88 R. Dunnett

rather than the mere occurrence of such action. The $\pi\varrho l\nu$ clause, on the other hand, limits duration of non-action or shows a simple temporal relationship between two single acts. When $\ell\omega_{\zeta}$ is used after a negative main clause, which is not the usual construction, it is the continuing lack of action in the main clause which is emphasized. It is not likely that a $\pi\varrho l\nu$ clause could fulfill the function of a $\ell\omega_{\zeta}$ clause.

To conclude, therefore, où $(\mu \acute{\eta}) \dots \pi \varrho \acute{\nu}$ and où $(\mu \acute{\eta}) \dots \grave{\epsilon} \acute{\alpha} \nu$ ($\epsilon \grave{i}$) $\mu \acute{\eta}$ should be regarded as functional equivalents. Moreover, every one of the examples examined, except a few which present special difficulties too involved to be discussed here, can be fitted into the form of one of the conditions discussed above by an analysis which is, as opposed to those in the standard grammars, systematic and consistent with the basic nature of the $\pi \varrho \acute{\nu}$ clause. The conditional nature of the $\pi \varrho \acute{\nu}$ clause, moreover, must be realized if its uses are to be correctly understood and systematically analysed.

Thessalian x15

By R. Dunnett, Oxford

The pronominal forms $\varkappa\iota_{\zeta}$, $\varkappa\iota$, $\varkappa\iota\nu\varepsilon_{\zeta}$, corresponding to Attic $\tau\iota_{\zeta}$, $\tau\iota$, $\tau\iota\nu\varepsilon_{\zeta}$ ($<*k^wi$ -) are well attested in two neighbouring regions of Thessaly¹). Their origin is not clear. Before a front vowel we should expect either a labial or a dental treatment of $*k^w²$): the velar is puzzling. This phonemic peculiarity has been compared with that of Ionic $\varkappa\tilde{\omega}_{\zeta}$, $\varkappa\sigma\tilde{\iota}o_{\zeta}$, etc., which alternate with the expected $\pi\tilde{\omega}_{\zeta}$, $\varkappa\sigma\tilde{\iota}o_{\zeta}$, etc. ($<*k^w$ -)³). It is unlikely, however, that we should look for an explanation to account for both phenomena: in Ionic the

¹⁾ In Larisa and Phalanna; for the evidence see Van der Velde, Thessalische Dialektgeographie, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1924, 62ff.; Thumb-Scherer, Gr. Dial., II, 60 and 76. The earliest inscription in which $\varkappa\iota\varsigma$ appears is IG IX 2, 1226, from Phalanna (Fifth Century).

²) Cf. O. Szereményi, The Labiovelars in Mycenaean and Historical Greek, Studi Mic. e Egeo-Anat., I (1966), 29, who, against the communis opinio, points to a dental treatment of the labiovelars before front vowels even in Aeolic.

³⁾ See Bechtel, Gr. Dial., III, 87ff. and Thumb-Scherer, Gr. Dial., II 262.

standard form is $\tau\iota\zeta$, and $\varkappa\iota\zeta$ does not occur; in Thessalian $\varkappa\tilde{\omega}\zeta$ and $\varkappa\sigma\tilde{\iota}o\zeta$ do not occur, but there is evidence for $\pi\sigma\tilde{\iota}o\zeta$ at least in one of the inscriptions which use $\varkappa\iota\zeta^4$). Moreover Ionic $\varkappa\tilde{\omega}\zeta$, $\varkappa\sigma\tilde{\iota}o\zeta$, etc. may perhaps be explained as due to a dissimilation of the labiovelar in forms of the type $*hok^w\tilde{\sigma}s$, $*hok^woios$ etc., and to a later spreading of the dissimilated forms, though the exact conditions in which this happened remain obscure. No similar explanation can be used for Thessalian. Even if it were possible to argue that a labiovelar is dissimilated into a velar between -o- and a front vowel, we should reckon with the fact that $*hosk^wis$ is not represented in Thessalian; its functions are taken by $\tau\iota\zeta$ or $\varkappa\iota\zeta$.

It appears, then, that Ionic cannot be of any help with the problem at hand. For $\varkappa\iota_{\zeta}$ in particular only a few explanations have been suggested, and most of them have already been refuted 5). One has found some favour: according to Solmsen and Schulze 6), $-\varkappa\iota_{\zeta}$ would have arisen in the compound $*ouk^wis$ (Homeric $o\check{v}\iota_{\zeta}$) due to the dissimilation of k^w after u. This is a possible but not totally convincing explanation for the uncompounded form $\varkappa\iota_{\zeta}$. In particular one misses any parallel example in Greek, while a counter-example (that of the simplex influencing the compound and not vice-versa) is found e.g. in Myc. o-u-qe, Gr. $o\check{v}\iota_{\zeta}$. The dissimilation of labiovelars after -u- into velars has taken place in the pre-Mycenaean period (cf. e-u-ke-to, qo-u-ko-ro: Gr. $e\check{v}\chi\varepsilon\iota_{\zeta}$, $\beta ov\iota(\delta)\iota_{\zeta} < *eug^wh-, *g^wouk^w-$), but in o-u-qe the labiovelar has been restored,—obviously on the analogy of the simplex qe: Gr. ι_{ζ} .

A more hopeful attempt to solve the enigma can start from the declension of $*k^wis$ itself. It is well known that the -n-element of $\tau\iota\nu\circ\varsigma$, $\tau\iota\nu\varepsilon\varsigma$ etc. is secondary. Originally $\tau\iota\varsigma$ must have declined like a normal -i-stem; the endings were added directly to the stem either in the zero grade $(*k^wi$ -) or in the full grade $(*k^wei$ -). A few dialects may have preserved this alternation, but it is likely that most dialects generalized the zero grade at an early stage. We have evidence for at least one form of the plural built on the zero grade of the stem, but without the -n-element: the nominative-accusative neuter plural $*k^wia$ (to be compared with Latin quia) is preserved in Attic-Ionic $a\sigma\sigma a/a\tau\tau a$, $a\sigma\sigma a/a\tau\tau a$. The alternation between $\sigma\sigma$ and $\tau\tau$ points to a

⁴⁾ IG IX 2, 517.

⁵) Cf. Van der Velde, loc. cit.; Bechtel, Gr. Dial., I 152; Schwyzer, Gr.Gr., I 200

⁶⁾ Solmsen, KZ N.F. 13 (1892), 299; further Rh. Mus., 58 (1903), 606; and Schulze, GGA 1897, 907f.

90 R. Dunnett

consonantal treatment of the pre-vocalic -i-, so that we must reconstruct an original *kwia; a similar form also accounts for the Megarian and Pindaric adverbs $\sigma \dot{\alpha}$ and $\tau \dot{\alpha}^{7}$). From these relics we can understand what the original declension was like. Whenever the case-forms were built on the zero grade of the stem and the endings began with a vowel (V), the resulting clusters could appear as k^wiV - or as k^wiV -. In other words we could expect either -i- or -i-, though we are not able as yet to establish the causes which determined the choice between the two possibilities⁸). A good example of a similar alternation is offered by Gr. $\delta \dot{\nu} \omega$ (< * $du\bar{o}$) vs. Gr. δώδεκα ($< *du\bar{o}$ -), or even Myc. dwo where it is likely that -w- is consonantal. One may also compare the double treatment of * $q^{w}i$ - in e.g. $\beta i \circ \zeta$ and $\zeta \tilde{\eta} v$. It follows that at an early stage forms like * k^wis , * k^wisi (dat. plur.) etc. were contrasted with doublets of the type $*k^wia/*k^wia$, $*k^wies/*k^wies$; the alternation between $*k^wi$ - and * kv_i - may have affected a large part of the declension (e.g. the genitives $*k^w ios$, $*k^w ion$?).

It is generally admitted 9) that the treatment of $*k^w$? is parallel to that of *k? and that, in fact, before a consonantal i, k^w is simplified to k. Thus the doublets mentioned above would develop to $*k^w$ ia/*kia, $*k^w$ ies/*kies etc., while $*k^w$ is, $*k^w$ isi etc. would remain unaffected 10).

The contrast between e.g. *kwia and *kia must have become phonetically more marked and phonemically relevant when the labiovelars tended towards dentals (or labials), and the cluster -ki-moved its own way. It is obvious, however, that in each dialect the regularity of the paradigm must have been continually safeguarded either by the selection of the more 'regular' forms (*kwia etc.) or by analogical repatterning. That is why, except for two isolated survi-

⁷⁾ See Schwyzer, Gr. Gr., I 616 and note 8. It is unlikely that these forms derive from a secondary *tia (rather than from the original *kvia > *kia): cf. Lejeune, Phon. Gr., 92.

⁸⁾ According to Sievers-Edgerton's laws, one should expect a consonantal treatment of the sonant only when the preceding word ended in a short vowel, but for this see a forthcoming article by A. Morpurgo-Davies. Cf. also F. O. Lindeman, La Loi de Sievers et le Début du mot en indo-européen, Norsk Tidss. Sprogvid., XX (1965), 38—108 passim.

⁹⁾ Cf. Lejeune, Phon. Gr., 38.

¹⁰) The relative chronology of these changes and those mentioned in the following paragraph is not clear, but it does not affect our argument. The only assumption that we have to make is that the spreading of the -n-element in the declension of $*k^{vi}$ - is later than the changes just mentioned.

vals ($\tilde{a}\tau\tau a$ and $\tilde{a}\tau\tau a$), Attic has formed all its declension on a dental stem, i.e. on the natural development of the original cluster of labiovelar and vocalic i. In other dialects analogy may have worked in the opposite direction. This could explain Thessalian $\varkappa\iota_{\zeta}$. The velar can be accounted for by an analogical spread of \varkappa from those declensional cases in which it represented the normal simplification of $*k^{w}$ - before ι . In other words, $\varkappa\iota_{\zeta}$ may owe its \varkappa to $*k\dot{\iota}$ es etc.; later a second process of analogy substituted $\varkappa\iota\iota\iota_{\zeta}$ for the expected $*\sigma\varepsilon_{\zeta}$ or $*\tau\varepsilon_{\zeta}$ ($<*k\dot{\iota}$ es)¹¹).

Über den "emphatischen Grundwert" des Potentialis

Von L. J. Elferink, Den Haag

Ruth Camerer spricht in dieser Zeitschrift 46, 1968, S. 106 über den "emphatischen Grundwert" der Partikel är. Zur selben Zeit erschien von meiner Hand das Buch "De Potentialis in het Grieks" (Den Haag-Scheveningen 1968, Bestell-Adresse: Scheveningen, P.O. Box 5094). Weil das Buch holländisch geschrieben ist, wäre es vielleicht gut, hier meine Ansichten kurz auf Deutsch zusammenzufassen.

Ich habe längere Zeit, genau wie Ruth Camerer, die Möglichkeiten eines emphatischen Grundwertes der Partikel äv erwogen, um schließlich doch zu ganz anderen Ansichten zu kommen. Schon die Tatsache, daß ein weites Gebiet von äv ganz außerhalb irgendeiner emphatischen Bedeutung liegt, hätte Ruth Camerer zu anderen Ansichten führen sollen. Dieses weite Gebiet ist nl. die Verwendung von äv in Irrealen Sätzen. Da im Irrealis die Partikel äv keinen emphatischen Wert hat, ist nicht einzusehen, weshalb äv in anderen Verbänden diese Bedeutung haben, ja sogar diese Bedeutung als "Grundbedeutung" haben soll.

Wahrscheinlich ist es Ruth Camerer genauso wie mir ergangen und sie hat sich, mit vollem Recht, gestoßen an der Formulierung des Bedeutungsinhalts des Potentials wie bei Schwyzer-Debrunner, Gr. Gr. 2, S. 324 (und in allen anderen mir bekannten Grammatiken),

¹¹) I would like to express my gratitude to Mrs. A. Morpurgo-Davies for so generously guiding me in the preparation and drafting of this note. Without her advice its formulation would have been unthinkable.