (Berlin, 1877–)

- I.Gonnoi* Helly, Bruno. 1973. *Gonnoi II: Les inscriptions*. Amsterdam: Hakert.
- I.Knidos* Blümel, Wolfgang. 1992. *Die Inschriften von Knidos. Teil 1*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag.
- I.Kyme* Engelmann, Helmut. 1976. *Die Inschriften von Kyme*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag.
- I.Olympia* Dittenberger, Wilhelm & Karl Purgold. 1896. *Olympia: Die Ergebnisse der von dem Deutschen Reich veranstalteten Ausgrabung. Textband v: Die Inschriften*. Berlin: Verlag von A. Asher & Co.
- I.Pergamon* Fränkel, Max. 1890–1895. *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*. (2 Vols). Berlin: Verlag von W. Spemann.
- I.Oropos* Petrakos, Vasileios. 1997. *Οι επιγραφές του Ωρωπού*. Αθήνα: βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας.
- I.Thespies* Roesch, Paul. 2007. *Les inscriptions de Thespies*. Lyon: HISOMA.
- I.Vallée Enipeus* Decourt, Jean-Claude. 1995. *Inscriptions de Thessalie 1: Les cités de la vallée de l'Énipeus*. Athènes: École Française d'Athènes.
- LIPP* Dunkel, George. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- LIV*² Rix, Helmut et al. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen (2e Aufl.)*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- LGPN* Fraser, Peter & Elaine Matthews (eds.). 1987–. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- LP* Lobel, Edgar & Denys Page. 1963. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- LSAG* Jeffery, Lilian Hamilton. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries BC. Revised edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LSJ* Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones & Roderick McKenzie. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon (9th ed.), With a Revised Supplement*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- McD* McDewitt, Arthur S. 1970. *Inscriptions from Thessaly: An Analytical Handlist and Bibliography*. Hildesheim: Olms Verlag.
- Neri* Neri, Camillo. 2021. *Saffo, testimonianze e frammenti: Introduzione testo critico, traduzione e commento*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- NIL* Wodtko, Dagmar, Britta Irslinger & Carolin Schneider. 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter Verlag.
- RV* van Nooten, Barend A. & Gary B. Holland. 1994. *Rig Veda: A Metrically Restored Text*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> (Amsterdam & Leiden, 1923–)
<i>SGDI</i>	Collitz, Hermann & Friedrich Bechtel (eds.). 1884–1915. <i>Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften</i> . Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
Voigt	Voigt, Eva-Maria. 1971. <i>Sappho et Alcaeus</i> . Amsterdam: Athenaeum.

The format for epigraphic references follows *edition* [reference number in the corpus].[line number of the inscription]. For example, the reference *I.Oropos* 74.4 would refer to Petrakos (1997), inscription number 74, line number 4; *SEG* 36:548.6–7 refers to *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* volume 36, entry number 548, lines 6 to 7, etc. Linear B tablets are cited according to standard Mycenological practices (cf. Palmer 2008). Dictionaries are normally cited by lemma. Abbreviations of Ancient Greek authors follow the conventions of the *LSJ*. Citation of fragments of Sappho follows the numeration of Neri (2021), while citation of fragments of Alcaeus follows the edition of Voigt (1971), but cf. also Liberman (2002). Citation of fragments of Corinna follows Page (1953). References to Hesychius refer to the edition of Hansen (2005), Hansen & Cunningham (2009), Latte & Cunningham (2018), Latte & Cunningham (2020). Textual references to the *Rigveda* follow the metrically restored text of van Nooten & Holland (1994).

Grammatical and Linguistic Abbreviations

Wherever possible the grammatical abbreviations in this work follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules (<https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>). Where the Leipzig Glossing Rules do not have specific equivalents to a Greek or Indo-European grammatical category (e.g. aorist, imperfect, etc.) I have set up my own abbreviations which I hope the reader will not find too absurd.

ACC	accusative
ABL	ablative
ACT	active
ADJ	adjective
ADV	adverb
Alb.	Albanian
AOR	aorist
Arc.	Arcadian
Arc.-Cyp.	Arcado-Cypriot
Arg.	Argolic
Arm.	Armenian
Att.	Attic
Boeot.	Boeotian
Av.	Avestan
Cret.	Cretan
Cyp.	Cypriot
DAT	dative
DU	dual
e.g.	<i>exempli gratia</i>
EGk.	East Greek
El.	Elean
F	feminine
Engl.	English
Gaul.	Gaulish
GEN	genitive
Gk.	Greek
Go.	Gothic
Hitt.	Hittite
IMPF	imperfect
INF	infinitive
INS	instrumental

IE	Indo-European
Ion.	Ionic
LOC	locative
Lat.	Latin
Lesb.	Lesbian
Lith.	Lithuanian
M	masculine
Meg.	Megarian
Myc.	Mycenaean
MID	middle
NOM	nominative
N	neuter
NWGk.	North West Greek
OAv.	Old Avestan
ocs	Old Church Slavonic
OIr.	Old Irish
ONor.	Old Norse
OPers.	Old Persian
Phoc.	Phocian
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
Pkt.	Prakrit
PL	plural
PN	Personal Name
PRS	present
PTCP	participle
SBJV	subjunctive
SG	singular
Skt.	Sanskrit
Sl.	Slavic
s.v.	<i>sub verbo</i>
Thess.	Thessalian
TochA	Tocharian A
TochB	Tocharian B
VOC	vocative
Ved.	Vedic
WGk.	West Greek
YAv.	Young Avestan

* unattested or reconstructed form

† unattested form expected from reconstruction

- $a > b$ a develops to b
 $b < a$ b develops from a
 $a \rightarrow b$ b is created/replaced by analogy to a

Epigraphic and Papyrological Abbreviations

For Classical Greek epigraphy I adhere throughout this work to the Revised Leiden Conventions for suggested by Krummrey & Panciera (1980). Transcription of Linear B sources follows the modified Leiden system standard to Mycenaean epigraphical practice, and transliterations are cited from their forms found in *DMic.* unless otherwise indicated. The most important K-P Leiden sigla are the following:

[...]	Unrestored lacuna or gap in original text of known length
[— — —]	Unrestored lacuna or gap in the original text of unknown length
[αβγ]	Restored lacuna in original text
<αβγ>	Restored or corrected characters erroneously omitted by ancient writer
{αβγ}	Letters in the text considered erroneous and superfluous by the editor
αβγ	Characters damaged or otherwise unclear in the text, ambiguous out of context.
<u>αβγ</u>	Characters read by a previous editor but are no longer readable on a stone
...	Traces of letters on the surface, insufficient for restoration by the editor
ΑΒΓ	Clear but incomprehensible letters
[[αβγ]]	Rasures (readable letters intentionally deleted) from the original text
<i>vac.</i>	Space left empty (<i>vacat</i>) on the stone or page

Note on the Accentuation of Dialect Forms

Evidence is sparse for accentuation in dialects other than Attic-Ionic, the Attic-Ionic koiné, and Lesbian. Therefore, in this work accentuation will remain unmarked on forms from dialects other than these. Cf. Probert (2003: 158–168) and Probert (2006: 70–82) for a survey of what is known of accentuation in dialects other than Attic-Ionic.

A Note on the Transcription of Ancient and Modern Greek Proper Names

Throughout this work I have attempted to maintain a certain consistency of transliterating familiar Ancient Greek proper names and toponyms with their Latinized forms (thus Attica rather than Attikē, or Thucydides rather than Thoukydidēs), however for less familiar proper names and toponyms I have retained a transcription (thus Thespiiai rather than Thespieae, Kierion rather than Cierium). I realize that this system is subjectively inconsistent, and I ask the reader's forbearance. Modern Greek proper names (when different from Ancient Greek) are transliterated to best approximate contemporary pronunciation.