The Origin of the Short-Vowel EY-Stems in Homer*
Jeremy Rau
Glotta; Zeitschrift für Griechische und Lateinische Sprache...; 2008; 84, Humanities Module
pg. 169

The Origin of the Short-Vowel *EY*-Stems in Homer*

By JEREMY RAU, Cambridge

Beside the inherited long-vowel inflection of the *eu*-stems in -ῆα, -ῆος, -ῆϊ (< PGk. *-*ēu̯a, -ēu̯os, -ēu̯i*),[1] the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have an alternative *eu*-stem inflectional pattern based on a short-vowel stem in -ε-: -έα, -έος, -έϊ. This short-vowel type is attested 2x among appellatives, 1x in an ethnic, 21x among proper names, and 412x among patronymic formations, cf.[2]

Appellatives (2x)[3]
τοκέων O 660, Φ 587

---

* I would like to thank Alan J. Nussbaum (Cornell University) and Martin Peters (Universität Wien) for much helpful advice and discussion during the preparation of this paper. Naturally, any errors of fact or judgment are solely my own responsibility.

[1] On the reconstruction of the Proto-Greek paradigm of the *eu*-stems, see Perpillou 1973: 63ff. and, on its Indo-European origins, Schindler 1976: 349ff.

[2] Here and below text citations and manuscript and papyrus sigla from the *Iliad* are given after West 1998–2000. For the *Odyssey*, text citations and sigla are from Ludwich 1891 and Allen 1917–19.

[3] Λ 151 ἱππεῖς is usually cited as a second instance of short-vowel inflection among *eu*-stem appellatives. However, while the motivation for the monosyllabic scansion of the ending here is clear – note the juxtaposition and polyptoton of πεζός and ἱππεύς,

　Λ 150–51 πεζοὶ μὲν πεζοὺς ὄλεκον φεύγοντας ἀνάγκηι,
　　　ἱππεῖς δ᾽ ἱππῆας – ὑπὸ δέ σφισιν ὦρτο κονίη
　　　"Foot-soldiers were killing the foot-soldiers who were fleeing perforce, and horsemen horsemen – and dust rose up under them" –,

the reading ἱππεῖς cannot be considered certain. Beside ἱππεῖς in a 1st c. A.D. papyrus (688) and the majority of the manuscript transmission, the tradition also offers the *variae lectiones* (= *v.ll.*) ἱππῆες in the 10th c. D and the 12-13th c. G and ἱππῆς in a 2nd – 3rd c. and a 4th c. A.D. papyrus (1197, 60), the 10th c. Venetus A (above the line), and the 11th c. Y. While ἱππῆες is unmetrical and most simply explained as having been introduced into the text after the normal nom. pl. ἱππῆες at Δ 144, Λ 52, and Λ 529 – on the problematic hiatus shortening and contraction analysis of Hagen 1995/96: 149ff., see Hackstein 2002: 24f. – and the ἱππεῖς given by most of the manuscript tradition and most modern editors is best taken as a *lectio facilior* since it shows the normal late Attic, Ionic and Koine *eu*-stem nom. pl. ending -εῖς, two conside-

Jeremy Rau

Ethnics (1x)[4]
Δωριέες τ 177

Proper names (21x)

'Αμαρυγκέα Ψ 630   Πηλέϊ Ω 61
'Ατρέϊ Β 105   Πορθεῖ Ξ 115
'Αχιλλεῖ Ψ 792   Πρωτέος δ 365
'Ιφέα Π 417   Τυδέα Ζ 222
Θησέα λ 631, Α 265[5]   Τυδέος Ξ 114
Καινέα Α 264   Τυδέϊ Δ 372, Κ 285
Νηλέα ο 229   Τυφωέος Β 783
'Οδυσσέα ζ 212, ρ 301   Τυφωέϊ Β 782
'Οδυσσέος Δ 491, ω 398 (mss. 'Οδυσσεῦς)

Patronymics (412x)

'Αζείδη- Β 513   'Ατρέος υἱό- Β 23, etc. 12x   'Ατρείων- Α 387, etc. 5x
Αἰγείδη- Α 265   Πηλέος υἱό- Α 489, etc. 6x   Πηλείων- Α 188, etc. 44x
'Αμαρυγκείδη- Δ 517,   Τυδέος υἱό- Β 406, etc. 29x
   Β 622   Φυλέος υἱό- Κ 110, 175
'Ατρείδη- Α 7, etc. 182x
Καινείδη- Β 746
Νηλείδη- Ψ 652
Οἰνείδη- Ε 813, Κ 497
'Οτρυντείδη- Υ 383, 389
Πηλείδη- Α 146, etc. 50x
Τυδείδη- Ε 18, etc. 65x
Φυλείδη- Β 628, etc. 7x

---

rations have long suggested that the reading ἱππῆς should be taken seriously. Cf. Chantraine 1948: 223 and West 1998–2000 *ad loc.* with reference to Wackernagel 1953–79: 1208ff. In the first place, ἱππῆς appears in two papyri and as a *v.l.* in the Venetus A, and thus has good and old manuscript authority. In the second, contraction over *digamma* hiatus as it appears in -ῆς < -ῆες < PGk. *-*ēu̯es* has clear parallels in early Ionic inscriptions – cf., e.g., nom. pl. Βοδεης (: Βουδεεύς, ethnic of Βουδεία) *SGDI* IV, 55, l.4, Chios, late 5th/early 4th c. B.C., and, for possible West Ionic evidence, Barrio Vega 1987: 253 – and agrees with what is found in the *Iliad* in τιμῆς Ι 605 (Ω: τιμῆις Ε [11th, after correction] R [12th, after correction]) < -ή-(ϝ)εις and τιμῆντα Σ 475 (no *v.l.*) < -ή-(ϝ)εντα. In view of these considerations, ἱππεῖς cannot be taken as a sure example of the use of the short-vowel stem in an *eu*-stem appellative and has been excluded from this discussion.

[4] The short vowel in the ethnic Δωριέες τ 177 is metrically necessary.

[5] A 265 is absent from most manuscripts. See West 1998–2000 *ad loc.*

A long-standing problem in Homeric linguistics and the one which will occupy this paper is how the short vowel in these forms is best explained.

Dialect Origins

The traditional explanation of the short-vowel *eu*-stems argues that they have their origins in Aeolic, where an inflectional distinction is said to have held between short-vowel proper names and long-vowel appellatives.[6] The evidence usually cited for this distinction stems from the Lesbian poets, cf.

Appellatives[7]	Proper Names and Patronymics
βασίληος A. 387 Voigt	Ἀτρείδαν A. 70, 6
βασίληες S. 17, 4, S. 161	Ἀχίλλεα A. 387
ἱππήων S. 16, 1	Νηρείδων A. 42, 11
μαλοδρόπηες S. 105a, 2	Νηρηΐδες S. 5, 1
τοκήων A. 61, 5, A. 72, 13,	Νή[ρ]ηος A. 42, 7
A. 6, 14, S. 16, 10	Πήλεος A. 42, 11

Two facts, however, argue against seeing the short-vowel *eu*-stems as an Aeolic feature in Homeric language. In the first place, the material found in the poets does not unambiguously demonstrate that Lesbian distinguished between short-vowel proper names and long-vowel appellatives. This is clear from the fact (1) that long-vowel inflection was also regular in the poets in proper names – cf. Νή[ρ]ηος and Νηρηΐδες – and (2) that all the short-vowel proper names and patronymics found in the texts are attested already in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* – i.e. Ατρείδαν and Πήλεος – or have obvious epic models – i.e. Ἀχίλλεα and Νηρείδων –, and can continue epicisms just as easily as real Aeolic forms.[8] A second problem is that there is no

---

[6] See Hoffmann 1891: 544, Bechtel 1921: 67f., Schwyzer 1939: 576, and Peters 1989: 158–9.

[7] Text citations of Sappho and Alcaeus are given after Voigt 1971.

[8] See Debrunner 1923: 36–9 and Hamm 1957: 158–9.

Jeremy Rau

evidence for an inflectional distinction like this in the actual Aeolic dialects. Long-vowel inflection is the rule for both appellatives and proper names in Thessalian[9] and Boeotian[10] inscriptions, and short-vowel forms appear in proper names in Asia Minor Aeolic inscriptions only in the 3rd c. B.C. and only after they are first attested in appellatives.[11]

A second approach argues that the short-vowel forms in Homer depend on an innovation in the "Achaean" dialects, where it is alleged the agreement of the *eu*- and *s*-stem nom. sg. -ης and acc. sg. -ην – cf., e.g., for the *eu*-stems, Arcadian hιερε̄ν *IG* V, 3, 1.3, Tegea, 4th c. B.C., and Cyprian nom. sg. ιjερε̄ς *ICS* 4, 1.5, New Paphos, 4th c. B.C., and, for the *s*-stems, Arcadian PN Σακλην, *IG* V, 6, 1.19, Tegea, 4th c. B.C., and Cyprian ἀτελε̄ν, *ICS* 217A, 1.10, Idalium, 5th c. B.C. – led to the analogical creation of an alternative *eu*-stem oblique in -ε-: viz. *s*-stem nom. acc. sg. -ης, -ην: obl. -ε-:: *eu*-stem nom. acc. sg. -ης, -ην: obl. $x, x \Rightarrow$ -ε-.[12]

However, an "Achaean" origin for the short-vowel *eu*-stems is also unlikely. In Cyprian and Mycenaean the *eu*-stems regularly preserve inter-vocalic digamma – cf., e.g., nom. pl. <ke-ti-e-we> *ICS* 217 *passim,* Idalium, 5th c. B.C. and gen. sg. <i-je-re-wo> PY Ea 756 –, and the default assumption must be that they have also preserved their inherited long-vowel inflection. In Arcadian, a long-vowel ante-vocalic shortening

---

[9] Cf., e.g., βασιλειος *IG* IX, 2, 517, 1.2, Larisa, c. 214 B.C. (= *Buck* 32), Αιολειεσσι *McD* 337, 1.19, Larisa, 2nd c. B.C. (= *Buck* 33). Short-vowel forms appear only in Αιολεα *McD* 337, 1.23, Larisa, 2nd c. B.C. and in one proper name, Θαμιεα, and two appellatives, γραφει and κασιεα, in an unpublished 2nd c. B.C. inscription from Histiaeotis, cf. Blümel 1982: 257f. In the case of Αιολεα, the short vowel is presumably to be ascribed to an engraver's mistake – note Αιολειεσσι in the same inscription –, and in the material from Histiaeotis, the short-vowel forms are likely due to Northwest Greek *Koina* influence.

[10] Cf., e.g., βασιλειος *IG* VII, 4136, 1.7, 2nd c. B.C., Ἀκρηφιειες *DGEEP* 541, 1.1, c. 300 B.C. and Ἀρκηφιειων *SEG* 15: 331, 1.1, early 2nd c. B.C.

[11] The earliest short-vowel appellative in Asia Minor Aeolic is βασιλεος *IG* XII 2, 526 d, 1.25, end of the 4th c. B.C., and the earliest short-vowel non-appellative is the ethnic Αιγαεεσσι *DGEEP* 644, 1.12, c. 290 B.C. For a useful survey of the Asia Minor Aeolic material, see Hodot 1990: 115ff.

[12] See Wathelet 1970: 276, who suggests this as a possibility.

rule that was operative in the 4th c. B.C. has largely obscured the prehistoric inflection of the type,[13] and there is only one dialect that offers anything relevant to the discussion, that of Orchomenos. Although this dialect does in fact seem to have lacked the shortening rule of its neighbors – cf. νηαταν *DGEEP* 664, 1.10, c. 369–361 B.C. and τα χρηατα *DGEEP* 665, 1.29, 36, c. 360–50 B.C. – and to have crossed the inflection of the *eu*- and *s*-stems in a way that would be consistent with a prehistoric analogy of the sort conjectured above – cf. the *eu*-stem τος Ηραεας *DGEEP* 665, 1.22, c. 360–50 B.C. and the *s*-stem Δ]αισθρασηι *O*.4, 1.9 Dubois, 3rd –2nd (?) c. B.C. – , two facts make it clear that it is worthless for establishing "Achaean" as a likely source of our forms. In the first place, ante-vocalic shortening is clearly attested in the 4th c. for the neighboring city Tegea, and it cannot be excluded with any degree of certainty that this rule was not also operative at Orchomenos.[14] In the second, the continued appearance of long-vowel *eu*-stems in this dialect into the 4th c. B.C. – cf., e.g., Τορθυνηων and Μετιδριηων *DGEEP* 664, 1.67, c. 369–61 B.C. and τον Αρηα *DGEEP* 665, *passim*, c. 360–50 B.C. (vs. 1.22 τος Ηραεας) – makes it clear that even if it could reasonably be assumed that the short-vowel *eu*-stems at Orchomenos are analogical, this analogy would have been so recent that it could not possibly have had any effect on the epic tradition.

A third approach argues that the short-vowel *eu*-stems have entered the epic tradition from some dialect of Neo-Ionic[15] which, like the East Ionic of Chios or the West Ionic of Eretria and Oropos,[16] analogically remodeled the quantitative meta-

---

[13] Cf., e.g., το χρεος *DGEEP* 657, 1.42f., Tegea, c. 324 B.C., and see Dubois 1986: 114f.

[14] See Dubois 1986: 118, who argues that all short-vowel forms in the Arcadian *eu*-stems are to be ascribed to such a rule.

[15] Cf. Bechtel 1921: 149.

[16] For useful surveys of the material, see Miller 1982: 103f. and Crespo 1994: 88.

thesis (= QM) version of the endings -έα, -έως (< PGk. *-ēμa,
*-ēμos) to -έα, -έος,[17] cf., e.g.,

Chios   Proper Names
> Θαργαλεος, Ἀνδρεος   *DGEEP* 688 C l.18, D l.6,
>   c. 475-50 B.C.
> Μνησεος, Φιλεος *DGEEP* 691, l.2, 9, late 5th/early
>   4th c. B.C.

Appellatives
> βασιλεας *SGDI* 5662, l.3, late 5th c. B.C.
> ιερει *SGDI* 5663, l.3, late 4th c. B.C.

Eretria Proper Names
> Κοινεος, Λιμνεος *IG* XII 9, 245 A, l.21, 325, early
>   3rd c. B.C.
> Ἀκτεος, Ἀριστεος *ibid.* B, l.30, 38

> **Appellatives**
> βασιλεα, βασιλει *IG* XII 9, 212, l.4f., 3rd c. B.C.

Oropos Appellatives
> ιερεα, ιερεος *IG* XII 11, 235, l.2f., 13, c. 386–77 B.C.

To evaluate this approach it is necessary to investigate the
Homeric evidence for the analogical remodeling of endings
affected by QM and to determine whether the distribution of
remodeled vs. non-remodeled forms is consistent with the
number of short- vs. long-vowel forms in the *eu*-stems.

Since forms with QM tend to be rare in Homer, less
frequently attested than their non-QM counterparts and not well

---

[17] The presence in these dialects of obvious QM reflexes in the *eu*-stems
and in forms that have an analogous phonological environment – cf., e.g., for
Chios, Ὀρθεως *SEG* 22, 508, l.59, mid. 4th c. B.C. and Λεωνικδεω (< *lᴂμo-)
SGDI 5657, l.7, late 5th c. B.C., for Eretria, Οισεως *Durante* 127, late
4th/early 5th c. B.C., and, for Oropos, νεωκορον (< *nᴂμo-) *DGEEP* 811,
386–77 B.C. – makes it unlikely that the short vowel in the forms just noted
depends on a rule of ante-vocalic shortening and not QM and remodeling as
has been assumed here. For more detailed discussion, see Nussbaum 1998:
63[217].

embedded formulaically,[18] it is generally agreed that QM was one of the latest Neo-Ionic linguistic developments to have made its way into the epic tradition before active oral composition came to an end.[19] In fact, there is only one word in Homer which is generally held to show QM and remodeling[20] and in which short-vowel forms are at all well attested – Homeric νηῦς 'ship.' For the distribution of forms with and without QM in this word, cf.[21, 22]

		+QM	-QM	Total[23]		+QM	-QM	Total
pl.	nom.	νέες	νῆες	11: 37	sg.	–	–	–
	acc.	νέας	νῆας	13: 181		νέᾳ	νῆα	1: 102
	gen.	νεῶν	νηῶν	40: 79		νεός	νηός	18: 93
	dat.	νεεσσί	νηεσσί	12: 33		–	νηΐ	0: 69

As this chart makes clear, forms of νηῦς that have QM always co-occur with forms without it, and while the QM variants can be roughly half as frequent as their non-QM counterparts – cf. the gen. and dat. pl. –, in most cases they are either less than a

---

[18] For a list of forms that show QM in Homer, see Chantraine 1948: 68ff.

[19] See Hoekstra 1969: 31ff.

[20] It should also be noted that it is not absolutely necessary to assume that the short-vowel forms in the paradigm of νηῦς 'ship' depend on QM and remodeling. For it is generally assumed that one part of the phonological process of QM consisted in the shortening of long vowels in hiatus before other long vowels. If it were possible to show that ante-vocalic shortening preceded QM in Ionic – and was not just concomitant with it –, then it might be desirable to explain the well-embedded short-vowel forms in νηῦς 'ship' by assuming that they have been analogically generalized from the gen. pl. νεῶν where the short vowel was phonologically regular. See Sommer 1977: 282. An approach like this would seem to have support in the fact that the gen pl. νεῶν is the best attested short-vowel form in the paradigm of this word in Homer and that short-vowel forms are all, apart from the gen. sg. νεός and the *hapax* νέᾳ (Ar.) ι 283, limited to the plural. In any event, however the short-vowel forms of νηῦς are ultimately to be explained, for purposes of the present argument the assumption is that they depend on QM.

[21] The numbers given here differ from those of Hoekstra 1969: 129 in counting repeated lines only once.

[22] In terms of formulaic distribution, the numbers are roughly equal among QM and non-QM forms. In both classes, one half to two-thirds of the forms figure in repeated segments and can be considered formulaic.

[23] In this and the following totals, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have been grouped together.

third as common or fail to occur entirely. If the short vowel in the *eu*-stems depends on QM and remodeling in Neo-Ionic, short-vowel forms should therefore be at most about half as frequent as their long-vowel counterparts. In the case of appellatives and non-patronymic proper names, the distribution of QM and non-QM forms is consistent with this figure. Short-vowel forms are in fact slightly less common than might be expected. For reasonably well attested proper names and appellatives, cf.

	+QM	-QM	Total
Proper Names[24]	Ἀχιλλεῖ	Ἀχιλλῆϊ	1: 8
	Νηλέα	Νηλῆα	1: 2
	Ὀδυσσέα	Ὀδυσσῆα	1: 16
	Ὀδυσσέος	Ὀδυσσῆος	2: 60
	Πηλέϊ	Πηλῆϊ	1: 6
Appellatives	τοκέων	τοκήων	2: 14

In patronymic formations, on the other hand, the distribution disagrees with that found in νηῦς. The short-vowel version of the suffix is alone used in the case of Ατρεύς (199: 0) and Τυδεύς (95: 0) and predominates in that of Πηλεύς (103: 12), while the expected distribution occurs only in patronymics to Νηλεύς (1: 12). Cf.[25, 26]

-είδη-	-είων-	-έος υἱό-
Ἀτρείδη- 182x	Ἀτρείων- 5x	Ἀτρέος υἱό- 11x
Τυδείδη- 65x	–	Τυδέος υἱό- 30x

---

[24] Names that are attested in Homer only a couple of times and that have only short-vowel forms have been excluded. On the use of the short-vowel *eu*-stem proper names in Homer, see Witte 1912: 388ff.

[25] Patronymics that are attested only one or two times have also been excluded.

[26] The short-vowel patronymics are also very well embedded formulaically. See the survey of formulae in the appendix below.

Πηλείδη- 53x	Πηλείων- 44x	Πηλέος υἱό- 6x[27]
Νηλείδη- 1x	–	–
ηϊάδη-	-ήϊο-	υἱό- -ῆος
–	–	–
–	–	–
Πηληϊάδη- 12x	[Πηλήϊο-][28]	–
Νηληϊάδη- 7x	Νηλήϊο- 4x	υἱό- Νηλῆος 1x

Given that the number of short- vs. long-vowel forms in the *eu*-stem patronymics is not consistent with what can be considered the upper bound in the distribution of QM vs. non-QM variants in Homer and that there is no principled way to explain why this is the case,[29] it is necessary to conclude that the short vowel

---

[27] Πηλέος υἱὲ and Πηλέος υἱὸς at Π 21 = Τ 216 = λ 478 #ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ ₃| Πηλέος υἱὲ ₇| μέγα φέρτατ' Ἀχαιῶν# and Α 489 #διογενὴς ₃| Πηλέος υἱὸς ₇| πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς# have been left out of consideration since the transmission alternates between Πηλέος, Πηλέως and Πηλῆος. See West 1998–2000 and Ludwich 1891 *ad loc*. If these lines continue something old – as is likely in the case of #ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ ₃| Πηλέος υἱὲ ₇| μέγα φέρτατ' Ἀχαιῶν# since the archaic-looking ₇| μέγα φέρτατ' Ἀχαιῶν# does not appear elsewhere –, Πηλέος υἱὲ and Πηλέος υἱὸς are best seen as late-epic replacements of *₃| Πηληϊάδη ₇| and *₃| Πηληϊάδης ₇| – cf. #ὦ Νέστορ ₃| Νηληϊάδη ₇| μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν# (Κ 87+) and #Μηκιστηϊάδης ₅| καὶ ἀπ' ὤμων τεύχε' ἐσύλα# (Ζ 28) ≈ #Μηκιστέος υἱὸς ₅| Ταλαϊονίδαο ἄνακτος# (Β 556 = Ψ 678).

[28] Πηλήϊο- is attested at Σ 60 = Σ 441 οἴκαδε νοστήσαντα, δόμον Πηλήϊον εἴσω. However, as it functions in this instance not as a patronymic but rather as a genitival adjective, it has not been included in the chart of patronymics.

[29] To preserve a Neo-Ionic approach here, it seems that one of two things would have to be argued: First, it could be argued that the frequency of the short-vowel patronymics to Ἀτρεύς, Πηλεύς and Τυδεύς is to be explained by assuming that these forms entered the epic tradition only after QM became an option in Neo-Ionic. But as patronymics constitute an essential element in the designation of the Homeric heroes and as it is unlikely that any significant hero would have been used in epic poetry without a patronymic, this explanation would require the additional assumption that Ἀγαμέμνων, Μενέλαος, Ἀχιλλεύς and Διομήδης have been introduced into the epic tradition only in its late Neo-Ionic phase. Although an approach like this might work in the case of Διομήδης since he is often said to have been introduced into the epic tradition by Homer himself, there is to my knowledge no evidence to support the assumption that Ἀγαμέμνων, Μενέλαος and Ἀχιλλεύς should be seen as late epic figures.

inflection of the *eu*-stems in Homer – at least as it appears in patronymics – cannot be explained as having its origins in Neo-Ionic.

A Creation of the Homeric Poetic Language

Since it cannot represent a feature of any of the dialects that are normally thought to have contributed to the Homeric poetic language, the only remaining approach to the short-vowel *eu*-stems is to argue that they have their origins in a specifically inner-epic innovation.[30] An analysis like this has in fact long

---

Second, it could be argued that once the short-vowel *eu*-stems became an option as a result of QM poets largely replaced the long-vowel patronymics with the new formations in -είδη-, -είων- and -έος υἱό- because these forms were more flexible in the hexameter than those in -ηϊάδη-, -ήϊο- and υἱό--ῆος. However, an approach like this is also problematic. For if (a) QM is so recent a linguistic development in the epic tradition that it requires the assumption that the poet of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* or his immediate predecessors still had access to non-QM variants and their associated formulae and if (b) it cannot be made likely that patronymics built to Ἀτρεύς, Πηλεύς and (possibly) Τυδεύς entered the epic tradition only after QM and remodeling in Neo-Ionic, then it is necessary to assume that although the poet(s) of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* had learned to use the long-vowel patronymics to Ἀτρεύς, Πηλεύς and (possibly) Τυδεύς and their formulae he almost entirely ignored these forms when composing the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* themselves. Given the traditional nature of the Homeric poetic language, this is not of course an attractive assumption. It becomes even more difficult, however, when one tries to explain why the poet has used the long-vowel patronymics to Πηλεύς and Νηλεύς – i.e. Πηληϊάδη-, Νηληϊάδη-, Νηλήϊο-, and υἱό- Νηλῆος – and their formulae in some cases – cf., e.g., ₅| Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος# and ₅| Νηληϊάδαο γέροντος# – but has entirely given them up in the case of Ἀτρεύς and (possibly) Τυδεύς. For in the case of the latter forms, it is obviously not possible to argue that the long-vowel patronymics and their formulae were in every instance less useful or desirable than those to Πηλεύς and Νηλεύς, and the only way to explain this discrepancy would be to assume that the poet for some reason decided not to use them in these cases or that they simply happen not to occur. Since an argument like this would not constitute a well-motivated explanation, it must also be rejected.

[30] An explanation of these forms as inner-epic innovations has also been recently proposed by M. West (2002: 262ff.), who argues that they have their origins in Ἀτρείδης, a patronymic formation to a lost proper name *Ἀτρείων or *Ἀτρείας. However, beyond the fact that there is no positive evidence in favor of this scenario and that the etymology and stem formation of the name

been on the books in the "metrical shortening" analysis propo-
sed by A. Debrunner (1923: 37–8) and codified by P. Chantraine
(1948: 105f.). In their view, the short vowel has its origins in the
patronymics in -εἴδη- and -είων-[31] where it was created by the
poets through the mechanical replacement of -η- by -ε- – viz.
*-ηΐδη-, *-ηΐων- ⇒ -εἴδη-, -είων- – in order to generate a useful
alternative for metrically inadmissible formations in *-ηΐδη- and
*-ηΐων- like *Πηληΐδη- (– –◡–) and *Πηληΐων- (– –◡–ˉ). Two
objections, however, have prevented this explanation from
gaining general acceptance:

1.) Since the metrically and morphologically correct Homeric
eu-stem patronymics must have been not *-ηΐδη- and *-ηΐων-
but rather -ηϊάδη-,[32] -ήϊο- and υἱό- -ῆος before the creation of
the short-vowel patronymics, the assumption that poets gener-
ated -εἴδη- and -είων- specifically as alternatives to *-ηΐδη-
and *-ηΐων- is not well motivated.

2.) There is no clear evidence in Homer for a process of
"metrical shortening," and so no reason to believe that epic
poets could have created -εἴδη- and -είων- from *-ηΐδη- and
*-ηΐων- by mechanically replacing -η- by -ε-.

While the first objection is correct and represents a minor flaw
in Debrunner's argument, the second is only in part valid and
depends on a misconception of what "metrical shortening" in the
epics might have involved. In recent years, it has become clear

---

Ἀτρεύς are fully unclear, this approach leaves unexplained why Ἀτρείδης
would have been reinterpreted as derived from an *eu*-stem and so have led to
the creation of other short-vowel *eu*-stem patronymics.

[31] Debrunner 1923: 37–8 assumes that patronymics in -έος υἱό- are late
creations based on -εἴδη- and -είων-. But since υἱό- 'son' is old in Ionic, there
is no reason not to assume that once the short-vowel *eu*-stem oblique became
an option in the patronymics -εἴδη- and -είων- the poets could not have
immediately created the patronymic collocation -έος υἱό-.

[32] Debrunner 1923: 37ff. seems to claim that the suffix -ιάδη- is a late
analogical creation. Although the precise details of its origin are unclear, the
feminine version of this suffix is attested already in Mycenaean, cf. nom. pl.
<ka-ra-pa$_2$-de> (PY Aa 788+) /karpjades/ (< *-i̯ades) – see Leukart 1994:
231f. –, and this of course means that it can be as old as the 2nd millennium in
Greek poetic traditions.

that the better attested counterpart of "metrical shortening," metrical lengthening, is not to be thought of as a strictly mechanical phenomenon but is better understood as part of a more general process whereby the Homeric poets generated metrically useful forms by analogy. That is, in many cases where the poets seem to have mechanically lengthened a short vowel or to have "stretched" a morpheme to make a word useable in the hexameter, what they have actually done is generated the metrically lengthened or "stretched" form by analogically exploiting cases where a similar word or morpheme had a long vowel or longer variant.[33] For clear instances of this process it is possible to compare the gen. pl. δυσαήων (ν 99),[34] which has been analogically "lengthened" from *δυσαέων on the model of τοκήων (8x *Il.*, 6x *Od.*) beside τοκέων (Ο 660, Φ 587), and further the masculine ᾱ-stem acc. sg. ||'Αντιφατῆα# (κ 114), which has been "stretched" from #'Αντιφάτην ₃| (ο 242) by analogy to the alternate *eu*-stem accusative sg.'s -ήν and -ῆα.[35] Now, if "metrical shortening" is similarly understood as an analogical process according to which the Homeric poets could create metrically useful forms by exploiting phonological and morphological variants, it can simply be interpreted as a corollary of the same process that is responsible for metrical lengthening.

"Metrical shortening" as an analogical process is in fact easily established for the Homeric poetic language. Already in his article on the short-vowel *eu*-stem patronymics, Debrunner (1923: 28f.) noted a second likely instance of this phenomenon, the adjective σκιόεντ- 'providing shade, shady.' This adjective, which appears 11x in the three formulas νέφεα σκιόεντα 5x (typically line-end), οὔρεα σκιόεντα 2x, and μέγαρα σκιόεντα 4x (always line-end), is clearly a *ϝent*-stem derived from the common Greek ᾱ-stem noun σκιή 'shade, shadow.' Unlike most

---

[33] See Wyatt 1969: *passim*.

[34] More specifically, ἀνέμων ₃| ◡◡–◡ ʃ δυσαήων at ν 99 has likely been created through modification and metrical lengthening from ₃| ἀνέμοιο ʃ δυσαέος || (Ε 865) and ₃| ζεφύροιο ʃ δυσαέος || (Ψ 200).

[35] See Wackernagel 1916: 160 and further below. On "metrical stretching," see Nussbaum 1998: 155.

u̯ent-stems in Homer, however, σκιόεντ- has been derived not by adding the suffix -u̯ent- directly to the -η- of its basis σκιή – cf., e.g., ἠχή 'noise, roar' → ἠχήεντ- 'roaring, echoing' (A 157, δ 72) – but rather by first replacing this suffix with the thematic vowel. As Debrunner rightly observed, this replacement is to be attributed to the metrical difficulty that versifying the morphologically correct *u̯ent*-stem *σκιήεντ- (– |ᴗ– –◡)[36] would have caused the poets, and the source of the thematic vowel is to be traced to the analogical replacement of -ᾰ-/-ᾱ- by -o- in the first members of compounds – cf., e.g., ἄελλα 'gust of wind, blast' → ἀελλόπος 'storm-footed' (Θ 409, Ω 77, 159) and ὑλή 'wood, forest' → ὑλοτόμος 'woodcutter(s)' (Ψ 114, 123) – and in the general Greek tendency to reinterpret first-member o-stems like these as alternative derivational bases – cf., e.g., ἀήρ '(lower) atmosphere, mist' → ἠεροειδής 'misty, murky' (E 770+) ⇒ ἠερόεντ- 'cloudy' (Θ 13, O 191, υ 64) and θύος 'burnt-offering' → θυοσκόος 'prophet' ⇒ θυόεντ- 'odorous' (O 153).[37]

Since there is clear evidence in Homer for at least one instance of "metrical shortening" via analogy, an analysis of the basic type proposed by Debrunner and Chantraine cannot be considered objectionable. To make a reasonable case for this approach it is only necessary (1) to identify a more suitable

---

[36] The poets had only two ways to make *σκιήεντ-, viz. ᴗ– –◡, usable in the hexameter. In the first place, they might have preserved the short scansion of word-final short vowels before *σκιήεντ- as they do in the case of, e.g., Σκάμανδρος. However, the neglect of "position lengthening" before #σκ- is rare in Homer and does not constitute a regular prosodic license. See Chantraine 1948: 110. On the other hand, they might have metrically lengthened *σκιήεντ- → *σκῑήεντ-, viz ᴗ– –◡ → – –◡. This strategy, however, would have produced four long vowels in a row and, as most *u̯ent*-stems like σκιόεντ- have apparently been created to figure specifically at the end of the line – see Witte 1913: 2226f. –, a dreaded spondaic line-end. Since both strategies involved difficulties, the obvious solution has been the creation of the analogical σκιόεντ-.

[37] The phonologically and morphologically regular *u̯ent*-stem derivative to θύος is apparently θυήεντ- 'odorous' (Θ 48, Ψ 148, θ 363), cf., e.g., τελήεντ- 'perfect' < *teles-u̯ent-. The switch from an s- to an o-stem derivational basis in θυόεντ- presumably has its origins in the coincidence of pairs like Hes. ὁ σκότος 'darkness' and Pind.+ τὸ σκότος 'darkness,' both of which could be interpreted as the derivational basis of the *u̯ent*-stem (Hes.+) σκοτόεντ- 'dark.'

motivation for why the poets would have created the short-vowel *eu*-stems and (2) to isolate the analogical model on which they might have done it.

The obvious way to approach the question of motivation is to start by considering what the patronymics to Ἀτρεύς, Πηλεύς and Τυδεύς[38] would have looked like before the creation of the short-vowel formations, and to determine whether there is any metrical or compositional factor in the verse positions they occupied that might have favored their replacement. As noted above, patronymics to Ἀτρεύς, Τυδεύς and Πηλεύς must in the first instance have been made with the long-vowel formations in -ηϊάδη-, -ήϊο- and υἱό- -ῆος and have had the shape:[39]

*Ἀτρηϊάδη-	*Ἀτρήϊο-	*υἱό- Ἀτρῆος
Πηληϊάδη-	*Πηλήϊο-	*υἱό- Πηλῆος
*Τυδηϊάδη-	*Τυδήϊο-	*υἱό- Τυδῆος

By their length and metrical shape, these forms must have been – and when they occur in fact are – limited to the following verse positions and segments: [40]

---

[38] Since the short-vowel patronymics are best attested in the patronymics to Ἀτρεύς, Τυδεύς and Πηλεύς, the operating assumption must be that the forms were first created for these names. Note, however, that it is not absolutely necessary to assume that the short-vowel patronymics were created for all these names at the same time. For instance, if Διομήδης has really been introduced into the epic tradition only in its properly Homeric stage, then the short-vowel patronymics in this case are probably later creations than those to Ἀτρεύς and Πηλεύς. But since it is impossible to determine on internal Homeric or linguistic grounds exactly when each of these names has entered the tradition and since all the names considered here have the same metrical shape and so would have offered roughly the same motivation for the creation of the short-vowel patronymics, all three have been included in the discussion.

[39] As a collocation, *υἱό- Ἀτρῆος would have been usable only with "position lengthening," viz. *#– υἱὸς Ἀτρῆος ₄ like I 539 #– υἱὸς Οἰνῆος ₄. It could, however, have figured as part of a construction of the type *#Ἀτρῆος φίλος υἱὸς ₄, cf. O 639 #Κοπρῆος φίλον υἱὸν ₄.

[40] Here and in the following discussion the patronymics to Πηλη- are used as a cover symbol to refer to *Ἀτρη-, Πηλη- and *Τυδη-.

Line Beginning

*#– Πηληϊάδη- ₍₇/₅₎|, cf., e.g., Ψ 303 #– Νηληϊάδαο ₁| and Ξ 460 #–
  Τελαμωνιάδηι ₅|[41]

*#– υἱὸ- Πηλῆος ₁|, cf., e.g., Δ 403, E 319 #– υἱὸς Καπανῆος ₁|

Line Beginning to Line Middle

*#–∪∪– ₃| Πηληϊάδη- ₇|, cf., e.g., K 87+ #–∪∪– ₃| Νηληϊάδη ₇|

*#–∪∪–∪∪– ₅| Πηλήϊο- ||, cf., e.g., Ψ 349 #–∪∪– ₃| Νέστωρ ₅|
  Νηλήϊος ||

Line Middle to Line End

₅| Πηληϊάδη- ∪∪–ͻ#, cf., e.g., A 1+ ₅| Πηληϊάδεω ᾿Αχιλῆος#

*₅| Πηλήϊο- || –∪∪–ͻ#, cf., e.g., M 349 = M 362 ₅| Τελαμώνιος ||
  ἄλκιμος υἱός#

₇| Πηληϊάδαο#, cf., e.g., λ 557 ₇| Πηληϊάδαο# and γ 465 ₇|
  Νηληϊάδαο#

*₇| Πηλήϊο- –ͻ#, cf., e.g., Δ 367 ₇| Καπανήϊος υἱός#

The first thing to note about the line positions occupied by these
forms is that nearly all of them either (1) fail to correspond to
typical verse and formulaic structures or (2) produce segments
that are of limited compositional use:

i.) The line-beginning positions *#– Πηληϊάδη- ₍₇/₅₎| and *#–
υἱὸ- Πηλῆος ₁| admit only a single long syllable at the
beginning of the line and, since there are a limited number of
words and particles that have this shape, are of somewhat
restricted utility.

ii.) The line-middle position *#–∪∪– ₃| Πηληϊάδη- ₇| rules
out a caesura in the third foot and, since a third-foot caesura
is nearly a metrical necessity in the Homeric hexameter,[42]
creates a rare and generally avoided line structure.

---

[41] Since long-vowel patronymics in the three stems under discussion are
rare and do not appear in all verse positions where they would have been pos-
sible, the patronymics to Καπανεύς and Τελάμων have been included for
purposes of illustration. Although these names have a different metrical
shape from our three *eu*-stems, they do not differ in their placement in the
line.

[42] Only 14 per 1,000 lines in the *Iliad* and 9 per 1,000 in the *Odyssey* lack
a third-foot caesura. See West 1982: 36.

iii.) The line-middle to line-end position ₅| Πηληϊάδη- ◡◡–ᵕ# produces a formulaic segment that is rare among proper names in all cases but the genitive singular.[43]

iv.) The line-end position ₇| Πηληϊάδαο# figures in a non-traditional slot for the genitive singular of proper names.[44]

v.) The segments *#–◡◡– ◡◡– ₅| Πηλήϊο- ||, *₅| Πηλήϊο- || –◡◡–ᵕ#, and *₇| Πηλήϊο- –ᵕ# face the problem that while patronymics in -ιο- are adjectives and require a head noun, the names Ἀγαμέμνων, Μενέλαος and Διομήδης cannot be used in the same line with the patronymics *Ἀτρήϊο- and *Τυδήϊο- and collocations of an ήϊο-adjective plus υἱό- produce segments like *₅| Πηλήϊος || ἄλκιμος υἱός# *vel sim.* or *₇| Πηλήϊος υἱός# which correspond to formulaic struc- tures that are either rare in the nom. and acc. sg. or that are easily filled with epithet plus proper name formulae, i.e. ₇| κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων#, ₇| ξανθὸς Μενέλαος# and ₇| κρατερὸς Διομήδης#.

The second thing to note is that although one essential function of patronymics in epic is to combine with proper names in the formation of larger formulaic and compositional units,[45] in the case of the four names under consideration only the following proper name plus patronymic formulae would have been possible:

Line Beginning

*#– Πηληϊάδης ₅| Ἀχιλεύς ₇| *#– Ἀχιλεύς ₃| Πηληϊάδης ₇|
*#– Πηληϊάδη ₅| Ἀχιλεῦ ₇| *#– Ἀχιλεῦ ₃| Πηληϊάδη ₇|

*#– Ἀτρηϊάδη- ₅| Ἀγαμέμνον- ||[46]   *#– Τυδηϊάδη- ₅| Διομήδε- ||
*#– Ἀτρηϊάδηι ₅| Μενέλαωι ||

---

[43] On proper name formulae in this position, see Parry 1971: 55f.
[44] On the formulaic difficulties posed by the genitive sg. of proper names in this position, see Parry 1971: 58–9.
[45] These considerations also hold for other formulaic combinations involving the long-vowel patronymics.
[46] The notation *#– Ἀτρηϊάδη- ₅| Ἀγαμέμνον- || is intended to signify that this segment is inflectible in all metrically suitable case forms.

Line-Middle
*₃| Ἀχιλεύς ₅| Πηλήϊος ‖
*₃| Ἀχιλεῦ ₅| Πηλήϊε ‖

Line Middle to Line End
From ₃|
*₃| Πηληϊάδης ₇| ⏑⏑–⏑ Ἀχιλεύς#   *₃| Ἀτρηϊάδης ₇| ⏑⏑– Ἀγαμέμνων#
*₃| Πηληϊάδη ₇| ⏑⏑–⏑ Ἀχιλεῦ#   *₃| Ἀτρηϊάδη(-) ₇| ⏑⏑– Ἀγαμέμνον/
                                          Μενέλαο-#

*₃| Τυδηϊάδης ₇| ⏑⏑– Διομήδης#
*₃| Τυδηϊάδη ₇| ⏑⏑– Διομήδες#

From ₅|
₅| Πηληϊάδη- Ἀχιλῆ-#   *₅| Ἀτρηϊάδης Ἀγαμέμνων#
                                          *₅| Ἀτρηϊάδη(-) Ἀγαμέμνον/
                                          Μενέλαο-#

*₅| Τυδηϊάδης Διομήδης#
*₅| Τυδηϊάδη Διομήδες#

Of these combinations, all apart from *₃| Ἀχιλεύς ₇| Πηλήϊος ‖,
*₃| Ἀχιλεῦ ₇| Πηλήϊε ‖ and the gen. sg. formula ₅| Πηληϊάδεω
Ἀχιλῆος# face the same problems as the simple long-vowel
patronymics and instead of facilitating composition as such
combinations normally do, generate a number of uncommon and
difficult-to-versify segments. In view of these facts it should be
clear that the original long-vowel patronymics to Ἀτρεύς,
Πηλεύς and Τυδεύς constituted a rather inconvenient and
uneconomical system, and one which must have greatly
restricted the poets' flexibility in versifying Ἀγαμέμνων,
Μενέλαος, Ἀχιλεύς and Διομήδης – names of some of the most
important heroes of the epic tradition as it is preserved.

Considered against this background, it is easy to see what
compositional advantages the short-vowel patronymics in -είδη-,
-είων- and -έος υἱό- would have provided the poets and why
these forms would have been created.[47] In the first place, they

_____

[47] A further question is why long-vowel patronymics have been preserved
in the formations to Νηλεύς and Πηλεύς but are missing from those to
Ἀτρεύς and Τυδεύς. While Debrunner 1923: 38f., followed by Chantraine

produced word-shapes that were better suited to the demands of
the hexameter – –◡◡– and –◡◡–◡ – and that could be used to fill
a number of compositionally crucial verse positions, cf.[48]

1948: 106, argues that the presence or absence of a long-vowel patronymic in
-ηϊάδη- is determined by whether the stem has preserved a patronymic
adjective in -ήϊο- – i.e. Νηληϊάδη-: Νηλήϊο- and Πηληϊάδη-: Πηλήϊο- (1x, but
not as a patronymic adjective) –, this cannot be considered the whole story.
The presence or absence of a patronymic adjective in -ήϊο- correlates with
whether or not this patronymic is useful in versification – both Νέστωρ and
Ἀχιλεύς are usable in the same line with an ήϊο-patronymic whereas
Ἀγαμέμνων, Μενέλαος, and Διομήδης are not –, and since patronymics in
-ήϊο- and -ηϊάδη- have different metrical shapes and are usable in different
metrical slots, it is unlikely that there is anything more than a descriptive
connection between the two formations. The preservation of the long-vowel
formations to Νηλεύς and Πηλεύς is probably rather to be explained by virtue
of the fact that they were traditional in a number of useful formulae, cf.

#ῶ Νέστορ ₃| Νηληϊάδη ₇| μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν# (6x)   (≈ #ῶ Ἀχιλλεῦ ₁| Πηλέος υἱὲ ₇| μέγα φερτατ᾽
                                                              Ἀχαιῶν# [3x])
₅| Νηληϊάδαο γέροντος# (2x)   ≈ ₅| Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος# (8x)
₃| κλισίην ₅| Νηληϊάδεω ἀφίκοντο# (1x)   ≈ ₁| κλισίην ₅| Πηληϊάδεω ἀφίκοντο# (1x)
                                                    ≈ ₃| κλισίην ₅| Πηληϊάδεω ἀφίκωμαι# (1x)
                                                    ≈ ἔπος ₅| Πηληϊάδαο φύλαξεν# (1x)
₅| θυγάτηρ ₇| Νηληϊάδαο# (1x)   ≈ ₅| κεφαλῆι ₇| Πηληϊάδαο# (1x).

The high percentage of long-vowel forms in the patronymics to Νηλεύς – cf.
also #τοῦ Νηληϊάδαο ₄| (Ψ 303), ₃| Νέστωρ ₅| Νηλήϊος || (Ψ 349), Ἀντίλοχος
₅| Νηλήϊος || (Ψ 514), #Νέστορ᾽ ◡–◡◡– ₅| Νηλήϊον || (Κ 18), and ₅| Νηλήϊωι ||
υἷι ἐοικώς# (Β 20) – is probably to be attributed to the fact that these forms
filled a number of convenient metrical slots and that since the names Νέστωρ
and Ἀντίλοχος were less common and more flexible in the hexameter than
Ἀγαμέμνων, Μενέλαος, Ἀχιλλεύς, and Διομήδης the poets had less need of
the short-vowel forms.
    For the question as to why there are no long-vowel formations attested for
Ἀτρεύς and Τυδεύς, there are two possible approaches. First, we might assu-
me that the patronymics to these names became current in the epic tradition
only after the short-vowel formations became an option and that the poets
simply never created the long-vowel patronymics for these names. On the
other hand, we might also assume that since patronymic adjectives in -ήϊο-
were not really useful in these cases and convenient gen. sg. formulae at the
penthemimeral caesura could be built with other material, i.e. ₅| Ἀγαμέμνονος||
Ἀτρείδαο#, ₅| Μενελάου || κυδαλίμοιο# and ₅| Διομήδεος || ἱπποδάμοιο#, the
poets simply phased out the long-vowel formations. In any event, since the
material of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* does not as far as I can see provide any
clear indication on these matters, a definitive solution as to which of these
two approaches is better seems impossible.
    [48] Patronymics to the stem Πηλε- are again given as a cover symbol for all
the patronymics under consideration.

Line-Initial	Line-Medial	Line-Final
# Πηλεΐδη- ₃|	# —◡◡ Πηλεΐδη- ₍₃/₅₎|	‖ Πηλεΐδαο#
	# —◡◡ Πηλέος υἱό- ₍|	‖ Πηλέος υἱό-#
	# —◡◡ Πηλεΐων- ₍|	‖ Πηλεΐων-#

More specifically, they gave the poets greater flexibility in versifying Ἀγαμέμνων, Μενέλαος, Ἀχιλλεύς and Διομήδης by filling a number of essential metrical and compositional slots that were otherwise absent from the names of these heroes:[49] the segment # Πηλεΐδη- ₃| gave each of these heroes a compositionally useful line-initial form, the segments # —◡◡ Πηλεΐδη- ₍₃/₅₎|, # —◡◡ Πηλέος υἱό- ₍| and # —◡◡ Πηλεΐων- ₍| provided Ἀγαμέμνων and Διομήδης with convenient forms for use before the third-foot caesurae and Ἀχιλεύς and Μενέλαος with forms of different metrical shape here, and the segments ‖ Πηλέος υἱό-#, ‖ Πηλεΐων-# and ‖ Πηλεΐδαο# created inflectible line-end adonics for Ἀγαμέμνων, Μενέλαος and Διομήδης and helped in inflecting a number of line-end formulae for Ἀχιλλεύς.[50]

---

[49] For the actual distribution and use of these patronymics, see the appendix below.

[50] While all the patronymics considered here agree in using the formation -εΐδη- at line-beginning and before the penthemimeral caesura, they partly differ in their preference for -εΐων- or -έος υἱό- at the feminine caesura and line end. In the case of Ἀτρεύς, both Ἀτρεΐων- and Ἀτρέος υἱό- occur. Since these are used to refer to Ἀγαμέμνων and Μενέλαος respectively, they serve to secondarily differentiate the sons of Ἀτρεύς. In the case of Τυδεύς and Πηλεύς, -εΐων- and -έος υἱό- are largely distributed by stem: Τυδέος υἱό- alone is used for Τυδεύς, while Πηλεΐων- is regular for Πηλεύς, i.e. Πηλεΐων-44x vs. Πηλέος υἱό- 6x. Debrunner 1923: 36 has tentatively suggested that the preference for -έος υἱό- in the patronymics to Τυδεύς and -εΐων- in those to Πηλεύς may reflect a dialect feature in the poems. This is an unnecessary assumption. Τυδέος υἱό- has been preferred because it supplied the nom. and voc. sg. line-end adonic formulae which were otherwise missing from the name Διομήδης and because all other necessary case forms could be built from this formation. Πηλεΐων-, on the other hand, has been largely preferred because it supplied a full range of oblique cases for the nom. and voc. sg. adonic formulae ‖ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς# ≈ ‖ ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς# and ‖ φαίδιμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ# ≈ ‖ ἐπείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ#, and provided a metrically useful alternative for forms of Ἀχιλεύς before the 3ʳᵈ foot caesurae, cf.

# —◡◡ Πηλεΐδης ₅| 7x	≈	# —◡◡— ₃| Ἀχιλεύς ₅| 15x
# —◡◡ Πηλεΐδη ₅| 3x	≈	# —◡◡— ₃| Ἀχιλεῦ ₅| 1x
# —◡◡ Πηλεΐωνα ₍| 2x	≈	# —◡◡— ₃| Ἀχιλῆα ₍| 15x

The motivation for why the poets would have created the short-vowel patronymics is clear and the only remaining matter in the "metrical shortening" analysis is to identify a likely analogical model on which these forms could have been made. The most obvious place to look for such a model is in some point of morphological overlap between *eu*-stems and *s*-stems. The best candidate for such a form is the alternative *eu*-stem nom. and acc. sg. endings -ής and -ήν. These endings have long been recognized as having been part of the repertoire of the early epic tradition,[51] and survive (1) in early epic epigraphic material – cf., e.g., ΦΙΛΙΟΝΕΣ COR 74*k* Wachter 2001 c. 570-560 B.C., ΑΨΙΛΕΣ ETR 1*b* Wachter 2001 c. 480-60 B.C., and ΑΨΙΛΕΣ ΠΑΤΡΟΚ[ΛΟΣ] Pugliese Carratelli 1986: 142 on a recently discovered early 6th c. B.C. frieze- or pinax-inscription in Achaean alphabet from South Italy[52] –, (2) in para-epic literary sources – cf., e.g., Ibycus ὀνομάκλυτον Ὄρφην (306 *PMGF* Davies) and Antimachus of Colophon Τύδης τ' Οἰνείδης (*Thebaid*, 6 Matthews) –, and (3) in slightly disguised form in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* themselves where they appear, e.g., in the nom. sg. proper name Κισσῆς Λ 223 (: Κισσηίδ- Z 299), which is best equated with the commonly attested proper name Κισσεύς[53] and parsed as a regular *eu*-stem ethnic made to the Macedonian place name Κίσσος,[54] and in the accusative sg.'s Τυδῆ Δ 384, Μηκιστῆ Ο 339, and Ὀδυσῆ τ 136, which are best

---

–◡◡ Πηλείωνι ⫽ 4x   ≈   # –◡◡– ₃| Ἀχιλῆϊ ⫽ 19x
–◡◡ Πηλείωνος ⫽ 5x   ≈   # –◡◡– ₃| Ἀχιλῆος ⫽ 12x
–◡◡ Πηλείδαο ⫽ 4x

–◡◡ Πηλέος υἱός ⫽ 1x and # –◡◡ Πηλέος υἱέ ⫽ 5x have obviously been generated to provide Πηλείων- with a convenient nom. and voc. sg. before the feminine caesura.

[51] See, e.g., Wackernagel 1916: 160[1].

[52] Note further the Attic nominative sg.'s listed at Kretschmer 1894: 19–94.

[53] Cf., e.g., Eur. *Hec*.3, etc. Although Κισσεύς also shows up as a *v.l.* in the 11th c. F (before correction) and the 13th c. O, this reading is an obvious *lectio facilior* and is best taken as an "improvement" of Κισσῆς (*Ω**) after the well-known post-Homeric form of the name.

[54] See also Wathelet 1988: 679f.

seen as relatively late recitational or transmissional corruptions of properly Homeric *Τυδήν, Μηκιστήν and *'Οδυσήν.[55]

Starting from these alternative *eu*-stem endings, it is easy to specify the analogical model on which the poets could have created the short-vowel *eu*-stem patronymics. For given that these endings would have been synchronically opaque to any non-"Achaean" epic poet and closely resembled the nom. acc. sg. -ής -ήν of epic *s*-stems like nom. sg. ζαής (M 157, ε 368) and acc. sg. ζαήν (μ 313), it is straightforward to suppose that the poets simply reinterpreted them as members of an alternative *s*-stem paradigm, and then used an analogical proportion of the type conjectured above for "Achaean" to generate a metrically convenient short-vowel oblique stem for use in *eu*-stem patronymics: *s*-stem nom. acc. sg. -ής -ήν: obl. -έ-:: *eu*-stem nom. acc. sg. -ής -ήν: obl. *x*, *x* ⇒ -έ-.[56] For the use of a similar analogy in Homeric language it is possible to compare the creation of the *s*-stem vocative sg. phrase # ῏Αρες ῎Αρες 3| (E 31 = 455) from the apparently "defective" *eu*-stem ῎Αρης ῎Αρηα/῎Αρην (E 909).

Conclusion

To sum up, in the course of this discussion it has been shown (1) that the origin of the short vowel *eu*-stems in Homer is to be sought in the short-vowel patronymics and (2) that while the vowel here cannot convincingly be explained as having its origins in any of the dialects that are normally held to have

---

[55] See Rau 2008: 1ff.

[56] Two additional factors have likely contributed to the interpretation suggested here. First, in all Greek dialects apart from Attic and Ionic once they had merged *ǣ < *ā and -ę̄-, the Homeric *eu*-stem nom. sg. -ής and acc. sg. -ήν would have corresponded in vowel quality only to the nom. and acc. sg. of *s*-stems and would for this reason have been especially liable to remodeling after this class. Second, since most of the dialects that are generally held to have contributed to the epic poetic language have remade the acc. sg. of *s*-stem proper names to -ήν, the alternate *s*-stem acc. sg. -ήν would likely have had additional support in the spoken language(s) of the poets.

contributed to epic language, it is possible to make a strong argument for why the Homeric poets themselves might have created these forms and to identify a fairly straightforward analogical model on which they might have done it. In line with these findings it is best to conclude that the short vowel in the Homeric *eu*-stems is the result of a specifically inner-epic analogical innovation, a "metrical shortening" of the basic type conjectured by Debrunner and Chantraine.

APPENDIX

Conspectus of the Short-Vowel Patronymics at Line End and the Third-Foot Caesurae

Line End

|| Πηλείωνα# 3x   ₅| μεγαθύμου || Πηλείωνος# 2x   ₄ ἀμύμονα || Πηλείωνα# 6x
|| Πηλείωνος# 2x   ₅| μεγαθύμωι || Πηλείωνι# 1x   ₄ ποδωκέα || Πηλείωνα# 10x
|| Πηλείδαο # 1x   ₄ ποδωκέϊ || Πηλείωνι# 2x

|| Ἀτρείωνος# 1x   ₅| Ἀγαμέμνονος || Ἀτρείδαο# 13x
|| Ἀτρείωνι# 1x
|| Ἀτρείδαο# 2x

₅| Μενέλαος ₄ ἀρήϊος || Ἀτρέος υἱός# 1x
₅| Μενέλαον ₄ ἀρήϊον || Ἀτρέος υἱόν# 2x (also *v.l.* for || ἀρχὸν Ἀχαιῶν# at Δ 195, 205)

|| Τυδέος υἱός# 8x   ₅| μεγαθύμου || Τυδέος υἱός# 2x   ₄ δαΐφρων|| Τυδέος υἱός# 1x
|| Τυδέος υἱόν# 3x   ₅| μεγαθύμου || Τυδέος υἱέ# 2x   ₄ ἀγαυοῦ || Τυδέος υἱέ# 1x

Line Middle at Third-Foot Caesurae

–∪∪ Πηλείδης ₅| 7x   # –∪∪ Πηλέος υἱός ₄ 1x
–∪∪ Πηλείδη ₅| 3x   # –∪∪ Πηλέος υἱέ ₄ 5x
–∪∪ Πηλείδην ₅| 1x   # –∪∪ Πηλείωνα ₄ 2x
                             # –∪∪ Πηλείωνι ₄ 4x
                             # –∪∪ Πηλείωνος ₄ 5x
                             # –∪∪ Πηλείδαο ₄ 4x

—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδης ₅| 8x   Ἀτρείδης ₅| Ἀγαμέμνων ‖ 1x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδην ₅| 2x   Ἀτρείδην ₅| Ἀγαμέμνονα ‖ 6x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδῃ ₅| 2x   Ἀτρείδεω ₅| Ἀγαμέμνονος ‖ 3x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδῃι ₅| 1x   Ἀτρείδῃι ₅| Ἀγαμέμνονι ‖ 7x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδεω ₅| 2x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδα ₅| 1x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδας ₅| 1x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδῃισι ₅| 1x

—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδης ₅| εὐρυκρείων Ἀγαμέμνων# 8x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδης ₅| δουρικλειτὸς Μενέλαος# 5x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδης ₅| ᴗᴗ– ₇| ξανθὸς Μενέλαος# 2x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδην ₅| Ἀγαμέμνονα ‖ ποιμένα λαῶν# 2x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδῃι ₅| Ἀγαμέμνονι ‖ ποιμένι λαῶν# 1x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδαι ₅| Ἀγαμέμνων ‖ καὶ Μενέλαος# 1x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδῃις ₅| Ἀγαμέμνονι ‖ καὶ Μενέλαωι# 4x

—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείωνα ₇| 2x (= Ἀγαμέμνων)
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρείδαο ₇| 2x
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρέος υἱὲ ₇| 1x   Ἀτρέος υἱὲ ₇| δαίφρονος ἱπποδάμοιο# 1x (= Μενέλαος)
—ᴗᴗ Ἀτρέος υἱὸν ₇| 2x   Ἀτρέος υἱὸν ₇| ἀρηίφιλον Μενέλαον# 1x

—ᴗᴗ Τυδείδης ₅| 7x   Τυδείδην ₅| Διομήδεα ‖ 2x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδείδην ₅| 2x   Τυδείδῃ ₅| δουρικλυτὸν ‖ 1x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδείδῃ ₅| 1x   Τυδείδεω ₅| Διομήδεος ‖ 1x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδείδεω ₅| 1x   Τυδείδῃι ₅| Διομήδεϊ ‖ 4x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδείδῃι ₅| 3x

—ᴗᴗ Τυδείδης ₅| δουρικλειτὸς Διομήδης# 1x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδείδης ₅| ᴗᴗ– ₇| κρατερὸς Διομήδης# 2x

—ᴗᴗ Τυδέος υἱὸς ₇| 1x   Τυδέος υἱὲ ₇| δαίφρονος ‖ 1x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδέος υἱὲ ₇| 1x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδέος υἱὸν ₇| 1x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδέος υἷι ₇| 1x

—ᴗᴗ Τυδέος υἱὸς ₇| ὑπέρθυμος Διομήδης# 1x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδέος υἱὲ ₇| δαίφρονος ἱπποδάμοιο# 1x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδέος υἱὸν ₇| ὑπέρθυμον Διομήδεα# 1x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδέος υἱὸν ₇| ὑπερφίαλον Διομήδεα# 1x
—ᴗᴗ Τυδείδαο ₇| δαίφρονος ἱπποδάμοιο# 1x

Bibliography

Allen, T. W. (1917–1919): *Homeri Opera* III–IV. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Blümel, W. (1982): *Die Aiolischen Dialekte, Phonologie und Morphologe der inschriftlichen Texte aus generativer Sicht.* Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 30. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Chantraine, P. (1948): *Grammaire homérique* I. Paris: Klincksieck.

Crespo, E. (1994): El origen de la flexión del tipo de Τυδέος, -έα en Homero. In *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos.* Pp. 87–92. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.

Debrunner, A. (1923): Metrische Kürzung bei Homer. In *ANTIΔΩPON Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel.* Pp. 28–40. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

del Barrio Vega, M. L. (1987): *El Dialecto de Eubea.* Unpublished Dissertation: Madrid.

Dubois, L. (1986): *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien* I. Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de linguistique de Louvain. 33. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Hackstein, O. (2002): *Die Sprachform der homerischen Epen: Faktoren morphologischer Variabilität in literarischen Frühformen. Tradition, Sprachwandel, Sprachliche Anachronismen.* Serta Graeca. 15. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Hagen, H. (1995): Zur Form ἱππεῖς bei Homer Λ 151. *Glotta* 73: 149–154.

Hamm, E.-M. (1957): *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios.* Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin: Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. 1951. 2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Hodot, R. (1990): *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie, la langue des inscriptions VIIe s. a.c.-IVe s. p.c.* Editions Recherche sur les civilizations. Mémoire. 88. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilizations.

Hoekstra, A. (1965): *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes.* Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, 71.1. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitg. Mij.

Hoffmann, O. (1891): *Die Griechischen Dialekte* I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kretschmer, P. (1894): *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht.* Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann.

Leukart, A. (1994): *Die frühgriechischen Nomina auf -tās und -ās*. Mykenische Studien 13. Sitzungsberichte. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. 558. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Ludwich, A. (1891): *Homeri Carmina* III. Leipzig: Teubner.

Miller, D. G. (1982): *Homer and the Ionian Epic Tradition*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 38. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Nussbaum, A. J. (1998): *Two Studies in Greek and Homeric Linguistics*. Hypomnemata 120. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Perpillou, J.-L. (1973): *Les substantifs grecs en -εύς*. Études et commentaries 80. Paris: Klincksieck.

Peters, P. (1989): *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zum Frühgriechischen*. Vienna: Unpublished Habilitation.

Pugliese Caratelli, G. (1986): In G. Olbrich, Friese und Pinakes aus Magna Graecia. *La Parola del Passato* CCXXVII: 122–152.

Rau, J. (2008): Δ 384 Τυδῆ, O 339 Μηκιστῆ, and τ 136 Ὀδυσῆ. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 108: 1-12.

Schindler, J. (1976): On the Greek type ἱππεύς. In A. Morpurgo Davies and W. Meid, edd., *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics offered to Leonard R. Palmer on the Occasion of his 70ᵗʰ Birthday*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 16. Pp. 349–357. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Schwyzer, E. (1939): *Griechische Grammatik* I. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaften. 2/1. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Sommer, F. (1977): Zur homerischen Flexion von νηῦς. In B. Forssman, ed., *Ferdinand Sommer. Schriften aus dem Nachlaß*. Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft. N.f. 1. Pp. 279–302. Munich: Kitzinger.

Voigt, E.-M. (1971): *Sappho et Alcaeus*. Amsterdam: Athenaeum-Polak & Van Gennep.

Wachter, R. (2001): *Non-Attic Vase Inscriptions*. Oxford-New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Wackernagel, J. (1953–1979): *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

– (1916): *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wathelet, P. (1998): *Dictionnaire des Troyens en l'Iliade* I. Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres. Documenta et instrumenta I. Liège: Université de Liège.

– (1970): *Les traits éoliens dans la langue de l'épopée grecque*. Incunabula graeca 37. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

West, M. L. (2002): Atreus and Attarissiyas. *Glotta* LXXVII: 262–266.
–   (1998–2000): *Homeri Ilias*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
–   (1982): *Greek Meter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Witte, K. (1913): Homeros. Sprache. In *Paulys Realencyclopädia der classi-
    schen Altertumswissenschaft* 16. Coll. 2213–2246. Stuttgart: Metzler.
–   (1912): Zur homerischen Sprache. *Glotta* 3: 388-393.
Wyatt, W. J. (1969): *Metrical Lengthening in Homer*. Incunabula graeca 35.
    Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.