

F.M.J. WAANDERS
 Klassiek Seminarium
 Universiteit van Amsterdam

UDC 811.14'02'373.611

ΔΙΑΙΤΑ, A WAY OF LIFE

Abstract: With most feminine nouns and adjectives (in nom. sg.) -ᾶ the earlier presence of the suffix $*\text{-}^{\text{v}}\text{ā}$ is evident; in a number of further instances, however, the one-time presence of $*\text{-y-}$ 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 $*\text{-}^{\text{v}}\text{ā}$.

1. Greek feminine nouns and adjectives belonging to the first declension can be divided into two groups, (a) those ending in nom./acc. sg. -ᾶ(v) (Att. -ῆ(v), but -ᾶ(v) after ε, ι, ρ, ᾶ < αι; Ion. -ῆ(v)), and (b) those ending in nom./acc. sg. -ᾶ̃(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 stems¹.

It is the group (b) which concerns us here. Proto-Greek had a suffix -yā̃, corresponding with Sanskrit -ī. The Indo-European shape of this suffix was $*\text{-ih}_2$, which became -yā̃ in Greek²; apart from a small number of words (μίᾶ̃ < $*\text{sm-ih}_2$, πόντια³, probably Myc. *e-ru-mi-ni-ja: elumniai* ‘beams’, cf. Hesychius ἐλύμνιαι δοκοὶ

¹ In Sanskrit, we find instances of feminine -ī (gen. sg. -yāh, etc.) alongside masculines in -ah ($*\text{-o-s}$), e.g. *devī* ‘goddess’ ~ *devah* ‘god’, etc. (Another type has sigmatic nom. sg. -ī-h, gen. sg. Vedic -iyah, later -yāh, e.g. *vrkīh* ‘she-wolf’ ~ *vrkāh* ‘wolf’.) There are no Greek examples of $*\text{-yā̃}$ beside -ος, to my knowledge; be we do find -ίς (-ίδ-) beside -ος (e.g. Ἀχαϊῆδες ~ Ἀχαιοί, Δαρδανίδες ~ Δάρδανοι; see Meier 1975: 27, 36).

² Cf. Ruijgh (1987: 301 n. 14; 1988: 450): $*\text{-ih}_2 > *\text{-ih}_2^a > \text{-iā̃}$.

³ $*\text{pot-}$ + extension -n- (Chantraine 1933: 107); *po-ti-ni-ja* in Mycenaean.— In δέσποινα, there seems to be loss of -t-; the number of syllables may be responsible ($*\text{despotnyā}$ with $*\text{y} > *\text{desponyā}$ > δέσποινα, as against πόντια with i). The number of syllables is certainly decisive for the unwonted contraction in Attic νομηνία, ου (ō) < εο < ewo (as against ταχέος etc. with uncontracted εο < ewo), and perhaps also for -κλής < -κλέης < -κλέτης in compounded names (which, as a rule, count four syllables or more).

ὀροφῆναι⁴—note the recessive accent of ἐλύμναι, and nouns in -τρια⁵), -iǎ appears to have been replaced by -yǎ after the inflected forms gen. sg. -yās, dat. sg. -yāi etc., where the -y- is regular (< *yeh₂-os, *yeh₂-ei)⁶.

A few combinations of consonant + y may survive into Mycenaean Greek (ry, ly⁷; wy; I suppose also ny, though I have not found any clear example⁸), whereas other combinations have visibly changed by then (p^(h)y > pt; t^(h)y > šš or ss⁹; 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 *-yǎ:

- -vǎ, -rǎ preceded by αι, οι, ē {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-; μοίρα < *smor-yǎ; Hom. κῦδιάνειρα < *-aner-yǎ; Αἴγινα < *Aig-in-yǎ (cf. αἴξι?); εὐθῦνα < *-un-yǎ, unless substituted for original εὐθῦνǎ¹⁰; etc.);

- -λλǎ < *-lyǎ (e.g. ἄελλα, θύελλα < *aw-el-yǎ¹¹, cf. ἄ(F)ησι, t^hu-el-yǎ, cf. θύειν);

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

⁵ -ti-ri-ja/-ti-ra₂ in Mycenaean (rather -triǎ than anything else; cf. Waanders 2005).—Cf., with extension -k-, the Latin suffix -tr-ī-c-, as in vic-trīx.

⁶ Except after ‘heavy bases’ (Sievers-Edgerton’s rule); usually, though, Sievers-Edgerton’s rule is violated in the case of -yǎ/-yā- 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)yo/l(i)yo [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 t^heranyǎ, 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 θεράπεινα 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 wanassǎ < *wanatyǎ, 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 εὐθῦνη in the MSS of Lysias. However, the long υ may plead for older *-un-yǎ.

¹¹ From a base *h₂wh₁-el-, likewise *thu-el-yǎ < *d^huH-el- (for *d^hewH-, see LIV²: 149 f.).

- -αιᾶ < (*-asyǎ—theoretically—or) -awyǎ (e.g. γραιᾶ, Myc. *ka-ra-wi-ja/ka-ra-u-ja* < *graw-yǎ/grau-yǎ cf. γραῦ-ς);
- -ειᾶ < *-esyǎ (e.g. Ἡριγένεια, Τριτογένεια < *-genes-yǎ) or *-ewyǎ (e.g. ταχεῖα < *t^hak^hew-yǎ¹²);
- -ῖᾶ in δῖα < *diw-yǎ* (derived from the name of Zeus), Mycenaean *di-wi-ja/di-u-ja* *Diwyǎ/ Diuyǎ*;
- -οιᾶ < (*-osyǎ—theoretically—or) *-owyǎ (e.g. Εὔβοια < *Ehu-g^wow-yǎ; perhaps Myc. *go-wi-ja* [dat. of] *G^wowyǎ*¹³ ‘Cow’, instead of the commonly assumed *G^wowyā*, or *g^wowyā*, see *DMic. s.v.*);
- -υιᾶ < *-usyǎ (e.g. μυῖα < *mus-yǎ, cf. Lat. *mus-ca* etc.; perfect participles in -υῖα < *-us-yǎ, Myc. *-u-ja: a-ra-ru-ja,]dē-di-ku-ja*¹⁴, with zero grade -us- beside masculine/neuter stems in -wos-: -ὠς, -ὄς¹⁵);
- -σᾶ (Att. -τᾶ) with intervocalic σσ/ττ < *-t^(h)yǎ (e.g. μέλισσα/μέλιττα < *melit-yǎ; and the feminine forms of -(F)εντ- adjectives in -εσσα, Myc. *-we-sa: -wessǎ*, with -e-analogically after the full grade in m./n. -went-, for -wassǎ < *-wnt-yǎ), or *-k^(h)yǎ (e.g. ἡσσα/ἡττα < *hēk-yǎ¹⁶; *vāssa/vātta/vḥssa/vḥtta* may derive from the verbal stem *vāχ-* ‘swim’, i.e. < *snāk^h-yǎ, rather than being cognate with Latin *anas* etc.; Myc. *su-za* probably σῦσσα, Ruijgh 1985: 52), or *-k^w(^h)yǎ (e.g. ὄσσα < *wok^w-yǎ);
- the numerous feminine participles ending in -vǎ < *-nt-yǎ, with postconsonantal σ < *ty (-vσ- preserved in, a.o., Arcadian¹⁷; Att. -Ion. and other dialects -āσᾶ, -ēσᾶ, -ōσᾶ, -ūσᾶ with loss of -v- and compensatory lengthening; Lesbian -αισᾶ etc.)¹⁸
- -ζᾶ < *-dyǎ (e.g. ἀργυρόπεζα < *-ped-yǎ; Myc. *to-pe-za, we-pe-za, e-ne-wo-pe-za: torpedzǎ, w^hespedzǎ, enewopedzǎ* (or -džǎ)), 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. Ἡριγένεια, Ἡφιγένεια, Ξανθίπη, etc.

¹⁴ A specialized sense of δεικνυμι, ‘instruct’, seems acceptable to me. Alternatively, scholars assume scribal error: *de-di-<da>-ku-ja*, from διδάσκειω.

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. -ὄς untouched—m. -ὠς, actually also the old form, could be reinterpreted as underlyingly /-ōts/).

¹⁶ Back formation from ἡτᾶσθαι, according to Wackernagel; I am not so sure.

¹⁷ -ns- is also assumed for Mycenaean (*o-pe-ro-sa: op^hēlonsǎ* or *op^helonsǎ*), although the spelling rules do not allow to prove the presence of *n* before *s*.

¹⁸ Athematic forms in -ασᾶ occur in some dialects, e.g. Myc. *a-pe-a-sa* nom. pl. *ap-ehassai*, with -ehassǎ < *-h₁ḡt-ih₂.

*-*gyǎ* (e.g. μάζα/μάζǎ < **mag-yǎ*¹⁹; φύζǎ < **p^hug-yǎ*; probably Myc. *a₃-za aī^dzzα*, Ruijgh 1985: 54).

A number of femines in -ǎ obviously resist interpretation as original -*yǎ* derivatives, namely those where -ǎ is preceded by β²⁰ (: πρέσβǎ), θ (: ἄκανθα), μ²¹ (e.g. τόλμǎ; Att., apparently replacing *τόλμη; Pindar has τόλμᾶ²²), φ (a number of words in Hesychius: κέρκαφα· ἐγγύη²³, λαίφα· ἀσπίς, σείφα· σκοτία), χ (again some Hesychian glosses: ἀσκόλαχα· ἀσκαλαβότης, ὕρραχα· πρίσχη). I have not found any examples of femines ending in -*yǎ*, -*kǎ*, -*πǎ*, which if they occurred would also be excluded as candidates for the group with suffix *-*yǎ*.

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

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

¹⁹ The long *α* 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 *большой* etc.). 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^m* (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 **py* > πτ), whereas **g^mv* first became **gy*, which developed along the same lines as original **g^v* (> ζ). The very few *rod*-presents from verb stems in (usually recent) β have πτ, e.g. βλάπτω ~ βλάβη (**mag^m*-? Cretan has forms with βλοπ, the π whereof is commonly considered to be more original, viz. the reflex of PIE **k^m*. cf. Skt *marcāyati* ‘damages’, *mrktāh* ‘damaged’ etc.. PIE root **merk^m*—cf. Lejeune 1972: 67, 79 n. § 68-6); note that *v*β- (cf. χέρνιβον) < **nig^m*- has an old present *v*ίζω (with ζ < **g^v* < **g^mv* according to sound law), eventually rivalled by analogical *v*ίπω.

²¹ **my* develops into *ny*, as in **g^mam-vō* > **g^manyō* > βαίνω, **k^hlam-yǎ* > **k^hlanyǎ* > χλαίνα (cf. χλαμ-ύς).

²² Cf. *GG* I: 476.

²³ The semantics of κέρκαφα allows us to suspect a neuter plural (< **χέρ-χαφ-*, cf. χείρ and Latin *habere* < **g^hh₁(e)bh-*?—rejected *LII*²: 196. on account of Sabellian data—*per* Grassmann’s rule?).

> *-*bzdǎ* (post-Mycenaean) > -βδǎ (loss of interconsonantal sibilant); there is no need to assume loss of -*y*- with Schwyzer (*GG* I: 475). With -ψǎ, on the other hand, we have δίψǎ (from Homer onwards, so Aeschylean δίψη may be a younger form elicited by the verb διψήν²⁴), but again the etymology is unknown. One gains the impression that postconsonantal *-*syǎ* develops through *-*šǎ* to -σǎ²⁵, so that δίψǎ could as well go back to **dip-s-yǎ*; Mycenaean *di-pi-si-jo(-i)*: *Dipsioi(hi)* and *di-pi-si-je-wi-jo*: *dipsiēwion* (adj. referring to oil, derived from **dipsieus* ‘priest of the Dipsioi’?) do not answer the question. The -*s*- in the combination *-*s-y*- may be ‘desiderative’²⁶.

Words with -ξǎ like δόξǎ, ἄμαξα, μύξǎ might go back to forms in *-*kt-yǎ*. 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: διξός ‘double’ (beside δισός/διττός < **dikh-yos*, cf. δίχα) is commonly explained as going back on **dikh^h-yos* (cf. δίχα), with *k^h* + *s* < *t^h**y*, and not simplification of *k^ht^hy* to *t^hy*. If **k^(h)t^(h)y* > ξ is the normal development, Mycenaean **wanassǎ* 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 -τ-). Nevertheless, -ξǎ need not in *all* instances derive from *-*k^(h)t^(h)yǎ*: in the case of ἄμαξα, for instance, a development **ham-aks-yǎ* > **hamaksǎ* > ἄμαξα is likelier, to my mind, in view of ἄξ-ων (cf. Latin *ax-is*). Δόξǎ has been explained in several ways: < **dok-t-yǎ*, or < **dok-sǎ* (→ δόξǎ; however, a doublet †δόξǎ/δόξη is not found), or, one might add, **dok-s-yǎ* (‘desiderative’ *s*, cf. fn. 26); Leumann (1950: 173 ff.) suspects reinterpretation of δόξαν, originally the neuter participle of the aorist δόξαι in the expression *παρὰ/κατὰ δόξαν*, as a feminine. Μύξǎ could be the result of either **muk-t-yǎ* or **muk-s-yǎ* (cf. Lat. *mūc-us*, with full grade **mouk-* or **meuk-*).

4. Without much ado, αἶσα (Myc. *a₃-sa*) and πείσα²⁷ are derived from **ait-yǎ*, **p^hei^h-yǎ* in the handbooks. There are two options

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

²⁵ Cf. ἔχιδνα, probably with **nyǎ* > **ñǎ* > -νǎ. Cf. Chantraine 1933: 109. Differently *GG* I: 475 (“Spurlos geschwunden ist *j* ...”)

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

²⁷ With analogical π-, after praes. πείθω; the same analogical π- in aor. ἔπεισα, fut. πείσω, 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. τριχός; act. aor. ἔθρεψα, fut. θρέψω, noun θρέμμα, praes. τρέφω, pass. aor. ἐτράφην, 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 $*t^{(h)}y > *t\check{s} > *ts > *ss$ (*Att. *tt*) > σ (*Att. τ) (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’: $*aig+k^wolos > *aik^wk^wolos$ (assimilation) > $*aik^wolos$ (simplification of k^wk^w)²⁸ > αἰπόλος. The same rationale may be assumed for παῦλα: $*pau-l-y\check{a}$ ²⁹ > $*paull\check{a}$ > παῦλα. Hesitantly, I also propose simplification (of *tt*) in δίαίτα ($*diait-y\check{a}$)—which makes it a word of Attic origin³⁰, to be sure; some scholars, on the other hand, assume dissimilatory loss of *y* (Chantraine 1933: 99 “peut-être de διαιτ²α le *y* étant dissimilé par les deux *i* précédents”), whereas others consider back formation from the verb διαιτάω/-ομαι (cf. *GEW* s.v. δίαίτα). Further evidence for simplification may be offered by λεύσω (found in MSS, and in a few inscriptions) instead of λεύσσω; geminate -σσ- of λεύσσω³¹ 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, μοῖρα, θύελλα, πάσα, participles like φέρουσα, στάσα, θεῖσα, δοῦα, etc. etc., but also (i) ἔπιβδα, (ii) words ending in -ψᾶ, -ξᾶ, (iii) words like ἔχιδνα, and (iv) αἶσα, πεῖσα, παῦλα, and δίαίτα, can all be accounted for within the framework of regular -*y* derivatives: (i) loss of interconsonantal sibilant in $\beta\delta < *bzd < *bdz/bd\check{z} < *bdy$, (ii) postconsonantal $\sigma < *s\check{s} < *t^{(h)}y$ or $*sy$, (iii) postconsonantal $v < *ñ < *ny$, and (iv) postdiphthongal simplification of a geminate.

²⁸ $k^wk^w > pp > \pi$ 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 -*l*-, cf. ἄελλα, θύελλα (§ 1).

³⁰ Theoretically, one or two other dialects would qualify, *i.a.* Boeotian.

³¹ Λεύσσω is a poetic word in Attic, without a prose form λεύτ(τ)ω to match it. Oddly, the Arcadian inscriptions *IG* 5(2).3 and *IG* 5(2).16 offer examples of λεύτω (participles: λεύτῶν, λεύτοντες).

References

- Burrow, T. 1973. *The Sanskrit Language*. New and revised edition (London: Faber and Faber).
- Chantraine, P. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris: Klincksieck).
- DMic. = *Diccionario micénico*, redactado por F.A. Aura Jorro bajo la dirección de F.R. Adrados. 2 vols (Madrid 1985, 1993: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas).
- GEW = Frisk, Hj.. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3 vols (Heidelberg 1960, 1970, 1972: Winter).
- GG I = Schwyzler, E. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik*. Erster Band: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion (München: Beck).
- Lejeune, M. 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien* (Paris: Klincksieck).
- Leumann, M. 1950. *Homerische Wörter* (Basel: Reinhardt).
- LIV²: *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix (Wiesbaden 2001: Reichert).
- Meier, M. 1975. *-ιδ-*. *Zur Geschichte eines griechischen Nominalsuffixes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Ruijgh, C.J. 1985. Problèmes de philologie mycénienne. *Minos* 19, 105-167 [= 1996, 43-105].
- 1987. *da-ma/du-ma δάμαρ/δύμαρ* et l'abréviation *DA*, notamment en PY En 609.1. In: Ilievski, P.Hr., Crepajac, Lj. (eds), *Tractata Mycenaea*. Proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, Held in Ohrid, 15–20 September 1985 (Skopje: The Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts), 299-322 [= 1996, 123-146].
- 1988. Observations sur les traitements des laryngales en grec préhistorique. In: Bammesberger, A. (Hrsg.), *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems* (Heidelberg: Winter), 443-469 [= 1996, 308-334].
- 1996. *Scripta Minora ad linguam Graecam pertinentia*. Volumen secundum. Edenda curaverunt A. Rijksbaron, F.M.J. Waanders (Amsterdam: Gieben).
- Ruipérez, M.S. 1956. Une charte royale de partage des terres à Pylos. *Minos* 4, 146-164.
- Waanders, F.M.J. 2005. *Liquid Dilemmas*. In: [Acta Austin 2000].