Genitive singular forms in Mycenaean Greek and in the Aeolic Dialects*

Elena Džukeska

Institute of Classical Studies
Faculty of Philosophy, Skopje

elena.dzukeska@gmail.com

Key words: Mycenaean Greek, Greek Dialects, Genitive Singular

This work studies the genitive singular forms in Mycenaean Greek and in the Aeolic Dialects. Greek dialects exhibit diversity with respect to the genitive – a diversity which is visible at the Indo-European level as well. Was the ending *-es/-os/-s* in Greek used only as *-os* or also as *-es* and *-s*? Does this ending have only a genitive function or also an ablative function? Which genitive ending is hidden in the masculine *a*-stem forms in *-āo*? Is only the pronominal ending *-syo* present in the *o/e*-stems or also *-so*? How are we to interpret the *o/e* stem genitives in *-oι* on the Thessalian inscriptions?

In the light of these questions a historical-comparative analysis of the genitive forms has been conducted at two points in space and time: the Mycenaean tablets from the 14th and 12th centuries B.C. and the Aeolic inscriptions from 8th - 2nd century B.C. The research is based on the complete Linear B corpus and most of the published Boeotian, Thessalian and Lesbian inscriptions. The examples were compared in terms of their phonological, morphological and syntactical aspects and classified according to ending, stem and part of speech.

The research confirmed that genitive singular forms of the athematic nominals both in Mycenaean Greek and in Aeolic Dialects regularly end in *-oς*. Differences appear in the *ēu*-stems and the *s*-stems. On the one hand, in Thessaly *s*-stem genitive ends in *-ει* not only in *-oς*, while on Lesbos and in Troad it ends in *-η*. This phenomenon, which is due to the confusion of these stems with the masculine *a*-stems, is confirmed rarely on late inscriptions in Thessaly, but is common and already confirmed in the 5th century BC on Lesbos and in Troad.

On the other hand, the development of *-w-* and *-s-* between vowels is at a different level in Mycenaean Greek and in Aeolic dialects. In Mycenaean, *ēu*-stems genitive ends in *-e-wo*, /-*ēw-os*/, and the *s*-stems genitive in *-e-o*, /-*e(h)-os*/. After the loss of *w* and *s* the *ēu*-stems in Boeotian and Thessalian had genitive in *-i:-os* and in Lesbian in *-ě-os*. *S*-stems genitive was in *-y-os.* But, writing doesn't always accurately represent the phonetic reality. On one hand there is a tendency to keep the traditional form, and on the other to record the real pronunciation. The research showed that the choice of the grapheme can be distinctive feature of a genitive form, i.e. of a part of speech.

Therefore, although the hypocoristics in *-ē-* in Aeolic dialects are declined as sigmatic stems, genitive forms indicate that there are specific features in their flexion. If we compare the ratio of the examples in *-ιος* and in *-εος* from compound personal names and from hypocoristics in the Boeotian dialect it appears that *-ιος* is four times more frequent than *-εος* in hypocoristics. Similarly, in Lesbian these hypocoristics end in *-η* more frequently than in *-εος*.

As for the original ablaut in the root or the stem, the analysis confirmed that it was already leveled in the Pre-Mycenaean period.

Genitive singular forms of the feminine *a*-stem nominals in the Greek language end in *-ᾱς*, written *-a* on the Mycenaean tablets, and *-ᾱς* in the Aeolic dialects, even when there is an influence from another dialect in the word stem. Probably *-ᾱς* contains the full grade **-es* of the genitive ending, but it is not visible because of the early contraction of the vowels of the ending and the stem.

With respect to the masculine *a*-stem nominals, Mycenaean forms ending in *-a-o* confirm the antiquity of the ending *-ᾱo*. In the Boeotian dialect the vowels *a* and *o* remain uncontracted, so *-ᾱo* is preserved even on late inscriptions and on inscriptions already influenced by the Ionic-Attic koine. On the other hand in Thessaly, where contracted forms in *-ᾱ* dominate, forms in *-ᾱo* appear only in small numbers, mainly on inscriptions where *-οιο* is used, which points to deliberate tendency for archaizing.

The parallel presence of genitives in *-a-o* and *-o-jo* in Mycenaean means that *-ᾱo* could not emerge either on the analogy with *-oo*, or with *-οιο* and therefore it is not derived from the pronominal **-syo*. There are several arguments why *-ᾱo* should be related to the pronominal **-so*. This ending is confirmed in the Germanic languages, not only in the pronominal, but also in the nominal declension, not only with the *o/e*-stems, but also with the *a*-stems. There is at least one form in Greek, *τέ-ο* from *τίς*, with the ending **-so*, corresponding with the O.Ch.Sl. *че-со* and Goth. *ƕi-s*. In Homer there are many examples of *τέο*, but none of **τεῖο*. The ending **-syo* could not have been used for the masculine *a*-stem nominals, because in the inflexions of the pronouns and adjectives it was not related to the *a*-stems.

The analysis showed that **-o-syo* is the only genitive ending for the *o/e*-stems in the Mycenaean period. Genitives in *-o-jo* are confirmed both in the nominal and in the pronominal inflexion. There are no certain examples in *-o-o*, that could confirm the presence of **-so* in the thematic declension. However, the possibility that this ending was spread to the *o/e*-stems from the pronouns and masculine *a*-stem nominals in the Post-Mycenaean period cannot be excluded.

Mycenaean *-o-jo* should probably be interpreted as **-oγγo*. As a result of the phonological changes and of the tendency to simplify the inflexion, in the Post-Mycenaean period *-οιο* developed into *-ō*. On archaic Boeotian and Lesbian inscriptions it is recorded as *-O*, and later as *-Ω*. In Thessaly the situation is more complex. In Thessaliotis, Hestiotis and Magnesia on the archaic inscriptions the ending *-ō* is written *-O*, and later *-OΥ*. Yet in Pelasgiotis, and Perrhaebia, the endings *-οιο* and *-οι* (< *-οιο* with apocope or elision of the final *o*) appear regularly, not only on archaic, but also on 3rd

and 2nd century B.C. inscriptions. The analysis of the examples showed that although the ending *-οιο* is used in standardized documents, its use is limited with respect to its distribution both according to parts of speech and according to syntactical function The analysis also showed that the distribution of the endings by regions is not absolute.

With respect to the syntactical function of the genitive the situation is completely different in Mycenaean Greek and Aeolic dialects. On Mycenaean tablets the use of the genitive to denote possession, most often with another noun, is confirmed by many examples. In few forms can one recognize the partitive function. However, there are no examples that denote separation - the basic function of the ablative. The small number of toponyms in genitive and of examples with prepositions is especially indicative. In the Aeolic dialects, on the other hand, apart from the forms in *-οιο,* genitives on the oldest inscriptions already show the ablative functions. Therefore, we can conclude that the Indo-European ending **-es/-os/-s*, at least from the viewpoint of Greek, originally had only a genitive meaning, just like **-syo* and **-so* and that this overtook the ablative functions in the Post-Mycenaean period.

* The PhD thesis was publicly defended at the Faculty of Philosophy in Skopje, Institute of
    Classical Studies, 2009