ΔΙΑΙΤΑ, A WAY OF LIFE

Abstract: With most feminine nouns and adjectives in (nom. sg.) -ά the earlier presence of the suffix *-ά is evident; in a number of further instances, however, the one-time presence of *-γ in the suffix is less clear, but can still be assumed. In this paper, I present the development of both clear and opaque instances of feminine forms in *-ά.

1. Greek feminine nouns and adjectives belonging to the first declension can be divided into two groups, (a) those ending in nom./acc. sg. -α(v) (Att. -η(v), but -α(v) after ε, ι, ρ, α < αι; Ion. -η(v)), and (b) those ending in nom./acc. sg. -ά(v). To group (a) belong, inter alia, feminines going together with (or: derived from) masculine o-stems (including pronouns), group (b) comprises, inter alia, feminine forms derived from masculine consonant stems.

It is the group (b) which concerns us here. Proto-Greek had a suffix -yά, corresponding with Sanskrit -ि. The Indo-European shape of this suffix was *-ih₂, which became -yά in Greek; apart from a small number of words (μία < *sm-ih₂, πότνια3 probably Myc. e-ru-mi-ja: elumniai ‘beams’, cf. Hesychius έλυμνιαί: δοκοί

1 In Sanskrit, we find instances of feminine -ि (gen. sg. -yāḥ, etc.) alongside masculines in -ah (*-o-s), e.g. devī ‘goddess’ ~ devah ‘god’, etc. (Another type has sigmatic nom. sg. -i-h, gen. sg. Vedic -iyah, later -yāḥ, e.g. vrkīṁ ‘she-wolf’ ~ vrkāḥ ‘wolf’.) There are no Greek examples of *-ya beside -ος, to my knowledge; be we do find -ις (-iδ-) beside -ος (e.g. Άχαιίδες ~ 'Αχαιοί, Δαρδανίδες ~ Δάρδανοι; see Meier 1975: 27, 36).


3 *pot- + extension -n- (Chantry 1933: 107); po-ti-ni-ja in Mycenaean.— In δέσποινα, there seems to be loss of -t-; the number of syllables may be responsible (*despōinyā with *γ > *desponyā > δέσποινα, as against πότνια with i). The number of syllables is certainly decisive for the unwonted contraction in Attic νομηνία, ou (ο) < eo < ewo (as against ταχέος etc. with uncontracted eo < ewo), and perhaps also for -κλής < -κλέης < -κλέπης in compounded names (which, as a rule, count four syllables or more).
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About the recessive accent of ἐλύμνιαι, and nouns in -τριά (5), -iα appears to have been replaced by -yα after the inflected forms gen. sg. -yαs, dat. sg. -yαi etc., where the -y- is regular (< *-yeh₂-os, *-yeh₂-ei)

A few combinations of consonant + y may survive into Mycenaean Greek (ry, ly; wy; I suppose also ny, though I have not found any clear example), whereas other combinations have visibly changed by then (p(h)y > pt; t(h)y > šš or ss; k(h)y > tš or ts; dy and gy > dž or dz).

2. In classical Attic and other dialects we find, from forms with the suffix *-yα:

- -vα, -pα preceded by αι, οι, ε {ει}, ι, υ (metathesis in the case of a/o + n/r + y, compensatory lengthening in the case of e/i/u + n/r + y) (e.g. τάλαινα, cf. m./n. stem ταλαν-; μοιρα < *smor-yα; Hom. κυδιάνερα < *-aner-yα; Αἰγίνα < *Aig-in-yα (cf. αϊξ?); εύθυνα < *-un-yα, unless substituted for original εὐθύνα10, etc.);
- -lαλα < *-lyα (e.g. άελλα, θυέλλα < *aw-el-yαu, cf. α(Ρ)ησι, θυελ-γα, cf. θύειν);

4 I wonder whether ὄροφηναι is correct. There seems to be no such adjective as ὄροφηνος (and the accent would be peculiar); perhaps the original text had ὄροφης, but I do not know how to explain the corruption which must then be assumed.


6 Except after 'heavy bases' (Sievers-Edgerton's rule); usually, though, Sievers-Edgerton's rule is violated in the case of -yα/-yα- feminines. See Ruijgh 1987: 301 n. 14.

7 Cf. recently Waanders 2005: xxx for ra₂, ro₂ probably = r(i)ya/l(i)ya, r(i)yо/l(i)yо [the acta Austin 2000 are due any moment now].

8 Ruipérez long ago proposed te-ra-ni-ja = acc. pl. θεραπνίας (1956: 156); with slight modification, we might assume a form tʰeranyα, with loss of -p-, similar to the loss of -t- in δέσποινα (fn. 3), which would provide us with an instance of ny. Unfortunately, however, we do not know what the subjects of PY Aq 64 will take, get, or whatever a-ke-re-se exactly means.—Alphabetic Greek has θεράπαινα and θεράπνη.

9 Apparently different from the result of *k(h)y, to judge by spellings like we-sa, not *we-za. Cf. Lejeune 1972: 104. Therefore, wa-na-sa may represent wanassα < *wanatya, with simplification *kty > *ty (rather than *ky). Ruijgh (1985: 63 f.) offers a different interpretation of the phonemic-graphemic correlation, and assumes the same development for t(h)y (with synchronically active morpheme boundary) as for k(h)y. In the end, as one can see, the two developments converged into one end result.

10 εύθυνη in the MSS of Lysias. However, the long υ may plead for older *-un-yα.

11 From a base *h₂wh₁-el-, likewise *thu-el-yα < *dʰuH-el- (for *dʰewH-, see LIV²: 149 f.).
-σσά (Att. -ττά) with intervocalic σσ/ττ < *-t(h)yâ (e.g. μέλισσα/μέλιττα < *melit-yâ; and the feminine forms of -(F)εντ-adjectives in -εσσά, Myc. -we-sa: -wessâ, with -e-analogically after the full grade in m./n. -went-, for -wassâ < *-wnt-yâ), or *-k(h)yâ (e.g. όσσα < *wokw-ya; ήσσα/ήττα < *hék-ya6; νάσσα/ναττα/νήσσα/νήττα may derive from the verbal stem νακ- 'swim', i.e. < *snâkh-yâ, rather than being cognate with Latin anas etc.; Myc. su-za probably σύ'σσα, Ruijgh 1985: 52), or *-k(w)h-yâ (e.g. ὄσσα < *wokw-ya);
• the numerous feminine participles ending in -νσά < *-nt-yâ, with postconsonantal σ < *ty (-νσ- preserved in, a.o., Arcadian17; Att.-Ion. and other dialects -ασα, -εσά, -όσα, -ϋσά with loss of -v- and compensatory lengthening; Lesbian -αισά etc.)18
• -ζα < *-dyâ (e.g. ἀργυρόπεζα < *-ped-yâ; Myc. to-pe-za, we-pe-za, e-ne-wo-pe-za: torpedâ, wâespédâ, enewopedâ (or -dêdâ)), or

12 Not the feminine counterparts of nouns in -εύς: these have -e-ja, not †-e-wi-ja in Mycenaean.
13 Feminine forms of nouns and adjectives otherwise communis (m./f.) generis occur when they are proper names (including ἐπικλήσεις), cf. Ἰφιγένεια, Ἡριγένεια, Ξανθίππη, etc.
14 A specialized sense of δείκνυμι, 'instruct', seems acceptable to me. Alternatively, scholars assume scribal error: de-di-<da>-kn-ja, from διδάσκω.
15 -wos- (-woh-) is still the form of the suffix in Mycenaean, but afterwards it is replaced by -(w)ot- (leaving the nominative singular form n. -ός untouched—m. -ως, actually also the old form, could be reinterpreted as underlyingly /-ōts/).
16 Back formation from ήττάσθαι, according to Wackernagel; I am not so sure.
17 -ns- is also assumed for Mycenaean (o-pe-ro-sa: opbîelonsâ or opbîelonsâ), although the spelling rules do not allow to prove the presence of n before s.
18 Athematic forms in -ασσά occur in some dialects, e.g. Myc. a-pe-a-sa, not -e-wi-ja in Mycenaean.
*-gyā (e.g. μαζία/μαζί < *mag-ya19; φύζα < *pʰug-ya; probably Myc. a3-zā a3dzza, Rijngh 1985: 54).

A number of feminines in -ā obviously resist interpretation as original -yā derivatives, namely those where -ā is preceded by β20 (: πρέσβα), θ (: ακανθα). μ21 (e.g. τόμμα; Att., apparently replacing *τόλμη: Pindar has τόλμα22), φ (a number of words in Hesychius: κέρκαφα: εγγύη23, λατίφα: ασπίς, σείφα: σκοτία), χ (again some Hesychian glosses: ἀσκόλαχα· ἀσκαλαβώτης, ὤρραχα· πρίσιχη). I have not found any examples of feminines ending in -γά, -κά, -πά, which if they occurred would also be excluded as candidates for the group with suffix *-yā.

3. Some feminines in -ā are not as perspicuous as those in the preceding section; moreover, among them are refections of nouns earlier belonging to the other group (-ā/-η), and others are of unknown origin.

Theoretically, we could expect forms in -πτά < *-p(ʰ)yā, and -ψά < *-p(ʰ)t(ʰ)yā. Hesychius has one or two words in -πτα which might belong here: θάπτα· μυία (Cretan), ἕπτα(?· ὁ δρυοκόλαψ ἔθνικώς, but the etymologies are unknown, and we cannot be sure that the -α is short. The voiced combination βδ in επιβδα (containing ἐπι- and -βδ-, zero grade of *ped-/pod- with voice assimilation) may well be the regular development of *bdy > *bd-yâ > *bdzâ

19 The long a must be secondary.
20 Inherited b (i.e., Indo-European/Proto-Greek) is an oddity: the β- of βέλτερος etc. may be of Indo-European origin. cf. Lat. de-bil-is. Skt balam (?—a loan-word from Dravidian, according to Burrow (1973: 384)). Slavic bol- (Russian болб). Greek β typically occurs in a number of loan-words, in the combinations (μ)βρ and (μ)βλ < *mr, *ml. and in post-Mycenaean Greek as the reflex of earlier g (still preserved in Mycenaean). Furthermore, b can be an allophone of p before a voiced stop.—For hypothetical *by. I would expect **βδ (parallel with *ρή > πτ). whereas *gνβ first became *γνβ: which developed along the same lines as original *gy (>) ζ). The very few rod-presents from verb stems in (usually recent) β have πτ Δ. e.g. βλάπτω ~ βλάβη (*mlagM -l? Cretan has forms with βλοπ. the π whereof is commonly considered to be more original. viz. the reflex of PIE *kʷ. cf. Skt marcāyat ‘damages’. mrktah ‘damaged’ etc.. PIE root *merkʷ”—cf. Lejeune 1972: 67. 79 n. § 68-6): note that νιβ- (cf. χερνιβον) < *nigʷ has an old present νίζω (with ζ < *gy < *gʷy according to sound law), eventually rivalled by analogical νιπτω.

21 *my develops into ny. as in *gʷam-νo > *gʷanyo > βαινω. *kʰlam-να > *kʰlanyā > χλαίνα (cf. χλαμ-ύς).
22 Cf. GG I: 476.
23 The semantics of κέρκαφα allows us to suspect a neuter plural (< *χέρ-χαφ-α. cf. χετρ and Latin habere < *gʰ(ɛ)l(b)-—rejected LII-2: 196. on account of Sabellian data—per Grassmann’s rule?).
> *-bzda (post-Mycenaean) > -βδά (loss of interconsonantal sibilant); there is no need to assume loss of -y- with Schwyzer (GG I: 475). With -ψά, on the other hand, we have δίψα (from Homer onwards, so Aeschylean διψή may be a younger form elicited by the verb διψήν24), but again the etymology is unknown. One gains the impression that postconsonantal *-syā develops through *-ṣā to -ṣā25, so that δίψα could as well go back to *dip-s-yā; Mycenaean di-pi-si-jo(-i): Dipsi(i) and di-pi-si-je-wi-jo: dipesiwion (adj. referring to oil, derived from *dipsieus ‘priest of the Dipsioi’?) do not answer the question. The -s- in the combination *-s-yā may be ‘desiderative’26.

Words with -ξά like δόξα, ἀμάξα, μύξα might go back to forms in *-kt-yā. A problem is caused by Mycenaean *Wanassa ‘Mistress’ (dat. du. wa-na-so-i), if simplification of *kt y to *ty (cf. fn. 9) is the regular development; this may appear very doubtful, however: διξάς ‘double’ (beside δισσός/διττός < *dikh-yaos, cf. διχά) is commonly explained as going back on *dikh-thyos (cf. διχάθα), with kh + s < th, and not simplification of kh-thy to i(h)ya. If *k(h)h(θ)y > ξ is the normal development, Mycenaean *wanassā must be a special case, probably due to the foreign origin of the word wanax, from which it is derived (note also the Doric name Φάνακες for the Dioscuri, without -t-). Nevertheless, -ξā need not in all instances derive from *-k(h)h(θ)yā: in the case of ἀμάξα, for instance, a development *ham-aks-yā > *hamaksā > ἀμάξα is likelier, to my mind, in view of ἀξ-ο(ν) (cf. Latin ax-is). Δόξα has been explained in several ways: < *dok-t-yā, or < *dok-sā (> δόξη; however, a doublet τδόξη/δόξη is not found), or, one might add, *dok-s-yā (‘desiderative’ s, cf. fn. 26); Leumann (1950: 173 ff.) suspects reinterpretation of δόξηn, originally the neuter participle of the aorist δόξαν in the expression παρά/ κατά δόξαν, as a feminine. Μύξα could be the result of either *muk-t-yā or *muk-s-yā (cf. Lat. mūc-us, with full grade *mouk- or *meuk-).

4. Without much ado, αίσα (Myc. a3-sa) and πείσα27 are derived from *ait-yā, *pʰeit(h)-yā in the handbooks. There are two options.

24 Διψά may have triggered the replacement of πείνα (Homer, Plato) by πείνα (Plato, Plutarch, etc.), ‘hunger’ and ‘thirst’ being semantically connected.


26 Cf. Chantraine 1933: 100. Desiderative -s- is best known from the sigmatic future.

27 With analogical π-, after præs. πείθω; the same analogical π- in aor. ἐπείθα, fut. πείθω, noun πίστις. As a matter of fact, alternation of voiceless stops as between aspirated (non-Grassmann context) and non-aspirated (Grassmann context) has been preserved only with θ/τ: nom. sg. θρίξ, gen. sg. τρίχος; act. aor. ἔθρεψα, fut. ἐθρέψω, noun ἄρμα, praes. ἄρμα, pass. aor. ἄρμάσσα, etc.
to explain the single -σ-, I believe: either \(^*_{t(h)}y\) after a diphthong developed in the same way as postconsonantal \(*_{t(h)}y\), or the development was \(*_{t(h)}y > *_{t}s > *ts > *ss\) (\(\text{Att. } ti\) > \(\sigma\) (\(\text{Att. } \tau\)) (simplification of a geminate after a diphthong, specifically). I think a case can be made for the second option, although there is not much to go on. However, it stands to reason that simplification of a geminate after a diphthong took place in αἰπόλος ‘goat-herd’: \(*\text{aig} + kw\text{olos} > *\text{aik}kw\text{olos}\) (assimilation) > \(*\text{aik}kw\text{olos}\) (simplification of \(kwkw\))\(^{28}\) > αἰπόλος. The same rationale may be assumed for παύλα: \(*\text{pau}-l-yā > *paullā > παύλα\). Hesitantly, I also propose simplification (of \(tt\)) in δίαιτα (\(*\text{diait}-yā*)—which makes it a word of Attic origin\(^{30}\), to be sure; some scholars, on the other hand, assume dissimilatory loss of \(\gamma\) (Chantraine 1933: 99 “peut-être de διαιτ ζα le γ étant dissimilé par les deux i précédents”), whereas others consider back formation from the verb διαιτάω/-ομαι (cf. \(\text{GEW} \text{s.v. } \text{δίαιτα}\)). Further evidence for simplification may be offered by λέυσσω (found in MSS, and in a few inscriptions) instead of λέυσσω; geminate -σσ- of λέυσσω\(^{31}\) may be, not the regular result of sound law, but due to analogical pressure, graphic or otherwise, exercised by the large group of -σσ- (Att. -ττ-) presents.

**Conclusion**

With the preceding phonological considerations, I hope to have made it plausible that not only the usual examples like τάλαινα, μοίρα, θύελλα, πάσα, participles like φέρουσα, στάσα, θείσα, δούα, etc. etc., but also (i) επιβδα, (ii) words ending in -ψά, -ξά, (iii) words like ἐχιδνα, and (iv) αἰσα, πείσα, παύλα, and δίαιτα, can all be accounted for within the framework of regular -γά derivatives: (i) loss of interconsonantal sibilant in βδ < \(*bdz < *bdz/bdz < *bdy\), (ii) postconsonantal \(\sigma < *s < *_{t(h)}y\) or \(*s\gamma\), (iii) postconsonantal \(\nu < *n < *ny\), and (iv) postdiphthongal simplification of a geminate.

\(^{28}\) \(kwkw > pp > \pi\) cannot be excluded; I feel, however, that simplification occurred rather early, whereas the change of labiovelars to labials/dentals is post-Mycenaean.

\(^{29}\) For the -I-, cf. αέλλα, θύελλα (§ 1).

\(^{30}\) Theoretically, one or two other dialects would qualify, \(i.a.\) Boeotian.

\(^{31}\) Λέυσσω is a poetic word in Attic, without a prose form λέυτ(τ)ω to match it. Oddly, the Arcadian inscriptions IG 5(2).3 and IG 5(2).16 offer examples of λέυτω (participles: λέυτων, λέυτοντες).
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